UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

VOLUME 111—PART 5

MARCH 24, 1965, TO APRIL 6, 1965
(PAGES 5727 TO 7200)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1965

J
11
.R
v.111
pt.5

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record
United States of America
PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 24, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this word of prophetic vision from Revelations 21: 1: *And I saw a new heaven and a new earth.*

Eternal God, we penitently confess that we are living in a difficult and desperate time when many areas of the world seem to be swept clean of any of the footprints of Thy divine sovereignty and there seems to be a letdown of lofty ideals and principles.

Despite the darkness and shadows may we believe in Thy omnipotence, with keeping and control over all men and nations and that the final victory for the forces of righteousness and love is sure and inevitable.

Inspire us to enter upon each day with new hopes and expectations, new desire and determinations. Show us how we may help to organize good will among men and may we be filled with a sense of something splendid impending when there shall come into the heart of humanity a moral and spiritual pressure constraining it to live by a greater faith in Thee and by the power of righteousness and love.

In Christ's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

BRADFORD COUNTY STRAWBERRY DAY

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, today is Bradford County Strawberry Day on Capitol Hill.

Our lovely Strawberry Queen, Miss Jane Adams, of Starke, Fla., is in Washington, D.C., and she has directed that each of my colleagues receive one pint of these succulent berries. Her majesty's order will be obeyed.

Mr. Speaker, I propose a toast to the Bradford County, Fla., strawberry:

Let's drink this cup
To a berry made up
Of delectableness alone—
A berry of its kindred clan
The seeming paragon.
To whom Florida's elements
And better stars have given
A taste so rare that it is true
'Tis less of Earth than Heaven!

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 46]

Ashley
Bonner
Clark
Cooley
Dent
Dickinson
Diggs
Ellsworth
Everett
Frelinghuysen
Hall
Hébert
Howard
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Kluczynski
McFall
McMillan
Miller
O'Neal, Ga.
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Rivers, Alaska
Rogers, Tex.
Roosevelt
Toll
Weltner
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 403 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means have until midnight next Monday, March 29, 1965, to file a report, including any supplemental or minority views, to accompany H.R. 6675.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2362, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 285 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 285

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed six hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and, pending that, I yield myself 9 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 285 provides for consideration of H.R. 2362, a bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. The resolution provides an open rule with 6 hours of general debate, making it in order to consider the committee substitute as an original bill.

The purpose of H.R. 2362 is to meet a national problem. This national problem is reflected in draft rejection rates because of basic educational deficiencies. It is evidenced by the employment and manpower retraining problems aggravated by the fact that there are over 8 million adults who have completed less than 5 years of school. It is seen in the 20-percent unemployment rate of our 18- to 24-year-olds. It is voiced by our institutions of higher learning and our vocational and technical educators who have the task of building on elementary and secondary education foundations which are of varying quality and adequacy.

The solution to these problems lies in the ability of our local elementary and secondary school systems to provide full opportunity for a high-quality program of instruction in the basic educational skills because of the strong correlation between educational underachievement and poverty. Toward this solution, it is important that our total capabilities in education be brought to bear, including the best available personnel and techniques, and a maximum use of modern instructional technology.

The problems would be solved to some extent by the passage of H.R. 2362.

Title I, education of children of low income families—fiscal year 1966, approximately $1.06 billion—is designed to encourage and support the establishment, expansion, and improvement of special programs, including the construction of school facilities where needed, to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children of low-income families. Public schools would be eligible for payments for programs designed to meet the special educational needs of children in school attendance areas having high concentrations of disadvantaged children. In these areas, the school district would design special educational services and arrangements, including those in which all children in need of such services could participate. These special programs include dual enrollment—shared services—arrangements, educational radio and television, mobile educational services and equipment, remedial education, preschool or afterschool programs, additional instructional personnel, equipment and facilities, and others judged necessary for improving the education of disadvantaged children. Local educational agencies would be eligible for payment equal to one-half the average per pupil expenditure in that State multiplied by first, the number of children—aged 5 to 17—in families having an annual income of less than $2,000; and, second, the number of children in families receiving payments over $2,000 under the programs of aid to families with dependent children. For the second and third year Congress would determine the "low income factor." Federal funds made available under this title would be used essentially for improving the education of educationally deprived students. State and local educational effort must also be maintained.

Title II, school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials—fiscal year 1966, $100 million—provides for a 5-year program to make available for the use of schoolchildren school library resources and other printed and published instructional materials including textbooks essential to improved educational quality in the schools of the Nation. A State plan would provide for a method of making available books, periodicals, documents, audiovisual materials, and other printed and published materials for the use of all schoolchildren in the State. Title to all of these materials and control and administration of their use would be vested only in a public agency.

Materials purchased with Federal funds would not be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship and when made available for the use of students in nonpublic schools would be the same as those used or approved for use in the public schools of the State.

Title III, supplementary educational centers and services—fiscal year 1966, $100 million—proposed a 5-year program to provide vitally needed educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality in elementary and secondary schools and to develop and establish exemplary elementary and secondary school educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs. Special personnel, equipment, and other costly educational services not normally available in most schools would be made available in centers for the widest possible participation of the entire community.

Title IV, educational research and training; Cooperative Research Act—fiscal year 1966, $45 million—authorizes the training of research personnel and improved dissemination of information derived from educational research development. Authority would be granted to utilize the research competence of research organizations not now eligible to contribute to the program, such as private noncollegiate research organizations and professional associations. In addition, the program would provide for the construction and operation of research facilities—such as those now at Pittsburgh, Oregon, Harvard, and Wisconsin, operating under funds from the Cooperative Research Act—to improve the quality of teaching in our schools and for the purchase of research equipment.

Title V, State departments of education—fiscal year 1966, $25 million—proposes a 5-year program to stimulate and assist in strengthening the leadership resources of State educational agencies. The State educational agency would identify educational needs of the State and design programs to meet these needs. Grants would be made to States on the basis of the relative public school population.

Title VI, the final title, has to do with definitions and certain limitations which will be discussed by the committee.

Mr. Speaker, this is a tremendously important piece of legislation. It deals, it seems to me, with the most basic problem with which our country is faced if we are to meet the problems of poverty and underemployment in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to make one comment with reference to a number of questions which have been raised recently by some of my colleagues dealing with the question of an open rule. I want to reiterate that this is an open rule. There are a number of communications having to do with the plea that this bill be passed exactly as now written. I should like to say quite frankly, as I have said to some of my colleagues, that so far as the Committee on Rules is concerned we have done our job. We have brought you an open rule, and it is up to the House to consider the amendments which will be offered. I, for one, expect to support amendments if I feel they will strengthen this piece of legislation because I have confidence in the membership of this House and I also have great confidence in the Committee on Education and Labor, but I feel that nothing is so good that it could not be better.

So I say in conclusion that this is an open rule. As we discuss this bill and as it is read there will be full and open opportunity for such amendments as may be offered and there will be the opportunity to support or oppose them as Members see fit.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, my colleague on the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK], has explained this rule and there is no necessity for me to repeat that explanation. Instead I would like to discuss for a few minutes, the legislation that is now before us.

We held hearings in the Committee on Rules for some 4 or 5 days on this bill, rather extensive hearings. We heard testimony from both proponents and opponents, all members of the great Committee on Education and Labor.

Perhaps in the very beginning I should say that all of us recognize that there are a great many problems confronting the educational institutions of this country. Both the States and the local school districts have problems, some of which are most difficult to solve.

Perhaps the prime question involved in this legislation, certainly one of the most important pieces of legislation to come before this House in many years, is whether, for the first time, the Congress is going to, by enactment of a law, embark upon a program of Federal aid to local and State educational systems in the elementary and secondary fields. Shall we retain, as we have from the very founding of this Republic, the present system of schools, both public and private, under the control of the people in the communities and in the States of the Nation rather than in the Federal Government?

Mr. Speaker, I have read and studied this legislation. This bill is one of the most dangerous measures that has come before us in my time. As one reads the provisions of this bill, as one applies what knowledge one may have gained from experience with other programs of a Federal nature, with other embarkations that we have made upon new activities in the field of Federal-State-local relations, one becomes convinced that sooner or later Federal bureaucracy under this legislation, unless it is greatly amended as the gentleman from California [Mr. SISK] suggested it may be amended, we shall have bureaucratic control from Washington that will take away from present school officials, boards of education, State and local, and educators, State and local, the power and authority, the rights and duties which they now have to direct, regulate, and administer education at the State and local level. This legislation will make one man at the head of the great bureaucracy all powerful, able to have his own way, to say, "You must do it this way or I will move in and do something else."

Mr. Speaker, I know the Members will be told in debate that this is not so, that this is not the intent and the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to challenge the intent and purpose of the members of the Committee on Education and Labor or the Members of the House who support this legislation. But I do challenge their wisdom in believing that when we give authority, as this legislation gives authority, to any bureaucrat in Washington to fix the criteria that a State or local district must meet, or to make his own policy, that we have placed the power of control in the hands of Federal bureaucracy. Mr. Speaker, as the years come and go that control grows stronger, more stringent year after year, until State and local controls will disappear entirely and we will have a Federal system of education.

Mr. Speaker, as I read this bill it provides for the expenditure of around $1.33 billion for the first year. A little of this authorization runs over into the next year.

One of the things that the bill provides in title I is a formula, presumably to help poor children in school districts where the income of the families is low—$2,000 a year or less. Yet, rather strangely, believe it or not, rather peculiarly and strangely, under the formula, title I, which provides for the expenditure of $1.06 billion the first year, presumably to help poverty-stricken children in areas where the schools are inadequate and the educational facilities meager, provides that some of the richest counties in the United States would receive more in the form of Federal aid for their schools than would the poorest counties in the United States. The money will not go to assist poverty-stricken children, but instead go in large amounts to some of the school districts in the United States, for instance, a county near Washington—Montgomery County, Md.—where funds are not needed and should not be allocated. This bill permits such expenditures at the expense of poverty-stricken school districts.

I would like to take a moment to discuss some of the powers that the Commissioner of Education has under the bill. In title I, the $1.06 billion title, he has the right to decide whether a State or local educational plan meets his criteria. What criteria? The criteria that he determines. The funds for that State or school district would be frozen until the school district or school officials comply with his order. Judicial review is provided in this particular title, but the law also provides—read it if you do not believe me—that once the Commissioner establishes his criteria, his own criteria at his own discretion, and the plan has failed to conform, the State or local school board must either accede to his criteria or receive no funds whatsoever under this section. That is just one example of the dictatorial powers of the Commissioner of Education.

The same thing applies to a certain extent under title II. The Commissioner is authorized to enter into arrangements directly with schools, private or public, for the distribution of funds for library books and other materials. He decides that himself. The bureaucrats down here in Washington who have no responsibility to anyone except the appointing officer have control. The Commissioner has almost unlimited power in the distribution of these funds. He is authorized to make grants—gifts—to a local agency on terms and conditions that he himself determines. Nobody else sets them up. The Commissioner can deal directly with the local school people and bypass the State Educational Commissioner. The State would have no authority over any installation set up under this title II. While the programs originate at the local level, only those plans which meet the Commissioner's criteria would be approved and, once set up, such educational centers will not be under the control of the State authorities.

There goes State control right out the window, and in comes Federal control. The Commissioner can do anything he pleases with facilities of this type.

Under title IV the same situation exists. The Commissioner can make research grants to nonprofit organizations, or individuals, or anyone he choses. I do not know what a nonprofit individual is, but you may have some in your district. He can give them whatever he decides in his judgment and in his discretion. Those left out are just simply left out. He is the master. It is his mind that controls.

I want to mention one other thing quickly before I run out of time. He is going to have help. Already there are 266—I want you to get this, please—266 advisory commissions in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, over 100 of them, if you please, in the Office of Education under the Commissioner. What do these advisory commissions do? Well, they advise somebody, including the Commissioner. What do they get for it? Just $100 a day for each day they are advising, plus their travel time, plus any expenses they may have. And the membership? Anywhere from 16 to 26 on each commission.

What are they going to do? Are they going to disagree with the man that appoints them, or are they going to tell him he is about right on everything he wants to do? We know, all of us know that it is going to make a wonderful propaganda force throughout this country aimed at the schoolteachers of this Nation. The advisory commissions will say this is a wonderful program and the Commissioner is a great fellow, and we ought to let the Federal Government take over control of our schools.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we apparently have come to the end of the road so far as local control over our education in public facilities is concerned. I abhor that. There is nothing dearer to the American home than the neighborhood school, where you have your PTA and your different organizations, and all take a vital interest in the school and have some control of it. I hate to see that tradition destroyed and that control removed from the little neighborhood in the country and located in the bureaucracy of Washington, but I think I see the handwriting on the wall. This is the great day that the bureaucrats in the Education Department have looked forward to and have fought for for a good many years.

There are several features that I would like to discuss and will probably discuss during the debate under the 5-minute rule, because there are several basic defects in this legislation, many of which the gentleman from Ohio has so eloquently referred to. This bill, if we must have this crown of thorns placed upon the heads of the mothers and local people, let us clean it up a little bit, just a little bit.

I will take the remaining few minutes I have to talk about one of those things that really ought to be corrected. You know, this bill got its steam out of the hysteria that is going on now relative to the minority race. They are the ones they say need education in order to put them on a basis of first-class citizenship. They, unfortunately, in great numbers, have been born and raised in poverty, necessary poverty, in the Southern States.

Now we see great armies of well-meaning people who want to help those folks. We see them invading the South, marching as Sherman's army marched to the sea 100 years ago. I wonder what their real purposes are? I wonder why ministers of the gospel should desert their flocks and go tramping through the mud on the second Sherman march through the South.

But the defect in this bill—the one major defect lies in the formula that has been rigged up by which this money is to be distributed to the schools. We were told, and the papers told us, and the President told us that we were going to spread this money around where it would help the lower income people.

Now let me tell you briefly because, unfortunately, I do not have the time to go into it deeply, but there will be an amendment offered on the floor to take care of this. That amendment will be offered by a Member of Congress whom I consider to be one of the most knowledgeable persons and the most enthusiastic person in favor of Federal aid for schools and one who I think has done as much for it as any Member who has ever sat in this House of Representatives. That formula in this bill provides that this money shall be distributed in the States where they have people with incomes less than $2,000. The basis upon which it is distributed—and here comes the little hook in it—shall be upon the amount of dollars that they now spend per child for education. That is, the better off the schools in a State are, the more of this money they will get, and the poorer off they are the less they get.

If a rich State is doing fine and has a fine school system and is spending a lot of money on schools—two or three times as much as the States that have hordes of these people—they get paid according to the amount of dollars per child spent for education.

The results of that little scheme is that the richer people are in the State and the less need they have for this, the more dollars per pupil they are going to get out of this bundle—and it is a fat bundle too for the first year—and it will be fatter for the second year as all of these things are.

If you pass this bill with this formula, those of you who favor the whole kit and caboodle are going to do a tremendous harm to the cause that you say you are trying to help because you are giving the bulk of the money to States which do not need it.

You can look at publications now in existence that show you just exactly how much each State is going to get and how much they are spending for education. The State that is spending three times as much for education per pupil—States that are spending a dollar, a dollar and twenty-five cents, or a dollar and fifty cents—will be getting three times as much per pupil for educating the rich as you are going to give to educate the poor in some other States which is not what you claim you are going to do when you cooked up this mess of hash.

I hope the Members of this body will get around and inform themselves as to what is in the bill.

I have merely cited one example of great wrong being done. If Members knew this bill they would not vote for that wrong.

I hope that we will get down to pure reason as to what you are about to put on the country, because you are not doing the things it was advertised we were setting out to do. Unless we do, we will not help very much those people about whom the tears are being shed in the mud in the great march through Alabama.

I appeal to you.

I know a great many of you want to do the right thing, but I also know, from long experience, that many of the Members of this House will never read that bill. I know from long experience that many Members of this House will avoid sitting here and listening to the discussion—and there will be ample discussion of this bill, because the Rules Committee gave 6 hours of general debate. I do not see a quorum in this Chamber now, though the discussion has barely started.

Yet, the bells will ring and Members will trek over from their offices. Some of those Members perhaps will not have listened to a word of the debate about this bill, but they will trek over from their offices, come to the doors on either side of the aisle, and ask an attendant on the floor, "How should I vote?"

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I have just received the following telegram from the American Farm Bureau Federation:

Hon. Watkins M. Abbitt,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Tremendous progress being made in improving our system of public education through State and local efforts. Passage H.R. 2362 first step toward eventual Federal control public education. Legislation gives unprecedented authority to Administrator without judicial review. Urge you vote against this proposal.

John C. Lynn,
Legislative Director, American Farm Bureau Federation.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I believe the gentleman from Virginia has made an excellent suggestion.

I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 47]

Anderson, Tenn.
Ashley
Bonner
Dent
Dickinson
Diggs
Everett
Evins
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Hall
Hébert
Holland
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
McFall
McMillan
Mailliard
Morrison
Pepper
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roosevelt
Toll
Weltner
Whitten
Wilson, Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 401 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, there is agreement on both sides of the aisles, and in the country, on the need for our society to spend more money in the field of education. The issue before us today is just how do we most effectively do this? One alternative is going to be presented to the House under this bill, which is the technique of using essentially the Federal income tax as a means of collecting revenues from the people and through the structure of the Federal Government sending it back to the States and communities for expenditure under Federal guidelines.

There is another way of doing this, in my judgment, that is preferable. That is to follow the tax policy which has been established in this country over a period of many years, not to tax the income that is being spent for a social purpose for which otherwise the Government would be asked to spend the money. That is the reason for the personal exemption we have in our Federal income tax for children, $600. That is the reason we have a a 20-percent deduction for donations to churches and other charitable organizations. This is the reason we do not tax income from municipal bonds, bonds that are used to build schools and other community facilities.

The unfortunate thing is that this House itself under the rule that we are now considering will have no opportunity of exercising its judgment over probably the most crucial issue involved in aid to education, that issue being, and I repeat, which of two alternatives should we take. This one alternative of using the Federal income tax to collect the money from the people and then, again through the Federal mechanism, distribute it back to the States and the communities where the money will be spent? Or the other alternative presented in the bill Congressman Ayres, Congressman Goodell and myself have introduced to have the Federal Government abstain from taking through taxation moneys spent on education by parents and local communities.

The reason this is so is that the tax reduction approach, or using a tax credit cannot be considered by the House under the rule we are debating. This is so for a practical reason as well, that the Committee on Ways and Means has not held hearings on the tax effect of the education incentive bill I have introduced.

This is not new theory, by the way, for two committees of the House to consider the same measure. The highway bill was very properly handled by referring it to the Committee on Public Works for considering the road-building aspect of it and to the Committee on Ways and Means for considering the fiscal aspect of it. So this could be done and should be done in the education bill. Let the tax credit portion be studied by Ways and Means and the Federal expenditure aspects be studied by the Labor and Education Committee.

I point out that the Ribicoff bill, to assist financing higher education with a tax credit to those who spent the money for this purpose was offered as an amendment in the Senate to the tax reduction bill of 1964. The Ribicoff bill, or Ribicoff-Curtis bill—because I introduced legislation along these lines many years ago—is part of the education incentive bill. If we are going to talk in terms of reducing taxes by $2 billion in excises this year, and I have argued that we should reduce excise taxes, and feel very strongly we should, nonetheless I think we should give priority to tax reduction in the amount of $2 to $3 billion for money that is being spent for education by the parents and the people within the communities and the school districts which my bill does. This tax reduction approach avoids the problems we have involved in this question of Federal control. It avoids the problems that exist in this very delicate matter of church-state relations.

I might add it is a much more efficient manner of spending the money because we are certain the money actually goes for education.

It is very interesting to me that the tax that has come under the most criticism since World War II is the Federal income tax. So much has it become a burden upon our economy that this administration, and I applaud it, finally told the Congress we had to lower it because it was impeding economic growth. Now let us not pile more Federal expenditure on this tax that we recognize is already too high. Let us reduce it further and use as our guidelines in reducing personal and local expenditures for education. The taxes that have responded the most efficiently since World War II interestingly enough have been the property tax and the State transactions taxes. If we would only relieve some of the burden on our States and communities which we impose through the Federal tax mechanism and the superstructure of the Federal bureaucracy, we would be in a position of having the communities and the parents who are Federal taxpayers have these moneys and be able to spend more for education.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken the floor today and I have gone before the Committee on Rules to urge that this matter be held up so that the bill which presents this other alternative, the tax credit approach, be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means for study.

I am satisfied that the best way for us to proceed here would be, and I hope this will come about after a sufficient debate is held, for the House to realize the seriousness of this and to refer this expenditure bill back to the committee and then the matter of tax reduction can be referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. Then we can come in here and have an opportunity to render a congressional judgment of this most major question of which way is the best way to go to improve the educational system in our society. I am satisfied that keeping expenditures in the local communities in the hands that also have the responsibility for raising the revenues is the better.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN], a member of the committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, reminds me of the father who called in the young man who was dating his daughter and asked him if his intentions were honorable or if he was operating under false pretenses.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, if it becomes law, will operate under false pretenses because title II of this bill states:

> To provide financial assistance (as set forth in this title) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families. * * *

Now the only relationship to low-income families is in a so-called formula to devise ways and means for distribution of this $1,060 million under title I to the various States. Beyond that there is no relationship to the low-income families.

This is a general aid to education bill and we are embarking upon a new road, on a new path, on a complete change in the policy of our government both at the Federal and State level and at local levels in the field of education. Because here for the first time we are getting into elementary and secondary school problems and the situations that exist there. But beyond that we are getting into the private schools, the church and state issue, in this bill now before this body.

The church and state issue is paramount all the way through the consideration of this bill.

Let me tell you about the scope of this bill, and I quote from section 205:

> (a) A local educational agency may receive a basic grant or a special incentive grant under this title for any fiscal year only upon application therefore approved by the appropriate State educational agency, upon its determination (consistent with such basic criteria as the Commissioner may establish).

Those are only a few words, but when you put the approval of these programs in the hands of the Commissioner here in Washington to set up the criteria, he is going to have complete power of approval over our educational system in this country.

Paragraph (1) that immediately follows this says:

> That payments under this title will be used for programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment and where necessary the construction of school facilities).

Now let us look at the definition of the word "equipment." On page 141, title VI, you will find the definition and it will show you how extensive and far-reaching this bill is.

> (d) The term "equipment" includes machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them, and includes all other items necessary for the functioning of a particular facility as a facility for the provision of educational services, including items such as instructional equipment and necessary furniture, printed, published, and audiovisual instructional materials, and books, periodicals, documents, and other related materials.

Mr. Speaker, this is all inclusive. It would allow the money to be spent in almost any field so declared by the Commissioner of Education to fall within his criteria.

There is one other point I wish to make. Is this legislation sound public policy?

This is a $1.3 billion bill. We are now operating on borrowed money. This body had to appropriate last year an additional $400 million to take care of the interest alone on our national debt, above that appropriated the year before; and it is expected we will have to appropriate this year at least $500 million more than the appropriation a year ago just to take care of the interest. The figure last year was $11.4 billion, the second highest of our total expenditures.

This is another $1.3 billion to come from what source? It must come from borrowed money. That is the only place it can come from, since we do not have a balanced budget.

Yesterday, the Ways and Means Committee reported a medical-care bill which, according to the press of this morning, is going to cost $6 billion in the year 1967, when it will first come into operation.

The young people, the people in our elementary and secondary schools today, are the ones who will have to suffer from the fiscal irresponsibility of our Federal Government today, because we are compounding the problems of these young people for future years, when they will take over the operation of this country, by increasing debt and increasing interest charges. We compound the problems they will have to solve.

This bill will not assist in solving the problems in the field of education. I hope that it will be rejected by the House.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time on this side to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I believe it should be abundantly clear that this House, today and tomorrow, when it deals with the subject matter of this legislation, H.R. 2362, is going to be dealing with one of the hardiest perennials in the whole flower garden of programs involving Federal aid.

I believe history will bear me out that it was 95 years ago, way back in 1870, that the first bill for Federal aid to education was introduced in the Congress of the United States. A bill actually was passed in 1871 in this House. Since that time more than 1,000 bills have been introduced, all of them proposing that the Federal Government should involve itself in this field of education on the primary and secondary levels.

A few years ago, one of the most respected voices in all of American education, that of Dr. James Conant, was heard. He wrote a book called "The Child, the Parent, and the State." In it he made this statement:

> Federal appropriations of $5 billion a year or more would, of course, lead to growing Federal influence upon the schools.

I wonder if there is a single Member of this body today who believes in his heart that when this bill has been passed we will not be embarking upon a program which will very soon involve us in expenditures not only of that order of magnitude but of many billions of dollars in addition thereto.

Of course, the argument is the same today as it has always been, that the alternatives are between inadequate support of our schools, poor education, and having Federal aid. Yet I believe the gentleman from Missouri made it clear in his remarks a few minutes ago that this is not a debate between the friends of education and the foes of education. This is not a debate between those who would be cavalier in their regard of the educational needs of the young people of this country and those who would see an educated generation.

I for one believe as deeply as anyone possibly could in the utmost necessity of seeing additional funds channeled into education. I say this even though I am mindful of the tremendous job that American educators have accomplished during these difficult post-World War II years when they were coping with burgeoning school enrollments. I simply believe, however, that we can accomplish the objective of better education by a combination of grants and tax incentives in the form of tax credits to individual taxpayers rather than embarking upon a massive program of general Federal aid.

This is a very fundamental debate between those who think education is simply not a Federal function and those who do; between those who think it is something that constitutionally, historically, and traditionally has been reserved to the States and those who think otherwise. Let me quote you one other brief phrase from the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association, which is, after all, one of the organizations which is today supporting this bill. They say this in a publication they issued last year:

> Under commonly accepted interpretations of the Constitution, education as such is not a Federal function. Education is among those matters reserved to the States. Therefore, the Federal Government ought not to interfere with the present diffused pattern of control, decisions of curriculum and staffing.

You will hear a lot of comment over the next 2 days, I know, that there is not any control involved in this bill, and that we are going to preserve the same local control over our primary and secondary schools that we have always had.

I listened, along with the gentleman from Ohio and other members of the Committee on Rules, for the better part of 5 days to extensive testimony on this bill. It was brought out even by one of those who will support this bill on the floor of the House that under title II, the title which deals with a $100 million grant for textbooks, that if there is not a State agency in a particular State authorized by law to provide library resources, then, I quote "the Commissioner shall arrange for the provision on an equitable basis of such library resources, textbooks, or other material." In other words, if there is no State agency that will do the job, the Commissioner goes in and does so for the State. I ask you if you can find any clearer example of direct Federal control than you find under title II of this legislation.

We had a bill on the floor of the House yesterday where the committee admitted in its report that it was not a perfect bill; that it was not an ultimate answer, but they said, "we will go ahead and pass it and experiment and so on and maybe find the right track." Some people will tell you that about the allocation formula under title I of this bill. Sure, it is unfair and gives something like $321 per pupil to the State of New York, which has the highest per capita income in the country, whereas it gives $120 per pupil to the State of Mississippi, where the need is greatest. But do not fret about that or do not worry about that, they tell us in reassuring tones. The time will come when we will amend the bill and change the formula. That is their solemn assurance. I think we need only recall what the experience has been under the so-called impact area aid bill which was passed, as I recall it, in September 1950, to realize that once we freeze into statutory law a formula whereby this aid will be dispensed, we do not have any very real or substantial hope of seeing that changed. I would plead with those of you who are still of an open mind in this Chamber today not to accept the allocation formula under title I with any hope or expectation that it will be changed or that it will be made more equitable and do the job. This bill will simply not accomplish the very lofty purposes as set forth in section 201 of H.R. 2362. It is not an aid merely to poverty-impacted and backward areas. How can you say that when the aid is going to 94 percent of the school districts of this country? How can you stand before this Chamber and say it is just to help those few economically deprived areas? It is a vehicle for massive general aid which will fully commit the Federal Government to the financing of primary and secondary schools.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I allude to one other very important matter mentioned by the gentleman from Nebraska. That is whether or not there has been any real resolution of the fundamental problem of whether under this bill we are possibly going to be violating the establishment of religion clause of the first amendment to the Constitution. Read even the viewpoint of a member of the majority on the Committee on Education and Labor, and you will find that they admit that there is a very real possibility of unconstitutional application of funds under that bill. I was mightily impressed, I will say, with the testimony before our committee yesterday or the day before of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] when she raised a very real possibility that in this bill we are not solving the church-state issue at all but merely transferring that controversy from the Congress to the community and that we may really be laying the groundwork for setting up strife and division within the local community by telling them to solve the problem which we in the Congress did not have the simple courage to solve by including in this bill the kind of judicial review provisions which would make possible an adjudication of this very important and basic issue.

I hope that under the 5-minute rule Members will listen to the amendments that are offered and that we may do something to improve what is now, I think, a bad piece of legislation. I would like to vote for a bill that would, in fact and in truth, accomplish the objectives as set forth in section 201 of the bill that is now before us. But I cannot emphasize too strongly that this bill as presently written is simply not fashioned to do that job. Instead it would dissipate and dilute the funds which it authorizes to the point where those truly in need are going to benefit least.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain statistics from the Federal Draft Board.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the House Committee on Education and Labor for bringing this comprehensive education bill to the floor of the House. If similar legislation was enacted 15 or 20 years ago millions of American youth who are now unemployed, living in poverty or following a life of idleness or crime would now be on their way to financial independence and enjoy American abundance and prosperity. We are today listening to the same bugaboo and unfair statements of what is going to occur if the Federal Government participates financially regarding the education of the youth of America.

Similar school legislation was sent up by President Kennedy in 1963. President Johnson, is 100 percent behind the bill H.R. 2362 now under debate.

It is a very simple bill. There is nothing complicated about it. This bill will aid in the fundamental education of millions of American youth in this Nation who are being denied the opportunity of an education.

Do not be misled. There are many special privileged lobbies working against this legislation which have converged upon Washington. And let me address the newer Members on both sides of the aisle. I represent a district that had a population of 340,000 when I came to Congress in 1943 and today we have a population of approximately 600,000. There are thousands and thousands of working men and women who have come from all sections of the country, especially during World War II, to work in the defense plants and the steel mills of my district. I remember, I think it was about 10 years ago, we had on this floor a school construction bill that was defeated by, I think, 4 or 6 votes. Everybody seemed to be in favor of that school construction bill to help communities that were having great difficulty in building schools for children who were wedged in crowded schoolhouses and schoolrooms; this condition existed not only in my district but in many other urban areas in the Nation. Millions over the Nation were very happy that something was going to be done to relieve the critical school situation. After a couple of days of debate, four very distinguished leaders of this House gathered back behind the rail, and in about 5 minutes a motion came down to strike the enacting clause of that bill; and by 4 to 6 votes the school construction bill was defeated.

That motion, succeeded in throwing out the window—defeating—an education bill which would have benefited millions of schoolchildren over the last 10 or 12 years. It took millions of dollars out of the pockets of the working men and women in my district, the same as it did in Chicago, in Pittsburgh, in Philadelphia, and other places.

Why, Mr. Speaker, there were many insurance companies, loan companies, and bank lobbies, pressuring Congress to defeat that bill and to get in on the financial bonanza. The financial wizards, organized a program to loan citys and towns millions at high interest to build schools. Today, there are school buildings in my district thrown together at prices, perhaps, three times what they cost to build. Local taxpayers are paying on a 30- to 35-year bond issue at a high rate of interest—taxpayers in my district—and over the Nation will be taxed for high interest, 35-year school bonds, during the major part of their adult life. The insurance companies and the banks will collect revenue throughout America at high rates of interest for the next 35 years thanks to almost the same identical pressure groups and propagandists who are opposing this school legislation.

Mr. Speaker, they talk about this bill going to financially burden the Federal Government. Since 1946 State and local bonded indebtedness has risen approximately 450 percent while Federal debt has only risen about 14 percent. During the same time State and local taxes have increased 340 percent while Federal taxes only 140 percent, before the 1964 Federal tax cut. This is higher than it was 20 years ago, primarily on account of these urban, industrial, and metropolitan areas trying to educate the children during this period of population explosion. The Federal Government only has a 14-percent increase as compared with a 450-percent increase for the local communities.

Further, Mr. Speaker, most people in America know what is going on. They are watching this bill. Indiana, my friends, has elected two new Senators since the day when that education school construction bill was tossed out the window. They are for this bill that we have pending on this floor of the House today. They are going to support it. Why? Because under the leadership of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, millions know the true facts on our school crisis.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a change over America. The people are beginning to find out that this is more or less a defense measure.

Mr. Speaker, several years ago I called up General Hershey of the Federal selective service and requested a tabulated breakdown by States of boys who were rejected in the draft on account of educational deficiencies. The startling figures are these. Some States have a good record. About half of the States have a poor record and about 14 or 15 of the States have from 25 percent to 35 percent, and some as high as 45 percent of the boys that were taken in the draft under the selective service were turned back on account of educational deficiencies.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to skip over just a few statistics here.

In one State 39.8 percent of that State's boys were sent home because they were educationally deficient, most of whom could not read and write.

Mr. Speaker, that condition was not confined, my friends, to States on account of racial conditions, 41.5 percent were sent home from the State of Kentucky. Twenty-nine percent were sent home from the State of Florida, 38.7 percent were sent home from the State of Arkansas. And, Mr. Speaker, listen to this one. This is the choice of all, the great State of Arizona. One would think that Arizona would certainly take care of its school students. The State of Alabama had 44.4 percent rejections. Arizona's record was "white," 20.5 percent; Negro, 26.3; rejectees for educational deficiency. They could not get into the armed services of their country. But some boy from Illinois, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Massachusetts, Washington, and other States had to take their place.

Mr. Speaker, let us see what the State of Washington did. They have an excellent record of only 6.7 percent. The State of Utah, 5.9 percent; the State of Indiana, 9.3 percent; the State of Maine, 8.4 percent. But when a State had rejectees up to 35 and 45 percent I believe it is time that this Congress should help the State officials to do something about it. God forbid that we have another war, but we do not want to see a draft rejection record on the part of the Selective Service Agency that might jeopardize the defense of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill represents a start in the right direction. We are going to hear opponents get up here on this floor of this House and send out this bugaboo about turning our schools over to the Federal Government.

This bill provides that control remains in the States and local communities. Federal participation is from a directional advisory angle. The funds are provided as follows:

Local school districts, $1,060 million; textbooks, libraries, $100 million; local educational service, $100 million; network regional centers, $45 million; State educational departments, $25 million.

The States will have control of their schools under this bill, but the Federal Government is trying to do something to give them money so that the kids can secure a better education.

Mr. Speaker, the two boys Grissom and Young who finished this flight yesterday were educated primarily by Uncle Sam, and it did not hurt them to have Uncle Sam pay their expenses for education. We would not have accomplished these great scientific achievements if we had not this educational assistance from our Government.

Here is what Secretary Celebrezze said before the Committee on Federal Control:

> The Federal Government has provided aid to education in various forms for many years without complaints against Federal control. They refer to the Morrill Act of 1862 (land grants to colleges); the act of 1890 making cash grants to land-grant colleges; the Smith-Hughes Act; the Impacted Area Aid Act of 1950; the National Defense Education Act of 1958, and the aid to higher education acts adopted during the last Congress. In a discussion with Representative GOODELL during the House committee hearings Secretary Celebrezze asked: "Can you cite to me one example in the hundred years that the Federal Government has been in the area of education where the Federal Government has taken control of a program?"

Mr. Speaker, I hope this aid to our school system is passed by a large majority without amendments.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 2362, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, education is the bulwark of our Great Society. We bring before you today a bill which recognizes as no bill that has ever come before this great body the importance of basic education to the maintenance of our great American heritage. When President Johnson delivered his state of the Union message at the beginning of the 89th Congress, he stressed the unique role that education must play if we are to achieve our goals of liberty, equality, and union. He called attention to the fact that a nation cannot remain both ignorant and great. He complimented us upon our tremendous achievements of the 88th Congress, but called even greater attention to the needs before us. This bill, H.R. 2362, would strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

Every aspect of our American life demands more and better education if we are to keep pace with the rapidly changing conditions of our society. We can no longer be satisfied with Federal participation concentrated upon the selected few who enter our institutions of higher learning. We are compelled to give our most sincere and dedicated attention to the masses of our American youth, youth whose futures are bright with promise, youth who give America new visions and new goals. We must not wait any longer—it is later than you think.

This bill before us will be legislating a basic principle—education for all of America's children without regard for poverty, cultural deprivation or any other artificial barrier. This principle is consistent with the basic dream of America as a nation of enlightened citizens who can act upon their own thinking. We cannot delay—the hour is far spent. All about us we see evidence of the need for increased Federal support to education. In one State alone, 49 percent of the young men drafted for service to their country were refused because they did not have the academic skills necessary to perform even as a private in the U.S. Army. We cannot concern ourselves only with children attending public schools. We must be interested in all children. We know that this bill does not meet every need, but again I say with my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, FRANK THOMPSON, we are legislating a principle.

Two years ago I introduced the concept of shared time as a means through which Federal support might be given to children attending nonpublic schools. During hearings which I conducted on this measure it was learned that already 35 states have had programs in shared time or dual enrollment covering many areas of the curriculum. Even though there had not been much general discussion about the idea, these experiences date back more than 40 years, and I dare to wager that some of my colleagues here present have shared in experiences of this kind during their elementary and secondary education.

During our present hearings on H.R. 2362 we took testimony from 117 witnesses. Our printed record included statements from 147 additional persons. After seven executive sessions of the full committee we reported the bill with a 23-to-8 bipartisan vote.

The bill does not authorize funds for the payment of private school teachers; nor does it authorize the purchase of materials or equipment or the construction of facilities for private schools. It specifically prohibits any Federal funds being used for religious or sectarian purposes and clearly states that:

> The local educational agency must provide satisfactory assurance that the control of funds * * * and the title to property derived shall be in the public agency for the uses and purposes provided in this title and that a public agency will administer such funds and property. (Sec. 205, subsec. 3, p. 79.)

Testimony taken from the leading professional organizations and church organizations agree that there has been no violation of the "wall" of separation. The Justice Department has also indicated that this bill is constitutional.

Some fear that the Federal Government might take control of education if this bill becomes public law, but may I remind you that throughout the bill responsibility for the determination of the program and its execution belongs to the local and State educational authorities. In title I—section 205, subsection A, page 78—a local educational agency may receive a basic grant or a special incentive grant only upon application therefore approved by the appropriate State educational agency. In title II—section 203, subsection A, page 94—any State which desires to receive grants must submit to the Commissioner a State plan. The grants for supplementary educational centers and services provided in title III are to be made to a local educational agency or agencies. Title V is specifically for the support and strengthening of the State departments of education. Hence, great care is given to the State's prerogative in the supervision and administration of public education.

However, may I further remind you that we have generally accepted the principle of aid to nonpublic institutions of higher learning. If this is sound public policy for the select few in higher education, should it not be equally sound policy for our children and youth in the elementary and secondary schools?

H.R. 2362, the bill before you, presents new landmarks in our struggle to obtain adequate elementary and secondary education for all of America's children. It is a fivefold program, each part of which is directed toward strengthening and improving the quality of American education.

Title I would provide a billion dollars of Federal funds to strengthen educational opportunities for 5 million children living in families who receive less than $2,000 a year. These young Americans have been paralyzed by poverty and the educational services have neglected to fill the gap in their educational experiences. Left unchecked, poverty's adverse effects become chronic, catagious, often leading to delinquency and crime. In the slums the schools are overcrowded, many are obsolete and unsafe. At least 30 percent of our schoolchildren go to school in classes averaging 30 or more pupils. In remote rural areas schools often offer inadequate programs under inadequate facilities. Title I adds a 3-year program designed to encourage and support the establishment, expansion, and improvement of special programs including the construction of minimum school facilities where needed to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children of low-income families. These special programs might include dual enrollment arrangements—shared time—educational radio and television, mobile educational services, remedial education, preschool or after school programs, additional instructional personnel, equipment and facilities, and other programs and activities judged necessary for improving the education of a disadvantaged child.

Local educational agencies would be eligible for payments equal to one-half the average per pupil expenditure in that State multiplied by first, the number of children—aged 5 to 17—in families having an annual income of less than $2,000; and, second the number of children in families receiving payments over $2,000 under the programs of aid to families with dependent children. For the second and third year, Congress would determine the low-income factor. Federal funds made available under this title would be used essentially for improving the education of educationally deprived students. State and local educational effort must be maintained. It is for this reason that the present formula uses the State's per pupil expenditure figure for determining the amount available for each child.

Those who would argue that the more prosperous counties would be rewarded unduly neglect to look at the full picture. For example, in the 10 wealthy counties cited by the opposition, the total expenditures for 1962 for public elementary and secondary school purposes was $466 million. Under the terms of title I these 10 counties would receive approximately $8.9 million, or 1.9 percent of their operating school budgets.

In the case of the 10 poor counties cited by the opposition, the total school budget is $13.2 million. The payments to these districts under title I would be approximately $4.5 million, or 34.2 percent of their 1962 school expenditures.

Title II is addressed to the important problem of instructional resources including library resources, textbooks, audiovisual materials, and other instructional resources. Particularly lacking in American schools are electronic devices, audiovisual materials, and other modern techniques of instructional materials.

Title II of the bill would authorize $100 million to be allotted to each State on the basis of the number of children enrolled in elementary and secondary schools within that State. This textbook program would introduce a new dimension beyond the present library services available. It would recognize that every child must have access to basic materials of instruction. The State and local educational agencies would set the criteria to be used in selecting the library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials to be provided under this title. These resources furnished from the expenditures allotted to this title and control and administration of their use shall vest only in a public agency.

Materials purchased with Federal funds would not be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship and when made available for the use of children in nonpublic schools would be the same as those used or approved for use in the public schools of the State. There is a provision for the Commissioner of Education to provide such resources to students in nonpublic schools in those States where the State agency cannot perform this function. Those who would argue that this is violation of States rights need only to be reminded that this is the current practice in the operation of a hot lunch program. I wonder if the opponents would "feed the body but not the mind."

Title III, supplementary educational centers and services, proposes a 5-year program to provide vitally needed educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality in elementary and secondary schools. It would encourage the development and establishment of exemplary elementary and secondary school educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs. Special personnel, equipment, and other costly educational services not normally available in most schools would be made possible in the educational centers provided in this title.

In order to assure that the programs under this title will be developed which will enrich educational experiences and opportunities already provided, the local educational agency must involve representatives of the cultural and educational resources of the area to be served. In the first fiscal year 1966 $100 million would be distributed among the States.

Title IV, educational research and training; Cooperative Research Act, authorizes the training of research personnel and improved dissemination of information derived from educational research and development. Authority would be granted to utilize the research competence of research organizations not now eligible to contribute to the program such as private noncollegiate research organizations and professional associations. In addition, the program would provide for the construction and operation of research facilities such as those now in operation at the Universities of Pittsburgh, Oregon, and Wisconsin, and Harvard University. If we are to truly improve the quality of teaching in our schools, we must give more assistance to the research facilities directed toward improving such quality.

Title V, grants to strengthen State departments of education. If the State departments of education are to continue their leadership role in the development of quality education for all of America's children, Federal aid must be given to these departments. The funds provided in this title—$25 million—are very limited indeed and serve only as a stimulation to the States in their growing concern for improving and strengthening the quality of education. But they indicate the Federal Government recognizes that even though we are 50 sovereign States, we are also the United States of America.

I wish to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from Kentucky, Congressman CARL PERKINS, not only for his specific efforts made in behalf of this bill, but for his lifetime of dedication to the cause of American children, to the efforts he has made since he first came to Congress to improve education on all levels for all children.

This is the precise moment in history for which we have waited. We cannot delay another moment. Let us pledge to teach our children—all our children—what they have not been taught. Let us teach all children that America belongs to them. Let us teach them about Crispus Attucks. Let us teach them about the first congregation of Jews to settle in Connecticut. Let us teach them about Lord Baltimore and the struggle of the Catholics to settle in America. Let us teach them about the struggle of the Quakers in Pennsylvania as they attempted to establish the City of Brotherly Love.

Let us teach every white boy walking down every dusty road in Georgia that America belongs to him. Let us teach every black boy out of the slums of Harlem that America is his. Let us teach every poor white in the mountains in Kentucky that the joys of America belong to him. Let us ring our bells of freedom and liberty throughout the land, and proclaim that peace cannot come until all know the joy of wisdom.

Let us not forget the words of the great brooding father when he said that this Nation "will never perish from the earth" as long as we maintain a government of the people—black and white—for the people—Jew and gentile—and by the people—Protestant and Catholic.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, 16 years' service on the House Committee on Education and Labor has given me a deep appreciation of education's role and legitimate needs. I firmly believe that the educational needs of the United States will be met only when the Federal Government accepts its responsibility to provide a greater share of the cost of public education.

I am greatly concerned over the increasingly critical needs of education—at all levels—and I have sought throughout my 16 years of service in this House to meet those needs by supporting and working for broad and comprehensive aid-to-education programs, under both Republican and Democratic Presidents.

And, while I believe there should be substantial Federal support of the whole of public education at all levels and of all types, I well know that the immediate priority legislative objective in the field of education must be substantial Federal support for public elementary and secondary education.

In recognition of the general needs in education, we have greatly strengthened the ability of our vocational education system to equip our citizens with the vocational competencies and skills required through the enactment of the Vocational Education Act of 1963. We have greatly expanded the opportunity for students to acquire baccalaureate degrees by strengthening our institutions of higher learning through the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, and through the increased opportunities for higher education under the provisions of the National Defense Education Act. We have enacted legislation to increase the opportunities for the training of physicians, dentists, and professional health personnel so as to assure our communities a more adequate supply of trained people in this important field.

It has been plain for us in the Congress to see that our national defense needs cannot be met without the scientists and technicians to keep pace with technological developments and opportunities. It has been plain to see that emphasis should be given to science, mathematics, and the strengthening of our college programs to produce this trained manpower. It has been plain to see the relationship between high unemployment rates and the lack of vocational educational opportunities.

However, the very foundation of these more advanced areas of education and training are our elementary and secondary school systems.

Just as it is easier to see the weaknesses in that part of the building or house which is above the ground, it has been easier for the Congress and educational groups in general to move to improve the superstructure of the educational system before addressing attention to weaknesses in the foundation of the system.

However, it is most evident that an individual armed with a solid basic education has acquired the ability to readily acquire new knowledge and new skills as the processes of automation and technology require him to adjust to new changes and new job opportunities.

It is further evident that the inability of many deserving students to obtain college admission may be based on the lack of funds locally to provide that individual with the appropriate elementary and secondary education.

In my judgment, the House has before it today in H.R. 2362, the greatest legislative challenge ever faced by any Congress in our Nation's history.

Although the States and local communities historically have borne the major responsibility of financing public elementary, and secondary schools, they no longer can do so unassisted. Property taxes, the traditional mainstay of school support, today are totally inadequate to meet the need in many areas.

As our national income depends more and more upon modern industrial economic activity, the adequacy of fixed property as a source of governmental support declines proportionately. Broadly speaking, the bulk of the wealth of the Nation is not available for support of public education by means of the antiquated system of school support under which we still labor. Corporate profits and compensation of employees now account for more than 81 percent of the total national income—GPO publication, "Economic Indicators, 1964." These increasing sources of wealth traditionally have paid very little taxes to support the public schools. If such wealth is to carry a portion of the cost of education, the taxes must be levied by the Federal Government. The most recent analysis available indicates that about 94 percent of taxes on personal and corporate income is paid to the Federal Government, leaving available to State and local government only a relatively small portion of the taxpaying power of the major income sources of the total economy of the Nation—Economic Report of the President, 1963.

This broader Federal tax base, I believe, must be utilized for education. There is a national interest in a well-educated citizenry, and the Federal Government, with these greater tax resources, has both the responsibility and the authority to help State and local governments meet at least minimum educational standards.

I believe that education is a matter of national concern; that not only our economic well-being but our national survival depends upon excellence in education. Education is big in terms of its impact—education is a paying investment. It has been estimated that in recent years our investment in education has been responsible for up to 40 percent of the Nation's growth and productivity. Educational investment is an investment which results in higher wages and greater purchasing power for the worker, and in the new products and techniques which come from trained minds.

Deviations in the quality of schools among communities contribute to the dropout problem—and the dropout problem is directly tied to poverty levels. A recent comprehensive study showed that almost half of the children from lower income neighborhoods do not complete high school. Yet, in sections of the country where provision is made for guidance, counseling, and other special programs, the dropout rate is being reduced. While these educational programs cost money, they are far more economical than the expense required to provide various welfare payments during the course of his life to an undereducated person who enters the work force unable to cope with the jobs available but unfilled.

The dollar loss to the individual with a poor education is great, but so is the dollar loss to the Nation in lack of purchasing power, lower tax revenues, and rising welfare costs.

Elementary and secondary schools will grow rapidly for years to come. College enrollment will reach 8,677,000 by 1975, compared with 3,610,000 in fall 1960. Skilled technicians will be more and more in demand while the unskilled and undereducated will find it virtually impossible to find employment. Failure to provide each child, regardless of his geographic location or his economic status, with a sound basic education as a foundation upon which to base his vocational or professional training, can condemn him to a future of bleak poverty and frustration. Such failure must be prevented by effective Federal action.

Every extraneous matter that could be pressed into service has been seized upon to confuse the issue, which can be very simply stated: Do the American people honestly want the best public schools and the best public education that can be provided for the youth of this Nation?

Last summer President Johnson asked some of the most outstanding educational minds in this Nation to tackle the problem of aid to elementary and secondary education. He gave them a single instruction: "Find out how we can best invest each education dollar so that it will do the most good."

The educators decided that the Nation's first job was to help the schools serving the children from the very lowest income groups. These families constitute the No. 1 burden in this Nation on our public school system. These families, we know, cannot bear their share of the taxes to help pay for their education, and unless their children get a good education we know that they become, as President Johnson has said, "tax eaters instead of taxpayers." That is why this administration has placed top priority on breaking the vicious cycle that today threatens the future of about 5 million children in this, the richest Nation on earth.

In the weeks since the President's special message on education, January 12, his proposal for overcoming shortcomings in public elementary and secondary education has truly been put at the top of America's agenda—just as the President hoped it would be. In my 16 years in Congress no domestic measure ever presented by any President to any Congress, has ever generated greater congressional interest and support.

All studies show that education's deficiencies are nowhere more marked than in the poverty of the schools that serve the children of the poor—this is true in the heart of our great cities and throughout many rural communities in America. One-third of the children in the 15 largest school systems of the Nation need special educational help—are classified as "educationally disadvantaged." In the inner city schools of these cities, as many as 60 percent of the students enrolled in the 10th grade drop out before graduation. Up to 80 percent of all school dropouts come from the ranks of the educationally deprived school children—those in the inner city schools and depressed rural areas. Our draft rejection rates for educational deficiencies are almost 50 percent in some areas of the Nation—in all areas they are high enough to be of real national concern. This need is apparent from the fact that there are over 8 million adults who have completed less than 5 years of school. The need is apparent from the 20 percent unemployment rate of our 18- to 24-year-olds.

In many instances the record discloses that the inadequate tax base at the local level for educational purposes has prevented the establishment of fully effective school systems and, as a result, the children suffer. In many of our cities and rural mining communities and other areas throughout America, poverty has reduced local resources to the peril point.

As President Johnson reminded us in his special message on education:

> We can measure the cost—of neglect—in even starker terms. We now spend about $450 a year per child in our public schools. But we spend $1,800 a year to keep a delinquent youth in a detention home, $2,500 a year for a family on relief, $3,500 a year for a criminal in State prison.

The objective of this bill is to use education—the very best education we can provide—for those who have been traditionally neglected by our schools and are most dangerously neglected today. If we can reduce the costs of crime, delinquency, unemployment, and welfare in the future by well-directed spending on education now, certainly, on this count alone, we will have made a sound investment.

The measure we are considering today has been given extensive and intensive consideration by the education committees and subcommittees in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. My General Subcommittee on Education took favorable action after the most extensive hearings devoted to a single legislative proposal in recent history. The hearings lasted 8 to 10 hours a day for about 2 weeks. The executive sessions of both my subcommittee and Chairman POWELL's full committee, during which amendments were considered, consumed many additional days and hours.

Although the President's proposal came through the full committee and the House General Subcommittee on Education substantially intact, numerous perfecting amendments which improve the operation of the act while maintaining the original purpose were adopted.

I know and regret that some Members will try to revive the so-called church-state fight, though that matter is totally irrelevant since every provision of every title of this legislation has been drawn under the close scrutiny of the Department of Justice as to constitutionality, and found to be totally without fault.

I particularly and specifically want to commend my colleagues on the General Subcommittee on Education, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY], the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] for their tireless, dedicated efforts in helping bring this measure into being. Their constituents—no, the entire Nation—owe these gentlemen a debt of gratitude for their outstanding and knowledgeable guidance and contributions.

From all the available evidence, the greatest need for strengthening our elementary and secondary school programs lies in those schools having high concentrations of children coming from low-income families. There is a high correlation between family income and underachievement in elementary and secondary schools. The late Senator Robert Taft declared:

> Education is primarily a State function, but in the field of education, as in the fields of health, relief, and medical care, the Federal Government has a secondary obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States.

H.R. 2362 has as its major purpose in the words of the President in his education message to "Bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most."

Title I of the bill is directed specifically to strengthening educational opportunities in those schools where there are concentrations of children coming from low-income families. This title takes a substantial step forward in giving poor school districts and poor schools the ability to offer programs of instruction which will eliminate the lack of educational opportunity. Almost $1.1 billion of the total of approximately $1.5 billion called for under this bill is allocated under title I.

In many rural areas and in small school districts the impact of title I will provide as much as a 30-percent increase in local school budgets during fiscal year 1966. In such communities the lack of local financial resources have kept these school districts from keeping pace with new teaching techniques, new equipment, and adequate curriculum offerings. In most of these school districts the average per pupil expenditures are well below the State average per pupil expenditure for the State in which the district is located. Funds in these districts have not been available to provide such important program improving projects as: Inservice training for teachers, additional teaching personnel to reduce class size, supervisory personnel and full-time specialists for improvement of instruction, institutes for training teachers in special skills, supplementary instructional materials and equipment, audiovisual equipment and other newly developed special educational media, language laboratories, science and reading laboratories, and laboratories for modern instruction in other subject areas. Particularly lacking, in these school districts, has been the financial resources to offer preschool instruction. Funds under title I will be available to local public school districts to strengthen programs in public schools for these and other projects and programs which will improve educational opportunity for educationally deprived children.

In addition to these projects and programs which can be used for the strengthening of public school programs, the bill requires some broadening of public educational programs and services in which elementary and secondary school pupils who are not enrolled in public school may participate. The extent of the broadened services will reflect the extent that there are educationally disadvantaged pupils within the area served by the school district who do not attend public school.

No provision of the bill authorizes any grant for providing any services to a private institution. Nor does the bill authorize funds for the payment of private teachers. It does not authorize the purchase of materials or equipment or the construction of facilities for any private school.

However, consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in the school district who are enrolled in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools, the local public educational agency will make provision, under the terms of the bill, for including special educational services and arrangements such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, educational media centers, and mobile educational services and equipment in which such children can participate.

Specific language has been adopted in the bill to assure that the local public educational agency will maintain administrative supervision and control of the programs provided and that the title to any property constructed or purchased shall be in a public agency and that a public agency will administer the funds and the property for the purposes of the title.

THE FORMULA USED IN THE BILL IS ONE OF THE MOST INGENIOUS EVER DEVELOPED TO DISTRIBUTE FUNDS TO AREAS OF SPECIFIC NEED

A great deal of time and effort was expended by the subcommittee and the full committee in exploring all ramifications of the formula.

The committee considered a large amount of educational statistics, economic statistics, and formula variations in an effort to find alternative approaches which would produce greater equity. No other formula considered by the committee attacks the problem as effectively and as equitably as the formula for the distribution of funds in title I. The formula would distribute $1.06 billion to local public school districts on the basis of the number of educationally deprived children in those school districts.

As has been previously observed, there is a strong correlation between income and educational deprivation. Census data are available to the county level to show the number of children ages 5 to 17—school age—who come from families whose income is less than $2,000 per annum. Accordingly, an entitlement for the school districts within a county would be determined by multiplying the number of such children plus additional children whose families received more than $2,000 under AFDC by 50 percent of the average per pupil current expenditure in the State. Thus, within a State, the payment to poor school districts will be equalized to the State average per pupil expenditure and will enable sharp and decisive upgrading and enrichment of elementary and secondary school programs in those schools where there are concentrations of educationally deprived children. The formula has had the greatest support of any formula of distribution ever proposed. The formula has had its critics but their alternatives create much greater inequities than the supposed inequities they seek to cure.

In this connection, it might be well to observe that some have criticized the formula because of the $2,000 level of income used in determining the number of children upon which a distribution of funds is to be made. Some say that the $2,000 income level does not represent as severe a state of poverty in one area as in another area. To some extent this certainly may be true, but wherever concentrations of children are found coming from families with that level of income, no one can deny that a state of deprivation exists. Moreover, the variations in the degree of poverty which may occur from area to area under the $2,000 family income level is to a great extent compensated by the factor in the formula which pays the school district for each such child on the basis of the average per pupil expenditures in that State. Moreover, the per pupil expenditure factor reflects the varying costs from area to area of providing educational services and programs.

In the minority report, the case of 10 so-called wealthy counties is compared to the case of 10 so-called poor counties. The minority fails to disclose all of the facts in their analysis of these 20 counties. What they have concealed is the impact of the Federal funds under title I on the local school district's elementary and secondary education programs. For example, in the 10 wealthy counties cited, the total expenditures for 1962 for public elementary and secondary school purposes was roughly $467 million. Under the terms of title I these 10 so-called wealthy counties would receive approximately $8.9 million, or 1.9 percent of their operating school budget. In the case of the 10 poor counties cited by the minority, this total school budget is $13.2 million. The payments to these districts under title I would be approximately $4.5 million, or 34.2 percent of their 1962 school expenditures. Thus the impact in title I on the poor counties will enable a sharp and decisive upgrading and enrichment of the elementary and secondary school programs. In the wealthier school districts, much smaller percentage increases will result but increases which nevertheless will enable the pinpointing of projects and programs to provide needed special educational services to the educationally deprived children clustered in pockets of poverty in the wealthier counties.

There are situations in all the so-called wealthy counties similar in condition to Toby Town in Montgomery County, which was given such prominent play in a Washington newspaper last Sunday, though they may be city slums instead of suburban pockets of poverty. We are concerned that deprived children be helped wherever they reside.

At this point in the RECORD, I would like to include a table showing the impact of Federal funds under title I in the 20 counties cited by the minority.

Some criticism has been made of the fact that the formula uses 1960 census data. Admittedly, 1960 census data would not be as useful as 1965 census data if such were available. It should be remembered, however, that 1960 census data has only been available since 1962.

The table follows:

"Rich versus poor counties"—The impact of Federal funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

[Dollars in thousands]

County	1962 educational expenditures [1]	Estimated fiscal 1966 Federal payment	Federal contribution as a percent of 1962 educational expenditures
Montgomery, Md	$44,073	$573	1.3
Arlington, Va	14,050	236	1.7
Fairfax, Va	26,950	349	1.3
Du Page, Ill	33,159	444	1.3
Marin, Calif	16,544	339	2.0
Westchester, N.Y	103,169	2,189	2.1
Bergen, N.J	72,214	1,315	1.8
Union, N.J	44,229	1,063	2.4
Montgomery, Pa	51,567	857	1.7
Fairfield, Conn	60,728	1,554	2.6
Total	466,683	8,919	1.9
Grant, W. Va	507	125	24.7
Falls, Tex	1,504	432	28.7
Sunflower, Miss	2,197	745	33.9
Knox, Ky	1,475	471	31.9
Tensas, La	1,244	329	26.4
Williamsburg, S.C	2,248	811	36.1
Sumter, Ala	1,047	391	37.3
Holmes, Miss	1,226	547	44.6
Breathitt, Ky	1,129	300	26.6
Tunica, Miss	620	357	57.6
Total	13,197	508	34.2

[1] Taken from U.S. Bureau of the Census. Census of Governments, 1962, vol. IV, No. 4, "Compendium of Government Finances," table 53, "Education Other Than Capital Outlay." This is the latest uniform listing by county of educational expenditures.

It does take time to process such information. The bill requires the use of the most recent census data that is available. However, the use of 1960 census data is the most reliable and accurate data uniformly applicable to all of the States on which to make a distribution. In fact, the alternative proposals with respect to formulas which have been suggested and which have been fully considered by the committee, would make use of the same census data.

As I have previously observed, census data are available to enable the formula to result in an allocation for every county in the United States. In some instances census data are available to enable such a breakdown to cities and towns. If census data are available for determining the amounts which will be available for school districts within a county, the terms of the legislation require its use.

When census data are not available below the county level, the State educational agency will provide for allocations to the school districts on the basis of uniformly available data for such districts which will correlate highly with educational deprivation. This could include such measures as reading comprehension levels, and children receiving support under the program of aid to families with dependent children.

In considering the legislation, the General Subcommittee on Education, in extensive hearings, had the benefit of the testimony of constitutional lawyers, religious group representatives, and educators and education associations. Expressions of concern were not directed at the major purpose and thrust of the legislation but about specific wording of sections. In this connection, former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Arthur S. Fleming, representing the National Council of Churches of Christ, testified late in January, and I quote:

> I have no hesitancy, therefore, in stating that the national council supports the basic principles incorporated in the proposal to make Federal funds available to public elementary and secondary schools in order to meet the needs of children in school attendance areas having a high concentration of disadvantaged children. We believe that it is a basically sound proposal. We welcome it.

As a result of some of the very helpful suggestions given us by the many witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee, amendments were made to the legislation to strengthen the bill. Subsequent to the adoption of these amendments, Arthur Fleming testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Education where the following questions and answers were given:

> Senator YARBOROUGH presiding pro tempore. Dr. Fleming, have you had an opportunity to see the amendments to this bill that have been adopted by the House subcommittee?
>
> Dr. FLEMING. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have, and I have a committee print of the House bill here with me.
>
> Senator YARBOROUGH. Do these amendments as added in the House subcommittee, in your opinion, meet the objections that you have in your statement or not?
>
> Dr. FLEMING. In my opinion they do.
>
> Senator YARBOROUGH. They do?
>
> Dr. FLEMING. They do meet the points that I have made in my testimony.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I would like to insert in the RECORD a summary of the major amendments adopted by the general subcommittee and the full committee and a statement rebutting the minority views on H.R. 2362 which are contained in House Report No. 143:

MAJOR AMENDMENTS TO THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965 ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION IN REPORTING THE MEASURE TO THE FULL COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 5, 1965

I

Amended section 205 of title I to require that a public agency administer the funds and property provided under title I and retain title to property.

II

Amended section 4 of title I to prevent funds provided under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 being counted in the impacted areas formula in computing entitlements under that educational program.

III

Adopted an amendment to title I requiring the Congress to fix factors in the formula for the 2d and 3d fiscal years of title I's operation, thus in effect, requiring congressional authorizations of appropriations for fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

IV

Amended section 201 of title II authorizing appropriations of $100 million for the purposes of title II for fiscal year 1966 and requiring additional congressional authorization for appropriations for the next ensuing 4 fiscal years of that title's operation.

V

Added a new section 205 to title II (renumbering subsequent sections). The new title requires that the title to all library resources and textbook material vest only in a public agency and that a public authority have sole control and administration of the use of such material. One effect of this amendment is to require the textbook material be made available to students on a loan basis only.

VI

Authorized appropriations of $100 million for title III for fiscal year 1966 and required additional congressional authorization of appropriations for the next ensuing 4 fiscal years of title III's operation.

VII

Amended section 304 of title III so as to authorize grants to local public educational agencies only and required local educational agencies to provide for the participation in the planning and execution of title III programs of persons who are broadly representative of the cultural and educational resources of the area to be served by the supplemental services. This differs from the original provision which would have permitted grants to nonpublic agencies and would have required institutional representation on any agency carrying out a supplemental educational service with Federal grants.

VIII

Amended section 401 of title IV which deals with the Cooperative Research Act amendments to absolutely prohibit grants or contracts with higher educational institutions for training in sectarian instruction or for work to be done in an institution or a department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects. Previously the amended section authorized the Commissioner to make grants to universities and colleges to assist in providing training and research in the field of education. The amendment makes clear that the grants cannot be used for any religious or sectarian research or teacher training.

IX

Also amended the definition of "research and related purposes" in section 403 of title IV so as to make absolutely certain that such terms does not include research, research training, surveys, or demonstrations in the field of sectarian instruction or the dissemination of information derived therefrom.

X

Amended section 501 of title V, increasing the authorization of appropriations for the purpose of grants to State educational agencies from $10 to $25 million for fiscal year 1966, and requiring additional congressional authorization for the next ensuing 4 fiscal years. In addition, this amendment also eliminated the requirement that the States match the grants for the first 2 fiscal years.

XI

Extended the existing impacted areas program (due to expire fiscal year 1966) to fiscal year 1968 so as to coincide with the expiration date of the new title II being added to Public Law 874.

A SUMMARY OF COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS TO THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, MARCH 2, 1965

TITLE I

(a) Approved an amendment to insert "(including preschool programs)" in section 201. This is the declaration of policy section. The purpose of the amendment is to make it clear that preschool programs is one of the means by which public local educational agencies may improve educational opportunities for educationally deprived children.

(b) Adopted an amendment to section 205 to make clear that nothing in that section should be deemed to preclude one or more school districts (at their option) from combining their grants for the purpose of initiating a more effective program.

(c) Adopted amendments which made clear that educational programs conducted by local public school agencies would be available to all children in those portions of title I which dealt with special dual enrollment, educational radio and television, and mobile educational services.

(d) Approved amendments to title I which will assure that the State educational agencies will see to the adoption of procedures for the objective measurement of educational achievement as one of the means of evaluating the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the public educational needs of children from low income families and that reports of such agency will include such information.

(e) Adopted an amendment to include in the formula children who are on public assistance (ADC), coming from families whose annual income is in excess of $2,000.

(f) Adopted an amendment to assure that effective procedures will be adopted for obtaining and distributing to teachers and school administrators significant information derived from educational research demonstration and similar projects.

(g) Adopted an amendment to establish a National Advisory Council to be appointed by the President within 90 days after the enactment of title I, for the purpose of reviewing the administration and operation of title I. The Council is to be composed of 12 members and in addition to their function of making recommendations for the improvement of the title and its administration and operation, the Council shall make an annual report of its findings and recommendations to the President not later than March 31 of each calendar year beginning after the enactment of the title. Such report and recommendations are to be transmitted to the Congress together with the President's comments and recommendations.

(h) Approved subcommittee amendments which require that a public agency administer the funds and property and retain title to such under the provisions of title I.

(i) Approved subcommittee amendment requiring the Congress to fix the factor in the formula for the second and third fiscal year of title I's operation, thus in effect, requiring congressional authorization of appropriations for fiscal years 1967 and 1968.

(j) Amended section 4 of title I to prevent funds provided under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 being counted in the impacted areas formula in computing entitlements under that educational program.

(k) Extended the existing impacted areas program (due to expire fiscal year 1966) to fiscal year 1968 so as to coincide with the expiration date of the new title II being added to Public Law 874.

TITLE II

(a) Approved subcommittee amendments requiring that a public agency retain title to textbooks, library resources and public instructional materials made available on a loan basis to elementary and secondary school students.

(b) Adopted language which assured that such materials would be available to elementary and secondary school students without discrimination as to the schools in which they were enrolled.

(c) Adopted clarifying language which makes clear that library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published materials are not being made available to schools but to children and teachers.

(d) Adopted an amendment reserving 2 percent of the sum appropriated for title II for allotment to the Commonwealth of

Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Island, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(e) Amended section 201 of title II authorizing appropriations of $100 million for the purposes of title II for fiscal year 1966 and requiring additional congressional authorization for appropriations for the next ensuing 4 fiscal years of that title's operation.

TITLE III

(a) Approved subcommittee amendments including the amendment requiring grants made available under title III to be made to a local public educational agency or local public educational agencies.

(b) Identified "physical education, recreation" as one of the many program objectives authorized for supplemental service and center projects.

(c) Adopted an amendment authorizing the Commissioner to reserve not in excess of 2 percent from the sums appropriated for title III to be apportioned among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, and further adopted amendment excluding such entities from the term "State", and adopted conforming amendments to the definitions contained in title VI.

(d) Adopted amendment to title III to emphasize, in connection with any funds authorized for the construction of facilities, the need for planning such facilities for multipurpose use for artistic and cultural activities after normal school hours.

(e) Authorized appropriations of $100 million for title III for fiscal year 1966 and required additional congressional authorization of appropriations for the next ensuing 4 fiscal years of title III's operation.

TITLE IV

(a) Adopted an amendment to include "information concerning promising educational practices developed in the programs carried out under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965" as information to be disseminated under the cooperative research expanded program authorized by title IV.

(b) Adopted an amendment requiring the Commissioner of Education to obtain the advice and recommendation of a panel of specialists who are not employees of the Federal Government, to assist him in making his evaluation of cooperative research grant proposals. Formerly this section required the advice and recommendation of "specialists."

(c) Adopted amendments to assure that one of the activities authorized by grants under the provisions of title IV was the dissemination of information requiring the innovations and developments produced by cooperative research.

(d) Amended section 401 of title IV which deals with the Cooperative Research Act amendments to absolutely prohibit grants or contracts with higher educational institutions for training in sectarian instruction or for work to be done in an institution or a department or branch of an institution whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation, or to prepare them to teach theological subjects. Previously the amended section authorized the Commissioner to make grants to universities and colleges to assist in providing training and research in the field of education. The amendment makes clear that the grants cannot be used for any religious or sectarian research or teacher training.

(e) Also amended the definition of "research and related purposes" in section 403 of title IV so as to make absolutely certain that such term does not include research, research training, surveys, or demonstrations in the field of sectarian instruction or the dissemination of information derived therefrom.

TITLE V

(a) Adopted an amendment to authorize State educational agencies to use title V grant funds for the purpose of providing consultative and technical assistance services with respect to "school health, physical education and recreation" among the other activities already authorized with the use of title V funds.

(b) Changed the date (formerly 1968) for the appointment of an Advisory Council on State Departments of Education so that the organization of such council will take place "within 90 days after the date of enactment of title V."

(c) Adopted an amendment requiring the Advisory Council to make an annual report of its findings to the Secretary not later than March 31 of each calendar year beginning after the enactment of title V and further requiring the Secretary to transmit each such report to the President and to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

(d) Amended section 501 of title V, increasing the authorization of appropriations for the purpose of grants to State educational agencies from $10 to $25 million for fiscal year 1966, and requiring additional congressional authorization for the next ensuing 4 fiscal years. In addition, this amendment also eliminated the requirement that the States match the grants for the first 2 fiscal years.

A REBUTTAL TO THE MINORITY VIEWS ON H.R. 2362, HOUSE REPORT 143

THE MINORITY'S ALTERNATIVE

Throughout the minority report the viewpoints reflect a failure to give accurate attention to the details of the legislation.

In general, the minority professes to recognize a great problem in providing educational opportunities for deprived children and a commitment to meet those problems, and in the same breath, offers a substitute which would eliminate half of the educationally deprived children helped by the committee bill and reduce the funds devoted to their education by more than 70 percent.

Moreover, their proposal, masquerading as an educational measure, is in reality a tax credit proposal giving some taxpayers windfalls, others Government subsidy, and providing the schools with nothing.

THE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS

The minority deceptively maintains that the distribution of funds would be wasteful and inequitable, and in an effort to prove this premise, cites the distribution of funds to 10 wealthy counties in the United States as compared to 10 poor counties. What they have concealed in their analysis is the impact of the Federal funds under title I on the local school district's elementary and secondary education programs in these 20 counties. For example, in the 10 wealthy counties cited by the minority, the total expenditures for 1962 for public elementary and secondary school purposes was $466 million. Under the terms of title I these 10 counties would receive approximately $8.9 million or 1.9 percent of their operating school budgets.

In the case of the 10 poor counties cited by the minority, the total school budget is $13.2 million. The payments to these districts under title I would be approximately $4.5 million or 34.2 percent of their 1962 school expenditures.

Thus the impact in title I on the poor counties will enable a sharp and decisive upgrading and enrichment of elementary and secondary school programs where there are concentrations of educationally deprived children.

In the wealthier school districts, much smaller percentage increases will result from title I, increases which nevertheless require the pinpointing of programs to provide needed special educational services to the educationally deprived child clustered in pockets of poverty even in the wealthiest counties.

The minority would give the impression that it favored amendments to more closely direct the bill toward poverty needs, but in effect, their proposals would have eliminated any of the bill's benefits for 3 million children who are unmistakably, by any calculation, children of poverty.

CENSUS DATA

The minority makes obtuse criticism of the formula's use of 1960 census data. Admittedly this is the most recent data available for a uniform distribution of funds to identify concentrations of poverty children. Even the minority recognizes this fact because in their so-called substitute, 1960 census data would be used for the distribution of an extremely modest program for 3- to 8-year-olds.

In a further effort to support the minority contention that the formula for the distribution of funds is inequitable, allocations to Texas, Maine, and Florida are cited. In this connection, the minority report states—"Texas, Maine, and Florida, for example, have approximately equal per capita income (which is often used as one index of State ability to support education), yet this bill would give Texas twice as much per school-age child ($31) as Maine would receive ($15), and half again as much as Florida would receive ($21)."

What the minority failed to state was that in Maine there are 20,000 kids coming from families with less than $2,000 per annum. On the other hand, Texas has 386,599, and Florida 143,000 of such children. The truth of the matter is that the formula utilizes the most recent and reliable data to focus Federal financial assistance to elementary and secondary schools where there are numbers of educationally deprived children to aid such children wherever they are found, whether in poor, average, or wealthy counties, and the resulting grants of funds will make substantial and meaningless contributions to the abilities of local school districts to do something for them.

PRESCHOOL EDUCATION

The minority report places great emphasis on preschool training, and in an effort to cast doubt on the effectiveness of H.R. 2362, makes this false statement: "Through omitting preschool training, H.R. 2362 fails to cover the most important educational period in one's life." Thus the minority chooses to ignore or has not read the very first section of the bill, section 201, which appears on page 70, and in part states: "The Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance * * * to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children."

The minority chooses to ignore page 6 of the committee Report No. 143 where preschool programs are given as a specific illustration of the types of programs that can be conducted by Federal funds under this act by local public school agencies in increasing educational opportunities for educationally deprived children.

FEDERAL CONTROL

Despite the minority's professed desire to preserve local public school autonomy over local school policy, its so-called substitute would make it mandatory for local public school districts to provide preschool programs irrespective of any consideration of local needs. On this point the full committee majority report emphasizes: "It is the intention of the proposed legislation not to prescribe the specific types of programs or projects that will be required in school districts. Rather, such matters are left to the discretion and judgment of the local public educational agencies since educational needs and requirements for strengthening educational opportunities for educationally deprived elementary and secondary school pupils will vary from State to State and district to district."

However, the real interest by the minority in preschool education seems simply to be a prelude to their so-called substitute legislation which would limit benefits to 3 to 8 year olds, thus cutting out several million educationally deprived children from receiving broadened and increased educational opportunities.

LIBRARY RESOURCES AND TEXTBOOKS

The minority report, in its criticism of title II dealing with library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials, completely ignores the uncontradicted and voluminous testimony as to the great shortages of such materials in our elementary and secondary schools throughout the country which are described on pages 8, 9, 10, and 11 of the committee report.

The minority's suggestion that this need can be met by broadening the provisions of the Library Services Act confesses to a lack of understanding of the need for school library resources. The Library Services Act serves only community libraries.

The minority's whispers concerning Federal control of textbook and library resources material ignores strict provisions in the bill which prohibit "any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States from exercising any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, programs of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system or over the selection of library resources, textbooks, or other printed or published instructional materials" which is contained in section 604.

It also ignores the provisions of title II which authorizes only those textbooks and library resources which have been approved for use by public authority in a State or which are actually used in the public schools of the State.

CRITICISMS OF COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION

To cast further doubt on the propriety of the legislation, the minority, by indirection, suggests that the legislation was not given careful consideration or that it was hastily conceived. For many Congresses, House and Senate committees have probed the problem of strengthening elementary and secondary education in this country. Many proposals for Federal assistance have met with failure because such legislation did not receive broad public support and because other issues became inextricably woven into the general legislation.

Extensive hearings were held during the 88th Congress by more than one subcommittee of the House Education and Labor Committee and by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee of the Senate, in an effort to get together all points of view concerning elementary and secondary educational needs. From these hearings and from extensive study by many agencies, the recommendations in H.R. 2362 came into being.

It has received the broadest public support of any elementary and secondary education proposal in the history of the Congress. All of the major education associations have expressed support for the legislation.

In addition, the extensive hearings conducted by the General Subcommittee on Education during this Congress have elicited expressions of approval as to the terms of the legislation from representatives of major religious groups whose counsel and suggestions have been followed in framing the final language of the bill. An account of the extensive nature of these hearings and considerations is given on page 23 of the report.

The minority report, in criticizing the work of the subcommittee and of the full committee, can be simply reduced to a criticism of the exercise of responsible and diligent conduct of the legislative business of the Congress. To have extended the hearings when there were no more witnesses to be heard, to have conducted further study of an already adequately probed field of investigation, would have amounted to unreasonable delay and procrastination.

Other language in the minority report again indicates a failure to read the bill. For example, the minority criticism of the use of language "temporary or other basis" is simply not justified because such language does not appear in the legislation reported.

The minority criticism of title III, "Grants for Supplemental Educational Centers," ignores the fact that centers and supplemental services projects would be operated entirely by local public educational agencies. Moreover, it completely ignores the requirements in the bill that applications by local public educational agencies for grants must be submitted to the State educational agency for consideration, comment, and appraisal before any grant can be made.

It completely ignores the fact that supplemental educational centers and services operated by local public educational agencies must conform to State law.

TITLE V GRANTS TO STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

Finally, the minority criticizes the lack of State matching requirements in grants to States for strengthening State education agencies. The administration's proposal for providing funds for strengthening State departments of education required matching beginning with the first year. If Federal funds were to be matched at the outset, State legislative approval would be needed. Such a requirement would hinder early participation by State departments of education in overall planning and development, to the detriment of all programs under their supervision. By the time this legislation is passed, many of the 47 State legislatures meeting this year in regular session will have adjourned. Of this number only 21 will meet in regular session next year. Special sessions of considerable expense and with considerable delay would be necessary prior to the State's participation. Consequently the committee's amendment eliminated matching requirements for the first 2 years of title V's operation. Matching will be required thereafter.

Titles II, III, IV, and V of the bill which deal with supplemental educational centers, library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials, educational research, and grants to State departments to strengthen educational services in those agencies, all have a direct bearing on improving the educational quality of programs conducted under title I as well as generally in elementary and secondary education systems.

Title II provides grants to States for the acquisition of textbooks, library resources, and other instructional materials to be made available to students and teachers on a loan basis. Such materials would be made available to such students, irrespective of their enrollment in public schools, however, such books and materials would be for the purpose of enriching educational opportunities and not supplanting those already being provided. In all instances the material used would be material approved for use in public schools.

The committee has received startling evidence as to the lack of library resources, textbooks, and instructional materials in all States of the Nation.

The pressure of school population growth, and school housing and teaching requirements, have left such needs ignored though they are fundamental to the improvement of quality and full educational opportunity.

Title III of the bill would authorize $100 million for the purpose of making grants to local public educational agencies or groups of such agencies for the construction and operation of supplemental educational centers through which educational services and enriched educational opportunities could be provided elementary and secondary school students. It is through such centers that opportunities for inservice teacher training, demonstrations of new teaching techniques, and instructional courses not offered in regular school programs, for example, could be provided for the benefit of the entire community. Such centers and programs would be conducted by the local public educational agency and be under its administrative control and supervision at all times.

Title III will make possible the translation of the educational innovations into the classrooms of our schools and will provide a means by which educational development from research and demonstration projects conducted under the Cooperative Research Act can be more effectively demonstrated and used.

Title IV anticipates the use of $45 million in new funds for the purpose of broadening educational research and the establishment of additional regional laboratory facilities of which there are now only four under the basic Cooperative Research Act.

Title V provides $25 million for grants to strengthen State departments of education through improved educational planning, research and demonstration programs, inservice training programs, and personnel exchange arrangements, among others. The strength of our decentralized public education system in this Nation depends upon the building of strong State programs. This title will contribute to that end.

This legislation in total represents a broad and imaginative approach to the solution of many basic educational problems facing our elementary and secondary school systems today. While we do not profess to have solved all such problems, we believe that this massive first step attacks the most critical areas of educational need and will contribute substantially to the goal of equal educational opportunity for all children. The benefits will accrue not only to the children but to the States and the Nation as a whole.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I am glad to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I am glad the gentleman has made this statement. I want to join him in what he has said.

The subcommittee has held hearings which gave every witness who desired to testify the opportunity to be heard. Under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, whose record in the field of education is second to none in the United States, the committee has produced a bill. Its committee report and record of hearings all give testimony to the quality of the work of that fine subcommittee.

The gentleman in the well of the House was the author of one of the great education landmarks in the history of this country, in the Vocational Education Act of 1963.

The entire subcommittee, ignoring other demands, giving up their evenings and weekends, handled a difficult job. The gentleman and his subcommittee members deserve the undying commendation of the House.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the distinguished majority leader and members of this committee that we heard every witness in the country who requested to be heard, every witness that the minority suggested. Those witnesses were all heard.

We did use reasonable diligence. We did not procrastinate. We have done that on too many occasions in the past.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. In order that I may call the attention of the House to a telegram I have just received dated today and delivered this afternoon, addressed to me, which reads as follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
March 24, 1965.

Congressman CARL ALBERT,
Majority Leader,
Washington, D.C.:

As the minister of the National City Christian Church, Washington, D.C., the National Church of the Disciples of Christ, I wish to go on record in support of the education bill H.R. 2362, as it is, now before Congress. I think questions being raised are really attempts to prevent passage of any bill, when we need to deal with this great problem and solve it now. I am in support of the bill for many reasons, but will not elaborate them here. I wish also to declare that no action has been taken by the international convention of Christian churches (Disciples of Christ) against the bill. In fact in recent years the convention, which is the most representative body of the denomination, has passed several resolutions favoring Federal aid to education.

It may be that within the denomination, some committees or departments have taken action concerning what they considered safeguards, just as such action has been taken by the national council of churches, and other religious groups. But the convention has taken no such action. It should also be stated that even if the convention had taken the action, it would not be binding on the churches, nor necessarily reflect the views of the churches. Indeed I am sure that many of our churches and many of our nearly 2 million members favor this aid to education. The main purpose of my telegram, however, is to state no such action against the bill has been taken by our convention, and to declare my support for the bill, as it is. I would like to add, if there is confusion in some quarters which led to my sending this telegram, it is just another warning concerning how careful groups, committees, departments should be in taking actions which leave the impression they speak for a denomination or a church.

GEORGE R. DAVIS,
Minister, National City Christian Church.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman made reference to full hearings. I think the RECORD should show that the hearings took a total of 10 days. The gentleman in the well was the chairman of the subcommittee and he was most generous in according full time for cross-examination of witnesses as they appeared before us and in scheduling the witnesses. However, I think in fairness it should be pointed out, also, that this was a brandnew bill and many of the witnesses who appeared had the copy of the bill for a day or two and so stated as they started their testimony. Also, that on the last day of the hearings we had 28 witnesses scheduled.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from New York that we have held hearings on general Federal aid practically every year for the past 16 years. All the witnesses that wanted to appear we heard. The minority were not cut off in their cross-examination. The distinguished gentleman from New York, himself, at times would interrogate a witness as long as an hour and a half. I will leave it up to the membership of this body, if you will get the hearings, as to whether or not this bill has been adequately considered. In my judgment, this bill has received perhaps as careful and as thorough consideration as any bill that has ever come before this House.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield briefly?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. I hold in my hands the hearings—and I have been chairman of this committee for the fifth year now—2,128 pages of testimony. As a Baptist minister who believes in "being Baptist bred and Baptist born and I am going to go to heaven on a Baptist horn," I want to point out to my fellow Baptists that Dr. C. Emanuel Carlson, executive director of the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs, testified 100 percent in favor of this bill.

Mr. PERKINS. Other groups that have expressed approval of the bill are the Episcopal Church bishops, the Orthodox Jewish congregations, the American-Jewish Committee, the National Education Association, the American Federation of Teachers, and the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman at this point, but shall decline to yield thereafter until I have finished my statement.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I do not intend to go back to debate the adequacy of the hearings so much as to focus upon and try to clarify one point. The gentleman in the well, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, commended the President for this new bill, this new approach, which has never been in the Congress before. I agree with him. It is an entirely new bill, it is an entirely new approach and a new type of Federal aid to education. However, that statement is in contrast with the statement of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN], when he spoke under the rule, and indicated, in effect, that this is the same old bill that has been here before—similar to a bill that President Kennedy had sent up here. But this is not an old bill. It is an entirely new approach; it is a bill that we have never considered before, and obviously this should be taken into account in determining the adequacy of the hearings; will the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. PERKINS. I do not agree with that. Several years ago in the Committee on Education and Labor I myself offered amendments to impacted area bills to distribute funds on the basis of poverty. The distinguished gentleman from Arkansas, WILBUR MILLS, more than 2 years ago, discussed this approach with me on the floor of this Chamber, and he said to me, You are never going to get a Federal aid to education bill until it is tied to the impacted area bills and those areas of need throughout the country, and eliminate this general religious controversy and all of these extraneous arguments.

I say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that this approach has been thoroughly thought out, has been considered before in the Committee on Education and Labor when bills along this line were introduced by myself last year, by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] and by the senior Senator from Oregon, Senator MORSE. Hearings were conducted in this area. This idea has been well considered in previous years by the Education and Labor Committee. So we are not throwing out any new material today before the Congress. However, it is the first time that we have reported a bill of this type out of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BELL. The adult education provision in the Poverty Act provides for adult education for people who have less than a sixth-grade education and are economically deprived. Some people from my home State have asked me where I should introduce the amendment, whether it should be in this bill or the Poverty Act, for adults who have more than a sixth-grade education and perhaps want to gain at night some kind of education to qualify them as high school graduates. I know in California this is provided for in the present State law.

Mr. PERKINS. I think I understand the gentleman. I will answer him and then yield to my chairman. But first let me congratulate the gentleman from California, who contributed immensely to the preparation of this bill in subcommittee.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] and the gentleman from Ohio

[Mr. ASHBROOK] made significant contributions. I particularly want to compliment the gentleman from California because he supported this piece of legislation.

Now I will reply to the gentleman's question and then I will yield to the chairman.

In my judgment, your amendment belongs to the poverty bill. That is where your amendment belongs and there is much support for an amendment of that type. I can promise you here and now, I will support the amendment when the chairman holds the hearings on the Economic Opportunities Act.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to my distinguished chairman.

Mr. POWELL. I can assure the distinguished gentleman from California that his amendment does belong to the Economic Opportunities Act. And as chairman of the full committee and also as chairman of the ad hoc Subcommittee on Poverty, I will be glad to accept that legislation when the hearings begin on that legislation.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, with reference to the language of title I, line 23, on page 70 of the bill with reference to preschool programs; is it the opinion of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky that this language would include the so-called nursery school programs or prekindergarten programs as well as kindergarten programs?

Mr. PERKINS. We specifically set forth in the bill authority to use grant funds for preschool programs. I think we set that out in one of the very first sections, section 201. But whether such programs would be used would be determined by the local public educational authorities. If they want to get all their youngsters in kindergarten and have nursery schools or in whatever way they prefer to do it, that determination will be made at the local level and the bill so provides.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to compliment the distinguished chairman of the full Committee on Education and Labor and the chairman of the general subcommittee on education for their dedicated and patriotic work in bringing this legislation to the floor of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I recall that Abraham Lincoln once said, "All that I am or ever hope to be, I owe to my Angel Mother." But what if, in a cultural sense, one's mother were not an angel? What would he be or ever hope to be?

These questions just now are beginning to be presented to the American people, and rightly so. They almost completely encompass the more obvious questions about crime and violence and overburdened welfare rolls.

As a young law student, I had become deeply concerned about the rise of violent crimes on our streets. I wanted to learn more about it. So as I studied, by day, the law which defines and punishes crime; I became a deputy sheriff and worked by night on the streets of our community to learn more about how human beings could bring themselves to do violence to others.

If I learned no other lesson from my 3 years as a deputy sheriff, I did learn this: at times, violence is a natural human temptation to anyone. And rather than bring one's self to violence, it is the function of self-control to bring one's self away from violence.

The persons I was obliged to arrest for crimes of violence, somehow, just did not have that self-control. Why?

Occasionally some of them were found to be mentally ill, but that was a minority of cases. Most of these violence doers were sane. Most of them were unemployed. Most of them were either grade school or high school dropouts. Most of them hardly knew how to read. And, indeed, most of them hardly knew how to hear and understand the English language.

And, indeed, too, most came from homes where the same catastrophies of ignorance plagued the parents and grandparents before them.

I have concluded that, if we really want to do more than just complain about crime; if we really want to prevent crime as well as punish criminals; if we really want to make our streets safe for decent living, rather than just close the cell door after violence is done to loved ones; if this is what we really want, we must redouble our efforts, toward ending the chain of ignorance of the culturally deprived children of today, before their embellished ranks descend with presently predictable violence upon the society of our children's generation—a society which could be a great one if we invest wisely in it now.

No one of us is born with the kind of kindness and respect for human dignity which the safety of civilization requires. For the first 2,000 days of our lives, we tend to become what we will be or can ever hope to be.

Opportunity in terms of later formal education or even remedial cultural training tends to be literally lost on deaf ears if the twiglike child cannot discriminate among the subtle sounds of his language, indeed his mother tongue.

If his mother's tongue and ear and eye cannot speak and hear and read the language, from whence will the child acquire the cultural skill to understand his language?

And if neither he nor his early adult associates can well comprehend the language, how shall he learn of the beauty of gentleness he will never have touched in the first 6 years of his life?

Psychologists tell us that if the child has not acquired proper audinomic skills by the time he enters the first grade, he will find it nearly impossible to acquire reading skills after he enters school. And he will be the school dropout, the unemployed, and as likely as not, the criminal of violence who will menace our children.

Well, there are places where something is being done to supply the culturally deprived children with the cultural skill they require to succeed in school. In a few places, educators have provided a nursery school program for children of 3, 4, and 5 years of age. The program is in three phases.

First, officials interview the culturally deprived parents, or rather "parent," since in most cases the father has deserted. And they remind the parent that she is unable to give her children the lessons in grammar and social grace which they need, but that, nevertheless, she can help by encouraging her little children to go a few hours a day to the nursery school. And by asking the children questions about the school when they come home, and even if the mother might not understand her children's answers, at least she would show an interest, and thereby encourage them to achieve.

The second phase of the program recognizes that the 6-year-old child of culturally deprived circumstances, by and large, has never ventured beyond the immediate area of his birth; that by the time he starts to school, he has hardly heard a thing but clanging ash cans, ambulances and monosyllabic vulgarity. He has no idea at all of the beauty and expanse of his society's horizons.

So they take the child on an outing to see the architectural accomplishments of his city—to hear a symphony—"music to soothe the breast," and a glance at the sunshine.

And the third phase, the nursery school itself. Highly trained teachers ready at every moment to repeat, "Don't say 'Ain't' or 'he don't' but 'he doesn't,'" and at the same time explaining why it is better—better for the child to reason out his conflicts with other children than to strike them.

Even the culturally deprived mother, lacking in cultural skills, in most cases, proves to be an angel mother once she is motivated to participate in breaking the chain of poverty and ignorance, between her generation and the next.

Studies of the effects of this program have revealed just what you would hope: the participants enter the first grade with sufficient momentum to keep pace with the children of cultural homes. And enough experience has taken place to have discovered that these children do acquire the reading skills necessary to avoid dropping out of school and into unemployment and delinquency—"taxpayers rather than taxeaters," gentlemen and ladies, rather than violent criminals.

But it is clear that they "have to be taught before it is too late, before they are 6 or 7 or 8."

Until we do this with these culturally deprived children, we will not solve the problem of poverty or the problem of crime in America.

This would not be an expenditure. It would be an investment, an investment to roll back a future ocean, of ignorance which threatens to surround children of today's cultured homes, an ocean of ignorance in which it might truly be folly to be wise.

The return from this investment to future generations would be as the oak to the acorn.

And as the philosopher said, "Civilization progresses because young men die for their country and old men plant trees under which they will never sit."

In our quest for a solution to crime in the coming decade, let others speak of "impeaching honorable justices of high courts." Let others speak of taxing people according to the number of children they have. Let others speak of colder and harsher philosophy and the brute force to beat back the savage element among us.

But let us begin to speak of building decent citizens who won't commit crime in the first place.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAHILL. I would like, first of all, to say to the gentleman from Kentucky, I share his concern for the children of this Nation, particularly the ones he so eloquently described as being the needy, and particularly the dropouts. The thought occurred to me as the gentleman was making his excellent speech that these dropouts and the economically deprived children, however, are not limited to those who attend public schools. Knowing how well versed the gentleman is as to this particular piece of legislation, I wonder if he would describe for me, and I trust for the other Members, specifically how this legislation can aid the students who attend the private schools of this Nation.

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman will turn to the bill, he will find that the bill does not give any assistance to the private schools of this Nation. We do provide opportunities for educationally deprived children who are not enrolled in public schools to participate in broadened public, special educational programs.

Mr. CAHILL. I understand that. I do not mean that aid is given to the schools, but could the gentleman spell out for me the children that can be given this aid.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, if the gentleman will turn to page 79 of the bill, under title I, we say there commencing on line 5:

> (2) that, to the extent consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in the school district of the local educational agency who are enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, such agency has made provision for including special educational services and arrangements (such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, and mobile educational services and equipment) in which such children can participate;.

In other words, in the plan that the local school authorities submit to the State boards or State school officer for approval, it is one of the requirements that they detail whether or not there are any educationally deprived children attending the nonpublic schools, and to that extent, what arrangements have been made to take care of special services for that type of youngster.

There is one important qualifying point. If the gentleman will notice, commencing on line 14 of the same page is the language:

> That the local educational agency has provided satisfactory assurance that the control of funds provided under this title, and title to property derived therefrom—

Regardless of what it might be—

> shall be in a public agency for the uses and purposes provided in this title, and that a public agency will administer such funds and property.

Mr. CAHILL. Suppose the local school district or the board of education, for reasons best known to themselves, refused to give aid to the private schools on the basis of the number of children in the private schools who would qualify under this bill. Would the school district or the board of education then be completely deprived of any State or Federal aid under the bill?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman that we do not undertake to say what any State does with its own funds. We do not undertake to go behind any State laws. As for Federal funds—they cannot be used for private schools but local educational agencies must make some provision for educating children who do not attend public schools.

Mr. CAHILL. I do not believe I made myself clear to the gentleman. Assume, if you will, that the State law permits it.

Mr. PERKINS. I understand the question. If the gentleman will read further, he will see that this plan is to be reviewed by the State educational authorities. Then we provide for judicial review.

Mr. CAHILL. I understand that.

Mr. PERKINS. The local educational agency cannot raise that question, but only the State authority can raise that, under judicial review.

Mr. CAHILL. Assuming, whatever the reason or whatever the final conclusion, that the children of private schools within the school district does not get from the local authority the aid to which it is entitled under this formula, my question is: would all aid for that school district be taken away from them because the children of private schools did not share in it on the basis of the formula in the bill?

Mr. PERKINS. Again let me repeat that there is no aid in this bill for private schools. If the services entitled to be received by disadvantaged private youngsters have not been taken care of, the State educational agency, of course, will send that plan back to the local educational agency.

Mr. CAHILL. So the gentleman concedes that one of the essential ingredients of this aid is that the children—not the schools, but the children—of private schools, if they qualify under the formula expressed in this bill, are entitled to the same aid as those who attend public schools, and the responsibility is on the Commissioner to see that that purpose is carried out.

Mr. PERKINS. I cannot agree with that statement. First, administration and approval of local school district plans and conformance rests with the State educational agency.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. If I may, I will respond in part to the question, only because on this particular point the subcommittee and the full committee had extensive discussion. I believe my distinguished colleague from New Jersey is raising a specter that shall not rise in the operation of this bill.

We had testimony from State superintendents and from local educational officials, complete and comprehensive testimony that there seems to be no problem whatsoever in working out the broad instructional arrangements for the purpose to which the gentleman is currently addressing his remarks.

If the gentleman will look at page 6 in the report, there is a very extensive description—not by any means a complete description, but an extensive description—of the kinds of programs which can involve children in nonpublic schools.

We are convinced, from the testimony and from the preparation of the bill and from experts in the field that these local arrangements can be worked out advantageously and worked out with ease. They will not involve constitutional demarcations.

I believe that the arrangements on a local basis will be sufficient to meet the needs of the non-public-school children who are in the disadvantaged areas.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield in that I may address a question to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY]?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAHILL. I know the gentleman is extremely well versed in the subject I am expressing my interest in, and I would like to state the question specifically. As I read the bill and as I read the report, it is possible for a local board of education to use the funds to hire additional teachers in order that the number of students in the classroom may be reduced. My question is this: Supposing the local school districts determine they need additional teachers in order to reduce a very large classroom population and, therefore, to provide the youngsters with more personalized instruction. If they do this for the public schools, must they also do this for the private schools?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me answer that question. They cannot send a public school teacher into a private school. That is not the intent of the bill.

Mr. CAHILL. I understand that.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me get back to your original question. With regard to the public-school administrators in all these areas where we have this shared time principle, they all state they can work this out; it is feasible and can be worked out without difficulty. That is the opinion of the school administrators.

Mr. Chairman, I do not yield any further..

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I think when the gentleman explains what is available to the private schools he should also read the definition of "equipment." When he read "mobile educational services and equipment" in section 205(a)(2), he forgot to read the definition of equipment which appears on page 91. The equipment as defined here refers to the equipment specified available to the private schools. It reads:

> The term "equipment" includes machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them, and includes all other items necessary for the functioning of a particular facility as a facility for the provision of educational services, including items such as instructional equipment and necessary furniture, printed, published, and audiovisual instructional materials, and books, periodicals, documents, and other related materials.

Everything except teachers.

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman will look at page 7 of the report, he will notice the report specifically states that we do not provide teachers for the private schools. We provide services. I am well acquainted with the definition of "equipment" but its use in 205(a)(2) is modified by the word "mobile". The gentleman is trying to read something into the bill that does not belong there.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, please, for a simple question?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. I am a little bit confused about shared time. Where is shared time to be spent?

Mr. PERKINS. It will be spent in the public schools.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Thank you.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from New York briefly.

Mr. GOODELL. I think one point perhaps should be clarified here. I believe that the gentleman will agree that there are some 26 States that under the provisions of their constitution or law do not permit shared time. This is the minimal participation by private-school pupils in a public-school financed program. It is the first step in trying to help the private school pupils and there are between 24 and 26 of our States, depending on the criteria used, whose constitutions forbid them to make this kind of time available.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is an able lawyer and he well knows you cannot do anything in this bill that you cannot do under the State law.

Mr. GOODELL. Exactly. And that means in 24 to 26 States you will not be able to give any aid to the private schools.

Mr. PERKINS. As I understand the gentleman from New York, his contention is there is no aid in here for the private schools and the 24 to 26 States to which he refers would not be prevented from participating in title I. Am I correct?

Mr. GOODELL. In the 24 to 26 States we are talking about now. On my own time I will go further into that aspect, but in those States the State law or the constitution forbids aid of a dual enrollment or shared-time nature to pupils from private schools.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Chairman, is it not a fact that the uneducated child is a handicapped child just as surely as the unfortunate youngster who has a chronic bodily ailment?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman two questions and to the first one either the gentleman in the well or the gentleman from New York may respond. I believe it has been said that no teacher could be hired by a public educational agency and placed in a private school; is that the gentleman's contention?

Mr. PERKINS. I will say to the gentlewoman that we have so stated in the report and the gentlewoman has that report before her.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, may I continue? Is it not true that when we were having committee meetings I said to the committee, Would it be possible to hire a teacher by a local educational agency and place her in a private school? And there was nobody in the committee who denied that this would be possible. Did not the gentleman from New York then respond by saying, "Well, if we had a speech therapist teacher she would be available to go into the private school." I would like first an answer to that question; was not that the gentlemans' response?

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I would be glad to respond. I think we are troubled here by difficulties with the inquiry of the gentleman from New Jersey directed at the provision of a teacher. A teacher would be one engaged in general instruction in the complete curriculum, who would go in and supplant a person now engaged in or employed in a private school. We do not contemplate that in this bill. When you talk of a speech therapist this is something different. You are dealing then with a specific need of the child. This specific need would, of course, be far divergent from any question of engagement in teaching religion or any other sectarian instruction. This would not be general teaching. We would send in specialists if they were needed in a given area for the benefit of disadvantaged children. There could be a number of children who would definitely need a therapist or teacher in that field. But a general instruction teacher is not provided in the bill. This is not a general instruction bill for the use of nonpublic schools.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If it is possible to send in a speech therapist teacher, is there any language in the bill saying that a teacher cannot go into a private school or that none of those services can be provided in a private school?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio 15 minutes.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROUDEBUSH].

Mr. ROUDEBUSH. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman to yield that I could comment on a telegram that was read into the record a few moments ago by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]. This telegram was from Dr. Davis who is the Pastor of the National City Christian Church of Washington, D.C. I wanted to make this comment to clarify and perhaps clear up some misconception that may exist in Members' minds. I am a Member of the Disciples of Christ, or Christian Church. My family has been members of this religious faith for five generations. I do not make this statement to be critical of Dr. Davis for he is a very fine religious leader, but I would like to point out that no pastor, no individual, no society, no group may speak for the Disciples of Christ or the Christian Church. Each church is supreme in itself; it is an entity in itself. We have no system of bishops. We have no hierarchy in our church. To me, this is the strength of our church. And, I am sure that Dr. Davis means to point this out in his telegram. But I would like to make it perfectly clear that Dr. Davis, whom I respect very highly, speaks only for himself as pastor of one church in the city of Washington, D.C., and not for the Christian Church throughout America.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I believe it is important that proponents of this bill not try to mislead anyone. I do not believe that the majority have given all of the information. I believe some of it is misleading information.

Mr. Chairman, we have a serious question before us, a question of church and state. This bill will provide more Federal assistance to the children of private schools than ever before.

Now, the hearings show that the bill was drawn in a constitutional way according to a majority of the people who testified, and I shall grant that.

However, I believe it is important that we tell the American people as well as our colleagues so that they may know what this bill will provide for private as well as public schoolchildren.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky said that on page 7 of the report it specified that there shall not be any payment of funds for teachers in private schools. This is not what it says at all. It says that the bill does not authorize funds for the payment of private schoolteachers. However, I see nothing in the bill or the report which would prevent a public school from financing the salary of a public schoolteacher to teach in a private school.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] indicated that a publicly financed teacher could not supplant a teacher who is already in a private school. But one can see the case of a private school, teaching educationally deprived children, one of the things that they might need is to divide classes because there are too many in each class and remedial reading would be a very important feature.

In addition to that under this bill, the type of education for the public school children must be provided for the private school children as well.

Mr. Chairman, I believe we ought to let people know that this is the case so all might know what is available to them rather than glossing over extremely controversial features.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I agree with my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE]. It does not seem to me that there has been a full explanation of just what this bill does.

Let me read from a letter which I am sure was placed at the desk of every Member this morning from the AFL-CIO. It says:

> For too many years, the church-state issue has made it impossible to obtain such legislation. We are extremely pleased therefore to see that the bill now coming before the House is being supported by important organizations representing all major religious denominations. It is our conviction, along with these organizations, that the bill raises no constitutional problems.

In the Rules Committee yesterday one of the gentlemen, a member of the Rules Committee, mentioned the organizations which endorsed this particular bill, and he included the National Council of Churches.

The National Council of Churches advises me that they have not endorsed this particular bill, though they support the general provisions in a Federal education bill and ask for a change in the judicial review section to include local educational agencies.

There has been an attempt made to give the impression that there is a consensus among all major church groups and that they all support this legislation.

The gentleman on the other side has referred to the Disciples Church of which George Davis, of National City Christian Church, is the minister.

May I read a letter which I received today from the headquarters of the Disciples Church at Indianapolis, signed by the executive secretary of the international convention, the president of the United Christian Missionary Society, the executive secretary of the department of Christian action and community service, and the executive secretary of the department of Christian education? It reads as follows:

> The education bill as presently written raises many questions for which adequate answers have not yet been given.
>
> The proposal for distribution of funds does not seem to take adequate account of certain States and areas with greater needs.
>
> The bill also introduces such concepts as "shared services"—which are very unclear. Under "shared services" can a teacher on the public payroll teach in a private school? What is included and what is excluded by stating that such teachers must be "temporary"?
>
> Since the local public agency which administers the funds must clear with local private school administrators, does this give a kind of veto power to private school administrators?
>
> Will this tend to produce serious and unfortunate interfaith disputes at local and State levels?
>
> Because of the unknown implications of several sections of H.R. 2362, we urge that an adequate judicial review section be added to the bill. Such a provision for judicial review would enable responsible evaluation of the results of this legislation. We urge that the Congress take sufficient time to consider carefully the need for this and possibly other clarifying amendments.
>
> Sincerely,
>
> DR. A. DALE FIERS,
> *Executive Secretary, International Convention.*
>
> VIRGIL A. SLY,
> *President, United Christian Missionary Society.*
>
> GEORGE O. TAYLOR,
> *Executive Secretary, Department of Christian Education.*
>
> BARTON HUNTER,
> *Executive Secretary, Department of Christian Action and Community Service.*

May I say other major denominations do not support this legislation as drafted. They have asked for a judicial review.

I would like to make one additional point: It has been said that on page 79 of the bill adequate provision is made because the local educational agency must retain title to the property and to the funds. May I submit to the House, I can retain title to my home but I can lease it for a dollar a year or I can allow anybody to use that house without payment of a single dime. May I point out I can control funds, too, but I can spend them for private or public services. And so can an educational agency as this legislation is written.

May I point to the letter that was sent from the leadership, and I find myself in a most regrettable position to oppose my leadership on this bill. But in the letter which came from the leadership today paragraph 3 reads:

> Federal assistance would be provided to over 90 percent of the Nation's school districts, which enroll 5 million children from low-income families. In these areas, the school district would design special educational services and arrangements, including those in which all children in need of such services could participate. These special programs include dual enrollment (shared services) arrangements, educational radio and television, mobile educational services and equipment, remedial education, preschool or afterschool programs, additional instructional personnel, equipment and facilities, and others judged necessary for improving the education of disadvantaged children.

In this letter these services are not limited to children in public schools. No such limitation can be found in the letter. And I ask anyone in the House to find any place in the specific legislation where it says these services are only for public schools. I have read the large print and the fine print, and I have read the report, and there is no place in this bill that says these programs, projects, and services can only be provided in public schools.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. At that point, if I may say to the gentlewoman from Oregon, it has been my understanding throughout the entire testimony and deliberations of the committee, that the purpose of this bill is to provide aid for private schoolchildren the same as for public schoolchildren. I have read the report, and I have read the bill. I agree with the gentlewoman from Oregon that there is nothing in this bill to permit funds to be used for private schools, and if I vote for this bill I am only going to vote for it on the assurance it does. I want to know if the Board of Education in my town provides a speech therapist for public school children, can they provide one for private school children? Another thing, if there are classes for talented elementary children in the public schools, can they not provide for similar classes in private schools?

Let me say to the gentleman, as I understand the purpose of this bill, it is to take care of the economically deprived child, the educationally deprived child; to take care of the dropouts. These are not peculiar to public schools. I will say that one sentence in this respect is the thing that prompted my question to the gentleman from Kentucky, and that is: "this bill does not authorize funds for the payment of private school teachers," but on page 6 of the report, it says "The program will be acceptable, if it provides additional teaching personnel to reduce classes in public schools."

It seems to me to reduce a class from 30 to 25 in a public school, and to have in the same community a private school with 70, is rather incongruous. You say you are not going to provide additional teachers for the private school for the purpose of this legislation and yet that you are sincere in saying that you want to take care of the educationally deprived child. I want to make this legislative history crystal clear so that if the bill passes the children of the private schools of this Nation will have an equal right to every facility that comes from the use of Federal funds.

I want to make sure that the school districts of our Nation understand it. I should like to ask the gentleman from New York whether or not physical education instruction would be available for private schools?

Mr. CAREY. Talking in terms of physical education instructors, let us say that the local educational agency, the board of education in this case, was to determine that a positive potential good use of the funds involved here would be to extend the program of physical fitness to all disadvantaged children. To me that would take into consideration the number of disadvantaged children who are in the nonpublic schools. That would provide a sufficient number of physical education instructors to cover that number of children. The fitness, the well-being, the welfare of the child, I am sure, and the fitness of the arrangement, I am sure, would govern. If there were a good-sized play yard in the vicinity that could be used, they could probably work out an arrangement to use that, but there would be no benefit, monetary or other, to private institutions. In fact, the private institution would have to commit itself in each area to do something. The individual would benefit, but not the institution.

Mr. CAHILL. I understand that, but does the gentleman mean that if the private school does not have a physical education instructor——

Mr. CAREY. For disadvantaged children.

Mr. CAHILL. Does the gentleman mean that this public school could then send a qualified instructor to the private school?

Mr. CAREY. To the children.

Mr. CAHILL. To facilities in a private school, say it was a rural school, that they could send an instructor on the public school payroll to the playyard to give deprived children that instruction?

Mr. CAREY. Yes, but the gentleman is reaching the point of educational policy at the local level. We cannot in this bill, and I hope the day will never come when the Congress will attempt to say educational policy is not for local educational agencies. We cannot mandate whether teachers are going to go or stay. We cannot translate academic freedom here or at a higher level. We must leave that with the local government, and this is what this bill attempts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. CAHILL. I wonder if the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky, who is the authority and who can really give us the legislative history, can say that where a private school has children who can qualify under this bill, and where they require specialized help, such as physical instructors or music teachers or speech therapists, or people of that qualification, and they do not have them, whether the gentleman would agree that the board of education can provide that type of assistance to private school children?

Mr. PERKINS. We do not undertake to interfere with the program of the local school agency. Broadened public school programs in which educationally deprived students from nonpublic schools could participate would vary from district to district within those types of special services circumscribed by section 205(a)(2).

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I want the chairman of the subcommittee to answer this question propounded by the gentleman from New Jersey because there are an awful lot of people in this country who may feel they are going to get a kind of aid that they are not going to be able to get. We have to establish the legislative history here. It is a simple question. It is Federal money that is going to be used and the question is whether this money can be used in the manner described by the gentleman from New Jersey provided that the State and local governments do not, and the State and local laws do not permit it?

Mr. PERKINS. There may be instances where that would take place, but I would say it would be very rare. Keep in mind that the conduct and operation of these programs are up to the local public school agency. It is the intent here not to put teachers in private schools although they may, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] mentioned, be for such special services as guidance and counseling.

Mr. GOODELL. Where is the dividing line? I would like the answer from the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. PERKINS. The legislation provides that:

> (2) that, to the extent consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in the school district of the local educational agency who are enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, such agency has made provision for including special educational services and arrangements (such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, and mobile educational services and equipment) in which such children can participate.

Mr. GOODELL. In other words, Mr. Chairman, Federal money can be used under title I to pay a public school music teacher or a physical therapist, which is what the gentleman from New Jersey is discussing, to teach in private schools?

Mr. PERKINS. Not at all. The publicly sponsored programs in which nonpublic school children can participate are limited to special programs of the type described in the section I have quoted.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman just contradicted completely what he answered 10 seconds ago.

Mr. SISK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SISK. I appreciate the gentleman from Ohio yielding because I think the gentleman from New Jersey brought up a very vital and important question. I think we are going to have to have a yes or no answer from my good friend on this side on this issue because we are getting to the very guts of the problem. I, for one, if the answer is in the affirmative to the gentleman's question will, of course, vote against this bill as I am sure many of my colleagues will. So we must have a very clear and decisive answer here.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may answer this question?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman from New Jersey asked the question: Where is the dividing line?

Mr. CAHILL. No, no; that is not the question. The question is, if I may say to the distinguished chairman, and may I state first I am in the converse position of the gentleman from California. He says if the answer of the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky is "Yes," he is going to vote against the bill. I want to say that if the answer is "No," I am going to vote against the bill.

I want to ask the gentleman this. I want to get the legislative history clear so that everybody in this House, regardless of how they are going to vote, will know what they are voting for. Therefore, I merely want to know, Mr. Chairman, specifically how the private-school children, the children attending the private schools of this Nation who are economically and educationally deprived, are going to benefit and if they do not benefit equally with the public-school children then is the local agency that has control of the expenditures of these moneys deprived of all moneys?

In other words, if they do not equalize the benefits of this bill to both the children of the public schools and of the private schools, will they be barred from getting money?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. POWELL. The answer to this is that the solution varies according to each area. We do not intend, in this Congress, to write the laws for local educational agencies or the States. It is up to the county and the State. It is up to the local board.

Mr. CAHILL. This is my point. Let us assume there is a board of education in a State which refuses to give aid to the children of the private schools because of the conviction of the individual members of the board of education that they should not do so. My question is: If they do not do it, will they be deprived of all benefits under this bill, so that no children in that area will get aid?

Mr. POWELL. Under the way it is written now.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from New York, a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. GOODELL. I should like to have the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] answer the question which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] did not answer. I believe the gentlemen from Kentucky answered "no" and then answered "yes." I should like to have the question answered.

Does this bill permit, in an area where the local and State law and constitution permits, a public school teacher in music or remedial reading or special therapy to teach in a private school? That can be answered "yes" or "no."

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] for an answer "yes" or "no." I believe it can be answered "yes" or "no."

The gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY], has answered "yes." As a matter of legislative history, I want to know whether that is the opinion of the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee. If that is the legislative history clearly, then we will know what this will do.

Mr. CAREY. If I may be permitted, I will answer.

Mr. GOODELL. I asked for an answer from the chairman of the subcommittee or the full committee. We ought to get the legislation clear.

Mr. CAREY. The gentleman phrased his question in terms I did not use and is asking for an answer to a question in terms I did not set forth.

Mr. GOODELL. I would like to have an answer to the question.

Mr. CAREY. Let the Record show it is the gentleman's question and not my question.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I will be delighted to try to answer the gentleman's question. We make provision for the educationally deprived non-public-school children.

Mr. GOODELL. This question can be answered "yes" or "no." As a matter of legislative history it should be.

Mr. PERKINS. I believe the report is quite clear and the law is clear. We do not intend to put teachers in private schools, no.

Mr. GOODELL. Is the answer "No"?

Mr. PERKINS. The answer is "No."

Mr. GOODELL. I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. Carey] whether he agrees the answer is "No."

Mr. CAREY. Let me point out that there is not a "yes" or "no" answer to this question, unless the gentleman phrases the question in a different manner. That is the hook in the question. That is the defect.

Mr. GOODELL. There is no "hook" in the question.

Mr. CAREY. There is.

The gentleman used the term "teaching in a private school." The private school is a juridical person. The private school is an entity. We do not plan to put teachers in the private schools, but we do intend to put teachers where the children who need the instruction are. That might be in a YMCA or in a local museum. That is a private institution, by the way.

Mr. GOODELL. Does the gentleman say that the private-school children are not in the private school?

Mr. CAREY. They might be in a building.

Mr. GOODELL. Can the teachers teach in the private school?

Mr. CAREY. They might be in the building where the private school gives instruction.

Mr. GOODELL. Can we provide, under this bill, a public-school teacher in a private school? That is what I want to know.

Mr. CAREY. Will the gentleman tell me how we can reach the children in the private school as students who need instruction if we do not teach them somewhere?

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman's answer is "Yes." The gentleman from Kentucky gave the answer of "No." Where are we?

Mr. CAREY. The gentleman raised the question along the lines that are legally dynamite, and he knows it. He indicated we would have children in the private school receiving private-school instruction, and it would not be private-school instruction, but it would be public instruction to the children who happened to attend nonpublic school. If that were convenient, according to the judgment of the board of education, as to putting the children and the teachers there, that would be their judgment.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell].

Mr. GOODELL. The question was very simple: Where the local law, the State law and constitution will permit, can a public-school teacher of music, of physical therapy, or of some others subjects—and I would like to know where your boundary is in subjects—teach private-school pupils in a private school? Now, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins] has said "No." The gentleman from New York [Mr. Carey] has said "Yes." I would like to have this a clear legislative history. There are a good many people who believe in the private schools and private school pupils getting equal treatment, who think the answer is "yes." And, if the answer is "no," we should have it clear right here. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky for the answer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has the floor.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky for an answer.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to my good friend from New York that throughout the years there have been people who have endeavored to get a religious controversy started. I think the bill is perfectly clear. I cannot visualize a situation anywhere that a local board of education would undertake to put a public-school teacher in a private school for general purposes.

Mr. GOODELL. If the gentleman will yield, I am sure the gentleman from New York [Mr. Carey] and this gentleman from New York can visualize it.

Mr. PERKINS. There can be some special services—shared time, maybe a guidance and counseling teacher—that would go from the public schools into private schools if the local law did not prohibit.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I think we should get the Middle West into this. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

I think that the gentleman from New York is looking for answers that cannot be found in this bill because they are not in this bill. You are raising all kinds of questions about the private schools. This bill outlines very specifically and categorically what the private schools can and cannot do with the money they get from the Federal Government. As regards the question the gentleman raised on the private schools——

Mr. GOODELL. I did not know the private schools were going to get any money from the Federal Government.

Mr. PUCINSKI. That is exactly it. This bill clearly spells out private schools cannot get any direct assistance, and the report further spells out on page 7, if my colleague will read it:

> No provision of the bill authorizes any grant for providing any service to a private institution, but at the same time the bill does contemplate some broadening of public educational programs and services in which elementary and secondary school pupils who are not enrolled in public schools may participate. The extent of the broadened services will reflect the extent that there are educationally disadvantaged pupils who do not attend public school.
>
> The bill does not authorize funds for the payment of private school teachers. Nor does it authorize the purchase of materials or equipment or the construction of facilities for private schools.

What this bill says is a child attending a private school needing additional instruction may get that instruction in a public school institution and for the gentleman to suggest that there is anything in this bill that is going to pour Federal funds directly into a private school is to muddy the waters.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AYRES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman from Illinois completely fuzzed over the issue.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Just read this language.

Mr. GOODELL. I would like to ask again of the gentleman from Kentucky or the gentleman from New York—and I am sure the gentleman from New York is disagreeing with you on the effects of this—this question: If the public school officials with Federal money wish to put a public school teacher in a private school to teach any subject, I would like to have a clear legislative history as to whether it is permitted in this bill.

Mr. CAREY. If the gentleman phrases his question "any subject," the answer would be "No," because that would include all subjects.

Mr. GOODELL. What subjects then would be permitted?

Mr. CAREY. "Special" is the key word. The gentleman knows that the word "special" is in the bill. These are special instructional services. Those that are special are not general. We do avoid the whole question. We do not intend to go into the question what would be general instruction because we do not find it in this bill. What is special would be determined by pedagogy.

Mr. GOODELL. What is the answer to the question of special educational services? What instruction would that be? Would that include the services of a music teacher?

Mr. CAREY. I would say a music teacher, yes, where that would be a definite need, but that would be provided for in the local educational agency.

Mr. GOODELL. Does it include a speech therapist?

Mr. CAREY. I should think so, but I am not making the judgment for the local public educational agencies.

Mr. GOODELL. Would it include a teacher of remedial reading?

Mr. CAREY. I should think remedial reading would be a subject that would be included.

Mr. GOODELL. So the gentleman from New York is of the opinion that public school teachers may teach on private school premises; is that right?

Mr. CAREY. I must answer the question with a question. Who else would provide the service if he did not?

Mr. GOODELL. Then the gentleman's answer is yes. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky if that is his answer, just as a matter of getting the legislative history.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman has answered the question very clearly.

Mr. GOODELL. Then the answer is yes?

Mr. PERKINS. My answer is no as to providing any teaching services to a private institution. The key here is the extension of special educational services to deprived children under public auspices and arranged for supervised and controlled by public authority.

Mr. GOODELL. All right, then we have a nice, clear legislative history to proceed with. Nobody knows what this bill is going to do.

Mr. PERKINS. There are special services as to which I would say "yes," but generally "no." These are discussed on pages 7 and 8 of the report as follows:

> No provision of the bill authorizes grant for providing any service to a private institution, but at the same time the bill does contemplate some broadening of public educational programs and services in which elementary and secondary school pupils who are not enrolled in public schools may participate. The extent of the broadened services will reflect the extent that there are educationally disadvantaged pupils who do not attend public school.
>
> The bill does not authorize funds for the payment of private school teachers. Nor does it authorize the purchase of materials or equipment or the construction of facilities for private schools. However, consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in the school district who are enrolled in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools, the local educational agency will make provision, under the terms of the bill, for including special educational services and arrangements such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, educational media centers, and mobile educational services and equipment in which such children can participate.
>
> Thus, the bill does anticipate broadened instructional offerings under publicly sponsored auspices which will be available to elementary and secondary school students who are not enrolled in public schools.
>
> In this regard the committee has adopted language in the bill to assure that the local educational agency will maintain administrative supervision and control of the programs provided under the title and that the title to any property constructed or purchased shall be in a public agency and that a public agency will administer the funds and property for the purposes of the title. Several opportunities are afforded local public educational agencies to meet the special educational needs of elementary and secondary school pupils regardless of whether they are enrolled in public schools through supplementary educational services authorized by title I such as broadened health services, school breakfasts for poor children, and guidance and counseling services. In addition, testimony received by the committee indicated the effectiveness in some areas of providing mobile art collections which could serve a community of schools on a rotating basis and the broadening of mobile-type public library services.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] has the floor, and if he will permit the Chair to make this observation, it is impossible for one reporter to take down the comments from two gentlemen who are talking at the same time.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Chair how much time is remaining of the time yielded to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES]?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman from Ohio desire more time?

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I remember when I first came here Speaker JOE MARTIN said to me, "You are never defeated on what you do not say."

Mr. Chairman, the United States has the highest standard of living ever known to man. This has been brought about by the initiative of the industrial engineer in the creation of ever-improving production facilities and the American workmen's unique ability of achieving the utmost from these facilities.

As the ability of the machine improves, so must that of the man. The sophistication of the machine creates a demand for a workman with a better educational background.

The opportunities for the man with "a strong back and a weak mind" have shrunk. Incidentally, I would change that old phrase to read "a man with a strong back and an untrained mind."

As a result of these technological advances, there are a great many of our citizens who cannot share in the bountiful life. Thus we have poverty amidst plenty.

The U.S. Congress has always shown great concern for our less fortunate citizens. This has been particularly true of the Education and Labor Committee. Our work in the last session of the Congress might well be called "education for labor." Through more student loans, greater university and college facilities, and a greater emphasis on vocational training, we created greater opportunities for many of our young citizens.

To further aid the impoverished, the 88th Congress passed the so-called antipoverty bill. We passed this measure though we doubted its efficiency. We would not err against the needs of the poor. I am not questioning this new legislation except to say that I believe that we should make certain that some of these funds actually sift down to the needy. It must seem to many of us that this agency has a very long, bureaucratic filter through which the funds are channeled.

It is with deep regret that I must report that our training and retraining programs have achieved no great successes. Dropouts in these programs are a major problem. Experts tell us that the principal reason for this is our failure in instilling proper learning habits in the child at an early age.

"Education for Labor," is highly important today—tomorrow it will be a necessity. The picture is indeed dark for the youth of the next generation who will be lacking in its benefits.

Equality of education for all children most certainly should be the great goal of any democracy. Only by doing this can we open the door of opportunity to all.

This, then, should be our principle legislative aim—to provide a bill that will do everything possible to aid and encourage the young children, who, otherwise might enter the ranks of the educationally deprived.

At the outset, we were told that this was the objective of the legislation that is before us today. If this had been true and if the bill had been efficiently drawn, I certainly would give it my support. Partisanship does not influence my evaluation of this bill.

I need not remind the veteran Members of this House that the late Senator Robert A. Taft was the author of a Federal-aid to education bill. As you recall, that measure had the full support of President Truman.

I do note that President Johnson, in his initial support of the bill that is before us today used an excerpt from the late Senator Taft's speech on that subject. He did this as an argument for the bill.

I wish that he had used Senator Taft's speech in its entirety. I do repeat that section of the speech as quoted in the Presidential message. Said Senator Taft:

> Education is primarily a State function, but in the field of education, as in the fields of health, relief and medical care, the Federal Government has a secondary obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States.

Senator Taft's sole Federal concern was for those educationally deprived children who required a basic floor of education that would give them the opportunity for a better life. In this category, and this category alone, did he feel that the Federal Government had a role.

Everyone who has read this most lengthy bill and attempted to digest its most intricate passages must agree that it was prepared by masters of fine print. Under the guise of helping the educationally deprived child, they have incorporated in this bill all of the ill-conceived legislation that Congress has turned down in past sessions.

It is true that much of the language is different but the objective of Federal control is insidiously injected. I deplore the use of such a worthy objective as a cloak for their attempt to create the first step for bureaucratic Federal control of the education of our children.

They know full well that had they made this attempt in a separate bill that the American parent would have risen in great anger.

There are those who in arguing for this bill would have us believe that our State and local educational administrators have failed in their duties. They use the draft rejection figures as a basis for their contention.

I wish to defend the great, dedicated school administrators, members of local school boards, and teachers who constitute our present school system. This school system has produced men and women that have brought the United States to an educational peak unequaled in history.

I would particularly pay tribute to our current school administrators. They have made tremendous strides with the funds available to them.

There are, however, areas in the United States who do not have the funds to carry out a truly comprehensive program. These we would help so that we might indeed have true equality of opportunity through education.

I would ask whether we are striving toward equality of education when we give the 10 richest counties in the United States practically twice the funds than we distribute to the 10 poorest counties? This for the same number of children.

The formula contained in this bill is indefensible. Newspaper editorials have stated that this measure should be called "school aid where least needed."

This is not the first bill to come before our committee that was so drawn that it would not achieve its avowed objectives. Hitherto, we have worked diligently in executive session until we have been able to present a complete, workable bill that would accomplish its purpose.

The minority members of the committee made such an attempt with this bill. Our amendments would have concentrated the funds where the need was the greatest. It would have pointed every title of the bill toward programs for economically and educationally deprived children. They also would have required State approval of Federal-local schools or at the very least see that they conformed to State law. All of our efforts to make this a good bill came to nothing.

The "bureaucratic camel" is attempting to get his head into the tent door through a new and clever method in this bill. A section of the bill would give the U.S. Commissioner of Education $100 million to establish so-called "Federal-local model schools." This he could do without State approval. Can anyone doubt that if this "camel head" is allowed to become law that the whole bureaucratic camel will soon be occupying the whole tent and our present local school administrators will be out in the cold.

We are today seeing the failures of recently enacted laws. These laws were steamrollered through Congress with great speed. Their objectives were worthy. We could have made good bills out of them if we had been given the opportunity. I know that their authors can take little pride in them now.

President Johnson, in his last press interview, stated that his new voting bill was open for such amendments that the Judiciary Committee saw fit to make. Certainly this departure in policy by the Chief Executive should pertain to any legislation affecting the schoolchildren of our Nation.

If the President is to be commended for this recognition of the duties and functions of congressional committees, most certainly he cannot object to our action in making the necessary improvements in the bill that is now before us.

Representatives Curtis, Goodell, and myself have prepared a bill, now submitted to committee, that would give real priority to the highest concentration of economically and educationally deprived children of an early age. This measure would distribute the money directly to the States to be used in the areas possessing the greatest need.

The remaining titles of the bill provide tax credits and payments to individuals to help meet the rising cost of education.

Since you have had the opportunity of studying this bill, I feel certain that you will agree that it would definitely raise the educational level of those whom we must help. Let me assure you that our bill is not of a partisan nature; the best legislative ideas of both Republicans and Democrats has gone into its making.

Here is a true antipoverty effort—a poverty preventative for the next generation.

Mr. Chairman, as you shall hear in detail from other members of our committee, the bill that is before us today not only fails completely in remedying our greatest educational problem, but actually contains the first step of Washington bureaucratic dictatorship in the field of education.

This is an important legislative day. Under consideration is a bill affecting all of the children of our Nation, and thus truly affecting the entire future of the United States.

We must make certain that this bill receives deliberate and just evaluation. This can only be done if we are to consider all of the alternatives. I plead with you to give us the opportunity to give this bill that deliberation that the future of our children deserves.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the distinguished member of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I am the Methodist nephew of a hard-shell Baptist preacher. My mother belongs to the Disciples of Christ Church. My father is Greek Orthodox, and before coming to the Congress of the United States I taught at a Roman Catholic college. If I can find myself a Jewish bride I would represent the finest example of the ecumenical movement in the 20th century.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 2362. At the outset of my remarks I would like to pay tribute to the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on General Education, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins] who has labored long and diligently to bring to the floor of this House a bill which will help strengthen the resources of American education at the elementary and secondary school levels. He is deserving of high praise for his persistence and for his dedication.

I want also to pay tribute to members of the General Education Subcommittee on both sides of the aisle for their contributions to this measure. I am pleased to see that my friend from New York [Mr. Goodell] is here, because I want to venture out onto a very precarious minefield at this point and try to bring some clarity to the very pertinent discussion we have just had.

I would like to propound an inquiry to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins], and to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Carey], in order to see if they both agree with my understanding of the answer to the question which the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] has put.

I refer to his question with respect to title I, which, I reiterate, has to do with the provision of special educational services to school districts where there are high concentrations of educationally deprived children.

Is it not true that in such school districts—and by "school districts" we here mean public school districts, and we here mean that Federal grants may go only to public school districts—is it not true that if a public school district should determine that it wishes to provide, in accordance with the provision in section 205(a)(2):

> That, to the extent consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in the school district of the local educational agency who are enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, such agency has made provision for including special educational services and arrangements * * * in which such children can participate * * *.

I reiterate, Mr. Chairman, in this specific situation and with respect to this specific section, is it not true that if the local public school agency should determine that a public school teacher, in order to provide "special" as distinguished from "general" services, goes to a private school for the provision of such, I repeat, special, as distinguished from general services—the distinction to be determined by the local public agency—and not by the Commissioner of Education or somebody out here in Washington, D.C., that such a teacher can do so?

Mr. PERKINS. It is appropriate as to special, yes, like a guidance counselor, but "no" as to general.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I ask the gentleman from New York if he agrees with this interpretation?

Mr. CAREY. Amen.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for just one question?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Yes, I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. I would say I would agree with the interpretation both of the gentleman in the well and the gentlemen from Kentucky and New York. But that is not the question. My question is this: Suppose the public school district does not—does not—determine that the pupil in a private school qualifies, even though the child comes from a family such as described in this bill, my question is this: Are all of the funds under this bill then taken away from that school district? That is the question.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I think I understand the gentleman's question. I refer the gentleman to page 78 of the bill, section 205(a), and I read to him as follows:

> A local educational agency may receive a basic grant or a special incentive grant under this title for any fiscal year only upon application therefor approved by the appropriate State educational agency, upon its determination—

And then there are listed a number of determinations which under the language of the bill must be followed; otherwise the State educational agency, under the language of the bill, ought not to approve the application of the local public school district. Nor, in turn, if the application goes from a State public educational agency to the Office of Education, ought the Commissioner, under the language of the bill, to approve an application from a local public school agency which omits any of the determinations set forth in the bill, one of which determinations is—and I refer the gentleman to page 79, section 205(2):

> That, to the extent consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in the school district of the local educational agency who are enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, such agency has made provision for including special educational services and arrangements * * * in which such children can participate.

So it would seem to me that if a local public school agency denies or fails to provide, "to the extent consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in private elementary and secondary schools"—if, I repeat, the local public school agency fails to include provision for and include special educational services and arrangements for such children, the application would not be approved. Does that answer the question?

Mr. CAHILL. Yes; it does. I would assume what the gentleman is saying is if children in a private school qualify under this legislation, regardless of the purposes or the desire of the local board, if they are not included then, in the gentleman's opinion, the Commissioner should not approve the program, and they would not get any Federal funds?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I think we are in agreement on this interpretation, but I want to add a point, and that is that we carry these matters to extremes.

Mr. CAHILL. That is not my desire. I think the gentleman has answered the question satisfactorily. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKIN] if he agrees with the opinion of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. PERKINS. I agree with the statement made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there are three particularly significant features of H.R. 2362, three features that stand out, as we consider this historic piece of legislation.

In the first place, this bill is a solidly based effort to provide educational opportunities to millions of American young people who come from poor families, who are poor children; to be specific, 5 million American children who are between the ages of 5 and 17, and who come from families with an annual income of $2,000 a year or less.

This bill is designed in title I to provide special educational programs and special facilities to help these educationally deprived children.

Secondly, this bill represents a thoughtful and balanced effort to provide certain forms of assistance for both public and nonpublic schoolchildren who can qualify without doing violence to our traditional constitutional doctrine of separation of church and state. I think it is instructive, Mr. Chairman, that this bill has enlisted remarkably widespread support in this respect, support to which reference has been made in our discussion this afternoon. I hope that at some stage of the discussion I will have an opportunity to read some of the statements, if it becomes appropriate, of distinguished church leaders who are well known for their positions on separation of church and state and who have endorsed this bill.

A former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Arthur Flemming, who was the Secretary of that agency under President Eisenhower, testified before our committee as the representative of the National Council of Churches. Mr. Flemming testified that in his judgment, as spokesman for the leading organization of Protestant churches in the United States, this particular proposal we are considering here today provides assistance that is constitutionally appropriate, assistance to children and not to private schools.

There is a third significant feature of H.R. 2362. This bill is aimed at encouraging and assisting educators to help lift the quality of education by stimulating educational research and training, experimentation, and innovation, and by strengthening State departments of education. This bill can significantly raise the level of all education in the United States.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, and I think what I am about to say is relevant to some of the questions raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], that the key to the success of these programs we hope here to authorize does not lie in Washington, D.C. The key to the success of these programs will be back at the local level, at the local public school level, at the State level, at the college and university level. If the local public school boards of our country use the resources that we provide in this legislation with intelligence and with imagination, these programs will vastly improve the quality of American education.

Fortunately, Mr. Chairman, the record shows that with respect to other programs of Federal support for education, a good many of which were authorized in the 88th Congress with strong bipartisan support—support which I hope is forthcoming on this bill this week as well—the record shows that America's educators at every level can provide the leadership which is essential to translating into effective support the assistance which is provided by the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, several members of the subcommittee will individually discuss the subtitles of the bill. I should like now to address myself to one title of the bill which bears directly on one of the three chief purposes of this legislation, namely, lifting the quality of education. I refer to title III of the bill.

Title III authorizes a 5-year program of grants to local public school agencies for the financing of supplementary educational centers and services. I note for the attention of the Members of the Committee that in his great message on education to Congress, President Johnson said:

> We think of schools as places where youth learns, but our schools also need to learn. The educational gap we face is one of quality as well as quantity.

Title III of this bill will help the schools of America learn new ways and new methods of doing their job better, and at the same time will help them do their job better.

I think one of the ablest witnesses who testified before our subcommittee on this bill was the distinguished Superintendent of Public Schools in Cleveland, Ohio, Mr. Paul W. Briggs. Mr. Briggs said:

> I think the program as outlined in title III is imaginative and one that perhaps might be the most innovative of any of the proposals that have been made by this Congress for a long time.

Let me now outline the major provisions and purposes of title III.

First, $100 million is authorized for 1966 and, in the 4 succeeding years, such sums as the Congress may authorize.

Second, local agencies, that is, local public school agencies, together with persons broadly representative of the cultural and educational resources of the area to be served, will be responsible for conceiving, for planning, for establishing, and for carrying out the programs contemplated in title III.

What do we mean by cultural and educational resources of an area to be served? We mean such resources as State educational agencies, colleges, and universities, nonprofit private schools, libraries, museums, artistic and musical organizations, educational radio and television.

I might add that title III contemplates that a number of local public school educational agencies may join together in order to support and develop a program which could support educational services to a large area.

The next step is this. The local public educational agencies involved, having gone through their planning at the local level, will submit their application to the State public school agency for its review, appraisal, and recommendations. Then the local public educational agency would submit to the Commissioner of Education its application for a center or service based entirely on what the local community felt was in its educational interest. Clearly, the educational needs of communities vary all over the Nation. It is, therefore, understandable that the forms of the centers and services will vary under this title.

I draw the attention of the members of the committee to section 303 of the bill beginning on page 103 which enumerates a list of possible services. The list does not pretend to be exhaustive.

The Commissioner, advised by an Advisory Committee on Supplementary Education Centers and Services would then act on the grant application.

I should point out at this point that each State receives an allotment under title III. In title III the allotment formula provides that half the funds—after 2 percent has been set aside to take care of Guam, American Samoa, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific—funds are alloted to each State—half on the basis of the number of children in the State from the ages of 5 to 17 and half on the basis of the total population in the State.

The reason that the total population of the State is taken into consideration is that these supplementary educational centers and services contemplated in title III are not directed to providing educational services only for school age children. Adult education services may also be authorized under this title of the bill.

The programs authorized under title III can benefit children in both public and nonpublic schools as well out-of-school youth, and as I have just said, adults.

But I want to reiterate that the teachers and services and facilities authorized under this title must be administered or supervised by the public educational agency.

I want to go further and point out that this title authorizes no funds for payments of private school teachers or for the construction of private school facilities.

Now Mr. Chairman, let us talk about the purpose and substance of title III. Here are some examples of the kind of services that might be provided under this title, and let me reiterate that it is a chief purpose of this title to enable local school communities and local school districts to provide educational programs that are not now available to them—not available at the present time either in sufficient quantity or quality. That is why we use the adjective "supplementary" educational centers and services in this title of the bill.

In addition, title III will enable local public school agencies to establish exemplary school educational programs which can serve as models for the regular school systems.

Let me give you an example of the kind of service that might be provided under title III. We all know because most of us have supported such legislation that in recent years, under programs provided by the National Science Foundation and National Defense Education Act, we have made remarkable advances in the teaching of science and mathematics and modern foreign languages in our elementary and secondary schools in the United States.

Yet we are still woefully deficient in science and language instruction in many schools.

Only 10 States have all their secondary schools equipped with science laboratory facilities, and less than 30 percent of our secondary schools have language laboratories for their students.

By 1968 we will need 40,000 more science laboratories for our high schools, a nearly 100-percent increase.

One way to help meet this need would be to provide a central lab facility which could serve entire districts or areas, facilities which it might not be at all feasible to provide for individual schools.

There are any number of fields where special teachers and special equipment could be made available to students on a rotating or shared basis. For example, mobile laboratories with well-trained teachers might provide instruction in chemistry, physics, and biology for a rural district which previously suffered from a shortage of qualified teachers and adequate laboratories.

Or certain vocational equipment might be made available to a number of schools on a shared basis.

The centers might also provide specialized guidance services, including psychiatric services and specialized testing. For example, it has been estimated that up to 10 percent of our schoolchildren have emotional disturbances that require professional treatment. But right now, there are only some 3,000 school social workers working with our elementary schools. Indeed, our committee heard testimony to the effect that fully five-sixths of our elementary schools have no psychological or psychiatric service available to them at all.

Title III funds might be used for such services.

Again, the supplementary centers might provide staff facilities for educating the handicapped or for specialized remedial work. Appropriate programs for gifted students might be provided at such centers.

Localities could use the centers for after school and evening activities, either for students with special talents or for those who simply have no place to study at home.

These supplementary centers therefore provide local communities the opportunity to begin now to do many of the things they need and want to do but have not been able to afford or would have had to provide piecemeal to scattered schools.

Moreover, the centers and services authorized by title III provide a way of translating into practice into the classrooms some of the new ideas that have been developed and are being developed in education today. I referred a moment ago to the National Science Foundation. Under a grant from the NSF some years ago a distinguished group of university physicists who were dissatisfied with the way physics was being taught in secondary schools established the Physical Sciences Study Committee under the leadership of Dr. Jerrold R. Zaharias of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

This group of distinguished physicists working in the Boston area put together a complete 1-year physics course for American schools that was sharply different from anything available before. It began to be used in 1960 and was a tremendous success. This success encouraged other scientists, biologists, chemists, anthropologists, to tackle similar problems in their fields with the help of NSF.

It is this kind of modern curricula development which has such important implications for training the future leaders of our country that can be encouraged by the programs contemplated under title III.

Let me quote a little further from the testimony of Mr. Briggs, the Cleveland school superintendent:

> The severity of our problem in Cleveland is compounded by the fact that American education must move into the space age: an age that requires progressively higher levels of confidence and skill, supported and reinforced by the best scientific know-how available. This is an age which demands superior education for all our citizens.
>
> I am thoroughly convinced that Cleveland cannot bridge the gap between its problems and the demands of this age without new, dynamic programs in education.
>
> The establishment of supplementary educational centers and services, as provided in title III, is a bold, innovative and educationally sound approach which will greatly assist in bridging this gap for Cleveland and other large cities with similar problems.
>
> The supplementary education center will enable us to offer a wide range of services to our children throughout the city with a minimum of delay.
>
> I am thinking of programs in the humanities, foreign languages, music, the arts and sciences that will in some way involve every elementary school child and broaden cultural horizons, sharpen academic appetites and bring understanding of new social and scientific concepts not usually or economically achieved through traditional classroom channels.
>
> I would envision, for example, a center containing a space age planetarium capable of seating 500 students. Adjacent to the planetarium would be located specialized laboratories and demonstration centers where our children could be given experiences not possible in the neighborhood school and where they would have the opportunity for face-to-face contact with other children having similar interests and with master teachers.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to helping local communities obtain educational programs and facilities they vitally need but cannot now afford, title III authorizes the development and establishment of exemplary school programs which can serve as models for regular school programs.

These models can be used for example for demonstrating new courses, new instructional materials, new teaching practices for the benefit of regular local school systems.

Once again, the local educational agency retains administrative control over such programs.

The local educational agency develops its program, the local agency applies for the funds, and, if funds are granted, the local agency runs the program.

Let me briefly reiterate, in my remaining time, Mr. Chairman, that title III programs would authorize remedial reading, science, and modern foreign language teaching, and would provide the kind of model school systems in which we could see the use of the latest educational techniques and the latest instructional techniques. We could dovetail some of the teaching in model schools and in the supplementary educational centers with the research that would be produced in title IV, the research title of this bill about which you are going to hear a good deal more from another member of the subcommittee.

I do wish to call attention of the Members of the House to the committee report, in which Members can see detailed a number of possible uses to which funds under title III may be put.

In conclusion, I wish to repeat that throughout title III the local educational agency will develop its program, and the local agency will apply for the funds. If funds are granted, the local agency will run the program.

I have read, not without some astonishment, some of the criticisms made by some of my friends on the other side of the aisle, which seem to suggest that somehow the Commissioner of Education is going to sit back in Washington and decide how he is going to spread this money all over the country. That is not true. That is inaccurate. The local public school agencies all over the United States who are interested in title III funds must apply for the moneys.

Mr. Chairman, the several programs authorized by H.R. 2362 can be of immense benefit in strengthening the enterprise of education in the United States:

Title I by providing education opportunities for some 5 million poor children.

Title II by making available textbooks badly needed by children in our elementary and secondary schools.

Title III by making available services not found in sufficient quantity and quality in communities throughout the Nation.

Title IV by encouraging the best educational research possible; and

Title V by strengthening our State departments of public education.

Mr. Chairman, these several titles of this bill place emphasis on local and State decisionmaking. Indeed, they are programs designed to enable local school districts to meet their responsibilities more effectively—which is, no doubt, the reason this measure has won such unprecedented support in the American educational community.

And, Mr. Chairman, this bill has been drafted so as to insure that public agencies maintain control of public funds.

Mr. Chairman, an extraordinary concensus has developed in the country in support of this bill, and I hope very much therefore that amendments which would cripple and perhaps kill this pioneer effort will be defeated.

Mr. Chairman, I hope H.R. 2362 passes with an overwhelming vote from both sides of the aisle so that American education can continue to be best.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I am going to oppose this bill if it remains in its present form. Let me state clearly why I am going to oppose it.

The allotment formula is bad. It will give the most money to the richest States. In fact, under this formula the rich will get richer as the years go on. Each State will count any expenditures from funds received under this program, when there is a determination of the average State expenditures for education. As New York gets $353 per child in this bill, it will be added to that which New York will receive in future years. Mississippi gets $120, and that will remain a lesser amount added to present expenditures. The rich will get richer and the poor will stay poor.

I also oppose title II. I believe that when the Federal Government provides textbooks for every child, this puts the Federal Government awfully close to influencing and determining what is in the curriculum. I say this not merely because of the textbooks aid in this bill but because of activities in which the Federal Government is already engaging. There are research programs now some which recently have been granted such as those to four universities in the country: Harvard, Oregon, Pittsburgh, and Wisconsin. These are grants for development of curriculum and textbook writing. We provide in other legislation for teacher institutes for the retraining of teachers. Now the Federal Government will be buying textbooks. With that I believe we will be only a step away from Federal control.

When I say this, I grant now that in this bill there is no direct Federal Government control. That is prohibited in the bill, but I say it is only one step away.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I agree with the point made by the gentleman from Minnesota. I believe it should be emphasized that the provision of textbooks is not limited to poor children or to economically or educationally deprived children. This is a general program of providing textbooks across the land to all children, public and private schools, the rich and the poor. It will provide books to the wealthiest counties in America, such as Montgomery County, near here, and to Westchester County in my own State. It will provide them all around the country. There is no criterion to try to help the poor areas buy textbooks, or to help the poor children.

I believe this is a critical point. The economically or educationally deprived standard is not applied anywhere in the bill except title I.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois for a question.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman said that this will make the rich States richer and the poor States poorer. Is it not a fact that under title I, $330 million, or one-third of the total under title I, will be allotted to 10 States in the Union.

Mr. QUIE. That is because they have the largest numbers of poor children. Even though it is a lesser amount per child, they have the largest numbers of poor children, therefore, in total funds it appears that some States get a great deal.

Mr. PUCINSKI. But it is a fact that $330 million under title I is going to be spent in 10 States of this Union, out of the 50 States in the Union.

Mr. QUIE. That is because of the number of poor children. The poor will stay poor and the rich will get richer under this bill, however.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. The reason that those States will get one-third of the money is that they have about two-thirds of the poor children. That does not seem to be a good ratio. They ought to get the same amount of money per impoverished child.

When there is given to Westchester County, the richest county in my State, $2.1 million for the same number of children that Sunflower, Miss., has, when they get $745,000, one-third the amount that Westchester County gets, I do not see how one can claim that there is anything fair about this formula.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I suggest that the gentleman redo his homework and arithmetic on the number of children in those 10 States.

Mr. QUIE. No. The gentleman from New York is correct.

Mr. Chairman, my opposition to title III is primarily because this sets up Federal local schools. The State has no voice in the operation of the educational centers in title III. We pay a lot of lipservice to our local school districts, but these local school districts exist because the State legislature set them up. We have really State programs in education in the elementary and secondary schools in this country. They are operating in the local school districts because the State legislature saw fit at one time to turn the responsibility for the operation of them over to the local school districts. So here we are circumventing an important opportunity for responsibility on the State level and title III is financed 100 percent by Federal funds. You know who has the voice in the programs in those centers when the Federal Government finances the entire program.

Just in passing, my opposition to title IV is because of the fact that I believe fellowships, traineeships, and internships should not be in this bill but should be in the higher education bill we are presently considering in the Green subcommittee.

So much for a brief determination on the question of why I am opposed to the bill. I am opposed to the bill for those reasons, not because there are private schools in the bill or because either public or private receive the aid, but I am opposed to it for the reasons I have just listed whether public or private schools receive the aid. However, when it comes to the question of private and public schools, I think we should be clear what this bill does for public and private schools.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

A few moments ago when the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] was speaking, he said that as a Baptist minister he wanted to make clear we support this legislation. Now, as a Baptist and as a Baptist minister, I am one of a number of Baptists and Baptist ministers who vigorously oppose this legislation. As an integral part of our faith is the priesthood of every believer and the autonomy of every Baptist Church, so no man can speak for Baptists or for the Baptist ministers. My position as a Baptist and as a Baptist minister is one of vigorous opposition. I wonder if the gentleman from New York will answer this question, if he spoke for himself or for Baptists in this regard.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. I spoke for myself, the minister of the largest Baptist Church in this Nation. I spoke for the Baptist Joint Committee on Public Affairs who testified, and the man who gave the testimony is Dr. Carlson of the Southern Baptists. They supported this bill exactly.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman.

May I say in spite of a disposition on the part of some Baptists and their leaders, there are many more who oppose this legislation and neither the gentleman from New York nor the Baptist Joint Committee can speak for Baptists or for their churches in this or in other matters because our churches are autonomous and our people are left free to form their own positions on political matters.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman from Alabama for that contribution.

The question of the constitutionality of aid to private school children, as I said a little bit earlier, was resolved in the minds of the administration and most of the supporters of this legislation. Some Jewish groups, the American Civil Liberties Union, many Protestant people and many members of the Catholic faith as well have privately questioned this bill, but I think the majority of the committee assumed this is constitutional and, therefore, it is acceptable. So I do not want to raise any question of whether private school children should receive aid or not. On the broad question of whether we should provide this or not, it is something you all have to determine when you vote for or against the bill.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I noticed the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota has carefully gone through the bill title by title announcing his reasons why he opposes the legislation. Is it not a true statement that the gentleman from Minnesota opposes general Federal aid to education in the elementary and secondary schools?

Mr. QUIE. In the elementary and secondary schools; I oppose broad general aid to elementary and secondary schools, public and private.

Mr. PERKINS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. One of the big difficulties in this legislation is that after it is passed there will be many a private school authority that will come to the public school authorities and say, "We ought to receive the same kind of assistance for the children in our schools that is being made available or is proposed to be made available for the educationally deprived students in the public schools." So I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee and the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] a question on a number of proposals that were suggested, some of them in the report, but a larger number in the hearings submitted by the Commissioner on Education, Mr. Keppel. Let us take the ones in the report which are lesser in number.

First, I had better ask the chairman of the subcommittee if all of these proposed programs listed in the report on pages 6 and 7 would be acceptable special educational programs under title I of this bill which the Commissioner already said are available.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota, on page 5 of the report, under "Use of Funds by School Districts," these are public schools. These are not all the possible programs that the local public educational agency may propose; there are many others. It is not limited to these by any means. These are programs administered by the public school agencies.

Mr. QUIE. The public school may utilize any of these?

Mr. PERKINS. For the public schools.

Mr. QUIE. For the public schools?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes; if they desire, and many more, perhaps.

Mr. QUIE. That is clear now, that all of these on pages 6 and 7 may be utilized by the public schools in the public school.

Now, the bill provides on pages 78 and 79 that both the public schools and the private school programs shall meet the special educational needs or shall be special educational services and arrangements; the word "special" applies in both places; is that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman will read the bill on page 79 he will see that private school programs are not mentioned. I regret to see the gentleman trying to read something in the language that is not there.

Mr. QUIE. Then I shall rephrase it. The children who attend private schools in section 205(a)(2) can only receive special educational services and arrangements; is that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct, if they are deprived youngsters.

Mr. QUIE. If they are deprived youngsters. Also under 205(a)(1) the public school children can only receive special programs to meet special educational needs.

Mr. PERKINS. Of the types mentioned in the bill.

Mr. QUIE. That is right.

Mr. PERKINS. There are others, but of those types, such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television——

Mr. QUIE. No; the gentleman is on the wrong section. I am talking about subsection 1 of section 205(a). This has to do only with the public schools.

Mr. PERKINS. Yes.

Mr. QUIE. And there are two parts. First, is assigned to meet the special educational needs; and second, which are of sufficient size, scope, and quality and give much promise of substantial success.

So, in either case they have to be special, is that not correct, because the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] mentioned in his comments just a few minutes ago that these had to be special programs.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me understand the gentleman's question. Is the gentleman talking about the public schools where——

Mr. QUIE. I am asking the gentleman if the word "special" applies to both public and private?

Mr. PERKINS. The word "special," of course, in the public schools—the local education agency, if it wanted a limited program, some special program, they would certainly have the authority.

Mr. QUIE. But they cannot provide general programs under this bill; is that correct?

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman will notice on page 78, line 20, it states:

> Which are designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children in school attendance areas—

And in the other section the term "special educational services" is used.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me at that point?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. It is my understanding—and I think the gentleman has raised an appropriate point—that with respect to section 205(a)(1), lines 19 and 20, where we are talking about the kinds of programs that could be carried on in the public schools, we are talking about programs which "are designed to meet the special educational needs of the educationally deprived children."

Mr. QUIE. Right.

Mr. BRADEMAS. And, if the gentleman will yield further, in school attendance areas with a lot of poor children in them, it would seem to me—and I think the hearings will bear this out—that it is obviously possible but not mandatory—because it is up to the local public school agency to decide—that if there were a public school district, let us say where 90 percent of the children came from the $2,000-or-under category, that an appropriate program to meet the special educational needs of that particular group might be reading, writing, and arithmetic, a general program of academic instruction. But that interpretation does not carry over onto page 79, section 205(2), line 9, where we are talking about "special educational services and arrangements" in which children in private schools can participate.

So, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's concern. I hope I have made clear that I have appreciated what he is up to.

Mr. QUIE. In other words, then, if in the private school 90 percent of the children enrolled are from families of less than $2,000, the private school children could not receive the same benefits as the public school children if they remained in the private school? In other words, they would have to come to the public school for that type of educational assistance?

Mr. BRADEMAS. It is possible that in the kind of situation which the gentleman describes that a remedial reading instruction course would be appropriate. But I want to make this additional point, because I want to again say that I think I understand what the gentleman has in mind doing here, that we want to be very careful not to impose unwarranted Federal controls from Washington, D.C., upon what the local public school agency determines is in the interest of the children of that particular community.

I know that there is no more eloquent opponent of Federal control of the curriculum on the Committee on Education and Labor than the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota. I know he would agree with me it would be most unfortunate if Uncle Sam were to try to dictate from Washington, D.C., to every public school agency and public school district in this country the kind of educational programs they can carry out. I fear this is a danger that is presented by the kind of interpretation which the gentleman may have attached to this particular part of the bill.

Mr. QUIE. I will get to the interpretation later.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. We are talking about a key instance, if I may have the attention of the gentleman from Indiana. He has spoken in behalf of local discretion, power, and independence. If I understood him correctly, when the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill], asked the question if a local school district refuses to give adequate attention and provide adequate service for the pupils in private schools or private school pupils, the Commissioner of Education would refuse to make the money available. Is that correct?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I want to say to the gentleman I really must quit trying to answer these questions, of the "when did you stop beating your wife?" type. That is precisely the kind of question that my friends on the minority side on the committee have been propounding to us all day. You cannot put us, I may say to the gentleman from New York, in the position where there will be absolutely no criteria in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Minnesota 10 additional minutes.

This is a key question. The gentleman from Indiana answered it, I believe, once. There was not anything tricky in the way I phrased the question. The gentleman from New Jersey asked the gentleman the question, you answered it, you said, "Yes, the Commissioner would refuse funds to a local school district which did not make adequate provision for the private school pupil."

Mr. BRADEMAS. That is correct.

Mr. GOODELL. All the gentleman from Minnesota, and myself and others, want to make clear is: What is adequate provision for the private school pupil? Let me ask the chairman of the subcommittee this question. He said one thing, and when you asked the very distinguished gentleman a question in this field he said the opposite.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I did not agree to what the gentleman from New York said.

Mr. GOODELL. We would like to have that clarified.

Mr. BRADEMAS. If I may respond to the gentleman: The entire purpose of my putting an inquiry with reference to the particular point the gentleman has again raised—of my putting the same inquiry to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Carey]—was to elicit a common response so that we do know where we stand on this matter. I can go through the whole question again, but if the gentleman will turn to pages 78 and 79 of the bill he will see the answer.

Mr. GOODELL. I know that.

Mr. QUIE. We have gone over that.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I thought that answered the question.

Mr. GOODELL. We will come back to this. The reason I asked the question is this: The gentleman from Minnesota is pursuing a line of questioning as to what special educational services and arrangements are. Your question to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] and to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Carey] used the words "special educational services could be provided in the private schools."

If you read the report, it appears you have listed special educational services on pages 6 and 7. The gentleman from Minnesota was pursuing this question as to which of these services are special educational services that could be provided in a private school. A lot of private school people hope they can get dollars here, and I think we would like to have a clear record on that.

Mr. BRADEMAS. This point I apparently failed to clear up, in my earlier response. The gentleman is making reference to title I. If you will look at pages 6 and 7, of the committee report, the list of services briefly enumerated come, beginning on page 78 of the bill, under section 205(a)(1) and (a), are "designed to meet special educational needs of educationally deprived children" under the public school program.

Mr. QUIE. On item No. 2 on page 6, it provides additional teaching personnel to reduce class size. I would ask the gentleman from Indiana, in regard to this statement, if you can provide additional teaching personnel to reduce class size? The gentleman indicated that in the case of a public school, if there are a tremendous number of children from families of less than $2,000 income, teachers in reading, writing, and arithmetic may be provided to reduce class size.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I would not contemplate this would be acceptable.

Mr. QUIE. I was asking about the private schools.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I understood the question, and I think I did answer the question. I want to go back to what I said earlier. In my judgment, that would not be appropriate because that would not be "special educational services" of the kind contemplated in section 205(2), on page 79 of the bill. That would be an appropriate kind of service set forth in section 205(a) to meet the special educational needs of public schools. But I want to make one further point. I think the gentleman is treading on very dangerous ground when he seeks to impose controls from Washington on the local public school agency in determining that.

Mr. QUIE. I want to see what the legislative intent was. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Kentucky, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Carey], if they would agree that this is correct, that item 2, to reduce class size, is acceptable for public schools but not acceptable for private schools.

Mr. POWELL. In that report, going from page 5 to page 7, you will note that all those suggested possible programs which are under local agencies are only for public schools. Then in the middle of page 7 you are again enumerating what is available for schools.

Mr. QUIE. I look at the wording on page 7 after the middle of the page as a subterfuge.

Mr. POWELL. I personally resent that because I wrote this report.

Mr. QUIE. No personal reflection is intended. You are saying funds are not available for private school teachers. Granted. But the bill grants money for public school teachers to teach in private schools, but this is not mentioned in the bill. The report says in the next sentence:

> The bill does not authorize funds for the payment of private school teachers. Nor does it authorize the purchase of materials or equipment or the construction of facilities for private schools.

But on page 9 of the bill it says that equipment can be one of the services and arrangements. So I say that is one of the areas on which we need legislative history. Equipment is defined on page 91 of the bill as everything except the teacher but no where does it say it cannot be placed on private school grounds if title is held by the local education agency.

Back now to the question the gentleman from New York did not answer. No. 2 on page 6, "Additional teaching personnel to reduce class size."

I take it, however, that the gentleman indicated that none of the provisions on pages 6 and 7 apply to private schools.

Mr. POWELL. That is correct, up to the middle of page 7. We are talking about the use of teachers to reduce class size in public schools.

Mr. QUIE. Let me ask the gentleman from Kentucky this question. Would you say that every item enumerated on pages 6 and 7, enumerating the programs of special education, apply only to the public schools and not to private schools?

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman that these are types of programs that the public schools may make available. The types of programs for the private deprived youngster is set out on pages 7 and 9 under special educational services and arrangements such as dual enrollment and educational radio and television.

Mr. QUIE. Will the gentleman just answer me yes or no? Are the programs enumerated on pages 6 and 7 only available in the public schools or are they also available for the local educational agencies to be placed in the private schools?

Mr. PERKINS. There may be very few programs that could be utilized in the private schools set forth in that list. But by and large all of these programs in my judgment are public school programs made available by public schools authority and under its control at all times.

Mr. QUIE. That answer is going to be a lot of help to a local educational agency.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I think the answer very clearly is in the words "not necessarily." There is not anything that necessarily restricts these to public schools only.

Mr. QUIE. That is an altogether different answer still from what the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Kentucky gave.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from Minnesota well knows that private pupils may participate in these programs. I do not think he should try to confuse anybody as to the individuals that may participate in the programs even though they be in the private school or public school.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. Before I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], as I get the answer now from the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] it is that these programs are only available in the public schools.

Mr. POWELL. That is correct.

Mr. QUIE. And they are not available to the public agency in a private school?

Mr. POWELL. That is correct.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman from Kentucky says they may be, in fact, though it be for private school children or pupils.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from Minnesota misunderstood me.

Mr. POWELL. I do not believe any such statement like that was made here at all.

Mr. QUIE. If I understood the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] correctly, he says it is correct. Now what did the gentleman from Kentucky say? Does he agree with the gentleman from New York?

Mr. PERKINS. These programs are under public school authority although available to deprived children to participate in. Certainly, these are public school programs.

Mr. QUIE. Now does the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] agree with these two distinguished gentlemen that these programs are available only in the public schools and the private school child would have to come to the public school in order to participate and they are not available for the private school child in the private school even though title was kept in the public school?

Mr. CAREY. If I may be permitted to answer that question in this way, this provision of necessity has to do with a public agency and only a public agency can mount the program. Therefore, the program being under the jurisdiction and control and administration of a public agency and these programs being designated as school programs have to take place in public schools because they are school programs.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. If I may ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] a question, you agree that the programs, I take it, listed on pages 6 and 7 are only being made available in public schools and cannot be made available in private schools?

Mr. CAREY. If they are school programs conducted by a school and for a school as an institution, then they have to take place in a public institution. I wonder if I can ask a question, if the gentleman from Minnesota will yield?

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman has a little reservation on this so I do not quite understand. Can some of the programs listed on pages 6 and 7 be made available to private school pupils?

Mr. CAREY. They are made available to the children—yes.

Mr. GOODELL. In the private school?

Mr. CAREY. No, they are made available to the children in the public school because the public school is administering the program. I want to inform the gentleman that the program has a fixed situs. There are public school programs that take place in my State and in my city where the situs is not part of the school but it is nevertheless a public school program.

Mr. GOODELL. Now I understand. In other words, we may have a public school program in a private school?

Mr. CAREY. Not as a private school—no—because a private school is legal entity and is different from a public school.

Mr. GOODELL. If the public school authority is providing one of these programs in a private school on private school property, then you conceive that this may be a public school program under your definition?

Mr. CAREY. It remains a public school program because it is initiated as a public school program and it is a public school program wherever it is held.

Mr. GOODELL. All right then, under this bill then you feel these services can be provided by public school authorities in the private schools?

Mr. CAREY. No.

Mr. GOODELL. Because it would be a public school program?

Mr. CAREY. No. My colleague is a good enough lawyer and an able enough lawyer to know that when one speaks of a private school he speaks of a legal, juridical entity.

Mr. GOODELL. On property owned by the private school?

Mr. CAREY. On property owned by the private school, if they are public school programs, no, because then we would be compelling public school children to go to the private school to get the public school programs. The gentleman knows we cannot do that.

Mr. GOODELL. For the private school pupils? I do not believe the gentleman answered the question.

Mr. CAREY. I have answered to the best of my ability. But I cannot answer the question to the conclusion of the gentleman and what he is attempting to reach, because I cannot share his conclusion.

Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield to me so that I may ask a question of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CAREY. I am being forced to reach what I hope is really a most unhappy conclusion. That conclusion comes from what the gentleman has said thus far.

The very able gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] very strongly supported the aid to education bill last year. He very strongly supported the higher education act and the National Defense Education Act, title 5(a), vocational guidance for private school children as well as public school children.

From the colloquy thus far, the only conclusion which I can reach is that the gentleman is opposed to giving any kind of assistance to children in the parochial schools who are needy. Is that a correct conclusion?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Minnesota yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman could not be more wrong.

I want to know what this bill is going to do for the private school pupils, and what will be involved, as a matter of legislative history. I do not wish to have the subcommittee chairman saying that it does not give aid to a private school pupil and another man making a legislative history saying that it does. I do not think that is fair to the American people. I do not think that is fair to the private schools. I do not think that is fair to the public schools.

We have a right to know what is in this bill and who is going to receive what under it.

Mr. CAREY. Then am I correct in assuming that the gentleman does favor giving some assistance to needy children in nonpublic schools?

Mr. GOODELL. I favor giving aid to the children in private schools to the extent that we can, constitutionally.

Mr. CAREY. Good.

Mr. GOODELL. We are trying to confine this. If we could get some clear answers we might know.

Mr. CAREY. The Department of Justice said that this bill was constitutional even before we tightened it up.

Mr. GOODELL. There are some distinctions which must be made. One cannot define whether a bill is constitutional or not until he knows what it is planned to do and what the limits are. We get different answers from everybody whom we ask these questions, as to what can be done under this bill as it is written. That is the whole key to it.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I should like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] a question.

On numerous occasions this afternoon we have repeatedly heard references to private schools. I should like to ask, when the phrase "private schools" is used, is it intended that this includes parochial schools as well?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York to answer the question.

Mr. GOODELL. Without question, the term "private school" includes religious parochial schools. It is a broad term which includes more than that, in that other types of private schools are also involved.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I might say, in commenting on the question raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] that last year, when the higher education bill was under consideration, it provided aid for both the private and public colleges. We made that very clear. We stated it flatly here on the floor. We said, "this provides grants to all colleges who qualify." We made it absolutely clear all the way through. We did not try to hide anything.

What I say today is that it seems you are trying to make it appear to some people that this provides aid for the private schools and to others that it does not.

The danger is not going to come to us in passing this bill. The problem will come up in the local communities, in the private schools in the community—the Lutheran private schools, the Catholic private schools, the Episcopal private schools or any other private school. They will come to the local public school agency and say, "We see these programs operating in your school. We have some poor children in our schools. We would like to have some of these programs, too. What kind of programs can we avail ourselves of?"

If those people could turn to a legislative history, when we ask questions on these matters which can be answered "yes" or "no," then all people could agree, and we could say, "This is the legislative history. You can avail yourselves of this but not that."

This seemed to be clearing up some when everybody seemed to agree with the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], that these programs on pages 6 and 7 of the report were available for the public school children in the public schools and that the private school children would have to come to the public schools to get them. Then we learned from the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY], that when he talks about the public schools, he means there could be a public school program being conducted on the grounds of a private school, or a museum, or someplace that was a vacant lot once before they built the building on it. This gives an altogether different picture from that we started to get from the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. POWELL. As you know, the idea of shared time on a Federal basis was my idea, and I referred it to the subcommittee of which the gentleman from New York is the chairman. I should know what this means, because that is the very basis of the entire situation: that public school buildings will have funds provided by the Federal Government for the educationally deprived under the local school agency and those children educationally deprived who go to private schools under this shared time concept now observed in 34 States will go to these public schools and share in these new facilities. That is the whole thing.

Mr. QUIE. May I point out to the gentleman that your bill does not provide for the language that is in this bill. Neither did this bill when it was sent up by the administration. But in the subcommittee the words "and equipment" on line 12, page 79, were added.

Mr. POWELL. That is right.

Mr. QUIE. And then the definition of "equipment" which appears on page 91 was added in which it defines as equipment, "machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them" and so forth, all the way through the definition.

I understand from what has been said today that as long as the public agency has title to the materials and administers it, it can be placed on the private school grounds. This the private school people ought to know so they can have this assistance if they want it.

Mr. POWELL. That is correct. All these new techniques of teaching are very expensive. Audiovisual, television, and tapes. You know that. These can be loaned by the local school agencies to private schools and the local school agency retains title to them. The Lord giveth and the Lord taketh away.

Mr. QUIE. They can put a structure on private grounds but they do not have to have wheels under it do they?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. QUIE. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman from Minnesota keeps referring to aid to private schools. We make no provision for aid to private schools when we make provision for such special educational services to the deprived child. The gentleman referred to the definition of "equipment." If he will read that definition, he will notice that is modified by the word "mobile" equipment.

Mr. QUIE. Where do you see the word "mobile"? You mean "mobile services and equipment"? You are saying these must be mobile structures that house them; they had better keep the wheels under the buildings?

Mr. PERKINS. If you will look at page 79 of the bill and lines 11 and 12 of the Report No. 143 you will see what I mean.

Mr. QUIE. Yes. Lines 11 and 12. It says, "and mobile educational services and equipment." You say in that language "mobile" refers to equipment as well as educational services?

Mr. PERKINS. Absolutely. And I think the gentleman will agree. He is a student of English.

Mr. QUIE. That means the structures will have to be constructed with wheels under them.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. QUIE. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I regret very much having to make this observation, but I think it was very unfortunate that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] turned himself from the merits of the discussion and the question and the very commendable effort of the gentleman from Minnesota to try to clarify what this bill means and directed his remarks in a personal way toward the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], in saying that apparently he was not interested in helping children to attend private schools. Not only is that unfair, but it is not consistent with the facts, because the gentleman from New York has been very helpful as far as amendments to the National Defense Education Act are concerned where teachers in private schools are concerned, but most prominent is the recent bill which he introduced along with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS], which would provide substantially more assistance to children in private schools than this bill and would do it in a way that would clearly be constitutional and would not raise constitutional questions and would not subject the private and parochial schools as well as the public schools to the type of Federal control which this bill will subject them to.

I hope that the gentleman will pursue his line of questioning so that we may hope to get answers that will enlighten the membership as well as the public generally on what this bill means. That is all we are trying to find out, exactly what the bill means so we will know how to vote.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman for those clarifying comments because I can say, too, from my knowledge of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] that there is no effort on his part to discriminate against people who send their children to private schools. They should not be hindered in any way from sending their children to private schools, if they so desire. So I can assure the House from my knowledge of the gentleman from New York that there was never any intention on his part to discriminate against them. But he wanted to clarify, as I am trying to do, what in the world this bill means for these individuals who are included in this legislation.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the comments made by my two colleagues. Let me give you an example of why I am concerned that the private school pupils are really going to get a pittance from this particular piece of legislation, especially in certain areas of the country. At page 149 of the hearings I asked Secretary Celebrezze:

> How many States permit aid to private schools?

Mr. Celebrezze's reply, the end of his reply I think it is fair to quote. He said:

> Our summary was that States having relatively absolute prohibitions against the use of public funds to aid sectarian schools, prohibited by the Constitution, were 28, prohibited by statute were 4.

As we went further in our colloquy, Secretary Celebrezze and myself, it developed that in 26 States it would be unconstitutional under their State constitution to provide what many of us feel is the minimal aid that should be given to private school pupils, dual enrollment, shared time. So you start right out with 26, more than half of the States, that cannot under their State constitutions provide such aid.

Then we get the information from the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] and from the gentleman from Indiana that if a State refuses to give aid to these private school pupils, the Commissioner will refuse to make the money available in that school district.

What will be the situation in these 26 States that will not even permit under their constitutions the minimal aid, permitting private school pupils to go to the public schools for shared time or dual enrollment? I think it is a very key question. A good many of the private school people feel that they are going to get a lot of money under title I. It is my feeling that they are going to get very little and perhaps the amount that they get may be in violation of the Constitution, the way the bill is written.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield.

Mr. POWELL. What the gentleman has said in his quotation of Secretary Celebrezze is correct. Also, there are 35 States that are now using the shared-time concept. Also the National Catholic Welfare Conference and Monsignor Hochwalt were very happy about this bill.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully direct the gentleman's attention to page 91, paragraph (13):

> The term "school facilities" means classrooms and related facilities * * *.

Then in paragraph (14):

> The term "equipment" includes machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them * * *.

I should like to ask the gentleman, what is the difference between "classrooms" in paragraph (13) and "any necessary enclosures or structures to house them"?

Mr. QUIE. The only thing I have been able to learn from the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] is that the "structures" mentioned in subsection 14 have to have wheels under them because he says in section 205(a)(2) "mobile" refers to the equipment. The only way I can interpret the word "mobile" is if such equipment has wheels under the structure or that any of the equipment is not bolted to the wall so they can carry it out any time they want to.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. There is one key definition and there seems to be a wide divergence of opinion as to its meaning. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] raised the question. I think in the section providing that aid must be available to private school pupils, they use the word "equipment." The definition of equipment becomes critically important. They do not use the words "school facilities" as such.

I think this is why the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] has especially directed his comments to the term "equipment."

The gentleman from California raises a very interesting question as to the distinction between the two. But this was one of the reasons why the gentleman from Minnesota, I believe, pointed particular attention to the term "equipment" in its definition.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, as I read on in section 14, it seems to include everything that would be necessary for an educational function.

Mr. QUIE. I would say everything, except the teacher is covered in subsection 14. I cannot find anyone who can tell me something that is not in there.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman from California has raised a very important point which I think should be cleared up. The term "equipment" includes machinery, utilities, built-in equipment, and any necessary enclosure or structures to house it and includes all other items necessary for the functioning of a particular facility as a facility for the provision of educational services, including items such as instruction equipment, necessary furniture, printing, publishing, and audiovisual instruction materials, books, and so forth. There are included no classrooms at all.

Mr. QUIE. No classrooms?

Mr. POWELL. No. That is to house the equipment.

Mr. QUIE. What is this facility for the provision of educational services if not a classroom?

Mr. POWELL. And be given to a private school by a local school agency in the audiovisual, and so forth field.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. If I understand the gentleman from Minnesota's colloquy with the key leaders of the other side, I believe he said the term "mobile" also applied to equipment.

The term "mobile" is used here on page 79 of the bill as to what you can provide for private schools. But when you get to the definition of equipment, we are going to have mobile built-in equipment, mobile utilities, and mobile structures and enclosures to house them.

It seems to me the gentleman is asking a very pertinent question.

The school districts are going to have to make a decision as to what kind of items they are going to have made available, because as the gentleman pointed out, the provisions on page 79 do not leave it in the discretion of the local district. It says that it has to make provision for these things and the Commissioner is going to have to decide what the public people are going to have to make available to the private.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York, a member of the subcommittee [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, this bill is a long time coming, and it will be a long time, I believe, in operation, and the more I read of the bill the more certain I am that, as drawn by the subcommittee, the language as set forth in the bill is clear to those who wish it clear and misty to those who wish it cloudy.

The word "special" means what the connotation "special" means in our language. The meaning of the words "special services" means services not for all teaching programs. In other words, each word in this bill has been carefully chosen. The bill, in my opinion, is a matter of precise draftsmanship. I am concerned that my colleague from New York [Mr. GOODELL], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], are restive because I made reference to their aims and desires. But I do think the time was there to cut the question.

I have listened for so long, and today especially, about the great concern of my colleague, as just evidenced, that the private schools will get only a pittance under this bill. I do not know what his description of a pittance is. I do know that the private schools will not get anything under this bill, but as to what the children will get under this bill for attending those schools, let me say here and now that the administration bill, the subcommittee bill, for the first time in any bill coming out of this Congress, does include the interest of all the children in all schools.

I want to find out if my colleague from New York backs that in principle?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAREY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I certainly agree with the gentleman we should have a program that helps private school pupils or private school children as much as public school children; but the gentleman has failed to convince me that when

32 States find it unconstitutional or illegal to provide any aid whatsoever, such as dual enrollment, which to me is quite simple, they are going to get any help at all.

Mr. CAREY. I will deal with that question because I hoped my colleague would bring it back out. New York State has one of the model constitutions in all the country. It was drawn by Elihu Root back in 1892, and the wording of that State constitution has been copied by many of the States. With reference to the granting of funds to sectarian institutions, all of the provisions come under the State distribution of funds for schools and direct individuals. None of these State constitutions refer to individualized services for the benefit of individuals. That is why the program administered for public schools to benefit children would not come under the prohibition of these State constitutions any more than they would come under the prohibition of the New York State constitution.

Mr. GOODELL. You are talking about a State.

Mr. CAREY. Referring to State funds. All of these constitutions speak in terms of State money. They do not pertain to Federal funds.

Mr. GOODELL. We have had some testimony of State officials to the contrary.

Mr. CAREY. I would suggest to the gentleman that he refer to the testimony and statements of the commissioner of the State of New York, Mr. Allen, a very reputable man and an outstanding educator, who stated that there would be no difficulty with this program.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman is referring to New York, but when you get 28 States that have a constitutional provision against opening their public school doors to private school pupils, to come in under a dual enrollment, it seems to me it is very unlikely you are going to get anything meaningful out of this.

Mr. CAREY. The prohibition applies to a single type of program. That is why we have a multiplicity of programs in this, so that they can choose one in helping the children who are disadvantaged in any one public school.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAREY. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman.

I share his concern, and have very much the same convictions as he does along the line of education for children in this country.

I hope that he has not misinterpreted my interrogation. I ask you frankly to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what is the legislative history of this bill and precisely what I think the gentleman feels is in this bill. What I should like to ask the gentleman is this: Can the gentleman tell us with any degree of specific instances exactly what the pupil of a private school gets or can get from this bill, or is it within the sole discretion of the school district in which the child resides?

Mr. CAREY. Certainly discretion plays a part in the decision but I would suggest that the need of the student is what would govern. If the child is deficient, say a Puerto Rican in English, I would suggest that is the kind of instruction he would receive.

Mr. CAHILL. Can the gentleman tell us the mechanics of how he would get that?

Mr. CAREY. A teacher proficient in English would try to bring that student's proficiency to the level of other students in the community, using materials from the public school program.

Mr. CAHILL. Would the teacher be supplied by the public school? Possibly the teachers in the private schools do not have sufficient time to give that child the specialized training he requires.

Mr. CAREY. If the child is deficient and is part of a group of students who are deficient in English, then that child in that school, or in other schools, will take part in this program, in the only place it can be given, in a language laboratory.

Mr. CAHILL. So does the gentleman say that if students in the private schools are not getting the quality of education the students in the public school are getting, and if in all instances they qualify under the criteria established in this bill, then they are entitled to the same quality of education within the school district as the public school child?

Mr. CAREY. The gentleman is trying to raise him to the level of excellence of the other students in that community.

Mr. CAHILL. In other words, the gentleman agrees that this bill has as its objective providing the same degree of education to the child in the private school as the child in the public school?

Mr. CAREY. Yes. I refer the gentleman to the very copious hearings we have on this bill. On some of these matters, we run into difficulty but that judgment comes from the school administrators from the States who came before the committee. These administrators indicated, one after the other, that in Los Angeles, New York, New Jersey, and Kentucky, they would have no difficulty in administering this for the benefit of all children.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAREY. I yield.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I have listened with great interest to the colloquy between the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from New Jersey. I know precisely the answer to the gentleman's problem, and I hope I can assist with this language. Services and arrangements are provided for nonpublic school students, not the special as distinguished from the general educational assistance. Thus public school boards could make available services of such special personnel as guidance counselors, speech therapists, and remedial reading specialists, who would reach into the public schools for service in the nonpublic school building, but these special services would not be part of the regular instructional program of the nonpublic school; thus the nonpublic schools would not get general classroom teachers in history, English, math, and social studies. In California and New York, they have strict constitutional provisions on aid to private schools, and particularly do not permit special services of the kind mentioned.

Therefore, the provision about providing full assistance under title I is up to the public school district, subject to the laws of the States.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Does the gentleman from New York agree with the language just read?

Mr. CAREY. Yes, it is almost as if I reiterated it.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am informed that the gentleman from Kentucky agrees?

Mr. PERKINS. I think the gentleman from New Jersey has eloquently stated the proposition.

Mr. CAREY. Mr Chairman, Albert Edward Wiggam has said:

> Intelligence appears to be the thing that enables a man to get along without education. Education appears to be the thing that enables man to get along without the use of his intelligence.

I should like to spread some intelligence about education upon this record, stressing our country's need for one without disclosing my lack of the other.

As a first item of intelligence, Mr. Chairman, some of our distinguished colleagues have expressed mystification about the source of the legislation, asking: "Where did this bill come from?"

It has been suggested that this formula, blend, and mix of titles was concocted in that occult and stygian house of alchemy, referred to scornfully by some as "downtown." On that point it is no secret that at the call of the administration, a task force—a most eminent and distinguished panel composed of the best educators, State, local, and Federal officials—worked for weeks on end to make recommendations on the kind of educational remedies we need for this day and age. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that it is good for the country we were able to avail ourselves of such a high order of good counsel in preparing legislation and that we would be unwise if not foolhardy to attempt to move forward in education without the help and guidance of those most knowledgeable in the field. But I reject any notion that we bring a bill to this floor that was precooked, frozen, and untouched by the human hands of our able subcommittee, full committee and our diligent and effective staff.

Through the long days and nights and weekends of hearings this bill has been stethoscoped and flouroscoped and microscoped and the only thing we resisted were the efforts of the minority to telescope it down to one-third its size.

Because of the splended effort which this bill represents I wish to pay a tribute to a most devoted and diligent subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky. Mr. PERKINS did not spare himself in any way in the conduct of hearings and executing executive sessions.

The staff of the subcommittee, particularly Dr. Deborah Wolfe and Mr. Jack

Reed, and of the full committee are truly deserving of high commendation.

Praise is due also to the subcommittee members on both sides for their uniformly high attendance and extensive interest in witness testimony which was characteristic of our deliberations.

Those of us who have been intimately involved with the bill know how carefully and precisely the bill has been studied, refined, redrawn, and tightened to meet every possible consideration of constitutionality, practicality, and sound policy.

Always our eye was trained on the fixed star of preservation of our traditional system of State and local control of education and the principles of educational freedom so well established in our history.

The bill before us today is about 70 percent evolution and 10 percent ingenuity. It is the result of the evolution of Federal aid to education proposals going back nearly 20 years in search of a workable approach. Most recently, the hearings and study conducted last year by the Select Subcommittee on Education under our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT], on his bill for impact of need and disadvantage, supplied the genesis for the basic approach in title I of this bill.

The origin of the concept is, therefore, no secret or mystery, and it originated here in Congress. Basically, in title I we seek to make available that quantity of support which will bring 5,200,000 children up to the level of educational excellence enjoyed by their fellow students. That quantity is estimated to require a commitment of $1 billion, and we make that commitment in the bill. We leave to local option, as we should the remedies and means to be used to achieve equality of excellence. Nowhere in this bill is there a Federal mandate. On the contrary, throughout the bill is the principle of local and State options, initiative and management.

Let me cite what title I would do for my city and what it can do for other great cities.

First, we can begin to meet the heavy cost of educating the needy child, the disadvantaged student on which we are currently spending about $120 more than we are for the more fortunate.

For the benefit of all the disadvantaged children in all the schools of New York City—public and nonpublic—we will be able to provide the services of additional personnel for such areas as health, guidance, dietetic improvement. We will be able to offer special instructional materials, extend our eminently effective higher horizons program, offer special library and cultural services, science coordination and large scale diagnostic, preventive and corrective services. We have prekindergarten programs underway and we can open these to more children in more neighborhoods and we can expand our system of all-day neighborhood schools.

In short, we will make title I work in New York City because the formula for distribution does two things that are imperative to meet our needs. First, it counts all our children who are in need and it recognizes the cost of education per pupil in our city and State to meet their needs.

After grappling with this formula for nearly 3 months, I have come to this conclusion: The formula is like eating olives. You may not like the first taste but as you digest it a few times it becomes more and more palatable.

The best proof of the workability of this formula is very simple. It counts every child and it recognizes the cost of the quality differential for educational excellence, locality by locality and the best proof of its merit in this bill is that no substitute formula offered to the committee would distribute these funds without penalizing one section of the country in order to support another. As is, this formula works. It deserves a trial. Most importantly by the action of our subcommittee the bill comes back before us next year for reexamination, review, and if need be, revision.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to the quantity of education provisions comprising title I, I would like to stress the quality of education features in chief as they are set forth in titles II and IV.

I have a paternal attitude toward title II as my bill, H.R. 13, which I suggested last fall and submitted in January, is basically the same as this title. Therefore, I strongly support the provisions of title II for the improvement of school library resources and other instructional materials for all of our schoolchildren. A school without a library is a crippled school and children who attend such schools are not being provided an equal opportunity for education. More than half of our schools, with more than 10 million of our children, have no school libraries at all.

This title would authorize allotments of $100 million to the States to be expended under a State plan developed by a State agency. The plan would set forth a program for the acquisition of library resources—including audiovisual materials—textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials for the use of children in elementary and secondary schools of the State. For the first fiscal year—1966—in which the program is operative, an amount equal to as much as 5 percent would be available from the State's grant to defray administrative costs of the program.

The State plan would set forth criteria to be used in making the library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials available to children and teachers in elementary and secondary schools in the State. The State plan would take into consideration the relative need of children and teachers for such materials and provide assurance that such materials would be provided on an equitable basis for all elementary and secondary school children and teachers.

In making library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials available to elementary and secondary students who were not enrolled in public schools, the State agency would be required, by the terms of the legislation, to so administer the program as to conform to State law.

The committee has taken care to assure that funds provided under this title will not inure to the enrichment or benefit of any private institution by providing that:

First. Library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials are to be made available to children and teachers and not to institutions.

Second. Such materials are made available on a loan basis only.

Third. Public authority must retain title and administrative control over such materials.

Fourth. Such material must be that approved for use by public school authority in the State. The selection of material would be entirely in the hands of State and/or local personnel.

Fifth. Books and material must not supplant those being provided children but must supplement library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials to assure that the legislation will furnish increased opportunities for learning.

These conditions can in no way under the terms of the legislation be circumvented, but at the same time, assurance in the administration of the State plan must be given so that the library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials will be available on an equitable basis to all elementary and secondary school children and teachers.

The availability of good school libraries and good teaching materials is essential to good teaching and true learning. Can we say that we are truly concerned with the ability of boys and girls to read well and with enjoyment and understanding if we do not provide school libraries for their use and libraries to guide them?

It is in the elementary school that lifetime habits and attitudes toward reading are developed. This is the school age when nearly all children like to read or be read to. But this natural desire can be frustrated and destroyed if reading is only a classroom chore, if there are no libraries to make it a journey of satisfaction and exploration.

This journey, however, is blocked in even our largest cities before it begins. In 10 of our largest cities, only 1 out of 4 schoolchildren in these cities had a library. One city had 2 elementary-school libraries serving less than 10 percent of the students. Three cities spent less than 15 cents a year for each pupil for library books. The pattern in these cities is duplicated elsewhere in the country, in towns and communities across the land. The answer in these schools to "why Johnny can't read" may well be that there is little for him to read and little stimulus or pleasure in reading.

"We have not really taught the student to read unless he reads because he wants to, sees sense and purpose in it, enjoys and profits from it," says John H. Fischer, president of the Columbia University Teachers College:

> Such reading is not likely to occur unless the student has a chance to choose books for himself* * *. It is this opportunity and stimulus that a library in a school provides.

One of the noted researchers on the teaching of reading to slow-learning, disadvantaged children testified that after those children learn to read, they need libraries to stimulate their desire and interest in continuing to read and learn.

In another piece of research it was found that when central libraries are provided in elementary schools, with qualified personnel to supervise and direct a program of services, children and teachers alike received a number of benefits otherwise denied to them: First, they had immediate access to a more adequate collection of learning materials both in their classrooms and central libraries—that is, more and better materials were found in those schools having a central library than in those using classroom collections alone; second, children did more reading and therefore there was less apt to be a significant proportion of nonreaders in schools having central libraries; and, perhaps most interesting to all; third, greater education gain between the fourth and the sixth grades was found to be associated with those children having access to a central library with a full-time librarian within their school building.

Many schools are just as inadequate in the quality and recency of their textbooks as they are in libraries. Textbook sales in our Nation in 1963 amounted to $293 million, or only $6.11 per student. In some States, as much as $12.32 was spent per student, in others as little as $4.76. Copies of a single modern hardback textbook often cost as much as the entire year's school budget for new instructional books.

For so many families the purchase of a child's textbooks is a luxury they can ill afford. A 1964 study shows that one-fourth of the school systems in 128 of our largest cities do not provide free textbooks at the high school level. Nonpublic schools rarely provide free textbooks. A poor family with children in high school may be required to spend $15 to $20 or more per child for up-to-date textbooks, a prohibitive sum when money does not exist for many of the barest necessities of life. In 1961 parents spent over $90 million for textbooks—approximately 40 percent of that year's total expenditures for textbooks. Children in families unable to support this extra burden are often turned from the halls of the school to the alleys of the slums. We cannot afford this loss.

I conclude, as did the President in his message on education:

> The cost of purchasing textbooks at increasing prices put a major obstacle in the path of education—an obstacle that can and must be eliminated.

For all these reasons, I urge your support of this essential education bill and specifically title II.

As to title IV, education is changing—and change accompanies progress. But mere change is no guarantee of quality. Change in education should be based on first-rate research and development and it should be made readily available to all students. Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 would amend the Cooperative Research Act of 1954—Public Law 83–531—to provide new and expanded programs of research and development to promote quality education in all schools of this Nation.

Significant progress has already been made in educational research. For example:

Programs have been developed to guide elementary school children in discovering the basic concepts of mathematics; results are so encouraging that many school systems throughout the country are adopting the methods.

Studies supported under the cooperative research program have shown that the rate of listening comprehension of blind children can be raised to levels above those for children with unimpaired sight—in fact, to four times the comprehension speed of braille.

Effective preschool education programs are being developed for children from impoverished backgrounds to compensate for the retarding effects of disadvantaged home and neighborhood backgrounds.

Grade school pupils have been successfully taught anthropology and college level economics; this indicates that curriculum evaluation and research are necessities at all levels.

Research is thus at the heart of improved education. However, our present expenditures on educational research are but a small answer to a great need. Education, with a total annual expenditure of about $34 billion is the Nation's No. 1 industry. Yet we spend only $72 million—or one-fifth of 1 percent of our total educational outlays—for research and development in this vital field.

Perhaps the greatest danger to our schools in an age of accelerating change is adherence to outmoded practice—a danger which persists in the absence of research. They system of national and regional educational laboratories which would be established under the Cooperative Research Act as amended by title IV of this bill is designed to avoid this danger by mobilizing resources at all educational levels to bring about innovation and experimentation.

DR. KILLIAN DISTRIBUTIVE INNOVATION

Education is the joint concern of local schools, universities, and other groups within communities—it is the concern of scholars and researchers from many disciplines as well as local school personnel. Accordingly the laboratory program will bring together artists, historians, mathematicians, and other scholars to work closely with psychologists, sociologists, teachers, and administrators from local school systems to develop and evaluate curriculums and educational programs.

Well-worn curriculums are now too often outworn. Curriculum innovation, which is crucial to quality education, will be an important function of the laboratory program. The laboratories will provide a means by which a variety of groups can work together in curriculum development, thus avoiding the possibility of any one group controlling what is taught in school systems. This interdisciplinary attack on educational problems is new but not unprecedented in educational research. In recent years the National Science Foundation and the Office of Education have supported projects in which competent scholars in several fields have worked side by side with local school personnel and educators. The laboratories will continue these efforts, but on a larger scale and with expanded scope. Most of the advancements thus far have been made in the fields of science and mathematics. The social sciences, the arts, the humanities, and other fields demand and deserve similar efforts to overcome outmoded curricular practice. The laboratories will bring together a variety of groups and individuals to work on just curricular innovation.

To carry out research is to assume the obligation of disseminating the findings, so that education as a whole may benefit. In medicine the average lag between research and its application is estimated at 2 years. In education, the process often takes 30 years or more. The record of education in publishing research findings has not been satisfactory, but the laboratory program is designed to overcome these shortcomings. One reason for this time lag traditionally has been the exclusion of teachers and administrators from the process of innovation. But who knows more about the schools than those who work in them every day? Under the laboratory program, as I have explained, these individuals will be involved from the offset. Each laboratory will be associated with local school systems where laboratory-tested techniques and programs can be tried out and evaluated on a large scale. This working relationship will also offer extensive means for demonstrating the effectiveness of tested techniques and programs.

Moreover by training teachers in the presence of these innovative activities, the laboratories will insure that the new generation of teachers will be prepared for new educational programs being developed and will themselves be open to experimentation and innovation. Teacher education does not take place in a vacuum. Practice and the lessons of trial and error are essential to teacher education. The laboratories will offer opportunities through model schools as well as through local school systems for student teachers to work with pupils under the supervision and guidance of experts. These "clinical" experiences are already part of present-day teacher education programs, but they fall short of the need in quantity and quality.

Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 can bring about the types of change in our educational system which will produce quality in educational materials, excellence in teaching, and reawaken the wonder of learning in children. To bring this about requires the efforts of many good people already doing many important things—scientists, scholars, teachers, and others inside and outside of the educational community. It is necessary to provide the facilities and the means to allow them to work continuously on the critical problems in American education and to make certain that this information becomes available to the schools in the form of rigorously tested and carefully evaluated educational techniques and materials. It is no less necessary to insure a continuous supply of well-prepared teachers and qualified researchers to continue this important task. The national and regional educational facilities established under this title can be the means of producing these changes in American education. What is necessary is the courage to experiment, the willingness to learn, and faith in the future of American education.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN].

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my unhesitating support for the bill presently under debate, as reported by the Education and Labor Committee. I am privileged to have given bipartisan sponsorship to the legislation, having cointroduced the administration's bill and having presented a supporting case in its behalf to the committee. Now I welcome the opportunity to discuss it today.

We must all come to recognize the overwhelming importance of education to the spiritual and material well-being of every citizen. We can no longer afford to shirk this prime responsibility because of trivial argument or secondary considerations.

In this country, presumably the most powerful and wealthiest in the world, there are still 8 million adults lacking more than 5 years of schooling. In 1963, 10 States with the lowest per capita income had draft rejection rates from 25 to 48.3 percent on mental tests. In the age bracket from 18 to 24, the unemployment rate hovers at 20 percent of those willing and able to find work.

These statistics, and a host of others, mean that the onrush of technology and automation and population growth is leaving structural disadvantage in its wake. There is a direct correlation between low income, environmental poverty, and educational deprivation.

The one instrument which holds the greatest potential in meeting these penetrating problems is better education and greater access to it. This bill is an effective response.

Title I will authorize $1.06 billion to strengthen the educational fiber of economically deprived areas. The funds will be directed toward regions where families average less than $2,000 in annual income. School districts in these concentrations will be able to hire additional staff, construct needed facilities, acquire new equipment, and expend for other appropriate uses.

Title II recognizes the increasing need for more school library resources, more textbooks and other instructional material. We have testimony that nearly 70 percent of all elementary schools lack libraries at a time when more and more of the working day will be spent in libraries and laboratories. A curriculum which cannot provide for library reference is obsolete.

In this instance the lack of libraries and instructional matter is not felt in any one particular area of the country, but is widespread and general. Title II provides $98 million to States on the basis of the number of children enrolled; drawings are dependent upon the submission of detailed State plans outlining the programing of funds. State plans must set forth their criteria in distributing the library resources, textbooks, and other material.

This authorization is not intended for the advantage of any specific private institutions. On the contrary, the bill insures that the benefits will accrue directly to the schoolchildren.

Supplemental educational centers and services are offered under title III. Local educational agencies may apply to the Commissioner of Education for a center or certain services especially designed to meet the varying needs and interests of school localities. Such applications must be approved by the State educational authority; and $100 million is authorized under this title for fiscal year 1966.

Many communities are expending enormous sums on education, and all of them feel the budget strain. Title III is designed to allow school districts to effectuate programs and services which the local educational authorities deem essential to their school system, and which are currently overshadowed by budgetary demands. Title III is meant to provide services such as guidance, counseling, remedial instruction, and health programs.

The issue before us is whether or not we shall provide a meaningful complement to traditional State responsibility in this field of education. We know that education is becoming an essential ingredient to the potential of every citizen; we know that a gulf exists between the demands of the labor market and the lack of skills and basic education which is a growing disadvantage.

The long-term answer to cyclical poverty and regional depression must rest with coming generations. To widen the access to better education is indispensable in addressing this acute national problem.

Hence the benefits of this bill are going to be realized over a long range of time.

I urge the House to adopt this measure with a convincing majority.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. COLLIER].

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, since I have been a Member of this body there have been several variable formulas for Federal aid to education at the primary and secondary school levels. The distinguished gentleman from New York pointed out that the formula upon which this legislation is now based was the result of recommendations, and study by experts in the field of education, and of this I do not doubt. However, I think it is true that many of the same experts have over the years come up with many other different formulas including one which was a marked change. It failed because Federal aid to education became entangled in a web of religion and politics and consequently fell into a sort or an impasse. Now we have this new formula to seek to circumvent the problem of the separation of church and state which got the whole issue bogged in the political mire 4 years ago.

At any rate, that is not my main problem at this moment.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to argue with my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, but I wonder if the pending bill actually does circumvent the church-state issue. The discussion we have had this afternoon, which has consumed most of our time, may be some indication that this bill does not avoid that issue. I wish to emphasize again that there are ways, notably the Ayres-Goodell-Curtis approach, under which we could provide education assistance to individuals—assistance which would preserve educational freedom, and under which there would be no constitutional question whatever. I would much prefer that approach.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman. If the objection is to the semantics I suppose I might plead guilty. However, the point I make is that the religious issue was thoroughly involved. I recall so well when a parochial school amendment was offered to the Federal-aid-to-education bill about 4 years ago the Chair ruled that it was not germane. I merely wanted to make the point that they have found a partial solution, let us say, whether you call it circumvention or not. But, as I said before, that is not my principal concern as one who intends to vote against this ill-conceived bill.

I have heard repeated reference to the term "educationally underprivileged." And I would certainly like to get this in perspective if it is possible. And for this purpose let me, if I may, give a hypothetical case. I would welcome an explanation of this from any member of the distinguished committee that has brought this bill to the floor of the House.

Let us assume that we have district A in State X which has a 600-pupil enrollment. It has 30 pupils, or 5 percent of this enrollment, which comes from families with incomes of less than $2,000 a year. The school tax revenue in this district is entirely adequate to provide schools with excellent standards and facilities.

Now, on the other hand, let us take the example of district B in State X which has again an enrollment of 600 pupils. None of the pupils in this district come from families with annual incomes of less than $2,000, nor are they sons or daughters of people on welfare or relief.

Yet let us assume further that this particular school district has school tax revenues of less than the amount in school district A.

Now, do I understand that notwithstanding that the facilities are better, the tax income which makes it possible to provide better facilities, better teachers and so on in school district A still makes the 5 percent of these students educationally underprivileged; whereas, the students in school district B where the tax revenue is less, where the standards and teaching perhaps are not as good, where facilities are not as adequte, are not educationally underprivileged children? Hence I just want to understand what an "educationally underprivileged" means.

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman will yield, there is no 5-percent provision in this title. We have a 3-percent provision and that only applies where the Federal Commissioner of Education has determined——

Mr. COLLIER. Since I have the floor, may I suggest to the gentleman that I have made a point here and I am sure the gentleman knows what the point is. This is a hypothetical situation and the percentage figure has absolutely no bearing on the question. There have been enough evasions today on this matter. I would think that at this late hour we could provide direct answers to the questions posed.

Mr. PERKINS. I regret that the gentleman did not want me to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. COLLIER. That is just it. I do want the gentleman from Kentucky to answer the question.

The question was, In which instance is the particular youngster in the hypothetical cases which I have propounded educationally underprivileged?

Mr. PERKINS. The purpose of this bill is to reach the deprived youngster whether he is in a wealthy community or a poor community.

We feel that the youngster that meets the qualifications as provided in this bill deserves assistance wherever he may be.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman, and I have no quarrel with this. But I would favor removing the term "educationally underprivileged" and say "the economically underprivileged," rather than deal in terms that are inaccurate as they pertain to this legislation.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. At this point, allow me to congratulate the author of this historic legislation—the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky—on his continued efforts to improve the lot of our educational system. Also, the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, the distinguished gentleman from New York, must share much of the credit for having this very necessary bill before us today.

Mr. Chairman, the idea of Federal aid to education is not a new one. The idea of allocating that aid on the basis of needy children, however, is relatively new. Little more than 1 year ago—on February 27, 1964—I introduced a bill to that effect. At that time hearings were conducted and investigations were made into the feasibility of such a concept. It was my intention to introduce a modified and improved version of that legislation in this Congress when H.R. 2362 was drafted and introduced. Let me say that my initial efforts are honored by this comprehensive package of promise. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins] has, in this bill, provided an answer to helping the educationally deprived child; a child who, through no fault of his own, finds himself steadily falling behind other more privileged students. Aside from title I of the bill, action is also called for in an across-the-board devotion of attention to the long-neglected realm of education.

Since the thrust of H.R. 2362 is, in fact, title I, it appears the better part of wisdom to devote most of my comments to the provisions contained therein. At the outset, it must be well understood that there will always be controversy with any formula which attempts to define what is or is not an educationally deprived child. Total agreement here is impossible. What is important, and where controversy can be replaced with near unanimity, however, is the concept of aid to education for children of needy families—for this is the best available measure of educational deprivation. What is or is not a needy family is likewise difficult to ascertain in a generalized formula. This notwithstanding, H.R. 2362 does provide a reasonable guideline of poverty for the vast majority of our citizens' children. Such a guideline is critical for the purposes of this bill; and these purposes—being mainly the improved education of unfortunate children—cannot honestly be disputed.

Mr. Chairman, we have heard, and will continue to hear, onslaughts to this legislation. The minority professes to recognize a great problem in providing educational opportunities for deprived children and a commitment to meet those problems, and in the same breath, offers a substitute which would eliminate half of the educationally deprived children helped by the committee bill and reduce the funds devoted to their education by more than 70 percent.

Mr. Chairman, I daresay that most of us in this Chamber have some sort of alternative proposal. I have debated several in my own mind and before the Committee on Education and Labor; proposals which would not touch the concept of the aid, but which would—in my eyes at least—provide a more equitable distribution of the funds if, indeed, that is possible. In any event, let us on this occasion finally stand up to the problem our educational system faces. Let us resolve that our greatest natural resource is the young and impressionable mind; the mind which can lend itself to promise and opportunity—or the same mind which may find itself stopped short of even a trace of hope.

Mr. Chairman, from this resolution I ask all Members to at least consider the child benefactor of this bill; and to set aside petty grievances about supposed regional inequities. Consider that child whether he be in New York or California or Alabama or Oklahoma. He is still a child, and he is an American; and he has been born into a land of unfulfilled opportunity; and he is justly entitled to a chance at that opportunity.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Thompson].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill. I commend it without reservation as a good bill; a bill which pinpoints Federal assistance to the areas of greatest need—the educationally and culturally deprived pupils coming from the most impoverished of our families.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins], author of the bill, and the chairman of the subcommittee which is managing the proposal, has given an adequate and thorough description of the various title, so I shall confine my remarks to general principles.

I do, however, want to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Kentucky for his long persistence in this field, as well as for the diligence he displayed this year in presiding over the long public hearings, the difficult markup sessions of the subcommittee, and his defense of the subcommittee draft during full committee sessions.

We have something in common in the field of education legislation, despite the fact that we represent different constituencies; he a rural area in Appalachia, I an urban area in the northeastern megalopolis.

During his first term in the House he got his baptism during the fight to enact the Thomas-Taft bill, which was hung up on the church-state issue. In 1961 I was the sponsor of President Kennedy's elementary and secondary education bill. It, too, fell by the wayside because of the self same church-state issue.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. First, I want to compliment the gentleman from New Jersey because I do not know of any individual who has contributed more in this field. The gentleman from New Jersey has in past years actively supported general aid to education. I agree wholeheartedly with the gentleman from New Jersey and with the experience that we have both had in this field. We have seen too many outstanding elementary and secondary educational bills fall by the wayside because of the religious issue. I think the gentleman will agree with me that some of our old enemies of Federal aid are back again trying to kill off another great piece of legislation.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins] and I are both very sensitive to this issue. I am not positive about him, but if the dignity of this body permitted me to remove my jacket, shirt, and undershirt, I could show Members the scars to prove my sensitivity.

I have these credentials to speak on this subject and I have these scars because of my own personal and deep convictions on the sanctity of the first amendment.

On that basis, then, I can assure my colleagues that I support this bill, in all of its ramifications, wholeheartedly and without reservation. The bill as originally proposed was clear in its intent on this critical matter. The changes made in subcommittee, as reflected by the committee amendment, strengthened the protections which were clearly the intent of the original legislation.

During our hours of debate today, and, when we get to the 5-minute rule, Members will be expressing doubts, raising questions, voicing reservations. The effect—no matter how sincere they may be—will be only to muddy waters.

We shall also be hearing a great deal about the formula in title I. I myself am not too happy with it. I cannot devise one that is better. As the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] has already pointed out, we are forced to use 1959 income data because there are no more recent data.

It is as simple as that.

Most of the arguments and dispute over the formula should not be directed to this bill. They should be directed to the appropriate subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, headed by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS].

That subcommittee will, within the next few months, begin hearings on bills to authorize the mid-decade census. Such legislation has been cosponsored by a number of colleagues from both sides of the aisle.

I hope the members of that subcommittee, the full committee, and the House, properly interpret our formula debate as an argument in behalf of the mid-decade, "instant census."

I hope the Bureau of the Budget reads this debate carefully. In another year the Budget Bureau told this subcommittee that there was no need for a mid-decade census.

This committee alone has this bill now; last year we had the Economic Opportunity Act and will soon be revising it. We are spending billions and distributing them on the basis of income data that are 6 years old.

One other point, Mr. Chairman, before I conclude. We have given the local public school agencies every latitude in devising programs to improve educational opportunities for the culturally deprived children. In doing so we recognize and pay tribute to the principle of local control of education. We also realize that the program of greatest urgency in one area may not necessarily be of such urgency in another.

I would hope, however, that local school administrators would not overlook the great advantages of well-conceived and well-operated preschool programs, run by professional educators, just because we have not spelled out these programs.

Again, because we have not spelled out such programs—in fact the legislation does not spell out any specific programs—let it be a part of the legislative history that we intend the "instructional materials" phraseology of the bill to include those materials peculiarly suited to preschool training programs.

A review of the testimony we heard shows ample evidence that well-conceived preschool programs, especially for children from impoverished families, can do and have done much to enable these children to stay abreast of their classes in the learning process.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I enthusiastically support this bill. I think it is entirely defensible and I think it is a splendid opportunity for the Congress to do what it should have done many years ago.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY].

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, I support fully the objectives of the President as far as hard-pressed school districts are concerned. Indeed, I have repeatedly said that I thought the only real long-range solution to our problems such as poverty and crime lies in education.

As to H.R. 2362, however, I am frank to say that unless certain amendments are adopted—which I understand will be offered—I cannot in all conscience support this legislation, in spite of the fact that many of my friends in education in the State of Washington have urged me to vote for the bill.

To begin with, I have grave misgivings as to the bill's constitutionality, and in this connection, I am hopeful that a provision will be added authorizing judicial review.

Nor am I happy with the basis of distribution of funds under title I. Unless this formula is changed, it will mean that many prosperous areas will receive disproportionate assistance, while districts with low-income families will suffer.

As to the bill, I think that we should face up to the fact that Federal assistance in this case would not be without cost to a State. According to the Tax Foundation, the first year's cost to Washington State taxpayers would be $18,600,000. Under various titles of the bill, we would receive back $12,718,444. Thus, we would receive back far less than we would contribute. But this is not my chief objection, and if certain amendments, as I said, are adopted—such as those that will be offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN]—I could look favorably on the legislation.

Meanwhile, I know that a great many of the constituents that I represent are fearful of this program. They view it as transferring too much control to the Federal Government and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Second, they think that it would lead to straight out-and-out Federal aid to education, regardless of need, and regardless of poverty areas. Then, too, of course, there is the constitutional issue of separation of church and state.

Recently, I sent out a questionnaire on this bill. The question was worded for me by a political scientist. A preliminary tabulation of replies, showing the concern of the majority of my constituents, was as follows:

One proposal before Congress is that we spend $1½ billion to give aid to schools in low-income districts, provide school facilities, textbooks and the like. Supporters argue that providing a decent education for all American children now will pay substantial long-range dividends, and that expenditures of this size are necessary if we are to have anything more than a token program. Opponents argue that this could lead to Federal control of education, and that it is unconstitutional to give any form of aid to parochial schools. How do you feel about Federal aid to education?"

No opinion	**0**
Very much in favor (18 percent)	**552**
Somewhat in favor (13 percent)	**350**
Neutral (3 percent)	**103**
Somewhat opposed (25 percent)	**730**
Very much opposed (41 percent)	**1174**

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated, unless the House makes a number of changes in the bill, I shall be constrained to vote against it.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. BURTON].

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I had not felt constrained to join in this debate today until a few moments ago, when I heard the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Kentucky, say it was his great interest in this bill that needy students deserving of help be reached wherever they are, in rich communities or in poor communities. I want to ask him, if he will yield to me for a question, if he would extend this great desire to include students living in populous counties and communities and students living in not-so-populous counties and communities.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman this bill reaches educationally deprived children regardless of whether they are in populous counties or rural counties.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Perhaps the gentleman can clear up a point for me that appears in the committee print in this bill. When it has reference to the State of Utah, it has no amount allocated for 11 of the counties in that State, and I think 7 or 8 of the counties shown are listed as depressed counties by the ARA and eligible for their assistance.

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman will turn to page 1234 of the hearings he will find listed data on all the counties in the Nation, and the counties listed with less than 100, of course, are not eligible under this bill.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. It is my understanding that this figure eliminates 11 rural counties that I represent in the State of Utah. As I was about to say, I think seven or eight of these counties qualify for ARA aid as depressed areas. One of the reasons they qualify for ARA aid is that they are depressed areas, and over the years because of economic conditions they have been losing population.

I wonder if the gentleman would support an amendment to strike that limitation.

Mr. PERKINS. We feel this is a reasonable figure. The subcommittee felt the cutoff figure of 100 was reasonable. The measure of poverty in this legislation is the number of children in families of less than $2,000.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Why do we have to have a cutoff mark?

Mr. PERKINS. From the standpoint of administration, we must have a figure that is reasonable.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Is it not true that the State and the county school districts, the local officials, are going to administer the program?

Mr. PERKINS. Where we have census data, the payments will be made to the State agency for that particular educational agency, but where we do not have the data below the county level that determination will be made by the State board of education and not by the county.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. This is on the county level. I am talking about 11 counties. If the State of Utah wants to arrive at a formula it cannot distribute it to the counties. I understand that the gentleman said they are prohibited from doing this.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman misunderstood my answer. In those counties with fewer than 100 educationally deprived children, under the definition of children in families with incomes less than $2,000, there is no impact in those counties. I do want to state that approximately 95 percent of the 3,100 counties qualify for assistance under this act.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I certainly disagree with that. I should like for the Chairman to see some of these counties. There is a very definite economic impact.

Mr. PERKINS. I believe the census data is the best and most reliable data we have available.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I want to say that these areas are definitely economically impacted. They are definitely in need of aid, if aid comes to the State of Utah.

I certainly believe the administering agency for the State of Utah would like to see some of these counties get aid.

I would again remind the House that 7 or 8 of these 11 counties being excluded, qualify for ARA aid.

I assume, from what the chairman said, that he would not support this amendment. I take it from that he would have to amend his earlier statement that he wants to see this aid go to deprived students, whether in rich areas or poor areas. He would exclude those who live in the less populous counties.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I believe the gentleman has made an excellent point and he has demonstrated how unfair and inequitable the formula in the bill obviously is. The aid provided under this bill is not going to be based on whether a school district is able to adequately finance an educational program.

Montgomery County, Md., for example, is the wealthiest county in the United States, where the average income is approximately $10,000 per year per family; yet Montgomery County is going to receive more than a half-million dollars the first year for children who are already going to the best public schools in the United States. The advocates of this bill have not explained how the half-million dollars going into Montgomery County will be used to help the so-called educationally deprived children in Montgomery County, which already has adequate ability to finance its school system, at the same time.

This bill would omit, and would not include, depressed counties in the gentleman's State which do not have adequate financial ability to finance an educational system.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. And each of these 11 counties has been losing population. As I say, seven or eight have qualified under the Area Redevelopment Act, because of depressed conditions.

May I add, in conjunction with what my friend from Michigan said, each of these 11 counties has its own county district school administration program. They could administer the program just as well as Salt Lake County, the largest recipient of the aid under the bill.

I had heard that there was a consensus among some Members of this body that they would accept no amendments to this bill, however worthy they might be. This colloquy has indicated to me that that may be the case.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico [Mr. POLANCO-ABREU].

Mr. POLANCO-ABREU. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration is of crucial importance to the schoolchildren of Puerto Rico. When it was under consideration by the Committee on Education and Labor, I explained for the record that year in and year out the largest item in the budget of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico has been for education. Twenty-five to thirty percent of the budget has regularly been devoted to educational programs. In 1940 this meant $7 million for the public schools, and for 1963 it meant more than $113 million, out of total revenues of $393 million. Yet, these sums were far from adequate to provide educational facilities and instruction by mainland comparisons.

I told the committee that in the sense of appropriating money for public schools in Puerto Rico the government has had to run fast just to stay even with the situation. Ours is a young population with the corresponding great percentage still of school age. Truly, it has been an enormous problem for Puerto Rico.

Despite our efforts to provide an adequate education, as we must, for our children, and with a school attendance compulsory only through the sixth grade, many of the children in the elementary grades are deprived of a schoolday such as is known generally by the children of the 50 States. We have both double enrollment and interlocking enrollment. Under the first of these, two groups of students share the same teacher, and she divides her time attending one group in the morning and the second group in the afternoon. Where present means require this division, the students gets only 3 hours of instruction per day. In interlocking enrollment, the same classroom is shared by two teachers; the first one uses it in the forenoon, and the second occupies it in the afternoon with another group of students. This procedure allows 5 hours of instruction per day.

Such multiple use of classrooms will have to continue in Puerto Rico until funds are available for the building of additional classrooms in sufficient numbers.

H.R. 2362, under the formula provided in title I, would contribute approximately $30 million to Puerto Rico's school system. It would provide more than one-fourth of the amount appropriated for education by the Commonwealth government in 1963. It would allow a tremendous improvement in educational facilities and in educational standards for Puerto Rico's children of school age. The reason for this is that there are approximately 488,000 families in Puerto Rico with incomes of less than $2,000 a year. This amounts to 60 percent of the Puerto Rican families who regrettably are in this low-income category.

In my opinion, no single piece of legislation which has ever come before the Congress could mean as much as the bill before us now, in terms of creating opportunity for the children of school age in Puerto Rico, both now and in the years ahead, and no bill has had such significance in the sense of building a foundation for a better, sustaining, and contributing citizenry of tomorrow.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, what is being tested today is this country's determination to recognize the importance of basic education as an arsenal of national strength. We have committed ourselves to the recognition of the importance of education to our national welfare in the field of higher education, in vocational education, in the sciences and mathematics. What is being discussed today is whether this Nation has a sufficient interest in the basic education of our young children in the primary and secondary schools across America. Does this Nation have a concern whether our children are receiving an education commensurate with their specific needs? And if an area of particular need is recognized as being general and uniform throughout this country, is this need being adequately met by any national program and indeed by any State program?

It has always been my belief that the single most important institution in a free and democratic society is its centers and systems of education. Through education, and education alone, a society is able to perpetuate itself, its ideals, its goals, its aspirations, its traditions and its culture. Education is not merely an instrument of the perpetuation of knowledge or the promulgation of technical data and methods. Rather it is a process by which a highly organized society transmits to its new citizens an understanding of a way of life, motivates them to create better ideas, and encourages the utilization of the greatest potential of an individual through the discovery of latent qualities. Without a highly developed educational system any society suffers in a diminution of the discovery of human potential. And even in a highly developed educational system often the individual needs of large segments fail of special attention because of the sheer weight of the size of the system and the numbers of children involved in this total process.

No one doubts the fact that children of the very poor families who live in the slum tenements all across this country suffer mentally as well as physically from this deprivation. Their family life is all but a vacuum of daily subsistence. There is no family effort or ability to supplement the young child's mind with the wonders of learning and the child is handicapped from this accident of birth for this socioeconomic disability which in most cases continues on as a fetter upon his whole future development.

The main thrust of this bill is to help give this kind of child, wherever he might be found, special help through programs initiated by the local school agencies.

So many of us enthusiasts for general aid to education have been struggling in our own local school areas to upgrade education generally. We have seen our efforts to produce substantial gains in achievement and in a higher quality of the educational product discouraged by proliferation of local meager resources into high cost areas of special education for special problems.

The greatest feature of this bill is its fundamental thesis; that special attention and programing need to be conceived to help the children of our economically deprived families. This bill commits $1 billion, roughly only 1 percent of the national budget, to this program of special aid to the educationally deprived youngsters of our country. Many educators tell us that these poor children often take 2 to 3 years after entry in the first grade to acquire the background of knowledge which most 6-year-olds bring with them when they first enter school. This bill will help to close this gap and give these children supplemental services to make up for the early years of intellectual deprivation. So much of our problems of the older child, of the dropout, of the undereducated, of the unskilled is rooted in our lack of care and attention during that child's early and formative years when it might have such a difference in his development, in his outlook, and attitude toward his ability to succeed.

I recognize that this is not a general aid bill and because it is not, it leaves much more for the future Congresses to consider. What it is is a first step, long overdue, toward the enactment of a comprehensive aid to primary and secondary education. So far as I am concerned the only general principle it establishes is the role of the National Government in the special concerns of basic education, and a commitment of a small part, at least, of our national wealth for special educational programs for our youth.

The special problems of a child from a poor family create special burdens upon the school system and upon the teachers who are called upon to devote extra effort for these children, sometimes at a sacrifice of others in the classroom. This program of special attention to these poor children will undoubtedly have impact upon the quality of education of others not directly affected by the bill. With special teachers for these underachievers, with supplementary instructional materials, with preschool training programs, with remedial programs in the basic areas, and with increased guidance facilities for these poor children, the total school population will benefit greatly by equalizing the range of competitive effort in the classroom. It is the beginning of a broad program of equalizing educational opportunity, so that the real talents and capabilities of the child can be discovered and encouraged to its ultimate potential.

The power of America lies in its human resource. This bill embodies the spirit and philosophy of our way of life, that each human being has the capacity of greatness. That in helping the poor child, this Nation sets forth its basic belief of the individual worth of man and his innate ability to contribute to our society, and that the poor need not continue to be poor, but that through education they may be liberated and their human power released for the betterment of the total society.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and to participate in this historic development of the enlargement of opportunities for millions of our deprived and disadvantaged children.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2362. The bill we are considering is a potent instrument in the eradication of poverty and its attendant ills.

It is an accepted fact that poverty tends to beget poverty. When a child rises above his impoverished surroundings, obtains a good education, and makes something of himself, his is called "the American story." We respect and admire such a person and give the story of his life wide publicity. And this is as it should be. We all love to hear about an individual who succeeds in spite of adversities in childhood.

If we have ever wondered about the fate of his poverty-stricken contemporaries, we have in the past quickly dismissed such a troublesome thought with the rationalization that it was not our concern.

But facts have been brought to our attention which show that it is our concern, the concern of the Congress, the several States, and of the Nation. Over 8 million adult Americans have completed less than 5 years of school. There is a 20-percent unemployment rate among our 18- to 24-year-old youngsters. Draft rejection rates in 10 of our States because of basic educational deficiencies ran as high as 25 to 48.3 percent in 1963. These and other similar facts are especially disturbing in the light of technological developments of recent years and their resultant demand for the skilled and the educated.

The proposed legislation dramatizes our national concern over this problem. It provides a remedy that is at once immediate, effective, and permanent. That it will have consequences reaching far into the future is apparent. Let us hope that by correcting educational deficiencies among children born to poverty, we will place within their grasp the tools that will enable them to live "the American story."

Mr. Chairman, I wish I were rising in support of this bill purely on its theory. I must confess, however, that I have more than a theoretical interest, for even in our so-called "paradise of the Pacific" conditions of poverty do exist as in other parts of the United States. We are further handicapped by a very high cost-of-living index. In a sense, therefore, Hawaii has many disadvantaged children who come from families with annual incomes which exceed the $2,000 set as the qualifying criterion. The bill ought to, but does not, provide for this differential.

However, in order to secure early passage of this bill, which is a giant stride in the right direction, I am prepared to accept the formula recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor in determining the amounts of grants to local public school districts. It is noted that title I has as its purpose the broadening and strengthening of public school programs in the schools where there are concentrations of educationally disadvantaged children. Hawaii will receive under this title an estimated amount of $2,127,585. Only six other States will receive a lesser amount.

Under title II, which provides for school library resources, textbooks, and instructional materials, Hawaii will receive an estimated $391,124; and under title III, which provides for supplemental educational centers and services, Hawaii's allocated grant is estimated at $530,441.

Finally, of the $25 million to be distributed under title V for the strengthening of State departments of education, Hawaii's share is estimated at $159,850.

These amounts may appear small in comparison with those which some of our sister States, California, for example, will receive. But let me assure you, Mr. Chairman, that this program is just as important and just as necessary in Hawaii as it is in any other State.

The President has called the attention of this Congress to the declaration of the Continental Congress in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787:

> Schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

The legislation now before us, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, represents a significant modern application of that declaration. I urge a favorable vote on H.R. 2362.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to lend my most earnest support to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and to urge its passage. Our Nation is sorely in need of the assistance provided in this measure to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in our elementary and secondary schools. Our young Americans need the vitalization of challenging instructions from which they can learn to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

It has long been a national goal that every American should receive education through the high school. The United States has been pacesetter for the world in this regard. Yet, as we approach this goal, it becomes apparent that it is not enough to meet present and future demands. It is not enough to reach that goal if we forsake excellence along the way. But why must we give our attention to these escalating goals? Why is education so important?

The answer lies in what we are coming to understand as a new definition to the word "freedom." There are many facets to freedom, but most importantly freedom is a personal quality. A man really free is capable of basing his actions on understandings which he himself achieves, on personal values—self-embraced. One is free only to the point that he understands himself, his surroundings, and his relationship to his society.

And the main restrictions to freedom are prejudice and ignorance.

As life grows in complexity, the ideal becomes a practical necessity. Thus, there are both idealistic and practical reasons that every man should have an opportunity to achieve that which will free his mind.

But freedom is not automatic—it is possible only for the individual who makes it a reality by his own efforts. Society sparks these efforts through its primary tool—the school.

It is obvious that programs dealing with poverty, education, and race relations are all overlapping and interlocked. I, however, agree with Walter Lippmann when he said:

> They will come to very little until there builds up behind them a mightily consensus, similar to that which now supports the national defense.

This war which we are undertaking will unfortunately be a long one. But there is one great difference in this type of war, as Mr. Lippmann pointed out. It will not be a war which will make our country poorer, but rather one which will enrich us in every way.

We have come to realize that the problems of poverty and education are two sides of a single coin. The modern industrial society of today needs the knowledge and skill of the educated man and woman. Conversely, the uneducated enter a labor market in which the unskilled are less and less in demand. This is glaringly evident in my own State of New Jersey, which is one of the most dynamic States in the Nation. For those who have the requisite preparation jobs are available at high rates of pay. But unemployment is alarmingly high among youths who have failed to complete high school. The international known economist, Gunnar Myrdal, has pointed out:

> The unemployment situation that is fastening itself upon the Nation, and the creation of an American substratum of people that have not the education and training necessary to integrate themselves in progressive American modes of life and work, challenge the very tenets of American society.

If we are to correct the serious problems in our society, we must provide equalization of educational opportunity and increased quality of education at all levels. We must insure that every young American can acquire the training needed to take a useful and rewarding place in our society. The legislation before us today will help our schools become a vital factor in breaking the poverty cycle by providing full educational opportunity to every child regardless of economic background.

The notable 1964 Democratic platform on education recognized that money spent for education is not really an expenditure but "the surest and most profitable investment a nation can make."

I believe that the national defense and welfare depends largely upon the best possible education of all Americans. A larger investment in education is the only insurance of this purpose. And Federal sharing of the additional expenditures is absolutely necessary.

The Federal Government has been involved in the support of education for a long time. Even before the adoption of the Federal Constitution, in the Survey Ordinance of 1785, the National Government provided:

> There shall be reserved the lot No. 16 of every township for the maintenance of public schools in each township.

Later, the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 emphasized the principle that education of the people must be a requirement for the continued existence of a democratic society.

We are all familiar with the great contribution by the land-grant college system to the development of our country, of the Vocational Education Acts of 1917, the GI bills, and the National Defense Education Act. The Federal role in giving aid to education has been an accepted and legitimate part of our history for almost 175 years. Each activity was legislated not merely as an experiment but to meet definite needs only when other remedies were inadequate. Each program has been administered without evidence of Federal restrictions on academic freedom. Time and again, the intention to avoid anything that involves or even implies Federal control of curriculums, methods or administration is reiterated. The National Defense Education Act declares:

> The States and local communities have and must retain control over the primary responsibility for public education.

To properly carry out this responsibility, the States and school authorities must have greater financial means than they presently possess.

To open up the horizons of learning to our underprivileged children is in many ways more thrilling than the conquest of space. Each title of the measure before us is needed to utilize our total capabilities in education, including the best available personnel and techniques and a maximum use of modern instructional technology. I should like to stress the importance of the school library in extending and enriching the school curriculum. The library is considered by many experts to be the heart of the school, and there is abundant evidence that quality in school library programs is directly related to academic achievement, to remaining in high school, and to continuing in college. Title II of the Elementary and Secondary Act will be of inestimable value in supplying all our children with well-stocked libraries and up-to-date textbooks and related materials.

So long as American children lack competent instruction, American education is not serving these United States. It is our duty to provide Federal assistance in improving our educational system so that all our children can enjoy essential educational services. Our goal must be, in the words of President Johnson, to "give every child education of the highest quality that he can take." Let this decade be remembered, as the keen observer of history, Arnold Toynbee, said, "as the time when mankind spread the benefits of their civilization to all men."

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. RHODES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Chairman, as chairman of the Republican policy committee, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2362.

This bill, advertised as an attack upon the problems of educationally deprived children, is, instead, an assault upon State and local control of education.

Its true purpose is the authorization of general Federal aid to education without regard to need. Its clear intent, in the language of the admirable minority views contained in the committee report on the bill, "is to order a different power structure in education by a dramatic shift of power to the Federal level."

Title I of the bill, which authorizes an annual expenditure of $1 billion for 3 years, purports to lend assistance in solving the problems created by educational deprivation among children of low-income families. However, the formula for distribution of these funds is unsound and results in a situation in which some of the wealthiest counties in the Nation would receive more funds than some of the poorest counties.

Montgomery County, Md., for example, with a median annual income of $9,317 per family is the wealthiest county in the entire Nation. Only 2 percent of its school-age children are from families having an income of less than $2,000, the amount used in the definition of a family whose low income creates educational deprivation among its children. Under the formula used in this bill Montgomery County would receive $572,000 for use in eliminating educational deprivation.

Tunica County, Miss., with a median family income of only $1,260 per annum is the Nation's poorest county. Over one-half of all its school-age children come from families with less than $2,000 annual income. Yet, it would receive only $357,000 under this bill. Unfortunately, inequalities of this nature abound in the bill.

Title I appears to leave approval of local programs for educationally deprived children to the State education agency, where such power belongs. However, almost hidden in the language of the bill is the power of the U.S. Commissioner of Education to require that such approval be consistent with the basic criteria established by him.

This, in reality, deprives the State agency or local school authorities of any real power to shape the programs to meet local needs. This centralization of power runs throughout the entire bill.

Title II of the bill authorizes some $100 million for the purchase by the Federal Government of textbooks and library materials. Although the choice of textbooks is left to the localities where it belongs, no language can guard against subsequent Federal controls. By creating a dependence upon the Federal Government, no matter how minor it might be initially, for the purchase of textbooks and school library materials, the possibility of Federal control over the choice of these textbooks and materials becomes a clear danger.

Title III authorizes $100 million annually for 5 years for the establishment by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, under terms and conditions laid down by him, of model schools at the local level by a direct grant of 100 percent of the cost to a local agency selected by him. A State government would have no control over the operation of such schools and its educational agency would only be authorized to make recommendations concerning them.

In plain language this section would permit the establishment anywhere in the Nation of a separate school system of Federal-local schools responsible only to the U.S. Office of Education.

Here again we have the empty provision for local origination of requests for the establishment of such schools but also we have the power vested in the U.S. Commissioner of Education to set forth the criteria required to meet his approval.

Titles IV and V of the bill permit long-term support for educational research and demonstration centers selected by the U.S. Commissioner of Education and grants to State agencies for hiring additional staff and improving services and further authorizes personnel exchanges between the Federal Office of Education and State departments of education.

Coupled with the provisions of title III, title IV would aid in developing new methods, new curriculums, and new instructional material and texts which would then be fed into the schools through the local-Federal system of schools.

This represents a double attack on State control of education and it is aimed squarely at the essential elements of any school system: Curriculum, course content, methodology, instructional materials, and professional standards for teachers.

This double approach to the firm establishment of the Federal presence in education would be buttressed by a more extensive subsidization of State education agencies. Funds under title V would not be matched by State funds, thus assuring a continuous reliance by State agencies upon the Federal subsidy.

If this should not be sufficient to induce a subservient status, a regular interchange of personnel with Washington should complete the work of making every State department of education a branch of the U.S. Office of Education.

In view of the many and serious deficiencies of this bill, and the clear dangers it poses to traditional State and local control of education, the Republican policy committee of the House of Representatives has gone on record as being opposed to the enactment of H.R. 2362 as it is presently written. It is our hope that this well-meaning but misguided bill will be rejected so that a measure that will meet the growing educational needs without Federal interference or any constitutional problems may be enacted. Such a bill has been developed by the minority members of the Education and Labor Committee. It would return revenue sources to States, localities, and institutions by means of tax credits and payments to individuals who are meeting the costs of education. I urge that H.R. 2362 be rejected so that this bill may have prompt and thoughtful consideration.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The success that this Nation enjoys today as a world leader has resulted from the sweat and toil of pioneers who labored to establish our place in the world. But the economic and scientific progress of the United States resulted from eagerness to learn, to explore, to create. This thirst for knowledge developed the talent that was needed to move us forward to new heights. It is this thirst for knowledge that will determine how we fare in the future.

We can be very proud of our success in educating our young. We enjoy an enviable position in the world by developing an educational system second to none in the world. But this Nation has not yet reached a position where we can sit back and pat ourselves on the back for achieving a perfect system, for there are areas in this country where we are woefully neglecting the young students of today for failure to provide them with proper facilities, the necessary instructors, and the books they need to satisfy their thirst for knowledge. I might add, a much stronger thirst for the world of today is a world of science, where each day new doors are being opened to vast spaces of the unknown. Spaces that beg to be explored and developed so that man can and will enjoy a more fruitful and longer life.

The world that we know today developed from the fire age, the stone age, the iron age, and now the space age. Who can say what lies ahead in the future and what new ages will develop. The one thing we are certain of is the rapid acceleration of development and the need for developing the young minds must be just as rapid.

Yes; we have a good education system in this country, but the question we consider today is not how good this system is, but what is lacking to insure all the young that they will be given every opportunity to develop their minds to meet the challenges of the new ages of tomorrow.

Yes; we have a good education system in the United States, but it is disturbing to know that "there are concentrations of educationally disadvantaged children." When you think of the low-income families in these United States who cannot upgrade themselves because they lack the necessary education to improve their way of life; when you consider the number of young able men in this country who are rejected for military service because they fail to meet the minimum standards of basic mental aptitude, due to the lack of proper education; and when you consider the number of school dropouts because of environmental conditions and inadequate educational programs, then, gentlemen, we can realize the urgent need for developing a program for expansion and improvement of local schools to meet the education needs of children of low-income families, for it is in these areas that we fail.

No, gentlemen, we cannot pat ourselves on the back for a wonderful educational system as long as there are children who are unable to take advantage of what this system has to offer because they happen to reside in school districts which lack the income-producing families to provide the necessary financial support for proper programs, techniques, equipment, and buildings. Unless Federal aid is given immediately to these areas, we will face a much graver problem of poverty in the United States in future years. A problem that will require a great deal more of Federal aid to resolve because uneducated people will be unable to meet the everyday challenges in a more modern world.

I could stand here all day citing facts of the disadvantaged child in mastering school work, of his chance in 1,000 to acquire effective learning habits without the benefit of proper elementary and secondary education, of the rate of increase in elementary school enrollments, which will magnify the problem with each passing year, and the burden facing this country if we do not provide proper education for the young, for we will have to provide for their needs in later life because they are not educated to become self-supporting. These are the facts revealed from Committee hearings. Facts that cannot be ignored or taken lightly.

The bill before us is the result of these facts that are now public record. We will provide grants for local school districts, grants for textbooks and school library materials, grants for local educational centers and services, grants to State departments of education, and a network of regional education centers. It is a good bill, one designed to meet the needs of today for meeting the problem now under consideration. I congratulate the Committee for their excellent work in reporting a most comprehensive bill.

As Benjamin Franklin once said, "An investment in knowledge pays the best interest," so we here, today, can make that investment by approving the legislation now under consideration.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter and excerpts of views by Republican Members.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I wish first of all to express my profound disappointment that this bill is not designed to meet the needs of educationally and economically deprived children.

We favor:

A program of cooperative action with States, conducted in school districts having a high concentration of deprived families, which concentrates on helping educationally deprived children at an early age to overcome the handicaps that consign them to failure in school.

Federal action to return revenue resources to States, localities, and institutions by means of tax credits and payments to individuals who are meeting the costs of education. In this way we can meet growing educational needs without Federal interference or any constitutional problems.

A determined effort to consolidate and simplify the myriad Federal programs in education which overlap and duplicate each other, and which are the cause of increasing confusion to our educational system.

We oppose—

Further concentration of educational decisionmaking in Washington in derogation of State, local, and private responsibility for education.

Federal action in education which bypasses States to work directly with local public schools, or which bypasses educational agencies to assign program responsibility to social welfare groups.

The continued proliferation of Federal education programs which do not result in improvements in the quality of education or in extension of educational opportunities.

DEFICIENCIES OF H.R. 2362 SUMMARIZED

First. The distribution of funds would be extremely wasteful and inequitable, with the wealthiest counties in the United States receiving millions of dollars in Federal aid, while some of the poorest areas would receive very little.

This bill is a thinly veiled attempt to launch a general Federal aid to education program by means of a spurious appeal to purposes which it would not adequately serve. It manages to incorporate the worst features of general aid with the worst features of specialized aid, while dispersing limited funds to 90 percent of our school districts without regard to need.

Second. The most urgent needs of educationally deprived children virtually are ignored, and only one of the bill's six titles even mentions deprived children; the oft-repeated description of this bill as "legislation designed for impoverished children" is wholly misleading.

Third. This bill contains very dangerous provisions which would permit the U.S. Commissioner of Education to establish Federal-local schools and facilities without the approval of a State education agency and financed 100 percent with Federal funds. This is the most direct and far-reaching intrusion of Federal authority into our local school system ever proposed in a bill before Congress.

EFFORTS TO IMPROVE THE BILL REJECTED

More than a score of amendments were offered by Republican members in the committee to clean up the worst features of this bill; with the exception of minor technical amendments, they were all rejected by the majority. These amendments would have:

Eliminated the very wealthiest counties from the benefit of Federal funds, thus concentrating assistance in urban slum and poor rural districts;

Focused every title of the bill on programs for educationally and economically deprived children;

Required State approval of Federal-local schools and facilities, or at least require that they be operated in accordance with State law.

Criticisms have not been limited to Republicans. A number of majority Members have expressed publicly their consternation over the distribution of funds and other aspects of this bill, but to no avail. This bill—and its hasty consideration by our committee—exemplifies a deeply disturbing tendency of the present administration to put politics above all considerations of national policy. This is a shocking attitude, particularly when it is applied to our schools.

ANALYSIS OF EDUCATIONAL NEEDS

At the outset, we wish to stress the magnitude and the urgency of the problem of educationally deprived children. We have in our midst, generally concentrated in urban slums and rural backwashes, several million children who have little hope for an education that will equip them for a constructive place in our society. Without special help at an early age, a large percentage of these children become school failures, dropouts, delinquents, and consigned permanently to poverty. This is a growing national problem and should be a major concern of our National Government. The causes of the problem are many and complex, and most are not rooted in our educational system. However, there is an impressive body of evidence that our schools can overcome this condition if they attack early enough in the life of the child. Despite expert testimony before our committee on this and prior occasions, this bill virtually ignores that evidence.

We intend to examine the evidence that the causes of this "social dynamite" can be overcome, and to make a practical proposal for Federal assistance in adequate measure to reach this objective.

Any intelligent examination of the merits of this bill—which pours funds into 90 percent of our Nation's school districts—must begin with a review of our current status in educational finance. We regret that this elemental task is left to the minority.

THE CRISIS OF 10 YEARS AGO

By 1955 the whole Nation was awakening to a prospect which had alarmed educators and informed laymen for several years—the postwar "tidal wave" of children was beginning to engulf the schools. The schools were not prepared for it; years of depression and war had left a huge backlog of construction needs, and, even worse, teachers were in short supply. Teachers had to be found from a generation of relatively fewer numbers of young people and of lower college enrollments, and salary scales were not competitive.

The simple arithmetic of the situation was frightening. Elementary and secondary school enrollments had remained stable at about 28.5 million since 1930; now they would increase by 50 percent in the 1950's. The increases would not begin to level off until late in the 1960's.

Most informed observers did not believe that this situation could be endured without a massive infusion of Federal assistance. The tone of President Eisenhower's 1955 White House Conference on Education was one of deepest concern. It concluded that educational expenditures would have to be doubled within 10 years if we were to escape a crippling debacle.

A 1958 study of the Rockefeller Bros. Fund, "The Pursuit of Excellence, Education, and the Future of America," typified careful analysis of the time. It warned that educational expenditures—in constant dollars—would have to be doubled by 1967, and would have to amount to 5 percent of a $600 billion gross national product, as opposed to the prevailing 3.6-percent level of 1958. The report painted a gloomy picture of the prospect that this could be accomplished largely with State and local effort. It characterized State and local tax systems as "in some respects archaic" and criticized the real property tax for being "notably laggard in its response to rising income." The report noted that it is "weakness in the State and local taxing systems more than anything else that gives rise to current proposals for increased Federal support of education."

DECADE OF EXTRAORDINARY PROGRESS

Since the percentage of educational revenues derived from Federal sources in these years has remained constantly under 5 percent, the challenge of the past decade has had to be met by State and local effort. The results speak for themselves.

While elementary and secondary school enrollments have increased by 44 percent since 1954, expenditures have increased 77 percent to nearly $24 billion annually. Between the fall of 1953 and the fall of 1963, for which we have the last reliable data, our national investment in all levels of education, school and college, public and private, more than doubled, to a total of $32.6 billion. These figures are in constant 1961–62 dollars. In short, we have done the "impossible" thing demanded of us.

These are not isolated or "trick" statistics. Our expenditures per pupil in average daily attendance in public schools—again, in 1961–62 dollars—rose from $296 in 1953–54 to $444 in 1963–64, a 50-percent gain; the number of teachers in all schools increased by 55 percent; pupil schoolteachers' salaries, in stable dollars, have increased 43 percent—over 60 percent in current dollars, as opposed to an increase of 44 percent for all wage earners. Since the fall of 1954, we have invested over $30 billion in public school construction, and built nearly 700,000 classrooms. The number of pupils per classroom and of pupils per teacher have steadily decreased.

Only 4 years after the 1958 Rockefeller Fund report was published, our gross national product had increased by $110 billion—to $554 billion—and total educational expenditures exceeded 5 percent of that figure. In short, we were several years ahead of the goal set for 1967.

No such dramatic improvement could reasonably have been foreseen in 1955. The "notably laggard" property tax, for example, yielded $10.7 billion to State and local governments in 1955, and $19 billion in 1962, an increase of 78 percent—State and local revenues from all sources rose 80 percent. A 1962 report of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations noted that:

> Since World War II the property tax has been exhibiting a vitality and a capacity for growth unanticipated by even its most partisan supporters.

We can face the future with confidence after this massive effort, which required overwhelming public support and, significantly, public dedication to the benefits of education. In the decade ending in the fall of 1963, elementary and secondary school enrollment increased 45 percent, as opposed to a projected 13 percent in the decade ahead. This should be an increase easily managed without a notable increase in effort. Normal economic growth should accommodate future needs.

These bare statistics do not in any way take account of dramatic improvements and experimental breakthroughs in the technology of instruction, or in our improved knowledge of the learning process. On the other hand, they should not be utilized to conceal the emerging problems and the unfinished tasks confronting American education.

The Soviet sputnik in the autumn of 1957 served to arouse the American public to some significant weaknesses in the quality of our education, as well as to the possible consequences of such weaknesses. We at once responded in impressive fashion, and with widespread and continuing results.

There is no Soviet earth satellite to galvanize our will to overcome the challenge of rising juvenile crime, youth unemployment, and the dangerous social alienation of youth in urban and rural slum environments. Nevertheless, the national concern for this complex of problems has found expression through an abundance of recent legislation, for the most part aimed at attempting to salvage young people after the damage has become obvious. It is time we turned our attention to preventing the damage from being done.

This is one standard by which the programs proposed by H.R. 2362 must be measured. Another vital consideration should be the ultimate consequences of those programs for valuable principles and relationships which undergird our remarkable system of public and private education. The analysis of the bill relates to these standards.

TITLE I—AID TO LOCAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Title I contains the bulk of the funds—$1 billion in the first year—and purports to follow the outline of the federally impacted schools legislation to which it would be attached. The amount of money available for a school district, or for a county, depending upon the availability of data, would be based upon the number of children in families having less than a $2,000 annual cash income. This number would be multiplied by one-half the State average per pupil expenditure for elementary and secondary education to get an amount of funds for each district or county. The funds are then directed to be used in "attendance areas" having a high concentration of low-income families.

The catch in all this is that a school district need have only 10 low-income pupils to qualify in some cases, and a county need have no more than 100 such pupils. The result is that the funds would be dispersed widely among 94 percent of the Nation's 3,000 counties. The wealthiest, having relatively few children of poverty, would be "cut in" on the benefits without appreciable effect on the problem.

The absurd distribution of funds resulting from this formula is shown by the following table:

Administration's school-aid bill—Federal funds for the wealthy

County and State	Family income data			School-age children		1st year funds under administration bill
	Median income	Under $3,000 (percent)	$10,000 and over (percent)	Number in families with less than $2,000 income	Percent of all school-age children	
United States	$5,660	21.4	15.1	4,911,143	11	$972,700,000
10 wealthiest counties:						
Montgomery (Maryland)	9,317	5.5	44.6	2,343	2	572,864
Arlington (Virginia)	8,670	6.0	38.6	1,347	4	235,725
Fairfax (Virginia)	8,607	5.8	37.8	1,994	3	348,950
Du Page (Illinois)	8,570	5.9	36.0	1,853	2	443,794
Marin (California)	8,110	8.8	33.4	1,278	4	338,670
Westchester (New York)	8,052	8.0	36.3	6,210	3	2,189,026
Bergen (New Jersey)	7,978	6.4	32.1	4,631	2	1,315,204
Union (New Jersey)	7,746	7.8	30.5	3,743	3	1,063,012
Montgomery (Pennsylvania)	7,632	7.4	30.7	3,535	3	857,238
Fairfield (Connecticut)	7,371	9.3	29.1	5,629	4	1,553,604
Total eligible children				32,563		
Total funds						8,918,087
10 poor counties:						
Grant (West Virginia)	2,437	64.0	3.0	833	35	124,950
Falls (Texas)	2,287	60.6	4.0	2,233	41	432,086
Sunflower (Mississippi)	1,790	68.1	3.9	6,184	42	745,173
Knox (Kentucky)	1,722	70.5	1.7	3,137	39	470,550
Texsas (Louisiana)	1,683	70.9	3.3	1,651	41	329,375
Williamsburg (South Carolina)	1,631	68.3	2.5	6,118	41	810,000
Sumter (Alabama)	1,564	72.3	2.7	2,790	43	390,600
Holmes (Mississippi)	1,453	72.0	2.8	4,453	52	547,432
Breathitt (Kentucky)	1,432	76.0	2.0	1,998	39	299,700
Tunica (Mississippi)	1,260	77.8	3.7	2,965	54	357,283
Total eligible children				32,452		
Total funds						4,507,149

Sources: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, "County and City Data Book"; Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, "Education Goals for 1965" (committee print), pp. 65–126.

Mr. Chairman, these weird consequences stem from the political decision to spread the funds as thinly as possible by establishing entitlements county by county. Were the funds allotted to the States (the normal procedure in Federal grant programs), it is inconceivable that any State would pour the funds into its wealthiest areas. Surely the State agencies in New York and Maryland, for example, would take funds earmarked by this bill for the well-financed schools of Westchester and Montgomery Counties and use them in central Harlem and Baltimore, if they had any choice in the matter.

Administration spokesmen allege that the less wealthy States get more funds per pupil if the funds are spread among all the school-age population. This is irrelevant, of course, in a bill supposedly designed to improve schools in impoverished areas. However, even that argument fails. Texas, Maine, and Florida, for example, have approximately equal per capita incomes—which is often used as one index of State ability to support education—yet this bill would give Texas twice as much per school-age child—$31—as Maine would receive—$15—and half again as much as Florida would receive—$21.

Inequalities such as this abound in this distribution scheme. The main point, however, is that no sane program to improve schools serving large numbers of deprived children would pour limited funds into the wealthiest areas of every State in the Union, where most children, rich or poor, already attend the best schools money can by.

THE POLITICAL REASON FOR A FOOLISH FORMULA

There is one simple political reason for administration insistence upon a patently foolish formula for distributing funds. Experience with the federally impacted areas legislation proves that once an area, however wealthy and self-sufficient, obtains a vested interest in Federal school aid funds, it will join a powerful lobby for the continuation of those funds.

Last year the Federal Government poured over $4 million of "impacted" aid into Montgomery County, Md., a suburb of Washington, D.C., which has the highest median family income of any county in the Nation. Nearly one-half of its families in 1959 had an income of $10,000 or more. Next year, under this bill, an additional half million Federal dollars would go to Montgomery County to fight "poverty" in its schools.

If we enact this bill in this form—as the administration insists—these inequalities and absurdities will be a permanent feature of a permanent program which is unrelated to financial or educational need.

A DISMAL DECISION

The uses to which these scattered funds may be put are set forth imaginatively as construction, acquisition of equipment, and for "special programs." The one proven need and great hope for culturally handicapped children—early childhood education—is virtually left out of this bill.

Instead, the dismal decision has been made to request a wholly inadequate amount of funds for this purpose—$150 million—for use by the poverty czar in the Office of Economic Opportunity. These funds cannot even be used for direct aid to schools or school systems; they are administered locally by warring tribes of social workers alined in loose consortiums which have seldom been able to work with school boards or educators. The experience of a similiar arrangement under the Juvenile Delinquency Act and the preliminary experience under the poverty program bears out the futility of this approach.

It is clear that we should be making a very large effort, with substantial Federal support, to provide nursery school and kindergarten experience for educationally deprived children as a part of our regular school system, reinforced by new techniques and materials already proven experimentally.

The truth of this contention is known to our committee. Chairman Powell stated on the first day of hearings that there should be a specific allocation for preschool education in this bill, and voiced his distrust of including it under the Economic Opportunity Act. The chairman is himself keenly aware of the needs in this field. The evidence of those needs should not be reviewed.

THE NECESSITY OF PRESCHOOL TRAINING

Much of the research in recent years in the field of child development has singular relevance to the culturally disadvantaged youth of this Nation. Current studies show that irreparable damage of preschool retardation is especially acute among the economic and socially deprived.

In his dramatic testimony on the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, Prof. Urie Bronfenbrenner, of Cornell University, stated, "we now have research evidence indicating that the environment of poverty has its most debilitating effect on the very young children in the first few years of life." Professor Bronfenbrenner, a renowned authority in this field, maintained that the result of improper early training "is a child so retarded in his development that when he gets to school he is unable to profit from the experience. What is more, the effect is cumulative; the longer he remains in school, the further behind he gets." Hence, no amount of normal schooling is enough to make up for a preschool deficiency.

Through omitting preschool training, H.R. 2362 fails to cover the most important educational period in one's life. This inadequacy was indicated by Dr. Omar K. Moore, of Rutgers University, in his testimony before the committee. In response to a question on the 5-year age limit contained in the bill, Dr. Moore said, "I think that especially for the culturally disadvantaged youngsters, 5 years is too late."

H.R. 2362 feebly attempts to treat the symptoms of our educational ills but fails to attack its causes. The bill recognizes the need for remedial education. Yet it virtually ignores preschool training, which could so drastically reduce the necessity of remedial work. Despite the obvious importance of remedial education it will never substitute for the proper training of the very young.

Investment in preschool and early elementary education not only results in conserving and perfecting human resources but in the long run will even effect a monetary savings. It would have the immediate effect of cutting the costs of remedial instruction and the long-range impact of reducing juvenile delinquency, unemployment, and other costly social and economic problems.

Any bill designed to upgrade and modernize American education which does not focus on preschool training is antiquated before it is even enacted. The most imaginative innovations of recent years in teaching techniques and equipment have been made at the preschool level. Let us not attempt a step forward by starting 10 years behind.

OTHER DEFICIENCIES

At first reading, this bill appears to leave approval of local programs to the State education agency, where the power belongs. However, there is inserted—hidden, almost—a power in the U.S. Commissioner of Education to require that such approval be consistent with basic criteria formulated by him. This effectively robs the State agency, or the local schools for that matter, of any real authority to shape the programs. This centralization of power in the U.S. Office of Education runs throughout the bill.

Title I avoids the question of aid to sectarian schools by requiring local agencies to make some arrangement—such as dual enrollment, television, or mobile services—for deprived children attending private schools. The difficulty is that there is no real guideline as to the adequacy of such arrangement, which leaves the Commissioner in the position of judge in the countless conflicts which would arise at a local level. It will require the most detailed regulations, and an onerous degree of control, to assure that arrangements are equitable.

In this and previous hearings on the subject it has become evident that dual enrollment—shared time—does not work well in all circumstances; for example, where private schools are located far from a public school and that indifference and outright opposition to these plans are a major factor in their slow development. One may doubt that private school pupils would receive much benefit under title I, but obviously many difficult problems would be raised in its administration.

Finally, the very basis for the distribution of funds to individual school districts is unreliable and inadequate. The only data on the number of families with less than $2,000 income is from the 1960 census, reflecting the situation in 1959. Hence it is already 6 years outdated and new data will not be available until 1970. If such outmoded data were used to determine allotments only at the State level, the likelihood of major changes as between States would be lessened, but when applied to a county or to a school district within a county all sorts of intervening events could have completely changed local needs not reflected in the data. The data is simply not responsive to change except at 10-year intervals, thus districts which might need no financial help, even initially, could receive it, while other districts suffering severe economic setbacks would be ineligible.

The adequacy of the $2,000 measure of income has been questioned repeatedly by witnesses and by Democratic and Republican members of our committee. In such States as New York and Illinois, for example, families on public welfare may have incomes of over $3,000. The annual benefit rate of aid to families with dependent children—unemployed fathers is $3,225 per year, $268.71 per month, in Illinois.

The majority tried to patch up this situation by an amendment which would count the children in families receiving public assistance where the family income exceeds $2,000. This leaves the peculiar and highly unsatisfactory result of not counting children of families who have exactly the same income—or even less income—as welfare families, but the income is gained through employment. There are whole counties in the State of Illinois where the median family income is less than the $3,225 welfare income level. The majority—with administration blessings—have come up with a bill which leaves out the children of poor families simply because their parents are employed.

Thus, not only would poor children of working parents not be counted for the purposes of this bill, but thousands of children of servicemen would be excluded. We can find no equity or fairness, or even any sense, in this kind of distribution formula.

The reason for these inadequacies is probably a political one involving the administration's determination to get an initial amount into as many school districts as possible, which will not limit funds in areas of greatest need. This can be done only by a juggling of outdated and inadequate data to achieve a predetermined initial outlay of $1 billion.

TITLE II—TEXTBOOKS AND LIBRARY MATERIALS

NO FOCUS ON DEPRIVED CHILDREN

Some commentators have been so unkind as to suggest that this title is the price the administration paid to get acceptance of title I. It would authorize appropriation of $100 million in the first year to make State-approved textbooks and a wide variety of library materials available to both public and private schools.

Strangely, this title does not pretend to be focused upon the needs of educationally deprived children. We attempted to provide that focus, but the amendment was rejected. The title directs the designated State agency, in vague language, to distribute such benefits to areas of greatest need, which, considering the status of school libraries in even very good schools, amounts to almost no direction.

ALTERNATIVES NOT CONSIDERED

Unquestionably, both States and localities, as well as private educational agencies, should review the adequacy of school library resources. Federal assistance is already available for both construction and improved services of public libraries, under the amended Library Services Act. Perhaps that act should be expanded to provide a wider and more flexible range of services for schoolchildren. This could be done without any of the serious constitutional problems raised by this bill, and in such a manner as to serve children and teachers in both public and private schools.

But no consideration has been given to any such alternatives by the administration or by this committee. Instead, they propose to embark upon the highly dubious course of direct Federal subsidies for school textbooks and school reference works and library materials. This is one of the paths which the most ardent advocates of Federal education aid have shied away from in the past—and with good reason.

DANGER OF FEDERAL PURCHASE OF TEXTBOOKS

Textbooks come close to the heart of the most sensitive area of the educational process; controversies over school texts are frequent and angry. Under the terms of this title, if a text used in a single school district should depict one racial or national group as inferior, or leave the clear inference that a President or other public figure was a traitor, or covertly adopt a Marxist interpretation of history, Federal funds could be used to supply that text to every child in the State.

The implications of Federal involvement in buying textbooks have not been thought out. No language in this bill can guard against subsequent Federal controls. One example of this truth should suffice: Shortly after enactment of the National Defense Education Act—which contains the identical "assurance against Federal control" found in this bill—an appropriations act forbade the use of National Defense Education Act funds to purchase instructional equipment originating in Communist countries. This control still applies both to public school grants and private school loans under the act.

A similar Federal interference in the choice of textbooks would have far more serious implications. The advocates of this bill have no idea how far the Federal Government is going in this sensitive field. We may ask whether they have looked down the road to a point where most school texts are purchased with Federal funds, and libraries in both public and private schools are stocked with materials at Federal expense; and we should then ask about the possible consequences of such dependence upon centralized financial responsibility.

FEDERAL RELATIONSHIP TO PRIVATE SCHOOLS

These questions apply with particular force to the relationship of the Federal Government to private education. It is easy to foresee, for example, the situation wherein virtually all textual materials used by private school children will be those approved by public school agencies. Is this a dependency which private school educators and religious leaders really wish to create?

Much of the discussion of this title before the subcommittee dealt with the constitutionality of Federal assistance, directly or indirectly, for sectarian school libraries. Whether one believes such assistance is or is not constitutional, applicable decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court make clear that the issue is presented by this bill.

The constitutional issue must be decided initially by each Member of Congress according to his own understanding, and ultimately, if a proper case arises, by the Supreme Court. But the basic issues of educational and public policy should be of immediate concern to everyone. These relate to the degree of centralization desirable in education, to the proper role of the Federal Government, and to the independence and integrity of private education.

These are difficult problems and they should command the most searching of inquiries. Instead, we have seen public hearings rushed to a conclusion, having been literally jammed with witnesess who had scarcely time to read the bill once, if at all. Subcommittee and full committee consideration was hurried to a predetermined conclusion.

We cannot blame harried school administrators for their eagerness to obtain additional funds, or fault fund-starved educational researchers for their desire to carry out vital work, but we would observe that great principles are not preserved and the "Great Society" is not built in the mindless frenzy of a gold rush.

TITLE III—SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL CENTERS

This title authorizes the U.S. Commissioner of Education, upon terms and conditions to be specified by him, to establish "model" schools at the local level by a direct grant of 100 percent of the cost to a local educational agency selected by him. A State government would have no control over the operation of this Federal-local educational institution, and the State education agency would only have the empty authority of making recommendations concerning them.

A FEDERAL SCHOOL SYSTEM

Stripped of all its unessential language, this title would permit the establishment in every State of a separate system of Federal-local schools responsible only to the U.S. Office of Education.

True, the "proposals" for these centers—which Commissioner Keppel described in his testimony as "educational institutions"—must originate at the local level from a public school agency. But obviously, since the U.S. Commissioner of Education approves only those which meet whatever criteria he may establish, such proposals must finally take the form prescribed by the Commissioner.

Are these centers really schools? The bill says that the funds shall be used for "the establishment, maintenance, and operation of programs, including the lease or construction of necessary facilities and the acquisition of necessary equipment, designed to enrich the programs of local elementary and secondary schools and to offer a diverse range of educational experience to persons of varying talents and needs by providing supplementary educational services and activities such as developing and conducting exemplary educational programs for the purpose of stimulating the adoption of improved or new educational programs in the schools of the State; comprehensive guidance and counseling, remedial instruction, and school health, psychological, and social work services; comprehensive academic services for continuing adult education; specialized instruction and equipment for students interested in studying advanced scientific subjects, foreign languages and other academic subjects; making available modern educational equipment and specially qualified personnel including artists and musicians, on a temporary or other basis to public or other nonprofit schools, organizations, and institutions; other specially designed educational programs which meet the purposes of this title."

MISLEADING LANGUAGE OF BILL

This language is a blank check to the U.S. Commissioner of Education to do anything he pleases with these so-called supplementary educational centers. Moreover, the language of the bill is flagrantly dishonest in its deliberate use to conceal the extent of the authority granted. For example, what is a "temporary or other basis" if not permanent; why specify instruction in "advanced scientific subjects, foreign languages," and then throw in "other academic subjects" as an afterthought?

This choice of language is deliberate. The drafters did not care to say that instructional equipment, or even teachers, could be made available to private schools on a permanent, or regular basis. They chose to say "temporary or other basis." Particularly, they did not care to openly authorize instruction, under Federal contract and terms, in political science, economics, American and world history, sociology, art, literature, music, handicrafts, and the rest of a complete curriculum. So, they chose to follow the magic words of "advanced scientific subjects, foreign languages" with the general phrase "and other academic subjects."

We are not caviling with mere drafting. Frankly, we are appalled at the lack of candor and the outright deception with respect to this bill. It is an affront to the Congress and a dangerous and dishonest game to play with the American public on any matter, but particularly one so vital as the education of our children.

STATE-LOCAL CONTROL ABANDONED

The choice presented by this title should and must be clear, however Congress may decide the issue: It is a choice between first, our historic pattern of local public education controlled locally under State law, and second, the establishment of a separate public education system financed and administered by a Federal agency. The committee even rejected an amendment to require that these Federal-local schools be administered in accordance with State law.

If Congress approves this title in this form, we shall have clearly abandoned the concept of State responsibility for public education. This is not a question of Federal aid; it is a question of Federal responsibility, and control. The notion advanced by Commissioner Keppel that these centers would be completely local affairs cannot be supported. It is pure fantasy to suppose that a local school board, which comes to the Federal Government for 100 percent of the funds to run an operation which can be approved only by the Commissioner, is dealing at arms length and upon terms of equality.

We urge that the Congress not give the U.S. Office of Education such authority until each Member understands exactly what is being authorized, and until the American public has had an opportunity to express informed views on this issue.

TITLES IV AND V—EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND ASSISTANCE FOR STATE EDUCATION AGENCIES

Title IV authorizes an enormous expansion of the Cooperative Research Act to permit long-term support for educational research and demonstration centers selected by the Commissioner of Education. Title V authorizes $25 million the first year for grants to State education agencies for hiring additional staff and improving services, and further authorizes temporary personnel exchanges between the U.S. Office and State departments of education.

ULTIMATE IMPACT CAMOUFLAGED

There is no objection to the expansion of Federal efforts under the Cooperative Research Act, as such. The act authorizes not only research, but demonstration projects and the dissemination of research findings. Over $15 million is available this year for the act, and there is no limitation to the authorization of appropriations.

But the provision in this bill for an additional $100 million for federally established research and demonstration centers must be read in context with the provision for supplemental education centers in title III. According to Commissioner Keppel, it is intended to develop new methods, new curriculums, and new instructional materials and texts, which would then be fed into the schools through the local-Federal system of supplementary centers.

The ultimate impact of the Federal activity is cleverly camouflaged. It represents a two-pronged attack on State control of education, and it is aimed squarely at the essential elements of any school system: Curriculum, course content, methodology, instructional materials, and professional standards for teachers.

This double approach to a firm establishment of the Federal presence in education would be further enhanced by a more extensive subsidization of State education agencies. We note that the Federal funds in title V would not be matched by State funds, which automatically assures a continuing reliance by State agencies upon the Federal subsidy after it has become a standard feature of their operation. If this should not be sufficient to induce a subservient status, a regular interchange of personnel with Washington should complete the work of making every State department of education a branch of the U.S. Office of Education.

FROM SCIENCE TO SOCIAL SCIENCES

For a number of years, largely through the National Science Foundation, the Federal Government has been instrumental in revising school curriculums in the physical sciences and mathematics. Although some concern has been expressed about the wisdom of a standardized approach to teaching science and mathematics, the objective nature of the factual content of these subjects has insulated this effort from the fear of Federal control. Also, the National Science Foundation has no institutional interest in the administration of public education.

This cannot be said for the U.S. Office of Education. By its very nature it is interested in educational policy, as distinct from the advancement of knowledge in particular fields. The distinction is profound.

Recent amendments to the National Defense Education Act extended the teacher preparation of the Office from the fields of modern languages and student counseling into the areas of English, geography, reading, and history. The research centers in title IV of this bill, and the Federal-local supplementary centers in title III clearly project the Office into every aspect of the school curriculum, including the subjective and politically charged fields of the social sciences.

In terms of our structure of educational control, to say nothing of public policy, this progression of Federal influence in the sciences to Federal influence in the social sciences is a quantum leap toward a centralized standardized, uniform national school system.

Whether it is wise to make this "great leap forward" should be a question for intensive national debate. There can be no debate, however, about the fact that such a leap is being proposed.

THE ACTUAL SCOPE OF THE BILL

Aside from passing references in title I to "educationally deprived children" and the use in that title only of a distribution formula based upon the number of children in low-income families, this bill is not confined to the needs of the educationally deprived.

The actual scope of the bill ranges over the entire spectrum of American education and probes into its most sensitive and vital areas. The textbooks and instructional materials in title II are not limited to needy children or impoverished schools, but are admittedly provided as part of a general program; the Federal-local school centers in title III are not limited to the needs of deprived persons, or "problem" students, but specify "persons of varying talents and needs"; that is, everyone. The same universal scope is found in the rest of the bill.

It is a complete misnomer, therefore, to label this bill as one for impoverished and neglected children. Whether the bill merits support or not is beside the point. The true purpose of this bill is to authorize general aid without regard to need, and the clear intent is to radically change our historic structure of education by a dramatic shift of power to the Federal level.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools, had come to no resolution thereon.

TRIBUTE TO VIRGIL I. GRISSOM

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. **HAMILTON**. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished son of Indiana, Virgil I. Grissom, has become the world's first space pilot and the first man to venture twice into the vastness of outer space.

As captain of the Gemini spaceship, Major Grissom altered his flight path and orbit in another historymaking achievement in America's brilliant space program.

In their 4-hour and 54-minute flight, Astronauts Grissom and John W. Young, wrote another chapter of excellence in our Nation's continuing effort to reach the moon and travel beyond.

Back home in Mitchell, in Indiana's Ninth District, the Grissom family continues to follow the quiet pattern of community life, while their most famous son makes history.

The parents, Mr. and Mrs. Dennis Grissom, live at the family home in Mitchell. Norman Grissom, "Gus'" older brother, lives in Mitchell. Another brother, Lowell, is in St. Louis; and a sister, Mrs. Joe Beavers lives in Baltimore, Md.

Major Grissom is married to the former Betty L. Moore, of Mitchell, whose father, Claude Moore, is still a hometown resident.

Back in Indiana, this great space pioneer is known as "Gus," the railroader's son who went to Purdue University, joined the Air Force, and became a much-decorated veteran of the air war over Korea.

All the world knows he is the man who rode the Mercury-Redstone flight of the Liberty Bell 7 on July 21, 1961. Launched from Cape Canaveral, the flight was suborbital, but its success completed the Redstone program and laid the foundation of our continuing series of manned flights.

Now, it is this same "Gus" Grissom who has had the well-earned privilege to open another vital part of our program of space exploration.

In Indiana, we are especially proud of him and his many achievements.

ELIMINATE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ON WAR CRIME TRIALS

Mr. **SCHWEIKER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SCHWEIKER**. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed by the upsetting possibility that the West German Parliament may extend the statute of limitations for prosecuting Nazi war criminals for only 4 more years. I speak out against that possibility. Four years is too short a period of time. I urge the German Parliament to consider that, for the heinous crimes of genocide, this statute of limitations should be extended indefinitely. There is no justifiable reason to do otherwise.

I have been following with great interest the progress of the West German Government as it has moved toward extending the statute of limitations. It is a subject which has evoked wide debate within the German Government.

Members of the U.S. Congress also have registered their deep interest in this debate. On January 22, 1965, I joined with a number of other Members of Congress in signing a petition to both houses of the West German Parliament, expressing our support for extending indefinitely the German statute of limitations for the prosecution of Nazi war criminals.

That was a good petition; it had a significant effect. For just recently the Bundestag, the lower house of Parliament, voted overwhelmingly for the principle of unlimited prosecution of war criminals. It sent to a parliamentary committee two draft bills, which would eliminate the statute of limitations. Only in this way can the Government of West Germany be sure that none of the mass murderers shall ever achieve immunity to prosecution. I hope the lower house of Parliament in Germany will have the fortitude and perseverance to continue their argument for this change in the law. I support their efforts, their candor, and their courage.

I am aware that German law—article 103 of the Bonn basic law—may require more than a simple act of Parliament to extend the statute indefinitely. By applying the regular method of constitutional amendment approved by two-thirds of the members of both houses, the statute could legally be extended indefinitely and war criminals previously not indicted could be prosecuted as they are found. Four years is not enough. The Government of the German Federal Republic has legal power to do more; to avoid a "reprieve from infamy" it must use this power.

Certainly there is ample precedent for having no statute of limitations on murder. None of the 50 States in our country has a statute of limitations on murder. Nor should any State or nation impose such limitations.

The limitation for the prosecution of war crimes to 20 years under the statutory criminal law of the Federal Republic of Germany does not have its origin in any enactment concerning war crimes. This limitation derives from the general provision of the German Criminal Code of 1871. By virtue of this code, prosecution for major crimes, including murder, is barred by the lapse of 20 years, unless the running of the period of limitation is either interrupted or suspended. But the crime of genocide, in which millions were exterminated, cannot be judged under the traditional standards for homicide. Nor was genocide even contemplated when this code was first adopted.

Genocide demands a different standard. It is time for that standard to be established. It can be achieved by constitutional amendment supported by two-thirds of both houses. This is the action which seems most advisable to assure that the statute on genocide will be extended indefinitely.

Excellent and thorough efforts by the German Government have been made to round up war criminals who may still be at liberty. I am impressed by the work that has been done by state prosecutors and investigations at the Ludwigsberg Center. I have read with interest the statistics on their success. But I urge that the German Parliament extend the statute of limitations indefinitely so that the embarrassment caused by one unindicted war criminal walking free on May 9, 1965, or even on May 9, 1969, may be avoided. This is an eternal debt, still owed—owed in perpetuity—to those who lost their lives at Auschwitz, at Dachau, at Belsen, at Buchenwald, or any other center of infamy now part of the German past.

RESULTS OF 1965 OPINION POLL FOR 22D CONGRESSIONAL DISTRICT OF OHIO

Mrs. **BOLTON**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mrs. **BOLTON**. Mr. Speaker, during the past 3 weeks over 21,000 replies have been received from residents of the 22d Congressional District of Ohio to my 1965 annual opinion poll. This response has been most gratifying, and as in previous years indicates the great interest and deep concern people have in the actions of their Federal Government.

It was good to receive the many hundreds of letters and comments on the questions contained on this poll. The views expressed on these issues together with the results obtained on this questionnaire are most helpful to me in sensing the real feeling of my constituents on the important legislative proposals coming before the Congress.

The question on establishing a national policy for control of water and air pollution received the largest favorable response—88 percent, with only 6 percent opposing, and 6 percent having no opinion on this issue. Residents of the 22d District and all Greater Clevelanders are particularly familiar with and sensitive to the question of water and air pollution. It is their overwhelming view that local and State efforts combined with those of private industry are unable to handle this troublesome problem without further Federal participation.

Legislation to provide for presidential succession brought forth an 80-percent favorable response, with 11 percent opposing and 9 percent having no opinion. The people of our Nation have been aroused by the assassination of President Kennedy to the immediate and dire necessity of the Congress taking early action to provide for the orderly transition of our Government in any future emergencies.

The question bringing forth the least favorable support concerned admission of Red China to the United Nations, with 28 percent favorable, 59 percent opposed and 13 percent having no opinion. The repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act brought forth the next lowest favorable response with 33 percent favoring, 51 percent opposing, and 16 percent having no opinion.

With all the publicity on the subject of health care to the elderly, and public awareness that some Federal solution must be forthcoming to assist those in need, it is interesting to note the concern of the residents of the 22d District as to whether the social security approach is the best way to solve this problem. Favoring the social security approach were 49 percent of the replies, with 45 percent opposing this method, and 6 percent having no opinion.

The House of Representatives recently approved an appropriation to continue the House Committee on Un-American Activities. Residents of the 22d District supported this action by a 4-to-1 majority. It is also heart warming to see the 5-to-1 majority in favor of legislation I have introduced to provide an income tax deduction of the cost of college tuition.

The complete results of this poll follow:

	Favor	Oppose	No opinion
Do you favor or oppose—			
Medical care:			
1. A hospital and nursing home program for the elderly paid through increased social security payroll taxes on employers and employees?	49	45	6
Immigration:			
2. Abolishing the present "national origin" quota system in favor of a priority system based on the skill of immigrants or their joining close relatives in the United States?	63	25	12
Taxes:			
3. Elimination of Federal excise taxes on such items as jewelry, cosmetics, toilet articles, furs, luggage, and ladies' handbags?	71	23	6
Labor relations:			
4. Repeal of sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act which now permits States to enact right-to-work laws barring union membership as a condition of employment?	33	51	16
Area redevelopment:			
5. Federal aid to areas plagued by chronic unemployment?	66	24	10
Education:			
6. A Federal scholarship program for needy college students?	68	24	8
7. An income tax deduction of the cost of college tuition?	78	15	7
8. The administration's general educational proposals for Federal aid in some form to all levels of education?	54	33	13
Water-air pollution:			
9. Legislation to establish a national policy for control of water and air pollution?	88	6	6
Presidential succession:			
10. The appointment by the President, with the consent of both Houses of the Congress, of a Vice President when a vacancy exists in the office of Vice President?	80	11	9
Congressional committees:			
11. Continuation of the House Committee on Un-American Activities?	67	17	16
Foreign policy:			
12. Giving foreign military and economic aid only to countries whose national policies are in basic agreement with the goals of the United States?	78	12	10
13. Admission of Red China into the United Nations?	28	59	11
14. Liberalizing our trade relations with Communist nations?	35	53	12
15. Continued participation in the conflict in Vietnam?	46	38	16

AUTHORITY TO USE GAS IN VIETNAM

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, several Members of the House commented on the use of nonlethal gas in Vietnam. Whatever differences of opinion there may be on this issue, I think we can all agree that the decision to use the gas is one that should have been made "at the highest level," the expression used by the gentleman from New York [Mr. STRATTON]. I would assume that means the President.

Therefore, it is surprising to learn that President Johnson was not consulted about the matter, even though it involved "only tactical problems." One is reminded perhaps of the rather striking debate that took place during the last campaign over the feasibility of allowing field commanders to employ tactical atomic weapons under certain conditions on their own authority.

The President, as a candidate, rejected such a policy out of hand. The Republican candidate was characterized as "trigger happy."

Now, it is odd to find that field commanders apparently have been allowed to make a military decision with tremendous political implications. The news of it has certainly had international impact. Our adversaries have been given a propaganda opening.

Had this development occurred under a Republican President, the other side of the aisle surely would have been a turmoil of Members seeking recognition to criticize such a decisionmaking process.

I would be the last to urge that we shape our policies in the world in accordance with the shifts of world opinion. I support our President's policy in Vietnam but I emphasize it should be our President's policy. In view of the statements made in the last campaign by the President and members of his administration and candidates of his party, it seems only fair to ask how it was that a decision with such important implications should not have merited clearance by the ultimate authority of the National Government, at the White House.

SPAIN SUBVERTS ITSELF WITH CUBA DEALS

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, yesterday a high-ranking diplomat defected from the Cuban Embassy in Spain only to tell the press after he had reached asylum in Paris that Fidel Castro was using his Embassy in Spain to launch subversion against the Franco regime.

The diplomat, Odon Alvarez de la Campa, was once a trusted Castro aide who participated in the Communist revolution in Cuba. His testimony gives dramatic proof to the treachery of Castro and his followers. Spain and Cuba have just signed a trade agreement which now makes Spain Castro's leading trade partner in Western Europe.

The American Maritime Association has revealed that Spain is building a large fleet of cargo vessels, refrigerator ships, and fishing boats for Cuba. Many of these will be used by Castro's seamen to compete against the U.S. fishing industry, as well as for spreading Communist subversion throughout this hemisphere.

But the fact also remains that Spain's help to Castro is being directed right back against her. By helping Communist Cuba, Spain is subverting herself, and assisting Castro in his efforts to foment trouble in this hemisphere.

Only a tight boycott against Cuba imposed by the free world will curb Communist Cuba.

INCIDENT IN THE STATE OF GEORGIA

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, this morning we again witnessed another incident that demonstrates the humiliation, harassment and intolerance heaped upon many of our citizens in certain sections of our country.

More than a hundred American citizens, en route from the Nation's Capital to Montgomery, Ala., were delayed in interstate travel when their train, chartered from the Southern Railroad, was left without a crew of the Atlanta & West Point Railroad in the State of Georgia. Mind you, these were American citizens traveling from one State to another. This is not one of those intolerable situations that are supposed to be commonplace in some far-off undemocratic country where the elite totalitarian rule. More and more, though, our Nation is becoming increasingly aware of the shameful hypocrisy of a state of mind that decries intervention in a supposedly genteel way of life. But I am sure that my colleagues and their constituents will not excuse this latest affront as merely another sample of a way of life that in its ante bellum days was the accepted expression of hospitality.

The Interstate Commerce Commission was created to regulate common carriers in the promotion of safe and efficient transportation service. I intend to ask that Commission to investigate this apparently calculated refusal of service and request that it take proper steps to insure safe and uninterrupted passage for our citizens wherever they may be in interstate travel.

Mr. Speaker, I say shame on those guilty crewmen and railroad managers for their spiteful acts.

INJUSTICE DONE TO OUR LOCAL POLICE BY ASSOCIATION

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Grover] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, as one who wholly supports the civil rights concepts of equal opportunity and equality under the law and certainly equality in voting rights, may I address myself to another injustice, the injustice done to our local police by association.

Oftentimes the lens is in focus on the mouse and misses the mountain. The concentration of national interest on the shameful events in Selma, Ala., a fortnight ago, would present, if unchallenged, an erroneous image of the policemen of the State, county, or local communities—an image unfair and undeserved.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is high time that someone took the floor of this House to speak out for the tens of thousands of completely dedicated Americans, God-fearing family men who make up the police forces of this country. These men are as much soldiers as our brave men in the far corners of the world in their unselfish devotion to duty—often dangerous and unacknowledged.

My hat is off to those I know well—to Nassau's and Suffolk's fine county and village police in my district—to New York City's finest—and to their colleagues in the police departments countrywide who have done so much for so many.

I am pleased to submit for the interest of the House this eloquent letter from a constituent to one of our local newspapers in praise of the men in blue.

Huntington, Long Island.

Editor, the Long-Islander: The continually growing efforts of certain individuals, some of whom are legislators, to circumvent and curtail the activities of policemen in the sworn duties of the profession, (i.e.) protecting life and property, detection of crime, arrest of offenders et al., is having a serious and menacing effect.

Police work is a never-ending, ceaseless effort that requires the utmost dedication in the war on crime. The police officer must feel appreciated, must feel he is backed by the citizenry in general as well as his superiors. Charles Murphy one of the most sagacious politicians in the heyday of Tammany Hall for all his Governor-busing, Senator-making proclivity refused to interfere with the orderly processes of the police department.

Today, however, politicians and officeseekers, in order to curry favor with group, are willing to scrap the duties of the police officer or so hamstring their operations as to make the job too onerous. The writer was amazed to note in North Carolina papers advertisements for candidates for New York City Police Department.

Suffolk County has not as yet felt this reluctance of police candidates to take the job of law enforcement but as we grow, it could be faced with the same problems. Our choice then would be to lower the high standards now required with a resultant loss of top materials; or, seek recruits in the hinterlands of the Nation.

Let us hope that zealous newspaper editors, television and radio commentators, together with political officeseekers, do not oversubscribe to the liberal views on the Declaration of Independence to such excess that they will undermine the very foundation of the beloved Constitution. Rapine, riot and revolution in every corner of the globe, have followed in the breakdown of law and order.

On this the eve of President Johnson's message on anticrime to Congress, he must stress that we jealously guard, protect, and justify the rights and duties of the police officer in his herculean task, against no matter the power or prestige of those who would oppose. Public opinion must prevail. Let us stand beside not behind the men who wear the blue.

Raymond A. Donovan.

MEDICAL CARE PROGRAM

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it is distressing to me, as I am certain it must be to millions of Americans, to see the Congress moving toward enactment of a massive, permanent Government medical care program in an effort to solve what is really a temporary problem.

For various sound and understandable reasons, the majority of Americans who are retiring today, or have retired in the past few years, have not been able to make adequate preparations to discharge obligations which may arise when serious illness strikes. For equally sound reasons, this is a temporary problem which will not affect so large a proportion of retired citizens in the years ahead nor affect any of them as seriously.

I listened with interest to a television program in which the senior Senator of New Mexico, Mr. Anderson, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes], and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] described their separate solutions to the problem.

The three bills have in common what is to me a fatal failing: They would establish giant new Federal or Federal-State programs that would go on forevermore, a continuing and increasing burden to the taxpayer, long after the problem they are supposed to cure could have cured itself. The committee bill introduced today has the same disadvantage.

The only proposal that does not have this built-in defect is H.R. 21, the comprehensive, voluntary insurance program I first introduced 3 years ago. H.R. 21 encourages people to take care of their own problems, and H.R. 21 can solve the present problem without fastening a permanent new bureaucracy on the taxpayers of this country.

Today's retired people face problems unique in our history. They experienced two World Wars and a great depression during the best years of their lives and their postwar earnings were subject to the burden of heavy taxes and soaring inflation. They are living longer than any previous American generation, and they are doing so in large measure because of the tremendous progress that has been made in American medical knowledge and techniques. Paradoxically, it is this same program in the field of medicine that places a heavy and often insurmountable burden on their slender resources, because modern medical care is costly beyond anything we have experienced in the past. They need help.

The next generation of retired persons will have much greater opportunity to prepare for retirement.

In the first place, they know they can expect longer lives and must make preparation. They will be people who spent most of their productive years in times of prosperity. They will be protected by the pension plans that are now being developed in most industries on a scale hitherto unknown. And they will have available to them methods of prepaying medical care insurance, company programs for the medical care of retired employees, and greatly improved insurance programs especially designed for the retired person. All of these things are now developing, proving the ingenuity of the free enterprise system and its ability to solve the problems of our people.

In the face of these facts, why adopt a program that would burden the already inadequate Social Security System with a tremendously costly, permanent hospital program, financed by a regressive payroll tax, as H.R. 1 would do?

Why adopt a program that envisions a complicated Federal-State relationship with uncertain benefits, depending upon the willingness of the States to increase their taxes or to divert funds from existing programs that already are inadequately financed? H.R. 3727 would do that.

All three would mean tremendous annual expenditures. Only H.R. 3727 includes any incentive to people to find the means of helping themselves, and this feature of the bill is at cross-purposes with all the rest. How effective will it be to provide a tax deduction for prepaid medical care insurance if the individual is assured the Government will take care of him anyhow?

H.R. 21 will accomplish more for less money because it relies on the genius of free enterprise and because it does not require the establishment of any new Federal or State agency or even the enlargement of any agency. And as the years go by, as medical care insurance becomes more comprehensive and more readily available and as our older people become better able to discharge their obligations, H.R. 21 will become less and less necessary. It is a crutch we can throw away when we no longer need it; not a brace we must wear for life.

The money and influence of the AFL–CIO, the Democratic Party, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have been used to publicize the King-Anderson bill. The AMA must be spending millions on publicity for the Curtis-Herlong bill. The fact that the ranking minority member and several of his colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means have prepared a bill has been widely noted in the press and certainly is newsworthy. Meanwhile, H.R. 21, the easiest and best solution to the problem, which has gained broad acceptance and support wherever it has been presented to doctors, senior citizens, and others during the past 3 years, receives little consideration.

I repeat, it will be a sad day for this country if we insist on trying to solve this temporary problem by building another bureaucratic monster. Let us take the simple, direct, effective route provided in H.R. 21.

TRIBUTE TO BENJAMIN L. ROSENBLOOM

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, today it is my sad duty to announce the passing of the late Benjamin L. Rosenbloom, one of our former Members, who served the First Congressional District of West Virginia, so ably, fearlessly, and with such distinction from 1921 to 1925 in the 67th and 68th Congresses.

Mr. Rosenbloom passed away last Monday in a Cleveland hospital at the age of 85 after a long illness.

An outstanding Republican, Mr. Rosenbloom was a close personal friend of mine. He was a leader while in the Congress in securing laws on stream pollution, guaranteeing bank deposits, and governing aliens. Often we had the opportunity over the years of my service in this body to compare notes of the many changes that have taken place.

Mr. Rosenbloom served in the West Virginia State Senate before coming to the Congress in 1921. During his congressional campaign, he compiled a paper he labeled "The Famous Fable" in which he voiced his opposition to prohibition.

Mr. Rosenbloom was a native of Braddock, Pa., was graduated from the West Virginia University Law School, and admitted to practice of law in West Virginia. From that time until his retirement in 1951, Mr. Rosenbloom practiced law in Wheeling, W. Va.

During this period, Mr. Rosenbloom also found time to serve as Wheeling city councilman, mayor, and newspaper publisher. Along with his busy lifetime of public service, he served as grand exalted ruler of the Wheeling, W. Va., Elks Lodge. In the 1930's, he founded a weekly newspaper called Tides which was best known for its outspoken editorial policy. He was quite outspoken on the subject of prohibition. At the time he mounted his crusade in the State senate, he was the only member of that body opposing the drys.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rosenbloom was a leader in his time. He maintained his keen interest in government long after he left the Congress. I am proud Benjamin L. Rosenbloom came from West Virginia—particularly proud that he came from the district in West Virginia I am privileged to represent. I believe we all are better people because of him and his lifetime of service to his State and Nation.

THE IMPORTANCE OF EDUCATION

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I echo the sentiments of the President on the importance of education:

> Nothing matters more to the future of our country, not our military preparedness—for armed might is worthless if we lack the brains to build a world peace; not our productive economy—for we cannot sustain growth without trained manpower; not our democratic system of government—for freedom is fragile if citizens are ignorant.

The need for better educational facilities and materials is current; the need for a more comprehensive education plan to secure adequate education levels for all Americans is current. These current problems should and must be met now. Our great country craves and needs better educated citizens if it is to continue as a prospering, vibrant society.

The public education of our children is primarily the responsibility of the States and local communities. The Federal Government has never sought to preempt this responsibility, and I want to exercise continued vigilance that this policy is adhered to. However, when spiraling costs place education beyond the means of our burdened local and State governments, the Federal Government has both the authority and responsibility to assist them. Local taxes in support of education and the sundry other responsibilities have reached the saturation point. The local resident is inundated with a myriad of local taxes which utilize real property holding as the tax base. There is a need to spread this burden; there is a need of providing a more equitable means of securing funds for the pressing needs of our communities. Very legitimately, the Congress has based its authority to enact legislation, which provides aid to education, upon its constitutionally granted power to use tax funds for the promotion of the general welfare. The connection between an adequate education for all of our children and the general welfare of this Nation needs neither an explanation nor a defense. As the Federal Government attempts to alleviate this lack of funds for education, it is continually harassed by one major impediment. Would the granting of Federal tax funds for the benefit of children attending sectarian and private schools violate the constitutional requirement of what has come to be called separation of church and state?

The first amendment to the Constitution of the United States declares in part:

> Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

This prohibition is not the outgrowth of an antireligious conviction on the part of our Founding Fathers nor a denial of the place of religion in the individual lives of our citizens or, in truth, in our national life. It represents, rather, a recognition of the necessity for Government neutrality in religious matters.

The Supreme Court has never been called upon to rule on the constitutionality of an act of Congress which establishes a program of assistance for the education of pupils in sectarian and public schools. There are, however, several opinions of the Supreme Court which have involved somewhat similar issues.

The case of *Cochran* v. *Board of Education* (281 U.S. 370), decided in 1930, involved a statute of the State of Louisiana under which money was appropriated for textbooks for schools of the State. The constitutionality of this law was challenged on the grounds that because schoolbooks were made available to private schools, including sectarian schools, property—tax money—had been taken by the State for private purposes in violation of the 14th amendment.

The Supreme Court upheld the Louisiana statute on the grounds that the schoolchildren and the State were the beneficiaries of the financial aid. The Supreme Court decision was premised on an important distinction. The distinction between the school as beneficiary and the child as beneficiary.

> The appropriations were made for the specific purpose of purchasing schoolbooks for the use of the schoolchildren of the State, free of cost to them. It was for their benefit and the resulting benefit to the State that

> the appropriations were made. True, these children attend some school, public or private, the latter, sectarian or nonsectarian, and that the books are to be furnished them for their use, free of cost, whichever they attend. The schools, however, are not the beneficiaries of these appropriations. They obtain nothing from them nor are they relieved of a single obligation because of them.

Another relevant case is *Everson* v. *Board of Education* (330 U.S. 1) decided in 1947 by the U.S. Supreme Court. This case involved a New Jersey statute which authorized district boards of education to make contracts for the transportation of children to and from all schools except those operated for profit. Under this authority, a school board authorized reimbursement to parents for fares which they paid for the transportation for their children to public or private schools.

Justice Hugo Black, speaking for the Court, referred to Thomas Jefferson's remark that the first amendment creates a "wall of separation" between church and state and declared that this wall must be kept high and impregnable. Justice Black reasoned that the provision of funds for school bus transportation for students in sectarian schools was not an aid to religion. It is an aid to the students; the program was obviously intended to benefit the child, not to aid or to establish a religion.

The first amendment was not intended to cut off church schools "from those services so separated and so indisputably marked off from the religious function."

In both these discussions, then, we see the development of the pupil-benefit argument. According to this line of reasoning, the Supreme Court has declared that a child by merely attending a sectarian school does not render himself ineligible to receive benefits which the State confers upon all students.

Further evidences of the Federal Government's assumption of responsibility and aid to education are noteworthy of discussion. It should also be noted that in these following programs Federal control of the educational goals, guidance, and programing was not present. The viability of the local system was at all times maintained and never infringed upon. The fear that Federal control goes hand in hand with Federal aid to education should be obviated upon close inspection of these programs.

Under the GI bill a plan was provided whereby veterans received Federal aid to continue their educations whether they attended a public or private school. No Federal control over curriculum or infringement on the separation of church-state postulate manifested itself. No one now would question the utility and the worth to the Nation of this program. Would anyone question the inuring benefits to the country secured by Federal Government grants to universities for research even though two of the largest grants went to Notre Dame and Yeshiva Universities? Here we have two distinguished universities who certainly have not been impeded by Federal regulation of their curriculum or other aspects of school administration.

The Federal Government has also extended tax privileges to those people who donate money to religious organization by way of an exemption, and has, in fact, extended tax exempt status to nonprofit religious organizations. Observation then points up the myriad of programs in which the church and the state can and do cooperate toward the apex of a better America.

The present Federal education bill has many inherent safeguards which maintain the wall of separation between church and state. The bill itself specifically declares:

> Nothing contained in this Act shall be considered to authorize the making of any payment under this Act, or under any Act amended by this Act, for religious worship or instruction.

Aid for any "religious worship or instruction," thus, is banned.

There are three titles which would provide benefits to students in sectarian and public schools.

The first is title I under which the largest appropriation would be made for the initiation of a 3-year program of assistance to local education agencies for the education of low-income families. These are the disadvantaged children, children of families who earn less than $2,000 per year, or whose parents are on welfare. They are the children who attend overcrowded, obsolete, unsafe schools; children who are candidates for juvenile delinquency and crime; and children who are a year behind in mastering their schoolwork by the time they reach the third grade, and up to 3 years behind if they reach the eighth grade. These are the children who are uninterested and unmotivated and who will be unskilled and unemployed.

The funds provided under this title will be used to establish, expand, and improve programs to meet the special needs of these children. This will include expanded guidance and teaching staffs, intensive counseling, remedial work, prekindergarten and full-day kindergarten programs, special instructional materials, and so forth.

The principle of shared time is also to be utilized by the administration's education bill. Shared time permits pupils in sectarian and nonprofit private schools to take some of their courses in public schools. It is interesting to note that limited shared-time programs, although not given that name prior to 1961, have been in successful operation in some parts of the United States for 40 years or more. The broad support for the shared-time proposal, by religious and nonreligious groups is engendered by the need of utilizing all the educational facilities available to the country. Shared time is a unique program in that it provides facilities for the student and does not infringe on the separation of church and state. The problem of education deprivation has no relevance to whether the child attends a public or private school. It has all the relevance to the welfare of the child and of the Nation.

Under title II, there is provision for a 5-year program to provide school library resources and instructional materials for teachers and children in public and nonprofit private elementary and secondary schools. Only those books used and recommended by the public school authorities would be provided for the private schools. This negates the possibility that materials for religious instruction would be purchased out of public funds. Additional separation as provided by a provision which specifies that title to the books and other instructional materials would be held only by a public agency.

Again, who would benefit from this provision? Is it not obvious that it is the child, and ultimately the Nation?

Title III calls for the initiation of a 5-year program for supplemental education centers and services in which all elementary and secondary school students would participate. Facilities for special instruction in science, languages, music and art; such services as counseling and guidance, health and social work; and such education centers as technical institutes, museums, art galleries, and theaters are unevenly distributed and inconsistent in quality throughout the Nation. These facilities are a vital part of an adequate education and should be available for all students. This title would provide common facilities which cannot be efficiently or effectively provided by each individual school, such as libraries, science and language laboratories, theaters, sports facilities, exhibit halls, auditoriums, and so forth.

Again, I ask who would benefit? Certainly, this cannot be termed an establishment of religion or even an aid to religion. As an added safeguard, a provision has been attached which specifies that the centers must be under the control of a public agency.

These are the provisions which would provide assistance to the students in private elementary and secondary schools. The bill has been carefully drafted to avoid the controversy which has blocked general school aid bills for the past 15 years. It has the indorsement of the National Education Association and the various religious organizations. The Justice Department has declared that it is constitutional. It appears to me that the pupil benefit argument which the Supreme Court has adopted in the past, is wholly relevant to this bill. The shared-time plan offers the safeguards and flexibility to achieve a high level of nationwide education without infringing on basic American postulates.

I truly believe that it is a wise, farsighted, and human bill, and that its enactment is essential if we are to have equality of educational opportunity for all of our children.

In a country so rich and so benevolent to other countries, it seems a folly that those Americans who are repressed, due to lack of correct educational motivation and facilities, are not aided. In the final conclusion, each American will rise or fall on his individual tenacity, motivation, and skill, but surely a good education is a minimum legacy that each generation can provide for the next.

PASSAGE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME BILL—A VOTE OF CONFIDENCE IN THE SENATE

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following editorial from this morning's Washington Post.

It is most unfortunate that this body approved H.R. 5688 on Monday and I trust that as the editorial suggests we can depend upon the Senate to reject it.

The editorial follows:

OMNIBUS CRIME BILL

The passage of the District crime bill in the House can only be understood if it is regarded as a vote of confidence in the Senate. One cannot believe that the House Members would have passed such a monstrosity if they had not been certain that the other Chamber would rescue them from the consequences of their folly.

While this explains this particular lapse, it hardly commends it. This is a dangerous piece of business and one day the Senate might nod and let some such measure get into law. In this case, the Senate seems fully alerted and has planned hearings that the House did not hold in which the multiple weaknesses of the omnibus crime bill surely will be made apparent. Failure of the House to even hear the administration witnesses who are supporting very different proposals is an act of discourtesy to the President that one might think Democratic Members would have wished to avoid.

The provisions on the Mallory rule and Durham rule raise the most serious constitutional questions. The improvised obscenity sections would threaten the constitutional rights of all publications in the District and expose them to calamitous losses on mere suspicion and in advance of judicial determination of guilt. There is little likelihood that the crime bill would survive long in the courts, but it is to be hoped that it will be killed long before it gets there.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XXII

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the 22d part of the series on "New York City in Crisis" appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

This installment appeared in the February 12, 1965, edition of the New York Herald Tribune and concerns the valiant efforts on the part of the 200 New York City Youth Board Street Club workers to understand and control the massive juvenile delinquency in the city's slums.

The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: THE STREET CLUB WORKER—THE CITY'S OWN PEACE CORPS

(By Claude Lewis)

Clement Cumberbatch is a 35-year-old college graduate who holds a dual degree in English and sociology, but his language is often the language of the street. He uses such terms as "thump" (to beat a person), "snagging," and "japping" (to mug or beat cruelly) with such ease and frequency that you wonder if he ever studied English at all.

Mr. Cumberbatch chooses to spend his days hanging out on street corners with high school and junior high school dropouts in the East Tremont section of the Bronx. Most policemen on the youth squad know him on sight.

They also know that he is one of the 200 street-club workers employed by the New York City Youth Board.

There is no question that street-club workers rank high on the list of the city's understaffed (200 of them cover 16,000 problem youths) and underpaid employees. Half of the youth board's total budget of $6.8 million last year was distributed among 65 contract agencies such as the YMCA, the CYO. and the Central Brooklyn Coordinating Council, Inc. Yet, despite this outlay—some $45 million over 17 years—the juvenile crime rate continues to soar.

DOLLAR FOR DOLLAR?

In 1953 when the street-club worker concept became a reality, a starting New York policeman was paid $3,700 a year, while a street-club worker, a college man, got $3,600.

Today, a starting policeman earns $6,647 a year while a street-club worker, who must still be a college graduate, earns only $4,500.

According to the youth board and the street-club workers, their problem is basically one of money and manpower.

Give us more men and give us more money, they say, and we will make deep inroads into the juvenile delinquency problem in New York.

"The city has not met the rise in crime with a solid preventive program," says a high-ranking youth board official. "Our major investment has got to be in people. The mayor has said that people are the city's most important resource. But he has consistently failed to provide the money necessary to develop them."

There is no question that, with more money and more men, the youth board—and particularly the street-club worker—could do a better, more comprehensive job.

What isn't so obvious—particularly to people who do not work for the youth board—is whether, at its present strength or even at double it, the street workers can ever substantially curb the frightening increase in juvenile crime.

IS IT TOO LATE?

Since the youth board was set up in 1947, more than $45 million has been spent on a wide variety of programs, all designed to conquer juvenile delinquency. This year alone, the youth board has a budget of nearly $7 million (of which $1.8 million has been poured into the street workers program), and the problems of youth, undisciplined, disrespectful of law, increasingly violent and with less hope than ever, are more critical than ever.

"I'm 19 years old and I ain't had nothing but trouble since I was born," says William Bennett (an alias), a Bedford-Stuyvesant gang member and dope addict. "How's anybody gonna help me? I needed help when I was born. Youth board workers are okay, they're tryin', but I don't think there's much they can do for me. It's a little bit too late."

Yet even if a larger street-club worker program were able to make impressive headway in curbing juvenile crime, which is highly debatable, it would still not be a true solution. For the street-club worker and the youth board can do nothing about the extreme problems of slum housing, slum schools, and slum hurt, which continue to produce these deeply troubled youngsters in the first place.

Ever since they broke up the large street gangs, street-club workers have become relatively unknown to most New Yorkers—and to the city administration. "With almost a million middle-class people leaving the city for the suburbs and being replaced largely by disadvantaged people, the role of the street-club worker will be more important than ever," says the youth board's executive director, Arthur J. Rogers. "We must think in terms of expanding our services."

Street-club workers fill the gap between the truant officer and the police officer. Their main duties are to prevent teenage gang members from "bopping" (fighting) and killing one another and to curb destruction and self-deterioration by bitter hostile youths throughout the city's 29 "high hazard" areas.

TRUST AND RESPECT

"Our kids test, and test, and test us in so many ways," says Mr. Cumberbatch, "that you have to remain constantly on guard. And they have their own code of ethics. Cross them and you've lost them, prove your friendship and you've made a friend. After all, all these kids are really looking for is an adult whom they can trust and respect.

"They don't want an adult with a wishy-washy personality. Many of them find that at home," Mr. Cumberbatch says. "They want someone who has standards, rules, and, most of all, that someone has to be a person they can look up to."

Quite often the angriest gang member is the brightest and the most resentful of authority—including that of the street-club worker. But once he is convinced he can trust a street-club worker, the worker finds far less difficulty in trying to change the goals of the gang members.

Officially, the street-club aid works a 37½-hour week, but in practice often as not he will work more than 55 hours in a week, at no extra pay. "Human problems don't stop on Friday evening at 5 p.m.," says Robert Cooper, leader of the street-club section of the youth board.

Mr. Cooper is right. But despite the necessity of the workers to remain on the streets long after their official time off—and even to work on their days off—the city is unwilling to pay for this extra duty. This is one of the reasons for the high turnover among the workers. (The turnover rate is about 30 percent and has been as high as 43 percent annually.) This fact becomes more important because it usually takes a worker about 6 months to "reach" his group. When he leaves, the next worker has a difficult time convincing the gang that he really cares about them.

NOT THE MONEY

Although every one of the city's 200 street workers is college trained; it is obvious that they do not take the job for the money. Street-club workers are among the most poorly paid professional people in the country.

After 2 years on a job which is sometimes more dangerous than that of the police officers (street-club workers are not armed), Mr. Cumberbatch earns only $5,750 a year, and he has put in more than 300 hours of overtime in the last 11 months. "Oh, I may be able to make it up by taking some time off," he says with a smile, but he knows that most of those 300 hours are lost forever. "I'm not crying," he said last week, as he slipped a cigar into an ivory and silver holder. "I'm not chained to the youth board. But no other job could possibly give me this much satisfaction."

Street-club workers are on 24-hour call 365 days a year. Even while on vacation they must let the office know where they can be reached. On their days (and nights) off, they are required to call the office at a special telephone answering service at least three times a day. Workers who cannot afford telephones must call in from public phones.

A TYPICAL DAY

On a typical day, Clement Cumberbatch (who serves as acting supervisor of the Morrisania-Belmont unit at no extra pay) arrives at his office at 555 East Tremont Avenue at noon. By 1 p.m. he tries to clear up such administrative chores as processing time-sheets, schedules, and filing requests for the station wagons his workers use to take the youthful offenders on trips around and outside the city. At 1, he searches newspapers for items relative to his work that may have taken place after his street workers went off duty at midnight or 1 a.m.

At 2 p.m. his staff of nine begins trickling in. This is the time Mr. Cumberbatch devotes to conferences on existing problems, to general instructions, to planning strategy, and to passing along word from downtown youth board headquarters at 79 Madison Avenue. Mr. Cumberbatch also helps his workers make youth referrals, he talks with probation and parole officers, school guidance counselors, officials at the youth board's treatment service bureau, and with the police.

At 6 p.m. the entire staff goes to dinner and at 7 they begin peeling off for their various areas within the unit.

Mr. Cumberbatch and his workers spend much of their time on the streets discouraging bopping and encouraging the youth to apply for jobs, return to school, or join community centers. His major effort is to get them off the streets. For almost 7 years, many centers would refuse to accept the referrals of the street-club workers, contending that these youths would disrupt their programs and create tension and ill feeling among their youth. However, street-club workers have since been able to discourage this attitude and have gotten thousands of their youths into these centers.

Not every street-club worker handles his problems the way Mr. Cumberbatch does. In Brooklyn, for instance, where hundreds of kids are gang members, in a section where drink and drugs are the way of life, one worker practices pragmatism.

"I'm here to get a job done," he says, "and I can't be completely tied down by department rulings. I'm supposed to call our supervisors the moment I find drug addiction among my gangs. But if I do that and eight or nine kids get busted (arrested) the next week, I've got to come up with some damned good answers for those still on the street."

In order to keep the lines of communication open, some street-club workers find it necessary to suppress instances of corruption and police brutality which they sometimes cannot fully substantiate. "You've got to remember," the Brooklyn worker says, "we're dealing with both the police and the kids and we've got to do what's necessary to keep them both fairly happy."

"A few years ago the city tried putting psychologists in the street, like we were in the street," Mr. Cumberbatch says, "but the program didn't work out too well. You know, these kids are too hip. They have been social worked to death. They've known social workers all their lives. They've met them at welfare, in school, family court, truant officers, guidance counselors, and probation officers.

"We try to deal with them without talking down to them. By the time these kids get out of school and into the street they've been through the whole bit. They know the laws of the court, and they know the street better than anybody else. You can't fool them and there's no sense in trying. They'll survive in most instances better than anyone else."

The question is, Will the street-club worker program survive?

The city has positions for only 200 street-club workers. Realistically, 500 could effectively cover the entire city and help check the rising rate of crime. There are areas that need but receive no attention by street-club workers because of the lack of money to expand their program. More than a few neighborhoods lack services such as those performed by the street-club workers last year:

During the last calendar year street-club workers referred 9,680 youths for jobs (3,719 were placed); 725 medical or dental referrals were made; 3,333 youths were given school counseling, while 1,091 were given spiritual attachments (the youth board works with religious leaders). More than 1,061 youths were referred to family agencies, and more than 1,025 were taken to museums or other cultural centers "to help them feel related to the totality of the city."

Because there are only 200 street-club workers (14 females among them), spread paper thin throughout all the boroughs except Staten Island, thousands of kids are left to their own devices, one reason the city's crime rate mounts year after year.

In the city's 29 high hazard areas (where 3,170,077 of the city's nearly 8 million people live) the street-club workers service close to 16,000 problem youths, an average of 80 teenagers to a worker.

MORE HELP WANTED

"And we are not helping all the kids who need us," says Mr. Cooper. "We are constantly getting calls and letters asking for help from places like Staten Island and Coney Island where we are not able to provide a single worker. Crime is rising in both of these areas, but we just don't have a nickel to provide the service needed."

Staten Island and Coney Island are just two of the many areas that appear to be stepchildren of the city. The youth board is spending only $110,000 in Staten Island (providing other services) and Coney Island—fast becoming one of the city's most critical areas—receives no help from the youth board.

A major criticism of the current city administration is that it has consistently failed to anticipate the need for expanding its programs as the city grows. Staten Island is a case in point. During the more than 5 years it took to complete the Verrazano Narrows Bridge which opened last November, the city did nothing to provide for the expanding population that is certain to include a number of problem youngsters.

When and if money for Staten Island ever becomes available, it will cost the taxpayers far more than would have been necessary if city hall had been able to see what was obvious to almost everyone else:

An administrative fact of life is that preventive measures are almost always less expensive than curative measures.

KILLED IN ACTION

In the nearly 18 years of the New York City Youth Board's existence, its street-club workers have a record of only one killed in action, and one critically injured.

In January 1963, Louis Marsh, 29, was beaten to death on a Harlem street. Four boys, ranging in age from 17 to 19, killed Mr. Marsh because he had carried out the job he was assigned to do—he headed off a rumble.

The inherent trouble-fomenting aspect of a street-club worker's role is rarely mentioned in official postmortems.

Most often, the conflicts that result in threats or violence to youth workers arise because a worker appears to be competing with the established leaders of the gangs. They try to control or influence the bulk of the gang's members, to turn the gang's interest from violence toward some socially acceptable outlet.

The best, but often the most difficult, way to bring about a change in the behavior of an antisocial gang is to do something about the gang's leader.

Most gang leaders are wild, violent types, but many are cunning and quiet. A worker must seek out the leader, try to gain his confidence, and then get to work on the rest of the group. This is dangerous because it represents the leader's greatest possible loss, the control of the only world in which he is important, or even acceptable.

Last year, street-club worker Henry Amadore's skull was fractured when he tried to settle differences between two warring factions on Manhattan's lower West Side. (Mr. Amadore recovered and is now working with younger children at a Manhattan church.)

NO USE FOR MARTYRS

"One thing we always stress to our new workers," says Mr. Cumberbatch, "is that we don't have any use for martyrs or heroes. We need people with brains; people who want to live and people who want to help the city's lost youth. If you're a suicide looking for a place to happen, don't come to the street-club workers, we can't use you."

Sometimes the services the street-club worker provides are incredibly basic. "Some of our kids have never been on a shopping trip. Some have never had a new coat, and others have dropped out of school simply because they don't own a decent pair of shoes. This happens most often with our girls. We encourage them to save their money, and we add the difference to whatever they've been able to save. Then one of our female workers takes them downtown to shop, to let them know that somebody cares whether or not they have a decent coat.

"A simple thing like this will sometimes be enough to get a girl back in school. Some of these kids have never had a chance from the beginning," says Mr. Cumberbatch. "Often when a girl of 19 has four illegitimate kids, this is her way of expressing the hopelessness of her life. This is her only weapon."

Many street-club workers come to the youth board to get enough experience so they can work in other cities—which almost always pay more. "We lost five of our top-level workers in the last 6 months," Mr. Cumberbatch says, "and the only reason they left was because they got a chance to make more money. The average increase a worker gets when he goes to a private organization is $2,000. How can they be blamed for leaving us? They can't."

MOONLIGHTING

Mr. Cumberbatch has a wife, Arden, three young daughters, and a mortgage to support. "We're just making it," he says, "and the only reason we can is because I'm able to pick up a few dollars moonlighting." Many workers are forced to take other jobs to help support their families."

"I don't like the word 'dedicated,' " he says. "In fact, I even resent it when it is applied to me because it lumps me with all the city's bleeding hearts and do-gooders. I'm neither. I came to the youth board over 2 years ago because of my personal commitment to do something for the slum citizen. I may work here for the rest of my life, or I may quit next week. I will leave this job the moment I feel I am no longer effective. That's my criteria for doing my job. I've got to be effective."

"I shudder when I think of what this city would be like if we all walked off. No one would be safe living here. Not one of the gangs we work with was involved in the riots in Harlem or Bedford-Stuyvesant last summer. The degree of restraint our boys exercised at that time was incredible. No one knows how many we dissuaded from acts of violence, we don't even know ourselves. We are pretty happy about our successes."

One thing the street-club workers are not happy about is the city's apparent apathy concerning the job street-club workers are doing. And they are not happy, either, about the "totally unrealistic" monetary rewards they receive.

"We are paid exactly what the city and the public think we're worth," Mr. Cumberbatch says, with a trace of bitterness in his voice. "How can anyone of even reasonable intelligence expect to attract and hold the kind of people needed to give a lost kid the service he needs and wants? We need more workers, but where are we going to get them?

"I think the city understands that we are here for the same reason people join the Peace Corps. We are committed to help the helpless. But we are the helpless, too. What can we do? Throw up our hands in despair? Of course not. You do the best you can with what you have, and hope that somehow you'll get the job done."

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XXIII

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following installment of "New York City in Crisis," which appeared in the February 13, 1965, edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

The rising criminal rate in New York City is of great concern to all of us who live there. This article documents part of the daily tragedy occurring in the Nation's largest city. All of us hope that this upward trend of violence can be halted.

The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: FRIGHTENED WOMEN AND RUTHLESS FACTS

(By Barry Gottehrer)

In Morningside Heights, two middle-aged sisters were beaten and robbed in the hallway of their apartment house.

In a middle-class section of the Bronx, a deaf mute was assaulted in front of her home.

None of the women were critically hurt. The city's press would normally not even mention the incidents—not because they were unimportant in the lives of those involved, but because they have become everyday occurrences in the greatest city in the world.

Yet it is precisely the frequency of these everyday occurrences that has created a growing fear among New Yorkers.

For years women have been afraid to walk down the city's slum streets and few people ventured out into the city's parks after dark.

Today it is no longer only the slum streets and the darkened parks that create this fear. Increasingly, as major crimes of violence continue to rise, New Yorkers have become afraid everywhere in the city—in their streets, in their parks, in their subways, in their own homes, at night and during the day.

Yesterday morning in the adolescent section of the Criminal Court Building, Judge Reuben Levy only shook his head as he stared out at the parents of four youths seized by police after the assault and robbery in Morningside Heights early yesterday.

The four youths, each held in $2,500 bail for hearing February 18, were accused in the attack on the two sisters in the hallway of their apartment building at 352 West 110th Street.

Miss Mary Cheller, 52, had two teeth knocked loose and had cuts on her face. Her sister, Mrs. Adele Kubilus, 53, suffered facial cuts and required several stitches.

The youths were identified as Frank Benson, 17, of 2237 Eighth Avenue; Milton Smith, 16, of 512 Manhattan Avenue; Harry Wiltshire, 16, of 1695 Madison Avenue; and Archer Miller, 17, of 658 Greene Avenue, Brooklyn.

Mrs. Sarah Kaminsky, 55, the deaf mute, was assaulted in front of her Bronx home at 2200 Tiebout Avenue Thursday evening. After a short chase, John Watson, an off-duty patrolman, apprehended Melvin Cox Harris, 27, of 1390 Boston Road, the Bronx, who was held in $1,000 bail yesterday, for a hearing in Bronx criminal court on Monday.

This growing fear of violence, which has been sweeping the city in the last year and has driven thousands of residents to seek protection by banding together in citizens patrols throughout the city, was documented statistically with the release of the annual crime figures last week.

According to police figures, major violence throughout New York City jumped 13.8 percent in 1964.

The report shows that 636 murders and nonnegligent manslaughters (an increase of 88 or 16.1 percent), 1,054 forcible rapes (an increase of 231 or 28.1 percent) and 14,831 assaults of all kinds (an increase of 1,806 or 13.9 percent) were committed in 1964.

Now the figures begin to mount for 1965.

The first murder of this year was discovered just 10 minutes past midnight on January 1, in a dark hallway on West 111th Street, several miles away from the well-lighted celebration going on in Times Square. The victim, a 19-year-old youth, had been shot through the heart.

Later in January, two women were slain within 3 days in widely separated sections of the city.

On January 9, Mrs. Gertrude Mason, an airlines clerk, was found stabbed to death in the self-service elevator of her Washington Heights apartment building. She had apparently been slain after an assault attempt following her return home from a 3:30 p.m. to midnight work shift at the East Side terminal in downtown Manhattan.

Early on the morning of January 11, Miss Mary Hernan, was stabbed to death in the lobby of her apartment building on a quiet street in Elmhurst, Queens. Her assailant has not been found—even though several residents of the area saw Miss Hernan being followed home that night, and at least one saw the murderer run away with blood on his hand.

(The witnesses told their stories only under police questioning. None had moved to help the girl, or to call police.)

It is not only the police department, however, which has been unable to quell these fears. Major subway crimes of violence have jumped 52 percent in the last year alone and reports of assaults and other crimes in the city's subways, guarded by the 1,118-member transit authority police, seem to have become an almost daily occurence.

"It's not just the bad areas of the city any more," one middle-aged woman, a resident of a high-income apartment house on Park Avenue, wrote the Herald Tribune in the response to the "New York City in Crisis" series. "It seems to be everywhere. And, the awful thing is that there doesn't seem to be anything we can do about it."

CONDEMNATION OF DISCRIMINATORY PRACTICES OF THE RUMANIAN GOVERNMENT AGAINST THE HUNGARIAN MINORITY

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PATTEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I join the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] and other colleagues, in cosponsoring today the resolution which condemns the discriminatory practices of the Rumanian Government against the Hungarian minority.

The charge of discrimination is always a serious one, for it reflects on the character of a person, or country, indicating a lack of reason. Therefore, great care should be exercised in making such a charge.

But the charge of discrimination by the Rumanian Government against the 1,650,000 Hungarians in that country has been substantiated.

The International Commission of Jurists has reported the occurrence of many cases of discrimination by the Government of Rumania.

There is more evidence.

In a comprehensive and disturbing article, "Trouble Over Transylvania," George Bailey wrote the following in the Reporter in November 1964:

> This spring, Rumanian authorities announced their intention to demolish the historic church of St. Layos, which they characterized as an eyesore.

The article points out that "to prevent this, several thousand Hungarians took up a day and night vigil for more than a week."

Religious discrimination is not the only kind of prejudice against the Hungarians in Rumania.

Bailey also wrote about cultural discrimination:

> The greatest single source of irritation to the Hungarians is the state cultural agreement with Rumania. Strict Rumanian application of the terms of the agreement has prevented the Hungarian Government from any sort of cultural link between the homeland and the minority.

In addition, there are restrictions against Hungarian citizens who are tourists.

And because every dictatorship fears enlightenment of the people, the Rumanian Government even extends its discrimination to the written word.

According to the article in the Reporter magazine:

> There were 32 Hungarian newspapers in prewar Rumania; today there is 1.

These are only a few reasons why the House should pass this resolution.

By doing so, the world would know of the discrimination going on in Rumania and expose that Government's policy. With the heavy weight of the free world applying pressure, perhaps this discrimination would be diminished and eventually end.

TAX CREDIT FOR AMOUNTS PAID FOR TUITION CHARGES FOR EDUCATION ABOVE SECONDARY SCHOOL LEVEL

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today which would amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by allowing a tax credit for amounts paid for tuition charges for education above the secondary school level.

It is unnecessary to belabor the point that tuition charges have soared during the last few years and that the cost of higher education is becoming prohibitive for thousands of low- and middle-income families.

The bill which I have introduced today would serve a double purpose inasmuch as it would provide relief for families who are laboring under the double burden of high taxes and continually mounting tuition payments.

This bill would provide the greatest relief for those whose need is greatest. It provides for a sliding scale of tax credits, a 75-percent credit for the first $200 of tuition expenses, 25 percent for the next $300, and 10 percent for the next thousand. Thus maximum tax credit would be $325.

Additionally, in order to insure that the benefits provided by this bill do not accrue to those who need tax relief least, I have included a provision that the tax credit be reduced by an amount equal to 1 percent of the amount by which the adjusted gross income exceeds $25,000.

This bill allows a tax credit to any taxpayer who pays tuition charges whether for himself or any other person. It is not limited merely to dependents. In this way, it could provide a major stimulus for philanthropy.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the need for aid to higher education in the United States. In my opinion, there is no better way to provide direct aid to education with less redtape and paperwork than by the passage of this bill. I strongly urge every Member of this House to give serious consideration to this singularly meritorious bill.

AN ARTICLE ENTITLED "IS THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM REALLY NECESSARY?"

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, the State of Rhode Island counts among its assets many outstanding educational institutions, including one of the oldest in America, Brown University. On leave from this excellent university and serving as the senior economist in the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency is Dr. Deane Carson.

In his capacity as senior economist in this important Government post, Professor Carson also edits the Journal of Finance, which included a fascinating article written by him entitled "Is the Federal Reserve System Really Necessary?"

As a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, the article was of real interest to me, though I cannot say that I concur with all of Professor Carson's views. I do believe, however, that it is certainly worth reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the text of the article follows:

[From the Journal of Finance, December 1964]

IS THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM REALLY NECESSARY?

(By Deane Carson*)

Since 1964 marks the golden anniversary of the Federal Reserve System, the title of this essay may appear somewhat uncharitable to those who have come to think of the Federal Reserve in terms only slightly less affectionate than those accorded to the Old Lady of Threadneedle Street.[1] I hasten to assure the reader that my heresy, if that is what it is, involves principally the word "system"; that is to say, I shall examine the need for a Federal Reserve System as it is presently constituted, quite apart from the generally acknowledged need for central bank monetary policy. While this task might be thought properly to lie within the province of the political scientist, I shall show that, on the contrary, there are many important economic aspects involved in such an inquiry.[2]

Central to the analysis which follows is the proposition that the success of the essential function of the central bank, monetary management, is independent of the structural arrangements that characterize its organization. This is to say, central bank policies can be executed within a variety of organizational structures, both internal as well as external vis à vis the commercial banking system. The Federal Reserve System qua system is but one of a number of such structural arrangements within which a monetary policy can be carried on.

Unfortunately, this fact is little appreciated. A fair sampling of money and banking textbooks, while explicitly silent on the point, leave one to infer that in some unique sense the existing system is a necessary adjunct to the pursuit of successful monetary management. After a chapter or two on the structure of the Federal Reserve System, the student is successively introduced to functions and to policy.

Out of this, or perhaps independent from this, have developed a mythology and a basic fallacy. The mythology has many aspects: it is generally believed that "member banks" are necessary to the conduct of monetary policy; it is generally believed not only that legal reserve requirements are necessary to the conduct of monetary policy but also that these reserves have to be held at the central bank; it is widely if certainly not universally believed that the Federal Reserve banks serve many useful functions that could not and are not performed by private institutions, such as discounting, clearing of checks, and provision of vaults for the safekeeping of securities; and, without exhausting the mythology, a rather substantial sentiment exists to the effect that the whole pyramid of varying authority—the 261 directors of Federal Reserve banks and their branches, the 12-man Open Market Committee, the 7-man Board, and the 12-man Federal Advisory Council—somehow formulates a monetary policy superior to that which could be conjured up by a single Governor of the caliber of Montague Norman or Benjamin Strong.

The fallacy that all this has fostered is simply this: monetary policy, being an extremely complex matter, requires a very complex system to make it operative, and the resources that we now allocate to monetary management are required to maintain a viable central banking function in relation to the goals we have assigned to the Federal Reserve.[3] In opposition to this I would advance the proposition that a simple central banking structure is most conducive to successful monetary management, other things equal, and that we can reduce both its internal and its external costs by adopting certain basic reforms.[4]

Basically, my proposals involve two such reforms which, while perhaps not interdependent at first glance, are closely related in fact. I propose, first, that membership in the Federal Reserve be placed on a completely voluntary basis; and, second, that compulsory legal reserve requirements be abolished. These, together with their corollary structural changes, are discussed in turn below.

I. THE CASE FOR VOLUNTARY MEMBERSHIP

At the present time, State-chartered banks may elect to become members of the Federal Reserve System; banks chartered by Federal authority must become members as a matter of law. This distinction between banks according to the source of charter was initially imposed on the grounds that the purposes of the Federal Reserve Act could only be carried out if a substantial fraction of the cash reserves of commercial banks were mobilized in the Federal Reserve district banks, and if a substantial number of banks had access to the discounting privileges afforded by these regional arms of the Federal Reserve System. Fears that compulsory membership for all commercial banks would compromise the rights of the several States, together with the easy expediency of subjecting federally chartered banks (which were already subject to Federal control) to captive membership in the System, were responsible for the distinction between banks as written into the Federal Reserve Act.

---

* Senior economist, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, and associate professor of economics (on leave), Brown University. Views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect those of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency.

[1] If the timing of this critique seems somewhat uncharitable, I must fall back on an amusing precedent: Allan Sproul, one of the more astute central bankers in recent times, advocated abolition of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency in his contribution to a book of essays sponsored by the Comptroller to mark the centennial of the national banking system. See his "The Federal Reserve System—Working Partner of the National Banking System for Half a Century" in Deane Carson (ed.), Banking and Monetary Studies: In Commemoration of the Centennial of the National Banking System, (Homewood, Ill.; Richard D. Irwin Inc., 1963), p. 77.

[2] This has been recognized by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN who has marked the Federal Reserve's 50th milestone in his own inimitable fashion; namely, by a thoroughgoing investigation of the structure of the Federal Reserve System, with an overriding emphasis upon its "independence" and mix of public and private powers.

[3] The recent Patman inquiry (hearings op. cit.), dwelt at some length on this matter although, unfortunately, its shots were so scattered that the essential allocation problem was submerged.

[4] Lack of space prohibits discussion of all such reforms. One in particular deserves separate treatment and cannot be included in this paper; namely, the need to transfer the supervisery functions now performed by the Federal Reserve to some other agency. This has been suggested by at least one present member of the Board, J. L. Robertson, and is reportedly looked upon with favor by others. In any case, the complexity of monetary management would seem to argue for single-minded attention of the Board.

I shall demonstrate in this section that voluntary membership (1) would not, as some have alleged, destroy the effectiveness of monetary management, and (2) would reduce the discrimination against (particularly) smaller federally chartered banks that are now captive members. Initially, we assume that the second part of the suggested reform is not adopted, that is to say, member banks continue to be subject to compulsory legal reserve requirements which must be held with the district banks. This assumption is dropped in section II of the paper.

Our initial task is to estimate the probable results of legislation providing for voluntary membership in the Federal Reserve. Such an estimate is based upon the assumption that national banks of any given size would elect to remain in the System in the same proportion that State-chartered banks of that size are presently members. Since we have data on hand on the assets of member national banks, and member State banks in various size groups, estimates can easily be generated. Tables 1 and 2 provide the basic data for these estimates. By summing the totals for various classes of banks in table 1, we observe that insured bank assets total $310.8 billion at the end of December 1963. Next, summing the totals of column 7 in each table, we find that if all insured commercial banks were accorded the right to forgo System membership, something like $98.1 billion of commercial bank assets would be "outside" the Federal Reserve. This represents 31.5 percent of total assets.

The effectiveness of monetary policy depends to some extent on the pervasiveness of its impact and possibly but not clearly upon the percentage of banking institutions that have access to the discount window.[5] Any correlation between policy effectiveness and number of member banks, however, must certainly be weak, since the impact of scarce or ample funds would not appear to depend upon the presence of Federal Reserve stock in the portifolio of any particular bank. Furthermore, our highly developed system of correspondent banking relationships insures that monetary policy changes will be transmitted to the entire banking structure. I would certainly argue, in any case, that the effectiveness of monetary policy with 68.5 percent of commercial bank assets covered will be no less than when 90 or 100 percent coverage obtains.[6] Since the reasons for this are covered in the following section, they need not be considered here.

TABLE 1.—*Number and assets of insured commercial banks, by size, December 1963*

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Deposit size (millions of dollars) (1)	National		State member		Insured nonmember	
	Number of banks (2)	Assets (3)	Number of banks (4)	Assets (5)	Number of banks (6)	Assets (7)
Less than 1	132	$123	24	$22	630	$535
1 to 1.9	388	702	131	224	1,665	2,766
2 to 4.9	1,316	5,100	465	1,758	2,563	9,228
5 to 9.9	1,145	9,082	328	2,530	1,282	9,760
10 to 24.9	935	16,037	277	4,647	688	11,314
25 to 49.9	329	12,739	104	4,068	144	5,434
50 to 99.9	167	13,257	68	5,549	48	3,573
100 to 499.9	164	41,052	64	15,170	30	6,102
500 and over	39	72,143	27	57,337	1	677
Total	4,615	170,233	1,488	91,215	7,051	49,390

TABLE 2.—*Estimate of assets of nonmember national banks if membership were optional*

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Deposit size (millions of dollars) (1)	Assets of—		Assets of insured nonmember banks as percent of insured State banks (4)	Assets of national banks (5)	Assets of national banks that would would be nonmembers (col 3 times col 4) (6)	Cumulative nonmember assets (7)
	Insured State banks (2)	Insured nonmember banks (3)				
Less than 1	$557	$535	96.1	$123	$118	$118
1 to 1.9	2,990	2,766	92.5	702	649	767
2 to 4.9	10,986	9,228	84.0	5,100	4,284	5,015
5 to 9.9	12,290	9,760	79.4	9,082	7,212	12,263
10 to 24.9	15,961	11,314	70.9	16,037	11,368	23,531
25 to 49.9	9,502	5,433	57.2	12,739	7,285	30,816
50 to 99.9	9,032	3,573	39.6	13,257	5,244	36,060
100 to 499.9	21,272	6,102	28.7	41,052	11,776	47,836
500 and over	58,014	677	1.2	72,143	842	48,678

An alternative to the voluntary membership proposal discussed above would provide for compulsory membership of all insured commercial banks above a given size. The cutoff asset size that has been occasionally mentioned is $10 million. Under this proposal, obviously, larger nonmember State banks would be required to join, while all national banks under the cutoff size would be afforded the choice now open to State-chartered banks. For the latest available data (end of 1963) I have calculated that this cutoff point would reduce "covered" assets by only approximately $6.2 billion under the extreme assumption that all national banks with less than $10 million total assets elect to forgo Federal Reserve membership. At the same time, voluntary membership would be extended to approximately 77 percent of all insured commercial banks, from the present 66 percent.[7]

On its face, this proposal would seem to be a superior alternative to completely voluntary membership. And indeed, it probably is a more satisfactory basis for discrimination than that found in the present law. On the other hand, its superiority to complete voluntarism can only be defended on the grounds that effective monetary policy requires that a large proportion of the reserves of the commercial banks be held in the form of compulsory balances at the Reserve banks. More precisely, it requires the finding of a positive correlation between effectiveness of monetary policy and the percent of total bank reserves held within the System. Again this is properly a matter for consideration in section II and is therefore postponed for the moment.

There are, however, clear advantages to the completely voluntary membership proposal. Certainly the most important of these is that it would enable all insured banks to choose between public and private supplies of banking services to banks. In this connection it is worthy of note that large private banks, as correspondents, now provide a very wide range of such services on terms that are clearly superior to similar services provided by the Federal Reserve banks. Among the more important of the latter are check-clearing arrangements, temporary loan accommodation, credit and operations analysis, and provision of economic information. Small national banks find it convenient to utilize these privately supplied services, against which they must carry correspondent balances, in spite of the fact that they must also carry legal reserves with the district banks. In effect, compulsory membership imposes a discriminatory burden on these banks in the form of double cash balances.

Table 3 demonstrates the extent to which Federal Reserve membership leads to this result.

It indicates a consistent pattern of higher cash holdings to total assets for member banks than for nonmember banks. This is not due to lower reserve requirements for State-chartered banks; indeed, of the selected States, nine have substantially higher reserve requirements than those currently imposed by the Federal Reserve,[8] six States impose legal reserve requirements that are substantially the same as System requirements,[9] and only two States[10] have reserve requirements that are substantially less than the Federal Reserve's 12.5 percent and 4 percent requirements against demand deposits and time deposits, respectively.

---

[5] Under present law the Federal Reserve banks can technically make advances to nonmember banks under 12 U.S.C. 347c.

[6] As a matter of fact, the middle 1920's are often considered years of effective monetary policy; at that time approximately 60 percent of commercial bank assets were covered.

[7] Table 1.

[8] Wyoming (20 and 10 DD and TD); Alaska (20 and 8); Idaho (15 percent of all deposits); Kansas (12½–20 and 5); West Virginia (15 and 5); South Dakota (12–20 depending on size but ⅓ may be held in bonds); New Hampshire (15 and 15); Vermont (30 and 8); and Mississippi (15–25 and 7–10).

[9] New Mexico and New Jersey (12 and 4); Hawaii, Connecticut, and Maine (12 and 5); and District of Columbia (12½ and 4).

[10] North Dakota (10 and 5); and South Carolina (7 and 3).

TABLE 3.—*Cash and balances with banks as a percentage of total assets of National, State member, and State nonmember banks in selected areas,*[1] *June 29, 1963*

State or area	National banks	State chartered member banks	State chartered non-member banks
United States	17.6	18.4	12.5
Alaska	12.9	----------	13.0
Connecticut	17.5	18.3	10.4
District of Columbia	18.3	16.4	14.5
Hawaii	17.1	----------	12.4
Idaho	11.8	12.4	11.7
Kansas	18.6	17.9	14.1
Maine	13.8	12.9	9.2
Mississippi	18.6	18.5	16.7
New Hampshire	17.6	----------	[2] 6.2
New Jersey	12.9	12.5	10.5
New Mexico	17.7	18.5	15.0
North Dakota	12.6	----------	[3] 9.4
South Carolina	20.3	16.4	15.2
South Dakota	13.4	13.6	11.3
Vermont	11.4	----------	6.8
West Virginia	17.2	19.2	12.7
Wyoming	15.2	17.2	14.0

[1] States were selected to exclude all those in which banks subject to Reserve city legal reserve requirements were in operation.

[2] Includes 20 banks, 1 of which was a member bank.

[3] Includes 115 banks, 2 of which were member banks.

Source: FDIC Assets, Liabilities, and Capital Accounts of Commercial, and Mutual Savings Banks, Mar. 18 and June 29, 1963.

The clear implication of these comparisons is that membership in the Federal Reserve leads banks to hold a higher proportion of their assets in cash than is considered necessary by banks that are not in the System. From this we deduce that compulsory membership of national banks, where it is due to a locked-in effect,[11] discriminates without economic justification against banks holding Federal charters. In effect, captive banks, particularly the smaller national banks, maintain sterile cash reserves required by law for which they receive few compensating benefits; in order to carry on their business, they also must carry correspondent balances which do bear a return in the form of needed services. Nonmember banks, which may and almost invariably do make their legal reserves serve double duty as service generating correspondent balances, are placed in a position of competitive advantage.

While the inequity of present membership requirements would be somewhat modified if compulsory membership were adopted, discrimination would not be eliminated. Indeed, while discrimination by charter would be avoided, total inequity might well increase. Under compulsory membership all banks that find privately produced bank services to banks superior to those provided by the Federal Reserve would be deprived of the choice now accorded to State banks. Since it is principally the larger banks that find Federal Reserve membership attractive, such a plan would tend to discriminate against small banks in general rather than against a particular segment of this group.

II. THE NEED FOR RESERVE REQUIREMENTS AND RESERVE BALANCES AT THE FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

Desired cash holdings of the banking system limit the marginal expansion of bank deposits and, to the extent that they are influenced by legal reserve requirements, it can be said that the latter serve as a fulcrum for credit control. More precisely, however, the monetary control mechanism operates via changes in the level of total reserves relative to desired cash holdings of the banking system. I shall contend in this section that the necessity for legal reserve requirements and minimum cash balances at Federal Reserve banks is a function of the particular objectives of Federal Reserve policy; I shall further argue that the locus of the banking system's cash reserves is of little significance with respect to either the structure of the Federal Reserve System, or its effectiveness as a central bank.

A. The functions of Reserve requirements and a proposal: Reserve requirement changes are a substitute for open market operations.[12] An initial justification for the existence of legal reserve requirements is, therefore, that their levels can be changed, and with them monetary and credit expansion potentials. It is not within the scope of this discussion to weigh the merits of changes in reserve requirements versus changes in the open market portfolio of the central bank. In a zero percent reserve requirement banking system, however, it must be recognized that the substitute, imperfect as it now is from the standpoint of effectuating monetary control, would no longer exist.

It can be argued, therefore, that some future situation might arise that would call for the raising of reserve requirements, even though the Federal Reserve Board has not seen a need to do so since February 1951, 13 years and several business expansions ago.[13] I recognize this possibility as a defect in the plan, but a defect which could be easily remedied through congressional action, given the compelling circumstances that would give rise to the need.

Quite apart from the above, a great deal of emphasis has been given to the level of legal reserve requirements as a base which limits the potential expansion of money and credit. Arithmetical exercises in standard textbooks "prove" that the height of reserve requirements determines the maximum expansion potential of any given amount of excess reserves, subject to assumptions that are usually specified.[14] It is not at all clear that this fact is relevant to the functionality of legal reserve requirements. In the first place, banks individually and in the aggregate would hold some level of desired cash reserves against deposits in the absence of legal requirements,[15] thus providing the "base" for monetary and credit expansion (or contraction).

In the second place, since the levels of reserve requirements have been progressively lowered (with few reversals) in the postwar period without appreciably affecting the performance of monetary policy, the question can be raised as to why they are at all necessary in the present context—that is, as a limitation on the potential expansion of money and credit.

Cash reserves can be controlled by open market operations, and the tone of the market observed by the simple device of central bank hypothication of the market's desired level of bank cash reserves. Given continuation of reporting requirements, the device of "shadow reserve requirements"[16] suggested here would enable the central bank to observe "excess reserves," "free reserves" and "net borrowed reserves" as indicators of money market conditions without the necessity of formal requirements.

The plan would work in the following way: suppose the Federal Reserve Board were to announce that it considered x percent of deposits (details aside) an appropriate level of cash reserves for the commercial banks (or some segment of the banking system).[17] Periodic reports to the Federal Reserve on actual cash holdings and deposits would give the monetary authorities precisely the same "feel of the market" that they now require to conduct defensive open market operations to offset very short-term disturbances in the money market.

It is of course a debatable question whether offsetting these changes is an appropriate objective of monetary control in the pursuit of longer range goals of full employment, price level stability, and economic expansion. Many would argue that day-to-day fluctuations in cash reserves need not interfere with the achievement of an appropriate level of change in the money supply which, after all, is the most important means of realizing the goals. Beyond this, it has been argued persuasively that free reserves are a misleading guide for monetary management.[18]

B. Slippage effects of the zero reserve requirement proposal: The proposal set out in skeleton form above[19] raises a very obvious question:

Will the abolition of reserve requirements increase the slippage that now exists between policy actions and policy results? Contrary to one's first inclination to answer affirmatively, it is not at all certain that this should be the case.

We are not concerned with slippages in general, but rather with one segment of the total lag between policy actions and their ultimate effects upon income and prices. This segment is the initial one, that which spans the sequence between a change in total cash reserves of the commercial banks and the employment of these reserves in loans and investments.

While this is basically an empirical question, intuition leads to the belief that if banks individually and collectively are in equilibrium (in the sense that their cash to deposit ratios are at the desired level), changes in cash reserves occasioned by open market operations will elicit responses quickly and in the right direction. If the Federal

---

[11] All national banks, of course, could escape the burdens of membership by changing to State charters. The costs of this, however, are quite high in many cases. When a bank changes its charter it must also change its name, entailing considerable out-of-pocket expenses and loss of goodwill. It is not reasonable to impose this cost in order to reduce other costs that have no economic justification, and where a reasonable alternative remedy is at hand.

[12] Cf. Joseph Aschheim, "Techniques of Monetary Control" (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1961), ch. II.

[13] On Nov. 26, 1960, the Board raised country bank reserve requirements from 11 to 12 percent, while simultaneously permitting the calculation of vault cash in the reserve base. This increase was a technical adjustment to the inclusion of vault cash and therefore does not count as a monetary policy action.

[14] Zero desired excess reserves, and no change in cash in circulation.

[15] For example, State chartered banks in Illinois are not subject to reserve requirements, yet they keep something in the order of 12 percent of their deposits in cash.

[16] I am indebted to Sherman Shapiro for coining this phrase to describe the mechanism.

[17] It is not necessary to make such an announcement to generate the statistical indicators. However, an announced level of appropriate reserves would benefit portfolio managers and managers of reserve positions in that it would remove one source of uncertainty as to central bank policy that would exist if the announcement were not made.

[18] Cf. A. James Meigs, "Free Reserves and the Money Supply" (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1962).

[19] Rather than extend this essay unduly by discussing the details of the proposal (transition problems, the eligibility of various cash assets for reserve computation, and other technicalities), I choose to leave these to future discussion.

Reserve purchases securities (presumably, but not necessarily with Federal Reserve notes), the banks will find actual cash in excess of desired cash, and will take steps (loans, investments) to return to equilibrium.

On the other hand, sales of securities by the central bank will push the banks into equilibrium in the opposite direction. If the Federal Reserve retains its discount window, the deficit banks could choose between "borrowing" from themselves and borrowing from the Federal Reserve bank. As Sprinkel has pointed out, the discount window is itself an institutionally sanctioned source of slippage; [20] I would suggest that its usefulness would depart with the demise of legal reserve requirements.

In effect each bank would have its own discount window; but we know that banks eschew borrowing as sin, and there is no reason to believe that this attitude would change just because the lender was the bank itself. I suspect that loan and investment officers would keep an even sharper eye on the actual cash ratio than they now do on the free reserve position. Temporary departures from desired equilibrium would occasion furrowed brows in the board room and charges to the operating officers to "get the cash ratio back where it is supposed to be."

Over the monetary cycle the banks might well change their levels of desired cash reserves relative to deposits in a way that would counteract monetary policy. But this is hardly a peculiar defect of the zero reserve requirement proposal, since in effect precisely the same thing occurs with existing legal reserve requirements.

III. CONCLUSIONS

I have presented the case for voluntary membership in the Federal Reserve and a system of zero required cash reserves. The Federal Reserve System has evolved in the past half century into a vast and cumbersome machine; a quasi-private organization, its regional staffs have grown far out of proportion to their importance in conducting monetary policy. The tourist business in Maine may indeed be an important area of economic inquiry, but it is difficult to see its connection with the goals of monetary control. The district Federal Reserve banks engage in such irrelevancies simply because of the archaic notion of membership in the Federal Reserve System. Catering to the banks to induce them to retain membership diverts a good deal of the attention of our monetary authorities from the main business at hand. Voluntary membership would go far toward a solution to this problem.

Reserve requirements are unnecessary to the effective conduct of monetary policy. They impose a tax on member banks that might well be levied in another way, if the revenue is needed or a need exists for penalizing this particular industry. Since they serve no liquidity purpose, it is extremely difficulty to justify their existence.

BYELORUSSIA'S INDEPENDENCE ANNIVERSAY

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. KELLY] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join with my colleagues in observing this 47th anniversary of the proclamation of Byelorussia's independence.

As we all know, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic was a founding member of the United Nations and, by virtue of its membership in that organization, continues to lay claim to the status accorded in international relations to sovereign states. However, the resemblance between the Byelorussian S.S.R. and any truly sovereign state ends there. The Byelorussian S.S.R. is an integral part of the Soviet Union, ruled from Moscow.

There is every evidence that the people of Byelorussia have not acceded to, nor are happy with, this status. During the many years that Byelorussia has been incorporated in the Soviet Union, exploitation and persecution of her people by authorities responsive to Moscow has been the rule, rather than an exception. As a consequence of this treatment, and massive deportations, the population of the Byelorussian S.S.R. is reported to be smaller today than it was a quarter of a century ago.

A further indication of the tragic plight of the people of Byelorussia appears in reports that additional massive deportations of her people have been decreed recently. According to these reports, over 2 million Byelorussians are to be removed from their lands and resettled elsewhere in the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I have been deeply concerned about the fate of the millions of people who live east of what is still, to a large degree, the Iron Curtain. I believe that the people of those lands, just like the people of other continents, have the right to choose the form of government under which they wish to live, and to organize their societies in accordance with their own national aspirations. It is quite obvious that this basic right is being denied to them today.

In commemorating this anniversary of the proclmation of Byelorussian independence, I wish to repeat my earnest hope that the day may soon arrive when the peoples of Eastern Europe may be able to live in peace and liberty. Our great Nation, dedicated to the principle of self-determintaion for all peoples, must continue to work for that goal.

RETIRING SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY DOUGLAS DILLON REJECTS TIGHT MONEY POLICY SUPPORTED BY BANKERS LOBBY AT SECRET NEW JERSEY MEETING WITH EUROPEANS

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last spring I commended Secretary of the Treasury Dillon for his act of financial statesmanship before the International Monetary Conference of the American Bankers Association in Vienna, Austria. Mr. Dillon warned that august assemblage of money lenders that we must not chance stifling our domestic economy by frantic efforts to correct our international payments deficit through higher interest rates and tighter money. Not only was that an act of statesmanship, in my book it was an act of sheer courage. Bankers generally do not welcome remarks not calling for higher interest rates, higher bank profits.

Secretary Dillon's sound advice did not deter the American Bankers Association for long, however. At their 1964 annual convention at Miami Beach last October, the ABA passed a resolution calling for tighter money. This advice was rejected by all but the Federal Reserve Board which within 30 days of the ABA command hiked the discount rate to 4 percent. This is what a logician would call "cause and effect."

In any event, Mr. Speaker, once more it is my pleasure to heartily congratulate Secretary Dillon for his firm stand against higher interest rates taken last week at the Princeton, N.J., nonpublic meeting of—you guessed it—the American Bankers Association. It is indeed gratifying that the Secretary reaffirmed his position on these vital questions of interest rates and monetary policy as one of his last official acts as Secretary of the Treasury.

About a tighter money policy Mr. Dillon gave the Princeton gathering, which included a number of continental European high interest, tight money experts, some good, sound advice:

> But even granting that assumption [tight money and high interest rates], such a policy would surely be self-defeating. Before it could achieve the interest rate objective, the extreme restriction of credit would surely move us toward domestic recession, and at a time when our economy is already failing to use its resources to the full. A recession would, in turn, delay our fundamental aim of creating a more favorable climate for investment in the United States. At the same time, it would rapidly create forces for easy money that would be likely to prove irresistible. Thus, the end result would not be an improvement but rather an aggravation of our balance-of-payments problem.

In closing, Secretary Dillon challenged the bankers to support President Johnson's voluntary balance-of-payments program.

Douglas Dillon deserves the thanks of the American people for a job well done. I wish him well on his return to private life.

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE 13TH ANNUAL MONETARY CONFERENCE OF THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION AT PRINCETON INN, PRINCETON, N.J., FRIDAY, MARCH 19, 1965

This is the fourth year in which I have had the special privilege of addressing this conference of distinguished leaders in the world of finance. These have been years of remarkable innovation in financial practices and policies—public and private—both within the United States and abroad. Internationally, we have fashioned a framework for mutual consultation and cooperation that—measured against our common objectives of steady growth and flourishing world trade, coupled with substantial price stability—has proved both durable and viable.

---

[20] Beryl Sprinkel, "Monetary Growth as an Economic Predictor," Journal of Finance, September 1959, p. 342.

But, despite much excellent progress, our international financial system still suffers from a disturbing disequilibrium—one I have discussed with you on previous occasions. This is the seemingly chronic tendency for capital to flow between countries in directions and in amounts that impede the entire process of restoring balance in the payments of deficit and surplus countries alike.

The group of 10, in their recent study of the international monetary system, concluded unanimously that ways must be found to improve the process of balance-of-payments adjustment. The United States wholeheartedly joined in that conclusion and welcomes the systematic studies of this matter now underway in working party III of the OECD. However, if these studies are to have truly useful results they must face up to the stubborn and extremely difficult problem posed by the deep structural imbalances in the world's capital markets that have enormously complicated the smooth functioning of the adjustment mechanism.

The nature of the problem is clearly illustrated by developments in our balance of payments last year. By 1964, the measures we had undertaken to improve our trade position and to reduce the balance-of-payments impact of our aid and defense programs had achieved visible and gratifying results. Yet, as you know, our deficit last year was once again disappointingly large, primarily because capital had poured out of the United States in unprecedented amounts—in significant part to the strong surplus countries of Western Europe. The recent annual report of the Monetary Commission of the European Economic Community highlighted this point, noting that an improvement of about $3 billion in U.S. transactions for goods and services and Government accounts had been largely offset by a $2 billion increase in private capital outflows.

Within the basic limitations set by the needs of an underemployed domestic economy, the United States throughout the last 4 years had been alert to the fact that excessively easy money at home could only aggravate the problem of capital outflows. By shifting much of the burden for promoting domestic expansion to fiscal policy and tax reduction, we have enabled our monetary authorities to move gradually, but steadily, to an essentially neutral monetary policy.

Our short-term market interest rates have climbed significantly since the 1960–61 recession, responding largely to two half-point increases in the discount rate. With the discount rate now at 4 percent, Treasury bill yields are within one-half percent or so of their postwar high—a high reached only briefly during the period of very tight money in 1959. Loan-deposit ratios of banks have gradually climed to a postwar peak, and other traditional measures of bank liquidity have confirmed a gradual tightening in their position. The Federal Reserve has rather steadily reduced the free reserves of the banking system, and, for the past month, the banks have actually operated with a small net borrowed reserve position. While corporate cash flow has remained high, liquidity ratios have reached the lowest levels in a quarter of a century.

Clearly, credit has remained readily available in the United States throughout this period, and our bank lending and long-term interest rates are still low relative to most other countries. But it is also a palpable fact that rising investment opportunities and credit demands at home, combined with increases in the Federal Reserve discount rate and greater restraint in the provision of bank reserves, have noticeably reduced the ease of our market. Yet, instead of declining in response to these developments, the capital outflow has accelerated.

This fact alone casts into doubt the thesis of those who view the problem almost entirely in terms of excessive domestic liquidity, with tighter monetary policy the simple, effective, and unique remedy. Naturally, if one defines an excess of liquidity as synonymous with an excessive capital outflow, I suppose that position would be unassailable. But that kind of analysis bears no realistic relationship to the difficulty we face today. All it does is to define away the substance of a very real and tough problem.

In my judgment, it is much more enlightening—although still not the entire answer—to analyze the problem in terms of differences in investment profitability, rather than in terms of liquidity. Consider, for example, the outflow of funds for direct investment abroad, which has continued to rise, reaching $2.3 billion in 1964. At the present time, many American firms clearly believe that a portion of their available resources can be most profitably invested in subsidiaries abroad. That calculation rests on a variety of familiar considerations—the more rapid growth of certain foreign markets; a desire to operate inside a wall of external tariffs; proximity to readily available raw materials; and lower production costs—to name some of the most obvious factors.

But perhaps most important of all is the fact that U.S. industrial development so far exceeds that of any other country. This has brought with it a degree of competition that is unknown anywhere else in the world. Add to this our enormous flow of savings, and it is not surprising to find a general acceptance of lower rates of return on capital in this country than prevail elsewhere—rates that only partially reflect differences in risks between investments here and abroad. At the same time, our businessmen and investors tend to place higher capital values on prospective earnings than is the case elsewhere, and our corporations at times find it attractive to pay higher prices in the acquisition of going concerns abroad than would seem reasonable to local investors.

Whatever the specific reason that particular direct investments abroad appear to a given company to be a more profitable use for its funds, the fact is that we cannot effectively influence this judgment by simply reducing liquidity and tightening credit at home. So long as the basic difference in profitability remains, any gain in terms of reduced foreign investment will entail a substantially larger cost in terms of dampening domestic investment as well. There seems, therefore, little warrant either in theory or in practice for basing economic policy on a presumption that corporate managers will permit considerations of the rate and availability of bank credit to affect their decisions on foreign investment, while leaving the domestic economy untouched.

In the broadest sense, international differences in the rate of return on investment—as these differences are reflected in interest rates and the intensity of demands for credit—also lie behind the accelerating outflow of bank loans and other credits abroad. This structural imbalance forced us to propose the interest equalization tax during the summer of 1963. It effectively increased the cost of long-term portfolio credit to foreigners in developed countries. As a result the outflow of long-term portfolio capital in 1964 dropped back to the 1960 level.

The plain fact is that foreign borrowers are willing and able to pay higher rates than domestic borrowers of similar credit standing with free access to the vast resources of the American credit market, and foreign loans are thus in many instances more profitable to the lending banks. The same is true for the placement of liquid funds by our corporations. But the massive outflow of these types of credit is also related to other deep-seated structural characteristics of American and foreign capital markets.

As you know, with rare exceptions, foreign financial markets, even in countries with the most highly developed economies, lack a large and fluid short-term money market. Long-term bond markets are usually even more constricted. As a result, in most other countries there is simply no effective mechanism by which private borrowers and lenders—and to a very considerable extent governments—can readily raise or dispose of large sums in short periods of time in the open market. Instead, the available funds within each country are channeled almost entirely through a relatively few big institutions dealing with individual customers on a personalized basis. These institutional markets are fairly well insulated from the short-term money market, and frequently respond only sluggishly if at all to the actions of the monetary authorities.

The fluidity and size of the market available to most private borrowers abroad is further impaired by the fact that many foreign governments preempt a very large fraction of the savings available for investment, or direct it into officially sanctioned uses, frequently with a sizable subsidy for preferred borrowers added along the way. This is partly a natural result of basic social decisions to provide, through government social insurance programs, the protection for citizens that we in the United States furnish to a much larger extent through private insurance and private industry. But, it is also a reflection, in many instances, of a conscious desire to provide special preferences to one major group of borrowers or another, and to maintain a high degree of government control of national economic development. In either case, the natural result is to leave those businesses and other borrowers that must look to the remainder of the market more or less perpetually starved for funds, and with an impelling desire to seek needed capital from abroad.

All of these factors have contributed to a structure of long-term interest rates in Europe that, with only one or two exceptions, has remained throughout the postwar period at levels that, in the light of past history, are unusually high. Official discount rates, and the money market rates more immediately influenced by the official rates, often bear little relationship to the load charges payable by local borrowers. And, faced with constricted internal markets, and thus denied a full range of fiscal and monetary tools, the authorities themselves often find it essential to pursue essentially domestic credit objectives—and in some instances even to finance internal budgetary needs—through adjustments in external flows of funds. Sometimes this is done by borrowing directly from abroad and sometimes by seeking to influence the external borrowing or placement of funds by their commercial banks.

The sheer size of the U.S. economy and the tremendous volume of funds raised in our credit markets—estimated last year at over $70 billion—help account for the much greater fluidity of our markets and their ability to adjust to, and absorb, large domestic or foreign demands with relative ease. But it is not a question of size alone. The relative freedom of the market mechanism, and the intensity of competitive pressures among institutions with a wide variety of investment options, permit funds to flow promptly from one sector of our economy to another in response to changing demands. And, a long history of confidence in our currency, further fortified by the stability of our prices in recent years, has encouraged individuals and investment institutions to commit funds freely at long term.

As a result of the pressure of the huge volume of private savings seeking investment in our market, our long-term interest rate structure has remained essentially stable during the past 4 years, even though money market rates have risen by 1½ percent or more to a range of 4 to 4½ percent. As a result, the differential between short- and long-term rates has almost disappeared. Nevertheless, the bond market has continued to absorb a record volume of long-term financing at stable rate levels.

Another indication of the strength of our longer term markets is that, over the past 4 years, they have not merely provided the vast amount of funds necessary to support high levels of homebuilding, a remarkable expansion in business investment, and the rapidly growing needs of our States and localities. They have also provided funds to the Government, equal to the entire $28.8 billion Federal deficit during the first 4 years of this administration. During that period more than that amount was placed in savings bonds and marketable debt maturing in over 5 years. This achievement is reflected in the increase of almost 1 year or 20 percent in the average length of the marketable debt to a level last seen in mid-1956.

In this setting we could not expect moderately tighter monetary policies to bring the needed reduction in the outflow of long-term funds abroad. The disparities in the structure of the capital markets of our different countries are simply too great to permit us to rely heavily on that approach toward adjustment. Much more is needed to bring interest rates here and in other industrialized countries into the rough alinement that is surely necessary if we are to put a permanent end to the destabilizing capital flows that have characterized the past 2 years.

It might, of course, be argued that extremely tight money would be able to do the job if continued over a long enough period. Such a policy rests on the highly doubtful assumption that in spite of our huge volume of savings it would be technically feasible—perhaps by drastically reducing the money supply—to raise the general level of our bank and long-term interest rates by the 1½ to 2 percent that would be needed to achieve interest rate parity with Europe.

But even granting that assumption, such a policy would surely be self-defeating. Before it could achieve the interest rate objective, the extreme restriction of credit would surely move us toward domestic recession, and at a time when our economy is already failing to use its resources to the full. A recession would, in turn, delay our fundamental aim of creating a more favorable climate for investment in the United States. At the same time, it would rapidly create forces for easy money that would be likely to prove irresistible. Thus the end result would not be an improvement but rather an aggravation of our balance-of-payments problem.

To cite these limitations and difficulties in the use of monetary policy is not, of course, to say that monetary policy does not have a useful and indeed essential role to play in helping the adjustment process in the United States, as in other countries. It has played such a role, is playing such a role now, and will continue to do so in the future. In fact, as I suggested earlier, one of our chief reasons for relying primarily upon fiscal policy to stimulate the domestic economy was to give monetary policy additional freedom in coping with our balance-of-payments problem. And I can assure you that monetary policy remains fully available for further use should the need arise. But I see no realistic prospect that the full burden for achieving a permanent international adjustment in capital flows can reasonably be thrust on American monetary policy alone now or in the forseeable future.

Instead, as I have suggested before to this group, the only really satisfactory long-range solution to our present problem of excessive capital outflows lies in achieving a more attractive environment for investment within the United States through tax reduction and sustained growth, together with the development of far larger, far more efficient and far more flexible capital markets abroad. While there has been some encouraging progress in both of these directions, much more remains to be done.

These are, of course, long-run measures, and their influence on capital flows must be expected to emerge only slowly. For the time being, the existing disequilibrium—and the urgency of reducing our deficit—has required that we seek the cooperation of our banks and other financial institutions, as well as of our industrial firms, in voluntarily reducing the flow of capital abroad. The response of those asked to participate in this voluntary program has been most gratifying. The effects are already clearly visible both in the foreign exchange markets and in our preliminary payments statistics which point to a sharp and favorable change since mid-February. But two swallows don't make a summer. We need a considerable period of balance to offset the deficits of the past. We know we can count on your cooperation in achieving this vitally needed result.

But the success of our present program does not, of course, meet the basic problem. The nations of the free world, working together, must develop better means for influencing capital flows within a basic framework of free markets and national objectives—and without placing intolerable burdens either upon monetary policy or upon the resources of the international monetary system.

We must be under no illusion that a different or improved international monetary system could in any way eliminate the need for adjusting these flows. But these two questions are nonetheless related, for one of the basic functions of the international monetary system is to provide sufficient means for financing deficits and surpluses to permit the working out of an orderly process of adjustment.

This linkage between the process of adjustment and the international monetary system seems to me to be at the source of much of the confusion and difficulty evident in recent international efforts to develop a common approach toward the further evolution of the international payments system. All the major countries are fully agreed, I believe, on the need for developing an assured method of generating international liquidity in adequate, but no excessive, amounts as world trade and production increases over the years ahead. This much clearly emerged from the studies of the group of 10 and the International Monetary Fund last year.

But in recent months, there has been little progress toward more concrete agreement on methods and approaches. The pronounced divergencies in view that have become evident can, I believe, be traced in good part to quite different assumptions about the relationship of international monetary reform to the current U.S. payments deficit.

The overriding need, in one European view, is to develop a mechanism which would force a prompt end to our payments of deficits. We fully agree with these European friends on the necessity for achieving early balance in our international accounts. And we intend to achieve this goal by our own actions, which now for the first time cover all aspects of our payments problem.

But, in assessing the problems of the international monetary system, our concern and that of a number of other countries has been to look toward the future, when there will no longer be an American payments deficit pumping dollars into the reserves of other countries. So the thrust of our thinking has been to find the best way of developing supplementary means of providing the liquidity that is likely to be needed. We feel that this can only be done gradually and by building on what we now have. And we emphatically disagree with the thesis recently propounded in some quarters which would turn back the clock and embrace an outmoded and highly restrictive system—a system that would surely cripple the growth of international trade and commerce as our deficit was ended.

Under the circumstances, with these broad differences of approach, any final resolution of the variety of issues that have been raised seems to me highly unlikely until the United States has brought its international payments into balance. As that is done it will become less and less easy to ignore the potential need for supplementary sources of reserve assets and international credit facilities. Meanwhile, difficult and time consuming technical studies are well underway under the auspices of the group of 10, helping to clarify the issues and to evaluate alternative techniques. These studies will, I believe, provide the basis for timely agreements on ways and means for improving the present monetary system well in advance of any urgent need.

In looking back on the past 4 years, and on the postwar period as a whole, there can be no question that the present system—anchored on gold and the dollar, and effectively supplemented by the International Monetary Fund—has served the world well. The extremes of inflation and deflation characteristic of other postwar periods have been avoided. Barriers to trade have been lowered or removed. And, in this environment, the vast productive capabilities of the free world have been released to the benefit of us all.

The challenge for the future is to build further on this system, recognizing its potential weaknesses and shortcomings, but preserving the elements of strength and flexibility that have contributed so much to our progress.

In this area, as in the area of adjusting capital flows, I have no fixed blueprint to offer to those who will share the responsibility for developing solutions. I remain confident, however, that solutions can and will be found, provided only that the United States discharges its own immediate responsibility to maintain the full strength of the dollar as the world's primary reserve currency by achieving an early balance in its international accounts. And with the help of you gentlemen that is exactly what we are going to do.

CHIEF AIM OF OUR FOREIGN POLICY SHOULD BE TO ENCOURAGE THE EVOLUTION OF A WORLD OF INDEPENDENT, VIABLE NATIONS

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Edwards] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the Pentagon should be reminded that the chief aim of our foreign policy is to encourage the evolution of a world of independent, viable nations, all or most of whom would look upon our country with respect, if not friendship, and as a consequence would tend to pattern their cultures in the mold of the free society.

It is a part of the Pentagon's job to implement this foreign policy. Wars are not wholly military. There are human and psychological aspects, and the battle for men's minds is frequently more important than the military.

The use of gas in Vietnam is a step backwards of incalculable magnitude. It is not worthy of our great Nation. Its military value cannot possibly counterbalance the wave of disapproval and dismay that has swept the world.

I found this morning's comments of the New York Times and the Washington Post particularly appropriate, and the texts of the editorials follow:

GAS (NONLETHAL) IN VIETNAM

The United States, in steady escalation of the Vietnamese conflict, is now revealed to have employed a nonlethal gas. It is possible to argue, as American military and civilian spokesmen do, that military objectives can be achieved with fewer casualties by using a gas that does not kill.

This argument overlooks one vital factor; and it displays, at the very least, a lack of imagination somewhere in the top echelons of the Armed Forces. People—ordinary people everywhere—have a strong psychological revulsion, if not horror, at the idea of any kind of poisonous gas, even a temporarily disabling type that only causes extreme discomfort including nausea and diarrhea when used against ordinarily healthy adults. But even this kind of gas can be fatal to the very young, the very old and those ill of heart and lung ailments.

In Vietnam, gas was supplied and sanctioned by white men against Asians. This is something that no Asian, Communist or not, will forget. No other country has employed such a weapon in recent warfare. If the United States believed that people everywhere would be logical and "sensible" and would understand that nonlethal gas constitutes really only another form of warfare and even a relatively humane one, someone has blundered grievously.

War, as Clausewitz said, "is only a part of political intercourse, therefore by no means an independent thing in itself." It is stupid to lay the United States open to a moral condemnation that is not confined to the Communist world.

The United States claims to be fighting in Vietnam for freedom, right, justice, and other moral principles, as well as against communism and for the security of the United States and the free world. By using a noxious gas—even of a nonlethal type—the Johnson administration is falling back toward the old axiom that all's fair in war. But this happens to be a war in which the moral stature of the United States is at least as vital as bullets, shells and bombs. Gas is a wretched means to achieve even the most valid ends.

[From the Washington Post]

BLACKENING OUR NAME

It is difficult to find out how much damage napalm and gas are doing the enemy but it is not hard to find out how much damage they are doing us. Our own Defense Establishment, every time it employs or permits the South Vietnamese to employ these weapons, is doing an injury to the good name of this country.

If these weapons were being employed with decisive effect, perhaps their use might be condoned as one of the necessities of a hard and brutal war, but in this situation there is not even the satisfaction of knowing that they produced impressive results. They have been employed just enough to bring down upon this country the rebuke of the civilized world. They have been utilized just enough to hold our country up to reproach. They have been resorted to just often enough to impose upon the U.S. Information Agency an impossible propaganda disadvantage.

The argument that the nontoxic gas is more merciful than antipersonnel weapons has some merit, but not much. The trouble is that although the gas may not be poison, the word is, and all the propaganda resources in the world cannot explain away its employment as an act of Christian charity and humanitarian mercy. The use of napalm against gun emplacements is debatable, but its employment against villages is indefensible and the difficulty of confining it to combat installations so great as to dictate that it be not used at all.

We hope that President Johnson will order the Defense Department to forgo the use of all gas and napalm in this war theater at once. The people of this country are prepared for and equal to the hard measures that war dictates, when those measures are clearly inescapable and unavoidable in the prosecution of a military purpose. They will not be reconciled to the use of such weapons where alternate means of defense exist. If the war in South Vietnam can only be won by losing our good name, Americans who have patiently supported the struggle will waver in their purpose. Mr. President, let us stop all use of napalm and gas in South Vietnam at once.

OPPRESSION OF MINORITIES IN TRANSYLVANIA

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the persecution and oppression of minorities by the Communist regime in Rumania has reached serious proportions and deserves to be condemned publicly by the Congress. The minorities affected are the Hungarians and Saxons who have lived for centuries in Transylvania which is now under Rumanian jurisdiction.

The subtle but nonetheless cruel and harsh plan of persecution launched against these minorities has caused grave concern among many Americans whose relatives and friends are the victims. Bulletin No. 17 of the International Commission of Jurists is devoted to an exposé of the tactics used by the Communist regime in Rumania. Many correspondents who have had an opportunity to visit Transylvania have returned with an abundance of criticism of what they have seen.

The theory of communism makes extravagant claims about the equal treatment of all people and is particularly critical of mistreatment of minorities. But the practice of communism is a far cry from the promises of its theory. What the Rumanian Communist regime is doing to the minorities in Transylvania follows a well-established habit of all Communist regimes. Oppression of human rights is a standard practice for all under their control and certain elements of the population are singled out for particularly harsh treatment.

Our sympathies go out to the Rumanian people for the persecution they have suffered at the hands of the Communist regime in control of their country. We are aware that neither the Communist Party nor the government installed by force in Rumania represents the freely expressed will of the people. The fault for persecution of minorities in Transylvania rests solely upon the Communist Party of Rumania which, as is well known, controls every facet of life in that country.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced House Resolution 290 for the purpose of providing the House of Representatives with an opportunity to condemn publicly the oppressive practices of the Communist regime in Rumania against the Hungarian and Saxon minorities in Transylvania. My resolution requests the President to use his good office in such manner as he deems appropriate to bring relief to these persecuted minorities.

I hope the House will act favorably and soon on this matter.

ADDRESS OF EDWIN M. HOOD

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in mid-February, Edwin M. Hood, president of the Shipbuilders Council of America discussed the uncertain state of our maritime position in the world. His speech was delivered to the Propeller Club of Portland, Oreg., whose members are capable, leading personalities in port and allied activities in Oregon. The speech of Mr. Hood is informative and his views are worth the closest consideration.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include the address in the RECORD.

A FORMIDABLE MARITIME CHALLENGE

(Speech by Edwin M. Hood, president, Shipbuilders Council of America, before the Propeller Club, Port of Portland, Portland, Oreg., Feb. 13, 1965)

As a major power, the United States, is geographically isolated from much of the world. The oceans virtually surround us. It has been said that in time of emergency 95 percent of all materials would have to be moved by sea. The importance of seapower should thus be self-evident.

Without a strong Navy, supported by a complementary strong merchant marine, under its own control in such time of emergency, the United States could well be fenced off from its allies and oversea bases. With the tremendous buildup of naval and merchant strength presently taking place elsewhere in the world, particularly in Russia, the case for an effective U.S. merchant marine—at defensible costs—on the grounds of national and international security alone is overwhelming.

With others, we of the private shipyard industry have long believed that the maritime needs of our country must be considered, evaluated and fulfilled within the framework of total seapower requirements. In that sense, seapower is recognized as including merchant ships as well as naval vessels, shipyard capacity, trade and commerce, and the ability to use geography and the oceans to advance national objectives.

To us, all of these separate parts must be coordinated to enhance our national interests, and it is for this purpose that we have continued to recommend the establishment of a Presidential Advisory Commission on Seapower Superiority. The Maritime Advisory Committee, worthy though its purposes may be, is directed to only a single facet of our present seapower dilemma.

Here is what I mean by a sea-power dilemma.

The Soviet Union is moving rapidly to control the oceans and trade routes of the world. As a naval power, she is already second only to the United States. As a maritime power, experts predict she will surpass the United States in less than 2 years. Because of her enormous fleet expansion program, the Soviet Union will soon be able to manipulate ocean freight rates at will, and through a superiority in terms of numbers of ships in-being and mobility, she will be well on the road to economic domination of the world, and the weight of numbers will soon begin to tell.

As of November 1, 1964, 673 merchant vessels of various sizes and types—mostly dry cargo ships and tankers—totaling 6,450,000 pennyweight were on order or under construction for the Soviet Union. With her own shipyards fully utilized, this tremendous building program is being accomplished by awards of sizable contracts to shipyards in East Germany, England, Finland, Holland, Hungary, Japan, Norway, Poland, Sweden, and Yugoslavia.

As of December 1, 1964, there were 40 commercial vessels, totaling about 615,000 pennyweight, on order or under construction in the United States. These involved 3 tankers, 34 cargo vessels, and 3 ferryboats. In other words, the Russians are building 16 times as many merchant ships as we are. In terms of tonnage, they are outbuilding us by a ration of better than 10 to 1. And, I might add, the Soviet Union is committing large domestic resources and a substantial portion of its foreign exchange to enlarging its merchant fleet.

While the Communists are building a new and modern seapower potential, almost half of our naval fleet is composed of vessels 20 years of ago and older. In less than 2 years, more than two-thirds of our Navy fleet will be over age. About 90 percent of all U.S.-flag dry cargo ships and 55 percent of our U.S.-flag tankers are 20 years of age or older. Our fleet of dry cargo ships engaged in domestic trades is virtually extinct. The average age of the ships in our Great Lakes fleet is 47 years. Our private shipyards are more than 50 percent idle. And, U.S.-flag shipping is carrying only 5 percent of our export and important commercial cargoes.

This comparative inventory of seapower resources presents at once a threat and a challenge.

Two months ago, the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. David L. McDonald, defined seapower as including both merchant and naval vessels plus "the mix of military, technological, and industrial capabilities related to the sea which crosscuts and intersects almost every aspect of our society." He said "the sciences of the sea may be on the threshold of an era of enormous expansion" and called for "a renaissance of American maritime capability."

We wholeheartedly agree that a maritime renaissance must be approached with the objective of obtaining a dollar's value for every dollar spent. This objective, however, should be accomplished on the basis of not how much or how cheap, but how good. From what I have already outlined, it should be clear that the quality of our total seapower effort leaves much to be desired.

But, when we talk about cost, to what do we really refer? Surely not only the financial statements showing the dollar value of assistance given by the Government.

Nothing creates such a wide diversity of employment, in such a variety of other industries and geographic locations as does the construction of a ship. Furthermore, maritime activities represent a joint venture undertaken by Government and industry, for the public good, and much is returned to the taxpayer and the Public Treasury in the form of employment, tax revenues, trade, balance of international payments, and national security.

Not too many years ago, in 1957, the then Maritime Administrator demonstrated with actual experience statistics reflecting governmental expenditures on the one hand, and with generated tax revenues and other offsets on the other hand, that U.S. maritime activities, from 1936 through 1957, had cost the American taxpayers not one red cent. No doubt the same case could be made today.

A regiment of economists and accountants, however, could not unravel and estimate the true financial cost, or take into proper account the multitude of indirect advantages to a nation building and operating its own merchant marine. The question, then, to be decided at this point and time in history would appropriately seem to be "what is the present and possible future cost to this Nation of not having an adequate shipbuilding and shipping capability?" We of the private shipyard industry suggest that this cost may well be beyond all comprehension.

Admiral McDonald also said in his speech before the Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers in New York on November 13, 1964, that "each generation of Americans takes a perverse delight in scuttling the merchant marine."

Even at this moment, there are those in Washington and elsewhere who are valiantly trying to promote the notion that all or part of the ships for the U.S. merchant marine should be constructed in foreign shipyards rather than in U.S. shipyards. The ultimate consequences of any such idea seem to have escaped them. Their proposed actions, if put into motion, could lead to the complete destruction of the U.S. private shipyard industry and ultimately to the complete demise of U.S.-flag shipping. The destiny of our cherished way of life could well be at stake.

It should be almost axiomatic that under existing world tensions, and with the rapid technological progress taking place on so many different fronts, the United States cannot afford to become dependent, even slightly, on other nations to provide modern ships for our merchant marine. Obviously, any "build abroad" or "buy abroad" alternative for our shipbuilding and shipping requirements would only aggravate the present situation, lead to further deterioration in the Nation's maritime posture, and severely weaken our seapower capability.

President Franklin D. Roosevelt began his 1938 message to the Congress on the U.S. merchant marine with this statement: "I present to the Congress the question whether or not the United States should have an adequate merchant marine. To me there are three reasons for answering this question in the affirmative. In substance, they were national security, national economy, and national prestige. Last week, a quarter of a century later, President Johnson, in his state of the Union address, indicated that he would soon send to the Congress a new policy for our merchant marine. As he approaches this formidable task, we hope he will present these three affirmative reasons as to why the United States should have an adequate shipyard industry:

1. The Secretary of Defense has said that from a purely military standpoint, a shipbuilding capability in this country is essential. If a shipbuilding capability is essential, it follows that the capability to repair and overhaul ships is equally essential.

2. Shipyard activities generate jobs, equipment sales, and production of material in every State of the Union.

3. If shipbuilding work is purchased abroad, these jobs and their consequent economic effects disappear—U.S. Treasury receipts decline accordingly and the balance of international payments is adversely affected.

The Chief of Naval Operations put it more concisely on November 13 last when he said:

"We all know that the more ships we have constructed for us in other lands and the more foreign bottoms we use to transport our exports and imports, the less need we have for shipyards in our own country. This, of course, means slow but certain death of those precious skills and know-how so essential to any seapower industry. This we cannot afford. We must become vitally—let me repeat, vitally—concerned with preserving and maintaining our repository of trained manpower resources found in our shipyard facilities.

"The reasons are fairly obvious. From this bank of sea technology will come the hundreds of specialized ship types we need to hold our status in the world. And if this talent bank be sufficient, we can, in the future, prevent the mad scramble of World Wars I and II to get our seapower cabin in order."

Even more concisely, the General Court of Massachusetts in 1641 proclaimed that the building of ships was "of great importance for the common good." But, the building of ships in the context of modern days, still "of great importance for the common good," is a vital taproot of vast national strength.

The question of size of the merchant fleet, the degree of reasonable control of the seas, and the degree of control over our own trade and commerce, together with the effective competitive use of merchant shipping to offset our adversaries, are proper matters for high national strategy determinations. The use of the merchant fleet as an economic weapon, just as the Soviet Union is now doing, should be given to priority consideration by the best authorities of the United States on a coordinated basis. No country in history has ever held a leading position without at the same time holding a reasonably dominant position on the seas. The relationship between seapower, shipping, and shipyards is equally historic. The sum of commercial ship operations—use and deployment—plus shipyard capacity and efficient use, then, must be contained proportionately in the total concept of seapower.

Accordingly, we urge that a program for maritime renaissance be carried to the highest levels of Government and to the citizenry. To this end, we again urge the appointment of a Presidential Advisory Commission on Seapower Superiority, composed of knowledgeable persons from both public and private life, for the purpose of recommending requisite steps to insure that the United States will long maintain supremacy on the high seas. Only on a top-level, coordinated basis can this basic challenge be faced effectively, realistically, and reasonably. We fervently hope that this concept will be included in the emerging design for the Great Society.

THIRD ANNUAL MEETING OF THE INTER-AMERICAN ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL COUNCIL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, between November 30 and December 12, of last year, the Inter-American Economic and Social Council—IA-ECOSOC—held its third annual meeting to review developments under the Alliance for Progress in Lima, Peru. IA-ECOSOC is one of the three dependent organs of the Organization of American States—OAS—and has provided since 1961 inter-American multilateral direction for the Alliance for Progress.

It was my good fortune to serve with my colleague, Congressman Armistead Selden, as a member of the U.S. delegation to the conference last December. Congressman Selden is chairman of the House of Representatives' Subcommittee on Inter-American Affairs. His profound knowledge of Latin American affairs was an invaluable contribution to the delegation.

The conference opened with a preparatory 1 week meeting at the expert level preceding the meeting at the ministerial level. The U.S. delegation at the ministerial meeting was headed by the very able Assistant Secretary of State and U.S. Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, Thomas C. Mann, recently nominated by the President for Under Secretary of State for Economic Affairs. Deputy U.S. Coordinator William D. Rogers headed the U.S. delegation at the meeting of experts. The quality of the work of both of these men deserves high commendation. Certainly, the effectiveness of the U.S. delegation was due in large part to their experienced and effective leadership.

The climate of the conference was both positive and optimistic. The meeting saw the launching of a new Special Development Assistance Fund, to be operated and supported on a multilateral basis. The statutes of the Fund and its first annual budget were approved. A number of participating nations pledged specific contributions, while others stated their intention to pledge specific contributions in the near future. The Fund, with a budget of about $9 million will support a number of multilateral Alliance activities including technical assistance for planning, technical training programs, public information, and technical assistance for institutional development.

The IA-ECOSOC also considered and approved a number of resolutions in addition to the statutes and budget of the Special Development Assistance Fund. Among these were requests for the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress—CIAP—to give special attention to certain problems such as external trade, maritime transport charges in relation to the balance of payments, regional integration and capital flight, and the relationship between population growth and social and economic development.

One of the most hopeful reports made at the conference was the Ministers' estimation that in 1964 for the first time, the average per capita growth rate for all of Latin America would equal or possibly exceed the target rate—2½ percent per capita per year—urged in the Charter of Punta del Este. They also noted the substantial increase—at least 8 percent—in export earnings which will probably materialize in 1964, when all the statistics become available.

In the estimation of the Latin American delegates, however, foreign trade continues to be a major problem, particularly with respect to maintaining recent price increases for basic commodities.

On a more pessimistic note, concerning agriculture, the review stated "that no great progress has been made, except in isolated cases, in the technical improvement of agriculture, in increasing agricultural productivity, or in carrying out programs of agrarian reform."

The Ministers stressed the need to promote more active participation in the programs for development by all the people, including rural and urban communities, labor unions, business groups, as well as government instrumentalities. This is a healthy development, in my opinion, and demonstrates a growing understanding of the social aspects of economic development.

In the housing field, IA-ECOSOC recognized the important efforts which many countries have already made. However, the gap between requirements and new housing construction continues to grow. There is no question in my mind that greater efforts will therefore be necessary in this field.

The Latin American delegations were particularly concerned with the relatively slow pace of regional economic integration through the Latin American Free Trade Association, and made a call for early action to accelerate integration through existing institutions. By contrast, the Central American countries were congratulated on the progress they have made in the completion of the Central American Common Market.

The general satisfaction expressed by all delegations with respect to the work of the Inter-American Committee on the Alliance for Progress—CIAP—which had been created by IA-ECOSOC the year before, was a highlight of the discussion at Lima. CIAP was set up as a sort of year-round multilateral executive committee of the IA-ECOSOC. Among other things, it conducted for the first time a review of each country's performance under the Alliance for Progress. This country review process is the heart of the economic and social development programs embodied in the Alliance. The concept is premised on the thesis that aid is useless unless the recipient country has developed a comprehensive plan which coordinates development problems such as land and institutional reform with monetary and fiscal problems. This was not done a few years ago with regard to Brazil, for example. The result? The United States was supporting the Brazilian currency during a period when the Brazilian Government was taking no steps to control an extremely high and rapidly growing rate of inflation.

I was greatly impressed by the preoccupation of Latin American member countries with external trade conditions and prospects. Of course, 1964 was a year that witnessed considerable international attention focused on the trade problems of the developing nations. This attention centered around the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development—UNCTAD—held in Geneva, March 23 through June 16, 1964. Prior to this conference, the Latin American nations held two meetings, the first at Brasilia and the second at Alta Gracia in Argentina. At Brasilia, the government experts considered a document prepared by the secretariat of the Economic Commission for Latin America—ECLA. The conclusions adopted at this meeting were subsequently reviewed at Alta Gracia by the representatives of 19 Latin American countries under the auspices of the Organization of American States. These meetings were intended to produce a consensus as to the goals of the UNCTAD.

In Lima, most spokesmen were critical of what they feared to be a protectionist tendency of the industrial countries. Substantial improvements by the developing countries, both in export earnings and in terms of trade in 1964, did not prevent considerable concern about the future trade prospects of the region.

Underlying these criticisms is a concern which has been explicit in inter-American relations for the last three decades: The Latin American nations, their economies oriented toward primary products, believe that the trend of the terms of trade is moving against them in favor of the industrial nations. They believe that the basic trend of the ratio of prices of their imports as compared with the earnings of their exports is increasingly unfavorable. Furthermore, they are faced with the prospect of greater balance-of-payments deficits as their imports increase due to development needs, imports made up for the most part of vitally needed machinery and machine products.

An obvious answer to these problems is a diversified economy. Even partial industrialization, however, is a lengthy process, especially in the face of severe social and consequent political strains. The one immediate answer that the Latin Americans see to this problem is expanded exports at stable world markets at higher prices. Under the umbrella of favorable world markets, the developing nations believe they can diversify and expand their economies.

Two things are certain: Most Latin American countries do not earn the import credit that they feel they need to achieve a satisfactory rate of economic growth; and, second, they believe that the answer to their problems lies in some form of regulation of the world markets for primary goods which are controlled in one way or another by the industrial nations. They believe primary products are sold in a buyer's market whereas industrial goods are sold in a seller's market.

It is obviously very frustrating to believe that the solution to one's problems is dependent on the good will of other nations. In the case of the Latin American nations, the expression to their frustration was found in UNCTAD and the meetings which preceded it.

These meetings are especially significant because they portend a new alinement in world relations. We no longer have an inter-American dialog, but a world duolog with industrial nations more or less alined on one side of the conversation and the developing nations alined on the other.

The effects of this alinement were certainly felt at UNCTAD where the developing nations clearly dominated the proceedings. If it maintains coherence, it will certainly be heard again in international organizations in general and in inter-American relations in particular.

The United States has clearly supported efforts of economic organization in the hemisphere, such as the Latin American Free Trade Association and the Central American Common Market. These groups are directed toward self-help by increasing intraregional trade. However, they also represent a possible base for a future duolog between the north and the south.

I believe that several important observations can be made about this conference:

First. The Latin American governments remain keenly sensitive to the possibility that wide price fluctuations of their principal export commodities may cause a recurrence of serious balance-of-payments deficits, thus wiping out their own efforts and the potential development progress supported by external assistance.

Second. The annual review of the Alliance for Progress is becoming more effective with each meeting. This year the conference spent much less time talking about external assistance and more trying to advance reform and development.

Third. The Lima meetings gave the clear impression that the peoples and governments of Latin America are becoming firmly committed to the principles and objectives of the Charter of Punta del Este.

Fourth. The work of CIAP in its first year of operation basically satisfied the expectations of the delegations. The general feeling was that the Committee had given the Alliance better cohesion and a decided multilateral direction. The report of CIAP to IA-ECOSOC was the basis of much of the debate at the meetings.

Fifth. Finally, as crucial as the economic and trade problems of Latin America are, I believe that more attention must be given social problems, such as public education, during the IA-ECOSOC meetings. In the early stages of development, public expectations are going to exceed accomplishment, substantial though that accomplishment may be. Consequently, the pressure for stopgap solutions which may be more illusory than real will be great.

It is my firm belief that such solutions can only be avoided by accompanying economic progress with sound social reform. IA-ECOSOC presents the nations of the hemisphere with an opportunity to examine the practical problems involved in social reform. I hope more of the Council's time will be spent doing so in the future. Just as meaningful economic development depends in the ultimate on a stable political framework, stable democratic political institutions depend in the long run on a sound foundation of social justice.

THE PRESENT SITUATION OF THE HUNGARIAN MINORITY IN TRANSYLVANIA

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, several of my colleagues have referred to the persecution of the Hungarian minority in Transylvania, now a Rumanian province, during the 2d session of the last Congress. They included my colleague from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

It remains a fact that the Rumanian Communist Government, despite its differences on economic and ideological interpretations with Soviet Russia, has stepped up its repressive measures against the Hungarian minority in Transylvania for the past 7 years, and no end to these measures is in sight. Yet, the Hungarian minority in Transylvania is numerous and culturally and scientifically probably the most constructive element in the province. Even according to the Rumanian census of 1956, its number reaches 1.65 million, more than the population of many newly independent nations.

The sufferings of the Hungarian minority in Transylvania started already in 1945-46 when Rumania acquired a pro-Communist, later a fully Communist, regime. Former leaders of the minority were jailed or slain, and the remaining Hungarian middle classes were robbed of their livelihood and forced to live outside of Transylvania under subhuman conditions as deportees. A Communist organization was superimposed upon the minority. A Hungarian bishop was imprisoned, and to this day he is kept under house arrest.

However, until 1957, the persecution was part of a great campaign against all non-Communist and anti-Communist elements in Rumania and many Rumanians also shared the fate of their Hungarian counterparts in Transylvania.

In the Stalinist period, the Gheorghiu-Dej government insisted that Communist rule had solved the nationality problem in Transylvania by granting "equality" to the Hungarian and other minorities. A "Magyar autonomous province" was created and Hungarian schools were generally maintained, though they had to teach Communist propaganda in order to indoctrinate the youth.

However, even this 1952 solution remained inadequate. The Magyar autonomous province included only about one-third of the Hungarians living in Transylvania, that part of Rumania which formerly belonged to Hungary. Deportations of "class aliens" and the settlement of Rumanian refugees from Bessarabia—which was ceded to the Soviet Union—slowly changed the composition of the city population of Kolozsvar, the capital of Transylvania, Nagyvarad—Oradea—and other centers from a predominantly Hungarian to a mixed or Rumanian one.

Even this relatively mild situation was altered by 1957. In October and November 1956 the Hungarian population in Hungary rose against their Communist masters and against the intervening Red Army. During the 10 days of success of this fight for freedom the Transylvanian Hungarians were also in a state of ferment and unrest. Demonstrations occurred in three major areas. Army units composed of Rumanians alone had to occupy the cities and the Magyar province in order to prevent uprisings. The Rumanian Army as such could not be used against the rebellious Hungarians in Hungary, mainly because of the questionable loyalty of the Hungarian components.

Staggering blows of the Gheorghiu-Dej regime hit the Hungarian minority in Transylvania in 1957 and early 1958.

First, hundreds of Hungarians, Communists and non-Communists, were arrested in 1957 upon charges of sympathizing with the Hungarian rebels of 1956. Those arrested included the more nationally conscious members of the Hungarian section of the Rumanian Communist Party. Only in Kolozsvar scores of them were put to a show trial and over several of them were executed. Realistic figures of those executed in the purges is estimated in the hundreds and those sentenced to long prison terms, in the thousands. Even those not arrested were often removed from their positions on local administration and many a Hungarian Communist in Transylvania had to make public self-criticism stating that he had succumbed to bourgeoise nationalism. The terror was used to abolish Hungarian educational institutions. In early 1958 students of the Bólyai Hungarian University at Kolozsvar—Cluj—"petitioned" the administration to merge with the Rumanian Babes University in the same city in order "to avoid cultural isolation." The college at Nagyenyed—Aiud—followed suit. After a dramatic meeting, in May, 1958, the Bólyai University faculty voted the merger, after which three of the participating professors committed suicide. Today, Hungarian literature is taught in Hungarian language only at the Bólyai-Babes University, and the proportion of Rumanian-Hungarian students is about three to one there.

The Bólyai University was not the only victim of the purges begun in 1958. In most Hungarian grade and high schools, parallel Rumanian sections were introduced. It took usually between 3 to 5 years of bribing and intimidation on the part of the authorities to make the parents and students apply for a merger of the Hungarian sections with the Rumanian ones into one Rumanian school. Today, there are hardly any high schools and only a small number of grade schools where Hungarian is the language of instruction. Even in purely Hungarian areas, Hungarian is only taught as a foreign language. In practice, because of the mergers, only the first-born sons of the Hungarian families are still sent to Hungarian schools, as their distance necessitates boarding costs.

The Magyar autonomous province, the last bulwark of Transylvanian Hungarians, was hit next. Under the euphemism of administrative reform, the districts of Háromszék—Trei Scâune—with their almost 100-percent Hungarian population were attached to the largely Rumanian province of Brasov—Brassó—thereby putting more Hungarians outside of the autonomous province. This was, however, not sufficient for the Gheorghiu-Dej regime. Other districts were united with the autonomous province, further reducing its Hungarian character. While in 1952, the province was 79 percent Hungarian, after 1961 the Mures autonomous province, as it is officially called, had only a 63-percent Hungarian majority, and only half of the local officials were Hungarians.

Not only by administrative transfers and by the abolition of the name Hungarian-Magyar in the autonomous province, but also by enforced population transfers, the Gheorghiu-Dej regime tries to scatter the Hungarian minority in order to facilitate its Rumanization. This fact was also acknowledged by the State Department in answering inquiries. The population transfers take various forms. First, Hungarian professionals are prevented from assuming leadership in the Hungarian community. Every professional person must apply to the state for his job, and the location of employment invariably lies outside of the autonomous province, or any other Hungarian inhabited area in Transylvania. More often than not, Hungarian professionals are sent into parts of Rumania outside of Transylvania. The number of Hungarian professionals is steadily decreasing. One infamous regulation prevents the admission of Hungarian students to the universities over and beyond a certain small ratio of the Rumanian students in the same field.

Industrialization proceeds at an increasing tempo in Transylvania, and the new plants, even in Hungarian areas, are staffed by Rumanians from manager to engineer to unskilled laborers. Thereby mixed areas and cities receive an increasingly Rumanian profile, while purely Hungarian areas become mixed. The manpower surplus of the Hungarian areas goes usually to Brasov and Bucharest in the south, and some sources maintain that Bucharest already has almost 200,000 Hungarians, making it the second largest Hungarian city after Budapest.

In addition to the enforced move of engineers and professionals as well as skilled workers between Rumanian and Hungarian areas in Transylvania, the Gheorghiu-Dej regime is also reviving language restrictions. Outside of the Mures autonomous province the use of the Hungarian language is forbidden in public, despite constitutional guarantees. Even in the Mures autonomous province, shopkeepers are forced to speak Rumanian only. These restrictions were confirmed by the foreign correspondent of the Reporter magazine, Mr. George Bailey, in the November 19, 1964, issue.

Mr. Bailey is not the only one reporting about the sad fate of the Transylvanian Hungarians. In May 1963, Edward Crankshaw, the noted British journalist and writer, also broached the subject in a syndicated article in the Observer. The Bulletin of the International Commission of Jurists in June 1964 summarized the ordinances and decrees in violation of the human and civil rights of the Hungarian minority.

Here in the House, several Members have raised their voices against the injustice. In the Senate, a former Foreign Service officer and now the able Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL] warned against our courting of Rumania without substantial concessions on Rumania's part with respect to the observation of human and minority rights.

For all these repressive measures form part of a larger political plan on the part of the Communist regime to eradicate the Hungarian minority in Transylvania within the next 10 or 15 years. At the same time, the Communist regime tries to improve relations with the United States and other Western nations, especially in the economic and cultural fields. We must watch out that in our well-intentioned drive to promote polycentrism in Eastern Europe we do not become participants to a subtle, but nonetheless lethal, genocide of the Hungarian minority in Transylvania which resided there since the 10th century and shaped the history of the region for a thousand years until 1918.

In this connection, I have today introduced, for appropriate reference, a House resolution condemning the discrimination perpetrated by the Rumanian Government against its Hungarian minority. I ask that it be read into the RECORD at this point, together with other documentation. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks for the RECORD.

H. RES. 291

Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania

Whereas the Government of Rumania is engaging in a deliberate policy of discrimination against the Hungarian minority population under its jurisdiction in educational, cultural, economic, linguistic, and administrative fields; and

Whereas this discrimination is clearly contrary to commonly accepted principles of international law and justice; and

Whereas, in accordance with the provisions of the 1947 Peace Treaty, the Government of Rumania undertook the obligation to grant the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms to all persons within her territorial and sovereign jurisdiction without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and

Whereas the International Commission of Jurists has reported the occurrence of numerous instances of discrimination on the part of the Government of Rumania against the Hungarian minority population of Transylvania: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the discriminatory practices perpetrated by the Government of Rumania against the Hungarian minority peoples be condemned.

TROUBLE OVER TRANSYLVANIA

(By George Bailey)

TIRGU MURES.—Rumania, in its own inimitable fashion, offers an instructive sampling of the tensions and contradictions that are tearing the Communist world apart. In this country, a general restiveness and political opportunism have gone so far that criticism of Moscow's leadership has taken more or less official forms.

Shortly after the return of a Rumanian delegation that had been dispatched to Peiping early this year in an attempt to mediate the Sino-Soviet dispute, the Rumanian Workers' Party published a 50-page declaration on its position with regard to the international Communist movement. The tract was explicitly directed against the Khrushchevian doctrine of apportioning economic activities to individual nations within the Communist bloc. As a declaration of economic independence, the document was anticlimactic. In the first 5 years of its drive to achieve "rapid and comprehensive industrialization," Rumania had already doubled its volume of trade with non-Communist countries while reducing its trade volume with Communist countries by one quarter. Within the same period Rumania had spent roughly half a billion dollars for industrial plant, equipment, and employment of technicians from the West, and more than a billion dollars have been earmarked for purchases in the West during the next 5-year period. Moreover, at a time when all other satellite countries were sharply reducing their trade with China, Rumania actually increased its China trade appreciably. In effect, Rumania had already become another Yugoslavia, a comparison that has been heightened by Yugoslavia's recent accession to Comecon as an associate member, while Rumania has been loosening its ties with that economic organization of the Eastern bloc.

But the declaration last April was much more than a formulated insistence on "economic self-determination." It was a manifesto proclaiming "the basic principles of the new type of relations between Socialist countries" and ruling out interference of any kind from any quarter in the political and cultural as well as the economic affairs of a "socialist and therefore truly sovereign country." The manifesto turned the Soviet prescription for collective action inside out, since it declared foreign policy an inviolable part of individual state sovereignty.

Above all, coming as it did in the form of a report on the mission to Peiping and a subsequent stopover in the Crimea, it took on the color of an official ruling on the Sino-Soviet dispute. In this sense, while professing incidental preference for some of the Russian arguments, the Rumanian leadership found for China. The finding was reinforced by Rumania's refusal to attend Khrushchev's ill-starred congress of Communist Parties to deal with China. The Rumanians had long ago discerned what the explosion of a Chinese atom bomb and its complement, the fall of Khrushchev, have since made generally clear—that China could not and can never be drummed out of the Communist movement. And both of these recent confirmatory developments have made the Rumanian leadership more confident than ever.

In fact, the Rumanian Communists have outwitted and outmaneuvered the Soviet Union at virtually every turn in a long course of events extending at least as far back as the 1952 ouster of the Moscow loyalist, Ana Pauker, and her clique. Then, or not long afterward, they reverted to their native tradition of circumspect doubledealing and discreet intrigue. Among the switches and shifts of the ideological shell game that ensued, there was none more successful than the Rumanian substitution of derussification for destalinization. To the delight of the Russophobe populace, by 1963 the Rumanian authorities had liquidated the Gorki Institute of Russian Studies, the Russian bookstore, the Rumanian edition of the Soviet magazine, New Times, and the obligatory study of the Russian language in all schools and universities. Since then virtually all Russian street and place names have disappeared.

But derussification is merely one of the many negative aspects of Rumanianization. Acting ostensibly as the honest and impeccably Communist broker between the Soviet Union and China, the Rumanians have actually cleared the way for their own traditional brand of supernationalism. "Greater Rumania," said a Communist diplomat recently, "is the whore of the Socialist camp, a Balkan whore bent on Balkanizing the Communist bloc." The Rumanian talent for divisiveness has nowhere been more evident than in the handling of the oldest Balkan problem of them all: Transylvania.

GRAUSTARKIAN SHOWPIECE

It has long been axiomatic that great powers adjust Balkan borders to suit their own purposes. This is particularly true of Transylvania, which has been passed back and forth almost as often as a bottle at a Balkan party. In the Treaty of Trianon, 1920, the Western Allies dismantled the Austro-Hungarian Empire, stripping Hungary of two-thirds of its territory and almost one-third of its population and ceding the greater part of both to Rumania. With the Vienna Award of 1940, Hitler gave the northern half of Transylvania, including its capital city of Cluj, back to Hungary and so stimulated a competition between Hungary and Rumania for Nazi favor in the field against the Russians, the Hungarian troops fighting for the addition of the southern half of Transylvania, the Rumanians fighting for the return of the northern half. Similarly, the Soviets at the close of the Second World War restored the Trianon border between Hungary and Rumania, calculating that this would tend to offset the Soviet Union's annexation of Bessarabia and the Bukovina from Rumania on the east and provide a popular national issue favoring the Communist-dominated government in Rumania; furthermore, the consequent failure of the not-yet Communist Hungary to obtain any sort of satisfaction on Transylvania might weaken the leading Smallholders' Party, which was the main obstacle in the way of a Communist takeover in Hungary. Like Hitler, the Soviets sought to use the Transylvanian issue as a means of keeping both Hungary and Rumania under control.

Naturally, there are a great many people who consider themselves Hungarians now living in Rumanian territory. More than half a million of them inhabit the strip of territory some 30 miles wide along the Hungarian-Rumanian border. This area, properly speaking, is not and never was part of Transylvania. It is made up of four counties of the old kingdom of Hungary and is geographically an extension of the central Hungarian plain. The other main concentration of Hungarians in Rumania is the solid block of Szeklers, some 700,000 strong, who have inhabited most of eastern Transylvania since the 10th century. The Szekler area lies almost exactly in the center of Rumania, more than 100 miles to the east of the Hungarian border. King Carol had agreed to cede the border area—the so-called Partium—to Hungary even before the Vienna Award was forced upon him, and the Hungarians had great hopes that the Soviets would undertake some doctoring of the border, especially after Hungary became Communist.

Instead the Soviets chose to provide an object lesson in Marxism-Leninism by applying the principle of genuine proletarian internationalism for all Communists to the 1,700,000 Hungarians in Rumania, who constitute the largest ethnic minority in Eastern Europe. Thus, article 82 of the Rumanian Constitution of 1952 provides that "Every individual national group may freely make use of its own language, and may freely visit at every level those institutions of general education in which instruction is given in its mother tongue * * *," and articles 19, 20, and 21 attempted to solve the millennial problem of the Szeklers through the creation of the autonomous Hungarian region. Modeled on the autonomous regions within the individual Soviet Republics, it was clearly meant to serve as a showpiece of genuine proletarian internationalism. Communist functionaries from Moscow, Bucharest, and Budapest converged on the region. Stakhanovites from all three countries were sent to instruct and inspire the workers, youth brigades were organized, factories and roads were built, farmers were persuaded or forced to join collectives. But then came the Hungarian revolt.

In retrospect, it is apparent that the Hungarian revolt in the fall of 1956 was the turning point in the course of communism in Europe. Establishing the Hungarians as the archculprits in the eyes of the Soviets, it provided the Rumanian Communist Party with a classic opportunity to demonstrate its loyalty to the Soviet Union. The Rumanian Communists were in a position to render the Soviet Union a signal service in playing host to Imre Nagy, Pal Maleter, and other leaders of the Hungarian revolt during their long incarceration and subsequent execution, relieving the Russians of the onus of deporting the rebels to the Soviet Union. They were also able to help the Soviet Union in Hungary by sending Hungarian-speaking "goon squads" to Budapest and the provinces to reinforce the decimated and thoroughly demoralized Hungarian Security Service.

At the same time, the Hungarian revolt thoroughly alarmed the Rumanian Communists. The reason was simple enough: the same anticommunism that exploded in Hungary immediately spread to the Hungarian minority in Rumania. As in Hungary, students, teachers, and university professors were in the forefront of the action. There were student demonstrations in Cluj, in Medias, in Timisoara, and in the administrative center of the Hungarian autonomous region. Tirgu Mures—in fact in every area where there were Hungarian students in any numbers. Furthermore, the revolt threatened to catch fire among the Rumanian peasantry and the country's intellectals. Some of the more circumspect Rumanians were only waiting to see whether the West would support Hungary. When that didn't happen, the Hungarians were obviously doomed.

There followed the Soviet isolation of Hungary and the branding of the Hungarians as fascists and chauvinists. The Rumanians were quick to take the Soviet cue, exploiting the official condemnation of the Hungarians to the hilt and applying it particularly to the Hungarian minority in Rumania. For the moment the Hungarian minority in Rumania rose in sympathy with the Hungarian revolution, Rumanians tended to see the whole thing as a part of the old campaign for the annexation of territory in Transylvania to Hungary. Thus the Rumanian Communist Party was not only fighting for its life, it was also fighting for what every Rumanian considers Rumanian national territory.

Russian troops put down the disorder in Rumania and thousands of Hungarians were arrested, perhaps hundreds put to death. In one trial alone in Cluj, 13 out of 57 accused were executed. This year some 8,000 political prisoners were released with considerable fanfare by the Rumanian Government in a general amnesty. But as far as I could ascertain in my recent travels through Transylvania, not one of the Hungarians arrested during the revolt has yet been released.

THE CAPITAL OF LIMBO

Two years after the revolt, the Rumanian Government received the great and all-important prize for loyalty and services rendered to the Soviets—the withdrawal of the Red Army. "Genuine proletarian internationalism" is also gone, and the Rumanian desire to keep the Hungarian minority in its place has found more and more ways of expressing itself. In 1959, the rector of the Bolyai University, Prof. Lajos Takacs, expressed his regret over the "nationalist isolation" of the Hungarian minority and requested the ministry of education "to examine the advisability of having two universities in Cluj." In June, 1959, the students and professors "unanimously approved" the merger of the university with the Rumanian Babes University.

Late in 1960, the Rumanian Government undertook the administrative reorganization of the entire country, ostensibly to effect a more rational economic division among the various territories. Actually, the reorganization achieved the ethnic gerrymandering of the autonomous Hungarian region, and the authorities have used economic measures to break up the Szekler communities and disperse the fragments throughout the country. The closing of Hungarian cultural institutions has also continued. The 600-year-old Hungarian college at Aiud was closed and its library impounded. In 1962 the last Hungarian institution of higher learning, the Institute of Medicine and Pharmacy at Tirgu Mures, was liquidated outright; the Rumanian authorities did not even bother to cloak the operation as a merger. The liquidation was officially described as "the reduction of Hungarian-language classes" at the institute.

It was in 1962 that the Rumanians launched their main administrative assault against the autonomous region. All key positions in administration and industry were taken over by Rumanians. Dimitru Puni, a Rumanian, was appointed chairman of the regional people's council. The Hungarian Writers' Association in Tirgu Mures was merged with a Rumanian Writers' Association imported for that purpose. In the same way, the Szekler State Theater was enlarged by the addition of a Rumanian section. The most far-reaching measure, however, was the merging of Hungarian with Rumanian schools. By the end of 1962 there was no longer a single wholly separate Hungarian school in Rumania. Within 2 years the new dispensation had made a mockery of the constitution's guarantee of access to schools, where instruction is given in each people's "mother tongue." Rumanian has effectively replaced Hungarian at every level as the language of official and public life. This is not only because the leaders and key functionaries of the region are all Rumanians who know no Hungarian; employees throughout the region have been put on notice that if they fail to use Rumanian in public they will be summarily dismissed.

I have seen how these regulations work. When I stepped into a shop in Tirgu Mures and addressed the salesclerk in Hungarian, he answered in Rumanian. I persisted in Hungarian. He persisted in Rumanian. Finally I asked him if he spoke Hungarian. "Whenever I can," he answered in Hungarian, "but we are under orders to speak Rumanian to customers." I asked if Tirgu Mures was not the capital of the Hungarian region. "This is the capital of Limbo," he replied.

Rumania's transformation from an obsequious satellite practicing "genuine proletarian internationalism" to a fiercely independent national state pursuing a policy of forcible assimilation of minorities is accompanied by a propaganda offensive on a broad front that includes the reinterpretation of history as a method of furthering the Romanization of Rumania. Rumanian writers have taken issue with Soviet historians on the apportionment of roles in the liberation of Rumania from the fascist yoke and won their point. The spate of articles and brochures produced to document the party's leading role in the "victorious armed uprising of August 1944," and the exploits of "the new Rumanian Army" is often supplemented with situation maps giving the positions and movements of the Rumanian units and "patriotic battle groups" in overrunning the "German-Hungarian forces" in Transylvania. The last map in one series I have seen delineates "the participation of the Rumanian Army in battles on Hungarian and Czechoslovak territory" in such a way that the Rumanian Army—not the Soviet Army—clearly developed the main thrust in the campaigns to liberate Budapest and Prague.

The main target for historical revision, however, is what Rumanian writers refer to as "the Hapsburg occupation," especially during its final period. At a conference of historians held last May in Hungary, Rumanians expounded their theory of "double exploitation and oppression of the masses by the dominant nations of Austria-Hungary." The great majority of landowners, they said, had been Hungarian and German; the great majority of peasants had been Slavs and Rumanians. This had resulted in a double burden of national as well as social oppression. The Hungarian hosts, a West German, and a Soviet historian denied the validity of the theory, which not only equates classes with nations but also distinguishes between the nationalism of dominant nations ("imperialist chauvinism") and the nationalism of suppressed nations ("national liberation movements"). The theory was not designed merely to denigrate the Hungarians retroactively as chronic imperialist chauvinists and justify Rumanian possession of Transylvania; it was also the academic celebration of Rumania's right to develop its entire range of basic industries as a unitary, independent, and fully equal state, not to be exploited by industrially dominant countries such as the Soviet Union, Czechoslovakia, and East Germany within Comecon.

THE HUNGARIAN HANDICAP

There is no doubt that the legacy of the Habsburg Empire and its hangnail Horthy "regency" of 1920–1944 has weighed heavily on the Hungarian Communists. As model proletarian internationalists, they have been constrained from the first to single out Hungarian history for special censure, an exercise in which they found themselves enthusiastically abetted by Rumanians, Czechs, and Yugoslavs, all of whose countries have large Hungarian minorities. For faithful Communists, the Hungarian revolt only proved that the Hungarians have still not managed to outlive their fascist-chauvinist past. In his preface to the new two-volume "History of Hungary," which appeared early this year, Eric Molnár states that the purpose of the work is "to expound Hungarian history in connection with the histories of our neighbor nations and by this means liquidate the Magyar global Hungarocentric, nationalistic point of view."

Even for Communists, it is difficult to promote their national interests while decrying the national character. The Rumanians can—and repeatedly do—tie the Hungarians in knots merely by reminding them of the Leninist rules by which the Hungarians (but not, apparently, the Rumanians) are bound. Thus the world was treated in early 1962 to the spectacle of the Hungarian Government prosecuting Hungarian patriots on Hungarian soil at the insistence of the Rumanian Government. A group of refugee Transylvanian intellectuals—there are many such in Hungary—had been holding regular meetings to consider what could be done to relieve the plight of the Hungarian minority. The Rumanian Government learned of the activity and demanded that the Kadar regime make an example of the group's leaders or bear responsibility for the breakdown of "Hungarian-Rumanian friendship." Three of the former Transylvanians were tried and sentenced. One, Dr. Sándor Püski, was sentenced to 4½ years in prison; the others got off a little lighter.

In retrospect, we can see that the Hungarian revolt, whose first demand was the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Hungary, made the continued presence of Soviet troops in Hungary essential to the existence of a Communist regime. Furthermore, the revolt virtually stripped the Kadar regime of any room for diplomatic maneuver inside as well as outside the Soviet bloc—particularly since the Rumanian Communist Party was able to turn the revolution to its own nationalistic purposes. And in the process, not surprisingly, Hungary's unequal struggle with Rumania has strained many a prominent Hungarian Communist's doctrinal allegiance to the breaking point. There is the persistent rumor in Budapest that former Foreign Minister Endre Sik, who had done yeoman service for the Kadar regime in the United Nations following the 1956 revolt, resigned in September 1961 when Kadar refused to forward to Moscow a protest note Sik had prepared on the Transylvanian situation. I can report that the atmosphere in even the top echelon of the Hungarian Communist Party is such that the rumor seems entirely plausible.

Meanwhile relations between Hungary and Rumania have deteriorated still further. Traditionally the churches have played a signal role in the alternate Magyarization and Rumanization of Transylvania; in general, the Catholic and Protestant Churches reflect Hungarian and German interests, while the Orthodox Church has always embodied the ethnic state religion of the Rumanians. As a result, Rumanian Communists have taken to supporting the Orthodox Church as their pawn in the struggle and persecuting the Catholic and Protestant Churches as Hungarian pawns. This spring, Rumanian authorities announced their intention to demolish the historic church of St. Layos, which they characterized as an eyesore, in the middle of the main square of Oradea. To prevent this, several thousand Hungarians took up a day-and-night vigil around the church for more than a week—an action that paralyzed traffic and threatened to produce a major riot at any moment. The Rumanian authorities finally reversed their decision—temporarily.

The greatest single source of irritation to the Hungarians is the state cultural agreement with Rumania. Strict Rumanian application of the terms of the agreement has prevented the Hungarian Government from establishing any sort of cultural link between the homeland and the minority. Hungarians in Rumania are restricted to a mere half dozen classical Hungarian authors such as the 19th-century epic poet János Arany and the lyricist Endre Ady. Most other books in Hungarian are translations of Rumanian authors. According to the terms of the agreement, no book concerning Transylvania may be published in Hungary without the approval of the Rumanian censors. Radio and television broadcasting are not restricted by the agreement, and here the Hungarians enjoy a geographical advantage since most of Transylvania is closer to Hungary than to Bucharest, which is on the other side of the Transylvanian Alps in any event. However, Radio Bucharest competes with Radio Kossuth in Hungarian-language programs, and the Rumanian authorities advise against listening to the Hungarian state radio.

The only comic relief in the situation is provided by the use both sides have made of the Hungarian-Rumanian film-exchange program. The Hungarian Government always takes the maximum of eight films a year—even though the notoriously poor Rumanian films are boxoffice poison—in order to insinuate an equal number of Hungarian films into Rumania. The Hungarians were incensed, however, when the Rumanians dubbed in Rumanian-language sound tracks and then added insult to injury by providing the minority with Hungarian subtitles. When the Hungarian Government protested, the Rumanians stopped the dubbing and provided Rumanian subtitles—but then deliberately desynchronized the Hungarian sound tracks. The old subtitles in Hungarian were at least legible.

The Rumanian authorities have adopted a wide variety of other measures to isolate the Hungarian minority from contact with what most of them think of as their homeland. A Hungarian in Rumania must wait from 6 months to a year for permission to visit relatives in Hungary—if he is lucky. Foreign tourists in Rumania are allowed the run of the country—unless the tourist happens to be a Hungarian citizen. In this case he is restricted to a radius of 6 kilometers from the center of the location he designates as his destination upon entering the country. If he oversteps this limit, the Hungarian tourist is arrested, interrogated, and summarily deported—if he is lucky. There were 32 Hungarian-language dailies in prewar Rumania; today there is one—which nobody reads at all. All these changes, Hungarians on both sides of the border must remind themselves ruefully, are the fruits of communism.

A hopeless dilemma confronts the once powerful Hungarian wing of the Rumanian Communist Party: its members must support, if not actively implement, the Rumanian Government's antiminority policy. As a result, the Hungarian wing has been purged by the Rumanian party leadership and ostracized by the Hungarian minority. As nearly as I could make out, the only crumb Hungarian Communists in Budapest can proffer to Hungarians in Rumania is the advice that they should infiltrate the Rumanian Communist Party in order to promote the practice of Leninist principles, particularly as regards minorities.

According to one historian I talked with, the organization of the Szekely area as an autonomous region put the Russians in a position "to balance the old Transylvanian question between Rumania and Hungary." But the position was abandoned with the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Rumania. Since then, the Soviet Union has kept pretty much out of the situation. In a speech during his visit to Hungary last spring, Khrushchev made a watered-down reference to the proper care and feeding of minorities. The Hungarians were openly dissatisfied with it, but about all they have been able to do is make official but unpublicized protests to the Rumanian Government. Recently, Premier Kadar upbraided the Rumanian delegation in Budapest over the treatment of the Hungarian minority in Rumania, but the Premier apparently succeeded only in leaving his visitors "highly offended."

The Rumanians were among the first to recognize "genuine proletarian internationalism" as merely a Soviet device to justify maintenance of military bases in Eastern Europe and so secure Soviet economic exploitation. And even this Soviet desire has been skillfully used by the Rumanians in the service of their own national cause, leaving others to make the sacrifices for the sake of international communism. In effect, Rumania capitalized on the misconceived gallantry of the Hungarians, whose revolt gave their neighbor a chance to win concessions from the Russians.

And through it all, the Rumanians clearly foresaw the reemergence of nationalism, which Communist theoreticians used to call "the main danger to the successful construction of the new state system." Far from being surprised by the Sino-Soviet split, the Bucharest government was banking on it. As a widely quoted Rumanian proverb has it: "In time the waters recede, the rocks remain."

THE HUNGARIAN MINORITY PROBLEM IN RUMANIA

(Bulletin of the International Commission of Jurists, No. 17)

From the 11th century until 1918, Transylvania, a region of some 23,300 square miles, or some 40,700 if the larger area including Maramures, Crisana and the Banat is included, came in one way or another under Hungarian rule. In 1918, it was ceded to Rumania as a region then consisting of some five and a quarter million, of whom half a million were German, one and a half million Magyar and the remainder Rumanian. There is a bitter and bloody history of national tensions. The region now comprises one of the most important national and linguistic minorities in Eastern Europe and provides an absorbing case study on the treatment of minorities in a Communist People's Republic. The total Hungarian population of Rumania, according to the 1956 census, was approximately 9.1 percent.

The detection of discrimination in most countries is a difficult process which does not appear from the ipsissima verba of legislation and it is difficult to pin down administrative practice as discriminatory unless the group discriminated against is expressly designated. It is usually a simpler process to examine legislation and practice to see what is missing from the point of view of the rights of a group in question. In a Communist state the denial of freedom to any particular group must be examined in the context of the entire social and political outlook of the state, since many rights and freedoms as understood in liberal democracies are denied to the whole population. If it be that a particular group resists the process of socialization more vigorously than another, it is not easy to see the line between discrimination against that group and the employment of greater force to deal with greater resistance. These facets of a Communist state have been much in evidence in the past and it is against this background that the minority question in Transylvania has to be considered. The experience of the Chinese People's Republic, with the peculiar blend of communism and chauvinism on the part of the ethnic majority, viz, the Great Hana, toward the Tibetans was, for example, admitted by the Chinese themselves. Again, discrimination exists in the Communist ideology itself, but is part of the general doctrine that social progress is to be achieved through the strengthening of the proletariat, which requires for its accomplishment the strengthening of class consciousness among the people. This has nothing to do with discrimination against a national, ethnic, religious, or linguistic group.

A further obstacle to a fully documented study of minority problems in Transylvania is the absence of sufficient reliable data. In a Communist society the public ventilation of grievances at the political level is severely restricted and silence extends also to minorities with a grievance.

THE PEACE TREATY AND THE CONSTITUTION OF 1952

The peace treaty concluded between the allied powers and Rumania in 1947, stipulates in Part II (political clauses), section 1, article 3 that:

1. Rumania shall take the steps necessary to secure to all persons under Rumanian jurisdiction, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion, the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms, including freedom of expression, of press and publication, of religious worship, of political opinion, and of public meeting.

2. Rumania further undertakes that the laws in force in Rumania shall not, either in their content or in their application, discriminate or entail any discrimination between persons of Rumanian nationality on the grounds of their race, sex, language, or religion, whether in reference to their persons, property, business, professional, or financial interests, status, political, or civil rights or any other matter.

Thus, the wording of the peace treaty clearly excludes discrimination against minorities and it is of little consequence whether the Hungarians in Transylvania are to be regarded as an ethnic, i.e., racial group, since their language alone is sufficient to bring them within this protection.

Particularly striking, both with reference to the peace treaty and in comparison with the constitutions of most other people's democracies, are the provisions of article 82 of the Rumanian Constitution of 1952. This article provides that all the national groups in the territory of the Rumanian People's Republic are entitled to use their respective languages and to have at all levels establishments of public education in which instruction is given in their mother tongue and further that the spoken and written language used by administrative and judicial authorities in districts where a national group other than Rumanian is in the majority should be the language of this national group; civil servants in such areas should be appointed from among members of this majority group, or if from other groups, it is necessary that they speak the language of the majority. Article 84 follows the lines of the Soviet Constitution in recognizing not only the separation of church and state but also the exclusion of the church from education. No religious community may have its own educational establishments, but theological schools may train people to carry out their part in religious services. In two other articles the constitution deals with the rights of national minorities. In article 17, which lists the duties of the Rumanian states, there is a duty owed by the state to protect national minorities and especially their culture, which ought to be socialistic in its content and national in its form. Article 81 goes into the realm of enforcible legal sanctions protecting minorities and within the general framework of provisions concerning equality before the law it is provided that any kind of chauvinistic persecution of non-Rumanian national minorities or any kind of propaganda calculated to bring about such persecution is a criminal offense.

It should be noted that only the cultural rights of minorities are mentioned and article 17 designates the Rumanian state as unitary, independent, and sovereign, thus excluding any form of federation, such as, e.g., the Soviet Union or the United States. In this respect, restricting minority rights to cultural matters and protection from persecution shows little advance from the position of national minorities in the former Kingdom of Rumania between the two World Wars. How far the cultural rights of the large Hungarian minority in Transylvania are respected will now be considered.

ADMINISTRATIVE MEASURES

Foremost among these is the redemarcation of regions and cities, thereby fragmenting the Hungarian population in such a way as either to reduce their majority or to convert it into a minority. The Hungarian autonomous province was created in 1952 by articles 19 and 20 of the constitution of that year. The total population of this province was, according to the 1956 census, composed of 77.3 percent Hungarians, 20.1 percent Rumanians, 0.4 percent Germans, 0.4 percent Jews, and 1.5 percent gypsies. In December 1960 a governmental decree modified the boundaries of the Hungarian autonomous province. Its whole southern part, which was predominantly Hungarian, was attached to Stalin province, which has now of course been renamed and is known as "Brasova." In place of this, several districts with an overwhelming Rumanian majority were joined to it from the southwest. This boundary adjustment reduced the Hungarian population by approximately 82,000 and increased the Rumanian population by approximately 131,000 out of a total population of just over half a million. The official reasons were to facilitate communications and administration, but the new name given to the freshly demarcated province echoes the real fact of the situation, vis., the substantial dilution of its Hungarian character. The province was no longer called the Hungarian autonomous province but the Mures-Hungarian autonomous province, after the River Mures.

The process of dilution was carried still further, though by less obvious methods, by the drive toward industrialization. The region adjacent to Hungary already had the highest rate of industrialization in the country but the program aimed at an overall stepping up, for the border regions of Transylvania as well as for the rest of the country. In a Socialist economy not only does industrialization mean the growth of the urban proletariat, but it also means the creation of a large industrial bureaucracy. In the process of stepping up the industrialization of industrial Transylvania, large numbers of civil servants, administrative staff, industrial bureaucrats, and workers of Rumanian nationality swelled the Rumanian population in the regions neighboring Hungary. In this case it is difficult to speak of a failure to respect the rights of the Hungarian minority. Industrialization with its consequent internal migration is a common enough feature of many societies. Where, however, there is an influx of a minority group and an exodus of a majority group the consequences for the culture of the majority group are important enough if the matter stops there. Many young Hungarians are obliged to leave Transylvania in search of work in the territories to the south and southeast of Transylvania, which are known as Old Rumania. And, it should be observed, the matter does not remain there, as will be shown later in this article.

There is another technique which frequently conceals de facto discrimination beneath a facade of general applicability. Whether or not the famous law No. 261 of April 4, 1945, and decree No. 12 of August 13, 1945, did in fact discriminate against Hungarians, its provisions certainly weighed very heavily on Hungarians who had Rumanian citizenship. This law provided that all persons who served in military or paramilitary organizations of a state having been at war with Rumania lost their Rumanian citizenship. Decree No. 12 fixed the operative date for such service as after August 22, 1944. For practical purposes this meant that the Hungarian minority would lose their Rumanian citizenship. The circumstances were that Rumania joined the Allies against the Axis Powers in 1944, while Hungary was under German occupation and on the Axis side until the end of the war in May 1945. The northern and predominantly Hungarian part of Transylvania was given back to Hungary in 1940 by the Germans and Italians and under the Hungarian regime of Horthy all adult males were obliged to enlist for military service and youths were required to join young people's paramilitary organizations. Through these circumstances few Hungarians escaped the threat of losing their nationality. It was provided that joining the Communist Party would save them from losing it.

DISCRIMINATION IN THE CULTURAL FIELD

The steps taken by the Rumanian authorities to weaken Hungarian culture are again in some cases mixed with what might be merely part of the general Communist policy. Thus, for example, both Catholic and Protestant churches were deprived of their schools; this in itself was merely part of the normal materialistic and secular policy of a Communist State and as such, although it struck a particularly severe blow at Hungarian culture, it was not discriminatory. But there was also a widescale destruction of centuries-old Hungarian private or public archives and libraries, and the devastation of old Hungarian castles to provide stone material for new buildings. Vital links with the past were thereby wiped out.

Until 1958, a large-scale educational system, from the primary to the university level, flourished in Hungarian. Since then, however, the situation has changed rapidly. The number of Hungarian primary schools is steadily dwindling and a decree now in force authorizes only the eldest of a family's children to study in a Hungarian-language school. At the level of higher education the Rumanian authorities introduced a system of "parallel sections." This meant that in such an institution a parallel Rumanian curriculum with Chairs held by Rumanians were introduced. When this cuckoo in the nest was big enough it took over the whole nest and the Hungarian section disappeared. Another method which helped in cutting down instruction in the Hungarian language was for the student body and the teaching staff of the institutions concerned to announce that for practical considerations and in accordance with their desire to perfect themselves in "the beloved Rumanian mother-tongue" they had decided to combine with a Rumanian-language institution, or in the case of a bilingual institution to go over entirely to Rumanian. This process was carried so far that even student hostels felt its impact; Hungarian students asked to share a room with a Rumanian in order to perfect their knowledge of Rumanian. At the present time the medical school in the capital of the Mures-Hungarian autonomous province is undergoing "parallelization." For Hungarian academic establishments there is now a limited admission quota. In 1958, the Hungarian University in Cluj, Bolyai University, fused with the Rumanian University of Babes. The fusion was marked by the suicide of three of the professors at Bolyai University.

Certain facets of this process in isolation could be laudable. For example, it is an excellent language training to share a room with someone speaking a different language, but the whole pattern of cutting down Hungarian-language instruction in an area which is or was so Hungarian that it was a part of Hungary for almost 900 years cannot be reconciled with respect to the constitutional rights of the Hungarian minority and is by no means explicable as part of the normal process of shaping a Communist society. For centuries Hungarian culture and tradition have taken deep root and survived the vicissitudes of fortune, both kindly and outrageous. It is difficult to conceive that a people so deeply rooted in its culture would itself clamor for the destruction of that culture by absorption into the Rumanian mainstream.

A further instrument for the dilution of the Hungarian majority in Transylvania is the resettlement of Rumanian refugees coming from Bessarabia. Their reintegration into Rumanian economic and social life has taken place mainly in Transylvania, where they constitute a large part of the labor force in the industrial development from the western belt neighboring Hungary to the heart of the Mures-Hungarian autonomous province, and they are settled mostly in cities where the proportion of the Hungarian population is still high, e.g., in Cluj, the capital of Transylvania.

The Rumanian National Statistical Office carried out a census in 1956 and it was emphasized that the civil servants carrying out the census were obliged to call attention in each case to the basic difference between nationality, i.e., ethnic origin, and mother-tongue. All persons registered had to state to which national ethnic group they belonged. The distinction between national group and mother-tongue and the obligation to state before officials one's national group drive a wedge between a people and its culture and this indeed is reflected in the figures given by the census. For every 1,000 people of declared Hungarian origin there were 1,042 giving Hungarian as their mother-tongue. It is difficult to believe that Hungarian, difficult and almost unrelated to other languages, is the mother-tongue of any but Hungarians, and yet 4.2 percent of the Hungarian minority group shrank from stating that they were Hungarian. The reasonable conclusion to be drawn from this is that in their eyes it was better not to declare oneself to be Hungarian. The more innocent explanation of gross inefficiency in the compilation of the census would seem to be negatived by the deliberate distinction drawn by officialdom where no real distinction exists.

Too many individual items which could be capable of other explanations than discrimination if taken singly point unmistakably when viewed as a whole toward a pattern of conduct. In short, as far as the Hungarian people in Rumania are concerned, they appear in the give and take of living together to lose on both the swings and the roundabouts. When this happens to a minority group it is difficult to resist the conclusion that they are being subjected to discrimination.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, many writers and statesmen have clearly described for us the specific data on the administrative, economic, cultural, and linguistic persecution of the basically anti-Communist Hungarian minority in Transylvania. I might add that suppression of cultural life is also taking place, as only recently the Transylvanian Hungarian Writers Union was merged with the Rumanian Writers Union and even in the Hungarian Theater at Marosvasarhely—Tirgu Mures—Rumanian plays were mostly performed in 1964.

We all realize that true ideological coexistence and friendship with Rumania will not be possible as long as the Communist Gheorghiu-Dej regime exists. Freedom is a commodity missing in the Rumanian life despite the sanctimonious and only partially kept promises of the Government to the State Department last year about amnestying the political prisoners. To this day, Communist sources mention the release of 10,000 prisoners, certainly less than the total number incarcerated during the Stalinist period and in the wake of the Hungarian Revolution of 1956. Interestingly, however, Hungarian sources in America only know of 67 specific cases where a Transylvanian Hungarian, imprisoned by the Communist regime, has been freed.

We should not give up our right to demand democratization of the regime and ultimately free elections before we throw several hundred millions of dollars that will only further upset our balance of payments, to the wolves in sheep clothes in Bucharest. We should remember that several Democratic platforms and all Republican platforms during the past 17 years were committing the administration, be it Republican or Democratic, to the cause of peaceful liberation of Eastern Europe.

However, at the present time we have made agreements with Rumania and we are implementing them both by direct aid and by allowing our private enterprises to export industrial machinery and know-how to Rumania. By doing so, we are helping Rumania to proceed with its industrialization plans despite lessened Russian aid and Comecon cooperation. Thereby, however, we are also undermining the solidarity of the Western bloc on East-West trade, a serious step indeed which led to a crumbling of trade barriers in strategic goods between our adversaries and allies. France and lately Germany are following the example set by England in extending long-term credits to Communist nations, which in most cases equals gifts, as the Communists were never known to pay their debts after a few years; witness the lend-lease debt which they still owe us.

Under these circumstances, it becomes imperative to conduct the economic and cultural relations with the Gheorghiu-Dej regime under the auspices of realistic bargaining and quid pro quo. The Johnson administration cannot escape the responsibility to promote American interests and the interests of freedom and human rights in negotiating with the Gheorghiu-Dej regime. Therefore, it is necessary to remind those who think that East-West trade will be the panacea to world peace and balance-of-payments difficulties and that internal differences with Moscow must absolve the Communist satellite regime from too close a scrutiny, that we cannot condone their repressive actions and must try to lessen or abolish them by using our economic leverage.

More particularly in the case of Rumania we must insist upon a cessation of political repression and economic scattering of the Hungarian minority. While we have only a limited influence over any Communist regime no matter what difficulties it might have with Khrushchev and his successors, it would not be impossible to insist upon conditions which are laid down in the United National Charter and the Rumanian Communist Constitution of 1952. Observance of these conditions would include:

First. Restoration of the right of freedom of movement to professionals in Rumania. This provision would also restore the right of professionals to change their present assignments for a new one which brings them closer to their home area or nationality region. The same provision should be applied also to technical personnel and skilled workers if assignments are available in their own nationality areas.

Second. A promise by the Rumanian Government not to use American funds, or American plants received for the furthering of Rumanization of Hungarian or German areas. Such a provision is not unusual, as we have asked even NATO allies not to use NATO military aid for certain purposes and financial checks were added to many foreign aid sums to other countries.

Third. Release of all political prisoners, including those belonging to the Transylvanian Hungarian minority by the set deadline June 30, 1965—this deadline was promised by the Rumanian Government in last May.

Fourth. Reopening of the merged Hungarian educational institutions, especially on high school and college level, including the Bolyai University and the college at Nagyenyed—Aiud. Also cessation of the parallelization where it does not now exist.

Fifth. Expansion of the elementary schools of the Hungarian minority, giving the opportunity to Hungarian parents outside of the autonomous province to send their children into Hungarian and parallelized schools rather than into Rumanian ones.

Sixth. Restoration of the Hungarian Writers Union and other cultural goods like the libraries of Gyulafehervar—Alba Julia—and Nagyenyed—Aiud—to the Hungarian minority.

Seventh. Permission by central and local authorities of the use of the Hungarian language in public both within and without the autonomous province in Transylvania.

Eighth. The reinstallation of the heroic Hungarian Catholic bishop of Gyulafehervar—Alba Julia—Aron Marton to his see and restoration of some Catholic and other denominational schools for the Hungarian minority in Transylvania, and preferably a new settlement with the various churches, including the Vatican.

Ninth. A reattachment of the districts of Haromszek—Trei Scaune—to the Mures Autonomous Province and restoration of the name Magyar Autonomous Province to the same. Also cessation of the constant replacement of local officials by Rumanians in this province, and numerical representation of Hungarians in the village and town councils in other Transylvanian areas.

Tenth. Free settlement rights of Hungarians in the cities.

Of course, even if all these reforms were implemented by the Gheorghiu-Dej it would not make his state a democracy as long as free elections would not show the real sentiments and opinions of the people. But we as Americans would have contributed our share to lessening the cross of double persecution from the Hungarian minority in Transylvania, and the administration would have at least a plausible explanation for its actions toward helping a Communist state.

Many people will say that attaching conditions will slow down the Rumanian secession from the Communist bloc. I do not believe so. The Rumanians quarrel with Moscow partly because of their own national economic interests, but partly because they clearly realize that the Soviet-Chinese rift and the growing power of Western Europe and the United States leave them no other reasonable choice. And Rumanian history shows that their diplomats whatever their social and political background were reasonable and calculating men. They are hard bargainers, but they know the limits of their power and influence. It is up to the administration whether 3 years from now we will hear the administration admit that it had foolishly squandered its funds and licenses upon a hard-line Communist state or whether the Members on my side of the aisle will be proven wrong by a genuine change in Rumania. However, if we do not act for freedom of both Rumanians and Transylvanian Hungarians, we will be guilty not only of a grave omission but of betraying all the principles in which we, on both sides of the aisle profess to believe as Americans. And let it not be said that someone did not warn us beforehand.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleague in expressing dismay at the discrimination being practiced against the Hungarian minority in Rumania today. This Nation, founded on freedom and equality for all, abhors discrimination wherever practiced whether at home or abroad.

There is documented proof that Rumania discriminates against the Hungarian minority in the educational, cultural, economic, linguistic, and administrative fields. In the 1947 peace treaties with the Allied Powers, Rumania agreed to grant to all under her jurisdiction the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms without discrimination as to race, sex, language, and religion. Inasmuch as Rumania has not lived up to her agreements, I believe it behooves us to take a stand before the world in opposition to this discrimination.

Because of my conviction that this body should interest itself in the plight of the Hungarian minority in Rumania, I am today joining with many of my colleagues in sponsoring a resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives of the United States that discriminatory measures of the Rumanian Government be condemned.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, the mistreatment the Hungarian minority in Rumania receive has long been a subject of grave concern to me as it should be to all freedom-loving people everywhere. Unfortunately, it is not a subject which has received the attention it deserves by our Government.

The Hungarian minority in Rumania suffers today largely because of its demonstrations in support of the Hungarian revolt which took place in Hungary in 1956. While not openly revolting, the unrest displayed in 1956 was not forgotten by the Gheorghiu-Dej regime which quickly became convinced that the Hungarians living in Rumania were not to be relied upon.

The subtle genocide that is being pursued against the Hungarian minority, still about 1.65 million strong, is a double persecution—one on the ethnic level and one on the ideological level—and should be recognized and condemned by the United States as such.

If we are to encourage limited Rumanian independence from Moscow by economic concessions, as we are apparently doing, we should demand some concessions in return and the concessions should be directed toward preserving the human rights of the Hungarian minority which is suffering so greatly under that Communist regime.

Mr. Speaker, U.S. funds should not be used to further repress those Hungarians who, in 1956, showed themselves to be our friends and have, as a result, incurred Communist and Communist-Rumanian displeasure alike.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join my colleague from New York [Mr. HALPERN] in deploring the mistreatment of the Hungarians living in Communist Rumania.

The 1,700,000 Hungarians in that country constitute the largest ethnic minority in Eastern Europe. Their cultural institutions are threatened with destruction by the Communist regime, largely because of the Hungarian Revolution in 1956.

The uprising in Budapest established the Hungarians, both in Hungary and in Rumania, as the enemies of the Communist state. Demonstrations of sympathy with the freedom fighters were conducted in Rumania while the fighting was in progress. Hungarian students marched in Cluj, Medias, Timisoara, and Tirgu Mures. The demonstrations frightened the Communists. It appeared for a time that the revolution might spread into Rumania itself.

As a result, those who took part in the demonstrations were savagely repressed. Russian troops throttled the nationalistic outbreak in Rumania, and thousands of Hungarians were arrested—many of them were later executed. The Rumanians inflicted such severe controls over the previously autonomous Hungarian group that Russian troops left the country 2 years after the revolt.

The Rumanian Government has continued its efforts to fragment and assimilate the Hungarian minority. One of the most far-reaching measures has been the consolidation of Rumanian and Hungarian schools. Also, Rumanian has been designated the official language. Moreover, the state cultural agreement between the Communist governments of Rumania and Hungary has in effect ended any meaningful connection between Rumanian Hungarians and their motherland. Among other provisions of the agreement is a prohibition against the publication of any book concerning Transylvania, which is where most of the Hungarians live, without approval of the Rumanian censors.

It is no easy matter for a Hungarian living in Rumania to visit Hungary. It is not unusual for a Hungarian to wait 6 months to a year for permission to visit the motherland. Conversely, Hungarians who visit Rumania are strictly limited to certain areas.

Mr. Speaker, there has been no visible improvement in the situation since I last discussed the subject in July.

I believe the United States should oppose mistreatment of minorities where ever it occurs. I think we should lend our power and prestige to the struggle against the overt discrimination being practiced in Rumania. It should be remembered that the Hungarian and Rumanian people have many interests in common, one of them being the ambition to rid themselves of Communist domination.

At a time when Rumania seems to be seeking closer ties, both economically and politically, with the United States, I think this country should make clear its belief in the fundamental principal of equality for all races and creeds. In Rumania, specifically, I think we should be concerned with the Hungarian minority's right to conduct its own schools, use its own language and, in general, to maintain its historic institutions in a free and peaceful manner.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may be permitted to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the subject I have just discussed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

REDIRECTING THE EXISTING SUBSIDIZED MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING PROGRAM TO FAMILIES OF LOW INCOME

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced, at the request of the National Association of Real Estate Boards, a bill to redirect the existing subsidized middle-income housing program to families of low income.

The National Association of Real Estate Boards has for many years opposed the extension of public housing primarily because this program involves the Government ownership of family shelter.

This year the realtors' association, while continuing its opposition to the extension of public housing, has proposed an alternative which deserves the serious consideration of the Congress. The alternative would permit a substantial reduction in the interest rate of the present submarket middle-income housing program—identified as FHA section 221(d)(3)—but limit the program to families of low income.

My purpose in introducing the measure is to permit timely consideration of this alternative to public housing by the House Banking and Currency Committee and its Housing Subcommittee in connection with other housing legislation.

The section-by-section analysis and the text of the bill follow:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED BILL TO AMEND SECTION 221(d)(3) OF THE NATIONAL HOUSING ACT

Section 1 amends the existing FHA 221(d)(3) program by redirecting it to low-income families and permitting a lower submarket interest rate; and—

(a) Limits use of the program to nongovernmental sponsors (cooperatives, nonprofit organizations, limited dividend corporations, individuals, etc.);

(b) Requires that mortgagors enter into regulatory agreements with the FHA Commissioner and agree to reserve at least 25 percent of the units of the project for families which have been certified by the appropriate local welfare agency as needing housing assistance;

(c) Provides for repair and rehabilitation loans of up to 90 percent of estimated value after such repair and rehabilitation for limited dividend corporations, partnerships, or individual mortgagors;

(d) Limits the occupancy of 221(d)(3) projects to low-income families, defined as those in the lowest income group and who cannot obtain decent, safe, and sanitary housing with 25 percent of family income; and

(e) Requires that in cases of repair and rehabilitation in which refinancing is involved at least 35 percent of the mortgage proceeds be expended for capital improvements to the project.

Section 2 amends section 221(d)(5) to authorize the Commissioner to reduce the interest rate below the rate determined by the statutory formula (presently 3⅞ percent).

Section 3 amends section 221(f) to: (a) Require the Commissioner to adopt regulations to insure that only families of low income are admitted to and occupy 221(d)(3) projects; and (b) require periodic reexamination of the income of the families living in the projects, and require that families move from the project when they are able to provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for themselves with 25 percent of their income.

Section 4 amends section 227(a)(1) to waive cost certification for projects covered by mortgages executed by limited dividend corporations, partnerships, or individual mortgagors (these mortgages will be based on estimated value after rehabilitation instead of cost).

H.R. 6705

A bill to amend the National Housing Act by providing assistance to families of low income in obtaining decent, safe, and sanitary housing

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 221(d)(3) of the National Housing Act, as amended, is hereby further amended to read as follows:

"(3) If executed by a mortgagor which is a private nonprofit corporation (as defined by the Commissioner), or a cooperative (including an investor-sponsor which meets such requirements as the Commissioner may impose to assure that the consumer interest is protected), or other mortgagor approved by the Commissioner, and regulated or supervised under Federal or State laws or by political subdivisions of States, or agencies thereof, or by the Commissioner under a regulatory agreement or otherwise, as to rents, charges, and methods of operation, in such form and in such manner as in the opinion of the Commissioner will effectuate the purposes of this section, including but not limited to an agreement by the mortgagor that he will make available not less than 25 per centum of the units of the property or project for occupancy by families who have been certified by the appropriate local welfare agency as being in need of housing assistance—

"(i) not to exceed $12,500,000;

"(ii) not exceed, for such part of the property or project as may be attributable to dwelling use (excluding exterior land improvements as defined by the Commissioner), $8,000 per family unit without a bedroom, $11,250 per family unit with one bedroom, $13,500 per family unit with two bedrooms, and $17,000 per family unit with three or more bedrooms; except that as to projects to consist of elevator-type structures the Commissioner may, in his discretion, increase the dollar amount limitations per family unit to not to exceed $9,500 per family unit without a bedroom, $13,500 per family unit with one bedroom, $16,000 per family unit with two bedrooms, and $20,000 per family unit with three or more bedrooms, as the case may be, to compensate for the higher costs incident to the construction of elevator-type structures of sound standards of construction and design; and except that the Commissioner may, by regulation, increase any of the foregoing dollar amount limitations contained by this clause but not to exceed 45 per centum in any geographical area where he finds that cost levels so require; and

"(iii) not exceed (1) in the case of new construction, the amount which the Commissioner estimates will be the replacement cost of the property or project when the proposed improvements are completed (the replacement cost may include the land, the proposed physical improvements, utilities within the boundaries of the land, architect's fees, taxes, interest during construction, and other miscellaneous charges incident to construction and approved by the Commissioner), or (2) in the case of repair and rehabilitation, the sum of the estimated cost of repair and rehabilitation and the Commissioner's estimate of the value of the property before repair and rehabilitation: *Provided*, That in no case involving refinancing, except where the mortgage is based on estimated value, shall such mortgage exceed such estimated cost of repair and rehabilitation and the amount (as determined by the Commissioner) required to refinance existing indebtedness secured by the property or project: *Provided further,* That in the case of any mortgagor other than a nonprofit corporation or association, cooperative (including an investor-sponsor), or a mortgagor meeting the special requirements of subsection (c)(1), the amount of the mortgage shall not exceed 90 per centum of the estimated value of the property or project after repair and rehabilitation: *Provided further,* That such property or project, when constructed, or repaired and rehabilitated, shall be for use as a rental or cooperative project, and low income families or families displaced by urban renewal or other governmental action shall be eligible for occupancy in accordance with such regulations and procedures as may be prescribed by the Commissioner and the Commissioner may adopt such requirements as he determines to be desirable regarding consultation with local public officials where such consultation is appropriate by reason of the relationship of such project to projects under other local programs: *Provided further,* That any property or project constructed, or repaired and rehabilitated, with the assistance of this section shall be available for occupancy only by families of low income, as hereinafter defined, and shall be available only in those localities, communities, or environs of communities which shall have requested such project: *Provided further,* That for the purposes of this section 'families of low income' means families (including elderly and displaced families) who are in the lowest income group and who cannot afford to obtain decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for their use with 25 per centum of family income: *Provided further,* That in the case of repair and rehabilitation involving refinancing, not less than 35 per centum of the mortgage proceeds shall be expended for capital improvements to the project; or"

SEC. 2. The proviso in section 211(d)(5) of the National Housing Act is amended to read as follows: "*Provided,* That a mortgage insured under the provisions of subsection (d)(3) shall bear interest (exclusive of any premium charges for insurance and service charge, if any) at an annual rate determined from time to time by the Commissioner, and".

SEC. 3. Section 221(f) of the National Housing Act is amended by adding a paragraph at the end thereof, as follows:

"With respect to any project covered by a mortgage insured under the provisions of subsection (d)(3), the Commissioner shall adopt and promulgate regulations to insure that only families of low income are admitted to such project. The Commissioner shall also require the periodic reexamination of the incomes of families living in the project and shall require any family to move from the project if the income of such family has increased sufficiently to enable the family to obtain decent, safe, and sanitary shelter with 25 per centum of family income."

SEC. 4. Section 227(a) of the National Housing Act is amended by striking the comma at the end of clause (iv) and inserting in lieu thereof the following: ": *Provided*, That such term shall not include a project or property covered by a mortgage insured under the second proviso of section 221(d)(3)(iii) of this Act."

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the Greeks are ancient friends of freedom. Their history is replete with chapters of struggle and sacrifice for individual liberty and for self-government.

Today marks the 144th anniversary of Greek national independence. This occasion provides us a welcome opportunity to commend our Greek allies for their dedication to the cause of human freedom and their adherence to the political principle of national self-determination.

Modern-day Greece takes pride in their revolution of March 25, 1821, and the role played by thoughtful Americans of that period in support of the Greek struggle for national independence. That is a bright chapter in the history of both nations, out of which has developed a warm and enduring bond of friendship.

When Greek national independence was threatened in the aftermath of World War II by the aggressor forces of imperial Russian communism, a great President of the United States moved with courage and speed to the defense of the Greek nation. The Truman doctrine stands today as another bright chapter in the history of both nations which has served to strengthen our mutual bonds of friendship.

We salute the Greek nation on this anniversary of their Independence Day and wish for them the full blessings of liberty.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. HALPERN (as the request of Mr. CLEVELAND), for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. BRAY (as the request of Mr. CLEVELAND), for 10 minutes, on March 25.

Mr. BRAY (as the request of Mr. CLEVELAND), for 10 minutes, on March 26.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND), for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. FEIGHAN (as the request of Mr. ADAMS), for 10 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa (at the request of Mr. ADAMS), for 30 minutes, on Thursday, March 25, 1965; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MACHEN.
Mr. DULSKI.
Mr. ROBISON.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CLEVELAND) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCEWEN.
Mr. FINO.
Mr. MORTON.
Mr. PELLY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. ADAMS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. MCCARTHY.
Mr. KLUCZYNSKI.
Mr. COOLEY.
Mr. CELLER.
Mr. CAREY.
Mr. BINGHAM.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1496. An act to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc, lead, and copper from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, March 25, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

793. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 47 million pounds of abaca from the national stockpile"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

794. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of additional costs resulting from unnecessary procurement of a diesel engine for the military 5-ton truck, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

795. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report on identical bidding in advertised public procurement for calendar year 1963, pursuant to section 7 of Executive Order 10936 issued April 24, 1961; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

796. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 35 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to the imparting or conveying of false information"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

797. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the calendar year 1964 report on extraordinary contractual actions to facilitate the national defense, pursuant to section 4(a), Public Law 85-804; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

798. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the application of the Union Producing Co. for refund of excess oil royalties (barging costs) paid by them on lease OCS 0480, pursuant to section 10(b) of 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

799. A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the protection of certain officers or employees of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

800. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a supplementary report of the highway cost allocation study, supplementing House Documents Nos. 54 and 72, 87th Congress, pursuant to section 210 of 70 Stat. 387, as amended (H. Doc. No. 124); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McCULLOCH: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 1. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; with amendment (Rept. No. 203). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DAWSON: Committee on Government Operations. Twelfth report on disposal of municipal sewage (Rept. No. 204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 6674. A bill to strengthen the market price of wheat, corn, oats, rye, barley, grain sorghums, soybeans, and flaxseed by prohibiting the Commodity Credit Corporation from making domestic sales of such commodities at prices less than 125 percent of current support prices plus reasonable carrying charges; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6675. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 6676. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 6677. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on general telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 6678. A bill to establish a national cemetery in New England; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 6679. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 6680. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to authorize retirement without reduction in annuity of employees with 20 years of service involuntarily separated from the service by reason of the abolition or relocation of their employment; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6681. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax to individuals for certain expenses incurred in providing higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 6682. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 6683. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6684. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits thereunder for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage, and for other purposes; to the Commitee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6685. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide a credit against the individual income tax for certain amounts paid as expenses of higher education; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 6686. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act with respect to the U.S. Botanic Garden, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6687. A bill to assist small business and persons engaged in small business by allowing a deduction, for Federal income tax purposes, for additional investment in depreciable assets, inventory, and accounts receivable; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 6688. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for the assassination of the President or the Vice President, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 6689. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 6690. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 or over; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 6691. A bill to validate certain payments made to employees of the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 6692. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the retailers excise tax on luggage, handbags, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6693. A bill to permit the transmission in the mails of lottery tickets and other matter mailed in a State where lotteries are legal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 6694. A bill to provide free postage for first-class letter mail matter sent by members of the Armed Forces of the United States; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HUTCHINSON:

H.R. 6695. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. KUNKEL:

H.R. 6696. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964 to correct inequities in the operation of such act with respect to transfers during the retroactive period of such act from prevailing rate positions to positions under the Classification Act of 1949; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 6697. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 6698. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on pens and mechanical pencils; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 6699. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act, 1938, as amended, to provide for minimum wages for certain persons employed in agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 6700. A bill to create the Freedom Commission and the Freedom Academy, to conduct research to develop an integrated body of operational knowledge in the political, psychological, economic, technological, and organizational areas to increase the nonmilitary capabilities of the United States in the global struggle between freedom and communism, to educate and train Government personnel and private citizens to understand and implement this body of knowledge, and also to provide education and training for foreign students in these areas of knowledge under appropriate conditions; to the Committee on Un-American Activities.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6701. A bill to amend section 212 and 213 of title 18, United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 6702. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to prohibit the sales of alcoholic beverages to persons under 21 years of age; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 6703. A bill to amend section 144 of title 28 of the United States Code; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 6704. A bill to amend Public Law 874 and Public Law 815 so as to authorize the advancement of grants-of-aid, building construction and operational funds for educational purposes which might not otherwise be issued; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WIDNALL (by request):

H.R. 6705. A bill to amend the National Housing Act by providing assistance to families of low income in obtaining decent, safe, and sanitary housing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.J. Res. 396. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the eligibility of certain persons to vote for any candidate for elector of President and Vice President or for a candidate for election as a Senator or Representative in Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWDY (by request):

H.J. Res. 397. Joint resolution to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia on behalf of the United States to transfer from the United States to the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency title to certain real property in said District; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H. Con. Res. 368. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. Mission to the United Nations to bring the Baltic States question before that body with a view to obtaining the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; the return of exiles from these nations from slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and the conduct of free elections in these nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H. Con. Res. 369. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should instruct the U.S. Mission to the United Nations to bring the Baltic States question before that body with a view to obtaining the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia; the return of exiles from these nations from slave-labor camps in the Soviet Union; and the conduct of free elections in these nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. Res. 288. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. Res. 289. Resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of House Report No. 175, the report of the Joint Economic Committee on the January 1965 Economic Report of the President with minority and additional views; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H. Res. 290. Resolution that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that oppression of minorities in Rumania through a systematic plan launched by the Communist regime in control of Rumania be condemned and the President of the United States is requested to take appropriate steps in our relations with the Rumanian Government as are likely to bring relief to the persecuted minorities in the controversial Transylvania region of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H. Res. 291. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

140. By Mrs. MAY: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington requesting that the Federal Sugar Act be amended so that the beet sugar industry of the United States will be authorized to market the additional quantities of sugar produced at the request of the Government of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture.

141. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States that land taken by the Government for the Atomic Energy Commission, or similar land, be returned to the original

owners on repayment by them of the condemnation price paid by them to the Government; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

142. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Maryland, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States dealing with the apportionment of State legislatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

143. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to approving the continuation of the predator and rodent control program which has effectively aided sportsmen, ranchers, stockmen and the general economy; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 6706. A bill for the relief of Michael Skeriotis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 6707. A bill for the relief of Lee Sai Wai (also known as Lee Ging Ying); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6708. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Zoraida Dolores Chang de Blanco; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 6709. A bill for the relief of Delroy De Lisser and his wife, Adline Gordon De Lisser; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 6710. A bill for the relief of Fiorella Colantonio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6711. A bill for the relief of Maria Grazia Giordano; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tenneseee:

H.R. 6712. A bill for the relief of Ioanis Kapetanopoulos (also known as John Captain); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 6713. A bill for the relief of Fortunée Gharbi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6714. A bill for the relief of Dr. Sung Suh Park; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6715. A bill for the relief of Domenico Surleti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 6716. A bill conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to make findings with respect to the amount of compensation to which certain individuals are entitled as reimbursement for damages sustained by them as a result of the cancellation of their grazing permits by the U.S. Air Force, and to provide for payments of amounts so determined to such individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 6717. A bill for the relief of Mir Vilayet Ali; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 6718. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Agnes Chin-An Sun and her daughter, Paulina Sun, and her son, John Sun; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOORE:

H.R. 6719. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kazuyo Watanabe Ridgely; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 6720. A bill for the relief of Ping-Kwan Fong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 6721. A bill for the relief of Hazel Marie Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 6722. A bill for the relief of Denis Ryan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 6723. A bill for the relief of Shirley Shueh-Lan Chen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 6724. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Papanikolaou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H.R. 6725. A bill for the relief of Jesus de la Garza; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STALBAUM:

H.R. 6726. A bill for the relief of William S. Perrigo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 6727. A bill for the relief of Dimitrios Stratos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 6728. A bill for the relief of Morris L. Kaiden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6729. A bill for the relief of Vivian Cohen Kaiden; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 6730. A bill for the relief of Pao Yuen Shih; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 6731. A bill for the relief of Jens Meyer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

140. By Mr. CORMAN: Petition of W. S. Leinberry and other voters of Los Angeles County, concerning section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

141. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Board of Supervisors, San Mateo County, Redwood, Calif., with reference to pointing out the need for a constitutional amendment on reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Bill To Permit the Transmission of Lottery Tickets in the U.S. Mails When Mailed in a State Where Lotteries Are Legal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL A. FINO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my bill to permit and allow the transmission in the U.S. mails of lottery tickets mailed in a State where lotteries are legal and proper.

My purpose in introducing this measure is to facilitate the distribution via the mails of New Hampshire sweepstakes tickets. Obviously, these tickets are going through the mails because they are getting tremendous circulation. Last year, only 13 percent of the winners were New Hampshire residents. Clearly, the tickets just did not pick themselves up and fly all over the world.

As is frequently the case in connection with gambling, the Federal Government is doing no more than managing to make itself look hypocritically absurd. To the best of my knowledge, no one is getting in any trouble for the instances of ticket mailing I am sure have occurred, but why not make the law reflect commonsense? Not that most of our gambling laws do.

I urge the Congress to take this chance to remove restrictions against mailing of lottery tickets so long as the lottery ticket is mailed in a State where the conduct of such lotteries is legal.

Greek Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1965, marks the 144th anniversary of Greek Independence Day. On that date in 1821 a band of Greek patriots began their struggle for freedom. This was the first echo in Europe of the American Revolution, and their efforts were inspired by the example of the revolution only a few years before which had brought about the existence of the "land of the free." The example of the American Revolution had sown seeds that had grown deep roots.

The Greeks looked upon the United States with hope and admiration. One of the first acts of the first Greek Senate in 1821 was an address to the American people:

> Friends, fellow citizens, and brothers, having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn toward you by just sympathy, since it is in your land that liberty has fixed its abode * * *. Though separated from us by mighty oceans, your character brings you near us * * *. Our interests are of such nature as to cement more and more an alliance founded on freedom and virtue.

Freedom for the Greeks did not come easily or quickly. Finally, 8 long years later with the sympathy and support of the American people and ultimately that of the entire civilized world, they won, as we had won earlier.

Mr. Speaker, Greeks are proud that Americans participated in that noble endeavor, and we, too, should be proud that we contributed to their inspiration as we join them in commemorating the 144th anniversary of their independence on March 25.

Supreme Court Salaries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, a lively House debate was touched off last week on a bill to equalize the salaries of the Supreme Court Justices by raising them the $3,000 a year which was cut out of overall salary increases last year. In these times, the mere mention of the Supreme Court is enough to spark a controversy.

When Congress raised salaries last year, the Senate chopped $3,000 off the $7,500 raises each Justice was to receive. This year it was up to the House to restore the full raises for the Court.

However, Congressmen critical of the Court took advantage of the debate to level a barrage of comment before turning down the pay raise.

There is no doubt that the High Court's decisions may not always make everybody happy. But I feel that the Justices should not be penalized on something as petty as a pay raise for what some others feel have been its injustices. Representative EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, told the House:

> I did not know when the bill was to be brought up that we would have a sort of field day of criticism against our highest Court.

And a field day it was. My own feeling is that whether or not I agree or disagree with the Supreme Court, I will always fight to preserve its independence as an equal arm of the Government. The Court will always be with us, regardless of its decisions and their popularity and regardless of salaries.

It is a shame that the pay raise for which I voted was the victim of Congressional pique. I feel that this was a backhanded way to get back at the justices.

Speaking of civil rights and the Supreme Court brings me to a brief discussion of President Johnson's speech on voting rights. The President demonstrated in his speech that he can be an eloquent speaker, that he can truly lead the country along the path to equality for all—the path to the Great Society.

His moving speech was a fine example of how a politician with high ideas can carry them to the Congress and the country in a message that may stand in history with the others made by Presidents who met moments of courage.

I have always supported the constitutional right of every American to vote and shall continue to do so. It is unfortunate that the lawlessness of some of the extremists on both sides make it difficulty for all the people who believe in constitutional government to move ahead with a program to insure these rights.

You will recall that my bill for construction of a working model of the Chesapeake Bay Basin was referred to the Committee on Public Works for action. At the same time, I asked Chairman GEORGE FALLON, of Baltimore, for early hearings.

Last week Mr. FALLON sent me a very encouraging letter about this much-needed project for Maryland. Representative FALLON wrote:

> The investigation and study that you contemplate of the Chesapeake Bay Basin is of genuine interest to me, and you can be sure it is my hope to get quick action from the legislation.

Three notes about my staff:

Miss Gene Miller, who many of you have known for years, is now Mrs. Gene Hollis. She and Ed Hollis of the State Department of Chesapeake Bay Affairs tied the nuptial knot last week. Gene is serving me as executive secretary, as she did for my predecessor, Richard Lankford, of Annapolis. I wish Gene and Ed the best of luck.

My district representative, Silas Dennis, of Hyattsville, has resigned as chief of the Hyattsville Police Department. He started with me in January, taking leave from the department. He is now a permanent member of my staff.

Also, Carol Bodiford, of Suitland, has joined my staff as a secretary.

These staff members—as do all of them—stand ready and willing to serve you.

A Rare Man of Our Times

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, Oscar Morris was a rare and vital kind of man, even in the field of journalism, which has given history more than its share of unusual men. Oscar was a writer and reporter who lived and breathed in the lines he put on paper. He was an able editor who knew his obligation to present both sides of an issue, but who defended his own views, popular or otherwise, with equal vigor. And, he cut the issues clean.

Oscar was a shirtsleeves newspaperman in the total sense of the term. He was at home and at his best with the men who covered city hall or the White House; with his companions black with newsprint or boys straining under a canvas bag of papers; with cameramen in the darkroom or with politicians in smoke-filled rooms.

Oscar Morris had an undenied compulsion to be where the news was, and for more than 27 years he followed the scent of developing news wherever it might lead him. At the same time, he was a deeply sensitive man, totally involved in the welfare of Salisbury, the Eastern Shore, Maryland, and his country. The hopes and disappointments, the plans and obstructions, the faith and even the fears of his neighbors, all these guided Oscar's pen and his heart.

I counted Oscar a friend. With him you always knew where you stood and it made you comfortable. With him one could feel a mind searching for facts, not just a personality searching for a place to hang his hat. Oscar sought the truth, and in his passing the truth has lost a friend.

Those of us in the public service have been stripped of wise counsel and a helping hand. The Daily Times and, indeed, the times in which we live, have lost a rare and special kind of man.

Letting the Bars Down on Foreign-Flag Competition With American Merchant Marine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, a witness, Mr. Thomas Meyer, representing the International Seafarers' Union, stated that the administration had advised his union of their intention to seek an exemption under the coastwise shipping laws, so that foreign-flag vessels could compete with American-flag operations doing business with Hawaii and Alaska.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, as I stated to the witness, that this information was shocking, considering the fact that a number of American-flag shipping lines already serve these two States. For myself, and I am sure for many members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I serve notice now that if such an exemption is sought, I shall strongly oppose it.

After all, these American operations are not subsidized, and I have every reason to believe they are furnishing excellent service.

Official Maritime Administration figures show that our domestic fleet engaged in intercoastal and coastwise trade, had declined since 1939 until the end of 1961 from 805 to 363 vessels, of which 273 were in coastwise trade. Meanwhile, there have been constant attacks on the Jones Act, to water down the protection which the Congress, recognizing the essentiality of a domestic fleet, has incorporated into our shipping legislation.

As the Seafarers' International Union representative told our committee, the results of letting down the bars in favor of foreign-flag ships may well be catastrophic.

Mr. Speaker, when an American-flag ship is used to transport cargoes, all of the freight dollars are conserved to the benefit of the United States, whereas the opposite is true if other vessels are used. As a result, the American-flag steamship industry contributes almost $1 billion a year directly to our balance of payments. If there were no American-flag fleet, our balance-of-paymens deficit would be some $2 billion greater.

Veterans' Administration Facilities in the State of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter which I addressed to Hon. William J. Driver, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, and his reply which relates to the facility at Dwight, Ill.:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., January 25, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM J. DRIVER,
Administrator, Veterans' Administration,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DRIVER: I have received a number of letters and telegrams from individuals in my district and from various parts of the State of Illinois protesting against the proposed closing of the facility at Dwight, Ill.

These communications have to be answered and I would appreciate hearing from you as to the justification for such a step.

Yours very truly,
JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
OFFICE OF THE ADMINISTRATOR
OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS,
Washington, D.C., March 1, 1965.

Hon. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KLUCZYNSKI: This is in response to your recent letter concerning the closing of the Dwight Veterans' Administration facility and I want to thank you for your thoughtful inquiry which affords me this opportunity to clarify certain points.

Although you are quite properly concerned with this action as it relates to Illinois, it might give you a better insight into the reasoning behind the closing to examine the decision in the light of the history of the Veterans' Administration medical program since the end of World War II.

While the Veterans' Administration was fortunate in having a number of highly skilled and extraordinarily dedicated doctors, nurses, and other medical staff, the medical program in the period between World Wars I and II had not fully shared in the general progress of American medicine. Then, with the end of World War II, and the influx of huge numbers of veterans needing medical care, what might be termed a "medical revolution" occurred.

That revolution had one essential element—that medical decisions be made on medical grounds. With new professional direction and working closely with the Nation's medical schools, the VA hospital program moved forward vigorously to meet two concurrent challenges. The first and immediate challenge was to its ability to absorb the massive influx of returning veterans who needed and deserved nothing but the finest hospital care. All existing VA hospital space was used in this effort, and additional beds acquired from the Armed Forces or from others. The second phase, still going on, was to assure that our hospitals were the right kind, in the right place, and able to offer the fullest possible spectrum of modern medical care.

As part of this second phase, new facilities were built as rapidly as possible, and old ones closed. The decision to close hospitals was made for a number of cogent reasons, for many of the hospitals under VA control were already obsolete by World War II, and a considerable number of those taken over at the end of the war were uneconomical or in other ways unsuitable. For example, a number were originally constructed for other purposes. Some were old soldiers' homes; one was a girls' school; some were formerly hotels; and many were of ungainly cantonment type temporary or semipermanent construction.

These stopgap structures were closed continually throughout the years as new facilities were constructed, and since 1950 we have closed or transferred title to 19 hospitals.

Physical obsolescence is, of course, only one of the many factors considered in the always painful decision to terminate a hospital which, we recognize, is often a source of legitimate pride to the community in which it exists.

Other significant factors are the forward march of medical knowledge and the continued migration of the veteran population. For example, and to a large degree as a result of our own research, the number of hospitalized veterans suffering from tuberculosis declined from 17,000 in 1954 to 7,000 in 1964. As a result, we were able to reduce the number of tuberculosis hospitals from 21 in 1955 to but 4 today. Their closing illustrates the fact that progress in medicine, as in any field, requires the abandonment of antiquated instruments.

But the picture of the VA closing hospitals is only part, the negative part, of what we have been doing through the years. The positive part consists of a dynamic program of building new facilities where needed, and replacing and modernizing other hospitals. The program of building new and replacement hospitals is now proceeding at an annual rate of approximately $100 million.

There are many ways to measure the enhanced effectiveness of our medical program as a result of this revitalization. Perhaps the best—and most dramatic—is in the number of patients treated. With approximately the same number of beds as in 1960, our hospitals are now treating almost 750,000 sick and disabled veterans, over 100,000 more than in 1960.

Three facts are clear: First, decisions on medicine are best made on medical grounds; second, there is ample precedent for the closing of marginal hospitals; and third, the Veterans' Administration is continually upgrading its facilities so that they serve more veterans more effectively.

Thus the closing of the Dwight hospital is a reflection of the fact that the Veterans' Administration cannot afford to maintain marginal units in a period of rising demand for its services, great changes in the focus of this demand, and increasing complication of the facilities needed to provide a full spectrum of care.

The continuing transfer of effort and resources by the Veterans' Administration into more effective facilities, far from conflicting with President Johnson's commitment to advance the health of the Nation is, I believe, completely consonant with it. For war, whether against foreign enemies, or the enemies of man's physical well-being, must be waged in the most effective manner, using only those tools that will best do the job.

Finally, and I think completely in line with your legitimate concern for the health of the community, veterans and nonveterans alike, it should be pointed out that the Veterans' Administration stands ready to assist in any effort to utilize this VA facility for health purposes or to meet other community needs, and that a number of former VA hospitals, such as those at Springfield, Mo.; Minot, N. Dak.; and Outwood, Ky., have been put to such constructive use by other Government or private nonprofit agencies.

One final word. The decision to transfer beds from the 11 marginal hospitals was taken only after the most detailed study during a period of many months; and the governing factor in this decision was the clear conclusion that the reorganization would increase the overall ability of our medical program to render better service to all veterans.

In view of your interest, I am also furnishing you with a copy of a statement Dr. Thomas H. Brem, professor of medicine at the University of Southern California School of Medicine, made to the chairmen of the several congressional committees. Dr. Brem is Chairman of a Special Medical Advisory Group, established by act of Congress to advise the Veterans' Administration relative to the care and treatment of disabled veterans.

Sincerely,
W. J. DRIVER, *Administrator.*

VA Versus Politicians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. McEWEN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. McEWEN. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed and shocked to read the contents of an editorial in the March 16 issue of the Washington Daily News. My shock and amazement stems from the fact that this editorial contains both factual errors and inaccurate inferences. The editorial, entitled, "VA Versus Politicians," follows:

VA VERSUS POLITICIANS

Suppose you were operating a business which cost you nearly $4 per day more for each customer than the national average. Or which had more than three times the annual upkeep cost of similar businesses. Or which was forced by circumstances to offer poor service.

Under such conditions, you hardly could be blamed if you decided to close your shop and move to a less costly, more convenient location. And the last thing you'd expect would be to find your decision a target of loud complaints by politicians.

Yet that is precisely the situation in which the Veterans' Administration finds itself as it seeks to close some of its hospitals and shift patients to newer and better ones. The very suggestion has brought howls of wrath from Members of Congress.

New York Senator Robert F. Kennedy, for instance, objects to the projected closing of the hospital at Sunmount, N.Y., in the Adirondack Mountains. He seems to think its closing would be an inconvenience to patients.

The fact is, as the VA has pointed out, that nearly half of Sunmount's patients come from more than 200 miles away. Recruiting of professional staff is difficult. Patients in need of highly skilled treatment must be transferred elsewhere. About the only people who stand to gain by Senator Kennedy's objection are the townspeople in Sunmount, who presumably are potential Kennedy voters.

Or take the VA hospital at Miles City, Mont., which has come under the protective wing of Democratic Majority Leader MIKE MANSFIELD. Because of its isolation and low

> patient load, the daily cost per patient at Miles City is $32.27 compared with a national average of $28.38. Staffers have had to be transferred from as far away as Minneapolis.
>
> Another hospital the VA wants to close, at Brecksville, Ohio, has an annual upkeep cost three and a half times the national average and a cost per patient treated six times higher than average.
>
> VA advisers concede that some of these hospitals are closer to the homes of some veterans than the new, modern medical centers which would replace them. But they ask: "When you need medical care, would you rather have quality or convenience?"
>
> The answer is that veterans could get more of both if the politicians would only let them.

I would be the first to concede that the Veterans' Administration hospital at Sunmount, N.Y., should be closed if the facts relating to that splendid facility were as reported in the News editorial. Assuming that the Sunmount VA hospital is the hypothetical business referred to in the article, I am constrained to point out that the cost per day to operate the hospital at Sunmount, N.Y., is $29.01. The national average for similar Veterans' Administration hospitals is $29.43. Patients presently served by the Sunmount hospital will be forced to obtain their medical care and treatment in hospitals more than 150 miles away. Three hospitals have been designated to receive future patients who would have been formerly served at the Sunmount facility. Two of these have a per diem cost in excess of the per diem cost at Sunmount. The average of the three is $30.64.

By any stretch of the imagination, could this be termed "less costly" to the Government or "more convenient" to the veteran population? The editorial erroneously cites as fact the allegation that "nearly half of Sunmount's patients come from more than 200 miles away. Recruiting of professional staff is difficult. Patients in need of highly skilled treatment must be transferred elsewhere." The fact is that more than 85 percent of the Sunmount admissions are from the 10-county area which the Veterans' Administration central office has designated as the Sunmount service area. None of these counties are 200 miles from Sunmount. During 1964, there were 1,304 new admissions to this hospital and only 71 of these were transferred from some other VA hospitals.

At the present time there is only one vacancy on the hospital staff, that of a psychiatrist. The hospital, however, has the services of four consultant psychiatrists. During the past 4 years, 20 applications for professional staff positions at Sunmount have been rejected because there was no vacancy on the staff.

Of the 1,304 admissions during 1964, only 47 were transferred to other hospitals, and 4 of these were for personal reasons. The remainder required cobalt therapy, open-heart surgery and similar unusual medical procedures which are not normally available in the average hospital.

Perhaps the Washington Daily News should look with its jaundiced eye at the other side of the ledger and question the propriety of abandoning this splendid multimillion-dollar plant which was completely renovated and modernized since 1952 at a cost of between $2½ and $3 million. Perhaps the News should take another look at the economy involved in the closing of a hospital which has been evaluated in the words of the chief engineer as follows:

> The present condition of buildings, both structurally and in regard to overall condition, is considered to be equivalent to installations not over 15 years old.

Perhaps the Washington Daily News should examine the inconsistencies in the policy of the present administration which, on the one hand, creates a poverty stricken area by closing this VA hospital and depriving the community of 45 percent of its total income from wages, while, on the other hand, asks the Congress to provide relief for poverty stricken areas.

The News editorial asks: "When you need medical care, would you rather have quality or convenience?" I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the men who suffered or were wounded on the farflung battlefields of the world protecting our national security, deserve both quality and convenience with respect to medical care. If it takes "howls of wrath from Members of Congress" to get both quality and convenience of medical care, then I shall be howling the loudest.

American Policy Toward South Africa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, March 22, 1965, our very able colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, Representative Donald M. Fraser, delivered an impressive address on "American Policy Toward South Africa" before the National Conference on South African Crisis and American Action, at the Willard Hotel, Washington, D.C.

In my judgment, this address by a distinguished member of the Foreign Affairs Committee—who also serves as chairman of the Task Force on Foreign Policy of the Democratic Study Group—deserves the careful study of the Members of the Congress and other readers of the Congressional Record. It constitutes a compelling statement of the need for more vigorous action by the United States to bring about a change in the abhorrent apartheid policies of the Government of South Africa.

As a member of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations for 3 years, I am acutely aware of the importance of this problem. The image of our country throughout Africa, and our influence in that continent, would be greatly enhanced by the type of action Representative Fraser has proposed.

The following is the text of Mr. Fraser's address:

American Policy Toward South Africa

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, no responsible citizen of this country can ignore what is happening in South Africa. Actions taken by the Government of South Africa challenge our conscience and call into question our leadership among Western nations. Every thoughtful person is on his own in attempting to plot our policies toward South Africa. For many of us, the simple fact of brutal racial discrimination which is the order of the day in South Africa should be enough to fix our policy. The denial of personal and political rights on the basis of the color of a man's skin is repugnant to our sense of decency. Any nation which as a matter of national policy sets apart people on the basis of race or creed and destroys their political and personal rights should be roundly condemned by every civilized nation.

This condemnation in words should be followed by action designed to make the disapproval effective within the limit of our capacity to do so. In a world in which men and women possess every hue and color of skin, it is unbelievable that such ugly discrimination can be left unchecked without reaping a grim harvest.

UNITED STATES CONDEMNS APARTHEID POLICY OF SOUTH AFRICA

The United States today does condemn the policies of apartheid in South Africa. The views expressed by the United States in the United Nations and in our bilateral relations with South Africa spring from a genuine feeling of dismay and moral indignation on the part of our Government. There is nothing hypocritical in our current policy.

But we need not establish hypocrisy before pressing on to the next question. Are we doing all that we can to change the policies of the South African Government?

The answer is that we are not.

It is true that we banned the sale of military equipment to South Africa in August of 1963 and that we joined in a U.N. resolution in December of that year calling upon all nations to cease the sale and shipment of equipment and materials for the manufacture and maintenance of arms and ammunition in South Africa. This measure has little effect upon South Africa.

In the meantime U.S. investments in South Africa have continued to grow. Moral condemnation alone seems to have had as little effect in South Africa as in the hard-core areas of racial discrimination in the southern part of the United States. It is entirely possible for the South African Government to conclude that U.S. denunciation of her apartheid policies is for the ears of others and that our real attitudes are reflected in our willingness to continue doing business as usual with her.

We need to adopt tougher policies toward South Africa. This is the conclusion which is shared by those Americans most knowledgeable about the realities of life in South Africa today.

Before we discuss what these policies should be, I want to answer several arguments offered by critics of a tougher policy.

SHOULD WE INTERFERE?

Some argue that we have no right to interfere in the affairs of another nation. If this principle has validity, it stems solely from expediency. It may be prudent at times to accept a policy of noninterference where an opposite policy would be, to coin a phrase, "counterproductive."

But the hard realities of the world today have left us with no choice. We are involved in the affairs of virtually every nation on earth, whether through our aid programs, our policy of containment, the activities of the USIA or even the CIA. We are not and cannot be an island unto ourselves.

The hollowness of the noninterference doctrine is illustrated by asking whether or not there is a man or woman today willing to sit idly by if the mass murder of Jews by the

Nazis were to be reenacted. Of course, it is an entirely different question to ask, in what way a nation should interfere in the affairs of another nation.

SOUTH AFRICA IS AN ALLY

Next it is claimed that South Africa is pro-Western, anti-Communist and occupies a strategic location. The critics argue that our primary interest is survival in the deadly cold-war struggle and this is no time to jettison an ally such as South Africa. Moreover, we have space-tracking installations in South Africa important to our space ventures.

South Africa has been an ally of the West. We welcomed her contribution to the Korean war and her support of Western policies in joint defense and in the U.N. We do not seek to destroy these relationships.

We seek only to induce the Government of South Africa to abandon her policies of apartheid from which flow discrimination, segregation, and repression. Nevertheless a tougher policy toward South Africa may cause her to turn away from the West. We must, therefore, take a hard look at this possibility.

If we take the cold war as our frame of reference, the balance sheet on South Africa contains both liabilities and assets. Set against the strategic value she offers as an ally are the liabilities which flow from her policies. As Communist China seeks an increasing role in Africa, the racial policies of South Africa are tailor made for her benefit. Moreover, the longer that South Africa follows her current racial policies the more violent the inevitable explosion and the less likely that there will remain a country with Western orientation.

The strategic value offered by a friendly South Africa is real, but is of importance only under certain limited circumstances such as the closing of the Suez Canal. The ultimate resolution of the East-West struggle is unlikely to flow from any set of circumstances in which this strategic value of South Africa plays a significant role.

In a way, the cold war argument in favor of South Africa and the counter argument of Communist exploitation of South African policies deserve each other. That South Africa is a liability to the West does not serve to justify a tougher line on our part. Her policies are wrong, dead wrong. They are morally repulsive to civilized man. The Communists are exploiting this issue just as they exploit every issue which gives rise to grievances.

But our interest in changing her policies are not bottomed on Communist exploitation. They are bottomed on the fundamental moral issues involved. It is unthinkable that we should condone through inaction the policies of South Africa because of the cold war. Such inaction would represent a moral paralysis destructive of our capacity to lead in the years ahead.

REPRESSION NOT LIMITED TO SOUTH AFRICA

Finally it is argued that suppression of the rights of people is not confined to South Africa. Brutal repression marks the fate of many people all around the world. The Soviet suppression of the Hungarian revolt in the midfifties is a for instance.

We stood by wringing our hands and passing resolutions in the United Nations condemning the Soviet Union much as we have done toward the apartheid policies of South Africa. Why, it is asked, do we now single out South Africa for a tougher policy while millions of people are enslaved today under totalitarian rules around the globe?

Because we cannot cure all the evils of the world at once is no reason to refuse to act where we may have the capacity to act effectively.

Moreover, I believe that in general and within the limitations of the real world we are doing what we can to improve the political and economic status of people everywhere. It is a fundamental premise of American foreign policy that democratic societies pose the least threat to our security. We nudge along and encourage the development of such societies. True, we may not always go about it skillfully.

I am prepared, however, to defend this version of American policy at length and with tenacity. By and large we are forced to deal with nations as we find them—but always seeking to moderate their unfortunate policies and stimulating the evolution of more open societies. Thus, we encourage diversity within the Soviet bloc, and we look for ways through which their police states may be modified.

WHAT CAN WE DO FOR OPPRESSED PEOPLE ELSEWHERE?

Is there more we can do to restore freedom to oppressed peoples in these countries? The use of armed forces seems out of the question.

Would economic sanctions be effective? We have employed these against most bloc nations, and offer the inducement of lessened sanctions as bloc nations demonstrate independence of Soviet control. In both Vietnam and Cuba we are using even more drastic measures, albeit wih uncertain results.

Generally speaking the same philosophy has guided our dealings with totalitarian nations on the right, such as Spain, Portugal and some of the Latin American nations. We seek economic advancement for their people. We believe that over the long pull in every society forces exist which tend to expand political and personal freedom. Doubtless our priorities are affected by the cold war, but immediate survival has always demanded first attention.

In South Africa unusual circumstances prevail. A democratic society does exist in South Africa for Europeans. But the majority in that nation are wholly excluded from participation on the basis of their color. Once a society embarks on racial policies born of fear, the future looks hopeless as the inevitable tensions grow deeper, suspicion mounts and violence becomes more probable.

PEACEFUL CHANGE IN A DEMOCRACY REQUIRES PARTICIPATION

Our faith in a democratic society stems in part from its capacity to accommodate peaceful change. For this system to work, those whose interests require action on the part of their government must be able to exercise their political rights to get this action. In the United States it can be argued with some force that the existence of large numbers of Negro voters in the North played a decisive role in bringing about a positive, rather than a negative result as Negro citizens in the South finally took matters into their own hands and met violence in Birmingham.

Where will this ameliorating influence come from in a country which not only deprives its non-European citizens of any effective voice in government, but where the official, formal position of the government itself favors the complete denial of these rights? Without external pressure comparable to the pressure which the North brought upon the South in the United States, there is little hope in South Africa for the non-Europeans.

In short, our foreign policy recognizes that the forceful imposition of democratic concepts on other nations is extremely difficult, and we must rely a good deal on the gradual evolution of democratic ways as they emerge from experiences within each society, much as our heritage of democratic values developed on the British Isles painfully and over many centuries.

In South Africa the Europeans for the most part adhere to these democratic concepts for themselves, but they deny them completely to others on the basis of racial differences. Thus, there is little hope that with the passage of time the racial policies of that government will be corrected.

Every indication today bears out the impression of many observers that South Africa is headed for an increasing degree of police state repression toward the non-European majority. Unless this trend is reversed the world as well as South Africa will pay heavily.

NEW POLICIES TOWARD SOUTH AFRICA

What policies should we adopt toward South Africa beyond those we have today? I do not believe that we should break off diplomatic relations with South Africa nor does expulsion from the United Nations have much to offer. Some hope that increased contact and exchange of persons may bear fruit. I believe this course should be followed so long as South Africa is agreeable. Such policies, however, are unlikely to be enough.

RESTRICT INVESTMENT AND TRADE

I believe we must consider adopting unilaterally or in concert with other nations measures such as restraints on investment in South Africa, curtailment of trade and embargoes. It is my view that such measures should be gradually enlarged over a period of time until South Africa changes her racial policies.

I turn back for a moment to the critics. Some will argue that such policies will not be effective because compliance by every nation with such restrictions and embargoes cannot be enforced. To illustrate this point they cite the heavy dependence of Great Britain upon trade with South Africa.

We won't know how effective a multilateral effort will be until we begin working out the details of such efforts. Willingness on the part of the United States to pursue such measures would represent an enormous step forward.

U.S. SHOULD ACT UNILATERALLY IF NECESSARY

But assume for a moment that we could not get the British to join us, or that even if they did there were still too many leaks. Should this deter us from acting? My answer is emphatically, no.

Our efforts to isolate Cuba were not conditioned upon worldwide compliance. We are equally free to bring pressure to bear on South Africa through various restraints initiated by the U.S. Government alone. It must be remembered that unlike Cuba, we are not seeking to destroy the Government of South Africa. We seek only to change her policies toward non-Europeans. We honestly and deeply believe this to be in her own interest.

But could even unilateral action by the United States bring about this result? Today the policy of apartheid appears to most South Africans to coincide with their economic interests. The substandard, discriminatory wages paid to non-Europeans represent a substantial economic benefit to the Europeans who gain the benefit of this labor at such low cost.

The history of discrimination, however, shows that when economic considerations clearly conflict with racial discrimination, racial discrimination begins to give way. This has been seen repeatedly in the United States.

Action by the United States to interrupt normal trade and commercial relations with South Africa would bring economic pressure on South Africa. An uneconomic consequence of their apartheid policy would be demonstrated. It will be even more persuasive, of course, as we succeed in winning broader support of these policies.

It is said that such action by the United States and other Western nations will only serve to harden the attitudes of the national party now in power as they exploit this unwarranted interference in their internal affairs from the outside world. No one can say with certainty what may follow from a substantial interruption of South Africa's commerce with other nations.

There are adequate reasons to believe that this pressure may provide the many Europeans in South Africa who today disagree with apartheid policy a more substantial basis on which to appeal for a change in that policy. Whatever happens, however, is surely to be less drastic than the final day of reckoning which will follow if no action is taken now. The longer South Africa travels down the road toward that final day of reckoning, the less chance that a society will emerge in which all can live together in peace.

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE, U.N. MAY ACT

It will not be long before the United States will have to make some hard choices about our policy toward South Africa. The International Court of Justice is likely to rule soon upon the question of whether or not South Africa has properly carried out her mandate over southwest Africa. Special committees of the United Nations have studied measures which may be taken against South Africa.

Action may come in the Security Council of the United Nations. Under section 5 of the U.N. Participation Act of 1945 the President may prohibit economic relations between the United States and any other country whenever the United States is called upon by the Council to give effect to its decision. To demonstrate our concern and our intentions, we should begin now to plan how best to effectuate the decision of the World Court if it should rule against South Africa, and how best to carry forward our determination that apartheid in South Africa must come to an end.

The actions which South Africa must take to end policies based upon racial discrimination, as Ambassador Stevenson has pointed out, must be worked out by responsible persons within South Africa.

WE MUST HELP SOUTH AFRICA MAKE RIGHT DECISIONS

We seek to create an environment in which the right decisions will be made.

We are a powerful nation. We want to employ that power for the advancement of mankind. The moral quality of our leadership is being sorely tested. Let us not falter. When the choices are difficult, we should follow that old and reliable maxim, "When in doubt, let us do what is right." Men everywhere will be grateful to us if we will do what is right.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, all lovers of freedom everywhere are in wholehearted sympathy with the unhappy Byelorussian people. These dauntless and daring souls regained their independence 47 years ago, but soon they were overwhelmed by the Red army of the Soviet and lost their freedom. The Government and the people of this country are painfully aware of the sad plight of the Byelorussian people since then. And it is sad to say that we have not been able to help them in any effective way, but it is heartening to see that the issue of Byelorussian freedom is kept alive through the efforts of Byelorussian-American Congress. I wish the congress success in all their worthy endeavors on the 47th anniversary celebration of Byelorussian Independence Day.

Legislation To Save Passenger Train Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. I rise in support for my bill, H.R. 6471, which I introduced last March 18, 1965, which would amend section 13(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the discontinuance or curtailment of passenger train operations or ferry services. I sincerely believe that the prompt enactment of this legislation is essential to save passenger train service in this Nation. Moreover, I am convinced that we simply must save railroad passenger services, and improve and expand them, unless our Nation is to have a completely congested highway system, and even dangerously overpacked airspace, only a decade or so hence.

The section of the Interstate Commerce Act which my bill would amend was enacted hastily in the closing days of the 2d session of the 85th Congress as part of the Transportation Act of 1958. This measure was regarded as emergency legislation intended to save the railroads from the alleged bankruptcy their spokesman had assured us was then facing the industry. Since that time, however, the railroads, instead of declining, have enjoyed some of the most profitable years in their history, but their higher profits, instead of bringing improved service to the general public as the Congress had the right to expect would be the case in exchange for the substantial aid it voted, have been accompanied with widespread service cutbacks and the discontinuance and downgrading of literally hundreds of passenger trains.

Section 13(a) under which the great decline in passenger train operations has taken place, has been characterized by one Federal court of appeals judge as a "strange, dismaying law—concerning which—one thing is certain; namely, that the public was ignored in—its—formulation." The first Federal court which considered this legislation not only found that it was a direct delegation to the railroad industry of authority to discontinue interstate passenger train services, but also that it was a clear invitation for such action.

The legislative history of section 13a, in my opinion, makes clear that Congress never intended by its action to enact legislation which would encourage the destruction of the passenger train. Rather, the whole purpose of the Transportation Act of 1958—which also contained many other provisions of great help to the railroad industry—was to do all that then seemed feasible to save, not destroy, railroad transportation in this country. Section 13a was enacted to provide a means of relief for those railroads which claimed that they had been unfairly treated by the denial of State railroad commissions of permission to abandon passenger services on which they allegedly were suffering heavy losses. The section was intended only to provide a means for the discontinuance of trains for which there was obviously no longer a need, and the record makes clear that Congress did not have in mind the abandonment of well-patronized and profitable trains like some of those which have been discontinued by the railroads under this provision.

Since the passage of this legislation, the railroads have discontinued literally hundreds of trains through the application of section 13a, whether justified or not. Experience has shown that the interests of the general public in passenger train services have not been adequately protected in these discontinuances. Many have been abandoned without even the holding of a public hearing, and when such hearings have been held, the burden of proof that continuance of the train would not be an undue burden on interstate commerce has fallen upon the protesting public, which simply does not have access to the financial and other information needed to prepare an adequate case. Moreover, the present law is unfair in that it denies the public the right of appeal to the courts while at the same time granting this right to the railroads.

Section 13(a) is so loosely written that it actually permits the railroads, on their own initiative, to discontinue any passenger train, including those on which they are making a profit, by the mere posting of a notice. Unless the carrier files an application and unless the Interstate Commerce Commission intervenes, that train is automatically eliminated. The present law also places further unfair restrictions on the public and the ICC by requiring the Commission to render a final order in each case within 4 months of the original discontinuance date set by the railroads or else the operation of the interstate train or trains ceases automatically. This arbitrary and unreasonable time limitation deprives the public of adequate time to prepare its case and has required the Commission to shortcut its customary and well-established administrative procedures. Finally, even though the ICC may order a railroad to continue the operation of a train or trains for a period of 1 year, it completely lacks authority over the quality of the service provided during this period. The result is that railroads can, and have, deliberately cut back the service on such trains, through such actions as eliminating mail, dining cars, parlor and lounge cars, and sleeping accommodations, so that customers are driven away and the railroads can show greater losses on the trains when they again announce their intent to abandon them a year later.

My bill, H.R. 6471, is intended to reverse this process and put the burden of proof upon the carrier's applicants where it belongs. Under this proposed legislation, carriers seeking to discontinue or change interstate passenger services would be required to apply to the Interstate Commerce Commission for authorization. The Commission would be required to hold public hearings and would be required to notify the Governors of the States at least 30 days in advance of such hearings. Before service could be discontinued or reduced, the Commission would be required to issue a certificate of findings that, first, public convenience and necessity require the change, in whole or in part, and that second, to continue the train or ferry operations without change would "constitute an unjust and undue burden upon the interstate operations" involved. The Commission also would be given authority to attach its own requirements as to the conditions, or terms, it finds needed for public convenience and necessity, including conditions for the protection of the interests of the employees adversely affected which are customarily imposed in other railroad abandonments. Provision also would be made for enjoining and punishing any railroad undertaking to make changes in service without compliance with the certification and hearing procedures.

Surely these amendments to section 13a are clearly in the public interest. They will put the burden of proof that passenger trains no longer are needed upon the carriers, where it properly belongs, but at the same time they will carry out the true intent of the Congress when it enacted section 13a by preserving a means whereby the carriers may circumvent grossly unfair decisions by the State commissions. The effect will be to give the Interstate Commerce Commission the power it now lacks but greatly needs to make certain that action to discontinue or change passenger train service is only taken in the public interest, and with the future and present needs of our Nation for such services clearly in mind.

Conservation Retrenchment Would Endanger the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, in this Nation's struggle from the depths of the great depression our Government entered a partnership with our farmers—a compact, if you please—to conserve and rehabilitate and rebuild America's greatest resource—the soil—which was washing, blowing, eroding, and wasting away because our farmers were too poor to forestall or to check this tragic loss to our Nation.

April 27, 1965, will mark the 30th anniversary of the enactment by the Congress of an historic piece of legislation, Public Law 46, which declared soil and water conservation to be a national policy and created the Soil Conservation Service to give leadership to such a program.

Over the years, Mr. Speaker, this program has wrought miracles, to assure us today and the generations to come that the land will feed us and bless us, abundantly.

Our farmers embraced the conservation movement with amazing enthusiasm and eagerness. They have invested millions and billions of their own money, as their incomes would permit it, in works of soil and water improvement on their own farms. They have written for America a food insurance policy that will protect all Americans down through the years.

The money our Federal Government has expended on conservation, in cooperation with farmers, is the best investment this country has ever made.

In the light of all this, Mr. Speaker, it is a shocking development of our time that the administration now is proposing that the Government retreat, or withdraw, from its full participation and leadership in the conservation movement, and burden our farmers, who already are hard pressed, with larger costs for the protection of our most basic resources, a work which properly is the responsibility of all of us in towns and cities as well as upon our farms.

Mr. Speaker, I was a Member of the Congress, the 74th, which passed the historymaking Conservation Act, without a dissenting vote, 30 years ago.

The Soil Conservation Service began its work on a demonstration basis under the direction of that great North Carolina conservationist—the father of soil conservation in America—the late Hugh Bennett.

So favorably was this program received that by June 30, 1936, the Soil Conservation Service had in operation 147 demonstration projects, averaging 25,000 to 30,000 acres each, 48 soil conservation nurseries for the development and production of new plants, 23 research stations, and 454 Civilian Conservation Corps camps. About 50,000 farmers had applied conservation measures to about 5 million acres. Thousands more sought the opportunity to participate in the program.

Experience had shown that this work would be more successful if locally managed and locally controlled—if the people themselves formulated their own programs and carried them out with Federal technical and other assistance.

Out of this came the idea of the local soil conservation district—now generally known as soil and water conservation districts—organized by the local people under State laws. Out of this came the unique partnership, entirely new in our history, wherein the Soil Conservation Service, a Federal technical agency created by the Congress, offered its assistance through these local districts in compliance with local needs and wishes, in conformity with State law, and in cooperation with local and State agencies and organizations.

In February 1937 President Franklin D. Roosevelt submitted to the Governors of all States a proposed State enabling act authorizing the formation of soil conservation districts specifically for soil and water conservation. Legislatures of 22 States passed such laws that year.

The first soil conservation district in the world was chartered August 4, 1937. I am proud to say it was in my home State—the Brown Creek Soil Conservation District in Anson County, N.C.

The Congress, beginning in 1937, fully endorsed the principles of this new movement by earmarking funds to provide the technical assistance of the Soil Conservation Service to the local people through soil conservation districts.

Since then the Congress has annually restated its views and its position on this great Federal-State-local cooperative undertaking by appropriating funds for this purpose on an expanding basis as the organization of districts swept across the country and the needs for technical and other assistance increased.

The Congress has strengthened this work also by creating new programs as needed. Notable among these are the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, aimed at corrective action in our long-neglected small upstream watersheds where more than half of our annual flood damage occurs and most of our water problems originate. Another is the Great Plains conservation program, first of its kind tailored to a great region of this land—a region having problems peculiar to its climatic and soil conditions—problems that can be solved only by a long-term approach.

Another is resource conservation and development projects, a new pilot program in 10 representative areas where an intensive effort will be made to accelerate the development of natural resources as the base for raising the economic level of the people, both rural and urban.

These and other advances in our national soil and water conservation program have stemmed from the experiences of people working together in soil conservation districts.

And, as the program has grown, it has come to be more meaningful to the people of the towns and cities as well as to the owners and operators of our vast farm and ranch lands. Urban people have always had a stake in this program, and they have supported it for 3 decades, but today they are participating in it more fully and deriving more direct benefits than in the early days of the program. The small watershed program is a good example of equal town-country cooperation and equal direct benefits. So too, is the growing trend toward income-producing recreation activities on private lands, and recreation projects growing up around watershed project reservoirs that are creating a substantial source of income in hundreds of American communities.

Mr. Speaker, our national soil and water conservation program has come a long way in these 30 years. Today nearly

3,000 local soil and water conservation districts cover more than 1.7 billion acres of land. These districts have nearly 2 million cooperators operating 648 million acres of land. They have applied 40 million acres of contour farming, nearly 20 million acres of stripcropping, 1.2 million miles of terracing. They have planted 11.3 million acres of trees and have built 1.3 million ponds.

Out of the total of 569 watershed projects approved for Federal assistance, nearly 400 had entered the construction stage in fiscal year 1964. Soil surveys have been made on 822 million acres. More than 16,000 Great Plains landowners and operators were droughtproofing 33.8 million acres of land under the Great Plains conservation program. Those are just a sampling of accomplishments.

These are accomplishments for all the people, for our land and water resource is the base of our economy, the foundation of our American way of life.

Despite these advances, we who have followed this program closely for the past three decades, know that soil erosion is still the dominant conservation problem on the non-Federal rural land of this country. Two-thirds of our land still needs conservation treatment of some kind. Conservation problems are inadequately treated on 62 percent of the cropland, 73 percent of non-Federal pasture and range, and 55 percent of non-Federal forest and woodland.

Mr. Speaker, I have recounted this brief history of the development of our national soil and water conservation program and some of its accomplishments because I am sorely troubled by the administration proposal for retrenchment in the Government's participation in the conservation movement.

I refer to the proposal in the President's budget message to reduce the item for technical assistance in the Soil Conservation Service appropriation by $20 million, and to establish a public revolving fund into which recipients of services would be required to pay 50 percent of the cost of such assistance. I am told this proposal originated in the Office of Budget Director Kermit Gordon, whose views on agriculture I have discussed previously in the House.

Mr. Speaker, adoption of this proposal would deliver a crippling blow to conservation in this country. It would do the program great harm. It could destroy it.

This proposal came like a bolt out of the blue. No study was made of its possible impact. No one familiar with the inner workings of this great program was consulted.

If any were, the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture was not one of them. On examination, one must conclude that this proposal originated with a Budget Bureau official who did not have the background to think it through. And perhaps it was put into motion by people who should know better but are willing to cripple existing essential programs in order to provide more money for new Government ventures such as the Appalachia program.

Mr. Speaker, if anyone would set out to create poverty in this Nation, I know of no surer way to do it, in the long run, than to stifle or discourage the conservation of our basic and vital resources.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, is it possible that the Director of the Budget and those high in the administration who follow his leadership are totally unaware of the histories of fallen civilizations down through the ages? Those civilizations withered and vanished when the rich soil that sustained and nourished them was eroded, wasted, and washed into the seas. I appeal to the Budget Director and to his followers to familiarize themselves with this doom that has befallen nations and peoples in centuries past.

Mr. Speaker, those of us who have worked closely with the conservation program for many years believe the immediate effect of the Budget Bureau proposal would be to reduce the establishment of soil and water conservation work by 50 percent.

It would have the further effect, once the Federal Government abandons its traditional position in this cooperative undertaking, of decreasing State and local government contributions, thus further crippling the program.

I am told that the $20 million reduction in funds for technical application assistance would reduce farm ponds by 30,000, terraces by 2,700 miles, earth moving of all types by 350 million cubic yards.

It would reduce sales to soil conservation district cooperators and contractors serving them of concrete by 200,000 cubic yards, concrete pipe by 6,670,000 feet, corrugated metal by 1,635,000 feet, steel pipe by 870,000 feet, asbestos-cement pipe by 1,300,000 feet, aluminum pipe by 5,370,000 feet, water pipe by 3,130,000 feet, tile by 75 million feet.

It would reduce contracting for water conservation and control conservation practices by $160 million. It would eliminate an estimated net profit of $14 million, thus forcing many small contractors into bankruptcy. It would eliminate 15,000 equipment operating and servicing jobs paying an average of $3,500 annually, a total of $52,500,000. It would cut the purchase of heavy equipment by contractors by 700 to 1,200 units—also light equipment purchases—totaling $20 to $30 million per year.

It would reduce by about 50 percent or 5 million acres the land seeded annually to grass, legumes, and grass-legume mixtures. This would cut sales of grass and legume seed by 60 million pounds annually, and cut sales of fertilizers for establishing grass and legume stands by 1 million tons annually.

The proposed cut would reduce by about 50 percent or 250,000 acres the land annually planted or seeded to trees and leave State and local agencies and private nurseries with a surplus of 250 million seedlings.

Mr. Speaker, the impact, as I have shown, would spread far beyond the landowners whom we would deprive of the conservation technical services they have been receiving. It would wreak havoc among various business segments of our society. The relatively small amounts the Federal Government puts into conservation are returned manifold to the public in the form of increased earnings and profits, and to the Federal Treasury in the form of greatly increased income taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the proposal of the administration that the Government retreat from its participation and leadership in the conservation movement is not in the national interest. It is dangerous to this Nation. It has stirred a clamor throughout the country of such proportions as to convince any reasonable man that the people insist that our basic and most precious resources be preserved, and that our Government shall measure up to its responsibility and shall not shirk, or languish or flag in these undertakings that insure the future of this Nation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I here urge the administration to disavow any interest in any proposition that will cripple or destroy the conservation movement.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the Members of this body may with full confidence assure their constituents that if this matter is pressed it will go down to resounding defeat in the Congress, and that the Congress will reaffirm the stand it took 30 years ago—that conservation is a national policy and the Federal Government has a responsibility of participation and leadership in protecting and building our vital and basic national resources.

Attorney General Testifies on Voting Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the statement by Attorney General Nicholas deB. Katzenbach before Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Judiciary Committee on the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965, on Thursday, March 18, 1965.

The statement follows:

> In our system of government, there is no right more central and no right more precious than the right to vote.
>
> From our early history, the free and secret ballot has been the foundation of America. This Congress stands as imposing evidence of that truth. And, if we have needed reminding, Presidents in every generation have repeated that truth.
>
> In a message to the 36th Congress, in 1860, President Buchanan observed that: "The ballot box is the surest arbiter of disputes among freemen."
>
> In a message to the 51st Congress, in 1890, President Benjamin Harrison said: "If any intelligent and loyal company of American citizens were required to catalog the essential human conditions of national life, I do not doubt that with absolute unanimity they would begin with 'free and honest elections.'"
>
> In a message to the 66th Congress, in 1919, President Wilson said: "The instrument of all reform in America is the ballot."

In a message to the 88th Congress, just 2 years ago, President Kennedy said: "The right to vote in a free American election is the most powerful and precious right in the world—and it must not be denied on the grounds of race or color. It is a potent key to achieving other rights of citizenship."

And yet, just 3 days ago, it remained necessary for President Johnson, in an eloquent message to this Congress, to say:

"Many of the issues of civil rights are complex and difficult. But about this there can be no argument. Every American citizen must have an equal right to vote. There is no reason which can excuse the denial of that right. There is no duty which weighs more heavily on us than the duty to insure that right."

The President called on the Congress and on the American people to meet that duty with the fullest power of heart, mind, and law. I appear before you today to support that commitment and to tell you in detail why this administration believes the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965 to be sound, effective, and essential.

I. DENIALS OF THE PAST

The promise of a new life for Negro Americans was first expressed in the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to the Constitution. The promise of freedom for the slaves was kept; the promises of equal protection and the right to vote without racial discrimination are yet, a century later, still empty.

Soon after the adoption of the Civil War amendments, Congress did indeed enact a number of implementing laws. Promptly after the ratification of the 15th amendment, the Enforcement Act of May 31, 1870, was passed, declaring the right of all citizens to vote without racial discrimination. Under the 1870 law, officials were required to give all citizens the same, equal opportunity to perform any act prerequisite to voting. Violation and interference were made criminal offenses.

In 1871, another law was passed to protect Negro voting rights. It made it a crime to prevent anyone from voting by threats or intimidation, and established a system of Federal supervisors of elections.

But these protections were neither adequately enforced, nor of long duration. Attempts to strengthen the legislation, occasioned by rising Negro disenfranchisement in the South, were unsuccessful. Congressional debates reflect the fear of disturbing the status quo of white supremacy. In 1894, most of the legislation dealing with the right to vote was repealed.

Meanwhile, some States had been busy enacting legislation to disenfranchise the Negro. They adopted a variety of devices, with no effort to disguise their real purpose—disenfranchisement of the Negro.

Whites unable to meet the new requirements were protected by the so-called "grandfather clause"—which could not possibly have applied to a Negro newly freed from slavery. The Supreme Court struck down the grandfather clause in 1915, but discrimination and disenfranchisement continued. The Negro's theoretical right to vote was successfully thwarted by intimidation and fear of reprisal. The white primary long served to disenfranchise Negroes, until declared unconstitutional in 1944. During this long period America almost forgot—and certainly ignored—its commitment to voting equality.

Beginning with President Truman's 1948 recommendation to Congress, based on the report of his Committee on Civil Rights, bills to protect the right to vote were introduced in successive Congresses.

Still, action did not come until the Civil Rights Act of 1957. That act authorizes the Attorney General to bring suits to correct discrimination in State and Federal elections, as well as intimidation of potential voters.

The Civil Rights Act of 1960 sought to make such lawsuits easier. It amended the 1957 act to permit the Attorney General to inspect registration records and to permit Negroes rejected by State registration officials to apply to a Federal court or a voting referee.

The Civil Rights Act of 1964 sought to make voting rights suits faster. It amended the 1960 act to expedite cases, to facilitate proof of discrimination, and to require nondiscriminatory standards.

What has been the effect of these statutes? It is easy to measure. In Alabama, the number of Negroes registered to vote has increased by 5.2 percent between 1958 and 1964—to a total of 19.4 percent of those eligible. This compares with 69.2 percent of the eligible whites.

In Mississippi, the number of Negroes registered to vote has increased at an even slower rate. In 1954, about 4.4 percent of the eligible Negroes were registered; today, we estimate the figure at about 6.4 percent. Meanwhile, in areas for which we have statistics, the comparable figure for whites is that 80.5 percent of those eligible are registered.

And in Louisiana, Negro registration has not increased at all, or if at all, imperceptibly. In 1956, 31.7 percent of the eligible Negroes were registered. As of January 1, 1965, the figure was 31.8 percent. The white percentage, meanwhile, is 80.2 percent.

The lesson is plain. The three present statutes have had only minimal effect. They have been too slow.

Thus, we have come to Congress 3 times in the past 8 years to ask for legislation to fulfill the promise our country made in the 15th amendment 95 years ago, the promise of the ballot.

Three times since 1956, the Congress has responded. Three times, it has adopted the alternative of litigation, of seeking solutions in our judicial system. But three times since 1956, we have seen that alternative tarnished by evasion, obstruction, delay, and disrespect.

The alternative, in short, has already been tried and found wanting. "The time of justice," the President said on Monday "has now come."

II. DENIALS OF THE PRESENT

The discouraging figures I have cited do not represent lack of will by any administration in administering the voting rights laws. These laws have been administered by four Attorneys General serving under three Presidents and representing both parties.

Nor do these figures represent any lack of energy, ability, or dedication by the lawyers of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice. I believe I have never, whether in government, in private practice, or in the academic world, seen any attorneys work so hard, so well and, often, under such difficult circumstances.

What these Negro voting figures do represent is the inadequacy of the judicial process to deal effectively and expeditiously with a problem so deep seated and so complex.

My predecessors have, for a decade, given this committee example after example of how this registration process has been perverted to test not literacy, not ability, not understanding—but race. Like them, I could, today, give you numerous examples of such perversions.

I could cite numerous examples of the almost incredible amount of time our attorneys must devote to each of the 71 voting rights cases filed under the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964. It has become routine to spend as much a 6,000 man-hours alone only in analyzing the voting records in a single county—to say nothing of preparation for trial and the almost inevitable appeal.

I could cite numerous examples of how delay and evasion have made it necessary for us to gage judicial relief not in terms of months, but in terms of years. For the fact is that those who are determined to resist are able—even after apparent defeat in the courts—to devise whole new methods of discrimination. And often that means beginning the whole weary process all over again.

In short, I could cite example after example, but let me, at random, pick just one: Selma, Ala.

III. THE RIGHT TO VOTE IN DALLAS COUNTY, ALA.

The story of Negro voting rights in Dallas County, Ala., of which Selma is the seat, could—until February 4—be told in three words: intimidation, discouragement, and delay.

There has been blatant discrimination against Negroes seeking to vote in Dallas County at least since 1952. How blatant is evident from simple statistics.

In 1961, Dallas County had a voting age population of 29,515, of whom, 14,400 were white persons and 15,115 were Negroes. The number of whites registered to vote totaled 9,195—64 percent of the voting age total. The number of Negroes totaled 156—1.03 percent of the total.

Between 1954 and 1961, the number of Negroes registered had mushroomed; exactly 18 were registered in those 7 years.

If effective and prompt remedies were necessary in any county, they were necessary in Dallas County. And as a result, the first voting case filed in the Kennedy-Johnson administration was brought against Dallas County on April 13, 1961.

The case finally came to trial 13 months later. In an additional six months came the district court decision. The court decided that prior registrars had, in fact, discriminated against Negro applicants. But, the court concluded, the current board of registrars was not then discriminating and, therefore, refused to issue an injunction against discrimination by the registrars. We appealed.

On September 30, 1963, 2½ years after the suit was originally filed, the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit reversed the district court and ordered it to enter an injunction against discrimination.

Nevertheless, the Department also had urged the court of appeals to direct the registrars to judge Negro applicants by the same standards that had been applied to white applicants during the long period of discrimination—until the effects of past discrimination had been dissipated. The court of appeals recognized that this type of relief might be needed in some cases, but did not order it in this case.

Our experience has shown that such relief is essential to any meaningful improvement in Negro voter registration in areas where there have been previous patterns of discrimination. Thus, after 2½ years, the first round of litigation against discrimination in Selma ended, substantially in failure.

Two months later, Department personnel inspected and photographed voter registration records at the Dallas County courthouse. These records showed that the registrars were engaged in obvious discrimination. With a topheavy majority of whites already registered, the registrars had raised standards for applicants of both races. The percentage of rejections for both white and Negro applicants for registration had more than doubled since the original trial in May 1962.

The impact, of course, was greatest on the Negroes, of whom hardly any were registered. Eighty-nine percent of the Negro applicants had been rejected between May 1962 and November 1963.

Of the 445 Negro applications rejected, 175 had been filed by Negroes with at least 12 years of education, including 21 with 16 years and 1 with a master's degree.

In addition to directly discriminatory practices, the registrars also were using one of their most effective indirect methods—delay. For example, on 11 of the 14 registration days in October 1963, 60 or more persons waited in line to register, but the average number of persons allowed to fill out forms was 36. In previous years—when the applicants were predominantly white—up to 148 applications had been processed in a single day.

For Negroes to register in Dallas County was thus extremely difficult. In February 1964, it became virtually impossible. Then, all Alabama County Boards of Registrars, including the Dallas County Board in Selma, began using a new application form. This form included a complicated literacy and knowledge-of-government test.

Since registration is permanent in Alabama, the great majority of white voters in Selma and Dallas County, already registered under previous, easier standards, did not have to pass the test. But the great majority of voting-age Negroes, unregistered, now faced still another, still higher obstacle to voting.

Under the new test, the applicant had to demonstrate his ability to spell and understand by writing individual words from the dictation of the registrar. Applicants in Selma were required to spell such difficult and technical words as "emolument," "capitation," "impeachment," "apportionment," and "despotism." The Dallas County registrars also added a refinement not required by the terms of the State-prescribed form. Applicants were required to give a satisfactory interpretation of one of the excerpts of the Constitution printed on the form.

As the result, we decided to go back to court. In March 1964, we filed a motion in Federal court initiating a second full-scale law suit against discriminatory practices in the registration process in Dallas County.

It should be noted that in September 1964, pending trial of this second law suit, Alabama registrars, including those in Dallas County, began using a second, still more difficult test.

In October 1964, our reopened Dallas County case came on for trial. We proved that between May 1962, the date of the first trial, and August 1964, 795 Negroes had applied for registration but that only 93 were accepted. During the same period, 1,232 white persons applied for registration, of whom 945 were registered. Thus, less than 12 percent of the Negro applicants but more than 75 percent of the white applicants were accepted.

Finally, on February 4, 1965—nearly 4 years after we first brought suit—the district court entered its judgment. This time, the court substantially accepted our contentions and the relief requested by the Department was granted. Specifically, the court enjoined use of the complicated literacy and knowledge-of-government tests and entered orders designed to deal with the serious problem of delay.

Whether this most recent decree will be effective only time will tell. We hope and expect it will be. But the Negroes of Dallas County have good reason to be skeptical. After 4 years of litigation, only 383 Negroes are registered to vote in Dallas County today. The recent events in Selma are indeed demonstrations—demonstrations of the fact that, understandably, the Negroes of Dallas County are tired of waiting.

The story of Selma illustrates a good deal more than voting discrimination and litigating delay. It also illustrates another obstacle, sometimes more subtle, certainly more damaging. I am talking about fear.

The Department thus has filed four separate suits against intimidation of Negro registration applicants by Sheriff James Clark and other local officials.

The first of these filed alleged that the defendants had intimidated Negroes from attempting to register by physical violence, baseless arrests, and prosecutions of Negro registration workers.

We introduced proof that Sheriff Clark had deputies present at every civil rights mass meeting in Dallas County. They took notes and license tag numbers. They harassed, arrested, and assaulted young voter registration workers. The district court found, however, that the Government had "failed in its proof" and denied injunctive relief. This decision is presently pending on appeal.

We filed a second intimidation suit in November 1963. This suit alleged that the local grand jury sought to interfere with the operation of the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice—and thus intimidated potential Negro voters who looked to the Department for assistance and action.

The Department of Justice introduced substantial proof in support of these allegations at the hearing, but the district court rejected this evidence and found that the grand jury had acted in good faith. This decision is also pending on appeal.

Our third Dallas County intimidation suit, also filed in November 1963, illustrates still a different level of harassment and fear. The defendants in this case, now awaiting trial, are the Dallas County Citizens' Council and its officers.

The suit alleges that they have adopted and sought to execute a program to frustrate court voting orders and to intimidate Negroes so they will not attend voter registration rallies.

We filed a startlingly overt example of this bigoted program together with our complaint. It was a full-page advertisement in the Selma Times-Journal on June 9, 1963, sponsored by the citizens' council. It was headed: "Ask Yourself This Important Question: What Have I Personally Done To Maintain Segregation?" And the text said, in part "Is it worth $4 to you to prevent sit-ins, mob marches, and wholesale Negro voter registration efforts in Selma?"

The fourth intimidation suit again was against Sheriff Clark and other local officials. It arose from events relating to voter registration and desegregation of places of public accommodation in Selma last summer. The case was tried before a three-judge district court in December 1964, and has not yet been decided.

At the trial, the Department introduced proof showing that the defendants had prosecuted, convicted, and punished Negroes discriminatorily and had issued and enforced injunctions preventing Negroes from organizing and discussing their grievances. Proof was also introduced to show that the defendants used unreasonable force against Negroes who exercised their rights and had failed to provide Negroes with ordinary police protection.

Let me be quick to point out that such intimidation is hardly limited to Dallas County; on this aspect as in others, Selma is merely a symbol. In Rankin County, Miss., three young Negro registration applicants were beaten in the registrar's office by the sheriff and his deputy. In our consequent suit, we were unable to secure relief even on appeal. The court ruled that the assault was not the result of bigotry, but of the deputy sheriff's vexation over crowded conditions in the registration office.

In Wilcox County, Ala., a Negro insurance agent became the first of his race to apply for registration in several years. Within weeks, 28 different landowners ordered him to stay off their property when he came to collect insurance premiums. To keep his job, the man had to accept a transfer and live away from his family, in a different county.

Again, we had to appeal. Today, 2 years later, the appeal is still pending.

There has been case after case of similar intimidation—beatings, arrests, lost jobs, lost credit, and other forms of pressure against Negroes who attempt to take the revolutionary step of registering to vote. And, despite our most vigorous efforts in the courts, there has been case after case of slow or ineffective relief.

We can draw only one conclusion from such instances. We can draw only one conclusion from the story of Selma. The 15th amendment expressly commanded that the right to vote should not be denied or abridged because of race. It was ratified 95 years ago. Yet, we are still forced to vindicate that right anew, in suit after suit, in county after county.

What is necessary—what is essential—is a new approach, an approach which goes beyond the tortuous, often ineffective pace of litigation. What is required is a systematic, automatic method to deal with discriminatory tests, with discriminatory testers, and with discriminatory threats.

The bill President Johnson has now sent to Congress, the bill about which he spoke so eloquently to you Monday, presents us with such a method. It would not only, like past statutes, demonstrate our good intentions. It would allows us to translate those intentions into ballots.

IV. THE PROPOSED VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

This bill applies to every kind of election, Federal, State, and local, including primaries. It is designed to deal with the two principal means of frustrating the 15th amendment: The use of onerous, vague, unfair tests and devices enacted for the purpose of disenfranchising Negroes, and the discriminatory administration of these and other kinds of registration requirements.

The bill accomplishes its objectives, first, by outlawing the use of these tests under certain circumstances, and second, by providing for registration by Federal officials where necessary to insure the fair administration of the registration system.

The tests and devices with which the bill deals include the usual literacy, understanding and interpretation tests that are easily susceptible to manipulation, as well as a variety of other repressive schemes. Experience demonstrates that the coincidence of such schemes and low electoral registration or participation is usually the result of racial discrimination in the administration of the election process. Hence, section 3(a) of the bill provides for a determination by the Attorney General whether any State, or a county separately considered, has on November 1, 1964, maintained a test or device as a qualification to vote.

In addition, the Director of the Census determines whether, in the States or counties where the Attorney General ascertains that tests or devices have been used, less than 50 percent of the residents of voting age were registered on November 1, 1964, or less than 50 percent of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964.

The bill provides that whenever positive determinations have been made by the Attorney General and the Director of the Census as to a State, or separately as to any county not located in such a State, no person shall be denied the right to vote in any election in such jurisdiction because of his failure to comply with a test or device. I shall present at the end of my discussion of the bill the information we have as to the areas to be affected by these determinations.

The prohibition against tests may be ended in an affected area after it has been free of racial discrimination in the election process for 10 years, as found, upon its petition, by a three-judge court in the District of Columbia. This finding will also terminate the examiner procedure provided for in the bill.

However, the Court may not make such a finding as to any State or separate county for 10 years after the entry of a final judgment, whether entered before or after passage of the bill, determining that denials of the right to vote by reason of race or color have occurred anywhere within such jurisdiction.

Because it is now beyond the question that recalcitrance and intransigence on the part of State and local officials can defeat the operation of most unequivocal civil rights legislation, the bill, in section 4, provides that the Attorney General may cause the appointment of examiners by the Civil Service Commission to carry out registration functions in any county where tests have been suspended by determinations of the Attorney General and the Director of the Census.

This result follows when the Attorney General certifies either that he has received meritorious complaints in writing from 20 or more residents of the county alleging denial of the right to vote by reason of race or color, or that, in his judgment, the appointment of registrars is necessary to enforce the guarantees of the 15th amendment.

After the certification by the Attorney General, the Commission is required to appoint as many examiners as necessary to examine applicants in such county concerning their qualifications to vote. Any person found qualified to vote is to be placed on a list of eligible voters for transmittal to the appropriate local election officials.

Any person whose name appears on the list must be allowed to vote in any subsequent election until such officials are notified that he has been removed from the list as the result of a successful challenge, a failure to vote for 3 consecutive years, or some other legal ground for loss of eligibility to vote.

The bill provides a procedure for the challenge of persons listed by the examiners, including a hearing by an independent hearing officer and judicial review. A challenged person would be allowed to vote pending final action on the challenge.

The times, places, and procedures for application and listing, and for removal from the eligibility list, are to be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission. The Commission, after consultation with the Attorney General, will instruct examiners as to the qualifications applicants must possess. The principal qualifications will be age, citizenship, and residence, and obviously will not include those suspended by the operation of section 3.

If the State imposes a poll tax as a qualification for voting, the Federal examiner is to accept payment and remit it to the appropriate State official. State requirements for payment of cumulative poll taxes for previous years would not be recognized.

Civil injunctive remedies and criminal penalties are specified for violation of various provisions of the bill. Among these provisions is one requiring that no person, whether a State official or otherwise, shall fail or refuse to permit a person whose name appears on the examiner's list to vote, or refuse to count his ballot, or intimidate, threaten, or coerce a person for voting or attempting to vote under the act.

An individual who violates this or other prohibitions of the bill may be fined up to $5,000 or imprisoned up to 5 years, or both.

It should be noted also that a person harmed by such acts of intimidation by State officials may also sue for damages under 42 U.S.C. 1983, a statute which was enacted in 1871. That statute provides for private civil suits against State officers who subject persons to the deprivations of any rights, privileges, and immunities secured by the Constitution and laws of the United States. Private individuals who act in concert with State officers could also be sued for damages under that statute, *Baldwin* v. *Morgan*, 251 F. 2d 780 (C.A. 5, 1958).

The litigated cases amply demonstrate the inadequacies of present statutes prohibiting voter intimidation. Under present law, voter intimidation is only punishable as a misdemeanor, unless a conspiracy is involved. But perhaps the most serious inadequacy results from the practice of some district courts to require the Government to carry a very onerous burden of proof of "purpose." Since many types of intimidation, particularly economic intimidation, involve subtle forms of pressure, this treatment of the purpose requirement has rendered the statute largely ineffective.

In our view, section 7 of the bill, which prohibits intimidation of persons voting or attempting to vote under the bill represents a substantial improvement over 42 U.S.C. 1971(b). Violation of this section would be a felony and could result in the imposition of severe penalties which should prove a substantial deterrent to intimidation.

And under the language of section 7, no subjective "purpose" need be shown, in either civil or criminal proceedings, in order to prove intimidation under the proposed bill. Rather, defendants would be deemed to intend the natural consequences of their acts. This represents a deliberate and, in my judgment, constructive departure from the language and construction of 42 U.S.C. 1971(b).

The bill provides that a person on an eligibility list may allege to an examiner within 24 hours after closing of the polls in an election that he was not permitted to vote, or that his vote was not counted. The examiner, if he believes the allegation well founded, would notify the U.S. attorney, who may apply to the district court for an order enjoining certification of the results of the election.

The Court would be required to issue such an order pending a hearing. If it finds the charge to be true, the Court would provide for the casting or counting of ballots and require their inclusion in the total vote before any candidate may be deemed elected.

The examiner procedure would be terminated in any county whenever the Attorney General notifies the Civil Service Commission that all persons listed have been placed on the county's registration rolls and that there is no longer reasonable cause to believe that persons will be denied the right to vote in such county on account of race or color.

The bill also contains a provision dealing with the problem of attempts by States within its scope to change present voting qualifications. No State or county for which determinations have been made under section 3(a) will be able to enforce any law imposing qualifications or procedures for voting different from those in force on November 1, 1964, until it obtains a declaratory judgment in the District Court for the District of Columbia that such qualifications or procedures will not have the effect of denying or abridging rights guaranteed by the 15th amendment.

I turn now to the information we have regarding the impact of section 3(a). Tests and devices would—according to our best present information—be prohibited in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, and Alaska, 34 counties in North Carolina, and one county in Arizona. Elsewhere, the tests and devices would remain valid, and similarly, the registration system would remain exclusively in the control of State officials.

The premise of section 3(a), as I have said, is that the coincidence of low electoral participation and the use of tests and devices results from racial discrimination in the administration of the tests and devices. That this premise is generally valid is demonstrated by the fact that of the six States in which tests and devices would be banned statewide by section 3(a), voting discrimination has unquestionably been widespread in all but South Carolina and Virginia, and other forms of racial discrimination, suggestive of voting discrimination, are general in both of those States.

The latter suggestion applies as well to North Carolina, where 34 counties are reached by section 3(a) and where, indeed, in at least one instance a Federal court has acted to correct registration practices which impeded Negro registration.

In view of the premise for section 3(a), Congress may give sufficient territorial scope to the section to provide a workable and objective system for the enforcement of the 15th amendment where it is being violated. Those jurisdictions placed within its scope which have not engaged in such violations—the States and counties affected by the formula in which it may be doubted that racial discrimination has been practiced—need only demonstrate in court that they are guiltless in order to lift the ban of section 3(a) from their registration systems.

That is, section 3(a) in reality reaches on a long-term basis only those areas where racial discrimination in voting in fact exists.

V. THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE BILL

I have shown why this legislation is necessary and have explained how it would work. It remains to determine whether it is constitutional. The answer is clear: the proposal is constitutional.

Far from impinging on constitutional rights—in purpose and effect, it implements the explicit command of the 15th amendment that "the right * * * to vote shall not be denied or abridged * * * by any State on account of race [or] color." The means chosen to achieve that end are appropriate, indeed, necessary. Nothing more is required.

Let me pursue the matter a little. This is not a case where the Congress would be invoking some "inherent," but unexpressed, power. The Constitution itself expressly says, with respect to the 15th article of amendment: "The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation" (amendment 15, sec. 2).

Here, then, we draw on one of the powers expressly delegated by the people and by the States to the National Legislature. In this instance, it is the power to eradicate color discrimination affecting the right to vote. Accordingly, as Chief Justice Marshall said in *Gibbons* v. *Ogden*, 9 Wheat 1, 196, with respect to another express power—the power to regulate interstate commerce—"[t]his power, like all others vested in Congress, is complete in itself, may be exercised to its utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations, other than are prescribed in the Constitution."

That was the constitutional rule in 1824 when those words were first spoken by Chief Justice Marshall. It remains the constitutional rule today; those same words were repeated by Mr. Justice Clark for a unanimous Court just recently in sustaining the public accommodation provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. See *Atlanta Motel* v. *United States*, 379 U.S. 241, 255.

This is not a case where the subject matter was exclusively reserved to another branch of Government—to the executive or to the courts. The 15th amendment left no doubt about the propriety of legislative action. And, of course, both immediately after the passage of the 15th amendment, and more recently, the Congress has acted to implement the right. See the very comprehensive act of May 31, 1870, 16 Stat. 140, and the voting provisions of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964.

Some of the early laws were voided as too broad and others were later repealed. But the Supreme Court has never voided a statute limited to enforcement of the 15th amendment's prohibition against discrimination in voting. On the contrary, in the old cases of *United States* v. *Reese,* 92 U.S. 214, 218, and *James* v. *Bowman,* 190 U.S. 127, 138-139, the Supreme Court, while invalidating certain statutory provisions, expressly pointed to the power of Congress to protect the right to:

"* * * exemption from discrimination in the exercise of the elective franchise on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. This, under the express provisions of the second section of the amendment, Congress may enforce by 'appropriate legislation.'"

And with respect to congressional elections, shortly after the adoption of the 15th amendment, the Court sustained a system of Federal supervisors for registration and voting not dissimilar to the system proposed here. See *Ex parte Siebold,* 100 U.S. 371; *United States* v. *Gale,* 109 U.S. 65. Constitutional assaults on the more recent legislation have been uniformly rejected. See *United States* v. *Raines,* 362 U.S. 17 (1957 act); *United States* v. *Thomas,* 362 U.S. 58 (same); *Hannah* v. *Larche,* 363 U.S. 420 (Civil Rights Commission rules under 1957 act); *Alabama* v. *United States,* 371 U.S. 37 (1960 act); *United States* v. *Mississippi,* No. 73, this term, decided March 8, 1965 (same); *Louisiana* v. *United States,* No. 67, this term, decided March 8, 1965 (same).

This legislation has only one aim—to effectuate at long last the promise of the 15th amendment—that there shall be no discrimination on account of race or color with respect to the right to vote. That is the only purpose of the proposed bill. It is, therefore, truly legislation "designed to enforce" the amendment within the meaning of section 2. To meet the test of constitutionality, it remains only to demonstrate that the means suggested are appropriate.

The relevant constitutional rule, again, was established once and for all by Chief Justice Marshall. Speaking for the Court in *McCullough* v. *Maryland,* 4 Wheat. 316, 421, he said:

"Let the end be legitimate, let it be within the scope of the Constitution, and all means which are appropriate, which are plainly adapted to that end, which are not prohibited, but consistent with the letter and spirit of the Constitution, are constitutional."

The same rule applies to the powers conferred by the amendments to the Constitution. In the case of *Ex parte Virginia,* 100 U.S. 339, 345-346, speaking of the 14th, 15th, and 16th amendments, the Court said:

"Whatever legislation is appropriate, that is, adapted to carry out the objects the amendments have in view, whatever tends to enforce submission to the prohibitions they contain, and to secure to all persons the enjoyment of perfect equality of civil rights and the equal protection of the laws against State denial or invasion, if not prohibited, is brought within the domain of congressional power."

See also, *Everard's Breweries* v. *Day,* 265 U.S. 545, 558-559, applying the same standard to the enforcement section of the prohibition (18th) amendment.

That is really the end of the matter. The means chosen are certainly not "prohibited" by the Constitution (as I shall show in a moment), and they are—as I have already outlined—"appropriate" and "plainly adapted" to the end of eliminating, in large part, racial discrimination in voting. It does not matter, constitutionally, that the same result might be achieved in some other way. That has been settled since the beginning and was expressly reaffirmed very recently in the cases upholding the Civil Rights Act of 1964. See *Atlanta Motel* v. *United States,* 379 U.S. 241, 261.

All workable legislation tends to set up categories—inevitably so. I have explained the premise for the classification made and, with some possible exceptions, as I have said, the facts support the hypothesis. But the exceptional case is provided for in section 3(c) of the bill which I have already discussed. Given a valid factual premise—as we have here—it is for Congress to set the boundaries. That is essentially a legislative function which the courts do not and cannot quibble about. Cf. *Boynton* v. *Virginia,* 364 U.S. 454; *Currin* v. *Wallace,* 306 U.S. 1; *United States* v. *Darby,* 312 U.S. 100, 121. See also, *Purity Extract Co.* v. *Lynch,* 226 U.S. 192.

The President submits the present proposal only because he deems it imperative to deal in this way with the invidious discrimination that persists despite determined efforts to eradicate the evil by other means. It is only after long experience with lesser means and a discouraging record of obstruction and delay that we resort to more far-reaching solutions.

The Constitution, however, does not even require this much forbearance. When there is clear legislative power to act, the remedy chosen need not be absolutely necessary; it is enough if it be "appropriate." And I am certain that you all recall that the Supreme Court—in sustaining the finding of the 88th Congress that racial discrimination by a local restaurant serving a substantial amount of out-of-State food adversely affects interstate commerce—made it clear that so long as there is a "rational basis" for the congressional finding, the finding itself need not be formally embodied in the statute. *Katzenbach* v. *McClung,* 379 U.S. 294, 303-305.

I turn now to the contention often heard that, whatever the power of Congress under the enforcement clause of the 15th amendment in other respects, it can never be used to infringe on the rights of the States to fix qualifications for voting, at least for non-Federal elections. The short answer to this argument was given most emphatically by the late Mr. Justice Frankfurter, speaking for the Court in *Gomillion* v. *Lightfoot,* 364 U.S. 339, 347, a 15th amendment case:

"When a State exercises power wholly within the domain of State interest, it is insulated from Federal judicial review. But such insulation is not carried over when State power is used as an instrument for circumventing a federally protected right."

The constitutional rule is clear: So long as State laws or practices erecting voting qualifications for non-Federal elections do not run afoul of the 14th or 15th amendments, they stand undisturbed. But when State power is abused—as it plainly is in the areas affected by the present bill—there is no magic in the words "voting qualification."

The "grandfather clauses" of Oklahoma and Maryland were, of course, voting qualifications. Yet they had to bow before the 15th amendment. *Guinn* v. *United States,* 238 U.S. 347; *Myers* v. *Anderson,* 238 U.S. 368. Nor are only the most obvious devices reached. As the Court said in *Lane* v. *Wilson,* 307 U.S. 268, 275: "The Amendment nullifies sophisticated as well as simple-minded modes of discrimination."

Nor do literacy tests and similar requirements enjoy special immunity. To be sure, in *Lassiter* v. *Northampton Election Board,* 360 U.S. 45, the Court found no fault with a literacy requirement, as such, but it added: "Of course a literacy test, fair on its face, may be employed to perpetuate that discrimination which the 15th amendment was designed to uproot." Id., at 53. See, also, *Gray* v. *Sanders,* 372 U.S. 368, 379.

Indeed, as the opinion in Lassiter noted, the Court had earlier affirmed a decision annulling Alabama's literacy test on the ground that it was "merely a device to make racial discrimination easy." 360 U.S. at 53. See *Davis* v. *Schnell,* 336 U.S. 933, affirming 81 F. Supp. 872. And, only the other day, the Supreme Court voided one of Louisiana's literacy tests. *Louisiana* v. *United States,* No. 67, this term, decided March 8, 1965. See, also, *United States* v. *Mississippi, supra.*

Thus, it is clear that the Constitution will not allow racially discriminatory voting practices to stand. But it is even clearer, as we have seen, that the Constitution invites Congress not merely to stand by and watch the courts invalidate State practices but to take a positive role by outlawing the use of any practices utilized to deny rights under the 15th amendment.

This bill accepts that invitation.

One may, I suppose, grant the constitutionality of the remedy proposed in this bill, but, nevertheless, oppose it on the ground that it places the ballot in the hands of the illiterate. On this theory, the remedy for existing discrimination would be to guarantee the fair administration of literacy tests rather than to abolish them. I suggest that this alternative is unrealistic.

In fact, the majority of the States—at least thirty—find it possible to conduct their elections without any literacy tests whatever. There is no evidence that the quality of government in these States falls below that of those States which impose—or purport to impose—such a requirement.

Whether there is really a valid basis for the use of literacy tests is, therefore, subject to legitimate question. But it is not for this reason that the proposed legislation seeks to abolish them in certain places.

Rather, we seek to abolish these tests because they have been used in those places as a device to discriminate against Negroes.

Highly literate Negroes have been refused the right to vote. Totally illiterate whites have been allowed to vote. In short, in these areas the literacy test is demonstrably unrelated to intellectual capability. It is directly related only to one factor: color.

It is not this bill—it is not the Federal Government—which undertakes to eliminate literacy as a requirement for voting in such States or counties. It is the States or counties themselves which have done so, and done so repeatedly, by registering illiterate or barely literate white persons.

The aim of this bill is, rather, to insure that the areas which have done so apply the same standard to all persons equally, to Negroes now just as to whites in the past.

It might be suggested that this kind of discrimination could be ended in a different way—by wiping the registration books clean and requiring all voters, white or Negro, to register anew under a uniformly applied literacy test.

For two reasons such an approach would not solve, but would compound our present problems.

To subject every citizen to a higher literacy standard would, inevitably, work unfairly against Negroes—Negroes who have for decades been systematically denied educational opportunity available to the white population.

Such an impact would produce a real constitutional irony—that years of violation of the 14th amendment right of equal protection through equal education would become the excuse for continuing violation of the 15th amendment right to vote.

The result would be something chillingly close to the mechanism once confidently described by the late Senator Theodore Bilbo of Mississippi:

"The poll tax won't keep 'em from voting. What keeps 'em from voting is section 244 of the constitution of 1890, that Senator George wrote. It says that a man to register must be able to read and explain the constitution when read to him. And then Senator George wrote a constitution that damn few white men and no niggers at all can explain." (See

Collier's magazine, July 6, 1946; Hearings Before the Special Committee to Investigate Senatorial Campaign Expenditures, 1946, p. 205.)

The second argument against such a reregistration "solution" is even more basic—and even more ironic. Even the fair administration of a new literacy test in the relevant areas would, inevitably, disenfranchise not only many Negroes, but also thousands of illiterate whites who have voted throughout their adult lives.

Our concern today is to enlarge representative government. It is to solicit the consent of all the governed. It is to increase the number of citizens who can vote. What kind of consummate irony would it be for us to act on that concern—and in so doing to reduce the ballot, to diminish democracy?

It would not only be ironic; it would be intolerable.

VI. CONCLUSION

I have come before you to describe the proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965, the need for this act, and some of the questions raised about it, and to do so in considerable detail. I will be happy to respond to your questions as fully as possible. I am prepared certainly, to remain here this morning, this afternoon, this evening, tomorrow, and every day that the committee feels my presence would be helpful. This legislation must be enacted.

However detailed my presentation may be and however extensive your consideration may be, there remains, nevertheless, a single, uncomplicated, and underlying truth: This legislation is not only necessary, but it is necessary now.

Democracy delayed is democracy denied.

The Need for Public Facilities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 24, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of the House an excellent address by my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota, the Honorable JOHN A. BLATNIK, that was delivered before the 34th annual meeting of the National Housing Conference.

Mr. BLATNIK expressed eloquently the need for more and improved public facilities.

I am pleased to note that my constituency, the 39th District of New York, was well represented at the meeting. Representing Buffalo, N.Y., were Robert K. Sipprell, executive director of the Buffalo Municipal Housing Authority, and Mrs. Sipprell; Richard Lang Miller, executive director of the Greater Buffalo Development Foundation; and George F. Rand, Jr., vice president of the Marine Trust Co. of Western New York and Mrs. Rand.

Following are the remarks of Mr. BLATNIK:

ADDRESS OF HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

The keynote of this administration was sounded by President Johnson in his state of the Union message when he said, "Our basic task is threefold: to keep our economy growing; to open for all Americans the opportunity that is now enjoyed by most Americans; and to improve the quality of life for all." These are the goals which your great organization has fought to achieve over the years. Those have been years of substantial progress and I am confident that the legislation which will be enacted by the 89th Congress will mark a major milestone in our unending efforts to build a better life for all of our citizens.

Those who hoped or feared that President Johnson's Great Society would be just an empty title have received their answer in a steady flow of Presidential messages and legislative recommendations sent to the Congress. While no one has yet discovered the secret of pleasing everyone, the administration's program as it is being unfolded in these messages shows a determination to accomplish as much as possible and a bold willingness to experiment in search of further answers.

I am particularly pleased with the President's emphasis on "quality of life." All too often we rate our national accomplishments just on the basis of quantity. Perhaps this is necessarily so because the economics which underlie our policies is not well equipped to measure quality. But I think the distinction is a very real one and one which should be made. I also believe that this emphasis has struck a responsive chord with the public and in the future our programs will be evaluated even more critically. This new dimension in our public policies has already been reflected in the staid pages of Fortune magazine. This month's issue carries an article entitled "The Half-Finished Society," which points out the disparity between our accomplishments in satisfying private consumption in contrast to public investment.

The article states, "Our immaculate homes are crowded with gleaming appliances and our refrigerators are piled high with convenience foods. But beyond our doorsteps lies a shamefully neglected social and physical environment."

This is strong language indeed and I think we can all agree that the author has taken a pardonable license with the facts—not all of our families enjoy gleaming new appliances on the one hand, and our towns and cities are increasingly successful in preserving and rebuilding attractive neighborhoods. Still there is much basic truth in the statement and it hits squarely at a problem which, in my opinion, calls for direct Federal assistance. In spite of the vigorous efforts of State and local governments, we have fallen far behind the need for public facilities. Everyone recognizes, at least in principle, that adequate water and sewer facilities, streets and sidewalks, public buildings, and so forth, are essential for sound community development. But too many people balk at the unpleasant burden of actually paying for them. In their minds they seem to divorce the benefits of public investment from the cost of paying for them and applaud the one and vote against the other. Admittedly taxes are still high, particularly at the local level. But we are paying a high and rising price for our neglect of public investment in terms of inadequate or antiquated or overcrowded facilities which carry their own cost, ranging from nuisances to outright threats to health and welfare.

This shortage of essential community facilities has a very direct bearing on our housing problems, not only by its effect on the public environment but by its effect on the volume and cost of housing production. The Housing Yearbook published by the National Housing Conference very perceptively includes up-to-date estimates of the minimum sales prices at which new homes are being offered in a number of cities. This gives an indication of how successfully private builders are serving families of modest income. I believe their new figures will be disquieting.

The Bureau of the Census has just released figures on sales prices of new homes and the median price in December was $20,600, a jump of $1,900 over the same month of the previous year. The Census Bureau release does not go into further detail but the economists at the National Association of Home Builders attribute this largely to the rapid rise in the price of land. And going one step further, this inflation of land value reflects largely the shortage of community facilities, particularly water and sewer lines, but including the whole range of necessary public investment that goes into a community. The shortage is not one of land itself but the fact that before land can be developed there must be a substantial investment in local public works. In most places builders say that they cannot build low-cost housing because they do not have the inexpensive land on which to put it. The administration's housing bill just submitted to the Congress includes some provisions which recognize this problem, such as the proposal for $100 million in grants next year for water and sewer facilities in growth areas. In my opinion, the basic solution to taking the inflation out of land values is a much higher level of Federal assistance for the whole range of essential facilities.

The fact is that the Federal Government has largely preempted the most fruitful source of revenue through the income tax. Moreover, this is a tax which yields an increase in the neighborhood of $5 billion a year without raising the rates as a result of normal economic growth. The overwhelming share of these taxes comes from our towns and cities and their needs should be given high priority in the use of them. Local government is faced not only with limited sources of tax revenues but with rapidly growing responsibilities. In his testimony before the Joint Economic Committee, John Kenneth Galbraith stated, "The great economic anachronism of our time is that economic growth gives the Federal Government the revenues while, along with population increases, it gives the States and especially the cities the problems." Just as one example of what Professor Galbraith was speaking of is the fact that in the past 5 years school enrollment has jumped by 5 million. Other responsibilities of local government have also increased sharply reflecting not only population growth but the ever-rising standards demanded by our citizens.

We have already begun a piecemeal approach to this problem with Federal grants for selected purposes. I believe it is fair to state that all of these programs of grant assistance for local public works have been successful, efficient, and strongly supported by mayors, unions, and other liberal public interest groups. The water pollution control program has amply proven its value and will become ever more useful under pending legislation. Personally, I believe that both the overall dollar level of the program as well as the 30-percent grant ratio should be raised. But, in any event, we have made real progress since that day almost exactly 5 years ago when our efforts to improve and expand the program met with a Presidential veto which we could not override. Another program which made an important contribution toward overcoming the backlog of needed community facilities was the accelerated public works program. More than 7,000 projects around the country were aided with those grants. But the fact remains that we need not only larger Federal investment for this purpose but also a continuing program so that communities can confidently plan their construction program in advance with assurance that a margin of Federal assistance will be available when they are prepared to get underway.

A program of substantial Federal grants for a wide range of community facilities is also important to another essential aspect of President Johnson's Great Society—the achievement of full employment and the maintenance of a high level of economic growth. Rapid economic improvement over the past 4 years has substantially reduced unemployment but there are still millions of men and women who cannot find jobs or who can find only part-time work. While praising our achievements we must not lose sight of the bitter problems that confront these unemployed workers and their families. This is a waste which we cannot tolerate either on humanitarian or economic grounds.

While we have sustained a remarkably long period of economic expansion extending to 4 years now, only a person with a very short memory can deceive himself that we have ruled out the possibility of recession. Much of our recent economic growth represents taking up the slack of the preceding years when the economy fluctuated between recessions and inadequate recoveries. Already many economists and business analysts are expressing concern over the trend of the economy later this year. In a growing nation it is not enough to maintain a level of production, even a high one. We must continue to expand to provide jobs for our growing labor force. This problem is compounded by the much-discussed postwar baby boom. Looking back 18 years we see a jump in the birth rate from 2.7 to 3.7 million. This means that over the next year or so the number of new jobseekers entering the labor force will increase sharply and be greater than we have experienced in decades.

President Johnson has cited unemployment of young, inexperienced workers as one of the greatest domestic problems facing us today. We cannot take it for granted that the economy will automatically produce the millions of jobs needed to provide for this influx of young workers and at the same time take care of those who will lose their present jobs through automation and shifts in demand and at the same time reduce unemployment to an acceptable minimum within a reasonable time.

The time to make our economic plans to assure that jobs will be available is now, and an important part of that planning should be a program to extend needed Federal assistance to overcome our multibillion-dollar backlog of community facilities and meet the requirements for future growth. To accomplish this I have introduced a bill, H.R. 2170, which would authorize 50-percent grants for nearly the whole range of local public works in towns and cities of all sizes, with the further provision that in depressed areas these grants could go up to 75 percent. The bill would authorize a continuing program of $2 billion a year for these grants.

This bill would meet several pressing problems. It would make a meaningful increase in the volume of construction of needed community facilities, thereby reducing the backlog which we must face up to sooner or later. It would help to make our cities better places in which to live and work. It would ease the financial crisis facing local government and help them to meet the whole range of their responsibilities. By opening up new land it would reduce the inflationary pressure on lot prices directly, reducing housing costs and making land available at costs consistent with lower priced housing. It would channel some of our tremendous national wealth to the neglected field of public investment and help redress the present imbalance between the private and public sectors. And finally, it will make an important and continuing contribution to sound and adequate growth of output, employment, and incomes.

This bill has already received the endorsement of the AFL–CIO and the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association which has always played a leading role in community development. The need for Federal grants for this purpose is recognized by both of the mayors' organizations and has their support. And the principle of grants for community facilities has the support of the National Association of Home Builders who recognize the limitation on their markets imposed by the shortage of land ready for development and the present high level of land costs.

This bill is among my highest legislative priorities and I plan to hold hearings on it later this spring. I believe the need for such a program is urgent and I am hopeful that we will be able to enact it into law.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rabbi Chaim U. Lipschitz, director, Mesivta Talmudical Seminary, Brooklyn, N.Y., offered the following prayer:

With great love Thou lovest us, O Lord, our God, and with Thy great compassion Thou hast abundance of pity on us. O our Father, our King, for the sake of our fathers who trusted in Thee, to whom Thou didst teach the statutes of life, so shalt Thou favor and teach us. O Father, who art a merciful Father, have compassion on us we beseech Thee, and grant our hearts understanding, that we may comprehend, hear, learn, teach, observe, perform, and establish all the learning of Thy law, with love; and enlighten our eyes in Thy law, and our hearts to love and fear Thy name, that we may not be abashed forevermore; for in Thy holy, great, and tremendous name we trust. We shall be glad, and rejoice in Thy salvation, when Thou bringest us with peace from the four corners of the earth and conductest us with uprightness, for Thou art the Almighty who workest salvation. Our God, and God of our Fathers, be Thou with the mouths of the deputies of this worthy Senate of the United States who stand in Thy presence. Teach them what they will say, instruct them what they will speak, answer their requests, and cause them to know how to glorify Thee. May they walk in the light of Thy countenance; may they bend their knees unto Thee, and with their mouths bless Thy people. O bless them altogether with the blessings of Thy mouth. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 22, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 22, 1965,

The Secretary of the Senate, on March 24, 1965, received a message from the House of Representatives, which announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 1496) to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of zinc from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, informed the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 3, Public Law 86–380, the Speaker had appointed Mr. FOUNTAIN, of North Carolina; Mr. KEOGH, of New York; and Mrs. DWYER, of New Jersey, as members of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 5688. An act relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia;

H.R. 5721. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 6453. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 1496) to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc, lead, and copper from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both, and it was signed by the Vice President.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 5688. An act relating to crime and criminal procedure in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 5721. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1939, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 6453. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request by Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF RECEPTION FOR ASTRONAUTS TO BE HELD TOMORROW AFTERNOON IN HOUSE CAUCUS ROOM

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the Speaker of the House and Representative Miller, chairman of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, have asked me to announce to the Senate that there will be a joint reception for the astronauts to be held in the House caucus room at 5 o'clock tomorrow afternoon. This reception will be open only to Members of the Senate and their immediate families. It will not be open to staff members, because there are 435 Members of the House in addition to Senators. I desired to make the announcement today so that Members of the Senate and their families may be able to attend the reception.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary and the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the Committee on Public Works were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business to act upon a nomination to be reported by the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd].

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Finance:

Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

One hundred and seventy postmaster nominations.

SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, it gives me a great deal of pleasure to report that the Senate Finance Committee has approved the nomination of a distinguished fellow Virginian, Henry H. Fowler, to be Secretary of the Treasury. There was no dissent as the committee voted 16 to 0 in favor of this appointment.

Members of the Senate will recall that Mr. Fowler served with distinction as Under Secretary of the Treasury from 1961 until he resigned in April of last year to resume his practice of law.

Mr. Fowler, who is a native of Roanoke, Va., began public service in 1939 as an attorney with the Tennessee Valley Authority. His broad background also includes service here on the Hill as counsel for the old Subcommittee on Education and Labor, work with several of the regulatory and independent agencies and with the Foreign Economic Administration.

In addition, he has served as Administrator of the National Production Authority, as Administrator of the Defense Production Administration, and as Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. He has also been a member of the National Security Council.

Because of this long and brilliant career of public service, Mr. Fowler brings to his new post an understanding of the workings of government, both legislatively and administratively, as well as domestically and internationally, which few men possess. These traits should serve him well as our Nation's top fiscal officer.

My long and warm personal relationship with him convinces me that Mr. Fowler will perform his new tasks with the same dedication with which he approached and accomplished his earlier public assignments. I am certain he will add luster to the great office for which he has been nominated.

The President has made a fine choice. I commend Henry H. Fowler to the Senate and I urge that his nomination be confirmed.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the Record at this point a brief biographical sketch of Mr. Fowler's background.

There being no objection, the sketch was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Henry H. Fowler—Designated for Appointment as Secretary of the Treasury

Born: Roanoke, Va., September 5, 1908.

Home: Alexandria, Va.

Education: Jefferson High School, Roanoke, Va.; Roanoke College, 1925–29; Yale University Law School, 1929–33.

Marital status: Married.

Experience: 1933–34: Private law practice; Covington, Burling & Rublee, Washington, D.C.; 1934–39: Attorney, Tennessee Valley Authority; 1939: Assistant General Counsel, Tennessee Valley Authority; 1939–40: Chief Counsel, Senate Subcommittee on Education and Labor; 1941: Special Counsel, Federal Power Commission; 1941–44: Assistant General Counsel, Office of Production Management and War Production Board; 1944: Economic Adviser, U.S. Mission for Economic Affairs, London; 1945: Special Assistant to Administrator, Foreign Economic Administration; 1946–51: Private law practice as senior member of Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington; 1951: Deputy Administrator, National Production Authority; 1952: Administrator, National Production Authority; 1952–53: Administrator, Defense Production Administration; 1952–53: Director, Office of Defense Mobilization; 1952–53: Member of National Security Council: 1953–February 1961: Private law practice with Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington; February 1961–April 1964: Under Secretary of the Treasury; April 1964—: Present position of senior partner in law firm of Fowler, Leva, Hawes & Symington.

Awards: Distinguished Alumni Award of Tau Kappa Alpha (1958); Distinguished Alumni Award of Roanoke College (1958); Alexander Hamilton Award (1964).

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the nomination.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. As one of the minority members of the Senate Committee on Finance, I wish to join in the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Virginia in regard to the nominee for Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fowler. We on our side of the aisle were unanimous in approving the nomination, and we shall deeply appreciate Mr. Fowler's services.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. METCALF. I concur in the tributes that have been paid to the newly appointed Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Henry H. Fowler. I know that Mr. Fowler, an outstanding and patriotic citizen, will ably serve our country as Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I should like to add to the encomiums being directed to the new Secretary of the Treasury. It was my privilege and pleasure to serve with Mr. Fowler in handling a number of revenue bills during the previous Congress. I know of no man in Government who has higher ideals and higher standards than has Mr. Henry H. Fowler. It is my judgment that he is a great credit to the State of Virginia, from which he hails, and to the legal profession. He has served ably in Government. As one of those who has worked with him, I repeat what I stated previously in the RECORD when Mr. Fowler was nominated. I am extremely proud to support his nomination.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. As a member of the Senate Committee on Finance, I should like to say that Mr. Fowler looks like a Secretary of the Treasury, he acts like one, he talks like one, and he conducts himself like one. I am more than proud to concur in the observations of my distinguished friend from Virginia and to add my salute to those that have already been tendered on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I thank the distinguished Senator from Illinois.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I concur fully with all the remarks that have been made in relation to the appointment of Mr. Fowler by the President and the confirmation of that nomination by the Senate. I do not believe that a finer choice could have been made. The Treasury Department and the United States are extremely fortunate to have a man of Mr. Fowler's caliber at the helm.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DODD. One of the really outstanding features of President Johnson's administration has been the great care with which appointive positions in the executive branch are filled.

To date President Johnson has adhered to a refreshing and sensible policy of bringing into the higher echelons men who have proven themselves able and dedicated in lower level positions.

The latest and perhaps the best example of this is the nomination of Henry H. Fowler to be Secretary of the Treasury.

It was only after careful consideration and after many possibilities had been screened that Henry Fowler was selected for this sensitive Cabinet office.

But now that he has been recommended to us, I and many of my colleagues, as well as the great majority of the experts in the fields of fiscal and monetary policy, feel that all along Henry Fowler was the logical choice, indeed the only one.

Henry Fowler and I were classmates at Yale Law School and we have maintained our friendship since that time, for over 30 years which is more years than either of us cares to remember.

He has lived up fully to the promise he showed as a young law student.

However, I am not speaking in support of Henry Fowler because he is an old friend. I am making this statement because I know he is one of the most able, most experienced, and most dedicated public servants in Washington.

He is best known to the public for the excellent work he did during the 4 years of the Kennedy-Johnson administration, in helping to guide through the two most important tax reduction measures in our history.

The 1962 depreciation changes and the 1964 general tax reduction that are on the statute books have accounted to a great extent for the high level of economic prosperity we enjoy today.

Few men have had Henry Fowler's opportunity to see such concrete results stem from their efforts so quickly, and this is a fitting tribute to his skill and hard work.

I have no hesitation in stating that in my opinion Henry Fowler will be one of the great Secretaries of the Treasury.

It will not be an easy task for anyone to succeed Douglas Dillon, who has done an excellent job as Secretary, but Henry Fowler is the man who can do it.

I urge prompt and unanimous approval of his nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

The nomination was confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. SMATHERS subsequently said: Mr. President, I believe that in nominating Henry H. Fowler as Secretary of the Treasury, President Johnson has selected the finest and ablest man to be found anywhere for this type and character of job.

I have known Joe Fowler for many years. He is a man of the highest integrity. His knowledge of domestic and international problems is extraordinarily wide and diversified.

Further, I am proud to claim Joe Fowler—a native of Roanoke, Va.—as a fellow southerner, but one who is first, last, and always the servant of the Nation and the servant of the entire people.

President Johnson has said, "He is one of the ablest and most dedicated men I know." President Johnson's judgment in this respect is shared by virtually all of us who have been privileged to work with and to know Joe Fowler.

He has already given long and honorable service to his country. President Johnson is the fourth President under whom he has served.

Joe Fowler can truly be called a self-made man. Time and time again he has set aside his own personal interests in order to answer the call of duty and serve his Government. The son of a locomotive engineer, he holds a doctor of jurisprudence degree from the law school of Yale University.

After a brief stint in private practice, he joined the legal staff of the Tennessee Valley Authority. Later, he served admirably as counsel for the Education and Labor Committee. In 1941, he was appointed Special Counsel to the Federal Power Commission. During World War II, he served in a number of mobilization and foreign policy posts. In each assignment his reputation grew as a man who could get things done.

After the war, Joe Fowler returned to private law practice—but not for long. In 1951 his Nation beckoned him again. During the Korean war he held top mobilization posts. In 1952 he was appointed Administrator of the Defense Production Authority. Later in the same year he became Director of the Office of Defense Mobilization. With the end of hostilities in Korea, or, I should say, at the cessation of hostilities in Korea, Joe Fowler once again returned to his first love, the private practice of law. However, in 1961, President Kennedy tapped him to be Douglas Dillon's right-hand man in handling the awesome crises of economic recession and balance of payments.

Working hand in hand, Dillon and Fowler began the drive to balance our international payments and played a vital role in formulating new economic policies. The measure of their success is the longest and strongest peacetime economic expansion this Nation has ever experienced.

The cornerstone of the success of our economic policy was the Revenue Act of 1964, the biggest income tax cut in our history. No one played a more important part in the passage of that bill than Joe Fowler. As Dillon's chief of staff, he ran the administration side of the bill with unerring judgment and flawless precision. But that was not all. He used his soft-spoken charm, his keen mind, and his tremendous powers of persuasion to do all in his power to speed this bill through Congress.

During that time, Joe Fowler was working 18 or 20 hours a day, 7 days a week. I know that to be a fact, because on many occasions, as many as 7 days a week, we would confer with him with respect to this particular bill.

It is the measure of this man's character that in all the thousands of personal contacts he made with members of both Houses and both parties during that time, I never heard his name mentioned except in the warmest and most complimentary terms.

He has a finely developed sense of where the responsibilities of the executive branch leave off and the prerogatives of Congress begin.

Almost every single one of us knows Joe Fowler, and many of us know him well. I doubt that the President could have found a man who enjoys as great respect from both business and labor, Republicans and Democrats, and from every section of the country, as does Joe Fowler. He will further President Johnson's goal of national unity as few men can.

When Joe Fowler resigned as Under Secretary a year ago, he let it be known at that time that because of obligations to his family he was returning to private practice for financial reasons, and because of his long desire to conclude his work in the Federal Government. He had no intention of returning to Government service. But when President Johnson told Joe Fowler his Nation needed him again, like a good soldier he set aside his personal wishes and his private interests, and returned to harness.

When I talked with him on the telephone, shortly after he had been notified of his appointment by the President, he told me he believed that the President of the United States was not only Commander in Chief of the Nation's defense, but also Commander in Chief of the Nation's welfare, and whenever the Commander in Chief called on him, he felt he had a responsibility to respond. That is what he has done.

That is public service of the highest order. The investment banker Sidney Weinberg called him a great patriot. I concur, and I am sure that President Johnson—who has known him for 30 years—also concurs.

I believe that he will once again serve his Nation and the American people with high distinction and great honor, and will live up to the highest and noblest traditions of public service in the future as he has in the past.

I am indeed happy to join those Senators who have lauded Mr. Fowler today.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request by Mr. **Mansfield**, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Amendment of Paragraph (a) of Act of March 4, 1913, as Amended by Act of January 31, 1931 (16 U.S.C. 502)

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend paragraph (a) of the act of March 4, 1913, as amended by the act of January 31, 1931 (16 U.S.C. 502) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Statistical Supplement, Stockpile Report

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statistical supplement, stockpile report, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Military Construction Contracts Awarded Without Formal Advertising

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on military construction contracts awarded without formal advertising, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Proposed Disposal of Certain Abaca From the National Stockpile

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the disposal without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 47 million pounds of abaca from the national stockpile (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Borrowing Authority

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Planning, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on borrowing authority, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report of Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System

A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Proposed Legislation Relating to Interstate Commerce Commission

A letter from the Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting drafts of proposed legislation, as follows:

A bill to amend section 1(14)(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes;

A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission, after investigation and hearing, to require the establishment of through routes and joint rates between motor common carriers of property, and between such carriers and common carriers by rail, express, and water, and for other purposes;

A bill to amend section 204(a)(3) of the Interstate Commerce Act respecting motor carrier safety regulations applicable to private carriers of property; and

A bill to establish a uniform system of time standards and measurement for the United States and to require the observance of such time standards for all purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Title 18, United States Code

A letter from the Acting Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend title 18, United States Code, with respect to the protection of certain officers or employees of the United States, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Supplementary Report of Highway Cost Allocation Study

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplementary report of the highway cost allocation study (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Department of Housing and Urban Development Act

A letter from the Director, Bureau of the Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on the waste of funds in construction of the Shahabad Depot in Iran under the military assistance program by the Department of Defense (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary compensation to Washington, D.C., area banks for cashing Government checks, Treasury Department, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs resulting from an inflexible policy of donating flour instead of wheat to voluntary relief agencies for distribution abroad under the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, Department of Agriculture, Agency for International Development, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary interest costs incurred by the Government because of excess progress payments to contractors, Post Office Department, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary transportation expenditures for privately owned vehicles transshipped between U.S. ports, Department of Defense, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on loss in revenues to the Government resulting from undercharges for rents and utilities to employees occupying Government-owned quarters, Department of the Interior, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on additional costs resulting from unnecessary procurement of a diesel engine for the military 5-ton truck, Department of the Army, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary dollar costs incurred in financing purchases of commodities produced in Brazil, Agency for International Development, Department of State, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the noncompetitive procurement of traveling wave electron tubes, Department of the Navy, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reports on Refund of Excess Oil Royalties

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the refund of excess oil royalties paid by the Continental Oil Co., during the period from March 1956 through June 1961 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the refund of excess oil royalties paid by the Union Producing Co., during the period from April 1960 through April 1964 (with accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Contractual Actions Taken To Facilitate the National Defense

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contractual actions taken to facilitate the national defense, for the calendar year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report of National Institute of Arts and Letters

A letter from the Assistant Secretary-Treasurer, the National Institute of Arts and Letters, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Institute, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF LADIES OF THE GRAND ARMY OF THE REPUBLIC

A letter from the District of Columbia representative, Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Silver Spring, Md., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the year 1964 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF BOYS' CLUBS OF AMERICA

A letter from the president, and national director, Boys' Clubs of America, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a financial statement of that organization, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF 18 U.S.C. 1114, RELATING TO ASSAULTS AND HOMICIDES

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend 18 U.S.C. 1114, relating to assaults and homicides, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 35, TITLE 18, UNITED STATES CODE, RELATING TO FALSE INFORMATION

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 35 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to the imparting or conveying of false information (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INCREASE OF LIMITATION ON EMERGENCY RELIEF FOR THE REPAIR OR RECONSTRUCTION OF HIGHWAYS

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to increase the limitation on emergency relief for the repair or reconstruction of highways under section 125 of title 23, United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF NATIONAL SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

A letter from the Secretary, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, for the year ended March 1, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

PETITION TO VACATE CONFIRMATION CIRCUIT JUDGESHIP IN FORMA PAUPERIS

A letter from the deputy clerk, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, Washington, D.C., enclosing, for the information of the Senate, a petition to vacate confirmation of circuit judgeship in forma pauperis, by one Maurice N. Whittington (with an accompanying paper); ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the General Assembly of the State of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"H.R. 128–212

"Resolution requesting Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and for other purposes

"Be it resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That this body respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to article X of the amendments to the U.S. Constitution by adding thereto the following:

" 'Among the rights reserved to the States shall be the right to sole and exclusive jurisdiction of public school systems in the separate States, and all rights, privileges and immunities of citizens of the separate States, as they relate to public school education, shall be determined solely by State courts. This Constitution shall not be construed in a manner to empower the President of the United States, the Congress or the Federal Judiciary to disparage or nullify this inherent right in the States.'

"Be it further resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the clerk of the house of representatives to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to all presiding officers of the legislatures of the several States, to the Governors of the several States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"In senate, read and adopted March 4, 1965.

"GEORGE D. STEWART,
"Secretary.

"In house, read and adopted February 16, 1965.

"GLENN W. ELLARD,
"Clerk."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 6

"Resolution requesting Congress to approve the Alaska Farmland Development Act

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

"Whereas Congressman RALPH J. RIVERS of Alaska has introduced in the 89th Congress H.R. 1136 which seeks to provide a program of agricultural land development in the State of Alaska; and

"Whereas the policy and purpose of H.R. 1136 is set forth in the proposal as follows:

" 'SEC. 2. DECLARATION OF POLICY AND PURPOSE.—In order to provide more adequately for the sound, efficient, and orderly development and utilization of agricultural land resources of the State of Alaska; to facilitate and assure the establishment of family-type farms as economic units of production and to encourage, promote, and strengthen this form of farm enterprise; to provide for Alaska's future economic growth by promoting a sound and stable agriculture, thereby insuring a more adequate and dependable food supply for the present and future population of the State; and in recognition of the strategic position of the State of Alaska in relation to national security and defense, it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, and the purpose of this act shall be, to provide for a program of agricultural land development in the State of Alaska which will assist agricultural producers to develop and utilize more effectively the productive capacity of the State's land resources for agricultural purposes': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of Alaska respectfully and earnestly requests Congress to enact H.R. 1136 this year; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be directed to the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate; the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable ALLEN J. ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry; the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture; the Honorable Orville S. Freeman, Secretary, Department of Agriculture; and the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT and the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"MIKE GRAVEL,
"Speaker of the House.

"——— ———,
"President of the Senate.

"WILLIAM A. EGAN,
"Governor of Alaska."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Commerce:

"HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 23

"Resolution relating to the creation of a National Oceanographic Council

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

"Whereas the economy of Alaska is in great measure dependent upon the natural resources of the ocean; and

"Whereas seafood is an important food source for Alaskans; and

"Whereas Alaska commerce is vitally dependent upon maritime transportation; and

"Whereas the importance of the oceans to the welfare of all citizens of the United States, as well as of Alaskans, was emphasized by the introduction, by Senator MAGNUSON, of Washington, of S. 944 which provides for the coordination of all Federal activities regarding oceanography by a proposed National Oceanographic Council; and

"Whereas expanded and efficiently coordinated national programs as envisoned by S. 944 would be of particular benefit to the people of Alaska: Be it

"Resolved, That the enactment of S. 944 by the Congress is respectfully urged by the Fourth State Legislature of Alaska; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate; the Honorable JOHN C. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman, Senate Commerce Committee; the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman, House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; and the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT and the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress."

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 40

"Resolution urging Congress to approve pending legislation to extend the term during which the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make fisheries loans under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

"Whereas a bill, S. 998, now pending in Congress would amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 so as to extend until 1975 the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to make loans for financing and refinancing the operations of commercial fishing vessels and the maintenance, repair, and replacement of these vessels and their gear; and

"Whereas the loan program available under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 will expire on June 30, 1965, unless S. 998 is enacted; and

"Whereas U.S. fishermen are in constant competition with foreign fishermen at fishing grounds where American vessels traditionally and, until recently, almost exclusively operated; and

"Whereas U.S. fishermen now have to compete with foreign fishermen for the U.S. market; and

"Whereas private financing on reasonable terms is not available to many fishermen because of the hazardous nature of the industry; and

"Whereas the U.S. fishing fleets are antiquated and unable to compete successfully with the more modernized foreign fishing fleets; and

"Whereas the fisheries loan program is essential for modernizing and upgrading U.S. fishing vessels in order that they may stay in operation and compete successfully against foreign fisherman: Be it

"*Resolved,* That Congress is respectfully urged to pass, and the President of the United States is respectfully urged to approve S. 998; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States and the President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable Warren G. Magnuson, chairman, Senate Commerce Committee; the Honorable Oren Harris, chairman, House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee; the Honorable Carl Hayden, chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee; the Honorable George H. Mahon, chairman, House Appropriations Committee; and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, U.S. Representative, Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"——— ———,
"President of the Senate.
"Mike Gravel,
"Speaker of the House.
"William A. Egan,
"Governor of Alaska."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

"Senate Joint Resolution 4

"Resolution petitioning Congress to propose an amendment to the Federal Constitution to preserve the bicameral aspect of State legislature

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

"Whereas the U.S. Supreme Court has held that both houses of a bicameral State legislature must be apportioned on the basis of population; and

"Whereas this holding now makes it impossible to apportion representation to reflect the diverse and conflicting interests within a State; and

"Whereas the decision of the Court will enable heavily populated areas to dominate State legislatures and will lead to a virtual loss of representation in all other areas of the State; and

"Whereas in order to prevent this complete disruption of the legislative process in the States, and to preserve for each State the right to balance its representation in the manner best suited to its individual situation, it is essential that the Constitution of the United States be amended to enable the State to apportion at least one house of its legislature on factors other than population: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the Legislature of the State of Alaska respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment in accordance with article V of the Constitution of the United States, adding to the Constitution an article allowing any State having a bicameral legislature to apportion the membership to one house of its legislature on factors other than population; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable Carl Hayden, President pro tempore of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, U.S. Representative, Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress; and the presiding officers of each house of the legislatures of the several States.

"——— ———,
"President of the Senate.
"Mike Gravel,
"Speaker of the House.
"William A. Egan,
"Governor of Alaska."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 27

"Resolution relating to the need to dredge the Kobuk River

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

"Whereas the Kennecott Copper Corp. is developing a large operation on the Kobuk River; and

"Whereas this mining operation will be of great benefit to the economy of the area and to Alaska; and

"Whereas it is imperative that this Nation's supplies of mineral resources, now and in the future, be augmented by the large deposits located in remote parts of Alaska such as the Kobuk area; and

"Whereas the river is at present only intermittently navigable during a short open season; and

"Whereas an adequate channel can be developed from the mouth of the river at the Melbourn Channel to a point 500 yards beyond the mouth of the Ambler River by dredging a relatively few river bars: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the Legislature of the State of Alaska urges that the Corps of Engineers be directed to dredge the channel at the earliest opportunity; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable John T. Connor, Secretary of Commerce; the Honorable Cyrus R. Vance, Secretary of the Army; Lt. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army; Col. Clare D. Farley, district engineer, U.S. Corps of Engineers; the Chairman of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress Advisory Committee; the Honorable Pat McNamara, chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee; the Honorable George H. Fallon, chairman of the House Public Works Committee; the Honorable Carl Hayden, chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee; the Honorable George H. Mahon, chairman of the House Appropriations Committee; and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, U.S. Representative, Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"——— ———,
"President of the Senate.

"Passed by the house March 11, 1965.

"Mike Gravel,
"Speaker of the House.
"William A. Egan,
"Governor of Alaska."

"House Joint Resolution 37

"Resolution relating to the construction of a breakwater at Kodiak

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

"Whereas the fishing industry at Kodiak and vicinity has grown in the past decade from a seasonal to an around-the-year multimillion-dollar operation; and

"Whereas hundreds of vessels from various ports on the west coast of the United States participate in this abundant fishing; and

"Whereas the growth projections for the fishing industry at Kodiak indicate accelerated growth and expansion during the next decade and thereafter; and

"Whereas the studies made for the present boat harbor at Kodiak did not and could not have anticipated such phenomenal growth and expansion; and

"Whereas the existing boat harbor can afford protection for only a portion of the fishing fleet operating in the Kodiak area; and during the severe storms that are common to this area, many vessels are unable to find suitable protection and are severely damaged; and

"Whereas the extensive amount of damage to fishing vessels in the Kodiak area has greatly increased marine insurance rates and caused economic hardship to the fishing fleets and great financial loss to marine underwriters: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Congress of the United States is respectfully urged to provide funds to enable the Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army, to begin construction of a breakwater at Kodiak; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House; the Honorable Carl Hayden, President pro tempore of the Senate; the Honorable Pat McNamara, chairman, Senate Public Works Committee; the Honorable George H. Fallon, chairman, House Public Works Committee; Lt. Gen. Walter K. Wilson, Chief of Engineers, U.S. Army; Col. Clare D. Farley, district engineer, Corps of Engineers, Alaska; and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

"Mike Gravel,
"Speaker of the House.
"——— ———,
"President of the Senate.
"William A. Egan,
"Governor of Alaska."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Oklahoma; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Concurrent Resolution 514

"Concurrent resolution expressing opposition of the Oklahoma State Legislature to the proposed decrease in appropriations to the Soil Conservation Service and to the proposed revolving fund

"Whereas the Bureau of the Budget has proposed that the Soil Conservation Service appropriation for assisting locally organized and locally managed soil and water conservation districts be reduced by $20 million and that soil and water conservation districts and cooperating farmers, ranchers, and other landowners pay the Federal Government up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance furnished in the design, layout and installation of planned soil and water conservation practices on their lands; and

"Whereas if adopted this proposal would seriously slow down the soil and water conservation effort on the privately owned lands of this Nation and would result in an estimated decrease of 40 to 50 percent in the annual application of conservation practices; and

"Whereas this proposal is adopted would reverse a policy of 30 years standing in which the Federal Government has provided technical assistance through the Soil Conservation Service without charge to farmers, ranchers, and other landowners to install farmwide conservation programs on their property; and

"Whereas the entire area of the State of Oklahoma is located within the boundaries of 87 soil and water conservation districts; and

"Whereas the State of Oklahoma has annually appropriated funds to local soil and water conservation districts to form a working partnership with the Soil Conservation service to install soil and water conservation practices on privately owned land; and

"Whereas if adopted this proposal would break faith with the State Legislature of Oklahoma who has been providing State funds for soil and water conservation with the understanding that the local-State-Federal team effort would be maintained as a team effort for the universal good of the Nation and all its people; and

"Whereas the adoption of the revolving fund proposal would treat landowners unfairly by requiring them to assume still more of the town and city responsibility for soil and water conservation when they are at present contributing more than one-half the total cost of soil and water conservation practices in Oklahoma; and

"Whereas the revolving fund proposal if adopted would severely retard water conservation and development in America at a time when such development is of necessity to all the people of this country; and

"Whereas assessments proposed by the revolving fund will fall primarily on family farms and small operators and will discourage and seriously curtail the application of soil and water conservation measures so vital to the strength and welfare of the State of Oklahoma and the Nation; and

"Whereas this proposed additional burden added to the cost of farmers and ranchers already in a depressed economical condition would greatly impair the ability of those people to participate in the conservation, development and utilization of our soil and water resources; and

"Whereas the supervisors and cooperators of the 87 soil and water conservation districts in the State of Oklahoma are of the opinion that the proposed cut in appropriations to the Soil Conservation Service for technical assistance and the proposed revolving fund are not practical nor in the best interests of the State of Oklahoma and of this country: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 30th session of the Oklahoma State Legislature (the Senate concurring therein)*,

"SECTION 1. The Oklahoma State Legislature hereby records its complete opposition to the proposal of the Bureau of the Budget to reduce the appropriations to the Soil Conservation Service in the amount of $20 million, and to the proposed revolving fund whereby landowners and operators would be required to pay for up to 50 percent of the cost of the technical assistance for soil and water conservation practices.

"SEC. 2. The Oklahoma State Legislature respectfully requests that the Congress of the United States continue the long established policy of providing technical assistance to soil and water conservation districts and that sufficient funds for such assistance be provided to meet the increased demand by the landowners of the State of Oklahoma and of the Nation.

"SEC. 3. That a duly attested copy of this resolution be transmitted by the speaker of the Oklahoma House of Representatives to President Lyndon B. Johnson; Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY; Senator ALLEN J. ELLENDER, chairman, Senate Agriculture Committee; Senator CARL HAYDEN, chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee; Congressman HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman, House Agriculture Committee; Congressman GEORGE M. MAHON, chairman, House Appropriations Committee; Kermit Gordon, Director, Bureau of the Budget; and to each member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation.

"Adopted by the House of Representatives the 9th day of March, 1965.

"J. D. MCCARTY,
"Speaker of the House of Representatives.

"Adopted by the senate the 4th day of March 1965.

"GLEN HAM,
"Acting President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Finance:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 26

"To the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:

"We, your memorialists, the house of representatives and the senate of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas during a recent emergency in sugar supplies and prices caused by the failure of foreign sugar interests to ship sugar to the United States in the quantities required by American consumers at reasonable prices, the Government of the United States appealed to American sugarbeet producers and beet sugar processors to produce additional quantities of this vital and necessary food without limits; and

"Whereas the sugarbeet farmers and beet sugar processing industry of the State of Washington and other States responded wholeheartedly to the appeal of their Government and, investing millions of dollars in expanded facilities, produced huge additional quantities of sugar; and

"Whereas such additional production was a significant and material factor in halting the rising tide of prices and therefore redounded to the benefit of American consumers; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States, in its last previous session, failed to amend the Federal Sugar Act to provide the authority for marketing the additional beet sugar produced at the specific request of the Government of the United States; and

"Whereas as a direct consequence, the beet sugar industry now is forced to carry huge inventories of additional sugar which cannot be sold under the present law; and

"Whereas the carrying of such inventories is a burden both to the sugarbeet farmers who have been forced to accept a 10 percent reduction in their sugar beet acreage, and to the beet sugar processing industry of the State of Washington and other States: Now, therefore,

"We, your memorialists, the house of representatives and the senate of the State of Washington, do hereby respectfully petition the Congress of the United States of America and, more particularly, the Representatives of the State of Washington in the U.S. Senate and in the U.S. House of Representatives, to take the steps necessary so to amend the Federal Sugar Act that the beet sugar industry of the United States will be authorized to market the additional quantities of sugar produced at the request of the Government of the United States; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of state to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Passed the house March 11, 1965.

"ROBERT M. SCHAEFER,
"Speaker of the House.

"Passed the senate March 11, 1965.

"JOHN A. CHERBERG,
"President of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 9

"Joint resolution relative to the Auburn Dam and Folsom South Canal

"Whereas there has been submitted to the Congress of the United States legislation to authorize construction by the Secretary of the Interior, as part of the Central Valley project, of both the Auburn Dam on the American River and the Folsom South Canal; and

"Whereas this proposed development is known to be economically justified, and has been determined to be engineeringly feasible; and

"Whereas the multiple-purpose project of the Auburn Dam will furnish additional water which can be used in the American River watershed, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region, the San Joaquin Valley, and areas to the south, and will produce additional electric power which would be available for pumping water to areas of deficiency in California's statewide water program; and

"Whereas the devastating storms and floods occurring recently have again endangered many lives and done great damage to public and private property in the American River watershed and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region; and

"Whereas construction of the Auburn Dam would greatly reduce the danger of future loss of life and injury to persons and property caused by floods in these areas; and

"Whereas the Folsom South Canal will serve to bring urgently needed supplemental water supplies to areas in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region and the northern San Joaquin Valley area, which supplies would be made available from storage of water in Folsom Reservoir, as supplemented by the proposed Auburn Dam and Reservoir; and

"Whereas both the proposed Auburn Dam and the Folsom South Canal are part of the California water plan and would complement the State's efforts to meet the water requirements of California's rapidly expanding population: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly)*, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to enact into law, at the earliest possible time, the necessary legislation to authorize the construction of the Auburn Dam and the Folsom South Canal, including authorization to include in such canal and related operating structures such additional works or capacity as the Secretary of Interior deems necessary and economically justified to provide for the future construction of the east side division of the Central Valley project, provided that the incremental cost of providing additional works or capacity in the Folsom South Canal to serve the east side division of the Central Valley project shall be assigned to deferred use for repayment from Central Valley project revenues; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate is hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

"Joint memorial to the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled

"We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 37th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

"Whereas it is known that one of the most pressing problems facing all areas of the United States and in fact all areas of the world today is the securing of the maximum beneficial use of land and water resources for the further progress of our people, of our State, and of our Nation, not only to realize the most from our present resources for the immediate problems of today, but also to meet our future needs for for the long-range future; and

"Whereas the area of southwestern Idaho known as the Mountain Home Snake River plain area contains a large body of land which is both economically and engineeringly feasible for the development of a highly productive and economically desirable potential for the further development of the people of this area and of the Nation, and which would add greatly to the overall economy and assist in stabilizing the existing economy of this State and of the Nation, and would present many opportunities to stimuiate the economic growth of the State and of the Nation; and

"Whereas adjacent to this fine body of potential irrigated land there are adequate supplies of water in the Snake River which are now running off and unused in the State of Idaho to the detriment of the State and Nation's economy; and

"Whereas upstream developments have been demonstrated to be in the long-range interest for providing the best and most comprehensive plan of development for the utilization of the water and land potential of our river basins; and

"Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with local interests, has made engineering, water resource, and land classification studies, which studies have given conclusive evidence of the economic and engineering feasibility of a development of this area under a plan known as the Guffey plan of development; and

"Whereas the orderly continued investigation and ultimate construction and development of a water resource program for the irrigation of this potentially productive area of the State of Idaho will inure to the benefit of the State and of the Nation at large: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session (the Senate and House of Representatives concurring)*, That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to give early authorization to the construction of the Mountain Home division, Snake River project, Guffey plan of development; be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Department of the Interior, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

"W. E. DREVLOW,
"*President of the Senate.*
"PETE T. CENARRUSA,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"ARTHUR WILSON,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Senate joint resolution applying to the Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that membership in both houses of a bicameral state legislature must be apportioned according to population and has thus asserted Federal judicial authority over the basic structure of Government in the various States; and

"Whereas this rule denies to the people of the respective States the right to establish their legislatures upon the same pattern of representation deemed advantageous for the Congress of the United States and provided by the Federal Constitution; and

"Whereas this action of the Supreme Court goes so far as to restrict the ability of the citizens of the respective States to designate the manner in which they shall be represented in their respective legislatures thereby depriving the people of their right to determine how they shall be governed; and

"Whereas the implications of this action by the Supreme Court raise serious doubts as to the legality of the present form of the governing bodies of many subordinate units of government within the States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the General Assembly of Maryland*, That this legislature respectfully applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

" 'SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress'; be it further

"*Resolved*, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of the State of Maryland is directed to send duly attested copies of this resolution under the great seal of the State of Maryland to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and each Member of the Congress from the State of Maryland."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Whereas the citizens of the United States fought two World Wars to protect the freedom of all people; and

"Whereas an essential freedom of a democratic society is the right to vote; and

"Whereas the minority groups in Alabama have attempted to exercise this right; and

"Whereas these attempts have been thwarted by the use of force, violence and fear by the State government of Alabama; Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the State of Washington*, That we do respectfully urge that the Congress, the President of the United States and the Attorney General of the United States take immediate action to protect the minority groups in the State of Alabama in their attempt to exercise their right to vote and that an end be brought to the blatant abuse of police power by the State of Alabama which has lead to the recent violence and bloodshed in that State; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Clerk of the House of Representatives to the President of the United States, the Senators and Representatives from the State of Washington, to the Vice President, to the President of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and to the Attorney General of the United States.

"S. R. HOLCOMB,
"*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*"

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Arizona; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"SENATE MEMORIAL 1

"Memorial urging the Congress of the United States to direct the Veterans' Administration to provide additional facilities in Arizona for the care and hospitalization of qualified veterans

"Your memorialist respectfully represents: The State of Arizona, because of its excellent climate, has attracted many thousands of veterans who have become residents of the State. As a result of such residence, the Veterans' Administration facilities have been used to capacity and an urgent need exists for additional facilities; and

"The shortage of beds in veterans' hospitals within the State of Arizona has resulted in many veterans being accepted for treatment and subsequently they are transferred to facilities in other States where beds are available. However, such action retards recovery of a veteran who prefers to be hospitalized where his relatives and friends are part of the community. Moreover, such action is an unwarranted financial burden to relatives who, in order to be close to the hospitalized veteran, must change their residence.

"Wherefore, your memorialist, the Senate of the State of Arizona, prays:

"1. That the Congress of the United States give favorable consideration toward the expansion of veterans' facilities in Arizona in order that the ever-increasing number of veterans residing within the State of Arizona may obtain hospitalization within their own community.

"2. That by direction of the Congress the U.S. Veterans' Administration survey the needs of Arizona's veterans and thereby determine whether additional veterans' hospitals and facilities should be constructed or whether additions should be made to existing veterans' facilities.

"3. The secretary of state of Arizona is requested to transmit copies of this memorial to each member of the Arizona congressional delegation, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, the President of the U.S. Senate, and to the Administrator of the U.S. Veterans' Administration."

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE RESOLUTION 11

"A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Montana urging the Federal Government to construct the proposed multipurpose Glacier View Dam on the North Fork of the Flathead River with proper emphasis on flood control and also integrate the flood control and power generating capabilities of Spruce Park and Hungry Horse Dams giving persons and firms in Montana first priority for electric power resulting from development of water resources in the State.

"Whereas additional upstream multiple-purpose storage areas are needed to get full value from water resources of the Columbia River Basin; and

"Whereas the need for additional storage areas arises because the natural runoff pattern from the Columbia River Basin permits the effective use of only a small portion of the flow and because the runoff is in large part the result of melting snow occurring as concentrated floods during a period of 2 or 3 months each spring when peak flows are commonly 10 times those of the low-water season; and

"Whereas large portions of western Montana were devastated by floods during early 1964 and this damage underscores the urgent need for development of water resources which would provide flood control; and

"Whereas protection from these floods cannot be economically provided by dikes, levees or other protective measures, and

"Whereas storage of the water in large multipurpose dams is the most feasible means of catching the floodwaters and holding them for release after the flood peak has passed; and

"Whereas a project to be known as the Glacier View Dam has been proposed to be located on the Flathead River at mile 177 on the western boundary of Glacier National Park, 72 miles upstream from Flathead Lake and 41 miles below the international boundary; and

"Whereas in addition to flood control, Glacier View would also provide hydroelectric power and recreation benefits; and

"Whereas when the project was proposed almost 10 years ago the multipurpose benefits combined to give the project a favorable benefit-to-cost ratio of 1.84 to 1; and

"Whereas due to increased needs for flood control, additional demands for electric power and greater needs for recreational facilities, it is probable that the benefit-to-cost ratio of the proposed project would be even more favorable at the present time; and

"Whereas operation of Glacier View Dam, together with Hungry Horse Dam on the South Fork of the Flathead River, would completely control the floods that cause damage in the Flathead drainage area, and would greatly assist in the control of damaging floods throughout the Columbia River Basin; and

"Whereas construction of Glacier View Dam would not flood any communities, and private property affected would be nominal; and

"Whereas in addition to a more even distribution of power production throughout the year, the Glacier View project would also firm up power production of dams located downstream; and

"Whereas the reservoir created by the dam would inundate about 12,000 acres—only about 1 percent of the total area of Glacier National Park—and would not affect game animals in the Park to any appreciable extent but would enhance recreational use of what is now an area of limited use; and

"Whereas the act of August 22, 1914 (38 Stat. 699) establishing Federal jurisdiction over Glacier National Park provides that beneficial use of water resources has a higher priority than 'reservation of all timber—natural curiosities—and the protection of the animals'; and

"Whereas a logical part of the development of water resources in this area would include a tunnel from the reservoir to be created by Spruce Park Dam to the reservoir created by Hungry Horse Dam; and

"Whereas in addition to enhancing flood control, this diversion would increase production of electric power at Hungry Horse Dam by about one-third and provide for additional power production at existing and proposed plants downstream; and

"Whereas the rapidly increasing population of the Pacific Northwest and the Nation place upon this generation a special responsibility for the maximum utilization of all the great natural resources bestowed upon this Nation by divine providence; and

"Whereas the industrial development of Montana and the Pacific Northwest will be enhanced greatly by the large amounts of low-cost power which can be made available by full development of the proposed Glacier View Dam and also through integrating the development of Spruce Park and Hungry Horse Dams; and

"Whereas consumers within the State of Montana should have first priority in obtaining any electric power generated as a result of development of water resources in Montana; now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Montana:* That the Federal Government is urged to provide the necessary legislation to authorize construction of the proposed Glacier View Dam on the North Fork of the Flathead River in Montana and to authorize a sufficient amount of money for detailed planning and construction of Glacier View Dam; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Federal Government is urged to also provide the necessary legislation to authorize construction of a tunnel which would link the reservoir which will be created by Spruce Park Dam with that created by Hungry Horse Dam; be it further

"*Resolved,* That although maximum flood control should be the primary objective of water resource development in northwestern Montana, consumers within the State of Montana should have first priority in obtaining any electric power generated as a result of water resource development in Montana. The Federal Government is, therefore, strongly urged to make such a power reservation when new projects in Montana are authorized or existing projects expanded; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the chief clerk of the house is instructed to send copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the President of the Senate and Speaker of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress, to each member of the Montana congressional delegation, to the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of the Bureau of the Reclamation, to the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Army Engineers, and to the Director of the Budget."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 24

"*To the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled:*

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas in 1950 the Federal Government, on behalf of the Atomic Energy Commission, condemned the Wahluke Slope irrigation project, which constitutes approximately 36,000 acres of the best part of the land in the Columbia basin irrigation project in the State of Washington; and

"Whereas much of the land had been homesteaded by people who wanted to keep it for themselves and their families to develop as irrigated farms; and

"Whereas the land had great value for these citizens; and

"Whereas the Atomic Energy Commission has been successful in improving the safety factor in the area to such an extent that they are now in the process of making this land available for irrigation; and

"Whereas this means that eventually the Government may turn the land over to settlers of their choosing: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That we, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington do respectfully petition that the President and Congress direct that the land taken by the Government, or similar land, be returned to the original owners on repayment by them of the condemnation price paid to them by the Government; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, to the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Washington.

"ROBERT M. SCHAEFER,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"JOHN A. CHERBERG,
"*President of the Senate.*
"S. R. HOLCOMB,
"*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*"

A letter in the nature of a petition from the chief executive of the Government of the Ryukyu Islands, signed by Seiho Matsuoka, relating to preferential duties on the goods to be imported from the Ryukyu Islands; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the board of directors of the international affairs council of the Miami-Dade County Chamber of Commerce, Florida, relating to import duties imposed on Americans returning to the United States from abroad; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the board of supervisors, San Mateo County, Calif., relative to the need for a constitutional amendment on reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Chicago, Ill., CORE or the Congress of Racial Equality, signed by Charles Smith, chairman, relating to the protection of civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the city council of the city of Worcester, Mass., relating to civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Democratic Farmer-Labor Club of the first ward of the city of Minneapolis, protesting against the treatment of civil rights marchers in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 15

"Concurrent resolution, memorializing Congress to enact legislation and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to take necessary administrative action to provide for an increase in the disposal price of grain being sold to millers of cereal grains to 120 percent of the support price, and to work toward long-term barter contracts with the underfed nations of the world to purchase American grain

"Whereas the grain surplus in the United States has been reduced by more than 50 percent from 1960 to 1964; and

"Whereas the grain now stored under Government loans constitutes less than 1 year's domestic consumption; and

"Whereas increasing grain production to provide a minimal diet for the world's underfed will provide the foundation for a peaceful and stable world; and

"Whereas increasing grain production will also increase the economic prosperity of the Nation's farming people: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the House of Representatives of the 40th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring therein) do memorialize the Congress of the United States and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to consider the advisability of enacting legislation or taking necessary administrative action to increase the production of cereal grains, to increase the disposal price of grain now being sold to millers of cereal grain to 120 percent of the support price, and to work toward long-term barter contracts with the underfed nations of the world to purchase American grain: Be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of South Dakota to the secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member of the Congress from this State, and to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture.

"Lem Overpeck,
"Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.
"Niels P. Jensen,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"Charles Droz,
"Speaker of the House.
"Walter J. Matson,
"Chief Clerk."

"House Concurrent Resolution 16

"Concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose and kill the proposed revolving fund through which farmers and ranchers would make $20 million in payments to the Soil Conservation Service for technical assistance

"Whereas the proposed revolving fund if adopted would seriously slow down the soil and water conservation effort on privately owned lands in South Dakota and the Nation resulting in a 40- to 50-percent reduction in annual application of conservation practices and reduce the quality of practices applied; and

"Whereas State legislatures, county governments, soil and water conservation districts, organizations and individuals over a quarter of a century have been steadily building up their financial contributions to the soil and water conservation effort on privately owned lands. If adopted, this proposal would break faith with State and local governments, soil and water conservation districts, organizations and individuals; and

"Whereas adopting of the revolving fund proposal would be unfair to American landowners. American landowners would be charged for technical assistance which the Federal Government now provides free of charge to people of many foreign lands; and

"Whereas soil conservation, flood control and development of our soil and water resources contribute to the well-being of all the people because they depend upon our limited supplies of soil and water for their daily requirements of food and water that come from well-managed countryside; and

"Whereas adopting of the revolving fund proposal would have a damaging effect upon the conservation and development of the soil and water resources of South Dakota and America because the type of technical assistance now being provided by the Soil Conservation Service is not available anywhere else, even for hire, to provide complete technical assistance for natural resource planning and development, acre-by-acre, farm-by-farm, property-by-property on individual land holdings, watersheds and whole communities; and

"Whereas a revolving fund would increase total conservation cost. A collection system outside the present accepted tax structure would have to be devised. Most farmers and ranchers would need more financial assistance to pay for technical aid to continue conservation and development of soil and water resources: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the 40th Legislature of the State of South Dakota, the Senate concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States to oppose and kill the revolving fund being proposed by the Bureau of the Budget and restore other recommended budget cuts effecting progress in conservation and development of soil, water and other natural resources: Be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of South Dakota to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"Charles Droz,
"Speaker of the House.
"Walter J. Matson,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"Niels P. Jensen,
"Secretary of the Senate."
"Lem Overpeck,
"Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate."

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MUNDT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"House Concurrent Resolution 23

"Concurrent resolution requesting the U.S. Corps of Engineers to grant to owners of land adjacent to the Missouri River the exclusive right to lease take-land adjacent to his property, at a fair appraisal price established by the Corps of Engineers, based on the contingency that the landowner retain ownership of the adjacent land, and, if the ownership is terminated by a conveyance of land the right accrue to the subsequent landowner

"Whereas the U.S. Corps of Engineers in its negotiations with the original lessee of take-land along the Missouri River has adopted the policy of giving the original lessee exclusive long-term leases to said take-land with the right of renewal regardless of the fact of ownership interest in adjacent or contingent land; and

"Whereas said policy has adverse affects on subsequent landowners of adjacent lands by precluding them from any opportunity to lease adjacent take-land; and

"Whereas the policy of the Corps of Engineers of precluding adjacent landowners from having access to the waters of the Missouri River causes subsequent landowners undue physical and financial hardship: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 40th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), That the U.S. Corps of Engineers consider granting to each owner of land adjacent to the Missouri River the exclusive right to lease take-land adjacent to his property, at a fair appraisal price established by the Corps of Engineers, said lease to be based on the contingency that the landowner retain ownership of said adjacent land, and, if said lease be terminated by a conveyance of land, said right accrue to the subsequent landowner; and be it further

"Resolved, That in the event the adjacent landowner does not lease the take-land at the appraised value, the same right be then granted to the highest bidder subject to all conditions deemed necessary by the Corps of Engineers; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of the Army of the United States; to the Chief of the Corps of Engineers of the U.S. Army at Omaha, Nebr.; to the Honorable Karl E. Mundt, and the Honorable George McGovern, U.S. Senators from South Dakota; and to the Honorable E. Y. Berry and the Honorable Ben Reifel, Representatives in Congress from South Dakota.

"Attest:

"Charles Droz,
"Speaker of the House.
"Walter J. Matson,
"Chief Clerk of the House.
"Lem Overpeck,
"Lieutenant Governor,
"President of the Senate.
"Niels P. Jensen,
"Secretary of the Senate."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Concurrent Resolution 10

"A concurrent resolution memoralizing the Congress of the United States to direct the Area Redevelopment Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Mines and Office of Minerals Exploration of the Department of the Interior of the United States to undertake a study of the feasibility of establishing metallurgical research operations and to explore mineral resources in the Black Hills of South Dakota

"Whereas the Black Hills of South Dakota are abundant in precious minerals and nonferrous metals and that these natural resources should be mined and processed; and

"Whereas that during the early history of the State of South Dakota, a great interest was shown in mining and great wealth was produced as a result of taking ores from the ground; and

"Whereas the Black Hills of South Dakota is an area that needs a redeveloping and a rebirth of her once tremendous mining industry; and

"Whereas a study of the feasibility of establishing metallurgical research operations could result in a plant being constructed in the Black Hills of South Dakota creating job opportunity and industrial development; and

"Whereas valuable mineral resources are known to exist in the Black Hills of South Dakota, the extent and exact location of which could be determined by the Office of Minerals Exploration of the Department of the Interior of the United States; and

"Whereas it is anticipated that the results of such a study will be of great economic benefit to South Dakota and its people: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That the Congress of the United States be, and is, memorialized to direct the Area Redevelopment Administration of the United States Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Mines and Office of Minerals Exploration of the Department of the Interior of the United States to undertake a study of the feasibility of establishing metallurgical research operations and to explore mineral resources in the Black Hills of the State of South Dakota; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the Members of the congressional delegation from South Dakota, the Area Redevelopment Administration of the U.S. Department of Commerce, the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, the Bureau of Mines of the Department of Interior of the United States, the Office of Minerals Exploration of the Department of the Interior of the

United States, and to the Industrial Development Expansion Agency, Pierre, S. Dak.

"Adopted by the Senate March 1, 1965.

"Concurred in by the House of Representatives March 11, 1965.

"CHARLES DROZ,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"LEM OVERPECK,
"*President of the Senate.*

"Attest:
"NIELS P. JENSEN,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"Attest:
"WALTER J. MATSON,
"*Chief Clerk.*"

The **VICE PRESIDENT** laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, for myself and my distinguished senior colleague [Mr. MONRONEY], I send to the desk enrolled Senate Concurrent Resolution 26, a concurrent resolution adopted by the Oklahoma Legislature, in support of the enactment of legislation to establish an Ozarka regional development program, and, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. President, the Congress of the United States has passed, and the President has signed into law, legislation for the development of the Appalachia region. The President of the United States in his state of the Union message to the Congress and his messages on the budget and on agriculture indicated his support for the extension of the regional development idea to other areas of the Nation.

There is no area of America which has more abundant natural resources, greater natural beauty, and more undeveloped potential than does the Ozarka region of eastern Oklahoma, western Arkansas, and southern Missouri.

Due to the hard work and ingenuity of the hearty people of this region, great developmental progress is being made. But, Mr. President, as in the Appalachia region, if the chronic unemployment and the poverty-level family incomes of this region are to be corrected—and they must be corrected, unless we are willing to see these human and natural resources wasted—we cannot do so by county planning or State planning.

We must move now toward the regional planning and development of this entire area.

The Ozarka region is contiguous, homogeneous in terrain and resources and problems. The region is living under the common burden of past exploitation of its natural resources, depletion of its soil, and wasting of its water. It suffers from inadequate roads and highways. These problems cannot be met by private action alone, nor by local or State action alone, nor by the Federal Government alone. They must be met head-on and solved by the joint and cooperative effort of private and local, State and Federal action, which can only be accomplished through the congressional establishment of an Ozarka Regional Development Commission and the appropriation of funds for the necessary planning and study.

This need is made more acute by the imminent 1970 completion date of the Arkansas River navigation project, which will bring navigation from the Gulf of Mexico, through the heart of this region, to a point near Tulsa, Okla. If all of the potentialities for new private jobs, new industry, new tourism, and new general economic growth are to be realized, orderly planning under the auspices of an Ozarka Regional Development Commission is urgently required.

Therefore, Mr. President, I commend the Oklahoma legislature for its approval of this project. I commend the chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], and that committee for their interest. I commend the President of the United States, to whose staff member, Mr. Lee White, I have especially sent a copy of this resolution, for his support of the regional development concept.

I am glad to join with my distinguished colleagues from Arkansas and Missouri in urging the early approval of the Ozarka Regional Development Commission.

Further, I am most pleased to see that in the message of the President of the United States on ARA received in the Senate today, recognition is given to the needs of Oklahoma and Arkansas by name, that the extension of the regional planning concept is asked and an appropriation of $15 million is requested for additional regional planning commissions to be established. I especially commend the President of the United States for this portion of his message.

We in Oklahoma are ready to get underway in the more rapid development of the Ozarka region.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 26

Concurrent resolution extending the support of the Oklahoma Legislature to the Congress of the United States for the enactment of legislation for the Ozarka Regional Development Program; and directing distribution of this resolution to the appropriate United States officials

Whereas the Congress of the United States has established the policy of supporting economic development in sections of the country which fall behind the national average in per capita income and employment through the enactment of the Area Redevelopment Act and the Public Works Acceleration Act and its present consideration of the Appalachian Regional Development Bill; and

Whereas the President of the United States has, in his State of the Union address and in his messages to the Congress on the Budget and Agriculture, indicated his continued support for such a policy; and

Whereas U.S. Senator FRED R. HARRIS and members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation have proposed an "Ozarka" regional development program for eastern Oklahoma and neighboring States similar to that now under consideration by the Congress for the Appalachian Mountain region; and

Whereas the formulation and implementation of an economic development plan for "Ozarka" will require complete cooperation among the Federal, state, and local governments as well as businessmen, farmers, and working people in the area: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 30th Legislature of the State of Oklahoma (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That this legislature hereby indicates its support for the enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States to extend the regional development concept to the Eastern Oklahoma "Ozarka" region and commends its representatives in Congress for their efforts in support of such a program; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the expressed intent of this Legislature that the State of Oklahoma and the agencies and subdivisions thereof lend all possible aid, assistance, and cooperation in the formation of an Ozarka Regional Development Program to include a portion of the State of Oklahoma; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of senate is hereby directed to forward appropriate copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Honorable PAT MCNAMARA, chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, and the Honorable GEORGE H. FALLON, chairman of the House Public Works Committee, and to the members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation, each of whom is commended for his past efforts and further encouraged to support the planning and implementation of an Ozarka regional development program.

Adopted by the Senate the 4th day of March 1965.

CLEETA JOHN ROGERS,
Acting President of the Senate.

Adopted by the House of Representatives the 10th day of March 1965.

J. D. MCCARTY,
Speaker of the House of the Representatives.

Attest:
BASIL R. WILSON,
Secretary of the Senate.

By **Mr. JAVITS:**

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"RESOLUTION 18

"Concurrent resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York memorializing the Congress of the United States to adopt legislation necessary to continue the center operated by the Veterans' Administration at Bath, N.Y.

"Whereas in a supposed economy move by the Secretary of Defense, it is planned to abandon the Veterans' Administration Center at Bath, N.Y.; and

"Whereas these facilities have been in operation either by our own great State or the Federal Government since 1877 to give medical treatment, care and comfort for our deserving war heroes, especially the aged veterans; and

"Whereas these veterans who have been cared for in the past and those now being aided at Bath were willing, when our great Nation was endangered by the foe, to make the supreme sacrifice, it is only just that we demonstrate some sacrifice on all our parts at this time; and

"Whereas it seems justifiable at this time, in making sacrifices, that our war veterans be first considered rather than last; and

"Whereas the Veterans' Administration at Bath is the only home for aged veterans in the Northeastern United States and its location is excellent, geographically, from a civilian defense standpoint; and

"Whereas to abandon these facilities at this time would do great hardship to our veterans and prove economically unsound: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved (if the senate concur)*, That the Congress of the United States be and hereby is respectfully memorialized to enact legislation with convenient speed, that will prevent the Secretary of Defense from pursuing his course to abandon the Veterans' Administration Center at Bath, N.Y.; and be it further

"*Resolved (if the senate concur)*, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

"By order of the assembly,
"JOHN T. MCKENNAN,
"*Clerk.*

"Concurred in with amendments, March 3, 1965.

"By order of the senate:
"GEORGE H. VAN LENGEN,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"Senate amendments concurred in, March 8, 1965.

"By order of the assembly:
"JOHN T. MCKENNAN,
"*Clerk.*"

"RESOLUTION 37

"Concurrent resolution of the Senate and Assembly of the State of New York memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the necessary legislation to provide for the establishment and erection of a veterans hospital in Monroe County

"Whereas the Batavia Veterans Hospital is a 257-bed hospital which was originally planned, long before World War II, to take care of World War I and Spanish-American War veterans in the Buffalo-Rochester area. At that period the facility was adequate. However, since the end of World War II and the Korean conflict, with an additional 18,000,000 veterans added to the list of those entitled to hospitalization, a hospital expansion program was essential. This resulted in the city of Buffalo getting a hospital, as well as Syracuse and Albany, Rochester being bypassed as it was assumed that the old 257-bed Batavia Veterans Hospital would be adequate for the needs of Rochester area veterans; and

"Whereas this is a gross inequity to Rochester area veterans as they number 100,000 in the metropolitan area (80,000 in the Rochester area) including veterans from all wars. The Batavia Veterans Hospital is nowhere near adequate enough for their needs. At any given time, the Batavia Veterans Hospital has a Rochester veteran population of 80 to 85 percent. Also many veterans in the Rochester area who must obtain a treatment not handled at Batavia, are sent to the Buffalo facility at great inconvenience. Rochester area veterans find it difficult to understand why a city of their size, the 23d in the Nation, should lack proper medical and hospital facilities freely given to communities much smaller; and

"Whereas Rochester area veterans have to journey a minimum of 38 miles to get to the Batavia Hospital which creates a definite hardship on the next of kind who would like to visit them. The Buffalo Veterans Hospital is 70 miles away, which increases the hardship. The only nearby facility of a general medical nature is the Bath Veterans Hospital situated 75 miles away; and

"Whereas the Batavia Veterans Hospital is situated in a rural county having a population of approximately 8,000, placing a veterans hospital in the Rochester area in the center of veteran population would equalize the present hospital program across the State, with a facility in Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse, and Albany. This represents the great central population belt in this State, second only to the New York City metropolitan area itself; and

"Whereas to further justify the building of a hospital in the Rochester area is the dogmatic fact that the city is a well-known medical center which would simplify the hospital staffing problem making it easy to provide every type of medical facility currently available; and

"Whereas the bed capacity of all veteran hospitals in western New York with the exception of Canandaigua, which is neuropsychiatric, totals only 1,481 beds divided as follows:

Batavia Veterans Hospital	257
Bath Veterans Hospital	273
Buffalo Veterans Hospital	951

Of these hospitals, only Batavia is even remotely convenient (38 miles distant) and this is the smallest hospital of them all, totaling only 257 beds. When you consider that Syracuse has a 488-bed general-medical hospital, and Albany has a 1,000-bed general-medical hospital, it is difficult to reconcile ourselves to the fact that Rochester has no hospital whatsoever, and must depend primarily on a 257-bed hospital, 30 years old and 83 miles away; and

"Whereas the Buffalo VA Hospital has all it can do to take care of its own veteran residents which number a quarter million, including Niagara Falls and adjoining towns. We do not think that this facility answers our problem at all. Where Rochester area veterans, after discharge from a VA hospital, are eligible for certain periods of outpatient treatment and medication at the hospital, they are frequently unable to avail themselves of this additional benefit due to cost and inconvenience of travel; and

"Whereas the Monroe County Board of Supervisors has donated enough land owned by Monroe County to the Federal Government for the purpose of establishing a VA hospital; and

"Whereas this land is close by the renowned Strong Memorial Hospital and the University of Rochester Medical School, with continually visiting specialists of the medical profession from all parts of the world who might be sufficiently interested to review any rare ailment of a veteran hospitalized: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved (if the senate concur)*, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is respectively memorialized by the Legislature of the State of New York to enact legislation for the establishment, erection, and maintenance of a veterans hospital in Monroe County; and be it further

"*Resolved (if the senate concur)*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

"By order of the assembly:
"JOHN T. MCKENNAN,
"*Clerk.*

"Concurred in without amendment, March 3, 1965.

"By order of the senate:
"GEORGE H. VAN LENGEN,
"*Secretary.*"

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

RESOLUTION OF GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PELL], and myself, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a copy of a resolution passed by the General Assembly of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations memorializing Congress to repeal the Federal tax on jewelry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

H. 1117

Resolution memorializing Congress to repeal the Federal tax on jewelry

Whereas the Congress of the United States did in the year 1954 impose a tax on jewelry sold at retail equivalent to 10 percent of the selling price; and

Whereas the aforesaid tax was imposed during the Korean emergency to discourage the manufacture of jewelry, and the reason for the imposition of said tax no longer exists; and

Whereas the imposition of said tax has placed a great burden on the domestic jewelry industry already beset by low-wage foreign competitions and increasing tariff barriers against jewelry exports; and

Whereas the manufacturing of jewelry and related products is one of the leading industries of the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations providing employment for many of its citizens; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Members of the Congress of the United States be and they hereby are respectfully requested to repeal the Federal tax on the sale of jewelry at retail; and be it further

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be and he hereby is requested to transmit to the Senators and Representatives from Rhode Island in the Congress of the United States duly certified copies of this resolution in the hope that each will use his best efforts to enact legislation to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

JOINT RESOLUTIONS OF MAINE LEGISLATURE

By Mrs. SMITH (for herself and Mr. MUSKIE):

A joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"JOINT RESOLUTION 452

"Joint resolution proposing abolition of futures trading of potatoes on the New York Mercantile Exchange by the Congress of the United States

"We, your memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Maine in the 102d legislative session assembled, most respectfully present and petition your honorable body as follows:

"Whereas the Constitution of the United States provides that the Congress may regulate commerce among the several States; and

"Whereas potatoes are now traded in futures contracts on the New York Mercantile Exchange, 6 Harrison Street, New York City, N.Y.; and

"Whereas the price at which future contracts are bought and sold has a direct and immediate effect on cash prices received by producers for potatoes in Maine and all other areas producing potatoes for market; and

"Whereas futures prices reflect the effects of manipulation and unlimited speculation to the detriment of producers of potatoes; and

"Whereas futures trading of potatoes obstructs all attempts of Maine potato producers to market their product in an orderly fashion; and

"Whereas futures trading of potatoes encourages overproduction in Maine and all other producing areas with resulting disastrously low prices for the producers; and

"Whereas experience has proven that futures trading can be carried on without detrimental and depressing effect on price only in the case of those commodities which can be stored for extensive periods of time either within the areas of production or the areas of marketing and distribution; and

"Whereas Irish potatoes are a perishable commodity that do not lend themselves to extended periods of storage, especially following preparation for market; and

"Whereas Irish potatoes historically are one of the most volatile commodities in terms of price range and in degree of sensitivity to myriad market factors, including total volume produced, anticipated production, available supply on track and in the marketplaces, as well as many others; and

"Whereas many areas of production have vehemently registered their opposition to the continued trading of Irish potatoes futures, either with or without the supervision of the Commodity Exchange Authority of the USDA, and producers in Maine, by mail ballot, have voted overwhelmingly in favor of abolishing futures trading in Maine potatoes; and

"Whereas the Congress of the United States has already established a precedent for the action to be proposed by this resolution in the instance of another perishable commodity, namely onions, leaving potatoes as the only perishable commodity now being traded on the futures market: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That we, your memorialists, recommend that the Congress enact legislation abolishing futures trading in Irish potatoes upon the New York Mercantile Exchange or upon any commodity exchange; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this memorial, duly authenticated by the secretary of State, be immediately transmitted by the secretary of State, by mail, to the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress and to the Members of the said Senate and House of Representatives from this State.

"In senate chamber: Read and adopted, sent down for concurrence, March 5, 1965; ordered sent forthwith.

"EDWIN H. PERT,
"*Secretary*.

"House of representatives: Read and adopted in concurrence, March 9, 1965.

"JEROME G. PLANTE,
"*Clerk*."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Maine; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"JOINT RESOLUTION 451

"Joint resolution requesting Members of Congress to support the agricultural conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service

"Whereas the preservation of the soils, water, forests and wildlife of this Nation, and in particular the topsoil, is necessary; and

"Whereas we believe the preservation of these resources is a responsibility of all people; and

"Whereas farmers and landowners through conservation practices have made Maine a far more beautiful State for both rural and urban people to enjoy; and

"Whereas the agricultural conservation program and the technical assistance provided the landowners of Maine by the Soil Conservation Service are a vital link in the overall natural resource conservation movement through the State; and

"Whereas for the past 30 years the U.S. Department of Agriculture, through the agricultural conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service, has done much to maintain and improve these resources, and make landowners and society in general more conscious of the need for such preservation; and

"Whereas during this period some 25,000 Maine farmers and landowners have put to good use the many conservation practices of the agricultural conservation program; and

"Whereas in carrying out these practices Maine farmers and landowners are now more than matching Government funds dollar for dollar; and

"Whereas, through the medium of agricultural conservation program farmer-elected committeemen and soil conservation district supervisors throughout the State, farm leadership has been developed to a most helpful degree; and

"Whereas we believe that farmers, particularly through this defense period, should not be forced to exploit their soils in the production of the additional food and fiber needed; and

"Whereas we firmly believe that such would become a necessity should funds to operate the agricultural conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service be curtailed: Now, therefore be it

"*Resolved by the 102d legislature*, That the Congress of the United States be respectfully urged to give the necessary and adequate support to the continuance of the agricultural conservation program and the Soil Conservation Service; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That Maine Senators EDMUND S. MUSKIE and MARGARET CHASE SMITH, and the State Representatives in Congress, WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY and STANLEY R. TUPPER, be asked to give their wholehearted support to the agricultural conservation program, and to vote to continue the annual national appropriation of $250 million for the agricultural conservation program, and to restore the recommended cut of $20 million in Soil Conservation Service funds; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That an adequate amount be set aside from such appropriation to make it possible to administer the program through the present system of farmer-elected committeemen; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the secretary of state be directed to transmit duly attested copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the chairman of the Senate and House Committees on Agriculture, to the chairmen of the Senate and House Committees on Appropriations, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to the Maine congressional delegation.

"In senate chamber: Read and adopted, sent down for concurrence, March 5, 1965.

"EDWIN H. PERT,
"*Secretary*.

"House of representatives: Read and adopted in concurrence, March 9, 1965.

"JEROME G. PLANTE,
"*Clerk*."

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, without amendment:

S. 390. A bill to extend to volunteer fire companies the rates of postage on second class and third class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations (Rept. No. 129).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of a committee print entitled "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments—Supplement, January 4, 1965" (Rept. No. 139);

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of additional copies of House Document Numbered 103 of the Eighty-sixth Congress (Rept. No. 131);

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution to print the proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn of Texas (Rept. No. 132);

H. Con. Res. 97. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled, "Our American Government. What Is Is? How Does It Function?" (Rept. No. 133);

H. Con. Res. 125. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of inaugural addresses from President Washington to President Johnson, and providing for additional copies (Rept. No. 134);

H. Con. Res. 153. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the tributes by Members of Congress to the life, character, and public service of the late Sir Winston Churchill (Rept. No. 135);

H. Con. Res.167. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a study of compensation and assistance for persons affected by real property acquisition in Federal and federally assisted programs (Rept. No. 137);

H. Con. Res. 338. Concurrent resolution authorizing the publication as a House document of the Department of State white paper relating to North Vietnam's campaign to conquer South Vietnam (Department of State Publication 7839) (Rept. No. 138); and

S. Res. 89. Resolution authorizing attendance at the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, to be held in Wellington, New Zealand (Rept. No. 130).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

H. Con. Res. 165. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document No. 103 of the 88th Congress; with an amendment (Rept. No. 136).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

S. 1462. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 140).

NAN B. TWIFORD—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 94) to pay a gratuity to Nan B. Twiford, which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Nan B. Twiford, aunt of Adele R. O'Connor, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to 11 months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE ON FOREIGN CURRENCY AND U.S. DOLLARS USED IN 1964 IN CONNECTION WITH FOREIGN TRAVEL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, in accordance with the Mutual Security Act of 1954, as amended, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Committee on Commerce concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized by those committees in 1964 in connection with foreign travel.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Report of expenditure of foreign currencies and appropriated funds by the Committee on Commerce, U.S. Senate, between Jan. 1 and Dec. 31, 1964

Name and country	Name of currency	Lodging		Meals		Transportation		Miscellaneous		Total	
		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency
Bartlett, E. L.:											
Japan	Yen	70,200	195.00	65,520	182.00			42,120	117.00	177,840	494.00
Germany	Deutsche mark					4,320	1,087.06			4,320	1,087.06
Subtotal			195.00		182.00		1,087.06		117.00		1,581.06
Kenney, Jeremiah J., Jr.:											
France	New franc	443.20	88.64	395	79.00	60	12.00	14.80	2.96	913	182.60
Germany	Deutsche mark					2,527.60	631.90			2,527.60	631.90
Subtotal			88.64		79.00		643.90		2.96		814.50
Markel, Daniel B.:											
France	New franc	604.10	120.82	587.15	117.43	174	34.80	114.75	22.95	1,480	296.00
Germany	Deutsche mark					2,523.80	630.95			2,523.80	630.95
Subtotal			120.82		117.43		665.75		22.95		926.95
Scott, Hugh:											
New Zealand	U.S. dollar		105.00		75.00				4.00		184.00
Fiji	do		40.00		30.00						70.00
Germany	Deutsche mark					6,627.92	1,667.40			6,627.92	1,667.40
Subtotal			145.00		105.00		1,667.40		4.00		1,921.40
Total			549.46		483.43		4,064.11		146.91		5,243.91

RECAPITULATION

	Amount
Foreign currency (U.S. dollar equivalent)	$4,989.91
Appropriated funds: S. Res. 283	254.00
Total	5,243.91

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,
Chairman, Committee on Commerce.

MARCH 23, 1965.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1598. A bill for the relief of Jean Kathleen Baker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1599. A bill to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. RIBICOFF when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1600. A bill for the relief of certain members of the American Hull Insurance Syndicate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. LAUSCHE:

S. 1601. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in Ohio; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. LAUSCHE when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMATHERS:

S. 1602. A bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 for the purpose of enabling the Federal Aviation Agency to provide air traffic control services which will be adequate to meet the needs of civil aviation and the national defense, and to safeguard air traffic against the hazard of mid-air collision; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. SMATHERS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1603. A bill for the relief of Raymond C. Dudley; and

S. 1604. A bill to incorporate the Youth Councils on Civic Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRIS (for himself, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. MORSE, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 1605. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. HARRIS when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1606. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make it a Federal crime to assault or kill any employee of the Department of Agriculture or the Public Health Service when such employee is engaged in certain inspection duties at ports of entry or border stations of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. FONG when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KUCHEL:

S. 1607. A bill to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. KUCHEL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 1608. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. MILLER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1609. A bill to amend the Presidential Inaugural Ceremonies Act;

S. 1610. A bill to establish a register of blind persons in the District of Columbia; to provide for the mandatory reporting of information concerning such persons, and for other purposes;

S. 1611. A bill to transfer certain functions from the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia to the District of Columbia Court of General Sessions and to certain other agencies of the municipal government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes:

S. 1612. A bill to establish a Board of Higher Education to plan, establish, organize, and operate a public community college and a public college of arts and sciences in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 1613. A bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia and to supplement the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia in order to provide for the indemnification of persons sustaining injuries or damages as a result of the operation of motor vehicles by financially irresponsible persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TOWER:

S. 1614. A bill to designate Vietnam as a combat zone for Federal tax purposes, effective retroactively to January 1, 1961; and

S. 1615. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives for the support of educational institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1616. A bill to provide for the punishment of persons transporting stolen sheep or goats in interstate or foreign commerce and for persons selling or receiving stolen sheep or goats transported in interstate or foreign commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tower when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

S. 1617. A bill to provide for a temporary moratorium on payments under FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages for mortgagors who are unemployed as the result of the closing of a Federal installation, and for other purposes; and

S. 1618. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain housing owned by servicemen at or near Federal bases or installations which have been, or are being, closed in whole or in part; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tower when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

S. 1619. A bill to permit members and former members of the Armed Forces retired on or after October 1, 1963, for physical disabilities incurred as a direct result of armed conflict to have their retirement pay recomputed whenever the rates of basic pay applicable to the grade in which they retired are increased; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(See the remarks of Mr. Douglas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 1620. A bill to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Johnston when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1621. A bill to amend section 202(b) of the Federal Power Act with respect to the interconnection of electric facilities; and

S. 1622. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to prohibit abandonment of facilities and service without the consent of the Federal Power Commission; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mrs. Neuberger) (by request):

S. 1623. A bill to amend the Act of August 1, 1958, relating to a continuing study by the Secretary of the Interior of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses to this resource; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF:

S. 1624. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide that the program under which Government contracts are set aside for small-business concerns shall not apply in the case of contracts for maintenance, repair, or construction; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 1625. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit certain tax-exempt organizations to engage in certain activities for the purpose of influencing legislation directly relevant to the purposes which qualify such organizations for tax exemption, without losing certain benefits under that Code; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Metcalf when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. Miller):

S. 1626. A bill to limit the authority of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to new construction or alteration of veterans' hospitals and the closing of such hospitals; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Metcalf when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 1627. A bill for the relief of David R. Boylan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1628. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and the Act of February 13, 1911, to eliminate those provisions which require payment to the United States for overtime services of customs officers and employees; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dominick when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUSKIE (by request):

S. 1629. A bill designating the birthday of President John Fitzgerald Kennedy as a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 1630. A bill to provide for specific employment policies in order to promote maximum employment, to reduce unemployment to its minimum acceptable levels, to promote an adequate rate of economic growth, and to preserve reasonable price stability; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. Clark when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1631. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Clark County, Nev., to Francis W. Thorne; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 1632. A bill to require the registration of pistols in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

(See the remarks of Mr. Tydings when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE:

S. 1633. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, in order to authorize a program to improve safety on the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems of highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HARTKE (for himself, Mr. Scott, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Moss, Mr. Lausche, and Mr. Dominick):

S. 1634. A bill to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hartke when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Byrd of Virginia, Mr. Curtis, Mr. Dominick, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Hickenlooper, Mr. Hruska, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Miller, Mr. Morton, Mr. Prouty, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Scott, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Thurmond, and Mr. Williams of Delaware):

S. 1635. A bill to require annual approval by the Congress of aggregate amounts of expenditure authorizations contained in general appropriation acts; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Allott when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MUNDT:

S.J. Res. 66. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the period from August 31, through September 6, in 1965 as National American Legion Baseball Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Mundt when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S.J. Res. 67. Joint resolution to establish a national flower of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTIONS

PROMOTION OF PEACE AND SECURITY IN SOUTHEASTERN ASIA AND THE PACIFIC

Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. Inouye) submitted a concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) to promote peace and security in southeast Asia and the Pacific, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above concurrent resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Javits, which appears under a separate heading.)

HONOR OF VICTORY OVER POLIOMYELITIS

Mr. HILL submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 30); which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Whereas April 12, 1965, is the tenth anniversary of one of the most significant medical achievements of our time, Doctor Jonas Salk's development of a successful vaccine against poliomyelitis; and

Whereas in the ten years since the introduction of the Salk vaccine, there has been a 99 per centum reduction in the number of cases of polio in the United States; and

Whereas this dread disease which once attacked as many as fifty-seven thousand Americans in a single year and made the summer months a time of fear and apprehension for parents across the Nation, has now been eliminated as a public health problem; and

Whereas this great medical victory was won through a unique partnership between the American people and medical scientists like Doctor Salk, under the auspices of the National Foundation-March of Dimes, and with the outstanding cooperation of the United States Public Health Service; and

Whereas a leading example of how this partnership is continuing and expanding is the Salk Institute for Biological Studies in La Jolla, California; and

Whereas this institute was conceived as a research center where scientists of international reputation could come and map out the high strategy of man's fight for health; and

Whereas Doctor Salk and his colleagues from all over the world are now at work on projects aimed at discovering the basic concept of life itself; and

Whereas from this research can flow the specific methods to control disease and to promote the health and better understanding of man and his full potential: Now be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Doctor Jonas Salk and the National Foundation-March of Dimes be congratulated on this tenth anniversary of the announcement of the world's first effective vaccine against polio, and our confidence be expressed that the work of the National Foundation-March of Dimes—specifically its fight against birth defects—and of the Salk Institute for Biological Studies will bring about the blessings of better health for our society and all its citizens.

RESOLUTIONS

STUDY OF RECREATION IN THE LAKE TEXOMA AREA

Mr. TOWER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 91) calling for a study of recreation in the Lake Texoma area, which was referred to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Tower, which appears under a separate heading.)

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "FRAUDS AND DECEPTIONS AFFECTING THE ELDERLY, INVESTIGATIONS, FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS, 1964"

Mr. SMATHERS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 92) to permit reprint of Committee on Aging's Report entitled "Frauds and Deceptions Affecting the Elderly, Investigations, Findings, and Recommendations, 1964," which was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration:

Resolved, That there be printed for the use of the Special Committee on Aging six thousand additional copies of its committee print of the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, entitled "Frauds and Deceptions Affecting the Elderly, Investigations, Findings and Recommendations: 1964," a report by the Subcommittee on Frauds and Misrepresentations Affecting the Elderly.

EXPRESSION OF SENSE OF SENATE ON BRIEFING OF SENATORS GENERALLY CONCERNING SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. COOPER submitted a resolution (S. Res. 93) to express sense of Senate on briefing of Senators generally concerning situation in Vietnam, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the above resolution printed in full when submitted by Mr. Cooper, which appears under a separate heading.)

NAN B. TWIFORD

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 94) to pay a gratuity to Nan B. Twiford, which was placed on the calendar.

(See the above resolution printed in full when reported by Mr. Jordan of North Carolina, which appears under the heading "Reports of Committees.")

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, for myself and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Clark], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. Dodd], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Douglas], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. Gruening], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart], the Senator from New York [Mr. Javits], the Senator from New York [Mr. Kennedy], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. Long], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Tydings], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams], I introduce, for appropriate reference, the bill to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development submitted to the Senate today by President Johnson. This is the administration's bill the President called for in his message on cities "to give greater force and effectiveness to our effort in the cities."

I ask unanimous consent that the bill remain at the desk for the remainder of this week in order that Senators who wish to do so might join as cosponsors. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill together with a section-by-section summary of it be printed in the Record at the end of my remarks.

In addition, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record after the summary of the bill a report prepared at my request by James R. King of the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service entitled "Congressional Action Related to the Proposed Establishment of an Executive Department, Office, or Commission to Deal With Problems of Urban Areas."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred. Without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record; and the requests of the Senator from Connecticut are granted.

The bill (S. 1599) to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Ribicoff, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, long ago it was said that "barbarians build their houses separate, but civilized men together." Through the course of modern history the city has indeed become the focal point, not only of our society here in America, but throughout modern Western civilization as well.

Ours is an urban society. Already the great majority of Americans live in cities and their suburbs. By the year 2000 over four-fifths of our 350 million people will live in large, metropolitan groupings. Already the bulk of our Nation's wealth is created day by day in our urban areas. The health of our society hinges on the well-being and progress of our cities and suburbs and the people who live in them.

But our cities and suburbs are in trouble. The costs of local services are rising at an alarming rate. Local taxes this year are running about 140 percent higher than just 15 years ago. They are continuing to rise, and the same is true of State taxes. The burden on local governments to meet the need for more services grows heavier day after day, week after week, month after month. And there is no end in sight to the need for more schools, more highways, more hospitals, more sewerage and water facilities, and more and better programs to house our urban population and improve our communities.

No more complex and pressing problem faces us than the problem of how to help our local communities, large and small, to meet their urgent needs today and prepare to meet even greater burdens which loom on the horizon.

That is what this bill is all about. We should create an executive department to represent the urban population, their cities and suburban communities at the Cabinet table so the problems of an urbanized America are considered at the proper level of government. The existing Agency—the Housing and Home Finance Agency—was created 18 years ago to coordinate two programs—the mortgage insurance program of the Federal Housing Administration and the program of Federal aid to local communities to provide public housing for low-income families.

Since then a vast range of entirely new programs has been given to the Agency to administer. Congress has recognized the problems of urbanization and made provision for the solution of many of them. But it has up to now ignored the question of the proper administration of some 40 Federal programs for community development that are now available to our urban areas. It is now time for us to take the reasonable and logical step of creating a Department that can—with far more efficiency, economy, and authority—administer to the complexity that is our urbanized Nation.

We must keep in mind, as the President has reminded us, that our urbanization is not defined in terms of numbers alone. We are talking about more than geography and numbers; we are talking about a way of life—and the social facts are as important and more so than the numerical definitions. These urban ways of living will be the subject of utmost concern to the new department being proposed today.

We must try, through this new Agency, to focus on what President Johnson has described as the core of the urban problem—the quality of the lives of the people living in our urban areas.

We are not dealing with the problems of the city dweller alone but the problems of American society itself. During the 10 years that this proposition has been before Congress—this decade of deliberation—a new generation of slum children has reached school age. The pollution of water supplies and 350,000 tons of smog a day still threaten our very health and safety. Clogged city streets and inadequate transportation facilities still plague the downtown shopper and commuter. Roadside slum towns, junkyards and neon nightmares disgrace us and even raise some question of how civilized we really are in comparison to the barbarian who built his house separate.

This new department will not be able to answer all the questions or solve all the problems that are associated with urbanization, but it can offer a start. It can become home base for the "enormous growth of interest and knowledge and intellectual ferment" that the President asked to be continued and expanded "as we painfully struggle to identify the ills, the dangers, and the cures for the American city."

Mr. President, there has been talk enough. Now is the time for action. I consider passage of this bill to be minimum recognition by Congress of the long and difficult path that our citizens have been treading, sometimes quite alone, toward a high quality of urban life. They need our attention; they need our help; and as servants of the public interest we can do no less than meet the needs of the 135 million Americans who happen to live in urban America.

Mr. President, I wish to announce that hearings on S. 1599 and other related bills will be held in room 1318 of the New Senate Office Building on March 31 and April 1 beginning at 10 a.m. The leadoff witness will be Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Kermit Gordon. Groups and individuals who wish to be heard should contact Mr. Jerome Sonosky, staff director of the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization, room 162, Senate Office Building, extension 2308.

The bill (S. 1599), summary, and report, presented by Mr. RIBICOFF, are as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Department of Housing and Urban Development Act".

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby declares that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of our people require, as a matter of national purpose, sound development of the Nation's urban communities and metropolitan areas in which the vast majority of its people live and work.

To carry out such purpose, and in recognition of the increasing importance of housing and urban development in our national life, the Congress finds that establishment of an executive department is desirable to achieve the best administration of the principal programs of the Federal Government which provide assistance for housing and for the development of the Nation's communities; to assist the President in achieving maximum coordination of the various Federal activities which have a major effect upon urban, suburban, or metropolitan development; to encourage the solution of problems of housing and urban development through State, county, town, village, or other local and private action, including promotion of interstate, regional, and metropolitan cooperation; and to provide for full and appropriate consideration, at the national level, of the needs and interests of the Nation's communities and of the people who live and work in them.

ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT

SEC. 3. (a) There is hereby established at the seat of government an executive department to be known as the Department of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Department"). There shall be at the head of the Department a Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary"), who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Department shall be administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary. The Secretary shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the heads of executive departments.

(b) The Secretary shall, among his responsibilities, advise the President with respect to Federal programs and activities relating to housing and urban development; develop and recommend to the President policies for fostering the orderly growth and development of the Nation's urban areas; exercise leadership at the direction of the President in coordinating Federal activities affecting housing and urban development; provide technical assistance and information including a clearinghouse service to aid State, county, town, village, or other local governments in developing solutions to urban and metropolitan development problems; encourage comprehensive planning by the State and local governments with a view to coordinating Federal, State, and local urban development activities, and conduct continuing comprehensive studies, and make available findings, with respect to the problems of housing and urban development.

(c) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to deny or limit the benefits of any program, function, or activity assigned to the Department by this or any other Act to any community on the basis of its population or corporate status, except as may be expressly provided by law.

UNDER SECRETARY AND OTHER OFFICERS

SEC. 4. (a) There shall be in the Department an Under Secretary, four Assistant Secretaries, and a General Counsel, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter provided by law for under secretaries, assistant secretaries, and general counsels, respectively, of executive departments, and who shall perform such functions, powers, and duties as the Secretary shall prescribe from time to time.

(b) There shall be in the Department an Assistant Secretary for Administration, who shall be appointed, with the approval of the President, by the Secretary under the classified civil service, who shall perform such functions, powers, and duties as the Secretary shall prescribe from time to time, and whose annual rate of compensation shall be the same as that now or hereafter provided by or pursuant to law for assistant secretaries for administration of executive departments.

TRANSFERS TO DEPARTMENT

SEC. 5. (a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b) of this section, there are hereby transferred to and vested in the Secretary all of the functions, powers, and duties of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, of the Federal Housing Administration and the Public Housing Administration in that Agency, and of the heads and other officers and offices of said agencies.

(b) The Federal National Mortgage Association, together with its functions, powers, and duties, is hereby transferred to the Department. The next to the last sentence of section 308 of the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act and the item numbered (94) of section 303(e) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 are hereby repealed, and the position of the President of said Association is hereby allocated among the positions referred to in section 7(c) hereof.

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 6. (a) Section 19(d)(1) of title 3 of the United States Code is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a comma and the following: "Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development."

(b) Section 158 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 1) is amended by adding at the end thereof:

"Eleventh. The Department of Housing and Urban Development."

(c) The amendment made by subsection (b) of this section shall not be construed to make applicable to the Department any provision of law inconsistent with this Act.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

SEC. 7. (a) The personnel employed in connection with, and the assets, liabilities, contracts, property, records, and unexpended balances of appropriations, authorizations, allocations, or other funds held, used, arising from, or available or to be made available in connection with, the functions, powers, and duties transferred by section 5 of this Act are hereby transferred with such functions, powers, and duties, respectively.

(b) No transfer of functions, powers, and duties shall at any time be made within the Department in connection with the secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association unless the Secretary finds that the rights and interests of owners of outstanding common stock issued under the Federal National Mortgage Association Charter Act will not be adversely affected thereby.

(c) The Secretary is authorized, subject to the civil service and classification laws, to select, appoint, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers and employees, including attorneys, as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act and to prescribe their authority and duties: *Provided,* That any other provision of law to the contrary notwithstanding, the Secretary may fix the compensation for not more than six positions in the Department at the annual rate applicable to positions in level V of the Federal Executive Salary Schedule provided by the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964.

(d) The Secretary may delegate any of his functions, powers, and duties to such officers and employees of the Department as he may designate, may authorize such successive redelegations of such functions, powers, and duties as he may deem desirable, and may make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out his functions, powers, and duties. The second proviso of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is hereby repealed.

(e) The Secretary may obtain services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946, at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals.

(f) The Secretary is authorized to establish a working capital fund, to be available without fiscal year limitation, for expenses necessary for the maintenance and operation of such common administrative services as he shall find to be desirable in the interest of economy and efficiency in the Department, including such services as a central supply service for stationery and other supplies and equipment for which adequate stocks may be maintained to meet in whole or in part the requirements of the Department and its agencies; central messenger, mail, telephone, and other communications services; office space; central services for document reproduction and for graphics and visual aids; and a central library service. In addition to amounts appropriated to provide capital for said fund, which appropriations are hereby authorized, the fund shall be capitalized by transfer to it of such stocks of supplies and equipment on hand or on order as the Secretary shall direct. Such fund shall be reimbursed from available funds of agencies and offices in the Department for which services are performed at rates which will return in full all expenses of operation, including reserves for accrued annual leave and for depreciation of equipment.

(g) The Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the Department of such device as he shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of such seal.

ANNUAL REPORT

SEC. 8. The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable after the end of each calendar year, make a report to the President for submission to the Congress on the activities of the Department during the preceding calendar year.

SAVINGS PROVISIONS

SEC. 9. (a) No cause of action by or against any agency whose functions are transferred by this Act, or by or against any officer of any such agency in his official capacity, shall abate by reason of this enactment. Such causes of action may be asserted by or against the United States or such official of the Department as may be appropriate.

(b) No suit, action, or other proceeding commenced by or against any agency whose functions are transferred by this Act, or by or against any officer of any such agency in his official capacity, shall abate by reason of the enactment of this Act. A court may at any time during the pendency of the litigation, on its own motion or that of any party, order that the same may be maintained by or against the United States or such official of the Department as may be appropriate.

(c) Except as may be otherwise expressly provided in this Act, all powers and authorities conferred by this Act shall be cumulative and additional to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities otherwise existing. All rules, regulations, orders, authorizations, delegations, or other actions duly issued, made, or taken by or pursuant to applicable law, prior to the effective date of this Act, by any agency, officer, or office pertaining to any functions, powers, and duties transferred by this Act shall continue in full force and effect after the effective date of this Act until modified or rescinded by the Secretary or such other officer or office of the Department as, in accordance with applicable law, may be appropriate. With respect to any function, power, or duty transferred by or under this Act and exercised hereafter, reference in another Federal law to the Housing and Home Finance Agency or to any officer, office, or agency therein, except the Federal National Mortgage Association and its officers, shall be deemed to mean the Secretary. The positions and agencies heretofore established by law in connection with the functions, powers, and duties transferred under section 5(a) of this Act shall lapse.

SEPARABILITY

SEC. 10. Notwithstanding any other evidence of the intent of Congress, it is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that if any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstances, shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this Act or its application to other persons and circumstances, but shall be confined in its operation to the provision of this Act, or the application thereof to the persons and circumstances, directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

EFFECTIVE DATE AND INTERIM APPOINTMENTS

SEC. 11. (a) The provisions of this Act shall take effect upon the expiration of the first period of sixty calendar days following the date on which this Act is approved by the President, or on such earlier date as the President shall specify by Executive order published in the Federal Register, except that any of the officers provided for in sections 3(a), 4(a), and 4(b) of this Act may be nominated and appointed, as provided in such sections, at any time after the date this Act is approved by the President.

(b) In the event that one or more officers required by this Act to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall not have entered upon office on the effective date of this Act, the President may designate any person who was an officer of the Housing and Home Finance Agency immediately prior to said effective date to act in such office until the office is filled as provided in this Act or until the expiration of the first period of sixty days following said effective date, whichever shall first occur. While so acting such persons shall receive compensation at the rates provided by this Act for the respective offices in which they act.

SECTION-BY-SECTION SUMMARY OF A BILL TO ESTABLISH THE DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

SHORT TITLE

Section 1 provides that the act would be cited as the "Department of Housing and Urban Development Act."

DECLARATION OF PURPOSE

Section 2 sets forth the purpose of the bill and that the Congress finds that establishment of an executive department is desirable to carry out the purpose.

Congress would declare that the general welfare and security of the Nation and the health and living standards of its people require, as a matter of national purpose, sound development of the Nation's urban communities and metropolitan areas in which the vast majority of its people live and work.

To carry out the purpose, Congress would find that establishment of an executive department is desirable to (1) achieve the best administration of the principal programs of the Federal Government which provide assistance for housing and for the development of the Nation's communities; (2) assist the President in achieving maximum coordination of Federal activities which have a major effect upon urban, suburban, or metropolitan development; (3) encourage the solution of problems of housing and urban development through State, county, town, village, or other local and private action (including promotion of interstate, regional, and metropolitan cooperation); and (4) provide for full consideration, at the national level, of the needs and interests of the Nation's communities and their people.

ESTABLISHMENT OF DEPARTMENT—RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY

Section 3(a) establishes the Department of Housing and Urban Development and provides that it would be headed by a Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, who would be appointed by the President with Senate confirmation.

The Department would be administered under the supervision and direction of the Secretary. The Secretary would receive compensation at the rate now or hereafter prescribed by law for the heads of executive departments. (At present, under sec. 303(a) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, the secretaries of departments receive $35,000 per annum.)

Section 3(b) directs the Secretary, among his other responsibilities, to advise the President with respect to Federal programs and activities relating to housing and urban development; to develop and recommend to the President policies for fostering the orderly growth and development of the Nation's urban areas; exercise leadership at the discretion of the President in coordinating Federal activities affecting housing and urban development; provide technical assistance and information (including a clearinghouse service) to aid State, county, town, village, or other local governments in developing solutions to urban and metropolitan development problems; encourage comprehensive planning by State and local governments with a view to coordinating Federal, State, and local urban development activities; and to conduct continuing studies of housing and urban development problems.

Section 3(c) provides that nothing in the bill shall be construed to deny or limit the benefits of any program, function, or activity to any community on the basis of its population or corporate status, except as may be expressly provided by law.

UNDER SECRETARY AND OTHER OFFICERS

Section 4(a) provides that there shall be in the Department an Under Secretary, four Assistant Secretaries, and a General Counsel, all of whom would be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. These officers would perform the functions, powers, and duties prescribed by the Secretary. They would receive the same compensation as the under secretaries, assistant secretaries, and general counsels of other departments. (At present, under sec. 303(c) of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964, under secretaries receive $28,500 per annum, and under sec. 303(d) of that act, assistant secretaries and general counsels receive $27,000 per annum.)

Section 4(b) provides that there shall be in the Department an Assistant Secretary for Administration who would be appointed by the Secretary with the approval of the President. The Assistant Secretary would receive the same compensation as is provided by law for assistant secretaries for administration of executive departments ($26,000 per annum). He would perform the functions, powers, and duties prescribed by the Secretary.

TRANSFERS TO DEPARTMENT

Section 5(a) transfers to the Secretary all the functions, powers, and duties of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, the Federal Housing Administration, and the Public Housing Administration, and the functions, powers, and duties of the heads and other officers and offices of those agencies.

Section 5(b) transfers the Federal National Mortgage Association, together with its functions, powers, and duties, to the Department. The Secretary of the Department would be vested with the functions, powers, and duties of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator with regard to FNMA. The Secretary would therefore become the Chairman of the Board of Directors of FNMA. FNMA would be an entity within the Department, and the rights and interests of the owners of outstanding common stock issued under the FNMA Charter Act would not be affected by the transfer.

Section 5(b) would also repeal language in section 308 of the FNMA Charter Act (12 U.S.C. 1723), which was superseded by a subsequent provision in the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964. Section 308 provided that the President of FNMA received compensation at the rate established for the heads of the constituents of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964 listed the salary for the President of FNMA separately. Under the provisions of section 5(b) of the bill the separate listing in the Salary Act would be repealed, and the President of FNMA would be one of the six positions provided in section 7(c) of the bill with compensation at the annual rate applicable to level V of the Federal executive salary schedule provided by the Executive Salary Act of 1964 ($26,000).

CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

Section 6(a) would amend section 19(d) (1) of title 3 of the United States Code to place both the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development in the line of succession to the office of the President of the United States. They would be eligible to act as President only if the Vice President, Speaker of the House, President pro tempore of the Senate, and the heads of other executive departments having precedence over them by law are unable to serve as President.

Sections 6(b) and 6(c) are technical provisions which would extend to the new Department the provisions of title IV of the

Revised Statutes, except to the extent inconsistent with the bill. Those provisions deal with such matters as departmental vacancies, regulations, duties of clerks, details and employment of personnel, oaths, subpenas, and witness fees.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 7(a) provides that all the personnel, liabilities, and resources, including funds, property, and records available in connection with the functions transferred by section 5 to the Department, are transferred with the respective functions.

Section 7(b) provides that no transfers of functions may be made within the Department with respect to the secondary market operations of the Federal National Mortgage Association unless the Secretary finds such transfers would not adversely affect the rights and interests of the owners of FNMA common stock.

Section 7(c) would authorize the Secretary to appoint and fix the compensation of Department personnel and prescribe their duties. The law applicable to the Federal civil service would apply to employees of the Department. The Secretary further would be authorized to fix the compensation for not more than six positions at the annual rate applicable to positions in level V of the Federal executive salary schedule provided by the 1964 Executive Salary Act ($26,000).

Section 7(d) permits the Secretary to delegate any of his functions to such officers and employees of the Department as he may designate and to authorize successive redelegations of functions he has delegated. The Secretary is also authorized to prescribe necessary rules and regulations. This subsection repeals a portion of section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1451(c)), so that the Secretary could delegate or redelegate authority to (1) approve the workable program of a locality for dealing with its overall problems of slum and blight, (2) certify that Federal assistance to urban renewal work enumerated under section 101(c) may be made available to a community, and (3) determine that the relocation requirements of section 105(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 have been met.

Section 7(e) authorizes the Secretary to obtain the services of experts and consultants at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals.

Section 7(f) authorizes the Secretary to establish a working capital fund, similar to those in other departments, for operating various common administrative services in the Department such as supply, messenger, mail, telephone, space, library, and reproduction services. The revolving fund would be financed through appropriations, and charges against the agencies and offices in the Department for which services are performed.

Section 7(g) directs the Secretary to have a Department seal made and provides for judicial notice of the seal.

ANNUAL REPORT

Section 8 requires the Secretary to make an annual report to the President for submission to the Congress on the activities of the Department during the preceding calendar year.

SAVINGS PROVISIONS

Section 9(a) would provide that no cause of action by or against any agency or officer whose functions are transferred by the bill would abate by reason of the new act, and that such causes of action could be asserted by or against the United States or any appropriate official of the new Department.

Section 9(b) provides that any pending litigation or other proceeding by or against any agency or officer whose functions are transferred by the bill would not abate by reason of the new act, and also provides for appropriate substitution of successor parties.

Section 9(c) provides that, except as expressly provided in the bill, all powers and authorities otherwise existing would not be affected by the bill. All rules, regulations, and orders issued under applicable law prior to the effective date of the bill would continue in effect unless modified or rescinded by the Secretary or other legally authorized officer or office of the Department. References in other Federal laws to the Housing and Home Finance Agency, or to any officers, office, or agency therein, except the FNMA and its officers, would be deemed to mean the Secretary. This subsection also provides that the positions and agencies (HHFA, FHA, and PHA, and their heads and officers) transferred under section 5(a) of the bill would lapse.

SEPARABILITY

Section 10 provides a standard separability clause.

EFFECTIVE DATE AND INTERIM APPOINTMENTS

Section 11(a) provides that the act would take effect 60 days from the date of its approval, or on such earlier date as the President may specify. However, in the interim, and any time after approval of the act, the President could nominate and the Senate could confirm the Department's officers. The Assistant Secretary for Administration could also be appointed during the interim period by the Secretary with the approval of the President. Such officers would not enter on duty until the act takes effect generally.

Section 11(b) makes provision for designation by the President of interim officers, as may be necessary, for a 60-day period immediately after the effective date of the act.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION RELATED TO THE PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF AN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OR COMMISSION TO DEAL WITH PROBLEMS OF URBAN AREAS

(By James R. King, economic analyst in Regional Development and Housing, Economics Division, February 26, 1965)

INTRODUCTION

It has long been recognized that the growth of urban areas in the United States has presented a major problem at local, State and National levels. Prior to the turn of the century less than one-half the population lived in urban areas; today 70 percent are classified as urban.

Moreover, there are now 50 urban places in the United States with a population of more than 250,000 each as compared to 15 in 1900. These 50 urban places house 40 million people rather than the 11 million that resided in cities of this size in 1900.

Towns with populations of between 25,000 and 50,000 at the turn of the century numbered only 82 and supported only 2.8 million citizens; today 14.8 million Americans live in 429 places of this size.

Small places of 2,500 to 5,000 have increased from 832 in 1900 to 2,140 in 1960 and presently account for a population of 7.5 million as compared to 2.9 million at the beginning of this century.

Urbanization has spared no size community its thrust. All have suffered under the strain of an increasing need for public facilities to accommodate the influx of population, usually in the face of a seeming inability on the part of local governments to provide a broad enough tax base to support such an increase.

State governments, it is charged, have shown little interest in assisting local communities in their effort to provide public improvements in their jurisdictions. Therefore, the Federal Government has been petitioned to play an increasing role in the provision of funds and services to local communities.

These developments have led, since 1954, to a growing interest on the part of some Members of Congress and other interest groups and individuals in the establishment of some type of executive department, office, or commission to deal specifically with problems of urban areas.

This report constitutes a chronological outline of the legislation, hearings and Presidential messages that have gone to make up the body of congressional activity concerning this concept. Two appendixes have been included at the end of the discussion: (1) A complete list of all bills related to the creation of a department, office, or commission on urban affairs, and (2) a brief bibliography including all references cited in this report.

This report is based in part on three prior Legislative Reference Service reports: Hilda M. James, "History of Congressional and Related Activities Concerned With the Establishment of a Department of Urban Affairs, 1961"; Erin M. Woodall, "A Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing: Summary and Selected Statements Pro and Con, 1962"; and Richard S. Greene, "Legislation Proposing a Department of Urban Affairs, 1963."

EVENTS PRIOR TO 1954

Connery and Leach, in their 1960 publication, "The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas," indicate that interest in creating a Department of Municipalities dates back to at least 1912. In that year Philip Kates suggested such a Department as primarily a study group to investigate all aspects of urban living and make their findings available to local authorities.

Kates' proposal, which appeared in American City,[1] interested Woodrow Wilson who replied in a letter printed in the same publication to the effect that he would like to discuss the proposal with Kates.

Nothing developed, however, and Connery and Leach cite a 1919 proposal by Harlean James for a Department of Civic Economy as the next major effort to create a Department to deal with urban affairs. As with the Kates' idea, James' Department would primarily conduct studies and experiments making its findings available to city and hamlet alike.

James' proposal suffered the same fate as that of Kates. The New Deal era brought the next significant development with the advocacy of a "voice for the cities" by Charles E. Merriam of the National Resources Board in 1934. Merriam, at that time, did not spell out his proposal as to form, but by 1942 he was committed to a separate administrative agency in Washington to care for the interests of the growing urban population.

After the end of the war, according to Connery and Leach (p. 168), Nathaniel S. Keith proposed in an unpublished manuscript, a Department of Community Development which in his words would "give the needed structure to the Federal interest in this field and provide Cabinet-level policy coordination for all Federal activities with an impact on community developmental problems."

Although further research might uncover other examples, and perhaps some variation in proposals, the analysis by Connery and Leach serves to point up the trend in thought. Apparently the increase in Federal aid to local communities has shifted the emphasis on the need for a department from a study or information agency, as suggested by Kates and James, to a body representing the urban population, as suggested by Merriam, and finally to Keith's proposal which emphasized coordination of Federal activities.

At the same time, the various proposals that have been submitted to Congress since 1954 usually reflect some combination of all three concepts. The need for continued study of urban problems, representation of the growing urban population, and coordination of Federal assistance to local communities are included, with varying degrees of emphasis, in most arguments for creation of an arm of the President to deal with urban problems.

---

[1] Philip Kates, "A National Department of Municipalities, American City," January 1912, p. 405–407.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION 1954–61

Beginning with the 83d Congress, proposals for the establishment of a Department of Urbiculture or a Department of Urban Affairs have been submitted to each Congress. As already noted, the major purposes of these proposals have been (1) to study urban problems and make the information obtained available to local communities, (2) to give the urban population representation at the Cabinet level equal to that offered the rural population by the Department of Agriculture, and (3) to achieve some degree of coordination in Federal activities and programs related to urban affairs.

Mr. J. **Arthur Younger**, a Representative from Calilfornia, introduced the first proposal for the establishment of a Department of Urbiculture in 1954 (H.R. 100032, 83d Cong.). No action was taken on this bill. During 1955, however, hearings were held by the House Committee on Government Operations on a similar bill submitted by Representative **Younger** (H.R. 1864, 84th Cong.).

H.R. 1864 was primarily educational in purpose and sought as its analogy the work of the county agent of the Department of Agriculture. The purpose of the act was stated as follows:

"Sec. 2. The Congress finds that many of the most pressing problems facing the people of the United States grow out of the lack of knowledge and understanding of proper techniques in utilization of urban land; and that there is a corresponding national interest in the development of the science of urbiculture. Recognizing the invaluable contribution made by the Department of Agriculture in promoting increasingly efficient use of farmlands, the Congress enacts this act in order to provide a corresponding executive department to develop methods of dealing with pressing social, economic, and civic problems growing out of inadequate knowledge of the principles of using and developing urban lands, and to make these methods available to the people of the United States through suitable educational programs." [2]

The act would have created a Secretary of Urbiculture and transferred to him the functions of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, the Federal Housing Commissioner, and the Public Housing Commissioner. In addition, the act would have transferred the Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal National Mortgage Association, and the National Housing Council to the new department.[3]

The hearings attracted little interest with only seven witnesses, including Representative **Younger**, appearing to testify. Letters were received from five other sources.

Acceptance of the concept of a Department of Urbiculture was uniform throughout the hearings, but, friendly criticism developed over the scope of the propoasl.

Albert B. Cole, Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, testified that his agency, while receptive to the idea implicit in the bill was forced to oppose its passage because of the lack of clarification as to what areas of Federal activity the proposed Department would actually cover. Mr. Cole said: "So, what I am saying is this: We really are in favor of this committee examining this program. We think it is very important. Frankly, we look with favor upon the idea if the Congress and the executive branch can develop a plan which would be acceptable. We think it is growing in importance to such an extent that we can no longer ignore the need for the Federal Government to bring together in a coordinated program all of the programs which the Federal Government has upon urban living. Therefore, while we do not approve the enactment of this present bill, we are highly complimentary and very much interested in this approach, and would like to work with you to develop ideas which I have just barely touched upon this morning—a 'bare bones' approach, so to speak." [4]

Testimony from Percy Rappaport, Assistant Director of the Bureau of the Budget, disclosed an attitude similar to that of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Mr. Rappaport stated that, although his Bureau opposed the Younger bill:

"In taking such a position, the Bureau is in no sense opposed to the general objectives of the bill as we understand them. From my reading of the bill, it is my impression that the purpose is to create an executive department of the Government which, with respect to those people who live in cities and towns, would have the same enormously helpful role that the Department of Agriculture has had in relation to the farmers of this Nation.

"In drawing such a parallel, however, as the bill does in section 2, the result is to prescribe a role for the proposed Department of Urbiculture which would be far too limited and restricted. Section 2 provides only for a department which would undertake research in the development of methods for dealing with urban land problems and which could make these methods available to the people only through suitable educational programs.

"In contrast, the Housing and Home Finance Agency—whose functions would be transferred to the new department—is already engaged in action programs of a wide variety and scope. These programs affect the home-finance institutions, the home-building industry, the States and the cities and the individual renter or home purchaser. In other words, the present activities of the Government, which under the provisions of section 4(b) of the proposed bill would be transferred to the new department, have already gone far beyond the types of programs outlined in section 2 of the bill.

"It is for these reasons that the Bureau of the Budget believes that H.R. 1864 does not provide a suitable basis for considering the establishment of an 11th executive department." [5]

Both Cole and Rappaport, in answer to direct questions, stated that they felt the bill to be too restrictive.[6]

Representatives of the National Housing Conference, American Institute of Planners, American Municipal Association, and the National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials either gave testimony or sent letters in support of H.R. 1864. Each indicated that its support was primarily for the concept of creating a Department to deal with urban problems and little testimony dealing specifically with the Younger bill was given by these associations. All made some reference to expanding the scope of the proposal but there was no clear consensus as to what the scope should be.

H.R. 1864 was not reported, but it did represent the beginning of a long line of legislative proposals of a similar nature which extends to the present time.

During the 2d session of the 84th Congress, two bills were introduced proposing the creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs (S. 3159, Mr. Lehman; and H.R. 10295, Mr. Davidson). These bills died in the Committee on Government Operations.

The same fate was sustained by H.R. 1019, introduced by Mr. **Younger** during the 1st session of the 85th Congress and S. 2159, introduced by Mr. **Clark** (for himself and others), during the same session. No proposals for a Federal Department were made during the 2d session of the 85th Congress, but Mr. Ostertag introduced a bill proposing a temporary commission on metropolitan problems.

Hearings were again held in 1959 when 11 bills were introduced to establish some kind of executive body responsible for the development and coordination of urban programs.

H.R. 781 (**Griffiths**); H.R. 2423 (Rains); and H.R. 4481 (Addonizio) sought to establish a Department of Urban Affairs. Representative **Younger** continued to propose a Department of Urbiculture (H.R. 984) and gained the support of Senator Keating (S. 2397), and Representative **Bennett** of Florida (H.R. 9259), for this approach.

Representative Ostertag again introduced a bill to create a Commission on Metropolitan Problems (H.R. 2416). This time four other measures were introduced to the same effect: S. 1431 (**Clark**); H.R. 7282 (Bentley); H.R. 7378 (Granahan); and H.R. 7465 (**Fascell**).

All House bills were given a hearing before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations, June and July of 1959, with the exception of H.R. 9259 which was introduced after the hearings were held. Interest centered primarily on the creation of a Commission on Metropolitan Problems and H.R. 7465 (**Fascell**) was favorably reported with amendments August 18, 1959.

The two Senate bills received a hearing by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate and the Clark proposal (S. 1431) to create a Commission on Metropolitan Problems was reported September 2, 1959. As in the House, attention during the Senate hearings was primarily directed at the Commission proposal with the Department concept receiving less attention.

Although the House and Senate version of the bill to create a new Commission on Metropolitan Problems differed in several structural aspects, the basic purpose and function of the proposed Commission was the same in each. The following excerpts from the Senate and House Reports respectively point out some of the similarities and differences:

"PURPOSE

"S. 1431, introduced by Senator **Clark**, would establish a temporary bipartisan Commission composed of 18 members to make a 'full and complete investigation and study of Federal policies and programs relating to the needs and problems of the Nation's metropolitan areas' for the purpose of determining—

"1. The present and prospective needs of the Nation's metropolitan areas;

"2. The capabilities of the different levels of government to meet such needs;

"3. The extent to which the Federal Government is assisting metropolitan areas in meeting such needs;

"4. Means for improving the coordination of Federal, State, and local policies and programs.

"Six members of the Commission would be appointed by the President of the Senate from the Senate, six would be appointed by the Speaker of the House from the House of Representatives (four from the majority and two from the minority in each case), and six would be appointed by the President of the United States, including the heads of two agencies of the executive branch, two Governors (one from each party), and two mayors (one from each party). The Commission would submit its final report, including recommendations, to the President and to the Congress on or before February 1, 1961, and cease to exist 6 months after submission of its report.'[7]

---

[2] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Government Operations, "Creation of a Department of Urbiculture," hearings, 84th Cong., 1st sess., p. 1.

[3] Ibid. p. 2.

[4] Ibid. p. 21.

[5] Ibid. p. 25.

[6] Ibid. p. 22, 25.

"PURPOSE

"The purpose of H.R. 7465, as amended, is to establish a Commission on Metropolitan Problems and Urban Development which shall study and investigate the problems of municipalities and metropolitan expansion, with special reference to the need, in terms of adequate governmental structures, to establish sound revenue policies as related to State and National revenue policies, and to determine the services which such governmental structures should provide.

"It shall also study existing and developing efforts to cope with municipal and metropolitan problems including Federal policies and programs and any need for improved coordination thereof. It shall formulate findings and recommendations 'as to necessary and desirable steps to be initiated at the National, State, and local levels, to insure sound and orderly metropolitan growth within the framework of our traditional patterns of responsibility and control.' The Commission will be composed of 15 members to be appointed by the President and shall submit its findings and recommendations to the President for transmittal to Congress within 18 months. The Commission will be authorized to hold hearings, will be given the power of subpena, and may request information from departments and agencies of the executive branch of the Government."[8]

The House did not act on H.R. 7465, but the Senate passed S. 1431 with amendments on September 10, 1959. No action was taken in the House, however, and the measure died.

During this same period of time a related bill was being considered by Congress. In its minority views on H.R. 7465, several members of the House Committee on Government Operations had expressed the opinion that the urban problems being considered were intergovernmental in nature and should fall under the administration of the proposed Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations which would be set up by H.R. 6904. This bill had been reported favorably by the House Committee on Government Operations, and was passed by the House on August 17, 1959.

The minority reasoned that—

"If the undersigned have misinterpreted the purport of H.R. 7465 and if the problems of municipalities and metropolitan expansion contemplated here are intragovernmental rather than intergovernmental, then the bill would have the Federal Government intrude in areas of local and State jurisdiction and encourage further dependence on the Central Government.

"The undersigned are basically opposed to expansion of Federal authority and activities, especially with reference to those functions which should and can be performed by the States and municipalities. But we believe the Federal Government can and should be of assistance from the perspective of its proper role in Federal-local relationships. For that reason, we favored H.R. 6904 and believe Federal advice and assistance can and should be provided with respect to metropolitan problems through the Commission that bill creates.

"Creating two commissions simultaneously, with duplicating and overlapping functions, will not only be costly and confusing but may well lead either to divergent views and incompatible conclusions or to delay and inactivity because of the necessity of coordination and consultation to avoid conflict.

"In any event, the undersigned cannot espouse both a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations as contemplated by H.R. 6904 and a Commission on Metropolitan Problems and Urban Development as contemplated by H.R. 7465.

"CLARE E. HOFFMAN.
"R. WALTER RIEHLMAN.
"GEORGE MEADER.
"CLARENCE J. BROWN.
"FLORENCE P. DWYER.
"JOE HOLT.
"ROBERT P. GRIFFIN.
"GEORGE M. WALLHAUSER.
"JESSICA MCC. WEIS.
"ODIN LANGEN.
"ROBERT R. BARRY."[9]

H.R. 6904 fared better than either the House or Senate measure to create a Commission on Metropolitan Problems and after joint committee hearings was reported (July 31, 1959), went to conference, and was signed as Public Law 380 on September 24, 1959. The creation of a Commission on Intergovernmental Relations evidently put a damper on subsequent initiative for this approach to metropolitan problems. A Commission on Metropolitan Problems has not been legislatively proposed since 1959. On the other hand either a department or office has been proposed in every subsequent session.

During the 2d session of the 86th Congress, three bills H.R. 11918 (LINDSAY); H.R. 12508 (HALPERN); and H.R. 13024 (Santangelo) were introduced in suport of a Department of Urban Affairs, but no action followed. Another measure, S. 3292 (CLARK and others) would have established a Department of Housing and Metropolitan Affairs. This bill was referred to the Senate Banking and Currency Committee where hearings were held by the Subcommittee on Housing as part of its regular hearings on housing legislation in 1960. Moreover, S. 3292 was reported favorably by the committee on June 16, 1960.

In commenting on the growing support for such a department, the committee noted that: "Twenty-two years ago, the President's Committee on Administrative Management called attention to the needs of urban communities and urged the Bureau of the Budget to assume future responsibilities in this area. In 1942, Charles E. Merriam called for a Department of Urbanism within the Federal Government during a conference on this subject at Harvard University. Eight years ago, the National Housing Conference recommended to Congress the establishment of a Department of Housing and Urban Development. In subsequent years, this recommendation has been supported by the American Municipal Association, representing more than 12,000 cities in the United States, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, representing more than 315 cities in the United States, the AFL–CIO, the National Association of Home Builders, the National Association of Housing & Redevelopment Officials, and the Society of Planning Officials."[10]

Opposition to such a department, however, was also evident in the 1960 hearings.

Both the Bureau of the Budget and the Housing and Home Finance Agency submitted opinions opposing S. 3292. The Bureau of the Budget objected on grounds that the newly created Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and other previously existing Federal agencies were already engaged in the study of metropolitan problems and coordination of Federal programs to assist urban areas. In addition, the Bureau objected to the lack of specified functions that the new Department would perform.[11]

The Housing and Home Finance Agency, on the other hand, concurred in the idea that a department should be established but opposed S. 3292 on other grounds. The Administrator, in a letter to the committee chairman stated as follows: "The objections, which I see in S. 3292, relate only to the timing and the method of approach."[12] The Administrator felt that the subject of creating a new department was a long-term proposition which could be dealt with at any time. Furthermore, he insisted that the proper method of creating a new department was by Presidential reorganization as authorized under the Reorganization Act of 1949.[13]

Opposition to the proposed Department was also recorded in the statements of the National Association of Real Estate Boards,[14] and the United States Chamber of Commerce.[15] Both organizations felt that the creation of such a department would tend to institutionalize Federal aid to local communities.

S. 3292 was passed over on June 18, 1960, and June 28, 1960, and died on the calendar.

The period 1954–61 was thus one of evolution from the original introduction of the concept of a Department of Urbiculture to study metropolitan problems to the more specific function of coordination of Federal assistance programs implicit in S. 3292. The study function, although still considered to be very much a part of the function of the proposed Department, was, at least temporarily, sidetracked by the creation of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations in 1959.

By the beginning of 1961, hearings on the subject of metropolitan problems had been held twice in the Senate (1959 and 1960), and twice in the House (1954 and 1959). No bill was reported out of the 1954 hearings, but the 1959 hearings produced two favorably reported measures (H.R. 7465 and S. 1431) to create a Commission on Metropolitan Problems, and following the 1960 hearings, the Senate committee reported favorably on a bill to create a Department of Housing and Metropolitan Affairs (S. 3292). None, however, were acted on in both Houses and only S. 1431 came to a vote in either House.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTION, 1961–62

On January 30, 1961, the administration started an intensive campaign for a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs that carried over into 1962. In his state of the Union address on that day, President Kennedy said: "Our national household is cluttered with unfinished and neglected tasks. Our cities are being engulfed in squalor. Twelve long years after Congress declared our goal to be a decent home and a suitable environment for every American family, we still have 25 million Americans living in substandard homes. A new housing program under a new Housing and Urban Affairs Department will be needed this year."

On March 9, 1961, President Kennedy again called for such a department. In his housing message of that date the President said:

"Urban and suburban areas now contain the overwhelming majority of our population, and a preponderance of our industrial, commercial, and educational resources. The programs outlined above, as well as existing housing and community development programs, deserve the best possible administrative efficiency, stature, and role in the councils of the Federal Government. An awareness of these problems and programs should be constantly brought to the Cabinet table, and coordinated leadership provided for functions related to urban affairs but appropriately performed by a variety of departments and agencies.

---

[7] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, "Providing for the Establishment of a Commission on Metropolitan Problems," S. Rept. 881, 86th Cong., 1st sess., p. 1.

[8] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Government Operations, "Establishing a Commission on Metropolitan Problems and Urban Development," H. Rept. 940, 86th Cong., 1st sess., p. 4

[9] Ibid., p. 21, 22.

[10] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency, "Department of Housing and Metropolitan Affairs," S. Rept. 1607, 86th Cong., 2d sess., p. 5.

[11] U.S. Congress, Housing legislation of 1960, hearings, 86th Cong., 2d sess., p. 73.

[12] Ibid., p. 70.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid., p. 328.

[15] Ibid., p. 1029.

"I therefore recommend—and shall shortly offer a suggested proposal for—the establishment in the executive branch of a new, Cabinet-rank Department of Housing and Urban Affairs."

This request was formalized on April 18, 1961, when President Kennedy sent Congress draft legislation to carry out his recommendations. H.R. 6433 (FASCELL), and S. 1633 (CLARK) were introduced as the administration bills.

By this time, however, 13 other Members had introduced similar bills and 2 more bills were introduced on April 20. This made a total of 17 measures to create some kind of Department of Urban Affairs, Department of Urbiculture, or Department of Urban Affairs and Housing introduced in the 1st session of the 87th Congress.

Though differing in title, all the bills introduced in the 1st session sought to establish a Cabinet-level department to deal with the problems of urban areas.

Hearings were held on H.R. 6433 in late May and early June of 1961 by a subcommittee of the Committee on Government Operations of the House,[16] and S. 1633, along with S. 289 (Keating), S. 375 (HARTKE), S. 609 (Bush), were considered in late June of the same year by the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations of the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate.[17]

Although differing materially in their wording and content, all four bills considered in the Senate and the one House measure taken up, had in common the creation of a new department headed by a Secretary, and all bills visualized the Housing and Home Finance Agency as the nucleus of the new Department, with the possible exception of the Keating proposal, which left the transfer of existing agencies entirely to the discretion of the President.

In varying degrees of emphasis, all five bills listed the functions of the new Department as the study of housing and development problems, policy recommendation to the President, technical assistance, and coordination of Federal activities.

During the hearings many former friends of the proposed Department joined new friends in advocating its creation.

Leading organizations supporting the proposals for a new Department of Urban Affairs in 1961 included: The American Municipal Association; the U.S. Conference of Mayors; Americans for Democratic Action; American Institute of Planners; American Veterans' Committee; National Housing Conference; National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials; AFL–CIO; National Urban League; American Institute of Architects; Florida League of Municipalities; Alabama League of Municipalities; National Association of Mutual Savings Banks.

The basic premise of the proposals for the establishment of this Department was to coordinate and expedite planning and activity under the existing Housing and Home Finance Agency which now cover a wide range of diverse but closely interrelated activities. These programs include among others: insurance of mortgages and loans on new and existing housing; financial assistance for low-income housing; financial aids to communities for comprehensive local planning, slum clearance, and renewal of urban areas; advances and loans for the planning and construction of needed public facilities; loans to meet increasing needs for college and university housing; and financial aid for critical mass transportation problems in urban areas. The proponents of the new Department argued that it would help pool our national resources for urban research, planning, and programs and thereby facilitate the solution of vital urban problems. The advocates of the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing also asserted that the increase in the size, scope, complexity, and national significance of urban problems which accompanied the transformation of our Nation from a rural society to a predominantly urban one warrants the creation of a Federal Department of equal rank with the Department of Agriculture, which deals primarily with rural problems.

Along with both new and old friends, testimony was heard by several old and new opponents to the creation of a new Cabinet level department to deal with urban problems.

Those opposed to an Urban Affairs and Housing Department expressed the view that the creation of such an executive department presupposed a permanent and expanding Federal role in housing and urban renewal and gives the status which distorts the proper role of the Federal Government in this area. In their opinion, addition of another Federal department would tend to undermine historic Federal, State, and local relationships by opening up a direct avenue of approach for the extension of Federal financial assistance to municipal officials which will bypass the States.

The opponents also pointed out that the new Department could not achieve its stated goal of coordinating all Federal activities in the field of housing and urban affairs since the proposed Department would not include the Federal Home Loan Bank System and the housing program of the Veterans' Administration, which together account for over half of the financial support of private housing in the United States.

Statements in opposition to the proposals for a Department of Housing and Urban Affairs also pointed out that many of the pressing problems of urban areas, such as airport and highway construction, are not peculiar to urban areas, making it impossible to coordinate all the Federal activities related to urban areas in a Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.

Major organized opposition to a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing came from the following organizations: The National Association of Real Estate Boards; the U.S. Chamber of Commerce; The National Association of Manufacturers; The National Association of County Officials; Council of State Governments; The American Farm Bureau Federation; The National Association of Home Builders.

The Housing and Home Finance Agency did not testify at either the House or Senate hearings, but David E. Bell, then Director of the Bureau of the Budget, appeared at both hearings in favor of the new Department.

During the House hearings Bell stated the position of the Bureau of the Budget as follows: "Thus, an executive Department of Urban Affairs and Housing is clearly needed, first, to provide the most effective administrative framework for strengthening coordination and providing effective leadership in urban development, and, second, to recognize the growing significance, magnitude, and permanence of current programs administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency."[18]

Bell also emphasized that the new Department would consider the problems of small towns as well as large metropolitan areas. In response to a question regarding the large portion of his testimony devoted to small areas, Bell indicated that "in our judgment the smaller areas have a most important stake, essentially a larger stake than the bigger areas, in the passage of a bill of this kind."[19]

On August 28, 1961, the House reported a clean bill (H.R. 8429),[20] and on September 6 the Senate reported an amended version of S. 1633[21] identical to the clean bill reported in this House a few days before.

As reported, the two measures differed from the draft legislation sent to Congress by President Kennedy in two respects: (1) the FHA retained its independent status within the new Department and was not dissolved as originally requested, and (2) a language change was made to define an urban area as a city or township of any size, incorporated or unincorporated, thus insuring that the jurisdiction of the new Department would extend to small as well as large areas.

Minority reports were filed in both Houses with opposition centering on the suspended direct relationship that the Federal Government and large metropolitan areas were trying to establish on a permanent basis, largely bypassing State governments.

In commenting on S. 1663, the Senate minority stated that: "Enactment of this legislation will not encourage the initiative of States or of cities, but will violate the principles of the Federal system, usurp authority vested in State governments, crumble the walls of self-determination, demolish local leadership, and build ever higher the stronghold of Central Government."[22]

On the House side, the minority report on H.R. 8429 stated the position that:

"If the State and local governments are to be done away with as vestigial remnants of an outmoded system, let it be stated clearly so that those concerned are aware of the real issue and not deluded with the housing camouflage. There is more involved here than conferring Cabinet status on the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The preservation of our Federal system of government is involved."[23]

Additional minority opposition was based, among other things, on the unnecessary proliferation of departments of Cabinet rank, the lack of small town support, and the lack of administrative necessity since no new programs were proposed.

Neither the House bill or the Senate bill reached the floor in 1961. Both measures were carried over into the 2d session of the 87th Congress.

On January 24, 1962, the House Rules Committee refused to grant a rule for floor action on H.R. 8429. Six days later President Kennedy submitted to Congress Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, creating a Cabinet-level Department of Urban Affairs and Housing.[24] The plan was submitted under the terms of the Reorganization Act of 1949, which authorized the President to submit to Congress plans to reorganize Government agencies through transfer, abolition or consolidation of agency functions.

---

[16] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Government Operations, "Department of Urban Affairs and Housing," hearings, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

[17] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, "Establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing," hearings, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

[18] Ibid., p. 37.

[19] Ibid., p. 51–52.

[20] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Government Operations, "Establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Other Purposes," H. Rept. 1053, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

[21] U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Government Operations, "The Department of Urban Affairs," S. Rept. 879, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

[22] Ibid., p. 25.

[23] U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Government Operations, "Establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Other Purposes," H. Rept. 1053, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

Reorganization plans under the 1949 act take effect automatically within 60 days unless disapproved by a simple majority vote in either House and are not subject to amendment.

On the same day that the President's Reorganization Plan No. 1 was transmitted to Congress, House Resolution 530 (Meader) was introduced in the House and on January 31, S. Res. 288 (McGee) was introduced in the Senate. Both resolutions disapproved the plan.

The House Committee on Government Operations held hearings on Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962, February 6–8 and the Senate Committee on Government Operations held hearings February 14–16. Major witnesses for and against the plan were virtually the same as those appearing before the respective House and Senate committees during the 1961 hearings. No major witness expressed a change of position from that taken the year before. Thus, arguments for and against the proposed Department also ran much the same as those of 1961.

On February 15, 1962, one week after the close of its hearings, the House Committee on Government Operations reported House Resolution 530 unfavorably, which meant that the majority of the committee favored the President's plan rather than the resolution of disapproval.

A minority report was filed opposing the plan (favoring H. Res. 530) on the grounds that "Reorganization Plan No. 1 is premature, unnecessary, will not accomplish what its proponents represent, and is contrary to sound principles of governmental organizations."[25]

It was announced that House Resolution 530 would be considered in the House on February 21. This prompted the Senate leadership to ask for a discharge petition on Senate Resolution 288 which had not been reported in the Senate. On February 20, a motion to discharge the Senate Government Operations Committee from further consideration of Senate Resolution 288 was defeated on a 58 to 42 rollcall vote.

As anticipated, the House took up House Resolution 530 on February 21 and adopted it by a 264 to 150 rollcall vote. This vote put an end to consideration of Reorganization Plan No. 1 in the 87th Congress.

While the major activity in the second session of the 87th Congress centered on the President's reorganization proposal, individual Members continued to introduce legislation to effect a change in the Federal structure for dealing with metropolitan or urban problems.

Seven bills were introduced in 1962: five would have created an Office of Urban Affairs, one an Office of State and Urban Affairs, and one a Department of Federal-State-Urban Affairs. No action was taken on any of these proposals, but the idea of an office as opposed to a department represented a new approach, as did the proposal for a Department of Federal-State-Urban Affairs.

The proposed Office of Urban Affairs or Office of State and Urban Affairs would study urban problems, advise the President, and be responsible for the coordination of Federal assistance programs.

The proposal for a Department of Federal-State-Urban Affairs in addition to placing formal consideration of the traditional intergovernmental relations both in its title and its statement of purpose, would transfer all functions of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations to the new Department. Other transfers to the new Department are the ones included in former Department of Urban Affairs bills.

CONGRESSIONAL ACTIVITY SINCE 1962

President Kennedy made no mention of the Department of Urban Affairs in his state of the Union message at the outset of the 88th Congress in January 1963. No draft legislation was submitted, nor were any bills introduced in the name of the administration. The need for a new department was mentioned, however, in the President's budget message of January 17, 1963.

Lack of executive initiative did not prevent continued congressional interest in such a department from being expressed by individual Members, however.

Eight House bills were introduced in the 1st session of the 88th Congress: five for a Department of Urban Affairs, one for a Department of Urbiculture, one for an Office of State and Urban Affairs, and one for an Office of Community Affairs. No Senate measures were offered, and no hearings were held in the House.

President Johnson did not mention a new Cabinet post in his 1964 state of the Union message, but in his housing message of January 23, 1964, he included the following comments:

"If we are to deal successfully with the complex problems of our urban and suburban communities, we need governmental machinery designed for the 1960's, not the 1940's. The Housing and Home Finance Agency, established 17 years ago primarily to administer housing programs, has seen its responsibilities enlarged progressively by the Congress during the intervening years to include the broader aspects of community development as well. The Agency now administers such major community development programs as urban renewal, urban planning, public facilities planning and loans, open space, and mass transit. These basic changes in the Agency's role and mission are not adequately reflected in the Agency's current organization and status which remain much the same as they were in 1947. Action to convert the Housing and Home Finance Agency into an executive department is long overdue.

"The size and breadth of the Federal programs now administered by the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the significance of those programs clearly merit departmental status. A new Secretary of Housing and Community Development would be in a position both to present effectively the Nation's housing and community development needs in the highest councils of Government and to direct, organize, and manage more efficiently the important and closely interrelated housing and community development programs now administered or proposed for the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

"I recommend that the Congress establish a Department of Housing and Community Development."[26]

Two days later S. 2475 [Clark] was introduced to carry out the President's request. On February 13, an identical bill, H.R. 9983 [Reuss], was introduced in the House. No further action was taken on these bills, but the concept of a Department of Housing and Community Development did receive some comment in the hearings on the Housing Act of 1964 held by Banking and Currency Subcommittees in both Houses during February and March, 1964.[27]

Thus far in 1965 President Johnson has placed great emphasis on the administration's intention to create a new Cabinet-level department. In his state of the Union message of January 4, the President cited his plans for the American city:

"An educated and healthy people require surroundings in harmony with their hopes.

"In our urban areas the central problem today is to protect and restore man's satisfaction in belonging to a community where he can find security and significance.

"The first step is to break old patterns—to begin to think, work, and plan for the development of entire metropolitan areas. We will take this step with new programs of help for basic community facilities and neighborhood centers of health and recreation.

"New and existing programs will be open to those cities which work together to develop unified long-range policies for metropolitan areas.

"We must also make important changes in our housing programs if we are to pursue these same basic goals.

"A Department of Housing and Urban Development will be needed to spearhead this effort in our cities."[28]

The President again mentioned the need for such a department in his budget message on January 25, and has promised to send draft legislation to Congress in the near future.

SUMMARY

There is no question that the problems of the urban areas in the United States are great and growing. There is also no question that the Federal Government has a responsibility to assist municipalities that seek its help. Past this broad ground of agreement there is little consensus as to what should be done or how it should be done.

As indicated in this report, Congress has been at work since 1953 attempting to define the proper procedure and scope of Federal activity in the area of urban affairs. It is no simple problem.

Difficulties in establishing Federal policy regarding local community assistance stem largely from ambiguities inherent in recent Federal relations with municipal government, from the question of jurisdiction within the executive branch of the Federal Government, and from the appropriate functions to be performed.

First there is the changing relationship of the Federal Government to the local communities in the context of our Federal system of government. Traditionally, intercourse within the system has been between the several States and the Central Government in Washington. In the past few decades, cities and towns, as well as large metropolitan areas have looked more and more to the Central Government in Washington for financial assistance. This has strained the traditional federalism we have long accepted as proper, by establishing a direct relationship between the Central Government and local municipalities, which are actually creations of the several State governments.

The growth of the Federal grant-in-aid program has established a de facto relationship where no de jure relationship has existed. Large Federal expenditures in local communities have in many cases by-passed the State governments entirely, creating a new kind of federalism which tends to exclude the State as a functional unit. This change in the structure of American federalism has been a source of strong opposition to the institutionalization of the new relationship through the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs.

---

[24] U.S. Congress, message from the President of the United States, "Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962."

[25] U.S. Congress, Committee on Government Operations, "Approving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962," H. Rept. 1360, 87th Cong., 2d sess., p. 39.

[26] U.S. Congress, message from the President of the United States, drafts of bills relating to housing, 1964.

[27] U.S. Congress, Committee on Banking and Currency, housing, and community development legislation, 1964. Hearings, 88th Cong., 2d sess.; also, U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency, housing legislation, 1964. Hearings, 88th Cong., 2d sess.

[28] U.S. Congress, message of the President of the United States, state of the Union message, 1965, p. 8.

Second, there remain wide areas of divergence of views as to the place of the new department, agency, or commission in the executive branch of the Government, the potential of overlapping or conflicting jurisdictions, and the additional authority it would give the President.

Finally, within the ranks of those who support the idea of a Department of Urban Affairs in general, there is no well-defined statement as to what the scope of the new Department should be—either geographically, i.e., What is an urban area? or functionally, i.e., What Federal programs other than those of HHFA would be included later?

Federal activities in the area of local public works through the Area Redevelopment Administration and Accelerated Public Works programs raise additional questions as to whether these functions might not also be a part of the new Department. Both programs instituted since 1961 were not in existence at the time of last hearings on creating a new department.

It would be well to note that the functions of the Area Redevelopment Administration were at one point (See Douglas-Payne bill, S. 3683) scheduled to be administered by the HHFA, and that the Community Facilities Administration, a constituent unit of HHFA, presently administers all ARA and APW Public Facility loans and grants—approximately 30 and 50 percent of the programs of ARA and APW respectively.

Moreover, the recently enacted antipoverty program was not in existence at the time of the last hearing on the Department on Urban Affairs. This new program with its many aids for urban areas will have to be considered in relation to the creation of a new department.

Recent support by many Members of Congress for a regional approach to economic development adds still another dimension to the consideration of the new Department. No clear notion of what constitutes a region has yet appeared. If a region comes to mean a metropolitan area it must surely have a great deal to do with urban affairs, and, hence, may be a function of the new Department.

Therefore, regional functions, such as air and water pollution control, highway and airport development, and wildlife and recreational preservation can also be considered in connection with the proposed Department of Urban Affairs.

Conversely, there are those who oppose the creation of a new department precisely because it may become a broad-based Department of Urban Affairs rather than primarily a Department of Housing. The National Association of Home Builders and the National Association of Counties fall in this category.

Consideration of the hearings discussed in this report indicate that the evolution of the legislation introduced and considered by Congress shows a tendency to concentrate on the growing role of Federal grants-in-aid, with consideration shifting from primary study of urban problems to a coordination of Federal activities in urban areas.

The next round of hearings, which will probably be held during the 89th Congress will, no doubt, address the problems of scope, mentioned above, as well as the problems of federalism and grants-in-aid, which have been a part of the history of the development of the concept of a Department of Urban Affairs.

In closing, it appears fitting to record an exchange between several members of the House Committee on Government Operations and Congressman YOUNGER during the 1955 hearings on the creation of a Department of Urbiculture—the first hearings to be held on this subject:

"Mr. YOUNGER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

"I want to express my personal appreciation to you and to the committee for scheduling a hearing on this bill. I want to state at the outset that I am not naive enough to believe that a bill of this character can be speedily passed in the Congress.

"Mr. BROWN. You mean you do not expect to have it enacted before we adjourn?

"Mr. YOUNGER. Not before we adjourn, Mr. BROWN.

"Mr. DAWSON. We will have the hearing and do it when we come back.

"Mr. YOUNGER. However, I am convinced that a bill of this type sometime will be passed, and a department as authorized by this bill will be created. It may be 8 or 10 years from now.

"Now, my only object is to start the counting of the time for the 8 or 10 years from now, rather than from 2 years from now or 4 years from now."

APPENDIX I

Legislation proposing a department, office, or commission to deal with urban problems: 1953–64

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS (ACT)

Bill No.	Sponsor	Congress	Date of introduction
H.R. 7731	Griffiths	84th	July 29, 1955
H.R. 3383	do	85th	Jan. 22, 1957
H R. 5732	Rains	do	May 14, 1957
.R. 781	Griffiths	86th	Jan. 7, 1959
R. 2423	Rains	do	Jan. 15, 1959
I .4481	Addonizio	do	Feb. 16, 1959
R. 11918	Lindsay	do	Apr. 26, 1960
R. 12508	Halpern	do	June 2, 1960
R. 13024	Santangelo	do	Aug. 17, 1960
R. 301	Bennett of Florida.	87th	Jan. 3, 1961
H.R. 350	Fascell	do	Do.
H.R. 557	Rodino	do	Do.
H.R. 962	Griffiths	do	Do.
H.R. 964	Halpern	do	Do.
H.R. 2042	Lindsay	do	Jan. 6, 1961
S. 289	Keating	do	Jan. 10, 1961
S. 375	Hartke	do	Jan. 11, 1961
H.R. 2389	Addonizio	do	Jan. 12, 1961
H.R. 5346	Farbstein	do	Mar. 8, 1961
H.R. 6065	Ryan of New York.	do	Mar. 29, 1961
H.R. 1123	Rodino	88th	Jan. 9, 1963
H.R. 1640	Halpern	do	Jan. 10, 1963
H.R. 4067	Ryan of New York.	do	Feb. 21, 1963
H.R. 5955	Patten	do	Apr. 30, 1963
H.R. 8942	Lindsay	do	Oct. 28, 1963

DEPARTMENT OF URBICULTURE

H.R. 10032	Younger	83d	July 23, 1954
H.R. 1864	do	84th	Jan. 10, 1955
H.R. 1019	do	85th	Jan. 3, 1957
H.R. 984	do	86th	Jan. 7, 1959
S. 2397	Keating	do	July 16, 1959
H.R. 9259	Bennett of Florida.	do	Sept. 14, 1959
H.R. 1125	Younger	87th	Jan. 3, 1961
H.R. 434	do	88th	Jan. 9, 1963

DEPARTMENT OF FEDERAL-STATE-URBAN AFFAIRS

S. 2861	Boggs	87th	Feb. 19, 1962

DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS AND HOUSING

H.R. 6433	Fascell	87th	Apr. 18, 1961
S. 1633	Clark, others	do	Do.
H.R. 6538	McDowell	do	Apr. 20, 1961
H.R. 6547	Toll	do	Do.
H.R. 8429	Fascell	do	Aug. 1, 1961

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

H.R. 9983	Reuss	88th	Feb. 13, 1964
S. 2475	Clark	do	Jan. 29, 1964

Legislation proposing a department, office, or commission to deal with urban problems: 1953–64—Continued

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND METROPOLITAN AFFAIRS

Bill No.	Sponsor	Congress	Date of introduction
S. 3292	Clark, others	86th	Mar. 29, 1960

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

S. 3159	Lehman, others	84th	Feb. 8, 1956
H.R. 10295	Davidson	do	Mar. 29, 1956
S. 2159	Clark, others	85th	May 27, 1957
H.R. 12153	Rains	86th	May 10, 1960
H.R. 12161	Addonizio	do	May 11, 1960
S. 609	Bush	87th	Jan. 26, 1961

COMMISSION ON METROPOLITAN PROBLEMS

H.R. 2416	Ostertag	86th	Jan. 15, 1959
S. 1431	Clark	do	Mar. 16, 1959
H.R. 7282	Bentley	do	May 20, 1959
H.R. 7378	Granahan	do	May 26, 1959
H.R. 7465	Fascell	do	June 1, 1959

OFFICE OF URBAN AFFAIRS

H.R. 10302	Dwyer	87th	Feb. 20, 1962
H.R. 10393	Schweiker	do	Feb. 26, 1962
H.R. 10445	Fulton	do	Feb. 27, 1962
H.R. 11674	Scranton	do	May 9, 1962
S. 3516	Scott	do	July 6, 1962

OFFICE OF STATE AND URBAN AFFAIRS

H.R. 10301	Barry	87th	Feb. 20, 1962
H.R. 5162	do	88th	Mar. 28, 1963

OFFICE OF COMMUNITY AFFAIRS

H.R. 7509	Schweiker	88th	July 11, 1963

APPENDIX II

PROPOSALS FOR A DEPARTMENT OF URBAN AFFAIRS: A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF BOOKS, ARTICLES, AND GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS [1]

I. BOOKS AND ARTICLES

"A Federal Department of Urban Affairs," Current Municipal Problems, August 1959: 1–7.

"Action Postponed on Urban Affairs Department," Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1961: 367–371.

BIBLE, ALAN, "Uncle Sam's Metro Job," National Civic Review, December 1960: 595–601.

"Cabinet Seat for the Cities," Business Week, November 26, 1960: 71–4.

"Cities Poised To Join Cabinet," Business Week, April 22, 1961: 129–30.

"City Desk in the Cabinet?" Senior Scholastic [pro-con], November 15, 1961: 12–13.

CLARK, JOSEPH S., "To Come to the Aid of Their Cities," New York Times magazine, April 30, 1961: 11.

"Congress Blocks Urban Affairs Plan," Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1962: 380–384.

"Congress Gets Urban Affairs Bill," Engineering News-Record, April 20, 1961: 23.

"Congress Kills Cabinet Seat for Cities," Architectural Forum, March 1962: 5.

Connery, Robert H., and Richard H. Leach, "Do We Need a Department of Urban Af-

---

[1] NOTE—This bibliography deals only with articles pertaining directly to the creation of a Department of Urban Affairs. In addition, publications of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and hearings conducted by the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Senate Committee on Government Operations should be consulted along with other articles and books on metropolitan planning, intergovernmental relations, and Federal grants-in-aid.

fairs"? Western Political Quarterly, March 1960: 99–112.

——"The Federal Government and Metropolitan Areas," Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1960 [especially ch. 5].

"Debacle," Newsweek, March 5, 1963: 24.

"Defeat of Urban Affairs Post Leaves Big Cities With Big Problems," Business Week, Mar. 3, 1962: 72.

"Do we need a Secretary for Urban Affairs?" [pro-con] Senior Scholastic, Oct. 11, 1963: 10–11.

"Forcing the Urban Issue," Economist, Feb. 24, 1962: 704.

Gelman, Norman I., "Metropolitan Areas and the Federal Government," Editorial Research Reports, Jan. 21, 1959: 41–58.

Graves, W. Brooke, "American Intergovernmental Relations," New York Scribners, 1964. [Especially pp. 677–694, 905–906, 916–918.]

Hacker, Andrew, "Voice of 90 Million Americans," New York Times magazine, Mar. 4, 1962: 11.

Hindman, Jo, "Who Are the Metrocrats?" American Mercury, June 1960: 71–78.

"How Washington Would Control Your City," Nations Business, October 1963: 94.

Humphrey, Hubert H., "To Aid the Small City," National Civic Review, December 1961: 582–586.

Hutchinson, Theodore M., "Metropolitan Area Problems: The Role of the Federal Government," Ann Arbor, Mich., legal publications, legislative research center, University of Michigan Law School, 1961, 65 pages.

"Kennedy's Pitch for the City Vote," Business Week, Feb. 10, 1962: 32–33.

Lindsay, J. J., "Underprivileged Majority," Nation, Mar. 10, 1962: 208–210.

"Our Shame and Glory," America, Feb. 3, 1962: 579.

"Politics and Urban Needs," Commonweal, Mar. 9, 1962: 607.

"Proposal To Establish a New Federal Department of Urban Affairs and Housing," Congressional Digest, November 1961, [includes pro-con]: 257–288.

"Reorganization Act," Congressional Quarterly Almanac, 1963: 392.

"Should Uncle Sam Be Your Mayor?" Nations Business, January 1961: 14.

"Should Your Cities Growth Depend on Washington," Nations Business, October 1961: 116.

"The National Government and Urban Affairs," Vital Issues. Center for information on America, Washington, Conn., vol. XII, No. 6, February 1963.

"Urban Affairs," New Republic, Feb. 5, 1962: 6.

"Urban Department," Senior Scholastic, Feb. 14, 1962: 21.

Urban Talk," Newsweek, Feb. 19, 1962: 22.

"Voice for the Cities?" Economist, Jan. 20, 1962: 227.

Wagner, Robert F., "Help for Our Cities," National Civic Review, January 1960: 6–10, 21.

"Washington Reaches for Your City Hall," Nations Business, November 1961: 34–35.

"We Do Need a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing," Better Homes and Gardens, November 1961: 86.

Wheaton, William L. C., "A New Cabinet Post?" National Civil Review, December 1959: 574–578.

Younger, J. Arthur, "We Need a Department of Urban Affairs," This Week, Aug. 5, 1957: p. 8.

II. GOVERNMENT DOCUMENTS

Hearings

U.S. Congress, House, Committee on Government Operations, "Creation of a Department of Urbiculture." Hearings before a subcommittee, 84th Congress, 1st session on H.R. 1864. (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1955, 52 p.)

U.S. Congress, "Department of Urban Affairs and Housing." Hearings before a subcommittee, 87th Congress, 1st session, on H.R. 6433. (May and June 1961, Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961, 241 p.)

U.S. Congress, "Metropolitan Problems and Urban Development." Hearings before a subcommittee, 86th Congress, 1st session, June 3, 9, 19, and July 21, 1959. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959, 151 p.)

U.S. Congress, "Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962." Hearings before the Committee on Government Operations, 87th Congress, 2d session, February 1962. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962, 285 p.)

U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency. "Housing Legislation of 1960." Hearings before a subcommittee, 86th Congress, 2d session on various bills to amend the Federal housing laws. (May 1960, Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960. 1041 p.)

U.S. Congress, Committee on Government Operations, "Create a Commission on Metropolitan Problems." Hearing before the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, 86th Congress, 1st session on S. 1431 and S. 2397, July 24, 1959. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959. 73 p.)

U.S. Congress, "Establish a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing." Hearings before the Subcommittee on Reorganization and International Organizations, 87th Congress, 1st session, on S. 1633, S. 289, S. 375, and S. 609, June 1961. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. 238 p.)

U.S. Congress, hearings before the Committee on Government Operations, 87th Congress, 2d session, on Senate Resolution 288, February 1962. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962. 313 p.)

U.S. Congress, "To Establish an Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations." Joint hearings before the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations and the Senate Committee on Government Operations, 86th Congress, 1st session on H.R. 6904, H.R. 6905 and S. 2026, June 16, 17, 19, and 22, 1959. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959. 206 p.)

REPORTS

U.S. Congress, House Committee on Government Operations. "Approving Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962." (H. Rept. 1360, 87th Cong., 2d sess., on H. Res. 530.) February 15, 1962. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962. 47 p.)

U.S. Congress, "Establishing a Commission on Metropolitan Problems and Urban Development." (H. Rept. 940, 86th Cong., 1st sess., on H.R. 7465.) August 18, 1959. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959. 22 p.)

U.S. Congress, "Establishing a Department of Urban Affairs and Housing, and for other purposes." (H. Rept. 1053, 87th Cong., 1st sess., on H.R. 8429.) August 28, 1961. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. 33 p.)

U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Banking and Currency. "Department of Housing and Metropolitan Affairs." (S. Rept. 1607, 86th Cong., 2d sess., on S. 3292.) June 16, 1960. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1960. 12 p.)

U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Government Operations, "providing for the establishment of a Commission on Metropolitan Problems." (S. Rept. 881, 86th Cong., 1st sess., on S. 1431.) September 2, 1959. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1959. 21 p.)

U.S. Congress, "The Department of Urban Affairs and Housing." (S. Rept. 879, 87th Cong., 1st sess., on S. 1633.) September 6, 1961. (Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961. 30 p.)

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGES

U.S. Congress, House message of the President of the United States. Drafts of bills relating to housing. (H. Doc. 206, 88th Cong., 2d sess. Jan. 27, 1964.)

U.S. Congress, message on housing and community development. (H. Doc. 102, 87th Cong., 1st sess. Mar. 9, 1961.)

U.S. Congress, Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1962. (H. Doc. 320, 87th Cong., 2d sess. Jan. 30, 1962.)

U.S. Congress, state of the Union message. (H. Doc. 73, 87th Cong., 1st sess. Jan. 30, 1961.)

U.S. Congress, House Document 1, 89th Congress, 1st session, January 4, 1965.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN HULL INSURANCE SYNDICATE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill, and in connection therewith a memorandum in support thereof.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record along with the memorandum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and memorandum will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1600) for the relief of certain members of the American Hull Insurance Syndicate, introduced by Mr. Dirksen, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That notwithstanding the provisions of clause (3) of subsection (c) of section 201 of title II of the War Claims Act of 1948, as amended, members of the American Hull Insurance Syndicate, incorporated in the United States, shall be deemed to be "American Nationals" as defined therein but only for the purposes of the said Act.

The memorandum presented by Mr. Dirksen is as follows:

Memorandum in Support of a Bill To Provide for the Relief of Certain Members of the American Hull Insurance Syndicate

The 1962 amendment to the War Claims Act of 1948 (Public Law 87–846) made provision for recovery by the members of the American Hull Insurance Syndicate[1] of certain net losses on war risk insurance written during World War II. Unfortunately this amendment deals with many classes of claimants and the general nationality test prescribed by the amendment precludes recovery by certain Royal-Globe Insurance Cos., incorporated in the United States (hereinafter called Royal-Glove Insurance Cos.) though other members of the American Hull

---

[1] The American Hull Insurance Syndicate was formed pursuant to authorization found in section 29 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 (previously known as "American Marine Insurance Syndicates" and "American Marine Hull Insurance Syndicate") (U.S.C.A., sec. 885) for the purpose of providing an American market for marine insurance against loss or damage by fire and against marine risks and disasters of war and other risks. Since 1920 this syndicate has written the major share of insurance on ships owned by U.S. nationals.

Insurance Syndicate are authorized claimants. The annexed private bill is designed to cure this disability and this memorandum is intended to further document the necessity for its introduction.

At the outset of World War II, because of an uncertainty in the law, the U.S. Maritime Commission felt unable to provide insurance against risk of war loss to vessels transporting commodities basic to our war effort. As a stopgap measure the American Hull Insurance Syndicate agreed to write this insurance at stabilized premium rates until the Maritime Commission assumed responsibility, which occurred in April 1942. During the interim period approximately 1,300 ships were either damaged or sunk with a loss to the syndicate members of $191 million. Payment of these losses had the effect of completely wiping out reserves built up by them over a period of more than 20 years.[3]

The Special War Claims Commission reported that in previous conflicts such as World War I, marine insurance companies were recognized as proper claimants by courts and commissions dealing with war claims. This recognition was based upon the fact that insurance is considered a contract of indemnity which adheres to the property insured and the insured suffers no loss to the extent that payments are made by the insurer who thus stands in the shoes of the insured to the extent that he is entitled to recovery. This right of subrogation has long been sanctioned and is implied in such contracts even in the absence of specific language spelling out the right. Despite the recommendations of the Commission that these traditional subrogation claims be validated, it required a long and sustained effort to secure their recognition in Public Law 87-846. Even so, a novel test was inserted which has the effect of denying the Royal-Globe Insurance Cos. any relief in contrast to their recoveries with respect to World War I losses of a similar nature.

This denial is the result of the nationality test contained in section 204 of the 1962 amendment which requires not only that the initial claimant be a fully qualified "national" (which is the traditional test in war claims) but also that the insurance company which paid such a loss also be a fully qualified "national." This "double derivative" test is new and was not contained in World War I legislation. It is submitted that if the general right of subrogation of the insurance companies is recognized, no valid distinction should be based upon a further test of the nationality of the insurer because its claim must fail in any case where the initial claim would fail for any reason, including failure to meet the nationality test. It is an artificial and unnecessary refinement to impose a new and independent nationality test on one whose rights are completely derivative in nature.

Royal-Globe Insurance Cos. made no attempt to withdraw from their obligations nor were their resources rejected in meeting the emergency payment of losses. We respectfully submit that their claim for treatment as equals under the act should be recognized. For the foregoing reasons the private bill attached hereto should be enacted.

Respectfully submitted.

AMERICAN AND FOREIGN INSURANCE Co.,
GLOBE INDEMNITY CO.,
Successor to Star Insurance Co. of America.
NEWARK INSURANCE CO.,
QUEEN INSURANCE CO. OF AMERICA,
Members of Royal-Globe Insurance Cos.

NEED FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL CEMETERY IN THE STATE OF OHIO

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in 1862, Congress passed a bill which President Abraham Lincoln signed into law which established the national cemetery system.

The law provided:

> That the President of the United States shall have power, whenever in his opinion it shall be expedient, to purchase cemetery grounds, and cause them to be securely enclosed, to be used as a national cemetery for the soldiers who shall die in the service of the country.

This principle of providing a final resting place for our honored war dead has been carried on for over a hundred years as an expression of the people's gratitude.

We have been involved in two World Wars and numerous armed conflicts since the conclusion of the Civil War and it was apparent that the national cemetery system had to be continued and even expanded to fulfill a moral obligation to our servicemen.

There are 98 national cemeteries in the United States. However, viewed from today's needs the system is inadequate. It has been pointed out that the United States has not made a consistent effort to keep abreast of the growth of the veteran population.

A study has been conducted which showed that "of the 72 national cemeteries now open, 15 will have to close by 1969 and another 12 in the following decade."

Also, the space available is so located as to favor certain veterans and to disfavor others due to an imbalance in the area location of the sites.

There is no national cemetery in Ohio and to use the words of my distinguished colleague, the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON:

> If we are to fulfill our obligation in having space available for burial of our veterans in a location where their loved ones may visit their grave site, action must be taken to establish additional cemeteries.

Therefore, I send to the desk a bill which would authorize the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in Ohio.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1601) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in Ohio, introduced by Mr. LAUSCHE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958, TO PROVIDE AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SERVICES

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958, for the purpose of enabling the Federal Aviation Agency to provide air traffic control services which will be adequate to meet the needs of civil aviation, national defense, and safeguard traffic against the hazard of midair collision.

The proposed bill would provide that air traffic controllers who have accumulated 20 years of active control service in the field shall have the right to retire at the age 50, with the consent of the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency.

In principle it bears some resemblance to the 20-year retirement legislation which Congress has already provided for the agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and officers of the Foreign Service, Department of State.

The measure will not extend 20-year retirement to all of the employees of the Agency. Its benefits are limited to those employees who are involved in air safety and is intended to provide the early retirement opportunity to those controllers who have reached the age when they are no longer able to make the rapid and often split-second decisions separating aircraft which are necessary to prevent midair collisions. The existing Civil Service Retirement Act is inadequate for this purpose.

Until recently, the air traffic controller was called the forgotten man of civil aviation. The Secretary of Commerce in 1956 publicly described air traffic controllers as "unsung heroes of aviation."

The Senate Commerce Committee in favorably reporting what is now known as the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 had this to say with respect to air traffic controllers:

> Your committee has been impressed with the vital role which these employees play in promoting air safety and in compensating for present technical deficiencies in our air navigation system. As a group, the skill, loyalty, and devotion to duty of the control tower and air route traffic control center personnel is scarcely excelled anywhere in the Government service. The burden placed on these men, especially in high density traffic areas often requires them to put in long, unbroken, nerve-wracking hours of service for which under present personnel regulations they cannot adequately be compensated.

The committee then goes on to say that there should be a study by the Administrator to include ways and means of strengthening the air traffic control service through various measures including special retirement for controllers. Report No. 1811, Senate, 85th Congress, 2d session.

The Congress adopted this recommendation of the Senate committee and the Administrator made the required study which reached the Congress belatedly in September 1961. In his report the Administrator recommended 20-year retirement for air traffic controllers but the bill never was set for hearing by reason of the inability of affected agencies to accept other provisions of the measure.

I desire to make clear, if it is not already apparent, that the purpose of this proposed bill is safety alone.

It would provide air traffic controllers with a realistic retirement policy that will make it possible for controllers to relinquish their vital control responsibilities and retire from the service when they are no longer able to fulfill the high standard of safety that Congress has laid down for air transportation. That standard is not ordinary safety, but, and I quote from the act "the highest possible degree of safety."

---

[3] See, Special War Claims Commission, Jan. 16, 1953, House Document No. 67, 83d Cong., 1st sess.

To appreciate the need for earlier retirement for air traffic controllers, I think it is necessary to take a glance at the nature of control work and impact of the job stresses and the natural forces of aging on the controller's ability to meet its demanding duties. The crucial task of the air traffic controller is the traffic decision, the purpose of which is to safeguard against the disaster of midair collision, the lives and property entrusted to him, and at the same time to satisfy the economic demands of industry in providing the most expeditious movement of the traffic and the elimination of traffic delays.

These vital decisions of the controller in this jet era of unparalleled congestion and fabulous speeds must be made in quick time, oftentimes in seconds and even split seconds.

The controller cannot afford the luxury of deliberation for the jets cannot wait. He must have the mental capacity for rapid analysis of the immediate traffic situation, the formulation of a sound decision on momentary facts that are constantly changing, and the almost instantaneous delivery of concise and accurate instructions in critical traffic situations.

This process demands the mental faculties of quick thinking, retentive memory, accurate analysis and judgment under pressure, and concentration. These mental qualities must endure unimpaired if the controller is to fulfill "the highest possible degree of safety" for the traveling public.

Investigation has disclosed that mental faculties requisite to the prevention of midair collision generally slow up as the controller approaches the age of 50; that they deteriorate with age; and that this deterioration is amplified in the case of air traffic controllers by the nerve-racking character of the control work.

Thus the major factors in the declining proficiency of air traffic controllers are the natural forces of aging and the stressful character of the occupation. When that deterioration occurs the controller, regardless of his ripe experience and judgment, is often unable to act safely in complex traffic situations and the short time available to him to make such decisions.

At this point I should like to call to the attention of the Senate the recent age factor study which was conducted by the Federal Aviation Agency through its Civil Aeromedical Institute in Oklahoma on the effects of aging on air traffic control job performance and their implications to safety. One phase of the study was based on a survey of 1,130 individuals who had completed basic training and entered on-the-job training. The report states that the losses during the on-the-job period increased progressively with age ranging from a low of 19 percent for the age group of 21 to 25 years to 86 percent for the individuals of age 45 and older. The FAA states:

> The potential safety hazard due to the increased chance of control errors on the part of the older group is drastically illustrated.

It should be kept in mind that all controllers are not alike in their inability to exercise the particular mental faculties required of the controller. Some will be able to endure beyond 50 and still retain the particular faculties, including even the element of speed, which are essential to the complex task which the law has imposed upon controllers. But the majority, like the baseball player, will be unable to avoid the inevitable forces of aging with the slowing-up effects which they entail.

What I am saying here today does not mean that airplanes in great numbers are falling from the air as a result of conditions that now exist in the Air Traffic Control Service.

What I do mean is that conditions are building up in our air space as a result of the revolutionary changes which have taken place in aviation which give warning of future trouble unless we do something about it. The number of near collisions, or "near misses" as they are sometimes called, are part of the handwriting on the wall, and we should give heed to this warning.

We must today anticipate the future and devise necessary measures to prevent future mishaps. We should not act only after a disaster has occurred.

I sincerely hope that early and favorable action will be taken on this measure, which I believe is vitally necessary in the field of air safety.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1602) to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 for the purpose of enabling the Federal Aviation Agency to provide air traffic control services which will be adequate to meet the needs of civil aviation and the national defense, and to safeguard air traffic against the hazard of midair collision, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR PROSECUTION OF PROJECTS IN CERTAIN COMPREHENSIVE RIVER BASIN PLANS FOR FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, pursuant to recent testimony by the Corps of Engineers before the Senate Public Works Committee, the Congress should seriously consider the necessity of passing a special bill providing "monetary authorization" for fiscal year 1966 to make possible the continued development of some 10 river basin projects which are approaching ceiling limitations on authorizations.

This action is necessitated by the possibility that the omnibus rivers and harbors bill may not become law in time to assure monetary authorization for these basin projects before they reach the ceiling limitations on present authorizations established under the last omnibus rivers and harbors bill.

The basins covered by the bill I am introducing today are: Arkansas, Brazos, central and southern Florida, Columbia River, Los Angeles-San Gabriel, Missouri River, Ohio River, Ouachita, upper Mississippi River, and West Branch, Susquehanna River. In this bill authorization for 1 additional year is provided. It is thought authorizations needed for additional years would remain in the omnibus bill.

These 10 basin developments are facing work stoppage unless "monetary authorizations" are made early in fiscal year 1966.

As stated by Maj. Gen. Jackson Graham, Director of Civil Works, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, before the Senate Public Works Committee, on March 22, 1965:

> At the present time there are 21 river basin or major project plans which are subject to monetary authorization ceilings. Unless additional authorization is provided early in fiscal year 1966 work will have to be either suspended or slowed on 10 of these during the fiscal year. If we continue obligations as originally scheduled, monetary authorizations wil be exhausted for 9 of the 10 on July 1, 1965; and for the 10th by early October. The situation is most critical with respect to the Arkansas, central and southern Florida, Columbia, Los Angeles County, Upper Mississippi, and West Branch Susquehanna plans and projects on which available monetary authorization ceilings will be exhausted during the first few months of fiscal year 1966, based on obligating remaining balances essentially month by month, consistent with scheduled progress on each contract and required supporting features. A slowdown of construction progress is inherent in this procedure. On four others, the Ohio, Missouri, Ouachita, and Brazos, we can perhaps continue through the end of December 1965 before it would be necessary to suspend further activity. We believe needed work on the affected basin plans and projects can be continued in an orderly and efficient manner if additional authorizations are provided now to permit continuance on the basis of anticipated obligations through fiscal year 1968.

Recent authorization ceilings established in 1962 will be exhausted during the first few months of fiscal year 1966. Thus, we would be faced with a virtual shutdown on these projects, some of which were approved by Congress as far back as 1936. We are concerned here with monetary authorizations—apart from appropriations—which are necessary to permit continuing implementation of these projects in an orderly and efficient manner. The Corps of Engineers has an approved budget of slightly over $1 billion for fiscal year 1966. These projects are included in this budget, and lack only the authorization by the Congress in order to receive the needed appropriations to keep them on schedule. Through passage of this bill, we would avoid any increase in costs to the Federal Government involved in renegotiating contracts, rising construction costs, and expenditures involved in updating plans and procedures.

Therefore, Mr. President, for myself, Senator MONRONEY, Senator MORSE, Senator YARBOROUGH, and others, I send to the desk for introduction and appropriate reference a bill authorizing appropriations for these projects in order to guard against any delay in construction plans during fiscal year 1966, and I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD and lie at the desk until the close of business, Thursday, April 1, to give opportunity for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The bill (S. 1605) authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes, introduced by Mr. HARRIS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in addition to previous authorizations there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the prosecution of the comprehensive plan of development of each river basin under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Army referred to in the first column below, which was basically authorized by the act referred to by date of enactment in the second column below, an amount equal to that shown opposite such river basin in the third column below:

[Millions of dollars]

Basin and act of Congress, amount:	
Arkansas River, June 28, 1933	115
Brazos River, Tex., Sept. 3, 1954	6
Central and southern Florida, June 30, 1948	11
Columbia River, June 28, 1938	73
Los Angeles-San Gabriel, Aug. 18, 1941	10
Missouri River, June 28, 1938	24
Ohio River, June 22, 1936	3
Ouachita, May 17, 1950	1
Upper Mississippi River, June 28, 1938	14
West Branch, Susquehanna River, Sept. 3, 1954	6
Total	263

PUNISHMENT FOR ASSAULT OR KILLING OF ANY EMPLOYEE OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE OR THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make it a Federal crime to assault or kill certain employees of the Department of Agriculture or the Public Health Service engaged in performing inspection duties at ports of entry or border stations of the United States.

Under sections 111 and 1114, title 18, United States Code, it is a crime for any person to assault or kill certain employees of the United States while engaged in their duties.

My bill would merely extend the protection to certain employees of the Department of Agriculture engaged in certain inspection services at ports of entry and border stations of the United States and to Department of Agriculture employees when they assist in the performance of customs immigration duties at such ports of entry and border stations. It would also extend sections 111 and 1114 of title 18 to cover certain officers and employees of the Public Health Service when such officers and employees are engaged in certain inspection services.

These Federal employees should be accorded as much protection in their work as other Federal department or agency employees assigned in the same areas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1606) to amend title 18, United States Code, to make it a Federal crime to assault or kill any employee of the Department of Agriculture or the Public Health Service when such employee is engaged in certain inspection duties at ports of entry or border stations of the United States; introduced by Mr. FONG, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

POINT REYES NATIONAL SEASHORE, CALIF.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduced for appropriate reference a bill to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of California, and for other purposes, and I ask that it be appropriately referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1607) to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore in the State of California, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie at the desk for 1 week—that is to say, until next Thursday, April 1, for possible cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF TITLE II OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT TO INCREASE THE ANNUAL AMOUNT OF EARNINGS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the pension benefits payable to them.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD, that it be printed and appropriately referred, and that it lie over through next Thursday for the addition of additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and will lie over until next Thursday, April 1, for additional cosponsors, as requested by the Senator from Iowa.

The bill (S. 1608) to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the annual amount individuals are permitted to earn without suffering deductions from the insurance benefits payable to them under such title, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a)(1) paragraphs (1), (3), and (4)(B) of subsection (f) of section 203 of the Social Security Act are each amended by striking out "$100" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$150".

(2) The first sentence of paragraph (3) of such subsection (f) is amended by striking out "$500" each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "$600".

(b) Paragraph (1)(A) of subsection (h) of section 203 of such Act is amended by striking out "$100" and inserting in lieu thereof "$150".

SEC. 2. The amendments made by the first section of this Act shall be effective with respect to taxable years beginning after June 1965.

SEC. 3. In addition to all sums which are authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund under other provisions of law, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to such Fund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter, such sums as may be necessary to place such Fund in the same financial position as that which it would have occupied if the preceding sections of this Act had not been enacted.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, under present law, benefits are withheld from those under age 72 at the rate of $1 for each $2 of annual earnings between $1,200 and $1,700 and $1 for each $1 of annual earnings above $1,700.

My proposed bill would change the law so that benefits would be withheld at the rate of $1 for each $2 of annual earnings over $1,800, instead of the present $1,200; and $2,400 instead of the present $1,700 would be the limit for cutting off benefits.

The bill also provides that the increase in costs shall be taken from the general revenue of the Treasury. The explanation for this is simple—to avoid a further drain upon the $320 billion in unfunded liabilities of the social security fund.

Mr. President, many social security pensioners simply must augment their pensions in order to make ends meet. This is particularly true of those who have a low earnings base and whose pensions are therefore low.

My bill will enable them to become more self-sufficient which, in itself, is a status that lends itself to the peace of mind due our older citizens. It recognizes the importance of income for older persons as the basis for independence and dignity.

DESIGNATION OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN THEATER AS A COMBAT ZONE FOR INCOME TAX PURPOSES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, it will be recalled that on January 12 I introduced S. 459 designating the southeast Asian theater as a combat zone for income tax purposes.

Since that time I have become aware of a defect in the original bill in that it was not sufficiently retroactive to cover servicemen who have served our Nation in Vietnam since the real beginning of the American buildup there.

Therefore, I now send to the desk a revised bill that would be retroactive to January 1, 1961, and I ask that the text of the bill be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1614) to designate Vietnam as a combat zone for Federal tax purposes, effective retroactively to January 1, 1961, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 112(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of combat zone) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "The term 'combat zone' also means the area comprising (A) Vietnam, and (B) the waters and land areas adjacent to Vietnam as designated by the President by Executive order for purposes of this section."

(b) Section 112(c)(3) of such Code (relating to service performed in a combat zone) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "Service is performed in the combat zone of Vietnam if performed on or after January 1, 1961, and on or before the date designated by the President by Executive order as the date of the termination of combatant activities in such zone."

SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable year 1961 and all subsequent years, including the full year during which the President proclaims termination of combatant activities as prescribed in Section 1(b) of this Act.

INCOME TAX CREDITS AND INCOME TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR EDUCATION EXPENSES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill designed to provide income tax credits and income tax deductions for education expenses on all levels. This is essentially the same bill I sponsored last session.

May I say that in addition to the bill I now propose, I am an active cosponsor of S. 12 by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. I hope S. 12 will receive favorable action here this session along with the measure I now propose.

My bill has three main provisions:

First. It provides a tax credit for homeowners for that portion of their real property tax which is used for maintenance, operation, and construction of public elementary and secondary schools. Every such taxpayer would obtain this education assistance whether or not his children attend public school.

Second. It provides a tax credit for individuals and corporations for gifts and contributions made to nonprofit institutions of higher education. This contribution credit could not exceed $100 for an individual and $1,000 for a corporation.

Third. It provides a tax deduction for taxpayers who are themselves students or whose spouses or children are attending college. College expenses covered by this bill would include tuition and fees; books, supplies and equipment; and room and board. Total deductions would be limited to $2,000 for each student attending college, and the coverage for room and board would be limited to no more than $90 per month. A progressive limitation feature would curtail the amount of deduction granted to taxpayers with higher incomes.

Mr. President, as a former college professor, I am fully aware of the worries of many American families about the adequacy of our schools and their curricula. I am equally aware of the worries of many families that the costs of college education for their children are far beyond their means.

This is a pressing problem in which the very future of our Nation is at stake. Additional American resources must be applied to the needs of education.

It is my belief that the tax credit and deduction approach is the best way to apply those needed resources. Although other plans have been put forward, this approach has, it seems to me, two key advantages contained in no other plan now being discussed.

First, the tax credit approach preserves local and State control and supervision for education.

Second, the tax credit approach eliminates the troublesome question about separation of church and state.

Under the tax credit and tax deduction plan for aid to education, the taxpayers' money never leaves his control; that money never is sent to Washington and partially sent back to local schools and colleges. Thus, there are no Federal strings attached, no control strings, and no strings that can tangle in the consitutional brierpatch surrounding private and religious-backed schools.

Under the tax credit plan, such as I now propose again, the taxpayer applies his money wherever and whenever he wants. He decides how best to educate his children and then does it. And under this legislation he will have a choice of greatly expanded and improved educational institutions from the first grade through the university.

May I emphasize again that this tax relief approach offers an acceptable means of channeling greatly increased new funds into education, tax supported or privately supported, State controlled or independent, secular or religious. And, this is accomplished within the framework of a policy long acknowledged by the Congress—a policy of giving incentive to taxpayers to make voluntary contributions to programs benefiting both individuals and the entire society.

I believe these bills would help preserve the diversity and flexibility of the whole American educational system, a diversity of vital importance in maintenance of the freedoms and pluralism so cherished in our national life.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1615) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide tax incentives for the support of educational institutions, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TOWER, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to credits against tax) is amended by renumbering section 39 as section 41, and by inserting after section 38 the following new sections:

"SEC. 39. REAL PROPERTY TAXES PAID FOR SUPPORT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION

"(a) GENERAL RULE.—There shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to the taxes on real property paid or accrued during the taxable year which are imposed for the support of public elementary and secondary education, but only to the extent that such taxes do not exceed the lesser of—

"(1) $100, or

"(2) the amount of the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year, reduced by the credits allowable under section 32 (relating to tax withheld at source on nonresident aliens and foreign corporations and on tax-free covenant bonds), section 33 (relating to foreign tax credit), section 34 (relating to credit for dividends received by individuals), section 35 (relating to partially tax-exempt interest), section 37 (relating to retirement income), and section 38 (relating to investment in certain depreciable property).

"(b) INCOME TAX BENEFITS NOT TO EXCEED AMOUNT OF REAL PROPERTY TAXES PAID FOR SUPPORT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION.—If the amount allowable (but for this subsection) as a credit under subsection (a) for any taxable year, when added to the amount by which the tax under this chapter for the taxable year is less by reason of the deduction allowed under section 164 for real property taxes for which credit is otherwise allowable under subsection (a), exceeds the total amount of real property taxes paid or accrued during the taxable year which are imposed for the support of public elementary and secondary education, the amount allowable as a credit under subsection (a) shall be reduced by an amount equal to such excess.

"(c) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT OF REAL PROPERTY TAX PAID FOR SUPPORT OF PUBLIC EDUCATION.—For purposes of subsection (a), the amount of any tax on real property which is imposed for the support of public elementary and secondary education shall be—

"(1) with respect to any real property tax imposed solely for such support, the amount of such tax; and

"(2) with respect to any real property tax imposed in part for such support, the portion of such tax—

"(A) designated in the bill for such tax submitted to the taxpayer by the taxing jurisdiction imposing such tax; or

"(B) determined from information set forth in such bill or from information furnished to the taxpayer by such taxing jurisdiction, as the amount of such tax which is imposed for the support of public elementary and secondary education.

"(d) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) TAXES MUST BE DEDUCTIBLE.—No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) with respect to any real property tax unless such tax is allowable as a deduction for the taxable year under section 164.

"(2) TAXES CONSTRUCTIVELY PAID.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, the provisions of subsections (d), (e), and (f) of section 164 shall apply to real property taxes with respect to which credit is allowable under subsection (a).

"Sec. 40. Contributions to Institutions of Higher Education.

"(a) General Rule.—There shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount (subject to the limitations of subsection (b)) equal to the amount of contributions by the taxpayer, payment of which is made within the taxable year, to or for the use of one or more institutions of higher education.

"(b) Limitations.—

"(1) Individuals, etc.—In the case of a taxpayer other than a corporation, the credit under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed $100.

"(2) Corporations.—In the case of a corporation, the credit under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed $10,000.

"(c) Contributions to Which Applicable.—Subsection (a) shall apply to a contribution to or for the use of an institution of higher education only if—

"(1) such contribution is a charitable contribution within the meaning of section 170(c), and

"(2) if such contribution is made for the use of an institution of higher education but is not paid to such institution and is not made available to it by the recipient, such contribution may be used by the recipient only for the same purposes for which such institution of higher education may expend its funds.

"(d) Institution of Higher Education Defined.—For purposes of this section, the term 'institution of higher education' means only a duly accredited educational institution—

"(1) which normally maintains a regular faculty and curriculum and normally has a regularly organized body of students in attendance at the place where its educational activities are carried on,

"(2) which regularly offers education at a level above the twelfth grade, and

"(3) contributions to or for the use of which constitute charitable contributions within the meaning of section 170(c).

"(e) Application With Other Credits.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) to the taxpayer shall not exceed the amount of the tax imposed on the taxpayer for the taxable year by this chapter, reduced by the sum of the credits allowable under this subpart (other than under this section and section 31).

"(f) Correlation With Section 170.—

"(1) In general.—Deduction shall not be denied under section 170 (relating to charitable, etc., contributions and gifts), for contributions to institutions of higher education otherwise allowable as a deduction under such section, by reason of the fact that such contributions are taken into account in determining the credit allowable under subsection (a).

"(2) Reduction of credit.—If the amount allowable (but for this paragraph) for any taxable year as a credit under subsection (a) for contributions to institutions of higher education, when added to the amount by which the tax imposed by this chapter for such taxable year is less by reason of the allowance of a deduction under section 170 for such contributions, exceeds the amount of such contributions, then the amount allowable as a credit under subsection (a) shall be reduced by an amount equal to such excess.

"(g) Regulations.—The Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

(b) The table of sections for such subpart A is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 39. Real property taxes paid for support of public education.

"Sec. 40. Contributions to institutions of higher education.

"Sec. 41. Overpayments of tax."

Sec. 2. (a) Part VII of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to additional itemized deductions for individuals) is amended by renumbering section 218 as section 219, and by inserting after section 217 the following new section:

"Sec. 218. Expenses for Higher Education.

"(a) Allowance of Deduction.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a deduction the expenses for higher education paid by the taxpayer during the taxable year which are incurred by him, by his spouse, or by a dependent (as defined in section 152(a)).

"(b) Definitions.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) Expenses for higher education.—The term 'expenses for higher education' means amounts paid for—

"(A) tuition and fees required by an institution of higher education for attendance at such institution;

"(B) fees required by an institution of higher education for a course of instruction at such institution;

"(C) books, supplies, and equipment certified by an institution of higher education as necessary for a course of instruction at such institution; and

"(D) meals and lodging while attending an institution of higher education, but only if the individual for whom such amounts are paid is, at the time such expenses for meals and lodging are incurred, a full-time student at such institution or is enrolled in courses having at least one-half of the number of hours required to qualify as a full-time student.

"(2) Institution of higher education.—The term 'institution of higher education' means an educational institution (as defined in section 151(e)(4))—

"(A) which is accredited by a recognized national or regional accrediting agency, and

"(B)(i) which is authorized to confer any baccalaureate or higher degree, or (ii) whose curriculum consists of courses at least two-thirds of which are courses of instruction within the meaning of this section.

"(3) Course of instruction.—The term 'course of instruction' means a course of instruction for the successful completion of which credit is allowed toward a baccalaureate or higher degree by an institution of higher education authorized to confer such degree, or which is required for graduation by the institution of higher education offering such course.

"(c) Limitations.—

"(1) Expenses of each individual.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for the expenses for higher education of any one individual paid during the taxable year only to the extent that such expenses do not exceed $2,000.

"(2) Spouse.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for the expenses for higher education of the spouse of the taxpayer paid during the taxable year only if—

"(A) the taxpayer is entitled to an exemption for his spouse under section 151(b) for the taxable year, or

"(B) the taxpayer files a joint return with his spouse under section 6013 for the taxable year.

"(3) Meals and lodging.—

"(A) Full-time students.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for the expenses for higher education described in subsection (b)(1)(D) paid during the taxable year which are incurred by any individual who at the time such expenses are incurred is a full-time student only to the extent that such expenses do not exceed—

"(i) in the case of such expenses incurred while the individual is attending an educational institution away from home, $90, multiplied by the number of months during the taxable year in which the individual attends an educational institution away from home, or if greater, by the number of months for which payment is made during the taxable year for meals and lodging for the individual while he is attending an educational institution away from home; or

"(ii) in the case of such expenses incurred while the individual is attending an educational institution not away from home, $45, multiplied by the number of months during the taxable year in which the individual attends an institution of higher education not away from home, or, if greater, by the number of months for which payment is made during the taxable year for meals and lodging for the individual while he is attending an educational institution not away from home.

"(B) Less than full-time students.—Deduction shall be allowed under subsection (a) for the expenses for higher education described in subsection (b)(1)(D) paid during the taxable year which are incurred by any individual who at the time such expenses are incurred is not a full-time student but who is enrolled in courses having at least one-half of the number of hours required to qualify as a full-time student only to the extent that such expenses do not exceed an amount determined under subparagraph (A)(i) or (ii), whichever is applicable, except that, for purposes of this subparagraph, there shall be substituted for $90 in subparagraph (A)(i), and for $45 in subparagraph (A)(ii), an amount which bears the same ratio to $90 or $45, as the case may be, as the number of hours in which such individual is enrolled bears to the number of hours required to qualify as a full-time student.

"(C) Special rules.—For purposes of subparagraphs (A) and (B), a month during which an individual attends an institution of higher education for less than 10 days shall be disregarded; and an individual who is attending an institution of higher education not away from home, but who is required by such institution to accept meals and lodging furnished by such institution, shall be treated as if he is attending an institution of higher education away from home. For purposes of this section, the amounts paid for meals and lodging of an individual while he is attending an institution of higher education not away from home shall, in the case of meals and lodging furnished to such individual by the taxpayer, be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(4) Other personal and living expenses.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), deduction shall not be allowed under subsection (a) for any amount paid, directly or indirectly, for any personal or living expenses. In the event an amount paid as tuition or fees includes an amount for any personal or living expense (including meals or lodging) which is not separately stated, the portion of such amount paid which is attributable to such personal or living expense shall be determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate.

"(5) Taxpayers having substantial taxable income.—The amount which (but for this paragraph) would be allowable as a deduction under subsection (a) shall be reduced by the amount by which the taxable income of the taxpayer (computed without regard to this section) exceeds—

"(A) $10,000, if the taxpayer is unmarried and is not a head of a household (as defined in section 1(b)(2)) for the taxable year, or is married and files a separate return for the taxable year, or

"(b) $20,000, if the taxpayer is married and files a joint return with his spouse for the taxable year, or is a head of a household or surviving spouse for the taxable year.

"(d) Reduction for Certain Scholarships, Fellowships, and Veterans' Benefits.—The expenses for higher education paid by the taxpayer with respect to any individual which (but for this subsection) would be taken into account under subsection (a), shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, be reduced by any amounts received by or for such individual during the taxable year as—

"(1) a scholarship or fellowship grant (within the meaning of section 117(a) (1)) which, under section 117, is not includible in gross income, or

"(2) education and training allowance under chapter 33 of title 38 of the United States Code or educational assistance allowance under chapter 35 of such title.

"(e) Exception.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to any amount paid which is allowable as a deduction under section 162 (relating to trade or business expenses)."

(b) The table of sections for such part VII is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 218. Expenses for higher education.
"Sec. 219. Cross references."

Sec. 3. The amendments made by this Act shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1965.

S. 1616—PUNISHMENT FOR PERSONS TRANSPORTING OR RECEIVING STOLEN ANIMALS IN INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, for some time the members of the Texas Sheep and Goat Raisers Association have felt that sheep and goats should be included in present legislation that makes it a violation of section 2316, title 18 of the United States Code, to transport stolen cattle across State lines.

I feel that this is a fully justified and reasonable concern of importance to sheep and goat raisers from other States as well, and I therefore offer an amendment to correct this shortcoming of present law.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1616) to provide for the punishment of persons transporting stolen sheep or goats in interstate or foreign commerce and of persons selling or receiving stolen sheep or goats transported in interstate or foreign commerce, introduced by Mr. Tower, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1616

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2311 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting, immediately after the paragraph containing the definition of "securities", the following new paragraph:

"'Sheep or goats' means one or more sheep or goats, or the carcass or carcasses thereof;"

Sec. 2. (a) Section 2316 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2316. Transportation of cattle, sheep, or goats

"Whoever transports in interstate or foreign commerce any cattle, sheep, or goats, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both."

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO FHA-INSURED AND GUARANTEED MORTGAGES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for appropriate reference, bills to provide for a temporary moratorium on payments under FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages for mortgagors, who are unemployed, or in the case of servicemen, transferred as the result of the closing of a Federal installation.

The enactment of this legislation would lessen the impact on those Federal employees and servicemen adversely affected by the closing of Federal facilities throughout the country.

It is certainly a fact that such employees have contributed much to serving their country. Now, as a result of base closings, many of these civilian employees are being forced to seek employment in areas far removed from their present homes.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt that most of the base employees would prefer to remain in their respective communities, where they have their homes, where they have raised and are raising their families, where they are an integral part of the community life.

It is usually difficult, of course, for those separated from base employment to find other employment immediately, particularly since there will be in many of the areas a labor surplus market, at least temporarily.

The most important aspect of these bills in providing for a moratorium on home payments, for civilians, is to give additional time to those affected to find employment in the immediate area. The serviceman would be afforded additional time to sell his home, and would not have to dispose of it under such adverse market conditions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bills be inserted into the Record at this point. I ask that the bills lay on the table for additional cosponsors through Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills will be printed in the Record, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Texas.

The bills, introduced by Mr. Tower, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1617. A bill to provide for a temporary moratorium on payments under FHA-insured and VA-guaranteed mortgages for mortgagors who are unemployed as the result of the closing of a Federal installation, and for other purposes.

S. 1617

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "mortgage" means a mortgage which (A) is insured under the National Housing Act, or (B) secures a home loan guaranteed or insured under the Serviceman's Readjustment Act of 1944 or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The term "Federal mortgage agency" means—

(A) the Federal Housing Commissioner when used in connection with mortgages insured under the National Housing Act, and

(B) the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs when used in connection with mortgages securing home loans guaranteed or insured under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code.

(3) The term "distressed mortgagor" means an individual who—

(A) is unemployed, although willing to work, as the result of the closing (in whole or in part) of a Federal installation, and

(B) is the owner-occupant of a dwelling upon which there is a mortgage securing a loan which is in default because of the inability of such individual to make payments of principal and/or interest under such mortgage.

Sec. 2. (a) Any distressed mortgagor, for the purpose of avoiding foreclosure of his mortgage, may apply to the appropriate Federal mortgage agency for a determination that suspension of his obligation to make payments of principal and/or interest under such mortgage during a temporary period is necessary in order to avoid such foreclosure.

(b) Upon receipt of an application made under this section by a distressed mortgagor, the Federal mortgage agency shall issue to such mortgagor a certificate of moratorium if it determines, after consultation with the interested mortgagee, that—

(1) the mortgagor is not in default with respect to any condition or covenant of the mortgage other than that requiring the payment of installments of principal and/or interest under the mortgage, and

(2) such action is the only available means whereby a foreclosure of such mortgage can be avoided.

(c) Prior to the issuance to any distressed mortgagor of a certificate of moratorium under subsection (b), the Federal mortgage agency shall require such mortgagor to enter into a binding agreement under which he will be required to make payments to such agency, after the expiration of such certificate, in an aggregate amount equal to the amount paid by such agency in behalf of such mortgagor as provided in section 3. The manner and time in which such payments shall be made shall be determined by the Federal mortgage agency having due regard to the purposes sought to be achieved by this Act.

(d) Any certificate of moratorium issued under this section shall expire on whichever of the following dates is the earliest—

(1) one year from the date on which such certificate is issued;

(2) thirty days after the date on which the mortgagor to whom such certificate is issued ceases to be a distressed mortgagor as defined in the first section of this Act; or

(3) the date on which such mortgagor becomes in default with respect to any condition or covenant in his mortgage other than that requiring the payment by him of installments of principal and/or interest under the mortgage.

Sec. 3. (a) Whenever a Federal mortgage agency issues a certificate of moratorium to any distressed mortgagor with respect to any mortgage, it shall transmit to the mortgagee a copy of such certificate, together with a notice stating that, while such certificate is in effect, such agency will assume the obligation of such mortgagor to make payments of principal, and, if so specified in the certificate, of interest, under the mortgage.

(b) Payments made by any Federal mortgage agency pursuant to a certificate of moratorium issued under this Act with respect to the mortgage of any distressed mortgagor shall include, in addition to the payments referred to in subsection (a), an amount equal to the unpaid principal and interest charges which had accrued under such mortgage prior to the issuance of such certificate and subsequent to the date on which such mortgagor became a distressed mortgagor as defined in the first section of this Act.

(c) While any certificate of moratorium issued under this Act is in effect with respect to the mortgage of any distressed mortgagor, no further payments of principal, and, if so specified in the certificate, of interest, under the mortgage shall be required of such mortgagor, and no action (legal or otherwise) shall be taken or maintained by the mortgagee to enforce or collect such payments. Upon the expiration of such certificate, the mortgagor shall again be liable for the payment of all amounts due under the mortgage in accordance with its terms.

(d) Each Federal mortgage agency shall give prompt notice in writing to the interested mortgagor and mortgagee of the expiration of any certificate of moratorium issued by it under this Act.

SEC. 4. The Federal mortgage agencies are authorized to issue such individual and joint regulations as may be necessary to carry out this Act and to insure the uniform administration thereof.

SEC. 5. There shall be in the Treasury (1) a fund which shall be available to the Federal Housing Commissioner for the purpose of extending financial assistance in behalf of distressed mortgagors as provided in section 3, and (2) a fund which shall be available to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs for the same purpose. The capital of each such fund shall consist of such sums as may, from time to time, be appropriated thereto, and any sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended. Receipts arising from the programs of assistance under section 3 shall be credited to the fund from which such assistance was extended. Moneys in either of such funds not needed for current operations, as determined by the Federal Housing Commissioner, or the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs as the case may be, shall be invested in bonds or other obligations of the United States, or paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

SEC. 6. Section 1816 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(a)" before the text of such section, and by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(b) With respect to any loan made under section 1811 which has not been sold as provided in subsection (g) of such section, if the Administrator finds after there has been a default in the payment of any installment of principal or interest owing on such loan, that the default was due to the fact that the veteran who is obligated under the loan has become unemployed as the result of the closing (in whole or in part) of a Federal installation, he shall (1) extend the time for curing the default to such time as he determines is necessary and desirable to enable such veteran to complete payments on such loan, including an extension of time beyond the stated maturity thereof, or (2) modify the terms of such loan for the purpose of changing the amortization provisions thereof by recasting, over the remaining term of the loan, or over such longer period as he may determine, the total unpaid amount then due with the modification to become effective currently or upon the termination of an agreed-upon extension of the period for curing the default."

S. 1618. A bill to provide for the acquisition of certain housing owned by servicemen at or near Federal bases or installations which have been, or are being, closed in whole or in part.

S. 1618

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That for the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "mortgage" means a mortgage which (A) is insured under the National Housing Act, or (B) secures a home loan guaranteed, insured, or made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 on chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code.

(2) The term "Federal mortgage agency" means—

(A) the Federal Housing Commissioner when used in connection with mortgages insured under the National Housing Act, and

(B) the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs when used in connection with mortgages securing home loans guaranteed, insured, or made under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 or chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code.

(3) The term "serviceman" means a person who is serving on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States or in the United States Coast Guard.

(4) The term "property" means real property improved with a one- or two-family dwelling which is owned by a serviceman.

SEC. 2. (a) A Federal mortgage agency is authorized to acquire title to any property upon which there is an outstanding mortgage, if it determines—

(1) that such property is situated at or near a Federal base or installation which has been, or has been ordered to be, closed in whole or in part;

(2) that the owner of such property has been, or is being, transferred from such base or installation;

(3) that as the result of the actual or pending closing of such base or installation there is no present market for the sale of such property upon reasonable terms and conditions; and

(4) that if such property is not acquired, as herein provided, foreclosure of the mortgage thereon will in all probability be required.

(b) The purchase price of any property acquired hereunder shall not exceed an amount, determined by the Federal mortgage agency to be necessary, to enable the owner (1) to retire any outstanding obligation owing on the mortgage covering such property, and (2) to recover the value of his equity interest in such property.

SEC. 3. (a) The Federal mortgage agencies are authorized to issue such individual and joint regulations as may be necessary to carry out this Act and to insure the uniform administration thereof. Such regulations shall prescribe the terms and conditions under which payments may be made under the provisions of this section, and decisions by the Federal Housing Commissioner or the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, as the case may be, regarding such payments, and the terms and conditions under which the same are approved or disapproved, shall be final and conclusive and shall not be subject to judicial review.

(b) Each Federal mortgage agency shall have power to deal with, rent, renovate, or sell for cash or credit any properties acquired by it pursuant to this Act.

SEC. 4. Section 223(a) of the National Housing Act is amended—

(1) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (7) and inserting in lieu thereof "; or"; and

(2) by inserting after paragraph (7) a new paragraph as follows:

"(8) executed in connection with the sale by the Government, or any agency or official thereof, of any housing acquired pursuant to an Act entitled 'An Act to provide for the acquisition of certain housing owned by servicemen at or near Federal bases or installations which have been, or are being, closed in whole or in part.'"

SEC. 5. Such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act are hereby authorized to be appropriated, and any sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended.

RETIREMENT PAY OF VETERANS WOUNDED IN COMBAT

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which amends Public Law 88–132 to provide that veterans who are retired because of combat wounds may receive the same increases in basic pay per grade which are given to persons of the same rank who remain in service. It seems to me that this is a just and human recognition of the service rendered by those who were so severely wounded that they were required to retire from the service. I ask that a more detailed statement in support of the bill and the bill itself be printed in the RECORD.

Lest any questions be raised about a possible conflict of interest on my part it may be appropriate to state that, first, I have not drawn any disability retirement pay since I came to the Senate over 16 years ago; and second, when I retire, I will not accept any increase to which I might otherwise be entitled if this amendment is passed.

I ask unanimous consent that a statement in support of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1619) to permit members and former members of the Armed Forces retired on or after October 1, 1963, for physical disabilities incurred as a direct result of armed conflict to have their retirement pay recomputed whenever the rates of basic pay applicable to the grade in which they retired are increased, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

The statement presented by Mr. DOUGLAS is as follows:

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF DOUGLAS BILL TO PROVIDE THAT VETERANS WHO ARE RETIRED BECAUSE OF COMBAT WOUNDS MAY RECEIVE THE SAME INCREASES IN BASIC PAY PER GRADE WHICH ARE GIVEN TO PERSONS OF THE SAME RANK WHO REMAIN IN SERVICE

On October 2, 1963, Public Law 88–132 was enacted with an effective date of October 1, 1963.

With exceptions not herein relative, the 1963 act freezes the service members' pay at retirement except insofar as changes in the Consumer Price Index are found to occur. Prior to this legislation, all persons in retirement pay status received amounts computed as a percentage (maximum 75 percent) of "monthly basic pay" at retirement with certain adjustments.

Monthly basic pay is found by examining tables which state a specific sum for grade and length of service. Prior to the 1963 amendment, retired persons received some benefit from increases in active duty military pay because the formula defined "monthly basic pay" so as to reflect later adjustments in "applicable permanent rates." (The tables.) Thus, a colonel who retired after 20 years with 50 percent of his base pay used to get the benefit thereafter of all pay raises for 20-year colonels—to the extent of 50 percent. The 1963 amendment eliminated this and now persons retired—for whatever cause—can never receive a pay increase except as the Consumer Price Index is found to rise by 3 percent or more in a given year.

The proposed legislation would have the effect of repealing the 1963 amendment for the benefit only of persons retired for disabilities resulting from combat wounds. This change is urged because:

1. Unlike retirees who receive pay because of 20 or more years of service, and who can plan their futures, a combat wounded disabled veteran is often prevented from completing his career. Thus, by the very act of serving his country to the utmost, short of death, he is deprived of the emoluments which flow from promotions and longevity.

2. By the 1963 act, largely an economy measure, the Congress appears to have turned its back on and broken faith with a group of men who heretofore could look to some betterment in their lives, at least to the extent that military personnel in general received pay raises. While reasons of economy may justify the 1963 change as to regular retirees, special consideration should be given to those who are struck down and crippled by enemy fire.

3. As the course of history seems unfortunately to indicate the strong possibility of more brush fire wars, the Congress should show special consideration for those few who are in the future wounded in these actions.

4. One needs no course in economics to realize that the benefit that might enure by reason of Consumer Price Index changes in no way can compensate for the deprivation occasioned by the 1963 amendment.

5. The cost to the Government will be inconsequential. Statistics will no doubt show that the number of people who retire due to combat wound disability is quite limited.

6. It appears harsh, thoughtless, and unnecessary that frequently a man who never goes into battle can rise to a level of high rank and pay, while his combat colleague, crippled in his prime, must take the measure of his country's gratitude in a frozen pay scale.

CONSOLIDATION OF THE TWO JUDICIAL DISTRICTS OF THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto. This bill has just been approved by the judicial conference of the United States at its March meeting.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1620) to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto, introduced by Mr. Johnston, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 202(b) OF FEDERAL POWER ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 202(b) of the Federal Power Act with respect to the interconnection of electric facilities. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1621) to amend section 202(b) of the Federal Power Act with respect to the interconnection of electric facilities, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1965.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Transmitted herewith for the consideration of the appropriate committee are 20 copies of a draft bill to amend section 202(b) of the Federal Power Act to give the Commission authority to direct the interconnection of electric facilities "on its own motion" and not only "upon application" as is now provided. The proposal was before the 88th Congress in S. 2050 and H.R. 8209.

The Commission is now authorized to order interconnections, after opportunity for hearing, upon application by a State commission or by any person engaged in the transmission and sale of electric energy, where such action does not compel the enlargement of generating facilities or impair a public utility's ability to render adequate service to its customers. The proposal, without changing the standards or procedure presently incorporated in the section, will permit the Commission to take the initiative where it believes the public interest would be benefited by ordering such interconnection.

The Commission's recent National Power Survey has demonstrated the large extent to which the public can benefit by increased interconnections among the Nation's electric utility systems. As the report makes clear, the initiative for major interconnection efforts must come from the various utility systems themselves. There will be situations, however, where studies by the Commission will indicate a need for an interconnection or sale or exchange of energy based on information not available to a person who could apply under existing law. This is especially true with respect to the more than 3,000 small systems throughout the Nation, many of whom could greatly benefit from interties with larger systems in their general area but who do not have the resources or bargaining power to negotiate an interconnection on fair terms.

For these reasons it is our view that this proposal to authorize the Commission to initiate interconnection proceedings is clearly in the public interest. The requirements for hearing and the existing limitations upon the circumstances in which the Commission can order interconnections (which we do not propose to change) will fully protect the public utilities from any undue interference in their established mode of operation. Similar authority to permit the agency to initiate action to require interconnecion or coordinaion in the public interest is granted to both the Federal Communications Commission (see 47 U.S.C. 201, 214) and the Interstate Commerce Commission (see 49 U.S.C. 1(14) and (21), 15).

The proposed amendment would close a large gap in the Commission's program to help develop a coordinated system of power supply in this country in which the benefits of interconnections and power pooling are shared by the consumers of all systems, the small as well as the large. We therefore urge its adoption.

Respectfully,

Joseph C. Swidler,
Chairman.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL POWER ACT TO PROHIBIT ABANDONMENT OF CERTAIN FACILITIES AND SERVICE WITHOUT CONSENT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Federal Power Act to prohibit abandonment of facilities and service without the consent of the Federal Power Commission. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1622) to amend the Federal Power Act to prohibit abandonment of facilities and service without the consent of the Federal Power Commission, introduced by Mr. Magnuson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The letter presented by Mr. Magnuson is as follows:

Federal Power Commission,
Washington, D.C., March 4, 1965.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Transmitted for consideration by the appropriate committee are 20 copies of a draft bill to amend the Federal Power Act by adding a new subsection (g) to section 202. The amendment would prohibit a public utility from abandoning or curtailing interstate electric service or facilities, unless the Commission found, after notice and opportunity for hearing, that the abandonment or curtailment is consistent with the public interest. The proposal is comparable to the provisions of section 7(b) of the Natural Gas Act governing abandonment of service and facilities by natural gas companies. Bills which would have accomplished the objective of this proposal were introduced in the 88th Congress at the request of the Commission (H.R. 6835; S. 1699).

The Commission's recently published National Power Survey Report highlights the increasing importance of interstate electric service as the electric industry expands its interconnections across State lines to take full advantage of the economies of coordinated operations. It is essential that electric power distributors relying upon wholesale service be assured of an abundant supply of electricity to meet the growing demands of their customers. The assurance of continued service at just and reasonable rates beyond the term of existing contracts is essential if small systems are to be encouraged to enter into wholesale power arrangements with the larger systems.

While it has been held that abandonment of established service constitutes a change in a rate schedule subject to the provisions of section 205 of the act (see *Pennsylvania Water & Power Co.* v. *Federal Power Commission*, 343 U.S. 414, 423–424 (1952)), the degree of protection this section provides to distributors may not always prove adequate. This results from the fact that when a public utility files a new schedule under section 205 proposing to abandon or limit existing service the filing can only be suspended by the Commission, pending hearing as to its lawfulness, for a maximum period of 5 months. If the Commission has not reached a determination of the matter at the end of the suspension period, the abandonment or limitation on service can be make effective by the utility. Since the small distribution system cannot run the risk of even a temporary break in service it is important that the Commission be vested with direct authority to pass upon any proposed abandonment or curtailment of service in advance of such action.

The Commission urges the adoption of the bill.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,
Chairman.

CONTINUING STUDY OF THE EFFECTS OF CERTAIN PESTICIDES UPON FISH AND WILDLIFE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, during the last Congress, the Commerce Committee heard the late Rachel Carson, the famed biologist whose "Silent Spring" alerted millions of Americans to the potential danger from the uncontrolled use of pesticides, call for expanded "research on the effect of pesticides on fish and wildlife and for public education in these matters." As Miss Carson noted, fish and wildlife possess not only "sentimental and esthetic importance" but are critical "to the national economy and to the revenues of our States." She told us:

> During 1962, 19,403,465 of our Nation's residents purchased fishing licenses in our 50 States, paying for these licenses a total of $54,163,163. This revenue will be lost if the fish disappear.
>
> In this same year 13,996,353 bought hunting licenses, according to the latest, but incomplete, information from the Fish and Wildlife Service, paying for these licenses the total sum of $63,983,798. Again, this revenue will be gone if our game birds and animals are exterminated.
>
> Our commercial fisheries employ directly 212,000 of our citizens and last year produced fishery products valued at $381 million harvested in this country.

The authorization for pesticide research by the Department of the Interior is now limited to an annual appropriation of $2,565,000. In his message to Congress on Natural Beauty, President Johnson dealt with this limitation:

> Pesticides may affect living organisms wherever they occur.
>
> In order that we may better understand the effects of those compounds, I have included increased funds in the budget for use by the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare to increase their research efforts on pesticides so they can give special attention to the flow of pesticides through the environment; study the means by which pesticides break down and disappear in nature; and to keep a constant check on the level of pesticides in our water, air, soil, and food supply.
>
> I have asked the Secretary of the Interior to submit legislation to eliminate the ceiling on pesticide research.

The bill which I introduce today at the request of the Secretary of the Interior will eliminate that ceiling. I ask unanimous consent that the bill and the letter from the Secretary of the Interior be printed at the close of my remarks, together with a recent release from the Department of the Interior announcing the development of guidelines for testing the toxicity of new pesticides to fish and wildlife.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill, letter, and release will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1623) to amend the act of August 1, 1958, relating to a continuing study by the Secretary of the Interior of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses to this resource, introduced by Mr. Magnuson (for himself and Mrs. Neuberger), by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1623

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 2 of the Act of August 1, 1958 (72 Stat. 479), as amended by the Act of September 16, 1959 (73 Stat. 563), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 2. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

The letter and release, presented by Mr. Magnuson, are as follows:

U.S. Department of the Interior,
Office of the Secretary,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1965.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: Enclosed is a draft of a proposed bill "To amend the act of August 1, 1958, relating to a continuing study by the Secretary of the Interior of the effects of insecticides, herbicides, fungicides, and other pesticides upon fish and wildlife for the purpose of preventing losses to this resource."

We recommend that this bill be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration, and we recommend that it be enacted.

In the report of the President's Science Advisory Committee "Use of Pesticides," of May 15, 1963, the following recommendation was made:

"The Panel recommends expanded research and evaluation by the Department of the Interior of the toxic effects of pesticides on wild vertebrates and invertebrates.

"The study of wildlife presents a unique opportunity to discover the effects on the food chain of which each animal is a part, and to determine possible pathways through which accumulated and, in some cases, magnified pesticide residues can find their way directly or indirectly to wildlife and to man."

President Johnson in his recent message on natural beauty stated:

"Pesticides may affect living organisms wherever they occur.

"In order that we may better understand the effects of those compounds, I have included increased funds in the budget for use by the Secretaries of Agriculture, Interior, and Health, Education, and Welfare to increase their research efforts on pesticides so they can give special attention to the flow of pesticides through the environment; study the means by which pesticides break down and disappear in nature; and to keep a constant check on the level of pesticides in our water, air, soil, and food supply.

"I have asked the Secretary of the Interior to submit legislation to eliminate the ceiling on pesticide research."

The enclosed bill will accomplish this.

The act of August 1, 1958, as amended (16 U.S.C. 742d–1) directed the Secretary of the Interior to undertake a comprehensive and continuing program of study and research on the effects of pesticides on our Nation's fish and wildlife. The purpose of this program is to find amounts, percentages, and formulations of pesticidal chemicals which can be used safely, and which will prevent losses to this valuable resource. An annual appropriation of $280,000 was authorized to carry out this program. In 1959 this amount was increased to $2,565,000. This is the present ceiling on pesticide research.

Under this ceiling, the present program includes controlled laboratory studies of acute and chronic toxicities to selected species of wildlife and fish, development of new and improved methods of testing and analysis, the measurement of pesticide residues in tissues and organs of fish and wildlife specimens, and pre- and post-treatment observations of the effects of pest control chemicals upon the fish and wildlife environment.

The studies to date have revealed widespread presence of the residues of several widely used pesticidal chemicals in specimens of fish and wildlife collected from practically all parts of the country. Little is known, however, concerning the possible presence of many other present-day pesticidal materials or of their effects upon survival, reproduction, and growth of the fauna inhabiting land and water areas subjected to treatments or contamination by these substances. The acute and chronic effects resulting from exposure to combinations of such toxic agents are likewise largely unknown, although related studies have shown that one chemical may heighten the effect of another. While some of the residue levels of these chemicals are not considered dangerous to humans, they may be well above the levels tolerated by more sensitive forms of animal life, such as fish and shellfish. Further expansion of research is needed to increase knowledge of these effects; and where they are found to be harmful, to facilitate the discovery and development of substitute methods for necessary pest control that are more selective in their modes of action and do not persist in the environment for prolonged periods.

Enactment of the enclosed bill will permit such an expansion.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this draft bill from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Sincerely yours,

Frank R. Briggs,
Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

[From U.S. Department of the Interior]

Interior Department Develops New Tests for Pesticides

The Department of the Interior announced today it has developed guidelines for testing the toxicity of new pesticides to fish and wildlife. The recommended procedures stem from experiments conducted by the Department under its intensified program to safeguard these important resources from poisoning.

Facts about toxicity are needed by manufacturers of pesticides to support their applications for Government registration of new pesticide compounds.

The Department's evaluation procedures, developed in cooperation with the National Agricultural Chemical Association, are similar to those used by research stations of the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife and the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in the Department.

The procedures are intended to produce information on the lethal and sublethal toxicity of pesticides to a variety of animal, fish, and shellfish species. They are not considered to be the sole means of testing for toxicity.

The guidelines recommend procedures for obtaining data on:

Lethal and sublethal toxicity to mammals, required by the Departments of Agriculture and Health, Education, and Welfare.

Lethal toxicity to one species of waterfowl (mallard duck) and one of the following: bobwhite quail, ring-neck pheasant or coturnix (Japanese quail).

Lethal toxicity data on rainbow trout as the representative of coldwater fish; and one of these warm-water fish: bluegill, goldfish, or channel catfish.

Sublethal toxicity on the eastern oyster as representative of the marine mollusks. Lethal tests can not be made on the oyster because it closes its shell against a concentration of pesticides that would be fatal. The sublethal test shows the amount of reduction of shell growth caused by a pesticide.

The guidelines describe the feeding, housing, and temperature control for birds to be tested, the number of birds to be exposed to pesticides and their diets, and the periodic observations to be made. Similar recommendations are made for testing of fish.

The Department of the Interior said the Pesticides Review Staff of the Fish and Wildlife Service will assist manufacturers in evaluating any methods such producers devise to test pesticides.

AMENDMENT TO SMALL BUSINESS ACT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Small Business Act by repealing the so-called small business set-asides in Government construction. Construction set-asides have created a number of very serious problems in the building construction industry. Organized labor in building construction, as well as management groups with which I have consulted, strongly support my proposal.

In addition to repealing the small business set-aside in Government construction, my bill would set up a system of reports to the Small Business Administration from prime contractors on Government construction projects. Such reports could be used by the Congress in its continuing effort to improve the operation of the SBA.

Throughout our history, building construction on Government projects has been awarded on the basis of responsive competitive bidding. Without competitive bidding, the specter of political favor, the waste of taxpayers' money, and the prospect of inefficient and inadequate work performance will be with us again.

One of our best defenses against monopoly in Government construction is the responsive competitive bid. No matter how large or how small a man may be, he is not entitled to the job unless he can meet price competition in the construction industry.

In other small business set-asides, competitive bidding is used to determine price. After the price has been determined in this manner, the procurement item in question is set aside in order that small business men may have an opportunity to meet the competition of price as well as quality.

This has not been the case, however, in the operation of the small business set-aside in Government construction. Competent contractors sometimes are not permitted to bid. The result is that the Government does not always know what a fair price for these set-aside jobs might be.

The set-aside in Government construction also can be harmful to labor-management relations. Contracts in construction are arrived at before jobs are bid and begun. Because of this practice, stable labor relations in the industry depend upon agreements of a continuing nature between unions and established contractors. Construction set-aside, by definition, invites workers who are nonunion and not organized into Government construction. If they are not in business, or have not been in business as contractors, then they obviously have no incentive to become part of the labor-management fabric in this industry.

Although the defenders of the construction set-aside insist that small business contractors with Government contracts pay the prevailing wage provided by the Davis-Bacon Act, the fact remains that these set-aside contractors are not required to pay the so-called fringe benefits which exist in most other construction contracts.

In addition to this advantage, Mr. President, the set-aside contractors make very little contribution to the manpower training program of the construction industry. They do not participate in apprenticeship agreements and, therefore, are not carrying their share of the burden.

Finally, the small business set-aside in construction should be repealed because it simply has not worked. It is my understanding that the arrears and liquidation rate of loans by SBA to the construction industry are much higher than other types of loans. When this is compared with the average loss rate of all SBA loans of something less than 2 percent, it is apparent that we should take another look at this phase of the program. In our efforts to assist the small businessman and to promote the general welfare, we should not impose upon the building construction industry, a system of set-aside which is opposed by labor and management and which is detrimental to the best interest of the Federal Government.

I believe in the Small Business Administration and the efforts of the present administration to strengthen this agency. I do not believe, however, that the set-aside procedure should be applied in the building construction industry. I hope the majority of this body will agree.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the desk until Thursday, April 1, for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

The bill (S. 1624) to amend the Small Business Act to provide that the program under which Government contracts are set aside for small business concerns shall not apply in the case of contracts for maintenance, repair, or construction; introduced by Mr. METCALF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 and ask unanimous consent it lie at the desk for cosponsors until next Thursday, April 1, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Montana.

The bill (S. 1625) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to permit certain tax-exempt organizations to engage in certain activities for the purpose of influencing legislation directly relevant to the purposes which qualify such organizations for tax exemption, without losing certain benefits under that Code; introduced by Mr. METCALF, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENT OF TARIFF ACTS OF 1930 AND 1911

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and the Tariff Act of 1911. This bill is identical to S. 2173 which I introduced during the 88th Congress and which was cosponsored by 17 other Senators.

The customs law under the Tariff Act of 1930 provides that no merchandise, baggage, or passengers arriving in the United States from any foreign port shall be unloaded on a Sunday, a holiday, or at night, except under a special license granted by the collector of customs. Before any such license is granted, however, the collector requires that the person or persons making the request agree to pay the compensation of customs officers assigned to duty on Sunday, a holiday, or at night. There is a provision in the present act which exempts highway vehicles and ferries from these overtime charges. Thus, the full burden of these charges falls upon the private aircraft operator as well as commercial airlines, steamship, and railroad lines.

I have always been at somewhat of a loss to understand why people traveling by automobile, ferry, or even on foot, receive regular customs service 24 hours of every day but people who travel by private or commercial aircraft, steamship and railroad must pay sometimes enormous overtime charges on weekends, holidays and after 5 p.m. The commercial air, water, and rail companies pass this cost along to their passengers in the general fare and thus, we are often unaware of such charges when traveling on these facilities. But the private pilot, and there are thousands of them, must dig these charges out of his pocket each time he has the misfortune of returning to the country on weekends, holidays, or after 5 p.m.

These charges can sometimes be quite high. Quoting from a letter I received from the Commissioner of Customs:

> The cost of overtime services depends upon the salary of the customs officer performing

the service. On Sundays and holidays this will equal 2 days' pay regardless of the time required up to 8 hours.

According to figures supplied to me by the FAA, a typical GS-9 inspector, whose straight time rate is $3.54 per hour, receives $28.32 for 1 hour of call back overtime work between 7 and 8 p.m. For 1 hour of work between 10 p.m. and 11 p.m., this employee receives $42.48. He can receive up to $70.80 for 6 hours of overtime work in the course of 1 night. For 1 hour of work on a Sunday or holiday, this same GS-9 inspector receives $56.64. In fact, I am told by reliable sources that many customs inspectors receive overtime pay for extra inspections that equal or exceed their annual base pay.

The Bureau of Customs justifies these extra customs charges on the ground that people traveling by private aircraft, commercial airline, steamship, or railroad are not specifically exempt persons; that it has no discretionary authority in the application of the statute; that its job is to enforce expressed congressional intent. The legislative history behind the Tariff Act of 1930, however, shows no congressional intent to require extra customs charges for people traveling by private and commercial airline, steamship, or railroad. On the contrary, the legislative history is such that the possible exemption of such people was not even considered by Congress. These overtime laws were enacted in an era when the small aircraft's future as a common means of transportation was unknown. They were enacted in an era when the future significance of transportation and foreign commerce to our Nation's economy probably was not fully visualized. In fact, current customs overtime requirements are based on a statute which is over 50 years old. Today, when more and more people are flying and utilizing small aircraft as a common means of transportation; when approximately 80 percent of today's total aviation travel in the United States is conducted by private aircraft; and when more and more people are using commercial airlines, steamships, and railroads for transportation and foreign commerce, it seems to me the law should be amended to meet the need for full-time inspection services without special charges. The use of these modes of travel and commerce will undoubtedly increase as time goes by, and it seems to me that it is inequitable to require only one group to pay for the cost of necessary governmental services.

One of the basic purposes of the existing tariff law was to discourage foreign commerce transactions at other than the so-called regular 8-to-5 business hours then established, and because inspection personnel work schedules could not be predicted in view of the unpredictable operating schedules of transportation companies then in operation. Our trade policies, public service demands, and transportation systems, techniques, and schedules have changed in the last 50 years.

Many public service functions of both private industry and our Government are now required 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. In light of what I have said, this is particularly true with regard to private aircraft travel and the transportation business. Although the 40-hour week is the general rule for employees of both private industry and Government, both have found it better and desirable to rotate and schedule employees on work shifts covering days, nights, weekends, and holidays. We have all seen such scheduling work, and our country has prospered under it.

Presently, the Bureau of Customs is closed down 60 days a year and at night in many cases unless private parties enter into labor contracts with Government custom employees for what is considered a special service. This condition is allowed by laws which assume that private aviation travel and our international transportation system can likewise shut down and stop on Sundays, holidays, or at night. It is inferred from these laws that our Government has no public service obligations and duties with respect to private aviation travel or foreign commerce except during so-called regular business hours, Monday through Friday. The truth of it is that the public services which the Bureau of Customs provides are necessary 24 hours a day, 7 days a week for the benefit of the people returning to the United States by private aircraft, commercial airline, steamship, or railroad, as well as by other modes of transportation. This inspection service is performed in the national interest and not in the interest of one portion of the public. We are all affected by foreign travel and commerce. It seems fair that we should all bear such an inspection expense just as we do for returns to the United States by automobile, ferry, or by foot on a Sunday, a holiday, or at night. It seems to me that remedial legislation has been long overdue.

The President has recently announced his intention to submit to Congress a major plan of reorganization of the Bureau of Customs. The legislation that I am introducing is most timely and would seem to be a logical subject for inquiry in connection with such a reorganization. A survey group recently issued a report to the Secretary of the Treasury. The report itself is quite lengthy but the survey group did briefly consider the Customs overtime laws. A brief history of these laws is contained on pages AV-13, 14, and 15 of their report, and I ask unanimous consent that this portion of the report may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the portion of the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIEF HISTORY OF CUSTOMS OVERTIME LAWS

The present customs overtime statutes are section 5 of the act of February 13, 1911, 36 Stat. 901, as amended by the act of February 7, 1920, 41 Stat. 402 (19 U.S.C. 261, 267) and section 451 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1451).

Section 5 of the act of February 13, 1911, supra, provided that "the Secretary of the Treasury shall fix a reasonable rate of extra compensation for night services of inspectors, storekeepers, weighers, and other customs officers and employees in connection with the lading or unlading of cargo at night, or the lading at night of cargo or merchandise for transportation in bond or for exportation in bond, or for the exportation with benefit of drawback, but such rate of compensation shall not exceed an amount equal to double the rate of compensation allowed to each such officer or employee for like services rendered by day, the said extra compensation to be paid by the master, owner, agent, or consignee of such vessel or other conveyance, whenever such special license or permit for immediate lading or for unlading at night or on Sundays or holidays shall be granted, to the collector of customs, who shall pay the same to the several customs officers and employees entitled thereto according to the rates fixed therefor by the Secretary of the Treasury." The section also provided for the payment of such extra compensation to boarding officers.

The act of February 7, 1920, supra, amended section 5 of the 1911 act to provide that the rates of extra compensation shall be fixed "on the basis of one-half day's pay for each 2 hours or fraction thereof of at least 1 hour that the overtime extends beyond 5 o'clock postmeridian (but not to exceed two and one-half day's pay for the full period from 5 o'clock postmeridian to 8 o'clock antemeridian), and two additional days' pay for Sunday or holiday duty." The amendment made some other changes including substitution of "overtime services" for "night services", using the phrase "required to remain on duty" between 5 p.m. and 8 a.m., and providing that extra compensation shall be paid "if such officers or employees have been ordered to report for duty and have so reported, whether the actual lading, unlading, receiving, delivery or examination takes place or not." For discussion of the 1920 amendment see (1919) 59 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 640; (1920) H. Rept. No. 567, 66th Cong. 2d sess.; (1920) 59 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 2171.

The first, second, third, and fourth sections of the act of February 13, 1911, supra, providing for special licenses to lade or unlade cargo of vessels at night and related matters, were repealed by section 643, Tariff Act of 1922, which provided, in sections 450, 451, and 452, for special licenses to lade and unlade upon the giving of a bond conditioned, among other things, upon the payment of overtime compensation in accordance with section 5 of the act of February 13, 1911, supra. Sections 450, 451, and 452, of the Tariff Act of 1930, were similar to the corresponding sections of the 1922 Tariff Act, except that the new section 451 contained additional provisions for assigning customs officers and employees upon request of the master, owner, or agent of a vessel. Section 451 of the 1930 act was amended by section 9 of the Customs Administrative Act of 1938, to provide that "Upon request made by the owner, master, or person in charge of a vessel or vehicle, or by or on behalf of the owner or consignee of any merchandise or baggage" for overtime services, officers or employees will be assigned to perform "any such services which may lawfully be performed by them during regular hours of business." Thus the coverage of the overtime provisions were extended so as not to be limited to services in connection with the lading or unlading of vessels.

The term "day's pay" in the above-mentioned 1920 amendment was the subject of a decision by the Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia in *Meyer* v. *Morgenthau* (1941) 122 Fed. (2d) 216. The Treasury Department had provided (in Treasury Decision 49669) that the daily rate of pay for overtime services should be the gross daily rate of regular compensation, except that when such gross daily rate of regular compensation was less than $5 or more than $8, the daily rate of extra compensation should be $5 or $8, as the case might be. The court held that the term "day's pay" as used in the statute meant a day's pay at the employees regular rate of pay, and that the Treasury regulation was, therefore, invalid.

The above-mentioned provision of section 9 of the Customs Administrative Act of 1938, amending section 451, Tariff Act of 1930, also provided that "Nothing in this section shall be construed to impair the existing authority of the Treasury Department to assign Customs officers or employees to regular tours of duty at nights or on Sundays or holidays when such assignments are in the public interest." This related to the practice of assigning customs employees to regular tours of duty without extra compensation at night and on Sundays and holidays at border crossings (and some other places) where customs service was required at all hours of the day and night during the 7 days of the week. This practice was held by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of *United States* v. *Myers* (1944) 320 U.S. 561 and 321 U.S. 750, to be valid as to night services on weekdays but invalid as to Sunday and holiday services. The Court held that extra compensation under the 1911 act, as amended by the 1920 act, must be paid for all services within its purview performed at any time during the 24 hours of a Sunday or holiday.

After the decision in *United States* v. *Myers, supra*, section 451, Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U.S.C. 1451), was further amended by the act of June 3, 1944, 58 Stat. 269, to exempt the owners, operators, or agents of highway vehicles, bridges, tunnels, or ferries from reimbursing the Government for extra compensation of customs employees for services performed at these facilities.

Another important court decision on the customs overtime laws was the decision of the Court of Claims in *O'Rourke* v. *United States* (1947) 109 Ct. Cls. 33. In that case, the court held that extra compensation under the 1911 act, as amended, was payable for inspectional services performed at free bridges and highways as well as for services at toll facilities. There were also a number of other questions decided in the case.

The current customs regulation on extra compensation under the customs overtime laws is section 24.16 of the customs regulations of 1943 (19 CFR 24.16), as amended. One provision of that regulation which has been the subject of considerable discussion is the provision, in certain situations, for compensable time in addition to the time spent at the place of the overtime assignment. This provision (in paragraph (g), as amended by T.D. 52903) is supported by the authority given to the Secretary of the Treasury in the 1911 act, as amended, to fix reasonable rates of overtime compensation. In this connection, reference is made to the above mentioned decision in the case of *Meyer* v. *Morgenthau*, 122 Fed. (2d) 216, in which the court said that "the fixing of pay for overtime services includes two elements; the definition or measurement of the 'overtime service,' and the definition of the pay for such services. The Secretary, has, and exercises, a considerable discretion in regard to the first element * * *."

This memorandum does not purport to mention every statute that has ever been passed or every court decision on customs overtime. Some old statutes prior to the act of February 13, 1911, and a few court decisions on particular points, which would not seem to be of interest in connection with the present consideration of the overtime question, are omitted.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, the survey report also discussed several recommendations in this regard made by the O'Connel citizens task force report. However, this was not any kind of a study in depth. The surface was just barely scratched.

Because the subject of this bill is a revenue matter, it will undoubtedly be referred to the Senate Finance Committee. Since this is a matter which vitally affects commerce, I intend to ask the Senate Commerce Committee to conduct a study and investigation into the entire matter so that we may have a complete record.

Mr. President, this is an important piece of legislation and would fit nicely into any proposed reorganization of the Bureau of Customs. It attracted widespread support during the last Congress not only among Senators but in many segments of industry as well.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie at the desk until the close of business on April 1, 1965, for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will lie on the desk until the close of business on April 1, 1965, as requested.

The bill (S. 1628) to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 and the act of February 13, 1911, to eliminate those provisions which require payment to the United States for overtime services of customs officers and employees, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN LANDS IN CLARK COUNTY, NEV., TO FRANCIS W. THORNE

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Clark County, Nev., to Francis W. Thorne.

Mr. Thorne and his predecessors in interest have occupied this particular 20 acres in southern Nevada for over 30 years under the apparent mistaken premise that a patent had been issued by the United States and that they were secure in their ownership of the property.

Recent investigations now confirm that title still vests in the Government.

This bill provides for the conveyance of the property to Mr. Thorne, at fair market value plus such sums as may be determined by the Secretary to reimburse the United States for the administrative conveyance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1631) to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Clark County, Nev., to Francis W. Thorne, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REGULATION OF CERTAIN FIREARMS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as a member of the District of Columbia Committee, I rise to introduce an item of legislation to which I attach a good deal of importance. It is a pistol regulation bill for the District of Columbia.

This bill is designed to keep deadly weapons out of the hands of irresponsible persons, and would prevent such persons from purchasing pistols. In addition, it would require that firearms of 12 inches or less be registered with the police.

This bill is designed to implement a part of the President's message on the District of Columbia.

This bill is designed to protect the overwhelming majority of law-abiding citizens of the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, this bill is designed to save lives.

The bill was drafted by the District of Columbia Commissioners, with the able assistance of Mr. David Acheson, U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia. I have changed section 104, however, to provide that the first offense shall be a misdemeanor, and any subsequent offense a felony. The bill would not prohibit responsible persons from possessing handguns in their homes and places of business. The bill would simply require that persons owning pistols register them with the police. Criminal penalties are provided for violation of the registration provisions.

In addition, penalties for illegally carrying concealed weapons, and for possessing such prohibited weapons as sawed-off shotguns and machineguns, would be increased.

These provisions, together with the lengthening of the period of investigating prospective purchasers of pistols, will constitute important weapons in our fight against crime and lawlessness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1632) to require the registration of pistols in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. TYDINGS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

SPOT IMPROVEMENTS FOR HIGHWAY SAFETY

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the improvement of highway safety is a cause with which I am deeply concerned. Extension of the Interstate Highway System from 41,00 to 60,000 miles, as authorized in my bill S. 1272, is one means to this end. Adoption for use by the public of the new GSA standards for automobile construction, as provided in Senator NELSON's bill, S. 1251, which I have cosponsored, is another approach. I expect in the near future to introduce proposed legislation to allow a speedup in the construction of the interstate highway system, removing the restrictions which keep it on a pay-as-you-go basis.

Today, as one more tool in the war against traffic accidents, I am presenting a bill to provide Federal funds for spot improvement of high-accident areas on the federally assisted primary, secondary and urban road systems, the so-called ABC system, throughout the Nation. Before describing the fairly simple mechanism by which this bill would cut the terrible traffic toll, I wish to sketch in the background and demonstrate the need for this approach.

In an interview published in U.S. News & World Report under date of March 1, the noted traffic engineer, Wilbur S. Smith, was asked:

> Are streets and highways, themselves, causing some of the accident problems?

Mr. Smith, who headed the executive committee of the National Academy of Sciences' Highway Research Board in 1964, replied:

> To some extent, yes, though not as much as the human element. We know of places where accidents occur repeatedly—where the curves are too sharp or intersections are too hazardous or visibility is obstructed, and so on. Defects of this kind can be corrected through simple engineering, and save many lives. My own feeling is that we should spend more money on these changes, even if we have to spend less on building new roads.

The Bureau of Public Roads has not been unaware of this need, and neither has the President. In a letter to Secretary Hodges just 1 year ago, on March 23, 1964, President Johnson called for encouragement and assistance to State and local governments in the development of priority safety programs, giving special attention to hazards on highways with high accident experience.

Such a program, within the confines of the present Federal aid to highways on the 50–50 matching basis applied to ABC roads, and using highway trust fund resources, was encouraged by the Bureau of Public Roads, which described the types of projects to be undertaken in a memorandum issued last May to its regional and division engineers, and to State highway departments. In order that the type of projects I am discussing may be clear, following are some of the typical projects specified in a Bureau of Public Roads release of May 4, 1964:

Widening of narrow traffic lanes;

Construction of stable shoulders of adequate width, or reconstruction of existing shoulders to provide additional width;

Reconstruction to increase sight distances on curves;

Widening of narrow bridges or other structures;

Installation of protective devices at railroad crossings;

Removal of roadside curbs and fixed obstructions;

Construction of fencing; and

Construction of service roads, entrances and exists, curbs, and similar facilities to regulate traffic.

In a report issued last December, the Bureau of Public Roads pointed to some of the achievements such a program can bring. A study of spot improvements of this kind by the Virginia Department of Highways showed that 11 minor projects to correct higher-than-average accident locations reduced accidents by 66 percent and fatalities from 13 to only 1 in a comparable period of time. The total investment of only $43,000 resulted in cutting accident costs—and no price can be set on fatalities and injuries—by $153,000.

In California, 169 minor improvement projects costing an average of $13,000 each, reduced accidents by 32 percent in the face of increased traffic volume.

Since the total number of Federal-aid safety projects under the existing program up to January 1 of this year totaled on 153 in all, scattered over 32 States and the District of Columbia, it is obvious that States such as California have been proceeding on their own. But the fact that in the months which had elapsed since the Bureau of Public Roads sought to stimulate the program, only 153 projects were begun, shows that there is not enough incentive to really make a strong effort in the States. Money that has to be used for spot improvements must be taken from funds which would otherwise be building new roads. A new highway project is more highly visible. Widening a bridge, or installing a special curb-divided left turn lane, may be dramatic in the cutting of accidents, but the results do not show to the public so readily.

Under the existing program, as I have said, there is 50 percent Federal participation in the ABC system—which is 70 percent primary or urban and 30 percent rural in character. But there is no real incentive to spur State and local road authorities toward applying the funds to spot improvements.

My bill will give that incentive. First, it will provide authorization of up to $100 million for this specific purpose, over and beyond the funds already available from the "dedicated" highway trust funds, so that the sum provided will be over and beyond what is already available. It will give a further incentive by providing a more generous Federal share, using the same manner of apportionment to the States but making the Federal funds available for up to 70 percent of the spot-improvement costs rather than restricting them to 50 percent. It specifies that "such projects shall be given priority in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary."

In these ways, we will be making a much stronger attack on the goal, placing first emphasis upon the most dangerous spots, and applying our existing, and quite adequate, engineering skill to the obliteration of dangers which have been ignored despite accident frequency in these various locations.

With a record high of 47,800 persons killed on our streets and highways last year, with 1,600,000 persons injured, with an economic loss estimated at $7 billion, we must do more to meet the need. The $100 million authorized from the general Treasury by my bill will be repaid manyfold by the sheer economics involved in accident cutting, not to mention the savings in lives and crippling and distress. It is scarcely less than criminal to do less than we know how with highway engineering to cut this terrible toll.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may lie on the table for 1 week in order that those who desire may join me in cosponsoring the legislation. I also ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD and will lie on the table for 1 week as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 1633) to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, in order to authorize a program to improve safety on the Federal-aid primary, secondary, and urban systems of highways, introduced by Mr. HARTKE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1633

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, is amended by inserting at the end of chapter 1 a new section as follows:

"§ 135. ADDITIONAL PROGRAM FOR PRIMARY, SECONDARY, AND URBAN SYSTEMS TO ADD SAFETY FEATURES.

"(a) In addition to other funds authorized for the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems there is authorized to be appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, not to exceed $100,000,000 which shall be available, in accordance with the provisions of this title for projects on the Federal-aid primary and secondary systems, including extensions into urban areas, which are approved by the Secretary as adding useful safety features to existing highways in such systems. Such projects shall be given priority in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary.

"(b) The amount appropriated for any fiscal year for the purposes of this section shall be apportioned among the States, one-third in the manner provided in section 104(b)(1), one-third in the manner provided in section 104(b)(2), and one-third in the manner provided in section 104(b)(3). A State's apportionment pursuant to this section for any fiscal year shall be available during such year and the succeeding fiscal year for paying not more than 70 per centum of the costs of projects authorized in this section."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 1 of title 23 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following:

"§ 135. Additional program for primary, secondary, and urban systems to add safety features."

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excellent article entitled "Engineered Safety," written by Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator in the Bureau of Public Roads, which was published in the August 1964, issue of the American Road Builder. The illustrations of spot improvement work given there by Mr. Whitton show very clearly the values of this approach and the necessity for a modest investment in this kind of work.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENGINEERED SAFETY

(By Rex M. Whitton, Federal Highway Administrator, Bureau of Public Roads)

President Johnson's call for an accelerated attack on traffic accidents through the Federal aid highway programs has focused attention on the role of engineering and construction in highway safety. The President called for "priority safety programs giving special attention to hazards on highways with high-accident experience."

In response to the President's directive, the Bureau of Public Roads is urging State highway departments to apply a substantial portion of their available Federal aid primary and secondary road and urban extension funds toward spot improvement projects which would eliminate such accident-inducing hazards.

Measurable reductions in accidents and fatalities at given locations have resulted from such improvements in the past. Further, there is good reason to believe that a redoubled effort to correct these hazardous conditions throughout the country will contribute significantly to reducing the Nation's tragic traffic toll. The fact that 43,400 Americans lost their lives in traffic accidents last year, and that these accidents cost more than the total annual public investment in highway construction, certainly demands we apply our engineering know-how toward bringing this problem under control.

Engineers recognize that highway transportation and traffic safety involve a system comprised of the driver, the vehicle and the roadway and its environment. Therefore, the sound approach to traffic safety is a systems approach which takes into account these elements. Unfortunately, there has not been sufficient public recognition of this concept. There has, instead, been a general tendency to blame nearly all accidents on the driver. The resulting overemphasis on the driver in various safety programs has diverted attention and energy from the very real progress which can be realized through building safety into our roads and streets.

The contribution that engineers and road builders can and do make is entirely consistent with the systems approach to traffic safety. Well-designed highways reduce the demands placed on the driver and the vehicle, and they provide an added margin for errors or malfunctions in these elements of the system.

The outstanding example today of built-in safety is the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways. Studies of completed portions of the Interstate System have shown a fatality rate of 2.8 deaths per 100 million vehicle miles, compared with a rate of 9.7 on older highways in the same traffic corridors. The Bureau of Public Roads estimates that the interstate will save 3,500 lives this year alone, and 8,000 lives a year when it is completed in 1972.

With the entire 41,000-mile network in operation, it will carry 20 percent of the total traffic. This still leaves 80 percent to be handled by all other roads and streets, most of which are not as safe as the interstate. Hopefully, normal long-range construction improvements will eventually increase their safety as well as their adequacy to meet the growing demands of our transportation system. The prospect of traffic tolls in 1964 or 1965 being even higher than those in 1963 has created an urgency for immediate action, however. Accordingly, the Bureau of Public Roads is asking that spot improvements for safety be given a special priority. This priority would move them to construction well in advance of the time they would otherwise be scheduled on the basis of general route improvement.

In considering what can be done to make our older roads safer, it is well to look at the design features of the Interstate Highway System. Obviously, however, not all roads can or should be freeways built to interstate standards. Design features responsible for the fine safety record of the interstate include control of access, divided lane roadways, wide lanes, easy curves and grades, and long-sight distances. Headon crashes, opposite direction sideswipes, and angle and pedestrian collisions are virtually eliminated by such features.

The relationship of these and other roadway elements to traffic accidents has been documented in various engineering studies. A compilation of this research was published last year under the title "Traffic Control and Roadway Elements," by the Automotive Safety Foundation, in cooperation with the Bureau of Public Roads. These and other studies indicate the results that can be obtained from spot improvements, as the following examples illustrate.

Lane widening: A study of 240 miles of highway sections in Illinois, which had been widened from 18 to 22 feet, showed reductions in accident rates ranging from 21.5 percent for low volume roads to 46.6 percent for higher volume roads.

Shoulder widening: In Virginia, the shoulders on a 15-mile section, which had varied from 1 to 4 feet in width, were widened to a uniform width of 6 feet, 4 feet of which was surface treated. In the 2 years prior to widening there were 102 accidents; in the 2 years following, only 69. The accident rates per million vehicle-miles were 2.76 and 1.86 for the two periods.

Resurfacing: In Detroit, brick-paved Michigan Avenue at its intersection with Clark Street was slippery when wet. In the year before it was resurfaced there were 57 accidents involving Michigan Avenue traffic at the intersection; in the first year after, only 18. The number of accidents occurring while the surface was wet dropped from 32 to 8. The second year after resurfacing there were 23 accidents, only 7 of which occurred on wet pavement.

Clear roadside: In four Virginia counties 25 percent of the fixed-object accidents involved trees. A program was begun to remove all trees within 15 feet of the roadway. After the program had been underway for some time, a comparison was made of accidents before and after. The number of accidents involving trees had dropped from 28 to 17; the number of persons killed and injured had dropped from 37 to 12. During this period, the number of other types of accidents remained nearly constant. Similar safety improvements include the removal of utility poles, culvert headwalls too close to the pavement, roadside curbs, and other fixed obstructions, and the flattening of side slopes to provide a clear recovery area of vehicles out of control.

Curves and grades: When 7 curves in California were realined to increase the radius, injury accident rates dropped 84 percent. Where reconstruction of long grades is not feasible, the installation of truck-climbing lanes can minimize dangerous passing situations and rearend collisions.

Curve signing: A resigning program for all curves in Kansas included larger signs placed farther in advance of the curve, and the use of "safe speed" indications. In the year before resigning, there were 49 fatalities on curves; in the year following, 28.

Bridge and overpass widening: Research by the Bureau of Public Roads and the National Safety Council reveals a significant relationship between bridge width and safety. It shows that where structure width was 1 foot or more narrower than the approach width, the accident rate was 100 accidents per 100 million vehicle-miles. Where the structure was up to 5 feet wider than the approach the rate was 58, and where the structure was 5 or more feet wider the rate was only 12.

Intersections: In Portland, Oreg., the former Slavin Road intersection on Barbur Boulevard, a major arterial, with access at grade and traffic light control, averaged 120 accidents and 60 injuries a year. After installation of a grade-separation structure with freeway-type access, accidents dropped to 4 and injuries to 2 a year, a reduction of 96 percent, even though average daily traffic counts increased from 11,000 to 13,000.

This is a dramatic, but partial, list of what can be accomplished for traffic safety through engineering. The list also includes protective devices at railroad crossings, medians and dividers, channelized intersections, construction of service roads, entrances and exits (and similar facilities to regulate traffic), proper use of guardrails, guideposts, and delineators, edge marking and highway lighting.

Special mention should be made of uniform traffic controls and signs. Improper or missing traffic control devices can confuse or mislead the motorists and create accident hazards. The Bureau of Public Roads accordingly is striving to achieve nationwide uniformity of such signs, signals, and markings on Federal aid highways by the end of 1966.

The response of the State highway departments to the accelerated safety improvement program indicates their concern over the accident problem and their desire to make safety a primary objective in highway construction and improvements. Their plans for eliminating hazardous conditions will pay lasting dividends in lives saved and accidents prevented, even if the results do not become apparent in the remainder of this year.

Certainly, much has been done and much has been learned about making our roads and streets safer. With this experience we can meet the challenge now before us. One thing is sure: the opportunity for road builders to apply their skills for the benefit of all Americans was never greater.

MARKING OF STEEL CONTAINERS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I offer again today for myself and Senators SCOTT, RANDOLPH, MOSS, DOMINICK, and LAUSCHE, a bill to insure the identification of steel shipping containers manufactured from imported steel. This Steel Shipping Container Identification Act is being introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman WILLARD CURTIN, who was among those who introduced parallel legislation there last year. It has only minor changes from the bill which I introduced on April 22, 1963, and which was cosponsored by nearly a dozen of my colleagues.

This bill would prohibit the introduction into commerce of any shipping container, as defined in the bill, manufactured in the United States chiefly from imported steel, unless the container is marked with the name of the country of origin of the steel. It would permit buyers of steel shipping containers—defined in the bill as "all steel drums and pails used for shipping products to wholesale or retail distributors or to commercial users"—to know when imported steel is used in their manufacture. More important, it would promote the use of steel produced in this country, but it would do so without any forbidding of imports.

The House bill of last session, H.R. 5673, received hearings in the Subcommittee on Commerce and Finance, which heard on November 9, 1963, statements of support from representatives of the Steel Shipping Container Institute, the United Steelworkers of America, and others. On July 9, 1964, the full Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce issued a favorable report—House Report 1552, 88th Congress—and the bill was passed by the House of Representatives on August 12, 1964. I trust that this legislation may secure passage in both Houses of the Congress in this session.

Iron and steel is the most basic production industry of the Nation, as we are all aware. In the States of Indiana and Pennsylvania this industry provides nearly a quarter of a million jobs. It is vital to protect these jobs and those of other steelworkers throughout the Nation.

It is probably a little-known fact outside the steel industry that the greatest use of sheet steel outside of the automotive industry is in the manufacture of shipping containers. For a number of years the steel shipping container manufacturing industry has been severely depressed, operating substantially below full capacity. Profit margins are at a minimum and price competition is severe. Companies using foreign steel in container manufacture enjoy a significant cost differential. Because of these conditions, the smaller companies, although they might prefer domestic steel, find themselves compelled to purchase foreign steel. This trend has been accelerating, leading to a shrinkage in the market for the domestic steel industry.

The inroads of these imports may be seen by the fact that imported steel sheets in 1961 totaled 57,900 tons. In 1962 the figure more than tripled to 172,900 tons. It tripled again in 1963, the year my previous bill was introduced, reaching 527,400 tons. Estimates for last year are that the tonnage of imported steel sheets again nearly doubled, to about 1,025,000 tons.

Under existing law, shipping containers manufactured outside the United States, like other finished products, must be marked as to country of origin. Sheet steel imported into the United States must likewise be marked. But when the marked sheet steel is further processed into another product, such as a steel shipping container, there is no requirement that it be marked with the name of the country of origin of the steel.

The bill I am offering requires that the container must have embossed on the top head, in letters at least one-quarter inch high, the legend, "Steel in this container made in ———," designating the country of origin. Each steel container manufacturer must maintain records showing the source of steel used in its manufacture. Enforcement, including the use of criminal sanctions involving fines up to $5,000 and imprisonment up to 1 year, would be under the Federal Trade Commission.

This bill, as I have noted, does not prohibit importation of steel sheets. It does not affect the tariff laws. It is concerned only with domestic commerce under the law. But if the requirement of publicizing the origin of the steel involved discourages the use of imports and the purchase of sheet steel from domestic manufacturers instead, it will not only help our own jobs and companies, but it will also have a helpful effect on our balance-of-payments problem.

In order that other Members may have the opportunity to join Senator Scott and myself in sponsoring the bill, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it may lie on the table for 1 week and that the text of the bill may be printed in the Congressional Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record, and will lie on the table, as requested by the Senator from Indiana.

The bill (S. 1634) to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel, introduced by Mr. Hartke (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1634

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Steel Shipping Container Identification Act".

DEFINITIONS

Sec. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "person" means an individual, partnership, corporation, association, or any other form of business enterprise.

(b) The term "commerce" means commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, or between two points in the same State but through any point outside thereof, or in any possession of the United States or in the District of Columbia, or between any such possession and another, or between any such possession and any State or foreign nations, or between the District of Columbia and any State, possession of the United States, or foreign nation.

(c) The term "State" includes the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(d) The term "Commission" means the Federal Trade Commission.

(e) The term "shipping container" shall mean all steel drums and pails used for shipping products as defined by the Department of Commerce:

(1) Drum: Any single wall cylindrical or bilged container having a capacity of over twelve gallons to one hundred and ten gallons, inclusive, constructed of steel sheet and inclusive of all gages.

(2) Pail: Any steel shipping package with or without bail and handle having a capacity of one gallon to twelve gallons, inclusive, constructed of steel sheet twenty-nine gage or heavier.

MARKING OF STEEL SHIPPING CONTAINERS

Sec. 3. (a) It shall be unlawful and shall be an unfair method of competition and an unfair and deceptive act or practice in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act for any manufacturer of steel shipping containers to introduce any such container into commerce whenever such container is manufactured in the United States in whole or in chief value from steel made outside the United States, unless such container bears embossed on the top head of the container in letters not less than one-fourth of an inch in height the legend "Steel in this container made in ———"; with the blank space being filled with the name of the foreign country in which such steel was made.

(b) It shall be unlawful and shall be an unfair method of competition and an unfair and deceptive act or practice in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act for any person to deface, destroy, remove, alter, cover, obscure, or obliterate any mark placed on a steel shipping container pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, if the purpose of defacing, destroying, removing, altering, covering, obscuring, or obliterating such mark is to hinder or prevent other persons from obtaining the information given by such mark.

RECORDS

Sec. 4. (a) Every manufacturer of steel shipping containers shall maintain proper records showing the origin of the steel used in all steel shipping containers made by him, and shall preserve such records for at least three years.

(b) The neglect or refusal to maintain or preserve the records required by this section is unlawful, and any person neglecting or refusing to maintain such records shall be guilty of an unfair method of competition, and an unfair or deceptive act or practice in commerce under the Federal Trade Commission Act.

ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 5. (a) Except as otherwise specifically provided in this Act, this Act shall be enforced by the Commission under rules, regulations, and procedures authorized for in the Federal Trade Commission Act.

(b) The Commission shall prevent any person from violating the provisions of this Act in the same manner, by the same means, and with the same jurisdiction, powers, and duties as though all applicable terms and provisions of the Federal Trade Commission Act were incorporated into and made a part of this Act; and any such person violating the provisions of this Act shall be subject to the penalties and entitled to the privileges and immunities provided in the Federal Trade Commission Act as though the applicable terms and provisions of such Act were incorporated into and made a part of this Act.

(c) The Commission is authorized and directed to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary and proper for the purposes of administration and enforcement of this Act.

(d) The Commission is authorized to cause inspections, analyses, tests and examinations to be made of any steel shipping container subject to this Act.

CRIMINAL PENALTY

Sec. 6. (a) Whoever willfully violates sections 3 or 4 of this Act shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both, in the discretion of the court: *Provided,* That nothing in this section shall limit any other provision of this Act.

(b) If the Commission has reason to believe that any person has violated sections 3 or 4 of this Act the Commission may certify all pertinent facts to the Attorney General and if the Attorney General concurs, he shall cause appropriate proceedings to be brought for the enforcement of this Act against such person.

APPLICATION OF OTHER LAWS

Sec. 7. The purposes of this Act shall be held to be in addition to, and not in substitution for or limitation of, the provisions of any other Act of Congress.

Sec. 8. This Act shall take effect ——— after the date of its enactment.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION TO HELP STEEL INDUSTRY

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the production of iron and steel provides over a million and a quarter jobs in the United States. Unfair competition, predatory pricing, and outright dumping of foreign steel constitute a threat to those jobs and to the overall economy of our Nation.

In 1961, some 57,900 tons of steel sheets were imported into the United States.

In 1962, this tonnage climbed to 172,900.

In 1963, the amount grew to 527,400 tons, and in 1964 an estimated 1,025,000 tons of steel sheets were imported from foreign steel producers.

Shipping containers, such as drums and pails, are second only to automobiles in the usage of steel sheets. I believe that the purchasers of these containers have a right to know whether or not they are helping to create and maintain jobs for Americans, and improve our balance-of-payments position, or to create jobs for foreign workers and damage our already troubled balance-of-payments position.

That is why I have today cosponsored legislation introduced by Senator HARTKE to require U.S. manufacturers of steel containers, using in whole or in chief value steel made outside this country, to label their products with the country of the steel's origin.

This bill would require each such container to have embossed on its top, in letters not less than one-fourth of an inch in height, the legend "Steel in this container made in ———", the blank space being filled with the country of origin.

Passage of this legislation would in no way limit the freedom of choice of the manufacturer or the user. It is not punitive. It does not ask special favors, nor does it increase duties or tariff protection. But it would enable the user to make a choice between American steel and foreign steel when he purchases steel containers.

A BILL TO REQUIRE ANNUAL APPROVAL BY THE CONGRESS OF AGGREGATE AMOUNTS OF EXPENDITURE AUTHORIZATIONS CONTAINED IN GENERAL APPROPRIATIONS ACTS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, for myself and Senators BENNETT, BYRD of Virginia, CURTIS, DOMINICK, FANNIN, HICKENLOOPER, HRUSKA, JORDAN of Idaho, MILLER, MORTON, PROUTY, SALTONSTALL, SCOTT, SIMPSON, THURMOND, and WILLIAMS of Delaware, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to require annual approval by the Congress of aggregate amounts of expenditure authorizations contained in general appropriation acts. I ask that the bill be printed at the end of my remarks and that it be held at the desk for 1 week so that others may cosponsor it if they wish to do so.

The mechanics of the procedure contained in the bill which I introduce would be that the Congress would continue to break down the budget request into separate appropriation bills, and pass on it in some detail in those separate bills. Then, after all of the separate general appropriation bills for the year had been passed, Congress would be required to pass a joint resolution approving the total aggregate amount contained in those separate bills before the money would be available for expenditure. Thus, we would review not only the merits of individual programs, but the total amount of new funds to be provided as against expected total income for the fiscal year.

Actually, Mr. President, sizable sums which the Congress acts on would be left outside the scope of this bill, for practical reasons. Appropriations of trust funds would not be covered, nor would retirement of debt. Deficiency and supplemental bills would also be outside this bill's coverage, simply because it would not be practical to hold up the whole appropriations process until we were assured that no further funds would be required in any program. The "continuing resolution" under which the various agencies continue to function until the appropriations procedure is completed would also be excluded from the bill's coverage.

But the bill would at least cover the bulk of our appropriations, and would oblige us to consider the budget requests in relation to anticipated income for the year. Even more importantly, it would enable us to review our action on the earlier passed bills in light of what action we take on later bills. I think it would be informative both to the Congress and to the citizens of the United States.

The procedure provided is somewhat similar to that followed in my State of Colorado, and in several other States. The Colorado Legislature is required to look at its total appropriation because the State constitution prohibits appropriations in excess of receipts from taxes. I recognize that the Federal Government does not have this kind of limitation imposed on it, but I believe that the Congress should have both the opportunity and the obligation to make that kind of comparison and to decide whether the total figure approved in the separate bills is really what we want to spend in light of expected income, the state of the economy, and any other relevant factors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD, and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bill (S. 1635) to require annual approval by the Congress of aggregate amounts of expenditure authorizations contained in general appropriation acts, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Government Operations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That unless otherwise expressly provided therein, no expenditure authorization contained in a general appropriation act for any fiscal year shall become effective until there shall have been enacted—

(1) all other general appropriation acts for such fiscal year; and

(2) a joint resolution containing a statement of the aggregate amount of expenditure authorizations for such fiscal year contained in all such general appropriation acts, including any amendments thereto, and a statement to the effect that the Congress approves the expenditure of such aggregate amount.

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "expenditure authorization" means an appropriation, contract authorization, authorization to spend from public or corporate debt receipts, limitation on expenditures authorized to be incurred against revolving funds or funds of Government corporations, cancellation of obligations of Government agencies to the Treasury, reappropriation, reauthorization, or any other authorization to withdraw moneys from the Treasury of the United States, but does not include an appropriation of trust funds or a transaction involving public debt retirement.

(2) The term "general appropriation act" does not include a deficiency or supplemental appropriation act, or an act or joint resolution providing temporary expenditure authorizations pending enactment of a regular appropriation act.

SEC. 3. This Act shall be effective with respect to general appropriation acts for fiscal year 1966 and subsequent fiscal years.

AMERICAN LEGION JUNIOR BASEBALL

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, we South Dakotans are proud of the fact that Milbank, S. Dak., is the birthplace of American Legion junior baseball. A monument in Milbank commemorates the inception of this worthy program in 1925.

While others are talking about physical fitness and combatants for juvenile delinquency, the American Legion for 40 years has offered a program which provides outstanding opportunities to acquire physical fitness, to develop personal responsibility and good citizenship, to learn the value of teamwork and mutual cooperation, as well as to acquire individual proficiency and an opportunity to advance to a professional career in the sport of baseball. More than 15 million youths of 18 years of age and under have participated. South Dakota has been a leader in this activity ever since the idea was originated out in Milbank in 1925.

This year, as junior league baseball marks its 40th anniversary, the little world series will be played in its birthplace, South Dakota. The Sidney L. Smith Post 24 in Aberdeen will serve as host during the week beginning August 31. In observance of this event, the South Dakota Legislature recently adopted a resolution requesting Gov. Nils Boe to designate the week of August 31 through September 6 as Junior Legion Baseball Week.

Because this program is a nationwide event and because it has benefited young Americans all of these years, I think it is fitting that Junior Legion Baseball Week should be a national event. Therefore, I am introducing a joint resolution that in honor of the 40th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion baseball program, the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the period from August 31 through September 6, in 1965 as "National American Legion Baseball Week" and inviting the Governors of the several States to issue similar proclamations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 66) to provide for the designation of the period from August 31, through September 6, in 1965 as "National American Legion Baseball Week," introduced by Mr. Mundt, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

STUDY OF RECREATION IN THE LAKE TEXOMA AREA

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the location of Lake Texoma with large metropolitan areas both to the north and to the south has made it one of the most popular recreational areas in the mid-United States.

However, although recreation now has become a most important function at the reservoir, recreation is not included as one of the purposes for the project. There is considerable evidence that recreation should be so included, and I believe an additional study of this proposal would be beneficial.

Therefore, I submit a resolution calling for such a study.

May I point out that more than 7 million persons visited Lake Texoma in 1963 and that more than 8 million visited it last year. It is estimated that some $25 million was spent by visitors to the area last year.

Total investments around the lake amount to more than $30 million, not including private boats and yachts. There are more than 60 homesite areas and, of course, the shoreline is only partially developed.

The need for power has been reduced by the completion of a number of hydroelectric projects since Denison Dam, and recreation has gained in importance every year.

My resolution would provide for a review of the Lake Texoma situation by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors. That Board would be charged with making a recommendation about the advisability of modifying existing project purposes to include development of recreation as a project purpose and about the feasibility of conducting pumpback and silt studies.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of the resolution be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 91) was referred to the Committee on Public Works, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, created under section 3 of the River and Harbor Act, approved June 13, 1902, is requested to review the reports on the Red River and Tributaries, Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Louisiana, submitted in House Document Numbered 378, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session, and subsequent reports with a view to determining whether, in addition to the authorized purposes for which the Denison Dam-Lake Texoma project is being operated and maintained, namely: flood control, generation of hydroelectric power, navigation, water supply, regulating the flow of Red River, and other beneficial purposes, it would be advisable to modify the existing project to include the development of recreation as a project purpose and to conduct pumpback and silt studies of the project.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES; THAT COMMITTEES BE AUTHORIZED TO FILE REPORTS; AND THAT THE VICE PRESIDENT OR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE BE AUTHORIZED TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate, following today's session, until March 29, 1965, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives; that the committees be authorized to file reports; and that the Vice President or President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. Jordan] may be added as a cosponsor of S. 1065 and that, in future printings of S. 1065 his name be added.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. Fannin] be added as a cosponsor of S. 1175, to amend title II of the Social Security Act, and that he be so listed at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] be added as a cosponsor of S. 1117, the rapid transit bill, and that his name appear on this bill when it is next printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILL

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 15, 1965, the names of Mr. Allott, Mr. Fannin, Mr. Holland, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Morton, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Simpson, and Mr. Young of North Dakota were added as additional cosponsors of the bill (S. 1506) to amend the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to authorize grants under the act for community action programs in the field of consumer credit education and consumer debt counseling, introduced by Mr. Bennett on March 15, 1965.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON PROPOSALS TO EXTEND THE REORGANIZATION ACT

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, I wish to announce that the Subcommittee on Executive Reorganization of the Senate Committee on Government Operations will hold a hearing on Monday, March 29, 1965, in room 1318 of the New Senate Office Building on two bills proposing the extension of the Reorganization Act of 1949.

The two proposals under consideration will be S. 1134, which I introduced on February 17, giving the President permanent authority to submit reorganization plans to Congress under the existing limitations of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended, and S. 1135, which was introduced by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations [Mr. McClellan]. It would limit the extension of the President's authority to submit reorganization plans to a 2-year period. Both proposals will be thoroughly reviewed and studied. Officials of the Bureau of the Budget will testify.

NOTICE OF CLOSE OF RECORD ON HEARINGS ON ARTS AND HUMANITIES FOUNDATION BILLS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], the chairman of our Subcommittee on the Arts and Humanities, I announce that the record on the hearings recently conducted on the Arts and Humanities Foundations bills will be closed at the end of the day Monday, March 29. Any person desiring to submit comments on these proposals should deliver them to the subcommittee by that date.

REORGANIZATION PLAN NO. 1 OF 1965—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 125)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Bass in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate the message from the President of the United States on reorganization of the Bureau of Customs. The message has been read in the House. Without objection, the message will be printed in the Record without being read, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

All that we do to serve the people of this land must be done, as has been my insistent pledge, with the least cost and the most effectiveness.

In my state of the Union, I announced it was this administration's intention to "reshape and reorganize" the executive branch. This goal has one objective: "to meet more effectively the tasks of today."

I report today now one step taken forward toward that goal as part of our progress "on new economies we were planning to make."

I submit today a plan for reorganization in the Bureau of Customs of the Department of the Treasury.

At present the Bureau maintains 113 independent field offices, each reporting directly to Customs headquarters in Washington, D.C. Under a modernization program of which this reorganization plan is an integral part, the Secretary of the Treasury proposes to establish six regional offices to supervise all

Customs field activities. The tightened management controls achieved from these improvements will make possible a net annual saving of $9 million within a few years.

An essential feature will be the abolition of the offices of all Presidential appointees in the Customs Service. The program cannot be effectively carried out without this step.

The following offices, therefore, would be eliminated: collectors of customs, comptrollers of customs, surveyors of customs, and appraisers of merchandise, to which appointments are now required to be made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Incumbents of abolished offices will be given consideration for suitable employment under the civil service laws in any positions in Customs for which they may be qualified.

When this reorganization is completed, all officials and employees of the Bureau of Customs will be appointed under the civil service laws.

All of the functions of the offices which will be abolished are presently vested in the Secretary of the Treasury by Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950 which gives the Secretary power to redelegate these functions. He will exercise this power as the existing offices are abolished.

The estimate of savings that will be achieved by the program of Customs modernization and improvement, of which this reorganization plan is a part, is based on present enforcement levels, business volume, and salary scales. Of the amounts saved, approximately $1 million a year will be from salaries no longer paid because of the abolition of offices.

The proposed new organizational framework looks to the establishment of new offices at both headquarters and field levels and abolition of present offices.

This results in a net reduction of more than 50 separate principal field offices by concentration of supervisory responsibilities in fewer officials in charge of regional and district activities. In addition to the 6 offices of regional commissioner, about 25 offices of district director will be established. The regional commissioners and district directors will assume the overall principal supervisory responsibilities and functions of collectors of customs, appraisers of merchandise, comptrollers of customs, laboratories, and supervising customs agents.

At the headquarters level, four new offices will be established to replace seven divisions. A new position of Special Assistant to the Commissioner will be created and charged with responsibility for insuring that all customs employees conduct themselves in strict compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. Up to now this function has been one of a number lodged with an existing division.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

It should be emphasized that abolition by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965 of the offices of collector of customs, comptroller of customs, surveyor of customs, and appraiser of merchandise will in no way prejudice any right of any person affected by the laws administered by the Bureau of Customs. The rights of importers and others, for example, before the customs court, arising out of the administration of such functions will remain unaffected. In addition it should be emphasized that all essential services to the importing, exporting, and traveling public will continue to be performed.

This reorganization plan will permit a needed modernization of the organization and procedure of the Bureau of Customs. It will permit a more effective administration of the customs laws.

I urge the Congress to permit Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965 to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 25, 1965.*

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. KUCHEL:

Transcript of interview of Senator Dirksen by Joseph F. McCaffery over WMAL–ABC–TV, February 7, 1965.

THE USE OF GAS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, the use of even a nonlethal gas in South Vietnam is shocking. It cannot be justified—despite all the protestations of Secretary McNamara and Secretary Rusk—on moral or practical grounds.

Morally, the use of any gas rests on extremely tenuous ground. As the Geneva Protocol of 1925 pointed out, "the use of asphyxiating, poisonous, or other gases" has been "justly condemned by the general opinion of the civilized world."

The protocol made no distinction between lethal and nonlethal gases. Nor, for that matter, have we. During World War II—the most widespread and deadly war in history—and all of the Korean action we refrained from chemical warfare. Recently, there have been increasing reports of the use of chemical warfare by the Egyptians in Yemen. Will we now condone such actions on the basis of our own?

We cannot escape the consequences of our actions by legal sophistries. We may not have ratified the 1925 protocol, but we have effectively bound ourselves to its terms by our actions. There is no question but that the use of gas is wrong. More than that, it is just plain stupid.

The use of gas in South Vietnam has accomplished nothing, at a very great risk to our interests. This is scarcely a sound rule of conduct in international affairs.

The gas was used three times. Twice there were no Vietcong in the area. On the third occasion, a strong wind prevented the gas from being effective, and the "people were not very ill."

It is claimed that the gas is a humane weapon for use when the Vietcong have mingled with the civilian population and we cannot tell friend from foe. If we cannot tell before we use the gas, I fail to see how we can tell after the victims have recovered from its effects.

Moreover, I understand that we have even failed to provide effective protection to the South Vietnamese troops who use the gas. We have issued them gas masks designed for the bigger boned and larger stature American soldiers, and the loose fitting masks present a real hazard to the South Vietnamese.

Still another tragedy of the use of gas in Vietnam is the effect on our allies. President Johnson has painstakingly put together a growing consensus of world opinion that he is right in resisting aggression. His policies have been receiving overwhelming support at home and increased understanding abroad.

Now that support has been placed in jeopardy. A constituent of mine sent me a telegram today which asks a very appropriate question: "Do we not take diplomatic soundings beforehand?" From what information I can gather, the answer is "No." Expressions of shock and outrage have come from around the world.

We have opened Pandora's box. We have begun an action which never should have started. Let us end the use of gas in South Vietnam now.

Mr. President, in yesterday's New York Times Mr. James Reston discussed the use of gas in Vietnam. I think everyone should read this article carefully and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WASHINGTON: JUST A LITTLE OLD "BENEVOLENT INCAPACITATOR"

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 23.—The Pentagon's main argument for using nauseous gas in Vietnam is that it is better in some cases to gas the Communists than to maim or kill them. The officers here even have a wonderful phrase to describe the new instruments of chemical warfare: "benevolent incapacitators."

This, of course, was the defense for using poison gas in the First World War. It wasn't very benevolent and it often incapacitated a man for life, and it sent such a shudder through the world that even in so savage a conflict as the Second World War it wasn't used.

Secretary McNamara was careful to explain that he was not supplying poison gas to the South Vietnamese Army. He almost sounded as if he was doing the Communists a favor by treating them like rowdy race rioters in Rochester, but the thing is not quite as innocent as he made it sound.

WHAT NEXT?

The trouble with reverting to the use of any kind of gas in war is that it opens up so many other possibilities of chemical warfare. The use of gas on the battlefield has almost stopped in the last two generations, but the art of chemical warfare has not.

There is now a whole new arsenal of gases that not only nauseate, but stun and paralyze the enemy. The military correspondent of the Evening Star in Washington, Richard

> Fryklund, for example, recently reported on the latest and best—a gas called BZ by the U.S. Army.
>
> He tells of recent tests of BZ at the Army's Chemical Warfare Proving Grounds at Dugway, Utah. Volunteer soldiers were submitted to the effects of BZ while they were executing simple battlefield operations.
>
> "In one case," he reports, "a soldier on guard duty was gassed. He was approached by a strange soldier who said he did not know the password. The guard tried to remember what to do about it, couldn't, got tired of the whole problem and sat down and went to sleep. * * *
>
> Secretary McNamara emphasized that the only gas that was used in Vietnam was the same as the gas that can be purchased at a store. But the same argument made for nauseous gas could also be made for BZ or even for some of the paralyzing gases. After all, it is more benevolent to paralyze a man than to kill him with a machinegun.
>
> Where do you draw the line on the McNamara argument? And even if you draw it at nauseous gas, how do you know what gas the enemy will use after you start this devilish business?
>
> The national policy on the use of all chemical weapons has been that the United States would consider using them only if the enemy used them, but the Pentagon's reaction to the criticism of using nauseous gas was merely to express surprise that anybody would be disturbed.
>
> Nobody concerned has even claimed that the use of the gas was effective. The military spokesman in Saigon said it proved of little value on the three occasions it was used. In two cases, according to United Press International in Saigon, it was discovered that no Reds were in the area. In a third, a few Communists may have been "demoralized," but "there was a fair wind that day and the people were not very ill."
>
> The main effect was merely to nauseate a lot of people all over the world with the thought that gas could be used merely on the authority of the South Vietnamese soldiers concerned.
>
> One unfortunate aspect of the incident was that it occurred precisely at the moment when the United States was beginning to gain a little more understanding in the world for its policy in Vietnam.
>
> Ever since the United States started bombing North Vietnam and dropping napalm firebombs on Communists targets, there has been a considerable outcry for negotiations to end the war. President Johnson has insisted from the start, as he told 42 State Governors at the White House this week, that he would go anywhere at any time if he thought he could serve the cause of peace, but that there was simply no evidence that the Communists were interested in negotiating a settlement in Vietnam.
>
> This view is now being confirmed by the principal foreign offices of the world. The British Foreign Secretary underscored the point at the White House today. He told the President that the Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko, had said in London a few days ago that it was useless to talk about negotiations.
>
> REBUFFED ON TALKS
>
> The French, who have been the principal agitators for a negotiated settlement, now concede that their explorations in Peiping and Hanoi have been rebuffed, and the Canadians report that their official on the International Control Commission in Vietnam was not even given the opportunity to discuss negotiations with the North Vietnamese Communists.
>
> Accordingly, the propaganda over Vietnam was beginning to turn a little to the American side, when the gas incident was disclosed, incapitating our own propagandists, and not very benevolently either.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, today, March 25, 1965, marks the 144th observance of Greek Independence Day. Throughout history, the Greeks have been leaders in man's endless quest to secure for himself the blessings of liberty. It is to their courage and indomitable spirit that all those who value freedom pay tribute on this occasion.

Few people in history have had to undergo the hardships which the Greeks have endured for the sake of freedom. From the age of the city-state when they stood fast against the Persian invasions, through their 6-year long battle against Ottoman domination, the victorious outcome of which we observe today, until the present when Greece stands as a proud bulwark of democracy on the very threshold of a nation dedicated to the eradication of popular government, their fight has been long and often bitter. But seldom in history has the noble cause of liberty had as determined an adherent.

The concept of democracy which lay at the foundation of the government at Athens more than 2,000 years ago has had a most profound effect on the development of Western political theory and practice. The Greeks' emphasis on the dignity and rights of the individual, and on the rule of law, are the most basic and important components of democratic governments today.

A year ago our feelings of joy on this occasion were saddened by the news of the death of King Paul. The loss of this man, so strongly committed to the lofty principles of his Greek heritage, was keenly felt. Today, however, more than a year after the reins of government passed into the capable hands of his son and successor, King Constantine, people of Greek ancestry have even more reason to take pride in their nation's history and accomplishments. Today Greece continues as living, positive proof of a people's dedication to democracy.

I have long valued the friendship and counsel of the large Greek community in Massachusetts. I also value my friendship and associations with the Greek Ambassador here in Washington, Mr. Alexander Matsas, who has served his country well.

To these friends, and to their Hellenic brothers throughout the world, I extend my sincere best wishes on this important anniversary.

RETIREMENT OF HON. DOUGLAS DILLON AS SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I think this is an appropriate time to speak of the retiring Secretary of the Treasury, the Honorable Douglas Dillon. I should like to read from an editorial entitled "Changing Guard at Treasury," published in the Washington Post of March 20, 1965, in which the following statement is made about the retiring Secretary:

> In embracing the modern theory of fiscal policy, in reforming the depreciation guidelines, in dealing vigorously and imaginatively with vexing balance-of-payments deficits, Douglas Dillon wrote a brilliant record at the Treasury. He was by far the best Treasury Secretary of the postwar period, and it is, indeed, doubtful whether he has a peer in this century.

The judgment expressed by the Washington Post is held by many in the Congress and the country, and I cannot add to it. In every post that Douglas Dillon has held, whether it has been Ambassador to France, Under Secretary of State in the administration of President Eisenhower, or Secretary of the Treasury, under President Kennedy and President Johnson, he has brought to all of these important positions unusual ability, courage, the sense of duty, a patriotic desire to serve his country, and an unfailing sense of humor. He is uniquely fitted for public service, and I have no doubt that in the future he will be called upon again to serve our country. He deserves the commendation and the best wishes of the Senate, and Congress and, indeed, the American people. And it can be said that Mrs. Dillon has brought the same high sense of public duty and loyalty to every task.

SALUTE TO THE NATION'S AIRLINE INDUSTRY, AND TO THE SPLENDID ROLE CALIFORNIA HAS PLAYED, AND WILL PLAY, IN ITS EXPANSION AND IMPROVEMENT

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, just 40 years ago this month, the first regular year-round U.S. domestic air passenger service was established. I am proud to recall that it happened in California. The airline was known as Ryan Airlines and it operated between Los Angeles and San Diego. The airline is no longer in existence, and the route has since been taken over by other airlines, but it did mark the beginning of regular passenger air service as we know it today.

At that time, the one-way fare between the two cities was $17.50 and the flying time was 1 hour and 30 minutes. Today, the flying time is only 30 minutes and the fare is only $10.35.

Mr. President, I am proud of the way in which the people of my State have participated in the expansion and improvement of the commercial airline industry of this country and throughout the world. We are now almost on the threshold of a supersonic air transport system in which we shall be able to fly from New York to Los Angeles in a matter of minutes.

That is a dramatic improvement in service, and this small segment typifies much of what has been happening throughout the entire air transportation network.

Because this month is an anniversary of an important air transportation event, it provides an excellent opportunity to review some of the improvements that have taken place in our overall air transport system and to take a look at some of the airline plans for improvement in the future.

Californians could well take a good look at air transport, because aviation has meant a great deal to California and the entire west coast. The two grew up together.

The growing up has encompassed four decades of technological revolution. The first decade began with the first transcontinental air-rail passenger service linking Los Angeles and New York. Passengers took trains by night and flew by day. The whole trip took 48 hours. While that seems slow by present-day standards, it was a lot better than the 80 hours it took to travel between the two cities by rail alone. The one-way fare was $339.48. Passengers flew in an unpressurized, three-engine Ford plane that was proud of the fact that it had "large square windows that could be opened in flight for fresh air."

The second decade began in 1935 with a revolution in overocean communications. Giant seaplanes took off from San Francisco to provide regularly scheduled air service to Manila in 59 hours of flying time and 6 elapsed days versus weeks by sea. Technological improvements came thick and fast. Sleeper flights were introduced, transcontinental time was cut to 14 hours, transatlantic service began, four-engined pressurized planes became standard, and the first all-freight planes went into service.

The third decade, from 1945 to 1955, saw the industry take advantage of the momentum created by the aviation technical advances of World War II. Round the world scheduled air service from California began in 1947. Californians could reach New York in 7½ hours in the new DC-7. The introduction of long-range planes such as these permitted a transpolar route from Los Angeles across the top of the world to London and Scandinavia. Regular air mail helicopter service was initiated by Los Angeles Airways.

The fourth decade brings us up to the present and anyone who has flown across the Nation in the last few years is familiar with the comfort and speed of the jet aircraft. The flight time from Los Angeles to New York is less than 5 hours and the one-way, first-class fare is $160.90, a far cry from the $339 and the 48 hours of 1929. One one occasion, I flew on a commercial flight from Los Angeles to Washington in a little more than 3 hours.

This brief history coincides closely with the rapid development of California as a center of commerce and industry and as the most populous State in the Nation. California's contribution to the progress of aviation has been considerable. Since the very beginning, this State has been the primary manufacturer of aircraft. Of the total airline aircraft in service, almost 63 percent was built in California. These aircraft have enabled the airlines of the United States to take leadership in world aviation. At the same time, the airlines' purchase of these aircraft has had a booming effect upon the State's economy. Since the end of World War II, some 2,331 airliners have been purchased by the airlines of this country and the world, pumping some $5 billion into California's economy.

California represents a key State in the air transportation system. More than 15 percent of all of the Nation's airline men and women work and live in the State and the annual airline payroll runs close to $200 million.

Not only do Californians build airliners, they also fly in them in great numbers. More than 7 million passengers a year board commercial airliners in California, a number equal to the entire population of metropolitan Chicago. Last year, more than 33 percent of all the passenger miles operated throughout the entire United States were on planes which originated, terminated, or passed through California. Actually, airline surveys show that Californians fly more than the average U.S. citizen. The odds are that the passenger sitting next to you on any transcontinental flight will be a Californian. Thus, Californians are among the airlines' best customers and, at the same time, the airlines are one of California's best customers.

The airlines have experienced good years and lean years. Even during the lean years of the late fifties and early sixties, they had the courage to commit billions to reequip themselves for the civil jet age which we now enjoy.

Many questioned the wisdom of their decision at the time it was made. Some said: "The airlines are doing well enough with propeller equipment; why should they take a chance on the jets until their profit picture improves?" The risks were very large, but the airlines turned out to be farsighted. Now that the airlines are experiencing their first good year in a very long time, we should not forget the financial risks they took during the lean years.

We should be aware, too, that at the beginning of the fifth decade that a new technological revolution is taking place. The long-range jets are being supplemented by short-range jets like the DC-9, which rolled out early this month and will be in service soon. This new plane, and other jets like it, will bring jet service to many smaller communities. Understandably, many of these smaller communities have been impatient for this improved service. New and more productive versions of the longer range jets are also being planned.

Right now the airlines have so far announced orders for 300 new jets which will cost them more than a billion and a half dollars. The current jet fleet is 558; hence, as of now, an increase of 53 percent in the number of jets is planned. New orders are being announced every week.

By the end of California's fifth decade as a partner in the air age, the supersonic jet will be a reality. The current feasibility studies indicate that an SST is well within our capability to build and to operate economically and safely. Currently, the Government is weighing designs from two manufacturers, one of which is the California-based Lockheed Co.

Airline planning sees the SST coming into service some time early in the next decade. When the supersonic age arrives, it will have a dramatic effect on our transportation pattern. Californians will cross the country in a little over an hour, and no place in the world will be more than a few hours away from California. The SST program represents a challenge and an opportunity for the United States and it is hoped that we will move ahead in this important program with all possible speed.

The new air transportation system which is being built, brick by brick, also includes hundreds of millions of dollars worth of ground equipment.

One of the primary objectives of the airlines is to eliminate delays due to weather. California is a leading producer of all-weather landing systems which are currently being tested by the airlines for installation in the next few years.

Also, the 120 million passengers who will be flying the airlines by 1970 will require enormous investments in electronic reservations equipment. California has a stake in this investment, also, since the State is a leading producer of electronic devices.

This is a brief summary of an extensive list of new equipment that the airlines are in the process of purchasing, designing, and installing. Obviously, this new transportation network in the air and on the ground will cost a great deal of money. Fortunately, the airlines are finally achieving a level of adequate earnings. The airlines are going to need not only one good year but many good years if they are going to do all of the things that they need to do to improve their system.

The money that they are earning and which they hope to make has a lot of work to do. As customers looking forward to ever-improving airline service, and as a leading supplier of airline equipment, people in California hope that the airlines may soon achieve a sustained period of prosperity.

The airline industry has a major impact on the economy. Expansion of its services means thousands of new jobs in the airlines, thousands of new jobs at airports and around airports, thousands of new jobs in the electronics industry, and the fuel industry, as well as in the aircraft industry and its related groups of suppliers.

The Nation's airline industry is an invaluable national resource. California is proud of its role as a major contributor to airline development. We look forward to a new decade of technological revolution. California will again play a leading role in helping the airlines improve and develop the Nation's vital transportation system.

NORTH AMERICAN WATER AND POWER ALLIANCE

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, one of the best of the many articles now appearing in national magazines and newspapers on the North American Water and Power Alliance concept was carried Sunday in the Washington Post.

NAWAPA would trap the wasted water of Alaska, the Yukon, and British Columbia, and channel it to the Canadian plains, the Great Lakes, the Western United States, and Mexico. It is the bold new concept for meeting America's water crisis which is under study by the Western Water Subcommittee of the Senate Public Works Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the excellent article on NAWAPA written by Frank C. Porter, and entitled "A Gasping Continent Sees an Arctic Oasis," be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A Gasping Continent Sees an Arctic Oasis

(By Frank C. Porter, Washington Post staff writer)

Water became such a problem in Montana at one time that it sold for $1 a barrel while the same quantity of oil brought only 10 cents.

Today, the lack of water is reaching crisis proportions—not just for a single State but for the Nation as a whole—and is widely advertised as America's most pressing resource problem.

Western States have taken to squabbling over the already inadequate supply from the Colorado River. The Great Lakes have fallen to dangerously low levels. Water engineers, particularly in the great urban areas, wonder how they will meet the growing needs of industry, agriculture, and a population expected to top 200 million in only a few years.

But planners are drawing new hope from a proposal that might solve the problem at one massive stroke. This is a bold $100 billion plan to divert wasted water from the continent's great Northwest to thirsty areas of Canada, the United States, and Mexico.

The huge integrated system is designed to end the critical water shortage in the Western States, restore the Great Lakes to their normal level, and furnish 70 million kilowatts of new power—or one-third the present generating capacity of the entire United States.

It would be history's biggest public works program.

It would provide a vast complex of waterways, including a 2,000-mile seaway from Lake Superior into the heart of Alberta which could be extended to Vancouver on the Pacific coast. It would give Mexico eight times the amount of new irrigated farmland that the Aswan Dam will create in Egypt.

Its proponents believe that it would take care of the continent's water needs for at least the next century, but the plan's implications go far beyond water and power.

Those who have worked on it claim that it would markedly accelerate the economic growth of all three countries. They conceive of it as an adjunct to the administration's poverty program in that it would create, directly and indirectly, an estimated 4 million new jobs—roughly the same figure as the number of unemployed in the United States.

It is also claimed that the system would greatly increase land values and thereby broaden the tax base; that it would provide vast new recreational facilities, and that it would be a boon to dozens of industries, including construction, steel, copper, aluminum, cement, building equipment, and electronics.

Christened the North American Water and Power Alliance (NAWAPA), the scheme has been developed over the past 5 years as a labor of love by the Ralph M. Parsons Co., a big engineering and construction firm based in Los Angeles.

It so impressed some legislators that a special Senate Public Works Subcommittee held little publicized hearings on the plan last October. The subcommittee's chairman, Senator FRANK E. MOSS, Democrat, of Utah, hopes to win President Johnson's support and has written twice to Secretary of State Dean Rusk asking that talks be initiated with the Canadian Government.

So far, there has been no official response from Rusk, but some administration officials are known to be intrigued by the idea. Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall, for example, has said: "I'm for this type of thinking. I'm glad the engineers think so much of it and I want more people to hear about it."

But whatever enthusiasm it stimulates, NAWAPA may never come out of its dream state. If it should jell, it will take 10 years to plan and at least another 20 to build, Parsons engineers estimate. It presents almost endless complexities in international relations, sectional rivalries, cost and engineering analyses, financing problems, resource allocation, and the like.

"The evaluation itself is a tremendous job," says Floyd E. Dominy, Commissioner of the Bureau of Reclamation. He notes that Grand Coulee Dam on the Columbia River, a huge project but minute compared to NAWAPA, took 25 years to plan and has been under construction for another 25.

On the other hand, NAWAPA is unlikely to die an easy death. "Everyone who has worked on it has fallen in love with it," says a Parsons consultant. And every engineer who has studied it thoroughly is convinced of its feasibility, he adds.

Grandiose and visionary as it may appear, few experts are disposed to laugh NAWAPA off if only because of its impressive sponsorship. It was conceived by the late Donald McCord Baker, retired water planning engineer for Los Angeles.

He took it to Parsons, which turned over its facilities to him for further study and carried on the project after Baker died. Parsons' prestige (the company was prime systems contractor for Minuteman and Titan, among other things) has not hurt NAWAPA.

The system would originate in Alaska and Canada's Yukon Province, where huge dams would trap 20 percent of the runoff from such big river basins as the Tanana, the Yukon, the Copper, and the Susitna and store it in a series of interconnected reservoirs at an elevation of about 2,000 feet.

The water would then flow south through a complex of canals, tunnels, lakes, dams, lifts, and reservoirs, picking up new supplies in British Columbia from the Liard, Frazer, Peace, Kootenay, Columbia, and other rivers. Where the terrain rises, giant pumps would lift the waters a total of 1,000 feet.

The heart of the system would be the Rocky Mountain trench, a fingerlike 500-mile reservoir contained in a natural gorge extending down into Montana. From the northern end of the trench, a canal dredged to 30 feet depth would extend all the way to Lake Superior, furnishing water and transportation to the great plains of southern Canada.

An offshoot of the Canadian-Great Lakes waterway, the Dakota Canal would feed into the upper Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, making them navigable the year around. Another offshoot canal would lead through Lake Winnipeg northward to Hudson Bay.

The flow from the Trans-Canadian waterway would lift the now-depressed level of the Great Lakes back to normal, reduce present pollution, enhance power generation at Niagara, and improve St. Lawrence Seaway navigation by stabilizing its level.

Two other waterways would flow into Lake Huron; the James Bay Seaway, connecting with Hudson Bay, and the Knob Lake barge canal, which would help open up the vast mining areas of central Quebec.

South from the Rocky Mountain trench, a further complex of canals, tunnels, and waterways would carry water to virtually the entire West and to the three northernmost States of Mexico.

Parsons claims that the system would recoup its investment in 50 years and that it could be operated for about $500 million annually. Receipts from water and power alone would top $4 billion yearly, it figures, and half these revenues would go to Canada—a good talking point to counter any nationalistic resentment that might develop in the Dominion against the concept of shared resources.

Actually, more and more Canadians are coming to realize that their nation can become an indispensable provider for the big sister south of the border. For example, British Newfoundland Corp., a huge consortium, is now trying to line up New England and New York as prime customers for a $2 billion, 6.5-million-kilowatt hydroelectric plant it hopes to build at Grand Falls on the Hamilton River in Labrador.

THE RIGHT TO VOTE

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, one of Oregon's excellent daily newspapers, the Eugene Register-Guard, carried an editorial which I find extremely valuable in reminding me of what the U.S. Constitution actually provides regarding voters' rights.

National attention is focused on the inability of a large segment of the American population to vote. This editorial makes a compelling point:

> The heart of the Federal effort is not to give the Negro the vote, but to prevent the States from keeping it away from him because of his race.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial of March 18, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Examining That "Right To Vote"

Widespread misunderstanding of the right to vote has been revealed in the wake of troubles in Selma and the President's request for broader Federal powers to protect the Negro right. One Oregon editorial page even carried the amazing assertion that the U.S. Constitution "very specifically grants the right to vote to all the citizenry of this Nation."

Not so. The Constitution grants nobody the right to vote. However, the course of American history has dictated that the right be extended more and more broadly. Thus the right is a part of the American tradition, almost a part of the unwritten Constitution, even though the great document itself is almost silent on the matter.

The Constitution makes these provisions:

"That those who vote for Members of Congress shall not have to meet qualifications different from those who vote for members of the more numerous house of the State legislature. (By custom this has been extended to those who vote for presidential electors.)

"That the right to vote shall not be abridged because of color, race, or previous condition of servitude.

"That the right shall not be abridged because of sex.

"That the right shall not be abridged because of failure to pay a poll or other tax."

Beyond that, it's a matter of State decision. Most States place 21 as the voting age. But 2 use 18. Others could. Or they could use 16 or 35. Residence requirements vary, too, from as little as 30 days in some town elections to 2 years in Alabama, Mississippi and South Carolina. (In Oregon, it's 6 months, except that persons who have lived here a shorter time may vote for President and Vice President.) Literacy tests vary. States may or may not make provisions for absentee voting.

At the Constitutional Convention delegates could not agree. Should there be universal suffrage, or should the vote be saved for those of high ecconomic and social status? Leaving the matter to the States was a compromise. And most States restricted the vote considerably, usually requiring at least the ownership of property as a qualification. New Hampshire took a major step forward in 1794 when it instituted the poll tax in place of property ownership. Thus the poll tax was, in the beginning, a liberalizing, not a restricting, device. Oregon, until 1948, restricted the vote in school elections to the owners of real property.

Gradually the right to vote was extended throughout the States, to whites and free Negroes alike. The first backward step came not in the South, but in Connecticut and Massachusetts. In the 1850's those States instituted stiff literacy requirements to prevent voting by newly naturalized immigrants.

In 1870, the 15th amendment to the Constitution was ratified by the requisite 26 States. (Oregon, by the way, ratified this one belatedly; and it did not do so until 1959, after having rejected it 89 years earlier.) This is the amendment the President is asking for machinery to enforce. It prohibits a State from preventing a citizen from voting solely because of his race or color.

After the Civil War, as long as Federal troops were in the South, Negroes voted, often to the near exclusion of whites. Between the end of the war and 1900, three States elected Negro Lieutenant Governors. Southern States sent 22 Negroes to Congress in this period. Yet, after 1877, when Federal troops were no longer in the South, white supremacy began coming back.

And another, nonracial, factor entered. Late in the century the strong tides of populism began to be felt in the impoverished South. The old power structure began making voting difficult, not only to keep the Negro from the polls, but also to keep the poor white in his place. In the last decade of the 19th century, the number of Negro voters in Louisiana declined from 127,823 to 12,902. In the same period the number of white voters declined from 126,884 to 87,240.

Nonetheless the populist sentiment prevailed in many Southern communities. Demagogic politicians used the race issue then to unite the whites against the Negroes. The poor white turned not upon the rich white who sought to oppress him, but upon the Negro whom he proceeded to oppress. The poll tax and requirements as to literacy and residence were the weapons. After the Supreme Court's historic school decision in 1954, Mississippi, seeing the handwriting on the wall, stiffened its qualifications for voting.

As recently as 1958, the Supreme Court upheld the validity of literacy tests. In *Lassiter v. Northampton Board of Elections*, coming up from North Carolina, the Court upheld the tests, but said they must be "absent of the discrimination which the Constitution condemns."

It is this "discrimination which the Constitution condemns" that is at the heart of the Federal effort—not to give the Negro the vote, but to prevent the States from keeping it way from him because of his race.

S. 218: A BILL TO KILL EFFECTIVE FPC REGULATION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Federal Power Commission is similar to a conscientious police force trying to carry out its duties: without constant citizen support it cannot continue to do its job, and those it seeks to regulate in the public interest assume control of the situation. One such effort to subordinate consumer interests to private aims is currently embodied in a bill pending before the Senate Commerce Committee—S. 218.

The Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, Joseph C. Swidler, has transmitted to the Senate a detailed analysis of S. 218. Mr. Swidler's analysis points up clearly the dangers inherent in this truly startling piece of legislation, which would wipe out major functions of the Federal Power Commission.

REPEAL OF AUTHORITY SOUGHT

This is a tricky piece of legislation, but in effect we are asked to emasculate the work of one of our Nation's major regulatory agencies. In the words of Mr. Swidler:

> S. 218 contains only two sentences but they would substantially repeal the Commission's regulatory authority over interstate power companies.

Probably the greatest evil of S. 218 is in the effect it would have on the Nation's small, privately, municipally, and cooperatively owned electric power companies who are dependent upon the large utilities for wholesale power supplies. The bill would do away with existing safeguards over such sales.

COMPANIES OPPOSE RATE REDUCTIONS

Reasons for the opposition of private parties to FPC's authority are not hard to find. The current Commission has, in an unprecedented manner, taken seriously its responsibilities in the field of regulating interstate wholesale sales of electricity. Statistics show the rate increases granted by the Commission during the past 3 years, compared with the rate decreases in wholesale sales of electricity:

Fiscal year	Reductions	Increases
1962	$127,100	$2,030,900
1963	1,204,795	278,902
1964	1,448,125	489,400
1965 (1st 8½ months)	7,454,000	740,000

Mr. President, the Federal Power Commission deserves the congratulations and commendations of all of us for this remarkable record of rate reductions, most of which will be passed along to benefit the average American citizen who consumes this electricity. If rate reductions for the balance of fiscal 1965 continue on the same basis, they will amount to over $11 million for the year, compared with only $127,000 3 years ago. As Mr. Swidler so aptly comments:

> It is no coincidence that this attempt to repeal the substance of the Federal Power Act, while retaining the shell, comes when the Commission, for the first time in its history, has under way a comprehensive and vigorous program to bring about reductions in excessive wholesale rates.

At this moment the Commission has before it 35 rate proceedings or investigations of wholesale contract terms involving annual bills in excess of $100 million.

CONSUMERS ENTITLED TO FAIR RATES

It is small wonder that many major power companies are eagerly supporting S. 218, which would take the heart out of the FPC's jurisdiction over these sales. Numerous companies are making unwarranted profits, and they are making them at the expense of the ultimate consumer through overcharging small privately and publicly owned electric systems. The effect of S. 218 on the FPC's future rate reduction activities is well summarized by Chairman Swidler:

> S. 218 would require the Commission to dismiss every one of these cases, not because the record supports the existing rates, but on the unfounded assumption that the work is unnecessary. The wholesale power customers of this Nation and the consumers they serve are entitled to the benefit of rates that can be defended as reasonable under the standards of the act and the decisions of the courts.

STATES NOT EFFECTIVE REGULATORS

The pretense of S. 218 is that it will give jurisdiction which it strips from the Federal Power Commission back to the State regulatory agencies. Amazingly, some of the State regulatory agencies have come to the support of the bill on this ground. The FPC analysis meets the argument squarely:

> We submit that wholesale rate regulation in interstate commerce is a matter of national concern. It has never been carried on effectively by the States because it involves utility operations and national policies which are beyond the reach of any single State. This is the reason the Federal Power Act was passed in the first place.

Mr. President, the last sentence quoted needs to be underscored: "This is the reason the Federal Power Act was passed in the first place." I think we all need to be reminded of that fact.

This innocent-looking piece of legislation would effectively gut an agency created by the Congress of the United States to police an industry whose activities were not subject to the normal competition of the marketplace. By the time the Federal Power Act was passed, the electric power industries empire was already so far out of hand that it threatened the entire economy.

FUTURE OF REGULATION AT STAKE

With two sentences, S. 218 would return our country to the state of affairs that existed before the act was passed. It does not do it boldly and directly, but rather by indirection and subterfuge. It needs to be exposed for the ill-advised course it suggests we take. As Mr. Swidler says:

> The fact is that the alternative to FPC regulation of wholesale transactions is no effective regulation at all.

The Federal Power Act is only 30 years old. But if S. 218 is enacted, this reform statute will assume the character of an old man—a toothless caricature devoid of strength and capable of only staring helplessly at abuse. It seems to have taken three decades for this law to realize its potential, and I do not support those who would cut it down in its prime.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report on S. 218, together with an analysis of S. 218, prepared by the Federal Power Commission be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report and analysis were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, REPORT ON S. 218, 89TH CONGRESS

A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect of the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission

S. 218 contains only two sentences but they would substantially repeal the Commission's regulatory authority over interstate power companies.[1]

---

[1] A detailed explanation of the bill's provisions is attached as app. A.

The first sentence of S. 218 would exempt from Commission justification any utility whose system is interconnected with an interstate power pool if the utility confines its ownership of facilities to one State and is not directly and permanently connected with the facilities of a utility deriving its major revenues in another State. This provision would immediately exempt some 55 of the Nation's 180 major electric power utilities each of which is an integral part of an interstate power network but interconnects only with companies in its own State. This is not all. In addition, if S. 218 were enacted, most of the Nation's remaining utilities could organize themselves so as to escape Federal regulation, simply by creating new companies at the State line.

The second sentence sets up a complicated test which when applied to the practical circumstances of the industry would exempt all sales at wholesale by major public utilities to municipalities, to cooperatives, and to many investor-owned companies. It would thus eliminate the Commission's wholesale rate justification insofar as it applies to thousands of small systems throughout the Nation which are dependent on the major power systems for their bulk power supply.

In the Commission's opinion, the enactment of S. 218 would mean the end of responsible regulations of this Nation's electric utility systems which Congress established in the Public Utility Holding Company Act in 1935. We strongly urge that it not be adopted.

A brief description of the scope of the Commission's existing authority under the 1935 Federal Power Act may be helpful in evaluating the intended impact of S. 218.

Under existing law, there is a clear division of responsibility between the Federal Government and the States. The States are given exclusive jurisdiction over the sale of electricity at retail, whether the electricity originates from intrastate or interstate sources. The Federal Power Commission's rate jurisdiction is limited to sales at wholesale in interstate commerce and to the interstate transmission of electric energy.

In addition, the FPC has been given the responsibility for establishing and enforcing a uniform system of accounts applicable to all public utilities coming within its jurisdiction; for passing on mergers of such utilities among themselves and with other electrical systems, large or small; for preventing interlocking directorates; and for insuring that local distributors of power can secure the interconnections with such utilities necessary to receive power upon reasonable terms.

As indicated, this basic authority, which is part of the congressional effort through the Public Utility Holding Company Act to prevent recurrence of the abuses which had beset the utility industry, would be immediately eliminated for about a third of all of the electric companies. What this would mean can be judged from the fact that the Commission removed from the rate base of seven of these companies, who would no longer be subject to the Commission's accounting jurisdiction, $47 million as a result of Commission audit of their books. The elimination of the authority to prevent interlocking directorates between such companies and with other public utilities, or to approve their merger with or acquisition of other electric systems, would clearly also be a long step backwards toward the days of unimpeded intercompany manipulations.

The exhaustive congressional and Federal Trade Commission hearings which preceded enactment of titles II and III of the Federal Power Act in 1935 revealed to the Nation the urgent necessity for Federal regulation of the price at which electric energy is sold at wholesale in interstate commerce and for control over the accounting and financial practices of these utilities. The committee report on this legislation pointed to the fact that even in 1935 "local operating units have been tied together into vast interstate systems" and "were entirely beyond the reach of the States either legally or practically." (S. Rept. No. 621, 74th Cong., 1st sess., p. 17.)

Congress recognized the need for Federal regulation when only a small fraction of the Nation's electrical systems were interconnected in interstate pools. The recently completed national power survey points out that "today 97 percent of the industry's generating capacity is to a greater or lesser degree interconnected in five large networks." The largest existing group of interconnected utilities covers roughly the entire Eastern United States, as well as two Canadian Provinces.

The national power survey projected possible savings of as much as $11 billion a year by 1980 if the industry takes full advantage of the economies inherent in large-scale, multistate operations. We do not suggest that the large utilities would be unable to profit by these technological developments in the absence of Federal regulations. We strongly believe, however, that such regulation is essential if wholesale customers, and in the long run the American consumer, are to receive their share of the benefits.

It is no coincidence that this attempt to repeal the substance of the Federal Power Act, while retaining the shell, comes when the Commission, for the first time in its history, has under way a comprehensive and vigorous program to bring about reductions in excessive wholesale rates. Attached to these comments is a detailed listing of the 35 separate proceedings or investigations in progress before the Commission in which rate reductions to wholesale customers or the elimination of unfair terms in wholesale contracts are being sought. These proceedings involve every region of the country and affect the rates to some 600 power distributors involving annual wholesale power bills in excess of $100 million.

S. 218 would require the Commission to dismiss everyone of these cases, not because the record supports the existing rates but on the unfounded assumption that the work is unnecessary. The wholesale power customers of this Nation and the consumers they serve are entitled to the benefit of rates that can be defended as reasonable under the standards of the act and the decisions of the courts. We believe there is no reason in the public interest for the Congress to enact S. 218 which would call a halt to the Commission's active and successful program of rate regulation, and there is every reason for continuing this important activity.

The need for a continuing Federal regulation of the wholesale rates which would be decontrolled by S. 218 is pointed up by the rate reductions which the Commission's efforts have brought about. Starting with fiscal year 1962 (July 1, 1961–June 30, 1962), the reductions and increases in wholesale rates allowed each year by this Commission were as follows:

Fiscal year	Reductions	Increases
1962	$127,100	$2,030,900
1963	1,204,795	278,902
1964	1,448,125	489,400
1965 (1st 8½ months)	7,454,000	740,000

There are many factors which have contributed to this record, but we believe that one of the most important is this Commission's determination to fully exercise its regulatory responsibilities under the Federal Power Act. This program is just beginning to gather momentum, but the many millions of dollars of rate reductions already achieved is ample proof of the need for its continuation. The fact that wholesale customers throughout the Nation are bringing their rate problems to the Federal Power Commission is the clearest demonstration of the fact that these problems cannot be solved at the local level.

We submit that wholesale rate regulation in interstate commerce is a matter of national concern. It has never been carried on effectively by the States because it involves utility operations and national policies which are beyond the reach of any single State. This is the reason the Federal Power Act was passed in the first place.

What is at stake is not merely rates to consumers but the most efficient use of our natural resources. Federal regulation is necessary to assure the availability of low-cost power from interstate power pools at reasonable rates to the many small utilities, public and private, whose operations are not carried out on a scale large enough to enable them to generate their own power from the most economical sources. In the absence of Federal regulation, they will be required in many cases to continue to build small and relatively high-cost generating stations which fail to make the most efficient use of our natural resources. In other cases, access to low-cost power sources may be a question of survival for the smaller systems.

The Nation values its pluralistic power economy and the place in it of the independent small systems—public, cooperative, and investor-owned. The necessity for Federal regulation to assure the survival of these small- and medium-size power systems is unmistakable. The National Power Survey found that there are over 3,600 electric power systems in this country today but that the 100 largest systems account for about 89 percent of total generation. There are about 1,500 small systems which purchase part or all of their requirements at wholesale from public utilities subject to FPC jurisdiction.

Regulation is vital if the small systems and the millions of consumers they serve are to receive their fair share of the benefits which the emerging power pools make available. The enactment of S. 218, besides eliminating the Commission's authority to assure bulk power supply on fair terms to existing customers, would also eliminate the Commission's authority to order the additional interconnections which in many situations are needed to permit small systems to share in the benefits of scale enjoyed by the large utilities in existing pools.

S. 218 is being advocated on the theory that the sales at wholesale in interstate commerce to thousands of power distributors throughout the Nation are matters of local concern and that these rates can be effectively regulated by the States. If maximum efficiency is to be achieved, the wholesale rates of systems which are joined in multistate pools cannot be regulated by the separate and different treatment of the various State commissions. No one State could be familiar with the transactions of a multistate pool, transactions which go to the heart of fixing wholesale rates for any company in the pool.

There are also practical reasons of economy and efficiency which support the wisdom of the congressional decision in 1935 to lodge wholesale rate responsibility at the Federal level. This specialized activity requires the efforts of experts who devote their full time to mastering the intricate operations of these interstate power networks. Few, if any, of the State commissions could be expected to staff itself for the discharge of this specialized responsibility. Indeed, it would be most wasteful and inefficient to set up 48 Power Commission already has the staff which is performing this task to the satisfaction of the wholesale customers for whose benefit regulation is intended. The diverse separate organizations which could not possibly do an effective job, when the Federal policies of the States if they made a serious attempt to carry out this responsibility would impose a great strain on pool formation and operation.

The fact is that the alternative to FPC regulation of wholesale transactions is no effective regulation at all.

S. 218 is not the first attempt by the electric utilities to gain exemption from the effective regulation. A bill similar to S. 218, the so-called Miller bill (H.R. 2972, 80th Cong., 1st sess.), was introduced and received the support of the utilities in 1947. However, after comprehensive hearings were held on this proposal before a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce the bill failed to be reported out of committee. During the decade of the 1950's when the Commission's electric rate work was almost nonexistent, there were no attempts to pass such decontrol bills.

Congress, however, in 1954 reiterated its belief that Federal regulation of the electric utilities is necessary. In passing the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to encourage the private power companies to build atomic generating plants the Congress inserted a specific provision of that act, section 272, to insure that the regulatory provisions of the Federal Power Act were applicable to the transmission and sale at wholesale of such energy in interstate commerce. Congress wanted to be sure that the benefits of this new source of power, developed at the Federal Government's expense, were passed on to the wholesale customers.

In the words of the Supreme Court, the Congress in 1935 "drew a bright line easily ascertained, between State and Federal jurisdiction." The Congress recognized then, what is even more true today, that the practicalities of electric regulation are such that Federal regulation of interstate wholesale sales together with State regulation of all retail sales is the line of division of responsibility which makes sense in this particular area of our Federal system. Such a division of authority has served the consuming public and the industry well for three decades. There is no good reason to eliminate the Federal Government's area of responsibility to regulate the Nation's largest and fastest growing utility industry and every reason to continue this important activity. We urge the Congress not to enact S. 218.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION,
By JOSEPH C. SWIDLER,
Chairman.

ANALYSIS OF S. 218, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Section 1 provides for citing the bill as the Federal Power Act Amendment of 1965.

Section 2 declares the matters which would be exempt under section 3, below, to be matters primarily of local concern and subject to regulation by the States.

Section 3 would amend subsection 201(f) of the act. The first sentence would exempt from Federal Power Commission jurisdiction any company, including any nonprofit corporation or membership or cooperative association engaged in rural electrification, where (a) all of the generating and transmission facilities of such company are wholly within one State; and, (b) none of the facilities of such company is directly connected with the facilities of any public utility otherwise than by a Federal Power Commission authorized or approved emergency connection, or by a connection within the same State with the facilities of a public utility deriving the major portion of its electric revenues from sales at retail or for resale at retail within such State.

The second sentence of the bill would exempt transactions involving the sale or, within the State in which delivery takes place, the transmission of electric energy to any entity exempted by subsection 201(f), as amended by this bill, or to any nonprofit corporation or membership or cooperative association engaged in rural electrification, by a person or public utility which derives a substantial portion of its electric revenues from sales of electric energy at retail within such State.

I

A. The first of the new sentences added by S. 218 would exempt from any regulation by the Commission electric utilities which:

1. Own or operate facilities for the generation and transmission of electric energy wholly within one State, and

2. Are not directly interconnected with another public utility, except by:

(a) An emergency interconnection authorized or approved under section 202, or

(b) A connection within the State with a public utility deriving the major portion of its revenues from retail sales within the State or from sales for resale within the State.

[Rural electrification cooperatives are mentioned as being included among the "persons" eligible for exemption, but only if they qualify under the above tests.]

B. Retain the Commission's jurisdiction over:

1. Electric utilities owning or operating facilities in two or more States;

2. Electric utilities permanently interconnected with other utilities at State borders; and

3. Utilities permanently interconnected within the State in which all their facilities are located with a utility in group (1) or (2) which does not derive the major portion of its revenues from sales at retail or for resale within such State.

II

Under the second of the new sentences sales at wholesale in interstate commerce would be:

A. Exempt from the Commission's rate jurisdiction under sections 205 and 206 of the Federal Power Act if made to:

1. Any "entity" exempted from Commission jurisdiction by subsection 201(f), as herein amended [including not only the electric utilities covered by I, supra, but all the Federal and State governmental bodies already exempted by section 201(f)] or

2. Any rural electrification cooperative, by any "person or public utility" a "substantial part" of whose electric revenues from sales within the State in which the sale is made is derived from sales at retail.

Since almost all sellers of electric power are vertically integrated and derive a substantial part of their revenues in any State from retail sales, all wholesales sales to municipalities, to other governmental bodies, and to the exempt utilities under the first new sentence (the category (1) sales), or to cooperatives (the category (2) sales), would be exempt, except in the few cases where the seller is predominately a wholesaler or transmission company.

B. The Commission would retain jurisdiction over wholesale sales in interstate commerce:

1. Between electric utilities which remain "public utilities," and

2. By a public utility to a cooperative or municipality at the border of, or across the border into a State in which the seller has no substantial retail sales, assuming that delivery of a border sale is deemed to take place in the buyer's State.

III

Under the second new sentence the bill would also exempt from Commission jurisdiction the transmission of electric energy within the State in which delivery is made to the facilities of any exempted entity or cooperative and would also exempt the transmission facilities themselves. The purpose of the provision is not clear but it could be argued that it would have the effect of precluding Commission jurisdiction over wheeling to or for municipalities or cooperatives and to provide that a company doing business primarily in one State does not lose its exemption if it operates facilities in another State which are used solely for wheeling purposes.

Proceedings and investigations underway

Name of public utility	Wholesale revenue	Number of wholesale customers	Location of customers by State
Southwestern Electric Power Co	$2,756,992	23	Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, and Oklahoma.
Kentucky Utilities Co	4,748,702	19	Kentucky.
Virginia Electric & Power Co	6,822,738	37	Virginia and North Carolina.
Pennsylvania Power & Light Co	1,180,724	11	Pennsylvania.
Interstate Power Co	1,687,436	35	Iowa, Minnesota, Illinois, South Dakota, and Wisconsin.
Appalachian Power Co	2,181,666	6	Virginia.
Illinois Power Co	3,096,410	19	Illinois.
Western Light & Telephone Co., Inc	1,231,185	25	Kansas.
Wisconsin Power & Light Co	5,080,150	40	Wisconsin.
Lake Superior District Power Co	702,812	4	Wisconsin and Michigan.
Florida Power Corp	5,236,416	20	Florida.
Central Illinois Public Service Co	6,562,688	26	Illinois.
Pennsylvania Electric Co	3,707,868	19	Pennsylvania.
Arkansas-Missouri Power Co	824,337	6	Missouri and Arkansas.
Missouri Power & Light Co	375,775	7	Missouri.
San Diego Gas & Electric Co	99,347	3	California.
Dayton Power & Light Co	2,420,621	23	Ohio.
Florida Power & Light Co	1,829,142	7	Florida.
Kansas City Power & Light Co	472,289	11	Missouri and Kansas.
Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co	2,709,772	23	Arkansas and Oklahoma.
Public Service Co. of Oklahoma	5,750,346	17	Oklahoma.
Nantahala Power & Light Co	119,942	3	North Carolina.
Central Vermont Public Service Co	124,855	6	Vermont.
Union Electric Co	1,731,506	8	Iowa and Missouri.
Missouri Edison Co	25,577	1	Missouri.
Eastern Shore Public Service Co. of Maryland	1,057,936	15	Maryland.
Northern States Power Co. (Minnesota)	5,309,461	40	Minnesota, South Dakota, and North Dakota.
Wisconsin Michigan Power Co	1,928,200	11	Wisconsin and Michigan.
Delaware Power & Light Co	2,626,800	9	Delaware.
Alabama Power Co	5,547,894	24	Alabama.
Kentucky Power Co	505,862	4	Kentucky.
Georgia Power Co	14,765,911	88	Georgia.
Mississippi Power Co	2,343,928	6	Mississippi.
Duke Power Co	15,659,004	50	South Carolina and North Carolina.
Eastern Shore Public Service Co. of Virginia	195,310	1	Virginia.
Total	111,446,602		

OREGON COUPLE NOT DUPED BY AMA PROPAGANDA

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, among the many letters I have received pertaining to the promotion of "eldercare" by the American Medical Association, the one I am calling to the attention of the Senate today is a typical example. Since the administration cannot spend an equal amount in support of S. 1 as that being spent by the AMA, I must answer each letter I receive individually and try to correct some of the false impressions that have been created.

Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Olsen, the authors of this letter, found in a surgeon's office "an array of colorful brochures on eldercare—one served to confuse because it was entitled 'Help Make Medicare Fair.'" This couple was alert to the issues and the AMA's campaign, and took the trouble to write me about it.

The colorful pamphlet to which the Olsens refer is just one example. Appearing in most of Oregon's newspapers is an advertisement that states the following:

> The medicare legislation (H.R. 1), now before Congress and backed by the administration, is unfair because it promotes medical assistance for everybody over 65 years—rich and poor alike, regardless of need.

Nowhere does it say "eldercare," or that its sponsor is AMA. However, it ends in heavy dark type: "Write your Congressman to support H.R. 3727—the fair-medicare proposal." The logic used here seems very strange. The advertisement implies that medicare is unfair because it is equal, and in order to be fair it should be inequitable, and to do this we write our Congressman to support H.R. 3727.

There are many more examples. However, I prefer to let the letter from an enlightened constituent tell the story, and I ask unanimous consent to have the letter from Mr. and Mrs. Clarence Olsen printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and enclosure were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND, OREG.,
March 9, 1965.

Senator MAURINE B. NEUBERGER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NEUBERGER: My husband, 72, and I, 58, have each two daughters, all of them rather poor. We have, still, $5,000 in the bank, just about enough for a real bout of illness. We have a small home about four-tenths paid. My husband receives $79 per month in social security, and I have a part-time office job which pays around $100 a month: out of this we pay $61 GI house payment and over $40 per month for inadequate hospital and surgical care. Would you consider us among "the wealthy, the well-to-do, and the self-supporting"?

My husband, Clarence, will have a serious operation in 10 days. In the surgeon's office he found an array of colorful brochures on eldercare—one served to confuse because it was entitled "Help Make Medicare Fair." In these we found your name, address, and proper salutation with the suggestion that courtesy and/or a compliment were desirable. This was not difficult because we have followed your long and sensibly liberal voting record and have read in the daily press of your concern for the plight of the average sick senior citizen. On reading the pamphlets further we learned that "The problems of the over-65 population, which have been highly exaggerated, are diminishing," and that "eldercare, which helps those who need help, undoubtedly would cost less in the future as more and more elderly reach retirement age with increased assets and more retirement income." We have evidently not cultivated friends among the affluent group with whom the doctors are acquainted, and I think a much larger group cannot pass a means test and also cannot afford proper medical advice and treatment.

We write to urge you to vote for medicare, H.R.1. We feel the passage of this bill would remove the specter of a costly future siege of hospitalization. Mutual of Omaha has just raised my husband's senior policies about 20 percent, due to rising hospital costs. Our insurance provides $20 of the $40 per day average for room and board, but special hospital services over and above this expense sometimes exceed same. By taking a means test after our cash reserve is gone we could, as things now stand, obtain public hospitalization. But how about our small home, and how about that American freedom of choice?

Why is the AMA spending millions to promote eldercare, an unhelpful plan in poorer States where help is most needed, instead of medicare? They emphasize that it would increase taxes. Is their opposition to medicare grounded in concern about the overtaxing of our children (the latter are hopeful that we not become dependent on them, remember?), or in concern about loss of profits for doctors and hospitals? Many AMA members are conscientious and dedicated, and many opposed to the cold-blooded policies. We have been warned by insurance agencies against medicare. Does an insurance shadow loom back of the solid AMA lobby?

In conclusion, medicare's low-cost plan is better than nothing. If it is unsound fiscally to add medical care it can be left out and provided by private insurance. Let us keep our homes and enough money to maintain our pride: limit our incomes to $10,000 if necessary, but please pass a decent medicare, call it what you will.

Sincerely yours,

ESTHER M. OLSEN,
CLARENCE E. OLSEN.

MILITARY NEWSPAPER REFUSES PUBLICATION OF GI BILL ARTICLE

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, despite diligent and continued efforts on behalf of the supporters of the cold war GI bill, our ability to keep the servicemen informed of its merits and progress has constantly been thwarted by boycotts on behalf of the military, the press media, and indeed this body itself, by refusing consideration of the bill for over a year during the 88th Congress. This is so despite the fact that the bill was on the calendar.

I have spoken before of the Defense Department's desire to maintain our cold war veterans in a state of "intellectual servitude" by opposing this bill and by retarding information concerning it, even though they are supposedly the spokesman for the young men who would benefit by the bill.

The proof of this censorship has recently been revealed to me in the form of an article written for the Gateway Newspaper, a publication at Andrews Air Force Base here in Washington. This article was written in the normal course of duty by a writer on the staff of the Gateway News, which is not an official Department of Defense publication. Yet, this article was not allowed to be printed, with the excuse given that the Department of Defense was opposed to the bill. Because they are opposed to the bill, they have exercised censorship over a nonofficial publication.

The determination of the Defense Department to refuse to help the cold war veteran is seriously impeding the ability of our servicemen to even read about the cold war GI bill.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter transmitting this article, with the omission of the signature to protect the courageous serviceman who informed me of this injustice, be printed at this point in the RECORD, along with the article to illustrate the quality and newsworthiness of that suppressed information.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEAR SENATOR YARBOROUGH: Here is the story written by an Air Force sergeant of which I spoke to you about over the phone last Wednesday. The writer of the story took great pains to insure that he did not offend the Department of Defense, administration, or any other organization that would cause the story to be killed. I personally feel he did write an unbiased and objective story and that the paper should have printed it; especially since it was a byline story; clearly indicating that the story was based on his own opinions and views.

I called you hoping that you might be able to take the very story that military policy caused to be scrapped and use it to show why many of our military personnel, especially those in remote areas like Antarctica, Vietnam, Cuba, etc., are not aware of the existence of such a bill.

This story definitely doesn't compromise any security material which simply means that the story was killed due to personal opinion by the so-called brass in the Armed Forces. If this is the case, which seems quite evident, then the Department of Defense, which is supposed to represent or act as a lobby for the majority opinion of our military personnel has, without canvassing an opinion, taken upon itself to oppose a bill which I found to be favorable with the majority of the persons I have spoken to in reference to the bill.

This is the kind of freedom of expression in the services which often leads to ignorance of current issues among its personnel.

Hope you can use this and if I can be of any further help please don't hesitate to call me. Hope everything is going well with you.

Sincerely,

——— ———.

COLD WAR BILL—S. 9

Navy Journalist (JO3) Richard W. Kelly is assigned to the Naval Air Facility at Andrews Air Force Base. Recently, the native of Coral Gables, Fla., was invited to appear before Congress in behalf of the passage of a new cold war bill (S. 9), which if enacted, would make educational assistance and home loan guarantees to some 5 million eligible veterans.

Invited to appear before the Senate's Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee by its chairman, RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Democrat, of Texas, and ROBERT F. KENNEDY, Democrat, of New York, a strong proponent of the measure, Journalist Kelly told the Senators, in part, this story:

"I first became interested in the cold war bill during my deployment with a Seabee battalion to Guantanamo Bay, Cuba, resulting from the Cuban crisis in late 1962. Had I been able to afford it, I would have been in college instead, but like so many other young Americans, I joined the military service shortly after graduating from high school. Now that my enlistment is ending soon, I would like to go to college in order to realize my education goals. I'm still confronted with financial difficulties, but with Uncle Sam's help, I'm sure that I can achieve my educational ambitions."

To this, Senator Yarborough added:

"Each year a large number of our American youths enter military service to give from 2 to 4, or more, years of their lives to the defense of their country. They do so, and this country needs them to do so, because foreign powers continue to threaten the security of this Nation and the free world. So long as there is a Vietnam, a Berlin crisis, or an island threat from Cuba, our American youth will be required to serve their Nation. The bill I have introduced provides an opportunity to demonstrate that we, as a nation, do recognize the extreme, unique personal sacrifices exacted from our cold war veterans by their military service."

The Texas Senator also pointed out that only 44 percent of the draft-eligible young men ever serve their country in uniform. While these men are sacrificing 2 to 4 years of their lives just at the crucial age of peak development, the 56 percent of their counterparts are utilizing this time to further their careers and develop their futures. It is just these admirable young men who are serving their country that are least able to afford an education, least prepared for a civilian occupation, and those who have to struggle the hardest to survive the competition for the future. Hence, the injustice is magnified, as we take the very men who must struggle the hardest in life, and set them 2 to 4 years behind in their competitive position, just because they do the admirable thing and are among the 44 percent who defend their country.

"Last year," added Mr. Yarborough, "unemployment compensation for veterans increased $2 million to over $96 million—money which could have reaped benefits if used for the training of veterans. Here is the place where cold war veterans need help. He does not need a 'reward'—what he needs is a 'chance.' Whatever his military experience, hazardous or not, there is a need for readjustment assistance to help him get his ship of success back into the mainstream of opportunity."

According to Mr. Yarborough, Mr. Kennedy, and 38 other Senators who joined together for introducing the cold war bill at the first session of the 89th Congress on January 6, 1965, the measure will provide service men and women, upon discharge, vocational readjustment and restore lost educational opportunities whose higher learning ambitions were interrupted or impeded by reason of active duty between January 31, 1955, and July 1, 1967.

It is by no means a bonus or a pension plan; it is simply a readjustment plan to train a veteran to become self-sufficient and thus avoid the necessity of a bonus or a pension. It is a way to give these young men, like journalist Kelly, an opportunity to return to civilian life and to realize their educational objectives at the most formative time in their lives.

Frankly speaking, the cold war GI bill, if enacted, will more than redress inequities and provide opportunities. In addition, it will help build an educational fortress which, in the long run, will be of more value in defending our freedom than all the armaments in existence.

THE 144TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on this date, 144 years ago, March 25, 1821, Greek patriots struck a blow for freedom in raising their flag of liberty against all of those who had sought foreign domination of them. After more than 400 years of alien domination, against which they regularly struggled to cast off the chains of foreign rule, the freedom-loving Greeks threw off the yoke of intervention and became their own rulers.

Perhaps one of the most notable aspects of this successful revolution was the direct inspiration which the Greek people received from the American revolution which preceded it by almost 50 years. Not only did the Greek revolution have the sympathy of the American people, but constant support was echoed from Americans throughout our Nation.

The Greeks, on the other hand, looked to America with hope and inspiration, and, after winning their freedom, one of the first acts of the Greek Senate was a tribute to the American people.

Today, we pay honor to the heroic sacrifices of the Greek peoples in that struggle for freedom, and the whole free world pays tribute to that day in history when the flag of freedom was raised over Greece.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query the distinguished majority leader about the program for the remainder of the day and the remainder of the week, insofar as he knows it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in response to the questions raised by the distinguished minority leader, as the Senator knows, the business for today will be Calendar Nos. 116 and 117. The first is a bill to promote a more adequate national program of water research. The second is a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as amended, and the Clean Air Act, as amended, to provide for improved cooperation by Federal agencies to control water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities and to control automotive vehicle air pollution.

Both of these bills were reported from their respective committees unanimously. It is anticipated that there will be some speeches this afternoon.

At the conclusion of business today, the Senate will go over until 12 o'clock noon Monday. Next week, we shall have such measures to consider as S. 390, permitting volunteer fire companies to use second- and third-class bulk mailing at the rates established for nonprofit organizations; numerous resolutions from the Committee on Rules and Administration; S. 1462, authorizing contract with the Middle Rio Grande, conservancy district, New Mexico, for payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; S. 1000, permitting transfer of title to movable property to agencies assuming maintenance responsibility for project works serving industrial and municipal functions; S. 254, authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon; and S. 1229, uniform policies with respect to recreation, if reported.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to query further whether it is the intention of the majority leader to go over from the end of business today until next week?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF WEST GERMANY AND THE REPUBLIC OF ISRAEL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I had expected to detain the Senate with an address on the relationships between the Federal Republic of West Germany and the Republic of Israel. I am not at all sure, in view of the committee meeting of the Committee on the Judiciary as it concerns the voting rights bill, which committee will meet again this afternoon, that I shall have an opportunity to do so.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks may be printed at this point in the Record, together with such clippings and other material as I have gathered on the subject.

There being no objection, the remarks and articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech of Senator Everett Dirksen

A great historical event took place last week when the German Federal Republic and the State of Israel established formal diplomatic relations.

The Federal Republic did not yield to the tactics of Nasser. All free nations will be pleased with this firm and prompt action of Chancellor Erhard's government.

At the end of my remarks, I shall enter in the Record excerpts of editorials and news items from the U.S. press, like Chicago Daily News, New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Chicago's American, Chicago Jewish Sentinel, and other papers. Also, I should like to include the dossier of the East German leader Ulbricht, who presides over the German Soviet Zone, where 17 million Germans are waiting for the day to gain their freedom.

May 8 will mark the 20th anniversary that Germany, because of Yalta, Teheran, and Potsdam, has been divided—just like North and South Korea, and North and South Vietnam. But we know that 99 percent of these 17 million Germans are anti-Communist and are praying daily to be reunited with their own country. Let us hope and pray that we will not witness another disaster, too, before the East German people are free.

I have noted with great satisfaction that the bill to extend the statute of limitations for Nazi war crimes was introduced in the German Parliament on recommendation of the Erhard cabinet and already it has had overwhelming support on the rollcall by our colleagues of the German Bundestag, after its first reading. As in our own country, such laws are made, or approved, or changed by a vote of the Parliament. The first vote in the German Parliament indicates that when the third reading takes place, this law will become the law of the German Federal Republic.

Now, my distinguished colleagues, Senator JAVITS, Republican, of New York, Senator RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut, Congressman MULTER, Democrat, of New York, and Senator SCOTT, Republican, of Pennsylvania (see CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dated January 7 and 15, and February 1, 1965), paid high tribute to the Ambassador of the German Federal Republic, His Excellency, Dr. K. Heinrich Knappstein, for the forthright position he has taken on the issue of extension of the statute of limitations for Nazi war crimes. We all respect Ambassador Knappstein for his moral courage. He is a true patriot of his country and a great friend of our Nation. He started his diplomatic career in my own State, in the city of Chicago, as the first German consul general after World War II. I was glad that my colleagues paid tribute to him.

My distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New York, Mr. JAVITS, paid tribute last week on the floor of the Senate to the German Parliament for their decision. Senator JAVITS included in his remarks many editorial comments, which need not be reprinted here. But it is worth repeating Senator JAVITS' personal remarks with which I would like to associate myself (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, dated March 11, 1965, page 4871):

"EXTENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS IN THE GERMAN FEDERAL REPUBLIC

"Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I draw the attention of the Senate to the fact that the Bundestag of the German Federal Republic yesterday acted affirmatively by an overwhelming vote in taking the necessary parliamentary step to bring about an extension of the statute of limitations so that there should be no time limitation at all applied to prosecutions for murder and genocide. Three hundred and thirty-three of the four hundred legislators present voted to send to committee proposals to eliminate entirely the statute of limitations as it applies to these crimes.

"This action of the Bundestag is convincing proof of the desire of the German people to take the necessary steps to prevent any Nazi criminal who can be found from escaping prosecution for his acts. The Bundestag of the German Federal Republic is to be highly commended for the forthright stance it has taken on the side of justice.

"I ask unanimous consent that newspaper articles on that subject may be printed at this point in the RECORD."

However, today, I wish to pay tribute to Ambassador Knappstein's chief, Chancellor Erhard, and the German Parliament on their prompt action of establishing diplomatic relations with Israel. And my congratulations to Prime Minister Eshkol of Israel and his Parliament for their quick and wise decision, and their prompt action in ratifying the Prime Minister's action.

In a lengthy address last week, Chancellor Erhard expressed great satisfaction and happiness that finally Israel and Germany have established normal diplomatic relations. The German Chancellor has defied Nasser's pressure tactics.

In explaining the position of Germany, he said among other things (following are excerpts of the address which the Chancellor delivered in Munich after both countries agreed to diplomatic relations):

EXCERPTS FROM REMARKS BY CHANCELLOR LUDWIG ERHARD

"I would like to state here explicitly that I feel deep satisfaction that the Israeli people, their Government and their Parliament have grasped the hand which we stretched out to them, and that we have, after so many tragic years of detachment, now established the ground for peaceful order, for normal and beneficial relations with Israel. I am convinced that this step will also contribute to establish peace in the Near East area in general.

"The nonexistence of diplomatic relations with Israel was in my eyes always an unnatural situation and I am happy that I decided to clear the way."

In 1960, Chancellor Erhard's predecessor, the great, retired Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, met the then Prime Minister Ben-Gurion in New York. Chancellor Erhard's decision was not a sudden one; it was uppermost in his mind. This is confirmed by a statement that Professor Erhard made last October, long before the new tension developed between Bonn, Cairo and Tel Aviv.

Speaking to the German Parliament last October, Chanceller Erhard even then said:

ERHARD'S REMARKS LAST OCTOBER

"The tensions in the Near East continue to represent a danger spot for world peace. Our Near East policy, therefore, requires careful consideration and watchfulness (permanent attention and scrutiny).

"In this area we have no special political interests, but only the desire that its nations, with whom we wish to maintain equally good relations, may attain economic and social progress on a basis of a peaceful atmosphere.

"Our relationship to the State of Israel is not only determined by political considerations. It cannot be separated from the burden [responsibility] which national socialism inflicted on the German people. We have tried to heal what human power is able to heal. But we know, no matter how great our good will is, the past cannot be forgotten. The Federal Government sincerely regrets that certain incidents disturbed the gradual improvement of the German-Israeli relationship and caused serious concern in Israel. All the more I welcome the most recent statement by the Israeli Prime Minister before the Knesset (Israel Parliament). I acknowledge with appreciation that Prime Minister Eshkol makes efforts to understand the problem (situation and position) of the Germans.

"We very well understand that in particular the work of German scientists in countries, whose relationship to Israel is extremely strained, causes bitterness and stirs up feelings of tension. Prime Minister Eshkol has recognized that such activities are widely condemned among the German people. In this connection, the Federal Government regrets and disapproves any activity by Germans in foreign countries which could result in danger to peace.

"I would like to add that we shall exhaust all possibilities which will contribute to remove from the Israeli nation the feeling of threat (menace) to peace by Germans."

A few days ago, Washington was honored with the visit of the new majority leader of the German Parliament, the distinguished Dr. Rainer Barzel. Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, Democrat, of Alabama, was host to Dr. Barzel at a Senate luncheon. Dr. Barzel succeeded the great statesman Dr. Heinrich von Brentano who, after a long illness, passed away last year. We all remember Dr. von Brentano's great friendship, his moral courage, and his statesmanship when he was Dr. Adenauer's Foreign Minister. In Dr. Barzel the German Parliament has selected a worthy successor.

Dr. Kurt Birrenbach, another member of the German Parliament also visited with us and later went to Israel. Both were emissaries of their Chancellor, Dr. Erhard; both conferred with many of our colleagues and the State Department. I was also pleased to see that President Johnson, who determines our foreign policy, and whose foreign policy we must support, conferred at length with Dr. Barzel.

Dr. Barzel and Dr. Birrenbach also conferred with important American laymen, thus preparing themselves to brief their Chancellor, Dr. Erhard, and to give him a true picture of American sentiment on the important questions facing not only Israel and Germany but the entire free world.

The leadership of American Jewry have shown wise and great restraint during this crisis. I could mention many names, but I am proud that among these men are Dr. Joachim Prinz, president of the American Jewish Congress and Mr. Morris Abram, president of the American Jewish Committee. Two of my own constituents did their utmost in the interest of the United States and our allies—Israel and the German Federal Republic—namely, the Honorable Philip Klutznick, former Ambassador to the United Nations and honorary international president of B'nai B'rith, and my long time friend, Maj. Gen. Julius Klein.

In addition to the newspaper editorials and commentaries, I ask for permission to insert in the RECORD the statement by my old and distinguished friend Gen. Julius Klein of Chicago, who has served his country with distinction in peace and war. He is known to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle; he has performed special missions for Senate committees for which he received the highest tribute from our colleagues of both parties. Julius Klein was a close associate of our late leader Senator Taft. He is a good friend of our Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, and of many others who serve in both Houses of Congress. His statement reads as follows:

"Chancellor Erhard's action in establishing full diplomatic relations between West Germany and Israel is most commendable and deserves the plaudits of all free men. Equally does the decision of Prime Minister Eshkol and the Israel Parliament, taking quick action to grant Germany's request for the exchange of ambassadors.

"Chancellor Erhard demonstrated the courage to defy the blackmailing tactics of the Egyptian dictator Nasser. This move will have a most responsive effect and encourage the free world not to yield to political, economic, and military blackmail.

"This is a most historic event, and again illustrates the sympathies and friendship of Chancellor Erhard and the people of Germany, and the distinguished former chancellor, Dr. Adenauer, manifested ever since the State of Israel was first established.

"Free people throughout the world have noted with great satisfaction that the Erhard government introduced legislation to extend the statute of limitations against Nazi war criminals. The first reading of this bill has already taken place in the Bundestag. It will get sufficient votes to become law in Germany so that no Nazi criminal who can be found will escape just punishment.

"I hope that the Western powers will help to break down the Berlin wall, behind which 17 million Germans are enslaved. This is a position the United States has long supported, and is of greatest importance not only for a united Germany but also for the free world. The Soviet puppet in East Germany, Walter Ulbricht, has done everything possible to bring about chaos. No Nazi criminals are being tried or traced behind the Berlin wall. No restitution has been made by East Germany to Jewish victims of nazism. No help was given to Israel by the Ulbricht regime, which has recently pledged $100 million to help Nasser.

"Israel remains America's most trusted fortress of democracy in the Middle East, and the Federal Republic of Germany is our loyal military, political and economic ally. Our Government's policy in regard to the Federal Republic should be supported by all Americans. We all hope that Israel and Germany will soon exchange ambassadors and continue to support each other in the interest of all free nations."

Many people in the United States do not realize that there are at the moment, according to Ulbricht and Moscow, two "Germanys." The Berlin wall of shame separates the German people and it is Mr. Ulbricht who, under orders from Moscow, has been directing a vicious campaign not only against the Federal Republic and Israel but also the United States. Twenty years have gone by since 17 million Germans were enslaved.

As stated previously, May 8 marks the 20th anniversary of this tragic event in history when Stalin cynically disregarded the Soviet's obligation and commitment—the pact entered into with the other three powers—England, France and the United States with relation to Berlin. What was supposed to have been a four-power agreement in maintaining some kind of stability in Berlin became instead a divided city separated by a huge barbed wire wall with Mr. Ulbricht at the helm in East Berlin and East Germany. Not until the wall is taken down, and not until the Germans are united again will tensions and conflict in Europe be eliminated.

While all of us have our eyes trained on the Far East at the moment, we must not overlook this important problem facing the West, and especially our loyal NATO ally, West Germany. We must not wait until another explosion takes place.

I present for the Record a short dispatch from the New York Times, dated March 19, 1965, concerning an address by the president of the American Jewish Congress, Dr. Joachim Prinz, in which he also castigated the Ulbricht Communist regime in East Germany. If I had the complete text before me, I would insert it in full. It reads in part:

"U.S. JEWISH LEADER SCORES GERMAN RED STAND ON ARABS

"Washington, March 17.—Dr. Joachim Prinz, president of the American Jewish Congress castigated the East German Government Wednesday for its 'Arab adventurism' in the Middle East.

"Addressing the national convention of the women's division of the congress at the Shoreham Hotel here today, Dr. Prinz said that while the Jewish community was justified in criticizing West Germany, the Communist regime to the East represented a greater danger.

"'Here is a regime,' he declared, 'that boasts of former Nazis who hold high Government offices, that refuses to offer any restitution or indemnification for the horrors of Nazism and that today openly supports the reckless militarism of the Arab States'."

Some years ago, we had the honor and privilege to welcome on the floor of the Senate our at-that-time German colleague Dr. Wolfgang Pohle, a distinguished parliamentarian, jurist and top industrialist. I recall with pleasure when we listened to him at the luncheon and dinners given in his honor by our late colleague Senator Styles Bridges, and the then Senator Hubert Humphrey, Senator Dodd, Congressman Celler, and others. He explains in a letter to a friend the still-existing problem in Germany that again came to the special attention of the American people when the issue of the statute of limitations for Nazi war crimes became a subject for headlines, and caused protest all over America.

We are all happy that this problem is on the way to being solved, just as we are about the prompt action that the Erhard government took when they established diplomatic relations with Israel last week.

Because Dr. Pohle is a distinguished scholar, and has been a member of the international, legal, and parliamentary bodies, his remarks are of great importance, and point up the difficulties of the constitutional and political problems involved in extending the statute of limitations. What Dr. Pohle has to say on the subject deserves also our careful attention. Here are his observations.

DR. POHLE'S LETTER

"A motion has been put in the Bundestag by Abgeordneter Benda (Berlin CDU), which was signed by many members of the House, for instance, by Dr. Wilhelmi, supporting an extension of the statute of limitations for war crimes. At present I am making investigations as to the form of such an extension. Probably the basic idea is, that from 1945 onwards the statute of limitations for such crimes does not cover 20 years, but 30 years, and that, for instance, also crimes committed at the beginning of the Nazi-regime, i.e., in the years 1933 and 1934, are not yet barred by the statute of limitations.

"I realize, of course, the extraordinary propaganda and the political importance, which must be attached to such a measure. As you know, there are a number of personalities supporting such a step, i.e., businessmen, scientists and personalities in public life apart from the Bundestagsabgeordneten. This opinion can be found among all groups of the population.

"But the whole affair has to be regarded also from another aspect. I recently told Ambassador von Etzdorf so in London, who the next day had visitors representing several organizations, which also pleaded with him for extension of the statute of limitations. In this context I do not deal with the question whether the extension of the statute of limitations or the omission of such a measure is compatible with a constitutional state, or whether it is consistent with the Grundgesetz (constitutional law).

"The whole affair is, as you say, also of greatest political importance in the reverse sense. For years the population of the Federal Republic has heard nothing else than the horrible news about the trials regarding Auschwitz, Treblinka and other camps. They all deal with crimes committed during the war. Due to the great number of these trials—as far as I know, 2,000 lawsuits are still pending and are by no means statute-barred—throughout the whole world the impression is created, that:

"1. The German people, which made common cause with the Nazis and tolerated their rule, are a gang of murders and accomplices.

"2. The crime committed during the Nazi period took place solely in the Federal Republic of Germany.

"Both impressions are an incredible distortion of the historical facts methodically directed by the East.

"As to the first point we know, since we are witnesses of that time—our children were not a part of that experience—how national socialism came into being. After the boom of the years 1926–28 there began an economic crisis, which led—supported by mass unemployment—to extreme tendencies to the right and especially to the left. When we saw at that time the Communist "Rotfront"—battalions marching through the German towns, it was indeed a terrifying sight. The German people still remembered the frightful day, when the Communist leaders Max Hoelz, Thaelmann and his companions unleashed civil war by acts of violence. The fact, that national socialism was an ultraright counterorganization, whereas the Government had, despite the existence of a small army, not much striking power, is today often forgotten. It is equally forgotten that the National Socialists were soon generally accepted by the decision of the Reichskonkordat, but several pacts with foreign countries, e.g., the German-Polish agreement, by the visits of foreign statesmen in Godesberg and Munich and by many other similar actions (Olympiade 1936, visits of foreign political leaders at the Reichsparteitag in Nürnberg). This took place at a time, when it was already known that there existed concentration camps—and that the racial question was an essential part of the National Socialist doctrine, as it is described in Hitler's 'Mein Kampf.' It was particularly disastrous, that the inner opposition movement against national socialism, which already came into being at that time and later on gained ground, did not find any response abroad.

"One should therefore present to the world a correct background of the historical facts and not an image, which is wholly distorted by the crimes in the death camps during the war (which must by no means be palliated). We owe this not only to the world, but to our young generation. Neither should this be forgotten by the world organizations.

"And 2: As far as I know, the Federal Republic is the only country coping relentlessly with its past by these trials. When I returned from Nürnberg, the idea was preponderant to enact a general amnesty. At that time this idea was also supported by politicians, whose names are today in good repute in the SPD and CSU and who are regarded as particularly moderate. This idea was, however, not realized.

"On the other hand one has never heard of such trials in the 'Deutsch-Demokratische Republik' behind the Berlin wall.

"Does the world believe, that the watchmen of the concentration camps are only living among the 55 million Germans of the Federal Republic? Does the world not think that some of these elements might also be living among the 17 million people of the DDR? In Austria, too, there are very few and exceptional investigations regarding Nazi crimes, though it must be said for the sake of truth, that noted leaders of the national socialist movement, e.g. Hitler, Kaltenbrunner, Seyss-Inquart and others were of Austrian origin.

"And what is heard about the punishment for the hundred thousand atrocities committed to German soldiers, for instance in Yugoslavia, Hungary, in Czechoslovakia, in Poland (and there also to civil service men belonging to administrative organizations) and also in France by the so-called 'resistance'—atrocities to soldiers and private persons, who mostly had no part in the national socialist movement and were only doing their duty for their country according to general moral principles and the law. And is there anything heard about lawsuits initiated by the occupation forces of the East because of the millions of atrocities (murder, manslaughter, rape) to the German civilian population? How did the Russians punish the watchmen of those 10,000 Polish officers who they killed in Katyn—as we clarified in Nürnberg? And what does the world think about the fact, that there were hundreds of thousands of SS-men coming from Norway, Belgium, Holland, Hungary, and Lithuania?

"I should not have the slightest doubt advocating the extension of the statute of limitations for war crimes by 20, 30 or even 50 years, provided this take place on a mutual basis and a general international agreement. I am sure that you, too, do not really agree to exposing and condemning the Federal Republic as sole refuge for all war and national socialist criminals, as the present actions do imply. This is certainly the result of the escalated question of the extension of the statute of limitations."

Here are some of the news stories and editorials selected from thousands that appeared all over the country:

"A Burden for Bonn: Resist Arab Blackmail," (Chicago Daily News, Mar. 15, 1965.)

"Israeli Cabinet Approves Offer of Tie With Bonn," (the New York Times, Mar. 15, 1965.)

"Nasser Spread Thin," (New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 17, 1965.)

"Israel and Bonn," (the New York Times, Mar. 15, 1965.)

"Israel Accepts Ties With Bonn," (New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 15, 1965.)

"U.S. Opposes Full Recognition by West Germany," "Bonn Makes Conciliation Moves Toward Israel," (both: Sentinel, Mar. 11, 1965.)

"Germans and Jews," (Lebecker Nachrichten, Lubeck, Germany, Feb. 28, 1965.)

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily News, Mar. 15, 1965]

A Burden for Bonn: Resist Arab Blackmail

(By Max Freedman)

Washington.—Once again the Middle East is being slowly stirred to a new crisis. It is unreasonable to expect this area to remain quiet indefinitely while the roots of antagonism are inflamed and rancorous.

The United States is not doomed to wait in supine horror for disasters to break upon us. It can do something, but not very much, to avert the crisis. For conditions in the Middle East remind us in almost classic terms of the limitations that face American policy.

Officials in the State Department now pondering the swirl of opinion in the Arab world are aware that the most rational solutions have little chance of acceptance where the rule of reason is not respected.

Many times in recent years the leaders of Arab States have shown that the concept of enlightened self-interest is not congenial to them. They think with their emotions, often with their passions, and are in the grip of entrenched prejudices at the mere mention of Israel's name.

Since there is no shortage of prejudice and passion in Israel, the debate soon passes from the reasoned compromises of diplomacy to the embattled dogmas of a racial feud.

Watching this mournful history, repeated so many times, experienced American officials dread a return of the inflamed passions of the Middle East. They know with a sickening conviction that the United States will again be dragged into the middle of a crisis which it has done nothing to start and which it can do very little to stop.

In private, Arab diplomats concede that the occasion for the present crisis has been chosen with a singular lack of good judgment. But the choice has been made and they see no escape from its ominous consequences.

By any fair test, the recognition of Israel by West Germany cannot be regarded as a casual episode of diplomacy. It has overtones of history and tragedy, and testifies to the slow victory of reason over hate.

The German people cannot be expected to go through history dragging after them the corpse of Nazi tyranny. Twenty years have passed since the death of Hitler and a new generation has arisen without any responsibility for the concentration camps.

A succession of German leaders, beginning with Konrad Adenauer, have shown a patient sense of justice and liberality in their dealings with Israel.

Diplomatic recognition will place the final seal of reconciliation between two peoples whose tragic destiny has united them in one of the supreme catastrophes of the human story. Such a quiet end to a tragedy of tears must be cherished by all who abhor revenge as a wild justice and a mutilation of the spirit.

In Israel the response to Germany's offer has not always been wise and magnanimous. The most instructed and responsible leaders of opinion have welcomed the overture from Bonn and are eager to establish normal diplomatic relations with the German people.

The final decision in Israel was not taken without an agony of self-questioning and anxious scrutiny of conscience.

Israel in the end will accept the act of recognition with Germany not as a perfunctory gesture but as a solemn commitment to work in unity and in peace for all just causes that point mankind to the milestones of progress.

It is precisely across this historic movement of reconciliation that the Arab world has now thrown its shadow and its attempted veto. West Germany must be curiously insensitive to its own honor if it is willing to allow its relations with Israel to be dominated and determined by the threats of Arab States.

Yet the Arab leaders have not hesitated to use the brutal weapon of blackmail as their main threat against Germany. The Government of West Germany has done a service to peace by resisting this pressure, refusing to bend or break before it, and honors its commitments as if all Arab bluster were an idle pageant without meaning or weight.

All this is painfully clear to the State Department. But it has been given a sudden and disturbing insight into the passions quivering in the Arab world and it does not like what it has seen. That is why it is watching with growing anxiety the movement toward the abyss in the Middle East.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 15, 1965]

Israel Cabinet Approves Offer of Tie With Bonn: 14 of 16 Ministers Support Plan To Exchange Envoys—Two Reserve Decision—Hope Seen on Disputes: Eshkol Expects Accord on Aims and Nazi Crimes—Arabs Will Retaliate

(By W. Granger Blair)

Jerusalem (Israel sector) March 14.—The Israel Cabinet formally approved today the "immediate establishment" of diplomatic relations with West Germany.

The decision was announced at the end of a Cabinet session in which all but 2 of the 16 ministers in the coalition government supported diplomatic ties with Bonn. The two reserved their decisions.

[The Associated Press reported from Cairo early Monday that the foreign ministers of 13 Arab States had decided to break diplomatic relations with West Germany if it extended diplomatic recognition to Israel.]

The move came a week after a West German offer of diplomatic ties and 4 days after a special West Germany envoy returned to Bonn from here, carrying assurances that Israel would accept the offer.

Thus the decision was not unexpected, despite persistent recent reports from Bonn that Israel had specified conditions to acceptance of the West German offer that Bonn could not agree to.

MATTERS CALLED SEPARATE

These reports had been vehemently denied by authoritative sources here, who insisted that the question of ties was not dependent on other matters at issue between the two Governments.

The other matters involved West German arms supplied to Israel, extension of the West German statute of limitations on Nazi war crimes and the presence of West German scientists in the United Arab Republic.

A Government spokesman said this evening that Premier Levi Eshkol had informed the Cabinet that he had "grounds to assume" that "an agreement" would be reached with Bonn on "questions that were controversial."

A source close to the Premier was more explicit. He indicated that the question of statute of limitations beyond 20 years after the end of the war had already been all but resolved by extending the parliamentary action in Bonn. As for the German scientists, the source said the Government was "morally satisfied" with Bonn's position.

Other sources also indicated that Bonn was prepared to honor its arms obligations to Israel under existing agreements.

The problem for Bonn, it would appear, is to find a way to fulfill obligations without aggravating the Arab nations any more than necessary.

It was also understood that the ground was being prepared for arrangements to help satisfy Israel's future defense needs without violating Bonn's resolve not to supply arms to "areas of tension" in the future.

However, the whole question of Bonn's attitude on arms to Israel might be appreciably modified, in the view of informed sources, should the Arab governments, particularly Cairo, carry out threats to recognize Eact Germany upon the opening of West German-Israel diplomatic relations. Thus, attention was focused on the Arab foreign ministers' meeting in Cairo.

DEBATE TO BE TUESDAY

Premier Eshkol will present the Government's decision to the Kresset (parliament) Tuesday. Although the debate undoubtedly will be heated, there is almost no chance that Parliament will not endorse the move.

The two Governments are expected to move rapidly to establish formal ties. This will involve the question of where the West German Embassy will be. The Israelis want it in Jerusalem, but as a ranking official put it, "we are not going to fight about it."

All the major powers have established embassies in Tel Aviv to avoid conflict with a 1947 United Nations resolution that placed Jerusalem under international trusteeship. The situation became anachronistic after the Israel Government moved its offices to Jerusalem, which it maintains is Israel's capital, in 1950.

A number of countries, especially from Africa and Latin America, have embassies in Jerusalem. Bonn may do the same because it is technically not bound by the 1947 resolution as it is not a member of the U.N.

[From New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 17, 1965]

Nasser Spread Thin

President Gamal Abdel Nasser has been a busy man in these past few months. He has fomented war in the Congo, waged a humiliatingly inconclusive one in Yemen, and conducted a diplomatic game with West Germany which will probably have far-reaching effects. But how well the United Arab Republic has fared in all of this frenzied personal statecraft is another matter.

The steps by which Nasser arrived at an open break with Bonn show a perverse kind of cunning. First, Nasser pressured West Germany into ending its arms shipments to Israel—which might count as a gain for the Arab world. Then he flaunted a visit by Walter Ulbricht, of Communist East Germany, before all the nations. Except as a form of international impudence, this does not promise much for the United Arab Republic. And, when Bonn, in retaliation, sought diplomatic relations with Israel, Nasser declared that he would break both diplomatic and economic ties with the Federal Republic.

This would seem to be a plain case of cutting off the United Arab Republic's nose to spite its face, but Nasser tried to get the other Arab States to go along with him. Those of North Africa have very close ties with Western Europe; they apparently opposed any severe action against West Germany. The others seem to have agreed to recall their Ambassadors from Bonn, but not to recognize the Communist puppet Germany or break economically with West Germany.

In all, it is not clear what Nasser has done for his country, beyond driving West Germany and Israel closer together, just as France and Israel became partners after Nasser seized the Suez Canal. It is a curious series of episodes in the history of diplomacy and it suggests that Nasser is better at devising means of annoying other nations than of helping his own.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 15, 1965]

ISRAEL AND BONN

The Israel decision to accept West Germany's bid for formal diplomatic relations is a constructive move that benefits both sides. It also helps clear the international atmosphere. Earlier reports of Israeli conditions for normalizing relations raised possibilities that could have adversely affected the position of Chancellor Erhard's government, while providing ammunition for Israel's enemies.

As Israel Foreign Minister Golda Meir remarked last week, the West German suggestion that diplomatic relations be established produced a debate "between the head and the heart" for every Israeli. With memories of Hitler's mass murder of Jews still strong, it is understandable that there should be a carryover of emotional repugnance to the idea even two decades after nazism's overthrow. The decision to accept Bonn's offer, therefore, represents a victory for reason over emotion. Israel's international position and its economic prospects both stand to gain materially from closer ties with West Germany, and these considerations properly proved decisive.

The confusion already reigning in Arab ranks testifies to Chancellor Erhard's wisdom in deciding to counter Egypt's welcome to Walter Ulbricht by the positive move of recognizing Israel rather than the negative one of breaking relations with Cairo. President Nasser was not serving any Arab interest when he received the East German leader, and the result of his action has already brought open criticism of him from Tunisian President Bourguiba.

Nasser's recent threats against Bonn represent a form of attempted blackmail that can only increase West German resentment. Many Arab leaders whose prestige is less personally involved than that of the Egyptian strong man can easily calculate that their countries would suffer substantially from a break in relations with Bonn. They are hardly likely to want to bear the costs of his folly.

President Nasser did not plan it that way, but at this moment Israel and West Germany appear to be the prime beneficiaries of his blundering venture into international gamesmanship.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 15, 1965]

ISRAEL ACCEPTS TIES WITH BONN: ISRAEL ACCEPTS TIES WITH WEST GERMANY

(By Richard Chesnoff)

JERUSALEM.—Israel's Government decided yesterday to accept West Germany's offer to establish full diplomatic relations immediately.

With two abstentions, Premier Levi Eshkol's coalition cabinet voted unanimously for the ties. The Ahdut Haavoda Socialist ministers refrained from voting pending their party's official decision today.

Despite international reports to the contrary, informed Jerusalem sources said yesterday that Israel and West Germany had reached "basic agreement" on the major issues outstanding between them.

These sources reiterated last week's report from Israel that West Germany had agreed to fulfill—perhaps through a "third party"—an arms-shipment deal cut off last month under pressure from President Nasser of Egypt.

Foreign Ministry sources said the formal exchange of ambassadors between Israel and West Germany would now "move swiftly."

Mr. Eshkol will present the government verdict to the Knesset (Parliament) tomorrow. Political observers said that although some fervent opposition to the move is expected, Mr. Eshkol is assured of a minimum of 65 percent Knesset backing.

The Cabinet Secretary said Mr. Eshkol told the Cabinet: "There is a basis for hope to find agreed settlement on outstanding questions."

Other sources, said Mr. Eshkol, were "quite satisfied" with the results of his secret talks last week with West German Chancellor Erhard's special envoy, Kurt Birrenbach. The emissary is expected to return from Bonn Wednesday to continue the negotiations.

When he goes later this month for talks with British Prime Minister Wilson, Mr. Eshkol may stop for talks with Chancellor Erhard.

The $80 million, American-backed arms deal with Israel was halted by Bonn after threats by President Nasser to recognize the East German Communist regime if the shipments continued. The cutoff strained Bonn's informal relations with Israel but did not succeed in halting Cairo's friendly moves toward East Germany.

The Jerusalem sources said that Bonn, not wishing to antagonize the Arab States more than it has by recognizing Israel, might fulfill the unfinished portion of the arms deal—about $16 million worth—through a "third party."

Israel has steadfastly turned down Chancellor Erhard's offer of economic compensation for the arms halt.

As to the future, Bonn reportedly has offered Israel an extensive, no-strings-attached economic grant but has not acceded to an Israel request for direct Bonn military aid beyond the original deal.

CAIRO.—Israel's decision to accept a West German proposal to establish diplomatic relations threw the Cairo conference of 13 Arab Foreign Ministers into turmoil yesterday, conference sources reported.

The ministers called their second recess of the day, still without a decision on any retaliatory steps taken against Bonn, after receiving a report of the Israeli Cabinet decision.

Conference sources said the report provoked a "heated discussion," with at least four Foreign Ministers urging their colleagues not to vote for reprisals beyond the power of the Arab world to implement.

President Nasser has urged the Arab States to break diplomatic and economic relations with Bonn and recognize Communist East Germany if Bonn establishes relations with Israel. Saturday night he said Egypt would take these measures regardless of what the other Arab States did.

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Sentinel, Mar. 11, 1965]

BONN MAKES CONCILIATORY MOVES TOWARD ISRAEL—ERHARD SAYS HE WILL STOP ALL AID AND CREDITS TO NASSER

BONN (JTA).—Chancellor Ludwig Erhard, in an official statement issued to the press, announced Sunday that the West German Government is ready to establish diplomatic relations with Israel and to compensate Israel for the rest of the promised arms aid which was cut off after a protest from Egypt. The statement also said that the Bonn government will stop all economic aid and further credits to Egypt.

The statement emphasized that the West German Government rejects any kind of intervention in her affairs, and particularly in her relationship with Israel. At the same time it pointed out that the granting of diplomatic recognition to Israel is not directed against any of the Arab States. The Chancellor's statement stressed that President Nasser has jeopardized the traditional German-Arab friendship and that the state visit by Premier Ulbricht of Communist East Germany to Egypt, at Nasser's invitation, is bound to influence this friendship.

The Chancellor's statement was read at an extraordinary press conference by State Secretary Karl-Gunther von Hase who declared that the Chancellor, empowered by the Federal Republic's constitution, has spelled out his government's foreign policy, as well as his own position. The statement made it clear that the policy has been formulated after consultation with Germany's principal allies—the United States, France and Britain. It noted that all of Germany's political parties represented in the Bonn Parliament have been informed of the policy statement.

(Official circles in Jerusalem told the Jewish Telegraphic Agency Sunday that the statement by Chancellor Erhard is a "surprise," in view of the Bonn government's position of the last week. Observers in Jerusalem wondered Sunday whether Dr. Erhard's mention of fulfilling his government's arms aid agreement with Israel meant that he was now ready to carry out the Israel-German pact and will resume Germany's arms deliveries upon which Israel insists.)

The statement concluded as follows: "After very careful consideration of the problems as a whole, and through weighing all possible developments, even those outside of the immediate interests of Germany in the Middle East, the Chancellor has decided:

"1. The invitation of Ulbricht by Egypt has been countered by the Federal Republic by the stopping of economic aid. This means the Federal Republic will not participate in Egypt's second 5-year plan. The Federal Government will not grant to Egypt any further capital aid, and refuses to grant Egypt any delays in the payment of Government-guaranteed debts due for long-period credits. Running obligations will be reconsidered, of course, in accordance with international law.

"2. That part of the German people living in the Soviet Zone has been deprived of the self-evident right to self-determination. The justification of this rule by force will be considered by the Federal Government of Germany an unfriendly act and countered in each case by appropriate measures.

"3. The Federal Republic of Germany wishes to establish diplomatic relations with Israel. This step is bound to normalize conditions. It is not directed against any Arab country.

"4. By its decision not to supply arms to areas of tension, and by deciding to compensate for the rest of deliveries pending, in agreement with Israel, the Federal Government has contributed considerably to the evolution of a clear Middle East policy. The Federal Government thinks it necessary to declare in this context that it rejects endeavors to influence its policy in this area particularly as regards its relations with Israel, be it the 'conflict partner' who tries to do so or whoever he may be.

"5. Together with its allies, who have repeatedly asked Germany to be responsible for peace and quiet in the Middle East, the Federal Republic will endeavor through its presence to diminish tensions."

GERMANS AND JEWS: EACH MUST LEARN TO FACE THE OTHER WITHOUT PREJUDICE

(NOTE.—This is one of the typical articles that appeared in the German press.)

LÜBECK, February 28.—It often seems as though we don't really want to overcome our past, but to overwhelm it. At the moment there are two matters in particular giving rise to this impression: Is the term of limitation for murder with respect to unpunished Nazi crimes to be extended or not? And: Is the Federal Republic bound to support Israel with weapons in its struggle for existence against the Arab states?

These are two questions that have divided the Germans to just about the same extent as they have prejudiced the rest of the world against the Federal Republic. In fact, full-page advertisements, discussing the betrayal of the nation toward which our guilt is greatest, have been published by Jewish organizations in the United States. These are serious allegations, and written in blind anger. The German Ambassador in Washington has deplored them, and quite rightly.

UNTRUSTWORTHY

Yet just as serious as making allegations like this is to take the stand of a well-known Swiss newspaper, a paper that tends to favor us. It expresses the opinion that there is a feeling of discomfort in the world, a discomfort called Germany. It would hardly be possible at the moment to express more clearly and kindly the fact that we have once more managed to get ourselves a name for being untrustworthy and unreliable. We are beginning to look like the wicked Germans again, the people who can't be trusted an inch.

How has our political and moral standing managed to decline to such an extent? In the first place, the federal government has failed repeatedly and culpably to do the right thing. It hesitated when it was time to negotiate, or it finally reached a decision it more or less had to recall later. And the problems of the term of limitation and military aid to Israel have finally become classic examples of just this. In both cases, Dr. Erhard's cabinet was too quick to commit itself. It either did not want to see, or could not see, what the consequences of such rashness would be. In the matter involving the statute of limitations, the Federal Republic has already corrected its stand, but doubts about us still remain. Because we were the very ones to arouse them. And the same is true for the question of military aid to Israel. Intermediation is already being mentioned. And so it doesn't seem quite impossible that this particular Bonn decision may be corrected. On the one hand the Israelis are insisting that we fulfill our part of the secret treaty, and, on the other, Nasser has, according to the Hallstein Doctrine, become an enemy.

We have got ourselves caught in an embarrassing situation for which we ourselves are to blame. In the final analysis we shall only be able to get out of it by allowing more than we originally wanted to prevent. But the Federal Republic was not the only one to blame for the decline in our political and moral standing—a decline that is weakening our position considerably. The international pressure on Bonn, more conscious than unconscious, has contributed just as much to this as the wave of nationalism that is beginning to set in in the Federal Republic. These two factors are connected with one another, and each depends upon the other. The more strongly the pressure from outside makes itself felt, the more strongly is the counterpressure going to build up from within, and vice versa: a highly dangerous spiral in which we have got ourselves involved and to which the Federal Government has contributed. It wanted to break down nothing abroad and spoil nothing at home. It wanted to remain internationally reliable and nationally recognized. Yet, even in this, it has failed so far. It has perhaps never been so clear as it is at the moment that the relationship between the Germans and the Jews is a keystone of all our politics. The moral keystone particularly. This tends to be forgotten from time to time. The crimes against Jewish people during the Third Reich remain unparalleled. And the expiation for these crimes must, accordingly, be unparalleled, too. Recognizing these basic facts must overshadow any reference to our exemplary financial reparations, or the statement that we should at last be left in peace. Understandable though it is that many Germans want to close old accounts, wanting to do this sort of thing pays less politically than being able to do it. So we have to be satisfied with the fact that it just is not within our power to break with our past, and never will be. Not from our side, at least.

The Federal Republic and the nation itself have usually ignored this, because they are beginning to regard their past more and more as a curse. By saying he was willing, if necessary, to live in the same society as murderers, one of our most competent spokesmen, the Federal Minister of Justice, Mr. Bucher, of all people, damaged our reputation so much abroad that it will be difficult to repair. People abroad regard the question of the term of limitation not only as a legal one, but primarily as political and moral, and it is in this light that it should be discussed; morally we are bound to stand by it.

Confronting our unsubdued past unswervingly makes it difficult, of course, to deal with the present. It is unfair on many Germans that they should have to walk around like marked men. Neither East nor West make any distinction in the matter. Where the term of limitation is concerned, the East is enjoying the opportunity of seeing us dangle helplessly at the mercy of those who know they have us where they want us. And, in the matter of military aid to Israel, it was the West, the Americans mainly, who sent us to the Near East front to haul the chestnuts from the fire, knowing how dependent we are on America. It would have been incomparably better if we had not allowed ourselves to be sent, but had gone of our own accord.

NASSER'S BLACKMAIL

And in the Near East, there is only one answer now to Nasser's blackmail: to take up diplomatic relations with Israel. And if Israel, moreover, demands military aid from the Federal Republic of all countries, even this seems logical.

The young Jewish State is exposed to a deadly threat. Mr. Ben Gurion, long the Prime Minister of Israel, is responsible for the maxim that "All that matters is to insure the survival of the survivors." We may believe him, just as we might wish the world to believe him, when, as the most prominent of all Jews, he never tires of making a distinction between the Federal Republic and Hitler's Reich. His word may carry the greatest weight. But it is only when Germans and Jews have learned to face each other without embarrassment, that they will be able finally to settle their political misunderstandings without having to express their moral rearmament by drawing swastikas on synagogues, or calling for the boycott of German firms. It is still by our attitude to the Jews that we are going to be judged.

NATIONAL PROGRAM OF WATER RESEARCH

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 116, S. 22, and that it be laid down and made the pending business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 22) to promote a more adequate national program of water research.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported with an amendment on page 2, line 3, after the word "with", to strike out "private firms and individuals" and insert "those private firms and individuals whose training, experience, and qualifications are, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, adequate for the conduct of water research projects"; so as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) section 200 of Public Law 88–379 of the Eighty-eighth Congress is repealed and
>
> (b) That there is enacted in lieu thereof the following:
>
> "SEC. 200. There is authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior $5,000,000 in fiscal year 1966, increasing $1,000,000 annually for five years, and continuing at $10,000,000 annually thereafter from which he may make grants, contracts, matching, or other arrangements with educational institutions, private foundations, or other institutions; with those private firms and individuals whose training, experience, and qualifications are, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, adequate for the conduct of water research projects; and with local, State, or Federal Government agencies, to undertake research into any aspects of water problems related to the mission of the Department of the Interior, which may be deemed desirable and are not otherwise being studied."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, what action has been taken on S. 22?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 2, line 3, after the word "with", to strike out "private firms and individuals" and insert "those private firms and individuals whose training, experience, and qualifications are, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, adequate for the conduct of water research projects".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, the bill is in pretty much the same shape as when it was passed by the Senate a year or so ago. It went to the House, and the House took out one of the provisions, and made provision that the President had to report back to Congress the things done by way of water research contracts. The President was reluctant to sign it under the doctrine of Executive privilege. There was a long discussion about it. We told the President that, if he signed the bill, we would correct it. What comes to us is S. 22. It was reported unanimously by the Senate committee. I hope there will be no objection to it.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, these amendments to the Water Resources Act of 1964 are a necessary step to insure that the provisions of the act will be better designed to carry out the program's worthy objective of insuring the Nation at all times of a supply of water sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the requirements of its expanding population.

These amendments would not change the purpose; but they would enlarge the scope of the program, and would remove some undesirable limitations from it. First, the title II authorization for grants, contracts, and matching arrangements with educational institutions, private foundations, and other institutions is changed from the $1 million a year of the original act to $5 million for the first year, increasing $1 million annually for 5 years, and continuing at $10 million annually thereafter.

Secretary Udall has notified the Senate that in the short life of the Office of Water Resources Research, 36 research proposals, totaling $1,750,000, have been received. This experience indicates that the $1 million ceiling is inadequate, and that the $5 million authorization for the first year is justified.

This bill wisely drops the provision prohibiting support of title II research at institutions where there is a title I water resources-research institute. These institutes will become the Nation's centers for this type of research; and to artificially restrict support for them flies in the face of the objectives of the act.

When President Johnson signed Senate bill 2, of the 88th Congress, into law, he requested the deletion of the provision giving the Senate and the House Interior Committees veto power over title II grants and contracts. As the President pointed out, such a provision "violates the spirit of the constitutional requirement of separation of power between the executive and legislative branches."

Now we are wisely deleting that provision.

Texas is one of the 28 States which will not have enough water by the year 2000 if current practices are continued. This program has widespread support in Texas. Six proposals from the Texas Water Resources Research Center have been submitted. These involve research into the water cycle, water and land management, and into qualitative, economic, and institutional aspects of water resources research.

The whole future of the southwestern part of the United States is vitally dependent upon water. No sounder investment of public funds can be made today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT AND CLEAN AIR ACT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar No. 117, S. 560. It will not take much time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The Legislative Clerk. A bill (S. 560) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act as amended, and the Clean Air Act, as amended, to provide for improved cooperation by Federal agencies to control water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities and to control automotive vehicle air pollution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Works with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Federal Installations, Facilities, and Equipment Pollution Control Act".

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS OF FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Sec. 101. Section 9 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 466h), is amended by inserting "(a)" after "Sec. 9." and by adding at the end of such section the following:

"(b) In order to prevent or control water pollution which may endanger the health or welfare of any persons, any Federal department or agency having jurisdiction over any building, installation, or other property shall discharge wastes therefrom only in compliance with standards for such discharges as are established by the Secretary. Such standards applicable in any State shall (1) be established after consultation with appropriate officials of such State with respect thereto, (2) be consistent to the extent possible with any standards established by the Federal Government, by such State or by the municipality where applicable, and (3) not require a lesser degree of pollution control than such Federal, State, or municipal standards. The Secretary or his duly authorized representative is authorized to enter any such building, installation, or other property at reasonable times for the purpose of inspecting and investigating waste discharge practices.

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated necessary amounts to be expended for the installation, maintenance, and operation in Federal buildings, installations, and other property of waste disposal systems which are certified by the Secretary to have been designed in accordance with the standards promulgated under subsection (b). Such amounts shall be appropriated to the Federal departments or agencies concerned. Any Federal department or agency having under its jurisdiction any building, installation, or other property which does not meet standards established pursuant to subsection (b) shall request from the Congress such appropriations as may be necessary to comply with such standards.

"(d) No building, installation, or other property shall be constructed, otherwise prepared for use, or expanded by any Federal department or agency after the effective date of this subsection unless such construction, preparation, or expansion includes waste disposal practices determined by the Secretary to be adequate for the purposes of this section.

"(e) In order to assist in assuring appropriate maintenance and operation of waste disposal systems, the Secretary shall provide training in such matters to personnel of any Federal department or agency, at the request of the head of such department or agency.

"(f) Each Federal department or agency shall, not later than one year after the effective date of this section, report to the Secretary the waste disposal practices in effect at buildings, installations, and other property under its jurisdiction. The Secretary shall make a report to the President and the Congress not later than eighteen months after the effective date of this section, with respect to (1) Federal buildings, installations, and other property not in compliance with standards established pursuant to subsection (b) prior to the date of such report, (2) any reasons for such noncompliance, and (3) the Secretary's recommendations as to what action should be taken in order to accomplish compliance. The Secretary shall make a report to the President and the Congress each January 1 thereafter with respect to the effectiveness of actions taken by Federal departments and agencies to prevent and control waste pollution."

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS OF CLEAN AIR ACT

Sec. 201. Section 6 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857e) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) Effective on and after October 1, 1966, no Federal department or agency shall purchase any automotive vehicle unless such vehicle is manufactured or equipped to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants from its exhaust in accordance with standards established by the Secretary. In establishing such standards, the Secretary may exempt special purpose vehicles from the provisions of this subsection."

Sec. 202. Section 7 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 1857f) is amended—

(1) by striking out the last sentence in subsection (b); and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated necessary amounts to be expended for the installation, maintenance, and operation in Federal buildings, installations, and other property of such devices as are certified by the Secretary to be adequate for the purposes of subsection (b). Such amounts shall be appropriated to the Federal departments or agencies concerned. Any Federal department or agency having under its jurisdiction any building, installation, or other property not in compliance with requirements established pursuant to subsection (b) shall request from the Congress such appropriations as may be necessary to accomplish compliance.

"(d) No building, installation, or other property shall be constructed, otherwise prepared for use, or expanded by any Federal department or agency after the effective date of this subsection unless such construction, preparation, or expansion includes air pollution control measures determined by the Secretary to be adequate for the purposes of this section.

"(e) In order to assist in assuring appropriate maintenance and operation of devices or other means of prevention or control of air pollution, the Secretary shall provide training in such matters to personnel of any Federal department or agency at the request of the head of such department or agency.

"(f) Each Federal department or agency shall keep the Secretary informed of air pollution control practices in effect at buildings, installations, and other property under its jurisdiction and shall promptly inform the Secretary of the absence of, or failure to institute practices necessary and adequate for the purposes of this section and the reason or reasons therefor. The Secretary shall report each January to the President and to the Congress on the status and effectiveness of actions taken under this section to prevent and control air pollution by such Federal departments and agencies.

"(g) The Secretary or his duly authorized representative is authorized to enter any such building, installation, or other property at reasonable times for the purpose of inspecting and investigating air pollution control practices."

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be considered as new text for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I offer two technical amendments to S. 560, as amended. These are to insert the word "subsection" instead of the word "section" on page 7, line 25, and on page 8, line 5.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendments. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, Senate bill 560, designated as the Federal Installations, Facilities, and Equipment Control Act, introduced by myself and 15 cosponsors, would provide a more effective basis for the control of water and air pollution from Federal buildings, installations, or other property. It would also provide that automotive vehicles purchased by the Federal Government, on and after October 1, 1966, be manufactured or equipped to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants from exhaust emissions. Certain special-purpose vehicles would be exempt from this provision.

I want to note at this point that devices have been tested and approved which are replacements for elements of the exhaust systems and which reduce harmful exhaust emissions. Also, the automobile industry has indicated that certain engine modifications that are commercially practicable could be made to reduce exhaust emissions.

The legislation was first suggested by the ranking minority member of the subcommittee [Mr. Boggs]. As in the case of other pollution control legislation, he has played a leading and constructive role in the development of this bill.

Briefly, S. 560, as reported by the Committee on Public Works, provides the following:

First. Establishes a procedure for setting standards for allowable discharges of waterborne waste from Federal installations.

Second. Authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make necessary inspections and investigations of waste discharge practices.

Third. Authorizes funds to install, maintain, and operate works to control water pollution and directs appropriate agencies to request necessary funds.

Fourth. Requires that all new or expanded installations include facilities to attain desirable degree of waste pollution control.

Fifth. Authorizes training of personnel to operate and maintain waste treatment works.

Sixth. Establishes a system for periodic reports to the President and the Congress on waste treatment control programs in Federal installations.

Seventh. Provides for automotive emission standards to be applied to all federally purchased automotive vehicles after October 1, 1966. Certain special-purpose vehicles may be exempted.

Eighth. Authorizes funds to install, maintain, and operate air pollution control devices and directs the appropriate agencies to request necessary funds.

Ninth. Requires that all new or expanded installations include air pollution control measures.

Tenth. Authorizes training of personnel to operate and maintain devices or other means of controlling air pollution.

Eleventh. Establishes a system for periodic reports to the President and the Congress on air pollution control practices and the effectiveness of actions taken.

Twelfth. Authorizes Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to inspect and investigate air pollution control practices at Federal installations.

These expanded areas of Federal activity are essential to a meaningful national water and air pollution control program.

It would be less than fair if we require, through Federal legislation, that States, municipalities, corporations, and private individuals adhere to antipollution practices and not require the same degree of attention to the problems of water and air pollution by our Federal agencies.

Much attention has been given to the water and air pollution problems by our Federal agencies; however, there is no real coordinated direction on their part in reducing the problem. Many agencies are operating under a variety of directives and instructions, but there is no direct congressional mandate to install the necessary waste treatment facilities, nor has any particular agency been designated to take the lead in assuring that proper action is taken. Most agencies are preoccupied with the problems of their basic mission and are unwilling or unable to obtain funds to correct the problems of water and air pollution.

The committee has been told by a number of State officials of their frustrations in attempting to have Federal agencies provide waste treatment works to meet desirable water quality standards, while at the same time, under their State laws, they have required that municipalities, corporations, and State-controlled institutions carry out practices designed to correct the problem. This same situation exists with respect to air pollution problems, although to a lesser extent because the air pollution program is only in its infancy. Nonetheless, coordinated direction needs to be given to the prevention and control of air pollutants from Federal installations.

With respect to the problem of controlling air pollution resulting from automotive vehicle exhausts, I would like to commend the General Services Administration for their forward-looking action in specifying exhaust standards to be met by certain types of vehicles purchased by it after October 1, 1966. However, there are other Federal agencies who have their own purchasing authority, and they, too, should be required to specify that exhaust emissions be controlled to desirable limits. Also, there needs to be a centralized Federal authority to study effects of emissions and means of controlling them.

The committee is aware that certain types of military vehicles, such as tanks and other combat vehicles, and certain types of vehicles used for civilian purposes should be exempt from the application of standards, since the control of emissions is not possible, practicable, or necessary. Also, at this time sufficient research has not been made to determine the extent of the effect of emissions from diesel-powered vehicles, nor means of effectuating control. Therefore, a provision has been included which would allow exemptions from standards in special instances.

It is my belief that this legislation is a meaningful step in the right direction on the road to more effective water and air pollution control and a healthy environment for all of us. I urge its passage by the Senate.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, I would like to concur in the remarks just made by the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. Muskie], relative to S. 560, a bill to provide for improved control of air and water pollution from Federal installations and facilities.

Since the first water pollution control legislation was enacted during President Eisenhower's administration, each administration has recognized the role and responsibility of the Federal Government in pollution control. Unfortunately, while the Federal Government has provided moneys and technical assistance to States and municipalities for water pollution control, they have been somewhat less diligent in requiring Federal installations and facilities to control pollution.

As a result, in some instances fine efforts to clean up our streams have gone for naught as the result of a Federal installation continuing to pour inadequately treated wastes into the Nation's streams. This bill, Mr. President, for the first time provides the mechanism and the congressional mandate for Federal agencies to take affirmative action to control both air and water pollution at their installations

Mr. President, I am glad to be a cosponsor of this bill and desire to congratulate the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. Muskie] for all his interest and work in developing this bill.

I think this legislation is needed. It will be helpful. I urge that it be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendments to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the Clean Air Act in order to provide for improved control of water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities and automotive vehicles."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PROPOSED VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I have been listening to and reading with a sense of shocked incredulity the explanation by the Attorney General of the United States to the President's proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965. Not since the time of the enactment of the Force Acts in Reconstruction Days has such a heinous and oppressive measure been advanced in the Congress of the United States, directed solely and alone against certain Southern States. The States of Mississippi, Alabama, Louisiana, and Georgia, to the greatest degree, and those of South Carolina, Virginia, and North Carolina, to a lesser degree, are to be tried, convicted, and sentenced by the administration, through the instrumentality of the Attorney General, with the consent of Congress. The constitutional rights and privileges of the people and the constitutions and laws of the States are to be nullified, abridged, and supplanted, insofar as voter qualifications are concerned. The Constitution of the United States is crystal clear. The States, and only the States, have the power and the right to fix the qualifications of voters residing therein. The Supreme Court of the United States has said time and time again that a literacy test requiring interpretation of sections of State constitutions or understanding of the duties and obligations of citizenship is a reasonable and just exercise of State sovereignty. It is now proposed that all voter qualifications prescribed by either constitutions or statute in Mississippi and other named Southern States be supplanted by qualifications to be set by an arbitrary determination of the United States Attorney General, and it is apparent that the most he will require will be that a person be 21 years of age and a citizen and resident of Mississippi. Not only an illiterate, but one absolutely lacking in all of the attributes of good moral character, or any moron not incarcerated in an institution can be qualified to vote under the proposed legislation.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mississippi, Alabama, and Louisiana are being singled out and penalized primarily because they have exercised their constitutional right to disagree with laws enacted by the Congress of the United States or laws passed by the Supreme Court of the United States and decided that they would litigate the enforcement of these laws through every court in every jurisdiction and in any manner and form that it was possible for human ingenuity to design to fight the ultimate determination of their validity and their enforcement by a final court decree. Thank God, Mississippi fought and is still fighting the constitutionality and application of certain of the provisions of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964. If Congress does not somehow take the power of litigation and access to the courts away from our State, we are going to continue to fight what we consider to be the unconstitutional provisions that are inherent in this legislation. But now we have apparently fought, according to the administration and the Attorney General, not wisely, but too well. The judicial processes, even with loaded courts, are inadequate to inflict upon the people of the States herein mentioned the Federal Government's ideas as to what constitutes discrimination in voting registration practices on the grounds of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. I deny that either Congress or the Attorney General has any constitutional power to make a judicial determination that the State of Mississippi has violated the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States and that Congress has both the power and right to put the Attorney General in the place of the legislature and constitution of the State of Mississippi and let him arbitrarily fix the voter qualifications of all the people of Mississippi, both black and white.

This is an insult not only to the white people of the State of Mississippi, but also to those numerous members of our Negro population who, as responsible citizens, have qualified to vote and have voted over a long period of time. Even if there had been in the past some indications or evidence of a denial or abridgement of the right to vote on the part of any individual in Mississippi by reason of his race or color, there is no justification or logic in taking a position that two wrongs make a right, and rather than have a uniform application of a reasonable literacy test against both white and Negro applicants, all literacy tests will be nullified and both literates and illiterates of each race will be registered just as fast as they can run to either a Federal examiner appointed under the direction of the Attorney General by the Civil Service Commission or a Mississippi circuit clerk, the duly constituted registrant under Mississippi law.

Mr. President, how could this Congress conceivably enact legislation that was specifically designed to apply to only 6 or 7 States of the Union and leave the other 43 or 44 free from its application? This is inconceivable under any theory of equal protection of the laws and evenhanded justice and application of law. I charge, Mr. President, that a criteria was deliberately built to achieve this result, and it was so designed that States such as Texas could be omitted from its application. Also, the State of New York seems to be omitted, either through legal legerdemain or because the Attorney General does not have any reason to believe that there is any such thing as discrimination existing within the confines of that State. New York has a literacy test. In lieu of taking the test, it is required that one produce a certificate showing an eighth grade education. New York also grossly discriminates against non-English speaking Puerto Rican citizens by requiring literacy in English. Yet it is said that New York is not covered by the bill.

The bill has a strange nomenclature and language all of its own. It condemns States which it alleges employ tests or devices as some sort of alleged technique to discriminate against a class in the registration and voting processes. Tests and devices are defined as:

First. Demonstration of the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter.

Second. Demonstrate any educational achievement or his knowledge of any particular subject.

Third. Possess good moral character, or

Fourth. Prove his qualifications by the voucher of registered voters or members of any other class.

Now, according to the Attorney General's calculation, there are a total of 22 States, both North and South, that have in their constitution or laws regarding voter qualifications one or more of the tests or devices above enumerated. Therefore, they had to devise some system for eliminating all but the States they wanted to put the knife in. So the next gimmick is an arbitrary one that goes back to November 1964 and provides that where a State has any one of these tests or devices as a qualification for voting with respect to which the Director of the Census determines that less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age residing therein were registered on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 percent of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964, then that State or political subdivision would come within the terms of the bill. This formula was designed to catch Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, and 34 counties in North Carolina. It does so because of the fact that the Southern States have traditionally voted a smaller percentage of the total population than the more populous areas of the East, Midwest, and West. If Mississippi desires to employ a literacy test which requires a reasonably intelligent understanding of government and the duties and obligations of citizenship, she has a constitutional right to do so; and if this should disqualify residents—white or black—so be it. Furthermore, voter apathy is neither a moral nor a constitutional sin, and there is not, and never has been, a constitutional requirement in this country that every citizen is required to vote. The privilege of not voting is just as great and just as sacred as the privilege of exercising the ballot, although all responsible citizens should exercise their privilege of suffrage.

Now, let us consider further the percentages of voting population who cast ballots in the 1964 presidential election. In the first place, Southern States have always been primarily a one-party State and have never been in the habit of casting as many votes in Federal elections as they do in their primary elections, when the local, county, parish, and State officers are up for election. Alaska is caught in the toils, but there will be no penalties against Alaska because only 49 percent of her population voted in the 1964 election. Arizona has tests and devices, but it was eliminated because 55 percent of its population voted. California has tests and devices. It was eliminated because 65 percent of its population of voting age voted, and on down the line of Eastern States.

I do not believe that this proposed formula has any meaning or substance whatsoever. It was designed solely and alone because it would embrace the States and only the States that the Attorney General wished covered. As to political subdivisions of States, when the figures are furnished to us, I believe that it will be revealed there is just as much voter apathy in Harlem, in the South Side in Chicago, in the black belt of Philadelphia, and in the Negro wards of Los Angeles as there is right here in the District of Columbia and throughout the South, where there is a heavy concentration of Negro population; and I propose, Mr. President, before any final votes are taken on the passage of this bill, to see that amendments are offered so that if it passes, it will not be class legislation that grossly discriminates against a few States and does not apply to others. Furthermore, I challenge the entire basis of any retroactive formula that is devised on figures provided by the Director of the Census for the year 1964. There was no census in 1964, and there is no manner or technique of any kind or character by which the Director of the Census can make an honest and true statement as to the number of persons of voting age who were residents of any State or any political subdivision of a State on November 1, 1964. This was more than 4 years after the 1960 census, and I am sure that the Director of the Census himself is going to admit that his estimate is subject to errors of great magnitude. Such evidence would not be worth the spoken words in a court of law as to a situation that existed in November 1964. It was as early as 1849 when the Supreme Court of the United States held that the census of 1840 could not be taken as evidence of the number of freeholders in a State in 1842. I propose that this and many other matters will be given full and careful scrutiny while this bill is being considered, and I predict that when the American people come to the realization of what a monstrous crime is being perpetrated in the name of the 15th amendment against the people of a limited number of Southern States, they will rise up in horror and urge the repudiation of this unconstitutional type of vindictive legislation.

Mr. President, the draftsmen of this bill so distrust the people in the affected Southern States that the doors of the local Federal courts are forever closed to them in raising any legal issues as to the application of the terms of the legislation. The one court, the only court, that is given any jurisdiction to entertain suits concerning the validity and application of the proposed law is the district court for the District of Columbia. The Federal trial judges, and the Federal appellate judges for Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, and Georgia are not to be trusted. Litigants much travel hundreds and even thousands of miles to reach a court in which they can enter. It has been known for years that an appointee could not be considered for the District bench unless he had the wholehearted endorsement of the NAACP. But so far as Mississippi is concerned, neither this State nor any political subdivision could even get into this court for a period of more than 10 years in order to prove it is not guilty of violations of the act. The bill reverses established legal process and requires that the party charged with an offense prove himself not guilty.

The Wall Street Journal has recently published two splendid editorials condemning the proposed legislation in all of its aspects, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 22, 1965]

AN IMMORAL LAW

When President Johnson last Monday asked Congress for a new law to safeguard the voting rights of Negro citizens he rested his case on the Constitution and on a basic principle of morality.

What he has now proposed that the Congress do is enact a law which would violate that Constitution he asks us not to flout and, more, which is itself immoral.

If you think not so, consider:

The administration bill offers a formula—a complicated one, which we will come to in a moment—to prohibit certain States from using any test of a citizen's ability to read and write our language as a qualification for voting.

The argument for doing this is the 15th amendment to the Constitution which provides, clearly enough, that neither the Federal Government nor any State shall deprive a citizen of his vote "on account of" his race or color.

But the proposed bill does not stop with providing a means against the violation of the 15th amendment. It does not aim at insuring that any such State literacy test shall be fairly drawn and impartially administered so that it may not be used as an excuse to deprive anyone of his vote "on account of" his race.

The effect—and indeed the purpose—would be to abolish such tests entirely in the affected States. And that flies squarely in the face of this selfsame Constitution which the President professes to uphold.

The very first article of that Constitution authorizes the individual States to decide the qualifications of voters in both Federal and State elections, subject only to the proviso that whoever is deemed qualified to vote for "the most numerous branch of the State legislature" is automatically qualified to vote in Federal elections.

Making this a State function was no casual decision. It was reaffirmed in identical language in the 17th amendment—adopted, incidentally, more than 40 years after the 15th amendment—which provided that all such qualifications should be impartially applied among all citizens.

This principle in the Constitution has been repeatedly upheld and affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court, not merely in dusty antiquity but as recently as 1959 by judges presently sitting upon that bench.

Now we are well aware that there are a good many people, and perhaps the President is included, who oppose any literacy requirement. They say that a man's illiteracy is irrelevant to the question of having his judgment counted in public affairs. No man can quarrel with the right of such people to argue their case and, if persuasive, to alter the Constitution so as to prohibit them.

But the requirement that voters be able to read and write is by no means restricted to those Southern States now the object of this special legislation. Many others—including New York State—require that qualification, as the Constitution entitles them to do.

If it is immoral, as the President says, to deprive a qualified citizen of his right to vote "under color of a literacy test," is it moral to violate one part of the Constitution under the color of upholding another which is in no wise in conflict?

Nor does the question end there, for what this bill proposes to do is to set up a double standard. Some States would be permitted to keep their literacy requirement. Others would not.

The formula prescribed is that of a ratio between the number of persons of voting age within a State and the number of voters in an election. If 50 percent or more of the voting age inhabitants do vote, then the State is absolved. The Federal authorities will keep out, and the State may set its own qualifications for voters, including literacy tests. Otherwise, no.

This formula has been carefully devised so that in practice it is expected to apply only to six States, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, and Virginia. In these States the Federal authorities would not only have the right to supervise voter registration but to abolish the voter qualifications they don't like.

A few moments reflection on this formula will suggest such weird paradoxes, and the possibility of such strange discriminations, as to stagger the mind.

A minor one is that a strict application of the formula would probably make it applicable to Alaska. However, a way has been devised to exempt it, which as much as anything suggests that the intent is not to write a general rule of law but to subject certain States to special laws.

Not so minor, but certainly weird, is the provision that a person once registered as a voter by the Federal authorities will be stricken from the list if he fails to vote "at least once during three consecutive years while listed." In short, you have to vote or you can't.

Of more consequence is the fact that if we have this law a citizen, white or Negro, can be entitled to a vote in Alabama no matter how illiterate he is, or for that matter even if he is a moron. But if the same citizen, white or Negro, lives in New York State he will not be entitled to vote.

This would create a truly ingenious paradox. The illiterate citizen, Negro or otherwise, would find himself with more "rights" in Alabama and her five outcast sister States than in the great State of New York. More, the educational level of the voting citizens of Alabama, the low level of which is part of the general complaint against it by civil rights leaders, would be further reduced. And this by Federal sanction.

Unfortunately, the irony is not funny. Beneath the paradox lies a serious question. Is it moral that our national laws should apply one rule to one State and another to another, requiring that the people of one State abolish qualifications for voters while the people of another State may uphold their standards?

Nor is that the end of the consequences of that weird formula. Recall that it permits the Federal Government to put all this machinery in motion, the takeover of the whole voting procedure by Federal authorities, only when the voting percentage of a State falls below 50 percent of the voting age population. If there was ever a device open to what President Johnson calls manipulation, this is it.

So long as a State contrives that one-half of its adults vote, it is free of the formula. This will not be overlooked by ingenious men who can contrive many things when justice is measured by percentages.

And this brings us to what we think is the fundamental immorality of this proposed law, unintentioned though it may be by those who drew it.

Any citizen, white or Negro, has the right to be treated by the law like all other citizens. If he has to meet qualifications to vote—age or any other—they must be only the qualifications asked of all. If he qualifies like any other he has the right to vote, and to deny him that right is to deny him what is inalienably his.

It makes no difference whether 99 percent of his neighbors vote or whether only 20 percent do. It makes no difference whether he has voted in the last three elections, or in none at all before he presents himself at the polls. His right is to vote or not vote as he pleases.

That is the whole of the moral issue. And the whole duty of government, insofar as it touches this matter, is to see that all equally can exercise this right.

The constitutional duty of the Federal Government is to see that this right is not abridged—anywhere, populous States or sparse States, Northern States or Southern States, where many go to the polls or where few take the trouble to. The means of assuring this—everywhere—is what any Federal voting law ought to do, and all it ought to do.

To play with complicated formulas, to measure justice by percentages, and to aim punitive laws at some States, not only violates both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution but buries the real moral question in sophistry.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 24, 1965]

A Question of Perversion

When the Attorney General began his explanation and defense of the proposed Federal voting bill he adopted a fascinating line of reasoning that deserves more attention than it seems to be getting.

Appearing before a Senate Judiciary subcommittee, Mr. Katzenbach made no claim that the Constitution gives to the Federal Government the authority to set voting qualifications in all the several States, nor did he cite any Supreme Court opinions to suggest that the Federal Government has this power.

He hardly could have. For the very first article of the Constitution—reaffirmed by the 17th amendment—lays down only one qualification which the national Government may insist upon, namely that all voters qualified to vote for the most numerous branch of any State legislature must be qualified also to vote in any national election.

The 15th amendment to the Constitution adds one other, and a very important one. It is that no State may take away the voting rights of any citizen "on account of" his race or color. And the 24th amendment bars poll taxes as a requirement for voting.

In short, then, the Constitution says this: No State may set higher qualifications for voting in Federal elections than in State ones, that no poll taxes shall be levied, and that every citizen must be treated equally by the voting laws of each State. Within that framework, each State is free to establish its own qualifications as to age, length of residence, literacy and the like.

This view has been consistently affirmed by the Supreme Court. Only 8 years ago, in a case specifically involving a literacy test in North Carolina, the Court repeated that "the States have long been held to have broad powers to determine the conditions under which the right of suffrage may be exercised." The limitation on that power, in the Court's words, is that they cannot authorize "the discrimination which the Constitution condemns."

So to justify a Federal law to override State voting requirements and permit the Federal Government to eliminate literacy requirements in some States, Mr. Katzenbach had to adopt the line of reasoning that the abuse of a principle condemns the whole principle.

That is, he argues that the Federal Government, under color of the 15th amendment, has the authority to override the constitutional right of some States because literacy tests "have been perverted to test not literacy, not ability, not understanding—but race." And this is sufficient reason for the Federal Government to eliminate them entirely wherever such perversion has taken place.

This argument, please note, is quite different from an argument for a Federal law requiring that all literacy tests be fair and equitable and that Federal authorities be authorized, wherever necessary, to see that it is so.

The fact that literacy tests can be fair and equitable, in fact, is conceded; the literacy test of New York State will be left untouched, as will those in a number of other States. But the distinction is not made on an examination of the individual merits, judicially measured, of such tests. The merits or demerits would be measured, under this law, by how many people vote.

On Mr. Katzenbach's line of reasoning the Congress could have abolished poll taxes—surely a thing susceptible to abuse—by simple statute instead of, as was properly done, by constitutional amendment.

Indeed, on this line of reasoning the fact that police powers are sometimes abused by local policemen—and they certainly are—would become an argument not for halting the abuse but for eliminating the local police powers.

For our own part, we have no reason to doubt that in some places the constitutional principle under which each State sets its own voting requirement has been perverted to deny some people the voting rights they are entitled to. And we agree that this is a strong argument for national action to remedy those abuses, wherever occurring.

But if that is also an argument for altering the Constitution in unconstitutional fashion, then what the Attorney General of the United States is saying is that one perversion justifies another.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, it is going to take hours and even days to properly analyze and explain the iniquitous features that are contained in this proposed legislation. Under the flag of the 15th amendment, it is proposed that copious portions of both the body and amendments to the Constitution, before and after the 15th, be nullified and set aside. I earnestly ask that every Member of this body, even those who have signed as cosponsors of the bill, keep an open mind and carefully hear the arguments, constitutional, legal, and moral, that we will make against the bill. Do not be a party to placing an incubus such as this on a handful of States and people, to the exclusion of all others. When this kind of legislation is finalized, the republican form of government guaranteed to every State of the Union under the Constitution will be wholly and completely destroyed.

SENATOR COOPER'S VIEWS ON THE FOREIGN AID PROGRAM

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, the able and distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] has expressed very pertinent and forthright views on our foreign aid program, in an article written by Mr. Dick Kirkpatrick, which appeared in the Cincinnati Enquirer on March 14.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the body of the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Time for Good, Hard Look: The United States Has Lost Control of Foreign Aid, Cooper Says

(By Dick Kirkpatrick)

Washington.—Senator John Sherman Cooper, Republican, of Kentucky, former Ambassador to India and a friend of foreign aid, is one of those who believe Uncle Sam has lost control of the foreign aid program and ought to do something drastic to get back the reins.

Nations have grown to rely on the special assistance grants and the foreign aid loans (up to 40 years and starting at 1 percent interest in the first 10 years). Any suggestion to cut back drastically brings a bite on the hand that Uncle Sam extends to feed the biter.

And especially any major change in a troublesome country, such as Egypt, may bring screams that Uncle Sam is interfering with the nation's internal affairs, threats to do something about the Suez Canal, or threats to deal with the Communist bloc.

In an effort to help get Uncle Sam's hands off the bear he is holding by the tail, Senator Cooper last December suggested that President Johnson simply stop the entire foreign aid program throughout the world, except perhaps in South America.

Such a halt would give the United States time to review the aid program, without charges of cantankerous nations that the move was aimed at them or their internal affairs.

It definitely would put Uncle Sam back in the driver's seat, while making the review. At the same time, it would not bring the foreign aid program to a complete halt since current commitments still would continue—and there is an estimated $7.5 billion in foreign aid pipelines (that is, in process), or enough for a couple years of operation.

Since World War II, including the Marshall plan, American foreign aid has totaled $115 billion. Some repayments are dribbling in on loans—last year there was approximately $100 million repaid.

President Johnson in January submitted a $3.38 billion foreign aid program for fiscal 1966. It was the lowest request since the program began in 1946 and reflected the White House's sensitivity to the growing trend to whittle down the aid program as congressional and taxpayer gripes about it mount.

The trouble with foreign aid comes when the nation begins spending American dollars for purposes against U.S. interests—such as when Egypt uses American dollars to help its developmental projects, and uses its own resources to supply rebels in some of the emerging African nations.

But then, if the American aid were withdrawn, Uncle Sam would be accused of attaching "strings" to his aid, trying to interfere with the independence of the nation, when technically the aid is a "loan" that is supposed to be paid back with interest and, therefore, bears no other obligations.

President Johnson has not responded to Senator Cooper's suggestion to halt any new aid programs while taking a good look.

Oddly enough, President Johnson went out of his way a year ago to announce the adoption of another Cooper proposal—only nothing more has been done about it.

For years Senator Cooper has been backing authority for the President to appoint advisory committees to make a country-by-country study of the foreign aid program, to review its effectiveness.

When he presented his foreign aid program early in 1964 President Johnson did an almost unprecedented thing in referring to Senator Cooper by name and said a general advisory committee was being named.

At the time, President Johnson said it was hoped that at least four or five country reviews, including two or three in Latin America, would be completed in 1964.

But, no such committee ever was appointed.

Senator Cooper said the United States should not be concerned by the furor created if further funds were halted.

"It would simply let all countries know that our aid program, established for good purposes, is our program and not theirs; that it is not fair to our people who must pay the bill, or to their people who are its objects, unless it is used effectively; and as a nation which has shown restraint and decency in its international relations, that we have the right to expect the same treatment and respect."

In any event, Senator Cooper contended, Uncle Sam should not let any nation "blackmail" the United States with threats to get rejected American aid from the Communist bloc. He said such nations should be told the United States is not out to outdeal Russia, but to help develop a reasonable 5-year program of assistance.

"The countries we aid will respect us for insisting upon these conditions, for they will be benefited, and without loss of any independence," he said.

EIGHTY-FIRST BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF JUDGE FLORENCE ELLINWOOD ALLEN

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I had intended to deliver these remarks on the Senate floor on Tuesday, March 23, the appropriate date; but, without forewarning, the Senate adjourned from Monday, March 22, to Thursday, March 25. Belatedly, therefore, it is with much pleasure and respect that I call to the attention of Senators the fact that Tuesday, March 23, 1965, marked the 81st birthday anniversary of the Honorable Judge Florence Ellinwood Allen, one of the most able and distinguished jurists of our time.

In 1934, Florence Allen was appointed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt as a judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit. She became the chief judge of the court in 1958, and is now senior judge of that court. At the time of that appointment, she was a judge of the Supreme Court of Ohio, and had served as a judge of that court for 12 years, since 1922. Previously, she had been, since 1920, a judge of the Court of Common Pleas of Cuyahoga County, in Cleveland.

Judge Allen is the first and the only woman to receive appointment to a U.S. Court of Appeals and to become the chief judge of a Court of Appeals. She is widely recognized as an eminent jurist and an authority on the constitutional law of the United States and in the broad field of international law.

She has received the honorary degree of doctor of laws from 25 colleges and universities; and she received the Albert Gallatin Medal, the highest award of New York University, from which she received the bachelor of laws degree in 1913.

Her early ancestors were among the first 1,000 inhabitants of the land which a century and a half ago was known as "the land 'way out west in Ohio."

On her paternal side, she is a descendant of Ethan Allen, the American Revolutionary soldier who heroically led the Green Mountain Boys in the capture of Fort Ticonderoga. Her maternal ancestors have their source in Dr. Samuel Fuller, of *Mayflower* time and fame. They were men and women of toil who helped to clear the forests and build our hamlets and towns. They bore the scars of toil and war, and shared in the joys that came with triumph. They were teachers in our schools, educated in the classics and the arts.

However, she need not call upon the noble deeds of her ancestors to add luster to her achievements. Through work, integrity, study, courage, and a gifted mind in a troubled and difficult world, she has brought glory to the Allen name. She need not take from ancestral graves the glory her forebears had won. By the force of her own character and the product of her individual toil, she has earned the laureled wreath of fame.

Although she was born in Utah, her forebears settled in the Western Reserve, which became the State of Ohio; and she has lived in Ohio, in the areas of Columbus and Cleveland, most of her life. She is one of Ohio's most distinguished citizens.

Clarence Emir Allen, her distinguished father, was a Representative from the State of Utah in the 54th Congress, from January 4, 1896, until March 3, 1897. Upon the admission of Utah as a State into the Union, he was the first Utah Representative elected to Congress. He was a graduate of Western Reserve College, in Ohio, a teacher and scholar in the classics, a lawyer, and active in mining pursuits in Utah.

Upon the occasion of her retirement as an active judge of the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, on October 15, 1959, when her portrait was received by the court, Chief Judge Thomas F. McAllister said:

> The heart and mind of Florence Allen will flame for generations as a beacon for thousands of young women who will take their rightful places in government, in the practice of law, and in judicial service—and lawyers and judges yet unborn will read the words she has written, in the endless, ever-old, and ever-new quest for justice.

Judge Allen in her early years campaigned for the constitutional right of women to vote throughout the United States. Throughout her life, she has been a champion of women and a great leader of women; and she is venerated by them throughout the United States and in many countries of the world.

Endowed with great talents, she developed and employed them throughout her life in great causes. She is a great American.

In truth, she is a kind of renaissance woman, possessed of a great diversity of interests. She is possessed of an encyclopedic mind, humane sympathies, and noble, poetic, and musical sensitivity.

She is spared of the evil of thinking too much about thoughts and not enough about feelings and things.

Moreover she is not a captive of the rashness of present-day civilization. She is not motivated by rootless competition, speed, hurry, noise, and superficial pleasures. She believes in herself, in her beloved, in her home and country. These beliefs are for her the summit of good.

Woven into her knowledge of prosaic law is a spiritual quality rooted in poetry, music, and religion. Because of these spiritual qualities, she sees more widely, feels more deeply, and speaks more clearly and simply. She absorbs facts and figures as a blotter absorbs water.

The life of her achievements will remain with people far longer than her physical life. Her life will be looked to as an example for others to follow.

Mr. President, upon this occasion of the 81st anniversary of the birth of Florence Ellinwood Allen, I am pleased to join her many, many friends and admirers in extending warm congratulations and best wishes for her continued good health, happiness, and many blessings.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORT QUOTAS MUST BE RETAINED

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, earlier this month I appeared at hearings conducted by the Department of the Interior on all aspects of the mandatory oil import control program, at which time I urged that quotas be maintained on imports of foreign residual oil in order to avert damage to our Nation's coal industry and to the economy of my own State of West Virginia. Oil imports in 1964 were equivalent to some 70 million tons of bituminous coal. If this coal had been mined and sold, it would have increased mine and railroad employment, vital to the welfare of West Virginia, and would have provided an upward impetus to the general economy of the Appalachian region.

Following the hearings, Mr. Stephen F. Dunn, president, National Coal Association, wrote a guest editorial for the Huntington, W. Va., Advertiser, stressing the need for protection of our Nation's coal industry through maintenance of controls on the importation of foreign residual oil.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point the statement which I presented at the Interior Department hearings, together with the guest editorial by Mr. Dunn.

There being no ojection, the statement and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by U.S. Senator Robert C. Byrd of West Virginia

Mr. Secretary, my very definite views on regulating and controlling the importation of foreign residual oil are well known to you. From the time of my election to Congress in 1952 to the present day, I have watched with concern the problems created in my State by the ever-increasing use, in this country, of a foreign waste product.

I shall not burden you or take your time with volumes of statistics. Your files are undoubtedly replete with these inasmuch as they have been presented before, and I have no doubt that they will be brought up to date by others who will testify today. However, approximately 4½ barrels of residual oil constitute the equivalent of 1 ton of coal, and the loss of each ton of coal production has its impact upon my State and the people I represent. In 1953, my first year in Congress, residual oil imports amounted to 131,533 barrels. Our annual imports of foreign residual now constitute more than twice that amount, and the effect on the economy of West Virginia and Appalachia is direct and traumatic. These imports have their impact upon the jobs and upon the wages of coal miners and railroad workers. They affect the revenues of coal producers and the railroads; they are reflected in Federal, State, and local taxes.

The mining of coal is an extremely costly business. In the event of a national emergency, the coal industry will again be called upon to supply the fuel needs and other important power requirements. The continuing trend toward greater mechanization, together with the rising price level of mining machinery, has greatly increased the capital investment required for profitable coal mining operation. Additionally, retired railroad rolling stock is not easily or cheaply replaced, and unless the rail industry has the fiscal capacity and the financial stamina to handle greatly increased demands for coal in time of emergency, the Nation's security will be jeopardized. Moreover, an industry plagued by declining employment for a generation cannot raise a new generation of skilled and experienced coal miners in the time of an emergency to take the place of irreparable and irreplaceable equipment. Financial investments of the degree required cannot be made without the assurance of dependable future markets, and industries jeopardized by cheap waste products from abroad lack the desired assurance of that dependable future.

I think it also apropos to express the warning that we should guard against placing too much dependence on a foreign source of residual oil which may be denied to us as a result of hostile acts committed in shipping waters or at the source of foreign supply.

Finally, Mr. Secretary, the administration and the Congress have taken decisive and positive steps to assist in the rehabilitation of Appalachia. A dependable and healthy future for the coal industry is a necessity if we are to hope for an improved and more viable economy in the future of Appalachia. One way to underwrite a strong coal industry and an Appalachian economy that is in concert with the national economy would be to exercise appropriate and continuing controls over the imports of foreign residual oil. I do not maintain that residual imports ought to be entirely prohibited, as this would be unreasonable. I do submit, however, Mr. Secretary, that to remove or relax the quotas which now limit the imports of residual oil would compound the problems of Appalachia which the Appalachian Regional Development Act was designed, in some degree, to solve and would be a serious and costly mistake which the administration would long regret.

[From the Huntington (W. Va.) Advertiser, Mar. 22, 1965]

GOVERNMENT ACTION ON FUEL OIL CURB COULD SPARK MAJOR MINE DEVELOPMENTS

(Guest editorial by Stephen F. Dunn, president, National Coal Association)

The hand of the Federal Government is extended toward Appalachia and the coal industry, which is the Appalachian region's economic mainstay. We should know in a few days whether this is a helping hand—or a fist which will deliver still another damaging blow to a region and an industry already badly hurt by Government action.

If the Government wants to help coal, the Secretary of the Interior will continue mandatory controls on the importation of residual fuel oil. For this help to be effective, he should also give assurance that import quotas will stay at the present level for several years, instead of continuing their annual 9-percent increase.

As George Love, chairman of Consolidation Coal Co., told the Secretary March 11, Appalachian coal has a chance for a 65-million-ton annual market increase in east coast utilities by 1980. This would mean a capital investment of $650 to $780 million in new mines, $700 million in transportation equipment and facilities, and thousands of jobs for miners and railroad workers. But this will not happen as long as there is a prospect that residual oil import quotas may be increased at any time to eliminate coal from this market. Utilities will not sign long-term coal contracts, and lacking and assured market, coal companies and railroads cannot make the huge investments necessary for new mines and facilities.

Both West Virginia Senators ably testified for continuing controls over residual oil imports. Senator JENNINGS RANDOLPH said the welfare of domestic fuels industry, the people dependent upon them, and the security of the Nation, require "a meaningful, predictable program" of import controls. Senator ROBERT C. BYRD pointed out that a "dependable and healthy future" for the coal industry is necessary to improve the economy of Appalachia, and one way to assure this is to continue import controls on residual oil.

The hand of Government has dealt the coal industry other damaging blows. At a cost of some $2 billion, it has developed atomic power to competitive stature in coal's prime market—power generation. Nor is the Government yet content—the Atomic Energy Commission wants another $181 million in the next fiscal year to develop still more full-scale power reactors to take customers away from coal.

This proposal is particularly hard to justify because present types of atomic powerplants—and even the so-called advanced types which the AEC now proposes to subsidize—burn up our Nation's limited supplies of low-cost atomic fuel. And these supplies are indeed so limited that the Director of AEC's Division of Raw Materials has estimated the cumulative demands for uranium oxide will exhaust U.S. reserves between 1977 and 1980.

In contrast, America has enough coal for centuries. West Virginia alone could supply all the Nation's coal requirements at the 1964 production rate for more than 100 years. Some time in March, West Virginia produced her seven billionth ton of coal—but she has more than 50 billion tons of recoverable coal still buried under her hills.

True, our coal reserves, though enormous, are finite. Some time in the far future they will be exhausted, and then America will need her reserves of low-cost atomic fuel. But, meanwhile, the AEC hopes to develop so-called high-grain breeder reactors, which will make available more energy from atomic fuel than they consume. It should try to do so—in a deliberate, orderly manner. There is no need for a crash program. There is no need to squander taxpayers' funds, and our essential supplies of atomic fuel, on inefficient reactors.

Appalachia produces all the coal this country exports—almost 48 million tons in 1964. As David L. Francis, chairman of Princess Coals, Inc., of Huntington, pointed out in a recent letter to President Johnson, these foreign sales make a $500 million per year reduction in America's balance-of-payments deficit. We hope the Government will redouble its efforts to remove the barriers which foreign governments erect against our coal, for coal exports yield double benefits by helping the hard-hit Appalachian area and simultaneously bolstering the Nation's economic position.

The Government's program to aid Appalachia carries a price tag of $1.1 billion. But this elaborate program may be less helpful in the long run than some simple Government decisions which would cost the Government nothing.

In fact, Congress could save the taxpayers several million dollars by putting a checkrein on the Atomic Energy Commission's ambitions and getting AEC out of the business of creating unnecessary competition for coal.

Extending and stabilizing residual oil import controls would cost the taxpayers nothing but, as Mr. Love pointed out, it could bring an investment of $1.5 billion in private funds to Appalachia and create thousands of steady, high-paying jobs, and all it takes is the right decision by the Secretary of the Interior.

The coal industry and the Appalachian area are watching and waiting.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF OUR MERCHANT MARINE—SPEECH BY SENATOR MAGNUSON

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from the State of Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] was honored yesterday, Wednesday, March 24, by the Washington chapter of the Propeller Club of the United States at a luncheon at the National Press Club, Washington.

In turn, Senator MAGNUSON honored the occasion by an important address on the significance of our merchant marine.

The authority, interest, and enthusiasm that the chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee has in this area of our national concern is so well known that an expression of his thoughts was enough to summon a great audience patriotically dedicated to the promotion and support of the American merchant marine.

I feel that even a wider audience should have access to Senator MAGNUSON'S remarks and I ask unanimous consent that this speech as an important document be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY SENATOR WARREN G. MAGNUSON BEFORE PROPELLER CLUB, WASHINGTON, D.C., CHAPTER, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Distinguished guests and members of the Washington Chapter of the Propeller Club, it is a pleasure for me to be with you to discuss the American merchant marine, and a particular pleasure to be introduced by my friend and colleague, Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, and invited by your president, Earl Clark.

For me this week has had a special maritime significance. Not only have I an opportunity to address this distinguished maritime group, but this week I completed arrangements for awarding a contract to compile and codify the U.S. maritime laws. On Monday, I signed the contract with Pike & Fischer, Inc., a Washington firm highly respected in the maritime field. I need not stress with this audience the need for and significance of this action. For a number of years, the Propeller Club and other organizations and individuals interested in our merchant marine have attempted to have this effort undertaken. Now it is underway.

The contract will call for the preparation of a draft compilation and formal revision of the several Shipping and Merchant Marine Acts, principally those of 1916, 1920, 1928, 1933, 1936, and the Ship Sales Act of 1946. Both the contract and the informal discussion that have been held with the contractor have made it absolutely clear that no substantive changes are to be made in the proposed draft. Some changes will, of course, be required because none of the basic Merchant Marine Acts have been rewritten since the reorganizational plans became law. But, I want to assure you that the Senate Commerce Committee will watch this with greatest care and will ask others to help.

Under the terms of the contract, the initial draft is to be completed this fall. The program then calls for a wide distribution of the proposed draft. Copies will be made available and full comments requested from the Maritime Administration, the Federal Maritime Commission, and other Government agencies. At the same time, private groups will be asked for their comments. As a part of the review program, the Senate Commerce Committee will appoint a special advisory group on the compilation of maritime law and I hope to appoint to this advisory group many of those who have worked with the Senate Commerce Committee in the past on other maritime law revision problems.

If all comments on the draft are promptly received, it may be possible to introduce a bill in the next session bringing together the U.S. merchant marine laws. This will take much work, but I am confident of your continued support.

My hope is that the compilation of the merchant marine acts will be timed to coordinate with the revision of the customs and coast guard laws. I have been advised that the U.S. Coast Guard has already undertaken the revision of its laws and that the Bureau of Customs has recently assigned additional staff to complete their work. Mindful of this need and the need for coordinated effort, I have written the new Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Fowler, and suggested close cooperation.

If the work progresses at the anticipated rate, we could have before Congress next session a new proposed maritime code with three parts: the first relating to the U.S. merchant marine, the second to the Bureau of the Customs, and the third to the Coast Guard. If all interests are fully informed each step of the way and if care is taken that no substantive changes are made, I believe that a new code can be passed into law that will conveniently bring together the many scattered statutes that pertain to the area of our mutual concern—the U.S. merchant marine.

I personally am very much encouraged by the progress made in this program. And I would like to share with you another development that I find encouraging. I am convinced that the United States for the first time in recent years is moving aggressively toward substantially improving our balance-of-payments position. As you know, the United States has continued to register a rather substantial deficit during the past 7 years. Last year, we had a deficit of $3 billion. I think that President Johnson and Secretary Connor should be congratulated for concentrating on this problem and for pursuing the voluntary program recently outlined. In stating what could be done, Secretary Connor strongly encouraged business to expand exports and to increase the use of American-flag vessels and airlines.

I would like first to make a few comments regarding the program of expanding U.S. exports. As you know, this is a subject in which I have a particular interest. Last year, U.S. exports exceeded $25 billion and we recorded a favorable balance of trade of $6.5 billion. Despite this, the $3 billion deficit in the balance of payments persisted so substantial improvements are still to be made.

Last week, the Senate Committee on Commerce held hearings for several days on a bill I proposed entitled the "Export Expansion Act of 1965." I will not comment on this legislation at great length, but, it has become quite clear from the record made even in the first few days of hearings on this bill that much can be done to encourage our exports and the development of new foreign markets. We have not pursued our commercial interests as aggressively as we might.

During hearings on the bill, the committee will review the adequacy of the present program of commercial attaches and of commercial-type trade fairs, and the need for a trade development corps. But, of all the inadequacies of our present export promotion program none, in my opinion, appears more formidable than the inadequacy in export financing. We all realize that this country has an abundance of capital which could be channeled into financing exports at a rate of interest comparable with the best terms that could be made available by any country in the world. The fact is that we are not doing this. The Export-Import Bank is the U.S. primary export financing facility. The Bank has followed a policy of extreme caution. In some instances, this may be justified, but it has had a serious impact on many of our national economic and commercial interests. It is, in my opinion, essential that the United States provide some means of extending export credit in those countries that are somewhere between the point of requiring constant economic aid and the point of full economic maturity. The U.S. AID program, of course, has been and is directed toward bringing developing countries out of their condition of economic stagnation into a period in which ordinary commercial transactions become feasible. We have, as you know, spent billions of dollars on this effort and we are today finding that many of the nations which we have helped are having to turn to Europe for commercial type loans shortly after our AID program is phased out. Certainly the hope was that the AID program would benefit the American economy in the long run by permitting American interests to gain the initial economic advantage in the developing countries. We believe that AID should lead to trade, but not having an export financing program competitive with Europe, we are today forcing many commercial interests in nations which have received aid to look to Europe and, in some instances, to the Communist bloc for softer commercial loans for needed imports. The importance of these developing foreign markets must be realized, and the new emphasis on export promotion as a means of improving our balance of payments is timely. With a more flexible form of export financing, the United States can find new markets and a substantial improvement in the balance of payments can be expected.

The other phase of the balance-of-payments program on which I would like to comment relates to encouraging the use of U.S.-flag vessels. I sincerely hope that the significance of this policy is understood, and understood clearly, for it is a new policy. In the past, the United States has only suggested in quiet ways that it might be helpful to use U.S.-flag carriers, but never has it been an official policy of the United States to actively and aggressively encourage this. The immediate question is how this policy can best be implemented.

Before offering some suggestions on how to implement this policy, I would like to place the problem in some perspective. The United States in 1964 had a balance-of-payments deficit of $3 billion and spent $1 billion for the services of foreign-flag vessels. During the same period, the United States was credited with $700 million in ocean freight transportation. American-flag vessels carried only 9 percent of the U.S. oceanborne foreign trade last year. In comparison, the United Kingdom carried 52 percent, France carried 59 percent, and Japan carried 46 percent. The relatively low percentage carried by American-flag vessels is related directly to the inadequacy of our present fleet, particularly the bulk carrier fleet, and the underutilization of important segments of the active fleet. I am advised that last year the United States subsidized lines operated on average in ocean shipments outbound from the United States with 85 percent capacity utilized to Europe, 75 percent utilization to South America, and 90 percent to the Far East. On inbound trades, the figures reflect a 55 percent capacity utilization on average from Europe, 50 percent from South America, and 60 percent from the Far East. Of course, individual companies in many instances varied widely from the average. Nevertheless, it is clear that a substantial improvement in utilization could be made on liner trade routes, notably inbound. This is significant because the U.S. importer often is in a position to make decisions on routing and liner cargo moves on conference rates. Therefore, the American importer would be relatively sure of space available by specifying American-flag carrier and would pay the same freight rate charged by foreign-flag liner operators. The potential appears promising.

I, therefore, hope Secretary of Commerce Connor will seriously consider calling in the near future a meeting of the Department's recently appointed Balance of Payments Advisory Committee to consider this particular aspect of the program. I am sure that if such a meeting were held, practical means could be developed with maritime industry and labor cooperation to implement effectively this constructive effort.

I would offer another suggestion. In asking for business cooperation certain information and reports were requested from over 600 businesses prominent in the U.S. foreign trade. I certainly hope that as a part of the reporting program an attempt will be made to obtain information as to what is being done or could be done by Government or the maritime industry itself to increase the use of U.S.-flag vessels. I think that the President's program is significant for our business community, for the U.S. merchant marine, and for the improvement of our balance of payments. It deserves our full support and certainly has mine.

As this use increases, I am sure that more of our shippers will find that it costs no more to use American-flag ships. In return, they will find a far more efficient operation.

One of America's largest shippers, and certainly its most important, is the Department of Defense. It could follow this advice to great advantage.

I've always thought the Department of Defense has not given the support to our merchant marine that it deserved. This includes testimony presented to Congress. It includes the assignment of cargo.

Actually, our merchant marine should figure as importantly in Defense Department planning as any other phase of logistics because in times of emergency our merchant marine is one of the first segments of private industry to receive the call and, fortunately until now, to heed it.

Vice Adm. John S. McCain, Jr., recognized this fact when he recently said:

"We are presently involved in a total 'wet war' with the Soviet Union."

He added:

"There is intense competition in the fields of merchant shipping, oceanography, and the fishing industries, as well as between navies."

Admiral McCain warned:

"Perhaps the greatest challenge to our seapower supremacy is the Soviet merchant marine."

He noted that the United States has 900 flagships in the merchant marine while the Russians have 1,200. And they hope to double this by 1970.

I believe that there are many others in the Department of Defense, as Admiral McCain, who are basically conscious of this role which only our merchant marine can fill.

But we have our work cut out for us in hammering this message home to all officials in the Defense Department, just as we must take this message home to all Americans.

I can assure all those who work to improve our defense posture that we are facing a real serious problem unless we meet these merchant marine needs in the near future.

WHAT IS BEHIND THE VA CLOSINGS?

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the April issue of the American Legion magazine contains a penetrating and thorough analysis of what is behind the effort to close out certain Veterans' Administration facilities and to consolidate others.

The article is written by American Legion National Commander Donald E. Johnson, and I call it to the attention of the Senate because I think it reveals information which all Members of the Senate—the entire Congress for that matter—should have before the final decision is reached as to whether or not these needed and vital facilities are terminated or reduced.

Mr. President, I am more than ever convinced that this present effort to close VA facilities represents not only a complete disservice to the American veterans but to the general taxpaying public as well for the claimed economies of such closures simply are nonexistent.

That and other important points are made abundantly clear in Commander Johnson's report, and I ask unanimous consent that his article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S BEHIND THE VA CLOSINGS?

(By National Commander Donald E. Johnson)

At this writing the assault on adequate veterans' medical and counseling services launched by the Veterans' Administration directive of January 13 has been slowed. The Congress has barred until May 1 any steps to close the 11 hospitals, 4 domiciliary homes, and 16 regional offices.

This does not mean we have won the battle. It means we have time to fight it.

The crucial test comes now. Advocates of the cutback are betting that the initial congressional and public resistance will subside, clearing the way for the closings. We must sustain in coming weeks the barrage of protests, backed by facts and logic, which has been leveled at Washington. If you have already written to your Congressman and Senators, write again. Write to President Johnson at the White House. Ask him if it is a purpose of the Great Society to impose additional hardship and heartache upon sick and helpless veterans.

Developments since the cutback announcement, reported in further detail on page 31 of this magazine, have served to confirm our first grim estimate of the situation.

The real target of the January 13 order is not the facilities marked for closing. It is the special status and recognition historically accorded America's veterans—the bottom stone of the entire veterans' benefit program.

The current attack, masterminded by the Bureau of the Budget, is designed to carry out by executive department edict those recommendations of the Hoover and Bradley Commissions which the Congress rejected. Their aim: to remove the Veterans' Administration as the Federal agency serving veterans and to parcel out its responsibilities to other agencies under a social welfare scheme.

If this slash in service goes through, others will follow. VA services will be diminished for veterans and opened to increasing numbers of nonveterans.

The VA at first claimed that the closings would save millions of dollars and that the facilities were selected because they were obsolete, hard to staff, or had low patient demand. Both claims turned out to be total misrepresentations.

In meetings with American Legion representatives and in testimony before Congress, Administration spokesmen admitted that the alleged economies could not be documented. They acknowledged that the cutback, involving wholesale transfers of patients and personnel and equipment, would raise—not lower—operating costs. They conceded that any saving from a reduction of VA services would be offset by the cost of adding equivalent services in other agencies.

Why was the economy argument tried? Apparently, strategists hoped it would add another star to the administration's thrift crown and would give Members of Congress a politically potent answer for any criticism back home. Fortunately, the people and the Congress weren't fooled.

The VA's stated reasons for selecting the facilities proved to be equally indefensible. In January the 271-bed hospital at McKinney, Tex., had 279 patients and 74 veterans on the waiting list. Congressman RAY ROBERTS of Texas stated, without contradiction, that the hospital "has at least 7 to 10 more years of life without any major repairs."

Confronted with facts refuting their case against one facility after another, VA officials explained that errors had been made. The Wall Street Journal of February 18 attributed this to VA's "anxiety to forestall criticism." The record indicates that the agency, under a Budget Bureau ultimatum, was trying to justify actions that couldn't be justified on their merits.

With the original case for the cutback discredited, the Administration is taking a new tack. The closings should be effected, we are now told, because they will result in improved service to veterans. Somebody close to the White House must be convinced that the American people will believe anything.

In late January, while a freeze on new patient admissions to the 11 hospitals was in force, a veteran residing 15 minutes away from upstate New York's Castle Point Hospital was stricken by meningitis. Turned away at Castle Point, he had to be ambulanced 2½ hours through ice and snow to the hospital at Albany. Is this the "improved service" they promise?

Phillip S. Hughes, an Assistant Director of the Budget Bureau, told the House Veterans' Affairs Committee that the cutback would be "disruptive to those affected." Mr. Hughes speaks from the computer-insulated shelter of a Federal bureaucracy where dollar signs and digits take precedence over human needs and the Government's good faith. Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON, of New Mexico, spoke for a larger group of Americans when he observed: "In dealing with the sick or disabled veterans we are not dealing with commodities; we are dealing with human beings. They cannot be treated as mere numbers on a punch card."

Will shutting down 16 regional offices improve VA services? On the contrary, it can only mean second-class service for all veterans living outside metropolitan areas.

Closing the offices in Vermont and New Hampshire, for example, would compel veterans in those States to go to Boston for counseling or claims help. With rail and bus service virtually nonexistent, they would have to make the trip by car and then wait their turn in an office coping with a greatly expanded workload. Obtaining the help, now quickly available at regional offices in their respective States, might well cost them 3 or 4 days with attendant expenses. How many veterans or their widows or dependents with claims can afford that kind of investment? Most of them are in need, and many of them are too sick or disabled for such trips.

The VA says hospitals to be built later will make up for the beds lost in the cutback. But what about the veterans who will need hospitalization in the meantime? And what assurance do we have that the VA can keep its word?

The fact is that while the VA proposes, the Budget Bureau disposes. Twenty months ago the VA inaugurated a nursing bed program which it said would provide 4,000 beds for veterans. Today, the program has 46 beds. The Budget Bureau sat on the funds needed to activate it.

The January 13 order, it is clear now, has nothing to do with economy of efficiency or improved service to veterans. It appears, rather, to be one step in a long-range administration plan to merge and subordinate the VA system in an all-purpose Federal health and welfare colossus.

President Johnson in his 1965 budget message to the Congress said, "As we continue to improve our social security and health protection programs, we should place greater reliance on these programs for meeting veterans' needs not connected with their military service." A Budget Bureau official testified that there will be "interrelation" between VA care and medicare, and that medicare "will certainly decrease the demands upon VA facilities." Under a "cross-servicing" procedure hatched in the Budget Bureau, VA hospitals shortly will accept seamen and other Merchant Marine beneficiaries formerly treated in Public Health Service facilities.

The intent is plain. It contemplates the day when there will no longer be a single Federal agency charged with looking after legally certified veterans' needs: when nonservice-connected veterans will be identified only as numbers on national welfare rolls; when admissions to veterans' hospitals will be processed without regard to wartime service in the Armed Forces.

This is the ultimate dimension of the challenge we face. We must fight it one battle at a time, and the present battle is over the pending VA cutback. Join it. Help win it by mailing your protests and appeals to the White House and the Congress.

WHAT IS A FARMER?

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, the American farmer works in wind and weather producing an abundance that makes the people of this Nation the best fed in history, and he does it in relative silence in a time of noisy sound from the commercial world about other problems in other segments of the economy.

We often hear about the productive genius of our farmers. All too seldom, however, do we hear from the farmer's wife, the indispensable partner in American agriculture.

Mrs. Doris T. West, of Thomas & West Farms, Meadville, Mo., has written a tribute, in one of the best word pictures I have read, of the many roles a farmer must fill. Mrs. West helps her husband operate a 900-acre beef-hog farm in Linn County, Mo.

I ask unanimous consent that her article entitled "What Is a Farmer?" as published in the Farm Journal of February 1962, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS A FARMER?

(By Doris T. West)

Farmers are found in fields—plowing up, seeding down, rotating from, planting to, fertilizing with, spraying for, and harvesting if. Wives help them, little boys follow them, the Agriculture Department confuses them, city relatives visit them, salesmen detain them, meals wait for them, weather can delay them, but it takes Heaven to stop them.

When your car stalls along the way, a farmer is a considerate, courteous, inexpensive road service. When a farmer's wife suggests he buy a new suit, he can quote from memory every expense involved in operating the farm last year plus the added expenses he is certain will crop up this year. Or else he assumes the role of the indignant shopper, impressing upon everyone within earshot the pounds of pork he must produce in order to pay for a suit at today's prices.

A farmer is a paradox—he is an overalled executive with his home his office; a scientist using fertilizer attachments; a purchasing agent in an old straw hat; a personnel director with grease under his fingernails; a dietitian with a passion for alfalfa, aminos and antibiotics; a production expert faced with a surplus, and a manager battling a price-cost squeeze. He manages more capital than most of the businessmen in town.

He likes sunshine, good food, State fairs, dinner at noon, auctions, his neighbors, Saturday nights in town, his shirt collar unbuttoned and, above all, a good soaking rain in August.

He is not much for droughts, ditches, throughways, experts, weeds, the 8-hour day, helping with housework, or grasshoppers.

Nobody else is so far from the telephone or so close to God. Nobody else gets so much satisfaction out of modern plumbing, good weather and homemade ice cream. Nobody else has in his pockets at one time a three-bladed knife, checkbook, a billfold, a pair of pliers and a combination memo book and general farm guide.

Nobody else can remove these things from his pockets and, on washday, have overlooked: five "steeples," one cotter key, a rusty spike, 3 grains of corn, the stub end of a lead pencil, a square tap, a $4.98 pocket watch, and a cupful of chaff in each trouser cuff.

A farmer is both faith and fatalist—he must have faith to continually meet the challenges of his capacities amid an ever-present possibility that an act of God (a late spring, an early frost, tornado, flood, drought) can bring his business to a standstill. You can reduce his acreage but you can't restrain his ambition.

Might as well put up with him—he is your friend, your competitor, your customer, your source of food, fiber, and self-reliant young citizens to help replenish your cities. He is your countryman—a denim-dressed, businesswise, fast-growing statesman of stature. And when he comes in at noon having spent the energy of his hopes and dreams, he can be recharged anew with the magic words: "The market's up."

PENNSYLVANIA STATE SENATE URGES VOTING RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the right to vote is a fundamental right guaranteed every American by the Constitution. It is a right which the 15th amendment, adopted 95 years ago, very clearly states "shall not be denied or abridged" because of "race, color, or previous condition of servitude." But it is a right which is still denied many Americans because of the color of their skin. That is why a group of us here in the Senate have been working since February on new voter registration legislation, and have introduced a bill which would insure the right of every American to vote.

But the grim drama which has been unfolding in Selma, Ala., in recent weeks has brought tragic new emphasis to this failure to comply with a fundamental law of our land. The death of 26-year-old Jimmie Lee Jackson, by wounds inflicted by the Alabama State police, aroused decent citizens in all parts of the Nation.

The murder in Selma of a respected clergyman, and the vivid picture of a racist sheriff's armed possemen beating and flogging Americans whose only crime was a desire to vote, focused the attention of all Americans on the fact that many of their fellow citizens in Alabama and elsewhere are still barred from voting because of their color.

The Senate of Pennsylvania has passed a resolution urging the U.S. Congress to pass such legislation. I ask unanimous consent to insert into the body of the RECORD this timely resolution.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The success of any democracy depends upon the right of the citizenry to express itself at the polls. Whenever this right is denied to any citizen or group of citizens, democracy itself is in jeopardy.

It has been obvious for some time that there are many places in our country where citizens are denied the right to vote because of their race or color. This has been accomplished by making it almost impossible for such people to register to vote.

The events of the past several weeks in Selma, Ala., have reminded us of this blot on our form of government.

Because the registration officials in Selma, Ala., continued this form of denial, peaceful demonstrations of protest have been conducted. The police and others have responded to the demonstrations with violence. Many demonstrators have been injured, some seriously.

Many members of the clergy, of all faiths, throughout the land, went to Selma to join the demonstrators and add the weight of their religious and moral convictions to the issue. One of the clergy who went to Selma was the Reverend James J. Reeb, a 38-year-old Unitarian-Universalist from Boston, Mass. While in Selma, Reverend Reeb was attacked and badly beaten. As a result of this beating, Reverend Reeb died. He left behind a wife and four children.

The President of the United States, Lyndon B. Johnson, is about to address a joint session of the Congress of the United States to discuss proposals he is about to submit to the Congress insuring the right to register and vote for all citizens of our country: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania hereby expresses its profound sadness on the untimely death of the Reverend James J. Reeb and extends to his family its condolences; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to adopt into law the proposals insuring citizens of the right to register to vote; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to each of the two Senators and to each of the Representatives from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

Attest:

MARK GRUELL, Jr.,
Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.

SENATOR SCOTT LAUDS ROLE OF EPISCOPAL CHURCH IN CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, all of our churches and people of all faiths have been working, and working hard, for progress in civil rights, but, as a member of the Anglican communion, I am particularly proud of the active role of my Episcopal Church over the years in the civil rights movement.

In Selma, Ala., when State police and the armed possemen of a segregationist sheriff were turned loose on American citizens peacefully demonstrating for the right to vote, more than 110 representatives of the Episcopal Church went to Alabama and joined in the protest.

Twelve Episcopal bishops and hundreds of clergy joined in the now historic march on Washington in 1963.

My heart swelled with pride when I recently read in a Washington paper that Washington's Episcopal suffragan bishop, Paul H. Moore, Jr., was the first to answer pleas for contributions to finance a kitchen for voting rights demonstrators at Washington's Lafayette Square. He immediately wrote a check for $100 with an agreement that any leftover funds would be sent to families of persons injured in Selma. Bishop Moore, and countless members of the Episcopal clergy, were in the forefront of that demonstration of sympathy for the brutalized and disenfranchised Negro voters of Alabama.

This involvement of the Episcopal Church and its clergy in the civil rights movement is no new thing. As far back as 1943 a biracial committee was formed. One of this committee's guiding principles was: "Desegregation must be the goal for all church institutions and agencies."

In a resolution adopted by the 59th General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1958, the Episcopal church resolved to "work together toward the establishment, without racial discrimination, of full opportunities in fields such as education, housing, employment, and public accommodations."

All across America, in pulpits, in pews, and on picket lines, leaders and members of the Episcopal Church have been and are directly involved in this great struggle for human liberty. They know that, though progress has been made, though the Macedonian cry of the churches echoes and reechoes, the road ahead is still a long one. They are concerned, in the words of the Right Reverend Robert L. DeWitt, bishop of Pennsylvania, with the constant slowness of that progress. And they feel that we must, as Bishop DeWitt has so eloquently stated, "do whatever we can to move, whatever we can to learn, to help ourselves to change, to help men and institutions—including the churches—to wake up and move."

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the proposed Federal budget for fiscal 1966 as it relates to the agricultural conservation program and, more particularly, to the Soil Conservation Service, has become a matter of deep concern to the farmers and conservationists of Missouri. The budget for fiscal 1966 recommends a 20-percent cut in appropriations for soil conservation technical assistance and a 40-percent reduction in appropriations for cost-sharing aid. To replace the reductions in funds for these programs, there is proposed legislation to establish a public enterprise revolving fund to finance the cost of technical services provided to soil and water conservation districts and cooperating farmers. Institution of the fund would require cooperating districts or landowners to pay to the Soil Conservation Service a user's charge of up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance, with collections of $20 million estimated for 1966.

I believe that these reductions in appropriations for our conservation programs, and the institution of the revolving fund to take their place, would seriously impede national efforts to stimulate and effect conservation of our vital soil and water resources and would undermine the progress that has been made toward this goal in the last 30 years. The effect of such changes in the soil and water conservation program would be especially unfortunate in Missouri because the agricultural conservation program and the development of soil conservation districts has been slow in acceptance until recent years. At the present time we have 65 soil and water conservation districts established in Missouri out of a total of 114 counties in the State. But interest has broadened in recent years and we have been progressing rapidly: seven districts organized in fiscal 1963, six districts organized in fiscal 1964, and four in fiscal 1965. This progress is traceable to the devotion and efforts of many people in Missouri who realize the value of the soil and water conservation program to our State. But the progress could not have been accomplished without the full participation of the Federal Government in providing aid and technical assistance on a local basis. In Missouri, much remains to be done, and perhaps more than in any other State in the Union the cause of development and scientific management of our soil and water resources depends on continued and expanded Federal participation and assistance. Reductions in appropriations or the substitution of the so-called revolving fund device would cripple the program in Missouri. I have heard from very nearly all of the soil and water conservation districts in Missouri and their letters all indicate they share the view and the alarm I have expressed. I would like one letter, which I believe illustrates the concern felt by the people of my State particularly well, to be printed at this point in the RECORD. The letter is from the chairman and the members of the board of supervisors of the Scotland Soil and Water Conservation District.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HON. EDWARD V. LONG,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LONG: We need your help. The Federal Budget Bureau has proposed legislation that, if enacted, will kill the Scotland Soil District program.

The proposed budget for assistance to soil districts for fiscal year 1966 (July 1, 1965, to June 30, 1966) is $104,103,000. This is $130,000 less than the last fiscal year, but the Budget Bureau has recommended to Congress that soil district cooperators be forced to pay $20 million of the proposed budget for fiscal year 1966.

This would be done by the soil districts charging district cooperators for services from the Soil Conservation Service. Money collected by the soil districts from cooperators would be returned to the Federal Government to be used as a revolving fund.

Under the proposed legislation, there would be no charge for services on watersheds, farm planning, soil surveys, flood prevention, Greal Plains conservation programs, and resource conservation and development projects. This would mean that all the $20 million would have to be paid by cooperators using the Soil Conservation Service for layout and installation of conservation practices on their individual farms.

This would average out about $7,000 to each soil district, and would probably mean $14,000 to an active district like ours. We feel like the soil district could not operate under these conditions if the proposed Federal legislation is enacted.

We had an active program in 1964, but no one was knocking our door down demanding assistance in applying conservation practices. It still takes hard selling and a good educational program to get the work done. Landowners do not fully realize the value of conservation practices until they are applied to the land.

It is impossible to measure the value of soil and water conservation in dollars. What is the value of an acre of land that will produce food and fiber forever?

The Scotland soil district is probably the best financed district in Missouri. If you will refer to our financial statement for 1964, you can see that our donations from district cooperators was $475.50. This, plus some other district income, was about sufficient to carry out the district educational program.

It is our opinion that 99 percent of our district cooperators would be unable or unwilling to pay for technical service for layout of conservation practices.

Scotland County has good land and good farmers. We would say it was about the average county for the Corn Belt. Our young farmers are World War II veterans. About 10 percent of our farmers are drawing social security, about 70 percent are over 50 years old. We have less than 5 percent of our farmers under 30 years of age. Over 80 percent of Scotland County farmers have net incomes of less than $3,000.

Most farmers over 60 years old have semiretired or retired on the farm. They produce very little, but are happy where they are. As these people die, the land is normally absorbed into larger units that must produce.

A lot of people are worried about having too many farmers. We are worried about having enough farmers in the future. Absorbing small units into larger ones is not the complete answer. The present average farm wage in Scotland County is $150 per month.

In Indian language, the administration has been speaking with a forked tongue. We've heard talk of the poverty program, beautifying the countryside, help for small farmers, economic stability, the importance of conservation work in Johnson County, Tex., self-help programs, local leadership and self-government, and the Federal Government's responsibility to its people. Yet, the administration has proposed legislation that will kill the soil district program, which has been doing all of these things the last 30 years.

Yours truly,

FLOYD DUNN,
Chairman.
RAYMOND AUSTIN,
Vice Chairman.
E. R. WEBBER,
Treasurer.
EUGENE NEWLAND,
Member.

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, the importance of the Soil Conservation Service to the people of Missouri is evidenced by the resolution adopted by the Missouri State House of Representatives, House Resolution 113, which I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD:

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 113

Whereas the house of representatives of the 73d general assembly, resolves that the Missouri General Assembly strongly protest to the Congress of the United States, the proposed cut in funds for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, as recommended by the Bureau of the Budget; and

Whereas the present agricultural budget for soil and water conservation has remained the same for several years while costs have been increased; and

Whereas good progress has been made in Missouri in the past 30 years, but much work is yet to be done; and

Whereas 11 million acres of cropland is subject to erosion and 4 million acres of flatland have a drainage problem; and

Whereas Missouri has 18 million acres of cropland making it one of the outstanding agricultural States in the country; and

Whereas soil and water are without a doubt the most important resources in Missouri affecting both family farms, rural communities, and urban areas; and

Whereas the reduction of funds by $20 million as recommended to be paid by landowners for technical assistance in applying practices would retard and delay the progress of soil and water conservation which is, as stated, national concern, affecting the welfare of all citizens of our State: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress be encouraged to restore the proposed $20 million cut in appropriations for the U.S. Soil Conservation Service in order that Missouri may continue to provide technical assistance to landowners in installing planned conservation on their lands; and be it further

Resolved, That we also urge a continuation and expansion of this effective program which we believe is essential for maintenance of the family farm, the economic stability of the rural community, and the preservation of our water resources, food supply, and recreational opportunities for both rural and urban communities; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, President of the Senate, and to each member of the Missouri delegation in the Congress of the United States.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF CONFERENCE BETWEEN GENERALS LEE AND GRANT AT APPOMATTOX, VA.

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, I should like to extend to Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and to the general public, a most cordial invitation to attend exercises, in the national interest, at Appomattox, Va., April 9, 1965.

On that date we shall observe the 100th anniversary of one of the most important dates in our history.

It is the anniversary of the day on which Gen. Robert E. Lee and Gen. Ulysses S. Grant met at the conference table in Appomattox and negotiated peace terms between the North and the South.

I know of no event of more importance to the Nation since our Constitution was adopted. It represented the uniting of a war-torn nation, the healing of a breach, the welding together of a great people, the rebirth of a nation.

There will be conducted at the Appomattox Court House National Historical Park commemorative services honoring these two great men, Generals Lee and Grant, as well as the peace that was achieved that day 100 years ago.

Gen. Ulysses S. Grant III, a grandson of General Grant, and Robert E. Lee IV, a great grandson of General Lee, will take part in the ceremony dedicating the restoration of the old courthouse where the Confederate soldiers were mustered out after the peace terms had been agreed upon.

Mr. Bruce Catton, the author of "A Stillness at Appomattox," a noted scholar and Pulitzer Prize winner as well as a great historian, will deliver the address.

The Marine Band from Quantico will provide the music. The Governor of Virginia and many other notables will be present.

A great monument stands there now as an emblem of peace among our people, and in memory of those fine men who fought and died for the principles they believed in.

THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, March 25 marks the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian independence, for it was on March 25, 1918, that the proud freedom-loving Byelorussian people proclaimed their sovereignty and established the Byelorussian Democratic Republic with its capital in the historic city of Minsk.

This freedom, alas, was enjoyed but a short time for despite all of the sacrifices made by her people the young Byelorussian state was unable to preserve her independence against the onslaught of Russian Communist forces which overran the tiny country early in 1921.

Since that brutal takeover by the Communist Russians some 10 million Byelorussians have been forced to live under the oppressive Soviet totalitarian regime. As those of us in the free world know full well, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, which was created in place of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic, is nothing but an administrative arm of the Moscow government, and does not represent the will of the Byelorussian people.

In spite of their being forced to live under the burdensome yoke of Soviet totalitarianism, the Byelorussian people have not abandoned their goal of national freedom and independence. This is why March 25 is being celebrated by Byelorussians throughout the free world as a symbol of their national aspirations.

We here in the United States assure the Byelorussians of our continued interest and concern, and express our fervent hope that the valiant efforts of these people will be rewarded, and that Byelorussia will once again be free.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today marks the 47th anniversary of the Byelorussian Independence Day—an anniversary of great importance for American citizens of Byelorussian descent. They are a loyal group who have been doing everything they can to protest Soviet oppression, and to regain the independence and freedom of Byelorussia.

An eloquent plea was made last week by the distinguished Most Reverend Archbishop Vasili, of the Byelorussian Autocephalic Orthodox Church, when he delivered the opening prayer in the Senate. Because the flame of freedom burns brightly in the hearts of these captive people, in spite of harsh restrictions, deportations, imprisonment, and other repressive measures, and because their hope for independence is still strong, it is extremely important that the United States keep alive this hope of freedom. My respect for the self-determination of the Byelorussian people is well known, and I take this opportunity to reaffirm my support of efforts on their behalf and on behalf of the freedom of all the peoples of the captive nations.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted at the convention of the Americans of Byelorussian descent, held on March 21, 1965, at the Hotel Biltmore, in New York City, for the 47th anniversary of the independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Byelorussians of the free world have been closely following the events in the country of their origin. By virtue of their unflagging efforts to keep in touch with their former compatriots, there emerges a picture of Byelorussians oppressed by communism but forever trying to improve their present status and to change their future for the better. Undoubtedly, they have succeeded in pushing back the darkness somewhat. Nonetheless, their aspirations to a Byelorussian statehood have so far been blocked by the incubus of a foreign ideology, placed on their country by violence.

The idea of democratic freedom and independence, which the Byelorussians have consecrated with lives, is indestructible among them. This idea was given impetus by the anti-Russian uprising of 1863; it was developed and enriched by a host of writers of the national rebirth movement, and in the years of the Byelorussian national revolution of 1917 to 1918 it reached fruition. The convention believes that national independence for Byelorussia will be realized, for the independence movement constitutes an organic part of the historical process in this century.

Democratic sovereignty, the theme of this period, was expressed by the Byelorussians through their national leader, the poet Janka Kupala (1882–1942), who wrote: "Each people should be its own master."

Sooner or later, the Byelorussian nation shall become its own master. This is its most sacred dream and yearning. The achievement of this goal is in the interest not only of Byelorussia but of the whole community of nations.

In the world of today, cowering from the specter of nuclear war, international understanding is more urgently needed than ever. The existence of the United Nations underlies this need.

Coexistence and cooperation among nations, however, will rest upon firm foundations only when each nation will speak for itself; when neighboring states or nationalities will not usurp another nation's name and economic resources, as in the case of Byelorussia, whose name is being used by Russia in its international manifestations and blackmailing.

The endeavors of Byelorussians to have the right to speak for themselves and to be their own masters constitute the essence of recent developments in Byelorussia. They become especially obvious among the younger generation of the Byelorussian intelligentsia: among writers, artists, teachers and students. Through their voices and creative talents, the Byelorussian people are striving to rehabilitate their past, of which it was totally deprived during the years of Stalinist terror, and to promote a maximum of political and economic freedom. Taken all together, these aspirations form the core of the idea of independence and democracy as it was promulgated in the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

We, the participants of this convention for the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian independence, therefore solemnly resolve—

In the all-out, further struggle for free Byelorussia,

To spotlight the cultural, economic, and political achievements of the Byelorussian people; and

To unmask before the world the political, economic, and moral enslavement of Byelorussia by Soviet Russian imperialism.

May the torch of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic of March 1918 never go out.

Long live the free democratic Byelorussia.

STANISLAU STANKEVICH, Ph. D.,
National President of the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc.
ULADZIMIER NABAGIEZ, M.D.,
President of the New York Branch of the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc.
SIARHIEJ HUTYRCHYK,
President of the New Jersey Branch of the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, March 25, 1965, is the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian National Independence Day, a day of great importance to American citizens of Byelorussian descent, as well as for all Byelorussians living in the countries of the free world, and in Byelorussia itself, occupied and oppressed by Soviet Russia today. It is the day on which Byelorussians celebrate the happy period in which their country enjoyed independence.

On March 25, 1918, the Council of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic proclaimed the independence of the Byelorussian state, but their freedom soon became a prize they had to win on the battlefield. Armed forces of Germany, Russia, and Poland, engulfed the Byelorussian Army from the east and from the west, finally conquering Byelorussia and dividing her territory among themselves.

During the Second World War on June 27, 1944, the Second Byelorussian Congress convened in Minsk. The Congress annulled all treaties of the occupational governments concerning Byelorussia and approved the proclamation of independence for the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. However, Russian power once again crushed the Republic and, in an attempt to crush also the spirit of the Byelorussian people, the conquering Soviet Union ignored natural ethnographical order and redistributed the people.

During this 47-year history of persecution and oppression, the anniversary of the 1918 proclamation of independence has been honored in the free countries of the world. Against the mass terror the Russians have used to destroy more than 5 million of their population, against the increased intensity of Russification and antireligious campaigns in the press, the Byelorussian people have shown valiant courage and determination. They have earned the respect and admiration of all peoples and have become an exceptional symbol of resistance to Communism. It is proper that we should join them on this day in the rededication of their goals toward a free and independent Byelorussian Republic.

HUMAN RIGHTS AND GENOCIDE CONVENTIONS

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on March 11 it was my privilege to address a conference convened in Washington by the ad hoc Committee on the Human Rights and Genocide Conventions, a citizens' organization representing virtually every sector of the American community and embracing organizations that can claim to speak for some 100 million Americans.

The Genocide Convention has been languishing in the Foreign Relations Committee now for almost 16 years. Three other U.N. conventions dealing with the abolition of all forms of slavery, the abolition of forced labor, and the political rights of women, have been there almost as long.

I believe that our failure to ratify these conventions projects a most unfortunate image of the United States to the rest of the world. I also believe that much of the opposition to the ratification of these conventions is based upon misunderstanding and misconceptions.

I ask unanimous consent to insert into the Record at the conclusion of my remarks the text of my statement before the conference of the ad hoc Committee on the Human Rights and Genocide Conventions. I hope that my statement will help to throw some additional light on these sadly misunderstood measures. And, I hope too that support can be found to bring them to a vote before this session concludes.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Need To Ratify the Genocide Convention and Other U.N. Conventions on Human Rights

(Remarks of Senator Thomas J. Dodd before the conference of the ad hoc Committee on the Human Rights and Genocide Conventions, Statler Hilton Hotel, Washington, D.C., Thursday, Mar. 11, 1965.)

Mr. Bingham, reverend clergy, distinguished guests, I have accepted your invitation to address this conference out of a sense of duty because I believe there is no more important item of unfinished business on the calendar of the Senate than the ratification of the Genocide Convention.

It is now 17 long years since the Genocide Convention, with strong American backing, was approved by the U.N. General Assembly. And it is 15 years—almost 16 years—since it went to the Senate for ratification in June 1949.

The convention has been ratified by 67 nations to date, including all the members of the Communist bloc in the U.N. But for some strange reason, the great United States of America, which has done more to extend the frontiers of freedom than any other nation, has not ratified the convention.

In June of 1949, President Truman submitted the Genocide Convention to the Senate with his own enthusiastic endorsement.

In January of 1950, a special Genocide Subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, under the chairmanship of a great Connecticut Senator, Brien McMahon, conducted public hearings. It was my privilege to testify in favor of ratifying the convention before this committee. I say it was my privilege not only because of the great importance I attach to the convention but because of the exceptionally distinguished body of citizens, representing more than 50 national organizations, who took the witness stand with me to urge ratification.

In its report to the full Foreign Relations Committee, the McMahon subcommittee strongly recommended ratification of the convention. But despite extensive hearings, despite the declared approval of all the major religious, ethnic, civic, and veterans organizations, the covenant still languishes in the Foreign Relations Committee without affirmative action.

Fifteen years, sixteen years, is a long time to wait for the ratification of any treaty or convention. The long lapse of time, has, I am afraid, blurred our memories and obscured the issues and dulled our conscience. There have been times in our history when the Government has needed prodding, and other times when Congress has needed prodding or intervention from citizens and citizens' organizations. I believe that this national conference, representing as it does every sector of the American community and embracing organizations which can claim to speak for 100 million Americans, constitutes a citizens' intervention in the highest American tradition.

Those of you who have initiated this conference and those of you who have come here to participate in its deliberation will, in my opinion, merit the thanks of coming generations of Americans. This conference, from what I have already seen of it, will unquestionably serve to bring the issue of genocide to life again. And you will, I hope, be able to clear away the intellectual cobwebs that have obscured the issue and encourage the Senate to take the long overdue action of ratification.

What is the Genocide Convention about? In my opinion, there could be no simpler or more fundamental moral issue written into a covenant between the nations of the world.

Essentially, the convention establishes that genocide is a crime under international law; and it defines genocide as the destruction of a racial ethnic or religious or national group, or part of that group, committed with the specific intent to destroy this group, in whole or in part. It includes the actual killing of members of the group, or causing them serious bodily or mental harm, or deliberately inflicting conditions of life on them calculated to bring about their physical destruction, or forcefully transferring children of the group to another group. It states that these acts are punishable, as well as conspiracy to commit genocide, to direct or publicly incite to commit genocide, or complicity in genocide.

Under article 5 of the Genocide Convention, the contracting parties undertake to enact, in accordance with their respective constitutions, legislation which would give effect to the provisions of the convention and which would establish penalties for persons guilty of acts of genocide.

It seems to me that nothing could be clearer than this.

For me the Genocide Convention has a special personal meaning because as executive trial counsel at Nuremberg I had spread before me, in nightmarish detail, the whole incredible story of Nazi barbarism, of its fiendish persecution of the Jewish people, and of the gas chamber and crematoria that snuffed out the lives of more than 5 million Jews and of millions of Ukrainians, Poles, and other Europeans.

The convicted Nazis were charged with crimes against humanity. The word "genocide" had not yet come into common usage at that time. But to a very large degree this is what the Nuremberg trial was about. For the first time there was spread on the record of an international tribunal the details of massive crimes involving millions of victims—crimes perpetrated not against individuals but against entire peoples and ethnic groups.

While I was at Nuremberg I learned about other acts of genocide that were not made part of the trial record.

I learned of the mass deportations of the Volga Germans and the Kalmuks and the Chechens and other Soviet minority people during the war years.

I learned the true facts about the massacre in the Katyn Forest of 10,000 Polish officers who had been prisoners of the Soviets.

I learned of the mass deportations of scores of thousands of intellectuals and community leaders from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia in the period following the Soviet occupation.

I learned, in short, that Communist totalitarianism, like Nazi totalitarianism, uses genocide as an instrument of policy, and that the death of nazism did not necessarily mean that we had put an end to the problem of genocide.

Although 67 nations have ratified the Genocide Convention, it has, by and large, remained ineffective, inoperative, and without the necessary authority because the United States has thus far refused to add its ratification.

The years that have elapsed have witnessed situations where genocide has unquestionably been perpetrated and other situations where there was strong prima facie evidence of genocide.

In the case of Hungary the massacre of 25,000 Hungarian freedom fighters by the Red army and the subsequent mass execution and imprisonment of scores of thousands of Hungarian intellectuals, brought the charge from many quarters that the Soviets were guilty of genocide.

One year later the Chinese Communists crushed the Tibetan revolution with such ruthless measures that the International Commission of Jurists, in its report on the question of Tibet, made the unequivocal statement that Red China had been guilty of the crime of genocide.

In recent years we have witnessed in the Soviet Union a systematic campaign against the Jewish minority and the Jewish religion. While there have been no mass killings of Jews, it is clear that the objective of this campaign is the early and total obliteration of the Jewish religion and of Yiddish culture. Is this genocide within the meaning of convention? This is a matter that might have to be decided by some properly constituted authority. But certainly the allegation of genocide in this case merits the most careful consideration.

In each of these instances the conscience of America has been shocked. We have cried out in protest. Our leaders and our spokesmen have decried the mass killings, and in some cases, they have even used the term "genocide" in referring to the crimes perpetrated by the Communists in these countries.

But the impact of our protest is weakened and our ability to intervene effectively remains seriously restricted so long as we ourselves have not ratified the Genocide Convention, which makes such acts an international crime.

What is more, I feel that our entire moral position, and our claim to leadership in the fight for freedom and justice and human decency, is prejudiced by our failure to ratify the Genocide Convention and the three other United Nations conventions dealing respectively with the abolition of all forms of slavery, the abolition of forced labor, and the political rights of women.

What an irony it is that this Nation, which abolished slavery almost 100 years ago, which does not practice genocide at any level of government, which long ago put an end to forced and indentured labor, and whose women enjoy the broadest political rights, should abstain from ratifying these four basic United Nations documents dealing with the rights of man, while the Communist nations, which are guilty on every score, have ratified all of these conventions or most of them.

What a false image of the United States our persistent failure to ratify these conventions projects to the world.

Needless to say, the Communists are clever enough to make use of our failure for the purpose of challenging our commitment to freedom and blackening our reputation. Among the newly emerging nations of the world, regrettably, the most widely believed facts about the United States are frequently those purveyed by radio Moscow or Peiping.

For example, in January of 1964, there was a debate in the UN subcommission on the prevention of discrimination and the protection of minorities. The Soviet member strongly opposed the establishment of international machinery for reporting upon and encouraging the elimination of racial and ethnic discrimination. At every point he was on the defensive. Finally, he decided to go over to the offensive.

The Soviet spokesman suggested that it was rather hypocritical of the American delegate to charge the Soviet Union with resisting the establishment of implementation machinery when "the United States had not ratified the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide or the Convention on Slavery."

The American delegate had to reply in embarrassment that he could only "regret of course that my country has not ratified the Convention on Genocide."

I am certain that as this exchange was reported over radio Moscow and radio Peiping, primitive peoples around the world were led to believe that the United States was opposed to ratification because it practices slavery and practices genocide.

It is time—high time—that we put an end to this invidious situation.

In the words of our martyred President, John F. Kennedy, "The United States cannot afford to renounce responsibility for support of the very fundamentals which distinguish our concept of government from all forms of tyranny."

There is only one way out of this dilemma. The Senate of the United States must at the earliest opportunity act to ratify the Genocide Convention and the Conventions on Slavery, Forced Labor, and the Political Rights of Women.

I know that some Senators have expressed the opinion that these measures will fail of ratification because we cannot get two-thirds of the Members of the Senate to vote for them. With this point of view I strongly disagree.

This conference has demonstrated in the most dramatic possible manner that the American people, in their overwhelming majority, favor the ratification of the four U.N. conventions dealing with the rights of man. I am confident that, given the necessary leadership, and given a patient exposition of the facts to the Members of the Senate, the Senate will not only ratify these measures, but will do so by a very substantial majority.

And I want to pledge to you that during the months to come I shall make this one of my chief objectives both within the Foreign Relations Committee and within the Senate itself.

There is one final proposal I would like to make. Looking forward to the time when the Genocide Convention has been ratified, I think we must start thinking in terms of practical measures to make it effective.

As the convention now reads, each nation ratifying the convention undertakes to enact legislation to implement the convention, and it also provides that any person charged with commission of an act of genocide should be tried by a court of the state in whose territory the act was committed.

These articles of the convention, in my opinion, constitute the most effective answer to those who charge that ratification of the convention would result in a surrender of our sovereignty to some unnamed and nonexistent international tribunal. But the articles leave something to be desired because it is questionable whether any Communist states can be trusted to prosecute their own nationals for the crime of genocide. And it is also questionable whether any state, Communist or democratic, will, in our lifetime, voluntarily agree to submit matters of such significance to the judgment of an international tribunal. I believe this is so despite the fact that no democratic state has practiced genocide or will practice it.

How then can we give effect to the Genocide Convention?

There is an approach to this problem which would involve no surrender of national jurisdiction, but which would be more effective as a deterrent to genocide than the present provisions of the treaty.

The United Nations has been at its best when it has been a matter of setting up an investigative committee to establish the facts in countries like Greece, or Hungary, or South Africa, or Borneo, or Vietnam. Invariably, these committees have reported objectively and fearlessly.

When the Genocide Convention is ratified, I would like to propose that serious thought be given to establishing a continuing investigative mechanism within the United Nations, under which serious allegations of genocide would lead to the appointment of special committees with the instruction to investigate and report back.

The member nations of the U.N. would be obligated to cooperate with such committees in any investigations conducted on their territory. The committees would have no juridical power, nor would the U.N. itself. But the mere power of investigation—the power to seek out the facts and bring them to public light—would, in my opinion, operate as a powerful deterrent to genocidal crimes and to other violations of human rights.

If the U.N. could be endowed with this responsibility by the consent of its member nations, it would give the world organization new meaning and a new lease on life.

I submit these thoughts for your consideration because I am confident that the Genocide Convention will be ratified, and the time is, therefore, arriving when we must begin to think of next steps.

I wish you godspeed in your deliberations.

THE 144TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it is particularly fitting that the Senate should pay tribute to the Greek nation on the occasion of the 144th anniversary of its independence.

I say this because this body, as it is constituted and as the Senate carries out its duties, as well as other institutions in our Republic, might not exist were it not for the great heritage of Hellenic culture. For this is the culture which has in large measure shaped the ideals on which the best of our ways of life is based.

As brave men of other nations pioneered in exploring our physical world, the intellectual giants of ancient Greece pioneered in that fascinating territory of the mind of man.

There are few areas of modern political, spiritual, and cultural life that do not have their roots in concepts discussed and promulgated in the marketplaces of Athens.

The debt of the Western World to Greece is not entirely for these contributions of the mind, however, as we have in the course of the history of this century had many occasions to be grateful to these brave people for being our allies in resisting common oppressors.

On this day 144 years ago the Greeks began a struggle, which was to last for 6 years, to end the domination imposed by their Ottoman conquerors. This effort culminated in 1827 in the establishment of an independent Greek state.

The stalwart Greek people since that momentous day in their history have resisted the threats and arms of would-be aggressors. Because of this, we look to Greece as a protector and defender of our cherished liberties.

In recent years, Greece successfully resisted and repulsed the Communists who attempted to infiltrate their country during a period of dissension after World War II. Since that time, they have been one of our stanchest allies in the cold war and a valuable NATO member.

The individualistic Greek character is evident today in the vitality, creativity, and skills of immigrants from that country. Our country is richer today because of the industry and leadership these people and their descendants have contributed to America.

I hope that our efforts to liberalize the immigration statutes will be successful this year. To a greater degree then our doors again will be opened wide so that we can benefit more fully from the talent and skills of the Greek people.

At this time last year, Greece and her friends were mourning the death of King Paul, who had led the nation with so much courage during the difficult days of World War II and during the postwar years when the Communists threatened expansion into the Mediterranean area.

It is heartening to know that young King Constantine is carrying on in the tradition of his father. And so today, in extending congratulations to Greece on their Independence Day, we also wish the country and their young ruler the best for many, many years to come.

MANAGED NEWS

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, not long ago the press of America rose up in righteous anger over what it called "managed news" from the Federal Government. The press adopted the position that it can best serve the interests of the reading public by presenting or interpreting the facts without Government direction.

I subscribe to this idea and I am opposed to the concept of "managed news." Yet, I wonder if the public is aware that a startlingly large segment of the press is itself guilty of a curious double standard in this regard. It accomplishes this through what might be called the "managed editorial." In the trade, I understand this is referred to more inelegantly as "boilerplate." This is the practice whereby an organization will prepare an editorial on a given subject and mail it to newspapers across the Nation, frequently in a form where all the editor need do is drop it into the right sized hole in his paper. Needless to say, the editorial is written to advance the cause of the organization which furnishes it.

I am sure everyone is aware that an editorial is opinion, and that it need not be based on facts, or even logic. Therefore, I would not question the right of newspaper editors to adopt the views that appear in these "canned editorials."

However, a serious question can be raised regarding the journalistic ethics and integrity of an editor who would foist these "canned pearls of wisdom" onto his readers without citing the source. If the editor wants to parrot the views of the National Association of Manufacturers or the chamber of commerce he is at full liberty to do so. But should he not owe it to his readers to tell them he is doing so?

The practice I have described is not new. However, we seldom have an opportunity to see the technique clearly in action. But now we have that opportunity, and for it we are indebted to—of all people—the American Medical Association.

Recently I received in my office a 171-page book entitled "U.S. Newspapers Comment on Health Care for the Elderly." I am sure every congressional office received a copy. The foreword states that the book contains "a cross section of American newspaper editorial opposition to medicare and support of the eldercare bill." The bill, of course, is the one sponsored by the AMA. The forward notes that the editorials "represent only a sampling of newspaper opinion," and the AMA, in "respectfully submitting the book," concludes:

> We believe that the opinions expressed in these newspapers reflect the viewpoint of a majority of the American people on this important domestic issue.

Those are the words of the AMA. And after glancing through the book one cannot help but wonder how many of the editorials also are the words of the AMA.

One need not leaf very far in the book before a curious pattern emerges.

An editor in Mesa, Ariz., for example, seems to have hit on the very same words to denounce medicare, as an editor in Aiken, S.C. Or the views of the Modesto, Calif., editor coincide precisely with those of the editor in Roanoke, Va.

Such unanimity of opinion would seem to be a rare thing. But is it?

On page 16 we come across an editorial that begins:

> The American Medical Association has offered Congress a program of health care for the elderly which merits thoughtful consideration by Members of Congress.

Oddly enough, we find the same editorial on page 61, page 74, page 78, and so on. At least 11 different, widely scattered newspapers in the AMA "sample" used the same editorial.

Another "managed editorial" begins:

> It is generally conceded that a measure providing health services for the over-65 age group will be passed by Congress this session.

At least 10 newspapers carried that one.

Still another begins:

> One wonders how many people—and especially those in the 65-and-over age group—actually know what medicare would or would not do.

Well, Mr. President, one might better wonder whether the readers had any idea where this canned editorial came from—or that it had appeared in at least 10 newspapers in the AMA sample.

Altogether at least six different versions of AMA-slanted editorials show up in the AMA's collection, and these were used by more than 50 newspapers.

The packaged material appears occasionally under the byline of a local reporter, and in one instance an editorial is referred to by a paper as a "Washington exclusive."

It was so exclusive that only six or seven other newspapers cited in the AMA book used the identical language.

I have not attempted to find out where these particular canned editorials originated, but I am sure the answer would produce no great surprises. The pattern speaks for itself.

A smoothly functioning, well-financed propaganda machine is at work here, pumping out prepackaged and predigested ideas for consumption by unsuspecting newspaper readers.

I do not know whether these packaged editorials appear because a harried editor needs to fill space, because of pressure from his county medical association, or because he is genuinely swayed by the arguments. The point is that the practice does exist—and it is deceitful.

I was pleased to note, parenthetically, that no Michigan newspapers snapped at the AMA bait. Although a few Michigan newspaper editorials appeared in the AMA collection, they appeared to be individual efforts, independently arrived at.

Up to the present, the AMA's boilerplate attack has not been very successful. Every reputable public opinion poll published in recent years has shown that an overwhelming majority of Americans favor the administration's medicare program.

But I call this to the attention of the Senate on the chance that some Senators, busy with other matters and lacking the time to delve below the surface of the AMA's latest propaganda effort, might take at face value the AMA's claim that this is a representative sampling of newspaper editorial sentiment.

The people who write to me, and to whom I talk in Michigan, are much better barometers of public opinion than all the canned editorials the AMA can collect.

But that does not excuse the practice nor some of the press for engaging in it.

BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS HEARINGS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the statements made by Mr. William McChesney Martin, Jr., Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, by Prof. Paul W. McCracken, of the Graduate School of Business Administration, University of Michigan, former member of the Council of Economic Advisers, and by Prof. Fritz Machlup, of Princeton University, before the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Banking and Currency Committee.

These statements contain important discussions of the issues involved in these hearings, and I believe it would be helpful to the Senate and to the country to make them available in this way.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM MCCHESNEY MARTIN, JR., CHAIRMAN, BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL FINANCE OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, MARCH 10, 1965

For the second time in less than 2 years, a national program to reduce and eventually eliminate our large international payments deficit has been launched. Our first program, begun with President Kennedy's message to Congress of July 18, 1963, met for a time with a measure of success, but in the course of last year, signs of fresh deterioration appeared. The fourth quarter of 1964 brought a near-record payments deficit. During the first 6 weeks of 1965 tentative and fragmentary data indicated that a similar deficit was threatening for the first quarter of the current year.

The need for more vigorous action was clear. President Johnson's program of February 10, 1965, was in response to this challenge. For an important part of the program, the President called upon the Federal Reserve to assume major responsibility. Accordingly, we have now communicated to the commercial banks and other financial institutions of this country guidelines for a voluntary effort to restrain their foreign lending.

It may be helpful to you in the course of my statement to explain briefly the approach to our international payments problem followed by the Federal Reserve in laying down its guidelines.

The magnitude of our payments deficit is determined by three main factors: First, the commercial balance on goods and services; second, our military expenditures abroad and our economic aid to foreign countries; and, third, the net outflow of our private capital into foreign countries. The President's program attacks the deficit on all three fronts. But as the Federal Reserve is not asked to deal with Government expenditures, my comments will be directed primarily to problems on commercial account and private capital account.

It cannot be stressed too often, in my opinion, that the main contribution of monetary policy both to our continued domestic expansion and to the restoration of our international payments equilibrium is the maintenance of credit conditions that help bring about cost and price stability. Avoidance of both inflation and deflation not only averts one of the main perils to sustainable economic growth; it is also indispensable to preservation and improvement of the international competitive position of our industries at home and in world markets.

The further expansion of our commercial surplus depends on continued avoidance of cost and price increases—although, needless to say, many other factors, such as the level of economic activity at home and abroad, also play important roles.

By providing monetary conditions favorable to price stability, Federal Reserve policy has, in my judgment, been as successful as could be expected in furthering a satisfactory development of our payments balance on current account. I do not want to minimize the importance of some signs pointing toward renewed upward cost and price pressures. As I said in my testimony before the Joint Economic Committee on February 26, I cannot avoid the feeling that we have been, and still are, sailing very close to the edge in this area. But the overall changes up to now in per unit costs of production, in wholesale prices, and in the cost of living, have so far not imperiled our international trade performance.

With regard to the Federal Reserve's contribution to minimizing outflows on capital account, the matter, unfortunately, is not quite so simple. While our commercial balance has shown record surpluses, our capital account has shown record deficits. The total net private U.S. capital outflows in 1964 amount to over $6 billion—twice as much as our total payments deficit—and the net expansion of bank credit to foreigners alone accounted for more than one-third of this capital outflow.

As a matter of principle, the aim of Federal Reserve policy is to maintain monetary conditions that are conducive to an adequate supply of credit and capital. This means a supply large enough to finance continuing economic expansion domestically without inflation, but not so generous as to make possible either an unsustainable investment boom or an undue spillover of funds to foreign countries.

The supply of credit and capital in recent years, in my judgment, certainly has been large enough to meet all legitimate domestic financing needs. It has so far not given rise to an unsustainable boom—although developments in some fields such as construction need to be carefully watched. But our monetary policy has permitted credit in the United States to remain relatively cheap and plentiful in comparison with other major markets, and thus has been a factor in the magnitude of our private capital outflow.

While this capital outflow has played an important part in swelling our payments deficit, we must remain mindful that the United States is and will probably continue in the future to be an important source of credit and capital for the rest of the world. As the richest and most productive nation of the world, the United States is capable of generating the largest supply of savings, both in absolute terms and in relation to national income. Our accumulated stock of invested capital is also larger than that of any other country, again both in absolute amounts and in relation to national product. Hence, our domestic demand for new investment is relatively less urgent than in most if not all foreign countries. With a larger supply and a somewhat less strong demand than in other countries, the availability of credit and capital, will tend to be greater, and the cost of credit and capital lower, than in the rest of the world.

This is not an unusual situation. In previous periods, the same relation obtained with respect to those nations that happened to be in the economic and financial lead for their time. France, the Low Countries, and especially Britain were for many generations a continuing source of credit and capital for the rest of the world, and during those periods their interest rate levels were naturally lower than in borrowing countries.

It is clear that restoration of our foreign payments equilibrium does not require our capital outflow to come to anything like a full stop. Arithmetically, a cutback in our private capital outflow of about one-half of the 1964 volume would suffice to wipe out the entire payments deficit provided all other elements in the payments balance remained the same. Realistically, it would be both impracticable and unwise to put the entire burden of correcting the payments deficit on private financing.

The main problem confronting the Federal Reserve—and our Nation at large—is how to reduce the net outflow of credit and capital without at the same time constricting the domestic supply so much that financing needed for our expanding economy at stable prices is unduly impeded.

Two alternative courses of policy are available to cope with this problem: One, a general increase in the cost and a lessening of the availability of credit; and the other, specific action designed to cut only the supply of credit and capital to foreigners without impinging on the needed supply to the domestic economy.

The Federal Reserve has to some extent followed the traditional course of the first alternative. At the time President Kennedy was formulating his program and in the prospect of its early announcement, the Federal Reserve shifted its policy posture in the direction of less domestic ease and increased its discount rate from 3 to 3½ percent, and shortly after lifted the ceiling interest rate on time deposits in the maturity range of 90 days to 1 year to 4 percent. These actions were promptly reflected in financial markets. Within a few weeks the Treasury bill rate had risen by more than one-half a percentage point and over ensuing months long-term interest rates drifted upward by just over one-eighth of a point.

These upward shifts in the level of domestic interest rates went some distance in better alining our interest rates with those in foreign markets. Through the second half of 1963 and the early months of 1964, this alinement continued tolerably satisfactory. About this time, in major industrial countries abroad, strong credit demands accompanying strong economic growth and creeping inflation were carrying foreign interest rates to levels fully offsetting the advances that had been experienced in U.S. markets. In recognition of the pull that the higher foreign rates might exert on our credit supplies, the Federal Reserve in August firmed domestic money market conditions slightly further, with the result that the Treasury bill rate moved modestly above the discount rate.

Under continued pressure of inflationary trends abroad, however, the availability of credit came under increasing central bank restraint in various foreign markets. In these circumstances, capital outflow from the United States accelerated.

About the time we were experiencing this mounting capital outflow, an adverse payments balance for the United Kingdom put the pound sterling under strong pressure in international markets, resulting in large drains on Britain's monetary reserves. That country was obliged to take a number of emergency steps, including the establishment by its central bank of a discount rate of 7 percent. To support the pound in international markets, the Bank of England arranged for a $1 billion drawing on the IMF along with about $3 billion of credits with other central banks.

In view of uncertainties which developed at this point in international financial markets and in recognition of the advances in short-term rates that had been occurring in other international markets, the Federal Reserve raised its discount rate last November from 3½ to 4 percent. At the same time, ceilings on the interest rates that banks are permitted to pay on time deposits of over 90 days were raised to 4.5 percent. Short-term rates in our money market promptly moved upward further about a quarter of a percent in adjustment to these changes; long-term rates, however, continued to fluctuate narrowly within the range they had moved since the beginning of 1963, reflecting the continued large flow of domestic savings.

It is impossible to say how large the capital outflow in the fourth quarter might have been if we had not taken the actions when we did. All that we now know is that in spite of whatever inhibiting effect may have come from these actions and the accompanying increase in short rates, there was a further rise in lending and investing abroad.

Nevertheless, we have not moved further in the traditional way to constrain our renewed capital outflow. Considering the desirability of further reducing our level of unemployment and more fully utilizing our resources, we have risked permitting some spillover of funds into foreign uses, and have sought other, more selective means of coping with the outflow problem.

There are three selective ways by which capital outflow can be reduced: by tax measures; by exchange controls; or by enlistment of voluntary cooperation.

The interest equalization tax is an example of the first approach. Experience with this approach so far has indicated both its strength and weakness. It is generally agreed that a tax is more consistent with the principles on which our economy is based than would be the use of direct controls or an appeal to voluntary cooperation. But a tax statute can hardly avoid some opportunities for legal escape, since it is extremely difficult in legislative drafting to foresee all loophole possibilities. Too embracing a tax, with many exceptions and qualifications, could be so complicated to administer that its effectiveness would be seriously impaired.

Exchange controls have not been tried in the past, except under wartime conditions, and I, for one, hope they will not be tried. By shifting decisionmaking in individual business transactions from participants to some Government agency, this approach would be repugnant to the principles of our economic system. Also, experience everywhere has shown that exchange regulations, if couched in general terms, can be avoided as easily as a special tax; and if elaborated in great detail, become so oppressive that they also hamper business activities beneficial to our payments situation. And once this route has been chosen, experience has demonstrated the difficulty of retracing one's steps towards freedom from controls. Of the three methods of selective restraint, exchange controls are, in my judgment, the one that should not be seriously contemplated.

This leaves for comment the voluntary approach. This method also has shortcomings. The person, individual or corporate, adhering to a voluntary program, may be penalized in favor of an uncooperative person. But if widespread voluntary restraint can reasonably be expected, the method has three advantages: first, it leaves the ultimate decision to the market participants; second, it is flexible enough to take care of changing circumstances and of the experience gained in the process; and third, given the good faith of all parties, it avoids the encumbrance of legalistic interpretations of the rules of the game.

With regard to the expansion of credits to foreigners granted by banks and other financial institutions, the prospects of general compliance with voluntary efforts are particularly good because a comparatively few institutions account for the great bulk of the total funds involved. And the response the Federal Reserve has encountered in its initial efforts to implement the President's program has been quite encouraging.

Last week, the Federal Reserve issued its guidelines to the banks and to other financial institutions. The guidelines provide that any bank may expand its credit to foreigners by 5 percent of the amount outstanding at the end of 1964. Such a figure is consistent with the expected growth of our national product and also the expected growth of international trade. But it is much smaller than was the rate of last year's credit outflow. All of us realize that the restraint asked for may create hardship in individual cases.

Our guidelines, which are directed to each bank individually, are designed to distribute the burden as equitably as possible and to avoid unnecessary inconvenience. In particular, they are designed to avert any adverse repercussions on our international commerce; on sound development efforts of less developed countries; and on such countries as Canada and Japan, which are largely dependent on U.S. financing, and Britain, which is suffering from serious payments difficulties of its own.

We expect that banks will continue to grant bona fide export credits; such credits are to be given absolute priority. Obviously, no priority can be claimed for credit extensions that substitute a credit sale for a cash sale or that substitute financing by U.S. banks for financing from nonbank or foreign resources.

We also expect that banks will continue to finance sound development projects of less developed countries. But clearly a less developed country should not rely on U.S. credit for projects that can and should be financed either with the country's own resources, or by other industrial nations—e.g., where the project envisages imports from European suppliers.

The guidelines explicitly state that substantial cutbacks are expected only in nonexport credits to those fully developed countries that are not customarily dependent on U.S. financing and that do not suffer from payments difficulties. Most if not all continental European countries should fall into this category.

The guidelines for nonbank financial institutions are more general and tentative in their specifications. They envisage cutbacks in the placement of liquid funds abroad, primarily in the so-called Euro-dollar market. In the case of short- and medium-term credits, the guidelines for banks are in effect applicable to nonbanks. But in the case of long-term credits (with a maturity of 5 years or more), which are probably more important in the case of nonbanks than of banks, no specific target has been set. Most longer term credits to fully developed countries are subject to the interest equalization tax. No effort is being made to discourage continued long-term investments in less developed countries, which need this type of assistance more urgently than additional bank credits.

While I am optimistic about the effectiveness of the voluntary restraint efforts, it would be impossible to give any quantitative estimate of their probable impact on our payments balance this year. Some banks greatly increased their credits to foreigners during the first 6 weeks of this year; some made very heavy advance commitments which they will have to honor; some carry many long-term credits among their outstanding assets, on which only small repayments are expected this year; others expect to have to increase their export credits and their loans to less developed countries without being able immediately to reduce sufficiently their nonexport credits to industrial countries. Banks that find themselves in such predicaments as these have been given 12 months to reduce their outstanding credits to no more than 105 percent of the 1964 level.

Moreover, we realize that in spite of all good will and vigilance some leakage will occur, in the sense that nonbanking institutions may grant some credits customarily granted by banks. The effect of such leakage on the overall reduction of nonbank credits to foreigners cannot be predicted at this stage.

For the moment, we appear to be making good progress indeed. But of course, the real test of the program lies ahead. Meanwhile, I should not like to say more than that we expect the net expansion of both bank credit and total credit to foreigners to be reduced this year by a substantial amount.

This reduction in capital outflows will be welcome. But in itself it will not be sufficient to assure the success of the President's program. For that, two things more are required; a further increase in our export surplus and a further decrease in our Government expenditures abroad. To borrow a word from the other side of the Iron Curtain, the program is like a troika, which cannot move if only one of its three horses keeps going.

Since I envisage success for the program, there is not need for me to dwell on actions that might become necessary if the program were not as successful as expected. But the inference from the analysis of the situation is unequivocal. With exchange controls decidedly inadvisable, and with tax measures unlikely to be more effective than voluntary action, a return to the traditional recipe of further restraint may be necessary in the monetary sphere, as may be further restraint in the spheres of military expenditures, economic aid and tourism.

But even if the program of voluntary cooperation achieves the greatest possible degree of success, we cannot think of it as a permanent institution. This program can serve as a dike for a period of time, but still farther ahead we have to look for a more basic adjustment of our international payments balance. The better we succeed in keeping our industries competitive in international commerce, and the better we succeed in reducing our Government payments abroad, the less we will need to be concerned about our capital outflow, and the sooner we can return to a system that leaves balance on capital account to the forces of a free market.

TESTIMONY OF PAUL W. McCRACKEN, PROFESSOR, GRADUATE SCHOOL OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN, BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, MARCH 16, 1965

Mr. Chairman, if we look through the tops of our bifocals at the enormous amount of discussion in recent years about our balance-of-payments problem, we find three broad approaches to a diagnosis.

EXCHANGE RATE ADJUSTMENTS

First, there is the view that the dollar is overvalued, and an adjustment in the exchange rate will be required to restore equilibrium. I do not propose to say much about this for two reasons. The evidence does not yet suggest that the dollar is overvalued internationally. Even with AID exports excluded our exports exceed our imports by a comfortable margin. Moreover, a downward adjustment of our exchange rate relative to other currencies is not only not called for, but probably is not even possible. Certainly the British could not tolerate an appreciation of the pound relative to the dollar, and it is doubtful if such other countries as Japan, Canada, or even many continental European countries would thus acquiesce in having their international competitive position relative to the United States adversely affected. There is little point in putting on the agenda what probably should not occur and almost certainly could not take place.

At the same time it is important to bear one thing in mind. An exchange rate is a price. Through time conditions do change. Price-cost levels move differently in different countries. Patterns of demand can change. The structure of exchange rates that represent equilibrium at one point in time may not be correct for a decade or two later. Our system in some respects exposes us to the problems of both fixed and flexible rates. Rates are fixed (within tolerances of plus or minus 1 percent), but emergent nervousness about the possibility of a change can readily become a source of problems—as we were again reminded last November. The result is that our present system tends to produce crises, often preceded by varying degrees of domestic deflation and ad hoc exchange controls, and a crisis is apt to be required to force even needed adjustments in the price of one currency in terms of another. This is, in my judgment, an underrated weakness of our present international financial system. And we must find some way to get beyond the present intellectual paralysis where one who uses the term "exchange rate adjustment" is immediately suspected of thinking lewd financial thoughts.

Clearly, however, an adjustment of exchange rates is not on the agenda of desirable or even possible corrective measures, and my own concern here is with other matters.

STRUCTURAL PROBLEMS

A second diagnosis of our problem has placed particular emphasis on the pattern or structure of our international transactions. This is by now generally understood, and I need not belabor the point here. This analysis, of course, points out that our generally strong payments position is the victim of particularly large specific outflows—AID and the leakage of dollars from our military installations around the world being leading candidates. Those who emphasize the impact of these leakages, of course, recognize that technically one cannot point to any item in a balancing account, where by definition debits equal credits, as the source of the problem. If some other items had been different from what they were, the item singled out could have been what it was without causing trouble. Even so it does not strain credulity to suggest that large noncurrent outflows do complicate the problem of sustaining balance in our external payments. And the administration has expended a good deal of effort and ingenuity in trying to moderate or neutralize these specific outflows.

EXCESSIVE LIQUIDITY

There is a third diagnosis of the problem. It places heavy stress on monetary or liquidity factors. Hydrostatic analogies come readily to mind. If a bathtub is overflowing, it is obviously overflowing at the low section of the rim. If that low section is built up, the tub will not run over there. It will, however, continue to overflow somewhere until the faucet running too much water into the tub is turned down.

We have an increasingly international market for money and capital. If the supply of liquidity is superabundant for domestic purposes, things do begin to happen. This becomes an attractive place for foreign borrowers to obtain funds. Some parent companies may prefer to use funds invested in Treasury bills here to finance more of a foreign subsidiary's requirements. U.S. corporations with surplus funds may intensify their search for acquisitions abroad as well as at home. And from time to time decisions may be made to keep some surplus funds abroad as a matter of policy. These are apt to be marginal shifts, not a 180° about-face in any corporation's policy. Even so the aggregate of marginal shifts can be consequential.

Fortunately, we do not have to choose up sides on this matter of diagnosis. One can conclude that large noncurrent dollar drains contribute to our external deficit, and at the same time conclude that a part of the problem is monetary or liquidity in its origin.

The evidence is increasingly clear that there is a monetary or liquidity dimension to this problem of disequilibrium in our external payments.

U.S. balance of payments

[In billions]

	1958	1964	Change
Balance on current transactions	$1.5	$7.3	+$5.8
U.S. Government grants and capital [1]	−2.6	−3.7	−1.1
U.S. private capital, net	−2.9	−6.2	−3.3
Foreign capital [2]		.3	+.3
Errors and unrecorded transactions	.5	−.7	−1.2
Balance, regular transactions	−3.5	−3.0	+.5

[1] Net, excluding advance debt repayments.

[2] Excluding foreign liquid assets.

Source: "Background Information on U.S. Balance of Payments," Senate Banking and Currency Committee (89th Cong., 1st sess.), 1965, pp. 2–3.

It is interesting to compare the data for 1958 and 1964. The arrangement of the data on page 2 of the "Background Information on the U.S. Balance of Payments," prepared for this committee, is useful for this purpose. In 1958, the first year of substantial deficits in our balance of payments, the gap was $3.5 billion. In the intervening years this problem received unremitting attention from the administration. Aid has been substantially tied. The Secretary of Defense has undertaken heroic efforts to supply military forces from the United States, at considerable dollar costs, and to induce offset purchases of military equipment to neutralize the payments leakage from our military units abroad. And during these 6 years there was a massive favorable shift in our balance on current transactions. Yet the overall balance in 1964, on regular transactions, was still slightly over $3 billion. There were enormous shifts in the subbalances, with the overall result disconcertingly similar to that for 1958.

We must, of course, not read too much into this similarity in overall results for these 2 years. Certainly it is reasonable to assume that in the absence of measures taken to reduce payments and to augment receipts, the 1964 performance would have been even more unfavorable than it was. At the same time the magnitude of the overflow was only moderately smaller than at the beginning of the period, and the major countershift neutralizing most of the improvement in the balance on current account was a sharp rise in capital outflows, with a particularly sharp rise in the outward movement of short-term funds. The pattern of this shift within an overall deficit that improved only moderately strongly suggests that our problem increasingly has been having a monetary or liquidity dimension.

ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRAM

Given the nature of the problem the administration's program has much to commend it. It has a quality of decisiveness and determination about it, and this has itself had a therapeutic effect. Undoubtedly most companies engaged in international commerce can, with some extra effort, improve the balance of their own international transactions. The program is also heavily designed to moderate the capital outflow, whose sharp rise has seemingly neutralized a good deal of the improvement elsewhere. The purist may have reservations about the approach, but in the real world there will always be policies implemented in ways that are not technically quite consonant with the impersonal forces of the marketplace.

At the same time there are some implications to the administration's approach to retarding the flow of capital that should be kept squarely before us. First, a system that allows increases in lending equal to a certain percentage of an institution's base-period volume is a system of allocating shares of the market. Yet it is the rivalry and competition for business, each trying to increase his share of the market, that constitute the dynamic forces producing progress, and this is true among financial institutions as well as in other markets.

Second, such a program may develop internal stresses that will erode its effectiveness through time. Cases will surely arise where businesses see (or, at least, think they see) their competitors using this restraint as an opportunity for some one-upsmanship. It will certainly occur to some that the next act in this unfolding drama is apt to include outright controls concerning the use of dollars abroad—in which case the prudent thing is to keep some funds abroad. (A colleague at the university, planning to spend his 1966 family vacation in Europe, asked if it might not be wise to have a modest deposit in some bank abroad.) It would be quite a departure from historical experience if these arrangements involved in the plan do not spawn a good many ingenious end plays. A system, in short, establishing rules of the game that make it in the interest of the business to do what is not wanted, and then asks him to do what is not in his own interest, will generate pressures that tend to devitalize its own effectiveness. This, in turn, can easily cause a moderate, voluntary program to metamorphose into a more extensive system of direct controls. We have already gone from tied aid, to supplying military units abroad (at greater cost) from the United States, to the interest equalization tax, to the Gore amendment, to the present more extensive program. This is not inconsequential distance already backward away from the liberal international trade and financial system which it was our objective to establish at the end of the war.

MONETARY POLICY IS THE KEY

These more ad hoc or direct approaches can facilitate the restoration of external equilibrium if—and, in my judgment, only if—they are backstopped by a moderately less easy credit policy than we now have. If the general monetary and credit situation were such, for example, that on the average financial institutions would not want their foreign lending to rise much beyond the specified percentage of last year's volume, the stresses and strains that could eviscerate the effectiveness of the administration's program (or gradually convert it to one of outright direct controls) can probably be kept below the threshold point. Recent moves toward a less easy credit policy will be helpful and may be adequate. In any case a moderately less rapid rate of monetary expansion is now clearly in order.

IMPACT ON DOMESTIC ECONOMY

Fortunately this is not a choice between vigorous, sustainable domestic expansion and equilibrium in our external payments. Indeed, the evidence increasingly suggests that the domestic economy could also do with a reduced rate of credit expansion. Since the fourth quarter of 1961, the money supply (including time deposits) has been increasing somewhat more rapidly than business activity. And by the final quarter of last year the ratio of the money supply to GNP was 52.1 percent. It is necessary to go back to 1955 to find a ratio of the money supply to GNP of comparable size (excluding, of course, the recession year of 1958). And from yearend 1964 to mid-February monetary expansion was at the rate of 10.4 percent per year (using here St. Louis Federal Reserve Bank data). The change in loan expansion is also impressive. Some decline in bank loans following the turn of the year is a normal seasonal development, and from yearend 1963 to early March 1964 loans at weekly reporting banks declined $1,194 million. During the same period this year there has been a contraseasonal increase of $1,217 million. Moreover this demand is widespread over the economy.

Money supply and GNP

[Dollar amounts in billions, seasonally adjusted]

Year	GNP	Money supply	
		Amount	Percent GNP
1955—1st quarter	384.3	$207.1	0.539
2d quarter	393.0	208.6	.531
3d quarter	403.4	210.0	.521
4th quarter	408.9	211.0	.516
1956—1st quarter	410.6	212.0	.516
2d quarter	415.0	213.6	.515
3d quarter	421.0	214.5	.510
4th quarter	430.0	215.7	.502
1957—1st quarter	438.5	218.4	.498
2d quarter	442.1	220.3	.498
3d quarter	448.3	221.7	.494
4th quarter	442.3	222.0	.502
1958—1st quarter	432.9	224.7	.519
2d quarter	437.2	229.7	.525
3d quarter	447.0	233.5	.522
4th quarter	460.6	235.9	.512
1959—1st quarter	472.0	238.7	.506
2d quarter	487.8	241.0	.511
3d quarter	482.7	242.2	.502
4th quarter	488.5	241.3	.494
1960—1st quarter	500.4	241.1	.482
2d quarter	504.1	241.2	.478
3d quarter	503.5	243.7	.484
4th quarter	502.1	246.6	.491
1961—1st quarter	500.4	250.6	.501
2d quarter	512.5	257.3	.502
3d quarter	521.9	260.8	.500
4th quarter	537.8	264.4	.492
1962—1st quarter	544.5	269.4	.495
2d quarter	552.4	274.4	.497
3d quarter	556.8	277.8	.499
4th quarter	565.2	283.8	.502
1963—1st quarter	571.8	290.3	.508
2d quarder	577.4	295.4	.517
3d quarter	587.2	300.1	.511
4th quarter	599.0	306.9	.512
1964—1st quarter	608.8	312.9	.514
2d quarter	618.6	317.9	.514
3d quarter	628.4	324.0	.516
4th quarter	634.6	330.8	.521

Source: Federal Reserve and Department of Commerce. Money supply includes time deposits.

I do not myself attach any mystical significance to monetary matters, and I do not regard myself as one who finds tight money and high interest rates inherently good things. At the same time the diffused nature of routes by which monetary changes exert their effects on business activity suggests that there is a significant lag between these monetary changes and the visible effect of these changes on the economy. In 1954–56 we saw the effect of a monetary policy that was too easy too long followed by a policy that became quite tight, too tight, trying to cope with an expansion that finally generated quite a head of steam.

Change in commercial and industrial loans at weekly reporting banks

[In millions of dollars]

Borrowers	Dec. 31, 1963, to Mar. 4, 1964	Dec. 30, 1964, to Mar. 3, 1965[1]
Manufacturing	−314	718
Durable	−14	439
Nondurable	−300	279
Mining	−206	152
Trade	−344	413
All other	−330	−66
Total	−1,194	+1,217

[1] Preliminary.

Source: Federal Reserve.

In the interests of keeping the domestic expansion orderly and vigorous, the monetary expansion in 1965 should be discernibly less than last year. And this is precisely what would also be helpful in restoring external equilibrium also. It is to be hoped that the administration, which has shown commendable determination about other aspects of the problem, will not jeopardize their own program by insistence that monetary policy remain frozen at its present posture. This committee could play an enormously constructive role by recognizing explicitly that there are times when the responsible execution of monetary policy requires shifts toward reduced rate of credit expansion.

Let me emphasize that I do not urge this because of greater concern about the international position of the dollar than for full employment at home. Ours has traditionally been a full employment economy, and it must continue to be. (There is no other period in this century when we have had such sustained unemployment as since 1958, except, of course, the great depression.) At the same time moving from 5 to 4 percent unemployment will require a more delicate performance from economic policy than when we were trying to get from 6 to 5 percent. Now there are bottlenecks that must widened, sensitive prices have been rising, some labor markets already have shortages. A policy of keeping the credit accelerator to the floor would increasingly court the risk of disorderly developments and an unnecessarily abrupt subsequent shift to tight money that could easily, as in 1957, throw us into another reversal.

A major rationale for tax reduction (which I have urged in and out of Government since early 1958), was to give the economy a stimulus, at the same time leaving us freer to adapt monetary policy and monetary conditions to the international financial and economic environment. The time has come to use some of that freedom we thereby gained.

IMPORTANCE OF STABLE COST-PRICE LEVEL

One final point. If events of recent years teach us one thing it is the crucial importance of a reasonably stable cost-price level. We see this in our own experience. In the mid-1950's cost-raising wage settlements, followed by announced price increases, became an annual Sadie Hawkins day ritual for many industries. Inflation-mindedness became pervasive, we entered upon a period of persisting unemployment, and our balance of current transactions in our external accounts by 1959 was negative. While economic policy was too deflationary from 1957 to 1959, this disinflationary policy did establish the basis for more favorable developments since. We have had vigorous expansion, our price-cost level has been quite stable, and we have had an impressive improvement in our balance on current transactions. If that inflation and inflation-mindedness of the 1950's had not been squelched, devaluation of the dollar would probably have occurred by now. Those who deplore the disinflationary policies of 1957 and 1959 (and, let me repeat, they were probably unnecessarily restrictive) must not overlook the fact that the better recent performance of the economy is the beneficiary of those earlier actions.

Increase in exports and export prices

[In percent]

Country	Export prices	Value of exports
1953 TO 1963		
Japan	−11	123
Italy	−9	73
France	−3	35
Switzerland	−1	25
Netherlands	1	45
Average of 5	−4	60
Sweden	2	40
Canada	3	17
Germany	3	100
United States	6	13
United Kingdom	9	26
Average of 5	5	39
1958 TO 1963		
Italy	−5	92
Canada	−4	26
France	−2	59
Japan		90
Sweden	2	52
Average of 5	−2	64
United States	2	30
United Kingdom	4	28
Netherlands	4	55
Germany	6	66
Switzerland	7	60
Average of 5	5	47

Source: International Financial Statistics.

We also see the importance of maintaining a stable cost-price level as we look more broadly at international experience in the last decade. The decade happens to divide at the point where our own payments deficit widened, and about the point at which major currencies became convertible. It may, therefore, be useful to look at each half of the decade separately. Suppose we examine the export experience of 10 industrial nations. In the first half of the decade the five nations with the best export-price performance had an average increase in exports of 60 percent. The five with smaller increases in export prices had an average increase in exports of 60 percent. The five with larger increases in export prices had an average increase in exports of only 39 percent. From 1958 to 1963 the same pattern is indicated. The five nations with the better price performance again experienced a larger export gain than those with less favorable export price developments.

Actually export price comparisons probably understate the extent to which our international competitive position has improved in recent years. The rise in domestic price levels abroad relative to the rise here has been far greater than the differential change in export prices. The 8-percent rise in the cost of living here since 1958 is lower than that of any other country in the table and compares well with increases elsewhere ranging up to 35 percent in Japan. The rise in these domestic price levels has undoubtedly opened up opportunities for U.S. exports, and has been a part of our strong export performance in recent years.

Cost of Living Index, December 1964 (1958=100)

Country:	*Index*
Canada	109
France	130
Germany	115
Italy	127
Japan	135
Netherlands	117
Sweden	121
Switzerland	115
United Kingdom	118
United States	108

Source: International Financial Statistics. Index is for December of the latest month available.

At the same time there is little in the data to suggest that the price of strength in world markets is a retarded, arthritic domestic economy. The nations with relatively large gains in exports tended to be those with particularly vigorous economies at home—e.g., Italy, Japan, and Germany. And the economies with a relatively poor export performance were those whose domestic economies were also sluggish. This is reasonable. The dynamic, innovative, aggressive economies are the ones that we would expect to grow both at home and in external markets.

CONCLUSION

There is much in recent developments that is encouraging. Our balance of current transactions is highly favorable. We are, therefore, spared the agonizing problems that arise with an intractable lag of exports behind imports. This critically important recovery of strength since 1959 in our balance on current account is a major dividend from our having maintained a reasonably stable cost-price level in recent years, and the basis for this was established with the disinflationary policies of the mid-1950's.

The major item on the agenda of unfinished business now is to reduce moderately the rate of credit expansion. This, as it happens, is also desirable in order to keep the domestic expansion sustainable and orderly. And a moderately less easy credit policy is also essential if the actions now being taken to implement the administration's program are not to generate internal strains that either erode the program or lead us still further down the road of capital and exchange controls, an inconvertible dollar, and an increasingly illiberal international trade and financial system.

STATEMENT OF DR. FRITZ MACHLUP, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS AND INTERNATIONAL FINANCE, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY, BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, U.S. SENATE, MARCH 17, 1965

I suppose that we all have learned that no one can forecast the balance of payments of next year or any future period. Too often have the attempted forecasts by Government departments or private experts proved wrong. While we can usually know in what direction a particular event, measure, or change will affect the external balance, there are too many variables involved to permit reasonably accurate predictions of the net outcome. Our inability to predict does not reduce the significance of research and analysis in international finance. There are enough important connections and relations about which we know a good deal and may learn more.

THE SIZE OF THE DEFICIT

One thing that many have had a hard time understanding but have finally learned is that the accounting balance of payments may be calculated in many different ways and, hence, that the size of the surplus or deficit is not uniquely determined. In order to distinguish balances measured by different arrangements of accounts and items, experts have proposed a bewildering nomenclature by adding to the "current balance" and the "capital balance," a "basic balance," a "regular transactions balance," an "official settlement balance," an "overall balance," an "exchange market balance," and a few more. While this may confuse the layman, it helps to make it clear to him that he cannot comprehend the issues involved.

There was a controversy between two administrative departments because the most widely publicized balance showed a greater deficit than would be shown under a different arrangement of accounts. In particular, if increases in dollar holdings of private foreigners were included in the regular capital balance as an inflow of foreign short-term capital, rather than treated as a way of financing a deficit of U.S. payments, the reported deficit would look much less threatening. The sound and fury about this issue is understandable only if one believes that important decisions in international finance are influenced by reports about the exact size of the U.S. deficit. Personally I doubt this. But those who believe it point to the fact that liquid dollar holdings by private foreign individuals, firms, and banks now amount to about $14 billion. The U.S. deficit in the years in which these holdings were built up would have been that much smaller had it been calculated by the method used by most European governments. Again, I do not think that statistical reporting or accounting procedures can ultimately affect the actual flow of funds among nations.

The greatest surprise to the layman comes with the statement that a deficit in the U.S. balance need not indicate anything about the position of the U.S. dollar and that, for example, the same deficit may at one time be a welcome relief of a world dollar shortage, but at another time an embarrassing deterioration of a dollar glut. The layman's shock can be mitigated by telling him that the demand for dollars to hold—the demand, that is, by private foreign parties and by official foreign authorities for liquid dollar assets in the form of balances with American banks or securities of the U.S. Government—cannot be seen from any accounting statement. There is dollar shortage when foreign authorities buy dollars with great eagerness and there is dollar glut when they buy dollars with reluctance; the balance of international payments may be exactly the same in both situations. And just as there can be dollar shortage with a deficit in U.S. payments, a dollar glut may exist with a surplus. The first situation, dollar shortage despite a U.S. deficit, existed in the early 1950's; the latter situation, dollar glut despite a U.S. surplus, may arise when the United States attains a surplus in its balance of payments while foreign parties, official or private, still feel that they hold more dollars than they want.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE DEFICIT

The worst misses in governmental forecasting were due to the fact that the officials concentrated on particular deficit items and believed that the deficit would disappear or decrease if these items were chopped down. But, alas, the balance of payments has behaved like the mythical Hydra, growing more ugly heads for each head successfully chopped off.

In 1958 the overall balance on regular transactions showed a deficit of $3.5 billion. From that year to 1964, merchandise exports increased by $8.8 billion, private income from foreign investment increased by $2.5 billion, the sum of sales of goods and all services increased by $13.3 billion, military expenditures were reduced by $600 million, and the entire balance on current transactions improved by $5.8 billion. Yet the deficit in 1964, measured the same way as in 1958, was still over $3 billion.

Evidently the strong improvement of the current balance was offset by an increase in the deficit of the capital balance. The increase in net capital outflows looks especially bad if most of the inflow of foreign short-term capital is excluded from the net capital balance—and, as we know, the Commerce Department reports do not include the acquisition of liquid dollar assets by foreigners in the regular capital balance. But in any case, looking only at the movements of private U.S. capital, the changes in recent years are quite conspicuous. Comparing the same 2 years as before, the outflow of private U.S. capital increased from $2.9 billion in 1958 to $6.2 billion in 1964—that is, by $3.3 billion.

It may be tempting to take a sharp sword and chop off this particular head of the Hydra. Can it be done without causing substitute heads to grow? No one can be sure. It is quite possible that a forced reduction in the deficit on capital account will cause a reduction in the surplus on current account. If every dollar that is forcefully kept from being sent abroad for direct investment, portfolio or other long-term investment, or for acquiring various kinds of short-term assets, were invested in the United States, in addition to what would be invested in any case, we should expect a deterioration of our current balance. On the other hand, if the dollars which are kept at home (because of the wishes of our Government) are then kept idle, or are kept from being created by the banking system, then the improvement in the capital balance need not cause a deterioration of the current balance. (Some analysts of feedback effects ask themselves what the foreigners do with the money they receive and cannot do if they do not receive it, but fail also to ask what the Americans do with the money which they are prevented from transferring.)

The interrelationships between the different accounts of the balance of payments are rather complicated, but this is no excuse for disregarding them altogether. Too often must we see that some of our official experts fail to anticipate these interrelations. The belief, for example, that a reduction in direct investments abroad will fully be reflected in an improvement in the balance of payments is naive.

My diagnosis, after examining the various items in the outflow of capital, leads me to the conclusion that a reduction of some items would lead to a reduction in the surplus on current account, whereas a reduction of other items would not affect the current balance. We shall come back to this point after looking at the breakdown of the U.S. capital account.

OUTFLOWS OF PRIVATE U.S. CAPITAL IN 1964

The statement of the Secretary of the Treasury before this subcommittee on March 9 gives, in table 8, the date on the outflow of U.S. private capital during 1964, both for the first three quarters (January to September) and for the entire year. It is important to note that the outflow picked up considerable momenum during the last quarter.

Direct investments had been $1.5 billion during the first three quarters. The figure for the year is $2.2 billion. This means that the outflow on this score was $700 million during the fourth quarter, which is an annual rate of $2.8 billion, or an increase of 40 percent over the annual rate of the first three quarters.

The purchase of foreign securities was $200 million in the first three quarters, but $700 million for the entire year. Thus, the outflow on this account was $500 million during the last quarter, which is an annual rate of $2 billion, compared with an annual rate of less than $267 million during the first three quarters. The increase is 650 percent.

Other long-term capital outflows were $800 million in the first three quarters and $1.3 billion for the entire year. This means an outflow at an annual rate of $2 billion during the last quarter, compared to an annual rate of $1.06 billion during the first three quarters. The increase is 89 percent.

The short-term capital outflow was $1.4 billion in the first three quarters, but $2 billion for the entire year. This means an annual rate of $2.4 billion during the last quarter, against $1.9 billion during the first three quarters. The increase is 26 percent.

It stands to reason that this enormous gain of momentum in the last quarter of the year cannot be entirely due to seasonal factors but occurred chiefly under the influence of expectational factors, probably in increased fear of a devaluation of the dollar and a fear of restrictions on the transfer of funds.

If it is true that the increase in capital outflow was motivated by expectational factors, one could draw the following inferences:

1. Wrong expectations can often be reversed by pronouncement and actions that demonstrate the expectations to be unjustified.

2. If expectations are reversed, not only will further capital outflows motivated by the wrong expectations be stopped, but capital may start flowing in the opposite direction.

3. If a capital outflow is not expected to last but likely to be reversed, it would be inappropriate to desire a real adjustment of the balance of payments, that is, an adjustment of the flow of goods and services to the flow of capital.

REAL ADJUSTMENT VERSUS COMPENSATORY CORRECTION

Analysts of the balance-of-payments situation have long used the dichotomy between adjustment and financing a surplus or deficit. It is analytically more appropriate to distinguish three types of changes in the balance of payments: real adjustments, compensatory corrections, and temporary financing.

Real adjustments reduce or remove an imbalance through changes in relative incomes, prices, and resource allocations. Compensatory corrections reduce or remove the need for real adjustment in the long run, either through changing the current account by means other than the forces of real adjustment or by changing donation accounts and capital accounts. Temporary financing accommodates the excess demand or excess supply in the foreign-exchange market until real adjustment is either accomplished or made unnecessary.

Most serious students of international economics adhere to the classical view that the current account should be made to adjust to the balance on capital account. To attempt the opposite, that is, to correct the flow of capital to match the balance in the flow of goods and services, is usually ineffective or inefficient. An exception to this rule, however, may be recognized with regard to purely speculative capital movements that are likely to reverse their direction in due course. Thus, if we believe that a large part of the present deficit on capital account is only temporary and reversible, then we should not insist on a real adjustment of the balance of payments. It would be wasteful to force a flow of goods and services to match a flow of funds that can be expected to be reversed in the near future.

The implications of these general statements for our analysis of the outflow of U.S. private capital are the following: To the extent that the capital outflow is induced by differences in the marginal productivity of investment here and abroad, we should not interfere with such outflow but should instead facilitate real adjustment of the current balance. To the extent, however, that the capital outflow is motivated by reversible expectations, we should not insist on a real adjustment but should instead promote the reversal of the expectations.

REVERSING THE EXPECTATIONS

We have not been very astute in persuading people here and abroad that their expectations or fears are unfounded. On the contrary, our behavior has been designed to reinforce the two kinds of fears that motivate the outflow of capital, the fear that the dollar may be devalued, and the fear that transfers of funds abroad may be restricted. Let us discuss what we have done to increase these fears and what we might do to reduce them.

The fear of devaluation

1. Instead of freeing all our gold for export; that is, for the repurchase of our dollar liabilities, we have taken only a half measure and have left on our statute books the requirement of a 25-percent gold reserve for Federal Reserve notes. This strengthens widely held expectations to the effect that we are not prepared to use all our gold in the defense of the external value of the dollar.

2. Whenever certain foreign monetary authorities have announced that they would use some of their dollar holdings for purchasing gold from us, we have responded with a frown. Yet, any reluctance or sign of indignation about an outflow of gold strengthens the belief of the people that we consider this as a weakening of our position. If my banker frowned and sighed whenever I cashed a check, I would certainly not wish to keep my deposit with him. We ought to give up our gold not with reluctance and apprehension, but with an air of friendly nonchalance.

3. Our attitude concerning our gold holdings should change completely: We should invite all reluctant holders of dollars to come and buy as much gold as they wish; we should insist that no one hold dollars just to accommodate us; dollars should be held only by those who really prefer interest-bearing dollars to sterile gold.

4. This preference for dollars over gold could be forcefully increased if we accepted the suggestion made in the minority views on the "Annual Report of the Joint Economic Committee," 87th Congress, 2d session, 1962. According to this suggestion, the United States should eliminate its guarantee to purchase "gold from foreigners at $35 an ounce or at any other predetermined price." In the minority view, the "termination of the guarantee to buy at a fixed price would be likely to sharply reduce [gold] speculation and, at the same time, stimulate a return of sizable amounts of gold to the United States." If there is serious doubt that gold can always be sold to governmental and monetary authorities, the speculators' risk of loss from holding gold may be too great and he may convert it into dollars.

5. A more effective policy for reversing expectations concerning the future of the dollar would be the acceptance of a plan which I presented in 1960. It consists in a gradual lowering of the price of gold, say by 1 percent every quarter of a year. I shall refrain from discussing it at this point, because I know that the resistance to it cannot be overcome.

The fear of restrictions

While we have done badly regarding the fears of devaluation, we have done even worse concerning the fears of restrictions. In fact, we have created and promoted such fears.

1. From some semiofficial quarters the possibility of governmental restrictions on the outflow of capital was suggested a few months ago. This was incredibly stupid.

2. We have actually introduced guidelines and challenges which, if they are not regarded as restrictions, are widely considered as the first step toward restrictions.

3. To reverse these fears we ought to tell every businessman that he should use his funds wherever business interests indicate. If we could possibly assure businessmen that there would be neither direct controls or restrictions nor any moral suasion, neither any obligation to make reports on foreign transactions nor any publicity about nonconformance with official directives, we would soon see a flow of funds returning from abroad.

RADICAL CHANGES IN OUR SYSTEM

Again and again in recent years have we heard warnings against radical changes of our monetary and economic system. All sorts of plans have been criticized and rejected on this score. There have been warnings against the complete removal of the gold reserve requirements, against floating and even against a little more flexible exchange rates, against changes in the price of gold, against an international central bank, and even against modest extensions of powers of the International Monetary Fund, etc. I submit that any or all of these changes would be less radical than the change promulgated during the last 2 weeks in the issuance of guidelines by the Federal Reserve Board and the challenges to private business by the Secretary of Commerce. Not since the NRA in 1933 has this country attempted in peacetime to transform the managements of private business into lengthened arms of the Government. By calling on the business community—even if this is confined to 600 business firms—for voluntary cooperation we have taken an enormous step away from our system of free enterprise.

Protestations to the effect that these guidelines and exhortations are not prohibitions or binding regulations reveal a lack of understanding. Some think there is a great difference between outright prohibition of certain transactions under the threat of legal sanctions and mere exhortation against these transactions under the threat of publicity in the case of nonconformance. In actual fact, corporate management is more afraid of a threat of adverse publicity than of a fine of a few thousand dollars. Hence, I submit that the guidelines and the program of voluntary cooperation are in effect restrictions and regulations of private banking and private business. That there was no outcry against this radical change of our system of free enterprise indicates the degree to which our people's belief in fundamental values of our economic system has weakened and the belief in the benefits from a system of public regulation has grown stronger.

My lament for free enterprise will not strike many sympathetic chords. It will probably be regarded as an expression of the nostalgia, if not hysteria, of an old-fashioned libertarian. I am painfully aware of this. But my warnings against our present policy are not merely on these general grounds. They are also on the ground that our policy will be effective only if the adverse expectations about the future of the dollar are reversed—and in this case the interference with business decisions would be superfluous. Indeed, the reversal of expectations would be much more easily achieved if Government did not feel compelled to resort to measures involving moral compulsion.

I conclude that the measures are either not necessary or futile. Their quick repeal would be more helpful than the most punctilious voluntary cooperation would be. For such cooperation cannot last if it becomes too expensive.

CONCLUSION

Where does all this leave me? Although I repeat that most forecasts of balance of payments are worthless, I shall attempt a diagnosis of the present situation.

The deficit of our capital balance includes large amounts of speculative, reversible movements. In my judgment the reversible portion is large enough for us to rely on this correction as one that would make further adjustments of the balance on current account unnecessary.

The reversible flow of capital depends on expectations regarding the future value of the dollar as well as the freedom of transferring dollars back and forth without any restrictions or inhibitions. If favorable expectations could be created on both these scores, I would be quite optimistic about the disappearance of the present dollar glut without resort to policies injurious to our economy or the world economy.

TRIBUTE TO ADM. SAMUEL ELIOT MORISON

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, those who have attended Harvard College have been privileged to study history under Adm. Samuel Eliot Morison. Millions of other people have had the opportunity to learn our history from his many books. Admiral Morison has also served as official historian of the U.S. Navy.

Now Admiral Morison has published another historical work called, "The Oxford History of the American People," which adds another major work to a long and distinguished career as a historian.

I ask unanimous consent that an article on Admiral Morison appearing in the New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 5, 1965]

MORISON REMAINS THE ADMIRAL WHO RULES THE SEAS OF HISTORY—AFTER 50 YEARS OF WRITING, HE PREPARES TO LAUNCH A STUDY OF AMERICA

(By Harry Gilroy)

BOSTON, March 3.—Samuel Eliot Morison, who has written and lived history for 50 years and has capped it all with 5 years of intensive work on "The Oxford History of the American People," sums it all up with, "I'm proud of being an American."

The 1-volume, 1,150-page work will be published by the Oxford University Press on April 22. The history ranges from sometime between 13000 and 17000 B.C. when a 30-year-old woman was buried near what is now Midland, Tex., to the end of the administration of John F. Kennedy.

"I absorbed history from birth," Mr. Morison said last night. A hint of a smile brightened his serious face just as a blue-and-white polka-dot bow tie lightened his dark gray suit. He sat in a book-lined room at his home at 44 Brimmer Street, a red-brick house on a street that still has red brick sidewalks.

The historian was born there in 1887. Charles W. Eliot, who became president of Harvard University, was a cousin. Harrison Gray Otis, a leader of the Federalist Party, was an ancestor.

When Mr. Morison was in his junior year at Harvard he disclosed to Prof. Alfred Bushnell Hart that the Otis papers were in the family wine cellar; he was immediately put to work on what became his first book.

THE MANTLE OF CHANNING

He won his doctorate with the two-volume work, and Prof. Edward Channing then confided that he was tired of teaching colonial history. Mr. Morison recalled that the professor had said, "Now Sammy if you keep out of jail and not run around with too many radicals and socialites, we'll get you into Harvard and you can take over colonial history." And that's what happened.

At this point, Mr. Morison's recital was interrupted.

"Admiral, you give the wrong impression," expostulated his wife, a lovely blonde woman in a cantaloupe-colored dress. She always uses his naval title. His connection with the Navy began when he entered as a lieutenant commander in World War II, in which he saw action, and continued throughout the writing of the 15-volume "History of U.S. Naval Operations in World War II."

"He is a Renaissance man," she said. "He is a wonderful sailor. He has gone fox hunting. He has been socially gay. He has gone to balls, loved music, lived in the old way that no longer exists. When he writes history, it is with knowledge of what things are really like on all levels and in all kinds of things."

Mr. Morison smiled over his wife's comments and added:

"I have no imagination. I can't write about a battlefield until I have been over it nor about sea warfare unless I have taken part in it."

IN THE WAKE OF COLUMBUS

That is what led Professor Morison from Harvard in 1938 on a voyage to duplicate Columbus' and to the book "Admiral of the Ocean Sea: a Life of Christopher Columbus." Professor Morrison received a Pulitzer Prize for the work.

"Lots of people still believe the myth that Columbus made his first voyage to prove the world was round. I wrote that book to correct such myths and to show what great things Columbus accomplished on all his voyages."

The historian has rendered services to or has known leading figures in the administrations of every President since Woodrow Wilson. President Johnson has given him the Presidential Medal of Freedom.

Mr. Morison said that his new book deals not only with American leaders and great issues but also with ordinary American people.

He added that when he thought over the sweep of history, "I feel very proud of the American people."

He mentioned that he had been 3 years at Oxford University and was very happy there.

"But I never dreamed of becoming British as T. S. Eliot and Henry James did," he said. "I am an American and I am proud of being an American."

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, Greek Independence Day has a special meaning for Americans. When Greek patriots rose against their oppressors 144 years ago, they became the first European people to carry on the American movement for independence. Americans of that day could not help but make the Greek cause their own. Even though the common historical experience of both our countries goes back a scant century and a half, the ideals and principles which form the basis of our political and social institutions and which gave impetus to our desire for freedom can be traced through the centuries to the inception of democracy in the Greek city states.

At the time of the revolution, American leaders expressed their sympathy for the Greek cause. Some volunteered to serve with the sorely outnumbered Greek patriots and others organized efforts to send at least symbolic aid to the Greeks. The struggle for independence was long and bitter. The Greeks, however, saw their tenacity crowned with success and after many centuries of foreign rule freedom was gained by the Treaty of Adrianople of 1829, followed by the London protocol of 1830. During the next century the Greeks devoted themselves to encompassing all persons of Greek heritage within their national boundaries and to establishing a stable government.

With the beginning of World War II they again showed fierce devotion to freedom and independence by repelling the Italian invasion of 1940 and by stubbornly resisting the German invasion of 1941. The end of World War II, however, brought no respite to the Greeks, who faced a new and ominous threat within their boundaries in the form of armed Communist guerrilla bands seeking to overthrow the Government. Although the struggle against the guerrillas was long and delayed economic reconstruction by several years, it, too, was crowned with success.

Since that time we have been gratified to see the establishment of a strong, stable Government in Greece and to observe the development of a pulsing, growing economy. During my visit to Greece in 1962, I was impressed not only by the extraordinary beauty of the country with its many historical and cultural monuments, but especially by the warm friendliness and progressive spirit of the people. I am proud of the many significant and lasting contributions that they and their American descendants have made to the heritage of Massachusetts and our Nation. It is, indeed, a great pleasure for me to extend my greeting to the people of Greece and to their many friends and relatives in the United States on this celebration of their independence.

BANKING VERSUS THE ANTITRUST LAWS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Miami Herald of March 16 entitled, "Unscramble a $7-Billion Omlet."

Mr. President, this editorial refers to the decision of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of New York in the Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co. case decided on March 11, 1965. This opinion was the outgrowth of two decisions by the Supreme Court; *U.S.* v. *Philadelphia National Bank,* 374 U.S. 321 (1962) and *U.S.* v. *First National Bank & Trust Co. of Lexington,* 376 U.S. 665 (1964). In the Philadelphia and Lexington cases the Supreme Court, for the first time in its history, held that bank mergers were subject to section 7 of the Clayton Act and section 1 of the Sherman Act. The Philadelphia case held that the proposed merger would violate both section 7 of the Clayton Act and the Sherman Act. The Lexington case held that the merger there violated the Sherman Act. The Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co. case held that its merger violated section 1 of the Sherman Act and section 7 of the Clayton Act.

These decisions were reached although the responsible Government agencies which considered the applications for mergers had held, after considering all the factors involved including both banking factors and competitive factors, that the mergers were affirmatively in the public interest. In addition, in the New York case the New York State banking superintendent of banks had also approved the merger.

I said at the time the Philadelphia decision was announced that it was "one of the most incredible cases of judicial legislation which the Court has handed down." I also said that I was shocked both at the result and the Court's casual disregard for congressional intent and purpose. I pointed out that Congressman CELLER, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, had testified in favor of the Bank Merger Act, though with stronger provisions, because bank mergers were not covered by section 7 of the Clayton Act. Five representatives from the Justice Department also testified to this fact—Attorney General Brownell in 1957, Deputy Attorney General Walsh in 1959, Judge Barnes in 1956, Judge Hanson in 1957 and the Honorable Robert A. Bicks in 1960. In addition, Congressman CELLER induced the House to pass an amendment to section 7 of the Clayton Act which would have made it apply to bank mergers, but this failed in the Senate. Finally, an amendment was proposed by Senator O'Mahoney to the Bank Merger Act in 1959 which would have imposed the stricter standards of the Clayton Act, but this was defeated by a vote of 29 yeas and 55 nays. In its report the committee intended to leave no doubt that section 7 of the Clayton Act should not apply. It said:

> Since there was widespread agreement that some mergers were in the public interest and should be approved, even though they might result in a substantial lessening of competition, the committee concluded that the strict rule of the 1950 amendment of section 7 of the Clayton Act was inappropriate to the field of banking * * *.
>
> The committee, therefore, concluded that it was preferable to handle bank mergers under rules specially designed for the banking industry.

The decision in the Philadelphia case was entirely unexpected. Mr. Justice Harlan condemned it by saying:

> I suspect that no one will be more surprised than the Government to find that the Clayton Act has carried the day for its case in this Court.

He went on—

> The result is, of course, that the Bank Merger Act is almost completely nullified; its enactment turns out to have been an exorbitant waste of congressional time and energy.
>
> This frustration of a manifest congressional design is, in my view, a most unwarranted intrusion upon the legislative domain.

In the Lexington case Mr. Justice Harlan's dissent criticized the application of the Sherman Act—made necessary because the Government had not thought that the Clayton Act would apply when it filed its complaint—on the ground that, "The truth is, of course, that this is, if anything, a Clayton Act case masquerading in the garb of the Sherman Act."

At the time of the Philadelphia decision I said that it was too early to tell just what the decision means. It now seems clear that at least it will mean an effort by the Department of Justice and the courts, carried out with the threat of contempt fines and the appointment of masters in chicanery, to split the merged bank into two different banks. What with the changes that have gone on and the growth that has occurred since the merger, they will clearly not be the same two banks they were originally. How the depositors, borrowers, and other customers, and how the officers, employees, and stockholders will feel toward these new banks we do not know. I think we are now beginning, however, to see the unfortunate results of ill-considered efforts by the Supreme Court to supersede the Congress as the legislative body of the United States.

The editorial from the Miami Herald is a clear and convincing picture of the dangers that lie before us in this field.

I also ask to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter from the Honorable K. A. Randall, Director of FDIC in which he endorses the views of Mr. Justice Harlan concerning the meaning and effect of the Bank Merger Act and its construction by the courts.

There being no objection, the editorial and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Miami (Fla.) Herald, Mar. 16, 1965]

UNSCRAMBLE A $7 BILLION OMELET?

A slight rash of bank mergers around the country in 1961 has been followed by Justice Department action to undo what many thought logical and lawful at the time.

The most spectacular of these antitrust suits involves Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co. of New York, a $7 billion institution. Whether the Federal Government is right or wrong, the timing of the matter gives pause. How do you unscramble these eggs after 4 years?

Under a Federal court ruling which warned of "a clear and imminent threat that a handful of banks are likely to sew the market up tight," the New York concern must be returned to the two-bank status which obtained in 1961.

No more intricate and costly divestiture could be imagined.

A bank is essentially a service industry. If it is sizable, it is involved every day in thousands of transactions embracing tens of thousands of persons in one manner or another. Manufacturers Hanover, for example, has 136 branches throughout New York City. The task of pulling all of this apart and making two out of one would be staggering.

Even more disturbing is the strange history of the New York case.

When Manufacturers and Hanover came together in 1961 the merger had the explicit blessing of the Federal Reserve Board. The Antitrust Division of the Justice Department waited until the day of the actual merger, which took many months to arrange, before it attacked what one arm of Government already had applauded and which the court has acknowledged is desirable though illegal.

If the law is pursued relentlessly in an industry which has known many mergers over the years the result could be banking chaos.

FEDERAL DEPOSIT
INSURANCE CORPORATION,
Washington, March 25, 1965.

Hon. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This note is for your information following my discussions with your chief of staff, Mr. Matthew Hale, relating to an article in the American Banker, March 23.

* * * * *

Without any qualification, I believe that the Bank Merger Act of 1960 is the finest, clearest statement of policy in regard to mergers and competition the bank regulatory agencies have ever had. Problems arose when the Philadelphia-Girard case was superimposed upon the Bank Merger Act standards.

The legislative history, the terms of the act, and your statements on the floor of the Senate should leave no doubt in anyone's mind that section 7 of the Clayton Act was not to be used in bank merger cases. Mr. Justice Harlan, in his dissent, clarified this position, and I would hope that someday this magnificent dissent could find its way to the foreground of interpretation in this area of bank supervision.

A further problem relating to the Philadelphia-Girard case is the definition of "a line of commerce." As you know the Justice Department allows only commercial banking to be measured as a competitive factor under their regulations yet, from the legislative history, the bank supervisory agencies are required, as they should be, to look at the competitive effects of other financial intermediaries.

Again, Senator, may I state that I support your philosophy wholeheartedly.

Kindest personal regards.

Sincerely yours,

K. A. RANDALL,
Director.

THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal for March 24, 1965, contained an editorial entitled "A Question of Perversion"; the Greensboro Daily News for March 23, 1965, carried an editorial entitled "Special Laws and Blanket Indictments"; and the Washington Evening Star for March 24, 1965, carried an article, by Richard Wilson, entitled "Question Lingers on Voting Bill." These editorials and this article made some sound observations concerning the pending Federal voting rights bill, and merit the thoughtful consideration of all men who revere the Constitution of the United States, and wish to preserve constitutional government in this country. For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that these editorials and this article be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 24, 1965]

A QUESTION OF PERVERSION

When the Attorney General began his explanation and defense of the proposed Federal voting bill he adopted a fascinating line of reasoning that deserves more attention than it seems to be getting.

Appearing before a Senate judiciary subcommittee, Mr. Katzenbach made no claim that the Constitution gives to the Federal Government the authority to set voting qualifications in all the several States, nor did he cite any Supreme Court opinions to suggest that the Federal Government has this power.

He hardly could have. For the very first article of the Constitution—reaffirmed by the 17th amendment—lays down only one qualification which the National Government may insist upon—namely, that all voters qualified to vote for the most numerous branch of any State legislature must be qualified also to vote in any national election.

The 15th amendment to the Constitution adds one other, and a very important one. It is that no State may take away the voting rights of any citizen "on account of" his race or color. And the 24th amendment bars poll taxes as a requirement for voting.

In short, then, the Constitution says this: No State may set higher qualifications for voting in Federal elections than in State ones, that no poll taxes shall be levied, and that every citizen must be treated equally by the voting laws of each State. Within that framework, each State is free to establish its own qualifications as to age, length of residency, literacy, and the like.

This view has been consistently affirmed by the Supreme Court. Only 8 years ago, in a case specifically involving a literacy test in North Carolina, the Court repeated that "the States have long been held to have broad powers to determine the conditions under which the right of suffrage may be exercised." The limitation on that power, in the Court's words, is that they cannot authorize "the discrimination which the Constitution condemns."

So to justify a Federal law to override State voting requirements and permit the Federal Government to eliminate literacy requirements entirely in some States, Mr. Katzenbach had to adopt the line of reasoning that the abuse of a principle condemns the whole principle.

That is, he argues that the Federal Government, under color of the 15th amendment, has the authority to override the constitutional right of some States because literacy tests "have been perverted to test not literacy, not ability, not understanding—but race." And this is sufficient reason for the Federal Government to eliminate them entirely wherever such perversion has taken place.

This argument, please note, is quite different from an argument for a Federal law requiring that all literacy tests be fair and equitable and that Federal authorities be authorized, wherever necessary, to see that it is so.

The fact that literacy tests can be fair, and equitable, in fact, is conceded; the literacy test of New York State will be left untouched, as will those in a number of other States. But the distinction is not made on an examination of the individual merits, judicially measured, of such tests. The merits or demerits would be measured, under this law, by how many people vote.

On Mr. Katzenbach's line of reasoning the Congress could have abolished poll taxes—surely a thing susceptible to abuse—by simple statute instead of, as was properly done, by constitutional amendments.

Indeed, on this line of reasoning the fact that police powers are sometimes abused by local policemen—and they certainly are—would become an argument not for halting the abuse but for eliminating the local police powers.

For our own part, we have no reason to doubt that in some places the constitutional principle under which each State sets its own voting requirement has been perverted to deny some people the voting rights they are entitled to. And we agree that this is a strong argument for national action to remedy those abuses, wherever occurring.

But if that is also an argument for altering the Constitution in unconstitutional fashion, then what the Attorney General of the United States is saying is that one perversion justifies another.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Mar. 23, 1965]

Special Laws and Blanket Indictments

In the present tense situation in Alabama Federal officials—and indeed everyone connected with the civil rights controversy—should check carefully on facts and figures before sounding off in public.

Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach failed to do this in remarks made before a House committee last Friday. The substance of his testimony was sound—much of the civil rights story in the South had been one of "intimidation, discouragement and delay" in the struggle to win full citizenship rights for Negroes.

But the Attorney General barked up the wrong tree when he dragged 34 eastern North Carolina counties into the picture and linked them with Alabama. The reference was to the projected abolition of literacy tests in counties where less than 50 percent of eligible citizens turned out to vote—and they included Aroostook County in Maine as well as most of four Southern States, parts of Alaska and Arizona and 34 counties in North Carolina.

"They may have had a snowstorm in Aroostook County," the Attorney General told the committee, "but they didn't have a snowstorm in 34 counties of North Carolina, and they didn't have a snowstorm in Mississippi."

No, there was no snowstorm down here last November. But as for North Carolina neither was there specific "intimidation, discouragement or delay" in registration or voting for Negro citizens. The only protests about registration delays in North Carolina in recent years have been confined to one county, Halifax—and that situation has now been cleared.

Let it be understood by Mr. Katzenbach and others, including President Johnson and Rev. Martin Luther King, that North Carolina cannot be tarred with the brush of Alabama or Mississippi. Negro citizens have had the right to register to vote here just as other citizens have. They have been subjected to the same kind of literacy tests which apply for all other would-be voters—except in several very rare situations in Halifax County.

To equate conditions in North Carolina with those in Dallas County simply because less than 50 percent of the eligible voters went to the polls last November is presumptuous and inaccurate. It indicts the thinking behind the President's new Federal voting legislation.

There are far, far more reasons than racial discrimination behind some of the voting apathy in North Carolina, Mississippi or New York. As we noted the other day, the Guilford County Elections Board has tried to cooperate in getting more registrants on the books; a study of its recent efforts reveals that even voters signed up by an intensive campaign have stayed away from the general election in droves.

It is grossly unfair to infer that simply because 50 percent of the eligible voters failed to go to the polls, racial discrimination is the reason.

The more we study the President's Federal voting legislation, the more we are convinced that the 50-percent figure is ill advised. Indeed, the whole idea of setting up special laws to cover certain statistical situations may not work fairly. The Federal Government's duty is to see that all citizens are allowed to register and vote if they desire to do so. It is not to create special rules for some citizens which do not apply to all citizens. And that quite clearly would be done if literacy tests and other voter qualifications are abolished in certain areas but allowed to flourish in others.

Basic constitutional principles are involved on both sides of this controversy over suffrage rights. One principle ought not to receive higher priority than another, closer home, and the Attorney General should watch his blanket indictments based on fuzzy statistics.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 24, 1965]

Question Lingers on Voting Bill

(By Richard Wilson)

The question that the advocates of the new voting rights bill have as yet failed to answer adequately is this: Why should literacy tests as a qualification for voting be perfectly all right in 45 of the 50 States but invalid in the other 5?

If a voter in Alabama who cannot read or write is qualified to vote in a Federal or any other election why should not an illiterate New Yorker have the same right? The right to vote certainly has no connection with the number of people who vote, and it is manifestly unjust to bar an illiterate from voting in a State where less than 50 percent of the qualified voters cast their ballots, but to permit him to vote in a State where more than 50 percent of the voters go to the polls.

This, nevertheless, would be the effect in 606 counties in 10 States of the passage of the voter rights bill sent to Congress by President Johnson.

The only justification offered for this anomaly is that it is the only way to force election officials in those 10 States to register Negroes to vote. Otherwise, they will enforce prohibitive regulations that prevent Negroes from voting, but not enforce the same regulations on whites who could not meet the qualifications.

This is another example of the devious legislative tactics in the Johnson administration to achieve results by legal circumlocution. Another outstanding example is the aid to education bill that attempts to get around the church-state issue.

From the President's recent statements it can be concluded that what he really desires is the removal of virtually all restrictions on voting for persons 18 years old, and over, if they are sane, and in spite of the fact that the Supreme Court would have to reverse itself in finding that the imposition of reasonable qualifications is valid.

It must be admitted that literacy tests as a qualification for voting are honored in the breach in the North. Thirty States have no such requirements. States that do have literacy requirements often do not enforce them, or the enforcement is so cursory as to be meaningless.

New York requires proof of an eighth grade education or demonstration of the ability to read as a requirement for voters. This excludes a great many people, including recently arrived Pureto Ricans, from voting and is being challenged in the courts. Previous Federal legislation proposals would have required a sixth grade education as proof of literacy.

Residency requirements are universal. In short, people are not born in this country with an inherent right to vote at any time or any place. This is a right for which they must qualify by tests that vary from State to State, and which was affirmed by a 1959 Supreme Court decision. The layman would think that the Constitution is quite clear on this point in its 1st article and in the 17th amendment, to say nothing of the 1959 decision of the Supreme Court.

Furthermore, the Johnson voting rights bill recognizes this principle by providing that a voter shall be stricken from the rolls if he fails to vote at least once in 3 consecutive years. Thus the Federal law would impose restrictions Congress regards as reasonable while outlawing other restrictions imposed by the States.

Why is not the issue confronted squarely? Why is Congress not asked to abolish literacy requirements in all States altogether?

The answer to that is clear. It is because literacy requirements have validity both in reason and in law. It makes sense that a voter should have at least an elementary ability to read and write the language of the country in which he resides. It makes sense that States should have the power to set reasonable minimum standards for voters, and the proposed law recognizes that by itself setting some standards. It hardly needs to be argued, also, that a Federal law should apply equally to the citizens of all States.

The strange, awkward, and unequal nature of this new legislation shows how wrong it is to try to legislate on such complicated matters in an atmosphere of violence-provoking public demonstrations.

The Johnson administration was rushed into the presentation of a law that has so many obvious flaws that it can immediately be challenged in the courts. Elaborate and tricky formulas provide no answer for a more basic question: Why in a nation with compulsory, universal public education are so many people, Negro and white, illiterate? And why should there be a premium on illiteracy in some States and not in others?

MENTAL ILLNESS AND INSTABILITY—ADDRESS BY LUTHER W. YOUNGDAHL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, recently the Honorable Luther W. Youngdahl, judge of the District Court for the District of Columbia, addressed the American Association of School Administrators, at Atlantic City, N.J. In his speech, he outlined the basic necessity for a concerted attack on the problems of mental illness and instability in some 48 million young Americans. Judge Youngdahl, when he was Governor of the State of Minnesota, first turned the attention of our State to the problems of mental health, a concern and emphasis followed in and amplified by the present fine and able Governor of the State of Minnesota, Karl F. Rolvaag.

His concern parallels that of our President, Lyndon B. Johnson, in providing full utilization of Federal programs to combat mental illness and retardation. I ask unanimous consent that Judge Youngdahl's speech be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

New Frontiers in Mental Health: Developing the Potential of Our Youth

(An address by Judge Luther W. Youngdahl, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, to the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, N.J., February 17, 1965)

While looking through one of the recent issues of your bulletin, the School Administrator, I came across some striking examples of the foresightedness of your association. In 1891, for example, it appeared that your predecessors passed a resolution limiting speakers to 5 minutes. At a later meeting it was ruled that "all speakers discussing a paper shall speak without a manuscript."

I should like to be exempted from both these rulings today in order that that I may speak to you about a subject very close to my heart—the role of mental health in developing the potential of our Nation's most precious natural resource: our youth.

My interest in mental health dates back to more than 40 years ago when I was assistant city attorney of Minneapolis. It seemed to me then that a large number of cases involved some kind of emotional disturbance. When I became Governor of Minnesota in 1947, it was only natural that one of my major concerns should be mental health. In the intervening years, more than 28 of which have been on the bench, I have seen many tragic cases, but most tragic by far have been those involving young people.

You, too, have had a long-standing interest in our youth. As early as 1894, your predecessors recommended that the States enact laws permitting the introduction of kindergartens into the public school system. There have also been resolutions endorsing vocational education and urging that schools discourage children from forming the habit of smoking cigarettes. I was particularly interested in a proposal made in 1908 urging that large cities set up special ungraded classes to instruct children of immigrants unable to speak English. This was accompanied by a proposal for evening school to teach the English language to adult immigrants. These early resolutions of the American Association of School Administrators bear a striking resemblance to some of the President's recent proposals for our educational system that come in response to a long-standing need.

The President's program is designed to bring the full benefits of education to our youth. I was particularly interested in the proposals for preschool programs to overcome the effects of cultural impoverishment, and for special educational resource centers. These centers would, among other things, provide services for physically and mentally handicapped children. This program offers us a great opportunity to deal constructively with two major impediments to the learning process—cultural deprivation and emotional instability. It also offers a vehicle for closer cooperation between mental health and the schools.

As the educational leaders of America, you have been expected to overcome many obstacles, and it must have often seemed that you were doing it singlehandedly. The responsibility for bringing the benefits of a universal, free public education to 48 million young Americans is no small matter. Moreover, the importance of the task steadily increases as our society becomes one in which there is little room for the unskilled and uneducated.

For years—indeed throughout the history of our country—the schools have stood alone in facing the problem of how to educate the seemingly ineducable. You have been confronted with children who are incapable, antagonistic, or, at best, indifferent toward learning. Your profession and your own instincts demand that you design an educational system fitted to the abilities, interests, and needs of every child. Thus you must find a way to help the social misfits, the physically and emotionally handicapped, and the culturally deprived, while at the same time meeting the needs of the academically able.

It is not an easy dilemma; but it is one that thousands of men and women devoted to the field of mental health are trying to help you solve. This challenge of bringing young people to their fullest intellectual and emotional potential has marshaled the forces of education and mental health into a new partnership. Together, you stand at the edge of the greatest frontier man has ever faced—the unexplored reaches of the human mind.

Most people have accepted without much questioning the widely prevalent idea that there is a stigma attached to mental illness; that nothing can be done about it; and that the unhappy victims must be put away in some institution to spend the rest of their days.

These ridiculed, abused, and maligned members of our social family cannot speak for themselves. They are made mute by sickness, guarded walls, and the loss of their civil rights. Their heartbroken families are rendered equally silent by the cruel stigma which false social attitudes attach to the mentally ill. Casualties of the spirit, voiceless and powerless, their very personalities, yes, their very lives are completely dependent on the concern, wisdom, and compassion of those of us who are more fortunate.

Almost two decades ago, while Governor of Minnesota, I secured the passage of legislation establishing a bill of rights for the mentally ill. The first sentence in this bill of rights stated that mental illness is a disease to which there should be no shame or stigma attached. We have been slow to change our thinking in this area of human relationship. But the time has come when a vast majority of the mentally ill need no longer be put away in an institution—out of sight, out of mind.

One of the first efforts at exploration is being made through a vast new national mental health program to help men reach their maximum potential with minds free from emotional disturbance. In this unprecedented effort, every possible community resource will be used to improve the mental health of our citizens. The community mental health program, as it is called, has two major objectives: First, to treat mental illness in the community rather than in distant State hospitals; second, to prevent mental illness by finding and eradicating its causes.

A test was given in an institution for the mentally ill to determine whether the sick individual was ready for release. The patient was placed beside a tap of running water. A large empty tub was placed beneath the tap. An empty pail was placed beside the tub and the patient was asked to bail out the water. If he started to bail out the water without first turning off the tap, the source of supply, it was concluded that he did not have sufficient judgment and discretion to justify his release from the institution. But if he first turned off the tap, the source of supply, and then started to bail out the water, it was determined that he had sufficient judgment and discretion to warrant his release from the hospital. I am sure you can quickly draw the analogy that we have not been paying enough attention to prevention in eradicating the causes of mental illness. You will observe that the real thrust of this new program is the emphasis on prevention.

One-fourth of all Americans are in the Nation's classrooms. Thus the schools are in a unique position to detect children who, left unaided, may develop serious learning problems and mental illness. Of all community resources, the schools are perhaps the most vital factor in insuring the success of this program. In return, they will have much to gain from its successful operation.

Let me further describe this effort which Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY has termed "one of the boldest programs in the field of mental health in the history of the world," by briefly tracing its historical development.

In the 1840's Dorothea Lynde Dix's crusade against the misery of the mentally ill led to the establishment of a State hospital system. Over the years, rising numbers of patients caused these institutions to become deplorably overcrowded. In 1908, Clifford Beers, a former mental patient, criticized squalid conditions in State mental hospitals. His book, "A Mind That Found Itself," heralded the beginning of an organized citizen's mental hygiene movement.

During World War II, when one in eight young men were rejected for military service because of emotional instability, the need for better psychiatric treatment in this country became shockingly apparent. As a result, Congress enacted legislation in 1946 authorizing the establishment of the National Institute of Mental Health in Bethesda, Md. This act brought to fruition the idea of Federal aid advanced by Dorothea Dix a century earlier.

In 1949, the new National Institute of Mental Health became the focus for the Federal Government's program supporting research into the causes of mental illness, training of needed mental health personnel, and aid to the States in developing mental health services in the community. The introduction of tranquilizing drugs in the mid-1950's gave tremendous momentum to the community psychiatry movement by making it possible to treat large numbers of hospitalized patients and to discharge many others.

Several more years of planning ways to provide adequate services to the mentally ill in the community culminated in February 1963 with President Kennedy's message in behalf of mental health. He told Congress, "We need a new type of health facility, one which will return mental health care to the mainstream of American medicine, and at the same time upgrade mental health services." Construction of this new type of facility—the community mental health center—became possible in October 1963, with passage of the Community Mental Health Centers Act. This legislation authorized Federal matching funds for use by the States to construct comprehensive community mental health centers.

This new national approach involves much more than the construction of a network of at least 500 mental health centers by 1970. It involves a shift in orientation to include both treatment and prevention of mental illness.

A center will provide a full range of services—from diagnosis and treatment to rehabilitation—at the time of the patient's need, and near his home. In many communities this will mean coordinating existing services and facilities to allow patients to move from one to another without administrative hinderance.

In addition, and equally important, a center will provide consultative services to individuals and agencies who daily deal with the public. Clergymen, general practitioners, pediatricians, judges, police officers, and teachers will be assisted in recognizing the warning signs of emotional disturbance and in knowing how to find help. As society's gatekeepers they will be able to unite in an integrated effort toward promoting better mental health.

The success of this great undertaking will depend upon the vigorous support of States and communities, professional and voluntary groups, and individual citizens. Already planning groups comprised of nongovernment professional people, including educators and other school representatives, are involved in developing State plans.

Like all great social movements, this one will require the support of thousands of individuals—persons like yourselves who have such a vital role in community affairs. It is imperative that the entire community, and particularly the schools, join in this endeavor. Our hopes for eventually bringing men to their fullest intellectual and emotional potential are closely tied to the success of this program.

As the mental health centers program evolves, the world unfortunately is not standing still. Emotional problems and their consequences continue to beset society, and the schools have their share.

Recent research discoveries, however, have given us a better awareness of how to prevent the worst effects of two factors that hamper and often stagnate the learning process in schoolchildren—stress and cultural deprivation.

Stress, of course, is something with which you are all too familiar. You are expected to run our schools while at the same time mediating and dealing constructively with the demands of parents, teachers, legislators, budget experts, newspaper editors, special interest groups, school boards, and the community at large.

The child often lacks this kind of "coping strength" and cannot acquire knowledge when preoccupied with even minor stresses which he has not yet learned to handle. When a teacher notices that a pupil cannot learn, gets along poorly with other children, is restless, and has repeated physical illnesses, she may be witnessing early symptoms of emotional disturbance. The teacher who can recognize these symptoms, which often differ very little from normal behavior, has a unique opportunity to prevent school misbehavior and learning failure. The symptoms may be caused by difficulties between the child's parents which the child can only sense. Or the trouble may stem from more visible crises such as the birth of a sibling or a death in the family. Research studies have identified certain crisis periods that every child encounters. These include entry into school, the so-called third-grade crisis when classroom emphasis shifts from preparation for achieving to achieving, the transition between junior high school and high schools, and the transition between high school and college.

Mental health experts have found that by giving special help and understanding to the child during crisis periods, the teacher can exert a tremendous influence in helping him over these emotional hurdles. At the same time, the teacher can help the child build immunity to stress so he can face future crises with even greater strength.

The many children who have not learned how to handle stress help form the basis for some disheartening statistics. It has been estimated that 1 out of every 10 children in public schools in the United States is emotionally disturbed. About 250,000 of these 4 million disturbed children are seen in mental health and child guidance clinics each year. Only a third of these children, however, actually receive treatment. The rest are merely diagnosed or evaluated for other agencies. Looking ahead, we have this grim prospect: Although the total number of patients in mental hospitals is expected to drop by 1970, the number of patients in the 10-to-24 age group will increase.

Even more distressing to me, however, is the fact that well over half a million young people are brought before the courts each year as juvenile delinquents. Last year, while the total number of children in the 10-to-17 age group rose by 3 percent, the number of juvenile delinquency cases in the same age group rose by 10 percent.

These are the children who do not succeed in school, who are handicapped in earning a living, and who try to restore their self-confidence through antisocial behavior. These are the children whose failure in school so undermines their self-esteem that they often fall an even easier prey to emotional illness.

The schools, through strengthened mental health programs, are our best hope for reversing these trends which point toward even more widespread waste of our youth. In addition to helping children past crisis points, the schools can play a vital role in preventing emotional problems by screening and identifying stress-vulnerable children. An encouraging experiment in this type of primary prevention has been conducted in several schools in Pennsylvania. Tests were administered to children of preschool age to determine the degree of success they were likely to have in their first year of school. The parents of children who were regarded as probable failures were advised to postpone enrollment of their children until 6 months to a year after the regular enrollment age. Most parents who kept their children back when advised to do so found that the children were essentially successful when they did start school. Parents who refused to follow the advice to hold their children back were distressed to find that nearly all these children fulfilled the prediction of school difficulty and failure.

Another factor that has come to be recognized as having a tremendous effect on the development of cognitive capacities, as you know, is the child's early experience with language. I mentioned earlier the association's resolution passed in 1908 to help foreign immigrants learn our language. Today we have a large group of our own citizens who, although they have lived in this country for several generations, have been separated by economic and cultural differences from the mainstream of society. They live in a world of want and deprivation. When their children reach school age, we find that, like the immigrants at the turn of the century, they do not even speak the same language that is used by their teachers and schoolmates in our middle-class-oriented schools. They can hardly be expected to understand even a moderately complex English sentence when they have never before heard one. They are behind before they begin; by third grade they are hopelessly lost; by sixth grade many of them are dropouts; by their early teens they have forsaken society just as society had originally forsaken them.

We have only recently reached that stage of enlightenment at which we would admit that it is not inherent biological defects which cause these children to be lower in intelligence according to arbitrary IQ measurements. It is their surroundings that suffocate them. While they may have been created equal, their quality of opportunity exists in name only.

The schools are now being called upon to play a larger part in breaking the vicious circle of poverty, lack of education, low job skills, and continuing poverty. Their help is needed in counteracting some of the worst effects of cultural deprivation so that the intellectual capacities of these children can grow.

As you know, much concern is currently focused on enrichment programs for culturally deprived children in their early years. Experts on child development have found that by the age of three, many mind and behavior patterns have crystallized. Thus, increasing attention is being given to nursery school programs designed to help children overcome the worst handicaps of their impoverished environment.

We await implementation by Congress of the President's proposed education program, with its exciting implications for strengthening our schools.

However, the national mental health program, already initiated by the Congress, promises to make available important new resources to schools to help them meet their broad new challenge.

The task ahead is great.

Although it is likely that no society has ever made the most of the potential of all its members, our world today puts new demands on us. We must do better than others have done. Although our schools cannot solve all problems, they are crucial to finding any solutions. As your association marks its hundredth year of service to our country, I am confident that you who are present here will play an important role in finding those solutions. And now, more than ever before, you do not stand alone.

Just before I left the governorship of Minnesota in 1951 to accept a position on the Federal bench in Washington, the mentally ill patients of the hospital at Hastings, Minn., gave me a farewell party on the hospital grounds. One of their number was selected to present me with a certificate of appreciation for my work in the area of mental illness. After a recitation of some of the recent accomplishments, the certificate closed with a quotation from Edwin Markham, as follows:

> "There is a destiny that makes us brothers,
> None goes his way alone.
> All that we put into the lives of others
> Come back into our own."

So it is with you in your great calling in life—all that you have been putting into the lives of these precious youngsters and your continuing dedication in their behalf will come back into your own lives in rich measure.

We have been worshipping the gods of science and material advancement until we now see ourselves trapped by the monstrous weapons we have devised. Having learned the art of war, we must now learn the art of peace. Having created the mystery of atomic fission, we must accept the golden rule and the Sermon on the Mount.

We stand at the threshold of a great and stimulating future. The significant issue before us is the dignity of the human personality and reverence for life. We Americans are faced with a challenge such as we have never faced before—it is a challenge not of destroying, but of building—a challenge to explore not yesterday's wilderness, but today's plateau of human welfare and dignity. The frontiers of yesterday are closed. The pioneering of the wilderness and of geographical frontiers is over for us. But a new frontier awaits—a frontier whose boundaries are limited only by our imagination and good will. The frontier is waiting for us in the words of Kipling:

> "There's no sense in going further,
> 'Tis the end of civilization,
> So they said and I believed it,
> Till a voice as loud as thunder
> Rang interminable changes on one everlasting whisper,
> Day and night repeated,
> Something hidden, go and find it,
> Go and look beyond the ranges,
> Something lost beyond the ranges,
> Lost and waiting for you. Go!"

THE GOOD WORK OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the so-called regulatory commissions occupy one of the most difficult and dangerous points in Government. If they try to protect the public interest, they are frequently attacked, both openly and quietly, by the interests they are supposedly regulating. On the other hand, the members of the public whom they are trying to protect are often ignorant of the efforts of the regulatory body in their behalf, and are so absorbed in their personal activities and problems that they seldom back up their defenders. In the meantime, the special-interest groups keep trying to detach and win over the erstwhile defenders of the public.

The all-too-common result is that the concentrated private interests are able to conquer the diffused public interest.

The Federal Power Commission is at the very focal point of this quiet, but immensely important struggle. In recent years, I have admired the fairness and public spirit of this Commission, under the chairmanship of Joseph C. Swidler, who has been ably supported by

Charles R. Ross and David S. Black. I have prepared a summary of the recent work of the Commission, and I ask unanimous consent that this statement and an accompanying table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and the table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RECENT WORK OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

In the last 3½ years the Commission has worked earnestly to improve its performance and to speed the dispatch of its workload. Although much still remains to be done, a great deal has been accomplished. Progress can be reported in the following important areas:

(a) Administrative reform: Beginning in the fall of 1961, the Commission moved swiftly to reorganize its staff to emphasize responsibility for moving cases along. It streamlined its hearing procedures, eliminated lengthy field investigations and made extensive use of settlements rather than prolonged litigation to dispose of cases. Bureau chiefs were encouraged to raise the quality of their staffs and to make the most effective possible use of available manpower. Most impartial observers of the Commission agree that the agency is now alert and responsive and dispatching its workload with reasonable promptness.

(b) Natural gas regulation: In the past 3 years the Commission has completely cleared up the enormous backlog of pipeline rate cases, which involved a cumulative total of $1.6 billion of rates collected subject to refund. In the process the Commission has ordered refunds of $550 million. In addition the city gate prices of natural gas throughout the country has been reduced by a net annual amount of $125 million. Hundreds of producer cases have also been settled. These settlements have increased the total of refunds to over $650 million. The foregoing refunds and rate reductions are by far the largest which any regulatory agency has ordered in the history of regulation.

The disposition of the pipeline rate cases has not only benefited consumers but the pipelines as well. While the refunds were large, the rate levels which the Commission approved permitted the pipelines to meet all of their costs and earn about 6½ percent on their total investment and 10 percent or more on the equity of most pipelines. Even more important, the decisions removed the cloud of uncertainty which threatened the financial standing of many pipelines. In 1961 the amount of rates collected subject to refund had reached such staggering totals that many pipeline companies could not be certain that they were in solvent condition, or whether they were paying dividends from earnings or capital. None was in position to provide investors with firm financial statements. This situation is a thing of the past.

The Commission has also speeded up the pace of its pipeline certificate work. In fiscal 1964 the Commission issued certificates for $748 million in new construction as compared with $683 million in 1963 and $373 million in 1962. The handling of these cases has been greatly speeded up and the cases now pending before the Commission while large in number on the whole represent a normal working backlog.

With respect to the rates of natural gas producers the Commission has made progress in developing a system of regulation that is fair, effective and administratively feasible, but the payoff stage is still some months away. Meanwhile, by the flexible use of the settlement device the Commission has been able to hold the backlog steady in the last 3 years while it has been putting into operation this new system of regulation on an "area" basis, which the Commission believes is better adapted to the economics and structure of the natural gas producing industry than company-by-company determinations.

As early as 1960 the Commission had issued a policy statement in which the Commission expressed its intention to set rates on an area basis. The Commission divided the Nation's gas producing fields into 23 areas and announced interim rates for each area during the period in which formal area rate proceedings were in progress to determine permanent rates. Two area rate cases had been initiated but little had as yet been done to prepare them for trial. The Commission since mid-1961 has used the system of interim ceiling prices although in a number of areas the initial rates have proved excessive and have been reduced.

The Commission has moved ahead on the area rate program, and four proceedings are now underway. One of these (the Permian Basin case) is now in its final stages, the hearing examiner having rendered his decision and the case being now set for argument (beginning February 8) and decision before the Commission. By the end of this fiscal year the Commission hopes to have established a pattern for the area rate cases which will enable it to prescribe fair and reasonable rates in every producing area in the country within the following 2 or 3 years. To devise an effective system of regulation for natural gas producers has proved to be one of the greatest challenges with which any administrative agency has ever been confronted. The most difficult part of that task is now accomplished.

The net result of the Commission's activities in the last 3 years is that much of the regulatory uncertainty and delay which plagued the gas industry 3 years ago has been remedied. The natural gas industry is financially sound and gas is in sufficient supply so that we are encouraging expansions to take on new markets where natural gas is not presently available. At the same time producer rates have been stabilized at a nationwide average of approximately 16 cents per M.c.f. and the city-gate price has declined, so that consumers are now able to buy gas more cheaply than they could in 1961.

(c) Electric utility regulation: Electric rate regulation by the Federal Power Commission, which was a neglected responsibility 3 years ago, is now a going activity. Three years ago most of the companies subject to FPC jurisdiction did not even file their rates with the Commission, and the filings which were received were routinely processed. Today most of the electric power companies which the Commission considers are subject to FPC jurisdiction have filed their wholesale rate schedules, and within the limits of existing manpower the Commission's power staff gives close study to the filings. For fiscal year 1962, prior to the beginning of the buildup of electric rate work, rate reductions totaled only $127 thousand. Thus far in fiscal year 1965, reductions of more than $4 million have already been filed and accepted. An undetermined amount of additional reductions were made by the electric power companies in rate revisions put into effect incident to the initial filings with the Commission.

Even more important than the specific rate reductions is the fact that the public, cooperative and private systems which are dependent upon wholesale purchases for their bulk power supply are now aware that there is a forum where the reasonableness of wholesale rates can be adjudicated. This has greatly improved their bargaining position in dealing with the major companies which constitute their sources of supply. In addition, the work of the FPC on wholesale rates and our supporting audits of utility books can be of major assistance to the State Commissions in regulating the retail rates for electric power.

What is at stake in establishing effective regulation of the electric power industry is not merely the assurance of fair rates to consumers but also the efficient use of our natural resources. The long-term guarantee of a wholesale power supply at fair rates and on reasonable terms under Federal regulation would make it unnecessary for some of the distributors to construct generating plants of uneconomically small size. Such plants are generally wasteful both of capital and fuel.

In the hydroelectric field the Commission has halved its backlog of new license applications, thus releasing a billion dollars of new construction to help stimulate the economy. What remains is substantially on a current basis. The Commission has initiated new measures to insure full utilization of the recreation potential of the hundreds of private projects which are now licensed by the FPC and many more which will be licensed in the future. It has also taken steps to require closer policing of the safety features of these impoundments in order to avoid any possibility of such catastrophies as have happened recently in Italy, France, and Spain as a result of dam failure or overtopping.

One of the most important activities of the Commission in the power field has been the conduct of the national power survey. This project which has been carried out in cooperation with industry advisory committees representing all segments of the electric power industry, the privately owned systems, Federal and municipal systems, and the REA cooperatives. In the survey the Commission has sought to plot a course of coordinated growth for the industry which by 1980 would make possible the use by all power systems of the most advanced generation and transmission technology. The survey report, which was released on December 13, 1964, suggests patterns for joint planning among the power companies for system expansion and for pooling their systems through heavy transmission interconnections. The goal is lower cost electricity for all Americans.

The power survey was conducted under provisions of the Power Act which direct the Commission to encourage the voluntary interconnection of the Nation's power systems. It is an outstanding example of Government and industry cooperation in the utility field. It represents a milestone in the history of cooperation in an industry where factional differences run deep and where teamwork among industry segments requires constant encouragement.

The Commission has also used its influence to encourage a higher level of research in the electric power industry, and greater cooperation among industry elements in carrying on research activities. At its instance an ad hoc committee of leading representatives from all industry segments, the electric equipment manufacturers, and the universities, is now formulating a proposal for industrywide coordination of research in the fields of power equipment and power utilization.

The general goals of the Federal Power Commission in the electric power field are an integrated, low-cost industry, a technologically advanced industry, an industry with all segments working together, and an industry in which the benefits of improved technology and intersystem coordination are shared in fair measure with ultimate consumers.

In the last 3 years the trend of electric power rates like those of natural gas has been down. These reductions in energy costs have contributed to the ability of other industries to hold the price line.

The Commission's program for both the electric power and natural gas industries under the Kennedy and Johnson administrations has been designed to promote the growth of these major sources of energy in a manner that will make the most efficient use of our capital and exhaustible fuel resources. Both of these industries are financially healthy, technologically alert, and are bringing essential energy to consumers at wholesale prices which are lower now than when we took office.

Natural gas fact sheet for State of Illinois, 1963

	Number of customers	Volumes sold (thousand cubic feet)	Revenue (dollars)	Average revenue dollars per thousand cubic feet
(1) Annual total natural gas retail sale bill (from Bureau of Mines):				
(a) Residential	2,369,000	289,550,000	326,618,000	1.128
(b) Commercial	153,000	74,887,000	65,057,000	.869
(c) Industrial	(1)	276,027,000	115,610,000	.419
(d) Total	(1)	[2] 640,464,000	507,285,000	.792
			Volume (thousand cubic feet)	Percent of total
(2) Gas supply (from Bureau of Mines):				
(a) Local production			9,459,000	1.36
(b) Received from outside State			688,128,000	98.64
(c) Total supply			[2] 697,587,000	100.00
				Cents per thousand cubic feet
(3) Average price charged by interstate pipeline companies to distributors:				
1961				31.58
1963				30.65
				Amount
(4) Dollars refunded by interstate pipeline companies to distributors between July 1, 1961, and June 30, 1964				$40,453,723

[1] Not available.

[2] Difference between gas supplied and gas sold is in gas transmitted out of State, used by companies, lost, and unaccounted for, and net change in underground storage volumes.

THE PRESIDENT'S BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROGRAM AND LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, since the announcement, of the President's voluntary balance-of-payments program, there has been growing public concern that the program will be used not only to limit the flow of private capital to industrialized nations, but also to the less developed countries.

In view of the great potential harm that restrictions on the flow of private U.S. capital to less developed countries may use to our entire postwar effort in these countries, I asked Secretary Dillon and Chairman Martin, of the Federal Reserve Board, to give me a clarification of the administration's position in this regard.

In response to my letter of March 9, 1965, Secretary Dillon categorically stated that the voluntary balance-of-payments program will not be used to this effect. He made it clear that under the 5 percent Federal Reserve guideline, commercial banks have been asked to give the highest priority to loans to less developed countries. He also reaffirmed that the encouragement of productive private investment in the less developed countries remains administration policy.

In response to an identical letter from me, Chairman Martin makes the following key points:

First. He does not not believe that the President's program conflicts in any serious way with the objective to establish viable private sectors in less developed countries.

Second. Direct investment and other types of long-term investment which are directed toward efficient and productive investment in already existing U.S. enterprises or new enterprises in less developed countries would clearly not be out of spirit with the President's program, as it is likely that the capital outflows required would in many cases be offset by exports of U.S. equipment and materials and returns of investment income.

Third. To the extent that a slowing of U.S. bank credit may in some cases have seriously adverse effects on the balance-of-payments positions of individual less developed countries, that would of course be a factor for U.S. banks to take into consideration in assigning relative priorities to the credit demands they receive from those particular countries.

In view of the concern of the financial community of the country in this matter, I ask unanimous consent that this exchange of correspondence, as well as a Federal Reserve press release dated March 8, containing guidelines to commercial banks, be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence and the release were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

March 9, 1965.

Hon. Douglas Dillon,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Department of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Secretary: I am deeply disturbed by reports to the effect that the President's voluntary balance-of-payments program will be used to limit the flow of private U.S. capital to less developed countries. This would represent a reversal of the principle laid down in the interest equalization tax and other legislation, such as the proposed 30-percent investment tax credit which would encourage private U.S. investment in less developed countries. A limitation on the flow of private U.S. investment to less developed countries could undermine our foreign aid program and be injurious to our desire to establish viable private sectors in less developed countries. There are also involved questions of net gain in any such policy.

I would appreciate it if you could furnish me with a report on this matter at your earliest convenience.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

Jacob K. Javits,
U.S. Senator.

The Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, March 17, 1965.

Hon. Jacob K. Javits,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Jack: The reports you received to the effect that the President's voluntary balance-of-payments program will be used to limit the flow of private U.S. capita to less developed countries are wrong. It has been made clear on several recent occasions by the administration that not only the interest equalization tax but the voluntary restraint program is directed at U.S. capital outflow to developed countries. You may be interested in the enclosed quotations from various recent statements and press releases.

With respect to bank lending under the 5-percent Federal Reserve guideline, banks have been asked to give the highest priority to loans to less developed countries. There may be occasions, of course, where banks will want to use the guidelines as a reason for refusing a loan request from a less developed country applicant to whom the bank does not want to lend for entirely different reasons.

You may be sure that the administration's policy of encouraging productive private investment in the less developed countries has not changed. We do expect, of course, that less developed countries will not become channels for an indirect flow of U.S. capital to other advanced countries.

I was glad to hear from you on this matter.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

Douglas Dillon.

Enclosure.

QUOTATION FROM LETTER OF SECRETARY CONNOR TO AMERICAN BUSINESS FIRMS DATED MARCH 12, 1965

First, we regard the national objective of increasing the contribution by private enterprise to growth in less developed countries of such importance that we do not wish this program to inhibit the flow of these investments.

QUOTATIONS FROM FEDERAL RESERVE PRESS RELEASE DATED MARCH 5, 1965, ON GUIDELINES FOR COMMERCIAL BANKS

Within the 5-percent guideline, absolute priority should be given to bona fide export credits. Credits that substitute for cash sales or for sales customarily financed out of nonbank or foreign funds are not entitled to priority.

With respect to nonexport credits, banks should give the highest priority to loans to less developed countries and should avoid restrictive policies that would place an undue burden on countries such as Canada and Japan, which are heavily dependent on U.S. financing, and on the United Kingdom, which is suffering from balance-of-payments difficulties.

MARCH 9, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM MCC. MARTIN, Jr.,
Chairman, Federal Reserve System,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I am deeply disturbed by reports to the effect that the President's voluntary balance-of-payments program will be used to limit the flow of private U.S. capital to less developed countries. This would represent a reversal of the principle laid down in the interest equalization tax and other legislation, such as the proposed 30-percent investment tax credit which would encourage private U.S. investment in less developed countries. A limitation on the flow of private U.S. investment to less developed countries could undermine our foreign aid program and be injurious to our desire to establish viable private sectors in less developed countries. There are also involved questions of net gain in any such policy.

I would appreciate it if you could furnish me with a report on this matter at your earliest convenience.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senator.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS,
OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, March 16, 1965.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: Thank you for your letter of March 9, 1965, expressing your concern with respect to reports that the President's voluntary balance-of-payments program will be used to limit the flow of private U.S. capital to less-developed countries.

As you know, the Federal Reserve is not directly concerned with the part of the President's program that relates to direct investment. Nevertheless, I should like to make some general comments on the program, in connection with our desire, as you put it in your letter, to establish viable private sectors in less-developed countries. I do not believe that the President's program conflicts in any serious way with that objective.

As I see it, the accomplishment of that objective depends in very great degree, first of all, on what the less-developed countries do themselves to create an economic and social environment conducive to sustainable growth sparked by private enterprise.

The contribution U.S. private enterprise can then make, where the conditions are favorable, is threefold. It can supplement the long-term capital resources of the country. It can embody the capital which it brings to the country, together with savings subsequently generated within the country, in well-selected and efficiently planned physical facilities and it can operate these facilities efficiently, helping, as it does so, to raise the general level of skills and productivity both of management and of labor in the country. Where existing U.S. enterprises are already performing these functions in less-developed countries, or where they see new opportunities of doing so effectively, it is likely that the capital outflows required will in many cases be offset by exports of U.S. equipment and materials and returns of investment income. In such cases the carrying out of direct investment plans would clearly not be out of spirit with the President's balance-of-payments program.

I am sure you will agree that the growth of viable private sectors in less-developed countries depends very importantly on continued growth of world trade and economic growth in industrial countries. But this in turn depends on the maintenance of a healthy international payments system. Under present circumstances, it is urgently important that the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit be reduced, so that the dollar may continue to play its role as the keystone of a sound and flexible international payments system, and so that the economic growth of the United States—and indeed of the whole Western World—may continue without the disturbances that would be occasioned by failure to solve this balance of payments problem.

For these reasons, I believe it can fairly be concluded that reduction of the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit will contribute significantly and in a relatively permanent way to the viability of private sectors in the economies of the less-developed countries, while whatever inconveniences may be imposed on those countries by the program for reducing the deficit will be transitory and of minor importance.

I mention these possible inconveniences because I do think it is possible that there may be some demands for U.S. bank credit from less-developed countries that will not be fully met this year. However, if that should happen, it need not be more than an inconvenience to the countries concerned. Other sources of credit are available to would-be borrowers from U.S. banks, and it may be that the borrowers will have to make greater use of other sources this year, including European sources as well as the banking systems of their own countries.

To the extent that a slowing of U.S. bank credit outflow may, in some cases, have seriously adverse effects on the balance-of-payments positions of individual less-developed countries, that would, of course, be a factor for U.S. banks to take into consideration in assigning relative priorities to the credit demands they receive from those particular countries. But, as you know, the total outflow of U.S. bank credit reached an unusually high level last year, and I am confident that a considerable cutback in the flow this year need not have widespread serious adverse effects on the balances of payments of the less-developed countries.

Sincerely yours,

WM. MCC. MARTIN, Jr.

PRESS RELEASE OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE

MARCH 5, 1965.

The Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System today issued a set of 14 guidelines for commercial banks to follow in complying with the President's program to improve the Nation's balance-of-payments position, in part through voluntary efforts to restrain foreign lending and investment. It was recognized that, in restraining the growth of loans to foreigners, banks will be foregoing some of the gains that would otherwise have accrued to them. Nevertheless, the Board stated, if a voluntary program is to be effective, the national interest must come first in decisions on future specific loan transactions.

The guidelines for foreign lending operations specify that absolute priority should be given to all bona fide export credits. With respect to nonexport credits, banks are expected to give the highest priority to loans to less developed countries and to avoid restrictive policies that would place an undue burden on Canada, Japan, and the United Kingdom. To meet these priorities the guidelines contemplate that nonexport credits to other advanced countries will be cut back to the extent needed to achieve the goal of the President's program.

The objective of the program is that outstanding bank credit to nonresidents of the United States not rise above the amount outstanding at the end of 1964 by more than 5 percent. Banks which find themselves in excess of the target are expected to reduce their foreign loans as quickly as possible, and, in the most extreme case, to bring their lending back to the target level within the next 12 months.

The guidelines cover the method of calculating the base for an individual bank against which the rise of 5 percent in outstanding loans can be measured. They also clarify how those banks already in excess of the target as a result of year-to-date operations will be expected to bring their operations within the policy objectives. The guidelines spell out, among other topics, the relationship of trust departments to the program, the handling of financial transactions for customers, the position of Edge Act Corporations, the operations of foreign branches of U.S. banks and of U.S. branches of foreign banks.

In considering problem areas involved in the development of the guidelines, the Board had the benefit of technical advice from the following specialists in commercial bank foreign operations:

Mr. Roger Anderson, Continental Illinois National Bank, Chicago, Ill.; Mr. Harry P. Barrand, Jr., Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., New York, N.Y.; Mr. Alfred W. Barth, the Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, N.Y.; Mr. W. A. Hurst, Bank of America National Trust & Savings Association, San Francisco, Calif.; Mr. John M. Meyer, Jr., Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, New York; and Mr. J. J. Wieckowski, Girard Trust Bank, Philadelphia, Pa.

The Board pointed out that the role of these individuals was advisory only. They were not asked to approve or disapprove the guidelines nor to assume any responsibility in connection with their formulation.

The Board indicated that the guidelines, effective immediately, will be reviewed from time to time in the light of experience gained from operation of the program. The interpretations are designed to help individual banks make the decisions regarding their own operations that are required to insure an effective program.

Copies of the new guidelines are being made available through the Federal Reserve banks to all commercial banks in the country. Banks having questions concerning their application are urged to consult with the Federal Reserve bank of their district.

PREFACE TO GUIDELINES

The following guidelines have been designed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for use in implementing President Johnson's program for the voluntary curtailment of foreign credit by banks. They will be in effect until modified or supplemented. However, they may be changed from time to time in the light of new circumstances and in the light of the experience gained as the program goes forward. The guidelines should be helpful to individual banks as they play their own particular part in the achievement of the President's overall balance-of-payments program, and each bank should feel free at any time to discuss its problems with the Federal Reserve bank of its district.

It is clear that banks, in undertaking a voluntary role in the program, are being called upon to make sacrifices. In restraining the growth of their loans to foreigners they will be foregoing some of the gains that would otherwise have accrued to them. But, if a voluntary program is to be effective, decisions on future specific loan transactions must be made primarily with an eye to the national interest rather than profits. The achievement of the President's goal will be in the long-term interest, not only of the Nation, but also of the individual institutions which are now being called upon to forgo immediate advantage or gain.

1. Establishing a target base for an individual bank: The objective of the program is that outstanding bank credit to nonresidents of the United States not rise above the amount outstanding at the end of 1964 by more than 5 percent, subject to the conditions set forth in guideline No. 3.

The following steps are involved in calculating the base, and the amount of credit outstanding on any particular date, for an individual bank:

1. Take outstanding claims of U.S. banking offices on foreigners as of December 31, 1964, as required to be reported on Treasury Department foreign exchange forms B–2 and B–3. Contingent accounts, such as unused balances of letters of credit and commitments to lend, are excluded from the base. (For further information reference is made to the instructions printed on forms B–2 and B–3.)

2. Subtract from this amount any claims for account of customers included on the forms, as well as any participations in individual loans arranged by the Export-Import Bank or made with Export-Import Bank guarantees.

3. Add any claims not reportable on forms B–2 and B–3, such as long-term foreign securities and permanent capital invested in foreign branches and subsidiaries.

4. Compensating balances, or any other claim on the lending bank of the debtor or of any other person by arrangement or understanding with the debtor, should not be deducted from loans or other claims on foreigners for purposes of determining the base.

5. It is expected that a simplified form for making the above calculation, and for making monthly reports on foreign credits, will be furnished to the banks within a short time.

Banks which are exempted from reporting on the Treasury forms because their foreign credits are below the minimum reporting requirement are nevertheless included in the program.

2. Participations in Export-Import Bank loans and loans guaranteed by the Export-Import Bank: Participations in individual export loans arranged by the Export-Import Bank, loans with Export-Import Bank guarantees or insurance, and holdings of Export-Import Portfolio Fund participations are excluded from the 5 percent target.

The role of the Export-Import Bank within the framework of the President's program will be coordinated by the National Advisory Council for International Monetary and Financial Problems.

3. Banks in excess of 5 percent target: It is clearly recognized that some banks may currently be above the 5 percent target because of loans made prior to February 11, 1965, or may subsequently be brought above the target as a result of (a) binding commitments entered into before February 11, or (b) the extension of bona fide export credits, or (c) the extension of credits at the specific request of an agency of the U.S. Government. A bank in such circumstances would not be considered to be acting in a manner inconsistent with the program; however, it should reduce its claims on foreigners to 105 percent of the base as quickly as possible. Even in the most extreme case, this reduction should be accomplished within the next 12 months.

Such a bank will be invited periodically to discuss with the Federal Reserve bank of its district the steps it has taken and proposes to take to bring about the reduction of its claims on foreigners consistent with these guidelines.

Banks with bona fide commitments are clearly not being asked to refuse to honor such commitments, even if honoring them involves a temporary excess of lending above the target. However, banks would be expected to seize every opportunity to withdraw or reduce commitments, including credit lines, that are not of a firm nature, and to ensure that drawings under credit lines are kept to normal levels and usage. At time of renewal, all credit lines should be reviewed in light of their consistency with the voluntary foreign credit restraint program. Proposed extensions of renewals of existing bona fide commitments should be reviewed in the same manner.

4. Loan priorities: Within the 5 percent guideline, absolute priority should be given to bona fide export credits. Credits that substitute for cash sales or for sales customarily financed out of nonbank or foreign funds are not entitled to priority.

With respect to nonexport credits, banks should give the highest priority to loans to less developed countries and should avoid restrictive policies that would place an undue burden on countries such as Canada and Japan, which are heavily dependent on U.S. financing, and on the United Kingdom, which is suffering from balance-of-payments difficulties.

Given the probability of some expansion of the end-of-1964 volume of loans for financing exports and the priorities established for the less developed countries, as well as the need to avoid restrictive practices with regard to Canada, Japan, and Britain, it is expected that nonexport credit to the other advanced countries will be cut back to the extent needed to achieve the goal of the President's program.

Without attempting to specify all types of loans that will need to be restricted, it is obvious that credits to developed countries, that can be cut back with benefit to our balance of payments and with the least adverse side-effects include: credits to finance third-country trade; credits to finance local-currency expenditures outside the United States; credits to finance fixed or working capital needs; and all other nonexport credits to developed countries that do not suffer from balance-of-payments difficulties.

5. Bank sales of foreign assets to U.S. residents: In general, banks should not expand their lending abroad by selling to U.S. residents (including U.S. banks) claims on foreigners existing as of the base date and replacing such assets with other loans to foreigners. Sales to U.S. residents of foreign securities owned on the base date, which would be free of the interest equalization tax, or of loan participations, could assist an individual bank to stay within the 5 percent target, but would clearly not benefit the U.S. payments position. Therefore, in the event of any such sales the bank's base should be reduced by an amount equivalent thereto.

6. Banks with no foreign loans outstanding on December 31, 1964: In general, banks with no previous foreign lending experience would be expected not to make foreign loans during 1965. However, bona fide export loans to foreigners may be made in reasonable amounts, provided this financing does not represent a shift from previous U.S. or foreign sources of financing. Banks making foreign loans for the first time should take precautions to insure that their activities do not become a means through which credit is extended to foreign borrowers who have been denied credit by established lenders cooperating in the voluntary program.

7. Banks whose previous foreign business has consisted almost entirely of export financing: The few banks falling in this category would ordinarily be expected to keep within the 5-percent ceiling. Since they would have no maturing nonexport loans to provide funds for additional export credits and would therefore need to rely upon nonrenewal of maturing export loans, reasonable amounts in excess of the target from time to time would not be considered in conflict with the program. But every effort should be made by such banks to keep their lending within the ceiling. They should take care to insure that export loans do not represent a shift from previous U.S. or foreign sources of financing.

8. Trust departments: Managing officers of trust departments should be made familiar with the voluntary restraint effort. They should bear the purpose of that program in mind in making any acquisitions of foreign obligations for trust accounts. For example, they should not exercise their authority under any trust account to acquire foreign obligations which, in the absence of the restraint program, would have been acquired by the bank for its own account. Pension funds, including those administered by banks, will be furnished separate guidelines, as part of the program to restrain foreign credits of nonbank financial institutions.

9. Financial transactions for customers: While banks must, of course, follow instructions given to them by their customers, it is expected that, in buying foreign investments for customers, they will be guided by the principles inherent in the President's balance-of-payments program. They should not encourage customers to place liquid funds outside the United States. Banks should not place with customers foreign obligations which, in the absence of the restraint program, they would have acquired or held for their own account.

10. Foreign branches: It is assumed, of course, that U.S. banks having branches, as well as subsidiaries and affiliates, in foreign countries will not utilize them to avoid the foreign credit restraint program for U.S. banks.

Foreign branches have independent sources of funds in the countries in which they are located and from third countries, in many cases through the attraction of Euro-dollar deposits. The balance-of-payments program is not designed to hamper the lending activities of the foreign branches insofar as the funds utilized are derived from foreign sources and do not add to the dollar outflow. Concern arises only in those cases where the resources are derived (directly or indirectly) from the United States.

Total claims of the head office on oversea branches, including permanent capital invested in, as well as balances due from, branches, represent bank credit to nonresidents for purposes of the program.

11. Problems of Edge Act corporations: Edge Act and agreement corporations are included in the voluntary credit restraint effort. The foreign loans and investments of such a corporation may be combined with those of the parent bank for the purposes of the program, or separate targets may be set for the parent bank and the subsidiary.

An Edge Act corporation that has not yet undertaken any significant volume of loans and investments may take as a base, alone and not in combination with its parent, its paid-in capital and surplus, up to $2.5 million, even though an equivalent amount of foreign loans and investments had not yet been made as of December 31, 1964.

12. U.S. branches and agencies of foreign banks: Branches and agencies of foreign banks located in the United States are requested to comply with the principles of the program of credit restraint applicable to domestic banks.

13. Substitution of export credit for credit for other purposes: Banks should be on the alert to avoid granting credit to domestic customers if the result would be to aid the latter in making foreign loans or investments inconsistent with the program. Even export credit to foreigners, if it supplants credit previously obtained from foreign sources and thus frees the foreign funds for other uses, may be detrimental to the U.S. payments position.

This is obviously a difficult area and one in which there is considerable room for possibly damaging substitution of domestic for foreign financing, and for substitution of export credits to foreigners for other credits to foreigners. In general, success will depend on the ability of banks to identify loans that are inconsistent with the program and on the application of the Department of Commerce program with respect to foreign credit and investment by nonfinancial firms.

14. Management of a bank's liquid funds: Banks that have placed their own funds abroad for short-term investment purposes, including U.S. dollar deposits outside the United States or the acquisition of non-U.S. money market paper, should refrain from increasing such deposits and investments and should, in a reasonable and orderly manner, seek to reduce them. Since such funds are ordinarily placed outside the United States solely to provide a slightly higher rate of return, they are strong candidates for reduction under the program.

This guideline applies equally to deposits and investments payable in foreign currencies and to those payable in U.S. dollars.

This guideline does not call for a reduction in necessary working balances held with foreign correspondents, although such balances are also considered claims on nonresidents for the puropses of the program.

THE U.S. BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DEFICIT AND WORLD MONETARY REFORM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, should our latest attempt to cut down on our balance-of-payments deficit continue to be as effective as it appears to be at present, we may be laying the groundwork for effective negotiations concerning the reform of the existing international monetary system.

Since the annual International Monetary Fund meeting in Tokyo, last October, there has been growing recognition that, in the future, expansion of the world's monetary needs should not be left entirely to happenstances; namely, the deficit in the U.S. balance of payments. As in the case of other countries, it could be reasonably expected that the U.S. payments deficit will be brought under control as soon as possible. Tacit recognition was also given to the need to entrust an increasingly influential role to the IMF in the operation of the international monetary system. But it was evident that as long as our European friends possessed ample dollar reserves, they would continue to insist that the United States clamp down on its balance-of-payments deficit, before they would agree to meaningful negotiations about the future of the international monetary system. President de Gaulle's February 4, 1965, press conference was only the latest indication of the generally held European attitude.

As the threat of the reversal of the dollar outflow appears on the horizon, voices in Europe are being heard in regard to the dangers that this will cause to the stability of the international monetary system and world economic expansion. Perhaps it is too early to say that there is an immediate threat to the functioning of the system, or that our latest effort to deal with the U.S. balance-of-payments deficit has been successful. But this new situation makes entirely clear what the world would be up against if the U.S. payments deficit would be "solved," without at the same time having arrangements made to provide for an adequate supplement to the existing gold-exchange standard, which forms the basis of the present international monetary system. Given the very substantial international asset position of the United States and its vital global commitments, it would not be in our interest if we were to eliminate vital economic and military programs on the ground of financal necessity.

The groundwork for new negotiations concerning international monetary reform should be laid now, regardless of the day-to-day changes in the international financial situation of the United States and Europe.

Several recent expressions of opinion by Secretary Dillon and by leading international economists lend new urgency to the need for a basic reform of the international monetary system. I refer specifically to Secretary Dillon's testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee on March 23; and to testimony before the International Finance Subcommittee of the Senate Banking Committee, last week, by Dr. Walter Salant, of the Brookings Institution, and principal author of the "U.S. Balance of Payments in 1968," and to testimony by Charles Kindleberger, professor of economics at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Although it is still commonly believed that there is presently no shortage of international liquidity to finance expanding trade and payments, and although no liquidity crisis, with its accompanying deflationary shrinkage of world trade and investment generally, is said to be foreseen for several years, or at least not until the United States eliminates its balance-of-payments deficit, I believe—and I have been joined in this by my Republican colleagues on the Joint Economic Committee—that the turning point is nearer than is generally realized. This viewpoint is now receiving more and more support.

For more than a year and a half, the Republicans on the Joint Economic Committee have urged that the administration seize the initiative, and call a well-planned international monetary conference to initiate basic reform of the system before the world is faced with a deflationary crisis. The administration now agrees with the need for basic reform, but is awaiting the elimination of our payments deficit before taking specific action. The administration cannot wait much longer; time is clearly running out.

Talk of a dollar shortage is gradually replacing concern over the dollar glut. On March 23, Secretary Dillon declared that as the United States is about to bring the balance of payments into balance, the "danger" for the world in the future would be a "shortage of international reserves, rather than an excess." When the United States "gets into balance," he declared, the nations "will need to consider whether some other form of reserve asset than the dollar will be needed."

In his testimony on the balance of payments, Dr. Salant showed that a sharp improvement in the basic balance occurred in 1964; and he concluded that it reflected fundamental improvement. He told the Committee:

> Most, although not perhaps all, of the required fundamental adjustment in prices and incomes has been made.

As for the large capital outflows, which contributed to the increased total deficit, he believes they represent a temporary phenomenon, and are likely to taper off, even in the absence of restraints, or at least to cease to increase much in the coming years.

In discussing the dangers ahead, Dr. Salant noted several recent events that have unsettled the monetary environment and shaken the position that international liquidity was adequate to world needs. The British payments crisis, the French attitudes toward the dollar and international monetary reform, and the continuing shrinkage in the U.S. gold stock, in the face of mounting short-term dollar liabilities, have had the effect of reducing international liquidity. For one thing, these influences have given rise to increased private hoarding of gold, which puts further pressure on the whole system. This is happening against a background of increasing world trade, which is increasing the need for reserves. Dr. Salant said:

> In the face of these developments I find it hard to see how one can any longer maintain that there is no shortage of liquidity now.

He added:

> The measures the United States has taken to reduce capital outflows have increased Japan's dependence on other sources of capital and on its own official reserves. The United Kingdom feels less able to lose reserves. In short, countries in deficit or in precarious balance are feeling more pressed about their international liquidity. But countries with surpluses do not seem to feel they have too much; although the Continental European countries complain about too much total liquidity, they do not take the actions necessary to reduce its international component; i.e., they do not seem willing to lose international reserves. To put the same things in terms of balance-of-payments deficits and surpluses, the desire of deficit countries to cut their deficits has intensified, but this has not been offset by an increase in the willingness of surplus countries to reduce their surpluses. This whole situation adds up to the makings of a scramble for liquidity, which could result in a world monetary crisis.

Dr. Salant believes the adverse effects of not ending our balance-of-payments deficit and our gold drain are less than the dangers that could result from ending them too rapidly. He fears that the United States may "join a competitive scramble for liquidity" that would simply aggravate the existing strains in the system.

If Dr. Salant is correct and if, in fact, basic balance has been largely achieved, then the wisdom of the administration's controls over capital outflows becomes particularly suspect. One danger may well be that they do their work too quickly and too well. The strengthening of the dollar on the foreign-exchange markets and the rise of the Eurodollar rate indicate that the program may be sharply reducing the dollar outflow to Western Europe.

In his testimony before the Committee, Dr. Kindleberger specifically noted the deflationary consequences that success of the President's program may have. He pointed out:

> To halt capital flows to Europe at this time by voluntary restrictions, taxation, or otherwise, is to tighten interest rates in Europe, at long term, rather than at short. There are plenty of short-term funds, as evidenced by the dollars held by the private market and those that could be acquired by the banking system from official holders. The need is rather for long-term funds. A reduction in their amount may cut investment, produce recession, and put real, instead of liquidity balance-of-payments pressure on this country.
>
> I am concerned that our balance-of-payments measures may push Europe into deflation, which would create real balance-of-payments surpluses.

Dr. Kindleberger might have noted the likelihood of a spillover into our own economy of deflation in Western Europe.

Not only do these considerations lend urgency to the need for basic reform of the system, but they also make more likely the reaching of an international agreement. Once a dollar shortage begins to threaten, European nations will show a greater willingness to make significant progress in bringing up to date a monetary system that was created to serve the entirely different world economy that existed at the end of World War II.

Some of the international monetary issues that are emerging are effectively discussed by Bernard D. Nossiter, in an article published in the Washington Post of March 13, 1965, and by Murray J. Rossant, in his column in the New York Times of March 22, 1965. I ask unanimous consent that these articles and one from the New York Times of March 24, and an editorial from the Washington Post of March 18, 1965, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles and the editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 13, 1965]

U.S. DOLLAR FLOW ABROAD IS REVERSED—BANKS AND BUSINESS RESPOND TO JOHNSON APPEAL TO CURB OUTGO

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

PARIS, March 12.—Dollars are flowing from Europe back to the United States for the first time in years.

American bankers and corporation treasurers, particularly the bankers, are responding to President Johnson's appeal for restraint with an unexpected zest.

European financial authorities had doubted that President Johnson's appeal for self-imposed curbs on the dollar outflow would work. They said as much to Washington in private talks. But now some of those authorities are prepared to eat their words.

A telephone check today of key monetary figures in Basle, Frankfort, and Paris turned up the same story in all three financial centers: the dollar has suddenly assumed an unlooked-for strength.

No estimates of the reverse flow are available here. But two objective indicators show what has been happening.

A month ago, when Mr. Johnson issued his call to business leaders, 1 dollar could be swapped for 4.325 Swiss francs. Yesterday, the dollar fetched 4.345 francs. The difference, less than 0.5 percent, does not seem like much. But when currency deals are made in tens of millions of dollars, a few centimes for each mounts up.

A second indicator is the new and higher rate that lenders are charging for Eurodollars. These are the dollars that Americans and others deposit in banks here to lend anywhere. In the last few days, borrowers have had to pay 0.5 percent more for these dollars, up to 5.5 percent, for loans of 6 months. This is a clear sign that Eurodollars are scarcer.

This dramatic turn of affairs has produced some curious changes in the European financial press. For months, financial writers here have been complaining about a surfeit of dollars and the slack ways of American financial life.

DOLLAR GAP NOW FEARED

But just the other day, Les Echos, the French Wall Street Journal, complained that there is now danger of a dollar gap or shortage that could cause deflation in Europe. Similarly, the Financial Times of London was fretting this morning over the prospect that the different moves of Washington and London may curb world trade by holding back on the currencies that finance the great part of it.

None of this means that the conservative men who run Europe's banks are convinced that the United States has solved its balance-of-payments problem. They fear that the so far successful appeal to American businessmen will have only a limited life.

Most of all, they still think there are too many dollars floating around the world. The continental bankers will not be happy until the Federal Reserve System begins to mop up some of those dollars and lifts American interest rates to attract more dollars at home.

The sudden reversal in the dollar flow, the authorities agree, stems in part from the artificial buildup of dollars sent here before the President's message. American banks and corporations, fearing that the administration would impose controls on their loans and investments, poured dollars into Europe at a great rate to beat the gun. Now these unneeded dollars are being repatriated.

Some banks clearly exceeded the guidelines for foreign lending laid down by the Federal Reserve. These banks are also bringing dollars back to come into line.

Corporation treasurers also appear to be heeding the President's plea to stop investing their spare cash in the profitable European market. Moreover, continental bankers say that some American corporations have told their European affiliates that American money will be tight for them this year. The affiliates have been urged to borrow what they need in Europe.

Indeed, the sudden shortage of funds has led some bankers outside the principal countries to fear that economic activity in Europe will be affected.

An important banking official in Madrid said last week that the United States should now come forward with its own plan to reform the international monetary system in a way that will avoid deflation.

But he is still in the minority. European bankers in the more powerful nations generally agree that Washington should not present any plan until the American deficit is completely wiped out.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 22, 1965]

WHITHER THE DOLLAR?—QUESTION OF SHORTAGE REPLACING GLUT DRAWS ATTENTION IN MONETARY WORLD

(By M. J. Rossant)

Will the dollar glut be replaced by a dollar shortage? For the first time in over a decade, this question is receiving serious attention in monetary and financial circles here and abroad. The quick success of the Johnson administration's new voluntary program to curb the outflow of dollars is largely responsible. Even the most skeptical have been impressed by its initial impact.

When the program was first announced doubts were voiced, here and abroad, about its effectiveness. These doubts are fading as the flood of dollars going to Europe is being shut off.

The glut has not yet been checked. Foreign governments in fact have been stepping up their purchases of gold from the United States with excess dollars they have accumulated. But for the most part, these surpluses were amassed before Washington began putting pressure on business.

FEARS ARE GROWING

The notion of a shortage is just a notion, but fears that it will materialize are growing. If it comes, it could mean a deflationary shrinkage of trade and economic growth, according to delegates at the American Bankers Association's monetary conference held last week in Princeton. The dollar shortage seers were in a minority, but it is one that is growing in numbers.

Those who think that the glut may be replaced by a serious shortage are not merely wishful thinkers. They say that in the 1950's—the whole world was preoccupied by fears of a dollar shortage long after Washington began running huge deficits that produce the huge excess of dollars in Europe.

Now, they argue that concern about the dollar glut is heightening at a time when there is evidence of dollar scarcity.

Hal B. Lary of the National Bureau of Economic Research has observed that shifts in a country's payments position can take place with amazing rapidity, achieving a snowballing effect. The United States has had this sort of experience in running its deficits, but it can also work in reverse.

The prospect of a return to a surplus position has been emphasized by Robert Triffin of Yale University. He has said that the United States has succeeded in making "great improvement" in cutting down on the huge drains that plagued it in the past, an improvement that has been masked by the big and abnormal outflow of private capital. Now that the administration has taken steps to cut the private outflow, the overall deficit could be transformed into a surplus in relatively short order.

A GOOD FORECASTER

Mr. Triffin, who is the author of the controversial Triffin plan for reforming the international monetary system, has a good record in the precarious art of forecasting monetary movements. Other monetary students, including Walter S. Salant of the Brookings Institution, have made similar analyses, suggesting that the tide is about to turn.

This does not mean that Henry H. Fowler, who is slated to take over as head of the Treasury Department, can sit back and relax. But it may give him time to learn the ropes of international finance and gain the confidence of foreign officials.

If progress can be sustained and the dollar glut replaced by a shortage, the administration will be in a position to resume pressing for additional reform of the international monetary system. The issue of reform has been deadlocked since the dollar came under attack, but Europe may be amenable to change once the dollar is no longer acting as the financial fuel for expansion.

According to those who foresee a possible dollar shortage, a lot depends on a continued holddown on the outflow of private capital. Mr. Salant believes that this drain will decline naturally, but many others are less sure.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 24, 1965]

Warning Voiced on World Funds—Dillon Cites the Danger of a Reserves Shortage Rather Than Excess—U.S. Deficit Holds Key—Future Leveling of Payments Balance Would Affect the Holdings in the West

(By Edwin L. Dale, Jr.)

Washington, March 23.—Secretary of the Treasury Dougles Dillon, making his final appearance before a congressional committee, said today that the "danger" for the world in the future would be a "shortage of international reserves rather than an excess."

Mr. Dillon told the House Banking Committee that this danger would rise "since our balance of payments is about to be brought into balance."

Deficits in U.S. international transactions supply reserves to other countries by adding to their dollar holdings.

The occasion for Mr. Dillon's testimony today was consideration by the committee of legislation authorizing the United States to accept a 25-percent increase in its quota in the International Monetary Fund, along with a general increase of the same amount by the other members.

RAYBURN HOUSE MEETING

It was the first meeting of the committee in its new and impressive hearing room in the recently opened $100 million Rayburn House Office Building.

That additional costs on the building—it has been called the most expensive in the history of the world—were still being incurred was made clear by pounding of carpenters on the roof that frequently interrupted Mr. Dillon's testimony and brought forth quips by the committee members.

Representative William A. Barrett, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, in a reference to recent U.S. gold losses, said he thought the pounding must be by Frenchmen.

The questioning was generally friendly, and the committee is expected to approve the legislation.

ON QUOTA INCREASES

Mr. Dillon rejected suggestions that the European countries had not contributed sufficiently to the fund-quota increases, though he agreed that the United States would have welcomed extra quota increases by countries such as France that declined to accept them.

Mr. Dillon emphasized that world reserves were "adequate at the present time," especially if augmented by the newly enlarged credit facilities of the fund.

When the United States "gets into balance," he added, the nations "will need to consider whether some other form of reserve asset than the dollar will be needed."

He said, however, he did not think a decision would be required "until we have been in balance for a year or two or three—until we can see the effect of our being in balance."

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 18, 1965]

Reversing the Outflow

Although one must be cautious in interpreting evidence after only 1 month, it would appear that the administration's program for eliminating the balance-of-payments deficit is working very well, perhaps too well for the comfort of those Europeans who never hesitate to excoriate this country for its profligate ways.

Writing from Paris, Bernard D. Nossiter reports the Commerce Department and Federal Reserve Board programs which have been set up to stanch the outflow of dollars are beginning to pinch like a tight shoe. There has been a sharp increase in the Eurodollar rate—the interest rate on dollars borrowed in Europe—and concern in the European financial press lest a reversal of the dollar outflow precipitate a deflation.

While this country is still some distance from the goal of eliminating its payments deficit, European fears of deflation are well founded if somewhat premature. In addition to the upward pressure on interest rates, a reversal of the dollar outflow will reduce the volume of capital investment in Europe and inhibit the growth of international liquidity, the monetary reserves that are essential to expansion of world trade.

The dangers inherent in the elimination of the U.S. payments deficit can be averted through the creation of a new international monetary unit, a substitute for dollars and gold in the reserve coffers of trading nations. But the basis for an agreement on international monetary reform has not been achieved, and until it is Europe will suffer from the disciplinary actions that it urged upon the United States.

CONGRESS SHOULD BACK BAIL REFORMS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I was most honored to cosponsor S. 646, S. 647, S. 648, and S. 1357, bills to modernize and reform an unfair bail system at the Federal level. I have received encouraging support for my position in this matter; and I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune be reprinted at this point in the Congressional Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Congress Should Back Bail Reforms

National efforts to reform bail systems deserve encouragement from Congress this year when it considers procedures in Federal courts.

Under the American system of law, the only reason for bail is to secure the presence of an accused person at trial. Yet studies have shown that freedom between the time of arrest and trial too often is determined by financial ability, and that high bail is sometimes used to keep defendants in custody.

These procedures have been denounced by the Department of Justice, by the National Conference on Bail and Criminal Justice in Washington last May and by the results of such experiments as the Manhattan Bail Project in New York. In its first 3 years, that project released 2,195 selected defendants solely on their promises to return for trial, and only 15 failed to do so. The rate of default for those freed on bail was three times as great.

That study and those being carried on in at least 10 other cities indicate that consideration of community ties—rather than just financial ability—might release perhaps half of all criminal defendants with little or no bail and at no greater risk than in the present system. At the same time, poor defendants would not be dependent on the whims of professional bondsmen for freedom.

Three bills already have been introduced in the Senate and House to change present procedures, and an omnibus bill supported by the Department of Justice and the White House is expected next month. In addition to modernizing an unfair system at the Federal level, passage of one of these measures would be a clear invitation to States and cities to do the same.

JOB CORPS LEADERS HANDLE BOYS OF ALL BACKGROUNDS AND PROBLEMS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the war on poverty has enlisted many talented youth leaders to guide and harness the restless energies of young men out of school and out of work.

The Washington Daily News has performed a splendid service by sending its reporter, Samuel Stafford, to the Job Corps camp at Catoctin, Md. His three-part series of articles tells how Troy Weaver, a 34-year-old camp counselor who once played with the Harlem Globetrotters, has managed to deal with the fears and hopes of young boys who recently have arrived at this youth conservation camp near Washington, D.C.

I am sure that the war on poverty will enlist many fine young men like Troy Weaver. His experiences illustrate that it is possible to inspire despondent young boys to better themselves.

The State of Minnesota is proud of the pioneering efforts of Vice President Hubert Humphrey and my colleague in the other body, John Blatnik. For years, they urged Congress to launch a youth conservation corps. This program will not overnight undo the damage which poverty and lack of opportunity have done to thousands of young people. It will, however, make it possible for what good there is in every person to have a chance.

Last year, it was cynically said that it would be cheaper to send poor boys to Harvard than to send them to Job Corps camps. It is obvious, however, that boys with medical problems, reading difficulties, and lack of motivation to stay in school are poor candidates for Harvard. The early successes of the Job Corps, however small, indicate that the vision of Vice President Humphrey and Representative Blatnik and the many others who encouraged this program was well conceived.

Therefore, I commend to all Senators these articles which appeared in the Washington Daily News; and I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

That's All We Do Here—Work and Eat

(By Samuel Stafford)

Troy Weaver jumped out of the yellow bus with the agility of a basketball player and turned to watch his boys debark.

They were a sad-sack lot of teenagers and they knew it. Unskilled, short on schooling, they possessed only the clothes on their backs and a large measure of hope that this at least might be a start to somewhere.

Ten of those who stepped self-consciously off the bus at Camp Catoctin, Md., the Nation's first antipoverty program Job Corps conservation camp, were Negroes, the other 10 white.

Troy Weaver, 34, camp counselor who once played with the Harlem Globetrotters, said, "C'mon, men, you're Job Corpsmen now * * * Nothin' to be so sad-mouthed about. This is your big chance. Mud? Yeah, we got lots of mud. You boys gonna work, turn that mud into grass * * * When do you eat? Man, that's all we do here, work and eat."

Some of the boys smiled and others made feeble jokes, and Troy Weaver continued to practice his specialty, which is getting along with the kids whom society somehow overlooked.

"See that bulldozer over there? Some of you may be driving it some day. You work hard, you can go all the way."

LONG DAY

That's the way it had been all the way up from Baltimore on the bus.

Talk their language. Kid them, needle them, irritate them, roughhouse with them if they're in the mood. But always listen to them. Be square, never lie, and never lose contact.

For Troy, who used to work with slum street gangs and teenage dope addicts in New York and Cleveland, the day had begun badly. The new boys—some from northern city slums and others from ramshackle Midwest farm villages and hillbilly coal towns—were to assemble in Baltimore, and Troy was to bring them to camp at about 11 a.m.

But two Corps recruits from Connecticut missed connections. And a New Jersey boy somehow got lost en route.

It was nearly 2 p.m. when the bus reached camp. The foul-up threw the schedule 3 hours behind, and created later problems for the staff.

There was a welcoming speech by Al Maxey, the softspoken director of Camp Catoctin who used to be a Yellowstone Park ranger, and then a hurry-up lunch, after which the 20 new Corpsmen assembled in the recreation room.

Troy, in slacks and a campus sweater that buttoned down the front, talked easily to the boys.

"How about some of you new boys stand up and introduce yourselves," he said.

A boy got up and stammered, "I'm Steve * * * I'm Steve Fil * * * Steve * * *." His face reddened. "I'm Steve (long pause) * * * Fil * * * Fil * * * Fillipo, of New Haven."

"Fine, fine," Troy Weaver said. Other recruits introduced themselves.

Troy said, "Now the clothing situation is bad. We got here late and probably can't do much about it today. Each of you was supposed to get a complete duffel bag, pants, shirts, and so on. But they won't be here till later. We expected larger boys than we have."

He and other staff members checked the boys to make sure they'd been issued blankets, pillows, towels and such.

THE FUTURE

Then Troy said conversationally, "There's a wealth of things you can learn to do here to equip yourselves for the future. You can say to yourself, 'What am I now * * * what would I like to be?' and you can fill in with what you need. We give 10 hours a week in the education building in reading, arithmetic, typing and other things you need to get a job.

"We work on the principle that you can do better if you teach yourself * * * and we'll function as guides. We start you just where you are in reading and arithmetic and bring you up.

"You grade yourself. If you cheat, you cheat yourself."

Two or three boys looked puzzled.

Staff members explained that the Corpsmen would be divided each day into three groups: "work details"—carpentry, plumbing, electrical or other craft shops, building fire trails and other chores—counseling and educational sessions.

"I'd like you to think of this as a little city," Troy said. "It may sound bad to you, but somebody has to collect garbage. We need a mailman. Somebody has to put up the flag."

FIRST LETTERS

He urged the boys to write home after supper.

"Write, 'Dear Mom, Dear Sweetheart, Dear Sugarpie,' " he said. "I at least got to Catoctin. I think it's great. Or 'I think it's the worst place in the world.' Anything you want."

"Where do you get stamps?" a farm boy asked shyly. Another boy wanted to know where to get a lock. The questions were answered.

Troy dropped naturally into the role of older brother.

"You want to say to hell with it all," he said casually, "you got problems with your girl, you come to old Troy."

He talked about the Boys' Council, formed the night before by corpsmen who had arrived earlier, about off-hours trips to nearby towns to see basketball games or movies, and plans for building a ball field come spring.

"It's a good place," he said. "Maybe you think, 'I failed in school,' but there are no failures here."

HOME

The new corpsmen were told they could smoke anywhere in camp, but were expected to empty any dirty ashtrays they saw.

"We'd like each boy to think of this as his home," Troy said.

"Can your family come and visit you?" a boy asked.

"Sure, I don't see why not." Troy asked whether anybody had any gripes, and a tall Negro boy rose and said, "I'm disappointed. I thought once I got down here in this no-man's land, I could pull down a broken heap and fix it up."

Troy thought about this.

"Well, of course, under Job Corps rules, no cars are allowed at the camp," he said.

"I mean just fix it up so when I leave in 2 years I'll have a heap."

"Maybe that's not a bad idea," Troy said. "You're among the first Job Corpsmen in the country. If there's going to be any changes in the program, you'll help make them."

Another boy said, "If your wife's having a baby, can you go home?" (Very few of the boys are married.)

Troy laughed. "I'd like to see anybody keep me here if my wife was having a baby," he said.

"What about girls?"

"We're going to try to work up some social entertainment—and that means boy meets girl."

ALLOWANCE

Teachers Maurice Robinson and Warner Cheeks and Work Leader Jim Troxell explained other details of the program. The corpsmen were told they would get $30 spending money to start with, and a lump sum of $75 for "dressup clothes."

They will be credited with $50 a month, and if they send half of this home each month, the Government will match it with another $25.

"I think it's pretty nice here," a boy named Herman volunteered.

When the orientation program was over, the boys adjourned to play ping pong and cards and listen to records. Some of the strangeness was beginning to wear off.

After supper, Troy flopped wearily on his bed.

"Whew," he said. "Rough day."

But his troubles were only beginning.

A young man entered the room and announced: "One of the new boys says he's going home."

And Troy went off to see what he could do.

A LOST BOY IS FOUND AND LOST AGAIN

(By Samuel Stafford)

Troy Weaver, the counselor at Camp Catoctin, Md., the Nation's first Job Corps conservation camp for school dropouts lay on his bunk, eyes half closed, listening to the confusing blend of laughter, the ticktock of ping pong balls and driving rock and roll from the recreation room next door. It had been a hard day.

Some of the new arrivals had gotten in late, due to a mixup, and all of the boys were far from home, and some seemed bored and edgy.

Troy listened for signs of trouble, and it came in a rush. A boy burst into Troy's room.

"Troy," he said, "one of the guys who came today wants to leave. He said he hates it here."

HELP

The messenger was one of the old boys from a group of Job Corpsmen who had come to Camp Catoctin a few weeks earlier.

Troy sighed and got to his feet. "Looks like one of those days," he said, and followed the boy through the crowded recreation room and out the front door.

Another boy materialized out of the darkness. His name was Perryman and he was one of the old boys, too.

Perryman nodded at a thin blond, pimply-faced boy beside him, and told Troy Weaver: "He says he is going to catch the next bus out. Maybe I can help with the problem."

Troy said, "Thanks. I will let you know what happens."

INTRODUCTION

Then he put his arm around the blond boy, and said, "I forgot your name."

"Richard," the boy said. "I come in from New Jersey."

"Oh, you are the fellow who was lost, came by car. Well, you have had a bad day all around, have you not?"

Troy, arm still around Richard, said, "let us talk about it in my office."

They walked through the mud in silence for a few moments, and then Troy asked gently, "What is wrong? You homesick?"

Richard's eyes were nearly hidden under the blond thatch. His hands trembled and his lower lip quivered. He wore a dirty blue windbreaker and tan cotton pants.

"Yeah," he said, "I guess so."

"First time you have been away from home?"

"Yes." Richard looked at the ground.

They neared the door of the education building, and Troy, with the sure instinct of one who has been on many streets before, asked softly, "Who is it you miss?"

"My dog, Cindy," the boy said.

"Just your dog?"

"No, my brudder, too. I thought my brudder was coming along with me. My brudder got turned down. He always lost out on every Government thing he ever tried for."

WHEN?

They entered Troy's cubbyhole counseling office. Richard, tears welling up, dropped into a chair. Troy sat on the edge of his cluttered desk.

"When did you decide to leave, Richard?" Troy asked, gazing into space.

"The minute I walked into this place." Richard's jaw worked violently. "My fodder and I thought I was going to Oregon. I didn't know I was coming here till I got on my way."

Troy laughed, but not harshly. "Be glad you're in Maryland," he said. "It's a lot longer trip home from Oregon."

A trace of a smile crossed the boy's face before he allowed himself to become miserable again.

INTERESTS?

Troy gazed at the ceiling, scratched his head, yawned, and casually asked, "What is it you like to do?"

The forlorn lump of a boy in the chair stirred uneasily. "Well," he murmured, "play the guitar, I guess."

"You play the guitar we have in the rec room?"

"I plunked it a little."

"You met your roommate yet?"

"No."

Troy said, "You haven't even been in your room yet. Have you seen any of our buildings?"

"Well * * * no." The boy's hands still trembled.

"My point," said Troy, "is that you don't even know what we do or the programs we have and you want to leave. You think that's right?"

"I guess not," Richard said hesitantly.

"Have any idea what you want to learn?"

"Well, I thought I might want to drive a bulldozer."

A SPARK

Troy's feigned torpor vanished.

"Well, didn't you see those bulldozers lined up out front when you came in?" he said. "You can learn to run one here. But there's other things to do, too. You make your bed at home?"

"I don't sleep on a bed * * * I sleep on a couch."

"Live in a big house?"

"No, a little house."

"What's your father do?"

"He paints boats." Richard wiped at his tears with a grimy sleeve.

SCHOOL

Troy let the silence gather. Then he asked, "When did you quit school?"

"Eighth grade."

"Why?"

Richard made a face and shrugged. "I didnt like it. They call you names and things. I told 'em I was quitting and I did."

"You like anything in school?"

Another shrug. "Spelling and reading was okay, but I hate arithmetic."

Troy informed him that the would have to learn arithmetic to handle bulldozer work.

"I dunno," Richard said. "I just don't like it here. My folks told me if I wanted to come home, just come home. I guess my mind's made up."

HIS CHOICE

Troy Weaver said, "I'm not going to try to talk you into staying. That's up to you. All I want you to do is give us a chance."

Silence from Richard.

"What else do you like to do?" Troy asked. "You like movies?"

"Not very good. Maybe monster movies. I just like to be alone."

"Why?" (Gently.)

"I don't know", Richard said, biting his lip.

Troy said, "Maybe I can fix it up for you to get a roommate. Maybe that boy, Perryman, who wanted to help you * * *"

"I don't care," Richard said with a shrug. "I mean, I'm not going to start a fight with him or anything, but I don't care."

PRECURSOR

"You know, a week ago Perryman wanted to leave," Troy said.

"Yeah but somebody stopped him outside the gate and made him get into a truck."

Troy grinned. "That was me," he said. "Only I didn't tell him to get into the truck. I just talked to him and afterward he got in. It was his decision. You like girls?"

"No."

"Well, that's up to you, too, but you can't just keep leaving everything that doesn't work out for you." "You know, Richard, some day you're going to have to leave your father, mother, and dog, and you have to get ready for it. You're almost a man. We can help you get a driver's license and other things."

SPORTS?

A long pause. Then, "Do you like sports?"

"No. Just weight lifting and karate."

"Well," Troy said, "we've got a Marine sergeant here who knows weight lifting, and we got a gym. Didn't you see that yet, did you? Didn't give us a chance."

Richard smiled sheepishly.

Troy got up and left the office to handle another problem, and when he returned, he said, "Well, what do you think?"

Richard, smiling faintly, said, "I guess maybe I'll stick it out. * * *" But seconds later, he shook his head and muttered, "No, my mind's made up. I was stupid to think I'd like it here. I'm going."

Troy faced the boy and said, "Nobody makes you stay or go. Nobody pushes you here. We all get lonely. I'd like to see my wife and kids down in Washington, but I'm lucky to see them once a week. Maybe I can move them up sometime. I came up to Catoctin because I believe in it and I like the work. I like the kids—and, Richard, I want you to consider me a friend."

He left it at that. But later he and Maurice Robinson, a teacher at the camp, decided to have Billy Tucker, a small, talkative 16-year-old Virginia country boy, room with Richard and try to cheer him up. But 2 hours after this decision was made Billy announced in the recreation room that he, too, was going home.

Two Negro boys promptly talked him out of it. "The food's too good," one of them said.

Later that evening, Troy look Richard along when he drove to nearly Thurmont for cigarettes. Troy gave the boy half a dollar, which Richard refused at first, but finally he accepted it and bought some cigarettes, too.

A dispute was brewing in the recreation room when they got back to camp.

James Blackmon, who wears a pearl in his right ear—a badge of his old New Haven, Conn., club—and James Truesdale, nicknamed "Moose," of Camden, S.C., had disagreed on the choice of TV programs, and the argument was escalating.

Troy, Maurice, and other staff members soothed the combatants and Blackmon and Moose were told to straighten up by the Boys' Council, formed mainly of "old boys" at camp.

"We never had trouble like this, and we don't need it," said Ray Martin, 17, son of a Kentucky coal miner. "We got a big chance to make good here, and we don't want to spoil it."

EXIT RICHARD

Troy flopped wearily on his bunk. It had been a tough day.

"When they get a full crew of 100 corpsmen here," he said, "I'll be afraid to leave at all."

But then he said, "Funny thing—after they've been here about 3 days, they settle down and they're OK.

As for Richard, he hung around camp for 2 days, brooding, and then he joined up with two other homesick boys and left for home.

"Those guys are crazy," said a boy who watched them go. "Government give 'em a good chance and they throw it away."

A Day With Some Boys Just Beginning

(By Samuel Stafford)

Recently, I conducted a highly-unscientific attitude survey among some adults I had reason to believe were broadminded.

"Give me," I said, "your impressions of a typical school dropout."

Their collective portrait showed a hard, delinquent kid, too dumb or too lazy to make it in school, who therefore spent much time in the streets, preoccupied with girls and other mischief.

But when I stayed at Camp Catoctin in the mountains of Maryland, the Nation's first Federal Job Corps rural camp for dropouts, this boy was nowhere to be seen.

Instead, I found an assortment of boys—Negroes and whites, some from big cities, North and South, and some from Midwest farms or Appalachia's dreary mining towns—most of them shy, meek, uncertain, suggestible, vulnerable, and anxious to please.

"We have no kids with bad records here," said Al Maxey, Catoctin's director, "although a few have had scrapes with police. We're not geared to handle juvenile delinquents."

And a Catoctin staff member said, "One thing I've noticed. The kids here aren't nearly as sophisticated as juvenile delinquents I've known."

Camp Catoctin, only a mile from Camp David, the Presidential retreat, and 61 other conservation camps throughout the country, eventually will house 100 boys each. Other Corpsmen will learn trades in larger urban camps.

COUNTRY BOY

Billy Tucker, a pint-sized, talkative 16-year-old from a Wise County, Va., town so small "you can spit from one end to the other," dropped out of school in the seventh grade. He has eight brothers and sisters, and his father, he says, "hasn't worked 7–8 years, ever since he got mashed up in a coal mine."

Billy helped out some by "choppin' wood." He has few interests. "I only like to swim and fish," he said. He is crazy about the food at Catoctin. "Best butter I ever ate," he said wolfing down two platesful.

CITY FELLOWS

Henry Lee Epps, Jr., 17, a Negro from a broken home in Baltimore, is one of the original 9 boys who opened the camp 2 months ago. He is expected to ease the way for succeeding waves of Catoctin Corpsmen.

Henry is an enthusiast.

"Why'd I join up?" he asked. "To get to be somebody, that's why. My grandma saw about the Job Corps in the paper and told me about it. I like it here."

Bill Keefer, 20, comes from Uniontown, Pa., a town whose future often has looked as dark as its old buildings.

"My dad worked the Buckeye and other coal mines," Bill said. "Then, about 6 years ago, there was an explosion. His insides were messed up and he had to go on relief. Eight kids in my family. I quit in eighth grade. I wasn't burning up the course and my family needed the money I earned. It's good here. I want to get more schooling, maybe learn to run heavy equipment."

THE MIDWEST

When I first met Bill, he was showing Herman Singleton, 19, a Galesburg, Ill., farm boy, how to iron his pants.

"My dad," Herman said solemnly, "got killed when I was a baby. Grindstone flew apart and hit him."

Herman has eight brothers and a sister.

"I quit after tenth grade," he said without bitterness. "I couldn't get along. It was just a little bit too hard. I farmed, picked corn, did baling, and disking. I read about the Job Corps in the paper and took the tests. I think it's pretty nice here. I want to get my high school diploma and learn mechanics on foreign cars."

KENTUCKY BOY

When I first met Ray Martin, 18, he was earnestly listening to Herbert Grimm, foreman of camp roads and trails, who was operating a hugh front-end loader. Ray had seen him plowing through the dirt, and asked him to show him how it worked. Mr. Grimm had obliged.

Afterward, Ray said, "I want to learn everything around here. Mostly, I'm interested in mechanics."

Ray comes from Whitesburg, Ky., and has 11 brothers and sisters. He dropped out of school in the seventh grade. ("I couldn't hack it, things were tight, I had to go to work.") He ran a motor in a coal mine and later read about the Job Corps, and signed up.

Like several of the original nine boys who opened the camp, Ray has blossomed into a camp leader and a moving force in the newly organized Boys' Council—an important liaison between corpsmen and staff.

How did his family like the idea of his joining the Job Corps?

"Liked it real smart," Ray said.

I discovered Richard Tyndall, 17, a small, blond boy from Dillon, S.C., doing pushups in the latrine.

"Gained 5 pounds doing these exercises," he explained. "Come around a year from now and see me. I'll be like Atlas. The Government's doing a good thing for us here."

Gregory Ratliffe, of Baltimore, a remarkably thin boy, was filling cans with cement to make his own barbells.

"When I quit school, man, I wasn't never goin' back," he told me. "Got a job as busboy, laborer, all that. Goin' nowhere. Then I saw the Job Corps thing."

REVEILLE

Organized exercise at the camp has typical hurdles to overcome.

First Sgt. Samuel Griffiths, a muscular health food addict on loan from the Marine Corps, directs the physical education program.

One recent morning, he sat in the recreation room, waiting for the boys to fall out for calisthenics at 6 o'clock. A few boys straggled into the room. Clearly the Sarge was disappointed.

"Maybe it's the weather," he ventured. "A little drizzly out."

Later, when no new exercisers appeared, he said, "Can't understand it. Usually, we get a full turnout."

So a call was put out for Troy Weaver, Catoctin's chief counselor and a former Harlem Globetrotter basketball player. Troy rampaged through the barracks, pounding on doors, deftly turning aside excuses from his sleeping charges.

"Calisthenics, men," he boomed. "How come you old men ain't out of the sack yet? Bad example to the new men. Let's go, let's go."

A colored boy named Moose said, "I ain't goin' to take no exercises, got a bad foot."

Troy said, "Get a nurse's certificate," and kept pounding on doors.

The barracks soon emptied and Moose was left alone. Reluctantly, he joined in calisthenics, a victim of group pressure.

CONFIDENCE

At breakfast, the Sarge ladled protein powder ("It makes you feel tiptop") out of a can to fellow staffers who regard this food-and-fresh-air fanatic with amusement, awe and respect. They know his value in building morale among the boys.

"He makes the corpsmen feel like tigers," a colleague said.

An attempt to show the boys what life can offer—and how they can get it—is apparent in all the staff work.

Troy is giving an attitude test to new recruits.

"What this place really means is that if the other guy can do it, you can do it too," he says. "You want a swimming pool, a maid, a big house in the country, breakfast in bed?"

There is a chorus of "Yeses."

"Well," Troy says, "You can have these things. But it takes money. You have to work to get the money. And you have to have a job to earn money. And you have to learn to get a job."

TRADES

The boys at Catoctin will learn such crafts as auto mechanics, plumbing, heavy equipment operation, and forestry, while maintaining the campsite and refurbishing nearby parks.

A few critics have suggested that the Job Corps is designed to be a "showpiece" in the antipoverty war. They say only the "good kids" are admitted—that the program will not touch many delinquent boys who need it most. Where, such critics ask, does one draw the line in accepting or rejecting a boy on the basis of his police record? Do you accept a boy with a school truancy record, but turn an auto thief down?

What will happen to all the bitter rejects among hopeful applicants?

A REPLY

A national antipoverty office official said, "This kind of carping is ridiculous. The national office does not do the screening. Local offices—like the United Planning Organization here in Washington—do it with the help of social workers, the boy's church if he has one, juvenile authorities, school officials, and police.

"If all of these people decide a boy probably will benefit from the program, then he is a good bet to be accepted. Anyhow, only about 1,000 or so have been screened throughout the country out of more than 125,000 applicants, so how can anybody criticize the screening process so early in the game?"

That mistakes will be made is conceded. To restore some measure of hope to a boy in peril of losing a race he never ran is a delicate chance and altogether exciting undertaking.

Al Maxey, the former Yellowstone National Park ranger who now directs Camp Catoctin, puts it like this:

"It is like being the first plow that goes through the virgin snow at Yellowstone. That is a lot more fun than being one of the 10 or 12 plows that follow along behind."

MINNESOTA'S PARTICIPATION IN INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION YEAR

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, the year 1965 was designated by the United Nations and by a proclamation by President Johnson as International Cooperation Year. The President has called on all Government agencies, his executive staff, and other citizens to do everything in their power to encourage and develop projects that will prove to the world that we believe peace and good will throughout the globe can be maintained through cooperation.

One of the first of such projects developed after months of negotiations between Midland Cooperatives, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn., and the Dominican Government, and resulted in a refinery project that has matured to the point where formal construction activities will start within a very short time.

Midland Cooperatives, Inc., is a large regional cooperative, with headquarters in Minneapolis, and several hundred member cooperatives scattered through several Midwestern States. I am well acquainted with Midland's management and its board of directors. All are to be commended for the initiative and courage they have shown in successfully negotiating an oil-refinery concession with the Dominican Government. The covering agreement reflects the kind of cooperation that has played such an important role in the development of our own country, and I am confident that it will be the foundation of similar results with the people of the Dominican Republic.

As a part of the agreement, Midland is setting aside a sum in excess of $500,000 a year that will be used to develop and promote the cooperative movement at all levels in the Dominican Republic. Furthermore, Midland is lending the Dominican Cooperative Institute the necessary equity capital whereby the latter can be a full and equal partner in the ownership of the refinery. It is the plan of Midland to train Dominican nationals in its refinery at Cushing, Okla., so that the maximum number of Dominican citizens will participate in the operation of the new facility. At all levels of the Dominican society, American cooperatives are already showing an interest and a direct participation.

Murray D. Lincoln, who for many decades has been a leader in the cooperative movement in the United States, is to be commended for the initiative he showed. Midland's general manager, A. J. Smaby, and his associates, Milton B. Zeddies and J. A. Bierbaum, did an outstanding job in handling the final negotiations for the refinery agreement. Mr. Smaby has for many years been an active participant in the international cooperative field, and is chairman of the board of the International Cooperative Development Association, a member of the board of the International Cooperative Development Fund, a member of the central committee of the International Cooperative Alliance, a member of the Inter-American Cooperative Finance Institute, and a member of the board of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A.

Dr. Donald Reid Cabral, president of the Triumvirate of the Dominican Government, and his associates, are also to be commended, because any decision such as the one involved in this project touches upon every political and economic facet of the Dominican Republic's national life.

Recently, the Export-Import Bank approved a $5.5 million loan to assist in the financing of the construction of this refinery. This action reflects most favorably on the judgment and initiative displayed by Harold Linder, president of the Bank, and his staff.

I think it of importance that recognition be given this major breakthrough by American and Dominican cooperatives, since it will not only benefit our people, but also will be an example to others of what can be accomplished by using the cooperative approach.

It is fitting that this event happened in the year proclaimed by our President as International Cooperative Year. We in Minnesota are proud that so many Minnesotans played vital and active roles in this unprecedented venture.

AUTOMOBILE-TIRE SAFETY

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the Federal Trade Commission recently held 3 days of public hearings on the serious problem of automobile-tire safety. The transcript of these hearings runs in the neighborhood of 800 typewritten pages.

I testified at these hearings; but I was unable to sit through all 3 days and to listen to all of the testimony. I have assigned a member of my staff, however, to review the entire transcript. Several newspaper and wire-service reporters who also have heard about the transcript have contacted me recently, in an attempt to obtain copies of the transcript. They stated that they considered some of the testimony contained therein to be "explosive" and of wide public interest. The transcript contains testimony from acknowledged experts in the field of tire manufacture, which indicates a very alarming situation in the industry. I cannot undertake at this time to give a complete account or summary of the testimony in the transcript, but it includes matters such as these:

Many new cars come equipped with tires which are not adequate, even for normal use.

Six-passenger sedans with big trunks are tested for tire purposes with only three passengers and no luggage.

Some compact station wagons require eight-ply tires; yet many firms are shifting from four-ply to two-ply tires.

Tire sizes stamped on the tires do not tell the actual size, and were never intended to do so.

Ply-rating labels have "no understandable meaning" within the industry.

The automobile and tire industries say that choosing the right tire is up to the motorist. Yet there is no way the motorist can make this choice.

The American public and the press should have this full transcript laid before them. It indicates that untold thousands of people are buying fine new cars, loading them up with children and baggage, and setting out across the country in the belief that they are perfectly safe. Actually, many of them are sitting on a time bomb.

My files are filled with letters from people who have had tires fail on practically new cars in perfectly normal use. Now this hearing record explains how such things happen, and raises the question of how many of our 47,000 highway deaths last year were caused by tire failure.

I have written to the chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, Paul Rand Dixon, asking the FTC to publish the full transcript. I also have written to the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], as chairman of the Senate Commerce Committee and as a member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, suggesting that Congress should be willing to pay the cost of publishing such an important hearing record if the FTC is unable to do so.

In the transcript of the FTC hearings, the president of the Rubber Manufacturers Association testified that the selection of the proper tire for a specific car is the responsibility of the individual motorist. Yet, this same official testified that the public was wrong in thinking that the tire size stamped on the tire, such as 7.50x14, was actually a measurement of the tire size.

The Rubber Manufacturers Association president testified:

> The tire name size is molded on the product as a nominal designation for purposes of easy identification by the customer. It is not intended to precisely define the physical dimensions of the tire or the wheel in which it is mounted.

Mr. President, I consider such a statement absolutely unbelievable. In one breath, they say the motorist must pick the right tire for his car; in the next breath, they say the labels on the tires do not mean anything. How in the world is the motorist supposed to pick the right tire?

The FTC Commissioners themselves were shocked at some of the testimony on how the automobile and tire industry fitted the tires to new cars. For instance, one of the Commissioners asked a tire-industry official:

> You say that your test for a six-passenger sedan, which has a big trunk for luggage and so on, is based on the assumption that there will be only three passengers and no baggage?

The tire industry spokesman replied: "Yes, sir."

Another top tire industry official testified that some compact station wagons should have 8-ply tires to carry the loads which they could accommodate.

An FTC Commissioner replied:

> A compact station wagon doesn't come with an 8-ply standard tire as standard equipment.

A tire industry witness replied:

> There is an option in almost all instances, I think you will find, which is recommended in the car-care manual, perhaps, of the company.

Mr. President, this is shocking testimony by itself; but it is made far worse when we read, later on, that the president of the National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association testified:

> The word "ply-rating" has no understandable meaning any more.

They tell the motorist that he must study the car-care manual, to know the number of plies his tires need; and then they tell him that the "ply-rating" labels on the tires have no understandable meaning.

A reading of the transcript reveals that even the tire and automobile industry spokesmen are anxious to have reforms made. There is no need to berate these witnesses; they are telling the truth about a scandalous situation. The responsibility belongs to Congress and to the American public. We should make this 800-page indictment available, and then should move promptly to correct the inexcusable conditions which it exposes.

THE U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH HOSPITAL AT LEXINGTON, KY.

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, this is a brief report, for the benefit of Senators, concerning my visit over the weekend of February 27, to the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital at Lexington, Ky., as a member of the Penitentiaries Subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. The hospital, as Senators are aware, was opened in 1935, for the treatment of narcotic addicts.

The Lexington hospital and its program are discussed in the second of two well-researched and well-written articles in the Life magazine issues for February 26 and March 5, 1965. I ask unanimous consent that the portion of the article referring to the Lexington hospital be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, the Lexington hospital has approximately 1,000 patients, about two-thirds of whom are Federal prisoners under sentence, and the remainder are largely addicts who have voluntarily committed themselves for treatment. Regardless of whether they are prisoners or voluntary patients, their course of treatment at the hospital is largely the same. They are first taken off drugs, usually heroin, given a period of convalescence, and then subjected to an individually prescribed treatment program.

During my visit, I stopped in the ward in which a number of patients were being withdrawn from drugs; and my observations there were almost in direct contrast with the dramatizations of such situations that one often sees on television. The patients were not sweating, writhing, or experiencing much obvious discomfort or suffering. They were sitting there, lying there, or walking around, much as would patients in any other type of hospital.

I learned from Dr. Robert W. Rasor, the medical officer in charge of the hospital, who was my guide, that very few addicts these days experience severe withdrawal symptoms. By the time heroin gets to the addict, it has been cut so many times that not much of the original substance remains. This development is another indication that addiction is more a psychological than a physical problem. The easiest part of the treatment process is to relieve the addict's physical dependence on drugs; the hardest part is to equip him psychologically to resist returning to drugs.

I need not discuss in this report the nature and prevalence of addiction. That has been done quite thoroughly and expertly in the Life articles. I was interested to learn, however, that over a recent 5-year period, Lexington received only 7 patients from North Dakota.

In contrast, the hospital received approximately 7,000 from New York. The hospital statistics suggest that narcotics problem is largely concentrated in the cities of New York, Los Angeles, Chicago, and Detroit.

While, as I have pointed out, about two-thirds of the patients are sentenced Federal prisoners, the admission figures show a markedly different ratio. Of some 2,500 admissions during 1965, nearly 2,000 were voluntary. The high turnover among the voluntary patients is attributable to the fact that the hospital cannot require them to remain for a stipulated period of treatment. One-fourth of the voluntary patients leave the hospital, against medical advice, within 9 days, and the majority within 90 days.

Needless to say, virtually all persons who leave against medical advice revert immediately to the use of drugs.

I have heard various estimates, ranging up to about 95 percent, of the rate of relapse among addicts who have been to Lexington. Dr. Rasor advises me, however, that there are no really valid statistics on this score. A number of circumstances, including the legal protection given Lexington patients as to their identity as addicts, have handicapped research in this respect. The limited followup that has been done suggests that, while there may be a high rate of relapse, most addicts eventually abandon the use of drugs as they reach the middle and late thirties and the early forties. Addiction is chiefly a disease of young people. A similar pattern, I am told, is also characteristic of criminal behavior.

The rehabilitation program is psychiatrically oriented. The hospital has a dozen psychiatrists and a half-dozen psychologists, among whom there is approximately a 90-percent turnover every 2 years, and a number of social workers who are also psychiatrically trained. Several rooms have been set aside for group therapy sessions led by the professional personnel. As a member of the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice, which currently is inquiring into the use of surveillance devices, I was interested to note that the rooms were equipped with one-way windows. The nature of the windows is known to the addict patients, and they are intended to facilitate the training of professional personnel for work with addicts. Many group therapy sessions are also recorded, and the discussions are later analyzed for research training, and treatment purposes.

The hospital gives addicts a chance to acquire more socially constructive habits. They are exposed to healthy forms of recreation; and the hospital is particularly well equipped in this respect. It has excellent facilities for athletic activities, handicrafts, sedentary avocations, and even a theater that is better than any I have seen so far in other Federal institutions.

The patients are also assigned to a wide range of occupational fields, not only for the purpose of teaching them good work habits and skills, but also to put them in situations where they must learn to get along with coworkers, instructors, and supervisors. In addition to the usual trades and occupational fields represented in the operation of the hospital, there is a furniture factory, a needle-trade factory, and a print shop. The output of the three industries is sold to other Government agencies, chiefly the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The hospital also has an attractive chapel, and the patients are given every encouragement to participate in religious activities and to seek religious counseling.

The rehabilitation program at Lexington has many strengths. Its chief weakness is that there is very little or no follow-up supervision or assistance when the patients are released to their communities. Too often they return to exactly the same sort of circumstances and problems that led to their addiction in the first place. Their return to drugs under these circumstances is predictable.

The work of the Addiction Research Center at Lexington, which is supported by the National Institute of Mental Health, and is headed by Dr. William R. Martin, is particularly significant. The Center was established at the same time as the hospital, with the mission of investigating the cause, treatment, and prevention of drug addiction. It has a staff of approximately 50 people, and a budget of about $500,000 annually.

Among other things, the Center tries to detect the abuse potentialities of new drugs being considered for the market; and its work has been a tremendous public service. It has successfully kept off the market a number of drugs with an addicting potential. In this phase of its work, the Center serves as a clinical testing center for the Drug Addiction Committee, of the National Research Council; and for the Expert Committee on Habit-Forming Drugs, of the United Nations.

The Center's researches associated with the various psychological, physical, biochemical, and emotional reactions that follow the administration of drugs have led to the experimental development of what are termed narcotic antagonist drugs. The Center has tentatively identified at least one drug that may someday be useful in the treatment of addicts. When administered to an addict once a day, it would prevent the various effects of any narcotic that he might take, including the euphoria and the physical dependence. When administered after a narcotic had been taken, it would reverse the effects of the narcotic, and would bring on withdrawal symptoms. In the first instance, the drug would prevent the readdiction of the treated addict. In the second, it would help in detecting the treated addict who had reverted to the use of drugs.

The Center has also done some work on the development of a nonaddicting painkiller. The importance of this work is dramatized by the fact that, among occupational groups, doctors and nurses have the highest rates of addiction. The hospital almost always has a number of these medical people as patients. Their presence underscores the fact that education—"knowing better"—is not necessarily the answer to the drug problem.

I was informed that the Center has begun to do some work on alcohol addiction. It was in our discussion on alcoholism that the problem of narcotics addiction began to appear in its proper perspective. In the United States, approximately 5 million people habitually use alcohol to excess. Several hundred thousand are as thoroughly addicted to alcohol as is any addict to heroin. In contrast, the best available estimate concerning the prevalence of drug addiction numbers the victims at about 60,000.

As a result of my visit to Lexington, I would urge upon the appropriate agencies of the executive branch and the appropriate committees of Congress the development of legislation which would accomplish these objectives:

First. A compulsory civil commitment procedure which would prevent the departure of the voluntary patients from the narcotic hospitals until they have completed the full course of rehabilitative treatment prescribed by the medical and psychiatric staff.

Second. More flexibility in the sentences given to Federal offenders who are narcotic addicts, in order that they may be released to the community on trial when the hospital professional staff feels that they are ready.

Third. A more adequate system of community supervision and followup for both voluntary patients and released prisoners, including halfway houses in such communities as Los Angeles, Chicago, Detroit, and New York City, where the incidence of addiction is high enough that such facilities can be economically warranted.

Fourth. An expansion of the work of the Addiction Research Center at Lexington, particularly including a large-scale study of the problem of alcohol addiction.

Fifth. The development of incentives which will prevent excessive turnover of medical and psychiatric personnel in the U.S. Public Health Service. This turnover handicaps the treatment programs both of the narcotic hospitals and of the Federal penal and correctional institutions whose hospitals are staffed by Public Health Service personnel.

Sixth. The Federal control of other drugs with an abuse potential, whose victims cannot be accepted, under current statutes, for treatment at the Lexington and Fort Worth narcotics hospitals.

EXHIBIT 1

HOSPITAL FIGHTS A FRUSTRATING BATTLE

The world's largest, oldest, most prestigious center for treating drug addicts sits atop a hill near Lexington on a thousand acres of Kentucky's finest bluegrass meadowland. It opened 30 years ago as the U.S. Narcotics Farm, but when addicts started writing in to order narcotics, the name was hastily changed to the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital. It has been an off-and-on home for countless addicts, who refer to it simply as "K.Y." Until recently, when a few big cities started putting aside hospital beds for addicts, Lexington and a smaller Public Health Service hospital in Fort Worth, Tex., were just about the only spots in the United States where a junkie could hole up, get off heroin, catch his breath and have a crack at permanently overcoming his addiction.

The scores of addict treatment centers that spread across the country—there are 40 in New York City alone—range from the well-known, multichaptered Synanon (Life, Mar. 9, 1962) to the offices of a few individual physicians with an honest sympathy for addicts. But Lexington still bears the brunt of addiction treatment, taking in 1,900 voluntary patients and 432 Federal prisoners last year (at any one time prisoners, who stay longer, outnumber voluntaries).

Anyone who has never been a voluntary patient before and uses any drug included in a long—but outdated—list set by Federal law may get in simply by showing up at the main gate. Former voluntary patients who seek readmittance must file an application. Unfortunately, some of the more hazardous addicting drugs, like barbiturates and amphetamines, are excluded from the list, and users of them are admitted only if they also use a listed drug. While a once-in-a-while marihuana smoker can get in, a dangerously addicted barbiturate user is turned away.

Checking into Lexington, an addict finds himself swept up by a system designed to take him off drugs and keep him off. Getting him off is not much of a problem. Because of the high price of heroin on the street, few addicts today can afford enough to give them a severe habit. When they kick the habit, even without assisting medication, they ordinarily experience intense nervousness, runny nose, goose flesh, diarrhea, mild stomach cramps—symptoms familiar to anyone who has fought off a bad case of flu. To relieve discomfort during the first few days of withdrawal, heroin addicts get a periodic swallow of methadone, a synthetic narcotic. Barbiturate addicts get pentobarbital. After a few days, the addict's body has lost its dependence on heroin and needs not drugs but rest and food.

The real battle at K.Y. is not with the addict's body but with his mind. He must be weaned from his emotional craving for drugs. Once off drugs, he is moved to "orientation," where for 3 weeks he is tested and talked to by psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers and job trainers. Finally assigned a room in "population," he finds himself with a 30-hour-a-week job or a school program teaching him to be almost anything from a printer or pants presser to a dental assistant.

From here on in, Lexington stops looking like a hospital. The staple medicine is other people. The addict is forced to cope with the staff and other patients, and now he has no drugs to help him escape—as he always has before—the problem of dealing with other people and with himself. Group therapy sessions help him along and, if he needs it, he may get individual therapy from 1 of the hospital's 14 staff psychiatrists.

Treatment does not always go so smoothly. Most patients are big city heroin addicts who, though they come voluntarily to the hospital, may not be really sure they want to make the break. Sometimes they try to smuggle drugs in with them. They show a resourcefulness and ingenuity picked up in years of street living. Addicts have hidden heroin under their toenails, taped to the bottom of their feet, stuffed behind dental plates, sprinkled through their hair. To inject drugs smuggled into the hospital, patients have fashioned syringes from plastic bottles and needles from ballpoint pens. Some years ago, the entire hospital system appeared outsmarted when patients suddenly started showing up high on heroin. Security men sitting in the admitting rooms could not detect the flaw, and the heroin kept coming in. Finally a helpful addict sent a hospital official a copy of a leaflet he had bought on a Harlem street corner for $1. It was titled "How To Smuggle Drugs Into Lexington": simply, go in with a couple of bags of heroin in your hand, ask for a paper towel to wipe your nose, crumple the bags into the towel and hold on to it—nobody will suspect the towel because a hospital official gave it to you in the first place. And it worked.

Dr. Frederick B. Glaser, the psychiatrist who appears on the preceding pages, considered the two young sisters to be among his most hopeful patients. "You talk to those girls," he said before they had returned to New York, "and your heart goes out to them. They're ingenuous, not at all hardened. Both girls break a lot of rules, but you hate to punish them because they're so childish and they break them so innocently. One day they don't go to work and you tell them they have to, and they ask innocently, 'Why?' They're so childish that someone suggested that when they do something wrong, we ought to just spank them. If I were in New York and could see these girls as outpatients I think I could help them."

When they did get back to New York, the younger sister moved in with her mother and the older one went back with a 60-year-old bookie who had kept her before she went to Lexington. They live only a few blocks from a corner—96th Street and Broadway—popular with junkies and pushers. "I try to stay out of the neighborhood," the older sister said, looking up toward the drug-infested corner, "but it's tough. The other junkies ride you when you're off the stuff. I guess they want to get you back on so they won't feel put down by you. I really want to stop drugs. At K.Y. I saw these junkies with scars and abscesses and all that. That's not for me. I want to stop." But a week after leaving Lexington, she was back on drugs—and so was her sister.

Doctors at Lexington, though disappointed, were hardly surprised. Very few Lexington patients—probably less than 10 percent—stay off drugs when they get home. Dr. Glaser and the other doctors would seem to have ample reason for feeling that they are fighting a losing battle. But they do not. They are bolstered by one intriguing and extraordinary fact: nearly half the country's addicts are in their twenties, and only 11 percent are over 40. What happens to an addict when he begins to age? Evidently, as he grows older, he also grows up. He matures. His compulsion to avoid the desperate, degraded life of addiction overpowers his compulsion to use drugs.

Many psychiatrists believe that the maturing process can be hastened by hospital therapy, that as the addict experiences drug-free life in a hospital—or perhaps even in a jail—a layer of maturity is laid down within him. Each time his addiction is arrested for a few more weeks or months, the layer thickens. Finally, he outgrows his infantile need for the solace of drugs and gives them up. This theory, combined with the obvious humanitarian necessity of providing some kind of hospital treatment to addicts, is what refutes Lexington's high relapse rate—and keeps its doctors plugging.

Dr. Glaser scratches his head and listens to suggestions and gripes from some addicts in one of the female dormitories (their faces have been retouched). His toughest job in treating patients is getting them to recognize their problems and to attack them without the help of drugs. Many addicts have for so long used drugs to insulate themselves from the world and its anxieties that they cannot recognize a problem when they see it. They reject responsibility for their own lives. Some prisoner patients, upset by the relative freedom and the responsibility it implies, ask to be transferred to conventional prisons where every door is locked and every movement regimented. Teaching all patients to accept responsibility, to recognize their faults and to move ahead into the complicated business of living a drug-free life can take months and years of steady, perceptive, inspired labor.

Almost all the patients' problems have something to do with their families. A young girl received a telegram from her husband telling her that her father had been fighting with him, trying to break up the marriage. He said that if she wasn't home in a week he was going to kill her father or be killed by him. The girl read the telegram and burst into tears.

"Why can't I kick my habit and be happy one time in my life, when I love this man so much. All my father ever did all my life was drink and chase me and make trouble for me. And now I finally find one man worth giving up drugs for and why won't he leave me alone?" Glaser said softly, "I'll arrange for you to make a phone call home. See what you can do to keep from leaving. Maybe your husband sent the telegram in a fit of anger or desperation and things aren't really that bad. Try to stay as long as possible and let us help you."

Another voluntary patient complained that because she had bad teeth no one in her "alley" (dormitory corridor) liked her. She demanded a room in another alley. Glaser explained that rules forbade such a move until she had been in the room for a certain number of weeks.

"Well, I can't stand it there," she cried. "I don't like anyone. They don't like me. I'd rather be on the street than living there. If I stay there, I'll have to have something to calm me down. Else I'll have to go back to the street."

"You'll have to decide what you think is best," Glaser said, and left her to think it over. "Sometimes," he explains, "you have to force patients to face their problems. They'll try anything to make you bend and solve their problems for them. But that's what's been happening all their lives. That's why they're sick and on drugs. You can't let yourself do it."

Another patient told Glaser she went on drugs because she felt guilty about having stolen a wallet from her grandfather when she was 14. She stays on drugs, she said, because her husband has just been transferred to Mexico and won't give her air fare to get there.

"But he says he'll give you the fare. He just won't give you round trip fare," Glaser points out.

"If he wanted me, he'd give me a ticket to there and back home."

"Then it's not really your fault you're on drugs, is it? It's your grandfather's and your husband's fault."

"Yes."

"Well, then, if you're just a victim and it's not really your fault at all, why are you here for therapy? Maybe you should send your grandfather and husband here for therapy. It's their problem."

"Well, if it's anything I've done, I don't know what it could be."

"Then I don't think we can help you until you realize that you have something to do with what happens to you, that you have some responsibility, that it's not all just other people and fate."

"I'll think about it," she said. "After a while I might get to think it's partly my fault—maybe."

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, today also marks the 144th anniversary of the Greek Independence Day, which should have special significance to the United States and to the entire world, because throughout history the Greek people have been in the forefront in the struggle for the liberty of the individual.

Today, Greece, a member of the NATO alliance, is one of our stanchest allies. She has successfully resisted and repulsed the Communists who attempted to infiltrate her after World War II. To the peoples of the captive nations, Greece is, indeed, a symbol of hope for their future independence and freedom. I am, indeed, proud to have this opportunity to pay tribute to a friend and ally on the the 144th anniversary of her independence.

A COURT OF VETERANS APPEALS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, it was my great pleasure to join in the sponsorship of S. 1200, a bill to establish a Court of Veterans Appeals.

Congress has provided a comprehensive system of benefits for veterans, their surviving widows, children, and dependent parents. The extent of this program is shown by the fact that the budget for fiscal year 1966 contains more than $4 billion for the payment of compensation and pensions. Unfortunately, the law provides that decisions of the Veterans' Administration on all claims for compensation and pension benefits shall be final and conclusive, and cannot be reviewed by any officer of the United States or any court thereof.

Over the years, Representatives and Senators have been approached by veterans seeking their assistance in furthering their attempts to establish service connection for their disabilities. In studying the results of these efforts, I find that the percentage of "wins" has been rather small. Quite possibly those who lost did not have real claims. Nevertheless, I have been impressed by the sincerity and honesty of veteran claimants. In some instances they have convinced me that they have had valid claims to the extent that, upon reading Board of Veteran Appeals decisions in denial, my original views have remained unchanged.

It has been my observation that these cases usually have fallen in the area where the doctrine of reasonable doubt was the determining factor and it was not resolved in the veteran's favor.

This is the type of case I believe would benefit the most by a Court of Veterans Appeals; and I am sure that a considerable number would fall in this category. A veteran who has a case of this sort, and is denied the benefit he is seeking, cannot avoid feeling that he has not received justice. Further recourse to a court would help to dispel this feeling, regardless of the outcome, and, in my opinion, provides sufficient reason for establishing a court.

It has been said before, and I think it bears repeating when considering matters of this sort, that many times the appearance of justice is almost as important as justice itself. If a court can accomplish this—and I believe it can—then certainly it should be established.

There is further justification for it: Military retirement cases can be taken to the U.S. Court of Claims; but, through some strange quirk, benefits administered by the Veterans' Administration are considered gratuities, and are not subject to review by a court, despite the fact that in each instance the basic issue is the establishment of a disability which arose in service.

The Government life insurance program administered by the Veterans' Administration is an exception. Insurance cases can be taken into court, because they are considered contract cases. It is my feeling—and I know it is shared by others—that when a man enters the Armed Forces, he does so with the assurance that should he incur a disability while serving, he will be compensated for it. This is an implied contract; and when a controversy arises, a court should be available to settle it.

The Veterans' Administration over the years has done an admirable job; but it is an inescapable fact that the Board of Veterans Appeals is in the unenviable position of making determinations in claims against the very organization of which it is an integral part. Justice can never be fully served under these conditions.

THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I call the attention of Senators to several editorials and an article commenting on the President's address to Congress on March 15 and the proposed legislation on the so-called voting rights. These editorials merit the attention of all Members of the Congress who wish to consider objectively this proposed legislation, which the President is demanding be passed with limited consideration and study. These editorials and the article are as follow:

"This State and Voting," from the State, of Columbia, S.C., dated March 3, 1965.

"The President's Speech," from the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C., dated March 17, 1965.

"Asking Too Much for Too Little," from the Greenville News, of Greenville, S.C., dated March 17, 1965.

"Has This Nation Truly Come to Such a Pass?" from the Spartanburg Herald, of Spartanburg, S.C., dated March 17, 1965.

"More Vicious Than Anticipated," from the Augusta Chronicle, of Augusta, Ga., dated March 18, 1965.

"Innocent Till Proved Guilty?" from the Augusta Herald, of Augusta, Ga., dated March 20, 1965.

"Johnson, the Omnipotent," from the Savannah Evening Press, of Savannah, Ga., dated March 16, 1965.

"L.B.J.'s Voting Rights Speech," from Human Events, of Washington, D.C., dated March 27, 1965.

"Sixteen Laws Already Available," from the Chattanooga News-Free Press, of Chattanooga, Tenn., dated March 15, 1965.

"An Offense to South Carolina," from the Columbia Record, of Columbia, S.C., dated March 22, 1965.

"Question Lingers on Voting Bill," an article by Mr. Richard Wilson which appeared in the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., on March 24, 1965.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that these editorials and the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks, together with my newsletter, dated March 22, 1965, entitled "The Art of Omission."

There being no objection, the article, editorials, and the newsletter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the State, Mar. 20, 1965]

THIS STATE AND VOTING

Under one provision of President Johnson's proposed Voting Rights Act, it looks as if South Carolinians are going to have to register and vote whether they have an interest in doing so or not—if they want to exercise the last chance to manage their own voter registration.

The device which would bring Federal voting registrars to South Carolina is the provision which would come into play if less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age are registered or if less than 50 percent vote in an election.

Negro leaders openly say that Negroes in South Carolina generally face no obstacles whatsoever in registering to vote. In fact, it was recently discovered that one person with a whole string of disqualifying convictions had been registered.

It may come as a shock to the people in Washington, but obviously less than 50 percent of the voting age whites and Negroes participated in the last election, for which there was nevertheless a record turnout.

Some simple calculations are revealing. The State has a population of about 2,300,000 according to the last census. About 35 percent are Negroes.

Assuming that 50 percent of this group of voting age (the actual percentage is higher), this would leave more than a million white persons of voting age, and about 400,000 Negroes. Last fall 524,578 voted out of 772,748 persons who had registered.

This leaves us with less than half the eligibles registered—probably for both white and Negro. Estimates are that about 400,000 white persons voted last fall—certainly less than 40 percent of those of voting age.

According to Justice Department figures, incidentally, approximately 34 percent of eligible (according to age) Negroes are registered in the State. The percentage of white and Negro registrants seems fairly close.

Thus would come the Federal registrars—even though on one can cite any reason other than citizen apathy for their having to come.

South Carolina, it seems might have to engage a little compulsory registration, and voting, if it wishes to keep control of its election machinery.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Mar. 17, 1965]

THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECH

President Johnson responded to the pressures of Selma with an ultimatum to Congress.

The Federal Government, he declared, will usurp State and local authority for the registration of voters.

Specifically, he said, the Government will lower the bars to Negroes. He was not specific about Indians, Puerto Ricans, Eskimos, or Mexican-Americans, but he left the impression that he included illiterate whites.

His drastic and sweeping recommendations in an address to the Congress and the Nation were designed to cure isolated evils where some States and communities deliberately deny voting privileges to Negroes by subterfuge or unreasonable standards of suffrage.

These problem areas exist in the South, so the President is repeating a common fallacy, the condemnation of the whole for the offense of the few.

As spelled out in a news release, a key provision of the President's new civil rights program is: "Without resorting to the courts, the Federal Government could wrest control of voter registration in all problem areas of the South. The United States could enter wherever 50 percent or less of eligible adults in a State or county either failed to register or vote in last November's general elections."

South Carolina is lumped in that category, but is not guilty of denying registration and votes to Negroes. The Federal Government has tried unsuccessfully to find evidence of discrimination or intimidation.

One has only to visit the polls on election day or the courthouses on registration days to see that Negroes in this State register and vote the same as whites. The qualifications for both are the same. The requirements for eligibility are simple.

The applicant must have resided a year in the State, 6 months in the county and 60 days in the precinct. He must be 21 and have a citizenship record free of felonies. He must be able to read a section of the Constitution or show proof of property assessed at a minimum of $300. The standard for voting is as reasonable as it is simple.

It behooves the Congress to remove the sectionalism of the President's demands.

The President revealed in his address that he was susceptible to the pressures of racial demonstrators—of being blackjacked, as he had expressed it earlier. His reference to northern cities showed that he was sensitive to the criticism of Martin Luther King's lieutenants and such racial radicals as Cecil Moore, of Philadelphia. As he spoke, work was still under way to complete the bill for presentation, which indicated the expediency the President felt.

Last April, the White House was concerned about the effects of Communist associations and influences upon King and his movement. Now, a year later, King has become the dominant figure in American politics. The President has adopted his theme, "We Shall Overcome."

King's frequent consultations at the White House, his defiance of State and Federal authority in Alabama, his constant pressures against the President and the Congress—all have contributed to the urgency and extremity of the President's action and the frenzy in the Congress to prevent further violence of racial demonstrations North and South.

The President was correct in his sermon when he said that no American—no qualified American, that is—should be denied the right to vote. But in the protection of that right, other constitutional rights should also be respected and preserved.

[From the Greenville (S.C.) News, Mar. 17, 1965]

Asking Too Much for Too Little

No one can argue with the basic premise set forth in President Johnson's over-dramatized special address to Congress and the Nation Monday night:

Every qualified citizen of the United States is entitled to the privilege of voting in any election which affects his welfare.

That privilege—not an unmitigated or unrestrained right, but a privilege—is inherent and explicitly provided for in the Constitutions of the United States and the 50 States.

Nor can anyone deny that many persons, not all of them Negroes by any means, have been denied the privilege of registering to vote and to cast a free and unfettered ballot in certain local, State or National elections. There have been flagrant violations of the Federal Constitution and even of the Constitutions and statutes of the States by officials of those same States.

But that is as far as we can go, and as far as any one should go with Mr. Johnson's speech. It wound up as another eulogy of the Johnsonian utopia and at points stooped to outright demagoguery.

The administration has allowed the Nation and the States to suffer too much and is now asking too much to achieve too little in the way of results which could have been achieved long ago by more orderly processes. These would not have created the existing bitterness between groups and the wounds on the body politic, much less go on to make them worse.

The President is asking Congress to enact legislation which, in a few States at least, would allow Federal officials to move in, suspend such qualifications for registration as literacy tests and register all persons of voting age, seemingly as expeditiously as numbers racket tickets are handed out in the ghettos of New York City.

Early reports on the proposed law, such as they are, indicate that anyone meeting age and residency requirements, who is mentally competent and has not been convicted of a felony would be declared eligible and would be registered by an appointed Federal registrar without further question.

Who would define mentally competent and how, and how it would be measured, is an interesting question.

President Johnson again is putting Congress in the position of legislating, or refusing to legislate, in an atmosphere of hysteria, bitterness, prejudice, and the threat of violence. The situation is worse than it was when the Civil Rights Act was passed last year.

What's more, he is asking for new legislation before the Civil Rights Act has been fully tried as a possible solution to the impasse which has developed in some areas.

Persons who, as President Johnson says, have been "illegally denied the right to vote" have always had recourse to the State and Federal courts to assert that right. The Civil Rights Act gives the Federal Government the power to step in and initiate court action.

The President says this would take too long. As a matter of practical fact, however, it would be easy enough to obtain a court order enjoining election officials from discriminating in any matter pertaining to suffrage, and such an order could be enforced overnight.

Unless the purpose is to wipe out all State voting qualifications, there is no other—except to appeal to the Negro masses who have been worked up to a fever pitch by agitators who have made the most of isolated State or local shortcomings.

At one point in his speech, the President made a sotto voce appeal to the demonstrators to calm down, but it was lost in his condemnation of State officials which damned the whole South to criticize a part of it. He spoke of the once quiet and lovely town of Selma, Ala., as some ugly pit of hell.

He spoke of the American Negro meaning, of course, the demonstrators following Martin Luther King and his motley, many-hued henchmen as the real hero of a struggle to overcome bigotry and injustice.

He named the wrong heroes.

The real heroes are the law-abiding Negroes who have quietly taken advantage of their opportunities, who have refrained from activities which at the very least amount to incitement to violence and who have qualified, registered, and voted on their individual merits.

The real heroes, too, are the white Americans, especially millions in the South, who have patiently helped Negroes who deserved help and who have made their influence felt for the realization of the rights of all men.

Heroes, too, are the thousands of law enforcement officers who have been able to keep their heads and have refused to be provoked by insult and injury into the use of violent force.

It is these people, rather than the politicians in Washington, the demagogs in many places and the agitators and demonstrators in the streets, who will save the situation these people have created—if at this late date it can be prevented from becoming chaos or anarchy.

[From the Spartanburg (S.C.) Herald, Mar. 17, 1965]

Has This Nation Truly Come to Such a Pass?

Has it come to such an utterly incomprehensible pass in this country?

Apparently it has.

The President of the United States has proposed legislation deliberately calculated to discriminate against one section and not the other.

Congress, they say, will approve his plan without hesitation.

The measure would eliminate virtually all qualifications for voting.

But only in the South. The fact that Alaska is included is purely incidental and without practical effect.

The administration says it is presuming that in any State where fewer than 50 percent of the people of voting age actually voted there was racial discrimination.

It happens that this standard fits the six Southern States and Alaska. That's all.

Negroes are privileged to register and vote in South Carolina. Three U.S. Attorney Generals have tried to establish proof to the contrary, but they failed. The Civil Rights Commission likewise has produced no justifiable complaint of that nature in this State.

Yet, South Carolina is presumed to be guilty.

And what is the punishment?

The State is to lose all control over the qualifications for its voters. (But New York and Chicago, where political corruption and manipulation have been rampant, are not touched.)

The legislation will make possible the assigning of full-time Federal employes to see to it that every Negro of voting age, though many may have to sign with an X, are qualified in South Carolina. But not in the North.

Negro citizens stand to lose as much as any others when the framework of responsible government is shattered.

The Negro in the South—at least in this part of the South—has progressed immensely in the modern era. He has accomplished his significant improvement through his own talents, determination, and intelligence.

Many doors of economic and educational opportunity are opening to him.

The ultimate destiny of the Negro will not be served by the power of illiterate and uninformed voters; nor will it be gained by dissension and violence.

His proper role will be won by continued intelligent development of the skills and talents he possesses.

How tragically ironic it will be if this role is destroyed by the excesses of those who cry the loudest that they are his saviors.

It can happen if the premium is put on ignorance and disruption rather than intelligent participation in good government.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Chronicle, Mar. 18, 1965]

More Vicious Than Anticipated

Yesterday the Chronicle, in an editorial, repeated its often-expressed belief that no American citizen, anywhere, who is qualified under the fair administration of his State's voting laws should be prevented from registering or from voting.

We expressed the hope that the voting rights bill which the Johnson administraion would send to the Congress, following the President's address on that subject would be reasonable and fair to all concerned. That was before the bill had been delivered and made public.

Now that the proposed bill has reached the Congress it must be pointed out that the President, in an effort to secure rights for some, would destroy rights for others. The bill would, in several ways, violate the principles of government which have made the United States a land of liberty. Based on information in a news wire service account, the following conclusions may be reached:

It would provide for application of the Federal intervention process in any State or county where literacy or other tests were used as of November 1, 1964, and where the number of registered voters or the number of votes cast in the November 4 election was below 50 percent. Thus, the bill would make no allowance for voter apathy. Its provisions could be put into effect merely because registered voters preferred to go fishing.

The bill says that if a State or county wished to avoid coming under the terms of proposed law, it would have to prove it to a three-judge Federal Court in Washington, D.C., that there had been no voter discrimination in the past 10 years. This provision would adopt the principle that the officials involved would be considered guilty until they could prove themselves innocent, a complete reversal of our system of law. It would make present officials liable for what their predecessors did for a decade in the past. It would move an alleged offense from the jurisdiction in which it was said to have occurred to Washington, D.C.

A court decision that a county or other voting district had practiced discrimination would bar that district from seeking to escape the effects of the law for 10 years. This 10-year probationary sentence meted out through Federal intervention is a clear indication that the purpose of the bill is not corrective, but punitive.

The bill provides that the U.S. Attorney General could appoint Federal vote registrars (they are called examiners in the bill) for any election district if he received complaints from 20 persons in that district that they had been denied voting rights. It would require not proof, as fair judicial procedure would seem to require—only complaints. The Attorney General also could impose Federal control, the news dispatch says, either on complaint "or if he thought such action were otherwise necessary." We have indeed lost a great part of our heritage of law if what one man "thinks" is to be legal justification for usurping State or local functions.

Any person who registered with a federally appointed registrar up to 45 days before election day could vote, regardless of State laws imposing an earlier registration deadline. Here is something which is totally irrelevant to voters' registration rights. It is simply a matter of highhanded rewriting of State laws in Washington.

Any registered voter refused the right to cast his ballot could complain to a Federal official, and the local U.S. district court could withhold any certification of the election until this person voted. This procedure makes possible a system of harassment by which one person in each State could hold up the entire certification of elections in his State. Should protests come in mass numbers—a sort of huge election sitdown—then results could be delayed for months while Federal officials checked out thousands of complaints to see if the complaints were actually from persons qualified, and if they actually had been denied the right to vote.

States would be prohibited from passing new voter-qualification laws to avoid the effect of the new Federal intervention statute, except that such a law might be permitted if a three-judge Federal court in Washington, D.C., approved it as not interfering with voter rights. In other words, no State legislature would have the definite power to correct by statute any present inequity. Such an attempt would be invalid until subject to review and approval by an out-of-State court. The necessity for carrying all actions under this bill to Washington, D.C., makes it appear that the administration no longer trusts even its own Federal judges outside of the Capital City.

Penalties for interfering with the right to vote would be up to 5 years in prison, a $50,000 fine, or both.

This is a bill which would curtail more liberties than it would assure. No matter how much it represents the thinking of radical advisers, President Johnson must bear the blame for a wholly vicious approach to a problem demanding understanding and reason.

Certainly there are enough levelheaded men in our Congress to point out, during debate, the flaws in this ill-considered proposal.

If they fail to prevail, there are potential tragic consequences for all Americans in the measure which is being sold to the Nation in the glittering guise of equal rights.

What no man must forget, no matter the color of his skin, is that a Federal bureaucracy, once it gains the power to impose its will, can exercise that power to the detriment of any group or cause on which it may care to turn its wrath.

[From the Augusta (Ga.) Herald,
Mar. 20, 1965]

INNOCENT TILL PROVED GUILTY?

There is something ironic in the comments of three Augusta Negro leaders on President Johnson's proposed voter registration bill, and the irony shows just how unfair and unreasonable the bill would be.

The leaders—the Reverend C. S. Hamilton, Henry Brooks, and Attorney John Ruffin—did not criticize the proposed bill. However, their comments to newsmen Wednesday clearly indicated that "evils" the bill is designed to eradicate are in many instances more imaginary than real.

The bill, if passed, would pave the way for Federal intervention in the registration of voters where (1) literacy or other tests were used as of November 1, 1964, as voter qualifications, and where (2) the number of registered voters or the number of those voting in the November 4 election was below 50 percent.

The stated purpose of the bill is the elimination of discrimination against Negroes seeking the franchise. And, obviously, President Johnson presumes that voter registration and/or voter turnout statistics can be used to pinpoint such discriminatory practices.

We have no doubt that in many cases highly unfair "tests" are employed by voter registrars to prohibit Negroes from voting. But this is not the case in Richmond County, yet it, too, apparently would fall under the provisions of the proposed bill.

Each of the three Negro leaders said they know of no discriminatory practices here to keep Negroes from the polls. They attributed the absence of many qualified Negroes on election days to sheer apathy.

Hamilton, vice chairman of the Georgia chapter of the NAACP, said he has not had more than three complaints in his 8½ years in Augusta. Even then, he explained, "These people had trouble with the literacy requirements" necessary for registration in Richmond County. Ruffin and Brooks said they have had no complaints at all, and Hamilton added that even when a voter registration drive succeeds in qualifying new voters, arduous effort is needed to get them to the polls on election days.

How, then, we ask, can President Johnson or Congress possibly justify the application of the proposed bill to places like Richmond County? Obviously, the statistics of voter activity here point to no iniquitous evil. They point, instead, to voter apathy among both whites and Negroes.

As we see it, the proposed legislation reflects the hypocrisy we have learned to expect from Washington relative to civil rights. For while it so righteously flails prejudice in the South, it reveals its own prejudice toward the South.

Surely, means other than sweeping legislation which indicts communities so rashly and unfairly can be found to remedy real discrimination. President Johnson's proposed bill is nothing short of Federal tyranny disguised as weeping altruism.

[From the Savannah (Ga.) Evening Press,
Mar. 16, 1965]

JOHNSON, THE OMNIPOTENT

Just 10 weeks after he delivered his state of the Union message to Congress in a similar nighttime personal appearance, President Johnson appeared before the Congress and the American people to present a rather strange message. If it is possible to get a hybrid mixture by crossing Pandora's box with an iceberg, this is what the man from Texas sought to achieve last night. In short, there is more to it than meets the eye.

How the President can equate the events at Selma, Ala., with those at Lexington and Concord—or even Appomattox—is a question which should weigh heavily on the mind of every thinking American. Perhaps Mr. Johnson provides the ready answer when he says that those who advise us to hold on the past are denying the future. It would appear that the President likes to take poetic license with our glorious history and heritage when it suits his mood and purpose and then discard that very same heritage on the scrap heap in order to score a point of political advantage.

While he put a little frosting on the cake to diffuse and confuse the unsuspecting, the President left no doubt whatsoever that his remarks were a silver platter response to those who had demonstrated at Selma and in the Capital of the Nation. This time, more dramatically than the aftermath of Birmingham, a President of the United States capitulated to "mobrocracy" and lawlessness.

Lest anyone draw an erroneous conclusion, we here and now reaffirm our faith in the vitality of the U.S. Constitution. We deplore, with equal vigor, any and all attempts to distort this document from its original shape and purpose for individual or group gains to the advantage of any other.

The Constitution of this Nation is a whole document and any effort to lift fragments of the whole to press a single advantage ignores the restraints and guarantees embodied in the whole fabric. Fractionalization can only lead to ultimate destruction.

The wording of the 15th amendment should be clear to one and all. There is, however, a tendency to gloss over the fact that this is not the sole reference to voting rights contained in the Constitution. The 17th amendment, for example, states that in regard to the election of U.S. Senators "the electors in each State shall have the qualification requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures."

Section IV, article I while giving the legislatures the primary responsibility for determining the time, places, and manner of holding elections for U.S. Senators and Representatives retains to the Congress the power to alter such regulations with an exception. The exception leaves to the States without question the right to designate the places Senators are chosen.

Thus, it is easy to see that the Founding Fathers intended that the several States should retain control in large measure over the method in which elections are conducted. The Nation can ill afford to have these principles gutted by Presidential whims, acts of a kowtowing Congress or a misguided Supreme Court ruling. Principles once destructed are not quite the same even if the pieces are glued together carefully.

In almost the same breath in which the President spoke of upholding the Constitution, he dignified and glorified those who demonstrated by terming them the real heroes. Not a single mention was made of those law enforcement officials who were sworn to uphold the law and did.

How can we ever have respect for law and order in this Nation again when the Chief

Magistrate of the country gives sanction to those who flout not only State and local laws but orders of the Federal courts to whom they have turned in their quest for special recognition?

It would seem that the President, in adopting this stance showed his ignorance of article IV of the Constitution which states: "The United States shall guarantee to every State in this Union a republican form of government, and shall protect each of them against invasion, and on application of the legislature, or of the executive (when the legislature cannot be convened), against domestic violence."

Where is there a man who can truthfully deny that some of our States have been subjected to an invasion by persons who have no lawful grievances in the States they invade? Where is there a man who can deny that there has been domestic violence? It would seem that the President has fallen victim to a case of selective color vision and semantical constitutional blindness.

The club that the President brandished last night would, for all practical purposes, abolish every form of formal requirement that one needs to meet in order to register to vote. Registration blanks would simply list the person's name, address, age and length of residence. No provision is made, according to the pronouncement, for the exclusion of convicted felons, lunatics or illiterates.

The real catch to putting the Federal Government in the driver's seat is the proposal which would allow Federal registrars to work in any State or election district where 50 percent of the eligible voters were not registered or 50 percent did not vote in the general elections. We can only assume that the Federal registrars will be picked by the Civil Service Commission through the odious process known as selective certification.

The President's proposal calls for Federal intrusion into every election held in this country and this conceivably includes party primaries, too. He is not content with Congress acting in a procedural fashion as it did with the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Mr. Johnson demands immediate action.

After unveiling his latest plan for submission to a militant minority, the President went on to detail the ingredients of his "dream." Without appearing to be sacrilegious, one can only conclude that the President wants to go down in the history books as the omnipotent one. His visions and pronounced plans to implement them tend to put him on a pedestal higher than that reserved for God or His Son. This type of omnipotence is out of character with the American dream and is a dangerous philosophy to follow. It can only lead down the path toward total disaster.

[From Human Events, Mar. 27, 1965]

L.B.J.'s Voting Rights Speech

Does any Northern nonsegregationist politician have the courage to challenge President Johnson on his civil rights speech? Will somebody, anybody, peg his talk before a joint session of Congress as the puerile, dangerous, demagogic stuff and nonsense that it was?

Surely the death of the Reverend James Reeb was a terrible and tragic event and undoubtedly some Alabama troopers were guilty of excessive force during bloody Sunday, as the civil rights demonstrators refer to the first breakup of their proposed march to Montgomery. These actions were reprehensible and their perpetrators should be punished.

But the President's address, we believe, was not an authentic plea for Negro equality before the law. Nor was it a worthy plea for equal voting rights, though if anyone might be an expert on the abridgement of voters' rights it should be the incumbent President, once referred to as Landslide Lyndon for his mysterious 87-vote victory to the Senate in 1948.

No; Lyndon's message was something else again. It had the unerring ring of the charlatan, not the statesman; the sales pitch of Elmer Gantry, not St. Paul.

For if the truth be told, the President's talk was simply an outrageous use of prime time to propagandize the American people over three television networks for 60 minutes about his domestic political program. Furthermore, it was a wonderful opportunity for L.B.J. to indulge in self-adulation with a major altering of the facts in his own life.

The "voting rights" topic was only the launching pad for serious discussion about the Great Society and the even greater Lyndon.

A President sincerely interested in securing voting rights legislation for the Negro, with aid from both sides of the aisle, would have rigorously avoided jeopardizing that plan with a crass plunge into the political arena and a thinly veiled demand for congressional enactment of highly dubious antipoverty legislation and other Federal welfare measures. But not L.B.J.

The Negro, according to Johnson, must not only have ballot rights. He must also possess a "trained mind" (L.B.J.'s education boondoggle), a "healthy body" (L.B.J.'s medicare package), a "decent home" (L.B.J.'s housing program), et cetera, et cetera, et cetera.

And what else did the President's stirring message teach us? For one thing, we were overcome to learn that President Johnson, who never sponsored a civil rights bill until 1959 and who put a restrictive covenant in his own property, has been the champion of the civil rights movement ever since the late 1920's when he saw Mexican-Americans with "the pain of prejudice" in their eyes.

As his harangue droned to a close, the President's touches of megalomania began to grow lyrical: "I want to be the President who educated young people * * * I want to be the President who helped feed the hungry * * * I want to be the President who helped to end war among the brothers of this earth. * * *"

Where, oh where, is the Republican to retort to such blather? Perhaps the networks will give equal time.

The entire Nation, not only Selma, has been engulfed with civil rights demonstrators in the past several weeks. Men have been killed in Alabama and hurt in Washington, D.C. Plainly, President Johnson could have done a great service to the country by bluntly warning the demonstrators, who have helped to incite this violence, that such demonstrations will no longer be tolerated, now that Congress and the courts have taken over.

But the President, for reason known only to him, felt it best to sanction the demonstrations and glorify the demonstrators.

The Negro's "demonstrations have been designed to call attention to injustice, to provoke change and stir reform." (Indeed, it took 8 weeks of Selma demonstrations before Johnson moved.) "And who among us can say we would have made the same progress were it not for his persistent bravery * * *?" In other words, continue the lie-ins, on with the sleep-ins, hurrah for the sit-ins, forward with the marches—unless, of course, they're at the White House.

The President's demagogy, we feel, attained special heights. And it was reflected in Johnson's peremptory demand that Congress enact his bill posthaste: "The time for waiting is gone," he said.

It was also reflected in Lyndon's egregious assertion that there is "no constitutional issue" regarding his new bill to amend the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

But there is a constitutional issue, Mr. President. There is nothing in the Constitution that gives broad authority to the Federal Government to establish voter qualifications within the State.

Article I of the Constitution confers on the States the right to establish qualifications for their own voters in State and local elections. The 15th amendment says only, "The right of the citizen of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color or previous condition of servitude."

But under the Johnson proposals, the politically appointed Attorney General, without a court order or proof of discrimination, can see to it that Federal registrars (euphemistically called examiners) will insure registration of voters in State, Federal, and local elections. Moreover, these registrars can totally ignore State qualifications such as literacy tests and the like.

The "goal" of L.B.J.'s legislation, reports the Washington Post, "is to strike down all discriminatory literacy tests, so-called understanding and character tests, and even so-called moral tests, unless it can be shown that the applicant has been convicted of a felony."

Certainly, there is legitimate doubt as to whether it is constitutional for Congress to eliminate these State tests. Senator SAM ERVIN, Democrat, of North Carolina, considered one of the top legal experts in the country, argues that for years Congress has believed such legislation as the President proposes could only become legal if it were submitted in the form of constitutional amendments.

Notes the Chicago Tribune about Lyndon's vote package: "These were originally the doctrines of the post Civil War radical Republicans with the force bills of the 1870's, which were struck down as unconstitutional by the Supreme Court of that day."

The Washington Evening Star, while generally favorable to L.B.J.'s proposals, also commented: "For our part, we prefer to reserve judgment until what the President calls a 'simple uniform standard' becomes available for scrutiny.

"One reason for this is the presentation of fiction as fact in some parts of his address. For instance, referring to the undeniable efforts in some areas of the South to keep Negroes from voting, Mr. Johnson said: 'The fact is that the only way to pass these barriers is to show a white skin.' The fact is that is not a fact—at least as far as Alabama is concerned. Assuming that Governor Wallace told the truth on Sunday, and we have seen no denial of what he said, there are some 115,000 Negroes registered and eligible to vote in his State. This represents more than 20 percent of all the votes cast in Alabama in the 1960 presidential election. So we want to see what kind of voting standard. * * * The true test is whether an individual, white or black, is qualified. * * * It does not seem to us too much to ask that all voters should pass a reasonable, modest literacy test."

Another major argument against the President's bill is that under the 1957, 1960, and 1964 Civil Rights Acts the machinery to achieve fair voting is already available. In Selma, as a result of a Federal court order in February, nearly 3,000 Negroes have made applications to register. In the absence of proper cause, if these applicants aren't registered by July a Federal judge can insure that they will be registered through court-appointed officials.

The political bias of these election proposals is strikingly apparent. Under L.B.J.'s formula, Federal registrars will be able to go into those States which have literacy or similar qualifying tests and in which the director of the census determines that fewer than 50 percent of the people were registered to vote in the November 1964 election, or fewer than 50 percent actually voted.

As of now, seven States are immediately brought under the scope of the L.B.J. proposals. Five of these States just happened to vote for Senator Barry Goldwater in 1964. If the politically appointed registrars are able to do away with major voting qualifications, including literacy tests, it is not hard to imagine that thousands of "functionally illiterate Negroes," to borrow a term from BOBBY KENNEDY, could be put on the rolls by these registrars. Since Negroes tend to vote heavily Democratic, the political motivation of L.B.J. and his cohorts of these proposals are not hard to understand.

Negroes certainly have the right to vote on the same basis as other citizens—and this should be strictly enforced—but voting illiterates, black or white, will not help the democratic process. It would be wise for Congress to take a longer look at the President's proposals than he has suggested.

[From the Chattanooga (Tenn.) News-Free Press, Mar. 15, 1965]

SIXTEEN LAWS ALREADY AVAILABLE

President Lyndon B. Johnson is scheduled to speak to a joint session of Congress tonight to propose enactment of a new voting rights bill. This may give some people the impression that there is not now sufficient legal protection for the right to vote. But such a conclusion would be most erroneous.

Already on the lawbooks as Mr. Johnson prepares to speak are 16 laws designed to protect the right to vote.

It is not an absence of legal means to secure the right to vote that has brought a crisis to Alabama and to our Nation. The crisis has been a result of determination by Martin Luther King and other agitators not to use the law but to use demonstrations by mobs in the streets instead.

Using the 16 laws now in force would not attract so much attention. Using the laws through calm court procedure would not attract big contributions to the treasuries of the agitators. Street marches by mobs almost always bring conflict and conflict is what the agitators feed on to gain personal fame, power and money.

Mr. Johnson realizes how these things are. Mr. Johnson is a supreme politician. And so instead of pointing out the availability of 16 laws that might be used—some of them for civil action to assure the right to vote and some of them for criminal action to punish any who unjustly deny the right to vote—Mr. Johnson calls for enactment of another law for which he can take credit in the eyes of the agitators who have disrupted society instead of using the available laws for any legitimate aspirations.

We do not believe that in every case local authorities have acted justly, wisely, or well when it comes to the administration of voting regulations. We believe every citizen of each State should have an equal right with all other voters in his State to register and vote. Regulations for voting vary from State to State, as the Constitution provides for. But whatever regulations are in force in any State should be applicable on a fair basis to all in that State. Since this may not have been the case in every situation, there may properly be resort to the many laws available for redress. But there is no propriety in mob action that not only ignores legal remedy but stirs illegal violence.

The Constitution provides in article I, section 4: "The times, places, and manner of holding elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by law make or alter such regulations, except as to the places of chosing Senators." Under this provisions, therefore, Congress may act only on times and manner of holding elections—not on registration qualifications of voters.

In article I, section 2, the Constitution says how qualifications of voters, or "electors," as they are called here, may be established: "the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." In other words, the qualifications necessary for a voter to vote for a member of his State house of representatives shall be the same qualifications required for participation in Federal elections.

The 15th amendment states: "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

With this background, the laws protecting the right to vote have been enacted.

If the existing laws had been used, there would be no crisis today. And there is no real need for a new law such as Mr. Johnson will call for tonight.

IF SHOE WERE ON OTHER FOOT

There are some people who have a prejudice against Alabama's Gov. George Wallace and so they don't want to hear or heed anything he has to say. If they did, they might be embarrassed by the soundness of what he points out on some occasions.

Yesterday, a television program had been set up for the purpose of roasting Governor Wallace, a procedure which is supposed to be highly pleasing to those throughout the country who prefer this sort of thing to bull fighting and bear baiting. But it didn't turn out that way. Governor Wallace made some points that thoughtful people need to consider. The Governor showed, for example, how a nun had been quoted in a news story as saying a hospital had denied an injured Negro treatment, but that the nun denied making any such statement, that the Negro did receive treatment, and that if there were any instance in which a Negro or anybody else were denied treatment, Governor Wallace would see to it personally that something was done about it.

This, the Alabama Governor said, was merely one minor example of the inflammatory way the situation in the South has been misrepresented. He himself would be inflamed if told a hospital had denied a Negro treatment, the Governor said—but it simply wasn't true, as the quoted nun herself attested. The Governor never did get a good answer as to how the lie had been reported in the first place. He did show how agitation by misrepresentation works.

But perhaps the most pointed observation by the Governor was contained in his comparison of the Selma situation with what might have happened if the agitation had been transplanted to New York. And it is not unreasonable to suggest application of the situation to New York, for that city and many other Northern cities have had racial riots far worse than anything that has occurred in the South.

The people of Selma have been the victims of outside-agitated mobs of demonstrators in their streets for a solid 8 weeks. Can you imagine that? What, Governor Wallace asked, would New York do if several hundred demonstrators should mill around Times Square in New York City for 8 solid weeks?

We all know the answer. New York wouldn't tolerate such a situation. Selma has. Yet, said Governor Wallace, the people of Selma have as much right to have their streets clear as do the people of New York.

When President Lyndon B. Johnson found the halls of the White House cluttered with a dozen sit-in demonstrators a few days ago, he didn't put up with it for very many hours.

When Washington police found Pennsylvania Avenue cluttered with demonstrators lying down on the pavement, they didn't put up with it for very many minutes.

Yet Selma has had it for 8 weeks—and it continues.

We happen to believe that in many places in the South the reaction of officials and innocent citizens to the mob demonstrations has not been very wise. Yet those who are not the direct targets and victims of such mob actions find it hard to imagine the pressures that are built up—one purpose being to provoke legally constituted authorities into making mistakes, or into allowing situations which bring about violence and injury and even death. These are the "tools" of the agitators.

It is easy to criticize Alabama. But nobody can conceive toleration of an 8-week-long demonstration in any Northern city.

[From the Columbia (S.C.) Record, Mar. 22, 1965]

AN OFFENSE TO SOUTH CAROLINA

President Johnson's voting rights bill is commendable in its intent and salutary in its declaration that "no voting qualification or procedure shall be imposed or applied to deny or abridge the right to vote on account of race or color."

But its enforcement provisions violate truth, honor, the Constitution, and are fundamentally discriminatory against whole segments of the American citizenry.

Six Southern States are singled out for discriminatory treatment, based on an arithmetical proviso of percentage of eligible adults registered to vote. A 50-percent voting or registration level triggers the discrimination against these States or areas.

South Carolina is included.

The Government's contention is that the less than 50 percent registration or voting record in our State is prima facie evidence of discrimination. Such an allegation is utterly without foundation, palpably fraudulent, and is an offense to the whole people of our State.

For years this newspaper has insisted upon the prompt registration of all voters whose eligibility should be determined by fair tests, uniformly applied without regard for race, color, or sex. We have insisted, as has our State government, upon no discrimination against Negro registrants.

The mathematical computations of low registrations in select South Carolina counties led two Attorneys General, William Rogers under Eisenhower and Robert Kennedy under his brother, to dispatch investigators to our State. In both instances, no discrimination was found.

On the few occasions in which minor infractions were discovered, swift remedy was effected by State and local insistence upon equity for all.

In short, there is at present no discrimination against the Negro in South Carolina. And the whole State is resolved that each citizen is entitled to register without discrimination.

(Two major factors account for the State's low percentage: (1) The high degree of illiteracy among both Negroes and whites, with the greater rate found among the former; and (2) an apathy deplored by Negro registration leaders themselves.)

Yet, South Carolina—under the President's proposed bill—would be forced to give up its simple literacy test because of the statistical hypocrisy of the bill. Other States would be allowed to retain their literacy tests.

Literacy tests, fairly administered, have been sustained by a succession of Supreme Court decisions stretching from the 1870's to 1959. In 1898, the Court held that literacy tests which are drafted so as to apply alike to all applicants for the voting franchise would be deemed to be fair on their face, and in the absence of proof of discriminatory enforcement could not be viewed as denying the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment.

Denial of suffrage by literacy tests (such as the Boswell amendment to the Alabama constitution) was quite rightly stricken down by the Court.

In the Guinn case and in the 1959 Lassiter case, the Supreme Court reaffirmed the rights of the States to impose fairly administered literacy tests, since "the ability to read and write likewise has some relation to standards designed to promote intelligent use of the ballot."

The fundamental question Congress must face with regard to South Carolina is: Has the State of South Carolina sought to disenfranchise the Negro overtly through statutory enactment or covertly through inequitable administration of its electoral laws?

The answer in both instances is negative and has been sustained by two investigations of two Attorneys General of the United States.

We cannot speak for, and do not attempt to speak for, other States singled out for discriminatory treatment under the President's bill.

But we resent the absolutely false allegations of the bill and urge the Congress to consider with exacting care the remedy that has been proposed. We strongly suggest alteration of the proposed legislation, which is unconstitutional and discriminatory on its face.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 24, 1965]

Question Lingers on Voting Bill

(By Richard Wilson)

The question that the advocates of the new voting rights bill have as yet failed to answer adequately is this: Why should literacy tests as a qualification for voting be perfectly all right in 45 of the 50 States but invalid in the other 5?

If a voter in Alabama who cannot read or write is qualified to vote in a Federal or any other election why should not an illiterate New Yorker have the same right? The right to vote certainly has no connection with the number of people who vote, and it is manifestly unjust to bar an illiterate from voting in a State where less than 50 percent of the qualified voters cast their ballots, but to permit him to vote in a State where more than 50 percent of the voters go to the polls.

This, nevertheless, would be the effect in 606 counties in 10 States of the passage of the voter rights bill sent to Congress by President Johnson.

The only justification offered for this anomaly is that it is the only way to force election officials in those 10 States to register Negroes to vote. Otherwise, they will enforce prohibitive regulations that prevent Negroes from voting, but not enforce the same regulations on whites who could not meet the qualifications.

This is another example of the devious legislative tactics in the Johnson administration to achieve results by legal circumlocution. Another outstanding example is the aid to education bill that attempts to get around the church-state issue.

From the President's recent statements it can be concluded that what he really desires is the removal of virtually all restrictions on voting for persons 18 years old, and over, if they are sane, and in spite of the fact that the Supreme Court would have to reverse itself in finding that the imposition of reasonable qualifications is valid.

It must be admitted that literacy tests as a qualification for voting are honored in the breach in the North. Thirty States have no such requirements. States that do have literacy requirements often do not enforce them, or the enforcement is so cursory as to be meaningless.

New York requires proof of an eighth grade education or demonstration of the ability to read as a requirement for voters. This excludes a great many people, including recently arrived Puerto Ricans, from voting and is being challenged in the courts. Previous Federal legislation proposals would have required a sixth grade education as proof of literacy.

Residency requirements are universal. In short, people are not born in this country with an inherent right to vote at any time or any place. This is a right for which they must qualify by tests that vary from State to State, and which was affirmed by a 1959 Supreme Court decision. The layman would think that the Constitution is quite clear on this point in its 1st article and in the 17th amendment, to say nothing of the 1959 decision of the Supreme Court.

Furthermore, the Johnson voting rights bill recognizes this principle by providing that a voter shall be stricken from the rolls if he fails to vote at least once in three consecutive years. Thus the Federal law would impose restrictions Congress regards as reasonable while outlawing other restrictions imposed by the States.

Why is not the issue confronted squarely? Why is Congress not asked to abolish literacy requirements in all States altogether?

The answer to that is clear. It is because literacy requirements have validity both in reason and in law. It makes sense that a voter should have at least an elementary ability to read and write the language of the country in which he resides. It makes sense that States should have the power to set reasonable minimum standards for voters, and the proposed law recognizes that by itself setting some standards. It hardly needs to be argued, also, that a Federal law should apply equally to the citizens of all States.

The strange, awkward, and unequal nature of this new legislation shows how wrong it is to try to legislate on such complicated matters in an atmosphere of violence-provoking public demonstrations.

The Johnson administration was rushed into the presentation of a law that has so many obvious flaws that it can immediately be challenged in the courts. Elaborate and tricky formulas provide no answer for a more basic question: Why in a nation with compulsory, universal public education are so many people, Negro and white, illiterate? And why should there be a premium on illiteracy in some States and not in others?

The Art of Omission

(Strom Thurmond, U.S. Senator from South Carolina, reports to the people)

The President's address to Congress and the Nation, on the evening of March 15, 1965, deserves the thoughtful examination and evaluation of every American. The course he set for the Government may well determine the fate of the Nation.

The President told the Nation that the denial of voting rights to Negro citizens in Selma, Ala., had demonstrated the need for a new law.

The President did not tell the Nation that on February 4, 1965, a Federal court, acting under the Civil Rights Acts of 1960 and 1964, had made it possible for all Negroes who could read and write in Dallas County, in which Selma is located, to register and vote in the next election, and that the court order provided that the Federal voting referee, already appointed by the court, would register all who wanted to register and were not registered by July 1965.

The President told the Nation that present law could not secure the ballot for Negro citizens.

The President did not tell the Nation that in Selma, Ala., itself, the right to vote in the next election had already been insured under existing law for all Negroes who could read and write. He did not tell the Nation that there are already 16 Federal laws, 6 criminal and 10 civil, on the books to protect voting rights, including laws to protect voting rights of minorities enacted in 1957, in 1960, and in 1964. He did not tell the Nation that the Civil Rights Act of 1960 already provides for the appointment of Federal voting referees.

The President told the Nation that the only way for a person to qualify to register to vote in Alabama was to present a "white" face.

The President did not tell the Nation that there are already 115,000 Negroes registered to vote in Alabama, more than 20 percent of the vote cast in the 1960 Presidential election.

The President told the Nation that his proposed law would strike down State literacy requirements for voters.

The President did not tell the Nation that as late as 1959 the Supreme Court, itself, upheld the constitutional power of the States to impose literacy requirements for voters.

The President told the Nation that the 15th amendment to the Constitution prohibited the denial of the right to vote because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

The President did not tell the Nation that the 15th amendment is self-executing—that is, that it can be enforced by the courts without any legislation being passed by the Congress. He did not tell the Nation that article I, section 2 of the Constitution provides that those who may vote to elect Members of the U.S. House of Representatives are those who shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature, or that this exact language is used again in the 17th amendment, which provides who shall be eligible to vote in elections of Senators.

The President told the Nation that Congress had the right to pass legislation enforcing the 15th amendment.

The President did not tell the Nation that the 15th amendment did not repeal the constitutional right of the people of each State to establish qualifications for voting, and that any law passed by Congress purporting to supersede those qualifications, as does the law proposed by the President, is patently unconstitutional.

The President told the Nation that people have a right to demonstrate and that he would use the full power of the National Government to protect that right.

The President did not tell the Nation that although all Negroes in Selma, Ala., who could read and write were already insured of the right to vote, that thousands of people from all over the country, led by an outsider, had conducted mass public demonstrations for over 8 weeks completely disrupting the affairs of peaceful and law-abiding citizens. He did not tell the Nation that the agitation was designed by its leader primarily to induce violence, which would in turn provide headlines and money-raising potential across the country, and not to secure the right to vote.

The President told the Nation that his legislation would override State eligibility requirements wherever 50 percent of eligible voters are not registered to vote or did not vote.

The President did not tell the Nation that his voting law formula is so drawn that it would apply to the entirety of six States, five of which just happen to have cast their electoral votes against him in the election last fall, and in some of which, such as South Carolina, there have been no restrictions and no complaints whatever against registration and voting of any qualified person.

I oppose the denial of the right to vote to any qualified citizen, but I oppose just as adamantly any attempted power grab by the President and Congress, which defies the Constitution, and I oppose most of all any submission by the Government to lawless mob rule and invitations by the Government to anarchy.

Sincerely,

Strom Thurmond.

RESOLUTIONS ON CARE FOR ELDER CITIZENS AND THE RIGHT-TO-WORK PRINCIPLE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Chamber of Commerce of Tyler, Tex., the home of the annual and beautiful rose festival, has recently adopted two resolutions on matters of legislative concern to Congress.

I am pleased to note that I am in complete agreement with the members of the Tyler Chamber of Commerce in their support of the eldercare bill and retention of the Texas right-to-work law. In order that other Senators may be advised of the views of Tyler citizens in these areas, I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Resolution Supporting Adequate Care for Elder Citizens

All public spirited citizens are concerned about the best way to provide adequate health care to citizens over 65 years of age. The 1963 Report of the President's Council on Aging and other studies of the problem indicate that elderly people as a group do not experience severe problems in this area. Over 60 percent of the 18 million elderly in the United States carry some form of voluntary prepayment health insurance; 72 percent of Texas elderly citizens are so covered. However, there are many citizens who do need help such as those on old age assistance, or others who become burdened beyond their ability in meeting the costs of major illness, etc. Those who need assistance, and only those, can get it under the Kerr-Mills law passed in 1960. The Texas constitution was amended in November 1964, so as to increase the benefits obtainable under this 1960 law, by those needy and elderly in Texas. It gives aid only to those in need whereas the social security approach assures aid to all employed, when they become ill in elder-years, regardless of need and at much greater cost to all.

Aid to those in need under the proposed Herlong-Curtis Eldercare Act of 1965, would consist of medical, surgical, dental, hospital, nursing home, and drug benefits rather than being limited to hospital and nursing home care. State and Federal funds would be provided on a sliding scale basis, to persons aged 65 or older who are in need, as defined by their incomes, the defining limits being set by the individual States. Recipients would obtain policies providing a wide spectrum of medical, surgical, and hospital benefits from health insurance companies or from Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans. Under the proposal an individual would pay all, part, or none of the cost of the policy, depending upon his total income. Individuals whose incomes are under specified minimums would have the entire cost of the policy paid by the State agency that would administer the program. Eligibility for benefits would be determined solely by use of a simple information return in which the applicant would list his income from all sources.

The Herlong-Curtis Eldercare Act of 1965 would thus maintain the basic principles that persons 65 years old or older who need help in paying for health care should receive help, but only they; that maximum responsibility and authority for providing such help should be retained by the States; that funds from the Federal source should be from general tax revenues; and that voluntary health insurance and prepayment principles should be utilized whenever possible.

All this is in sharp contrast with the proposed King-Anderson medicare principle of a compulsory health insurance plan whereby social security taxes or payroll taxes on all ages of working citizens, would provide certain limited hospital and nursing home benefits to the elderly: Therefore be it

Resolved, That (1) the Tyler Chamber of Commerce favors the enactment by Congress of the proposed Herlong-Curtis Eldercare Act of 1965 and opposes the pending King-Anderson bill in Congress or other like measures, (2) the appropriate officers of the Tyler Chamber of Commerce shall transmit this resolution to appropriate Texas Members of the U.S. Congress and to others as they deem it advisable.

(Adopted in the regular stated meeting of the board of directors at Tyler, Tex., Mar. 17, 1965.)

Resolution in Support of the Right-To-Work Principle

Whereas there now is before the Congress of the United States proposals aimed at repealing section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act of 1947, which reads as follows:

"Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or territorial law."

Whereas this proposition is a fundamental part of the laws of Texas as enacted in 1947 by the legislature in reliance upon section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act and which reads as follows:

"ARTICLE 5207A, VERNON'S ANNOTATED TEXAS CIVIL STATUTES

"Section 1. The inherent right of a person to work and bargain freely with his employer, individually or collectively, for terms and conditions of his employment shall not be denied or infringed by law, or by any organization of whatever nature.

"Sec. 2. No person shall be denied employment on account of membership or nonmembership in a labor union."

Whereas the system of free enterprise is peculiarly and especially a cherished American tradition, applying alike to the business enterprise and to the individual, to the employee and to the employer; and

Whereas these principles have been stated over and over again in many acts of social legislation, as for example in the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964 which states that it shall be unlawful for an employer to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin: Therefore be it

Resolved, That (1) the Tyler Chamber of Commerce endorses and supports the right-to-work principle believing that the freedom of an individual to choose whether or not to belong to a labor union is a fundamental right that should be protected, (2) the appropriate officers of the Tyler Chamber shall transmit this resolution to appropriate Members of the U.S. Congress urging the retention of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act as a basic law of the land.

(Adopted by the board of directors at its regular stated meeting Mar. 17, 1965, at Tyler, Tex.)

FUNDS FOR CONTROL OF PREDATORS AND RODENTS—RESOLUTION OF TEXAS LEGISLATURE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Legislature of the State of Texas has adopted a concurrent resolution on a most important matter about which I believe other Senators would want to be informed.

The legislature has expressed its grave concern about plans to curtail the Federal funds utilized by the Bureau of Fisheries and Wildlife in State-Federal, matching-fund programs designed to control predators and rodents. The budget for this vital work in our State was cut $31,000—from $206,000 to $175,000. The overall budget for the U.S. effort was cut $350,000—from $2,731,000 to $2,381,000.

I fully concur in the request by the legislature that the predator and rodent control program be continued and fully supported by Federal funds. I am certain that the program will continue to receive the help and financial support it always has received from Texas sportsmen, ranchers, and stockmen, and from the Texas Legislature.

I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 41

Whereas the State of Texas, through Texas A. & M. University cooperates with the U.S. Department of the Interior in the control of wolves, coyotes, mountain lions, bobcats, and other predatory animals and rodents with funds appropriated out of the State treasury when matched by the Congress; and

Whereas ranchers, stockmen, county commissioners, courts, livestock organizations, and wolf clubs financially support the program individually and collectively to prevent depredations upon their livestock; and

Whereas the State of Texas has supported the Bureau of Fisheries and Wildlife and its predecessor agencies; and

Whereas the control of predatory animals in Texas has increased the game supply to the extent that it now provides revenue for the landowners and sport for an ever increasing number of sportsmen; and

Whereas control of certain wild animals is necessary for the prevention of rabies in humans, wildlife, and livestock: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of Texas, the House of Representatives concurring, That the legislature of Texas express its approval of the request by the Bureau of Fisheries and Wildlife for the continuation of the predator and rodent control program, which has effectively aided sportsmen, ranchers, stockmen, and the general economy, and oppose any reduction or lessening of adequate support thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the U.S. Senators from Texas, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives, and to the dean of the Texas delegation in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Preston Smith,
Lieutenant Governor,
President of the Senate.

RESOLUTION ON BRACERO LABOR

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the League of United Latin American Citizens of San Antonio has recently adopted a resolution concerning bracero labor. In order that the entire Senate may share the views of council No. 2 on this important issue, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States proposed legislation for the importation of bracero laborers from Mexico; and

Whereas the contention by the proponents of this legislation that the domestic stoop labor force is inadequate, is false and a subterfuge; and

Whereas Lulac Council No. 2 is well aware that there are now in Texas thousands of unemployed migratory farm laborers; more than sufficient to meet the needs of all employers, farmers and growers and the only reason why this availability of domestic labor force is not being utilized is the refusal of these employers, farmers and growers to pay decent wages; and

Whereas the true effect of the proposed legislation is to subject the thousands of Americans of Mexican descent whose livelihood depends on this type of work to starvation wages and a substandard way of living wholly incompatible with decency and health. That the American of Mexican descent of the State of Texas pleads for an opportunity for economic growth and for a full share in the participation of the new society: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Lulac Council No. 2 does hereby oppose any and all proposed legislation calling for the importation of bracero laborers or the importation of any other labor force and petitions our Congressmen and Senators to actively work and vote for the defeat of this legislation. That copies of this resolution be mailed to Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, Senator RALPH W. YARBOROUGH, Senator JOHN TOWER, and U.S. Congressman HENRY B. GONZALEZ.

(Adopted at a regular meeting of Lulac Council No. 2 on Friday, March 5, 1965.)

ALEX ALCOCER,
President, Lulac Council No. 2.
PETE TIJERINA,
Chairman, Lulac Council No. 2.

RESOLUTION URGING RELAXATION OF LIMITS ON VETERANS' INCOMES FOR ELIGIBILITY TO RECEIVE PENSIONS

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, recently I received a most thoughtful resolution adopted by Galveston Barracks No. 1447, of the Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A.

So that other Senators may share the views of the members of Barracks No. 1447, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GALVESTON BARRACKS NO. 1447,
VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I OF THE U.S.A.

The following resolution was adopted on March 11, 1965, by Galveston (Tex.) Barracks No. 1447, Veterans of World War I of the U.S.A.:

"Whereas existing legislation (sec. 503 of title 38, U.S.C.) sets limits on war veterans' incomes for eligibility to draw the veterans pension well below the poverty level now recognized as a basic for economic opportunity needs;

"Whereas many pensioners and annuitants, because of the poverty income level set by existing law, are not eligible to enjoy the benefits of cost-of-living increases granted to an individual under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment or similar type plans or programs, and some veterans must either forego or waive such paid-in benefits as those offered under certain public or private retirement plans; and

Whereas veterans with only the small pension for support find themselves in utterly dire circumstances and are all but humiliated by a Government pledged to give reasonable recognition for services rendered in the interest of national security: Be it

"*Resolved*, That either the aforementioned income limitation be raised to more reasonable levels, so as to remove the poverty penalty and stigma, or that a law be enacted by the Congress to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code to exclude from consideration as income for the purpose of determining pension eligibility, all amounts paid to an individual under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar type plans or programs. (Attention is invited to H.R. 5677, already offered and scheduled for study by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It is recommended that this bill be amended to afford relief for veterans who are ineligible for retirement pay under programs other than the pension legislation.)"

MORRIS H. MILLER,
Commander.
DONALD J. NELSON,
Adjutant.

RESOLUTION URGING THE PRESIDENT AND OTHER OFFICIALS TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF CITIZENS OF ALABAMA TO ASSEMBLE AND VOTE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. MCCARTHY] and myself, I present a resolution, adopted by the Senate of the State of Minnesota, urging the President, the Vice President, and the Attorney General of the United States and the Governor of Alabama to protect the rights of citizens of Alabama to assemble and to vote. I ask that the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 5

Resolution urging the President, Vice President, and Attorney General of the United States and the Governor of Alabama to protect the rights of citizens of Alabama to assemble and to vote

Whereas the constitutional rights of certain citizens of Alabama to vote and to peaceably assemble are being forcibly repressed by that State, in a violent manner intolerable to freemen; and

Whereas such forcible repression is in violation of the oaths of office of the Governor of that State, and the public officials acting under him, to support and defend the Constitution of the United States; and

Whereas it is the duty of government to protect the rights of the citizen against abuse and oppression, no matter what its source; and

Whereas the public authorities of Alabama have been unwilling to assume that duty, and instead appear to be harassing and injuring those who assert their rights, in a manner befitting a totalitarian police state; and

Whereas the passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 makes it clear that the voting rights of our people and their freedom to assemble peaceably shall not be abridged: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Minnesota, That the public authorities of Alabama be urged to recognize the civil rights of all their citizens, that they subordinate their fears and intolerance to the truth of Judeo-Christian ethics and precepts and that they take the steps necessary to protect their citizens and preserve their rights before it becomes immediately necessary to interpose further Federal force, and lacking immediate State action, that the President be urged to instruct the Attorney General to take immediate steps to implement the powers of the Federal Government to protect the rights of American citizens, through the use of U.S. marshalls and such other law enforcement agents as are legally and properly required to carry out the law and to secure the rights of Americans who find themselves deprived of their basic freedom; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be instructed to send copies of this resolution to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, the Vice President of the United States, the Honorable Nicholas Katzenbach, the Attorney General of the United States, the Honorable George C. Wallace, the Governor of Alabama, and Members of Congress from the State of Minnesota.

CY TORREY,
Secretary of the Senate.

THE 144TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE INDEPENDENCE OF GREECE

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today is the 144th anniversary of Greek independence. It is a happy occasion for the people of Greece, and for all who love freedom.

Our form of government in the United States is, in large part, derived from the Greeks. Our democratic system is based largely on the principles laid down by the great Greek philosophers and statesmen of ancient times. The founders of our country, notably Hamilton and Washington, were greatly influenced by the ideals of freedom, liberty, and national independence practiced by the statesmen of ancient Greece.

In the largest sense, the whole Western World is indebted to Greece for the enlightenment of man and the advancement of civilization.

Greece began its inspiring history when she threw off the chains of subservience to the Ottoman Empire on March 25, 1821. Archbishop Germanos of Patras joyously raised the flag of freedom over the monastery of Kalavrita at the end of the bitter 6-year Greek War of Independence.

From 1827, when free Greece elected Demetrios Capodistrias as President, the nation has built slowly but surely against the heavy odds of poverty and wars.

Greeks and Americans often have stood together when freedom and peace were threatened. In World War II, the outnumbered Greek Army helped defeat Mussolini's Fascist legions.

Americans and Greeks fought shoulder to shoulder when they defeated the Communist attempt to subjugate Greece. As a nation, Greece has strengthened the Western alliance far out of proportion to its size and its 8 million population, and has fought communism longer than any other nation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

America owes much to Greece for the important roles that one and a half million Americans of Hellenic background have played in our society. They have distinguished themselves in every area of human endeavor, from cancer specialist to military hero, from musician to congenial restauranteur.

Today, Greece's ideals of liberty and justice, which have never been destroyed by force of tyranny and aggression, continue to offer hope and inspiration to all people of the world wanting to be free.

THOMAS W. MILLER, ONE OF NEVADA'S MOST DISTINGUISHED CITIZENS

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, last week's American Legion convention in Washington, D.C., brought one of the more colorful leading figures in Nevada to the Capital. Thomas W. Miller, of Reno, a member of the Legion's national executive committee, is not only one of Nevada's most distinguished citizens but also is among the oldest living former Representatives from the State of Delaware.

Mr. Miller is currently serving as chairman of the Reno Park Commission, only one of the many public services he has performed for my State since moving to Nevada in 1934.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a February 20 news story published in the Wilmington, Del., Evening Journal describing the career of Mr. Miller.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Ex-Congressmen Keep Interest in Public Life: Miller Bosses Parks in Reno

(By Tom Greer)

The five living former U.S. Representatives from Delaware share some common background characteristics.

All are native Delawareans, four of them Wilmingtonians. All are Republicans. Four served as commissioned officers during wartime.

They share another characteristic: a continuing taste for public life. Each pursued a career in some facet of government or politics after ending his service in the House of Representatives.

The lives of these five former lawmakers will be examined in a series of articles, beginning today with that of the eldest.

It has been 50 years since Thomas W. Miller, 78, went to Washington as U.S. Representative from Delaware but the half century hasn't dulled his zest for public service.

Miller lives in Reno now and he's as sharp as a needle from a Nevada cactus—or a leaf of Delaware holly. He is well informed about Delaware affairs, as well as those in his adopted State.

"I subscribe to the Wilmington Morning News," he said in a telephone conversation recently. "I realize you're not related to the late A. O. H. Grier (veteran News-Journal editor and writer) by the spelling of your name.

"The death of my good friend Senator C. Douglass Buck was a great shock. I feel a deep sense of tragedy, for I grew up with him," he added in the next breath.

On another tack, still in the same 30 seconds: "I see my friend Bill Frank went to Panama. Say hello to Bill for me."

Born in Wilmington June 26, 1886, Thomas Woodnutt Miller is the son of the late Charles R. Miller, a former Delaware Governor. He attended public schools here and graduated from Yale University in 1908.

He served as secretary to Representative William H. Heald, of Delaware, 1910–12, and during that period studied law in Washington. He was Secretary of State of Delaware from 1913 to 1915.

When he was elected U.S. Representative in 1914 he was the youngest elected to the 64th Congress. Part of his single 1915–17 term coincided with his father's term as Governor.

Harking back to his congressional years, Miller recalls that with the advent of World War I, companies trading in munitions with the Allies came under attack on the floor. One such incident occurred in December 1915, when Representative Clyde H. Tavenner, Democrat, of Illinois, renewed his attacks, with particular reference to the Du Pont Co. Miller said that in one of his initial remarks on the House floor, he replied so vigorously that Speaker Champ Clark sent the sergeant at arms with his mace to separate the two Congressmen.

In another instance, Miller said he engaged in a floor fight supporting the Du Pont Co. when an embargo bill that would have prevented munitions shipments to the Allies was being debated. Representative Dorsey W. Shackleford, Democrat, of Missouri, was needling Miller for his opposition to the bill. "The gentleman from Delaware represents a State with three counties when the tide is out and two when it is in," said Shackleford.

Miller replied, in part: "He (Shackleford) has to impute unfair motives to me but he was perfectly willing to have an embargo on everything else except the great Missouri mule, the animal that hauls the engines of war."

Miller was identified early with the preparedness movement and was one of the originators of the military training camps program. He served his own military apprenticeship at Plattsburgh, N.Y., barracks in 1915.

It wasn't all work in Washington, though. Miller was a member of the Republican congressional baseball team, pitching and playing right field. In the 1916 game in Washington—which the Republicans won 9 to 6—he caught the ball thrown out by President Woodrow Wilson.

Miller recalled that he placed in nomination the name of Gen. T. Coleman du Pont as Delaware's favorite son presidential candidate at the Republican National Convention in Chicago in June 1916. He said that Du Pont received a smattering of complimentary votes from a half-dozen other States.

When the United States entered World War I in 1917, Miller enlisted as a private in the infantry. He rose to the rank of lieutenant colonel, was cited for gallantry and meritorious conduct and awarded the Purple Heart.

After the war he was a cofounder and an incorporator of the American Legion, serving as vice president and presiding officer of the Paris caucus, at which the Legion came into being.

Miller is the only man in the Nation to have held the highest Legion post in two States. He was State department commander of Delaware in 1932–33 and held the same office in Nevada in 1943–44.

He was also a member of the Legion's national executive committee from Delaware, from 1919–28, and still serves in a similar capacity from Nevada.

Long having had interests in mining and ranching, Miller moved to Nevada in 1934, where he became active in that State's conservation movement. He is the originator of the Nevada parks system and served as chairman of the Nevada State Park Commission until his official retirement in 1959.

He is now chairman of the City of Reno Park and Horticultural Commission, a member of the Washoe County Republican Committee, a member of the board of the desert protective council (a conservation group), a member of the home service committee of the Red Cross, a junior warden and vestryman of Trinity Episcopal Church, Reno.

Miller likes to travel and hunt big game, "Deer and elk mostly, and sage hen sometimes," he says identifying the last as western game bird.

Miller goes to the park and horticultural commission offices in Reno's city hall every day, he said, and also has a private office in the park.

Miller was married to Katherine Marie Tallman in Wilmington, October 4, 1913. A year after her death in 1945, he married Eleanor Taylor, of Reno. There are two children by his first marriage, Comdr. Thomas Lloyd Miller, U.S. Navy, retired, of Miami, Fla., and Stonington, Conn.; and Mrs. George P. Bissell, Jr., of Greenville. He has six grandchildren, the eldest of whom is Russell Tallman Miller, a resident of Nevada and the father of the elder Miller's two great-grandchildren.

Miller returned to Wilmington briefly last summer and while here, culled from his stored personal papers those he considered worth keeping. He is well known in Delaware and has many friends here, although he has outlived many of his contemporaries in Delaware politics.

Miller now is busy with plans for his annual trip to Washington next month as chairman of the American Legion's national legislative liaison committee.

"I'm looking forward to entertaining the Delaware congressional delegation again, just as I do every year when I go to Washington.

"I'll be in Delaware, too. I'll look you up," he said.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY—MARCH 25

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, March 25, 1965, is the 144th anniversary of Greek Independence Day—reminding all of us of the dedicated patriots of Greece who rose in the cause of freedom in 1821, and successfully gained liberty from foreign domination for the nation that has been the Western World's cradle of democracy.

This revolution against 4 centuries of oppression, was a resounding echo of the American Revolution; one which stirred the minds and hearts of men throughout the world.

Americans, still conscious of their own great struggle, joined the movement. President Monroe said in a message to the Congress that, "It is natural, therefore, that their—the Greeks—contest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States."

The feeling was not one-sided. One of the first acts of the Greek Senate in May 1821, was an address directed to the American people stating, "Our interests are of such nature as to cement more and more an alliance founded on freedom and virtue."

Our two Republics have maintained this close relationship throughout the years. Time has passed, but former victories have not guided us to the millennium. We still feel the cold winds from behind the Iron and Bamboo Curtains.

We still must maintain our vigilance in these strained times. Together with such firm allies as Greece, I am confident we will eventually prevail.

I salute the people of Greece on this important anniversary of their independence. It is a day of meaning for all people who hold liberty sacred.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 5 minutes in the morning hour.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin withhold his request until morning business has been concluded? He can then use his 5 minutes at that time.

Mr. PROXMIRE. I am happy to oblige the Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Vermont is recognized.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, with the consent of the Senate, I am glad to yield 5 minutes to the Senator from Wisconsin.

INTERNATIONAL BALANCE OF PAYMENTS PROBLEM

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has been holding a series of hearings on the international balance-of-payments problem. Some of the papers presented at the hearing have been so helpful and informative that I believe that at least in part they should be brought to the attention of all Members of Congress because so many of our decisions are governed by our concern for the Nation's balance-of-payments dilemma.

One of the most interesting papers was submitted by Prof. Richard N. Cooper of Yale University.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the statement written by Mr. Cooper.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT FOR THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, MARCH 18, 1965, BY RICHARD N. COOPER, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, YALE UNIVERSITY

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am very pleased to appear before you. I have been asked to talk on the competitive position of the United States and its relationship to the balance of payments. My observations will necessarily overlap to some extent with those you have just heard from Mr. Salant, but I hope the overlap will not be too great.

When we speak about the competitive position of a country, or the competitiveness of its products in world markets, we are attempting to assess how well that country is doing in international trade, relative both to its own past and to the performance of other countries. I intend first to say something about the competitive performance of the United States, then to discuss several of the dimensions of competitiveness which I think are especially important, and finally to ask whether we can rely on further improvements in our competitive position to solve the balance-of-payments problem which currently confronts this country.

I

There is no question about the basic strength of America's competitive position. Total exports of goods and services from the United States reached $36.5 billion in 1964, far higher than had ever been recorded before for this or any other country. The United States provided over one-sixth of total world exports of merchandise. This country is of course also a heavy importer, and American imports of goods and services have grown by over $5 billion since 1960, paralleling the remarkable expansion of our gross national product. Despite this rapid rise in imports, however, the surplus of exports of goods and services over imports of goods and services has risen in every year since 1959, except for a slight fall in 1962; and in 1964 this surplus stood at $8.1 billion the highest in our history except for the Second World War years of 1943 and 1944 and the postwar year of 1947 when the United States was exporting heavily to Europe and importing very little. Of this surplus, $6.5 billion was provided by merchandise alone, and the remainder reflected for the most part our large earnings on foreign investment.

These figures apply to total exports of goods and services, including those financed by the American Government as part of our foreign aid program and those exports resulting from special government-to-government arrangements concerning the purchase of military equipment. If we make adjustments for these sales, the size of the surplus declines, but the sharp and steady improvement over the past few years remains. On the definitions of the U.S. Treasury Department, our commercial surplus grew from $3.7 billion in 1960 to $5.9 billion in 1964.

A substantial part of the growth in American exports and even in the growth of the trade surplus can be explained, of course, simply by the growth in world trade, which has been exceptionally rapid in recent years, rising in 1964 to $151 billion, 12 percent above a year earlier. American exports have naturally participated in this rapid growth. At the same time, the U.S. economy, being relatively mature, has been growing more slowly than many countries abroad, and U.S. imports have thus failed to grow as rapidly as world imports.

Recently, however, American exports have grown even more rapidly than total world exports, and hence the U.S. share of world exports has increased slightly, after declining for many years. Analysis of export shares has become so fashionable these days that one tends to forget its limitations: the strong influence of the particular dates chosen for comparison, the paradoxical possibility that a country's export share can rise in every one of its markets and still decline in total, the implicit but inappropriate normative implication that maintaining one's share in world markets is crucial or even important. There are several reasons for believing that the U.S. share of world exports both would and should decline somewhat over time. The formation of large discriminatory free trade areas, such as the European Common Market, the European Free Trade Association, and the Latin American Free Trade Association, would naturally lead to a decline in America's share of world exports (though not necessarily in the total value of exports), as intraregional trade expands in response to lower internal trade barriers. Moreover, as incomes in the less developed countries of today rise, and as their economies become able to provide a wider range of goods of reasonable cost and quality, trade among them can be expected to increase. It is now extraordinarily low, accounting for less than 10 percent of world trade. This increase would be a salutary development, but it would lower U.S. export shares.

In spite of these reasons for some decline in American export shares, however, the share of American exports increased in 8 of 10 areas around the globe between the first half of 1963 and the first half of 1964, the latest period for which complete trade figures are available. Moreover, the slight decline in the U.S. share of imports into Japan * * * was due, not to inroads from competitors in the European Common Market, but to a rising Japanese demand for materials from the less developed countries. Indeed, export shares of the European Common Market declined in a number of important regions during the same period.

These figures, taken all together, do not mark a country with a weak or a deteriorating competitive position. On the contrary, to many foreigners the competitive position of the United States is disconcertingly strong and is improving at an alarming rate, a theme to which I will return below.

II

If we look behind these indicators of competitive performance to the various factors which determine or influence the competitiveness of a country's products, we find evidence which is somewhat more difficult to evaluate. Competitive performance is determined by a number of factors—price, quality, design, delivery time, credit terms, servicing arrangements, and, not least, vigor of salesmanship. It is often difficult to determine which factors govern any particular sale.

There is, however, one dimension of competitiveness in which American performance has been unambiguously excellent, and that is price and, underlying price, costs. Wholesale prices of industrial goods are only half a percent higher today than they were in 1959. Prices of intermediate industrial materials, important in American exports, have actually fallen since 1959, and prices of producer finished goods have risen by only 2½ percent. These price movements compare very favorably with price trends abroad. Since 1959 wholesale prices of industrial products rose 15 percent in France, 12 percent in Italy, 9 percent in Netherlands, 16 percent in Sweden, and 12 percent in the United Kingdom. Only Canada, Germany, and Japan maintained price records comparable to that of the United States, and German prices have begun to rise significantly during the past year.

These trends are quite different from those which prevailed in the preceding 5 years, 1954 to 1959. During that period U.S. prices rose substantially more than those of its major competitors, and the American export position weakened accordingly.

Comparisons of movements in domestic wholesale prices do not represent an ideal measure of price competitiveness, for two somewhat conflicting reasons. First, the the coverage of domestic wholesale prices does not represent accurately the composition of a country's exports—it is too broad in some respects, too narrow in others, and it often includes the prices of imported goods. For the purposes of assessing changes in our price competitiveness we badly need an accurate index of export prices, as we recommended some years ago in the Stigler report to the Budget Bureau on "The Price Statistics of the Federal Government." We can get a very rough indication of export price performance, however, from figures compiled by the United Nations on the "unit value of exports of manufactures" from the major exporting nations. These show less divergence from country to country than do the movements in wholesale prices of industrial products, as might be expected given the stiff competition in the international markets. Nonetheless, the export "unit values" have risen more rapidly in most major countries during the past few years than they have for the United States. The major exceptions, again, are Canada, whose devaluations in 1961 and 1962 lowered export unit values about 8 percent, and Japan, which has manifested steadily falling export prices.

The second defect in wholesale price indexes as a measure of price competitiveness is the one to which I just alluded: In a highly competitive world wholesale prices cannot diverge much from country to country. It is necessary therefore to undertake the more difficult task of examining movements in costs rather than prices. Here again the U.S. performance has been good. Hourly earnings of workers in industry rose only 19 percent in the United States between 1958 and 1964, compared with increases of 29 percent in Belgium and Britain, 56 percent in France, 58 percent in Germany, 61 percent in the Netherlands, 70 percent in Italy, and 70 percent in Japan. These vast differences in wage increases reflect largely, of course, differences in the growth in productivity from country to country. But when allowance is made for that, labor costs rose substantially less in the United States than they did in most other countries. A recent study by the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that between 1959 and 1962 labor costs per unit of output in manufacturing rose by only 2 percent in the United States, compared with 13 percent in Britain, 23 percent in Germany, 9 percent in Japan, and so on. Wage increases have been outstripping increases in productivity handsomely in most countries since 1962, so this trend toward higher costs abroad has continued.

It is sometimes suggested that comparisons of percentage increases for wages are not appropriate, since foreign wage levels are so much lower than they are in the United States. Thus a 10-percent increase in $1 per hour is absolutely less than a 5-percent increase in $2.54 per hour, which was the average hourly earning in U.S. manufacturing industries in 1964. This observation is arithmetically correct, but it is analytically incorrect. Broadly speaking, the level of wages in each country reflects its productivity; if wages are higher in the United States than elsewhere, that is because productivity is also higher.

I once estimated average productivity per man-hour in manufacturing for a number of countries for the year 1959 and found it to vary from $3.89 in the United States to about $0.40 in Japan, with the European countries clustered around $1 per hour.[1] Japanese firms cannot, of course, afford to pay their workers even $0.75 per hour if their average net output is only $0.40 per hour. Productivity abroad has gone up rapidly since 1959, so these figures are now somewhat out of date. But the basic point remains that relative movements in unit labor costs are the result of relative changes in wages and productivity, not of absolute changes in wages. If the general level of wages rises by the same percentage in two countries and productivity remains unchanged, the rise in unit labor costs will generally be the same regardless of disparities in the wage levels.

As the preceding observations indicate, American performance in the areas of price and cost competitiveness has been very good during the past few years, the compound effect of stability at home and rising prices and costs abroad. Recently some analysts have become alarmed by the very sharp rise in certain raw materials prices which has taken place during the past 15 months, and have suggested that this rise in prices may threaten the ability of American exports to compete in world markets. I would like to suggest, to the contrary, that the rise in materials prices, by itself, will help rather than hurt the U.S. balance of payments. There are four reasons for this. The first and most obvious, but possibly the least important, is that the United States is itself a substantial exporter of industrial materials and therefore benefits directly, in the short run, from higher prices for such products as aluminum, sulfur, phosphates, oilseeds, and so on. Europe and Japan, by contrast, export only very small amounts of industrial materials and import them heavily.

Second, higher materials prices mean higher foreign exchange receipts to primary producing countries, including Canada as well as many less developed countries. In the past these countries have spent a higher-than-average share of increases in earnings on purchases from the United States. This should be considered in conjunction with the fact that Europe and Japan together are much larger importers of industrial materials than is the United States, so most of the additional earnings of the primary producing countries will come from Europe and Japan. And, of course, earnings on U.S. investments in primary producing countries will rise.

Third, some evidence suggests that a given rise in prices of industrial materials will raise the manufacturing costs of our major competitors more than it will raise U.S. manufacturing costs, because materials account for a larger share of total unit costs abroad than in the United States. A survey of comparable firms in the United States and abroad by the National Industrial Conference Board showed materials accounting for an average of 46 percent of total manufacturing costs in the European Common Market, for instance, compared with 32 percent in this country.[2] Similar relationships prevailed for other countries. (For the same reason, Europe benefited substantially from the weakness in primary product prices following 1960, for this helped offset the gradual rise in labor costs there. Merely halting the fall in materials prices therefore increased the cost pressures on European firms.)

Finally, when materials prices do rise they tend to rise more rapidly in international markets, where European purchases are made, than in the tariff-sheltered and largely domestically supplied market in the United States. This factor will put still further pressures on European and Japanese costs in a period of rising prices.

Putting all these factors together, higher materials prices should strengthen the U.S. trade position, even after allowing for the higher prices which American firms would admittedly have to pay for their own imports of raw materials.

I have dealt at some length on price and cost factors in our competitive position. A number of economists are inclined to give these second place in importance compared with the "quality" of American goods and in particular with the invention and production of new and advanced products. According to this line of argument, the United States draws its export strength in manufactures not so much from lower prices and costs as from a continual outpouring of new and advanced products which are not available elsewhere—from a "technological lead" which gives the United States a momentary advantage until other countries begin to produce identical or competing goods. And by that time Americans have devised still newer and better products.

In terms of this argument, the weakening competitive position of the United States during the 1950's can be explained by an erosion of this technological lead. Other countries began to develop new products themselves, and they began to produce new American products more quickly after their development here. It is not difficult to appreciate the reasons for any diminution of America's technological lead which may have taken place. Other countries have become highly alert to the benefits of research and development expenditures and to advanced technical education, and they have stepped up their program in both areas. France quite explicitly bases a part of its case for maintaining an atomic weapons program—and for its joint efforts with Britain to produce the supersonic airliner Concorde—on the "technological fallout" which large programs such as this can generate. Countries which want to remain in the technological forefront feel they must have active and popular programs which attract high quality personnel to the technological frontier and keep them there. I do not pass judgment on these arguments, but only note that they are given important considerations abroad. The concern of Britain and others about the "brain drain" arises in part from the same considerations.

A second factor tending to reduce the technological lead of the United States is the very rapid growth in American direct investment abroad, especially in Europe. Direct investment outflows from the United States to Europe have grown from $190 million in 1958 to over $1,200 million in 1964. With American capital go American management skills and American know-how. Indeed, increasingly these factors have been exported even in the absence of direct investment in productive facilities abroad. In 1964 the U.S. earned about $1 billion in royalties and fees for rights to produce patented American products, for technical and managerial advice from American firms, and the like. Only two-thirds of these receipts came from U.S. subsidiaries abroad. We are engaging increasingly in the export of knowledge per se, disembodied from American goods and from American capital.

I regard this as one of the most far reaching of recent developments in international trade. While the U.S. benefits directly from the sale of this knowledge, such sales do cut the technological lead of American industry further and increase foreign competition with many American products. It is worth recalling that exporting knowledge was not always so easy. In medieval Europe severe restrictions were often placed on the movements of skilled craftsmen, lest they take their trade secrets to rival cities. And it was not until 1843 that Britain removed its prohibition on the export of machinery, especially textile machinery—a prohibition designed to preserve Britain's primacy as a manufacturing center by withholding up-to-date capital equipment from would-be foreign competitors. A legacy of these limitations on the movement of technical knowledge is found today in our own restrictions on exports to the Soviet bloc, which extend well beyond materials of direct military value.

The recent improvement in the American competitive position has taken place despite increasing attention abroad to the application of new technology. I do not know how to assess the net value to the United States in the long run of exporting our technology. Certainly from a global viewpoint it is desirable. But it may reduce our export sales of some products.

There are many other dimensions of competitiveness. I will say something briefly about only one more, credit terms, because it is a dimension of competitiveness which is of particular interest to this Committee. The level of interest rates and credit availability which we maintain in this country influence among other things the cost of export credit. A rise in interest rates at home will stiffen the credit terms which American exporters offer their customers. British exporters have castigated Britain's frequent reliance on increases in interest rates for this reason. A report by the Federation of British Industries points out that "it is a disagreeable paradox that steps to protect the currency at a time of crisis in the balance of payments can in themselves increase the difficulties of expanding exports," and urges the British Government to pursue a policy of lower and more stable interest rates.[3]

---

[1] "International Aspects of Technical Change," in Automation, John T. Dunlop (editor), the American Assembly, 1962.

[2] Theodore Gates and Fabian Linden, "Costs and Competition," National Industrial Conference Board, 1961.

So far, being able to offer favorable credit terms has aided American exporters. The rise in American interest rates over the last year and a half may not have impeded exports much because foreign interest rates have also risen. To that extent, however, the United States did not improve its balance-of-payments position by raising interest rates either.

Some countries attempt to mitigate the deleterious effect of higher interest rates and tighter credit on exports by providing special facilities for export credit, such as the rediscounting privileges for export paper at the central banks in France and Italy and the French exemption for export credit from the 10-percent credit ceilings which have been imposed since September 1963. While these measures are easy to understand—the United States has taken steps to ensure that the interest equalization tax will not limit exports—we should avoid pursuing the dangerous and self-defeating path in which one country after another tightens credit and then introduces special rates for export credit which represent in effect, export subsidies, since they provide domestic firms an incentive to sell abroad rather than at home. Such a policy would be costly to growth without benefit to the balance of payments.

III

As I have already indicated, the U.S. trade position is very strong, it has been improving, and at least some of the factors which determine a country's competitive position continue to work in favor of further improvement. That is good, and it is important for our balance of payments. We should avoid measures which weaken our competitive position. At the same time, I think that the emphasis currently placed on increasing exports still further as a principal means to correct the payments deficit is inappropriate. We must remember two things: the basic symmetry in international trade and the large size and relative importance of the United States in world trade. The first means that any improvement in the competitive position of the United States—any further increase in the already huge American surplus—necessarily involves a deterioration in the current account balance of the other countries. The second point means that any significant improvement in the U.S. position will be substantial in size and noticeable in the accounts of others, not negligible as it might be for improvements in the trade balance of, say, the Philippines or even of India. These countries can plan on expanding export markets without the need for others to take it much into account. The same is not true for the United States.

The underlying symmetry in international accounts and the preponderant size of the United States must be set against the attitudes which other nations have taken toward their own trade positions during the past few years. Canada, the most important trading partner of the United States, has an announced objective of reducing its dependence for external balance on capital inflows by eliminating its current account deficit—which arises largely from its transactions with the United States—over the next few years. It has already moved very far in this direction, reducing its current account deficit from $1.5 billion in 1959 to under $0.5 billion in 1964. Some Canadians point to the time when Canada would become a net exporter of capital—with a corresponding current account surplus—as would seem consistent with its wealth and per capita income.

British officials have for years spoken of the need to raise Britain's current account surplus to £300 million ($840 million)—a very large increase from the present level—to cover its large overseas financial commitments and to build up its dangerously low reserves. Japan's trade position has improved very greatly during the past year, but Japanese officials continue to be concerned with strengthening Japan's competitive position too—partly to meet new international competition as it undertakes further trade liberalization, partly to reduce its current account deficit of roughly $0.5 billion a year and to reduce its large external indebtedness.

Even the European Economic Community, whose members collectively have been accumulating reserves at an incredible rate and who have been claiming gold from the United States, has expressed alarm at the sharp deterioration in its own trade position during the past few years. The trade balance of the EEC with the rest of the world slipped from virtual balance in 1960 to a deficit of $3.0 billion in 1963 and of $2.3 billion in the first 9 months of 1964, despite the sharp downturn in Italy. Credit restraint, already severe in Italy and France, is being applied increasingly in other members of the EEC largely in response to this deterioration and to the related increase in prices.

We find the same story with other countries. Switzerland is very much worried about the vulnerability inherent in a huge current account deficit balanced—sometimes overbalanced—by a massive inflow of short-term funds. The less developed countries, too, all want to improve their export earnings; but fortunately we can count on them to spend these earnings for debt repayment or badly needed imports rather than accumulate them as reserves for more than short periods of time.

It is clear that not all countries can succeed in realizing these inconsistent objectives of expanding export earnings in relationship to import earnings at the same time. Some of them are bound to be frustrated. The United States, with its already huge surplus, is in an especially weak position to argue that it needs the improvement most. As I indicated earlier, the American surplus might in fact rise somewhat further as a result of favorable movements in costs and prices which have already taken place and will continue in the near future. But additional measures to increase it further will meet both resentment and resistence from our major trading partners. Such measures are likely to be thwarted by countermeasures taken by others to stimulate their exports, by stiff opposition to further reductions in trade barriers, and possibly even by increased barriers to trade. I do not think that we can rely on that route to solve our balance of payments problem.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, another helpful and expert witness was Dr. N. R. Danielian, president of the International Economic Policy Association, which represents a number of the largest companies in this country, including companies which have invested abroad very widely.

Mr. Danielian's testimony—while I do not agree with all of it—was, I thought, helpful and explained his viewpoint and those of a number of large companies which have been responsible for increasing their investments abroad by billions of dollars in recent years.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the conclusions and the recommendations of Mr. Danielian.

There being no objection, the conclusions were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

CONCLUSIONS BY N. R. DANIELIAN

Mr. Chairman, I would like now to summarize the implications of these facts and make certain recommendations.

1. It is a major error of fact to blame private capital exports, particularly direct investments abroad, for the balance of payments deficits. It is a major error in policy to try and resolve the deficits by control of private investments abroad, particularly in developed countries. About $9 billions of foreign revenues—more than one-fourth of our total external earnings, are derived from direct private investments abroad. It makes no sense as a national policy to try and retard, discourage, or control, this source of external income.

The attempt to deal with deficits through the private capital account is also based on the assumption that the balance of payments deficit is a short-term phenomenon. Our analysis of the facts indicates that it is due to the continued $7, $8 or $9 billion a year Government transfers of wealth and purchasing power abroad. As long as this continues, the deficit will not be temporary but a permanent phenomenon, and we should exert all our efforts in earning money on investments from countries that are stable and secure in their political structure and currency. This country cannot possibly meet its continuing obligations abroad by making it a habit of appropriating, year after year, billions of dollars for long-term, soft, no-interest loans and grants and military expenditures abroad, while at the same time curtailing one of the two most important sources of cash income, secure investments abroad.

2. I think the facts indicate that it is also an illusion to think that we can solve this problem by expanding exports unilaterally while we curtail investments abroad. The facts show that much of our favorable export accounts are in machinery and raw materials, mostly to developed countries, in part due to our direct investments. In other categories such as consumer end products, the trends have turned against us.

One of our easy assumptions is that we are competitive in the price of manufactures. During my extensive travels abroad, one of the first explanations given by U.S. commercial counselors for the diminishing percentage of U.S. exports in relation to total imports of other countries is noncompetitiveness in price. Of course there are items in which we are in a favorable position. But there are many products in which this is not true. Because our desire in the period after World War II was to encourage exports from the war-torn countries, we built certain biases into international agreements. For example, the GATT agreements allows the forgiveness of turnover taxes in exports, it does not allow a similar concession of income taxes. As European countries base their tax system mainly on turnover taxes, this favors the European exporter to the extent of 20 or 25 percent in export price discounts, without being accused of dumping or export subsidies, but any move by us to forgive a portion of income taxes on exported goods would be considered in violation of GATT.

There is another structural development which will inhibit U.S. exports to an increasing degree. This is the growth of common markets and free trade areas, as well as the desire of developing countries to be self-sufficient in manufactures. The very essence of common markets is to favor the members and discriminate against the nonmembers. Thus the prospects of increasing net earnings by exports of manufactured end products will be limited. The permission to establish common markets and to discriminate against nonmembers, without violating the most-favored-nation provision of GATT is another provision established in the postwar period to favor Europe.

---

[3] Export Incentives, 1962.

The opportunities of solving this problem by a unilateral increase in exports of $3 billion are not good. The underdeveloped countries do not have the cash—they want foreign aid which they will use for industrial development behind protective tariff walls. The Communist countries are limited in their gold and foreign exchange resources, and the best you can hope for there is limited exports of essentials, such as grain, and barter arrangements; or long-term credits, which would not help our balance of payments.

Many of the developed countries, Japan, Canada, and Great Britain, have their own balance-of-payments deficits, and hence, are in no position to increase imports from us unilaterally. In fact, all three of these countries are trying to reduce their deficits by buying less abroad and selling more.

This leaves us with the surplus countries, mostly the EEC and Spain. It would require almost a 100-percent increase in our sales to them to increase our exports by $3 billion; or we would have to take away that much of their markets in third countries—both attempts fraught with both economic and political dangers.

Thus, we have been pursuing a national policy since 1961 which was contrary to recognizable historical trends, could not possibly have succeeded, and, by following an illusion, we have delayed other solutions of the problem of deficits.

3. The assumption that the trade negotiations under the Kennedy round will help us improve our balance-of-payments position needs such more careful scrutiny than it has received to date. The Common Market's desire is to lower our tariffs in categories of industries and products which heretofore have given us the largest trade account surplus. The very controversy on tariff disparities is designed to breach the U.S. market in those products. On the other hand, in fields such as grain exports, where we have a tremendous price advantage, we have made concessions in the Dillon round of negotiations in order to help the completion of the Common Market arrangments: in accepting the variable levies and a high price support program in the EEC, both of which threaten to diminish our exports of these products. In the area of consumer end products, I am afraid the statistical trends show the prospects of our increasing cash sales are rather dim.

Everybody seems to want our machinery for tooling up to produce their own consumer products, and it is doubtful that the current trade negotiations will change that trend. Whenever there is an opportunity to increase sales, as for instance in U.S. compact cars, the nontariff barriers put in our way are insurmountable and possibly beyond the reach of trade negotiations.

4. It is a current illusion that tied aid prevents leakage of dollars. A more careful and penetrating analysis of aid and trade will indicate, I believe, that more and more of our sales to underdeveloped countries are being shifted from cash account to credit account, and the saving in dollar exchange resulting therefrom is being spent in other countries. This is true also of the aid given by international institutions.

5. In the area of defense expenditures abroad, there has perhaps been some lag also in appreciating the significance of new technological developments. This lag is perhaps responsible for the maintenance of troops in Western Europe 20 years after the termination of hostilities. We are not, of course, in a position to make recommendations with respect to strategic military planning, but one cannot help but wonder whether there are not some alternative arrangements or choices we can offer to our allies that will diminish our out-of-pocket expenses for this purpose.

RECOMMENDATIONS

With these conclusions in mind, we would like to advance for your consideration a number of specific recommendations.

1. We should stop frightening the capital markets of the world by hints of forthcoming controls and regulations. There is nothing more sensitive in economic life than liquid capital. We must remember that, in addition to such capital held by institutions and individuals of other nations and U.S. corporations, there are millions and millions of Americans with money in the bank who may be scared into taking panic action that will bring about the very consequences we seek to avoid. We should stop frightening capital into unnecessary movements.

2. A very determined effort should be made, in addition to those already undertaken by the Defense Department and AID, to curtail Government outlays abroad by approximately $1 billion. To accomplish this, we suggest, first, converting the foreign aid program to a lend-lease basis instead of a line-of-credit basis, financing only U.S.-produced components of specific incremental development projects. This means termination of program loans, balance-of-payments loans, and budgetary assistance.

The present techniques of giving foreign aid have proved wasteful, because they finance current consumption and unproductive employment; and have added to our balance-of-payments deficits because they cause substitution of credit sales for cash sales.

Where there is absolute military necessity for balance of payments and budgetary help, then the President should be provided with sufficient contingency funds to take care of it on a case-by-case basis.

At the same time, more discriminating attention should be given to opportunities for dollar sales under title IV of Public Law 480, and for a possible amendment to title I, which would require at least 25 percent payment in hard currency. It would indeed help our balance of payments much more if we got 25 percent in dollars or other hard currencies, and made a gift of the rest, than to maintain the illusion of cash sales for local currencies.

While these changes are being worked out, we recommend at least a 20-percent cut in section 202 and 252 appropriations under the Foreign Assistance Act, immediately, and that they be phased out completely as soon as the lend-lease program is set up.

3. The United States should become more aggressive in the protection of existing markets in our trade negotiations. To accomplish this, we must cease putting undefinable political objectives ahead of clearly definable economic advantages. I believe this is the only country where there is such a separation in the minds of policymakers and diplomats.

For instance, there has been pressure in the United States to push Great Britain into the Common Market. If we do this, we are sure to lose additional agricultural sales which we can ill afford. If England should go into the Common Market, other EFTA countries will follow, and we would be discriminated against in all of them.

I suggest that while the EEC takes the next 2 or 3 years to consolidate itself, economically, we should proceed to develop a common market of our own—the Atlantic Common Market—by amending sections 211 and 251 of the Trade Expansion Act. Section 211 gives the President power to reduce tariffs on commodities in which the Common Market and the U.S. trade account for 80 percent of world trade. This provision was nothing more than an inducement to Great Britain to enter the Common Market, because no appreciable number of commodities qualified, except jet aircraft, without British membership in the EEC. That provision should now be expanded to allow bilateral negotiations with Canada, Great Britain—in fact, all Commonwealth countries—with the EFTA countries, with the Latin American Free Trade Area, the Central American Free Trade Association, and with any other countries at the discretion of the President. This revision will permit us to negotiate for the expansion of our markets in other countries around the world, instead of hanging on the ropes waiting on Mr. de Gaulle's pleasure.

This cannot be done, however, without amendment of section 251, which extends unconditional most-favored-nation treatment to all countries. This provision should be amended by making the granting of concessions conditional so that we would retain bargaining power instead of giving concessions free to the EEC. With these changes, the U.S. Government will reacquire the initiative in trade negotiations, and the attainment of an Atlantic Common Market becomes feasible. This may be the quickest way to bring about the Atlantic Community so important to Western defense.

4. Immediate steps should be taken by Export-Import Bank: (a) To stop making balance-of-payments loans as an adjunct of AID policy, and return to its original purpose of making specific project loans to encourage exports; and (b) to liberalize its export credit and insurance facilities to become completely competitive with similar facilities offered by other countries.

5. We should put the Common Market countries on notice that the United States will take steps to reduce its military expenses and tourist expenses in the balance-of-payments surplus countries by at least $1 billion unless they make an offer to purchase, additionally, from us at least that amount of incremental products by reducing their protectionist devices against U.S. agricultural products, U.S. automobiles, coal, and a variety of other products for which they have need and which we can provide at reasonable prices; and be prepared to carry it out. Another alternative they should be offered is sharing in the costs of Western defense by an equivalent amount.

6. The Congress should instruct the Executive to cease and desist from further commitments to international institutions for foreign aid, until prior authorization is obtained from the Congress. I think we should put a moratorium for a while on appropriations for no-interest, long-term, soft loans.

The Congress should also instruct, by legislation, our representatives in these institutions, particularly the World Bank and the Inter-American Bank, to vote against the issuance of bonds in the U.S. market, and insist that dollar loans be tied to U.S. procurement. It is not easy to understand how, consistently, the Congress can tell foreign borrowers not to come to the American money market and American investors to refrain from investing abroad, while these international institutions, with the faith and credit of the U.S. Government behind them, borrow in the United States, get generous appropriations, and lend untied funds to underdeveloped countries.

7. The U.S. Government should take a good hard look at the effect of international commodity agreements on U.S. balance of payments. Are international cartels, even if contrived by governments, the effect of which is to raise the price of imports, in the U.S. interest? Are commodity agreements, such as the wheat agreement, the effect of which is to share markets, rather than sell more U.S. agricultural production, to the interest of our country? Are international price

maintenance subsidies, as in sugar, to the interest of the United States? Can we not devise ways whereby, if the U.S. consumer is called upon to pay a premium price, the difference between world price and U.S. price can be set aside as a foreign aid fund, thereby diminishing the necessity of direct aid appropriations? Again, in this area, the United States faces the responsibility of developing a policy consistent with our overall commitments and interests.

8. The charters of the post-World War II international institutions should be reexamined to see whether they need amendments to bring them in line with current conditions. Established at a time when the world bias was in favor of Europe, many of these provisions now prevent the United States from taking initiatives in solving current problems.

I have already referred to two provisions of GATT, in tax treatment, and in exceptions given to EEC, which make it difficult for us to expand our exports. There are other institutions, such as the World Bank, IDA, Inter-American Bank, which need to be reviewed. This reexamination should include the proportion of U.S. participation, procurement policies, and the purposes for which funds are to be used.

Every 2 years the Congress is presented with proposed amendments, always for increased appropriations, but never with any substantiative changes in charter provisions. The next revision should concern itself with fundamental amendments of the charters of these institutions. But before going into such an effort, it is to be hoped that the Congress will find ways of studying these charters and making basic recommendations to the Executive.

I wish to thank the committee for its patience and indulgence in hearing out our extensive examination. We have devoted a great deal of time and effort in studying these problems. It is extremely heartening to us that such an important body as this committee has made this effort worthwhile by giving us this opportunity.

I must also express my personal gratitude and pleasure to our member companies which have given us the freedom to speak out the truth as we see it. The points we have made here are the results of the research and discussions of the participants here. No one else has seen or reviewed this statement, not even committees of our organization or member companies.

I do not know whether they would agree or disagree with these conclusions and recommendations. Therefore, in all fairness, I want to save them any blame, and assume full responsibility for this presentation.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the London Economist has published a provocative and thoughtful editorial in this field. I should like to quote briefly from it, before asking unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

It reads:

> If there is a further series of large speculative movements of funds in the gold and foreign exchange markets this year, those in the eye of the storm will be liable to recommend two policies: A new dose of illiberal restrictions abroad, even though beggar-my-neighbor policies are the precise policies that need to be avoided; and further deflation at home, even though the whole free world's economic conjuncture might by then be set on a dangerously deflationary course. Then the snowball really could start to roll.
>
> This is not a forecast of inevitable disaster. The odds, to repeat, are still that the world will avoid a serious international financial crisis this year, not because of brilliant international economic management, but just because of the luck of the way the wind blows. It can even be argued that none of the restrictive things that have been done in the past few months—except those done by General de Gaulle—has in itself been demonstrably wrong. But it is certain that the world's chancelleries should at least be working out a contingency plan, in case the wind does blow the wrong way. The essence of it should be a determination that, if a serious threat does rise to world economic activity and world employment, then the whole course of international economic policy should be turned round with the one prime object of restimulating that activity and that employment. Nothing should be allowed to stand in the way of this.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the London Economist be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DANGEROUS WATERS

The international economic conjuncture is more worrying now than at any time since the end of the war. There is a definite danger of relapse into world illiberalism. It is conceivable that there could be a relapse into world recession. And too many of the governments and central financial authorities of the world are looking fixedly in the opposite direction.

To begin with the most familiar danger, that of old-fashioned, cyclical recession. It would be silly to exaggerate the warning signals, but even more silly completely to disregard them. In both the United States and Britain, the guardians of the two key world currencies, economic forecasters are singing a remarkably similar tune: they see the danger of some internal overheating of their economies in the first half of the year between now and April of 1966, but suspect that there may be a slowdown or possibly a downturn of activity in the second half of it. In Britain such a downturn seems only too probable. In the United States, it fortunately seems less so. Those who fear a recession there rest heavily on the apprehension that once American industry feels that it can cease stockpiling steel for fear of a strike in the early summer, it may stop buying too much and order too little. Most of the other so-called leading indicators in the much-charted American economy give an impression of strength, though not of unmixed strength. In Wall Street, most of the big institutional investors are said to be confident that no long setback is likely; this is important, because if there were a 1-day attack of stock market jitters, as in 1962, there would probably be a sufficient rush of bargain price orders to bring prices rebounding up again on the morrow. Still, when all this has been said, no practiced forecaster would deny that after the summer of this year the American economic prospect presents a picture of some uncertainty.

In continental Europe, France shows signs already of relapsing into a recession; the impact of this on total world demand might offset the fact that Italy should be about to recover from one. The other West European countries and Japan mostly expect further advances in 1965, though not at the great pace of some recent years (indeed in Japan this week stock market prices have touched a 4-year low, amid a rather worrying wavelet of bankruptcies, and none of the other major bourses has recently been looking exactly happy). Most important of all, over the rest of the world, and particularly over the primary producing countries, hang the clouds of a darkening prospect for international trade. These clouds arise because, even if the United States and Britain do escape an internal recession, both these key currency countries are most definitely going to be fighting throughout 1965 against what they regard as the grave balance-of-payments crises—and both at the same time.

So far, President Johnson's administration has tackled its balance-of-payments problem in what might be called a Socialist way: by direct cajolements and semicontrols against American capital transfers and tourist expenditure abroad. The Labor government of Britain began by tackling its problem in a high Tory way, through large temporary increases in import tariffs; since that has proved unpopular abroad, it is under pressure to resort now to the low Tory way of deflating the economy by a fairly tough budget. If these American and British measures work smoothly, in their declared object of seeing that the two reserve currency countries do not create any more reserves, their flow of funds to the outside world will be sharply curtailed. It is difficult to see how this can avoid giving a further deflationary twist to raw material prices.

The biggest danger of all will arise if these measures succeed in sharply cutting American and British outpayments to oversea countries, but do not appear to their respective governments to be succeeding sufficiently well, because of a concurrent growth of speculation against their currencies. The speculation against the dollar would be speculation in favor of gold. Already, the action of some European countries in converting their dollars into gold carries a threat of a snowball effect; however determinedly the Federal Reserve authorities deny that they would ever countenance a rise in the price of gold, everybody knows that a fall in the price of gold is even less likely, so that speculators have a one-way option. The speculation against sterling arises because every international businessman knows that if the dollar were devalued against gold, sterling would be devalued against it too, and certainly not by a lesser amount. From this, and from the battered weakness of sterling's reserves, despite the good February trade returns, yet another danger arises.

The tone of recent speeches by the Governor of the Bank of England and others suggests that the city would not disagree that 1965 does indeed carry at least some threat of being another 1931. But while to the ordinary man the horror of another 1931 means the specter of quite unnecessary unemployment and a total sizing up of international trade, to many conservative finance ministers and central bankers the nasty image of 1931 is that then was the year when there was a collapse of confidence in their established (and inefficient) way of running the international financial system. They instinctively suppose that it was this collapse of confidence which caused the slump and the unemployment—instead of the other way around. They believe that it is this faltering of confidence in a sound international financial system which must be fought at all costs, and they automatically associate lack of soundness with spending too much (especially on foreign goods), not with starting to spend too little. If there is a further series of large speculative movements of funds in the gold and foreign exchange markets this year, those in the eye of the storm will be liable to recommend two policies: A new dose of illiberal restrictions abroad, even though beggar-my-neighbor policies are the precise policies that need to be avoided; and further deflation at home, even though the whole free world's economic conjuncture might by then be set on a dangerously deflationary course. Then the snowball really could start to roll.

This is not a forecast of inevitable disaster. The odds, to repeat, are still that the world will avoid a serious international financial crisis this year, not because of brilliant international economic management, but just because of the luck of the way the wind blows. It can even be argued that none of the restrictive things that have been done in the past few months—except those done by

General de Gaulle—has in itself been demonstrably wrong. But it is certain that the world's chancelleries should at least be working out a contingency plan, in case the wind does blow the wrong way. The essence of it should be a determination that, if a serious threat does arise to world economic activity and world employment, then the whole course of international economic policy should be turned round with the one prime object of restimulating that activity and that employment. Nothing should be allowed to stand in the way of this: not the interesting differences of opinion between practicing economists on whether this or that scheme for increasing world liquidity is marginally preferable, not the attachment of central bankers to their accustomed system of rigidly fixed exchange rates, not the arguments that can no doubt be started about who has been most at fault.

The objections so far successfully voiced against all proposals for easing the rigidity of the present international payments mechanism and for increasing world liquidity—whether Triffin, Stamp, Maulding, Brookings proposals, or whatever—have been that they could make it too easy for wicked governments to inflate: because they could loosen the disciplinary restraints imposed by balance-of-payments difficulties under the present international mechanism. Even those who regard these restraints as still most necessary in existing circumstances must surely see that a contingency could arise when national reflations would be the path of virtue, and when it would be desirable to have an international payments mechanism that encouraged them. For the economic, and still more the political, consequences of any relapse into serious recession by the non-Communist world would be dire indeed.

At present there is no such contingency plan in existence. Since the murder of President Kennedy, there has been no commanding world leader with the modernity of economic mind to take over a dominating influence if a crisis does befall. It is one of the worrying accidents of 1965 that the political ministers directly in charge of economic and financial affairs in both America and Britain are going to be new, inexperienced men; in Europe, there is no economic or finance minister of outstandingly reassuring stature either. All the financial advisers are still instinctively attuned to fighting inflation instead of deflation. Most governments nowadays, unlike in the 1930's, do have a bevy of professional economic advisers, who understand the contingent problems; but most of them are quietist sorts of economists, anxious to avoid any impression of extremism by looking inconveniently far ahead, because in the last resort the politicians are not sufficiently engaged with economics to take kindly to far-out solutions when self-styled practical men say that such remedies are politically and institutionally impossible.

The most appropriate analogy is a seafaring one. The ship of the world economy is floating on what are still, to the immediate eye, relatively placid seas; but it is also now in latitudes which, by known experience, are a possible hurricane belt. There is no captain on the bridge. There are a number of mildly quarreling, inexperienced mates, of no agreed order of seniority. The financial advisers in the crew are well trained in the ways of sailing ships rather than steamships, and convinced that all that should be done is to make sure that one has a sound ship floating well above the Plimsoll line, rather than worrying oneself with abstract sciences like meteorology. There are a number of economic advisers about, who boast that, without being extremist or alarmist or avant garde, they have at least recommended that while passing through the hurricane belt we should consider carrying umbrellas. Although it is true that even in the most dangerous latitudes a hurricane hits even ill-organized ships only rarely, this is not a comfortable vessel to be on. We passengers, battened in the holds, have some reason to send up anguished wails about it.

MENOMINEE INDIAN TERMINATION BRINGS TRAGIC POVERTY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a few years ago Congress decided to terminate the reservation status of the Menominee Indians, the first time that an entire Indian tribe had gone through a termination of the position they enjoyed on a federally recognized reservation. I believe Congress would be interested in the consequences of that separation. I must report, regretfully, that the consequences for this Wisconsin tribe have been very bad, in spite of the fact that the State of Wisconsin and its university has tried to help the Menominees. The Menominees have suffered greatly. They are poor. Many are unemployed. The health of these Indians has suffered seriously.

This is the Nation which at one time controlled a large portion of Wisconsin, and with which we made a treaty under which one small primeval area in Wisconsin was to remain as their territory.

An article in the Milwaukee Sentinel of March 22 points out graphically how these fine Menominee people have suffered. And how this proud tribe is gradually and painfully disintegrating. I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POVERTY OF MENOMINEES AN ASSAULT ON SENSES

(By Larry Fields)

The poverty of the nearly 3,000 Menominee Indians struggling to survive in Wisconsin's Menominee County assaults the five senses.

Their poverty is the taste of despair and potatoes without meat.

It is the sound of a baby crying for food and an icy wind wheezing through a rotting hole in an occupied house.

It is the feel of castoff clothing and futility.

It is the odor of overcooked cabbage and unwashed bodies.

It is the sight of children with nothing to do and women who have turned too old too soon.

Above all, it is the chilling statistics which have just led the Federal Bureau of Indian Affairs to call Menominee County a pocket of poverty.

And the pockets of nearly all who dwell there are empty.

President Johnson has declared that families existing on annual incomes of $3,000 a year or less are poverty stricken. The average annual wage in Menominee County is $2,300. The typical family consists of five persons.

Approximately one out of every seven persons in the county—412—receives welfare aid.

More than one-third of the Indian population—1,022—fuel their bodies on food surpluses distributed by the Federal Government.

With these grim figures, a daily fact of life, it is little wonder that many Menominees use whisky and sex as a temporary escape from reality.

There are, among the 496 families in the county, 113 problem drinkers, according to the Wisconsin State Medical Society. This includes a "distressing number of heavy drinking mothers."

The State department of public welfare reported in a 1962 survey that there were 4.8 unwed mothers in Wisconsin for every 10,000 people. The ratio of unwed mothers in Menominee County for the same population breakdown amounted to 99.8.

Although Menominee County is one of the most scenic sectors of Wisconsin, the picture there is a series of portraits in blue.

Ever since her husband died 2 years ago, Mrs. Agnes Moshoquit, 77, has been afraid that she might get sick or die without anyone knowing of it.

"I've got nobody now. Nobody ever comes to see me," she said.

Mrs. Moshoquit, tiny and toothless, lives in a rickety, two story frame house near the community of Neopit.

The rooms on the second floor are closed. Climbing stairs is difficult for an old woman: Besides, it is easier to heat only one floor in the house.

An ancient wood burning stove in the kitchen is the only source of warmth. The frail old woman must chop her own wood supply.

"I fell down four times last month when I went outside to chop," she said. "My leg and my hand still hurt."

There is, of course, no indoor plumbing. Until 2 weeks ago, she was able to draw water for cooking and washing from a well on her property.

But the pump broke and she can't afford to have it repaired.

Mrs. Moshoquit said that her nearest neighbors refuse to allow her to use their well unless she pays $1 per bucket of water. Her monthly income is $58 from social security benefits.

She requires only one bucket of water a day. But the nearest neighbor who will let her have the water free of charge lives one-quarter of a mile away.

This can be an agonizing journey in the winter.

Several times last month, Mrs. Moshoquit said, it was so cold inside her house that water she had stored overnight froze into ice by morning.

She doesn't own an automobile, and this adds to her hardship. There is no public transportation in Menominee County.

The closest store is 2 miles from her house. Unless she is willing to pay someone to drive her, she must hike to the store.

Several times a month, Father Marcellus Cabo, pastor of St. Anthony's Catholic Church in Neopit, stops by and serves as chauffeur.

The priest transports her to Keshena, 12 miles distant, to pick up her skimpy allotment of commodities from the food surplus depot.

"The hardest thing, though, is chopping the wood," she said. "After I chop the wood, I'm no good for the rest of the day."

The $56 a week that Edward Kauquatosh, 41, earns as a laborer in the Menominee lumber mill doesn't stretch very far. It has to support his wife, Mary, 45, and their 10 children, ages 8 and 18.

"Last week," he said, "I had to spend my whole paycheck on shoes for the kids."

Edward doesn't smoke or drink. He can't afford such pleasures.

The family's diet mainly revolves around their food surplus allotments. Fresh meat on the table is rare.

The Kauquatoshes usually have to pay a neighbor $5 to drive them to Keshena to pick up their monthly food rations.

Their home is 2 miles from the lumber mill. To save money, Edward eats lunch at home. This means he has to walk to and from work four times a day.

The medium-size framhouse in which Laura Wayka and Harriet Waukau live is bursting with humanity. It is home to 22 people.

The girls, sisters, each with three childen, are supported by welfare aid.

The house, owned by their parents, is occupied by their grandfather, brothers and sisters, and acres of assorted children.

The youngest member of the clan is Laura's 1-month-old baby. The oldest is their 75-year-old grandfather.

The sour fragrance of cabbage and unwashed diapers permeates the house.

Laura, 23, was abandoned by her husband. She has no idea where he is.

Harriet, 24, divorced her husband.

The women tried living by themselves for awhile, but soon learned that their anemic welfare checks made such an arrangement practically impossible.

Because the family owns no car, they rarely go out. There are no movie theaters or any type of commercial entertainment in Menominee County. (There aren't even any doctors in the county.)

Entertainment consists of watching, in staggered shifts, the one television set.

William La Rock, Jr., 30, and his wife, Mary, 32, live with their three small children (ages 3, 2, and 1) in a shabby two-room shack which contains running insects instead of running water.

Each day La Rock drives to a small stream 3 miles from his house to fill a bucket with water. Often there are others at the stream with similar purposes.

La Rock was laid off from his job at the lumbermill last year and has been on welfare since. He occasionally works part time with the highway department.

The La Rocks said they were planning to leave Menominee this fall and move to Milwaukee.

"This is my home and I'll always love it, but there's nothing here for me anymore," he said. "At least I'll be able to find work in Milwaukee."

La Rock said that in the last year, 15 of his relatives moved to other cities in the Midwest.

More and more, the young Indians of Menominee County are leaving the land of their ancestors in order to survive.

BELOIT DAILY NEWS PRAISES SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY OF AMERICAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Beloit Daily News, which is an outstanding Wisconsin newspaper, has commented on the sense of responsibility of the Nation's students. In view of all the criticism that has been leveled at the students of the Nation, this kind of thoughtful and objective praise by a highly respected newspaper should be called to the Nation's attention. It reads:

GOOD WORD FOR STUDENTS

Much is being said and written about young people going to the dogs in a handbasket, especially on college campuses. Perhaps college presidents are in the best position to know how college students are behaving, and one of them thinks he detects "an increasing maturity in the Nation's students." He is Vernon R. Alden, president of Ohio University at Athens.

"Today's students," he says, "regard college not as a haven from responsibility but as a training ground for citizenship. They see themselves as the conscience of the Nation; they are supplying the energy for needed social change."

One thing is certain, stresses Alden: More students are going into teaching, social work and politics, fewer into business. The reason is that they can live comfortably in almost any career they choose. Satisfaction, then, not money, becomes the deciding factor.

"As I look at today's students," says Alden, "I am deeply moved by their maturity. It is fortunate that they are accepting responsibility at such an early age, for already the torch of leadership is being passed to them."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield to me, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM—THOUGHTFUL COMMENTS BY STUDENTS OF THE HISTORY CLASS OF CUSTER COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL IN MILES CITY, MONT., AND REPLY BY SENATOR MANSFIELD

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the members of Mr. Gray's junior year American history class in Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont., have written me recently to present their views on the situation in Vietnam and to ask me to state mine. These young men and women and their teacher, Mr. Gray, are to be commended for encouraging serious discussion and analysis of this issue. Their thoughtful comments in these letters give reassuring evidence that as the years go by Montana and the United States will continue to be blessed with an informed and responsible citizenry.

My reply to their request may be of some interest to others, and I therefore read it, as follows:

U.S. SENATE,
OFFICE OF THE MAJORITY LEADER,
Washington, D.C., March 10, 1965.

DEAR ———: I have received your letter and a number of other letters from your classmates concerning Vietnam. You express your views and you ask me to express mine on this very serious question.

First, I want to commend your teacher, Mr. Gray, for encouraging this discussion and I want to compliment you for participating in it in a most intelligent and mature way. I have gained a great deal in understanding from reading your letters.

Now let me state my views to you on Vietnam, as you requested.

The war in Vietnam is a war among Vietnamese but Americans are becoming more and more involved in the fighting. Scarcely a week goes by without a report of several American soldiers being killed or wounded. Each life is precious and each death a tragedy. But if we look at this situation fully, we will see that we are still not involved in the kind of conflict which we experienced in World War II or even in Korea. The casualties among Americans in those other conflicts would sometimes equal or surpass in 1 day what we have borne in Vietnam over the past several years.

In other words, the American involvement in the conflict in Vietnam is still far short of what it was in those other recent wars with which you are familiar, I am sure, from your class studies or the experiences of your own families.

Yet, the fighting in Vietnam could grow into another Korea or another world war. Some people say: "Well, why not? Let's go in and get it over with quickly." The answer is that that is not an answer at all. A war in Asia could last for many years, spread further and further and bring millions of casualties and cause widespread devastation and destruction. In my view, we owe it, not only to the rest of the world, but to our own people to do whatever can honorably be done to prevent that kind of tragedy and suffering.

But it is going to take two sides to prevent a larger war from developing out of Vietnam. And it is going to take two sides to bring to an end even the small war which is now in progress in Vietnam. If it is going to be an honorable end, it means that the people who live in South Vietnam have got to have reasonable security and a reasonable opportunity to decide what they want for themselves.

That is the reason why Americans were sent into Vietnam in the first place—to help the Vietnamese people. It is their country and it is still their war and I hope that it can be kept that way. I would not like to see the United States involved in Vietnam any longer than it takes to help bring about a just solution which secures the freedom of South Vietnam. I would want to see the fighting, not extended, but ended just as soon as possible on that basis.

That is the way the situation looks to me. Once again, I would like to compliment you and your classmates and your teacher for pursuing this discussion and to thank you for bringing me into it by your letters.

With best personal wishes, I am
Sincerely yours,
MIKE MANSFIELD.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a list of the Custer County High School students who wrote letters to me on the situation in South Vietnam.

There being no objection, the list of students was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Jim Beardsley, Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont.

Linda Bergerson, Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont.

Jerianne Chezum, Box 119, Miles City, Mont.

Virginia Clendenen, 809 South Sewell, Miles City, Mont.

Susan Enghusen, Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont.

Bill Hildenbrand, 216 North Eighth, Miles City, Mont.

Laura Jan Huntzicker, 412 South Center, Miles City, Mont.

Robert J. Kelley, 908 Woodbury, Miles City, Mont.

Rick Kouba, Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont.

Pat Mackenzie, Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont.

Barbie Petersohn, 1910 North Jordan, Miles City, Mont.

Lynn Ronning, Custer County High School, Miles City, Mont.

Carol Shook, 713 South Cottage Grove Ave., Miles City, Mont.

Linda Sterling, Route 1, Box 274, Miles City, Mont.

Anita Strub, 811 Wells, Miles City, Mont.

Jack Whitten, 2115 Main, Miles City, Mont.

AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND MEXICO ON THE COLORADO SALINITY PROBLEM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the friendly and sympathetic atmosphere which exists between the Republic of Mexico and the United States has helped to make it possible to work out a solution to another long-standing irritant in our relations. It has just been announced that an agreement between the two nations covering the Colorado salinity problem has been achieved. It follows a 1963 treaty on the El Chamizal and ranks with it as an outstanding example of a solution to a complex and long-standing international difficulty worked out by the processes of reason in a setting of mutual accommodation and mutual respect.

The water salinity problem on the Colorado River has caused considerable economic hardship to Mexican farmers who live near the border areas in the Mexicali Valley and who depend on the waters of the Colorado to irrigate their fields. And, of course, the utilization of the river is of immense importance in the agriculture and other activities of the Southwest region of our own Nation.

The new agreement is an equitable answer to the difficulty. It is expected to make sufficient fresh water available to both Mexicans and Americans living in the area served by the Colorado River.

Many months of hard work by Mexican and United States negotiators have gone into completing this settlement. The Governors of seven American States were consulted at every step of the negotiations and each gave their cooperation in making a solution possible. Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall, Under Secretary of State Thomas Mann, U.S. Ambassador Anthony Freeman, U.S. Border Commissioner Joseph Freidkin and his staff, Terrance G. Leonhardy and T. R. Martin of the Department of State, and Robert Sayre of the White House staff, represented the United States in the protracted negotiations. The main burden of the Mexican point of view was carried by former Ambassador Antonio Carrillo Flores, now Minister of Foreign Affairs, and Commissioner David Herrera Jordan. All of these men labored long and hard in working out a compromise. They have made a great contribution in the spirit of good neighborliness embodied in the Charter of Punta del Este. The Mexican-United States parliamentary meetings of the past several years have also made a profound contribution to this achievement not only by increasing the mutual understanding of the problem of Colorado salinity through discussions among the legislators of both countries but also by developing a high degree of reciprocal sympathy with respect to the whole range of relations between Mexico and the United States. The work of the distinguished Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], who has headed the Senate group of the U.S. delegation, the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the ranking Republican in the U.S. Senate, the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], the Chairman of the Latin American Affairs subcommittee, and all the others on the delegation has been outstanding in this connection.

Still other problems exist between Mexico and the United States but the augury for their friendly and mutually beneficial settlement is encouraging. Needless to say if a similar spirit of reasonable amicability characterized our relations all over the world, the goal of world peace would be furthered immeasurably.

I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "United States, Mexico Reach Pact on River Water," published in the New York Herald Tribune on March 23, 1965, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALT IN THE COLORADO: UNITED STATES, MEXICO REACH PACT ON RIVER WATER

(By Barnard L. Collier, Latin-American correspondent)

WASHINGTON.—The United States and Mexico reached final agreement yesterday on the touchy problem posed by the claim that the United States was pouring crop-killing salt water into Mexico's part of the Colorado River.

In a White House statement yesterday, President Johnson announced that he had approved an agreement worked out by the International Boundary and Water Commission. It will allow Mexico to control the salinity of the water flowing into irrigation ditches in the Mexicali Valley.

The agreement provides for a U.S.-built extension of an existing drainage canal which will divert salt-laden water from a U.S. irrigation project east of Yuma, Ariz., away from the Mexican irrigation system when the Mexicans choose to do so.

"The agreement has been considered by the Governors of the Colorado River Basin States and by the chairmen of the appropriate congressional committees," said the President, "and all have agreed to it."

The diversion project is expected to cost the United States about $5 million. If Congress speeds additional appropriations, the project will be finished by next October—the period when the Colorado flows least and saltiest into Mexico.

Among the nearly 300,000 Mexicans in the rich Mexicali Valley just below the California border, the angry cry of "sal"—salt—has long signified anti-Yankeeism. In the last 5 years, Leftists and Communists rallied peasants and farmers to protest and riot.

The dispute dates to shortly after the 1944 treaty between the United States and Mexico, which guarantees Mexico at least 1.5 million acre feet of the Colorado River's water each year. (An acre-foot is the amount of water needed to cover 1 acre of land to the depth of 1 foot.)

That quantity, the negotiators knew, was sufficient for future irrigation purposes in the cotton-growing valley. But even then they realized the quality of the water would some day become a sticky issue.

The Colorado River water that flowed across the border into Mexico then contained approximately 900 parts of salt per million parts of water—a little more than is tasty, but usable nonetheless. Then more and more irrigation projects using the Colorado's water were started on the U.S. side.

The project that caused most of the trouble was the Wellton-Mohawk farm development near Yuma. There the irrigation waters from the Colorado turned desert into lush farmland. But the relatively pure water that made crops grow in Yuma area was drained back into the Colorado via the Gila River and crossed the border into Mexico laden with leached out salt.

On occasion, the Mexicans insisted, the water flowing back out of the Yuma area contained up to 20,000 parts of salt per million parts of water. (Sea water contains about 35,000 parts per million.) The Mexicans were furious.

The salt crisis finally brought a joint United States-Mexican communique in the early summer of 1962, in which President Kennedy and Mexico's President Adolfo Lopez Mateos promised to reach a permanent solution by October 1963.

Meanwhile, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation opened 12 fresh-water wells that pumped clear water into the Gila and diluted the Yuma waste water down to 4,000 parts of salt per million. By the time it mixed with the Colorado water again the salt level dropped to about 1,800 parts per million.

Still Mexico claimed that the wells alone were no permanent solution.

The Bureau of Reclamation, however, contended that the water going to Mexico was usable. If the Mexicans would lay tiles along their irrigation ditches, keeping much of the water from draining through salty soil and getting even saltier, the farms at the end of their irrigation network would have little to complain about, the Bureau said.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to comment briefly on what has been said by the distinguished majority leader. One of the plus signs that we can put against our foreign relations these days—and we have had too few of them—is the relationship which now exists between the United States and the Republic of Mexico. At no time in history has the relationship between these two countries been more amicable and more understanding than it is today. That is because the officials of our executive branch of the Government and the representatives of our legislative branch of Government and their counterpart of the Mexican Government have been considerate and understanding in dealing with the problems which have confronted us.

Of all the work which has been done, no one has made a greater contribution to the complete understanding which we have on so many subjects with our neighbors to the south today than has the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. He is greatly admired and respected, not only by Mexican officials, but by all the people of Mexico as well. I am glad to pay him this well earned tribute at this time.

TRANSFERRING THE COSTS OF FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, will the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, with the understanding that I do not lose my right to the floor, I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, the Johnson administration has proposed to transfer the costs of Federal meat inspections to the meat industry. In his recent budget message the President asserted:

> Fairness to all taxpayers demands that those who enjoy special benefits should bear a greater share of the costs.

He then singled out the costs of Federal meat inspection as an example of an activity in which he would shortly propose legislation for that purpose.

In my opinion, the President could have hardly picked a worse example as a vehicle for charging "those who enjoy special benefits" with the costs of Federal services. It is fallacious and spurious to assume that the meat industry is the sole or even the major beneficiary of meat inspection.

Federal meat inspection has the sole purpose of insuring that every American who eats meat—and I daresay that includes virtually our entire population—buys only wholesome, disease-free meat products when he shops at his meat market or grocery store. If anything, Federal meat inspection imposes financial burdens on the meatpackers and others who fall under the scope of the Federal activity. They must maintain high standards of cleanliness in their operations that are costly. Yet those costs are willingly absorbed to insure that the consumer receives the highest quality meat and meat products.

It is the consumer who receives the benefit of the Federal meat inspection, not the industry.

The President's proposal would without question weaken inspection and endanger health. It is difficult to believe that President Johnson would advocate such a result.

By using the President's strange line of reasoning there are many other Federal activities which special user charges could be placed on the direct beneficiaries. For example, why are not the salaries of FBI agents charged to the users or beneficiaries of their services? Why are not the costs of mine safety inspections absorbed by the coal industry? Why are not the costs of the multifarious activities of the U.S. Public Health Service charged to users such as a community which has had its water supply inspected or those members of a community who have been saved from a possible outbreak of a communicable disease by quick action from a Public Health Service team of medical sleuths who have traced the course of a carrier of a deadly disease? Or why not charge the costs of Federal Aviation Agency inspections of airports and aircraft to the industry? Or why not charge customs inspections to those who are having their baggage checked? Or why should not the entire cost of the National Bureau of Standards be borne by industry or other direct recipients of its services? Or why not charge the food and drug industries with the costs of FDA inspections?

It would be possible to go on and develop an imposing list of services performed by the Federal Government that might be charged to a so-called specific user, but I cite the examples listed above merely to emphasize my point. The costs of Federal meat inspection, the FBI, the Public Health Service, the FAA, the FDA, and the National Bureau of Standards and many, many others are not intended to help specific individuals. They are for the protection of all of us. They are for the promotion of the public health, safety, and welfare—to mention the specific constitutional authority under which these programs were established. Therefore, the costs of these programs should be borne by the general public in the form of tax revenues.

There is no practical way in which industry can fairly absorb the costs. The costs can go only in two places if placed on the industry. They can be transferred to the consumer in the form of higher meat prices, which is highly unlikely because of the competitive situation with both meat imports and nonfederally inspected meats. Or, the costs can be transferred to the meat animal producers by paying them less for their product. This would be a gross injustice. The beef cattle industry is already hard-pressed financially by competition from beef imports, increasing production costs, and low market prices.

There are many meatpacking plants in the United States. Of course, the most of them by far are small operations. The President's proposal would be disastrous to small packers and processors and would result in a curtailment of the market for livestock in the areas where they are located.

Mr. President, the Washington Post on March 22, carried an excellent editorial opposing the proposed transfer of Federal meat inspection costs. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 22, 1965]

Paying Inspection Costs

> A quiet move is underway in Washington and in some of the States to shift the cost of meat inspection from the taxpayer to the packers. The idea has a superficial appeal because of the budgetary savings it would permit, but it is also arousing much opposition. Many observers believe that it would bring about a deterioration in the service and accentuate fluctuations in the price of meat.
>
> In a strong market, it is assumed that meat inspection costs assessed against the packers would be passed on to the consumers, causing prices to rise more than they otherwise would. In a weak market, packers would deduct the cost of inspection from prices paid to livestock producers, thus adding to the troubles of an industry which has been under pressure in recent years. Congress will doubtless be wary of approving a possible depressant to livestock prices.
>
> More serious is the underlying principle of paying for public services out of the public purse. Meat inspection is required for the protection of people against disease. It is said that 30 diseases which afflict human beings may be derived from animals. Rigid and independent inspection of all meat put on the market is imperative to protect the public from these sources of infection. This work is as much a public function as the quarantining of individuals with communicable diseases.
>
> If the cost of meat inspection were charged against the packers, inspectors would almost inevitably feel some obligation to those who paid their salaries. Businessmen are not asked to pay the policeman who patrols the street. Importers are not asked to pay the customs official who checks over their purchases abroad. It is the public in general that benefits from impartial and thorough inspection of meat, and we think the public should continue to pay for it from the public purse.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont would yield, I should like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield for that purpose, with the understanding that I shall retain my right to the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. Harris in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

STATUS OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, if the current crisis in Vietnam is not escalated into total war, a course to which I am utterly opposed, some kind of negotiations must ultimately take place—when or where, I do not know.

Of one thing I am reasonably sure, however; it is that the basic negotiation will be between parties who do not trust each other.

In the present state of affairs, the North Vietnamese and their allies will not trust the South Vietnamese and their allies, and vice versa.

If military forces are to be withdrawn, if liquidation in blood is to be avoided, there must be some international presence to police the terms of whatever agreement may be reached.

I do not seek to prejudge the nature of negotiations or to propose methods of policing arrangements, except to note that devices similar to the International Control Commission have been spectacularly unsuccessful in both Vietnam and Laos.

Perhaps they would work if reconstituted, or if they were operating under more viable agreements than the 1954 accords on Vietnam and the 1962 agreement on Laos.

I could not agree more with those who say that the Vietnamese conflict cries out for United Nations attention.

But in the present situation, it is an idle dream to suppose that this bankrupt organization could be effective.

The sad thing, perhaps even the tragedy of the 1960's, is that the United Nations when it is needed most is virtually non compos mentis.

It is unable to act in ways in which it might be effective.

As reported in a recent article in a news magazine:

> It all started with the U.N. bond issue, initiated in 1962 by the United States to provide for collective financing of the Congo operation in the face of increasing congressional hostility both to the operation and to the fact that the United States had been paying voluntarily 60 percent or more of the costs.

There were among us in Congress some who saw in the bond issue the beginning of the undermining of the financial integrity of the United Nations—a process which has now proceeded to the point where that Organization cannot be called upon when it is most needed.

Financial manipulations, encouraged by the United States in 1960 and 1961, made it possible for states who were falling behind in payment of their assessments for peacekeeping operations to use the device of a large U.S. grant to keep their records clear.

They were not only permitted to do this, they were even encouraged to do it, although as a matter of principle many of these states themselves supported the opposition of the Soviet Union to the exercise by the General Assembly of authority to fix assessments for peacekeeping operations.

Senators will recall that during debate on the United Nations bond issue some of us questioned the administration rather vigorously on two points:

First, we sought to learn from the Department of State what the American reaction would be if the General Assembly were at some future time to assess the United States for the costs of sending a United Nations force into some area where the United States had its vital interests involved on the other side.

Specifically, I asked one nongovernment witness:

> If the International Court finds the operations in the Congo perfectly legal, and the assessments to pay the costs thereof binding upon its members, would it be possible for the United Nations to send troops of different nations into any country in the Western Hemisphere and assess the United States for its share of the costs regardless of the fact that we might have vetoed such action in the Security Council?

This was a question the State Department did not want to consider, let alone answer.

The Department was so concerned with rubbing the Russian and French noses into the legal interpretation of article 19; it was so sure that the General Assembly would follow American legal reasoning; it was so sure that the General Assembly would never find the United States on the minority side, that the Department was not able to even contemplate the discomfort of having the shoe on the other foot.

Even in 1962, some Members of this body felt that the State Department, in the words of a recent editorial, published in the New Republic of February 13, 1965, was "trying to enforce on Russia and France a principle which it would never allow to be enforced against the United States."

Some of us saw then what the New Republic now describes "in retrospect," namely, that—

> The State Department's thesis looks more like a clever ploy than a noble policy, for nobody seriously contends that the Department, much less Congress, would accept as binding on America an assessment of the General Assembly for a peacekeeping venture, or any other kind of venture, authority for which was adopted over U.S. objection.

The second point some of us pursued with the administration was that the U.N. bond issue was an unfortunate device to put off the evil day when, with or without Court approval, the national interests of a great power would serve to nullify article 19.

That day is now here. We urged in 1962 that the issue be faced then, and that we not procrastinate.

Some Members of this body proposed a short-term loan to the United Nations, not in an effort to put off the evil day, but to bring the issue of financing the U.N. to a head so that it could be dealt with in time to avoid the hamstringing of the United Nations at some critical moment when it was needed.

Others urged that alternative methods of financing these peacekeeping operations be explored, including a proposal I made that the World Bank devote some of its special reserve funds—now at over $1 billion—to helping the United Nations solve its financial difficulties.

I do not overstate the case if I say now that these positions were rather quietly sneered at.

There is an almost overpowering phobia in the executive branch of the Government toward ideas emanating from Congress.

But what is past is prolog. It is prolog to the situation in which we find ourselves now.

The American approach to the financing of the United Nations has collapsed like a punctured balloon. The balloon which so many conscientious and hardworking nongovernmental groups supported as late as 1962 has now gone flat.

No wonder that at the moment the United Nations is foundering. Very few people in or out of Government seem to be concerned.

In 1945, only two U.S. Senators voted against the United Nations Charter.

In fact, the devotion and the worth of a Senator at that time was likely to be judged by the ardor with which he supported the charter.

Yet, today less than 20 years later, no Member of Congress rises to his feet, with voice trembling with patriotic emotion, seeking to defend the U.N. or even demand its survival.

World statesmen only sporadically and unemotionally call for the preservation of the Organization.

And the press of the world, including our own great publications, fails to battle the creeping paralysis which is inexorably chilling and numbing the body of this world organization.

Our great editors seem content with dreary pedantic studies which offer no real solution to the critical need.

The enthusiasts who only a decade ago were valiantly essaying to strengthen the United Nations seem to have found other outlets for their crusading spirit.

The present situation is fraught with irony.

At no time since San Francisco have the United States and Russia been closer to a common understanding of the interests of the great powers in the United Nations.

These two nations know all too well the cataclysmic effect of a nuclear confrontation.

They know, also, of the desire of the smaller, poorer nations that outnumber them to share the world's wealth and fasten small power solutions on the great power interest—at the expense of the great powers, of course.

Actually, the current dispute over financing the police operations of the United Nations is a symptom rather than the cause of the deeper malignancy affecting the United Nations.

The real sickness involves the readjustment of powers and influence between the greater powers and the lesser nations rather than a struggle between the Soviet bloc and the West.

Indirectly, this struggle does affect our relationship with the Communist bloc, but this relationship will become more understanding and manageable once the great power and small power problems have been worked out.

To find a solution to this issue, we have to realize that it involves a new relationship between the Security Council, where the great powers are dominant, and the General Assembly, where the smaller powers have the votes.

A new workable method of financing United Nations peace and security functions would not result in merging great power and small power thinking into a single school of thought, but it certainly would enhance the prospect of the U.N. again becoming a virile organization and would give hope to the unsung and inarticulate millions that have been giving way to despair.

Out of the several financing proposals that have been put forth, a workable system can be developed, one which will instill vitality into a presently anemic but vitally necessary international body.

It is not my purpose at this time to review these suggestions.

With all the talent available to the executive branch of the Government, there should be no great difficulty in developing reliable means to pay for peace and security functions.

I have put forth my proposal for World Bank assistance on several occasions.

I have recently noted a most interesting proposal put forth in a private memorandum I have received, the substance of which is repeated in an editorial entitled "The U.N. Abused," published in the New Republic of February 13, 1965. While this proposal in itself does not provide a complete answer, it does nevertheless furnish a basis upon which a workable and acceptable structure might be founded.

Mr. President, one thing which bothers me very much is the evidence I have seen in the press indicating that the United States is still indulging in questionable practices in financing the United Nations.

Senators will recall that late last year the United States, with calculated care, made it clear to the United Nations that the United States would withhold its pledge to the United Nations Special Fund until there had been some settlement of the article 19 issue.

In short, we told the lesser developed nations of the United Nations that unless they stuck with the United States on the crucial issue of whether France and Russia would be denied a vote in the General Assembly until they had paid up their past assessments for peacekeeping, there would apparently be no massive U.S. contribution to the technical assistance activities of the United Nations.

I need not remind Senators that the U.N. did adjourn after a procedural vote—interpreted by some as a repudiation of the U.S. position—but it adjourned with its financial problem still unresolved.

But now what has happened?

On March 2, 1965, 3 weeks ago, the United States announced that it would donate $60 million to the United Nations Special Fund and expanded technical assistance program.

In the words of the New York Times:

> Three months ago, when negotiations were underway to try to solve the knotty financial and political problems of the world organization, Washington delayed its usual pledge to the program to exert pressure on the Soviet Union, France, and other countries to pay assessments.

One might well ask why the United States decided all at once to contribute $60 million to the Special Fund.

The answer was quick in coming.

The next day a headline in the Washington Post read as follows: "U.N. May Need Loan; Cash Low."

The story points out that although members had been asked to pay the equivalent of 80 percent of their 1964 assessments, only a trickle of money has been coming in.

Then, significantly continues the dispatch:

> If members have not paid up $6 million by the end of next week, the U.N. will have to borrow from the deposited reserves of the U.N. Special Fund. It will then have to pay the Special Fund interest equal to the return now being earned by the Fund's investments.

And where does the Special Fund get its money? The United States, of course.

The United States contributes 40 percent of the budget of the Special Fund and had announced a $60 million donation the day before.

Mr. President, I am no financial genius.

I have neither the time nor the inclination to audit the books of the United Nations. So what I am about to say will undoubtedly be denied, misunderstood, or quibbled away.

But on the face of the evidence I submit that the following propositions are a fair statement of the present situation:

First. The United Nations is seriously in debt because of the cost of so-called peacekeeping operations which have been voted by the General Assembly over the objections of certain permanent members of the Security Council.

Second. General Assembly assessments to meet the cost of peacekeeping operations have in general not been paid by members who have disagreed with the purpose for which the assessments were levied.

Third. The United States has insisted that assessments levied by the General Assembly for peacekeeping operations are a legitimate charge upon all members and that failure to pay these assessments should result in denial of voting rights to delinquent members.

Fourth. The United States in support of this position was willing to delay meeting the issue by supporting the sale of U.N. bonds to buy time for resolving the financial issue.

Fifth. When the chips were really down and the United States was confronted with the alternative of forcing an Assembly vote on the application of article 19 to Russia and France, with the possibility that a winning vote might have led to Russian withdrawal, it backed away. The United States now recognizes that if it were in the position of the Russians or the French, it would probably react in the same way.

Sixth. Having muddled through the recently adjourned session of the General Assembly without resolving the financial difficulties of the United Nations, the United States is now paying Peter so that Paul may be robbed—with interest, of course, and in accordance with a resolution of the General Assembly adopted during its recent session by the technique of unanimous consent.

Mr. President, there are those who may think that the burden of my remarks is negative.

I assure them that is not my intention.

I want the United Nations to survive.

I want it available as an instrument capable of action in trouble spots wherever they may arise.

I want United Nations bridges to be strong enough to bear all kinds of traffic between East and West, between the underdeveloped world and the developed world, and between the Soviet bloc and the free world.

This is not presently the case.

If the United Nations is ever to have a future, it must stop avoiding issues on the theory that if they are avoided they will go away.

Its future is contingent also upon candor in recognition of long-term interests as well as short-term expediencies.

There is no point in reviewing the failures or the successes of the past.

We must start from where we are.

On the part of the United States, this means acceptance of the fact that it is unwilling and unable to force the United Nations to abide by article 19.

It means acceptance of the fact that the United States is not willing to have article 19 applied to itself when its vital interests are involved.

It means that the United States must admit frankly that once again it is meeting U.N. expenses indirectly by supporting activities such as that of the United Nations Special Fund, from which funds in turn are borrowed to meet other expenses of the United Nations.

In short, Mr. President, this Nation needs a clean and forthright statement of what the United Nations means to the United States in 1965, as distinct from repetitions of what it meant in 1945.

Only by this clearing of the decks will it be possible for the United Nations to proceed in a constructive way to get its financial affairs in order so that, in terms of the bureaucracy, it may once again become a viable institution for peace.

Let there be no mistake. The United Nations with its many shortcomings still serves the interests of the great powers, even though they be on the opposite sides of many crucial issues.

It also serves the interests of the small powers, perhaps even more since their voices and influence would be lost if the United Nations were to lapse into obscurity.

Finally I want to say this:

The time has come for the President of the United States to cut through the underbrush of procrastination and mutable principles that have enveloped the United Nations.

He can do this by putting the strength of his office and his personality behind any one of a number of proposals for solving the financial problems of the United Nations.

He could instruct his representative to the United Nations to reconcile our position with the Soviet and French position on the assessment of members for peacekeeping functions—a view which may shock some, but a position which would definitely be in our own national interest.

What if article 19 does become a dead letter if, as a result, the United Nations continues available as an instrument of peace?

Unless some agreement is reached by the great powers, article 19 is dead as a doornail anyway.

International events of recent weeks seem to have overwhelmed the capacity of this Government for affirmative action, except in the military field.

The President of the United States has a magnificent opportunity to put the United States back into the lead in international diplomacy by putting the United Nations back into business.

It is his personality, rather than the accumulated prejudices of the State Department that must present our image.

It is harder to be magnanimous than petty; it is harder to be realistic, than legalistic. But we must be.

I am not yet ready to abandon the United Nations.

I do not think the American people are ready to abandon it.

I do not think the people of this world are ready to abandon it.

And I do not think the President of the United States is ready to abandon it, either.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Once again the distinguished Senator from Vermont has performed a public service. He is not known as a waster of words, but he is known for his commonsense, and his down-to-earth attitude, on which basis he so ably reflects not only his own State of Vermont, but the United States of America as well.

First of all, let me compliment the distinguished Senator from Vermont, the dean of Republicans in this body, for the remarks which he has just made.

I recall that when the U.N. bond issue was before this body some years ago, he was roundly criticized, and without the slightest justification, not by his colleagues, to be sure, but by some columnist and others, for stating some plain truths about the financial situation of the U.N. and for forecasting a recrudescence of the problem if the truth were not faced. His colleagues on both sides of the aisle were as one in his defense; not that he needed it, because every one of us knows that when the able and distinguished Senator expresses himself he does so with the greatest of sincerity and with the plain wisdom and straightforwardness and integrity associated with the State of Vermont.

It is most unfortunate that his words on that earlier occasion were not heard with the same understanding in the executive branch and heeded by that branch as they were on the floor of the

Senate. We would not now be up against the predicament of a U.N. with seriously eroding influence to our detriment and that of the world that now confronts us.

It may not be too late to check this trend; and if it is at all possible, it will be due to the courage, honesty, and perception of men of the caliber of the Senator from Vermont, whose words, I hope, this time will not fall on deaf ears in the sectors of the executive branch which have day-to-day responsibility for formulating our policies and conducting our operations in the U.N.

So once again I compliment the Senator from Vermont on his statement on the U.N.

I would note further that he has also made a contribution to the discussion of the Vietnamese problem by relating the difficulty of its solution to the financial difficulties of the United Nations.

If the Senator would permit me, I would like to draw from him additional elucidation on several points which he raised either directly or inferentially on this point.

Could the Senator suggest in what way the United Nations might be useful in resolving the Vietnamese conflict if it were not confronted with financial difficulties?

Mr. AIKEN. As I stated in the beginning of my remarks, either the situation in Vietnam and the military operations there will escalate into a greater war, with a strong possibility that it may become a total war through the use of nuclear weapons, or negotiations must take place at some point. I do not know where or when that will be.

As I pointed out, if negotiations take place and some agreement is reached between the north and south sections of Vietnam, such agreement will have to be watched over and its terms enforced. That is obvious. It is obvious from the experience we have had in Laos and Vietnam up to date, that that policing body or watching body cannot be set up by either or both of the conflicting parties if they do not trust each other. If we had a strong United Nations, it would be the logical body to carry out the supervision of any agreement reached by North and South Vietnam and their allies.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I take it, then, that the Senator is of the opinion that in various circumstances and in various parts of the world, if there were a fairly, or fairly thoroughly, united U.N., with adequate financing it could be of continued service in maintaining the peace and trying to bring order out of discord.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is expressing my thoughts exactly. I feel if there were a strong, reliable, nonbankrupt United Nations at this time, there would be a greater willingness to negotiate between the warring parties, the warring philosophies in southeast Asia, than there is today. I feel that one reason they continue fighting today is that they do not know what the end would be if they started negotiating, provided there were no other body capable of supervising the carrying out of the terms of any agreement which might be reached.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has anticipated my next question by answering it, so I will forgo it; but I would like to ask this question if the Senator will yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator outline to the Senate his views of the extent and nature of the U.S. interests in Vietnam?

Consideration of this question involves, it seems to me, the evaluation of the domino or cork-in-the-bottle theory of southeast Asia affairs.

Is it likely, in the Senator's judgment, that a settlement in Vietnam would be followed certainly by all the other nations in southeast Asia going down the Chinese drain, so speak?

Mr. AIKEN. I am not completely sure what our interests in South Vietnam or that part of the area may be today, but I know what they were when we first went into South Vietnam. The Senator from Montana may recall that one night he and I had a rather protracted discussion with President Diem, whom I considered as the best administrator that country ever had.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no question about it; and his assassination was one of the most unfortunate events that could have occurred. It marked the decline of South Vietnam as a free and independent nation.

Mr. AIKEN. It hit the skids as soon as he was ousted from office and assassinated. We went in there at his request because there were a few hundred, or possibly a few thousand, rebels throughout the country.

We have stayed there. Four or five years ago, we had 400 advisers, largely of an economic nature, in there. I am in favor of that. I believe that we have placed too much emphasis on our military operations and too little on economic support for South Vietnam. The situation has gone from bad to worse. It became intolerable after President Diem was assassinated. At the present time we have approximately 30,000 troops in South Vietnam, with probably more on the way if the war should escalate and its area be expanded—which will probably mean as many as 300,000 to 400,000 additional troops to be sent there. I have heard of even larger estimates. A good share of our Navy is tied up in that area, which is not counted in the estimates we read as to the kind of assistance we are giving South Vietnam.

Yet, I do not believe that we can get out precipitately. The situation has become so bad, and so much bitterness has been engendered, that there would undoubtedly be thousands of executions in Saigon and other parts of the country should we get out before an understanding was reached.

Now the Senator from Montana had another part of his question which related to this subject.

Mr. MANSFIELD. About a settlement in Vietnam, I asked if it would be followed by all the rest of the nations of southeast Asia going down the Chinese drain?

Mr. AIKEN. I do not believe that it would be followed by that. I do not believe that the smaller countries of southeast Asia have any more desire to become satellites of China and come under the control of Red China than have the countries of Eastern Europe any desire to be satellites of Russia, from which they are now gradually emerging into their own again—I hope they are, anyway.

I believe that North Vietnam has every reason in the world not to wish to become a satellite of Red China; and that she will not become a satellite of Red China unless the United States forces her to become one. But, if we continue raids over North Vietnam and continue the use of the weapons which we have been using, apparently more or less indiscriminately, we may force North Vietnam to call on China for Chinese troops by the million.

As we have read in the morning newspapers, we know that China has asserted that if North Vietnam calls on her for men, she will supply them.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct in his reading of the morning press. He is also correct in his earlier assumption, because it is based on the more than 1,000 years of enmity which has existed between the people of Vietnam and the Chinese colossus to the north.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Montana is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We know that all the countries in southeast Asia were, at one time, tributaries or vassal states of the Chinese Empire.

Now, if the Senator from Vermont will yield further——

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. As the Senator knows, there has been a great deal written in the press of late concerning the use of so-called riot gas and napalm in Vietnam.

Is the Senator aware that the decision to use the so-called riot gas was made by the South Vietnamese, and that insofar as our Government is concerned, the decision to make it available was that of someone way down the bureaucratic line; and, further, insofar as the President was and is concerned, I can state flatly that he did not know of its use until after the fact, even though the gas was first used approximately 3 months ago.

What is the Senator's reaction to an officer of the bureaucracy who takes it upon himself to make a decision of this kind, or who fails to inform the politically responsible officer of the Government—and I mean the President—of a decision to use it on the part of our South Vietnamese allies?

Mr. AIKEN. As the Senator has stated, I am sure that the President had no knowledge that these unusual and nearly—if not quite—outlawed weapons were to be used against the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese people.

Mistakes have been made. The worst mistake is probably the gap in the line of command from the top down to the bottom. Somewhere along that line of command, someone took it upon himself to supply the weapons for which the President is now getting the blame. The rest of the world is not going to try to hunt up the officers who approved the use of napalm or gas of any kind—even a non-lethal gas—the rest of the world will blame the President. The President, in their eyes, is the United States.

It is one of our most unfortunate happenings; but, I repeat, I am sure that the President had no knowledge that any gas was to be used until he heard about it through the news media.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. I believe that the President was notified, for the first time, 2 or 3 days ago, by the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara.

However, it is a situation which psychologically is bound to have adverse effects so far as this country is concerned. No one should underplay the importance of psychology in relation to our position with respect to the rest of the peoples of the world.

Will the Senator from Vermont yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Turning to the Senator's penetrating analysis of the United Nations financial difficulties, would not the Senator from Vermont agree that the larger question for all of the member nations of the United Nations—including ourselves—is to decide not in generalizations, but in specifics, just what it is they wish the United Nations to be, what role they wish it to play, and just how that role can be effectively realized and implemented?

Mr. AIKEN. There is no question as to what the nations of the world wish the United Nations to be.

All nations, including our own, are selfish to a degree and wish the United Nations to benefit them, but in the aggregate, the nations of the world wish the United Nations to be an organization which will encourage understanding throughout the world and not be an arena for carrying on squabbling or inciting developments which become worse than squabbles.

I believe that the nations of the world wish the United Nations to be a body which will promote the economic and social levels of all countries—including our own.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Including our own.

Mr. AIKEN. We can be selfish to that extent, just as much as Tanganyika, Bolivia, or any other country can. I believe that the nations of the world wish the United Nations to sponsor and promote agreements which promote peace among the nations of the world. I do not believe there is any question as to what the world wishes the United Nations to be. That is what it was set up for in 1945, but we have not kept up with the times.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is a question of realization and implementation, and perhaps revision of the charter, as provided for in San Francisco in 1945.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator from Montana is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator from Vermont yield further?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Is it not true that the United States was partly instrumental in bringing about the present difficulty, by creating in 1950, with the socalled uniting for peace resolution, the illusion that the General Assembly could be utilized as a substitute for an estopped Security Council? The idea might have looked good at the time, but now it has come back to haunt us in this financial dilemma. Does not the distinguished Senator from Vermont agree?

Mr. AIKEN. I agree with the Senator from Montana. But, at that time, the membership of the United Nations was so small that the United States was nearly always sure of a two-thirds vote in the General Assembly, and did not look forward to the time when it would be in the minority.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator from Vermont, of course, having served so well as a delegate to the United Nations, is well aware that what he speaks is the truth.

As the Senator pointed out several years ago, if we continue to step into the financial breach which results largely from a willingness of member nations to vote for actions but not to pay for them, we are only adding to the long-range problem of the United Nations, as the Senator from Vermont has indicated. We put off facing this problem in effect by the bond purchase a few years ago.

Does the Senator believe that it should be put off again or that it is wise to avoid facing the problem at this time?

Mr. AIKEN. It should not be put off. It should not have been put off 2 years ago, either. I became rather worked up over the proposal of the U.N. to go into deficit financing through the issuance of bonds, of which the United States was supposed to buy the lion's share, and then have the little nations of the world, about 80 of them, stop paying their dues when the proposal to go on deficit financing was made. The first proposal put before the body was to issue bonds in the amount of $200 million. It is my belief that that was to be the initial issue, with plans to go on deficit financing for a long time, and that some of them really had in mind the issuing of nearer to $2 billion worth of bonds than $200 million worth. The United States would have been expected to buy most of them. That would have been another indirect method of the United States paying the bills for everybody else. The 80 small countries stopped paying their dues when this proposal was made, because they thought that if the United Nations went into deficit financing, they would be able to vote for all kinds of programs and charge them to the issuance of the bonds, most of the money for which eventually would come from the United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct. Many of these nations will vote for huge appropriations, but when the time comes to have them pay their pro rata share, they will not do so.

Mr. AIKEN. One representative of a small nation, that had been assessed $8,000, I believe, said to me, "But we are poor. You are rich. You pay it."

Mr. MANSFIELD. We probably did. Will the Senator yield once more?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Does it not seem somewhat foolish for our State Department to have spent years trying to force the Soviets to pay for peacekeeping operations which it does not support and then withdrawing from the precipice when the Soviets persist in their refusal to pay? It seems rather futile to me to insist that article 19 be enforced and then to withdraw from that position at the last moment. Either we believe in the application of that article or we do not. And the executive branch ought not to talk one way before the Congress and another in the halls of the United Nations. We cannot have it both ways. Is it not incumbent upon us to decide which way we want it? Is the executive branch not, in essence, seeking to force on others the application of a principle which if forced on us at another time we would strenuously resist?

Mr. AIKEN. We certainly would not agree to pay the cost of maintaining a United Nations police force in Panama or Haiti or in any other part of the world where our interests were strong. Yet we insist on enforcing this on other countries who feel about it as we would under similar circumstances.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator. He has made a distinct contribution; and, as always, I have learned a great deal.

Mr. AIKEN. We certainly should not do as we did last fall and threaten the smaller countries that we would not give anything to the special fund until those countries help us force Russia to pay for something which the Russians did not believe in, and which we would not do ourselves if we were in their position.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator read the press reports this morning, I believe.

Mr. AIKEN. Yes; I read those reports this morning. After we had made a positive statement last fall, we backed away from it, with the result that less than a month or 3 weeks ago we made a contribution of $60 million to the special fund. That could have been made at that time for no other purpose than to enable the U.N. itself to borrow from that fund to keep going until we could think of some other method of handling it. Our part in the U.N. has not been particularly laudable in recent years, certainly not in recent months.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, first, I should like to join the majority leader in saying that the able Senator from Vermont has made a very important contribution to this very difficult subject. I listened to a great part of his speech and read all of it. There is one point that I should like to bring out. As a member of the Appropriations Committee and as one who has supported foreign aid and who has supported the United Nations since its creation, I regret to say that it seems to me that the United Nations increasingly is becoming another entity—if we want to call it that—of the United States.

If the United Nations were to be entirely or even to a large extent, financed by the U.S. Government, I would question the value of the United Nations. In such a case it would probably be better for us to proceed independently, rather than through the

United Nations. I should not like to see that happen.

The Senator is a member of the Foreign Relations Committee, and I am a member of the Appropriations Committee. As a member of that committee I have devoted much time and attention in recent years to the matter of appropriations for foreign aid and international organizations.

Our problem, with respect to the United Nations, is complicated by the fact that its budget is made up in November and voted on in December. Then the executive department comes along and asks us to appropriate money in June in the amount that has been agreed upon.

The Senator mentioned $60 million. So far as I know, we have had no request for it, certainly not in the Appropriations Committee. It seems to me that it is very important, if the United Nations is to continue—and, like the Senator from Vermont, I hope it will continue—that Congress, as the appropriating body, shall be given the opportunity to discuss what our payments should be and the background on which our payments are to be based.

Is it the opinion of the Senator from Vermont who has expressed his views on this subject so well that the executive department should give Congress a greater opportunity to discuss our relationship to the United Nations including its financial aspects?

Mr. AIKEN. Of course, Congress has every right in the world to discuss this situation, because Congress is elected by the people of the United States, and it represents the people of the United States. We cannot be expected merely to rubberstamp any ideas which may happen to emanate from the executive branch. As an example, I read from an Associated Press dispatch which has just been handed me, and which came over the wires a few hours ago. It reads:

> WASHINGTON.—The United States intends to go ahead with large contributions to the United Nations despite the failure of the General Assembly to lower the boom on its big power delinquents, U.S. sources said today.
>
> This means U.S. payments of about $200 million this year to the United Nations and related agencies, regardless of whether Russia, France, and others in arrears pay their assessed I O U's.

How will that sound around the world? Other nations will say, "The United States offers to buy the United Nations and pay $200 million for it."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. If we do so, we shall have reneged on article 19.

Mr. AIKEN. If the United Nations were reorganized, we would not give up our veto power. We would not agree to pay the United Nations for keeping a police force in Haiti, the Dominican Republic, or possibly in Puerto Rico, or in other areas. We would not agree to do it. We must simply reach an understanding, in order that we may look forward with some optimism to a cessation of hostilities in southeast Asia.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. As the Senator from Montana has said, the great difficulty is that we are going ahead with these loans, and the educational fund, and in carrying forward the peacekeeping functions simply on the basis that we are going to finance them.

Mr. AIKEN. I will not be a party to the making of an offer for the United Nations so that it will be a U.S. instrument.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. That would not happen if the United Nations and its Security Council were functioning in the way they were intended to function.

Mr. AIKEN. The U.N. as it is today represents the end of one phase of international cooperation. We cannot stop our efforts to cooperate with other countries of the world in an effort to seek peace. We cannot say that every country can wage war if it so desires.

We shall now enter another phase. We can enter it by straightening out the affairs of the United Nations now. We can enter the next phase by knocking the U.N. completely out of the picture and perhaps trying to start another organization with more compatible membership, as we have in SEATO, SENTO, and NATO, and then after a while we discover that the memberships of those organizations are not so compatible.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Coming from the section of the country from which the Senator from Vermont and I come, we wish to see the United Nations continue if possible.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sorry that we are not getting more support from the people with sound views in our area of the country. For a long time I have not received letters in support of the U.N. Those people have found their outlets for crusading elsewhere.

But we must remember that the atom bomb does not care what one's race, creed, or color is, or whether one is rich or poor, or whether he lives on a farm, on Beacon Street, or wherever it might be.

The most important thing in the world today is to avoid an escalation of the Asian war until it reaches a point at which it becomes a general war, and finally a total war with the use of nuclear weapons.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate what the Senator has said. I could not agree with him more. The great problem that faces the Congress in the next 2 or 3 months is how to work out the financial aspects of the operation of the United Nations so that it does not become totally dependent on the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. The $200 million would not be totally lost if the United States paid the lion's share of all the expenses. But a good share of it would go down the drain, and it would not gain us respect in the rest of the world.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. It would go down the drain because it would not accomplish the objective for which the organization was intended.

Mr. AIKEN. It could not accomplish it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I congratulate the Senator.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator's opinion means a great deal to me.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON. I did not wish this opportunity to pass without expressing my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from Vermont for a very timely discussion of a problem that will confront the Congress and our Nation in the very near future. The majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] have laid the groundwork for what will be a great congressional debate and, indeed, a great debate all over this Nation, as to the future of the United Nations.

Mr. AIKEN. All over the world.

Mr. CARLSON. Yes; as the Senator has said, there will be a great debate all over the world. I have no doubt about it.

I had the privilege of serving as a delegate to the United Nations in the 19th session of the United Nations, which was the last session. I am somewhat familiar with the problem which the distinguished Senator from Vermont has mentioned. The problem of financing is a difficult one. While my service at the United Nations was most interesting, it was also frustrating. The problem of financing must be solved. It will be solved, as I see it, through the future actions of the Congress, particularly the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, of which the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] is a member.

One of the privileges of serving on the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations is to sit next to the Senator from Vermont. There I have the privilege of enjoying his sound and constructive advice time and time again. He has again demonstrated to the Senate and to the country the problem which is confronting us in the United Nations.

Very frankly, as one who spent the entire month of December at the United Nations, to which we contribute $29.3 million—32 percent of the cost of the United Nations aside from the special fund—I should like to say very frankly that we shall either have to increase that amount or we shall have to decide what the future of the United Nations shall be. In my opinion, the answer to that question will be determined in this very body. The groundwork has been laid this afternoon for weeks of discussion of that question. We should get at it.

I agree that we must have some international organization where nations can meet and discuss world problems. Such an organization is necessary in an age in which the world has shrunk so in size, both in communications and in transportation, so that it is important that we act. It is best that we get underway soon.

The proposal may not be the best way to handle the problem. But the determining factor will be the financing. I well remember the occasion on which the Senator discussed the $100 million bond issue. Having served in the United Nations, I should like to say, if I remember correctly, that $85 million of those bonds have been invested, used, and the funds carried into other countries.

Mr. AIKEN. We have put in approximately $80 million.

Mr. CARLSON. $80 million?

Mr. AIKEN. About that.

Mr. CARLSON. If I remember correctly, the indebtedness of the United Nations for peacekeeping operations is around $154 million at the present time.

Mr. AIKEN. The amount is not insurmountable if we get at it now.

I have purposely refrained from saying today how I would do it. That is the business of the executive branch. The members of the executive branch have enough brains to do it. It remains to be seen whether they have enough wisdom and determination to do it.

But if those in authority desire a strong United Nations, we can have a strong United Nations. If the great powers get together we can do so. I am inclined to think that that is entirely possible. Those of us who make the appropriations must decide whether we shall appropriate money to sustain a growing concern or whether we shall appropriate money to sustain a growing rathole.

Mr. CARLSON. And also whether we shall appropriate money to support an ineffective organization.

Mr. AIKEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. CARLSON. There has been some talk about sending the problem of Vietnam to the United Nations. What could the United Nations do in relation to that problem when they will not even pay for the peacekeeping operations in the Congo? In that respect it has been ineffectual.

Mr. AIKEN. My major reason for speaking as I have today is to put the United Nations in such shape that we can look hopefully toward a cessation of bloodshed in Asia and get away from the fear that some day, before too long, we might be engaged in total war.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator that this is the time when the United Nations will become a strong international agency or fall by the wayside.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, if the Senator from Vermont will indulge me a moment before I start on my own address, I, too, would like to congratulate the Senator for a magnificently provocative address. I not only consider the Senator my senior in the Senate, but I honor and love him as a great American and a great friend. When he shows his eternal youth, as he did today, in so provocative a statement, it is a great joy to those like myself who are interested in these subjects. I should like, if I may, to clarify the point because I think I know the Senator's mind on this subject very well. It seems to me that what the Senator has said in effect is this: No matter what we do about the money, the important thing is the authority. In other words, the United Nations, having shown a certain capability through the General Assembly to do something about peacekeeping, is now denuded of a valuable authority because it handles its money business unwisely. This would be a great loss to the world, and even if we begin to recognize that article 19 is a nullity and, in reality, if we are to have money for peacekeeping operations it must be contributed voluntarily—even if we got to that point—preserving the authority of the General Assembly so it could authorize peacekeeping operations, even if financed voluntarily, is extremely valuable.

It seems to me that the Senator has separated the wheat from the chaff. It is the authority that we wish to preserve. We do not desire that to go down the drain because of the fact that the money equation has been badly handled.

Mr. AIKEN. As I said, I have some ideas, and, I know that the Senator from New York has some, as to what could be done. First, before it can be done, we must get away from obstinacy. If we wish to put the U.N. on the road as a going concern, I think we can do it.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Vermont for his magnificent address today.

I ask unanimous consent that I may call for a quorum without losing my right to the floor.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE USE OF RIOT GAS IN VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have in mind making a statement on Vietnam today. Before I address myself to that subject, I should like to say a word about the flurry over the use of so-called riot gas in Vietnam, which has dominated the news for the past few days.

It happens that on this particular subject I have a slight amount of expertness, because during World War II I served as an officer in the Chemical Warfare Service of the U.S. Army. I can attest to Senators that the gas used—and I have checked it—is a riot gas. It is not a lethal or asphyxiating or poison gas, as described in the Geneva convention, with which I had a great deal to do when I was in the Army, because I was Secretary of the Inter-Allied Committee on Chemical Warfare. So I can assure Senators that we are not involved in any undertaking which concerns the use of gas as described in the Geneva convention, even though we are not a party to that convention.

Second, the type of gas being used has been used in emergencies for many years in riot situations and, therefore, it is not a new or unusual preparation for this situation.

It may be that our officials all the way down the line, including those who did not inform the President, should have foreseen the propaganda outcries and should have avoided the use of this gas or not allowed others to have it for use. This would have been much wiser in the interests of our Nation, a more sound decision, and stronger evidence of responsibility.

But I do not see that this incident is more than a flurry. I hope we shall not be diverted from the main point by the commotion which is taking place and which is especially being boomed by Communist propagandists. I am quite confident that the gas clouds will shortly blow away. We should put the issue in focus and not allow it to divert us from the basic Vietnamese situation, which is so critical, and to which I shall now address myself.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in order to incorporate in a definitive way my views on the subject of the war in Vietnam, I submit a concurrent resolution and ask that it be received and referred.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29) was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 29

Whereas the Congress by joint resolution approved August 10, 1964, declared that it "approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression" and further declared that "the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed forces, to assist any member or protocol state of the southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom," and the President has exercised authority under such joint resolution; and

Whereas the Communist regime in North Vietnam continues its deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression against its neighbors and the nations joined with them in the collective defense of their freedom; and

Whereas the United States is continuing to assist the peoples of southeast Asia to protect their freedom and has no territorial, military, or political ambitions in that area, but desires only that these peoples should be left in peace to work out their own destinies in their own way; and

Whereas questions have been raised at home and abroad as to the willingness of the United States to join in negotiations for an end to hostilities in Vietnam: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the United States is determined to assist in ending aggression against South Vietnam by the Communist regime in North Vietnam; and the Congress approves and supports the actions of the President, including the use of the Armed Forces, in the defense of the territorial integrity and political independence of South Vietnam, as being in the national interest; (2) that the objectives of the United States are to bring about the cessation of hostilities and the restoration of peace, tranquility, and security in South Vietnam; and to assist South Vietnam in obtaining a full opportunity for self-determination, religious freedom, economic and social progress, the establishment and strengthening of free institutions, and the enjoyment of friendly relations with its neighbors; and (3) that the United States is ready, whenever there is any willingness by the other appropriate parties to do so, to undertake honorable negotiation to attain these objectives.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be listed as a cosponsor of the concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, for many weeks now, along with other Senators, I have backed the President in the use of airpower against North Vietnam, while at the same time requesting that the President advance the general principles on which we are willing to negotiate for a cease-fire and peace in Vietnam. As a logical sequel to the resolution adopted August 10, 1964, to reflect subsequent events and a new phase of the situation following the attack on U.S. ships in the Bay of Tonkin, and to express what I believe should be our policy in South Vietnam, I have today submitted a concurrent resolution concerning this issue.

I should like to read the operative part of it:

> *Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress (1) that the United States is determined to assist in ending aggression against South Vietnam by the Communist regime in North Vietnam; and the Congress approves and supports the actions of the President, including the use of the Armed Forces, in the defense of the territorial integrity and political independence of South Vietnam, as being in the national interest; (2) that the objectives of the United States are to bring about the cessation of hostilities and the restoration of peace, tranquility, and security in South Vietnam; and to assist South Vietnam in obtaining a full opportunity for self-determination, religious freedom, economic and social progress, the establishment and strengthening of free institutions, and the enjoyment of friendly relations with its neighbors; and (3) that the United States is ready, whenever there is any willingness by the other appropriate parties to do so, to undertake honorable negotiation to attain these objectives.

Mr. President, the concurrent resolution first confirms our determination to continue to help South Vietnam put an end to aggression from the North. In this, there must be no doubt that the Congress is behind the President.

Next, the concurrent resolution approves and supports the President's actions to date in defending the territorial integrity and political independence of South Vietnam.

Third, the concurrent resolution expresses our desire to restore peace.

Fourth, it states our interest in the self-determination of South Vietnam as well as in its religious freedom, economic and social progress, free institutions, and friendly international relations.

Finally, and most importantly, the concurrent resolution asserts our willingness to enter into honorable negotiations.

It in no way alters or supersedes the joint resolution of August 10, 1964; it is in the nature of a needed supplement to it. It is a supplement because if an honorable peace is not obtainable by negotiations—and let our fellow countrymen know this well—if an honorable peace is not obtainable by negotiation, the United States is committed to continue in the struggle with all that this implies. I say this with the greatest responsibility as a Senator of the United States who represents nearly 18 million people. We cannot pull out as we stand now. We can only honorably perform our commitments, unless the ground is washed out from under us and it becomes absolutely clear that there is no will to resist in South Vietnam.

My added purpose in submitting the concurrent resolution stems from an acute awareness of a grave danger that we face in our efforts to contain Communist expansion in southeast Asia, a danger that is too seldom mentioned, perhaps because it is the one that should most readily be dealt with.

I speak of the danger caused by an erosion of support among the American people themselves for the effort in South Vietnam which is so essential to our national interest, to freedom, and to peace.

One gage of the gravity of this danger is congressional mail, and a recent survey by U.S. News & World Report among the Senators of both parties and all political colorations shows this mail running heavily against our military action in Vietnam. For months, though it may sound extreme, my own mail has been running in some weeks as high as 50 to 1 against our Vietnam operation, and contacts with other sources of constituent opinion bear out the fact that much misunderstanding exists on this issue.

One factor which contributes to misunderstanding is the lack of authoritative information concerning the will of the South Vietnamese people. More and more, in recent weeks, the desire of the South Vietnamese to carry on the struggle and continue to receive our assistance has been questioned.

How can we find out what the South Vietnamese people really want? I certainly am not suggesting a Gallup poll in South Vietnam. I am suggesting an examination of all the evidence available, including evidence from areas under Government control, areas under Vietcong control, performance of the South Vietnam forces, ability or inability of the Vietcong to carry on their activities with the aid or consent of the people, the demonstrated ability or inability of nonregular, so-called militia forces to defend villages and hamlets against Vietcong attack, reports of U.S. forces in the field, and reports of correspondents and others who have traveled in the countryside and been able to observe the people and communicate with them.

I am sure the President has access to more facts and more reliable information than the rest of us, and can, therefore, come to a more considered and more accurate conclusion. I am also sure that the American people would like to hear that conclusion and the reasons for it. They would take his word for it, but they want to hear it from him.

If the President concludes that a majority of the people are determined to resist and want our help—as I assume is implicit in the continuance of our presence there—the announcement of this conclusion and the evidence on which it is based would serve to gain further support for our policy.

But the principal cause of the danger of loss of support for our policy is that many Americans are worried and confused over our aims and our plans in South Vietnam. In short, they need reassurance that we do, in fact, have an attainable goal and are taking all proper measures to attain it.

This danger of erosion of American support can be met, in my judgment, if the President deals with this question: Since our aim is not unconditional surrender, what are the general principles on which we are willing to negotiate a settlement of the Vietnamese situation?

The President, in his press conference last Saturday, again restated the will of the United States to assist the South Vietnamese people in fighting aggression from Communist North Vietnam and to do all necessary to stop this aggression. He has the support of Congress—and he certainly has my support—for the actions taken so far to make good this commitment, including the air attacks against military targets in North Vietnam. But we all know that the retaliatory use of airpower alone is not a policy in a complex political and social, as well as military, situation. It is only a means to an end, and the more the people and the world know about that end, the greater the likelihood of attaining it.

It is clear that the political problems of the south will not be resolved only by military pressure on the north. It is also clear that we are not engaged in South Vietnam for an "unconditional surrender," which, as everyone knows, would be impossible at this time. And let us remember that historically we have made declarations to deal with this implication in World War I and II and Korea. The declarations at the time of World War I were contained in President Wilson's famous 14 points. In World War II, there were declarations of intent by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill. In the Korean war, the general principles involved in achieving a settlement were declared. In my view, the general principles for honorable negotiations—and I state these specifically because we must get down to cases so that the American people are assured that we have an attainable objective in taking the tremendous risk which we are taking in South Vietnam—should include:

First. A cease-fire halting both the fighting in South Vietnam and the air strikes against North Vietnam.

Second. Establishment of an International Commission on Vietnam to supervise the cease-fire, a prohibition against infiltration of arms or insurgent personnel into South Vietnam or any compromise of the territorial or administrative integrity either of North or South Vietnam, withdrawal of North Vietnamese military and paramilitary personnel from South Vietnam with implementation guaranteed by a peacekeeping force of the International Commission or a composite force of the type utilized in the settlement in Korea, and withdrawal of such United States and allied forces as will suit the type of settlement arrived at.

Third. Establishment of a government in South Vietnam with free institutions, perhaps guaranteed by the United Nations or otherwise internationally guaranteed, and with provisions for implementing a program of social and economic reform, which is crucial to the peace and prosperity of South Vietnam.

Fourth. Normalization of trade and other economic relations between North and South Vietnam.

I point out with respect to this fourth point that South Vietnam is the traditional granary for North Vietnam and that there is a tremendous potential in the economic development of the Mekong Delta. What could be done by international financing of the Mekong project could be of enormous value to both parts of Vietnam.

Of course, the give and take of real negotiations would temper any plan of this kind—elements would be added, subtracted, and modified. Nor do I assert that this is the only—or even the best—settlement plan. I put it forth merely as the kind of result which might be sought by negotiation.

The purpose of the concurrent resolution is to show our willingness to undertake negotiations. But it takes two to negotiate, and one side may have to be convinced by the firmness and determination of the other that the bargaining table is the best solution. This is why I, and other Senators, backed the firmness and determination manifested by the United States in recent weeks in our positive response to North Vietnamese belligerency. Coupled with this response, however, must be an indication that we are ready to negotiate.

There are dangers in such a course as there are dangers in every course. The world is not a safe and easy place, and we cannot act at all if we are unwilling to act boldly and wisely, with ultimate faith in our own strength and purpose.

The Korean settlement reached with the Communists after 2 long years of negotiation at Panmunjom was not, as was true of Laos—though we took a risk in both cases—a settlement we made only to have our hopes dashed.

A settlement in South Vietnam is, in itself, not contrary to our interests so long as it is not just the first step toward a Communist state. We have not had total success with such solutions, but we have not had total failure either.

Such a plan may contain disadvantages quickly evident to those who possess information not available to all, not the least of which may be that it is just not feasible. But it is not enough to respond to aggression, although that is required. It is not enough to express our determination to prevent the Communists from taking over South Vietnam, although that is our goal. We must also determine what kind of negotiated settlement we are prepared to consider and, without necessarily supplying the details, state its general principles to the world and, most important of all, to the American people.

I close as I began, on the proposition that the greatest danger which faces us with respect to our policy, is a dangerous erosion of the support of the American people because they are unclear as to our objectives and how our policy should be working to attain them. I believe—and I have suggested the way in which this can be done—that if we state our objectives, and they are limited and reasonable objectives, this will consolidate the American people behind the efforts of our Government, which I am convinced are right.

Certain historic confrontations have taken place in the recent history of our country. There was one in Berlin. There was one in Cuba. Today there is one in Vietnam. Each of these was tremendously portentous, containing the potential of a great world conflagration which, nonetheless, must be risked in the interest of freedom.

If we are running great risks—and they are great indeed—the least we can do is solidify the support of our own people, and of the people of the world, by outlining limited objectives and sticking to them, even if we do not have complete and final success. Certainly we should stick to them as the basis of a settlement which we all know must be made to bring to a conclusion the trying situation in Vietnam.

I hope that these ideas will be considered by the administration and that we may soon clarify the issue and the development of our policy.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, is the Senator preparing to make a speech?

Mr. COOPER. I am.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withdraw his request?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

WILLIAM C. FEAZEL

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I am glad to yield to the Senator from Louisiana, with the understanding that in doing so I shall not lose my right to the floor. I should also like to state that I intend to make a statement today on South Vietnam. It is not a long one. However, I have already yielded to many Senators, and I know that the Senator from Louisiana must make his claim, so I am glad to yield to him; but then I wish to make my statement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I am grateful to the Senator from Kentucky for yielding to me at this time.

Last week, Louisiana lost one of its truly great citizens. I refer to my predecessor in this body, the Honorable William C. Feazel.

My admiration for Bill Feazel has been such that his picture has hung alongside my desk from the day I took the oath of office in 1948. Bill Feazel was of humble birth in Union Parish in North Louisiana. He knew what it was to want for the necessities of life. Yet he came up the hard way to become a member of the State legislature and an extremely successful businessman in the oil and gas industry. The thing that so much impressed me about Bill Feazel was that his successes in life never turned his head and his heart never ceased to beat in sympathy and understanding for those less fortunate than he.

Senator Feazel possessed a lifetime interest in State and national affairs. It seemed to many of us that he felt he could render a greater contribution to his fellow man by spending his money supporting people whom he deemed worthy of public office than in almost any other way. He was a lifelong Democrat and he supported people whom he believed to be sincere in serving the interest of all the people, regardless of the cost to him personally.

I recall early in the year 1948 that Bill Feazel had been the principal financial backed of my uncle, the late Gov. Earl K. Long. His contribution during his campaign ran into the hundreds of thousands of dollars. At that time, he assured persons interested in the oil and gas business that Earl Long would be fair to the oil and gas industry.

When Earl Long became Governor of Louisiana, he was confronted with promises he had made which would require an increase in State taxes of a figure that exceeded $60 million annually, to pay the cost of welfare payments to the aged, a veterans' bonus, free school lunches, and a major pay raise for all school teachers. Several of us advised the then Governor that it would be virtually impossible to finance such a program without an extremely heavy increase in taxes on the oil and gas industry, which accounted for about 40 percent of the industrial activity of Louisiana.

On that occasion, a number of outstanding representatives of the oil industry went to Bill Feazel, pointing out that the Governor's program would virtually treble the taxes they were paying. They contended that this constituted a breach of faith, particularly insofar as Bill Feazel was concerned. It was pointed out to him that the increase in taxes would cost him several millions of dollars. On that occasion, Bill Feazel told those good men that the new Governor should never have made such promises if he had not intended to keep them. He said that if the Governor thought it was necessary to levy such heavy taxes on the oil industry in order to keep his promises, he was prepared to pay his share of it. That is exactly what happened.

It was my privilege to enjoy the friendship and support of Bill Feazel throughout my entire political career. He had a great number of friends whom he had also favored with his friendship and loyalty. It was my experience that he never let any of them down. Nor did he ever turn his back on any friend, no matter what humiliation or misfortune they might have suffered. No man that I have met in my lifetime so consistently urged me to do what my conscience told me was right about public affairs, regardless of the consequences it might entail.

Bill Feazel is mourned by his widow, Cynthia Day Feazel, his loyal and devoted helpmate throughout life, and his two daughters, Lallage Feazel and Gertrude Feazel Anderson. He leaves behind him two fine grandsons, Hank Anderson and Bill Anderson, whom we hope to see continue in the tradition of their grandfather. To all the members of his family we extend our deepest sympathy.

In our moment of sadness in the loss of a dear friend and a good public servant, it is comforting for those of us who believe in the Almighty, to know that there is a reward beyond this place of toil where the good deeds of men like Bill Feazel are not overlooked.

THE SITUATION IN VIETNAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield, without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about the situation in Vietnam and to make one chief point: That the President make it clear to the people of the United States, and to the nations of the world, that the United States is willing to determine through negotiations if a peaceful, just, and honorable settlement of the war in Vietnam is possible.

Let me emphasize the single point that I desire to make. It is that the President make it clear again that the United States is willing to enter into negotiations. I am sure that this is the President's intention, but I believe that many people in this country, many of our allies, and many other nations, are not certain.

I give my reasons for believing this to be true. I believe that our Government is prescribing conditions as a prerequisite to negotiations which will not be accepted.

The Communist Chinese and the North Vietnamese have announced as a condition of negotiation that the United States must withdraw from South Vietnam. This is a condition which the President rightfully says cannot, and will not be accepted. But our Government has imposed its own condition—that it is not prepared to enter into negotiations until the intervention and aggression of North Vietnam ceases. This is the object of our presence in Vietnam, but I think it unlikely that the Communists will agree to this condition for negotiations, as we will not agree to their condition that the United States withdraw. It is a kind of demand from both sides for unconditional surrender. I believe it more reasonable to say that we are prepared to enter into true negotiations, for in the course of negotiation, the United States could marshal its arguments and influence against the intervention of the Communists, and seek a settlement consistent with our objectives in South Vietnam.

We will remember that in Korea, and in Vietnam in 1954 and 1955, no such conditions were imposed by either side prior to negotiations, but a cease-fire was sought; then through negotiations, the effort was made to attain the objectives that we still seek today. We can never accept the conditions now imposed by the Communists, and it is reasonable to say that they will not accept ours. The result is that as long as both hold to these conditions, there is little chance of negotiation.

There is no evidence that the Communists are willing to negotiate at all, or that they will agree to any settlement which would end their support of the so-called "war of national liberation" which they have initiated. The support of wars of national liberation has become a declared policy of the Communist world. Nevertheless, I make my proposal for a clearer statement of the willingness of the United States to negotiate, for two reasons.

First, it is my view that the strong action taken by the President of the United States has given notice to the Communists that we do not intend to be driven out, which I doubt can be made clearer. If our bombing is accelerated, it could reach a point where the resistance and intransigence of the Communists will be hardened, and the intervention of the Communist Chinese and Russia made more likely. And I must say that the use of harmless gas, while it could be justified in defense of our ultimate security, is wrong in the present situation and is more likely to harden the position of the Communists.

My second reason for urging a clearer United States position with regard to negotiation is that it is the tradition of the United States, and one consonant with our system of government, that we take every reasonable step to reach a peaceful settlement without resort to war. We do differentiate our system of government from that of Communist China, the Soviet Union and other Communist countries in our willingness to make this effort.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is constantly interesting and exciting to me that at times men's minds "zero in" in the same way. I did not in any way consult with the Senator from Kentucky. I did not know that he would speak today on the subject of Vietnam.

Mr. COOPER. I have had the same feeling about the Senator's statesmanlike speech. I did not know that he would speak today on this subject.

Mr. JAVITS. It gives one almost a creepy feeling to read words which express essentially the basic idea that there is something lacking; namely, our declaration that we are truly ready to negotiate—not on grounds of unconditional surrender, not on the basis of "You get out, or we will not get out; but let us stay where we are, and negotiate"—truly ready to negotiate.

I am grateful to the Senator from Kentucky. It is typical of the extraordinary qualities that he brings to the Senate.

It is interesting to know that men who are charged with this great responsibility, as we are, should come to the same conclusion; and this is an extraordinary example of it.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate the generous remarks of the Senator from New York. It is rather interesting to note that without any consultation we are expressing similar ideas. I am very grateful to the Senator.

I do not know that there is any substance to the statements that are heard, that we intend to accelerate our action in North Vietnam.

At times there are rumors also, of the old theory of preventive war. Knowing the President as a man of peace and honor, I say categorically that it is not his theory or purpose. But there may be some who hold to this theory. I do not believe it is consistent with the tradition of our country, or with our system of free government.

When I speak of a clearer statement of willingness to negotiate, I hope that our country will make it clear that we are willing to accept the offices of the Geneva Conference, of the United Nations, or perhaps a "community" of concerned nations, of which the Prime Minister of Canada, the Honorable Lester B. Pearson, spoke in New York City, on March 5, 1965.

I believe that Mr. Pearson's suggestion, that a community of responsible and concerned nations might be organized to participate in a settlement, and to police it, is worthy of the most serious consideration. I quote from his speech:

> We need cool heads to assess the meaning of the struggle in southeast Asia. We need hard reason to guide our reactions and decisions. We should not permit either anger or anxiety to sway our judgment.
>
> The first principle is surely that mankind can no longer afford war in the atomic age. This statement might seem a truism were it not for the fact that some Communist governments make an explicit reservation—that so-called "wars of national liberation" are exceptions and must be tolerated by human society as a permissible form of state action.
>
> We have to scotch this dangerous illusion. Assistance given across frontiers in support of local revolts is as great a violation of basic rights of nations and basic concepts of international law as invasion by any other means. Every form of outside interference by force is aggression. Unchecked, it will lead by escalation to general war. Today, we cannot afford any "permissible" kinds of international violence. All must be outlawed.

Mr. President, this is very significant, because it indicates the support of Canada for our basic aims in southeast Asia. I quote further from Mr. Pearson's address:

> As I see it, the struggle in southeast Asia today is basically an attempt to establish the principle that armed assistance from outside to "wars of national liberation" constitutes aggression and must be checked.
>
> How to do this is the concern of the whole international community. It follows, therefore, that the whole community has a responsibility to see that such situations are brought under control. If a single power has to undertake this task, there arises the danger of widening the struggle into general war. So the nations of the world must be ready to produce an alternative.
>
> Such an alternative could lie in the international community itself taking over the responsibility of sealing off frontiers against guerrilla infiltration and massively and effectively—and I mean effectively—policing

> and enforcing international agreements that aim to check and control local hostilities. If the Geneva Agreements of 1954 had provided for supervision and policing and enforcement in this way, the infiltration of Laos and South Vietnam from the outside could have been checked in time.
>
> Today, therefore, the aim of the international community must be to secure conditions in southeast Asia in which, under international control and international supervision and effective international policing, states in that area can work out their own affairs and conduct their own policies without interference from any neighbor or any outside power.
>
> If out of the present awful risk of escalation, we can move to such an international settlement, then the United States can be spared the onerous and ungrateful task of acting alone against aggression, and the world will have taken one more step toward effective and impartial organization of international peace.
>
> If diplomatic negotiations could be held on the basis I have just outlined, then resumption of the Geneva Conference of 1954 would be well worthwhile.
>
> We must seize this opportunity, from the danger we face, before it is too late.

I am sure that we could consider seriously the suggestion of the Government of Canada, a good friend, and one which supports our basic purposes in southeast Asia.

Only a few weeks ago, February 13, the Canadian delegation of the International Control Commission in Vietnam, filed a dissenting statement to the majority report of the Commission, stating explicitly that recent events, including American action, were the result of the intensification of the aggressive policy of the Government of North Vietnam. I ask unanimous consent to have this report printed in the body of the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I do not believe that we would have anything to lose if the President of the United States were to say clearly again, and without the condition of which I have spoken, that the United States is willing to undertake negotiations. We do not have to enter into negotiations if the Communists impose the conditions of our withdrawal, and of course, if negotiations were undertaken, we would not be required to accept any settlement unless it were consonant with the objectives of our country and with standards of international decency and law.

In making this statement, I wish to make it clear that I am not recommending or suggesting that the United States withdraw from its commitments in South Vietnam. The SEATO treaty, approved by the Senate in 1955, committed the United States and all signatories to extend protection to South Vietnam upon the request of its government and upon approval of the signatory governments through their constitutional processes. In August 1964, after the attack on American naval vessels in the Bay of Tonkin, Congress adopted by an almost unanimous vote a joint resolution approving and supporting the determination of the President: "to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression." The second part of the resolution is very important in consideration of the present situation:

> SEC. 2. The United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia. Consonant with the Constitution and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

South Vietnam along with Cambodia and Laos are protocol states.

It was my view at the time of the debate last August—and I said so in the debate—as it is my view today, that through the adoption of this resolution, the Congress supported the constitutional authority of the President, and extended to him any additional authority that he might need in order to take such steps as he might believe proper to defend the security of the United States and to halt the aggression against South Vietnam.

I believe that last August we expressed the condition that the Congress should act through its constitutional processes, and we confirmed to the President the authority that he is using today.

The statement that I make today is consistent with the position that I have held for years.

It has been a long time ago, but in 1954 I spoke in the Senate urging that negotiations be undertaken respecting the problem of Vietnam, rather than the use of our own troops.

Last April, I made the statement in the Senate that I thought it was time for negotiations. Last year, I supported the resolution which reinforced the authority of the President of the United States. I was glad that I did so. But in a speech in the Senate on August 6, I expressed my hope that the President of the United States would use all of the great powers of his office and of our country to find a peaceful and just solution in South Vietnam.

The problem of Vietnam is one of long standing. The United States has been engaged in Vietnam since 1954, and for 8 years before, we were providing assistance to the French. Today, except for the consideration of similar problems that might arise in the future, there is little point of talking about the past. We are required to deal with the existing situation.

I think it just and fair to say that the situation in Vietnam is one which President Johnson inherited. We have confidence in him. We know that he speaks truly when he says that it is not his intention, or the intention of our Government or its people to expand the war, and that we seek only to deter, and if necessary to prevent, the wrongful action of the Communists, which contravenes all concepts of international law. But it is right to continue to make every effort to find, difficult as it is, a just solution for the settlement of the situation in South Vietnam, without war.

Mr. President, I summarize the point of my talk. I recognize that it is difficult to find any avenue toward negotiations. I believe that it is necessary for the President to make it clear that we are willing to enter true negotiations without conditions imposed upon us by the Communists. On our part, I do not believe that we can reach negotiations by imposing as a prerequisite that the Communist cease their intervention, rightful as our position is. For then we stand in confrontation, with a position of unconditional surrender and with the possibility of war as the only arbiter.

Finally, if negotiations are possible—and no one can say whether they will be, it appears to me that the proposal of Mr. Pearson, Prime Minister of Canada, a friend, and the leader of one of our best friends—Canada—that it might be possible to organize a community of concerned and responsible nations which would undertake responsibility toward negotiations and policing a just settlement.

I close by saying that, like many other Members of this body, I have had some experience in war—an experience which does not compare to that of those who were constantly in combat, but an experience which I value above all others. Anyone who has had such an experience knows, awesome as it is, that it does not make one less afraid or less courageous. It makes one determined to protect the security and honor of his country. But it makes one also more determined and thoughtful about seeking out every honorable course to avoid the possibility of war, perhaps the awful eventuality of a nuclear war, with all of the sorrow and disaster it would bring to our country and to humanity. If we cannot reach such a peaceful and honorable settlement in Vietnam, we stand together, supporting the President as we do now, to defend, at whatever cost, our security and our freedom.

STATEMENT OF THE CANADIAN DELEGATION TO THE INTERNATIONAL CONTROL COMMISSION—VIETNAM

The Canadian delegation considers it necessary to append a minority statement to the foregoing majority report.

2. The Canadian delegation agrees that the situation in Vietnam continues to be dangerously unstable, and events since February 7 in North and South Vietnam have provided a dramatic demonstration of this continuing condition. The delegation believes, however, that the causes of this situation must be seen in context and, therefore, reviewed in the framework of the Commission's full range of responsibilities under the Geneva Agreement. By concentrating on a very limited aspect of the situation in Vietnam, the majority report runs the serious risk of giving the members of the Geneva Conference a distorted picture of the nature of the problem in Vietnam and its underlying causes.

3. In reporting on the events in North and South Vietnam since February 7, the Canadian delegation, therefore, deems it necessary to set these events in their proper perspective. In the view of the Canadian delegation, they do not stem from any essentially new factors in the situation in Vietnam, nor can they be seen in isolation; rather, they are dramatic manifestations of a continuing instability which has, as its most important cause, the deliberate and persistent pursuit of aggressive but largely

covert policies by North Vietnam directed against South Vietnam. The Commission's special report of 1962 drew attention to the fact that "armed and unarmed personnel, arms, munitions, and other supplies have been sent from the zone in the North to the zone in the South with the object of supporting, organizing, and carrying out hostile activity" and that "the PAVN has allowed the zone in the North to be used for inciting, encouraging, and supporting hostile activities in the zone in the South aimed at the overthrow of the administration in the South," thus showing, beyond reasonable doubt, violation of various articles of the Geneva Agreement by the People's Army of North Vietnam. This judgment by the Commission was based on conclusions reached by the Commission's Legal Committee after exhaustive examination of allegations and evidence pertaining to this problem. The final paragraphs of those conclusions read as follows:

"The legal committee concludes (reference paragraphs 742 to 746 and paragraph 754 in section VI) that it is the aim of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party (the ruling party in the zone in the North) to bring about the overthrow of the administration in the South. In September 1960, the third congress of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party held in Hanoi (in the zone in the North) passed a resolution calling for the organization of a 'front' under the leadership of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party for the overthrow of the administration in the South. Such a 'Front for Liberation of the South' was, in fact, constituted under the sponsorship of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party. There are present and functioning in the zone in the South, branches of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party and the Front for Liberation of the South along with its armed branches, namely, the 'Forces for Liberation of the South' and the 'People's Self-Defence Armed Forces.' The Vietnam Lao Dong Party and the Front for Liberation of the South have the identical aim of overthrowing the administration in the South. The Vietnam Lao Dong Party, the Front for Liberation of the South, the Forces for Liberation of the South and the People's Self-Defence Armed Forces have disseminated in the zone in the South propaganda seeking to incite the people to oppose and overthrow the administration in the South. There exists and functions a 'voice' of the Front for Liberation of the South and a 'Liberation Press Agency' which assist in the above-mentioned activities. It is probable that Hanoi Radio also has assisted in the said activities. Propaganda literature of the Front for the Liberation of the South and in favour of the activities of the Front has been published in the zone in the North and has been distributed abroad by the official representatives of the DRVN.

"The Legal Committee further concludes that:

1. The Vietnam Lao Dong Party in the zone in the North, the various branches of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party in the zone in the South, the Front for Liberation of the South, the Forces for Liberation of the South and the People's Self-Defence Armed Forces have incited various sections of the people residing in the zone in the South, including members of the Armed Forces of the South, to oppose the administration in the South to overthrow it by violent means and have indicated to them various means of doing so.

2. Those who ignored their exhortation and continued to support the administration in the South have been threatened with punishment and in certain cases such punishment has been effected by the carrying out of death sentences.

3. The aim and function of the Front for Liberation of the South, the Forces for Liberation of the South, and the People's Self-Defense Armed Forces are to organize and to carry out under the leadership of the Vietnam Lao Dong Party, hostile activities against the armed forces and the administration of the South by violent means aimed at the overthrow of the administration of the South.

"The legal committee concludes also that the PAVN has allowed the zone in the North to be used as a base for the organization of hostile activities in the zone in the South, including armed attacks, aimed at the overthrow of the administration in the South in violation of its obligations under the agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam."

4. Since the date of its special report, the Commission has continued to receive from the South Vietnamese liaison mission complaints of an increasingly serious nature, alleging an intensification of aggression from the North. In these communications, the liaison mission has brought to the Commission's attention mounting evidence to show that the Government of North Vietnam has expanded its aggressive activities directed against the Government of South Vietnam and has infiltrated growing numbers of armed personnel and increasing amounts of military equipment into South Vietnam for the purpose of overthrowing the Government of South Vietnam by force. The liaison mission has informed the Commission that, as a result, the Government of South Vietnam has been obliged to request increased foreign aid for self-defense.

5. In its letter No. 383/PDVN/CT/TD/2 dated January 27, 1965 (attached as app. I), for example, the liaison mission has provided the Commission with details of secret bases and related installations established in South Vietnam with the support of the Government of North Vietnam and other Communist countries. In the same letter, the liaison mission has provided the Commission with a recapitulatory list of arms, munitions, and equipment of Communist origin, the seizure of which has been reported to the Commission since the date of the Commission's Special Report of June 2, 1962.

6. In letter No. 539/PDVN/CT/TD/2 dated February 12, 1965 (attached as app. II), the liaison mission has reported to the Commission that, during the period 1959 to 1964, more than 39,000 men have been introduced into South Vietnam from North Vietnam in violation of the Geneva agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam. The liaison mission has provided details of the selection, training, infiltration routes, arms and equipment of these men, based on declarations obtained from prisoners of war, defectors, and captured documents.

RESOLUTION ON VIETNAM

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I desire to make a supplemental statement. I wish to make two modest suggestions supplementing what I have said today about the situation in Vietnam. To introduce my discussion of the first suggestion, I submit a resolution and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolution (S. Res. 93) was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. COOPER. I shall read the resolution:

That it is the sense of the Senate that the majority and minority leaders, together with the chairmen and ranking members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Senate Armed Services Committee, should use their good offices to arrange for meetings of Senators who are not members of the two committees to be briefed fully by the Secretary of State and Secretary of Defense concerning the situation in Vietnam, such groups to approximate 20 in number.

In past years I have urged this kind of procedure on the floor of the Senate in connection with defense matters before the Committee on Armed Services; for because of the complexity of modern weapons systems and the limitations of security, it has become almost impossible for those who are not members of the Committee on Armed Services to obtain much information about matters of defense.

To the suggestion that we can always attend hearings and read the record, I should like to say that it is not always practical to do so. If we do go, we cannot question those who testify. I have also found that often many portions of the transcripts of hearings are deleted on grounds of security. I remember that when I went to the Committee on Foreign Relations to read the record of the first Cuban episode, it was impossible, from reading it, to have any clear indication of what had happened because of deletions.

So I have submitted the resolution respectfully, but yet with the determination to call attention to this problem and as a means to urge the majority leader and the minority leader, and the chairmen and ranking members of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services—whom we respect and in whom we have confidence, to use their offices to urge the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense to brief Senators who are not members of the two committees, in small groups not exceeding 20 in number. I believe we have the right and the duty to ask for this assistance because, as I have said, Congress has its responsibility concerning the most important situation that our country faces today.

My second suggestion concerns the Committee on Foreign Relations. The committee is made up of outstanding Members of the Senate—Members who, by reason of their experience, access to wide and detailed information, and their personal stature, have the best opportunity to advise Congress and, indeed, give counsel to the executive branch of the Government. I know that they have met many times with the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, and perhaps with the President, and that they are deeply conscious of their responsibility. Nevertheless, because Vietnam is presumably the most important, critical problem relating to our security, and because it is interrelated with our policy all over the world, and because it holds the danger of war, I take the liberty of urging the Committee on Foreign Relations to devote its time and its knowledge to continued discussions of this problem, to ascertain if, as a committee, it can make helpful, constructive suggestions to the executive branch and to give greater advice to the Senate.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. COOPER. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thought the Senator from Kentucky might be interested to know that the Secretary of Defense recently issued an order that all persons who are serving in key positions in the Federal Government, including Members of Congress, are no longer eligible to be in the Reserve program, particularly the Ready Reserve program.

Prior to this time, many Members of the Senate and of the House of Representatives were members of those units and were receiving regular weekly intelligence reports from the respective units to which we were attached. We have now been denied those reports by order of the Secretary of Defense.

I recently wrote to the Secretary of the Air Force, suggesting that even though we had been placed on the inactive list, he should supply us with the briefs, so that we, as Members of Congress, might know what was taking place, by means of a weekly, current reportorial style of briefing. I received an unequivocal answer that this could not be done within the Reserve program, and that the Department was not organized to act in any other way.

I have just finished sending the same type of request to the Secretary of Defense, hoping that all three services together could give us briefings on a weekly basis, so as to keep us up to date.

In my opinion, it is absolutely unreasonable for the State Department to expect us to deal with the extremely important matters that we have before us all the time, as the Senator from Kentucky has made explicitly clear in his excellent speech, but at the same time say that we will not be given the information on which to base logical judgments. It seems to me to be the height of irrationality for the executive branch to take this stand; but it is one that, up to date, the Department of Defense has been taking.

Mr. COOPER. I appreciate the comments of the distinguished Senator from Colorado. I understand he is talking about information which would ordinarily be given the members of the Committee on Armed Services. I appreciate his statement. What I am discussing is an issue that I believe is larger.

We are here as representatives of our States and, in a larger sense, representatives of our country in the discussion of and consideration of questions which are larger than the concerns of any State.

I know that crisis after crisis has occurred since World War II. When a crisis occurs, it is the one which is most dangerous and most important. But I have thought that Vietnam is one of the most difficult crises that this country has faced because its many factors have not obtained in other situations.

We know what our commitments are in Berlin. We know that there is a wide source of support from some of the NATO countries and certainly from the people and government of West Germany. There are other situations in the world where we have made our position clear, and where the conditions are favorable to our support.

But considering the instability of government in Vietnam, its distance away, and the activity of Communist China, I believe Vietnam to be one of the most difficult situations our country has faced since World War II.

It is for that reason that I have made these suggestions. The first would provide fuller information to the Senate. The second is a respectful suggestion that there is no more important duty for our Committee on Foreign Relations than to apply its great abilities and great intelligence to continued study and discussion of this problem in the quiet of its executive session, in an effort to assist the President and the executive branch in the solution of the problem and give the Senate its leadership.

In saying that, I do not want to divert attention from the chief point that I have wanted to make in my statement today. That point is that I believe it is incumbent upon our administration to remove impossible preconditions of negotiation as we reject the impossible conditions set by North Vietnam and Communist China and make the clearest signal possible that we are willing to enter true negotiations—to determine if a peaceful settlement, consistent with our honorable commitments and our security, is possible.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. GORE. Yes.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this request has been cleared with the minority leader. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be permitted to sit during the session of the Senate on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

FARM UNION SEEKS DISTRICTING STAY

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, there came to my desk recently an article from the New York Times of Thursday, March 18, 1965, reporting that the Farmers' Union has just had a national meeting and supported the proposed constitutional amendment on legislative reapportionment.

I ask unanimous consent that this article may be printed at this point in the RECORD, it being pertinent not only to the Senator who is now occupying the chair, but also being in conformity with my own opinion that it should be passed as soon as possible.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 18, 1965]

FARM UNION SEEKS DISTRICTING STAY—BACKS A MODIFIED VERSION OF POPULATION FORMULA

(By Donald Janson)

CHICAGO, March 17.—The National Farmers Union adopted today a policy of opposition to the Supreme Court ruling requiring reapportionment of State legislatures on the basis of population alone.

The vote, taken after more than an hour of spirited debate at the organization's annual convention represented a repudiation of the leadership in the Farmers Union.

The vote, weighted to reflect membership strength in the various States, was 112,540 to 89,947.

BATTLE FOR DOMINATION

Thus the Farmers Union joined the other major general farm organizations, the National Grange and the American Farm Bureau Federation, in the battle by rural interests to retain a dominant role in State legislatures despite declining farm population.

The legislative pattern in most States has long been for representation based on population in one house and such considerations as area in the other.

This has made it possible for rural interests to continue to dominate one house in many States in the face of a population shift to the cities.

Of the farm groups, only the Farmers Union has been sharply divided on the issue. James G. Patton, Farmers Union president, has publicly supported the Supreme Court decision of equal representation for all as consistent with democratic principles. He and Glenn J. Talbott, vice president, voted with the minority today.

During the debate in the Grand Ballroom of the Sherman House, a director of the Oklahoma Farmers Union, Leland Stanford, shouted from the floor that "if Jim Patton and these other leaders of ours don't have the guts to speak up for farmers let's get them out of here."

MODIFICATION IS ASKED

Other speakers said opposition to the "one-man, one-vote" principal enunciated by the Supreme Court would not square with the Farmers Union policy of support of the Constitution and might alienate friendly Congressmen and labor unions.

The policy statement adopted by the Farmers Union calls for a constitutional amendment permitting States to apportion one house without primary regard to population.

It expresses the fear that urban-dominated legislatures might ignore the interests of farmers in tax, school and other legislation.

Adoption of the policy puts the Farmers Union in a rare alinement with its much more conservative rival, the Farm Bureau.

The Farm Bureau is conducting a drive to encourage State legislatures to petition Congress to call a constitutional convention to draw up an amendment that would set aside the Supreme Court ruling.

Thirty-four such State petitions are needed to force congressional action. Then, to become law, the amendment drawn would have to be approved by three-fourths of the States.

President Johnson sent the convention a message of concern "that there is such a disproportionate share of poverty in rural America." He pledged to strive to "recapitalize rural America and strengthen our family farm system of agriculture."

AIRLINE SERVICE

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, the development of air transportation has been one of the key factors in the economic expansion we have experienced in recent decades. Technological progress in aviation has been achieved through the combined efforts of aircraft manufacturers, the airline industry, and the Federal Government. Cooperation of individual cities has contributed also. It has been generally recognized that such development is so affected with the public interest as to justify the expenditure of public funds.

Each year we spend millions of dollars of tax funds for the construction of airports and for the development and operation of safety equipment and control of the airways. Developmental costs for new aircraft are subsidized indirectly through the defense program, and we are now proposing the direct subsidization of development of a supersonic airliner for commercial application. In the area of operational costs the Federal Government has, through the direct subsidy program, in effect, guaranteed profitability of our certificated carriers, all in the interest of insuring service adequate for the public convenience and necessity.

We hear a great deal these days about the necessity of maintaining U.S. leadership in international air travel. It appears that we seek to maintain this leadership by concentrating our efforts on the development of bigger and bigger planes that will fly higher and faster and can stay aloft for longer and longer distances without having to land to refuel, or to serve passengers.

Much is made of new speed records between the east and west coasts and between continents—with the elapsed time always measured, of course, from takeoff to landing rather than in terms of the total elapsed time from departure from residence or office to arrival at destination.

Our major trunk carriers are operating in the black and, for the most part, are no longer dependent upon operating subsidies. This is a development which is naturally pleasing to the taxpayers. This has been achieved despite such innovations as first-run movies in flight and other extras which, according to the advertisements of at least one carrier, make air travel so plush that passengers refuse to get off the plane when it lands.

This is called progress. And, in a way, it is progress. The difficulty is that unless one is flying from coast to coast or from one of the Nation's largest metropolitan areas to another, he is likely to find that there is less air service available today than there was 8 or 10 years ago.

For the passenger from New York to Los Angeles or to Miami a flight is usually available at just about any time of the day he may wish to depart, many of the flights being nonstop. Unfortunately, the same is not true if one wishes to go from Little Rock to Louisville.

The fact is that most of our State capitals and other cities in the Nation, with the exception of the very largest metropolitan areas, are serviced by fewer and fewer flights as our planes get bigger and faster. With respect to the major population centers in the State of Tennessee, this statement has been statistically confirmed by information supplied to me at my request by the Civil Aeronautics Board.

I asked the CAB to compile for me the scheduled flights from the airports of Memphis, Nashville, Chattanooga, and Knoxville for the past 10 years. The CAB has furnished comprehensive information listing all scheduled flights at each of these airports to and from each of the 10 cities constituting the given airport's top-ranked origin and destination markets. Generally, this data confirms that the number of flights has declined substantially, notwithstanding the fact that the number of passengers has steadily increased.

It is true that larger planes, with more spaces, provide the same number of seats as do a larger number of planes with fewer spaces. But one flight a day to and from a given point simply does not provide service as adequate as would three flights even if the one flight were by a plane three times as large. The public convenience and necessity is better served by the wider choice of departure and arrival times.

Moreover, the larger planes at faster speeds do not necessarily cut down on travel time on intermediate range flights, for the simple reason that the large jets require larger runways at airports further removed from the actual points of departure and destination. I am not here suggesting that we should turn back the clock and scrap large jetplanes or such airports as Dulles International built to accommodate them. But, in traveling from Washington to Nashville, Tenn., one does not save time by driving to Dulles to use a jetplane. Nor is Nashville served by the jet which departs from Dulles, or New York and passes over Nashville at 20,000 or perhaps 35,000 feet, to land at Memphis, or Dallas, or some place else.

To determine the degree to which service has declined at Tennessee airports I shall now refer to certain of the statistical data supplied by the CAB. Generally, the number of flights from the named Tennessee airports to and from their major markets increased from 1954 to 1957. But 1957 seems to have been the high water mark as far as the number of available flights is concerned. Since then, with some exceptions to which I shall refer, the trend has been steadily downward.

MEMPHIS

Memphis is the largest city in Tennessee and is often called the hub of the midsouth area. With a population of approprimately 600,000 and growing rapidly, Memphis is a transportation and trade center for a large area, drawing from Arkansas, Mississippi, and Tennessee.

Memphis' major air passenger markets, as measured by total number of origin and destination passengers are New Lork, Chicago, Nashville, Atlanta, St. Louis, New Orleans, Dallas, Washington, Little Rock, and Birmingham. Total passengers to and from these cities increased from 161,000 in 1954 to 206,000 in 1957, and to 300,000 in 1963. Its heaviest traffic is with New York. In 1957 there were 14 daily flights from Memphis to New York, or 98 flights per week. In February 1965 there were 3 daily flights, 5 flights which operated 6 days per week and 1 which operated only on Saturday, a total of 52 flights for the week. The decline in flights is not quite as marked from New York to Memphis. In 1957 a passenger from New York could take any of 14 daily flights to Memphis. By February 1965 there were only 4 daily flights, plus 7 which fly 6 days a week. The total number of flights per week from New York to Memphis thus declined from 98 to 70. The combined number of flights to and from New York declined from 196 per week in 1957 to 122 in 1965. Meanwhile passengers to and from Memphis and New York increased from 29,500 in 1957 to 48,000 in 1963.

The total number of flights per week from Memphis to the 10 named cities, and from these cities to Memphis, increased slightly, from 1,170 in 1957 to 1,260 in February 1965. This increase is due primarily to a larger number of flights by local service carriers to relatively nearby points such as Little Rock and Nashville. There was also some increase in service to Chicago.

But service to and from Washington, as is the case with New York, declined sharply. In 1957 there were 70 weekly flights to Washington, and 70 from Washington to Memphis. By February 1965 service to Washington had declined to 45 flights per week, and service from Washington had declined to 60 flights per week.

Considering the increase in the population of Memphis, and the increase in airline passengers, the service now available to Memphis falls far short of what is required for adequate service to the public.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table showing the number of scheduled flights per week to and from Memphis' 10 top-ranked origin and destination markets.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—*Scheduled flights per week, Memphis, Tenn.*

Origin and destination	Sept. 1, 1957	Feb. 1, 1965
Memphis to New York	98	52
New York to Memphis	98	70
Memphis to Chicago	47	72
Chicago to Memphis	40	66
Memphis to Nashville	49	61
Nashville to Memphis	49	67
Memphis to Atlanta	54	68
Atlanta to Memphis	54	74
Memphis to St. Louis	34	52
St. Louis to Memphis	28	46
Memphis to New Orleans	47	59
New Orleans to Memphis	54	65
Memphis to Dallas	55	76
Dallas to Memphis	55	56
Memphis to Washington, D.C	70	45
Washington, D.C., to Memphis	70	60
Memphis to Little Rock	83	103
Little Rock to Memphis	83	102
Memphis to Birmingham	48	33
Birmingham to Memphis	54	33
Total	1,170	1,260

NASHVILLE

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, Nashville, Tennessee's capital city, has recently completed major airport improvements, with runways and other facilities fully adequate for the jet age. No similar progress is discernible with respect to the service available to Nashville by trunk airlines.

Nashville's 10 top-ranked origin and destination markets are New York, Atlanta, Memphis, Chicago, Knoxville, Washington, Louisville, Chattanooga, St. Louis, and Cincinnati. Passengers to and from these cities increased from 210,700 in 1957 to 266,300 in 1963. But the number of flights available per week to and from these cities declined from 1,110 in 1957 to 772 in February 1965.

Like Memphis, Nashville has experienced a sharp decline in available service to and from New York and Washington. In 1957, there were 96 flights per week to New York, and 96 from New York. Now there are 45 to New York—less than half of what it was in 1957, please note—and 52 per week from New York to Nashville.

In 1957, there were 63 flights per week to Washington from Nashville. Now there are only 41. The number of flights from Washington to Nashville has declined from 69 to 47 per week.

Service from Nashville to Chicago and return has declined more than 50 percent. Service to Louisville has declined almost 50 percent.

The lack of timely departure and arrival times result in more than mere inconvenience to travelers. A real economic impact is involved. In 1957, an attorney or a businessman could take a 6:40 a.m. flight from Nashville to Washington, arriving at 11:40 a.m. A relatively short taxi drive would put him into his hotel, into an office, or a downtown business center by 12 or 12:30 p.m. This passenger could transact business in Washington and take any one of four flights back to Nashville, leaving Washington after a day's work between 6:55 p.m. and 9:10 p.m., either of which would arrive in Nashville in the early evening hours.

The early morning flight out of Nashville was a heavily patronized flight. I speak from experience. Many a time I have boarded this flight to find my friend, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. Monroney] aboard, likewise enjoying the service which was then available. It was a popular flight from Oklahoma.

Today, unless one wishes to leave Nashville at 3:05 a.m. on a flight that arrives at Dulles airport at 5:36 a.m., the first available flight to Washington does not arrive until 1:25 p.m. This means, in nearly all cases, that 2 days rather than 1 are required for the transaction of business in the Nation's Capital by businessmen, attorneys, and public officials who wish to come to the Nation's Capital for public or private business.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a table showing the number of scheduled flights per week to and from Nashville's ten top-ranked origin and destination markets.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Table 2.—*Scheduled flights per week, Nashville, Tenn.*

Origin and destination	Sept. 1, 1957	Feb. 1, 1965
Nashville to New York	96	45
New York to Nashville	96	52
Nashville to Atlanta	49	55
Atlanta to Nashville	70	48
Nashville to Memphis	49	67
Memphis to Nashville	49	61
Nashville to Chicago	69	20
Chicago to Nashville	49	20
Nashville to Knoxville	35	34
Knoxville to Nashville	28	34
Nashville to Washington, D.C	63	41
Washington, D.C., to Nashville	69	47
Nashville to Louisville	90	48
Louisville to Nashville	75	41
Nashville to Chattanooga	47	28
Chattanooga to Nashville	61	21
Nashville to St. Louis	27	28
St Louis to Nashville	20	21
Nashville to Cincinnati	34	34
Cincinnati to Nashville	34	27
Total	1,110	772

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield at that point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGovern in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. GORE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator was good enough to mention my name in the co-use of flights through Nashville. It is a gateway from Oklahoma to Washington and New York on one of the major airlines.

The distinguished Senator from Tennessee is rendering a great service to all cities like Nashville, Oklahoma City, Tulsa, Chattanooga, Memphis, and countless other cities, including Dayton, Cincinnati, and Cleveland in Ohio, and Indianapolis, Ind.—I could mention dozens of others—who are suffering from lack of jet transportation.

In other words, much of the service we once knew with the good old reliable DC–6's and the Constellations, which would take a passenger from here to there, is no longer available as a convenience to travelers.

As the Senator from Tennessee has so ably pointed out, we can get on a plane at 5 o'clock in the morning, but we cannot get to Washington before noon to save our lives. My experience in going through Nashville has become less and less attractive because of the morning flight we once knew, which put us off in Washington about noon from Oklahoma City. The evening flight resembles the New York subway during rush hour because of the crowded conditions on the plane. This not only affects persons who travel for pleasure but also—because it is an Electra flight with only a small number of tourist seats being allocated—makes it impossible to get a tourist seat even 3 weeks ahead of plane departure time. That is how bad it is. I have tried it. I like to ride tourist when I can because in that way I can go back and forth more times between Washington and Oklahoma City for the same amount of money.

Reserving a tourist seat 3 weeks ahead is much too late for tourist accommodations on flights which go through Nashville.

Therefore, not only have the flights been diminished, but they have also made it impossible to fly tourist even though the airline advertises tourist accommodations. The Senator from Tennessee is doing the whole Nation a valuable service in inviting attention to the inadequacies of the service to certain intermediate points.

Had the railroads attempted to do this, there would have been a howl of frustration from Washington which would have been heard all the way to Wall Street, the seat of power of the railroad companies, as an avoidance of the service they had pledged to give the public.

The multimillion dollar airports near the cities which accommodate jet flights have actually resulted in fewer rather than more flights. The land around the multimillion dollar airports is constantly being improved at the expense of the taxpayers, furnishing many of the airports with landing fields for the scheduled airlines to use.

I wish to associate myself with what the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore], has said, and only regret that more Senators are not in the Chamber to hear his exposition which has been so carefully researched as to the actual reduction of flights in this day and age.

Let me say to the Senator from Tennessee that it was his original complaint of several months ago, in colloquy with me, which led to a calling of the hearings which will soon be held by the Aviation Subcommittee of the Committee on Commerce of the Senate, to determine the reason for the inadequacy of service in such cities and towns as the Senator from Tennessee is detailing on the floor of the Senate this afternoon.

I invite him to be one of the opening witnesses, to testify to the inadequacy of service to certain cities, and tell what has happened to the service which could be maintained at convenient hours when once upon a time the Constellations and the DC–6's carried so much of the load of air travel.

I believe that the jets have proved to be a mixed blessing. They provide service on the hour and every hour from Washington to Los Angeles, but it is very difficult to get from New York to Washington, New York to Oklahoma City, Nashville or farther south.

It should be remembered that it was these cities that helped to bring these airlines to the point where they are now. The airlines are now forgetting that fact and are, instead, rushing in a frantic effort to see how much service they can wring out of the distant points. An airline's duty is one of service as well as moneymaking. I commend the Senator for bringing this point to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am grateful for the comments of the distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma. I am encouraged that the subcommittee of which he is chairman will soon hold hearings on the subject. I suggest to him that his subcommittee consider the recommendation of legislation which would give to the Civil Aeronautics Board greater authority and responsibility with respect to the quality and quantity of service provided a city by a certificated carrier.

Railroads cannot abandon a city without the approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. A certain airline, which I shall not name, has completely abandoned service to one of Tennessee's airports.

The statistics do not tell the full story, because the number of flights in and out, which I have listed, includes the local service flights, and does not reveal the full extent to which the major trunklines have diminished their service.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Senator is correct. The lack of clarity in the law giving the Civil Aeronautics Board the right to approve or disapprove airline schedules may have to be called into force if this trend toward inadequate service is not corrected. The Civil Aeronautics Board has never exercised power over scheduling. It exercises the right of allocating the route structure. I would presume that if an airline does not fly that route structure with adequate service, the CAB could deny it the right to fly that route. However, that would merely mean that the airline would overfly the community and leave it with inadequate service.

For that reason, the hearing will be quite important to determine whether additional powers should be given the Civil Aeronautics Board. If our trunk airlines cannot fly to intermediate points, and if they neglect passenger service there, while saturating the more or less lush markets with super service, something will have to be done about it.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator. I make no such suggestion and certainly do not wish to imply any threat, but I recall to the able Senator that when the electrical utilities failed to serve the people of the United States, Congress found it advisable to enact a law providing a program to promote rural electrification. When the telephone utilities were not vigorous in supplying adequate service, the Congress found it advisable to inaugurate a rural telephone program.

I should not like to see the airlines serving intermediate-sized cities allow service to deteriorate to the point that Congress would have to consider such action with respect to air service. I do not think that is advisable or that it will become necessary. However, the trend is clearly toward poorer service, instead of better service, to most American cities, notwithstanding the expenditure of large amounts of taxpayers money.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. It is quite interesting to note that as the airlines have become more profitable and the number of passenger miles flown has increased dramatically from year to year, the number of airlines, particularly trunklines, has decreased over the past few years. This has been the result of mergers and combinations. There would have been more of these if the Civil Aeronautics Board had not put its foot down and said, "Enough is enough." Although free competition is limited to a degree by the certificate of convenience and necessity, which is required to fly certain routes, I would remind the Senator that it takes only a piece of paper from the Civil Aeronautics Board to activate any number of routes. Many of the feeder lines, to which the Senator has referred, may at some time be in a position of seeking to be made junior trunklines, or perhaps even senior trunklines, if intermediate service is continued to be neglected by existing trunklines.

Mr. GORE. A little more competition might be helpful. It has proved to be helpful in many other instances during our history.

CHATTANOOGA

Chattanooga, Tennessee's third largest, is a progressive city in the southeastern section of the State. Her 10 top-ranked origin and destination markets are New York, Atlanta, Nashville, Chicago, Washington, Memphis, Charlotte, Miami, Knoxville, and Philadelphia.

The number of scheduled flights per week at Chattanooga to and from the above 10 cities declined from 652 in 1957 to 437 in February 1965.

Chattanooga has slightly more-frequent service in February of this year to and from Memphis and from Chicago. In all other respects, insofar as the ten cities are concerned, there was less-frequent service.

In 1957 there were 28 flights per week from Chattanooga to Miami and 14 flights per week from Miami to Chattanooga. As of last month there was no direct service at all, either way. This abandonment of direct service to and from Miami has occurred despite the fact that the average number of daily passengers to and from Miami has increased by about 27 percent.

By what stretch of the imagination can this be called an improvement in service?

I do not allege that the carriers have any concerted plan to curtail the opportunity of Tennesseans to come to Washington and New York. But Chattanooga, too, has suffered a sharp decline in the number of available flights to and from each city.

There were only one-third as many flights per week from Chattanooga to Nashville last month as there were in 1957. If the major trunk carriers are defending their less frequent schedules between nearby cities with the argument that local service carriers are providing this service, here is one example in which that argument is not convincing.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point in the RECORD a table showing the number of scheduled flights per week to and from Chattanooga's 10 top-ranked origin and destination markets.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 3.—*Scheduled flights per week, Chattanooga, Tenn.*

Origin and destination	Sept. 1, 1957	Feb. 1, 1965
Chattanooga to New York	35	19
New York to Chattanooga	35	26
Chattanooga to Atlanta	55	69
Atlanta to Chattanooga	62	56
Chattanooga to Nashville	61	21
Nashville to Chattanooga	47	28
Chattanooga to Chicago	54	21
Chicago to Chattanooga	33	35
Chattanooga to Memphis	21	26
Memphis to Chattanooga	21	26
Chattanooga to Washington, D.C	28	19
Washington, D.C., to Chattanooga	28	12
Chattanooga to Charlotte	20	14
Charlotte to Chattanooga	20	7
Chattanooga to Miami	28	0
Miami to Chattanooga	14	0
Chattanooga to Knoxville	41	32
Knoxville to Chattanooga	49	26
Chattanooga to Philadelphia	0	0
Philadelphia to Chattanooga	0	0
Total	652	437

KNOXVILLE

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, Knoxville is Tennessee's fourth largest city. It is the home of the University of Tennessee and, in addition, serves as the airport for the vital atomic energy complex at nearby Oak Ridge and the Alcoa industrial complex.

Knoxville's 10 top-ranked origin and destination markets are Nashville, New York, Atlanta, Washington, Chicago, Memphis, Cincinnati, Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, and Birmingham. Scheduled flights per week to and from these cities declined from 660 in 1957 to 583 in February 1965.

Service from Knoxville to New York declined from 56 flights per week to 33 per week. Return flights dropped from 49 to 26 per week. Service to and from Washington also declined, although not quite so sharply.

There has been no substantial increase in service to any of the cities to which most people in and around Knoxville want to go, except to Memphis.

Although the number of passengers arriving at and departing from the Knoxville airport has continued to increase over the years, they have fewer choices as to times of departure and arrival. I do not equate this situation with progress.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a table showing the number of scheduled flights a week to and from Knoxville's 10 top-ranked origin and destination markets.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 4.—*Scheduled flights per week, Knoxville, Tenn.*

Origin and destination	Sept. 1, 1957	Feb. 1, 1965
Knoxville to Nashville	28	34
Nashville to Knoxville	35	34
Knoxville to New York	56	33
New York to Knoxville	49	26
Knoxville to Atlanta	49	49
Atlanta to Knoxville	27	28
Knoxville to Washington, D.C	69	54

TABLE 4.—*Scheduled flights per week, Knoxville, Tenn.*—Continued

Origin and destination	Sept. 1, 1957	Feb. 1, 1965
Washington, D.C., to Knoxville	62	42
Knoxville to Chicago	27	21
Chicago to Knoxville	28	28
Knoxville to Memphis	35	47
Memphis to Knoxville	42	59
Knoxville to Cincinnati	34	21
Cincinnati to Knoxville	42	42
Knoxville to Pittsburgh	14	13
Pittsburgh to Knoxville	21	13
Knoxville to Philadelphia	14	20
Philadelphia to Knoxville	0	7
Knoxville to Birmingham	14	6
Birmingham to Knoxville	14	6
Total	660	583

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if this analysis had been confined to the trunk carriers, the decline in service, as measured by the number of available flights would have, statistically, been much more marked. I have included the flights by local service carriers in this analysis in order to present the total number of scheduled flights as fairly as it can be pictured without in any way seeking to emphasize the extremes.

Local service carriers have an important role to play in the provision of overall service. By and large they are doing a good job. So, for that matter, are the trunk carriers. But in my view, the trunk carriers, as, perhaps, the inevitable consequence of the rush to jets, are leaving a gap in service which the local service carriers are not equipped or designed to serve.

As I indicated earlier in these remarks, service between major metropolitan cities, provided by trunk carriers, is more frequent and faster than it was in prior years. With the development of the local service carriers, service between intermediate-sized cities which are relatively near each other has, with some exceptions, also improved. The local carriers have also brought service to many smaller communities which otherwise would have no service. But the service available to intermediate-sized cities to and from the larger metropolitan areas, to which many people wish to travel, and to and from each other, is declining rather than improving.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield.

Mr. MONRONEY. I am in agreement with the distinguished Senator on the lack of service being extended, or the apparent lack of eagerness to extend service. In all fairness to the trunklines, however, I should like to add that this situation may be on the way to correction with the delivery of the intermediate type jet aircraft. As the distinguished Senator realizes, the 707's and the DC-8's had extremely long cruising ranges, and therefore they were better equipped to serve the long haul rather than the short haul or the intermediate traffic, the up and down traffic, the traffic with a stage length, for example, between Tulsa, Oklahoma, and Nashville.

With the coming of the new equipment—the Boeing 727 and the fabulous new Douglas DC-9—with adequate orders being placed by the trunklines, the equipment situation may provide some hope. I have been promised better service from Oklahoma City. That service will be improved with a 727 jet flight from Washington, D.C., to Oklahoma City and from Oklahoma City to Washington. That service may be expanded to other intermediate towns as delivery of these planes finally catches up with those of us who seem to be on the low end of the totem pole in the dispensing of airline service.

I know it will not come too soon, because we have waited a long time since the 1957 period when the adequacy of the service seemed to come to a somewhat abrupt end with the inauguration of the long-legged jets, which overflew us. I hope with the delivery of this new equipment, making possible more economics service to those intermediate points, we shall no longer be plagued with the inadequate service of which the Senator so eloquently speaks.

Mr. GORE. It sounded very good to me when I heard it for the first time about 5 years ago, but as I have watched the service deteriorate, not only year after year but month by month, my patience in waiting for the new equipment has become a little strained. I dare say that there is much merit in the views which the Senator from Oklahoma has expressed. I hope that with delivery of new equipment, designed particularly to provide better service to the intermediate-sized cities—and that constitutes most of the cities in the country, for there are not many cities like New York or Los Angeles—we will soon have available a service which will reveal this improvement. I have waited long and now wait impatiently for it, but in view of the Senator's statement, I shall wait hopefully yet.

I realize that our trunk carriers operate on the profit motive, but so do the electric utilities; so do the railroads; so do the telephone companies.

Airline service has been brought into being and made feasible by vast expenditures of the taxpayers' money. The Civil Aeronautics Board must have the necessary authority. And unless it has the will to exercise its responsibility as a regulatory agency, the Congress had better bestir itself both with respect to the CAB and with respect to the authority which it has or does not have or is willing or unwilling to exercise.

I do not advocate that airlines should be required to operate expensive planes nearly empty at great loss merely to serve the convenience of a few individuals. What gives me concern is the overall direction of the industry. I seriously question whether policies now followed by the airlines and by Government best serve the public interest, or, in the long run, the best interests of the carriers themselves. In the final analysis, any private industry must provide a product or a service that meets a public demand.

In my opinion, the Aviation Subcommittee of the Senate should, as a matter of priority, conduct an exhaustive survey of the air service currently available to the American people. I suggest that particular attention be paid to the needs, and the degree to which these needs are being met, of the great mass of our citizens who do not live in the very large cities—and of those who do live in those cities but desire to travel to one not so large.

The taxpayers have invested much money in the development of airline service. I do not begrudge a penny of it. But if we are to continue to invest, such as in the development of the SST, we ought to be sure that the result will be more, as well as faster and safer, service to the American people.

The role of the CAB and the FAA should be thoroughly analyzed. Perhaps some of the ground rules need to be changed.

At present, a municipality which requires more frequent, or additional, service is pretty much at the mercy of the carrier or carriers who have "certificates" to provide service to and from a given point or points. It sometimes seems to me that these certificates are heavy on the side of authority and light on the side of responsibility to provide service. Generally, there is little that can be effectively done by a community when service is decreased by a certificated carrier.

The CAB has an enormous and a complex task if it properly fulfills its responsibility to the public. This is true of any regulatory agency. It must constantly guard against the tendency of regulatory agencies to assume the point of view of the industry it is supposed to regulate.

I call this particularly to the attention of the able and distinguished senior Senator from Oklahoma. There is a great tendency on the part of the Civil Aeronautics Board and its personnel, like the chameleon, to look more and more like the limb on which it perches.

I observe in passing that within days after I had requested certain statistical information from the CAB to prepare this address, the fact that I was interesting myself in this matter became known to some of the major carriers. Calls to my office sought to elicit just what I had in mind. I made and make no secret of it. It is perhaps a coincidence that since I requested this information, two trunk airlines have advised my office of additions or improvements in service contemplated by them with respect to service to Tennessee.

I welcome this promised improvement.

I do not minimize the problems of the carriers in their efforts to obtain for their stockholders a reasonable return on their investment. But the fact remains that in important respects there is less service available to the American people than there was several years ago, despite our claims to continued progress.

Bigger and faster planes serve a useful purpose. But I seriously question whether our rush, pellmell, into the jet age is fully or adequately serving the interest of the traveling public.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. GORE. I yield with pleasure to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I compliment the Senator on his thorough research and his thought-provoking challenge to the trunklines to serve the cities that furnished the traffic that built the trunklines from their fledgling start to the position of power they now occupy. I recall an old Chinese proverb:

> When you drink the water, do not forget the spring from which it flowed.

The wealth, power, and prestige of our airlines originated in the traffic from Nashville, Chattanooga, and Memphis, from cities like Tulsa and Oklahoma City, from Wichita, Kans., Des Moines, Iowa, and Omaha, Nebr., cities which now are neglected. Instead the air carriers rush to fly from coast to coast the largest number of plush flights.

I compliment the distinguished Senator from Tennessee for calling attention to this deficit in what otherwise would be a rather outstanding picture of air traffic.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. Since he invited me to testify, I wish to avail myself of the opportunity. Has the Senator in mind any date when hearings will commence?

Mr. MONRONEY. Probably some time in May. The Easter recess is approaching, and it is difficult to make plans ahead of that time.

Mr. GORE. I shall look forward to an appearance before the Senator's committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. If I guess correctly, we shall probably have a majority of the Members of the Senate complaining about the inadequacy of service to communities and towns of their States, as the Senator has mentioned in the case of Tennessee. I only hope that others who speak will document their cases as well as the Senator from Tennessee has done this afternoon on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. GORE. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

FULL EMPLOYMENT—A REQUIREMENT OF THE GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I should like to discuss this afternoon the next step down the long, long road to the Great Society: attainment of a full employment economy.

This year, the Nation will climb toward still higher levels of affluence. Our gross national product is expected to reach $660 billion. During the last 48 months it has increased by more than a fourth. So has the amount of money in the pocket of the average consumer for spending on other than the necessities of life. Industrial production is up by a third over what it was 4 years ago and industrial profits are half again what they were in 1961.

If we are able to maintain this pace of expansion—and we have the economic know-how to do so, if we wish—the United States will achieve a gross national product sometime within the next 10 years of $1 trillion.

This is the measure, in our affluent society, of the abundance which now lies within our grasp.

We have entered a new stage in the development of human society—a stage of which abundance, not scarcity, is the hallmark. We have broken the shackles of mere subsistence and survival for a majority of our citizenry. And now, in the words of Walt Rostow in his little book "The Stages of Economic Growth," we have the promise of "seeing what men can and will do when the burden of scarcity is lifted from them."

The President has sensed this promise in framing the political challenge of the Great Society.

In making the transition from a subsistence to a mass consumption economy, however, we have left many problems unsolved. While our technology and productive potential have surged forward, many individuals, policies, and institutions have been left behind. Such institutions as Congress, for example, operate much as they did in the days of candlelight, the stagecoach, and the China Clipper.

While the great economic successes of the tax cut of 1964 have shattered many of the old cliches which until recently hamstrung national economic policy, some, more appropriate to the days of Adam Smith than our own, still prevail.

Many families and communities which are caught up in the difficulties of transition are paying an unfair price for general progress. Despite our record levels of expansion over the last 4 years, for instance, nearly 4 million Americans are looking for work and are unable to find it, while millions of jobs go unfilled for lack of qualified applicants.

Although we are the richest Nation in the world by far, we are plagued with an unemployment rate higher than all but one or two of the more advanced industrial nations.

This does not make sense. Unused manpower means lower levels of consumption. Lower levels of consumption mean unused productive potential. Last year, despite one of the best rates of economic growth in our peacetime history, the Council of Economic Advisers estimated a gap of $25 to $30 billion between the Nation's potential output and its actual output because of unemployment and an inadequate rate of growth.

Why are we still plagued with joblessness, despite our recent reasonably rapid rates of expansion?

First, of all, because even these rates are not high enough to absorb the flood of war babies now pouring onto the labor market—and this flood will continue until 1980. Our labor force currently numbers 76 million. By 1970 it will rise to 86 million and by 1980 it will be up to 101 million.

The people who comprise this labor force are now alive, so we know actually, not merely by prognosis or educated guess, how big the labor force will be.

Another disturbing factor is that half of all those who will have entered the work force by 1970 will be under 25 years of age.

Half of all those who will have entered the work force by 1970 will be under 25, and it is this age group which is experiencing the greatest difficulties in finding work. Its unemployment rate is twice that of the rest of the work force.

We need a rate of expansion high enough therefore, to absorb this horde of young people.

It must also be high enough to absorb those displaced by advancing technology, changing markets, and industrial obsolescence. Much of the blame for our failure to achieve full employment in recent years has been laid to that grossly misunderstood phenomenon, "automation." Far more than automation is involved, but there can be little doubt that technological change has taken its toll in certain occupations.

One general way to measure the impact of advancing technology is to look at the increase in goods and services each American worker is able to produce in a year compared with past years—a statistic couched in terms of increased output per man-hour or sometimes referred to as the "productivity increase."

The average annual productivity increase for 1909 to 1947 was 2 percent. That is, each year, American workers produced 2 percent more than they did the previous year with the same amount of work.

If the labor force had remained stable—which, of course, it did not—the gross national product would have risen 2 percent, or, in the alternative, would have remained the same, and 2 percent of the labor force would have become unemployed.

The 1947–62 average annual productivity increase was 3 percent. The 1958–63 average was 3.1 percent. The average rate of increase for the past 4 years, however, has risen to 3.6 percent.

An increase of 2 to 3 percent and perhaps 3½ percent in the rate of output per man-hour is more dramatic than it initially appears. Since it means that it takes fewer workers each year to produce the same amount of gross national product, obviously the gross national product must grow enough each year to make certain that no one is thrown out of a job because of increases in output per man-hour made possible by improved technology. As an example, if we assume for a moment that our labor force is not growing and that it totals 75 million persons, an annual productivity increase of only 2 percent would mean that it would take 1.5 million fewer workers to produce the same gross national product as it did the previous year. In other words, the gross national product would have to grow enough to generate 1.5 million new jobs in order to prevent unemployment.

With productivity rising at a rate of 3 percent annually, we would need 2.25 million new jobs. If the 3½ percent rate of the last 4 years should prove to be a new longrun trend, 2.6 million jobs per year must be created to keep unemployment from rising.

Now we must add to that figure the additional new jobs needed to absorb all those new young workers from the "war babies" generation who are now joining the labor force. If we take both increases in productivity and the growth in the size of the labor force we can expect for the remainder of this decade into account, the economy must generate an average of 3½ million new jobs a year through the rest of the decade just to keep unemployment from rising beyond its persistent recent level of 5 percent of the work force. An additional 2 to 3½ million jobs would be needed to reduce unemployment to 4 percent of the labor force and another three-fourths of a million to reach 3 percent, which, in my opinion, is what we must define as reasonable full employment. This includes an allowance for workers who reenter the labor force as job opportunities increase. The rate of economic growth necessary to create enough jobs to hold unemployment at present levels exceeds 4 percent. In order to reduce unemployment to 3 percent by 1968, the economy would have to expand at nearly 5½ percent per year in constant dollars plus additional growth in money terms to offset any increases in the price level.

In the President's manpower report for 1965, the Secretary of Labor arrived at a similar conclusion. He wrote:

> Taking into consideration the need to create jobs to reduce the unemployment rate from the current level of 5 percent to a more acceptable level it will be necessary to sustain an annual average rate of increase in gross national product about equal to this year's high rate of growth for the next half-dozen years. It is obvious that an aggressive policy of action to stimulate output and employment growth will be necessary if even the present high rate of unemployment is not to rise further.

The Joint Economic Committee in its comments on the President's Economic Report last week expressed concern that the recommended cuts in excise taxes plus increases in social security benefits and any economic impetus from the 1966 Federal budget will not be enough to prevent the unemployment rate from rising toward the end of the year. The committee points out that the present $100 billion budget will result in a sharp increase in the full employment budget surplus early next year and that this may act to brake our present expansion and force the rate of unemployment up.

The President seems aware of this danger and in his Economic Report he states that, if employment conditions should warrant, he may come back to Congress later in the year to ask for additional tax and monetary authority to cope with any slackening in the rate of growth. He also has asked Congress to improve its own part in this process by providing means for acting rapidly on any such recommendations.

We should grant the President's request. Indeed, I would personally support discretionary authority to the President to vary tax rates up or down 5 percent in order to cope with the rise and fall in the business cycle.

But if our commitment to full employment as a goal is to be taken seriously—and it must in any program to build a Great Society—it is not enough for us to say that if signs of a downturn show up we will take action; by that time it may be too late. We must, through a proper coordination of public and private policy, prevent a downturn from even occurring.

And it is my opinion that we have not made full use of the Employment Act of 1946 to that end. Apparently, the Joint Economic Committee agrees. Last week the committee commented:

> The act specifies that the President include in his report a program "for carrying out the policy declared (in the act) together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable" * * * We can understand the difficulties of presenting early in the Congress a completely rounded legislative program, but the requirement for the prompt development of national policy each year makes the submission of such a program imperative * * * The Employment Act also calls on the President, in his economic report, to set forth not only current levels of employment, production, and purchasing power, but also "such levels needed to carry out the policy declared in the act." * * * It would have been helpful if the Council of Economic Advisors had published in its report a specific dollar figure for its forecast of potential gross national product in 1965, and for the likely gap between this figure and its forecast of actual gross national product."

It may well be that the directives in the Employment Act of 1946 are adequate and that only our administration of the act needs to be strengthened. I agree with the majority members of the Joint Economic Committee, however, that now, as the 20th anniversary of this historic statute approaches, we should review its provisions to see if they need updating in the face of new economic knowledge and techniques which can help us achieve full employment.

To further facilitate this review, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the Employment Act of 1946 and ask that it remain on the desk for 2 weeks for additional cosponsors.

The bill would require the President, as part of his Economic Report, to submit to Congress each year a full employment and production budget which would anticipate for the approaching fiscal year and the next 5 fiscal years, the projected performance of the national economy and the degree to which this performance will exceed or fall short of conditions necessary to assure full employment and production with stable prices. Under the bill, he would also be required to submit a Federal budget and a tax and monetary program designed to minimize any full employment surplus or deficit which might be anticipated.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD there be inserted the full text of the bill together with a section-by-section analysis.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, it will remain at the desk as requested, and the bill and analysis will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1630) to provide for specific employment policies in order to promote maximum employment, to reduce unemployment to its minimum acceptable levels, to promote an adequate rate of economic growth, and to preserve reasonable price stability, introduced by Mr. CLARK, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A bill to provide for specific employment policies in order to promote maximum employment, to reduce unemployment to its minimum acceptable levels, to promote an adequate rate of economic growth, and to preserve reasonable price stability

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Employment Act Amendments of 1965".

FINDINGS AND DECLARATIONS OF POLICY

SEC. 2. It is and has been the policy of the United States, set forth in the Employment Act of 1946, to promote maximum employment, production and purchasing power and to create and maintain conditions in the national economy under which useful employment opportunities will be afforded to all those who are able, willing, and seeking to work.

The period following the declaration of this policy has been one of profound economic and technological change. These changes have taken place at a time when the rate of economic growth has been substantially less than that necessary to absorb the combined pressures of rapid labor force growth and labor displacement caused by technological change.

These factors, in combination, have tended to impair the development of the maximum employment polices set forth in the Employment Act of 1946, have contributed to the rate of unemployment and underemployment, have limited the Nation's ability to meet its domestic and international commitments, have increased pressures on an already inadequate educational system, have retarded economic opportunity for millions of our citizens and have spawned conditions of deprivation which foster delinquency, crime, racial discrimination, and poverty.

It is accordingly declared that in order to attain maximum employment, production, and purchasing power as set forth under the Employment Act of 1946, specific goals and objectives for the attainment of these policies must be established.

SEC. 3. Section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946 is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. The Congress declares that it is the continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to use all practicable means consistent with its needs and obligations and other essential considerations of national policy, with the assistance and cooperation of industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments, to coordinate and utilize all its plans, functions, and resources for the purpose of creating and maintaining, in a manner calculated to foster and promote free competitive enterprise and the general welfare, conditions under which there will be afforded useful employment opportunities, including self-employment, for all who are able, willing, and seeking to work, and to establish a manpower utilization policy designed to promote maximum employment and to reduce unemployment to its lowest acceptable levels, and to promote, as a necessary concomitant thereto, an economic policy designed to develop and maintain rapid economic growth and reasonable price stability."

SEC. 4. Subsection (a) of section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(a) The President shall transmit to the Congress not later than January 20 of each year an economic report (hereinafter called the Economic Report) containing the following information:

" '(1) an analysis of the economic and employment conditions in the United States, setting forth: (i) the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power obtaining in the United States and such levels needed to carry out the policy declared in section 2 of this Act; (ii) current and foreseeable trends in the levels of employment, production, and purchasing power; (iii) a review of the economic program of the Federal Government and a review of economic conditions affecting employment in the United States or any considerable portion thereof during the preceding year and of their effect upon employment, production, and purchasing power; and (iv) a program for carrying out the policy declared in section 2 of this Act, together with such recommendations for legislation as he may deem necessary or desirable;

"'(2) a national employment and production budget, setting forth: (i) short-range and long-range projections of the size of the labor force; (ii) short-range and long-range projections of the levels of gross national product, Federal, State, and local government expenditures and total employment reasonably anticipated under foreseeable private actions and existing public policies; (iii) short-range and long-range goals or objectives for maximum employment, specifying the amount of total absolute employment required to achieve maximum employment; (iv) short-range and long-range goals or objectives for maximum production, specifying the amount of gross national product representing maximum production; (v) short-range and long-range goals or objectives for attaining maximum purchasing power; and (vi) the extent to which one or more of the basic objectives of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power should be modified in order to maintain the policy of reasonable price stability whenever the President finds that any of these objectives are in conflict with such policy, including the measures which, in the opinion of the President, should be taken in order to reconcile the policy of reasonable price stability with the goals or programs for attaining maximum employment, production, and purchasing power; and

"'(3) a full employment Federal budget, setting forth: (i) the estimated gross national product which will be required to attain the maximum employment and production objectives established under paragraph 2 (iii) and (iv) hereof; (ii) a summary of those portions of the national employment and production budget required under paragraph (2)(ii) hereof setting forth the gross national product expected under foreseeable private actions and existing public policies; (iii) a program of such Government expenditures and other measures, fiscal and monetary, as he may deem necessary to attain the maximum employment, production, and purchasing power objectives established under paragraph (2) (iii), (iv), and (v) hereof. which program shall include a short-range and long-range proposal for outlays designed to contribute to economic growth and the general welfare which may include but shall not be limited to conservation, development, and reclamation of natural resources, improved transportation systems, urban renewal, public housing, education, agricultural assistance, health, environmental improvements, and public welfare; and (iv) a review of the achievements of the immediate past short-range and long-range full employment Federal budget including the degree to which maximum employment, production, and purchasing power objectives were achieved and the reasons for any failure to achieve objectives previously established.'"

Sec. 5. Subsection (b)(3) of section 5 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) as a guide to the several committees of the Congress dealing with legislation relating to the Economic Report, not later than March 1 of each year, to file a report with the Senate and the House of Representatives and with each appropriate standing committee thereof, containing its findings and recommendations with respect to each of the main recommendations made by the President in the Economic Report, including the sections covering the national employment and production budget and the full employment Federal budget, and from time to time to make such other reports and recommendations to the Senate and the House of Representatives and to each appropriate standing committee thereof as it deems advisable."

Sec. 6. Such Act is further amended by adding the following new sections:

"HEARINGS AND REPORTS BY THE STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

"Sec. 6. (a) The Senate and House Appropriations Committees shall each in full committee hold hearings and consider in its entirety the full employment Federal budget and shall report to their respective Houses of Congress as to their findings and recommendations. Among the witnesses to be called at such hearings shall be the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee.

"(b) The standing committees of both Houses of Congress, when holding hearings on legislation substantially affecting the policies of this Act or the realization of its objectives of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power shall hear as witnesses on that legislation the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee. Reports pertaining to such legislation shall contain a statement of the Joint Economic Committee's position upon that legislation and the views of the standing committee with respect thereto.

"PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

"Sec. 7. (a) In order that the people of the United States, through their representative leadership may participate effectively in the development of private and public economic policies directed toward maximum employment, production, and purchasing power, there is hereby established a National Economic Advisory Council (hereinafter referred to as the 'Advisory Council') which shall serve in an advisory capacity to the Council of Economic Advisers and shall, among other duties, review annually and publish its recommendations on the national employment and production budget and the full employment budget.

"(b) The Advisory Council shall consist of twenty members to be appointed by the President from among representatives of industry, agriculture, labor, consumer, and public interest groups, and State and local governments. Members of the Advisory Council shall serve for terms of two years, except that members appointed to fill vacancies caused by death or resignation shall be appointed for the unexpired terms of their predecessors. One of the members shall be designated by the President as Chairman of the Advisory Council.

"(c) Members of the Advisory Council shall be entitled, while attending meetings of the Advisory Council, to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the President, but not exceeding $75 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence as authorized by law for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

"(d) The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers shall furnish the Advisory Council with such personnel, facilities, and services as may be necessary to enable it to perform its functions.

"IMPROVEMENT FOR BUDGETARY PRACTICE

"Sec. 8. For the purposes of describing to the Congress in more meaningful terms the impact of the Federal budget upon the economy and to enable the Congress to distinguish more effectively between the various types of expenditures, the President shall in the annual budget message—

"(1) present a full and detailed account of the flow of cash payments between the public and the Federal Government and shall specifically indicate the amount of the estimated cash surplus, or estimated cash deficit, as the case may be; and

"(2) separate operating expenditures from investment-type expenditures which add to the wealth and prosperity of the country using such definitions and such detail as he shall deem appropriate.

"DEFINITIONS

"Sec. 9. As used in this Act:

"(1) The term 'short range' means each fiscal year beginning July 1 following the submission of the Economic Report to the Congress and the term 'long range' means the next succeeding five fiscal years beginning July 1 following the submission of the Economic Report to the Congress.

"(2) For the period ending June 30, 1968, the term 'maximum employment' means a level of unemployment in the civilian labor force not to exceed 4 per centum of the labor force. Thereafter, the term 'maximum employment' shall mean a level of unemployment no greater than 3 per centum of the civilian labor force.

"(3) 'Maximum production' means that amount of production resulting from maximum employment, commensurate with freedom of choice between employment and leisure, and maximum productivity under conditions reflecting optimum utilization of scientific knowledge, technological improvements, labor force, and managerial ability.

"(4) 'Maximum purchasing power' means that amount of purchasing power necessary to maintain maximum employment and production, to make possible adequate economic growth and to assure a minimum adequate personal and family budget to all groups in American society without generating that type of inflationary pressure which results from purchasing power markedly in excess of maximum productive capacities."

Sec. 7. (a) Except as provided in subsections (b) and (c), this Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment.

(b) The provisions of sections 4, 5, and 6 shall become effective January 1, 1966, and shall be applicable to the Economic Report transmitted on January 20, 1967, and each succeeding year thereafter.

(c) The provisions of section 8 shall be effective with respect to the annual budget message for the fiscal year 1967 and each subsequent budget message.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. Clark is as follows:

Section-by-Section Analysis: "Employment Act Amendments of 1965"

Section 1 gives the short title of the bill as "Employment Act Amendments of 1965."

Section 2 reaffirms the national commitment to maximum employment, production, and purchasing power as national goals. Declares that the Congress has found that those goals have not been attained since enactment of the Employment Act of 1946 because of rapid growth in the labor force and profound economic and technological change. Calls for specific economic and employment goals to be established.

Section 3 amends section 2 of the Employment Act of 1946 to declare that it is the intent of Congress that the Federal Government, in close consultation with representatives from all major segments of the economy, coordinate its plans, functions, and resources to provide maximum employment, purchasing power, and economic growth.

Section 4: (1) Requires the President to send to Congress not later than January 20 of each year an "Economic Report" containing an analysis of current economic and employment conditions, projections of major trends in employment, production, and purchasing power, a review of the Federal programs affecting these trends, and a program designed to carry out the commitments contained in the next section.

(2) Requires the President to submit with the economic report a "full employment and

production budget" providing short- and long-range projections of labor force growth, gross national product, governmental expenditures at all levels and employment projected upon foreseeable public and private actions. This budget shall include short- and long-range goals for maximum employment, production, and purchasing power and shall state the extent to which they may have to be modified in order to preserve reasonable price stability.

(3) Requires the President to submit a "full employment Federal budget" setting forth the gross national product needed to attain maximum employment, production, and purchasing power in the following fiscal year, including a short- and long-range capital budget for expenditures in such employment generating fields as resource conservation and development, transportation, community development, education, agriculture, health, welfare, and environmental improvements.

Section 5 requires the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress to file with both Houses not later than March 1 of each year its findings and recommendations with respect to the Economic Report, including those sections dealing with the full employment and production budget.

Section 6 requires the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses to hold hearings on the full employment and production budget, including as witnesses, the chairman and ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee.

Section 7 establishes a National Economic Advisory Council which shall be consulted by the Council of Economic Advisers in the preparation of the full employment and production budget and the entire Economic Report. The 20 members of the Council shall be drawn from industry, labor, agriculture, consumer and public interest groups and State and local government. Members will serve for 2 years and one shall be designated by the President as Chairman. They shall receive no salary but shall receive $75 per diem and travel expenses while attending the sessions of the Council.

Section 8 requires the President, in order to more fully inform Congress concerning the impact of the full employment Federal budget upon the economy, to distinguish between various types of expenditures by describing fully the flow of cash payments as well as the cash deficit or surplus and by distinguishing between operating expenditures and investment-type expenditures.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I hope that the Joint Economic Committee will study this bill in connection with its review of the Employment Act. As Chairman of the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I also intend to schedule hearings on it. I hope that out of these deliberations by the two committees the outlines of a more comprehensive and effective national policy for full employment will emerge.

Under this amendment to the Employment Act—which incidentally derives directly from the original intentions of the authors of the Employment Act—the President could provide us with rough targets in employment and investment needed to efficiently utilize our manpower and productive resources.

If a level of unemployment no higher than 3 percent were to be attained by 1968, for example, the President, under this amendment, would estimate that we will need a gross national product of $734 billion in 1963 dollars. To achieve that GNP his calculations would find that we must put an additional $5 billion into the pockets of consumers each year from now until 1968, or public purchases of goods and services must increase by a like amount, or there must be a combination of the two.

I agree, however, with the Joint Economic Committee that not all of the needed expansion in GNP can or should be provided in the private marketplace through tax cuts and monetary incentives. Because of the heavy financial burden this Nation has borne for 20 years in national defense, there is a gigantic legacy of unmet needs plaguing the Nation holding back whole regions, and thus the country as a whole, from meeting its full potential because of obsolescence. Some of these chronic needs will be met by the administration's new programs in the war on poverty, Appalachia, and economic development, and education. But a serious effort to meet them can cure both chronic obsolescence and chronic unemployment.

> The door is open for a great expansion of educational, health, and other services to the Nation's disadvantaged people and to other far-reaching efforts to remove the scars from our society and reduce the obstacles which hamper its progress—

The Secretary of Labor commented in the President's manpower report.

> The very success of the economy in achieving record levels of output, employment, and income has helped to overburden many public services—to the point where future economic growth will be adversely affected unless these services are rapidly strengthened. Automobile purchases and use, for example, have outstripped the capacity of streets and highways. Gains in industrial output and population growth have placed severe strains on water and other natural resources and on police and fire protection services. And the prospect of continued rapid population growth adds another dimension of need for enlarged school, hospital, recreational, and other facilities.

It is in meeting such needs as these—most of them identified in the past as in the public sector of the economy—that much of our future employment potential lies. This is why the bill which I have introduced requires the President to catalog such needs in a capital budget and design a plan to fill them in his full employment budget.

The allocations to community development and housing, for example, have never been governed by considerations of how they might affect annual employment levels. Yet programs of this type, having a very high labor content per dollar spent, are an important part of the job-creating impetus which Federal expenditures can give.

Witnesses before the Employment and Manpower Subcommittee estimated the urban renewal and housing labor content at from about $560 to $660 per $1,000 contract award. The Department of Labor estimates that each $1 million of contract awards in construction creates 115 man-years of work.

The field of community development—which includes housing, urban renewal, mass transit, highways, pollution control, the construction of other local public facilities, and community planning—represents one of the largest areas of unmet needs in the Nation. There are, at the present time, between 7 and 8 million substandard dwelling units in our urban areas. The crop of young people in the war babies generation is now reaching maturity and will soon be marrying and starting families. The demands for new and rehabilitated dwellings, therefore, will increase dramatically. In addition, the growing proportion of older citizens in the population calls for the construction of housing specially adapted to their needs. An additional need for more low rent or purchase housing units is evidenced by the number of families who are unwillingly doubled up for economic reasons.

There are an enormous number of obsolete commercial and industrial structures in our metropolitan areas. Continuous expansion of metropolitan regions will increasingly direct attention toward improving inadequate transportation facilities—whether bus, subway, or railroad commuter service—as well as stepped-up construction of roads, bridges, and tunnels to accommodate mushrooming auto traffic.

Additional investment in facilities to support metropolitan growth is essential: schools, colleges, hospitals, health centers, playgrounds, and recreation buildings, welfare institutions, sewer and water plants, and lines.

The sums which will be required just to keep up with population growth in urban areas are staggering. Reliable estimates indicate that an investment of between $500 and $700 billion, both private and public, will be necessary just to accommodate the increasing urban population over the next 20 years. If the elimination of existing blight and obsolescence is included, an average annual investment of between $120 and $125 billion in private and public funds will be required each year over the next two decades in order to preserve and restore the vitality of the metropolitan areas of the country. This compares to public and private expenditures of about $50 billion in 1961.

In the sparsely populated sections of the Nation urgent needs also exist. In one study cited before the subcommittee, the total Federal investment in resource development—watershed conservation, forest stand improvement, soil conservation, and recreational development—required over a 10-year period came to $4 billion, about twice the current rate of expenditures. Approximately 250,000 new jobs would be generated by an additional $2 billion allocated for this purpose over a decade.

Several years ago Resources for the Future, Inc., estimated that a backlog of needed work programs in forestry, soil and water conservation, parks, fish and wildlife: range revegetation, water pollution and sediment, and other similar investments would require an investment of nearly $20 billion.

This calculation did not include the heavy construction programs in water development with a backlog of authorized prospects nearly equal in size. Total requirements for withdrawal of water from lakes and streams in the United States in 1954 was 300 billion gallons daily, or only about 27 percent of the total streamflow, withdrawals in 1980 would be about 559 billion gallons daily and in the year 2000, more than 888 billion gallons daily, or more than 80 percent of total streamflow.

Water programs up to 1980 total almost $55 billion for Federal programs and $173 billion for non-Federal programs.

Some of the programs for expansion of development of water facilities are based on urgent needs to overcome accumulated backlogs. For example, the Public Health Service estimates that to overcome the backlog in municipal sewage treatment facilities by 1971 would require expenditures of $600 million annually, or more than twice the present rate of expenditure.

There are many new areas affording opportunities for new employment and investment in the technological segments of the private sector, too. Properly directed, technological advance can create far more new employment opportunities than it destroys. It can do so if applied in whole new areas of human endeavor. In late 1963, the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower heard from over 2 dozen representatives from the aerospace industries concerning the opportunities for new employment which could be created by conscious use of the new technology we have devised in the space and defense efforts. They were almost unanimous in their judgment, however, that it would take a conscious, directed effort by the Federal Government to induce the use of these new technologies into untried fields. They argued that the markets for these new potentials are too ambiguous at present to lure investors into them unless Government creates the special opportunities necessary to make such an undertaking profitable.

It was this testimony which prompted the subcommittee to recommend creation of the President's Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress which was subsequently approved by Congress and which will make its recommendations on these matters next January.

The subcommittee was able to discover numerous highly technological fields in which the enormous technological expertise gained in the defense and space efforts can be applied, such as worldwide detailed inspection and surveillance systems for policing arms control; communications, command, and control systems; new educational technology for the classroom; new aids for air traffic control; medical electronics; new energy sources; mass transportation, and oceanography.

We have a national obligation to bring the many lessons we have learned in defense-related enterprise to bear upon the continuing unmet public needs of our communities and our people—needs which the defense industries and their advanced technologies may be able to help meet in this century of technological revolution. Certainly we have seen in the last decade, in defense and in space, the most remarkable achievement of national goals undreamt of a decade ago. We have assembled, in recognition of new national goals in space, in communication, and in national security, expert teams of engineers, research men, men of industry, and production forces. By a massive infusion of human effort, these teams have put man into space and, hopefully, in the long-range future, first on to the moon and later on other planets. We have proved through these efforts that when, as a nation, we clearly define for ourselves a priority goal, a 20th century technology can span, in a matter of months or a few years, a human advance which might otherwise have taken decades for its achievement.

In my view the time is soon approaching when we must harness the kinds of energies and technical skills which have been created to meet national goals in defense and in space to improve the conditions of human life. There are vast unmet community and human needs in the United States. There are millions of Americans who wish simply to live in a safe and sanitary house which they can afford to rent or buy. Our technology can afford to help them do just that.

I have in mind the millions of Americans who would benefit from a mass urban and interurban transportation system—efficient, speedy, and inexpensive. I believe that the experts on propulsion who can put tons of instruments on the moon or send a man around the earth in 90 minutes, could get a commuter comfortably to his job and back to his home, 30 miles away, in one-half or one-quarter the commuting time presently endured by millions of working citizens.

I have in mind the millions of American children who are waiting for the benefits of 20th century technology to provide them with adequate schools, educational facilities, and teaching aids. I am confident that a communications system which can flash a television picture around the earth in an instant, can solve the communications tangle in our schools and provide a topnotch information and education service to millions of schoolchildren.

Can we harness the technology which has put us in space to meet these pressing human and community goals? What is the proper role of the Federal Government in providing the benefits of 20th century technology to a community's schools, its mass transportation system, its public works, its public and private housing, and its productive resources? These are some of the challenging questions for this economy of systematic invention. These are some of the questions with which the new Presidential Commission deal. The new jobs we need so desperately will not come from the application of sophisticated technology to traditional productive enterprise, but they will come from the application of technology to whole new lines of endeavor and unmet need.

Today, I speak only of those employment policies needed to create the new jobs we need for full employment. In another speech I shall discuss the manpower policies we need to make certain that the skills of our people meet the needs of the economy.

Today, I wish only to stress that our technological society has become so massive in its capabilities and its real problems so incredibly complex that we can not hope to utilize our full potential without some major departures in public and private policy. We will have to apply the same principles of the "systems" approach as we have in defense or space.

Such an undertaking implies that we shall have to engage in some of the long-range national planning and coordination which nearly all of the nations of Western Europe have adopted since the end of World War II. The essential defect in America's kit of economic programs is coordination.

There must be some direction, some coordination. Someone must set national objectives and performance levels. Someone must hitch present policy to future prospects. And in no field is this more true than in our attempt to bring our technological capabilities to bear on some of our chronic public needs. The bill I introduce today would move us toward that objective by requiring the President to define goals for us and devise programs to achieve those goals through intelligent use of the Federal budget.

Change is the only permanent part of the modern scene. In a static society anticipation and foresight are unnecessary. But when the daily lives of 200 million people are in constant flux; when their individual welfare is threatened by forces beyond their control; then planning and a definition of social objectives is essential. And only government can provide that perspective for the community as a whole.

John Dewey once wrote that a "culture which permits science to destroy its values without permitting science to create new ones is a culture destroying itself."

Now, in the early days of the Second Industrial Revolution, we have this opportunity to create those new political values which will carry us toward our objectives. This bill today attempts to define some of the issues implicit in such an undertaking.

> We built this Nation to serve its people—

The President said in his 1965 state of the Union message.

> We want to grow and build and create, but we want progress to be the servant and not the master of man.
>
> We do not intend to live—in the midst of abundance—isolated from neighbors and nature, confined by blighted cities and bleak suburbs, stunted by a poverty of learning and an emptiness of leisure.
>
> The Great Society asks not only how much, but how good; not only how to create wealth, but how to use it; not only how fast we are going, but where we are headed.

The most dangerous phenomenon in American life today is social and political lag, a lag between what the world requires and what our political institutions are willing to provide.

Our purpose must be to build a world in which technological innovation and efficiency are not ends in themselves. Our purpose is to blend them to the cause of human freedom, intellectual excellence, perfection of the community and full employment of our talents and skills.

The promise in the Employment Act of job opportunities for all those able and willing to work has not yet been fulfilled, the President stated in his economic report.

The test of government of, by, and for the people is how well it responds to the challenge of providing a gainful role for every citizen. The bill I introduce today is designed to achieve that end.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the Record there be printed, an article entitled "Two Economic Reports: Canada and the United States," by Gerhard Colm of the National Planning Association; a column by J. A. Livingston, financial writer for the Philadelphia Bulletin entitled "Nation's Spirit Gets a New Uplift" which appeared in the Washington Post on Sunday, March 21; an article from Business Week of March 6 entitled "Changing Rules of Growth"; and an editorial from the March 1 Washington Post entitled "The Challenge of Growth."

There being no objection, the articles and editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the National Planning Association, February 1965]

Two Economic Reports: Canada and the United States

(By Gerhard Colm, NPA chief economist [1])

With the coming of the new year, the economic goals and prospects of Canada and of the United States were subject to a thoroughgoing review on both sides of the border. The comparison between the Annual Review published by the Economic Council of Canada under the title "Economic Goals for Canada to 1970" and the U.S. Economic Report of the President highlights both the differences and the similarities of the two varying approaches.

ECONOMIC GOALS FOR CANADA

The Economic Council of Canada has submitted its first Annual Review. Canadian statutes prescribe specifically that the council examine the prospects, "potentialities," and policies for medium- and long-term growth of the Canadian economy. This report represents the first Canadian attempt to provide the annual systematic and comprehensive look into the future prescribed by law. In 1956, a 25-year projection was published by an ad hoc royal commission (Gordon report), but it was only in 1963 that the legislature set up the council and gave it the duties, among others, of recommending national economic policies related to economic growth; studying the effects of technological change and automation on economic growth and employment; discussing with representatives from industry and other private groups "what specific plans for production and investment in major industries * * * will best contribute to a high and consistent rate of economic growth"; studying regional economic problems; and encouraging cooperation between labor and management in the promotion of economic growth.

The council consists of 28 members. Of this number, three are professional, full-time "directors," one of whom serves the council as chairman. The remaining 25 members (including eight members of the Private Planning Association of Canada) serve on a part-time basis; they are leading representatives of primary and manufacturing industries, commerce and finance, organized labor, and consumers and are drawn from all regions of Canada. A staff of specialists provides support work for the group.

The council projects a potential annual rate of growth in real output, i.e., measured in constant prices, of 5½ percent for the period to 1970. Such a rate would be considerably higher than that actually accomplished for 1956–62, although about the same as that for the period for 1949–56.

The 5½-percent rate of growth suggested in the report is a target—a calculation of the potential—and not a best-judgment forecast. That this is a target rate is perhaps emphasized by the increase it represents over the 3-percent rate of growth experienced since 1956. The review points to the acceleration of total labor force growth and, even more dramatic, to the increase in numbers of young workers, as pushing potential above that of postwar years. Productivity was depressed over the past 7 years for many and varied reasons (some of which were short term), and there are a number of factors—such as accelerating research and technology and an increasingly skilled labor force—which will be more favorable to productivity gains in the future.

Other goals beside economic growth are recognized by the council. Full employment, which is defined as no more than 3-percent unemployment, has a special meaning in an economy which in 1958–62 had an average of 6.7-percent unemployment, substantially higher than in other industrially advanced countries. The 3-percent rate is called a realistic objective for 1970 but is not considered an ultimate goal. Reasonable price stability is a second goal. A third goal is expressed in terms of the widest participation in economic growth with respect to both regions and economic groups. A viable balance of payments is also of particular concern because of the importance of external factors to the Canadian economy. In regard to the balance of payments and growth as goals, expansion of world trade, especially in primary commodities, and sustained economic growth of the United States are prerequisites. The difficulties of obtaining these goals is not underestimated and the possibility of conflict between the goals and their means of achievement is given serious consideration.

The projections are expected to be used as guides for government policies and as benchmarks for business managers and labor leaders. In addition to the aggregate growth rate, the council examines the expectation and prospects for consumer expenditures, public and private investment, international transactions, and government expenditures; a possible pattern of demand by these sectors which would be consistent with the "potential" total output is sketched for 1970. By setting forth the pattern, the council does not intend that its review be substituted for planning in government or the individual sectors, but urges that the review be used as a framework within which more specific analysis can be undertaken.

The council outlines in a very broad way the implications for policy in regard to expenditures, taxation, and other economic policies believed to be needed to realize the various goals. Government expenditures (all levels of government) are projected as increasing by 5 percent per year in constant prices. The largest rates of increase are in foreign aid, transportation, health (publicly sponsored health insurance is not assumed until after 1970), and education. Only a slight percentage rise is anticipated in defense and in defense-related expenditures; this is a fairly important factor in keeping the total government expansion at a moderate rate. The increase in government revenues—at present tax rates—is projected at a somewhat larger rate than the increase in expenditures. Therefore, a budget surplus would be expected if actual output reached its potential by 1970. Since the council desires a "combination of levels of tax rates and expenditure programs which would yield a rough balance if the economy were operating at potential output," a recommendation follows combining some future tax reduction with the increase in expenditures. The council also appeals for public and private efforts to enhance productive efficiency and increased competitiveness of Canadian industry, for responsible restraint in both wage demand and business pricing, and for private long-range planning of business investment outlays.

COMMON GROUND

In basic approach there is much in common between the Canadian Review and the U.S. Economic Report of the President.

Both reports use the concept of the production gap. Conventional business-cycle analysis and economic-stabilization policy were concerned with the periodic ups and downs in economic activity. Restraining the boom and mitigating recessions were the objectives. The trend—the average rate of growth—was expected to take care of itself. In recent years, the emphasis has shifted. The major concern is now with economic growth. This requires a new method of measuring the primary task of economic and fiscal policy. The answer was the construction of a curve depicting the economic potential and contrasting it with the actual development for the past and prospects for the future, assuming continuation of present economic and fiscal policy. The difference between the two curves is the production gap; the objective of policy is to narrow this gap.

Chart I, based on the Canadian Review (1964) and the U.S. Economic Report (1965), depicts the gap for the recent past. In both cases, the charts show the narrowing of the gap since the 1960–61 recession but also the short fall from potential that still remains.

For the next 5 years, the Canadian Review projects a potential rate of growth in real terms of 5½ percent per year. The U.S. Economic Report uses for recent decades a potential rate of growth of 3.5 percent, for the present a rate of 3¾ percent, and for the next 5-year period a rate of 4 percent per year, possibly somewhat more thereafter. The rate is rising because of increased additions to the labor force and more rapid productivity advances. To compare the Canadian 5½ percent potential rate of growth with the 4 percent for the United States, three points should be considered. First, the Canadian potential rate of growth is measured from an actual base year 1963 to a target year 1970. The U.S. rate is measured from the present potential to a potential in 1970. If the U.S. rate of growth were measured in the same way as the Canadian, it would not be 4 percent but 4.6 percent. Second, the Canadian concept of potential output assumes 3 percent unemployment, but for the United States reduction to 4 percent is assumed as an interim goal. Third, the expected relative increase in the labor force, high in both the United States and Canada in contrast with Western Europe, is still higher in Canada than in the United States (see chart II—chart not printed in the Record).

Both reports use the concept of the full employment budget and the theory of the so-called fiscal drag. The actual course of revenues, expenditures, and the resulting surplus or deficit is partly determined by (a) the conditions of the economy, as when relatively low income and high unemployment result in low tax revenues and high unemployment compensation payments, and (b) policy decisions to step up programs or reduce tax rates in order to activity influence the level of economic activities. In order to examine the influence of budget policies on the economy, fiscal changes can best be measured in terms of a full employment budget. In a full employment budget the revenues are estimated as if income and profits were at the level of full resource utilization (unemployment not more than 4 percent in the United States and 3 percent in Canada), and the expenditures are similarly estimated.

---

[1] Assisted by Carol S. Carson.

Given full employment in recent years, the U.S. Federal budget would have consistently shown a surplus, although the actual course of events produced a deficit in most of these years. When coupled with the actual level of expenditures, these deficits were the result mainly of individual and corporate income being lower than their potential, thereby producing smaller tax revenues. Only last year did tax cuts substantially reduce the surplus on a full employment budget basis. These tax cuts are credited by the Economic Report with direct or indirect responsibility for the faster pace in economic activities and the narrowing of the production gap (see chart III—chart not printed in RECORD).

Both the U.S. Report and the Canadian Review assume that with economic growth full employment revenues have a tendency to increase faster than expenditures, thereby preventing income and profits left after taxes for consumption and investment from increasing as fast as the economic potential. This acts as a constant, built-in drag on the economy—the so-called fiscal drag. This theory leads both groups of advisers to recommend that in the course of economic growth it is possible and necessary to increase Government programs and to reduce tax rates in the same period.

DIFFERENCES IN EMPHASIS

The mandate for the Canadian Council requires emphasis on the intermediate- and long-term future. Other agencies of the Government and the central bank are concerned with the short-run prospects. The Employment Act of 1946, which established the U.S. Council of Economic Advisers, is vague on the timespan to be covered. The emphasis of the U.S. Economic Report, judging from the number of pages allocated, is still on the review of the past and the outlook for the immediate future. The U.S. Report gives a forecast for this year's GNP—$660 billion as the midpoint of a $10 billion range with only little promise of improvement in the rate of unemployment. The President's Economic Report does, however, look at the immediate problem in the perspective of the longer run future. The official report of the President, which largely has the purpose of urging early congressional action on administration proposals, naturally emphasizes the near-term outlook, while a nonpolitical advisory report of the type produced in Canada also naturally emphasizes the longer term outlook if for no other reason than in order to avoid the political controversies of the day. The Canadian Council justifies its emphasis, however, on a more basic premise. They say: "It is desirable to avoid excessive preoccupation with short-term cyclical behavior, and to attune policy more consistently to longer term views of basic economic conditions and trends, and to reduce uncertainties regarding general economic policies. * * * Steady economic growth is the best way to avoid recessions."

Nothing in the U.S. Economic Report would contradict this statement. Although a growth-supporting policy is the best way to reduce the probability of a recession, one can never be sure that it will be fully successful. Adoption of the best fire-prevention policy should not be an occasion for getting rid of the fire engines. The U.S. Report properly makes recommendations for readying policies to be used in case of a downturn. This has no counterpart in the Canadian Review. The U.S. Report also makes some interesting qualitative observations concerning the longer run prospects. It believes that the changing age structure of the American population will generate increasingly rising consumer demand and that technological development will induce increasing investments. Therefore, a strengthening of demand in the private sector is expected, lessening reliance on the contribution of fiscal policy in support of economic growth.

For the period to 1970, the Canadian Review not only posits the rate of potential growth, but depicts the 1970 target in quantitative estimates for consumption, investment, international transactions, and government budgets. Moreover, staff studies published under the auspices of the Canadian Economic Council give even greater detail on output and investment potentials. Such estimates are believed to be of greatest usefulness for business planning. The American counterpart presents no such estimates.

DIFFERENCES IN ORGANIZATION

The differences in the character of the reports result in part from the differences in the character of the Councils themselves.

In the United States, the Council is an advisory staff of the President. It is located in the Executive Office of the President and its three members are appointed by the President with the consent of the Senate. The Economic Report is the President's report even though it is prepared with the assistance of the Council; its recommendations are the President's recommendations. The Council's own report only provides background analysis and fills in details. The Canadian Council is also set up by the federal government, but it is not part of the government machinery. Indeed, the three full-time members are given 7-year contracts purposely to remove them from politics. The Canadian Council thus must sell its report and recommendations to the Government on the basis of merit.

The Council in Canada includes, by statute, persons who are representative of all sectors and regions of the economy. In this first report, all members signed the report without dissent, so that all signers assume responsibility for the contents. By thus drawing all groups into the deliberation, it is hoped that the document will have greater force and appeal in influencing decisions in the private and public sectors.

The Canadian law provides for a scope of activity more similar to the French idea of planning than to that in the United States. The semi-independent organization of the Council in Canada, however, is quite unique. It is similar to some proposals debated in the United States during the deliberation of what became the Employment Act of 1946; namely, setting up a semi-independent economic council reporting to both the President and the Congress.

Might such a semi-independent, nonpolitical organization with membership drawn from all economic groups be more effective for the United States than the present setup? I believe not. First, under the American presidential system, the President should have full responsibility for the recommendations on economic and fiscal legislation submitted to the Congress and for the economic and fiscal policies of his administration. He needs advisers directly in his own office. This does not deny the usefulness of outside advice, but I doubt that the semipublic structure of the Canadian Council would be compatible with the presidential system in the United States. Second, I believe that the separation of advice on short-run prospects, on the one hand, and medium and long range, on the other hand, may lead to difficulties. The immediate policies should be nothing but a step in the direction of the longer run. Third, I am not sure that a report of the character of the Canadian document would find unanimous support by professional economists, business leaders, labor leaders, and others from both parties in the United States. Such a document would be of little use if all controversial material had to be removed in order to obtain unanimity. Fourth, the Employment Act of 1946 authorizes the U.S. Council to set up advisory committees of business, labor, consumers, and State and local governments. Advice of such groups has been obtained from time to time. However, more could be done than has been done thus far to make the representatives of the private sector partners in the process of policy formulation.

Nevertheless, the fact remains that the character of the U.S. Economic Report as an official presidential statement places certain restaints on it which are absent in the Canadian system. This explains why under the American system there is need for private organizations which represent business, labor, and professional groups to take leadership in providing planning guidelines until they become a generally accepted routine which can be taken over by government.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1965]

BUSINESS OUTLOOK: NATION'S SPIRIT GETS A NEW UPLIFT

(By J. A. Livingston)

President Johnson has done something for the young generation. He has aroused the sympathy of men for men, of the well-off and well-educated for the not-so-well-off and poorly educated. Beatnikism is yielding to the therapy of purpose.

There is no telling what the economic consequences will be. A ground-swell progress is possible.

The grand design of the Great Society did not begin with Johnson. John F. Kennedy captured the mood in the 1960 presidential campaign when he promised to get the country moving again. He documented his aspiration in the 1962 Economic Report to Congress.

The President permitted his Council of Economic Advisers, then headed by Walter W. Heller, to chart the deficiency of the Nation's industrial effort—the gap between potential and actual output of goods and services, and what it would take to close it.

This graphic portrayal of deficiency has been repeated in every Economic Report since. Thus, the 1965 report indicates that if manpower and machines had been more fully utilized in 1964, if the unemployment rate had been only 4 percent of the labor force instead of 5 percent the gross national product (GNP) would have been $649 billion, not $622 billion.

The Nation, according to the chart (not printed in RECORD), operated at 90 percent of potential, a far better record than in early 1961, when the country was just emerging from the 1960 recession. Then the shortfall (at an annual rate) was 9 percent.

In the immediate months ahead, economic momentum and psychology could further narrow the gap. Expectations are changing. The widely accepted 1965 forecast "first-half up, second-half also up, but not so fast," is tilting higher. Says the latest Morgan Guaranty Survey: "There are emerging hints of greater underlying buoyancy * * * than was projected in most year-end business forecasts."

Sure, strike-charged activity in autos and steel has accelerated production. The Federal Reserve Board index advanced to a new high, 138.8 in February, as against 138.1 in January and 128.2 in February a year ago. Nevertheless, an 8-percent gain in 12 months is a notable achievement.

Even more important, capital outlays of corporations on plant and equipment are expected to increase 12 percent this year. The confidence multiplier is at work, providing jobs, increasing demand for raw materials, adding to consumer buying power. This should make up for the sag (and then some) in housing starts, which in February were at an annual rate of 1,422,000 compared with the abnormally high rate of 1,650,000 a year ago.

President Johnson has lifted minds above the immediate. He has rejuvenated America's tired sense of destiny. In his civil rights address to Congress, he could utter words which, were the Nation in a different mood, would be described as corny: "I want to be the President who helped feed the hungry and to prepare them to be taxpayers instead of taxeaters. I want to be the President who helped the poor to find their own way."

His war on poverty has directed young hearts away from the materialistic outlook of the organization man.

Now youngsters parade, argue over free speech, join the Peace Corps, go to homes of underprivileged families to tutor youngsters whose parents have no educational background, and have a sense of social opportunity: Being their brothers' helpers.

As an example, 4,500 persons quickly joined the Volunteers in the Service to America—VISTA. Reward: Subsistence in an underprivileged home and a sense of mission. This was no downy 9 to 5 stint with opportunity for advancement. It was rugged living—24 hours a day in a strange, impoverished environment.

The American economic miracle has been characterized by ever-expanding consumption, ever rising living standards for a larger and larger portion of the population. President Johnson is using an old formula but with new force. He hopes to accelerate this historic process.

He is, in a sense, hothousing the growth of the middle class through education and example. This will enrich all families, corporations and stockholders. Yes, even the Government, by creating more taxpayers.

And in the process, we could close the gap between achievement and potential.

[From Business Week, Mar. 6, 1965]

Changing the Rules on Growth: Brookings Study Says Gains in Equipment Efficiency Make Fastest Expansion Possible

Observers of the current long business upswing can't help feeling that there has been a fundamental change in the way the U.S. economy works.

The growth rate has stepped up to 5 percent per year—measured in real terms. Yet wholesale prices remain stable; unemployment clings close to the 5 percent mark; industry still operates without pressure developing upon capacity; and capital spending shows a tendency toward slow decline as a percentage of total national output.

The underlying factor that has made this remarkable performance possible is better capital equipment—that is, capital equipment that produces more output for a dollar's worth of investment.

The evidence: That's the major conclusion that emerges from a new Brookings Institution study, "Investment Demand and Economic Growth," by Bert Hickman.

The Hickman study shows that in 1948, a dollar's worth of capital invested in plant and equipment produced, on the average, 72 cents worth of output a year. By 1957, a dollar's worth of capital stock was yielding an annual output of 85 cents. And in 1962—the last year for which Hickman provides an estimate—$1 in capital stock was yielding 92 cents in output. All these figures are stated in terms of constant dollars. Thus, from 1948 to 1962, the real increase in the productivity of capital equipment was 28 percent.

Of course, that figure represents the average gain for the entire economy. The gains in the productivity of capital differed widely from industry to industry.

Way up: For example, in the chemical industry, the productivity of $1 worth of capital in 1948 was 68 cents; by 1962, this had risen to $1.35—a 99 percent gain. In nonautomotive transportation—mostly airlines—the gain was from 98 cents in 1948 to $2.70 in 1962, a 176 percent rise. Public utilities climbed from 14 to 25 cents, a 79 percent increase.

By contrast, the productivity of a dollar invested in railroad equipment and stock rose only from 21 cents in 1948 to 22 cents in 1962, a 5 percent gain. Rather strikingly, the gain in the productivity of the machinery industry, as estimated by Hickman, was also only 5 percent over the 14-year period. But this may reflect the high productivity already achieved in that industry in 1948, when $1 worth of stock of equipment yielded an annual output of $2.38; by 1962, this figure had reached $2.50.

Since the annual output of a dollar's worth of capital varies so between industries, it's inevitable that the average productivity of plant and equipment for the entire economy will vary over the years as the product mix of the capital stock shifts. For instance, an economy investing heavily in computers may get more extra efficiency per dollar than one investing chiefly in steel rails and box cars.

Thus, prior to World War I, when the bulk of investment was in railroads, public utilities, and heavy capital goods, the annual output that could be produced by a dollar's investment showed a declining trend. Since World War I, with the continuous shift toward highly efficient machinery, productivity of capital has been climbing.

I. WHAT THIS MEANS

For the individual company, increased productivity of capital obviously means lower costs—and a chance to boost profits. For the whole economy, it means faster growth in the potential output—that is, faster growth in what the economy is capable of producing if its capital and labor resources are fully utilized. But this does not necessarily mean that the economy will actually grow faster in any given year or period. If the management of the economy is clumsy or wrongheaded, this faster growth in potential output may cause economic stagnation.

Hickman shows in great detail that the increasing productivity of capital played a major role in the sluggish growth of the U.S. economy during the 1957–62 period. Because demand for the growing total potential output of the economy was not strong enough, unemployment increased, excess capacity grew, and this slowed the rate of capital spending. The result was the "inbetween years" that marked the end of the Eisenhower administration and the start of the Kennedy administration. The period ended when bolder fiscal policy—especially the big 1964 tax cut—strengthened demand for what the more efficient U.S. economy was fully capable of producing.

Bold policy needed: Hickman believes that a continuing increase in the efficiency of capital goods will create a need for bold fiscal policy through the rest of this decade if the economy is to operate close to full employment.

He reasons that, given the growth of the labor force and of productivity, the economy will have to grow by about 4 percent a year, if it is to avoid an increase in unemployment. Consumption has been growing approximately parallel to the growth of the entire economy. But, because of the increasing efficiency of capital, plant, and equipment, spending has been growing more slowly than the total economy. In fact, Hickman estimates that a full-employment course to 1970 would require capital spending to grow only one-half as fast as gross national product. If these trends continue, some other major component of GNP—such as residential construction or Government spending—will have to grow faster than GNP, in order to offset the relative decline in capital spending.

Assuming that the economy was approximately at a full employment level in 1964 and will stay fully employed for the rest of the decade, Hickman's projections indicate that capital spending would decline from 9.4 percent of GNP in 1964 to 8.2 percent in 1970, a decrease of about 13 percent.

Old problems remain: Hickman argues that the future will repeat the problems of the past 7 years. Looking back, he says that it was theoretically conceivable that the offsetting factor to declining capital spending in 1957–62 could have been residential construction or inventories. But he believes this would have been unlikely under the conditions prevailing then. He concludes that only an active, stimulative budget policy would have put the economy on a stronger growth trend.

During the 1957–62 period, Federal tax rates and spending were such that the budget would have run surpluses ranging from $4.5 billion to $12.1 billion, if full employment had been attained. Those potential surpluses would have been too great a drag for private sectors of the economy to overcome, as Hickman reads history. Only by a combination of higher Government spending and a big tax reduction, he holds, could the drag have been reduced and businesses and the whole economy have reaped the benefit of higher rates of capital efficiency.

II. LOOKING AHEAD

Hickman's view is that stimulative fiscal policies—implying frequent budget deficits—will be needed from now to 1970 to keep the economy on a full employment growth path. He does note that one possible way to make it easier to attain and maintain full employment would be to reduce the rate of private savings—and to shift toward higher rates of growth in private consumption.

But neither Hickman nor other economists raising this possibility think it likely to happen—presumably because the percentage of disposable income that consumers save has been remarkably stable at around 7 percent. This saving habit promises to continue into the future, and doesn't seem to be much affected—except for short-run interludes—by changing tax rates.

Some chance: Yet there is a chance that the savings ratio may slip lower as a result of consumers' own decisions. This has happened before. According to studies by Harvard's Simon S. Kuznets—the leading authority on past longrun savings and investment trends in the U.S. economy—individuals saved about 11 percent of disposable income in the last quarter of the 19th century, and about 9 percent of disposable income during the non-war period between 1900 and 1930. The 7 percent rate is only about a generation old.

Moreover, since young families save a smaller percentage of their income, the shifting age distribution of the U.S. population—which is getting younger as it grows—may reduce the savings ratio below the 7-percent average.

Another possibility: There's also a chance that the current trend of climbing productivity per dollar of capital investment will reverse itself. That, too, as Kuznets' studies show, has happened before. Though this appears unlikely in the few years between now and 1970, it could happen in the longer run—possibly as a result of shifts toward heavy investment in areas such as atomic energy or new urban transportation systems. Kuznets, in fact, concludes that the U.S. longrange problem is likely to be undersaving, rather than oversaving, relative to investment needs.

For the near term, however, the Hickman study will tend to support the school of thought that thinks either more Government spending, or more tax cuts, are essential to keep the economy growing at high-employment rates.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 1, 1965]

The Challenge of Growth

Economic growth is a double-edged sword. While it confers immediate benefits in the shape of goods and services, it also poses challenges for the future to which a viable society must respond. One of those challenges, that of providing gainful employment for a burgeoning labor force, is delineated in projections for the years 1970 and 1980 recently published by the Department of Labor.

The labor force—those working or actively seeking work—now numbers 76 million. By 1970, assuming a continuation of current economic and demographic trends, it should rise to 86 million, and by 1980 the addition of 15 million more entrants will bring the total up to 101 million.

Of the 9 million persons who will enter the labor force by 1970, one-half are expected to be young workers under the age of 25. Since great difficulties are now being encountered in finding employment for inexperienced workers, the Labor Department projections suggest that a redoubling of efforts to provide adequate training and a rapidly expanding economy are imperative. An average of 1.5 million jobs must be created merely to absorb the new labor force, and we shall have to do much better than that in order to offset the effects of increasing productivity.

FLIGHT BY ASTRONAUTS VIRGIL GRISSOM AND JOHN YOUNG

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, Tuesday, March 23, was indeed a proud day for America.

Astronauts Virgil Grissom and John Young successfully orbited the earth three times in their Gemini III spacecraft, the Molly Brown.

This historic flight holds great import for the future. The fact that the astronauts were able to control the flight of the spaceship was significant. Gemini III was flown forward, backward, and upsidedown in its flight of 4 hours and 54 minutes, preparing the way for rendezvous missions to be performed at a later time. These maneuvers introduced a new era of manned flight in space.

I was proud to join our Vice President and six Senate colleagues—Senators MONRONEY, CANNON, HOLLAND, FONG, PROUTY, and JORDAN—as well as Members of the U.S. House of Representatives, not only to witness the flight, but to have a chance to inspect the Apollo project and to talk with the scientists, technicians, and workers who implement America's space program.

The blast-off and the entire flight was an awesome spectacle.

One is keenly aware of the courage and the skill of the astronauts, and we are proud, indeed, that our own Major Grissom is the only man ever to have ridden twice in a spaceship.

Our visit and inspection tour of Launch Complex 39 at the Kennedy Space Center's 88,000-acre spaceport on Merritt Island was breathtaking.

Complex 39 was designed for the lunar Apollo Saturn V vehicle—the one that will land a man on the moon. A vehicle assembly building is being constructed here, to be the world's largest structure in terms of volume, stretching over 525 feet in the Florida sky. It will accommodate four Apollo Saturn V vehicles simultaneously in vertical position.

The launch vehicle and Apollo spacecraft will be assembled on a massive mobile launcher over 400 feet tall and weighing 10,600,000 pounds.

When the launch vehicle and the Apollo spacecraft are completed, they will be moved by a vehicle known as the crawler-transporter over a 3-mile, specially built roadway designed to support loads of approximately 18 million pounds.

Thousands of dedicated engineers, scientists, technicians, and support personnel at Cape Kennedy, in Government, and in industry are laboring ceaselessly to achieve many firsts in man's conquest of space for peaceful and scientific purposes.

Their accomplishments confirm the total acceptance of the immense challenge of space exploration.

I commend these dedicated Americans for their impressive contributions to the space era, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to continue their support of the space program.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD without being read, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The promise of America is opportunity for our people. It must therefore be a matter of concern to all Americans when any of our fellow citizens is denied the chance to build a full life for himself and his family.

Yet this is the condition of life for millions of our fellow citizens in areas of distress scattered across the continent.

At a time of instant communication and swift transport it is difficult to realize how varied are the regions of this country. Abundance and opportunity, progress and hope are, however, not evenly spread over the land. The same diversity of conditions which contributes to the richness of our society and culture, also bears with harsh inequality on those in stricken stretches of America.

A wide array of programs and weapons has been called into action to make sure no American is denied opportunity because of his race, or lack of education, or the poverty of his birth.

As our people more fully realize their human potential, we must be sure that the economic potential in all areas and regions is also realized. Indeed, in order to be fully effective, education programs, health programs, the programs of the war on poverty, and many other activities require complementary efforts to promote sound economic conditions and the proper physical environment.

Opportunity should not be closed to any person because of the circumstances of the area in which he lives.

Moreover the distress or underdevelopment of any part of the country holds back the progress of the entire Nation. This has been one of the great lessons of the last 30 years. Region after region from the Deep South to the Far West has been brought into the mainstream of our economic life. The consequence has been increased vitality and strength, not only in those areas whose resources had been previously underemployed, but for the Nation as a whole. Nonetheless, much remains to be done.

A growing nation cannot afford to waste those resources, human and natural, which are now too often neglected and unused in distressed areas. We cannot afford the loss of buying power and of national growth which flow from widespread poverty. Above all, we cannot afford to shut out large numbers of our fellow citizens from the fulfillment of hope which is shared by the rest. For that would be the denial of the promise of America itself.

The troubles and the potentials of depressed areas which contain approximately 27 million people vary widely. They are scattered across almost every section of the country. But they share certain common characteristics.

Nearly always their population growth is well below the national average, and often it is declining. Large areas in Illinois, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and elsewhere have lost more than 20 percent of their population in the last decade, while America as a whole was increasing its numbers by almost as much.

This pattern of decline is a symptom of economic distress. For in these areas employment and income are far below the national average. Unemployment rates of 10 to 15 percent are not uncommon. In dozens of counties more than 50 percent of all families have annual incomes of less than $2,000.

Worst of all, the distressed area is usually caught in a web of circumstances which block progress and lead to further decline.

Young people are forced to leave school earlier to help support their families, thus depriving themselves of needed skills and knowledge. Many young people must leave families and homes behind them in search of greater opportunity, stripping the area of badly needed skill and energy. Older men and women tend to stay on, clinging to the communities and friends which have been part of their lives and which enrich their existence.

As income goes down, these areas are less and less able to support schools, hospitals, and other public facilities needed to train their people and otherwise equip them to meet the demands of modern life. They are often too poor to provide the public structures—from roads to water—needed to attract new business and new jobs. The result is a steadily mounting toll in human poverty and retardation of the Nation's progress.

To break this downward spiral, to restore vitality and forward motion to America's distressed areas, I recommend a program of area and regional economic development—focused upon the economic needs of distressed areas and aimed at providing the conditions which can lead to growth. This program will be based primarily upon the experience of the accelerated public works program, the Area Redevelopment Administration, and the Appalachian Regional Development Commission.

The economic development of distressed areas, like that of a nation, is an enormously complex process. It requires work and cooperation from both public and private enterprise. It requires partnership between officials at every level of government—local, county, State, and Federal. It demands attention to a wide diversity of development needs—from improved transportation and water supply to industrial incentives and public facilities. It means that the varied resources and abilities of each region must be harnessed in a concerted effort to build a solid economic base for increasing industry, bringing with it more jobs and higher income.

In this effort we build upon the invaluable experience of the experimental area redevelopment program carried on for the last 4 years.

First, ARA has shown that helping businessmen to expand or to build new plants, coupled with financial assistance to provide needed public facilities, can produce new jobs.

As of January 31, 1965, the Area Redevelopment Administration had approved 548 projects of which over 300 were in rural areas. These projects have and will assist in the creation of over 115,000 jobs. According to a recent study, more than three out of every four persons now working on ARA-assisted projects were not working full time prior to their present jobs. All of these jobs were in new, expanded, or restored facilities.

Second, ARA has shown that the cost to the Government of creating these jobs is less than the cost of supporting these workers and their families through public assistance programs.

It has been estimated that, taking into account all outlays, the average nonreturnable one-time cost to the Federal Government for each job is about $800. More than this is saved in not having to pay unemployment compensation and welfare benefits to persons employed as a result of ARA activities. The cost is made once—the benefits continue as long as the jobs last.

Third, ARA has shown that people in our communities will work together in economic self-help programs.

Under the area redevelopment program, more than 1,000 local committees have been formed to work on overall economic development programs. Some of the programs are producing dividends without any other Federal aid whatsoever.

Fourth, ARA has shown that counties can be advantageously grouped together to promote cooperation on problems of mutual economic interest.

Under the area redevelopment program some 75 multicounty programs have been approved. The counties of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, for example, are tackling common problems with their own regional organization called UPCAP. The counties of southeastern Ohio are jointly organized through Ohio University to assist in the growth of local industries. Northeastern Pennsylvania is working under the leadership of Wilkes College to plan and carry out an areawide economic development program.

Drawing on this past experience we can now move ahead with a long-range program of area and regional economic development to assist in restoring economic health to distressed areas of America.

BASIC PRINCIPLES

Under the new program three basic principles will guide our action.

First, we will devote maximum effort to providing the conditions under which our private enterprise system can provide jobs and increased income. It is up to private business to take advantage of improved conditions for making profits by expanding present businesses or starting new ones, thereby increasing opportunity for the people of the region.

Second, no Federal plan or Federal project will be imposed on any regional, State, or local body. No area will be declared distressed by Federal decree. No economic development district will be designated unless the State and local people want it to be designated. No plan will be approved unless it also has the approval of State and local authorities. No programs or projects will be originated at the Federal level. The initiative, the ideas, and the request for assistance must all come to Washington, not from Washington.

Third, the Federal Government will seek full value from every dollar spent or loaned under this program. Every proposal will be tested to see if it offers substantial promise of increasing economic development commensurate with the Federal funds involved. Only if a project meets this test will it be approved. Over the years the increased economic activity stimulated by this program will return its cost many times to the Federal Treasury.

ORGANIZATION FOR DEVELOPMENT

A key feature of this new program is the proposal to group together distressed counties and communities in economically viable development districts. Planning and assistance will concentrate on the needs of the area as a whole, as well as on individual counties and towns. Moreover, for planning many programs it makes sense to work in terms of larger regions encompassing in some cases parts of two or more States.

This is merely the recognition of a simple fact. Neither distress nor the potential for development respects State, county, or community boundaries. The economies of many areas are an organic whole. Just as many counties have declined together, they must advance together if they are to advance at all.

For individual counties and communities are often not capable of individual growth. Their industry must draw upon workers from other areas, and this means educated and trained workers must be available. Factories in communities in other counties can offer employment and rising income to their people. Large-scale public facilities can be built most economically if they are designed to serve the needs of a large area. Many other Federal programs, such as assistance in the construction of hospitals, can be carried on more effectively if they are consistent with a genuine, regionwide program of development.

Often places which are not themselves in distress can with help and stimulation provide new jobs for the people of a surrounding distressed region.

Grouping counties together will permit assistance to be concentrated on those communities and industries whose rapid development offers the most hope for all the people of a region.

Thus we hope to work with regions which contain all the components of economic advance, unhampered by rigid boundaries.

The new organization for development will have four main components:

First, redevelopment areas: The counties and labor commuting areas which are the basic units of the region, and where employment and income figures reveal conditions of distress and provide a measure of progress.

Second, economic development districts: Organizations of distressed areas—generally multicounty in nature—which will work together on common problems and can sustain economic growth once the development process is started.

Third, action planning commissions for regions: Multi-State regions where comprehensive, long-range economic planning can be carried out by joint Federal-State Commissions, to solve economic problems too large or difficult to be dealt with on a local basis.

Fourth, economic development centers: The places where resources can be most swiftly and effectively used to create more jobs and higher income for the people of the surrounding area. These centers may or may not themselves be distressed. Successful development is frequently easier to achieve when a number of activities are located in a single community large enough to offer the advantages which flow from size itself. Clusters of industry tend to attract other industry. And such clusters offer the prospect of increased economic activity and improved economic health of the entire area.

To implement this design for development I recommend that the Secretary of Commerce be given authority to: First, designate redevelopment areas on the basis of data relating to unemployment or income; second, work with States to organize multicounty economic development districts; third, include in such districts economic development centers not otherwise eligible for designation as redevelopment areas; and fourth, invite and encourage States to establish multi-State regional action planning commissions to prepare long-range action programs to improve the economic growth of the region.

This program, national in scope, is intended to aid those areas most in need of assistance throughout the country. Accordingly, it is necessary to provide objective criteria to determine those areas qualified for assistance under the program, and thus the bill contains measurable standards for eligibility based on either unemployment or median family income statistics. Qualifying unemployment data would be the same as in the Area Redevelopment Act. In addition, counties could qualify if the median family income is less than 40 percent of the national median.

Indian areas would be designated after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior.

When there has been a sudden plant shutdown or closing of a military installation, the Secretary would be authorized to designate areas for assistance if he determines that the area can be expected to become eligible within 3 years unless assistance is provided.

The program will contain standards which insure that aid is concentrated on areas of real need, and that it is being distributed on an objective basis.

INSTRUMENTS OF DEVELOPMENT

Our experience with various forms of assistance under ARA and the accelerated public works program has shown us ways to improve our techniques and our tools for providing economic growth.

DIRECT GRANT PROGRAM

I recommend a direct grant program for development facilities related to economic development and matched at 50 percent of the cost of the project. In addition, because of the long-term economic depression in many of the depressed areas, I am recommending authorization of supplementary grants to help the most needy communities to meet their matching share of Federal grant-in-aid programs. Additional Federal assistance up to 80 percent of the net project cost would be made available to communities unable to take advantage of regular Federal programs because of their inability to raise the required local share. These supplemental payments to needy communities would be limited to programs assisting in the construction or equipment of development facility projects, including those eligible for 50 percent grants under this proposed legislation.

An annual authorization of $250 million for grants for development facilities and supplemental payments is being requested.

LOAN PROGRAMS

The existing ARA program of loans for land, building, machinery, and equipment has provided loans at 4 percent interest, of up to 65 percent of the cost of the project for industrial or commercial facilities. As of January 31, 1965, 396 projects have been approved under this program amounting to an investment of $173 million in ARA funds.

Private capital has participated with the Federal Government to a great extent in these projects. All told, approximately $127 million has been invested in these projects from all non-Federal sources, of which some 300 private banking institutions have invested more than $40 million.

Nevertheless, we need to do more to encourage greater utilization of private capital in redevelopment projects. To this end, I propose that the Secretary of Commerce be authorized to reimburse approved borrowers 2 percentage points of the cost of interest to them for up to 10 years on money borrowed from private institutions for expansion or establishment of plants in redevelopment areas in accordance with the development programs.

This proposal will stimulate greater use of private capital in recovery and development. Moreover, it avoids tying up large blocks of Federal funds over long periods of time. The Federal Government's share of these new contracts during any one year would be limited to $5 million. This would facilitate and encourage $250 million of private investment annually in depressed areas.

I am also recommending that authority be granted to guarantee working capital loans up to 90 percent. These guarantees would be available to supplement other financial assistance under this program.

The present ARA program of low-cost 40-year loans for development facilities would be continued largely unchanged under the new program.

These direct loans and loan guarantees would be available to firms where their activities promise to create increased long-term employment.

An annual authorization of $170 million is recommended for a revolving fund, which would include direct loans for commercial and industrial facilities, loans for development facilities, and reserve for working capital guarantees.

The present requirement in the Area Redevelopment Act that State or local public agencies provide 10 percent of the cost of industrial projects, and that local investors must wait until the Federal loan has been entirely repaid before receiving repayment of principal, has worked a hardship on many needy communities. Accordingly, I am recommending that this requirement be reduced to 5 percent of the project cost and that repayment be concurrent with repayment of the Federal loan. In exceptionally needy cases, the Secretary of Commerce would be authorized to waive the 5-percent requirement. However, in no case will there be a waiver of the requirement that at least 15 percent of the total project cost be invested as equity or on a lien subordinate to that of the Federal investment.

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE

It is not enough to simply help finance projects. These projects must be part of a comprehensive plan to build a viable economy. To do this we must provide technical assistance and encourage the formation of development organizations large enough to hire trained people to prepare comprehensive plans and carry them out. For these purposes, I am recommending the following new types of assistance:

Grants and technical assistance to regional action planning commissions to enable them to prepare long-range regional economic development programs within the context of overall industrial, transportation, recreation, and other natural resource planning. An annual authorization of $15 million is proposed for this purpose.

Grants and technical assistance to multicounty economic development districts for formulating overall economic development plans.

Additional Federal grants of 10 percent for development facility projects which are part of an approved district development plan, as a special incentive to encourage communities to work together.

Federal grants and loans for designated economic development centers in order that economic development districts will have resources sufficient to sustain their growth.

For the last two purposes I am recommending an authorization of $50 million. To allow ample time for the States to prepare well-thought-out action programs, no projects would be approved under this authorization until 1 year after enactment of the legislation.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

This enlarged and redirected program of economic development will be administered by the Department of Commerce, which has also been responsible for the existing experimental program. The legislation I am proposing would create the position of Economic Development Administrator in that Department. The functions and powers of the existing Area Redevelopment Administration would be transferred to a successor organization to be created by the Secretary of Commerce to administer the new act.

Many other Federal programs also can contribute to the economic development of distressed areas. It is essential that these programs be closely coordinated to make sure resources are used with maximum effectiveness in reaching the common goal of a higher standard of living for the people of these regions. Therefore, I have directed the Secretary of Commerce to work closely with interested departments and agencies in achieving a coordinated Federal effort. It is especially important that this effort be carried forward in close cooperation with the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The antipoverty program will help people improve their ability to obtain and hold a job. This program is designed to increase the number of jobs available to those who want to work. Obviously both efforts are essential to the future growth of distressed areas. I intend to see that they work closely together toward the common objective.

CONCLUSION

There are three important things to remember about this program. First, it is designed to extend opportunity to those now deprived of a full chance to share in the blessings of American life. As such it has a call upon the moral conscience of every citizen.

Second, it will benefit all Americans. The experience of the last 30 years has shown conclusively that the increasing prosperity of any region of this country increases the prosperity of the Nation. We have truly become a national economy. Higher incomes for the people of Illinois or Arkansas mean increased markets for automobiles from Detroit and steel from Pittsburgh. Poverty in one area slows progress in other areas.

Third, the job can be done. We have the resources and the skill to extend American abundance to every citizen and every region of this land. This program will help give us the instruments to match our determination to eliminate poverty in America.

The conditions of our distressed areas today are among our most important economic problems. They hold back the progress of the Nation, and breed a despair and poverty which is inexcusable in the richest land on earth. We will not permit any part of this country to be a prison where hopes are crushed, human beings chained to misery, and the promise of America denied.

The conditions of our depressed areas can and must be righted. In this generation they will be righted.

Lyndon B. Johnson.

The White House, *March 25, 1965.*

AREA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT TITLE

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the Senate has just received the President's message on area and regional economic development. In this message, he has made recommendations which are focused upon the economic needs of distressed areas, and directed at providing the conditions which can lead to growth and to improvement of the towns and counties in which the people of these areas want to maintain their residence.

I welcome the recommendations of the President, and I am pleased to note that he has based these recommendations primarily upon the experience of the accelerated public works program, the Area Redevelopment Administration, and also the Appalachian Regional Development Commission, which helped develop the Appalachian bill the Congress enacted this year. I know that the committees of both the House and Senate will give careful consideration to these proposals, and I want to comment only briefly on the main points made in the message to the Congress.

As one who has spoken and voted for the accelerated public works program, I am glad that a program of direct grants for 50 percent of the cost of constructing public facilities related to economic development is included in the message. More importantly, the request for an annual authorization of $250 million for this program, including a provision for greater assistance for communities whose financial condition makes them unable to raise the required local share, would place this program on a regular basis—a procedure I have long urged to meet the needs in many areas of our country that want to work to share in the economic growth and affluence of the rest of the Nation.

The request for an annual authorization of $170 million for a revolving fund which would provide loans for commercial and industrial facilities, for connected public facilities, and for working capital guarantees, is one which deserves close study by the Congress. In addition, the new recommendations for authorizations of funds for technical assistance on a multicounty basis, and in connection with the full development of regional resources, are proposals which I know the committees will review carefully.

The ARA program has been one which has stimulated enterprise and created jobs in many parts of our country, but it has also had its problems which have been recognized as the agency developed its experience to meet different needs in different sections of our country. I hope that attention will be given to these proposals, to a study of the accomplishments of the program since its beginning in 1961, and to the need for revisions and improvements which many of us have urged in the Senate for many years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Harris in the chair). What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROPOSED CUT IN SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE BUDGET

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a crisis which is developing in the Nation's vital soil conservation efforts. I speak of the administration's proposal to cut $20,130,000 from the Soil Conservation Service budget for 1966, and to establish a revolving fund to absorb this loss.

The dominant conservation problem on the non-Federal rural lands today is soil erosion. A recent study made by the Department of Agriculture—the "National Inventory of Soil and Water Conservation Needs"—reveals that conservation problems are inadequately treated on 62 percent of the country's cropland, 73 percent of non-Federal pasture and range, and 55 percent of non-Federal forest and woodland.

Great strides, however, have been made in recent years toward developing proper conservation practices. In the forefront of these efforts has been the Soil Conservation Service. Of particular importance has been the technical assistance provided by the Service to the individual landowner in helping him to plan and develop conservation practices.

It is proposed to cut funds for these technical services from the budget and to substitute in its place a revolving fund. This would force soil conservation districts, or individual landowners and operators, to pay to the Service up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance furnished.

Mr. President, this proposal will seriously jeopardize water resource development in this country. We are not moving fast enough in this area now. We need more funds, not less. I believe that the revolving fund plan is unworkable and can lead only to a decline in proper conservation practices. Districts unable to offset the $20 million would be forced to reduce proportionately the technical staff providing assistance.

In Indiana, for instance, the impact of the budget cut would be severe. More than $230,000 would have to be raised each year to maintain the program at present levels. About 70 man-years of technical time would be lost without the funds.

Perhaps this budget cut is proposed as an economy measure. Action to reduce Government spending is laudable in many instances, but here we have a clear case of false economy. By failing to fund this relatively small cost for valuable technical know-how, we will bring about enormous dollar losses in soil, crops, water and wildlife.

The problem of water resource development and land management is national in scope and affects every one of our citizens. We cannot expect the small landowner to bear the entire burden of conservation costs. He already pays a percentage of construction costs and all of the maintenance costs. It should be recognized that urban people, too, benefit significantly from a balanced watershed development. Urban residents want unpolluted streams, recreation areas and attractive countrysides. The public interest requires an increase—not a decrease—in funds for these purposes.

I urge every Senator to study this problem carefully and to join me in opposing any effort to reduce or hinder our land and water conservation programs.

GENERAL SCHRIEVER ON COMPUTER SYSTEMS

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, a speech on the use of computers in the Air Force, which operates more than 500 of them as the heart of its systems management program, recently came to my desk. It was written by Gen. Bernard A. Schriever, commander of the Air Force Systems Command, and was given at the 11th Annual Data Processing Conference of the American Management Association.

Because of the importance of data processing and because of the contents of General Schriever's remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have the address printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Evolution and Challenge of Systems Management

It is a distinct pleasure to take part in this conference on "Management and the Computer." I see from the program that the computer portion of your conference has been covered by the speakers and panelists who are experts in data processing and management information systems. I would like to discuss the management aspect, drawing specifically on the Air Force experience in managing the largest military development program in the Nation's history—the ICBM.

Let me begin with a few observations about the place of the computer in the management picture. Military requirements, of course, have greatly stimulated the pace of computer development. Today the Air Force operates more than 500 computers. They are at the heart of many of our systems, especially command and control systems. They enable us to perform tasks that would be simply impossible without them.

It seems to me that the new challenges to computer systems and designers and those which constantly face management are similar in at least two ways:

First, the computer, like the management approaches we adopt, must be placed in its proper perspective in our way of life. It must be fitted into our free enterprise system. Among other things, it will be measured by its contribution to our national economy and to our industrial base.

Second, the computer, like any other resource, must be capable of supporting decisionmaking in the most economical and effective manner. It must be competitive among other alternatives.

Simply stated, my view of the computer in management is that it should assist top management in making better big decisions. A misuse of the computer is to use it to participate in all decisions. I think this kind of misuse often occurs because the computer is still a mystery to much of the top management. Too many specialists and interpreters get into the act—in the so-called software area. We must work toward computer systems which will allow the manager and the computer to communicate directly, and we believe that technology can provide this capability.

The Air Force faced the same challenges in managing the ballistic missile program. We not only needed to take full advantage of the free enterprise system, and find the approach which best supported the decisionmakers, but we also needed to make fullest use of our valuable scientific, technological, and industrial resources. I believe that the lessons we learned remain valid today and for the years ahead.

At the outset of the ICBM program in 1954 we faced two categories of problems—one which involved technology and one which involved management. A committee of prominent scientists advised us that both categories of problems could be solved, but that each demanded a special approach. Our success in solving the technological problems is a matter of record. The extent to which that success depended upon the evolution of management needs to be better known.

During the late 1940's and early 1950's the management problems associated with weapon systems acquisition had been relatively simple. We could normally start by designing a basic aircraft and then install the "black boxes," such as communications equipment, radar, armament, and other more or less off-the-shelf items. In short, our approach involved straightforward engineering. A systems engineering approach carefully integrating the various subsystems was not necessary.

But the ICBM required a whole new dimension of management. It involved a whole variety of technical problems, which often had to be solved simultaneously. The overall task—from initial concept to the deployment of the missiles in operational sites across the Nation—was unprecedented in size, cost, and urgency.

We had the military resources, the scientific resources, the industrial resources, and the manpower to develop this radically new weapon system. But we needed to find the way to harness these resources effectively—to weld them into an effective instrument that could meet the urgent challenge facing the Nation. This was primarily a challenge to management, and the challenge today is not too different from what it was 11 years ago.

Should we meet this challenge by trying to achieve a rapid buildup of Air Force in-house resources, at the cost of many millions of dollars for Government facilities? This is the traditional "arsenal" approach. There were two compelling reasons for rejecting it. First of all, it ran directly contrary to the Air Force philosophy of drawing directly on the Nation's vast scientific and industrial resources. Secondly, and more important, this approach would not allow us to rapidly attract, motivate, and employ all the outstanding scientists, engineers, and managers who were needed.

What was the alternative? After consulting leading scientists and industrial executives, the Air Force decided to reaffirm its basic philosophy of employing the total resources in the scientific and industrial community.

Immediately we faced the question of how to organize and manage this effort. A review of both Government and industrial capabilities revealed that no single organization had sufficient expertise in all the technical fields involved in developing the ICBM. This fact led the Air Force to adopt the concept of an associate contractor team working directly with the Air Force. This concept permitted the Air Force to have a direct contract with each of several major specialized contractors, thus taking advantage of the specialized capabilities available and making possible closer management control.

Because of the size and complexity of the ICBM program it was necessary to form a separate and independent organization to perform the critical function of systems engineering and technical direction (SE/TD). This is a unique discipline which requires an extremely high degree of competence. The associate contractor approach, together with the use of the independent SE/TD group, insured that we made use of the outstanding talent of the Nation, whether in government, industry, or the universities. In addition, the associate contractor structure provided competition in both cost and technical excellence.

The success of this approach is now a matter of record. In spite of the fact that the ICBM program was a pioneering effort on a scale never before attempted and involved a whole new dimension of technical complexity, it succeeded beyond all expectations. The range, payload, and accuracy of today's ballistic missiles far exceed the most optimistic predictions. Furthermore, they were developed ahead of schedule.

We were able to achieve these results through a management approach in which we carried on a number of activities concurrently. These activities included development, test and evaluation; establishment of a logistic system; training of people; construction of technical and operational facilities; and production. If these had been done in sequence, the leadtime for the total system would have been much longer and the overhead costs would have been greater. Thus the concurrency approach made it possible to save both time and money. This latter advantage is not always recognized.

Obviously some degree of concurrency is involved in the development of any major weapon system, but this does not always or necessarily mean concurrency in technical development. I want to stress this point. Concurrency has often been taken to mean stretching the state-of-the-art, but this is not the case. Technology is only one element of the total system acquisition. Depending on circumstances, we can take an approach involving high technical risk, as with the ICBM, or low technical risk, as with the C–141 jet transport or take an approach somewhere in between. But in each case concurrency is involved in the system acquisition cycle.

We must always use judgment in employing this management concept, as we must in employing any management concept. It is simply not possible to take a single management approach and say, "This is the only way to develop a new system." Rather, our approach should always be appropriate to the task we have to do—considering the size, the cost, the urgency, and technical risk involved, and other relevant factors.

This brings me to a second consideration which has affected the evolution of systems management, and that is the constant challenge to shorten the time cycle for systems development, while at the same time making maximum use of the potential of technology. This problem is not unique to the military. To the businessman it might take the form of the following two questions: Do we want to use today's technology and hardware to build a product that may be equal to or perhaps marginally superior to our competitor's products, but which is available relatively soon? Or do we want to assume a certain risk and build a product which will require some new technology but which will be definitely superior to the products our competitors are building?

To translate these questions into the language of military systems development, the first approach might be called the use of "hardware building blocks." The second would then be called the use of "technological building blocks."

Each of these approaches has certain advantages and certain drawbacks. The use of hardware building blocks minimizes the technological and economic risks, but at the same time it introduces the real risk of early obsolescence. This may not only be dangerous from a military point of view, but may actually cost more money in the long run. The use of technological building blocks, on the other hand, involves technical risk, but it was this approach which enabled us to create today's superior ballistic missile force in time to meet the Soviet ICBM challenge. Future challenges may very well demand that we follow the same approach. With today's broad spectrum of technology and its continuing evolution, there is no doubt that technical superiority is combat superiority.

We must strive to attain the best balance between hardware and technological building blocks, between concurrent and sequential activities, and among the often conflicting considerations of time, cost, technical risk, and operational requirements. We can attain this balance only if we remain clear about the results we need to achieve.

The most important result of this evolution in Air Force management is the strategic superiority which our Nation enjoys today. But there are also a number of substantial side benefits. Let me mention a few of them. First, by relying on the total resources to be found within the scientific and industrial community, we have avoided the buildup of a multibillion-dollar Government network of facilities. Second, we have encouraged and maintained a strong, competent, up-to-date industrial base composed of all areas of technical endeavor. Third, we have insured that healthy industrial competition is always available and flourishes in such specialized fields as guidance, propulsion, reentry vehicles, and so forth. In this way we have not only contributed to building the industrial base for our national space program but have also fostered numerous commercial applications of new technology.

Thus the management approach which evolved in the ICBM development effort not only achieved its objective of creating a superior missile force, but at the same time provided a direct input to the national economy. This fact is worth noting, because we live in an age when neither the military nor the economic aspects of national security can be considered in isolation. Our objective must be superior military strength and a strong economy; both are essential to our overall national security.

Effective SE/TD is still an essential part of system management. We have found that the best way to remove any question as to the complete objectivity and impartiality of the systems engineering/technical direction contractor is to assign the SE/TD function to a nonprofit, nonhardware producing organization. Furthermore, the use of the SE/TD contractor is selective. Where the technical complexity and the systems integration problems do not require unusual capability across the broad spectrum of scientific disciplines, we follow the more traditional methods of systems acquisition.

The challenges of the future will certainly call for further innovations to cope with the complex and demanding tasks ahead of us. These innovations are not to be feared, but welcomed. I do not believe that we shall ever reach a perfectly static set of management procedures, any more than we will ever prevent technology from moving ahead. Contrary to what some people may say, technology has not reached a "plateau." Actually it continues to move forward rapidly, and we must work to keep our technological leadership. We must maintain the technological superiority that is the key to national security. Our management practices must be geared to encourage this superiority.

This is the challenge facing all of us. It is clear that computer technology will make possible far-reaching changes in management. In only a few years it has already had a significant impact on the way we do business—both in the Government and in industry.

We must make sure, however, that the tail does not begin to wag the dog. The goal of management is not merely to evolve toward more complex and more involved methods of procedure. Its objective is not just some theoretical model of completeness and efficiency. Quite simply, its only aim is to get the job done—with speed, effectiveness, and economy. Furthermore, it must enable us to do the job within the framework of our democratic goals and values.

This is the principle which the Air Force has followed in its development of systems management. It has frequently led us to evolve new concepts, and we have not been afraid to depart from tradition. I think the results fully justify this approach, and I am certain that it will be required to meet the challenges of the future.

PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, in a very short time, the President will have submitted proposed agricultural legislation for consideration by Congress.

Every year, I receive considerable mail, and a volume of telephone calls and telegrams, directed to questions or suggestions concerning farm programs—ranging from how to make them better to how to get rid of them entirely. I am certain that all Senators enjoy a similar experience.

I have been struck by certain facts and considerations that run through these letters, and which recur in meetings and discussions I hold with various groups and delegations. These are items, incidentally, that are evident each year when farm legislation is considered.

There is still a high level of misunderstanding between various segments of the urban and rural populations. It is not clearly recognized by all that their ties are close, that interrelationships are continuous and vital, and that even in this age of specialization each is wholly dependent upon the other.

These are not alien worlds. While certain facets of the daily mode of life may vary, both segments assume and carry responsibilities that would be meaningless without the other. The occupational skills and workload of the farm, urban or city dweller may be extremely different but each needs the expertise and help of the other to survive.

The efforts and output of each are inexpugnably entwined in the national welfare. A metropolitan and industrial nation, no matter how strong, could be reduced to a second-rate power, even a debtor nation, without a continuous and even flow of wholesome food supplies. A nation dominated by agricultural interests could only fail to reach its maximum capabilities in growth and outlook.

This Nation has been blessed with a strong and responsive agriculture, and with a viable industrial and business complex. The interests, activities, benefits, and burdens of each blend together.

Six million American workers are needed to supply the farmer with tools, machines, materials, and services for food and fiber production. Farmers bought $41 billion worth of goods and services in 1963—$29 billion for production supplies, and $12 billion for services.

Ten million workers transport, process, manufacture, and sell farm goods. In 1961, manufacturers of food products alone had 1.7 million employees and a payroll of $8.4 billion.

With ever-increasing efficiency, the American farmer now produces enough food for himself and 31 others. We spend only about 19 percent of our take-home pay for food. Britishers spend about 29 percent, Russians 40 percent or more.

Many a factory worker lives in a rural community or is a part-time farmer; many a farmowner lives in town or is a part-time factory worker. Many a farmer enters the business world when he retails his product, sets up his own processing operation, or becomes a stockholder in an allied industry. Many a city dweller has an interest in a family farm or is a gentleman farmer who receives the benefits of commodity and conservation programs.

Examples of the interrelation of rural and urban interests are many and varied. To deny an interdependence is to beg the issue. To misunderstand this fact brings forth criticism from urban interests that are not wholly merited by the farmer. It brings forth indignation from the farmer that should not be directed specifically to the city dweller.

One thing is certain, however: Without an abundance of food, and the means and services to move it to market, both rural and urban consumers would be paying high and premium prices for many a commodity, and a disastrous spiral of inflation would be started.

The second fact that emerges is that, as with no other segment of our economy, agriculture is the least equipped to bring its individual or cumulative production into line with demand so that farm income reflects an equitable return on investment. In no other segment of the economy is there less consensus on how to meet the problem.

Agriculture speaks with a babble of voices. Each commodity group seemingly considers itself a separate entity and evidences little consideration for the others—although their mutual aims are basically the same. Within each commodity group are the divergent interests of producers and the allied interests—the processors, manufacturers, mills, and what-have-you. Add to this a general distrust by geographical regions, and muddied waters only become darker.

Also, it is apparent that, all claims withstanding, no agricultural group or organization—and certainly no national farm association—speaks for agriculture.

Considerable criticism has been voiced about the complexities of commodity programs. The farmer in Indiana, who for the most part has diversified operations, is particularly sensitive on this point—and I suggest rightly so. But I suggest also that any legislation adopted by the Congress is mandated by the very condition it reflects. Until clear and simplified mandates are received from within agriculture, then the legislation that agriculture seeks can only meet the many and diverse claims that it makes.

A third point is that price support programs, initiated by the Congress in the public interest and for the national welfare, have been tarred by some with the black brush of handout to the point that this type of subsidy, if it is a true subsidy, has been distorted to a caricature of its basic meaning.

The concept and intent—in fact, the reality—of price-support operations is that of dollar and cent values placed upon eligible commodities which reflect a minimum fair value to the farmer only when, and if, he places that commodity under loan. Price-support programs do not guarantee a profit to any farmer.

The accumulation of commodity stocks by the Government that began to become burdensome and costly during the 1950's—and with certain commodities at the present time—can be attributed primarily to the aversion within agriculture to place restrictions upon yield. Of what value are general acreage restrictions when yields per acre for all the major commodities are annually surpassing previous records?

Be that as it may, the fact remains that those portions of farm programs that may be considered subsidy-type operations are not limited to agriculture in our economic system. They are unique only in that they are the most open to public scrutiny and the most susceptible to criticism.

I believe that it should be borne in mind, too, that commodity programs are not outright payments for mere services rendered. They are basically loan programs, in which a specified commodity is pledged as collateral. Takeover by the Government occurs when the loan is defaulted. Land diversion and retirement features of farm programs are predicated upon conservation principles which protect our national resources. All are designed to meet a definite need at minimal cost—not only for the farmer but also for all taxpayers.

For those individuals and groups interested in farm legislation, I would commend, and recommend the reading of "Farm Programs and Dynamic Forces in Agriculture," which was prepared by the Legislative Research Service of the Library of Congress and transmitted to the Committee on Agriculture and

Forestry, U.S. Senate. This document was ordered to be printed and appears under date of February 4, 1965, 89th Congress, 1st session.

I find it interesting to note in this detailed and objective report that, in the absence of price-support programs in the years 1961–65, net farm income would have declined by one-half, to about $6 billion a year. In addition to some $6 billion annual losses in farm income, farmers also would have experienced decreases of several billion dollars a year in farmland values—rather than the increases which occurred.

It is also interesting to note in connection with these observations that similar conclusions were reached by study groups of Iowa State University, Pennsylvania State University, and Oklahoma State University.

It is possibly true that, as charged, certain inequities may exist in present price-support legislation—that many benefits accrue to the larger operators, that the higher productive farm units use support programs as a hedge for their overproduction, and that the smallest farm units are not given sufficient legislative protection and incentive.

If these charges are true, then I believe that due consideration should be given to realining support mechanisms so that the national interest is served to the fullest.

The fourth point is that considerable interest has been created over proposed rural development programs and in connection with resource development programs. These are needed and long-awaited proposals. Many benefits have already been derived. Many added benefits will undoubtedly be forthcoming.

However, I suggest that, insofar as our basic concern is for a strong agriculture, we do not get the cart before the horse—and relegate the growing of crops to a mere contingency of rural affairs.

The reason for being of a farmer—large or small—is to grow a needed commodity at a profit which will assure an adequate and even flow of food and fiber to market, and at a fair price to the consumer.

A strong rural America, with an aggressive rural development, rests firmly on a sound and progressive onfarm economy.

The farmer needs to avail himself of all that is part and parcel of our high standard of living. Rural America needs to avail itself of all the advantages and incentives that are encompassed in the principles of the Great Society.

But a clear line of understanding must be maintained between those programs directed primarily at increasing the purchasing power, and the bargaining power, of the farmer and those designed solely to supplement these programs, or as vehicles to aid those farmers forced off the land for want of income.

A fifth point is that I find it paradoxical and tragic that the Department of Agriculture should become the whipping post for so much undue criticism. As the saying goes, "It is flayed if it does, and peeled if it does not."

I make the point that many harsh evaluations of the Department are due to misunderstandings of its role and function.

Perhaps no other department of Government administers so many programs that affect consumers. Certainly, this Department is second to none in its day-to-day concern and efforts to protect and to further the national interests.

A sixth and final point is that the value of agriculture has been downgraded and the image of agriculture has become blurred. I am afraid that much of the fault lies within agriculture itself.

Many within agriculture are now voicing concern that changing population trends, the growth of metropolitan areas, and the increased representation from urban areas will have an adverse effect on agricultural legislation. There is concern that the voice of rural America will be lost in the hurly-burly sounds of megalopolis and that the votes will be cast only on the basis of urban interests versus rural need.

I suggest that this is a false and shortsighted view. I have not supported all farm legislation proposed, but it was not because those city people I represent recommended that the farmer be written off the books.

Whether or not farm legislation as presented this year is acceptable to the majority of the Senate remains to be seen. It will be neither accepted nor voted down, however, on the simple basis of rural vote against urban vote. It will be considered on its merits, and on the basis of fact, need, and feasibility as presently known.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. **ALLOTT**. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXPORT SALES OF CATTLE TO ITALY

Mr. **ALLOTT**. Mr. President, a short time ago Mr. Joseph McCaffrey, in television comments, spoke about the cattle industry. The substance of it was that the Secretary of Agriculture is about to deprive the United States of what had been building into a lucrative cattle export business, at a time when this country is desperately in need of increased overseas trade.

The problem is that the cattle must have health certificates, and as Mr. McCaffrey points out:

> The health certificate now provided by the Department of Agriculture contains spaces for 16 head of cattle on a single sheet of paper. When a shipment of 500 heifers or cows is exported to Italy, they may be sold to as many as 500 individual buyers. Each cow must have a certificate to accompany it. If the health certificate has 16 head of cattle on it, it makes it extremely difficult to complete the resale in Italy. In fact, at times some of the sales have fallen through in Italy because of the inability of the broker to provide the proper health certificates for an individual cow.

Mr. President, this is merely a question of administration. Italian buyers have asked—even pleaded and said they would pay the cost of printing the individual certificates—and yet all of their urging is to no avail because Washington smugness and bureaucracy keeps them from furnishing a certificate for each head of cattle which would go into Italy.

Under date of March 17, I wrote a letter to the Secretary of Agriculture asking about this problem. As yet I have heard nothing from him on the subject, either by way of explanation or as to whether a correction will be made.

In this day when we are so concerned about the price of our livestock and the sale of livestock, and when many times it has been said on the floor of the Senate and other places that we have an overpopulation of cattle, that we have too many cattle in this country, and that fact leads to depressed prices, it seems rather paradoxical that we could not get a reconsideration of this matter, which is merely administrative, in the Department of Agriculture, in order that we might continue the export of our cattle and other livestock to Italy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Mr. McCaffrey's remarks together with a copy of the letter I wrote to the Secretary of Agriculture on March 17 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TELEVISION COMMENTS OF JOSEPH MCCAFFREY

A government worker becomes a bureaucrat when he becomes inflexible.

This inflexibility, which is setting in with Agriculture Secretary Freeman, is about to deprive the United States of what had been building into a lucrative cattle export business. And at a time when this country is desperately in need of increased overseas trade.

Italian buyers have been buying cattle along the east coast and shipping them back home. But because of the inflexibility of the Department of Agriculture, the buyers are about to transfer their activity to Canada.

This is the problem. The cattle must have health certificates. The health certificates now provided by the Department of Agriculture contain spaces for 16 head of cattle on a single sheet of paper.

When a shipment of 500 heifers or cows is exported to Italy, they may be sold to as many as 500 individual buyers. Each cow must have a certificate to accompany it. If the health certificate has 16 head of cattle on it, it makes it extremely difficult to complete the resale in Italy. In fact, at times, some of the sales have fallen through in Italy because of the inability of the broker to provide the proper health certificates for an individual cow.

The Italian buyers have pleaded; they have even said they will pay the cost of printing the individual certificates.

All to no avail. Washington smugly tells them it is impossible; that one cow cannot be listed on one piece of paper.

President Johnson, instead of curtailing the travel of schoolteachers in Europe this summer, might help the balance of payments if he talked to the Department of Agriculture.

Canada, by the way, has told the Italian shippers they are willing and eager to supply one certificate for each animal.

MARCH 17, 1965.

Hon. ORVILLE FREEMAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On a newscast last night, I heard a report that the United States has lost, or is about to lose, a sizable amount of export sales of cattle which have been going to Italy. The report says that the Italian buyers have commenced negotiations with Canadian exporters.

The particulars, as explained on the newscast, are that the Italian buyers are in a cooperative purchase arrangement, so that one individual purchaser may receive only one or two animals, although the cattle were shipped in lots of 100 or more. Many of the cattle are resold in Italy by the buyer, and a USDA inspection report is required for the resale. For that reason, the buyers would prefer that only one animal be listed on the USDA form used for inspection of export cattle. However, the USDA form has space to list 16 head. The Agriculture Department personnel concerned with the inspection took the position that they absolutely could not issue individual inspection reports, but that 16 animals had to be listed where there were 16 spaces on the form. Result: the Italians are going to purchase the cattle they want from Canada rather than from us.

I would appreciate having from you a detailed explanation of the situation described and confirmation or denial of the allegation that the Italian purchasers have turned to Canada for their further purchases. The report is almost incredible, particularly in view of the efforts by our cattle producers to increase exports, and I would like to have your side of the story.

Sincerely yours,

GORDON ALLOTT,
U.S. Senator.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously enterd, until Monday, March 29, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 24, 1965:

IN THE ARMY

The following officer, presently on the temporary disability retired list, for reappointment to the active list, as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, and as temporary major general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 1211, 3442, and 3447:

Maj. Gen. Hobart Hewett, O12328, U.S. Army.

IN THE NAVY

Rear. Adm. Edward E. Grimm, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy for a term of 3 years.

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 25, 1965:

THE JUDICIARY

The following-named persons to be Assistant Attorneys General:

Fred Moore Vinson, Jr., of Maryland.

Edwin L. Weisl, Jr., of New York.

Lawrence Gubow, of Michigan, to be U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Michigan for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 16, 1965.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

John G. Adams, of South Dakota, to be a member of the Civil Aeronautics Board for the term of 6 years expiring December 31, 1970.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

James J. Wadsworth, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for the unexpired term of 7 years from July 1, 1964, vice Frederick W. Ford, resigned.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

Carl E. Bagge, of Illinois, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 22, 1967, vice Harold C. Woodward, deceased.

Charles Robert Ross, of Vermont, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission for the term expiring June 22, 1969. (Reappointment.)

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be captains

John C. Phillips
Robert C. Darling
Miller J. Tonkel

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

John L. Sweeney, of Michigan, to be Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Sam Zagoria, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring December 16, 1969, vice Boyd Leedom, term expired.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT

Stanley R. Resor, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of the Army, vice Paul R. Ignatius, resigned.

IN THE NAVY

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Bernard F. Roeder, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 25, 1965:

DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY

Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to be Secretary of the Treasury.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Right Reverend Protopresbyter, Nikolaj Lapitzki, Whiteruthenian (Byelorussian) Greek-Orthodox Church of St. Euphrosynia, South River, N.J., offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

All generous God, the source of justice, on this day commemorating the anniversary of independence of Byelorussia, we humbly bow our heads and pray that Byelorussia and all other captive nations may soon receive a new birth of freedom.

Almighty God, the source of kindness, bless and instruct the leaders and legislators of the United States of America, so that they would arrive at the decisions which would lead to peace and freedom for all mankind.

O, Almighty God, the source of love, shorten the days of misunderstanding among nations, and give peace and your blessings to all the people on the earth. Thou art the Saviour and Protector, and we glorify Thy name today and shall forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following date the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

On March 24, 1965:

H.R. 45. An act to amend the Inter-American Development Bank Act to authorize the United States to participate in an increase in the resources of the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank.

RECEPTION FOR ASTRONAUTS GRISSOM AND YOUNG

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Speaker, I wish to extend to all Members an invitation to attend a reception in the caucus room of the Cannon Office Building tomorrow afternoon at 5 o'clock, for the two astronauts who have just so successfully flown through outer space.

The two astronauts, Virgil Grissom and John Young, will be there.

Unfortunately, we must limit the invitation to Members of the Congress and their immediate families. Consequently, we cannot allow the members of the congressional staffs to attend because there are so many people who want to see the astronauts that I am afraid Members of Congress would not have that opportunity.

I urge you to be present. I know there will be business on the floor but we are going to try to arrange it so that we can get off the floor in time to see these men who have made such a great contribution to space science and to the honor and dignity of our country.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I am not sure that my question should be directed to the gentleman—maybe it should be directed to the Speaker—but for the benefit of Members who are interested, do I correctly understand that there will also be a joint meeting of the Congress?

Mr. MILLER. No.

Mr. COLMER. I read that in the press.

Mr. MILLER. No, there will not be a joint meeting.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. YOUNG. We all agree that the American space achievements in the last few days have been nothing short of fantastic. We know a great many contributions have gone into the entire space effort. We know the great contribution that has been made by the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House and its great chairman, the distinguished gentleman from California.

FILING OF REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL FOR 1966

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report on the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for 1966.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. REIFEL reserved all points of order on the bill.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 48]

Ashbrook
Bonner
Brock
Clark
Dent
Dickinson
Everett
Frelinghuysen
Green, Oreg.
Hébert
Howard
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Martin, Ala.
Toll
Tupper
Widnall

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 414 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

REORGANIZATION OF BUREAU OF CUSTOMS, DEPARTMENT OF THE TREASURY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 125)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Government Operations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

All that we do to serve the people of this land must be done, as has been my insistent pledge, with the least cost and the most effectiveness.

In my state of the Union, I announced it was this administration's intention to "reshape and reorganize" the executive branch. This goal had one objective: "to meet more effectively the tasks of today."

I report today now one step taken forward toward that goal as part of our progress "on new economies we were planning to make."

I submit today a plan for reorganization in the Bureau of Customs of the Department of the Treasury.

At present the Bureau maintains 113 independent field offices, each reporting directly to Customs headquarters in Washington, D.C. Under a modernization program of which this reorganization plan is an integral part, the Secretary of the Treasury proposes to establish six regional offices to supervise all Customs field activities. The tightened management controls achieved from these improvements will make possible a net annual saving of $9 million within a few years.

An essential feature will be the abolition of the offices of all Presidential appointees in the Customs Service. The program cannot be effectively carried out without this step.

The following offices, therefore, would be eliminated: collectors of customs, comptrollers of customs, surveyors of customs, and appraisers of merchandise, to which appointments are now required to be made by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Incumbents of abolished offices will be given consideration for suitable employment under the civil service laws in any positions in Customs for which they may be qualified.

When this reorganization is completed, all official and employees of the Bureau of Customs will be appointed under the civil service laws.

All of the functions of the offices which will be abolished are presently vested in the Secretary of the Treasury by Reorganization Plan No. 26 of 1950 which gives the Secretary power to redelegate these functions. He will exercise this power as the existing offices are abolished.

The estimate of savings that will be achieved by the program of Customs modernization and improvement, of which this reorganization plan is a part, is based on present enforcement levels, business volume, and salary scales. Of the amounts saved, approximately $1 million a year will be from salaries no longer paid because of the abolition of offices.

The proposed new organizational framework looks to the establishment of new offices at both headquarters and field levels and abolition of present offices.

This result in a net reduction of more than 50 separate principal field offices by concentration of supervisory responsibilities in fewer officials in charge of regional and district activities. In addition to the 6 offices of Regional Commissioner, about 25 offices of District Director will be established. The Regional Commissioners and District Directors will asume the overall principal supervisory responsibilities and functions of collectors of customs, appraisers of merchandise, comptrollers of customs, laboratories, and supervising customs agents.

At the headquarters level, four new offices will be established to replace seven divisions. A new position of Special Assistant to the Commissioner will be created and charged with responsibility for insuring that all Customs employees conduct themselves in strict compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. Up to now this function has been one of a number lodged with an existing division.

After investigation I have found and hereby declare that each reorganization included in Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965 is necessary to accomplish one or more of the purposes set forth in section 2(a) of the Reorganization Act of 1949, as amended.

It should be emphasized that abolition by Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965 of the offices of collector of customs, comptroller of customs, surveyor of customs, and appraiser of merchandise will in no way prejudice any right of any person affected by the laws administered by the Bureau of Customs. The rights of importers and others, for example, before the Customs Court, arising out of the administration of such functions will remain unaffected. In addition it should be emphasized that all essential services to the importing, exporting, and traveling public will continue to be performed.

This reorganization plan will permit a needed modernization of the organization and procedure of the Bureau of Customs. It will permit a more effective administration of the customs laws.

I urge the Congress to permit Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1965 to become effective.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 25, 1965.*

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2362, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2362, with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] had 1 hour and 4 minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ayres] had 1 hour and 11 minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Bray].

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, we are faced again with an urgent appeal to provide broad-scale Federal aid to education. Once again the pleas are heard that if massive Federal aid is not provided our school systems will be unable to meet the coming needs, and our Nation will suffer from an increasing educational lag.

Mr. Chairman, there are many of us who have heard this cry raised repeatedly in previous years. I remember that the demand for Federal aid to education reached its peak in the mid-1950's. At that time we were told that the school population would rapidly increase as a result of the postwar baby boom and if Federal aid was not provided our State and local governments would be unable to meet this need. Anyone who does not recall the urgent tone of those appeals and the dire threats which were made can quickly return to the congressional hearings and debates of 10 years ago and see what I mean.

A majority of the Congress remained unconvinced and the Federal aid programs proposed at that time were never enacted. It is important to ask, "What has happened to our public schools in the past decade?"

The record of the 10 years between 1954 and 1964 reveal a truly remarkable progress in the field of education. To meet rapidly exploding needs the forces of our educational and governmental units throughout the land responded with great vigor and responsibility.

True to the estimates of that time, public school enrollments increased by 42.8 percent during this decade. To accommodate these millions of new students the number of classrooms rose 57.6, percent thus permitting a reduction in the average number of pupils per classroom from 30.5 to 27.6.

During the same period the total teaching staff increased 55.4 percent thus allowing a reduction in the number of pupils per teacher from 26.0 to 23.9.

Financing these tremendous increases in school plant and operating expenditures was not easy, but it was accomplished upon the initiative of parents and taxpayers throughout the land. Total public elementary and secondary school expenditures increased by 134.5 percent. The current expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance increased by 50 percent.

This was not done at the sacrifice of teachers' salaries for they were increased by 61 percent.

I would like to point out that in each of these indexes of school need and performance the increase in percentage terms has been much greater than the 42.8-percent increase in enrollment.

I do not deny that the problems were great, but the excellent performance of our schools in meeting the needs demonstrates that it can be done without Federal aid.

The projected increase for the next 10 years is only 15.2 percent. Surely if we met the 42.8-percent increase in the last decade we need hardly believe that the needs of the next 10 years are of a critical nature or by themselves justify massive Federal aid.

Once again the proposals for Federal aid seek to give the most to those areas which have done the least to help themselves in meeting school needs.

The proposed Federal aid to education bill is to the distinct disadvantage of Indiana. Indiana's citizens have been paying high taxes to build and support their schools for many years, and that is as it should be. However, in recent years Indiana has been losing a great deal of industry with payrolls amounting to millions of dollars to States which pay less taxes than we do. These States have been using their low tax rate as a bait to entice industry away from Indiana, and I regret to say that this has been successful.

Thirty-five States in the Union will receive higher benefits per capita under this bill than will Indiana. Allow me to point out a few examples: Indiana will receive $4.89 per capita under this bill: Alabama will receive $10.42 per capita and Mississippi $13.28. This will only encourage and help these States in their drive to get Indiana industry to move to their State, enabling them to keep their tax rates low by giving them a Federal subsidy.

Yes, Indiana will get $23 million under this bill, but Hoosiers will pay far more than that in taxes to benefit other States.

Why does not this bill give to each State the same assistance per capita or give to each State a percentage of the Federal taxes paid in that State? The reason this is not done is that there would be no Federal bureaucracy to determine which area is to receive money and which area is not.

The heavy revenue demands of the Federal Government do leave little opportunity for State and local governments to raise the revenue they require. For this reason I have for several years supported legislation which would require the Federal Government to turn back to each State the Federal cigarette tax collected from the residents of that State.

Under this proposal Indiana would receive far more money and there would be no Federal bureau to dominate education in Indiana.

The Federal Government now collects an 8-cent tax on each package of cigarettes sold. Such money could be returned to each State, earmarked for use in the field of education. The process would be similar to the tax money collected by a county treasurer who in turn distributed the tax money to the local school districts.

Each State then could distribute this money to the various school districts on a fair and equitable formula. Different States have different educational problems and could fairly distribute such funds in a manner that would meet the specific needs and desires of the citizens of that State.

This Federal cigarette tax amounts to approximately $2 billion per year. Indiana would receive approximately $50 million per year from this cigarette tax money, which is the amount Hoosiers pay in Federal cigarette taxes—no more, no less.

The plans that have been presented for "Federal aid" to education have run into many difficulties. These proposals carry with them obnoxious controls and overburdening cost for supervising and "snoopervising" that many of us cannot tolerate.

I want to point out that the tax plan which I suggest is the fairest, most equitable means by which we can make it possible to augment local taxes.

If we are interested in running our own schools and receiving back from the Federal Government for schools the money we pay, the legislation which I propose will do the job.

This approach to Federal aid was endorsed earlier this month in a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Governors' conference. This group of State Governors asked for a proportionate return of Federal tax revenues to State governments to enable State governments to accept more responsibility in providing needed services for their citizenry and to decrease the alarming trend toward complete Federal domination. Although the Governors' proposal was of a general nature, my specific proposal relating to cigarette tax funds designated for educational use is in line with their suggestion.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. Stafford].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this measure to provide Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools. As I stated in a public release on March 11, I support the intent and purpose of this legislation for several reasons.

The educational needs of our children must be met. There is sufficient evidence that our States and local governments need assistance from the Federal Government in order to meet these needs.

I am convinced, as a lawyer and as a former attorney general of my State of Vermont, that sufficient safeguards are written into this legislation to keep controls of our education system at the State and local level and with public agencies.

From a practical standpoint, this proposal is the only general aid to education bill presented over these many years with a real chance of passage by the House of Representatives.

For those who are unalterably opposed to any type of Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, I cannot make any appeal.

But to those who have recently and over the years come to the conclusion that our local and State governments truly need financial assistance in providing better education to our children, let me say this.

As a former Governor, I have struggled with the problem of meeting these costs. Our State and local governments have had to cut corners on educational costs and even defer programs they knew should be offered to these children. The ability to raise taxes to meet these mounting costs on the State and local level is severely limited, and it is highly questionable that reducing the tax burden on the Federal level would result in making the job of raising taxes on the local and State levels any easier at all.

If this program helps the States to meet the needs of educationally disadvantaged children, it will help the educational standards for all our children. I am convinced that it will do this.

Some of you may want to wait for the "perfect" bill which would give Federal aid to education. While you are waiting for this "never-never legislation," our children will continue to receive inadequate educational instruction because, like it or not, our States need and want financial help.

For my own part, I am ready to get on with the task we face in education by supporting this measure now at hand.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, as many Members know, I voted to report the bill from the committee. I did so with a certain amount of reservation, however. I do not consider this bill perfect in all regards by any manner or means, nor do I believe that there has been any bill which has passed this House which has been perfect in all regards, by any manner of means.

I believe there is some room for improvement, and I am hopeful that the majority on the other side of the aisle will accept some constructive amendments.

I believe, however, that the pattern of our Nation's development at this point has created a need for additional Federal assistance, particularly in deprived areas, to education at the State and local levels in elementary and secondary schools.

My home State of California is unique in many ways. However, as the most populous State, it faces most of the educational problems common to all States.

I hope you will bear with me as I discuss some of our problems in California, particularly those related to other States and to population growth.

California's population today is 18 million. In 15 years it will reach 27 million—1 million children are added to our school system every 4 years.

The implications of such a growth are overwhelming of course. Particularly when it is related to the administration of a State educational system. These are implications not only for California, but for the entire Nation.

By 1975 another 10 million children between the ages of 5 and 17 will swell the already crushing numbers enrolled in our elementary and secondary school systems.

How then, is California coping with its share of the problem? And California is doing a great deal more than many other States in this regard, but I must admit it is still not doing well enough.

California presently has the fourth most crowded classrooms among all States. There is an average of 33 youngsters in every classroom. And it should be noted that this is the case in spite of the fact that 72,000 of our children attend school on a part-time basis.

And in spite of the fact that California has spent $1.5 billion in State funds for construction aid to school districts.

This outlay obviously has not kept up with the need for about 5,000 additional classrooms per year. Not to mention the elimination of presently inadequate and unsafe facilities.

Simply to reduce the average number of pupils per classroom by 1, from 33 to 32, would cost $100 million and an additional $78 million per year for salaries and operating costs. The cost of education is stifling.

But it must be remembered that education is only a portion of the demand that is placed on the State and local budgets each year. Competing for the tax dollar in every State are pressing needs of health, employment, sanitation, transportation and a myriad of other equally necessary social services. Reflecting such demands are the following facts:

Between 1954 and 1963 per capita municipal tax revenues increased by 43 percent in the United States. Local government indebtedness increased by 119 percent.

In California, property tax revenues have increased nearly five times since the end of World War II, far outrunning the rise of its personal income.

The increase in this source of revenue has been nearly twice as fast in California as in the United States. There are indications that the upper limit is being approached. Taxpayers are becoming increasingly reluctant to pay.

This is especially true among the elderly whose incomes are fixed and who make up 10 percent of the California population. A measure of this reluctance is indicated by the increasing incidence of property tax delinquency.

Since 1952, the Statewide delinquency of due taxes has more than tripled while the total property tax charge has doubled. These facts coupled with my own personal knowledge of great taxpayer unrest in the Los Angeles area, indicate the gravity of the problem. So concerned has the California Legislature become that last year it carried out an exhaustive study of the entire tax structure.

A 360-page report was devoted to property taxes. It must be said, however, that California has certainly tried to meet its responsibility to education. Realizing the basic educational need, California voters approved 75 percent of the total dollar amount of bond issues proposed for the construction of school facilities since 1954.

In 1963, approval was given to $330 million new school bond issues throughout the State, the largest dollar amount approved in the period since 1954.

The presently overcrowded classrooms give testimony to the fact that these efforts have not been sufficient. The city of Los Angeles presents a typical picture of the pattern of debt and demand. Including all local taxes, Los Angeles citizens paid $8.72 per hundred dollars value in 1964. Out of the $8.72, $3.91 was spent on education. A quick glance at the statistics indicates why.

Los Angeles is the second largest school system in the Nation with a total of 491,000 elementary and secondary school pupils—30,000 new pupils are added each year. A closer look shows that the downtown area—the major target of this legislation—is most in need—12,000 pupils are concentrated in five high schools as compared with 9,000 in the 9 suburban high schools.

The concentrated need is further reflected by a comparison of the pupil dropout figures for the two areas. The downtown high schools had a dropout rate of from 21.6 to 17.3 percent of pupil enrollment. The suburban group showed a rate ranging from 1 to 3.7 percent of pupil enrollment. The conclusion is obvious.

The schools in which children need education the most have the largest overenrollment. The schools with the most need are losing approximately one out of five pupils before graduation via the dropout. The facts are clear. The statistics are ominous.

We are here today in an effort to stem the tide that threatens our State educational systems.

Title I would make $1 billion available to low-income school districts on the basis of one-half the average expenditure per pupil in the State multiplied by the number of children aged 5 to 17 whose families have less than $2,000 income per year and the number of children aged 5 to 17 from families whose incomes from aid to families with dependent children are $2,000 or more. This formula appears to provide the most practical remedy to the very problems that I have outlined.

The impacted urban areas with critically limited resources are directly rifled in upon. In California, there are 227,000 children aged 5 to 17 in families with less than $2,000 income per year. There are over 153,000 children aged 5 to 17 from 46,000 families receiving more than $2,000 aid under the dependent children provisions of the Social Security Act. A great portion of this assistance would go to school districts within the cities.

We therefore have a program in which the solution relates directly to the need. I would like now to address my remarks, with particular emphasis, to the Republican side of the aisle.

As a Republican, it is my firm belief that we have before us a program that is deserving of our reasoned support. A program with which our party could find itself closely associated. We are faced today with critical national problems inherent in educationally deprived people.

They are translated in terms of high school dropout rates, high draft rejection rates, hard-core unemployment, and the presence of 8 million American adults who do not have a fifth grade education.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, the result is economic poverty and it cannot be separated from educational poverty.

Since the inception of the present administration's war on poverty our party has been charged with a lack of concern for the poor of the Nation.

These charges stem from a sound opposition, I believe, to most of the makework proposals that have thus far been presented to us. I shared that opposition to such programs, as you may know. I have also voted against such programs as the Antipoverty Act, Appalachia, and many others. But I sincerely believe that we have an opportunity today to strike a blow at what we all know to be the root of poverty, educational deprivation.

Mr. Chairman, Republicans have been accused of being against everything. I do not think that is true. But I certainly do not want to be a part of being opposed and being considered to be opposed to education. Education is an area in which we strike poverty right on the head. Education is really the answer to the problem, with respect to the state of our poverty today.

Mr. Chairman, years ago, as a boy, I was taught that the strength of a nation lay in her natural resources such as coal, iron, steel production, and agricultural production from which she could build economic and military leadership. We have now conquered the basic needs of our Nation and far different challenges are presented to us, challenges that call for far different results, educated people.

Mr. Chairman, the success of yesterday's Gemini flight was a challenge to our educational resource.

Mr. Chairman, automation is another challenge. Does anyone seem to think here that an educational program is not going to help us fight the problem of automation when in 1970 we will have 22 million new young people in the labor market looking for jobs?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, also rising crime rates represent another factor. Does anyone think that education is not going to be helpful in working toward the ending of high crime rate as well as critical high school dropout rates, or hard-core unemployment?

Mr. Chairman, these modern-day challenges will only be met with a firm dedication to education.

As with any program of this magnitude, there are certain weaknesses. But there should be a specific elimination of them rather than a total rejection of the legislation. Certainly, we can pick out parts of this legislation and say, perhaps, some changes should be made. But I believe we should keep our eye on this point which is the advantage to the Republican Party in espousing this legislation, and thus being able to say this is our method of fighting poverty.

Mr. Chairman, the brunt of the measure is aimed to provide incentive for what has become the most fundamental resource of our Nation today, education.

We have the responsibility of insuring its success.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT].

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL], on what I feel was a very fine address to this House.

Mr. Chairman, I take great pride in joining my colleagues on the Education and Labor Committee in enthusiastic support of H.R. 2362, a bill to assist the elementary and secondary schools of our Nation. This is yet another brick in the building of President Johnson's "Great Society." Indeed, it represents one of the most vital bricks. It has been apparent for some time that there is a direct relationship between conditions of poverty and lack of educational development and poor academic performance.

California, and particularly Los Angeles, will gain much needed Federal assistance through this bill. I am pleased to note that the committee accepted the Roosevelt amendment requiring the use of data recognizing the immigration to California of approximately 225,000 school-age children per year; as well as the amendment which adds to the basic formula the number of school-age children in families receiving welfare assistance where such assistance results in income above the basic $2,000 test due to the large number of children in such families. The latter adds approximately $13 million to California's share of title I funds, and will mean approximately $3,700,000 additional funds for the Los Angeles area—funds which are badly needed for the relief of our hard-pressed property taxpayers.

After the additions noted above, the grand total for Los Angeles County is $31 million—of which the city of Los Angeles will receive approximately $25 million.

Other titles of the bill provide: $100 million for State agencies for the purchase of school library resources, library materials and textbooks, which will be available on an equitable basis to all elementary and secondary school children and teachers; $100 million for the establishment by local educational agencies of supplemental educational centers within the community to provide special educational services, which otherwise would not be available to all children in the area; remaining funds to be used to expand educational research under the Cooperative Research Act of 1954; and to strengthen State educational agencies.

Testimony presented to the committee illustrated sharply and starkly that the conditions of poverty or economic deprivation produce an environment which in too many cases precludes children from taking full advantage of the educational facilities provided. There was virtually unanimous agreement that aid to the economically disadvantaged child represented the basic approach to widespread educational improvement in this country.

When this body considered and passed the President's Economic Opportunity Act, it was clear that the major, long-term weapon in the war against poverty must be education. Under title I of this legislation, the schools can become a potent instrument for breaking the poverty cycle by providing full educational opportunity to every child, regardless of economic background.

The bill's major thrust is found in title I, which would provide $1.06 billion to local school districts to improve public school programs in schools where there are concentrations of children from low-income families, or from families receiving welfare payments.

Some broadening of public school programs and services in which nonpublic school children may participate is expected. Programs will be broadened to the extent there are poverty-stricken children in nonpublic schools. The local educational agency will maintain administrative supervision and control of all programs and all funds. The bill does not authorize any grant for any service to a private institution. It does not authorize payment of private school teachers' salaries; it does not authorize private school construction; it does not authorize purchase of equipment or materials for private schools.

Let me make it absolutely clear that the committee has consulted with eminent constitutional experts so as to draft language which does no violence to the constitutional provisions for separation of church and state. These experts agree that the language of the bill avoids the church-state issue.

Mr. Chairman, I completely support this bill and hope that it will be speedily passed.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN].

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support this legislation because I believe it is long, long overdue.

Mr. Chairman, I speak today with the realization that we have before us a matter upon which the foundations of our system of free, democratic government rests—education. Without adequate education for every member of our society, democracy is critically weakened; for it is only a knowledgeable mind that can make truly free choices, and it is only an educated man that can truly avail himself of the equal opportunity our way of life promises to provide.

I have in the past watched with regret as bill after bill in this area has failed to solve the complexities of the problem and has consequently disappeared in the legislative mill. The task of improving our school systems is an immense one and no one legislative proposal can hope to do the whole job, but the time has come when we must act. Education is desperately in need of aid and some forceful measures must be taken which answer the needs without compromising the principles of the Constitution. I come here in support of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 because I believe that it does this.

Some may argue, as they have in the past, that there is no need for Federal aid to education, that the States and localities can cope with the problem unassisted. One need only look at a few pertinent statistics to see how unrealistic such a view is. Within the last two decades, State and local bonded indebtedness has risen approximately 450 percent, compared with a 14-percent increase in the Federal debt. In that same period, State and local taxes have increased about 340 percent, while Federal taxes rose only 140 percent. Many States and localities simply cannot meet the enormous tax increases that would be necessary to implement a program of quality education. Therefore, I say there is a need for Federal aid, a burning need, a need we must meet.

The proposed legislation was a good bill as originally drawn; it is a better bill as amended in committee. A basic purpose of the bill is, as the President said in his education message, to "bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most"—to improve education in those poverty stricken areas where it has long been substandard. I believe the bill as reported would carry out this purpose admirably. The effect of the legislation on my home State of New York may serve as an example.

New York ranks first in the Union in average per pupil educational expenditures. But it also has a very large number of school-age children from economically deprived families. Consequently, while some students are afforded the best quality education presently available, many others, especially in the Nation's largest city, attend woefully inadequate schools. Under the allotment formula in title I of the act as originally drawn, New York would have been eligible for approximately $75 million in grants for use in economically deprived areas. The original formula provided grants on the basis of the number of school-age children from families with income less than $2,000 per year. The committee realized, however, that this formula did not take into account another sizable body of indigent children, largely from families whose income exceeds $2,000 only because they receive aid for dependent children. The committee wisely amended title I to include these children in the formula for determining grants. As a result, the amount of grants to New York will be increased by approximately $16.7 million. It should be noted that this increase is not to be subtracted from the proposed grant to any other State, but will be made available from additional appropriations. It is also important that in the bill as reported, Congress, not the Commissioner of Education, will establish by law the formula to be used in determining grants for the second and third years of the program.

In the past, any mention of aid to nonpublic schools has raised the question of constitutionality. I, myself, have been very concerned with this question in that I believe it is of the utmost importance that we maintain those basic religious and political freedoms that the Constitution has outlined. But it has often been this very issue that has defeated so many aid proposals in the past. Realizing that aid is needed more desperately than ever, the President and the Congress sought a means by which they could walk the narrow line between the Constitution and its violation, and come up with a meaningful assistance program. It was finally determined that aid could be given to the underprivileged child attending a nonpublic school by giving the aid to the child rather than to the school. Admittedly, this demands a broad interpretation of the Constitution, but I believe it is to the credit of Congress and the President that such a workable interpretation has at last been found and that we can now end our dubious heritage of inaction in this field.

Even before the present bill was formally drafted, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare solicited the opinion of the Office of the Attorney General as to the constitutionality of the proposed measures. The Attorney General's Office held that the measures were Constitutional, ending its statement in these words:

> Accordingly, we conclude, and remain of the view, that the first amendment is not a bar to carrying out the provisions of the bill.

Still, the committee made several changes in the language of the bill to make its constitutional basis doubly sure. For example, under title I, pupils in private schools are entitled to a proportionate share of the grant to the local public educational agency. But the committee has amended section 205 of title I to state explicitly that funds provided under this title must be controlled by a public agency; that title to any property derived from such funds must remain in a public agency; and that a public agency must administer such funds and properties. Similarly, title II was amended by the committee to assure that books and other learning resources will be made available to private school pupils only on a loan basis, and that a public educational agency will retain title and administrative control over such materials. Thus, the proposal assures that assistance will be rendered students without in any way enriching the private institutions which they attend.

Certainly, this aspect of the bill is difficult, but that is because the situation which it attempts to cover is difficult. I believe, and have been informed by knowledgeable sources, that the bill is constitutionally correct. With this belief, I feel that what is most important is that we get on with the problem before us. There are grave inadequacies in our educational system, and we have a bill which will take important steps toward correcting this situation. At worst, it is a calculated risk that can be corrected by the courts if in error. At best, it can offer hope for those millions of Americans who would otherwise be the victims of inferior schooling.

I have stated that there is no cure-all for the educational ills of our country. But I see the present proposals as an initial treatment in what, through perseverance and foresight, can result in a complete, if not rapid, cure. Briefly then, how will the proposed legislation move to effect that cure?

Well aware of the relationship between poverty and low educational achievement, it will pump funds into areas in which children from low-income families are concentrated, with the aim of meeting in a variety of ways the specific needs of these educationally deprived children.

Realizing, even in this age with its stress on the laboratory, that the printed word is still the foundation upon which education is built, it will provide funds for library resources, textbooks, and other learning materials for areas which are presently deficient in them.

It will aid the local educational agencies in establishing supplementary centers at which educational and cultural opportunities presently unavailable in the local schools will be offered, and through which universities, museums, State educational agencies, and individuals accomplished in the arts and sciences can share their knowledge with our youth.

It will authorize grants to institutions, organizations, and individuals for the furtherance of educational research and development, and for the dissemination and implementation of the results of such programs.

And finally, it will help the State educational agencies to strengthen their potential for leadership and to isolate and provide for the educational needs within the States.

I repeat my belief that education is the keystone to maintaining the democratic principles of our Government and to providing a better way of life for all our citizens. In my 33 years of continuous public service, I have never voted against an education bill. With the obvious needs that are before us now, I feel this is no time for me to change my position. I wholeheartedly support the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and urge its quick passage.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN.]

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2362 and urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, no task before our Nation is more important than improving and expanding the educational opportunities of all our people.

Education is the foundation of our democratic society. It is the key ingredient in our economic and social progress. Yet today thousands of young people are not receiving its benefits and thousands more are not being educated to their maximum capacity.

The relationship between high educational and high economic attainment, and the relationship between poor education and poverty, has been clearly and significantly demonstrated.

During the last 10 years jobs for high school graduates have increased by 40 percent, while jobs for those who failed to enter or complete high school dropped by 10 percent.

Unemployment of young people with an eighth grade education or less is 4 times the national average, yet nearly 1 million continue to quit school each year.

The lack of adequate education is one of the major factors in our present high rates of youth unemployment, delinquency, and crime.

Failure to improve our educational performance is therefore, as President Kennedy so aptly stated 2 years ago, "Not only poor social policy, but poor economics."

Mr. Chairman, this bill before us today does not, of course, meet all of our educational needs. It does not, for example, afford enough resources for needed new school construction, or for necessary teacher recruitment, or for overdue improvement in teachers' salaries.

But it is a beginning. It is a national program for a national problem.

It correctly recognizes that poverty has perpetuated itself; that it has been viciously passed from one generation to another at the very time that most Americans have been enjoying the greatest affluence of our history. It recognizes that this cycle must be broken, and it wisely moves to this task by giving financial assistance and a better opportunity to those children and to those communities who need it most.

A second-rate system of education is no more tolerable than a second-rate system of defense. We can and we must do better, for at stake is the future of our children and our country.

I urge that this bill be passed as a beginning to the vital task at hand.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished member of the subcommittee who worked so hard on this legislation, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD].

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss one of the most important titles in the bill, title V. This title is designed to strengthen our decentralized system of education in the United States, and improve State leadership and service for the elementary and secondary education programs in each of the States.

One of the most effective means of improving educational programs at the elementary and secondary levels in our Nation is to improve and strengthen the State educational agencies that are responsible for supervising and directing State systems of education. In short, to strengthen State departments of education.

In 1962–63, State departments of education distributed to local school districts $8 billion of State funds to supplement more than $11 billion of local funds. They also served as the administrative agencies for the States in conducting activities receiving $700 million of Federal funds. This bill will raise the amount of State administered Federal funds to $2 billion. State departments of education also have a massive responsibility under State laws for regulating the operation of the institutions in State systems, of education, and for providing the statewide leadership essential to continuing educational progress, and improving the quality of education.

At a consequence of the burgeoning needs in education, few if any State departments of education have sufficient resources to perform the work now expected of them. Frankly, many of our State departments of education are so understaffed that they are unable to do properly even the ministerial duties assigned to them by law. The leadership services that should be provided by these departments to local school districts are increasingly inadequate.

It has been estimated that in the past 5 years there has been a 40-percent turnover in State supervisory personnel. A majority have gone into better paying positions at the local level and at colleges and universities. For the legislation proposed in this bill to achieve optimum results, it is imperative that the leadership resources of our State departments of education be strengthened considerably.

This bill in its entire approach puts maximum emphasis on the role of State departments of education.

One of the many chief State school officers who testified before our subcommittee was Dr. Lynn Bartlett, superintendent of public instruction for the State of Michigan. An experienced leader among school officers, Dr. Bartlett said:

> As I read the President's message on education, and as I have carefully gone over the Education Act in preparation for this hearing, I could not help but be impressed with the many new and additional responsibilities a State department of education must assume if this act is to be effective and fully implemented.
>
> These new and additional responsibilities would have to take their place alongside the many other necessary and essential duties that are part of our own State programs and other Federal programs already in operation.
>
> Because of these factors, in addition to the additional responsibilities that are coming daily, the provisions of title V are most necessary.
>
> It goes without question that a well staffed State educational agency with an adequate budget is essential to the planning, the guidance, and the coordination of an educational program equal to the challenge, the needs, and the demands of our 20th century society.
>
> One of the measures of adequacy regarding State educational agencies is the ratio of personnel to school enrollment. Nationally, these ratios range from 1 State educational employee for every 2,274 pupils to 1 State educational employee for every 55,719 pupils, with the average being 1 for each 10,890 pupils.

I would note that Michigan ranks 45th in the Nation with only 5 States having a higher ratio than the Michigan ratio of 1 State education employee for every 22,217 pupils.

This is deplorable and needs immediate correction.

The passage of this title would do much to help alleviate this situation.

In the face of this kind of evidence, title V is the title of this bill which provides positive assurance that the work and responsibilities that are added to the work and responsibilities already carried on by State departments of education by this bill will be carried on in a fashion that will in no way diminish the ability of those departments to administer the programs they already have.

This is a 5-year part of the bill. It originally started out with a matching formula in it. After we heard from the principal State offices throughout the country, the subcommittee recommended and the full committee agreed that during the first 2 years this title will be fully funded by Federal money, with no State matching funds involved. Starting the third year a matching formula which will give extra assistance to the poor States comes into effect.

Our thought in removing the matching provisions during the first 2 years was that we wanted to have money available immediately to the State school officials so that they could proceed to implement this legislation without any delay.

You have all read, as I have, with interest the special message that President Johnson sent to Congress on education. He made mention of the objectives of this title in that message. I recall his words to you. He said:

> State leadership becomes increasingly important as we seek to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education. We should assist the States by strengthening State departments of education in their efforts to provide consultative and technical assistance for local school districts and local school leadership, formulate long-range plans, expand educational research and development, improve local and State information about education, identify emerging educational problems, provide for the training of State and local education personnel, conduct periodic evaluation of educational programs.

And perhaps more important than anything promote teacher improvement courses.

The bulk of this money will be distributed throughout the States on a formula that is designed to be sure that every single State will receive at least a basic allotment of money that will make a meaningful contribution to a State department of education.

"Promote teacher improvement courses." Under this title an appropriation of $25 million is authorized for the fiscal year 1966. Eighty-five percent of the funds appropriated would be apportioned in the following manner: Up to

2 percent will be reserved by the Commissioner for apportionment to American Samoa, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands; $100,000 will be apportioned by the Commissioner to each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia; and the remainder will be apportioned to the 50 States and the District of Columbia on the basis of the relative number of public school children in each State.

The basis grant portion of the title would be to assist State educational agencies in planning, initiating, and expanding activities designed to achieve the purpose of the title as set forth in section 501. To obtain these grants, States would submit applications to the Commissioner of Education through their State educational agencies.

Fifteen percent of the $25 million authorized for fiscal 1966, or $3,750,000 may be used by the Commissioner to make grants to States to pay part of the cost of experimental projects for developing State leadership or for the establishment of special services which, in the judgment of the Commissioner, hold promise of contributing substantially to the solution of problems common to the State educational agencies of all or several States. That is to say, for programs having regional or national significance.

Finally, I would like to repeat a statement made by Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel, which seems to me to summarize the reasoning that serves as the basis for title V:

> In the long run, nothing we in education can do—whether in Washington or anywhere else—can be more important than strengthening the capacity of our States to respond to the educational needs of our time. This is the crux of the challenge. In education, we look to the States not merely as a matter of law or precedent, but as a matter of practical soundness and necessity.

In the conclusion of my discussion of title V, I should like once again to use a quotation, this time from Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel, who testified before the committee on this title. This quotation relates to a matter that should be important to all Members, particularly to my friends on this side of the aisle, because it gives you a little bit of a clue as to the emphasis that is being placed on this by the people who are going to be charged with its administration. I quote from Commissioner of Education Keppel:

> In the long run, nothing we in education can do—whether in Washington or anywhere else—can be more important than strengthening the capacity of our States to respond to the educational needs of our time. This is the crux of the challenge. In education, we look to the States not merely as a matter of law or precedent, but as a matter of practical soundness and necessity. In this Nation of 50 States, with vast and independent enterprises for education, the Federal Government must participate—not toward domination, but as a partner in a vital enterprise.

The success of Federal investment in education depends upon dynamic and imaginative educational planning at all levels, particularly at the State level. Title V is an essential component of a full five-prong attack on the problems of poverty by the enrichment of the educational opportunities of culturally deprived children.

I would like to direct your attention above my head, above the Speaker's rostrum, above the gallery, and over the center door of the wall behind me where you will see inscribed a quotation by Daniel Webster—

> Let us develop the resources of our land, call forth its powers, build up its institutions, promote all its great interests and see whether we also in our day and generation may not perform something worthy to be remembered.

If there was ever a time when the Members of the Congress of the United States had a greater opportunity to prove that they are willing to accept the admonition inscribed on the wall of this Chamber, this is the day.

This is our second day of debate on the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The question of the Federal Government's role and obligation in education has been before the Congress in one form or another for the past 100 years. However, never at anytime in that 100 years has the need for enlightened action by the Congress been greater than it is now.

There are 5 million children of poverty doomed to be a continuing part of the vicious poverty cycle by the lack of educational opportunities which this legislation can provide.

We have it within our power at this moment, in this Congress, to determine whether these 5 million school age children of poverty will escape this cycle or will themselves become parents of poverty within the next decade.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GLENN ANDREWS].

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2362 or the administration education bill for the educationally deprived. If I may borrow from my eloquent colleague from Texas, Mr. JAMES C. WRIGHT—it has a little bit of good for everybody in it—a spoonful of dirt for every watershed. It aims at 90 percent of the school districts of the Nation. As wild as the shooting is in this bill, I can scarcely see how they missed 10 percent of the counties. It seems to me that any such bundle of grapeshot would have reached the entire Nation and not discriminated against 10 percent of our counties for no just or sound reasoning.

Never have so many underprivileged children been talked about so much and been helped so little as in this bill. I defy anyone to show me how any underprivileged child will be helped any more than the richest kid in town in title I of this bill. I admit to a slight bone being thrown to the impoverished child in title II where he will get Federal supplied books, the most dangerous of all areas. I also can conceive that in title III where $100 billion is proposed as a gift to school boards throughout the country to do with whatever they wish—a truly astonishing grant—the impoverished child may possibly get an additional crumb, in some specialized supplementary Federal Government school.

The history of the Republic may be clearly seen in this bill. For 95 years the Central Government has attempted to appropriate the last and most important function of the State, and that is education. Even now, thoughtful men cry out for us to halt.

Is there a need? Fifteen years ago when the late Senator Taft saw the tremendous influx of war babies hitting the elementary schools there was legitimate concern that many of the States would be unable to make it. Federal aid at that time might have had some reason to it. Now the crisis generally is past. The States themselves have done a magnificent job generally speaking. With an enrollment increase of 42 percent, they have increased expenditures 157 percent. The States and local communities have produced or borrowed 95 percent of this expenditure increase. The immediate need for surface pump priming which this bill provides is over, or certainly not grave. It is as if, to borrow from Dr. Samuel Johnson, the States, like spent swimmers in midstream have gasped and fought their way to the shore and as they are pulling themselves out on the banks, the Federal Government now rushes down to encumber them with help.

Are there special and individual needs throughout the Nation, or below the surface needs as compared to general needs? The answer is "Yes." All educators are realistic enough to appreciate a distribution of ready Federal cash.

I read a telegram I received this morning:

> This wire is to express our continued interest in H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. It is our sincere hope that you will oppose all amendments, vote against the motion to recommit, and vote for H.R. 2362 for final passage. Your interest is appreciated.
>
> J. REVIS HALL,
> *Superintendent, Anniston City Schools.*

I came from a State that spends as much of its income percentagewise as New York does on education, which is less than half what New York spends. We are admittedly down the ladder in education. We are on the brink of having this body turn our entire State over to illiterates, both Negro and white, and the very number of them frightens us. Few States suffer this number of illiterates. A voting rights bill eliminating literacy tests is punitive only to my State, Mississippi, and several others.

Nevertheless, I shall vote against this bill even with the amendment to be offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon which at least gives some degree of honor to the bill. That amendment which gives substantial aid to the poorer States saves the bill from having a spurious appeal to an ideal which is not reached in fact by the actual bill itself. Yes, I shall vote for the Green amendment. As my good friend Judge Smith has stated: If the hour of history is at hand when a crown of thorns must be worn, then let us aim our first volley where the needs are.

The real irony of the thing is that if there is a need, the need was produced by this body—by the failure of this body to relinquish certain taxing areas back to the States—the drying up of the tax sources by the preemptive quality of the taxing power has provided the need itself. John Marshall's dictum in McCulloch against Maryland comes to mind. The power to tax is the power to destroy.

There is a way to take care of the need. It is contained in the Republican Educational Incentive Plan. Federal tax credits will be allowed whenever an individual has paid a State educational tax.

This resolves the public and private school issues. It is the great new concept in Federal-State relationships. If it is now only an idea in this "Great Society," it is the best and most promising idea in the last 30 years. It may ultimately save this Republic.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I believe that, with respect to almost every educational bill which has ever been before this House, I have given my wholehearted support after we have been able to work out in the committee certain amendments to strengthen the bill. There is no question in my mind that the educational opportunities in this country must be expanded and the quality of education in all of our schools—whether they be in Oregon; or in Alabama, as the preceding speaker said; or in New York; or in Pennsylvania; or in any other State—must be improved. We must work to improve the quality of instruction.

On the bill which is now before this House I do have some reservations—reservations which have been expressed by the spokesmen for many organizations which are opposing this bill, or are urging judicial review, or are urging a change in formula.

Mr. Chairman, first I should like to call to the attention of the Members of this House the declaration of policy as set forth on page 70 of the bill.

DECLARATION OF POLICY

SEC. 201. In recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in this title) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

Mr. Chairman, it is my contention that if this is really the intent, to provide better educational programs for the needs of the most educationally deprived children who come from families with low incomes—and in this bill it is defined as those children who come from families with less than $2,000 income—it is exceedingly difficult for me to reconcile the results produced by this formula.

Mr. Chairman, the facts are irrefutable that under this formula the very States who are the poorest get the least amount of money. Let me list the 12 lowest: Alabama, the State from which the gentleman who just preceded me spoke [Mr. GLENN ANDREWS], $140 for each poor child from the State of Alabama. Arkansas, with a low per capita income, gets $151; Idaho, $152; Georgia, $153; Kentucky, $150; Mississippi, the lowest of any State in the Union, $120; North Carolina, $160; Oklahoma, $175; South Carolina, the second lowest of any of the 50 States, $132; Tennessee, $145; Virginia, $175; West Virginia, $150.

Now, if I may take a few examples, Kentucky and Louisiana have almost the same number of educationally deprived children as defined in this legislation. Kentucky has approximately 188,000 and Louisiana approximately 190,000. Yet for every poor child in the districts where these poor children are in Kentucky, for every poor child we will give them $150 or $28.2 million total. In Louisiana we will give for every poor child $199, or a total of $37.9 million. Thus Kentucky and Louisiana have almost the same number of eligible children as defined in this bill and Louisiana will receive almost $10 million more or $49 more per child.

Let me take the two extremes—Mississippi and New York. Mississippi has 232,600, approximately, eligible children or poor children as defined in this bill. They will get only $120 for each one or a total of $28 million. However, in New York, with a per capita income of almost $3,000 compared to Mississippi's $1,379, with 260,000 of their children defined as "poor" in this bill—New York will get not $28 million but $91 million or $353 for each child as defined in this bill.

Now, may I ask, where is the justice, where is the equity in this, to give the State which has the highest or one of the highest per capita incomes the most money? I am sorry to say I am forced to agree with one of the speakers yesterday that under this formula the rich States who have the most money for education get more and the poorer States are the ones that get the least. The old quotation, "To those who have will be given."

Let me cite the results in a couple of counties. In Sunflower County, Miss., there are almost the same number of poor children as defined in this bill as there are in Westchester County, N.Y., which I have never heard described as a particular depressed area. In Sunflower County, Miss., for every poor child we will give $120 or a total of $754,173. But in Westchester County for every poor child we will give $353. So for almost the same number of children in Mississippi we will give them $754,000 but in Westchester County we will give them $2.2 million or almost three times as much.

Let me take two other counties—Greene County, Tenn., which has about 3,324 poor children as defined in this bill and Oneida County in New York which has about 3,260 or almost the same number. However, in Tennessee we will give for the poor child $145 and the total amount Greene County, Tenn., will receive is $483,643. But the county in New York with the same number will get over $1 million.

There are other counties close by and if time permitted I would like to include them. Franklin County, Pa., has almost the same number as Burlington County, N.J. Franklin County, Pa., will get $406,000. Burlington County, N.J., will get $477,000.

Certainly I would say to my colleagues there must be a more equitable way to allocate the funds if we are truly interested in what we say we are, in the policy statement, in trying to raise the standards of educationally deprived children in those areas where there is the highest concentration of such families.

The other morning, in the Committee on Rules, the gentleman from Indiana talked at some length, and very accurately, about the number of rejectees under the Selective Service Act. It is shocking that in some of the States over 50 percent of our young men cannot pass the Selective Service test because of lack of mental qualifications. And yet, under the formula in this bill we do the very least for those States that have the highest percentage of rejectees. Those States that have had turned back the largest number will get the smallest amount in dollars.

It has been said that it costs more to provide education in New York than it does in Mississippi or South Carolina or Alabama. I think this is debatable. I suspect that there would be a great many people in Mississippi or Alabama or South Carolina, if they had the per capita income, who would like to attract the best teachers in the country and offer salaries in the $7,000 and $8,000 bracket. But it surely does not cost more to construct buildings or to hire teachers in New York than it does in Alaska, where we have the highest cost of living. And yet in New York we give $353 per child and in Alaska $267. It does not cost more for education in New York than in Illinois or in Pennsylvania or the District of Columbia. And yet there are no two States in the Union that receive the same amount of money for the poor children.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that all of you have read the article in this morning's Washington Post by Jimmy Breslin. If you have not read it, I would call your attention to it and express the hope that before the day is over you will read it. This article says that "Lowdnes' Little-Fed Schoolhouse Sits With Roof Flapping in Wind."

I include it at this point in the RECORD:

NEGRO EDUCATION IN ALABAMA—LOWNDES' LITTLE-FED SCHOOLHOUSE SITS WITH ROOF FLAPPING IN WIND

(By Jimmy Breslin, Herald Tribune News Service)

MONTGOMERY, ALA., March 24.—The Rolen School sits in the dirt off U.S. Highway 80 in Lowndes County, Ala. It is a public school of the State of Alabama for grades one to six. It has 80 Negro students and 3 Negro teachers. It is open from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m. but from the road it looks like a deserted shack.

The Rolen School is a wooden building that was a church when people in Lowndes

County wore Confederate uniforms. It once was painted yellow. The building sits off the ground on small piles of loose red bricks. It has 10 frame windows. Nearly all of the panes are broken.

Beaverboard, put up on the inside, covers the broken windows. The school has a tin roof. Today, part of the roof was flapping in the breeze coming through the fields.

A shack in the dirt field behind the school serves as a bathroom. A long-handled ax stands against the building. The students gather wood at lunch and then chop it for the fires inside.

The school has five wooden steps, rotted. An adult cannot stand on them.

PERMIT NEEDED TO ENTER

The principal, John Bowen, who also teaches the fifth and sixth grades, stood outside the school today. He is 40, and has gray-topped hair. He wore a long-sleeved dark blue sports shirt. His arms were folded in front of him and he spoke quietly.

"Nobody is allowed inside the school without a permit, we were told," he said.

"When did they tell you this?"

"Well, when all the people started coming around here they told me that."

"I see. They don't want anybody to get a look at the place."

"Well," he said, "I work for the county school system. You shouldn't work for a person, then give him bad publicity. But I have to say you can't learn in this school. There's no way to learn here. It's just impossible."

"If you'll excuse me, I'm going to go into your school without this permit."

THE VIEW INSIDE

The inside of the school was divided into three rooms. The first and second grades were in the room on the left. There were 11 small black faces with big eyes sitting on those benches around a wooden picnic table. A girl was on her stomach on another bench, looking up at the visitor. The teacher, Josephine Jackson, wearing a pink dress, sat at a bridge table in the corner, next to a big rusted stove.

Beaverboard covers the classroom window, but light comes in through large holes in the side of the building. The holes give the kids a view of the fields. The kids also can look through a huge hole in the floor and see coal ashes and empty pork and bean cans on the ground under the classroom.

"We use coal, when we can get it, and wood in the winter," Miss Jackson said. "It runs to, oh, 'bout 25 degrees here in the winter. We hardly ever get below zero. The children wear hair rags and overcoats. They don't have gloves. When it gets too cold they sit with their hands in the coat pockets."

"Can you get anything done here at all?"

"Well, I try as hard as I can."

"Do the parents know what's going on?"

"Oh, I don't think they understand, either," she said. "They went to the same kind of school as this and these children here will have to send their children to a school like this and, oh, I guess it never will come to an end."

BRIGHT PUPIL

"Do you have a bright one?" Miss Jackson was asked.

"That one," she said, pointing to a little girl in pigtails and white sweater.

The top of the girl's workbook said her name was Janice Cosby. On the first page, she had printed, "See the kitten. The kitten says mew mew." It was done neatly.

"Do you like school?" she was asked.

Her eyes brightened and her head shook up and down. "Yop," she said.

"Do you do any writing at home?"

"Yop. In the backyard when I get home."

"What does her father do?" the teacher was asked.

"Farmer," she said. "Sharecropper."

"And what happens to the girl here?"

"When she gets old enough, she goes into the field and picks cotton and doesn't come to school any more."

CARDBOARD DOOR PANELS

A door with cardboard panels led to the next classroom, which was for the third and fourth grades. Old Alabama license plates were nailed here and there around the room to cover holes in the floor.

A heavy woman in a striped dress stood against the wall and watched the 17 students, who sat on benches and did nothing.

The fifth and sixth grades were in the backroom, a big, bare place with cement blocks and pieces of charred firewood on the floor. A kid in a raincoat was hammering a nail into a bench that was falling apart.

A small cluttered table, with an old blue globe on it, was in the front of the room. There were no blackboards or charts hanging on the wooden walls.

There were some 25-year-old schoolbooks on a shelf.

LUNCHLESS LUNCH TIME

A hand bell tinkled in the next room and kids walked out the door into the yard. It was lunch time. Most of them stood in the dirt or went in front of the building and sat on the top step. None of them had anything with them to eat.

"Hey," one of them was asked, "don't you have anything for lunch?" He shook his head yes.

"Light bread and hot sauce. I eat it on the way to school."

"Don't they get any lunch to bring?" Bowen was asked. He shrugged. He could see the visitor did not understand Lowndes County, Ala.

The visitor to the Rolen School got into the car and drove out on to the highway and back to Montgomery. The marchers were by the airport now, and the line was long.

They march in the sun because of things like the Rolen School.

And in the State capitol, which sits under a flagpole that has the Confederate flag flying over the American flag, the legislature passed a special resolution condemning the ministers who are in the civil rights march and calling attention to all "the fornicating" going on among the marchers.

And the Governor of the State of Alabama, which, in the year 1965, in the United States of America, has the Rolen School as part of its great educational system, sits in his office and says he is not going to give in to this mob rule of Communists.

The people here must be seen to be believed.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman 5 additional minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the gentleman from New York for being so liberal after the gentleman on my side could find no more time. But seriously, may I say to my liberal friends on my side of the aisle, after the liberality on my left, that we—and I include myself—we who have been talking about the conditions in Mississippi and who have been talking about and deploring the conditions in Alabama and other Southern States now have a chance to do something besides talk.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me for a question?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Yes, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. As a Mississippian, may I say to the gentlewoman that I am very grateful to her for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I would like for the gentlewoman to go one step further—and I am sure she has the information at hand—and tell the House whether or not Mississippi spends as high or probably a higher percentage of its tax dollar for education than any other State in the Union?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. In terms of effort index—and I cannot quickly go down all the States, so I cannot answer your question as to whether you have the highest—the national average effort index—and this is based upon the number of dollars actually spent in terms of per capita income—is 4.6 percent. In Mississippi, you have an effort index of 5.04, which is higher than the national average.

May I say to my friend, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] that your effort index in Mississippi, the effort that you are making to try to provide better schools, is higher than in the State of New York. Yet you would get only $120 under the provisions of this bill and New York would receive $353.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield to me?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. I read the article to which the gentlewoman has referred in the morning Post and think that the facts set forth in that article represent a tragic situation. But I am concerned that if we gave to the State of Alabama, with the present Governor of Alabama and the present legislature in Alabama, all of the money provided for in this bill, does the gentlewoman feel they would do anything for that particular school?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I have confidence that there would be an attempt made, after the passage of the civil rights bill. If we were talking about 5 years ago, I might have the same reservations which the gentleman from Ohio has. However, I believe that in every State there are indications that they want to do something about it and are making greater effort than in many northern States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, may I complete my statement before yielding further? Then I shall be glad to yield.

Mr. Chairman, I really am serious in saying to my liberal colleagues, those of you who honestly and sincerely have been terribly concerned about the events in Selma, concerned about events in Mississippi during the last 2 or 3 years: Are you really shedding crocodile tears? Are we making pious statements about how awful things are and how we really want to do something about it, and then, when we have a bill that is before the House, we do the very least for these States of any single State in the Nation?

Mr. Chairman, this bill does not fit into my sense of fairness and justice.

I know that it has been said that it costs more to provide education to children in the State of New York, but it costs no more than in Chicago, or Alaska, or Washington, D.C.—yet the dollars per child are considerably higher. I am told it will be said later that we increase the percentage going to the budgets in these States in the South more than we do in the northern States. This seems to me pretty irrelevant, how much and what percentage increase in the budget, because if you have absolutely nothing and you give them $5, you have increased it percentagewise 500 percent. If you are spending $700 in New York and you have been given $350 more, then you are not going to increase them so much percentagewise.

This seems to me to be a very funny kind of an argument. It seems to me we should be working in this formula so that it can be applied on a fair and equitable basis nationwide in an effort to raise the standards for educationally deprived children who come from families with an income of less than $2,000, no matter in what State they may reside.

May I also suggest that if this is not the purpose of the bill, then let us not fool the American people. If our purpose is to give the most money to those States that already spend the most, and they already have the greatest resources, then let us state it in the declaration of policy and not pretend that we are really trying to spend the money where we have the highest concentrations of poor children.

Mr. Chairman, at the proper time I hope to offer a formula in the form of an amendment to this bill which will allow every poor child, no matter in what State he resides, to have the same amount of money allocated under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this seems to me to be fair and equitable.

Therefore, if the formula is as we say we intend it to be, then we would provide the same kind of opportunity to all children whether they be located in the South, in the North, the East or the West.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman an additional minute to answer a question.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. The State of Utah last year had the somewhat dubious distinction of being the first State ever to be sanctioned by the National Education Association. I believe the root of the problem was the inadequate salaries the State was then able to pay our teachers. Our neighbors to the north of us in Idaho have an even lower salary schedule than we do. The question I have is this: Would this bill with its present formula help close the disparity between states like Utah and Idaho as compared with our nearby neighbor, California, or would it widen the disparity?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, may I congratulate the gentleman on having one of the highest effort indexes in the United States. You have 6.3. Under this formula you would get $187 for each child. In California they will get $265, and in the neighboring States it would vary, as well as all over the country.

I think the answer to the gentleman's question is: It would widen the gap, because the States already having the most would still have more money, and you would be in a less competitive position to attract teachers.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. I should like to inform the gentleman who got exercised over whether or not Alabama would use Federal money, if granted in this bill for education, that in the last 2 years Alabama has borrowed $100 million directly to go into the educational fund, we have borrowed $30 million last year for schools, and we are at the point of borrowing $125 million more for schools. In this case the Federal Government has refused to relinquish its taxing powers to the States themselves, and we had to go to the sales tax to do this financing. We have a 4-percent sales tax to take care of these borrowed funds.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. HAYS. That is not too much to brag about. We have had a sales tax in Ohio for 25 years, and that was for the education of all children.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Griffin].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, some of our colleagues may vote for this bill because they think it will cure poverty. Others may vote for this bill, not as poverty legislation, but as a general aid to education bill. It ought to be one or the other but, unfortunately, it is a poor bill for either purpose.

The gentlewoman from Oregon [Mr. Green] has done an excellent job of pointing out how inequitable and unfair is the formula insofar as it allocates funds among the several States—under this bill, the States which need the most get the least—and the States which need the least get the most.

I should like to make the further point that the bill is inequitable and unfair not only as it allocates funds among the States, but also as it allocates funds among the school districts and counties within a State. Keep in mind that the criteria for eligibility of a school district or county is based upon the number of children in families with annual incomes of less than $2,000. Eligibility for assistance under this bill is not related to the actual need or the wealth or ability of a school district to finance an adequate educational program.

For purposes of illustration, consider a typical situation: The Members will have situations like this in their congressional districts, and in their States.

Assume for a moment that school district A has no industrial or valuable commercial property within it. It is a residential district. Most of the people within this suburban area are unskilled and semiskilled workers employed in a plant which is not located in the school district. Assume that there is little or no unemployment, and that the average income of the families is over $2,000. The average income may be in the neighborhood of $3,000, $4,000, or $5,000. However, this particular school district, relatively speaking, is a poor school district within the State. Indeed, it might be the poorest. It is bonded to the limit of its ability to bond. Its teachers are poorly paid; and its classrooms are crowded.

However, because district A does not have the requisite number of children from families with incomes less than $2,000, the school district is not elegible for any assistance at all under this bill. Keep in mind that the State cannot put aid provided by this bill into a district that does not qualify, no matter what the needs of that school district may be.

Suppose further, that in adjacent school district B, where an industrial plant is located, there are in the shadows of this plant some families with incomes of less than $2,000. However, in school district B, because of the presence of the industrial plant and other commercial property, the assessed valuation is three, four, or five times the amount of that in district A. Relatively speaking, school district B is a wealthy district; wealthy because it has valuable industrial and commercial property which is taxable, and because most of the people have high incomes. School district B has a good school system; good buildings and the classrooms are not crowded. However, because the requisite number of children from low-income families live there, wealthy school district B is eligible to receive aid under this bill.

It is not clear whether the purpose of this bill is to cure poverty or to provide general aid to education. But, surely, in either case, we ought to insist on a more equitable formula than the one provided in this bill.

Let me focus attention on another inequity in this bill. It is frequently said that eligibility under this bill is based solely on the number of children from families with incomes of less than $2,000. There is an exception to that in the bill. As the result of an amendment offered in the committee by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski], and adopted by a divided vote, a family that is on welfare—aid to dependent children welfare—will be counted under this bill in determining the eligibility of a school district or county, even though the income of that family on welfare may exceed $2,000.

As I understand it, in some of the larger cities, like Chicago and New York, families on welfare average as much as $3,200 a year. Certainly, these are poor families and we should be concerned about them in devising any formula which is to be based upon poverty. But is the formula in the bill an equitable formula, and does it make sense?

What about a family with the same number of children where the head of the family is earning $3,200? A family which earns $3,200 will not be counted; but a family on welfare with income of $3,200 will be counted.

What about the situation of a totally disabled head of the family who is on social security? This family may be just as poor as the family on welfare—and just as unable to pay local school taxes; but the family of a disabled social security beneficiary will not be counted under this bill in determining eligibility if its income exceeds $2,000.

What about the disabled veteran receiving a veteran's pension? He is unable to work, with children to support, and unable to pay his taxes, unless he has some special State or local exemption. If his income exceeds $2,000, he will not be counted and his children will not be counted in determining eligibility under this bill. Surely, the poverty formula established in this bill, insofar as it counts certain welfare families but excludes others who are equally poor, is inequitable and unfair.

I should like to yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] to ask if he would quarrel with what I have said.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman talked about a man who earns $3,200 a year against the individual on public assistance. What happens in the case of the individual who earns this money? He is not a burden on the local community and the taxpayers are not supporting his family. He earns that money and is within that bracket. But the family that is on public assistance, the community gets this twice. First they must provide the $3,200 of public assistance out of the taxpayers' pockets, then they must provide the educational facilities for the same family. So I submit the analogy the gentleman made does not hold water.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. He may find justification in his mind, but I do not.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should like to focus attention on page 80, subparagraph (7); section 205 of the bill relating to the application of a local educational agency and the provisions which must be agreed to by a local educational agency "consistent with such basic criteria as the Commissioner of Education may establish." Subparagraph (7), at line 17 reads as follows:

> "(7) that wherever there is, in the area served by the local educational agency, a community action program approved pursuant to title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452), the programs and projects * * *

I assume that means programs and projects under this aid to education bill "have been developed in cooperation with the public or private nonprofit agency responsible for the community action program."

I should like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] if it is not true that an amendment was offered in Committee to strike out the words "in cooperation with the public or private nonprofit agency responsible for the community action program" and to insert in lieu thereof the words "after consultation with". And, is it not true that this amendment was rejected?

Mr. PERKINS. That amendment, I think, was discussed—but let me say——

Mr. GRIFFIN. The only purpose for which I have yielded to the gentleman from Kentucky at this time is to answer the question.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me make this clear.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I shall yield to the gentleman later but not at this point.

Mr. PERKINS. I think the gentleman should let me explain.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I cannot yield to the gentleman at this time but I shall yield to the gentleman later.

Mr. Chairman, I merely wished to substantiate that an amendment was offered in committee to strike out the words "in cooperation with" and to insert the words "after consultation with". Now, if a local educational agency cannot take action under this bill except "in cooperation with" the local, public or nonprofit agency which has been designated to operate the community action program under the poverty bill, that could be a disturbing situation.

What does "cooperation" mean? In light of the legislative history, "cooperation" in this case may mean that the public or nonprofit agency in charge of the local poverty program would have a veto power over what the local educational agency could do under this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. GRIFFIN. There ought, at least, to be notice of the fact that the so-called aid to education program provided by this bill not be run exclusively by the local educational agency. It will be run by the local school system "in cooperation with" whatever organization the poverty administration downtown may have selected to run the local poverty program in the particular community.

Now, I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky who may be able to throw some light on this situation.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me say to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that in a community where you have—assuming that this bill is enacted and assuming that you had a community action program—a preschool program we provide in the legislation for consultation, as it should be, for the purposes of preventing overlap or duplication of effort. But we specifically make it clear that the community action agency could not veto a school program provided for in this bill. If the gentleman will turn to page 8 in the committee report, he will find this language:

> This section does not give the community action agency any veto over programs developed by the local public educational agency under title I of this bill.

That is very clear. The provision should be in the bill, because there should be consultation and there should be cooperation of that type.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The gentleman is saying, even though an amendment was rejected in the committee which would have required only "consultation," that the words "in cooperation with" require only consultation. Is that what the gentleman is saying? Or, does "cooperation" require more than consultation?

Mr. PERKINS. I have been reminded that we had discussion of an amendment of that type, but it was never offered in the subcommittee or full committee.

The important thing is that this program is administered by a public agency. They have control of the funds and the property. If the gentleman will look on page 79, lines 18 and 19, he will see the language:

> A public agency will administer such funds and property.

Mr. GRIFFIN. In light of the legislative history, which concerned me, I am glad to have the gentleman's statement that there is no such veto power. I do recognize that a statement to that effect is made in the report. It is important, however, to reiterate it on the floor, in order to make it clear that a local agency in charge of the community's poverty program will not be able to veto a program put into effect by a local educational agency under this bill. I was concerned, and I believe with some reason, that the words "in cooperation with" as used in the bill might require cooperation. I suppose with the statement of the gentleman from Kentucky, we can be assured that a local educational agency will not have to cooperate, so long as there is consultation.

Mr. PERKINS. I believe we have made that perfectly clear, and the gentleman well understands it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Over and over again during the debate reference has been made to the approximate cost of title I, with the cost of title I stated as being $1 billion.

I believe it should be kept in mind that there is no ceiling on the authorization in title I in the bill as reported; the bill contains an open end authorization.

Title I is an amendment to Public Law 874. Once enacted, the authorization will go up automatically above $1 billion, depending on how many districts or counties should be entitled from time to time to funds under this formula. So, there is no ceiling, as I understand it, on the authorization in the bill.

Others have focused attention upon the broad and unlimited authority of the Commissioner of Education to appoint advisory councils. I should like again to focus attention upon section 602 of the bill, on page 145, which provides:

> The Commissioner may, without regard to the civil service laws, * * * appoint an advisory council or councils to advise and consult with the Commissioner with respect to carrying out his functions under this or any other law.

Those who are appointed to these advisory councils will receive $100 a day. Under the bill, there is no limit as to how many councils can be appointed or how many people will be appointed to each council. The authority to appoint such advisory councils is not even limited to the objectives of this bill; the Commissioner will have a blank check to appoint as many people as he wants to advise him with respect to his functions under any law.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILBERT].

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The education bill before us represents years of study, work, and research of the need for Federal assistance to schools. It marks the beginning of the combined efforts of all of us to improve the quality of education in elementary and secondary schools. The bill goes a long way in wiping out educational inequalities in underprivileged communities. By using the children of low-income families as a formula for aid, the bill gives recognition to the special need of deprived children.

The main purpose of the bill is to improve schools in low-income districts. About 90 percent of all districts in the United States are expected to qualify for at least some of this money.

H.R. 2362 gives some assistance to children who attend private and church-related schools to the extent that children who attend private and parochial schools will be able to participate in certain public school programs if they qualify under the "disadvantaged definition." This is the most controversial portion of the bill. I believe that separation of church and state is essential to the integrity of public education as a foundation of a free society, and is imperative for the protection of freedom of religion itself. I believe, however, that sufficient safeguards exist in the bill to prevent violation of constitutional and ideological principles. These safeguards assure that all funds, facilities, and materials provided in the bill shall be under the control of the local public school authorities.

Nonpublic schoolchildren would benefit through a "shared time" arrangement as they already do in some areas. Nonpublic schools would not be given Federal funds under the bill, but would be given joint use of classrooms and other facilities. Consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in the school district who are enrolled in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools, the local educational agency will make provisions, under the terms of the bill, for including special educational services and arrangements such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, educational media centers and mobile educational services and equipment in which such children can participate.

Some broadening of public school programs and services in which nonpublic schoolchildren may participate is expected. Programs will be broadened to the extent there are poverty-stricken children in nonpublic schools. The local educational agency will maintain administrative supervision and control of all programs and all funds. The bill does not authorize any grant for any service to a private institution. It does not authorize payment of private school teaches' salaries; it does not authorize private school construction; it does not authorize purchase of equipment or materials for private schools.

Title I of the bill will authorize $1.06 billion to strengthen the educational fiber of economically deprived areas. It authorizes grants for local school districts for improvements and expansions which contribute particularly to meeting the special needs of educationally deprived children. The funds will be directed toward regions where families average less than $2,000 in annual income. School districts in these concentrations will be able to hire additional staff, construct needed facilities, acquire new equipment, and expend for other appropriate uses.

Mr. Chairman, a district would qualify for assistance if it has at least 100 public school children of families earning less than $2,000 a year, excluding welfare payments under aid to families with dependent children program, or if such children make up at least 3 percent of the enrollment. A qualifying district, on submitting satisfactory plans would get directly in return, for each impoverished child a sum equal to half the amount now being spent per child annually by the State on its public schools.

Briefly, here is what the bill would do for New York and other large cities. We are currently spending about $120 more per disadvantaged child than for the more fortunate child. All disadvantaged students in New York schools—public and nonpublic—will benefit from the services of the additional personnel in areas such as supplemental health and food services, guidance, summer schools, and work experience programs. Special materials and programs, library and cultural and remedial instruction, language labs, science services, preschool training programs, will be available to all schoolchildren. The bill will help to provide an expansion of our system of all-day neighborhood schools. Needy students would be helped at the college level by a program of scholarships, loans, and work-study opportunities.

The estimated first-year fund allocation proposed in H.R. 2362, based on one-half of the individual State's per pupil average cost of education, for the State of New York, would be $91,893,253.

H.R. 2362 recognizes the cost of education per pupil in New York to meet their needs, and it will assist all children who are in need.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly support title II of the bill which provides for the improvement of school library resources and other instructional materials for all schoolchildren. Many of our children are attending schools without libraries—about one-half of our schools have no libraries—and these children are being deprived of a great and valuable resource which this bill would provide. This title would authorize allotments of $100 million to the States to be expended under a State plan developed by a State agency. It would provide a program for the acquisition of library resources, including audiovisual materials, textbooks, and other instructional materials for children in elementary and secondary schools.

The State plan would take into consideration the relative need of children and teachers for such materials and provide assurance that such materials would be provided on an equitable basis for all elementary and secondary schoolchildren and teachers. The State agency would be required to administer the program in conformity with State law. State plans must set forth their criteria in distributing the library resources, textbooks, and other material. This authorization is not intended for the advantage of any specific private institutions. On the contrary, the bill insures that the benefits will accrue directly to the schoolchildren.

Title III offers supplemental educational centers and services. Local educational agencies may apply to the Commissioner of Education for a center or certain services especially designed to meet the varying needs and interests of school localities. Such applications must be approved by the State educational authority; and $100 million is authorized under this title for fiscal year 1966. Title III is designed to allow school districts to effectuate programs and services which the local educational authorities deem essential to their school system, and which are currently overshadowed by budgetary demands. This title is meant to provide services such as guidance, counseling, remedial instruction, and health programs.

Title IV provides new and expanded programs of research and development to promote quality education in all schools of this Nation. This title can bring about the types of change in our educational system which will produce quality in educational materials, excellence in teaching, and reawaken the wonder of learning in children. Regional educational laboratories can offer a promising way of meeting problems of research, development, and dissemination. The laboratories will have close ties with the State departments of education. They will also work directly with the schools and supplementary education centers in order to bring innovation directly to the student.

Title V establishes a 5-year program of grants to be made by the Commissioner of Education to assist States in strengthening their State educational agencies, through State programs which may include long-range State planning, training of educational personnel, consultative and technical assistance to local schools, and expansion of education research.

Title VI includes a provision that nothing contained in the act may be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources, textbooks, or other printed or published instructional materials by any educational institution or school system. This title also provides that nothing in the act may be construed to authorize the making of any payment for religious worship or instruction.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 2362 would provide tremendous improvements in the educational standards and facilities for the children of Puerto Rico. Title I of the bill would contribute approximately $30 million to Puerto Rico's school system. It would provide more than one-fourth of the amount appropriated for education by the government of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in 1963.

Sixty percent of the families of Puerto Rico have incomes of less than $2,000 a year. This means that 488,000 families in Puerto Rico qualify in the low-income category provided in this bill.

As the distinguished delegate, the gentleman from Puerto Rico [Mr. POLANCO-ABREU], said in the House yesterday, no piece of legislation which has ever been before the Congress could mean so much as this bill in terms of creating opportunity for the children of Puerto Rico.

Mr. Chairman, I join with the many educational, labor and civic organizations who have written to me expressing their strong support of H.R. 2362. This bill will be a memorable piece of legislation in the field of education, not only in the scope of the program but in future programs. Although it is not perfect, the bill represents, in my opinion, a great step toward providing a better education for millions of children, including minority groups, and it will help break the vicious chain of hereditary poverty—the poverty that stems from cultural deprivation.

It represents a splendid beginning in a campaign to eliminate widespread differences in educational opportunity and establish a more democratic educational system that will take into account the long-ignored handicaps of the underprivileged and the culturally deprived children of our country.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2362 which I believe will go a long way toward helping local communities meet the alarming rise in the cost of their educational programs at the elementary and secondary levels.

I do not believe there is a Member in this House of either party who can deny that the cost of public school education has increased in every local community throughout this country at a more rapid rate than any other single item in municipal budgets.

One reason for this fantastic increase is the need for specialized education to the children of this Nation's chronically impoverished families. This today is the highest item in our school budget anywhere in the Nation—rich State or poor State.

Let there be no mistake about H.R. 2362. President Johnson has demonstrated sound judgment in proposing the Federal Government help each individual local community meet the rising cost of providing education for these culturally deprived youngsters on the basis of standards established by each county. And I stress here, almost every county in the Nation has youngsters of impoverished families. I suggest every Member go over to the committee table and pick up a copy of this committee print which lists the number of impoverished children in each county in the United States. You will find the tabulation beginning on page 65 and it will show each Member the number of impoverished children in the counties in his district. The tabulation clearly shows there are poor children in every district in the country. Mrs. GREEN, I ask the rich to help the poor. Ten poor States will receive $330 million or one-third of the total—the other 40 States and 3 trust territories will share the remainder.

It makes sense that the Federal Government should become a partner in this effort because, Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government today is spending billions of dollars throughout America to help maintain public assistance programs in local communities.

The Federal Government has more than just a passing interest in this problem for another reason. That is because so many of the indigent in our industrial centers are youngsters whose families have migrated to the urban areas of America simply because job opportunities have been eliminated in the rural sections of the Nation. This mobility becomes a Federal problem particularly since local communities cannot impose the cost of education for the children of these mobile families unto the community from whence they came.

It is important, however, to stress that this bill is designed to help the poor people all over America. I wish to emphasize that no community can get any assistance under title 1 unless it has children of impoverished families.

This bill properly recognizes that poverty is not limited to any one section or one community of America.

This bill properly recognizes that there are poor people in literally every section of our country, and this bill attempts to bring the most meaningful type of assistance to meet the peculiar problems of each individual community which has victims of poverty.

This bill recognizes that even in the great State of Texas, where Houston and Dallas are two of the richest communities in the world, there are still more than 386,000 children who come from families with an annual income of less than $2,000 a year.

This bill also recognizes that while we have the peak of prosperity in New Orleans, in the bayou country, and other parts of Louisiana, there are 190,000 children in impoverished families.

This bill also recognizes that throughout this country no single community has a monopoly on wealth nor is poverty confined to any single geographic area.

To the critics of the formula in this bill, I should like to stress over and over that no school district can qualify for assistance under title I unless it does, indeed, have children with families under $2,000 annual income or are on a public assistance program.

This bill further quite properly recognizes that each State in this Union has established its own standards consistent with its abilities. There are those who would try to change the formula to provide a single standard for the entire Nation in the amount of Federal assistance. The distinguished lady from Oregon apparently chooses to overlook the fact that it costs more to educate a child in Michigan or Illinois than it does to educate the same child in a poorer State. She presumes that the richer States should have a horn of plenty with no bottom.

I submit that advocates of a single standard, whether they want to admit it or not, in effect are saying that we should have in many communities of America a dual system of education with the poor children getting a lower standard of education.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important for the Members of this House to know that in this bill, which would provide Federal aid for the education of impoverished children, we are also extending for 2 years Public Law 874, which is more commonly known as the federally impacted areas school bill. For the new Members of this House, who may not be familiar with this program of Federal aid to school areas impacted by Federal activities, let me hasten to tell you that we now spend some $350 million annually in direct Federal aid to local school districts throughout the United States, as the Federal Government's contribution toward helping to educate the children of people employed by the Federal Government. And mind you—this bill which we are today extending for 2 more years, provides that the Federal Government shall match one-half of the local cost in educating a child.

I have not heard critics of Mr. Johnson's formula suggest here in this Chamber that we change the impacted areas formula to a national standard. There are some 320 Members of this House whose districts share in the federally impacted areas program. And that program quite properly recognizes that it costs more to educate a child in a school district in Oregon than it does to educate a child in a school district in Louisiana or Mississippi. And quite properly, the Federal Government many years ago, when this impacted areas bill was first enacted, decided to meet one-half of the cost of education in the respective community, instead of applying a national norm, as critics of Mr. Johnson's formula suggest we do in the education bill before us today.

I am confident that we are dealing with reasonable men here in this House. I am confident that no Member of this House wants to ignore the problems of the individual States in meeting their school problems. I can think of no greater injustice than to have the Federal Government pay one-half of the cost, based on the cost in individual school districts under Public Law 874, which is in the bill before us today, and then adopt a national norm for the poor children in the same respective State. In other words, what they are saying is, go ahead and let the Federal Government pay one-half the per-student cost of educating a child in a school district in Missouri who comes under Public Law

874—the impacted areas bill—but for every child in that school system from an impoverished family, the Federal Government will pay only one-half of a national norm. It just does not make sense. But that is exactly what those who would change the formula would do.

And Mr. Chairman, I submit here and now that anyone who suggests that the facts are other than as I have stated them to be, makes a stranger of the truth.

Make no mistake. If we were to accept an amendment to this formula providing for a national norm, it would not be long before local school districts would set up one standard for the fortunate children of their community and another standard for the poor children. In those school districts where the per student cost is high, the poor student would get an inferior quality of education. In those school districts where the per student expenditure is below the national standard, the poor children would, in effect, be getting a substantially better education than the rest of the community.

President Johnson's proposal establishes a standard of equity where we permit each individual State to set its own criteria and then the Federal Government proceeds to meet half the cost of that State's criteria. This, to me, is a sound approach, and I should like to congratulate the committee for bringing forth an equitable bill.

Those who argue against this formula ignore the fact that different communities for various reasons have varying costs per pupil for education.

For example: Alabama spends $242 per year per pupil; Arkansas spends $261 per year per pupil; Mississippi spends $229 per year per pupil; Texas spends $358 per year per pupil; Illinois spends $504 per year per pupil; and New York spends a staggering $628 per year per pupil.

It therefore should be very clear to the critics of this formula that if this Federal aid is to be meaningful to every single State of this Union, it must help that individual State to meet the cost of education to the impoverished child's immediate community. Otherwise we would be in effect shortchanging the impoverished student who happens to be in a community of high educational expenditures.

At the appropriate time, Mr. Chairman, I shall get permission to include a table showing the per pupil expenditures per State so that my colleagues can compare for themselves the equity in the formula suggested by President Johnson. To attempt any other formula than the one proposed by the committee would be to advocate a double standard of education in each community throughout America, and I doubt if that is the intent of this Congress.

Current expenditures per pupil by State [1]—selected school years 1945–46 to 1961–62

State	1945–46	1949–50	1955–56	1959–60	1961–62
Total [2]	$136.41	$208.83	$294.22	$375.14	$418.50
Alabama	68.57	117.09	187.64	241.15	242.29
Alaska				[3] 546.32	[3] 619.37
Arizona	136.93	240.70	312.35	403.56	447.23
Arkansas	64.76	111.71	160.47	225.17	261.34
California	169.21	(4)	[5] 343.54	[5] 424.00	[5] 457.00
Colorado	136.12	219.66	305.58	396.14	429.45
Connecticut	174.39	254.62	340.87	436.08	493.71
Delaware	152.48	258.77	363.35	455.75	485.11
Florida	103.31	181.27	257.60	317.64	350.58
Georgia	64.60	123.37	194.03	253.47	288.81
Hawaii				324.55	358.49
Idaho	116.55	186.00	245.89	289.70	[5] 321.30
Illinois	175.11	258.46	353.48	438.41	504.77
Indiana	144.53	235.49	291.22	368.68	429.61
Iowa	143.88	230.53	299.05	367.71	411.06
Kansas	141.25	218.57	294.68	347.72	410.34
Kentucky	86.33	120.82	168.26	233.07	301.44
Louisiana	101.36	214.08	281.68	371.94	388.28
Maine	109.39	157.47	221.52	282.73	323.88
Maryland	126.19	213.39	297.09	392.70	440.07
Massachusetts	179.85	236.44	328.20	408.91	468.66
Michigan	147.33	219.55	330.40	415.10	452.95
Minnesota	157.96	242.24	324.57	425.21	473.80
Mississippi	46.32	79.69	157.47	205.91	229.44
Missouri	137.36	173.57	263.94	343.96	392.69
Montana	215.44	267.56	348.56	410.78	450.74
Nebraska	$142.48	$217.07	$277.51	$336.98	$367.05
Nevada	162.32	246.22	348.31	430.41	455.22
New Hampshire	135.01	210.51	282.64	347.24	387.89
New Jersey	211.82	279.81	381.96	487.54	535.43
New Mexico	134.60	222.48	318.01	362.67	410.81
New York	209.76	295.02	425.61	561.59	628.53
North Carolina	81.43	140.82	188.69	237.24	301.08
North Dakota	138.02	226.27	286.80	366.69	403.04
Ohio	147.03	202.12	282.91	365.04	397.23
Oklahoma	111.86	207.05	249.35	311.36	332.74
Oregon	157.88	272.00	356.53	448.33	504.18
Pennsylvania	144.80	215.76	333.45	409.44	450.59
Rhode Island	160.84	240.40	324.92	413.38	462.39
South Carolina	74.31	122.39	188.09	220.06	246.31
South Dakota	153.93	230.34	309.49	346.82	375.37
Tennessee	76.16	132.17	188.95	238.07	259.06
Texas	118.12	208.88	265.23	332.34	358.95
Utah	129.30	178.56	240.50	322.45	350.38
Vermont	122.89	192.87	262.66	343.93	[5] 407.60
Virginia	92.29	145.56	213.50	274.21	320.60
Washington	183.33	247.63	332.11	420.42	468.34
West Virginia	101.30	149.86	197.18	258.44	291.68
Wisconsin	147.73	230.01	334.91	[6] 413.04	[6] 472.47
Wyoming	171.38	262.77	344.77	450.38	499.94
District of Columbia	172.22	256.24	348.87	431.16	462.30
Alaska	218.02	317.19	418.66		
Hawaii	159.72	214.82	243.55		

[1] Data are for pupils in average daily attendance in full-time public elementary and secondary day schools.

[2] Beginning in 1959–60, totals include Alaska and Hawaii.

[3] Because of the high cost of living in Alaska, per pupil expenditure data for this State cannot readily be compared with those for other States.

[4] Not available.

[5] Estimated by Office of Education.

[6] Excludes vocational schools not operated as part of the regular public school system.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said about the 10 richest counties of America siphoning off money from the 10 poorest counties.

I think it is important to show that the 10 richest counties in this country, including Du Page County, Ill., spent a total of $466 million in 1962 for public education in these 10 counties. Under this bill, these 10 counties would receive $8.9 million or 1.9 percent of their total expenditure for public education in these 10 counties.

We are all concerned that the 10 poorest counties in the United States spent a total of only $13 million for public education. These 10 poorest counties would receive, true enough, only $4.5 million of Federal aid, but this $4.5 million constitutes 34.2 percent of Federal contribution to their educational expenditures.

At the appropriate time, Mr. Chairman, I shall ask permission to include an appropriate table showing the comparison between the 10 wealthiest and 10 poorest counties in the United States.

Rich versus poor counties—The impact of Federal funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

[Dollars in thousands]

County	1962 educational expenditures [1]	Estimated fiscal 1966 Federal payment	Federal contribution as a percent of 1962 educational expenditures
Montgomery, Md	44,073	573	1.3
Arlington, Va	14,050	236	1.7
Fairfax, Va	26,950	349	1.3
Du Page, Ill	33,159	444	1.3
Marin, Calif	16,544	339	2.0
Westchester, N.Y	103,169	2,189	2.1
Bergen, N.J	72,214	1,315	1.8
Union, N.J	44,229	1,063	2.4
Montgomery, Pa	51,567	857	1.7
Fairfield, Conn	60,728	1,554	2.6
Total	466,683	8,919	1.9

Rich versus poor counties—The impact of Federal funds under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—Continued

[Dollars in thousands]

County	1962 educational expenditures [1]	Estimated fiscal 1966 Federal payment	Federal contribution as a percent of 1962 educational expenditures
Grant, W. Va	507	125	24.7
Falls, Tex	1,504	432	28.7
Sunflower, Miss	2,197	745	33.9
Knox, Ky	1,475	471	31.9
Tensas, La	1,244	329	26.4
Williamsburg, S.C	2,248	811	36.1
Sumter, Ala	1,047	391	37.3
Holmes, Miss	1,226	547	44.6
Breathitt, Ky	1,129	300	26.6
Tunica, Miss	620	357	57.6
Total	13,197	4,508	34.2

[1] Taken from U.S. Bureau of the Census. Census of Governments, 1962, vol. IV, No. 4, Compendium of Government Finances, table 53, "Education other than capital outlay." This is the latest uniform listing by county of educational expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it also important to recall some other statistics which show how much the Federal Government is already spending to help the 10 poorest States in the Union meet the problem of feeding and clothing their impoverished families. I cite these figures to demonstrate that the Federal effort should be viewed as a whole instead of merely in terms of this one piece of legislation.

The Federal Government now contributes 75.9 percent of the total amount spent for public aid to poor families in Alabama; 76.1 percent to poor families in Arkansas; 75.2 percent to poor families in Georgia; 74.4 percent to poor families in Kentucky; 79.2 percent to poor families in Mississippi. Contrast this to the Federal Government's contribution of only 44 percent to the total amount spent for public welfare for the impoverished families in Illinois; 45 percent to impoverished families in California; 44 percent to impoverished families in New York; and 51 percent to impoverished families in Oregon.

Mr. Chairman, my point here is that it is unfair to say that we are somehow denying the poor families of our poorer States Federal aid at the expense of our richer States, because when you take the entire Federal effort and Federal contribution in all programs in these poorer States of the Union, you find that in each instance the Federal Government spends vastly more money for assistance in those 10 poorer States than it does in the rest of the Union.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that those who try to say that President Johnson's formula penalizes the poorer States to the advantage of the richer States are just muddling the facts.

Every State has its share of poor people, and I submit there is not a Member in this Congress who is not aware of the fact that every community in his district is today experiencing serious problems in meeting the needs of the poor people amongst them.

Mr. Chairman, I shall also include a series of other tables at the appropriate time which further justify the equity of the committee's carefully worked out formula. It is my hope that my colleagues will study these tables in the RECORD so that they can better understand how justified this committee is in its position.

One of the tables shows how much the individual States spend for education per pupil and a comparison between the States. This table clearly demonstrates that it does indeed cost a good deal more to educate a child in Illinois than some of the other States of the Union. Another table shows a comparison of per capita earnings and it is important to demonstrate that while Illinois spends more than twice as much per pupil for education, our per capita income is nowhere near twice as much as some of the poorer States.

Another table which I shall include in the RECORD shows the total State expenditure by States as compared to per capita income by States, and here again we find a substantial variance among the several States which could not be ignored by this committee in drawing up its distribution formula.

Another table shows the difference in salary standards, and these too must be considered in recognizing that if this legislation is to be meaningful to the respective school districts, it must be of a nature and amount which will help those local school districts meet the difference in cost for teaching personnel.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, much has been said about the wealth in States and their ability to meet their educational obligations. I believe we should study the comparative indebtedness of these so-called richer States in their effort to give their children a higher standard of education. Admittedly, Alabama is a poorer State, but Alabama has a State school indebtedness of only $109 million, compared to $1,119 million for Illinois; $2,458 million for New York; and $2,160 million for California.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this House will stand by the committee which has studied all the aspects of this problem, and after great deliberation has concluded that the formula before us is indeed the most equitable for all the people of the Union.

Mr. Chairman, I should like also to discuss briefly another aspect of this bill. Yesterday we witnessed a heated debate on proposals in this bill to bring some assistance to the private schools of America within the constitutional limitations. I believe the committee has done an excellent job in trying to find a constitutional balance for helping our nonpublic schools which are today educating more than 7 million American children at an annual saving to the taxpayers of more than $3 billion. The committee properly has recognized that students in private schools should be eligible for assistance in this act within the framework of constitutional limitations.

The committee has carefully drawn up a formula which has been approved by Monsignor McManus, superintendent of parochial schools in Chicago—the largest parochial school system in the world, and also by the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

I believe the formula is properly described on page 7 of the report, and I should like to cite that report at this point:

> DUAL ENROLLMENT AND BROADENED PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAMS TO REACH ALL EDUCATIONALLY DEPRIVED CHILDREN
>
> No provision of the bill authorizes any grant for providing any service to a private institution, but at the same time the bill does contemplate some broadening of public educational programs and services in which elementary and secondary school pupils who are not enrolled in public schools may participate. The extent of the broadened services will reflect the extent that there are educationally disadvantaged pupils who do not attend public school.
>
> The bill does not authorize funds for the payment of private school teachers. Nor does it authorize the purchase of materials or equipment or the construction of facilities for private schools. However, consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in the school district who are enrolled in nonpublic elementary and secondary schools, the local educational agency will make provision, under the terms of the bill, for including special educational services and arrangements such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, educational media centers, and mobile educational services and equipment in which such children can participate.
>
> Thus, the bill does anticipate broadened instructional offerings under publicly sponsored auspices which will be available to elementary and secondary school students who are not enrolled in public schools.
>
> In this regard the committee has adopted language in the bill to assure that the local educational agency will maintain administrative supervision and control of the programs provided under the title and that the title to any property constructed or purchased shall be in a public agency and that a public agency will administer the funds and property for the purposes of the title. Several opportunities are afforded local public educational agencies to meet the special educational needs of elementary and secondary school pupils regardless of whether they are enrolled in public schools through supplementary educational services authorized by title I such as broadened health services, school breakfasts for poor children, and guidance and counseling services. In addition, testimony received by the committee indicated the effectiveness in some areas of providing mobile art collections which could serve a community of schools on a rotating basis and the broadening of mobile-type public library services.

There are other provisions in this act to give parochial schools assistance in the use of public school textbooks on a loan basis, which would bring badly needed help to the private schools for their indigent pupils. But in every instance, the committee was careful to preserve the basic constitutional safeguards.

I believe it is a credit to the religious organizations of this Nation, of all faiths and beliefs, that they have all rallied in their support for this bill. Those who would argue here that the bill either does not go far enough, or goes too far, should study the testimony of the most responsible and eminent religious leaders of America who have a deep and abiding sense of responsibility in this field. During the hearings on this bill, there was quite properly great concern expressed that the committee be careful not to tip the careful balance of separation of church and state. And the committee took this testimony into careful consideration.

So far as I know, Mr. Chairman, this is the first time in the history of the United States that all religious denominations have sent witnesses to appear before this committee in support of the passage of such legislation, and specifically in support of the passage of the present legislation in its present, carefully worked out form.

Mr. Chairman, I am confident that this bill, in its present form, will stand up to any subsequent test at any level of our judicial system.

This brings me to the final point I want to raise on this legislation, and that is the suggestion for judicial review.

There are those who urge some language be inserted in this measure to provide for judicial review; I suggest that such an amendment is not necessary; I suggest that it would expose every school district to harassing legal problems; it would result in a legal patchwork of judicial decisions.

This bill in its present form is subject to review by the U.S. Supreme Court, and, in view of the Supreme Court's most recent decision to rule on and review the use of prayers in the public schools, I cannot imagine for a moment that in this instance the Supreme Court would refuse a writ of certiorari to review the provisions of this bill which would give assistance to private schools.

I am sure that, just as soon as this bill becomes law, there will be any number of suits filed to challenge its constitutionality. We can make this statement with confidence because of suits brought before the Court challenging the higher education bill and the bill to aid medical schools which were passed in this Congress.

Furthermore, I should like to point out that this bill now has a provision for judicial review, whenever the Commissioner of Education refuses to grant a State any assistance. This provision is quite proper because a refusal by the Commissioner does not involve a constitutional question, and therefore we on the committee, wanting to make sure that a Commissioner of Education could not arbitrarily or capriciously deny a State Federal aid, have provided judicial review of his decisions in each of the titles.

But there is no need for such a proviso regarding the constitutionality of this legislation because no Member in this Chamber can seriously argue that a citizen cannot bring a suit testing those provisions in this bill which provide aid to the private schools' and church schools' indigent children.

Our refusal to put such language in this bill is to protect the local school administrators from arbitrary harassment.

But I repeat, Mr. Chairman, that I am confident that a constitutional test will lie, and certiorari will issue, whenever anyone wants to challenge seriously the provisions of this legislation.

I, of course, would not venture to indicate the final outcome of what such a suit would be, but that is not the issue today. The issue is whether or not a constitutional test can be held, and I submit that the recent actions of the Supreme Court clearly indicate the Court would indeed entertain such a suit.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill. It would help relieve the local communities of this Nation in meeting the crisis they face to provide education for the impoverished and educationally deprived children of their areas. I hope this bill will be adopted by the House in the manner that it was reported by the committee.

The aforementioned tables follow:

Expenditures for public assistance by source of funds and State, calendar year 1963 [1]

State	Amount (thousands)					Percentage distribution				
	Total	Federal	State and local			Total	Federal	State and local		
			Total	State	Local			Total	State	Local
Total [2]	$5,183,683	$2,840,885	$2,342,798	$1,693,084	$649,714	100.0	54.8	45.2	32.7	12.5
Alabama	114,810	87,103	27,707	27,626	81	100.0	75.9	24.2	24.1	0.1
Alaska	4,521	2,187	2,334	2,334		100.0	48.4	51.6	51.6	
Arizona	29,178	20,057	9,121	9,092	29	100.0	68.7	31.3	31.2	.1
Arkansas	61,361	46,697	14,664	14,664		100.0	76.1	23.9	23.9	
California	761,728	348,160	413,568	269,084	144,484	100.0	45.7	54.3	35.3	19.0
Colorado	91,394	47,928	43,466	34,905	8,561	100.0	52.4	47.6	38.2	9.4
Connecticut	65,817	29,707	36,109	32,875	3,234	100.0	45.1	54.8	49.9	4.9
Delaware	5,889	3,306	2,584	1,683	901	100.0	56.1	43.9	28.6	15.3
Florida	98,327	71,820	26,507	23,380	3,127	100.0	73.0	27.0	23.8	3.2
Georgia	104,140	78,327	25,812	20,632	5,180	100.0	75.2	24.8	19.8	5.0
Hawaii	12,426	6,121	6,304	6,304		100.0	49.3	50.7	50.7	
Idaho	14,547	9,503	5,044	5,014	30	100.0	65.3	34.7	34.5	.2
Illinois	313,380	140,710	172,670	156,075	16,595	100.0	44.9	55.1	49.8	5.3
Indiana	44,982	29,391	15,590	9,281	6,310	100.0	65.3	34.6	20.6	14.0
Iowa	62,585	35,418	27,166	16,977	10,189	100.0	56.6	43.4	27.1	16.3
Kansas	53,892	29,476	24,417	11,973	12,444	100.0	54.7	55.3	22.2	23.1
Kentucky	79,235	58,946	20,289	19,402	887	100.0	74.4	25.6	24.5	1.1
Louisiana	187,609	133,012	54,598	54,598		100.0	70.9	29.1	29.1	
Maine	27,296	16,989	10,307	7,635	2,672	100.0	62.2	37.8	28.0	9.8
Maryland	49,973	27,978	21,995	17,518	4,477	100.0	56.0	44.1	25.1	9.0
Massachusetts	197,146	93,890	103,257	61,928	41,329	100.0	47.6	52.4	31.4	21.0
Michigan	208,966	78,510	130,456	77,091	53,365	100.0	37.6	62.4	36.9	25.5
Minnesota	108,947	47,040	61,907	21,169	40,738	100.0	43.2	56.8	19.4	37.4
Mississippi	56,388	44,684	11,705	11,336	369	100.0	79.2	20.8	20.1	.7
Missouri	146,227	95,209	51,019	50,704	315	100.0	65.1	94.9	34.7	.2
Montana	15,157	6,656	8,500	2,765	5,735	100.0	43.9	56.0	18.2	37.8
Nebraska	24,023	14,551	9,072	6,498	2,974	100.0	60.6	39.4	27.0	12.4
Nevada	7,849	3,239	4,610	2,071	2,539	100.0	41.3	58.7	26.4	32.3
New Hampshire	10,590	5,265	5,325	2,606	2,719	100.0	49.7	50.3	24.6	25.7
New Jersey	106,710	44,066	62,645	27,881	34,764	100.0	41.3	58.7	26.1	32.6
New Mexico	28,552	19,332	9,220	9,173	47	100.0	67.7	32.3	32.1	.2
New York	567,041	254,846	312,195	157,574	154,621	100.0	44.9	55.1	27.8	27.3
North Carolina	91,576	67,108	24,467	11,228	13,239	100.0	73.3	26.8	12.3	14.5
North Dakota	15,820	9,565	6,254	4,479	1,775	100.0	60.5	39.5	28.3	11.2
Ohio	227,085	107,987	119,097	97,061	22,036	100.0	47.6	52.4	42.7	9.7
Oklahoma	150,121	96,233	53,889	53,037	852	100.0	64.1	35.9	35.3	.6
Oregon	45,764	23,551	22,212	16,419	5,793	100.0	51.5	48.6	35.9	12.7
Pennsylvania	265,451	141,266	124,185	119,706	4,479	100.0	53.2	46.8	45.1	1.7
Rhode Island	24,705	12,332	12,373	11,358	1,015	100.0	49.9	50.1	46.0	4.1
South Carolina	33,842	25,570	8,272	7,874	398	100.0	75.6	24.5	23.3	1.2
South Dakota	14,961	9,501	5,460	3,987	1,473	100.0	63.5	36.5	26.7	9.8
Tennessee	61,542	47,454	14,088	10,944	3,144	100.0	77.1	22.9	17.8	5.1
Texas	229,668	167,231	62,437	59,604	2,833	100.0	72.8	27.2	26.0	1.2
Utah	22,231	14,336	7,895	7,877	18	100.0	64.5	35.5	35.4	.1
Vermont	9,387	6,410	2,977	2,052	925	100.0	68.3	31.8	21.9	9.9
Virginia	33,658	23,739	9,919	5,046	4,873	100.0	70.5	29.5	15.0	14.5
Washington	106,965	53,372	53,593	53,593		100.0	49.9	50.1	50.1	
West Virginia	60,422	44,841	15,581	15,133	448	100.0	74.2	25.7	25.0	.7
Wisconsin	85,273	37,407	47,866	21,896	25,970	100.0	43.9	56.2	25.7	30.5
Wyoming	6,327	3,127	3,200	1,472	1,728	100.0	49.4	50.6	23.3	27.3
District of Columbia	17,679	9,799	7,880	7,880		100.0	55.4	44.6	44.6	
Guam	294	152	142	142		100.0	51.7	48.3	48.3	
Puerto Rico	19,479	9,462	10,017	10,017		100.0	48.6	51.4	51.4	
Virgin Islands	748	317	431	431		100.0	42.4	57.6	57.6	

[1] Covers old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, aid to blind, aid to permanently and totally disabled, medical assistance to the aged, and general assistance data which are available; includes administrative costs and vendor payments for medical care.

[2] Excludes Guam, Puerto Rico, and Virgin Islands.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; Social Security Administration.

Total and per capita personal income by State, selected calendar years, 1929–63 [1]

State	Total personal income (millions)						Per capita personal income					
	1929	1930	1949	1959	1962	1963	1929	1930	1949	1959	1962	1963
Total	$85,661	$72,753	$205,452	$381,326	$439,977	$461,610	$703	$556	$1,382	$2,163	$2,368	$2,449
Alabama	856	704	2,429	4,617	5,164	5,538	324	250	810	1,425	1,557	1,655
Alaska	(2)	(2)	(2)	555	661	704	(2)	(2)	(2)	2,523	2,731	2,839
Arizona	254	231	889	2,425	3,181	3,340	591	477	1,245	1,934	2,141	2,142
Arkansas	564	471	1,438	2,360	2,782	2,986	305	242	780	1,327	1,510	1,607
California	5,502	5,257	17,835	40,960	49,053	52,317	995	775	1,725	2,671	2,881	2,974
Colorado	642	578	1,794	3,769	4,618	4,831	637	516	1,385	2,182	2,440	2,464
Connecticut	1,641	1,415	3,452	6,873	8,069	8,490	1,029	834	1,699	2,755	3,074	3,185
Delaware	240	241	599	1,299	1,466	1,570	1,017	916	1,896	2,959	3,139	3,298
Florida	753	892	3,210	9,384	11,221	11,933	521	486	1,203	1,959	2,065	2,111
Georgia	1,015	967	3,098	6,079	7,145	7,715	350	310	932	1,558	1,750	1,864
Hawaii	(2)	218	685	1,290	1,587	1,667	(2)	525	1,354	2,118	2,394	2,462
Idaho	225	226	706	1,180	1,351	1,366	503	434	1,239	1,793	1,930	1,916
Illinois	7,280	5,566	14,654	25,693	28,895	30,020	957	705	1,690	2,576	2,861	2,948
Indiana	1,973	1,767	5,398	9,741	11,041	11,648	612	519	1,364	2,110	2,368	2,481
Iowa	1,419	1,183	3,403	5,412	6,075	6,399	577	469	1,320	1,972	2,190	2,302
Kansas	999	694	2,397	4,302	4,911	5,017	535	380	1,245	1,990	2,217	2,255
Kentucky	1,020	855	2,624	4,563	5,283	5,545	391	303	921	1,514	1,713	1,792
Louisiana	866	834	2,789	5,165	5,692	6,072	415	357	1,050	1,611	1,689	1,776
Maine	479	417	1,061	1,717	1,918	1,971	601	493	1,175	1,792	1,961	2,007
Maryland	1,260	1,186	3,384	7,133	8,555	9,163	777	661	1,453	2,338	2,646	2,786
Massachusetts	3,862	3,162	7,066	12,381	14,260	14,889	913	727	1,490	2,436	2,750	2,853
Michigan	3,803	3,215	9,522	17,467	19,264	20,624	793	624	1,504	2,253	2,399	2,541
Minnesota	1,539	1,432	3,810	6,706	7,712	8,152	598	517	1,298	1,985	2,228	2,329
Mississippi	570	444	1,391	2,490	2,906	3,183	285	205	667	1,152	1,285	1,390
Missouri	2,275	1,914	5,219	9,260	10,385	10,900	628	506	1,344	2,161	2,406	2,518
Montana	312	294	791	1,328	1,558	1,553	595	530	1,390	1,991	2,235	2,197
Nebraska	811	521	1,699	2,788	3,319	3,376	590	395	1,305	1,989	2,295	2,312
Nevada	79	90	276	759	1,104	1,246	878	841	1,758	2,720	3,154	3,386
New Hampshire	322	274	663	1,201	1,394	1,450	690	559	1,244	1,995	2,241	2,313
New Jersey	3,714	3,100	7,930	15,499	18,073	18,861	931	751	1,622	2,601	2,843	2,915
New Mexico	171	184	717	1,688	1,888	1,953	407	352	1,113	1,819	1,894	1,918
New York	14,105	11,152	26,144	45,197	51,243	53,361	1,159	825	1,756	2,720	2,929	3,013
North Carolina	1,046	1,111	3,596	6,716	8,177	8,601	334	316	919	1,492	1,738	1,807
North Dakota	253	202	678	986	1,400	1,300	375	314	1,136	1,573	2,212	2,050
Ohio	5,178	4,265	11,736	21,977	24,215	25,164	781	619	1,472	2,286	2,412	2,474
Oklahoma	1,077	805	2,432	4,083	4,675	4,858	454	345	1,155	1,774	1,910	1,953
Oregon	647	629	2,235	3,845	4,324	4,568	683	582	1,562	2,190	2,393	2,502
Pennsylvania	7,531	5,933	14,771	24,757	27,015	28,017	775	599	1,422	2,204	2,373	2,452
Rhode Island	596	500	1,173	1,832	2,082	2,153	871	713	1,464	2,145	2,371	2,433
South Carolina	470	511	1,700	3,142	3,745	3,944	270	273	838	1,327	1,530	1,588
South Dakota	288	219	690	1,027	1,460	1,390	417	340	1,084	1,513	2,025	1,886
Tennessee	982	886	2,992	5,346	6,184	6,588	377	308	925	1,507	1,693	1,783
Texas	2,752	2,600	9,778	18,132	20,437	21,351	478	409	1,283	1,918	2,019	2,068
Utah	284	251	821	1,630	1,999	2,083	559	462	1,224	1,859	2,087	2,119
Vermont	225	172	414	697	794	827	627	480	1,122	1,806	2,052	2,121
Virginia	1,054	1,127	3,626	7,043	8,399	8,907	435	422	1,101	1,793	1,977	2,057
Washington	1,166	1,058	3,641	6,372	7,426	7,575	750	617	1,587	2,257	2,467	2,484
West Virginia	794	723	2,050	3,060	3,224	3,348	462	387	1,062	1,635	1,795	1,883
Wisconsin	2,001	1,615	4,614	8,310	9,291	9,617	682	517	1,361	2,123	2,312	2,368
Wyoming	151	145	440	720	810	834	677	585	1,588	2,215	2,440	2,475
District of Columbia	615	735	1,677	2,215	2,537	2,645	1,273	1,117	2,078	2,888	3,215	3,315

[1] Personal income by State is the current income received by residents of the States from all sources, inclusive of transfers from government and business but exclusive of transfers among persons. Total personal income for all States differs from total personal income of the United States in that the latter includes income disbursed by the Federal Government to its civilian and military personnel outside the United States.

[2] Not available.

Source: Department of Commerce, Office of Business Economics.

Public elementary and secondary school expenditures by State,[1] selected school years, 1945–46 to 1961–62

[In thousands]

State	1945–46	1949–50	1955–56	1959–60	1961–62
Total [2]	$2,906,886	$5,837,643	$10,955,047	$15,613,255	$18,338,487
Alabama	39,054	79,374	134,070	191,165	200,779
Alaska				24,195	31,894
Arizona	14,840	41,535	83,138	139,697	171,261
Arkansas	22,959	54,354	71,690	100,548	121,438
California	221,435	623,359	1,280,350	2,021,625	2,396,124
Colorado	25,861	59,458	126,061	189,508	214,927
Connecticut	41,174	83,748	156,406	231,407	275,926
Delaware	5,724	13,118	29,604	55,667	53,134
Florida	38,970	97,319	226,826	367,207	438,159
Georgia	46,102	95,225	166,676	236,764	285,494
Hawaii				48,766	57,921
Idaho	11,687	26,267	42,964	52,527	60,777
Illinois	178,815	358,198	627,899	846,734	989,521
Indiana	81,692	158,180	260,008	393,626	477,022
Iowa	59,525	114,174	186,992	235,678	287,179
Kansas	41,500	72,391	157,982	216,003	235,378
Kentucky	38,033	68,092	96,995	148,236	202,608
Louisiana	39,991	112,753	191,806	298,618	300,224
Maine	14,769	25,143	39,911	59,674	75,284
Maryland	35,116	94,545	186,622	286,550	345,086
Massachusetts	93,224	124,559	272,537	368,907	441,525
Michigan	134,015	274,534	581,448	811,973	919,987
Minnesota	64,667	118,163	258,676	352,448	404,969
Mississippi	21,080	40,786	81,329	148,791	151,189
Missouri	78,573	112,463	222,219	300,749	363,007
Montana	18,316	31,607	51,722	64,021	74,191
Nebraska	29,478	47,193	86,539	112,836	126,250
Nevada	$3,427	$8,757	$21,638	$32,641	$43,872
New Hampshire	8,154	16,939	29,559	41,114	51,283
New Jersey	120,017	199,986	399,081	599,007	702,663
New Mexico	13,820	33,509	73,640	88,902	115,198
New York	351,711	617,811	1,256,339	1,742,717	2,055,891
North Carolina	63,477	151,323	225,311	294,744	374,437
North Dakota	14,594	24,905	41,687	59,694	69,897
Ohio	158,379	291,920	573,343	799,953	932,380
Oklahoma	45,467	87,611	150,036	185,751	200,456
Oregon	31,651	93,325	136,818	185,229	214,288
Pennsylvania	205,379	348,118	584,052	797,498	927,726
Rhode Island	13,929	21,538	37,350	53,035	68,600
South Carolina	28,959	63,465	141,732	136,686	159,941
South Dakota	15,683	27,071	44,392	53,855	65,483
Tennessee	39,596	104,576	155,927	214,459	241,485
Texas	138,465	303,013	546,691	757,092	894,409
Utah	17,897	33,800	68,861	97,490	114,405
Vermont	6,520	11,548	21,024	28,144	32,240
Virginia	47,840	100,920	188,478	266,942	329,001
Washington	59,661	113,845	225,113	319,393	385,167
West Virginia	40,108	69,666	96,059	122,434	138,815
Wisconsin	69,861	123,868	244,225	332,960	410,895
Wyoming	7,661	14,737	35,114	46,844	48,300
District of Columbia	14,031	27,871	38,060	52,752	60,381
Alaska	1,391	4,101	13,093		
Hawaii	12,712	19,412	30,551		

[1] Includes current expenditures, capital outlay, and interest for public day schools, expenditures for operation of summer and adult programs, community services, and community colleges.

[2] Beginning in 1959-60, totals include Alaska and Hawaii.

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

Average annual salaries of instructional staff [1] in public elementary and secondary day schools by State, selected school years 1945–46—1961–62

State	1945–46	1949–50	1955–56	1959–60	1961–62
Total [2]	$1,995	$3,000	$4,156	$5,174	[3] $5,700
Alabama	1,276	2,111	3,386	4,002	4,071
Alaska				[4] 6,859	[4] 7,285
Arizona	2,167	3,556	4,472	5,590	6,190
Arkansas	1,068	1,801	2,378	3,295	3,685
California	2,987	(5)	5,243	[3] 6,600	[8] 7,100
Colorado	1,822	2,821	4,012	4,997	5,349
Connecticut	2,393	3,558	4,730	6,008	6,770
Delaware	2,202	3,273	4,561	[3] 5,800	6,303
Florida	1,719	2,958	[6] 4,130	5,080	5,624
Georgia	1,081	1,963	3,161	3,904	4,494
Hawaii				5,390	5,551
Idaho	1,672	2,481	3,550	4,216	4,479
Illinois	2,280	3,458	[7] 4,757	[7] 5,184	[3] 6,300
Indiana	2,143	3,401	4,376	5,542	6,409
Iowa	1,676	2,420	3,181	[3] 4,030	5,001
Kansas	1,666	2,628	3,673	[3] 4,450	4,925
Kentucky	1,295	1,936	2,698	3,327	4,427
Louisiana	1,537	2,983	3,885	4,978	5,282
Maine	1,409	2,115	2,881	3,694	4,288
Maryland	2,262	3,594	4,513	5,557	6,242
Massachusetts	2,512	3,338	4,337	[7] 5,545	5,850
Michigan	2,337	3,420	4,711	5,654	6,022
Minnesota	1,878	3,013	4,121	5,275	5,816
Mississippi	856	1,416	2,436	3,314	3,637
Missouri	1,793	2,581	3,520	4,536	5,143
Montana	1,838	2,962	3,633	[7] 4,425	4,977
Nebraska	$1,514	$2,292	$3,171	$3,876	$4,470
Nevada	1,992	3,209	4,496	5,693	6,157
New Hampshire	1,530	2,712	3,510	4,455	4,861
New Jersey	2,561	3,511	4,747	[7] 5,871	6,285
New Mexico	1,970	3,215	4,492	5,382	5,700
New York	2,946	3,706	5,277	6,537	6,941
North Carolina	1,602	2,688	3,400	4,178	5,190
North Dakota	1,469	2,324	[7] 2,929	3,695	4,192
Ohio	2,165	3,088	4,337	5,124	5,554
Oklahoma	1,796	2,736	3,703	4,659	4,997
Oregon	2,164	3,323	4,423	5,535	[3] 6,100
Pennsylvania	2,124	3,006	4,400	5,308	5,733
Rhode Island	2,098	3,294	4,442	[7] 5,400	5,903
South Carolina	1,152	1,891	3,005	3,450	3,865
South Dakota	1,530	2,064	2,943	3,725	4,138
Tennessee	1,287	2,302	3,156	3,929	4,198
Texas	1,640	3,122	3,983	4,708	5,379
Utah	2,016	3,103	3,922	5,096	5,337
Vermont	1,692	2,348	3,105	4,466	4,997
Virginia	1,574	2,328	3,422	4,312	4,824
Washington	2,547	3,487	4,554	[7] 5,643	6,190
West Virginia	1,676	2,425	3,112	3,952	4,432
Wisconsin	2,002	3,007	4,127	[8] 4,870	[8] 5,709
Wyoming	1,654	2,798	3,851	4,937	5,546
District of Columbia	2,637	3,920	5,304	6,280	6,664
Alaska	2,655	4,268	5,431		
Hawaii	2,795	3,508	4,230		

[1] Includes supervisors, principals, teachers, and other instructional staff.

[2] Beginning in 1959–60, totals include Alaska and Hawaii.

[3] Estimated by Office of Education.

[4] Because of the high cost of living, data for Alaska cannot readily be compared with those for other States.

[5] Not available.

[6] Includes teachers in junior colleges.

[7] Includes some personnel in addition to instructional staff.

[8] Excludes vocational schools not operated as part of the regular public school system

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education.

Local long-term debt outstanding by unit of government, and school debt by State, end of fisca' year 1962

[In thousands]

Purpose and State	All units	Counties	Municipalities	School districts	Townships	Special districts
A. All purposes						
Total debt	$55,455,581	$5,208,329	$25,098,929	$13,656,448	$1,303,386	$10,188,490
Schools	18,119,401	1,056,017	1,892,212	13,656,448	578,113	938,119
Utilities	12,280,170	1,101	8,880,305		160,057	3,237,310
Other	25,056,010	4,151,211	14,326,412		565,216	6,013,061
B. School purposes by State						
Alabama	$109,449	$3,388	$59,134	$46,927		
Alaska	35,389		542	34,847		
Arizona	149,458			149,458		
Arkansas	110,907			110,907		
California	2,160,983		44,322	2,116,661		
Colorado	250,931			250,931		
Connecticut	360,229		112,306	12,859	$235,064	
Delaware	44,015		3,855	40,160		
Florida	293,162			293,162		
Georgia	164,378	19,111	40,747	104,521		
Hawaii	12,751	801	11,950			
Idaho	56,027			56,027		
Illinois	1,119,229			1,119,229		
Indiana	298,717			125,830	172,887	
Iowa	241,150			241,150		
Kansas	228,710			228,710		
Kentucky	186,414	370	21,219	164,826		
Louisiana	372,223		7,710	364,513		
Maine	48,058		21,177	8,862	18,018	
Maryland	423,374	316,832	106,542			
B. School purposes by State—Continued						
Massachusetts	$423,048	$335	$130,986	$41,251	$250,476	
Michigan	862,289		3,066	859,223		
Minnesota	528,295	4,325	26,094	497,876		
Mississippi	103,706			103,706		
Missouri	366,467			366,467		
Montana	62,273		92	62,181		
Nebraska	113,828		3,004	110,825		
Nevada	53,291			53,291		
New Hampshire	47,874		20,402	27,472		
New Jersey	754,953	2,295	172,483	562,456	17,720	
New Mexico	40,956			40,956		
New York	2,548,997	7,854	691,137	1,826,031	23,974	
North Carolina	259,544	259,544				
North Dakota	51,535			51,535		
Ohio	1,047,868		17,181	1,030,687		
Oklahoma	127,225	2,855		124,370		
Oregon	135,479			135,479		
Pennsylvania	1,065,555			300,796		$764,759
Rhode Island	66,263		42,530	1,731	22,002	
South Carolina	45,537	4		45,533		
South Dakota	27,815			27,815		
Tennessee	275,034	215,142	57,490	2,403		
Texas	1,195,955		13,323	1,182,633		
Utah	80,515			80,515		
Vermont	20,875		3,819	6,546	10,510	
Virginia	314,907	223,316	91,591			
Washington	285,990			285,990		
West Virginia	58,985			58,985		
Wisconsin	446,450		189,556	256,893		
Wyoming	42,338			42,338		

Source: Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman in the well knows full well that one of the purposes of Public Law 874 is the payment in lieu of taxes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, we have heard that argument before; and I refuse to yield any further. We have gone through that.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I think we ought to set the record straight immediately after the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] has finished speaking.

The gentleman from Illinois fully knows, but has chosen not to tell his colleagues, that in Public Law 874 the poor States of the Nation, if their local expenditures for education are not as great as the State average, they receive the State average. And, if the State average is not as great as the national average, they receive the national average.

In the case of the State of Alabama under Public Law 874 they receive the national average.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The gentleman knows——

Mr. QUIE. I have not yielded to the gentleman from Illinois. I would like the gentleman from Illinois to yield to me as I did to the gentleman yesterday. After the gentleman starts doing that I shall yield to him again.

But, Mr. Chairman, I think the record ought to be straight as to the effect of Public Law 874 which has for its purpose the payment to school districts of amounts in lieu of taxes, because the people who live on or work on a Federal establishment do not pay the property taxes on that property.

There are some cases as in Fairfax County in Virginia and Montgomery County in Maryland where Federal employees pay taxes but these counties are receiving aid under the impacted areas bill for these same people. There is about $150 million which goes down the drain in that boondoggle. The amendment which I have proposed in prior years should be supported although the gentleman from Illinois does not choose to support such an amendment.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor].

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2362.

Mr. Chairman, my State of Minnesota has developed over the years one of the finest educational systems in the United States. We in the North Star State are justly proud of what we have done to provide the very best in educational opportunities for our young people. As a high measure of our educational attainment, studies have shown that Minnesota ranks eighth of all the States in the percent of selective service registrants failing the mental test.

In the school year 1963–64, the 3,016 public elementary and secondary schools in Minnesota had 739,735 students enrolled. The per pupil expenditure amounted to $468. Only nine other States stood higher than that in that particular school year.

Now, I know Mr. Chairman, the argument will be used that other States are not as able to provide for their students—that they have peculiar economic problems. Well I might remind my colleagues that Minnesota too has an acute economic problem on our Iron Range, as well as other financial problems. But despite this, Minnesota has taken sufficient interest in providing a sound educational system to the point where only nine other States do better than Minnesota in per pupil expenditure.

The Minnesota Legislature has also established a loan program for school construction in areas where there is a proven need.

Minnesota also ranks high in the salaries paid to our teachers as well as several other criteria used in ranking a State's educational program.

And we have 34 universities, colleges and junior colleges, church, State or privately owned and operated.

We are proud of what we have done, basically through State and local government, to build this system. We do not need or want Federal aid and control for "impoverished children." We will do it ourselves.

We do not need or want Federal aid and control to buy books and other library materials. We will do it ourselves.

We do not need or want Federal aid and control for communitywide supplemental educational centers which bypass our State board of education. We will take care of these needs ourselves.

We do not need or want Federal aid and control to provide grants to our State board of education. The Minnesota Legislature can appropriate these funds, and does.

Mr. Chairman, the only two major provisions of this bill which I can in all good conscience support are the provisions for improving educational research and for the continuation of the impacted aid program. These two programs are national in scope and are legitimate concerns of the Federal Government.

The first provision of this bill, the one calling for aid to the poorer schoolchildren throughout America, is the one which has attracted the most interest, both before the bill came to the floor and in these recent hours. Everyone, of course, is interested in improving educational opportunities for our lowest income groups throughout America. But under the guise of helping impoverished children, this section amounts to a generalized program of Federal aid to education.

Minnesota would receive a little over $20 million in Federal aid under this first provision. The Internal Revenue Service, in response to my request, had advised me that Minnesotans would pay almost $30 million in taxes for this $20 million in benefits.

Residents of Anoka and Hennepin Counties, Minn., the only two in my Third Congressional District, would pay about $7 million in taxes to finance this program, but would receive only $2⅓ million in benefits.

Anoka County would receive $139,000 out of the $19 million allotted to the State. That amounts to less than 1 percent of the total.

Mr. Chairman, Anoka County receives 6 percent of the total State aids which the State of Minnesota, through its allocation system, pays out each year. Surely the State of Minnesota knows far better than the Federal Government how school funds should be allocated within Minnesota.

But let us take this one step further. Anoka County presently receives a bit more than 4 percent of the Federal funds which now come into the State of Minnesota for educational purposes. Now, Mr. Speaker, how misguided can we be?

Here we have the Federal Government sending funds into Minnesota under such programs as Smith-Hughes, George Barden, school lunch, National Defense—titles III and V, Civil Defense, Public Laws 815 and 874, and Johnson O'Malley which figures out to 4 percent for the county of Anoka. And now we are asked to consider an education bill which is supposed to be based on need which allocates less than 1 percent for Anoka County.

Mr. Chairman, outside of the basic disagreements I have with Federal aid to elementary and secondary education, I now find that this bill—this grandiose Great Society scheme for education—does not even have an allocation formula which makes sense.

Palm Beach County, Fla., with 6,663 children in the requisite category, is scheduled to receive $1,292,622 under the terms of title I of this bill. Westchester County, N.Y., one of the richest counties in the country and one with 400 less children affected, will receive $2,189,026 in aid. Mr. Chairman, the median family income for Palm Beach County, Fla., is $4,784. The median family income for Westchester County, N.Y., is $8,052.

Under terms of this bill the average impoverished child in Palm Beach County, Fla., will receive $194. In Westchester County, N.Y., each child will be credited with aid amounting to $352. Palm Beach County will receive almost 10 times as much, and Westchester County 15 times as much as Anoka County, Minn.

The House has already seen the figures of the comparison between the 10 richest and 10 poorest counties in the Nation and the effect this bill will have. The above are but further examples of what is wrong with this bill. It violates the concept of fairplay while being heralded as a great boon to impoverished children. There are better approaches to improving the quality of education in America. Bills which implement these approaches are pending in this House. They should be given a hearing.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. Andrews].

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I would like to commend the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green], a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, for her excellent remarks here today. There have been those happiness boys who have read the committee estimates of fund distribution, made fancy press releases, but forgot to look behind the fancy figures and examine the formula.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot forget the fact that a poor child in the State of North Dakota is as deserving of help as a poor child in the State of Illinois. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] says it costs about $504 to educate a child in Illinois, and about half of that in one of the poorer States of America. He cannot deny that education is poorer generally in the poorer States than in the wealthy States, and this is the heart of the matter. This is what needs correction.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot allow this Nation's children to be frozen into an arbitrary formula where the rich get richer and the poor get poorer.

This is our main objection to this bill, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Sickles].

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I also rise in support of H.R. 2362.

I want to say at the outset that I was one of those who in the beginning had some serious misgivings about the formula included in the bill. One of the things that caused me concern with respect to the formula was the information put in the Congressional Record on February 24 by the Honorable William H. Ayres of our committee with respect to the amounts of money given to the 10 wealthiest counties as compared to the amounts of money allocated to the 10 poorest counties.

Perhaps, the reason why I focus my attention on this so much is because one of those counties is located in my district. I represent the entire State. I have an interest, not only in the suburban area of Washington in which I live, but in the entire State.

I certainly would not want to support a bill that would be so unreasonable as to unjustly enrich Montgomery County at the expense of the poor students who also live in my district, in the hard-core area of Baltimore, or those who live in the Appalachia region in the western end of my State.

You will recall that the table listed 10 selected wealthy counties and 10 selected poor counties in the United States according to median family income and showed that the number of children in families under $2,000 was about equal—that is, 32,000—but that the 10 wealthy counties received approximately twice the total amount of money that the poor counties received. This is purported to prove that the administration's proposal to aid disadvantaged children is designed to give support where it is least needed.

What the table in fact illustrates—and this is all it illustrates—is that when payments are related to State average expenditures, the payments per child in one State will be twice the payments per child in another State if the latter State is only spending half as much per child as the former. This is essentially what is involved in the States where the counties listed are located.

If the administration bill were a general aid proposal based upon equalization principles, then the criteria cited in the table would be relevant. The proposal is, however, categorical aid designed to benefit educationally disadvantaged children. It is designed to aid such children wherever they are found, whether in poor, average, or wealthy counties.

One of the premises of this legislation is that it takes extra expenditures of money to remove the disadvantages of these children. Most school districts, whether wealthy or poor, find it difficult to spend extra sums for poor children in their district, and it is these extra expenditures that are vitally needed. With special Federal funds specifically earmarked for aid to the disadvantaged, little objection can be raised within the district since funds are not, obviously, being taken from one child to be spent on another.

Another point might also be made. In virtually all State special aid programs, such as those for the blind or physically handicapped, for example, funds are supplied by the States to cover the extra costs of such programs in all districts. It is generally felt that no district, regardless of wealth, should have to support these programs once the State has assumed responsibility.

Cultural or educational disadvantage is being recognized by this legislation as a special category of concern by the Federal Government.

If we were to try to draw a line above which no county or school district could receive aid for its disadvantaged children, where would we draw it? Should we say that all counties or school districts with a median family income above the national average cannot qualify? The national median family income in 1959 was $5,660. This would exclude the following cities with above-average median family income: Detroit, Mich., $6,069; New York, N.Y., $6,091; Akron, Ohio, $6,466; and Chicago, Ill., $6,738.

But the need for special aid in these cities is enormous.

Nor can it be said that we propose to help the wealthy counties listed at the expense of the poorer counties. Note that while the number of disadvantaged children in the two groups are the same, the total enrollment and population in the wealthy counties are over 10 times that in the poor counties. While it is not possible to estimate precisely the amount of Federal taxes contributed by each of the groups, a conservative estimate would show the wealthy group contributing 40 to 50 times as much as the poorer group.

They are certainly paying many times over what they receive. The poorer counties, in turn, are receiving many times over what they pay. It seems to me it is with little grace when we say to these counties that are paying substantially into the program that they have caught their finger in the cookie jar when they want to receive back under the formula established to help depressed areas even in these wealthy counties.

The use of the State average expenditure per pupil was placed in the legislation to compensate for the higher costs of education in the industrial and urban areas and to effect the income "in kind" of farm areas. Under these conditions, it was felt that a 50-percent increase in the per pupil expenditures for disadvantaged children would have the same relative effect wherever they are found. A flat rate figure would have the effect of either being inadequate in many instances if it is kept low or providing an unreasonable and unmanageable increase if kept at a medium rate.

The amount of money being distributed under the present plan would amount to less than 1 percent of Montgomery County, Maryland's school budget, but would increase Tunica County, Mississippi's school budget by 58 percent in the first year. We question whether such a short-range increase could be properly digested in terms of educational expenditures and so Tunica County's budget increase is limited by the legislation to 30 percent in fiscal 1966.

What we have witnessed in the presentation of a selected top and a selected bottom 10 counties is a study in extremes which has ignored the 3,000 counties in between. This legislation was not designed to aid only poor counties. It was designed to aid disadvantaged children wherever they live, whether in a rural or urban slum or in pockets of poverty in wealthy communities. There are such places as Toby Town in Montgomery County, and Gum Spring in Fairfax County, two of the wealthiest counties in the table.

We propose a bill which is equitable, and this legislation meets that criterion. Let us not assess it on the basis of something it is not. It is not a foundation or equalization program. It is a program which will make a major contribution toward removing the educational disadvantages suffered by children in poverty and assure them equal opportunity to seek a full life in our society.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SICKLES. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. The formula proposed for distribution of the funds authorized in the bill can be reviewed next year; can it not?

Mr. SICKLES. Yes, it can, and it is the plan of the chairman to do so.

Mr. LANDRUM. Under the formula this plan for distribution of these funds is not to be construed as a permanent method of distributing these funds?

Mr. SICKLES. That is exactly right.

Mr. LANDRUM. So if the Committee on Education and Labor and the Commissioner of Education and the States and local election boards exceed the program discussed in the first year of operation and find there are inequities in the formula for distributing the funds, the Congress will have an opportunity next year to review that formula.

Mr. SICKLES. That is exactly right. I thank the gentleman for his comment.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SICKLES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I should like to congratulate the gentleman on making such an excellent presentation of the question.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, first of all let me say that while I, too, have some misgivings about the formula, I must be frank and recognize that there is a need indeed for some aid to our educational system. I certainly agree with the majority that the educationally deprived child, the needy child, and the dropouts particularly, are the ones that deserve and should get this needed education.

I read with interest, as I am sure all of you have, the suggested plans and programs on page 6 of the report.

This is one time that I am sorry the Federal Government left the decision up to the local agencies. I would hope that all of this money could have been concentrated on such programs as special classes for the physically handicapped, the disturbed, the socially maladjusted child, for preschool training programs, for remedial programs, for programs for early identification and prevention of dropouts, for increased guidance, so that we on the Federal level could get to the root and to the causes of the problems.

But I think it is about time we begin to talk frankly in this Committee of the Whole House about what this bill does not do and what it purports to do.

I may be in error, but I think in answer to the gentleman from Illinois as to the reason why we do not use the formula in Public Law 784 and why we do not give this money to the local school boards to use as they see fit and why we directed this aid to the educationally deprived child—the reason we do that, as I understand it, is to come under the constitutional approval of aid to the schools as is outlined in the Supreme Court case of Everson versus Board of Education.

In other words, the purpose of this is to give the aid to the child. It is the "child benefit theory." Otherwise, if that were not the case, we could give this money directly to the board of education.

Since we are using the child benefit theory under the Everson case which all of you know is the schoolbus case that originated in New Jersey whereby children from parochial schools were permitted to be transported at public expense to parochial schools on the theory that it benefited the child—and since that is the theory of this bill, I want to know why is there such a reluctance on the part of the committee to admit that the purpose of this bill is to help the children who go to private schools just as much as—and equally—and the same as the children who go to the public schools?

I want to know why is there a limitation on that help? Why is it limited to specialized services? Why do not the children who go to the private schools, if this is the theory of the bill—the child benefit theory—why do they not get the same equal treatment? For certainly, it cannot be denied that needy children go to private schools. It cannot be denied that dropouts go to private schools. It cannot be denied that service rejects go to private schools. So why then if the purpose of this bill is to help the needy, the reject, and the dropout, and if it is based upon the constitutional permissive, approved theory of the child-benefit program—why cannot the committee recognize and admit that the child who goes to the private school is entitled to the same treatment and the same care as the child who does not go to a private school?

This is what I want to know because I have been told by many of my friends and my colleagues whose judgment I respect that actually it does provide that; that the funds are for the benefit of the needy—that the funds are for the benefit of all children regardless of the school, and that this is the reason for this bill. All I want to know is—why do not we put this in the RECORD? Will the Chairman say this for the RECORD? Will not the Member in charge of the bill, the chairman of the subcommittee, make the legislative history here? I can say to you that this is spelled out in the report because on page 7 of the report, you will see in the next to the last paragraph these words:

> Thus, the bill does anticipate broadened instructional offerings under publicly sponsored auspices which will be available to elementary and secondary school students who are not enrolled in public schools.

Again, on page 16, under title III of the bill, we find, in the next to the last paragraph, these words:

> Criteria developed in the title provide that the Federal funds could not be used to supplant funds normally available to the localities, that the money granted to local public educational agencies would be used for programs accessible—

And these are the key words—

> to all appropriate children in the area to be served irrespective of their school enrollment, and that local educational agencies will utilize the best available talents and resources in the area to be served.

I submit that the purpose of the legislation, as it was written, is constitutional. I submit that the desire of the committee is to give the aid to all children who are qualified. Therefore, I do not understand why there is a reluctance on the part of the chairman of the subcommittee to say so for the RECORD.

Therefore, I want to ask him a question. Do the criteria which are set forth in title III of this bill apply to title I of the bill; and, therefore, is it intended that the money in title I is to be used subject to State law in an equal amount among all educationally deprived and needy children of whatever school they attend? Will the gentleman answer that "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. PERKINS. I will not answer the question "Yes" or "No."

Mr. CAHILL. Then I do not yield.

Mr. PERKINS. Because it cannot be. Let me answer the question.

Mr. CAHILL. I do not yield.

Mr. PERKINS. The bill speaks for itself.

Mr. CAHILL. I should like to propose the question to another Member. I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID], if he will answer the question.

In your judgment, is the money in title I intended to be used subject to State law equally among all educationally deprived and needy children regardless of the school they attend? Will you answer that question "Yes" or "No"?

Mr. REID of New York. I would say to my distinguished colleague from New Jersey that in my judgment, subject to State law and to the approval of the State under title I and to the programs submitted by the local educational agency or agencies, it is clear that funds for some of the illustrative purposes the gentleman mentioned are to be applied for all educationally deprived children within the low-income district as prescribed and defined by the bill. It is my understanding there is not to be any difference between those in a nonpublic school and those in public school. In a broad sense, I believe the answer to the question is that there is not to be any distinction.

Mr. CAHILL. And, therefore, the funds are to be used equally.

Mr. REID of New York. That is my understanding of the intent of the legislation subject to the various caveats I have mentioned and that are in the several titles in the bill. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. CAHILL. Very well. Does the chairman of the subcommittee agree with the gentleman from New York?

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to state that the bill speaks for itself. The gentleman has been addressing himself to two titles, and reading from the report on title III, which is certainly separate and apart from title I.

In title I under broadened public school offerings of special educational services are provided for the nonpublic school children, the private schoolchildren. In title III, the publicly operated educational centers, bring educational innovations and demonstrative educational programs and services in which not only the public school pupil but also the nonpublic school pupil can participate.

Mr. CAHILL. If I may have the gentleman's attention, in response I say I recognize the difference between title I and title III, and I concede under title III the aid is specifically spelled out and that there is no doubt, in my judgment, at least, that under title III children who attend private schools are entitled to equal treatment. But I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there is only $100 million appropriated or authorized under title III whereas there is $1 billion X million under title I. My question is this: do the criteria established in title III also apply with equal force to title I? That is my question.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I addressed myself to title III yesterday and the gentleman will recall that he and I had a colloquy on a related point and I referred him to page 5750 of the RECORD.

Mr. CAHILL. Yes.

Mr. BRADEMAS. However, in response to the gentleman's question, if I understand it correctly, the answer is that the criteria set forth in the bill on pages 106 through 109—and on page 109 is the particular criteria to which the gentleman refers in title III—those criteria apply to that title and the criteria set forth in title I apply to that title.

Mr. CAHILL. But my question is—and if I may say too, it was really the gentleman's very frank and reassuring statement that sent me back to the bill last night—I find in my judgment that the things the gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. THOMPSON, assured me were in the bill were provided for specifically in title III. That is the special help and special therapists. That is all in title III. There is no doubt about that. But my question is this: is that same type of aid available under title I where all of the money is?

Mr. BRADEMAS. If the gentleman will read title I and consult the colloquy yesterday, there are a series of possible uses for the title I funds. The gentleman will be clearer in our discussions if he will not try to mix the two titles, because title I is the only title of this bill which is specifically directed toward meeting the problems of educationally deprived children.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota to answer the question.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, if we read on page 5758 of the RECORD the answer that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] gave yesterday, it indicates there that under title I only special type programs will be available for the private schools and he talks about such things as guidance counselors, speech therapists, and remedial reading specialists and says specifically that general course teachers will not be available for the private schools. But today we hear they are all available.

It was established by the chairman of the committee yesterday that the general courses are available only for the public schools. Looking on page 6 of the report, additional teaching personnel to reduce class size and any teachers they need—but the gentleman from New Jersey yesterday stated specifically they would not be included, as did the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL]. We have an altogether different answer today.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I might say that the gentleman is correct. I stated specifically and categorically what I believe to be the situation. The gentlemen from Kentucky and New York agreed. Unhappily, though, on page 5758 of the RECORD it was incorrectly reported. If the gentleman will yield me enough time to reread it correctly, you will see I have answered it.

Mr. QUIE. Could you get some time from your side on this? This is an important matter, and we are just about out of our time.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. May I have 3 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has the floor.

Mr. QUIE. With the understanding that the gentleman from New Jersey will be yielded 2 minutes from the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], I will yield to the gentleman from New Jersey to read his statement. This is correct, that you will get 2 additional minutes?

Mr. POWELL. I yield the gentleman 2 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (reading):

> Services and arrangements provided for nonpublic school students must be special as distinguished from general educational assistance.
>
> The decision about the best arrangement for providing special educational assistance under title I is left to the public education agency of the school district, under the constitution and laws of the State.
>
> Thus, public school boards could make available the services of such special personnel as guidance counselors, speech therapists, remedial reading specialists, school social workers who would reach the nonpublic schoolchildren——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey (continuing):

> school social workers who would reach the nonpublic school children in the public schools or through public services in the nonpublic school buildings, or through mobile services, or through ETV, or through community centers, et cetera. But these special services would not be part of the regular instructional program of the nonpublic schools. Thus, nonpublic schools could not get general classroom teachers in history, English, mathematics, and social studies.

This is where the error was in yesterday's RECORD at page 5758. It should be noted:

> That States like New York and California which have very strict constitutional prohibitions on aid to private schools still do permit special services of the type mentioned. This legislation, therefore, respects State and local autonomy and judgment.
>
> It should also be pointed out that shared time—instruction in the public schools under public school control—now goes on in 35 States. Thus, it already occurs with greater frequency than suggested by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. The 35 States are: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. CAHILL. Then it is the gentleman's considered opinion that the statement which he very kindly presented to me last evening and which he reaffirms today has application to all of the funds authorized in title I of this bill as well as to the funds in title III of the bill?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. No, only in title I.

Mr. CAHILL. Only in title I?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. CAHILL. If the gentleman will yield further, I call his attention to page 16.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished member of our committee the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY].

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, we are at present considering a bill for Federal aid to education, a bill which has been called a historic "first" in this country. But this bill is also a reaffirmation of this country's continuing commitment to the education of our people.

Almost 200 years ago, before our great Nation had even adopted a Constitution, the Continental Congress declared that "Schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." This present education bill allows us to continue, in 1965, to fulfill that declaration which was made in 1787.

I do not believe there is really any debate today, nor has been in the entire history of our great Nation, on the question of whether or not there should be public aid to education. The debate today, and throughout our history, has rather been on the question of what kind of aid.

In this context it is clear that as the representatives of the American people we have a duty to continually reexamine what kind of educational encouragement and aid we are providing for our people and to evaluate whether it is "the right kind at the right time."

After much study Commissioner Keppel recommended to the President, and President Johnson presented to this Congress, a bill which points the way to a solution of today's problems in education. The most significant part of the proposed legislation, as all have recognized, is emphasis on providing special Federal aid to the children from poor and welfare families.

This new departure must be our answer to our new awareness that our educational system has failed over the years to provide equal education to rich and poor children. This failure is not a minor one, it is not one which I will fatalistically accept; it goes to the root of our entire history of free, public education. For the guiding principle underlying the idea of free, public education is that no child should be denied an education because he cannot afford a private education. We have allowed deviations from the basic premise; we have allowed, in fact, a difference in educational opportunities for rich and poor children.

This bill which is before us today is a commitment to return to the basic premise of our educational system. I unreservedly support that commitment.

This afternoon an amendment will be offered to the bill which will, I believe, strengthen that commitment. The amendment, which I shall support, would provide that the entire amount of money requested under title I be divided by the total number of poor and welfare children, and that the resulting figure, about $200, be the basis for distributing funds under title I. This change is from the present formula which uses as a basis for the aid the per pupil expenditure of each of our 50 States.

I believe the proposed amendment is a crucial one, it is crucial for the basic concept of equal education for all, for just as we believe that a child should not be penalized because he comes from a poor family, I believe a child should not be penalized because he lives in a poor State.

If Johnny's father has a low income and little property, and therefore pays little in taxes which are used to support his State's educational system, is it fair to penalize Johnny by providing his school less Federal funds for his education than are provided to the schools in a rich State? I do not believe the American credo of free, equal, public education would allow this.

In fact, the present formula would be a penalty for past errors, for a past crime of omission. For if a State in the past has been unable to provide sufficient funds for education we would be penalizing it in the future by giving that same State less money. I believe this kind of "ex post facto" judgment must be stricken from the bill.

Our commitment to public education is one of the underlying strengths of this Nation. For what better defense could there be for democracy than an educated populace? Democracy depends on an educated, informed people; the present education bill, and the amendment which will be offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN], will help us achieve that goal. I urge my fellow Representatives to follow in a tradition over 175 years old and support this commitment to education, to our children, and to our Nation's future.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. Don H. Clausen].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, time does not permit a Member of Congress who is not a member of the Education and Labor Committee to adequately present his point of view on this legislation. What used to be the greatest deliberative body in the world, has now turned into an arena where collectivized conformity is required on the part of our colleagues. On an issue of this magnitude and great importance, every Member desiring to express himself should be given the openminded and undivided attention of the entire Committee. However, it is quite obvious to me that openmindedness would be highly desirable but totally impossible with the existing mood so prevalent today.

Therefore, I will not take the time to develop my point of view but simply ask that I be permitted to restate my position on education by inserting a copy of a speech I made in Santa Rosa something over a year ago. I submit it for the benefit of some of my colleagues who will be reviewing the debate as recorded in the Congressional Record. It is intended to remind the Members that constructive alternatives for financing our educational systems are available providing, of course the atmosphere of openmindedness on the part of political leaders prevails. This is but one of many alternatives and I will predict other concepts and alternatives will develop in the coming years.

I believe the gentleman from New York has presented his case in an articulate manner. He is deserving of the commendation of this House but I am convinced his remarks will fall on deaf ears.

Heretofore, I have supported the impacted areas legislation because the Federal Government has a clear responsibility to provide payment to affected school districts but in this bill you added an extension of Federal aid that in my judgment, touches on the question of constitutionality. Further, the intervention of the Federal Government into our educational system has never been projected so boldly.

The fact that State educational systems can be completely bypassed is a very dangerous precedent and title V specifically demands conformity to Federal requirements. This is the door opener to Federal control.

Again for this reason I insert my remarks so the Record will include my position on education. Many of us are for similar objectives but the methods for achieving these goals differ substantially. I'm convinced history will record my approach as being proper.

While I find myself in disagreement with this approach, I will not let up in my efforts to convince others to look toward the tax revision and reform concept to assist in financing our educational needs. This will eliminate any possible control of our educational system.

The above-mentioned speech follows:

Today, I have a few comments to make regarding taxes. Some people feel that the tax cut will make people feel happy through this election and a few more to come. To me, this was not the purpose of the bill.

The purpose of the tax cut was primarily to spur the Nation's economy. I tend to believe that this was somewhat overplayed and that only part of the expected economic surge will be realized.

To me, the real reason for this tax cut was to return this $11½ billion to the private sector, to provide capital for growth and expansion, to increase job opportunities of a more permanent nature. Further, it was mandatory that we revise our tax rate structure to permit more equitable competition with other economic unions forming throughout the world.

For every dollar California taxpayers pay to the Federal Government, they get back 79 cents in services, according to the Congressional Quarterly. It is obvious to anyone that those dollars will buy a lot more in services if they are left here in the first place.

If any State in the Union can afford to pay its own way, it is California.

So, my first announcement to you tonight is this: This is not the last of the big Federal tax cuts. If I and a growing number of responsible Congressmen have anything to say about it, this is just the beginning of a major tax reform—hopefully at all levels of government. The major aim of this tax reform is to return Federal tax sources to State and local governments so they can handle their own problems—all directed toward reducing the unbearable load of our real property taxpayers. And to provide a broader tax base to support our schools—our cities, counties, and other units of local government where the demand for service actually occurs.

My own theme is "Home Rule."

"Leave to private initiative all the functions that citizens can perform privately; use the level of government closest to the community for all public functions it can handle; utilize cooperative intergovernmental agreements where appropriate to attain economical performance and popular approval; reserve national action for residual participation where State and local governments are not fully adequate; and for the continuing responsibilities that only the National Government can undertake."

My motto is "Strong local government is the foundation of our Republic." No one can dispute the fact that our educational system, based on home rule, or call it local control if you will, is the greatest in the world. And no one can dispute that our educational system, along with our American system of individual initiative and responsibility, has given our people the highest standard of living in the world.

Yet, our educational system is primarily supported by one of the most limited tax bases available to government—the property tax. Those who earn money pay the bulk of their income, corporate, and excise taxes to the Federal Government. These same people pay the bulk of their sales and use taxes to the State. But the property owners, and this includes many people on retirement incomes, who have already paid for their chilren's education, pay most of the support for our schools. The objective we must all work for is to equalize the tax burden by providing a tax program that properly considers the mobile population problem.

Some will say that the answer is to go to the Federal Government for help from its vast sources of income. And I say to you that to ask for Federal help is to ask for Federal control. I firmly believe it is constituitonally the morally obligatory to maintain a decentralized system of education in America.

I say this without reservation. Federal control has followed Federal aid in many areas. Frankly, the personnel and agencies of Government would not be doing their job if the contingencies for disbursement were not maintained. I would cite further, the Supreme Court of the United States:

In 1942, a case was argued over whether a farmer could accept Government supports but refuse to abide by the attendant Government acreage controls. Justice Jackson, writing the majority decision against the farmer (*Wickard* v. *Filburn*), said:

"It only appears that, if he could get all that the Government gives and do nothing that the Government asks, he would be better off than this law allows." He further said, in a general vein: "It is hardly lack of due process for Government to regulate that which it subsidizes."

This, of course, does not preclude the Federal Government recognizing its responsibilities under the impacted area, National Defense Education Act and the National Science Foundation programs.

It is my firm conviction that the solution to our school problems * * * and many of our other problems * * * is to permit home rule to prevail. We must remove tax sources from the Federal Government and return them to the States. The States, in turn, must overhaul their tax structures or revise revenue allocations to provide a broader tax base at the local government and school board level. These new funds could be used as a new source of revenue or relief to the ad valorem taxpayer.

This will give you the funds to meet your own responsibilities. At the same time I pledge to work for more spending cuts at the Federal level so we can afford to repeal these tax sources. I would, however, remind you that we must take into account a major problem of concern to many of us—the national debt. We must come forth with a positive program to retire this debt. I am currently conducting research toward this end.

Individual and community responsibility is the backbone of this country. If and when this is gone, all is lost. We would become mere automations under a socialist master.

A great taxpayer revolt already is building up in this country. My correspondence, and that of my colleagues, shows this. Property owners, of course, are the most concerned. Those of us who subscribe to the philosophy of doing everything possible to permit the private enterprise system to flourish are most encouraged with our successes this far. (Tax cut and foreign aid—more emphasis in the private sector.)

Our first step is to channel this taxpayers' revolt in the right direction. We must provide proper leadership. We must solicit the cooperation of all representatives of government and organizations such as the Sonoma Taxpayers Association.

So I am proposing to you tonight a resolution. A resolution that I hope will be adopted by every school board, village, city, county, special district, and civic body in this district. I am going to send a copy to every one of these bodies and urge that they endorse it.

Further, I am going to send copies of this resolution to all of my 434 colleagues in the House of Representatives. I will ask that they endorse it and likewise send copies to all the local government bodies in their districts.

Now, I would like to read to you what this resolution says:

"HOME RULE AND TAX REFORM RESOLUTION

"*Resolution urging revision of tax structure among the various levels of government*

"Whereas all local governments in the United States of America are firmly committed to the advancement of the principles of home rule and local self-determination; and

"Whereas these precious principles of American local government are meaningless unless the counties, cities, school districts, and other special service districts concerned have available tax resources for financing local governmental functions; and

"Whereas with home rule, there invariably comes the necessity of home responsibility and the challenge of home achievement since the fulfillment of home rules does not involve the denial of governmental services to the people nor does it involve their being furnished at substandard levels; and

"Whereas the common property tax is now the universally overloaded mainstay of local government finances with the inevitable result that self-sufficiency of local governments is seriously hampered; and

"Whereas local governments need additional independent sources of revenue in order to enable proper home rule performance of governmental services; and

"Whereas strong local government is the foundation of our Republic: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by* ——, That support is hereby expressed for the allocation of specific tax sources to local government; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That support is hereby expressed for an immediate revision of the tax structure at the State and Federal levels with the single goal of returning tax sources to local units of government, thereby enabling said local governments to be more self-sufficient in their own right."

If you concur, I will solicit your support. This resolution, I feel, will set the stage for action by the Congress and all levels of government. I personally feel that the first major step in this tax reform could be the Federal excise tax.

The Federal excise tax on telephone service, cosmetics, jewelry, furs, leather goods, amusements, etc., was levied during the Korean war. It was promised that it would expire 2 years later.

But for more than a decade, this tax has been extended year after year. The administration and the Congress has broken faith with the people time after time. In reality, this tax should have been the first to go. It provides Federal income of some $13 billion a year, not a great deal more, relatively speaking, than the recent income tax cut.

To illustrate that possible repeal of the excise tax is not just a dream, I have talked to the chairman and members of the House Ways and Means Committee about it. This is the committee that handles tax bills. I fully believe we can look forward to action to implement these objectives.

It is my plan to continue working with the First Congressional District's schools, cities, counties, as well as the League of California Cities, the County Supervisors Association, the National Association of County Officials in Washington, and any volunteer organization dedicated to the cause of fiscal integrity to advance this tax reform concept.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLANCY].

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2362 and urge the defeat of this proposal. The proponents of this measure have utilized the well-tested "poverty" label as a guise to secure passage of this legislation.

The expressed purpose of this bill is to meet the needs of educationally and economically deprived children, but instead it establishes a far-reaching Federal aid to education program which, of necessity, will provide more and more Federal control of our educational systems in this country.

Under this legislation, decisionmaking with respect to course content, curricula, instructional materials and professional standards for teachers would be centralized in the U.S. Office of Education. The language of the bill states that every local project under title I must conform with the criteria established by the U.S. Commissioner of Education in Washington. Federal control inevitably follows Federal grants as surely as night follows day.

Under title II, the Commissioner must approve a State plan which specifies the criteria used by the State in book selection. Under title III we have Federal-local schools teaching youth, training teachers, and responsible only to the Commissioner. Under title IV, the Commissioner will select research areas and be involved with curricula, texts, and course content fed into schools from the laboratories and through the Federal-local schools. And under title V, the Commissioner will be authorized to assign employees from his office to the State departments of education and vice versa.

This legislation provides the framework upon which a massive Federal education agency will be built in the future. Succeeding bills will undoubtedly furnish the bricks and mortar to complete the structure.

Several years ago, the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare published a pamphlet entitled, "A Federal Education Agency for the Future," and here are a few statements from that publication.

The Office of Education "may expect to administer operating programs of significantly increased scope and impact." The pamphlet goes on to say that programs may be anticipated in such areas as the "broadening of Federal interest in curriculum and improvement of instruction." Elsewhere in the booklet, we read:

> In addition to the Federal level of public policy determination, the Office has much concern with policy matters at the State and local levels, and in higher education institutions.

What was forecast in that publication in 1961 is being authorized here today.

A cursory study of the table in the minority views showing the funds which would be allocated under title I to the 10 wealthiest counties in the Nation and 10 poor counties indicates that whoever devised the formula was not advised that the alleged purpose of the bill was to aid the needy. The end result of this legislation is to give far more money to the wealthiest counties with very small percentages of children in the poverty category and less money to the poorest counties in the Nation with much higher percentages of children from poor families.

Furthermore, the bill presupposes that inferior education is provided for children of low-income families in many of the counties throughout the Nation and that the standard of education is lower for the children of low-income families than that of high-income groups in some of the school districts. This is not the case in my own county, Hamilton County, Ohio. The same standards of education are provided for the children in neighborhoods where income is low as that provided in neighborhoods where income is high. In fact, the students at any one of our elementary and secondary schools often represent a cross-section of income levels.

Another aspect of the bill I would like to mention is the question of aid to nonpublic schools. I believe those who favor such aid will find the benefits available under the bill disappointingly small. It is also well to note that the committee amended title II so that library resources and textbooks are made available to nonpublic schools on a loan basis only. Public authority must retain title and administrative control over such materials, and they must be approved for use by public school authority.

In general, I favor the approach of tax credits as the soundest and fairest assistance in financing the costs of education. This type of assistance is free from Federal control, both substantive and procedural, over educational policies. Moreover, there would be no need to expand the Federal bureaucracy to administer such a program. Second, this approach eliminates the church-state controversy. And, third, it eases the heavy tax burden of our citizens. We have already been advised that more Federal aid for education will be requested next year, and these same tax-burdened citizens will have to pay for it.

There is nothing in the Federal fiscal picture to warrant the claim of Federal aid proponents that the Federal budget can better bear the burden of additional school financing than can State and local budgets. The Federal Government can obtain money to subsidize education only by taking it away from taxpayers in the States. The people would be much better off to keep their money at home, for programs which taxpayers themselves approve. Tax credits are by far a better means to enable individuals to meet the cost of education, whether it be in public or private institutions.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REID].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill, H.R. 2362. From the colloquies that have occurred here and the testimony before the committee the need is very clear.

The bill, in my judgment, is correctly directed at one of our most serious problems of 5 million educationally deprived children of the United States, at the correlation between educational underachievement and poverty. It is directed toward a serious lack of library facilities and textbooks, it is directed at the need for more and better research, it is directed toward strengthening, as appropriate and constitutional, State agencies which in my judgment should be strengthened.

It would be my hope that this bill and the principles included in it, wherein they are constitutional, will have broad, bipartisan support.

I believe that the bill does comprehend some reasonable and relatively clear language with regard to local control over education; particularly in title I.

With regard to the formula, no doubt it could be improved, but I have not heard a better one. I might say that no child in these United States should be abandoned because of the accident of his residence. No county, so far as we know, is completely free of poverty.

Further, I believe that the committee has added some sections that are consistent with the separation of church and state, which is a clear and fundamental principle.

Therefore I hope the House will support this bill, which will do much to help deprived children in poor-income districts of the United States. America must face this serious problem and important opportunity here and now. This is our future and our children are our future's best hope.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I have a question relative to one of the sections of the bill, and I would like to have the matter that appears to be somewhat ambiguous cleared up.

I would like to request the chairman to give me the answers.

Is the term "nonprofit" as defined in title VI, section 601(g) to be interpreted in such a way as to restrict the availability of assistance granted under this legislation in the other titles?

Mr. POWELL. I shall be happy to recognize the chairman of the Committee on Interior, my mentor. May I say in reply to the gentleman's question that: First, title VI definitions do not apply to titles I and IV. Second, the word "nonprofit" does not appear in title II. Third, the use of the term in section 304(a) of title III is inclusive and not restrictive. Fourth, title V involves grants to State departments of education where the definition is irrelevant, therefore inapplicable.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. McVicker].

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

I believe that the Congress should pass this legislation both because it provides ample and imaginative measures to strengthen elementary and secondary school programs, and because it represents a realistic approach to basic educational needs.

In recent years, the cost of education has been making prodigious and ever-increasing demands on local and State governments which have pushed them to the limits of their financial abilities. To meet these demands for adequate school programs, local school districts must rely on one of the most inequitable and regressive taxes—the real estate tax. This present measure will go far to relieve the extreme pressure on the States, and at the same time it will enable them to provide special educational programs which until now have been too much in the backwash of educational attention.

This bill reemphasizes the conviction of the Congress that the States themselves can best manage the affairs of their own schools, since all facilities and programs financed under titles I, II, and III are entirely owned and operated at State and local levels. There is no Federal control; there is Federal support.

As I have strongly supported the principle and fact of equalization among all the areas within my own State of Colorado to provide States moneys to local school districts on the basis of need, so I believe in the same principle of equalization among all the States of the Union to provide financial support through the States to the local district.

The elementary and secondary bill is commendable for numerous reasons. The largest allocation, under title I, bolsters public school programs in areas where there are concentrations of children from low-income families, yet it duly considers school districts where there are fewer families who would qualify for the arbitrary "poverty" designation, but where schools have nonetheless been hard pressed to find adequate finances.

The authors of this bill have wisely recognized that one of the most sorely inadequate and neglected aspects of elementary and secondary education is that of our school libraries. Surely we cannot hope to provide the high quality of education in this country that we seek when nearly 70 percent of our public elementary schools have no library.

Title III of this bill is particularly commendable because it seeks to remedy some of the neglected educational areas of the past through counseling, remedial instruction, and special educational services for rural people. It also looks to the future in providing for special educational services such as classroom television, shared services between schools, and specialized instruction and equipment.

Finally, the provisions which will finance the expansion of educational research and further the training of educational personnel will go a long way toward keeping the competence of teachers abreast of the improvement of school facilities.

There is still much left undone, but this bill will make a large and important first step. We seek excellence, in our Nation's schools.

Quality in education does not come just by chance. You must be willing to pay for what you get. This bill points in the right direction America's willingness to equitably pay for what we are dedicated to: equal opportunity for excellence in education for all.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Annunzio].

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the administration's elementary and secondary education bill (H.R. 2362). I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate on this particular bill from both sides of the aisle. I have read with great interest this bill, the various titles under the bill, the report of committee hearings and the report of the committee. It is with a profound sense of appreciation that I commend the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky, the Honorable Carl D. Perkins, and his fine subcommittee for bringing before this House and to the attention of the American people one of the outstanding education bills in the history of our Nation. I also want to congratulate the chairman of the committee, the Honorable Adam Clayton Powell of New York, for the great contribution he has made to the hundreds and thousands of children throughout America who are in need now of better education. I should also like to extend my appreciation to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable Roman Pucinski, eighth ranking Democrat on the Labor and Education Committee, who gave me freely of his time in order to consult with me on the aims and aspirations of the committee with reference to this education bill.

It is our responsibility, as Representatives of the people of this great Nation, to provide for quality education for all its citizens, whether they are in the North, in the South, in the East, or in the West. This bill provides special assistance in areas where educationally deprived children are concentrated. This bill does not provide assistance to private or parochial schools as some of those who oppose this bill have not only inferred but accused this administration of breaking down the doctrine established in America of separation of church and state. There is not one dime in this bill that is appropriated directly to any private or parochial school. All of the moneys appropriated in this bill are for the purpose of benefiting the educationally deprived children from poor families in America who are in need of special attention in their education. This bill provides for the local boards of education and local administrators to determine the special educational needs and wants of their communities and to develop special projects to equip and enhance the quality of education of the educationally deprived children in their respective communities.

The distinguished general superintendent of schools for the city of Chicago and president of the Great Cities Research Council for School Improvement, Benjamin C. Willis, whom I had the privilege of talking with in the city of Washington, wholeheartedly approves this legislation. I have received many letters and many telegrams from school principals and school administrators who are in favor of this legislation. The Illinois Education Association has had their representatives call on me in my office urging me to support this legislation. Speaking on behalf of the people in my district, my city, and my State, and as a man who spent 9 years as a teacher in the Chicago public schools, it is with a feeling of deep responsibility that I urge my colleagues to pass this legislation. This legislation can be truly named "the emancipation of American education," because it provides the teachers and the tools to educate every child regardless of race, color, or creed.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST].

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Chairman, I have studied this bill and the report on it, as well as the hearings. I intend to support the bill. I think the need for it has been amply and clearly demonstrated.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SCHEUER].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, it is a proud privilege for a freshman Congressman to raise his voice and to cast his vote for this great bill embodying a noble purpose—to begin now the task of helping our public schools.

The public school system has been one of the great creative triumphs of American democratic society. Over the last century our public school system helped make our pluralistic society work—it stretched out a helping hand to children of farmers, miners, factory workers, children of native born Americans and immigrants alike—children of all faiths and colors.

In simpler bygone days the little red schoolhouse and McGuffey's reader could perform this miracle. But today we face a far different, a far more complicated challenge. Today we live in a complex, and automated urban society. For the first time in our history, a strong back and willing heart are not enough to permit most men and women to play useful and rewarding roles in our society. They must also be equipped with learned skills and developed talents to play productive roles in our new urban economy.

There is not a Member of this honorable body who does not have personal knowledge that our public school system today is not doing the job for those children in our Nation who come from underprivileged and deprived homes.

Let us begin now to do that job.

There is no Doctor Pangloss in this Chamber who would tell us that this is a perfect bill conceived in the best of all possible worlds—designed to meet all problems, and to create none. It is a bill wrought on the forge of this pluralistic body, and fired by the commitment of many Members to make the necessary minimum concessions and compromise to achieve a basic philosophy and structure acceptable to as many as possible.

Of course, the bill presents many questions and problems. None of us who have participated in molding and forming this bill believe it presents final answers. We are convinced of only one thing—that it provides now a courageous, ingenious and imaginative beginning.

Let us begin.

The members of the committee have considered carefully the very constitutionality of the bill which we have heard debated in this Chamber. We have provided what we all felt was a meaningful set of safeguards to insure the proper operation and administration of the bill's many new programs.

We feel that the bill is constitutional on its face. We are also well aware that many thoughtful people share a common concern over the possibility that the bill may be administered in an unconstitutional fashion in some local programs.

The programs envisioned under title I are, of course, experimental in nature. The infinite variety of the innovations possible under the bill makes it difficult for any Member to foresee all of these possibilities and to seek to guard against the variety of ways in which local programs might theoretically be conducted in an unconstitutional manner.

We believe we can reasonably assume that local public officials will carry out their public duties, specifically, to administer the shared-time and other programs contemplated in title I, in conformity with the clear intent of the Congress, with the administrative regulations promulgated by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, with State and local laws, and with the U.S. Constitution.

We have created a national advisory council with public members of distinction to be appointed by the President, and with adequate professional staff to be provided by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to assure that this is the case, and that the full educational potential of the program is achieved.

We thoroughly expect that the council will scrutinize the operation of the programs under title I in communities across the country to make sure, among other things, that local community programs are carried on in such a fashion so as not to violate the intent of the Congress, and to maintain the proper relationship between the State and the nonpublic schools. If the council members were to find evidence of any abuse, they would be in a position to recommend additional administrative safeguards, and if necessary, remedial legislation, to halt any such practices and to insure that they will not be repeated in other communities in the future.

We likewise expect that the council, in conducting a continuing scrutiny of the various programs will make sure that their full educational and enriching potential is achieved in day to day operations in the local communities.

In the course of the hearings of the subcommittee, virtually all of the educators who appeared before us agreed on the desirability of the mixing and shoulder-rubbing in the classrooms between the nonpublic school children and the public school children which would result from the shared-time programs, and other programs contemplated under title I, as well as in the operations of the supplementary educational centers, provided for in title III. We expect the council and its staff, in its on-going scrutiny of these programs, to make sure that the added educational enrichment produced by this classroom interaction is in fact achieved in the conduct of these local programs.

The experimental program contemplated in title III of the act providing grants to local education agencies for supplementary educational centers and services promises to produce rich dividends in producing new approaches and new techniques to stimulate and nourish the youthful minds which so desperately need help.

This program, like the massive injection of aid in local public schools envisaged under title I, will depend upon local public educational leadership for its driving force; will depend upon local experience, local professionalism, and local insight into the nature and quality of the problems faced by the disadvantaged children in each community. It is the organizing philosophy of this legislation to place local professional school administrators and local elected school board members together in the driver's seat.

The bill provides that the new supplementary educational centers shall not only serve to educate the child, but to elevate the surrounding community as well. The bill assures that the new educational centers will have adequate space and facilities for artistic and cultural programs not only for the benefit of the schoolchildren during the daytime, but also for the neighboring community use during the weekend and evening hours.

The new educational centers will be designed for multipurpose use so that classrooms, auditoriums, and the variety of special audiovisual facilities will be adaptable for use in cultural programs in the arts and humanities which will be planned both for the children during the daytime and for meeting the needs of the adult community for evening and weekend programs. These programs will include: Performance of drama, concerts, and dance recitals; demonstrations by professional theatrical organizations and amateur theatrical groups; and courses, lectures, and seminars employing all audio and visual techniques on the performing arts and humanities.

The President has sent to the Congress an eloquent message recommending passage of legislation which will at long last recognize and encourage the vital role of the arts and humanities in our national life.

A subcommittee of the Education and Labor Committee, chaired by our brilliant colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. FRANK THOMPSON, is now considering the President's program for a National Foundation for the Arts and a National Foundation for the Humanities which would encourage development of talent, as well as a wide variety of projects and programs in the arts and humanities. The fund to be made available will be used primarily for development of talent and programs and not for bricks, stone and mortar to house these activities.

Thus, it is hoped that the projected new educational centers will help bring the President's program to local communities and provide the neighborhood with a focal point for exciting and stimulating programs in the arts and humanities.

Mr. Chairman, in the past decade and a half, the American people have reached out to the poor, the sick, the ignorant, and the oppressed around the world in an outpouring of compassion and generosity unmatched in the annals of human history; Americans have poured out their substance—well over $100 billion—as well as the time, strength, and talents of our finest and most dedicated professional men and women, to help those less fortunate on this globe who look to us with hands and hearts outstretched.

Is it too much to ask that we begin now the task of setting our own society right; that we set our sights now to devoting less than 1 percent of the resources we have sent overseas, to assist our youth at home who are now condemned to lives of uselessness and despair on the marginal outer fringes of society?

If we really believe that the future of our Nation lies in our youth; if we really believe in the dream of an egalitarian society; if we really cherish the Judeo-Christian ethic and the Sermon on the Mount, we will face the moral imperative: we will begin now.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHEUER. I yield.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman and to proclaim my support of this worthwhile bill, which I think is long overdue and much needed.

The historic moment for which the friends of education have waited for many years is now upon us. I urge the House to enact the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. I acknowledge, of course, that it is not perfect. Bills seldom are. But we must now take that first, historic step, and then continue our efforts. We must not become more absorbed with preserving an issue than with reaching a solution.

We have made great progress in our support of education in this country. The Eighty-eighth Congress was rightfully heralded as "The Education Congress," and it passed several laws strengthening American education. It voted Federal aid to higher education and to vocational education, and enacted a library services bill. In addition, the 88th Congress expanded the student loan and manpower development and training program and substantially enlarged the National Defense Education Act. These actions marked a beginning. Let us now continue.

The previous school legislation has not solved our national problems. There is still a critical shortage of well-trained teachers, and an alarming lack of adequate classrooms throughout the Nation. Together they are severely restricting the quality of American education. May I repeat what President Johnson said in his November 1 policy paper on education:

> We will need a minimum of nearly 400,000 new classrooms in our public schools during the next 5 years to eliminate overcrowding and replace unsatisfactory facilities! We will need over 800,000 new public schoolteachers in the next 5 years to keep up with expanding enrollments and to replace those teachers who retire or resign—and we need to increase incentives so that our best people will be attracted to the teaching profession.

Because of the immediate as well as projected classroom and teacher shortages, we must take action at once. The formula for distributing funds proposed in H.R. 2362 is not the formula that many of the friends of education in this Chamber prefer, but it is a satisfactory formula, and we must not jeopardize the whole bill because it fails to provide all we would like. It will improve existing aid programs. For instance, it broadens the concept of Federal impact. I have long felt that the definition of "Federal impact" and eligibility under Public Laws 81-815 and 81-874 has been too narrowly interpreted. This narrow interpretation has, in effect, contributed to educational inequities among States and school districts. I see in title I of H.R. 2362 corrective legislation to help eliminate such inequities. The more realistic concept of "Federal impact" inherent in H.R. 2362 would enable Public Law 874—only—to function in a broader national interest.

Title I, in effect, proposes that the concept of "national impact" be broadened to include the problems caused by the presence of large numbers of children from low income families—those with $2,000 or less per year. I wholeheartedly support this expansion to provide for channeling Federal funds to disadvantaged school districts, with the administration of such funds remaining with State and local education agencies. H.R. 2362 is not really a general aid to education bill to provide an equalization formula for financing public schools, but it will have some of the same effects, without some of the features that are so vigorously opposed by various groups in our society.

But I repeat: H.R. 2362 is a step forward, and the progress which it makes possible will be marked by cooperation between the State education systems and the National Government. The bill recognizes the economic facts of life regarding education: real property is taxed by the States to the point where the tax threatens business survival, especially in agriculture. Sales and use taxes are regressive by nature and have reached a height that is nearly unendurable. Income taxes are increasingly the domain of the Federal Government. Equalization over State lines through Federal help seems the only solution.

Not that the States should reduce their efforts in behalf of education. I believe that the States should lead in educational support, not follow.

I come from a State whose educational problems have been exposed to the national spotlight. I am pleased to note that a dynamic new State administration under the leadership of a brave and knowledgeable new Governor passed in the recent session of the State legislature a program that has removed the shadow of adverse publicity from our national image. I am proud that Utah did not wait for a Federal program before doing something—a policy pursued by some previous administrations in my State. The actions of the recent legislature will help to restore Utah to its position of leadership in educational effort.

I am proud that Utah has good schools, and a reputation for quality education, paid for at great sacrifice by our citizens. We rank first among the States in percentage of our personal income spent for education, but 37th in personal income per schoolchild. We spend 47 percent of our total State budget for education, and only five States spend more dollars per capita.

These expenditures have paid great dividends. Utah students complete more years of school than students from any other State, and fewer of our young men are rejected by the Selective Service for failing the preinduction mental tests than those from any other State.

In short, we have large families and our children stay in school longer. We spend a large part of our income, both personal and public for education, but we want to do better. We are still not able to provide the quality education that we wish to, and it is increasingly difficult for us to keep pace with the expenditures of larger and more affluent States.

The citizens of Utah owe a great debt of gratitude to their heroic and self-sacrificing teachers who have resisted the temptation to desert their posts of duty for higher salaries and better facilities in more prosperous States. But the sacrifice and diligence of educators in a State are not enough.

I remind you that the investigative report of Utah schools in 1964, conducted by the Utah Education Association and the National Education Association found as follows:

> 1. There were inadequate and dangerous school facilities which need to be replaced and improved.
>
> 2. There were overcrowded classrooms and conditions of work discouraging to students and to teachers.
>
> 3. The curriculum offered was narrow, and special programs and facilities normally available were lacking in most areas of Utah.
>
> 4. The salary schedules generally in force in Utah were inadequate to attract and hold competent teachers and school administrators.
>
> 5. Programs, personnel, and facilities for continuing education for school dropouts and for adults were generally lacking.

These deficiencies were not solved by the recent legislature. They could not be solved with the resources available. In my judgment, the provisions of H.R. 2362—with a first year authorization for Utah of more than $4 million—will do much to help strengthen education in my State. It will help elevate the standards of teachers to the levels the importance of their job demands; it will help pay teachers the salaries which the required skills warrant; it will help cut the student-to-teacher ratio to the point which good sense requires; it will help build the classrooms which are needed; and it will help give every child in the country the educational opportunity—from kindergarten through college—which too few have today.

Let me discuss some of the other provisions of this bill which will have significant importance for Utah.

Title II provides for a 5-year program to make available, for use of all schoolchildren, school library resources and printed and published instructional materials including textbooks. I am particularly pleased at this aspect of the bill. I recall my parental frustration when my own children attending school in both Utah and Maryland—in schools of above-average facilities and reputations—were handicapped because of insufficient textbooks. If this problem needs Federal attention for a solution, then I am for Federal attention.

As President Johnson stated in his special message on education:

> TOWARD FULL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY
>
> Just as ignorance breeds poverty, poverty all too often breeds ignorance in the next generation. This is a national problem. Federal action is needed to assist the States and localities in bringing the full benefits of education to children of low-income families.

The provision that materials purchased with Federal funds cannot be used for sectarian instruction or religious worship, and the requirement that materials made available for the use of students in nonpublic schools can be the same as those used or approved for use in the public schools of the State, represent in my view sound assurances that constitutional barriers between church and state will not be transgressed.

Title III, which provides for supplementary educational centers and services, represents a bold and imaginative stride toward the goal of improving elementary and secondary level education in certain poverty areas. I agree that the supplementary education centers must be available to public and nonpublic school students alike. I enthusiastically applaud the fundamental theory of the legislation of concentrating the new Federal aid on the students from the poor family, who need it most, and making benefits broadly available to all such students, regardless of their attendance at public or private schools.

The supplementary education centers, in my view, hold great promise for improving education, especially in the large cities of our Nation, such as Salt Lake City, located in my district. Such supplementary centers could, for example, furnish special courses in science, foreign languages, and the arts. They could provide special classes for economically and culturally deprived children and special instruction for gifted students. Title III takes cognizance of the fact that dollars per capita are not enough. It is very likely true that education for the culturally deprived will cost more per student than education for the average student. Such a discrepancy should not prevent the deprived child from receiving a good education.

Title III, as well as title II preceding it, unfortunately may arouse controversies as to the propriety of providing services to nonpublic school pupils in addition to aiding the Nation's public elementary and secondary schools. However, I feel that such assistance as provided under both titles II and III is justified in terms of individual benefit to students, and does not constitute direct aid to nonpublic schools. Titles II and III are directed toward the improvement of the educational opportunity of all children who are receiving substandard education because of their low economic status. Obviously, the aid is to the individual.

I believe that the provision of both titles II and III will be sufficiently under public control, and contain sufficient safeguards and restraints to assure a strengthening of the quality of American education. And, in my judgment, the Constitution of the United States of America, as well as every consideration of sound public policy, requires that none of the provisions of either title II or III should be construed as providing Federal assistance to support any sort of religious observance, indoctrination, or education.

With regard to the provisions of title IV—Amendments to the Cooperative Research Act of 1954—it should be pointed out that the 1954 act authorized the Office of Education to have jurisdiction over a program which would permit the Commissioner of Education to enter into contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with universities, colleges, and State education agencies for the conduct of research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education.

The program which has subsequently emerged from this decade of experience has facilitated significant progress in educational research, particularly in such areas as curriculum improvement and improved teaching techniques. I am particularly pleased that, under the amendments proposed by title IV, authority would be granted to utilize the research competence of research organizations not now eligible to contribute to the program, such as private noncollegiate research organizations and professional associations.

I view the Cooperative Research Act as among the most outstanding Federal aid to education programs in existence, and I support without reservation the amendments offered under title IV of H.R. 2362. We are living in a new world—a world which is in a process of change with no indication that the rate of change will decelerate. On the contrary, all of the evidence points to the need for us to learn to live with continuous change. This emphasizes the need for an ongoing program of research into new methods and procedures which will enable us to improve our ability to educate more people, both better and more quickly. Money spent for research is an investment in people which can return great dividends to the individual and society.

There was a time when significant educational research was being conducted in my State, but money for research in education was the first casualty in the economy drives of the State administrations of the late 1940's and the 1950's. The losses in educational competence and professional progress because of reduced research activities are incalculable. Some educational activities might be costing us less today had we invested in research yesterday.

Finally, with regard to title V—strengthening State departments of education—I have, during my 5 years in Congress, maintained that American education must be kept both strong and decentralized. The Federal grant program offered under title V of H.R. 2362 would provide a minimal but significant breakthrough in aiding State education agencies in expanding their staffs and strengthening their services to the local school districts. Therefore, this proposal has my wholehearted support.

A second feature of title V which would permit an interchange of personnel between States and the U.S. Office of Education for cooperative educational activities and technical and other assistance, which would help in the strengthening of American education, also has my backing. It provides the first serious attempt to bolster the legal and administrative foundations of our State educational systems.

However, I support this bill for reasons other than the benefits it would bring to my State.

The education of our youth is a national concern and requires national attempts at solution. In fact, education has really become an international problem, with the quality of schools and teachers and texts being very important factors in the development of national policy in international affairs. Hopefully, books and ideas, instead of bullets and bombs, have become the major weapons of warfare in the second half of the 20th century.

It is, then, in the national interest for the National Government to assume a greater responsibility in education.

The people of Utah, the people of the entire Nation, want and deserve the best public schools and the best public education that can be provided for our youth.

I sincerely hope that the bold and imaginative provisions contained in H.R. 2362 will evoke on the part of the 89th Congress a willingness to move forward and make the education of our youth, as President Johnson has said, "the No. 1 business of the American people."

Five years ago when I was a Member of the 86th Congress, I was privileged to speak in favor of the School Construction Assistance Act of 1960. I concluded with a pertinent paragraph from the writings of the great philosopher, Alfred North Whitehead. Those remarks still seem singularly significant today:

> In the conditions of modern life the rule is absolute: The race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed. Not all your heroism, not all your social charm, not all your wit, not all your victories on land or at sea, can move back the finger of fate. Today we maintain ourselves. Tomorrow science will have moved forward yet one more step, and there will be no appeal from the judgement which will then be pronounced on the uneducated.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 8 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in all the debate thus far on this bill, and in all of the hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor, almost nothing has been said about the extraordinary progress we have made in this Nation in providing education. The mistaken impression is left that our educational system is in dire condition.

If this impression is left from our debate, then all perspective has been lost. It is important that we keep our perspective and do not overstate any problems in education. Our teachers, school administrators and school boards have in fact done a magnificent job of providing ever-higher standards of education and ever-increasing opportunities for education.

Many of the children from impoverished families do attend some of the finest schools in the entire world, and have the advantage of all of the programs we have discussed here. Moreover, all children in this country, whether they are from wealthy families or economically deprived families, have the advantage of free, public education.

And we must not neglect the fact that our private and parochial schools are striving constantly to broaden educational opportunities for all children.

Mr. Chairman, it must be said—and we must not leave this record with a contrary impression—that the progress of American education in the past 10 and 20 years is a near miracle, and is an everlasting monument to the dedication of professional educators and to the intelligence of the American people.

Let us look at that record. In 1944 we spent $2 billion for public elementary and secondary education, which was 1.44 percent of our national income; in 1964 we spent $21.3 billion for our public schools, which was 4.45 percent of our national income. For all levels of education, higher and lower, public and private, we spent $3.5 billion in 1944, or 2.07 percent of our income; in 1964 this was $33.7 billion and 7.04 percent of national income.

No nation in all the world makes a comparable investment in education. In this last decade we have more than doubled our expenditures for public education; we have more than doubled our expenditures for all education; and we have very nearly doubled the percent of our income invested in education.

These facts are based upon figures supplied by the U.S. Office of Education and by the National Education Association.

Educational expenditures 1944, 1954, 1964

	Public schools (elementary and secondary)		All education (public and private, higher and lower)	
	Amount (billions)	Percent of national income	Amount (billions)	Percent of national income
School year ending in—				
1944	$2.0	1.44	$3.5	2.07
1954	9.1	2.98	13.9	4.57
1964	21.3	4.45	33.7	7.04

In the past decade we experienced a tidal wave of students in the public schools. However, while enrollments increased by 43 percent, revenues increased by 157 percent. Classrooms increased by 53 percent; instructional staff by 55 percent. Teachers' salaries were increased by 65 percent, as compared to 44 percent for all other wage and salary earners. The number of pupils per classroom declined from 30.5 to 27.6; the number of pupils per teacher dropped from 26 to 23.9.

In 1961, President Kennedy estimated that the Nation would need to build 600,000 classrooms over the next 10 years, or 60,000 per year. In the past 5 years we have averaged 70,000 classrooms each year, and there is no sign of a decline in this rate. These are the undisputable facts of our remarkable progress in education. They are facts taken from official sources, such as the U.S. Office of Education, and from the National Education Association publications.

What of the decade ahead? Official estimates are that the tidal wave of pupils in elementary and secondary schools is over. 1964 marked the end of the 12-year educational cycle of the huge crop of postwar children. The rate of enrollment increases will fall from 43 percent in the past decade to 15 percent in the decade ahead.

Our country has made this great progress in the face of this enormous enrollment pressure which will now ease off—our birth rate has been dropping for nearly a decade and in 1964 stood at one of the lowest points in our national history.

Mr. Chairman, the astounding fact is that 95 percent of these great efforts for public education has been made through State and local effort. It has not required massive—or even very significant—assistance from the Federal Government.

Why is not this sort of factual analysis presented by the U.S. Commissioner of Education and by the President, for that matter, when the Congress and the Nation are asked to consider the Federal role in education? I can only say that such is not the case.

Only one witness before our committee presented these facts. He is Dr. Roger A. Freeman, an economist and authority on school finance, who is a senior staff member of the Hoover Institution of Stanford University. Government witnesses painted their usual gloomy picture—which represents far less than even half the truth about our educational system.

Mr. Chairman, I have taken this time to present these facts to the House, not so much for the sake of arguing the merits of H.R. 2362, but to restore some perspective to our deliberations.

The whole truth is that, with all of our educational needs and the ever-present room for improvement, our teachers and parents, the taxpayers and private contributors, have made and are making a magnificent and unparalleled effort to educate the children of America. I resent having our schools and school systems portrayed as educational and intellectual wastelands. This simply is not true.

American educators, school administrators, teachers, and parents deserve our congratulations and gratitude for their efforts. The record of their achievement speaks for itself.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot remember in the time that I have been in the House of Representatives when there has been more confusion and more misapprehension about a piece of legislation than there is on this bill.

Let me say right at the outset, there have been a great deal of statements made about the sorry condition of education in this country. I am not complacent about our education. I think we should do more. Obviously, if we enacted a full-scale Federal program of educational aid, in 10 years we would still be in here saying the things that are wrong with our education—because it is never perfect.

But let us get some things clear on the record about education in this country.

In 1944 we spent $2 billion on elementary and secondary education. That was about 1½ percent of our national income. In 1964 which are the latest figures available, we spent $21.3 billion for our public schools—not 1½ percent but 4½ percent of our national income.

For all levels of education, higher and lower, public and private, we spent $3,500 million in 1944 or about 2 percent of our income. In 1964 we spent $33.7 billion which is 7 percent of our national income. No country in the world makes a comparable investment in education.

Now what is wrong with this bill? What is the role of the Federal Government in education at the elementary and secondary level? We have seen our colleagues on the other side supporting the bill, trying to tell private school people that they are going to get aid under title I in various ways and trying to reassure the public school people that the private school people are not going to get the kind of aid that the public school people are fearful is going to happen. But some of you perhaps heard the colloquy that occurred yesterday on this floor. I hope you will reread the RECORD today to see precisely the confusion that there was about what kind of programs public funds can be used to support in private schools. The RECORD is still unclear. The closest we have come, after all the chaos and the mixup, is that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] took the floor and at page 5758 he cited what aid could go to private schools, what subjects public school teachers could teach, if you will, on private school property. He said and I quote:

> Thus public school boards could make available services of such special personnel as guidance counselors, speech therapists, and remedial reading specialists, who would reach into the public schools for service in the nonpublic school.

And today he added school social workers to this list. Now we are in a peculiar position as a great legislative body, saying in effect it is constitutional to have remedial teachers—public-school teachers of remedial subjects—teaching in private schools, but that it is unconstitutional to have nonremedial public-school teachers to teach in private schools. Now I ask you? Is this a fair constitutional distinction? Do you draw a constitutional line between remedial and nonremedial public-school teachers? They are both education teachers. They even have gone so far as to imply that they are drawing the line between remedial reading teachers and remedial mathematics teachers or some other kind of remedial teachers. They may well include all remedial teachers.

I believe we should be writing a bill to truly help the private-school pupils as well as the public-school pupils. But I tell the Members that this kind of provision is very questionable. As surely as I am standing here in the well, no competent constitutional authority is going to draw the line constitutionally for public-school teachers going into private schools as to whether they are remedial teachers or nonremedial teachers of educational subjects.

My friends, this is befogged—intentionally, I fear, befogged—because the advocates of this bill do not wish to be specific about what can happen. So long as it is general and vague they can keep the support of all parties, those deeply troubled on one side and those deeply troubled on the other.

What else is wrong with this bill? The allocation formula in title I to distribute $1 billion is supposedly to help the poor children, the educationally and economically deprived children of this country, yet it gives the wealthiest county in New York State, Westchester County, $2.1 million for the same number of poor children that there are in Sunflower, Miss., while Sunflower is to get only $745,000, one-third in the amount of money. The money truly is to go to the richest counties, because it is based on the per pupil expenditure in those counties. Of course the wealthiest counties are spending more per pupil on education. Is it right to try to equalize and help the needy by giving more aid to the richest counties in the country?

I commend the gentlewoman from Oregon for pointing this out, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ayres] and others who have made it clear that the 10 richest counties in this country will receive twice as much money as the 10 poorest counties, with the same number of poor children.

What else is wrong with this bill?

My friends, only 2 years ago we would not have considered bringing a bill of this nature to the floor, with such a degree of Federal intervention in the decisions at the local level with reference to education. This is a Federal control bill, if one ever was written. In title III alone we are authorizing—I am aghast; I cannot believe this Congress is close to enacting a provision such as this—a $100 million program to set up Federal local schools which can bypass completely the States and State educational authorities. When I offered an amendment to at least require the State educational authorities to approve these loans or grants, it was turned down.

When I offered an amendment to require these Federal local schools to conform to State educational policies and State law, it was turned down. Why? It was because they want to go in with the Federal local schools, into the States, regardless of State educational policies, and set up Federal education policies.

Next we come to title II, textbooks purchased by the Federal Government. Do Members recall the great debates we have had over the control of education, and how we would give money for construction, and the question of whether to make a little bit available for teachers' salaries but not operating expenses, not anything where Federal control could be imposed? Now we are to make $100 million available to purchase textbooks for our local and State people, and we are not even going to focus it on the areas where the children are economically deprived. This is for all over the country, for every school district.

Finally, there is title V, perhaps the most dangerous of all. Here we are going to give $25 million to the State education departments to "strengthen them." But there are 20 pages in this title providing Federal controls, Federal powers in the Commissioner. The Commissioner can then say, "you can have this money only if you pursue educational policies which I, the Commissioner for Education, approve."

Mr. Chairman, I hope that our colleagues will turn down this legislation.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Joelson], an expatriate from the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, when I was first elected to Congress I was assigned to the House Committee on Education and Labor. Then, as now, I was convinced that the Federal Government has a responsibility to improve the quality of primary and secondary education, and I supported Federal aid to education.

It was discouraging and frustrating to me to see the issue bogged down in acrimony and dispute over the years. But today we have taken the ball to the one-yard line, and I urge my colleagues to join together for a touchdown. We owe this obligation to the youth of America.

I would also like to mention the difficult and sensitive issue of church and state. I have considered the pending bill carefully and I am satisfied that it provides a reasonable compromise that should be supported by all people of good will. I hope that crippling amendments will be avoided and that the bill will be passed in its present form.

I can truthfully say that I shall vote for this bill happily and without any mental reservation.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, before I yield the balance of my time to the last member of our Committee on Education and Labor, I would like to remind the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] openly and publicly that his own witness whom he requested to appear before us, a noted constitutional lawyer, Leo Pfeffer, said the bill was constitutional.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Meeds].

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, I consider it a privilege to rise for the first time in general debate to support what I feel to be the most significant legislation to come before this 89th Congress—the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

I feel that President Johnson summed it up beautifully when he said in his education message, "Poverty has many roots, but its taproot is ignorance."

If we are to advance into the era of the Great Society this legislation—legislation aimed at eradicating ignorance—must be passed.

While I would like to talk about the entire bill, others have covered it very well. Therefore, I will restrict my discussion to title IV.

Mr. Chairman, exciting innovations are taking place in education today.

Research has shown that mentally retarded youngsters can learn vocabulary at six times our normal rate by use of newly developed techniques of program instruction.

Research has proven that blind children can acquire information at four times the speed of braille by a new technique called compressed speech.

A new program has been developed which allows teachers to teach algebra to fifth graders which previously was reserved for high school students.

I could cite many examples, all examples of programs in operation with the support of the Cooperative Research Act of 1954. Laudable as these examples are, our efforts are not enough.

Education is the second largest endeavor of the American people—second only to national defense. We are spending $34 billion annually across this Nation for education. But, of this amount only $72 million is used for research, development, and dissemination—one-fifth of 1 percent. Compare this to the expenditure of $8 billion for research and development of our national defenses—almost 10 percent of our total expenditures in this field. Most progressive corporations allocate at least 10 percent to research, development, and dissemination.

The need to develop new methods to keep pace in this modern society is great, but it is imperative that new methods be the result of sound research, not fad, fancy, or fashion. Title IV seeks this result.

Title IV will revise and supplement the Cooperative Research Act of 1954 to provide broader support for educational research, development, and dissemination. Under the act of 1954 four research centers were established. One at the University of Pittsburgh, and others at the University of Oregon, University of Wisconsin, and at Harvard. These four centers cannot adequately provide educational research for 26,000 school districts in this Nation. Under the 1954 act as revised by title IV we will be able to expand to other universities, colleges, and private nonprofit organizations. The title provides grants for research, training, internships, fellowships, and allowances. It authorizes a $100 million appropriation over 5 years to be spent for projects and grants only after the recommendation of a panel of experts who are not employees of the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, we have no more important undertaking than to see that our people are properly educated. Research is a vital ingredient of education. Title IV supplies that vital ingredient.

Mr. Chairman, education is the key to coping with the future. We have been a long time realizing that. The quality of our education will, to a large extent, determine our future greatness or future failure as a nation. With this education bill, we are investing in greatness.

Figures indicate that since 1946 State and local bonded indebtedness has risen about 450 percent while the Federal debt has increased only about 14 percent. These figures clearly demonstrate why Federal help is necessary if our education system is to meet the increasing challenges and responsibilities facing it.

Local control by either the State department of public instruction or the local school districts is the very foundation of the administrative procedures contained in the bill. Local school districts would plan and execute the program to fill the needs of their communities. In some instances, the State superintendent's office would review the plans. The Federal Government is simply stepping in to provide the money that local school districts badly need. Under this bill, educational programs will be developed by the local agencies that best know their own situation.

Estimates indicate nearly $1,400,000 would be made available to school districts in my district under title I and another $3,350,000 would go to my State of Washington, under the other titles of the bill. This is badly needed by Washington and desperately needed by many other States. I know of no State that claims to be able to do all that is necessary to provide the quality of education this Nation must achieve.

The bill contains five titles, or sections, each designed to attack a different problem.

Title I adds a 3-year program to Public Law 874, the aid to impacted areas law. It is designed to encourage the establishment, expansion, and improvement of special programs for the educationally deprived children of low-income families. Schools would be eligible for aid for programs designed by the public school officials to meet this need at the local level.

These special programs could include remedial education, additional instructional personnel, equipment and facilities, and a number of other things that the local school district would determine could best meet their needs.

The State department of education would be responsible for distributing allotments within the State based on its approval of plans submitted by local school districts. However, upon approval, the county schools would receive the total amount for which they were eligible.

The importance of this section of the bill is clearly demonstrated by facts brought out forcefully during hearings. For example, evidence shows that an educationally disadvantaged child finds himself a year behind in mastering school work by the time he reaches the third grade. He is 3 years behind when, and if, he reaches the eighth grade. These disadvantaged children are primarily from extremely low-income families in which the parents have little education.

One-half of the youth rejected by the Selective Service because of inadequate education had fathers who had not completed the eighth grade. One-half were from families whose head was either unemployed or employed at a very low income unskilled job.

This shows that poverty breeds ignorance and ignorance, in turn, breeds poverty. Title I would attempt to halt this vicious circle.

Title II of the bill provides for school library resources and instructional materials. The current public school levels of 6.2 library books per pupil and $2.28 annual expenditure for books per pupil are well below the recommended professional standards of 10 books and $4 to $6 annual expenditure per pupil.

Title II would provide a first year authorization of approximately $100 million for a 5-year program to make available for use of schoolchildren library resources, including textbooks. A State plan would provide the method of making these available to all schoolchildren. Materials purchased with Federal funds would not be used for sectarian instruction. The books would be chosen by local school boards, within the framework of State laws and would remain the property of the public agency.

While the problems existing in school districts impacted by poverty are particularly acute, there are also chronic limitations in elementary and secondary schools throughout the Nation regardless of the level of community wealth. Among the variety of supplementary services that make the difference between a poor school and a good school are special instruction in science, languages, music and the arts; counseling and guidance; health and social work.

Yet while these needs are recognized, today less than one-quarter of our elementary schools have the services of a guidance counselor one or more days a week, for example.

Title III of the education bill provides a 5-year program to provide vitally needed education services, not adequately available at the present time. Programs that might be included under this section would be remedial instruction, enriched academic programs, and guidance and counseling services.

The first year authorization would include approximately $100 million.

Improvement of teaching requires, in addition to the establishment of needed programs, research and training to seek better ways of getting the most out of our educational system for each child. Title IV would work in that direction.

There is a total annual expenditure of about $34 billion for education in the United States. About $72 million, or only one-fifth of 1 percent is spent on research.

This is not good when you consider that many progressive private industries invest as much as 10 percent of that total expenditure for research and development.

Title IV would amend the Cooperative Research Act of 1954—Public Law 83–531—by authorizing the training research personnel and improved dissemination of information derived from education research and development. The goal of this program is a national network of federally supported but State and university operated research centers.

Title V is aimed at strengthening State departments of education. There would be $8,500,000 in the first year's authorization. The major aim would be to improve the quality of teacher preparation, including student teaching with cooperative institutions of higher education. It would also help the State departments of education to improve their effectiveness.

This Nation has been dedicated to progress since its inception. But the sources of progress can change with the changes in our society—with changes in our needs.

Today, education is the hub from which the spokes of progress emanate. We must strengthen that hub.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Washington consumed 3 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, the very immensity of the innovations possible under H.R. 2362 makes all the more difficult and impossible the task and responsibility for me—and others, I believe—to decide whether this bill is constitutional or as the distinguished lawyer from New York, Congressman SCHEUER, said:

> The infinite variety of the innovations possible under this bill makes it difficult for Congressmen to foresee all these possibilities and to guard against programs which might be conducted in an unconstitutional manner.

Congressman SCHEUER continued:

> I voted for this bill in committee and I believe it to be constitutional. However, I share with several committee members, as well as with many of the witnesses who have appeared before the committee, a real concern over the possibility that the bill may be administered in an unconstitutional fashion in some local programs.

Therefore, at a minimum, I hope a judicial review section will be added to the bill.

I include in the RECORD at this point communications which have been received in recent days urging that a judicial review section be added to this bill:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
March 23, 1965.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

It would be improper for anyone in Congress to say that all Protestant forces have endorsed the education bill, since we have not given full consideration to this bill in our commission on research and social action. I would concur with the judgment of the social trends committee of the National Lutheran Council that we must give attention to some of the possible danger points in such legislation, and it would appear that provision for judicial review would be a wise and proper safeguard.

DR. FREDRIK A. SCHIOTZ,
President, American Lutheran Church,
Minneapolis, Minn.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
March 25, 1965.

Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As executive secretary of the International Convention of Christian Churches and a member of the general board of the National Council of Christian Churches, I wish to reaffirm my support for an "adequate provision for judicial review" in the education bill (H.R. 2362) which would assure that the programs developed under this bill are "compatible with the religion clause of the first amendment." This language approved by the general board of the National Council of Christian Churches on February 26, 1965, clearly calls for a judicial review which makes possible a test of the validity of programs under the bill as related to the first amendment. I urge that an amendment be added to this bill which would enable local educational agencies to raise the first amendment question.

A. DALE FIERS,
Executive Secretary, International Convention of Christian Churches.

A COMMUNICATION TO THE MEMBERS OF THE U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON THE SUBJECT OF A JUDICIAL REVIEW PROVISION IN THE BILL FOR FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION, MARCH 23, 1965

The bill for Federal aid to education introduced by Representative CARL D. PERKINS, with the support of the administration (H.R. 2362), will shortly come before the House for debate and action. Although a number of desirable changes have been made in the bill by the House Committee on Education and Labor, it still contains some provisions that could be administered in a manner violative of the requirements of the clauses on religion in the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Yet there is a substantial possibility that, if the bill is enacted in its present form, it will not be possible for anyone to initiate a proceeding enabling the courts to pass on the constitutional validity of the programs financed under its terms.

It is an acceptable part of our legal system that constitutional guarantees are enforceable by the courts and that actions by governmental agencies are subject to judicial review to insure adherence to constitutional principle. Programs under the Federal aid bill, however, appear to fall within an exception to that general rule since no individual or official would be in a position to initiate a proceeding for such judicial review.

As a result, it is entirely possible that Federal funds may be paid out in substantial amounts and over a number of years, without any person having the opportunity to obtain a judicial ruling on the legality of this use of the taxpayers' money. That is a situation plainly at variance with the general assumptions underlying our judicial system.

The undersigned organizations therefore believe that it is essential that H.R. 2362 be amended so as to permit judicial review. Inclusion of such a provision is an eminently sensible precaution. Those who believe that the bill presents no constitutional problems can hardly object to a procedure that would result, if they are right, in judicial vindication of their claims. On the other hand, they can hardly claim that unconstitutional programs should be allowed to continue unchecked.

We [the organizations listed below] therefore urge support of an amendment to H.R. 2362 providing for judicial review. (Such an amendment, of course, could contain appropriate provisions to guard against multiple or protracted litigation.) Only by adopting such an amendment, could Congress guard against expenditure of public funds in violation of the basic law of the land.

American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

American Jewish Committee, 165 East 56th Street, New York City.

American Jewish Congress, 15 East 84th Street, New York City.

Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue, New York City.

Central Conference of American Rabbis, 40 West 68th Street, New York City.

Jewish Labor Committee, 25 East 78th Street, New York City.

Jewish War Veterans, 1712 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Rabbinical Assembly of America, 3080 Broadway, New York City.

Union of American Hebrew Congregations, 838 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

Unitarian-Universalist Association, 25 Beacon Street, Boston, Mass.

United Synagogue of America, 3080 Broadway, New York City.

EVANSTON, ILL.,
March 23, 1965.

MRS. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The National School Boards Association composed of the 17,000 local school boards responsible for educating 95 percent of the Nation's public elementary and secondary school pupils would strongly support a proposal to amend H.R. 2362 to incorporate a provision for judicial review. Important concerns about separation of church and state and local controls of a strong vigorous system of public education mandate this support.

W. L. ROBINSON,
President.

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION OF CHRISTIAN CHURCHES,
Indianapolis, Ind., March 24, 1965.

Hon. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MRS. GREEN: H.R. 2362 (the education bill) as presently written raises many questions for which adequate answers have not yet been given.

The principle for distribution of funds does not seem to take adequate account of certain States and areas with greater needs.

The bill also introduces such concepts as "shared services" which are very unclear. Under "shared services," can a teacher on the public payroll teach in a private school? What is included and what is excluded by stating that such teachers must be "temporary"?

Since the local public agencies which administer the funds must clear with local private school administrators, does this give a kind of veto power to private school administrators? Will this tend to produce serious and unfortunate interfaith disputes at local and State levels?

Because of the unknown implications of several sections of H.R. 2362, we urge that an adequate judicial review section be added to the bill. Such a process of judicial review would enable responsible evaluation of the results of this legislation. We urge that the Congress take sufficient time to consider carefully the need for this and possibly other clarifying amendments.

Sincerely yours,

A. DALE FIERS,
Executive Secretary, International Convention of Christian Churches.

VIRGIL A. SLY,
President of the United Christian Missionary Society.

BARTON HUNTER,
Executive Secretary, Department of Christian Action and Community Service.

GEORGE O. TAYLOR,
Executive Secretary, Department of Christian Education.

INDIANAPOLIS, IND.,
MARCH 25, 1965.

Congresswoman EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The following telegram was sent to CARL ALBERT. You have recently received a communication from Dr. George Davis, minister of National City Christian Church, stating his personal support for the education bill as it is presently written and implying that resolutions of the International Convention of Christian Churches tend to support his position. We understand that his telegram was read in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD yesterday. Dr. Davis has every right to this opinion. However, it should be pointed out that the major emphasis of all resolutions of the international convention on this subject emphatically state that public moneys should be used only for public education. A recent partial survey of our membership showed that 85 percent of those who replied agree that "No tax in any amount large or small can be levied to support any religious institutions." Our position which we communicated to you yesterday should not be interpreted as opposition to the basic purpose of the bill. But we are committed to the need for an adequate judicial review section in the education bill as a more accurate reflection of the thinking of our membership.

BARTON HUNTER,
Executive Secretary, Department of Christian Action and Community Service, United Christian Missionary Society.

MARCH 23, 1965.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.:

United Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, exclusively representing all 48,000 teachers and professional staff of New York City Board of Education urges you vote against Federal aid to education bill. The measure would violate church-state separation, grant public tax fund to parochial schools, create divisiveness in America, accelerate flight of students from public schools, increase segregation in public schools, weaken our system of public education. Our 2,000 delegates from over 850 schools have overwhelmingly voted against this bill. We urge its defeat.

ALBERT SHANKER,
President, United Federation of Teachers.

STATEMENT FROM MRS. WALTER N. OLVERSON, EDITOR, EDUCATION PUBLICATIONS, EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 25, 1965

If H.R. 2362 is jammed through in its present form now, we may all have good reason to regret it.

There has been too much rush and too little deliberation on the programs authorized by this legislation. If ever a bill needed full delineation of its consequences, it is this one, because it reaches to the very foundations of our system of public education.

Careful examination is the more important because the bill concerns a subject in which there is no disagreement as to purpose, only disagreement as to method. Everyone endorses the objective of better schools. Our school system has undergone extensive improvement already. Haste and unwise Federal action could reverse the process.

The objective of better schools concerns our children and their readiness for a better tomorrow, and is essential to economic growth and national security. It is not a party matter or a political matter, and it should not be the subject of ready compromises or makeshift arrangements. It extends far deeper, and is far more important, than politics or any short-range interests, whatever their character.

The bill, in its present form, would plunge the Nation headlong into the church-state issue. There is no cautious approach to this issue here. We would go into it totally and blindly.

The church-state issue is before the courts now. If the bill should be enacted as reported from the committee, the church-state issue would be spread over 90 percent of the school districts of the Nation.

The problem would be further complicated by the fact that the bill provides for extensive Federal direction of the course of public and nonpublic elementary and secondary education, reaching into curricula, methods, programing, and goals.

Can we say with any assurance that the present cooperative relationships of public and private schools will not be disrupted by Federal aid which involves such things as equipment, textbooks, and the sharing of facilities and teachers? We certainly should approach with caution an action that could upset relationships that have been developed, in hundreds of communities, over the generations that our educational system has grown.

On top of all this, however, the bill as reported makes no provision for a judicial review of this question of aid to church schools. Do we really believe we could clamp a lid tightly enough on the constitutional kettle to hold back the steam that the bill inevitably would generate? Are we unaware of the reaction potential in this legislation? By all means, the bill should provide for judicial review of this question of aid to church schools so that this issue could be settled at the earliest possible time. Otherwise, the entire American educational system could be damaged.

We are being asked to rush action on this measure before the contents of important documents are made known. Careful examination of the subject of Federal aid to elementary and secondary education would seem to require the release of the Gardner Task Force report on Federal programing in the field of education and the Office of Education study of the justifications for the existing impacted area aid program.

When we are legislating in an area as important as this one is, why should valuable information be withheld? Surely, when we venture into legislation whose final consequences cannot be known, the truth more than ever is our friend. In any case, we cannot escape it, for as Goethe well observed, "Nothing that shuts truth out is safe from truth."

Rather than to legislate hastily and cursorily in a field that involves the education of our children, it would be better not to legislate at all.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
March 25, 1965.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Aid public schools only, otherwise gradual destruction is evitable as in Holland after government began subsidizing church schools 45 years ago, 80 percent children there now in church schools whereas previously 80 percent in public schools.

MRS. DOREEN M. TAYLOR,
Executive Director, Americans for Public Schools.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. AYRES] has performed a remarkable service in presenting the table of the 10 wealthiest counties which would receive a total of $8.9 million from the Federal Government under provisions of the bill now before us. Given proper circulation, that table could be the determining factor in the fate of this legislation, for no responsible individual—regardless of his philosophy on Federal intervention in State and local school affairs—would accede to any such unjust and inequitable use of U.S. Treasury funds.

The editor of the Johnstown, Pa., Tribune-Democrat was quick to publish his views on the subject when the table was made available to him, and under unanimous consent, I include this analysis in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. Certainly a similar response will come from editors and thought leaders throughout the country once they have an opportunity to digest the import of the bill.

Those of us who have been in Washington for any length of time are familiar with Montgomery County, Md., which is promised more than half a million dollars under this bill. The drive out River Road to Potomac is always an exciting experience, though anyone who resides in the average American community cannot help but react with mixed emotions as he passes the luxurious showplaces with multicar garages, riding stables, and Olympian swimming pools. An added convenience is that all homes are handy to a country club, each with a luxurious lounge and dining room with elegant cuisine.

Recognizing that not all of Montgomery County adjoins River Road, the fact remains that the average family income of the entire county is $9,317. I do not know how much the residents have invested in stocks, bonds, and Swiss banks, but you can be certain that the total would go a long way toward reducing the debt of the Federal Government.

Now I am not proposing that Uncle Sam look into this accumulated wealth as a start to getting out of hock. He is already putting a good-sized tax bite on these comfortable citizens, and they will duly file their returns before April 15 whether or not they return from Florida by that time. What I am suggesting is that the people of my constituency and yours should not be expected to put up the wherewithal for Montgomery County to carry on its school program.

I only wish that it were possible for each Member of Congress to compare statistics on personal income in his own counties with the Montgomery County table before this bill were to come to a vote. Certainly there are few among us who would not come to the conclusion that this is a deplorable piece of legislation that should be chucked right back to committee. Can the taxpayers of your constituency afford to assist Montgomery County take care of its school expenses? I remind my colleagues that this same county received nearly $4 million in Federal impact funds for its schools last year. The people in the Pennsylvania counties of Armstrong, Cambria, and Indiana have all we can do to maintain a good school system of our own without being expected to contribute to the more opulent areas of our society.

We will be hearing that the Federal Government will put up the wherewithal for the monstrous spending orgy, but our people back home have still not been mesmerized into believing that the Bureau of Engraving and Printing need only turn up the presses to absorb the cost of the project. They know too well what bureaucratic extravagance has done to their income. You need not go far from the classroom to find casualties of inflation, for there are retired teachers in every community whose pensions and savings are worth only a fraction in buying power of what they were given to believe they would have at the close of their careers.

The Federal Government cannot give back to the people more than it takes from them. Whatever amount of funds flow out of Washington is necessarily only a portion of what has been taken in, for the expenses of a bureaucracy are multifarious. Should this bill become law, another large block of high-paying Government jobs will be created. Salaries for this new set of Government workers will be two times, three times, and four times the income of the teachers in our schools then beholden to Federal authorities.

For beholden they would be, Mr. Speaker, since Federal control follows Federal funds as surely as day follows night. It is a tragic thought, for the assembly-line process of teaching would deprive both our teachers and our students of freedom of thought and of individual imagination and investigation. Whether the Federal Government buys books, grants scholarships, or merely sends a check to be used for educational purposes, ground rules must be set up to make certain that recipients conform to Washington standards.

There are two obvious ways in which Congress can assist State and local school systems in overcoming financial difficulties. Either or both would make more money available for building new schools, for equipping them, for increasing teachers salaries, and for whatever other uses might be decided upon by local authorities. I have introduced a bill to increase tax exemptions for parents of students in order that taxpayers might be able to retain a greater share of their earnings to meet local needs. Another method of helping with the school problems would be to return a percentage of total tax income from each State earmarked for educational purposes. Neither of these methods would require the establishment of a new and costly bureaucracy to dispense funds and services, and neither would open the way to Federal control.

To give our people the most for their money and to assure them of the freedom that our schools have enjoyed through the years, I ask my colleagues to reject this horrendous and unjust legislation now before the House and to turn instead to a reasonable, inexpensive, and unencumbering kind of relief that I have suggested.

The editorial from the March 4 Johnstown Tribune-Democrat follows:

School Aid Bill's Formula Unsound

A comparison of figures in the administration's Federal school aid bill, approved Tuesday by the House Education and Labor Committee, reveals that the distribution plan for the $1.3 billion is a bit out of kilter.

Figures brought to light by Representative William Ayres, an Ohio Republican, disclose what could happen in a hypothetical situation.

Let's say the Government has on hand surpluses of all the foodstuffs and is doling them out to all States. If the Government were to distribute the food along the same lines as those called for in the school aid legislation, Texas would get most of the beef and Idaho most of the potatoes.

That's about what will happen should the present allocation plans of the school aid bill be followed.

Representative Ayres has taken the 10 wealthiest counties in the Nation and 10 of the poorest and has shown that the well-off ones will be getting almost twice as much aid as the other 10—despite comparable numbers of pupils from impoverished families, defined in the bill as those with less than $2,000 in annual income.

Illustration: Westchester County in New York has 6,210 children (3 percent of its pupil population) in such families. Sunflower County in Mississippi has 6,184 children (42 percent) so classified.

Payment basis: Multiply the total number of children from impoverished families by one-half of the State's average expenditure per public school pupil.

Result: Westchester would receive $2.1 million, Sunflower $745,000.

Reason: New York spends more per pupil than does Mississippi.

Westchester gets more even though it has more well-off families to absorb the cost of bettering the schools.

The effect of such a formula for payment would seem to encourage States spending less on education to increase their outlays. To put the aid where it is most needed, the process would have to be reversed. However, that might tend to make the higher spending States reduce their expenditures.

In his analysis, Representative Ayres says, "we do know that some schools in large cities and impoverished rural areas are being overwhelmed by large numbers of school-age children whose environment leaves them unprepared to take advantage of educational opportunities. I am most sympathetic toward this matter and at first glance at the proposed bill could but agree that the problem cried for solution."

But Tuesday, Representative Ayres said, "Instead of concentrating on those of the greatest need the bill would pour funds into many districts where the need is either negligible or does not exist at all."

The provision of the bill which qualifies counties for aid on the basis of 100 schoolchildren from families making less than $2,000 a year makes 94 percent of the Nation's 3,000 counties eligible. Counties with a very small percentage of their pupils so classified certainly should be able to handle their own problems. The Federal money should be left for counties whose percentage of impoverished children is in the higher brackets.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to voice my strong support for this bill, especially in this critical time facing our cities.

If anything is going to help solve the problem of our seriously disadvantaged city areas, it is improved primary and secondary public education. It is gratifying, of course, to see an education bill for schools at this level, but it is especially noteworthy that we have a bill that is reasonably responsive to the needs of our urban areas. The cities of this great country have been generous over many decades to the more rural areas. The richer States have, without complaint, made tax money available to the Nation, with relatively small return to themselves. This bill is fair to all, and at the same time it recognizes the special problem of our specially disadvantaged areas.

New York receives the largest allocation of funds under this bill, and under title I New York receives by a fairly substantial amount the largest share. This is as it should be for New York has the biggest problem in some of its pressure areas such as Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant. Title I is designed to meet head on the problem of massive educational shortages in public school districts having high concentrations of children from low-income families. Of course it will not cure all the ills. It may not make even a large inroad. But it will make at least a big dent.

Mr. Chairman, I and the other Members of the Committee on the Judiciary are considering important civil rights bills. Many thought we had solved the legislative problem in 1964. We did not. And we may not solve it in 1965 with another civil rights bill. We will never solve the civil rights problem until we uplift school and housing conditions in these overcrowded, slumridden, disadvantaged areas. Good, strong public schools at early ages is essential to more jobs and less welfare, more leadership and less indolence, more responsibility and less crime, more abundance and less poverty.

I am pleased also, Mr. Chairman, that the bill recognizes the need for strengthening State departments of education. Our country will be stronger and better primary public education offered when State education departments are made stronger.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, it is gratifying to me personally to see included in the bill a form of a concept that I authorized in the last Congress of a National Advisory Council, appointed by the President. Such a council is necessary with title I, for the problem of disadvantaged children in this country, and especially in our cities, is a complex one to which all the answers have by no means been found. This Council will do much to assist the Congress and the executive branch in the future.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Helstoski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Education is the foundation of a democratic form of government. An enlightened citizenry is essential to its growth and prosperity. These are truths accepted by most of our citizens, so education then becomes an investment in the foundation of our country.

Probably the most significant returns from investment in education are certain qualities and insights that are essential for growth in economic as well as other spheres of life. Education contributes to the development of a literate and informed people capable of maintaining free institutions and achieving democratic aims. Education helps in maintaining the degree of political and social stability that is essential for economic and other forms of national growth. Education develops respect for scientific research and for the new knowledge it discovers. Education aids in developing readiness to apply new knowledge to economic and other areas of life. Education plays a major role in developing the specialized technicians and the broadly educated and responsible leaders demanded in all fields in a complex and highly developed society such as that of the United States.

It is imperative that we recognize the many and highly significant returns which accrue from wise investment in education. It is also imperative that we avoid the social penalties that have their origins in neglect of education.

It is a shocking fact that while the United States stands for equality of opportunity, it permits gross inequalities in educational opportunity.

Far too high a percent of our citizens suffer handicaps that result from lack of functional literacy. Fewer and fewer children are denied schooling completely, but many children attend poor schools and only for a short period of time. Lack of adequate schooling, both as to quality and amount, is partly responsible for the millions of disadvantaged Americans who have recently been migrating from undeveloped rural slums to congested urban slums.

Low educational achievement is associated with low earning capacity, unemployment, high rates of rejection for military service, and dependence on various types of relief.

Recent analyses of the relation of education to economic development indicate that the development of "human capital"—specifically, investment in education—has actually been more important as a source of economic growth than has the accumulation of physical capital.

Education contributes directly to economic growth because it improves the quality of the labor force. Education contributes directly, but significantly, because it is the source of the research for much of our technological progress.

It has been estimated that in recent years investment in education has been responsible for up to 40 percent of the

Nation's growth and productivity through higher wages and greater purchasing power for the worker in the new products and techniques which come from trained minds.

Yet, while we want the best kind of school possible, we have not yet demonstrated as a nation that we are willing to pay for the best. We must face up to the need for the very large number of teachers that will be required, as well as for the increasing need for teacher specialization.

We must substantially raise teachers' salaries and help to insure that a higher proportion of our schoolteachers will become career teachers.

Schools of the kind we want will cost more money, a lot more money. The cost of education will continue to rise even if we merely accommodate sheer numbers and do nothing at all to improve the quality of education.

For a long time, there have been wide gaps between fiscal needs and resources not only among the separate States but often among the school districts of some of the wealthier States.

Even though poorer States often make a greater tax effort for education than the wealthier States, the level of their educational support is often far short of what is adequate because of their insufficient tax base.

The need for Federal aid to education—particularly at the elementary and secondary levels—is greater today than ever before. Essentially, the problem is that States and communities have unequal resources with which to meet their educational needs.

Many States and localities have made truly heroic efforts to meet their educational needs, in some cases doubling the percentage of their income committed to the support of education.

Yet for all this effort, inequality of educational opportunity has actually become greater in recent years. In 1957, the five States lowest in educational expenditure, spent an average of $238 less per pupil than did the five States highest in educational expenditure. By the 1962–63 school year, this gap between the five lowest and highest States had widened to $322 per pupil.

We are therefore farther from equal educational opportunity than we were years ago.

Many areas simply lack adequate financial resources and, in other areas, such as the Appalachian coal regions, once great resources are rapidly being depleted.

Moreover, the problems of urban schools are becoming particularly severe as tax resources are steadily moving to the suburbs, leaving the city schools with the expensive job of educating disproportionate numbers of children from low income and minority group families. Educators know how to reach these children, but it is a costly process which few cities and States can undertake alone.

It is obvious that the squeeze on the limited tax sources of States and localities is getting tighter and tighter each year as school costs grow and tax resources shrink—especially in the less affluent parts of the country.

In 1962 local sources contributed 56.7 percent of all public elementary and secondary school revenues. State governments contributed 39 percent of all school revenues. The Federal Government contributed only 4.3 percent of all school revenue. In fiscal 1962 Federal taxes accounted for 66 percent of all tax revenues, but less than 1 cent of each Federal tax dollar went for schools.

It is unmistakably clear that the Federal Government is not presently contributing its fair share in the financing of American education.

Only at the Federal level can taxes be collected where the wealth is, and made available for education where the children are.

Although Congress has been unable to pass a "general Federal support bill"—for school construction and/or operation and maintenance, including teachers' salaries—the Congress has approved many forms of specialized or "categorial" aids.

However, insofar as elementary and secondary schools are concerned, the Federal money has been forthcoming only for various special and limited programs. It is usually given to meet a particular national crisis—such as vocational training in the World War I era, emergency depression aid in the 1930's and in recent years Federal funds under the National Defense Education Act to meet the cold war challenges to American education dramatized by the Soviet Union's Sputnik I. But these and a few other limited programs have made little dent in helping the Nation's schools meet their overall mounting financial problems.

I believe that President Lyndon Johnson, as President John F. Kennedy before him, has put the needs of American education in their proper perspective. Never before in our Nation's history have two Presidents shown the knowledge of, and interest in, the problems confronting American education.

In a ringing reaffirmation of his campaign pledges to improve the whole of American education, President Johnson's education policy paper of last November 1, drew a portrait of a cohesive educational structure and pledged "to get on with the task" of building that structure. Said President Johnson, in part:

> We must act. I pledge now to put education at head of our work agenda. First, we must broaden and improve the quality of our school base. We will need a minimum of nearly 400,000 new classrooms in our public schools during the next 5 years to eliminate overcrowding and replace unsatisfactory facilities.
>
> We will need over 800,000 new public school teachers in the next 5 years to keep up with expanding enrollments and to replace those teachers who retire or resign—and we need to increase incentives so that our best people will be attracted to the teaching profession. But most of all we must provide a good education for every boy and girl—no matter where he lives.

In my view it is imperative that we move forward immediately, and we have the opportunity to do so by enacting H.R. 2362 which this honorable body has presently under debate. Our crucial needs at the elementary and secondary level are intensifying. Our deficiencies are growing more critical every day. We cannot afford to lose another year in making a national effort to lift the quality of elementary and secondary school instruction.

H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, constitutes the first step in accomplishing the objective, so desirable, of a quality education for each of our young people.

Title I of the bill proposes the allocation of aproximately $1 billion to provide an acceptable education for approximately 5 million young people coming from families having less than $2,000 annual income. The remaining titles of the bill propose the first step in raising the quality of education throughout our elementary and secondary schools. It would allocate $255 million to—

School library resources and instructional materials;

Supplementary educational centers and services;

Educational research and training; Cooperative Research Act; and

Strengthening State departments of education.

When the magnitude of the problem is compared to the proposed expenditure, this must be recognized as a very modest approach to the ultimate solution of the problem. I commend the House Committee on Education and Labor for presenting to us a vehicle in this bill to provide adequate educational facilities to our youth and urge the Members of this House to support it in making it a reality.

The education of our people, young and old alike, is a national investment. This investment will yield tangible returns in economic growth, in improved citizenship, and in higher standards of living. Free men and women value education as a personal experience and opportunity.

It is the responsibility of all educators, all citizens, and all levels of government to join in doing whatever is necessary to ensure that our educational institutions—and with them our precious freedoms—grow and flourish.

At this time I would like to commend to your thoughtful consideration a quotation from "The Rockefeller Report on Education—the Pursuit of Excellence—Education and the Future of America":

> All of the problems of the schools lead us back sooner or later to one basic problem—financing. It is a problem with which we cannot afford to cope half-heartedly. Education has always been essential to achievement of our political and moral objectives. It has emerged as a necessary ingredient in our technological advancement. And now events have underscored its value in terms of sheer survival.
>
> It will not be enough to meet the problem grudgingly or with a little more money. The Nation's need for good education is immediate; and good education is expensive. That is a fact which the American people have never been quite prepared to face. At stake is nothing less than our national greatness and our aspirations for the dignity of the individual. If the public is not prepared for this, then responsible educators, business leaders, political leaders, unions, and civic organizations must join in a national campaign to prepare them.
>
> But first our national leaders will themselves have to grasp the true scope of the

task. Perhaps the greatest problem facing American education is the widely held view that all we require are a few more teachers, a few more buildings, a little more money. Such an approach will be disastrous. We are moving into the most demanding era in our history. An education system grudgingly and tardily patched to meet the needs of the moment will be perpetually out of date. We must build for the future in education as daringly and aggressively as we have built other aspects of our national life in the past.

During a recent visit to Washington of Dr. Frederick L. Hipp, executive secretary of the New Jersey Education Association, it was my pleasure to discuss the various aspects of the pending education bill. At that time, I requested of Dr. Hipp certain information as to the impact of this legislation upon the children of New Jersey, plus some statistics regarding the need for Federal funds to alleviate certain conditions in the educational field of the State.

The figures presented to me by Dr. Hipp are very revealing and I would like to take this opportunity to share this information with my colleagues in this House by inserting Dr. Hipp's letter into the RECORD at this point:

NEW JERSEY EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Trenton, N.J., March 4, 1965.
Hon. HENRY HELSTOSKI,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HELSTOSKI: We are most pleased to know of your favorable attitude toward President Johnson's proposals to provide Federal assistance to elementary and secondary education. As you know, areas of New Jersey are very much in need of such Federal assistance. Eighty-eight percent of our population is classified as urban and this brings with it all of the problems to be found in most large cities in the Nation. With 888 persons per square mile, we have the greatest density of population of any State in the Nation.

Our crime rate increased 50.1 percent from 1958 to 1963. In 1963, New Jersey suffered the 13th highest crime rate of 50 States.

It is obvious that we need to broaden our curricula when we see 11,639 dropouts in one school year. The jobless rate for high school dropouts—which was 12 percent in 1961—rose to 31.7 percent in 1963. We consider this situation to be socially dangerous.

Studies show that 58,079 New Jersey children are suffering part-time education and 46,646 are in substandard classrooms such as basement rooms, churches, fire stations, and the like. Furthermore, 6,526 of our teachers do not meet the minimum standards for certification.

In spite of the great need for giving individual attention to children, 20 percent of our 28,141 regular elementary classrooms have more than 30 pupils. One out of 28 has more than 35 pupils. Only 43 percent had 25 or fewer pupils.

In summary, New Jersey is a highly urbanized State whose school problems are multiplying in the midst of its rapid growth. President Johnson's program for Federal assistance directed at many of these problems can give real hope to thousands of New Jersey's children.

Sincerely yours,
FREDERICK L. HIPP,
Executive Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened very attentively to the entire debate on this legislation and believe that the arguments in support of H.R. 2362 far outweigh those presented in opposition to it. I am in full accord that the need for financial assistance to our schools and libraries is acute and that this legislation should be passed by an overwhelming vote by this honorable body. We shall not regret our support of this measure and we shall take a great step forward in helping the youth of today to obtain a better education to carry on as influential citizens of tomorrow.

Mr. O'BRIEN. Mr. Chairman, we are nearing the end of general debate on an historic bill, the first general education bill to reach the floor of the House of Representatives.

In a few minutes, we will arrive at the crucial stage of our deliberation, the stage at which we will vote either to gut and mangle this legislation by amendment or send it to a final vote in a form which will offer substantial assistance to the children of our Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished committee which brought this bill to the floor has accomplished a legislative miracle. It has achieved a delicate balance between conflicting viewpoints, and it has constitutionally skirted the pitfalls which prevented aid in the past for all our children, whether in public or private schools.

I have listened most carefully to the debate today and yesterday and I am forced to the sad conclusion that there are some among us who hope, by adroit amendments, to appeal secretly to our prejudice.

The danger to this historic bill lurks in two areas. On one side we have proven friends of education who are bemused by their own theories and who will accept amendments from those who seek only to emasculate the whole proposed program. They are the unwitting tools of the "divide and conquer" plotters.

On the other side is a group relying on fallacious constitutional arguments to kill this bill as a workable measure by baring it to the judicial stones and arrows of any crackpot bigot in the Nation. They do not openly say here that they are against the bill because its benefits range outside the public schools. That would be politically dangerous. Instead they would have us write into the measure a judicial review provision which would be seized by others to negate and nullify the whole program.

They will seek to lull us also by an amendment changing the formula for educational aid, an amendment that could wreck the measure.

I do not claim that the formula in the bill is perfect. I do not think any State has ever written a perfect formula for the distribution of its educational funds. But I do say that the formula we have is workable. It has been drawn carefully, in cooperation with skilled educators and administrators. If we tinker with it, we will find that we have destroyed the mainspring of the watch.

If any here think that they can vote for amendments which gut the bill and then redeem themselves politically by voting for the bleeding carcass that is left, I warn them that the American people are becoming aware of that form of legislative quackery.

We have a good bill. Let us pass it and, at long last, fulfill our responsibility to the youth of our Nation.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I am told that the pending Federal aid to education bill could result in the distribution of about one million dollars to the schools of the 16th Congressional District of Ohio, or about 2 percent of the amount that is now being spend for education in Stark, Wayne, and Tuscarawas Counties.

This money could be used for special programs that would help the "educationally deprived children" of the district, and I suppose it is possible to segregate in some manner the children from low income families who could be classified as "educationally deprived" and spend this amount of money in their behalf next year.

I have been urged to support the bill because educators in my congressional district tell me that they despair of getting sufficient State or local funds to operate the kind of public school system they believe we should have in Stark, Tuscarauas, and Wayne Counties. I am told that Ohio is stingy with school funds and that our per capita expenditures for schools is below that of many States with smaller per capita resources. And so my teachers and principals, at least a number of them, ask me to vote for this Federal aid bill.

I think we should examine Ohio's situation carefully before we permit our frustration and discontent to lead us into support of this Federal aid measure. We should consider what this may cost Ohio.

Ohio's share of the Federal tax burden for the $1,060 million to be spent under title I would be $58,600,000, or almost $22 million more than we would receive for our schools under this title. If Ohio schools are desperately in need of another $36,700,000 to spend for educationally deprived children or any other educational purpose next year, it seems to me much wiser to raise that amount in Ohio rather than to send $58,600,000 to Washington in order to get back $36,700,000.

We can relate these figures to the 16th Congressional District, as well. We would get about $1 million. But based upon the per capita tax burden in the 16th Congressional District, our people would have to contribute $2,390,000 to get that $1 million. Again, it seems to me that we could better afford to find some means of raising that million dollars in the 16th Congressional District, instead of sending nearly $2.50 to Washington for every $1 we receive back.

These figures illustrate the financial nonsense of this particular Federal aid program, but let us go farther into the subject and consider the probable effect of the Federal aid payment upon our inclination and our ability to provide adequate support for the schools.

If I were a school administrator in Ohio, desperately yearning for additional funds with which to do a better job, I would be most fearful that this pittance from the Federal Government would undermine if not block any effort to increase State and local support.

I would be afraid that my future requests for more State and local money would be met with indifference. "You are getting it from the Federal Government, now," might be the reply. "Why do you continue to bother us?"

Whatever State and local inclination there may be to do a better job for the schools would be seriously curtailed.

Moreover, the additional tax burden to support the Federal Government would make it more difficult for the State and local governments to raise additional money to support the schools. Heavy Federal taxation is one of the reasons given for the lack of ability of local governments. Increasing the Federal load certainly would make this problem more acute.

No, Mr. Chairman, if I were an Ohio school administrator hopeful of getting enough money to do an outstanding job in my school district, I would oppose this bill because it does not give me enough money to make a real difference and it will be a stumbling block in the path of any campaign to increase State and local aid.

Beyond these considerations lies the problem of Federal control of local schools.

I am fully aware that the bill contains language which purports to remove any possibility of Federal control over the kind or content of instruction. All of this is supposed to be regulated in the States.

But I know that the Federal Office of Education and the National Education Association are eager to promote what they call the excellence of educational opportunity, and they can do so only by imposing their views about curricula, teaching methods, and textbooks on the local school districts. Federal aid is the medium through which they can force the local schools to accept this kind of dictation.

I know further that we here in Congress have the responsibility to see that Federal dollars given to anyone for any purpose are spent wisely and thriftily for that purpose. I insist that we discharge that responsibility to the best of our ability. And the only way we can be certain of this in the field of Federal aid for education is to exercise some control of education. Despite all the protestations and legislative enactments, these are facts. This bill is the foot-in-the-door for Federal control of education; make no mistake about it.

There are many technical reasons why I would oppose this bill even if I were a supporter of the general idea of Federal aid and control of education. I think it is a bad bill.

I am going to vote against it.

Before I close, let me say that for many years I have had pending in the House a bill to provide that 1 percent of the Federal income tax on individuals and corporations collected in each State be returned to that State for use for educational purposes as the legislatures may direct, without Federal control. If we can prove the need for more money for the schools in the various States, this is the avenue I believe we should follow. Let the Federal Government be the tax collector, if the States cannot or will not do the job, but let the Federal Government return all of that tax, without deductions for administrative overhead, without Federal control, for the States to spend. Under my proposal, Ohio's share for the last fiscal year would have been $45,093,910, some $12 million more than provided under title I of the pending bill.

Some of you may recall that the House adopted my bill when it was offered as a substitute to a pending Federal aid measure some years ago. Subsequently that vote was reversed on a rollcall, but I think that it demonstrated the general appeal of the proposal. I was pleased last year to note that a similar method of aiding the States has been considered by the President's economic advisers, and I heartily recommend it in preference to any of the complicated Federal aid formula that are developed in most such bills. This is the one method by which the Federal Government can give financial aid to States without imposing upon them Federal control of the operation of all State agencies.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, the events which took place yesterday at Cape Kennedy, Fla., and extending around the world point up in the most dramatic way possible that the United States does not have to take a back seat to anyone in the fields of technical and scientific theory and its application.

It points up the fact that education in the United States—the educational system which is the basis for all our accomplishments in space, in agriculture, in chemicals and plastics, in the ever-growing files in the Patent Office—is at least "pretty good."

I am convinced, however, that pretty good is not good enough for this country. We have the capability and the need to be undisputedly the best in the world. Our educators are the finest, not only in science and technology, but in the liberal arts, in history, in economics, in all the areas worthy of academic study. It is up to us to help these fine teachers educate their students to be the best in the world. I think that this bill takes a giant step toward accomplishing this goal.

We will be hindered in our search for the best so long as there are areas in this country where low incomes mean low revenues which mean inadequate schools for our youth in these areas. The war on poverty is aimed at eliminating the low incomes for as many of these people as possible. But the problem will not be solved as long as some of our schools cannot afford books and equipment necessary for transferring ideas and theories and facts from the minds of the world's great thinkers to the minds of our youth. We must exhaust every possible avenue of seeking new and better ways of teaching and of implementing these methods as we discover them. We must put aside our regional and personal squabbles and do everything within the power of Congress to make our educational goals come true.

No one action taken by Congress can raise education in this country to the unchallenged level of being the best in the world. The problems are too complex and complicated and deep to allow solutions which will solve the problems tomorrow or even next week. But each day that we hesitate, the problems become more serious and more remote from solution. We must act, not rashly, but with speed; we must act with the single criterion of what is best for this country.

I cannot express too strongly my conviction that the bill currently before us would, if passed, be of great value in our move toward the best quality education possible and the best possible society. When we refer to this bill and similar measures as school aid we should keep in mind that this is a misleading term. In reality, this is student aid. Schools and teachers are almost meaningless when separated from the students. A great portion of their value comes from the amount of help they can give students in the various learning processes and stages. The bill now under consideration is a good bill because it does make this distinction. Every proposal is aimed at helping the students. This should be the basis for all such aid proposals.

I am proud and pleased to join the ranks of the supporters of this legislation. I firmly believe that it will be the best way we can help American education to become the undisputed leader of the world and the best way we can make the war on poverty effective not just this year or next year, but for the many years to come.

I urge your support of this great measure.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will now read the substitute committee amendment printed in the reported bill as the original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965".

TITLE I—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES AND EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAW 874, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

SEC. 2. The Act of September 30, 1950, Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended (20 U.S.C. 236–244), is amended by inserting:

"TITLE II—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR THE EDUCATION BY FEDERAL ACTIVITY"

immediately above the heading of section 1, by striking out "this Act" wherever it appears in sections 1 through 6, inclusive (other than where it appears in clause (B) of section 4(a)), and inserting in lieu thereof "this title", and by adding immediately after section 6 the following new title:

"TITLE II—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES FOR THE EDUCATION OF CHILDREN OF LOW-INCOME FAMILIES

"Declaration of policy

"SEC. 201. In recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in this title) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

"Kinds and duration of grants

"SEC. 202. The Commissioner shall, in accordance with the provisions of this title, make payments to State educational agencies for basic grants to local educational agencies for the period beginning July 1, 1965, and ending June 30, 1968, and he shall make payments to State educational agencies for special incentive grants to local educational agencies for the period beginning July 1, 1966, and ending June 30, 1968.

"Basic grants—Amount and eligibility

"SEC. 203. (a)(1) From the sums appropriated for making basic grants under this title for a fiscal year, the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine and shall allot such amount among Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective need for such grants. The maximum basic grant which a local educational agency in Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands shall be eligible to receive shall be determined pursuant to such criteria as the Commissioner determines will best carry out the purposes of this title.

"(2) In any case in which the Commissioner determines the satisfactory data for that purpose are available, the maximum basic grant which a local educational agency in a State shall be eligible to receive under this title for any fiscal year shall be (except as provided in paragraph (3)) an amount equal to the Federal percentage (established pursuant to subsection (c)) of the average per pupil expenditure in that State multiplied by the sum of (A) the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in the school district of such agency, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)), and (B) the number of children of such ages in such school district of families receiving an annual income in excess of the low-income factor (as established pursuant to subsection (c)) from payments under the program of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act. In any other case, the maximum basic grant for any local educational agency in a State shall be determined on the basis of the aggregate maximum amount of such grants for all such agencies in the county or counties in which the school district of the particular agency is located, which aggregate maximum amount shall be equal to the Federal percentage of such per pupil expenditure multiplied by the number of children of such ages and families in such county or counties and shall be allocated among those agencies upon such equitable basis as may be determined by the State educational agency in accordance with basic criteria prescribed by the Commissioner. For purposes of this subsection the 'average per pupil expenditure' in a State shall be the aggregate current expenditures, during the second fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the computation is made, of all local educational agencies in the State (without regard to the sources of funds from which such expenditures are made), divided by the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agencies provided free public education during such preceding year. In determining the maximum amount of a basic grant and the eligibility of a local educational agency for a basic grant for any fiscal year, the number of children determined under the first two sentences of this subsection or under subsection (b) shall be reduced by the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (as established pursuant to subsection (c)) for whom a payment was made under title I for the previous fiscal year.

"(3) If the maximum amount of the basic grant determined pursuant to paragraph (1) or (2) for any local educational agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, is greater than 30 per centum of the sum budgeted by that agency for current expenditures for that year (as determined pursuant to regulations of the Commissioner), such maximum amount shall be reduced to 30 per centum of such budgeted sum.

"(4) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'State' does not include Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(b) A local educational agency shall be eligible for a basic grant for a fiscal year under this title only if it meets the following requirements with respect to the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (as established pursuant to subsection (c)):

"(1) In any case (except as provided in paragraph (3)) in which the Commissioner determines that satisfactory data for the purpose of this subsection as to the number of such children of such families are available on a school district basis, the number of such children of such families in the school district of such local educational agency shall be—

"(A) at least one hundred, or

"(B) equal to 3 per centum or more of the total number of all children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in such district,

whichever is less, except that it shall in no case be less than ten.

"(2) In any other case, except as provided in paragraph (3), the number of children of such ages of families with such income in the county which includes such local educational agency's school district shall be one hundred or more.

"(3) In any case in which a county includes a part of the school district of the local educational agency concerned and the Commissioner has not determined that satisfactory data for the purpose of this subsection are available on a school district basis for all the local educational agencies for all the counties into which the school district of the local educational agency concerned extends, the eligibility requirement with respect to the number of children of such ages of families of such income for such local educational agency shall be determined in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Commissioner for the purposes of this subsection.

"(c) For the purposes of this section, the 'Federal percentage' and the 'low-income factor' for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, shall be 50 per centum and $2,000, respectively. For each of the two succeeding fiscal years the Federal percentage and the low-income factor shall be established by the Congress by law.

"(d) For the purposes of this section, the Commissioner shall determine the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, of families having an annual income of less than the low-income factor (as established pursuant to subsection (c)) on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available from the Department of Commerce. At any time such data for a county are available in the Department of Commerce, such data shall be used in making calculations under this section. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall determine the number of children of such ages from families receiving an annual income in excess of the low-income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)) from payments under the program of aid to families with dependent children under a State plan approved under title IV of the Social Security Act on the basis of the best available data for the period most nearly comparable to those which are used by the Commissioner under the first two sentences of this subsection in making determinations for the purposes of subsections (a) and (b). When requested by the Commissioner, the Secretary of Commerce shall make a special estimate of the number of children of such ages who are from families having an annual income less than the low income factor (established pursuant to subsection (c)) in each county or school district, and the Commissioner is authorized to pay (either in advance or by way of reimbursement) to the Secretary of Commerce the cost of making this special estimate. The Secretary of Commerce shall give consideration to any request of the chief executive of a State for the collection of additional census information.

"Special incentive grants

"SEC. 204. Each local educational agency which is eligible to receive a basic grant for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, shall be eligible to receive in addition a special incentive grant which does not exceed the product of (a) the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agency provided free public education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and (b) the amount by which the average per pupil expenditure of that agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, exceeded 105 per centum of such expenditure for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964. Each local educational agency which is eligible to receive a basic grant for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, shall be eligible to receive in addition a special incentive grant which does not exceed the product of (c) the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agency provided free public education during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and (d) the amount by which the average per pupil expenditure of that agency for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, exceeded 110 per centum of such expenditure for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964. For the purpose of this section the 'average per pupil expenditure' of a local educational agency for any year shall be the aggregate expenditures (without regard to the sources of funds from which such expenditures are made, except that funds derived from Federal sources shall not be used in computing such expenditures) from current revenues made by that agency during that year for free public education, divided by the aggregate number of children in average daily attendance to whom such agency provided free public education during that year.

"APPLICATION

"SEC. 205. (a) A local educational agency may receive a basic grant or a special incentive grant under this title for any fiscal year only upon application therefor approved by the appropriate State educational agency, upon its determination (consistent with such basic criteria as the Commissioner may establish)—

"(1) that payments under this title will be used for programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipmeent and where necessary the construction of school facilities) (A) which are designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children in school attendance areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families and (B) which are of sufficient size, scope, and quality to give reasonable promise of substantial progress toward meeting those needs, and nothing herein shall be deemed to preclude two or more local educational agencies from entering into agreements, at their option, for carrying out jointly operated programs and projects under this title;

"(2) that, to the extent consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in the school district of the local educational agency who are enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, such agency has made provision for including special educational services and arrangements (such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, and mobile educational services and equipment) in which such children can participate;

"(3) that the local educational agency has provided satisfactory assurance that the control of funds provided under this title, and title to property derived therefrom, shall be in a public agency for the uses and purposes provided in this title, and that a public agency will administer such funds and property;

"(4) in the case of any project for construction of school facilities, that the project is not inconsistent with overall State plans for the construction of school facilities and that the requirements of section 209 will be complied with on all such construction projects;

"(5) that effective procedures, including provision for appropriate objective measurements of educational achievement, will be adopted for evaluating at least annually the effectiveness of the programs in meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children;

"(6) that the local educational agency will make an annual report and such other reports to the State educational agency, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the State educational agency to perform its duties under this title, including information relating to the educational achievement of students participating in programs carried out under the title, and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the State educational agency may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

"(7) that wherever there is, in the area served by the local educational agency, a community action program approved pursuant to title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452), the programs and projects have been developed in cooperation with the public or private nonprofit agency responsible for the community action program; and

"(8) that effective procedures will be adopted for acquiring and disseminating to teachers and administrators significant information derived from educational research, demonstration, and similar projects, and for adopting, where appropriate, promising educational practices developed through such projects.

"(b) The State educational agency shall not finally disapprove in whole or in part any application for funds under this title without first affording the local educational agency submitting the application reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"Assurances from States

"SEC. 206. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the program of this title shall submit through its State educational agency to the Commissioner an application, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which provides satisfactory assurance—

"(1) that, except as provided in section 207(b), payments under this title will be used only for programs and projects which have been approved by the State educational agency pursuant to section 205(a) and which meet the requirements of that section, and that such agency will in all other respects comply with the provisions of this title, including the enforcement of any obligations imposed upon a local educational agency under section 205(a);

"(2) that such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures will be adopted as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies) under this title; and

"(3) that the State educational agency will make to the Commissioner (A) periodic reports (including the results of objective measurements required by section 205(a)(5)) evaluating the effectiveness of payments under this title and of particular programs assisted under it in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, and (B) such other reports as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this title (including such reports as he may require to determine the amounts which the local educational agencies of that State are eligible to receive for any fiscal year), and assurance that such agency will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve an application which meets the requirements specified in subsection (a), and he shall not finally disapprove an application except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State educational agency.

"Payment

"SEC. 207. (a)(1) The Commissioner shall, subject to the provisions of section 208, from time to time pay to each State, in advance or otherwise, the amount which the local educational agencies of that State are eligible to receive under this title. Such payments shall take into account the extent (if any) to which any previous payment to such State educational agency under this title (whether or not in the same fiscal year) was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to it.

"(2) From the funds paid to it pursuant to paragraph (1) each State educational agency shall distribute to each local educational agency of the State which is not ineligible by reason of section 203(b) and which has submitted an application approved pursuant to section 205(a) the amount for which such application has been approved, except that this amount shall not exceed an amount equal to the total of the maximum amount of the basic grant plus the maximum amount of the special incentive grant as determined for that agency pursuant to sections 203 and 204, respectively.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to pay to each State amounts equal to the amounts expended by it for the proper and efficient performance of its duties under this title (including technical assistance for the measurements and evaluations required by section 205(a)(5)), except that the total of such payments in any fiscal year shall not exceed 1 per centum of the total of the amount of the basic grants paid under this title for that year to the local educational agencies of the State.

"(c)(1) No payments shall be made under this title for any fiscal year to a State which has taken into consideration payments under this title in determining the eligibility of any local educational agency in that State for State aid, or the amount of that aid, with respect to the free public education of children during that year or the preceding fiscal year.

"(2) No payments shall be made under this title to any local educational agency for any fiscal year unless the State educational agency finds that the combined fiscal effort (as determined in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner) of that agency and the State with respect to the provision of free public education by that agency for the preceding fiscal year was not less than such combined fiscal effort for that purpose for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

"Adjustments where necessitated by appropriations

"SEC. 208. If the sums appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, for making the payments provided in this title are not sufficient to pay in full the total amounts which all local and State educational agencies are eligible to receive under this title for such year, such amounts shall be reduced ratably. In case additional funds become available for making payments under this title for that year, such reduced amounts shall be increased on the same basis that they were reduced.

"Labor standards

"SEC. 209. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"Withholding

"SEC. 210. Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to any State educational agency, finds that there has been a failure to comply substantially with any assurance set forth in the application of that State approved under section 206(b), the Commissioner shall notify the agency that further payments will not be made to the State under this title (or, in his discretion, that the State educational agency shall not make further payments under this title to specified local educational agencies affected by the failure) until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments shall be made to the State under this title, or payments by the State educational agency under this title shall be limited to local educational agencies not affected by the failure, as the case may be.

"Judicial review

"SEC. 211. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its application submitted under section 206(a) or with his final action under section 210, such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(c) Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

"National Advisory Council

"SEC. 212. (a) The President shall, within ninety days after the enactment of this title, appoint a National Advisory Council on the Education of Disadvantaged Children for the purpose of reviewing the administration and operation of this title, including its effectiveness in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, and making recommendations for the improvement of this title and its administration and operation. These recommendations shall take into consideration experience gained under this and other Federal educational programs for disadvantaged children and, to the extent appropriate, experience gained under other public and private educational programs for disadvantaged children.

"(b) The Council shall be appointed by the President without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of twelve persons. When requested by the President, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out the functions of the Council, and the Secretary shall make available to the Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out such functions.

"(c) The Council shall make an annual report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this title) to the President not later than March 31 of each calendar year beginning after the enactment of this title. The President shall transmit each such report to the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

"(d) Members of the Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the President, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in Government service employed intermittently."

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (interrupting the reading of the bill). A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Are the committee amendments being considered at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. We are reading the bill by sections. When the section is completed, amendments will be in order. This section will not be completed until line 2, page 89, has been read.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Then the committee amendments will be considered first?

The CHAIRMAN. Then amendments will be in order.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I thank the Chairman.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. GREEN OF OREGON

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. GREEN of Oregon: On page 72, beginning with line 3, strike out "(except as provided in paragraph (3)) an amount equal to the Federal percentage (established pursuant to subsection (c)) of the average per pupil expenditure in that State" and insert in lieu thereof "an amount equal to the Federal share (established pursuant to subsection (c))".

On page 72, line 21, strike out "percentage of such per pupil expenditure" and insert in lieu thereof "share (established pursuant to subsection (c))".

On page 73, beginning on line 1, strike out "For purposes of this sub-" and all that follows down through the period on line 9.

On page 73, beginning on line 19, strike out everything down through line 2 on page 74, and on page 74, line 3, strike out "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(3)".

On page 75, beginning on line 18, strike out "percentage" and insert in lieu thereof "share".

On page 75, line 20, strike out "50 per centum" and insert in lieu thereof "$200".

On page 75, line 22, strike out "percentage" and insert in lieu thereof "share".

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, in general debate I tried to outline the purpose of this particular amendment. It seems to me that if we really intend to do what we say in the policy statement in the bill, that this legislation is for educationally deprived children and for the "poor child" as defined in the bill as one who comes from a family that has less than a $2,000 income, then there is no justification for an allocation formula that would distribute the funds to give the richest States the most money.

May I call your attention to the fact that in arriving at the total amount that is spent in a State, this includes funds from local sources, State sources and Federal sources. In this bill there is wide variation—but in each case it works out so the poorest States with the highest number of educationally disadvantaged get the smallest amount of money. As I mentioned previously, it goes from $120 for each poor child as defined in the bill in the State of Mississippi, which has a per capita income of $1,379, to $353 for every poor child as defined in the bill in the State of New York with a per capita income of $3,000. The States which have the most get the most.

The amendment which I propose, it seems to me, is based on justice and on equity. It would simply say that the total amount that is estimated as the cost of this title of the bill, $1,060 million would be divided by the total number of poor children eligible under the definition. This actually amounts to $201.17. In order to simplify the matter we have taken the figure of $200. My amendment would simply provide a formula so that every poor child as defined in the bill would get $200, whether that child lives in Mississippi or New York, or Oregon or the District of Columbia.

If I may quickly go down the list of States at the present time for those of you who have not looked at the chart, the present formula provides:

Funds under title I of H.R. 2362

	Per capita personal income, 1963	Estimated number of children in poverty category as defined in H.R. 2362, as reported	Estimated allocation of funds under title I of H.R. 2362, as reported	Estimated amount received per child in poverty category under title I of H.R. 2362	Effort index based on per capita income, 1963-64, percent
National average	$2,443				4.60
Alabama	1,656	226,700	$31,738,000	$140	4.21
Alaska	2,819	5,299	1,430,938	270	5.41
Arizona	2,115	42,890	9,757,481	227	5.93
Arkansas	1,508	139,702	21,095,002	151	5.09
California	2,930	276,093	73,145,300	265	5.53
Colorado	2,386	37,784	8,454,110	223	5.45
Connecticut	3,162	25,997	7,175,172	276	3.84
Delaware	3,250	7,899	1,966,851	249	3.98
District of Columbia	3,398	17,924	4,633,354	258	2.69
Florida	2,111	143,795	27,896,230	194	4.45
Georgia	1,865	225,699	34,517,871	153	4.43
Hawaii	2,476	10,585	2,127,785	201	3.97
Idaho	1,934	15,136	2,311,382	152	4.37
Illinois	2,945	181,047	43,360,809	239	3.71
Indiana	2,475	80,398	18,772,978	233	4.82
Iowa	2,274	75,988	17,325,264	228	5.05
Kansas	2,231	44,560	9,752,736	218	5.60
Kentucky	1,789	188,101	28,215,150	150	3.77
Louisiana	1,768	189,996	37,904,234	199	5.64
Maine	2,008	20,673	3,907,179	189	4.44
Maryland	2,778	58,716	14,356,074	244	4.41
Massachusetts	2,850	58,959	13,988,754	237	3.26
Michigan	2,528	144,908	32,729,320	226	4.97
Minnesota	2,332	82,092	20,876,677	254	5.65
Mississippi	1,379	232,603	28,028,704	120	5.04
Missouri	2,508	128,242	26,866,755	209	3.73
Montana	$2,239	15,967	$3,750,273	$234	5.63
Nebraska	2,293	36,093	6,793,169	188	4.26
Nevada	3,372	3,414	658,184	191	4.48
New Hampshire	2,308	7,540	1,609,796	213	4.14
New Jersey	2,900	71,113	20,196,092	283	4.14
New Mexico	1,887	40,634	8,931,560	220	6.57
New York	3,000	260,764	91,893,253	353	4.69
North Carolina	1,813	303,475	48,556,000	160	4.71
North Dakota	2,030	24,323	5,069,610	208	5.57
Ohio	2,483	164,613	36,708,699	223	4.48
Oklahoma	1,953	88,966	15,596,196	175	4.58
Oregon	2,515	29,190	7,893,807	270	5.51
Pennsylvania	2,444	204,287	49,519,506	242	3.76
Rhode Island	2,398	14,986	3,746,500	250	4.06
South Carolina	1,584	192,597	25,519,125	132	4.54
South Dakota	1,932	31,232	6,249,152	200	5.33
Tennessee	1,776	213,694	31,092,525	145	4.23
Texas	2,046	386,599	74,580,048	193	4.81
Utah	2,129	13,989	2,627,783	187	6.31
Vermont	2,092	8,043	1,556,327	193	4.24
Virginia	2,066	168,285	29,433,775	175	4.22
Washington	2,505	44,195	11,275,168	255	5.60
West Virginia	1,872	104,943	15,741,450	150	4.37
Wisconsin	2,380	64,653	16,078,428	248	4.72
Wyoming	2,427	5,817	1,470,960	253	6.08
U.S. total		5,161,198	1,060,082,973		

A poor child in the State of Alabama under this formula would get $140. One in Arkansas, would get $151. One in Florida would get $194. If you have one in Georgia, $153. If you have one in Idaho, $152. If you have one in Kentucky, $150. If you have one in Mississippi, $120. If you have one in Nebraska, $188. If you have one in North Carolina, $160. If you have one in Oklahoma, $175. If you have one in South Carolina, $132. If you have one in Tennessee, $145. If you have one in Virginia, $175.

The wealthier States, of course, get a great deal more. As I stated, New York has the highest, and New Jersey has the second highest, $283.

May I suggest that the equitable way would be to divide it so that every poor child, no matter where he lives, gets an identical amount so that the educational service in that district could be improved.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Oregon has so distinguished herself in the contribution she has made to the cause of higher education, we all esteem her so highly, that it is with the greatest diffidence that I rise to oppose anything she advocates in this House. However, this is a very vital matter which is now involved. The outcome of the vote on this amendment may have a very material influence on whether or not this bill will be enacted.

I appreciate the sincerity of the gentlewoman in presenting the formula which she has offered to this House, but I respectfully suggest that she has mistaken the concepts upon which this bill is designed. I beg your attention to page 70 of the bill:

> DECLARATION OF POLICY
>
> In recognition of the special educational needs of children of low-income families and the impact that concentrations of low-income families have on the ability of local educational agencies to support adequate educational programs, the Congress hereby declares it to be the policy of the United States to provide financial assistance (as set forth in this title) to local educational agencies serving areas with concentrations of children from low-income families to expand and improve their educational programs by various means (including preschool programs) which contribute particularly to meeting the special educational needs of educationally deprived children.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is not designed to bring the expenditure for all children in the elementary and secondary schools of America up to the same level. I hope some day we shall see the Congress provide an equalization fund, as is provided in many of our States, to bring into the poorer States an expenditure per pupil up to the level of the richer or at least to the level of the average, both in the counties and the States. But we are taking the first step, and the first step is to help the local community bring the educational expenditure for deprived children up to the level of the ordinary children who are not in the deprived class. That is what the gentlewoman overlooks. She is asking us to take the total amount provided by this bill divided by the total number of eligible children and give the same amount to each. That is an equalization per child, but it violates the concept upon which this legislation is designed, namely, to give assistance to the local school authorities in giving the same educational opportunity to the deprived child as is given to the normal child.

Now, do the advocates of this amendment, Mr. Chairman, propose that a child, let us say, in Mississippi or Alabama or in any other State where the expenditure per pupil is about one-third of what it is in the State of New York—as I say—do the advocates of this amendment propose that the Federal Government is to say that every deprived child in the State of Mississippi is to get three times as much spent upon that child as is spent upon the individual deprived child in the State of New York? Are we going to make the deprived child superior in Mississippi and inferior in New York to his nondeprived fellow pupils? That would be the inevitable effect of that principle being applied in New York. You would give New York for the deprived child only about one-third of what the expenditure is for each one of the ordinary children not in the deprived class in the schools.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the distinguished gentlewoman.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I am sorry the gentleman misunderstood. I did not suggest for one moment that a child in Mississippi or Alabama would get three times the amount a child would get in the State of New York. I suggested that this formula is unfair because we give New York three times the amount given to Mississippi. Liberals talk about Mississippi and Alabama and we shed crocodile tears about how awful conditions are down there and we know many have been educationally deprived for a long time; then when we have a chance to do something—we give New York three times what we will give them in Mississippi and Alabama.

The purpose of my amendment is not as you have stated it—I never suggested that we give children in Mississippi or Alabama three times as much as in New York—quite the contrary. I object to giving children who already have good schools three times as much as those children who are so deprived. You and I and others cry about it and say how awful it is. Now we have a chance to do something about it besides just talk about it. It seems to me—and I suppose it is an unladylike statement—but I think this is the time to either put up or shut up. Do we mean that we want to help these States or do we just want to talk?

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the gentlewoman for corroborating my argument because she said that while she did not intend to give the deprived child in Mississippi three times as much as it would otherwise get, inevitably if you take all the money and divide it equally among all the children, the children will get an average expenditure which inevitably will be more than the average child gets in Mississippi and less than the average child gets in New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Now, Mr. Chairman, to indicate how this works out, the State of Mississippi, and I have a formula here, has 233,000 children in the deprived class. Mississippi would get a total of $28 million—22.4 percent of its total expenditure would be provided by the Federal Government under this bill.

Whereas the State of California would only get 3 percent of its total expenditure and the State of New York would get 3.8 percent of its expenditure under this bill.

In other words, what we are doing here today, I hope, is to say that we will give incentive to the districts and to the States that spend less and we will encourage the States that spend more in an effort to try to raise the quality of education for all the children of the country.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I gladly yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. GIBBONS. Talking about incentive and effort, I have a table that I want to insert in the RECORD at the end of this debate that shows something about incentive and effort. I think this table was compiled by the National Education Association. It shows unequivocally that in these wealthier and more affluent States, they are not trying any harder than these poor little States. In fact, the State of Mississippi which ranks 50th in ability to pay, ranks 5th in effort to support education in their communities. While we are talking about rewarding States and helping States, I think it is important to point that out. The poor States cannot put up any more money. These poor States simply do not have the resources.

Mr. PEPPER. May I reply to my eminent colleague. The gentleman said that some of the States cannot provide adequate educational opportunity to all of its children. That is what we propose to help them do by this legislation. But do we desire to raise the level of expenditure for the deprived child in Mississippi above the expenditure in Mississippi for all other children? Why are they to be preferred in Federal assistance, compared to the other children in Mississippi? That is what we are talking about now.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman has made a very outstanding speech and has contributed considerably to the discussion.

If the argument of the gentleman's colleague were valid, this should not be a bill to aid the disadvantaged student, but it should be a bill to equalize educational expenditures throughout the United States. If it is valid to say that because one State tries harder than another—if that is the argument—then these funds should be distributed on the basis of effort. If it is valid to say that one State cannot do more, then these funds should be distributed on the basis of inability to pay. That does not recognize the educational system of this country. As the gentleman has so well said, it does not recognize what we are trying to do in this bill.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able leader for so succinctly stating the question.

We all know that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare of the other body, Senator Hill of Alabama, has been the father of the appropriations made under the Hill-Burton Act. One would naturally surmise that a formula which would apply to the distribution of Hill-Burton funds, offered by the able Senator from Alabama, would not be unfair to his State or to the South.

I have a comparison of the funds available to the several States if the Hill-Burton formula were applied to the distribution of these funds compared to what would happen if the formula provided in the present bill were used. May I refer to Alabama. If the Hill-Burton formula were applied, Alabama would get $25 million. Under the formula embodied in this bill Alabama would get $31 million. Is that discriminatory against Alabama?

Mississippi, under the Hill-Burton formula, would get $18 million. Mississippi, under the formula in the present bill, contrary to the amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon, would get $28 million.

Therefore, I believe that is proof positive that a distinguished Member of the other body very much concerned about the South has laid down a formula which would not give the South as much as the formula proposed in this bill.

I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] may proceed for an additional 5 minutes.

Mr. CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GURNEY. I should like to point out a fact here which I believe is important, because it affects the State of Florida, the State of the gentleman who previously spoke in the well of the House.

A point has been made here that this is a bad bill. The point we are arguing on now is whether the distribution formula is good or bad. I take the position that so far as the State of Florida is concerned the distribution is very bad.

Let me point out a fact which affects the State of Florida. I am not certain whether it affects other States or not. Within the State of Florida many years ago, we enacted, to help our educational program along, what we call a minimum foundation plan for our public schools. The point was that many of our counties were poor, and some of our counties were wealthy, and we would take money away from the wealthy counties and give it to the poorer counties in order to "beef up" their educational system.

This arrangement worked fairly well until World War II came along, when we had a population explosion in Florida. Now it does not work well at all, because our wealthy counties now, which are generally our fast-growing counties, are not getting the amount of money they ought to be getting out of this minimum foundation plan. However, now along comes this education bill we are discussing here today on the floor and which the gentleman from Florida so eloquently spoke on a moment ago. Let me tell you what this does as between two congressional districts in Florida. One that I speak of is my own congressional district and the other I will not name so that I will not embarrass anyone, but it is a congressional district which is less than one-half the size of mine. That congressional district, with less than half the pupils that are in my congressional district, will get considerably more funds than mine, that is, $2 million total. My district gets about $1.8 million. However, this is the point I want to make here: In that congressional district which gets more money, the amount of money paid per-pupil-cost is about the same. They are getting just about the same. They have no classroom shortage. All of the pupils are housed in this congressional district, whereas in my congressional district there are 346 additional classrooms that are needed right now to house the pupils there now. Sixty-five replacement classrooms are needed in my district almost at once, in addition, or a total of 411. Thousands of the pupils in my district are attending double sessions and are housed in temporary facilities. We actually have a higher pupil load per teacher than the other congressional district has. Now here is the important point. Moneys for schools in Florida come from four sources, local taxes, State allocations to the counties, part of a racing tax, and Federal moneys. My county raises 38.9 percent of its school money from local taxes, the other district raises 19.6 percent. To put it another way money from my district raised by State taxes goes into the other district for 71.4 percent of school money in the other district comes from State taxes, only 52.8 percent in my district.

Under the formula in this bill this other district, with far less needs than my district, bearing far less of its tax load than mine, with less than half the school students gets more money. Federal tax money will go out of my district into this other district, the formula of money distribution here is not only unfair, it is fantastically ridiculous.

Now I will say this: All of these figures so far as the gentleman's own congressional district is concerned are even worse, so that his people are really getting the short end of the stick under this particular proposal here, and I would not be surprised if other States probably suffer the same inequity, in their congressional districts.

This is a bad distribution system, and I support the amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Florida for his contribution.

Listening to the arguments of the other gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper], I get the feeling that he thinks the wealthy school districts of the country are ignoring the needs of their educationally deprived children and are not providing education for them. Let us take Montgomery County, Md., which is the wealthiest county in the United States. Are they ignoring, absolutely ignoring, the needs of the educationally deprived children there? I doubt it. They have the money to take care of all children's educational needs. The amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon would simply provide that Montgomery County would receive the same amount of money per pupil who comes from a family with an income of less than $2,000 as a child in Mississippi—an equal amount.

Let me point out, Mr. Chairman, last year what happened with the educational legislation. That was called by some the "education Congress." We had the vocational education bill and the higher education bill, which had an allotment formula. Let me point out in those two bills, the higher education bill and the vocational education bill, the formula we finally had to agree to with the Senate provided that the poorer States would receive more per child than the wealthier States. That is the way the Federal Government assisted the States in educational legislation before when it saw fit to put in an allotment formula to assist the poorer States more than the wealthy States. However, we have a bill before us now which provides greater amounts of aid to the wealthy States and wealthy school districts. It was pointed out that the 10 wealthiest school districts or wealthiest counties in the country will get about twice as much money as the 10 poorest counties in the country with about the same number of children in them. Or, as the gentlewoman from Oregon has so well pointed out, in the State of New York each school district would receive $353 per pupil, while in Mississippi they receive $120 per pupil. All she is asking is that we make it fair and equal for everyone and that each school district receive the same amount per child.

If the truth were known New York is already spending a great deal for their educationally deprived children. New York is spending perhaps more for her educationally deprived children than she is for the other children and she has the money to finance that. But I would say that the amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon really gives a great deal to the State of New York compared to what we have done in previous years in education bills. She has stated that we should give them all equal amounts. The problem in Mississippi, Alabama, and Arkansas, and the poorer States as it has been told to me by my colleagues from those States has been that they do not even have the buildings in some cases for these young people.

They are overcrowded. I heard one of my colleagues say that you could throw a dog through the cracks in some of the school buildings. Surely they need buildings, and they need teachers, and they need the entire program for educationally deprived kids. That is going to cost a great deal more money even though it is the South than it would for the additional services for educationally deprived children in New York or California or Illinois or any of the wealthier States where many of the facilities are already available.

So, if we are ever going to help the South where the poorer children are we have got to do at least this much in the allotment formula. I have said many times that if we had treated the South immediately after the Civil War as well as we have treated West Germany and Japan after World War II none of these problems would be before us today. Coming from the North we suffer, because our ancestors caused that to happen. Now today we say that these wealthy States should have more than the poor States; New York three times as much as Mississippi. Today we can at least even things up and in this allotment formula give each of them an equal amount according to the number of children that they have.

Certainly, if the people in the South have more of those children they will receive more money, but they should receive the same amount of money per child as anyone else in the country.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for his remarks and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record following those of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie].

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I say this to you: Let us not be the sapless branch of this Government, as one of our colleagues from the other body titled his book, a sapless branch that cannot change a thing in this bill because the executive branch says, "Do not accept any amendments to the bill." If we, in our good judgment, think that this would be a better allotment formula, let us have courage enough, starch enough in our spines to approve the amendment to the bill. It might take a few more days to pass the bill in the Congress, but we are a long way before this Congress adjourns. Let us show that there is some independent judgment on our part. That is the only way this Congress will ever amount to something in the fabric of our governmental system in these United States, that we take some action like this today. I believe now is our opportunity to show that we have some independent judgment of our own.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I believe that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] while standing in the same position in which he is now standing stated on yesterday that he is opposed to Federal aid to private or public schools at the primary or secondary level?

Mr. QUIE. Broad, general aid yes, but I supported the vocational education bill as passed by the House last year as I did National Defense Education Act.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Is the gentleman now suggesting that if the amendment which has been offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] is adopted to this bill, the gentleman would be willing to support it and to provide that kind of aid to both private and public schools at the primary and secondary level?

Mr. QUIE. If title I could be separated from the other titles, my answer would be "yes." As I indicated yesterday I have some objections to titles II, III, and IV but if some of the amendments which will be offered are adopted to this bill, I would support the entire bill at that time.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green].

This amendment will bring the bill in line with the objective, that is, provide equal educational opportunity for all children of America. It is in the name and interest of the poor children of our Nation that this bill was submitted to the Congress. But, as the gentlewoman from Oregon has so well pointed out, the formula provides for a most inequitable distribution of funds. As she has said, the formula would make the rich richer and the poor poorer.

The State of Mississippi, from whence I hail, has for years made an effort toward education unequalled by any other State in the Union. While we do not have the taxable resources and revenues equivalent to that of other States, the facts are that we have over the years led all States in dividing our tax revenues with education. As of this moment we are not the leading State in this respect but we are fifth, exceeded only by Utah, New Mexico, Alaska, and Louisiana.

Furthermore, there is no discrimination, none whatsoever, in the distribution of our education dollar as between white and colored teachers or students. True, our average teacher payment is low as compared with the national average. Nevertheless both white and colored are paid under the same formula. Identical salaries are paid to those with identical degrees and identical years of service.

There is no discrimination in the capital investment in our school facilities. Mr. Chairman, I doubt that any State has made greater struggle to improve the educational standards of its people than has the State of Mississippi. True, we are far, far behind in the tax dollar spent per pupil as compared with the tax dollar spent in other States, and particularly the wealthy States. I repeat, however, that we stand high in the effort index and are surpassed by only four States in the distribution of our tax dollars to education.

Regrettably, we have a number of poor children in our State. We want to train, educate, and rear these children to be skilled adults, capable of making a material contribution to the welfare and progress of our country.

The amendment offered by our colleague from Oregon is designed to do equity to the poor. It is designed to bring the bill in line with the objective, that is, to offer equal educational opportunity to all alike. This can only be done by the adoption of her amendment.

I hope the amendment will have the approval of this body.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I also am going to criticize this formula, but from a somewhat different point of view.

Mr. Chairman, the real objection to this formula is that it does not recognize the difference between the level of income that means poverty in one part of this country and the income level that means poverty in another part of the country.

Mr. Chairman, if $2,000 a year is poverty in the Delta, then $5,000 is "poor" in Chicago and $6,000 would be "poor" in New York.

When we count deprived children under this formula we are counting a lot of children in the rural Southern States that are no worse off than children from families with higher incomes in some of the northern industrial States. The payment of the State average per pupil cost of education for each deprived child is an attempt to partially offset this inequity.

If instead we take that inequity and compound it, as the Green amendment would do, we will have created a monster.

Mr. Chairman, as the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] pointed out, the Hill-Burton formula—and that is what we used to have the fights about on aid bills; remember, we would come in with a bill from the committee that provided so much per schoolchild and someone would rise and offer the Hill-Burton equalization formula which was supposed to favor the low income southern rural States—well, as the gentleman from Florida pointed out, the formula contained in this bill right now does better by the Southern States than any formula that has ever passed this Congress. It does better by the South than the Hill-Burton formula, it does better by the South than the poverty formula in the Landrum bill of last year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman from Oregon has proposed an amendment to exaggerate that advantage.

Mr. Chairman, I know that the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green] would support this bill if her amendment were adopted and she may even support it if her amendment is not adopted. But many of those who are supporting this amendment and who intend to vote for this amendment, are doing so not with the intention of supporting this bill if the amendment passes, but with the intention of opposing this bill regardless and they hope that others will join them if the change they advocate is agreed to.

It may not be a vain hope, Mr. Chairman. The adoption of the Green amendment would reduce the allocation to the State of California by some $18 million. It would reduce the amount allocated to the State of New York by some $40 million.

Mr. Chairman, these States have large delegations and their interest in this amendment is obvious.

So, this is a good bill. This is the best formula that could be obtained for the South and for everyone else. If we want this bill we had better protect this formula.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the very able gentleman from Michigan for making crystal clear the equitable foundation upon which this bill rests. I am from a district and State which on the surface would appear to benefit by the formula offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon, but I have to be realistic. I know that in the national view the bill which has been reported by this committee is the attainable objective before us, and if we want a bill that will do something about the problem of education where we have these poor children and poor families, we must support the committee bill or we will have nothing.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I could not agree with the gentleman more.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I too want to compliment the gentleman, and I would like to point out to the committee that in the City of Los Angeles there are more than 900,000 people who live in families with less than $6,000 a year income. In other words, that little city, if it was taken out, would rank ninth in the country. Under the Green amendment we would be making that poverty situation worse than it is at the present time. We would be raising poverty instead of doing something about it. We in Los Angeles welcome those who join in from other States. The committee formula helps us take care of these people. The Green amendment would seriously hinder our efforts to do so.

I compliment the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Does not the gentleman agree that during his years in the House the history of legislation in this field is strewn with the wreckage caused by so-called improvements made on the floor?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Yes; and I am afraid that this amendment would improve the bill right down the drain. I ask that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment. I think it is only fair to point out that if this amendment were to prevail certainly some of us on this side would be constrained to offer another amendment later on to Public Law 874 which would provide, among other things, in order to be consistent with the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon, that the local contribution rate under Public Law 874 for each local educational agency shall be equal to the average per-pupil expenditure in the United States for the preceding year.

My distinguished colleague from Minnesota earlier today said on this floor that of the $350 million that is being spent annually under Public Law 874 for impacted areas, about $150 million goes down the drain. As a matter of fact, I believe he used the word "boondoggle." He was disturbed that I would not yield to him previously. I shall be happy to yield to him now so that I may ask him if he would support the amendment to bring 874 into conformity with the amendment that is now before us?

Obviously we have two proposals in this bill. We have one proposal to help educate the deprived children of America, and we have another proposal to continue Public Law 874 for 2 more years. Under the present structure, we would have the Federal Government under 874 paying one-half of what it costs to educate the child in each district. The committee proposal in the Education Act is based on that same concept and continues this concept to help educate children from impoverished families. The gentlewoman from Oregon has proposed a new concept in title I. She wants the money distributed on the basis of a national norm instead of one-half the cost in each respective district. It would appear to me if your are going to adopt a national norm in title I as suggested by the gentlewoman from Oregon, we ought to be consistent in Public Law 874 and provide the same distribution concept based on a national norm instead of paying one-half the cost in each individual school district.

Mr. QUIE. If this amendment prevails I would be happy to adopt the same kind of amendment for 874, if the gentleman would agree to change 874 to conform with the formula at present in the bill if the Green amendment does not prevail. He knows they are not identical now. He knows that the school districts which do not receive as much as the national average under Public Law 874 can elect to receive the national average, the national average that the gentlewoman from Oregon is trying to get for all schools by her amendment. Her amendment will make the formula in this bill more like Public Law 874 than is the case now for poor States.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I doubt if my colleague could think for one second that the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon even comes close to the concept of distribution in Public Law 874. Now I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida if he would support the same amendment to Public Law 874, to make it consistent with the amendment to title I suggested by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN]?

Mr. GIBBONS. Yes, I would.

Mr. PUCINSKI. You who are tempted to support Mrs. GREEN's amendment should know what you are doing. If you adopt the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon, you are inviting a wholesale revision of Public Law 874. I should like to make it crystal clear that the adoption of Mrs. GREEN's amendment to title I, must bring similar amendments to Public Law 874 if the Congress is to be consistent. I am sure you do not want a double standard in this bill.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I think the gentlewoman from Oregon knows I am a great admirer of hers, but everybody is entitled to an occasional error, and I think this is the error of the gentlewoman from Oregon.

She is placing a premium on a State failing to meets its educational responsibilities. She is in effect arguing the same way the young man argued when he shot his parents and came before the judge and pleaded for mercy on the ground that he was an orphan.

She is making these arguments, I would also point out, in behalf of States which constantly are warning us against a Federal octopus, against Federal control and intervention, but whose officials stand in line asking for more, like Oliver Twist.

It has been said that these States cannot afford the cost of education. I will offer them some free advice as to how they can afford it. They can afford it by racially integrating their educational facilities, and I am not talking about token integration, I am talking about real integration. I'm talking of eliminating duplication and waste by desegregating public schools.

I should like to remind the gentlewoman from Oregon that the Civil Rights Act provides that no State that fails to integrate can get any Federal funds; so whatever she is proposing may not work out and may be entirely academic.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. When the gentleman says these States are not adequately supporting their schools, may I point out that the State the gentleman comes from has the second highest amount of any State in the Union, $287 under this formula.

The effort index for New Jersey is 4.14. The national average is 4.6.

Alabama is making a greater effort in terms of per capita income than is the State of New Jersey; and the State of Mississippi is making a much greater effort than is the State of New Jersey in terms of the dollars they have. You and I agree on civil rights. We have never had any dispute on this, but the situation today does seem strange to me. You and I both have applauded people who have been and are willing to go into these States and give their lives for that in which they believe, but we are not apparently willing to send any dollars. That is really something I do not quite understand.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. The gentlewoman from Oregon has just cast a grave doubt in my mind as to the validity of this index that she has been referring to here today. I recall vividly that the testimony before our subcommittee indicated that New Jersey has the highest local property tax rates in the entire United States for the support of education. When witnesses for cities like Trenton were testifying before us, they indicated that 88 percent of the total cost of education was supported by local individual property taxpayers in New Jersey. We were utterly startled when we discovered what a normal workingman's home was assessed for school taxes in the State of New Jersey and in Michigan, for example, we were doing very well and we discovered really that they are not paying taxes very heavily at all in comparison to the State of New Jersey. If the State of New Jersey ranks very low on this index to which the gentlewoman from Oregon has referred, then I have very serious doubts as to the validity of the figures that she is giving us here today.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOELSON. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GIBBONS. I know the gentleman from Michigan wants to be correct. He referred to the effort index of the States. I have some published figures here given to me by the Library of Congress on the 50 States starting first and greatest effort, the State of Utah and these figures show that the State of New Jersey ranks 41 in effort. In other words the State of New Jersey is not trying very hard.

Mr. JOELSON. I am not here pleading for New Jersey. I am pleading for justice.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois a few moments ago spoke about the present law and the impacted areas section of this law, Public Law 874. I believe he was in error, Mr. Chairman. Because the present law specifically provides that either a State average, the average cost for educating the public school pupil within the State, or the national average may be used. This is exactly the same except for the matter of a few dollars, as the amendment the gentlewoman from Oregon has offered. The gentleman from Illinois is wrong in his concept of the present law and impacted areas program.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would suggest that the gentleman from Nebraska take another look at that law because the gentleman will find that under Public Law 874 the Federal Government pays one-half of the school district average. This bill provides one-half of the State average.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Or one-half of the national average.

Mr. PUCINSKI. One-half of the school district. And the gentleman from Illinois is not wrong.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Or one-half of the national average. I would call the attention again to the gentleman from Illinois that that is specifically in the present law on impacted areas and one-half of that may be paid to those school districts.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. QUIE. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois, if he would go over and talk to Dr. Wolfe about this and some of the people who know Public Law 874, he would not say what he has just said. The gentleman from Nebraska who has worked on the impact legislation and who has worked on it for a long time, knows well that the school district has a choice either of receiving 50 percent of the State expenditure or 50 percent of the national average—whichever is highest.

And the States of Alabama and Mississippi under Public Law 874 have an opportunity to receive the national average. The gentlewoman from Oregon's amendment says—let everybody take the national average and be fair to all. Also, I would point out to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD] that if he would look at the State of New Jersey, he cannot consider only property taxes. New Jersey has never gotten around to levying income taxes or sales taxes. When you determine the effort index, you take what taxes from all sources which are paid for education and compare it with the per capita income. Other States must include their nonproperty taxes which are spent for education when their effort index is figured. We find that New Jersey is not high on the effort index even though she has a high property tax.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Again I should like to call attention to the fact the gentlewoman's amendment follows out the present law, Public Law 874, in regard to impacted areas.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the process of hearings one of the things which became apparent to many of us on the subcommittee considering this legislation was that the allocation formula, although superficially attractive, was extremely discriminatory as to certain parts of the country.

I have heard today the statement that it costs more to help a poor child in Westchester County, or some county of that nature, than it does in Mississippi or Alabama. I cannot understand that kind of viewpoint. What we are saying, in effect, when we accept that statement, is that the more money a district has the more money it should get, the wealthier a county is the more money it should get, because in the wealthy counties it costs more to take care of the poor children. Does that really make sense?

I believe we do have some higher labor costs in Westchester County, perhaps, than in Mississippi. There are some other additional costs. But to say that we should change the old system of allocation we have had in the past in other aid bills and put in an allocation formula which rewards the rich seems to me to be completely contradictory.

Last year, in the vocational education and higher education bills, we accepted formulas which would allocate more money to the areas of greatest need.

The majority leader a few minutes ago said that this should be a bill to equalize education expenditures. How, may I ask, are we to equalize educational expenditures around this country when we give, under this formula, $350 to New York State and only $120 to the State of Mississippi per pupil? Is this the way to equalize educational expenditures?

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will pass. I believe sincerely that if we are going to enact a program of massive Federal expenditures to help poor children in this country, we should do it to help them where the poor children are. We should do it on a fair basis which gives the same amount per child to every area of this country.

The built-in equalization and the built-in extra benefit to some of our poorer States will accomplish precisely the purpose of this legislation as it has been enunciated by its sponsors.

I compliment the gentlewoman from Oregon for offering this amendment, which in many respects meets the objections raised by the Republicans on the committee during the hearings and during the deliberations on this bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. During the last session of the Congress, I was interested in a particular amendment on the defense appropriation bill, and the gentlewoman from Oregon, at the time this amendment was being considered, spoke up and said that although she seldom agreed with me on most issues she felt on that issue the position I had taken was right.

I was grateful for her support at that time. On this occasion I am delighted to have an opportunity to reciprocate, because I believe in this instance she is right. The formula that she is presenting to the Committee is a formula by any criterion which is preferable to the one contained in the bill. Furthermore, I think for those of us who are jealous of the prerogatives, the rights, of the legislative branch, that we should without question take the hearings and see that the hearings prove that the formula recommended by the administration does need revision and does need adjustment.

I compliment the men and women of the Committee on Education and Labor who, through their interrogation, have shown convincingly that this formula in the bill needs revision. I thoroughly endorse the petition taken by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and support the position taken by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], and others in behalf of this amendment.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time in order to indicate my provincialism as a New Yorker. The word "New York" has been bruited about in the well of the House today. The wealth of New York has been greatly stressed. But we are not talking about New York's wealth today but of our disadvantages, and we do have disadvantages. New York has disadvantages in many of our counties—yes, in Westchester County, too. I think we should spread on the RECORD here for the benefit of my colleagues from New York, including the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], just what this change in formula will do to our State's allotment. The State of New York under the formula now will receive a total of $91 million. This change in formula drops us down to $52 million or a loss of $40 million to our State. This would be all right—and let us be generous about this—if we could educate the disadvantaged children of New York, over 250,000 of them—and there are more deprived children in New York City day after day—if we could educate these children at Mississippi prices. However, we cannot educate New York children at the average prices somewhere else, we have to pay the actual costs in New York for this program. This is bound up with heating and building schools and paying teachers' salaries. We have a collective-bargaining agreement which covers our teachers' salaries, so we have to pay the going price for salaries. If we are going to educate disadvantaged children, we have to meet that price. This formula change would just about wipe out the entire city of New York in the bill. The city allotment of the State's $91 million would be $40 million. If you cut the State back $50 million, we would be losing substantially half of the benefits that need to go to the disadvantaged children in New York, in Harlem, Bedford, Stuyvesant, Red Hook, yes Suffolk, and even Westchester County.

I would like to yield to my colleague from Westchester County, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OTTINGER], who knows something about poverty. It may be something of an anachronism, but he does.

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Chairman, if I did not know something about poverty before running for public office, I do now.

I have heard Westchester County disparaged by the gentleman from New York time and again during this debate. The poor from Westchester County are just as poor as the poor from any other part of the country. And perhaps they are in a more difficult situation because they are living in one of the highest cost areas of the country. One out of every twelve families in Westchester County live below the national standard of abject poverty.

It was classic in Latin America where I did a good deal of work to deplore the situation of the very, very rich living side by side with the desperately poor and the great frustrations this situation produced in society. This is just as dramatically true in Westchester County. The poor people of Westchester certainly deserve to participate in this program in accordance with the costs that they have to pay for education.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAREY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I address myself to my friend from New York [Mr. GOODELL], because I thought I heard him say—and if I am wrong I am sure he will correct me—quote the distinguished majority leader as having said earlier that the committee bill is designed to equalize educational opportunities. Is that what the gentleman from New York said?

Mr. GOODELL. I believe he said equalize educational expenditures.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to respond?

Mr. CAREY. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. I think the gentleman misunderstood me. I said, or at least intended to say, that if the purpose of this bill is to bring the disadvantaged child in every State up to the national average then we should have a general Federal-aid bill aimed at making the per capita expenditure for every child in the United States the same. I was merely pointing out that if the purpose was to equalize education it should not be limited to the disadvantaged child. I am sure that that is the gist of what I said.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the gentleman did not want to misstate what the majority leader had said.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say further that this formula has been examined in the subcommittee hearings and has had the approval of every leading educational association, of every State superintendent in the North and in the South who came before the committee. It has been examined from that viewpoint and it has stood that test. I suggest to my colleague from New York that he do not try to hack away at this bill and try to take $40 million from my State, because when he tours that State one of these days I am going to show him poverty that he has never seen anywhere else. New York needs this money just as much as does any other State in the Union for her disadvantaged children.

Mr. GOODSELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. POWELL. Did not the gentleman from New York get permission just a few minutes ago to speak for 5 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. POWELL. I make the point of order, then, that he is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I yield briefly to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I was very much moved by the appeal from the gentleman representing Westchester County for the poor youngsters in that county. But as I look at this bill I feel that we are trying to set areas of priority, we are trying to help youngsters in the areas that have the greatest need and, doing so, I must immediately cross Westchester County off the list of those that should receive aid. Three percent of their children, 3 percent are in the category of coming from families with income less than $2,000. When you look through the list you will find Mississippi and Alabama and counties in other States in this country that go below that figure for 25 percent of their children, and up to 40 percent and 50 percent of their children who are in that category.

It seems to me that we should set some priorities here and put the money where it is most needed. This allocation formula in the bill does not do that.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, the basic premise, the argument of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and also the majority leader, as I understand is that this bill is not an equalization bill, not a general aid bill; but that it is a bill which limits its benefits to poor children.

Let us see if that is true. I would like the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] to follow my remarks, if he will, because I have some questions to direct to him. Suppose in a public school district that there are enough children of families with incomes of less than $2,000 so that the school qualifies for assistance under title I.

Suppose further that some of these children need remedial reading, and the school hires a teacher for remedial reading? Under this bill, will the children from families of less than $2,000 income be the only ones who could attend that class in remedial reading, or could all of the children who need the instruction attend that class in remedial reading?

Mr. PERKINS. All the children can attend that class in remedial reading under this proposed legislation. The grants are to be used by the local public educational agency to provide greater educational opportunities in the public schools where there are concentrations of educationally deprived children.

Mr. GRIFFIN. All of the children who need remedial reading could attend the class, whether or not they come from families with incomes of less than $2,000; right?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct, under this legislation.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I decline to yield further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. PERKINS. Because lack of educational achievement naturally follows low income.

Mr. GRIFFIN. May I ask a further question; is it necessary that a child be from a family with less than $2,000 income to attend that class for remedial reading?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I will yield to the gentleman from Michigan, if the gentleman will answer my question.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I am a little bit surprised that the gentleman from Michigan——

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield if the gentleman is not going to answer my question.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I would like to answer the question if the gentleman will give me an opportunity.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Is it necessary, under the bill, for any of the children to be from families of $2,000 per year income in order to attend this class in remedial reading?

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. I am surprised to hear the gentleman ask this question as a member of the committee. If the gentleman will read the section of the bill dealing with this subject, he will find the answer.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I know the answer to the question, but I think it should be on the RECORD and I am sorry that the gentleman did not answer it.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. The distinguished gentleman from Michigan well knows that we do not put special hats or labels on any of these youngsters as to whether they come from families of low income, or whether they come from a higher income family, if they need that course in remedial reading and if they are attending a public school where there are concentrations of educationally deprived children, they can get the benefit.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The answer to the question is that the number of children of families with income of less than $2,000 is only a measurement of the aid that goes into the district, but it has nothing to do, necessarily, with the aid that goes to the children of that school?

Mr. PERKINS. No; the gentleman is wrong. The gentleman is absolutely wrong. In this regard the bill specifies:

SEC. 205. (a) A local educational agency may receive a basic grant or a special incentive grant under this title for any fiscal year only upon application therefor approved by the appropriate State educational agency, upon its determination (consistent with such basic criteria as the Commissioner may establish)—

(1) that payments under this title will be used for programs and projects (including the acquisition of equipment and where necessary the construction of school facilities) (A) which are designed to meet the special educational needs of educationally deprived children in school attendance areas having high concentrations of children from low-income families and (B) which are of sufficient size, scope, and quality to give reasonable promise of substantial progress toward meeting those needs——

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Does the gentleman from Kentucky now contradict what he said in the committee and in the subcommittee, that we must not segregate the poor children and that we should construct schools and that we should have programs that would help the poor and not the rich families, but should have programs that will primarily help the poor children?

Mr. PERKINS. This bill is designed to help the educationally deprived children.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Are educationally deprived children the same as economically deprived children?

Mr. PERKINS. There is certainly a high correlation between low income and educational deprivation if they meet those standards.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If they meet what standards?

Mr. PERKINS. If large numbers of children from low income families attend a school all evidence points to the fact that you will find large numbers of educationally disadvantaged children in that school. The funds under this bill will be concentrated in those schools, as the distinguished gentleman knows.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Georgia may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FLYNT. Mr. Chairman, first of all, I regret that the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] objected to the request that I be allowed to speak for an additional 5 minutes. I sought to be assigned time during general debate as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] well knows. That request was denied by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Since early January 1965 I have been in close contact with the gentleman from Kentucky in an effort to help bring about a good education bill under the standards set out under the bill which he introduced early in the session, and I have assured the gentleman since early in January of my desire and intention to support legislation coming out of his subcommittee and his committee on this subject.

Under unanimous consent granted before the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole, I now place in the RECORD, first, a reprint from the Federal Register of Friday, December 4, 1964; second, instructions to school districts regarding compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964; third, an HEW form, entitled "Explanation of Assurance of Compliance with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Regulation Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964"; fourth, HEW form 441, assurance of compliance; fifth, a reprint of an article which appeared in the Sunday edition of the Atlanta Constitution, dated March 7, 1965; sixth, a followup article which appeared in the Atlanta Constitution on the morning of March 8, 1965; seventh, a telegram addressed to me and to each Member from the Georgia delegation, signed by Mr. Jack Acree, executive secretary, Georgia School Board Association; eighth, a telegram addressed to me signed by Hon. J. C. Brown, chairman, Carroll County Board of Commissioners; ninth, a letter addressed to me signed by Dr. Quinton Prince, superintendent of schools of the Carroll County Board of Education, Carrollton, Ga.

(The matters referred to follow:)

[From the Federal Register, Dec. 4, 1964]

TITLE 45—PUBLIC WELFARE

SUBTITLE A—DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE, GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Part 80—Nondiscrimination in Federally assisted programs of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—effectuation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

(New part 80 to subtitle A 45 CFR)

Sec.
80.1 Purpose.
80.2 Application of this part.
80.3 Discrimination prohibited.
80.4 Assurances required.
80.5 Illustrative applications.
80.6 Compliance information.
80.7 Conduct of investigations.
80.8 Procedure for effecting compliance.
80.9 Hearings.
80.10 Decision and notices.
80.11 Judicial review.
80.12 Effect on other regulations; forms and instructions.
80.13 Definitions.

Authority: The provisions of this part 80 are issued under section 602, 78 Stat. 252, and the laws referred to in appendix A.

§ 80.1 Purpose.

The purpose of this part is to effectuate the provisions of title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (hereafter referred to as the "Act") to the end that no person in the United States shall; on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

§ 80.2 Application of this part.

This part applies to any program for which Federal financial assistance is authorized under a law administered by the Department, including the federally assisted programs and activities listed in appendix A of this part. It applies to money paid, property transferred, or other Federal financial assistance extended under any such program after the effective date of the regulation pursuant to an application approved prior to such effective date. This part does not apply to (a) any Federal financial assistance by way of insurance or guaranty contracts, (b) money paid, property transferred, or other assistance extended under any such program before the effective date of this part, (c) any assistance to any individual who is the ultimate beneficiary under any such program, or (d) any employment practice, under any such program, of any employer, employment agency, or labor organization, except to the extent described in § 80.3. The fact that a program or activity is not listed in appendix A shall not mean, if title VI of the Act is otherwise applicable, that such program is not covered. Other programs under statutes now in force or hereinafter enacted may be added to this list by notice published in the Federal Register.

§ 80.3 Discrimination prohibited.

(a) *General.* No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program to which this part applies.

(b) *Specific discriminatory actions prohibited.* (1) A recipient under any program to which this part applies may not, directly or through contractual or other arrangements, on ground of race, color, or national origin:

(i) Deny an individual any service, financial aid, or other benefit provided under the program;

(ii) Provide any service, financial aid, or other benefit to an individual which is different, or is provided in a different manner, from that provided to others under the program;

(iii) Subject an individual to segregation or separate treatment in any matter related to his receipt of any service, financial aid, or other benefit under the program;

(iv) Restrict an individual in any way in the enjoyment of any advantage or privilege enjoyed by others receiving any service, financial aid, or other benefit under the program;

(v) Treat an individual differently from others in determining whether he satisfies any admission, enrollment, quota, eligibility, membership or other requirement or condition which individuals must meet in order to be provided any service, financial aid, or other benefit provided under the program;

(vi) Deny an individual an opportunity to participate in the program through the provision of services or otherwise or afford him an opportunity to do so which is different from that afforded others under the program (including the opportunity to participate in the program as an employee but only to the extent set forth in paragraph (c) of this section).

(2) A recipient, in determining the types of services, financial aid, or other benefits, or facilities which will be provided under any such program, or the class of individuals to whom, or the situations in which, such services, financial aid, other benefits, or facilities will be provided under any such program, or the class of individuals to be afforded an opportunity to participate in any such program, may not, directly or through contractual or other arrangements, utilize criteria or methods of administration which have the effect of subjecting individuals to discrimination because of their race, color, or national origin, or have the effect of defeating or substantially impairing accomplishment of the objectives of the program as respect individuals of a particular race, color, or national origin.

(3) As used in this section the services, financial aid, or other benefits provided under a program receiving Federal financial assistance shall be deemed to include any service, financial aid, or other benefit provided in or through a facility provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance.

(4) The enumeration of specific forms of prohibited discrimination in this paragraph and paragraph (c) of this section does not limit the generality of the prohibition in paragraph (a) of this section.

(c) *Employment practices.* Where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance to a program to which this part applies is to provide employment, a recipient may not (directly or through contractual or other arrangements) subject an individual to discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin in its employment practices under such program (including recruitment or recruitment advertising, employment, layoff or termination, upgrading, demotion, or transfer, rates of pay or other forms of compensation, and use of facilities), including programs where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is (i) to reduce the unemployment of such individuals or to help them through employment to meet subsistence needs, (ii) to assist such individuals through employment to meet expenses incident to the commencement or continuation of their education or training, (iii) to provide work experience which contributes to the education or training of such individuals, or (iv) to provide remunerative activity to such individuals who, because of severe handicaps cannot be readily absorbed in the competitive labor market. The following programs under existing laws have one of the above objectives as a primary objective:

(*a*) Department projects under the Public Works Acceleration Act, Public Law 87–658.

(*b*) Community work and training programs under title IV of the Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 609.

(*c*) Work-study program under the Vocational Education Act of 1963, P.L. 88–210, sec. 13.

(*d*) Programs listed in appendix A as respects employment opportunities provided thereunder, or in facilities provided thereunder, which are limited, or for which preference is given, to students, fellows, or other persons in training for the same or related employments.

(*e*) Establishment of sheltered workshops under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. 32–34.

The requirements applicable to construction employment under any such program shall be those specified in or pursuant to Executive Order 11114.

(d) *Indian Health and Cuban Refugee programs.* An individual shall not be deemed subjected to discrimination by reason of his exclusion from the benefits of a program limited by Federal law to individuals of a particular race, color, or national origin different from his.

(e) *Medical emergencies.* Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, a recipient of Federal financial assistance shall not be deemed to have failed to comply with paragraph (a) of this section if immediate provision of a service or other benefit to an individual is necessary to prevent his death or serious impairment of his health, and such service or other benefit cannot be provided except by or through a medical institution which refuses or fails to comply with paragraph (a) of this section.

§ 80.4 Assurances required.

(a) *General.* (1) Every application for Federal financial assistance to carry out a program to which this part applies, except a program to which paragraph (b) of this section applies, and every application for Federal financial assistance to provide a facility shall, as a condition to its approval and the extension of any Federal financial assistance pursuant to the application, contain or be accompanied by an assurance that the program will be conducted or the facility operated in compliance with all requirements imposed by or pursuant to this part. In the case of an application for Federal financial assistance to provide real property or structures thereon, the assurance shall obligate the recipient, or, in the case of a subsequent transfer, the transferee, for the period during which the real property or structures are used for a purpose for which the Federal financial assistance is extended or for another purpose involving the provision of similar services or benefits. In the case of personal property the assurance shall obligate the recipient for the period during which he retains ownership or possession of the property. In all other cases the assurance shall obligate the recipient for the period during which Federal financial assistance is extended pursuant to the application. The responsible Department official shall specify the form of the foregoing assurances for each program, and the extent to which like assurances will be required of subgrantees, contractors and subcontractors, transferees, successors in interest, and other participants in the program. Any such assurance shall include provisions which give the United States a right to seek its judicial enforcement.

(2) The assurance required in the case of a transfer of surplus real property shall be inserted in the instrument effecting the transfer of any such surplus land, together with any improvements located thereon, and shall consist of (i) a condition coupled with a right to be reserved to the Department to revert title to the property in the event of breach of such nondiscrimination condition during the period during which the real property is used for a purpose for which the Federal financial assistance is extended or for another purpose involving the provision of similar services or benefits, and (ii) a covenant running with the land for the same period. In the event a transferee of surplus real property proposes to mortgage or otherwise encumber the real property as security for financing construction of new, or improvement of existing, facilities on such property for the purposes for which the property was transferred, the Secretary may agree, upon request of the transferee and if necessary to accomplish such financing, and upon such conditions as he deems appropriate, to forbear the exercise of such right to revert title for so long as the lien of such mortgage or other encumbrance remains effective.

(b) *Continuing State programs.* Every application by a State or a State agency to carry out a program involving continuing Federal financial assistance to which this part applies (including the programs listed in part 2 of appendix A) shall as a condition to its approval and the extension of any Federal financial assistance pursuant to the application (1) contain or be accompanied by a statement that the program is (or, in the case of a new program, will be) conducted in compliance with all requirements imposed by or pursuant to this part, or a statement of the extent to which it is not, at the time the statement is made, so conducted, and (2) provide or be accompanied by provision for such methods of administration for the program as are found by the responsible Department official to give reasonable assurance that the applicant and all recipients of Federal financial assistance under such program will comply with all requirements imposed by or pursuant to this part, including methods of administration which give reasonable assurance that any noncompliance indicated in the statement under subparagraph (1) of this paragraph will be corrected.

(c) *Elementary and secondary schools.* The requirements of paragraph (a) or (b) of this section with respect to any elementary or secondary school or school system shall be deemed to be satisfied if such school or school system (1) is subject to a final order of a court of the United States for the desegregation of such school or school system, and provides an assurance that it will comply with such order, including any future modification of such order, or (2) submits a plan for the desegregation of such school or school system which the Commissioner of Education determines is adequate to accomplish the purposes of the Act and this part, and provides reasonable assurance that it will carry out such plan; in any case of continuing Federal financial assistance the Commissioner may reserve the right to redetermine, after such period as may be specified by him, the adequacy of the plan to accomplish the purposes of the Act and this part. In any case in which a final order of a court of the United States for the desegregation of such school or school system is entered after submission of such a plan, such plan shall be revised to conform to such final order, including any future modification of such order.

(d) *Assurances from institutions.* (1) In the case of any application for Federal financial assistance to an institution of higher education (including assistance for construction, for research, for a special training project, for a student loan program, or for any other purpose), the assurance required by this section shall extend to admission practices and to all other practices relating to the treatment of students.

(2) The assurance required with respect to an institution of higher education, hospital, or any other institution, insofar as the assurance relates to the institution's practices with respect to admission or other treatment of individuals as students, patients, or clients of the institution or to the opportunity to participate in the provision of services or other benefits to such individuals, shall be applicable to the entire institution unless the applicant establishes, to the satisfaction of the responsible Department official, that the institution's practices in designated parts or programs of the institution will in no way affect its practices in the program of the institution for which Federal financial assistance is sought, or the beneficiaries of or participants in such program. If in any such case the assistance sought is for the construction of a facility or part of a facility, the assurance shall in any event extend to the entire facility and to facilities operated in connection therewith.

§ 80.5 Illustrative applications.

The following examples will illustrate the application of the foregoing provisions to some of the major programs of the Department. (In all cases the discrimination prohibited is discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin prohibited by title VI of the Act and this part, as a condition of the receipt of Federal financial assistance.)

(a) In grant programs which support the provision of health or welfare services, discrimination in the selection or eligibility of individuals to receive the services, and segregation or other discriminatory practices in the manner of providing them, are prohibited. This prohibition extends to all facilities and services provided by the grantee under the program or, if the grantee is a State, by a political subdivision of the State. It extends also to services purchased or otherwise obtained by the grantee (or political subdivision) from hospitals, nursing homes, schools, and similar institutions for beneficiaries of the program, and to the facilities in which such services are provided, subject, however, to the provisions of § 80.3(e).

(b) In the federally affected area programs (P.L. 815 and P.L. 874) for construction aid and for general support of the operation of elementary or secondary schools, or in programs for more limited support to such schools such as for the acquisition of equipment, the provision of vocational education, or the provision of guidance and counseling services, discrimination by the recipient school district in any of its elementary or secondary schools in the admission of students, or in the treatment of its students in any aspect of the educational process, is prohibited. In this and the following illustrations the prohibition of discrimination in the treatment of students or other trainees includes the prohibition of discrimination among the students or trainees in the availability or use of any academic, dormitory, eating, recreational, or other facilities of the grantee or other recipient.

(c) In a research, training, demonstration, or other grant to a university for activities to be conducted in a graduate school, discrimination in the admission and treatment of students in the graduate school is prohibited, and the prohibition extends to the entire university unless it satisfies the responsible Department official that practices with respect to other parts or programs of the university will not interfere, directly or indirectly, with fulfillment of the assurance required with respect to the graduate school.

(d) In a training grant to a hospital or other nonacademic institution, discrimination is prohibited in the selection of individuals to be trained and in their treatment by the grantee during their training. In a research or demonstration grant to such an institution discrimination is prohibited with respect to any educational activity and any provision of medical or other services and any financial aid to individuals incident to the program.

(e) In grant programs to assist in the construction of facilities for the provision of health, education, or welfare services assurances will be required that services will be provided without discrimination, to the same extent that discrimination would be prohibited as a condition of Federal operating grants for the support of such service. Thus, as a condition of grants for the construction of academic, research, or other facilities at institutions of higher education, assurances will be required that there will be no discrimination in the admission or treatment of students. In the case of hospital construction grants the assurance will apply to patients, to interns, residents, student nurses, and other trainees, and to the privilege of physicians, dentists, and other professionally qualified persons to practice in the hospital, and will apply to the entire facility for which, or for a part of which the grant is made, and to facilities operated in connection therewith. In other construction grants the assurances required will similarly be adapted to the nature of the activities to be conducted in the facilities for construction of which the grants have been authorized by Congress.

(f) Upon transfers of real or personal surplus property for health or educational uses, discrimination is prohibited to the same extent as in the case of grants for the construction of facilities or the provision of equipment for like purposes.

(g) Each applicant for a grant for the construction of educational television facilities is required to provide an assurance that it will, in its broadcast services, give due consideration to the interests of all significant racial or ethnic groups within the population to be served by the applicant.

(h) A recipient may not take action that is calculated to bring about indirectly what this part forbids it to accomplish directly. Thus a State, in selecting or approving projects or sites for the construction of public libraries which will receive Federal financial assistance, may not base its selections or approvals on criteria which have the effect of defeating or of substantially impairing accomplishment of the objectives of the Federal assistance program as respects individuals of a particular race, color, or national origin.

§ 80.6 Compliance information.

(a) *Cooperation and assistance.* Each responsible Department official shall to the fullest extent practicable seek the cooperation of recipients in obtaining compliance with this part and shall provide assistance and guidance to recipients to help them comply voluntarily with this part.

(b) *Compliance reports.* Each recipient shall keep such records and submit to the responsible Department official or his designee timely, complete and accurate compliance reports at such times, and in such form and containing such information, as the responsible Department official or his designee may determine to be necessary to enable him to ascertain whether the recipient has complied or is complying with this part. In the case of any program under which a primary recipient extends Federal financial assistance to any other recipient, such other recipient shall also submit such compliance reports to the primary recipient as may be necessary to enable the primary recipient to carry out its obligations under this part.

(c) *Access to sources of information.* Each recipient shall permit access by the responsible Department official or his designee during normal business hours to such of its books, records, accounts, and other sources of information, and its facilities as may be pertinent to ascertain compliance with this part. Where any information required of a recipient is in the exclusive possession of any other agency, institution or person and this agency, institution or person shall fail or refuse to furnish this information, the recipient shall so certify in its report and shall set forth what efforts it has made to obtain the information.

(d) *Information to beneficiaries and participants.* Each recipient shall make available to participants, beneficiaries, and other interested persons such information regarding the provisions of this part and its applicability to the program under which the recipient receives Federal financial assistance, and make such information available to them in such manner, as the responsible Department official finds necessary to apprise such persons of the protections against discrimination assured them by the Act and this part.

§ 80.7 Conduct of investigations.

(a) *Periodic compliance reviews.* The responsible Department official or his designee shall from time to time review the practices of recipients to determine whether they are complying with this part.

(b) *Complaints.* Any person who believes himself or any specific class of individuals to be subjected to discrimination prohibited by this part may by himself or by a representative file with the responsible Department official or his designee a written complaint. A complaint must be filed not later than 90 days from the date of the alleged discrimination, unless the time for filing is extended by the responsible Department official or his designee.

(c) *Investigations.* The responsible Department official or his designee will make a prompt investigation whenever a compliance review, report, complaint, or any other information indicates a possible failure to comply with this part. The investigation should include, where appropriate, a review of the pertinent practices and policies of the recipient, the circumstances under which the possible noncompliance with this part occurred, and other factors relevant to a determination as to whether the recipient has failed to comply with this part.

(d) *Resolution of matters.* (1) If an investigation pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section indicates a failure to comply with this part, the responsible Department official or his designee will so inform the recipient and the matter will be resolved by informal means whenever possible. If it has been determined that the matter cannot be resolved by informal means, action will be taken as provided for in § 80.8.

(2) If an investigation does not warrant action pursuant to subparagraph (1) of this paragraph the responsible Department official or his designee will so inform the recipient and the complainant, if any, in writing.

(e) *Intimidatory or retaliatory acts prohibited.* No recipient or other person shall intimidate, threaten, coerce, or discriminate against any individual for the purpose of interfering with any right or privilege secured by section 601 of the Act or this part, or because he has made a complaint, testified, assisted, or participated in any manner in an investigation, proceeding, or hearing under this part. The identity of complainants shall be kept confidential except to the extent necessary to carry out the purposes of this part, including the conduct of any investigation, hearing, or judicial proceeding arising thereunder.

§ 80.8 Procedure for effecting compliance.

(a) *General.* If there appears to be a failure or threatened failure to comply with this regulation, and if the noncompliance or threatened noncompliance cannot be corrected by informal means, compliance with this part may be effected by the suspension or termination of or refusal to grant or to continue Federal financial assistance or by any other means authorized by law. Such other means may include, but are not limited to, (1) a reference to the Department of Justice with a recommendation that appropriate proceedings be brought to enforce any rights of the United States under any law of the United States (including other titles of the Act), or any assurance or other contractual undertaking, and (2) any applicable proceeding under State or local law.

(b) *Noncompliance with § 80.4.* If an applicant fails or refuses to furnish an assurance required under § 80.4 or otherwise fails or refuses to comply with a requirement imposed by or pursuant to that section Federal financial assistance may be refused in accordance with the procedures of paragraph (c) of this section. The Department shall not be required to provide assistance in such a case during the pendency of the administrative proceedings under such paragraph except that the Department shall continue assistance during the pendency of such proceedings where such assistance is due and payable pursuant to an application therefor approved prior to the effective date of this part.

(c) *Termination of or refusal to grant or to continue Federal financial assistance.* No order suspending, terminating or refusing to grant or continue Federal financial assistance shall become effective until (1) the responsible Department official has advised the applicant or recipient of his failure to comply and has determined that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means, (2) there has been an express finding on the record, after opportunity for hearing, of a failure by the applicant or recipient to comply with a requirement imposed by or pursuant to this part, (3) the action has been approved by the Secretary pursuant to § 80.10(e), and (4) the expiration of 30 days after the Secretary has filed with the committee of the House and the committee of the Senate having legislative jurisdiction over the program involved, a full written report of the circumstances and the grounds for such action. Any action to suspend or terminate or to refuse to grant or to continue Federal financial assistance shall be limited to the particular political entity, or part thereof, or other applicant or recipient as to whom such a finding has been made and shall be limited in its effect to the particular program, or part thereof, in which such noncompliance has been so found.

(d) *Other means authorized by law.* No action to effect compliance by any other means authorized by law shall be taken until (1) the responsible Department official has determined that compliance cannot be secured by voluntary means, (2) the action has been approved by the Secretary, (3) the recipient or other person has been notified of its failure to comply and of the action to be taken to effect compliance, and (4) the expiration of at least 10 days from the mailing of such notice to the recipient or other person. During this period of at least 10 days additional efforts shall be made to persuade the recipient or other person to comply with the regulation and to take such corrective action as may be appropriate.

§ 80.9 Hearings.

(a) *Opportunity for hearing.* Whenever an opportunity for a hearing is required by § 80.8(c), reasonable notice shall be given by registered or certified mail, return receipt requested, to the affected applicant or recipient. This notice shall advise the applicant or recipient of the action proposed to be taken, the specific provision under which the proposed action against it is to be taken, and the matters of fact or law asserted as the basis for this action, and either (1) fix a date not less than 20 days after the date of such notice within which the applicant or recipient may request of the responsible Department official that the matter be scheduled for hearing or (2) advise the applicant or recipient that the matter in question has been set down for hearing at a stated place and time. The time and place so fixed shall be reasonable and shall be subject to change for cause. The complainant, if any, shall be advised of the time and place of the hearing. An applicant or recipient may waive a hearing and submit written information and argument for the record. The failure of an applicant or recipient to request a hearing under this paragraph or to appear at a hearing for which a date has been set shall be deemed to be a waiver of the right to a hearing under section 602 of the Act and § 80.8(c) of this part and consent to the making of a decision on the basis of such information as is available.

(b) *Time and place of hearing.* Hearings shall be held at the offices of the Department in Washington, D.C., at a time fixed by the responsible Department official unless he determines that the convenience of the applicant or recipient or of the Department requires that another place be selected. Hearings shall be held before the responsible Department official or, at his discretion, before a hearing examiner designated in accordance with section 11 of the Administrative Procedure Act.

(c) *Right to counsel.* In all proceedings under this section, the applicant or recipient and the Department shall have the right to be represented by counsel.

(d) *Procedures, evidence, and record.* (1) The hearing, decision, and any administrative review thereof shall be conducted in conformity with sections 5–8 of the Administrative Procedure Act, and in accordance with such rules of procedure as are proper (and not inconsistent with this section) relating to the conduct of the hearing, giving of notices subsequent to those provided for in paragraph (a) of this section, taking of testimony, exhibits, arguments and briefs, requests for findings, and other related matters. Both the Department and the applicant or recipient shall be entitled to introduce all relevant evidence on the issues as stated in the notice for hearing or as determined by the officer conducting the hearing at the outset of or during the hearing.

(2) Technical rules of evidence shall not apply to hearings conducted pursuant to this part, but rules or principles designed to assure production of the most credible evidence available and to subject testimony to test by cross-examination shall be applied where reasonably necessary by the officer conducting the hearing. The hearing officer may exclude irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious evidence. All documents and other evidence offered or taken for the record shall be open to examination by the parties and opportunity shall be given to refute facts and arguments advanced on either side of the issues. A transcript shall be made of the oral evidence except to the extent the substance thereof is stipulated for the record. All decisions shall be based upon the hearing record and written findings shall be made.

(e) *Consolidated or Joint Hearings.* In cases in which the same or related facts are asserted to constitute noncompliance with this regulation with respect to two or more programs to which this part applies, or noncompliance with this part and the regulations of one or more other Federal departments or agencies issued under Title VI of the Act, the Secretary may, by agreement with such other departments or agencies where applicable, provide for the conduct of consolidated or joint hearings, and for the application to such hearings of rules of procedures not inconsistent with this part. Final decisions in such cases, insofar as this regulation is concerned, shall be made in accordance with § 80.10.

§ 80.10 Decisions and notices.

(a) *Decision by person other than the responsible Department official.* If the hearing is held by a hearing examiner such hearing examiner shall either make an initial decision, if so authorized, or certify the entire record including his recommended findings and proposed decision to the responsible Department official for a final decision, and a copy of such initial decision or certification shall be mailed to the applicant or recipient. Where the initial decision is made by the hearing examiner the applicant or recipient may within 30 days of the mailing of such notice of initial decision file with the responsible Department official his exceptions to the initial decision, with his reasons therefor. In the absence of exceptions, the responsible Department official may on his own motion within 45 days after the initial decision serve on the applicant or recipient a notice that he will review the decision. Upon the filing of such exceptions or of such notice of review the responsible Department official shall review the initial decision and issue his own decision thereon including the reasons therefor. In the absence of either exceptions or a notice of review the initial decision shall constitute the final decision of the responsible Department official.

(b) *Decisions on record or review by the responsible Department official.* Whenever a record is certified to the responsible Department official for decision or he reviews the decision of a hearing examiner pursuant to paragraph (a) of this section, or whenever the responsible Department official conducts the hearing, the applicant or recipient shall be given reasonable opportunity to file with him briefs or other written statements of its contentions, and a copy of the final decision of the responsible Department official shall be given in writing to the applicant or recipient and to the complainant, if any.

(c) *Decisions on record where a hearing is waived.* Whenever a hearing is waived pursuant to § 80.9(a) a decision shall be made by the responsible departmental official on the record and a copy of such decision shall be given in writing to the applicant or recipient, and to the complainant, if any.

(d) *Rulings required.* Each decision of a hearing officer or responsible Department official shall set forth his ruling on each finding, conclusion, or exception presented, and shall identify the requirement or requirements imposed by or pursuant to this part with which it is found that the applicant or recipient has failed to comply.

(e) *Approval by Secretary.* Any final decision of a responsible Department official (other than the Secretary) which provides for the suspension or termination of, or the refusal to grant or continue Federal financial assistance, or the imposition of any other sanction available under this part of the Act, shall promptly be transmitted to the Secretary, who may approve such decision, may vacate it, or remit or mitigate any sanction imposed.

(f) *Content of orders.* The final decision may provide for suspension or termination of, or refusal to grant or continue Federal financial assistance, in whole or in part, under the program involved, and may contain such terms, conditions, and other provisions as are consistent with and will effectuate the purposes of the Act and this part, including provisions designed to assure that no Federal financial assistance will thereafter be extended under such program to the applicant or recipient determined by such decision to be in default in its performance of an assurance given by it pursuant to this part, or to have otherwise failed to comply with this part, unless and until it corrects its noncompliance and satisfies the responsible Department official that it will fully comply with this part.

§ 80.11 Judicial review.

Action taken pursuant to section 602 of the Act is subject to judicial review as provided in section 603 of the Act.

§ 80.12 Effect on other regulations; forms and instructions.

(a) *Effect on other regulations.* All regulations, orders, or like directions heretofore issued by any officer of the Department which impose requirements designed to prohibit any discrimination against individuals on the ground of race, color, or national origin under any program to which this part applies, and which authorize the suspension or termination of or refusal to grant or to continue Federal financial assistance to any applicant for or recipient of such assistance under such program for failure to comply with such requirements, are hereby superseded to the extend that such discrimination is prohibited by this part, except that nothing in this part shall be deemed to relieve any person of any obligation assumed or imposed under any such superseded regulation, order, instruction, or like direction prior to the effective date of this part. Nothing in this part, however, shall be deemed to supersede any of the following (including future amendments thereof): (1) Executive Orders 10925 and 11114 and regulations issued thereunder, (2) the "Standards for a Merit System of Personnel Administration," issued jointly by the Secretaries of Defense, of Health, Education, and Welfare, and of Labor, 28 F.R. 734, or (3) Executive Order 11063 and regulations issued thereunder, or any other regulations or instructions, insofar as such Order, regulations, or instructions prohibit discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin in any program or situation to which this part is inapplicable, or prohibit discrimination on any other ground.

(b) *Forms and instructions.* Each responsible Department official shall issue and promptly make available to interested persons forms and detailed instructions and procedures for effectuating this part as applied to programs to which this part applies and for which he is responsible.

(c) *Supervision and coordination.* The Secretary may from time to time assign to officials of the Department, or to officials of other departments or agencies of the Government with the consent of such departments or agencies, responsibilities in connection with the effectuation of the purposes of title VI of the Act and this part (other than responsibility for final decision as provided in § 80.10), including the achievement of effective coordination and maximum uniformity within the Department and within the Executive Branch of the Government in the application of title VI and this part to similar programs and in similar situations.

§ 80.13 Definitions.

As used in this part—

(a) The term "Department" means the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and includes each of its operating agencies and other organizational units.

(b) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(c) The term "responsible Department official" with respect to any program receiving Federal financial assistance means the Secretary or other official of the Department who by law or by delegation has the principal responsibility within the Department for the administration of the law extending such assistance.

(d) The term "United States" means the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, Wake Island, the Canal Zone, and the territories and possessions of the United States, and the term "State" means any one of the foregoing.

(e) The term "Federal financial assistance" includes (1) grants and loans of Federal funds, (2) the grant or donation of Federal property and interests in property, (3) the detail of Federal personnel, (4) the sale and lease of, and the permission to use (on other than a casual or transient basis), Federal property or any interest in such property without consideration or at a nominal consideration, or at a consideration which is reduced for the purpose of assisting the recipient, or in recognition of the public interest to be served by such sale or lease to the recipient, and (5) any Federal agreement, arrangement, or other contract which has as one of its purposes the provision of assistance.

(f) The term "program" includes any program, project, or activity for the provision of services, financial aid, or other benefits to individuals (including education or training, health, welfare, rehabilitation, housing, or other services, whether provided through employees of the recipient of Federal financial assistance or provided by others through contracts or other arrangements with the recipient, and including work opportunities and cash or loan or other assistance to individuals), or for the provision of facilities for furnishing services, financial aid or other benefits to individuals. The services, financial aid, or other benefits provided under a program receiving Federal financial assistance shall be deemed to include any services, financial aid, or other benefits provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance or with the aid of any non-Federal funds, property, or other resources required to be expended or made available for the program to meet matching requirements or other conditions which must be met in order to receive the Federal financial assistance, and to include any services, financial aid, or other benefits provided in or through a facility provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance or such non-Federal resources.

(g) The term "facility" includes all or any portion of structures, equipment, or other real or personal property or interests therein, and the provision of facilities includes the construction, expansion, renovation, remodeling, alteration or acquisition of facilities.

(h) The term "recipient" means any State, political subdivision of any State, or instrumentality of any State or political subdivision, any public or private agency, institution, or organization, or other entity, or any individual, in any State, to whom Federal financial assistance is extended, directly or through another recipient, for any program, including any successor, assign, or transferee thereof, but such term does not include any ultimate beneficiary under any such program.

(i) The term "primary recipient" means any recipient which is authorized or required to extend Federal financial assistance to another recipient for the purpose of carrying out a program.

(j) The term "applicant" means one who submits an application, request, or plan required to be approved by a responsible Department official, or by a primary recipient, as a condition to eligibility for Federal financial assistance, and the term "application" means such an application, request, or plan.

Effective date. This part shall become effective on the 30th day following the date of its publication in the FEDERAL REGISTER.

Dated: November 27, 1964.

[SEAL] ANTHONY J. CELEBREZZE,
Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Approved: December 3, 1964.
LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

APPENDIX A

PROGRAMS TO WHICH THIS PART APPLIES

Part 1. Programs other than State-administered continuing programs.

1. Experimental hospital facilities (sec. 624, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 291n).

2. Health research facilities (title VII, part A, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 292-292j).

3. Teaching facilities for medical, dental, and other health personnel (title VII, part B, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 293-293h; secs. 801–804, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 296, 296a–c).

4. Mental retardation research facilities (title VII, part D, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 295–295e).

5. University affiliated mental retardation facilities (part B, Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act, 42 U.S.C. 2661–2665).

6. Heart disease laboratories and related facilities for patient care (sec. 412(d), Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 287a(d)).

7. Municipal sewage treatment works (sec. 6, Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. 466e).

8. Loans for acquisition of science, mathematics, and foreign language equipment (title III, National Defense Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 445).

9. Construction of facilities for institutions of higher education (Higher Education Facilities Act, 20 U.S.C. 701–757).

10. School construction in Federally-affected areas (20 U.S.C. 631–645).

11. Educational television broadcasting facilities (47 U.S.C. 390–397).

12. Surplus real and related personal property disposal (40 U.S.C. 484(k)).

13. George Washington University Hospital construction (76 Stat. 83, P.L. 87–460, May 31, 1962).

14. Loan service of captioned films for the deaf (42 U.S.C. 2491–2494).

15. Residential vocational education schools (20 U.S.C. 35*l*).

16. Department projects under the Public Works Acceleration Act (P.L. 87–658).

17. Research projects, including conferences, communication activities and primate or other center grants (secs. 301, 303, 308, 624, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 241, 242a, 242f, 291n; sec. 4, Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. 466c; sec. 3, Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857b).

18. General research support (sec. 301(d), Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 241).

19. Community health studies and demonstrations (sec. 316, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 247a).

20. Mental health demonstrations and administrative studies (sec. 303(a)(2), Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 242a).

21. Migratory workers health services (sec. 310, Public Health Service Act, 76 Stat. 592, P.L. 87–692, Sept. 25, 1962).

22. Intensive vaccination projects (sec. 317, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 247b).

23. Tuberculosis and venereal disease control projects (current appropriation Act, P.L. 88-605).

24. Air pollution demonstration and survey projects and control programs (secs. 3 and 4, Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857b, 1857c).

25. Water pollution demonstration grants (sec. 4(a)(2), Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. 466c).

26. Health research training projects and fellowship grants (secs. 301, 433, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 241, 289c).

27. Categorical (heart, cancer, air pollution, etc.) grants for training, traineeships or fellowships (secs. 303, 433, etc., Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 242a, 289c, etc.; sec. 3, Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857b; sec. 4, Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. 466c).

28. Advanced professional nurse traineeships, improvement in nurse training and partial reimbursement to diploma schools of nursing (secs. 805, 806, 821, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 296d, 296e, 297).

29. Grants to institutions for traineeships for professional public health personnel (sec. 306, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 242d).

30. Grants to schools for specialized training in public health (sec. 309, Public Health Service Act, 242g).

31. Grants for special vocational rehabilitation projects (sec. 4, Vocational Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. 34).

32. Experimental, pilot or demonstration projects to promote the objectives of title I, IV, X, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act (sec. 1115, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 1315).

33. Social security and welfare cooperative research or demonstration projects (sec. 1110, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 1310).

34. Child welfare research, training or demonstration projects (sec. 526, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 726).

35. Research projects relating to maternal and child health services and crippled children's services (sec. 532, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 729a).

36. Maternal and child health special project grants to institutions of higher learning (sec. 502(b), Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 702(b)).

37. Maternity and infant care special project grants to local health agencies (sec. 531, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 726).

38. Special project grants to institutions of higher learning for crippled children's services (sec. 512(b), Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 712(b)).

39. Demonstration and evaluation projects and training of personnel in the field of juvenile delinquency (Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961 (42 U.S.C. 2541, et seq.)).

40. Cooperative educational research (20 U.S.C. 331–332).

41. Language research (title VI, National Defense Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 512).

42. Research in new educational media (title VII, National Defense Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 541–542).

43. Research, training, and demonstration projects under Vocational Education Act of 1963 (sec. 4(c), 20 U.S.C. 35c(c)).

44. Grants for research and demonstration projects in education of handicapped children (20 U.S.C. 618).

45. Training grants for welfare personnel (sec. 705, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 906).

46. Allowances to institutions training graduate fellows or other trainees (title IV, National Defense Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 461–465; sec. 4, Vocational Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. 34; secs. 301, 433, etc., Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 241, 289(c), etc.; sec. 3, Clean Air Act, 42 U.S.C. 1857b; sec. 4, Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. 466c).

47. Grants for teaching and the training of teachers for the education of handicapped children (20 U.S.C. 611–617).

48. Training persons in the use of films for the deaf (42 U.S.C. 2493(b)(4)).

49. Training for teachers of the deaf (20 U.S.C. 671–676).

50. Research in the use of educational and training films for the deaf (42 U.S.C. 2493 (a)).

51. Operation and maintenance of schools in federally affected areas (20 U.S.C. 236–244).

52. Grants for teacher training and employment of specialists in desegregation problems (sec. 405, Civil Rights Act of 1964, P.L. 88–352).

53. Issuance to agencies or organizations of rent-free permits for operation, on Federal property in the custody of the Department, of vending stands for the blind, credit unions, Federal employee associations, etc. (Randolph-Sheppard Vending Stand Act, 20 U.S.C. 107–107f; 45 CFR Part 20; sec. 25, Federal Credit Union Act, 12 U.S.C. 1770; etc.)

54. Higher education student loan program (title II, National Defense Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 421–429).

55. Health professions school student loan program (title VII, Part C, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 294; secs. 822–828, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 297 a-g).

56. Land-grant college aid (7 U.S.C. 301–329).

57. Language and area centers (title VI, National Defense Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 511–513).

58. American Printing House for the Blind (20 U.S.C. 101–105).

59. Future Farmers of America (36 U.S.C. 271–291) and similar programs.

60. Science Clubs (20 U.S.C. 2 (note)).

61. Howard University (20 U.S.C. 121–131).

62. Gallaudet College (31 D.C. Code, Ch. 10).

63. Hawaii leprosy payments (sec. 331, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 255).

64. Grants to schools of public health for provision of comprehensive training and specialized services and assistance (sec. 314(c), Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 246(c)).

65. Grants to agencies and organizations under Cuban Refugee program (22 U.S.C. 2601(b)(4)).

66. Grants for construction of hospitals serving Indians (P.L. 85–151, 42 U.S.C. 2005).

67. Indian Sanitation Facilities (P.L. 86–121, 42 U.S.C. 2004a).

68. Areawide planning of health facilities (sec. 318, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 247c).

69. Training institutes under sec. 511 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended (20 U.S.C. 491) and under title XI of such Act as added by P.L. 88–665 (20 U.S.C. 591-592).

Part 2. State-administered continuing programs.

1. Grants to States for control of venereal disease, tuberculosis, and for public health services (heart, cancer, mental health, radiological health, etc.) (sec. 314, Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 246), and current appropriation act).

2. Grants to States for water pollution control (sec. 5, Federal Water Pollution Control Act, 33 U.S.C. 466d).

3. Grants to States for vocational rehabilitation services (sec. 2, Vocational Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. 32).

4. Grants to States for projects to extend and improve vocational rehabilitation services (sec. 3, Vocational Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. 33).

5. Designation of State licensing agency for blind operators of vending stands (Randolph-Sheppard Vending Stand Act, 20 U.S.C. 107–107f).

6. Grants to States for old-age assistance and medical assistance for the aged (title I, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 301–306).

7. Grants to States for aid and services to needy families with children (title IV, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 601–609).

8. Grants to States for aid to the blind (title X, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 1201–1206).

9. Grants to States for aid to the permanently and totally disabled (title XIV, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 1351–1355).

10. Grants to States for aid to the aged, blind or disabled or for such aid and medical assistance for the aged (title XVI, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 1381–1385).

11. Grants to States for maternal and child health services (title V, part 1, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 701–705).

12. Grants to States for services for crippled children (title V, part 2, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 711–715).

13. Grants to States for special projects for maternity and infant care (sec. 531, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 729).

14. Grants to States for child welfare services (title V, part 3, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 721–725, 727, 728).

15. Grants to States for public library services and construction (20 U.S.C. sec. 351–358; P.L. 88–269).

16. Grants to States for strengthening science, mathematics, and modern foreign language instruction (title III, National Defense Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 441–444).

17. Grants to States for guidance, counseling and testing of students (title V–A, National Defense Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 481–484).

18. Grants to States for educational statistics services (sec. 1009, National Defense Education Act, 20 U.S.C. 589).

19. Surplus personal property disposal donations for health and educational purposes through State agencies (40 U.S.C. 484(j)).

20. Grants to States for hospital and medical facilities (title VI, Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S.C. 291–291z).

21. Grants to States for community mental health centers construction (Community Mental Health Centers Act, 42 U.S.C. 2681–2688).

22. Grants to States for vocational education (Smith-Hughes Act, 20 U.S.C. 11–15, 16–28; George-Barden Act, 20 U.S.C. 15i–15q, 15aa–15jj, 15aaa–15ggg; Supplementary Acts, 20 U.S.C. 30–34.

23. Grants to States for mental retardation facilities (Part C, Mental Retardation Facilities Construction Act, 42 U.S.C. 2671–2677).

24. Arrangements with State vocational education agencies for training under the Area Redevelopment Act and the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 (42 U.S.C. 2513(c), 2601, 2602).

25. Grants to States for comprehensive planning for mental retardation (title XVII, Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. 1391–1394).

[F.R. Doc. 64–12539; Filed, Dec. 3, 1964; 4:23 p.m.]

Instructions to School Districts Regarding Compliance With Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: Nondiscrimination in Federally Assisted Programs

I. NONDISCRIMINATION IN FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS

Section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 provides that: "No person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

Title VI also directs each Federal agency to adopt regulations to carry out the provisions of section 601. A regulation pursuant to title VI has been issued by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and approved by the President effective

January 3, 1965. (Title 45, Code of Federal Regulations, pt. 80.)

The following instructions are intended to aid local school districts and other agencies participating in federally assisted programs administered by the U.S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, in fulfilling the requirements of title VI and the regulation. Particular attention is directed to section VI of these instructions: Procedure for Submitting Assurances.

II. ASSURANCE OF COMPLIANCE

For a school district or other agency to be eligible for Federal financial assistance under any program administered through the U.S. Office of Education the official governing body of the school district or other agency is required under section 80.4 of the regulation to furnish an assurance of compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act. A standard assurance of compliance, Form HEW–441, is provided for any school district or other agency prepared at the time of submitting the assurance to comply fully with the requirement of nondiscrimination stated in section 601 of the act. The filing of this standard assurance form, which is applicable to all schools operated by the school district, satisfies the assurance requirement for all programs of Federal financial assistance administered by the Office of Education. Once the standard assurance of compliance has been filed each future application or reapplication for Federal financial assistance need only contain or be accompanied by the following statement by an authorized official of the applicant:

The assurance of compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act dated _______________
(Month, day, year)
applies to the application submitted herewith.

Programs of Federal financial assistances administered through the Office of Education to which the assurance of compliance would be applicable, include:

National Defense Education Act, title III (acquisition of equipment for science, mathematics, history, civics, geography, modern foreign languages, English, and reading instruction).

National Defense Education Act, title V (guidance, counseling, and testing).

Vocational and technical education programs; Smith-Hughes, George-Barden, and Vocational Education Act of 1963.

Manpower Development and Training Act.

Area Redevelopment Act (training under sec. 16).

School Assistance in Federally Affected Areas (operation and maintenance under Public Law 874 and school construction under Public Law 815).

Library Services and Construction Act.

Adult basic education program; title II–B of the Economic Opportunity Act.

Educational Improvement for Handicapped Children and Youth.

III. SCHOOL DISTRICTS UNDER COURT ORDER OR PLAN OF DESEGRATION

A school district not yet fully desegregated or otherwise not in a position to give an assurance of full compliance with section 601 of the act should not execute form No. HEW 441. Such a school district may, however, apply for Federal financial assistance if it can comply with the requirements of 80.4(c) of the regulation, regarding court orders and plans for desegregation.

A school district or agency which elects to apply under section 80.4(c)(1) of the regulation should submit a copy of the final court order together with a report of the present state of compliance with that order and its program for continued compliance.

A school district or agency which elects to apply under section 80.4(c)(2) of the regulation should submit a plan which must meet the following conditions as a minimum:

1. Attendance areas. No plan contemplating the use of attendance areas for desegregated grades will be satisfactory unless such areas are bounded by rational and reasonable lines and are part of a system of unitary, nonracial zones.

2. Initial assignment, transfer, and reassignment. All provisions in a plan for initial assignment, transfer, or reassignment to schools (and within a school) must, for desegregated grades, operate without regard to the race, color, or national origin of any individual.

3. Plans based on freedom of choice. Insofar as desegregation plans based on concepts of freedom of choice make use of any restrictions upon choice (for example, policies governing cases of overcrowding), all such restrictions must operate without regard to the race, color, or national origin of any individual.

4. Timing; special educational problems incident to desegregation. Each plan must specify the steps (and fix a time schedule applicable to each step) to be taken toward operation of the schools in accordance with the policy of nondiscrimination stated in section 601 of the act and the regulation. In any event, the plan must provide for a substantial good faith start by the beginning of the school year next following submission of the plan. In addition, the plan must provide a schedule of appropriate preparatory steps to prepare the staff and community for desegregation. Such preparatory steps must begin immediately upon adoption of the plan. Any steps taken prior to adoption of the plan should also be reported.

5. Public notice. No plan will be satisfactory unless it contains specific assurance that ample notice will be given to pupils, parents, and the general public of rules and regulations respecting assignments, transfer, reassignments, and of other provisions of the plan. Such notice shall be given suitably in advance of the time at which individual choice or action must be taken.

In the case of a school district submitting a plan of desegregation, the burden rests with the school district to establish that the time prescribed in the plan for its implementation is necessary in the public interest and is consistent with good faith compliance at the earliest practicable date.

The Commissioner reserves the right to reevaluate a plan periodically to determine its adequacy to accomplish the purposes of the act and the regulation.

Such plans are not in any way binding on parties to litigation involving questions of discrimination in the policies or practices of the district.

IV. EFFECT OF SUBMISSION OF ASSURANCE OF COMPLIANCE IN STATE-ADMINISTERED PROGRAMS

Effective as of January 3, 1965, the effective date of the regulation, State agencies may not make any new commitments of funds for any purpose to a school district in federally assisted programs unless an assurance of compliance, court order, or satisfactory desegregation plan has been submitted to the State agency.

Where a school district or other agency submits a plan of desegregation, the State agency may not take any of the above actions until the State agency is notified by the U.S. Commissioner of Education, after review of the plan, that Federal financial assistance may be extended.

Thus, for example, after January 2, 1965, no new agreements, contracts, or project approvals for vocational education programs, or for vocational education school construction, or for equipment or remodeling under title III, National Defense Education Act, or for guidance and counseling programs under title V, National Defense Education Act, or for training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act or Area Redevelopment Act, or for library services or construction may be entered into or approved by the State agency unless an assurance of compliance, court order, or approved plan is first obtained from the applicant.

Federal financial assistance due and payable pursuant to commitments made by the State agency prior to January 3, 1965, may be paid in spite of the failure of a school district or other agency to submit the required assurance of compliance, court order, or desegregation plan. However, the State agency in such case must notify the Commissioner of Education of such failure, and Federal financial assistance to the district may be terminated pursuant to the procedures for compliance set forth in section 80.8(c) of the regulation.

After the effective date of a final order entered by the responsible Department official under section 80.10 of the regulation that a school district or other agency is not in compliance with the regulation, the State agency may not make available any Federal financial assistance to such school district or other agency where the provision of such assistance is inconsistent with or prohibited by any provision in such final order.

V. DIRECT FEDERAL ASSISTANCE (PUBLIC LAW 815 AND PUBLIC LAW 874)

Effective as of January 3, 1965, the effective date of the regulation, the U.S. Commissioner of Education will not approve any new projects for Federal financial assistance to a school district or other agency or any other direct assistance program under Public Law 815 or Public Law 874, unless an assurance of compliance, court order, or desegregation plan has been submitted to the Office of Education.

Where Federal financial assistance is due and payable pursuant to an application approved by the Office of Education prior to January 3, 1965, such assistance may continue except as it may be terminated pursuant to the procedures for compliance provided in section 80.8(c) of the regulation.

VI. PROCEDURES FOR SUBMITTING ASSURANCES

The instructions below represent the procedures for submitting assurances of compliance by school districts and other agencies to meet the administrative requirements of the Office of Education. The State educational agencies may instruct school districts and other agencies to file additional copies of the assurance with the State agency for its administrative purposes.

When indicating the name of the school district or other agency, give the full legal name of the district or agency. Also indicate on the form the county and State in which the district or agency is located. If the school district is a Public Law 815 or Public Law 874 applicant, in order to secure prompt processing of the applications, it should indicate the most recent project numbers for these applications, for example, Iowa–64–E–910.

Under the signature on form HEW 441, type the name and title of the official signing.

State administered Federal assistance programs

School districts receiving funds only under State administered programs (such as vocational education, titles III and V of National Defense Education Act, etc.) and not receiving funds under any direct assistance programs (such as Public Law 874 or Public Law 815) submit two signed copies of the assurance, court order, or plan to the State agency. The State agency will retain one copy and forward one copy to the Office of Education.

Direct Federal assistance

For school districts receiving assistance only under assistance programs directly administered by the U.S. Office of Education (such as Public Law 815 or Public Law 874), file the same number of signed copies of the assurance, court order, or plan as is required for application under the particular program. Under Public Law 815 or Public Law 874, for instance, submit three signed copies of the assurance, court order, or plan to the State agency in accordance with the usual procedure for application under these programs. The State agency will retain one copy and forward one copy to the appropriate regional office of the U.S. Office of Education and one to the U.S. Office of Education.

Both direct and State administered programs

If the school district is receiving assistance under both direct assistance and State administered programs, follow the procedures above for direct assistance, but make sure that one copy of the assurance, court order, or plan is sent to the State agency for its files if this is not otherwise provided for.

Since the particular office approving a grant at either the State or Federal level cannot approve a grant unless it has on file a satisfactory assurance, court order, or desegregation plan, the local agency is responsible for making sure that the required copies of these documents have been received by the appropriate office.

Local agency to retain one copy

The local school district should keep at least one copy of the signed assurance, court order, or desegregation plan for its files.

EXPLANATION OF HEW FORM 441, ASSURANCE OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE REGULATION UNDER TITLE VI OF THE CIVIL RIGHTS ACT OF 1964

Section 80.4 of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's regulation effectuating title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 requires that every application to the Department for Federal financial assistance shall contain or be accompanied by an assurance that the program or facility to be assisted will be conducted or operated in compliance with title VI of the Civil Rights Act and with all requirements imposed by or pursuant to the Department's regulation.

Section 80.4 further provides that "the form of the foregoing assurance and the extent to which like assurances will be required of subgrantees, contractors, transferees, successors in interest and other participants," shall be specified by the responsible Department official. Under this authority, HEW form No. 441 has been specified as the form of assurance which shall apply to all applications for Federal financial assistance (except for continuing State programs which must meet the requirements of sec. 80.4(b) and school districts availing themselves of sec. 80.4(c) of the regulation) submitted to the Department after January 3, 1965, also the circumstances have been specified under which an applicant shall obtain comparable written assurance of compliance from its subgrantees, contractors, and transferees. (See answers to questions 11 and 12 below in this regard.)

HEW form No. 441 constitutes a legally enforceable agreement to comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and with all requirements imposed by or pursuant to the regulation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued thereunder. Applicants are urged to read the Department's regulation before executing the assurance.

The following explanation of the requirements of the Department's regulation and the examples of the kinds of discriminatory practices prohibited by them are for the guidance of the applicants.

1. By executing the assurance (HEW form No. 441), what does an applicant agree to do?

Answer. The applicant agrees to make no distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin in providing to individuals any service, financial aid, or other benefit under any program receiving Federal financial assistance extended to the applicant by the Department.

2. What is meant by "distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin"?

Answer. "Distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin" includes (1) any type of segregation, separate or different treatment, or other discrimination on that ground; (2) the imposition of any admission, enrollment quota, eligibility, or other requirement or condition which individuals must meet in order to be provided any service, financial aid, or other benefit under a program or to be afforded an opportunity to participate in a program, if the race, color, or national origin of individuals is considered in determining whether they meet any such requirement or condition; (3) the use of membership in a group as a basis for the selection of individuals for any purpose, if in selecting members of the group there is discrimination on the ground of race, color, or national origin; and (4) the assignment of personnel to provide services, or the assignment of times or places for the provision of services, on the basis of the race, color, or national origin of the individuals to be served. It does not, however, include distinctions on the ground of race, color, or national origin determined by the responsible Department official to be necessary to the conduct of research or experimental programs having as their primary objective the discovery of new knowledge concerning special characteristics of particular racial or other ethnic groups.

3. What is meant by "service, financial aid or other benefit"?

Answer. "Service, financial aid, or other benefit" under a program receiving Federal financial assistance includes any education or training, any evaluation, guidance, counseling, or placement service; any health, welfare, rehabilitation, housing, or recreational service; any referral of individuals for any of the foregoing services; any scholarship, fellowship or traineeship stipend or allowance, and any loan or other financial assistance or benefit (whether in cash or in kind), which is made available to individuals (1) with the aid of Federal financial assistance, or (2) with the aid of the applicant's or of other non-Federal funds required to be made available for the program as a condition to the receipt of Federal financial assistance, or (3) in or through a facility provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance or the non-Federal matching funds referred to in (2).

4. What requirements are placed on the use of facilities?

Answer. The applicant agrees to make no distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin in making available to individuals the use of any land, building, equipment, or other facility leased, acquired, constructed, improved, or equipped with the aid of Federal financial assistance extended to the applicant by the Department, including—

(a) the use of any room, dormitory, ward, or other space in the facility;

(b) the use of any equipment in the facility;

(c) the use of any office, waiting room, restroom, eating, recreational, concession, or other accommodation or convenience provided in the facility;

(d) the use of any facility not provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance if the availability of such facility is required as a condition to the receipt of Federal financial assistance for the federally assisted facility.

5. What requirements are placed on the opportunities to participate in a program receiving Federal assistance?

Answer. The applicant agrees to make no distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin in affording opportunities to individuals to participate (other than as employees) in any program receiving Federal financial assistance extended by the Department to the applicant, including opportunities to participate—

(a) as providers of any service, financial aid, or other benefit to individuals under the program (e.g., as physicians, surgeons, dentists, or other professional practitioners seeking the privilege of practicing in a federally aided hospital or other facility),

(b) as conferees, observers, consultants, or advisers, or as members of advisory or planning groups, or

(c) as volunteers (e.g., as voluntary workers, or as patients or other subjects of study or experimentation in research, survey, demonstration, or like programs).

6. Does that mean that an applicant who signs the Department's assurance may nevertheless make distinctions among his employees on the basis of race, color, or national origin?

Answer. Title VI of the Civil Rights Act does not concern itself with employment practices except where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment. Thus, where a basic objective of the program is to provide employment, the applicant's employment practices are subject to the Department's regulation. However, even where this is not the case an applicant may be precluded from engaging in any discriminatory employment practices under the provisions of title VII of the Civil Rights Act, Executive Orders Nos. 10925 and 11114, and the merit system regulations.

7. When an applicant's employment practices are covered by the Department's regulation, what requirements must be met?

Answer. The applicant agrees to make no distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin in its employment practices (including recruitment or recruitment advertising, hiring, layoff or termination, upgrading, demotion, or transfer, rates of pay or other forms of compensation, and use of facilities) with respect to individuals seeking employment or employed under any program receiving Federal financial assistance extended to the applicant by the Department, in those programs where a primary objective of the Federal financial assistance is to provide employment to such individuals. This includes programs under which the employment is provided—

(a) as a means of extending financial assistance to students or needy persons,

(b) to students, fellows, interns, residents, or others in training for related employment (including research associates or assistants in training for research work), or

(c) to reduce unemployment or to provide remunerative activity to individuals who because of severe handicaps cannot be readily absorbed in the competitive labor market.

8. What effect will the regulation have on a college or university's admission practices or other practices related to the treatment of students?

Answer. An institution of higher education which applies for any Federal financial assistance of any kind must agree that it will make no distinction on the ground of race, color, or national origin in the admission practices or any other practices of the institution relating to the treatment of students.

(a) "Student" includes any undergraduate, graduate, professional, or postgraduate student, fellow, intern, student, or other trainee receiving education or training from the institution.

(b) "Admission practices" include recruiting and promotional activities, application requirements, eligibility conditions, qualifications, preferences, or quotas used in selecting individuals for admission to the institution, or any program of the institution, as students.

(c) "Other practices relating to the treatment of students" of opportunities to participate in any educational, research, cultural, athletic, recreational, social, or other program or activity; the performance evaluation, discipline, counseling of students; making available to students any housing, eating, health, or recreational service; affording work opportunities, or scholarship, loan or other financial assistance to students; and making available for the use of students any building, room, space, materials, equipment, or other facility or property.

9. Does the assurance of nondiscrimination apply to the entire operation of an institution?

Answer. Insofar as the assurance given by the applicant relates to the admission or other treatment of individuals as students, patients, or clients of an institution of higher education, a school, hospital, nursing home, center, or other institution owned or operated by the applicant, or to the opportunity to participate in the provision of services, financial aid, or other benefits to such individuals, the assurance applies to the entire institution. In the case of a public school system the assurance would be applicable to all of the elementary or secondary schools operated by the applicant.

10. What about a university which operates several campuses?

Answer. Section 80.4(d)(2) of the regulation provides for a more limited assurance only where an institution can demonstrate that the practices in part of its operation in no way affect its practice in the program for which it seeks Federal funds. This would be a rare case.

11. If an applicant intends to make use of other individuals to help carry out the federally assisted program, does the requirement not to discriminate apply to such a subgrantee or contractor?

Answer. It does. The applicant must require any individual, organization, or other entity which it utilizes, to which it subgrants, or with which it contracts or otherwise arranges to provide services, financial aid, or other benefits under, or to assist it in the conduct of, any program receiving Federal financial assistance extended to the applicant by the Department, or with which it contracts or otherwise arranges for the use of any facility provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance for a purpose for which the Federal financial assistance was extended, to comply fully with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the regulation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare issued thereunder.

12. Must this assurance of nondiscrimination by the subgrantee, etc., be in writing?

Answer. In the case (1) of any contractual or other arrangement with another such individual or entity which will continue for an indefinite period or for a period of more than 3 months, (2) of any subgrant, or (3) of any conveyance, lease, or other transfer of any real property or structures thereon provided with the aid of Federal financial assistance extended to the applicant by the Department, the applicant shall obtain from such other person, subgrantee, or transferee, an agreement, in writing, enforceable by the applicant and by the United States, that such other individual or entity, subgrantee, or transferee will carry out its functions under such subgrant, or contractual or other arrangement, or will use the transferred property, as the case may be, in accordance with title VI of the act and the regulation will otherwise comply herewith.

13. What obligations does the applicant have to inform beneficiaries, participants, and others of the provisions of the regulation?

Answer. The applicant must make available to beneficiaries, participants, and other interested persons information regarding the provisions of the regulation and protections against discrimination provided under title VI of the Civil Rights Act. The Department will issue shortly more detailed instructions on carrying out this phase of the regulation.

14. What obligations does the applicant have to keep records and to make them available to the Department?

Answer. From time to time, applicants may be required to submit reports to the Department, and the regulation provides that the facilities of the applicant and all records, books, accounts, or other sources of information pertinent to the applicant's compliance with the regulation be made available for inspection during normal business hours on request of an officer or employee of the Department specifically authorized to make such inspections. More detailed instructions in this regard will also be forthcoming from the Department in the near future.

15. Must separate assurance forms be filed with each application?

Answer. As a general rule once a valid assurance is given it will apply to any further application as long as there is no indication of a failure to comply.

Assurance of Compliance With the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Regulation Under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964

Carroll County Board of Education (hereinafter called the "applicant") hereby agrees that it will comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–352) and all requirements imposed by or pursuant to the regulation of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (45 CFR pt. 80) issued pursuant to that title, to the end that, in accordance with title VI of that act and the regulation, no person in the United States shall, on the ground of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination under any program or activity for which the applicant receives Federal financial assistance from the Department; and hereby gives assurance that it will immediately take any measures necessary to effectuate this agreement.

If any real property or structure thereon is provided or improved with the aid of Federal financial assistance extended to the applicant by the Department, this assurance shall obligate the applicant, or in the case of any transfer of such property, any transferee, for the period during which the real property or structure is used for a purpose for which the Federal financial assistance is extended or for another purpose involving the provision of similar services or benefits. If any personal property is so provided, this assurance shall obligate the applicant for the period during which it retains ownership or possession of the property. In all other cases, this assurance shall obligate the applicant for the period during which the Federal financial assistance is extended to it by the Department.

This assurance is given in consideration of and for the purpose of obtaining any and all Federal grants, loans, contracts, property, discounts or other Federal financial assistance extended after the date hereof to the applicant by the Department, including installment payments after such date on account of applications for Federal financial assistance which were approved before such date. The applicant recognizes and agrees that such Federal financial assistance will be extended in reliance on the representations and agreements made in this assurance, and that the United States shall have the right to seek judicial enforcement of this assurance. This assurance is binding on the applicant, its successors, transferees, and assignees, and the person or persons whose signatures appear below are authorized to sign this assurance on behalf of the applicant.

Carroll County Board of Education.
By J. C. Brown, *Chairman of Board.*
Dated March 1, 1965.
Carrollton, Ga.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Mar. 7, 1965]

One Hundred and Seventy Rights Pledges Invalid, U.S. Says—Only Five State Systems Eligible for Funds

(By Hal Gulliver)

Certificates of compliance to the 1964 Civil Rights Act signed by 170 of Georgia's 196 school systems are in effect worthless scraps of paper, Federal officials say.

These systems are still in violation of the new law, according to U.S. Health, Education, and Welfare Department spokesmen.

Their schools do not qualify for Federal aid funds, despite the decision by local boards of education to sign the certificates.

The hard-line policy spelled out by U.S. Office of Education officials in Washington this weekend will require all presently segregated school systems to submit detailed desegregation plans for next September.

"They were misinformed somewhere along the line," Davis S. Seeley, U.S. Office of Education, says of the Georgia school officials.

Seeley, special assistant to U.S. Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel, was named last month to direct the equal educational opportunities program which administers titles IV and VI of the Civil Rights Act affecting school desegregation.

"Georgia got most off on the wrong track," Seeley said.

However, large numbers of segregated school systems in other Southern States still do not qualify for Federal aid because they signed certificates of compliance, Federal officials say.

Segregated school systems will be allowed to file again "as soon as the thing gets straightened out," Seeley said.

Compliance with the Civil Rights Act demands at least a substantial start on desegregation, he added.

State educators contend that this amounts to a drastic shift in policy by the U.S. Office of Education.

"The HEW office sent 1,000 copies down of the certificate of compliance. This position that Mr. Seeley's office is now taking, that segregated systems could not sign, was never stated. The fact that 1,000 copies were sent down makes you wonder if there weren't some second thoughts," Dr. Allen Smith, associate State school superintendent, said.

"A segregated school district would have to file a voluntary desegregation plan" (rather than sign the certificate), Seeley said this weekend.

Only a "totally desegregated" school system would be eligible to sign the certificate, he declared.

Federal officials insist that the instructions sent to local school districts in January made it clear that a segregated system could not sign the certificate of compliance.

One statement in the instructions reads as follows:

"A school district not yet fully desegregated or otherwise not in a position to give an assurance of full compliance * * * should not execute form No. HEW 441" (the certificate).

Georgia education officials, on the advice of the State attorney general's office, interpreted the certificate as a "statement of intent" pledging a local school system not to discriminate after signing.

State educators told local school officials that a school system had three choices: (1) Submit a copy of the Federal court order under which their schools were desegregating, (2) send in a detailed desegregation plan, or (3) sign the certificate of compliance pledging an end to all discrimination in schools.

One complaint made by Federal officials is that Georgia educators failed to invite an HEW spokesman to attend three meetings held in the State in January to explain the Civil Rights Act to local school officials.

This may be one reason for the confusion, Seeley said.

"As a practical matter, plans should be filed now to be put into effect by September," Seeley said.

School systems filing worthless certificates of compliance will be contacted in the next several days, he continued, and told that they must submit desegregation plans.

As it now stands, only 5 of Georgia's 196 school systems are unquestionably in compliance with the Civil Rights Act and eligible for Federal funds. These are the systems now operating under Federal court order.

Sixteen school systems have already submitted desegregation plans, but these must be approved by the U.S. Office of Education.

One Department of Education official said that most of these plans will undoubtedly be rejected by Federal officials because they include requirements already rejected by Federal courts.

At stake is more than $50 million in Federal funds received by Georgia schools last year. State educators estimate that the State will receive an additional $39 million per year under President Johnson's proposed education program now in Congress.

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution, Mar. 8, 1965]

SANDERS SHARPLY CRITICIZES RIGID U.S. SCHOOL POLICY

(By Hal Gulliver)

Gov. Carl Sanders was sharply critical Sunday of the hard-line policy effecting school desegregation announced by Federal officials during the weekend.

"I think it's a pretty ridiculous situation when people send out forms, and then say they're worthless," Sanders declared.

Certificates of compliance to the 1964 Civil Rights Act signed by 170 of Georgia's 196 school systems are of no value, Federal officials say.

Schools in the systems are not in compliance with the new law and are still not eligible to receive Federal funds, according to officials of the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

These school systems must now send in detailed school desegregation plans for next September to qualify for Federal money, officials say.

Sanders failed in a last-minute attempt to persuade Federal officials to ease the newly stated hard-line interpretation of the 1964 Civil Rights Act.

"I've done all I can," the Governor said reluctantly, after conferring by telephone with Lyndon B. Johnson, U.S. Commissioner of Education Francis Keppel, and other Federal officials during the weekend.

Georgia schools could lose over $50 million per year in Federal money by failing to comply with the Civil Rights Act. At stake also is an additional $39 million per year which Georgia would receive under President Johnson's education bill pending in Congress.

Only five Georgia school systems—those under Federal court order—are now fully in compliance with the law.

The statement of policy by Federal officials could create "an utterly hopeless situation," in Georgia school districts, Sanders said.

TRYING TO FORCE

"They're trying to force people to go out and force a situation," he continued.

"Federal officials should never have mailed them out (the certificates of compliance) unless they expected them to be signed and returned," the Governor said.

Sanders said this represents a "complete about-face" on policy by U.S. Office of Education officials.

"They should have known what they were doing," he said.

Georgia school systems were "misinformed somewhere along the line," David S. Seeley, U.S. Office of Education, commented.

Any segregated school system will have to file a plan of desegregation sometime this spring, Seeley said, rather than simply sign the certificate of compliance.

Only a totally desegregated school system would be eligible to sign the certificates, he added.

This interpretation of the certificates was never stated until now, Dr. Allen Smith, associate State school superintendent, contends.

Earlier, State and local school officials believed that a segregated school system could sign the certificates as a statement of intent that local school officials would not discriminate in anyway from the time the certificate was signed.

ATLANTA, GA.,
March 12, 1965.

Hon. JOHN F. FLYNT, Jr.,
Representatives House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The dedicated local school board members of our great State of Georgia and the administrators of our several school systems are highly indignant over the fact that their integrity was not only questioned but made a "public spectacle" by certain individuals in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare when they questioned the intelligence, deliberated intent and dedicated resolve of the great majority of Georgia's 1,130-odd school board members when they, by official action, placed on public record their unqualified intent to comply with the requirement of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by signing the certificate of compliance submitted to them through proper channels together with instructions which were unquestioned at the time and which they followed, as bitter as was the experience which they underwent in so doing. You are respectfully requested to render every possible assistance in clarifying the highly detrimental situation and in rectifying the great injustice which has been perpetrated upon some of the finest and most public spirited citizens in America.

Respectfully,

JACK ACREE,
Executive Secretary,
Georgia School Board Association.

VILLA RICA, GA.,
March 7, 1965.

Hon. JOHN F. FLYNT, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We are very much disturbed about the item in the Atlanta Journal-Constitution this date advising that the boards of education have not complied with Civil Rights Act. Please give us your interpretation of this law together with what we should do to protect our schools against the loss of Federal aid and the violations of the Civil Rights Act.

Yours very truly,

J. C. BROWN,
Chairman,
Carroll County Board of Education.

CARROLL COUNTY
BOARD OF EDUCATION,
Carrollton, Ga., March 8, 1965.

Hon. JOHN J. FLYNT, Jr.,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. FLYNT: As Mr. J. C. Brown, chairman Carroll County Board of Education, indicated to you in his telephone conversation Sunday, we were surprised and disturbed by the apparent change in the interpretation of the civil rights compliance procedure by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It is my feeling that the school boards of Georgia acted in good faith when they signed the compliance agreements. I know personally that several superintendents and boards right here in our area have been working diligently to prepare practical transfer procedures so that this problem could be handled in an orderly manner.

I personally cannot see how the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare can refuse to accept these certificates without breaking faith with the 170 Georgia school boards.

We are enclosing a copy of the compliance agreement form along with other materials dealing with this topic as you requested.

We appreciate your interest in this problem.

Sincerely yours,

QUINTON PRINCE.

Mr. Chairman, I sometimes wonder why any Member of the Georgia delegation addresses himself to either this amendment or to this bill because officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have been quoted in the press of our State as saying that Georgia is not eligible to participate and that the Department does not honor and does not consider as valid the assurances of compliance which as of March 5, 1965, had been signed in good faith by at least 170 of the 196 school boards of our State.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the State of Georgia and the people of the State of Georgia have done their utmost in good faith to comply with recent legislation enacted by the Congress of the United States in 1964 which is referred to in the documents I have placed in the RECORD of these proceedings.

Mr. Chairman, there are certain portions of that act of 1964 with which the majority of the people of Georgia find ourselves in violent disagreement. But we are good citizens who abide by the laws duly enacted by the Congress of the United States. I have faith in our State and in our people. I know that however distasteful it may have been to sign such assurances, I know they were signed in good faith.

When we are told in advance by a spokesman for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that the Department does not trust the people of Georgia, that they do not trust the Georgia school boards, and that they do not accord to us the good faith which we accord to them, then personally and on behalf of the people of my State I resent it.

Mr. Chairman, I must inquire whether there is going to be any reversal of this outrageous position which has been taken by the Department officials.

Since the quoted article appeared on March 7, 1965, I have been in conferences with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, the U.S. Commissioner of Education, an Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and with Mr. David S. Seeley, of the U.S. Office of Education, who is quoted in the article of March 7, 1965, as the spokesman for the Department.

The assurance of compliance—HEW Form 441—is prospective in its language. This form was prepared by the Department and the Department is responsible for the language it contains.

The Department officials have broken faith with the school boards of Georgia and have rejected the offers of good faith made by responsible school board members all over Georgia.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

Mr. GIBBONS. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. POWELL. I move that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Flynt) there were—ayes, 181, noes, 114.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Powell and Mr. Goodell.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes, 179, noes, 123.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. Hanna].

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Chairman, I would say that we have a question here of quantity and quality. There is no reason for us to expect that we are going to have the answer qualitatively, because California in 1926 went into its first equalization bill in education and is still trying to find equality. So we will have to look a long time to find that.

Education does not happen in a vacuum, it happens qualitatively in society. If the State makes a qualitative effort to do something in education, ask what it is doing in other fields, because that is the quality effort.

I cannot think of quality and quantity without thinking of what I believe would be the favorite story of the majority leader.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HANNA. You will not hear the story that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Brock].

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Chairman, the difficulties which we in the less industrialized States face occur because of a disparity between the amount of money we can pay our teachers and that paid in the more industrialized States. In other words, because our disposable per capita income is lower, then our tax base is smaller. Thus it is difficult to compete, for example, in paying adequate teacher's salaries.

This bill, by putting more money into the richer areas, will widen the gap of opportunity and lessen our competitive ability. To me it is incredible that anyone sincerely interested in the disadvantaged youth of our Nation would vote to widen the gap of opportunity, would refuse to give the same amount of money or assistance to every child regardless of his State or community. This is simply a matter of equity.

The young people of the South or of any other area deserve better and more honest treatment.

I support the amendment of the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green]. I am grateful to her for offering it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Callaway].

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the remarks made by my colleague, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Flynt].

The school boards of Georgia have overwhelmingly shown their good faith in compliance with the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. As of March 5 this year, 170 out of 196 school boards have signed certificates of compliance. Although no charges of bad faith have been made, the officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare have not accepted these certificates.

The Department's officials will accept certificates only from school districts that are under a court order or that have submitted acceptable plans of desegregation. This is true, even though these officials privately admit that these requirements may well lead to additional suits and additional court orders rather than voluntary compliance.

In my conversations with Department officials, I was told quite frankly that our State of Georgia had no choice. I was told that once the bill we are debating today is passed, the Federal school aid to Georgia will be so great that Georgia will have to comply with Federal regulations, no matter how arbitrary.

My points, Mr. Speaker, are these: Georgia has acted in a responsible manner; the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has replied in an arbitrary manner; and, with the passage of this bill, the actions of the Department will no doubt become more arbitrary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Hathaway].

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I rise as a member of the Committee unequivocally to support the Green amendment.

The whole point of title I is to provide funds for those children who are most educationally deprived, the children from poor and welfare families.

Why should a poor child in Maine or Mississippi get less Federal money than a poor child in New York or California?

The present formula in title I discriminates against the poor children who happen to live in States which are presently spending less than the national average per pupil expenditure.

It is discriminating against those children who have probably already suffered more than any others from an inadequate education.

Education is a national matter.

We cannot think of education in terms of how much our own States will get from this or any other bill.

Mrs. Green, who introduced this amendment, comes from the State of Oregon, a State which will receive less under title I by her proposed amendment.

Mrs. Green is to be commended for her devotion to the education of all American children, whether in Oregon, Oklahoma, or Ohio.

The present formula would in fact punish in the future those States which have failed to provide adequately for the education of their children, often only because they were financially unable to do so.

For if we allot money to the States on the basis of what they have expended in the past, what they are expending now, we will be perpetuating the difference in educational opportunity between the so-called rich and poor States.

Our country was founded and has grown and will continue to grow on the solid foundation of equal opportunity for all. Educational opportunity is the most important opportunity in a person's life.

For we all know the tragic statistics which are the story of an inadequate education. We know that the lieftime earnings of a person are directly related to the amount and quality of his education; that the tragedy of unemployment is far more common for those with less education; that the embarrassment of welfare is far more likely for those with inadequate education.

The year 1965 is not the time and the education of our children must not be the issue in which we allow ourselves the luxury of thinking in local terms.

Together, as representatives of all the people and all the children of the United States, we should, we must, support this amendment.

And then we can pass the education bill knowing we have made it the best, the most equitable possible bill.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time remaining to me to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons].

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I was not given the opportunity to speak on this bill. I am a member of this committee. I have devoted my time to it. I regret that my chairman cut me off with but three-quarters of a minute to talk. But, regardless of the outcome of the Green amendment, I am going to vote for this bill because it is a good bill. All I am asking you to do is to vote for the Green amendment because the Green amendment does simple justice to poor kids in the United States wherever they may be. It seems to me that we as Americans have one trust and one responsibility and that is to treat the poor children alike whether they be in New York, Chicago, Ill., Florida, California, or any place else. All you are doing, if you do not adopt the Green amendment, is making it tougher for poor children in Mississippi and Florida to catch up with the children in the rest of the United States. The late great President wrote a book called "Profiles in Courage." Mrs. Green here today typifies that book. She is voting against the leadership of her party. Her amendment takes money from her State and makes it available to help poor children in poorer sections of the United States. No Member of this House is better informed on legislation affecting education matters. She is presenting this amendment because she knows it is correct even if it is not at this time popular. Her courage and wisdom should be an inspiration to all of us to vote for her amendment and after it is adopted to vote for this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid].

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Chairman, it is with regret that I must rise in opposition to this amendment, as I have great and deep respect for the gentlewoman from Oregon. The principle is very simple. The cost in different school districts varies. I believe this amendment could discriminate against high-cost school districts and therefore against children in these districts. Therefore, I must regretfully oppose it.

And I would add that in Westchester County we have poverty amid affluence; 1 in 12 families lives in abject poverty and 1 in 5 families in serious poverty.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. William Ford].

Mr. WILLIAM FORD. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I rise to express amazement that our friends on the other side of the aisle are seeking to support an amendment which removes from this bill the most important provision for incentive at the local level. A party which consistently insisted Federal programs should always encourage maximum participation by the States and local governments and always encourage local incentives. They would strip away from this bill these incentives, and invite State legislatures to count how many children will qualify in their State and multiply it by $200 and then deduct that from the appropriations they make to support education in their State next year. If you adopt this amendment you will do, in effect, the opposite of what this bill intends to do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with no little amusement to the viewpoint expressed by some—not all I am glad to say, of my friends on the Republican side—at their expressed interest in helping poor children. I say this because I have here a press release dated the 8th of March containing a story and a summary of the Republican tax credit education bill which they confess will cost the U.S. Treasury $5 billion and in which bill they propose only $300 million for the education of poor children, as compared with $1.6 billion which was proposed in title I of H.R. 2362 for assisting in the education of poor children.

Methinks the Republicans do protest too much:

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Martin].

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. MARTIN OF ALABAMA

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Martin of Alabama moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, let us pause for a moment and think about some of the children to whom we are addressing ourselves today as underprivileged. I come from the great State of Alabama. Historically it has had many problems, problems that we of this generation for the most part did not create but problems which fate itself wrought. One of our great problems is to upgrade the educational level of our citizenry.

Let me direct the attention of the Members who went to Selma and the gentlemen today who are working conscientiously to help upgrade the Negroes among our citizens and to help grant them the right to vote—which, incidentally, I am for—that in many counties of Alabama 80 percent of the people are of the Negro race; and 60 to 70 percent in many other counties. The children you are talking about today as underprivileged, for the most part, need more help than any children in the United States.

I want to ask you if you are going to crusade in this country, let us crusade with honesty and integrity and let us tell the people of this country that education is No. 1—and it is No. 1. And if we are going to help these people we need to help them secure for themselves a right in America to earn with dignity a spot in this great and bountiful land which they can do only when they have sufficient education.

Do not vote against them. Do not vote against this amendment. If you vote against this amendment you vote against the very people that you say you want to help. Let the press, let the gallery, let America look at you today and let them see what vote you cast. Let us see if you are going to vote to help educate these people of the South. They need your help, they need your conviction, they need your honesty, they need your integrity. They need from the gentlewoman from Oregon her amendment to be passed today.

I will lay the case at rest, but I want you to bear that in mind when you cast your vote.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the preferential motion.

Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt that this amendment will be defeated. That has been demonstrated. But I do want to place a few facts in the record prior to the defeat of the amendment. One is that the men who are proponents of this amendment, backing the gentlewoman from Oregon, except for the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Gibbons], and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. Hathaway], are sworn enemies of this bill from your Subcommittee on General Education.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I also resent that kind of statement, since I was the proponent and sponsored the amendment—to say that everybody who supports this particular amendment is an enemy of the bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman did not hear my remarks. I said the proponents who are backing her, except for the two gentlemen named, are against this bill. I did not say she was. I will say that the gentlewoman did vote for this bill with the present formula. I will say that the gentlewoman did sign the majority report. I will say that I convened two caucuses of the Democrats and the Republicans who were in favor of this bill in order for them to discuss her ideas with the gentlewoman from Oregon.

And so I have come to you, Mr. Chairman, having clearly indicated that I have done my task as chairman in a fair way, I am sure the gentlewoman will agree.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. Yes, I gladly yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. The chairman of the full Committee on Education and Labor has been very fair during the years I have served under his chairmanship on the committee. But I think the Record should also show that I did not sign the majority report. I did not even see the majority report before it was filed. It was never sent to me nor to my office. I did not see fit to file any minority report but decided to come to the floor of the House with the amendments which I have.

I would also suggest to the gentleman from New York and remind the gentleman that at the two caucuses I did offer my formula and objected to the formula which is now contained in the bill. If the gentleman remembers, the majority of the Democrats were opposed to it. It was at that point that I decided the matter should be taken to the floor; is that not correct?

Mr. POWELL. No; it is partially correct. What we asked was for you to give us a detailed analysis of the formula.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. As of what date?

Mr. POWELL. As of the last caucus.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. This morning?

Mr. POWELL. No, before that. Because I have your formula as of yesterday.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. When I first came to the Congress and submitted an amendment I was very naive and very green. I thought, at least, I was being gracious to the proponents of the bill and suggested the amendment in advance. I learned then that one does not give them a week to work on it in order to tear it to pieces.

Mr. POWELL. Well, the gentlewoman knows that I have always been fair with the gentlewoman and I shall continue to be fair with you.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. I yield to the distinguished Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the committee has reported the bill, the majority of the committee, and it is very equitable and fair.

We have been fighting for this legislation for many, many years.

I can remember only several years ago under former President Eisenhower when the enacting clause was stricken out by four or five votes and the great majority of my Republican colleagues at that time voted to strike out the enacting clause, including some of the Republican leaders at that time.

Mr. Chairman, we have been fighting for years for this legislation. We are now in a position where we can put an effective bill through. The amendment which has been offered in good faith by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green], if adopted, may seriously interfere with the passage of the bill.

Therefore, I urge the defeat of the amendment and the passage of the bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to my friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Flynt], who did not get all of the time that he desired during the general debate, that I shall gladly assist him in getting such time when the next section is read. However, there was a misunderstanding between the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins] about that and I did not know about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the preferential motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. Martin].

The preferential motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I was interested to hear the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. William D. Ford] say that this bill, if we enact this amendment, will have no incentive in it.

The amendment does not affect the incentive section of title I. The incentive section remains so that we can in future years, if the expenditures are increased, these funds will be increased. The amendment also does not affect the section which bars the reduction of expenditures by the local authorities in receiving funds. Both of those sections remain intact.

Mr. Chairman, I particularly appreciated the gentleman from New York [Mr. Carey] exposing my motives for supporting this legislation, as being completely virtuous and self-effacing. I believe this money should go where it is needed on an equal basis and not to the counties that can take care of their own problems.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] to close debate.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time and ask for a vote on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, on that I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Powell and Mr. Goodell.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 136, noes 202.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate, and amendments thereto, to this title close at 6 o'clock.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate and amendments thereto to title I of this act close at 6 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves that all debate on section 2 containing title I close at 6 o'clock.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Perkins and Mr. Quie.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 178, noes 78.

So the motion was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 70, strike out everything following line 8, through line 2 on page 89, and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"TITLE II—NATIONAL EQUAL EDUCATION DRIVE; GRANTS FOR SPECIAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS FOR DEPRIVED CHILDREN

"APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

"SEC. 201. (a) The Commissioner of Education (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'Commissioner') shall carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the succeeding fiscal year a program of grants to State education agencies for the support of special educational programs for children who because of social, cultural, economic, or educational deprivation are unable to benefit fully from school attendance.

"(b) For the purpose of making grants under this title there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, the sum of $300,000,000, and for the succeeding fiscal year such sums as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law. In addition to the sums authorized to be appropriated under the preceding sentence, there is authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, for making such grants the difference (if any) between the sums authorized to be appropriated for preceding fiscal year and the aggregate of the sums which were appropriated for such preceding year.

"ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 202. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 101 for any fiscal year the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 5 per centum thereof, as he may determine for allotment as provided in subsection (c). The remainder of such sums shall be allotted by the Commissioner among the States so that the allotment to each State will be an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the number of children three to seven years of age, inclusive, of families having an annual income of less than $3,000 in such State bears to the total number of such children in all the States.

"(b) The number of children three to seven years of age, inclusive, of families having less than $3,000 annual income in each State and in all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him from the Department of Commerce.

"(c) The amounts reserved by the Commissioners under subsection (a) shall be allotted by him among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for the type of assistance furnished under this title. For the purposes of this section, the term 'State' does not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Canal Zone, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

"CERTIFICATION BY STATES

"SEC. 203. (a) Any State desiring to participate in the program authorized by this title shall submit through its State education agency to the Commissioner an application, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which certifies—

"(1) that payments under this title will be used for programs in school attendance areas having a high concentration of children of families having less than $3,000 annual income;

"(2) that the State has made a survey of school attendance areas to determine which have the greatest concentrations of such children and has established a system of area priorities (set forth in the application) to insure that payments will go to attendance areas having the greatest immediate need for the programs described in section 104;

"(3) that payments under this title will be used only for programs and projects which have been approved by the State educational agency pursuant to section 104 and which meet the requirements of that section, and that such agency will in all other respects comply with the provisions of this title;

"(4) that such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures will be adopted as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for Federal funds paid to the State (including such funds paid by the State to local educational agencies under this title; and

"(5) that the State educational agency will make an annual and such other reports to the Commissioner, in such form and containing such information, as may be reasonably necessary to enable the Commissioner to perform his duties under this title, including such reports as the Commissioner may require to evaluate the effectiveness of payments under this title and of particular programs assisted under it in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, and assurance that such agency will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Commissioner and necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(b) The Commissioner shall approve an application which meets the requirements specified in subsection (a) and he shall not disapprove an application except after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing to the State educational agency.

"USES OF FEDERAL FUNDS

"SEC. 204. (a) Grants under this title may be used, in accordance with the applications approved under section 203, for—

"(1) the planning, supervision, and development of programs designed to assist educationally deprived children aged 3 to 7 years, inclusive, to overcome the handicaps that limit their ability to take advantage of educational opportunities, and of programs designed to improve education for such children, including the development of pilot projects designed to test the effectiveness of plans so developed; and

"(2) the establishment, maintenance, and operation by local educational agencies of programs, including the construction of facilities and the acquisition of equipment, which meet the needs of educationally deprived children by providing educational services and activities such as—

"(A) preschool nursery and kindergarten training and education specially designed to prepare deprived children for successful entrance and performance in elementary education;

"(B) remedial classes and programs in early childhood education;

"(C) supplemental programs and services, which might include programs outside of school hours, health and social services, and utilization of artistic and cultural resources available in the community;

"(D) improvement of educational resources for early childhood education through provision of special personnel, library materials, and audiovisual recreation and other equipment;

"(E) the use of a corps of master teachers and teaching assistants with special training who would be given additional incentives to work with educationally deprived children in school attendance areas having large concentrations of such children.

"(b) In the conduct of programs described in subsection (a) educational agencies shall in no case limit participation in such programs to children who are in attendance in public schools.

"(c) In the planning, development, and operation of the programs authorized by this title, State and local educational agencies may contract for facilities and services with other public and private agencies, organizations, and institutions in any manner permissible under State law.

"PAYMENT

"SEC. 205. (a) The amount which each State may be paid under this title for a fiscal year shall not exceed, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, 100 per centum of the cost to the State and its political subdivisions in such year of carrying out programs described in section 104(a); for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, such amount may not exceed 66⅔ per centum of such costs in such year.

"(b) The Commissioner shall from time to time pay to each State, in advance or otherwise, the amount which that State is eligible to receive under this title. Such payments shall take into account the extent (if any) to which any previous payment to such State educational agency under this title (whether or not in the same fiscal year) was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to it.

"(c)(1) No payment shall be made under this title for any fiscal year to a State which has taken into consideration payments under this title in determining the eligibility of any local educational agency in that State for State aid, or the amount of that aid, with respect to the free public education of children during that year or the preceding fiscal year.

"(2) No payments shall be made under this title to any local educational agency for any fiscal year unless the State educational agency finds that the combined fiscal effort of that agency and State with respect to the provision of free public education by that agency for the preceding fiscal year was not less than such combined fiscal effort for that purpose for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964.

"LABOR STANDARDS

"SEC. 206. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this section, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"WITHHOLDING

"SEC. 207. Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to any State educational agency, finds that there has been a failure to comply substantially with the certification set forth in the application of that State submitted under section 103(a), the Commissioner shall notify the agency that further payments will not be made to the State under this title (or, in his discretion, that the State educational agency shall not make further payments under this title to specified local educational agencies affected by the failure) until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments shall be made to the State under this title, or payments by the State educational agency under this title shall be limited to local educational agencies not affected by the failure, as the case may be.

"JUDICIAL REVIEW

"SEC. 108. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its application submitted under section 103(a) or with his final action under section 107, such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner within areas of his jurisdiction as prescribed herein, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(c) Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in title 28, United States Code, section 1254.

"COMPREHENSIVE STUDY

"SEC. 209. The Commissioner shall submit to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for transmission to the Congress on or before December 31, 1967, a full report of the operation of this title, including its effectiveness in improving the educational attainment of educationally deprived children, and his recommendations, if any, with respect to amendments to this title.

"AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 88-452

"SEC. 210. Section 205(a) of the Act of August 20, 1964 (Public Law 88-452; 78 Stat. 518), is amended by inserting the following sentence at the end thereof: *"Provided, however,* That such special remedial and other noncurricular eduactional assistance shall not include preschool nursery and kindergarten training or educational programs conducted by public educational agencies."

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 211. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education.

"(b) The term 'construction' means (1) erection of new or expansion of existing structures, and the acquisition and installation of equipment therefor; or (2) acquisition of existing structures not owned by any agency or institution making application for assistance under this Act; or (3) remodeling or alteration (including the acquisition, installation, modernization, or replacement of equipment) of existing structures; or (4) a combination of any two or more of the foregoing.

"(c) The term 'educationally deprived children' means children three to seven years of age, inclusive, who by reason of an adverse social environment, cultural handicaps, or low economic status (or combinations thereof) are unprepared for entry into elementary school or are unable to attain standards of academic performance which are normal for children in their age group.

"(d) The term 'equipment' includes machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and necessary enclosures or structures to house them, and includes all other items necessary for the functioning of a particular facility as a facility for the provision of educational services, including items such as instructional equipment and necessary furniture, printed, published, and audiovisual instructional materials and books, periodicals, documents, and other related materials.

"(e) The term 'local educational agency' means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools. Such term also includes any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school.

"FEDERAL ADMINISTRATION

"SEC. 212. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act or any Act amended by this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

"(b) In administering the provisions of this Act or any Act amended by this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

"FEDERAL CONTROL OF EDUCATION PROHIBITED

"SEC. 113. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources or printed or published instructional materials by any educational institution or school system."

Mr. QUIE (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as read.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POWELL. Is this the bill, Mr. Chairman, addressing my remarks through you to the author of the substitute, that has the tax exemption in it?

Mr. QUIE. No. There is no tax exemption or tax credit or anything having anything to do with the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. POWELL. Oh. This is not your $5 billion bill, then.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

The Chair hears none, and the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, let me tell you what this amendment, which is a substitute to title I, does and then my reasons for offering it.

This substitute provides $300 million which will be based on the number of children, ages 3 to 7, in the State, from families with incomes of less than $3,000. It will be allocated to each State according to the ratio that the children of this nature bear to the number of children of this nature in the Nation. So, each State will receive the same amount per child. This will provide 100-percent Federal funding the first year and two-thirds Federal funding the year thereafter. It would go toward programs to reach the culturally and socially deprived children of preschool age.

Title I of the bill has only a passing reference to preschool children in the declaration of policy. However, this would go specifically for the children of preschool age. Preschool nursery and kindergarten training and education specially designed for these deprived children—remedial classes and programs for children in their early education and so forth, including the use of a corps of master teachers and teaching assistants with special training. It would give them additional incentives to work with educationally deprived children in school attendance areas having large concentrations of such children.

My reason for offering this is I believe the Federal Government has the responsibility to improve the educational level of children before first grade. In my philosophy I believe that the States and local governments have the responsibilities in grades 1 through 12. The Federal Government has assisted for many years to a substantial degree in the grades above 12, at the higher educational levels. However, here is an area of great unmet need. The educationally deprived child being talked about for these 2 days in the bill H.R. 3262 are the ones who have been lost before they ever reached school for first grade. The children who are poverty stricken and result in the unemployed; the ones we were trying to reach last year in the antipoverty bill for the most part were lost before they ever attended public schools. We heard a great deal of testimony about these children. They are the easiest to reach and you can motivate them easier at this age than they can be at a subsequent age. The correction you have to make later on can be prevented if you have special programs designed to reach the children ages 3 to 6.

There is a great deal of information available to us if we would take the time to study it. Studies have been made by the Ford Foundation.

Martin Deutsch of the Institute of Developmental Studies of New York Medical College; Dr. Urie Bronfenbrenner of the National Advisory Council of the Institute of Child Health and Human Development, who gave testimony on this subject last year; and you can read the report of the juvenile delinquency evaluation project in New York City by Prof. Robert M. MacIver. Each one of these people states that the time to reach these young people with special programs is before they ever start the first grade.

There is no sense in having all these expensive programs of trying to reach these kids at a later age and permit the breeding ground to continue. We must have the program specifically designed to reach these young people and the later programs will not be necessary.

I believe that my substitute, therefore, would reach the real problem better than the proposal we have before us in title I of H.R. 2362 and with a smaller amount of money.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I go back to the brief remarks I made during the limitation of debate several minutes ago when I said that I had a few dark suspicions about the genuine commitment of some—I hasten to point out some, not all—of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle who were expressing such very deep concern about poor children. I think that the amendment offered by my good friend, for whom I have the highest regard, the gentleman from Minnesota, lends at least a modicum of credibility to my charge because this proposed amendment provides only $300 million in grants to aid educationally deprived children, whereas in title I of the committee bill we provide in excess of $1 billion to aid the poor children of this country in improving their educational opportunities.

I further point out that the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota is very restricting indeed in that it applies to children only between ages 3 to 7—or is it 3 to 8?

Mr. QUIE. Three through seven, which would be the same as 3 to 8.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Whereas the committee bill will cover a far larger age group than does the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota.

I would point out that we have been given by the gentleman from Minnesota no very good estimate of how many children would be aided in his proposed amendment but it ought to be clear that with only $300 million as compared to $1 billion plus in title I of the committee bill far fewer children could be helped under his amendment, or they could be helped to a much smaller degree.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota is a good example of offering a supposed bit of assistance without much substance to attack the very serious problem to which the committee bill is directed, and I hope very much that the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota will be overwhelmingly defeated.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to my colleague from Indiana.

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for yielding.

I believe under title I the bill as it is presented indicates that it is at the complete discretion of the local school unit to determine whether or not the preschool children will receive a program. I will ask my colleague from Indiana if it is not a fact that it is within the complete discretion of the local school authorities to devote all the money they receive to that program if they think it is needed?

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman's understanding is correct.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. The administration bill in title I provides assistance for children aged 5 to 17, but not preschool age children.

Mr. JACOBS. The gentleman is not correct about that. Preschooling would include anything from birth to the first grade.

Mr. QUIE. When you compare my formula with that which is contained in the bill——

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I do not choose to yield further.

The formula in title I is based upon the number of children aged 5 to 17 coming from families of $2,000 a year or less. That is the formula. The funds provided under title I could be used for preschool children as well.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Yes. I yield further to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. What the gentleman really points out here is the fact that in title I of the bill the money does not necessarily have to be used only for the children ages 5 to 17. It can be used for any educationally deprived child in the school, and they can be the wealthiest kids in the district. This money is for them. This is for any child.

Mr. BRADEMAS. The gentleman is misleading when he makes that kind of statement. It is precisely the same kind of point that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] was earlier endeavoring to make, with no greater success, I venture to say, in his colloquy with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment is defeated.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take the full time. I simply want to commend the gentleman from Minnesota for offering this amendment. He was very active in producing this proposal. He has long been interested in the early school and preschool training program in an effort to try to interrupt the cycle of poverty—poverty in education and poverty in economic status.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program which aims itself directly at poor children at the age when they can be helped in the most effective way.

All of the testimony which we had before our committee indicated this to be the case. It gives the funds to the States, the educators, at the local level to utilize for this particular purpose.

It is a program that eliminates all of the dangers of Federal control, relying upon the States to take up the burden of trying to redirect some programs to help those young children from poor families.

Most of my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, I am sure on this floor believe in that kind of a program. We should do it by stimulating the States and the local boards of education to move in this direction. It is an effective program and I might say it is title I of the Republican substitute which we would have liked to have offered on the floor here today.

Titles II, III, and IV include the tax credits and other provisions that we put in the Republican substitute. This is the Republican program from the members of the Education and Labor Committee aimed at helping the poor children between 3 and 8 years of age.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and for the work that he did in developing the Republican substitute.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that title I, as I said before, puts the Federal emphasis on areas where there is definite need. We have no idea whether the children of a preschool level will receive any assistance under the bill unless such an amendment is adopted.

Right now the administration proposal is to handle deprived children, culturally and socially deprived children, under the antipoverty program or through the Office of Economic Opportunity. There is a tremendous amount of experience which has been gained in our public school system, so I believe this proposal in my amendment would work better.

This amendment would provide that we leave these deprived children under the public school system, these children who are 3 through 7 years of age. These are the young people of which a study was made who live in Chicago. Some of them had not gone 6 blocks away from their home to see Lake Michigan, it was reported.

These are the young people in Chicago who when asked how big a horse or cow was in a picture, answered, "3 to 5 inches." They had not received any experience, no educational experience which they would automatically receive in associating with their parents if in a middle-class environment. Here is a crying need for Federal assistance. The incentive is needed for the local communities to reach these people. We have given categorical aid many times before. In 1917 we began the vocational program, we increased it in 1946, and again last year. We saw nothing wrong with that kind of aid. I ask you to give the same kind of categorical aid to the deprived children ages 3 to 7, these young people who need help more than anyone else, but they are the ones who have the least done for them. It has been recognized by authorities in this country that these young people are in need of this kind of aid.

I ask you to support this amendment.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like the opportunity to question the sponsor of the amendment with regard to some details of the amendment. It is my understanding that the amendment would allocate $300 million to ages 3 to 7 only; is that correct?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct, 3 through 7 only.

Mr. CAREY. That would be the first grade in the public school system?

Mr. QUIE. Yes.

Mr. CAREY. What provision would be made for children not in public schools?

Mr. QUIE. It would go to children of parents who normally send children to public schools. This would permit the money to be spent using the facilities of public schools similar to the way they do in Baltimore, using the facilities of churches, for instance, to reach these children. The people hired by the Public Education Agency would use these facilities because they are being used otherwise only on Sunday.

Mr. CAREY. Your amendment limits the entire bill to the preschool area alone. There is nothing in here for those who might use this special education service to receive any assistance whatsoever if they are over the age of 7?

Mr. QUIE. That is correct. That is the responsibility of the local education agencies.

Mr. CAREY. Do I also understand that the allocation of funds in this bill would be on the same basis?

Mr. QUIE. It would be exactly the same as this except we use the $3,000 figure rather than $2,000 in order to include more people.

Mr. CAREY. I must continue my opposition to the amendment. I would suggest the gentleman's amendment is too meager and does not go far enough. I am pleased to see the majority recognizing some of these facts; that Federal assistance is popular legislation, but has been strongly opposed by the majority in the past. There must be some others who definitely need the same kind of service.

Mr. BRADEMAS. If the gentleman from New York will yield to me, I would like to ask another question of the author of the amendment. I think I heard the gentleman from Minnesota respond to the gentleman from New York if the State receiving funds under his proposal wished to establish preschool programs for private school students as well as public school students, the State would be free to do so?

Mr. QUIE. In a way we are talking about different situations. I do not know how we can provide for schoolchildren who have not attended school yet, the children of parents who would normally send these children to private schools after they get to the right age.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Can the gentleman answer this question: Has the gentleman any judgment on the relative percentage of students in each of these categories who would be assisted under his proposal?

Mr. QUIE. That would be pretty difficult. I do not see how you can make any determination.

Mr. CAREY. This is the classic attempt of the minority to offer amendments so that the bill will not help all the children who need help. How can we disregard the testimony of the local agency leaders who came to Congress and said they wanted to work across the whole range? How can we segregate the three to seven group? How can we here make our judgment prevail over theirs?

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment not because I do not favor the cultural training of prekindergarten, preschool children. My campaign to be a Member of this House was conducted in large measure on that very subject. I understand very well that with respect to a child of 6 or 7 or 8 years of age, his personality, his propensity to learn, his ability to hear and discriminate among the sounds of the English language, have largely been formed and the opportunity for remedial training is literally lost on his deaf ears in the grade school. I think it is true what the song says, that they have to be taught before it is too late, before they are six or seven or eight.

It was for that reason that yesterday I asked the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the subcommittee, whether or not in his opinion the language "preschool training" would include prekindergarten training of culturally deprived children. His answer was in the affirmative. My own opinion is that his answer was correct.

I would point out to the gentleman from Minnesota that if, in the discretion of all the school boards of the United States of America, preschool training was a matter of higher priority than grade school or secondary school training, under the bill as it now stands they have the discretion to use the entire funds appropriated for that very preschool training. Under this amendment the suggestion of $300 million for preschool training could very well by strong implication limit the amount of money under this bill to $300 million which could be spent for preschool training. So I rise in opposition to this amendment, because I do support the preschool training program, and I do not want to see the local authorities, the local school boards, told by the Federal Government, "You can only spend $300 million for this kind of program." That is the kind of Federal control that I certainly believe the Members of this House are opposed to.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JACOBS. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I think the gentleman misunderstands my amendment. It is $300 million out of the $600 million for preschool training. Mine is a substitute for the entire title I. Whereas you put a limitation of $1,063 million on title I, I say $300 million and no more at this time can be spent for preschool training. There is in there money for those under age 17 under my amendment, if it is adopted.

So your argument that this is a control or earmarking of the funds does not apply any more than earmarking the funds at $1 billion. But you are correct in stating that my amendment only provides $300 million under title I. So my amendment will provide for less Federal expenditures in such cases.

Mr. JACOBS. My response then to the gentleman would be in two parts. First, I do believe under the present circumstances the local school districts in this country, when this bill becomes law, will have the discretion to use any amount of the money that is allocated to their school districts for preschool training. Second, by clear implication, if this amendment is adopted, those local school boards would be restricted to a smaller amount. I have seen too many judges decide too many cases on the implication language in statutes to doubt this result.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this bill and the conduct of the debate on it is indeed a tribute to the persistency of those who have long been dedicated to achieving Federal injection into the primary and secondary schools of this country—regardless how they accomplish it.

We have had several formulas for Federal aid to education over the years, as you know. Many of them were devised by educators who perhaps have now come up with the very questionable formula that is embraced in this bill.

Of all the formulas in the past, many of which were not very good, this is the least sensible of all of them. The formula in this bill is, and every Member of this House has to admit this to himself, a buckshot approach to a problem that should demand pinpointing.

Some years ago we had a bill that would have channeled help to a particular school district where that school district could not provide proper teaching instruction and where the facilities were inadequate. That individual school district would then have been able to make application for aid, establish its financial need, and in this manner we would have directed the required aid accordingly—to where the need exists. Now we are going to use the 1959 census, as I understand it, to determine the formula but only when it is convenient. In the first place, the 1959 census because of its age is not going to be accurate obviously because of the changes which take place in 6 years. But, ah, here is another gimmick. If you look at the report, it says where such a census is not available—they would use the results of achievement tests.

Now goodness gracious, what relationship is there between achievement tests for the purpose of establishing this formula on the one hand and the formula of children coming from homes with a family income of less than $2,000?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLIER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me during the course of the excellent statement he is making, for which I commend him.

Mr. Chairman, I stand here having worked on this legislation since this Congress convened. I have seven amendments to title I. I think they bring out important points with reference to this legislation. The education bill that we are considering is perhaps the most important major piece of legislation that will come before this Congress this year. Those seven amendments, if I were to offer them, would have to be sent up to the Clerk's desk and acted upon without a word of explanation from me and without a word of answer from anybody on this floor. Is that the way that we as a great deliberative body should decide major issues or policy? The Great Society has turned today into a great steamroller. I think every liberal who calls himself a liberal sitting on the other side of the aisle who believes that these things should be debated and exposed to the light of day to arrive at a proper decision and a proper policy for our country should be ashamed.

Mr. COLLIER. I thank the gentleman.

I submit that perhaps one of the reasons is, the longer this debate goes on the more evident it becomes how bad this legislation really is. The administrative procedure as outlined in the legislation and as explained contradictorily in the debate leaves any real understanding of it about as clear as a flea in a London fog.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on section 2 has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The Chair said "on section 2." It was my understanding that the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor said "title I." Am I incorrect?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair put the motion on section 2, which contains a title I.

Mr. GRIFFIN. So the debate is closed at 6 o'clock on section 2, but not on the remainder of title I?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. POWELL. I should like for the Clerk to repeat my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may have made another request than that, but since the other sections of this title have not been read, and since no unanimous-consent request has been made that they be considered as read, no motion could have been in order on anything except that which was read. That was section 2.

Mr. POWELL. I beg to state, Mr. Chairman, that the motion I offered was on all amendments and debate on title I, and there was no point of order raised against it.

The CHAIRMAN. There may have been a misunderstanding, but the Chair knows how he put the motion, and he knows he could not have put the other motion at that time. The other sections of that title had not been read, nor had unanimous consent been requested that they be considered as read. It does happen that section 2 contains a different title I. That is the motion which the Chairman put.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. POWELL. Is it possible for the Chairman to put the motion as made?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stated the motion as the Chair at that time understood it. There was no correction of the Chair's statement of the motion. The motion stands as stated. That was what the Committee voted on.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on all amendments on title I close at a quarter after 6 o'clock.

Mr. QUIE. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. QUIE. The Clerk has not reached section 3 as yet. For that reason, I make the point of order that such a motion is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is well taken. Such a motion can only apply to sections as they are read.

Mr. ARENDS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ARENDS. Was the original agreement entered into to close at 6 o'clock?

The CHAIRMAN. A motion was passed to close debate on section 2 at 6 o'clock.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. QUIE. If any Member has an amendment to section 2, he will be able to offer it at this time, but there will be no debate?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct. If any Member rises with an amendment to section 2, he will be able to offer it, but there will be no debate on it.

If there are no amendments to section 2, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TECHNICAL AND CONFORMING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 3. (a) Clause (A) of section 3(c)(4) of the Act of September 30, 1950, Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended (20 U.S.C. 238(c)(4)(A)) is amended by striking out "(is," and inserting ", but excluding funds available under title II) is,".

(b) The sentence which immediately follows clause (B) of section 4(a) of such Act

(20 U.S.C. 239(a)(B)) is amended by inserting "(exclusive of funds available under title II)" immediately after "Federal funds".

(c)(1) Such Act is further amended by inserting "TITLE III—GENERAL" above the heading for section 7, and by redesignating sections 7, 8, and 9, and references thereto, as sections 301, 302, and 303, respectively.

(2) Subsections (b) and (c) of the section of such Act redesignated as section 302 are amended by striking out "this Act" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "title I".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 4. (a) Paragraph (2) of the section of the Act of September 30, 1950, Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, redesignated by section 3 of this Act as section 303, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) The term 'child', except as used in title II, means any child who is within the age limits for which the applicable State provides free public education."

(b) Paragraph (4) of such section 303 is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof ", except that for the purposes of title II such term does not include any education provided beyond grade 12".

(c) Paragraph (5) of such section 303 is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", or any expenditures made from funds granted under title II of this Act or titles II or III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965".

(d)(1) Paragraph (8) of such section 303 is amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "the District of Columbia,", and by inserting after "the Virgin Islands" the following: ", and for purposes of title II, such term includes the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands".

(2) Sections 3(d) and 6(c) of such Act (20 U.S.C. 238(d), 241(c)) are each amended by inserting "American Samoa," after "Guam," each time that it appears.

(e) Such section 303 is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraphs:

"(11) The term 'county' means those divisions of a State utilized by the Secretary of Commerce in compiling and reporting data regarding counties.

"(12) The term 'construction' includes the preparation of drawings and specifications for school facilities; erecting, building, acquiring, altering, remodeling, improving, or extending school facilities; and the inspection and supervision of the construction of school facilities.

"(13) The term 'school facilities' means classrooms and related facilities (including initial equipment) for free public education and interests in land (including site, grading, and improvements) on which such facilities are constructed, except that such term does not include those gymnasiums and similar facilities intended primarily for exhibitions for which admission is to be charged to the general public.

"(14) The term 'equipment' includes machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them, and includes all other items necessary for the functioning of a particular facility as a facility for the provision of educational services, including items such as instructional equipment and necessary furniture, printed, published, and audio-visual instructional materials, and books, periodicals, documents, and other related materials.

"(15) For the purpose of title II, the term 'elementary school' means a day or residential school which provides elementary education, as determined under State law, and the term 'secondary school' means a day or residential school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law, except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12."

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlemen from Minnesota yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee, after our conversation of awhile ago that he intended to rise at 6 o'clock, if that is still his position.

Mr. POWELL. Not now. No.

Mr. ARENDS. Does the gentleman expect to come in early tomorrow?

Mr. POWELL. I hope to come in early.

Mr. ARENDS. It would be well for the gentleman to stay with his word to quit at 6 o'clock tonight rather than coming in tomorrow at 11 o'clock.

Mr. POWELL. We will finish up in about 5 or 10 minutes.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS], the chairman of the subcommittee, a question.

On page 91, lines 15 through 23, we have the definition of the word "equipment." Would it be possible, if a local public educational agency desired to do so in order to provide special education arrangements for the educationally deprived children of private schools, to build structures to house the equipment which they loan them, of course, the title to that structure remaining in the public educational agency but the structure being constructed on the grounds of a private school.

Mr. PERKINS. The question, I feel, is answered on page 91, lines 8 to 14; and on page 79, subsection (3) where it says:

> that the local educational agency has provided satisfactory assurance that the control of funds provided under this title, and title to property derived therefrom, shall be in a public agency for the uses and purposes provided in this title, and that a public agency will administer such funds and property;

The answer is "No."

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman just explained it and the conclusion was that the answer was "Yes" and now he says "No."

Mr. PERKINS. I think the gentleman well knows that if a local public school agency is to retain title to real property it cannot be constructed on private property. The question answers itself.

Mr. QUIE. It cannot be constructed on private property?

Mr. PERKINS. That is correct.

Mr. QUIE. Suppose the equipment is mobile, if there were wheels under it, such as a mobile educational laboratory.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman is reiterating what we went over time and time again during this debate. The bill provides for some special educational services for the educationally deprived youngster attending nonpublic schools. That mobile equipment will still belong to the public agency.

Mr. QUIE. But the mobile equipment may be placed on private school grounds, may it not?

Mr. PERKINS. What would be wrong with that within the limits we have provided?

Mr. QUIE. I am not saying anything is wrong with it; I am asking the question.

Mr. PERKINS. The mobile equipment would still be the property of the public agency.

Mr. QUIE. That is granted. All I want the gentleman to say is "Yes" if that is the answer. Then it can be located there?

Mr. PERKINS. It would be possible, but only within those guidelines pertaining to "special services and title requirements," set forth in the report and the bill which we have gone over previously and which the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. THOMPSON, so carefully explained earlier in today's debate.

Mr. QUIE. We know that the title has to be in the local public agency.

Mr. PERKINS. Let me read to the gentleman what the bill requires:

> Services and arrangements provided for nonpublic school students must be special as distinguished from general educational assistance * * *.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield for that purpose. This has already been read into the record.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield further.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important at least that the private schools in my congressional district know what this bill says because they are entitled, as I read this bill, to money for the children who attend their schools, who are educationally deprived; not that they be from families of incomes of less than $2,000, but that they be educationally deprived.

As was stated in the hearings, but has not been stated on the floor, mobile science laboratories are available to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on and amendments to title I, section 4, close in 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOODELL. May we have the motion of the gentleman from New York repeated?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the motion as he understood it. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] moves that all debate on section 4 of title I close in 5 minutes.

The question is on the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 92, line 6:

EXTENSION OF TITLE I OF PUBLIC LAW 874 EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

SEC. 5. Sections 2(a), 3(b), and 4(a) of title I of the Act of September 30, 1950, Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, as amended (20 U.S.C. 237(a), 238(b), 239(a)), are each amended by striking out "1966" each place where it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1968".

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, this is the extension of the impacted aid program for a period of 2 years

I therefore move that all debate and all amendments thereto close in 2 minutes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this merely for the Record.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. Perkins] whether it is proposed that further hearings will be held soon for revision of Public Law 874. I refer specifically to certain inequities that I think the gentleman knows about, the formula which makes it impossible for my city of Los Angeles at the present time to qualify for this assistance?

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, let me say to my distinguished colleague from California that it will be the purpose of the subcommittee to continue hearings on Federal aid to education and we would expect to resume those hearings within the next 3 or 4 weeks.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I want to thank the gentleman very much. I shall look forward to the action on this in order that the city of Los Angeles may be able to qualify for this impacted aid assistance.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 92, line 13:

TITLE II—SCHOOL LIBRARY RESOURCES, TEXTBOOKS, AND OTHER INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS

APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZED

Sec. 201. (a) The Commissioner shall carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, a program for making grants for the acquisition of school library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools.

(b) For the purpose of making grants under this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I am grieved that Members of this body did not have an opportunity to present important amendments to this bill and debate them. For the information of my colleagues and the permanent record, I ask unanimous consent that five of the seven amendments I wished to offer be set out in full at this point in the Record:

AMENDMENT THAT WOULD HAVE BEEN OFFERED BY MR. GOODELL

Beginning with line 1 on page 71, strike out everything down through line 8 on page 78, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"Sec. 202. (a) The Commissioner shall during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, make basic grants to State educational agencies in accordance with the provisions of this title.

"(b) For the purpose of making grants under this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,060,000,000; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

"ALLOTMENTS TO STATES

"Sec. 203. (a) From the sums appropriated for carrying out this title for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine and shall allot such amount among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this title. From the remainder of such sums, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in the State of families having an annual income of less than $2,000 bears to the total number of such children of such families in all the States. The number of such children of such families shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'State' shall not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

"(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for that year but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 202 shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a) for such year."

Page 78, line 11, strike out "or a special incentive grant".

Page 78, line 14, strike out "such basic criteria as the Commissioner may establish" and insert in lieu thereof "its certification under section 205".

Page 81, beginning in line 13, strike out "an application, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which provides satisfactory assurance" and inserting in lieu thereof "an application which certifies".

Page 82, line 22, strike out "which meets" and insert in lieu thereof "if it and the certification contained therein meet".

Page 83, line 1, strike out "(1)", and "subject to the provisions of section 208".

Page 83, beginning in line 4, strike out "tne amount which the local educational agencies of that State are eligible to receive under this title" and insert in lieu thereof "amounts equal to amounts expended by the State in accordance with its certification under section 205, except that the amount so paid in a fiscal year may not exceed the State's allotment under section 203 for that fiscal year".

Page 83, beginning with line 11, strike out everything down through line 20.

Page 84, beginning in line 3, strike out "to the local educational agencies of the State".

Page 84, beginning with line 19, strike out everything down through line 4 on page 85.

Page 85, line 21, strike out "assurance set forth in the State plan" and insert in lieu thereof "certification contained in the application".

Redesignate sections 205, 206, and 207 (and cross references thereto) as sections 204, 205, and 206, respectively; and redesignate sections 209, 210, 211, and 212 (and cross references thereto) as sections 207, 208, 209, and 210, respectively.

Amendment to H.R. 2362 that would have been offered by Mr. Goodell:

"On page 78, lines 14 and 15, strike out '(consistent with such basic criteria as the Commissioner may establish)'."

Amendment to H.R. 2362 that would have been offered by Mr. Goodell:

"On page 80, lines 21 and 22, strike out 'in cooperation with' and insert in lieu thereof 'after consultation with'."

Amendment to H.R. 2362 that would have been offered by Mr. Goodell:

"On page 74, strike out everything following line 20 and insert in lieu thereof:

"'(B) equal to 6 per centum or more of the total number of all children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in such district, whichever is greater.'

"On page 75, line 5, strike out 'one hundred or more.' and insert in lieu thereof 'equal to 6 per centum or more of the total number of all children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in such county.'"

Amendment to H.R. 2362 that would have been offered by Mr. Goodell:

"On page 82, following line 25, add the following new section and renumber the remaining sections accordingly:

"'AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"'Sec. 207. For the purpose of making payments under this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,060,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the succeeding fiscal year, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.'"

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Bolling, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A further message from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

A BILL TO MAKE THE ORANGE BLOSSOM THE NATIONAL FLOWER

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a House joint resolution on today to make the orange blossom the national flower. In this I am joined by the members of the Florida delegation. It is our belief and that of the people of Florida that the orange blossom would make an ideal national flower. There are many reasons. It has a continuing history dating back to earliest recorded times. It is mentioned in the Bible and in writings coming out of China in ancient history. None of this overlooks the sentimental side of the orange blossom. Beautiful and fragrant, it is the accepted bridal flower.

Seated in the family gallery today is Miss Karol Kelly of Zephyr Hills, Florida's lovely Citrus Queen of my State. She well typifies the spirit of the occasion which we observe here.

Oranges and orange blossoms have been distributed in the Capitol today through the cooperation of the Florida Citrus Commission. The delicious fruit of the orange tree already is well known to you, but it is the blossoms in particular that we want you to become acquainted with today. They are creamy white, waxen in texture, do not deteriorate quickly, and are fragrant with a heavy perfume, which is heady and yet lovely. Those of you who have been privileged to stand in the evening in an orange grove and to sniff the rich odor of the blossoms have shared a delightful privilege indeed.

After seeing our queen tasting our oranges, and smelling the fragrance of their blossoms, we trust you will approve this resolution by acclamation.

In the language and sentiment of flowers, the orange blossom is the special symbol of marriage. When we hear of a young couple planning to be married, a picture of orange blossoms flashes through our minds. It seems a bride just must have a cluster of orange blossoms tucked in her veil to hold it in position. Often the corsage which she carries is of these fragrant flowers mixed with others. Each of you can picture a bride with her bouquet of orange blossoms, slowly walking down the aisle to "Mendelssohn's Wedding March."

The orange blossom was adopted by the Legislature of the State of Florida in 1909 as Florida's State flower.

The orange tree originally was native to Asia. Centuries later it was introduced into Asia Minor from whence it was taken to the warm Mediterranean regions. Having traveled west from Asia to Spain and Africa, the orange tree was carried westward again by the Spaniards to the Caribbean Islands and to Mexico at Vera Cruz where seedlings were planted in 1518.

The Spanish settled at St. Augustine, Florida, in 1565 and records indicate that sometime afterward oranges were thriving around the settlement. The Indians liked the fruit and as they ate it, traveling through the forests, they dropped some of the seeds, which soon sprouted as wild orange trees in present-day South Carolina, Georgia, and Alabama.

The plantings in Vera Cruz spread to Lower California and much later, over 200 years, it found its way into California. Franciscan Father Junipero Serra brought with him to California seedlings of the orange tree, which he planted at the San Diego Mission about 1769. The first large orange grove was not planted in California until 1805 at San Gabriel Mission. Thus, we are indebted to the Spanish for the orange blossom and orange trees in the New World.

Oranges are raised in every State along our southern border—nine States all told.

After the tree has blossomed, the fruit begins to appear. Blossoms and mature fruit can be seen on the trees at the same time, a very unusual situation. When the fruit is ripe, we all know the benefits derived from eating an orange or drinking its juice. In addition to its nutrient value, it contains the important vitamins A, B, and C in large amounts, so necessary to our health.

Next to apple production, the orange comes second of all fruits raised in the United States.

With this background to the orange blossom, the Florida delegation in Congress seeks to have it designated as the national flower of the United States.

What other flower that grows in a garden can give mankind so much: Beauty, fragrance, purity, and finally a healthful fruit. Not the rose nor the daisy nor the marigold nor the carnation can give us sustenance. All do give satisfaction to our soul, whereas the orange blossom gives more—fruit.

THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN REPUBLIC

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, this date, March 25, marks the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic. It is a date which certainly at once sparks forth the vitality of a people filled with a zest for liberty, and demonstrates again the pallid tragedy which has become the lot of millions of people behind the Iron Curtain. While the political existence of this Republic was short lived by force of Russian imperialism, it was nonetheless a historical event that expresses the undying will of Byelorussian devotion to freedom.

It is most noteworthy that the tenacity of Byelorussians on both sides of the Iron Curtain continues to nurture their fervent desire to once more bring to their homeland the freedom of government tasted but lost 47 long years ago.

I congratulate the Byelorussians on this anniversary and wish them an early return of freedom and self-government.

Resolution of the Convention of Americans of Byelorussian Descent, Held on March 21, 1965, at the Hotel Biltmore in New York City for the 47th Anniversary of the Independence of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic

The Byelorussians of the free world have been closely following the events in the country of their origin. By virtue of their unflagging efforts to keep in touch with their former compatriots, there emerges a picture of Byelorussians oppressed by communism but forever trying to improve their present status and to change their future for the better. Undoubtedly, they have succeeded in pushing back the darkness somewhat. Nonetheless, their aspirations to a Byelorussian statehood have so far been blocked by the incubus of a foreign ideology, placed on their country by violence.

The idea of democratic freedom and independence, which the Byelorussians have consecrated with lives, is indestructible among them. This idea was given impetus by the anti-Russian uprising of 1863; it was developed and enriched by a host of writers of the national rebirth movement, and in the years of the Byelorussian national revolution of 1917 to 1918 it reached fruition. The convention believes that national independence for Byelorussia will be realized, for the independence movement constitutes an organic part of the historical process in this century.

Democratic sovereignty, the theme of this period, was expressed by the Byelorussians through their national leader, the poet Janka Kupala (1882–1942), who wrote: "Each people should be its own master."

Sooner or later, the Byelorussian nation shall become its own master. This is its most sacred dream and yearning. The achievement of this goal is in the interest not only of Byelorussia but of the whole community of nations.

In the world of today, cowering from the specter of nuclear war, international understanding is more urgently needed than ever. The existence of the United Nations underlines this need.

Coexistence and cooperation among nations, however, will rest upon firm foundations only when each nation will speak for itself; when neighboring states or nationalities will not usurp another nation's name and economic resources, as in the case of Byelorussia, whose name is being used by Russia in its international manifestations and blackmailing.

The endeavors of Byelorussians to have the right to speak for themselves and to be their own masters constitute the essence of recent developments in Byelorussia. They become especially obvious among the younger generation of the Byelorussian intelligentsia: among writers, artists, teachers, and students. Through their voices and creative talents, the Byelorussian people are striving to rehabilitate their past, of which it was totally deprived during the years of Stalinist terror, and to promote a maximum of political and economic freedom. Taken all together, these aspirations form the core of the idea of independence and democracy as it was promulgated in the Byelorussian Democratic Republic.

We, the participants of this convention for the 47th Anniversary of Byelorussian Independence, therefore solemnly resolve:

In the all-out, further struggle for free Byelorussia, to spotlight the cultural, economic, and political achievements of the Byelorussian people; to unmask before the world the political, economic, and moral enslavement of Byelorussia by Soviet Russian imperialism.

May the torch of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic of March 1918 never go out.

Long live the free democratic Byelorussia.

For the convention:

Stanislau Stankevich, Ph.D.,
National President of the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc.
Uladzimier Nabagiez, M.D.,
President of the New York Branch of the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc.
Siarhiej Hutyrchyk,
President of the New Jersey Branch of the Byelorussian-American Association, Inc.

USURPATION OF LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY BY AN ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise on this occasion to protest one more blatant usurpation of legislative authority by an administrative agency of our Government.

I refer to the arbitrary and unrealistic action of the Department of Labor in setting a minimum wage of $1.25 per hour for educational trainees in the Youth Corps.

It is one thing for Congress to set a minimum wage for breadwinners engaged in interstate commerce, but it is altogether a different matter for a Federal agency which does not answer to the electorate to give away that electorate's tax money to those we are trying to help provide with education and the skills necessary for earning a living.

While I was not a Member of the House when the poverty bill was being drafted, it is my understanding that it was the intent of this body to provide the necessary subsistence to enable the greatest number of our underprivileged youth to receive the highest level of basic education, plus additional skills through vocational training, and enable reentry into school.

These are worthy goals and I subscribe to them. But because of this unrealistic and typically bureaucratic edict, these goals are being thwarted at two points:

First, because the total amount to be spent on this program is set by law, any such unrealistic wage will automatically decrease the number of underprivileged youths who can participate.

Second, because this wage is in many cases higher than that provided by local industries not covered by Federal minimum wage legislation, the youngster may be earning more than his parent. This could encourage dropouts—the very thing this bill is designed to avoid.

This is only one instance among many that makes one wonder why Congress labors long and conscientiously to enact sound, constructive legislation only to see it go down the drain because of inept, bullheaded application.

THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the No. 1 business of the American people today is education.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (H.R. 2362) is an essential step that we must take.

If we are to keep faith with our forefathers, we here today have an obligation to the younger generations, and those yet to come, to provide the opportunity for the best education possible in order that they may be properly prepared to assume positions of responsibility and leadership which will one day be theirs. The teachers in our public school systems, the elementary and secondary schools, do more than educate our children. They are, in fact, the primary guardians of our democratic heritage. Therefore, the strength of our Nation will depend in the future, as it has in the past, on the strength of our elementary and secondary schools.

No one can deny the fact that we must do everything within our power to give local school districts of limited financial resources an opportunity to provide every child—those who come from families with such limited incomes—an opportunity for a solid foundation in the basic education of skills.

It is with deep respect that I pay highest compliments to the Honorable CARL D. PERKINS, of Kentucky, chairman of the General Subcommittee on Education, of the Committee on Education and Labor, for his dedicated service and untiring efforts which resulted in our consideration of H.R. 2362.

In particular, the formula that he has proposed for financial assistance is equitable and fair and it will provide our local school districts with the essential finances which they so desperately need in order to properly fulfill their responsibilities.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, it is my fervent hope that the Members of the House will pass this historic legislation exactly as reported by the Committee on Education and Labor, without a single amendment.

MAPLE SIRUP RESEARCH

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, it was announced on December 31, 1964, that a research program costing $285,400 to further improve the quality and reduce the cost of producing maple sirup would be discontinued. The explanation for this decision was that the returns on the research dollar of the USDA would probably be higher in some other area. In view of the spectacular results of the past research program on maple sirup it is felt that there is no further place to go with maple sirup research.

The research financed by the USDA, costing about $1,500,000 since 1948, has indeed produced spectacular results. It can very well be said to have preserved the industry, and kept maple sirup on our tables.

Here are some of the most spectacular accomplishments:

First. The yield of sap per tree has been increased 60 to 80 percent.

Second. The flavor quality per gallon of sirup has been increased four times.

Third. The factors causing offgrade sirup have been found and eliminated.

The net effect of this research to the farmer will be, once it has been fully applied, a sixfold increase in the value of the product from his sugarbush.

In 1964, the value of maple products produced in the United States was $8 million. Production was the highest in the last 9 years, and so was the price. This means that maple products, unlike many farm products, has a very high elasticity of demand, and that if production is increased further, the effect on price will not be great. Increased production will result in increased farm income—without Government supports.

These areas of research need further work, and justify a continuation of this program:

First. Methods for storage of sap without deterioration: The unpredictability of occurrence and amount of maple sap flow often results in the production of sap quantities far in excess of the capacity of evaporating equipment. This necessitates the storage of sap for periods of 4 to 6 days and results in deterioration of the sap. Current practices permit satisfactory storage for a maximum of 24 hours. Methods should be developed to provide for the delivery of sterile sap to the evaporation storage facilities. Better methods of sap handling and sanitation in the woods, in transit, and in plant storage tanks are needed.

Second. Expansion of studies already initiated on the adapting of food processing plant equipment and modifying sirup making procedures: This work should be expanded so that more food processing plants can be converted to maple sirup production during their idle period. This was recommended by the Forestry Research Advisory Committee at their meeting in November 1964.

Third. Improvement in the efficiency of sap evaporating equipment: The cost of evaporating maple sap to sirup is one of the major items in maple sirup production. A further lowering of evaporation costs is essential to the lowering of the price of sirup.

Fourth. Identification of the flavor potentiator in maple sirup: Preliminary studies have indicated the presence of a flavor potentiator in maple sirup. Work should be initiated to discover its nature and identity. The production of this food potentiator could provide new and expanded outlets for maple sirup.

Fifth. Studies on the nature and properties of maple flavor precursors: This will provide information necessary for further improving sirup manufacturing methods. The identity of the precursors of maple flavor and tests for identifying them would be of great value to the Forest Service in their selection and propagation of maple trees for maple sirup production.

Sixth. Methods are needed for the culturing, stocking, and commercial distribution of cultures of organisms required for the development of enhanced maple flavor by controlled fermentation.

Seventh. Methods to prevent the formation of sugar sand in sirup: Methods need to be developed that will remove the formative agents of sugar sand from sap or sirup. This could be done by use of a chelating agent to be added to the sap or sirup or by ion exchange techniques. In either case the treatment must in no way affect the maple flavor.

In the middle of February, in Michigan, we begin to get our first thaws. The sun, on a clear day, begins to give its warmth to us again. The rough black bark of the sugar maple absorbs the heat of the sun's rays, and on the south side of the trees the sap begins to stir. This is the time we tap the tree, and join in the resurgence of life as winter begins to melt away. The trees give of their mellowed sweetness through the month of March, until their buds are swollen and their flowers burst into bloom, throwing their pollen to the bees and to the winds.

I hope we may continue to help these hardy men who love their maples to learn more about them, so that the bounty which they give us will continue to increase. I trust the Department of Agriculture will reconsider its decision.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 43, I was recorded as not voting.

Due to my attendance at a meeting in my district relative to the preservation of the Ansley Wilcox House as a national historic site, I was delayed in returning to Washington. If I had been present, I would have voted "yea."

BASIN AUTHORIZATIONS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a number of us who serve on the Committee on Public Works have joined today in introducing a bill to provide a 1-year extension on basin authorizations for 10 basins in the country which face the situation in which the authorizations will be exhausted in the very near future and appropriation requests therefore would be imperiled.

We wish to make it very clear that this basin authorization bill which is being introduced is not intended in any way to be a substitute for an omnibus bill or to delay in any way an omnibus bill, because it is my understanding that the Committee on Public Works does intend to proceed with hearings on new projects under an omnibus bill in the very near future.

We invite those who are in the basins affected by this legislation introduced today to join us in seeking the quickest possible consideration and approval of this legislation.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMONDSON. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CRAMER. I am delighted to join in the introduction of this legislation. It is absolutely essential at this time. I trust Congress will take immediate action.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY THROUGH EDUCATION

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, having been assured by a high authority that H.R. 2362 would be brought to some conclusive action today, I confirmed longstanding arrangements to participate in the wedding ceremony of my daughter, Virginia, to Dr. James Mount. The wedding is taking place in Akron, Ohio.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, I have consistently supported all of the truly constructive educational bills that have been introduced in Congress. As my remarks of yesterday must indicate, I cannot support H.R. 2362, as it has been presented.

Early this March, I requested the House Rules Committee to withhold action on this bill until my educational bill, H.R. 6349, could be considered. This bill was also introduced by Representatives CURTIS and GOODELL. I would call your attention that one title of this bill is identical to that introduced by Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF.

It is unfortunate that the House is not to have the opportunity to vote on this legislation. H.R. 6349 would certainly bring about equality of opportunity through education—however, the Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] has advised me that this bill would not be germane to H.R. 2362, as a substitute.

Meetings with the minority assure me that the plans for the corrections of the many inequalities of H.R. 2362 are in most capable hands. The very Members who shall offer amendments and opposing action on H.R. 2362 are the very same Members who have so ably added corrective amendments to other legislative matters that have successfully been enacted into law.

THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF MEETING OF GRANT AND LEE AT APPOMATTOX

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, Friday, April 9, is the 100th anniversary of one of the most important dates in the history of our Nation. One hundred years ago on that day, Gen. Robert E. Lee and Gen. Ulysses S. Grant met at the conference table at Appomattox, Va., and negotiated peace terms between the North and the South. I know of no event of more importance to our Nation since our Constitution was adopted. It represented the uniting of a war-torn nation, the healing of a breach, the welding together of a great people, the rebirth of a nation.

There will be conducted at the Appomattox Court House National Historical Park commemorative services honoring these two great men, Generals Lee and Grant, as well as the peace that was achieved that day 100 years ago. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant III, a grandson of General Grant, and Robert E. Lee IV, a great-grandson of General Lee, will take part in the ceremony dedicating the restoration of the old court house where the Confederate soldiers were mustered out after the peace terms had been agreed upon. Mr. Bruce Catton, the author of "A Stillness at Appomattox," a noted scholar, and Pulitzer Prize winner as well as a great historian, will deliver the address. The Marine Band from Quantico will provide the music. The Governor of Virginia and many other notables will be present.

On behalf of the people of Appomattox in particular and Virginia in general, I extend to my colleagues in the House of Representatives a cordial invitation to attend these exercises as our guests and to visit this great shrine which stands as an emblem of peace between our people and in memory of those great warriors who fought, bled, and died for principles they believed in and were willing to sacrifice their all in defense of same.

THE STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS ON NAZI WAR CRIMINALS AND GERMANY'S RECOGNITION OF ISRAEL

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all of us are gratified today by the news that the West German Parliament has extended the statute of limitations on the prosecution of Nazi war criminals until 1970. I know that all of the members of the Jewish community recognize this as a further demonstration of responsibility on the part of the West German Government.

We are equally pleased at the imminent prospect of an exchange of ambassadors between West Germany and Israel.

The West German authorities are to be highly congratulated for their response to the dictatorial demands of President Nasser of the United Arab Republic. This courageous action deserves tribute from all of us who have supported the cause of the State of Israel.

These actions—the recognition of Israel and the extension of the statute of limitations—are in stark contrast to the position taken by the Soviet puppet government in East Germany. That Government has done everything possible during the past 20 years to create chaos in Europe. From the Berlin airlift to the Berlin wall, East Germany has demonstrated the lack of interest of its Soviet masters in securing peace in Germany or for that matter anywhere in the world.

Concomitantly, East Germany has done nothing whatever to atone for Germany's crimes during the Second World War. No Nazis are being tried or traced behind the Iron Curtain. Little or no cooperation in making records of the Nazis period available has been received from the Soviets or their satellites. No restitution has been made to the Jewish victims of nazism from them. No help has come to Israel from them.

What has come from behind the Berlin wall? A pledge of $100 million to assist President Nasser of Egypt.

Israel is the only existing democracy in the Middle East. All believers in freedom throughout the world welcome the actions of both Israelis and Germans in demonstrating to the free world that morality is a function of government and that blackmail must be resisted.

We commend all freedom-loving people everywhere who joined in the effort to convince the Federal Republic of Germany to act as properly as it has.

We salute the high-minded officials of that Government for once more standing up for the right.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE: A TRIBUTE

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today we pay tribute to the Byelorussians, a people who have been cursed by the misfortunes of geographic determinism; for there is no doubt that if their country had not been situated within the shadows of great Russian power, Byelorussia would probably be an independent nation-state today.

Geographic determinism is a principle in politics that can work to the advantage or disadvantage of nation-states. We Americans were singularly blessed by the geographic fact that during our formative years we were isolated by and large from the incessant political struggles that plagued modern European states. And when we were sufficiently strong, we were able to make our entry onto the world political scene with more than a reasonable assurance of success.

But, nations like Byelorussia have never enjoyed the benefits of geography. Caught up in the crossfire of the Teutonic-Slavic struggle, they never had the choice to achieve their national aspirations in an atmosphere of political serenity. In fact the only respite they enjoyed as a nation came with the dissolution of Russian power and at that time they declared their independence. But with the reemergence of Russian power in the form of Soviet communism, Byelorussian independence was doomed.

On this day of national dedication we join with freemen the world over in renewing our pledge to the universal hope of self-determination of all peoples.

MARYLAND DAY

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, Maryland Day, 1965, marks the 331st anniversary of the founding of the colony that has become one of the great States of the Union. In the course of 331 years Maryland has given the Nation and the world many concepts that are now basic principles of modern thinking. Religious toleration and the right of women to participate in political activity were, for example, both asserted in 17th-century Maryland.

In 1965 we shall mark the bicentennial of an event in Maryland history that has few parallels in its importance to all of America. A tax to be raised through stamps required for legal documents was imposed on the American colonies by the British Parliament in 1764. As most taxes are, the stamp tax was unpopularly received, but in addition it raised the constitutional questions of "taxation without representation" and the extent of the legislative powers of the Parliament at Westminster over the colonies of British America. Discontent was expressed through the organization of the "Sons of Liberty" and the adoption of resolutions of protest.

In Maryland the reaction to the Stamp Act was rational, forceful, and highly significant. The greatest patriot interest in the colony was expressed in Frederick County, the mother county of western Maryland, whose boundaries then included all that now comprises Montgomery, Washington, Allegany, and Garrett Counties and much of Carroll County. The 12 judges of Frederick County rendered an opinion that the court should proceed with its business without the controversial revenue stamps, and it so ordered its clerk. This action won immediate and vigorous approval. The dean of Maryland historians, James McSherry, in assessing the importance of the judicial action said the "Frederick County court had the high honor of first deciding, in a legal manner, the unconstitutionality of the Stamp Act."

McSherry further reports:

> This decision was received with joy; and the people hastened to celebrate so important and significant an event. The festival took place in Frederick, on the 30th of November, 1765. The "Sons of Liberty," in funeral procession, in honor of the death of the Stamp Act, marched through the streets, bearing a coffin, on which was inscribed: "The Stamp Act, expired of a mortal stab received from the Genius of Liberty, in Frederick County Court, 23d November, 1765, aged 22 days." Zachariah Hood, the late unfortunate stamp distributor, was chief mourner, in effigy, and the whole affair ended merrily in a ball.

Mathew Page Andrews in his "History of Maryland" adds some interesting details in describing the repudiation:

> On December 10, in a supplement entitled "an apparition of the late Maryland Gazette," the editor announced that the magistrates of Frederick County had resolved that business should go on without stamps, on the plea that the Stamp Act had not "been legally transmitted to them." This decision of the magistrates was celebrated in Frederick Town by an elaborate pageant or public parade. Such proceedings served to attract popular attention to the principles under discussion. On this occasion, pursuant upon the colors, drums, and a banner proclaiming the independent action of the magistrates, there came inscriptions such as "Magna Carta," "Charter of Maryland," "Trials by Juries Restored," "Oppression Removed," "Liberty and Loyalty." Finally, there appeared a coffin with the legend: The Stamp Act, expired of a mortal stab received from the Genius of Liberty in Frederick County Court, 23d November, 1765—aged 22 days.

Charles Albro Barker, in "The Background of the Revolution in Maryland" calls the court's order the "first sign" of resistance:

> The first sign that the colony would disregard the tax came from Frederick County, in November. The county judges decided that, since they had never received official notice of the Stamp Act, they would proceed with the regular business of the court, as if they had no reason to believe that special circumstances existed. The decision was celebrated in a fitting manner. Self-styled "Sons of Liberty" of Frederick town honored the judges with a ball and many patriotic toasts. They buried the Stamp Act in a mock funeral, where the only mourner was an effigy of Zachariah Hood.

The political consequences of the ferment that arose because of the stamp tax are probably unequaled in all history. The constitutional principles of representative government and political self-determination which were to justify the revolution in the next decade were made household words throughout America by the intense interest aroused by the Stamp Act.

A less recognized aspect of the action of the Frederick County court was the impact upon judicial as well as political precedents. Although the court adopted a lawyers' pretext for its action, there is no doubt from contemporary reaction and from all the surrounding circumstances that the court fully understood and appreciated the importance of its decision in repudiating the Stamp Act. McSherry is right in saying that the court labeled it "unconstitutional," and not worthy of obedience.

Thus we find jurists in America even before the foundation of the Republic who had the courage to be independent of the power that elevated them to the bench. The Frederick County court, a remote tribunal in a distant province placed so great an importance on "liberty" that it struck down the decree of an imperial parliament, and reinforced the power of courts to protect the rights of a people even against its own rulers.

The repudiation decision is, therefore, a great judicial precedent in America and one of the important steps toward the establishment of our State and Federal system of judges independent of either executive or legislative control.

The court was justly revered in its own day and has been given recognition for all of these two centuries. In 1894 the General Assembly of Maryland declared that November 23 should be a legal holiday in Frederick County. In 1904 a memorial to the immortal judges was erected in the present Frederick County Courthouse. It is important to remember each of them: Joseph Smith, Samuel Beall, Thomas Price, William Luckett, David Lynn, Joseph Beall, Andrew Heugh, James Dickson, Charles Jones, Peter Bainbridge, William Blair, and Thomas Beatty.

Today I have introduced a resolution calling upon the President of the United States to proclaim November 23, 1965, as Repudiation Day in recognition of the great significance of the action of the Frederick County court as a preamble to the American Revolution, and to further bear witness to the importance that we still place upon a judiciary that has the courage to be independent and the wisdom and strength to protect the liberties of the people against every sort of tyranny.

THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there is no reason to believe our remarks in this Chamber today will affect in any way the independence and the freedom of the millions of Byelorussians, who 47 years after they declared their independence from czarist Russia, continue to live their lives under another kind of Russian imperialism. In recalling this anniversary date, perhaps we can accomplish two things: One, in some way let the Byelorussian people know that Americans do not for one moment believe that Byelorussian incorporation into the U.S.S.R. was a free and independent act on the part of the Byelorussian peoples; and two, to remind ourselves that our freedom and independence is a cherished goal denied to millions who live behind the iron curtain.

A brief review of the history of the Byelorussian people may give a renewed meaning to our own freedoms. Although the Byelorussians were a defined cultural and social group as early as the 10th century, their subjugation to Russia began in the 15th century when their country was overrun by the "barbaric Muscovite hordes." For more than the next 300 years, the Byelorussians were completely oppressed by czarist Russia. One would think that after 300 years the people would have lost all of their national feeling and unity, but this was not the case, for when czarist Russia fell to the Communists in the Russian Revolution of 1917, these people declared their independence March 25, 1918—just 47 years ago. At the time the Byelorussian National Republic was proclaimed the country was occupied by the Germans, but when the Germans left, the Communists moved in, and early in 1921, just about 3 years after independence, the Red Army occupied the country and independence came to an end. Since the 15th century, except for 3 years, the Byelorussians have lived under Russian rule.

Although we cannot give the Byelorussian people their independence, we can give them the best wishes of the American people as they remember a happy date in their history—47 years ago.

PROPOSED PUBLIC RECORDS LAW

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today for consideration by the House of Representatives a bill designed to give the public greater access to information about activities of the Federal Government.

The bill's objective is to prevent the unnecessary suppression or manipulation of public information by Federal agencies. Some Government agencies have lost sight of the fact that they exist to serve the people, and have come to feel as though they themselves have the sole responsibility to determine what the public should and should not know about the Government.

This bill would require that every Federal agency make all its records promptly available to any citizen and would give the courts power to order records made public when they are improperly withheld. It includes several specific exceptions.

The bill would establish guidelines and procedures which should make it easier to get information out of the Federal Government. In this connection, I want to commend the work of the Foreign Operations and Government Information Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee for its work.

Because of the substantial support for the subcommittee's activities under Chairman John E. Moss, I am encouraged that we can obtain action on a good bill this year.

Enactment of a public records law would be a positive statement that Congress intends to make public all records of the executive branch of Government with but a few exceptions.

In the 18-year history of the public information section of the Administrative Procedure Act, events have shown that instead of providing for more expeditious release of public information, it actually serves as a vehicle by which agencies can withhold information from the public.

The existing law needlessly provides opportunities for secrecy-minded Government officials to ignore the stated congressional intent that agencies "take the initiative in informing the public."

The law mentions "secrecy in the public interest" fails to define the meaning of "public interest." Each agency is permitted to draw up its own definition.

The existing law provides for withholding of information relating to the "internal management of an agency," but this has permitted secrecy regarding matters such as budget procedures.

The Hoover Commission Task Force on Legal Services and Procedure reported that under the "internal management" exemption, "hundreds of interpretive regulations contained in the claims manual of the Bureau of Old-Age and Survivors Insurance, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, were not published nor otherwise made available to the public; these were the very same rules which governed the settlement of more than 2 million claims a year."

Under existing law, if a Government agency can find no other basis for withholding information, it can resort to the vague and all-encompassing concept that the information be held "confidential for good cause found."

As a result of these problems, Government agencies have been able to withhold substantial amounts of information from the public, and I want to submit, Mr. Speaker, that this situation, together with the generally expanding centralized authority in the Federal Government, constitutes a real threat to the continued strength of our democratic system of government.

Excessive control of information about a government always accompanies the assumption of excessive power by that government, and the survival of our representative system depends on a continuing public access to information about the Government.

The proposed bill would require that a Federal agency would have to prove its right to withhold specific records. Persons seeking Government information could file suit in a U.S. district court which would have the authority to order the production of agency records improperly withheld and would have the power to punish agency officials for contempt if they refused to disclose the records.

Federal Government records which would be exempted from the disclosure requirements would include national defense and foreign policy secrets specifically protected by Executive order, documents relating to internal personnel rules and practices of an agency, privileged trade secrets, agency memoranda dealing solely with matters of law or policy, personnel and medical files, investigatory files compiled for law enforcement, and certain reports used by agencies responsible for regulation of financial institutions.

Activities and decisions of the Federal Government should be open to full scrutiny of citizens. But too often we are confronted with bureaucrats who seem determined to keep the business of Government under a rug of secrecy.

The management of news has become an accepted procedure in almost every departmental office, from top to bottom, in the administration.

A public records law is badly needed so that citizens will be better able to determine whether Federal agencies are acting in ways which are responsive to the needs and wishes of the people.

EDUCATION

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, although I have spent over one-half of my life in the field of politics, I consider still that my profession is teaching. I began my teaching career in a one-room school with all eight grades at Opperman, Ohio. I taught in a junior high school in Cambridge, Ohio. I was principal of the high school for 4½ years in my home town of Senecaville, Ohio. I resigned in January 1931, to serve in the Ohio State Legislature. I was superintendent of schools at Murray City, Ohio, when I was elected to Congress in 1932. I resigned the first of March in 1933 to take my seat in Congress. I realized then, as I do now, that the hope of my country rests upon the character and education of the young people who, generation after generation, assume the burdens and the privileges of citizenship in our Republic.

Education has made great strides since I taught my last class in school. In spite of this progress, the incentive and the opportunity for education is seriously lacking in our country. In spite of all the money spent by local taxpayers and States, 8 million adults in the United States have completed less than 5 years of school. School dropouts are setting an all-time record which primarily accounts for the fact that 20 percent of all young people between the ages of 18 and 24 years, are unemployed. When we compare this figure with the national average of unemployment, somewhere near 5 percent, we can only conclude that something more is needed. The population explosion has crowded our schools to the point where individual attention to a pupil such as I received as a student and gave as a teacher, is no longer possible. It is shocking to note that of all young men called up under the Selective Service System, 21.6 percent were rejected because they could not pass the fairly simple mental tests uniformly given throughout the country.

The burden of building new schools and operating them has raised real estate taxes to the point where the property owner cannot be expected to assume greater and greater burdens. Federal aid to primary and secondary education has long been discussed by educators and nearly every interested group in our Nation.

Two things have been uppermost in the minds of all our citizens. The first is the fear that the Federal Government would attempt to control education in the local school districts. Under H.R. 2362, all funds will be distributed through each State to local school authorities, who will determine what use will be made of all Federal funds. I am convinced that the Federal Government, through this bill, will have no more control over the operation of local schools than they have had under the vocational education program which has been in existence for many decades. The use to which Federal funds will be applied will be determined solely by the school authorities in each State and each local school district. I see no possible way under this bill where the business of education can, in any way, be shifted from "back home" to Washington.

The second thing that has worried many people in connection with Federal aid to primary and secondary schools, is the long-established principle in our country that church and state should be separate as was envisioned and declared by the framers of our Constitution. After a study of the hearings and the bill itself, I am convinced that this principle will not be violated.

In the first place, the bill authorizes no funds for the payment of private school teachers. Neither does it provide for the purchase of materials or the construction of facilities for private schools. The most it provides is that educationally deprived children in nonpublic schools, under approval and absolute control of the local public school agency, may attend dual enrollment classes and take advantage of educational radio and television programs and other educational media centers. The local public school authorities may adopt certain instructional offerings in which any student may participate.

In a letter received this week from Andrew J. Biemiller, director, department of legislation, American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, he states:

> For too many years, the church-state issue has made it impossible to obtain such legislation. We are extremely pleased, therefore, to see that the bill now coming before the House is being supported by important organizations representing all major religious denominations. It is our conviction, along with these organizations, that the present bill raises no constitutional problems.
>
> The AFL-CIO urges you, therefore, to vote for H.R. 2362 without amendment so that this program can be placed into effect at the earliest opportunity.

Under this bill, grants to local school districts in Ohio would amount to $36,708,699. To improve school libraries, et cetera, Ohio would receive $5,406,689. For supplemental education, Ohio would receive $4,912,452. For improvement of the State Department of Education, Ohio would receive $964,737.

In addition, the education leaders of Ohio, speaking for the public school groups they represent, unqualifiedly and specifically endorse H.R. 2362, which provides Federal aid to primary and secondary schools in our Nation. I have received the following telegrams urging me to support this legislation:

Hon. ROBERT T. SECREST,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Educational poverty is a problem which Ohio is not recognizing. High teacher-pupil ratios in our classrooms in Ohio are making it impossible to provide individual attention to thousands of children. There are additional educational objectives contained in H.R. 2362, which will enrich Ohio's educational program. The teachers in Ohio strongly request your support of H.R. 2362, as recommended by the House Labor and Education Committee.

CHARLES W. COOK,
President, Ohio Department of Classroom Teachers.
LORAIN, OHIO.

Hon. ROBERT T. SECREST,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: The education of the children of America for the space age will necessitate a cooperative effort of local, State and National financial resources. Ohio's 2 million children will benefit measurable by passage of H.R. 2362. I urge your support of this bill as now written by voting favorably on the floor of the House.

ROBERT DOWLING,
President, Ohio Education Association.
ALLIANCE, OHIO.

Hon. ROBERT T. SECREST,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Two million children need your support in upgrading elementary and secondary education in the State of Ohio. H.R. 2362 will supplement State and local financial contributions to the children of Ohio to the extent of over $35 million. We have studied H.R. 2362, and are satisfied that it is a bill for students. We encourage your support. Resist all efforts to amend or recommit this legislation.

THOMAS QUICK,
President, Ohio Association of School Administrators.
COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Hon. ROBERT T. SECREST,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Ohio high school principals believe education needs of Ohio's 2 million schoolchildren demand passage of H.R. 2362. Additional $35 million applied to education in Ohio will definitely provide more adequate program. Your help in securing immediate enactment of H.R. 2362 will serve best interest of Ohio and Nation.

ROBERT D. REGULA,
President, Ohio Association of Secondary School Principals.
FREMONT, OHIO.

Hon. ROBERT T. SECREST,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We urge your good services toward passage of H.R. 2362. We work very close to the schoolchildren of Ohio and we know that their educational programs require the financial aid for improvements provided by the

Education Act of 1965. Please seek quick enactment without amendment.

JAMES C. KING,
President, Ohio Department of Elementary School Principals.
COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Hon. ROBERT T. SECREST,
U.S. House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Our association urges passage of H.R. 2362. Ohio needs this aid for education.

RALPH H. WOODIN,
Executive Secretary, Ohio Vocational Association.
COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Representative ROBERT T. SECREST,
Washington, D.C.:

H.R. 2362 is a bill Ohio needs to provide more educational opportunity for our children. The bill has sound economic value in that an educated people is essential to job security or attainment. Welfare will require fewer dollars with an educated people. Teaching children to read and write through remedial education programs and providing more individual teacher assistance is a primary goal of H.R. 2362. Your favorable vote will assure greater educational opportunity for the educationally disadvantaged.

THOMAS O'KEEFE,
Executive Secretary, Ohio Education Association.
COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Hon. ROBERT T. SECREST,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The 1,000 members of the Ohio School Counselors Association urge you to support H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

W. R. DRURY,
President, Ohio School Counselors Association.
XENIA, OHIO.

Every one of these educators represent the teachers of Ohio. These teachers are dedicated men and women who do the best they can with the material they have, and I am convinced this bill will give them better materials with which to perform their work as educators.

The late Senator Robert Taft, with whom I served in the Ohio State Legislature in 1931, said:

> Education is primarily a State function, but in the field of education, as in the fields of health, relief and medical care, the Federal Government has a secondary obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States.

One of the outstanding programs in Ohio is Buckeye Girls State, sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary of the Department of Ohio. In the foreword to their brochure text is the following:

> Government in Ohio is a highly specialized business of tremendous proportions which furnishes essential services at appreciable costs. Only thorough basic understanding of the American system and by reasonable information on public affairs can the individual citizen, who must pay his share of that cost, hope to safeguard valued American institutions and elevate the standard of public service. A thriving democracy depends on an informed and ever-vigilant citizenry.

I was the author of the bill passed by Congress in the mid-1930's to celebrate the Ordinance of 1787 and the settlement of the Northwest Territory. Nearly every community in Ohio had a fitting and memorable celebration of this great document. The Ordinance of 1787 provided "that schools and means of education should forever be encouraged in the Northwest Territory." In my opinion, this bill, H.R. 2362, is another step forward in education consistent with the Ordinance of 1787 and the spirit of our National Constitution.

The facts convince me that this is a good bill and I intend to support it. In the first place, the need for better education has been clearly demonstrated. In the second place, the homeowner and the businessman has been taxed in many districts beyond reason in an effort to provide an education for the children of our country. In the third place, I am convinced that this bill will still leave complete control in the hands of public State, county, and local school boards. In the fourth place, I am convinced that the constitutional principle of separation of church and state is not violated by this proposed legislation.

Education is not a matter of party. It is the lifeblood of this Republic. As one who believes that teaching, next to the clergy, is the most essential of all professions, I support and will vote for this bill to further education of a new generation upon which the future of our Republic must rest.

NEW YORK PUERTO RICAN COMMUNITY URGES CONGRESS TO ABOLISH LITERACY TESTS

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary is conducting hearings on the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (H.R. 6400). Yesterday I testified before the committee and recommended a number of amendments to strengthen the bill so that it would reach every barrier to the franchise. I urged the committee to abolish completely the literacy test which has been used to disenfranchise American citizens in both the South and the North. I have introduced H.R. 2477 to outlaw literacy tests. I pointed out that the literacy test in New York State prevents many Spanish-speaking citizens from registering to vote. In equity and justice Congress should abolish it.

Today the Honorable Herman Badillo, Commissioner of Relocation of the City of New York, vice president of the Legion of Voters, Inc., and a member of the National Association of Puerto Rican Civil Rights, testified before the Committee on the Judiciary. He was accompanied by Mrs. Irma Santaella, Deputy Commissioner of Correction of the City of New York and president of the Legion of Voters, Inc.; Gilbert Gerena Valentin, president of the National Association of Puerto Rican Civil Rights; Jose Morales, secretary of the National Association of Puerto Rican Civil Rights; and a large delegation of representatives of organizations active in the Puerto Rican community of New York who came to Washington to express the determination of the Puerto Rican community to achieve full equality at the ballot box. As American citizens, they were petitioning their Government for a redress of grievances in the time-honored American tradition, and they are to be commended for their leadership in the struggle for freedom.

After the hearing before the Committee on the Judiciary, Commissioner Badillo, Commissioner Santaella, Gilbert Gerena Valentin, and Jose Morales went to the White House to present the testimony for President Johnson.

In his testimony Commissioner Badillo estimated that there are some 330,000 Puerto Ricans of voting age in New York City who have not enjoyed the right to vote because of the literacy test. He said, "We are then, American citizens, proud of our heritage, proud of our contribution to the general welfare of our Nation, and stand ready to contribute to our Nation's defense against any and all enemies." And he asked Congress to "take action to do away with the literacy test." I strongly urge my colleagues to heed his words and include the full text of his eloquent testimony at this point in the RECORD:

TESTIMONY OF HERMAN BADILLO BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES, WITH RESPECT TO VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965, A BILL TO ENFORCE THE 15TH AMENDMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 25, 1965

My name is Herman Badillo. I am here as vice president of the Legion of Voters, Inc., of which Mrs. Irma Vidal Santaella, who is here with me, is president and as a member of the National Association of Puerto Rican Civil Rights of which Mr. Gerena Valentin, who is here with me, is president. We are all here with a delegation of representatives from scores of organizations which are active in the Puerto Rican community of New York City and New York State. We are here to speak on behalf of more than 750,000 Puerto Ricans who are residents of New York State and who are being denied the right to vote by means of the requirement of literacy test in the State of New York as well as by other devices. Of course, much of what we have to say applies with equal force to Negro citizens in New York State who are also denied the right to vote by the same means. But I will speak here today with particular reference to the Puerto Rican community since this is the community that we belong to, that we have experience with, and that we are in a position to represent.

At the outset I would like to commend President Johnson for his magnificent message on Monday, March 15, with respect to voting rights. Those of us who were watching him on television were electrified when he urged local governments to "open your polling places to all people, allow men and women to register and vote whatever the color of their skin. Extend the rights of citizenship to every citizen of this land." This is precisely what we have come here to ask for.

We have come to the Congress of the United States to urge that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 be extended to guarantee Puerto Ricans and other citizens of the State of New York the right to vote by eliminating what we consider a grossly unjust and undemocratic barrier to the right to vote—the literacy test.

Puerto Ricans are citizens of the United States and have been so for close to 50 years. In the last three decades we have joined the millions of Americans throughout the land who have migrated to new communities in search of better opportunities.

We have settled in more than 100 communities throughout the United States, where we today, number approximately 1 million persons. We have come from a vigorous and dynamic island that has in the last 20 years transformed itself from a once poor land into one of the fastest developing areas of the world. Puerto Ricans in Puerto Rico are today a major bridge between the two great cultures of the Americas. Ours is a society that has blended a rich Hispanic heritage with a system of government familiar to all Americans for, as you know, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is molded in the same pattern as the Federal Government and the States of the Union.

We are very active participants in our government, keenly aware of our rights and responsibilities as citizens both of the Commonwealth, and of the United States.

We have demonstrated our responsibilities as citizens in many ways, not the least of which has been in the defense of our Nation. We have served and shed blood in World Wars and Korea. It is interesting to note in this regard that service in the Armed Forces is not limited to Americans literate in English for Americans of any and all linguistic backgrounds are called to serve the Nation in time of need.

In the Korean conflict where 91.2 percent of the Puerto Rican participants were volunteers, 1 of every 42 casualties suffered by U.S. troops was a Puerto Rican.

Puerto Rico suffered 1 casualty for every 660 inhabitants of the Commonwealth as opposed to 1 casualty for every 1,125 inhabitants of the Continental United States.

We are then, American citizens, proud of our heritage, proud of our contribution to the general welfare of our Nation, and stand ready to contribute to our Nation's defense against any and all enemies.

In the State of New York today, according to estimates made by the migration division of the Puerto Rican Department of Labor, we number some 750,000 persons. The greater bulk of the Puerto Rican community resides in the city of New York with smaller populations in Rochester, Buffalo and other communities.

Of the 730,000 Puerto Ricans in the city of New York, approximately 250,000 are of less than voting age. We have calculated that out of a total of more than 480,000 potential voters, there are today 150,000 Puerto Ricans registered to vote. In other words, some 330,000 Puerto Ricans are eligible to vote but have not been able to avail themselves of this, the fundamental right of American citizens.

We submit to you that it is the literacy test which deprives this very substantial number of citizens of their voting rights in New York State very much in the same way as literacy tests do in other States of the Union.

One has only to examine the history of literacy tests to see this more clearly. As President Johnson noted in his recent message to the Congress on voting, "the first literacy tests were legislated in Northern States in an effort to exclude immigrants—especially Irish—from the franchise."

Bigotry and race superiority were clearly evident in the 1915 New York Constitutional Convention debate on literacy tests when a prominent delegate to the convention stated: "Gentlemen, we must stop to think of what we are. This is not a question of nations, it is a question of races, and when all is said and done there is not a man in this room who dares deny that we are an English race, born and bred and brought up with the traditions of the men of England; of Anglo-Saxon stock."

One of the most vigorous opponents of literacy tests during that convention was Robert F. Wagner, Sr., father of Mayor Robert F. Wagner of New York. Mayor Wagner, I may point out, is as energetically opposed to literacy tests as was his distinguished father. Our mayor has indeed been a champion in our cause both in New York City and in the State.

Mayor Wagner's father at the convention in 1915 in an eloquent appeal to the delegates said, "Can you not recognize in the amendment a clandestine effort to prevent (the) assimilation of alien blood into our citizenship and to segregate and exclude the foreigner from the rights, the privileges, and the opportunities which we have always held out to all men? Literacy is not a test of character or personal fitness but of opportunity. In other words he's being penalized for not having had the opportunity to get schooling."

There exists then a myth in our State of New York that a citizen can be an intelligent, well-informed voter only if he is literate in English. We differ with that view very emphatically.

When any New Yorker opens a newspaper in the subway to read about Dr. Martin Luther King in Selma or President Johnson in Johnson City you can be certain that his neighbor, reading a Spanish-language newspaper is reading the same news—not only that, but his cousin riding a bus to work in San Juan is also doing precisely the same. It is highly probable that the story was written by the same reporter, since the wire services that serve the New York English-language newspapers also serve newspapers in Puerto Rico and Latin America. The same is true about columnists—the same Drew Pearson who is syndicated in newspapers throughout the land also writes for a Spanish-language newspaper in New York where his column is called "Tio Vivo" instead of Washington Merry-Go-Round.

The folks in New York who read the Spanish-language daily press, the weeklies, magazines, view Spanish-language newsreels and listen to the half dozen Spanish-language radio programs, are as well informed about the world around them as any of their neighbors, for the news they read or listen to has to do with city hall, Albany, Washington, San Juan, Moscow, or Saigon.

Puerto Ricans in the State and city of New York, however, are increasingly bilingual. Tens of thousands have over the years availed themselves of the free English-language instruction program offered in New York and other communities.

Yet we submit once again that whether a Puerto Rican does or does not write in English should not and must not affect his right to vote.

As one eminent observer has put it, "The vote was never intended to serve as a means of coercing people to learn English."

Gentlemen we pay taxes to support our city, State, and Federal Government; when asked to serve our country in time of war we are never asked to take a literacy test; we perform all the obligations of citizens; yet many of us are denied the most important right—the right to join with our neighbors to choose who will represent us. We seek relief from this injustice.

We point out, however, that it is not only the existence of literacy test requirements that concern the Puerto Rican community in New York State. There are numerous Puerto Ricans who are eligible to become voters who could pass the literacy test. We are concerned because every year many thousands of citizens who attempt to take the test and to register and who qualify for doing so, are prevented from exercising their right to vote by techniques which are designed to impede and obstruct the registration process.

President Johnson stated in his speech "the Negro citizen may go to register only to be told that the day is wrong, the hour is late or the officer in charge is absent." This same kind of pattern is repeated in the local registration in New York City, year after year. Literacy test certificates suddenly disappear so that it takes 2½ hours or maybe all day by the time a new supply is received from the central office of the board of education. Pencils and other supplies are found to be lacking and I can say from experience that I have had to buy pencils from a local candy store in order that people on line could go in and take the literacy test. Polling places and registration places are closed before the time scheduled by law, and I can say from experience that in the year 1960 when I was cochairman of the late President Kennedy's campaign in East Harlem I proved before the county board of elections that 14 Puerto Ricans, some of whom had waited as long as 5 or 6 hours to register, were turned away because a local school was closed one-half hour before the time to register had expired.

These 14 Puerto Ricans whose story was reported in the New York City newspapers, were representative of many of the others who were on line who could not afford to take the time off from work in order to spend a whole day at the board of elections. They were also representative of the many thousands of others throughout the city of New York who were similarly disenfranchised.

I can testify from personal experience last year in New York City during a local firehouse registration campaign that there were waiting periods of up to 6 or 7 hours. People who were on line waiting to take the literacy test found after waiting several hours and getting to the head of the line, that suddenly they were in the wrong line. They were advised that this was the line for registration only and that they had to get in another line to take the literacy test. In another case, prospective voters were given five literacy tests instead of one, having to take all of the tests to qualify for registration. We could document any number of such occurrences during every election period throughout the city and State of New York.

I submit, therefore, that the literacy test is wrong as a matter of principle and that it is wrong as a matter of practice. We ask that this Congress take action to do away with the literacy test. You may say, "Why doesn't the State of New York take action?" I want to remind you that the requirement of the literacy test is a provision in the New York State constitution and that when Mayor Wagner spoke out publicly against the literacy tests the mail coming into city hall was four to one against such a change. It is clear from this experience that an amendment to the State constitution which would require the vote of the people of the State of New York, would encounter great opposition in the State. So, therefore, it would be idle to suggest that we should be the ones to correct this wrong. In fact, those people whose very rights are in question, Puerto Ricans and Negroes, would not be participants in this election since they are unregistered. Our only recourse, gentlemen, is through action by this Congress. This action could be taken in one of two ways.

1. By amendment to the Voting Rights Act of 1965. I would not, of course, presume to suggest the exact language of an amendment to this committee, but I would request that such an amendment provide that the benefits of this act apply to a political subdivision of a small enough size, such as the assembly district or preferably the election district, that would be of benefit to the Puerto Rican community in New York. I understand that the attorney general has been thinking in

terms of the county when he speaks of political subdivision. Certainly this kind of political subdivision is adequate for many of the rural areas of the South but I would call to your attention that the county of which the chairman of this committee is one of the Representatives, the County of Kings, which is only one of the counties of New York has over 3 million residents. The Puerto Rican community in this county, while considerable in number and larger than that of most counties of the South, forms less than 10 percent of the 3 million people involved. The only proper way in which the benefits of the legislation could be extended to insure the greatest protection of voting rights would be to provide that the 50-percent requirement of registration of eligible voters be applied to a small enough political subdivision, such as the election district. If there were sufficient time we would not hesitate to show that there are many election districts and some assembly districts in predominantly Puerto Rican areas where less than 50 percent of the eligible voters are registered.

By providing a small enough political subdivision you would not only be helping the Puerto Rican, you would be helping the purpose which President Johnson has been seeking. There are many urban areas of the South where the counties are so large that the Negro people who should be registered would constitute such a percentage of the total county as not to be beneficiaries of the provisions of this law.

2. Attorney General Katzenbach was reported in the New York Times, when he testified before this committee last Friday, to have stated that although he was sympathetic to and understood the difficulties of the Puerto Rican community, it was his judgment the present bill could not provide relief for the Puerto Rican. The news article continued as follows: "But Mr. Katzenbach told the Constitutional Subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee that he felt deeply about this situation. It is his view, he said, that the English language test disenfranchises 'many intelligent citizens' of Puerto Rican birth.

"It would be preferable, he said, if New York State corrected this obvious discrimination. But if the New York State Legislature did not act, he said, he is confident that Congress could.

"He expressed some doubt that the problem could be met under the authority of the 15th amendment, which forbids the denial or abridgment of the right to vote because of race or color.

"Presumably his doubt rested, first, on the question of whether Puerto Ricans could be covered by the words 'race' and 'color.' Second, there is no evidence, as there is in several southern States, that New York's literacy test was adopted to permit racial discrimination in registration."

I have already pointed out the reasons why it is unlikely that the Puerto Rican community in New York can expect any relief from legislation in New York State since the abolition would require an amendment to the constitution of New York State where the Puerto Rican would not have a voice in the voting. Accordingly, it is perfectly clear that if the relief is going to be provided it will have to come from this Congress. If the Attorney General understands the problem, is in sympathy with it, and wants to prevent the disenfranchisement of Puerto Ricans of New York State, then why is no action being taken by him? I ask on behalf of the Puerto Ricans of New York for the introduction of a companion bill to the Voting Rights Act of 1965, under the 14th amendment of the Constitution, which would take the action that New York State cannot and will not do, and would unequivocally declare the literacy test provision of the State of New York totally invalid and without effect. I ask that this be done now.

OPPORTUNITY FOR OUR PEOPLE—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 126)

The **SPEAKER** laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The promise of America is opportunity for our people. It must therefore be a matter of concern to all Americans when any of our fellow citizens is denied the chance to build a full life for himself and his family.

Yet this is the condition of life for millions of our fellow citizens in areas of distress scattered across the continent.

At a time of instant communication and swift transport it is difficult to realize how varied are the regions of this country. Abundance and opportunity, progress and hope are, however, not evenly spread over the land. The same diversity of conditions which contributes to the richness of our society and culture, also bears with harsh inequality on those in stricken stretches of America.

A wide array of programs and weapons has been called into action to make sure no American is denied opportunity because of his race, or lack of education, or the poverty of his birth.

As our people more fully realize their human potential, we must be sure that the economic potential in all areas and regions is also realized. Indeed, in order to be fully effective, education programs, health programs, the programs of the war on poverty, and many other activities require complementary efforts to promote sound economic conditions and the proper physical environment.

Opportunity should not be closed to any person because of the circumstances of the area in which he lives.

Moreover the distress or underdevelopment of any part of the country holds back the progress of the entire Nation. This has been one of the great lessons of the last 30 years. Region after region from the Deep South to the Far West has been brought into the mainstream of our economic life. The consequence has been increased vitality and strength, not only in those areas whose resources had been previously underemployed, but for the Nation as a whole. Nonetheless, much remains to be done.

A growing nation cannot afford to waste those resources, human and natural, which are now too often neglected and unused in distressed areas. We cannot afford the loss of buying power and of national growth which flow from widespread poverty. Above all, we cannot afford to shut out large numbers of our fellow citizens from the fulfillment of hope which is shared by the rest. For that would be the denial of the promise of America itself.

The troubles and the potentials of depressed areas which contain approximately 27 million people vary widely. They are scattered across almost every section of the country. But they share certain common characteristics.

Nearly always their population growth is well below the national average, and often it is declining. Large areas in Illinois, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and elsewhere have lost more than twenty percent of their population in the last decade, while America as a whole was increasing its numbers by almost as much.

This pattern of decline is a symptom of economic distress. For in these areas employment and income are far below the national average. Unemployment rates of 10 to 15 percent are not uncommon. In dozens of counties more than 50 percent of all families have annual incomes of less than $2,000.

Worst of all, the distressed area is usually caught in a web of circumstances which block progress and lead to further decline.

Young people are forced to leave school earlier to help support their families, thus depriving themselves of needed skills and knowledge. Many young people must leave families and homes behind them in search of greater opportunity, stripping the area of badly needed skill and energy. Older men and women tend to stay on, clinging to the communities and friends which have been part of their lives and which enrich their existence.

As income goes down, these areas are less and less able to support schools, hospitals, and other public facilities needed to train their people and otherwise equip them to meet the demands of modern life. They are often too poor to provide the public structure—from roads to water—needed to attract new business and new jobs. The result is a steadily mounting toll in human poverty and retardation of the Nation's progress.

To break this downward spiral, to restore vitality and forward motion to America's distressed areas, I recommend a program of area and regional economic development—focused upon the economic needs of distressed areas and aimed at providing the conditions which can lead to growth. This program will be based primarily upon the experience of the accelerated public works program, the Area Redevelopment Administration, and the Appalachian Regional Development Commission.

The economic development of distressed areas, like that of a nation, is an enormously complex process. It requires work and cooperation from both public and private enterprise. It requires partnership between officials at every level of government—local, county, State, and Federal. It demands attention to a wide diversity of development needs—from improved transportation and water supply to industrial incentives and public facilities. It means that the varied resources and abilities of each region must be harnessed in a concerted effort to build a solid economic base for increasing industry, bringing with it more jobs and higher income.

In this effort we build upon the invaluable experience of the experimental area redevelopment program carried on for the last 4 years.

First, ARA has shown that helping businessmen to expand or to build new plants, coupled with financial assistance to provide needed public facilities, can produce new jobs.

As of January 31, 1965, the Area Redevelopment Administration had approved 548 projects of which over 300 were in rural areas. These projects have and will assist in the creation of over 115,000 jobs. According to a recent study, more than three out of every four persons now working on ARA-assisted projects were not working full time prior to their present jobs. All of these jobs were in new, expanded or restored facilities.

Second, ARA has shown that the cost to the Government of creating these jobs is less than the cost of supporting these workers and their families through public assistance programs.

It has been estimated that, taking into account all outlays, the average nonreturnable one-time cost to the Federal Government for each job is about $800. More than this is saved in not having to pay unemployment compensation and welfare benefits to persons employed as a result of ARA activities. The cost is made once—the benefits continue as long as the jobs last.

Third, ARA has shown that people in our communities will work together in economic self-help programs.

Under the area redevelopment program, more than 1,000 local committees have been formed to work on overall economic development programs. Some of the programs are producing dividends without any other Federal aid whatsoever.

Fourth, ARA has shown that counties can be advantageously grouped together to promote cooperation on problems of mutual economic interest.

Under the area redevelopment program some 75 multicounty programs have been approved. The counties of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan, for example, are tackling common problems with their own regional organization called UPCAP. The counties of southeastern Ohio are jointly organized through Ohio University to assist in the growth of local industries. Northeastern Pennsylvania is working under the leadership of Wilkes College to plan and carry out an areawide economic development program.

Drawing on this past experience we can now move ahead with a long-range program of area and regional economic development to assist in restoring economic health to distressed areas of America.

BASIC PRINCIPLES

Under the new program three basic principles will guide our action.

First, we will devote maximum effort to providing the conditions under which our private enterprise system can provide jobs and increased income. It is up to private business to take advantage of improved conditions for making profits by expanding present businesses or starting new ones, thereby increasing opportunity for the people of the region.

Second, no Federal plan or Federal project will be imposed on any regional, State or local body. No area will be declared distressed by Federal decree. No economic development district will be designated unless the State and local people want it to be designated. No plan will be approved unless it also has the approval of State and local authorities. No programs or projects will be originated at the Federal level. The initiative, the ideas, and the request for assistance must all come to Washington, not from Washington.

Third, the Federal Government will seek full value from every dollar spent or loaned under this program. Every proposal will be tested to see if it offers substantial promise of increasing economic development commensurate with the Federal funds involved. Only if a project meets this test will it be approved. Over the years the increased economic activity stimulated by this program will return its cost many times to the Federal Treasury.

ORGANIZATION FOR DEVELOPMENT

A key feature of this new program is the proposal to group together distressed counties and communities in economically viable development districts. Planning and assistance will concentrate on the needs of the area as a whole, as well as on individual counties and towns. Moreover, for planning many programs it makes sense to work in terms of larger regions encompassing in some cases parts of two or more States.

This is merely the recognition of a simple fact. Neither distress nor the potential for development respects State, county, or community boundaries. The economies of many areas are an organic whole. Just as many counties have declined together, they must advance together if they are to advance at all.

For individual counties and communities are often not capable of individual growth. Their industry must draw upon workers from other areas, and this means educated and trained workers must be available. Factories in communities in other counties can offer employment and rising income to their people. Large scale public facilities can be built most economically if they are designed to serve the needs of a large area. Many other Federal programs, such as assistance in the construction of hospitals, can be carried on more effectively if they are consistent with a genuine, regionwide program of development.

Often places which are not themselves in distress can with help and stimulation provide new jobs for the people of a surrounding distressed region.

Grouping counties together will permit assistance to be concentrated on those communities and industries whose rapid development offers the most hope for all the people of a region.

Thus, we hope to work with regions which contain all the components of economic advance, unhampered by rigid boundaries.

The new organization for development will have four main components:

First, redevelopment areas: The counties and labor commuting areas which are the basic units of the region, and where employment and income figures reveal conditions of distress and provide a measure of progress.

Second, economic development districts: Organizations of distressed areas—generally multicounty in nature—which will work together on common problems and can sustain economic growth once the development process is started.

Third, action planning commissions for regions: Multistate regions where comprehensive, long-range economic planning can be carried out by joint Federal-State commissions, to solve economic problems too large or difficult to be dealt with on a local basis.

Fourth, economic development centers: The places where resources can be most swiftly and effectively used to create more jobs and higher income for the people of the surrounding area. These centers may or may not themselves be distressed. Successful development is frequently easier to achieve when a number of activities are located in a single community large enough to offer the advantages which flow from size itself. Clusters of industry tend to attract other industry. And such clusters offer the prospect of increased economic activity and improved economic health of the entire area.

To implement this design for development I recommend that the Secretary of Commerce be given authority to: (1) designate redevelopment areas on the basis of data relating to unemployment or income; (2) work with States to organize multicounty economic development districts; (3) include in such districts economic development centers not otherwise eligible for designation as redevelopment areas; and (4) invite and encourage States to establish multistate regional action planning commissions to prepare long-range action programs to improve the economic growth of the region.

This program, national in scope, is intended to aid those areas most in need of assistance throughout the country. Accordingly, it is necessary to provide objective criteria to determine those areas qualified for assistance under the program, and thus the bill contains measurable standards for eligibility based on either unemployment or median family income statistics. Qualifying unemployment data would be the same as in the Area Redevelopment Act. In addition, counties could qualify if the median family income is less than 40 percent of the national median.

Indian areas would be designated after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior.

When there has been a sudden plant shutdown or closing of a military installation, the Secretary would be authorized to designate areas for assistance if he determines that the area can be expected to become eligible within 3 years unless assistance is provided.

The program will contain standards which insure that aid is concentrated on areas of real need, and that it is being distributed on an objective basis.

INSTRUMENTS OF DEVELOPMENT

Our experience with various forms of assistance under ARA and the accelerated public works program has shown us ways to improve our techniques and our tools for providing economic growth.

DIRECT GRANT PROGRAM

I recommend a direct grant program for development facilities related to economic development and matched at 50 percent of the cost of the project. In addition, because of the long-term economic depression in many of the depressed areas, I am recommending authorization of supplementary grants to help the most needy communities to meet their matching share of Federal grant-in-aid programs. Additional Federal assistance up to 80 percent of the net project cost would be made available to communities unable to take advantage of regular Federal programs because of their inability to raise the required local share. These supplemental payments to needy communities would be limited to programs assisting in the construction or equipment of development facility projects, including those eligible for 50 percent grants under this proposed legislation.

An annual authorization of $250 million for grants for development facilities and supplemental payments is being requested.

LOAN PROGRAMS

The existing ARA program of loans for land, building, machinery, and equipment has provided loans at 4 percent interest, of up to 65 percent of the cost of the project for industrial or commercial facilities. As of January 31, 1965, 396 projects have been approved under this program amounting to an investment of $173 million in ARA funds.

Private capital has participated with the Federal Government to a great extent in these projects. All told, approximately $127 million has been invested in these projects from all non-Federal sources, of which some 300 private banking institutions have invested more than $40 million.

Nevertheless, we need to do more to encourage greater utilization of private capital in redevelopment projects. To this end, I propose that the Secretary of Commerce be authorized to reimburse approved borrowers 2 percentage points of the cost of interest to them for up to 10 years on money borrowed from private institutions for expansion or establishment of plants in redevelopment areas in accordance with the development programs.

This proposal will stimulate greater use of private capital in recovery and development. Moreover, it avoids tying up large blocks of Federal funds over long periods of time. The Federal Government's share of these new contracts during any one year would be limited to $5 million. This would facilitate and encourage $250 million of private investment annually in depressed areas.

I am also recommending that authority be granted to guarantee working capital loans up to 90 percent. These guarantees would be available to supplement other financial assistance under this program.

The present Area Redevelopment Act program of low-cost 40-year loans for development facilities would be continued largely unchanged under the new program.

These direct loans and loan guarantees would be available to firms where their activities promise to create increased long-term employment.

An annual authorization of $170 million is recommended for a revolving fund, which would include direct loans for commercial and industrial facilities, loans for development facilities, and reserve for working capital guarantees.

The present requirement in the Area Redevelopment Act that State or local public agencies provide 10 percent of the cost of industrial projects, and that local investors must wait until the Federal loan has been entirely repaid before receiving repayment of principal, has worked a hardship on many needy communities. Accordingly, I am recommending that this requirement be reduced to 5 percent of the project cost and that repayment be concurrent with repayment of the Federal loan. In exceptionally needy cases, the Secretary of Commerce would be authorized to waive the 5-percent requirement. However, in no case will there be a waiver of the requirement that at least 15 percent of the total project cost be invested as equity or on a lien subordinate to that of the Federal investment.

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE

It is not enough to simply help finance projects. These projects must be part of a comprehensive plan to build a viable economy. To do this we must provide technical assistance and encourage the formation of development organizations large enough to hire trained people to prepare comprehensive plans and carry them out. For these purposes, I am recommending the following new types of assistance:

Grants and technical assistance to Regional Action Planning Commissions to enable them to prepare long-range regional economic development programs within the context of overall industrial, transportation, recreation, and other natural resource planning. An annual authorization of $15 million is proposed for this purpose.

Grants and technical assistance to multicounty economic development districts for formulating overall economic development plans.

Additional Federal grants of 10 percent for development facility projects which are part of an approved district development plan, as a special incentive to encourage communities to work together.

Federal grants and loans for designated economic development centers in order that economic development districts will have resources sufficient to sustain their growth.

For the last two purposes I am recommending an authorization of $50 million. To allow ample time for the States to prepare well-thought-out action programs, no projects would be approved under this authorization until 1 year after enactment of the legislation.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT ORGANIZATION

This enlarged and redirected program of economic development will be administered by the Department of Commerce, which has also been responsible for the existing experimental program. The legislation I am proposing would create the position of Economic Development Administrator in that Department. The functions and powers of the existing Area Redevelopment Administration would be transferred to a successor organization to be created by the Secretary of Commerce to administer the new act.

Many other Federal programs also can contribute to the economic development of distressed areas. It is essential that these programs be closely coordinated to make sure resources are used with maximum effectiveness in reaching the common goal of a higher standard of living for the people of these regions. Therefore, I have directed the Secretary of Commerce to work closely with interested departments and agencies in achieving a coordinated Federal effort. It is especially important that this effort be carried forward in close cooperation with the Office of Economic Opportunity.

The antipoverty program will help people improve their ability to obtain and hold a job. This program is designed to increase the number of jobs available to those who want to work. Obviously both efforts are essential to the future growth of distressed areas. I intend to see that they work closely together toward the common objective.

CONCLUSION

There are three important things to remember about this program. First, it is designed to extend opportunity to those now deprived of a full chance to share in the blessings of American life. As such it has a call upon the moral conscience of every citizen.

Second, it will benefit all Americans. The experience of the last 30 years has shown conclusively that the increasing prosperity of any region of this country increases the prosperity of the Nation. We have truly become a national economy. Higher incomes for the people of Illinois or Arkansas mean increased markets for automobiles from Detroit and steel from Pittsburgh. Poverty in one area slows progress in other areas.

Third, the job can be done. We have the resources and the skill to extend American abundance to every citizen and every region of this land. This program will help give us the instruments to match our determination to eliminate poverty in America.

The conditions of our distressed areas today are among our most important economic problems. They hold back the progress of the Nation, and breed a despair and poverty which is inexcusable in the richest land on earth. We will not permit any part of this country to be a prison where hopes are crushed, human beings chained to misery, and the promise of America denied.

The conditions of our depressed areas can and must be righted. In this generation they will be righted.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 25, 1965.*

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE WYDLER AT FOURTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE OF AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR QUALITY CONTROL

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STAFFORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, recently the Long Island section of the American Society for Quality Control presented their fourth annual conference at Hofstra University in Hempstead, N.Y. The principal speaker was my colleague, JOHN W. WYDLER, who represents the Fourth Congressional District of New York, where the conference was held.

Representatives from all over the United States attended this conference, designed to cover a broad spectrum of interest involving management, engineering, and reliability. The conference was a great success and the speech given by my colleague, Congressman WYDLER, was praised both for its content and timeliness as to the future of American industrial precision and the Long Island area which it represents. I wish to enter it in the RECORD.

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE WYDLER

The American Society for Quality Control has been an increasingly important influence in the development of American technology. This is attested to by the rapid growth of your society, particularly the Long Island section, in numbers of members; and, more importantly, by the acknowledgment of your influence in the reliability of our military and space hardware, and the improved image of American goods and services throughout the world. I congratulate you on your efforts. They are in the finest American tradition—being voluntary, stressing individual initative and dedicated to making things better.

In the 89th Congress, which is now well underway, I have once again been elected to serve on the Science and Astronautics Committee of the House of Representatives. My committee has just completed several weeks of intensive briefings by officials of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and the National Aeronautics and Space Council in connection with the authorization of the NASA budget for fiscal year 1966. My remarks today will attempt to point up some directions which I see the space program taking and some possible new courses of action in which you in industry can be of assistance.

It seems to me that quality control and reliability have been shown to be a basic factor in the competition between the United States and Russia for space supremacy. Our program is designed to accomplish the three goals of contributing to national security, exploring space for scientific purposes, and achieving preeminence in space technology for international prestige. Since 1957 when the Russian sputnik thrust us abruptly into this competition, up to the present time and possibly well into the future, we have been working under a basic handicap of insufficient booster capability. In comparison with the Russian program, every experiment which we have devised has had to be accomplished with a limited payload weight. As a result, our equipments have had to reach a high state of reliability without the "luxury of redundancy" which greater booster power might afford.

It is not possible to make a detailed point-by-point comparison of the United States and Russian programs and arrive at any overall answer to the question as to who is ahead. Each country has areas of superiority. Certainly, the Russians have produced no program of applications satellites which would match our proven capability in communications, meterology, geodetics, and navigation. On the other hand, last year's three-man Russian space vehicle again demonstrated the substantial lead which they have in manned space flight. According to Dr. Charles Sheldon of the National Aeronautics and Space Council, the Russian backlog of experience in manned space flight is "still substantially greater than our own, possibly as great as 37 Mercury orbits versus about 280 sputnik cosmic ship orbits." The launching of our two-man Gemini next Tuesday heralds the beginning of a second accelerated phase of American manned flight. And the speed of development is shown by the fact that in the last few days the Russians have added 17 new orbits and walked in space. These developments add a new urgency to your mission.

The Russian capability to include redundancy is nowhere better illustrated than in the Voskhod vehicle and its "shirt sleeve" environment. Our concept of life-support system for astronauts has evolved from the military practice of high-altitude pressure suits. Although most of our pilots complain of the restrictions on movement inherent in these cumbersome garments, we have felt that the protection of the individual against leakage from the space capsule was so important that the personally fitted space suit was necessary. The Russians, having the booster power to launch a large roomy vehicle, are able to allow their cosmonauts the increased freedom of action of a shirt sleeve environment and in addition carry pressure suits onboard which could be donned in an emergency. Our Gemini and Apollo launch vehicles simply do not afford the weight-carrying ability for a backup system even if our astronauts had room within the capsule to struggle into the suits. Size is a factor in reliability—and the Russians are ahead.

Another aspect of quality control in the Russian and American programs may be gained from examination of the relative civilian technologies of the two countries. Frequent references appear in the Communist press as to the shoddiness of Russian goods such as telephones, washing machines, tractors, and TV sets. In 1950, according to a report by the Library of Congress, the Soviet Union began an intensive program to improve quality control but continuing complaints of disrupted factory schedules and high maintenance of consumer appliances indicate that progress has been very slow and disappointing. Of course, this deficiency in quality control in consumer goods may not carry over into the Russian space program for it is obvious that such a totalitarian regime can divert the best talents into high priority work for the Government. Soviet propaganda has given us a picture of virtual infallibility as far as their space program is concerned. Nevertheless, responsible U.S. officials have stated that the Soviet failure rate overall is somewhat like our own. No details are made available because of the classified nature of U.S. information. We do have public knowledge of 10 Soviet failures in escape missions contrasted with their 8 successful launches to lunar and planetary flight.

In comparison with Russia's poor reputation for reliability in commercial technical products, the United States entered the space age with a historical attitude which included mass production standards and planned obsolescence. These hallmarks of Western technology have proved, perhaps, to be as much of a drawback to success in space as the Russian shoddiness. However, it is testimony to the diligence with which your profession has pursued its business that the United States has achieved at least as good a record of success-to-failure ratio as has Russia—and without the aforementioned booster power.

An impressive American achievement seems to be in the making in the so-called guaranteed reliability concept. The appearance of quality control and reliability specifications concurrent with the increased usage of incentive contracting may be the most significant development in industry-Government relations in some time. I am aware of the conclusion of the Aerospace Industry Association Committee on Electric Systems reliability which was published recently. It states that "Once the problems of describing and measuring reliability have been solved, the use of incentive contracts for reliability may increase rapidly." I believe this will mean a marked improvement in the management of federally funded research as well as increased profits for industry.

Another excellent result of recent efforts in American quality control is the renaissance of craftsmanship and pride of workmanship which seemed to have been lost in our industry with the advent of automation and production-line methods. I am referring here to the basic concept, sometimes called the "zero defects" program. The goal of this program, to prevent all defects, will have benefits not only for the Government and industry but for the individual worker.

The zero-defects program is a good example of how concepts, devices, and processes developed in our space program can have a salutary effect on the entire American economy. These fallout or spinoff applications are a valuable byproduct of Government research and are used, to some extent, to justify large-scale Federal technology programs. However, it is becoming increasingly clear that the fallout benefits cannot be obtained merely by Government efforts to disseminate information. The successful spinoff is more often characterized by a degree of cleverness and innovation in the user industry which is quite comparable to the ingenuity which went into the original discovery.

An example of Federal information dissemination efforts are the Technical Information Centers set up by the NASA. We need one of these on Long Island. I will continue my best efforts to secure one for our area.

More specific examples of the adaptation of defense-space quality-control techniques to commercial products are being brought to light every day. Household applicances manufacturers have often incurred the wrath of customers over products which failed after a short time or required substantial maintenance. Computer companies which leased their equipment and were responsible for the maintenance themselves also began to examine their reliability policies. With the orientation of business becoming increasingly sympathetic to the customer, companies such as Raytheon, Westinghouse, Bell Telephone, and IBM have paid considerably more attention to the time element in reliability and have increased their product life. The result of this is already shown in increased profits. Management has informed its engineers that it is just as important to make reliable products as it is to invent new ones. And the technical skills required are comparable. The profit motive is having its effect on reliability control.

I would now like to turn to the future direction of the space program and indicate at least one area where the prediction of reliability has a substantial bearing on our policies. The applications satellite program is one of our proudest achievements. It has made possible a unique combination of Government and free enterprise in the Communications Satellite Corp. Other future applications may also be developed and operated by private industry. One such device which may prove feasible in the next year is the navigation satellite. A report of the Joint Navigation Satellite Committee will be made this summer and may recommend further development of an operational system. Congress would then be asked to establish a policy for the commercial use of the satellite.

These commercial application satellites must be shown to have a reasonable chance of profit before they will be accepted over ground-based alternatives. The possibility of profit is also a turning point in the decisions of the Government to subsidize the project and in industrial participation in it. Since the launch costs of these satellites make up a large share of the total funding, the profit becomes extremely dependent upon useful life in orbit. For example, a navigation satellite would compete with various ground-based systems. If chosen for eventual development, the costs would have to be recovered by a charge to the user, the individual ship or aircraft owner who would install receiving equipment. The profits from this charge would depend greatly on the lifetime of each satellite. Once the system was placed in orbit, most of the costs to the operator would be over until a replacement system had to be launched. If it seemed unlikely that sufficient reliability could be attained to insure profit, then the decision to go ahead with the development on a commercial basis might have to be deferred. One suggested design for a navigational satellite set a goal of at least 3 years' life in orbit for economic feasibility. Certain currently available components showed a mean time to failure of only 12,000 hours or about 1½ years so that these components would have to be duplicated in the satellite. This is feasible but adds a weight penalty to the proposed system.

Another instance of reliability in the space program is provided by the recent successful launching of the Pegasus, a meteroid detection satellite. The hearings before my committee brought out the fact that this experiment is really a "hitchhiker" on the Saturn I booster while the latter is in development. However, the confidence in our knowledge of the meteroid hazard which will be developed by the statistically large body of data from the three planned Pegasus launchings could pay off many times if it leads to more reliable design of our future space vehicles with minimum weight meteroid shielding. However, the need for three such shots has yet to be proven to my satisfaction.

Thus, quality control, reliability engineering, and careful design can combine to give our space program the maximum potential for the dollars which we invest.

The success of NASA's recent space accomplishments attest to the benefits to be derived from a vigorous and stringent quality assurance program. With respect to NASA launch vehicles, the success records of several workhorses deserve particular mention: 8 Saturn launches without a failure, 11 solid-fueled Scout successes in the last 12 flights, 28 successful Atlas flights in the last 29 attempts, and Thor-Delta has placed 8 of 9 Tiros weather satellites into successful orbit. Spacecraft quality and reliability has shown substantial improvement. NASA has a current record of approximately 90 percent successful spacecraft in spite of the fact that second and third generation spacecraft are far more complex and contain many more parts than the first primitive models of a few years back. Also, the useful life of unmanned satellites has been increased to the point that operation for periods of a year or more is now the rule rather than the exception.

The direction of our space program is easy for me to tell you about—up until 1970, at least. That is because we are committed to the Apollo program. The attempt at a manned lunar landing is the only approved space program which NASA has. This is a peculiarity of our national policy which needs substantial thought in the immediate future. Many of our research and development programs such as the nuclear-electric power source SNAP-8, the liquid hydrogen fuel M-1 engine and the 260-inch solid-propellent motor, are caught in a "requirements merry-go-round." This reasoning prevents their full development until a specific mission requirement is pinned down.

On the other hand, our space planners have not come forward to Congress with any requests for post-Apollo missions. It is time such plans were formulated and accepted. The long-range leadtime of many advanced research and technology programs makes it obvious that such plans should be forthcoming soon. To a great extent, these plans depend upon an extension of what is possible with present and predictable future equipments. Since over 70 percent of NASA's research is done in extramural laboratories, it is up to industry to continually generate ideas for space planning and I know that many of the companies represented here today spend substantial amounts of their own money on such original proposals. But the synthesis of a national program consistent with our goals and the wise allocation of resources can only be finalized by the Federal agencies involved.

The interim report of the Federal Council for Science and Technology for the year 1963—which was just recently issued—states the need for long-range planning because of "a foreseeable reduction in the rate of growth of Federal expenditures for development, primarily as a result of the evolution of the programs of NASA and the Department of Defense." The significant phrase is "reduction in the rate of growth." No one believes that the space program is going to come to a halt with the accomplishment of the Apollo lunar landing. However, we must proceed immediately to formulate our plans for post-Apollo programs in terms of major NASA goals in order to avoid serious lag in long leadtime technology. In addition, such planning can prevent manpower and resource dislocations and establish guidelines for industry in seeking markets and demands outside the Federal Government for its products. There will be increasing Federal funding of research and development programs in other areas such as environmental pollution, desalination processes, transportation, and oceanography. We must get Long Island into this field and do it in a major way. Projections for the entire Federal Government are extremely complex and it will take a new alertness on the part of industry to keep up to date with rapidly shifting trends in science.

The future of Long Island industry in the continuing space program will depend on how well its leaders participate in the formulation of new NASA plans and other national technology programs and most importantly—how we work together. Increased effort will be required to equip your companies and focus your talents for successful competition bidding. We hear a great deal today about regional differences in distribution of Federal contracts. These inequities are real and we have felt some of them here in Long Island. Nevertheless, the status of your industries is much better than those in some of the other areas of the country which have yet to make a significant contribution to space technology. The chairman of my House Committee on Science and Astronautics, Mr. MILLER, of California, recently reiterated the firm position that the NASA program cannot become a "WPA." This means that the only criterion for placing Federal contracts should be the competence of the bidder. Long Island need have no fears of losing contracts to California or Florida if we remain alert and well informed as to Federal plans and continue to strive for the goals of quality and reliability which are constantly promulgated by the American Society for Quality Control—and if we work together. The excellence of our products and services will continue to secure a leading role in the U.S. space program.

Finally, I wish to stress quality control of man himself—for man is a part of the system.

This is so whether he is the man in the capsule or the man on the ground building the capsule.

The man must be strong not only in mind and body—but most importantly in spirit as well.

That is America's ace-in-the-hole.

The recent Russian feats have to me primarily a military significance. They constitute a continuing threat to our national security.

In a broad sense then, our survival depends on quality control.

This is the challenge that faces you. I am confident you will be equal to the task.

THE REPUBLICAN HOUSING AND URBAN RENEWAL BILL

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, for the second year in a row the Republican members of the House Special Housing Subcommittee have developed and presented a major housing and urban renewal bill. The original announcement of this step this year was made on February 19, 1965.

The gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer] introduced H.R. 6623 on March 23, and my own bill, H.R. 6501, was introduced on March 18, 1965.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Fino], and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Harvey] have advised me that they will shortly introduce companion measures to these bills.

I am pleased to present a section-by-section analysis of the Republican housing and urban renewal bill for the information of my colleagues, who may wish to cosponsor it, and others.

Section-by-Section Analysis of the Housing and Redevelopment Act of 1965

Section 1, Short title: The bill would be cited as the "Housing and Redevelopment Act of 1965."

TITLE I—LOW-RENT HOUSING IN PRIVATE ACCOMMODATIONS

Section 101, housing requirements and rental payments:

This section provides a supplementary form of low-rent housing, utilizing existing privately owned housing. It identifies and defines such housing as that which is decent, safe, and sanitary, so certified by the local housing authority from quarters made available voluntarily by private owners. No more than 10 percent of the available units in a building could be used, except in the case of buildings with small numbers of units.

This section provides that the selection of tenants would be a joint function of the local housing agency and the property owner. Rents are to be negotiated between the local housing agency and the property owner, and payments of rent by tenants would go to the local housing agency who would pay that amount plus the local subsidy to the landlord.

Section 102, contract authority and number of units: This section would provide for a 2-year program of 30,000 units per year, 60,000 total, and for the payment of the subsidy under such contracts as are written in keeping with that of other public housing.

Section 103, income limits for occupancy and rents:

This section would provide the necessary language to allow the new program to conform to the present program in terms of the above.

The idea for a rent certificate or rent supplement approach to low-income housing was first suggested by Republicans in their housing bill of last year. A specific reference to the Republican bill is contained in the House Banking and Currency Committee report on the Housing Act of 1964, with a notation that this deserves further consideration. Since then the idea has gained widespread bipartisan support, and the administration has also given consideration to this approach.

The program, successfully carried out in Toronto, Canada, and on an experimental basis in other areas, has the advantage of providing immediate housing for those low-income citizens now faced with long waiting lists for conventional public housing. It is estimated that there are now sufficient conventional public housing units already authorized by Congress, and as yet not under construction, to occupy the Public Housing Administration's efforts in this field for the next 5 years. The rent supplement approach would allow PHA to correct this fault in its operations at the same time supplying as much or more needed housing than it has supplied on a yearly basis during the past decade or more.

At the same time, cost of the rent certificate operations would be far less than for conventional public housing, and the property used would remain on the local tax rolls, paying full property taxes. This approach to housing low-income families would stimulate rehabilitation, which in turn would enable property owners to meet housing and building code requirements. Together, these two operations would perform the joint function of eliminating slums while preserving neighborhoods.

TITLE II—URBAN RENEWAL AND REDEVELOPMENT

Section 201, study of housing and building codes, zoning, and tax policies:

The Congress finds that in order to determine how (1) property owners and private enterprise can be encouraged to serve as large a part of the housing need of the Nation as they can, and (2) Federal, State, and local governmental assistance can be directed to place greater reliance than in the past on local property owners and private enterprise for such purposes there is a need to study housing and building codes, zoning, tax policies, and development standards. The Federal Housing Administrator is directed to make such a study and submit a report on it to the Congress within 1 year of the enactment of this section. Such additional funds as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section are authorized.

This section builds on the Republican suggestion of last year for a study of tax policy, as well as the recommendation of the Joint Economic Committee's report of 1964 (p. 13), and is broadened to include areas mentioned by the President in his message on the cities. Unlike the President's study proposal, this report would be made directly to Congress, and its findings would thus be assured of publication. Only last year a Presidential Task Force on Housing and Urban problems was widely mentioned in the press as being in operation, yet no report regarding its study and findings has been released to the public or to Congress.

Section 202, conformity with minimum housing standards for welfare recipients: Section 101(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is amended to provide that the use of Federal funds under title I, IV, VII, X, XI, XIV, or XVI of the Social Security Act for payment, including rents, for housing accommodations be conditioned upon the establishment or designation of a State or local authority or authorities which shall be responsible for developing and maintaining standards of health and safety for such housing accommodations and upon such accommodations conforming to the minimum standards housing code, laws, and regulations relating to health, sanitation, and safety of buildings required by section 101(a) of the Housing Act of 1949.

The problem of social security recipients living in substandard housing has long concerned Congress, as well as leaders at the State, county, and municipal government level, as well as civic and religious leaders. The sudsidy of slum housing through Federal public welfare payments amounts, it has been estimated, to nearly $750 million a year.

The sad and terrible story of the slums occupied by our public welfare recipients was told by Edgar May, Pulitzer Prize winner, in his book, "The Wasted Americans," published by Harper & Row, who wrote that: "Probably more than 1 billion welfare dollars were paid to the order of landlords in the United States in 1962." This includes the largest unpublicized Government subsidy in the Nation. For, in too many instances, it quietly subsidizes slums. In part, it constitutes the premium payments of a national housing shortage that is most acute among the poor.

Section 202 is similar to section 4 of H.R. 5839 introduced by our distinguished colleague, the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. Mills] in the 88th Congress in response to the President's message on the problems of the elderly.

Section 203, establishment of priority for residential projects, and a loan program for profitable commercial redevelopment:

This section would amend section 102 of the Housing Act of 1949 by adding at the end a new subsection which would provide that in connection with any project on land which is to be redeveloped for nonresidential and nonpublic use, the Federal Urban Renewal Commissioner would be authorized to make loans instead of grants to municipalities or local public agencies. Such loans would be in such amounts not exceeding two-thirds of the aggregate net project cost, and would bear interest at a rate of not less than the going Federal rate plus one-half of 1 percent; except that such a loan would bear no interest for any period prior to the date on which the land involved is sold or otherwise disposed of by the municipality or local public agency. No part of any such loan would be required to be repaid during any year unless the real property tax revenues derived during such year from the redeveloped property are in excess of the average annual real property tax revenues which are derived from the same property during the 5 years immediately preceding condemnation of such property. The Commissioner would require repayment of no less than 20 percent of the increase in tax revenues for any particular area.

Financial assistance would not be extended with respect to any urban renewal area which is not predominantly residential in character and which, under the urban renewal plan therefor, is not to be redeveloped for predominantly residential or public uses unless the governing body of the local public agency certifies to the URA Commissioner and he finds that all residential redevelopment necessary or appropriate in the community is completed, under construction, or planned for.

The pressure for commercial redevelopment funds has often resulted in the neglect of true housing needs. As of March 1964, Prof. William G. Grigsby, of the University of Pennsylvania, found that 25 percent of the communities receiving Federal aid had no residential reuse projects, and another 25 percent had less than 50 percent in residential reuse. As of April 1964, statistics show that a city as large as Cleveland, Ohio, had 56 percent of its funds in nonresidential use projects, despite rent strikes, a 221(d)(3) failure, and other evidences of housing neglects. The priority for residential housing is clearly needed in the law.

At the same time, private enterprise has demonstrated that even without urban renewal assistance, profitable commercial redevelopment is possible. The loan program envisioned by the bill would require no repayment without an increase in real property tax revenue from the project, the justification for most such projects, and thus would continue to subsidize those projects needing such assistance. Although the URA Commissioner could set a repayment schedule above the minimum of 20 percent of the tax revenue increase, we expect that the city under all circumstances would reap the great majority of the benefits of the increased tax revenues. To ask the cities to make a minimum effort to repay where they can afford to do so, however, seems appropriate in light of the fact that the homeowner, tenant, and small businessman is required to repay his loan in full under the rehabilitation loan sections of the Housing Act of 1964, and the home improvement loan sections of the Housing Act of 1961.

Section 204, priority for low- and middle-income housing in urban renewal areas: Section 105(b) of the Housing Act of 1949 would be amended by this section to provide that at least 50 percent of any housing which may be constructed in any urban renewal project would be designed for occupancy by persons from the lower middle-income, and low-income segments of the population as determined by the local public agency in accordance with regulations prescribed by the URA Commissioner, and that the rentals, sales, or other charges to be established for living accommodations in the housing so designed and made available will not exceed the level which such persons can reasonably be expected to pay.

Concern for the present overemphasis on luxury housing and commercial redevelopment was expressed from both sides of the aisle in the debate on the Housing Act of 1964 in the House. A study by Professor Grigsby, of the University of Pennsylvania, concluded that only 20 percent of the $3 billion allocated for urban renewal so far has been used to provide lower income family shelter. This section would allow for an economic mixture of rental and sales housing with sufficient opportunity for profit to attract redevelopers, yet would place the priority where it belongs.

Section 205, relocation of displacees from urban renewal areas: This section would require a feasible method for the temporary relocation of individuals, families, and business concerns displaced from urban renewal project areas, and the provision in other areas not generally less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities at rents or prices within the financial means of the displacees. A further provision requires that the project shall be carefully staged to insure that persons are not displaced any more rapidly than they can be relocated, that the relocation will be carried out with a minimum of hardship to those displaced, with particular emphasis on devices designed to facilitate continued operation of the business concerns to be displaced, such as staggered displacement of such concerns, reduced rents, and so on.

The Commissioner shall require, within a reasonable time prior to the actual relocation of any displacee, a certification from the local public agency that the requirements of this section have been complied with, and a certification that each dwelling unit used for the relocation of any displacee has been inspected and is in full compliance with the applicable housing and building codes. If the URA Commission finds that the local public agency is not complying with any such requirement, or that any part of the housing and building accommodations so required are not actually available no further assistance shall be made available by the URA with respect to such urban renewal project until such noncompliance ends. Business concerns displaced would be accorded a priority of opportunity to return to and relocate in such urban renewal area.

One of the major areas of failure and hardship in urban renewal has been relocation. Studies by the General Accounting Office, the Connecticut Advisory Committee on Civil Rights, academic and private sources have disclosed relocation into other slum areas. There is evidence that relocation officials do not have sufficient information on those displaced from an urban renewal area, with relocation assistance often starting too late to aid those already moved away. In some cases, a lower standard has been used to judge the fitness of relocation housing than the standard used to justify the urban renewal project in the first place. Small business failures have averaged 35 percent from urban renewal displacement, according to the staff study of the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition of the House Public Works Committee. In another study prepared for the Small Business Administration by Brown University, many businesses were found relocating in areas as bad or worse than those they were displaced from. The Select Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives showed that virtually all of the 45,000 Negro enterprises are located in depressed urban residential neighborhoods, and an unusually large number of these are displaced by urban renewal.

Republican proposals adopted into the Housing Act of 1964, which recognized for the first time in either law or regulation the responsibility for business relocation assistance, are a start. But much more remains to be done. Recently new statistics have been published by the Housing and Home Finance Agency claiming improvements in relocation procedures, but 20 families out of every 100 relocated ending in slums, and 35 business failures out of every 100 businesses displaced, are still too high to be tolerated, given the original purpose of urban renewal, as well as its glowing promises. Of particular importance is a provision for more thorough verification of decent, safe, and sanitary relocation housing at the time of relocation, as recommended by the Connecticut Advisory Committee on Civil Rights. A simple process of certification that relocation housing was not in violation of any housing, building, health, or safety codes would provide additional protection, and promote code enforcement and compliance. Since the bulk of those being displaced are small businesses and low- and moderate-income families, a priority for low- and moderate-income housing in urban renewal projects, and a small business lease guarantee program, as suggested in other sections of this bill, would be particularly appropriate.

Section 206, prohibition against writedown on land to be used for profitable commercial redevelopment, except in case of displacees: This would amend section 105 of the Housing Act of 1949 by adding at the end thereof a new subsection providing that no real property acquired or held by the local public agency in connection with the project shall be sold for commercial redevelopment at a price less than the fair market value of the same quantity of land used for purposes for which such land is to be used in parts of the community other than an urban renewal area, unless the sale is to a person who owned, rented, or leased commercial property within that community, and who was forced to relocate from such property as a result of Government acquisition.

Section 207, rehabilitation of structures in urban renewal areas:

Rising national criticism has concentrated on the penchant of local planning and urban renewal officials for the acquisition and razing, with the aid of URA funds, of perfectly sound buildings. Under this section no structure shall be acquired, demolished, removed, or otherwise disposed of under an urban renewal plan if (a) such structure can be economically improved or modified to meet the requirements reasonably established by the local public agency for integration into the plan for the redevolpment or rehabilitation of the project area, and (b) the owner or lessee of such structure promptly agrees, and presents satisfactory evidence that he is able, to make such improvements or modifications (including the modifications necessary to develop the property in accordance with any design criteria and objectives which may have been established for the project area) within such period of time as the local public agency determines to be reasonable. For the purposes of clause (b) above, the owner of record of any property shall be given first priority to improve, modify, or develop such property and the lessee (if any) shall have second priority.

This section would underscore the intent of the Congress expressed last year in the Housing Act of 1964 when it adopted the Republican proposals for priority for rehabilitation over clearance, and a new low interest rehabilitation loan plan. It would also be entirely in line with the comments by President Johnson in this year's message for "intensive rehabilitation" on a neighborhood scale.

A further provision of this section requires that the Housing Administrator must be furnished evidence that the applicable standards used for finding and declaring an area suitable for urban renewal shall, in the case of housing, building, health, and public safety codes and regulations, be in accordance with the housing, building, health, and public safety codes and regulations of the locality. The need for such a provision is shown by the GAO reports to Congress that localities use one standard for declaring an area suitable for urban renewal, and a lower one for relocating displacees into other areas.

Section 208, requirements of redevelopment in accordance with the urban renewal plan:

In many cities, after an urban renewal plan is launched, real property acquired, and residential and business buildings razed, the area lies vacant, sometimes for years, at a great loss to property tax revenues.

This is true in Washington's southwest urban renewal project, where a great deal of land has lain idle and vacant for 10 years. Twenty-three thousand persons lived in this area before urban renewal, 76 percent of whom were Negro, according to published reports, and most of these residents of the area were in the low and lower middle-income categories. The area now is more than 90 percent white under the city's highly publicized urban renewal program. Land in this area has lain idle for 10 years.

Once cleared, land in urban renewal projects in a number of cities has been used for parking lots while private developers have been sought. In other cases the plan for which the land was acquired has had to be scuttled, because a private developer could not be found willing and able to develop the property in line with the original plan. Washington's southwest urban renewal project is typical of this situation also, because the 530-acre project was acquired and promises given to provide that 40 percent of the housing units in the area would rent for $17 a room or less. After acquisition, displacement, and bulldozing, a new plan was substituted which provides rental apartments up to $500 a month, prime office space, and sales type housing up to $75,000 and more. Few of the former residents and property owners and businessmen of the area have been able to return to it, because of financial reasons.

This section attempts to forestall such problems by providing that no new contract for loan or capital grant under this title shall be entered into with any local public agency unless the LPA shall have furnished satisfactory evidence that the redevelopment of project areas previously approved have been undertaken and carried out in accordance with the urban renewal plans and with the terms of such contracts. In any case where contracts for more than 50 percent of the land required under the plan have not been entered into within 3 years after the date of final approval of the project no new contract for loan or capital grant under this title shall be entered into with any local public agency until contracts for more than 50 percent of the land acquired for redevelopment have been negotiated by the LPA.

Section 209, requirement that at least 30 percent of funds be used for code enforcement and rehabilitation projects: This section would provide a floor under the rehabilitation and code enforcement provisions of the Housing Act of 1949 by requiring that at least 30 percent of the aggregate amount of grants and loans contracted for under this title and under section 312 of the Housing Act of 1964 shall be for projects which involve primarily code enforcement and rehabilitation.

Last year, Congress enacted several provisions of the Housing Act of 1964 which dealt with rehabilitation and code enforcement, based on provisions in the Republican housing bill. The President cited these sections particularly in signing the Housing Act of 1964, and this year he has called for increased effort in the area of code enforcement and rehabilitation. Unfortunately, the administrators of the program have failed to respond adequately to the challenge. No funding of last year's $50 million authorization for the rehabilitation loan program was requested in the final supplemental appropriations bill last year. Regulations regarding either the loan program or code enforcement urban renewal projects have been unnecessarily slow in developing. Since commercial renewal has been allocated, by law, 30 percent of the available funds, it seems only logical to allocate, by law, at least that amount of available funds for the much more productive and rewarding code enforcement and rehabilitation-oriented projects. Prevention of blight, the preservation of neighborhoods, and the more economical and widespread use of the tools for code enforcement and rehabilitation are steps to which we must adhere with action as well as words.

Section 210, facilities whose cost will be recovered out of revenues: This section deals with a problem which was revealed in a June 1962 GAO review of noncash grant-in-aid credits allowed for publicly owned parking facilities and the position of the Housing and Home Finance Agency in the matter.

The GAO suggested to Congress that it "may wish to consider enacting legislation which would amend the Housing Act of 1949 to exclude from noncash grants-in-aid all publicly owned facilities to the extent that the capital costs of such facilities are contemplated to be recovered out of revenues derived from their operations." An amendment to this effect has not been adopted thus far.

In its 1962 report to Congress the GAO disclosed that "In connection with certain slum clearance and urban renewal projects, URA has tentatively allowed noncash grant-in-aid credits amounting to $9.3 million for certain land and construction costs applicable to six publicly owned parking facilities. The cities where the facilities are located plan to recover, out of revenues derived from the operations, the entire costs of the parking facilities. The effect of allowing these noncash grants-in-aid will be that the cities will be reimbursed in amounts in excess of the actual costs of the facilities. The entire costs, totaling about $12 million, will be recovered through user charges, and, in addition, about $6 million will be contributed by the Federal Government as a result of the grants-in-aid being included in the project."

Dr. Robert C. Weaver, the HHFA Administrator, advised the Congress at the time that: "Special problems have arisen with respect to parking facilities because of the extent to which they are frequently revenue producing and because they provide a service which is often similar to that provided by private enterprise. We believe that these problems would be met by the enactment of the enclosed draft legislation which would reduce the noncash credit allowable with respect to publicly owned parking facilities by that portion of their total cost which is anticipated to be recovered from revenues."

Section 211, streets and other facilities only partly benefiting the project area: The General Accounting Office recommended to Congress a change in section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 to clarify the minimum amount that a facility should benefit the project to be declared eligible as a noncash grant-in-aid. The GAO recommendation followed a finding that many of the facilities tentatively allowed by the Urban Renewal Administration as noncash grants-in-aid were actually ineligible, or the amount of credit allowed, based on the benefit to the project, has been excessive. The Urban Renewal Administration agreed with the GAO recommendation. This section would write the GAO recommendation into law.

Section 212, noncash local grants-in-aid; facilities financed with other Federal funds: At present, no part of a public improvement or facility that is financed by Federal funds or subsidy can be included in the local noncash grant-in-aid which is the local share of an urban renewal project. This section would provide for an exception in the case of the regular Federal payment to the District of Columbia.

Section 213, noncash local grants-in-aid; facilities constructed without notification or prior to Federal recognition of project: This section would provide that no public improvement or facility could be included as part of the noncash local grant-in-aid if it had been begun 3 or more years prior to Federal authorization for assistance to the urban renewal project, without notification to the administrator. In recent years, the purpose of allowing noncash local grants-in-aid has been distorted to the point where many cities pay very little in cash, and many of the projects allowed as noncash contributions to the local share of the project were started years prior to any thought of the use of urban renewal for the area. This section would set a 3-year limitation in place of the discretionary provisions now in the law.

Section 214, definition of local public agency: This section would provide that the local public agency involved in carrying out the local effort for urban renewal be directly responsible to the local or State government. At present, the local public agency is independently authorized by State statute, and too often does not work in harmony with the local government, and cannot be held responsible by the electorate.

Section 215, rehabilitation loans: This section would provide for an additional authorization of $250 million over a 2-year period for the Republican rehabilitation loan program begun last year. The loans are low-interest loans designed to help the tenants, homeowners, and small businessmen in urban renewal areas renew their own property rather than be subject to clearance. Although this program was cited by many from both sides of the aisle in the House and Senate debates on the Housing Act of 1964, and was praised by the President in signing the bill, and although the President this year has called for an additional effort in the area of rehabilitation and code enforcement, the Johnson administration has not requested any new authorization for this program.

This section would also provide a $5 million experimental program, out of the above authorization, for deteriorating areas not yet classified as urban renewal areas, using the same type of rehabilitation loan. These so-called gray areas, if acted upon early enough, could be prevented from turning into more serious problems. It is the intent of this section, coupled with other provisions of this bill, to fulfill the goals expressed by the House Banking and Currency Committee in its report on the Housing Act of 1964, when it said:

"The committee believes that this low-interest rehabilitation loan program, coupled with those provisions of this bill which strengthen and emphasize the role of code enforcement by the communities, and authorize urban renewal projects which consist entirely or substantially of a program of intensive code enforcement, can substantially assist in eliminating and preventing the development and spread of slums and blight without the use of urban renewal capital grant funds."

TITLE III—FHA MORTGAGE INSURANCE PROGRAMS

Section 301, FHA mortgage financing for veterans: This section would provide for a mortgage insurance program for veterans who have not used their eligibility under the GI program. The mortgages are limited to one-family residences, 100 percent of $20,000, and 85 percent of any value in excess of $20,000, up to the maximum of $30,000 for FHA insured mortgages. This would provide assurance that armed service personnel, now and in the future, would have their contributions recognized, in case the present program under the Veterans' Administration should continue to be phased out.

Section 302, mortgage insurance for housing in outlying areas: This section would provide for an increase in the amount that may be insured under section 203(i) of the National Housing Act from $11,000 to $15,000. It would extend to private enterprise the same insurance ceiling now available to the Farmers Home Administration. Section 203(i) is the best section of those available under the Federal Housing Administration for financing rural homes. Industry is cooperating, but rural residents want and many can afford more house than can be built for $11,000.

The Farmers Home Administration's direct loans on nonfarm properties for nonfarmers average about $14,000, and are an expensive item in the Federal budget. By raising this artificial limitation, the resources of private enterprise can be put to work, providing greater assistance at lower cost. The original justification for the present limit was that an extra one-half percent servicing fee was allowed. This fee is no longer permitted, but the ceiling has never been allowed to rise to a level where the program could be effective.

Section 303, general FHA mortgage insurance authorization: This section would provide FHA with a continuing right to insure up to the amount of insurance it has in force as of October 1, 1965. It contrasts with the present law which denies to FHA the right to insure after September 30, 1965. The latter provision was little noticed when proposed and passed in 1961. It was inserted into the Housing Act of 1961 in order to hold FHA hostage for other programs which do not have its widespread appeal and acceptance. The result is that if these other programs are not extended, then FHA is dead as well.

The agency, faced with a declining natural market for FHA insurance, but with a strong economic demand for its services, does not need additional authorization for its insurance program. What it can use is its present right to insure. At its present 30 year age, the mortgages being paid off every year are sufficient, if it is allowed to reuse the insurance retired for new risks, to keep it in business at the pleasure of Congress.

Section 304, mortgage insurance for low and moderate income families: This section would provide for an extension of the low and moderate income mortgage insurance program, under FHA, authorized in section 221(f) of the National Housing Act, from 1965 to 1967. It is of particular importance to continue this program in light of a need for a renewed emphasis on low and moderate income housing in urban renewal areas.

TITLE IV—OTHER FEDERAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

Section 401, college housing loans: This section would provide for a continuation of the successful college housing loan program at its present rate through 1966, and provide for a lowering of the interest rate. The present interest rate, pegged to the average cost of Government borrowing, has risen sufficiently since the enactment of this program to have a braking effect on the use of the program. The college housing need, however, continues, and rather than fall back on more costly Government grants, it is preferable to lower the cost of the loans to the institutions.

Section 402, direct loans to provide housing for the elderly and the handicapped: This section would provide for a continuation of a program which has received widespread bipartisan support. It would remove the dollar limitation on the funds available and substitute instead a cutoff date of June 30, 1969. As in the case of the college housing loans, the interest rate would be lowered, to eliminate the present practice of having the increased cost reflected in higher rents. This was obviously not the intent of Congress, and the lower interest rate will again allow a valuable program to continue without the need to substitute a more costly one in its place.

TITLE V—COMPENSATION OF CONDEMNEES

This title was first offered last year in the Republican housing proposals. It is a recognition of the fact that condemnation awards have not been sufficient for many displaced tenants and property owners. In particular, the small businessman has been inadequately assisted, contributing heavily to the average failure rate of 35 percent for those displaced by urban renewal. The few changes made last year were recognized by the Senate Housing Committee as being accepted on a trial basis pending the study by the Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition of the House Public Works Committee. A full review was promised in 1965. The subcommittee's staff report has been completed and published with the suggestion that other committees of Congress, according to their jurisdiction, should look into this field. No new legislation has been offered by the administration in this area.

This title now contains many suggestions of the staff study mentioned above, and they are noted in the section-by-section analysis. In addition, we have again proposed the use of replacement cost as a measurement of an equitable reward. It is the first comprehensive compensation legislation to be introduced in Congress. According to the Real Property Acquisition Subcommittee staff study, some 66,000 families and individuals, and 13,000 businesses, per year, will be displaced by urban renewal and other housing programs in the future. This is ample evidence of the need for further congressional action.

Section 501, declaration of policy.

Section 502, definitions.

Section 503, land acquisition policy.

This section would provide that, as a condition to Federal assistance, each applicant for Federal aid would be required to follow certain procedural practices relating to the acquisition of land or other property. These provisions include: a stress on negotiated settlement; prior appraisal and offer; compensation for damage to the remainder of the property, or the acquisition of the whole piece if the owner would be left with an uneconomic remnant; permission for the owner to remove the structures not needed by the authority; 180 days' notice prior to relocation; rental adjustments on acquired property reflecting loss in patronage; the elimination of the need for an owner to institute legal proceedings; a prohibition against stalling or other tactics to force a sale; and a requirement that the economic and social effects of dislocation be taken into account in determining project boundaries. These are the recommendations of the staff study for the Special Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition.

Section 504, assurance of compensation: This section would provide that, as a condition of Federal assistance, the applicant would agree to the compensation criteria of this bill.

Section 505, compensation: This section would provide for an owner of a property interest, including tenants, to have the higher of the actual value of the property interest taken, or its replacement cost.

Section 506, payment before eviction: This section would provide that each condemning authority would set aside 90 percent of their appraised value of the property to be taken for the use of the person entitled to the award within 15 days of the notice of taking. This would avoid the situation where the owner of a property interest might otherwise have to wait on a possible court settlement to receive his money, even though he would be forced to move in the meantime and incur large relocation costs. The owner of the property interest, in this new provision, would be relieved in many cases from the burden of borrowing in order to relocate, or the possibility of failure in the case of the small businessman without sufficient funds or credit.

Section 507, actual value: This section would define actual value of a property interest taken under eminent domain in the usual sense of the highest cash price it could reasonably bring in the marketplace. It would, however, provide that any increase or decrease in value as a result of the likelihood of the proposed project would not be considered. This would prevent land speculation, and protect the property owner whose property values could otherwise be reduced. It is a recommendation of the staff study for the Real Property Acquisition Subcommittee.

Section 508, expenses incidental to transfer of title: This section would provide for reimbursement to the owner of a condemned property the costs of any recording fees, transfer taxes, and similar expenses incidental to the transfer of title to the public agency, any penalty costs for prepayment of mortgages, and the prorata portion of property taxes for the period before the vesting of title. It is a recommendation of the staff study for the Real Property Acquisition Subcommittee.

Section 509, litigation expenses: This section would provide that an owner of property would be reimbursed for reasonable attorney's fees, appraisal and engineer fees, connected with a condemnation proceeding when the final judgment was for the owner on the question of the right to condemn, or where the proceedings were abandoned. A recommendation of the staff study.

Section 510, displacement by code enforcement for urban renewal project or voluntary rehabilitation under urban renewal plan: This section would provide for those displaced by code enforcement or voluntary rehabilitation projects under the Housing Act as amended last year by the Republican proposals to be deemed displaced persons for purposes of assistance. A recommendation of the staff study.

Section 511, replacement cost: This section would define replacement cost to be the entire cost of replacing a property interest, lost through condemnation, with an interest substantially similar.

Subsection (a) would provide that this award would include: The purchase price of real or personal property to reproduce the interest previously possessed; all moving expenses; rents, profits lost, and overhead expenses due to a suspension of the business; reinstallation of fixtures and equipment; reopening costs; attorney and broker fees; and duplication of taxes, interest, and rent.

Subsection (b) would provide for protection against an overly generous award in the case where property would be replaced by a substantially different interest.

Subsection (c) would provide for the case of damage to property or a portion of property being taken.

Section 512, taking and damage defined: This section would define taking to relate to any acquisition by eminent domain of a property interest in a whole or partial manner. It would define damage to relate to the net decrease in value of a property located adjacent to property acquired for a project, as a result of the project.

Section 513, requirements for approval of contracts or agreements for Federal financial assistance: This section would provide that no new contract for assistance would be entered into after July 1, 1966, without the agreement by the applicant to the procedural and compensation requirements of this act. Although the staff study for the Special Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition, in their proposed legislation, provides for such a requirement, it does not have any leeway for the time needed to change certain State and local ordinances, where necessary. A minimum amount of time should certainly be allowed.

Section 514, enforcement: This section would provide for review of compliance and possible suspension of funds.

Section 515, application: This section would provide that nothing in this title would apply to any project contracted or planned for prior to enactment of this act.

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS AND ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

Section 601, establishes the FHA as an independent agency in the executive branch of the Government: This section would provide for the establishment of an independent FHA, divorced from its status as a constituent agency of the Housing and Home Finance Administration. The powers of the Commissioner are transferred to a Board of Directors of the FHA, who are to be three in number with no more than two of whom being of the same political party. Terms of office are set, and one of the three members, all named by the President and confirmed by the Senate, will act as chairman. The action of change is to take place within 90 days, after the enactment of this act.

FHA-insured mortgages are the backbone of the national mortgage market. Insured mortgages are the only truly effective device for channeling mortgage funds from credit surplus to credit short areas. FHA serves a broad range of income groups. In 1962, 48.6 percent of FHA mortgages on new homes were for people with incomes below $7,200 and 51 percent of its mortgages on existing homes were for people in this same income group.

FHA's ability to direct its efforts to the areas of maximum benefit, and to freely determine the actuarial soundness of its programs is restricted, so long as it is a part of a larger governmental organization more concerned with sociological and political problems than with finance. The housing amendments of 1955 recognized this problem for the Home Loan Bank Board and the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, and separated them from the HHFA.

FHA is financially independent—its sole function is the insuring of loans and all Government funds advanced to start it have been paid back with interest. All operations are conducted out of income from fees and insurance premiums. Reserves are adequate for a major disaster. FHA and HHFA budgets are not interdependent so no problems would be created. Administratively, FHA is presently self-sufficient.

FHA operations being well defined and the agency being financially self-sufficient, the problem of additional agencies reporting to the President would be nominal. The achievement of housing goals depends to a major degree on the enthusiastic participation of private capital which can best be achieved through an agency primarily oriented to the problems of the private capital market.

Section 602, establishment of the housing and renewal agency to administer jointly the public housing and urban renewal programs: This section would provide for the amalgamation of the present public housing and urban renewal agencies within the Federal Government's Housing and Home Finance Agency. The new Agency, to be known as the Housing and Renewal Agency, would promote economy and efficiency of operation. Both present Agencies employ numerous individuals performing the same functions, including the review of slum clearance reports, land acquisition in the field, relocation, and planning surveys. Their statistical analyses have the same purpose and relate to the same activities. Their land appraisers, auditors, engineers, building inspectors, fiscal experts, and lawyers have almost the same identical activities.

In the field, many of the local housing authorities of the FHA, and the local urban renewal agencies, operate under a single executive director and combine their operations. Many of the people working at the national and local level of URA have graduated to their present positions from the public housing field. In addition to the possibilities of ending the duplication of efforts in the specialty fields, economy and efficiency could be promoted by combining the executive, information, statistical, administrative, legal, general service, and allied departments.

The first part of the section, subsection (a), sets up the new Agency and its Commissioner.

Subsection (b) transfers all of the functions of the public housing and urban renewal agencies to the new Agency, and also provides that all laws relating to the old agencies, all agency regulations, and al regulatory or advisory groups presently operating shall continue in force or operation.

Subsections (c) through (e) pertain to conforming language.

Subsection (f) would provide for the section to take effect within 90 days of passage, the actual day to be determined by the HHFA Administrator and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who are provided with the necessary authority to carry out the purpose of the act.

Section 603, establishment of the Office of Urban Affairs: This section would provide for an Office of Urban Affairs in the Office of the President. It would provide an upgrading of the role of urban affairs, and establish a clearinghouse of information and coordination for the various programs within the Government departments, dealing with urban problems. It would provide a central point of access for State and local governmental officials seeking information and assistance.

Section 604, insurance of leases by the Small Business Administration: This section would provide for a Small Business Administration lease guarantee program to insure small business leasing opportunities in downtown areas. An insurance fund is established for leases running 10 years or less. In testimony to the House Special Subcommittee on Housing in the fall of 1963, the Urban Renewal Commissioner recognized the need, under questioning, for a program of this nature. Studies by the Small Business Administration and the House Special Committee on Small Business indicate that over 100,000 firms have been displaced by urban renewal by 1962, and another 100,000 or more will be displaced in the next 10 years. Without additional assistance, upward of 35,000 firms will never open their doors again following this displacement. With operational experience, this program could well be expanded to include firms locating outside of downtown areas.

Section 605, increase in insured amount of bank deposits and savings and loan accounts: This section would amend the Federal Deposit Insurance Act and title IV of the National Housing Act so as to increase the maximum coverage of each depositor of an insured bank and each share account holder of an insured savings and loan association. The existing limit of $10,000 per account would be increased to $25,000. Officials of both the FDIC and the FSLIC have testified that such increases in insurance coverage safely could be made without increases in premiums for such insurance. The existing limit of insurance coverage was set 15 years ago when the insurance coverage was increased from $5,000 to $10,000 per account.

In the interval since, time deposits in banks and savings accounts in savings and loan associations have more than doubled and such savings have become of increasing importance to our national economy. The increased insurance coverage will encourage the public to further expand the portion of its assets held in savings accounts. This will be of particular importance to mortgage credit as we move into the prospective heavy housing demands that will face us in the latter part of this decade.

Section 606, FNMA secondary market operations: This section would provide authority for the Federal National Mortgage Association to deal in conventional mortgages. Purchases are limited to those mortgages which have outstanding balances of 80 percent or less of the appraised value of their respective properties. Purchases of mortgages insured under the National Housing Act are permitted, but not if they exceed 100 percent of the unpaid principal amounts, are held by States or municipalities or either's instrumentalities, or in excess of $17,500 per dwelling unit. In this last case, certain exceptions are made in the case of mortgages under section 220, or title VIII, or section 213, or properties in an urban renewal area, or properties in Alaska, Guam, and Hawaii. This new authority would assist the market for both new and existing homes by increasing the marketability of mortgages, making them a more liquid and attractive investment.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, there are no greater friends of liberty and justice in the free world today than the people of Greece. It is no accident that this is so. The people of Greece fought hard for their independence—for four centuries of foreign domination. Just 144 years ago today, a small band of Greek patriots raised the flag of liberty and declared their determination to be free.

The struggle for Greek independence in the early years of the 19th century won a great deal of support all over the world. This was particularly true here in the United States where our own political philosophers drew on the inspiration of Plato's call to excellence in leadership and Aristotle's insistence on a government of limited and divided powers.

President Monroe spoke for all America when he said in his annual message to Congress in 1821:

> Genius and delicacy in the arts, daring and heroism in action, unselfish patriotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion to public and private liberty, all these are connected with the name of ancient Greece. It is natural that their (the Greeks') contest should arouse the sympathy of the United States.

From my own State of Massachusetts came important American support for Greek independence. Edward Everett of Harvard entitled his oration for the degree of master of arts in 1814, "The Restoration of Greece." It was Everett who later assisted Daniel Webster in his famous statement on Greece delivered before the Congress.

This feeling of camaraderie with our Greek friends has increased over the years. Many Americans of Greek ancestry have contributed a great deal to our culture and our economy.

Shortly after World War II Greece met still another threat to liberty—from Communist guerrillas. At that time the heart of America again went out to the Greek people and our first major postwar military assistance went to Greece in that hour of need.

The wisdom of our support for Greece has been demonstrated time and time again as the Greek people have tried hard to bring about steady economic growth and social reform—in a framework of democratic respect for human dignity. They are succeeding and will continue to succeed, I am sure.

Our relations have remained close through the years and it is with great pleasure that I rise on the floor today to pay tribute to the noble heritage of the Greek people. We stand with them in a true spirit of brotherhood and share their hope and ideal of a world at peace under justice.

INTERNATIONAL CAPITAL FLOWS AND INTEREST RATE DIFFERENTIALS

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the debate over how to correct our chronic balance-of-payments deficit, considerable disagreement exists over the importance of interest rate differentials on international capital flows. Those who wish to continue an easy money policy at home generally insist that interest rate differentials between the United States and foreign nations have little effect on capital flows. Several Democratic members of the Joint Economic Committee argued this point during the Joint Economic Committee's recent hearings on the President's annual reports.

Personally, I believe the weight of economic evidence shows capital flows, particularly short-term flows, to be sensitive to interest rate differentials. If this is true, it would indicate that market-determined interest rates in the United States would help to keep funds at home, and, perhaps, even draw foreign funds into our country. This would mean a significant improvement in our balance of payments.

The bibliography below represents a listing of the serious studies published in recent years in the United States on the subject of international capital flows and interest rate differentials.

Only Bell's study offers significant general support for the position that there is little evidence that capital flows are very sensitive to international interest rate differentials and changes in these differentials. The Bell study, moreover, is older than several others on the list; it has been critically examined by Cohen and found wanting in several respects.

The position that capital flows are not interest sensitive seems somewhat doubtful as applied to short-term flows. Even Bell finds some sensitivity to interest rate differentials; the question is really one of degree. In his evaluation of these studies, Robert Roosa testified—on July 9, 1963, before the Joint Economic Committee—that he regarded the Cohen paper as the most useful and most up to date and that the volume of interest-sensitive flows is significant. One can really only counter this judgment by pointing out that the studies are not decisive in that the data are somewhat crudely classified while the number of factors influencing short-term capital flows is very large.

The situation is somewhat different, however, with respect to the interest sensitivity of long-term investment. The studies generally indicate that, at most, changes in rates and rate differentials affect the timing of borrowing—in other words, that, unless interest rate changes are reversed within a few months, long-term capital flows will not be deterred by higher rates in a lending country or encouraged by lower rates.

In addition to the studies listed, a brief summary of the Federal Reserve's view, as of December 1963, appears in the latest edition of the Federal Reserve System: Purposes and Functions, pages 158-160.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bell, Philip W., "Private Capital Movements and the U.S. Balance-of-Payments Position," in Factors Affecting the U.S. Balance of Payments. (Compilation of studies prepared for the Subcommittee on International Exchange and Payments of the Joint Economic Committee, Washington, 1962), pages 395–482.

Cohen, Benjamin J., "A Survey of Capital Movements and Findings Regarding Their Interest Sensitivity," in the U.S. balance of payments, hearings before the Joint Economic Committee, July 1963 (Washington, 1963), pages 192–208.

Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia, "How Sensitive to Interest Rates? Some Statistical Evidence," Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia Business Review, November 1962, pages 8–10.

Gemmill, Robert F., "Interest Rates and Foreign Dollar Balances," Journal of Finance, volume XVI (September 1961), pages 363–376.

Katz, Samuel I., "Yield Differentials in Treasury Bills, 1959–64," Federal Reserve Bulletin, October 1964, pages 1241–1260.

Kenen, Peter B., "Short-Term Capital Movements and the U.S. Balance of Payments," in the U.S. balance of payments, hearings before the Joint Economic Committee, July 1963 (Washington, 1963), pages 153–191.

PUBLIC VERSUS PRIVATE EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE PROGRAMS

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have recently corresponded with the Chairman of the State Department's Board of Foreign Scholarships, Mr. John M. Stalnaker, about the relationship between private and public educational exchange programs. The Board of Foreign Scholarships administers the Hays-Fulbright Act (Public Law 584). It came to my attention that in publications of the Board of Foreign Scholarships, and the related U.S. Advisory Commission on International Education and Cultural Affairs, the true relationship of public programs to private programs was not presented. Public programs of educational exchange, which represent at most an estimated 10 percent of all such programs, are presented as the crucial element without which private programs would either be impossible or ineffective.

Public educational exchange programs must be considered supplementary to private programs. The role of the public program must be to coordinate private programs, and provide additional services when needed. Their ultimate effect must be to stimulate and enrich private activity, rather than to smother it. We have all become aware of the extensive efforts of private educational, missionary and other private institutions in the field of international educational and cultural exchange—efforts which have in some cases existed for over 100 years.

I was heartened by Mr. Stalnaker's fundamental agreement with my views, and particularly by his statement in his February 8 letter to me that he hoped "the Board will use the theme of public and private programs for one of its future reports." I strongly endorse his suggestion. I have every confidence that such a report, based on suggestions in my March 24 letter, will be published.

Under unanimous consent I place this correspondence in the RECORD:

JANUARY 14, 1965.

Mr. JOHN M. STALNAKER,
Chairman, The Board of Foreign Scholarships, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STALNAKER: I recently received a copy of your publication, "Teacher and Scholar Abroad." I was extremely interested in this report and I have two questions concerning the role of your agency and the Federal Government as a whole in encouraging and implementing the exchange of students between the United States and other countries.

First of all, I am interested in how the 10 percent of all exchange students handled through this Federal-sponsored agency fit in with the other 90 percent of exchange students handled through private programs. What are the differences between the private and the Government programs? Is the Government-sponsored program supplemental? Does it work in the same areas—geographically and/or academically? On what levels do the two programs operate—secondary, college level, or both? What are the requirements for a student taking part in the Government program as opposed to the private programs?

Secondly, it appears that your report points up merely the advantages of student exchange in general, federally as well as privately sponsored programs. What I would like to know is if there are any advantages to one program rather than the other; public versus private? I would certainly appreciate any assistance which you might be able to give me in these matters.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
THE BOARD OF FOREIGN SCHOLARSHIPS,
February 1, 1965.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: I appreciate the interest expressed in your letter of January 14, 1965, in our recent report, "Teacher and Scholar Abroad."

Before responding to your two questions specifically, I should note that the educational exchange program under the responsibility of the Board of Foreign Scholarships—a Presidentially-appointed public body—are funded and managed by the Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs of the Department of State. Overseas some 64 U.S. diplomatic missions and 48 binational boards or commissions, the latter established by executive agreements, in over 100 countries play a key role in insuring that the program serves the broad interests of the United States in its relations with other countries.

I can best answer your first question by saying that the Board's academic exchange programs—students, teachers, and professors—represent a small but highly selective part of the total flow of such exchanges to and from the United States. The foreign students, all college level but principally graduate students, include many who may be professionals in their own countries and not students, but who want the opportunity of graduate study in the United States. They probably differ most from those under private programs in the rigorous screening and selection process through which they go by our binational committees abroad, with considerable attention to priority fields of study.

Three-fourths of our foreign student awards are so-called "travel only" grants without which the student would be unable to accept scholarship and other assistance from American universities. In some parts of the world we offer a number of undergraduate grants to increase the flow of students from countries where few opportunities for study in the United States exist.

The U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs when asked by the Congress to appraise the effectiveness of this program expressed the view "that one of the most important signs of effectiveness of the program has been its catalytic effect—in bringing about significant changes in approaches, in stimulating development both abroad and in the United States." ("A Beacon of Hope," April 1963.)

The best answer I can offer to your second question is that the position which the United States holds in the world today really requires a continuing partnership of public and private effort in this field of activity. To my mind the question cannot be phrased as an "either" "or" proposition. The U.S. Advisory Commission concluded "that the educational and cultural exchange program has proved itself an essential part of America's total international effort."

I believe this Federal effort is essential not merely as a symbol of official interest, but in continuing to encourage private support for such activities in the national interest, and to do those few things which government can best do, including obtaining official support and recognition of the value of these programs by other governments.

I have enclosed a copy of "A Beacon of Hope," which may give you additional information on these questions. If I can be of further help please let me know.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. STALNAKER,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1965.

Mr. JOHN M. STALNAKER,
Chairman, Department of State,
The Board of Foreign Scholarships,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STALNAKER: Thank you very much for your responsive letter to the questions I posed about the overall efforts in our society in the teacher and scholar exchange programs with particular reference to the relationship of private programs to governmental programs.

I agree with your statement that the question cannot be phrased as an either or proposition and I am sorry if you so interpreted the purport of my questions. But I do believe it is important to decide whether the Government role is to be one of collaboration "effectively with the nongovernmental world," or one of "coordinating all international education and cultural activities" or one of supplementing and innovating "At another level conduct a program of its own. Not itself a specialized program * * *" but to "explore and open up many lines of interest some of which will prove worthy of more intensive exploitation by specialized agencies." I am quoting from the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs of April 1963, "A Beacon of Hope" (p. 55 and then page 60).

I think it is important to point up an ambiguity in the report of the Advisory Commission itself concerning the proper role of Government. On page 55 the sentences immediately preceding the quotation I set out, read "In a pluralistic society, the Government will not wish to control or coordinate the vast range of educational and cultural exchange activities carried on by the various private elements in the society. But it is essential that the Government collaborate effectively with the nongovernmental world." Yet, as I point out, on page 60, under the heading "The Role of CU," is the statement "CU's objectives must be understood at two levels. First of all, CU has the charge of assisting the Secretary of State in his responsibility for coordinating all international and cultural activities. It is the one agency that must never cease to look at the whole range of international educational and cultural programs, governmental and private; and never cease to ask itself what the role of Government should be in respect to that total range."

Now in order to coordinate, or collaborate, or supplement or innovate with intelligence one must have a broad grasp of the whole range.

In the booklet "Teacher and Scholar Abroad" there is a glaring failure to present the whole range. Only once is there a reference to the fact that the Government programs under discussion relate to only 10 percent of the whole range within the society and there are no specifics at all about the 90-percent activity. In fact, the rhetoric is such that the virtues of the whole range is attributed to the 10-percent governmental activity. The 10-percent figure is at some variance with the statement at the bottom of page 37 of "A Beacon of Hope" which refers to the State Department's exchange program as constituting "only about 5 percent of all foreign students on U.S. campuses." I think the two figures can be reconciled perhaps if the 10 percent referred to the State Department program and other governmental programs although it did not say so, or included foreign students in travel status rather than "on the U.S. campuses."

However, whether the State Department program is 5 percent and total governmental programs 10 percent, the fact remains that the bulk of the activity lies in the private sector and there is very little information even in "A Beacon of Hope" about the history, extent, variety, and quality of the private programs. What is particularly lacking in "A Beacon of Hope" is some estimate of the rate of growth of the private programs vis-a-vis the governmental programs historically and in the very immediate past.

I have called attention to a phenomenon which I have observed in other areas of endeavor in our society where Government and private endeavor meet, by reducing it to a corollary to Gresham's law. The Curtis corollary states "Government money drives out private money." It would be interesting to know whether the heavy movement of Government into the field of exchange students has fostered or hampered the rate of growth of the private sector and whether the rate of growth of our total activity has been enhanced or slackened. Government activity can be coordinated so that it minimizes its impact through the operation of the Curtis corollary; certainly with adequate study and wisdom Government can supplement and can innovate without having the Curtis corollary go into operation. Indeed, if the study and wisdom are superior, the supplementation and innovation can increase the activity in the private sector so the overall total in the society is increased. Perhaps this has been true in the field under discussion but at the present there seems to be insufficient information upon which to base a judgment.

However, pamphlets such as "Teacher and Scholar Abroad" are not designed to encourage further private activity. Indeed, the thrust is discouraging to private activity because the impression is fostered that Government is handling the job and certainly grabbing the laurels. Even "A Beacon of Hope" is written with the emphasis on the tail rather than the dog. It is very difficult to determine in all too many instances in the pamphlet whether the problems pointed up, or the progress noted, is in the whole range, or in the Government sector or in the private sector, or what the mix may be. This is in spite of the fact that in many instances the line of demarcation between private and governmental is the crucial matter.

Is I have remarked, I found no discussion of the rate of growth in either the Government or private programs. Some reference is made in respect to quality aspects and some reference to variety aspects * * * but there is no growth data of either improved quality or variety.

In fact, on page 8 of "A Beacon of Hope" I find this very disturbing statement. "The foreign affairs of the United States also include a program for exchange of persons * * * the extraordinary new dimension in the relationship of one country to another. This program was concerted as a direct effort of the American people to bring about mutual understanding between themselves and the people of the world. There has been nothing quite like this * * * a peaceable, sizable exchange of persons, carried on by a government on behalf of an entire people * * * in the whole history of human affairs."

Well, if the people were conducting this program themselves without Government help * * * and apparently the U.S. people have been * * * before 1949 * * * when the State Department first thought it important to collect data for Government activities in this area * * * it would seem that the first thing for the U.S. Government to do would be to call attention to this fact, not throw it into the shadows by this unwarranted boast about governmental activities. Furthermore, I believe the very commendable agreement made by the U.S. Government with China to have China utilize the indemnity moneys owed to the United States as the result of the Boxer Rebellion to send Chinese students to the United States for education was a more important first in this field.

Surely the idea of exchange students was not new * * * even though massive Government participation ("massive" to a 5- or 10-percent amount) might have been new. Cecil Rhodes caught the point by establishing the Rhodes scholars. So did the founders of the American University at Beirut, Yale in China, etc. * * * Indeed the full extent of our private educational, public health, and medical missionary programs which started with the first Western European colonization of this continent and have continued ever since, were all following out this basic philosophy.

The Institute of International Education was established 50 pears ago. This gives us a better perspective of what has been going on in this area.

I am quite pleased with many of the specific recommendations of the Advisory Commission, particularly those which point out the needed further emphasis on the private sector even though, paradoxically, they were contained in a pamphlet the overall thrust of which extended the other way. On page 8 the Commission lists "four rather remarkable characteristics impressed upon it by the American people who gave it shape" and yet it lists last the one which should be listed first, for emphasis; i.e., "Finally, it relies in very large part on private participation and initiative * * * direct official involvement is kept to a facilitative minimum." But, I submit, is official involvement kept to the facilitative minimum when Government publications like "Teacher and Scholar Abroad" project the image of the Government programs with little or no reference whatever to the private programs which does not even mention that in the Government programs, "* * * for every dollar expended by the exchange program on foreign students, it is estimated that approximately $2 to $4 are put into the program by other * * * largely academic, agencies"? (p. 50.)

The Commission recommends the establishment of more field or regional selection centers under private auspices * * * like "the new centers which have recently come into being at the initiative of private organizations such as the African-American Institute and the Institute of International Education." (p. 38.) However, the Commission then concludes with a cart-before-the-horse suggestion, "Some sort of arrangements would have to be worked out so that these centers (which would be set up regionally rather than in every country) would complement and not usurp the functions of the local Bi-National Commissions already established or to be established." (p. 39.)

Shouldn't the thrust be the other way? That the Bi-National Commission should complement and not usurp the private centers already established or to be established?

I believe that Government's role should be to supplement and to innovate so that the growth in the basic program, the private program, is encouraged and not stifled. More activity, a better quality activity, being more on a people-to-people basis, and a more varied activity should result.

Now if this is correct theory, the Government must publish its reports of its activities in proper context by giving to the private sector its proper encomiums, and its share of the criticism. Reports like "Teacher and Scholar Abroad" result in firming up the misconception already existing in the public mind about the student exchange programs that they consist principally of the "Fulbright scholarships."

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

THE BOARD OF
FOREIGN SCHOLARSHIPS,
DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, D.C., February 8, 1965.

Hon. THOMAS B. CURTIS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CURTIS: I appreciate very much your recent thoughtful letter about public and private academic exchange programs. I delayed my response until I had the opportunity to show your letter to several members of the Board of Foreign Scholarships at our spring meeting just concluded. I have also sent copies of the letter to the Chairman of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs and to the Assistant Secretary of State for Educational and Cultural Affairs because your comments touch on their programs and responsibilities.

The Chairman of the Advisory Commission may wish to comment specifically on the numerous references in your letter to their report, "A Beacon of Hope." The Department of State may have other comments on the coordination of public efforts with private programs—a responsibility assigned to the Assistant Secretary of State.

I know of no member of our Board who would not agree with your observation "that the Government's role should be to supplement and to innovate so that the growth in the basic program, the private program, is encouraged and not stifled." This Board and its predecessors have been guided by this principle since the initiation of these programs in the late 1940's.

In publishing "Teacher and Scholar Abroad" we did not intend to report on the entire range of public and private programs—important as these are. Nor did we intend to leave the impression that the activities of the Board of Foreign Scholarships represent the entire effort in this field, or even a major part of the effort.

We sought rather to fulfill a more limited function prescribed in the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961: Reporting annually to the Congress on the program under the Board's jurisdiction, and reporting "to the public in the United States and abroad to develop a better understanding of and support for the programs authorized by this act." We felt that the theme—"first person reports of the U.S. exchange program"—was a timely one to illustrate the diversity of these exchanges in the words of the participants. This aspect has not been publicized heretofore.

I am hopeful that the Board will use the theme of public and private programs for one of its future reports. Let me thank you again for writing at length about this. Your views are appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN M. STALNAKER,
Chairman.

MARCH 24, 1965.

Mr. JOHN M. STALNAKER,
Chairman, the Board of Foreign Scholarships, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STALNAKER: Thank you for your reply to my letter of February 8, 1965. I am encouraged that you and Mr. Gardner agree with my view that the role of Government is to supplement and innovate so that growth in our fundamental educational exchange program, the private program, is encouraged, not stifled.

I am particularly pleased with your comment in the last paragraph of your letter that you hope "the Board (of Foreign Scholarships) will use the theme of public and private programs for one of its future reports." I would also recommend that this theme be used in a future report of the U.S. Advisory Commission on International Educational and Cultural Affairs.

It seems essential to me that, in fulfilling your organization's statutory requirement to report to Congress and the public, the true scope of public versus private educational exchange programs be made clear. As we are both aware, public programs account for only 10 percent of activity in the educational exchange area.

Such a publication should answer the questions I posed in my letter to you on January 14: what are the differences between private programs and the Government program; is the Government-sponsored program supplemental or does it work in the same areas—geographically and/or academically; on what educational levels do the two programs operate—secondary, collegiate, or both; what special requirements are there for Government-sponsored students compared to private program requirements?

I am taking the liberty of sending a copy of this letter to Messrs. Gardner and McPherson and sending copies of our full correspondence to Representatives BOLTON and ADAIR. I will also place our correspondence in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

With best wishes.

Sincerely,

THOMAS B. CURTIS.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MCDADE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, it is part of the nature of man to seek out the fatherhood of the good things he sees about him. We speak of George Washington as the father of his country. We speak of Einstein as the father of the atomic age.

It is interesting, therefore, in seeking such fatherhood, to note how frequently we end up with the name of a great Greek. Pythagorus is the father of mathematics. Euclid is the father of geometry. Homer is the father of epic poetry. Aeschylus is called the father of the drama. Aristophanes is called the father of comedy. Phidias is called the father of sculpture. Herodotus is the father of history.

The list is indeed endless. In whatever field we work, be it art or science, mathematics or music, philosophy or sculpture—the Greeks were there and were great. It is said of Alexander the Great that once when he was visiting the philosopher Diogenes, he remarked: "If I were not Alexander, I would wish to be Diogenes." All of us could well wish to bear the names that have come down like beacons through the centuries: Socrates, Plato, Aristotle—or even the first great woman poet of all time: Sappho.

So, on this day, when we celebrate the independence of Greece, we are celebrating the independence of not merely a nation, but of a whole civilization that may well be called the cornerstone of the modern world. It would be the greatest triumph for America if, 2,500 years from now, men would say that we gave to the world a greatness equal to that which was given by the Greeks.

The independence of Greece was not won at a small price. For more than four centuries Greece had labored under the oppressive burden of Turkish conquest. On an average of once every 11 years the Greek people had risen against the Turks, only to have their hopes drowned each time in a tide of blood and destruction. But on March 25, 1821, a small band of Greek patriots once again raised the flag of revolution against the Turkish conquerors, and once again a war for independence was started.

They pledged, as they raised this flag, that they would have liberty or death. For many, it was death. There was little interest in the capitals of Europe in this fight for freedom. Turkey was the sick man of Europe, and the strength of Turkey in the balance of power in Europe was more important than the freedom of Greece. The Greeks were, in the words of Chesterton, "countless, voiceless, hopeless." They were deserted by the nations that should have come to their help. They were facing the power of the Ottoman Empire. They were without arms, without armament. No sane man would ever dream that they could succeed. But they succeeded.

The nations of the world would not help. But the people of the world were profoundly moved by the struggle. Byron died in the swamps of Greece, trying to lend his hand to the fight. Americans were moved by the conflict, because their own freedom was still fresh with them. So moved were they by the oratory of Edward Everett, professor of Greek at Harvard University, that President Monroe, in his annual message to Congress, cited the glories of Greece and affirmed the sympathy of the entire United States with the Greeks in their fight for liberation.

Slowly, inexorably, the weight of civilized thinking swung toward the Greek war for independence. Slowly the conscience of the world awakened, and as the conscience awakened, so, too, did the nations. The sight of these people fighting against the great Turkish Empire became too much even for the alliances of Europe. And when the nations of Europe finally spoke with power, Greece became a free country once again. In 1829 the terrible war came to an end. In 1830, Great Britain, France, and Russia solemnly declared that they would guarantee the independence of the Kingdom of Greece.

It is, therefore, with great delight and with no small pride that I take this occasion to recall the history of the struggle for Greek independence. I am delighted that this nation, truly called the father of our civilization, is still among the roster of free nations. I am proud that America, though small at that time, was still big enough to stand by the Greeks in their hour of desperation.

But above all I would point out the continuing richness of the contributions of Greece to our world. Twice she was at our side during the two World Wars fought in this century. Our soldiers and her soldiers fought to save the world from cruel Nazi slavery. And all over America today the sons and daughters of Greece will take time today to remember the home whence they came, or their fathers, or their grandfathers. They will remember her not as one long since dead, but as a living and vibrant nation still giving the richness of her art, her literature, her philosophy to the world. They will remember her as Poe once remembered Helen:

On desperate seas long wont to roam,
  Thy hyacinth hair, thy classic face,
Thy naiad airs have brought me home
  To the glory that was Greece,
  And the grandeur that was Rome.

PLACING FIRST-, SECOND-, AND THIRD-CLASS POSTMASTER APPOINTMENTS UNDER CIVIL SERVICE MERIT SYSTEM

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which I have long felt has been needed. The bill is designed to take all postmaster appointments of the first, second, and third classes out of politics and place them under the civil service merit system.

The Postmaster General, rather than the President, would make the appointments of postmasters on the basis of competitive examinations. Under the bill I have introduced, Senate confirmation would not be required; in fact, no political test or qualification would be permitted.

It is my strong belief that the present method of using postmasterships as political patronage severely weakens the postal system. For example, a clerk with long and efficient experience and genuine ability does not have an opportunity for promotion to postmaster unless he has the proper political clout. I am aware of situations in some States whereby postmasters are regularly appointed and soon fired because of the changing political picture in these States. In other cases, postmasters have been serving for years under "temporary" or "acting" status. This is so because the politicians cannot come to agreement on a permanent appointment. In places where this kind of a situation takes place, the morale of employees is low and service is often correspondingly low.

If the civil service merit system has value, and I believe that it has, I see no reason why it cannot be applied in the case of postmaster appointments. The adoption of this system will enable us to attract the most able persons into postal service and will introduce a certain professionalism into the service. These definite plus factors, combined with others, more than justify legislation of the kind I suggest.

EDUCATIONAL TAX BENEFITS

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MacGregor] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing a bill which I previously introduced in the 88th Congress.

This bill has widespread support across the Nation and, I believe, here in the Congress. It provides that the head of a household may deduct from his income tax a percentage of costs paid for higher education by the immediate members of his family. The bill also considers educational costs of part-time students and makes adjustments for scholarships and educational allowances.

This kind of legislation is much more meaningful than much of the talk we hear today about tax cuts. An allowed deduction for educational expenses should serve as a stimulus to higher learning, too.

This kind of legislation is of special importance to lower income families, as it provides for greater percentage deductions for those with lesser gross incomes.

Finally, this legislation is long overdue. It is my hope that the House will take the initiative in passing and implementing it in this 89th Congress.

IF YOU CAN GET THE MONEY, RISE ABOVE PRINCIPLE

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Devine] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. DEVINE. Mr. Speaker, on this day when so many seem to be willing to rise above principle in order to get their hands in the Federal till at any cost, I am reminded of an editorial published in the Columbus Dispatch, way back in 1960.

The so-called "education bill" then was not nearly as atrocious as the monstrosity being foisted on the American people today. Goodbye local control; here comes more Washington bureaucracy.

The editorial follows:

NEA's Heart Is Where There's Most Money

In a report entitled "What Everyone Should Know About Financing Schools," the National Education Association reveals with startling frankness that its heart is where the money is. The NEA is going after that Federal money with a vengeance.

Dr. John K. Norton, professor emeritus of Teachers College, Columbia University, author of the report, states his case this way:

1. Most school money (56 percent) comes from that level of government—the locality—which is "weakest" in ability to raise tax revenues.

2. Most of the remainder of the school support (40 percent) comes from the States, which is second in taxing ability.

3. Only a "pittance" (4 percent) comes from the Federal Government which he describes as "by far the most effective source of tax revenue (raising 69 percent of all taxes)."

To questions such as "Does not all revenue come from the same source, the pockets of the people? Why send it to Washington and then back?" Dr. Norton replies:

"These questions disregard the key issue. The relevant factor is that when Congress sees the need for revenue, it is not plagued by the fears that beset State legislatures and local fiscal bodies.

"State and local governments cannot consider need for revenue solely on the basis of the value of the public undertaking involved. Rather, they hesitate to extend their taxing systems for fear of placing their communities or States at a competitive disadvantage relative to other areas, even when the funds are for an undertaking as productive as good schools."

What the NEA report is saying here is that Congress should take over the public schools because the voters in a school district cannot be depended upon to provide as much money as Congress has the potentiality of providing.

If the NEA thesis is correct, then let us do away with all local governments and look to Congress for all funds to operate cities, villages, townships, counties, and State governments, as well as school districts. The voters, it seems, take too many things into consideration when they vote on local levies—what it will cost them and what they will get for their money, for instance.

Under the pressure of powerful lobbies, such as the NEA, Congress could find something new to tax, or go into debt, or start up the printing presses in the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and thus finance the schools, because the people do not cast direct votes on these propositions as they do when they vote local school levies and approve local bond issues. Such would seem to be the reasoning of the NEA.

Apparently, the theme of the NEA is "Let's take school financing out of the hands of the people and place it in the hands of a Federal bureaucracy with virtually unlimited funds at its disposal."

The superior tax-collecting procedure inherent in the Federal Government, Dr. Norton says, has found it possible to support highways, housing, agriculture, hospitals, welfare, and a $40 billion defense budget—so let's toss in the schools.

If the time ever comes when the people of the cities and villages, school districts and townships are answerable to the NEA superstatists for operating the public schools, public education as Americans have known it will be at an end. It will be vested in Washington bureaucracy. The voters—the people at home—will have lost control of the schools to which they send their children.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Byelorussia. I am pleased to join my colleagues in the House of Representatives in paying tribute on this occasion to the brave Byelorussians whose short period of freedom was cut short by the Bolshevik forces of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Government which now rules the Byelorussian people certainly does not represent their wishes or hopes, but merely serves as an instrument of oppression. Thus, the Byelorussian people suffer in the same manner as the other captive peoples of communism under a cruel dictatorship.

May I take this opportunity to commend the many Americans of Byelorussian origin who continue to strive for the eventual restoration of freedom for their homeland.

This anniversary serves as a reminder that the spirit of freedom continues to burn in the hearts of the Byelorussian people behind the Iron Curtain and that the desire for independence and self-government continues to be the greatest weakness of the Soviet Union.

Mr. Speaker, may I again emphasize to the Members of the House the importance of establishing a special House Committee on Captive Nations in order to call to the attention of the world the cruel oppression under which the Byelorussian and other captive nations of communism suffer.

Since I, myself, am descended from immigrants who came to the United States from Poland, I have maintained a special interest in the peoples of areas adjacent to the land of my forebears. The heroic people of Byelorussia have been extremely effective in maintaining their spirit and determination in the face of Communist oppression. We must not permit their spirit and determination to be in vain.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Lipscomb] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. LIPSCOMB. Mr. Speaker, the Byelorussians constitute one of the important group of Slavic peoples in Eastern Europe. Their historic homeland borders Poland on the west, Lithuania on the northwest, the Ukraine on the south, and Russia proper on the east. In this relatively large expanse of more than 80,000 square miles they have lived throughout their known history. During the late Middle Ages they formed a sovereign state of their own, held their destiny in their own hands, and developed their own distinct civilization. Long before the emergence of modern Russia they thus had their own independent state.

For centuries these rugged people had been subjected to the oppressive regimes of the czars, whose tyrannical governments tried hard to wipe out all national feeling among these people. Fortunately their agents did not succeed in this task, and in the end Byelorussian national spirit won out. When the regime in Russia was overthrown, the Byelorussians became free. Early in 1918, on March 25, they proclaimed their national independence. That memorable date marked the rebirth of the new Byelorussia, ushering in a new era for its people.

Regretfully, however, the freedom and independence thus regained proved temporary and shortlived. Before these unhappy people had time to strengthen their new state, it was attacked by the Red army, completely overrun, and by mid-1919 Byelorussia was annexed by the Soviet Union.

Since then these people have been almost submerged and lost in the huge Soviet empire. Isolated and separated from the West by hundreds of miles, they have been completely at the mercy of their Soviet overlords. For more than four decades they have not known freedom. During the last war they had hopes of attaining freedom and independence, but all their hopes were shattered by the devious designs of Soviet authorities. Thus they have less freedom today than they had during the interwar years, but they have not given up their hopes for eventual freedom. On this 47th anniversary of their independence day let us all pray for their deliverance from Communist totalitarian tyranny.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to extend their remarks in the Record on the bill H.R. 2362.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

STEERING COMMITTEE, INTEREST RATES, AND THE PRESIDENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, my name is Wright Patman, Democratic Representative from the First District of Texas. For 36 years, I have been a controversial Congressman. This has been of my own choosing.

It would have been relatively simple for me to avoid much of the controversy that has been attracted to me. All I would have had to do would have been to fight the good fight for the overdog. When you do this, it is possible to accumulate all kinds of plaudits—honorary degrees from great universities, press acclaim, approval of your every action by those lobbies whose chief reason for existing is to aid their special interest at the expense of the American people.

I admit that I, too, have had a special interest. It is to pass good legislation. Good legislation to me is that which serves the people well. Good legislation has durability.

EXAMPLE OF GOOD, DURABLE LAW

Take the case of a law that was passed over 45 years ago, the one that says long-term Government securities shall not bear interest exceeding 4.25 percent. This law has served the American people so well that they have been able to go through two of the most horrendous wars in all history—the most devastating, worldwide depression in all history—and here and there a brush-fire war to boot—all without the need for breaking this 4.25-percent ceiling on long-term Government securities.

Now there is a concerted campaign on the part of the banking lobby and its handmaiden, the Federal Reserve System, to increase interest rates, which would result in puncturing this 4.25-percent ceiling that has done so well by us for nearly half a century. Should this ceiling become only history, we can forget all about moving in the direction of the Great Society so nobly envisioned by my friend, Lyndon Baines Johnson.

If the banking lobby succeeds in its blind ignorance and ruthless drive toward upping interest rates on Government securities above 4.25 percent, then we may be sure that there will be an acceleration of the present trend toward higher interest rates on all types of loans.

HISTORY OF HIGH INTEREST

Historically, high interest rates mean trouble. In a newspaper article that I wrote for United Press International, published last Sunday, I noted that Solon, the Athenian lawmaker, forbade men being sold into slavery because of unpaid interest charges.

I have studied a great deal of the history of money and interest, which for so long was called usury. I learned that the lending of money at interest was outlawed by both the Jewish and Christian churches for over a thousand years.

In the 10th century, under King Alfred, laws were enacted which provided that all the effects and lands of those who loaned money at interest would be forfeited to His Majesty.

And during the reign of Henry II, in the 12th century, those who loaned money at interest not only had to forfeit their estates to the King, but their children were disinherited.

Right here and now I want to go on record as opposing any legislation so drastic.

Two hundred years later in the 14th century, the crime of loaning money at interest became a capital offense. Again I wish to state that the punishment is too severe.

Now let us go to the year 1693, when the treasury of England was empty. It was during the reign of King William III, who was carrying on a war against France's Louis XIV. He needed money in the worst way—$5 million worth, so he went to the goldsmiths. It so happened that during this period, corruption was general in England and the goldsmiths, who were the lenders of money, had become fabulously rich at high interest rates. They pursued a policy of loaning up to 10 times the amount of gold they actually possessed. They issued receipts for gold which was not in their vaults.

It is a fact that I have stated on the floor of the House many times—our present banking system permits banks to issue credit at approximately the same ratio today, that is, 10 times the amount of dollars they have in reserve. This puts them in a favored class and gives them privileges which should never be abused.

To propagandize and lobby and connive to secure higher interest rates now, when the banking community is making more profit than ever before in its history, is most certainly an abuse of the privilege bankers now enjoy.

LONG-TERM GOVERNMENT'S INTEREST UP, EVERYTHING UP

The bellwether of all interest yields centers upon how much Uncle Sam pays for his long-term paper. Raise the yield and the cost of all money goes up, credit becomes tight, everybody rushes for a storm cellar and the cruel wind of economic restriction blows over the land. Then there is no growth to the economy. Then there are higher unemployment figures. Moreover, the Government is forced to operate at a greater deficit to keep disaster from getting altogether out of hand.

APPEAL TO DEMOCRATIC MEMBERS

It is my feeling that there is not a man on the floor of this House, be he Republican reactionary or modern Democrat, who wants anything like this to happen. That is why I am appealing directly to the Democratic Members of the Congress to join with more than 70 of our colleagues who are already signed up for a steering committee to hold long-term Government securities within the 45-year-old 4.25-percent ceiling. These Members come from over 30 States. Now I am going to ask that every State in the Union be represented, because this should be truly a national crusade. The people in the South and West are paying higher interest rates than those in the East. Nonetheless, up will go all rates if the crime of eliminating the 4.25-percent ceiling is successful.

I do not believe my colleagues on either side of the aisle want financial and economic disaster to fall upon the American public. I think that many of the bankers back home are willing to let well enough alone. I believe that the drive is sparked by the concentrated money interests, mostly in New York, who are venal enough to insist upon killing the goose that lays the golden egg.

As I indicated in that United Press article alluded to a moment ago, the banking lobby has used our gold outflow and imbalance of payments as a pretext to increase interest rates. I now learn that our retiring Secretary of the Treasury, in remarks before a recent monetary conference of the American Bankers Association, rejected the use of a tighter monetary policy to help the Nation reduce its deficit. He stated that:

> We could not expect moderately tighter monetary policies to bring the needed reduction in the outflow of long-term funds abroad.

And that a tight money policy would surely be "self-defeating."

The outgoing Secretary said:

> Before it could achieve the interest rate objective, the extreme restriction of credit would surely move us toward domestic recession.

WELCOME TO NEW TREASURY SECRETARY

Now we have a gentleman from Virginia, Henry Fowler, as the new Secretary of the Treasury. I rather doubt that he would want a tight money, higher interest rate policy that would bring about the end of our contemporary prosperous period. I am certain one of his goals is not to implant a depression so long as he is Secretary of the Treasury. I have a feeling that he understands how disastrous increasing the 4.25 percent ceiling would be to our economy.

WHO CONTROLS MONEY POLICY

It is a sad fact, however, that neither the Secretary of the Treasury, nor even the President of the United States, really has control of the money policy of our country. As the Members of this House know, as chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, I have a bill pending which embodies the recommendations of the majority of our Domestic Finance Subcommittee of 1964, which called for a modernization of the Federal Reserve System. Such modernization would mean an end to the dominance of the entire Federal Reserve System by the New York banks through their control of the New York Federal Reserve Bank.

In effect it would mean an end to the fraudulent independence of the Federal Reserve System. As countless top economists, such as Seymour Harris and John Galbraith, have pointed out, the Fed is not independent from the banking clique who have so long controlled the money system of America to the detriment of the people.

For the long pull, I want you gentlemen to think of the need of restoring the monetary policy of the country to the Congress, the President, the Secretary of the Treasury, instead of to a few believers in the divine right of money kings, including some of the kings themselves, most of whom reside in New York.

LET'S HOLD THE LINE

Today, though, I want you to center your thought on the need for holding the line on these long-term Governments, so that Chairman William McChesney Martin of the Federal Reserve System, and Alfred Hayes, head of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, and the rest of the ruling clique, and the lobby of the American Bankers Association, are not able to get away with the monetary mayhem they are trying to perpetrate.

Let us hold the line. Let us reverse the trend toward higher and higher and higher interest rates, which if not checked can suffocate the American people. Come along, join up with the steering committee. Serve your people back home, who do not wish to be suffocated with high interest charges. Do not permit them to be victims of usury as existed in the dark ages, or as exists today in those nations which have a few rich and many poor.

ADVANCE WITH L.B.J.

Do you really want to advance with Lyndon Baines Johnson toward a great society? Then come along with those of us who are working toward a sound American money policy based on adequate credit—you note I said adequate credit and not easy money—for the legitimate needs of American businessmen, both small and large, and the personal needs of any American who requires credit at reasonable rates. With a sound fiscal and monetary policy, the Great Society is an authentic possibility. Without such a policy, the goal can never be reached.

I wish to announce that I have asked the President to meet with our steering committee so that we may reassure him that we, like the President, are in favor of no increase in interest rates, particularly on long-term Government securities. As I have indicated, there can be no Great Society unless we have a monetary policy that takes care of an expanding economy. I would like nothing better than to go with my fellow Democrats from 50 States for a White House visit for the purposes I have just mentioned:

THE 89TH CONGRESS—UNOFFICIAL STEERING COMMITTEE OF HOUSE DEMOCRATS TO OPPOSE ANY INCREASE IN INTEREST RATES ON LONG-TERM GOVERNMENT BONDS AS OF MARCH 19, 1965

Alaska: Rivers.
Arizona: Udall.
Arkansas: Trimble.
California: Brown, Burton, Cameron, Corman, Dyal, Edwards, Hanna, Hawkins,

Holifield, Moss, Roosevelt, Roybal, Sisk, Van Deerlin, and Wilson, C. H.
Delaware, McDowell.
Florida: Pepper.
Georgia: Mackay, Stephens, and Weltner.
Hawaii: Matsunaga and Mink.
Idaho: White.
Illinois: Annunzio and O'Hara.
Indiana: Madden.
Iowa: Hansen and Schmidhauser.
Maryland: Friedel.
Massachusetts: O'Neal.
Michigan: Diggs and Griffiths.
Minnesota: Karth and Olson.
Missouri: Sullivan.
Montana: Olsen.
New Jersey: Daniels, Krebs, McGrath, Minish, Rodino, Thompson, and Helstoski.
New York: Bingham, Ottinger, Resnick, and Ryan.
Ohio: Ashley, Gilligan, and Vanik.
Oklahoma: Johnson and Steed.
Oregon: Green and Ullman
Pennsylvania: Barrett, Dent, Holland, Nix, and Rhodes.
Rhode Island: St Germain.
South Carolina: Dorn and Gettys.
Tennessee: Evins.
Texas: Gonzalez, Patman, and Wright.
Washington: Meeds.
West Virgina: Kee.
Wisconsin: Kastenmeier and Reuss.
Seventy-two Members from 31 States.

Following is a list of only several instances among many indicating that money is tightening and interest rates rising generally and causing tremendous pressures on the 4¼-percent interest rate ceiling on long-term Government bonds:

First. In the 6 weeks from the first half of January 1965 to the second half of February 1965, the money supply has declined steadily from $160.1 billion to $158.8 billion. This represents a decline of over $1.3 billion, or an annual rate of decline of 6.5 percent. In contrast, the money supply from July 1963 to mid-January 1964 increased at an annual rate of 6.2 percent. During the depression period July 1957 to July 1960, the rate of growth of the money supply averaged less than 1 percent a year as interest rates were increasing.

Second. The interest rate on short-term Treasury bills has reached a market yield of just under 4 percent, the highest in 5 years. Our taxpayers are paying an additional $600 million in interest costs on the national debt due to this unnecessary short-term rate boost just since 1961. And, just since the end of 1963 to the present, the interest rate on 91-day Treasury bills has increased more than 20 percent. Since 1946 the interest rate on this class of Government securities has increased by 900 percent.

Third. The market for municipal issues is sluggish due to monetary tightening, according to the New York Times. Typical of such issues are Georgia school bonds, Florida school bonds, Ft. Worth, Tex., bonds, University of Rhode Island bonds, Utica, Mich., school bonds, and the Public Housing Administration bonds. Other recent examples of higher borrowing costs to municipalities are Prince Georges County, Md., bonds, Fairfax County, Va., bonds, and Fresno, Calif., bonds. The excess interest payable over the lives of these bonds amounts to many millions of dollars.

Fourth. Mortgage rates, too, rose slightly in January on loans not backed by the Government. The average rate for mortgages on new homes was 5.79 percent in January, up from 5.76 percent in December and 5.75 percent in November. All this points to tightening credit for long-term borrowings, according to Finance Week magazine.

Fifth. The Wall Street Journal in a recent article headlined, "Bankers Quietly Begin Raising Loan Charges on a Selective Basis," reports that several large banks are not heeding President Johnson's request to keep borrowing costs stable. The article adds that "term loans at the prime rate rapidly are becoming a thing of the past."

Sixth. Last November 24, the Federal Reserve Board raised the discount rate which member banks must pay on borrowings from the Federal Reserve from 3½ to 4 percent.

Seventh. Yields on 26-week Treasury bills are also up.

Eighth. The Federal National Mortgage Association has been forced to raise the interest rate it pays on short-term discount notes.

Ninth. The rates charged by finance companies on commercial paper have steadily risen recently.

Tenth. The 4¼-percent 1987–92 Treasury bonds, bellwethers of the money market, have been selling below par, thus in fact exceeding the 4¼-percent interest ceiling.

Eleventh. The average free reserves of our commercial banks which are members of the Federal Reserve System have been drastically reduced to a much lower level than the average level for the year 1964.

Twelfth. The Federal funds market has been trading at 4 percent and even higher because of the scarcity of bank reserves.

Thirteenth. Housing starts in 1965 are down substantially from the comparable period in 1964. This softness in the housing market may be traceable to higher interest costs on home mortgages.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

OPENING OF HOUSING LEGISLATION HEARINGS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a statement I made before the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this morning the Housing Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Honorable WILLIAM A. BARRETT, of Pennsylvania, chairman, began a series of hearings on the housing and urban development bill of 1965.

It is my feeling that this legislation, which I was privileged to introduce as H.R. 5840, will be a milestone in housing measures—ranking with the housing bills of 1949, 1954, and 1961 in opening new approaches for attacking our housing and urban development problems. While Congress as a body can enact legislation for better housing throughout this country, it is also our obligation to make certain that there is an adequate money supply available at reasonable interest rates to take advantage of any new dynamic program. It would be useless, for example, to enact legislation providing for new vistas of public housing while at the same time allowing interest rates on money used to finance these projects to reach such a height that it is economically unsound to borrow these funds. I am including in the RECORD a copy of my introductory remarks at the opening of the hearings of the subcommittee this morning:

INTRODUCTORY SPEECH BY CHAIRMAN WRIGHT PATMAN BEFORE HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE OF HOUSE BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE, THURSDAY, MARCH 25, 1965, ON THE HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT BILL OF 1965

Today the Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee is beginning very important extensive hearings on H.R. 5840, the 1965 housing bill, which I introduced, and an identical bill, H.R. 5841, introduced by Chairman BARRETT. This bill is the administration's proposal. Dr. Weaver and his top staff from the Housing and Home Finance Agency will be our leadoff witnesses. We want to welcome you all back with us. This is a bill of great national importance, and we want to get the informed ideas and opinions of just as many persons and groups as we can before the committee acts on it.

I have had the privilege of working on many housing bills throughout my years in Congress. I speak from experience when I say that we have the opportunity this year to enact a bill which will be a milestone—ranking with the housing bills of 1949, and 1954, and 1961 in opening new approaches for attacking our housing and urban development problems.

The President has again shown that he understands the scope and urgency of this country's needs and that he sees them in terms not just of statistics but of people. This is a bill for all our citizens, including those in our cities, suburbs, and rural areas. The bill makes, for example, special provision for rural housing. It provides new programs for basic sewer and water facilities and for mortgage insurance for land development, which will be of special importance in the suburbs and other rapidly-growing areas.

This is a good bill as it is presented to us. I think, however, that we can make it an even better one. I hope and expect that all of us on the committee, on both sides of the table, can work together to shape a bill that will deserve, and will obtain, truly bipartisan support.

There is one area that I myself am going to be especially concerned with in considering this housing legislation. That is the question of interest rates. We are already paying more than $5 billion a year too much on the national debt because of precipitous interest rate increases during the 1950's.

INTEREST RISE DAMAGES PROGRAMS

The rise in interest charges since we passed the Housing Act of 1961 has already destroyed much of what the Congress hoped to accomplish through that bill. The most important provision in the 1961 Housing Act was the new 221(d)(3) program, designed to make reasonable interest-rate financing available so that housing could be provided for displaced and other low- and moderate-income families at rentals they could afford. The program interest rate then was 3⅛ percent; now it is 3⅞ percent, and I understand that it will shortly be going up to 4⅛ percent. A 1-percent increase may not sound like a very important change, but it makes over a $10 difference in the monthly rent that a typical low-income family has to pay under the program. This amount to these people is a lot of money.

The same thing has happened in other housing and public facilities loan programs. The program of housing for the elderly we started in 1959 is almost at a standstill. In the college housing program the interest rate will shortly be a full 1¼ percent higher than the rate we provided by special legislation in 1955. These programs are important for the whole country—from Texarkana College in my district to a moderate-income housing project in New York. I don't want the people we have been trying to help through these programs to think that we have joined forces with the banking interests.

We have heard all kinds of new and old excuses raised in the past several years attempting to justify why we must have a high-interest rate structure in our country. The shopworn arguments of inflation is just around the corner, the balance-of-payments problems—these and other reasons—have been given why we have to jack up interest rates. Not a one of these reasons has any basis in fact. We do know, however, in the specific instance of housing legislation that these programs have severely suffered from the increase in interest rates over the past several years.

EXHAUSTED ALL EXCUSES

In my opinion, we have more than run out of excuses for not making available adequate financing at reasonable interest rates for our housing and urban development loan programs. There can be no valid excuses for refusing to help through housing legislation, our colleges, our low-income families, our small towns needing public works projects, and the other programs under the broad umbrella of our housing laws in this country.

There are other important questions which the committee should look into and explore. Among them they include the following:

1. Why are mortgages—VA and FHA in many instances now selling below par? There is no reason why these mortgages, backed by the full credit of the Federal Government, should be selling below par. It is obvious that the flow of savings going into mortgages will not be as great as long as mortgage paper is selling at a loss. How can this be prevented? How can those who have invested in this paper be assured of repayment at 100 cents on the dollar, as we did at one time with Government securities? How can we make sure that the greatest amount of funds necessary flows into this vital field of housing, and those who through purchase of life insurance and other investments are not penalized by having to sell mortgages at a loss?

This is a vital matter, and one which I trust the committee, staff, and witnesses will speak to during these hearings.

2. Another matter of vital concern to me is this. How do we get the greatest amount of housing built, that people can afford, and at the same time benefit the entire economy greatest? Are interest rates the key to this matter? We have seen in other programs such as the RFC, Small Business, Rural Electrification program, and others that by encouraging economic activity at reasonable interest rates, the entire economy has benefited. Even if the interest rate in these programs were subsidized to some small extent, the increase in economic activity, the increase in taxes paid, both individual and corporate, more than outweighed any subsidy cost in the interest rate.

Why wouldn't this be the same in housing? If the interest rate on these various housing programs under consideration here were at a minimum, how much more could be generated in the way of house construction, greater tax returns to all levels of Government, and greater ultimate income to the entire American people?

This is another matter which I hope will be fully explored during these hearings.

3. Do we need to explore the feasibility of new methods of financing such programs as housing and other community facilities? This was a subject when the Joint Economic Committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, explored just this month. I would like to read into the record some of the findings and suggestions contained in the 1965 joint economic report. These statements speak both to the importance of interest rates and their role in assuring high levels of economic activity, and the intriguing subject of new methods of financing.

"MONETARY POLICY

"The task of economic recovery and achieving sustained economic growth is not yet completed. It is doubly imperative that the monetary authorities avoid the mistakes of the past and not be tempted or persuaded into a premature application of the monetary brakes.

"Fearfully aware of how easily the stimulative effects of tax reduction might be undone by unwise monetary policy, the committee last year again urged that the monetary authorities follow a policy of monetary expansion in line with the needs of an expanding economy.

"The economic improvement during 1964 has demonstrated the wisdom of that policy. The monetary authorities, apparently also mindful of the error of having prematurely tightened money in past periods of recovery, during the early part of the year maintained sufficient availability of credit to permit a fuller utilization of economic resources.

"We believe that the sustained economic recovery thus far experienced, albeit still less than sufficient to reduce unemployment to acceptable levels, would not have been possible had the past mistaken bias toward an early restriction (in effect, an early contraction when measured against the needs of a growing economy) been repeated. Unfortunately, there has been increasing evidence, beginning in the fall months of 1964 and becoming more marked thus far in 1965, that the monetary authorities are turning toward tighter money. As the recovery progresses, the lessons of the past seem to become unlearned. Economic recovery is not promoted by assertions that market forces have been tightening themselves when in fact the monetary authorities lower the target level of "free reserves," raise the discount rate, and allow the short-term interest rate to inch upward.

"Before this dampening process goes further we must remind the monetary and debt management authorities again that the current task of recovery is not yet done. A stronger economic pulse is insufficient reason for monetary authorities to rush for the sedatives or apply a tourniquet.

"The maintenance of adequate credit has been somewhat constrained because the majority of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System apparently feels that higher interest rates are necessary to prevent outflows of short-term capital. There is some question as to whether short-term rates are an important factor in capital movements abroad. Furthermore, the problem of short-term interest rate differences as between this country and Europe arises from the policy of European countries to use restrictive monetary policies and high interest rates to solve their own domestic problems rather than to use restrictive fiscal policies.

"The monetary authorities of this country have responded to this situation in a manner characteristic of central bank thinking. They have encouraged a rise in domestic short-term interest rates in a presumed effort to hold and attract short-term funds in spite of higher foreign rates.

"We believe that the ready acceptance and prompt rationalization by the Federal Reserve System authorities of the need for increasing short-term rates have not given much sufficient weight to the alternatives. Desired effects upon the balance of payments might have been obtained by other means, such as measures affecting the rates of saving in the United States, measures improving the climate for the investment of savings in a thriving domestic economy, measures involving various voluntary limitations on short-term capital exports, and, if the need be sufficient, measures for the direct regulation of short-term capital outflows.

"The monetary authorities have indeed been aided by one such device, the interest equalization tax, which has tended to penalize the outflow of capital from the United States. The President has recently taken steps to further discourage short-term outflows. We suggest that the Congress, in order to close loopholes and make these restrictions effective, may shortly need to consider applying similar interest equalization tax constraints to short-term bank loans of less than 1 year maturity.

"Rising short-term rates in the United States must sooner or later be recognized as being basically incompatible with domestic expansion. Long-term rates, it is true, have been held relatively constant, although they have in fact risen nearly one-quarter percent since the beginning of 1963. We are now confronted with the possibility, indeed probability, that a further rise in the short-term rates must inevitably exert upward pressures upon the long-term rates.

"The pressures toward higher long-term interest rates are particularly disturbing in the light of recent debt management policy. On February 20, 1961, the Federal Reserve System departed from its "bills preferably" policy. It announced that it was then purchasing in the open market U.S. Government notes and bonds of varying maturities, some of which would exceed 5 years. Authority was granted by the Open Market Committee for transactions in securities of "longer maturity" than those dealt in under the previous policy. The announcement, altogether unclear as to Open Market Committee concepts of "long" or "longer" maturities, was widely interpreted to mean that the system was moving to hold down, if not reduce, rates at the long end of the interest curve for Government, mortgagors, and businesses.

"In the 4 years since that announcement, the Federal Reserve System portfolio has been increased by approximately $10 billion, less than $700 million of which has been in maturities of over 5 years. Approximately two-thirds have been in maturity groups of under 1 year. The maturity distribution of portfolio holdings at the end of January 1965, indeed, shows a slight reduction in the proportion of holdings held in the "over-1-year category." The resolution of the Reserve authorities to hold down long-term rates has, to say the least, been disappointing.

Nor is it clear that the debt management authorities have applied their energies very vigorously to holding down long-term interest rates. The Secretary of the Treasury in his testimony to the commitee submitted a table, and took pride in observing that, "an amount larger that the entire $25.1 billion increase in the marketable debt since January 1961 has been financed over that period in longer term issues; marketable debt due in 5 years or more is up $26.9 billion." Why did the Treasury Department, during an economic recovery period, seek to extend the average maturity of the Government debt by competing for and absorbing long-term funds? However adequate or inadequate its reasons may be, the fact is that neither the monetary nor the debt management authorities have been vigorous in bringing downward pressure on long-term rates while actively and calculatedly raising short-term rates on balance-of-payments grounds.

"The committee recommends that the Federal Reserve authorities and the Treasury cooperate to avoid further increases in domestic interest rates and that:

"Secular increases in the money supply should be provided at the same rate as the growth of real gross national product and should be provided through open market purchases of longer term Federal securities, rather than by either increased holdings of short-term Treasury issues or through the lowering of reserve requirements.

"Debt management should be so handled by the Treasury as to reinforce expansionary fiscal and monetary policies—in particular, they should avoid new issues in longer maturities and advanced refunding at times and in amounts that will frustrate the above recommendation for monetary policy, thus putting upward pressure on long-term interest rates and unnecesarily raising the amount of interest the Government must pay.

"Those responsible for the complementary functions of monetary policy and debt management should recognize that the usual good sense of low-interest rates as encouragements to the economy are this year buttressed by the requirements for financing at minimum cost major governmental programs in education, housing, rehabilitation, and development.

"We urge that the Congress and the monetary authorities give serious, openminded consideration to a search for the best ways of financing the requirements of the President's program for education, overcoming poverty, and for general community and rural rehabilitation. Attainment of these objectives will require increased investment in schools and other facilities by Federal, State, and local governments, the magnitude of which over the next few years may well be as high as $25 billion or more.

"Under current financing practices, the communities of the Nation will have to borrow most of this amount. Even though States and municipalities do have a slight advantage in issuing bonds arising from the tax exemption of income on their obligations, interest costs on these borrowings each year and over the life of the bonds would, under conventional practices, be large and burdensome. Moreover, the communities most in need will have to pay higher rates although less able to do so.

"The special needs of our society for education and rehabilitation are so great that they challenge us to find new methods of financing, such as the feasibility of financing through special-purpose, low-interest-rate bonds, issued directly to the Federal Reserve System. The funds thus made available to the Federal Government would be available for direct investment in needed community developments or for relending to communities themselves at a low rate of interest.

"In considering methods of financing we need to be especially mindful of two things: (1) The Federal Reserve authorities and commercial banks are the trustees of the sovereign power to create credit; and (2) the economic report indicates a persistent gap between existing gross national product and potential. Because the national needs of the program are so great, it is imperative that new methods of financing be explored so that the burden of interest on the sovereign be held to a minimum rather than multiplying the already large cost by payments to middlemen. So long as the gap arising from unused capacity exists, we need to be concerned about reducing its size, rather than fearful of inflationary pressures.

"The committee's report, a year ago, concluded that the Nation had a right to expect better performance by the monetary authorities than it had been getting, adding that 'we must learn from experience and avoid repeating past mistakes.' Except for the rise in the short-term rate, the performance during 1964 in maintaining availability of credit, gives hope that economic lessons have been learned from experience with applying the monetary brakes while the economy is still on the uphill grade as in mid-1957 and early 1960. We warn, however, that the creditable record of the past year is again vulnerable to premature restriction. Because the record has been good thus far, it is doubly important that, in the absence of a clear and present danger of inflation, an unmistakable need to raise interest rates to protect the dollar internationally, or clear evidence of a general deterioration of quality in currently extended credit, restrictive measures should be avoided."

Do we need to develop new methods of financing economic activity such as housing? If we did, would there be a net benefit achieved? Would we get more and better housing at costs which the American people can afford? This suggestion is one of the most stimulating yet developed. If we could once make a breakthrough in this area—by direct financing using the public's credit—I believe we would never again have to face the problem of poverty, recession or depression in this country.

I hope the committee, the witnesses, and staff will explore this idea along with the others suggested above, and the many more which other members will bring up during these most important hearings.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Murphy] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of the 144th anniversary of Greek Independence Day, we congratulate the Greek people on their achievement and courage, and it gives me great pleasure to join with my colleagues in paying tribute to Greece.

When we read of the Greek war of independence early in the 19th century, we were overjoyed to learn how they overthrew the oppressive yoke of alien rule and regained their richly deserved independence.

During their trials and tribulations, their triumphs as well as their national misfortunes, they counted upon our sympathy and support, and today, on the 144th anniversary of their independence, I am happy to be able to say that we have not disappointed them. We have found ways to be of help to them whenever the country, which did more than any other to create Western civilization, needed our help.

One hundred and forty-four years ago Archbishop Germanos, of Patras, raised the standard of revolt in his monastery as Kalavryta against the Turks on March 25, 1821, and his people joined him in a national struggle against their oppressors. His daring deed ushered in a new day for the Greek people. That courageous act by a stout-hearted dignitary of the Greek Church marked a sharp break with the preceding centuries. That day became the Independence Day of the Greeks, and so it remains to this day.

The war which these gallant people waged for almost a decade against the ruthless forces of a powerful enemy at times appeared to be against too high odds, and many friends of the Greek people were rightly apprehensive of its outcome. There were times when the Greek cause seemed all but lost, beyond redemption, and the Greeks seemed almost down and out. But here again the Greeks once more proved their true worth by holding out until their friends abroad could prevail upon their governments to go to the aid of beleaguered and enslaved Greeks. When these governments heard, in 1827, that the Turks were taking captive Greeks out of the country and were offering these poor souls as slaves for sale, they could no longer refrain from open intervention in the Greek War. Fortunately for the Greeks, for all lovers of freedom and for the cause of humanity, this removed any question as to the outcome of the struggle. Greek freedom and independence was assured by the destruction of the Turkish fleet at Navarino Bay in October of 1827.

Since achieving their independence the Greek people have had anxious moments, faced hardships and at times their very independence has been in danger. At such times we have played our part honorably and well in helping the Greeks in their effort to maintain their independence. At the end of the last war we saved Greece from falling into the Communist sphere of influence, and today Greeks are among our staunchest allies in our struggle against Communist totalitarianism. Mr. Speaker, on this 144th anniversary of Greek Independence Day, I greet the people of Greece as our loyal allies and cordial friends.

LATIN AMERICAN HOME LOAN BANK

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Pepper] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill, H.R. 6798 to provide for establishment of a Latin American Home Loan Bank. Encouragement of the creation of such an institution that could aid the development of thrift institutions in Latin America has been one of my long-standing interests. On August 19, 1963, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman], who is chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I introduced identical bills on this subject—H.R. 8143, introduced by Representative PATMAN, and H.R. 8144, introduced by me. On August 22 and 23 and September 12, 1963, hearings were held on these and similar bills before the Committee on Banking and Currency. Testimony was received from savings and loan officials who had made extensive studies on the spot in Latin America concerning the means of encouraging the creation and development of local thrift and home financing systems. Reports made by several such officials were included in the record of those hearings. Testimony was also received from Federal officials, trade association officials, businessmen in charge of housing project operations in Latin American nations, and from some of our distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives.

Further opportunity to consider and discuss this proposal was fortunately presented to me as a speaker and delegate to the Second Inter-American Savings and Loan Conference held in Santiago, Chile, in January 1964. Participating in that conference were Latin Americans from several nations and U.S. citizens interested in developing thrift and home finance institutions throughout the great subcontinent to the south of this country.

In the light of the extremely helpful discussion and suggestions emanating from the committee hearing and the Santiago conference, I have made certain changes in the legislative proposal set forth in H.R. 8144 in the 88th Congress.

First, I have limited its scope to the direct and indirect development of thrift and home finance institutions in Latin America, instead of conferring upon the Bank worldwide responsibilities. The most successful efforts along this line of endeavor in underdeveloped countries to date have occurred in that area of the world. As of the end of calendar year 1964, a total of 83 savings and loan associations with almost 222,000 savers had accumulated net savings of $68.1 million. With that capital serving as a nucleus, over 27,000 new homes had been financed with total outstanding mortgages of $126.5 million. It is most interesting to note that the home finance dollar is more productive in terms of producing adequate shelter in Latin America than it is here at home, for the estimated average sales price of these new homes amounted to only $5,800. Most encouraging is the fact that these statistics represent increases within a single year of 66 percent in savers, 68 percent in amounts saved, 76 percent in number of new homes financed, and an astonishing 122 percent in mortgages recorded. These savings institutions are presently located in only six of the Latin American nations. It is to feed the momentum of this movement and to extend it to other areas in Latin America that an organization like the proposed Latin American Home Loan Bank is greatly needed.

One result of this growth in thrift in Latin America that I feel we do not fully appreciate is that the savings above mentioned are all local capital raised in the countries that form the seat of the thrift institutions we have been discussing. It is not difficult to realize that each of these U.S. dollar equivalents that proceeded to form a pool of local capital in Latin America represented one less U.S. dollar that was required to be exported from the United States to achieve this splendid total of home finance. Here, then, is a striking example of the reason that several of my colleagues and I have been seeking the enactment of legislation to establish a coordinating organization in the United States that will foster such local growth of Latin American capital by providing seed capital for creating new thrift institutions in our good neighbor countries to the south and by offering a source of finance to assist the further growth of existing thrift institutions in Latin America.

When the legislation we desire has demonstrated the admirable results I predict it will achieve in Latin America, it will be timely to consider extending its scope to other quarters of the globe.

A second change I have made in my earlier version of the proposed legislation is found in the composition and manner of selection of the Bank's Board of Directors. Briefly, under the new bill, 3 of the 15-member board would be public interest members selected by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, 3 would give representation to 2 Latin Americans and 1 Federal Home Loan Bank President, also selected by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and 9 would be elected by stockholders of the Bank. Initially these nine would be chosen from personnel of stockholders, but for subsequent terms the choice of the stockholders would be unfettered and they could elect nine directors from any walk of life. I do not claim that this is the only workable solution of creating a viable board of directors for this fine Bank, but I do feel that this arrangement affords fitting representation to the element of control to which the Federal Home Loan Bank Board may claim entitlement by virtue of its status as watchdog of the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation insurance reserves. The arrangement also gives appropriate recognition to the likely investment of Federal Home Loan Bank funds in the new Bank. I am especially delighted that this composition of the Board of Directors will include two representatives of the Latin American area who can bring to the deliberations of the Bank intimate and valued knowledge of the manner in which proposed Bank actions or policies would be accepted in Latin America. They would provide the leavening absent in a board consisting wholly of citizens of the United States. Finally the interests of Bank stockholders would be continuously represented through the presence on the Board of Directors of nine persons elected by the stockholders themselves.

The new bill provides that the Board of Directors would be initially chosen in its respective parts for staggered terms of 1, 2, and 3 years, and thereafter for terms of 3 years, so that the terms of one-third of the body would expire annually. The fact that two-thirds of the Board of Directors would remain intact in any given year would serve to provide desirable continuity to the governing body of the Bank. While the bill poses no bar to successive reelection, the selectors or electors have a fairly frequent opportunity to require the members of the Board to give an accounting of their stewardship. In a venture as novel as that proposed in this bill, I deem this to be a desirable arrangement.

A third change from the former version of the bill finds the Federal Home Loan Bank Board retaining its overall regulatory control, but adds a provision borrowed from Export-Import Bank of Washington experience whereunder the National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems, a Cabinet-level group established under the Bretton Woods Agreement, would be granted the authority from time to time to establish general lending and other financial policies to govern the Bank's Board of Directors. It is my present opinion that this accommodation will adequately enable the Cabinet officers most concerned with foreign policy and operations of the United States to lay down broad guidelines within which the Bank may proceed under the more specific regulation to be provided by the Federal Home Loan Bank Board and its own Board of Directors. It appears to me that this procedure is preferable to including on the Board of Directors itself two nominees of the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively, to serve as advisers and is also preferable to the precatory statement that the Federal Home Loan Bank Board shall be guided by the Department of State toward the end that Bank actions may be consistent with U.S. foreign policy.

A fourth change from my former version of the bill would enlarge the potential class of eligible stockholders of the Bank to include any person, including any corporation, partnership, or trust. My aim in this respect is to attract as large a potential pool of equity capital for the Bank as is practicable, rather than leaving the general public in the position of participating directly only as holders of debt obligations that may be issued by the Bank. The bill retains the former bill's safeguards as to asset and reserve limitations for stockholders that have savings accounts or deposits insured by FSLIC or FDIC. As another innovation, voting rights are limited to one vote for each thousand dollar par value of stock with an outside limit of 50 votes that may be cast by any one stockholder. With these safeguards against takeover of the Bank by investors uninitiated in the fields of thrift and home finance, it should also be borne in mind that the proposed tripartite nature of the board of directors has added another bulwark against a raid by outside investors to control the governing body of the Bank. As corollaries in the securities field, the new bill requires that par value of the Bank's stock equal its issue price and that the Bank must receive cash payment for stock at the time it is issued. Taken together this set of changes should serve to make it easier to raise working capital for the Bank more quickly than would have been the case under the former version of the bill.

A fifth set of changes from the earlier version deals with functions authorized to be performed by the Bank. Under the new bill, the Bank is given discretion to assist thrift and home finance institutions abroad that are organized as stock associations as well as institutions of that nature that are mutual in form. The authority is permissive and flexible. The Bank will make the decision regarding the type of organization of the institution or institutions it is attempting to aid in any given instance.

Regardless of sentiment in the United States that may favor either the mutual or the stock form of incorporation, it must be kept in mind that the institutions this bill is designed to develop will not be formed under U.S. laws or located in the United States. I deem it essential to remember that successful as any given mode of organization may have been in this country, the basic principles of operation when transplanted to foreign shores must be accompanied by a willingness to adapt the style of organization that will execute those principles to the mores and customs of the jurisdiction that will serve as the locale of the institution to be developed. Therefore it seems highly advisable to arm the Bank with flexible powers so that it may meet acceptable requirements for adaptation.

Also in the category of functions the new bill would broaden the powers of the Bank on a permissible but not mandatory basis by authorizing it to assist in developing facilities abroad for insuring savings and insuring mortgages, and for providing secondary market facilities in Latin America. Again, the Bank could resort to use of any or all of these powers where their use appears desirable or hold them in reserve where their use does not seem appropriate in any given set of circumstances. The new bill would also grant the Bank authority to conduct the training of personnel to operate the institutions the Bank is assisting to develop. Once again, this is a permissive, not a mandatory, function of the Bank, to be utilized on occasions when the Bank deems it appropriate to accomplish its overall mission.

As a sixth change, Bank borrowings under the new bill would be limited to 10 times the par value of its outstanding stock. This should put a desirable control on the overall issue of Bank debt obligations, and thus improve their likely quality as lawful investments for public funds. The changes formerly explained that should make the raising of equity capital easier should also make it less necessary for the Bank to raise as much borrowed capital as would otherwise be the case.

The new bill would exempt from Federal income tax income from both debt and equity securities issued by the Bank. The results accomplished from the operation of this Bank should save a related amount of foreign aid grants by the U.S. Government. Under the circumstances the proposed tax exemption would assist in attracting capital at a net saving to the Federal Government over what outright grants of foreign aid would cost.

A seventh change in the bill is found in the provisions in section 9 making specific loan and equity investment guarantees under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, available to the Bank from the Agency for International Development. An additional $50 million would be authorized for that purpose in addition to the $350 million proposed to be provided for housing project and thrift institution guarantees under the Foreign Aid Act of 1965 presently pending before the Congress.

If the Members of the House could have been with me at the Santiago Conference in 1964 to see the great expectations our friends in Latin America place in the program proposed in this legislation, I am sure they would share my enthusiasm for this proposal. I want to emphasize two points.

First. Not 1 penny of taxpayers' money is directly involved in this program. The only indirect relation between such moneys and the bill is the insurance of savings by FDIC and FSLIC in the case of thrift institutions that invest up to 1 percent of their assets in Bank stock, and the potential guaranty of Bank loan and equity investment that might be made available by AID upon application from the Bank. However, the working capital of the Bank would derive from proceeds of sale of its stock, loans, if any, floated by the Bank, and its earnings. In this respect the Bank would constitute a close parallel to a Federal savings and loan association and a Federal Home Loan Bank.

Second. The proposed program will not work at cross purposes with our country's efforts to achieve a favorable balance of payments. I understand that our balance-of-payments remedial policies are not intended to be applied in underdeveloped areas. The legislative program proposed in this bill is intended to operate only in underdeveloped areas in Latin America. Because of the severe shortage of housing that exists in that part of the world, underdeveloped areas coincide with the geographic area known as Latin America in the field of home finance. Moreover, the very purpose of the program envisaged by this bill is to develop pools of local thrift capital in Latin America. Consequently any immediate investment of U.S. dollars is of a pump-priming nature. It is expected that these relatively few dollars will serve to develop an indigenous system of thrift and home finance institutions in Latin America that should serve to decrease the request for dollars to be exported from the United States for home finance in Latin America.

Our friends to the South place high hopes in this proposed program. I hope that this Congress will provide solid substance for those high hopes by enacting legislation along the lines of the bill I have introduced. A third Inter-American Savings and Loan Conference is scheduled to be held in Quito, Ecuador, later this month. Early congressional attention to this bill would serve to sustain the faith the people of Latin America have placed in the frequent assertions made by officials of the U.S. Government that we to the North want to help our good neighbors to the South to help themselves.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE LATIN AMERICAN HOME LOAN BANK ACT

Section 1. Short title: "Latin American Home Loan Bank Act."

Section 2. Definitions:

(a) Bank: Latin American Home Loan Bank.

(b) Board: Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

(c) Member: Member of Bank, except where context refers to member of Federal Home Loan Bank.

(d) Stock: Bank stock.

Section 3. Bank incorporation: Board shall provide for incorporation and operation of Bank. Board has general regulatory power. National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems shall establish general lending and financial policies of Bank.

Section 4. (a) Board of Directors: 15 persons—3 public interest members chosen by Board (may include savings and loan personnel)—2 Latin Americans and 1 Federal Home Loan Bank President chosen by Board. Nine from personnel of subscribing members elected by latter initially, thereafter members elect any 9 persons. Terms, initially 1, 2, and 3 years, thereafter 3 years. Compensation, same as Board members, except Federal officeholders for profit and Federal Home Loan Bank officers receive none. Chairman and Vice Chairman elected by Board of Directors for annual terms. Directors may succeed selves and hold until successor qualifies. Vacancies filled for unexpired term. Non-U.S. citizen's oath not to conflict with his duties as citizen of his homeland. Bank management vests in Board of Directors. Board and Bank may delegate functions. Bank may delegate functions of Board of Directors, Chairman, and Vice Chairman.

(b) Board of Directors as incorporators file organization certificate with Board. Bank's principal office anywhere in United States; may establish branch offices anywhere it operates. Bank has general corporate powers, including power to sue and defend wherever it operates. Certificate of organization may be amended by Board of Directors with Board approval.

(c) Board of Directors may hire and dismiss Bank personnel.

(d) Bank may be public depositary and Federal fiscal agent.

Section 5. Capital stock: Board controls issuance of stock, including issue price.

Section 6. Eligible members: Federal Home Loan Bank, members of Federal Home Loan Bank (includes Federal savings and loan associations), State-chartered savings and loan associations authorized to be Federal Home Loan Bank members, mutual savings banks, and any person, including corporation, partnership or trust. All stockholders are Bank members. Vote: 1 per $1,000 par value of stock owned, maximum 50 votes per member. No stock issued until fully paid.

(b) Grants stockholding authority for Federal Home Loan Banks, Federal savings and loan associations, State-chartered savings and loan associations authorized to be Federal Home Loan Bank members, mutual savings banks and any Federal Home Loan Bank member, but all the foregoing are limited to investing not over 1 percent of assets in bank stock (except mutual savings banks not insured by FDIC), and except that limit for a Federal Home Loan Bank is 1 percent of capital stock, reserves, and surplus. No Federal savings and loan association. Federal Home Loan Bank member (except an insurance company), or mutual savings having FDIC insurance may buy Bank stock unless its reserves and surplus equal at least 5 percent of savings accounts.

Section 7. (a) Operations—Defines:

Foreign thrift and home financing institution: organization outside United States that receives savings and finances homes, and has Latin American office.

Foreign home loan bank: Latin American organization making loans or advances to or investments in thrift and home finance institution in its country.

Foreign insurance facility: Latin American organization that insures savings accounts or mortgages.

Foreign secondary market facility: Latin American institution that maintains secondary market for mortgages.

(b) Bank may lend, advance funds, or invest in shares or obligations of organizations defined in (a) above. Bank has customary and appropriate powers of an international banking organization. Bank may aid formation and development of thrift and home finance and related institutions abroad. Bank may conduct studies and training. Bank funds may otherwise be invested as Board approves.

Section 8. (a) Borrowings: Bank may borrow up to 10 times the par value of outstanding stock, but needs Treasury approval for a public offering.

(b) Bank obligations are lawful investments for fiduciary and public funds (except Federal Reserve Bank funds and except that national bank trust funds must comply with Federal Reserve regulations).

(c) Other laws governing securities and exchanges are made inapplicable.

Section 9. (a) Guaranty of investments: Bank is an eligible U.S. investor under the AID guaranty program.

(b) AID program is amended to permit guaranty, on terms and conditions fixed by the President, of Bank equity investments and its loan investments to the extent not already covered by that program. An additional $50 million guaranty fund is authorized, raising the total to $400 million for the AID housing and thrift institution guaranty program.

Section 10. (a) Miscellaneous: Federal Reserve Banks and Federal Home Loan Banks may act as depositaries and fiscal or other agents for Bank.

(b) Bank may use and pay for services of Federal Government agencies. Expenses of Bank, Board, and FSLIC are nonadministrative.

(c) Bank stock and obligations are exempt from Federal and State taxes (except Federal estate, inheritance, and gift taxes).

(d) Bank itself is exempt from all Federal and State taxes (except State and local taxes on real property).

Section 11. (a) through (e): Federal criminal statutes that apply to financial institutions, officers, employees, and examiners are extended to protect the Bank.

Section 12. Separability: This act generally governs Bank actions. Should part of the act be held invalid, the remainder stays in effect.

Section 13. Right to amend: The right to alter, amend, or repeal the act is reserved.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. NEDZI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, today we observe the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of the Byelorussian National Republic.

Byelorussia was an independent nation long before most of the members of the United Nations achieved nationhood. The Byelorussians, never feeling that they were a make-believe nation, have for centuries maintained a sense of national entity under Russian oppression and domination. They have maintained their religion and their language.

Like their neighbors, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Poland, and Ukraine, they are denied their right of self-determination.

After centuries of foreign rule, and unsuccessful attempts to revolt in 1812, 1830, and 1863, Byelorussia proclaimed its independence in 1917. Within 4 years, however, Russian domination was reimposed.

In spite of discouragements, a spirit of independence persists, the fictitious statehood devised by the Soviets is resisted, and this third largest ethnic group in the Soviet Union keeps alive a national feeling.

Americans of Byelorussian descent continue to call attention to the fight for self-determination. By our observance today, we help them in this fight.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. McGRATH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, today being the 47th anniversary of the birth of the Byelorussian democratic independence, I feel all Americans might benefit from giving thought to the unhappy history of this brave people which has waged wars for several centuries to preserve the independence which even today is denied them.

The post-World War II experience of the Byelorussian people with the Russian Communists might well become the experience of all nations in today's free world if the Kremlin succeeds in its drive toward world domination and if we of the West relax our vigilance or lose heart in our fight to remain free.

The persecutions the Byelorussians have been subjected to by conquerors over five centuries, particularly the brutal mistreatment they received at the hands of the Nazis and, more recently, the Communists, should give us all pause.

Today, the hopes and dreams of those who created the Byelorussian Democratic Republic on March 25, 1918, are still alive, but their country exists today as the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, created by the Kremlin leaders and completely unrepresentative of the some 18 million Byelorussians.

In fact, the Byelorussian S.S.R., the third largest constituent Soviet Republic, has within its present borders less than half the population and about one-half the territory its ethnography and language would fix as its population and area.

In the modern history of Byelorussia, we can take a warning from the cruel manner in which their Soviet masters absorbed and crushed this freedom-loving people. The Kremlin has not, however, crushed the desire for independence of the Byelorussian people, and we must strengthen our resolve to make certain the fate of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic never befalls the United States of America.

A BETTER FATE FOR BYELORUSSIA

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is appropriate that we pause once again to note the anniversary of the establishment of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic some 47 years ago. It helps us bring our own values into focus to honor those who in the past have struggled for the freedom of this ancient land and those who today, in the face of all adversity, keep faith with this historic goal.

This is not an anniversary of joyous celebration, Mr. Speaker, for the Byelorussians have experienced independence only once in modern times, in the year 1918. Rather, it is an occasion of sadness and sober rededication to the principle of self-determination and to the inalienable right of this brave little nation to see it put into practice.

Despite the heavy migration of Byelorussians to other countries, and heavy losses of population during the wars, some 6 to 7 million persons there today speak their own national language and maintain their separate national tradition. Byelorussian is a Slavic tongue which evolved from the early Russian language under the influence of centuries of Lithuanian and later Polish rule.

"Byelo" of course means "white," and the Byelorussians reportedly derived their name from their traditional white homespun garments. Never blessed with great prosperity, their greatest misfortune was to be placed by an accident of geography between larger contending states. In 1795, in the third partition of Poland, the expansionist Empress Catherine the Great of Russia completed a process of piecemeal takeover of Byelorussia from Poland which had been going on since the 15th century. Napoleon fought across Byelorussia in his advance on Moscow in 1812, and the most famous battle of the grim retreat from Moscow took place at the Berezina River of Byelorussia.

German forces fought the czarist Russians across Byelorussia in World War I, reaching the capital city of Minsk in 1918. When the new Republic was proclaimed on March 25 of that year, the torch of freedom flamed but briefly, only to be overwhelmed later the same year by the numerically superior forces of the Red army. Again the following year, in the Russian-Polish conflict, and again in World War II, in the furious combat of Hitler's Wehrmacht and Stalin's Red army, the Byelorussian people and their homeland suffered seemingly endless death and destruction.

Surely those who have suffered so much and who have sought their independence so long deserve a better fate than continued oppression under foreign totalitarian rule. Surely, Mr. Speaker, a better day will come. Then the deception of nominal statehood, controlled from Moscow, will be replaced in a restoration of the true national independence which Byelorussians and those of Byelorussian descent have never ceased to work for and to cherish.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Delaney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the Byelorussian people. It is singularly appropriate, therefore, that we in this great Nation, who have experienced liberty for nearly 188 years, should pause for a moment to reflect on the tragic history of these valiant people. For 300 years the Byelorussians toiled to purchase the jewel of liberty, but only for 3 years were they destined to possess it before their nation was crushed under the brutal heel of Soviet tyranny.

For three centuries the Byelorussians existed as an ethnically distinct people endowed with their own customs and cultural traditions and with a strong consciousness of their separate national destiny. And every hour during those 300 years their intense yearning for national independence never once wavered. In 1918, the chance was seized and an independent Byelorussian National Republic was proclaimed, only to collapse 3 years later before the onslaught of the Red army.

Their profile in history vividly reminds us today that we must strive, as President Kennedy reminded us, "to build a new world of law where the strong are just and the weak secure and the peace preserved." Only in such a world will the noble aspirations of these freedom loving people be realized. We salute them, and pray that one day they may regain their long-cherished independence.

FLORIDA FLOOD CONTROL

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Rogers] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to increase the monetary authorization for the central and southern Florida flood control project. This project spans all or parts of 18 counties in Florida, and is credited with saving millions of dollars and countless lives since it was authorized by the Congress in 1948.

The CSSFCD has in a large part made the growth of Florida possible. The project has turned land once inundated by flood and hurricane into land useful to new industries and new Florida residents who have come from virtually every part of America.

The benefits of this project have been estimated at over $200 million. This is pretty good return in view of the total expenditures of approximately $175 million in the first 15 years of this project.

But the phenomenal growth of Florida, and particularly the area encompassed by the CSSFCD, make flood control protection a critical necessity. Now, as a result of the changing land use which has accompanied Florida's population expansion, the planning of this project as it was originally conceived has had to change as rapidly and drastically as has the face of the land itself. Flood control theories and practices as they affect Florida have been altered and extended to conform to the growth of our State.

The existing monetary authorization for the project is $127,300,000. With $13,320,000 in the President's budget for fiscal year 1966, and appropriations through June 30, 1965, coming to a total of $124,500,000, the basin authorization for the project is in need of increase. Even with the appropriations of $124,500,000 to date, a theoretical monetary authorization balance of $2,800,000 is left.

There is barely enough authorization left to now carry construction on the project through the first quarter of fiscal year 1966. Unless there is an increase of at least $30 million as proposed in the legislation which I have today introduced, there will have to be cutbacks and curtailment of operations as well as a halt to new construction starts.

This situation would of course seriously hamper the progressive growth and orderly development of our flood control projects so drastically needed to give the protection needed for the expanding area served by the CSSFCD.

I urge the Congress to act promptly on my bill introduced today to give monetary increase to the central and southern Florida flood control project.

REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. St Germain] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill identical to one I introduced in the 88th Congress, and it has provisions which are of deep interest to many of the major cities of our Nation, including Providence, the capital city of my own State of Rhode Island.

This legislation, if considered favorably by the Congress, will eliminate the population limitation set by previous legislation under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, and title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955. Specifically, the present law contains a provision for assistance to cities situated within economically depressed areas. Most cities within these areas are allowed three-quarters of the cost of urban renewal projects, instead of two-thirds of the cost, which is the usual amount granted. However, present legislation contains an additional stipulation which denies the cities having a total population of 150,000 and above the three-quarter allowance. Although it is evident that the original intent of the legislation was to provide additional benefits and increased incentives to depressed areas, the present law does not accomplish this; for it provides additional assistance to the smaller cities and the towns within depressed areas, but denies this additional benefit to the larger cities within the same depressed areas. This is neither logical nor equitable. Certainly if small cities in our labor depressed areas have economic problems, it stands to reason that the larger cities within these areas have even more need for they have larger and more complicated problems.

Therefore, in line with our present desire to combat poverty throughout the country, I urgently request the support of my colleagues for the repeal of this restriction in order that the larger cities of our economically depressed areas may increase activities in urban renewal planning and development.

TAX ASSISTANCE FOR THE ORTHOPEDICALLY HANDICAPPED EMPLOYED

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Keogh] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the President's poverty campaign will, we are certain, restore hope to the Nation's distressed and disinherited during this period of great national prosperity. One such forgotten group is the Nation's employed orthopedically handicapped; a heavy expense burdened group whose average income ranges from submarginal to marginal.

Legislation to accord income tax assistance to the orthopedically handicapped taxpayer has for some years been pending in Congress. H.R. 424, which I have reintroduced, is a bill to provide an additional tax exemption in the case of an orthopedically handicapped taxpayer suffering from a 50-percent-or-more loss or loss of use of one or more extremities under the "Schedule for Rating Disabilities of the Veterans' Administration"—Federal Register, volume 29, No. 101, part II. In addition, deductions not exceeding $600 for transportation expenses in going to and from work would be allowed. This bill will, if passed, grant a measure of assistance to those physically handicapped persons most in need of it. H.R. 424 can reduce some inequities for the disabled, currently existing in the Internal Revenue Code.

In order to appreciate the wage status of the orthopedically handicapped worker, I refer to figures released by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which indicate that during the year 1963, of 368,696 referrals for vocational rehabilitation, only 110,136 were accepted; before rehabilitation, the average weekly wage was a low $8 per week and, after rehabilitation, average weekly wages rose to $42 per week. Of those rehabilitated, 47 percent had one or more dependents. Each year there was a backlog of 70 percent of referrals still in need of rehabilitation; 34 percent of the rehabilitants needed surgery and treatment. The average countrywide cost of prosthetic devices was $172 per rehabilitant, according to the VRA. However, the average person does not acquire prosthetic devices at such low prices; the going rate in the New York area is $500 for the average cost of a full artificial leg; $450 for artificial leg below the knee, and so forth. Other costs for the rehabilitant are: bilateral brace $350—brace extended to trunk add $50—brace above the knee $250 to $350, brace below the knee $100, wheel chair—standard—$200, custom-made special shoes average $120 to $175 for the first pair and $85 to $100 for the second pair, and so forth.

As can be seen, the orthopedically handicapped, by reason of their disabilities, are compelled to spend substantial sums of money, out of proportion to their level of incomes in order to maintain their rehabilitated status. Their expenditures frequently include:

First. Expenses incurred for the purchase, repair, and replacement of orthopedic and prosthetic devices not entirely deductible under the medical deduction provision of the code—special orthopedically built shoes are in this category.

Second. Unusual wear and tear of clothing caused by constant friction with orthopedic and prosthetic devices, crutches, and by falling.

Third. Additional expenses often include higher apartment rentals due to need of ground floor quarters or elevator apartment accommodations, which are higher rental apartments.

Fourth. Many disabled find it necessary to hire taxicabs daily in going to and from work. In the New York area the average weekly cost for this type of travel is about $25 to $30.

Fifth. In approximately 10 percent of the cases, the disabled, as defined in the bill, find it necessary to purchase automobiles to allow for mobility to and from work, and so forth. These automobiles, of necessity, must be kept in top condition to avoid mechanical failure. Hand controls are a requisite. A businessman can deduct the cost of his vehicle, as well as vehicular expenses for the production of income, while his physically handicapped employee who needs his car for the production of income cannot, despite the fact that he might be in a wheelchair and despite the extenuating circumstances.

Sixth. Paraplegics often find it necessary to purchase their own homes which are specially equipped with fixtures installed at lower levels. Ramps and wider doorways must be built to allow for ingress and egress to and from the premises.

Seventh. The disabled are frequently compelled to hire someone to do the household cleaning and repairing.

Eighth. Due to discrimination in the labor market, physically handicapped persons are frequently forced to accept lower wages and salaries.

Ninth. They are, as substandard risks, compelled to pay higher life insurance rates where they are able to afford the minimums of life insurance coverage. By the same token, they are rejected for health and accident insurance and, as a result, have higher medical and hospital expenses than the average taxpayer.

From the foregoing, it is obvious that the orthopedically handicapped taxpayers are subjected to heavy financial expenses that the average able-bodied taxpayer is not subjected to.

Many physically handicapped persons could have been rehabilitated were it not for their expenses in relation to their low wages and the high cost of maintaining their rehabilitated status. Many are frequently resigned to remaining home since their low gross income, less tax deductions, would give them a lower net income than if they remained home on relief.

According to figures published in the 1964 United States Statistical Abstract, the total number of 1963 job placements through public employment offices amounted to 13,818,000. This figure includes 278,000 physically handicapped persons who were placed in jobs; the latter comprise 2 percent of all workers placed by public employment offices. However, 2 percent apparently is too high a figure when one considers that the handicapped are rarely placed through private employment agencies and since, percentagewise, public employment offices place a higher percentage of handicapped workers.

By taking 2 percent of 68,809,000 total employed civilian labor force for the year 1963, we get a total theoretical physically handicapped working population, including every type of disability, of 1,376,180. However, the U.S. Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation finds that out of 110,136 rehabilitants 36.7 percent of this total include all orthopedic deformities, amputee and trunk cases varying from less severe to severe. If we multiply .367 with 1,376,180, we get 505,057 orthopedically handicapped persons, all told, affected by this legislation. Since the 36.7 percent includes 14.5 percent severe cases and 22.2 percent less severe cases, a further breakdown shows that there are 199,536 severe cases and 305,521 less severe cases. Allowing for a possible 100,000 borderline cases between severe and less severe to possibly qualify under H.R. 424, then we can assume that approximately 300,000 maximum would qualify under this tax legislation.

Even if all 300,000 disabled taxpayers claimed $600 tax exemptions with savings of $120 each, the savings in taxes for disabled taxpayers would be a total of $36 million. If as many as 15 percent of the 300,000 disabled taxpayers took advantage of the transportation deductions, they would save up to $4 million. The grand total for both types of savings would be approximately $40 million.

One must remember that it costs an average of from $479 to $544 to rehabilitate an orthopedically handicapped person. For the rest of his or her life the rehabilitated person will have to purchase, replace, and repair all sorts of prosthetic devices, specially built shoes, specially built braces, crutches, wheel chairs, automobiles and automobile hand controls, to say nothing of corrective surgery.

After rehabilitation, the disabled worker, as previously noted, earned an average of $42 per week. The average weekly benefit in the United States for a totally unemployed worker under the various unemployment insurance programs—State—for the fiscal year 1963-64 was $35.59; income which is not taxable. The disabled worker's average weekly income is only $6.41 more than unemployment income and the latter income is taxable in full.

The granting of tax assistance under H.R. 424 during the current session of Congress would lighten, to a degree, the financial burdens weighing heavily on the shoulders of the employed handicapped taxpayer.

In the past, the U.S. Tax Court denied handicapped taxpayers deductions for transportation expenses to and from work holding that these are merely commuter expenses—*John C. Bruton* v. *CIR,* 9 TC-88a; *Comm.* v. *Flowers,* 326 U.S. 465; *James Donnelly* v. *Comm.,* 28 TC, No. 159. The orthopedically disabled individual uses his or her car as a necessity and not as a luxury. H.R. 424 would aid the handicapped taxpayer by allowing deductions up to $600 where they are presently disallowed.

I trust that H.R. 424 will be enacted at this session of Congress. Such legislation is long overdue.

A partial list of organizations and individuals endorsing H.R. 424 follows:

Adlai Stevenson, Averell Harriman, Robert F. Wagner, the late Herbert H. Lehman, the late Eleanor Roosevelt.

Governors: Annual Conference of Governors, summer 1963—Joe Foss, South Dakota; William W. Barron, West Virginia; G. Mennen Williams, Michigan; Price Daniels, Texas;

William L. Guy, North Dakota; Orval E. Faubus, Arkansas; Leroy Collins, Florida; Bert Combs, Kentucky.

Senators: JOHN SPARKMAN, Alabama; JACOB JAVITS, New York; BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER, Iowa.

Brooks Hays, Arkansas (former president, Southern Baptist Convention).

Newspapers: New York Times, New York Daily News, Sioux City Journal, Christian Herald, Electrical Union World, Progressive Farmer.

ORGANIZATIONS

Religious: National Council of Churches of Christ, U.S.A. (40 million); Methodist Church, U.S.A. (10 million); International Convention Disciples of Christ; American Council of Christian Churches; United Church Women; United Lutheran Synod, New York and New England; Riverside Church; Catholic War Veterans, U.S.A.; Jewish War Veterans, U.S.A.

Labor: American Federation of Labor-Congress of Industrial Organization (13,500,000); International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO; Transport Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO; International Association of Machinists, AFL–CIO; United Automobile Workers of America; Labor's Non Partisan League.

Farm: National Farmers Union, U.S.A.; Progressive Farmer.

Veteran: Catholic War Veterans of U.S.A.; Jewish War Veterans of U.S.A.; American War Dads; American Legion, New York and Missouri Departments; Veterans of Foreign Wars, U.S.A.; Disabled American Veterans (Nos. 87 and 45); Army and Navy Union (N.Y. County Council); Masonic War Veterans (State of New York); Amputee Veterans of America; Italian-American War Veterans, U.S.A.

Medical: American Academy of Compensation Medicine; American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons; American Congress of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation; American Physical Therapy Association; Maine Medical Society.

Law: New York Workmen's Compensation Association.

Old Age Pension Groups: National Institute for Social Welfare (200,000); Old Age and Public Assistance Union of Illinois; Rocky Mountain Institute for Social Welfare.

Women: General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Social Work: National Association of Social Workers; Jewish Community Services of Long Island.

Fraternal: Grand Lodge, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, New York State; Grand Lodge, Free and Accepted Masons, New York State.

Handicapped: National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis; National Amputation Foundation; Congress of Organizations of the Physically Handicapped, Inc.; Joint Handicapped Council; Paralyzed Veterans of America; National Association of the Physically Handicapped, Inc.; Dr. Howard Rust-Rehabilitation and world renowned medical expert on the handicapped; medical editor of the New York Times.

In sympathy with H.R. 424: Daughters of the American Revolution.

Support H.R. 424 in principle: Taxation Committee of the Chamber of Commerce, U.S.A.; National Grange (farm).

How long, Mr. Speaker, must those who do so much to help themselves be denied so little as is sought for them by H.R. 424?

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE: A TRIBUTE

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, once again we commemorate the anniversary of Byelorussian independence.

On this solemn occasion we pay tribute to a people who have a yearning to assert their own national identity. For what they feel is a sense of pride in their nation, in their history, in their culture, and in their role as a people in the world today.

But the Byelorussians have no genuine way to assert their own sense of national identity. There is no freedom of cultural expression in the Soviet Union. There is no political freedom. There is no way, no instrumentality, in which they can establish their own national separateness.

This is not possible because Byelorussians are a people subjugated within a vast totalitarian, multinational state. On the one hand the Soviets claim that the various non-Russian peoples have the constitutional right of freedom. The various constituent republics are supposed to have the right to secede. This is, of course, a fiction. And it is a fiction also when the Soviets claim that the nationalities have the right to establish and permit to flourish their own particular cultural heritage.

The destiny of the non-Russian peoples of the Soviet Union is already established, and their destiny, if Soviet policy is successful, means complete destruction of any idea of national separateness and assimilation into the larger national ideal. This ideal constitutes a mixture of Communist and Great Russian values. In other words, Byelorussians, Ukrainians, Armenians, and the other non-Russian peoples will lose all sense of national identification with their culture and historical past. For those who wish documentation for this projected destiny, I suggest that you review those parts of the third program of the Soviet Communist Party that deals with the nationality problem.

On this day of commemoration of Byelorussian independence it is well for us to face the unpleasant realities that beset all the non-Russian peoples of the U.S.S.R. Their tasks ahead will be difficult and challenging. All odds are against them except one, and that is the lessons of history. We can find hope and solace in history; for the Russians have in the past instituted powerful programs of Russification, and they failed. And I do not doubt that with this enormous human task facing them today, they will fail again.

To all Byelorussians who love their native land, I extend my warmest congratulations, and I join with all freemen in the hope that your destiny will not be one of enslavement but rather one in which you will have the right to determine your own national future.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XXIV

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the 24th part of the series on New York City in Crisis appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

This installment contrasts the efforts of other cities in coping with the problems of modern urban society with those of New York City. It appeared on February 14, 1965.

The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—HOW OTHER CITIES BATTLE DECAY, IDLENESS, RACE STRIFE

(By Barrett McGurn, of the Herald Tribune Staff)

DETROIT

"The whole thing is not to go to the well too often."

Jerome P. Cavanagh, 37, mayor of America's fifth-largest city, rolled back in his overstuffed swivel chair and explained how Detroit has organized not one but three citizens' groups to deal with the decay of the heart of the city, with unemployment, and with racial friction.

Civic leaders have suggested that New York might take similar action to improve the deteriorating conditions of life and work in the greatest city of the world.

There were many difficulties in setting up the Detroit committees, Mayor Cavanagh said. Some automobile manufacturers tried to beg off on the ground that "we're not tied to one city—we work on a world basis." There were also political problems because of scattered small governments around the Detroit central area.

That situation would be even worse in New York, where there are 16 million people and 1,600 separate county, borough, township, and village governments inside the three-State metropolitan area. But Detroit's own problems in that regard are not inconsiderable.

"In our metropolitan area," the sharp-eyed, quick-smiling Mayor Cavanagh pointed out, "we have 4 million people and 500 local governments."

Bankrupt

When Mayor Cavanagh, a Democrat running as a nonpartisan, took over in Detroit 4 years ago, the municipality was bankrupt. Before anyone had time to cry "ouch," the new chief executive put in a 1-percent income tax for everyone who worked in the city, whether he lived there or not. Even Canadians from nearby Windsor were required to pay.

Lately the out-of-city residents have been cut back to a tax of one-half of 1 percent, but $45 million a year is still flowing into Detroit's coffers from all income tax sources, and the city is, as Mayor Cavanagh says now, far from bankrupt.

The three civic groups were patched together by asking busy, prosperous men to give time and funds for specific, quick-moving, cooperative projects. Fund requests were limited and no time was squandered.

One city group works against racial discrimination. Detroit's population is 30 percent Negro.

Another, the Detroit Metropolitan Industrial Development Corp. (known as "Demidco"), finances hotels, motels, and other new jobmaking ventures, serving as a channel for large Federal funds.

A third, the Metropolitan Fund, helped by the Ford Foundation, serves as the liaison between Detroit and its surrounding "bedroom communities," conducting regional-plan studies and convincing outlying groups to cooperate on water, sewage, pollution control, and other projects.

The change

The handsome outer suburbs had looked upon Detroit's swarming, heterogeneous population with about as much concern as the rural districts of Connecticut's Fairfield County or the rich commuter communities of New Jersey nurture for Harlem, but the Metropolitan Fund has made strides in changing that.

A typical civic group was the one dealing with racial friction. The Episcopal Bishop of Michigan, the Rt. Rev. Richard S. Emrich, stated that he convinced Walter P. Reuther, president of the United Auto Workers Union, that he should take part, and Mr. Reuther used a chance meeting at a party to get Henry Ford II, chairman of the board of Ford Motor Co., to join up, too.

Each of the three groups has from 50 to 100 members. Presidents and vice presidents of Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler—typical "world interest" concerns—and the chief administrative officers of Wayne, Detroit, and Michigan Universities sit side by side with Mayor Cavanagh, labor leaders, and church officials inside the directing boards of the three.

Some of the three groups meet as often as once a month—a real sacrifice of time for busy men, but one that has borne fruit. In a city that saw 34 dead and 700 injured in a 1943 race riot, for instance, Mayor Cavanagh can boast now that "we have the country's best racial peace record for a city of our size."

What Detroit has done, so have many other cities. Here are a few:

NEW HAVEN

A decade ago there was a don't-rock-the-boat city administration. Then a whirlwind who had been Yale University's press agent, Richard C. Lee, became mayor.

The Ford Foundation gave $2,500,000 to help organize Community Progress, Inc., a group of businessmen, city officials and other community leaders. A fund of $138 million ($88 million of it private capital) was raised for new construction in rundown areas.

Racially integrated housing and a better commercial area are the results, and it is the city's pride that the R. H. Macy Co. has shown its confidence by moving in.

ST. LOUIS

The grim quip about St. Louis in the early 1950's was that the once glorious "gateway to the West" was peopled by civic leaders who thought that "the best place for money is in the bank."

All that is changed. Sidney Maestre, then chairman of the board of the Mercantile Trust Co., formed Downtown in St. Louis, Inc., which is raising $89 million in private funds to end the decay of the city's heart. Other businessmen created Civic Progress, Inc. Mr. Maestre and David R. Calhoun, Jr., then president of the St. Louis Union Trust Co., cooperated with the reform city administration of a former college professor, Raymond Tucker, a Democrat, to put across a $110,000,000 public improvement bond issue, the largest in St. Louis history.

With the help of a 300-member committee the two bankers combed through $240 million in fund requests, then lured an additional $2.7 billion in Federal, State and private aid. Expressways, slum clearance, new parks, new health centers and a revived downtown area were the result.

SEATTLE

A newspaperman (Ross Cunningham, associate editor of the Seattle Times) and a chamber of commerce director (the late Dan Follett) agreed in 1954 that Seattle needed an economic shot in the arm—a fair. They got the fair and more besides.

The Central Association, a group of downtown businessmen, was organized. Fair, city, Federal, and private projects were combined. In all, $200 million was spent to put in throughways, fix up the city's core, combat water pollution, and meet housing needs.

PITTSBURGH

The city boasts of a renaissance, and one look at the soaring downtown Golden Triangle skyscraper section tells why. Frank Lloyd Wright once said that the only thing in Pittsburgh worth saving was its somber granite jail, but no one would say that now. Newspapers, businessmen, the steel mills, and the city administration pooled forces to fight air pollution, river flooding, unemployment, and downtown decay.

PHILADELPHIA

Comics used to call it "Forest Lawn with light." In the 17th century it was America's first planned city, thanks to William Penn, but by the early 1950's a "Chinese wall" carrying the Pennsylvania Railroad split the city, factory areas were blighted, traffic was a mess.

Then reform began. Businessmen and bankers formed the Greater Philadelphia movement, joining forces with the six-decade-old committee of 70 (a group of churchmen, labor leaders, factory operators, educators). A reform administration moved into city hall.

Now the railroad's wall is down. City, State, Federal, and private funds have run up fine new office buildings and hotels. A 30-acre riverfront slum has become a $100 million food distribution center. And the historic Philadelphia of the 18th century has not been sacrificed.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XXV

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues part XXV of the series on "New York City in Crisis" appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

This installment concerns the dilemma of New York City's small hospitals and appeared on February 14, 1965.

The article follows:

New York City in Crisis—City's Small Hospitals: A Crisis in Inefficiency

(By Earl Ubell, Science Editor)

You can call them hospitals of good intentions. They make no profit on their patients. They take care of the poor, often at a loss. Men of good will and good bank accounts give them time and money. Religious orders operate some of them.

But despite the best intentions, you can die needlessly in them because they have not kept up with medicine.

These hospitals are in deep trouble. And it is getting worse. They hover between the pit of bankruptcy and the pendulum of time. Time is running out for these well-intentioned institutions. The march of inflation squeezes them on one side; the advance of medical science from the other.

SIZE

These well-intentioned hospitals are 33 charity institutions, voluntary hospitals, which have fewer than 200 beds. In hospital jargon, they are called "small voluntaries" to distinguish them from the profitmaking proprietaries and from the 500-bed to 1,500-bed giant medical centers such as Presbyterian, Mount Sinai and St. Vincent's hospitals, also voluntary.

Daily, reports of impending catastrophe pile up:

From the city department of health: the reliability record of the small voluntary hospitals' laboratories is the worst of any group of institutions in the city, except profit-making proprietary hospitals.

From the American Medical Association: These hospitals do not have approved medical teaching programs. Experts say such teaching is essential to high quality medical care.

From the State department of social welfare: Small hospitals have a higher proportion of staff and technician vacancies than any other group of hospitals.

From the Hospital Review and Planning Council: Small voluntaries are growing relatively more inefficient. We will not approve construction or modernization of any hospital of this size.

REACH

All this, with the best intentions in the world. All this, while men of good will continue to pour millions into the hospitals. All this, while Blue Cross struggles to keep its insurance premiums from soaring beyond the reach of the middle class.

"New York City is at the crossroads in hospital development," says Dr. Jack C. Haldeman, president of the hospital council. "In the next decade we're going to see these small hospitals consolidated into large units. The trend has already begun."

Msgr. Patrick J. Frawley, director of health and hospitals of Catholic Charities of the Archdiocese of New York says: "We know that the small hospital is the weakest institution in our group. We are moving as quickly as we can to eliminate them or merge them into larger institutions."

Other hospitals are moving quietly for merger or affiliation with larger institutions.

Not all the small voluntaries have bad records. A few, through mighty efforts and devotion of staff and doctors, have managed to keep care at high quality. But they are very few indeed.

In the meantime, physicians continue to send their patients into these places and sometimes there is trouble.

A young woman has a baby delivered by Caesarean section: the doctor was not qualified to perform the operation.

SCRUTINY

The operating room logbook showed a number of operations performed by certain doctors. The names of the physicians could not be found in any of the official listings of doctors.

A hospital got wind of an impending visit by a special committee to study long-stay patients. Seven of these patients, who were there longer than 30 days, were discharged on Sunday, the day before the visit.

A small hospital with ambulance service received a series of severe-injury patients. Emergency room lacked equipment and staff to handle them.

Most hospital experts agree that small size limits a hospital's medical competence and operating efficiency.

On medical competence, the evidence is overwhelming. For example, in New York a good hospital should have a good teaching program for doctors. A teaching program, they say, improves the care of the patients because medical students keep older doctors on their toes. When doctors know they are being watched, they perform better.

Further, a teaching program provides round-the-clock doctors' surveillance because interns and residents, who are doctors, are on duty. And if a hospital wants interns and residents it must provide good teachers, good equipment, and enough patients to study.

Under the rules of the American Medical Association, a hospital must have at least 150 beds to operate an approved internship program. That requirement immediately eliminate 21 of the small voluntaries, which have fewer than 150 beds.

SHORTCOMINGS

Even if a hospital is approved for an internship—the lowest rung of clinical education—that does not mean it will attract interns. Since there are fewer American medical school graduates each year than available internships, many go unfilled or are filled with graduates of foreign medical schools.

Some of the small voluntaries "buy" their interns abroad, promising them medical education and enough money to live handsomely. When the "intern" arrives he finds no medical teaching program and discovers that he has actually become an indentured medical factotum.

In the realm of specialty training—the residencies—the picture is far worse. Here the A.M.A. and the specialty organizations require good medical supervision, equipment and enough patients for the training doctor to work on.

Yet very few small voluntaries have approved programs in all four basic specialties: medicine, surgery, obstetrics-gynecology and pediatrics. Fewer still have approvals for anesthesiology, pathology or radiology. And at least a dozen lack approvals in all seven.

In some of the small voluntaries, lack of such teaching programs does not necessarily mean that its doctors are not good. Many top specialists in large voluntary hospitals use small voluntaries as "overflow" hospitals when they cannot get a patient admitted to a big center.

PAY

However, it is no secret in hospital circles that New York City contemplates using residency programs as a hallmark of quality of care. The city pays out some $50 million to all voluntary hospitals for the care of indigent patients. About 15 percent of this goes to small voluntaries.

If the city requires a hospital to have approved residency programs in medicine and surgery to be eligible for payments, about 17 hospitals will lose their city income entirely. This step would put enormous pressure on these institutions: for some, city payments constitute nearly 25 percent of all income.

The city has already started to crack down on those voluntary hospitals which keep patients to get city money even though there is no medical indication for hospitalization. Dr. Ray E. Trussell, commissioner of hospitals, recently put the situation this way:

"The 'survival' patient is an administrative designation of mine to characterize patients who are kept in hospitals at public expense for unnecessary prolonged stays in order to maintain income.

"The hospitals which are characterized by larger proportions of very long-stay patients in their census are usually professionally weak and financially desperate. Any sudden removal of city-charge, long-stay patients from any one of these institutions could cause a closing of the doors forever."

Dr. Trussell did not name names, but a study done by Columbia University in 1961 indicated that small voluntaries and one large voluntary in financial difficulty were the worst offenders.

Small size limits medical competence in many other subtle ways. Take laboratories. To operate a good laboratory, a hospital needs a full-time pathologist, an M.D. who is well versed in laboratory techniques. It also requires skilled technicians.

A hospital with 50, 100, or even 150 beds would be hard pressed to hire a pathologist at $25,000 a year. So many hospitals share pathologists who oversee the laboratories on a part-time basis. It doesn't work.

Dr. Morris Schaeffer, director of the city health department's bureau of laboratories, has given mystery specimens to those small hospital laboratories. They flunk miserably. Half the time they could not make a bacteria diagnosis; they would mess up blood groups and spoil simple chemical determinations.

"The small voluntary hospitals," he said, "had records as a group as bad as the proprietary hospitals." The latter group, Dr. Schaeffer discovered, had the worst performance of any in the city. On the basis of those findings plus other irregularities in proprietary (profitmaking) hospital operations, the city recently adopted a stringent proprietary hospital code.

Except for inspections of laboratories and infant nurseries by the city health department and the threat of the withdrawal of city-charge patients, the city can do little to regulate the voluntary hospitals.

BEYOND REACH

Under State law, voluntary hospitals fall under the jurisdiction of the State department of social welfare. This department has 10 inspectors, all nurses, and two supervisors to inspect 85 municipal and voluntary hospitals, 101 homes for the aged, 47 dispensaries, 50 temporary shelters, and 6 public home infirmaries, a total of 289 institutions.

By contrast, the city department of hospitals has 40 inspectors plus 4 doctors and a supervisor to watch over 80 proprietary hospitals and 47 private nursing homes, a total of 127 institutions.

The State department of social welfare visits each voluntary hospital once a year; the city's inspectors check proprietaries every 3 months.

"We are doing the best we can," says Mrs. Vivian Bucknan, who is in charge of the State's inspection team.

The State has an interim set of regulations on which it has been working for nearly 4 years but which have not yet been adopted by the State board of social welfare. The wheels of State government grind slowly.

In any case, the document leaves to the hospitals the qualifications of the doctors who practice in them. In the proprietary hospital code these qualifications are set by law.

Further, State inspectors adopt an attitude of supervision and consultation rather than inspection and enforcement.

"After all," Mrs. Bucknan says, "these are voluntary institutions. They want to do a good job. And by and large they do. We find in New York City we have not had to close a hospital for violations."

However, Mrs. Bucknan acknowledged that small hospitals have more nursing and technical personnel vacancies than large hospitals have. "In some places in this city," she said, "it isn't safe for a nurse to be out at night."

Many hospital men criticize the State code because it is weak in setting standards of medical care and because it is being administered by an agency more concerned with welfare than with health and hospitals. There is considerable discussion at State levels about the advisability of transferring this duty to the department of health.

Smallness gets in the way of medical care by eliminating necessary equipment. Dr. Martin Cherkasky, president of the Greater New York Hospital Association, points out that a small hospital may have enough equipment to handle a small medical problem.

"The hitch is," he says, "is to be caught in a little place with a big problem."

As medicine advances, Dr. Cherkasky says, more equipment, better laboratories, and more nursing are needed. A hospital with fewer than 200 beds cannot afford these medical luxuries.

Ideally, a small hospital should transfer difficult cases to a big center and a big center should move its easy ones, to the small hospital. "It doesn't work out that way," Dr. Cherkasky says, "doctors take an intimate interest in their patients. They sometimes act as though they own their patients and they don't let go."

NEW RULE

On efficiency, the evidence is also against small hospitals. A State law passed in 1964 gave power of life and death over new hospitals in the city to the Hospital Review and Planning Council of Southern New York. The council is made up of outstanding medical and hospital experts in the city.

The council stated that it would disapprove construction of any hospital, voluntary or proprietary, which had fewer than 200 beds, except in extreme circumstances. At the moment, the council is leaning toward, and probably will adopt, a new standard for New York City of a minimum of 350 beds.

Under this standard, 62 of the voluntary hospitals in this city would never have been built. Their total capacity of 11,000 beds represents just half of the voluntary hospital beds in this city.

REAR ENTRANCE

Inefficiencies creep in by the back door. A small hospital has more trouble keeping its beds full because of restrictions of room availability. A full hospital is an efficient hospital.

Dr. Haldeman, of the hospital council, points out that smallness breeds nursing inefficiencies, too. An ideal nursing unit consists of 35 beds, he says. A small hospital would find it more difficult to group its units into 35-bed sizes.

Purchasing, linen supplies, cleaning, maintenance, administration, and food service all suffer in the small hospital from high-unit costs. In brief, it costs less for each towel, for each cup of soup, for each hospital record if you deal with 500 of them rather than with 50 or 100.

Dr. Haldeman says that the council has been refusing permission for small hospitals to modernize their plants. "They would be throwing good money after bad," he says.

As a result, merger talks have been going on. Some mergers have already been announced. Monsignor Frawley of catholic charities, had indicated that mergers and closings are in the planning stages in his group of hospitals. In the Brooklyn diocese where there is the heaviest concentration of small religious hospitals, there is strong talk of mergers, too. Msgr. Joseph F. Brophy, Monsignor Frawley's counterpart in Brooklyn, refuses to discuss them, but he says there will be an announcement soon.

Among nonsectarian hospitals, similar moves are being made. Hospitals supported by the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies went through a consolidation about a decade ago.

A SOLUTION

"It will take about ten years to complete the consolidation of all the little hospitals around New York," Dr. Haldeman says, "All we need is money."

The council has calculated that the city's hospitals need about $390 million to repair and rejuvenate themselves. And this money is needed for all of them. Nobody seems to know where it will come from. The Federal Government has cut back on funds for new city hospital construction now that most of the rural hospitals have been built.

New York State's constitution forbids the State to appropriate funds for voluntary hospital construction; thus it would take an amendment to get State money for this project. Dr. Haldeman points out that California will match Federal money for voluntary hospital construction.

As for the city, it has its own hospital burden—rebuilding Harlem, Kings County and Bellevue Hospitals, upgrading medical care in other hospitals, and providing long-term care for indigent patients.

In the meantime, small hospitals will continue to take care of patients—sometimes a Caesarean section will be done by an unqualified surgeon; sometimes an ambulance will arrive with a case too difficult for the emergency room; and sometimes you might get stuck in a small place with a big problem.

FIREARMS LEGISLATION IS NEEDED NOW

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced three bills to increase control on the sale and use of firearms and other dangerous weapons.

The first of these bills would require the registration of pistols in the District of Columbia. It is similar to my bill, H.R. 637, which I introduced on January 4, 1965, and was transmitted to the Congress by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to implement part of President Johnson's message on the District of Columbia contained in House Document 86.

The bill is explained in some detail in the following letter from Commissioner Tobriner which accompanied the draft proposal:

March 16, 1965.

The Honorable the Speaker,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. Speaker: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have the honor to submit herewith a bill "To require the registration of pistols in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes."

This bill implements the President's message to the Congress on matters relating to the District of Columbia (House Document 86). In discussing the crime situation, the President stated that—

"Some control of firearms within the District is urgently needed. Legislation providing for the registration of pistols, which is an appropriate first step, will shortly be transmitted to the Congress by the Commissioners."

Existing law permits the responsible and law-abiding citizens to possess a pistol in his home or place of business without a license. The bill does not change existing law in this respect.

The principal purposes of the bill are two:

1. To require registration of pistols owned or possessed within the District of Columbia.

2. To forbid ownership or possession of pistols by persons having certain dangerous or irresponsible characteristics.

Meaningful criminal sanctions to enforce these requirements are contained in the bill.

The registration requirement is designed to put on record the identity of each pistol within the District of Columbia and of each person having ownership or possession of a pistol. This will, we believe, provide data which will aid the police in the solution of crimes committed with pistols (almost all crimes committed with firearms in the District of Columbia are committed with pistols).

Crimes committed with pistols in the District, as in other large cities of the United States, have been steadily on the increase in the past few years. The Commissioners and the Federal authorities believe that one factor has been the easy availability of pistols. J. Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, stated in June of 1963 that—

"The easy accessibility of firearms is a significant factor in murders committed in the United States today * * *

"Guns are by far the most lethal weapons used in assaults to kill—seven times more deadly than all other weapons combined."

We believe that an important step in reducing the crime rate is to provide tighter legal control over the acquisition, possession, and records of pistols.

Pistols were used in the District of Columbia in 24 homicides in fiscal year 1962. This number increased to 37 in fiscal year 1964. The number used in aggravated assaults in the 1962 fiscal year was 393. This number increased to 467 in the fiscal year 1964. The number of pistols used in robberies in fiscal year 1962 was 262, and in 1964 the number increased to 482. Thus, nearly 1,000 violent crimes involved the use of pistols in the fiscal year 1964. These statistics do not fully state the magnitude of the danger of pistols, since they measure only actual crimes of violence, taking no account of pistols carried illegally, which are instantly capable of violent use.

The major changes in the law proposed by title I of the bill would:

1. Require registration with the Chief of Police of pistols.

2. Provide criminal penalties for possession of unregistered pistols.

The major changes proposed by title II would:

1. Add new categories of persons prohibited from possessing pistols. These would be persons convicted of misdemeanors involving the use of pistols, persons under 21 years of age (except while actually engaged as a regularly enrolled member in the activities of an organization authorized to receive pistols from the U.S. Government), frequent offenders involved in drunken driving or habitual intoxication, and persons found to have mental disorders. Under existing law, only four categories of persons are prohibited from possessing pistols. They are (a) drug addicts, (b) persons convicted in the District or elsewhere of a felony, (c) persons convicted of prostitution, keeping a disorderly house, or vagrancy, and (d) persons not licensed to sell guns and convicted of violating the Dangerous Weapons Act.

2. Increase penalties for illegally carrying a pistol on one's person or possessing certain prohibited dangerous weapons, such as machineguns.

3. Increase from 48 to 120 hours the time for police to investigate the qualifications of a prospective purchaser of a pistol, before delivery may be made.

In developing the bill, the Commissioners had the close cooperation and assistance of Mr. David C. Acheson, U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia.

The Commissioners most strongly urge enactment of the bill.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that this bill is consistent with the administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

Walter N. Tobriner,
President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia.

The second bill that I have introduced today would amend the Federal Firearms Act to prohibit the mail-order sales of firearms to individuals by limiting firearms shipments in interstate commerce to shipments between importers, manufacturers and dealers. It also prohibits sales of all types of firearms to persons under 21 years of age except sporting rifles and shotguns. The bill contains a number of other provisions which I believe to be essential in the proper regulation of firearms and is calculated to implement part of President Johnson's attack on the problem of rising crime in this country. It is similar to my bill, H.R. 1110, which I introduced on January 4, 1965.

The third bill I have introduced today would impose special taxes on the importing, manufacturing and dealing in destructive weapons and would increase the rates of existing taxes.

Both of these latter proposals have been sponsored in the other body by our distinguished former colleague, the senior Senator from Connecticut.

I sincerely hope that the House Committee on Ways and Means, to which my bill, H.R. 1110, and the two bills amending the Federal Firearms Act and National Firearms Act, that I have introduced today, have been referred, will schedule hearings on these proposals in the very near future. Similarly, I hope that the Committee on the District of Columbia will schedule hearings on H.R. 637.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, how appropriate it is for us today, in commemoration of Byelorussian independence, not only to recall the very valiant act of these people in declaring their sovereignty as a nation, but in a larger sense to realize the universal implications of their bold declaration.

For the Byelorussians emerged more than victors over centuries of oppression when they declared their independance in 1918; their victory was a victory for all men in their belief that they inherently possess the right to be free.

As our distinguished Secretary of State Dean Rusk stated, in speaking of the American Declaration of Independence:

These principles were set forth not as the special property of the inhabitants of the British Colonies in North America but as universal truths, applicable to all men and for all time.

And, over the decades, the appeal of these principles has endured and broadened. Could there be more eloquent testimony to this truth than the Byelorussian declaration which came nearly a century and a half later?

It is these principles which the Byelorussians courageously fought to uphold and worked to preserve that we share with men and women in every other country. Thus, it is more than sadness we feel when we recall that the Byelorussians, as many others, are not really free; it is more than sympathy that we express when we see their bondage.

On this day of remembrance of Byelorussian independence we are reminded of our President's thoughts when he said, "We have worked to help the nations of Eastern Europe move toward independence. This is their people's goal and this is our people's continuing resolve."

That freedom and independence will once again be a reality for the Byelorussian nation is our fervent hope, Mr. Speaker, as we remember with admiration our Byelorussian friends.

THE ROAD TO FREEDOM IN EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KREBS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following memorandum from the 11th session of the Assembly of Captive European Nations, Document No. 393, dated March 24, 1965:

THE ROAD TO FREEDOM IN EAST-CENTRAL EUROPE

I

The prevalent view in the West is that the situation in Europe has undergone a significant change for the better during the last 2 years. Fully absorbed by the rift with Red China, by difficulties with its Eastern European satellites and by domestic problems, the Soviet Union is supposed to have dropped any expansionist aim in Europe. Preoccupation with the war in Vietnam and economic prosperity, as well as an overoptimistic assessment of developments in east-central Europe, further feed the impression that Western Europe is not only secure but can look forward patiently to the gradual recession of Soviet influence.

The Assembly of Captive European Nations cannot share this optimistic evaluation of recent events in Europe. In the view of the assembly, one can at best speak of a change of Soviet tactics in Europe. The policy of intimidation, as symbolized by the Berlin ultimatum (1958–62), foundered on the shores of Cuba. The emphasis is now on political penetration through the old device of popular fronts. The new, nationalist and moderate, image some of the Western European Communist Parties are striving to project is likely to serve this purpose regardless whether or not it was a genuine emancipation from a rigid, Moscow-set course of policy. But this new emphasis on political penetration in no way excludes the danger of a return to the policy of intimidation. The possibility, indeed, that Moscow may revert sooner or later to the attempt of gaining ground by pressures, backed up by conventional military power, cannot be discarded. In this context, the practical deterrent influence the nations of Eastern Europe represent, to the extent they endanger Soviet lines of communication, constitutes a factor of Western European security which cannot and should not be neglected.

There can be no doubt that the Communist world is beset with troubles. The deepening Moscow-Peiping rift, the instability inherent in the collective-type of leadership the Soviet Union has had since the ouster of Khrushchev, the structural crisis of Communist agriculture, the more and more obvious inadequacy of rigid economic planning—are undeniably hampering Soviet expansionism.

But these developments should not obscure the fact that Communist aims have not changed; that Soviet military power remains deployed in East Germany, Poland, Hungary, and the Baltic States, that is, in the heart of Europe; that the apparently increased autonomy of the Communist Parties in Western Europe enhances their effectiveness; that the new projection of the satellites as genuinely independent removes an important obstacle to Communist advances through political penetration and internal subversion; that the widely heralded changes in Eastern Europe have not altered the nature of the Communist regimes or their basic, if less evident, dependence on Moscow; that these changes are designed to make the Communist system work and thus render it domestically more acceptable and internationally more respectable.

If one is mindful of the divergencies which have developed recently within the Western Alliance and of the slackening of the sense of danger in Europe under the impact of a rather optomistic view of the crisis the Communist world is undergoing, one can only conclude that difficulties are present on both sides of the Iron Curtain. Opportunities to gain ground, therefore, appear to be open to both the free and the Communist side.

It is the considered view of ACEN that if the free nations hold their ground in the next few years and continue to demonstrate their determination to help the peoples in east-central Europe to recover full freedom and independence, while refraining from actions apt to lend prestige or to help the Communist regimes to solve their serious economic problems, necessity will compel these regimes to adopt more rational ways involving greater freedom of action for economically essential segments of the population, such as the technological and managerial elite and the peasants. Concessions induced by pressure and necessity might unleash an irreversible process of disintegration of the totalitarian pattern. The very nature of the Soviet regime, with its built-in crises of succession and civil war potential, might provide the opportunity for such a process culminating in acts of self-deliverance.

II

To further the process of national and human emancipation in Eastern Europe, it is essential to distinguish carefully between the peoples of east-central Europe, the potential allies of the West, and the Communist rulers who keep them in bondage.

It is imperative to avert any kind of actions apt to be construed as acceptance of the finality of the political status quo in Eastern Europe.

It is most useful to indicate by appropriate diplomatic actions awareness that uniting Europe in its natural borders and making it politically, militarily and economically self-reliant is, in the long run, the only sound and dependable foundation for peace and security in the key area of Europe.

It is necessary to show awareness of the fact that in spite of the differences from one Eastern European country to another, their situation is fundamentally the same. Their relationship to the Soviet Union cannot be defined in terms of an alliance or a mutual security arrangement. The Soviet Government guarantees, indeed, the Communist regimes against their internal enemies rather than national territory against external aggression. The certainty of Soviet intervention acts as a deterrent upon the ruled and an assurance to the rulers. In such conditions the attitude of the majority toward the regimes remains one of mute hostility. This hostility and the pressures it causes, chiefly in the form of noncooperation and other types of passive resistance, is a proven source of positive changes, particularly when it goes hand in hand with steady pressures from without. It creates, moreover, for the Soviet Union a risk factor, which has played in the past and, given the growing nuclear stalemate, may again play in the future an important deterrent role to Soviet aggressiveness.

One can hardly stress enough that the diminution of unnecessary terror in east-central Europe, on the pattern adopted in the Soviet Union, does not mean a basic change in the Communist system. The dictatorial rule by a single party, a minority group, supported by policy and military forces, remains the essential feature of the Communist regimes. The freedoms of speech, press, assembly and association are still denied in east-central Europe. There is no multiparty system, in spite of the nominal existence, in some countries, of sham peasant or democratic parties which have adopted the platform of the Communist Party and have acknowledged its "leading role." The "elections" are still held with single governmental lists. There are no opposition candidates. This one-party system is basically the same in the nine captive countries, in spite of some differences in the degree of police control and of the operation of the economic system. Guarantees against arbitrary arrest and detention and the rule of law are still conspicuous by their absence. Religion and churches continue to be persecuted.

In all the East European countries the peasants constitute the majority of the population. But, with the single exception of Poland, they have been deprived of their freedom and their land by collectivization, which was enforced in most of the area during the last decade, after the death of Stalin. Consequently, the peasants are deeply hostile to the dictatorship of the Communist minority.

III

For all these reasons it is incumbent upon the Assembly of Captive European Nations to stress that, both in the short- and long-term perspective, the Western Powers have a vital stake in the friendship of the peoples of Eastern Europe and a clear interest in fostering among them the belief that there is for them reasonable hope of deliverance.

In this conviction, the Assembly appeals to the governments and peoples of the free world, and particularly to the U.S. Government:

1. To reaffirm at every appropriate occasion the validity of the wartime and postwar legal commitments and pledges with respect to Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and Rumania and to ask compliance therewith;

2. To call before the United Nations and in negotiations with the Soviet Union for an all-European settlement based on the right of self-determination and to seek the withdrawal of Soviet troops from east-central Europe, the restoration of political and human rights and free elections under international supervision;

3. To demand a United Nations inquiry of the state of human rights and fundamental freedoms in east-central Europe, including an investigation of conditions in prisons and forced-labor camps;

4. To exact—as proposed by the Executive Council of the AFL–CIO in its statement of March 1, 1965—in return for whatever credits or other economic advantages the free nations may deem expedient to grant, commensurate concessions in the form of: (a) effective and self-enforcing measures to assure the exercise of human rights and fundamental freedoms to the peoples of east-central Europe; (b) changes in the economic policies of the Communist regimes designed to foster social welfare and do away with the present, politically motivated but economically deficient course of policy, both in agriculture and industry; and (c) hard and fast commitments to put an end to Soviet economic exploitation by means of discriminatory prices in the foreign trade between the Soviet Union and the individual east-central European countries and thus make certain that Western credits will not indirectly subsidize the economy of the Soviet Union.

THE HAMMOND PICTORIAL HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN NEGRO

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KREBS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, at this time of moral crisis in our Nation's history, as dramatized by the unhappy events in Selma, Ala., I should like to call attention to the thoughtful comments of that distinguished Negro historian, Dr. Charles H. Wesley, of Central State College at Wilberforce, Ohio, in his foreword to the forthcoming "Pictorial History of the American Negro" being published by C. S. Hammond & Co. of Maplewood, N.J.

FOREWORD

(By Charles H. Wesley [1])

Pictures of the American nation of peoples would be composed of various minority groups, each of whom has been contributing through the years to the development of American life and history. Many races, cultures, and peoples have found their homes in this, the land of the free, and an American picture should include all of them. It is well known that lines have been drawn and that there have been omission and separation of peoples on the basis of religions, language, race, and color. These peoples have come from England, Ireland, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, and all Europe, parts of Asia, and the islands, but it must be remembered, also, that millions came from Africa. This land in history has had civilizations, cultures, and governments in ancient and medieval periods, prior to the rise of the devastating slave trade, which were just as valuable and as glorious to history as those in Europe prior to the rise of its national states. From the 16th century through to the middle of the 19th century, within the law and outside of the law, the descendants of Africa were brought involuntarily, as others had come voluntarily and involuntarily, to the Western World. We are a nation of immigrants, or the descendants of immigrants, none of whom has a priority in history's esteem.

The Negro population has grown through the years until it now constitutes the largest minority group of the American population, and, next to the Indian population, is the oldest of America's minority groups. Negroes arrived in the area of the United States nearly a century prior to the founding of the first English colony, having come with Spanish explorers, but not as slaves, and having been participants in a settlement in Virginia in 1526. It is important that this length of continuing residence be known since there has been some tendency to regard the Negro as one of the out-groups in America, who should return to his native land, rather than as American, and accordingly can be omitted from word and pictorial presentations of America.

This group of Americans, as have other groups, has made significant contributions to American life and culture. These contributions have been made by individuals and they have been made by the group, despite disadvantages, discriminations, and separations from the mainstream of American life. The account of these contributions should be better known to all Americans in the interest of the improvement of human relations. In this respect, there is no such thing as "Negro history," or "Jewish history," "Irish history" or other histories, as separate entities or detached contributions to American history. The only reason why there is such a history is the neglect, omission, and distortion of contributions which have been made by these special groups. Too often historians have presented in textbooks the story of one group, and for them have told this story well; but they have neglected to present the story concerning other groups of people. The result has been that it has required many years and special endeavors to call to the attention of the textbook writers, the historians, the social scientists, and the people who read, who look, and who think, that peoples of different colors and cultures have also contributed to American history. For these reasons, the Hammond Pictorial History of the American Negro has significance and definite meaning for all Americans.

This picture history * * * carries the observer through the American colonial period, the institution of slavery, the irrepressible conflict, the effects of Jim Crow, the migrations to the North and to cities, the changes in the Negro status, the decisions of the courts, the marches to freedom, and the Negro today. Pictures from many sources are presented in this unusual presentation with brief descriptive and dramatic wording.

In this connection, Samuel Taylor Coleridge in his "A Day-Dream" writes: "My eyes make pictures when they are shut." Pictures in eyes that are shut have been made of the Negro in history, and have been supported and developed by lack of information and personal contacts. In fact, in order that people may understand people, information is not enough. There must be learning experiences, eyes must be opened to see pictures rather than permit the eyes to be closed and maintain the same false and incorrect pictures which have been learned from an earlier generation, parents at home, uninterested and biased teachers at school, and from people in the streets. The home, the school, and the neighborhood are the places where boys and girls are first "carefully taught" the ideas, the concepts, the pictures, and the word pictures which are fundamental in their adult lives for the characterizations of darker Americans. The images which they receive are often maintained throughout their years.

Moreover, if a Negro youth is unable to identify himself with those who are seen in pictures of American life because their very appearance seems to denote for them a superiority, he can so readily assume his own inferiority. This reaction is described by Booker T. Washington as a youth in his "The Story of the Negro," as he described a picture in his first geography used in the elementary grades. The book had on one page a picture of George Washington and beside him was a picture of a naked African with a ring in his nose and a dagger in his hand. This type of presentation has created bad reactions from white and black youth, the former through assumptions of superiority and the latter of inferiority.

It is the challenging task of publications, teachers, schools, and community agencies to remove and reconstruct the basic false concept, to give new experiences and impressions in the interest of good human relations, and to substitute new pictures and truthful images, so that the stereotypes of difference and inferiority can be removed. Even if youth should have in earlier years the implanting of correct ideas, memory can be very short, the impressions of the environment are deepened vigorously, and imagination of them can be much longer. The images ofttimes outlast the words, even when allied with fact. And yet, the once learned fact can be erased by a fertile imagination stimulated by separations, innuendoes, and disparagement, but the picture can remain. Words may fade, but pictures fade less often and they can continue to exist in the subconscious self. Making history graphic through pictures is a most important step in the current educational program.

This is basic in the quest for background by Negro youths and adults in the United States. Unfortunately, there is a self-image of depreciation created by the Negro people of themselves. It is not a consciously adopted image created by them. There are facts which they face in their environment that create and reinforce the image. There can be a change in this self-picture when the facts and the inspiration for the future can be directed for definite purposes. When they see themselves as inferiors and are conditioned as intellectually and culturally incompetent, and there are no evidences in books and classrooms to oppose, delimit, or explain this conclusion, there is frustration, defeatism, and reaction against others.

Negroes have undertaken to do something about this. They have organized the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, and have been publishing studies, textbooks, and individual pictures of prominent Negroes, which have been placed on the walls of schools, colleges, universities, and institutions, so that more correct views can be secured of these aspects of Negro life and history. The strength of the forces seeking to keep the Negro in his place, and to have him as a despised person, had been so great that it is necessary to have all avenues of education used in order to bring to the masses of Americans new and truer views concerning Negro-Americans. In such situations, pictures have value, and particularly pictures which show that the participants are, after all, human beings, Americans at work and at play, striving for advanced status as citizens, searching for the ways of freedom known to other Americans, learning activities valuable to the community when they are accepted or have the opportunity.

Such pictures * * * are not primarily for entertainment, and they should be connected with the appropriate discussion in words which should also lead to additional reading. There is need in Negro history for historical books, documents, and primary sources on solid historical foundations. There is need for interpretation, brilliant narration, and sound teaching of the facts of unknown Negro history. There is also a definite need of pictures, portraitures, and pictorial presentations for the study of Negro history and minor scenes, some with completeness and others with less completeness. The picture can become the gateway to a larger learning.

---

[1] President of the Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, Washington, D.C.

There are scenes herewith in the history of the current freedom movement, which can lead to the development of understanding and esteem for its leadership, its demonstrations by youth from the schools, colleges, and universities and the sacrifices in money and themselves by dedicated men and women, white and black. There are scenes of misguided white Americans clad in robes and hoods who rudely and violently block the free pathways of American democracy, revealing their crude efforts to keep the Negro in his place. Scenes appear of Negro groups who, because they have freed themselves from fear itself, march nonviolently along the road to freedom, refusing as Americans to be ignored, neglected, or denied. Such pictures, even when eyes are shut, will not leave undisturbed the onlooker and the reader.

The ultimate test of the value of these pictures can be found in the changed attitude which disregards color and ethnic divisions and uses it as an integral aspect of the total American scene. When eyes that have been shut have made incorrect pictures, they should be opened to the realities of these pictures which are descriptive of the Negro-American's history, and they may lead toward the truth, and finally to changes in attitude and in behavior. Through these channels, some southerners and some northerners may then free their minds and eyes of the stereotypes which have violated the truth for so long a period as well as the American dream itself. Seeing truly and really, they may reject the slanted newspaper interpretations, and discard the inherited local caricature and burlesque of the American with the darker skin.

Just as the maps, charts, and graphics of C. S. Hammond & Co. have given Americans world understanding of international problems, scenes, and peoples, it is more than probable that the wider distribution of these pictures of our national scenes will have similar effects within the Nation. Since the dramatics of the Negro revolution have been treated and editorialized in varying ways by writers and observers, and by the many representatives of the press of the Nation, it is in this context that this presentation of pictures has definite values.

PATMAN'S BELIEFS

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, more so than not, men through history who have taken courageous stands and have fought for the best interest of the general welfare, have often been misinterpreted, misquoted, and misunderstood.

Although there are many people who both understand and admire the distinguished dean of the Texas delegation, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, there has never been enough said about the House Banking and Currency chairman's battles for the people.

Therefore, I would like to share with you Chairman PATMAN's letter to the editor of the Wall Street Journal which appeared March 23, 1965, in which he clarifies a misinterpretation of his proposals:

REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN'S BELIEFS

EDITOR, THE WALL STREET JOURNAL:

I enjoy reading the comics in most newspapers. I like Peanuts, Li'l Abner, Penny, and many others.

One comic page that I look at occasionally I find more amusing than the others. It is the page of The Wall Street Journal that carries the editorials. It portrays so vividly the viewpoint of those who believe in the divine right of money kings. Consequently, it is really hilarious.

For example, an editorial called "Behind the Fiscal Fog" (March 4) sets out to make it appear that I am in favor of "printing press" money because I had the temerity to suggest that we may be paying bankers too much to finance government securities (State and local as well as Federal), and that it might be possible to save the taxpayers enormous sums of money and avoid an increase in the deficit by having the Federal Reserve System at least assist in government financing.

It's perfectly all right, according to those who believe in the divine right of money kings, for commercial banks to manufacture money on the credit of all the people for the prime benefit of the few—big bankers, that is. This is not inflationary. It would only be inflationary, according to the Wall Street Journal, if the Government were to have the Federal Reserve System purchase its notes at, let us say, one-quarter or one-half or three-quarters of 1 percent. This would bring about "printing press" money by cranking up the "overworked currency printing press."

To keep the record straight—for the 6 World War II years, mid-1940 to mid-1946, the total Federal deficit (net borrowings) was a little over $199 billion, which was financed through Government offerings of not over 2.5 percent; much of it ranging from seven-eighths of 1 percent down to one-eighth of 1 percent.

This financing was done during the most widespread and savage war in all history, without resorting to any overworked printing press. It would seem to me that the credit of all the people in this, the most financially sound and wealthiest Nation on earth, might be similarly extended during peacetime to allow low interest rate governmental borrowings from America's central bank, the Federal Reserve System—without resorting to any overworked currency printing press.

This would tremendously ease the burden on the taxpayer. I admit that commercial banks would lose some of the especial benefits they now derive from buying high interest rate governments on the credit of all the people of this Nation.

What the Wall Street Journal wants is obviously what the banking establishment wants; namely, a double cost for all governmental projects. It is fair to assume that borrowings by various governments—State, local, and Federal—for long-range projects many times call for 25-year loans. A reasonable cost for such loans in the present market would approach 4, 5, or even 6 percent, so that over a 25-year period or less, the interest cost paid would equal the total amount of money borrowed. A billion dollars for projects, a billion or more for private banks. A million dollars for a schoolhouse, a million or more for private banking institutions.

I believe this toll is too heavy and can be eliminated. I believe the way to eliminate most of it merely calls for the Federal Reserve banks to buy legitimate governmental securities, municipal, State, and Federal, for a service charge of less than 1 percent.

I do not believe in the equity of a double toll charge, as does the Wall Street Journal. Bankers need not profit on poverty elimination, education, farm and urban renewal, mass transit, and a hundred other benefits the most prosperous Nation on earth can well afford provided the citizens are not suffocated by high and unnecessary interest charges.

While I have been rather critical of what I have termed your comic page, I do wish to commend you and your working newsmen for turning out a very valuable financial newspaper.

WRIGHT PATMAN,
U.S. House of Representatives.

FREE AMMUNITION AGENCY PROJECTS RECORD BUDGET

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, recent newspaper stories have reported that the Army's free gun and ammunition program is to be curbed. According to one story, the Army plans to tighten control over the program, which goes under the name of the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice and the Office of Civilian Marksmanship, and is revising its system of giving or selling guns to civilians. Another story states that the entire subsidy—free ammunition, guns and other services—is being reexamined by the Defense Department.

I have been alerting the public about the dangers of this loosely organized gun and ammunition subsidy for almost a year and there is nothing I would welcome more than official notice or even unofficial knowledge that the Army or the Defense Department plans a crackdown. But while stories and rumors of curbs, cutbacks and controls are being reported in the press, the gun and ammo give-away program is growing and expanding. Proof of this may be seen in the new budget for fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. For the talk is about tighter controls, but the facts as shown by the budget are that the program is scheduled to expand in fiscal year 1966. According to the budget, the dollar value of ammunition issued without charge in 1964 was $1,434,000. The estimated value of ammunition given away in fiscal year 1965 is $1,684,000. And the estimated value of ammunition to be given away in fiscal year 1966 is $1,796,000. The free ammunition is the most impotrant part of the program and the costliest.

The reports of the controls and curbs have been attributed to officials in the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army. But these officials have not been named or identified.

My interest in the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice goes back almost a year when I discovered the extensive guns and ammo giveaway that it promotes. Beginning in May of last year I began a series of speeches delivered before this House in which I explained in detail not only the manner in which this giant subsidy operates to benefit the

National Rifle Association and private gun clubs throughout the Nation, but also how extreme right-wing organizations like the Minutemen were exploiting the program to arm themselves. More than 400,000 persons belong to gun clubs receiving free guns and ammunition. How many of these are right-wing extremists, members of the Minutemen, or other self-styled para-military groups no one seems to know. Least of all does the Defense Department or the Army know because of the laxity and looseness with which this program is handled. But the leaders of the Minutemen and other extremists regularly advise their followers and dupes to form gun clubs, affiliate with the NRA, and get their supply of free guns and ammunition.

It is no wonder that over the last 5 years membership in the NRA nearly doubled while at the same time the Army was giving it almost $12 million in subsidies.

On May 26, 1964, I wrote to the Secretary of Defense to express my fears that the Civilian Marksmanship program had gotten out of hand and was being used by right-wing extremists, and to raise a number of questions about costs to the Federal Government. On July 15, 1964, I received my answer from the Department of the Army to which my letter had been referred. The costs of the program had been ever greater than I had supposed. From 1959 to 1964 the Army had given away to private gun clubs 246.9 million rounds of free ammunition costing $7.2 million. In the same period, the Army had placed $2.3 million worth of guns on loan to gun clubs. In the same period the National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice had spent $2.5 million to conduct rifle matches and other activities.

These facts were brought out for the first time as a result of my initial letter to the Defense Department and after considerable prodding. For during the 7 weeks it took for an answer to come back, numerous telephone calls had to be made to the Pentagon to remind the Defense Establishment that my letter had not been answered. Still, an answer was finally made, and I am grateful for that.

I frankly do not know whether to be grateful or not for the recent batch of rumors about tighter controls and curbs. Of course, I have been urging tighter controls and curbs on this guns and ammo subsidy for almost a year. Of course, I have been warning my colleagues and the people about the dangers of this program for almost a year. Obviously, I would be delighted to learn that the rumors, attributed by the newspapers to anonymous officials, were true. But there stands the new budget, in complete contradiction to the rumors of cutbacks, projecting future estimates for fiscal year 1965 and fiscal year 1966 not of reductions but of increases—substantial increases.

Anyone who can reconcile the rumors with the facts is welcome to try. He should begin by explaining how it is a reduction of the guns and ammo giveaway program to hand out $1,434,000 worth of free ammunition to private gun clubs in 1964, to hand out $1,684,000 worth of free ammunition in 1965, and to hand out $1,796,000 worth of free ammunition in 1966. How does one curb a free ammunition subsidy by giving away $362,000 worth of free ammunition more in 1966 than in 1964?

With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an article that appeared in the Washington Post, March 21, 1964, well written by Rasa Gustaitis; an article that appeared in the Washington Star, March 14, 1965; and an article that appeared in the Wall Street Journal, March 9, 1965:

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 14, 1965]

ARMY TO CURB LOANS OF GUNS

The Army plans to tighten control over its loans of arms to gun clubs and its gun sales to individual members of the National Rifle Association, it was learned yesterday.

Proposed changes in the Army's methods of distributing its guns to civilians were prompted by the President's forthcoming gun legislation and widely expressed fears that Army guns may fall into the hands of rightwing extremists.

Under the Army program now being developed, States would know which of their residents were getting Army guns as well as the serial numbers of the weapons.

Guns would be delivered to a central location in each State rather than shipped directly to each gun club by the Army.

An impartial study also is to be made to determine whether the long-established, congressionally authorized National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice serves a useful purpose from the viewpoint of the national defense.

GUN CLUBS AFFECTED

Potentially affected by the Army's revised program are the more than 400,000 members of gun clubs as well as the much larger overall membership of the National Rifle Association.

The President's gun measure due to go to Congress this week, is aimed at helping the States to impose effective controls over firearms within their boundaries.

The Army wants to fit its own civilian marksmanship program into the framework and philosophy of this legislation.

Under the administration's gun legislation, mail-order gun sales to individuals would be halted; gun shipments would be made only among importers, manufacturers and dealers; license fees to deal in guns would go from a nominal to a substantial figure; importation of surplus military weapons would be virtually eliminated, and the sale of firearms to persons under 21 (or under 18 in the case of rifles and shotguns) would be prohibited.

ARMY ACTING

An Army spokesman said that the Army was revising its system of giving or selling guns to civilians so the program can be continued in line with this legislative proposal.

The Army's civilian marksmanship program has been in existence by act of Congress since early in the century. Under its rules clubs requesting to be enrolled must show they have 10 members or more, are NRA-affiliated and have access to a range.

An adult or senior club can get on loan up to eight .30-caliber rifles, four .45-caliber pistols and four .22-caliber rifles.

Recently various members of Congress have protested that the Army is, in effect, "subsidizing" the extremists by lending guns to clubs. They base this on repeated advice to the membership of such groups as the extremists Minutemen to join a gun club.

NO EVIDENCE APPARENT

"This really worries us," acknowledged an Army spokesman. "We don't know enough to say with assurance that we don't have any extremists in the gun clubs but there's nothing to indicate that any member of a gun club was ever involved in inappropriate things. We've asked a number of questions about this to see if we missed anything but no misuse of Army guns by club members is known."

Under the Army's new plans, the States keeping track of the extremists will be able to determine if any of them show up in the ranks of gun clubs receiving Army guns.

The States also will be informed of sales of Army guns to individuals. This is another congressional authorized program. Gun buyers must send in their NRA card, a statement that they are 18 or over, have never purchased a comparable item from the U.S. Government and have taken the NRA pledge. This includes statements that they don't belong to an organization advocating violent overthrow of the Government and have never been convicted of a crime of violence.

Now under consideration is an Army requirement for more positive character assertions by would-be gun buyers so, if they lied, they could be prosecuted for making false statements to the Government.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 21, 1965]

GUN CLUBS BLOCK WEAPONS CURBS

(By Rasa Gustaitis)

The fountainhead of the Nation's anti-gun-control lobby is an income-tax-exempt organization that has received more than $12 million in Federal subsidies in the past 5 years.

The subsidy—free ammunition, guns, and other services provided by the Army—has helped the National Rifle Association to nearly double its membership in that period.

This subsidy is now being reexamined by the Defense Department, a spokesman confirmed last week. The program is designed to improve civilian markmanship, but questions have been raised about its merits and about having NRA-affiliated rifle clubs conduct the program.

The NRA now numbers 675,000 members in this country and abroad, plus 462,000 nonmembers in 12,000 affiliated gun clubs. More than a million persons are thus reached by the stream of publications flowing from the association's headquarters at 1600 Rhode Island Avenue NW.

And those publications have helped trigger a flood of mail any time a law is proposed to control firearms.

Since the assassination of President Kennedy, no single significant law requiring registration or strict control of weapons has been enacted by Congress, a State, or a major city.

A rifle association policy statement holds that "firearms legislation is of insufficient value in the prevention of crime to justify the inevitable restriction which such legislation places upon law-abiding citizens." The group has consistently opposed most arms control legislation.

The association had $7 million in assets and an annual budget of about $4 million in 1963. It received 64 percent of its income from membership dues, 25 percent from advertisements in its monthly magazine, the American Rifleman, and 11 percent from other services, including sales of its publications.

Last summer, Representative HENRY B. GONZALEZ, Democrat of Texas, asked the Defense Department for information on the Army's programs conducted with NRA members and affiliated clubs.

The Army reply showed that $12 million had been spent since 1959, not including cost of weapons sold at special rates to NRA members. The figures broke down as follows: $7.2 million for 246.9 million rounds of free ammunition supplied to gun clubs from fiscal 1960 to fiscal 1964; $2.3 million worth of guns and equipment on loan to gun clubs; $2.5 million for the Army's National Board for the Promotion of Rifle Practice to conduct rifle matches and other activities in its civilian marksmanship program.

The National Board was set up by law 62 years ago to provide marksmanship training and enable citizens to become proficient with small arms through a program conducted with the Rifle Association. Last year, 17 of the 25 Board members were also NRA members.

Not included in the $12-million figure is the cost, if any, of the Army's selling 539,267 rifles, shotguns and pistols to NRA members at special rates.

The association is exempt from taxes under the Internal Revenue Code's subsection 501 (c)(4) which exempts "civic leagues or organizations not organized for profit but operated exclusively for the promotion of social welfare * * * and the net earnings of which are devoted exclusively to charitable, educational or recreational purposes."

The Rifle Association does not consider itself a lobbying group and is not registered as such with the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Yet in a publication it boasts: "No other organization carries on such a continuous and successful effort to inform its members about proposed antigun laws which would restrict the ownership and use of shotgun, handgun and rifle alike."

Jack J. Basil, head of the association's legislative service, states that although legislative bulletins, letters and even telegrams are sent to members, it is up to them to make up their minds.

The bulletins, however, leave no doubt as to what the association considers an intelligent opinion. For example, when a bill was introduced in the Baltimore County Council last year requiring police permission to buy firearms, Frank C. Daniel, NRA secretary, noted in a bulletin:

"The regulation of all private firearms transactions in so large a county where the possibilities of evasion are numerous would create an impossible enforcement problem."

[From the Wall Street Journal]

Private Armies Cause Concern, Spur Efforts To Tighten Gun Laws—Minutemen Gird to Fight Reds; L.B.J. Asks Congress to Curb Mail Order Sales of Weapons

"We've seen our last free election in this Government. Now we'll wait until things get so bad that the American people are willing to support an underground revolution. We wouldn't lead the revolt but we hope we could supply some of the people, the know-how and the material."

This statement is offered in the even, soft drawl of 41-year-old Robert B. de Pugh, of Norborne, Mo. Mr. de Pugh, besides being president of Bio-Lab Pharmaceutical Co., a veterinary medicine concern, is the leader of a militantly anti-Communist organization called the Minutemen. He believes that the Minutemen must be prepared if necessary to repel invaders from abroad or subversion from within the Government with armed force.

But if the Minutemen are worried about Communists, many public officials are just as worried about the Minutemen and similar organizations which have been springing up around the country. A bill now before the California Legislature, aimed at such groups, outlaws two or more people getting together as a "paramilitary organization" to practice with weapons or give instruction in their use. Exempt from the bill would be organizations formed purely for "recreation," and members of the National Guard, college and school military classes and veterans' groups.

Concern about armed extremist groups, combined with anxiety about guns falling into the hands of emotionally disturbed individuals and professional criminals, is spurring other efforts at local, State and Federal levels to tighten controls over the distribution and use of guns. Yesterday President Johnson called on Congress to outlaw mail order sales of guns, reminding the legislators that a mail order rifle was used to assassinate President Kennedy. Many such efforts, however, face stiff opposition from hunters, target shooters, gun collectors and retailers who regard some regulatory proposals as infringements of their constitutional right to "keep and bear arms."

For his part, the Minutemen's Mr. de Pugh says: "No new gun law will hamper us from getting what we need." He adds that "we're pretty proficient in getting them (guns) from our sources," though he won't say what these sources are. Each Minuteman is required to possess a rifle, a sidearm, and 300 rounds of ammunition.

The Minutemen organization is loosely knit, and Mr. de Pugh says this is deliberate. "A definite chain of command is a weakness in a strictly underground movement," he explains. Under Mr. de Pugh are about 50 State or area coordinators, each of whom can operate independently. Below them are "bands," each with a leader. The bands are broken up into anywhere from 2 to 20 "teams" of 6 men each. Mr. de Pugh won't disclose exact membership figures for the Minutemen but he does say that each member has a number and that he has given out 62,000 numbers to State and area coordinators for eventual distribution.

"Our greatest accomplishment is the fact we've developed an organization large enough and diverse enough so that it couldn't possibly be destroyed now," claims Mr. de Pugh.

The U.S. Government, Mr. de Pugh fears, appears to be heading toward "peaceable surrender" to communism. "We're trying to show them the people will fight if the Government doesn't."

A CHANCE TO PRACTICE

Mr. de Pugh encourages Minutemen to join the National Rifle Association and local gun clubs. Such membership, he says, serves "as a cover for our activities and gives us a chance to practice shooting undetected."

Gun clubs approved by the National Rifle Association, State affiliates, and the National Guard are eligible to buy arms at cutrate prices and get free ammunition from the Defense Department under a program aimed at sharpening the skills of civilian marksmen. Mr. de Pugh denies that Minutemen get arms through this program because "those guns are registered and could be confiscated." But California law officials say they suspect that some extremist groups have infiltrated gun clubs or formed their own so they could get weapons from the Government.

Last year, Stanley Mosk, then California attorney general, asked the Defense Department for a list of members of California clubs receiving arms under the marksmanship program. But the National Board To Promote Rifle Practice, which administers the program, said such lists "weren't available." Now Mr. Mosk's successor, Thomas Lynch, plans to try again soon to get the information.

The rifle practice board annually distributes about $1 million worth of guns and ammunition to members of some 5,600 groups, including clubs sponsored by the NRA, Boy Scout groups, veterans' organizations, and even church-affiliated groups. The Army has taken an active interest in civilian sharpshooters since 1903, and members of the rifle practice board claim this interest paid off handsomely during World War II when "thousands" of marksmen from civilian gun clubs served in the Army as shooting instructors.

The National Rifle Association says there is no hard evidence that extremist groups have infiltrated gun clubs it approves. Association officials resent attempts to link the organization, even in the role of an unknowing host, to "private armies and guerrilla forces."

The Defense Department marksmanship program is only one of the concerns of officials and lawmakers worried about guns. They're also trying to enact new laws, or tighten existing legislation, dealing with such things as registration of gun owners and the carrying of concealed weapons.

Advocates of new gun control laws see perhaps their best chance for success in urban areas where politicians aren't subject to pressure from hunters and gun-toting farmers and ranchers. Thus, the Philadelphia City Council is expected soon to approve a firearms registration ordinance which gun enthusiasts bitterly call "the most restrictive of any in the United States." It would require that a Philadelphian be finger-printed, photographed, and approved by police before he could buy or own any kind of gun.

At the State level, since January 1 alone, gun control bills have been introduced in more than a dozen legislatures. But progress in most States is likely to be limited and slow, because legislators will try to avoid "stepping on the toes" of gun enthusiasts.

Bills in Maine and Virginia would tighten laws requiring licenses to carry hidden pistols in the streets. The measures aren't likely to raise violent objections from gun groups since they restrict only the carrying, not the owning of concealable weapons. Sixteen States already forbid anyone but policemen and military personnel from carrying concealed weapons.

The gun groups probably will support proposals in several legislatures to prohibit shooting across highways and to demand proof of competency in weapons handling for teenage gun users. Such provisions already are in effect in many States.

A California legislative committee recently drafted nine bills which primarily tighten laws on pistols, revolvers, and machineguns. The package represents a compromise with gun enthusiasts, and one lobbyist for gun organizations describes it as a "very comprehensive legislative job" unlikely to draw much opposition.

But gun enthusiasts probably will take a much different attitude toward three tougher bills, introduced last week by California legislators for regard the compromise package as too lenient. One bill would let local law authorities give pistol-carrying permits only to residents of their own jurisdiction. As things stand now, lawmen complain, a man whose background is such that his own police chief won't grant him a pistol permit can get one in another town where he isn't known.

At the heart of the fight against many restrictions on guns is the National Rifle Association, whose 670,000 members usually also belong to affiliated State and local groups. The NRA isn't registered as an official lobbying body, but still gets its message across effectively through letters members write to legislators on key committees.

There are two main lines of argument against gun control laws. For one thing, gun groups contend that stringent regulations make it difficult for citizens to own and use guns to protect themselves against criminals. They also argue that requiring all gun owners to register would make it that much easier for a foreign power or domestic revolutionaries to disarm loyal American citizens.

MILITARY PAY RAISE

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the conscience of this Nation would be shocked if it learned that while promoting a war against poverty, the Federal Government itself continues to promote poverty. This it is doing by underpaying thousands in its employment.

Like most Americans who are too busily involved in their own bailiwick to note the injustice which we impose upon a dedicated segment of our citizenry, I have been shocked out of my lethargy by a series of newspaper and magazine articles to speak out and make every effort to do something about correcting an inexcusable situation. I refer, Mr. Speaker, to the shabby treatment we accord fellow citizens of our military forces. They are the forgotten segment of our population, perhaps because they are without unions or lobbyists. We certainly do not expect a civilian employed on a full-time basis, on call 24 hours a day, to work for anything less than a living wage. Why then should we expect our men in uniform who are the first to be asked to risk their lives in defense of our American way of life, including our standard of living, to work for anything less than a living wage? It is almost unbelievable and no doubt shocking to the average American that an enlisted man in grade 1 (lowest rank) is paid only $78 a month in his first 4 months of duty and then only $83.20 for the following 20 months that he is in the service.

No one expects a man to provide for a family of four on a monthly salary of $167.10; but, curiously enough if a man is in military uniform we expect him to do so.

Mr. Speaker, I am continually amazed at the number of our career personnel in the Armed Forces, who with firm dedication and a great deal of sacrifice to themselves and their families, accept the lot of the underpaid and give unselfishly of themselves to the service of their country. They are dedicated men whom we ought to make every effort to reward rather than neglect. It is no secret that the heart of our uniformed services is the educated, trained, and highly professional man, whether enlisted or commissioned. Unless these men make a commitment to a professional career in our Armed Forces, the American people have much to lose, both in money and human resources. It is more than mere speculation to say that we are losing the kind of men I am talking about by the thousands each year. The U.S. Navy League recently published the results of a study of manpower and pay which are, quite frankly, alarming.

The league pointed out that the Navy alone loses 130,000 enlisted personnel each year and about 10,000 officers. No small amount of these men are highly competent professionals, whose skills must be replaced at a huge cost to the American people.

As it has been so eloquently stated by our able chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina: "We may develop the most exotic weapons systems in the world; we may build the finest missiles; we may construct fantastic underwater missile launchers; we may lead the world in equipment, but if we do not have men and women provided with a standard of living equivalent to the standard of living they are defending, then one of these days we will awaken to the sad realization that our Armed Forces are sadly deficient in two indispensable ingredients—leadership and motivation."

I propose that we seriously consider raising the salaries of the lower grades, in both the enlisted and officer ranks, by as much as 50 percent, and increasing allowances for dependents at all grade levels, to the extent that our men in uniform may be able to look forward to providing his family with a decent living and his children with a college education.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. MINISH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, for centuries the Byelorussian people were almost lost in the huge czarist empire of Russia, and peoples in the rest of the world were hardly aware of Byelorussians as a distinct ethnic group. Then toward the end of World War I when these 10 million Byelorussians asserted their freedom and proclaimed their independence of Russia, all peoples became very much aware of this historic fact.

On March 25, 1918, when the czarist regime was shattered, Byelorussians formed their own independent state in their historic homeland, with its capital at Minsk. At once they set out to rebuild their new state in the image of their centuries-old dream, and in freedom they were doing their utmost to attain their goal. But all their efforts were of no avail, and all their hopes were dashed by the aggressive Red army. Before the end of 1918 Byelorussia was attacked, overrun, and then made part of the Soviet Union.

Thus ended the brief but glorious period of independence in Byelorussia. Today for more than 45 years the Byelorussian people have been prisoners in their homeland, effectively sealed off from the free world by hundreds of miles behind the Iron Curtain. But they have not given up their hope for freedom and are praying for the day of their deliverance from Communist tyranny. On the 47th anniversary of their independence, Mr. President, we join them in their prayers.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FREIDEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the anniversary of Byelorussian independence. This is a day upon which we of the free world pay tribute to a people who have long suffered from the deprivation of liberty. It is also a day upon which we rededicate ourselves to the principles of universal freedom.

It would be easy for Americans to lapse into a mood of passive acquiescence on this question of loss of liberty. But this we have never done. Our own institutions are by no means perfect; nor have they ever been perfect. They are, after all, only the creations of man with all his weaknesses and shortcomings. Ours is a system of perfecting democracy in which we seek ultimately the idealistic goal established by our Founding Fathers, the goal of universal freedom.

In one sense ours is a privileged nation for the fact remains that we as a nation have never suffered the total loss of freedom. Thus, we cannot really know the pains and anguish of enslavement; we cannot really know the misfortune that has befallen those heroic Byelorussian peoples who, after a momentary respite of freedom, have again been brought under the tyranny of the Russian state.

For all the benefits we have enjoyed, still we as a people have been on the firing line of freedom so many times in our brief history that I feel sure we need not experience the loss of freedom to know its real value. Even at this very moment our American men are in Vietnam fighting for the ideals of human liberty. These ideals have always inspired our Nation to great sacrifice and I believe they will always do so.

In commemorating the national independence of Byelorussia as we are doing today, it is fitting to pay tribute to those who have lost their freedom, but it is also fitting to call the attention of the world to our own commitment to the cause of freedom. In so doing, we reaffirm our own commitment and in our reaffirmation we revitalize that glorious ideal to which we hope and pray all mankind aspires, the ideal of universal freedom. This act of rededication gives heart to the downtrodden; it gives them hope for the future that one day they, too, may enjoy the blessings of liberty and have within their own power the right to determine for themselves their nation's destiny.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, recently I received from the secretary of the Senate of Pennsylvania and from the chief clerk of the house of representatives in Harrisburg copies of two resolutions which were introduced in those respective bodies.

These resolutions were of consequential interest to me, and I felt that they might be of interest to the other Members of this Congress as well.

They are as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE SENATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

The closing of the Olmsted Air Force Base at Middletown, Pa., will add to the unemployed of central Pennsylvania about one-fourth of the total to be made unemployed by the recent order of Secretary of Defense, Robert S. McNamara, closing certain installations throughout the United States. About 12,000 families will be seriously affected by the order.

In addition to the economic suffering of the unemployed the Commonwealth and the political subdivisions of the area will be adversely affected by the resultant additions of poverty-stricken families to relief rolls, etc., and the economy of central Pennsylvania will grind to a low point in the years to come because of the loss of the annual $73 million payroll of the base.

National defense expenditures in Pennsylvania constitute only one-third of the amount spent in New York and only one-eighth of that spent in California. The phasing out of the Olmsted Base will lower the share of the Commonwealth to less than 3½ cents of each national defense dollar.

Olmsted Air Force Base is the only base operated by the Air Force in Pennsylvania. Its closing may result in inadequate protection for Pennsylvania and Northeastern United States: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara be urged to rescind the order directing the phasing out of the Olmsted Air Force Base at Middletown; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each Senator and Representative from Pennsylvania in the Congress of the United States.

Attest:

MARK GRUELL, JR.,
Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.

HOUSE RESOLUTION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF PENNSYLVANIA

History, science, and the demonstrated individual worth of immigrants from all countries of the world establish that our immigration laws are obsolete. The discriminatory National Origins Act should be repealed and corrective legislation enacted by Congress. To exclude a skilled or gifted person because the country of his birth has a small quota is both undemocratic and wasteful.

This is a Nation of immigrants in which citizens of many cultures and ethnic origins live and work side by side to make the American ideal of equality for all men a reality.

Immigrants represent less than 0.25 percent of the total work force. Those entering the labor force have talents and skills which are in short supply in our economy: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to repeal the National Origins Act and that it pass corrective immigration legislation to demonstrate to the world that we believe all men to be equal under law; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, the President of the Senate of the United States, the Members of Congress from Pennsylvania, and the chairman of the Committee on Immigration.

FREE TRADE

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, while the Congress grinds out much needed legislation to relieve distress, discomfort, need, and want in our Nation we should listen once in a while at least to those among us who have sobering thoughts on the state of our Nation.

Recently, a copy of a letter came into my possession and I was impressed with the seriousness and sincerity of the writer's observations.

Whether we agree or disagree with his premise on free trade we must admit that his logic, for the industry he represents, has merit.

For the past several years I have predicted the impending gold crisis based upon the same logic as contained in this letter and the records of our trade balances. While it is an exercise in futility to try to change the course of the river of free trade thinking at this point it might not be so futile if we could start looking for the answers, for the future.

We have started a serious and disastrous philosophy of profit over any other consideration in our trade policy.

The case of Studebaker is one in point. I will bet my last dime that we will soon lose the bulk of our parts industry not alone to Canada but to U.S.-owned foreign site facilities.

This is as sure as a new day tomorrow.

The letter follows:

IMPERIAL GLASS CORP.,
Bellaire, Ohio, January 15, 1965.

MR. JACK MCDERMOTT,
Editor, Gift & Tableware Reporter,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR JACK: Thanks for the invitation to write you a letter re my philosophy on free trade for your publication. I respectfully decline. It would accomplish nothing. This I've learned over the past 30 years, the hard way.

The retailer cares not about such philosophy or reasoning. His desire is to buy at the best possible price and to sell at a profit. He cares nothing about source; excepting S. & H., about the lone, sterling and worthwhile exception that proves my allegation.

He cares not to listen to the story of tariff duties once being our Nation's prime source of revenue, and that now he himself and American manufacturers are paying huge annual taxes to replace those no-longer-existing duties and yes, to even provide the capital investment necessary to produce the plant facilities for the foreign production.

He's not at all interested in the historical fact that on this continent there first existed and still exists the only truly free trade in the entire world—interstate trade. And that it is fair trade too, because wages and taxes and transportation are fairly equal and seldom subsidized.

The retailer is too busy to note the true impact of the statement that 93 percent of the fine china sold in America in 1964 was foreign-made. He's only concerned with the fact that it made him a profit.

He's not a bit distressed that jobs were lost at Imperial last year when counterfeit, low-priced candlewick arrived from Japan and Czechoslovakia. He bought it.

Nor is he concerned that at the recent Atlantic City show Toscany presented a copy of our pressed scroll stemware from Italy, for sale at about 50 percent off our closely-marked suggested list price. The fact that his purchase of this low-cost, nigh duty free copy will cost American workmen jobs does not register as he buys it. All that he registers is the sound of his cash register.

He does not care at all that as imports increase because they are tax free, his own business and personal taxes increase to make free trade still freer. In fact he often sees to it that importers do actual harm to domestic producers. He's utterly blind to the economic truth that today's importation is a tapeworm living off American taxes, and that he cannot escape paying his full share of this cost.

Nor do the journals of our trade find this whole matter, or even small segments of it, worthy of mention, and for obvious reasons. They too are managed press—policies directed by the majority of their advertisers.

As I sit before my open fire tonight, dictating this letter to you, I'm not unmindful that I recently talked, after much correspondence, with one from a country over the sea who frankly told me he was interested in buying all our equipment and shipping it to his "home nation" where it would all be employed to produce glass for export back here and that such a cash purchase could be made because of American Government money available to him through his country.

This is of no interest to your retailers (and none of their business). Even though it would increase their taxes, and yours, neither of you would be bothered, nor would our Congress be concerned for they, in their infinite wisdom, would provide—but at whose cost? Tax-supported Appalachia would just be extended to include another community.

The chip has been long-gone if it ever was on my shoulder re this subject. I've turned to prayer and away from logic. Thinking and reason is distasteful in the Great Society and sophistication reigns instead, which word I was taught to mean complex, not clarity. I only want a fair break. I do not want my taxes used to provide and support tax-free competition against me. When it comes to free trade, I'd like some of it too. I've been unable to change just for the sake of change. I'm too old a dog, I reckon. Goodnight.

Confidentially,

CARL GUSTKEY,
President.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, until World War II Byelorussians were among the least known of the many peoples living under the yoke of Soviet communism. We had heard of the Ukrainians, the Baltic peoples, of peoples in the Caucasus, and even of those in distant Asiatic areas, but one seldom heard of the Byelorussians despite the fact that as an ethnic group they are more numerous than any of the groups named above. As a matter of fact these 10 million Byelorussians constitute the third largest ethnic group in the Soviet Union, exceeded only by the Russians and the Ukrainians. And these people, with their past glory, had lived there in the area east of the Baltic Sea, north of the Black Sea in northeastern Europe through the Middle Ages. Early in modern times their country was annexed to Russia and so remained until they regained their freedom in 1918.

These Slavic but distinctly different ethnic people managed to retain their national traits and traditions, and succeeded in keeping alive their national sentiments while subjected to Russia's czarist regime. Finally, when the czarist regime was no more, Byelorussians felt free and proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918. Soon they set up their own government and were masters of their own destiny for a very brief period. Within less than a year, however, the Red army overran the country, and independent Byelorussia ceased to exist. All freedom vanished from Byelorussia, but the vivid and joyous experience of that brief period still lives in the hearts and minds of the Byelorussian people.

For more than 45 years these people have been suffering under Communist domination in their homeland. But they have found it hard to reconcile their lot with the ways of oppressive communism. Neither those who endure the Communist regime there, nor those Byelorussians living abroad, have recognized the Soviet rule over their homeland. Americans of Byelorussian descent detest and despise both the regime in the land of their ancestors and those who rule there. On the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Day we all join these people in this observance and express the hope that soon Byelorussians shall be free from Communist domination in their homeland.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Daniels] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, March 25 marks the 47th anniversary of the attempt of the Byelorussian people to make themselves independent, the goal of all men proud of their distinctive cultural, historical, and linguistic heritage.

The endless series of autocratic regimes centered in Moscow has never been willing to tolerate diversity. They have spared no amount of effort and no amount of blood to force different nationality groups into a common mold without the opportunity of self-government, and deprived of the most fundamental civil rights.

The collapse of the corrupt and ineffective czarist regime during the First World War gave many of the subjugated nationalities the chance they had longed for to establish themselves as free and independent nations, threatening no one, desiring only to live their own lives in peace.

The people of Byelorussia boldly and courageously seized this opportunity to proclaim themselves an independent republic after 3 years of German wartime occupation had come to an end.

But even though the faces had changed in the Kremlin, and the ideological justification for tyranny had shifted from the discredited notion of divine right of kings to the corrupt notion of all power to the party, these two regimes had one thing in common: they were determined to wipe out all traces of national identity and independence.

The first onslaught of the newly formed Red army came a year after Byelorussian independence has been proclaimed, and in 1921, the territory of the Byelorussian people was divided between the Soviet Union and Poland.

A similar pattern took place in the Second World War. There was a period of German occupation followed by the renewal of Moscow domination through the instrument of the Red army. Only this time the whole of the territory was swallowed up and Poland also became a puppet satellite.

Now that the rulers in Moscow have proclaimed their intolerance of all independence and national identity everywhere in the world, the peoples in the free world have become part of the struggle that, on a smaller scale, was waged by the Byelorussian people 47 years ago. Let us look upon that time as the beginning, not the end, of man's irresistible movement toward the goal of freedom for all peoples.

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Boland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, the world will always be indebted to the Greeks for their contributions in all fields of human learning, in the arts and the sciences. Centuries before our era Greeks were formulating political ideas and ideals which became the foundation of our modern democratic political institutions. In this, as we all know, the Greeks were pioneers without rivals or equals. In the sciences they broke new ground and in a sense paved the way for modern scientific miracles.

Unfortunately, however, with all their learning and genius for understanding, the Greeks proved incapable of adequately defending their political institutions and were conquered by less gifted but more powerfully organized peoples. The last of these peoples were the Ottoman Turks who overran Greece more than 500 years ago and made Greece a province of the Ottoman Empire for some 400 years. But the Greeks managed to preserve the spirit of freedom and individual worth. They yearned for their independence, and 144 years ago they set out to attain it.

On March 25, 1821, Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised a new national emblem over his monastery at Kalavryta, signaling the Greek revolt against the Turks. Thus began long years of struggle to establish a new and free Greek nation. Though fighting against overwhelming odds, the Greeks were united in their uncompromising determination and love of liberty. They won the admiration of other free nations, and had their wholehearted sympathy, including that of the United States. We watched anxiously their fight, were overjoyed by their eventual victory, and then witnessed the newly independent nation grow from infancy to maturity in the course of more than 100 years.

This country has always taken keen interest in the well-being and safety of Greece, and we have done our very best to aid her in many ways. And we have found that our confidence was not misplaced, and our aid was not wasted, for today in free, democratic, and independent Greece we have one of our stanchest allies in our struggle against the Communist world. On the 144th anniversary of Greek independence, Mr. Speaker, I wish the Greek people peace and prosperity.

THE 144TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, marks the 144th anniversary of Greek independence. It was on March 25, 1821, that the first European echo of the American Revolution was heard on the European Continent. On that day, 144 years ago, a band of dedicated freedom-loving Greek patriots raised a flag of liberty and swore that they would have freedom or die in the attempt. It was not the first time that the gallant remnants of the brave Greek nation had risen against foreign domination. For more than 4 centuries of alien domination, they had fought for liberty regularly, on an average every 11 years. Each of those attempts was drowned in blood and destruction.

But the 1821 rising was destined to succeed. Fighting against incredible odds, accepting stoically the price not only in blood but in property that the alien rulers exacted, the Greeks fought on amid their smoldering homes and burning orchards—for the trees, too, were destroyed to quench the spirit of liberty—and 8 long years later they won, as the Americans had won earlier, thus affirming for the first time in Europe the right of nations to rule themselves.

Today, too, Mr. Speaker, the Greek Cypriots on the island of Cyprus are again demonstrating that indomitable spirit for justice and the dignity of man.

On this 144th anniversary of Greek independence my hope is that all America will pause to pay tribute to these heroic people.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the Greek publication, the Chicago PNYX, be included in the RECORD.

This article in this great paper which I received from Peter N. Mantzoros, editor, very eloquently describes the occasion of this heroic anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, the article is as follows:

TWENTY-FIFTH OF MARCH 1965, 144TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

March 25, 1821, marks the first European echo of the American Revolution. On that date, 144 years ago, a band of dedicated freedom-loving Greek patriots raised a flag of liberty and swore that they would have freedom or die in the attempt. It was not the first time that the gallant remnants of the brave Greek nation had risen against foreign domination. For more than four centuries of alien domination, they had fought for liberty regularly, on an average every 11 years. Each of those attempts was drowned in blood and destruction.

But the 1821 rising was destined to succeed. Fighting against incredible odds, accepting stoically the price not only in blood but in property that the alien rulers exacted, the Greeks fought on amid their smouldering homes and burning orchards—for the trees, too, were destroyed to quench the spirit of liberty—and 8 long years later they won, as the Americans had won earlier, thus affirming for the first time in Europe the right of nations to rule themselves.

They found scant support from other European governments at first, those brave Greek fighters. The great capitals of Europe were more concerned with the balance of power and with supporting Turkey, whom they called then the sick man of Europe, rather than allowing the Greek subjects of the Turk to gain freedom.

But the justice of the Greek cause prevailed. The example of the American Revolution had sown seeds that had grown deep roots. Freedom lovers from other nations came to offer their lives in the cause of Greek liberty. Greeks are proud that Americans participated in that noble endeavor.

In 1821, when the Greeks rose against the Turkish Empire to throw off the yoke of nearly 450 years, to the average American Greece was either a remote country, somewhere in Europe, or an ancient civilization, famous for its books and buildings. Soon, however, Greece became a real and immediate entity. The Greek struggle for freedom stirred the American press, aroused American orators and stimulated the neoclassic trends in American art, literature, and architecture. American opinion was unanimous. A people whose tradition was a source of inspiration to American democracy, a nation fighting for its liberty, should be free.

The first American to sponsor the cause of Greek liberty was Edward Everett, professor of Greek at Harvard University. A man of strong convictions, Everett was determined not only to make speeches for Greece, but to act. In the name of Greece he initiated a crusade against the reactionary and oppressive policy of the Holy Alliance in Europe.

His efforts for Greek independence were to bear fruit, and a year later popular feeling was officially reflected in President Monroe's annual message to Congress, which declared: "Genius and delicacy in the arts, daring and heroism in action, unselfish patriotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion to public and private liberty, all these are connected with the name of ancient Greece. It is natural, therefore, that their [the Greeks'] contest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States."

The Greeks, on their side, looked upon the United States with hope and admiration. One of the first acts of the first Greek Senate in May 1821, was the delivery of an address to the American people, beginning: "Friends, fellow citizens, and brothers, having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn toward you by just sympathy, since it is in your land that liberty has fixed its abode * * *. Though separated from us by mighty oceans, your character brings you near us * * *. Our interests are of such nature as to cement more and more an alliance founded on freedom and virtue."

Soon interest in Greece spread beyond Everett's campus at Harvard. Throughout the 1820's, students in American public schools, colleges, and universities were holding meetings, passing resolutions, and writing expressions of support for the Greek cause.

The youth of America at that time was keenly interested in the struggle for human freedom which it saw going on in Greece. Some young men volunteered in the Greek armed forces. Young George Jarvis, Jonathan Miller, and Samuel Gridley Howe distinguished themselves on the Greek battlefields. Their own American Revolution was only a few decades past; the interim years had seen the writing of the American Constitution and the careful construction of a republic on the foundations of freedom. Theirs was not merely a passive interest in what was happening in Greece; they felt that their own ideas and lives were involved, and, over a hundred years ago, they felt America could not remain isolated.

Eventually, the heroic sacrifices of the Greeks could no longer be ignored. Public opinion in the civilized world was revolted by the brutal suffering of a small heroic nation that was obviously determined to die fighting rather than live in bondage and the great European powers swung their weight behind the Greeks who, at last, obtained for themselves the benefits of freedom, an idea that they gave to the world.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, nearly all peoples everywhere celebrate their independence day, and to each it has its special significance. Some observe and celebrate to mark once more a turning point in their national history; others do so in a perfunctory manner, as if such days were like other holidays, marked on the calendars and so to be observed. Still others celebrate their independence days in solemn ceremonies even though their independence is unfortunately nothing more than a mere memory. But the Greek Independence Day is of immense significance both to the Greeks and to all others who are aware of their inestimable debt to the Greek genius.

To the Greek people its significance lies in the fact that after their forebears had given birth to the idea of freedom and democracy, and had practiced and enjoyed the blessings of the fullest freedom in their homeland, and then had lost it nearly 2,000 years ago, the Greek people were able to regain their freedom early in the 19th century. Its larger significance is that nothing has pleased the citizens of the free world more than to see these descendants of gifted Greeks attain their freedom. That is why the free world, especially the West, has been something of a guardian angel of the modern Greek state for nearly a century and a half.

World-rocking events have transformed much of the Grecian world since 1821, when the Greek struggle to throw off the Ottoman yoke began. Conquerors and invaders have come and gone, but the original Greek ideal of freedom has remained as one imperishable hallmark of freemen. It is just as highly prized today as when it was conceived and developed by the Greek genius, although some free people act somewhat unaware of its immense influence on us. In this we are deeply indebted to the Greeks as the fountainhead of such an inspiration for us all. Conscious of our obligation to the Greeks, we naturally would do our best to reciprocate in some way, and this we, Americans in particular, have done on many occasions.

The Greek state grew up and took its place in the community of sovereign nations, and we as well as other friends of Greece everywhere did our utmost to help the small but dynamic state gather strength and attain full maturity. And when in time of trouble Greece was under serious threat, even in danger of losing its very independence, we did not sit by and watch it be devoured by its foes. On more than one occasion, I am happy to say, we were instrumental in saving Greece from threatening dangers and chaos. At the end of the First World War our financial aid was decisive in saving Greece from bankruptcy. At the end of the last, when this cradle of freedom was in mortal danger of being engulfed in a Communist chaos, we did not hesitate to lend sufficient aid to save Greece from communism. And today we can take just pride in what we did. In our relentless struggle against tyrannical communism the Greeks are our loyal allies and firm friends. On the 144th anniversary of Greek independence, let us hope and pray for peace and prosperity, for power and fortitude, for the Greeks in their continuing determination to protect their hard-won independence and to help defend the frontiers of freedom.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1821, 144 years ago, the Greek people launched a struggle to regain their liberty from the Ottoman Turks. On the anniversary of this occasion it is only appropriate that we reflect on the sources of friendship between the people of Greece and the people of the United States, and that we express our hope that the ties binding our two nations will remain as strong in the future as they have been in the past. We cannot overlook how deeply the practice of democracy in our country has been marked by the experience and traditions of ancient Greece. We and other peoples of East and West have been nourished for centuries by the legacy of the poets, philosophers, and dramatists of ancient Greece. Nor can we forget how deeply the American people were stirred by the Greek struggle for independence in the early 19th century. American leaders consistently expressed their support for the Greek cause through the years while the struggle was being waged. Some Americans volunteered to fight with the Greeks; Americans in many communities organized groups to send aid to the Greeks. More recently, following World War II, the Greeks had to renew their struggle for independence. The Ottoman Turks were replaced by threatening Communist armies both within and without. This time also, Americans felt a surge of sympathy for the threatened Greeks. Following the proclamation of the Truman doctrine in 1947, massive economic and military aid was sent to Greece. Without the determination of the Greek people to safeguard their independence, however, this aid would have been insignificant. Today the Greek Government is strong and stable, and the Greek economy is experiencing rapid growth. Moreover, Greece, as a member of NATO is making a significant contribution to the defense forces of the West. On the occasion of the 144th anniversary of the Greek struggle for independence, it is a pleasure to express my admiration for the spirited, confident, and courageous people of Greece.

Mr. BURKE. Mr. Speaker, on this 144th anniversary of Greek independence we once more acknowledge our immense debt to the Greek genius. These immortal creators of ideas and ideals were among the first lovers of freedom and were the first to evolve effective democratic institutions. Their thought was so profound and practical that no people before their time, and probably none since, has achieved the luster of their civilization. And the democratic ideas and ideals which they developed benefited not themselves alone, but all mankind. These ideals, as we realize today, are timeless and universal. That is the most valuable contribution of the Greeks to our own civilization.

It is sad, but true, that such gifted and gallant people, matchless masters in evolving great institutions, proved too disunited to preserve these institutions when faced with powerful foes. So almost 2,000 years ago the Greeks lost their freedom and were subjected to alien regimes in their homeland. One empire after another held them down for more than 1,000 years, and then came the Ottoman Turks. They made Greece a province of their empire and ruled over the Greek people with an iron hand. But the Greeks were not lost in this huge empire; they kept up their centuries-old ideals of freedom and independence and looked for the first opportunity to reestablish them.

On the 25th of March 1821, they unfurled the banner of revolt against the Turks, and for 6 years they fought their more powerful foes as their ancestors had fought against the more powerful Persian invaders of Greece. At times the issue seemed in doubt, and many friends of the Greek people abroad feared that the Greek cause would be lost unless effective and immediate aid was rushed to them. Happily such aid was provided in the form of Britain's navy, which in one pitched battle at Navarino in October of 1827 annihilated the Ottoman fleet, thereby assuring the freedom and independence of Greece.

We in this great Republic are deeply indebted to many people for their contributions to our way of life. But over all and above all, Mr. Speaker, we owe a great and inestimable debt of gratitude to the Greek genius. For that and for many other reasons I am proud to participate in this observance of the 144th anniversary observance of Greek independence.

Mr. VIVIAN. Mr. Speaker, the calendar of history marks Friday as the anniversary of a famous event in man's struggle for freedom and self-government—the 144th anniversary of Greek independence.

After more than 450 years of foreign domination and countless earlier uprisings, the long rule of the Turkish Empire was broken.

One of the first American sponsors of the Greek cause was Edward Everett, Harvard University professor of Greek, who initiated a crusade in the name of Greece against the oppressive policy of the Holy Alliance in Europe. From Professor Everett came the start of America's support of Greece's struggle for freedom. Six years before the outbreak he discussed conditions in Greece in his master of arts oration. Interest soon spread to other colleges and universities where meetings and resolutions expressed support for the Greek cause.

Sympathy for the Greek struggle was aroused by the press in America. Among the Americans who went to the aid of the Greeks and participated in their bid for freedom were three who distinguished themselves on Greek battlefields—George Jarvis, Jonathan Miller, and Samuel Gridley Howe.

Professor Everett's efforts for Greek independence were rewarded later when President Monroe's annual message to Congress declared:

> Genius and delicacy in the arts, daring and heroism in action, unselfish patriotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion to public and private liberty, all these are connected with the name of ancient Greece. It is natural, therefore, that their contest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States.

One of the first acts of the first Greek Senate in May 1821, was the delivery of an address to the American people which began:

> Friends, fellow citizens and brothers, having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn toward you by just sympathy, since it is in your land that liberty has fixed its abode.

In the same spirit of liberty that had sparked the fight for self-rule earlier on American soil, the struggle and sacrifices which began on Greek soil in 1821 brought for that small heroic nation the benefits of freedom born of an idea their own ancesters had given to the world. The justice of their cause—that freedom and democratic ideas expounded by ancient Greek philosophers should thrive on Greek soil—well warranted the sympathy offered by the American people at the time of the struggle, and well warrants the tribute we pay it here today.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to represent a number of distinguished citizens of Greek ancestry in Michigan's Second District. I also represent a city named soon after that revolution to honor one of its great patriots, the city of Ypsilanti, Mich. I wish to join with them today in paying tribute to the Greek Republic.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a communication from the Royal Greek Embassy, on Massachusetts Avenue NW., in Washington, D.C., regarding the 144th anniversary of Greek Independence Day, which falls on March 25. This statement is so interesting, and the facts it deals with are so significant that I am pleased to include the text of the statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the information of my colleagues:

> March 25, 1821, marks the first European echo of the American Revolution. On that date, 144 years ago, a band of dedicated freedom-loving Greek patriots raised a flag of liberty and swore that they would have freedom or die in the attempt. It was not the first time that the gallant remnants of the brave Greek nation had risen against foreign domination. For more than four centuries of alien domination, they had fought for liberty regularly, on an average every 11 years. Each of those attempts was drowned in blood and destruction.
>
> But the 1821 rising was destined to succeed. Fighting against incredible odds, accepting stoically the price not only in blood but in property that the alien rulers exacted, the Greeks fought on amid their smoldering homes and burning orchards—for the trees, too, were destroyed to quench the spirit of liberty—and 8 long years later they won, as the Americans had won earlier, thus affirming for the first time in Europe the right of nations to rule themselves.
>
> They found scant support from other European governments at first, those brave Greek fighters. The great capitals of Europe were more concerned with the balance of power and with supporting Turkey, whom they called then the sick man of Europe, rather than allowing the Greek subjects of the Turk to gain freedom.
>
> But the justice of the Greek cause prevailed. The example of the American Revolution had sown seeds that had grown deep roots. Freedom lovers from other nations came to offer their lives in the cause of Greek liberty. Greeks are proud that Americans participated in that noble endeavor.
>
> In 1821, when the Greeks rose against the Turkish Empire to throw off a yoke of nearly 450 years, to the average American Greece was either a remote country, somewhere in Europe, or an ancient civilization, famous for its books and buildings. Soon, however, Greece became a real and immediate entity. The Greek struggle for freedom stirred the American press, aroused American orators and stimulated the neoclassic trends in American art, literature, and architecture. American opinion was unanimous: a people whose tradition was a source of inspiration to American democracy, a nation fighting for its liberty, should be free.
>
> The first American to sponsor the cause of Greek liberty was Edward Everett, professor of Greek at Harvard University. A man of strong convictions, Everett was determined not only to make speeches for Greece, but to act. In the name of Greece he initiated a crusade against the reactionary and oppressive policy of the holy alliance in Europe.

His efforts for Greek independence were to bear fruit, and a year later popular feeling was officially reflected in President Monroe's annual message to Congress, which declared: "Genius and delicacy in the arts, daring and heroism in action, unselfish patriotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion to public and private liberty, all these are connected with the name of ancient Greece. It is natural, therefore, that their (the Greeks') contest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States."

The Greeks, on their side, looked upon the United States with hope and admiration. One of the first acts of the first Greek Senate in May 1821 was the delivery of an address to the American people, beginning: "Friends, fellow citizens, and brothers, having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn toward you by just sympathy, since it is in your land that liberty has fixed its abode. * * * Though separated from us by mighty oceans, your character brings you near us * * *. Our interests are of such nature as to cement more and more an alliance founded on freedom and virtue."

It was natural for the American institutions of higher learning to take the lead in aiding the Greek cause; there intellectual freedom was upheld as the cardinal aim in education, and youthful enthusiasm for justice and liberty ran high. From Harvard University came the signal for America's support of Greek freedom. It was given by Edward Everett 6 years before the outbreak of the Greek Revolution, in his oration for the degree of master of arts in 1814, which he called "The Restoration of Greece." It contained many prophetic notes. Judging by later reports, his listeners were carried away by the eloquence with which he pleaded for an independent Greece. After graduation from Harvard, Everett visited Hellas on the eve of its independence. He wrote an engaging account of his experiences in Greece during 1818 and 1819 which unfortunately has never been published.

It was Everett who guided Daniel Webster in his famous address on Greece, delivered before the American Congress.

Soon interest in Greece spread beyond Everett's campus at Harvard. Throughout the 1820's, students in American public schools, colleges, and universities were holding meetings, passing resolutions, and writing expressions of support for the Greek cause.

The youth of America at that time was keenly interested in the struggle for human freedom which it saw going on in Greece. Some young men volunteered in the Greek armed forces. Young George Jarvis, Jonathan Miller, and Samuel Gridley Howe distinguished themselves on the Greek battlefields. Their own American Revolution was only a few decades past; the interim years had seen the writing of the American Constitution and the careful construction of a republic on the foundations of freedom. Theirs was not merely a passive interest in what was happening in Greece; they felt that their own ideals and lives were involved, and, over a hundred years ago, they felt America could not remain isolated.

Eventually, the heroic sacrifices of the Greeks could no longer be ignored. Public opinion in the civilized world was revolted by the brutal suffering of a small heroic nation that was obviously determined to die fighting rather than live in bondage and the great European powers swung their weight behind the Greeks who, at last, obtained for themselves the benefits of freedom, an idea that they gave to the world.

Mr. NEDZI. Mr. Speaker, the face of Greece, as Nikos Kazantzakis said, bears 12 successive inscriptions: Contemporary, the period of 1821, the Turkish yoke, the Frankish sway, the Byzantine, the Roman, the Hellenistic epoch, the classic, the Dorian middle ages, the Mycenaean, the Aegean, and the Stone Age.

Most Americans are familiar mainly with the classic and the contemporary faces of Greece.

We have been conscious of Greece's tenacity in World War II when, in defeating Mussolini in Albania, it became the first nation to turn back the Fascists. We followed Greece's grudging retreat before the German armies, winced at its painful restoration amid civil war in the late 1940's, smiled at its flowering into a strong two-party democracy in the 1950's and 1960's. And we are hopeful it will measure up to its responsibilities in the tension-filled Cyprus crisis of today.

There is a new interest in contemporary Greece. It is engendered by Greece's great lure for tourists, for it combines antiquity with wonderful climate and hospitable people. Interest is heightened by an increasing Greek contribution to 20th-century culture. I think of Mitropoulos and Callas and Hadjidakis in music, Kazan and Cocoyannis, Mercouri and Cassavetes in the theater and cinema, Kazantzakis and Seferis in literature, Doxiadis in city planning. There are hundreds more, thousands more, not as well known, but destined to contribute greatly.

All civilized men and women owe something to the golden age of Greece. It is axiomatic that Western civilization had its beginnings there.

In this regard, modern Greek wits have for years been saying "We gave lights to the world but forget to keep some for ourselves." If this was ever true, it is being corrected in Greece today.

There is underway a new flowering of Greek thought and achievement. It would be too much to hope for another golden age, but I expect men and women of Greek blood to contribute much to world knowledge in the decades ahead. Education is becoming universal in Greece today—and this will bear fruit. Moreover, the offspring of Greek immigrants have reached maturity in the English-speaking nations, and we have already seen significant contributions here, and we can look for more.

Why do I mention the English-speaking nations? A wise old coffeehouse philosopher in Detroit once pointed out that only in English-speaking lands do Greek immigrants succeed in large numbers. I think this point is well taken. Greek energies and minds have found fertile soil in the United States, England, and Australia.

The contemporary achievements of the Greeks find inspiration in the deeds of ancient Greece. Because they are descendants of great predecessors, many happily feel a duty to think great thoughts and perform great deeds.

Kazantzakis writes in his "Journey to the Morea":

> Walk through Corinth, Argos, Olympia, Megalopolis, and Sparta, and an unexpected responsibility weighs on your shoulders; on the shoulders of all the living Greeks around you. The names have a strange and irresistible power—whoever is born in Greece, whether or not he wishes, undertakes great responsibilities.

The successes, the opportunities, and the hopes of contemporary Greece were made possible by the war of independence of 1821. Peloponnesus, Athens and environs, and many of the Aegean islands were freed after 400 years of Turkish occupation.

Greek Independence Day marks the 144th anniversary of that day, March 25, 1821, when Archbishop Germanos of Patras, raised the banner of freedom at Kalavryta. In an interesting parallel of history, another man of Patras, Prime Minister George Papandreou defends the banner of freedom in modern Athens.

The fever of patriotism burned in the Greek breast in 1821, and it has so burned in generations thereafter. The Greek idea, that is, the recapture of the unredeemed lands—Crete, the islands, Thessaly, Epirus, Thrace, and Macedonia, was riveted in the minds of Greeks from childhood. This was the great motivation which saw 50,000 Greek immigrants in America, in a remarkable but little-known chapter of history, return to Greece in 1912–13 to fight in the Balkan wars. This hardy band paid their own passage across the Atlantic, clothed themselves, fought without financial reward, and saw large numbers of their comrades killed. They helped return northern Greece to Greek hands.

Of the 50,000, many returned to the United States, raised families, and became solid citizens of America. Now in their seventies and eighties, these men do not see their numbers replenished from abroad. Only a trickle of Greek immigrants come to American soil, for the Greek quota is a tiny 308 a year.

The Greek fighting spirit overcame heavy odds against Mussolini's army in 1940, throwing it back into Albania. And this same spirit delayed, perhaps fatally, the German timetable in Russia in 1941, by inflicting unexpected damage on the German invaders in Greece. And we know that the Greek expeditionary forces performed admirably in Korea in 1950–53.

It has been estimated that there are over a million Americans of Greek descent. Invariably, they are good family people, law abiding, and industrious. Over 40,000 reside in Metropolitan Detroit. I know they are proud to be Americans, and proud to form part of the historic bond which has existed between Greece and America.

The U.S. Congress is the epitome of democracy—a Greek idea. In this Capital City, indeed in the construction of the Capitol itself, we honor Greek architecture. The Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials are, in a sense, Greek. And so, the ancient Hellenes beautify our city physically as they enrich us politically and spiritually.

The ancients of Greece are the ancestors of all the Western World. On this anniversary of Greek Independence Day, I am pleased to pay tribute to the ancients and to their direct descendants. Long may they prosper.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, 144 years ago today, the heirs to the civilization of ancient Greece, proclaimed their independence and took their rightful place among the democracies of the world. Today, we salute this brave nation on the anniversary of their independence.

Greek independence was achieved after four centuries of alien domination, during which the valiant Greek people fought for their independence on an average of once every 11 years. Despite the losses and frustrations suffered in these attempts, the fire of liberty was not extinguished by the blood they shed. Finally, on March 25, 1821, their efforts were crowned with success.

Although other European nations gave little support to the democratic nation which was created, here in the United States, support for their cause was found. It grew quickly as the North American Nation which had fought for and secured its own liberty, wholeheartedly determined that a people whose tradition was a source of inspiration to American democracy should be free.

As President Monroe told the Congress:

> Genius and delicacy in the arts, daring and heroism in action, unselfish patriotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion to public and private liberty, all these are connected with the name of ancient Greece. It is natural, therefore, that their contest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States.

For its part, the new Greek nation looked upon the United States with hope and admiration. In May 1821, the first Greek Senate addressed the American people, saying:

> Friends, fellow citizens, and brothers, having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn toward you by just sympathy, since it is in your land that liberty has fixed its abode * * *. Though separated from us by mighty oceans, your character brings you near us * * *. Our interests are of such nature as to cement more and more an alliance founded on freedom and virtue.

In the years since 1821, admiration has continued to flow in both directions between Greece and the United States. The tribulations the Greek nation withstood during the Second World War and the troubles which beset that country after the war ended aroused Americans to not only sympathize, but to actively help their Greek "friends, fellow citizens, and brothers" remain free.

The contributions made and still being made to the growth of the United States by the Greeks who have chosen to make their homes here continue to cement the feelings we have for Greece, and on this anniversary of their independence, we salute them.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in paying tribute to the Greek people who today commemorate their victorious struggle for independence from the Ottoman Empire.

This Greek Independence Day serves to remind us, too, of the invaluable legacy these gifted people have bestowed upon the world: architecture, sculpture, philosophy, and politics, of course, come quickly to mind. But we in the Congress are particularly aware of the experiments in democratic government carried on at Athens 2,000 years ago which inspired our Founding Fathers in fashioning our own democracy.

On this 144th anniversary of their independence we all wish peace and prosperity to the valiant and talented Greeks, our friends in peace and war.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the celebration of the 144th anniversary of the day on which the Greek people declared their determination to once again become a free people after centuries of foreign domination is a great occasion in the history of mankind. March 25, 1965, provides us with the opportunity to recall the manifold contributions of Greece to Western civilization, and the awakening of modern interest in the fate of the Greek people as a result of their resolve to once again become an independent nation, announced to an unconcerned world nearly 1½ centuries ago.

It has become axiomatic to say that we owe a great debt to the civilization which flourished in Greece in the millenium before the birth of Christ. Yet how many of us are actually aware of the extent and depth of this contribution? It is to Sophocles, Euripides, Aristophanes, and other playwrights that we owe the birth of drama as we know it. It is to Euclid, Archimedes, Hipparchus, Hippocrates, Aristotle, and others that we owe the birth of the sciences which have so changed the face of the world we live in. And, it is to innumerable painters, sculptors, and architects that we owe the esthetic foundations of many of our arts. Actually, it would be impossible to acknowledge fully our debt except within the confines of many volumes, so many disciplines does it encompass—including the most important of all: philosophy, forever associated with Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle.

Perhaps most important of all, let us remember that Greece was the birthplace of the democratic ideal. The Athenians were prepared to pay to defend it against the major powers of the ancient world. And, centuries later, their descendants are still concerned with defending and cherishing this ideal. We have seen their courage against various aggressors displayed over and over again, most recently in their fight to keep Greece free during and after the Second World War.

It is, therefore, with pride that I acknowledge the debt of the civilized world, and especially the United States, to the achievements of Greece, and the indomitable courage with which they have defended their liberties throughout history.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is with particular pleasure that I pay tribute today to the Greek nation on the occasion of Greek Independence Day. As the only Member of Congress of Greek origin, I naturally take special pride in this celebration of the 144th anniversary of the start of the Greek struggle for independence.

It was on March 25, 1821, that the Greek people declared their independence from the oppressive Ottoman Empire. Although the Greeks had tried unsuccessfully to throw off Turkish rule many times during their 450 years of bondage, the effort launched on March 25, 144 years ago today, was destined to succeed. The lonely struggle of the Greek people against the power and force of the massive Ottoman Empire aroused the sympathy and support of Europe and America and finally, after 7 years of intermittent warfare, the determination of the Greeks, combined with assistance from her friends abroad, succeeded in achieving the long-sought-for goal of Greek independence.

It is fitting that we in America should join the Greek people in celebrating this great moment in Greek history for several reasons. One of these is our debt to Greece for many of our American institutions, most strikingly our democratic system of government. The impact of Greek philosophy, art, literature, and political thought has contributed immeasurably to our own civilization. The emphasis on the dignity of man and the freedom of the human mind which marked Greece's golden age has been a rich legacy which has helped to shape our American traditions of law and government.

Moreover, the millions of Greek immigrants who have come to our shores have enriched our land. Greek-Americans have made impressive contributions to our national life in many fields.

The natural sympathy that has long existed between the American people and the people of Greece was enunciated during the Greek war of independence by President James Monroe when he said:

> Genius and delicacy in the arts, daring and heroism in action, unselfish patriotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion to public and private liberty, all these are connected with the name of ancient Greece. It is natural, therefore, that their contest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States.

The ties that linked our two nations in the 1820's have been further strengthened in the intervening years. Our countries have stood together in war and in peace: as allies during World War II; in the Greek struggle against Communist guerrillas just after the war; and today in the NATO Alliance.

It is thus with a deep respect for the Greek people and for the independent nation which their courage and determination have created that I join with my fellow Americans in marking Greek Independence Day.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, 144 years ago, Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised the flag of revolt at Kalavryta on March 25, 1821, and opened the Greek struggle for liberty against the Ottoman Turks. For almost four centuries, Greece had formed part of the Ottoman Empire. Greeks had been frequently persecuted for their religion. They had endured an oppressive system of taxation which in its cruelest form required one out of every five male Greek children to become part of a Turkish infantry corps known as the Janizaries. By the time of the Napoleonic Wars, the Turkish Empire had entered a period of decline. The Turkish administration in Greece had become a lax and corrupt bureaucracy which invited revolt. The flame of nationalism, fanned by revolutions in North America, South America, and France, spurred the Greeks to seek their long-lost liberty.

The struggle was to be long and bitter. It immediately attracted the attention and sympathy of Americans who had so recently fought with success for their own independence. In many American communities, groups were formed to send aid to Greece, and in public forums, American leaders expressed their support for the Greek cause. Thus President Monroe on December 3, 1822, said that "the mention of Greece fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible." He regretted "that such a country should have been overwhelmed and so long hidden."

He expressed the hope "that these people will recover their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth." Daniel Webster, while pleading for American support of the Greek effort, pointed to the debt that Americans and all peoples of the Western World owed to Greece. He spoke as follows:

> This free form of government, this popular assembly, the common council held for the common good, where have we contemplated its earliest models? This practice of free debate, and public discussion, the contest of mind with mind, and that popular eloquence, which if it were now here, on a subject like this, would move the stones of the capital—whose was the language in which all these were first exhibited? Even the edifice in which we assemble, these proportioned columns, this ornamental architecture, all remind us that Greece has existed, and that we, like the rest of mankind, are greatly her debtors.

The Greek cause also attracted sympathy in England, France, and Russia, although the support rendered to the Greeks by the governments of these countries was not entirely disinterested. The Russians hoped to eject the Turks from the Balkans; the French and the English did not wish to see the Turks replaced by the Russians. The Greeks benefited by these rivalries. When their success seemed in doubt, the Russians, French, and English came to their assistance. Following the decisive naval battle of Navarino of 1827, Greece secured her independence by the Treaty of Adrianople of 1829 and the London Protocol of 1830. Only gradually and through sustained efforts, however, was Greece able to extend her boundaries to include many Greeks left under foreign rule by the settlement of 1830.

Mr. Speaker, in our own century, the Greeks waged a new struggle for their liberty. This time, the American Nation, now grown mighty and determined to aid free nations resisting external aggression and internal subversion, was able to extend substantial material assistance to the Greeks in addition to moral sympathy. Thanks in part at least to aid given under the Truman doctrine, Greece is a strong and independent nation today. It is obvious that ties between this Nation and Greece are longstanding and many. I am confident that they can only increase and be further strengthened in years to come.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today, March 25, 1965, presents us with an opportunity once again to acknowledge our debt, indeed the debt of the whole world, to the civilization and achievements of Greece.

On this date, 144 years ago, the people of Greece rose against the domination of the Ottoman Empire with the intention of once again becoming a free and independent state. For 9 long years they continued this battle, until, with the aid of Great Britain, France, and Russia, they finally achieved their goal of full independence. It is not inappropriate to ask why the major powers of Europe came to their assistance. The answer is not hard to find; perhaps it is best to quote the words of one of our own Presidents, James Monroe, who said:

> The mention of Greece fills the mind with the most exalted sentiments and arouses in our bosoms the best feelings of which our nature is susceptible. * * * A strong hope is entertained that these people will recover their independence and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth.

For in fact it is to Greece that the United States and the other nations of what is referred to as "Western civilization" trace their origins. In this small country in the millenium before the birth of Christ there occurred one of the greatest flowerings of the abilities and talents of mankind in recorded history.

Pericles, the ruler of Athens during the Golden Age, once said:

> If all things are fated to decline, at least say of us, O future centuries, that we built the most famous and the happiest of cities.

I think that we, here and now in the 20th century, more than 2,000 years later, can agree with him. Over the span of human history since that time, the names of that place and time are still bright; Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle, the fathers of philosophy, who organized and systematized ideas of human conduct and the regulation of human affairs, and whose speculations on ethics and government have formed the base of later theories and models. Bertrand Russell once described the history of our civilization since that time as nothing much more than a series of extended and often tedious footnotes to Plato.

Other names still live. The literature and drama of ancient Greece includes the tragedies of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripedes; the comedies of Aristophanes and Menander, and the poetry of such varied figures as Homer, Hesiod, Aesop, and Sappho. The sculptures of Praxiteles, Pheidias, Polyclitus are renowned. In the sphere of architecture, succeeding generations have copied and recopied the magnificent Greek models: the Parthenon, the Propylaea and others of the Acropolis, as well as temples and public buildings still standing in such sites around the Mediterranean as Paestum, Delphi, and Syracuse.

And what of Greek science and mathematics? Hippocrates, the father of medicine, whose oath of service we still use; Euclid, the father of geometry; Hipparchus, the father of trigonometry; Appolonius; Archimedes; and perhaps most important Aristotle, who insisted that scientists should apply inductive reasoning to their researches.

Although the ancient Greeks lived in a world of natural and human disaster, their unquenchable curiosity about the world around them, their logic, and their desire to explain this world in human terms released them and their spiritual descendants from the innumerable shackles of superstition, taboos, and inherited beliefs. They resorted to inductive logic, mathematics, and founded the many sciences. They created and worked in nearly all the arts: dance, theater, painting, sculpture, poetry, and prose. In doing so, they established many of the esthetic standards by which we have judged succeeding works.

Mr. Speaker, let it not be thought, however, that the modern-day descendants of these famous Greeks have not retained their ability to excel in the various fields of human endeavor. The works of such authors and poets as Nikos Kazantzakis and George Seferis, who won the Nobel Prize for Literature in 1963, are well known throughout the world. In the other arts, Elia Karan, Michael Cacoyannis, Dimitri Mitropoulos, Yannis Tsarouhis, and Giannoules Halepas are similarly well known for their achievements in drama, cinema, music, painting, and sculpture.

But, despite their great achievements the various city-states of Greek antiquity were able to unite politically only once—in order to defeat the armies of the Persians. This inability led to their annexation by Philip of Macedon and his famous son, Alexander the Great. Yet, through Alexander's ambition for a world empire and his admiration for Greek learning, Greek civilization was spread to all of the territories which he conquered, forming the basis of the Hellenic culture which was to become the standard of the ancient world.

The death of Alexander and the breakup of his empire led to the conquest of the Greeks by the Roman Empire in the second century B.C. Although Greece became a province of Rome, Athens continued to be a center of learning and culture which wielded tremendous influence throughout the Empire. Then, when the Roman Empire split, Greece became a part of, even the heart of, the Byzantine Empire for more than a thousand years. During this period, the Greek genius once again flowered, producing the great art and culture of Byzantium.

After the conquest of Constantinople by the Ottomans, the Greeks, although allowed considerable autonomy, felt the lack of freedom. In their first unsuccessful attempt to assert their independence in 1770, they were decisively defeated. By the end of the 18th century, the Greek people, despite numerous differences, were developing a strong sense of national consciousness. The increasingly wealthy and powerful middle class began to challenge the primacy of the prelates and the old provincial aristocracy; even more important, it enthusiastically embraced the revolutionary ideology of the French Revolution.

On the eve of that memorable day, 144 years ago, March 25, 1821, the Greeks had become a significant power. The population amounted to over 3 million, and their military strength was greater than at any time since their occupation by the Ottoman Turks. In addition, they possessed a readymade navy of several hundred ships, the result of treaty provisions between the empire and Russia. Likewise, the Greeks had the capital resources necessary for a revolution. But, above all, they had developed a national consciousness and a determination to win their independence—by force of arms if necessary.

Throughout the early 1820's, the battles between the Greeks and the Ottoman Turks produced only a stalemate. Then the Ottoman Sultan called upon one of his vassals for assistance, and the Greek revolution appeared doomed. The apparently hopeless situation changed almost overnight with the intervention of the great powers; although they interfered because of the fear that the whole balance of political power in Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean would be destroyed, there was another important motive.

The tremendous intellectual awakening and ferment which the Renaissance had occasioned made the peoples of Europe aware of the debt which they owed to Greece. Groups of sympathizers with the plight of the Greeks exterted powerful pressures on the governments of the great powers for intervention in the Greek war of independence. And, individuals from all over Europe voluntarily offered their services toward this goal. Undoubtedly the most famous of these was Lord Byron, the famous English poet, who lost his life at the Battle of Missolonghi.

The efforts of the Governments of Russia, Great Britain, and France however, cannot be said to have been entirely disinterested. The Russians, for example, wanted to drive the Ottomans out of the Balkan Peninsula, and the French and English were concerned that Russian power there would only replace Ottoman power. Able to take advantage of these rivalries, Greece finally secured her independence with the blessings of these three great powers by the Treaty of Adrianople of 1829 and the London Protocol of 1830.

The years following independence were concerned with internal consolidation and acquisition. Thessaly, most of Epirus and Macedonia, Crete, and the majority of the Aegean Islands were added to the kingdom. And, only gradually was Greece able to settle her constitutional problems, involving dynastic difficulties and the search for a responsible and popular monarch. It was not until the election and accession of Prince William of Denmark, who took the title King George I of the Hellenes, that many of these problems were settled. The new King promised to uphold and defend the constitution of 1864, which proclaimed a monarchical democracy.

The independence which the Greeks had won after nearly 10 years of effort was threatened at various times, but never as severely as during the Second World War. Although the country had been torn by internal strife after the First World War, the unprovoked attack by the Italian Army on October 28, 1940, was sufficient to unite the people of Greece to a new defense of their liberties. Under the great army commander, Gen. Alexander Papagos, the Greeks were able to repulse the initial attack. In the spring of 1941, however, the Germans came to the aid of the Italians, and began the invasion of Greece, for they needed to hold the Balkans if the attack on Russia were to be effective. The King and his government fled into exile, and a 3½-year period of occupation and privation set in. Greece suffered severe damage to her economy—the merchant marine was reduced by 75 percent, industrial production fell by 80 percent, the railroads were inoperable, the roads were more than 50 percent destroyed. When the Germans finally withdrew in 1944, there remained only devastation and complete political and economic chaos.

The end of the war, however, did not mean that the travails of the Greek people were at an end. Elements of the Greek resistance movement had fallen under Communist domination; they refused to surrender their arms and called for the formation of a new Greek republic. Throughout the immediate postwar years, these forces received support from Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia—all under the control of the Communists. A bitter civil war was slowly draining the life out of what was left after the havoc of the World War.

Early in 1947, Great Britain, also facing an economic crisis as the result of the war, said it could no longer continue her financial and military support of the Greek Government. President Truman asked and received from Congress the authority to begin immediate financial and military aid to Greece. This commitment, known as the Truman Doctrine, proved to be the catalyst for effective action in the civil war. By 1949, with the defection of Yugoslavia from the bloc and the closing of its border to the Greek guerrillas, as well as the efforts of an American military mission under General Van Fleet, the Greek Government was able to force the last remnants to either surrender or take refuge in Albania.

With the civil war over, the Government was finally able to turn its attention to internal development. As a result of American aid, amounting to over $1 billion under the various aid programs, and the determined efforts of the Greeks themselves, the recovery of Greece was effected.

Since the recovery program was begun, Greece has made truly impressive progress in stabilizing its economy: The output of various minerals has increased by over 50 percent, the production of electricity has increased by over 150 percent, and one of the traditional trades of the Greeks of yore as well as today, merchant shipping, has gone from about 500,000 tons in 1946 to over 5 million tons.

The measure of the Greek success is also provided by the fact that Greece had achieved sufficient political and economic stability to be accepted for associate membership in the European Common Market. At the same time, Greece has not shirked her responsibilities as a member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, providing the West with eight divisions.

No survey of Greece could end without some mention of the role of the Greeks in countries other than their own, including the United States. For centuries, from ancient colonies all over Sicily, southern Italy, and the northern coast of Africa in antiquity, to cities on all the continents of the world today, Greek immigrants and their descendants have added their talents and skills to those of others. Today, then, we acknowledge the Greek contribution to that unique blend of cultures which makes up the United States.

Mr. Speaker, when Americans today seek to express the ideals of our democratic society, they might turn to the pages of Thucydides, one of the great Greek historians, who reports the words of the funeral oration of Pericles:

> Our constitution does not copy the laws of neighboring States; we are rather a pattern to others than imitators ourselves. Its administration favors the many instead of the few; that is why it is called a democracy. If we look to the laws, they afford equal justice to all in their private differences; if to social standing, advancement in public life falls to reputation for capacity, class considerations not being allowed to interfere with merit; nor again does poverty bar the way; if a man is able to serve the state, he is not hindered by the obscurity of his condition. The freedom which we enjoy in our government extends also to our ordinary life. There, far from exercising a jealous surveillance over each other, we do not feel called upon to be angry with our neighbor for doing what he likes, or even to indulge in those injurious looks which cannot fail to be offensive, although they inflict no positive penalty. But all this ease in our private relations does not make us lawless as citizens. Against this fear is our chief safeguard, teaching us to obey the magistrates and the laws, particularly such as regard the protection of the injured, whether they are actually on the statute book, or belong to that code which, although unwritten, yet cannot be broken without acknowledged disgrace.

This was the ideal of ancient Greece; it remains today the ideal of our own Government and democracy, and a lasting tribute to the genius of Greece.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Today, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the other Members of Congress in paying tribute to the Greek people on the occasion of the 144th anniversary of their independence.

The rebirth of a free and independent Greek nation 144 years ago is certainly an important milestone in the history of mankind. The courageous Greek people, who were the first to practice democracy and independence in ancient times, declared their independence of Turkish rule on March 25, 1821, but did not emerge as a sovereign state until 11 years later, when their freedom was assured by the Convention of London.

Since that time Greece has become a valued member of the community of free nations and is one of our stanchest allies in the free world struggle against communism. We should be proud of the effectiveness of the cooperation that has existed between Greece and the United States in the entire history of our relations and which is especially strong at the present time.

In conformance with the historic friendship between the Greek and American people, the United States should certainly develop a practical foreign policy position on the question of Cyprus. The lack of leadership by the Johnson administration in this field is an international tragedy. Truly responsible leadership on the part of the United States should have produced by now enosis of the island of Cyprus with Greece, while safeguarding the rights of all residents of the island.

Greece, which developed Western civilization as we know it, continues to provide an ever-increasing role of leadership in the preservation of our modern society.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 144th anniversary of the independence of Greece. In their homeland and in many nations which, like ourselves, have received immigrants from Greece, this 144th anniversary is being celebrated today. We are proud to honor this anniversary, for there are no more independent people or greater lovers of freedom than the people of Greece.

I think that we should take the time to reflect upon the courageous efforts of the Greek patriots who fought against overwhelming odds to gain their independence.

Although dominated for centuries by Ottoman rulers, the freedom-loving people of Greece never lost sight of the goal they have set for themselves and kept the hope that some day they might free themselves from oppression.

The first great step of the valiant fight for freedom by the Greek people from Ottoman rule was taken on March 25, 1821, when Bishop Germanos of Patras raised the flag of liberty of the Church of Aghia Laura. This revolutionary banner was blessed and the call to battle issued. Greeks by the thousands answered the call and the long campaign for independence began.

The Greek fighters were inspired by the successful revolution which occurred in America only a few years before and which brought about the existence of our great Nation. The example of the American Revolution had planted the seed of freedom which had taken deep root among the other freedom-loving nations of the world.

The efforts of those courageous Greeks impressed the freedom-loving people of the United States. The youth of America at that time was keenly interested in the struggle for human freedom which it saw going on in Greece. Some young men volunteered to serve in the Greek armed forces, with the realization that this cradle of Western civilization—the Greek nation—must not remain enslaved. Among those Americans who distinguished themselves in this battle for freedom were such well-known personages as Dr. Samuel Gridley Howe, Capt. Jonathon Peckham Miller, Gen. George Jarvis, and a host of others.

This country took a firm stand in favor of the Greek patriots, and America's popular feeling was officially reflected in the 1822 message to Congress made by President James Monroe which set down the famous Monroe Doctrine. In promulgating this doctrine, he stated:

> A strong hope has been entertained, founded on the heroic struggle of the Greeks, that they would succeed in their contest and resume their equal station among the nations of the earth. It is believed that the whole civilized world takes a deep interest in their welfare * * * their cause and their name have protected them from dangers which might, ere this, have overwhelmed any other people * * * there is good cause to believe that their enemy has lost forever all domination of them; that Greece will become an independent nation. That she may obtain that rank is the object of our most ardent wishes.

The determination of the Greek people to be free and independent was not to be denied. With the aid of sympathetic volunteers from all over the world, the justice of the Greek cause prevailed and the yoke of Ottoman rule was shaken off and complete independence came to Greece in 1832.

America owes much to Greece, not only for her great contributions to culture and education, but also for the important role that the Greeks have played as a bulwark against communism and Communist aggression in the eastern Mediterranean, as a member of the NATO alliance. The Greek Government has granted the United States the use of its airfields and naval facilities and the Greek Army is supplied with modern arms and equipment under the NATO agreements. Thus, the role of the Greek nation in the free world is a vital and significant one.

Persons of Greek descent may well be proud of their cultural and political heritage with their contributions to government. The contributions of Greece to the cause of human liberty have been great and lasting.

Our commemorating of the Greek Independence Day serves as a reconfirmation of our devotion to democratic principles and of our faith that the idea which came into being a thousand years ago in Greece will surely win over the powers of darkness which threaten the world today.

Mr. Speaker, in my congressional district I have many good friends who are Americans of Greek extraction. Many of them are Greek immigrants who came to America because America loomed great in their minds as the promised land. They have grown with America and have become leaders in business, the professions, and in the civic and public life of our community. I join with them in honoring Greek Independence Day and assure them of continued support for their historic efforts to strengthen the structure of their social and economic life.

I feel sure that the coming years will enable the people of Greece to enjoy continued freedom and economic well-being, which they so richly deserve.

I salute the gallant Greek nation with these words, "Zito Hállas." Long live Greece.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, every year the 25th of March provides us with an opportunity to pay our respects to the intellectual achievements of the Greek people, as well as their steadfast and wholehearted commitment to democracy, and defense of the best of Western ideals.

In fact, today represents the 144th anniversary of the independence of the modern state of Greece. Yet I am sure we are all aware that it is impossible to even talk about Western civilization without mentioning the contributions which the Greeks throughout history have made. Indeed, it is in the ancient city-state of Athens that the idea of democracy was first discussed and applied. The great minds of antiquity—Socrates, Plato, Aristotle—debated and analyzed the myriads of possible political systems, and many of their insights remain valid to the present day. At the same time, others were founding or shaping the outlines of a great number of the arts and sciences with which we are all familiar: poetry, drama, painting, sculpture, and architecture; geometry, trigonometry, zoology, botany, physics, and mathematics. Our world today would be a far more primitive place had not these and other Greeks first begun to explore and explain their surroundings in meaningful human terms.

Lest it be thought that their successors on that rocky peninsula achieved nothing, we need only recall the culture and glory of the Byzantine Empire, as well as the achievements of Nikos Kazantzakis, George Seferis, Elia Kazan, Dmitri Mitropoulos and many others in our own time.

The determination of the Greeks to fight for their heritage and their ideals has been demonstrated time and again, from the battle of Thermopylae, to the battle of Missolonghi, to the battle of Athens during the Second World War. We are, therefore, privileged and honored to acknowledge our debts to Greece, and our friendship and sympathy for the Greek people. I take this opportunity to add my own best wishes to those of others on this anniversary, and express the conviction that the glory of Greece and the closeness of our relations with that country will forever remain.

Mr. Speaker, Greek achievements and accomplishments are known to me because I have many Greek constituents. I have the greatest admiration and respect for those whose ancestral bond is to Greece. Their contributions—religious, civic, athletic, social, political, cultural, economic—have considerably enriched my home community of Rochester, N.Y., and earned the Greeks the lasting friendship of their fellow citizens.

So, on this occasion while my thoughts are meant for all Greeks, they are prompted particularly by my appreciation and affection for those I have the honor to represent in Congress.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, March 25 is not only Greece's national holiday, but it is the date on which the seeds sown by the Founding Fathers of the American Republic bloomed on another continent for the first time.

On March 25, 1821, an overwhelmingly outnumbered, valiant band of Greeks rose against their foreign ruler, as they had done every generation for four centuries, only to be beaten down every time in waves of terror that spared neither humans, nor animals, nor even trees—this ruler had systematically destroyed the forests and orchards of Greece.

But the justice of the Greek cause prevailed because the rising of March 25, 1821, was designed to succeed, perhaps because the new American Nation had established that all nations have the right to live in freedom. The American Nation supported the Greek fighters for freedom and thus the Greeks, who first established freedom as the one true basis of government, became independent once more.

Mr. Speaker, in the 144 years since, Greece has been a faithful and gallant ally of America. In the First World War, the Second World War, the fight against Stalinist domination of Europe, and the Korean war. In the fight against Communist terror, the American Government helped the Greeks materially, and they won, beating back an invasion launched by international Communists, and set an example that we would like to see emulated in Vietnam and elsewhere. The Greeks won because their people could be trusted to fight, gun in hand, for freedom, as they had always done—most notably in the glorious struggle which began on March 25, 1821.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, civilization owes much to ancient Greece, but it owes a great debt to modern Greece, also.

Greece of old gave us heroes and sages on whom to pattern a way of life at the same time that it nourished a spirit of freedom that not even centuries of oppression could extinguish.

The hopes that inspire freedom-loving men everywhere burned on through Roman, Byzantium, and Ottoman Empire occupations, burned bright enough to light a war of liberation that lasted almost a decade.

The war of independence that brave Greeks launched on March 25, 1821, a date which today all free men celebrate, unfortunately had to be rewon many times.

But none of the enemies of freedom finally prevailed, and it is a glory to all of us that the flood that was post-World War II communism broke, finally, on the stone wall that was Greece.

Mr. Speaker, the people who are free, and the people who one day will be free, together owe and will owe a great debt to the people who cradled our Western civilization.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, on this historic occasion, it is highly appropriate that we should pay fitting tribute of congratulation, gratitude, and admiration to the Greek Nation and the infinitely great Greek people both at home and abroad.

Little we say could adequately express the feelings of affection and pride we have for our Greek-American friends and neighbors for their tremendous contributions of superb citizenship, marvelous achievements for our free way of life and the warmth of their friendship and the depth and inspiration of their patriotism. Surely, in these great respects, no other people in this or any other country could possibly excel them.

And there is another thought which inevitably prompts our wonder, pride, esteem, and appreciation in unlimited and glowing terms today, and that is the glory of the Greek heritage and the great debt which we share in common with all other civilized nations for the truly indescribable benefits and blessings conferred by that epochal heritage upon all mankind.

Hellenism is more than a nationality, more than a racial entity, more than a passing phase of contemporary life. It is a great, ancient, deeply entrenched world culture infusing virtually every type of civilization in the world, an influence for good and beauty and the "golden mean" that touches profoundly into many ways of life, particularly those like our own that are animated primarily by full recognition of the worth and dignity of individual man and rest upon the freedom and moral authenticity of the individual human being.

The cult of the beautiful, the supremacy of moral and familial values, the dialog of personal liberty and the exaltation of the human spirit which the ancient Greeks brought forth and gave to the world, form, in truth, the very basis of our philosophy and practice of ordered free government and the modes and customs of our everyday life.

I could go on and on to recite the wonders of Greek law and culture, Greek art, literature, Greek sculpture, philosophy, science, mathematics, democracy and general culture and the immortal contributions of the Greeks to us and to world civilization.

But I could talk for many hours and days and never fully encompass the wide range, deep impact and most significant effects of Greek contributions to this great country of ours and to many other great countries, not only in this generation, but throughout the long channels of history.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the Greeks of antiquity and of the present-day world. I am proud and grateful for what they have done for mankind, for America, for all our people, and for our Nation.

And I am proud of their warm, inspiring friendship and personal loyalty which means so much to me. How fortunate we are to have them as great, constructive forces in our America.

And how fortunate the world is to have such a great people, wedded to all the finest principles of freedom, democracy and justice which their ancestors did so much to fashion and promulgate to the world, as neighbors, as friends and as steadfast fellow workers in the protection and enrichment of that freedom.

How fortunate we all are that the glorious Greeks are with us. May they long endure to shed their light and their warmth on struggling humanity and honor and sustain us with their devoted friendship.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, 1821, Greek patriots raised the flag of liberty and swore to win freedom or die in the attempt. On this anniversary occasion it is becoming that we here in the Congress of the United States should review and give expression to our great and everlasting debt to ancient and to modern Greece and the people of Hellenic blood. After our own Revolution the Greeks were the first nation of Europe to throw off an alien yoke and fight for national freedom. While our own freedom may have been a source of inspiration to the Greeks, we, in turn, derived from Greek history much guidance.

Alexander Hamilton, while agreeing that a federal government should be an association of independent communities, argued for a strong central government. He said:

> Theory is in this case fully confirmed by experience. The amphictyonic council had, it would seem, ample powers for general purposes. It had in particular, the power of fining and using force against delinquent members. What was the consequence? Their decrees were mere signals of war. The Phocian war is a striking example of it. Philip, at length, taking advantage of their disunion and insinuating himself into their councils, made himself master of their fortunes.

Madison, also a student of the history of Greece, warned that no foreign power should ever be permitted to deal with separate states. He pointed out that the Kings of Persia and Philip of Macedon through intrigues with the amphictyonic confederates, destroyed their league.

Madison's Journal, and other notes and journals of the Constitution, are filled with references to the experiences of the Greek cities and lessons derived from their mistakes which were applied by Madison and Hamilton to our own situation and to our profit.

Not only is Greek history interwoven with our Constitution, both through philosophy and warning against errors, Greek philosophy is discernible in our political science. In his Politics Aristotle uses the term "politics" meaning "citizens."

The early Athenian Government gave people freedom of thought, speech and action. Its laws were designed to benefit all citizens. Their early experiment with democracy came nearer to providing justice for all citizens than any form devised before or since that time.

In the field of science, Hippocrates is known as the "father of medicine." His code of medical ethics is expressed in the pledge:

> With purity and holiness, I will pass my life and practice my art. Into whatever houses I enter, I will go there for the benefit of the sick and will abstain from every injurious act and corruption. Whatever in my professional practice—or even, not in connection with it—I see or hear in the lives of men which ought not to be spoken of abroad, I will not divulge. While I keep this oath unviolated, may it be granted me to enjoy life and the practice of the art, always respected among men, but should I break or violate the oath, may the reverse be my lot.

This oath is still subscribed to by those who practice medicine. It is not surprising that medicine made great strides under the leadership of Hippocrates. He recognized the value of keeping and studying case records.

One of the most noted of Greek scientists was Aristotle, who wrote on such subjects as physics and biology. He explained the use of the lever a hundred years before Archimedes was born.

Two Greek scientists, Leucippus and Democritus, advanced the atomic theory.

John Stuart Mill wrote:

> The Greeks are the most remarkable people who have yet existed * * *. They were the beginners of everything, Christianity excepted, of which the modern world makes its boast * * *. They were the first people who had a historical literature; as perfect of its kind * * * as their oratory, their sculpture, and their architecture. They were the founders of mathematics, of physics, of the inductive study of politics, of the philosophy of human nature and life. In each they make the indispensable first steps, which are the foundation of all the rest.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, one of our stanchest and most steadfast allies, in the struggle against godless communism, has been Greece. The Greeks were among the first to feel the heavy hand of Communist terrorism and banditry. By extending a helping hand in 1947, we were able to help Greece overcome her Communist insurgent problem, and go on to again become a viable nation and later a valued member of the NATO alliance. In so doing we partially repaid the debt we all owe to our heritage of Greek civilization and democracy. It is therefore fitting that on the occasion of her 144th anniversary, we again remember our debt to this valiant little Mediterranean nation. It is with these thoughts in mind that I wish to insert in the RECORD this statement by the Royal Greek Embassy:

THE 144TH ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY, MARCH 25, 1965

March 25, 1821, marks the first European echo of the American Revolution. On that date, 144 years ago, a band of dedicated freedom loving Greek patriots raised a flag of liberty and swore that they would have freedom or die in the attempt. It was not the first time that the gallant remnants of the brave Greek nation had risen against foreign domination. For more than four centuries of alien domination, they had fought for liberty regularly, on an average every 11 years. Each of those attempts was drowned in blood and destruction.

But the 1821 rising was destined to succeed. Fighting against incredible odds, accepting stoically the price not only in blood but in property that the alien rulers exacted, the Greeks fought on amid their smouldering homes and burning orchards—for the trees, too, were destroyed to quench the spirit of liberty—and 8 long years later they won, as the Americans had won earlier, thus affirming for the first time in Europe the right of nations to rule themselves.

They found scant support from other European governments at first, those brave Greek fighters. The great capitals of Europe were more concerned with the balance of power, with supporting Turkey, whom they called then the sick man of Europe, rather than allowing the Greek subjects of the Turk to gain freedom.

But the justice of the Greek cause prevailed. The example of the American revolution had sown seeds that had grown deep roots. Freedom lovers from other nations came to offer their lives in the cause of Greek liberty. Greeks are proud that Americans participated in that noble endeavor.

In 1821, when the Greeks rose against the Turkish Empire to throw off a yoke of nearly 450 years, to the average American, Greece was either a remote country, somewhere in Europe, or an ancient civilization, famous for its books and buildings. Soon, however, Greece became a real and immediate entity. The Greek struggle for freedom stirred the American press, aroused American orators and stimulated the neoclassic trends in American art, literature and architecture. American opinion was unanimous: a people whose tradition was a source of inspiration to American democracy, a nation fighting for its liberty, should be free.

The first American to sponsor the cause of Greek liberty was Edward Everett, professor of Greek at Harvard University. A man of strong convictions, Everett was determined not only to make speeches for Greece, but to act. In the name of Greece he initiated a crusade against the reactionary and oppressive policy of the Holy Alliance in Europe.

His efforts for Greek independence were to bear fruit, and a year later popular feeling was officially reflected in President Monroe's annual message to Congress, which declared: "Genius and delicacy in the arts, daring, and heroism in action, unselfish patriotism, enthusiastic zeal, and devotion to public and private liberty, all these are connected with the name of ancient Greece. It is natural, therefore, that their [the Greeks'] contest should arouse the sympathy of the entire United States."

The Greeks, on their side, looked upon the United States with hope and admiration. One of the first acts of the first Greek Senate in May 1821, was the delivery of an address to the American people, beginning, "Friends, fellow citizens, and brothers: Having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn toward you by just sympathy, since it is in your land that liberty has fixed its abode * * *. Though separated from us by mighty oceans, your character brings you near us * * *. Our interests are of such nature as to cement more and more an alliance founded on freedom and virtue."

It was natural for the American institutions of higher learning to take the lead in aiding the Greek cause; there intellectual freedom was upheld as the cardinal aim in education, and youthful enthusiasm for justice and liberty ran high. From Harvard University came the signal for America's support of Greek freedom. It was given by Edward Everett 6 years before the outbreak of the Greek revolution, in his oration for the degree of master of arts in 1814, which he called "The Restoration of Greece." It contained many prophetic notes. Judging by later reports, his listeners were carried away by the eloquence with which he pleaded for an independent Greece. After graduation from Harvard, Everett visited Hellas on the eve of its independence. He wrote an engaging account of his experiences in Greece during 1818 and 1819 which unfortunately has never been published.

It was Everett who guided Daniel Webster in his famous address on Greece, delivered before the American Congress.

Soon interest in Greece spread beyond Everett's campus at Harvard. Throughout the 1820's, students in American public schools, colleges, and universities were holding meetings, passing resolutions and writing expressions of support for the Greek cause.

The youth of America at that time was keenly interested in the struggle for human freedom which it saw going on in Greece. Some young men volunteered in the Greek armed forces. Young George Jarvis, Jonathan Miller and Samuel Gridley Howe distinguished themselves on the Greek battlefields. Their own American revolution was only a few decades past; the interim years had seen the writing of the American Constitution and the careful construction of a republic on the foundations of freedom. Theirs was not merely a passive interest in what was happening in Greece; they felt that their own ideals and lives were involved, and, over 100 years ago, they felt America could not remain isolated.

Eventually, the heroic sacrifices of the Greeks could no longer be ignored. Public opinion in the civilized world was revolted by the brutal suffering of a small heroic nation that was obviously determined to die fighting rather than live in bondage and the great European powers swung their weight behind the Greeks who, at last, obtained for themselves the benefits of freedom, an idea that they gave to the world.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to include their remarks in tribute to this anniversary of Greek Independence Day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FARM POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HANSEN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I have here in my hand the results of an independent survey which was conducted by a group of leaders in my home State of Iowa. I would like to share with my colleagues the results of this survey which is one of the clearest and most definitive statements for the direction of farm policy by a nonfarm group that I have ever seen.

The group which conducted the survey is an organization known as the "Iowa 99 Legislative and Advisory Group." This group is composed of one rural leader from each of the 99 counties in the State. They were assisted by the statistical department at Iowa State University in Ames.

Their objective is to spotlight and emphasize the problems of our rural economy and recommend necessary measures to legislative groups at State and National levels. In order to canvass the opinion and thinking of a major business group, this committee recently asked the State's 849 bankers to give their views on procedures for improving the farm economy and on a broad range of public policies.

So far there has been an unbelievable 50-percent response from the bankers, most of it from those of the smaller towns of the State where bankers are closest to people of the farms and have quick, continuing communication with them. I also feel this was indeed an excellent group to survey since all of us are most aware of the part financial institutions play in our economic stability. I, of course, am deeply interested in this activity and have more than a casual interest in the opinions of the bankers of Iowa, being a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee. Even more important, I represent the Seventh Congressional District in which 68 percent of the people live in the rural areas. This is why I am so vitally interested in what the bankers think about farm policy.

Certainly you need not be reminded of the depressed conditions of our family farmers as a result of the continuing downward trend in farm income. There is, of course, a growing appreciation of the relationship between income opportunities for the family farmers of our Nation and the economic well-being of people who live and work in the towns of our rural areas. I must admit that it was a pleasant surprise to find the degree of understanding that was expressed by bankers of Iowa in this vital survey.

At this particular time, as all of us anxiously await the President's farm bill, I think it is most appropriate that we carefully solicit the opinions of everyone and heed the needs of our family farmers which have such a great impact on the economic conditions of our main street businesses. I want to take this opportunity to commend the Iowa committee of 99 for their efforts in collecting these opinions. After reading them, all of you will, I am sure, agree that these were not leading but were most explicit and left no doubt as to the intentions of the individual answering them.

The failure of the great majority of our family farmers to receive parity of income equal to the incomes of other segments of our economy is being reflected in the unfavorable business conditions in the towns which provide farm families with goods and services. I want to point out and emphasize to both my rural and nonrural colleagues that unless action is taken soon to further improve the farm income situation the pinch will be felt in cities large and small across our great Nation. They are directly or indirectly dependent upon farm and nonfarm rural customers for the products of their factories, plants, and mills. I am sure, therefore, that the opinions expressed by these Iowa bankers in this timely questionnaire will be of great interest to each of you. This is especially true since Congress will consider action this session on a broad range of farm and food legislation.

Asked if they would favor a 4-year extension of the present or similar farm program, more than three-fourths of the bankers responding to the questionnaire, specifically 77 percent answered "Yes."

In response to the question "will termination of all farm commodity price supports have a favorable or unfavorable effect upon your community," 63 percent said such termination would have an unfavorable effect—27 percent said "favorable."

Sixty-eight percent of the bankers responding to the questionnaire are against elimination of farm price supports, and 55 percent say that farmers cannot solve their problems without Government help.

In response to the question as to whether or not businessmen in their communities are doing better now than in the previous 4 years, 40 percent said business conditions had worsened this year, 26 percent said the situation is unchanged, and 30 percent said business was better.

The majority of the bankers responding to the questionnaire—namely, 60 percent—feel that farmers in their areas are now making some financial progress. In view of the answers to farm program questions, I think it only fair to conclude that farmer-Government cooperation is contributing to the modest progress that has been made since the start of the current feed grains program.

With figures reflecting percentages, a summary of the qestionnaire returns are as follows:

1. Do you think farm price supports should be eliminated? Yes, 26; no, 68, no response, 6.

2. Can farmers solve their problems without Government help? Yes, 33; no, 55; no response, 12.

3. The Kiplinger letter stated that within 5 years most, if not all, commodity farm supports will be gone. If so, will it affect your community? Favorably, 27; unfavorably, 63; no response, 10.

4. In 1964, President Johnson sent a mission to Europe to promote high quality meat trade. Would you favor that our Congressional Agricultural Committee should further this type of meat promotion in major foreign cities? Yes, 96; no, 4.

5. As agricultural exports are the largest U.S. dollar earner, do you favor feed grain and soybean exports to Russia and satellites? Yes, 69; no, 30.

6. Do you favor agricultural exports to China? Yes, 34; no, 53.

7. Would you favor credit selling to expand our agricultural exports? Yes, 34; no, 60.

8. Would you favor helping shipowners so that we can equally compete with other grain exporting nations who have lower operating costs? Yes, 52; no, 41.

9. Would you recommend using foreign ships at lower cost? Yes, 35; no, 58.

10. Would you favor the present or similar farm program extension of 4 years? Yes, 77; no, 19.

11. What method would you favor to keep farm production prices in balance? More effective controls, 20; increased exports, 42; present system, 15; no response, 23.

12. Should there be a concerted effort to get major farm groups to join forces to gain more effective long-run benefits for agriculture? Yes, 85; no, 9.

13. Are businessmen doing better, worse, or the same as during the last 4 years? Better, 30; worse, 40; same, 26; no response, 4.

14. Do businessmen in your area feel their income is directly tied to agricultural income? Yes, 92; no, 5.

In his agricultural message to the Congress last February 4, the President of the United States said:

> Farm policy is not something separate. It is part of an overall effort to serve our national interest, at home and around the world.

I am hopeful that when the major items of farm and food legislation come before the Congress the President's accurate observation of the widespread impact of agricultural policy will be remembered.

The family farms of the United States do far more than keep millions of Americans supplied with an abundance of top-quality foods at fair prices. They are customers for billions of dollars worth of goods and services that move out to the countryside from cities and towns. They can continue their fine record of production, and be increasingly good customers, only if Government gives them the cooperation essential to their achievement of earning opportunities comparable to those experienced by the other segments of our economy.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues for careful study the survey results contained herein, and call your particular attention to the understanding and sympathetic concern that has developed in the banking fraternity for the agriculturist and his problems.

It is my hope that this material will assist this Congress in developing an answer that will serve the best interests of our Nation through the improvement and continuation of a program that has proven its value during the past several years.

Mr. HANSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

USE OF CHEMICAL, BIOLOGICAL, AND RADIOLOGICAL WEAPONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PUCINSKI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KASTENMEIER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address the House of Representatives to discuss the subject of the use of chemical, biological, and radiological weapons. Much has been said here and abroad in the last 72 hours as a result of the use of American-supplied tear gas-type chemical weapons by the South Vietnamese.

The facts reported in the press are these: On January 27, 1965, the South Vietnamese encountered a village in Phu Yen Province on the southern tip of the Vietnam peninsula that had been infiltrated by the Vietcong. The mission of the South Vietnamese was to capture the village. They had the choice of attacking the village on foot, by bombing from the air, or by shelling with artillery or mortar fire. This is virtually the same situation faced day after day in the war in Vietnam. In this case gas was used. The gas incapacitated all within the village permitting the South Vietnamese to enter the village, capturing Vietcong and gaining control of the village. The gas used is characterized by the Defense Department as a riot-control-type gas similar to tear gas, having no residual effect. As the Secretary of Defense has said, the gas was used for the purpose of saving lives.

Statements released by our headquarters in Saigon on Tuesday confirmed that gas was used by the South Vietnamese, that the gas was provided by the United States and that it was released from dispensers in helicopters provided by the United States.

Subsequent Defense and State Department statements confirm that three types of gases have been available to the South Vietnamese from our supplies and that these gases include the following three agents:

DM, a pepperlike irritant that causes sneezing, coughing, headaches, tightness in the chest, nausea and vomiting. It incapacitates a victim for a half hour to 2 hours.

CS, a recently developed tear-inducing agent that irritates eyes, nose and respiratory tract and causes chest pains, choking and vomiting. Its effects last 5 to 10 minutes.

CN, a tear-inducing irritant that also causes irritation to the skin. Its effects last about 3 minutes.

The Defense and State Department statements further indicate that the authority to use these riot-control-type gases had been delegated to area commanders, presumably for that purpose—riot control, and that the decision to use the gas had not previously been cleared with either the Pentagon or the White House. According to news reports, Secretary McNamara and Secretary Rusk first heard of its use in combat in news stories. The White House has stated that the President did not know of its use or approve of it in advance.

It is not clear from information available to me whether the South Vietnamese initiated the request for gas to use in such situations or whether our military authorities in the field pressed its use upon the South Vietnamese.

On September 3, 1959, in the face of growing interest then being shown by our military in the development of chemical, bacteriological, and radiological warfare weapons and techniques, I introduced a resolution, House Joint Concurrent Resolution 433, which reads as follows:

> *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That the Congress hereby reaffirms the longstanding policy of the United States that in the event of war the United States shall under no circumstances resort to the use of biological weapons or the use of poisonous or obnoxious gases unless they are first used by our enemies.

At that time my efforts were attacked as providing the Communist world with an opportunity to twist my words to their advantage and to place the United States in a bad light. My response to this charge then, and it is most relevant to the situation we find ourselves in today, was that we must reaffirm our longstanding position against the use of these weapons unless they are used against us first. Furthermore, President Eisenhower's supporting statement against first use gave all the support necessary on this issue.

Such has been our policy ever since President Delano Roosevelt first enunciated the policy in 1943 when he said:

> Use of such weapons has been outlawed by the general opinion of mankind. This country has not used them, and I hope that we never will be compelled to use them. I state categorically that we shall under no circumstances resort to the use of such weapons unless they are first used by our enemies.

Furthermore, the tone of all correspondence which I had with the State Department with regard to the concurrent resolution mentioned earlier confirmed that our capability was designed as a defensive effort and not for the first use. I read now from a letter from the Department of State dated January 15, 1960, which concludes with the quote from President Eisenhower:

> With respect to U.S. policy governing the use of biological and chemical weapons in war, this is a matter in which any policy decision involving their use rests solely with the President of the United States. At his news conference of January 13, 1960, the President responded to a question bearing directly on this matter. When asked about U.S. policy with respect to being the first to use these agents in war, the President said in part that, "So far as my own instinct is concerned, is to not start such a thing as that first."
>
> I hope you will find the foregoing information of assistance.
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
> *Assistant Secretary.*

Both Houses have studied the question of the use of CBR weapons in warfare. A fine report was made by the Senate Subcommittee on Disarmament of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. In its report, the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, dated August 10, 1959, on "Research in CBR Warfare," commented on this aspect of the use of these weapons:

> It must be made perfectly clear that the United States does not seek to find any opportunities for using these or other forms of warfare. The natural revulsion against the bizarre effects of both old and new CBR agents make them ready targets for international propaganda campaigns.

The great body of public opinion still adheres to this view of gas warfare. The New York Times in an editorial on Wednesday which ended with the sentence, "Gas is a wretched means to achieve even the most valid ends," begins with the following two paragraphs:

> The United States, in steady escalation of the Vietnamese conflict, is now revealed to have employed a nonlethal gas. It is possible to argue, as American military and civilian spokesmen do, that military objectives can be achieved with fewer casualties by using a gas that does not kill.
>
> This argument overlooks one vital factor; and it displays, at the very least, a lack of imagination somewhere in the top echelons of the armed forces. People—ordinary people everywhere—have a strong psychological revulsion, if not horror, at the idea of any kind of poisonous gas, even a temporarily disabling type that only causes extreme discomfort including nausea and diarrhea when used against ordinarily healthy adults. But even this kind of gas can be fatal to the very young, the very old and those ill of heart and lung ailments.

The Washington Post in a similar vein commented bitterly in its lead editorial on Wednesday as follows:

> The argument that the nontoxic gas is more merciful than antipersonnel weapons has some merit, but not much. The trouble is that although the gas may not be poison, the word is, and all the propaganda resources in the world cannot explain away its employment as an act of Christian charity and humanitarian mercy.

Two principal arguments echoed in these editorials are made with some effect in favor of using nonlethal gases in a war of this kind. The first contention is that the use of gas is a humane means of accomplishing tactical missions which are otherwise very costly in terms of the lives of civilians as well as military. The second is that since the gas is nonlethal and without prolonged effect, it is a desirable weapon to use in guerrilla-type war where the guerrillas are intermingled with noncombatants.

The humaneness argument rings a little hollow since we are supporting the South Vietnamese at the same time with napalm and white phosphorous which are in themselves inhumane weapons. Horrible as these weapons are, however, they are an accepted part of the standard military arsenal. They were used in World War II and Korea. Whether they ought to be or not, they are not part of the forbidden CBR family.

More important, however, the humaneness and nonlethal arguments used in favor of these gases are beside the point.

This is the central issue: The use of gas by any nation creates a precedent for later use by other countries of other gases. Its use represents the first opening of the box in which humanity has kept the arsenal of these weapons sealed since the First World War. Any use of these weapons opens the door to the use of other more lethal and inhumane weapons. The questions we must ask before using these weapons are: Are we to unilaterally open up this box of horror weapons before all mankind? Are we to reverse our past policy of so long standing in such an offhand fashion? I believe our answer is and should be a resounding "No."

Let us look at some of the weapons or agents which have stayed locked up in a sort of Pandora's box. The agents available to us are presumably available to others including the Communist world.

I will first consider some of the chemical agents available today—others may now be available with other more bizarre effects:

Blister agents: These are cumulative poisons, such as mustard, nitrogen mustard, and lewisite. They are rapidly absorbed through the skin. They not only blister, but can cause blindness and attack many internal organs, including the lungs, bloodstream, and digestive tract.

Choking agents: Principally phosgene, it attacks the lungs so that the victim progressively moves from coughing to drowning in the liquid which accumulates in his own lungs. It also brings on nausea and vomiting and the victim goes into shock. With this gas and its attendant symptoms in the background, it is not surprising to have world opinion respond with indignation at the introduction of the use of gases, blithely dismissed as merely causing nausea.

Blood gases: These include hydrogen cyanide, cyanogen, chloride, and arsine. These, in concentration, are very deadly. They travel via the lungs to the bloodstream to stop the transfer of oxygen in the blood with consequent severe effects, particularly on the central nervous system.

Tear gas and vomiting agents: These are considered harassing agents and their effects, while acute, pass in ordinary circumstances. Vomiting agents also may be used in combat in the hope of making men remove their protective masks to become vulnerable to more deadly attacks.

Nerve gases: These constitute the real significant change in weaponry in this field. They cause casualties before they can be detected by the human senses. Less than a minute of exposure is lethal. As gases, they travel via the lungs, although a liquid droplet will penetrate the skin. They disrupt nerve signals to the muscles. Symptoms begin with respiratory troubles, salivation and perspiration, vomiting, cramps, involuntary elimination and leading through convulsions to death.

I next turn to biological agents: Five classes of micro-organisms represent the primary classifications from which biological warfare agents can be drawn:

First. Fungi are most commonly usable against plants, although San Joaquin Valley fever is a fungus infection which attacks man.

Second. Protozoa are a possibility, but are difficult to grow and transmit. Malaria and amebic dysentery are diseases of this type.

Third. Few bacteria are harmful, but some important disease types exist. Potential biological warfare agents are anthrax, brucellosis, glanders, tularemia, plague, bacillary dysentery, and cholera.

Fourth. Another group are the rickettsiae, including typhus, Rocky Mountain spotted fever, and Q fever.

Fifth. The next category consists of the viruses, such as influenza, psittacosis, and Venezuelan equine encephalitis.

In past wars, epidemics among men have often taken as many lives as the battlefield, even though the diseases were spread by natural rather than artificial means. The artificial introduction of diseases to populations not used to them can have a powerful effect. There is also the possibility some laboratory will come up with a new mutant strain which is more virulent than the normal forms.

Radiological agents are a less well-known and understood matter. They are classed in two groups: Those which may derive from a controlled reactor or accelerator and are disseminated by means similar to chemical or biological agents, and those which are deliberately created by the explosion of a nuclear or thermonuclear device at the combat location.

A fourth category testifying to the capability of laboratories to widen the range of these heinous weapons includes the psychochemicals. These agents or incapacitating agents as they are known fall into two groups: First, those which produce temporary physical disability such as paralysis, blindness, or deafness; and second, those which produce temporary mental abberation. Unlike the lethal war gases or the more virulent biological agents, these incapacitants can produce purely temporary effects without permanent damage. In this respect they more nearly resemble the riot-control gases or some biological agents which are deliberately not killers. But in another respect, they are quite different. They act swiftly, and their arrival may not be heralded by any human senses except as to the effects realized.

The discussion of incapacitating agents brings us back to the use of gas by the South Vietnamese. The gas used there is described as a form of tear gas or nauseating gas used to incapacitate the victims. The step from tear gas to the use of the most modern psychochemical incapacitating agent, on close analysis, is a short one. The steps to the other gases are short ones, too, and not within our control, once the weapons have been used.

It must be remembered that nonlethal gases were used by both the French and Germans in World War I. With the precedent of the use of such gases established, it was not long before the lethal gases were employed with such long-lasting and anguished effects.

The use of gas in Vietnam is of grave concern to me, particularly in the light of a recent statement by our Ambassador to Vietnam, Maxwell D. Taylor. General Taylor, in a speech to the Saigon Lions Club on March 22, 1965, is quoted with reference to American employment of weapons in the area in an AP dispatch in the Washington Post, Tuesday, March 23, as follows:

> What has been done thus far is public knowledge. What will be done in the future is something for Hanoi to worry about.

The significance of this statement, it seems to me, is not only that it portends a willingness on our part to use weapons and tactics which may or may not embrace the CBR arsenal—and I trust and hope it does not—but it also makes quite clear that these steps will be taken in secret, on the premise that these measures have been given the silent assent of the American people. This entire situation also emphasizes the risks involved in allowing our military commanders to take actions which may effect changes in policy. Of course, when we rely heavily on military action, this is one of the ever-present dangers that must be guarded against.

I feel the time has come to let the President know how we feel about these and other steps taken in the name of national necessity. I can recall the fate of another great nation which accepted the morally repulsive as a national necessity.

I personally feel there is time to take the action necessary to reaffirm our commitment to the traditional standards governing the conduct of war.

From all reports I have seen, including Secretary McNamara's statement describing the agents used, the decision to provide gas to the South Vietnamese for use in combat was made by our military commanders in Vietnam without consultation with the Defense Department, the State Department, or the President. I believe an investigation is needed to determine how our military commanders are able to violate what is established national policy of long standing. I and several other Members of Congress have addressed a letter to the President containing a request for such an investigation. We have also called upon him to restore exclusive control and direction over the use of chemical, biological, and radiological weapons to the Presidency and, in the light of prior Executive pronouncements of policy against our first use of such weapons, to provide the world with a statement of this administration's policy in this area.

In this way what clearly appears to be a unilateral violation of our policy of no-first-use can be rejected as a violation of policy rather than accepted as a reversal of policy. In this way our national prestige and moral standing can be maintained.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. KASTENMEIER, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. RYAN, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous matter.

Mr. FEIGHAN, for 15 minutes, on tomorrow; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FINO.

Mr. CORBETT.

Mr. PILBIN in five instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. HALPERN.

Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. FLYNT to revise and extend remarks to be made by him in Committee of the Whole today and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DINGELL.

Mr. HANLEY in two instances.

Mr. JOELSON in two instances.

Mr. PATTEN.

Mr. MCVICKER.

Mr. MACHEN.

Mr. HELSTOSKI.

Mr. DULSKI.

Mr. PUCINSKI.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 26, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

801. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the audits of Government Services, Inc.,

and its employee retirement and benefit trust fund and supplemental pension plan for the year ended December 31, 1964; to the Committee on Government Operations.

802. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary costs incurred for commercial protective service used for shipments of classified material, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

803. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a review of financial condition and operations, for fiscal years 1962 and 1963, U.S. Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Government Operations.

804. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary costs incurred in the relocation of highways at the Amistad Dam project, U.S. Section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico; to the Committee on Government Operations.

805. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary costs resulting from inadequacies in the administration of the Inter-American highway program in the Republic of Panama, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

806. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of weaknesses in negotiation and administration of contracts for resettlement of Cuban refugees, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

807. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of records proposed for disposal pursuant to 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

808. A letter from the president and national director, Boys' Club of America, transmitting an audited financial report of the club for calendar year 1964, pursuant to Public Law 84-988; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

809. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a copy of the annual report of the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1964; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

810. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize issuance and sale of participation interests based on certain pools of loans held by the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

811. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the Governor of Guam for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 6(b) of the Organic Act of Guam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DENTON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 6767. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAIR:

H.R. 6732. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 6733. A bill to authorize the acquisition of lands for addition to the Adams National Historic Site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6734. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on communications services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CABELL:

H.R. 6735. A bill to provide competitive equality between State and National banks with respect to branching powers; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By MR. DULSKI:

H.R. 6736. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 6737. A bill to correct inequities in the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Retired Federal Employees Health Benefits Act and in other laws governing civil service retirement benefits and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6738. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that the child of an insured individual, after attaining age 18, may continue to receive child's insurance benefits until he attains age 22 if he is attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 6739. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6740. A bill to provide a rent certificate program for low-income housing in private accommodations, to establish a priority for low- and middle-income housing in urban renewal projects, to provide additional rehabilitation and relocation assistance, to create a new veterans' mortgage insurance program, to continue the Federal Housing Administration, college, and elderly housing programs, to provide comprehensive compensation for condemnees, to insure efficiency and economy in the administration of Federal housing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 6741. A bill to encourage the preservation and development of a modern and efficient passenger rail transportation service in the northeastern seaboard area by granting the consent and approval of Congress to the States of Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, and New York to negotiate and enter into a compact to create their own Northeast Rail Authority, and by guaranteeing certain loans and other credit to such authority; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6742. A bill to provide a deduction for income tax purposes, in the case of a disabled individual, for expenses for transportation to and from work; and to provide an additional exemption for income tax purposes for a taxpayer or spouse who is physically or mentally incapable of caring for himself; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GONZALEZ:

H.R. 6743. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that small business corporations which elect to have their shareholders taxed in the manner provided in subchapter S may elect to have distributions made in the first 2½ months of a year treated as if made on the last day of the preceding year; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 6744. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 6745. A bill to require the registration of pistols in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'BRIEN:

H.R. 6746. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act, as amended, in respect to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over State canals, river regulating reservoirs and facilities or power projects incidental thereto; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6747. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act with respect to the jurisdiction of the Federal Power Commission over streams and other bodies of water the navigable portions of which lie within a single State; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. QUILLEN:

H.R. 6748. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on household-type electric air heaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS of Florida:

H.R. 6749. A bill authorizing an additional appropriation for the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 6750. A bill to eliminate the population limitation as it affects the eligibility of communities in redevelopment areas for certain benefits under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, and title II of the Housing Amendments of 1955; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H.R. 6751. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, with respect to the hours of operation of certain broadcasting stations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 6752. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VIVIAN:

H.R. 6753. A bill to declare the old channel of the River Raisin in Monroe County, Mich., between the Monroe Harbor Range Front Light and Raisin Point, its entrance into Lake Erie, a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 6754. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of Alabama:

H.R. 6755. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 6756. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 6757. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 6758. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6759. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TRIMBLE:

H.R. 6760. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 6761. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mrs. HANSEN of Washington:

H.R. 6762. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 6763. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 6764. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SWEENEY:

H.R. 6765. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6766. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DENTON:

H.R. 6767. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota:

H.R. 6768. A bill for the relief of the Kensal School District, North Dakota; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 6769. A bill to limit the authority of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to new construction or alteration of veterans' hospitals and the closing of such hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 6770. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 6771. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code to remove the limitations with respect to relocation payments made for moving expenses of persons and businesses displaced by highway construction; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 6772. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6773. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6774. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIN:

H.R. 6775. A bill to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 6776. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 6777. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation of the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 6778. A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6779. A bill to amend section 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to proceedings against certain witnesses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 6780. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LIPSCOMB:

H.R. 6781. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on general telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 6782. A bill to amend the National Firearms Act to impose special (occupational) taxes with respect to engaging in the business of importing, manufacturing, and dealing in destructive weapons such as bombs, grenades, rockets, missiles, bazookas, and antitank guns, to impose taxes with respect to the making and to the transfer of such weapons, and to increase the rates of special (occupational) tax, transfer tax, and making tax imposed by the act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6783. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 6784. A bill to authorize appropriations to carry out the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 6785. A bill to establish uniform dates throughout the United States for the commencing and ending of daylight saving time in those States and local jurisdictions where it is observed, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WHALLEY:

H.R. 6786. A bill establishing certain qualifications for persons appointed to the Supreme Court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 6787. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for deduction of certain education expenses of teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KLUCZYNSKI:

H.R. 6788. A bill to authorize certain modifications of the project for Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DERWINSKI:

H.R. 6789. A bill to authorize certain modifications of the project for Calumet Harbor and River, Ill. and Ind.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 6790. A bill to increase the limitation on emergency relief for the repair or reconstruction of highways under section 125 of title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6791. A bill authorizing an additional appropriation for the comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes in central and southern Florida; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6792. A bill to amend the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to provide for the improvement of urban mass transportation in the northeastern United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 6793. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By. Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6794. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to place the Federal Housing Administration cooperative housing mortgage insurance program on a mutual basis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 6795. A bill to provide for appointment by the Postmaster General of postmasters at first, second, and third class post offices; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6796. A bill to provide a percentage deduction for certain expenses paid for the higher education of the taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 6797. A bill to amend Public Law 503, 84th Congress, so as to provide annuities for the widows of certain Foreign Service officers who retired prior to the effective date of the Federal Employees Group Life Insurance Act of 1954; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 6798. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Latin American Home Loan Bank, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 6799. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act provisions for construction of health research facilities by extending the expiration date thereof and providing increased support for the program, to authorize additional Assistant Secretaries in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6800. A bill to extend and otherwise amend certain expiring provisions of the Public Health Service Act relating to community health services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6801. A bill to authorize mortgage insurance and loans to help finance the cost of constructing and equipping facilities for the group practice of medicine and dentistry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6802. A bill to authorize assistance in meeting the initial cost of professional and technical personnel for comprehensive community mental health centers; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 6803. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEPHENS:

H.R. 6804. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WRIGHT:

H.R. 6805. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.J. Res. 398. Joint resolution to establish a national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.J. Res. 399. Joint resolution to establish a national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.J. Res. 400. Joint resolution to establish a national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.J. Res. 401. Joint resolution requesting the President to designate November 23, 1965, as Repudiation Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.J. Res. 402. Joint resolution to establish a national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.J. Res. 403. Joint resolution authorizing an appropriation to enable the United States to extend an invitation to the World Health Organization to hold the 22d World Health Assembly in Boston, Mass., in 1969; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.J. Res. 404. Joint resolution providing for the erection of a memorial statue to the late Dr. Robert H. Goddard, the father of American rocketry; to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.J. Res. 405. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives shall be 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 370. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to prosecutions for war crimes in the Federal Republic of Germany; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. POWELL:

H. Con. Res. 371. Concurrent resolution requesting the President to bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H. Res. 292. Resolution authorizing cards of identification for certain officers and employees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H. Res. 293. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representative with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H. Res. 294. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H. Res. 295. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. Res. 296. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H. Res. 297. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H. Res. 298. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to discriminatory practices by the Government of Rumania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H. Res. 299. Resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives with respect to the continuation of recent efforts on the part of the President to secure a universal condemnation of anti-Semitism; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIDER:

H. Res. 300. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study the operation of hospital facilities by the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H. Res. 301. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to transfer the responsibilities of the Committee on Un-American Activities to the Committee on the Judiciary; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H. Res. 302. Resolution that it is the sense of the House of Representatives that oppression of minorities in Rumania through a systematic plan launched by the Communist regime in control of Rumania be condemned and the President of the United States is requested to take appropriate steps in our relations with the Rumanian Government as are likely to bring relief to the persecuted minorities in the controversial Transylvania region of that country; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

144. By Mr. SENNER: Memorial of the Arizona State Senate to expand veterans' hospital facilities within Arizona; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

145. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States requesting full appropriation support for the commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964; to the Committee on Appropriations.

146. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States supporting legislation to direct a survey to determine the feasibility of dredging a waterway between Tenakee Inlet and Port Frederick; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 6806. A bill for the relief of Wah Kin Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6807. A bill for the relief of Carmen Yaki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 6808. A bill for the relief of Vibeke Langballe; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 6809. A bill for the relief of Miss Stella Klaridopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6810. A bill for the relief of Yi Joo Wang, Sue Juan Luan, Sue Shiang Luan, Regina Luan and Jean Luan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 6811. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment on certain claims of Clayton B. Hellner against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 6812. A bill for the relief of Giuseppe Badulato; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6813. A bill for the relief of Antonio Lamberti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 6814. A bill for the relief of Antonio Salati; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6815. A bill for the relief of Domenico Venditti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OTTINGER:

H.R. 6816. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Pastilha; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 6817. A bill for the relief of Leo Temmer, M.D.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS:

H.R. 6818. A bill for the relief of Miss Patricia Peghini; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SULLIVAN:

H.R. 6819. A bill for the relief of Dr. Orhan Metin Ozmat; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

142. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the city council, Chicago, Ill., with reference to urging enactment of legislation for open registration and voting rights for all American citizens, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Edward Keating

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY H. McVICKER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, last Friday the people of Colorado and the people of this Nation lost a courageous and able leader. Edward Keating, a former Member of the House of Representatives who served with great distinction, was a man of purpose and vision whose efforts on behalf of the labor movement brought forth a series of accomplishments that will stand as a monument to his great generosity and spirit of justice. He possessed wisdom and insight which led to his understanding of the free enterprise system and the course it would take in history, and his was the sense of perspective which enabled him to recognize the role that labor would take in American enterprise.

Edward Keating was born in Kansas on July 9, 1875, the youngest of nine children of Stephen Keating, an Irish patriot who fought for Ireland's freedom and was forced to flee to America in 1848. His father died when Edward Keating was only 5 years old, so Mr. Keating knew early in his life what it means to work hard and to attempt to overcome poverty. But Mr. Keating grew up to be an inspired man. He transcended the hardships of his youth with a consuming desire to serve his family and his fellow man.

The energy which was to characterize his activities in the Congress and in the labor movement was immediately apparent at the outset of his career. He entered the newspaper business as a copyholder, but rose rapidly to become a reporter for the Rocky Mountain News. His career flourished as he accepted more and more responsibility, and in short succession he became city editor, managing editor, and finally became editor of the Rocky Mountain News, where he served from 1906 to 1911. He served as the president of the International League of Press Clubs during 1906 and 1907. Mr. Keating served as president of the Colorado State Board of Land Commissioners from 1911 to 1913.

In 1913, his service was rewarded by the people of Colorado with his election to the U.S. House of Representatives, where he remained for a period of 6 years. During that time, he was responsible for several notable pieces of legislation concerning the labor movement.

Soon after his retirement from the Congress, he became the editor of Labor, a dynamic paper that fought for the interest of the general public as well as for that of the American worker.

Edward Keating was a man of purpose whose life was notable by a series of considerable accomplishments. But probably the greatest monument to his achievements, and the one in which he would take most pride, is the great number of families that enjoy better homes, education, and medical care. His death is a great loss to the people of his State and his country, whom he served so nobly.

Disabled Veterans and Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include herein a press synopsis of a speech I recently delivered before the Disabled American Veterans at Southbridge, Mass., in my district, with reference to the closing of the Rutland, Mass., VA Hospital and the most deplorable events at Selma, Ala.:

DISABLED VETERANS AND CIVIL RIGHTS

Before the Disabled American Veterans at Southbridge Sunday, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN made a dual attack on the proposed closing by the Veterans' Administration of the Rutland VA Hospital and what he termed the "hideous brutality and savage mistreatment of Negroes and whites at Selma, Ala."

"In the name of our immortal veterans, Rutland VA Hospital must be kept open," said PHILBIN, "and in the name of everything that is sacred in this country, the inequities of Selma must be speedily redressed, voting rights assured to all, and civil rights in every respect be safeguarded and enforced.

"There is no way that anyone could possibly justify the closing of the Rutland VA Hospital. It is necessary, yes imperative, to provide proper hospitalization and care for the veterans of central Massachusetts, indeed our entire area.

"To transfer these veterans to other hospitals miles away from their homes, or even to other inadequate institutions near their homes is a shabby and completely unsatisfactory way to care for the needs of sick and disabled veterans.

"I have personally appealed to President Johnson in strongest terms not to permit VA to destroy, alter, or reduce the fine service Rutland Hospital is rendering.

"This is a time for this great organization and all veterans groups, and all relatives and friends of the veteran, 87 million strong, to demand their rights from the Federal Government.

"The abandonment of Rutland Hospital might save some relatively paltry sum for the Government, though this is very doubtful and has not been shown by the figures, but such action would visit our veterans and their dear ones with pain, anguish, and inconvenience that no economy measure could ever justify.

"I have been much encouraged by my talk with the President, and my colleagues in the Congress, but the struggle to keep Rutland Hospital open will be long and difficult, and we must continue our united front with all possible vigor and intensity, until we have achieved our goal of proper, comprehensive, modern medical care and treatment for our veterans."

Touching on the situation at Selma, PHILBIN said:

"The events at Selma are nauseating and sickening to all Americans, especially to veterans who fought to save the liberties and civil rights of everyone in this great, democratic Nation.

"We want no police state tactics here. We want no storm troopers, no Russian cossacks beating helpless people, white or black, whatever their color because they dare to stand up for voting rights, or other civil rights that are and must continue to be the birthright of every American.

"There can be no compromise on this issue. Congress has provided the law, and will continue to supplement it in every way necessary. But it is up to the executive department and the enforcement officials of this great Government to enforce the law, to protect the people in their right to assemble, to speak, to protect, and to vote, and to be treated as equals under the law.

"If these precious things cannot be secured in America to all people, then we shall be untrue to our own heritage of freedom, and we will become the laughingstock of the world.

"There can be no delay, equivocation or compromise. I hope and pray this issue can be settled promptly and effectively in an orderly way under the law without further bloodshed and trouble. At all costs it must be settled if it takes the armed strength of this Government to do the job. American freedom and justice must be guaranteed to all."

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian Independence Day.

The people of Byelorussia, often known as White Russians, are an ancient people whose history dates back much further than that of the Great Russians. They are one of the more numerous and ethnically distinct peoples in the Soviet sphere. Although racially related to the Russians and other Slavic peoples, they have always had a distinct national character of their own which has remained with them to this day.

Their historic homeland lies east of Poland and west of Moscow, with its center in the famous city of Minsk. Byelorussia became part of the Russian Empire early in the 16th century, and remained as such until the Bolshevik revolution of 1917 which destroyed the czarist empire. The Bylorussians were among the non-Russian national groups which asserted their freedom and proclaimed their national independence. On March 25, 1918, the Byelorussian National Republic was established.

But, as happened in so many other cases, these long-subjugated people were not destined for freedom. Early in 1921, before they had a chance to enjoy the fruits of their victory, the Soviet Red Army overran their country and made it a part of the Soviet Union. In less than 3 years, independent Byelorussia vanished, and today it continues to live only in the minds and hearts of patriotic Byelorussians suffering under Soviet dictatorship.

Despite the heart-rending hardships endured by these people under one of the worst tyrannies known to man, the Byelorussians have not given up their hope for freedom. Let us continue our prayers that this day will not be far off so that these people may enjoy the blessings of freedom in their historic homeland.

Results of Public Opinion Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT J. CORBETT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, recently I completed another poll of public opinion in the 18th Congressional District of Pennsylvania. This district lies to the north and east of the city of Pittsburgh wholly within Allegheny County. Its total population is 409,291, of whom 109,923 are registered Democrats and 108,092 are registered Republicans.

The 18th District of Pennsylvania features a great many industrial areas along the Ohio and Allegheny Rivers and has many strictly residential areas. It has a little farming in the sections farthest removed from the city and quite a little coal mining.

Most ethnic groups of any sizable importance are found in the district, with a higher than normal number of Germans and Italians.

An equal number of questionnaires were sent to Republicans and Democrats. No way of determining how many of each party responded was utilized. Only signed replies were counted. The percentage tabulations follow:

TABULATED RESULTS FOR POLL CONDUCTED JANUARY 1965

1. All things considered, would you rate President Johnson's performance in office as (a) good, (b) fair, (c) bad? (a) 32 percent; (b) 55 percent; (c) 13 percent.

2. Do you believe that America's prestige in the world has improved in the last 4 years? Yes, 17 percent; no, 83 percent.

3. Should we (a) make greater efforts to win the war in South Vietnam, or (b) seek a truce and get out? (a) 56 percent; (b) 44 percent.

4. Do you have confidence that the U.S. dollar will for the predictable future remain one of the soundest currencies in the world? Yes, 68 percent; no, 32 percent.

5. Would you favor keeping the U.S. military out of Africa, except under United Nations auspices? Yes, 89 percent; no, 11 percent.

6. Would you vote to cut our Federal excise taxes at this time by approximately $2 billion? Yes, 56 percent; no, 44 percent.

7. Do you think the national minimum wage should be (a) kept at $1.25 per hour, or (b) raised to $1.50, or (c) be raised to $1.75? (a) 57 percent, (b) 32 percent; (c) 11 percent.

8. Should we abolish race and nationality in determining eligibility for immigration to the United States? Yes, 43 percent; no, 57 percent.

9. Do you believe that the administration's antipoverty program will substantially reduce poverty in the United States? Yes, 20 percent; no, 80 percent.

10. Do you favor President Johnson's proposal to advance $1 billion for public schools in poverty impacted areas? Yes, 66 percent; no, 34 percent.

11. Do you support Defense Secretary McNamara's plans to abolish the military reserves and reassign some of their units into the National Guard? Yes, 74 percent; no, 26 percent.

12. Would you favor the gradual elimination of our farm price-support program? Yes, 88 percent; no, 12 percent.

13. In considering medicare for the aged, would you prefer (a) it be financed out of general tax funds, (b) it be financed by increasing social security taxes, or (c) that no new program be adopted? (a) 31 percent; (b) 25 percent; (c) 44 percent.

14. Do you believe that it is good for the country that the Democrats have a 2 to 1 majority in the House and Senate? Yes, 15 percent; no, 85 percent.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to commemorate the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian Independence, for in so doing we are remembering a brave and courageous people. The Byelorussians have displayed an inspiring commitment to the ideals of freedom and independence, goals which were realized in 1918. And even though their sovereignty as a nation was suppressed shortly thereafter, they have not yet relinquished this wonderful ideal.

The declaration of independence which the Byelorussians made in 1918 was to bring to fruition the long-cherished dream of freedom. Sadly, however, it was not to be that, "From now on the Byelorussian National Republic is to be a free and independent power," as they so boldly stated in their assembly and fervently believed in their hearts. Within a year this nation was to be converted into a battleground, becoming a pawn in the maneuverings of enemies. Occupied first by the Red Army and then later by the Polish Army, Byelorussia was partitioned by these two powers in 1921, signalling the suppression once again of an independent republic and a national aspiration.

The rule of force, however, cannot obliterate the truth: That Byelorussia is a nation of culturally united people, speaking one language is a truth that cannot be denied. That the Byelorussians are an ethnically oriented people, working toward distinct goals is evident. That the Byelorussians wish to become a vital member of the international community is clear, though at present, even with U.N. membership, it is impossible for Byelorussia to raise her own, distinct voice.

It is with great admiration that we salute these people who yet hold to the ideal of national sovereignty and independence. We join with these long-suffering people as well as those Byelorussians who have become part of our American nation in the prayer that their aspirations shall be realized.

Congressman Monagan's Brilliant Review

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very brilliant book review recently appearing in the New York Times written by our very able, outstanding, distinguished, and beloved friend, the esteemed gentleman from Connecticut, the Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN.

This article reviewed the recent books, "Home Place" by the distinguished journalist, William S. White, and "House Out of Order" by our very able and distinguished colleague, the Honorable RICHARD BOLLING, both books dealing in various ways with the House and the Congress, its rules and procedures, some current criticisms and proposed reforms.

I think that Congressman MONAGAN has put both these books in proper perspective and his commentary will be a very valuable, lasting contribution to the subjects and questions discussed.

I take pleasure in congratulating and highly commending my valued, esteemed, and dear friend, Congressman MONAGAN, on his fine, superbly written book review. Truly, it was a gem of clarity, wisdom, and commonsense.

The book review follows:

A MEMBER TAKES THE FLOOR

(By JOHN S. MONAGAN)

The open season on Congress continues. Nearly every week sees the publication of a new book viewing clinically and usually unfavorably the Members of our National Legislature and the congressional institution itself. Senators, like JOE CLARK of Pennsylvania, give their view halloo and join the hunt. The alumni magazine of the former Congregational Indian School in New Hampshire, which I had the honor to attend, recently juxtaposed, with what I hope was unconscious humor, pictures of the school's nine better-than-average congressional alumni with an article entitled "Can Congress Survive?" by a Ph. D. faculty member. Even Pageant magazine turned an inquiring eye on Capitol Hill last November and sandwiched its notorious "rating" of congressional Members between articles on "Kissing After Marriage" and ads explaining how to remove hemorrhoids.

Two books on the House of Representatives now arrive to join the swelling tide on this fascinating subject. In spite of their rather arch titles, "Home Place," and "House Out of Order" are stimulating and knowledgeable and, therefore, welcome. However one may view their conclusions, they have the authority and genuineness that are lacking in too many legislative studies and can come only from prolonged exposure to Representatives and representative assemblies.

From the point of view of experience it would be difficult to find people more competent to dissect the House than William S. White, columnist, congressional correspondent, and idolator of the Senate; and RICHARD BOLLING, nine-term Congressman from the Fifth District of Missouri. At the same time, one would be hard put to discover a greater divergence of opinion than that reached by these pundits as a result of their dissection. White's view is generally friendly and constitutes a spirited defense of the status quo. BOLLING's is critical to the point of being waspish.

Chafing at the restraints imposed by the seniority system and committee review, BOLLING would reform the House by making the party caucus the supreme arbiter of policy and the ultimate source of committee nominations. Under this dispensation, the majority would be the strong right arm of the White House. WHITE, however, finds the seniority system inevitable but improvable and justifies the present procedure as necessary to constitute a vital legislative winnowing process and a means whereby this House of Congress performs its function as a coordinate branch of our Government rather than as a servile agent of the Executive.

Bandying epithets such as "legislative barons," "oligarchs" and "mandarins," BOLLING takes out after the House committee chairmen, labeling them "perverse" and "elderly" and charging them with frustrating the popular will as expressed in Executive proposals. His particular targets are the Rules Committee, which he calls an "abbatoir for liberal legislation," and its astute chairman, Judge HOWARD W. SMITH, whom he terms the director of the "conservative fugue."

WHITE, on the other hand, points out the role of the House in making "climatic decisions" in our national affairs, explains the necessity of committee work in an institution of 435 Members and singles out chairmen like WILBUR MILLS, Democrat, of Arkansas, of Ways and Means; EMANUEL CELLER, Democrat, of New York, of Judiciary; and GEORGE MAHON, Democrat, of Texas, of Appropriations, as men who are little known nationally, but who have done more than many well-publicized Senators to shape the financial, social, and defense policies of our Nation.

Recognizing the limitations of the seniority system, WHITE maintains convincingly that there is no viable alternative. While granting the recent obstructionism of the Rules Committee, he argues with force that it would have to be invented if it did not exist and that it can be bypassed whenever a determined majority so decides.

Viewed in proper perspective, BOLLING's strictures seem less tenable and WHITE's measured support more reasonable when one actually identifies committee chairmen such as the men named above along with MILLER, Democrat, of California, of Science and Astronautics, MORGAN, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, of Foreign Affairs, PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, of Banking and Currency, and HARRIS, Democrat, of Arkansas, of Commerce. Some of these men admittedly are no longer young, but they are clearly not opposed to progressive legislation. One may question, too, whether a House which in the last Congress produced a civil rights bill, a tax cut, legislation fostering vocational education and industrial retraining, financing for the wheat sale to Eastern European countries, a pay increase to Government employees, the antipoverty program, and increased social security benefits can legitimately be described as a "shambles" and in "wretched condition" as charged by BOLLING.

All will agree that House procedures are far from perfect, and BOLLING provides valuable suggestions for upgrading in this area and in the fields of conflict of interest, length of congressional terms, control of campaign costs, selection of committee staffs, and improvement of committee hearings. Incidentally, as a progress note it should be pointed out that the House itself this year adopted a 21-day rule for discharging bills from Rules and also empowered the Speaker to route conference reports past Rules and directly to the House. However, when one compares our House with other assemblies in the world—the raffish and regimented House of Commons, the cowed Chambre des Deputês, and particularly the captive bodies behind the Iron Curtain—one can take pride in our achievement and status.

While discursive and uneven in style, "House Out of Order" provides an excellent analysis of congressional press relations, candid and sometimes irreverent portraits of House leaders, an interesting category of congresssional types, detailed and revelatory if somewhat self-congratulatory, sidelights on the passage through the House of the Landrum-Griffin and civil rights bills and a serious booboo in characterizing "Southie Is My Home Town," the alma mater of South Boston, as a "ribald" song. BOLLING's main proposal would split the Democratic Party or revive the Republican-Conservative-Democratic coalition.

"Home Place" is tight, well-organized and magnificently written. House members will take issue with White, however, on his undue reverence for the Senate and his criticism of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The unending monologs in the other body, the lack of germaneness and the action by the two major Senate rules of "unanimous consent or nervous prostration" are not admired by the orderly House. In his criticism of the committee, White seems unaware of recent subcommittee work and solid legislative achievement in a time of increased isolationism.

For the ultimate description of the House, White's words are appropriate. It is, he says, "a microcosm of the people of the United States themselves"—with all their virtues and all their faults.

Honored for Solar Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERVEY G. MACHEN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. MACHEN. Mr. Speaker, while the United States probes outer space and attempts to learn the secrets of the sun and the stars, Mr. Harry E. Thomason, a patent attorney for the U.S. Army Materiel Command here, has harnessed the sun's rays and put them to work heating and cooling his house at 7354 Walker Mill Road in District Heights, Md.

Mr. Thomason recently was awarded $100 by the Army Materiel Command for his solar heat collector invention which he developed on his own time and separate from official duties. He voluntarily gave the U.S. Government free license to use this and several other of his inventions in solar heating and cooling.

Mr. Thomason's work in solar energy has been widely recognized. He and the solar houses he has built in suburban Maryland have been the subjects of articles in national magazines and in scientific journals.

The award he received is an honor justly accorded this attorney-scientist.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 45th anniversary of the proclamation of independence of the Byelorussian people, an anniversary sadly observed, for independence is a condition of the past for these unfortunate citizens of a proud country.

This tiny satellite country—a satellite in position, in government, but not in spirit, remains a constant reminder of the octopus arms of the Communist doctrine.

Byelorussia knows the harsh, brutal stamping of armies over her soil. Three and a half centuries of slavery are engraved on the pages of her history books; three and a half centuries of denial of human rights, dignity—oppression. Yet these bold people, never fearing suppressions, formed many governments to overthrow their foreign intruders.

We all remember the cruel annals written during the first World War. Byelorussia was not excluded. German armies captured part of the country and assumed military control. Russia controlled another segment. Finally, during World War I, the Byelorussian people proclaimed to the world that they were living and would continue to live. The Great National All Byelorussian Congress on December 5–17, 1917, decreed the state of order of Byelorussia and the rights and freedoms of its inhabitants and peoples.

On March 18, 1918, a constitutional decree established first the provisional form of the Byelorussian National Republic to create a completely independent statehood. By March 25, 1918, independence was reverentially proclaimed. The Government resulting from this proclamation expanded its activity in all fields of national life with the exception of the military—forbidden by the Germans. Important advances were made in the areas of education, culture, social protection. The Byelorussians tried to secure recognition from other states in order to open up diplomatic and consular offices in surrounding countries. The Republic was recognized de jure by Austria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, and the Ukraine.

The German troops withdrew in November of 1918 and immediately the Red army began to advance into Byelorussia. The Byelorussian forces were insufficient to offer sizable opposition. However, the Government continued its efforts to form armed Byelorussian forces to defend the independence but to no avail.

Russian armies tramped through the country extinguishing the hope of the Byelorussian independence in their path.

The Polish-Bolshevik War ended with a treaty between the warring powers in Riga on March 18, 1921. Byelorussia, as a result was divided between Poland and Soviet Russia. Part of Byelorussia was given to Latvia and the other to the Russian Government. Eventually the Soviet Government was established after a war with the Byelorussians.

Today Byelorussia joins her neighbors in the suppressed struggle for national and individual freedoms—freedom of speech, of government. The candle of hope will burn through the rains of tyranny and the long expected dawn will eventually splash light on this unfortunate country.

The 47th Anniversary of Independence of Byelorussian Democratic Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, when the Byelorussian people proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918, their Democratic Republic was born.

This independence was achieved after many years of hope, struggle, and sacrifices. But victory and happiness turned to defeat and sorrow, for despite the courage and determination of the young Republic, Bolshevik forces soon overwhelmed it.

The Byelorussian-Soviet Socialist Republic was then created, but it does not represent the Byelorussian people—it is merely another Soviet satellite.

As we celebrate the 47th anniversary of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic's proclamation of independence, it is significant that the observance is made by not only Americans of Byelorussian descent and Byelorussian immigrants in the United States, but by the entire free world.

I know that some day, the independence and freedom the Byelorussian people lost 46 years ago, will be regained and preserved, for tyranny does not, and cannot endure.

It cannot endure, because it is conceived in evil, born in violence, and raised in despotism—and because it rules with force and injustice. It lacks popular support and therefore cannot endure.

But freedom, supplemented by strength and courage, can and does endure, because it is good and peaceful, governing with reason and justice. It enjoys broad popular appeal and does succeed.

That is why the Byelorussian people should not yield to despair. They should live with hope in their hearts, because some day they will be free again, for their courage and patriotism are strong and great.

Byelorussian Independence: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, today we commemorate the anniversary of Byelorussian independence. It is a day upon which we of the free world pay tribute to a people who for a few moments in a period of international upheaval had enjoyed the right of self-determination.

In commemorating Byelorussian independence, one calls to mind one of the greatest principles ever proclaimed by man, and that is, the principle of self-determination. It is this principle that provides the pulsebeat of democracy, for what it means in essence is that the peoples themselves have the sole right to determine their own national destiny.

Self-determination, as a principle of politics, had been a product of the age of enlightenment. It is a product of the thinking of those great philosophers of democracy such as John Locke who belived that man had a natural right to govern himself. Today it is easy for us to become indifferent to the genuine revolutionary character of this idea. For its time, this principle of natural rights was indeed revolutionary, for it had taken shape in a political climate when all men by and large believed that kings of nations governed by divine right, that is, that their power and authority were derived from God and thus all men were bound by the absolutist declarations of their government.

The notion of natural rights of man, however, preached a different doctrine. It held that all men had certain inalienable rights that derived from nature itself and among those rights was the right of self-government. In other words, the commonly held notion of power and authority of government from above was reversed, and these rights were now said to be deposited within the people who through the exercise of those rights created their own particular form of government.

Thomas Jefferson had, of course, applied this wonderful democratic principle to the American setting. And he fused this principle with the evolving concept of American nationalism which had taken the concrete form of our Declaration of Independence and eventually our Constitution. Thus in America, what had been a matter of theory had now become a practical political reality.

At the same time, however, another new principle that would determine man's destiny was also evolving, and that was the principle of nationalism. The Western world had witnessed the marriage of the principles of self-determination and nationalism in America. And as the 19th century moved on it was to see both principles govern the thought of all men who sought national independence.

Byelorussians were moved by both of these principles, but not until their opportunity had arisen during World War I were they able to apply them in their full meaning. Byelorussians, along with the other suppressed peoples of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian Empires, had seen a new hope for their Nations as the power of the former oppressors had dissolved under the impact of war. Fired by a deeply engrained nationalism and inspired by the principle of self-determination, the leaders of Byleorussia declared their national independence and set into motion forces which they hoped would make their aspirations a concrete reality.

Self-determination remains the dream of men everywhere. Few people are more aware of this than the Byelorussians, or White Russians as they are also known to us. These people are united by cultural tradition, a common language, a history of struggle and most of all a common hope for freedom from foreign domination.

On March 25, 1918, Byelorussian people proclaimed their independence. On that date the Byelorussian Democratic Republic was born, and it appeared that this new Nation would take its rightful place among the free Nations of the world.

Unfortunately, those hopes were never to become a reality; not because of any failure in their national resolve, but rather because of the awesome power of the newly emerging Communist Russia whose military forces had swept over the territories of the former Russian Empire, conquering them again, and eventually reasserting a new and more terrible form of tyranny.

On this day of national commemoration it is fitting, therefore, that we Americans pay tribute to the gallant Byelorussian peoples. It is also fitting that we take this occasion to reassert our own faith in the principles of democracy, for it is in those principles that we find the strength to sustain ourselves as a Nation in the trials of the present and future, and it as also in those principles that we find the greatest inspiration for all men who seek a better life.

Humanitarian Work of New Jersey Rotarians

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. JOELSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned of the great humanitarian service being done by members of the Rotary Clubs in seven counties of New Jersey. The Rotary Club of Paterson, N.J., is very active in this great work.

These Rotary Clubs are soliciting medical and dental equipment as well as medical and dental textbooks to be sent to Rotary Clubs in India for distribution.

This material will ultimately be sent to an area which is principally rural in nature and contains approximately 130 million people. Although we have 1 physician for every 700 people in the United States, there is only 1 physician for every 5,000 people in this area in India.

The shortage of hospital beds in this area of India is even more shocking, and as a result disease and misery are rampant.

Dentists are practically nonexistent, there being only 1 for each 58,000 people, and the few dentists available there greatly need equipment.

I am proud that the Rotary Club of Paterson shows sufficient interest and concern to participate in this project, and I wish them success as well as the great satisfaction which comes from service.

Social Security Disability and Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been greatly concerned about certain interpretations by the Social Security Administration that have resulted in turning down a relatively large number of applications for disability benefits based upon what is in most instances essentially permanent and total disability.

Under the Social Security Act, the antecedent disability is defined "as of long and indefinite duration" and which prevents the individual from engaging in any substantial, gainful activity.

I believe it is the restrictive interpretation of this latter phrase which has resulted in the denial of many applications that would appear on their face to warrant favorable action.

I have personally known of numerous instances where persons were suffering from some serious heart condition, paralytic shock, or from serious personal injury, or other conditions which left them, not only completely disabled to perform any substantial gainful work, but completely and permanently disabled them from performing any work for the rest of their lives, and yet their applications were not favorably acted upon by social security.

I do not think that this result is in keeping with the intent of Congress, the spirit or the letter of the act, because I think considering the way the act has been written, it would be possible for the agency to make administrative interpretations that would cover cases which on the record and on the evidence would plainly appear to be instances of total, permanent disability without any question.

It is apparent to me that there are other deep-seated problems relating to social security that the Congress will have to continue to consider, such as the adequacy of current benefits. I appreciate, of course, that while that is of greatest moment to the recipients, it is also presenting extremely difficult, challenging problems to the Congress, since we must maintain solvency of the social security trust fund and we cannot take action that will result in impairing this fund in any way.

The alternative is of course to make reasonable adjustments upward of social security benefits and pay the difference out of the ordinary revenue of the Government. This would be a very expensive matter, and when it is considered, together with other matters affecting social security, it can readily be appreciated that the problem before Congress is really one of overhauling the entire social security system to make it more effective and responsive to current high costs of living and the needs of the disabled, social security recipients, and the needs of ordinary social security recipients, who are finding in increasing numbers that their payments are woefully and painfully inadequate to sustain them in advancing years.

These problems cover a great deal of ground and will continue to require to my mind a great deal of intensive and extensive examination, consideration, policy determination and expert draftsmanship such as would be best assured by long committee hearings and painstaking study.

It is clear that the general revision of the Social Security Act is needed and I believe that it would be very unwise to defer this action which also should include the integration of other social legislation related to social security that the Congress may consider and adopt. We cannot allow this great, valuable system to become a sprawling administrative nightmare.

I submit that it is not sound public policy to delay further in vigorously tackling these problems, because with the increase in wages, prices, interest, rents, and the advancing, inflationary spiral which at all costs must be kept within tolerable bounds, that the growing needs of social security recipients will result in serious inadequacies and injustices, if the benefits are not equitably adjusted to meet current costs and standards, and if the Congress fails to coordinate all purposes germane and related to social security in the overall cost to those covered, the employers and the Government.

One approach to these questions might well lie in a careful, massive, prolonged study by some commission of Government authorized by the Congress to review these matters and come up with appropriate recommendations for legislation to be submitted to appropriate committees of the House. But I urge prompt early consideration of these matters and meanwhile the effective adjustment by Congress of a proper legal formula that will insure prompt, reasonable disability benefits to those eligible members of the social security system, who can show by competent, medical evidence that current disabilities actually disable them from performing "any substantial work for the foreseeable future," and whose condition is tantamount in all practical respects so far as ability to work is concerned, to total permanent disability.

I want to express my thanks to the learned chariman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from Arkansas, Chairman MILLS, for his warm interest and his willingness to undertake a study of the problem of providing a suitable legal formula for the determination of disability benefits and for his many other contributions to this cause.

I propose to continue my interest and my labors in these matters in the hope that the Congress may take effective, equitable action in the not too distant future. It is mandatory if we are to make the social security system truly responsive to the needs, entitlements and deserts of the rank and file of the American people and after all, is that objective not our job?

Meanwhile, it is vital, as I see it, for Congress to move with all possible speed with the passage of the social security increases voted by Congress last year.

We must cut all red tape and end all unnecessary delay. The small relief this bill gives is sorely needed by very many fellow citizens who should have had these benefits, these small increases last year.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN V. LINDSAY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 47th anniversary of the Byelorussian declaration of independence. On that day in 1918, the hopes and aspirations of nearly six-score years were realized. A once-proud people joyfully welcomed the opportunity to demonstrate to the world that the long czarist oppression had not dulled their zeal for self-government. We are all sadly aware that the republic was short-lived; but, to my mind, there is a particular poignancy surrounding the Soviet takeover. For many among us do not comprehend the depth of the anguish which this unwarranted act created among Byelorussians, both in the homeland and around the world. The reason for this is that a great number of individuals, in the United States and Western Europe, assume this people to be a group native to Russia. On the contrary, Byelorussia is a separate entity, with its own language, culture, and customs. It is for these very reasons, coupled with the memory of past independence, that the people of this nation never capitulated in the face of czarist rule and oppression. They remembered a period, several centuries before, when their nation had flourished, and had made significant contributions to the progress of Western man. These sentiments gave rise to several courageous revolts, each of which was crushed by the forces of imperial

Russia. The Byelorussian people displayed the same independent courage under the Communist yoke, and in the famous Slutsk uprising of 1920, heroically battled against impossible odds, in the full knowledge that if unsuccessful they would experience even greater cruelty and reprisals. The Red army wiped out the resistance, fierce vengeance was taken, and a foglike silence enveloped the country.

Let no one be deluded by the absence of physical revolt since 1920. History shows that the Byelorussian people have not given up. Quite the contrary, the flame is very much alive. Having been subjugated for all but 3 of the last 170 years, they have developed a singular capacity for passive resistance, and it is this quality which sustains them now, and in which the Kremlin can find no solace or comfort. By one means or another greater measures of freedom will come.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, March 25, 1965, marks the 47th anniversary of the proclamation of Byelorussian independence. The German occupation of western Byelorussia during the First World War had provided an opportunity for the leaders of Byelorussia to express their love of freedom and their longings for independence. Although the Brest-Litovsk peace treaty between the Central Powers and Soviet Russia on March 3, 1918, ignored these aspirations for liberty, on March 25, 1918, the valiant national council proclaimed Byelorussia an independent republic.

The Byelorussian state had little chance to survive despite the bravery of its people. With the defeat of Germany, the Soviet Government repudiated the Brest treaties. Occupying all lands evacuated by the Germans, the Soviet proclaimed a Byelorussian S.S.R. on January 1, 1919. In the peace treaty between Poland and the Soviets in March 1921, Byelorussia was partitioned between its two large neighbors. The Second World War, however, ended with almost all of Byelorussia within the Soviet border.

Today the Soviets make some pretense of permitting a special status for the Byelorussian S.S.R. It is a signatory of the United Nations Charter and signed the partial test ban treaty in Moscow. We know, however, that the Byelorussian people have been completely subjugated to the Soviet Communists and are among the captive peoples behind the Iron Curtain, without basic political rights, without fundamental freedoms, and without the opportunity for self-determination.

We in the United States have a living link with the people of Byelorussia in thousands of Americans of Byelorussian ancestry and Byelorussian immigrants who have helped to build our country. As the leaders of the free world, we have a special responsibility to sustain the love of freedom among all people. As freemen we must sympathize with all those behind the Iron Curtain who are denied the priceless rights of freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion.

Because of our devotion to freedom, it is fitting that we pause a moment in our daily work and join with Byelorussians throughout the free world and our countrymen of Byelorussian descent in celebrating this anniversary of the proclamation of an independent Byelorussian republic. We reaffirm that the maintenance and strengthening of freedom around the globe is the main tenet of American foreign policy, and that we have faith that freedom will ultimately win in the never-ending struggle against tyranny. We take this occasion to assure the Byelorussian people that they have not been forgotten by the free world. We understand their plight, and sympathize with the hope for freedom that they must keep hidden from Communist sight. It is our wish that the day will come when all men may live in a world of peace and plenty and, above all, of freedom.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, at the end of the First World War many submerged and almost lost nationality groups regained their freedom and attained sovereign and independent status. That was one of the most welcome results of a terrible and most destructive war. Subject nationalities of once powerful but now crumbling empires threw off the yoke of their oppressors and proclaimed their freedom. The Byelorussian people, who had been held down under the Russian czars for centuries, proclaimed their national independence on March 25, 47 years ago.

The people of Byelorussia had their own sovereign, independent state before the rise of the Russian Empire. Then, centuries ago, they were overwhelmed by the Russians, lost their independence and suffered under the czarist autocracy of Russia. During the long period under the czars, they carefully guarded their national traditions and their heritage, never abandoning hope for a chance to regain their national freedom. They therefore seized upon the welcome opportunity provided by the overthrow of the czarist regime in Russia, and proclaimed their independence on March 25, 1918. They established their own democratic form of government in their historic capital city, Minsk; and in the short time allotted to them, they began to rebuild their war-torn country. Unfortunately, however, the Byelorussians were not to enjoy their richly deserved reward for long. In December of that same year the Russian Bolsheviks expanded the area under their control. The Red army overran Byelorussia, which was annexed by the Soviet Union, with some 10 million Byelorussians as helpless victims.

Since then Byelorussians have been living under the oppressive yoke of their detested Communist overlords. Their lives are rigidly regimented and their labor is ruthlessly exploited. Their movements and behavior are closely watched by the ubiquitous state police, and they are forced to work for the Moscow-controlled Communist state. Their tyrannical bosses are trying to extinguish all ethnic and national sentiments among them, including all hope of freedom for Byelorussia.

Fortunately, even under these almost unbearable conditions, the liberty-loving Byelorussians still cling to their ideals of freedom and independence. In view of their steadfast dedication to these noble ideals, I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that they will have their reward in freedom. On this 47th anniversary of their independence I wish the Byelorussian people fortitude and forbearance in their struggle against totalitarian tyranny.

Byelorussian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 47th anniversary of the signing of the Byelorussian Declaration of Independence.

It is altogether appropriate that we in America should join with all freemen in commemorating this date, for the Byelorussian people are no longer free to determine their own course in world history.

Their territory has been seized by the Soviet government and the people subjugated in a police state. Yet, there is strong evidence to indicate that the people have not been incorporated into the Communist view of total domination over the minds of men.

The Byelorussians retain their spirit of independence and their love of freedom.

In this citadel of freedom, the Congress of the United States, we are pleased to acknowledge the Byelorussian Declaration of Independence as a further bulwark against the tyrrany of political and personal oppression.

March 25, 1918, was a historic date in Byelorussian history and in world history. The expression of liberty and human dignity written into the declaration have lasted throughout the succeeding 47 years.

The Soviets may rule the land, but as long as there are those who remember this great Declaration of Independence, no Soviet regime will conquer the free hearts of Byelorussia.

The Humanities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, the culture of America is the outward manifestation of our ideals, our aspirations, and our way of life—the reflection of our civilization itself.

This culture of ours is neither exclusive nor of recent development. While in many respects it mirrors our national aims and characteristics, our love of the fine arts, and science, our manners and customs, our inner motivations and impulses, our most profound goals, our loftiest concepts, it is essentially a composite of the past, a clear reflection of the present, and to some extent, probably a forecast of the future.

Our American culture reveals the things that are in our hearts, the preoccupations of our minds, and the deep-hidden stirring of our souls.

From other nations and people principally Western Europe but also many other parts of the world from the time of antiquity to the present, we have derived most of the basic patterns and ingredients that make up our culture.

In the broad sense, our culture embraces our freedoms and the governmental institutions we have developed to protect them, and it includes our dedication to the higher things of the spirit and the strong spiritual promptings which are, and until recently eroded substantially by materialism and other mechanistic philosophies always have been, a primary, fundamental basis of the American dream.

While culture embraces our manners, our social graces where we have them, our humane and compassionate reactions and the niceties and courtesies we display in our relations with others, it goes much deeper into our very system of government, our educational processes and our posture as a nation and a people in a world torn by strife, sorrow, fear, and uncertainty.

Culture is transmitted from one generation to another in the family circle, in the community, in the church, in the school, in the marts of trade and industry, and for the individual it does not necessarily require formal education, although that may be very helpful, and is becoming more increasingly necessary and desirable for the individual, since knowledge is, in the best sense, not only the progenitor, but the preserver and the disseminator, the creator and encourager of culture without which it will languish and wither.

To that end, we must as Americans be concerned more vitally and urgently than ever, though we seem not to be, with the development and spread of learning and the building of its facilities for generating the increase and dissemination of knowledge, because knowledge is the indispensable bloodstream and mainstream of our life and our civilization and the very bulwark of our freedom and the best promise of our future well-being, prosperity, happiness, and peace.

For this reason, and in order to promote the national good, we must constantly strive these days with intensified vigar and militant spirit of devotion and dedication to build and enrich this great heritage of American culture which is so much a part of our country and the differentiating characteristics of our people.

It is with these thoughts in mind that we note the recent progress report of the Commission on Humanities recommending a National Foundation for the Humanities.

My able, distinguished colleague and valued friend, Congressman WILLIAM MOORHEAD, of Pennsylvania, introduced in the House the bill embodying the recommendation of the Commission urging that "the United States must not limit its efforts to science and technology, but must give full value and support to artistic activity."

Those words were extremely well and appropriately spoken by my colleague, and I want to associate myself with them in approval and agreement.

I think the important thing now in this field is for the Congress to get a start in promoting this great work which is so closely related to the national interests, and the growth, the development of the Nation, and the well-being, advancement, and happiness of the American people, and in turn the many peoples of the world who have an orientation toward us and may be influenced by the example we set, good or bad. Of course, we intend always that it shall be good and wholesome, constructive and fruitful, for personal liberal, moral, and spiritual integrity and the betterment of mankind.

The role of the specialist in our current day society is vital and must be given closest attention, and we must by all means recognize that the role of the generalist is of preeminent importance, since it is from the pool of individuals trained in the humanities that the bulk of the great, essential, inspirational leadership of the Nation comes.

It is important that both specialists and generalists should work hand in hand, and that individuals of promise, ability, and aspiration be given fullest possible opportunity to secure the very best training and education to which he aspires. The doors to higher education should be open to all who aspire, and special encouragement and assistance must be given to highly qualified individuals who seek either specialized or generalized education.

There must be no invidious distinctions drawn between scientists and generalists—all should have the chance to get the best education of which they are capable. In this process, all should be treated equally and one group or one person should not be preferred over others unless on their merits they are entitled to special consideration. The fit must prevail, but those who earnestly aspire must not be turned aside. One of them may be a Newton, an Einstein, or a Michelangelo.

Legalized Gambling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, in our near-perfect government of checks and balances, the high resolve of one branch sometimes leads it into an error of excess, but in due course a correction invariably is made. Yet it remains the obligation of all of us always to confront the possibility of a mistake whenever we see or sense it, and to prevent it from initially being made.

In the matter of taxation to meet the growing costs and mounting needs of public works, education, and social services, we are—somewhat like Government—each guided by a stabilizing conscience. And so, a problem becomes virtually nil when the presented choice is between a further burden upon the economy or a serious injury to the country's social fabric.

Among the responsible and thoughtful people of the congressional district of New York State whom I have the honor to represent, a dedication to American mores has led to apprehensions and fears concerning a measure which has just been introduced for consideration before the New York State Legislature.

The bill would permit creation of a legalized off-track betting system in the city of New York for the stated purpose of raising revenue to run the city and to eliminate bookmaking, the illegal gambling racket which fertilizes an octopus-like criminal empire infecting this country. Who could challenge the objectives? But who could accept the false thesis that by increasing neighborhood gambling we can reduce the number of rodents who feed upon it?

This cannot be a party matter. Governors, Senators, and other civic leaders alike in New York State have opposed legalized off-track wagering. The roster of opposition includes the honored New York names of Lehman, Dewey, Harriman, Rockefeller, KENNEDY and JAVITS. The threatened legalization of off-track betting is something on which we must see eye to eye as Americans. The discussion has lasted too long among government leaders and the public in New York City; and both the support and opposition to the proposal have been strong.

The proposed act, incorporating the device of a public referendum to decide upon a matter which should not pass beyond the critical purview of a legislative body, would remove responsibility far from the sociological expertise that it demands.

There exists nevertheless the imminent possibility of its passage.

What might appear on the surface to be an internal problem for the State of New York alone could, in truth, work far-reaching injury to our entire people. I come from the Syracuse area of upper New York State, removed by many miles from the city of New York and from the immediate impact of such legislation, but not by many miles from the ultimate influence of that great metropolis in action of this nature.

The more important problems which it would create, I am convinced, are of consequence even to those of you from other States and from areas where there is no horseracing and no wagering of note. The falling domino principle would surely apply to this bill endangering our Nation's social and economic fabric. No State, no community, would be left unhurt by this act which would, by its passage, accord to one State the right to sound the sociological tune for the Union.

The right of a State to legislate moral matters is a historic one, and there is no disposition here to dwell upon that aspect. However, a State's assumption of a right to legalize procedures, such as I have outlined, of unquestionably negative value touches on the national interest and might properly deserve the attention of the Congress. Legalized off-track betting would promote poverty, encourage criminality and so prey upon the poorer classes as to set itself in direct conflict with the meaningful antipoverty program hopefully initiated by this Congress. It would additionally impose new problems on the law enforcement agencies of our country.

Abundant evidence establishes that such a measure would be the seed from which would grow a vast injury to our economic stability and to our American ethic. No single State should undertake, inadvertently or not, to generate forces which might do violence to our people's basic and historic decency.

In Great Britain, where illegal cash betting with bookmakers abounded, neighborhood off-track betting offices were legalized in 1961. Among the purposes of the betting and gaming bill, as then expressed by a wide range of public officials, were: To ease the burden on the police; to keep gambling within reasonable bounds; to equalize treatment for different social classes of the community—the upper-income bettors had access to credit bookmakers, the poorer did not—and to do something to restore some respect for the law. Now, with less than 5 years of experience, there is ample reason to conclude that these aims have hardly been realized. Instead, there have been an increase in gambling turnover of at least 400 percent, with the lowest income areas particularly affected; juvenile indoctrination into gambling as an acceptable form of entertainment; a great increase in the number of bettors and a coincidental rise in the volume of bad debts and the divorce rate. Throughout Great Britain there are today more than 16,000 betting shops legalized with the owners paying taxes on the volume of wagering and taxes on income.

The accepted propriety of gambling—by implication on anything—has led to an extensive spread of gaming clubs where roulette, dice, one-armed bandits, cards, and other gambling opportunities are provided. We have of late seen advertisements in color in this country stating that Americans, are, of course, welcome to those clubs; and these are a reflection of how even a conservative society can alter one facet of its character, perhaps without conscious realization of the fact, over a short span of years.

There is pure horror in this situation. Its frightening aspects are skillfully described in a book only recently published, "Gambler's Money: The New Force in American Life," by Wallace Turner, Pulitzer Prize winning reporter on the New York Times. The author applies this description to one of our own garish cities:

> This is the strangest city in America. It is also the origin of an infectious immorality that rides out of the desert on a golden flood of gambling wealth to spread its peculiar brand of ethics across the Nation.

Concerned for our social fabric, Mr. Turner concludes:

> When gamblers are given a foothold in legality, they rapidly expand it into a permanent bridgehead from which they branch out in all directions. * * * At the very least, the gamblers must be contained. They must never be given the feeling that the general morality has been dragged down to their level. For if they do, they'll move a level lower and tug down on the rest of us from there.

It is argued now in New York that off-track betting will decrease bookmaking and ease the police burden, in addition to producing revenue variously estimated in a range from $10 million to $215 million for New York City. All of these contentions are patently unrealistic. Mr. Milton R. Wessel, an acknowledged expert on organized crime and law enforcement, who was chief Federal prosecutor of the 1959 Apalachin syndicate trial, ably covered aspects of the proposal in an article entitled, "Legalized Gambling—The Dreams and the Realities," published in the January 18, 1965, edition of the Nation magazine and reprinted in an excerpted version in the New York Herald Tribune of January 21, 1965.

Mr. Wessel states:

> The New York State Commission of Investigation, in a sweeping series of raids during the fall of 1959, seized the actual account books of underworld gambling operations and so was able to pinpoint the sources of gambling cash. A resulting study showed the following: (1) baseball gambling represents 50 percent more money than horserace betting; (2) football betting is one-third larger than horseracing; (3) even basketball represents nearly as large a betting handle as do the horses. In addition, there is an enormous play on the numbers (policy) and a smaller, but substantial, play on boxing and hockey.
>
> No bookie in the city of New York is going to close up shop just because legalized off-track betting (granting all the claims of its advocates) has deprived him of about one-seventh of his profits.
>
> The fantasy becomes even more absurd when one examines in detail the proposals of the New York plan.

As if to confirm Mr. Wessel's conclusion—from actual statistics—long in advance, the New York Times, of October 1, 1963, in an article by Charles Grutzner, exploring the effect of activities of the Federal Bureau of Investigation on the local scene at that time, stated:

> About the only thing that is not worrying the bookmakers is * * * State legislation to permit municipal horse parlors with legal off-track betting. The bookmakers believe that, instead of being put out of business by such competition, they would get extra business.
>
> The surviving bookmakers are not running too fast to pause for a horselaugh if you ask whether legalized off-track betting parlors operated by the city would put them out of business.
>
> "If anything can help this sick business back into prosperity it would be a municipal horse room in every neighborhood," said one.
>
> "In Britain off-track betting has quadrupled since they legalized bookmaking 2 years ago.
>
> "Once betting on the races is made legal and respectable every other housewife will run to the nearest horse parlor to risk a couple of bucks. She'll soon find out that the illegal book will take her parlays, back-to-back bets and markers (play on credit) and carry her winnings to her. She won't have these privileges at a legal horse room. So, with a woman's experience in shopping, she'll take the bargain and never mind whether it's legal."
>
> This bookmaker, whose views were shared by a majority of those interviewed, said legal horse parlors would become magnets for illegal bookmakers to operate in the vicinity.
>
> The bigtime bookmakers—and there still are several—could not care less. Three-fourths of their business now is on sports games. And their big horseplayers are business executives or racketeers who want instant service by telephone. They envision no serious competition from a legal horse parlor where the bet must be made in person.

The real victim of legalized off-track betting would be the poorer classes. In effect, this was clearly indicated as an incidental result of a survey financed by Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., preparatory to its televising of a study in depth on off-track betting. The survey, dated November 1963, was undertaken by International Research Associates, Inc., and among its findings there were several which were particularly indicative: First, one out of four people who are currently not racetrack goers find the idea of a city-operated station appealing and think it would encourage them to bet.

Second. Puerto Rican men are significantly more likely than other New York men to say that they would use the city-operated off-track betting stations.

Third. Negro men are more likely than others to say they would bet almost daily; and

Fourth. Seventeen percent of New York's female population say that they will bet if the centers are provided by the city.

The implications are obvious for all to see. The technical problems involved, including a high cost of operation, appear to be matters significant only to the State of New York, which at present derives approximately $135 million directly from wagering at racetracks within the State. But surface appearances are rejected by responsible businessmen among my constituents who, more than depending upon a sense of foreboding, question the preachments and practices which an off-track betting law would set in motion.

Is it not devious for a government to encourage widespread gambling, figuratively in every neighborhood, rather than to offer honorable solution of its fiscal problems by furthering a sense of civic responsibility? Is it not fiscally unsound to spend $1 in order to reap $2 in taxation when the present cost in New York State is one-fiftieth of that cost? Is it not unwise conditioning of a people to develop what has aptly been termed the "something-for-nothing syndrome"?

We live in an era of rapidly growing national economy, when the Nation is dedicating itself to an unlimited war on poverty and to the maintenance of its dignity and improvement of its image and its prestige. We must continue to strengthen all our safeguards and to oppose all threats to those goals. It is with that awareness I seek to alert this Congress at this time.

Someday soon, perhaps sooner than we now realize, it may be necessary for this House of Representatives to demonstrate its serious concern.

Fino Offers Bold Legislation for Federal Authority To Surmount the Rail Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced legislation to amend the Mass Transportation Act of 1964 to create a Federal Northeastern Transportation Authority to subsidize, rehabilitate, and restructure passenger transportation between lower Maine and northern Virginia—the jurisdictional area is delineated in detail below.

My bill sidesteps a number of the shortcomings of the legislation so far offered—unsuccessfully—to bring Federal aid to bear on the deteriorating rail situation. The bill calls for a wholly Federal authority to subsidize and regulate passenger transportation. The Authority proposed is not dependent on State financial support or political concurrence. The bill proposes wholly Federal financing of the passenger transportation deficit, in keeping with my concept of passenger transportation as an ultimately Federal responsibility. The bill provides for the structuring of the proposed Authority within the framework of an existing transportation program—the Mass Transportation Act of 1964. The bill would make available to the Northeast Transportation Authority $50 million of the money authorized to be appropriated annually for the mass transportation program.

The purposes of the Authority proposed under my bill would be severalfold. Initially, it would aim at the immediate rehabilitation of failing rail passenger services. This would be done by negotiating "cost plus" contracts with passenger carriers, whereby those carriers were given the difference between revenues of the required service and the cost of providing that service, plus a percentage of that cost as profit. Until the Authority should certify itself as ready to perform this task, the bill would empower the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Administration to make appropriate contracts with passenger carriers. A key objective of the proposed Authority would be the regularization of commuter rail service on a reliable contract basis.

The Authority would also, as proposed, seek to develop high-speed intramegalopolitan rail service, and would be authorized to use a share of moneys presently authorized to be used for demonstration projects by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator.

If constituted as set forth in the bill, the Authority would exercise rate and route regulatory powers over megalopolitan air, rail, and bus passenger transportation as presently exercised by the ICC and CAB. These powers would be so exercised as to aim at the development of a more efficient and economical megalopolitan transportation structure. Wasteful competition would eventually be eliminated. Transportation resources would be rationalized: air, rail, and surface transit would be used for appropriate distances or districts. The regulatory powers of the proposed Authority would eventually—used in conjunction with cost-plus passenger service contracts—be exercised so as to withdraw carriers from service obligations that could be better handled by another type of carrier.

The Authority would also be empowered, where necessary, to purchase or operate a carrier, although its power to take over properties without additional congressional consent would be limited to purchases of under $20 million. No passenger carrier could discontinue megalopolitan passenger service without the consent of the Authority.

The proposed Authority would have seven Commissioners appointed for 5-year terms, initially staggered. The salaries of Commissioners would be $21,000 per annum.

The proposed Authority would be financed by appropriation until such time as it might be granted the power to issue revenue bonds in connection with later undertaken specific operations or construction.

Since December, when I first began work on this bill, I have watched the railroads edge closer and closer to total abandonment of passenger service. These developments should not be a surprise. In the last quarter century, passenger service has shown a profit only during the war years. There is nothing new about the dilemma of the railroads, except the publicity that dilemma has received. Now we have come to the point where we must face up to the need—the immediate need—for large-scale Government aid.

Recently, the Regional Plan Association released comments of commuter railroad presidents the gist of which was that all the commuter lines serving the New York metropolitan area are willing to hand over their passenger operations to a responsible Government agency if Government subsidies are not forthcoming. These officials do, however, prefer the idea that the Government should contract for commuter service—or in essence, subsidize such service—in different areas rather than take over the railroads. I agree. I prefer the concept of "equalization payments" by which the Government pays for the difference between revenues and costs of providing what is, after all, a necessary public service, to the concept of Government owned and operated railroads. My bill aims at setting up a framework for Government financial aid—and not only to railroads, although they are our immediate concern, but to other carriers as well.

In my opinion, the political and financial responsibility for such financial aid and control must lie with the Federal Government. The simple reason is that the Federal Government has both the power and the money. The several States have little of either. They seem unable to agree on any plans that have any real teeth or treasury. Probably any State plans would involve largely Federal money in any event, so it is my feeling that the political body created to deal with the transportation problem in the Northeast ought to be a Federal agency. Ultimately, the financial and planning power of the Federal Government must be brought to bear—and there is no time like the present.

I am not proposing a nationwide agency. For the moment, I think we would do well to test a Federal transportation authority's ability to do the job in the area where the problem is most pressing—the northeastern urban "megalopolis." I do not think that these problems are the problems of metropolitan New York alone. I think that the problems of the urban coastal area are highly interrelated, and that controlled development of transportation in the Northeast should be on an integrated rather than scattered basis. It would not be fair to subsidize only the metropolitan New York transportation problem. The crisis presenting itself today is an opportunity and a challenge to regularize and modernize the entire northeastern transportation complex. A halfhearted, haphazard, and piecemeal attack on this problem will cost double tomorrow what it saves today.

I hope that progressive transportation thinking will not be shunted aside in the name of economy, because, as I said, such would only be false economy. I also hope that this proposal will not be branded as sectional, for while it is true that it is aimed at the transportation complex of just one area, it is also aimed to provide a trial run in Federal participation in passenger transportation.

What can be learned in the Northeast can be applied to other areas as the economic patterns of those areas move, as they must, toward the socioeconomic complexity of the Northeast. Perhaps a Great Lakes Region Authority or a Southern Pacific Coastal Authority might follow a successful Northeastern Authority.

This is an innovative measure, but it is a considered one, hammered out as the sound points and shortcomings of other transportation proposals have exposed themselves. We live in an age of supercities and superproblems. There is an ever-growing and necessary interrelation of politics and multidirectional growth planning. I urge the Congress to mold the future rather than be buffeted by it. This is a challenge to be grasped, not ignored.

Following is the megalopolitan jurisdiction:

THE MEGALOPOLITAN JURISDICTION

Maine: Counties of Cumberland and York.

New Hampshire: Counties of Hillsboro and Rockingham.

Massachusetts: All counties.

Rhode Island: All counties.

Connecticut: All counties.

New York: Counties of Suffolk, Nassau, Queens, Kings, Richmond, New York, Bronx, Westchester, Rockland, Putnam, Orange, Dutchess, Sullivan, Ulster, Greene, Columbia, Albany, Rensselaer, and Schenectady.

New Jersey: All counties.

Pennsylvania: Counties of Pike, Lackawanna, Luzerne, Monroe, Northampton, Lehigh, Berks, Schuylkill, Lebanon, Dauphin, York, Lancaster, Chester, Delaware, Montgomery, Bucks, and Philadelphia.

Maryland: All counties save Garrett and Allegany.

Delaware: All counties.

District of Columbia.

Virginia: Counties of Arlington, Fairfax, Loudoun, Prince William and Fauquier.

Lead, Zinc, and Copper Disposals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am desirous of expressing my warm appreciation to all those who were so helpful and considerate to me and our committee in facilitating the favorable consideration by the House on Tuesday, March 23, under unanimous consent of the bill, H.R. 1496, as amended by the Senate. This measure authorizes the disposal, without regard to the 6 months waiting period, of lead, zinc, and copper from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile.

As the House understands, this bill provides for the disposal of certain urgently needed strategic materials, principally lead, zinc, and copper that are urgently needed by industry to alleviate current shortages which are causing part-time operation and unemployment in certain industries, and are now threatening to cause even greater unemployment and more serious conditions in these industries.

I want to commend the subcommittee for its prompt, expeditious consideration in reporting the lead and zinc bills when they were before us. It was our expectation and intention to proceed promptly with consideration of several bills for disposal of copper that were pending in the House, but which lacked needed reports from the Federal agencies concerned.

However, when the lead and zinc bills were sent to the other body, certain amendments were added to the zinc bill providing for copper disposal. We should have much preferred to conduct our own hearings on copper in the House, but under the circumstances, since this measure and the lead bill were incorporated into the zinc bill, we did not feel it would be desirable to duplicate the Senate hearings. It was the decision of the House Armed Services Committee to expedite action on these disposals by accepting the Senate amendments, even though we felt that it would have been better to proceed with hearings on each individual disposal request, and in accordance with our practice, receive adequate evidence concerning the subject matter of pending copper bills, thus giving those who introduced measures on this subject full opportunity to be heard and have their witnesses heard and thus enable our committee to make its own record in our own committee hearings.

However, I feel that we have discharged our duty to the House and to all those concerned in accepting the Senate amendments in this particular instance, even though we do not want it to be understood or construed that this established a precedent that would be followed in the future.

We have made every possible effort to safeguard the national interest in these disposals and to prevent the disruption of markets and price variations to the extent that can be done by legislation, and we have taken great pains to assure there will be orderly, fair, equitable disposal procedures and that our committee will be in a position to follow up these matters to make sure that the intent of this legislation is being followed in every feasible, practicable manner.

In all these disposals, it is our expectation that the Government will make a profit from the sales taking place as a result of the action of the Congress on this bill.

There are so many people who are serving and assisting our committee in these matters that it would not be possible to enumerate all of them here. I do want to express my warm, personal appreciation to my very distinguished chairman, the Honorable L. MENDEL RIVERS, who contributed so invaluably to the results achieved, to the officials of the Government, particularly the General Services Administration, the Office of Emergency Planning and those from industry who gave us the benefit of their views and their valued cooperation.

I am also especially thankful to several distinguished friends and colleagues of the committee and the House who introduced bills for the disposal of copper and who so graciously withdrew their request for House committee hearings in order to expedite final action. Some of these colleagues are: the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE], the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. IRWIN], both members of the Armed Services Committee, and our esteemed colleagues, the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MONAGAN], the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN], the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN], the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY], the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUTCHINSON], and my valued colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

I think that the example set by all these and other distinguished gentlemen in the House on Tuesday in expediting this bill is one of the finest instances of wholehearted cooperation I have seen during my service here, and I hope the passage of the bill will be helpful in alleviating the shortages of these valuable metals and improve the sorry plight of several industries faced with operational and unemployment problems as a result of present conditions affecting the availability of these materials.

Senator Dirksen Interviewed on the Art of Political Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS H. KUCHEL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, March 25, 1965

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, one of the most delightful recent television interviews, and certainly one of the most informative ones, was conducted by Joseph F. McCaffrey with Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, of Illinois, as his guest. I have gone to considerable pains to get a transcript of the interview with our esteemed minority leader because I think the Senate should share in the wisdom which marks the comments of our colleague. The interview was first broadcast on WMAL-ABC TV, Washington, D.C., on February 7, 1965, on Mr. McCaffrey's program known as "Closeup."

I ask unanimous consent that the transcript of the interview be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JOSEPH MCCAFFREY. Good evening, I'm Joseph McCaffrey. Welcome again to "Closeup, the Capitol." My guest this evening needs no introduction to anyone who has ever watched television, certainly no introduction at all to anyone who is interested in public affairs. This gentleman first came to Congress as a Member of the House in 1933 and served there until he retired voluntarily in January 1949. He was elected then to the Senate in 1950 and has served there ever since. I think if there was a Congressional Hall of Fame, and I really think there should be one, that this gentleman would be the first man who would be selected for it. Because he is, and I am sure that almost any other reporter who covers the Hill will agree, the complete Senator. He is the perfect Senator, if in the world of human beings there is such a thing as anyone who is perfect or anything that is perfect. And in just one moment I will yield the balance of the time on this program to the distinguished minority leader of the U.S. Senate, Everett McKinley Dirksen. Senator Dirksen, in many ways it is a miracle that you were in the Senate, in that no one ever thought you would return to public life when you left the House. The verdict was that you were going to be blind. Will you tell us the fears and feelings that went through your mind at that time?

Senator Dirksen. Yes, I remember the incident rather vividly. I had six or seven physicians including one here in Washington, a very noted physician who was an eye specialist who had been in the Wilmer Clinic at Johns Hopkins Hospital in Baltimore. I recall so well the day when he called in the morning and said there was a division of opinion as between him and others as to whether this retinitis condition was malignant or not, but they thought at least I ought to go to Johns Hopkins and think about having an enucleation—which is a nice fancy word for the removal of one of your eyes. I remember how Mrs. Dirksen and I wept when the news came. I very dutifully went to Baltimore that morning on the train. I remember telling the surgeon over there afterward, when I got there, that I had consulted with another doctor and came to the conclusion that I would not permit the removal of my eye. He said, "What doctor?" "Oh," I said, "A very great big doctor, He lives way upstairs." "Oh," he said, "You are one of those guys, are you?" I said, "Yes, I am. I am a rather rough, uncouth sort of a person, but I am one of those guys." He said, "All right, if that is the way you want it; I'm going to California tomorrow so make up your mind." I said, "I have made up my mind," and that was it. That is my good eye. The other one has some scar tissue on it but it does very well for peripheral vision. Incidentally I became an expert on eyes myself at that time but there is something that hits you, you can just envision a black world for a while.

Mr. McCaffrey. Did you have any fear, any panic when they first talked to you about this?

Senator Dirksen. I would not call it panic but I was fully sensible of what confronted me and how serious this really was because just think of those limitations on what you can do and how long you have to be out of circulation before you can undertake to get anything done and learn an entirely new technique where you feel your way in the world.

Mr. McCaffrey. Senator, those who observed you during your years from 1933 until 1949 in the House and who have observed you since your return here to the Senate say that you have changed a great deal, that you may have mellowed perhaps. How would you compare yourself in the Senate today with yourself when you were in the House? Do you see or think there is any difference in you as an individual as an operating Member of Congress?

Senator Dirksen. Well, I think you will have to remember first of all, that I am somewhat older than I was in those days. I came here at age 36 or 37, full of energy and ready to just fairly push the dome off the Capitol, until older and well demeaned Members advised me that that dome has been there since they came and would be there when they were gone and would be there when I was gone. So perhaps it might be well to slow down a little. Then I think you learn certain things which somehow fill out your philosophy as a legislator and I pretty much agree with this kind of language—that this free government is like an old waterlogged scow, it doesn't move very fast, it doesn't move very far at one time, but it never sinks and maybe that is the reason we have a free government today. I was thinking how many free governments are just in too great a hurry that suddenly flop over and take on a dictatorial and despotic cast because they can't wait for normal forces to undertake the changes that are necessary in the constant climb of people to a better life.

Mr. McCaffrey. Senator Dirksen, you have been criticized at times for not being consistent—that over the years, your position on various issues has changed.

Senator Dirksen. Well consistency is a hobgoblin of small minds—was it Emerson who said it?—a foolish consistency or an inconsistency and I have often thought the only people who do not change their minds are sleeping peacefully in some cemetery or they are in an institution—involuntarily there—and have lost the capacity to change their mind. So I hope that the time will never come when I can't adjust to new circumstances and new conditions because it is an accelerated world. How fast it moves—and I need only to get a touch of nostalgia and dip into my past; go way back to my boyhood days—to see the changes that have taken place to become thoroughly sensible of what has happened in this world.

Mr. McCaffrey. How would you sum up your philosophy of life, Senator?

Senator Dirksen. Well, I want to be ready for change at all times. I think I subscribe fully to the definition of progress as the constant and intelligent and undramatic action of life on what is here. Perhaps I can best illustrate it by saying the atom has been here ever since this world was created but it has taken all these millions of years to break it down, to fracture it, to find it, to see what is inside of it, and to lay open this great force that has changed the whole destiny of the world and the destiny of mankind.

Mr. McCaffrey. Any Senator has a hectic pace in life and because Senator Dirksen is the Minority Leader in the U.S. Senate, his pace is even more hectic. It is nothing for him, for example, to have 150–200 people to come to see him in the course of a day and how does he get away from this? We have some pictures which I would like to show you at this time to illustrate how a Senator, in this case Senator Dirksen, relaxes. These are pictures—these are some of your flowers, Senator—and this is Mrs. Dirksen with you at your home in Leesburg and what do you grow down there? What crops do you grow?

Senator Dirksen. Well, frankly, we grow a little bit of everything. Not only in the vegetable line but in the flower line as well. I do not want to be an expert. I do not want to be a professional. I never want to loose my amateur standing—

Mr. McCaffrey. As a gardener?

Senator Dirksen. As a gardener and so I go for these very simple things that give me a lot of joy whether you grow them singly or in great masses. People wonder some about my fidelity to the marigold. Well, take a marigold in great mass and it lasts right up to frost and are here all summer and fall. You can enjoy the mass color anywhere in the garden and it is a hardy flower. But I love petunias, I like to dabble a little in roses and on a small scale I do fairly well at it. I love zinnias because of their rich color. They just absorb all the color in the sun and what a gorgeous sight it is to see them in great mass colors all through the summer and it is another hardy flower, so hardy in fact that it has a way of resisting bugs. So does petunias. But that gives me a lot of fun and variety and then I garden a little in the vegetable field. Start early—that I learned as a boy—starting with radishes and lettuce and onions, the first to mature in early spring. And then you move on to carrots and turnips and to red beets and then, of course, you always have a stand of potatoes and a stand of tomatoes. I always have a little kale. There must be one green vegetable with plenty of iron content.

Mr. McCaffrey. Senator, in your youth you aspired to be an actor. In fact, you did write and sell and produce some plays——

Senator Dirksen. Very little but at least——

Mr. McCaffrey. Well, you got paid for them and there are a lot of playwrights who have never been able to sell, you know. How related is politics to the theater, would you say?

Senator Dirksen. Well, you have this common identity. To begin with, you deal with people. You are in front of people in political life even as you are on the stage and out of it there must develop a poise, a certain presence, a capacity for putting your thoughts in words, in poignant expression, so that it is conveyed to people and persuades them and in that respect there is complete identity between the theater and I think, political life.

Mr. McCaffrey. One of the main requirements, it seems to me, of a man in public life is that he had patience, that he be able to suffer fools gladly and that he take all the other little inconveniences which comes along and doesn't let these things get to him. Is this something that you have to be born with or can men in public life learn to adjust to all these things?

Senator Dirksen. They can learn but——

Mr. McCaffrey. Some of them don't.

Senator Dirksen. No, the gift of patience, of course I think, is a highly desired attribute because you are dealing with people, they have fixations, they have convictions about any number of controversial matters. You have to hear them out. You have to be careful not to be too precipitous or capricious in pointing out what you think the weakness in the other fellows case may be, especially if he is on your side of the aisle politically speaking. So that requires, I think, gentle discussion and a very gentle oil can art as I call it, so that the bearings never get hot. You don't develop frictions that suddenly blow into pieces and if you can keep it on the quiet side and have every aspect of the matter explored without anybody becoming fractious at any time you're most likely to get results. What was it that Lincoln said—we shall sooner have the chicken by hatching the egg than by breaking it.

Mr. McCaffrey. Is this the secret of your great ability to work compromises? Now there are many examples, in your case, of your ability to bring about a compromise, the most classic one and the one that will go on the history books certainly is the work you did on the civil rights bill last year in the Senate. Is this the secret of being able to get men to work together?

Senator Dirksen. Yes.

Mr. McCaffrey. Restraining yourself first perhaps?

Senator Dirksen. If you have a common objective it is the starting point of course. There may be a dozen roads to get there. Some of them tortuous, some not satisfactory, some of them difficult, some of them over high ground—where lies the best road with the fewest barriers or obstacles in it? Well, it takes some doing, of course, to finally work around until you get into that road and that does require patience and you do have to hear the other fellow's case. He may not agree with you at all but, little by little, whatever difficulties are in the way begin to yield and before you know it you are at the end of the road and it looks as if it has been consummated by a rather satisfactory joining. And you say, all right, that's the route to get there, that's the route back, and that is the route up there again.

Mr. McCaffrey. In your 30 years in Congress, you have served with hundreds of men and women. What do you think is the great hazard—now we are speaking as human beings—of public life? Do you think it is drinking or do you think it is the inability or refusal to grow as times go on or do you think it is a development toward cynicism that is apparent in some Members?

Senator DIRKSEN. First of all, there is a danger of getting into a political rut, so to speak, and life may go by you. That's very unfortunate indeed. That means, of course, that you will not adjust. What was it that Lincoln said: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. As our case is new, so we must think anew and act anew."

Mr. McCAFFREY. If you come from Illinois you have to know Lincoln, don't you?

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes; and then he added this one part. He said: "We must disenthrall ourselves and then we shall save our country." That is a great line and I think over and over a person in public life has to take inventory, to see where he is at the moment, to take a look back to see from whence you came and then see where the high road goes and then if your thinking is not attuned to it you disenthrall yourself. You take a new stance and a new look and if you are willing to look long enough and hard enough, I am rather confident that the right cast of mind and the right thoughts will come which are adequate to what lies ahead.

Mr. McCAFFREY. As a person and also in your many public statements you are always the optimist. Does your optimism ever falter in the face of all of the problems that face us today not only at home but also abroad?

Senator DIRKSEN. No, because even if there are frustrations and goodness knows every life is attended with some frustration certainly; there is still ample time and room and cause for optimism because there are so many good things and so many blessings that you can count in life that come. So I see no reason why one shouldn't look on the optimistic side. Besides how can you look on life constructively without being an optimist because it is the only aggressive, affirmative attitude of mind that will do you any good in coping with a problem there on the doorstep everyday.

Mr. McCAFFREY. You served under five Presidents, from F.D.R. through Johnson. Taking them one at a time, how would you appraise these men beginning with Franklin Delano Roosevelt. You were elected the same year he was first elected, 1932. You survived his big sweep of 1936 too.

Senator DIRKSEN. Well, how should you appraise different personalities. Franklin Roosevelt and the mellifluous voice who had a way of charming people and did charm the country. There were so many things with which I disagreed in those days, many with which I agreed, many with which my constituents disagreed and then they used to scold me a good deal about it. But certainly a personality of a type all its own that is rather rare. Then followed by Truman, rather mundane, rather earthy who could chop off his words. I had a great regard for Truman. He could scold you in language that you could understand and at the same time he could pat you on the back. I recall when I went to say goodby to Truman after this eye malady struck me and I said I would wait in Washington until I went to say goodby. And I said, Mr. President, the custom is to pack your bags and get out of this town overnight but I would not do it. And he said to me at the White House, "Why did you quit? We need fellows like you around here." Well, when I got around to the Senate race, finally after friends importuned me, I remember Truman took me apart as nobody ever did as if he had never seen me in his life, yet he thought they needed me around here. When they observed his 80th birthday, I think, I was there and made a speech on the occasion and I joshed him a little about it and he laughed and he said, "Oh, DIRKSEN, life is like that." So he was a different type entirely but he had those who were devoted to him with a deep and affectionate devotion. And then of course, there came Dwight Eisenhower. As the whole world knows, I was for Bob Taft and I didn't know how President Eisenhower would think about me and particularly some of the remarks I made in the nominating speech in Chicago. You may remember that one line I said was that it wouldn't take a committee investigation to determine Bob Taft's politics. Maybe at the time I said it I wasn't fully conscious of the fact that it was quite a little dig but President Eisenhower and I became the firmest of friends and I carried the flag for him on issues and controversies.

Mr. McCAFFREY. Let you have that hot poker.

Senator DIRKSEN. I used to say that if nobody will pick up the hot poker I will pick it up. And then came the late John Kennedy. Of course, we had known each other for 10 or 12 years before he acceded to the Presidency. We knew each other in the House and we knew each other in the Senate. I had great affection for him and I think it was reciprocated. There was something genteel and gracious, there was a sublime grace about John Kennedy and it stuck to him all his days. And how often he called me to the White House to sit for perhaps an hour to talk about many things and say, "Where am I on this?" "Well, Mr. President, you're not." And then the question, how to get results? And of course, it is quite a compliment, I think, when the President who bears another party label from mine calls me to ask how he gets out of a difficulty and extricates himself from a real problem in the Senate. My duty as an American, of course, with an allegiance and fidelity to my country requires that I help him. I would be a poor citizen indeed if I didn't do the same for any President regardless of his politics where the country's interest is at stake. But he was truly a great character in my book. Now President Johnson and I sat across the aisle from each other——

Mr. McCAFFREY. The man you probably know the best.

Senator DIRKSEN. Yes, he as majority leader and I as minority leader. We used to make medicine, as I say, over in his office. Of course we had to make book and make schedule on what came up. The Senate is a two-way street, that is one thing we are always agreed on. A minority leader with some backing could just truss up the Senate any old time with a filibuster or anything else and stop it in its tracks and the majority leader could do likewise. And so we agreed that we had to work together because the overriding interest was the well-being and the welfare of the Republic, the United States of America. It was on that ground we used to battle it out and believe me we have had some hot and tempestuous times in his office and in mine but never at any time did either of us lose sight of the fact that the objective was the country and its people.

Mr. McCAFFREY. Let me ask you the final question, Senator DIRKSEN, and this is always an unfair question, perhaps. But looking back over your life—and you said you do look back every once in a while—looking back over your life is there anything that you would undo that you did or is there anything that you didn't do that you would like to have done?

Senator DIRKSEN. Just one. That is when I voted for a bill while in the House of Representatives in the Truman administration to send miners and perhaps railroaders into the Army unless they quit striking and went back to work. That is the bill that Senator Taft stopped in its tracks in the Senate and as I look back I think if I could undo a vote that vote I would undo.

Mr. McCAFFREY. A pretty good record with only one regret out of what—maybe 3,000 votes or 5,000 votes that you've cast.

Senator DIRKSEN. It could be, but you see, there we were all caught up in a vortex of feeling that extended all through the country and people were getting pretty harsh about it and naturally that is reflected in the halls of Congress so perhaps they will stake me one vote that I regret. I do regret that one, of course.

Mr. McCAFFREY. I'll be back in 1 minute.

Senator DIRKSEN. I want to thank you very much for a delightful program.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MARCH 26, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., prefaced his prayer with these words from Philippians 3:13–14: *Reaching forth, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.*

Almighty God, we thank Thee for this significant day when we are paying tribute and honor to two American patriots and heroes.

We proudly acknowledge that they have captured our imagination and admiration by soaring upward and onward into space.

Grant that their achievement may symbolize the faith and courage we need for the adventure of the aspiring and ascending moral and spiritual life.

Expand and enlarge our minds and hearts with a passion to attain unto the highland and heavenly life.

We humbly confess that there may be many obstacles, but Thou wilt sustain us with this assurance:

"He who, from zone to zone,
  Guides through the boundless sky thy
    certain flight,
In the long way that I must tread alone,
  Will lead my steps aright."

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order before the Journal is read?

Mr. GOODELL. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 49]

Bonner
Everett
Frelinghuysen
Green, Oreg.
Hébert
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
McDowell
McEwen
Mackie
Martin, Mass.
Miller
Mosher
Springer
Toll
Tupper
Widnall

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 416 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE JOURNAL

The Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS (interrupting the reading of the Journal). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. (After counting) 222 Members are present, a quorum.

The Clerk will continue the reading of the Journal.

The Clerk proceeded to read the Journal.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS (interrupting reading of the Journal). Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 50]

Ashmore
Ayres
Bonner
Conyers
Corman
Dorn
Everett
Foley
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Hagan, Ga.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Herlong
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
McDowell
MacGregor
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Miller
Mosher
Rivers, Alaska
Smith, Calif.
Springer
Stafford
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, La.
Toll
Tupper
Widnall
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 397 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

THE JOURNAL

The Clerk continued reading the Journal.

Mr. ALBERT (interrupting the reading of the Journal). Mr. Speaker, I move that the Journal be approved as read.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I make that motion and yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, we all recognize that this is one of the most important legislative proposals that will come before this body in this session of Congress, and perhaps one of the most important legislative proposals for a good many years to come. It will set a pattern of relationship between the Federal Government, the State and local boards of education throughout each of the 50 States. It will attempt to resolve the critical relationship, though perhaps muddy it, between the state and the church.

It seems to us on this side of the aisle that because of the importance of this legislation there ought to be a maximum, but yet a reasonable, time for a full discussion of these critical issues. The only reason that we on our side have done what we have done so far today is because of the limitation on debate that was voted yesterday which we think is unfair and inequitable and which precluded debate on title I.

There were at the Speaker's desk at the time the limitation was imposed seven proposed amendments by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell]. Also there were two amendments by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] and there may have been others. But because of the limitation, these well-thought-out, conscientiously drafted amendments were precluded from consideration by this body.

We feel that in light of our efforts to try to be cooperative and our efforts not to be dilatory we in the minority ought to have a fair opportunity today to continue responsible, reasonable consideration of this legislation.

The Speaker and others in the leadership on the majority side, I hope will agree that we have tried to sit down and work out some reasonable opportunity for us in the minority to offer appropriate amendments in Committee of the Whole. The minority suggestions are reasonable as to time for the appropriate consideration of issues and amendments vital to America. We feel that an arbitrary limitation to vote at, say, 4 o'clock, does preclude in my judgment the proper consideration of this vital bill by the Members of this body.

We have four more titles to consider and they involve all of the basic issues that were discussed yesterday and the day before. They involve those issues that will have a serious impact upon the relationship of church and state, as well as the relationship between the Federal Government, the State, and local governments.

Mr. Speaker, we in the minority do not intend in the time remaining, to pursue any dilatory tactics. But we hope and trust that those on the other side of the aisle will realize and will understand that what we are doing is trying to give the House of Representatives or the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union an opportunity to work its will intelligently and responsibly on this bill of 147 pages.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that as we move along there will not be on any amendment an arbitrary cutoff of debate, that there will not be any action that will preclude an amendment from being considered and adequately discussed.

And, so, I say, if necessary, in order to give us and the American people an opportunity to examine this bill in detail that we should not quit at 4 o'clock. If necessary we can go on later tonight, if necessary we can go on tomorrow, and if necessary consider it on Monday.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, may I advise the Members of the House first of all that we had hoped on this side, and we still hope, that we would be able to finish this bill by 4 o'clock. As the Members know, the astronauts who have just recently finished the Gemini flight so successfully are to be guests of the Speaker, and all Members of the House and their families are invited to meet with them.

May I say further, Mr. Speaker, that, on the matter of cooperation, we could easily have finished the general debate on this bill, had we done what we had originally intended to do, on Wednesday night. But the committee rose at 6 o'clock, on the request if I am not mistaken of and to accommodate the Republican leadership, and all Republican Members, something that we always like to do; something that we always do when we can.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has spoken of dramatizing this situation and of cooperating. Mr. Speaker, may I observe that ever since the new image made its appearance in the legislative firmament I have been hearing a lot about cooperation from the other side. But I am waiting to see the first cooperative effort put into effect.

Mr. Speaker, we passed the Appalachian bill with scarcely any support from the other side except from Members who live in the areas affected.

We brought this week, this bill, which is a most important bill, designed to meet a national purpose, benefiting Republicans and Democrats and all Americans, for the consideration of the House after it had been considered in the committee, after it had been recommended by the administration, and before that, by a task group that worked upon it trying to solve a difficult problem but one to which a solution was necessary.

Mr. Speaker, where is the cooperation from the Republican side on this bill?

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States sent up here just a few days ago—and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Celler] and his great committee have been actively pursuing committee consideration of it—a voting rights bill.

All I have been able to hear from many gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, on this side of the Capitol are political speeches over radio and television stations criticizing the bill and criticizing the efforts of the President of the United States to face up to this responsibility in this area.

Mr. Speaker, when is the cooperation of the new Republican leadership going to start?

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD rose.

The SPEAKER. The previous question being moved, the Chair is going to put the question.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Oklahoma if he would withdraw and withhold the moving of the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 274, nays 119, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

YEAS—274

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Annunzio
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Baldwin
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Beckworth
Bennett
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conyers
Cooley
Corman
Craley
Culver
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Landrum
Leggett
Lindsay
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Poage
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, S.C.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Taylor
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Weltner
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitten
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—119

Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Bates
Belcher
Bell
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Callaway
Carter
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Collier
Conable
Conte
Corbett
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Findley
Fino
Ford, Gerald R.
Fulton, Pa.
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hall
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Harvey, Mich.
Hosmer
Hutchinson
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McEwen
Martin, Ala.
Mathias
May
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morse
Morton
Nelsen
Pirnie
Poff
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Robison
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Saylor
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Shriver
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Stanton
Talcott
Teague, Calif.
Thompson, La.
Thomson, Wis.
Utt
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Whalley
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Wydler
Younger

NOT VOTING—40

Ayres
Battin
Blatnik
Bonner
Brown, Calif.
Casey
Clausen, Don H.
Colmer
Dague
Dickinson
Everett
Fogarty
Frelinghuysen
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Lennon
McMillan
MacGregor
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mosher
Pelly
Rooney, N.Y.
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tunney
Tupper
Whitener
Widnall
Wright

So the previous question was ordered.

Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. DOW changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. COLLIER changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert] that the Journal as read be approved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, has the reading of the Journal been completed?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state, in response to the question of the gentleman from Iowa, that the reading of the Journal has not been completed, but a motion has been made that the Journal be considered as read and approved.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry: Is not the motion then subject to a point of order?

The SPEAKER. Not at this stage.

Mr. GROSS. The point of order comes too late?

The SPEAKER. At this particular point. The Chair would not want the inference to be drawn that the point could not be made under other circumstances. At this particular point, under the circumstances, the point of order comes too late.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry. Would a point of order be in order after the vote?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state, the vote having been taken, the will of the House having been expressed, a point of order would not lie.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Albert].

The motion was agreed to.

So the Journal as read was approved.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 22. An act to promote a more adequate national program of water research; and

S. 560. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the Clean Air Act in order to provide for improved control of water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities and automotive vehicles.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H.R. 2362, with Mr. Bolling in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday the Clerk had read through section 201 of the committee substitute, ending on line 4, page 93.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. Griffiths] be permitted to proceed for 5 minutes and to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection of the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DEATH OF MRS. VIOLA GREGG LIUZZO IN ALABAMA

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, Viola Gregg Liuzzo, killed in Alabama last night, was my valued constituent.

To her husband and to her five young children I extend my deepest sympathy.

Mr. Chairman, the President has announced that four men have been picked up and will be charged with violation of the civil rights law. But where are the local officials of the State of Alabama?

Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Liuzzo offered a ride from Montgomery to their homes to those who sought the right to vote. Is that so evil? Is this a crime punishable by death in the State of Alabama? Is that the law of Alabama?

Mr. Speaker, we are going to find out. As a onetime judge in a criminal court let me say to the citizens of Alabama, if you know who killed this woman, whether you are white or colored and you do not report that information to the proper law enforcement officers of Alabama, then you too must share the guilt of the murderer.

Mr. Chairman, the world is not made safe by laws, by policemen with clubs, nor yet by armies. It is made safe by men who love their fellow man and who lay down their lives for him.

Mr. Chairman, I expect Mrs. Liuzzo's murderer will be named. Then will come the test of Alabama officials. If when the murderer is brought before the court and if then an Alabama judge, as in the Reeb case, dares to permit bail on any theory that the murderer will not be convicted and is therefore bailable, he, in fact, becomes an accessory to murder because he is really broadcasting to the entire community that he does not believe the murderer should be convicted.

Mr. Chairman, I sat as a judge and I know the power of judges.

In this case let order return to Alabama. Let Alabamians prove that a murderer is a murderer whether he kills an Alabamian or a brilliant and courageous young northern mother.

Mr. Chairman, should the citizens of Alabama fail to bring the killer to justice they will prove once and forever that the unwritten law of Alabama is more powerful than the written law of all past generations; that faceless men enforce that unwritten law with greater accuracy than the elected State officials of Alabama enforce the written law and the Constitution of their fathers; but they will have proved also that there is not as much courage in the whole of the State of Alabama as there was in Viola Gregg Liuzzo.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] be excused from any teller votes.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not in order in the Committee of the Whole, the Chair will advise the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section close in 10 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a motion pending.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAMER. What section is the motion directed to?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the motion is to close debate on section 201, title II, in 10 minutes.

Mr. CRAMER. A further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAMER. Has section 201 been read?

The CHAIRMAN. It was read yesterday. It was the last matter read, at that time, as the Chair announced at the opening.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply disappointed in this great legislative body today. A great philosopher once said, "Power corrupts, absolute power corrupts absolutely."

There is no question but what you gentlemen on that side of the aisle have the power, and can vote us down any time you want to. You do not have to listen to the opposition, you do not have to listen to anybody who disagrees with you on anything.

What are you afraid of? You have the votes. Are you afraid to have this exposed to some light and some debate?

The majority leader spoke of cooperation. I say to you that cooperation in a democratic republic does not mean conformity, it does not mean a rubberstamp government.

We have serious problems in connection with this legislation. They are not partisan problems. They do not divide us down the middle of this aisle. You have as many Members troubled by the provisions of this legislation as we do, and these issues should be debated. The way you are proceeding, this is not going to be an Education Act, it will be the Railroad Act of 1965.

Let me raise one of these issues, and I am sorry to be so distressed and angry, but I think some of these things involve the very dignity of our legislative body and the preservation of our system.

This morning the Washington Post carried an editorial. The Washington Post said that the legislative history that we created here on the floor in the past few days is plain nonsense with reference to the issue.

I quote:

> The report of the Committee on Education and Labor says unequivocally that "No provision of the bill authorizes any grant for providing any service to a private institution, but at the same time the bill does contemplate some broadening of public educational programs and services in which elementary and secondary school pupils who are not enrolled in public schools may participate. The bill does not authorize funds for the payment of private school teachers." Sending any public school employee into a parochial school would obviously be "providing a service to a private institution in direct defiance of this language." It would also, manifestly, do violence to the constitutional injunction against any governmental support of religion. Catholics really ought not to be left under any misapprehension on this score.

We have up here the matter of legislative history. I think I am being completely honest and direct on this that under this act public personnel, special personnel such as guidance counselors, speech therapists, and remedial reading specialists could be in a parochial school.

I think this is a vital issue. The private school people believe they are getting aid, considerable aid, or will be getting it, out of title I. There has been an effort by the advocates to make out to the private school people that they are going to get aid here, and to the public school people that the private school is not going to get aid. There has been an effort to cloud this over to the point where we get one gentleman in the leadership saying "yes" to a question and another saying "no" to the same question.

I think we have a serious obligation as Representatives in a great deliberate body passing on perhaps the most important legislative action in this entire session and I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee to clear up this record. I think for the legislative history we must have word from the chairman of the subcommittee and the chairman of the full committee. What are we doing? Is it permissible under this act for special personnel such as guidance counselors, speech therapists, remedial reading specialists, and remedial other types of teachers on the public payroll to go on the premises of private schools and teach? Can the gentleman from New York answer this question "yes" or "no"?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I would like to have an answer. Can the gentleman from New York answer the question? He is chairman of the committee. This is the legislative history.

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman from New Jersey will answer the question.

Mr. GOODELL. Does the answer of the gentleman from New Jersey carry the imprimatur of the chairman?

Mr. POWELL. I am a simple parish priest.

Mr. GOODELL. Does the gentleman from New York say that the gentleman from New Jersey is answering as a matter of legislative history?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I will get some time later.

Mr. GOODELL. The gentleman cannot answer it?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Yes. I will get some time.

Mr. GOODELL. The time is limited to 10 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I am really sorry for my distinguished friend from New York, who is obviously so distressed and angry, that he is also quite confused. I refer the gentleman to page 5979 of the RECORD, and I will repeat the language once again:

> Services and arrangements provided for nonpublic school students must be special

as distinguished from general educational assistance.

The decision about the best arrangement for providing special educational assistance under title I is left to the public education agency of the school district, under the constitution and laws of the State.

Thus, public school boards could make available the services of such special personnel as guidance counselors, speech therapists, remedial reading specialists, school social workers who would reach the nonpublic schoolchildren in the public schools or through public services in the nonpublic school buildings, or through mobile services, or through ETV, or through community centers, et cetera. But these special services would not be part of the regular instructional program of the nonpublic schools. Thus, nonpublic schools could not get general classroom teachers in history, English, mathematics, and social studies.

That States like New York and California which have very strict constitutional prohibitions on aid to private schools still do permit special services of the type mentioned. This legislation, therefore, respects State and local autonomy and judgment.

It should also be pointed out that shared time—instruction in the public schools under public school control—now goes on in 35 States. Thus, it already occurs with greater frequency than suggested by the gentleman from New York.

The 35 States are: Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Vermont, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

Services and arrangements provided for nonpublic school students must be special as distinguished from general educational assistance.

The decision about the best arrangement for providing special educational assistance under title I is left to the public education agency of the school district, under the Constitution and laws of the State.

Thus, public school boards could make available the services of such special personnel as guidance counselors, speech therapists, remedial reading specialists, school social workers who would reach the nonpublic schoolchildren in the public schools or through public services in the nonpublic school buildings, or through mobile services, or through ETV, or through community centers, et cetera.

Mr. GOODELL. All right.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. But these special services would not be part of the regular instructional program of the nonpublic schools.

Mr. GOODELL. All right.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Now you wanted it clear and I want to make it clear.

Mr. GOODELL. I think the gentleman made it clear. I know what he is quoting, but the gentleman has said that it is constitutional for remedial instructors on the public payroll to teach in the private schools but that for nonremedial teachers or instructors it is not constitutional.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman from New Jersey has not said what is or is not constitutional.

Mr. GOODELL. This act will permit a remedial teacher to go into the private schools but not the nonremedial teacher.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. That language was printed with some error the day before yesterday, but was corrected yesterday and made explicit.

Mr. GOODELL. I understand.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. And it has unanimous agreement, so far as I know, of everyone on this side, including the chairman of the full committee and the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. GOODELL. Will the gentleman agree that the editorial in the great Washington Post this morning was wrong?

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. In my judgment it was wrong factually, but I think also that your interpretation of it, as you have recited it here, is wrong. For instance, the gentleman said the editorial said that the language was nonsense. That is not what they said. They said the unhappy misunderstanding was nonsense. The error of the Washington Post was in error in its reference to the Judiciary Committee. The gentleman's error was one of interpretation.

Mr. GOODELL. I read what it said and it was in context, I believe.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. The gentleman reads the Washington Post, but the Washington Post is not writing the legislative history here. We are writing the legislative history.

Mr. GOODELL. I want it understood what our legislative history is. The American people have a right to know what we here in the House of Representatives are doing.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. If the gentleman will yield further, the American people are capable, I hope, of understanding this language more quickly than you do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 92, line 20, strike out "textbooks,".

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFIN

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRIFFIN: On page 92, line 23, strike out the period at the end of the line and insert the following: "in school attendance areas serving large numbers of educationally and economically deprived children."

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a point of order against the amendment. We have not read that title yet or that section.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan is to section 201(a).

The question is on the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GRIFFIN) there were—ayes 61, noes 104.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODELL

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: on page 92, line 13: strike out everything beginning on line 13, page 92, through line 3 on page 101, and renumber titles III, IV, V and VI as titles II, III, IV and V respectively.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CLEVELAND. May I have an explanation of the amendment just read? Is there any way I can have it explained?

The CHAIRMAN. All debate has been closed, by order of the Committee, on this section.

Mr. CLEVELAND. No matter what the amendment is, all debate is closed off?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must be aware of the rules with respect to this.

Mr. CLEVELAND. May I have the amendment read again?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

Mr. MULTER and Mr. ROOSEVELT objected.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The amendment may be read again only by unanimous consent.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Allotment to States

SEC. 202. (a) From the sums appropriated for carrying out this title for any fiscal year, the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine and shall allot such amount among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this title. From the remainder of such sums, the Commissioner shall allot to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the number of children enrolled in the public and private elementary and secondary schools of that State bears to the total number of children enrolled in such schools in all of the States. The number of children so enrolled shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him. For purposes of this subsection, the term "State" shall not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(b) The amount of any State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for such fiscal year shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates during such year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the original allotments to such States under subsection (a) for that year but with such proportionate amount for any of such other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates such State needs and will be able to use for such year; and the total of such reductions shall be similarly reallotted among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reallotted to a State under this subsection during a year from funds appropriated pursuant to section 201 shall be deemed part of its allotment under section (a) for such year.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section of this title and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I object to such a request.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman made a motion.

The motion is not in order until there has been debate on the section.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I come from Minnesota. I did not know how minorities were treated while I was there.

I understand full well what the Negro goes through as a minority now that I am in the Congress. The Republican minority today and yesterday is just as dead in its effort to maintain its rights to present its views on this legislation as is Pastor Reeb, with whom I graduated in 1950 from St. Olaf College, or the lady who lost her life last night.

In fact, if this attitude continues, where the minority is denied its rights to present its views on legislation here in the House, representative government is as dead in America as those two fine Americans who recently gave their lives.

Now, one minority is no more important than another. This country functions well when minorities are given their rights. You do not have to look at us on the Republican side. We perhaps should take care of ourselves, according to you in the majority, but I would just like to point to the gentlewoman from Oregon. The gentlewoman from Oregon has shown more courage in this body than any one of us here. I can say to my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, that this is the kind of courage that our country expects in its elected Representatives—the courage to stand up on the most controversial issue we have ever known, the church-state issue. I say that the House today is shirking its duties, as it did in the last 2 days, by trying to hide and fuzz the really close constitutional question we have here—the decision of national policy of how children who attend nonpublic schools can be assisted. The minority is denied the right to pursue its ideas, to lay out the issues clearly so that the American people might know what this legislation does, because this House is afraid that some people of the religious faiths that send their children to parochial schools are going to defeat them in the next election.

Now, we have a responsibility for the American people to know, no matter what happens to us in the next election, what this legislation says. We have some other questions in this legislation that everybody on both sides has talked about for a long time; that is, the Federal Government's influence in education. This is a controversial and more dangerous question than the church-state issue. When the gentlewoman from Oregon and a number of other members of our subcommittee and I were in Russia, one of the things which stood out was the standardization of their education system. I remember they said they had changed their elementary and secondary school system. They put one person in charge in each republic because out of Moscow they had standardized it so much that their local schools had not represented fully the intricate differences in each republic. One of the great aspects of schools in America is our diversity of education, so you have different education in Minnesota, New York, California, and Mississippi. Out of that we have people who are educated differently but yet have the greatest education system known any place in the world; also we permit the free right of people to send their children to nonpublic schools if they so desire. But if this legislation has the possibility of direction over private schools, then everyone who is interested in the private schools ought to look at it very closely and seriously lest they lose this right of freedom they have, because many of the new ideas and innovations we have seen in education come from private schools and are a part of the public schools today. These schools must be treated fairly. So it is important that we permit our people in the local communities to make their decisions through their local educational agencies and State agencies rather than to permit what I believe will be undue governmental influence over them.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this title and all amendments thereto close now.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Oregon will state it.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that there was a motion offered on ordering the previous question and there was no vote taken. Therefore, I rise to strike out the requisite number of words on the motion made, on which there was no vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentlewoman please restate her request.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, a motion was made by the chairman of the full committee, on which no vote was taken. I rise in opposition to that motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that motion was held not in order at that time because no debate had been had on that section. Such a motion is not in order until debate is had.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, then I rise in opposition to this motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] withdraw his motion?

Mr. POWELL. I do not, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I understand the chairman of the full committee to move that debate on title II be cut off at this time. Was that the motion by the gentleman from New York?

The CHAIRMAN. The motion, as the Chair understood it, was that all debate on section 202 of title II close.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Mississippi rise?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, do I understand the ruling of the Chair to be that a motion to close debate is not debatable?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. That is a new one on me.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentlewoman withhold that until the pending motion before the Committee is acted on?

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I am offering a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will advise the gentlewoman that a preferential motion is before the Committee. A motion to close debate is also a preferential motion.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York that all debate on section 202 of title II close now.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Gerald R. Ford) there were—ayes 97, noes 92.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Perkins and Mr. Goodell.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 156, noes 97.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I offer a motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Green of Oregon moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Oregon, who just received a great ovation, be allowed 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. On this particular motion debate is limited to two 5-minute speeches, one for and one against.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentlewoman from Oregon yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. By unanimous consent can the Committee take such action?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has a duty to protect the proceedings of the Committee, and its precedents and practices, and the Chair desires to make clear he will protect the procedures of the House.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. As I understand, the Chairman objected?

The CHAIRMAN. No; but the Chair is required by the precedents and practices of the House to protect the procedures of the House.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Under unanimous consent I believe the Committee can proceed?

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee can do at all times anything it wishes by unanimous consent that is not inconsistent with the rules of the House. The Chair is only trying to protect the procedures and practices of the House.

This is all coming out of the gentlewoman's time.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I did not yield, so I am sorry it is taken out of my limited 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I have been a Democrat all of my life, and one reason I have been proud to be a Democrat is because we have believed in protecting the rights of the minority. I have never interpreted the Democratic platform or the statements we have made that this applies only to ethnic groups; that we are only interested in protecting the rights of Negroes or any other minority. There was a man long ago who said "I may disagree with what you say, but I will defend to death your right to say it."

Today it seems to me we have in the House a determined effort to silence those who are in disagreement.

A statement was made a moment ago by one of my colleagues, with whom I have been on the same side in many legislative battles. He said that all the members of the committee on this side agree that there is no possibility of a church-state issue. There is serious question about the church-state issue. As a Democrat I do not undertand why we, as the majority party, are afraid to have this discussed. I wish that for once we could have a Supreme Court decision on whether such aid is constitutional or is not.

I would call your attention to the Congressional Record of yesterday, beginning on page 5988, a list of all of the organizations that have asked for a judicial review, because they believe that there are serious constitutional questions. I invite your attention to that. One starts out from the Lutheran Church:

> It would be improper for anyone in Congress to say that all protestant forces have endorsed the education bill.

I do not think the provisions have been made clear as to what this bill says. Let me call attention to certain statements. First of all, may I call your attention to page 5743, a statement made by the chairman of the subcommittee, one of the architects of the bill. On page 5743 this gentleman says:

> Mr. Perkins. Let me answer that question. They cannot send a public school teacher into a private school. That is not the intent of the bill.

Then if you will turn over to page 5746, the same gentleman says:

> It is the intent here not to put teachers in private schools although they may, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. Carey] mentioned, be for such special services as guidance and counseling.

Then I must conclude this first statement is in error.

The gentleman from New York also made his position equally clear because on page 5744 Mr. Carey had a new definition of a teacher. I have taught for many years, and I have never heard this definition:

> A teacher would be one engaged in general instruction in the complete curriculum.

This is at variance with all I have understood.

On page 5747 the gentleman was asked if there were teachers who could go into private schools, and he gave this interesting answer:

> The private school is an entity. We do not plan to put teachers in the private schools, but we do intend to put teachers where the children who need the instruction are. That might be in a YMCA or in a local museum. That is a private institution, by the way.
>
> Mr. Goodell. Does the gentleman say that the private-school children are not in the private school?
>
> Mr. Carey. They might be in a building.
>
> Mr. Goodell. Can the teachers teach in the private school?
>
> Mr. Carey. They might be in the building where the private school gives instruction.
>
> Mr. Goodell. Can we provide, under this bill, a public school teacher in a private school? That is what I want to know.
>
> Mr. Carey. Will the gentleman tell me how we can reach the children in the private school as students who need instruction if we do not teach them somewhere?

Then on pages 5747 and 5748 we find this exchange:

> Mr. Goodell. I would like to ask again of the gentleman from Kentucky or the gentleman from New York—and I am sure the gentleman from New York is disagreeing with you on the effects of this—this question: If the public school officials with Federal money wish to put a public school teacher in a private school to teach any subject, I would like to have a clear legislative history as to whether it is permitted in this bill.
>
> Mr. Carey. If the gentleman phrases his question "any subject," the answer would be "No," because that would include all subjects.
>
> Mr. Goodell. What subjects then would be permitted?
>
> Mr. Carey. "Special" is the key word. The gentleman knows that the word "special" is in the bill. These are special instructional services. Those that are special are not general. We do avoid the whole question. We do not intend to go into the question what would be general instruction because we do not find it in this bill. What is special would be determined by pedagogy.
>
> Mr. Goodell. What is the answer to the question of special educational services? What instruction would that be? Would that include the services of a music teacher?
>
> Mr. Carey. I would say a music teacher, yes, where that would be a definite need, but that would be provided for in the local educational agency.
>
> Mr. Goodell. Does it include a speech therapist?
>
> Mr. Carey. I should think so, but I am not making the judgment for the local public educational agencies.
>
> Mr. Goodell. Would it include a teacher of remedial reading?
>
> Mr. Carey. I should think remedial reading would be a subject that would be included.
>
> Mr. Goodell. So the gentleman from New York is of the opinion that public school teachers may teach on private school premises; is that right?
>
> Mr. Carey. I must answer the question with a question. Who else would provide the service if he did not?
>
> Mr. Goodell. Then the gentleman's answer is "Yes." I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky if that is his answer, just as a matter of getting the legislative history.
>
> Mr. Perkins. The gentleman has answered the question very clearly.
>
> Mr. Goodell. Then the answer is "Yes"?
>
> Mr. Perkins. My answer is "No" as to providing any teaching services to a private institution. The key here is the extension of special educational services to deprived children under public auspices.

I think the gentleman from New York very persuasively pointed out the need for a judicial review when he said yesday:

> Now we are in a peculiar position as a great legislative body, saying in effect it is constitutional to have remedial teachers—public-school teachers of remedial subjects teaching in private schools, but that it is unconstitutional to have nonremedial public-school teachers to teach in private schools. Now I ask you? Is this a fair constitutional distinction? Do you draw a constitutional line between remedial and nonremedial public-school teachers? They are both education teachers. They even have gone so far as to imply that they are drawing the line between remedial reading teachers and remedial mathematics teachers or some other kind of remedial teachers. They may well include all remedial teachers.
>
> I believe we should be writing a bill to truly help the private-school pupils as well as the public-school pupils. But I tell the Members that this kind of provision is very questionable. As surely as I am standing here in the well, no competent constitutional authority is going to draw the line constitutionally for public-school teachers going into private schools as to whether they are remedial teachers or nonremedial teachers of educational subjects.
>
> My friends, this is befogged—intentionally, I fear, befogged—because the advocates of this bill do not wish to be specific about what can happen. So long as it is general and vague they can keep the support of all parties, those deeply troubled on one side and those deeply troubled on the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Oregon has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

Mr. Chairman, I was sorry to see the filibuster that was started here today, because it consumed much time that could have been profitably taken up in useful debate.

I am outraged at the misinformation that is being put out to selective groups from what source I do not know concerning the most important piece of legislation coming before this House in many Congresses.

I respectfully refer to the communication that I received by wire this morning which states in part as follows:

> Titles I through IV of the education bill violate church-state separation in giving tax funds to religious schools and create divisiveness in America.

This statement is completely false as every Member in this Chamber today knows. All of the funds in title I through title III in the bill will go directly to local public school agencies or to State public educational agencies and the provisions of title IV simply involve improvements to the existing cooperative research act.

Mr. Chairman, as I stated, I regret to see this situation but I think we should proceed here diligently and vote down this motion.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PERKINS. I yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think a statement should be made by me to clarify some of the misunderstanding that has been unnecessarily created. We adjourned on Wednesday night at 6 o'clock. That was done at the request of the Republican leadership. We adjourned last night at 6:30 o'clock p.m. He spoke to me and I was glad to adjourn at that hour. I try to have an understanding mind, but I think the principle of understanding minds is a two-way street.

So far as the question of arbitrary action is concerned, I do not want to charge anybody with trying to force something down on me, but I am aware of the fact that some kind of implied intimidation is being made and I do not like it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. Green].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. There can be no further debate until the next section is read.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

State plans

Sec. 203. (a) Any State which desires to receive grants under this title shall submit to the Commissioner a State plan, in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary, which—

(1) designates a State agency which shall, either directly or through arrangements with other State or local public agencies, act as the sole agency for administration of the State plan;

(2) sets forth a program under which funds paid to the State from its allotment under section 202 will be expended solely for (A) acquisition of library resources (which for the purposes of this title means books, periodicals, documents, audio-visual materials, and other related library materials), textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools in the State, and (B) administration of the State plan, including the development and revision of standards relating to library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials furnished for the use of children and teachers in the public elementary and secondary schools of the State, except that the amount used for administration of the State plan shall not exceed for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, an amount equal to 5 per centum of the amount paid to the State under this title for that year, and for any fiscal year thereafter an amount equal to 3 per centum of the amount paid to the State under this title for that year;

(3) sets forth the criteria to be used in allocating library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials provided under this title among the children and teachers of the State, which criteria shall—

(A) take into consideration the relative need of the children and teachers of the State for such library resources, textbooks, or other instructional materials, and

(B) provide assurance that to the extent consistent with law such library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials will be provided on an equitable basis for the use of children and teachers in private elementary and secondary schools in the State which comply with the compulsory attendance laws of the State or are otherwise recognized by it through some procedure customarily used in the State;

(4) sets forth the criteria to be used in selecting the library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials to be provided under this title and for determining the proportions of the State's allotment for each fiscal year which will be expended for library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials, respectively, and the terms by which such library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials will be made available for the use of children and teachers in the schools of the State;

(5) sets forth policies and procedures designed to assure that Federal funds made available under this title for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of State, local, and private school funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials, and in no case supplant such State, local, and private school funds;

(6) sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including any such funds paid by the State to any other public agency) under this title; and

(7) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) The Commissioner shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York, the chairman of the committee, rise?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on section 203 of title II——

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman will permit, the Chair will advise the chairman of the committee that motion is not in order until there is debate on the section.

For what purpose does the gentleman from New York, a member of the committee, rise?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to consume 5 minutes myself, but I wish to say, in response to what our great and distinguished Speaker said, I do not understand the reason for this unseemly haste at this point. We were told we would have a fair opportunity to debate this bill and to offer amendments. As all of us know, we had about nine amendments to the most crucial section of the bill, title I, last night, and we could not speak either for or against them under the limitations of time.

Today, when we came in, we were told the bill would be finished at 4 o'clock. There was an ultimatum or deadline—"That's final. Take it or leave it."

There is not much power available to a minority, especially a minority as minor as we are in numbers. Our only power is to protest in any way we can and to try to appeal to the American people with respect to the unfairness of this situation, which will not permit adequate deliberation on the most important piece of legislation to come before this Congress.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. If I may, I should like to continue the statement of a moment ago, as to why I believe it is necessary to let this House know what is actually in the bill. I believe there are Members here who do not know.

I agree with some who have spoken before, that there are parts of the report which are actually misleading. This is the only reason I am asking for a fair amount of debate in the House of Representatives of the United States, which is supposedly the greatest deliberative body in the world.

This church-state issue is not something we can brush aside. We may think that by avoiding the debate today we can eliminate the controversy. We cannot eliminate the controversy, but we may transfer that controversy to every community and every hamlet in this country, because this will give the local educational authority great leeway in providing any of the program, projects, or services listed on page 6 or 7 of the report. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. William D. Ford], a very ardent supporter of this bill, said this both on the floor in a private conversation yesterday afternoon and in a caucus of the Democratic members of the committee. He said that there was nothing listed on page 6 or 7 that could not be provided in the private schools or in the public schools or any place under the canopy of heaven with the Federal tax dollars.

This Education Committee, in my judgment, has not made clear to the Members of the House what is in this bill. There have been all kinds of contradictions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I said before, this question of church-state cannot be eliminated and every one of us—if we transfer it to the local educational agency—is going to be involved in it, because since there is no limitation in the bill on how the funds can be spent for the construction of facilities and the hiring of teachers with public funds and placing them in private schools, then there is no limitation on the pressures which can be brought to bear upon the local educational agency. We may very well see the appointment or election of school board members on the basis—not of their qualifications—but on whether they are Catholic, Protestant, or Jew—or a member of the John Birch Society or a follower of Billie James Hargis. These groups may also set up their own private elementary school system with Federal funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the chairman suspend for a minute?

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state his preferential motion?

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. That the Committee rise and strike out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have to advise the gentleman from Alabama that that motion will not be in order again until substantial change is made in the bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate and all amendments to section 203 close in 5 minutes, with one-half of the time reserved to the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman of the committee moves that all debate and all amendments——

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HARDY. He is moving that he is going to have half of the time. Is that a proper motion? I had understood it was not. I believe it can be done by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the chairman of the committee please restate his motion?

Mr. HARDY. I understood the motion.

Mr. POWELL. I withdraw the previous motion. I move all debate and all amendments on this title and this section close in 10 minutes.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the original motion be read.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I want to know whether or not it takes unanimous consent to withdraw the motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to withdraw the motion.

Mr. POWELL. That is right. I withdraw it. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw it.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire a vote on his original motion?

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair state the motion as originally made?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. At the time that the gentleman from New York made the motion his voice was inaudible. I strongly feel that the motion that he made should be reread and read loud.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will attempt to state how he understood it. It may be in error.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the reporter read what the Chairman said so we can all hear it. It would be very helpful.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan, the distinguished minority leader, is putting the Chair in the same position he had him in a little while ago. This goes straight, head on, into all of the practices and procedures of the House to have the reporter rereport a motion.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the motion as the Chair understood it. The Chair will say frankly the Chair had a little difficulty hearing it, but my understanding of the motion was that the chairman of the committee moved that all debate and all amendments to section 203 be closed in 5 minutes.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. And time was reserved for the chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not hear that.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOSMER. In the event that the motion is carried, if put, would the motion carried be that which was actually made by the gentleman from New York, or according to the record as reported, or would it be the motion as stated by the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The motion will be as stated by the Chair, as was the case yesterday and is the case today.

The motion is that all debate on this section close in 5 minutes.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that in his opinion the "ayes" had it.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. GERALD R. FORD and Mr. PERKINS.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 149, noes 126.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HARDY] for approximately 1 minute.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, today I am not proud of the performance of this body. I have served here for approximately 19 years, and I have been real proud of most of the operations that we performed during that time.

I do not think we have ever had a bill that is more important. Perhaps we will never have one more important than the bill we have before us today.

There are two major issues here, and certainly there is no legislation that needs more detailed discussion, more comprehensive debate, than the question of church-state relations and the question of centralized control of the education of all the youth of our country. Concentration in Washington of control over all the education machinery could be dangerous to the very fabric of our government. We must guard against this.

I had not intended to say a word about this measure. I did want to listen, and I wanted to learn, and my purpose in taking the floor is to say that if it takes us all of next week to dispose of this legislation it might be time well spent. We ought not to rush through this bill. It is far too important and too far reaching.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD) the time allotted him was given to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 95, lines 5, 10, and 21, and on page 96, lines 2, 5, 14, 17–18, and 20, and on page 97, line 4, strike out the word "textbooks".

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment because this is the one part of title II I disagree with. The library services provision I think is a good feature in this title. We have helped libraries in other bills in the past. The Congress has established itself as a supporter of library services. This will assist the library services in the schools and for all.

As you know, this title is not limited to educationally deprived children. With textbooks I think we are treading on dangerous ground. Textbooks are available for public and private school children. For public schools I say it is danerous because it is one step from the Federal Government deciding what shall be in those textbooks.

I say that for this reason: Today the Federal Government is providing research in curriculum. Four grants were made, one each to Oregon, Wisconsin, Pittsburgh, and Harvard Universities for research in curriculum and textbook writing. Last year the National Defense Education Act amendments provided for institutes not only for science and modern foreign languages and math but also other subjects. So we have the Federal Government financing research and training of teachers, and now with this bill it will finance textbooks, this will put the Federal Government one step away from Federal control able to take that step anytime such steamroller tactics again take place.

Now as far as the private schools are concerned, the bill provides that the local public education agency can make the decision as to which textbooks shall be available, and private school children will have only these available to them. They will not be able to make the decision. The private school will have to receive the textbooks as determined by the public agency. You can therefore see the danger we are getting into if Federal influence becomes a serious problem.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I am shocked to hear the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE] make the suggestion that there is anything in this bill that would limit the freedom of choice of the public schools in the textbooks that would be provided by these funds. He knows very well as a member of the committee that there will be a list prepared by the local public school agency of books available under this title. No school or no student is obligated under any circumstances to take advantage of the textbooks made available. The practice will not vary from the plan and methods now used throughout the country in those States that do furnish textbooks.

I would like to state further that it has been the intention of this legislation from the beginning to include textbooks and that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], would not have been necessary in the original draft, but we added textbooks so there should be no question in anyone's mind that we intended the definition of library resources to include textbooks—for children, not schools or institutions—without regard to the place of school attendance of those children choosing to use such textbooks.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFIN

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GRIFFIN: On page 96, line 1, insert "educationally and economically deprived" before "children" and strike out the words "and teachers."

On page 96, after line 12 insert the following:

"(C) provide assurance that library resources, textbooks, or other instructional materials shall be made available in school attendance areas having a high concentration of educationally and economically deprived children."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GRIFFIN), there were—ayes 65, noes 133.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Payments to States

SEC. 204. (a) From the amounts allotted to each State under section 202 the Commissioner shall pay to that State an amount equal to the amount expended by the State in carrying out its State plan. Such payments may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

(b) In any State which has a State plan approved under section 203(b) and in which no State agency is authorized by law to provide library resources, textbooks, or other printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in any one or more elementary or secondary schools in such State, the Commissioner shall arrange for the provision on an equitable basis of such library resources, textbooks, or other instructional materials for such use and shall pay the cost thereof for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1970, out of that State's allotment.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the preferential motion?

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. It is to strike out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may state to the gentleman that until there has been substantial change made in the bill that motion is not in order.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as one privileged to be a former public school teacher, I have a feeling that if the schoolchildren in America today, whether they are deprived or not deprived, could witness this performance by the Representatives chosen by their parents to represent them in this high seat of government that a near unanimous conclusion would be reached by them, that we are the ones who need the help and not them.

This bill reported out of committee some 10 days or 2 weeks ago after considerable hearings and discussions by able members of the House Committee on Education and Labor, of which I was formerly a member, has been available to all of the membership for study. I have in my limited way tried to take advantage of the time that has elapsed since the bill was reported to make a study of it. Not only because I wanted to know what was in the bill and to see if we are really doing what I think ought to be done but because I believe that along with most other Americans we, regardless of our feeling on specific issues and details of this bill, know that the time now confronts us when something must be done to improve our support of education in our elementary and secondary schools.

It is not a comfortable feeling to have as your guests in this Capitol two distinguished young ladies from one of the great women's colleges in America and have them ask you while you are dining with them, "What is the matter? Why are you afraid of us?" Now I ask, Why are we unwilling to do as Webster tells us day after day when we look at the etching on this piece of granite over the Speaker's chair? Why are we unwilling to call forth the power of this Nation, its resources, both human and natural, to help our young people meet the educational needs and challenges of 1965?

The first taxes levied in this country upon the citizens for public education was to give religious instruction.

The whole fabric of our Government is based on education.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. LANDRUM. Now we come to this question of the establishment of religion in the first amendment to the Constitution. Justice Black, I think, in the Everson case hit it head on when he talked about what is this business of establishment of religion. Let me quote him please. He said:

> Neither a State nor the Federal Government can set up a church. Neither can pass laws which aid one religion, aid all religions, or prefer one religion over another. Neither can force nor influence a person to go to or remain away from church against his will or force him to profess a belief or disbelief in any religion. No person can be punished for entertaining or professing religious beliefs or disbeliefs, for church attendance or nonattendance. No tax in any amount, large or small, can be levied to support any religious activities or institutions, whatever they may be called, or whatever form they may adopt to teach or practice religion. Neither a State nor the Federal Government can, openly or secretly, participate in the affairs of any religious organizations or groups and vice versa. (U.S. 330, *Everson* v. *Board of Education,* 1 (at p. 15).)

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to clarify, for the distinguished gentleman in the well of the House, the reason I objected before. I am very sorry.

Mr. LANDRUM. If the gentleman from New York will yield to me, I need no clarification. I have the utmost of respect and the highest regard for the gentleman and his sincerity of purpose, ability, and I take not the slightest offense.

Mr. GOODELL. I appreciate the gentleman's feelings, and wish to reciprocate.

My problem is that we have been given advice that we are trying to finish by 4 o'clock. We have a flock of amendments here which I fear may not be discussed.

Mr. LANDRUM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, the words of Justice Black are found in 330 United States Reports, Everson against Board of Education, page I at pages 15 and 16.

I have studied to the very limit of my capacity H.R. 2362, and I cannot find any word or line anywhere in it which establishes a religion. No church is being set up by this bill. No religion is being aided. No one would be forced to attend a church or to profess a belief or disbelief of any kind. Nor would the Federal Government participate in the affairs of a religious organization.

Those parts of this legislation which provide materials or services to children in attendance at nonpublic schools are plainly and unequivocally for the benefit of children and not for a particular school or church.

Let us see what the bill does do, as opposed to what it does not do. The Federal Government would help local school districts give special services to the poor children in those districts and as a result thereof, mind you, help also all of the other children, and the taxpayers, the fathers and mothers of those other children. The States would have to provide textbooks to students who need assistance at the schools, and the local public school officials would decide which books would be bought. Everybody would be benefited.

Let us grant to those who have expressed some fears that perhaps on the local level there could be some difference in the way the bill is administered in one section of the country as opposed to another. But, mind you, at no time and by no means under this bill can we be charged with violating our constitutional oath to support the first amendment to the Constitution. We are not here authorizing the appropriation for, nor will we later appropriate funds for, the establishment of a religion. We will here authorize and we will later appropriate funds for the further expansion of a public educational program which will benefit all of the children of America; and, by benefiting them, thusly, we will come to the day when no Member of this House—and let us hope no citizen of this Nation—can have reason to deplore tragic and ill-advised circumstances occurring in our land today.

Voting laws and civil rights laws are not the answer here. The answer is in educating all of the people—the young and the old, the believers and the unbelievers—to the real assets and strengths of a great democratic society.

So let us get this debate back on the track. I heard someone say yesterday something about stampedes. Let us not stampede anything. Let us calm down as representatives of the American people and provide here, as we know we must provide, for the future education of the young men and young women of America. And do not be concerned about the power of the Federal Government to do something in contravention of local customs and State customs. The authority to do such as that is no more in this bill than it is already in the law.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, are there any amendments at the desk to this section?

The CHAIRMAN. Does anyone desire to offer any amendments to this section?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. What section are we on?

The CHAIRMAN. This is section 204.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the House of Representatives will be reshaping America if the bill before us today is passed. The bill will drastically change the institutions that are America.

Like my very distinguished and beloved friend, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM], who preceded me in the well, many Members of this House will vote for this bill with the conviction that they are doing a great service for the country. I should like to make the point and caution, however, that many who vote for this bill today may well regret their vote after this act goes into operation.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that the children who attend private and parochial schools in this Nation need assistance. There are ways that we can and should help them—ways that would provide more significant assistance than is available in this bill, without raising constitutional questions and without stirring controversy in our communities.

I am not so much concerned with the constitutionality of the provisions of this bill—at least, with respect to the first amendment: If she indicated that this bill violates the first amendment, I disagree with the gentlewoman from Oregon. However, I believe that the provisions of title I of this bill which do provide for assistance to students of private and parochial schools are poorly drafted; they are too vague and indefinite. As a matter of policy it is especially important that these provisions should be clear and certain.

I regret to say it, but someone today should put the Members on notice. You are about to vote for a bill which, in its present form, is likely to ignite a civil war in almost every community of this Nation. Let me explain why that is so.

If you have a copy of the bill before you, look at section 205(a)(2). You will note that a local public educational agency which submits an application for aid under this bill can qualify only if it is determined that "to the extent consistent with the number of educationally deprived children in the school district of the local educational agency who are enrolled in private elementary and secondary schools, such agency has made provision for including special educational services and arrangements (such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, and mobile educational services and equipment) in which such children can participate."

It is important to note that there is no clear or precise definition of what "services and arrangements" means. The only clue provided by the bill is that the services and arrangements should be "special" services and arrangements, such as dual enrollment, educational radio and television, and mobile educational services and equipment, in which children attending private schools can participate.

If the meaning and scope of this language were clear and definite, it is doubtful that any serious question of constitutionality could be raised. As the language now stands, however, it will stir controversy, and it will invite applications of the law which may exceed constitutional bounds.

What does the language, to which I have referred, mean? Quite understandably, the parents of children in the private and parochial schools in each community, which is eligible for aid under this bill, will make a determined effort to obtain as much assistance as possible for the benefit of their children.

How much assistance, and exactly what kind of assistance, can be provided under this bill by a local public school agency for children who attend the private and parochial schools?

It is clear that the local public educational agency cannot qualify for aid unless it does provide "special" services and arrangements in which private and parochial school children can participate. But the language of the bill is so vague and indefinite that the nature and extent of that aid is necessarily left to negotiation at the local level between public and parochial school officials. Provisions made for such aid to children of private and parochial schools must be approved by the State educational agency "consistent with such basic criteria as the Commissioner of Education may establish."

It must be apparent that the vague and indefinite language in this bill on so crucial a point is an invitation to civil war in nearly every community of this Nation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] has expired.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have permission to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I shall be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York if he will permit me to continue for a few more minutes.

Mr. CAREY. Within the 5 minutes?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The children of private and parochial schools may, or they may not, get very much assistance under this bill. It appears to me that the amount and kind of such assistance will probably vary from community to community, depending upon the religious complexion and the power structure in the various communities; and depending also on what the Commissioner of Education may consider to be compliance with the provisions in this bill to which I have pointed.

Frankly, I would not want to be the Commissioner of Education with the job of administering a law with language that is so vague and pregnant with controversy. This bill will place the Commissioner of Education in that unfortunate position.

Obviously, there are ways that the Federal Government could, and should, assist those children who attend private and parochial schools. Congress could do it through the Ayres-Goodell-Curtis bill which would treat all school children equally, and which would not raise the difficult and divisive problems to which I have alluded. Congress could provide such aid through a system of tax credits, or through a junior GI bill of rights that would return Federal funds to be applied toward tuition and expenses in schools. Such an approach would avoid constitutional questions and, most importantly, it would provide equality of treatment and preserve educational freedom.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Based upon what the gentleman has said, does the gentleman think it is conceivable that if this bill passes, candidates may run for local boards of education or for the position of superintendent of public instruction on the basis of the type of arrangements or services or assistance they might be willing, or unwilling, to make or offer to private educational institutions?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I do foresee not only the problem described by my colleague from Illinois, but I can foresee other very disturbing problems as well. In some States this bill may precipitate efforts to amend State constitutions to prevent aid from going to private parochial schools. In other States, understandably, this bill will spark determined efforts to remove existing State constitutional provisions which now restrict or preclude aid to private and parochial schools.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I want to take this time merely to point out that the language which the gentleman has quoted is not contained in title II of the bill but is contained in title I of the bill. We have proceeded past title I, but since the gentleman has——

Mr. GRIFFIN. Yes, and I am sorry that we did not have sufficient time in which to debate it.

Mr. CAREY. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman pointed out that the administration of the bill will cause great concern at the local level among educators in the administration of this title.

I should like to quote to the gentleman and to the members of the Committee a long-distance telephone call which I received at 11:45 a. m. today from Mr. Frank Stevens, supervisor of school libraries of the New York State Department of Education. He informed me that he is working on several State plans for the administration of title II in New York State and is cognizant of our State constitution and that he foresees no difficulty in the administration of the title under the present language of title II of H.R. 2362.

Also, a distinguished educator from the city of Los Angeles when he was asked did he think he would have trouble in making arrangements for taking care of needy children under this title, he responded that if they could not help those children under the provisions of this bill, they did not deserve to be called educators.

Apparently, Mr. Chairman, my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], does not trust the educators of this country to administer the bill fairly and effectively and I do.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, apparently this bill is going to be passed and is going to become law. I devoutly hope and pray that the gentleman from New York is right. But I fear and I think many people know in their hearts and minds that this may not be the case.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. I believe the gentleman from Michigan is right, when he says there is no question as to the constitutionality of this bill as he did in title I in his previous colloquy.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I object to the policy of creating vague and indefinite language which will only precipitate and encourage civil war at the local community level. In many communities where they have been working out the problems for the various public and parochial schools they have been able to do that. But this is legislation which is bound to erupt into great controversy in every community.

Mr. CAREY. If the gentleman will yield further, I cannot foresee how we can have civil war in following the precepts of constitutional legislation.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. I have stated that I think these are constitutional questions. I am not a lawyer, and even if I were, there are some who think it constitutional, and others who believe it unconstitutional within the legal profession. However, there are church-state questions that are raised. I feel that the gentleman in the well has very eloquently stated them.

Mr. Chairman, I also have concern about transferring this controversy to the local community with disruptive and devisive results, and harmful to local educational programs.

The gentleman from New York has read from the statement of one individual who said he thought it could be administered very well in that area.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN] may proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Oregon.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. May I read a telegram which I have received recently? "The National School Boards Association, composed of the 17,000 local school boards responsible for educating 95 percent of the Nation's public elementary and secondary pupils would strongly support a proposal to amend H.R. 2362, to incorporate a provision for judicial review. Important concerns about separation of church and state and local controls of a strong, vigorous system of public education mandate this support."

May I add that for once and for all this Congress and the people of the United States should have a court decision and say whether it is constitutional or not.

Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's concern about the children in private schools. I want them to have the best education they can be given. My own preference would be the shared-time concept which would allow unlimited funds to go to the public-school facilities whereby any child from a private school could attend 5 mornings a week or 3 days a week and take science, foreign language, music, art, physical education, or any other classes in a public school on the basis of any arrangements worked out at the local level between private school authorities and public school agencies.

Mr. Chairman, I have three nieces and nephews that are now in parochial schools. One is a boy at the high school level which has no gymnasium in this private school and they use a nearby one on Saturdays. This is not as it should be.

I have a niece and a nephew who are in the elementary schools, one in a class of 51 children and one in a class of 48. They have no music and art courses, no foreign language, no school lunch program—none of the extra services which we provide in the public schools.

I want those children to have the same services. I think there is a way to do it that will not create problems at the local level, and that would be to limit the public funds to the public schools, but to make them wide open to any child, and all programs and services available to any children who attend the private schools.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out the National School Boards Association, the sender of the telegram just read, is an organization that has attempted to gut every school bill that has come before the Congress since I have been here. This appears to be their latest in that series of efforts.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section do now close.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. GERALD R. FORD) there were—ayes 127, noes 96.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, under the Rules of the House would it be possible or permissible to move to close debate on the whole bill until each section has been read?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the practices and precedents of the House the bill is being read by sections. A motion is in order to close debate on each section after it has been read and debated.

Mr. HALLECK. How much debate on each section is required to be had?

The CHAIRMAN. At least 5 minutes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Public control of library resources, textbooks, and other instructional material and types which may be made available

SEC. 205. (a) Title to library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials furnished pursuant to this title, and control and administration of their use, shall vest only in a public agency.

(b) The library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials made available pursuant to this title for use of children and teachers in any school in any State shall be limited to those which have been approved by an appropriate State or local educational authority or agency for use, or are used, in a public elementary or secondary school of that State.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, are there any amendments at the desk to this section?

The CHAIRMAN. No amendments have been offered.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section do now close.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against that.

Mr. POWELL. I withdraw it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the afternoon the gentlewoman from Michigan expressed profound and deep personal concern about the tragedy that occurred in Alabama last night. I want to assure her and the Members of this House that the millions of law-abiding, decent, God-fearing Alabamians share her concern, and we express the hope that the guilty party will be apprehended, prosecuted, and convicted as early as possible.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SELDEN. Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Alabama for his statement and concur with his remarks. At the same time, I want to emphasize to the Members of the House that efforts to indict the Governor and the people of Alabama for isolated instances such as the one that regrettably took place last night is as uncalled for as would be a similar indictment of the Governor or the people of the State of New York for the murder of Malcolm X.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I, too, would like to join with my colleague on the other side of the aisle in expressing to the gentlewoman from Michigan our profound sorrow at the death of Mrs. Liuzzo in Alabama. To her husband and to her children go our deepest sympathy.

I, too, want to say that the vast majority of Alabamians and southerners are law-abiding people, as evidenced by the patience and the little violence that has occurred in the 9 weeks they have been under pressure from thousands of outsiders in one of the worst demonstrations any people of any State has had to endure.

The man or woman, be he from Alabama or be he from elsewhere, who pulled that trigger, committed a dastardly act. I hope with all my heart that he is swiftly brought to trial and, if found guilty, punished to the full extent of the law. Good people in Alabama, as good people anywhere, hate with all the passion that is in us the coward who, under cover of darkness, takes the life of another human being.

But I would like to remind you of the terrible experience the people of Alabama are going through. Over 25,000 people from all over this land have been gathered in our towns for 9 weeks. These are all kinds of people, good people, well-meaning people, rightwingers, leftwingers, Socialists, Communists, thugs, and some the dregs of society. There have been repeated and well-organized instances of provocation against the law enforcement officers; our duly elected State officials have been ridiculed and vilified from one end of this land to the other; our citizens have been pictured in cartoons in many newspapers as monsters, as slinking rats, and every other vile thing that could be printed. How can any little town, anywhere in America, hope to survive such an onslaught?

Some weeks ago I requested the President and Members of Congress to use the influence of their offices to bring an end to these demonstrations, pointing out that the President had promised the demonstrators their voting rights bill.

Now, I say once more, let us end this lawlessness. Remove from the streets the attempts to legislate and let us return to the American way of solving our problems in the courts and Congress, in proper procedures in legislating our laws.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, some people have pointed an accusing finger at our Governor, George Wallace. I want to assure you that no one deplores the tragedy of last night more than Governor Wallace. Governor Wallace is a law-abiding citizen. He is a Christian gentleman. I am sure he will lend the great weight of his office to see that the guilty parties are brought to justice.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section close now.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman who has just spoken, spoke out of order. Therefore, there was no debate on the bill. Therefore, I ask if it is possible to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman obtained the 5 minutes by the motion to strike out the last word. Therefore, there has been debate on this section.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Administration of State plans

SEC. 206. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any State plan submitted under this title, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State agency administering the plan reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to such State agency, finds—

(1) that the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 203(a), or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provisions,

the Commissioner shall notify such State agency that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Chairman, as a freshman Congressman of less than 3 months, I stand appalled at what I see. I have heard a great appeal today from democractic leadership condemning Republicans for lack of cooperation in this 89th Congress.

I should like to reply with a Biblical phrase, "As ye sow, so shall ye reap."

What does the Democratic Party expect of freemen when on issue after issue its will is imposed, not by merit of the issue, but by pure power politics along the party line?

What I see transpiring here day after day is the best example of the phrase—"don't bother me with facts, my mind is made up"—that I have ever seen.

May I remind the gentleman of the majority that they are not just here because of duty—they are here to do their duty, which to me means to listen, to learn, and to vote intelligently. Now, how can this be done without full opportunity for discussion?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have something to say—deaf ears or not.

This House today probably will pass the administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965—an act I consider to be totally unnecessary, tremendously extravagant, and an unwarranted intrusion by the Federal Government in the educational affairs of the 50 States.

The States can, Mr. Chairman, take care of their own needs as evidenced by the actions of the 38th session of the Idaho State Legislature which probably will conclude its work and adjourn today. It has given the most effective answer possible to the crushing centralism of the Federal Government. It has approved a budget that will not leave the community or the individual to grapple with conditions beyond their power to manage, nor will it abdicate local responsibility by inviting the Federal Government to resolve local situations from

Washington. Idaho is willing to meet and to master its own problems at home.

As proof of this, the Idaho State Legislature enacted a brandnew 3-percent sales and use tax, reduced income taxes and property levies by $25 million, passed an improved free-port law, and commenced the job of making sense out of an archaic and obsolete system of property valuation.

It increased general governmental services by nearly 35 percent and ended with the books in balance.

Mr. Chairman, the Idaho State Legislature—and this is a point I would like my colleagues to note well today—the Idaho State Legislature authorized a 42 percent increase in expenditures for public schools. Appropriations for the support of the two universities will be up 22 percent. The importance of this is that the funds will be spent as Idaho dictates, not as Big Brother in Washington feels they should be spent. Idaho will determine what curricula will be used in its schools. Idaho will determine what qualifications a teacher shall have. Idaho will determine what textbooks will be used. And, as many Members here today well know, H.R. 2362 can well lead to the ultimate determination of these matters by the Federal Government.

Idaho Gov. Robert E. Smylie said of this legislature:

> It has faced and solved more of the human problems of our people than any session in modern times and has proved to be a truly responsive instrument of public service. We don't need to worry about any growing sentiment for Federal intervention in Idaho's affairs. We are doing the job at home and we are doing it well.

I concur in Governor Smylie's statement—and I submit that this is an outstanding record for a State with a population of just 700,000, 67 percent of the area of which is owned by the U.S. Government, and which is spread over 88,000 square miles of mountains, desert and forests.

Mr. Chairman, State governments appear weak and feeble only when they fail to keep abreast of the times. A State has to operate on a pay-as-you-go basis, simply because it does not have the Federal Government's unlimited capacity for incurring debt. Where State governments are willing to keep the store and pay the bills, they are doing and will continue to do a good and satisfactory job. Facing up to problems and solving them with courage and imagination is not an exclusive attribute of the Federal Government, and where State Governors and legislatures are willing to do the job and do it right, you hear very little sentiment for coming hat in hand to Washington.

Public education is a responsibility of the State and local governments—and their financing is also a local responsibility. These responsibilities are successfully being carried out in Idaho.

To me the only possible objective of such a program is to gain centralized control of education with all its political implications.

If and when it is determined that the States are unable, by themselves, to shoulder the burden of their educational expenses, then there are other ways—far better ways—in which the Federal Government could participate. As an example, the Federal Government could return to the States a lump sum based on factors such as average daily attendance of the States schools, taxes received by the Federal Government from the citizens of the States, and educational needs of the States.

Mr. Chairman, the real effective response to the ever-increasing centralization of power in the Federal Government—power such as is gained through measures such as the one we are considering at this time—is found in records such as the record of the 38th Idaho State Legislature.

I ask that my colleagues keep this in mind when they vote today on H.R. 2362.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on all amendments to section 206 close now.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Judicial review

SEC. 207. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of its State plan submitted under section 203(a) or with his final action under section 206(b), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I shall yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON]. I do this to enable a Member who is not on the committee to have an opportunity to have 5 minutes to state his views on this section.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time because I think an inference was left in the RECORD, from the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], that those who have today and yesterday and on the day before raised the church-state issue have done so as enemies of this legislation and because they have a desire to gut the bill.

I would point out that the record before the committee shows the representative of the American Civil Liberties Union, Mr. Speiser, representing an organization that clearly said it was for Federal aid to education, had this to say about the draft of the bill we are considering today:

> At is is written the bill could authorize the most dangerous subversion of the constitutional principle of church-state separation since James Madison's famous remonstrance set the direction of American civil liberty in 1786.

Mr. Chairman, I think the late speaker of the House, Mr. Sam Rayburn, once said the most valuable phrase in the English language was, "Just a minute." It is time for this House, if it takes all day today and tomorrow and, as the gentleman from Virginia said, if it takes all next week, let us take the time to explore the ramifications of this tremendously important proposition. I read the same editorial to which reference was made earlier, which appeared in the Washington morning newspaper, where they said a provision designed to promote judicial review is desirable and ought not to be objectionable to anyone dedicated to the Constitution.

Every one in this House has taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. Are we too busy? Do we have so little time in our deliberations here that we cannot take the time to talk about the church-state principle involved in this bill? I have heard some of the greatest sophistry during the last 3 days that I have ever heard in the 5 years I have been privileged to serve in this body. We had the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] say in response to the question, "Will a teacher employed by a public educational agency go in and teach in a private school?" And you heard him answer this: "He will not go to the school. He will go to the pupil."

I would submit that if he goes to that pupil and teaches in a private school, he is going to the school. It is only the most absurd kind of legal sophistry which would impel us to any different conclusion. I would refer you to the words of the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in his well-circulated memorandum on this proposition back in 1961 when we were talking about this very thing. Here is what the legal counsel for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare said:

> One horn of the constitutional dilemma is that the State may aid a child to achieve a sound body and a sound mind. The other is that the State may not aid the religious instruction of a child. To adopt without qualification the theory that whatever benefits the child is ipso facto constitutional is to ignore the obverse proposition. It either proves too much or nothing at all.

I would submit we prove nothing at all if we stress the pupil-benefit theory, which is the theory that this legislation rests on, to the ridiculous extent it has been stressed in the argument which comprises the legislative history of this bill.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], pointed out the kind of situation that we are going to be getting into under this bill where because of the lack of clarity we find in section 205(a)(2) we are going to have people running for elective offices on school boards and State superintendents of public instruction and their platforms will be, "I am for giving the private schools that" and the other fellow will say, "No, I will see they don't get anything at all." Yet, under this bill as written you have no adequate provision for determining that question even in the courts. I submit that is the basic defect and vice of this bill. We cannot even be sure once it is passed we will be able to get a judicial determination as to what is or is not constitutional. Those of you in this House 2 years ago will remember that I raised a question on a higher education Federal-aid bill as to this point of judicial review. There were those who said do not talk about that. You are asking Congress to abdicate its constitutional responsibility to decide for itself whether or not this law is constitutional.

Ladies and gentlemen, I would point out that even a majority member of the House Committee on Education and Labor has pointed out in his views accompanying the majority report that there is a real concern over the possibility that this bill may be administered in an unconstitutional fashion in some local programs, and the truth is we do not have the means to determine whether or not that is so.

Mr. Chairman, those who raise this issue do so to protect the interests of those attending private schools. It is as much to their interest as it is to public school authorities to know precisely what benefits will be available to each under this legislation. We in the Republican Party are not opposed to equal treatment for private schools. It is for that reason that we have offered our alternative proposal which would benefit every student, in public or private schools, equally by giving the parent of that student a generous tax credit. That program has been publicly commended by the Citizens for Educational Freedom—CEF—as truly equal treatment for all American schoolchildren.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, one cannot help be impressed by the fast-talking performance of our friend who just finished. One cannot help be impressed, either, by the fact the gentleman takes out of context from an editorial, about which it was said earlier that the great Washington Post is not writing legislative history. I am going to be fascinated to watch the extent to which the distinguished gentleman follows the editorial language of that great newspaper in the future. He is in a brandnew abode now.

I might say also that the gentleman is quoting from a February 7 letter from Mr. Speiser of the ACLU and that his objections have since been met by subcommittee action.

I might suggest further you can beat this dog all you want for political purposes; you can demagog however subtly and try to scare people off at the expense of the Nation's schoolchildren with your demagoguery——

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman. I demand that those words be taken down.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Please take the words down.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has accused one of his colleagues of demagoguery.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. I was referring to a gentleman; who takes exception to that?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order: The gentleman must take his seat.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey will take his seat. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> I might suggest further you can beat this dog all you want for political purposes; you can demagog however subtly and try to scare people off at the expense of the Nation's schoolchildren with your demagoguery—

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BOLLING, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H.R. 2362 to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools, certain words used in debate were objected to and on request were taken down and read at the Clerk's desk, and he herewith reported the same to the House.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the words objected to.

The Clerk read as follows:

> I might suggest further you can beat this dog all you want for political purposes; you can demagog however subtly and try to scare people off at the expense of the Nation's schoolchildren with your demagoguery—

The SPEAKER. The Chair feels that Members in debate have reasonable flexibility in expressing their thoughts.

The Chair sees nothing about the words that contravene the rules of the House. The point of order is not sustained.

The Committee will resume its sitting.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2362) with Mr. BOLLING in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON].

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

There has been no motion to resolve the House into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union. The gentleman is out of order at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The House automatically goes back into the Committee of the Whole.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL].

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move now that all debate and amendments on section 207 be closed.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I could not hear the request of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. Well, I shall use my Baptist preacher's voice: I move that all debate on section 207 close now.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment pending at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman withhold his motion?

Mr. POWELL. I withdraw my motion.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment has apparently been lost between here and the desk. I will withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE III—SUPPLEMENTARY EDUCATIONAL CENTERS AND SERVICES

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 301. (a) The Commissioner shall carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, a program for making grants for supplementary educational centers and services, to stimulate and assist in the provision of vitally needed educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality, and to stimulate and assist in the development and establishment of exemplary elementary and secondary school educational programs to serve as models for regular school programs.

(b) For the purpose of making grants under this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $100,000,000, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the 3 succeeding fiscal years, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I have five amendments, and I ask unanimous consent that they may be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. BELL: On page 101, line 9, after "grants" insert "to State educational agencies for carrying out State plans."

Beginning on line 22, page 101, through line 22, page 103, amend section 302 by striking out the words "apportion", "apportioned", "apportionment", "reapportionment", and "reapportioned", and insert in lieu thereof "allot", "allotted", "allotment", "reallotment", and "reallotted" as may be appropriate.

On page 104, line 1, after the word "accordance" insert "with a plan submitted by the State educational agency and approved by the Commissioner, and in accordance".

On page 107, lines 1 and 3, strike out "Commissioner" and insert in lieu thereof "State educational agency";

On page 108, line 22, and on page 109, line 17, strike out "Commissioner" and insert in lieu thereof "State educational agency";

On page 110, strike out all of lines 3 and 4.

On page 110, line 10, strike out "apportioned" and insert in lieu thereof "allotted";

strike out all of line 12 and insert in lieu thereof "State which has a State plan approved"; on line 14 strike out "by the applicant under the application" and insert in lieu thereof "by the State under its approved State plan and in accordance with applications of local educational agencies".

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, these five amendments have three simple effects on title III. They require that the Commissioner actually allot $100 million to State educational agencies. No change is made in the formula and no change is made in the purposes for which these funds are to be used.

They provide the State agency submit a plan to the Commissioner which shows how they will use and distribute these funds within these States. This is exactly like almost all of our existing grants and programs, such as—vocational education and under the National Defense Education Act. The administration of this title is placed in the hands of the State educational agency, which would make funds available to local educational agencies but carry out a program of local supplemental educational services and centers.

In summary, these amendments really change this title only in one respect. The administration of the program is left to the State educational agencies subject to the approval of the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

I cannot see how any Member who honestly believes in State and local control of education can oppose this amendment. I intend to support this bill, but I am convinced it would be a far better bill if these amendments were agreed to.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that this is the one area where I think Federal control is very likely to or might possibly step in and become a serious factor. When you have supplementary schools scattered all over different States you are setting up pilot projects, among other things. It might be possible to conceive that a State could have Federal schools going. This I think is one of the most dangerous areas of the bill, in which Federal control may become a serious factor, and that is in just this title. I think we should look at it very carefully and analyze it very carefully.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I will ask the gentleman if it is not true that the administration of this particular title—title III—will follow the pattern of 874. The State educational agency there cannot control any act of the Commissioner, for the payment is made directly to the local school district. Am I correct?

Mr. BELL. We do not follow the same pattern as the impacted area legislation. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, from the standpoint of administration.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I want to commend the gentleman for offering the amendment. It improves the bill.

The answer to the gentleman's question is "Yes." You have a different kind of program here than in the old impacted area program. There are a number of conditions that can be imposed by the Commissioner of Education. The Commissioner of Education can go directly to the local agency, bypassing the State completely. When amendments were offered to try to make these Federal-local provisions conform to State law or State educational policy they were turned down. They were turned down because of the precise purpose they wanted to accomplish, to bypass the State completely. They wanted to go in where the State was not, in their opinion, doing the job and do the job themselves. I think the gentleman's amendment goes right to the heart of one of the important problems in this bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BELL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. POWELL. I commend the gentleman for his consistent support of this legislation. I assure the gentleman that his amendment will be given due consideration when this is adopted and we commence hearings on the next bill.

Mr. GOODELL. What a fine commentary on the legislative process, that we are going to start hearings immediately on another bill to correct the mistakes we make here.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this bill, and I want to give credit to the excellent work of the minority members of the Education and Labor Committee who have worked to show the House and the Nation the problems inherent in this legislation.

The heart of the issue we are discussing in this bill is the matter of Federal control over elementary and secondary education. I believe it is time we give this question the attention it deserves. If we intend to undertake a major departure from our present system of local and State operation of public school programs and give the Federal Government a controlling hand, then let us acknowledge this and have it understood by the country.

But if we are to proceed with this legislation merely under the impression that we are helping deprived children have access to education, and are doing so without attention to the question of Federal control, then I recommend we take a second look.

It is curious that some of the well-intentioned people around the country who are most concerned with things like academic freedom and censorship of reading materials, and freedom of expression, are in many cases the very same people who want us to rush into a program like this imposing the Federal Government into public education.

It is ironic that those of us in Government who seem most concerned with the problem of expanding Federal authority have the least encouragement, indeed the most vigorous opposition, from those who express a fear of the intrusion of an authoritarian central government into freedom of speech and civil liberties.

The minority has pointed out that the choice we have in this proposal today is between public education controlled at the local and State level and the establishment of a public education system financed and administered by a Federal agency.

The majority membership of the Education and Labor Committee during committee consideration of the bill even rejected an amendment to require that the new program be administered in accordance with State law.

Mr. Chairman, if we pass this bill we shall have clearly abandoned the concept of State responsibility for public education.

I am reminded of the remarks of a national newspaper columnist who wrote just yesterday in another connection about a conversation he had with a prominent German professor after the downfall of Hitler.

The professor was asked how it happened that he and his colleagues in education had allowed Hitler to come to office and expand his power at the expense of representative government. The professor said:

> We were indifferent, and did not sense what was coming. We were much too concerned with our own affairs. We in the educational world were preoccupied with our own pursuits. We took it for granted that everything being done was for a worthy objective. We didn't realize what we were getting into until it was too late.

Mr. Chairman, the cost of this bill is estimated to be approximately $1 billion for the first year. Presumably the cost will increase in subsequent years. This is a cost which is no doubt worthwhile from the standpoint of the need for this country to have a first quality public education system in those areas which may not be able to otherwise provide it.

But we all know the inefficiency, the loss of dollar value, which results when taxpayers send their money to Washington where the bureaucrats then send it back according to their own system.

Accordingly, to achieve both objectives of local control of our public education, and maximum dollar efficiency, I urge that we defeat this bill today and proceed to reduce taxes by $1 billion, thus making this money available for State taxes. Today, Federal taxes are almost confiscatory. It is no wonder some States are unwilling to increase their own taxes. One billion dollars equals about $85 per taxpayer. Just think what each State could do for education with this money brought in through its own taxing system.

In this way individuals throughout the country will be able to direct the same amount of money into education of their children, and will get a dollar's worth of return for every dollar spent, and will be free of Federal Government control.

In this way we will be able to retain the decisionmaking responsibility in education at the community level where it belongs, and will be able to avoid the centralization of control over education.

In this way we can perhaps avoid making the mistake of the Germany of the 1930's which gave our responsibility to an authoritarian centralized power while well-intentioned people assumed that "everything being done was for a worthy objective" until it was too late to do anything to correct their grave oversight.

The only thing wrong with my proposal is that this beloved Nation of ours has moved so far toward centralization of power in Washington that we have lost our perspective, and I fear that even such a basic proposal as this is now considered radical.

May we someday, somehow realize the error of our ways.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not rise in opposition to the contributions that have been made to the shaping of this legislation by our distinguished colleague from California, because I think the gentleman from California [Mr. Bell] has been an example on the other side of the aisle of the fact that an articulate and hardworking Member of the minority can make significant contributions to legislation.

I want to make that same observation with respect to our colleague on this committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Reid].

Mr. Chairman, it ought to be quite clear from the reading of the bill on page 110, lines 3 and 4, in section 304 (b)(4), that it is not the intention in title III of this bill to bypass the State educational agencies because, in the section to which I have just made reference, the requirement is clear that the local public educational agency after having fashioned and shaped at the local level its application for funds under title III, must submit that plan for review and recommendations to the State educational agency. The State educational agency is therefore clearly involved in this title of the bill.

I want to add that one of the most distinguished witnesses before our committee, who was once Science Adviser to President Eisenhower, Dr. James Killian, the present chairman of the board of MIT, testified very strongly in opposition to limiting funds under either titles III and IV to the States alone. I quote Dr. Killian from the hearings on the bill at page 1219 when he says:

> I would be strongly opposed to limiting funds under titles III and IV to the States.

And he points out that he is a member of the State board of education of Massachusetts and, therefore, could "see both sides of this question."

And he says also:

> I would very much oppose the proposition that came to you yesterday that this should be under State control.

And the proposition to which Dr. Killian referred is precisely the kind of amendment that is being suggested by our friend, the gentleman from California.

I would say further, Mr. Chairman, that we on the Committee are very much concerned that we should strengthen the capacity of the State boards of education to carry out their responsibilities in education. That is why there is a title V in this bill. I might say further that when title V came to us as originally introduced it had a $10 million authorization for the first year. It was on my own motion that that amount of money was raised from $10 million to $25 million. So although I appreciate very much the suggestion of the gentleman from California, it seems to me based on the testimony of distinguished educators, that if we retain local control and local initiative, we will be doing a much better job of protecting the purpose of title III, to provide supplemental educational services or supplementary educational services where they are not now present in adequate quantity or quality, than would be possible under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment of my friend, the gentleman from California, is defeated.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to add to what has already been said about the contribution made by the gentleman from California [Mr. Bell] and point out that we have discussed at great length in the subcommittee and in the full committee the ramifications of the amendments that have been suggested. It was only after a great deal of consideration, and I might say after serious consideration of Mr. Bell's very strong interest in the role of the States, that we determined upon the language that the committee has submitted to you here today.

I call your attention to page 108 of the bill, line 22, where you will see two words—"only if" which apply to the applications for grants.

In other words, the language of the bill reads: "Applications for grants under this title may be approved by the Commissioner only if—"

And there is a list of the number of things that must be a part of the application.

You will find on page 110, item (4), line 3, this language: "the application has been submitted for review and recommendations to the State educational agency."

This submission for review and recommendations is consistent with the best advice of people who are most likely to be in the forefront of establishing these special educational centers. And have been approved by the chief State school officers of the several States.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADEMAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, in furtherance of the colloquy that was just concluded, it was brought out that in the instance where a local contract has been consummated with the Federal agency that it must, therefore, have to be submitted to the State agency for review.

Now let me ask the gentleman, in the event that a State agency should not recommend the completion of this contract, could the local unit proceed notwithstanding?

Mr. BRADEMAS. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I note that the Speaker is in the well of the House. Would he give us the benefit of his information concerning plans for the Members of the House to visit with the astronauts?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad the gentleman propounded his question in the parliamentary inquiry.

It is my hope that the Committee of the Whole will rise within the next 15 or 20 minutes. Then, in the House, a unanimous-consent request will be made to authorize the Speaker to declare a recess in order that the Members and their dear ones can attend the reception for the two astronauts. After that we will come back, and the House will go back into the Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of this bill.

Does that answer the question?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Can the Speaker give us some guidelines as to the time we would have?

Mr. McCORMACK. I was going to suggest that I would have the bells rung 15 minutes ahead of time. I would say we probably should be back here somewhere between a quarter of 6 and 6 o'clock.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if I may, very briefly—and I assure the Committee I will take little time in this respect—I should like to continue my colloquy. I believe it should be made eminently clear, if the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Brademas] is willing to further answer the question. Let us make it eminently clear.

In the final analysis, the relationship is entirely between the Federal Government and the local school unit, and any State agency of education would not have any power whatsoever to void or cancel a contract.

Mr. BRADEMAS. That is half correct and half incorrect. I started to say it was absolutely incorrect, but the second half of the statement is correct. The first half of the statement of my colleague from Indiana is not correct.

My colleague said that the relationship is entirely one between the local public education agency and the Commissioner of Education and Office of Education. That is not correct.

Once again I turn the attention of my friend from Indiana to page 110 of the bill, in section 304, line 3. It is required that the application for funds be submitted for review and recommendations to the State educational agency.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. In furtherance of that, if it is required that they submit it, and if the State agency has no authority whatsoever, either to cancel or amend it, then what possible function could be served by submitting it?

Mr. BRADEMAS. Precisely the purpose set forth on page 110, line 4—to offer its appraisal, to offer its review, to offer its recommendations.

I should like to refer once again to page 1219 of the hearings, to the testimony of Dr. Killian. I quote Dr. Killian, because he is a distinguished educator. He does serve on a State board of education. He did serve on the Science Advisory Committee.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Will the gentleman please proceed.

Mr. BRADEMAS. He said:

> I would not think every State should attempt to develop the kind of curriculum you are talking about.

He said:

> They may be a consortium of universities as is happening in New York, but we ought to have freedom to devise the best kind of institution to meet a regional need.

Dr. Killian said:

> I think States in many cases could appropriately and advantageously do it, but I would not say all the States could do it.

He said, later in his testimony:

> I believe in a pluralistic society.

The whole point of the writing of this particular title III has been to involve the States in an appropriate, balanced way in the administration of this program, but not to exercise a final veto and control over the decisionmaking authority of the local public educational agency.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Certainly I appreciate the cooperation of my colleague from Indiana. I still disagree with him very vigorously.

Mr. BRADEMAS. I was sure the gentleman would.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I take this time because there seems to have been some confusion with respect to the reception of the two astronauts which is to take place at 5 o'clock. Unfortunately, this was a very hurried arrangement we had to make and we could not get proper notice to you. However, this will be held in the caucus room of the Cannon Office Building at 5 o'clock today. You and your wives and members of your immediate family are invited to be there. Unfortunately, because of the great number of people who wish to attend, we cannot invite staff members because the interest in seeing these people is so great that you Members of Congress would not see them. I ask you to come and see two of America's great young men.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment before us now, now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves all debate on section 301——

Mr. POWELL. On these amendments that were offered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. On these amendments now close.

The motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be permitted to read my amendments correctly. I understand there was a mistake made and that he read one amendment which comes later, into the five.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk reread the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. Bell].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Bell) there were—ayes 47, noes 93.

So the amendments were rejected.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. Goodell] if we could not expedite this bill by considering that each title has been read and open to amendment?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield to me, in view of the developments here, the number of amendments that have been offered and were ready to be offered and to be explained, I am sorry that I am constrained to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 101, line 22:

Apportionment among States

Sec. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated for carrying out this title for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum thereof, as he may determine and shall apportion such amount among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, according to their respective needs for assistance under this title. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall apportion $200,000 to each State and shall apportion the remainder of such sums among the States as follows:

(1) he shall apportion to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of such remainder as the number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, in the State bears to the number of such children in all the States, and

(2) he shall apportion to each State an amount which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum of such remainder as the population of the State bears to the population of all the States.

For purposes of this subsection, the term "State" does not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(b) The number of children aged five to seventeen, inclusive, and the total population of a State and of all the States shall be determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him.

(c) The amount apportioned under this section to any State for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, shall be available for payments to applicants with approved applications in that State during that year and the next fiscal year.

(d) The amount apportioned to any State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for the period for which that amount is available shall be available for reapportionment from time to time, on such dates during that period as the Commissioner may fix, among other States in proportion to the amounts originally apportioned among those States under subsection (a) for that year, but with the proportionate amount for any of the other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates that State needs and will be able to use for that period; and the total of these reductions shall be similarly reapportioned among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reapportioned to a State under this subsection from funds appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year shall be deemed to be a part of the amount apportioned to it under subsection (a) for that year.

Uses of Federal funds

Sec. 303. Grants under this title may be used, in accordance with applications approved under section 304(b), for—

(a) planning for and taking other steps leading to the development of programs designed to provide supplementary educational activities and services described in paragraph (b), including pilot projects designed to test the effectiveness of plans so developed; and

(b) the establishment, maintenance, and operation of programs, including the lease or construction of necessary facilities and the acquisition of necessary equipment, designed to enrich the programs of local elementary and secondary schools and to offer a diverse range of educational experience to persons of varying talents and needs by providing supplementary educational services and activities such as—

(1) comprehensive guidance and counseling, remedial instruction, and school health, physical education, recreation, psychological, and social work services designed to enable and encourage persons to enter, remain in, or reenter educational programs, including the provision of special educational programs and study areas during periods when schools are not regularly in session;

(2) comprehensive academic services and, where appropriate, vocational guidance and counseling, for continuing adult education;

(3) developing and conducting exemplary educational programs, including dual-enrollment programs, for the purpose of stimulating the adoption of improved or new educational programs (including those programs described in section 503(a)(4)) in the schools of the State;

(4) specialized instruction and equipment for students interested in studying advanced scientific subjects, foreign languages, and other academic subjects which are not taught in the local schools or which can be provided more effectively on a centralized basis, or for persons who are handicapped or of preschool age;

(5) making available modern educational equipment and specially qualified personnel, including artists and musicians, on a temporary basis to public and other nonprofit schools, organizations, and institutions;

(6) developing, producing, and transmitting radio and television programs for classroom and other educational use;

(7) providing special educational and related services for persons who are in or from rural areas or who are or have been otherwise isolated from normal educational opportunities, including, where appropriate, the provision of mobile educational services and equipment, special home study courses, ra-

dio, television, and related forms of instruction, and visiting teachers' programs; and

(8) other specially designed educational programs which meet the purposes of this title.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, which I feel represents the new horizons and goals for education.

Mr. Chairman, passage of the education bill today may well be the beginning of a new era in education. In fact, it may revolutionize the teaching and learning process. In the last half century, every aspect of American life has been invigorated by innovation except education. It lags behind. New machines, new processes, new ideas stir up industry, commerce, the social order. Rapid change is made possible by what the historians call the "invention of inventions." Invention no longer awaits the slow process by which a Newton happens to be sitting under an apple tree and an apple happens to fall on his head. Organized effort is made to foresee what is needed and to invent or discover what will meet the need. A big industrial concern runs an advertisement worded something like this: When we need a new material with special characteristics, we no longer hunt for it; we make it.

Progress depends on education, but in education itself there is slow progress. Methods and materials of instruction change little through the ages. The old prophet posed the question: "Whom shall he teach knowledge? and whom shall he make to understand doctrine?" Then he ventures an answer: "For precept must be upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, and there a little; for with stammering lips and another tongue will he speak to this people." And that is just about the way we try to do it today.

The procedure is monotonous and deadening. Little wonder that the youth of the land grow weary and disgusted and give up the effort. The result is loss of valuable brain power to an extent that would make an industrialist sick in his stomach.

And the loss comes in an age when we most need to put brainpower to work.

We need scientist-engineers who are at home in the wonderful world of electronics, and who are beginning to carry us into the possibly hostile world of outer space. We need a new breed of bioengineers who can uncover the processes by which living matter operates, and so become able to repair the defects of Nature in living organisms and to ward off the attacks of those agencies which we call disease. We need social engineers to solve the complex social problems created by vast masses of people living in close everyday contact. It is estimated that in 5 years we will need twice as many of these, and many others, as we have today. And today we have far too few. They are clothed with our greatest responsibilities: defense, and the creation of the new technologies which create jobs and make our economy grow. In a word, we need inventors of inventions, and we need them in quantity.

But where are we going to get them? The natural answer is: Schools. It is not intended here to belittle the accomplishments of our schools as they are currently organized and conducted. They have done a great and valuable work. But it is obviously not enough. What is needed in our schools is something of the same spirit that has overturned the physical and biological and social worlds. What is needed is a blaze of innovation that will set on fire the fuel of talent that lies latent in our youth, and fit them for the kind of responsibilities and opportunities which lie directly in front of them.

That is why this education bill seems so important to me. It is the first time we have recognized the direct relationship of money to the problem of improving our educational processes. We accept without question the necessity of generous spending to promote invention in terms of the physical. This year $21 billion—I said billion, not million—will be spent for research and development in the United States. And we have no doubt we will get our money's worth. Two-thirds of the amount will be provided by the Federal Government. Now at last a small sum has been set aside for development in the place where it counts most, in the very font and source of all human progress: the mind of the rising generation.

It is significant that the States have also caught the spirit of change and innovation in education. My own State of West Virginia, under the foresighted administration of Gov. Hulett Smith, has launched a new program, and provided funds for a start. Together, the new State funds and the Federal appropriation give a shot of adrenalin into the arm of the educational corpus. We can look forward with confidence to an educational renaissance that will justify the application of more medicine of the same sort.

I must confesss that I do not know just how educational progress can be increased to a pace that will match industrial change. I myself worked for a number of years trying to train young people to the limits of their capacity. Several members of my family are presently engaged in educational work. I share the frustration of millions of teachers in finding that my efforts to stir and inspire young minds brought insufficient and uncertain results. I just did not know enough. I just did not know how. But I am convinced there is a way, and that somebody can find it. Who knows what rich genius of innovation lies undiscovered in the classrooms of America, in teachers and students alike?

Money will open the creative ability of workers in the field of education, just as it has opened the fascination of the physical sciences to their votaries. For teachers have never felt the spur of monetary reward in finding new and better ways of doing what they have to do. Their place practically at the bottom of the wage scale proves it. But the training of young minds is intrinsically fascinating and rewarding. Almost anyone likes to teach—if he is not worried about making a living out of it. The immortal violinist, Jascha Heifitz, is reported to have retired from concert performance in order to devote his time to teaching. In explanation he says:

> I should like to pass on what I know to my pupils. I am beginning to understand why Liszt, Joachim, and Auer devoted so much of their time to teaching. To be an artist is like being entrusted with something precious for a brief time. It is the duty of an artist to hand it on, like those Greek runners who passed on the lighted torch, one to another. Also, I find teaching, much to my surprise, a pleasure.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that the funds provided by this bill will do at least a little to raise the whole educational process, on the level of teacher and student alike, to a position of dignity and fascination that will call forth their utmost efforts to meet demands of the most exacting calling on earth. We must educate to survive. And I trust, further, that results from this small experiment will be so evident and so promising that we can come back next year and ask for more.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Applications for grants and conditions for approval

SEC. 304. (a) A grant under this title for a program of supplementary educational services may be made to a local educational agency or agencies, but only if there is satisfactory assurance that in the planning of that program there has been, and in the establishing and carrying out of that program there will be, participation of persons broadly representative of the cultural and educational resources of the area to be served. For the purposes of this section, the term "cultural and educational resources" includes State educational agencies, institutions of higher education, nonprofit private schools, public and nonprofit private agencies such as libraries, museums, musical and artistic organizations, educational radio and television, and other cultural and educational resources. Such grants may be made only upon application to the Commissioner at such time or times, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Commissioner deems necessary. Such applications shall—

(1) provide that the activities and services for which assistance under this title is sought will be administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

(2) set forth a program for carrying out the purposes set forth in paragraph (a) or paragraph (b) of section 303 and provide for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the program;

(3) set forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this title for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available by the applicant for the purposes described in paragraphs (a) and (b) of section 303, and in no case supplant such funds;

(4) in the case of an application for assistance under this title which includes a project for construction of necessary facilities, provide satisfactory assurance (A) that reasonable provision has been made, consistent with the other uses to be made of the facilities, for areas in such facilities which are adaptable for artistic and cultural activities, (B) that upon completion of the construction title to the facilities will be in a State or local educational agency, and (C) that the requirements of section 308 will be

complied with on all construction projects assisted under this title;

(5) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant under this title; and

(6) provide for making an annual report and such other reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require to carry out his functions under this title and to determine the extent to which funds provided under this title have been effective in improving the educational opportunities of persons in the area served, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

(b) Applications for grants under this title may be approved by the Commissioner only if—

(1) the application meets the requirements set forth in subsection (a);

(2) the program set forth in the application is consistent with criteria established by the Commissioner for the purpose of achieving an equitable distribution of assistance under this title within each State, which criteria shall be developed by him on the basis of a consideration of (A) the size and population of the State, (B) the geographic distribution of the population within the State, (C) the relative need of persons in different geographic areas and in different population groups within the State for the kinds of services and activities described in paragraph (b) of section 303, and their financial ability to provide those services and activities, and (D) the relative ability of particular local educational agencies within the State to provide those services and activities;

(3) in the case of an application for assistance for a program for carrying out the purposes described in paragraph (b) of section 303, the Commissioner determines (A) that the program will utilize the best available talents and resources and will substantially increase the educational opportunities in the area to be served by the applicant, and (B) that, to the extent consistent with the number of children enrolled in nonprofit private schools in the area to be served whose educational needs are of the type which the supplementary educational activities and services provided under the program are to meet provision has been made for participation of such children; and

(4) the application has been submitted for review and recommendations to the State educational agency.

(c) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulations, be subject to approval in the same manner as original applications.

Mr. POWELL (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this section be considered as read and then the Committee will rise and the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] will be ready to offer his amendment when we return after the recess.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, when we come back amendments to this section will be in order?

Mr. POWELL. Yes.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Bolling, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools, had come to no resolution thereon.

SPEAKER EMPOWERED TO DECLARE RECESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker may declare a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair. The bells will be rung 15 minutes before reconvening.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2362, ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 2362, with Mr. Bolling in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose, it was agreed that section 304 of the committee substitute, ending on line 8, page 110, be considered as read and open for amendment at any point.

Are there any amendments to section 304?

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, before offering an amendment, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present, to establish whether 100 Members are here or not.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Ninety Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise, and on that motion I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Rodino and Mr. Quie.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 6, noes 103.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum is present.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, have 5 minutes been taken so I can offer a motion?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Quie] seeks recognition, but no debate has taken place.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Quie: On page 110, after line 8, insert a new subsection as follows:

"(d) All grants made under this title shall be for supplemental services and centers in school attendance areas having a high concentration of educationally and economically deprived children."

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make title III comply with the purposes stated in the bill which now apply only to title I; that the money utilized under title III for supplemental educational centers will be used in the areas where there is a high concentration of educationally and economically deprived children. It seems if there is one purpose at all for this title it would be to assist in those areas which have a problem because they have this high concentration of economically deprived children.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FINDLEY. If I understand correctly, the gentleman's amendment would limit the areas where these centers could be established to those areas with a high concentration of educationally deprived children.

Mr. QUIE. That is correct; there is no such limitation in the bill at the present time in title III.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this would be a very helpful amendment. The package is labeled an antipoverty program in the field of education and the acceptance of the gentleman's amendment would help direct assistance toward that label and therefore I urge support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, many amendments have been offered in sincere attempts to improve this bill. I have supported most of them.

However, even if all these amendments had been accepted, I sincerely question whether the resulting legislation would be in the public interest.

For years, the people of the United States—a majority of them, I believe—have been disquieted and concerned over what may happen to American education if the central government assumes a major responsibility for meeting ongoing expense of elementary and secondary schools.

For years the Congress has either rejected, or failed to act on proposals to provide funds for these continuing expenses. In my opinion, the restraint has been wise.

Federal dollars have a strange and captivating lure. They sing a siren song which to many is irresistable, and lure off course many an otherwise right-thinking citizen.

A few weeks ago, in this very building, I heard one of the leading educators of Illinois assert that Illinois—a State which is above average in its wealth—lacks the financial resources to meet adequately its future school needs. Even the best educated, it seems, have swallowed the fiction that Federal dollars somehow come from a distant planet, or perhaps from Santa Claus.

This bill ends these long years of debate and restraint, and therefore today is truly historic for American education. This bill, sold to many of us on the appealing label of antipoverty, is the foot-in-the-door long sought by those anxious to shift responsibility for education from the State and local community to Washington.

By mislabeling it an aid-to-poor-students program, its proponents have finally breached this high wall of citizen resistance to general Federal aid to education.

This bill is the fateful first step. Others will follow, just as surely as night follows day. And as time goes on, more and more of the financing of schools—public and private—will be shifted to the Federal Government. As this shift occurs, we may reasonably and properly expect the Federal Government to exert an ever-widening authority over what is taught in schools across this land.

In the process, as private schools lean on Federal dollars, they will lose their private character and therefore their justification for existence. In public education too, the healthy diversity of American education will diminish into a monotonous, monolithic facade built with Federal dollars.

To my knowledge, no one seriously expects this bill to be defeated. Certainly, I do not. Therefore, we can congratulate ourselves for having commemorated in one and the same day, a notable chapter in the conquest of space and the dawning of the Federal age in American education. In one we may rejoice, in the other shed a tear.

Mr. Chairman, as I speak for this amendment, I might point out also there will be other amendments which will be offered to title III which will have as their purpose the requirement that the State educational agency have more authority to decide whether and where the supplemental centers shall be constructed. One of the big, one of the serious problems that I am confronted with in this title, and why I cannot support it as it is, is that it goes for any purpose and the title does not permit proper authority to be exercised by the State educational agency. The State educational agency is established by the legislature as are our local school districts and the authority in the State really lies primarily with the State legislature.

I think that when the Federal Government steps in and makes these centers available for any purpose, making them Federal-local schools, financed 100 percent by the Federal Government, this brings in a Federal influence on the State and on the communities in which they are constructed, which should not be permitted.

So, with these amendments which we are offering, I feel we will strengthen this section of the bill, and make it more acceptable to the States so that it would be utilized in a fashion which would really reach the purposes of this legislation.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this section and amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GOODELL) there were—ayes 91, noes 46.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LAIRD. I believe this time is to be equally divided between all those Members on their feet at the time.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no rule that the time be equally divided. The rule is on the particular subject of an amendment.

The Chair is supposed to try to divide the time between those in favor on one side and those in opposition on the other side.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I cannot understand the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor yielding himself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman cannot yield himself 5 minutes. The Chair assumes he moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. LAIRD. He did not move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first recognize the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. GOODELL. Did I not understand that there was a limitation of 5 minutes' debate? Is not the situation then that those on their feet have an opporunity to divide the 5 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Only by the consent of the Committee.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. ARENDS. What was the Chairman's request?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair heard the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, say that he yielded himself 5 minutes. He obviously could not yield himself 5 minutes.

Mr. ARENDS. That is right. So, where are we now?

The CHAIRMAN. I assume he moved to strike out the last word.

Mr. ARENDS. Has he moved to strike out the last word?

The CHAIRMAN. He can rise in opposition to the amendment. He can do a variety of things.

Mr. ARENDS. What did he do?

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. POWELL. In opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. I thank the Chairman.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWELL. Gladly.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Chairman, I hope very much that this amendment is defeated. This amendment, if adopted, would destroy the very purpose of title III of this bill.

The other day in my remarks in explanation of this bill I pointed out that the bill had more than one purpose. It is quite true, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] said, that one of the purposes of the bill is to attack the problem of educationally deprived young people. But that is in title I.

I pointed out that another purpose of this bill was to lift the quality of all education in the United States. Title III is directed to that purpose.

Mr. Chairman, title III is directed toward improving the quality of education not only for poor children but for all children in elementary and secondary schools, where appropriate, and even in certain situations for adults.

It would be a great mistake—and this would be the effect of adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota—if we were to confine and restrict the supplementary centers and services which could be provided under title III to school districts where there is a high concentration of children coming from families of very low income.

It seems to me, therefore, Mr. Chairman, we should seek to encourage the kind of supplementary services to which title III is addressed for the entire community, and not restrict them as the gentleman's amendment would do.

I hope the amendment is overwhelmingly defeated.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS].

Mr. MEEDS. Is it not the purpose of title III to recognize a chronic limitation upon all school districts, not just the school districts with poverty, and that the purpose of title III will give consideration to that? Three-quarters of our elementary schools have no guidance counselors, and other facilities that all children are entitled to. Is it the purpose of title III to build up on that?

Mr. POWELL. The gentleman from Washington is exactly correct.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to join my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS], in opposing this amendment. The gentleman from Minnesota realizes that one of the ways he can accomplish his real purpose, which is to defeat any Federal aid to education, is by offering these amendments. What he does is destroy any possibility of giving assistance for educational research and educational expansion for the purpose of enriching the educational opportunities of all children in primary and secondary schools. Thus limiting the scope of the plan at the local level through the imposition in this bill of Federal controls that would prevent a local community from using those pilot projects that it believes would produce the best results. It would also limit their size by limiting them in a territory to children from low-income families, once again saying from Washington to the local officials "We are not going to trust you to conduct these research and pilot programs, but we are going to tell you how big they ought to be." This flies right in the face of the intent and purpose of this bill. I strongly urge that you vote to defeat these amendments.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman's amendment fails to recognize the intention of the committee in devising this type of title, for communitywide centers, because it would shorten the scope a great deal. We know there is a multiversity program involved here. There are a great many needs in education, and to limit it to the needy only would set up a different program, a caste system of county poorhouse schools, for instance, and I do not think we want our children to go to the county poorhouse for education. That is what the gentleman's amendment would accomplish.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, if I had risen to move to strike out the last word, rather than offering an amendment which would be voted on, then would the extra 5 minutes have been divided equally?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not in position to answer that kind of question.

Mr. QUIE. It may happen in the future as we go along with the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will meet the situation as it arises.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I believe there are now four amendments pending at the desk to this section. Do I correctly understand the situation to be that we must vote upon each of those amendments without any discussion, either for or against, at this stage?

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee has approved a motion that all debate on this section conclude. It has concluded. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. GOODELL. The amendments will simply be read?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BELL

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BELL: On page 110, strike out the period at the end of line 4 and insert "and has been approved by that agency."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BELL) there were—ayes 67, noes 99.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ASHBROOK

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ASHBROOK: On page 110, line 4, strike out the period and insert: ", and such agency finds that the proposals set forth in the application are consistent with State law."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. GOODELL) there were ayes 59, noes 107.

So the amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODELL

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: On page 101, strike out everything beginning with line 4, through line 7 on page 113, and renumber titles IV, V, and VI as III, IV, and V, respectively.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GOODELL).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODELL

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: On page 106, line 12, strike out line 12 and everything following through line 8 on page 110.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Payments

SEC. 305. (a) From the amounts apportioned to each State under section 302 the Commissioner shall pay to each applicant in that State which has an application approved under this title an amount equal to the total sums expended by the applicant under the application for the purposes set forth therein.

(b) Payments under this title may be made in installments and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments.

Advisory committee

SEC. 306. (a) The Commissioner shall establish in the Office of Education an Advisory Committee on Supplementary Educational Centers and Services, consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and eight members appointed, without regard to the civil service laws, by the Commissioner with the approval of the Secretary.

(b) The Advisory Committee shall advise the Commissioner (1) on the action to be taken with regard to each application for a grant under this title, and (2) in the preparation of general regulations and with respect to policy matters arising in the administration of this title, including the development of criteria for approval of applications thereunder. The Commissioner may appoint such special advisory and technical experts and consultants as may be useful in carrying out the functions of the Advisory Committee.

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee shall, while serving on the business of the Advisory Committee, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in my remarks yesterday concerning the National Advisory Council, the brevity of time prevented me from making a point that I think it is important to clarify in the RECORD.

I mentioned that the Committee expects that the National Advisory Council in conducting a continuing scrutiny of the various programs will make sure that their full educational and enriching potential is achieved in day-to-day operations in the local communities.

In the course of the hearings of the subcommittee, virtually all of the educators who appeared before us agreed on the desirability of the mixing and shoulder-rubbing in the classrooms between the nonpublic schoolchildren and the public schoolchildren which would result from the shared-time programs, and other programs contemplated under title I, as well as in the operations of the supplementary educational centers, provided for in title III. We expect the council and its staff, in its on-going scrutiny of these programs, to make sure that the added educational enrichment produced by this classroom interaction is in fact achieved in the conduct of these local programs.

I would like to ask our distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] as well as my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] whether in fact it was the consensus of the many experts who appeared before us that these programs would have a significant and enriching effect, in the interaction and in the mixing and shoulder-rubbing that they would produce between the children of the public schools and the nonpublic schools, and whether, indeed, it was not the consensus of the Committee that they intended this enrichment effect should take place in the day-to-day operation of the local programs?

Mr. PERKINS. There was considerable testimony along that line. I specifically recall one of the many outstanding witnesses was the former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Arthur Flemming, who was the spokesman for the National Council of Churches who, as well as others, stated that with the mixing of the students that would occur under shared-time programs, it was felt that an enrichment of educational opportunity would come about. That feeling was generally shared by other witnesses.

Mr. SCHEUER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY].

Mr. CAREY. I am pleased to respond to my colleague from New York.

I concur with the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that this would be a valuable learning experience. These children are going to live together for the remainder of their lives. A harmonious experience during their educational period—as the gentleman says, shoulder-rubbing—would be an educational enrichment, and I believe would contribute greatly to learning experience. That is one of the values of this bill.

Mr. SCHEUER. I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we on the minority side of the House have gone through an exercise of futility today from the standpoint of actually improving this legislation. Amendment after amendment has been offered to the various sections without proper debate and consideration.

We of the minority were precluded from offering and having considered some six amendments yesterday to the very important title I of this bill.

We are a minority in this 89th Congress, and painfully so. But we are also one of the two major parties of this Nation and, numbers aside, those who forget this or minimize this do our entire political tradition and our future in freedom a grave disservice.

Mr. Chairman, I trust that there is no Member of this House who would rise to defend a one-party system in this Nation. And I trust that there is no Member who will listen to me and fail to see the implications for our two-party system, of the minority party's role today. The House of Representatives by its actions on this legislation has proven the real danger to America when one party becomes a very strong overpowering majority and when there are but 140 in the minority. I believe that the people of the United States, Democrats, Republicans, and independents alike, will be repulsed by the demonstration which has gone on here in the House of Representatives today and yesterday. Americans will join with those of us in the minority to see that this kind of condition does not exist in the 90th Congress. For the good of our Nation the minority cannot be run over roughshod so far as proper consideration of important legislation is concerned.

The majority leader earlier today made some rather uncomplimentary remarks aimed at our new minority leader. He seemed to confuse what is meant by "cooperation" and "conformity."

We are not chained to executive branch on our side of the aisle. We will cooperate with the Executive when we believe that he is right, and we are giving that kind of cooperation to our President on the actions he believes are necessary in Vietnam at the present time. We of the minority will continue to give him strong and better support than he receives from his own party on issues where the national security of our country is involved.

Mr. Chairman, there is a difference of opinion on this piece of legislation. We feel that we should have had an opportunity to discuss and debate each amendment offered by individuals on our side of the aisle as well as those offered by those few individuals on the majority side of this House that do not support this bill in its present form.

The gentleman from California [Mr. BELL], a member of the minority party, who will support this legislation, was not even allowed a minute of time to discuss his amendment. He was not allowed a minute of time to explain an important amendment which he has worked on. He has listened to the hearings over a period of many hours and many days in the Committee on Education and Labor. Yet here on the floor of the House today, in this Committee of the Whole House, the majority, with its vast power, has run over the minority and not allowed for free debate and a free exchange of ideas.

No, we on our side of the aisle are for cooperation, but we are against conformity. We believe that the precedent which has been established here in the House of Representatives today has clearly shown the American people that there are great dangers in building up one party with an overpowering majority in this legislative branch.

Now, as far as I am concerned, I do not see any sense in even offering any more of these amendments today, because it seems to me that without the proper consideration, we have already shown—that we cannot get any consideration.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the minority can look at the other side of the aisle and say, "It is too bad, but you have run over representative government in the first 3 months of this 1st session of the 89th Congress."

Mr. Chairman, there is a definite need for the Congress to enact legislation in this session of Congress which will assist educational efforts throughout the country. This is necessary although the Federal Government is already playing a large role in financing education in this country.

For the past 6 years, I have introduced legislation in the Congress designed to assist the States with a maximum of financial aid and a minimum of Federal control or interference. This would be accomplished by returning to the States 5 percent of the Federal income taxes collected in those States with the stipulation that this money must be used for educational purposes. This, coupled with an equalization formula designed to give the greatest assistance to the States which need it the most would be a sound and efficient way for the Federal Government to fulfill its responsibility in the field of education.

Unfortunately, this is not the principle upon which the Johnson administration has based its education bill. Instead, the inequities that currently exist among the various States in terms of how much they can afford to spend on education is perpetuated by the Johnson administration bill.

This results from the way the fund distribution formula in the administration bill works. What it does is to give the greatest amount of financial assistance to those areas in the country which need it the least. For example, under the President's bill, Forest County in Wisconsin's Seventh District would receive $58,000 in Federal assistance while Montgomery County in Maryland—the richest county in the United States—would receive $572,864. The 10 richest counties in the United States would receive twice as much aid as the 10 poorest counties, even though the number of children needing assistance under the terms of the bill are the same.

This is hardly the most equitable distribution of Federal funds and certainly does not represent the best and most effective way to extend educational opportunities to those most in need of those opportunities.

I have supported amendments offered to this educational bill on the floor of the House of Representatives these past few days to change the distribution formula. I have supported these amendments to make the education bill a more equitable and more effective Federal undertaking.

Mr. Chairman, at the very least, the administration bill should have been amended so as to provide the greatest amount of aid to those counties or school districts which have the greatest need for Federal assistance. It is indeed regrettable that no important amendments were permitted by the majority.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Recovery of payments

SEC. 307. If within twenty years after completion of any construction for which Federal funds have been paid under this title—

(a) the owner of the facility shall cease to be a State or local educational agency, or

(b) the facility shall cease to be used for the educational and related purposes for which it was constructed, unless the Commissioner determines in accordance with regulations that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so,

the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility an amount which bears to the then value of the facility (or so much thereof as constituted an approved project or projects) the same ratio as the amount of such Federal funds bore to the cost of the facility financed with the aid of such funds. Such value shall be determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which the facility is situated.

Labor standards

SEC. 308. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on all construction projects assisted under this title shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have with respect to the labor standards specified in this section the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15) and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

TITLE IV—EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND TRAINING

SEC. 401. The second section of the Act of July 26, 1954 (20 U.S.C. 332), entitled "An Act to authorize cooperative research in education", is redesignated as section 3 and the material which precedes it is amended to read as follows:

"Purpose

"SEC. 1. The purpose of this Act is to enable the Office of Education more effectively to accomplish the purposes and to perform the duties for which it was originally established.

"Educational Research and Research Training

"SEC. 2. (a) (1) The Commissioner of Education (hereinafter in this Act referred to as the 'Commissioner') is authorized to make grants to universities and colleges and other public or private agencies, institutions, and organizations and to individuals, for research, surveys, and demonstrations in the field of education (including programs described in section 503(a)(4) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), and for the dissemination of information derived from educational research (including but not limited to information concerning promising educational practices developed under programs carried out under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965) and, without regard to sections 3648 and 3709 of the Revised Statutes (31 U.S.C. 529; 41 U.S.C. 5), to provide by contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements with them for the conduct of such activities; except that no such grant may be made to a private agency, organization, or institution other than a nonprofit one.

"(2) No grant shall be made or contract or jointly financed cooperative arrangement entered into under this subsection until the Commissioner has obtained the advice and recommendations of a panel of specialists who are not employees of the Federal Government and who are competent to evaluate the proposals as to the soundness of their design, the possibilities of securing productive results, the adequacy of resources to conduct the proposed research, surveys, or demonstrations, and their relationship to other similar educational research or dissemination programs already completed or in progress.

"(b) The Commissioner is authorized to make grants to public and other nonprofit universities and colleges and to other public or nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations to assist them in providing training in research in the field of education (including such research described in section 503(a)(4) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965), including the development and strengthening of training staff and curricular capability for such training. Grants under this subsection may, when so authorized by the Commissioner, also be used by such grantees (1) in establishing and maintaining research traineeships, internships, personnel exchanges, and pre- and post-doctoral fellowships, and for stipends and allowances (including traveling and subsistence expenses) for fellows and others undergoing training and their dependents not in excess of such maximum amounts as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, or (2), where the grantee is a State educational agency, in providing for such traineeships, internships, personnel exchanges, and fellowships either directly or through arrangements with public or other nonprofit institutions or organizations. No grant shall be made under this subsection for training in sectarian instruction or, for work to be done in an institution, or a department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

"(c) In addition to the authority granted by section 603(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, funds available to the Commissioner for grants or contracts or jointly financed cooperative arrangements under this section shall, with the approval of the Secretary, be available for transfer to any other Federal agency for use (in accordance with an interagency agreement) by such agency (alone or in combination with funds of that agency) for purposes for which such transferred funds could be otherwise expended by the Commissioner under the foregoing provisions of this section, and the Commissioner is likewise authorized to accept and expend funds of any other Federal agency for use under this section.

"(d) The Commissioner shall transmit to the Congress annually a report concerning the research, surveys, and demonstrations, the information disseminating activities, and the training in research initiated under this Act, the recommendations made by research specialists pursuant to subsection (a)(2), and any action taken with respect to such recommendations."

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, first I would like to a question or two of the chairman of the committee. My first question is this: Is it not true that under the Cooperative Research Act Federal money is granted to colleges and universities whether they are private or public?

Mr. POWELL. That is correct, just as the gentleman voted for higher education last year.

Mr. QUIE. So there can be no reason to object to these further grants to colleges and universities which are of a private nature?

Mr. POWELL. As the gentleman voted last year; the same philsophy.

Mr. QUIE. I should like to ask another question.

With reference to the additional agencies, institutions, organizations, and individuals that may receive grants, they may be public or private agencies. I ask, therefore, may any of these private agencies be private elementary and secondary schools?

Mr. POWELL. That is not designated. This is research in the field of education.

Mr. QUIE. Some of these could be demonstrations in the field of education. Would a grant primarily to a private elementary or secondary school, for demonstrations in the field of education be permitted?

Mr. POWELL. For a demonstration, research, and survey; yes, when in connection with an approved college or agency.

Mr. QUIE. The answer is "Yes"? Then, do we not have a constitutional question here wherein we permit a grant to a private elementary or secondary school?

Mr. POWELL. Well, if the gentleman will read the bottom of page 115, the gentleman will see the following language, which continues over onto page 116 of the bill:

> No grant shall be made under this subsection for training in sectarian instruction or, for work to be done in an institution, or a department or branch of an institution, whose program is specifically for the education of students to prepare them to become ministers of religion or to enter upon some other religious vocation or to prepare them to teach theological subjects.

Mr. QUIE. The chairman of the full committee well knows that church-related elementary and secondary schools do not exist for this purpose.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would like to point out, as can be seen in the Ramseyer print, that there is no change made in the kinds of organizations to which research grants may be made by the language which is contained in this bill.

The language appears on page 63 of the report and the language there reads as follows:

> Universities and colleges and other public and private agencies, institutions and organizations—

I believe that is the same language as contained in the 1954 Cooperative Research Act.

So, I simply say to the gentleman from Minnesota, if they could do it then, they can still do it and if they could not do it before, they cannot do it now.

Mr. QUIE. I yield further to the gentleman from Michigan in order to obtain an answer to another question: Are any of the additional activities provided for under the Cooperative Research Act by these amendments ones which would be conducted in a private elementary or secondary school?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I am sorry, but I cannot give an answer to that. It seems to me that religiously connected organizations do research now. I cannot see the difference between them doing research in one field and research in another field.

I would think that it could be done, but I would imagine it would have to be justified as a valid project furthering the purposes of education, just as any other project has to be.

If the gentleman from Minnesota will yield further, I would like to correct my earlier statement. I said that both private and public institutions could receive contracts prior hereto. But there has been some little expansion of that into the grant field. I would simply say that if they have a valid research project they could get a grant; yes.

Mr. QUIE. I would like to again have the attention of the gentleman from

Michigan in this respect: The language the gentleman was reading is not on page 63, which is not in the act. Therefore, what the gentleman read is an expansion from the present act.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Yes, that is what I tried to correct. Prior hereto it said: "with universities and colleges, including private colleges."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. QUIE

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. QUIE: On page 115, lines 9 to 21, strike out the sentence "Grants under this subsection may, when so authorized by the Commissioner, also be used by such grantees (1) in establishing and maintaining research traineeships, internships, personnel exchanges, and pre- and post-doctoral fellowships, and for stipends and allowances (including traveling and subsistence expenses) for fellows and others undergoing training and their dependents not in excess of such maximum amounts as may be prescribed by the Commissioner, or (2), where the grantee is a State educational agency, in providing for such traineeships, internships, personnel exchanges, and fellowships either directly or through arrangements with public or other nonprofit institutions or organizations."

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to finish questioning the chairman of the committee on the point I raised earlier before I speak on my amendment, if I may. I think it can be cleared up, and I hope it can.

I understand from what has been said so far that this possibly expands the agencies which may receive grants under the Cooperative Research Act, answered by the gentleman from Michigan. Again I come to the question of whether a private parochial elementary and secondary school can at all receive grants under this title?

Mr. POWELL. No, not under this title.

Mr. QUIE. This establishes the legislative history.

Mr. POWELL. I would like to point out in connection with cooperative research that there are now private colleges that reach into elementary and secondary schools for training.

Mr. QUIE. But the grants go to private institutions of higher learning.

Mr. POWELL. That is correct.

Mr. QUIE. None of the grants presently go to a parochial elementary or secondary school?

Mr. POWELL. No, not at present and this bill allows only research, surveys, and so forth, as the bill spells out.

Furthermore, under the definition on page 119, under (e) you will see it cannot be used for research, research training, surveys or demonstrations in the field of sectarian instruction or the dissemination of information derived therefrom.

Mr. QUIE. I hope what this means is that no grants can go to a parochial elementary and secondary school.

Mr. POWELL. I support the gentleman 100 percent.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I want to explain now what my amendment will do. I think it is unwise for us to add traineeships, internships, and fellowships under this title as part of the Cooperative Research Act. We are considering in the Committee on Education and Labor a higher education bill that has for its purpose expanding some of the traineeships or fellowships that are available under the Office of Education. We have made some fragmentation of financial assistance to students or to those who are studying which will lead to their doctorate degrees in bills in the past. I think this is unwise. Institutions of higher learning have so many programs to deal with serving the same purpose that unnecessary administrative costs continue to rise. These student assistance proposals should be under the National Defense Education Act.

For that reason I offer this amendment, not to remove Federal funds for this purpose but, rather, that we take this up later in the higher education bill and not consider it in this package which provides for research in curriculum and other activities that could change the method of teaching in our schools. When we have the purchase of textbooks for children and research in curriculum and training and retraining of teachers federally financed in one bill, this puts the Federal Government so close to making decisions and influencing curriculum possibly to provide standardization.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Chairman, I have indeed been torn by the tremendous urge to vote for this bill to add funds to the educational institutions of this country, in spite of the fact that I feel it violates all the principles which I believe have been the foundation of this country.

Our great President wants to increase the opportunities of education on all levels, which is indeed commendable, and I have no quarrel with the amount of money in the bill. But let us stop and consider the great departure from our tried and true system which is being undertaken.

There has been great debate that this bill leaves complete control in the States, that the States can make out their own program and that the administration will be according to State law. Well, if this is true, why the necessity of funneling all the requests and all the plans to the U.S. Commissioner of Education for approval?

I do not know the U.S. Commissioner of Education, but I am sure that he is an able man or he would not be holding the position. By the same token, I do not feel that he is so allwise on the matter of schools, whether it be on the local level or a statewide level, that he should have the say as to whether or not the money is being spent wisely.

This bill is an indictment on the efficiency and the wisdom of every State school system and every local school district. By voting for this bill, I would be telling your local school board and your State school superintendents or directors, whatever title they may have, and your State boards if you have one, that they do not know what they are doing. And that would be wrong. I, for one, have great faith in the elected school boards of this country, both local and State, as well as the State commissioners or directors of education.

If you want to give the people of this country some of their money back, which you collect from them, and earmark it for education, fine. But when you tell them that to get this money back, they must "submit to the Commissioner a State plan in such detail as the Commissioner deems necessary," you are asking for Federal control. And when you further state, as the bill does on page 95, that this plan must set forth "the criteria to be used in allocating library resources, textbooks, and other printed instructional materials," you are asking for further Federal control. And when you further provide, as stated in the bill on page 96, line 13, that the plan must set forth "the criteria to be used in selecting the library resources, textbooks, and other instructional materials," you are asking for more Federal control by the U.S. Commissioner because, in my opinion, the word "critieria" is as broad as the Commissioner wants to make it.

I repeat, I have no quarrel with the amounts of money involved, nor do I have any quarrel with any efforts to place emphasis on money going to poor areas of this country. But again, I repeat, if Federal control is not sought, and as argued here the last 2 days, none is intended, why not turn the money over to the State boards and the local districts for them to use as they see fit.

These boards in practically all instances are elected. They are responsible to the people, and soon all peoples will be entitled to vote in all areas where heretofore they have not. Let them continue to run our educational institutions in the manner in which they have in the past, which has proven to be a method of establishing the best public school system the world has ever known.

Again, I regret that I must disagree with the bill that the committee has brought forward, but I certainly do not quarrel with their objectives but must honestly disagree with their method.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 2362, is a massive fraud being perpetrated against the American public and, more specifically, the teachers, students, and taxpayers of the country. It is of dubious constitutionality and creates contradictory administrative situations. It is built entirely on false promises and, as we plainly see, is being stampeded through the House by brute force and demagoguery.

This bill, in its formation, presentation, and legislative processing, exposes the complete hypocrisy and dictatorial philosophy of the Democrat administration. It is tragic, Mr. Chairman, to note how Members of the majority party perform like a chorus line to the signals being snapped by the floor leaders for this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I feel very strongly that the massive hypocrisy and inconsistency of this legislation will be thoroughly recognized by the American public. Those who have been boobytrapped into supporting this measure will be among the first to recognize its grave defects and shortcomings. Those who have in advance recognized the defects and shortcomings will, unfortunately, be left in the position of substantial frustration and can merely say "I told you so."

Mr. Chairman, we have had a somewhat limited debate on this bill and more limited debate on amendments. The lack of respect for legislative procedure displayed by the majority is a black page in the history of the House. Mr. Chairman, despite the technical procedures used to stifle the constructive amendments offered by the minority, the record has been made in clear fashion. Therefore, I join a substantial but too small a group voting against this measure.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, it has been obvious to every Member from the moment debate started on H.R. 2362 that amendments, however meritorious, would not be tolerated or, for that matter, even considered objectively by the leadership and members of the majority party responsible for handling this important legislation on the floor.

It is regrettable that Members must sit on their hands and rubberstamp legislation without taking any independent action and without making a single change in legislation as important and as far reaching as H.R. 2362.

Those who oppose certain provisions of this bill and those who would offer amendments may be in the minority, but at least the opportunity should be given to all to fully discuss and debate their point of view. This opportunity has been denied by action of the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee in moving to shut off debate. In other words, amendments could be offered, but they would only be read, and the Member offering the amendment would be denied the privilege of explaining his amendment to the House.

I had an important amendment to what is commonly known as Public Law 874 and Public Law 815.

Public Law 874 now applies to those school districts having an enrollment containing 3 percent or more federally connected children. The law provides that when districts fall below that rate—as many will because of the recent defense base closings—such districts are eligible in the first year to receive payment for the actual number of federally connected children remaining enrolled. The next year the district receives one-half of the first-year amount. After the second year, they receive nothing.

My amendment provides for a longer tapering off of funds. It provides that such districts would continue to receive Federal funds as long as 1 percent of the children were connected with military installations. When the 1-percent level is reached, the districts would receive in the first year one-half of the 1-percent level payment; in the second year, one-third of that payment; and in the third year, one-fourth of that payment.

I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be set out in full at this point in the Record for the information of my colleagues.

Amendment by Mr. Dole: Page 92, after line 12, insert the following:

"Reduction of payments in areas affected by termination of defense activities

"Sec. 6. (a) Clause (B) of paragraph (2) of subsection (c) of section 3 of the Act of September 30, 1950, as amended (20 U.S.C. 238 (c) (2) (B) is amended to read, as follows:

" '(B) amounts to 3 per centum or more of the total number of children who were in average daily attendance during such year and for whom such agency provided free public education, except that—

" '(i) such 3 per centum requirement need not be met by such agency for any period of two fiscal years which follows a fiscal year during which such agency met such requirement and was entitled to payment under the provisions of this section, but the payment under the provisions of this section to such agency for the second fiscal year of any such two-year period during which such requirement is not met, shall be reduced by 50 per centum of the amount thereof; or

" '(ii) in the case of any local educational agency which fails for any fiscal year (following a fiscal year in which such agency met such 3 per centum requirement) to meet such 3 per centum requirement because of the termination of activities of the Department of Defense, the per centum requirement pursuant to this paragraph for such year and thereafter shall be 1 per centum; or

" '(iii) in the case of any local educational agency which fails for any fiscal year (following a fiscal year in which such agency met the per centum requirements of this paragraph) to meet such 1 per centum requirement because of the termination of activities of the Department of Defense, such agency need meet no per centum requirement pursuant to this paragraph for such year and the three succeeding fiscal years, but the payment under the provisions of this section to such agency for such year shall be computed as though such agency had exactly met such 1 per centum requirement, and for the first such succeeding fiscal year when such agency does not meet any per centum requirement pursuant to this paragraph, such payment shall be reduced by 50 per centum of the amount thereof, for the second such succeeding fiscal year by 66⅔ per centum of the amount thereof, and for the third such succeeding fiscal year by 75 per centum of the amount thereof.'

" '(b) The amendment made by this section shall be effective July 1, 1964.' "

The amendment should be a matter of general interest in any school district near a military installation curtailed or scheduled to be closed as the result of orders from Defense Secretary Robert McNamara.

In Kansas, for instance, Schilling Air Force Base is now in the process of being closed. This closing will affect some 13,000 officers, enlisted men, and their dependents, and will have a severe impact upon this relatively small community. The closing will also have a severe impact upon a number of school districts which, under my amendment, would receive necessary and proper relief.

As an illustration, Salina residents are now faced with paying $3½ million in school construction bonds which were issued prior to McNamara's closing order. Through Public Law 815, Federal money financed 14.8 percent of the total cost, even though 22.9 percent of the students in the Salina school system were federally connected.

Under the terms of the amendment, the original cutoff point at which 3 percent of the total number of students enrolled are required to be connected with a Federal installation—established as a phaseout point for funds—would be reduced, so that only 1 percent of the total number of students would be required to be in the federally impacted classification. Furthermore, in the case of Salina, the percentage reduction in funds would be graduated over a 3-year period, with the funds being cut off at the end of the fourth year. Existing legislation specifies the payment of only one-half of the cost in the second year, and no payment in the third year. The amendment would liberalize the phaseout portion of Public Law 874 and would give a community the benefit of funds for a longer period of time, even though the number of students identified with the federally impacted program were diminishing.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment and yield to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Smith], a former member of the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I have noticed all my life that where there is two or three gifted children enrolled in a particular school district, their parents, uncles, and aunts appeal to the school board to provide the specialized courses they need; but, where there might be a dozen or so behind because they started behind or because they spent preschool days with parents who have been educationally deprived they usually have the kind of parents that are not there fighting the battles for these special educational courses. These special programs are badly needed for many of the educationally deprived and the special courses that will be provided as a result of this bill are very important.

In Iowa we have a situation where special courses are provided both by county school boards and local school districts which have boundaries that do not follow county lines. These services may be provided by either or both the county school boards and the other school districts. The definition for a "local school agency" as it applies to titles II, IV, and V is broad and would include a county board in Iowa. That definition of a "local educational agency" is found on page 144 of the bill. But title I depends upon the definition that is in Public Law 874 and it is found in title 20, United States Code, section 244, subsection 6.

It is a different definition and I want to ask a question to make sure the Iowa county boards can continue to provide special educational courses with funds under title I of the bill also. The question is as follows:

Am I correct in assuming that in the administration of the program under title I a State educational agency may require that a local educational agency pay to another public educational agency that portion of a local educational agency's grant funds which reflect the cost of providing educational services or programs in the district served by the local agency which under the laws of the State are carried out by such other public educational agency?

Mr. POWELL. The answer is "Yes."

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Conforming amendments

SEC. 402. The section of such Act redesignated as section 3 is amended by striking out "this Act" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 2".

Construction of regional facilities for research and related purposes

SEC. 403. Such Act is further amended by adding the following new sections at the end thereof:

"Construction of regional facilities for research and related purposes

"SEC. 4. (a) There is authorized to be appropriated over a period of five fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $100,000,000 in the aggregate, to enable the Commissioner to carry out the purposes of this section. Sums so appropriated shall remain available until expended for payments with respect to projects for which applications have been filed under this section before July 1, 1970, and approved by the Commissioner before July 1, 1971.

"(b) Whenever the Commissioner finds that the purposes of this Act can best be achieved through the construction of a facility for research, or for research and related purposes (as defined in this section), and that such facility would be of particular value to the Nation or a region thereof as a national or regional resource for research or related purposes, he may make a grant for part or all of the cost of constructing such facility to a university, college, or other appropriate public or nonprofit private agency or institution competent to engage in the types of activity for which the facility is to be constructed, or to a combination of such agencies or institutions, or may construct or make arrangements for constructing such facility through contracts for paying part or all of the cost of construction or otherwise. The Commissioner may, where he deems such action appropriate, make arrangements, by contract or otherwise, for the operation of such facilities or may make contributions toward the cost of such operation of facilities of this nature whether or not constructed pursuant to, or with the aid provided under, this section. Title to any facility constructed under this section, if vested in the United States, may be transferred by the Commissioner on behalf of the United States to any such college or university or other public or nonprofit private agency or institution, but such transfer shall be made subject to the condition that the facility will be operated for the purposes for which it was constructed and to such other conditions as the Commissioner deems necessary to carry out the objectives of this title and to protect the interests of the United States.

"(c) All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors in the performance of work on construction of any project under this section shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a-5). The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this clause, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z-15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

"(d) Payments under this section shall be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, in such installments consistent with construction progress, and on such conditions as the Commissioner may determine.

"(e) As used in this section, the term 'research and related purposes' means research, research training, surveys, or demonstrations in the field of education, or the dissemination of information derived therefrom, or all of such activities, including (but without limitation) experimental schools, except that such term does not include research, research training, surveys, or demonstrations in the field of sectarian instruction or the dissemination of information derived therefrom.

"Definitions

"SEC. 5. As used in this Act—

"(1) The term 'State' includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

"(2) The term 'State educational agency' means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

"(3) The term 'nonprofit' as applied to any agency, organization, or institution means an agency, organization, or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

"(4) The terms 'construction' and 'cost of construction' include (A) the construction of new buildings and the expansion, remodeling, and alteration of existing buildings, including architects' fees, but not including the cost of acquisition of land or offsite improvements, and (B) equipping new buildings and existing buildings, whether or not expanded, remodeled, or altered.

"Short title

"SEC. 6. This Act may be cited as the 'Cooperative Research Act'."

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODELL

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: On page 113, strike out everything beginning with line 8, through line 3 on page 121, and renumber titles V and VI as titles IV and V, respectively.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike title IV. I think title IV is unnecessary. It has not been carefully considered as to its total impact on the present Cooperative Research Act. I believe we would bring amendments to the Cooperative Research Act out of our committee in separate legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the minority leader, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD].

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this legislative body over a period of almost 180 years has written a great tradition. It has developed an outstanding legislative heritage. The pages of history will show that the House of Representatives has adequately and effectively met one crisis after another. Laws have been enacted with the cooperation of the other body that have taken our country from where we were to the pinnacle, the peak where we are today.

But as we look at what has transpired today and what has happened in the last 2 days, I think we must come to the conclusion that our tradition and our heritage has been dimmed. We are writing bad law and we are failing to meet a crisis. As a matter of fact, we are creating a crisis not only at the local levels of our country but at the national level.

This record that we have written will be one of confusion. It will not be a record that will resolve problems. This legislation will magnify them.

Let us look at what we have done in the day and a half we have debated a bill that involves $1.3 billion.

We have adequately considered only one amendment where the time consumed in debate was an hour or more. On almost every amendment, we have taken, to discuss the details, 10 minutes or less. On far too many amendments that have been offered we have taken no time in debate. Such amendments have merely been read and roughshod action taken immediately.

The net result is, we have taken a 147-page bill and accepted, in effect, the direction of the executive branch of the Government and the recommendations of a limited number of our colleagues. We are, in effect, rubberstamping a majority of the committee who, in reality, have taken the recommendations of the executive branch of the Government.

I believe any fair, objective person would agree that we in this body ought to work our will, that we ought to make some changes in what the executive branch of the Government has submitted or what a mere majority of the committee has recommended. But we are rubberstamping here today the views of the executive branch of the Government and the action of a limited number of our colleagues.

I happen to feel very strongly that if we do what it appears we will do, this will be one further bit of evidence, and substantial at that, that there is a final breakdown—perhaps a total collapse—in what we believe is truly representative government.

This means to us on our side—and I look at those on our side—that we will be the pawn in the fist of the executive branch of the Government in the party different from our own.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may be given an additional 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, is it not true that the gentleman from New York only a few moments ago objected to the same request?

I withdraw my reservation.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the gentleman from New York.

I add that if we on our side are willing to accept this document, which has not been substantially changed from what came down from the White House and from the various departments concerned, I do not believe that we on our side are performing our function as a minority party. I believe that we have a responsibility to stand up and give to the millions of Americans who supported us an opportunity to have their voice raised in this part of the legislative branch of this Government.

So I plead with all of us to exercise our legislative responsibility. I do not think we have been doing so although many have tried valiantly against overwhelming odds. But, more importantly, I say to those of us on our side that we have an additional responsibility in legislation as vital, as crucial, as critical as this to exercise some strong action to give the 43 percent of the voters who voted for the Members of the House of Representatives the feeling that they have some number, some strength that is representing their philosophy and their viewpoint in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ].

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Chairman, there is not a Member of this body who is more interested in or desirous of improving the quality of educational opportunity for every American boy and girl, rich or poor, black or white, Jew or gentile, than I am.

I think I know something about schools—14 years of my life have been devoted to teaching and to school administration. I might add that I attended and taught schools in what would today be classified as "chronically depressed" areas.

While my constituents in Kansas do not need to be reminded of my longtime interest in this field, I reiterate in preface to my comments concerning H.R. 2362 that I remain committed to the continuing improvement in the educational opportunities for every American child.

Mr. Chairman, I have studied the bill. I have read the committee report, I have listened to the debate. As we approach the moment when our votes are to be cast and counted, I must, in good conscience, vote against this measure.

It had been my intention to offer an amendment to strike everything after the enacting clause of H.R. 2362 and insert an amendment which would return to each State 3 percent of the Federal income taxes collected within each State to be used for educational purposes.

If that amendment failed, I had intended to submit a second amendment which would set aside 3 percent of the total individual income taxes collected by the Federal Government to be returned to the States on the basis of the number of boys and girls within each State between the ages of 5 and 17 years. Such legislation would not require a host of bureaucrats to supervise or enforce it. The funds would go directly to the States.

Some of my colleagues who have been here far longer than I advised me that such an amendment would not be germane and would therefore be out of order. Our able Parliamentarian, whom I also consulted, has expressed the same opinion.

Mr. Chairman, let the record show that I regret the manner in which we have been forced to consider this legislation, and further that I resent certain comments by some proponents of this bill which seem designed to equate a vote against H.R. 2362 with a disinterest in the educational needs of our citizens.

The question before us is not whether we should improve the educational opportunities for every American boy and girl, but how. The question is not one of intent; it is rather one of procedure. I object to this measure, Mr. Chairman, because it leads us down the road toward Federal domination of our schools.

I object to H.R. 2362 because its accomplishments could hardly measure up to the expectations or aims of its proponents. If the aim is, as has been stated in favor of the bill, to help needy children, the formula which has been devised to distribute the funds clearly misses the mark.

As pointed out in the chart contained in the minority views to the committee report, the 10 wealthiest counties in the Nation, with median family incomes between $7,000 and $9,000 per year and a combined total of 32,563 children in families having less than $2,000 annual income, would, under title I of this bill, receive assistance totaling nearly $9 million. By contrast, with approximately the same number of children in this under-$2,000 category, the 10 poorest counties in the Nation, with median family incomes below $2,500, would receive a total of only $4½ million, or half as much as the 10 wealthiest counties would receive.

How anybody can get up with a straight face and call this kind of thing fair escapes me. In fact, the bill is full of such inequities, as has been admirably pointed out by my industrious and knowledgeable colleague from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN].

Personally, I favor some system which would reduce the heavy burden of Federal taxes on our citizens so that the State would be in a better position to pick up the tab on education. Further, I think it important that the States be allowed discretion and responsibility for the distribution of funds for educational purposes. We have been deploring the weaknesses in American education, but let us not forget its strengths and the remarkable job the States and local citizens have been doing. I must say I find it not entirely without humor that some of my colleagues who are supporting this measure by taking the position that people in the States no longer have the energy and wisdom to run their schools will be depending on the energies and wisdom of those people to reelect them to the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I regret that I must cast my vote in opposition to a bill which is advertised as a help to education, but I have studied the measure carefully and I believe the deficiencies of H.R. 2362 to be of such magnitude that I could not in good conscience join in making it law and concomitantly claim a continuing sincere interest in improving our schools and the educational opportunities for every boy and girl.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK].

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this bill. It is full of loopholes and presents a virtual bulldozer for Federal bureaucracy to overrun our long-established policy regarding local control of our schools. Unfortunately, all too many educators take the position that as long as some money is being spent, they are for it and will accept it regardless of any erosive effect it may have on the future of education.

I have been a member of the Education and Labor Committee for the 4 years I have served in Congress. I am a member of the subcommittee which heard the debate on this bill. I genuinely hoped that legislation could be adopted which would assist hard-pressed local school districts. I have myself offered two important pieces of legislation which would stimulate, not shackle, educational opportunities at the local level. This bill is one of the worst pieces of legislation I have seen come before the Congress and its pitfalls will trouble educators, boards of education, and, indeed, communities for years to come.

It also gave a striking example of the sheer, raw power of the majority party and the ruthlessness which power can manifest when it is not tempered by an adequate minority. I have seen debate cut off with no opportunity to present views on vital amendments. In one instance, the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL], moved that debate close in 5 minutes, this motion receiving the rubberstamp approval of the majority. He then took the entire 5 minutes himself and allowed none of us, including me, to even speak on important amendments to a vital section of this bill.

On one occasion he even flouted custom and refused to allow the minority leader to speak for an additional 5 minutes. In this case, the Speaker was able to get him to retract his objection. On one occasion, he moved to close debate before it had even started but fortunately the longstanding rules of the House required at least one speaker address himself to the matter before the motion could be made. This is typical of the steamroller tactics which passed this Federal aid to education bill.

On another occasion, the gentlelady from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] a proponent of the bill, was on her feet endeavoring to point out a particular shortcoming of the legislation. The gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] moved that all debate close "right now" and he was rubberstamped by the majority, a terrible discourtesy to this esteemed lady and an example of the roughshod treatment which can be expected when naked power is used by those who want to prevent a public debate.

It is only appropriate that these tactics brought the American people a bill so badly drafted and so tied together by sealing wax that no amendment could be accepted, regardless of merit, lest the political support for the bill by various groups who put the coalition together be withdrawn.

It is indeed a sad day for America when the Congress of the United States stops being a deliberative body and rubberstamp a bill so full of holes that it cannot be supported by those who are seeking educational excellence in our Nation.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, we had a number of other amendments to this title. I am sorry to say that the procedure which has been followed here today has made it abundantly clear that not only are we going to be unable to pass any constructive amendments but we are not even going to be able to be heard or understood as to what these amendments involve. So, from my viewpoint, Mr. Chairman, I will offer one additional amendment to title IV. Thereafter I personally will raise no objection to unanimous consent requests that title V be considered as read.

We have offered something like 34 amendments. About half of those, 15 or 16, we have been unable to explain, with no time available, because of the time limitations imposed by the majority moving that debate end on that section. This is a travesty on the legislative process, Mr. Chairman, but there is not any sense in keeping the Members and our colleagues here until midnight while this travesty continues. I think the sooner it is ended the better.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this is the second time in this session of this Congress that we have heard the words that we have just listened to, "travesty," "violations of the rights of the minority," "rubberstamp." I need not repeat the litany. You are familiar with it.

I rise only to take exception to these descriptions because they are untrue. Why do I say they are untrue? Well, let us take a look at what has happened on this piece of legislation. This bill came to us 3 days ago and we had 1 full day of general debate. Now I am informed—and I think my information is accurate—that we cut off general debate at about 6 o'clock on the first afternoon at the request of the minority. Not at the request of the majority. On yesterday we continued general debate until about 3 o'clock.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BOGGS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LAIRD. I think the choice that the minority leader was given was whether general debate would conclude at 6 o'clock or 6:30 p.m. When the Speaker asked him this question he suggested 6 p.m. The choice was between 6 and 6:30, and he recommended 6. I think we should not make too much of a point on the matter of one-half hour.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the Speaker.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman who just spoke was not part of the conference. The minority leader and I have no controversy about this. What the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] has stated is correct. There was no controversy at all. The minority leader came to see me and we agreed that we would rise between 6 o'clock and 6:30.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, of course the Speaker and I have no desire to get into any conflict on the question of the time the House was to adjourn yesterday. However, as I recall, we actually did adjourn about 6:20, or thereabouts. Early in the day, in the most friendly manner, we discussed the matter with the desire of reaching a proper time to conclude the business of the day. The time mutually agreed upon was between 6 and 6:30. There was no dispute, there was no argument. It was agreed that that was a reasonable time for us to conclude the business of the day on yesterday.

Mr. BOGGS. The point is that there was agreement on both sides on when the debate should end. I think we understand the situation. The Speaker conferred with the minority leader and they agreed on a time which was satisfactory to everybody. That is exactly the point. Nobody here has tried to stuff anything down anybody else's throat.

I would say to the gentlemen who just laughed that what is involved here is this—and I will just spell it right out. It is that this is a major portion of the administration's program. It just so happens that on last November this issue went to the people of the United States and when the votes were counted there were this many over here and that many over there. Let me say to the gentleman that as far as I am concerned the issue involved here is a very simple one. I know all about dilatory tactics. I happen to be a lawyer by profession. I know about pleading, and that sort of thing. But the issue involved here is whether or not we will pass an education bill which was part of the promise made by President Johnson when he ran for President. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS], has expired.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CEDERBERG. There is not any question about the passage of the bill. The majority side has the votes to pass the bill. All we want is sufficient time for the consideration of amendments. It is my understanding that the other body has not even started hearings on this bill. Why is it so important that we finish this bill tonight? Why not continue it next week and give adequate time for the consideration of all of the amendments? The gentleman knows that these amendments have not received the time to which they are entitled. What is wrong with such a request? What is wrong with our having a few more days?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman out of a wealth of legislative experience in this body I am not a member of this committee, but I am quite certain, if I know anything about this committee, that most of these amendments, if not all of them, have already been offered in the committee. In addition to that, these amendments were debated here in general debate. We had a debate here yesterday that lasted all day on the principal amendment to this bill, the so-called formula. And, no one sought to cut off anybody. We talked about it all day long.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are only 2 other basic issues involved in this bill. One of them is the church-state issue, as everyone knows; and the other is the related issue of judicial review.

Everyone understood the issues and we know them from A to Z. We have debated them since I have been in Congress. This is the first time we have been able to bring a bill here where the majority of the Members of this body on both sides of the aisle can reconcile the problems that confront them on these issues so that we can pass a bill. The reason we are staying here tonight is that we feel this is important enough for the American people and for our young people to pass this bill and get it on its way so it can become the law of the land.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I was quite amused at the previous speaker in referring to the words and expressions which have been used here.

I was reminded while the gentleman was making his speech we have learned two other words which have been coined and are now approved for common usage on the floor of the House and they are "demagog" and "demagoguery."

Mr. HAYS. They are not so new.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read.

Mr. POWELL (interrupting reading of bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of this title be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DERWINSKI. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object——

Mr. DERWINSKI. An objection was made and I do object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE V—GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN STATE DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION

Appropriations authorized

SEC. 501. (a) The Commissioner shall carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, a program for making grants to stimulate and assist States in strengthening the leadership resources of their State educational agencies, and to assist those agencies in the establishment and improvement of programs to identify and meet the educational needs of States.

(b) For the purpose of making grants under this title, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; but for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and the three succeeding fiscal years, only such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

Apportionment among States

SEC. 502. (a) (1) From 85 per centum of the sums appropriated for carrying out this title for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum of such 85 per centum of such sums, as he may determine and shall apportion such amount among the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this title. From the remainder of such 85 per centum of such sums the Commissioner shall apportion $100,000 to each State, and shall apportion to each State such part of the remainder of such 85 per centum of such sums as the number of public school pupils in the State bears to the number of public school pupils in all the States, as determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him. For purposes of this paragraph, the term "State" does not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

(2) Fifteen per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 501 for each fiscal year shall be reserved by the Commissioner for grants for special projects pursuant to section 505.

(b) (1) The amount apportioned to any State under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the Commissioner determines will not be required for that year shall be available for reapportionment from time to time, on such dates during that year as the Commissioner may fix, to other States in proportion to the amounts originally apportioned among those States under subsection (a) (1) for that year, but with the proportionate amount for any of the other States being reduced to the extent it exceeds the sum the Commissioner estimates that State needs and will be able to use for that year; and the total of these reductions shall be similarly reapportioned among the States whose proportionate amounts were not so reduced. Any amount reapportioned to a State under this subsection from funds appropriated pursuant to section 501 for any fiscal year shall be deemed part of the amount apportioned to it under subsection (a) (1) for that year.

(2) In accordance with regulations of the Commissioner any State may file with him a request that a specified portion of the amount apportioned to it under subsection (a) (1) be added to the amount apportioned to another State under that subsection for the purpose of meeting a portion of the Federal share (as defined in section 503(b)) of the cost of carrying out one or more programs or activities under an approved application of that other State. If the Commissioner finds that the programs or activities with respect to which the request is made would meet needs of the State making the request and that use of the specified portion of the amount apportioned to that State, as requested by it, would assist in carrying out the purposes of this title, that portion shall be added to the amount apportioned to the other State under subsection (a) (1) to be used for the purpose referred to above. The Federal share of the total funds expended for such programs or activities shall be adjusted on the basis of the proportion of such total funds so expended by each participating State from the amounts originally apportioned to each such State.

Grants from apportioned funds

SEC. 503. (a) From the amount apportioned to any State for any fiscal year under section 502 the Commissioner may, upon approval of an application or applications therefor submitted to him by such State through the State educational agency, make a grant or grants to such agency equal to the Federal share of expenditures incurred by such agency for the planning of, and for programs for, the development, improvement, or expansion of activities promoting the purposes set forth in section 501(a) and more particularly described in such application and for which such application is approved, such as—

(1) educational planning on a statewide basis, including the identification of educational problems, issues, and needs in the State and the evaluation on a periodic or continuing basis of education programs in the State;

(2) providing support or services for the comprehensive and compatible recording, collecting, processing, analyzing, interpreting, storing, retrieving, and reporting of State and local educational data, including the use of automated data systems;

(3) dissemination or support for the dissemination of information relating to the condition, progress, and needs of education in the State;

(4) programs for conducting, sponsoring, or cooperating in educational research and demonstration programs and projects such as (A) establishing and maintaining curriculum research and innovation centers to assist in locating and evaluating curriculum research findings, (B) discovering and testing new educational ideas (including new uses of printed and audiovisual media) and more effective educational practices, and putting into use those which show promise of success, and (C) studying ways to improve the legal and organizational structure for education and the management and administration of education in the State;

(5) publication and distribution, or support for the publication and distribution, of curricular materials collected and developed at curriculum research centers and elsewhere;

(6) programs to improve the quality of teacher preparation, including student-teaching arrangements, in cooperation with institutions of higher education and local educational agencies;

(7) studies or support for studies concerning the financing of public education in the State;

(8) support for statewide programs designed to measure the educational achievement of pupils;

(9) training and otherwise developing the competency of individuals who serve State or local educational agencies and provide leadership, administrative, or specialist services throughout the State, or throughout the area served by a local educational agency, through the initiation, improvement, and expansion of activities such as (A) sabbatical leave programs, (B) fellowships and traineeships (including educational expenses and the cost of travel) for State educational agency personnel to pursue graduate studies, and (C) conducting institutes, workshops, and conferences (including related costs of operation and payment of the expenses of participants); and

(10) providing local educational agencies and the schools of those agencies with consultative and technical assistance and services relating to academic subjects and to particular aspects of education such as the education of the handicapped, school building design and utilization, school social work, the utilization of modern instructional materials and equipment, transportation, educational administrative procedures, and school health, physical education, and recreation.

(b) (1) For the purposes of this section the Federal share for any State shall be 100 per centum for fiscal years ending prior to July 1, 1967. Thereafter the Federal share for any State shall be 100 per centum less the State percentage, except that (A) the Federal share shall in no case be more than 66 per centum or less than 50 per centum, and (B) the Federal share for the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands shall be 66 per centum. The "State percentage" for any State shall be that percentage which bears the same ratio to 50 per centum as the per capita income of that State bears to the per capita income of all the States (excluding the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands).

(2) The Federal share for each State for the fiscal years beginning July 1, 1967, and July 1, 1968, shall be promulgated by the Commissioner between July 1 and August 31, 1966, and the Federal share for each State for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1969, shall be promulgated by the Commissioner between July 1 and August 31, 1968. Such Federal share shall be computed on the basis of the average of the per capita incomes of each State and of all the States (excluding the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands) for the three most recent consecutive years for which satisfactory data are available from the Department of Commerce.

Approval of applications for grants from apportioned funds

SEC. 504. An application for a grant under section 503 may be approved by the Commissioner only upon his determination that—

(a) each of the proposed projects, programs, and activities for which it is approved meets the requirements of section 503(a) and will make a significant contribution to strengthening the leadership resources of the applicant or its ability to participate effectively in meeting the educational needs of the State;

(b) the application contains or is supported by adequate assurance that Federal funds made available under the approved application will be so used as to supplement, and to the extent practical, increase the amounts of State funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for projects and activities which meet the requirements of section 503(a);

(c) the application sets forth such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including any such funds paid by the State to agencies, institutions, or organizations) under this title; and

(d) the application provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

Special project grants

SEC. 505. Fifteen per centum of the sums appropriated pursuant to section 501 for each fiscal year shall be used by the Commissioner to make grants to State educational agencies to pay part of the cost of experimental projects for developing State leadership or for the establishment of special services which, in the judgment of the Commissioner, hold promise of making a substantial contribution to the solution of problems common to the State educational agencies of all or several States.

Payments

SEC. 506. Payments pursuant to grants under this title may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments, as the Commissioner may determine.

Interchange of personnel with States

SEC. 507. (a) For the purposes of this section, the term "State" means a State or any agency of a State engaged in activities in the field of education, but it does not include a local educational agency; and the term "Office" means the Office of Education.

(b) The Commissioner is authorized, through agreements or otherwise, to arrange for assignment of officers and employees of States to the Office and assignment of officers and employees in the Office to States, for work which the Commissioner determines will aid the Office in more effective discharge of its responsibilities as authorized by law, including cooperation with States and the provision of technical or other assistance. The period of assignment of any officer or employee under an arrangement shall not exceed two years.

(c)(1) Officers and employees in the Office assigned to any State pursuant to this section shall be considered, during such assignment, to be (A) on detail to a regular work assignment in the Office, or (B) on leave without pay from their positions in the Office.

(2) Persons considered to be so detailed shall remain as officers or employees, as the case may be, in the Office for all purposes, except that the supervision of their duties during the period of detail may be governed by agreement between the Office and the State involved.

(3) In the case of persons so assigned and on leave without pay—

(A) if the rate of compensation (including allowances) for their employment by the State is less than the rate of compensation (including allowances) they would be receiving had they continued in their regular assignment in the Office, they may receive supplemental salary payments from the Office in the amount considered by the Commissioner to be justified, but not at a rate in excess of the difference between the State rate and the Office rate; and

(B) they may be granted annual leave and sick leave to the extent authorized by law but only in circumstances considered by the Commissioner to justify approval of such leave.

Such officers and employees on leave without pay shall, notwithstanding any other provision of law, be entitled—

(C) to continuation of their insurance under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, and coverage under the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, so long as the Office continues to collect the employee's contribution from the officer or employee involved and to transmit for timely deposit into the funds created under such Acts the amount of the employee's contributions and the Government's contribution from appropriations of the Office; and

(D) to credit the period of their assignment under the arrangement under this section toward periodic or longevity step increases and, upon payment into the civil service retirement and disability fund of the percentage of their State salary, and of their supplemental salary payments, if any, which would have been deducted from a like Federal salary for the period of such assignment and payment by the Commissioner into such fund of the amount which would have been payable by him during the period of such assignment with respect to a like Federal salary, to treat (notwithstanding the provisions of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1959, under the head "Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund") their service during such period as service within the meaning of the Civil Service Retirement Act;

except that no officer or employee or his beneficiary may receive any benefits under the Civil Service Retirement Act, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, or the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, based on service during an assignment hereunder for which the officer or employee or (if he dies without making such election) his beneficiary elects to receive benefits, under any State retirement or insurance law or program, which the Civil Service Commission determines to be similar. The Office shall deposit currently in the funds created under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959, and the civil service retirement and disability fund, respectively, the amount of the Government's contribution under these Acts on account of service with respect to which employee contributions are collected as provided in subparagraph (C) and the amount of the Government's contribution under the Civil Service Retirement Act on account of service with respect to which payments (of the amount which would have been deducted under that Act) referred to in subparagraph (D) are made to such civil service retirement and disability fund.

(4) Any such officer or employee on leave without pay who suffers disability or death as a result of personal injury sustained while in the performance of his duty during an assignment hereunder, shall be treated, for the purposes of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as though he were an employee, as defined in such Act, who had sustained such injury in the performance of duty. When such person (or his dependents, in case of death) entitled by reason of injury or death to benefits under that Act is also entitled to benefits from a State for the same injury or death, he (or his dependents in case of death) shall elect which benefits he will receive. Such election shall be made within one year after the injury or death, or such further time as the Secretary of Labor may for good cause allow, and when made shall be irrevocable unless otherwise provided by law.

(d) Assignment of any officer or employee in the Office to a State under this section may be made with or without reimbursement by the State for the compensation (or supplementary compensation), travel and transportation expenses (to or from the place of assignment), and allowances, or any part thereof, of such officer or employee during the period of assignment, and any such reimbursement shall be credited to the appropriation utilized for paying such compensation, travel or transportation expenses, or allowances.

(e) Appropriations to the Office shall be available, in accordance with the standardized Government travel regulations, for the expenses of travel of officers and employees assigned to States under an arrangement under this section on either a detail or leave-without-pay basis and, in accordance with applicable law, orders, and regulations, for expenses of transportation of their immediate families and expenses of transportation of their household goods and personal effects, in connection with the travel of such officers and employees to the location of their posts of assignment and their return to their official stations.

(f) Officers and employees of States who are assigned to the Office under an arrangement under this section may (1) be given appointments in the Office covering the periods of such assignments, or (2) be considered to be on detail to the Office. Appointments of persons so assigned may be made without regard to the civil service laws. Persons so appointed in the Office shall be paid at rates of compensation determined in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, and shall not be considered to be officers or employees of the Office for the purposes of (1) the Civil Service Retirement Act, (2) the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, or (3) unless their appointments result in the loss of coverage in a group health benefits plan whose premium has been paid in whole or in part by a State contribution, the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959. State officers and employees who are assigned to the Office without appointment shall not be considered to be officers or employees of the Office, except as provided in subsection (g), nor shall they be paid a salary or wage by the Office during the period of their assignment. The supervision of the duties of such persons during the assignment may be governed by agreement between the Commissioner and the State involved.

(g)(1) Any State officer or employee who is assigned to the Office without appointment shall nevertheless be subject to the provisions of sections 203, 205, 207, 208, and 209 of title 18 of the United States Code.

(2) Any State officer or employee who is given an appointment while assigned to the Office, or who is assigned to the Office without appointment, under an arrangement under this section, and who suffers disability or death as a result of personal injury sustained while in the performance of his duty during such assignment shall be treated, for the purpose of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as though he were an employee, as defined in such Act, who had sustained such injury in the performance of duty. When such person (or his dependents, in case of death) entitled by reason of injury or death to benefits under that Act is also entitled to benefits from a State for the same injury or death, he (or his dependents, in case of death) shall elect which benefits he will receive. Such election shall be made within one year after the injury or death, or such further time as the Secretary of Labor may for good cause allow, and when made shall be irrevocable unless otherwise provided by law.

(h) The appropriations to the Office shall be available, in accordance with the standardized Government travel regulations, during the period of assignment and in the case of travel to and from their places of assignment or appointment, for the payment of expenses of travel of persons assigned to, or given appointments by, the Office under an arrangement under this section.

(i) All arrangements under this section for assignment of officers or employees in the Office to States or for assignments of officers or employees of States to the Office shall be made in accordance with regulations of the Commissioner.

Administration of state plans

Sec. 508. (a) The Commissioner shall not finally disapprove any application submitted under section 504, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State educational agency submitting the application reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency administering a program under an application approved under this title, finds—

(1) that the application has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 504(a), or

(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State educational agency that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

Judicial review

Sec. 509. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of an application submitted under section 504(a) or with his final action under section 508(b), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code.

Periodic review of program and laws

Sec. 510. (a) The Secretary shall, within ninety days after the date of enactment of this title, appoint an Advisory Council on State Departments of Education for the purpose of reviewing the administration of the programs for which funds are appropriated pursuant to this title and making recommendations for improvement of such administration, and reviewing the status of and making recommendations with respect to such programs and this title and with respect to other Acts under which funds are appropriated to assist State educational agencies to administer Federal programs relating to education.

(b) The Council shall be appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws and shall consist of twelve persons who shall, to the extent possible, include persons familiar with the educational needs of the Nation, persons familiar with the administration of State and local educational programs, and persons representative of the general public.

(c) The Secretary is authorized to engage such technical assistance as may be required to carry out the functions of the Council, and the Secretary shall, in addition, make available to the Council such secretarial, clerical, and other assistance and such pertinent data prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as it may require to carry out such functions.

(d) The Council shall make an annual report of its findings and recommendations (including recommendations for changes in the provisions of this title and of other education Acts) to the Secretary not later than March 31 of each calendar year beginning after the enactment of this title. The Secretary shall transmit each such report to the President and the Congress together with his comments and recommendations.

(e) Members of the Council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while serving on business of the Council, be entitled to receive compensation at rates fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time; and while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in Government service employed intermittently.

Mr. GRIFFIN (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of this title be considered as read, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this title, I hope, will be recognized as one of the most significant titles in the entire bill. It may be claimed, of course, because California under the formula receives the largest amount of money under the formula, that I am somewhat selfish; but I want to point out it does strengthen the State departments of education. There are some who have expressed to me a fear that there may be a conflict of church and state in this entire bill. I think it is important to point out that the statement was made a little while ago that the other body had not held any hearings on this bill. That is not correct.

I would like to call attention to the remarks of the former U.S. Commissioner of Education, Arthur S. Flemming, under the administration of President Eisenhower, representing the National Council of Churches of Christ, when before the Subcommittee on Education of the other body, the following colloquy took place:

> Senator Presiding. Dr. Flemming, have you had an opportunity to see the amendments to this bill that have been adopted by the House subcommittee?
>
> Dr. Flemming. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have, and I have a committee print of the House bill here with me.
>
> Senator Presiding. Do those amendments as added in the House subcommittee, in your opinion meet the objections that you have in your statement or not?
>
> Dr. Flemming. In my opinion they do.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from California for pointing out to the committee the testimony of Dr. Flemming after he had testified before the Senate committee. He had the benefit of reviewing a committee print after the subcommittee had made amendments. He testified in the Senate and gave his approval to this piece of legislation as the spokesman for the National Council of Churches.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

I want to reiterate to those who have any fears that those who had fears and who have studied the legislation are now convinced that there is no issue regarding church and state in this bill as it is now written. I hope, therefore, no one will be under any misapprehension with regard to that.

May I further say that I sincerely hope there will be an overwhelming vote on behalf of this bill, inasmuch as for the first time it does give help to the people who need it most in the field of the educational pattern.

Mr. PERKINS. If the gentleman will yield further, I hold in my hand a letter from the American Civil Liberties Union addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, a representative of which appeared before the committee. It is dated March 23. In the course of the letter this is stated:

> We do agree that the committee's action has strengthened the bill's safeguards against practices that might impair the historic and constitutionally guaranteed, mutual independence of religion and government in the United States. The committee has earned appreciation for the attention it has given to constitutional principle in the report and the redrafted bill.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. I thank the gentleman.

I would just add, Mr. Chairman, that we need not worry. There are none who should have any doubt there will still be the ability of a particular citizen to go into the State or Federal court and test the constitutionality of the act. But on the basis of the evidence placed before the subcommittee, and now before the Committee of the Whole, there could be no question that all doubts have been resolved concerning this important matter.

Mr. Chairman, I would like now to discuss title V, which is one of the most important parts of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

This title authorizes the U.S. Commissioner to make grants to stimulate and assist States in strengthening the leadership resources of their State educational agencies, and to assist those agencies in establishing and improving programs to identify and meet the educational needs of States.

This title authorizes expenditures of $25 million for fiscal year 1966 and such sums as Congress may deem necessary for the 4 fiscal years thereafter. The title would provide Federal grants to the States for planning and conducting programs of their own design. Funds could be used for the cost of such necessary components of these programs as personnel, equipment, or publications.

Grants would be made to the State educational agencies on the basis of applications to the Commissioner in which the agencies would describe proposed activities and how they would fulfill the purposes of the title; that is, how the agencies' leadership resources would be strengthened.

Funds would be available to State agencies under two sections of the title. Under section 502, 85 percent of the funds appropriated would be apportioned among the States and reserved for activities proposed by their educational agencies. The agency of one State might also request that part of its funds be allocated to the agency of another State for a specific project of mutual concern. Unused funds from a State agency's allotment for any year would be subject to reapportionment to educational agencies in other States. Under section 505, the remaining 15 percent is reserved to the U.S. Commissioner of Education for special grants to State educational agencies.

No matching of Federal funds by State funds would be required for the first 2 years of the program; for the remaining 3 years a matching formula would be applied. Under this formula, which is designed to assist the poorer States, the Federal share for any State would not be more than 66 percent or less than 50 percent.

Although this title calls for the smallest appropriation of any of the titles in this bill for fiscal year 1966, it is a very important part of the bill. The success of past Federal investments in education, and of others that may come, depends upon strong and balanced State educational leadership, planning, and coordination.

WHY TITLE V?

The foremost consideration of the administration in recommending this title is that if American education at the elementary and secondary levels is to be both free and effective, State departments of education must be strengthened without delay. The alternative to strong State departments is an educational lag and a default of leadership which can only result in a loss to the entire Nation. The rationale of this Federal program to aid State educational agencies is threefold:

First, the Federal Government has a vital interest in strengthening, stimulating, and supplementing educational leadership resources within the several States.

Second, it is clearly in the national interest for the States to identify and meet educational needs through State and local agencies so that our decentralized system of State, local, and institutional control of education will not be weakened.

Third, State departments of education occupy a strategic position in the structure of American education. They are the focal points for the improvement of education in the States. Not only does a State department serve as the instrument of the State to improve education throughout the State, but also it assists and cooperates with the Federal Government in the realization of the national interest in the State. It is a vital force in developing both the policies which are based upon the internal needs of the State, and the nationwide policies which need to be implemented within the State.

Title V recognizes the crucial position of the State departments, and is intended to strengthen the departments to help them meet the growing demands on them. As one witness before the committee—Superintendent Hansen, District of Columbia—aptly commented, the Federal support of educational agencies proposed in title V puts "strength close to the heartbeat of American education" and deserves enthusiastic endorsement.

The pressing needs of State departments are numerous. For instance, there is need for additional educational planning. State departments of education have indicated a need for greater effort in developing educational plans on a statewide basis, including the identification of educational problems, issues, and needs, and the periodic evaluation of State education programs.

At present, the State departments are generally so hard pressed to administer current programs that they cannot give this important basic function of educational planning the time or attention it deserves, nor do they have the necessary staff to do so. This title would make possible the grants of money to help provide skilled professionals now clearly needed but infrequently found—economists, political scientists, planning experts, sociologists, and the like—and to develop staff skills to keep up with educational needs in the years ahead.

The States have generally recognized the need for more planning, but have often been hampered from doing much about the need. A local school superintendent—Brownell, Detroit—who testified before the committee, in calling attention to the need for title V, said:

> We are not only aware, but grateful, for the services provided by members of the staff of the State agency who must function often in a multiple capacity because of budgetary limitation. The State program has been clearly defined and the organizational charts have been developed in such a way that all types of districts can benefit from the services offered. The real problem comes from the lack of staff to maintain the increased and increasing services expected of them.

The State departments of education would, under title V, be helped to have wide flexibility to study their problems, to plan, and otherwise to strengthen their leadership role in improving the quality of education—each State tailoring its title V program to meet its own unique needs.

We have been much impressed with the testimony of State superintendents of public education as to the problems they confront daily in attempting to meet the growing educational responsibilities being placed on their shoulders. The evidences of inadequacies and insufficient resources are abundantly revealed in the committee's hearing record and in the discussions of leading authorities such as Dr. James Conant's provocative new work, "Shaping Educational Policy."

There are many examples which might be cited of the problems confronting our State departments of education, but perhaps none is more graphic than that given in Commissioner Keppel's testimony relating to a medium-sized department in a middle-income State. In this State, 75 professional staff members assist 1,300 schools and 20,000 local school people in the administration of State and Federal funds and programs, in the improvement of instruction, and in the solution of technical problems relating to building, equipment, materials, et cetera, but these 75 State consultants can visit the schools of their State on the average of only one-half day every 7 years. One cannot conceive that under such circumstances, which are believed to be widespread, it is possible to have effective State educational leadership for the challenges of today and for the awesome responsibilities of tomorrow.

From many sides, including the State departments of education themselves, we have had indications of the need for greater effort and resources for educational planning on a statewide basis, including the identification of educational problems, issues, and needs, the development of programs to meet needs, and periodic evaluation of State education programs.

We have heard from the testimony before the committee that few State departments of education have staff engaged in long-range planning activities and no department has an organizational unit engaged in overall planning.

At present, the State departments are generally so hard pressed to administer current programs that they cannot give educational planning the time or attention it deserves, nor do they have the necessary staff. The new legislation, therefore, makes possible the provision of money to help provide skilled professionals now clearly needed but infrequently found—economists, political scientists, planning experts, sociologists, and the like—and to develop staff skills to keep up with educational needs in the years ahead.

We still need to improve and increase the flow of information about education to our citizens, to State legislatures, to the Congress, and to educators themselves as a basis for decisions about education.

The State departments have important responsibilities for preservice and inservice training programs and for teacher certification.

Improved State level planning in the teacher preparation area is imperative. The current annual need, just to replace those leaving the profession and to meet growing enrollments, totals approximately 180,000 teachers. Yet only about three-fourths of the 175,000 graduates trained for teaching enter the profession, a shortage of 45,000. States could use their title V apportionments to develop plans and programs to help meet these needs for better teacher preparation.

Adequate financing of the educational program remains a major problem of every State, made more complex by the relationship of the education function to all other governmental functions. Rapid change in both financial needs of education and the individual State's economy require continuous research, analysis, and evaluation by such specialists as economists, tax consultants, and school

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

finance experts. Wise decisions by legislators, State boards of education, and citizens about the allocation of public funds for education are difficult, if not impossible, without competent studies of this nature. As State departments are not now equipped to meet these needs, title V grants could be used for programs in this area of central importance to education at all levels.

Consultative and technical assistance is a basic means of making innovations in education bear fruit. Unfortunately, the press of the numerous tasks of educational leadership has almost everywhere prevented the States from devoting the attention they feel is necessary to serving local education agencies in this way.

Section 505 of title V authorizes a special fund of 15 percent—or $1.5 million—in fiscal year 1966—of the $10 million total in the title—to be used at the discretion of the Commissioner for grants to assist in the solution of educational problems common to two or more State educational agencies.

The section would enable the Commissioner to assist all or several of the State educational agencies—working separately or in concert—to try out ideas and services of general benefit. Ideas would be welcomed from any source, within or without the educational community, and the initiative for working out arrangements for specific proposed grants could originate either with one or more of the State educational agencies or with the Commissioner. Thus, in a very real sense, this section provides "risk capital" to explore or demonstrate possibilities which otherwise might not be tried.

Another significant provision of title V relates to the authorization for the interchange of personnel between the State departments of education and the Office of Education. One of the principal values of the American system of decentralized control of education has been the development of an array of vital ideas, policies, and methods. However, vitality from decentralization depends on effective communication of ideas among the administrative organizations in which ideas are developed or applied.

As one means of promoting desirable communications, title V provides that the U.S. Commissioner of Education could arrange with the States for the interchange of personnel between the Office of Education and the States for work which will aid the States or the Office in more effectively discharging its responsibilities. The length of any assignment would be not greater than 2 years. The bill provides in detail the responsibilities of the States and the Office in maintaining salary, health, accident, and retirement coverage of exchanged personnel.

Finally, in the words of President Johnson:

> In all that we do, we mean to strengthen our State and community education systems. Federal assistance does not mean Federal control as past programs have proved. The late Senator Robert Taft declared: "Education is primarily a State function, but in the field of education, as in the fields of health, relief, and medical care, the Federal Government has a secondary obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States."

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, if I correctly understand the gentleman from California he said that all doubts have been resolved concerning the church-state issue?

May I read some telegrams which have come in during this last week. This is from the President of the American Lutheran Church:

> It would be improper for anyone in Congress to say that all Protestant forces have endorsed the education bill, since we have not given full consideration to this bill in our commission on research and social action. I would concur with the judgment of the social trends committee of the National Lutheran Council that we must give attention to some of the possible danger points in such legislation, and it would appear that provision for judicial review would be a wise and proper safeguard.

Here is another telegram which came in yesterday. It is from the executive secretary of the International Convention of Christian Churches and a member of the general board of the National Council of Christian Churches:

> Indianapolis, Ind.
>
> Congresswoman Edith Green,
> *House Office Building,*
> *Washington, D.C.:*
>
> As executive secretary of the International Convention of Christian Churches and a member of the general board of the National Council of Christian Churches, I wish to reaffirm my support for an adequate provision for judicial review in the education bill (H.R. 2362) which would assure that the programs developed under this bill are compatible with the religion clause of the first amendment. This language approved by the general board of the National Council of Christian Churches on February 26, 1965, clearly calls for a judicial review which makes possible a test of the validity of programs under the bill as related to the first amendment. I urge that an amendment be added to this bill which would enable local educational agencies to raise the first amendment question.
>
> A. Dale Fiers,
> *Executive Secretary, International Convention of Christian Churches.*

I think all of the Members of the House have received the letter signed by a group of organizations which urge a judicial review provision in this particular bill.

The letter is as follows:

> A communication to the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives on the subject of a judicial review provision in the bill for Federal aid to education, March 23, 1965
>
> The bill for Federal aid to education introduced by Representative Carl D. Perkins, with the support of the administration (H.R. 2361), will shortly come before the House for debate and action. Although a number of desirable changes have been made in the bill by the House Committee on Education and Labor, it still contains some provisions that could be administered in a manner violative of the requirements of the clauses on religion in the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Yet there is a substantial possibility that, if the bill is enacted in its present form, it will not be possible for anyone to initiate a proceeding enabling the courts to pass on the constitutional validity of the programs financed under its terms.
>
> It is an accepted part of our legal system that constitutional guarantees are enforceable by the courts and that actions by governmental agencies are subject to judicial review to insure adherence to constitutional principle. Programs under the Federal aid bill, however, appear to fall within an exception to that general rule since no individual or official would be in a position to initiate a proceeding for such judicial review.
>
> As a result, it is entirely possible that Federal funds may be paid out in substantial amounts and over a number of years, without any person having the opportunity to obtain a judicial ruling on the legality of this use of the taxpayers' money. That is a situation plainly at variance with the general assumptions underlying our judicial system.
>
> The undersigned organizations, therefore, believe that it is essential that H.R. 2361 be amended so as to permit judicial review. Inclusion of such a provision is an eminently sensible precaution. Those who believe that the bill presents no constitutional problems can hardly object to a procedure that would result, if they are right, in judicial vindication of their claims. On the other hand, they can hardly claim that unconstitutional programs should be allowed to continue unchecked.
>
> We, therefore, urge support of an amendment to H.R. 2361 providing for judicial review. (Such an amendment, of course, could contain appropriate provisions to guard against multiple or protracted litigation.) Only by adopting such an amendment, could Congress guard against expenditure of public funds in violation of the basic law of the land.
>
> American Civil Liberties Union, New York City.
> American Jewish Committee, New York City.
> American Jewish Congress, New York City.
> Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, New York City.
> Central Conference of American Rabbis, New York City.
> Jewish Labor Committee, New York City.
> Jewish War Veterans, Washington, D.C.
> Rabbinical Assembly of America, New York City.
> Union of American Hebrew Congregations, New York City.
> Unitarian-Universalist Association, Boston, Mass.
> United Synagogue of America, New York City.

If I may read another telegram which came in yesterday. A copy was sent to me and the original was sent to the distinguished majority leader, the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Carl Albert, because he had included in the Record yesterday a telegram from Mr. George Davis, minister of National City Christian Church:

> Indianapolis, Ind.
>
> Congressman Edith Green,
> *House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:*
>
> The following telegram was sent to Carl Albert: "You have recently received a communication from Dr. George Davis, minister of National City Christian Church, stating his personal support for the education bill as it is presently written and implying that resolutions of the international convention of Christian Churches tend to support his position. We understand that his telegram was read in the Congressional Record yesterday. Dr. Davis has every right to this opinion. However, it should be pointed out that the major emphasis of all resolutions of the international convention on this subject emphatically state that public monies should be used only for public education. A recent partial survey of our membership showed that 85 percent of those who replied agree that "no tax in any amount large or small can be levied to support any religious

institutions." Our position which we communicated to you yesterday should not be interpreted as opposition to the basic purpose of the bill. But we are committed to the need for an adequate judicial review section in the education bill as a more accurate reflection of the thinking of our membership."

BARTON HUNTER,
Executive Secretary, Department of Christian Action and Community Service, United Christian Missionary Society.

Another sad commentary, Mr. Chairman: Witnesses before the committee had not even had time to study the bill. May I refer to the hearings themselves, when the gentleman who testified for the American Lutheran Council gave his testimony, he said this:

> We have not had the opportunity, obviously, to consider or comment on the present legislative proposal.

In other words, they have not even had time to read the bill.

The gentleman who appeared before the subcommittee representing the Methodist Board of Social Concerns said:

> The general legislative body of the church, the general conference, have not had the opportunity to consider this specific piece of legislation.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, there was a very eloquent spokesman who was in Washington on August 28, 1963. He is Rabbi Prinz. On January 20, 1965, Rabbi Prinz wrote these words, addressed in a letter, to the chairman of the committee.

In the third paragraph of that letter, he said:

> I wish to state, most emphatically, that the proposed schedule of hearings is manifestly inappropriate for these bills. The President's proposals have presented to the American people a totally new plan for dealing with a pressing national issue, a plan that raises serious questions under the constitutional requirement of separation of church and state. The specific terms of the bill have been available only in the last few days. In short, the American people have had no opportunity even to begin to give this matter the attention it requires.

The following additional telegrams urge the judicial review section be added to safeguard the rights guaranteed in the Constitution:

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
March 26, 1965.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Heartily support your proposed amendment to education bill providing for judicial review.

GEORGE J. HECHT,
Publisher, Parents Magazine,
Chairman, American Parents Committee.

EVANSTON, ILL.,
March 23, 1965.

MRS. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The National School Boards Association, composed of the 17,000 local school boards responsible for educating 95 percent of the Nation's public elementary and secondary school pupils, would strongly support a proposal to amend H.R. 2362 to incorporate a provision for judicial review. Important concerns about separation of church and state and local controls of a strong vigorous system of public education mandate this support.

W. L. ROBINSON,
President, National School Boards Association.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
March 23, 1965.

HON. BENJAMIN ROSENTHAL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

United Federation of Teachers AFL–CIO, exclusively representing all 48,000 teachers and professional staff of New York City Board of Education urges you vote against Federal aid to education bill. The measure would violate church state separation, grant public tax fund to parochial schools, create divisiveness in America, accelerate flight of students from public schools, increase segregation in public schools, weaken our system of public education. Our 2,000 delegates from over 850 schools have overwhelmingly voted against this bill. We urge its defeat.

ALBERT SHANKER,
President, United Federation of Teachers.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
March 25, 1965.

HON. EDITH GREEN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Aid public schools only, otherwise gradual destruction inevitable as in Holland after Government began subsidizing church schools 45 years ago; 80 percent children there now in church schools whereas previously 80 percent in public schools.

MRS. DOREEN M. TAYLOR,
Executive Director, Americans for Public Schools.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that a judicial review will be offered today and will be approved by this House

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODELL

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODELL: Beginning with line 21 on page 121, strike out everything down through line 3 on page 141, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Apportionment among States

"SEC. 502. (a) From the sums appropriated for carrying out this title for each fiscal year, the Commissioner shall reserve such amount, but not in excess of 2 per centum of such sums, as he may determine and shall allot such amounts to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands according to their respective needs for assistance under this title. From the remainder of such sums the Commissioner shall allot $100,000 to each State, and shall allot to each State such part of the remainder of such sums as the number of public school pupils in the State bears to the number of public school pupils in all the States, as determined by the Commissioner on the basis of the most recent satisfactory data available to him. For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'State' does not include the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands.

"(b) In accordance with regulations of the Commissioner any State may file with him a request that a specified portion of the amount allotted to it under subsection (a) be added to the amount allotted to another State under that subsection for the purpose of meeting a portion of the Federal share (as defined in section 503(b)) of the cost of carrying out one or more programs or activities under an approved application of that other State. If the Commissioner finds that the programs or activities with respect to which the request is made would meet needs of the State making the request and that use of the specified portion of the amount allotted to that State, as requested by it, would assist in carrying out the purposes of this title, that portion shall be added to the amount allotted to the other State under subsection (a) to be used for the purpose referred to above. The Federal share of the total funds expended for such programs or activities shall be adjusted on the basis of the proportion of such total funds so expended by each participating State from the amounts originally apportioned to each such State.

"Grants from allotted funds

"SEC. 503. (a) From the amount allotted to any State for any fiscal year under section 502 the Commissioner shall, on the basis of an application or applications therefor submitted to him by such State through the State educational agency, make a grant or grants to such agency equal to the Federal share of expenditure incurred by such agency for the planning of, and for programs for, the development, improvement, or expansion of activities promoting the purposes set forth in section 501(a), such as—

"(1) educational planning on a statewide basis, including the identification of educational problems, issues, and needs in the State and the evaluation on a periodic or continuing basis of education programs in the State;

"(2) providing support or services for the comprehensive and compatible recording, collecting, processing, analyzing, interpreting, storing, retrieving, and reporting of State and local educational data, including the use of automated data systems;

"(3) dissemination or support for the dissemination of information relating to the condition, progress, and needs of education in the State;

"(4) programs for conducting, sponsoring, or cooperating in educational research and demonstration programs and projects such as (A) establishing and maintaining curriculum research and innovation centers to assist in locating and evaluating curriculum research findings, (B) discovering and testing new educational ideas (including new uses of printed and audio-visual media) and more effective educational practices, and putting into use those which show promise of success, and (C) studying ways to improve the legal and organizational structure for education and the management and administration of education in the State;

"(5) publication and distribution, or support for the publication and distribution, of curricular materials collected and developed at curriculum research centers and elsewhere;

"(6) programs to improve the quality of teacher preparation, including student-teaching arrangements, in cooperation with institutions of higher education and local educational agencies;

"(7) studies or support for studies concerning the financing of public education in the State;

"(8) support for statewide programs designed to measure the educational achievement of pupils;

"(9) training and otherwise developing the competency of individuals who serve State or local educational agencies and provide leadership, administrative, or specialist services throughout the State, or throughout the area served by a local educational agency, through the initiation, improvement, and expansion of activities such as (A) sabbatical leave programs, (B) fellowships and traineeships (including educational expenses and the cost of travel) or State educational agency personnel to pursue graduate studies, and (C) conducting institutes, workshops, and conferences (including related costs of operation and payment of the expenses of participants); and

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

"(10) providing local educational agencies and the schools of those agencies with consultative and technical assistance and services relating to academic subjects and to particular aspects of education such as the education of the handicapped, school building design and utilization, school social work, the utilization of modern instructional materials and equipment, transportation, educational administrative procedures, and school health, physical education and recreation.

"(b) For the purposes of this section the Federal share for any State shall be 100 per centum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, 66⅔ per centum for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1969, and 50 per centum for each fiscal year thereafter.

"Approval of applications for grants from allotted funds

"SEC. 504. An application for a grant under section 503 shall be approved by the Commissioner only upon certification by the State educational agency that—

"(a) each of the proposed projects, programs, and activities for which it is approved meets the requirements of section 503(a) and will make a significant contribution to strengthening the leadership resources of the applicant or its ability to participate effectively in meeting the educational needs of the State;

"(b) Federal funds made available under the approved application will be so used as to supplement, and to the extent practical, increase the amounts of State funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for projects and activities which meet the requirements of section 503(a);

"(c) such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures shall be used as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State (including any such funds paid by the State to agencies, institutions, or organizations) under this title; and

"(d) the agency shall make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may require to carry out his functions under this title, and for keeping such records and for affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"Payments

"SEC. 505. Payments pursuant to grants under this title may be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, with necessary adjustments on account of overpayments or underpayments, as the Commissioner may determine.

"Administration of State plans

"SEC. 506. (a) The Commissioner shall not disapprove any application submitted under section 504, or any modification thereof, without first affording the State educational agency submitting the application reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

"(b) Whenever the Commissioner, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State educational agency administering a program under an application approved under this title, finds—

"(1) that the application has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of section 504(a), or

"(2) that in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Commissioner shall notify such State educational agency that the State will not be regarded as eligible to participate in the program under this title until he is satisfied that there is no longer any such failure to comply.

"Judicial review

"SEC. 507. (a) If any State is dissatisfied with the Commissioner's final action with respect to the approval of an application submitted under section 504(a) or with his final action under section 506(b), such State may, within sixty days after notice of such action, file with the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such State is located a petition for review of that action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Commissioner. The Commissioner thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.

"(b) The findings of fact by the Commissioner, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive; but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Commissioner to take further evidence, and the Commissioner may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall certify to the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.

"(c) The court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Commissioner or to set it aside, in whole or in part. The judgment of the court shall be subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code."

Mr. GOODELL (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, this is a rather long amendment in the nature of a substitute for the entire title, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment retains the $25 million annual authorization for title V. It retains the purposes for which the State education agency may use the funds. It retains the formula for distributing the funds among the States.

It makes these changes: First, the funds are to be actually allotted to each State to carry out the purposes of the title. Each State has a right to receive the funds. Under the present bill, no State education department has a right to receive the funds now apportioned, and if the State education department comes forward with a plan that satisfies the Commissioner, then they will receive a grant.

All a State must do, under my substitute, is file an application with the U.S. Commissioner which certifies that it shall use these funds for the purposes of the title.

In other words, this leaves complete authority in the State education departments to utilize this money from the Federal Government in their own wisdom to strengthen their departments.

In the second year, there is a one-third matching by the States, and thereafter it is one-half.

The authorization for exchange of personnel with the U.S. Office of Education is stricken by my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in good faith to dramatize the fact—and I think it is a fact—that title V in the bill is designed to take over our State education departments. We will make the same amount of money available to the State education departments with my substitute and we will tell them, "You can utilize these funds in any way you see fit." I have faith in our State education departments' professional people. We are moving in with this amendment to try to give the Commissioner of Education authority to make grants to the State education departments if they will do things the way the Commissioner feels they should be done. There are 20 pages, from page 121 to page 141, in this bill giving authority of one nature or another to the Commissioner of Education for imposing conditions on these grants to the State education departments. We want to strengthen them, but we feel they need money and they can meet these problems they have by certifying they will move in the direction that we have specified in the bill. The power of the Commissioner of Education to impose his will is not necessary.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to ask the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], a member of the subcommittee, if all the chief State school officers throughout the Nation did not endorse this particular provision and if they were not very much in favor of the provision as written.

Mr. GOODELL. I am glad the gentleman asked that question, because frankly I think you will find the State education department people primarily have endorsed this legislation, with all the authority it takes away from them and from the educators at the State level, so that they will get the $25 million divided and given to them in their State education departments. It is sort of the candy given to them for taking the medicine of accepting control from the Commissioner.

Now, in answer to the gentleman, yes, the superintendents from the State education departments did testify in favor of title V as written and, when asked the question by me, I believe every single one of them said, "We would much prefer it if you would give it without any strings." And that is what my substitute does. When asked if the States could handle this money and, if we gave them the money, they would know how to strengthen the projects they had themselves, without the Commissioner telling them what to do, to a man they said, "Yes. Absolutely. Please do it that way. We much prefer it."

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOELSON. I am surprised that the gentleman first said he had complete confidence in all the Commissioners of Education in the United States and in the next breath charged they would accept a bribe and endorse a law which——

Mr. GOODELL. You used the word "bribe," not I.

Mr. JOELSON. That was a clear implication when you said they would accept the candy for taking the medicine.

Mr. GOODELL. They believed in their departments and wanted them strengthened, and they will take this, if necessary, to do so. They would prefer the money without controls.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this title and on this bill close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. May I hear the motion again?

The CHAIRMAN. Would the gentleman restate his motion?

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will he advise me he has no more amendments?

Mr. GOODELL. I have no more amendments to this title that I am going to offer.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the motion. I move that all debate on this title be closed in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. Chairman, as I have talked to individuals who have been working with State education agencies, I believe they have said that the amendment as offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] will meet their purposes. It will have not only the flexibility that is provided in the amendment, which they need, but also the incentive to go to the State legislatures in future years and to encourage them to appropriate more money for the operation of State education agencies. Throughout the country the criticism that we have today of State education agencies is primarily justified because they have not had sufficient money to pay the salaries to hire the kind of individuals that they need.

Admiral Rickover spoke before our committee on the higher education bill and he referred to the criticism of State education agencies. He pointed out that sufficient educators were not in State education agencies, that you can get the individuals who are educators if you can pay them enough money to hire them, and use their ideas in the agencies if you provide the changes that they think are needed to fit the needs of the State.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I believe that the purposes we are trying to accomplish in this legislation are to help the States meet the needs and a good big part of that is with their educationally deprived children, and those needs can be met in this amendment.

It is offered to improve the legislation and not in any way to harm it. And for that reason I support the amendment of the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so I may ask the chairman of the committee a question?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Will the gentleman tell me how many advisory commissions and advisory councils would be made possible under the language of this bill?

Mr. POWELL. Two.

Mr. GROSS. Only two?

Mr. POWELL. Yes; two titles have explicit provision for establishing advisory councils.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman from Minnesota agree with that?

Mr. QUIE. No. There is a blanket provision for advisory councils. The Commissioner could set up as many as he wanted to. There are two specifically set up in the bill, but blanket provision in title 6.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, if you will turn to page 145, beginning with line 10, you will find a provision for an unlimited number of advisory councils, not only with respect to this law but with respect to any law. I had prepared an amendment to strike that out, because here is a list of present, current, existing advisory commissions numbering 31, the members of which would be paid $100 a day apiece; and most of them have 12 members.

The futility of offering amendments here has been so distinctly shown throughout the day that I have just abandoned the idea of offering that amendment.

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that there is no limit to the number of commissions under the blanket authority in title 6.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I should like to advise the gentleman from Virginia that I am going to offer an amendment somewhat similar to the one he referred to and perhaps he will support mine at the appropriate time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate under title V has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE VI—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Definitions

SEC. 601. As used in titles II, III, and V of this Act—

(a) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of Education.

(b) The term "construction" means (1) erection of new or expansion of existing structures, and the acquisition and installation of equipment therefor; or (2) acquisition of existing structures not owned by any agency or institution making application for assistance under this Act; or (3) remodeling or alteration (including the acquisition, installation, modernization, or replacement of equipment) of existing structures; or (4) a combination of any two or more of the foregoing.

(c) The term "elementary school" means a day or residential school which provides elementary education, as determined under State law.

(d) The term "equipment" includes machinery, utilities, and built-in equipment and any necessary enclosures or structures to house them, and includes all other items necessary for the functioning of a particular facility as a facility for the provision of educational services, including items such as instructional equipment and necessary furniture, printed, published, and audiovisual instructional materials, and books, periodicals, documents, and other related materials.

(e) The term "institution of higher education" means an educational institution in any State which—

(1) admits as regular students only individuals having a certificate of graduation from a high school, or the recognized equivalent of such a certificate;

(2) is legally authorized within such State to provide a program of education beyond high school;

(3) provides an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree, or provides not less than a two-year program which is acceptable for full credit toward such a degree, or offers a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or other technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge;

(4) is a public or other nonprofit institution; and

(5) is accredited by a nationally recognized accrediting agency or association listed by the Commissioner pursuant to this paragraph or, if not so accredited, is an institution whose credits are accepted, on transfer, by not less than three institutions which are so accredited, for credit on the same basis as if transferred from an institution so accredited: *Provided, however,* That in the case of an institution offering a two-year program in engineering, mathematics, or the physical or biological sciences which is designed to prepare the student to work as a technician and at a semiprofessional level in engineering, scientific, or technological fields which require the understanding and application of basic engineering, scientific, or mathematical principles or knowledge, if the Commission determines that there is no nationally recognized accrediting agency or association qualified to accredit such institutions, he shall appoint an advisory committee, composed of persons specially qualified to evaluate training provided by such institutions, which shall prescribe the standards of content, scope, and quality which must be met in order to qualify such institutions to participate under this Act and shall also determine whether particular institutions meet such standards. For the purposes of this paragraph the Commissioner shall publish a list of nationally recognized accrediting agencies or associations which he determines to be reliable authority as to the quality of education or training offered.

(f) The term "local educational agency" means a public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary schools. Such term also includes any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school.

(g) The term "nonprofit" as applied to a school, agency, organization, or institution means a school, agency, organization, or institution owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

(h) The term "secondary school" means a day or residential school which provides secondary education, as determined under State law, except that it does not include any education provided beyond grade 12.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

(i) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(j) The term "State" includes, in addition to the several States of the Union, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, Guam, American Samoa, and the Virgin Islands and for purposes of title II and title III, such term includes the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

(k) The term "State educational agency" means the State board of education or other agency or officer primarily responsible for the State supervision of public elementary and secondary schools, or, if there is no such officer or agency, an officer or agency designated by the Governor or by State law.

Mr. POWELL (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of this title be dispensed with and open to amendment.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will limit that to section 601, I would have no objection. Otherwise, I would.

Mr. POWELL. Fine.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, section 601 will be considered as read and open for amendment.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Advisory councils

Sec. 602. (a) The Commissioner may, without regard to the civil service laws, and subject to the Secretary's approval in such cases as the Secretary may prescribe, from time to time appoint an advisory council or councils to advise and consult with the Commissioner with respect to carrying out his functions under this or any other law.

(b) Members of such an advisory council who are not regular full-time employees of the United States shall, while attending meetings or conferences of such council or otherwise engaged on business of such council, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary, but not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b–2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFIN

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Griffin: On page 145, line 14, strike the words "appoint an advisory council or councils to advise and consult with the Commissioner with respect to carrying out his functions under this or any other law", and insert in lieu thereof "appoint, in addition to the advisory councils and committees authorized in preceding titles, an advisory council of ten members to advise and consult with the Commissioner with respect to his functions under this law".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Michigan yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the chairman of the full committee.

Mr. POWELL. I would like to go home in a blaze of glory, and I accept the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Griffin].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I have been here for 2 days watching the progress of this bill. I have come to the definite conclusion that there was a definite purpose on the part of the managers of this bill to see that there was not a "t" crossed or an "i" dotted. I had hoped I would be able to arouse enough interest to be of assistance in getting a "t" crossed or an "i" dotted in this bill so that we can show that this House did something constructive on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we have been treated like a lot of robots. We have had hundreds of amendments, but we were not even able to discuss them. When they were read, there was so much noise in the Chamber that no one could hear and understand them.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, very few people here in this Chamber are familiar with any of the amendments that have been voted down.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has been treated like it was just dropped down from heaven, that it is sacred and must not be touched.

Mr. Chairman, no committee, however efficient and effective, is perfect, including the near-perfect Committee on Education and Labor, the members of that committee are still human and to err is human.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not think anyone in this House of Representatives or any group of people could draft a piece of legislation as complicated as this and not have some of the sections contained therein which need to be corrected.

For instance you have two instances in this bill. I had amendments prepared which I had in my pocket until I saw the futility of the situation. In each one of those bills there is an appropriation of $100 million, and in each one of those it is provided that the money shall be distributed according to the formula amongst the 50 States of the Union according to what they are entitled to under that formula, yet in each of those paragraphs there is a paragraph hidden away which says the Commissioner, a bureaucrat, may take this $100 million and say to any State that they want to: "I determine that you do not need that money, so I am going to give it to the rest of the States."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I now understand why the Senate bought six cases of fragrant air bombs for $117. They were preparing for the advent of this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. To return to the subject I was discussing, there are two instances of $100 million that belongs to the sister States over which the Commissioner is given power to do as he sees fit in the way of discrimination to any State. That is bad legislation that no administrator, no matter how good he is can overcome, and I cast no aspersion against the present Commissioner. I do not know him. Those things ought not to be done. It is bad legislation.

I just got a crumb of comfort a little while ago when the Chairman announced that as soon as we get this bill passed they are going to take it up in committee and proceed to correct the obvious errors.

The Clerk read as follows:

Federal administration

Sec. 603. (a) The Commissioner may delegate any of his functions under this Act or any Act amended by this Act, except the making of regulations, to any officer or employee of the Office of Education.

(b) In administering the provisions of this Act or any Act amended by this Act, the Commissioner is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit agency or institution in accordance with appropriate agreements, and to pay for such services either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be agreed upon.

Federal control of education prohibited

Sec. 604. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources, textbooks, or other printed or published instructional materials by any educational institution or school system.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the future of 48 million children in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools will be directly and deeply affected by this important bill brought to us by the great Committee on Education and Labor.

We have before us an inspiring opportunity, for the first time in our history, to insure for every American child the right to a basic education.

This bill represents a significant step toward expanding educational opportunities for those to whom education has been an unkept promise.

This legislation has won the broadest support of any elementary and secondary school proposal in the history of the country. It has won wide approval because it is a fair bill, a practical bill, a balanced bill—a bill aimed at giving a greater number of children a basic education while at the same time improving the quality of education available to all children.

The bill recognizes that wherever poverty is found, in whatever degree, it places a burden on the educational institutions of the country.

It takes the States' educational expenditures into account and supplements them on a reasonable basis.

It focuses the impact of Federal aid on the underprivileged and makes its greatest thrust in the poorest States, and yet through its various programs in its several titles, it upgrades the entire range of elementary and secondary education.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill and I for one am not going to be disturbed by those who read into it threats that simply are not there.

The opponents of the bill have vascillated from one extreme to another.

They have said in one breath that too much central control is provided and in the next breath they have declared that local public school officials cannot be trusted to administer the bill in a manner consistent with our traditional views regarding the separation of church and state.

They have said that the bill does not do enough for the poorest States, yet they contend that the problem should be solved by a tax credit whose benefits would redound overwhelmingly to the richest States and the most prosperous people in America.

Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be frightened by this parade of hobgoblins.

I am not going to shrink before these nebulous fears about the future of our traditional American school system. I trust the principle of local self-government in the administration of the schools of this country.

The committee has taken pains to discover, to anticipate, and to correct problem areas. Practical applications of its provisions may, of course, dictate improvements in the years ahead. This bill is not intended to be a complete solution. It is the beginning of a great national effort in education. We plan to improve and expand it in the years ahead and the President has promised his support in these efforts.

But today we have before us a bill which takes a first decisive step. This bill will greatly improve our school system—not destroy it.

It will shore up our local institutions—not weaken them.

It will strengthen the authority and status of our State educational agencies—not diminish them.

It will help to make our schools stronger and freer and finer than ever before in our history.

It will advance the concept that every American child should have the opportunity to grow to the peak of his capacity.

Mr. Chairman, we have postponed for too long efforts to help the youth of this Nation.

Now is the time to act.

This is our historic opportunity.

This bill summons the overwhelming endorsement of all the Members of the House.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the bill.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNGER

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YOUNGER: On page 147, following line 2, insert the following:

"SEC. 605. The term 'Commissioner' wherever used in this Act shall be stricken out and the term 'Commissar' substituted therefor."

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Chairman, I have been here all afternoon in this labor of futility. We have learned some new words this afternoon that have been coined, and they are now permitted for common usage here on the floor. So I think we might as well try to coin another word in this bill, because apparently, if I have understood the debate, we are placing in the hands of the Commissioner of Education almost dictatorial powers. If he is going to have those dictatorial powers, we ought not give him a democratic name so far as his office is concerned. We ought to use a name which in common usage designates exactly what kind of powers we are giving him. That is the only purpose of this amendment. I think he has the full power of a commissar, and I think that he ought to have the title that goes with his duties.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Limitation on payments under this Act

SEC. 605. Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize the making of any payment under this Act, or under any Act amended by this Act, for religious worship or instruction.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF VIRGINIA

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 147, after line 7, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"SEC. 606. Any portion of this Act shall be subject to judicial review in the appropriate United States District Court in the District of Columbia with respect to its constitutionality."

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I know in the atmosphere here this afternoon, it is not considered perhaps by some of us good taste to mention the Constitution of the United States. I am still tempted to do so. I probably would not be tempted to do so if we had not just broken the ice a few moments ago with the amendment of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFIN], the first amendment, I believe, that was added on to the bill.

My friends, there has been a good deal of conversation around the floor about whether there would be opportunity under the law to test any part of the constitutionality of this act. It seems to me a way could be found. But nevertheless in order to allay those misgivings and in order that we may at least recognize that we do have a Constitution which is supposed to govern this country, it might be well to add those three little lines providing that this bill shall be subject to judicial review as to its constitutionality in the appropriate court in the District of Columbia. That is all there is to my amendment. I hope we will break the ice again with it. You know maybe the chairman of the committee will do as he did for the gentleman on the minority side of the aisle—maybe he will just concede this amendment and agree to it. I hope he will. I would like to see that much respect for our Constitution here in this great hoopla that we are having here today which I have regretted very much. I do not think that what has been going on here today is anything of which this House of Representatives would be proud. But I do hope this amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Not the chairman of the Judiciary Committee?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the distinguished dean of the House is going to discuss one of the important issues of this bill and he is chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that his time may be extended to 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, and I shall not object, I would hope that we may have the same amount of time.

Mr. ALBERT. I assure the gentleman that I will ask on behalf of anyone on the other side who desires that the distinguished gentleman may have equal time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, it is rather anomalous that the gentleman from Virginia would want recourse to the courts, when his conduct seemed to signify otherwise, in the sense that he has sponsored and approved legislation which would take away jurisdiction from the courts on various subject matters.

However, I must oppose this amendment for the following reasons, and I want the Members of the Committee to know that I weigh my words carefully. I have very painstakingly written what you are about to hear.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to make several points on the subject of judicial review which I think are vitally important.

We have heard a number of reasons why it would be undesirable to add to the pending bill any provision explicitly providing for judicial review in addition to that already provided by sections 211 of title I, 206 of title II and 509 of title V. I agree with those reasons. However, I also believe it is true that additional provisions for judicial review should be avoided in this bill because they are unnecessary.

I believe the law is sufficiently clear on the subject of judicial review that the following can be said with confidence: there is no aspect of this bill which raises issues of any significance in the field of church and state that will not be subject to judicial review. Judicial review will be available under general principles of law, regardless of whether it is expressly provided for in this bill. Moreover, the extent to which it is available would in the end be affected hardly at all by the addition of judicial review provisions in the bill, for the fact is that State and Federal law already makes available judicial remedies against executive action in practically every situation where a remedy could, as a constitutional matter, be provided.

It is, of course, clear that one who challenges official action must himself have suffered legal injury. Otherwise his suit would not constitute a "case or controversy." As a result, his suit would necessarily be dismissed by any Federal court. However, this result does not follow from the presence or absence of judicial review provisions in any Federal legislation but from the Constitution itself. We could not, therefore, escape

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

that limitation by amending this bill. Unless there is a "case or controversy"; that is, unless the suit is justiciable, the Constitution forbids the Federal court from considering the matter. If the case is justiciable and a constitutional question is involved, like church and state, whether we accept or reject the amendment providing for review, the case will be the amendment adds nothing—save trouble.

The point I wish to emphasize is that one who is legally injured can challenge a government official's action on the ground that it is either beyond his statutory authority or that it is taken pursuant to an unconstitutional enactment. This is true regardless of whether there exists any statutory authority for the suit other than the existing statutes providing for jurisdiction of cases arising under the Federal Constitution and statutes. See 28 United States Code sections 1331, 1343, 1361, 1252–1257; *Larson* v. *Domestic and Foreign Corp.*, 337 U.S. 682, 689, 690 (1948). This right to judicial review can be described and channeled by legislation, but the right already exists and does not need to be specifically mentioned in this legislation in order to make it available.

A second point I would like to emphasize is that in many cases State taxpayers' suits will be available as a means of obtaining judicial review, eventually leading to review by the Supreme Court of the United States. We have been told—correctly, in my opinion—that the Constitution does not permit the courts of the United States to decide an issue at the request of someone whose sole interest in the matter stems from the fact that he is a taxpayer and that an expenditure of Federal funds is involved. However, the cases make clear that the Federal Constitution presents no obstacle to the entertaining of taxpayers' suits by State courts or to the appellate review of State court decisions in such cases by the Supreme Court. Thus, in the famous case of *Everson* v. *Board of Education*, 330 U.S. 1 (1947), the Supreme Court accepted jurisdiction to review the decision of the New Jersey Supreme Court in a case brought by a plaintiff whose sole interest in the subject matter was that he was a taxpayer in the school district and wished to challenge the expenditure of funds to which he had contributed as a taxpayer.

We all know, I am sure, that most States have very much less rigorous rules about standing to sue in actions brought by taxpayers. Under the Everson decision, the fact that the action could not have been brought in Federal court originally, for lack of standing to sue, will not prevent the securing of review in the highest court in the land. What this means is that there will be effective and final review of constitutional issues, in practically every imaginable case, by means of actions brought initially in State courts and reviewed ultimately in the U.S. Supreme Court.

It is true that in *Doremus* v. *Board of Education*, 342 U.S. 429 (1952), the Court made it clear that the Everson ruling as to standing would only be followed in cases presenting "pocketbook" issues; that is to say, that it would not review decisions in State taxpayers' actions involving such matters as, for example, compulsory prayer and Bible reading, where the plantiff had no basis for raising the issue other than the fact that he was a taxpayer of the State or district. However, it should go without saying that actions brought to review the matters dealt with by this bill are likely to be "pocketbook" issues.

Even if that were not so, there is a third point to be made that resolves the problem in still another way. That point is that, in recent cases, the Supreme Court has very significantly relaxed what had been believed to be the standards governing standing to sue in controversies over freedom of religion and establishment of religion. Thus in the school prayer cases, the Court reviewed the validity of educational practices at the behest of the parents of children who were affected only in the sense that they might be embarrassed by having to ask to be excused from class during the exercises. There was no pocketbook interest involved, and indeed, there was no legal compulsion requiring the children to be present during the exercises of which their parents sought judicial review.

I do not challenge or criticize the decision of the Supreme Court in recognizing standing to sue in these cases. The point I wish to make is simply that the rulings show dramatically how unlikely it is that any significant church-state issue will be denied a forum on the ground that none of the parties involved has standing to sue. In my judgment the Court has, in deference to the great importance of the issues involved in this sphere of our national life, extended the law of standing to sue to insure that these issues may be resolved in accordance with law and the Constitution. As a result of this extension, and of the other points which I have made above, I think it is evident that there will be judicial review available as to each and every significant church-state issue that arises under this bill, regardless of whether an explicit provision for such review is made in addition to those already present in the bill.

I oppose this type of amendment because it would be an unwarranted slur on our deliberations in this Chamber; namely, to have us proclaim that what we do is actually constitutional and that we must put a label on our work.

It is not the practice to insert such a clause. It would be tantamount to saying that we have doubts and misgivings concerning the constitutionality of our acts. It would be a sign of weakness and irresolution.

Beyond that such an amendment would be an inducement to the irresponsible, misinformed, uninformed to bring suit. It would be in the nature of a neon sign invitation.

Remember this is a subject—church versus state, charged with tension and emotion. Suits would be brought—and by the scores—all over the country upon the slightest provocation.

Precious time—needed elsewhere—would be spent by the Commissioner of Education in defending these suits.

This important bill, wanted by the President and the Nation, has been woven and knit together with the approval of many factions—civic, religious, and welfare. It would indeed be a pity if its warp and woof were to be torn, its seams ripped open, and its fabric, so carefully put together, thus marred because of some misunderstanding of the right of any individual involved to bring such a suit to test the constitutional quality of this bill's material.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I was glad to have the opportunity to join in the applause for my old friend and colleague of many years.

I want to say that you can find fault with the District of Columbia as the court. I probably would have done so myself had I not been reading the voting law which the gentleman has prepared and is now trying to put through his committee which requires that the jurisdiction shall be in the District of Columbia. I want to follow his good example.

Mr. CELLER. Does not the gentleman know that to be inconsistent is to be intellectual?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman certainly has exhibited that.

In the first place, the gentleman misread the amendment which I offered. It has no reference to religion, but it is a blanket right to test the constitutionality of all the 6 titles to this bill. That was the purpose of making it a general amendment applicable to all parts of the bill. If the gentleman does not think we need it, I wonder why he objects to it? Also, I wonder how he would have known that somebody was going to offer this amendment, because I just scratched it off on the back of my bill and handed it up; and I handed it up in bad shape. But the gentleman I see has prepared an elaborate brief which must have taken him several days. Why is he so suspicious of mentioning the constitutionality of the bill? Has the gentleman any doubt about what the Supreme Court will do?

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, my answer to the gentleman is that as a lawyer of many years standing I have always made it my business to be prepared.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I know that, but I wondered how the gentleman got to be all of a sudden such a good mindreader.

Mr. CELLER. Frankly, I did not anticipate that the very distinguished gentleman from Virginia, for whom I have an abiding and affectionate regard, was to offer the amendment.

I had a suspicion that the amendment would be offered from another quarter. But, I took no chances. I was ready, waiting here all day long. I was ready to spring just as soon as anyone from any quarter offered this kind of an amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. If the gentleman will yield further, the gentleman must be awfully suspicious about this bill, to get all ready like that. Why is the gentleman afraid of putting it in the bill?

Mr. CELLER. Because there is no need of putting it in when it is already in the statutes and is the law. I repeat, we of the Judiciary Committee never put clauses like this in a piece of legislation if the present statutes and acts already give that right. It is useless and surplusage and has no value whatsoever.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not care for the additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Does the gentleman want 10 or 15 minutes?

Mr. GRIFFIN. No, thank you, the allotted time will be sufficient.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to indicate my general agreement with the thrust of the statement made by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary [Mr. CELLER], and to oppose the pending amendment.

The amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH], with whom I occasionally find myself in agreement, adds nothing of substance to this bill. If it were adopted, it might do no harm; however, it will do no good for the bill. As I read the amendment, it provides that "any portion of this act shall be subject to judicial review in the appropriate U.S. district court in the District of Columbia with respect to its constitutionality."

Mr. Chairman, there is no question that the act can be reviewed with respect to its constitutionality. The question is: Who can bring a suit for that purpose? Under the decisions of the Supreme Court, as indicated earlier by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, a constitutional question may be reviewed in a proceeding that constitutes a case of controversy. The Supreme Court has ruled that an individual taxpayer does not have sufficient standing or interest to raise a constitutional question in some situations.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia would not confer upon any person or entity any right to bring a suit which does not already exist in the absence of his amendment. If a suit or controversy can be maintained, the question of constitutionality can be raised, with or without his amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I believe it is important in this discussion to take note of the fact that the general question of the constitutionality of Federal aid to church-related colleges is now being considered in the Federal judicial system as the result of a case arising in the State of Maryland. Accordingly, the basic question involved is already being litigated in an appropriate forum, and it is expected that this case will reach the Supreme Court of the United States.

Under the circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I believe it would be appropriate to vote down the amendment.

AMENDMENT BY MR. ANDERSON OF ILLINOIS

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois as a substitute for the amendment offered by Mr. SMITH of Virginia: On page 147 add a new section numbered as section 606 to read as follows:
>
> "A suit or proceeding asserting that any provision of this Act or its application or administration is in violation of any provision of the United States Constitution or of section 605 of this Act may be brought by a State, a State educational agency, a local educational agency, or any public or other nonprofit institution or agency which is or may be prejudicial by the order of the Commissioner making or denying a grant or authorizing the providing of services, facilities, or equipment in a particular year to another such agency or institution, in a three-judge district court, in the State where the plaintiff is situated pursuant to sections 2282 and 2284 of title 28 of the United States Code."

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, at the outset let me make it clear I have offered this substitute amendment in an effort to take care of some of the objections that were raised by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary when he spoke a few minutes ago, and also by my colleague from Michigan, Mr. GRIFFIN.

As I understand the burden of the argument offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], first of all he said that this amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia was unnecessary, that there were already in three sections of this bill a provision for judicial review. I think it is clear from a reading of the bill with those sections it will affect only disputes between any State and the Commissioner. Therefore, I think they would not be broad enough to cover the problem that we have been talking about off and on for the last 3 days.

I might say I rise to my feet this evening in admiration particularly of the gentlewoman from Oregon, and I would pay tribute and express my admiration for the gentlewoman from Oregon because she has throughout this debate on this bill repeatedly focused our attention on this very important church-state issue.

I recall that when this first erupted day before yesterday the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], was told his questions were loaded with legal dynamite, and the gentleman from Indiana said it is a venture beyond mind conception. That is a doubt that has gripped many Members of this House in talking about these issues: we were exposing ourselves to something so dangerous that we better avoid it. Therefore, I admire the gentlewoman from Oregon and the gentleman from Virginia who have had the courage to bring this issue to the floor where it belongs.

In answer to the objections from the gentleman from New York, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, his only objection seems to be that this is going to erect a neon sign, it is putting up a signal for any taxpayer to file a nuisance and dilatory action that is going to hold up the expenditure of funds.

I have carefully provided how the suit should be filed. You will note the language of the substitute amendment says by a State educational agency, by a local educational agency, or any public or nonprofit institution or agency which may be prejudiced by an order of the Commissioner. These are people who would certainly have a legitimate interest in the adjudication of this very important and basic question. I for one believe, as I am sure the gentleman from New York does, that under the rules of law we can leave this matter to the courts. Frankly, I was a little disappointed in the presentation made by the gentleman from New York that he did not undertake in his learned discussion of the issue involved here to clear up some of the very real doubts that exist in the minds of many Members as to what the meaning of this bill is. That doubt is not confined to the Members of this body. It is a doubt found in the minds of the very people who testified in support of this legislation before the committee.

I have before me one brief excerpt of that testimony, the testimony of Mr. Sissel, representing one of the church groups, and here is what he said in his testimony before the committee:

> I am sure there is going to be widespread objection to the actual presence of a public employee, in this instance a teacher, or a guidance counselor or a psychological counselor or a social worker, in a private school building. It would be difficult to develop a public consensus on that.
>
> I will express a personal opinion here now which does not represent anyone's but my own, that is, that the key word in this section is "mobile." I think of several hundred, perhaps thousands, of Protestant churches who have very large Sunday school educational plants, 15, 20, and 40 classrooms in them which stand idle 6 days of the week and most of the seventh day. If it became feasible for these plants to have a full course of instruction except for a course on the catechism and a course on the Presbyterian interpretation of reality and sovereignty, if it became feasible and possible that the courses on history, arithmetic, science, English could be taught by public school teachers at public school expense using the public materials, I think the temptation for a large number of these schools to participate in that program would be almost overwhelming, particularly in some sections of the country.

As the gentlewoman from Oregon has pointed out, she has placed in the RECORD letters, wires, and other communications from reputable organizations all over this country expressing the very same kind of doubt. When these people gave their commitment to this legislation and expressed their support for Federal aid to education, they were not informed about the kind of language you find in section 508(2) of this bill. We find in fact and in truth some very novel propositions of law in this bill, propositions that have never been passed upon before. It is clear, I think, and I speak now particularly to the lawyers of this House, that since the decision of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts against Mellon, a case that was decided 40 years ago,

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

there has been no actual test or adjudication.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois may be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. POWELL. I object, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have 1 additional minute so that I may ask him a question.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended for 4 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I want to express my gratitude to the Speaker for that request.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I did not hear the gentleman's substitute amendment read. Does he cover the whole bill?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Yes. I can answer the gentleman's question by saying that I think it does. I think it has the advantage, however, of confining the party plaintiff to those groups who would have a legitimate interest in this, and therefore eliminate the purely nuisance type of suit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. The gentleman has given this matter much more study than I have. I offered my amendment from the back of an envelope. I should like to see this substitute adopted.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, as I understand this problem, the amendment offered involves the constitutional provision that the jurisdiction of Federal courts under article III extends to "cases" and "controversies" and the plaintiff must have a substantial interest in order to have standing to bring a suit. That is the holding of the Mellon case, as I understand it. The Mellon case decided that a Federal taxpayer's interest as a taxpayer in the expenditure of Federal funds was insignificant and that he did not have a sufficient pecuniary interest to bring the suit.

There are cases holding that we cannot create a "case" or "controversy" where one otherwise does not exist. The Muskrat case decided in 1911 is one of these. But I am sure the gentleman is aware of the case of Oklahoma versus the Civil Service Commission. This was a case arising under the Hatch Act which had been amended in the Senate to include a specific provision authorizing a judicial review. The defendant questioned the right of the State to bring the action. The Supreme Court in holding that Oklahoma was entitled to question the action of the Civil Service Commission under the Hatch Act relied strongly on the judicial review provision in the Hatch Act, saying that Congress had made Oklahoma's right to receive funds a matter of judicial cognizance. There is, thus, authority that a judicial review provision is meaningful.

In this case the Civil Service Commissioner was denying Oklahoma a share of her highway funds based upon the political activity of one of its highway commissioners.

I personally have had no doubts about the constitutionality of this bill as it is printed nor as it is explained in the committee's report. I must say, however, that from the colloquy here on the floor and the varying answers given to the identical question, it is easy for me to see how others might have such doubts. I know that people can have honest differences of opinion. I have a record in my own State of Oregon of supporting this type of legislation which by the way was subsequently declared unconstitutional by our own court.

If the act is constitutional, and I believe it is, I have no fear about inserting a provision for judicial review as carefully drawn to eliminate irresponsible actions as is the substitute offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

I see no reason why there should be apprehension held by any of the supporters of this bill. Indeed, we should all welcome a judicial determination of this very troublesome constitutional question of separation of church and state which has plagued this Nation for so many years, and which should be laid to rest for all time as promptly as possible.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman. I am not doing this on any partisan basis. I believe a fundamental question is involved. We ought to have the courage in this House to put in this bill that the constitutional decision can be reached.

Let me just close in the brief time I have, after pointing out I have been mightily impressed in making up my mind on the necessity of this provision in reading the excellent memorandum prepared by counsel for HEW in 1961. That discussion which, mind you, involved not just the incidental kind of benefits provided for in this bill—but he was talking about grants and loans. He said that even under that kind of situation unless there was a provision providing expressly for judicial review—and I quote—"There appears to be no realistic likelihood that Federal legislation raising the constitutional issues will be resolved by judicial decision."

We will be giving up the opportunity we have to make sure, as the gentleman from Oregon said, that this issue is resolved and that it is settled by the Supreme Court of the United States if we shy away from the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the substitute amendment.

Mr. Chairman, when I came to this Congress in 1953 along with the others who came to this body on that day, I took an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States. I thought then that I knew enough about the Constitution of the United States to understand the oath I was taking. I have taken that oath six times since. I have not felt any time since then that I had any less knowledge of the oath I was taking than when I took it the first time.

Now we all took that oath and we believe we understood what we were doing. We were then saying we did not want the Supreme Court looking over our shoulder to tell us in an advisory opinion whether or not our acts are constitutional.

So the issue here is not church-state. The issue here is not whether or not there can be judicial review. All lawyers and other Members of this body know that there can be and that there will be. The issue here is whether we intend to abdicate our responsibility to exercise our own proper judgment in interpreting the Constitution rather than surrendering that initiative to the courts.

I have heard many of my distinguished colleagues for whom I have the highest regard and affection state on many occasions that they did not want to see such language and such provisions put in legislation because they felt we would be doing just that—abdicating our responsibility.

I served 12 years—12 of the most satisfying years on the House Committee on Education and Labor. During about 6 of those years I had the high privilege of serving with one of the most distinguished men in this Congress, one of the most learned men of the law that I have come in contact with, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL]. In 1962, 2 years ago, in circumstances similar to this on a bill that was proposed similar to this, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 109, part 11, page 14989, the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] says this, and I quote him:

> It is not my view that we in Congress should abdicate our authority to interpret the Constitution any further. That is what this amendment does. It says that we in Congress do not interpret the Constitution; we do not determine whether this is a constitutional expenditure of funds. We ask the Supreme Court to tell us whether it is constitutional or not. Is that what we really want to do at this stage in our history?
>
> I think the balance perhaps is already out of proportion and we should not move further in that direction. The Congress has in the past made the decision in the expenditure of funds as to the constitutionality of the expenditure of those funds. I do not think we ought to now tell the Supreme Court that we are uncertain in this field for the first time and ask them, "Will you please come in and tell us whether we are doing right or wrong?" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 109, pt. 11, p. 14989.)

That is the distinguished gentleman for whose legislative ability, for whose legal ability, and for whose personality and sincerity I have the utmost high regard and respect.

Further in the colloquy, the gentleman from New York continued, and I quote him again:

> I think that clearly the action we [would] take here by passing such an amendment would have reverberations and ramifications that most of us are not even thinking about

today; and it might very well shake the foundations in ways that we have not anticipated.

In short, then, the position outlined by the distinguished gentleman was the position soon thereafter taken by this body, and if we are to carry out the oaths we took last January, if we are to say—as we said when we held up our hands and took the oath—that we understood what we were doing, then the position which the gentleman from New York outlined 2 years ago and which the House took following his admonition should be taken. We must take that responsibility now.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the legislation now under consideration deals with one of the most vital areas of American life, one in which almost every household has a common interest. It is essential, therefore, that all parents fully understand the provisions of H.R. 2362 and the long-range implications. This bill is a most complex one, and the fact that there is already much education legislation on the statute books further leads to additional confusion.

Whatever other differences may exist among Members of Congress as to the merits of Federal aid to education, there is one proposition on which we can all agree. That is the need for adequate educational opportunity for all, not merely for the social and economic benefits to be derived for the individual and hence the Nation, but also because America must continue to be a leading competitor in the world technological revolution. Our national security in a nuclear age gives education an entirely new dimension. Furthermore, the causes of many of our serious domestic problems today involve educationally deprived children, and we have seen the rising incidence of juvenile crime, youth unemployment, and the social anxieties of young people in substandard urban and rural areas.

The past decade has been characterized by not only a commendable interest in the advancement of educational excellence but also extraordinary progress in educational opportunity through State and local cooperation, and I believe that States and localities should continue to have discretion as to the best methods of aiding deprived children achieve equal educational opportunity. Although H.R. 2362 would appear to sanction this tradition, certain language in title I would require that local approval be consistent with the basic criteria established by the U.S. Commissioner of Education.

Title II, relating to the purchase by the Federal Government of textbooks and library materials, ostensibly safeguards free choice by local school officials, but once the initial dependence on the Federal Government for these supplies has been created, Federal control over the choice of what our children should read becomes a distinct possibility.

Title III authorizes the establishment of model schools at the local level completely financed by the Federal Government under conditions specified by the Commissioner of Education, the local school agency having only the privilege of making recommendations. This suggests the establishment of a separate school system of Federal-local schools responsible only to the U.S. Office of Education.

Titles IV and V would establish educational research and demonstration centers, also selected by the Commissioner of Education, and authorizes personnel exchange between the Federal Office of Education and State departments of education to aid in developing new methods, curriculums, and new instructional material and texts which would be introduced into the schools throughout the Federal-local system.

This bill seems to me to be a rather substantial further intrusion by the Federal Government into an area traditionally and rightfully reserved to the States and individual localities. While purporting to attack the problems of the educationally deprived children, the bill, for whatever reason, compromises State and local control of education and lays the groundwork for greater reliance on the caprice of politics and annual Federal appropriations. While the bill purports to serve the urgent needs of impoverished children, members of the Committee on Education and Labor have pointed out that the distribution formula in the bill will result in the wealthiest counties in the United States receiving the lion's share while the poorest counties will receive only a token allotment.

Would it not be better to support a program of cooperative action by the States, conducted in school districts having a high concentration of deprived families, assisting the children to overcome at an early age the handicaps which contribute to their failure in school? Would it not be better to return revenue resources to the States, localities, and institutions by means of tax credits and payments to individuals who are meeting the cost of education, thereby avoiding Federal interference and constitutional problems? Would it not be better to consolidate the existing Federal programs in education which duplicate each other and waste money and effort?

I think the Congress should take a more realistic and equitable look at this legislation, for the program envisioned will be a costly one at best. Hence, it should aim at the heart of the problem. In my judgment, H.R. 2362 should be recommitted for further study.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2362 and I urge its adoption.

The teachers and school administrators in my district, who know best the range and intensity of the problems of education, who daily wrestle with these problems in all their forms, who have devoted their talents, energies, and lives to this essential work, have expressed emphatically their support of this legislation in the form recommended by the majority report of the Committee on Education and Labor.

These men and women know, in ways that none of us can, the problems of trying to train and educate children from low-income families who live in crowded and squalid housing, whose parents' every move is devoted merely to providing them with food and clothing, and who cannot provide the surroundings—the books, records, pictures, and tutorial assistance—that are necessary to help them to keep abreast of the children from wealthier homes.

The teachers, administrators, and student counsellors know intimately the tragedy of impoverished children who fall gradually but inevitably behind what should be their level of achievement, so that by the time they reach the eighth grade they are 2 or 3 years behind the average in such fundamental skills as reading and mathematics. The teachers know that these children, once fallen behind, can never catch up, and that many of them will become high school dropouts and economic drones for the rest of their lives. But they also know what dramatic results can be achieved with these same children if only they are given the special help, the remedial training, the counselling and tutoring, and the encouragement they so desperately need, and which—through no fault of their own—they now lack.

These children need help, and we have at hand the means to provide that help. Any society which turns its back on these hundreds of thousands of poor children and stubbornly refuses to give them a real chance to become useful and productive citizens deserves—and will receive—the condemnation of history. If we fail to help these children now America will pay for many decades to come the incalculable cost of its neglect. Apart from the unspeakable personal tragedies of underdeveloped talents, we will pay the price of soaring welfare costs for the support of people who are inadequately trained to be useful in our increasingly complicated technological society. We will pay the price of poverty and ignorance begetting in succeeding generations more ignorance and poverty. We will pay the price of more broken homes, more human despair, more hopeless misery—that need not exist.

Education is the key to the great door of opportunity for these children. We in this Congress—not the children—have that key in our hands. How can we refuse to turn that key, and swing wide the door for these millions of eager youngsters?

The people who today are warning about the dangers of Federal interference in local education simply do not know their American history, and they will not face the fact that the Government of the United States has always been committed—since the days of Thomas Jefferson—to the proposition that all children should be afforded the opportunity of a full and rewarding life through education. They are of the same mind as those who about 50 years ago warned against the Federal Government outlawing child labor.

Two weeks ago in my district there was a meeting attended by nearly all the school district superintendents, and representatives of the parochial school system. They studied and discussed this legislation for more than 3 hours, and exchanged their views about the problems besetting their school systems. Not one of them expressed anything but approbation for the programs contained in

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

this bill. Not one of them expressed concern about the dangers of Federal control or the issue of possible conflict with the principle of separation of church and state. Without exception they spoke enthusiastically of the new opportunities provided them, of the improvements they could make in their educational systems under this bill, of the new areas of cooperation that can be developed between public and private schools for the benefit of all.

In the past week I have received telegrams endorsing passage of H.R. 2362 from the Ohio Education Association, the Ohio Association of School Administrators, Ohio Department of Classroom Teachers, the Ohio School Counselors Association, and the Ohio Education Association.

The people who know education, who know and work with the children, are asking us for these important new tools. We cannot, and dare not, turn our backs on them and on the rising generation of young Americans who will be the real beneficiaries of this legislation.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Chairman, I support passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, H.R. 2362. America's successes in space today have been made possible by past investments in education. I want the America of tomorrow to taste the successes of their own discoveries. And I support this legislation that will help assure those future successes.

The bill, H.R. 2362, in its expenditure of $1.3 billion, would help American education in five general ways:

First. It would improve the education of poverty-stricken children to help them break the cruel cycle of poverty that afflicts generations of families. School districts or counties with at least 100 school-age children, or 3 percent of its total school-age population, if that were less, coming from families with annual incomes of $2,000 or less during fiscal 1966, or whose income from public assistance exceeded that amount, would receive approximately $1,060 million during fiscal 1966.

Second. The bill would provide grants for purchase of school library books, materials, and textbooks to be made available to public and nonpublic school children.

Third. It would establish supplementary education centers to be shared by public and nonpublic students.

Fourth. This bill would expand education research and training programs to help keep pace with modern technological developments.

Fifth. Would provide grants to strengthen the individual State departments of education, which, in effect, help the States to help themselves.

Along with a specific prohibition of payments for religious worship or instruction, the bill would bar interference by the Federal Government in the traditional direction of education by local authorities as it should be.

I have listened to the debate with great interest and am impressed with the tremendous work that has gone into the preparation of this bill. I congratulate my colleagues on both sides of the aisle who will stand up and be counted for America's elementary and secondary schools.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise in support of the education proposal which we have before us today, H.R. 2362.

First of all I would like to point out that I started my career in public service as a member of a local school board of trustees so I have experienced first hand the problems which school districts face in trying to meet the day to day needs of providing a sound primary and secondary education to our children. Later I served in the California State Senate and witnessed, and I might add helped, from that level to insure an adequate education to all who deserve it. Now I am pleased to be here in this House as we see that the Federal Government meets its responsibility in the field of educating our children.

Actually the Federal Government has contributed to the cause of education for nearly two centuries. More than 160 Federal aid to education laws have been enacted by Congress since 1785. The Morrill Act of 1862 establishing land-grant schools was expanded in 1890 to authorize payment of Federal funds to land-grant colleges and universities. The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 provided Federal assistance to States for vocational education. Most familiar is the 1950 enactment of Public Laws 815 and 874, to assist schools in federally affected areas which has resulted in payment of millions to second district schools. Education or lack of it, knows no State boundaries.

Mr. Chairman, I would like for a moment to address myself to the problem of educating our children in California. Because of our own population growth, we are having tremendous difficulties building schools and training teachers fast enough. This growth has resulted from one of the most massive migrations in history, a westward migration which started with the discovery of gold at Sutter's Mill in Coloma, Calif., which I should point out is in the Second Congressional District which I am proud to represent.

The population explosion in California has continued through the years. Every 20 years the population has more than doubled. Today we have some 18 million people in the State. Ten short years from now we will have an estimated 27 million.

Every day of the year some 1,000 residents move across the California border to stay. This plus the galloping birth rate means that California is growing at a fabulous rate of 600,000 people per year.

What does this mean in relation to schools. First of all two of every five who arrive in the State are under 20 years of age and four of every five are under 40. If we do not have children when they arrive they soon begin having their families.

Starting with the days of the 49ers, it took until 1929 before California had a million children in school. This was a period of 80 years. Only 23 years later, in 1952, California has two million children in school. Seven years later the figure was three million and five years later it was over four million.

Each September when school opens in California there are waiting on the doorstep about 250,000 children who were not there when school closed the preceding June.

California is coping with the problem partially by crowding more and more children into already overloaded classrooms. Aside from Alabama, Mississippi, and Hawaii, my State, I regret to say, has the most crowded classrooms in the country. In the elementary schools, where 25 pupils per teacher is considered appropriate, California packs in 33. New York, by comparison, has the ideal of 25 per classroom.

California has been forced to continue to use partially prepared teachers, more than 11,000 of them serving on provisional credentials last year alone.

Valiant efforts have been made to end the classroom shortage but 72,000 children in the State still are attending school on a part-time basis. In the last 17 years the State has provided nearly $1.5 billion in State funds in construction aid to school districts which have exhausted their own resources. With all of this California has not been able to keep up with the need for about 5,000 or more additional classrooms a year for growth, let alone eliminate the backlog of inadequate, unsafe, and otherwise undesirable classrooms.

To correct the situation the cost would be tremendous. To reduce class size by 1 pupil, that is, to cut the average number of children in each classroom in California from 33 to 32, would require an expenditure of $100 million. The added salaries and operating costs of the classrooms needed to accomplish this smallest possible reduction in class size would amount to an additional $78 million a year.

One of the problems in California's elementary schools is the lack of sufficient libraries. Only 38 percent of California's 5,500 elementary school buildings have libraries of any kind.

The importance of the library resources portion of this bill is demonstrated when it is realized that supposedly wealthy California has been unable from State and local sources to provide anything resembling adequate library facilities in the elementary schools.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons, as well as others, I feel that I must give my complete support to this worthwhile legislation that is before us today.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Chairman, the elementary and high school age children of Greater Cleveland and the Nation are the true victors as this extended battle to pass massive school assistance is successsfully concluded today.

Under this legislation over $1 billion will be earmarked in its first section to assist nearly 4½ million children nationally who come from homes with incomes less than $2,000 in rural areas per year and $3,000 in our cities. Ohio's share will be $36 million. Tens of thousands of children in the city of Cleveland, whose lives are impacted by poverty, stand to benefit substantially under the first section of this legislation.

When I proposed similar legislation 2 years ago, it was apparent that a whole school system suffered gravely when any of its students needed intensive assistance to raise their standard of learning to the norm. It has been necessary in the past to spread a stringently limited budget more thinly by taking funds away from the majority of the system to give to the educationally and economically disadvantaged. Now it will be possible to assist those who need the most with funds provided by this legislation without weakening the rest of the system.

Funds will also be provided to upgrade library resources, textbooks, and instructional materials, thereby alleviating existing pressures and priorities for local funds in areas of high need. This program will be coordinated with title 3 as well as the Library Building Act.

We are particularly enthusiastic about title 3 of this bill, dealing with supplementary educational centers. Dr. Paul Briggs, superintendent of the Cleveland public school system, has been instrumental in the formulation of this section. Because of the diligence of Dr. Briggs and his capable staff, Cleveland is the first system in the Nation to submit a specific proposal under this title even though the legislation has not yet become law.

This section will provide the schoolchildren of Cleveland an unlimited exposure educationally to the arts, sciences, and professional world through lectures by experts from Cleveland and the Nation. The Cleveland plan also encompasses curriculum development and teacher training within these educational centers for the continual improvement of our school system. This plan is perfectly in keeping with our current space-age development plans. Cleveland area universities and colleges will have a great role of development and cooperation under this bill as well. It is the intent of Congress that these institutions of higher education be the source of new approaches to the grave and continuing problems of education and staffing to which our school systems are continually subjected.

We now will have an extrordinary opportunity to equip teachers to teach in their specific areas of assignment with materials which are highly relevant to their students.

Consequently, if this legislation is to succeed, children in our city and throughout the Nation will have an equal opportunity regardless of economic environment to contribute to the future of our Nation. We as a nation will have the honor of investing our faith and resources in our greatest hope for the future of this great Nation, our young people.

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2362 providing Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools.

The future of our Nation is in the hands of the children of today. We must insure that every child, regardless of his race, color, creed, or national origin, and his economic status in life, receives all the education and training he is capable of absorbing and using. We know that today educational opportunities are not equal—we must insure that no matter where a child lives or what school he attends that he has the best education we can offer. In my opinion, this bill will very nearly bring this goal into reality.

In this fast-moving age in which we live, the undereducated child is not able to compete in the workday world. To solve the problems of poverty, we must insure that the child has the education to compete for his share of the vast wealth of this Nation and only through education is this possible. There is no better investment that we can make than in our children—the dividends will be astronomical.

Mr. Chairman, for many, many years legislation has been introduced to provide Federal aid to education, but this is the first time that we have had on this floor a bill that is fair and equitable to all. I believe this measure will pass, and I urge my colleagues to rally to this cause and speed it on its way to law.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2362.

Communists, Russian and Chinese, have stated their objectives for world revolution: to force communism upon all nations. Brazenly and openly they have again and again stated that the United States is their main obstacle to achieve this end. Thus, the United States has been, and is today, engaged in a cold and, from time to time, a moderately hot war, to prevent this from happening.

More recently, Moscow has adopted a policy of peaceful coexistence with the West and, since the Cuban confrontation, we have experienced a "détente" in our relations with the Soviets, but they still proclaim their ultimate aim to "bury the United States" by whatever means at their will and disposal. And in making these statements they avow as a dogma of Communist ideology that any means justifies the end.

Peiping has always been and is now even more militant in its determination to promote Red revolution in order to dominate the people of the world. It has and continues to proclaim that the United States must be militarily defeated on the battlefield and that only by armed conflict can Communist takeover be achieved, and in this way they mean armed conflict and defeat of the United States as a military power. To this end it has for the past several years and is today engaging in an ever widening split with Moscow as to the means of achieving world domination for communism.

While there may be many who differ about the essence of this problem, I am one who firmly believes that the Communists, though they be Russian or Chinese, mean just what they say, just as Hitler meant what he said in Mein Kampf when he laid down a timetable for Nazi conquest.

There are many ways, not only to deter, but to prevent, this threat to the United States and the free nations of the world.

First, is to maintain our military strength.

Second, is to cooperate with our allies and those nations who wish to remain free through defense treaties and other organizations to prevent aggression. This, of course, includes our NATO allies, our SEATO allies, our CENTO allies, and the United Nations Organization.

Third, and perhaps most effective in the long run, means at our disposal is the vast wealth of our citizen manpower. This, of course, includes every element of human resources of a free people in a great democracy. And it is here that I see the greatest potential for the future. The economic and moral strength of a nation that is determined to remain free is indeed a mighty weapon against any aggressor. It is in this field that we have a great opportunity and responsibility to act if we indeed do not intend to perish from the earth.

I refer to the opportunity of peaceful competition. Competition in those areas where in the past we have been eminently successful—economic, cultural, and moral competition. In the past, we may not have matched the ingenuity of our British cousins as world tradesmen, but certainly we have mastered the techniques of mass production of domestic goods and services, as well as the means to distribute these goods and services at home and abroad. We have the brains, the skills, the wealth, and the means to use them provided we have the determination to do so, and provided we understand the need of the times.

And now I come to the main point, to understand the need. This is an educational problem. It is not only a problem of educating our children now and in the future to the fullest extent possible, but is also a matter of educating our people to understand the whys and wherefores of the need. We have met and surpassed the need for competition in a military sense but do we understand why this has been necessary?

We have made great strides forward in meeting the need for better understanding of the science of human relations, but we associate this problem primarily with our domestic problems. What do we know about international relations? What do we know about foreign policy? The magnitude of ignorance in this vital area of our welfare is colossal. It is all very well to say that if the President, "the office, not the man of the moment," decides to send troops to XYZ country, that it must be all right—he must know what he is doing and it is his responsibility to make the big decisions. There are unnumbered little, everyday decisions that lead up to the formulation of the basic foreign policy. It is these little events that lead up to the crisis decisions when having arrived on a collision course it becomes difficult, or almost impossible to turn back. It is in this field that all too many are either uninformed or misinformed. Here it is the ability of not the President alone, but of the American people who, in the final analysis, must give or withhold support to their Government, to have the maximum ability to decide for themselves the course they believe to be right

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

for their own security and welfare. These decisions must be based on fact and not fantasy or irresponsible rumor. It is not enough just to read newspapers or magazine articles. It also requires a great deal of educational effort to achieve the means to arrive at such a decision.

Every high school and college should require a course in American foreign policy, taught by instructors who are trained in special courses by experts in and out of Government. It is only through such broad education that the average citizen can have the tools to enable him to fully participate in the formulation of our foreign policy, which deals with the problems of international relations. Science and technology are blasting us into global orbit where we must find better answers to the problem of international human relations under law and order, or we shall indeed all perish from this earth.

In a recent article which appeared in Harper's magazine, Peter F. Drucker in an article entitled "American Directions: A Forecast" had this to say:

> Education has been our chief growth industry in the last 20 years. If the economists considered schooling part of the national product—as they should—our economic growth rate would have looked pretty good all through the postwar period.

Mr. Drucker goes on to say that 5 to 8 years from now there will be 50 percent more students in American colleges than there are today. And then he continues:

> Before we can digest the abrupt jump in college enrollment, the next wave will hit the elementary schools—the children being born now to the baby boom generation of the 1950's. This will increase public school enrollment, grade by grade, by another 40 to 50 percent until, around 1980 or so, this wave finally washes over the colleges once more. The first consequence will be a drastic increase in the costs of education. And to make this increase even more drastic, salaries will certainly go up again, since the supply of qualified teachers cannot possibly keep up with this sudden jump in demand. It is hard to see how we can avoid large-scale Federal support for education on all levels. In the poorer areas in particular, the schools already cost more than the local population can afford. It is sheer hyprocrisy to pretend that Federal support of education is possible without some considerable measure of national control. Will we support, for instance, schools that practice racial segregation? Or schools with curriculums and standards below a national minimum, or with a short school year? At the same time a technological revolution will hit American education. Programed learning is the first major technological change in teaching and learning since the printed book—and likely to have equal impact. The teacher shortage alone will hurry programed learning, no matter how sturdily the teaching profession resists. However, only skills and knowledge can be transmitted through a program. Everything else—character, values, behavior, and above all the use of imagination and the discovery of the new and exciting—requires a teacher. Programed instruction, therefore, predictably will unleash a debate over the function and methods of the American school such as we have not seen for a very long time.
>
> Opponents will argue that it undermines the basic educational values and underfeeds the growing child. On the other side will be the fanatics who see in programed instruction a panacea—which it surely will not be—and the doctrinaires who want to eliminate as "unscientific" whatever in the school curriculum cannot be programed. Altogether our society will be school centered. At least one-third of the American people will be in school a few years hence. (Only one-fourth is there now.) Preschool children, ready for nursery school or kindergarten, will make up another tenth of the population. Teachers are already the largest single occupational group in the country. Total school expenditures, a few years from now, will exceed our present defense budget by a substantial amount. (Today they already run around $30 billions a year.) At the same time, the structure of American education, its purposes, values, content, and direction will all become hot issues. Education is about to take over from the welfare state as a basic commitment of the American people. One might call this new phenomenon the knowledge state. Education is bound to become a focus of political life and political conflicts. So far, however, we have not even begun to think through national policies on education, let alone a national commitment to educational values and purposes. All we have so far—and it is a great deal—is a national commitment to education in quantity, and for everyone.

Mr. Chairman, in consideration of H.R. 2362, which will surely pass the House of Representatives today, the Committee on Education and Labor in its report sets forth the purpose of the bill in the following language:

> There has been, since the founding of our Nation, a Federal recognition of the national importance of education. In the President's education message to this Congress he observed that in 1787, the Continental Congress declared in the Northwest Ordinance: "Schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." In this decade Federal interest and concern has been greatly magnified because of educational implications inherent in technological developments and the relation of education to national preparedness.
>
> The purpose of this legislation is to meet a national problem. This national problem is reflected in draft rejection rates because of basic educational deficiencies. It is evidenced by the employment and manpower retraining problems aggravated by the fact that there are over 8 million adults who have completed less than 5 years of school. It is seen in the 20-percent unemployment rate of our 18 to 24 year olds. It is voiced by our institutions of higher learning and our vocational and technical educators who have the task of building on elementary and secondary education foundations which are of varying quality and adequacy.
>
> The solution to these problems lies in the ability of our local elementary and secondary school systems to provide full opportunity for a high quality program of instruction in the basic educational skills because of the strong correlation between educational underachievement and poverty. Toward this solution, it is important that our total capabilities in education be brought to bear, including the best available personnel and techniques, and a maximum use of modern instructional technology. The heart of the problem lies in our elementary and secondary school systems where there are concentrations of America's children of poverty. The late Senator Robert Taft declared: "Education is primarily a State function, but in the field of education, as in the fields of health, relief, and medical care, the Federal Government has a secondary obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States."
>
> The President in his education message stated that one of the four major tasks confronting us was to "bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most."

The reported bill is designed to carry out this task. It is now apparent to me that the most important educational tool of all—money—is going to be made available on a local, State, and Federal level. And so this tool will be at hand, in fact I would say it is now, or soon will be in your hands. But the main tool, the essential tool—the use of the funds—is in the hands of the educators in our public and private schools, colleges, and universities. And it is upon their shoulders that the full responsibility for meeting this greatest of all challenges in our civilization rests.

The answers now and in the future will determine whether or not we can successfully meet and overcome the challenge of Communist ideology and competition to win the minds of this and future generations. It will be this answer that will determine whether we survive or perish.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, as we near the end of debate on this historic bill, I would like to thank my colleagues for supporting my amendment in this bill to include in the distribution formula all those impoverished youngsters on public aid who, because of the large size of their family, receive in excess of $2,000 per year.

You will recall this bill in its original form would have limited Federal aid only on the basis of the number of children in each State whose total family income is below $2,000.

This formula, in its original form, would have imposed a serious inequity upon States like Illinois where, because of the heavy migration of large families from rural areas, the annual public assistance of many families exceeds $2,000 per year.

I wish to thank the members of the Education Committee for accepting my amendment to correct this inequity, and now I would like to thank the House for sustaining the action of my committee.

My amendment provided that in addition to those children whose family income is $2,000 per year or less, all the children on public assistance, even though the families' annual public assistance may exceed $2,000 a year, would be counted in determining the amount of aid to be given to a local school district.

What does this amendment mean? It means that Illinois, for example, will receive approximately $6 million more in the first year than it would have originally received. Most of this money will find its way to Chicago where we have a large concentration of unfortunate victims of poverty attending the public school system.

I am particularly gratified that this amendment has been accepted as part of the basic structure of this bill because to have omitted this large category would have been to shortchange communities like Chicago of the full participation of this program.

We have in Chicago an estimated 196,000 children whose families are receiving some form of public assistance. These are unfortunate youngsters because in most instances they need a highly specialized type of educational program to bring them up to the norm established for all youngsters in that city. A study of the school budget in Chicago will show that a large share of all school expenditures in Chicago goes into these areas of low incomes or high concentration of families on public aid. Because of the pressing needs of these areas, the local tax rate for property owners throughout the city of Chicago has been going up and up and up.

This urgently needed Federal assistance, and particularly the amendment which I had sponsored and which this House has accepted, gives us reason at least to hope that the climbing spiral of property taxes can be halted and ultimately reversed.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a district made up mostly of single-family homeowners. These are the taxpayers that have carried the most severe brunt of the constantly rising real estate taxes for public education. I am proud to have been a member of the committee which has brought before this House today a bill which in my judgment will help arrest or at least slow down substantially future increases.

I am aware of the fact that under this bill we cannot reduce local expenditures for education by the amount provided by the Federal Government. But despite this limitation, we have every reason to believe that future tax increases which would be necessary to meet the growing demand for highly specialized educational programs in these areas of high concentration of low-income families can be diminished because of the Federal aid to local communities provided in this bill.

I am grateful to my colleagues for supporting my amendment. This amendment will insure an equitable share for the large urban areas and we will feel the full impact of this amendment as better figures becomes available regarding the number of youngsters on public assistance in Chicago and other urban areas throughout the country.

This is a most important amendment and I am particularly pleased that it is the only major amendment accepted by the House to the administration's original formula.

There are many other aspects in this historic bill that should be of considerable help to the taxpayers of my district and to the people of America.

For the first time in the history of our country, the private schools of this Nation—doing such an outstanding job throughout America—are on a parity with the public schools of America consistent with constitutional limitations. No one has ever suggested outright Federal aid to church related schools, and quite properly, Mr. Chairman, those operating our church related schools have never urged such direct and outright Federal help.

Instead, we have provided assistance to the children themselves without in any way disturbing our constitutional concept between separation of church and state.

Nowhere in this bill can one find a single word that provides any Federal funds for the establishment or teaching of any given religion. But this bill does provide, for the first time in the history of our Nation, urgently needed assistance to poverty stricken youngsters who, for reasons known best to themselves, exercise their rights as free Americans by attending a parochial school.

This bill recognizes that it is the child who is of paramount importance regardless of whether he or she attends a public or parochial school. And yet, Mr. Chairman, this bill very carefully avoids any constitutional conflict.

I am proud to be a member of a committee which through hard work and diligent effort has at last resolved this historic problem which has occupied some of the most competent legal minds and educational leaders for several decades. And yes, Mr. Chairman, I am proud of the contribution that I have made toward helping find this constitutional solution.

Voting for this bill today gives one a sense of being a tiny particle in the tide of history, a tide which has helped America evolve a concept of human dignity which today shines as a beacon of hope for mankind throughout the world.

Mrs. **DWYER.** Mr. Chairman, the pending bill once again confronts the House with the age-old question of what to do with legislation which does not fully satisfy the desires of individual Members. Like most major legislation, this is a compromise bill, designed to harmonize conflicting views and needs. I doubt if any Member considers it perfect. Each of us, therefore, must decide for himself whether the advantages of the bill outweigh the disadvantages.

On the whole, Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a useful bill which will make a contribution toward meeting a recognized national need. On this basis, I shall vote for the bill.

For too many years we have engaged in fruitless debate over the means rather than the end of aid to elementary and secondary education. There has been broad agreement in the Congress and in the Nation for a long time that the Federal Government has a responsibility to help States and local communities—in a limited way and where the need is greatest—to improve the quality of education at the elementary and secondary levels.

Despite the best efforts of many States and communities, the need has grown in recent years. It has grown with the rapid increase in our population. It has grown with the widening gap between those who have shared in our national prosperity and those who have fallen ever farther behind. While better education is basic to the ability of people to help themselves achieve a better and more rewarding life, those States and local school districts where poverty is most serious usually have the least resources with which to provide the needed educational opportunities, let alone the extra effort which is required.

The results of this educational imbalance can be seen, at least in part, in the growing crime rate in many of our cities, in the stubbornly high unemployment levels especially among younger people, in the disturbing number of school dropouts, and in the delinquency, restlessness, and lack of purpose that haunts so many for whom the future should hold greater hope and challenge.

We have failed up to now, Mr. Chairman, to enact a school aid bill largely because we have failed to resolve the twin disputes of how to distribute Federal funds among the States and school districts and how to deal equitably with schoolchildren in public and nonpublic schools within the context of the constitutional separation of church and state—the very issues which have so enlivened the present debate.

Reading the bill and the committee report and listening to this debate have convinced me that on both issues the bill provides reasonable and workable compromise solutions. Perhaps they could be improved, but I have yet to see anything better.

On the question of the formula for distributing funds in title I of the bill, the major objection appears to be that deprived schoolchildren in the wealthier States will be getting a larger per capita share of assistance than similar children in the poorer States. If you look at only one set of statistics, this objection seems to stand up. It does so because the formula allocates funds to local school districts on the basis of the number of school-age children from families having annual incomes of less than $2,000 and from families whose incomes consist principally of aid to dependent children multiplied by one-half the average dollar expenditure per pupil in the State. Consequently, in cases where the numbers of needy children are the same, those school districts located in States with higher per pupil expenditures on education will receive proportionately more Federal assistance.

This is true, but it is not the whole truth. New Jersey, for instance, contributes nearly $3 in Federal taxes for every dollar it receives in Federal aid of all kinds; and under the formula in this bill New Jersey will continue to contribute substantially more than it receives. I do not object to this since a measure of equalization, something extra for needy areas, is an essential part of legislation of this kind. But I would certainly object—and vigorously—if a bill which is supposed to help deprived children reduced the share of help going to New Jersey's deprived children simply because they live in a rich State. It is no easier to be poor in New Jersey than it is to be poor anywhere else—the contrast, in fact, might make it worse.

In any event, Mr. Chairman, the formula in this bill will help channel New Jersey tax funds into New Jersey school districts which have high concentrations of deprived schoolchildren. This cannot be done in any other way under existing law. New Jersey will benefit—yes. But other poorer States will benefit, too.

What the opponents of the formula overlook, in their haste to compare the 10 richest counties—of which Union County, N.J., is one—with the 10 poorest counties, is that the former are much larger in population, have bigger school plants, higher costs, and—more important—bigger and more complex poverty

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

problems. Union County needs the million dollars-plus it will get under this bill.

The formula, then, is as fair and equitable as any I have seen.

The same can be said, I believe, for the way in which the bill would overcome any constitutional obstacle by channeling assistance directly to the needy children. No private or church-affiliated school would benefit from this bill. By the same token, no schoolchild, simply because he attends a nonpublic school, would be deprived of the help he needs.

While State and Federal education authorities would be responsible for assuring the equitable and efficient operation of the program, the bill would place primary responsibility for administering the assistance where it belongs—with the local school board. Local needs, local problems, local opportunities will differ, and local school boards should be in the best position to determine how to get help to those who need it, within the framework of the bill's objectives and the means it authorizes.

On the other hand, I do not believe we can overlook the inadequacies and the potential weaknesses in this bill. Fortunately, it provides only a 1-year authorization, and Congress should be capable of learning from any mistakes that may be revealed. Personally, I wish the standards in the bill were more clearly defined so as to provide more useful guidance to local authorities in deciding what projects would be certain to meet the tests of constitutionality.

I wish, too, the committee had made a greater effort to stick to priorities in suggesting the broad scope of programs for which funds could be used. In this respect, the education bill suffers from much the same looseness that has afflicted the administration's basic antipoverty program. Greater results might be accomplished, I suggest, if the committee had limited the purposes for which funds can be spent to a relatively few proven programs such as special classes for the physically handicapped, the emotionally disturbed, and the socially maladjusted. Special priority could wisely have been specified for preschool education—the kind of training which a growing number of our ablest educators believe is vital if culturally deprived children are ever to overcome their early disadvantages.

Nevertheless, these and related programs of demonstrably superior worth are authorized in the bill and I would hope that the U.S. Office of Education will exercise its discretion to assure that local projects will be the most effective possible.

With certain reservations, therefore, but with even greater expectations, I urge my colleagues to pass this bill and give it a chance to make the kind of contribution toward the lifting up of deprived children which we all want.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2362, which would strengthen and improve the quality of education in this Nation's elementary and secondary schools. It is designed additionally and equally to give powerful new impetus to the war against poverty and despair.

In short, H.R. 2362 reflects the growing national consensus that the battle to eradicate poverty and chronic unemployment will not be won, cannot be won, and is not going to be won until the full weight of education is thrown into the breech against these ancient oppressors of mankind.

H.R. 2362 reflects the growing national consensus that the journey in search of this country's true destiny must begin in the elementary and secondary schoolhouses of America.

I support H.R. 2362 because I believe with John F. Kennedy that—

> A free nation can rise no higher than the standard of excellence set in its schools and colleges. Ignorance and illiteracy, unskilled workers and school dropouts—these and other failures of our educational system breed failures in our social and economic system: Delinquency, unemployment, chronic dependence, a waste of human resources, a loss of productive power and purchasing power, and an increase in tax-supported benefits. The loss of only 1 year's income due to unemployment is more than the total cost of 12 years of education.

One cannot go out among the ordinary people, as I have done, without sensing a rising, restless, compelling sentiment for a stronger system of education that will stir the interest of their children and provide them with the know-how and skills to compete in an increasingly competitive world.

Many of these people never heard of Euripides, but in their own way they have come to understand that "who so neglects learning in their youth loses the past and is dead for the future."

Millions of our people are "dead for the future" because they neglected education in their youth—or because education neglected them.

I say that education is a national public trust. I say that the sons and daughters of the underprivileged are entitled to the same high quality of instruction that is provided for the more fortunate.

But there is no fairness, no uniformity in a system of education that permits the spending of $321 a year to educate one child in a public school and only $120 to educate another youngster who happens to live on the wrong side of the economic tracks.

So what we are fighting for here today is a bill that would help create a first-class school system and first-class opportunities in later life for all the boys and girls of America—regardless of the financial status of their parents and regardless of the economic condition of the area in which they live.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN] was eminently correct when he said that had this legislation been enacted 15 or 20 years ago "millions of American youth who are now unemployed, living in poverty, or following a life of idleness or crime, would be on the way to financial independence and enjoying American abundance and prosperity."

No one can say what the future holds for the generation now attending grade school. But, we can be absolutely sure that the word "education" is the most important and decisive to their hopes and aspirations.

H.R. 2362 provides $1.06 billion for local school districts; $100 million for libraries—those depositories where the wisdom of the ages is stored and classified; $100 million for local educational services; $100 million for a network of regional instruction centers, and $25 million for State educational departments.

The eight counties of my own 10th Congressional District of Ohio would be alloted $1,055,264 to strengthen and improve the quality of public education. These funds are desperately needed by them and needed now. Passage of H.R. 2362 would, of course, benefit all the children of my district—but it would do more to give a fighting chance in life to the 9,000 underprivileged children of southeast Ohio than all the handouts and relief checks ever issued by the Federal Government and the State of Ohio.

These are the youngsters, and millions like them all across America, who must be provided with the best in educational opportunities if the shackles of poverty are ever to be broken.

I am proud to say that H.R. 2362 has the declared vigorous support of nearly all the educational leaders of my State and district. These men and women are not impressed by the tiresome, long discredited claim that Federal aid to education means Federal control. And who would know better than they whether or not the Government in Washington is guilty of trying to dictate to local school boards and teachers?

I do not have the time here to list all the organizations and individuals in my State and district which have urged the prompt enactment of H.R. 2362, as reported out of the House Committee on Education and Labor.

A representative listing includes the Ohio Education Association; the Ohio Department of Classroom Teachers; the Ohio Association of School Administrators; the Ohio School Counselors Association; the Oak Hill Teachers Association, and school superintendents, principals, and private citizens throughout southeast Ohio.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as much as I recognize the limitless value of education, I could not bring myself to support H.R. 2362 if I thought for a moment that it violated the constitutional doctrine of separation of church and state.

I believe strongly and without reservation in this time-honored doctrine; I am convinced that America has reached its present pinnacle of greatness because both the Government and religion were and are equally free and equally beyond the direct influence of the other.

The legislation we debate today does provide for some forms of assistance to underprivileged children who are enrolled in nonpublic schools. For example, these youngsters could borrow textbooks for research and study from the central depository designated by State and local officials. They could also participate in certain public educational programs that are nonsectarian and unrelated to religious activities. In these cases, we would be simply heeding the individual child's cry for a helping hand, and not contributing toward the propagation of any religion or sect.

H.R. 2362 does not authorize the payment of public funds to any nonpublic school. It does not authorize funds for the purchase of material or equipment by or for nonpublic schools. It does not authorize so much as one penny for the construction maintenance or upkeep of a nonpublic school.

Moreover, this legislation specifically places control of the program in the hands of State and local boards of education. That is where the control ought to be. And I for one believe that the public educational agencies back home can be trusted to disburse these funds in a manner that is in strict accordance with established procedures.

I do want to say very frankly and very bluntly that I will personally help lead the fight to have this legislation declared unconstitutional and stricken from the books if it ever is misused as an opening wedge toward breeching the wall between church and state, or if the declared intent of Congress is ever shunted aside in the administration of this program.

With that clear understanding, I again declare my support of H.R. 2362 and urge its enactment without further delay.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, this act at long last brings full recognition of the national importance of education at all levels and expresses in clear and constructive form the national resolve that no child will be deprived of the opportunity for a good education because he happens to live in a low-income region or come from a poor family.

The act, by its strong emphasis on the control of expenditures by State and local authorities, overcomes the objections of those concerned with possible Federal control of local schools.

The church-state issue seems satisfied as fully as human judgment can make it so. Control and selection of all programs, the disbursement of funds and the title to all property and books involved rests in local public school officials, through whom these services are given to all needy children.

This act will make available to Tennessee more than $35 million annually for elementary and high schools. Only 11 other States will receive more. The act has the strong support of the Tennessee Education Association.

It is probably the most important piece of legislation to come up in this session of Congress and I am proud to have helped in its passage.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2362. It is the view of some of our distinguished Republican colleagues that the bill under consideration ought to be rejected because it provides for general aid to education, rather than aid entirely for impoverished children. Even if they were right I would not share their alarm, for I believe that enhancing the quality of education for all of our young people is a basic requirement for a great society.

Although education is primarily a State function, education is a national concern.

The most important feature of the bill under consideration, authorization of about $1,060 million for grants to school districts, has as the focus of its concern the educationally deprived. These funds will go to local school districts for the purpose of broadening and strengthening programs in schools where there are concentrations of educationally disadvantaged children.

In some school districts of the country, where financial resources are seriously lacking, and where, as a consequence, the overall quality of the educational system is low, funds made available under this bill will have the effect of general aid to education.

In such districts, where the educationally disadvantaged are to be found in large numbers, the effect of Federal funds made available will be to elevate the quality of the entire educational system.

In other districts of the Nation, where financial resources are greater, and where, as a consequence, the overall quality of the educational system may be high, the effect of the Federal funds made available will be that of permitting the establishment of special programs for the benefit of the district's educationally disadvantaged.

In either case, objectives of this major feature of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 will in some measure be achieved. This feature seeks to remedy the condition of inequality that now exists among America's children and young people. Whether the inequality derives from the areas of the country the youngster happens to live in or whether it derives from the area within a school district he happens to live in—that condition of inequality will be remedied—or partially so—by provisions of this bill.

Local circumstances will determine which is the best approach to remedy conditions of inequality; local circumstances will determine which is the best approach to improve educational opportunities for America's disadvantaged youngsters.

In closing, I compliment the members of the House Committee on Education and Labor and its able and effective chairman for their constructive and productive labors. I join that committee's bipartisan majority in urging passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have studied the hearings on H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and have listened carefully to the debates in this Chamber. I have decided to vote in favor of this legislation.

I have long been convinced of the need for Federal aid to our public elementary and secondary schools in this country. At this session, I introduced a bill to provide such aid, stressing particularly the needs of our great cities. This bill was along the lines of the recommendations made to President Kennedy early in 1961 by his Task Force on Education.

There is no doubt in my mind that, as our cities reach the limits of their financial resources, it is imperative that our public school systems receive assistance from the Federal Government with its rapidly expanding financial resources—which grow as the economy grows.

The present bill comes before us as a compromise of various points of view. It was the failure to achieve such a compromise which, in several previous instances, effectively blocked the passage of bills to provide Federal aid for elementary and secondary education.

The emphasis in title I of the present bill is to provide aid to disadvantaged children, and there is much to be said for that approach. It will assist the educational authorities to provide the extra help needed if our children in underprivileged areas are to be provided with the needed opportunities to escape from the vicious cycle of poverty and hopelessness. If these efforts are successful, they will benefit all segments of our communities and strengthen the fabric of our democratic society. To a degree, the provision of funds for such purposes will also permit local educational authorities to provide more funds for schools in areas that are not underprivileged.

Under the formula set forth in title I of this bill, the special needs of New York City do receive fair recognition.

I have given much thought to the question of whether this bill transgresses the basic principle of separation of church and state, and I have been impressed with the fact that not only the Department of Justice, but many organizations sensitive to this issue have concluded that the bill does not violate the first amendment.

It does appear, however, that conceivably the bill might be administered in such a way as to transgress the principle of church-state separation, even in those States which have strict constitutional or legislative standards. After consultation with the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, the Attorney General of the State of New York, and the Legal Reference Service of the Library of Congress, I am satisfied that, if such abuses should occur in the administration of this legislation, judicial remedies would be available to stop such abuses. I recognize that this will entail vigilance and effort by the defenders of the separation between church and state; in this area the National Advisory Council provided for in the committee's version of the bill should be of great assistance.

In summary, the risks involved in this bill are, in my judgment, outweighed by the benefits which will flow from it.

In arriving at my decision to support this bill, I am impressed with the fact that many children attending nonpublic schools suffer from poverty and are in need of the kind of special services that this legislation would provide. It is, to my mind, appropriate and desirable that they should be furnished such special services, just as for some years they have been furnished assistance in the area of transportation, health protection, and milk and hot lunch programs.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

I salute those in the executive branch who had the ingenuity to work out the essentials of this legislation in such a way as to make it possible for a Federal aid to education bill to be acceptable to the majority of the Congress, and I commend the chairman and the members of the House Education and Labor Committee who incorporated a number of amendments which have improved the bill, particularly from the point of view of the aid formula as it affects cities such as New York, and from the point of view of safeguarding the principle of separation of church and state.

For the Congress to adopt a bill providing for Federal aid to primary and secondary schools will indeed be a milestone. I trust that the wisdom of those who will be charged with the administration of this bill will be such as to prove unfounded the fears with respect to it expressed by many sincere friends of education.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. I further wish to state that I am completely in favor of this bill as it was reported from the committee and without any crippling amendments. My stand, I might add, is supported by the thousands of letters and telegrams I have received from the constituents of the First Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

The main point of controversy, of course, is the formula for the distribution of funds to aid our schoolchildren; and while the formula, as prepared and reported out by the committee, is not perfect, I do think it is the nearest approach to perfection I have ever seen used in such a bill.

The thrust of the proposed act is directed at improving substandard educational opportunities which are a direct result of economic shortcomings in the school systems. The fund appropriated would be distributed to every school district in every State in which there is a large group of students from poor families. Given these factors, and with our knowledge of the wide range of variation among the States in population and wealth, it is obvious that some States will get more Federal assistance, in terms of dollars, than others. The present formula assures that aid will go only where it is needed, and not necessarily where we as individuals would like to see it go. This, to my way of thinking, is the test of a good formula.

The bill now under consideration would extend educational benefits to all American children who are in need of help, regardless of the type of school they attend. That is, the Federal Government would aid in the education of both public and private school pupils. But need this call forth the needless fear of Government support of religion? I sincerely think not. The bill is replete with guarantees that no public funds will be expended except under the control of public agencies. There will be no unrestricted grants to private schools. The students of private schools would benefit by studying secular subjects in public schools and at public centers and by using publicly approved learning resources lent to them by public authorities. The private schools themselves would be enriched in no material way, and no public moneys could be used to further sectarian instruction. Due to these guarantees and controls in the language of this bill, I see no constitutional inconsistencies in the various programs proposed.

If there is any valid question about this issue, it would appear to be this: Can America help itself more by helping only a part of its children, or by helping all of them?

I feel there is only one honest answer to that question. When we all agree on it, we will pass the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, all during the 3 days of debate on H.R. 2362 we continued to hear there would be an amendment to the bill providing a new section for judicial review. The rumor continued to go the rounds that this added section would enumerate those who could sue for review by the courts. Then we all know that near close of debate late tonight, the gentleman from Virginia proposed a new section 606 which simply called for the entire act to be subject to judicial review in an appropriate court. Then there was a substitute that followed which would set out with more particularity those who would have standing to sue as to any provision in the bill.

In the teller count that followed the debate on the original amendment and on the substitute, I opposed both of these for the reason I did not want to be cast in the position of doing anything that might contribute to a failure to enact this bill into law. The debate seemed to me to be most illuminating in that it was brought out that there were three titles already in the bill which set up provisions for judicial review and the new amendments were unnecessary. Although it may be difficult for some to make up their minds, it seemed to me that notwithstanding the new section offered or even notwithstanding the judicial review sections provided in the original draft of the bill, if a citizen had suffered some legal injury there would certainly be right of redress by a hearing in the courts. No matter how many new sections we add or how much we underline the provisions already contained in the bill, no judicial review section is any good unless there is an injured party. There is no way to escape the limitation that in order to sue one must be injured. If there is no injury it is doubtful that a standing could be provided simply by seeking to give a person status by provisions in this bill. In many States taxpayer suits are available. Certainly our Constitution as it has been interpreted has never set forth any objections to taxpayer suits. Probably the most famous case involved in the religious issue in schools is the Everson case. That decision did not say a word to prevent effective or final review by the highest court in the land.

In connection with all the principal cases, there is a trend or perhaps one should say a thread running through all of the cases which seems to point to relation of rules concerning standing to sue. In none of these cases was there a denial on ground of standing.

Of course, there is nothing novel about Congress recognizing judicial review. This has been done on numerous occasions including the Communications Act of 1934 and the Declaratory Judgment Act which broadened judicial review in 1940. As late as 1949 the Barden bill set up a provision in which a taxpayer could enjoin certain expenditures.

What I am trying to say, Mr. Chairman, is that while provision of judicial review is fully consistent with past congressional practices and does not violate the separation of power between the judicial and legislative branches the better rule is no explicit provision for judicial review is usually needed. There is a school of thought that to provide for judicial review is for Congress to say in effect we have our doubts about this particular legislation and inclusion could be construed as an invitation to sue and as to the uninformed might even be an inducement to sue. Mr. Chairman, I oppose both the amendment by the gentleman from Virginia and the substitute that followed for the reason that it seemed to me there was already an adequate or effective provision for judicial review in the bill. First, section 211 of title I, page 86, clearly provides for review and while this section permitted a finding of fact by the Commissioner of Education there is a provision the court for good cause can remand the case to the Commissioner for further evidence and may even set aside the Commissioner's finding in whole or in part. I have heard it said to permit the Commissioner to make the conclusive finding of fact is like delegating the fox the chore of guarding the chickenhouse but if we look carefully at the judicial review provision we will see the real guard is standing in the background and is not the Commissioner but the court which can either affirm or review the action of the Commissioner and set his findings either in whole or part. The provision for a three-member district court which, of course, is necessary in a constitutional question is subject to review by the U.S. Supreme Court by way of certiorari.

Not only is there provisions for judicial review provided in title I but also in title II and then again in title V for substantially the same procedures are to be followed. To repeat, the Court can remand the case back to the Commissioner and upon the filing of appropriate petition the Court can entertain jurisdiction to set aside in whole or in part any application that it may be dissatisfied with and it provides the States shall have 60 days to file with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the circuit in which a State is located a petition for review of that action. The section contained in the original bill set up procedures as enumerated in title 28 of the United States Code.

Mr. Chairman, a separate section calling for judicial review may not do any harm but would not do very much good, either. Mindful of the interest of the American Civil Liberties Union and the

International Convention of Christian Churches, in particular, and the letters from several constituents notwithstanding, I did not want to be cast in a position of doing a single thing that might lead to defeat of this bill. While I do not know the reasons, I know several Members would have opposed the bill if it had contained a separate section on judicial review. It was my conclusion addition of other language than they already provided for judicial review might not only be a duplication but might result in a multiplication of lawsuits contesting this bill which could tie up and prevent plans authorized under the legislation for several years. Finally, I am advised there is currently pending before the courts a case in one of the Eastern States which has been carefully drawn so the Supreme Court will be able to establish clear doctrine on much of the so-called wall of separation of church and state. The Justice Department has said that this bill is constitutional. We do not want the bill to go unchecked or untested. There is an adequate and sufficient provision now in the bill. Cases now in litigation will serve as further tests. No separate section enumerating standing to sue is needed and could only add cumbersome language that would be surplusage.

Now, Mr. Chairman, for the RECORD, I think it is appropriate to point out and comment on some of the steps that were taken by the Committee on Education and Labor to strengthen the bill. I think this may be necessary particularly when one hears it said that this bill came from the executive branch without the crossing of a t or the dotting of an i. That just is not true. First look at section 205 of title I. This was changed to provide that a public agency must administer the funds. It was also changed to provide that all property acquired under the title must be vested in a public agency. It should be noted that this was really a major change and quite an important and substantial bolstering of the bill.

Then again in title II, a new section 205 was added which required that the title to all library resources and textbook material vest only in the public agency and that a public authority have sole administration over the use of such material. The effect of this amendment is to require that textbook material be made available to students on a loan basis only.

Later in section 304 of title III there was an amendment that authorized grants to local public educational agencies only. This amendment provided further that in the area of planning and execution of the programs, such be limited to persons as are broadly representative of the cultural and educational resources of the area to be served. This differed sharply from the original provision which would have permitted grants to nonpublic agencies and would have required only institutional representation on any agency carrying out a supplemental educational service with a Federal grant.

Then as if to guard further against any possible impairment of the first amendment of the Constitution, section 401 of title IV dealing with the Cooperative Research Act, was amended to prohibit absolute grants or contracts with higher educational institutions if such are training students to prepare them to become ministers of religion. This amendment should go a long way to assure those who have been concerned about religious schools that no grants can be used for teacher training in institutions that train ministers. Thus it is made abundantly clear that grants cannot be used for religious or sectarian research or teacher training.

Adding the fact that in most States they are already providing textbook service through what is called bookmobiles, which services go to both public and private institutions as a library service, and when you consider further the fact that the main function of the textbook amendment is to keep control of the textbooks and their selection in the hands of a public agency, and when you add further the fact that education centers will have programs that will be administered publicly, with mandatory consultation of appropriate groups in the community, one comes to appreciate the importance of the changes adopted by the general Subcommittee on Education in reporting the measure to the full committee.

With these changes it is not difficult to see that the fears of most of the individuals and groups that have opposed general aid to education have been erased. Their objections have been met. It is not a perfect bill but it will help children in every congressional district in America. While it will concentrate on educationally deprived children, it provides valuable assistance to library and textbook facilities and in addition strengthens State agencies.

It is a real privilege to vote "aye" and send to the other body a bill that will in the course of a short time become one of the most important enactments in the field of education in this century.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, pertinent to the discussion of H.R. 2362 are two articles by Mr. Raymond Moley which have appeared in Newsweek. I place them in the RECORD at this point:

PERSPECTIVE: FEDERAL SCHOOL AID—I

(By Raymond Moley)

One of the many expressions in Shakespeare which were inspired by his incredible contemporary, Christopher Marlowe, is "a great reckoning in a little room." Marlowe wrote it "infinite riches in a little room." No doubt Shakespeare as he lifted the gem recalled that Marlowe was killed in a quarrel over a tavernkeeper's reckoning of the costs of a long afternoon of eating and drinking.

I recalled this classical touch when I tried to analyze the President's message on education and the bill which was explained for him to the House subcommittee by Secretary Anthony Celebrezze.

Politics demanded that the bill's alleged benefits be spread to 90 percent of all school districts and that Catholic schools get at least a pittance. Fiscal reality required that the $1,250 million for the first year would allow no district or school to get very much. But its provisions make it clear that wherever the benefits would flow, the heavy hand of a Federal bureaucracy would follow.

The bill was very cleverly designed to offer a small bait to Catholics, who have opposed Federal school aid in previous years. There is also an inducement to State governments, which are struggling with the mounting cost of education. Educational theorists are won by money for their frills and fads. Integrationists are bought off by the bill's emphasis on help for the schools in which they are interested. And State school administrators' offices would be beefed up with funds for their bureaucracy. Of course, the National Education Association is made happy by any sort of Federal money for schools.

HELP FOR THE IMPACTED

The bill seeks, further, to dampen the opposition of those Americans who have always opposed Federal aid on principle. For it is made to seem that States and local districts will retain a measure of their traditional self-determination.

But when the House committee, quite fearful of what the Supreme Court will rule, attaches amendments, the Catholics will sip the dregs of bitter disappointment.

Title I of the bill is really an extension of the system of aid to "impacted areas" now in operation, which provides Federal help to school districts into which great Federal defense industries and many workers and their families have moved. But the bill is also designed to recognize districts "impacted" by poverty.

Title I would authorize $1 billion in the first year to be paid through the U.S. Office of Education to States which, under federally approved plans, would make grants to school districts with State-approved programs for children of low-income families. Presumably everything would be approved—school construction, teachers' salaries, nursery schools, adult education, and "counseling." Parochial school children would benefit through "dual enrollment," a scheme to spend part time in their own schools and part time in a public school.

ILLUSORY CATHOLIC AID

Title II would provide Federal funds to the States for library resources and textbooks. In those States which prohibit distribution of public funds for private use, the Federal Government would help directly, or the parochial school children would borrow books from a public agency.

Title III would set up model public-private educational centers for school administrators to view, admire, and emulate.

Title IV would permit the U.S. Office of Education to give grants to colleges and other institutions to do research, surveys, and demonstrations in educational science. The most serious of these supported activities is "curriculum development." The Commissioner of Education commented: "Our goal is a national network of federally supported but State- and university-operated research centers. They must have the facility to explore any avenue of improvement which can contribute to their mission."

Title V would provide money to help State departments of education to enlarge their operations.

Not only should Catholics remind themselves of the danger of Federal control of education generally, but they should contemplate how easily this bill can be amended in Congress or disallowed by the courts. In the end, Mr. Johnson's gesture may prove to be an illusion.

PERSPECTIVE: FEDERAL SCHOOL AID—II

(By Raymond Moley)

President Johnson's pursuit of what people are beginning to call a consensus in Federal aid to education faces very hard going. The complicated provisions in his plan to permit private and parochial schools to get some of the benefits—small though they seem to be when the fine print is examined—have already stirred serious opposition. Claims

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

of unconstitutionality abound. Then there is opposition from the strict separationists among Protestants, Jews, and those of no faith at all. The Anti-Defamation League urges that "specific standards and safeguards" be written into the bill to make sure that no public school child shall be exposed to "sectarian influence." Catholics, whose hopes were raised when Mr. Johnson proposed his omnibus program, now see their chance for aid vanishing.

It is clear that if the bill is passed in its present form it will be a divisive force throughout the land. Its provisions will be thrown open to endless litigation and possibly devastating judgments by the Supreme Court.

The President and Congress might well consider alternative means of aid to education. One such alternative approach is to provide the means by which the States, the school districts, and taxpayers may more easily pay for their own schools. This would be a means of allowing communities to raise some of the money which is now paid in Federal income taxes. Various versions of this have been proposed in the past.

TAX CREDITS

President Eisenhower proposed that the States should be permitted to collect a portion of excise taxes monopolized by the Federal Government. Nothing came of this proposal.

Representative Frank Bow, of Ohio, suggested that 1 percent of all individual and corporation income taxes be retained in the States for educational purposes. The Bow bill passed the House in 1961 by a voice vote but was later killed in a rollcall.

Walter Heller, former Presidential adviser, proposed returning some Federal taxes to the State unconditionally. L.B.J. shelved this idea, but is said to be holding it for use when the economy needs a stimulant.

The concept of a tax credit to parents of college students has been around for a long time. Senators and former Secretary Ribicoff proposed this form of college aid, and his bill almost passed the Senate last year. He has introduced it again with 31 cosponsors.

Representative Thomas B. Curtis is drafting a bill which would provide such credits for elementary and secondary education as well as for college. Under the Curtis plan, a taxpayer would be allowed against his Federal income-tax payment a credit of a stated percentage, based on the taxes he pays to State and local governments for educational purposes. This would not exceed $100. The taxpayer would be allowed the credit whether or not he has children in school—public, private, or parochial. Or he could take a credit of $50 for each child he has in public or private school or college, the total not to exceed $200.

BYPASS RELIGIOUS ISSUE

Presumably, this would permit the State or school district to increase taxes for educational purposes and also permit religious institutions to increase their demands upon parents of children in their schools. The allocation of this taxpayers' windfall between public and private education would be left to the States, the districts, and the religious institutions. In short, the Federal Government would wash its hands of the issue between public and private education.

Mr. Curtis says his bill, if passed, would "return a measure of taxing power to the local governing bodies which traditionally pay for and control education in this country." He says also that "it seems obvious to me that, if we pass this bill, we will have resolved the two otherwise insurmountable barriers to Federal aid to education: the fear of Federal control and the church-State issue."

There are certain advantages in this plan which make it preferable to a grant-in-aid program. It would provide the taxpayer with some additional capacity to pay for education. The question which would emerge, however, would be whether the States and school districts would or would not fully absorb the taxpayers' windfall.

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to lend my support to the Elementary and Secondary School Education Act of 1965. With our expanding and growing economy, we must continue to improve the education of the American people. We must build more classrooms, improve the quality of teaching, and equalize educational opportunities for every American child.

The youth of our country is our most important national resource. As a nation we have a vital interest in their education. For this reason I fully support the goal which the Education Act seeks to attain—that of bringing better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most and to provide incentives for everyone who wants to learn.

I oppose across-the-board aid to private schools on constitutional grounds. I do favor categorical aids which in my opinion would not be unconstitutional. This bill does not violate the principle of separation of church and state. America has accepted her role as the defender of human liberty and democracy. Now we must realize the fullest educational potential of all American children—the underprivileged as well as the affluent—to strengthen our position as the defender of liberty and democracy.

Among the many telegrams and letters which I received urging my support of the education bill were the following telegrams from educational organizations and schools:

We urge full support of President Johnson's education bill. Urge opposition to any amendments and urge you to vote against recommittal.

William Rynack,
President Metropolitan Association of Higher Education of the National Education Association, Time and Life Building, New York City.

The city teachers association of New York urges you to vote in favor of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (H.R. 2362) in its present form.

We implore you to vote against any efforts to amend or recommit (H.R. 2362).

Harry Vanhouten,
Executive Director City Teachers Association of New York, Time Life Building, New York City.

Please be advised that the Executive Council of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO voted in February to support President Johnson's elementary and secondary school program. In support of this position, our union is now conducting a nationwide referendum.

Charles Cogen,
President American Federation of Teachers.

We appreciate the courtesy shown to our representatives by you and your office last week. We are happy that House Education and Labor Committee approved H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. We urge your full support to H.R. 2362 as approved by the committee. This is a good education bill and should be passed by the House now.

Clayton E. Rose,
New York State Teachers Association.

As chairman of the Hewlett Woodmere Teachers Association I urge that you oppose all amendments to H.R. 2362 the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Vote against any motion to recommit. Vote for and please urge your colleagues to vote for the final passage of this long overdue bill.

Yours respectfully,

Joel Rindler,
Hewlett High School, Hewlett, N.Y.

That you oppose all amendments to H.R. 2362 the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Vote against any motion to recommit. Vote for and please urge your colleagues to vote for the final passage of this long overdue bill.

Yours respectfully,

Nicholas A. Girolamo,
Chairman, Federal Legislative Committee, South Nassau Zone Teachers Association, Forest Lake School, Wantagh, N.Y.

As chairman of the Valley Stream North High School Faculty Association, I urge that you oppose all amendments to H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; vote against any motion to recommit; vote for, and please urge your colleagues to vote for the final passage of this long overdue bill.

Yours respectfully,

Alphonse P. Mayernik.
Valley Stream North High School.

The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America has gone on record in favor of President Johnson's bill providing for Federal aid in education opportunity for America's underprivileged children, regardless of whether they attend public or religion-sponsored schools.

Moses I. Feuerstein,
National President, The Union of Orthodox Jewish Congregations of America.

Entire Orthodox Jewish community deeply opposed to any amendments to education aid bill especially judicial review amendment which would torpedo every possibility of bills hoped for enactment. Strongly urge you to vote against judicial review and other crippling amendments for which you will earn our deep gratitude.

Rabbi Morris Sherer,
Agudath Israel of America.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer some thoughts on certain sections of H.R. 2362, the bill to provide Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools. I agree, Mr. Chairman, that financial assistance to local schools is needed in some sections of our country. But I fail completely to understand how anyone can consider the formula for apportionment of Federal funds under title I to be an equitable method of judging local need. Although we are told in the bill itself that the main purpose of the grants to school districts is to help areas with "concentrations of children from low-income families," I was utterly amazed to learn that the 10 wealthiest counties in the Nation—with an aggregate of 32,000 families having poverty-level income—will receive almost $9 million in Federal grants. At the same time, the 10 poorest counties, also with 32,000 poverty-level families, will receive only $4.5 million, or just half as much as the wealthiest counties.

I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we delete the aid proposed under this bill to those school districts having a family median income in excess of $4,000 per year.

Those wealthier districts can well afford to take care of the less fortunate in their own districts. In most cases, those school systems are best which govern themselves and support themselves at the local level. We should not attempt to solve the financial problems of our Nation's schools without first recognizing that the sole sources of Federal money are the private citizen and the free enterprise corporation. Every time the Federal Government takes a dollar from these sources, claiming to return it to them in various benefits, a portion of that dollar stays right here in Washington. Moreover, under this bill, apparently some of this money goes not to the areas which really need it, but to areas like Westchester County, N.Y., which will receive nearly $2.2 million under title I alone. Counties in other parts of the Nation with the same number of poverty-stricken families will receive only about one-third the amount of Westchester County, the sixth wealthiest county in the United States.

Further, I should like to point out that this proposal will cost the people of my State more than twice the amount that the State will receive in grants. The people of California can spend their money more efficiently than that. I cannot help but feel, Mr. Chairman, that passage of this bill, as presently written, will signal the development of another bureaucratic slush fund—poorly administered and poorly apportioned as to its funding. That is the basic reason for my belief that this bill must be sent back to committee for further study and redrafting.

I also feel that we are nationalizing education to an extent previously unheard of. Under the provisions of this bill, the Commissioner of Education becomes a virtual czar, with powers almost unlimited. Under title III, for example, the Commissioner is authorized to establish model schools at the local level—upon terms and conditions to be specified by him. Although the proposals for the schools originate at the local level, the State governments only make recommendations to the Commissioner, who will approve only those proposals which meet whatever criteria he may establish. This is the beginning of highly centralized control over the Nation's education—centralized to the point where all power may soon reside in one man, probably in a new Cabinet position.

Mr. Chairman, we need to improve our education system, and to some degree improvements can be achieved through the use of Federal assistance. But let us not assume that Uncle Sam can do it all. Every dollar of aid offered by the Federal Government brings with it a sacrifice of some measure of local control. Proponents of this legislation have spoken loudly and at great length about their belief that no controls are imposed under the terms of this bill. But they are wrong, because the Commissioner of Education sets the basic criteria for every plan to be used in the States, and money is forthcoming only if the State meets the criteria of the Commissioner. That is control of an inherently dangerous kind.

If the Federal Government wanted only to be of assistance to communities around the Nation, it would be both helpful and logical simply to pass tax resources directly back to the localities needing assistance. But this bill involves much more than monetary support. I urgently suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we talk about an enlightened approach to assistance to education: Such as tax relief at the Federal level to those who pay school taxes at the local level; such as Federal grants only to areas which demonstrate a true need for such assistance; such as giving adequate recognition to the basic responsibilities of the States and local districts in the matter of education.

Mr. Chairman, I urge recommittal to allow for a basic reconsideration of the many inequities brought to light in the course of debate on this legislation.

And, finally, it is now obvious that discussion will be cut off before the bill can be fully debated. The 10 minutes which have been permitted for discussion on each section of this important bill are hardly adequate in view of the vast importance of the legislation and the fact that four or five amendments have been offered for many of the sections. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that majority rule in a democratic society was ever intended to include the stifling of legitimate debate. Since we in the minority cannot even present our views, much less have them submitted to a fair hearing, I am beginning to see at firsthand the grave dangers attached to one-party rule. This bill involves commitment which will run continuously and will no doubt cost the taxpayer as much as $5 billion per year in 5 or 10 years. Certainly we cannot afford to limit this debate arbitrarily in light of the long-range effects on our Nation, our schoolchildren, and our local governments.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I am proud to rise in support of H.R. 2362 which is the climax of a 20-year struggle for Federal aid to our hard-pressed State and local boards of education. I say climax because—make no mistake about it—this bill is going to pass for the simple reason that the people of this Nation want it to pass.

Our educational needs are national in scope and this bill proposes to raise educational levels nationally. We have heard all the old shibboleths about local control being threatened by this measure. This simply is not true.

Even under the old Articles of Confederation, Federal aid to the States was enacted. The Land Ordinance of 1785 provided that a section in each township should be set aside for public education. And there have been many, many other acts where the Federal Government assisted the States without threatening local control. The Morrill Act of 1862, the Smith-Hughes Act, the two great GI bills passed after World War II and during the Korean conflict, the National Defense Education Act and the measure to provide aid to so-called federally impacted area, a bill which always causes so many opponents of bills such as H.R. 2362 to do semantic flip-flops as they become ensnared in their own rhetoric, and many other acts which have put the Federal Government into the business of educating Americans without once threatening local control.

I know from the many letters and telegrams that I have received from educators and concerned citizens of the 14th District of New Jersey that the good people of the district which I have the honor to represent, want this bill to pass.

Title I of this bill provides assistance to local educational agencies for the education of children of low-income families by providing funds to give some kind of educational chance to the 5 million children in this rich and abundant Nation, whose families are existing—you really cannot say living—on an annual income of $2,000 a year or less, and children living in families having incomes of over $2,000 under the programs of aid to families with dependent children.

My State is a wealthy one, one of the wealthiest in the United States, which is not unlike those in other parts of this Nation. This is the great paradox of America, stark poverty in the midst of great abundance. This bill will give all of the children in New Jersey a chance to rise through their own efforts aided by the greatest contribution of the United States to the world, the concept that education is for all.

Under title I, New Jersey would receive $20,196,092 of the estimated $1,060,082,000 which would be dispersed among the States.

Hudson County where 6,936 children come from homes with a family income of less than $2,000 will receive $1,969,824. The effect of this in my own county will be to provide a great educational stimulus which otherwise could not be accomplished without severe damage to the financial structure of the county and without placing an increased burden on the property owners of Hudson County, who are already making heroic sacrifices to educate our children.

I cannot, of course, speak for every school system in America, but I do know that in Hudson County this money will be used wisely by our capable school administrators and I think that it will go far toward breaking the poverty cycle among the disadvantaged who live in my part of the State of New Jersey.

It is a source of great satisfaction to me that this title concedes that children in nonpublic schools who are educationally disadvantaged are also worthy of attention from the Federal Government. Under title I, the local educational agency can make provision for children in nonpublic schools in terms of providing special educational services.

Similarly, under title II, textbooks, library resources, and other such educational material may be made available to children in nonpublic schools on a loan basis, without, in any way, threatening the barrier between church and state.

Under title II of the bill, the State of New Jersey will receive $3,223,812 of the approximately $100 million which will be distributed for library resources, textbooks, and instructional materials.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Under title III for supplemental educational centers and services, grants will be made from State allocations by the Commissioner of Education to local public educational agencies for the purpose of financing supplemental educational services and centers. It is expected under this title that the local public educational authorities will be able to set up programs which will be of benefit to all children whether in public or private schools, without aiding any religious group.

Of the $100 million to be disbursed under this title, New Jersey's share would amount to $3,150,198 of the estimated distribution of $100 million.

Title IV of the bill would amend the Cooperative Research Act of 1954—Public Law 83-531—to provide a broader base for the support of research and development programs so that our educational programs can continue to keep abreast of the times. In this way, great improvements in methodology could be achieved while at the same time, ways could be discovered to achieve desired educational ends with a minimum amount of expenditure.

Title V of H.R. 2362 would authorize the appropriation of $25 million to the States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, Guam, and the Virgin Islands. The Commissioner of Education will grant each State board of education the sum of $100,000 which amounts to about 85 percent of the $25 million and the remainder will be apportioned among the States on the basis of the number of public schoolchildren in the State. New Jersey's share will amount to $576,593.

Never have the Members of this Congress been given a better opportunity to advance the cause of American education by a single stroke. By the passage of this bill we can further expand the splendid American dream that any American boy or girl will be given a real opportunity to achieve commensurate with his or her aptitude or ability. This measure, in a practical way, allows us to use the broad Federal tax base to wage war on ignorance and poverty in the United States. I know that this Congress will be equal to the challenge. I urge every Member of this House, Mr. Chairman, to become a part of the greatest single legislative achievement in the field of education that has ever been enacted in this House, by voting in favor of H.R. 2362.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Chairman, I want to compliment the committee for the splendid job it has done in preparing and reporting to the House this historymaking bill.

It is clear that precedents are being swept aside today, and that the Federal Government is entering an area in a very substantial way insofar as monetary assistance and support are concerned that has heretofore been believed to be principally one for the legitimate function of the several States and local subdivisions of government.

But the desperate conditions in many States and communities make the assistance provided by this bill more or less mandatory upon those interested in strengthening our national school system, broadening the educational opportunities of all our youth and perpetuating the vigor and well-being of our American society.

The needs of modern day education are so great and so demanding, so crucial if you will, that truly they can only be met in their entirety on a national basis by the Federal Government, by the support and assistance of local and State agencies, and functions by the National Government. Wisely and soundly administered, as provided by the bill, this aid should not and will not impair basic control of education at local and State levels.

It has been demonstrated in very many ways throughout the Nation that the States and local governments and the subdivisions thereof are no longer able adequately to provide the financial aid imperatively needed to adequately sustain elementary and secondary education throughout the Nation.

I will not allude at length to the problems of illiteracy and subnormality and the plight of the disadvantaged child, and the grave problems of so many communities that are not able to cope with the ordinary problems of providing a good, sound education for their children, let alone the many extremely challenging problems presented by special groups of children for whom special techniques and opportunities must be provided.

It is unquestionable, to my mind, that the time has arrived, indeed it has passed, when we must come to grips in a practical sense with the essential problem of strengthening our entire educational system, not only in physical terms such as plant and buildings, but in enlisting the best available specialized personnel and modern techniques and the maximum utilization of modern, instructional technology.

In this regard I have always been very much impressed with the sage observations of my friend, the late, very distinguished and esteemed Senator Robert Taft, who declared in substance that while "education is primarily a State function, in the field of education as in the fields of health, relief, and medical care the Federal Government has a secondary obligation to see that there is a basic floor under those essential services for all adults and children in the United States."

In these few words, Senator Taft, with his discerning mind and acknowledged genius in statecraft, well summarized for us of this generation in short concise terms the scope of the obligation of the Federal Government in basic fields that relate to the education of children and adults and the general well-being and vigor of all our citizens.

It should be noted that these remarks were made more than 10 years ago, and they not only pointed very significantly to areas of compelling need, but outlined, and in a sense prophesied in effect, the direction in which this great Nation should and must move, if we are to discharge our full obligation to the people and the children of America. In fact, these words are at once a gleaming blueprint as well as a concise program for political and social action in basic areas in which we are commendably and urgently advancing at this very hour. These noble words are worthy of a great statesman; they are the promise of our future fulfillment.

While the pending measure provides substantial funds for general and special educational purposes, it is not what might be called a broad bill in the sense that it covers the entire field. It is in fact a rather circumscribed bill, since it is designed "to bring better education to millions of disadvantaged youth who need it most."

Admittedly, it is difficult to arrive at a proper, workable formula that will equitably distribute funds throughout a country as large as ours, but on the whole the Committee has managed to tackle and perform this job in a very creditable manner, and I believe it is practical and can be effectively executed.

I do not propose to argue the case that various conditions of poverty trace back and are directly attributable to lack of educational opportunities, because I believe in my mind and heart that fact is self-evident—well substantiated in our contemporary national life.

To be sure, there are those unfortunates among us so constituted that they cannot pursue any education very far, and they are, and in justice and compassion must be, the natural objects of our concern, and must be provided for in some way outside the orbit of a general, education bill.

It is those who are possessed of the talents and the ability, if not always the zeal, necessary to absorb an education, that we seek to deal with in this forward-moving bill.

It is those, who through no fault of their own are born into environments of abject poverty, where they and their families are living below normal subsistence levels, those who well may be the potential leaders and workers of tomorrow, the ones upon whom America must depend, if we are to go forward as a great world power and a great Nation committed to a strong, free, productive, and adequate economic system that will provide prosperity and opportunity and high standards for all those willing to seize them in this Nation of free choice where initiative, work, and opportunity combine to make for individual fulfillment and national strength.

I feel very strongly about this question, because I think that we could do no greater disservice to our country than to continue conditions within its boundaries that deny to some children, not fortunate to be born into self-sustaining families, the chances that every American child, every child living among us, should have to secure a decent education, and to develop his or her potential for his own benefit and for that of his family and the country. Such an opportunity is a condition precedent to the full, proper development of our great potential. It is the promise of this Nation come to reality, the real hope for the future of freedom and democracy.

America cannot go forward part educated and part uneducated; some of our children afforded the right to adequate educational training and self-development, and others denied these essential privileges of free government in the space age.

I do not believe that democracy, as we know it and want it in this country, can flourish in these advanced, critical days without a well-informed citizenry, and with entire masses of our people and our children spread out in chronic pockets of need and distress across the country uneducated, untrained, unaware of the true significance of what is taking place about us, unequipped for the tasks and duties of citizenship, poorly schooled for leadership, consigned to lives of disadvantage, poverty, handicap, and frustration, wasting their natural talents and aspirations in the welter of confusion, uncertainty, and want which surround most of those who never have real chance to learn, or really know or understand what is going on around them. Such conditions are a sorry image for our Nation in the world—a travesty upon our glorious past and future destiny.

Where there is economic deprivation, there will be ignorance. There will be fear. There will be diseases. There will be crime. There will be juvenile delinquency and school dropouts. There will be antisocial conditions militating against the welfare of the state and American institutions. There will be bitter resentment and stark frustration taking refuge in radical panaceas and subversion. There will be gravest danger to the continuity and survival of this great, free Government.

I appreciate that the Committee could have selected different formulas for distributing the aid provided in this bill. But, in the main, I think that the one selected will enable us to make a good start and if it does not function as we now believe, we can in turn change it. On the whole, I think the formula is fair and workable and hope it will be effective.

The formula is relatively simple and determines grants to local, public school districts on the basis of one-half the average expenditure per pupil in the State times the number of children aged 5 to 17 years coming from families with annual incomes of less than $2,000 and the number of children aged 5 to 17 years from families receiving aid to dependent children with incomes of $2,000 or more per year.

The data to carry out this formula are readily available and the grants should reach those communities that need them most, we hope, without redtape or delay.

In the process, we can be assured that Federal funds provided will be directed to those localities where the problems exist and are concentrated.

The funds will be transmitted to each State educational agency. In turn, that agency will transmit authorization to each local public education agency operating a State-approved program.

Under the bill, the State agency determines whether the programs and projects submitted by local school districts are designed to further the purposes Congress has in mind. In addition, the State agencies will adopt such fiscal control and Federal accounting procedures necessary to assure proper disbursement of the Federal funds paid to the State. It would also initiate procedures to assure that the payments to school districts will be used for the programs and projects which have been approved by the State agency.

We have had assurances that Federal funds made available to the States will be used so as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of State, local, and private school funds that would otherwise be made available for these purposes, and that such Federal funds will in no case supplant local, State, and private school funds.

Under these provisions, States must set forth appropriate fiscal controls and fund accounting procedures and provide for making such reports as the Commissioner may reasonably require. It would seem, therefore, that insofar as the Congress can accomplish this end, rules of accountability, economy, and efficiency will be insisted upon, so that no Federal funds are improperly or wastefully used or diverted to uses not permitted by the act.

I hope that the regulations written incident to the act will encourage and insist upon economical management of all programs utilizing funds provided by this bill.

The shocking rise in State and local educational costs has occasioned great concern in many local communities where each year sees larger shares of total municipal budgets being spent for education. In many instances, tax rates in these communities have bounded to truly intolerable levels, and are threatening the economic soundness and general well-being of many communities. To be sure, this bill should and will help.

At the same time, it should be made clear that Federal moneys made available by the bill are not to be wasted, not to be frittered away with lavish, overexpensive, extravagant programs far beyond the needs and the capacity of the local communities involved.

The problems of meeting our educational needs in providing proper physical accommodations, qualified teachers, and the wide variety of special programs required by modern-day education are difficult enough without complicating them by unsound projects at the local level, obviously extravagant and beyond the means and the needs of the communities, and the Congress must make every effort to make sure that in this regard Federal funds shall not be available for uneconomical, poorly conceived, poorly administered educational programs.

The bill is designed to help the individual pupil and the funds made available are to the individual pupil and not to public schools or private schools as such unless they can meet the criteria spelled out by the bill.

Provision is made for school library resources, textbooks, and other instructional material on the basis of children enrolled in elementary and secondary schools in each State.

The appropriation by State authority is in line with American traditions and past practices.

Effective limitations have been placed on the distribution of the funds to make sure that the benefits are to be available to the children and the teachers, and not to institutions, and that public authority shall retain title to materials furnished on a loan basis.

Supplemental educational centers and services are provided by the bill, and as I mentioned previously, initiative and responsibility for the operation of school programs rests with State and local authority.

Cooperative research is encouraged and financed. National educational laboratories are provided. Grants to strengthen State departments of education are afforded, and, across the board, the bill strengthens education systems in many effective ways that are necessary today, if we are to meet the educational needs of the American children and the American people.

I feel that those who oppose the bill or want some change in the formulas have presented their views extremely well, and I am sure conscientiously, but frankly I am unable to accept either their premise that there is no present need of this bill, or their obvious efforts to portray the bill as an effort to build up in this country a conforming, educational bureaucracy that would destroy the initiative as well as the independence of the several States and dissipate the differences between them by law. The contrary is true since the bill is implemented by State and local agencies.

I can understand the reasoning of those who fear Federal dictatorship over education because to this I am strongly opposed, but I have the strong feeling that it is based upon fears and doubts concerning our local and State governments and our National Government that are not justified. We must and will safeguard our cherished, historic State and local self-government.

There is no reason to believe, for example, in my opinion, that the Federal Government intends to take over the job of education in this country to the exclusion of States and local units any more than there is reason to believe that the States and local communities would stand by and let Federal bureaucrats do it.

There are many and increasing areas in which the Federal Government is participating in the affairs of States, communities, and individuals, and this tendency has been stepped up in recent years. But if this trend is confined to promoting and strengthening the efficiency and effectiveness of the States and local units and providing necessary assistance under proper safeguards to protect constitutional rights, there should be no reason to fear it will result in the destruction of State and local governments; in fact it should strengthen them and the Nation as well.

I believe that in this day and age when we are growing so fast and are living in a world of such fabulous invention and scientific miracles when knowledge is mounting, and where speed is so often of the essence and where lack of funds can be paralyzing and devastating to modern

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

progress, it is entirely defensible that we should distribute some of the huge revenue of the Federal Government, derived from the people, to lighten the burdens of some subdivisions of government where the people reside, where their needs are, and where many urgent requirements exist, to help them with their governmental problems and particularly the financial problems arising from them. Our Government through our agricultural programs, has long done this with good effect for animals. It is time we did it for people.

I think it is unrealistic to think that some of these problems like education, health, general welfare, can be met without putting the taxing power of the Federal Government behind their solutions, in some discoverable, effective, reasonable degree.

Personally, I should like to see this done in such ways that would make it abundantly clear that the Federal Government does not intend and will not intervene in the administration of State government and will not take over the conduct or affairs of government at State and local levels—will not become a great, dictatorial force of centralized government stemming from Washington bearing down on the States and obliterating the rights of local communities, making a centralized police state out of this free Nation and its independent States.

In a word, we have a practical problem here. The State and local communities can no longer properly do the job of education. In fact, in some respects some of them have never done the job well.

In these days, if this essential job is not done in time, not only the communities, but State and Federal Government will suffer dire consequences. Every man, woman, and child in this country will be in danger, the Federal Government itself will be in danger of being overrun by the masses of untutored, untrained, uneducated people reproducing themselves at a terrific rate and weighting down our entire structure, familial, political, social, economic, and governmental, and in time turning this country into a virtual Tower of Babel dominated by the unenlightened, the unfit, and perhaps the twisted and distorted of mind and ideas, into a radical, totalitarian state. That is a prospect to which we cannot and must not turn the deaf ear of complacency.

Be that as it may, I think this bill is a worthy one. Its objectives are high-minded and lofty. It seeks to fulfill a great national need. If it is well and wisely administered it will fulfill that need well and thus greatly contribute to the banishment of poverty, ignorance, bigotry, and substandard conditions, which, if continued long enough at present and constantly increasing rates, would soon weaken the very pillars of this great Government.

Some have doubts that even now we can do this job. They think the problems of untutored human proliferation and population explosion have gone beyond us, and it is too late. I reject this view. I think we are late in tackling the problem, but if we show the will, determination, and skill, and the willingness to make bold, new steps forward, we can do the job and we can save America for ourselves, our posterity, and for the world, and for the greater glory of man joined in brotherhood under the fatherhood of the Divine Master.

I do hope that in the administration of the bill the basic truths I have outlined above will not be overlooked and that the Federal agencies concerned will keep this bill in proper perspective, not as an instrument for federalizing State and local governments, but as an effective weapon to use in the war against poverty, ignorance, disease, and the disgraceful lowliness degrading the standards of this country and endangering the survival of this free Government.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this education bill raises several important philosophic considerations which I would like to discuss. One of these is Federal aid to education, another is States rights and States responsibilities, and the equation for measuring the worth of this bill.

There is no doubt that the closer Government can be to the people, the more control the local citizen can maintain, the safer is our republican form of government. We are a federation of States, and yet the great experiment of loose States and absolute local control failed in the Articles of Confederation. This form of government was so weak that our forefathers reformed our system into our present structure, to give greater strength to the Federal Government. This was in recognition that certain responsibilities are beyond the scope and management of State government. In between these two extremes rest a gray area, that becomes the subject matter of constant controversy. We fought a Civil War over such a major controversy, and there it was decided by force of arms and much spilled blood that in the area of government preempted by Federal law the Federal Government predominates.

The principle of States rights has never been surrendered in the hearts and minds of the people of the United States, and I myself in many aspects favor the acceptance of local responsibility and control, not as a sentimental heritage from my forebears, but as a result of fear of complete control by an impersonal, far-removed power that may not understand the needs and particular problems of the people of my State. Our culture and laws are devised to fit our own situation, and we ourselves can best understand and solve these unusual problems.

So by broad principle, I believe that States on their individual problems can best solve these themselves and should accept these responsibilities.

This is the ideal, but this cannot in reality be the final answer, for in reality there are many pressing problems on which the States have not and probably cannot adequately accept their responsibilities. It is in this area that alternatives become elusive.

This is where our aversion to Federal aid to education collides with the need to educate. What are our fears? That through Federal aid to education a centralized government will control the minds of the young, and by so doing any future despot could then subvert our country and establish a dictatorship.

In comparing the principle of States rights to the need of educating our young for our national security and well-being the element of danger lies in the control of the curriculum. If Federal Government cannot or does not control the subject matter and accent, these young minds would not be molded to the thinking of the centralized agency.

So I believe the battleground is not whether or not the Federal Government should assist States in their educational needs, but rather whether or not the aid proposed would carry with it controls on the curriculums itself. We have long had Federal aid to education, such as the GI bill which educated so many of our citizens after World War II, who otherwise would not have had such educational opportunities. No one would deny the value of this program.

I believe the greater numbers of Americans today believe that it is proper for the United States to assist the individual States in the expenses of education; provided this help is given in such a way as to not infringe on the rights of the States to control their own educational policies.

I apply this test to the House elementary and secondary education bill, and I believe the bill insures that the controls of education will remain with State and local school agencies.

Section 604 of the bill is entitled "Federal Control of Education Prohibited." I would like to read this section to you:

> Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to authorize any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over the curriculum, program of instruction, administration, or personnel of any educational institution or school system, or over the selection of library resources, textbooks, or other printed or published instructional materials by an educational institution or school system.

If this bill is passed by the Senate, money would be allotted to the State and the State would, in turn, distribute this money to the local school districts. Your local school districts that run the schools have no direct contact with the U.S. Government.

This education bill does not carry with it any control of the curriculums. In the church-state battle, the original bill carries with it direct grants to parochial schools, which offended many on the church-state principle. In the committee, this bill was so modified to remove those direct grants. I consulted with religious leaders in my district who opposed these original direct grants to parochial schools, and they were unanimous in stating that almost all objections had been satisfied, and indicated that they could not conscientiously oppose passage in its amended form, especially in view of the good of the bill.

Generally, it is best that States legislate their own affairs and care for their own problems. It has become apparent, however, that the costs of educational facilities are increasing to such a point that many States cannot fully provide the necessary facilities. The question then is whether our children and Nation should be made to suffer as a result of this failure to provide educational opportunities.

Our country today faces a growing need for educational facilities. Today, one-fourth of all Americans are in our Nation's classrooms. Attendance in elementary and secondary schools will increase by 4 million in the next 5 years; 400,000 new classrooms will be needed to meet this growth. And already one-half of our Nation's existing classrooms are more than 30 years old

Today one student out of three now in the fifth grade will drop out before finishing high school, if the present rate is allowed to continue.

If we want to cut down the number of our citizens on public welfare, the best way is education of the present generation of young people. Lack of education and poverty often go hand in hand. Unemployment of young people with an eighth-grade education is four times the national average. It does not seem reasonable to spend $2,500 a year for a family on relief and only $450 a year per child in our public schools. But these are the facts. These growing needs must be met.

The 16th District of Texas will receive over $2.7 million to help defray the rising costs of education for children of families earning less than $2,000 a year. The school districts will receive needed textbooks and library materials selected by themselves, and the present program of help to local school districts impacted with the children of Federal personnel will be continued for 2 years. This is so important to our communities having a large military population.

Educating our children to the best of their abilities is important not only to our children themselves, but vital to keeping our State and local governments effective and our Nation safe from tyranny. A local community cannot be prosperous and attract new industries with many people unskilled to do the work of the community. A State cannot be effective unless its citizens are educated enough to recognize the needs of the State and meet the responsibilities of citizenship. For our national security we must have brainpower behind our armed might. We must compete and surpass the Communists in the technology race. The more educated a people become, the more it resists Communist tyranny. We cannot hide the fact that today the United States and the entire free world is in a race of minds and technology against the major Communist countries. In an actual sense it is a matter of survival of our system.

We are the oldest constitutional government in the world, but we can no longer dream along in a world of yesteryear, safe and secure in academic arguments.

Our country shall remain strong only as long as the weakest link is made strong enough to cope with the threats and aggressions of our enemies. Armament is not the entire answer to security. Sparta of Greece found this out in ancient times. Our strength as always lies in the utilization of our free spirit, in inventiveness, in the exercise of our minds, to the benefit of us all. Our hope for the future lies in the development of the minds of our young people through education, not only in how many missiles or troops we can send abroad. Latent genius and talent may lie anywhere, in the most crowded city, in the most humble surrounding on the Rio Grande. Young minds are like cotton crops or oilfields. They grow valuable and useful only as you cultivate them and attend to them.

So applying the necessary safeguards to insure local controls of education; considering the advantages to our security with a strong educational system; weighing the great need of our children of poorer families and needs of our less populated areas of the 16th District, and the fact that at least 18 out of 19 counties of our district would qualify for this assistance, I support the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, this is a crucial time for education in the United States. Some people may ask, why, in view of the economic progress we have been making and our predominant position of world leadership, is it necessary for the Federal Government to now begin to provide substantial aid to our Nation's elementary and secondary schools?

Our schools need Federal aid today because they are continually being asked to do more than was required of them in the past. Our schools are being asked today, not just to provide a basic education for all children, but to provide an education which will equip youngsters for a successful college career or to provide an education which will equip other youngsters for a highly competitive, skilled labor market.

Our schools need Federal aid today because we have reached the point in national maturity where we can no longer be satisfied with a goal of education for all, but we must strive for the goal of quality education for all.

Our schools need Federal aid today because in the decades to come the investment we make will determine whether we continue to be the most prosperous nation in the world, and the leader of the free world's democracies.

Historically, this country has realized that to have a strong, flourishing democracy there must be a strong, well-educated citizenry to support it. As far back as 1787, when the Continental Congress declared in the Northwest Ordinance that "Schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged" the Federal Government has realized its responsibility toward supporting our educational system.

The Federal Government contributed to the educational resources of this Nation by establishing the land-grant college system when it saw that State and local governments could not provide the higher education desperately needed by the youngsters of our growing and spreading Nation. In 1917 there was a growing need for vocational education to train and equip our youngsters with job skills, a need which could not be filled by State and local governments alone, thus the Federal Government responded with the vocational educational acts. When our troops returned from Europe and Asia after World War II, no State or local government could fill their thirst and need for education, so the Federal Government once again stepped forward, this time with the GI bills. And again, when it was a need for training youngsters in the engineering and scientific and technical fields, a need that could not be filled in any other way, the Congress passed the National Defense Education Act to fill this gap.

The role of the Federal Government in giving aid to education has been an accepted and honored part of our history for almost 175 years, accepted because each program was enacted to meet definite needs only when other remedies were inadequate, honored because each program has been administered without evidence of Federal restrictions on academic freedom.

H.R. 2362 shall take its place in history as another instance where the Federal Government has seen the need to join with the State and local governments in providing adequate education for our citizens.

H.R. 2362 will be accepted by the American people because this program will be enacted to meet definite need where other remedies are inadequate. H.R. 2362 will be an honorable part of our history because it will be administered without evidence of Federal restrictions on academic freedom.

To properly carry out their primary responsibility for public schools, the State and local governments must have the utilization of the greater financial means which the Federal Government can provide through the various titles of this bill.

Title I of the bill provides approximately $1.06 billion for aid to school districts where at least 3 percent of the elementary and secondary school youngsters come from families with annual incomes of $2,000 or less. Approximately 5 million of our 48 million schoolchildren come from such families, families whose income prevents them from supporting the decent schools their children desperately need in order to break out of the grasp of poverty. Title I is designed to support and encourage the establishment and expansion of special programs, including the construction of minimum school facilities, where needed, to meet the special needs of educationally deprived children of low-income families. These programs will be conducted, where needed, under a shared time arrangement so that no child who needs these services are denied them.

Title II of the bill provides $10 million to States for the purchase of books for elementary and high school libraries, and to purchase textbooks for children in public and private nonprofit schools. This title in the bill recognizes that every child must have access to the basic materials of instruction, if he is to receive a decent education.

Title III of the bill proposes a 5-year program to establish supplementary educational centers and services which would provide educational services not available in sufficient quantity or quality in elementary and secondary schools. During 1966, $100 million would be distributed among the States for these programs which will enrich the educational diet of our children.

In title IV, there is authorized the training of research personnel and improved dissemination of information derived from educational research and development. This would give more assistance to the research facilities which are directed toward improving the quality of our schools.

Finally, title V of the bill authorizes grants for the strengthening of State departments of education. The $25 million provided in this title would stimulate State departments of education to continue their leadership role in the development of quality education for all American children.

The enactment of H.R. 2362 will mean a brighter future for our schools, for millions of our youngsters, and inevitably, for our country.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is anyone in Congress or in my home State of Florida, who is more enthusiastic about education on all levels, or who believes more strongly than I, that more money needs to be spent on education, not only for classrooms, but for instructional materials and teachers' salaries.

I believe strongly, too, that our educational system is the real strength of our Nation. I always will support sound measures that improve education.

For example, I would gladly support a bill which earmarked a portion of our Federal tax moneys to be turned back to the States, earmarked solely for use in our State educational system, and which would leave control in State hands. Such a proposition would preserve the integrity of our State and local educational systems, which is a great overriding issue in this whole matter.

But after studying this bill and studying the report by Congressman ADAM CLAYTON POWELL's Committee on Education and Labor, I am convinced that this is not a sound piece of legislation.

There are many reasons why this bill is unsound. The biggest danger is that for the first time in the history of the Republic, the Federal Government is entering the field of general aid to education at the elementary and secondary level, signaling a dramatic shift of power from the local level to Washington.

This bold injection of the Federal Government into this field is camouflaged by proponents who argue the main purpose for the bill is that the Federal Government should and will help, in this legislation, poor school districts and underprivileged children.

As a matter of fact, however, this argument does not hold up on close examination of the bill. Instead, the most money will be funneled into the richest school districts in America and the least into the poorest.

Under this formula, the 10 richest counties, with approximately 32,000 children from poor homes, will receive $9 million.

The 10 poorest counties, with the same number of children from poor homes, will receive just half that amount, about $4.5 million. Nothing could be more unsound than this.

Here is another example of this inequality. Texas, Maine, and Florida have approximately equal per capita income per person and per family. Under the bill, Texas receives twice as much per school age child as Maine does, and half again as much as Florida does. This is certainly unfair.

Further, the bill ignores State distribution of school moneys, and under the present formula is another example of the inequality of distribution.

My 11th Congressional District of Florida is a case in point. Under title I of this bill, where the bulk of the money, over $1 billion, is to be spent, the 11th District, with desperate classroom shortage, thousands of students in double session, with more than twice the number of pupils than the 9th District. and raising 38.9 percent of its school money from local taxes, gets only $1,824,958.

The Ninth District, in turn, has no classroom shortage, raises only 19.6 percent of its school money from local taxes, but gets $2,009,840, or $200,000 more than we do under the bill.

As a matter of fact, taxes collected from my district by the State actually are funneled into the ninth district, as well as others, under the minimum foundation plan.

Yet, under this bill, we get a far less proportionate share of Federal money than this other district, although we not only deserve but actually need a greater proportional share. My district's tax money will be used in part to subsidize this other district and make a further imbalance.

There are more reasons why this bill is unsound.

There is the business of helping private schools which is to be done under this bill. I certainly do not think the Federal Government has any business using public Federal tax money to support private schools.

This provision tries to avoid the church-state issue by not giving money directly to private schools, but by making public facilities available to private school students. Thus, the church-state issue is carefully skirted, but for the first time this bill will put the Federal Government into this field, using public tax money.

Answers to questions dealing with whether or not pupils will be transported from private to public schools or whether the public school teacher will conduct classes in private schools were completely contradictory and were left unsettled.

Title II of the bill provides $100 million for both public and private school textbooks and library materials. The U.S. Commissioner of Education is given the power to set standards for texts and textbooks, the most dangerous thing I can imagine—what goes into a textbook, what kind of a textbook we are going to use in our schools. And yet, under this bill the Commissioner will make far-reaching decisions in this matter.

Under title III, the Commissioner will get $100 million to establish model schools at the local level, possibly the first step toward a complete takeover of our school system by the Federal Government. The Commissioner has authority to establish Federal-local schools without the approval of the State education agency. In other words, in this instance, the Federal Government will be fully in the local school business.

Title IV provides another $100 million for Federal education centers, permitting the Commissioner to further buttress his own Federal school power under title III. This new power provides more muscle to the Federal Government to get further in the education field.

In summary, I would go back to the main argument for this bill, that it is designed to aid economically deprived or neglected schoolchildren.

But a thorough analysis proves otherwise. Title I of the bill will distribute over $1 billion of the $1.3 billion total to 90 percent of the school districts in the country, without regard to actual need.

Under the remaining titles, distribution is not tailored to need, either; in fact, there is not even an attempt here to utilize the banner of poverty, although administration backers claim the bill is geared to the economically deprived child.

The textbooks and instructional materials under title II, for example, are not limited to needy children or poor schools, but are admittedly provided as part of a general program.

The Federal-local schools in title III are not limited to deprived children, or problem students, but specify "persons of varying talents and needs"; in other words, everyone—again stretching the education dollar to the breaking point.

We see here, then, for the first time, the Federal Government moving swiftly and surely into the field of general aid to elementary and secondary schools, casting the die for Federal control and doing away with the policy of local and State support and control of our public schools, a policy substantially followed for nearly 200 years in our Republic.

Various Republican proposals offering alternative solutions have placed principal emphasis on local control. This would be achieved through granting tax credits to the extent of local school taxes up to $100.

In addition, authorization would be given for a Federal income tax credit for individuals who assume the cost of tuition and other expenses of a college education.

Further demonstrating Republican concern for underprivileged children, Republicans have proposed to include a federally supported program for youngsters from 3 to 7 years of age, together with a $300 million grant to the States for this purpose.

Many educators believe and the hearings adduced testimony that training in the preschool years is the most important period in the lives of underprivileged children.

However, these and other constructive proposals were rejected outright as the huge administration majority has voted time and again to cut off debate.

The Democratic leadership in the House has made a travesty out of the legislative process in the consideration of this bill.

I think Congresswoman Edith Green, always a strong supporter of education and a member of the Education and Labor Committee, has summed up the problem well in the following remarks she made about this muzzling:

> Mr. Chairman, I have been a Democrat all of my life, and one reason I have been proud to be a Democrat is because we have believed in protecting the rights of the minority. I have never interpreted the Democratic platform or the statements we have made that this applies only to ethnic groups; that we are only interested in protecting the rights of Negroes or any other minority. There was a man long ago who said, "I may disagree with what you say, but I will defend to death your right to say it."
>
> Today it seems to me we have in the House a determined effort to silence those who are in disagreement.
>
> A statement was made a moment ago by one of my colleagues, with whom I have been on the same side in many legislative battles. He said that all the members of the committee on this side agree that there is no possibility of a church-state issue. As a Democratic I do not understand why we, as the majority party, are afraid to have this discussed. I wish that for once we could have a Supreme Court decision on whether such aid is constitutional or is not.

Mrs. Green's plea today to open debate was a brave attempt to buck the administration as was her effort yesterday to improve the distribution system which is so unsound.

Now I have always been enthusiastic about supporting our education system. And if States cannot raise enough local tax dollars, then I would favor giving them back tax dollars earmarked for education, from the income tax. But let us leave the control of education in local hands. Why is it necessary to surrender to the Federal bureaucrats?

I have seen nothing that convinces me that a few Federal administrators in Washington, highly insulated in their bureaucratic offices from the many varied problems of local school systems, are better prepared to solve school matters than local authorities.

In fact, I am convinced that they will not solve them nearly as well as local officials.

Education we are all for. But, let us reach good education through sound measures, not through poor legislation, as is this bill.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this title and all amendments now close.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Quie and by Mr. Goodell), there were—ayes 162, noes 108.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Perkins and Mr. Goodell.

The Committee again divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 190, noes 117.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Anderson] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith].

The question was taken.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. Anderson of Illinois and Mr. Perkins.

The Committee divided, and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 154, noes 204.

So the substitute amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Smith].

The amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee substitute as amended.

The committee substitute as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Bolling, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools, pursuant to House Resolution 285, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. GOODELL. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. Goodell moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2362 to the Committee on Education and Labor with instructions to report the bill back forthwith with the following amendment: On page 72, beginning with line 3, strike out "(except as provided in paragraph (3)) an amount equal to the Federal percentage (established pursuant to subsection (c)) of the average per pupil expenditure in that State" and insert in lieu thereof "an amount equal to the Federal share (established pursuant to subsection (c))".
>
> On page 72, line 21, strike out "percentage of such per pupil expenditure" and insert in lieu thereof "share (established pursuant to subsection (c))".
>
> On page 73, beginning on line 1, strike out "For purposes of this sub-" and all that follows down through the period on line 9.
>
> On page 73, beginning on line 19, strike out everything down through line 2 on page 74, and on page 74, line 3, strike out "(4)" and insert in lieu thereof "(3)".
>
> On page 75, beginning on line 18, strike out "percentage" and insert in lieu thereof "share".
>
> On page 75, line 20, strike out "50 per centum" and insert in lieu thereof "$200".
>
> On page 75, line 22, strike out "percentage" and insert in lieu thereof "share".

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. GOODELL. On that, Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 149, nays 267, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

YEAS—149

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Baring
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrnes, Wis.
Callaway
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Colmer
Conable
Cooley
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Gibbons
Goodell
Green, Oreg.
Griffin
Gross
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Hutchinson
Jarman
Jonas
Keith
Kornegay
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McCulloch
McEwen
McMillan
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Michel
Minshall
Mize
Moore
Morse
Murray
Nelsen
O'Konski
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schneebeli
Scott
Selden
Shriver
Sikes
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Stanton
Stephens
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tuten
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Weltner
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Younger

NAYS—267

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Baldwin
Bandstra
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Celler
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
Dawson
de la Garza

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LIBRARIES

Delaney
Dent
Denton
Devine
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harris
Harsha
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Kunkel
Landrum
Leggett
Lindsay
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Moeller
Monagan
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Sickles
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
Whalley
White, Idaho
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wydler
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NOT VOTING—17

Ayres
Bonner
Dague
Dickinson
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Frelinghuysen
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
MacGregor
Mosher
Springer
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tupper
Widnall

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. MacGregor for, with Mr. Evins of Tennessee against.

Mr. Ayres for, with Mr. Everett against.

Mr. Dickinson for, with Mr. Toll against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Hull with Mr. Dague.

Mr. Jones of Alabama, with Mr. Frelinghuysen.

Mr. Thompson of Texas, with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Tupper.

Messrs. THOMAS, HARSHA, BOW, and COLLIER changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. TEAGUE of Texas, WHITE of Texas, and BERRY changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 263, nays 153, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—263

Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Tenn.
Annunzio
Ashley
Aspinall
Baldwin
Bandstra
Barrett
Beckworth
Bell
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Brademas
Brooks
Brown, Calif.
Burke
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Carey
Carter
Celler
Chelf
Clark
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Donohue
Dow
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, William D.
Fraser
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Gallagher
Garmatz
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Grover
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Hicks
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Krebs
Landrum
Leggett
Lindsay
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDade
McDowell
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roosevelt
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schweiker
Secrest
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Todd
Trimble
Tunney
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wydler
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—153

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Anderson, Ill.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Baring
Bates
Battin
Belcher
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bolton
Bow
Bray
Brock
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burleson
Byrnes, Wis.
Callaway
Cameron
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Clancy
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Cramer
Cunningham
Curtis
Davis, Wis.
Derwinski
Devine
Dole
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Duncan, Tenn.
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Findley
Fisher
Flynt
Ford, Gerald R.
Fountain
Fuqua
Gathings
Gettys
Goodell
Griffin
Gross
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Hansen, Idaho
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Hébert
Henderson
Herlong
Holifield
Hutchinson
Jarman
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Keith
King, N.Y.
Kornegay
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
McEwen
McMillan
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Michel
Minshall
Murray
Nelsen
O'Neal, Ga.
Passman
Pelly
Poff
Pool
Quie
Quillen
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
Saylor
Schneebeli
Scott
Selden
Sikes
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Stanton
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, La.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Tuten
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Whitener
Whitten
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wyatt
Younger

NOT VOTING—17

Ayres
Bonner
Dague
Dickinson
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Frelinghuysen
Hull
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
MacGregor
Mosher
Springer
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tupper
Widnall

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

With this vote:

Mr. Evins of Tennessee for, with Mr. Frelinghuysen against.

Mr. Everett for, with Mr. Ayres against.

Mr. Toll for, with Mr. MacGregor against.

Mr. Hull for, with Mr. Mosher against.

Mr. Tupper for, with Mr. Dickinson against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Thompson of Texas with Mr. Dague.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Widnall.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2362, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF WEEK OF MARCH 29

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time in order to inquire of the distinguished majority leader as to the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield to me, in response to the inquiry of the minority leader, we, of course, have completed the legislative program for this week and the program for next week is as follows:

Monday, House Resolution 245, to authorize the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to conduct investigations and studies.

H.R. 824, consenting to compact on taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to agreement on bus taxation proration. This has an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

H.R. 3044, incentive pay for performance of hazardous duty on flight deck of aircraft carrier, also with an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

H.R. 5571, authorizing payment of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders. This also has an open rule and 1 hour of debate.

On Tuesday, H.R. 6767, 1966 appropriations, Interior and related agencies.

For Wednesday, H.R. 3708, Older Americans Act of 1965, with an open rule and 2 hours of debate.

H.R. 1111, Water Resources Planning Act. An open rule and 1 hour of debate.

For Thursday and the balance of the week, H.R. 4257, Manpower Act of 1965, also with an open rule and 2 hours of debate.

This announcement, of course, is made subject to the general reservation that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

If the gentleman will yield further?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

ADJOURNMENT OVER TO MONDAY, MARCH 29

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

LET'S GIVE IT A TRY

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, there was an editorial in this morning's Washington Post, entitled "Let's Give It a Try," which I read with a great deal of interest. Because of its timely message, I am inserting it in the RECORD, and would especially commend it to my colleagues' attention:

LET'S GIVE IT A TRY

The President's school aid bill is in danger—as much from its friends as from its enemies. It is not a perfect bill; but an effort now to make it perfect may end only in disaster. It is a bill which leaves a good deal of leeway to local school districts and communities. But an effort now to eliminate that leeway can end only in hopeless deadlock.

We believe that there are situations in which Congress must, as a practical matter, deal with legislation on a take-it-or-leave-it basis. This is one of them. The bill now being debated by the House of Representatives is the reflection of a compromise worked out skillfully and realistically by the White House. It offers certain benefits to pupils in private schools for the sake of which Catholic Church authorities have appeared to be willing to abandon their previously adamant objection to Federal aid to the public schools. And at the same time these benefits have not been of such a nature as to seem objectionable to those who—like this newspaper—have been adamantly opposed, alike on constitutional grounds and on grounds of public policy, to Federal aid to parochial schools.

The compromise, like any compromise, could not be considered ideal by either of the contending sides; nevertheless, it offered enough to both to make it seem acceptable. The compromise was carefully reviewed in the House Judiciary Committee, and certain defects were corrected there with the consent of both sides. But the amendments now being put forward by Members of the House—no doubt with good will and in good faith—would upset that compromise. We think, therefore, they ought to be rejected, regardless of their merits, for the sake of accomplishing the measure's main objectives.

It was a great misfortune that in discussion of the bill on Wednesday, two members of the Committee on Education and Labor gave conflicting answers to Representative GOODELL who wanted to know if a music teacher, a speech therapist, or a remedial-reading teacher employed by the public schools could go into a parochial school. Representative PERKINS said no; Representative CAREY said yes; and later both agreed that it would be up to a local public education agency to decide.

We think this is plain nonsense. The report of the Committee on Education and Labor says unequivocally that "No provision of the bill authorizes any grant for providing any service to a private institution, but at the same time the bill does contemplate some broadening of public educational programs and services in which elementary and secondary school pupils who are not enrolled in public schools may participate. * * * The bill does not authorize funds for the payment of private school teachers." Sending any public school employee into a parochial school would obviously be providing a service to a private institution in direct defiance of this language. It would also, manifestly, do violence to the constitutional injunction against any governmental support of religion. Catholics really ought not to be left under any misapprehension on this score.

Because the bill leaves latitude to local educational bodies, different programs will be pursued in different localities; and it may well be that some of these programs will entail practices raising constitutional questions. For this reason, we have been among those advocating a provision in the bill to facilitate judicial review—just as there are now provisions to facilitate judicial review if any State is dissatisfied with actions of the Commissioner of Education. But even this amendment, it is said, would upset the compromise on which supporters of Federal aid to education have been able to agree. We think a provision designed to promote judicial review is desirable and ought not to be objectionable to anyone dedicated to the Constitution. However, we would rather have the bill than the amendment and would therefore, if necessary, forgo the amendment for the sake of the bill.

For 20 years this newspaper has ardently urged Federal aid to education. We believe that the measure now before the House constitutes the last, best chance to obtain it. Let us, at long last, stop talking about the education of children who grow old while we quarrel and delay and let us try to revitalize our public school system. The passage of the education bill will be an experiment, not an irrevocable act. Let's give it a try.

Mr. Speaker, unquestionably there is today no greater or more pressing need than the fulfillment of the American dream—the education of our young people. Such education constitutes a precious national resource essential to the accomplishment of our great national goals and to the achievement of worthy aspirations of individual citizens.

It is most rewarding to live in a country where such emphasis is placed on the importance of education; and it is gratifying indeed to me to be a part of the legislative branch of the Federal Government and to be afforded the opportunity to participate in the formulation and enactment of legislation directed toward the goals set forth by President Johnson in his state of the Union message and his message on education, to the end that "every child must have the best education our Nation can provide."

Although I have a number of reservations about H.R. 2362, I intend to support it because of the overwhelming need for assistance to both schools and students.

While I do not agree with all the sentiments expressed in the editorial, I feel it appropriately sums up the urgent need for the passage of this legislation.

SEE AMERICA FIRST

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, passport applications this year are running at a rate which indicates that 1,300,000 passports will be issued in 1965. It is estimated that 1,500,000 Americans will leave the United States on extended vacation tours abroad and add to the frightening flight of gold which resulted in a $3 billion deficit in 1964. The drain on our gold supply for January 1965 amounted to $256 million. If sustained throughout this year we can anticipate a loss of over $2 billion.

In an effort to curb gold outflows, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall, on March 15 sought to enlist the domestic petroleum industry in the fight to "right the Nation's balance of payments by urging oil companies to step up their programs urging Americans to see America first."

While the Secretary of the Interior urges the spending of America's travel dollars on America's highways, international air carriers are engaged in unprecedented efforts to encourage foreign travel and spending abroad. The 21-day air round trip tourist fare between New York and London at $300 is $4.07 cheaper than the round trip fare between New York and San Francisco. The 21-day round trip tourist fare between New York and Paris at $341.80 is exactly $39.10 more than the cost of a round trip tourist air trip between New York and San Francisco. Why see America when London is cheaper and the excitement of Paris is only $39 more than a look at the Golden Gate Bridge?

How is it that the airlines flying the same equipment can fly over the ocean to Europe at a passenger cost of $0.087 per mile and charge an American traveler in the United States $0.114 per mile, using the same equipment. Why should domestic jet tourist travel in the United States cost $0.027 more per mile than the same kind of travel to Europe. Just how much are high domestic air travel charges contributing to the flight of gold by encouraging foreign travel over domestic travel?

Under these circumstances, it appears that a substantial reduction in domestic air tourist rates is long overdue. The domestic airline trunk carriers have become the "fat cats" of American business. The cost of the jet program has now been substantially paid off. The time has arrived to pass on to the American public some of the tremendous economies which result from faster, larger, and more fully utilized aircraft.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-five is the year for the domestic air carriers of this country to offer attractive, low round trip vacation fares to lure the American traveler to see America first, or to see it again—and keep the gold at home.

BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY OF PRINCE KALANIANIOLE OF HAWAII

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, today in our State of Hawaii we honor the anniversary of the birth of our beloved Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalanianiole, one of our most illustrious delegates to Congress from the Territory of Hawaii. The observance will be featured by appropriate programs in the schools and special ceremonies sponsored by Hawaiian Societies, the most noteworthy of which will be held at the Royal Mausoleum in Nuuanu Valley in Honolulu.

A lineal descendant of the last king of Kauai, Delegate Kalanianiole served faithfully in this august body until his death in 1922. A great champion of the Hawaiian people, he is best remembered for his sponsorship of the Hawaiian Homes Commission Act, which provided a new plan of homesteading for the rehabilitation of the Hawaiians; and which stands as a monument in his memory.

The people of Hawaii are proud of the record of Delegate Prince Jonah Kuhio Kalanianiole. We honor him today by remembering him as a great patriot and champion of human rights.

EDUCATION BILL OF 1965

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include a number of telegrams from citizens of my district and State in support of H.R. 2362.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

Chicago, Ill., March 26, 1965.

Representative John Brademas,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Your full support of the elementary and secondary education bill, H.R. 2362, as proposed by the education committee, will be appreciated. We urge you to resist all attempts to amend or recommit this important legislation.

Carroll R. Phillips,
State-Federal Relations Chairman, Indiana State Teachers Association, Fort Wayne, Ind.

South Bend, Ind.,
March 24, 1965.

Hon. John Brademas,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

We favor continued support H.R. 2362 for secondary schools without any amendment.

Thanks for the fine work.

George E. Carroll,
St. Joseph County ISTA Citizenship Chairman.

Michigan City, Ind.,
March 24, 1965.

Representatives John Brademas,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge you vote in favor of H.R. 2362 in present form to aid education. Public education needs additional funds from a large tax base such as Federal income tax to stem the rise in rates of the outdated property tax.

C. Delos,
Lonzo County Legislative Chairman, Indiana State Teachers Association.

Michigan City, Ind.,
March 25, 1965.

Congressman John Brademas,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your vote for H.R. 2362 without amendment.

Richard Surber,
Director, Special Educational, Michigan City Area Schools.

South Bend, Ind.,
March 25, 1965.

Representative John Brademas,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Strongly urge you to support in unamended form House bill 2362, a bill which would provide $500 per class room unit.

A. Drew L. Petrass,
Legislation Chairman, South Bend Community, Education Assistant.

South Bend, Ind.,
March 25, 1965.

Hon. John Brademas,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear John: Best of luck with H.R. 2362. All of humanity will be the beneficiary of your work today.

Thank you.

John J. Loughlin.

South Bend, Ind.,
March 25, 1965.

Representative John Brademas,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

I strongly urge your support in unamended form of House bill 2362, a bill which provides for $500 for classrooms units.

Harrison School Legislative Committee.

Michigan City, Ind.,
March 25, 1965.

Congressman John Brademas,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your vote for H.R. 2362 without amendment.

Max Bozarth,
Speech Therapist, Michigan City Area Schools.

Michigan City, Ind.,
March 25, 1965.

Congressman John Brademas,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your vote for H.R. 2362 without amendment.

Carolina Ringer,
Classroom Teacher, Hnapp School, Michigan City Area Schools.

Michigan City, Ind.,
March 25, 1965.

Congressman John Brademas,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

LaPorte County, Ind., teachers urge your support H.R. 2362 without amendment.

Mary Gasteyer,
Cochairman, LaPorte County Citizenship Committee, Indiana State Teachers Association.

GOSHEN, IND.,
March 24, 1965.
Representative JOHN BRADEMAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

School legislation. Respectfully urge you to support House bill 2362 without amendment.

PAUL GIBSON,
Chairman, Elkhart County Legislation and Citizenship Committee for ISTA and NEA.

ANNIVERSARY OF DANTE ALIGHIERI

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us should be reminded of certain significant anniversary ceremonies which will be held throughout the Nation this year. Seven hundred years ago in the year 1265 a baby boy was born to a noble family of the name Alighieri in Florence, Italy. Christened Dante this infant was to gain fame and renown during his lifetime but even greater acclaim during the centuries which have passed since his death.

I have followed with real interest and appreciation the plans which our fine Italian-American societies are making to honor the birth of this illustrious son of Italy.

If Dante's sole contribution to the literature of the world had been his deathless "Divine Comedy," he would have earned eternal honor as a great poet. The beauty and majesty of this literary gem is Dante's passport to immortality, but this was but one of his literary masterpieces, and poetry was only one of the great talents of this famous man.

For 700 years students of all countries and scholars of many nations have benefited from the wisdom and teaching of Dante in a variety of fields. His versatile mind was at home in science, art, music, psychology, and philosophy. His grasp of government was so complete and so far-reaching that he might well be revered for his statesmanship alone.

We are told that the two documents which were most used by the drafters of the United Nations Charter were the Constitution of the United States and Dante's political treatise, De Vulgari Eloquentia. Thus it is little less than a miracle that the product of one man's pen should survive 700 years and have a direct influence on a document so vital to the whole world today.

The exact day of Dante's birth is hazy and obscure with only the year being fully substantiated. The great poet died in Ravenna in 1321 at the age of 56. The period of the 13th century in which Dante lived was one of turmoil and social reform. Library resources of manuscripts were sorely limited, yet Dante in his short lifetime managed to acquire a staggering amount of information and knowledge. During his life in exile he mingled with the greatest thinkers of the world in several capitals. Many of his contemporaries made lasting impressions upon the minds of the generations to come, but none has carved such a deep and lasting niche in the monument to fame as Dante.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is particularly fitting that our Italian-born leaders and those of Italian ancestry should assume responsibility to arrange programs throughout the country to honor Dante. I hope that through their efforts all Americans may obtain greater understanding and appreciation of Dante and his great gifts to all of us.

And Mr. Speaker, it is particularly fitting that as we honored this past year another great Italian, Giovanni Verrazzano, with a U.S. commemorative stamp, we honor Dante with a similar gesture of our admiration and respect.

THE 47TH ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIA

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. BOB WILSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, for the 47th time, the people of Byelorussia observed a day which is as important to them as the Fourth of July is to us—the anniversary of their independence. Unfortunately, this anniversary cannot be celebrated as we celebrate our independence because the long arm to totalitarian Russian Government has long since reached out and brought the Byelorussians into its grasp.

The plight of the people of Byelorussia, their devotion to freedom and the sacrifices they have made over the 47 years since they declared their independence in 1918 should serve as an example to freedom-loving people the world over.

The spirit of the Byelorussians and all of the people of the captive nations locked behind the Iron Curtain is truly remarkable. That they have clung to the hope of freedom and liberty in the face of years of subjugation should inspire all of us.

I know that the dream of the day when Communist rulers no longer control the lives of the Byelorussian people is bright in their hearts. May that dream become a reality and may the independence day observation this year help call the attention of the free world to the cause of these long-oppressed people.

GUS GRISSOM—INDIANA BOY

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, Hoosiers have a way of showing up everywhere, even in outer space. So I do not think it is any matter of great surprise to the people of my native State than an Indiana boy, Air Force Maj. Virgil I. "Gus" Grissom, commanded the history-making Gemini flight of the spacecraft *Molly Brown* last Tuesday.

I salute Gus and his copilot, Navy Lt. John W. Young, for their skill and courage.

Gus was born in Mitchell, Ind., the son of Mr. and Mrs. Dennis Grissom and was graduated from Purdue University, one of the great engineering schools of the country.

As the first American astronaut to make two flights into space, Gus Grissom has brought new honors to Indiana and to Purdue.

His achievements symbolize the major contributions the Purdue faculty and alumni are making to the space age.

It is safe to say that there are few major scientific activities in America today which have not felt the impact either of research done at Purdue or the know-how of Purdue-trained engineers.

Having these things in mind, I am happy and proud to participate in the tributes being paid to our two astronauts today, and particularly to Gus Grissom, the first man in history to rocket twice into space and the first man in history to actually fly a spacecraft.

APRIL 15 IS FAST APPROACHING AND THERE IS NEED FOR PROMPT ACTION ON H.R. 4965, THE MIZE BILL TO GIVE TAXPAYERS RELIEF IN PAYMENT OF THEIR INCOME TAXES DUE AT THAT TIME

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, almost immediately after the enactment of the Revenue Act of 1964 early last year, the take-home pay of wage earners was increased. This resulted from reducing the withholding tax rate from 18 percent to 14 percent. Although it was recognized at the time that the new rate of 14 percent would result in underwithholding in many cases, the administration was eager to put this low rate into effect immediately in order to bolster the economy. Now millions of taxpayers face the task of making up underwithheld amounts.

The latest estimate on underwithholding as a result of the new withholding rate was given by Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon before the Joint Economic Committee on February 22 of this year. He gave an estimate of $400 million to $500 million, which was revised downward from an earlier estimate of $1 billion. This is in addition, of course, to the usual $5 billion or so each year that taxpayers owe. Various factors result in taxpayers owing taxes at the end of a taxable year. For example, some types of income are not subject to withholding. For other taxpayers withholding will not be adequate in such cases as rising incomes during the year, or the loss of a dependency exemption late in the year.

Fully appreciating the serious dilemma many taxayers face in raising these additional taxes before the deadline date of April 15, I have introduced a bill, H.R. 4965, which will give temporary relief. My bill allows taxpayers to split into two installments the taxpayment that is due on April 15 of this year. The first half would be paid on the due date; the other half would be payable on April 15, 1966. Thus, a temporary moratorium would be allowed for the payment of half of the additional tax.

Besides allowing some tax relief to individuals who will find it difficult to raise perhaps $100, $200, or more to make full payment for underwithheld taxes, my bill is concerned with the general economy. My views are shared by other Republican Members who have introduced similar bills. These views were also expressed in the minority report of the 1965 Joint Economic Report, which was just released on March 17. The report on page 107 states:

> The administration's plan to drop the withholding rate in 1964 from 18 to 14 percent, in many individual cases more than the drop in tax liabilities, is working severe hardships on many taxpayers. Not only are many taxpayers being required to pay large and unexpected taxpayments, in spite of the tax cut, but many others will receive smaller refunds than usual. Aside from the personal hardships that this involves, the situation is likely to have a destabilizing effect on the economy.

Near the end of last year, Wall Street Journal reporters interviewed individuals throughout the country to find out how the new withholding worked out for them as compared to their final tax liability for the year. A feature article written on their findings states:

> The results brought anguished outcries, suggesting that millions of Americans may be unprepared, psychologically as well as financially, for their impending official tax reckoning.

Now this reckoning is at hand.

As the Wall Street Journal survey indicates, various courses of action can be taken by the affected individuals—each course being a financial setback for the individual as well as for the economy. Some individuals will be required to curtail certain purchases, and, instead, use the funds to pay the additional tax. Those who usually receive a refund, but will either break even this year, or possibly even owe some taxes, will have to forego the vacation or other use they usually make of these refunds. Others will have to either dig into their savings or perhaps resort to borrowing. In the case of those who borrow, they not only have to pay the unforeseen taxes but also must incur heavy interest costs. Already the radio has been carrying advertisements by lending institutions, who are reminding individuals they may owe taxes this year because of the underwithholding provisions of the new tax law.

It is indeed unfortunate that we have allowed ourselves to come so close to the tax filing deadline of April 15 without having given some relief to these anxious individuals who face the necessity of paying taxes over and above those already withheld. My bill does not ask for any forgiveness of taxes. It merely allows the taxpayer a little more time to recover from the unexpected financial setback that he faces because of the underwithholding authorized by the Revenue Act of 1964. At the same time it will lessen the damage that would otherwise occur to the general economy as a result of a reduction in spending.

TEACHINGS OF SS. CYRIL AND METHODIUS

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 170 years ago a Russian Prince, Father Demetrius Augustine Gallitzin, was ordained to Catholic priesthood by Bishop John Carroll of Baltimore, Md. He came to this country in 1792 under the assumed name of Augustine Smith. He was the son of the Russian Imperial Ambassador to the Netherlands. I mention him today because there were others like him who left their homes of comfort in Europe and came to America to join the early pioneer movements, as pointed out in a very timely and fascinating article on the subject which was published in the February and March 1965 issues of the Good Shepherd, official organ of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America, and which I place in the Record at this point as part of my remarks:

Famous Slavs Who Brought Teachings of SS. Cyril and Methodius to America

(By John C. Sciranka)

On the threshold of the 12th centenary of the advent of brothers SS. Cyril and Methodius to what is now Slovakia, since they are apostles of the Slavs in general and the Slovaks in particular, it is most appropriate for us Americans to evaluate their apostolate in this country, which has some 35 million descendants and adherents of their Slavonic Christian heritage.

There are over 30 Slovak churches dedicated to them in this country, starting from Minneapolis, Minn., to Slovaktown, near Stuttgart, Ark. All these churches, including one in Brookside, Ala., were founded seven decades ago and the recent one, dedicated in 1963 at Deer Park, Long Island, N.Y.

The Poles, whom I wish to single out first, established a SS. Cyril and Methodius Seminary at Orchard Lake, Mich., also six decades ago, where not only the Polish, but all Slavonic students are admitted to study for the priesthood.

A century ago a great SS. Cyril and Methodius millennium received the blessing of Pope Pius IX, who summoned the first Vatican Council and founded a Slavonic Institute in Rome.

Pope Pius IX, elevated two Slovaks to the Sacred College of Cardinals; namely, Alexander Cardinal Rudnay and George Cardinal Haulik, first archbishop of Zagreb, Croatia, presently Yugoslavia, and also its Governor and founder of many institutions, including the Croatian Academy of Arts and Sciences.

A century ago, 80 million Slavs observed the millennium of SS. Cyril and Methodius, whose teachings reached the New World first, no doubt, with the sailors of Christopher Columbus, for the famous discoverer had Slav Dalmatians, then famous seafarers, on his voyage. And the first Poles, who came here in 1607, no doubt, held them in great admiration.

The Poles have large numbers of adherents and according to Johns Hopkins studies, there were Polish Catholics in Virginia even before 1770.

PANNA MARIA, TEX.

The Poles built the first church in America in Panna Maria, Tex., naming it after the Blessed Virgin, in 1854. The writer in a company of Rev. Michael J. Churak, supreme chaplain of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America and his delegates from the Perth Amboy, N.J., Slovak parish, met a delegation of this Texas Polish parish with their priest in Atlantic City, N.J., in the spring of 1963 during the convention of the National Council of Catholic Men. It is interesting how they founded a farming colony in Texas over a century ago, to which they brought from Poland not only farming implements, including plows, but also a cross and a bell from their church in the native Polish village.

Great pioneer work was also done by the Yugoslavs; namely, Croatians and Slovenes.

Here we wish to show that it was not only poverty which drove new immigrants to this country, so often emphasized by writers and authors in articles and books about immigration, but many well-to-do zealous Slavs came here to preach the Gospel of Christ in true SS. Cyril and Methodius spirit. This pertains not only to the Catholics but also to the Protestants; namely, the Moravian Brothers, who received their name from the famous Moravian Empire, ruled by Svatopluk, Mojmir, Rastislav, and other Slovaks. It was Ruler Rastislav who invited SS. Cyril and Methodius to Great Moravian Empire, where they arrived in A.D. 863 from Constantinople.

PRINCE GALLITZIN AND BISHOP BARAGA

In order to confirm the fact that not only the poor immigrants came to our shores but also noblemen the best proof of this is the Russian Prince Demetrius Gallitzin, born in 1770, who was one of the first ordained Catholic priests in the Original American Colonies by the first American Catholic bishop, Most Rev. John Carroll, later first archbishop of Baltimore, Md., whose brother was the signer of the American Declaration of Independence. Father Gallitzin is known as the "Apostle of the Alleghenies" and a town is named for him near Altoona, Pa. He died in 1840 and is buried at Loretto, Pa.

The other is Bishop Frederick Baraga, born in 1797 in Slovenia, now Yugoslavia, who also came from a family of nobles. He labored among the Indians of Wisconsin and Michigan for 37 years and died in 1868. He also assisted the first Catholic bishop of Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1831. His cause for beatification is under consideration in Rome.

SLAV COUNTESS WORKS AMONG THE INDIANS

Not only that Bishop Baraga left his life of leisure and comfort for the wilderness in the New World, to spread here the Christian teachings of SS. Cyril and Methodius, but historians inform us that his widowed sister, Countess Antonia de Hoeffern, inspired by his enthusiasm for the Indians, joined him to work among the pioneer women in the wilderness of the American Northwest. She was also a pioneer among the Slovene nuns in America, whose communities performed great services by training future American leaders, such as former Governor of Ohio and present U.S. Senator Frank Lausche, Congressman John Blatnik, and many others, who are of Slovenian descent. When her health broke down in the wilderness, she settled in Philadelphia and in 1849 opened a grade school for girls, following thus the example of Moravian Sisters, who founded the first college for girls in America. Bishop Baraga is honored by the State of Michigan, where he was the first bishop of Marquette diocese in 1865. There is also a Baraga County there, which the writer visited in respect to the great apostle.

DR. PUPIN AND DR. TESLA

Besides him it is proper to mention the two famous American Slav scientists, Prof. Michael I. Pupin, of Columbia University, and Dr. Nikola Tesla, famous inventor and electrical wizard. Both already deceased, enriched this country with hundreds of patents for the benefit of mankind. Both were fervent Christians and adherents of SS. Cyril and Methodian heritage. Dr. Pupin was a Serbian and Dr. Tesla a Croatian.

The Slovenes gave America many missionaries, also Bishop Ignatius Mrak and Bishop John Vertin, who were successors of Bishop Baraga at Marquette, Mich. Bishop James Trobec headed the St. Cloud, Minn., diocese. Bishop John Starina was first ordinary of Lead, now Rapid City, Iowa. Fathers Kundek and Konshak were well known missionaries.

Before the War of Independence, way back in 1680 a Croatian Jesuit found his way to New Mexico, where he labored among Indians. We find that several towns in Indiana were founded by Rev. Joseph Kundek, traveler and pioneer.

We are proud that the first ordinary of the Gary Catholic diocese is an American of Slovak descent. He is the Most Reverend Andrew G. Grutka, D.D., leader and patron of the 11th centenary celebrations in honor of SS. Cyril and Methodius whom the late Pope John XXIII, of blessed memory, chose to head the drive for the establishment of a Slovak Institute in Rome in their honor for the training of priests for Slovakia, now under communistic rule. Bishop Grutka led a delegation of Slovaks from the United States and 11 other countries, numbering 600 pilgrims, to the Vatican, where Pope Paul VI received them in a special audience on September 14, 1963.

Prior to that on September 11, the newly elevated Protonotary Apostolic, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Stephen J. Krasula, of New York City, preached in Slovak in St. Peter's Basilica, Rome, which was the first Slovak sermon in the history of this famous church, known as the cradle of Christendom. Also on September 12, Carol Cardinal Confalonieri pontificated in the famous Rome basilica Santa Maria Maggiore, for the Slovak pilgrims. It was recalled by Monsignor Krasula of New York City that in this basilica, Pope Adrian II approved and blessed the Slavonic Liturgical Books translated by SS. Cyril and Methodius.

And on September 13, 1963, Amleto G. Cardinal Cicognani, secretary of Vatican State, pontificated and preached in the basilica of St. Clement, where St. Cyril is buried. On September 15, Eugene Cardinal Tisserant blessed the Slovak Institute of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Rome, assisted by Bishop Grutka and American Slovak prelates and priests for which the funds of a half million dollars were raised in America by Slovak fraternal organizations, parishes and individuals, thus repaying at least partly the debt to the old country, from which the first missionaries in America received generous aid and some, like the mentioned Prince Gallitzin and Bishop Baraga had wealthy families and friends to support them, their cause, and associates.

SLAV PROFESSOR OF FIRST CATHOLIC COLLEGE IN AMERICA

In sequence let us look at the great contribution of the missionaries from what is now Czechoslovakia. When Augustine Herman, the first Czech in America, who founded the Bohemian Manor, after accepting large grants for preparing maps of Maryland and the neighboring States at the recommendation of the famous Peter Stuyvesant, the Dutch Governor of New Amsterdam, now New York, the Jesuits established the first American Catholic College in Bohemia. Md. Among the first professors of this college was Father James Farrar (Farár) which means pastor in Slovak.

We also learn that in 1742 another Jesuit, Father Wapeler, erected a church at Lancaster, Pa., and dedicated it to St. John Nepomucene, well-known Bohemian martyr, who was murdered and thrown into River Vltava for refusing to reveal to the jealous Bohemian king the confession of his queen-wife.

There are many Slovak churches named after this Bohemian saint in America.

BLESSED BISHOP NEUMANN

On October 13, 1963, thousands of American pilgrims gathered in Rome for the beatification of Venerable John Nepomucene, fourth Bishop of Philadelphia diocese, who born in Bohemia, present Czechoslovakia, in 1811. He was ordained in New York City. Later he joined the Redemptorists Order and was consecrated bishop in Baltimore, Md., in 1852.

Bishop Neumann was honored recently when Bishop James J. Navagh, of Paterson, N.J., announced the naming of a new minor diocesan seminary in his honor at Wayne Township, N.J. Bishop Neumann labored in New Jersey as a missionary.

Bishop Neumann was a linguist, who mastered 12 languages including Russian, Gaelic, Slovak, and his native Bohemian. He was the first American bishop to prescribe 40-hour devotions in his diocese and is known as a pioneer in Catholic education. His rich undertakings in this direction were followed up by the Most Reverend Joseph Dwenger, second bishop of Indiana.

Bishop Neumann was a great apostle of youth and spent much time teaching children until his brother Wenceslaus (Václav) came from old country and also became a Redemptorist. His brother later labored in New Orleans, where he died in 1896. It is most providential that the present archbishop of Philadelphia, Pa., Most Rev. John J. Krol, is an American of Polish descent.

In our days Bishop Neumann's successor was the Most Reverend Joseph Maria Koudelka, born in Bohemia on December 3, 1852. He came to a Wisconsin farm with his parents in 1868 and was educated at the St. Francis Seminary in Milwaukee, Wis. In 1875 he was ordained to the priesthood by Bishop Gilmour in Cleveland, Ohio. Bishop Koudelka was consecrated in 1908. He became auxiliary bishop in 1911 and second bishop of Superior, Wis., in August 1913. He gave missions in most of the American Slovak parishes, and took active part on February 1911 in organizing the Slovak Catholic Federation of America with Rev. Joseph Murgas, priest-scientist. He was honorary supreme president of the First Catholic Slovak Union and the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union and took part in their conventions.

Bishop Koudelka also was affiliated with leading American-Slovak fraternal organizations. He built a beautiful orphanage with the help of American Slovaks in Superior, Wis., and he died there on June 24, 1921.

He and Bishop Baraga were eulogized during the 28th convention of the First Catholic Slovak Ladies Union, held in September 1963 at Milwaukee, Wis., where the delegates voted $100,000 for the Institute of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Rome. Bishop Koudelka also served as honorary president of this ladies organization from 1909 until his death. Bishop Koudelka was a personal friend of Rev. Stephen Furdek, known as the "Father of American Slovaks."

The Byzantine Catholics of Ruthenian Slavonic Rite with an eparchy in Pittsburgh, Pa., headed by Most Rev. Bishop Nicholas T. Elko and a new eparchy in Passaic, N.J., headed by Most Rev. Stephen Kocisko have a beautiful seminary of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Pittsburgh, Pa.

SS. CYRIL AND METHODIUS BROTHERHOOD IN RUSSIA

The Ukrainians have been great admirers of SS. Cyril and Methodius and have formed a brotherhood in their honor in Kiev, Russia, in 1846. The object of this SS. Cyril and Methodius Brotherhood was to unite all the Christian Slavs and form the Slavonic United States of Europe on a pattern of our American democracy. Unfortunately, their plan was destroyed and the leaders imprisoned. Their great apostle, St. Vladimir, received Christianity in 998 through a marriage with Princess Anna of Constantinople, known as "Angel of Peace," which is another rich chapter in the Slav history linked with the heritage of SS. Cyril and Methodius.

ARCHBISHOP MARTIN J. SPALDING

The first among the American prelates to acquaint the U.S. Catholics with the great apostolate of SS. Cyril and Methodius was the Most Reverend Archbishop Martin J. Spalding, D.D., of Baltimore, Md., the predecessor of James Cardinal Gibbons, who endorsed the founding of our organization, the Slovak Catholic Federation of America in 1911 and also the predecessor of the present Lawrence Cardinal Shehan, first bishop of Bridgeport diocese and now archbishop of Baltimore, Md., who is quite familiar with the SS. Cyril and Methodius heritage. Archbishop Spalding published in 1867 the general history of the Catholic Church in which he mentions these two Slovak apostles. No doubt this publication was encouraged by the influx of Slavs during the American Civil War in which the Slovaks had their heroes, including the well-known Colonel Geza Mihalotzy.

Likewise, the well-known Most Rev. Archbishop John Ireland of St. Paul, Minn., was one of the first American prelates to bring students from Slavonic countries to study for the priesthood.

The late Monsignor William Heinen of Mauch Chunk, Pa., who also came to America with ambition to work among the Indians, learned here the Slovak language and founded 14 Slovak parishes in the Philadelphia archdiocese and the present Allentown diocese. Monsignor Heinen visited Velehard, where he preached in Slovak in the church, known as basilica of SS. Cyril and Methodius.

Most Rev. Michael Hohan, late bishop of Scranton diocese visited Slovakia during the Austro-Hungarian regime before World War I to acquaint himself better with the Slovak people. Under his guidance the congregation of the Slovak sisters of SS. Cyril and Methodius, founded by Rev. Mathew Jankola, was established and has a motherhouse and a beautiful St. Cyril's academy in Danville, Pa.

On September 30, 1880, Pope Leo XIII issued an encyclical "Grande Munus" in honor of SS. Cyril and Methodius and extended their veneration to the entire Christiandom.

Archbishop Jozef Strossmayer of Croatia was a great leader during this period.

IRISH MONKS IN SLOVAKIA

It is recalled that prior to the arrival of SS. Cyril and Methodius to present Slovakia, Irish monks labored in the country of our ancestry but due to lack of knowledge of the people's language their mission was not successful.

Bishop Gruika paid them tribute during the SS. Cyril and Methodius celebration on June 22, 1963, at St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York City, where he was a great preacher in Slovak, invited by Cardinal Spellman.

Slovakia is a birthplace of St. Martin, Bishop of Tours, born in A.D. 316, then known as Pannonia. Now it is an established

> fact that St. Martin was related to St. Patrick, the patron of the Irish, therefore, we emphasize that what St. Boniface is to the Germans, St. Augustine to the English, and St. Patrick to the Irish, that is what SS. Cyril and Methodius are to the Slovaks. The present Holy Father, Pope Paul VI, addressing the American Slovak pilgrims in the Vatican on September 14, 1963, in commemoration of the 11th centenary of the arrival of SS. Cyril and Methodius to Slovakia said: "Dear Sons of the Slovak Nations * * * Continue to cultivate the memory, cult, the imitation of your saints, who from distant Middle Ages even now light the paths along which the spirit of the Slovak people must pass in our time and in the future * * * continue to maintain the SS. Cyril and Methodius Institute with your offerings and your confidence."
>
> In conclusion it is most appropriate to pay tribute to all those, who perpetuate the heritage of SS. Cyril and Methodius, patrons and apostles now of some 300 million Slavonic peoples, the majority of whom are under the tyranical rule of atheistic communism.
>
> Considering the fact that before the arrival of SS. Cyril and Methodius to the present Slovakia and its neighboring countries 11 centuries ago the Irish monks labored there, it is, indeed, providential, that the day before their feast day, in the year of the 11th centennial, on July 6, 1963, one of the most beautiful churches, named in their honor, was dedicated by Most Rev. Walter Kellenberg, Bishop of Rockville Center diocese, at Deer Park, Long Island, N.Y., where Rev. William Behan is pastor. The mission was originally started by the Slovaks, who rejoice with their American Catholic neighbors of other nationalities that while the SS. Cyril and Methodius' Christian faith is being uprooted by the Reds in the countries, where they planted it, that here in a free America, their heritage is perpetuated in a true democratic spirit.

The author of the article, Mr. John C. Sciranka, is a well-known American Slovak journalist who in this article calls to our attention these forgotten pioneers, including Father Gallitzin, who labored for 41 years among the people of western Pennsylvania, spending his own money and refusing to return to Russia to claim his patrimony. We owe these great pioneers our tribute in their very historical and unique contributions to America.

Since we very proudly recognize our Nation to be the "melting pot" of the world, the contributions of these individual and national groups of immigrants are a very special chapter in the history of our country.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of the Members this fascinating historical review by Mr. Sciranka.

BILL TO MAKE THE KILLING OF THE PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT A FEDERAL CRIME

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, many of us believed the assassination of President Kennedy and its tragicomic aftermath would so arouse Congress that it would, after years of procrastination, achieve passage of a law declaring the killing of the President a Federal offense.

Our belief was short lived. Although a number of bills have been introduced to accomplish this end, none has been approved by either House. The assassination of a President, in the eyes of the law, remains no different from any police blotter homicide.

The United States Code contains a jerry-built section—18 U.S.C. 1114—which makes it a Federal crime to kill postal inspectors, Internal Revenue Service agents, employees of the National Park Service, U.S. attorneys and judges, and, among others, property guards in the employ of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The protection extends to members of the Secret Service, including, of course, those agents charged with safeguarding the lives of the men who hold the highest offices in the land. The situation is intolerable as well as illogical and should be remedied.

I am, therefore, introducing today a bill which would make the assassination of the President or the Vice President a Federal crime, subject to Federal prosecution, adjudication and punishment.

One of the objectives of the bill is to resolve the anamolous distinction that presently govern prosecution of crimes against officers and employees of the Federal Government. To cite two examples, it is a Federal crime—18 U.S.C. 871—to mail a threat to kill the President, but not to kill him. It also is a Federal offense—18 U.S.C. 372—if one person conspires with another to injure or kill the President. But the Federal Government has no jurisdiction if an individual, acting alone, murders the Chief Executive.

The bill I am sponsoring attempts, as simply and effectively as possible, to codify the various statutes relating to the killing or attempt killing of the President and Vice President, and all other officers or employees of the U.S. Government.

First, the bill designates the murder of the President or the Vice President, or the President-elect or Vice-President-elect, a Federal crime. The maximum penalty upon conviction would be death if the jury decided the case did not recommend clemency.

The attempted murder of the President or Vice President also would become a Federal offense, carrying a maximum penalty of 40 years imprisonment.

Second, the bill extends Federal jurisdiction to anyone who kills or attempts to kill any officer or employee of the United States while he is engaged in the performance of his official duties. The maximum penalty for murder in the first degree would be death. Conviction of attempted murder would carry a maximum penalty of 25 years imprisonment.

The bill further provides that anyone who assaults, resists, opposes, impedes, intimidates or interferes with the President, the Vice President or any Federal employee or officer while they are performing their official duties shall be charged with a Federal offense. The maximum penalty would be a fine of $5,000 and a 3-year prison sentence, or both. However, if a deadly or dangerous weapon is used in the assault or similar offense the penalties would be increased to a maximum fine of $10,000 or a prison term of 10 years, or both.

My bill attaches no reservations whatever to Federal jurisdiction over the assassination of the President or Vice President. Other bills introduced on this subject have granted jurisdiction only when the President is "engaged in the performance of his official duties, or on account of the performance of his official duties." This proviso seems to me to be unnecessarily restrictive. The language may present needless problems in determining whether the President was engaged in the performance of his official duties. Moreover, I see no reason why the murder of a President should not be a Federal crime even if the killing occurs while the Chief Executive is playing golf, attending a family funeral or engaged in other activities which may or may not be defined as "official."

The provision affecting Federal employees and officers, however, confines Federal jurisdiction to those offenses committed while the employee or officer is, so to speak, on the job.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is a worthy one, and deserving of passage. I urge its favorable consideration. It is not yet too late for us to acknowledge that we have learned the lessons so tragically brought to our attention by the events in Dallas during the last week of November 1963.

"WELL DONE," MAJOR GRISSOM

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I join my fellow Hoosiers, and all Americans, in saying, "Well done" to Maj. Gus Grissom on his extraordinary flight in the Gemini spacecraft this week. He and his flight companion, John Young, exhibited great courage and rarely excelled spirit of adventure in the calm manner in which they conducted this flight.

We in Indiana are especially proud of Gus Grissom, not only because he was born and raised in our State, but because he exemplifies those qualities which we want to instill in the youth of America. As an example of a good family man, and reflecting a good upbringing in a good environment, Gus Grissom is an outstanding American in more than one category.

I congratulate Gus on his most recent achievement and wish him and his family the best in the future. Gus' accomplishments in the space program afford us valuable information for future space exploration. Indiana, a State settled by some very hardy and persevering pioneer stock, is proud that one of its own has helped pioneer in the newest of frontiers.

THE CURTIS COROLLARY TO GRESHAM'S LAW

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis], is acknowledged to be one of the most brilliant Members in either Chamber. He is one of the leading financial and economic experts in the country. He is also one of the most diligent and hard-working men I know. He has evolved a theory of economics which he himself has dubbed "Curtis' Corollary to Gresham's Law." He presented it to the House last month during the debate on H.R. 45, the Inter-American Development Bank bill.

Gresham's law is simply that bad money will drive out good and the Curtis corollary is that Government money drives out private capital.

The formulation of this law has been noted by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch which recently carried an excellent editorial on the subject. I heartily endorse the editorial and its conclusion and recommend it to the consideration of my colleagues:

> In 1558 Sir Thomas Gresham, financial agent of the Crown, painstakingly explained to Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth that when two or more kinds of money of equal denomination—but unequal intrinsic value—are in circulation, the one with the greater value is hoarded and exported. Basically, the good knight explained to the Virgin Queen, bad money drives out good money.
>
> Some 299 years later the economic principle was given the name of Gresham's law. Now more than a century later on the floor of Congress there has been appended Curtis' corollary—Government money drives out private capital.
>
> While the news has yet to be hailed on the fields of academe, Representative Thomas B. Curtis' corollary certainly seems to hold true for the Alliance for Progress, which program is in need of reevaluation.
>
> As envisioned under the Alliance, $20 billion in investment moneys would go south of the Rio Grande, half of it from private sources. But Mr. Curtis charges that, as the Government dollars are being sent into Latin America, not only has the private sector not caught up, but it has actually declined during those years.
>
> Nor is it just American private capital that is being withdrawn. Latin capital is likewise being pulled out.
>
> Mr. Curtis suggests, and we second it, that the Alliance for Progress stop blindly pouring in dollars as though all is going according to plan, when all is quite obviously not going according to plan. It is time an exhaustive reappraisal was made of the entire Alliance for Progress program.
>
> Pointing to our payments imbalance, Mr. Curtis asks why 90 percent of the programs are for services—not goods—which further aggravate that problem.
>
> Mr. Curtis asks why the Bank's Fund for Special Operations—which lends to governments whose payments problems prevent their getting conventional loans—encourages Latins to spend the money in Latin America rather than here. How can one justify this type of operation when we face a critical payments problem ourselves?
>
> What Mr. Curtis is asking is that the Johnson administration, which is calling on one and all to cut back on expenditures abroad, starts practicing a little bit of what it is so piously preaching.

WASHINGTON POST HITS ADMINISTRATION'S INCONSISTENT STAND ON USE OF GAS IN VIETNAM

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday—page 5774 of the Congressional Record—I called the attention of the House to the inconsistency of the administration's handling of the decision on the use of gas as a weapon of war and the same administration's campaign opposition concerning authority for the use of tactical atomic weapons. Although field commanders are thought not competent to decide to use limited, tactical atomic weapons even under very restricted conditions, they are apparently given unrestricted rein to employ chemical weapons. The administration is trying to brush aside this sort of criticism and to minimize the use of tear gas in Vietnam as an inflated issue of no real substance.

There is substance of the gravest importance in this issue, however, the pooh-poohing attitude of the administration notwithstanding.

The Washington Post directed itself to this point in an editorial today. The editorial clearly shows up the inconsistency involved and I offer it for the Record in the earnest hope that it will be pondered by every Member:

> ### Gas
>
> There is a considerable amount of pious hypocrisy in some of the moans of outrage over the use of nontoxic gases in South Vietnam. Some of the protests originate in countries where the cruelties of the regime make vomiting gas by comparison look as innocent as cough syrup. There is, on the other hand, a great deal of world reaction that represents a natural and justifiable revulsion at the military use of any agent that may in future make it easier to gradually move across the line into the use of lethal gases.
>
> The reproach of American citizens and newspapers is of a double order: it runs to the use of the gas itself and to the damage that its ineffective employment has done the United States. There are few offenses in statesmen more deplorable than those that put the right in the wrong and that is what we have done. We have put a moral argument into the hands of our enemies and placed a moral burden on our friends. And it must be confessed we have not moved with agility to correct the error. A Government that only a few short months ago was voicing its horror at Senator Goldwater's suggestion that the choice of weapons be left to field commanders cannot hide behind the argument that the election to use gases is a field decision.
>
> What is especially revolting about it all is the fact that the employment of the nauseous gases was inept, ineffectual, and indecisive even in the few cases where it was used. For no sound practical reason we have given comfort to our enemies, dismayed our friends, and outraged many of our own citizens. We might have made something of a recovery by announcing withdrawal of our own supply of this agent from the theater. We have, on the contrary, made an inept and unconvincing defense of it.
>
> Wickedness sometimes wins in the court of world opinion by having success as a counsel and virtue often loses by having failure's clumsy clown as a lawyer.

THE FLORIDA-COLOMBIA ALLIANCE

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, Florida's secretary of state, the Honorable Tom Adams, recently addressed the international students at Florida State University in Tallahassee. His remarks concerned a new and unique program developing between our State and Colombia. The Florida-Colombia alliance is a program for internatioanl cooperation designed to strengthen commerce and democracy between the two partners. Its beginning is described by Mr. Adams as follows:

> The Florida-Colombia alliance has its roots in the diplomatic tours which have been sponsored for the past 3 years by the office of your secretary of state. Our interest in developing closer relationships between Florida and sovereign nations, resulted in an invitation from the Organization of American States in October of 1963 to make a goodwill tour of Colombia.
>
> During the initial visit consultations revealed that the Colombian Government places first priority for continued and accelerated development upon education. Therefore, it seemed that Florida could immediately respond in an effective way by initiating education programs thereby assisting the Colombians in meeting this pressing need.
>
> We thereby will have developed a relationship with these people which nothing can supersede even the momentary economic advantages of other nations, for there will always be those who pass across the stage with a momentary advantage in diverse fields. It appears to me, however, that if we can get this education exchange going, the future benefits will be so much more permanent than if we had made a flashy, papier mache approach which is too often made to gain momentary friendships.

The bonds between Florida and Colombia are being forged on the anvil of basic similarities. As the secretary of state noted:

> Colombia and Florida share similar climates and topography, especially along the northern coast; we share a common Spanish heritage, tradition, culture, and interest.
>
> We share similar economies, based upon agriculture, tourism, light industry, and excellent ports. Barranquilla is closer to Miami than is Philadelphia—the birthplace of American democracy. Bogotá is closer to Tallahassee than is San Francisco. Truly, Florida is cradled in the Caribbean community and can become even closer in more than just a geographical sense.
>
> Therefore, due to this natural affinity in so many areas we are working with Colombia as a point of beginning.

> Also due to their needs and our resources in education we determined that this, too, should be our point of beginning.

Student exchange is but the first step of an expanding relationship envisioned between Florida and Colombia. In his Tallahassee address, Mr. Adams points to the future by observing:

> We hope to expand upon the initial exchange of students by beginning faculty exchanges, sending technical experts in agriculture, ports development, public health, etc., to Colombia, training more students, teachers, and technicians in Florida and by assisting in the development of that nation's educational television facilities.
>
> To aid in the financing of these broadened types of education programs, we have created a Florida Inter-American Alliance Education Fund. It is our intention to incorporate this fund so that it can receive contributions from individuals, corporations, and organizations to foster and promote the educational programs of the alliance.

Last November 28, a distinguished Florida program development team departed to visit the northern coastal states of Colombia.

The team members, briefed in Miami by Mr. James H. Boren, Director of the Partners of the Alliance programs, included:

Mr. Bruce Barrow, international director, Florida JC's; Mr. Larry Benson, executive secretary, Florida-Colombia Alliance Committee; Mr. Joe Brown, executive assistant, Florida State Department of Agriculture; Mr. Ellis Clark, vice president, First National Bank of Miami, Fla.; Mr. Scotty Fraser, administrative assistant to the secretary of state of Florida; the Honorable Chuck Hall, mayor of Metropolitan Dade County, Fla.; Dr. Harry Philpott, vice president, University of Florida; Mr. Gene Phipps, Florida Partners Education Subcommittee; Mr. Stephen Richards, manager, Pan-American Sulphur Co.; Dr. James Wattenbarger, State director, Division Community Junior College.

This team of 10 Floridians from throughout the State traveled to Bogotá and the northern coastal states of Magdalena, Atlantico, and Bolivar last December with financial assistance from the partners of the alliance—a program brilliantly and successfully implemented by its enthusiastic and dedicated director, James Boren.

This team of Floridians, all experts in their fields, represented ports and trade, education, public administration, agriculture, public health, and civic organizations. Their purpose for the trip was to survey and determine possible avenues for new programs within the Florida-Colombia Alliance.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate and commend these gentlemen who have made such a significant contribution to the cause of better hemispheric understanding by the initiation of this important relationship. Their recommendations contain a blueprint for the future of the Florida-Colombia Alliance. The secretary of state sums up the alliance this way:

> We are laying a foundation for our program based upon achievement which we believe will last for generations. As every good construction engineer knows, foundations must be placed on a sound footing. For this reason we are taking one step at a time choosing priorities carefully, before we move forward on a planned, progressive path. Just as we are limiting our initial efforts to the Republic of Columbia so are we gaging Florida's first united statewide experiment in the adventure of international relations, to match Colombia's priority of needs.

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GILLIGAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on which I have the honor to serve, presently has under consideration H.R. 2485 which proposes a system of temporary and partial Federal support for the cost of technical and professional staff in newly constructed community health centers to be built under the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act.

I hope that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will report favorably to the House on this measure and that the Members of the House will approve it, thus enabling hundreds of American communities to launch a bold new program against the tragic ravages of mental illness. I feel confident, however, that the Members of the House will want assurance that the Federal funds authorized in this bill will be used by the several States to sponsor and promote more aggressive and sounder mental health programs, and will not be used as a device to permit the States to avoid their primary responsibilities in the field of mental health. To that end, I shall propose in the committee an amendment to H.R. 2485, designed to protect these objectives.

In order that my colleagues might better understand the situation which has developed in the State of Ohio which makes the amendment necessary, I will indicate the full background of the problem.

The purpose of H.R. 2985 is to provide the basis for a working partnership between the Federal Government, the governments of the several States, and organizations in local communities for a joint effort to develop what Secretary Celebreeze has termed "a bold new approach" to the problem of promoting mental health and preventing mental illness, the development and staffing of Community Mental Health Centers.

The Secretary has further pointed out that this committee's report on the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963 emphasized that the program should be "so tailored as not to result in the Federal Government's assuming the traditional responsibility of the States, localities, and the medical profession for the care and treatment of the mentally ill."

In other words, in providing further Federal assistance to States and local communities by providing a portion of the cost of professional and technical personnel for the initial operation of these new Centers, the objective is to encourage new and more intensive programs, not to replace with Federal dollars, local or State expenditures, and certainly not to provide a screen of new activity in this field behind which State governments can curtail or restrict their activities in the field of mental health.

The Federal Government obviously cannot and should not force the State governments to do anything, but it is well to realize the efforts and dollars of all of us will be wasted unless all the partners in this arrangement press forward with equal vigor, and do all within their power to achieve the goal. If any one of the partners is permitted to shirk its responsibilities the result will be a fraud on the taxpayers, and a cruel hoax on the families of the victims of mental disease.

For the Federal Government simply to provide matching grants is not sufficient to assure success of any program, if the State receiving them does not respond properly to its duty.

As an example, I point out the case of Ohio in regard to the use of Federal grants during the past year for rehabilitation of the mentally ill. Ohio for the last several years has lagged behind in this most important area, though it is a leader in wealth in the Nation. At present, Ohio is 52d out of 54 national jurisdictions in the number of mentally disabled persons rehabilitated per 100,000 persons of population. Additionally, the ratio of vocational rehabilitation counselors is 1 to 138,000 population, while the national average is 1 to 70,000 population. In spite of this fact, though the Federal Government allocated grants of $4.25 million for rehabilitation of the mentally ill to Ohio in 1965, fully $2.7 million, or 64 percent of the total grants, were not used simply because the State refused to come up with the matching funds.

Moreover, the State may juggle its bookkeeping methods, and by unilateral action divest itself of a continuing responsibility in a given field of endeavor. For example, Ohio recently adopted legislation implementing ADCU, and began transferring thousands of families from poor relief—a State program—to ADUC—a federally supported program. At the same time, the State, by unilateral action altered the terms of its poor relief program with local governments. Where traditionally Ohio had matched local efforts on a 50–50 basis, the State's effort was cut to 40 percent. In many cases the local governments had no resources to meet the added burden, and family allowances for thousands of people on poor relief were slashed to 70 percent of subsistence. The result of this action by Ohio was that State welfare expenditures were cut back, Federal and local expenditures climbed, and thousands of helpless, poverty-stricken people suffered in hopeless misery.

It must be emphasized that safeguards should be adopted to insure, so far as possible, that the States which would request and accept Federal assistance in these new programs in the field of mental health are really doing a reasonable and responsible job in this field.

The Director of the Department of Mental Hygiene and Correction of the State of Ohio appeared before this committee on March 4, 1965, to urge the adoption of H.R. 2985. In his testimony, Mr. Janis said that:

> On March 22, 1965, the citizens committee will submit an interim report to the Governor of Ohio. In this report they recommended that Federal funds should be made available to assist communities in the operation of comprehensive centers serving the mentally ill and mentally retarded. They too feel that if a job is to be done, the community, the State, and the Federal Government must join hands in behalf of improved programs for the mentally ill.

Mr. Janis' comment is only one side of the story of that report. Though it is due to be released on March 22, 1965, to the Governor alone, and later to the public, portions of that report have already been reported by the press. In the Columbus Ohio, Citizen Journal of February 25, 1965, it is reported that the subcommittee concerned with manpower had already made its findings known to the chairman of the citizens' committee. In that report these points were made:

First. The problem of manpower in the area of mental health in Ohio is of crisis proportions.

Second. Turnover of personnel is particularly critical at the supervisory level.

Third. The great loss of professional personnel in the State programs is all the more alarming in view of the rising rate of admissions to State hospitals.

Fourth. The low pay for psychologists, social workers, nurses, occupational therapists, and vocational rehabilitation counselors does not compare favorably with pay for similar positions in other States.

And most significant, in relation to the problem we are currently studying, the report indicates that "there has been an alarming and overwhelming loss of personnel in Ohio's State-aided community clinic programs."

The newspaper account indicated that when the director of finance in Ohio, Mr. Richard L. Krabach, was informed of the study, he estimated that it would cost at least $50 million to put the committee's program into effect. This may be so, for Mr. Krabach should know Ohio's financial situation better than anyone else. Is Ohio, then, making the kind of attempt that is required? The expenditures for mental health in Ohio—not including correction—for the past several years are:

Fiscal 1962	$64, 042, 510
Fiscal 1963	67, 792, 810
Fiscal 1964	67, 823, 799
Fiscal 1965	67, 821, 555
Fiscal 1966 (budget)	74, 745, 000

It should be noted that in fiscal 1963, 1964, and 1965, the amount expended varied less than 1 percent—indeed, the 1965 figure was lower than that for 1964.

But what is not apparent at first glance is that, in fact, Ohio, for each of these years, was actually falling far behind in mental health services. Statutory requirements for pay raises, along with increases in equipment costs, food, medicines, and increases in numbers of patients had to come out of the budget of each succeeding year.

In other words, just to keep the same level of services, Ohio should have been budgeting at least $4 million more each year. Consequently, by 1964, Ohio was $4 million below the budget for 1963. By 1965 it was $8 million below 1963. By 1966 it will have been $12 million below the standard of 1963, and by the end of fiscal 1966, Ohio will be $16 million below the standard of 1963. While it is true that there is great pressure on the State of Ohio by citizens groups which has caused a proposed budget increase in this area of more than $6 million for fiscal 1966, by the end of fiscal 1966, even if the Ohio Legislature grants the full request of the Governor, Ohio will have fallen $10 million behind the 1963 level. This is so, even at a time when most other States have increased the expenditures for their mental health programs far above the normal increments required by increased costs of services and construction.

It is interesting to note further how Ohio stands in relation to the other nine major industrial States in the Nation in certain categories. All ranking below indicate expenditures in public mental hospitals, 1963:

Category	*Rank*
Total daily expenditure per resident patient	10
Expenditures for capital additions and improvements (average daily per resident patient)	[1] 9
Total expenditures for public mental hospitals and public institutions for the mentally retarded	[2] 10

[1] Ohio's daily expenditure was $0.09; the 10-State average was $0.22; and the leading State (Indiana) spent $0.49.

[2] Ohio's expenditure was $6.32; the 10-State average was $9.62; and the leading State (New York) spent $15.02.

Mr. James A. Connolly, of the legislative relations committee, the Mental Health Association of the Cincinnati area, who did an exhaustive study of mental health expenditures in Ohio, estimates that at least $29 million more must be spent this year in Ohio for that State to come up to even the average of the second- to fifth-rated industrial States.

It is to be hoped that the State of Ohio, then, will not reduce its commitment to mental health because of an increase in Federal dollars, and claim that it is doing the taxpayers of Ohio a service.

It is to be hoped that the State of Ohio will not, as it did in its welfare programs, shift its responsibility for the community health centers to the communities, which could not possibly accept the new responsibility, when Federal grants decline and eventually stop, as they will under the terms of this bill.

It is to be hoped, further, that the State of Ohio will not, as it did in its programs for rehabilitation of the mentally ill, refuse to provide matching moneys to Federal grants in the future for such programs as this one we now consider.

Based on recent experience in my own State of Ohio, it is my firm conviction that the enactment into law of H.R. 2985 may very well provide tremendous impetus to a bold new program for the care and treatment of mental illness, but only if the bill is so amended as to prevent the kind of thing that has happened in Ohio for the past few years.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XXVI

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following 25th part of "New York City in Crisis."

This installment details the impact that this series has had on New York City. It appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 15, 1965:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—TRIB SERIES: THE IMPACT THUS FAR

(By Barry Gottehrer, of the Herald Tribune staff)

"New York is the greatest city in the world—and everything is wrong with it."

With these words the Herald Tribune on January 25 launched its investigative series—"New York City in Crisis."

The series has presented—and will continue to present on a continuing basis—a detailed and far-ranging indictment of a city government which through inefficiency and indifference has lost touch with its people and of 8 million people who through fear, frustration, and bewilderment have come to accept conditions and services that grow increasingly intolerable every day.

In order to probe beneath the surface of these problems that cloud the present and threaten the future of this greatest city in the world, a special team of four reporters and writers spent more than 6 months interviewing hundreds of city officials and citizens before the first story appeared.

One of the first persons interviewed was an officer of the Ford Foundation. He expressed great interest in the project but even greater skepticism about its effect.

"You're posing an interesting problem," he said. "But, frankly, I wonder if anybody really cares any more. New Yorkers still can be vigorous, vital, and effective when it is their own personal comfort or well-being that is being disturbed. The real question is: How much do New Yorkers care today about the problems of people on the other side of the city?"

A RESOUNDING ANSWER

Today, 3 weeks after "New York City in Crisis" started, the Herald Tribune has an answer to the Ford Foundation official's question.

From the thousands of phone calls and letters (a fifth full page of these appears today), it is obvious that New Yorkers do care deeply—about themselves, it is true, but also about people living on the other side of the city, about New York itself, and about the civic apathy and city inefficiency that have permitted these problems to become so vast and so critical.

Reaction to the series has been nationwide. Letters and calls have come in from all over the United States.

In Washington, two Congressmen—a Democrat from New York City and a Republican from New Jersey—entered four of the stories in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In New York, a city councilman called for an immediate investigation of the city's failure to prevent its middle class from leaving, a problem presented in the series.

Dozens of leading businessmen, church leaders, and educators have lauded the series. In response to the series, the New York Chamber of Commerce and the Commerce and Industry Association both have called for the formation of a supercitizens' council to bring about immediate action and get New York City moving again.

Four universities in the New York area have assigned the series as required reading in their city government and urban affairs classes.

And two other New York City newspapers and dozens of radio and television newsmen have praised the series editorially.

"It is not corruption that is killing this city," said Dr. Kenneth Clark, professor of psychology at City College of New York, the day the series started. "New York is dying from creeping dry rot, steadily increasing blight, and a total lack of leadership."

Over the last 3 weeks, the "New York City in Crisis" series has documented this creeping dry rot, this steadily increasing blight, and this lack of leadership—where important problems are turned over to special committees and then forgotten and where a government seems to survive by indecision and a policy of not rocking the boat.

Repeatedly, the series has brought into the open the failure of the city's urban-renewal program where, after 15 years and a commitment of $2.197 billion, only 24,000 apartment units out of a total of 63,000 are listed as completed by the housing and redevelopment board.

Under investigation, the city administration's glowing reports and press releases have paled alongside the facts.

In Bellevue South, citizens have been victimized by haphazard planning and indecision.

Dozens of small businessmen had checked with the planning commission and the HRB, learned that no renewal was planned for a certain address, moved in and then, months later at a loss of thousands of dollars to themselves, discovered that the city had changed its mind and altered its plans.

In Cooper Square, where residents credit the Herald Tribune's series for finally prodding the mayor into meeting with them after months of evasion and broken promises, citizens are being victimized by indecision and reports of political pressures.

And in the West Side urban renewal project, the one area that the city administration continues to single out with pride as a prime example of human renewal where the government and the people are working in complete harmony and agreement, citizens are outraged—by the administration's inefficiency, bureaucracy, red-tape and lack of coordination.

A DOCUMENTED RECORD

Over the last few weeks, the series has documented dozens of examples where the city increasingly has failed its citizens—in its hospitals, in its schools, in its streets, in its parks, in its subways, in its planning and in its attitude.

The series has revealed so far that more than 800,000 middle-class whites have fled the city since 1950 and been replaced by more than 800,000 Negroes and Puerto Ricans, a vast majority of whom possess little or no job skills.

The city administration says, "We must do something to keep our young middle class" but remains unable to do anything to stop the flow.

A garment-center businessman is more realistic. "More and more New York is getting to be a city of white collar jobs and blue-collar people," he said. "Words from city hall aren't enough. We need better and more reasonable housing, better schools and some protection in the streets."

Manufacturers who, because of taxes, unions, traffic, available facilities and the administration's attitude, are moving out of the city in increasing numbers.

The steadily increasing crimes of violence and a growing fear have convinced many New Yorkers that the police department is no longer able to make the streets, the parks, the subways, and even the most expensive apartment houses safe for the city's citizens.

There is a growing state of poverty where the gap between the rich and the poor becomes more insurmountable every day. Despite the considerable expense of taxpayers' money, thousands upon thousands of the city's Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and aged continue to live in rat-infested tenements where crime and deprivation walk hand in hand.

For these people, there are promises from city hall—promises and little else.

There has been a decline in services in almost every area where slumlords, because of redtape, antiquated housing code enforcement, and the courts, find it easier to pay a small fine rather than provide heat and the other required necessities for their tenants—and continue to get away with it.

The mayor's solution? After 1 year of planning, he has set up a special phone number that people can call if they don't have heat. The complaint will then be referred to the proper city agency and, after considerable redtape, something perhaps might be done.

To people who already know which agencies should be contacted and have already gone without heat for weeks and months after contacting them, the mayor's solution appears to be no solution at all.

WEEKS OF WAITING

Even in houses taken over by the city—for example, to make way for the Bellevue South redevelopment—where the city is the landlord, citizens have had to wait weeks until broken pipes are repaired and sewage is cleaned up.

In one instance, as reported in the series, the residents of one house in Bellevue South called the city for assistance when the pipes burst and flooded the basement with sewage. By the time the city got around to repairing the damage (not until a story appeared in the Herald Tribune), 2 weeks had passed and rats had moved into the basement.

In another instance, reported in the series (and repaired the day after the story appeared), a Brooklyn woman called the bureau of sewers on January 27 to say that a sewer outside her home had overflowed and backed up into her closet and bathroom. She was told it would be taken care of "as soon as possible." Despite several calls to the bureau of sewers and three to the mayor's office, the sewer was not repaired until 13 days later.

The tendency of city departments to take extreme amounts of time is not limited to sewers and cellars. This tendency starts at the top—with the mayor, who invariably promises immediate action, assigns the matter to some special commission and then, months and even years later, announces that he is still considering the problem.

There are dozens of examples of reports requested by Mayor Wagner or one of his appointed department heads, paid for with city taxpayers' money and then left to gather dust in the corners of city hall offices.

Two brought to light by "New York City in Crisis" are the Greenleigh survey (reportedly an indictment of the city's handling of the relocation of West Side urban renewal residents) and the Arthur D. Little Report (reportedly critical of the city's inability to stop the flow of manufacturers out of the city).

Both have been making the rounds of city department offices for months, one reportedly has already been revised to present a less shocking picture of failure, and neither has been released.

Asked about these reports, many city officials were, at first, reluctant to admit they even existed. Prodded, they did concede that they exist, that they were being studied and that they would be released shortly.

There are not many people, outside of the city administration, however, who believe that these reports would ever have been released to the public had not the Herald Tribune focused public attention on them. Yet, even with this exposure, few people, including many inside the administration, believe these reports will ever be released in their original form and tone.

Unlike corporations, which commission studies to improve their operation, the city government does not always commission studies and then act on the findings.

According to a spokesman for the city planning commission, city officials frequently soften the tone of a report—to make it more in keeping with the image of a booming economy and flourishing city they want to perpetuate. Sometimes, according to this one official, some reports are not made public in any form.

A typical example of bureaucracy and indecision at the top centers on two reports—one by the Commission on Human Rights and the other by the mayor's action panel.

The former—which called for the mayor to issue an executive order directing contractors doing construction work for the city to maintain integrated work forces at all levels of employment—was sent to Mayor Wagner 13 months ago.

The latter—calling for a city to refuse to deal with any contractor who, in turn, would deal with a union that had been found to discriminate—was sent to the mayor 10 months ago.

What has happened to these recommendations?

According to one of his aids, Mayor Wagner last week was still studying the proposals.

A decision, said the aid—who has given this same response to at least a dozen inquiries by the Tribune regarding the state of other long-overdue decisions—should be forthcoming shortly.

Yet, of all the examples of indecision, procrastination, inefficiency and pressure, none has persisted so long or so loudly as the Lower Manhattan Expressway.

A 2-mile stretch of highway that winds its way crosstown from the West Side Highway and the Holland Tunnel to the Williamsburg and Manhattan bridges, the Lower Manhattan Expressway was first placed in the city's master plan of arterial highways in January of 1941.

Today, more than 24 years later, it remains on this map and it is still not built or rejected.

CRITICS AND SUPPORTERS

There are some people—mainly area residents and civil rights groups—who say the expressway would be a drastic waste of money. They are extremely vocal and they are persistent—and they have studies which, they say, prove their point.

There are other people—mainly the administration, unions, and businessmen—who say that the expressway would stimulate the city's economy, ease the increasing traffic problems in lower Manhattan and perhaps bring about a rebirth of the area. They are extremely vocal and they are persistent—and they also have studies which, they say, prove their point.

And in the middle, the man who ultimately must make a decision, the man who must make a decision on a matter that he has already been both for and then against, on a matter that has already been studied to death, is Mayor Robert Wagner, who repeatedly has said that he doesn't think decisions should be made in haste.

When pressed by a TV news reporter recently about whether 24 years of consideration might be considered a little too long by some people, the mayor snapped back, "Not by the people who live there."

On this point, the mayor was either grossly misinformed or defending himself and his listeners.

His failure to come to a final decision on the Lower Manhattan Expressway has helped no one. There are few things the opponents and the proponents of this road agree on. One of them, however, is that the mayor has complicated the problem by not acting boldly.

While he has procrastinated, the area continues to decline drastically, small businessmen and homeowners are unable to borrow money to make repairs and a group of New Yorkers is being victimized.

The last hearing on the expressway was held on December 22 and, after it, the mayor said, "We are not going to stall this along."

Since then, when pressed for some indication when a decision would finally be reached, one of the mayor's aids said that the mayor would announce his decision by the end of January "at the very latest."

Today is February 15 and citizens all over New York are still waiting for answers and direction from city hall on the Lower Manhattan Expressway and dozens of other extreme and much-studied problems.

In the continuing series, "New York City in Crisis," the Herald Tribune will continue to press for these answers and action in an attempt to make this city a better city in which to live and to work.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XXVII

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following installment of "New York City in Crisis" which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 16, 1965.

This installment consists of two articles. The first concerns a crime prevention program for New York's subway system and the second concerns the problem of air pollution in New York City.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Feb. 16, 1965]

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—CITY TO HIRE 1,000 MORE POLICE, INSTALL ALARM SYSTEM IN SUBWAYS—WAGNER TELLS HIS PLANS TO COMBAT CRIME

(By Sue Reinert)

Mayor Wagner announced an emergency crime prevention program yesterday that will include the hiring of 1,100 additional policemen and the installation of experimental communications systems in the subways.

Outlining the program to 391 police recruits who were sworn in at the Police Academy, 235 East 20th Street, the mayor declared that "many of our law-abiding citizens have become alarmed and fearful over the increase in crime in our city."

Of the three subways communications systems that the mayor listed, two already are being installed by the transit authority. The third, said a transit authority spokesman, will be installed, but he did not know when or where.

The two experiments that are underway involve the installation of two-way radios connecting motormen's cabs to transit police headquarters, and the use of a warning light connecting change booths with the street above them.

The two-way radio experiment, to be put into operation on the IRT Lexington Avenue line between Bowling Green and 125th Street, was announced by the transit authority last February. It was then supposed to be in operation within 6 months, but a transit authority spokesman said yesterday that it would be working by June.

The spokesman said the flashing light had been installed 2 months ago in three stations, whose location he refused to disclose. The experiment cost the transit authority $1,800, he said.

The third system—an emergency alarm bell in passenger cars to advise the motorman of trouble—is being studied for "practicality," said the TA spokesman at first. Later, he said that TA Chairman Joseph E. O'Grady, after consultation with the mayor, had agreed to go ahead with a test of the system. The spokesman said he knew no details of the experiment.

The 1,100 additional policemen mentioned by the mayor will include 100 new transit policemen and 1,000 new men on the regular force. Questioned after his speech, Mr. Wagner estimated that each additional man would cost the city $8,000 or $9,000, which would mean a total expenditure of at least $8.8 million.

The mayor said he would seek funds for the 1,000 additional regular police in his next budget, which goes into effect on July 1. He was not definite about when he would ask more money for the 100 transit police, but city hall spokesman said later it would be "as soon as possible"—even before July 1.

Police Commissioner Michael J. Murphy said the 1,000 additional policemen would be used "primarily on foot patrol," where, he said, they would "make a difference in the prevention of crime." Mr. Murphy said he had "no idea" what proportion of the force is now on foot patrol, because the number changed from day to day.

Asked whether the police department was still having trouble recruiting men, the Commissioner said things had improved, but recruiting was still "not near where it should be."

The 391 recruits who were sworn in yesterday brought police strength up to 26,230, highest in police history. Despite this, the department is still 498 men below its quota of 26,728. That is the number of men that the city gives funds for.

Commissioner Murphy said he thought the recruiting picture would brighten because of additional benefits for policemen that make it an attractive job.

A police official said yesterday that recruiting efforts in minority-group neighborhoods had been intensified after the riots in Harlem and Bedford-Stuyvesant last summer. A visual check of the swearing-in ceremony yesterday indicated there were from 10 to 20 Negroes among the 391 recruits.

Mayor Wagner also announced yesterday that the transit police will begin new force deployments and new shift arrangements "to insure maximum protection of transit passengers at the times when, according to the statistics, maximum danger of crime and violence exists."

Among the other measures against subway crime listed by the mayor were a study by the transit authority of the feasibility of using two-way radios in change booths as well as in motormen's cabs, and a "campaign of public education" to persuade passengers to wait for trains near the change booths late at night.

A TA spokesman said he did not know how long the change-booth idea had been studied. He said he could give no definite information about how and when the educational campaign would be undertaken.

"Through these and other means which we are not prepared to disclose," said Mr. Wagner, "we hope to make our subways increasingly safe, with the end in view of making them absolutely safe."

Mayor Wagner mentioned crime statistics published last week that showed that major crime in the city rose by 9 percent in 1964, compared to 1963, and that major crimes in the subways rose by 52 percent during the same period.

He noted, however, that New York City's 9-percent increase was "less than other major cities," and that New York ranked 10th or lower among cities in the Nation in the categories of robbery, rape, felonious assault, narcotics offenses and manslaughter.

Because New York has a "mixed racial and ethnic composition," he said, the city "ought to have the greatest tensions, and, hence, crime. But it doesn't. Perhaps we ought to be a little proud of that."

But, the mayor said, "there are aspects of the rising crime rate which must give us all great concern and anxiety." He cited "the brutal violence that accompanies many crimes today," the fact that many of the brutal crimes are committed by teenagers, and the "deeply disturbing" increase in major subway crime.

Mr. Wagner said the city does not expect policemen "to be able, by themselves to wipe out crime in New York City." He said the crime problem and "deep, deep roots," which would have to be attacked as a long-range job.

The mayor told the recruits that the public expects policemen not only to prevent crime and catch criminals, but to be "polite, gracious, friendly and helpful, even under conditions of the greatest stress and strain."

He said the recruits must learn not only to "apply the necessary effective force to punks, hoodlums, and criminals," but also to protect the rights of all citizens regardless of race, creed or faith, without discrimination on any ground whatsoever.

The recruits will begin training today at the new police academy, opened last year.

STATE TO CITY: INSTALL AIR POLLUTION WARNING SYSTEM

(By Richard L. Madden)

ALBANY.—"Public interest and concern over the deterioration of the quality of air being breathed in New York City is mounting. All public agencies can do no less than be prepared to take action in the event of an emergency based on sound information."

That warning came yesterday from State Health Commissioner Hollis S. Ingraham in announcing that New York City will be asked to install a permanent air pollution warning system—or else face the loss of about $465,000 in annual State aid for air pollution control.

The city's existing temporary air monitoring system in operation since last October "cannot provide adequate information for taking either legal or voluntary action in the event of a serious buildup of air contamination over the city of New York," said Dr. Ingraham, who is also chairman of the State air pollution control board.

Arthur J. Benline, the city's commissioner of air pollution control, said in a telephone interview that he was "in accord" with the State's request for a permanent warning system.

The city, Mr. Benline observed, has been advocating such a system for the entire metropolitan area since 1961.

He also suggested that the State do more in the control of air pollution by dropping its restriction under which the State pays up to 50 percent of the $1 million of pollution control costs. The city wants the estate to pay half the cost, no matter how much is spent.

As for Dr. Ingraham's comments about the "deterioration" of the air over New York City, Mr. Benline said: "It's not only the air over New York City alone. The air over Hoboken and Yonkers and elsewhere is the same—it's the air over the metropolitan area rather than just New York City." He said:

"Calling it New York City's air is a terrible misnomer."

In his statement, Dr. Ingraham said the State would ask the city to install at least five additional air monitoring systems, one for each borough, as "a minimum network."

The alert system would use weather analysis and monitor the air on an "around-the-clock" basis to provide advance warning of serious air contamination that could endanger public health.

The initial cost of the system was estimated at $115,000, and would be split 50–50 by the city and State. At present the city has air monitoring equipment at six locations, plus a laboratory, but the equipment at each place is not complete.

Yesterday's order stemmed from a request by Governor Rockefeller that the State Control Board work with the New York City and New Jersey officials to establish an interstate air pollution warning system. The announcement said that procedures would be established for joint action.

The New York-New Jersey Cooperative Committee on Interstate Air Pollution recommended last September that both States launch an immediate interstate warning system but the committee has been hampered by lack of funds.

Under the proposed warning system, the affected areas would be asked to voluntarily cut back on pollution if sulphur dioxide, carbon monoxide and suspended dust reached high levels. If the danger increased, then limitations would be enforced, such as curfews on lighting and heating similar to wartime brownouts.

MURDER IN ALABAMA

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Gonzalez] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, Archbishop Robert E. Lucey, of San Antonio, Tex., a close and dear friend of mine, has for many years been a leader in the fight for social justice and civil rights. The progress made by the people of San Antonio, a southern city, is due to the leadership, wisdom, and humanity of persons like Archbishop Lucey. San Antonio is an integrated community. It is a mixture and a melting pot of people and cultures: Mexican, Anglo, Negro, Greek, Jewish, and Italian, among others. Problems remain, to be sure, but we are proving that a city in the South can integrate successfully and harmoniously.

Several days ago, Archbishop Lucey delivered a speech which has, especially today, a sad and prophetic ring, "Murder in Alabama." This statement, together with the actions of a good number of San Antonians who demonstrated in a march to the Alamo on March 9 in sympathy with the civil rights efforts in Alabama, show how far brotherly love can go in a southern community when it is encouraged and displayed by the civic and religious leaders.

With unanimous consent I am inserting in the Record a copy of Archbishop Lucey's speech, "Murder in Alabama," and a news story from the Alamo Messenger, March 19, 1965, "Localities Respond to Call of Race Trouble in Selma":

[From the Alamo Messenger, Mar. 19, 1965]

Murder in Alabama

(By Archbishop Robert E. Lucey)

In view of the atrocities perpetrated in Alabama last week and considering the worldwide indignation aroused by the tyranny of the State government there, it is well that we calm down for a moment and analyze the situation. To put ghastly despotism in proper focus let us consider some statements of the immortal Pope John XXIII in "Pacem in Terris."

"From the fact that human beings are by nature social there arises the right of assembly and association.

"If a man becomes conscious of his rights he must become equally aware of his duties. Thus he who possesses certain rights has likewise the duty to claim those rights as marks of his dignity, while all others have the obligation to acknowledge those rights and respect them.

"Those who have authority in the state may oblige men in conscience only if their authority is intrinsically related with the authority of God and shares in it. By this principle the dignity of the citizens is protected. When, in fact, men obey their rulers it is not at all as men that they obey them, but through their obedience it is God whom they reverence.

"Since the right to command is required by the moral order and has its source in God it follows that if civil authorities pass laws or command anything opposed to the moral order and consequently contrary to the will of God, neither the laws made nor the authorizations granted can be binding on the consciences of the citizens since God has more right to be obeyed than men."

The pontiff here quotes St. Thomas Aquinas who declares that civil law must correspond to right reason and insofar as it falls short of right reason it is not true law but a kind of violence.

The holy father then continues: "It must not be concluded, however, because authority comes from God, that therefore men have no right to choose those who are to rule the state, decide the form of government, and determine both the way in which authority is to be exercised and its limits."

This concept of political morality is refreshing because it sustains the dignity of man and recognizes his surpassing destiny. The citizen must be free. If human reason defends the state from treason it protects the people from tyranny.

In contrast, here is the philosophy of the segregationist: The state can do no wrong, the laws of the legislature bind in conscience; the decrees of the governor must always be obeyed.

The situation in Alabama is complex and involved. Many white citizens there have hated Negroes so deeply and so long that their thinking is perverted and words have lost their meaning. For example, the word "demonstrators" means colored people defying the sovereignty of the State, taking the law into their own hands, causing civil disorder, and endangering human life. Actually the Negroes were engaged in a peaceful march; it was State troopers, mounted police, and white neurotics who did the rioting.

A Negro has been murdered; many have been injured. Law enforcement officers used clubs, tear gas, and horses to subdue the freedom marchers. The police power of the State was used not to protect human rights but to destroy them. The semiofficial Vatican daily L'Osservatore Romano declared that discrimination is morally wrong and is being maintained in Alabama by bestial and uncivilized tactics.

Fortunately the voice of religion has been heard in Selma. Protestant ministers, Jewish rabbis and Catholic priests have gone there from many parts of the Nation to give witness to the faith that is in them and to play a vital role in a magnificent adventure in brotherhood. And Catholic Sisters, God bless them, marched down the streets of Selma giving testimony to the charity of Christ in deed and in truth. The conscience of America has revolted against the atrocities of Selma and the brutal denial of freedom.

After all this some Catholics will probably still maintain that civil law is sacred; priests should be the first to obey; they should stay home and be quiet. If some law is unwise let the laity clean it up. Priests should be docile, meek and humble of heart. Demonstrations are undignified.

These Catholics should recall that our Lord demonstrated vigorously one day even in the temple where He found men selling oxen, sheep and doves. He also saw moneychangers at their tables. And making a whip of cords He drove them all out of the temple. He even drove out the sheep and oxen. Then He poured out the money of the changers and overturned their tables. And He said: "My house is a house of prayer but you have made it a den of thieves." Using a whip on scoundrels seems to be much more vigorous than a peaceful march.

If it is wrong to defy an unjust law the leaders of the American Revolution were traitors to the crown and Benedict Arnold was a saint.

Localities Respond to Call of Race Trouble in Selma

Father Sherrill Smith, one of two San Antonio priests who marched in the civil rights demonstrations March 9 in Selma, returned to that troubled Alabama city this week to represent Archbishop Lucey at a memorial service for the Rev. James Reeb, slain Unitarian minister.

Dr. Martin Luther King, leader of the drive to gain voting rights for Negroes in Alabama, and Mathew Ahmann, executive director of the National Conference for Interracial Justice, requested Archbishop Lucey to attend the services.

Reverend Reeb, 38, of Boston, died of a skull fracture in a Montgomery, Ala., hospital following a brutal beating by four white men in Selma. The Unitarian minister, the father of four children, had participated in the short-lived March 9 demonstration.

Father Smith returned to Selma March 15 after participating in a solemn procession in honor of Reverend Reeb through downtown San Antonio. Father Lawrence Murtagh, the other local priest who joined the march in Selma, also led the procession along with Charles Watkins, local representative for CORE.

Approximately 400 Negroes and whites—Catholics, Protestants, and Jews—marched from the city hall to the Alamo where a memorial service was conducted for the deceased Unitarian minister.

Catholics were well represented in the procession, including some 20 priests, about 25 sisters from 5 religious orders, several seminarians, and scores of laymen.

Father John Wagner, executive secretary of the Bishops' Committee for the Spanish Speaking, opened the memorial service at the Alamo with a prayer. Praising Father Smith and Murtagh for "carrying the cross of human rights" in Selma, Father Wagner hoped their example will make it easier for others "who come after us." He asked that all have patience to "struggle with the future" and that "we never quit the eternal fight for justice."

Richard L. Dockery, local president of the NAACP chapter, presented the two priests with citations from the NAACP. The priests were honored for advancing the cause of human rights in Selma. Making the presentation, Dockery said the pair placed their lives on the line in Selma for human rights.

Father Smith, expressing appreciation for the citation, said he did not consider himself a hero for going to Selma. "The people in Selma are the real heroes because they are struggling daily for their rights," the priest declared. "Some of us are really Johnny-come-latelies."

Father Smith, like the other 500 ministers who joined in the March 9 demonstration, said he was also frightened on that day, but he prayed the march would lead to a breakthrough for civil rights.

After the march was halted and the demonstrators returned to a Baptist Church, Father Smith said that he was noticeably moved as the demonstrators began to sing "We Shall Overcome," the song of the civil rights movement.

The priest said he was aware of the "goodness, the peace, the love—that was always there. This is what we were trying to teach them (the troopers); that love is stronger than hate. Here (in Selma) is the gentle Christ suffering violence for love, for hope, for without the violence there would be no hope, or would there be hope of hope. It was then that I was certain that we, in fact, shall overcome."

Father Murtagh was outspoken in his views on the racial situation. He compared the suffering of the Negroes in Selma with the atrocities inflicted upon the Jews by the Nazis in Germany in 1938 and 1939.

However, the priest, an assistant pastor at Espada Mission parish, said the racial conflict was not limited to Selma. "When I returned to San Antonio from Alabama I picked up the newspaper and saw a real estate advertisement (which read) 'For colored'."

Then, telling of the discrimination the Latin Americans and the Negroes have encountered in San Antonio, Father Murtagh declared, "We must break up the northside so all races can live there equally." A British subject, the priest promised the minority group members present at the service, "I will never become an American citizen until you can walk with me equally."

The Reverend William DeWolfe, Unitarian minister, delivered the eulogy for Reverend Reeb. "Let us honor the memory of this martyr," he said, "who left us with a task of securing justice, liberty, and human rights for all our citizens."

Reverend DeWolfe urged the gathering to flood our Nation's Capital with letter upon letter calling for legislation guaranteeing voting rights, fair housing and employment and just wages. He called on the clergymen and nuns to recognize Reverend Reeb's meaningful sacrifice so they, too, can make our Nation the type of land that we want it to be.

THE SHAME OF THE FARM LABOR CAMPS

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr Speaker, the truth will out, and now it is out about the farm labor camps where braceros used to work and where Americans now work. Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz went to California to see for himself the farm labor camps where fruit is supposed to be rotting for lack of peons to pick it. Yesterday morning Secretary Wirtz made a surprise early morning visit to one and the conditions he was able to observe were so bad that he was provoked to express his shock and disgust. After viewing the miserable conditions that farm laborers are forced to work in, he said:

> It makes me ashamed that anything of this kind exists in this country.

And later he said:

> The place is filthy. As for the food—it was a wonder that anyone would eat it.

These sorry conditions, which Mr. Wirtz has now seen with his own eyes, underline what I have been saying about the need to terminate the bracero program for more than 2 years: Americans are perfectly willing to do so-called stoop labor but they do not want to do it for stoop wages and under stoop conditions.

Americans should not have to be treated like serfs. Americans have a right to decent wages and decent working conditions.

With unanimous consent I am inserting a story from today's Washington Post by Frank C. Porter describing Mr. Wirtz's visit to a large farm labor camp in California. This labor camp, in which about 200 men work, is one of 55 operated in California and Arizona by the same plantation owner:

WIRTZ CITES "SHAME" AT FARM LABOR CAMPS

(By Frank C. Porter)

FRESNO, CALIF., March 25.—Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz made a surprise visit to a farm labor camp near Salinas at dawn today and said "it makes me ashamed that anything of this kind exists in this country."

"The place is filthy," he told newsmen later. "As for the food—it was a wonder that anyone would eat it."

With less than 5 hours' sleep, the Secretary arose at 5:30 a.m. to pay the unannounced visit about the time the workers were finishing breakfast and leaving for the fields.

He was accompanied only by four aids.

Wirtz's trip followed a night session with leading spokesmen of the canning industry who told the Secretary they plan to move their operations to Mexico unless they receive Federal "assurance" of an adequate labor supply for growers.

Wirtz protested the "unfortunate overtones" of the request that he clear up the "uncertainty" that they said overhangs the farm labor situation in California.

It was nearly midnight when a delegation of the State's top canners, food processors, bankers, transport executives, and a Teamsters Union official wound up their high-pressure arguments for importation of Mexican braceros.

Public Law 78, which permitted the entry of these workers, expired December 31.

Growers in California and elsewhere contend that insufficient Americans are available or willing to tend and harvest the crops. They are asking for assurances that Wirtz will exercise his authority under immigration law (Public Law 414) to certify importation of farm workers in those particular cases where domestic labor is unavailable at fair pay and working conditions.

Wirtz is in the midst of a 4-day tour of California's rich farming valleys to determine firsthand if the need for braceros exists and if the standards for domestic workers are being met.

The camp that so upset Wirtz houses some 200 field hands and is one of 55 operated in California and Arizona by C. W. Englund, the biggest farm labor housing and feeding contractor in the States.

Reached at his Salinas office after Wirtz had flown to Fresno for a meeting with more growers and worker representatives, Englund strongly denied that his camp No. 1 was filthy or that the food was unpalatable.

He said that field hands in work clothes tramping in and out of bunkhouses and the messhalls are bound to create "some disorder" and track in some dirt. But the dormitories are swept and cleaned by camp employees each morning after the workers leave for the fields and the kitchen is scrubbed down after every meal, he said.

Englund told the Washington Post that inspectors from the Labor Department in Monterey County had visited the camp and found it up to standards.

His camp manager said the men were served hotcakes with butter, fresh eggs, oatmeal, coffee and bread this morning.

Wirtz also visited two other camps. One, a small grower-operated facility, was even worse than the Englund camp, he said. The other, maintained by Grower Bruce Church, was "spic and span" and the food appeared appetizing, the Secretary added.

"It is dead clear to me," Wirtz said with feeling aboard an Air Force plane, that camps such as the Englund camp "have a severely depressing effect on the hiring and use of workers."

Since he began the trip in Sacramento early yesterday, Wirtz has been told time and again that Americans won't perform stoop labor in the fields no matter how high pay and working conditions are raised.

"When they've got to get down there in that ground, you're just not going to get any [domestic workers]," William G. (Dud) Keyon, west coast Teamsters official, told the Washington Post.

On the other side of the fence is the Reverend James Vizzard, a longtime partisan of farm labor and director of the Washington office of the National Catholic Rural Life Conference. Out here to recover from a recent illness, he joined the group following Wirtz yesterday.

"The most urgent need here is a stable work force," says Father Vizzard. "I've done stoop labor myself, it's not that bad. You have to offer incentive."

WESTERN EUROPEAN REACTION TO THE ARAB BOYCOTT

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. JOELSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, business circles in the United States are not alone in condemning the disgraceful trade restrictions of the Arab boycott. It is encouraging to note that elements in other major trading nations are taking a stand against the boycott.

The distinguished and influential Swiss newspaper Neue Zurcher Zeitung recently published a rebuke to the boycott. The Zurich daily, which traditionally reflects the opinion of the Swiss business community, applauded companies that resist the boycott as follows:

> The fearless attitude of firms which have refused to become involved in the Arab boycott has also produced a positive political result, in that economic tensions in the Near East have been reduced and that a campaign conducted by the Arab States with a view to maintaining a politically unstable situation has been discredited—the degree to which the Arab boycott is successful depends largely on the stand taken by the firms chosen as targets for Arab threats.

The Swiss newspaper called on business firms to take an ethical as well as a commercial stand against the boycott:

> It is hardly likely that a firm which is anxious to safeguard its freedom of action in business—and which does not base its conduct purely and simply on the principle of coldblooded economic calculations but takes ethical considerations into account as well—would allow itself to be put under pressure by clumsy methods of this kind.

The Zurich paper exposed the phantom nature of the Arab boycott in this manner:

> The boycott of Israel by Arab countries does not present a uniform picture * * * it is colored by the specific nationalist and chauvinist interests of individual Arab countries. The procedure is not therefore hamstrung by any rigid principles for an "all-Arab" boycott. This point should be borne in mind by any firm which finds itself in the firing line of Arab boycott activities * * * threatening letters from the central office in Damascus, followed by similar letters from the regional organization in Alexandria, Kuwait or Beirut may easily give the impression of the beginning of a concentrated attack, while in reality they are only a sign of lack of coordination * * * the Arab countries themselves have very frequently yielded to the temptations of economic advantage.
>
> The sacrifice of the idea of the boycott in favor of economic advantage shows that the attitude of the Arab countries in regard to trade with Israel is—to some extent at least—mere bluff which is only likely to deceive firms that are unable to see through this humbug. There are, in fact, a number of firms which have ignored the insinuations of the Arabs and are still working with Israel and the Arab States simultaneously without any difficulties.

Because of its strong and sensible position on the Arab boycott I am offering for insertion in the RECORD a translation of the article.

THE ARAB BOYCOTT AGAINST ISRAEL

Israel is still at war with the Arab States. There is indeed no open fighting, but frontier incidents are continually casting flashes of summer lightning over the grim political scene in the Near East, and act as a constant reminder that the young State of Israel is still surrounded by an enemy hinterland and that the armistice rests on a fragile basis. For some time, the Arab States have transferred their activities to the economic front: banning of Israel vessels and merchandise from the Suez Canal, publication of blacklists of firms maintaining economic relations with Israel, threats to boycott firms intending to establish contacts with Israel. The efforts made by the Arab States to prevent Israel from carrying out its most important irrigation project must also be placed in the same category. The economic war has laws of its own: the tactics are designed to achieve the strategic objective of undermining the economic foundations of the enemy, obstructing his economic consolidation and development and thereby indirectly reducing his military striking force.

The forms taken by the economic war which the Arab countries are waging against Israel vary widely: they range from openly declared boycott through subversive agitation to defamation and threatening letters. They cover a field of action which ranges from the establishment of blacklists of firms which refuse to be influenced by Arab threats and goes as far as official diplomatic intervention, as in the case of the German reparation agreement or the pressure brought to bear on the European Economic Community. These tactics are, of course, concealed behind a massive propaganda smokescreen in which all the modern means of communication now at the disposal of the Arab countries are used. As the unsuccessful kidnapping affair in Italy focused the limelight of publicity for a brief moment on the "methods" used in the jungle of the secret services, so also the economic war "techniques" employed by the Arab countries in the twilight of illegality have from time to time been exposed before a wider public. The Norwich Union affair, the threats against the Chase Manhattan Bank (New York) and the Kamil case in Switzerland are only three examples from a list which is already considerable in length. Swiss firms are by no means immune from these regrettable attempts at blackmail.

BLACKMAIL METHODS

The most recent known attempt at blackmail against a firm established in Switzerland concerns Ring Hotel, Ltd., Basel. This case is typical of the methods used. The letter from the Arab Boycott Office, with a singular lack of diplomatic tact asked for replies to all the following questions, certified by a notary public:

"Have you any share in the financing of hotels in Israel? Do you, or your subsidiary companies, maintain agencies in Israel? Do you or your subsidiary companies hold shares in Israel? Have you or your subsidiary companies given technical assistance to Israel in any form? Have you or your subsidiary companies undertaken to represent any Israel firms? Does your firm, or any of your subsidiary companies, belong to a chamber of commerce in Israel?"

"Satisfactory answers" are requested to these questions, which are tantamount to an "economic inquisition"; failing this, the boycott office would be obliged "with great regret" to "recommend" the Arab countries to take specific countermeasures. The procedure adopted by the boycott office is comprehensive, direct, and somewhat unsubtle in form, and for this reason alone one would expect its effect to be considerably diminished. It is hardly likely that a firm which is anxious to safeguard its freedom of action in business—and which does not base its conduct purely and simply on the principle of coldblooded economic calculations but takes ethical considerations into account as well—would allow itself to be put under pressure by clumsy methods of this kind.

These isolated events are part of a system which is directed by the Arab Boycott Office in Damascus. This organization is unofficial but is responsible to the Economic Council of the Arab League. Regional committees exist in all the Arab countries, but they are subject to instructions from their national governments and are obliged to accept recommendations only from the regional office in Damascus. The organizational structure of this institution is sufficient in itself to give a clear indication of the lines on which it is working, even though the Egyptian regional committee, for instance, is subordinate to the Ministry of War and the Iraqi regional committee to the Ministry for Foreign Affairs.

These regional differences explain why the boycott of Israel by Arab countries does not present a uniform picture and why, rather, it is colored by the specific nationalist and chauvinist interests of individual Arab countries. The procedure is not therefore hamstrung by any rigid principles for an "all-Arab" boycott. This point should be borne in mind by any firm which finds itself in the firing line of Arab boycott activities. In fact, threatening letters from the central office in Damascus, followed by similar letters from the regional organizations in Alexandria, Kuwait, or Beirut may easily give the impression of the beginning of a concentrated attack, while in reality they are only a sign of lack of coordination.

Though the means used are massive, the effect of the Arab boycott has so far been relatively modest. It might, on the contrary, be argued that the Arab boycott has encouraged the Israeli people to make exceptional efforts in the economic field and that Israel's isolation from its natural hinterland has liberated energies which have made a decisive contribution to its economic growth. Awareness of the fact that, even on the edge of a political volcano, it is still possible to create political stability, with the added support of a viable and sound economy, may have acted as a powerful stimulus in Israel. The effect of the pioneering spirit has been intensified, rather than weakened, by the Arab threat. There is a variety of evidence to show that this is true—the most obvious indication, perhaps, being the intensive development of the Israeli merchant fleet. The main victim has been trade between Israel and the Arab countries, from which the latter could undoubtedly have profited in their efforts to promote the economic development of their territories. On the other hand, the main objective of causing serious damage to the Israeli economy has not been achieved.

POSITIVE EFFECTS OF TAKING A FIRM STAND

This is due to no small extent to inconsistency and equivocation in the attitude of the Arabs themselves. It has not been possible to provide the boycott with the fundamental principles of a "doctrine" which has to be followed at all costs. On the contrary, the Arab countries themselves have very frequently yielded to the temptations of economic advantage. The sacrifice of the idea of the boycott in favor of economic advantage shows that the attitude of the Arab countries in regard to trade with Israel is—to some extent at least—mere bluff which is only likely to deceive firms that are unable to see through this humbug. There are, in fact, a number of firms which have ignored the insinuations of the Arabs and are still working with Israel and the Arab States simultaneously without any difficulties. Accordingly, the degree to which the Arab boycott is successful depends largely on the stand taken by the firms chosen as targets for Arab threats. A firm which can perform useful services for the Arab countries is hardly likely to be put on the blacklist because it maintains relations with Israel as well. A typical example is the case of the airline companies serving both Israel and the Arab States, which did not allow themselves to be deterred by the initial difficulties they encountered in opening up their airlines in these territories, due to Arab resistance.

The fearless attitude of firms which have refused to become involved in the Arab boycott has also produced a positive political result, in that economic tensions in the Near East have been reduced and that a campaign conducted by the Arab States with a view to maintaining a politically unstable situation has been discredited. By adopting this attitude, the private economy is at the same time remedying a situation which is at variance with the spirit and the letter of the GATT Agreement. GATT itself has not yet gone so far as to issue any official condemnation of the Arab boycott, although Egypt—as an associate member of GATT—has undertaken to observe the principles set forth in the GATT statute.

SECRETARY DILLON'S TAX CUT PROPOSAL

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, in an address before the Bankers' Association, Secretary Dillon has proposed an additional cut in income taxes, with the stated purpose of favoring people in the low tax brackets.

His proposal can be put into effect by a simple measure which I have been advocating for some time. Return the personal exemption figure from $600 to $1,000, where it was before the war. The $600 exemption was adopted as a purely temporary measure to meet war needs. The war is over. Put the exemption back where it belongs.

This simple change would benefit most of all the people the Secretary wants to help. It would mean an immediate tax cut of approximately $56 for each dependent on the taxpayer's list. The cut would remove thousands of low-income families from the taxpaying lists entirely. Internal Revenue would benefit by saving the work needed to check out returns which bring in only a few dollars revenue each.

The simplicity and commonsense of this way of carrying out the Secretary's proposal should commend itself to the committees of the House responsible for tax legislation. I urge its serious consideration by all Members.

A byproduct of this form of tax cut might well be the retention of low-wage earners on payrolls, and off relief rolls. The low-income worker sees a considerable portion of his wages swallowed up by taxes. He is discouraged and tempted to give up the struggle and go on relief. The cut may be just the incentive needed to keep him on the job, instead of becoming a burden to society. I am placing my suggestion before the Ways and Means Committee, and bringing it to the attention of the administration.

BILL TO INCREASE COMPENSATION OF OVERSEA TEACHERS

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill which would raise the basic compensation of our oversea teachers to the level of that enjoyed by teachers here in the Nation's Capital. In the Nation's 10th largest school system, serving approximately 160,000 children of our military abroad, almost 7,000 oversea educators remain grossly underpaid. The lamentable fact is that these teachers who, in order to qualify for the job, were required to have 2 years of previous teaching experience and a college diploma are paid about the same as a civil service grade 4 stenographer who must have only a high school education.

Since 1959, when oversea teachers were removed from the GS scale by the Defense Department Oversea Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act, they have received a pay increase averaging only 6 percent. During the same period of time, Federal classified employees' salaries have been increased an average of 17 percent. To be sure, our oversea teachers have been the subjects of a blatant injustice.

Since it has refused to raise the teachers' pay while boosting everyone else's salaries, Congress is to blame for this inequity. And it is the Congress that must correct it.

The needs of American employees abroad must not be overlooked, and the oversea teachers need our help and support.

I call on my colleagues to support me in passing this needed legislation.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation which will be known as the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965.

We are all familiar with the fine work accomplished through Federal-State cooperation under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. I think most of us are also aware of the need for expansion and improvement of the vocational rehabilitation program.

The amendments I have introduced today are designed to make some of these improvements and to expand the program to meet some of those needs which are unmet today.

Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following section-by-section analysis of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965:

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965 SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1, short title: This section provides that the act may be cited as the "Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965."

Section 2, determination of vocational rehabilitation potential: (a) This subsection would replace the obsolete transition provisions in section 12 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act with provisions authorizing a new program of grants to States for vocational rehabilitation evaluation services to determine rehabilitation potential.

Under subsection (a)(1)(A) of the amended section 12, from the sums available for any fiscal year for grants to States to assist them in meeting the costs of providing vocational rehabilitation evaluation services each State would be allotted an amount which bears the same ratio to such sums as the product of its population and its allotment percentage (as defined in section 11(h)) bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

Under subsection (a)(1)(B) of the amended section 12, each State would be assured a minimum allotment of $5,000 for each fiscal year, or such other amount as may be specified as a minimum allotment in the appropriation act for that year. The amount necessary to provide each State with the minimum allotment would be derived by proportionately reducing the allotments of States having been allotted more than the minimum.

Subsection (a)(2) of the amended section 12 provides for reallotment of any part of a State's allotment not required by that State.

Subsection (b)(1) of the amended section 12 provides that the Secretary shall pay, out of each State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fixed year the Federal share, or 75 percent, in the case of any State which provides assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that its expenditures from State or local sources for vocational rehabilitation services under its plan (except for expenditures pursuant to section 3) will not be less than such expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, of the State's costs of providing vocational rehabilitation evaluation services to substantially handicapped individuals (including costs of administration) under the State's plan.

Subsection (b)(2) of the amended section 12 precludes dual payment with respect to any cost.

Subsection (c) of the amended section 12 defines "vocational rehabilitation evaluation services" to mean those services provided to any individual under a physical or mental disability constituting a substantial handicap to employment, during the period determined in accordance with regulations of the Secretary to be necessary for, and for the purpose of, ascertaining whether it may reasonably be expected that such an individual will be rendered fit to engage in a remunerative occupation through the provision of vocational rehabilitation services, and which would constitute vocational rehabilitation services if his disability were of such a nature that he would be a physically handicapped individual; however, the period during which evaluation services could be provided could not exceed 18 months for individuals who are mentally retarded or who have some other disability designated by the Secretary, or 6 months for any other disabled individual; and the services that could be provided could not include placement services, management services, and supervision for any business, the acquisition or provision of tools, vending stands or other equipment, stocks, or supplies for use in any business or remunerative occupation, or the establishment of rehabilitation facilities or workshops.

(b) and (c) These subsections would amend section 1 of the Vocational Rehabilitation act to authorize appropriations for grants to States under section 12 to assist them in meeting the costs of vocational rehabilitation evaluation services, and would amend references in sections 1 and 5 of the act to the section 2 or section 3 grant programs so that they would also refer to the new section 12 program.

(d) This subsection would make the amendments made by the preceding subsections effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1966.

Section 3, construction of rehabilitation facilities; workshop improvement; experimental projects; removal of architectural barriers: This section would redesignate section 13 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act as section 17, and would insert after section 12 the following new sections:

Section 13, grants for construction of rehabilitation facilities and workshops: Subsection (a) would authorize the Secretary, for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1965, to make grants to assist in meeting the costs of construction of public or other nonprofit workshops and rehabilitation facilities.

Subsection (b) provides that, in order to be approved, an application for a grant for a construction project must contain or be supported by reasonable assurances that the facility will be used for the purposes for which constructed for at least 10 years after completion of construction, that sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal share of the facility's cost of construction and to meet the cost of operating the facility, and that minimum standards of construction and equipment will be complied with. The application must also be approved by the State agency, and must contain or be supported by reasonable assurances that laborers or mechanics employed in the construction will be paid prevailing wages.

Subsection (c) provides that the amount of a grant under this section shall be equal to the same percentage of the cost of the project as the Federal share determined for rehabilitation facilities (as defined in sec. 625(g) of the Public Health Service Act) in the State; except that if the State elects to provide for variations in the Federal share among projects under subparagraph (A) of section 625(b)(1) of the Public Health Service Act, the percentage of the cost shall be determined in accordance with regulations of the Secretary designed to achieve results comparable to the results obtained under that subparagraph.

Subsection (d) provides that upon approval of any application for a construction grant the Secretary shall reserve the amount of the grant, and may pay the amount reserved in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine.

Subsection (e) provides that if, within 10 years after completion of any workshop or facility for which funds have been paid under this section, the facility shall cease to be a public or other nonprofit workshop or rehabilitation facility, the United States may recover from its owner the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value of the workshop or facility as the amount of the Federal participation in the cost of construction bore to the total cost of construction.

Subsection (f) would authorize the Secretary to make grants with respect to any workshop or rehabilitation facility for which a grant for a construction project has been made under this section to cover part of the costs of compensation of professional or technical personnel of such workshop or facility for 4 years and 3 months after the month in which the workshop or facility commenced operation. Such grants may not exceed 75 percent of these costs for the 15-month period following the month in which operation commenced, 60 percent of such costs for the first year thereafter, 45 percent of such costs for the second year thereafter, and 30 percent of such costs for the third year thereafter.

Subsection (g) would authorize the Secretary to make grants to the State agency to assist in meeting the cost of determining the State's needs for workshops and rehabilitation facilities and, upon application approved by the State agency, to public or other nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations to assist them in meeting the costs of planning workshops and rehabilitation facilities and the services to be provided thereby.

Subsection (h) provides that payment of grants under subsection (f) or (g) may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine.

Subsection (i) would authorize appropriation of such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the next 4 fiscal years for carrying out this section, and provides that sums appropriated shall remain available for payment with respect to construction or staffing projects approved under this section prior to July 1, 1970.

Subsection (j) contains the following definitions:

(1) "Construction" is defined to include construction of new buildings and expansion, remodeling, alteration, and renovation of existing buildings, and initial equipment of such new, expanded, remodeled, altered, or renovated buildings.

(2) The "cost" of construction is defined to include the cost of architects' fees in connection with construction, but it does not include the cost of acquisition of land or off-site improvements.

(3) A project for construction of a workshop may include such construction as may be necessary to provide residential accommodations for use in connection with the rehabilitation of mentally retarded individuals.

Section 14, workshop improvement: This section would authorize, during the period beginning July 1, 1966, and ending June 30, 1971, grants to States and public and other nonprofit organizations and agencies to pay 75 percent of the cost of projects for providing training services to physically handicapped individuals in public or other nonprofit workshops. Training services would include training in occupational skills; related services, including work evaluation, work testing, occupational tools and equipment required by the individual to engage in training, and job tryouts; and payment of weekly allowances to individuals receiving training. Allowances could not be paid to any individual for more than 2 years and could not exceed, for any week, $25 plus $10 for each of the individual's dependents, or $65, whichever is less. In determining the amount of such allowance, consideration would be given to the individual's need for an allowance, including any expenses reasonably attributable to training, the extent to which an allowance would help assure entry into and satisfactory completion of training, and other factors as specified by the Secretary which would promote the individual's fitness to engage in a remunerative occupation. The Secretary would make a grant for such a project only after his determination that the purpose of the project is to prepare physically handicapped individuals for a remunerative occupation, that the individuals will be only those who have been determined to be suitable for and in need of such training services by the State agency or agencies designated in section 5(a)(1) of the State in which the workshop is located, that the full range of training services will be available to each such individual as needed, and that the project will meet such other requirements as the Secretary may prescribe. Payments could be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as determined by the Secretary, and on such conditions as he finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

Subsection (b) would authorize the Secretary to make grants to workshops during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the next 4 fiscal years to pay part of the cost of projects to analyze, improve, and increase their professional services to handicapped individuals, their business management, or any other part of their operations affecting their capacity to provide employment and services for handicapped individuals. Grants could not be used to pay costs of acquiring, constructing, expanding, remodeling, or altering any building. Payment of grants could be made in installments, in advance, or by way of reimbursement, on such conditions, as the Secretary finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

Subsection (c) would authorize the Secretary to provide technical assistance to workshops directly or by contract. It would also authorize compensation of experts or consultants employed in providing technical assistance at rates not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, plus travel expenses.

Subsection (d) would establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Policy and Performance Council, consisting of 12 members, appointed by the Secretary from among leaders in the vocational rehabilitation or workshop fields, State or local government, and business and from among representatives of related professions, labor leaders, and the general public. The Secretary would also appoint one of the members to serve as Chairman. Each member would hold office for a term of 4 years, except that, of the 12 members first appointed, 3 would hold office for a term of 3 years, 3 would hold office for a term of 2 years, and 3 would hold office for a term of 1 year, as designated by the Secretary at the time of appointment. None of the 12 members would be eligible for reappointment until a year elapsed after the end of his preceding term. The Council would advise the Secretary with respect to the policies and criteria to be used by him in determining whether or not to make grants for projects for training services under subsection (a), make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to workshop improvement and the extent to which this section is effective in accomplishing this purpose, and perform such other services with respect to workshops as the Secretary might request. The Secretary would provide the Council with appropriate technical, administrative, and other assistance, and members of the Council would receive compensation, while attending meetings or conferences or otherwise serving on Council business, at rates not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time, plus travel expenses.

Section 15, waiver of statewideness requirements for locally financed activity: Section 15 would authorize Federal participation in the cost of vocational rehabilitation services furnished as part of any activity which, in the Secretary's judgment, is likely to assist in promoting the vocational rehabilitation of substantially larger numbers of physically handicapped individuals or the vocational rehabilitation of individuals with particular types of disabilities, if the non-Federal share of the cost of such vocational rehabilitation services is met from local public funds (including, to the extent permitted by regulations, contributed funds) even though the activity is not in effect in all political subdivisions of the State, to the extent and for such period as may be provided in accordance with regulations prescribed by him.

Section 16, National Commission on Architectural Barriers to Rehabilitation of the Handicapped: Subsection (a) would establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Commission on Architectural Barriers to Rehabilitation of the Handicapped, consisting of the Secretary, or his designee, who would be Chairman, and not more than 15 members appointed by the Secretary and representative of the general public, and of private and professional groups having an interest in and able to contribute to the solution of architectural problems which impede the rehabilitation of handicapped individuals.

Subsection (b) would direct the Commission to determine how and to what extent architectural barriers impede access to or use of facilities in buildings of all types by handicapped persons; determine what is being done to eliminate such barriers from existing buildings and to prevent their incorporation into buildings constructed in the future; and prepare plans and proposals for such further action as may be necessary to achieve the goal of ready access to and full use of facilities in buildings of all types by handicapped persons.

Subsection (c) would authorize the Commission to appoint special advisory and technical experts and consultants, to establish committees, to make studies, and to contract for studies or demonstrations to assist it in performing its functions. The Secretary would make available to the Commission any necessary technical, administrative, and other assistance.

Subsection (d) provides that members of the Commission and special advisory and technical experts and consultants appointed by the Commission would receive compensation, while attending meetings or conferences or otherwise serving on Commission business, at rates not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time, plus travel expenses.

Subsection (e) would require the Commission to submit interim reports as requested by the Secretary and, prior to January 1, 1968, to submit a final report of its activities and recommendations to the Secretary for transmission by him together with his recommendations to the President and then to the Congress.

Subsection (f) would authorize the appropriation of $250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the next 2 fiscal years for carrying out the purposes of this section.

Section 4, duration of extension and improvement projects: This section would authorize Federal participation in extension and improvement projects under section 3 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act for a period not to exceed 5 years rather than 3 years as at present.

Section 5, special programs and comprehensive planning to expend vocational rehabilitation services:

Effective July 1, 1965, this section would renew temporary, expired authority in section 4(a)(2) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (which would become section 4(a)(2)(A)) for project grants to States and public and other nonprofit organizations and agencies for planning, preparing for, and initiating special programs to expand vocational rehabilitation services in those States where, in the judgment of the Secretary, such action holds promise of yielding a substantial increase in the number of persons vocationally rehabilitated. Sums appropriated for special programs to expand vocational rehabilitation services would remain available until the close of June 30, 1971, but no sums appropriated for grants under section 4 for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1970, would be available for such programs.

Section 5 would also add a new clause 2(B) to section 4(a) of the act, authorizing grants to States (not to exceed $50,000 for any State for any fiscal year) to meet the cost of planning for the development of a comprehensive vocational rehabilitation program in each State, with a view to achieving the orderly development of vocational rehabilitation services in the State, and making vocational rehabilitation services available to all physically handicapped individuals in the State by July 1, 1975. Sums appropriated for planning of comprehensive programs would remain available until the close of June 30, 1968, but no sums appropriated for grants under section 4 for any fiscal year beginning prior to July 1, 1965, or ending after June 30, 1967, would be available for such programs.

Section 6, raising of limitations on training: This section would replace existing 2-year time limitations (and exceptions thereto) on training in sections 4(a) and 7(a)(3) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act with 4-year limitations.

Section 7, research and information: This section would add a new subsection (c) to section 7 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to authorize the Secretary directly or by contract to conduct research, studies, investigations, and demonstrations, and to make reports, with respect to the abilities, aptitudes, and capacities of physically handicapped individuals, development of their potentialities, and their utilization in gainful and suitable employment. Similar, but less explicit authority in subsection (a) of section 7 would be deleted. New subsection (c) would also authorize the planning, establishment and operation of an information service to make information on rehabilitation resources, research, and other matters which may be helpful in promoting the rehabilitation and employment of physically handicapped individuals available to concerned groups and persons. There would be authorized appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each succeeding fiscal year, in such sums as might be necessary to carry out subsection (c).

Section 8, flexibility in State administration:

Subsection (a) of this section would amend paragraph (1) of section 5(a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, providing that a State vocational educational or rehabilitation agency may be designated to administer or supervise the administration of a State's plan for vocational rehabilitational services, to permit, in addition the designation of the State education agency, or of an agency which includes one or more of the major public health, public welfare, or labor programs of the State.

Subsection (a) of this section would also amend paragraph (2) of section 5(a) of the act, requiring that if the agency designated is a unit of a State vocational educational agency, the head of that unit be subject only to the supervision of that agency, to require, instead, that the unit of whatever agency is designated as the State agency have a full-time director, be staffed completely or substantially with personnel who work full time on vocational rehabilitation, and be located at an organizational level and have an organizational status comparable to that of other major units of the agency (or, if the State agency is a State education or vocational education agency, that the director of the unit be the executive officer of the agency).

Appropriate provision would be made in paragraphs (1) and (2) as amended to allow for separate administration of that part of the State plan that relates to services for the blind, as is now the case.

Subsection (c) of this section provides that the amendments that would be made by subsection (a) would be effective July 1, 1967, but would allow States that chose to do so to comply with the new provisions sooner.

Section 9, special services for the blind and the deaf: This section would amend section 11(a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, defining vocational rehabilitation services, to add reader services for physically handicapped individuals who are blind and interpreter services for such individuals who are deaf, regardless of economic need.

Section 10, management services and supervision of business enterprises of the disabled: This section would amend section 11(a)(7) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to include within the meaning of vocational rehabilitation services, for small businesses operated by severely handicapped individuals and whose operation can be improved by management services and supervision by the State agency, the provision of such services and supervision, either alone or together with the acquisition by the State agency of vending stands or other equipment and initial stocks and supplies for use in such businesses.

Section 11, technical amendment: This section would amend section 4(d)(3) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, authorizing compensation of members of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Rehabilitation at rates to be fixed by the Secretary but not to exceed $50 per day, plus travel expenses, to allow council members to be paid up to $100 per day plus travel expenses.

PRESIDENT JOHNSON AND THE KU KLUX KLAN

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, President Lyndon B. Johnson's utter and total condemnation of the Ku Klux Klan ought to be the final and ultimate end of this scabrous affliction on the American body politic. Here for once in language and tone and righteous anger, a President of the United States, in office and in the very pith and moment of one of the Nation's greatest struggles for civil liberties, speaks out against a wholly unrepresentative aspect of the American character. For me, as with the President, this is an evil that, even as an evil, is uncharacteristic of the American way of doing things wrong. To me the Ku Klux Klan is an ugly outburst of a species of fanaticism that is without warrant, without even the faintest semblance of courage or style or bravado or brazen lawlessness that some criminals at least pretend to exercise, and belongs, of course, like communism, on the list of subversive organizations in the catalog of the reprehensible compiled by the Attorney General of the United States.

What matters in this moment is not so much that the Ku Klux Klan is a noxious growth, run through with cowardice, concealment, violent crime, and unutterable hate, but that President Johnson has, I hope forever, given it its coup de grace. These words of the President on the Ku Klux Klan deserve a place in every home in the land where those who pride themselves on their Americanism can point to them when someone offers the philosophy of hate and violence, of prejudice and bigotry as a way of life. It may very well be that what the President has just so eloquently and finally said about the Ku Klux Klan may apply to other organizations seeking to crawl out from under the stones of dismal and damp hideaways underground to make money from the gullible and the misdirected, or to disseminate with a fanatical faith, the shibboleths of malice and mental distortion, running, as always, diametrically counter to the American sense of justice and decency.

Of course, President Johnson and his Texas forebears for generations have opposed and fought the Ku Klux Klan and, of course, the very mind and soul of a President, any President, and remarkably this one, feel that here is an unclean thing that disturbs the vast and powerful foundations of nobility upon which our Constitution and our laws are founded. It may be said that this stricture against the Ku Klux Klan by President Johnson may be classified as only a Presidential statement made under the ferocity of the struggle now enveloping the country domestically. But it is my point of view, rather, that this is a historic utterance, that it has its place among the major pronouncements of a President, and that its sincerity and restraint, its force and its conviction, give it a certain immortality worthy of a high place among the documents of our country.

FRIENDS MAGAZINE

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FARNUM] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, my attention has been called to a recent issue of Friends magazine, which is published in Southfield, Mich., by the CECO Publishing Co., a subsidiary of the Campbell-Ewald Co.

Although not for sale, Friends magazine is distributed by Chevrolet dealers and owners throughout the country and has a circulation of 2,400,000, which makes it the ninth largest monthly magazine in the United States.

Since its beginning in 1939, the magazine has received over 50 awards for excellence from professional, editorial, and advertising groups. It contains topics of general reader interest, including travel stories on geographic regions and historical points of interest.

The November issue of Friends magazine is devoted exclusively to the Nation's Capitol—Washington, D.C.—and to our American heritage.

The color photography and editorial material in this issue are truly outstanding. There is no question that it will provide potential visitors to the Capital with much valuable information and background to help make their trip more rewarding.

The CECO Publishing Co. is to be commended for this fine exercise in public information.

CONGRESS HAS OBLIGATION TO HALT BLOODSHED AND GRIEF

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, there is a vile sickness rampant in sections of this Nation. Some persons are so afflicted by it they have been driven mad.

Hate and violence are waging a continuous and all too successful war against reason and understanding.

A President of the United States is shot to death by a mad gunman.

The leader of a nationalistic religious sect is gunned down by dissident followers.

In California a group of political fanatics plot to destroy the character of an honored Member of the U.S. Senate.

In Alabama a minister is clubbed to death on a public street.

And last night, along a lonely stretch of highway near Montgomery, a depraved coward hid in ambush to assassinate a mother of five children whose only crime was the belief that the freedom and rights granted by our Constitution were granted to all citizens of the United States.

When will it end?

When will little children go to Sunday school and church secure in the knowledge that some mad bomber will not destroy them?

When will men of God be free to walk the public streets without fear of being clubbed to death?

When will the lawmakers of this Nation take notice of the breakdown of local responsibility wherever it may occur and come to the aid of those who are denied the protection of the law?

When will we have the courage to face the forces of hate and disperse them?

Hate is not self-sustaining. It must be fed to survive. It must grow or perish.

There are individuals and groups in this Nation today who profit by hate; who sow the seeds of hate and reap a black harvest of violence.

One of the vilest offenders of human rights and the Constitution of the United States is the Ku Klux Klan.

They speak of protecting their way of life. But they seek to destroy ours.

For too long this group of white-robed rednecks has wantonly intimidated, terrorized, and victimized law-abiding citizens of this Nation with their savage law of the jungle.

For too long the forces of moderation have remained silent; have permitted the nightriders and rednecks to rule with a fist of iron and a heart aflame with hate.

There are five children in Detroit tonight who will never again know their mother's love. There are mothers in Alabama who will never again hear the sweet voices of their murdered children.

Their grief is our grief and we share it with them. However, if we continue to neglect the source of this grief then we must share its responsibility also.

When duly constituted officials cannot or will not use the means, methods and powers granted them to maintain law and order, then the job is left to the Congress. It is one thing to rely on the President of the United States to send in Federal troops and marshals to quell rioting and protect citizens from a mob filled with hate; it is quite another thing for the Congress to sit by and do nothing to halt the merchants of hate who plot to incite these mobs.

The Congress has an obligation. Let us fulfill that obligation. Let us move to halt this bloodshed and grief.

The Ku Klax Klan should be thoroughly investigated by the Congress. If there is fear that the trouble is Communist inspired then this aspect should not escape exposure. The danger to this Nation's security is as great from either extreme.

Any organization which seeks by conspiracy, subterfuge or any method to deny any person of his rights or life should be exposed and prosecuted.

The trust placed in us by those we represent requires action now.

The public safety of this Nation requires action.

The conscience of this Nation demands action now.

Assassination in the United States must cease.

EDUCATION BILL

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, while I realize that this bill is highly controversial, and apparently is involved in partisan politics, I have listened with great interest to the debate and have considered all of the problems and implications involved, and have tried to the best of my ability to reach a decision which I can only hope will meet with the approval of those whom I have the honor to represent. I have discussed the provisions of the bill with many of my colleagues here in the House, including members of the committee and with educators in my own district and State and with the superintendent of public instruction and other officials of the State of North Carolina. I have discussed the provisions of the bill with officials of the North Carolina Education Association and with the U.S. Commissioner of Education. Notwithstanding all of this, the bill is still controversial, and it has been difficult for me to make up my own mind. But, taking everything into consideration, I have decided that I should vote in favor of the bill. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, and I can assure my colleagues and my constituents that I have not been subjected to pressure, nor have I even been "lobbied" by the "administration," nor any other person, association, or organization. I have tried to face the issue forthrightly.

We all know that this bill presents problems which are perplexing and problems, ramifications and implications which are still, even at this moment, very controversial. As strange as it may seem, I do not recall that I have received a single letter or other communication from any one of my constituents in opposition to this bill. Not a single educator in my district or State has advised me that the bill is unreasonable, un-American or unconstitutional. All of the communications I have received have actually been in favor of the passage of the bill.

Much has been said about state and church aspects of the measure. Yet, I have not received a single letter from a single minister of any denomination in my district or my State, nor have I received a single letter from a lawyer from my district or my State in opposition to the measure.

Under the pending bill, only New York, California, Texas, and Pennsylvania will receive more money than will be received by North Carolina. This clearly indicates the great need in our State. Under the circumstances, after listening to the debate, studying the bill, and discussing it with those involved in our State and with those who will administer the bill, I decided that I would have to make up my own mind and do the best I could to represent the people of my district and my State.

I have discussed the matter with the U.S. Commissioner of Education and I have been assured by him that the several States will be requested to submit uniform programs and that we will not have a "crazy quilt" of educational programs in any one of the States. The Commissioner has great faith and confidence in our superintendent of public instruction, Dr. Charles F. Carroll, and in the board of education of our State and he has assured me that the recommendations of the superintendent of public instruction and the Board of Education of North Carolina will receive every possible consideration.

Whether North Carolina wants to admit it or not, the fact remains that in North Carolina we do have poverty and we do have ignorance and we have countless thousands of unfortunate people, mothers and fathers, who cannot even provide for their children the necessities of life, much less an education. If the implications of the pending measure are so fearful, so frightful and so diabolical, I wonder why someone in the district I represent or in the great State of North Carolina has not pointed out to me the objectionable features of the bill. I can only hope that the people whom I represent will understand that in voting for the bill, I am prompted by the purest of motives.

CIVIL RIGHTS VOTING BILL

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, the Chief Executive has proposed, and the committees of the Congress are now considering, a so-called civil rights voting bill. It is one of the most vicious, liberty-destroying, unconstitutional measures that has been proposed to the Congress since the adoption of our Constitution.

The Congress is being asked to enact a law that would clearly violate the Constitution. It would strike down State provisions that, since time immemorial, have been held proper and constitutional by the Supreme Court of our land. Yet, we saw this same Court, with one exception, leading the applause when the Chief Executive was making his address to the Congress. These same judicial officers will be the final arbiters on the constitutionality of whatever is enacted by the Congress.

A scheme has been set up which, if adopted, will convict the States which have been selected by the administration to be taken over by the Attorney General, who will be set up as a czar over the electoral franchise. He is given unlimited power and authority over certain Southern States, simply because less than 50 percent of the adult residents failed to participate in the national election of 1964. Many citizens did not participate because they felt they had no choice. Yet, this bill, as in Communist Russia, would require adults to participate in elections—whether they desired to do so or not.

The legislation, if enacted, will virtually wipe out State lines in the South, complete the centralization process, and demolish the constitutional guarantees which have meant so much to our people in the past.

We are told that the Soviets have a record of 99.9 voting percentage for candidates without opposition. This perhaps is the goal of those who sponsor this legislation—elections, full participation, and no opposition. A complete takeover such as we saw in Germany in the thirties is possible under this bill. At that time, many good people in Germany did not realize what was happening. The same could be true today.

This bill has been drawn up under a stress of hysteria and has been literally promoted through street demonstrations. When the Founding Fathers established our system of government, they set up a democratic process of government under which deliberative action was made paramount. Some other nations of the world have long lamented the fact that their governments are periodically overturned because of revolutionary elements parading and demonstrating in the streets. Yet, we now appear to be heading in the same direction.

The Attorney General in his appearance before the Judiciary Committee of the House in explaining the bill admitted that there had been no discrimination in registering people to vote in Virginia. The Civil Rights Commission has exonerated Virginia and readily admitted in its report that Virginia had not discriminated in registering people because of race, color, or creed. Yet, this bill convicts Virginia; puts the stamp of the criminal upon her; when all concerned readily admitted there has been no discrimination so far as registration is concerned. This shows the viciousness of the bill. This shows the scheme behind its enactment and the diabolic effort to take over the electorate of our State regardless of the fact that there has been no discrimination. Yet we stand convicted because of the criteria set up in the bill to convict an entire State, all of its officials and leaders, without a hearing, and when it is admitted by all that they are not guilty.

It will be a sad day for America when our elected officials establish a pattern of willingness to change our form of government at the behest of minority pressure groups who are willing to go to any lengths to impose their will.

I would like to include with my remarks a splendid editorial entitled "The Incredible Bill," which appeared in the Wednesday, March 24, edition of the Richmond News Leader. The editor of this newspaper, Mr. James J. Kilpatrick, has long warned of the direction toward which we are heading. This editorial cogently points out the fallacies of the criteria set up in this bill and I commend this to the reading of the Members of the House:

THE INCREDIBLE BILL

Most of today's editorial page is given over to publication of the text of Mr. Johnson's proposed Voting Rights Act of 1965. We urge readers of every political persuasion, liberals and conservatives alike, to take the time to read this bill and to reflect upon its provisions.

In earlier comment, we have touched upon what seems to us the most serious fault in the bill, that it undertakes to fix "qualifications for voting" through the process of Federal law. The power to fix qualifications for voting is a power clearly reserved to the States, subject only to the requirement that qualifications be enforced without discrimination among voters. In our own view, it is simply beyond the powers of the Congress, under the 15th amendment or any other provision of the Constitution, to fix general "qualifications for voting" not related to State discrimination by reason of race or color.

Let us move on today to what might be called the trigger provisions of the bill. It will be seen that the act would apply, under section 3, only to States that maintained on November 1, 1964, some test or device as a qualification for voting. But the law would not apply to all such States. It would apply only to those States, employing a test or device, in which less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age were registered on November 1, 1964, or in which less than 50 percent of such persons voted in the presidential election of 1964.

In Virginia, a prospective voter is required to register in his own handwriting. Under the bill, this would be a test or device. Last November, only 41 percent of the Commonwealth's voting-age population voted in the presidential election. Alabama saw 36 percent of its adults voting, Alaska 48.7, Georgia 43.2, Louisiana 47.3, Mississippi 32.9, and South Carolina 38.0. Though less than half the adults of Arkansas and Texas voted in November, the two States reportedly employ no test or device as the phrase is defined in the bill.

Note the discriminatory effect of the arbitrary cutoff point of 50 percent. South Carolina would be affected, but neighboring North Carolina—where 51.8 percent voted—would be exempt. Alabama and Mississippi would be subject to all the punitive provisions of the bill, but adjacent Tennessee—where 51.1 percent voted—would be exempt. New York has a literacy test far more rigorous than Virginia's, but 63.2 percent of the adults voted in New York, so New York would be exempt.

Let us move on to another provision. Note section 5(d), at the foot of the second column of the text. This has to do with persons, both white and Negro, who may have been registered by the examiners or registrars to be appointed under the law. The names of such persons shall be removed from the list if they fail to vote at least once during 3 consecutive years. Any other registrant, under normal State procedures, may vote or fail to vote as he pleases; but those persons registered by the Federal agents would be placed under a special compulsion.

Many other provisions might be singled out for discussion. Under the Constitution, the Supreme Court has original jurisdiction in all cases in which a State shall be party, but that provision is simply ignored in section 3(c) of the bill. Under the most ancient provisions of our Government, the States have had power to pass laws defining the qualifications of franchise and a presumption of constitutionality has attached to such laws. But under section 8 of this bill, these ancient provisions would be repudiated. No affected State could change its own voting laws without first begging the approval of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. Until Virginia was ruled exempt, the city of Richmond could not even provide by ordinance for additional precinct polling places.

These are some of the features of the President's incredible bill. Pushed along on winds of strong emotion, the bill reportedly commands the support of 80 Members of the Senate. We cannot believe that 80 Members of the Senate have studied the measure thoughtfully or have pondered the mischief it would do to the Federal system of government this Republic has known so long. Whatever the sins of Alabama and Mississippi and Louisiana may have been, two wrongs cannot make a right; they cannot make even a civil right. And discrimination is not to be cured by a punitive statute that singles out a few States and leaves the rest alone.

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Feighan] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure for me to pay tribute to our distinguished colleague, Congressman Frances P. Bolton, who will celebrate her 80th birthday March 29. She has long been a tower of strength in the Congress. Her outstanding service as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs has won for her the esteem of the American people, the respect, and admiration of foreign governments around the world.

Our colleague came to Congress 25 years ago, to fill the unexpired term of her late illustrious husband, Chester C. Bolton. She has been reelected to each succeeding term. Her tireless efforts in behalf of her constituents and in support of the highest ideals and hopes of our Nation have been rewarded by her constituents who are the final judges of the value of her public endeavors.

Mrs. Bolton has been called upon to undertake many missions of importance to the U.S. Government. She served as U.S. delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1953. In 1955 she headed a Special Study Mission to Africa involving on-the-spot study of conditions in some 24 countries. In 1957 President Eisenhower called upon our colleague to represent the United States at the Independence Day ceremonies of Ghana. In 1961 she served as a delegate to the British-American Parliamentary Conference at Bermuda.

For many years Mrs. Bolton has been a leader in the fields of social service, public health, nursing, the education of nurses, and in all phases of education. The people of Greater Cleveland are well aware of and grateful for her trail-blazing efforts in all these fields so necessary to the advancement of the common good. The generous philanthropies of Mrs. Bolton and her family have done untold good for the less privileged in Cuyahoga County where the good results of this generous spirit have been a lasting influence.

Of all the noteworthy accomplishments of our colleague, and there are many more than I have cited, I believe the greatest has been her role as mother and head of an outstanding Cleveland family. Mrs. Bolton has reared and guided to useful manhood three fine sons, who are carrying on the Bolton tradition of public service. Members will recall that one of her sons, Oliver, served in this House where he won deserved respect and admiration.

Those who say that a woman's place is in the home believe generally that the responsibilities of wife and mother are more than sufficient to occupy the full time of the most competent. But the remarkable life and career of our colleague has proven the exception to this claim. She has demonstrated that it is possible to be all that a mother should be and at the same time build a solid record of public service.

I salute my friend and our esteemed colleague, Mrs. Bolton, for her dedicated work in the Congress, her lively concern for the welfare of the Greater Cleveland community, and for her many contributions to the interests of our country. When I say I hope we will have the benefit of her experience and wise counsel for many years to come, I am confident I speak the sentiments of this House.

LOG EXPORTS MENACE AMERICAN JOBS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose today to focus attention on a problem which is rapidly becoming intolerable. While it directly affects the lumber-producing States of the West, it has serious implications for the entire Nation, since it involves the export of thousands of jobs at a time when chronic unemployment is threatening to undermine the economic well-being of the Nation.

The matter I want to direct your attention to is the growing menace of log exports to Japan while American mills lay off workers because logs are in short supply.

When a Columbus Day windstorm blew down a great deal of timber several years ago, Japan was accorded the opportunity to buy logs because American mills were not in a position to salvage all the downed timber which soon would fall prey to insects and rot if not harvested promptly. This put Japanese log buyers in competition with American mills. Apparently the Japanese found this arrangement to their liking. Ever since they have increased their purchases of American logs year by year.

These mounting Japanese purchases of American logs now work a tremendous hardship on American mills which must depend on national forest timber for their very existence. This is no idle threat. It is estimated that a billion board feet of logs went to Japan last year.

To give some idea of what this means, I only need to point out that 1 million board feet of log equals 5.6 year-round jobs in sawmills or 13.8 jobs in plywood mills. When you add it all up, 1964 log exports could have maintained 6,200 primary mill jobs if retained for use at home, plus an additional 4,000 supporting jobs. In other words, last year we exported some 10,200 jobs with the logs we sent to Japan.

While the log situation has been tight in 1964, it threatens to become even tighter in 1965, because of the Christmas floods which destroyed many logging roads and railroad facilities.

A sample survey of the 1964 problem shows that in the State of Washington the Pilchuck Shake Mill at Everett had to lay off 65 men because of short log supplies. Shakertown, Winlock, cut 20 men; Three Rivers, Darrington, cut 68 jobs; Stanwood Lumber, Stanwood, 35 jobs lost; Fitzer Lumber, Buckley, 15 men out; Tubafor Mill, Morton, 43 jobs stopped; Cowlitz Stud, Randle, 40 men off for week, maybe longer; Northwestern Lumber, Everett, cut one-third; Welco Lumber, Marysville, lost 1 month.

There is another aspect to the situation which you need to be apprised of. Japanese log buyers often outbid domestic buyers. Price seems to be no object to them. This forces American mills to pay prices for logs that work a real hardship on them. Consequently, the presence of a Japanese bidder at a log sale drives up the price of logs. This reflects itself in higher lumber costs and, in turn, higher housing costs and higher construction costs in general.

If Japanese log buyers are allowed to compete in the log market this summer, the toll of jobs will increase at an even faster rate.

Now I do not want anyone to get the idea that I oppose trade with Japan. Far from it. I have nothing but admiration for the tremendous job the Japanese have done in rebuilding their economy since the end of World War II. I appreciate also that Japan constitutes one of our major foreign customers.

However, I recently looked over a news release issued by the United States-Japan Trade Council. This release listed the top 10 U.S. exports to Japan during December. It showed that of the 10 major commodities exported to Japan, 7 constituted raw material. Exports of unmanufactured tobacco were up 32 percent. We sent $20 million worth of this tobacco to Japan. Raw cotton exports amounted to practically the same figure. Wheat, steel scrap, corn, copper, and bituminous coal also accounted for very substantial percentages of our exports to Japan. On the other hand, we imported from Japan cameras, tape recorders, radios, and a great many other manufactured goods involving a good deal of labor.

In effect, what we seem to be tending toward is becoming a supplier of raw materials for Japan, which then uses its own labor to produce manufactured goods involving a considerable amount of fashioning, assembling, and skilled labor.

Certainly, this is true in the case of log exports. The Japanese buy American logs, transport them to their country in Japanese bottoms, manufacture them into plywood and other finished products which they bring back to our shores again in Japanese bottoms. Because of the difference in wage scales, they can do this on a competitive basis with our own mills.

Senator Hartke, of Indiana, recently touched on the same matter in connection with the export of walnut logs, most of which now exist in his State. The supply of walnut logs is being drastically depleted by exports, while Indiana mills suffer from a lack of this valuable raw material.

About a year ago, the Department of Commerce instituted a quota on the export of walnut logs. Recently the new Secretary of Commerce lifted this quota, so that walnut logs once more are flowing out of the country at an alarming rate. Senator Hartke is asking that the quota be reinstituted. I concur heartily in his request.

What the Indiana furniture plants are suffering from the unrestricted export of walnut logs, the plywood and sawmills of the West are suffering from the mounting export of softwood logs to Japan.

I think the time has come for Congress to take a serious look at this situation with a view to passing corrective legislation.

Japan is in need of vast quantities of lumber and plywood. I am convinced if they cannot purchase all the wood they need in the form of logs, they will be happy to buy lumber products manufactured in this country.

I understand that hearings on this problem are to be held in Portland and Seattle by the Department of Commerce early next month. I am certain that these hearings will disclose the urgent nature of the problem and the need for legislation to control the amount of logs exported to Japan.

A "save our logs committee" has been organized on the west coast. The sole purpose of this committee is to focus attention on the seriousness of the problem.

Several months ago some 35,000 residents of the Willamette Valley in Oregon signed a petition urging some action to place some realistic restrictions on the export of logs to Japan. These are people who live in communities primarily dependent on the lumber industry for their economic health.

Aside from the dangerous foreign situation, I think nothing is more important to this Congress than saving the jobs of American workers. Certainly this is my view, and I am sure most of you share it with me.

We cannot afford to export 10,000 jobs per year at a time when more than 4 million Americans are unemployed. Furthermore, I believe most of you agree with me that we must not become a supplier of raw materials solely. The vast industrial complex which we have built up over the past generations is the most efficient in the world. We cannot allow it to wither on the vine because our tremendous supply of raw materials is made available to other nations.

I am sure that the present intolerable situation will be remedied sooner or later. My interest is in seeing that it is done sooner, so that ghost lumber towns do not once more dot the valleys of the West.

It is my intention to study this matter thoroughly and to introduce remedial legislation, unless some relief is forthcoming from the Department of Commerce.

I may say, also, that this problem has not as yet touched my own State, but it is inevitable that it will if the present course is allowed to continue.

The Nation needs every job now existing. The policy of exporting 10,000 jobs annually cannot be tolerated any longer. I ask your support in protecting the livelihood of thousands of skilled American woodworkers.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Hungate, for March 27 through March 30, on account of official business.

Mr. Widnall (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), for today, on account of illness.

Mr. Dague (at the request of Mr. Corbett), for March 26 and March 29, on account of illness in immediate family.

Mr. Bonner (at the request of Mr. Henderson), for past 10 days, on account of hospitalization.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Jonas (at the request of Mr. Cleveland), for 1 hour, on March 29; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Dickinson (at the request of Mr. Cleveland), for 1 hour, on March 30; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Olsen of Montana (at the request of Mrs. Mink), for 5 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Flood (at the request of Mrs. Mink), for 60 minutes, on April 1; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. Glenn Andrews his remarks during the debate on H.R. 2362, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Hansen of Idaho.

(The following Member (at the request of Mrs. Mink) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Irwin.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 22. An act to promote a more adequate national program of water research; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 560. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and the Clean Air Act in order to provide for improved control of water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities and automotive vehicles; to the Committee on Public Works.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1496. An act to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc, lead, and copper from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, March 29, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONTRACTUAL ACTIONS, CALENDAR YEAR 1964, TO FACILITATE NATIONAL DEFENSE

The Clerk of the House of Representatives submits the following report for printing in the Congressional Record pursuant to section 4(b) of Public Law 85–804:

National Aeronautics and Space
Administration,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1965.

Hon. John W. McCormack,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Speaker: This is a report to the Congress pursuant to section 4 of the act of August 28, 1958 (72 Stat. 927), submitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives pursuant to rule XL of that House.

During calendar year 1964, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration utilized the authority of the above-cited statute, as follows:

1. Under date of December 23, 1964, the NASA Contract Adjustment Board authorized the adjustment of two contracts for the

rental of automatic data processing equipment with the International Business Machines Corp., Washington, D.C., in a total amount not to exceed $33,798.81.

2. Under date of May 20, 1964, the Administrator of NASA made a determination pursuant to the act of August 28, 1958 (Public Law 85-804), that, from and after April 1, 1964, all contracts, or amendments or modifications thereof, for the performance of construction work at the Patrick Air Force Base, Cape Kennedy, and the John F. Kennedy Space Center, should include a clause requiring contractors and all subcontractors thereunder to abide by the money provisions of a project stabilization agreement, to the extent such money provisions were determined by the Government to be reasonable. The project stabilization agreement referred to is an agreement negotiated by and between the Patrick Air Force Base Contractors' Association and other local and national associations of contractors, and the Brevard Building & Construction Trades Council of the Building & Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO. The purpose of this agreement is to promote stability, efficiency, and economy of performance of contracts involving construction work at Patrick Air Force Base and the Cape Kennedy complex. The agreement was originally negotiated in 1962, and renegotiated for the period beginning April 1, 1964. On February 5, 1964, the President's Missile Site Labor Commission found the money provisions of the revised agreement to be reasonable for cost reimbursement purposes and recommended that they be authorized for payment on all Government contracts.

The determination under Public Law 85-894 made by the Administrator on May 20, 1964, was in implementation of the foregoing recommendation of the President's Commission. Pursuant to this determination, and an earlier similar determination made with respect to the project stabilization agreement as originally negotiated in 1962, 26 NASA contracts for construction work in the Cape Kennedy area which were awarded or amended during 1964 included the clause making the money provisions of the project stabilization agreement applicable. It is not possible to determine or estimate whether inclusion of this clause resulted in any increased costs under the contracts involved. However, as indicated above, the purpose of the project stabilization agreement is to promote stability, efficiency, and economy in performance of the contracts brought under it.

3. Under date of September 26, 1963, the Administrator of NASA made a determination similar to that described in paragraph 2 above with respect to contracts and subcontracts for construction work at the Mississippi test facility, in implementation of a project stabilization agreement which had been negotiated for that area and which is still in effect. Pursuant to this determination, 34 contracts for construction work at the Mississippi test facility which were awarded or amended in 1964 included the clause making the money provisions of the project stabilization agreement applicable. It is not possible to determine or estimate whether inclusion of this clause resulted in any increased costs under these contracts, but it may be noted again that the purpose of negotiating a project stabilization agreement is to promote stability, efficiency, and economy in performance of the contracts brought under it.

Sincerely yours,

HUGH L. DRYDEN,
Deputy Administrator.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

812. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of problems pertaining to the operation of certain radio equipment in selected units of the U.S. Army, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

813. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), transmitting a report of the location, nature, and estimated cost of certain nonarmory facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Army National Guard within the authorization of subsection 701 (1)(a) of Public Law 88-390, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2233a(1) and authority delegated by the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

814. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of unnecessary costs resulting from the failure to obtain competition for the procurement of power-unit clamps, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department; to the Committee on Government Operations.

815. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report on adjustments of contracts authorized by the administration for calendar year 1964, pursuant to section 4 of 72 Stat. 927; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 5508. A bill to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 206). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COOLEY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 5702. A bill to extend for 1 year the date on which the National Commission on Food Marketing shall make a final report to the President and to the Congress and to provide necessary authorization of appropriations for such Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 207). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 305. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 4257, a bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 208). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 306. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 824, a bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity; without amendment (Rept. No. 209). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 307. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 3044, a bill to authorize payment of incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier; without amendment (Rept. No. 210). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 308. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 5571, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders; without amendment (Rept. No. 211). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules: House Resolution 309. Resolution for consideration of H.R. 1111, a bill to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning; without amendment (Rept. No. 212). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAWSON:

H.R. 6820. A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 6821. A bill to incorporate the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6822. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 6823. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 6824. A bill to authorize certain loans by national banks to aid in the rehabilitation of urban areas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6825. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to authorize the Small Business Administration to assist small business concerns in obtaining leases of property in downtown business districts by providing insurance for such leases; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6826. A bill to provide a rent certificate program for low-income housing in private accommodations, to establish a priority for low- and middle-income housing in urban renewal projects, to provide additional rehabilitation and relocation assistance, to create a new veterans' mortgage insurance program, to continue the Federal Housing Administration, college, and elderly housing programs, to provide comprehensive compensation for condemnees, to insure efficiency and economy in the administration of Federal housing programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 6827. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the redevelopment by private persons of property in the downtown business districts of our cities by allowing the cost of such redevelopment to be amortized at an accelerated rate for income tax purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAWKINS:

H.R. 6828. A bill to designate the fourth Friday in September of every year as American Indian Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6829. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 6830. A bill to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6831. A bill for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 6832. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that adoption of a child shall not disqualify him from monthly insurance benefits to which he otherwise is, or upon application therefor would be, entitled, if such adoption is by the brother or sister of such child; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 6833. A bill to amend paragraph (a) of the act of March 4, 1913, as amended by the act of January 31, 1931 (16 U.S.C. 502); to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. MINK:

H.R. 6834. A bill to provide for the conveyance of certain real property situated in the State of Hawaii to the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 6835. A bill for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 6836. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 6837. A bill to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on passenger automobiles; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H.R. 6838. A bill to provide additional dental care for dependents of members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI:

H.R. 6839. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for Federal financial participation in payments withheld at the request of recipients of assistance under the Federal-State public assistance programs for the purchase of food coupons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SELDEN:

H.R. 6840. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6841. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act, as amended, to provide for the recomputation of annuities of certain retired employees who elected reduced annuities at the time of retirement in order to provide survivor annuities for their spouses, and for the recomputation of survivor annuities for the surviving spouses of certain former employees who died in service or after retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 6842. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the manufacturers excise tax on household-type hot water heaters; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TENZER:

H.R. 6843. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6844. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 6845. A bill to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. WALKER of New Mexico:

H.R. 6846. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 6847. A bill to amend the Export Control Act of 1949; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6848. A bill to amend section 35 of title 18 of the United States Code relating to the imparting or conveying of false information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 6849. A bill to amend chapter 161 of title 28 of the United States Code by adding a new section with respect to certain restraining writs or orders issued by U.S. district courts that affect property situated outside the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 6850. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make it a Federal crime to kill or assault the President or Vice President of the United States and any officer or employee of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 6851. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 6852. A bill to authorize the disposal, without regard to the prescribed 6-month waiting period, of approximately 47 million pounds of abaca from the national stockpile; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H.R. 6853. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 6854. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 6855. A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 6856. A bill to limit the authority of the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget with respect to new construction or alteration of veterans hospitals and the closing of such hospitals; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. TAYLOR:

H.R. 6857. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 6858. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended, in order to allow a priority of opportunity to displaced property owners to redevelop the land from which they were displaced in harmony with the project area plan when such land becomes available for purchase or lease for residential use from the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mrs. DWYER:

H.R. 6859. A bill to repeal section 165 of the Revised Statutes relating to the appointment of women to clerkships in the executive departments; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.J. Res. 406. Joint resolution designating the last Sunday in April of each year as National Indoor Sports Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.J. Res. 407. Joint resolution to establish a national flower of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.J. Res. 408. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to preserve, foster, and protect our Nation's spiritual heritage and deep-rooted dependence on divine guidance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H. Con. Res. 372. Concurrent resolution to request the President to initiate discussion of the Baltic States question before the United Nations with a view to gaining the independence of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia from the Soviet Union; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. Con. Res. 373. Concurrent resolution, second inaugural of Abraham Lincoln—Anniversary; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H. Res. 303. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H. Res. 304. Resolution authorizing cards of identification for certain officers and employees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

147. By Mr. MOORE: Memorial of the West Virginia Legislature requesting the Congress of the United States to investigate experimentation in the field of artificial nucleation, or interference by artificial means with the natural precipitation of rain, hail, snow, moisture, or water in any form in the atmosphere; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

148. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Georgia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the

purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to reserving exclusive jurisdiction of public school systems in the separate States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

149. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to appropriating funds necessary for inclusion of the Asotin Dam project in the current public works program; to the Committee on Public Works.

150. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to legislation to provide for an increase in the disposal price of grain being sold to millers of cereal grains to 120 percent of the support price, and to work toward long-term barter contracts with the underfed nations of the world to purchase American grain; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 6860. A bill for the relief of Indru S. Thawani; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 6861. A bill for the relief of Barbara Polly Lane; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 6862. A bill for the relief of Pierina Ghione; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 6863. A bill for the relief of Josef Doueck; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DEERLIN:

H.R. 6864. A bill for the relief of Hui Shoon Wot; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CALLAN:

H.R. 6865. A bill for the relief of Mario Mory; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6866. A bill for the relief of Rosa Mathilda Edwards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURLESON:

H.R. 6867. A bill for the relief of J. H. Reynolds, doing business as Reynolds Manufacturing Co.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6868. A bill for the relief of Alfred C. Altum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

143. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., with reference to changing the method of election of the President and Vice President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The 144th Anniversary of Greek Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, March 25, marked the 144th anniversary of Greek Independence Day. It was on this day in 1821 that the people of Greece began their struggle to throw off the yoke of Ottoman rule. It was a struggle that was to end successfully 6 years later, bringing to a close centuries of domination.

We celebrate other national independence days of great importance, but this day has a special significance. For it is the ancient Greeks who have bequeathed to us the philosophy and principles that have formed the cornerstone of our representative Government. In classical times Greece was one of the citadels of Western civilization. It was the Greeks who created the model state, and their achievements are the legacy of modern civilization.

There has long been a bond between the Greeks and Americans. When Archbishop Germanos of Patras raised the flag of freedom over the monastery of Aghia Lavra, President Monroe and Daniel Webster, as well as other American statesmen, were quick to declare they were in full sympathy with the intention of the Greek people to win freedom and self-determination.

Since winning their independence, the Greeks have had their ups and downs. But through it all they have remained firm in their dedication to freedom, democracy, and the dignity of man.

Greece had the misfortune to be overrun by the Nazis in World War II. No sooner had the Nazis been defeated than the Greeks were beset by Communist guerrilla forces.

With a hand from the United States under the Truman Doctrine, the Greek Government was able to subdue the Communist insurgents and maintain its hard-won independence.

Today modern Greece stands as a bulwark of democracy. It probably holds the distinction of having fought communism longer than any other member of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. And the Greeks are one of our staunchest allies in the defense of freedom.

We can never fully repay our debt to the Greek people for their defense of freedom and their development of democratic institutions. But we can take time out on this occasion to salute the million and a half Americans of Greek origin as we join hands with our allies across the Atlantic in celebrating Greek Independence Day.

Statement of the Honorable George V. Hansen of Idaho Before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE HANSEN
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, March 26, 1965

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks and to include extraneous material, I include in the RECORD one paragraph of a statement made to the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments by Mr. William Brown, research director for the Delaware State Chamber of Commerce.

The paragraph is:

> We believe the people of every State should have the right to fashion a State legislative system which best meets the needs of that particular State, as long as they adhere to a republican form of government, to their own State constitution and laws, and the applicable provisions of the Federal Constitution.

I also include statements I made before the same committee.

In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important matters to come before the Congress in many years. Because of this, and because of the fact that the House Committee on the Judiciary has scheduled similar hearings for the near future, I believe the statements will be of interest to my colleagues.

My statements follow:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE GEORGE V. HANSEN, SECOND DISTRICT IDAHO, BEFORE THE SENATE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE ON CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS, MARCH 4, 1965

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, it is a privilege and an honor to appear before you today and make this statement on a matter I believe to be one of the most important to come before the Congress in many years.

On September 13 of this year it will have been 177 years since the Continental Congress passed a resolution putting into effect the Constitution of the United States. It had been ratified by the 11th State—New York—less than 2 months previously.

Less than a year ago, and nearly 176 years following its adoption, the Supreme Court of the United States struck a severe blow at the very roots of this Constitution. Until that time—last June—I doubt that anyone in the United States with any knowledge of our Government and our history would even have considered it a possibility that the Supreme Court would presume to take upon itself the authority to inform the sovereign States of the Union that it didn't like the way their legislatures were structured—and that they must reapportion according to the Court's dictates.

The determination handed down last June by the Supreme Court was by no means unanimous. Justice Potter Stewart, in a bitter dissenting opinion, said the decision "finds no support in the words of the Constitution, in any prior decision of this Court, or in the 175-year political history of our Federal Union."

Justice Stewart also said:

"What the Court has done is to convey a particular political philosophy into a constitutional rule, binding upon each of the 50 States * * * without regard and without respect for the many individualized and differentiated characteristics of each State * * * stemming from distinct history, distinct geography, distinct distribution of population, and distinct political heritage."

Mr. Chairman, the fact that Justice Stewart's views are shared by many is attested to by our presence here today.

Mr. Chairman, the Constitution of the United States by its very nature is a document of carefully limited Federal powers with all other authority residing in the States. Probably the most remarkable feature of this instrument was the provision for a legislative body divided into two branches, one branch based on geographic representation, and the other on population. This, in my opinion, is perhaps the greatest contribution to political science made by the United States and is just one of the many delicate checks and balances provided for in the Constitution. Through it a majority cannot run roughshod over the rights of the minority, nor can a minority for long willfully obstruct the majority. It assures that careful deliberation will be given to all matters brought before the Congress. True—it perhaps, sometimes, slows down the legislative process. But it also prevents us from "acting in haste and repenting in leisure."

Most of the 50 States have legislative organizations similar to the Federal body; that is, one house based on population and the other on geography or other factors. And it is this system of government at which the Supreme Court decisions strike.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of great significance. Our State governments are not based on the Federal system—it is the other way around. Our Federal system is based on the systems of the States which founded our National Government.

None of the Thirteen Original States apportioned both houses of their legislatures solely on the basis of population. In the upper house, or senate, Delaware and New Jersey had equal representation for each county, regardless of population. Georgia, Massachusetts, New York, and Rhode Island had equal representation based on geographic units other than counties. Maryland, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, and Virginia based representation on geographic units with minor modification based on population. The upper House of Connecticut was based on population, but with major limitations to achieve geographic diffusion, and it was the same in New Hampshire, but with minor limitations. Only the upper House of North Carolina was based solely on population—and the North Carolina lower House was also based on population, but with major limitations, as in the case of the upper House of Connecticut, to achieve geographic diffusion.

So—the so-called Federal concept was not new. It had existed in the founding States. And, Mr. Chairman, without the adoption of this system, it is extremely doubtful that the Constitution would ever have been ratified. The smaller States, fearful of the power that would be exercised by the larger States should representation in both Houses of the Congress be based solely on population, were unwilling to support a strong national government. But with the "great compromise"—the apportionment of one House on population and with equal representation in the other—the fears of the small States were allayed and our Federal Constitution came into being.

Most of the States subsequently joining the Union adopted the bicameral system, and it has worked well. It has afforded the minority in the States the same protection it has afforded the minority in the Federal Government and, at the same time, has prevented the minority from long obstructing the will of the majority. It has led to a deliberative legislative process.

It is essential, Mr. Chairman, that the majority be protected from the minority by having one house of a bicameral State legislature apportioned on a basis of population. It is equally essential that the minority be protected from the majority by having the other house based on factors other than just population.

This is the system we have today, and it is a proven system. However, it is now under attack and unless the Congress acts—and acts soon—it will be destroyed. I uphold the right of the Court to correct inequities within the system. I would deny the Court the right to change the system.

A troublesome question arises in my mind, Mr. Chairman: With our Federal system based on the checks and balances of the founding States—if those checks and balances are abolishd by judicial fiat, how long will it then be before that same Court applies that same one-man, one-vote principle and decrees that both the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate must be apportioned solely on the basis of population?

In the matter of the reapportionment of State legislatures Justice John M. Harlan said:

"Judicial entry into this realm is profoundly ill advised and constitutionally impermissible."

We must correct the Court's mistake, Mr. Chairman, and we must see to it that the Court is alerted to the fact that the great majority of the people of the United States will not tolerate, now or in the future, the Court's "entry into realms * * * constitutionally impermissable."

I support, without reservation, a constitutional amendment which would state that both houses of a bicameral State legislature need not be apportioned solely on the basis of population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to state my views to you today on this matter.

Addition to the Statement of the Honorable George V. Hansen, Second District Idaho, Before the Senate Judiciary Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments

Mr. Chairman, I thank you for giving me the opportunity to present this supplementary statement to further clarify my position on reapportionment.

I believe it is important to emphasize that in advocating a constitutional amendment to allow one house of a bicameral State legislature to be apportioned on a basis other than population, we are asking for nothing new. This is possibly the most tried and proven piece of legislation ever considered for adoption. We, the proponents of this amendment, can comfortably point out that the system we desire to perpetuate has been by far the most successful of the legislative combinations used among the several States. This, in fact, was the very system used in one form or another by each State represented at the Constitutional Convention and was the pattern adopted in arriving at the "great compromise" of the U.S. Constitution.

Many points are raised questioning what would happen under the proposed amendment. The best and most irrefutable answer is to ask what has happened in the course of our history since the Constitution was put into operation on September 13, 1788, and prior to the recent catastrophic Supreme Court decision.

May I point out, Mr. Chairman, that our Constitution provides for a Federal Republic, not a democracy; and article IV, section 4, guarantees each State a republican form of government. May I add that pure democracy has been described many times as the worst possible form of government. Under pure democracy, the minority—or a minority—has no rights. It is completely at the mercy of the mob rule of the majority. And it is toward pure democracy that the one-person, one-vote concept leads us.

The point is raised that one house of a bicameral State legislature, controlled by minority representation, can block the will of a majority of all of the people of the State. But this overlooks the fact that the States, as well as the United States, have an executive branch, the chief of whom—the Governor—is elected on the basis of one person one vote. Thus, with the executive branch and one house of a legislature controlled by the majority, it is hard to see how the other house of this legislature could long thwart the will of the majority. Rather, it merely serves as a curb on the unbridled exercise of power by the majority.

If I may be permitted to do so, Mr. Chairman, I would like to refer briefly to one or two questions that have been posed.

First, it has been asked whether a person who is deprived of the right to vote because his grandfather had not voted in a particular State should have recourse to the courts. Certainly he should. Such legislation, if enacted by any State, I believe would clearly be in violation of the equal protection and privileges and immunities clauses of the 14th amendment. I do not believe any court in this land—State or Federal—would uphold such a law.

Also, I do not believe an issue such as a grandfather clause, or an issue such as a person being deprived of the right to vote because he does or does not own property, is relevant to the subject being considered. We are not discussing individual voting rights, but rather the question of the value of a person's vote—whether or not it should be of equal weight in determining the membership of both houses of a bicameral State legislature.

We believe this decision should rest with the people of each State, and not with the Federal courts.

Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, we are not attempting to create a new governmental process—we are merely defending a system that has existed for nearly 177 years and one that has been by far the most predominant form of government used by the States of this great Nation. True, there have been some inequities, and those that have not been corrected should be. But let us not throw out the baby with the wash water—let us not destroy the system just because some correctible inequities may exist.

Nearly every question that could be asked concerned with the effect of the proposed amendment has the unique potential of being answered by conditions of actual experience—an advantage seldom enjoyed by any such piece of major legislation. I hereby reaffirm my support of a constitutional amendment allowing one house of a bicameral State legislature to be apportioned on a basis other than population.

SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 29, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose throne is justice and truth: Frail creatures of dust, yet stamped with Thine image, serving our brief day on the world's stage and in an epochal period of history, when men are venturing from the earth—which is our home—out into the vastness of Thy created universe, we would set our little lives in the midst of Thine eternity.

We come with a vivid realization that not only in the haunting beauty of Thy handiwork, but also in the poignant want and woe of the world's needs, Thy voice to us is calling.

As those to whom has been committed the stewardship for the fair fabric of the Nation's life, in a violent world, grant us now, we pray, in these dread days of decision in national and international relationships, a saving experience of inner quiet and serenity.

We ask it in the name of the One whose victory makes these days in the cycle of the year forever holy, as He turned the mocking robe of derision into the crimson garments of sacrifice and into the white vestments of love.

In His name we lift our prayer. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 25, 1965, was dispensed with.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 25, 1965, the following report of a committee was submitted on March 26, 1965:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, without amendment:

S. 1000. A bill to amend the act of July 29, 1954, as amended, to permit transfer of title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions (Rept. No. 141).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations of the Committee on Government Operations be permitted to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Public Works:

John L. Sweeney, of Michigan, to be Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Maj. Gen. Hobart Hewett, U.S. Army, now on the temporary disability retired list, for reappointment to the active list, as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, and as temporary major general in the Army of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the postmaster nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the general orders on the calendar beginning with Calendar Order No. 118 and going through the remainder of the calendar in sequence.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will state the first order of business on the calendar.

EXTENSION TO VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENTS RATES OF POSTAGE ON SECOND- AND THIRD-CLASS BULK MAILINGS

The bill (S. 390) to extend to volunteer fire companies the rates of postage on second- and third-class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has favorably reported S. 390, a bill to extend to volunteer fire companies the rates of postage on second- and third-class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations. An identical measure passed the Senate August 6, 1964, but was not acted upon by the other body.

This bill adds volunteer fire companies to the group of qualified nonprofit organizations entitled to use preferential second- and third-class postage rates for bulk mailings. These nonprofit groups and associations are religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, labor, veterans, and others, to whom the Congress has seen fit to extend this mailing privilege.

Volunteer fire companies are composed of citizens who provide fire protection for their communities without pay. In many cases they maintain and improve their firefighting equipment through funds solicitated by mail. The cost of this solicitation has proven a strain on the limited budgets of many fire companies.

This bill would provide them with some financial relief to aid them in their good work.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, the volunteer fire companies of this Nation perform a necessary and essential service to their communities, and the purpose of S. 390 is to help them financially by extending to them the rates of postage on second-class and third-class mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations.

Every State has volunteer fire companies. Of the total of 21,487 fire departments in the United States 1,523 are paid and 19,964 are volunteer. If communities had to provide paid fire companies instead of relying on unselfish volunteer citizens the cost would be astronomical.

I appreciate very much the early and favorable consideration of this bill by the Post Office and Civil Service Committee ably headed by the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON].

The explanation of this bill is simple. It would amend laws pertaining to operations of the Post Office Department to add volunteer fire companies to the group of qualified nonprofit organizations already entitled to use preferential second- and third-class postage rates for mailings. Other groups already authorized by statute to use such preferential rates include religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans, fraternal, associations of rural electric cooperatives, and one official highway or development publication of each State of the Union.

This is a group to which volunteer fire companies should belong. There is no more dedicated or unselfish group of men and women in the country than those belonging to volunteer fire companies. You notice I mentioned women, and this is because the ladies auxiliaries of the fire companies back up the firemen themselves not only with food and hot coffee at the scene of a fire but with fundraising efforts throughout the year.

A prime fundraising program with most fire companies is a fund solicitation by mail. Enactment of this bill would be of immediate and specific assistance in this effort.

A mailing which has been costing a fire company approximately $1,000 using first class rates, for instance, would cost approximately $250 after this bill became law.

This is money which could be used directly to help the fire company get better equipment. In addition, I might add, fire companies are performing valuable service to their communities in supplying ambulance service and rescue trucks. And in many of the country's smaller communities a volunteer fire company also supplies the chief community building and a center for civic and social activities.

One further matter of explanation, Mr. President.

The Internal Revenue Service exempts volunteer fire companies from tax and allows as a personal deduction any contributions to volunteer fire companies. Postal authorities have from time to time said that they use the Internal Revenue Service definition of a nonprofit organization as a guide for permitting nonprofit mailings by organizations.

It is my hope that this bill will be enacted.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 129), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPLANATION AND ANALYSIS

S. 390 would amend 39 U.S.C. 4359(e)(2) and 39 U.S.C. 4452(d) by adding volunteer fire companies to the group of qualified nonprofit organizations entitled to use preferential second- and third-class postage rates for bulk mailings. Other groups already authorized to use such preferential rates include religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans, fraternal, associations of rural electric cooperatives, and one official highway or development publication of each State of the Union.

Volunteer fire companies perform an invaluable service to the American public. Without these citizens' unpaid efforts to protect both life and property, most villages and small towns would either be without fire protection or would have to undertake the expense of a professional fire department. In many cases, the latter alternative would prove financially impossible. In an effort to maintain and improve firefighting equipment, volunteer fire companies solicit public support by means of mailed letters requesting contributions. Even at ordinary third-class bulk rates, the cost of such solicitations proves to be a strain on the limited budgets of many companies. S. 390 would extend to this very worthwhile group a privilege of law which is presently enjoyed by several nonprofit groups and associations.

The Postal Office Department has not been able to estimate accurately the cost of S. 390.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4359(e)(2) of title 39 of the United States Code is amended by inserting after the word "fraternal," the words "volunteer fire companies,".

SEC. 2. Section 4452(d) of such title is amended by inserting after the word "associations" where it appears in the first sentence a comma and the words "and volunteer fire companies,".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

APPOINTMENT OF SENATORIAL DELEGATES TO COMMONWEALTH PARLIAMENTARY ASSOCIATION, WELLINGTON, NEW ZEALAND

The resolution (S. Res. 89) authorizing attendance at the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, to be held in Wellington, New Zealand, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the President of the Senate is authorized to appoint four Members of the Senate as a delegation to attend the next general meeting of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, to be held in Wellington, New Zealand, at the invitation of the New Zealand branch of the Association, and to designate the chairman of said delegation.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the delegation, including staff members designated by the chairman to assist said delegation, shall not exceed $10,000 and shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 103, 86TH CONGRESS

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 7) to authorize the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 103 of the 86th Congress was announced as next in order.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire what the resolution provides.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the resolution would authorize the printing of 13,550 additional copies of the Code of Ethics for Government Service, which was approved by the Congress on July 1, 1958. The Senate would receive 2,575 copies, roughly, and 10,975 would be provided for the House of Representatives.

Mr. AIKEN. Has any investigation been made to determine whether the Senate needs that number of copies or not?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would assume that the Committee on Rules and Administration looked into the question and reported the resolution unanimously.

Mr. AIKEN. That probably is a good assumption. I shall wait until we get to another item on the calendar before raising the question again.

The **ACTING PRESIDENT** pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 7) was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS OF ACCEPTANCE OF THE STATUE OF THE LATE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE, SAM RAYBURN, OF TEXAS

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 83) to print the proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn, of Texas, was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT OF PAMPHLET ENTITLED "OUR AMERICAN GOVERNMENT"—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 97) to authorize the printing as a House document the pamphlet entitled

"Our American Government" was announced as next in order.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I ask whether any Senator has looked into the warehouse to see how many copies of the document entitled "Our American Government" are still on hand.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am unable to answer that question. I can state only that the concurrent resolution was reported unanimously by the Committee on Rules and Administration. It would authorize an additional number of copies, and those copies are usually used for distribution in the high schools of the Nation.

Mr. AIKEN. There is nothing to indicate that any member of the Committee on Rules and Administration has looked into the warehouse to determine whether the additional printing requested is needed or not.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not know.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think it is about time that we paid some attention to hog-wild appropriations for the printing of additional copies of documents when we have a surplus of such documents already on hand. I believe that if the Committee on Rules and Administration would investigate the number of copies of "Our American Government" which are in the Senate warehouse, they would find it is approximately the same number that would be provided for by the concurrent resolution.

The Senators do not pick up all of these documents. They accumulate by the ton. Someone must pay for them. I cannot say that no member of the Committee on Rules and Administration has ever visited the warehouse, because at some time or other I presume Senators have. But I do say that if they investigate the particular item which we are now considering, they will probably find that there are about 200,000 copies available to the Senate in the warehouse right now. The bill calls for another 200,000 copies to be made available to the Senate and approximately 800,000, I believe, for the House.

We do not pay any attention to this business. The concurrent resolution calls for the printing of 206,000 copies for the use of the Senate and 878,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives. I am afraid that some of these documents are printed so that Members of Congress can get their names on them and distribute them all over their districts. That is about what it amounts to. This happens to be a good example with respect to which we find the proposal is absolutely unnecessary.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think it had better be passed over.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be passed over.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask that the Committee on Rules and Administration arrange to have counted the quantity of the documents that we now have on hand to find whether the Senate needs 200,000 in addition to the 200,000 that are lying there unused.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next order of business on the calendar.

PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT OF INAUGURAL ADDRESSES FROM PRESIDENT WASHINGTON TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 125) authorizing the printing as a House document of inaugural addresses from President Washington to President Johnson was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRINTING AS A HOUSE DOCUMENT TRIBUTES BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS TO THE LIFE, CHARACTER, AND PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE LATE WINSTON CHURCHILL

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 153) authorizing the printing as a House document of the tributes by Members of Congress to the life, character, and public service of the late Sir Winston Churchill was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed with illustrations as a House document all remarks by Members of the Senate and House of Representatives in the Halls of Congress which constitute tributes to the life, character, and public service of the late Sir Winston Churchill. The copy for such House document shall be prepared under the supervision of the Joint Committee on Printing.

SEC. 2. In addition to the usual number, there shall be printed five thousand eight hundred and sixty additional copies of such House document, of which one thousand five hundred copies shall be for the use of the Senate, and four thousand three hundred and sixty copies shall be for the use of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRINTING OF HOUSE DOCUMENT NO. 103, 88TH CONGRESS

The Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 165) authorizing the reprinting of House Document No. 103, 88th Congress, which had been reported from the Committee on Rules and Administration with amendments on page 1, line 8, after the word "printed", to strike out "one hundred thirty-two thousand additional copies to be prorated to the Members of the House of Representatives for a period of sixty days after which the unused balance shall revert to the House Document Room" and insert "one hundred sixty-three thousand additional copies of such document, of which one hundred thirty-two thousand shall be for the use of the House of Representatives and thirty-one thousand shall be for the use of the Senate", and on page 2, after line 4, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. Copies of such document shall be prorated to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives for a period of sixty days, after which the unused balance shall revert to the respective House and Senate Document Rooms.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRINTING OF STUDY RELATED TO COMPENSATION AND ASSISTANCE FOR PERSONS AFFECTED BY REAL PROPERTY ACQUISITION

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 167) authorizing the printing of additional copies of a study of compensation and assistance for persons affected by real property acquisition in Federal and federally assisted programs was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PUBLICATION AS HOUSE DOCUMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE WHITE PAPER RELATING TO VIETNAM'S CAMPAIGN

The concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 338) authorizing the publication as a House document of the Department of State white paper relating to North Vietnam's campaign to conquer South Vietnam was considered and agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PRINTING OF ADDITIONAL COPIES OF COMMITTEE PRINT ENTITLED "CATALOG OF FEDERAL AIDS TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS"

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) to print additional copies of committee print entitled "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments" was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for the use of the Senate Committee on Government Operations sixty thousand additional copies of its committee print of the Eighty-ninth Congress, first session, entitled "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments—Supplement, January 4, 1965", a study prepared by the Legislature Reference Service of the Library of Congress for the Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

NAN B. TWIFORD

The resolution (S. Res. 94) to pay a gratuity to Nan A. Twiford was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Nan B. Twiford, aunt of Adele R. O'Connor, an employee of the Senate at the time of her death, a sum equal to eleven months' compensation at the rate she was receiving by law at the time of her death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MIDDLE RIO GRANDE CONSERVANCY DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

The bill (S. 1462) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payments of operation and maintenance charges on certain public lands was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the provisions of the Act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 887), as amended by section 5 of the Act of June 20, 1938 (52 Stat. 779), by the Act of April 24, 1946 (60 Stat. 121), and by the Act of May 29, 1956 (70 Stat. 221), authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to provide by agreement with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, a subdivision of the State of New Mexico, for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on newly reclaimed Pueblo Indian lands and lands purchased by the United States by virtue of the Act of June 7, 1924 (43 Stat. 636), as amended, for certain Pueblo Indians, are hereby extended for an additional period of ten years to 1975.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 140), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF MEASURE

S. 1462, sponsored by Senator ANDERSON, of New Mexico, would extend for a period of 10 years, or until 1975, the authority initially granted the Secretary of the Interior by the act of August 27, 1935 (49 Stat. 887), to enter into contracts with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, New Mexico, for payment of operation and maintenance charges involved in the irrigation of some 11,000 acres of Pueblo Indian lands within the district. Assessment rates for these lands have been approximately $40,000 a year.

BACKGROUND OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

Reclamation of Indian lands in the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, a subdivision of the State of New Mexico, was authorized under the act of March 13, 1928 (45 Stat. 312). The district extends from approximately 40 miles north of Albuquerque nearly to San Antonio, N. Mex. Since time immemorial—long before the coming of the white man—the Indians living there had irrigated some of the lands—possibly as much as 8,000 acres at one time or another. The system they developed was primitive, but provided subsistence crops in relatively secure supply for the Pueblos.

When the conservancy district was first proposed, the Indians were hesitant about having their lands become a part of it because they properly were apprehensive that they might not be able to raise the money required to pay their share. In order that the project might proceed and to tie the Indian land within the boundaries of the district onto the new works, Congress appropriated on a reimbursable basis the funds for the Indians' share of the construction costs. The total reimbursable construction charges assessed against the Pueblo lands were $1,357,354.36, and were canceled under the Leavitt Act of July 1, 1932, 47 Stat. 864; 25 U.S.C. 386a).

In 1935, legislation was enacted authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to enter into agreements with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District to pay operation and maintenance charges on the Indians' land. This authority has been extended on three occasions, and Congress has regularly appropriated money for this purpose. The Federal appropriations have covered only charges assessed against the newly reclaimed Pueblo lands and the lands purchased by the United States for the Pueblos. The Pueblo lands that were adequately irrigated before the project was constructed are not subject to assessment. The newly reclaimed Pueblo lands include 11,074.40 acres; the purchased lands amount to 803.94 acres; the Pueblo lands that were adequately irrigated when the project was constructed comprise 8,847 acres. The total acreage benefited by the middle Rio Grande project, including both Indian and non-Indian land, is approximately 117,000 acres. Thus, the Indian lands benefited are but a small part of the district.

The Pueblos there still farm on a subsistence basis, with average-sized farms being less than 10 acres. The committee believes it would be in the best interests of the Indians as well as the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District if the payments now made by the United States were authorized to be continued, as provided in S. 1462.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

TRANSFER OF TITLE TO MOVABLE PROPERTY TO AGENCIES

The bill (S. 1000) to amend the act of July 29, 1954, to permit the transfer of title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial function was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Act of July 29, 1954 (68 Stat. 580), as amended by the Act of August 2, 1956 (70 Stat. 940), is further amended to read as follows:

"SECTION 1. That whenever an irrigation district, municipality, or water users' organization assumes operation and maintenance of works constructed to furnish or distribute a water supply pursuant to a contract entered into with the United States in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and Acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) (443 U.S.C. 371, note), the Secretary of the Interior may transfer to said district, municipality, or organization title to movable property which has been purchased with funds advanced by the district, municipality, or organization or which, in the case of property purchased with appropriated funds, is necessary to the operation and maintenance of such works and the value of which is to be repaid under a contract with the district, municipality, or organization. In order to encourage the assumption by irrigation districts, municipalities, and water users' organizations of the operation and maintenance of works constructed to furnish or distribute a water supply, the Secretary is authorized to use appropriated funds available for the project involved to acquire movable property for transfer under the terms and conditions hereinbefore provided, at the time operation and maintenance is assumed."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 141), explaining the purposes of the bill.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURPOSE OF MEASURE

S. 1000, sponsored by the chairman of the committee, Senator JACKSON, at the request of the Department of the Interior, would place municipalities on the same footing as irrigation districts and similar water users' organizations by authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to transfer title to movable property to them upon their assumption of the care, operation, and maintenance or works constructed to furnish or distribute a water supply.

Property purchased with Federal funds would be paid for by the municipality to which it is transferred. Examples of such property are especially equipped pickup and repair trucks, motors especially adapted to use on a particular project, and the like.

Under authority of the Title to Movable Property Act (the act of July 29, 1954, 68 Stat. 580, as amended by the act of Aug. 2, 1956, 70 Stat. 940), the Secretary of the Interior transfers title to movable property to an irrigation district or water users' organization when such district or organization assumes operation and maintenance of irrigation works pursuant to a contract entered into with the United States in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws. Movable property which is thus transferred has either been purchased with funds advanced by the district or other water users' organization, or has been purchased with appropriated funds, which funds are included in the repayment obligation of the district or organization. The Secretary may also use appropriated funds available for the project involved to acquire movable property for transfer to the district or organization at the time it assumes the operation and maintenance responsibility.

WATER NEEDS CHANGING

The emphasis and need for water in the West is changing. A priority for agricultural purposes is no longer responsive to the broader needs. There is a shift in reclamation activity from concentration on development for irrigation purposes to modern multipurpose projects in which municipal and industrial water supply, flood control, hydroelectric power, fish and wildlife conservation, recreation, navigation, and pollution control purposes are served along with irrigation. In the continual reshaping of our policy to meet current needs, our municipal and industrial water supply program has increased from nothing to about 10 percent of the total dollar volume of appropriations. A short 5 years ago we were delivering annually only 257 billion gallons of municipal and industrial water to contracting entities in 13 States; today, we are delivering over 493 billion gallons of municipal and industrial water to 91 major contracting entities in 15 States to help satisfy the domestic, commercial, and industrial needs of more than 10 million people. We currently have 30 projects involving an allocation to municipal and industrial water. These projects are listed as an attachment to this statement.

As noted, S. 1000 would place municipalities on the same footing as irrigation districts on title transfers to movable property. The same conditions would apply to the transfer of title to movable property to municipalities as currently apply to irrigation districts and other water users' organizations, i.e., the property must be purchased with funds advanced by the municipality, or, in the case of appropriated funds, the property must be necessary to the operation and maintenance of project works and the value thereof must be repaid under a contract with the municipality or other local contracting organization. In a number of cases, the local contracting district furnishes both irrigation and municipal water to its customers.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was agreed to.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, that concludes the call of the calendar. I thank Senators for their courtesy and patience.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the **PRESIDENT** pro tempore:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Commerce:

"HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 6

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to investigate experimentation in the field of artificial nucleation, or interference by artificial means with the natural precipitation of rain, hail, snow, moisture, or water in any form in the atmosphere

"Whereas experimentation in the field of interference by artificial means with natural precipitation is being conducted in several States, including the State of West Virginia; and

"Whereas the public interest, health, safety and welfare require that the effects of such experimentation be analyzed and evaluated by competent scientific investigation; and

"Whereas evaluation of the gain or loss occurring from such activities is in the national interest as well as in the interest of the people of the State of West Virginia: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia*, That the Congress of the United States investigate experimentation in the field of artificial nucleation, or interference by artificial means with the natural precipitation of rain, hail, snow, moisture, or water in any form in the atmosphere; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the clerk of the house of delegates is hereby directed to forward attested copies of this resolution to the President and Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the West Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States."

A resolution adopted by the Board of Trustees of the Village of Fox Point, Wis., relating to income taxes to be returned to the States and municipalities; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, at New Orleans, La., relating to the residency of Members of Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF OKLAHOMA LEGISLATURE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, the American farmer has long been recognized as a "tiller" of the soil. However, possibly even more significant to the future of American agriculture is the role of the farmer as a "steward" of the soil.

The Soil Conservation Service has, for nearly 30 years, assisted the American farmer in his battle against the erosion of the Nation's most precious natural resources of soil and water. Through this assistance, we have cooperatively avoided the recurrence of a disaster like the dustbowl days of the 1930's.

Man's technological advances have not included the development of means of manufacturing new soil. We have, however, through the Soil Conservation Service, devised important means of conserving the productivity of the land we now have.

This professional technology has for years been made available to the farmer at no cost, through the Soil Conservation Service. Free technical assistance has enabled the individual landowner to carry out conservation practices which otherwise would have been impossible due to his lack of monetary resources.

Conservation of our soil and water is beneficial, not to the farmer alone, but to every segment of our ever-increasing population. Continued production of food and fiber to meet the expanding demands of America and the world depends upon the continued stewardship and conservancy of our soil and water.

The Oklahoma State Legislature, by concurrent resolution which I submit for consideration by my colleagues, has clearly and rightly recognized the vital need for the continuation of technical assistance to the farmer at no increase in cost. The recommendation of the Budget Bureau to establish a revolving fund of $20 million, if adopted, will seriously hamper the future accomplishments of the Soil Conservation Service. Under this recommendation, those landowners who most need technical assistance would encounter the greatest hardships in paying for it. Thus, we would allow a creeping deterioration of our soil and water resources, which would in turn threaten our entire agricultural productivity in the future. I am absolutely opposed to this proposal.

I feel it is imperative that the Congress refuse to approve this increase in cost for technical assistance to landowners, I compliment the Oklahoma Legislature for acting on this serious problem, and I request on behalf of myself and my honored colleague, the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] that the resolution of the Oklahoma Legislature be printed at this point in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

A concurrent resolution expressing opposition of the Oklahoma State Legislature to the proposed decrease in appropriations to the Soil Conservation Service and to the proposed revolving fund

Whereas the Bureau of the Budget has proposed that the Soil Conservation Service appropriation for assisting locally organized and locally managed soil and water conservation districts be reduced by $20 million and that soil and water conservation districts and cooperating farmers, ranchers, and other landowners pay the Federal Government up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance furnished in the design, layout, and installation of planned soil and water conservation practices on their lands; and

Whereas if adopted this proposal would seriously slow down the soil and water conservation effort on the privately owned lands of this Nation and would result in an estimated decrease of 40 to 50 percent in the annual application of conservation practices; and

Whereas this proposal, if adopted, would reverse a policy of 30 years' standing in which the Federal Government has provided technical assistance through the Soil Conservation Service without charge to farmers, ranchers, and other landowners to install farmwide conservation programs on their property; and

Whereas the entire area of the State of Oklahoma is located within the boundaries of 87 soil and water conservation districts; and

Whereas the State of Oklahoma has annually appropriated funds to local soil and water conservation districts to form a working partnership with the Soil Conservation Service to install soil and water conservation practices on privately owned lands; and

Whereas if adopted this proposal would break faith with the State Legislature of Oklahoma who has been providing State funds for soil and water conservation with the understanding that the local-State-Federal team effort would be maintained as a team effort for the universal good of the Nation and all its people; and

Whereas the adoption of the revolving fund proposal would treat landowners unfairly by requiring them to assume still more of the town and city responsibility for soil and water conservation when they are at present contributing more than one-half the total cost of soil and water conservation practices in Oklahoma; and

Whereas the revolving fund proposal, if adopted, would severely retard water conservation and development in America at a time when such development is of necessity to all the people of this country; and

Whereas assessments proposed by the revolving fund will fall primarily on family farms and small operators and will discourage and seriously curtail the application of soil and water conservation measures so vital to the strength and welfare of the State of Oklahoma and the Nation; and

Whereas this proposed additional burden added to the cost of farmers and ranchers already in a depressed economical condition would greatly impair the ability of those people to participate in the conservation, development, and utilization of our soil and water resources; and

Whereas the supervisors and cooperators of the 87 soil and water conservation districts in the State of Oklahoma are of the opinion that the proposed cut in appropriations to the Soil Conservation Service for technical assistance and the proposed revolving fund are not practical nor in the best interests of the State of Oklahoma and of this country: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 30th session of the Oklahoma State Legislature (the Senate concurring therein):

Section 1. The Oklahoma State Legislature hereby records its complete opposition to the proposal of the Bureau of the Budget to reduce the appropriations to the Soil Conservation Service in the amount of $20 million, and to the proposed revolving fund whereby landowners and operators would be required to pay for up to 50 percent of the cost of the technical assistance for soil and water conservation practices.

Sec. 2. The Oklahoma State Legislature respectfully requests that the Congress of the United States continue the long-established policy of providing technical assistance to soil and water conservation districts and that sufficient funds for such assistance be provided to meet the increased demand by the landowners of the State of Oklahoma and of the Nation.

Sec. 3. That a duly attested copy of this resolution be transmitted by the Speaker of the Oklahoma House of Representatives to President Lyndon B. Johnson; Vice President Hubert Humphrey; Senator Allen J. Ellender, chairman, Senate Agriculture Committee; Senator Carl Hayden, chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee; Congressman Harold D. Cooley, chairman, House Agriculture Committee; Congressman George M. Mahon, House Appropriations Committee; Kermit Gordon, Director of the Budget; and to each member of the Oklahoma congressional delegation.

J. D. McCarty,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Glen Ham,
Acting President of the Senate.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Two concurrent resolutions of the Legislature of the State of South Dakota; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 15

"Concurrent resolution, memorializing Congress to enact legislation and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to take necessary administrative action to provide for an increase in the disposal price of grain being sold to millers of cereal grains to 120 percent of the support price, and to work toward long-term barter contracts with the underfed nations of the world to purchase American grain

"Whereas the grain surplus in the United States has been reduced by more than 50 percent from 1960 to 1964; and

"Whereas the grain now stored under Government loans constitutes less than 1 year's domestic consumption; and

"Whereas increasing grain production to provide a minimal diet for the world's underfed will provide the foundation for a peaceful and stable world; and

"Whereas increasing grain production will also increase the economic prosperity of the Nation's farming people: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the 40th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), do memorialize the Congress of the United States and the U.S. Department of Agriculture to consider the advisability of enacting legislation or taking necessary administrative action to increase the production of cereal grains, to increase the disposal price of grain now being sold to millers of cereal grain to 120 percent of the support price, and to work toward long-term barter contracts with the underfed nations of the world to purchase American grain; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of South Dakota to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Member of the Congress from this State, and to the U.S. Secretary of Agriculture.

"Charles Droz,
"*Speaker of the House.*
"Walter J. Matson,
"*Chief Clerk.*
"Lem Overpeck,
"*Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.*
"[seal] Niels P. Jensen,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

"House Concurrent Resolution 16

"Concurrent resolution, memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose and kill the proposed revolving fund through which farmers and ranchers would make $20 million in payments to the Soil Conservation Service for technical assistance

"Whereas the proposed revolving fund if adopted would seriously slow down the soil and water conservation effort on privately owned lands in South Dakota and the Nation resulting in a 40- to 50-percent reduction in annual application of conservation practices and reduce the quality of practices applied; and

"Whereas State legislatures, county governments, soil and water conservation districts, organizations, and individuals over a quarter of a century have been steadily building up their financial contributions to the soil and water conservation effort on privately owned lands. If adopted, this proposal would break faith with State and local government, soil and water conservation districts, organizations and individuals; and

"Whereas adopting of the revolving fund proposal would be unfair to American landowners. American landowners would be charged for technical assistance which the Federal Government now provide free of charge to people of many foreign lands; and

"Whereas soil conservation, flood control, and development of our soil and water resources contribute to the well-being of all of the people because they depend upon our limited supplies of soil and water for their daily requirements of food and water that come from well managed countryside; and

"Whereas adopting of the revolving fund proposal would have a damaging effect upon the conservation and development of the soil and water resources of South Dakota and America because the type of technical assistance now being provided by the Soil Conservation Service is not available anywhere else, even for hire, to provide complete technical assistance for natural resource planning and development, acre by acre, farm by farm, property by property on individual landholdings, watersheds, and whole communities; and

"Whereas a revolving fund would increase total conservation cost, a collection system outside the present accepted tax structure would have to be devised. Most farmers and ranchers would need more financial assistance to pay for technical aid to continue conservation and development of soil and water resources: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the House of Representatives of the 40th Legislature of the State of South Dakota (the Senate concurring therein), do memorialize the Congress of the United States to oppose and kill the revolving fund being proposed by the Bureau of the Budget and restore other recommended budget cuts affecting progress in conservation and development of soil, water, and other natural resources; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the secretary of state of the State of South Dakota to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

RESOLUTIONS OF GEORGIA LEGISLATURE

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, on behalf of my distinguished senior colleague from Georgia [Mr. Russell] and myself, I submit for appropriate reference and for printing in the Record resolutions adopted by the Legislature of the State of Georgia.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolutions will be received and appropriately referred.

The resolutions were received and appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"House Resolution 128-212

"Resolution requesting Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States; and for other purposes.

"*Be it resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia*, That this body respectfully petitions the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to article X of the amendments to the U.S. Constitution by adding thereto the following:

" 'Among the rights reserved to the States shall be the right to sole, and exclusive jurisdiction of public school systems in the separate States, and all rights, privileges and immunities of citizens of the separate States; as they relate to public school education, shall be determined solely by State courts. This Constitution shall not be construed in a manner to empower the President of the United States, the Congress or the Federal Judiciary to disparage or nullify this inherent right in the States;' and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the clerk of the house of representatives to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, to all presiding officers of the legislatures of the several States, to the Governors of the several States, and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"George D. Stewart,
"*Secretary.*
"Glenn W. Ellard,
"*Clerk.*"

"House Resolution 126

"Resolution requesting Congress to continue in full force and effect certain provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act; and for other purposes

"Whereas in 1947, the Georgia Legislature enacted a law which affirmed the inherent right of every person to work and bargain freely with his employer, individually or collectively, and give assurance that no person should be denied employment on account of membership or nonmembership in a labor union; and

"Whereas the movement for enactment of right-to-work laws began in 1944, and today some 20 States, with a total population in excess of 58 million, now have these laws in force; and

"Whereas at the national level, section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley bill, enacted in 1947, affirmed the authority of the States to pass such laws by providing that nothing in the act should be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment where such execution or application was prohibited by State or territorial law; and

"Whereas the U.S. Supreme Court subsequently upheld the constitutionality of section 14(b) and all State laws enacted under its authority; and

"Whereas, labor union leaders are organizing to bring about the repeal of section 14(b) by the 89th Congress, and, in the same vein, the National Labor Relations Board recently ruled to deny an employer the right to express his views to employees except through union representatives at the bargaining table; and

"Whereas the right-to-work law in Georgia and other States has served as the single greatest stimulant to economic growth since World War II, resulting in prosperity unprecedented in history; and

"Whereas people of Georgia believe in man's God-given right to earn his daily bread through honest toil, with free choice in accepting or rejecting artificial restrictions which may be imposed by labor or other forces: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Georgia (the Senate of Georgia concurring), That we memorialize the U.S. Congress to continue section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act in full force and effect, so that the right to work under its sanctions as guaranteed to 58 million people in 20 States will not be invalidated; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Senator and Representative from the State of Georgia in the Congress of the United States.

"Glenn W. Ellard,
"Clerk.
"George D. Stewart,
"Secretary."

"House Resolution 269

"Resolution requesting the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to transfer the Public Health Service hospital in Savannah to the site now occupied by the Hunter Air Force Base Hospital, in the event said Public Health Service hospital is closed; and for other purposes

"Whereas the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has announced that in the interest of economy the U.S. Public Health Service hospital in Savannah will be closed as of June 30, 1966; and

"Whereas said hospital has been in existence for over 60 years and employs over 150 employees with an annual payroll of over $1 million; and

"Whereas said announcement states if a Public Health Service hospital were to be retained in Savannah, the present facility would have to be replaced because it is totally obsolete; and

"Whereas considerable expenditures will be made to modernize and expand the five remaining Public Health Service hospitals located in major ports of this country to handle the expected 20-percent increase in patient loads; and

"Whereas the Department of Defense has recently announced the proposed closing of Hunter Air Force Base in 1967, including the new modern equipped hospital and dental clinic that was recently built at great expense to the Government, said hospital, clinic, and equipment requiring an expenditure of approximately $4 million; and

"Whereas said Hunter Air Force Hospital has a 200-bed chassis which meets the requirements of the Public Health Service as set forth in its report and further has considerable acreage which would permit expansion to meet the needs of our expected population explosion; and

"Whereas the Hunter Air Force Hospital in addition has new modern housing which could be used to house interns, resident physicians and nurses and would be of great assistance in attracting qualified personnel; and

"Whereas the Memorial Hospital is an expanding medical center with a fully qualified intern training program and nurse training program, which is in close proximity to Hunter and offers an excellent opportunity of close affiliation with the Public Health Service hospital for further training of its personnel; and

"Whereas the announced closing of the Public Health Service hospitals will result in hospitals being located in five major ports serving every geographical area on the coast of this Nation with the exception of the South Atlantic coast; and

"Whereas there is a great need for a Public Health Service hospital in Savannah as evidenced by the present facility operating at full capacity and, further, said need will increase with the scheduled closing of Hunter Hospital where retired military personnel and dependents are receiving treatment; and

"Whereas there is a great number of merchant seamen, uniformed members of the Coast Guard, Coast Geodetic Survey and Public Health Service employees and their dependents located in Savannah, as well as a large number of retired military personnel and dependents, veterans, Government employees, and members of the Armed Forces and their dependents; all of whom are entitled to treatment in the Public Health Service hospital: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare be urged to transfer the Public Health Service hospital to the site now occupied by the Hunter Air Force Base Hospital in the event said hospital is closed; and be it further

"Resolved, That Senator Richard B. Russell, Senator Herman E. Talmadge, and Gov. Carl E. Sanders are requested to do all within their power to correct this inequity and to retain for this section of our country this much needed facility and, further, that copies of this resolution be directed to them and to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

"George D. Stewart,
"Secretary.
"Glenn W. Ellard,
"Clerk."

To the Committee on Public Works:

"House Resolution 268

"Resolution requesting that the Walter F. George Reservoir be named Lake Chattahoochee; and for other purposes

"Whereas the Walter F. George lock and dam has impounded the waters of the Chattahoochee River in southwest Georgia, creating a 45,000-acre lake which lies over both Georgia and Alabama territory; and

"Whereas through the efforts of the State of Alabama, there is presently an effort to have said reservoir designated as Lake Eufaula; and

"Whereas the riverbed of the Chattahoochee River lies totally within the territorial limits of the State of Georgia; and

"Whereas the Chattahoochee River has been immortalized in song and story by the late Sidney Lanier, former poet laureate of Georgia, in his immortal 'Song of the Chattahoochee'; and

"Whereas one of the 159 counties in Georgia is named for the Chattahoochee River, as well as several cities and towns and soil conservation districts; and

"Whereas the name of this important reservoir should not bear the name of any particular city or town lying along this reservoir which is not representative of the general area through which this river flows; and

"Whereas the Chattahoochee River from its headwaters to the Georgia-Florida line lies totally within the State of Georgia; and

"Whereas Georgia Congressman Maston O'Neal has introduced legislation in Congress designating this reservoir 'Lake Winston Churchill': Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the General Assembly of Georgia, That this body does hereby urgently request the U.S. Congress to designate this reservoir as Lake Chattahoochee; be it further

"Resolved, That the State Highway Department of Georgia is hereby requested to place signs in sufficient number along the highway adjacent to this reservoir to properly and adequately designate the reservoir as 'Lake Chattahoochee'; be it further

"Resolved, That the clerk of the house of representatives is hereby authorized and instructed to transmit an appropriate copy of this resolution to the Georgia congressional delegation.

"George D. Stewart,
"Secretary.
"Glenn W. Ellard,
"Clerk."

APPOINTMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. On behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 88–271, I announce the appointment of the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jackson] as a member, on the part of the Senate, to the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico in lieu of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson], resigned.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, with amendments:

S. 254. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 142).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. KUCHEL (for himself, Mr. Allott, Mr. Bible, Mr. Jordan of Idaho, Mr. Moss, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Dominick, and Mr. Young of North Dakota):

S. 1636. A bill to clarify the relationship of interests of the United States and of the States in the use of the waters of certain streams; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Kuchel when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HAYDEN:

S. 1637. A bill for the relief of Pao Yuen Shih; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RANDOLPH (by request):

S. 1638. A bill to increase the limitation on emergency relief for the repair or reconstruction of highways under section 125 of title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SIMPSON:

S. 1639. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp commemorating the 75th anniversary of Wyoming's statehood; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. CANNON (for himself and Mr. BIBLE):

S. 1640. A bill to provide for the granting of patents with respect to certain desertland entries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. CANNON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1641. A bill to amend section 1403 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to perfect certain provisions of the International Aviation Facilities Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BURDICK:

S. 1642. A bill to officially designate as Garrison Dam the dam on the Missouri River in North Dakota commonly referred to by that name, and to change the name of the reservoir above such dam to Lake Sakakawea; to the Committee on Public Works.

CLARIFICATION OF RELATIONSHIP OF INTERESTS OF THE UNITED STATES AND OF THE STATES IN USE OF WATERS OF CERTAIN STREAMS

Mr. KUCHEL. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to clarify the relationship of interests of the United States and the States in the use of waters of certain streams. The bill is introduced on behalf of myself, Mr. ALLOTT, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, Mr. MOSS, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, and Mr. DOMINICK. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may remain at the desk for 1 week for the purpose of possibly obtaining additional sponsors.

This bill is a revision of my bill S. 1275, 88th Congress, with the same title and purpose, in which Senators MOSS, JORDAN, BIBLE, CHURCH, and ENGLE joined me.

This bill, like its predecessor, is sponsored by the American Bar Association, and was drafted in collaboration with, the distinguished water lawyer, Mr. Northcutt Ely, chairman of the Water Resources Committee of the Section of Mineral and Natural Resources Law of the American Bar Association. It incorporates principles which I first stated in a bill I introduced in a still earlier Congress, S. 2636 in the 87th Congress.

These principles attracted the support of the American Bar Association, as indeed they did of a large number of national, regional, and State organizations concerned with water resources. I am annexing a representative listing of some of them.

The Water Resources Committee of the Section of Mineral and Natural Resources of the American Bar Association subsequently subjected that draft bill to extensive study. The committee is composed of lawyers from all parts of the country, primarily, however, from the Western States, and most of them have had extensive experience in the water resources development field. As a result of the review of the draft bill by the Water Resources Committee, a number of amendments were recommended. I thought well of them and introduced the amended bill as S. 1275 in the 88th Congress.

The house of delegates of the American Bar Association, at its August 1963 meeting, adopted a resolution endorsing these principles as stated in S. 1275, 88th Congress, and directed its officers to appear in support of them. The bar association's resolution, with the recommendation of the section of mineral and natural resources law which led to its adoption, may be found at the end of my present statement.

Hearings on S. 1275 were held in the 88th Congress. The changes which I have now made, in introducing the present bill, are designed to clarify the points upon which some witnesses professed some misunderstanding. The objectives are unchanged.

We attempt in this bill to strike a fair balance between the exercise of Federal power, employed in the development of water resources and, on the other hand, the protection of preexisting property rights in those same waters. We are not concerned with doctrinaire disputes and the source of the Federal power. We do not pass upon the contention of some Federal lawyers that the Government owns the rights to all the water originating in Federal lands, because the King of Spain owned them and ceded them to Mexico, and Mexico ceded them to the United States. We do not argue the question of whether the United States has paramount power. We do not debate the question of whether, as creation of a State, it controls the water originating on the Federal lands in that State. We do not interpret old Federal statutes to discover whether they did or did not recognize appropriations of navigable waters, or dissect the claims of the States to the beds of navigable streams, with their attendant effect on water rights, especially riparian rights. All we do is to say that whatever the constitutional basis of the Federal point may be—whether the commerce clause, the property clause, the war power, the general welfare, or whatever—when the United States exercises its constitutional power to consider a project for the development and use of water resources, and the construction or operation of that project causes damage to, or conflicts with a preexisting property right in those waters which arose under the laws of the State, then the Federal power may, of course, be exercised, but compensation shall be paid for the taking of the water right, just as for any other real property.

My bill has the following basic objectives, stated in the order in which corresponding sections appear.

First. Effect of reservations and withdrawals: Section 1 would change existing law as to the effect of reservations or withdrawals of Federal lands on water rights which are created under State law.

Section 1 provides:

> SECTION 1. Subject to the exceptions stated in section 5, the withdrawal or reservation of surveyed or unsurveyed lands of the United States, heretofore or hereafter made, shall not affect any right to the use of navigable or nonnavigable water acquired pursuant to State law either.
>
> (1) before the establishment of such withdrawal or reservation, or
>
> (2) after the establishment of such withdrawal or reservation, unless, in the latter event, a Federal statute, or an officer of the United States authorized to make such a withdrawal or reservation, shall have promulgated the purpose, quantity, and priority date of the water right reserved to the United States or otherwise established under its own laws, and such promulgation shall have antedated the initiation of the conflicting right under State law.

We deal here with two situations:

The first is that where a water right has been initiated under State law before a Federal reservation or withdrawal of land along the same stream is made. We say that the preexisting State-created water right shall not be adversely affected by the later creation of a Federal reservation. There should be little dispute about this.

The second situation is that where the State-generated water right is created after the reservation or withdrawal is made. Here we say that the State-created water right is good unless some Federal statute, or an official authorized by statute to make such a withdrawal or reservation, specificially promulgates the purpose, quantity, and priority dates of the water right which the United States intended to reserve for the benefit of that reservation or withdrawal under its own laws, and the date of promulgation antedates that of the conflicting right claimed under State law. This gives ample opportunity for the definition and protection of water rights needed by any Federal reservation, while giving notice to the world of the priority date and magnitude of the Federal claim. Such notice is now lacking. This proposal would thus cure the gross unfairness of the present situation, under which a rancher who has used water for many years may find his water cut off because it originates in a national forest reservation, which was created still earlier, on which the Government now wishes to build a newly conceived project never contemplated when the withdrawal or reservation was made. This has happened.

Whereas in California, a high proportion of the mountain areas of origin of our water supplies are Federal lands, all of them withdrawn or reserved, the dormant Federal claim, undefined in magnitude, hangs like a sword of Damocles over present investments and over future planning of the use of our water resources.

Here it is fair to make acknowledgment of the contribution made by the Departments of Interior, Defense, and

Justice during the Eisenhower administration, under the chairmanship of Hon. Elmer F. Bennett, Under Secretary of the Interior, in drafting and presenting to the Congress the "agency bill," so referred to because it was the proposal of those Government agencies. It was prompted by the concern created by the Supreme Court's decision in *FPC* v. *Oregon*, 349 U.S. 435 (1955). Unfortunately it was never introduced in the form presented by the agencies, but was substantially amended before introduction, and the bill that was introduced failed of passage. I have drawn upon the "agency bill" in preparing S. 1275 and the present bill. Section 1 of S. 1275, which dealt with the reservation problem, was taken verbatim from the agency proposal. In my present bill, I have modified the earlier language in the interest of clarity. I have proposed language which would strike a fair balance between the preservation of established equities and the effectuation of the purposes of establishment of a Federal reservation. The key to the proposed compromise is the requirement that, if the making of a reservation is to cutoff rights of citizens to thereafter put water to use with any firmness to their water right, and thus require that water to waste to the sea until the Federal Government gets around to putting the reserved water to use, then, in order to have that drastic effect, the intent to do so must be stated, not merely implied, in a publicized statute or order which shall state the purpose, the quantity, and the priority date of the water right so reserved to the United States. Thereafter, and only thereafter, will private development of that water resource proceed at its own risk.

Note that here, as throughout the bill, we make these principles applicable to both navigable and nonnavigable waters. This is because the Government has recently claimed that the Desert Land Act, under which some 10 million acres have gone to patent in 16 of the Western States pursuant to a finding by the Secretary of the Interior, required by the statute, that the entryman had a valid appropriative water right under State law, gives no protection where the water right, even though so approved by the Secretary, is one which is asserted against the waters of a navigable stream such as the Sacramento, Columbia, San Joaquin, or Colorado.

Note also the cross-reference which we make to section 5. This has the effect of exempting Indian reservations from the effect of section 1. We except Indian reservations because a sense of fairness compels special rules for the protection of Indian wards of the Government, where the water is in fact used by Indians. As to the case where the water reserved for an Indian reservation is used by non-Indian lessees, I shall have more to say later, in connection with section 5.

Second. Rights claimed by the United States under State law: In section 2 we deal with the case in which the United States is not relying upon a water right which it claims to have created for itself under its own laws by a reservation or withdrawal of Federal land, but is relying upon a water right which was created under the laws of a State, and which the United States claims to have acquired either by an original appropriation made for its benefit, or by purchase or condemnation from a prior owner.

This section provides:

> SEC. 2. Any right to the diversion, storage, distribution, or use of water which the United States or those claiming under the United States assert to have been established under the laws of a State shall be neither greater nor less than the right recognized by the laws of such State in a private citizen in like circumstances, and shall be initiated and perfected in accordance with the procedure established by the laws of that State: *Provided*, That this section shall not affect any authority which the United States may have to establish water rights under its own laws, heretofore or hereafter enacted.

The United States does frequently acquire water rights by proceedings, in accordance with State law, before some State administrative agency, or by buying or condemning preexisting water rights from someone who himself had acquired them. Section 7 of the reclamation law provides for this, and this practice has been followed by the Interior Department for over 60 years. It would seem axiomatic that where the Federal Government elects to thus proceed under State law, it acquires only what State law gives. But Government lawyers make the contrary claim. For example, here is the Court's characterization of the Federal Government's claim in the Fallbrook case (*U.S.* v. *Fallbrook PUD*, 165 F. Supp. 806, 828–29 (S.D. Calif. 1958)):

> (2) State police regulation theory:
>
> That California's statutory application and permit procedures for the acquisition of an appropriative water right are police regulations which are inapplicable to the United States, with the result that, even if all other water users must comply with such procedures in order to acquire a valid appropriative right, the United States can obtain the right merely by taking and using water.

The language of section 2 would put an end to this sort of contention. But we do not intend to affect the instances in which the Congress has specifically empowered the United States to impound water and dispose of it by contract, as in the Boulder Canyon Project Act, independently of State law, as the Supreme Court construed that act in *Arizona* v. *California*, 373 U.S. 546 (1963), or the instances in which Congress may do so in the future.

Third. Compensability: Section 3 assures that when water rights, created under State law, are taken by the United States or under its authority, compensation shall be paid if the State itself would have to pay for them if it took them. This is perhaps the most important section in the bill. It reads:

> SEC. 3. No vested right to the diversion, storage or use of any waters, navigable or nonnavigable, acquired under the laws of a State and recognized by the laws in force as of the effective date of this Act in that State as being compensable if taken or used by or under the authority of the State, shall be taken or used by or under the authority of the United States without just compensation. "Vested right" shall mean either (1) an appropriative right initiated in accordance with the general laws of the State applicable to the appropriation of water rights, which has been exercised either by the commencement of actual diversion, storage or use of water, or by the commencement of construction of works for such purposes, and which is thereafter maintained with reasonable diligence in the completion of such works and application of water to such purposes, or (2) a riparian, overlying, or pueblo right, to the extent that such laws of the State recognize such rights, or (3) a prescriptive right or any other water right to the extent that water has been put to beneficial use.

This would remove an illogical anachronism which has been developed by the courts with respect to the so-called navigation servitude, by which the Federal Government may preempt the use of waters of a navigable stream or any of its nonnavigable tributaries which affect its navigable capacity, thereby destroying vested water rights, and do so without compensation for those rights so long as it is furthering navigation interests under the commerce power. But if the Federal Government takes a water right pursuant to any constitutional power other than the navigation facet of the commerce power, it has to pay compensation. That is demonstrated by *International Paper Co.* v. *U.S.*, 282 U.S. 399 (1931), in which the Federal Government took certain water rights pursuant to the war power and the Supreme Court held that compensation was constitutionally required.

See also *U.S.* v. *Gerlach Live Stock Co.*, 339 U.S. 725 (1950), in which, over the strong objections of the Department of Justice, the U.S. Supreme Court required the Government to pay for State-generated water rights taken in the development of the San Joaquin River, a navigable stream. It held that the taking was in aid of reclamation, not navigation. However, if those same rights, in either the International Paper case or the Gerlach case, had been taken by the Federal Government pursuant to its power to control navigation, no compensation would be required. The two decisions so recognize. This was the result reached in *United States* v. *Twin City Power Co.*, 350 U.S. 222 (1956), as to the "reservoir value" of lands flooded by a federally authorized project.

There is no logical basis for this exception to the general requirements of the fifth amendment, but it has become imbedded in the law. Fortunately, the Supreme Court has said that even though compensation is not constitutionally required in such cases, Congress may provide for compensation as it sees fit. Thus, with respect to certain Federal water resource development programs, Congress has already provided that if vested water rights recognized under State law are taken or infringed, then compensation shall be paid. This is true under the Reclamation Act of 1902—see Gerlach, supra—and the Federal Power Act of 1920. See *FPC* v. *Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.*, 347 U.S. 239 (1954). The present bill, in section 3, would simply extend the protection which Congress has afforded to property rights under the Reclamation Act and the Federal Power Act to all vested water rights—as defined in the bill—whenever such rights are taken or impaired by any water resource development projects undertaken by the Federal Government or under its authority throughout the Nation.

This bill would not endow any asserted rights with a sanctity that they would not have under State law. We seek to protect only the rights which have become vested prior to the Federal taking. In riparian-law States, the right inheres in the riparian land, as a part of its title. In the appropriation-law States, by "vested" we mean water rights initiated and maintained in accordance with State law, for the utilization of which diversion, storage, or other works have been actually constructed, and which are being applied to use with reasonable diligence. In such event, the priority of the right, as everywhere recognized, relates back to the date of its initiation, and its magnitude and value are subject to proof, as in any condemnation case. This is the rule in all of the appropriation-law States, the dry areas of the country. It is the rule recognized by sections 7 and 8 of the reclamation law. The magnitude of the right is limited not only by the capacity of the diversion works, but by the court's determination of the water supply available for that diversion, taking into account the streamflow and the water user's relative priority on the stream, as well as the court's determination of the issue of diligence as related to the quantity of water that the project could expect to put to use in a reasonable time. Cities and reclamation projects, for example, must build aqueducts and canals for their future populations and needs, not for those of today, and their water rights are not measured by the quantity of water that they used yesterday, but by the quantity that will be put to use ultimately by the diligent use of those works.

But we do not protect paper rights, such as those involved in *United States* v. *Grand River Dam Authority*, 363 U.S. 229 (1960). If a water right would not be compensable under State law if taken by the State itself, it will not be compensable if taken by the Federal Government. Moreover, we limit the test of compensability under State law to those State laws which are in force at the time of the passage of this bill. We thus avoid any possibility, however remote, that a State may hereafter create exotic water rights of some kind which the Federal Government may have to pay for. Private as well as municipal and State investments in water resource development should be encouraged. The Federal Government should not have to bear the whole burden of water resource development. Security of tenure is essential to the attraction of the necessary capital for this purpose. The protection of such investments should not be limited to nonnavigable streams. Under the Supreme Court's decisions, as the special master observed during the trial of Arizona against California, any stream is navigable which is deep enough to float a Supreme Court opinion.

If Federal water resource projects are in the national interest, as of course they are, it is only fair that the cost of destroying preexisting water rights to make way for those Federal projects, like the cost of destroying other real property, such as existing buildings, shall be borne by the Federal Treasury, not the individual investors who lose their water supply to the new project. The burden of the cost of acquisition of such rights, on most projects, is negligible to the Government, but catastrophic to the individual from whom they are taken without payment. A few years back the costs of water rights purchased by the Government on the great Central Valley project in California comprised less than 1 percent of total project costs.

Section 3 should properly lay to rest one of the Justice Department's most recent efforts to negate the congressional directive for compensation in the Reclamation Act and the Federal Power Act. It has asserted that no compensable private water rights can ever be acquired in a navigable stream absent congressional consent. The Department's contention is summed up in its brief of June 30, 1959, before the special master in Arizona against California, in which it spent several pages of argument attempting to justify the position that:

> As against the United States, privately owned rights to the use of the navigable waters are not possible in the absence of express provision therefor by Congress. (P. 48.)

If this is so, then, as I have stated earlier, millions of acres have been improperly patented under the Desert Land Act of 1877 throughout the West, because they are irrigated from navigable streams, and, under that statute, the entryman was not entitled to a patent unless he could prove to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that he had made a valid appropriation of water under State law. It seems incredible that anyone can seriously contend that the water rights in most of the western streams on which such development has been based are invalid and can be destroyed without compensation. This bill, in section 3, would make it clear that Congress does not share that view.

Fourth. Condemnation: Section 4 deals with the situation in which the Government finds it necessary to acquire State-created water rights which the owner declines to sell. The section provides:

> SEC. 4. If works hereafter constructed by or under the authority of the United States impair or interfere with the utilization of any right to the diversion, storage, or other use of water which is vested and compensable under section 3, and if agreement with the owner of said right as to the compensation due for such impairment or interference has not been reached by the time of the initial interference with such right, the United States shall initiate and diligently prosecute proceedings to condemn the same under appropriate Federal or State laws of eminent domain. If it shall fail to do so, no statute of limitations shall apply against a suit by the injured party against the United States for compensation for such impairment or interference in a Federal court of competent jurisdiction; but nothing in this Act shall authorize an action to enjoin such impairment or interference, if such an injunction action could not be maintained in the absence of this Act.

The section makes three important points:

First, if negotiation fails, the Government is directed to resort to condemnation, not merely to seize the water without judicial process and tell the luckless owner to sue in the Court of Claims. This has been done, and, under existing law, the Government has been sustained.

Second, the bill tells the Government that if for any reason it does not proceed in this orderly way, the owner's right to sue for compensation remains intact, and, moreover, no statute of limitation runs against him. The case in which this problem and the preceding one arose will be referred to in a moment.

Third, we say that the right to fair compensation, secured by this section, shall not be construed to impliedly authorize injunction suits to stop the building of a project. We add this in order to quiet some rather inchoate anxieties expressed in the hearings on S. 1275.

The compensability and statute-of-limitations problem is highlighted by *Dugan* v. *Rank*, 372 U.S. 609. In that case the Bureau of Reclamation, in constructing the Friant Dam unit of the Central Valley project, purchased a number of water rights on the lower reaches of the stream below the dam, and contracted with other users that it would maintain certain minimum streamflows. But it failed to work out satisfactory arrangements with certain other users who asserted various claims. When the dam was finally closed and operations were begun, the water supply to some of the claimants downstream was curtailed. Those users sought to enjoin the operation of the project unless the Government would maintain the natural flow of the stream at their points of diversion, or agree to a physical solution which would give them the equivalent of their preexisting rights. The Supreme Court held that the suit could not be brought against the United States, either directly or through certain Bureau of Reclamation officials, because there had been no congressional consent to suit. More importantly, however, the Court held that the Federal Government by the mere closure of the dam had partially taken the water rights of the complaining users and that the appropriate remedy was a suit for damages under the Tucker Act. Presumably the Court of Claims will make the necessary determination as to what water rights, if any, were taken and the compensation that should be paid as required by the Reclamation Act.

But witnesses in the hearings on S. 1275 asserted, and defended, the probability that the statute of limitations had begun to run when Friant Dam's gates were closed, and that this would preclude recovery in the Court of Claims.

The broad problem here concerns the proper relationship of the Federal Government to its citizens. If water rights have to be taken for a Federal project, they should be acquired in an orderly eminent domain proceeding in which adequate notice is given to all the potentially affected users, a declaration of taking is filed in the appropriate court, and all issues are joined before the project is built, and some unsuspecting user, far downstream, has his rights taken with no more notice than that the project is in operation. The danger of such a user's rights being cut off by the statute of limitations is substantial. The orderly way is for everyone to know what his rights are, to know what the Federal Government intends to do, and just what is going to be done in the way of curtailment of existing rights by construction of a Federal project. This is accomplished through the employment by the Government of traditional eminent domain proceedings if the necessary rights cannot be acquired by agreement. Contrary to some arguments which we have heard, this is no great burden on the Federal Government. But even if there are any burdens here, they properly should be placed on the Federal Government rather than on the individual water users. When a planning report is made for a project, for example, the construction agency is usually well aware whether existing rights on the stream may be impaired by the operation of the project. If purchase negotiations are unsuccessful, the United States should file a declaration of taking and then get on with the project.

Some have argued that requiring the Federal Government to go through eminent domain proceedings will unduly hold up the construction of projects. This possibility is negated and prohibited by the express language we propose. Immediate possession can be taken. If anyone is overlooked in this procedure, he is not entitled to stop the project by an injunction suit against a Bureau official. Some individuals, if overlooked initially, might have to be brought into the eminent domain proceedings later, or, if they are completely overlooked, might have to resort to the Court of Claims. Section 4 simply puts the burden on the Federal Government, where it belongs, to go forward in a reasonable and orderly fashion to obtain the necessary rights to get the project underway rather than permitting it to preempt a stream and throw the burden on the water users to try to find out what has been taken, if anything, and how they are to go about getting water or compensation. The bill proposes good policy and fairplay.

Fifth. Preservation of existing laws: Section 5 of the act is a series of savings clauses. Several, but not all of them, are derived from the original "agency bill."

> SEC. 5. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as—
>
> (1) modifying or repealing any provision of any existing Act of Congress relative to acquisition by the United States of rights to the use of water pursuant to State law;
>
> (2) permitting appropriations of water under State law which interfere with the provisions of international treaties of the United States;
>
> (3) amending, altering, or repealing any provision of any law which limits the acreage in single ownership that may be served with water made available under the reclamation law: *Provided*, That the same acreage limitations that are imposed by the reclamation law shall be applicable to water made available for irrigation under any other Federal law by users other than Indians, pursuant to a Federal reservation or withdrawal;
>
> (4) affecting, impairing, diminishing, subordinating, or enlarging (a) the rights of the United States or any State to waters under any interstate compact or existing judicial decree, (b) any obligations of the United States to Indians or Indian tribes, or any claim of right owned or held by or for Indians or Indian tribes, (c) any water right heretofore acquired by others than the United States under Federal or State law, (d) any right to any quantity of water used for governmental purposes or programs of the United States at any time prior to the effective date of this Act, (e) any right of the United States to use water which is hereafter lawfully initiated in the exercise of the express or necessarily implied authority of any present or future Act of Congress or State law when such right is initiated prior to the acquisition by others of any right to use water pursuant to State law, (g) any preference accorded by Federal or State law to any public agency with respect to electric power;

The reasons for these provisions may be briefly stated.

Subsection 1 states that nothing in this bill would repeal any act of Congress relative to acquisition by the United States of rights to the use of water pursuant to State law. Thus section 8 of the Reclamation Act of 1902, for example, would not be affected.

Subsection 2 simply states the existing law, that a treaty is the supreme law of the land and rights in international streams are not to impair or interfere in any way with the provisions of any treaty affecting those waters. This language originated in the "agency bill," and I have no objection to it.

Subsection 3 is new. It disclaims any effect on any acreage limitation provisions in the Federal or State laws. There is no conceivable way in which either S. 1275 or the present bill could be construed to repeal or affect the 160-acre limitation of the reclamation law, but, inasmuch as certain witnesses in the hearings on S. 1275 professed to be worrying about this imaginary ill, there is no harm in putting an end to this illusion.

The real acreage limitation problem is illustrated by what is now happening on the Colorado River Indian Reservation in Arizona and California. Here a massive expansion of irrigation of desert lands by large non-Indian lessees is under way, with the blessing of the Interior Department, which is a continuing process of issuing such leases. These lessees include large corporations which are allowed by the Government to lease up to 6,000 acres apiece, and which will reap huge profits from gobbling up, for speculative expansion, the water that is so desperately needed in central Arizona and in California for the preservation of the existing economies in those States. All that the Indians get out of this promotion is rental money, and the Government would be many millions of dollars ahead if it paid them more generous rentals than the corporate lessees offer, while postponing this unnecessary expansion of the overload on the Colorado River's water supply until we can import enough water to meet the existing requirements in Arizona, California, and Nevada. This will be costly at best. It will be even more costly if we have to import water to replace these increasing depletions, caused by non-Indian users of a water right that Congress reserved for Indians. My bill, in section 5(3), a new provision, accordingly would extend the 160-acre limitation of the reclamation law to the use of all water which is made available by a Federal reservation or withdrawal. Without this amendment, the 160-acre limitation does not apply to lands in Indian reservations, even a 6,000-acre corporate farm of a non-Indian lessee. The amendment, as a practical matter, affects only non-Indian large-scale lessees, because no Indian irrigates as much as the 160 acres of irrigated land which the reclamation law permits to a single man, or the 320 acres that it permits to a married couple; but, to make sure that Indian rights are not interfered with we do not extend the acreage limitation to uses by Indians themselves.

This situation on the Colorado River Indian Reservation is so serious that it should have an immediate and separate cure, perhaps in appropriation bills dealing with the particular reservation, and should not await enactment of this general legislation.

Subsection 4 of section 5 is a general disclaimer assuring that certain other existing rights and obligations are not impaired or modified in any way by this legislation. It is derived from the "agency bill," for the most part. In particular, subsection 4(a) preserves the rights of the United States or any State under existing compacts or judicial decrees—4(b) preserves obligations of the United States to Indian tribes, and rights held for any Indian tribes. This is discussed earlier in connection with sections 1 and 5(3). Subsection 4(c) leaves unaffected valid water rights heretofore acquired by other than the United States under Federal or State law—4(d) protects any existing uses by the Federal Government which were made for a valid governmental purpose under either State or Federal law, before enactment of this bill.

Subsection 4(e) is a prospective provision which would make it clear that valid future rights may be acquired for Federal projects by congressional authorization so long as such rights are initiated prior to the acquisition by others of intervening rights under State law. It is a simple statement of the priority principle which has been at the heart of water resources development in the West for a hundred years, and makes it clear—if any clarification were needed—that whatever power the United States may have under the Constitution and specific Federal legislation to generate water rights under its own laws is not restricted, nor is the Government compelled, by this bill, to resort solely to State laws to generate or acquire water rights which it may need. The same principle is respected in the proviso to section 2.

Subsection 4(f) preserves all existing preferences which appear in Federal and State law in favor of public agencies with respect to electric power. Again, there is no conceivable way in which S. 1275 could have impinged on such statutes. But some witnesses seemed to think there was, and there is no harm in saying that this shall not happen.

The final section provides:

SEC. 6. This act may be cited as the Water Rights Act of 1965.

Conclusion: This bill will facilitate the development of the Nation's water resources by putting an end to the most serious conflicts between Federal and State interests which now impede the coordination of these interests in regional planning.

The purpose of today's presentation is simply to explain what is in the bill, and why. I shall postpone to another day a more complete exposition of the urgency for action in the fields of conflict which this bill identifies and attempts to solve, and of the serious impediments which may stand in the way of the urgently needed development of our western water resources if we do not solve these problems.

I have a resolution of the house of delegates of the American Bar Association, adopted in August 1963; a statement in support of the section of the mineral and natural resources law of the recommended legislation, from the American bar; a tabulation of the support of S. 1275 in the 88th Congress, which, as I say, is the predecessor of the present bill. I ask unanimous consent that the documents to which I have just alluded be printed at this point in the RECORD, and I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of those inserts, a copy of the entire text of the bill be set forth in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk as requested, and the bill and documents will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1636) to clarify the relationship of interests of the United States and of the States in the use of the waters of certain streams, introduced by Mr. KUCHEL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. Subject to the exceptions stated in section 5, the withdrawal or reservation of surveyed or unsurveyed lands of the United States, heretofore or hereafter made, shall not affect any right to the use of navigable or nonnavigable water acquired pursuant to State law either—

(1) before the establishment of such withdrawal or reservation, or

(2) after the establishment of such withdrawal or reservation, unless, in the latter event, a Federal statute, or an officer of the United States authorized to make such a withdrawal or reservation, shall have promulgated the purpose, quantity, and priority date of the water right reserved to the United States or otherwise established under its own laws, and such promulgation shall have antedated the initiation of the conflicting right under State law.

SEC. 2. Any right to the diversion, storage, distribution, or use of water which the United States or those claiming under the United States assert to have been established under the laws of a State shall be neither greater nor less than those accorded by the laws of that State to uses of water by others than the United States (including the State itself) in like circumstances, and shall be initiated and perfected in accordance with the procedure established by the laws of that State; *Provided,* That this section shall not affect any authority which the United States may have to establish water rights under its own laws, heretofore or hereafter enacted.

SEC. 3. No vested right to the diversion, storage or use of any waters, navigable or nonnavigable, acquired under the laws of a State and recognized by the laws in force as of the effective date of this Act in that State as being compensable if taken or used by or under the authority of the State, shall be taken or used by or under the authority of the United States without just compensation. "Vested right" shall mean either (1) an appropriative right initiated in accordance with the general laws of the State applicable to the appropriation of water rights, which has been exercised either by the commencement of actual diversion, storage or use of water, or by the commencement of construction of works for such purposes, and which is thereafter maintained with reasonable diligence in the completion of such works and application of water to such purposes, or (2) a riparian, overlying, or pueblo right, to the extent that such laws of the State recognize such rights, or (3) a prescriptive right or any other water right to the extent that water has been put to beneficial use.

SEC. 4. If works hereafter constructed by or under the authority of the United States impair or interfere with the utilization of any right to the diversion, storage, or other use of water which is vested and compensable under section 3, and if agreement with the owner of said right as to the compensation due for such impairment or interference has not been reached by the time of the initial interference with such right, the United States shall initiate and diligently prosecute proceedings to condemn the same under appropriate Federal or State laws of eminent domain. If it shall fail to do so, no statute of limitations shall apply against a suit by the injured party against the United States for compensation for such impairment or interference in a Federal court of competent jurisdiction; but nothing in this Act shall authorize an action to enjoin such impairment or interference, if such an injunction action could not be maintained in the absence of this Act.

SEC. 5. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as—

(1) modifying or repealing any provision of any existing Act of Congress relative to acquisition by the United States of rights to the use of water pursuant to State law;

(2) permitting appropriations of water under State law which interfere with the provisions of international treaties of the United States;

(3) amending, altering, or repealing any provision of any law which limits the acreage in single ownership that may be served with water made available under the reclamation law: *Provided,* That the same acreage limitations that are imposed by the reclamation law shall be applicable to water made available for irrigation under any other Federal law by users other than Indians, pursuant to a Federal reservation or withdrawal;

(4) affecting, impairing, diminishing, subordinating, or enlarging (a) the rights of the United States or any State to waters under any interstate compact or existing judicial decree, (b) any obligations of the United States to Indians or Indian tribes, or any claim of right owned or held by or for Indians or Indian tribes, (c) any water right heretofore acquired by others than the United States under Federal or State law, (d) any right to any quantity of water used for governmental purposes or programs of the United States at any time prior to the effective date of this Act, (e) any right of the United States to use water which is hereafter lawfully initiated in the exercise of the express or necessarily implied authority of any present or future Act of Congress or State law when such right is initiated prior to the acquisition by others of any right to use water pursuant to State law, (f) any preference accorded by Federal or State law to any public agency with respect to electric power.

SEC. 6. This Act may be cited as the Water Rights Act of 1965.

The documents presented by Mr. KUCHEL are as follows:

RESOLUTION (NO. 54) OF THE HOUSE OF DELEGATES OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION ADOPTED AUGUST 1963

Whereas certain jurisdictional conflicts exist between the States and the Federal Government with respect to water resource developments; and

Whereas the Select Committee on National Water Resources of the U.S. Senate has reported, after an exhaustive study, that "the broadening pattern of these conflicts is conclusive proof of the urgent need for clear-cut, definitive action on the part of Congress to work out with the States a redefining of Federal-State powers and responsibilities for control, use, and development of water resources"; and

Whereas extensive hearings have been held by the Congress on this subject over the past 6 years with the result that certain problem areas have been brought into clearer focus and various legislative remedies proposed: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Bar Association urges the Congress to consider favorably legislation designed to preserve to the States their historic role in water resource development and to eliminate some of the impediments to fuller Federal-State cooperation in this field; and be it further

Resolved, That the officers of the association and the section of mineral and natural resources law be authorized to appear before appropriate committees of Congress in support of the foregoing resolution and legislation similar in substance to the attached draft of bill.

STATEMENT OF THE SECTION OF MINERAL AND NATURAL RESOURCES LAW IN SUPPORT OF RECOMMENDED RESOLUTION

The proposed resolution relating to legal rights to the use of water is the outgrowth of the extensive consideration which has been given to the problem of jurisdictional conflicts between the Federal and State governments for almost 10 years since the Supreme Court's opinion in the so-called Pelton Dam case, *FPC* v. *Oregon,* 349 U.S. 435 (1953). During this period, extensive hearings have been held by the Congress on the problem and a wide variety of legislative proposals put forth. The kind of legislative action proposed by this resolution would be an appropriate first step in meeting what the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources has termed the "urgent need for clear-cut, definitive action on the part of Congress to work out with the States a redefining of Federal-State powers and responsibilities for control, use, and development of water resources" (S. Rept. No. 29, 87th Cong., 1st sess. 66 (1961)). As water shortages have become an increasing problem in eastern areas of the United States, interest in this type of legislation has become national in scope.

"The legislation which this resolution would endorse (S. 1275 and H.R. 5914, 88th Cong., which are identical with app. A attached to this report) centers on four points: (1) The effect of Federal reservations of public lands on water rights recognized under State law (the bill preserves the latter rights, unless the reservation was created to establish a right to consumptive use, as for Indians, in which case the priorities established by the date of the reservation are protected); (2) the preservation of the primacy of consumptive uses over navigation on navigable streams west of the 98th meridian (this principle is already established by section 1(b) of the Flood Control Act of 1944, 58 Stat. 888–89, as amended, 33 U.S.C. 701–1 (1962), and a number of other flood control acts, but this bill would give its general application); (3) a direction that where the United States claims water rights under State law, it shall follow the procedure established by the State statute in acquiring them (some Federal officials have claimed water rights under State law while ignoring the State's procedural requirements relating to hearings, contests, etc.); and (4) a direction that water rights, if recognized as compensable in the State under which they are claimed, shall be compensable if taken by the United States (in the absence of Federal legislation providing otherwise, the Federal Government may impair vested water rights without compensation in constructing water resource development projects in furtherance of its powers under the commerce clause of the Constitution). Compare *United States* v. *Gerlach Livestock Co.*, 339 U.S. 725 (1950) and *FPC* v. *Niagara Mohawk Power Co.*, 347 U.S. 239 (1954) with *United States* v. *Twin City Power Co.*, 350 U.S. 222 (1956). If the United States acquires them otherwise than by purchase, it shall condemn them in appropriate proceedings rather than merely take them without notice and remit the owner to suit in the Court of Claims. See *Dugan* v. *Rank*, 83 Sup. Ct. 999 (1963)."

Support for S. 1275 in the 88th Congress

Testimony, resolutions, or statements of support for S. 1275 were received from the following, among others:

U.S. Senators: Senator Thomas H. Kuchel, of California; Senator Len B. Jordan, of Idaho; Senator Alan Bible, of Nevada; Senator Wallace F. Bennett, of Utah; Senator Milward L. Simpson, of Wyoming; Senator Peter H. Dominick, of Colorado.

Member of the House of Representatives: Hon. Ralph R. Harding, of Idaho.

Governors: Hon. Robert B. Smylie, Governor of Idaho; Hon. Mark O. Hatfield, Governor of Oregon; Hon. George D. Clyde, Governor of Utah.

Governors' committees: The Missouri River States Committee, composed of the Governors and 2 representatives of each of the 10 Missouri Basin States.

Representative of State legislature: Hon. Carley Porter, chairman, water committee, California State Assembly who presented assembly joint resolution No. 2.

Attorneys general: Hon. Duke Dunbar, attorney general of Colorado, representing the National Association of Attorneys General, accompanied by Hon. Daniel McLeod, attorney general of South Carolina, and Dr. Michell Wendell, counsel for the Council of State Governments; Hon. Stanley Mosk, of California, representing the Association of Western Attorneys General, accompanied by Hon. Charles E. Corker, assistant attorney general; Hon. John Raper, of Wyoming, accompanied by Hon. Charles Astor, member of the Natural Resources Board, and Hon. Eugene Van Camp, State commissioner.

State water resources boards or commissions: Montana State Water Conservation Board: Hon. Clarence Davis, Hon. C. H. Raymond, chairman; Commission of Soil and Water Conservation, State of Arkansas; Hon. Ed I. McKinley, Jr.; Nevada State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources: Hon. Hugh Shamberger, director; Mississippi Conservation Commission: Hon. Samuel Thompson, chairman; New York State Department of Conservation: Hon. Harold Weil; Florida Board of Conservation: Hon. Randolph Hodges, director; Tennessee Department of Conservation: Hon. Raleigh W. Robinson, director, division of water resources; Texas Water Commission: Hon. Joe D. Carter, chairman; Oregon State Water Resources Board: Hon. Dorel J. Lane, executive secretary; Colorado River Board of California: Hon. M. J. Dowd, chairman; Wyoming Natural Resources Board: Hon. Charles Astor, commissioner, Hon. Eugene Van Camp, member.

National organizations: American Bar Association: Northcutt Ely, chairman, water resources committee, section of mineral and natural resources law; National Association of Attorneys General: Hon. Duke Dunbar, attorney general of Colorado; National Reclamation Association: Hon. Hugh Shamberger, president, accompanied by Dr. Mitchell Wendell; Council of State Governments: Dr. Mitchell Wendell, counsel; National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts: Milton Fracke, chairman, water resources committee; Chamber of Commerce of the United States: John J. Meehan, secretary of the natural resources committee; Municipal Law Officers of the United States: Edward F. Taylor, chairman, water problems committee; National Association of Counties: Hon. Harold W. Kennedy, county counsel, Los Angeles County, Calif.; the Interstate Conference on Water Problems: Mr. Dorel Lane, chairman; Mr. Sam Thompson on behalf of the State of Mississippi, Mr. Harold Weil, Department of Conservation, State of New York, and Mr. Hugh Shamberger, director of the Nevada State Department of Conservation; the American Farm Bureau Federation: John Taylor, Esq; the National District Attorneys' Association: Hon. Richard W. Dickenson; American National Cattlemen's Association: Mr. C. W. McMillan.

Regional organizations: The Colorado River Water Users' Association (composed of representatives of major organizations of water users in the 7 Colorado River Basin States: Arizona, California, Colorado, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming): Hon. Dallas E. Cole, president, and Hon. Hugh Shamberger; County Supervisors' Association of California: Hon. Harold W. Kennedy, county counsel, Los Angeles County; Hon. William R. MacDougall, general counsel; Southern California Water Conference, representing 55 water agencies in California: James H. Kreiger, Esq., chairman; Feather River Project Association, California; California State Chamber of Commerce: Burnham Enersen, Esq.; Irrigation Districts Association of California: Burnham Enersen, Esq; the Bear River Protective Committee, Idaho: Hon. Lloyd Dunn, chairman; California Municipal Utilities Association: F. V. Frey, secretary; South Dakota Council of Producers, Business and Industry: C. F. Stilgebouer, president; Eel River Flood Control and Water Conservation Association, California: James D. Gilbert, president.

Counties, through their boards of supervisors or other governing bodies: county commissioners of San Juan County, Utah.

The following counties of California (in some cases acting as Boards of California County Flood Control or Water Districts): Alameda, Alpine, Butte, Contra Costa (ex officio the governing board of the Contra Costa County Water Agency), Del Norte, Fresno, Humboldt, Inyo, San Joaquin, Kings, Los Angeles, Mendocino, Modoc, Mono, Placer, Riverside, Sacramento, San Luis Obispo, San Mateo, Santa Barbara (with joint resolution with board of directors of Santa Barbara County Flood Control and Water Conservation District), Santa Clara, Solano, Sonoma, Tehama, Tuloumne, Ventura, Yolo, Yuba, and Siskiyo.

Districts, cities, and local organizations: city of Los Angeles, Calif., Hon. Samuel W. Yorty, mayor.

California districts: Fallbrook Public Utility District, California; Coachella Valley County Water District, California; Bueno Colorado Municipal Water District, California; San Dieguito Irrigation District, California; Laguna Beach County Water District, California; Orange County Water District, California; the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California; Norton L. Morris, executive secretary, the Kern County Water Agency, California; Hon. Harvey O. Banks, Nevada County Farm Bureau, California; Chamber of Commerce of the city of San Diego, Calif.

GRANTING OF PATENTS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN DESERT LAND ENTRIES

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and my colleague, the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. Bible], I introduce a bill and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee.

This bill is designed to correct an inequity resulting from an error made by an agent of the Federal Government.

Two constituents of mine in good faith accepted an assignment of homestead land entries, which assignment was subsequently approved by officials of the Bureau of Land Management. Following the acceptance of such assignment, the new desert land entrymen complied fully with the requirements of the homestead act, receiving encouragement and advice throughout from agents of the Bureau of Land Management and finally submitting final proof.

In fact, there was an extension given to the entrymen by the BLM for submission of such proof. The entire project was apparently looked upon as a sort of experimental plot whereby desert land in the particular area involved was being developed for agricultural use. Upon application for patent, however, the Bureau of Land Management suddenly realized that a mistake had been made and that any assignment of homestead entries by entrymen who had taken advantage of an act of July 30, 1956, which authorized suspension of development for a 3-year period, were precluded from assigning the acquired rights.

As a result of this error, the entrymen had expended over $40,000 in development of water and in performing necessary cultivation, all of which had been induced at the encouragement and with the full approval of BLM officials. It seems only fair, therefore, that since the law does support the decision of the Bureau, some equitable relief be granted the entrymen who acted at all times in good faith and made no attempt to circumvent or avoid compliance with the law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the bill, together with the text of decision of the Bureau of Land Management approving the desert land entry assignment to Mr. Dalton be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and decision will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1640) to provide for the granting of patents with respect to certain desert land entries, introduced by

Mr. CANNON (for himself and Mr. BIBLE), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, upon application at any time within one year after the date of enactment of this Act and payment of the amount prescribed by law, the Secretary of the Interior shall grant a patent, as provided under the desert land laws, to—

(1) Kathryn Dalton with respect to desert land entry, Nevada 032795; and

(2) Ralph C. Dalton with respect to desert land entry, Nevada 032796.

The decision presented by Mr. CANNON is as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT,
Reno, Nev., July 14, 1959.

DECISION

Desert land entry, Nevada 032796; assignor: Loretta G. Burns; assignee: Ralph C. Dalton.

DESERT LAND ENTRY ASSIGNMENT APPROVED

By decision dated November 20, 1956, desert land entry, Nevada 032796, was allowed to Loretta G. Burns for the N. ½ section 22, T. 16 S., R. 49 E., MD Mer. Nevada, containing 320 acres and is in good standing.

On June 23, 1959, the necessary documents were filed whereby Loretta G. Burns assigned all her rights in the above entry to Ralph C. Dalton. Accordingly, the assignment is hereby approved subject to the assignee's compliance with all the laws and regulations pertaining to desert land entries. Annual proof is due December 20, 1959, and final proof will be due December 20, 1962.

Circular No. 1991 is enclosed herewith and particular attention is invited to the annual and final proof requirements.

JAMES E. KEOGH, Jr.,
Manager.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 1403 OF FEDERAL AVIATION ACT OF 1958

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend section 1403 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to perfect certain provisions of the International Aviation Facilities Act. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1641) to amend section 1403 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to perfect certain provisions of the International Aviation Facilities Act, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The letter, presented by Mr. MAGNUSON, is as follows:

FEDERAL AVIATION AGENCY,
Washington, D.C., January 13, 1965.

Hon. CARL HAYDEN,
President pro tempore of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE: Enclosed herewith is a draft of a bill to amend section 1403 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to perfect certain provisions of the International Aviation Facilities Act.

This proposal is in the nature of technical amendments to the International Aviation Facilities Act. It updates that act by striking out references to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 and inserting in lieu thereof appropriate references to the Federal Aviation Act of 1958. It is recommended that it be enacted by the Congress.

It appears that at the time of enactment of section 1403 of the Federal Aviation Act (72 Stat. 808), a section containing amendments of a perfecting nature to make the terms of reference in the international aviation facilities consistent with the provisions of the newly enacted Federal Aviation Act, certain references in the International Aviation Facilities Act to the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 were overlooked and thus perpetuated in the language of that act. Since subsection 1401(b) of the Federal Aviation Act (72 Stat. 806) repealed the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, references to that act in the International Aviation Facilities Act are no longer appropriate.

For this reason this proposal would amend section 1403 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 by (a) substituting in section 3 of the International Aviation Facilities Act (49 U.S.C. 1152) the phrase "in section 101 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958" for the phrase "in section 1 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938," and (b) substituting in section 5 of such act (49 U.S.C. 1154) the phrase "Federal Aviation Act of 1958" for the phrase "Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938."

The Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection from the standpoint of the administration's program to the submission of the proposed legislation to the Congress.

Sincerely,

N. E. HALABY,
Administrator.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 6) authorizing the use of the good offices of the United Nations on behalf of the enslaved Baltic States, the name of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of March 10, 1965:

S. 1484. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act, to promote quality and price stabilization, to define and restrain certain unfair methods of distribution and to confirm, define, and equalize the rights of producers and resellers in the distribution of goods identified by distinguishing brands, names, or trademarks, and for other purposes: Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota.

Authority of March 15, 1965:

S. 1512. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that World War II and Korean conflict veterans entitled to educational benefits under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration who did not utilize their entitlement may transfer their entitlement to their children: Mr. HARTKE, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. MAGNUSON, and Mr. RANDOLPH.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert B. Green, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney, eastern district of Oklahoma, for a term of 4 years, vice Edwin Langley.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Monday, April 5, 1965, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

INTERIOR COMMITTEE HEARING—WILD RIVERS SYSTEM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee [Mr. JACKSON] had announced that hearings would be held on S. 1446, the wild rivers proposal, on April 13 and 14. Unfortunately, commitments prevented our holding these hearings at that time, and I wish to announce now that they have been rescheduled for April 22 and 23. S. 1446 is the bill to reserve certain public lands for a national wild rivers system.

This legislation was submitted to the Congress by the executive branch of the Government in a message from the Secretary of the Interior on March 3. In his February 8 message on natural beauty, the Presiednt recommended the establishment of a national wild rivers system. He included it as an important part of his effort to protect and preserve the beauty of America, as outlined in his message.

The hearings will begin at 10 a.m. on April 22 in room 3110, New Senate Office Building. This announcement is made for the purpose of giving notice to Members of the Senate and all others who may wish to testify at our hearing.

ASSASSINATION OF MRS. VIOLA LIUZZO, MICHIGAN HOUSEWIFE AND MOTHER

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on March 25, Mrs. Viola Liuzzo, a Michigan housewife and mother, was assassinated on an Alabama highway by nightriders while peaceably exercising her rights as a free citizen.

Prompt investigation by proper Federal authorities has led to the arrest and arraignment of four members of the Ku Klux Klan, who have been charged with violation of Federal law.

I compliment President Johnson for his strong condemnation of the Ku Klux Klan and other such hate groups. I assure him of my complete cooperation and support in his demand for legislation to curb all organizations and individuals who preach hate and advocate violence against other citizens.

I join in expressing my sincere condolences to Mrs. Liuzzo's husband and children and assure them, for what comfort it may be, that she did not die in vain.

CIVIL RIGHTS—RESOLUTION OF MICHIGAN SENATE

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, on March 8, 1965, the Senate of the State of Michigan unanimously adopted a resolution protesting the March 7 outrage that occurred in Selma, Ala., when American citizens sought to exercise their constitutional right to peaceful assembly and petition over the denial of the constitutional right to register and vote.

I have here a copy of that resolution and in order that the readers of the Congressional Record may know the unanimous sentiment of one house of the Michigan Legislature on this important matter, I ask unanimous consent that Resolution 66 of the Senate of the State of Michigan be inserted in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senate Resolution 66

Resolution of outrageous protest and a call for action by the Federal Government relative to the Alabama crisis

Whereas the citizens of Michigan as well as people throughout the United States and the civilized world were, Sunday night and early Monday morning, March 7 and 8, 1965, shocked, sickened and shamed by the news reports emanating from Alabama that several hundred Negro citizens of that State and the surrounding areas were flogged, beaten and gassed by Alabama State troops as they were proceeding in a peaceful "walk for freedom" near Selma, Ala.; and

Whereas to add to this shocking account of troopers beating, flogging and gassing peaceful citizens in the march for their constitutional rights, were additional reports that several hundred white bystanders cheered and hooted this scene from hell; and

Whereas while American Armed Forces are battling and dying in faraway places to preserve the concepts of democracy, we are treated to the sorry and saddened spectacle of our democracy being unable to handle its own problems in a peaceful and democratic way; and

Whereas many people will counsel caution and others will claim internal sovereignty of a State to handle its own problems, but when accounts of such outrageous brutality to citizens of a State by its own troopers are read and televised throughout the world, it is no longer a local matter but a problem of deep concern and one calling for immediate attention by the Government of the United States, whose very existence and certainly its prestige and image is on stage for the whole world to gaze at and wait for its action: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the members of the Michigan Senate call upon the President of the United States to take immediate action to intervene in Alabama and to carry out and exercise whatever constitutional powers he has to bring about an immediate era of peace to permit the citizens of that State to exercise their constitutional rights of expression and freedom of action and to provide a climate by which the citizens of the State of Alabama may continue to petition for their constitutional rights in whatever peaceful methods they deem desirable; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is urged to take immediate cognizance of the situation in Alabama and to enact such legislation that will enable the Federal Government to protect the constitutional rights of its citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States and to the Michigan delegation to the U.S. Congress.

Adopted by the senate March 8, 1965.

Beryl I. Kenyon,
Secretary of the Senate.

EMOTIONALISM AND EXTREMISM CONCERNING PROPOSED VOTING RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, David Lawrence, the distinguished editor of U.S. News & World Report, wrote an excellent column in the March 29 issue of his magazine dealing with the emotionalism and extremism behind the administration's proposed voting rights bill.

Mr. Lawrence is dismayed, as I am and as are many Americans, that the Government is being stampeded by street demonstrations and other forms of lawless conduct into passing what clearly is unnecessary and unconstitutional legislation.

I agree with Mr. Lawrence that it is indeed a sad day when the U.S. Government acquiesces to the pressures of a mob bent on creating strife and disorder. Such a course can lead only to anarchy.

I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Bowing to the New Extremists

(By David Lawrence)

The Government of the United States appears to have bowed to a new set of extremists.

The President, in an emotional address to a joint session of both Houses of Congress, described in general terms an unprecedented piece of legislation on voting rights and demanded that it be promptly passed. The text of the bill, however, wasn't even made public until later in the week. Members of the Supreme Court, attired in their judicial robes, sat in the front row in the House Chamber during the proceedings and joined in the applause for the President's speech.

The sweeping proposals which the President virtually ordered Congress to pass were pressured by street demonstrations, violent and nonviolent, sit-ins and lie-ins in many parts of the country and even inside the White House, as well as the Capitol and other Federal buildings. All this was designed to stampede the Chief Executive and Congress to brush aside the Constitution and to accept the extremist doctrine that "the end justifies the means." The tactics of the demonstrators triumphed.

The Constitution explicitly gives to each State the power to determine the qualifications of voters in national, State and local elections. The Consitution also declares that the right of citizens to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of race or color.

The new proposal arbitrarily singles out those States in the Union which, on November 1, 1964, happened to have registered less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age residing in the State or in any political subdivision, or in which less than 50 percent of such residents voted in the presidential election last November.

This is a statistical yardstick which would automatically adjudge as guilty of discrimination a State which had used any literacy test if in such a State less than half of the population of voting age had been registered to vote or if "any person acting under color of law" had in the previous 10 years engaged in any act denying the right to vote because of race or color.

An appeal to a three-judge court—only in Washington—would be allowed. Instead of the usual presumption of innocence for a defendant, the bill would establish a presumption of guilt for the suspected State or county. The governmental body not only would have to prove that it was not guilty of an act of discrimination on a specific date but also of any other such act on any other date in the preceding 10 years.

The bill, moreover, would strike down in those States any "test or device" that may have been used in the past years, even though State laws may have sought to establish whether or not an applicant had the ability to read and write, or may have prescribed some other standard test of literacy such as the Supreme Court of the United States itself upheld as recently as 1959.

To select certain States or areas and apply one kind of law to them while permitting other States and subdivisions to be immune from such interference is a conspicuous violation of the Constitution.

The whole controversy has revealed a disregard of basic constitutionalism. It is motivated by the reasoning of those who have argued that two wrongs make a right. It grows out of the rationalization, which so many people are making today, that, because injustices have been committed and discrimination has once been practiced on a wide scale in certain areas of the country, it is permissible now to diminish the rights of the States themselves.

Have we come to the point where the Congress of the United States may decide on whether a State will be permitted to remain in the Union? Have we reached a position where the national legislative body will do again what it did 100 years ago after the War Between the States had ended? The same State legislatures which had ratified the 13th amendment, abolishing slavery, were suddenly declared illegal by Congress when they rejected the 14th amendment. New legislatures were ordered to assemble and in some instances Federal troops were sent into the legislative chambers to compel "ratification" of the 14th and later the 15th amendment.

This was what happened in the Reconstruction period in American history. Are we to go through another such tragic era because of the submissiveness of both a Congress and a President to the dictates of pressure groups whose emotional demonstrations cause friction and disorder?

It is a sad story. Organized incitement to violence has swept many areas of the country. To yield to such demonstrations is to weaken the whole fabric of democracy and to encourage mobocracy.

It is a time for the processes of reason to supercede the hysteria of impassioned groups of citizens. For, granting that they have been unjustly treated, are there no ways to accomplish effective reforms except by violent demonstrations and a distortion of the basic provisions of the Constitution? Or must we continue to bow to the new extremist?

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Wall Street Journal for today, March 29, 1965, contains an editorial entitled "Means for a High Purpose." This editorial also deals with the voting rights bill. It points out that a number of laws are at present on the statute books concerning voting rights that have not been used by the Attorney General. The editorial also states forcefully that the bill that has been introduced and is now under consideration by the Committee on the Judiciary provides for unequal protection of the laws in the different States. The editorial recommends that if a voting rights bill is necessary, it ought to apply to all States alike, and not discriminate among the States.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEANS FOR A HIGH PURPOSE

The purpose of any voting law is, or at any rate ought to be, to protect the rights of every qualified voter everywhere.

So quite apart from the constitutional questions raised by the pending new voting law, such as its attempt to strike down arbitrarily State voting qualifications, not the least of its disappointing aspects is that it would not advance this high purpose it professes. Because it would apply only in a few States, it would leave untouched many possible places of discrimination.

If the advancement of voting rights everywhere is what its proponents truly desire, then much better means are at hand.

Probably no new law would be required at all, but rather the diligent application of those already existing. In any event, nothing more would be needed than a simple law devoid of complicated formulas that would not only raise new problems but fail to remedy the problem the law pretends to meet.

Even a cursory examination of the Federal statute books shows that we already have a plethora of voting laws. There is not only the 15th amendment to the Constitution, now so much spoken of, but also the 14th amendment which says that any State denying some citizens the right to vote shall have its representation in Congress proportionately reduced.

All by itself this would give Congress the most powerful of any weapon against a State practicing wholesale discrimination—if, as alleged, that is the problem that demands extreme congressional action.

But it is not necessary to rely on Congress doing what everybody knows it won't do, however loud the speeches. The officials of the executive branch are themselves already armed with a whole arsenal of legal weapons to safeguard voting rights and punish those who would deny them.

Beginning in 1865 the statute books have been loaded with such laws. Still available to those who would use it, for example, is the law that makes it a Federal crime, punishable by imprisonment, for anyone—including a registrar in Alabama—to deprive any qualified voter of his right to register and cast his ballot. If no one has lately gone to jail on this count, it is because nobody has been prosecuted on it.

The 1957 Civil Rights Act, moreover, gives the Attorney General personal authority to intervene in the courts to protect voting rights in any election, local as well as Federal. The 1960 law added teeth to this provision; it made it a special Federal crime for anyone to violate court orders in such cases.

The same law, incidentally, authorizes the Federal courts to appoint special Federal officials to oversee voting registrations where they find discrimination exists. This provision is little different from the one now proposed, except that the intervention power rests with the courts instead of the Justice Department and that it applies everywhere and not just in a few places.

The 1964 Civil Rights Act contains a whole catalog of both rules and enforcement authority, including some specific safeguards against the misuse of literacy tests and other qualification standards. Again the Attorney General was given full authority to bring action where he believed any of these provisions had been violated.

Obviously, then, the Congress has been diligent in the passing of voting laws. If discrimination persists, it is because they have not been diligently observed or enforced.

Attorney General Katzenbach explains that this failure is due to the endless delays possible in the judicial system where everything has to be litigated all the way to the Supreme Court and back again. Although it seems strange to hear an Attorney General speak impatience with the judicial system, if present enforcement is too cumbersome, what more can be done?

All that is required, surely, is a straightforward law authorizing Federal officials to supplant local registrars whenever and wherever there is a showing to any district court that voting laws are being inequitably applied.

The Federal registrars would then stand for the time being in the place of local registrars, having no authority to alter legal voting qualifications but full authority to see that each citizen is treated justly.

Such a law would conflict with no Constitutional principles; it would simply provide administrative machinery for the 15th amendment, which Congress is fully empowered to do. There should be no problem with compliance because the court's instructions would be to the Federal not the local officials. Action would not await the initiative of judges, and yet there would be safeguards against arbitrary action since the Attorney General must show cause for action.

More, we should then have a law not limited in application but aimed at equal justice everywhere. It could apply to all of Alabama or a part of New York; discrimination would not be excused simply because a majority of a State or district vote; discrimination against a few citizens would be as subject to the law's proscription as discrimination against many.

Most of this, in all truth, could be accomplished now under present law if men acted as they talked. But if we are to have another law, Congress at least ought not to commit fraud for political purposes when the means are at hand for achieving a high purpose.

EXPRESSION OF ABHORRENCE OF VIOLENCE IN ALABAMA—RESOLUTION OF ILLINOIS SENATE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, the Senate of the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois has approved Senate Resolution 64, expressing its abhorrence of violence evidenced by recent incidents in Alabama and has sent a copy of this resolution to every member of the Illinois delegation in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States over the signature of the President of the senate and the secretary of the senate. I ask unanimous consent that it be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 64

Whereas the right of citizens to peaceably assemble and petition for redress of grievances is fundamental to our scheme of ordered liberty and is an element of freedom without which our noble experiment in democracy would die as surely as totalitarian regimes throughout history have ingloriously perished; and

Whereas this body has been profoundly shocked and dismayed to learn of the violence involved in recent events in Selma, Ala.; and

Whereas the right of all citizens to vote is so clearly the keystone of democratic government and the systematic exclusion of voting rights on the basis of race and color is to be regretted and deplored; and

Whereas while we adhere to Thomas Jefferson's words that "we are not to expect to be translated from despotism to liberty in a featherbed," we do believe that democratic progress must and can be accomplished without violence or lawlessness: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 74th General Assembly of the State of Illinois, That this body express its abhorrence of the violence involved in the recent events in Alabama and that a copy of this preamble and resolution be sent to the members of the Illinois delegation in the U.S. Congress.

Adopted by the senate, March 23, 1965.

SAMUEL H. SHAPIRO,
President of the Senate.
EDWARD E. FERNANDES,
Secretary of the Senate.

THE SAD STATE OF GREAT LAKES FISHERIES

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Great Lakes fishing industry is in serious trouble. Over the past few years the industry has been faced with a continued and extreme decline in the fish that supported the industry in the past. For example, lake trout stocks that yielded an annual average production of 15.5 million pounds, worth about $7.5 million are gone from Lakes Huron, Michigan, and Superior. The situation is even worse on Lake Erie. Blue pike production in the U.S. fishery dropped from 6,855,000 pounds worth $1,136,000 in 1956 to 200 pounds worth $120 in 1963. Walleyes contributed 5,035,000 pounds worth $1,357,000 to the catch in 1957 and only 433,200 pounds worth $186,000 in 1962. On the other hand the Great Lakes now produce an overabundance of many fishes that have been little used by industry.

What has caused this serious decline?

First. There has been a serious loss through sea lamprey depredation—only one example of an increasingly serious imbalance between predators and prey.

Second. Pollution of the lakes and their tributary streams has had a great impact on the Great Lakes fish population. This pollution includes chemical additives from agricultural and other practices.

A third important factor is the depressing effect which the recent outbreak of botulism has had on fish consumption. Finally the practices of the industry are not as efficient as they should be.

There is no doubt that the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has tried, and tried hard within their limited resources, to meet this situation. Control of the sea lamprey has been pushed by the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, an international body, as fast as funds and facilities allow. Limited surveillance over the physical, chemical, and biological conditions in two of the Great Lakes has been maintained. A few economic methods of catching, handling, and processing the fishes currently available have been developed and demonstrated. However, there are not enough funds available to attack these problems quickly and efficiently. I want to draw the Senate's attention to the fact that, although the Great Lakes States contain about 40 percent of this country's population and contribute over 50 percent of total U.S. revenue, only 3 percent of the Bureau of Commercial Fsheries' budget is set aside for Great Lakes fisheries work.

It seems hard to believe that an industry in such serious trouble could be given this pittance when a little assistance could go so far, but it is true.

The work that has been done on sea lamprey control shows what could be accomplished if funds were available for work on other species and phenomena. The president of the Midwest Federated Fisheries Council has submitted to the Senate Appropriations Committee a statement indicating what is needed in the way of additional amounts for the revitalization of the all-important Great Lakes fishing industry.

This proposal advocates the appropriation of $780,000 to the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries for 35 additional full-time positions in such areas as biological research, exploratory fishing and gear research, technological research, marketing, and economics. It also calls for the construction of a prototype commercial fishing vessel and a biological research vessel at a cost of $650,000.

Mr. President, this adds up to $1,430,000. It may seem like a great deal of money. However, it is far less than the damage that a failure to appropriate these funds could have on the Great Lakes commercial fishing industry. Next year may be too late. The industry is on the ropes and about to go down for the third time. I intend to do all that I possibly can to see that these funds are appropriated and spent on behalf of the Great Lakes commercial fishing industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a statement entitled "What is Wrong in Great Lakes Fisheries and What Can Be Done About It?" submitted by Mr. Gerald Bolda, president of the Midwest Federated Fisheries Council.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS WRONG IN GREAT LAKES FISHERIES AND WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT IT?

(By Gerald Bolda, president, Midwest Federated Fisheries Council)

The fisheries of the Great Lakes are presently in serious trouble. To the average citizen this may not be particularly disturbing. These fisheries and their problems are symbols and symptoms of a much broader resource crisis, however, that involves the total Great Lakes resource complex.

These lakes are a national treasure—economically, esthetically, recreationally, and ecologically comparable to any natural resource complex in the United States, or for that matter, in the world. By historical and ecological accident, the fisheries of the Great Lakes have been the first to experience the effects of complicated and subtle resource changes and deterioration.

If a dynamic society has the capacity to solve the fishery problems, the future of the balance of the Great Lakes treasure is assured. If it does not demonstrate this capacity, the fishery (and particularly the commercial fishery) will go down and its defeat will scar the sport fisherman, the recreation seeker, and the urban dweller as well. The social cost of chronic epidemics is not counted alone in those who die. The living conditions of the survivors may not be worthy of a great society.

Deterioration of neither the fishery symbol nor the other resource values it represents has to happen unless we choose to let it. It is a national disgrace that we have allowed our lakes and their fisheries to deteriorate to a point where they are almost lost to us. It would be a national crime to disregard existing conditions in the mistaken assumption that fisheries are not important or that as long as we can use water its condition does not matter.

The immediate and outstanding symptom has been the dramatic weakening of the Great Lakes capacity to produce the fishes that supported the active and valuable fishery of the past. They now produce an overabundance of many species that have been used little or not at all by industry.

Gone from Lakes Huron, Michigan, and Superior are lake trout stocks that supported a commercial fishery in the United States and Canada, which yielded an average annual production of 15.5 million pounds, worth about $7.5 million at dockside. Reduced to complete or relative insignificance are the fisheries in those lakes for several species of whitefishes, for walleyes, and for burbot. Upset completely is the ecological balance among species that existed there.

Fisheries in Lake Erie are extremely demoralized and financially unstable. Gone from that lake are the keystones that supported a steady and lucrative fishing industry, second to none in the years 1945–58. Blue pike, walleyes, whitefish, and yellow perch stocks have dwindled to insignificance or changed character so much that their contributions to the fishery are almost nil. Blue pike production in the U.S. fishery dropped from 6,855,000 pounds worth $1,316,000 in 1956 to 200 pounds worth $120 in 1963. Walleyes contributed 5,035,000 pounds worth $1,357,000 to the catch in 1957 and only 433,200 pounds worth $186,000 in 1962. In less than 8 years the fishing industry in U.S. waters of Lake Erie lost dockside value in these two species alone of $2.5 million annually. Yellow perch populations have changed so drastically that their growth rate is slowed markedly. It now requires more than 4 years for the average perch to reach legal length of 8 inches. Whereas, in 1956 yellow perch grew to the then legal length of 8½ inches in 3 years.

What are these events that brought this rather stable and important segment of the Great Lakes resource to such a state? We believe the most important, among several changes, are: (1) sea lamprey predation; (2) loss of ecological balance between predators and prey; (3) pollution (due in part to overenrichment) of the lakes and their tributary streams; (4) chemical additives from agricultural and other practices (pesticides); (5) changing patterns in economics, sociological, and cultural development; (6) invasion of all of the lakes above Niagara Falls by alewives from Lake Ontario; (7) outbreaks of botulism and their depressing influence on fish consumption; and (8) the practices and prejudices of the fishing industry. These monumental changes, in combination or singly, established conditions that have exterminated some and seriously threatened other fish populations that made up the basis of the traditional commercial and sport fisheries.

The Bureau of Commercial Fisheries has been meeting these challenging situations with all facilities available to it. The regrettable fact is that much of this effort has been too little and, at times, too late. Concerted and comprehensive attacks on these problems are very recent. The capability to develop sound and proven solutions to many of them is still not within grasp. There are, however, some bright spots in this dismal picture which have resulted from such endeavors. Control of the sea lamprey is being pushed by the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, an international body, as fast as funds and facilities allow. The lake trout population in Lake Superior is showing good signs of reestablishment. Limited surveillance over the physical, chemical, and biological conditions in two of the Great Lakes has been maintained. Measurement and delineation of problems of overenrichment are beginning to yield some evidence needed to devise means of correction or, where such action is not possible, at least to describe the situations that industry will have to tolerate and to which it will have to adjust. There have been developed and demonstrated a few economic methods of catching, handling, and processing the fishes currently available. Industry has been assisted in many aspects of the task of making economic use of fish stocks available including product development, technology of fish handling and storage, and marketing of the catches either as industrial products or for direct human consumption.

But these promising developments lose much of their contribution because, generally speaking, they are not in sufficient strength to bring the depressed industry up to the stage where it can survive economically during this period of extreme stress. This is also true of the broader objective of halting the process of resource decline that affects much more than the commercial fishing industry. The element of time is critical if the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries is to succeed in providing the information and assistance that is necessary. Present approaches are sound. What is needed is an acceleration of activity so that results will reach industry while they can be used—before what is left of the Great Lakes fishery collapses completely. Results and assistance must reach these people while they still have the will and capability to help themselves.

The following tabulation, totaling an additional $780,000 for research and development involving 35 additional full-time permanent positions and $650,000 for construction, outlines what will be required to accomplish the desired acceleration. Anything less will leave us deficient and without answers when they are most needed:

Biological research: 11 full-time permanent positions	$300,000
Exploratory fishing and gear research: 8 full-time permanent positions	170,000
Technological research: 9 full-time permanent positions	200,000
Marketing: 4 full-time permanent positions	60,000
Economics: 2 full-time permanent positions	30,000
Statistics: 1 full-time permanent position	20,000
Total	780,000
Construction:	
Prototype commercial fishing vessel	100,000
Biological research vessel	550,000
Total	650,000

The increases listed above will be used as follows:

Biological research: There are four very pressing problems that will be solved only by immediately accelerated examination of the circumstances that brought them about: (1) The interrelationships and competitive actions among alewives, lake herring, chubs, and yellow perch. (2) The nature of the environment of fishes in Lake Erie and the dynamics of its deterioration as causal factors influencing or prohibiting production and survival of year classes of walleye, blue pike, and yellow perch. (3) The evaluation and surveillance of attempts to reestablish lake trout in Lakes Superior and Michigan. (4) The measurement and description of the effects of accumulations of various chemicals, nutrients, and pesticides on the basic productivity and fish producing capacity of the Great Lakes.

Accelerated investigations in these fields will answer many of the perplexing questions that inhibit proper orientation of fisheries as profitable enterprises in the complex of vital uses of the Great Lakes. Without such answers we cannot tell the fishing industry what levels of production to expect, how much fishing can be tolerated by the stocks, and what to plan on as far as continuity of supplies of fish is concerned.

These activities will also lead to the development of water quality standards for aquatic life. These will serve as indicators of approaching intolerable conditions in the continuity of fishery prosperity and availability of catchable stocks. Employment of these water quality standards will further assure the perpetuation and improvement of desirable aquatic organisms to the benefit of all users of the resource.

Exploratory fishing and gear research will (1) provide knowledge to industry concerning the seasonal distribution and availability of fish stocks and production costs, (2) develop more effective and economical fishing methods based on specific needs and conditions unique to the Great Lakes, and (3) test vessel designs and modern equipment applicable to Great Lakes fisheries.

Technological research will be intensified in the following three problem areas:

1. Development of industrial processes and products suited to Great Lakes conditions and species. Large quantities of underutilized fishes, such as sheepshead, carp, goldfish, alewife, shad, chubs, and smelt, are present in the Great Lakes. Existing pet food and fur animal food market outlets alone cannot be expanded sufficiently to permit significant expansion of the current industrial fishery. Research will provide data on the chemical composition of raw material and its suitability for a variety of industrial uses. Pilot equipment will be developed and demonstrated for the preparation of industrial products based on these species.

2. Development of new human food products and improved processing and preservation techniques. More highly processed products suited to modern competitive merchandising practices and consumer preferences will be developed. Techniques will be developed for improving stability and shelf life to maintain market continuity and acceptance. The results of this research will be conveyed to industry through an active technical extension program.

3. Development of processing and handling procedures that will result in safe fishery products of acceptable market quality. The botulinum organism is widespread in the Great Lakes environment. Outgrowth of this organism, with the production of its highly fatal toxin, has been shown readily potential under many current industry practices of processing and handling of fishery products. Research now underway will provide information on the characteristics of the botulinum organism and methods for its control. Through this program, this information will be applied to the development of industry processes and products which are completely free of hazard. Assistance will also be provided to industry in improving its sanitation practices.

Market development and consumer education related to Great Lakes fishery products will be intensified in the following areas:

1. Development of new and expansion of existing industrial-use markets for underutilized fishes such as carp, sheepshead, gizzard shad, alewife, and smelt.

2. Development of institutional markets—restaurants, hospitals, prisons, factory cafeterias—for Great Lakes fishery products.

3. Demonstrations and educational programs to stimulate increased use of Great Lakes fishery products by the homemaker.

4. Educational programs designed to improve the quality and merchandising of fishery products at the retail level.

Economics: Research to obtain detailed economic analyses of present production, processing, distribution, and marketing costs for each major fishery in the Great Lakes. These data will result in recommendations as to methods and procedures to be applied to the various production, distribution, and marketing phases of the industry.

Statistics: In the interest of increased efficiency and manpower conservation, all research data collected on the Great Lakes will be processed by means of ADP equipment. This will result in more timely analysis of data which can be applied to the problem at hand. Further, this will permit collection and analysis of specialized statistical information needed by all researchers working on Great Lakes problems.

CONSTRUCTION

1. Prototype commercial fishing vessel will illustrate a modern design applicable to Great Lakes fisheries. Its design will permit use of all types of fishing gear, efficient methods of handling and stowing fish, and maintenance of the quality of the catch. The vessel will be used to demonstrate to industry the application of new techniques, gear, and equipment. It will be fitted with the latest electronic instruments and research equipment so that it can be used in the accelerated exploratory fishing and gear research programs, and in other biological and technological studies.

2. Biological research vessel: Planning funds were provided in fiscal year 1964 for the design of an all-purpose biological research vessel. This floating laboratory has been designed to permit intensive coverage of extensive areas of the Great Lakes to keep abreast of the rapidly changing environment and its effect on aquatic life. The vessel will be equipped with the latest scientific instrumentation for studying the physical, chemical, and biological phenomena.

JUSTIFICATION FOR INCREASED RESEARCH EFFORT FOR GREAT LAKES FISHERIES

Eight Great Lakes States contain about 40 percent of the U.S. population. Over 50 percent of the total U.S. revenue is obtained from these eight States.

We have a dead and dying fishery industry on the Great Lakes. A more prosperous industry at presnt would stimulate rural economy.

Pollution and pesticides threaten future of Great Lakes fisheries as well as domestic water supplies and recreational facilities for millions of people. As our population grows the problem will become even more critical. Fishes and fish food organisms are affected before danger to man is imminent.

Practically all effort of fisheries agencies, including the U.S. Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, has been in sea lamprey control and lake trout rehabilitation. Work on other species and phenomena have been neglected. Methods of control of the lamprey have been discovered and demonstrated and the control program is well underway. Lake trout rehabilitation has progressed satisfactorily in Lake Superior and stocks of fish are increasing at a rapid rate. Lamprey control and lake trout rehabilitation is programed for all of the Great Lakes and is progressing satisfactorily. This is an excellent example of what can be done if a program is adequately staffed and financed.

The budget for Great Lakes fisheries work by the BCF amounts to less than 3 percent of the total BCF budget (for biological research only 1 percent). This indicates the low priority placed on fisheries work in the Great Lakes by the U.S. Government. Not enough pressure has been exerted to maintain the Great Lakes share of the BCF budget. The Great Lakes area has been slighted. This indicates that the pressures from the various phases of marine fisheries (oceanography, salmon, tuna, shrimp, etc.) has overridden needs for Great Lakes work. This neglect can no longer be tolerated.

USE OF "PARTY GIRLS" TO INFLUENCE DECISIONS AND LEGISLATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Washington Sunday Star of March 28, 1965, contained an article entitled "Baker Case Party Girl Admits Being Ex-Red," written by Mr. Paul Hope.

Mr. Hope's article is based upon information obtained by the investigators of the Rules Committee and the FBI concerning the manner in which party girls had been used by Mr. Baker and his associates.

From the beginning of this investigation questions have been raised whether girls were being used as a part of a program to influence contract decisions and legislation. It is most regrettable that this phase of the inquiry developed by the FBI was so noticeably ignored by both the committee and the Justice Department in their most recent report.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hope's article be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAKER CASE PARTY GIRL ADMITS BEING EX-RED

(By Paul Hope)

Ellen Rometsch, the German party girl mentioned prominently in the Bobby Baker case, has admitted being a member of Communist organizations in East Germany.

The Star has learned that Mrs. Rometsch, whose connections with the Baker case the Senate Rules Committee refused to look into, told investigators that prior to 1955 she was a member of a Communist youth organization and a Communist adult group.

Mrs. Rometsch denied having any Communist sympathies, however, and said she joined the two organizations to keep her job in East Germany. The nature of her work there was not disclosed. She went to West Germany in 1955.

Mrs. Rometsch, who came to the United States in April 1961 with her husband, a German Army sergeant, denied having operated as an intelligence agent for any country.

SPYING ROLE DISPUTED

A West German security agency, which made a check after her alleged sex activities in the Washington area became known, said there was no indication that she had any intelligence connections. The agency said she was considered a "security risk" because of her "moral weakness."

Her husband, Rolf Rometsch, who was attached to the German Embassy in Washington, was ordered back to Germany in August 1963 because of his wife's activities. They were divorced later.

Mrs. Rometsch has said she wanted to come back to the United States to marry a staff member of an important congressional committee. The committee staffer, who has said he had no connection with Baker, admitted dating Mrs. Rometsch when she was in this country, but said he thought she was single.

Republicans on the Senate Rules Committee have tried to get the committee to go into the so-called party girl issue of the Baker case, but the Democratic majority has steadfastly refused.

Last December, the Justice Department showed some members and staff personnel of the Rules Committee an FBI file on Mrs. Rometsch. The committee incorporated a summary of the file in its minutes, but the Democrats voted against going any further into the matter. This portion of the committee's proceedings has not been made public and is not expected to be.

The Star has learned that a number of women were mentioned in the file, at least four of whom were actively engaged in play-for-pay activity.

One woman, who described herself as the ringleader of the group, said the clients included Congressmen, public relations men, a dozen Senators, a couple of judges, and some members of the executive branch of Government. She refused to name them.

This woman, who said she never received money for arranging engagements for the women, named four who, she said, filled dates at the apartment of a man who has figured prominently in the Baker case. The man has been questioned extensively by the committee about other matters but not about girls.

FIFTY-DOLLAR-A-NIGHT INCOME

The woman said the women in the group didn't limit themselves to arranged dates, but also worked on their own and never earned less than $50 a night.

Another of the women said she attended a social function at the Southwest Washington townhouse Baker bought and which was occupied by his secretary and another Capitol Hill secretary.

The same woman said she made a trip to Germany in 1963 for which free transportation was provided by a man whose name has been mentioned in the Baker case testimony in connection with at least two business deals but who has never been called to testify. She also said she met two Congressmen at the apartment where she and the others filled dates.

As the person to be notified in case of her death, she listed in one document a member of a prominent Washington law firm. The lawyer said he met the woman at a social function and thought she was a lady until the Baker case broke.

SEX RELATIONS REVEALED

Another of the women said she had sex relations with a Governor and with a man who, she said, worked for the District of Columbia government.

The man whose apartment was referred to by the women told investigators he was a good friend of a Senator, whom he mentioned by name. He also listed as friends a House Member from New York, another from Massachusetts and a high-ranking military man with political connections.

Mrs. Rometsch was involved in what was described as a messy divorce case in Germany. She was first married to a West German army officer who said he lived with her 2 months until he found she was running around with another man. After they were divorced, the officer was killed in an auto accident.

She married Sergeant Rometsch in 1958.

"PARTYING" WITH BAKER ALLEGED

Mrs. Rometsch claimed that while she was in the Washington area, she had no sexual contacts with diplomats, Congressman, Senators, or Cabinet officers.

The self-styled ringleader said she and three other women mentioned were personally acquainted with Baker, former secretary to the Senate Democratic majority. But she said that Baker never asked her to provide any services for his acquaintances.

It has been brought out in Rules Committee testimony that a Baker acquaintance, a Puerto Rican businessman named Paul Aguirre, told a committee investigator he spent several days partying in New Orleans in May 1963 with Baker, Mrs. Rometsch and Baker's secretary, Carole Tyler.

This was in an interview prior to Aguirre's appearance before the Rules Committee. Aguirre invoked the fifth amendment against self-incrimination and refused to testify when called at a public session. Aguirre told the investigator, according to a memorandum read into the record, that Baker brought Mrs. Rometsch and Miss Tyler with him from Washington to New Orleans.

One German girl who stayed with Mr. and Mrs. Rometsch for a short time at their Arlington, Va., home, said Baker called the Rometsch house twice while she was there.

She also said Mrs. Rometsch said she knew someone who could get her a good job. She said she went with Mrs. Rometsch to the office of a friend of Baker where she met Baker and another man who has been mentioned often in the Baker case. She said nothing came of the interview and she got a job on her own.

INTEGRITY AND INDEPENDENCE: KEYS TO A FREE PRESS—ADDRESS BY CLARK R. MOLLENHOFF

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, on March 12, 1965, Mr. Clark Mollenhoff, Pulitzer Prize winner, of the Washington bureau, Cowles Publications, made an outstanding speech at the convocation marking the 120th anniversary of Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio.

In his remarks Mr. Mollenhoff points up in a most effective manner the responsibilities of both the press and the Congress to keep the American people informed as to the true facts of Government operations.

He cites specific cases to show the danger of how news can be suppressed or distorted by any administration which has the cooperation of a lazy press or a lazy Congress. At the same time he cites many examples to show how an alert press and an alert Congress can keep the American people informed, notwithstanding the desires of any administration to cover up.

I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTEGRITY AND INDEPENDENCE: KEYS TO A FREE PRESS

(Address prepared by Clark R. Mollenhoff, Pulitzer Prize winner of the Washington bureau, Cowles Publications, for delivery at the convocation marking the 120th anniversary of Wittenberg University, Springfield, Ohio, and the 50th anniversary of the campus newspaper, the Wittenberg Torch)

There have been many significant changes in government and journalism in the 50 years since the Torch was first published here at Wittenberg University. In those 50 years there have been many improvements in journalism education and in newspaper personnel and techniques. Yet today there is reason to ask if the press is keeping pace with its responsibility. There is reason for asking if the press will fulfill its obligation in the decade ahead.

We are embarking upon what our President calls the Great Society. He describes in extravagant terms how the wealth of the United States will be managed to provide a bountiful existence for everyone. The goals are laudable, but the grand design certainly carries with it greater responsibilities for government, for the press and for the average citizen.

Increased spending by the Federal Government, additional centralization of power in Washington, and more complicated government is almost certain to be the outcome. At the same time there is much talk about the necessity of a drastic overhaul of the machinery of our Federal Government to meet the responsibilities of new programs and to provide greater efficiency in managing our Federal Government. Much discussed is the need for what is called reform of Congress to make it less obstructionist and more likely that executive branch programs will be speeded through the legislative body.

Some overhauling of governmental machinery likely would be beneficial. It is conceivable that some changes in the operations of Congress are in order. However, it is well to keep in mind that any tampering with the checks and balances in our system of government involves hazards, and it is the responsibility of all of the people to see and understand those hazards. Many nations have experienced so-called reforms that resulted in an unhealthy concentration of power. Many nations have found too late that "efficiency" had eliminated some of the essential elements of a free society.

In this era of bigger and more complicated government and proposals for increasing changes, it is essential for the public to understand what is at stake in each change. It is essential for the public to be informed with facts and opinions through a communications system that is relatively independent of the self-serving pronouncements of politics and government propaganda.

Only an informed public can make the decisions necessary for democracy to work, for there is no democracy when the leaders of a nation have killed or crippled the means for effective dissent. Only an independent press can provide the means—the facts and the opinions—necessary for effective dissent and opposition to Federal administration.

For any analysis of the status of our American democracy, it is necessary to ask this question: Just how free and independent is the American press today?

Opinions would range from one extreme to the other. The press is accused of being "the tool of the executive branch" and it is lauded as "the greatest free press the world has ever known." It is possible to find evidence of press subservience to demonstrate a kept press theory. However, there are daily examples of press criticism of our highest officials, and an aggressiveness that certainly indicate press independence.

It would be an error to try to picture the press as under the thumb of the government, but it would be as great an error to picture the press as completely free and independent.

The whole problem of press freedom is complex. Full press freedom must include more than the simple freedom to print the facts and to criticize. It must also include the freedom to obtain facts, even when those facts may be embarrassing to government officials. There must be a reasonable freedom from retaliation by public officials who resent criticism. In an analysis of press independence it is necessary to examine every power the government has to retaliate against the reporter, editor, publisher, commentator or broadcaster.

I shall try to avoid broad oversimplification, and shall deal with recent cases and existing conditions that relate to the subject of press independence.

In many respects, the Bobby Baker case has put the spotlight on fine examples of initiative and independence by the press. Critical depth stories were researched, printed and followed with editorial comment even when they reflected unfavorably on some of our highest Government officials.

G. R. (Dick) Schreiber, of Vend magazine, and Jack Landau and Larry Stern did an excellent job in helping kick off the vending machine angles of the Baker investigation. Erwin Knoll, of the Newhouse Washington bureau, cracked the story on the Carole Tyler townhouse. Julian Morrison, of the Washington Daily News, did an important job on the complicated magic stock deals. Wallace Turner, of the New York Times, did his usual fine digging job on Bobby Baker's gambling associates. Life magazine's Bill Lambert and Keith Wheeler did great depth reporting on the financial affairs of Bobby Baker and Lyndon B. Johnson. The Wall Street Journal had its usual comprehensive reports on both Matthew H. McCloskey, Jr., and the Johnson family television operations.

The United Press International demonstrated unusual courage and independence when Julius Frandsen and Grant Dillman made the decision to move Merriman Smith's story on the arrest of Walter W. Jenkins on a morals charge. They did it at a time when persons representing the White House were making arguments that persuaded some newspapers to at least temporarily kill the story.

Perhaps the most consistently brilliant performance was by the Washington Star team of John Barron and Paul Hope. The backing they received, the depth investigation they were able to do, and the space given their "special report" series were vital in keeping the Bobby Baker investigation alive and moving during periods when the investigation seemed endangered by lethargy and fear.

A great deal of press aggressiveness and press independence were required to get that investigation going in the face of all the opposition from political leaders in the Congress and the executive branch. Senator JOHN J. WILLIAMS, of Delaware, could never have been successful if it had not been for help of an aggressive, independent press at several crucial points. The whole investigation would have fallen before it was started if there hadn't been a corps of independent reporters who believed that it was more important to push forward with the Bobby Baker story than to seek a favored position with the congressional leadership or with the White House.

While there were many of courage, there were many who did not wish to become entangled in a dispute with the leaders in the Congress or the Johnson administration. They did not want to risk being regarded as an "unfriendly" reporter who caused trouble. There were many who preferred the easier life which prevails for a reporter who doesn't push embarrassing questions. Life can be simple for the "friendly" reporter who isn't too nosey, and is consistently acceptable for "off the record" conferences with Cabinet officials, for the White House "pool" or for "leaks" of stories the administration wants peddled.

It is not intended that these comments be critical of all reporters who accept "leaks" of administration stories, who take their turns in a reporter "pool" arrangement, or who attend the off-the-record conferences. Certainly, the wire service reporters are compelled to retain a close relationship with an agency or the White House in the face of the overwhelming workload they must carry and the great pressure they are under to be first with every routine bit of news. Certainly, all working reporters should try to be reasonably agreeable and available for news "leaks" and off-the-record conferences.

My complaint is with those who permit dependence to become their pattern. The obligation to retain an independence must supersede the favors and pressures any administration may use to try to convert the press watchdogs into lap dogs.

The problem of avoiding seduction by high political figures is not one that is peculiar to the Washington area. There is a good deal of this same disease in our police stations, city halls, county courthouses and statehouses where reporters often become closer to the offices they cover than to the newspaper.

The lap dog problem is accentuated in Washington because of the size and complexity of our Federal Government. A newspaper with one or two reporters in Washington cannot expect them to be instant experts on everything, first on routine news stories, on a buddy-buddy relationship with all high officials, and also handle investigations that demand time, initiative and independence.

The incompetence, superficiality, and laziness that exists in the Washington press corps is not due to the lack of adequate personnel. There are plenty of bright and able newsmen in Washington who have sufficient experience and who have the desire to do work that means something. The problem is one of personnel management that deals with incentives. More thought must be given to this subject if press independence is to continue in Washington.

Reporters, editors and publishers must understand what it takes to cover big Government in Washington on any more than a superficial basis. If superficial color is what is demanded by editors and publishers, then that is what they will get in most cases. If editors and publishers are satisfied with a well-phrased rewrite of the self-serving Government propaganda, then it is likely that is what they will receive. If cute or clever stories are demanded, they will be written.

However, if a newspaper wants depth coverage on the problems of Government, this also can be arranged. The Bobby Baker case was a demonstration of what the press can do in pushing a pussy-footing Senate committee into doing a job it did not want to do. It is far from a thorough investigation at this stage, but the Rules Committee has been pushed into doing much more than it would have done if the press had been less aggressive and less independent.

There must be more of this aggressiveness and more of this independence if the press is to fill its responsibility in handling controversial or complicated matters.

Democracy lives upon information about government and politics. The citizen and taxpayer must have the right to know what government is doing, and must have the right to criticize the decisions and the activities of the lowest and the highest public officials.

The right to vote alone is meaningless unless there is a right to information that may reflect unfavorably upon public officials. The information is of little value unless there is a right to criticize without fear or retaliation by the government.

As our Federal Government becomes bigger and more complex, it represents more of a threat to our democratic form of government. Inevitably it becomes more difficult for the individual citizen to have a real understanding of what his government is doing.

Government officials, with a variety of motivations, flood the public with a mass of mixed information, propaganda, and plain misinformation. Often, this information flowing from high government sources represents only a modified version of the big lie technique of authoritarian governments. Often the public and the press must fight for the facts contrary to the government propaganda line.

The power of big government to dominate the news represents a constant threat to the real spirit of democratic government. The existence of this threat is not necessarily a conspiracy by either political party. It does not mean that most political leaders of today are any worse in their motivations than those of the past. It is simply a fact of life that it is more difficult to understand the $100 billion government than the $1 or $5 billion budget of 30 or 40 years ago.

The complex maze of big government does make it easier for the dishonest to go unnoticed, and for the unscrupulous political schemers to deceive the press and the public.

Since we cannot abolish this bigness, it is essential that we learn to live with it. We must manage to understand it so we can criticize it and control it. There must be a general public understanding of these basic points:

1. The importance of basic integrity and fairplay in Government decisions.

2. The necessity of a maximum of free access to information about Government activities and decisions.

3. The importance of the press in bringing out information of problems in Government.

4. The importance of Congress in providing the information that the press and public must use in arriving at conclusions on the operations of Government.

I believe that review of a number of cases that have been in the news in recent years can demonstrate the importance of each of these points. All of these cases are likely to continue in the news in the months ahead. They include the Billie Sol Estes case, the TFX contract investigation, and the Otto Otepka case.

There has already been much political commentary on all of these cases, with allegations of improprieties, conflicts of interest, and careless Government ethics. These problems are not new with the Kennedy-Johnson administration.

It is inevitable that there will be some corruption and mismanagement in Government under any administration, and we have certainly seen the pattern of corruption in Democratic and Republican administrations.

The classic Republican scandals involved the Harding administration with the major payoffs in connection with the leasing of Teapot Dome oil reserves. The Eisenhower administration had its conflict of interest in the Dixon-Yates power contract, its imprudence in the relationship between Sherman Adams and Bernard Goldfine and its corruption at the FCC involving Commissioner Richard Mack.

The tax scandals of the Truman administration involved payoffs and questionable decisions by many of the highest officials of the Bureau of Internal Revenue, the Justice Department, and several other agencies.

There is one point in mentioning those scandals of past Republican and Democratic administrations. It is to emphasize that no political party has a monopoly on virtue. Those of you who are familiar with my work will be aware I have been active in the past in exposing problems involving several Republican administrations in Polk County, the Truman administration and the Eisenhower administration. I have tried, and the Register (Des Moines, Iowa) has tried, to avoid any political partisanship in dealing with these problems of corruption or mismanagement. I have tried to avoid any ideological bent, for I believe that the facts are more important than any ideology. I try to apply the same standards of conduct to public officials whether they be Democrats or Republicans.

The Kennedy administration came into power in 1961 with vows to operate an open government, and with ringing pledges to take swift action against those involved in corruption or mismanagement. The Billie Sol Estes investigation was touched off by a little newspaper in Texas, the Pecos Independent, and largely because of aggressive newspaper reporting by Jack Steele and Earl Mazo the activities of Estes were subjected to hearings by two committees of Congress and revealed a national scandal in the operations of the Agriculture Department.

It was administration irritation with the critical stories in the New York Herald Tribune that resulted in President Kennedy dropping the subscription to that newspaper.

The investigation of this case by the McClellan subcommittee demonstrated the difficulty of obtaining the facts that are unfavorable to a government department. Secretary Freeman, who was apparently uninformed on some aspects of the Estes case, made a loud defense in which he charged that Republicans were ballooning the whole Estes scandal out of perspective. He denied any favoritism, and then proceeded to try to hide or disregard the facts showing favoritism.

The Department tried to discredit or muzzle N. Battle Hales, the one employee who had the courage to testify that he believed the cotton allotment transfers constituted "favoritism." In March 1964, Hales was denied an ingrade promotion that is normally automatic "because the Estes investigation report is still pending." Yet, within a 2-month period, Freeman's Department gave a Distinguished Service Award to Horace Godfrey, the Administrator of the ASCS at the time of the Estes mess.

This effort to punish the man who testified courageously does not promote honest independence. There has been too little press attention on this important point.

Two major stories of the last year—the TFX warplane case and the Otepka case—can serve to demonstrate how many Washington reporters and columnists failed in their role at watchdogs. They failed because they did not know their subject, or because they became propagandists for two political appointees. They failed despite the documented record made by committees of Congress.

The TFX story involved the integrity of the spending practices in the Defense Department, and the judgment of Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara. It involved a weapon system contract that would exceed $6.5 billion—the largest single contract in the history of the United States and probably in the history of the world.

McNamara overruled the top-level Pentagon source selection board that had favored awarding the contract to the Boeing Co. on the basis of both price and performance. Testimony before the McClellan subcommittee indicates McNamara will waste more than $400 million by an arbitrary decision to hand the $6.5 billion TFX program to Texas-based General Dynamics Corp.

Despite the documented record, a few hero worshiping reporters and columnists, feeding on Pentagon distortions, have been giving the public the line that McNamara's decision will somehow save the taxpayers a billion dollars.

They have accepted factually inaccurate smears against the McClellan subcommittee members from anonymous Defense Department spokesmen. They have disregarded or rationalized the evidence of "conflicts of interest" that should have caused two of McNamara's top aids to disqualify themselves in the TFX decision.

McNamara overruled the unanimous recommendation that favored the Boeing TFX on the basis of a superior performance rating as well as a price that would be lower by $100 million to $415 million by the figures available to McNamara at the time the decision was made.

It was possible that McNamara could have been right, but certainly the burden of proof was on him to establish that he was right since he overruled his subordinates to give the contract to General Dynamics. He signed a 5-page memorandum of "justification" on November 21, 1962, that was loaded with errors, according to the McClellan subcommittee record. One of the errors was a little slipup on the entire performance rating of the General Dynamics plans. The performance rating was greatly inflated. Also, McNamara had a little error of $32 million and a little error of $29 million.

To justify his decision, McNamara made a claim that General Dynamics had greater "commonality" of parts in its Navy and Air Force versions that would result in great savings on maintenance, repair, spare parts and training. The experts—civilian and military—testifying on engineering and military matters, have stated that the General Dynamics plane has little or no advantage over the Boeing plane in this area. One experienced aeronautical engineer declared that the idea of any substantial savings because of commonality was poppycock.

McNamara stated he could disregard the low bid of Boeing because Boeing cost figures lacked realism. Boeing officials stated they submitted detailed cost figures to the Defense Department, and had backup material available to demonstrate the realism of the bid. Boeing officials said the Defense Department never challenged their figures, but had arbitrarily tossed out their low bid.

The McClellan committee proved the only Defense cost figures available had some rather dramatic errors—$291 million and $340 million. McNamara could not have been right if he relied upon these figures, which he now admits were in error. What figures did McNamara have before him when he decided that Boeing lacked cost realism in making the low bid? When the auditors of the General Accounting Office questioned McNamara about his decision, he admitted he had no other cost study available. He said he made a rough judgment from his experience as an official at Ford.

McNamara told the GAO he got the figures out of his head. Comptroller General Joseph Campbell expressed his surprise that McNamara had no cost figures for such an important decision, and stated that the GAO feels there must be written documents to support such multibillion-dollar decisions. But this wasn't all.

McNamara downgraded the modern braking device—the thrust reverser—in the Boeing plane as being a risky engineering venture. The General Dynamics plane had a conventional dive brake that some say will make the plane obsolete before it is in production.

The Navy and Air Force requested the thrust reverser in the General Dynamics plane because of its superiority. Experts have testified it will cost $446 million more to equip the General Dynamics plane with the thrust reverser at this stage.

McNamara contended that Boeing's use of titanium in the wing structure was also risky. On this point, the McClellan subcommittee has produced expert testimony of metallurgists, including specialists in titanium, who disagreed with McNamara. The experts testified there was no unusual risk involved in the use of titanium in the wing structures, and that the use proposed by Boeing was conventional.

Gen. Curtis LeMay and Adm. George Anderson, then Chief of Naval Operations, approved the Boeing plane. They have told McNamara that they had reservations about the General Dynamics plane, and called it a wrong decision.

Granted this was a complicated and technical subject, but it was not impossible and the press, generally, failed to get to the heart of the matter.

The job that could be done was demonstrated by the fine work of Hanson Baldwin, of the New York Times; Cecil Holland, of the Washington Star; William Prochnau, of the Seattle Times; Albert Sehlstedt, Jr., of the Baltimore Sun, and Robert Hotz and George Wilson of Aviation Week.

There were only about a dozen reporters who read the whole record of the TFX investigation, and a few more who read enough to be familiar with the weakness of McNamara's position.

However, there were dozens of apologists for McNamara who have written authoritatively without benefit of reading the record. They have written from Pentagon handouts and from confidential inside information straight from McNamara, Assistant Secretary Arthur Sylvester, former Deputy Defense Secretary Roswell Gilpatric or former Navy Secretary Fred Korth.

Why would Defense Secretary McNamara overrule a unanimous recommendation to make what experts regard as a wrong decision to pay the highest price for the second-best plane?

He had help on this case from Gilpatric, the former lawyer for General Dynamics, and from Fred Korth, whose Continental National Bank of Fort Worth had General Dynamics for one of its best customers.

And, it should be no surprise, both Gilpatric and Korth recommended that the contract should go to General Dynamics, rather than Boeing. Chairman McCLELLAN and others have given the opinion that neither Korth nor Gilpatric should have had any role in the TFX contract in the light of their prior associations with General Dynamics. But many reporters and editorial writers—ignorant, gullible, or lopsidedly partisan—could see no conflict-of-interest problem in the role of Gilpatric or Korth.

Reporters I had worked with, and I might say agreed with, on the conflict of interest in the Dixon-Yates case in the Eisenhower administration, had no interest in going into the details of the role of Gilpatric or Korth. Others who had been aggressive in pointing up the role of Adolphe Wenzell in the Dixon-Yates case, wrote apologies for Gilpatric and Korth.

In some cases it was ignorance of the facts. In some cases it was laziness in dealing with a complex record. I am afraid that in a few cases it was political partisanship.

Most of the same factors were involved in the press failures in the coverage of the case of Otto F. Otepka. For more than a year now, Otto Otepka has undergone a most vicious and oppressive ordeal at the hands of his superiors in the State Department. He has been lied about, put under surveillance, and had his room bugged and his telehone tapped. He has been removed from his position of responsibility, ostracized from his friends, and in general treated in the manner one might expect from a police state.

If Otto Otepka had engaged in espionage, or had been suspected of being engaged in espionage, then there might be some justification for some of the steps taken against him. However, that is not the case. No one has alleged that Otepka has done anything disloyal to his Nation. He is accused of being disloyal to the State Department superiors by telling the truth to a Senate committee, and then producing documents to prove that his superior had given untruthful testimony under oath on a material matter dealing with the operations of the security program.

Otto F. Otepka, the chief security evaluator of the State Department, became a State Department employee in 1953 shortly after the Eisenhower administration came to power. Some reporters found this fact alone to be grounds for being hostile to Otepka, and they characterized him as the last vestige of McCarthyism at the State Department.

They did not know, or at least did not report, that Otepka was a career civil servant with no political ties who had been transferred from the Civil Service Commission to the State Department because of his experience as a lawyer and security evaluator. Otepka believed in a strict security operation, but he was not an irrational man who saw a Red under every bed. In fact, it was Otepka who had recommended clearance of Wolf Ladjinsky in 1954 when some more zealous persons sought to label the career agricultural attaché a security risk.

He served with such distinction as a security evaluator that in 1958 Secretary of State Dulles awarded him the Department's Disguished Service Award. Early in the Kennedy administration Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration Roger W. Jones commended Otepka as a skilled and balanced security evaluator. That was before direct conflict of testimony developed involving Otepka and his superiors.

Otepka delivered three State Department documents to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee to prove he was telling the truth. One of Otepka's superiors charged this was insubordination and violation of rules. To some reporters the delivery of documents to a Senate subcommittee was justification for firing.

They did not know, or at least did not report, that Otepka delivered the documents to prove that he was telling the truth with regard to the handling of a security matter. His testimony had been in conflict with the testimony of one of his superiors, and he produced the records to prove he was truthful.

Otepka delivered documents that also proved his superiors were wrong. To some State Department-oriented reporters and editorial writers, this was McCarthyism.

There are veteran reporters and editorial writers who do not understand the vital function of Congress in checking the administration and operations of the executive branch. Many cannot tell the difference between a responsible investigation as conducted by the late Senator Kefauver, Senator McCLELLAN, or Representative BLATNIK, and one of the late Senator Joe McCarthy's free-swinging extravaganzas. Many didn't try to tell the difference. They are automatically against any investigations, and automatically mouth the executive branch line without regard for its inconsistency or provable fallacy.

In their eagerness to oust Otepka, two State Department officials—John F. Reilly and Elmer Dewey Hill—took part in attaching a listening device to Otepka's telephone. A third official knew about it.

All three testified under oath that they had no knowledge that any wiretap, "bug," or listening device had been attached to Otepka's telephone. Not until after a Senate floor speech warned of perjury did these three high State Department officials write letters to the Senate committee admitting the use of listening devices on Otepka's telephone. However, in admitting the use of the listening device, the three officials explained that there was no listening on the wire and no interception of Otepka's calls. Since then, these letters—prepared by the State Department legal office and approved by Rusk—have been established as being inaccurate. One might even use a harsher term and call them false.

Electronic expert Hill has testified that he actually recorded more than a dozen conversations on Otepka's wire as part of a plan to try to get evidence to serve as a basis for ousting the security evaluator. He testified that Reilly knew of the recordings and had a special interest in one of them.

The documented record shows what is characterized by Senator DODD as "perjury," "falsification," and "lying" by three high-level officials who were trying to get Otto Otepka. Yet some newspapers have ignored this story. Others have continued to take the State Department line that the proof of false testimony on the wiretaps is not connected with the charges against Otepka.

Although Reilly and Hill have resigned, they have not been criticized by Secretary of State Rusk. Rusk allowed Belisle to remain on in the State Department for weeks after becoming aware of the untruthful statements in the transcript.

If Rusk and the State Department legal office were misled by Reilly, Belisle, and Hill, then they can be absolved of complicity in this conspiracy to commit perjury. However, if they knew those letters were false, then they must share the blame. We can only judge Secretary Rusk and other high officials by their actions since it was established that men in the State Department were involved in giving untruthful testimony, under oath, on a material matter. What has Rusk done:

1. He took no action to indicate disfavor with Reilly, Belisle, or Hill. On the contrary he kept Belisle on the payroll. Reilly and Hill were permitted to resign with no derogatory mark in their personnel record stemming from their untruthful testimony.

2. Rusk is pressing ahead with the Reilly-instigated charges to oust Otepka.

3. When the Federal Communications Commission hired Reilly as a hearing lawyer, the State Department made no effort to advise FCC Chairman William Henry of what was contended was an unauthorized use of a wiretap on Otepka or Reilly's untruthful testimony in denying it.

Why has Secretary Rusk acted in this manner? I will not speculate on the rationale behind such bureaucratic brutality. The facts are clear. It is unnecessary to even discuss motivation when the facts so clearly show a coverup for the falsifiers and continued harassment of Otto Otepka. In many ways the State Department's conduct has been as bad as anything Joseph McCarthy did in his most irresponsible moment.

But more outrageous than the State Department's action has been the press performance. Some newsmen accepted the State Department's philosophy that dissenters like Otepka should be squelched, and Congress barred from the facts.

There was aggressive reporting by a few newsmen—Earl Voss and Cecil Holland of the Washington Star, Willard Edwards of the Chicago Tribune and Dom Bonafede, of the New York Herald Tribune—but much of it was lost because few State Department reporters would dig deeply enough to understand the record.

The Otepka case involves the effectiveness of the State Department security program. It involves the question of the integrity of many high-level officials in a department that is entrusted with vital foreign policy decisions. Yet, with only a few exceptions, the press has ignored this major investigation or has given it coverage warped to the State Department distortions.

Fortunately, most reporting has been better than the reporting on the TFX investigation and the Otepka case. Most stories are less complicated, and take less concentrated study.

On the complicated stories and the controversial stories the press needs the help of Congress if it is to retain its independence and serve as an effective check on the executive branch. When the independence of the Congress is reduced, it represents a curb on the independence of the press.

When the threat of a congressional investigation is removed, sharply limited or otherwise compromised, the press has no power to force disclosure of information by the executive branch. Then newsmen are limited to what the agency officials wish to reveal on their operations, unless the newsmen are fortunate enough to have an inside agency source who would risk a job to cooperate. Limit the press to the information in handouts from the White House or any agency and you will find it dominated by a theme on the glories of the incumbent administration. Congressional committees, with all their faults, usually represent diversity of political views.

Take away the hearings of Congress on the controversial subjects and the radio and television industry will be even more susceptible to Government influence than they are today. There is no doubt that television is the most powerful communications media today, but by its nature it suffers from weaknesses that limit its independence even today.

Direct Government control over television programs would constitute a most obvious threat to liberty and could cause violent opposition. The more subtle erosions of independence often go unnoticed. Let us examine a few of them.

First, there are only three major networks that supply most of the Nation's stations with news and public affairs programs. This necessarily limits the diversity of viewpoint.

Second, all radio and television stations come under Government control through the Federal Communications Commission. While the networks and programing are under only a limited control, it would be a short step to tighter Government regulations and there is constant uneasiness about it.

Third, two of the three networks have direct or indirect interests in Government contracts in the communications and defense fields.

Fourth, the mechanics of television require an access to Government offices and a cooperation from high Government officials that newspaper reporters and magazine writers do not require.

Fifth, the great public interest that has grown, or been stimulated, in the President and his family places the Washington bureaus of the major networks in a delicate position. There is the demand for exclusive film of the President, the First Lady, and other family members. Each network must seek to remain in a position to compete for these exclusive shows, and the White House has complete control over cooperation on such special shows. There is no question about the distinct competitive advantage in being regarded as friendly to the White House and the administration generally.

The combination of all of these factors makes it unlikely that the networks will be highly aggressive in presenting critical material on any incumbent President or his top political appointees.

The only exception will be the straight reports on the charges of a political opponent or the criticism that originates in congressional hearings.

At the same time, newspapers and magazines have become more dependent upon cooperation with the administration for the color and inside information for exclusive articles. Also, the size of Government makes the Washington reporter more dependent upon the agency public relations offices.

Further limiting the independence of the press are such orders as the Sylvester directive at the Defense Department that requires that all officials, military and civilian, report all conversations with reporters to the Department information office before the end of each working day. Also, the functions of the Army, Navy, and Air Force information offices are being cut back and the information is being centralized in the office of Assistant Defense Secretary Arthur Sylvester.

Despite these steps, actual Government control of the press does not exist today because of resistance to news distortion tactics. However, the many subtle pressures at work can result in critical erosion of press independence in the future.

The responsibility for continued press independence is broader than the responsibility of reporters. The responsibility must also rest on editors, publishers, broadcasters, and the general public. I mention the public responsibility because in the highly competitive business of striving for public attention, newspapers must give attention to public demand or go out of business. If the public demand puts consistent emphasis on entertainment aspects of public affairs and superficial color, then more newspapers, magazines, and television will probably bend to this demand.

If the public fails to distinguish between thoughtful balanced commentary and big government propaganda, then the trend will be toward more and more thinly disguised administration propaganda.

It is the responsibility of the public to make the distinctions, to reward independence, and treat the superficial and the Government propaganda peddling to fitting contempt.

But even if the public is lacking in perception, it is the responsibility of our editors and publishers to resist the public whims that tend to encourage superficiality and destroy independence. Editors must seek to lead toward depth understanding of governments and politics, encourage dissent, and challenge the unsupported self-serving declarations of Government officials.

I know there are many independent editors today, for I have worked for some of the best for more than 20 years. I know there are a few others with the same tough and nonpartisan independence of Frank Eyerly, managing editor of the Des Moines Register, but there are too few who are as consistent in their independence. There are too few who enjoy a tussle with city hall, the county courthouse, the statehouse, or a national administration.

There are too many editors and reporters who make a few stabs at aggressive independence at some point and then retreat to the philosophy immortalized by Sam Rayburn and Bobby Baker: "If you want to get along, you have to go along."

This may be sage advise for budding political operators, but it is destructive of everything the free press should stand for. It should not be tolerated.

In commemorating this 50th anniversary of Wittenberg University's publication of the Torch we must remember that the next 50 years will present more severe tests for the press and our system of government. Even as we pay tribute to the journalistic skills—writing, editing, photography and makeup—we must understand that they are meaningless unless accompanied by aggressive independence and integrity. This will be true 25, 50, or even 100 years from now.

Hold fast to your integrity and your independence. They are essential to preserve a free press. They are vital if we are to retain a free society.

LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate convened briefly during the past week in order to permit the committees to meet both mornings and afternoons and to concentrate on urgent legislation. On Monday last, however, under the capable leadership of Senator DODD, of Connecticut, and assisted by Senators JAVITS and MAGNUSON, the Senate passed one of the most humanitarian measures cleared so far this year—a bill providing penalties for persons trafficking for money in interstate commerce in placing or in arranging for placement of children for adoption or permanent home care.

On Thursday last, the Senate unanimously confirmed the new Secretary of Treasury, the Honorable Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia. In addition, two legislative measures were passed and sent to the House. S. 22, the Anderson bill, carries out President Johnson's request to enlarge the scope and to remove limitations from the 1964 Water Resources Research Act. And as so well stated by the distinguished Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], the bill will "insure that the provisions of the act will be better designed to carry out the program's worthy objective of insuring the Nation at all times of a supply of water sufficient in quantity and quality to meet the requirements of its expanding population." This is the 15th Presidential request passed by the Senate to date.

The second measure, S. 560, sponsored and guided through the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE] and the distinguished Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS] provides a more effective basis for the control of water and air pollution from Federal buildings, installations, or other property. It also provides that automotive vehicles purchased by the Federal Government on and after October 1, 1966, must be manufactured or equipped to prevent or reduce the discharge of pollutants from exhaust emissions.

This week the Senate will consider, I hope, S. 693, a bill to strengthen certain provisions of the Foreign Agents Registration Act; S. 390, permitting volunteer fire companies to use second- and third-class bulk mailing at the rates established for nonprofit organizations; S. 1462, authorizing a contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, N. Mex., for payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; S. 1000, permitting transfer of title to movable property to agencies assuming maintenance responsibility for project works serving industrial and municipal functions; S. 254, authorizing the Secretary of Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon; and numerous resolutions from Senate Rules Committee.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a report on the Senate committee activity for the week of March 29, 1965, to April 3, 1965 and Senate legislative activity through March 25, 1965.

There being no objection, the reports were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ACTIVITY FOR THE WEEK OF MARCH 29 TO APRIL 3

Agriculture:

On March 31, hearings will be held on an amendment to the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act.

On April 1, hearings will be held on S. 7, a Presidential recommendation to provide for establishing the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in West Virginia.

Appropriations: Senate hearings will continue on Agriculture, Defense, and Labor-HEW.

Banking and Currency: Subcommittee hearings start March 29 on the Omnibus Housing bill.

Commerce:

Subcommittee hearings continue March 29, 30, April 1 and 2, on S. 547 and S. 559, cigarette labeling and advertising.

Full committee hearings March 31 on the export of walnut logs.

Foreign Relations: Hearings continue on the foreign aid authorization.

Government Operations:

Subcommittee hearing March 29 on S. 1134, permanent reorganization authority.

Subcommittee hearings continue March 31, on banking investigations.

Subcommittee hearings March 31 and April 1 on S. 1599, establishing a Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Interior:

Subcommittee hearing March 29 on S. 34, Missouri River Basin project.

Subcommittee hearing March 31 on S. 599, Central Valley project.

Subcommittee hearing April 2 on various Indian bills.

Judiciary: Hearings continue on voting rights bill.

Labor:

Subcommittee hearings continue on S. 600, the higher education bill.

Subcommittee hearings, March 29, 30, on vocational rehabilitation amendments.

Public Works: Subcommittee hearings March 30, 31, and April 1 on the 1965 cost estimates for interstate roads.

Space: Hearings to be concluded March 30 on NASA authorization.

SENATE LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY THROUGH MARCH 25, 1965

(Senate Democratic policy committee, 89th Cong., 1st sess.)

The tally sheet so far:

Senate activity:

Days in session	41
Hours in session	170:33
Total measures passed	106
Confirmations	25,087
Public laws	6

APPROPRIATIONS

Agricultural supplemental: Appropriated $1.6 billion for Commodity Credit Corporation, allowed the President final discretion in shipping surplus food to Egypt, and suspended until May 1 the planned closing of 11 VA hospitals, 4 domiciliaries and the merger of 17 regional offices. (Public Law 89-2 (Presidential recommendation).)

CONGRESS

Joint Committee on the Budget: Established a 14-member joint committee on the budget composed of 7 members from each Appropriations Committee, 4-to-3 ratio. The purpose of the joint committee is to serve the Appropriations Committees year round with the same expertise as the Bureau of Budget for the Executive. S. 2 passed Senate January 27.

Joint Committee on Organization of Congress: Established a 12-member bipartisan Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of Congress and to recommend improvements. Rules changes are eliminated from the study. Authorizes $150,000 through January 31, 1966, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate. First report to be submitted 120 days following effective date of the resolution. Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 passed Senate March 9, 1965; passed House March 11, 1965.

DEFENSE

Zinc, lead, and copper: Authorized the disposal of 200,000 tons of each of zinc and lead and the sale of 100,000 short tons of copper to producers and processors. (H.R. 1496, Public Law 89-9.)

Stockpile Act: Provides more statutory guidance on the purpose for which materials would be stockpiled; provides for disclosure to Congress and the public, pertinent information on the management; permits disposals of surplus material without requiring congressional action on each while retaining in Congress the power to disapprove proposed disposals; and makes contracts for furnishing materials to the stockpile subject to the Renegotiation Act. S. 28 passed Senate February 9. (Presidential recommendation.)

ECONOMY

Aid to Appalachia: Authorized $1.1 billion in aid to the 11-State Appalachian region and established the Appalachia Regional Commission; $840 million of this amount will be in the form of Federal grants for a 5-year highway construction program and a 2-year authorization of $252.4 million for a variety of economic development projects. (Public Law 89-4 (Presidential recommendation).)

Disaster victims: Directs the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make an immediate study of alternative programs which could be established to help provide financial assistance to those suffering property losses in flood, earthquake, and other natural disasters, including alternative methods of Federal insurance as well as the existing flood insurance program. S. 408 passed Senate January 28.

Gold cover: Repeals the requirement of 25-percent gold backing of commercial bank deposits held by the Federal Reserve banks, but retains the 25-percent requirement against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation. (Public Law 89-3 (Presidential recommendation).)

Manpower Act of 1965: Extends the Manpower Development and Training Act to June 30, 1970, authorizes $454 million for fiscal 1966, and provides up to 2 years' training in classrooms or on the job for persons unemployed because they lack education or skills. S. 974 passed Senate March 16. ((Presidential recommendation) House Calendar.)

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Goddard Day: Designates March 16, 1965, as Goddard Day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern-day rocketry. (Public Law 89-5.)

HEALTH

Community health services extension: Extends for 5 fiscal years, 1966-70, authority for grants to States and communities for mass immunization programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and adds measles. Extends for 1 year general and special health services, including those for migratory workers, chronically ill, and aged, and grants for research to improve such services. S. 510 passed Senate March 11. (Presidential recommendation.)

Loan cancellation: Permits cancellation of a portion of the unpaid balance of a student loan awarded to a physician or dentist who practices in a shortage area. S. 576 passed Senate January 28.

Water pollution control: Vests authority to establish purity standards for interstate water and authorizes $80 million in new grants to help States and localities develop new methods of separating combined storm-water and sewage-carrying sewer systems; increase the dollar ceiling limitations on individual grants for construction of waste treatment works from $600,000 to $1 million for a single project and from $2,400,000 to $4 million for a joint project involving two or more communities. S. 4 passed Senate January 28. (House Calendar (Presidential recommendation).)

Water pollution control, Federal installations: Provides for improved cooperation by Federal agencies to control water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities and to control automotive vehicle air pollution. S. 560 passed Senate March 25.

HOUSING

Distressed homeowners: Authorizes the Veterans' Administration to extend aid to distressed homeowners who, after relying on VA or FHA construction standards and inspections, find structural or other major defects in their properties purchased with GI mortgage loans which affect the livability of the property. S. 507 passed Senate January 27. (Presidential recommendation.)

INTERNATIONAL

Coffee implementation: This bill implements the International Coffee Agreement ratified in 1963, and authorizes the President to require all coffee entering U.S. markets and all exports of coffee to be accompanied by a certificate of origin or a certificate of reexport. Limits imports of coffee from countries which have not joined in the agreement; and requires certain record keeping. S. 701 passed Senate February 2. (Presidential recommendation.)

Disarmament Act amendments: Authorizes an appropriation of $20 million for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the Disarmament Agency, thus continuing the authorization on the same basis as fiscal years 1964 and 1965. H.R. 2998, in conference. (Presidential recommendation.)

Inter-American Development Bank: Provides for a $750 million increase in the U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank—over a 3-year period at the rate of $250 million a year. This represents the U.S. share of a planned $900 million increase in the fund, which will serve to strengthen multinational aid and the Alliance for Progress. (Public Law 89-6 (Presidential recommendation).)

JUDICIAL

Illicit traffic in child adoption: Imposes Federal criminal sanctions on persons engaged in interstate or foreign commerce in the illicit traffic of placing children for adoption or permanent free care. S. 624 passed Senate March 22.

PRESIDENCY

Presidential succession: Proposed an amendment to the Constitution, that will totally replace article II, section I, clause 5, relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency. Senate Joint Resolution 1 passed Senate February 19. (House Calendar (Presidential recommendation).)

RESOURCE AND RECREATION BUILDUP

Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area: authorizes $355,000 for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area in the States of Montana and Wyoming to provide for public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment of the proposed Yellowtail Reservoir, and for the preservation of the scenic, scientific, and historic features of the area. S. 491 passed Senate February 10. (Presidential recommendation.)

Kaniksu National Forest: Authorizes up to $500,000 from the land and water conservation fund to extend the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest to include lands necessary for the protection and conservation of the scenic values and natural environment of Upper Priest Lake in Idaho. S. 435 passed Senate March 4.

Manson irrigation unit, Washington: Authorizes $12.3 million for the construction and operation of the Manson unit of the Chief Joseph Dam project. The Manson unit has an irrigation potential of 5,770 acres of land, with half of the costs reimbursable. S. 490 passed Senate February 10.

Nez Perce National Historical Park, Idaho: Authorizes $630,000 for the purchase of 1,500 acres of land to establish the Nez Perce National Historical Park to commemorate, preserve, and interpret the historic values in the early Nez Perce Indian culture, the tribes' war of 1877 with U.S. cavalry troops, the Lewis and Clark Expedition through the area early in the 19th century, subsequent fur trading, gold mining, logging, and missionary activity. S. 60 passed Senate February 10.

River basin planning: Authorizes Federal grants of $5 million a year in matching funds to States for State project planning over a 10-year period; sets up a Cabinet-level water resources council to coordinate river basin planning; and authorizes creation of river basin commissions for regional planning. S. 21 passed Senate February 25. (H.R. 1111, House Calendar (Presidential recommendation).)

Water Resources Research Act: Amends the 1964 Water Resources Research Act to authorize grant, matching, and contract funds for assistance to educational institutions in addition to State land-grant colleges, to competent private organizations and individuals, and to local, State, and Federal agencies in undertaking special research in water resource problems. Authorizes $5 million for fiscal 1966 and increases the authorization by $1 million annually until the level of $10 million is reached. The ceiling of $10 million will remain thereafter. S. 22 passed Senate March 25. (Presidential recommendation.)

Yakima project, Washington: Authorizes $5.1 million for the extension, construction and operation of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project with an irrigation potential of 7,000 additional acres (present irrigated acreage is 19,000). All but approximately $135,000 is reimbursable. S. 794 passed Senate February 10.

TAXES

Motor Fuels Taxation Compact: Grants the consent of Congress to any of the several States and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity. S. 307 passed Senate March 15.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 12 o'clock noon on Thursday, next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES; FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS; AND FOR THE VICE PRESIDENT OR PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate, following today's session, until April 1, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and the House of Representatives; that committees be authorized to file reports; and that the Vice President or President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills and joint resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WHAT IS THE U.S. ROLE IN EAST ASIA?

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, an extremely knowledgeable and valuable article entitled: "What Is Our Role in East Asia?" written by Denna F. Fleming, emeritus professor of International

Relations at Vanderbilt University, appears in the March issue of the Western Political Quarterly.

Professor Fleming's qualifications are obvious from his autobiographical sketch from the latest edition of "Who's Who," which I ask to be printed at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the full text of his article be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I recommend this earnestly to all my colleagues both in the Senate and House, and urge them, whatever may have been their commitments under the pressure of events, to reappraise the whole situation in southeast Asia. We may not agree with every detail of Professor Fleming's scholarly presentation, but his general conclusions seem to me to be unanswerable, namely that we need an entirely new approach and that only disaster perhaps on a cosmic scale lies ahead, if the United States does not change its position and policy, and does it promptly. The war is escalating steadily, as could be foretold when President Johnson followed his mistaken advisers' counsels.

It is clear, of course, that when this article was written and printed it was just before the United States' bombing of North Vietnam, but that merely emphasizes the validity of Professor Fleming's contentions.

I also ask unanimous consent that a very pertinent letter to President Johnson, summarizing the extent of our folly, written by Florence Luscomb, of which she sent me a copy, be likewise printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 3.)

EXHIBIT 1

Fleming, Denna Frank, teacher; born Paris, Ill., March 25, 1893; son Albert and Eleanor (McCormick) F.; graduate East Illinois State College 1912, Pd. D., 1949; A.B. University of Illinois 1916, A.M., 1920, Ph. D., 1928; student Columbia, 1928; married Doris Sigrid Anundsen, June 29, 1929. Principal high school, Hume, Ill., 1912–14, teacher high school, Freeport, 1916–17, Walla Walla, Wash., 1917; principal high school, Tonica, Ill., 1919–21, and Colfax, 1921–22; assistant professor social science, Monmouth College, 1922–23; associate professor 1923–24; professor and chairman department, 1924–27; assistant professor political science, Vanderbilt, 1928, associate professor, 1930, professor, 1938, chairman department, 1940, research professor 1951–61, professor emeritus, 1961–. Instructor at Iowa State Teachers College, summers 1926–27. Penfield traveling scholar, 1932–33, 1938–39; member Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, 1946, 1948, 1949; adviser atomic energy section; State Department, 1946. Foreign editor Nashville Evening Tennessean, 1934–37; foreign commentator, WSM, 1939–47; radio commentator Woodrow Wilson Foundation, 1944–46, director 1950–55; Fulbright lecturer Conference on American Studies Cambridge U., 1954, School of International Studies, New Delhi, 1959–60. With AEF World War I. Member American Association of University Professors (member executive council), American Committee in Geneva Staff, 1932, American Academy Political and Social Science, American Political Science Association (vice president, 1943), Southern Political Science Association (president, 1941), Phi Beta Kappa Associates, Acacia, Delta Sigma Rho, Kappa Delta Pi, Phi Beta Kappa, Phi Kappa Phi, Democrat, Methodist, Mason. Club: Nashville Round Table (president, 1937). Author: "The Treaty Veto of the American Senate," 1930; "The United States and the League of Nations (1918–20)," 1932; "The United States and World Organization (1920–33)," 1938; "Can We Win the Peace?" 1943; "While America Slept," 1944; "The United States and the World Court," 1945; "The Cold War and Its Origins (1917–1960)," Vols. I and II, 1961. Home: 4721 Sewanee Road, Nashville 4, Tenn.

EXHIBIT 2

WHAT IS OUR ROLE IN EAST ASIA?

(By D. F. Fleming, Vanderbilt University)

(NOTE.—D. F. Fleming is emeritus professor of International Relations at Vanderbilt University and the author of a two-volume history of "The Cold War and Its Origins, 1917–60." He has recently served as visiting professor at the University of Arizona.)

The cold war is nearly 20 years old and it is obviously waning in its main theater. During World War II Roosevelt and Hull labored long to create a basis for making and keeping the peace in cooperation with the Soviet Union, the great ally which had borne the heavy brunt of the fighting on land and suffered most from death and destruction. However, when Roosevelt and Hull passed from the scene in 1945 their successors abruptly reversed their policies and opted for conflict with the Soviet Union over East Europe, and for the containment and encirclement of both the Soviets and communism throughout the world.

The same complete reversal of healing policies had happened twice before in our history, after the death of Lincoln and after the fall of Wilson. In 1918 the tragic results of the reversal were delayed, but they came inexorably. The stupidities and agonies and infinite wastes of World War I had convinced many millions of the best citizens the world over that a new start had to be made, a League of Nations must be created that would get all the nations into one body and prevent any more suicidal balance-of-power wars between rival alliances. Never in all human history had an overpowering need been so clear and clamant, yet it was quickly denied in the U.S. Senate, where the opponents of Woodrow Wilson preferred to return to isolation and let the world drift as before. Our lead in refusing responsibility for the peace was followed by Britain and France in the crises of the League of Nations and the world drifted into a far worse World War in 1939.

We do not know that our leadership in the League of Nations would have made the difference, but we do know that we did not try to make it succeed, except futilely on the fringes of the League during the Manchurian crisis in 1931–32. In 1945 we dutifully created another League of Nations and entered it, but we also plunged at once into two crusades—an old-fashioned balance-of-power fight with the Soviet Union and a crusade against communism everywhere. In other words, we heavily overcompensated for the failure of isolationism by coming close to assuming responsibility for everything everywhere in the world.

Our quick assumption of global responsibility was signaled by Churchill's Iron Curtain speech at Fulton, Mo., in March 1946, in Truman's applauding presence, and by the proclamation a year later of the Truman doctrine, forbidding the expansion of communism anywhere and in effect forbidding all revolutions around the globe, since they might turn Communist.

The Truman doctrine was the rashest and most sweeping commitment ever made by any government at any time. In it Mr. Truman followed his own inclinations, and those of the advisers to whom he listened, and at the same time sought to foil his Republican critics, who had won the congressional elections of 1946 on charges of softness on communism. No man ever gave greater hostages to fortune. Within 2 years the success of the Communist-led revolution in China punched a hole in Truman's doctrine as big as a continent, one containing the world's largest and oldest people. A year later, in 1950, the Korean war broke out and President Truman was compelled to defend his global policy in what became a long frustrating war. His Republican opponents at first applauded, but in the end they saddled him with "Truman's war," and it was primarily responsible for the defeat of his party in the 1952 election. Eisenhower went to Korea, as he had promised, and afterward accepted a stalemate peace.

Then for some 7 years under the leadership of John Foster Dulles our objective was "liberation" and the "rollback" of both communism and Russia in Europe. The Soviets did accept a negotiated withdrawal from Austria and they withdrew voluntarily from Finland, but the main lines of their World War II advance held. This was not strange, after what happened at Munich in 1938.

During the long years of the cold war we were taught that there was a great Red monolith which controlled all Communists everywhere, including the Chinese. Today, everybody knows that there is the deepest kind of split between Russia and China and that all the Communist states of East Europe are evolving lives of their own, usually in the direction of somewhat more freedom at home and better relations with the West. After leading the world in spending at least a trillion dollars on cold war armaments we have not been able to reverse the main result of World War II in Europe. There has been no rollback and we have come to understand that the terribly exhausted and devastated Soviet Union of the postwar years was both incapable of attempting and unwilling to attempt the world conquest which our post-Roosevelt leaders so hastily ascribed to her, and which we soon accepted as our first article of national faith.

In his last months President Kennedy gave us magnificent leadership in the direction of ending the cold war. In his address at American University, on June 11, 1963, he acknowledged Russia's abysmal postwar weakness and called for a reappraisal of our attitudes toward her and toward the cold war. President Johnson has also furthered this trend.

But there remains the Far East. There, Communist China has weathered severe setbacks and is gathering strength. She is also still in the militant stage of her revolution and very angry at us because of our support of the Chiang Kai-shek regime on Formosa and in the mouths of two Chinese harbors, because of our tremendous military power on Okinawa and along her coasts, and because of our other blockades of every kind—economic, diplomatic, and political. Moreover, she sees us occupying and fortifying the tips of two peninsulas on the Asiatic mainland, Korea and Vietnam, which are very close to her heartland. All the conditions for deep and permanent resentment on China's part are present.

For our part the prosecution of the cold war in Asia has always aroused the strongest emotions of our political rightwing. The defection of China to communism had not been expected and it has never been forgiven. Nor has a much wider section of our people been able to forget the bitter frustrations of the Korean war. So why not simply turn the focus of the cold war toward the Far East and keep our tremendous arms expenditures going another decade or two? And why not really push the cold war to "victory" in Asia?

Before we go in this direction we should soberly review our involvements in Asia and try to ascertain what our objectives there are.

Korea

Korea is a good place to begin.[1] What does the record show there? It shows first, that we proposed the division of Korea at the 38th Parallel to prevent the Russians from occupying all of Korea, which they could easily have done, and that they readily agreed. When our occupation forces finally arrived in Korea, on September 8, 1945, General Hodge found a Peoples Republic government already organized by a national assembly representing all Korea. He suppressed this broadly representative government in the south; and in the north the Russians managed to install their kind of rule. In the south we set up a rightist tyranny under Syngman Rhee, which was soon decisively repudiated in the election of May 30, 1950.

Contrary to the almost universal assumption, we do not know which side began the shooting in Korea on June 25. We do know that the North Koreans were well armed and ready and that they had been conducting a propaganda campaign for unification, but Rhee's government had been publicly threatening for months to march north. It had been defeated at the polls and may have been desperate. We do not know, either, that the Soviet government was behind the swift North Korean invasion of the South. It was boycotting the U.N. Security Council at the time, in support of seating Red China in the U.N., and was not present to veto U.N. action in South Korea's defense. If Moscow knew about the invasion, would it commit such an obvious blunder?

We know that that the U.N. quickly approved the Truman administration's almost instant decision to fight to defend South Korea, and that on October 7, 1950, it very reluctantly approved our new objective of going north to destroy the North Korean government and unify Korea by force, the same thing which the North Koreans had attempted. This decision, as I see it, was the greatest single foreign policy mistake in our history. It converted a small war, already won, into a dreadful catastrophe which devastated Korea from end to end, killed some 2 million people and wounded another 3 million. By the time the war ended South Korean military casualties alone had risen to 1,312,836 and the other side suffered a still greater slaughter.[2] Indeed, in the latter stages of the war our Army frankly labeled its objective to be "Operation Killer." The Korean war also cost us 144,173 American casualties and led us into the huge armaments budgets which still continue.

Is this the kind of solution toward which we are sliding gradually in South Vietnam? Before we answer "Yes, we must win," we should reflect on the results in Korea. There, after more than 10 years, Rhee's oppressive government was finally overthrown by national student uprisings, to be succeeded by a veiled military dictatorship. In South Korea we maintain an army of 600,000 Koreans, the fourth largest army in the world, most of whom would otherwise be unemployed or underemployed. Yet we also keep there on the front line 52,000 American combat troops which cost us more than $100 million a year. This is a part of the approximately $3 billion annually which our worldwide military forces cost us—about the same as our annual balance-of-payments deficit, which we have had steadily since the Korean war buildup in 1950. Because of these ever-mounting foreign deficits we now owe $25 billion in short-term indebtedness abroad and have only $4 billion in unearmarked gold to cover it. Senator FRANK CHURCH, of Idaho, has asked recently if this is to go on forever, in a discussion of "The Korean Paralysis."[3] What would happen if there should be a bad economic weather in the world and a run on New York?

South Korea's Plight

What, too, is to be done about South Korea? Her agricultural economy is too weak to support her 25 millions, rapidly increasing, while in North Korea there are minerals, water power, and industries enough to make all Korea viable. The South Koreans know this and nothing can suppress a deep and growing yearning for the reunification of Korea, which would enable all to live in at least relative decency. We are apparently trying to turn South Korea back to Japan, but the South Koreans bitterly resent that kind of solution. Are we incapable of any constructive thinking about the Korean problem? Or shall we wait until events take it out of our hands? Do we really want to subsidize the unhappy South Koreans forever?

A dispatch from Seoul to the New York Times on May 31, 1964, states that discontent is running high, along with rapid inflation, that we had to send more than 1 million tons of food last year, that "20 percent of South Korea's work force is unemployed and other heavy proportions are underemployed." But for the moment martial law, declared after conference with our officials in South Korea, represses student riots and demonstrations.[4]

Vietnam

As unrest simmers in South Korea, what is the situation in Vietnam, another Asiatic peninsula?[5] There, during World War II, we at first aided the Communist-led revolution of Ho Chi Minh against the Japanese and the French. But later, as soon as the Communist nature of the revolution became evident, we took the side of the French in their effort to reimpose their colonial rule on the Vietnamese. Then our Government increasingly poured every kind of aid into the hands of the French, deluging them with weapons and aid to the value of some $3 billion, but they could not win. With infinitely less aid from China the Vietnamese bled the French Army until by 1954 the French people could stand no more. Secretary of State Dulles fought hard to prevent the making of peace. He and Admiral Radford had plans for entering the war ourselves, but the reluctance of Congress and President Eisenhower prevented that and all of Mr. Dulles' threats could not avert the calling of a peace conference at Geneva. However, Mr. Dulles' stance of "angry negation" did prevent the victorious Vietminh from taking control of all of their country. Vietnam was divided at the 17th parallel, another tragic victim of the cold war.

Then after 8 years of French defeat the United States moved into South Vietnam in 1954 and set up another despot, Ngo Dinh Diem, who with Dulles' backing refused to permit the elections which the Geneva Conference had called for to unify the country, because he knew the other side would win. Washington stood behind the misrule of Diem's family for nearly 10 years, until it finally led to an army rebellion last year. We backed the Diem tyrrany because the Communists had renewed guerrilla war soon after the elections were frustrated, as they were expected to do. Lt. Gen. S. T. Williams, chief U.S. military adviser in South Vietnam at the time, wrote in U.S. News & World Report on November 9, 1964, that he was instructed to expect attack from the north when the deadline for the elections expired in July 1956 without their being held.

This new war is now more than 6 years old and it is reaching the proportions of the earlier one. Again we have poured in billions in weapons and supplies, and we have sent some 22,000 American officers and troops to train the city boys of Saigon and other towns to go out into the jungles and fight their rural brothers, which they are not keen about doing.[6] We tell ourselves that the Vietcong rebels are from North Vietnam—and some of them are, but relatively few.

The facts about who the rebels are have been stated in an authoritative book by Prof. Robert Scigliano of Michigan State University. This university worked in South Vietnam under a large U.S. contract until the operation fell under Diem's disfavor. It is Scigliano's judgment that only a small part of the Vietcong come from North Vietnam and that nearly all of these have been southerners who withdrew to the north after the Geneva agreements. The claim of massive infiltration from the north, he says, "does not appear to be supported by the available evidence."[7] This was verified in the New York Times as recently as July 5, 1964. In other words, even the Vietcong from the north are patriots fighting in the land of their birth, and this is true even if they were born and trained in North Vietnam.

For many years our correspondents on the spot have testified that the Vietcong were arming themselves by taking American weapons from our side. This has not been too difficult, since there is a false relationship between our officers and the conscripted youth of the towns, often seized forcibly. When two companies in an ambush broke and ran, "We beat them back to their positions with rifle butts, but finally there was no holding them," said U.S. Capt. Ralph C. Thomas. He added that this was the second time in 10 months that one battalion had fallen into ambush by violating the most elementary rules, and that some Vietnamese officers refuse to discuss battle plans in advance or even to consider American advice when it is offered. To most of them the Americans' chief function is to provide equipment, supplies, and air cover. (AP dispatch from Tra On, Vietnam, by John T. Wheeler. The Arizona Daily Star, Dec. 20, 1964.)

It should have been evident to us from the start that we cannot go into a far country and teach the youth to fight a deadly war against their brothers for our reasons. Failure was surely indicated by the ability of the North Vietnamese and Chinese to filter arms into South Vietnam, on the backs of men and in small boats at night, as they have been doing steadily in recent months. These supplies are rivulets, when compared to the mighty flood of war machines of every kind which we pour into South Vietnam, but they are sufficient to tighten steadily the Vietcong ring around Saigon.

---

[1] D. F. Fleming, "The Cold War and its Origins, 1917–60" (New York: Doubleday, 1961), II, 589–661.

[2] Encyclopedia Americana, p. 387; Time, Nov. 13, 1950, p. 23.

[3] The Nation, Apr. 16, 1964, pp. 347–48.

[4] Arizona Daily Star, June 4, 1964 (New York Times service).

[5] Fleming, op. cit., pp. 667–706.

[6] The extreme difficulty of inducing our proteges to become victorious fighters has been described many times in the dispatches, but never more clearly than in one from Malcolm W. Browne to the New York Times (and Portland Oregonian) on July 23, 1964. Referring to the apparently incurable habit of our trainees of getting themselves massacred in ambushes, a "high American officer'" said "We're begging, we're pleading, we're reminding them [the Vietnamese troops], we're cajoling: we cry, we stamp out in fury, we do everything, we bring them ice cream. But we haven't succeeded." What more could we do to make ferocious fighters out of people who don't have their hearts in it?

[7] Robert Scigliano, South Vietnam, Nation Under Stress (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1963), p. 148.

In its environs one of our supply ships has been sunk in port, a major airport has been shelled devastatingly and a hotel full of our officers bombed with grievous results. No American is safe, and a returning ship's officer reports that few Vietnamese shops will sell him anything lest they be bombed by the Vietcong.

These rebels have the most vital things that men can fight for at stake, and it does not make them less determined to win when we destroy their villages and families with high explosives and napalm and defoliate their countryside with chemicals. We must not think that in using these methods we are killing Vietcong alone, for much larger numbers of villagers also die. A dispatch of March 22 from Saigon to the Arizona Daily Star says: "The spectacle of children lying half alive with napalm burns across their bodies was revolting to both Vietnamese and Americans who entered the village."

This is one reason why the Vietcong are winning the war. They control and govern some two-thirds of South Vietnam and there is small reason to believe that there will be time to put into effect the plans which we have for mastering the country and making it into a showcase of contented living. The South Vietnamese have been fighting for nearly 20 years, first against French rule, then against American control, and they are desperately tired of the never-ending strife. They may turn neutralist at any time.

In these circumstances we hear increasingly demands and plans for bombing North Vietnam, to stop all aid from the north. It is wholly righteous for us to pour mountainous aid, including many troops, into South Vietnam, but diabolically wicked for trickles of aid to come in from North Vietnam. The advocates of victory at any price see these supply routes destroyed first, then the cities of North Vietnam, if necessary, and finally those of China, if the Chinese intervene, as they have already promised to do if we attack North Vietnam. They made the same pledge when we invaded North Korea in 1950. It is questioned now that the Soviets would honor their alliance obligations to defend China against us, yet Walter Lippmann warned us, on July 3, that "we must avoid the extreme of wishful thinking, which is to believe that in a war between China and the United States the Soviet Union would be neutral or on our side." We should remember, too, that on February 25, 1964, the Soviet Union warned the United States that if we extend the war into North Vietnam the Soviet people would render "the necessary assistance and support" to "the national liberation struggle in South Vietnam."[8] We might recall thoughtfully also that years of bombing everything in sight in Korea did not give us victory there. There, too, we had total control of the air.

It is quite true that China is in poor shape to fight and it is equally true that from our bases off her shores we have the power in turn China into a vast, helpless morass, or a desert, with our conventional and atomic bombs. The targets are all pinpointed, ready for the death of unlimited millions of Chinese. If it be granted that a nuclear world war could be avoided, we have the power to work our will upon China. Yet it does not follow that the Chinese leaders would fail to go to the aid of North Vietnam if we attack her. They believe deeply in the kind of war which won them control of China and which is winning in South Vietnam. There is also strong reason to believe that they think we would not risk the worldwide consequences of destroying their country with our superweapons.

This is the alternative to making peace which faces us. On August 3, 1964, the reliable Australian correspondent Denis Warner described the continued administrative and military decline in South Vietnam; the relentless rise of the Vietcong forces to some 250,000, including battle-tested reserves; and Ho Chi Minh's ability to send his 15 divisions throughout southeast Asia, followed by "the Chinese divisions that lie behind." Saying flatly that victory for the South Vietnam Government is out, Warner could find no military counter within our capacity except nuclear war. In other words, we would have to destroy Vietnam, at least, perhaps most of southeast Asia and presumably China, to win. "The war," he said, "would have to be nuclear or it would be lost."

Why Are We in Vietnam?

Before we slide gradually into such a human and moral catastrophe we ought to ask ourselves very carefully what it is that we are fighting for in South Vietnam. For "freedom," it is most commonly said. That is a word that comes easily to the tongue and there is no doubt that the Asiatic Communists do live under many regimentations and controls. On the other hand, there is small reason to believe that we could win a fair election in South Vietnam and no reason to believe that we could win an election covering the entire country. Among other reasons, the Vietnamese know that degrading poverty and destitution have been eliminated in China, and the liberty to eat is an elemental one. They would vote also for freedom from war and foreign control.

In the Eisenhower years it used to be said that we must not lose the tungsten mines and rubber plantations of South Vietnam. The latter are still mainly in French hands, and the French want the war stopped to save their investments. They still have half a billion dollars to lose. There is also much surplus rice in South Vietnam, of which we too have a surplus. But in the last analysis our reason for being in South Vietnam, beyond economic motives, is a belief that this peninsula is an extremely strategic spot and that if it "went" Communist all southeast Asia and beyond would turn Red.

This is the domino theory which has been used to justify every move in the cold war. In 1947 it was said that if Greece went Communist so would Turkey, the Middle East, Iran, and beyond. So, too, would Italy and France in the West. In 1950 the Korean war was justified in the same way. We have been taught likewise that if Formosa were lost the Chinese would soon take the Philippines, then Hawaii, then Catalina Island, and our own Pacific coast.

Under this theory any American intervention anywhere in the world can be justified. If South Vietnam goes, it is said, then a long set of standing dominoes will fall down through New Zealand to the south polar continent, which fortunately has been neutralized. But would they? The Vietnamese are a tough and patriotic people. They were ruled by China for centuries and have no wish to be again. Nor is there any evidence that Red China has dominated North Vietnam or North Korea. On the contrary, she has helped them both to industrialize, from her own limited means. China hopes to cut a big figure politically throughout the vast underdeveloped Southern Hemisphere. Would she begin by making colonies out of her small neighbors? North Vietnam and China do need the surplus rice of South Vietnam, but would they take it without payment?

Of course it is unthinkable to us that South Korea or South Vietnam should become Communist, but is that automatically involved in peace settlements which would neutralize both states by international agreements between the great powers, including China?

It would be a great gain to establish peace between the divided halves of Vietnam and Korea and permit them to trade with each other. There could be many slow stages in the drawing together of the north and south states. Neither would, or should, give up its presently established life quickly or without compromises and guarantees. I venture the belief that we cannot prevent the reunion of these divided peoples indefinitely, but that we can decide whether it is to be done gradually and by agreement, by revolution, or by war.

War with China?

Peaceful agreements would of course involve moderating our hostility to China, but is that really impossible? I well remember how we used to love the Chinese, when they were ragged, docile heathens, the subjects of our devoted missionary efforts. But since they became fighting men and Reds I note that they have become totally wicked. However, I observe also that we have been able to start ending the cold war with the equally wicked Russians after they gained missile power capable of destroying us.

This, too, will happen in China in the next 10 or 20 years, after which there will be no question of our clinging to the fringes of China and occupying islands in the Formosa Strait which she believes to be hers. When China gains the power to destroy us she will take control of the fringes of east Asia and leave it to us to convert a local war into a world holocaust. The basic choice before us is between destroying China with our nation-killing weapons soon or beginning to make peace with her, as the other nations of the world are doing. We must choose the latter course if we are to remain a civilized people, and we could begin by permitting China to take the seat in the United Nations which is guaranteed to her by its charter, before the other members seat her anyway. Then we could work for the neutralization and real self-government of the people of Formosa, while that is still a possible solution.

It is unreasonable to suppose that we can much longer control the entire Pacific Ocean, including the edges of Asia, against the will of the great powers and vast populations which live there. As in Europe, we shall have to accept the fact that World War II did have great and irreversible consequences in Asia. Max Freedman wrote from London on May 28 that "it is difficult for any British official to feel that Washington can have any enduring influence over the affairs of Laos and Vietnam, except at a price in men and money which the American people will refuse to pay."[9] On May 17 James Reston wrote that the French had learned three things: that however much the Vietnamese might differ from the Chinese they hated them less than the white man; that they are tough soldiers; and that no Western power could be established against China's borders."[10]

We are now learning the same things the same hard way, but fortunately we do have leaders who recognize the inevitable. With his usual courage and candor, Senator WAYNE MORSE was the first high official to challenge the futility of our adventure in South Vietname. He pointed out that we have always considered southeast Asia to be beyond our defense perimeter and demanded an end to our Vietnamese adventure. On March 10, Senator ERNEST GRUENING, of Alaska, made the same demand. He asked that we stop wasting billions of dollars "seeking vainly in this remote jungle to shore up self-serving corrupt dynasts or their self-imposed successors." He considered every additional life sacrificed in this forlorn adventure a tragedy. He did not say, either, every "American" life. On February 19, 1964, Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, the majority leader in the Senate, made a deeply impressive address in which he denied that any American national interest justified our assumption of primary responsibility in the Vietnamese war. "We have," he said, "teetered too long on the brink of turning the war in Vietnam, which is still a Vietnamese war, into an American war to be paid for primarily with American lives."[11] He was strongly supported by Senator E. L. BARTLETT, of Alaska, who deplored the way in which our policy in southeast Asia was "locked in rigid, inflexible terms." He urged greater support of President de Gaulle's diplomacy, which calls for neutralizing Vietnam, and a less emotional and less abusive discussion of Communist China.

---

[8] The New York Times, Feb. 26, 1964.

[9] Arizona Daily Star.

[10] New York Times.

On March 25, 1964, Senator FULBRIGHT, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, made his historic address on thinking unthinkable thoughts. He did not ask for our withdrawal from Vietnam, but he did condemn the "relegating of an increasing number of ideas and viewpoints to a growing category of 'unthinkable thoughts.'" He noted that when we refuse to believe something because it displeases or frightens us, "then the gap between fact and perception becomes a chasm and actions become irrelevant and irrational." He urged us to think "about the festering war in Vietnam."

On July 10 a statement signed by 5,000 university professors was issued in Washington calling for the neutralization of North and South Vietnam.[12]

It was doubtless impossible for the Johnson administration to move in the direction of making peace in southeast Asia and with China until after the 1964 political campaign was over. Now it will fail to do so at its peril. A Lou Harris opinion poll has already shown that more people favored neutralizing South Vietnam than opposed it, and that 45 percent opposed expanding the war to North Vietnam and only 26 percent favored escalation.[13] President Johnson must know, also, that the Republicans won the 1952 election on the frustrations of the Korean war and that they could win in 1968 on the frustrations of another endless war to regulate affairs on China's borders. Surely the President is astute enough to avoid carrying the albatross onus of a "Johnson's war." On the other hand, he can carry the country with him if he exerts strong leadership in making peace in Asia. The current Republican demand for victory and liberty in every part of the world is nothing less than a demand for American domination of the earth, but it is far too late for that. We have learned the limits of our power in Europe, and the limitations of our sway in Asia must also be learned. This will be very painful, since, as George Kennan said recently, the American tendency is "to view any war in which we might be involved not as a means of achieving limited objectives * * * but as a struggle to the death between total virtue and total evil."[14]

Our greatest investment in Vietnam is in prestige, but is our prestige to be conserved by making a bad matter steadily worse? It cannot truthfully be denied that the results of our efforts in Korea and Vietnam have been in both cases: division and tyranny, war and desolation, poverty and unhappiness for these small peoples. We have also achieved almost exactly the same results in Laos. Is this the way to conserve the prestige of the leader of the free world? And is wise and courageous action on our part to end such evils incapable of generating prestige?

The Urgency of Negotiation

The first essential is to recognize that our gamble in Vietnam has failed. In the 6 months since this article was first written the situation has gone from bad to much worse, both militarily and politically. Coup has succeeded coup and the military defeats have grown in magnitude. We tried hard to prove that we could learn antiguerrilla war, for application on all continents, and we have failed. We could not succeed as alien mentors against the will of the Vietnamese people. Now there are almost no moral resources left in South Vietnam for continuing the war. Twenty years of it are more than enough.

Yet, astoundingly, there are people in Washington who now propound the doctrine of going on with the manageable mess. Newsweek reported this development on January 11, 1965, quoting a specialist as saying: "It may take 10 years or more of no-win and no-lose. * * * But with the resources at hand we can control this thing and bring it to a satisfactory conclusion."

This assumption that the long deterioration in South Vietnam can somehow be held in suspension defies all of the forces which are operating there. As one commentator on the 1964 CBS Annual World Affairs Roundup said about Diem's 10 years as our man in Saigon, these were wasted years. We supported an image, an illusion. Shall we now waste another decade in trying to support a kaleidoscope of unpopular rulers?

This is a self-defeating endeavor. As W. M. Bagby observed in the New York Times on December 5, "The more overt our intervention, the more Saigon appears to be our puppet. We cannot successfully support dictatorships propped up by feudal lords and white men," and "China cannot be kept out of South East Asia by white men." If our basic purpose is to keep her out, we would defeat it by extending the war and bringing in Chinese troops. Only a negotiated settlement can really forestall the entry of Chinese troops, first into North Vietnam and then in the South—an eventuality that all Vietnamese dread.

Inevitably, too, by our very presence in Vietnam we are dealing with China. We are not dealing simply with the 3 million people in the corrupt city of Saigon, but with some 40 million Vietnamese, with about three-quarters of a billion Chinese, and with the Korean people. Each of these three nations is determined to have unity and freedom from foreign control, including ours.

Objections to Negotiation

But, it is said, our whole Asian policy would crumble if we turned toward negotiations with Peiping. The reply is, said Emmett Hughes in Newsweek, January 11, 1965: "We do not seriously possess an Asian policy. Since World War II we have simply rushed—or stumbled—toward various ramparts." He might have added that this is the very essence of the Truman doctrine, which launched us upon our antirevolutionary career.

To the objection that we cannot negotiate from weakness, Hughes replies that the truth is that one only negotiates from a position of weakness. Victors impose terms. He denies also that we have no negotiable assets to employ. We could offer to reduce our forces in Korea sharply, without eliminating a tripwire there, and China greatly needs trade with us.

This is one of those rare moments when levelheaded men in the Congress and among our citizens can exert themselves effectively to turn their country from a bankrupt course into one that would bring both honor and profit to us. Time, too, is short. General de Gaulle is almost certainly right in believing that each succeeding month will see the growth of Communist strength in South Vietnam. We might remember also that it was the never-ending losses of French officers that signalized French defeat in Vietnam. Yet we have already committed enough of our instructor officers and noncoms to Vietnam to man 4 of our 16 divisions, and we have already suffered 1,800 casualties. (Bernard B. Fall, in the New Republic, Jan. 16, 1965.) Are we incapable of learning from the hard experience of others?

But the warhawks cry in unison: "If we accept neutralization that will certainly be followed soon by a Communist takeover." That could be. The longrun probability is that all of Korea and Vietnam may have to live through a period of evolving communism, just as the East Europeans are. It is certain that peace in South Vietnam would mean strong participation in the Government by the National Liberation Front, the political arm of the Vietcong. But it does not follow that a coalition government would fail. James Robinson, the southeast Asia expert of NBC, said on December 29: "What we are fighting in Vietnam is a historical evolution. A neutrality there like Cambodia's is feasible. What we would have would be a coalition government that would last a long time."

Is this a worse prospect that deepening anarchy in South Vietnam and a complete Communist takeover? Peter Grose reported from Saigon in the New York Times on November 8 that the National Liberation Front (which is not entirely Communist) already has a shadow government which covers all of South Vietnam," backed by powerful professional and guerrilla forces and biding its time for a moment when leaders in Saigon turn in desperation to request a cease-fire. These parallel hierarchies, wrote C. L. Sulzberger on January 14, "have spread inexorably as Saigon's national administration has rotted. The fractional area it still holds is contested by rival warlords and political cliques. The disaster hitherto nibbling at our heels now stares us in the face."

What is feasible?

How much longer, too, can we continue to treat enormous China as something which does not exist, but which must be surrounded and contained? Surely this is an immaturity which we can no longer afford. We need to remember rapidly that the Chinese are not only the largest people in the world but by far the oldest in civilization, and perhaps the ablest. Certainly they have an unparalleled ability to survive. They are now united and strongly organized to advance into the 20th century. It will be infinitely better for us to help them with trade than to fear and hate and fight them. Again it is left to west coast leaders to see this, Gov. Pat Brown, of California, recently said in Washington: "We have tried to get the world to join us in rejecting all economic and political ties with China." This policy "has failed, as the steady increase in trade with the Chinese Communists demonstrates. All we have left is the vigorous hostility of the Chinese which our policy has provoked."[15]

It is time we realized that such hatreds and such adventures as the Vietnamese war cannot be afforded. Twice in my lifetime the world has lived through the long agonies of world war. In 1914 the big governments blundered, stumbled, and slid into war. Before 1939 three raging, tearing aggressor governments plunged the world into war—Hitler's Germany, Mussolini's Italy, and Tojo's Japan. Today we are having our very last chance to organize all of the governments and peoples—including the Chinese—into one group, the United Nations, for the purpose of establishing law and order and cooperation among them, in the atomic age. If we fail in this, Western civilization, at the least, will cease to exist. The choice before us is that simple and plain.

We must therefore shake off the current dangerous delusion that strong-arm tactics cannot only seize control of a great political party but get us anything we want in the world. We must work instead to establish a world community of all the peoples, while there is still time. "Let us," said President Kennedy more than a year ago, "make the most of this opportunity and every opportunity, to reduce tension, to slow down the perilous arms race, and to check the world's slide to final annihilation."[16]

---

[11] Ibid., Feb. 20, 1964.

[12] Portland Oregonian, July 11, 1964.

[13] Washington Post, Mar. 30, 1964.

[14] New York Times, July 1, 1964.

[15] San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 27, 1964.

This is certainly the only feasible course to take. It means giving up some of our aspirations for power on China's borders, some of our fixations that all Communist rule is wholly vile and that the law of social evolution never works in Communist countries. If power is what we must live by, we can still patrol most of the vast Pacific Ocean with our great sea and air armadas. We can still defend the Philippines from invasion, as we should, and perhaps Japan, though we cannot much longer prevent a large trade and closer relations between Japan and China. We can also help to stabilize the great Indonesia-Malaysia region.

A very impressive book by Robert G. Wesson has demonstrated with great cogency that our economic power base is declining rapidly, relative to the rest of the world. "Already," he warns, "the day is late." Since 1945 our power "to shape events has shrunk to less than half of what it was" and "the next 15 years may well see America's potential in the world halved again." Instead of opposing the rise of other powers, he urges us to accept the reality of becoming "one of several equals" in a multipolar world. The United States, he cautions, "does not have leisurely time to become accustomed to a world changing to its detriment." His final admonition is that "the fixation of the cold war obscures vision, but reason can still play a part in making the best of an unpromising and worsening situation. With cool thought, much can be done to bring to pass that civilization means good, not evil."[17]

Certainly we will fail in the Pacific unless we look beyond power to friendly relations with China, to helping her to improve the life of her great people, as the Russians have already improved theirs, thus joining the ranks of the more contented and satisfied peoples. We have become good neighbors with the Japanese, whose Hiroshima ashes tell them that they can have no future war with China. The same ashes, which we do not like to remember, should tell us that we too must become good neighbors with China and that this is the best way to be truly helpful to her small neighbors, who could become prosperous if we removed from them the grievous burdens of arms, war, and sundered nationhoods.[18]

The escalation course

As this article is printed, the alternative is all too clear. No one could read the eight main articles and leading editorial in the New York Times of February 14, 1965, without knowing that the United States had started on a collision course toward a nuclear world war, one which would kill 100 million of us. (McNamara's figure.)

If the Vietnamese war is escalated much further, no man may be able to stop it. Or, if catastrophe be avoided, we are headed toward a vast "limited" war throughout east Asia with the North Vietnamese, Chinese, and North Korean armies, a war which could not be won. Nor would the responsibility be accepted or borne—in 1968 or at any time—by the leading voices now crying for more and bigger bombings, including China's nuclear installations. If holocaust or exhaustion are to be avoided, President Johnson is entitled to strong and insistent backing by his true supporters for a policy of making peace in the Far East. The disaster alleged to be involved in political falling dominoes is minor and uncertain when compared to the imminent peril of the escalating military ones.

Our good name in the world is also at stake. We cannot compensate for losing the guerrilla war by imperiling everyone on earth. In the nuclear age there is no prestige in making war, or in trying to determine the internal affairs and civil wars of little nations everywhere. Nationalism is defeating all those who make this attempt, and it will continue to do so. There is prestige in leading for peace. In the terms of the Times editorial, this is a time to achieve greatness by restraint. It is also high time for a peace conference in which the United Nations plays the healing role for which Secretary General U Thant is so well fitted.

EXHIBIT 3

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.,
February 20, 1965.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: American policies in Vietnam:

1. Make a "scrap of paper" out of our solemn pledge to "refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb" the 1964 Geneva agreements which prohibited "the introduction into Vietnam of foreign troops and military personnel as well as of all kinds of arms and munitions" and specified that "no military base under the control of a foreign state may be established."

2. Have added to history a second "day of infamy" with our bombing of North Vietnam, with which we are not at war.

3. Have killed American boys by the hundreds and Vietnamese by the tens of thousands.

4. Are trapping us into another Korea which will slaughter Americans by the thousands.

5. Have burned alive countless babies and mothers with the napalm we have supplied to drop on peasant villages where Vietcong are "suspected" of being.

6. Have saddled on the Vietnamese people an endless succession of undemocratic, barbarous and corrupt governments hated by the overwhelming mass of the people.

7. Assert America's right to dictate half the world away what kind of government any people may establish.

8. Are losing all Asia to us, making Asians hate and fear us as ruthless imperialists.

9. Are criminal "brinkmanship"—gambling with world war and the destruction of the human race.

These policies are utter madness and can only lead America to disaster.

Our security, national interest, and honor require that the United States agree to ending the war and negotiating peace, by reconvening the Geneva Conference in order to establish a free and independent South Vietnam which shall be neutral and without bases, military forces, or arms of any foreign state, and with a government democratically elected by all the people of South Vietnam.

Mr. President, I implore you to take this honorable way out of the morass in southeast Asia in which we are being engulfed.

Sincerely yours,
FLORENCE H. LUSCOMB.

AMERICA WILL BE PROUD OF RAMPART DAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, last month the Department of the Interior finally released a very important report on the market for power that will be produced at Rampart Dam on the Yukon River in Alaska. The massive study of the Interior Department encompasses research performed by all bureaus of the agency concerned with the Rampart project. Participating in preparation of the report were the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Land Management, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the National Park Service, the Bureau of Mines, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, the Alaska Railroad and the Geological Survey. The Department has emphasized that the report, which is approximately 1,000 pages long and divided into three parts, is a report of the field offices of the bureaus involved and does not represent the final Rampart recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior.

Upon release of the report, Secretary Udall appointed a six-man task force to make an analysis of the field reports with a view to developing the definitive recommendation of the Department on Rampart.

Mr. Gus Norwood, executive secretary of the Northwest Public Power Association, and the organization he serves have long been strong supporters of the Rampart project and have given invaluable assistance to those who look forward eagerly to its construction. When the Department of the Interior released its recent report, Mr. Norwood made a prompt analysis of the document which is published in the March edition of the Pacific Northwest Public Power Bulletin. As Mr. Norwood's knowledgeable commentary on the report is very useful to all who are interested in Rampart, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article "America Will Be Proud of Rampart Dam" be included in the record at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA WILL BE PROUD OF RAMPART DAM

(By Gus Norwood)

The Nation that built Grand Coulee Dam, Hoover, Shasta, Fontana, and many other great works, now approaches the hour of decision on the greatest dam of all.

In a monumental report, the Department of the Interior agrees with the conclusions of the earlier Corps of Engineers report that Rampart Dam is feasible.

The long, rocky road toward construction of Rampart Dam in Alaska passed another milestone February 9, 1965, with publication of the three-volume, 998-page Department of the Interior "field report."

Secretary Stewart L. Udall initiated the next step by appointing a six-man task force to review the field report and consider the comments which will be submitted by the Governor of Alaska, Federal agencies and interested citizens and organizations.

---

[16] D. F. Fleming, "The Turn Toward Peace," the Annals, January 1964, pp. 157–169.

[17] Robert G. Wesson, "The American Problem: the Cold War in Perspective" (New York: Abelard-Schuman, 1963), pp. 6, 276, 280.

[18] On July 27, 1964, Newsweek (p. 41) published a careful estimate of China's readiness for war with us over Vietnam. It described modern new Chinese towns along the border; "about 300,000 troops in the area, with another 200,000 in reserve"; two full air force armies with 1,200 jet fighter planes nearby; and thousands of Vietnamese training in the hills.

On July 18 Henry Tanner cabled from Moscow to the New York Times that Soviet officials have made it plain to foreigners on many occasions that the Kremlin could not hope to avoid being dragged into any full-scale war in Vietnam involving the United States.

CONSERVATIVE STUDY

The report is conservative and in fact leans over backward to consider possible negative factors, assumed high construction costs, slow development of markets, and full repayment within 50 years.

The 5-inch thick report is not available for public distribution. A limited number of copies has been issued to the reviewing agencies, major Alaska newspapers, key libraries, the Alaska congressional delegation and interested associations such as Yukon Power for America and the Northwest Public Power Association.

"Field Report, Rampart Project, Alaska, Market for Power and Effect of Project on Natural Resources," in three volumes, 998 pages, January 1965, 125 tables, 54 plates and 26 photographs, 8 by 10½ inches, comprising preface and 10 parts, transmitted February 9, 1965, by Burke Riley, Department of the Interior Regional Coordinator for Alaska to Col. Clare F. Farley, District Engineer, Corps of Engineers, Anchorage, Alaska.

The report was prepared pursuant to the Army-Interior Agreement of March 14, 1962. It is a coordinated study prepared by the Bureau of Reclamation, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, Bureau of Mines, Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, Alaska Railroad and Geological Survey.

TASK FORCE TO REVIEW

To assist him in arriving at conclusions and recommendations for discussion with the Secretary of the Army, and for a joint recommendation to the President, the Secretary of the Interior on February 11, 1965, appointed a six-man task force headed by Henry P. Caulfield, Jr., Director of Interior's resources program staff; Joseph M. Morgan, Division of Water and Power Development; James T. McBroom, Fish and Wildlife; Joseph C. McCaskill, Mineral Resources Division; Roderick H. Riley, Bureau of Indian Affairs; and Eugene Zumwalt, Bureau of Land Management.

RAMPART DAM FACTS

The project as designed by the Corps of Engineers calls for a 530-foot dam with a head of 465 feet, 280-mile reservoir covering 10,600 square miles, with storage capacity of 1,265 billion acre-feet, 4-foot average annual drawdown, average annual flow of 113,000 cubic feet per second, reservoir filling period of 22 years, proposed 18 units of 280,000 kilowatts or 5,040,000 kilowatts producing 34.2 billion kilowatts per hour firm energy, with prime power of 3,904,000 kilowatts. Investment is estimated at $1.1 billion plus $650 to $1,120 million for transmission plus a Fish and Wildlife request of $580.5 million. Physically the dam would be somewhat smaller than Grand Coulee but produce 2½ times as much energy.

FIVE MARKETING CASES

For an assumed dam and transmission cost of $1.85 billion the cost of power is estimated at 2.05 mills at bus bar and 3.48 at load centers.

The most pessimistic Case I, assuming very slow load growth, would result in delivered power at 4.62 to 7.01 mills leaving out Fish and Wildlife requests.

All five transmission case studies assume basic use of 500 kilovolts alternating current with two lines to the Juneau or Haines area, and either two or three to the Anchorage area.

Case IV includes the dramatic 500 kilovolt direct current line 2,000 miles to Snohomish at a $514 million cost, 1,330,000 kilowatts delivery capacity and a delivery or transmission cost of 1.91 mills at 100 percent load factor and 2.72 mills at 70 percent load factor. To this transmission cost would be added the bus bar cost of 2.1 to 2.4 mills, thus making the Seattle price about 4 mills at 100 percent load factor and 5 mills at 70 percent load factor.

It remains to be seen whether construction cost would be as high as the $375,000 per mile for 500 kilovolt transmission lines and $210,000 per mile for wood pole 138 kilovolt. The figures appear too high.

Lowest costs are achieved for Case II–B at 3.33 mills at load centers assuming $763 million for transmission. This assumes 3 percent interest and 50-year repayment of each portion of the dam using the first unit as a spare and then placing 1/17th of the dam in the payout schedule as each unit is placed in operation.

ALTERNATIVE POWER

Part VII of the report evaluates coal, oil, gas and nuclear alternatives, and the five best hydro projects in Alaska and concludes that Rampart is the best.

SCHEDULE

Filling of the reservoir could start as early as 1972 with first power in 1975 from five generators at low head operation. Low loading would permit filling the reservoir in 16 years, while heavy loading would delay the last units to as late as 2020. The report assumes full reservoir by 1993, but Case II assume 18th unit in 2010.

CONCLUSIONS

On the basis of a quick review of this report, the following tentative conclusions are submitted. Rampart is the lowest cost power source available to Alaska. The Fish and Wildlife requests are unreasonable. Nonetheless, hatcheries and fish spawning channels and studies to mitigate duck nesting problems are essential.

The assumption of 50-year repayment is utterly unreasonable. The charge-off of all costs to power violates the concept of multiple-purpose development. The report appears to be on the high side in estimating construction costs.

The Bureau of Reclamation should be complimented on the outstanding depth and thoroughness in making the studies of alternative power sources and the five transmission case studies.

The evaluation of possibilities for developing each mineral appears narrow in view of the early stage of Alaska's mineral exploration. Under similar assumptions of counting only the sure known loads, the building of Grand Coulee Dam would have been delayed many, many years.

The report as a whole appears to be preoccupied with conventional feasibility in a situation which so obviously calls for a development-minded and pioneering-minded attack.

One indication of a more positive approach is the recognition that Rampart Dam would be helpful in bettering the lot of the natives through a higher standard of living and thus saving much money for other programs for natives.

By resolution and on the basis of the earlier power marketing report of the Development and Resources Corp., the membership of the Northwest Public Power Association voted to endorse the construction of Rampart Dam.

The fine-tooth comb study by the Department of the Interior justifies the association's full endorsement of the start of early construction.

As the task force and the various Federal agencies and the Governor of Alaska make their evaluation, it is suggested that major weight be given to the ground rules for this project.

First, the payout schedule should be set on the TVA basis of actual service life or 100 years, whichever is less.

It cannot sufficiently be emphasized that a 50-year-old hydro project of this scale is better than a brand new steam plant. It is ridiculous to pay off such a project as if it were an FHA mortgage on a frame house.

A major purpose of the project should be the economic development of Alaska and a reasonable cost allocation should be made for this purpose. Thereby Rampart Dam power would cost about 2 mills at the bus bar at 100 percent load factor, and then let the power marketing agency take it from there.

America will be proud of Rampart Dam. Let's get with it.

TRUTH-IN-PACKAGING LEGISLATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, S. 985, which was amended slightly from its original S. 387 of the 88th Congress—the so-called truth-in-packaging bill, was referred recently to the Senate Commerce Committee rather than the Senate Judiciary Committee which had jurisdiction over said S. 387. In the House of Representatives, three packaging and labeling bills similar to S. 985 of this session have been referred to the House Judiciary Committee. At the time of referral to the Senate Commerce Committee, the Chair ruled that I or any Senator could move to have the said S. 985 referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee if it were reported out of the Senate Commerce Committee and called up for Senate action.

I have made my position clear in this matter in a released minority report on the packaging bill. I said it was bad for the public, bad for the consumer, bad for the workers involved, bad for the businessmen, and bad philosophy for Government and also Government's relations with business, workers, and consumers. The American Legion magazine asked that I state my views in very brief words. These views may be found on page 17 of the American Legion magazine, April 1965 issue. Senator Hart also expressed his views.

Mr. President, for the information of the Members of Congress and the public, I ask unanimous consent that the following articles on packaging and labeling be placed at this point of the Record in the order noted: "Who Said Shoppers Are Stupid," in Nation's Business, 1965; "Let's Keep Politics Out of the Pantry," by Charles G. Mortimer, chairman of General Foods Corp., in Look magazine, January 26, 1965; and, lastly, Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen's views against a Federal packaging law, namely, S. 985, in American Legion magazine, April 1965.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Who Says Shoppers Are Stupid?

A Nation's Business experiment finds that even inexperienced teenagers are not at all confused by packaging, pricing, or labeling.

A heart-tugging melodrama is playing in Washington these days, starring Connie the Confused Consumer in the role of typical American shopper.

Connie's ordeal takes place in an average supermarket, where alluring but deceptive labels leave her dazed and helpless.

In her moment of peril, Connie is rescued by Uncle Sam, armed with something called "Truth-in-Packaging."

This melodrama has received rave notices from some people in the Nation's capital.

But not from business. And not from most consumers. They see the melodrama as more fiction than fact.

Political concern about the consumer in recent years has been channeled into a drive for enactment of so-called truth-in-packaging legislation. It would give the Federal Government the power to set up new and complex controls and standards over the packaging and labeling of many consumer items.

This would be in addition to present Federal laws requiring purity and quality in foods and drugs, and honesty in packaging and labeling.

Nation's Business conducted its own experiment to test the need for greater consumer protection. The experiment showed that even young, inexperienced students can be intelligent and resourceful shoppers in today's supermarket, that they are neither befuddled nor deceived by what they buy.

Here is what happened:

Six teenaged girls and a home economics teacher were selected at random from Yorktown High School in Arlington, Va., a suburb of the Nation's Capital.

Each test shopper was given a list of 35 categories of food and household commodities. None of the volunteers was told the purpose of the test. None was told how much to spend, how many items to buy in the various categories, or which brands to select. Two of the students had no previous shopping experience and none was familiar with the supermarket used in the experiment. All shopped immediately after the terse briefing, after school hours, by themselves, and without consulting with the others. The school had no official connection with the experiment.

The only hints given were: "Buy as if you were a homemaker," and "Use your own judgment."

All items on the shopping list have been cited at one time or another in congressional hearings as fooling or confusing the Nation's housewives.

When the students completed their swings through the supermarket they were interviewed separately by a Nation's Business editor. In addition, their purchases (bagged and returned to the school) were carefully checked over by Mrs. Lucy Nicholas, a teacher of home economics at Yorktown High.

The experiment results showed that:

Purchases the girls made were—in the judgment of Mrs. Nicholas—intelligent.

They were able to buy with a minimum of wasted motion and with few requests for assistance from store personnel.

None had any difficulty understanding printed information concerning price, weight or content of the items she bought.

The experiment revealed other things about the young shoppers. It showed that they are very much aware of brand names, that they are well informed on new methods of packaging, and that they pick items off the shelf more on the basis of family influence and personal taste than price advantage.

A typical comment: "Sure, I knew that brand A was less expensive than brand B, but I bought Brand B anyway because I think it's a better product."

There was nothing in the test results which indicated that the shoppers found packaging and labeling deceptive.

Mrs. Patricia Bain, another home economics teacher at Yorktown High, also shopped the Nation's Business list.

Considering the sketchy briefings they got, the shoppers turned in surprisingly uniform performances, both as to the time they were in the store and the amounts they spent. Mrs. Bain shopped the longest—50 minutes—and spent the least. Her bill came to $12.47.

Unlike the students, Mrs. Bain made mostly single-item buys in all 35 categories. Married, though with no children, she is accustomed to shopping for only her husband and herself—and for the limited storage capacity in their apartment.

"The youngsters really got more for their money than Mrs. Bain did," comments Mrs. Nicholas, "but their buying has to be considered in light of the fact that they come from larger families. They tended to shop more for specials and for a longer period."

Barbara Howe, a 17-year-old Yorktown senior, has a family that includes her parents, a 14-year-old sister and a Chihuahau. She says she definitely had "supply" in mind when she made her way through the supermarket aisles.

"I bought the large jar of instant coffee, for example. I can't see buying the small size or just one can or jar of something, because that means you'll have to come back to shop again real soon. To me, having something on hand—convenience—that's what's important."

Although Barbara was one of the fastest shoppers in the group (40 minutes), she commented: "If I'd known the store better I could have cut my shopping time in half."

The students were not told how long a time period to buy for, but most—on their own initiative—set up a target of about a week, according to Mrs. Nicholas. She says the girls generally showed good judgment and bought wisely. "The way they conducted themselves indicates that they are closely observing how their parents shop," she adds.

WHAT THE LIST INCLUDED

The shopping lists handed to the six students and Mrs. Bain consisted of these items:

Canned goods: Pork and beans, peas, tomatoes, pineapple, plums, peaches, vegetable soup, chicken soup, tuna fish, chicken, crab meat.

Packaged goods: Dried beans, dry cereal, cocoa, instant potatoes, gelation (flavored), fudge brownie mix, cake mix, tea, coffee, crackers, pudding.

Frozen products: Lemonade, orange juice, fish fillets, broccoli, peas.

Household and toiletry items: All-purpose cleanser, laundry detergent, dish detergent, paper napkins, paper towels, facial tissues, toothpaste, wax paper.

The store where the student volunteers shopped is a Kroger Co. supermarket, a typical suburban facility. Its manager, John Williams, an 8-year employee of the company, stocks 10,000 items in his shelves and display cases. In laundry detergents alone his customers may choose from no less than 10 different brands.

Here's a closer look at the youngsters:

Amber Ingram is a 16-year-old sophomore who had never shopped the Kroger store. In fact, she had done no supermarket shopping alone prior to the Nation's business experiment.

"I saw products I hadn't seen before and I feel that from now on I'll have more interest in the stores and what's in them."

Amber's bill came to $18.10. She looked for specials, buying three cans of name-brand peaches, two boxes of a two-for-39-cent facial tissue, for example.

"I didn't need a pencil and paper to figure out what was the best buy. I did it in my head. I would just work out which was the best buy per can," she said.

"If it is something you can keep a long time, something that won't spoil or anything like that, you can afford to buy a larger quantity."

Any difficulty at all?

"No difficulty."

Barbara Howe, the 17-year-old senior, had home economics training only in the eighth grade. She does do the family shopping sometimes, but admits she's "usually in a fat hurry" when she does, which may account for her speedy trip through Kroger's. She had been in the store only a few times. Her sole difficulty was in locating the frozen fish.

Barbara's bill totaled $15.22. She looked for multiple buys, too, although she feels that quality and brand names play the biggest part in her shopping decisions. When interviewed, she tossed around odd-size content figures and number-of-servings data like a seasoned homemaker.

Does she think it's deceptive for such things as cake mixes to depict the finished cake?

"I don't think that's deceptive at all. Who wants to look at a picture of cake powder?"

Does she think that shopping skill is something a girl can pick up on her own?

"If you've been eating for 17 years you can't help but learn something about food and food buying."

Barbara watches the ads for price fluctuations, especially in meat and produce.

Is there anything she doesn't like about shopping?

"Waiting in the checkout lines."

Joan Carolyn Welch was the other senior in the experiment. She's 17 and is taking a commercial course in high school.

Joan likes to shop. "I enjoy looking at the various brands and products on display. There's so much you should know. Like looking for specials. Food stores don't make much profit on what they sell, you know."

Her shopping bill was $14.66. Another bargain-seeker, she scanned the cardboard sale notices as she moved through the store. She had no trouble with amounts expressed in fractions.

Joan says she often doesn't worry about how expensive an item is if she thinks it tastes better.

"Shopping is something a girl can pick up on her own," she said, "but you have to learn how to put together a nutritious, balanced menu. A home economics course can help you there."

Her only complaint about labeling: "Maybe more products could indicate the number of servings on the package. This helps when you're planning a meal."

Janet Carabin, 16, had never shopped alone for groceries. She hadn't been in the Kroger supermarket for a couple of years, but she quickly got her bearings by checking the overhead signs and aisle markers and wound up tied with Barbara for fastest shopping time.

Her bill was $19.56, highest of the test. She bought some sale items, found the packaging information clear and helpful. In conversation with a Nation's Business editor she mentioned some of the recent innovations in food packaging. Among them: vegetables which come in a plastic bag that can be immersed in the cooking water.

Janet Redmon, another sophomore, is 16 and does all the food buying for her family. "I go every Friday," she said. "I like to do it; it's as much fun to me as going to a movie."

Janet spent $18.25 and chose a variety of brands.

INFORMATION ADEQUATE

She is guided by name brands and the amount in a package. Package and label information? She finds it adequate. (When she took a can of plums from one shelf she carefully examined it to determine the water content.)

One of the items Janet bought was the "Big Bonus Box" of powder for an automatic dishwasher—"four extra ounces free."

What she likes most about shopping is "keeping up with all the new changes. I think they should always be thinking of new conveniences for the consumer. I say more power to them."

Carol Simpson, 16, is just starting the food phase of a home economics class in Yorktown High's 10th grade.

She spent $15.45 and kept an eye peeled for good buys.

She does some of the family shopping and likes the variety offered in supermarkets.

She finds the package information helpful.

"Sometimes I'll check it closely, especially if I'm buying for a specific recipe."

Carol thinks brand, color, and appetizing pictures might influence her shopping choices, but she says that her mother's preferences probably have played a big role, too.

Any confusion?

"Only in locating a few items in the store."

To get a seller's-eye view of consumer savvy, Nation's Business interviewed personnel of the Kroger supermarket and other salespeople at supermarkets in the Washington, D.C., area.

WHAT THE SELLERS SAY

The portrait of the typical shopper drawn by these people hardly corresponds with that painted by those who are calling for more Federal regulation. Far from being timid, confused souls hopelessly adrift in "supermarketland," most buyers, especially housewives, are a flinty band that surveys the newspaper food sections during the week and then descends on weekend supermarket sales with the determination of commandos hitting the beach, say sellers.

Some people, of course, are always going to be confused or misled by any system of competitive pricing and promotion.

But regulations by Uncle Sam or anyone else aren't likely to help this minority of shoppers, marketing experts make clear.

"They're getting shrewder all the time," said one supermarket manager, shaking his head. "They come through the door clutching bargain buys clipped from our newspaper ads and the specials from ads by all the other stores in the neighborhood."

This comparison of one store's offerings against another's is sometimes called cross-shopping in the trade. Buyers who carefully note only the bargain sales and then systematically pick them off in one market after another are sometimes known more irreverently as gravediggers.

SHARP SHOPPERS

At Arlington's Kroger supermarket, meat department manager Jack Linkenhoker tells of finding a shopping list that had been dropped by mistake into a display of packaged hamburger. On the list the shopper had scribbled all the sale items being offered that day by five different stores. "People are sharp," says Mr. Linkenhoker. "They know what they want."

Walter P. Margulies, president of Lippencott & Margulies, Inc., a New York industrial design firm, says: "Every day there is a nationwide vote taken by consumers in the supermarket and other stores.

"They vote for the products they select and buy. If they find they've been cheated, they never buy that product again.

"This is a much more effective form of regulation than anything the Government could set up. People have a great variety of likes, needs, and notions. They don't want to go back to the era when they could have any color car they wanted as long as it was black."

Some of the dangers of Federal regulation are pointed out by designer William Snaith, president of Raymond Loewy-William Snaith, Inc.

To define the individual character of a product and make sure the consumer understands its qualitative difference when compared with similar products, the container industry has in recent years "engaged in increasingly ingenious, economical, and convenient container shape developments," Mr. Snaith says.

"The consumer doesn't buy a 'quantity' in itself, but rather the benefits obtained through the very special, different characteristics of a product. Anything that can be done to project this difference in terms of package shape, appearance, and function is of benefit.

"The proposed legislation will, in effect, deny the consumer this important additional aid in making an educated selection. It will tend to encourage an increasing degree of package uniformity which will effectively disguise important differences in character, taste, performance and convenience between different products competing in the same general area."

WHAT OTHER STUDENTS SAID

After the supermarket experiment, Nation's Business interviewed 28 other Yorktown High School students, asking them to answer in writing such questions as these:

How much experience have you had in supermarket shopping?

What is it you like most about shopping? What do you like least?

Do you ever find yourself confused when you are in a supermarket or ordinary grocery store? If so, what is it that confuses you?

Do the packages, cans and other containers displayed tell you what you want to know about the products?

The young people who answered the questionnaire are all taking home economics. They range in age from 15 to 17. Most of them have shopped in supermarkets and several indicated they do the regular buying for their families. Most reported that they enjoy shopping. Adverse comments centered largely on time spent waiting in checkout lines and the hustle-bustle of aisles crowded with shopping carts.

Reaction to packaging information was generally favorable. Few reported any difficulty in understanding information on labels, though there were several who suggested that more food processors include information as to number of servings. Said one 16-year-old: "I like to shop because practically all of your needs are displayed by one company or another and the conveniences of the modern supermarkets are most helpful."

Many young homemakers in the United States today have had special training in purchasing. Nationally, an estimated two and a half million teenagers are enrolled in junior and senior home economics courses. Many of these courses include specific instruction on how to shop intelligently for clothing and food items.

In Arlington, according to home economics supervisor, Katherine R. Conafay, the food instruction gets into such details as how to vary menus, how to read labels, how to differentiate package sizes, quality and quantity.

Companies in the food and clothing industries make mountains of information on their products available to teachers of home economics. Some of this information is, in turn, passed on by the teachers to their students. Some of it is specifically designed to help young people make intelligent purchases, regardless of brand.

The availability of such literature (many States also publish consumer aids) is a factor which merits noting in the present controversy over the consumer.

Most people agree that business must fairly and clearly identify its products. Arguments arises over how well this is now being done. Groups and individuals who oppose more Federal regulation argue that existing laws and industry practices have produced packaging that is both honest and understandable.

Let's Keep Politics Out of the Pantry

(By Charles G. Mortimer, chairman, General Foods Corp.)

The typical American housewife is intelligent, experienced, and better informed about running a home than her counterpart in any preceding generation. Let's call her Mary Jones. Right now, she's shopping at her favorite supermarket. Because it, too, is typical, its shelves are lined with some 8,000 different items. Yet Mary Jones knows just what she wants, and she gets it. Into her cart go the prepackaged meats, quick-frozen vegetables, canned soups, frozen juice concentrates, prepared cake mixes, heat-and-serve rolls and all the other good things the Jones family will have served up to them at their dining room table in the week to come.

As she leaves the supermarket, Mary Jones takes it for granted that what she has bought is the purest, most nutritious, easiest-to-prepare food the world has ever seen. Having spent 40 years in the food business, I can attest to the fact that her assumption is correct and, what's more, that the prices she has paid are the most reasonable to be found anywhere on earth.

But what Mary Jones probably does not know—and what disturbs me deeply—is that the machinery of free competition which has made ours the best fed nation on earth is in danger of being tampered with. It is being attacked by certain people in Government who have the perverse notion that the Mary Joneses of America need more Government protection than the ample safeguards they already have.

The danger is substantial, but before I describe what I call "politics in the pantry," I would like to cite a few facts that show just how great a value food is in today's America. Since her family is average in size and income, we'll use Mary Jones as our example.

Back in 1948, out of every after-tax dollar earned by the Joneses, about 26 cents went to buy food. Today, because food prices have gone up less than other prices, and because incomes have soared, food purchases take only 19 cents of each take-home dollar. So the Joneses now have 81 percent instead of 74 percent of their net income left over to spend on everything else, from clothes and household furnishings to insurance and their children's education.

Compare this with conditions in other countries. In England, the average family spends 29 percent of its income on food. In France, 31 percent. In Japan, 47 percent. And in that so-called workers' paradise, Communist Russia, food takes fully half of each family's after-tax earnings.

But even this isn't the whole story. The Joneses are eating far better than the families in these other nations—and better, in fact, than the Joneses themselves used to eat, just a few years ago. They are eating more and choicer cuts of meat. They are eating foods never before matched in purity or nutrition. And they are eating delicious new foods—many of them "convenience" products that sharply reduce the amount of time Mary Jones must spend in her kitchen.

Thanks to these new products, Mary's daily cooking chores take only 90 minutes. (Not many years ago, women used to spend more than 5 hours preparing a day's meals.) With this extra free time, many Marys—14 million of our American housewives—are able to hold outside jobs as well as run their homes, thus contributing in a very material way to a better standard of living for their families.

What makes it possible for Americans to eat so well and so conveniently for so little? The answer lies in two potent forces that protect the housewife as she pushes her shopping cart down the supermarket aisle.

The first of these forces is the necessary and comprehensive Government regulation that is respected and adhered to by the various segments of the vast food industry. Through laws now on the books, Government agencies effectively safeguard the purity of food products and control the information printed on food-container labels.

The second protective force is competition—the heart of our free enterprise system. This force has been a mighty factor in making America's abundant food supply the finest to be found anywhere in the world. It is a major reason for all those new food products, since each processor is constantly seeking ways to gain new customers.

The wooing of consumers through new and improved products has wrought a tremendous change in the Nation's eating and food preparation habits, a change more sweeping than many people realize. A friend of mine told me recently that he was in his kitchen one afternoon when his wife returned from a food shopping trip.

"I looked at what she had bought—things like precooked rice and a prepared cheese and noodle dish—and I realized that more than half the items weren't even on the market when we were first married. Why, I'il bet," he said, "that there have been over a thousand new food products in the past 20 years."

His estimate was low. My own company alone introduced some 50 new food items in just the past year. The entire industry spends over $100 million annually on research and development of new grocery items.

With America's thousands of food processors competing for consumer patronage in a free economy, and with our Government enforcing essential health and labeling regulations, the food shopper is in an enviable position indeed.

Recently, however, some Government officials have started playing "politics in the pantry." Belatedly, they have discovered the consumer as a politically potent entity. That's quite an audience because, of course, everybody is a consumer. So they are pitching emotion-charged appeals to that audience. Through headline-making innuendos, they imply that America's food-marketing system needs to be watched and regulated even more closely than it is.

Here are a few of their actions that are causing consumers to question the very system the Mary Joneses of this country find so satisfactory:

Senator Philip Hart, Democrat, of Michigan, has introduced what he calls a truth-in-packaging bill. It implies that food manufacturers are taking advantage of consumers through deception in the sizes and weights of packages and the information printed on labels. Among other things, this bill with the politically appealing name would give the Government the right to dictate weights and other standards for food-product containers.

Mrs. Esther Peterson, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, has held four consumer conferences at which housewives were not only invited but urged to submit complaints about the products they buy in their chosen supermarkets or other retail stores.

A National Commission on Food Marketing has been launched amid speculation that it would result in an exposé of what some Members of Congress have called profiteering by middlemen at the expense of both farmer and consumer.

Ostensibly, these actions were taken to help the consumer. Actually, they could, if implemented, hurt him. At the very least, they represent an unwarranted and unnecessary intrusion by Government into the American marketplace.

Take Senator Hart's bill, for example. It ignores completely the fact that price competition is by no means the only competition which benefits the consumer. By making all packages "look alikes" on the shelf, restrictive legislation would stifle innovation and put a halter on an indispensable form of competition: the freedom to bring out packages which are easy to open, easy to close, easy to handle, easy to store. Each of these represents an added value passed on to the consumer. My own company, for example, wouldn't have introduced instant coffee in a carafe or table sirup in a reusable pitcher if consumers didn't prize these containers as added values.

Advocates of more Government controls insist that food shoppers are often misled by nonstandard package shapes and deceptive labels. This is just not true. Any manufacturer who tries to trick the housewife into buying his product by packaging or labeling it deceptively will soon go out of business. She may buy it once, but she'll never buy it again. And since marketing a food product involves heavy costs, no processor can remain solvent on one-time sales. He depends on repeat volume.

Another contention of those who advocate still more governmental control is that labels are "hard to understand" and that the consumer is "confused" by odd-ounce weight on packages. The assumption, apparently, is that package sizes and weights are produced willy-nilly. Again, my own company offers an example of the absurdity of that kind of thinking. We pack vanilla pudding and chocolate pudding in the same size box. As rightfully required by law, the label on every package shows the weight of the contents. The vanilla-pudding weight is three and one-quarter ounces, while the chocolate-pudding weight is four ounces. The reason is that this is the quantity of pudding mix which, in the case of each flavor (as stated on the label) will yield exactly four servings of one-half cup each when blended with two cups of milk.

Because of the difference in the density of the two flavors, to pack the vanilla in a four-ounce size would necessitate giving America's housewives recipe directions with an odd measure of milk to be added—and more servings than she has planned on.

Is this what the consumer wants? Is this a Federal case—a matter calling of enactment of legislation by the Congress of the United States?

While Congress considers the demands for unnecessary new limiting controls, Mrs. Peterson has been holding public meetings and frequent press conferences inviting homemakers to register complaints.

I want to make it clear that I regard and respect Mrs. Peterson as a conscientious and dedicated public servant. But she is part of a political party and subject to pressures aimed at currying favor by offering the consumer "more protection," whether it is really needed or not.

The fact is that despite the best of motives, her consumer conferences—with their emphasis on complaints—have, in my opinion, resulted in more harm than good. For one thing, they have unnecessarily created doubts in the minds of consumers where none had existed, and indeed where none are warranted. For another, they represent just one more intrusion by Government into an area where, in our free society, Government does not belong.

But even more ludicrous than the politically slanted campaign to prod complaints from consumers is the image drawn of the typical American housewife. In their attempt to show why the housewife needs more Government protection, proponents of additional controls have created the impression that she is a timid, naive, confused little woman, hopelessly gullible, bewildered by the endless variety of products on the grocery shelves and exposed, as she shops, to the machinations of lurking, profit-hungry figures who dominate the food business.

This, of course, is utter nonsense. I can testify from experience that when it comes to clever buying, the American housewife can give lessons to a Yankee horse trader. She knows exactly what she wants, and she knows precisely what it's worth to her. And if you don't provide her with what she wants at what she considers a fair price, you won't get her as a customer.

What politicians don't seem to understand is that no manufacturer can "force" a consumer to select his product, out of all those displayed, any more than a politician can "force" a voter to pull the lever by his name in a voting booth. Politicians need to be reminded also that we in the food business are up for election all the time.

Where a politician has to run for office once every 2, 4, or 6 years, every shopping day is election day for us. The homemaker casts her ballot—for or against—by taking our product off the shelf or leaving it there. She can make or break a product and can even "vote" a company right out of business. Every major food processor has in its files the stories of products that were developed at great expense only to languish on supermarket shelves because they failed to win a sufficient number of purchases by the only person qualified to control the American food industry: the American housewife. So my image of the American consumer is quite different from the one shared by the proponents of more and more Government regulations. The consumer is smart. She is alert. And she very effectively does everything that is necessary to keep the food processor in line.

All this is not to say that Government involvement in business is all, or per se, bad. The National Commission on Food Marketing, for example, could be a very good thing. The study the Commission will complete by next July 1 could help bring to Americans much-needed understanding of how our advanced society gets food from farm to table. It could, for example, clarify just who is really a farmer, by distinguishing between those rural dwellers who raise crops for a living and those whose main income is from industrial employment, even though they do "farm" some very small acreage as a sideline.

Most importantly, the Commission's study could clear up, once and for all, the question of just what a "middleman" is. For centuries, this word has carried a connotation of "all take and no give." Since earliest civilization, a middleman has been pictured as one who buys cheap and sells dear, contributing nothing to the value of the goods in the process.

That probably was true, way back. But today, the villain the politicians are chasing is no villain at all. Far from it. In our urbanized, industrialized society, the middleman is the one who takes raw food from the farm and then makes it possible for people to eat it.

Milk in a pail at a farmer's gate is worth nothing to the 9 out of 10 Americans who live off the farm. As a weekend dairy farmer, I am only too painfully aware of that. Consumers can't possibly all drive out and get their daily quart. The only way milk takes on value is through its availability when and where the consumer can conveniently get it. In other words, consumers simply won't pay for wheat in the barn, peas on the vine, or hamburger on the hoof.

The food marketing chain of events encompasses all the vast activity that goes on from farm gate to checkout counter. This has created and sustained the Nation's market for processed farm products. And this adds value after value—at a reasonable cost—every step of the way.

I said the cost is reasonable. It is, in fact, surprisingly low. For example, the U.S. Department of Agriculture reports that the homemaker gets frozen orange juice concentrate for less money per glass than she pays for juice she squeezes from fresh oranges. Similarly, a cup of excellent instant coffee costs her less than one she brews herself. She also saves money, as well as work, by buying processed frozen or canned peas and corn, frozen lima beans and spinach, canned spaghetti and chicken chow mein, among a great many other listed as bargains by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Yet politicians prattle about consumers' being "forced" to buy processed, packaged foods at premium prices.

Instead of hurting the farm, the food marketing complex actually helps him. It helps him just as it does the consumer. For at the same time that it makes is possible for people to eat, it creates sales for the farmer's crops.

We hear much about how small a share of each dollar spent for food goes to the farmer. Yet, the fact is this: If every single dollar of corporate profits made by the food marketing industry were eliminated—that is, all the profit of processors, wholesalers, food chains and independent food retailing corporations—the total marketing bill would be reduced only enough to add a single percentage point to the farmer's share of the retail food dollar.

So the farmer certainly is not victimized by the food marketing system. Neither is the homemaker. Yet the politicians say both are, and demand stricter controls.

Actually, my great concern in all this is not alone for the food industry, but for the free society of which the food industry is such a vital part. What disturbs me most is the destructive impact a heavier hand of Government is bound to have on the free choice we Americans now enjoy. For we are faced with the grim prospect of having Government officials tell the consumer what products she can buy and what kind of package she can buy them in. We see vote-conscious politicians informing the housewife that she doesn't really need all those things she's been purchasing; she has merely been gulled into wanting them.

The point really at issue—the point involving one of our cherished freedoms—is simply this: Who is to say what is a need and what is a want? Shall we, as individuals, continue to determine the answer, or shall we leave it to an allwise, paternalistic Government to decide?

I feel the danger is most acute in the area of food distribution. For in any standard of living, food is the No. 1 requirement. Before he can do anything else, man must satisfy his hunger and be nourished in the process.

As certain people in Government with political motives champion the case for more and more controls, there are others, fortunately, who speak out for freer free enterprise. Representative CATHERINE MAY, Republican, of Washington, made this statement, lauding the American homemaker for her competence and discrimination:

"She (the homemaker) has done, and is doing a wonderful job in needling, inspiring, and in regulating American business enterprise. And to reward her, I want to protect her. Not with more Government regulations and laws. I want to protect her freedom of choice. I want to protect her right to reward or punish the businessman. I want her to stay the boss of the marketplace. As long as she is, there's no danger to our free enterprise system."

FEDERAL PACKAGING LAWS?—NO

(By Senator EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Republican, of Illinois)

I am against the mislabeled truth-in-packaging bill. It would be harmful or destructive to the many millions of American consumers, workers, and businessmen. S. 985 (S. 387 of 88th Cong.) would create a dramatic inversion of the traditional relationship of the private citizen with his Government. I know of no comparable intrusion into private business affairs by Federal agencies as contained in S. 985.

S. 985 is proposed legislation which will lead to less competition rather than greater competition; which will stifle innovation by new or smaller manufacturers as well as the larger ones; which will lead to regimentation and standardization by weights and measures; which will discourage business by its antibusiness attitudes; which will hurt the consumer through higher prices resulting from higher costs and less choice of products; which will hurt labor through less jobs; which will result in less taxes to Government through greater deductions caused by increased manufacturing costs, and through the general harm to our economy.

Existing Federal Trade Commission and Food and Drug Administration laws are sufficient and effective. From the testimony of the Chairman of FTC and FDA, it is abundantly clear that present laws, if they are vigorously enforced, afford protection against most, if not 100 percent, of the major complaints. Both Chairmen admitted that they could do a better job with increased appropriations and personnel—which are forthcoming. Failure to enforce existing laws is odd rationale for enacting new ones. Thirty-three Federal agencies and 135 Federal programs, at a cost of $953 million, are now in effect to protect American consumers.

There must be proven a great need for this proposed packaging law before enacting new and extremely restrictive legislation that could lead to regimentation, which we abhor in socialistic and communistic countries. Such proof fails to appear in the testimony.

The packaging bill is bad for the consumer because:

1. A Good Housekeeping magazine survey says 95 percent of women read labels and are informed.

2. It prohibits placing price reductions by manufacturers through "cents off" promotions. A survey shows that women overwhelmingly favor cents off.

3. The standardization and regimentation will cause a great increase—several hundred million dollars—in costs of production that the consumer will be called upon to pay in higher prices for the product. Make no mistake about this.

4. Consumers will be deprived of new and better products to meet their many changing needs if these restrictive provisions become law.

5. By the consumer being denied new, better, and greater variety of products to meet his needs, it will also hurt the economy, the businessmen, and the workers.

The workers will be hurt by the proposed new law because it will curtail employment needed in innovation and expansion of products. Statements of two AFL-CIO unions are against a major portion of S. 985.

WATER POLLUTION: SERIOUS PROBLEM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, pollution of the Great Lakes is becoming an increasingly serious problem. Conditions are deplorable and growing rapidly worse. The Great Lakes, which comprise the world's largest and most valuable fresh water source, are rapidly becoming one continuous cesspool. We are killing one of the greatest natural resources we have.

Eight States with 15 percent of the Nation's population border the Great Lakes. Nearly one-fourth of the country's manufacturing is situated in the Great Lakes basin. There are 28 metropolitan areas within this region. The problem of pollution of the Great Lakes is of vital interest to the citizens of this region, for in large part their future is dependent upon whether or not necessary remedial action is instituted.

As the junior Senator from Ohio, I am particularly distressed at the contamination that now prevails in Lake Erie. What is happening to Lake Erie is typical of the entire Great Lakes. From Ohio's port cities—Toledo, Sandusky, Lorain, Cleveland, Ashtabula, Fairport, and others—Lake Erie stretches out over 10,000 square miles. Each day 3 million tons of debris and filth are dumped into Lake Erie, which is in all probability the largest body of seriously contaminated fresh water in the world. It is estimated that half of this is contributed by the Detroit River. Another major contributor is the Cuyahoga River, which winds through the heart of Cleveland's industrial complex. Contributing heavily to the problem are the oil refineries, the steel mills, the chemical plants, and other industries that border the rivers and streams which flow into the lake. In addition, cities on the lakes and their major tributaries discharge their sewage into the water. Sewage treatment plants do eliminate much of the harmful elements in sewage, but they are not 100 percent effective. Also, herbicides and pesticides used for agricultural purposes are washed off the lands by rain and find their way into Lake Erie.

The enormity of the problem can be appreciated by noting that the Great Lakes, which themselves cover 95,000 square miles, drain an area of 200,000 squares miles. Their total watershed is 900 miles long and 500 miles wide.

The Senate recently passed a water pollution control bill which empowers the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish water quality standards if State and interstate agencies fail to fix standards acceptable to him. Although the bill does strengthen enforcement powers, it does not go far enough. A lengthy period of time is involved in this procedure, usually a minimum of 18 months. Unfortunately, many, many tons of foul water will flow under the bridge in that time.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare needs greater authority to compel prompt compliance with the law. The water pollution problem is so serious now that experts have testified that if remedial action is not taken soon Lake Erie, and perhaps the other Great Lakes, could be dead within a decade or two, unable to sustain any form of life, animal or vegetable. This would be a national tragedy with limitless harmful ramifications.

Half of the metropolitan areas of the lakes depend upon them for their water. No longer is an adequate supply of decent water available unless their water intakes are placed excessive distances off shore and, I might add, at staggering costs.

No longer can citizens find recreation at many once crowded beaches, for the sandy shores are hazards to health. Unsanitary swimming beaches stretch for miles along the Lake Erie shoreline. The beaches are beautiful, but the water of Lake Erie is putrid. No longer may fishing enthusiasts enjoy productive excursions to many favorite lake areas, for polluted water has caused many species of fish to die off and altogether disappear from Lake Erie. The commercial fishing industry on the Great Lakes has already been greatly curtailed by the existing contamination. I speak for its continuation in productive business and for our consuming public to enjoy eating good fish at moderate prices.

Ten years ago Erie, Pa., boasted a fleet of 30 boats, engaged in commercial fishing. Today there is one. Ten years ago one boat with a crew of five could catch 8,000 pounds of fish. Ten years ago we in Ohio enjoyed good fresh water fish available at low cost to the general public. Today a two-man crew is lucky to take 500 pounds in a day. In this 10-year period five species of fish have disappeared—have been eliminated from the lake because of the filth and impurity of the water.

Evidence is clear that environmental changes brought about by pollution are the cause of serious declines in the production of traditionally high value fish life in Lake Erie. During the past decade, the total catch from U.S. waters of Lake Erie has declined 45 percent and the dollar return 60 percent.

Mr. President, the Great Lakes region boasts vast resources of many kinds which contribute greatly to the economic well-being of the two great nations which share their shores. These resources must not be further abused. Action must be taken now by the Federal Government. Furthermore the five Great Lakes—Superior, Huron, Michigan, Erie, and Ontario—with their white beaches and Niagara Falls are part of a most beautiful area in the northern half of the Western Hemisphere.

The nature of the problem is such that it cannot be effectively or realistically solved by the individual States. Rivers, streams, and lakes do not recognize State boundaries. Pollution emptying into a small stream is carried into larger streams and then into interstate rivers or the Great Lakes. For the most part the States themselves have been unable, or unwilling, to cooperate to the degree necessary to correct the problem, although there have been notable exceptions. Federal enforcement in cooperation with State and local governments is absolutely necessary at this time to prevent further pollution of our Great Lakes. To illustrate this situation a Cleveland, Ohio, television commentator recently stated: "Industries in Cleveland are reluctant to spend millions of dollars to stop their polluting if industries in Detroit, bigger offenders, are not willing to do the same thing."

Mr. President, failure of State and local governments to make a serious breakthrough in controlling pollution of their water supplies has invited Federal intervention. Someone must lead the way. It is unconscionable to continue to allow one of our Nation's greatest God-given natural resources to be contaminated and polluted beyond redemption and the use of fresh clear water and beautiful uncontaminated waterfronts denied to future generations. Now is the time for concerted, coordinated efforts to alleviate once and for all this enormous problem. We need State-Federal action with provisions for enforcement—provisions with teeth in them.

Mr. President, I yield the floor, and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WILD RIVERS BILL

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Salmon River in central Idaho is one of the six rivers included in the Federal protection portion of the Wild Rivers bill which I introduced 2 weeks ago. I am sure the people of Idaho want to preserve the Salmon in its untampered state as this bill would do, and the Twin Falls Times-News, in an editorial March 15, reinforced this belief. It is a fine summation of the importance of preserving the Salmon, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Wildest of Wild

Idaho can rejoice at the request to include the Salmon River in the proposed National Wild Rivers System. Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall included the Salmon and the middle fork of the Clearwater in his request to Congress. The proposed Wild Rivers System would preserve conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values. Moreover, it would take a special act of Congress before any dam could be licensed by the Federal Power Commission on any stream included in the Wild Rivers System.

This latter provision in itself is good news to thousands of outdoor enthusiasts and sportsmen who have dreaded the day when a concerted attempt might be made to dam the Salmon River. Naturally, it's no guarantee some Federal agency won't push such a project in the future, but at least there's a temporary barrier in the way of any dam construction.

The Salmon River is a natural for any Wild Rivers System. Many Idahoans believe it's the wildest of the wild, although for many miles from its readily accessible source, the Salmon belies its other name, "River of No Return." Then after meandering around and gathering volume and strength, it literally plunges into a rugged, scenic canyon for its wild trip across the waist of Idaho. Here is some of the most rugged and scenic terrain in the Nation. A resident of the Plains States just simply wouldn't believe it.

Perhaps some day the Salmon River and the rugged terrain adjacent to it will need some sort of protection to prevent exploitation. But for the present there seems little chance man will succeed in spoiling the natural beauty of this rugged setting short of construction of some sort of dam. It's true that use and penetration have increased in recent years, but nowhere near the sort of human invasion necessary to dilute this striking, extensive wilderness.

So perhaps the time for some sort of preservation action is now, before the human mind devises some sort of way to exploit the Salmon River country. It's far easier to prevent something that would ruin the region than to restore it to the natural state after undue exploitation. It's difficult to visualize anything that could change the entire nature of the Salmon River country, but it's just as well to take steps to preserve the wildest of the wild.

SENATOR NELSON SPEAKS UP FOR CONSERVATION

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] has been sounding the alarm for some time about the wanton destruction of natural resources which has been going on in this country. As Governor of Wisconsin, Mr. Nelson won the enactment of a pace-setting program of outdoor resource acquisition and preservation, financed by a special $50 million fund over a 10-year period. The Wisconsin outdoor resources program is being copied today by a number of other States.

Recently, Senator Nelson called attention to the great new opportunity to save a significant part of the natural beauty of our land. He made the point that the great commitment of President Johnson to the conservation of natural resources, combined with the new emphasis given to conservation by our news media, is giving America "one last chance" to save some of our natural landscape, our wildlife, our woods, and our waters.

The National Wildlife Federation asked Senator Nelson to keynote the federation's annual meeting here recently. The Senator's speech was a call to arms to all Americans—especially those who belong to a wide variety of conservation organizations—to forget their narrow interests and band together for a really bold advance. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's stirring address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks to National Wildlife Federation, Washington, D.C., March 5, 1965

It is an honor to be given the opportunity to keynote the 29th annual meeting of the National Wildlife Federation, and I want you to know how much I appreciate it. All conservationists are aware of the fine work of your organization and we commend you for it.

My message to you today is going to be very simple. I think we now have the greatest opportunity in recent history for a major breakthrough in conservation. And yet I am not at all sure that this breakthrough is going to be made. I think it is entirely possible that we will blow this chance. And, if we do, we may never have another like it.

The answer depends on whether we can get all of our conservationists and their organizations to join and fight together in a unified common effort.

The answer rests largely with people like you who have always represented the broad concept of conservation.

First, let me outline this golden opportunity which is suddenly handed to us in 1965.

A great new surge of interest in the conservation of natural resources is making itself felt in our country.

There is a rapidly growing concern with conservation that just was not there before. What accounts for it? Well, I'm not sure but perhaps some people care now who did not care before because they have the money and the leisure to enjoy the out of doors; or perhaps it is because increasing tens of thousands of people in our vast metropolitan wastelands finally sense a growing isolation from nature; or because of the dawning awareness that the children have no place to play, the adults no place to relax in peace, and the environment no place to accommodate the beauty and wonders of nature. Whatever the reasons, there most certainly is a developing sense of dismay over the wanton destruction of our resources.

The outstanding development was President Johnson's message to the Congress on natural beauty. This gave us what we have long needed—the leadership and inspiration of the President to summon all of America to save something of the land of beauty handed down to us by our forefathers.

The President's commitment comes on the heels of the 88th Congress, which enacted the land and water conservation fund, the Wilderness Act, the Clean Air Act, and many related measures, and which is being justly hailed as the conservation Congress.

Newspapers, magazines, and television have "discovered" conservation. They are giving it attention it has not had for a long, long time if ever before in history.

This awakening of the Nation to what Secretary Udall has called the quiet crisis was helped greatly by the late President Kennedy's decision in the fall of 1963 to make a nationwide tour devoted entirely to the urgent problems of natural resources. Never in our lifetimes has there been a greater opportunity to strike a major blow for conservation.

But frankly, our record of seizing opportunities in the past is not very good. We are all passionately in favor of conservation—the particular piece of it which interests us. Our energies are divided among innumerable organizations, each with a special concern with its little piece of nature, and an appalling lack of concern with nature as a whole. Insects, birds, fish, animals, water, soil, wilderness, trees, and plants are all part of the scheme of nature—a kind of intricately woven fabric—just snip one thread and the whole thing begins to unravel. True conservation is the protection of the public interest in natural resources.

What we have done in this country is to develop a vast network of special-interest conservation. We have lost our broad vision of the public interest, and we have fallen to quarreling over little pieces of it. All of us know this from personal experience.

Last week, I had a national boating organization down on my neck—because I offered a proposal to help clean up the pollution of the Great Lakes. Why should the spokesmen for fresh water boaters be alarmed about steps to save our fresh water? Because this plan might require boats to install better toilets.

They're all for fighting pollution, understand—the other guy's pollution—but after all, the pollution from boat sewage is a small part of the problem, so "leave us alone." You know the story. It has happened over and over again—in the Wisconsin Legislature and in meetings of our State conservation congresses and in the Congress and everywhere else.

The cottage owners are fighting the fishermen who want to use what some people consider their private lake.

The fishermen are fighting the water skiers.

The farmers are fighting the pheasant hunters.

The States are fighting the Federal Government.

The Public Health Service is fighting the Senate Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee.

The Agriculture Department is fighting the critics of pesticides.

Business and industry in general fight any effective conservation measure if it costs them any money on the "patriotic" ground that this will inhibit economic growth. Every one of these groups has a vital economic stake in the conservation of natural resources, and while we are quarreling, the house is burning down.

Never before in history have we been so highly organized in the field of conservation—and never before have we been destroying our natural resources at such a rapid rate.

We have destroyed our rivers—whose clear blue waters once delighted swimmers and fishermen, and accommodated fish and wildlife. Every major river system in America is now polluted. Waterways that once were sources of pleasure and beauty and recreation are now forbidden to human contact and objectionable to sight and smell. We have plundered our forests.

We are strip mining the land, ripping the earth to pieces with shovels as big as houses which spread ugliness, erosion and siltation on a scale undreamed of a few years ago, and once the coal is gone the land lies barren and ruined for any purpose.

We are overpopulating and overdeveloping our public parks, turning many of these last refuges of cool, green beauty into sylvan slums. We are utterly failing in our obligation to add new park space, even though our population will double by the year 2000.

We are bulldozing away most of the green spots and open spaces in our cities, for highways and interchanges and parking lots and other forms of progress.

We are pushing heavy industry into the last sanctums of natural beauty, up the beautiful river valleys in quest of sparkling water to cool our hydroelectric turbines.

We are blighting the landscape with junkyards, with buildings deliberately designed to shock the eye, and with monstrous, electrified billboards which wage war with one another in the battle to catch the eye of the passing citizen.

We are planning a highway through the California redwoods.

We are considering a barge canal through scenic Lake Champlain.

We are building a steel mill in the Lake Michigan sand dunes.

We are damming our trout streams, filling in our swamps, cutting down our trees, poisoning our birds, and suffocating our fish.

Worst of all, we are destroying our sources of fresh water and the source of much of our scenic beauty and our recreational pleasure.

The Great Lakes are becoming progressively more polluted every year—first of all, by community sewage systems which dump raw sewage into the lake; secondly, by industries which dump lethal chemicals, and third by ships which dump almost every form of waste directly into the lakes.

The southern tip of Lake Michigan is turning into a cesspool. Three steel plants, three oil refineries, several communities, and thousands of ships are pouring out pollutants at an astonishing rate—human waste, industrial acids, and iron slag. A Federal study shows that the organism which is the principal food for the finer grades of fish has practically disappeared, and trash fish have taken over. The study shows that pollution on the lake bottom in this area is practically irreversible.

If we want an example of where we are going, we need only look at Lake Erie. It is the dumping ground for the sewage outflow from Detroit, Toledo, Cleveland, Erie, and Buffalo. Among other things, it receives 2½ million tons of silt a year. Some people think it will eventually just fill up. But before it does, life will cease to exist in its waters. Studies show that the percentage of chlorides in Lake Erie, which closely reflects municipal sewage pollution, is 230 percent higher than in 1900. The water also shows an amazing concentration of calcium, sodium, potassium, and sulfate compounds. It is no longer simply water. It is a disgraceful, disgusting chemical tank.

Last summer, 2,600 square miles of Lake Erie, over one-quarter of the entire lake, were almost without oxygen and unable to support life because of algae and plant growth, fed by pollution from cities and industries.

There are 1,300 communities in this country where the storm and sanitary sewers are interconnected. During rainstorms, these cities have no alternative but to release raw sewage into a nearby lake or river. This is done in my own State, in the city of Milwaukee, and in many other communities. Public beaches have been closed to swimming in Milwaukee, on the shores of the third biggest fresh water lake in the world off and on since 1959.

We will never make any major progress in fighting pollution until these storm and sanitary sewers are separated. The estimated cost of doing this all across the Nation ranges anywhere from $20 to $30 billion.

Think what a problem this poses for the Nation. Think of the task involved in ripping up sewer lines in 1,300 communities. But it needs to be done, and instead of setting out to do it, we are quarreling about the price of fishing licenses or the distance which public access landings shall be from private homes.

I commend Governor Rockefeller for his proposal to spend $1.7 billion to clean up New York's rivers, lakes, and streams. A substantial portion will be spent for sewage treatment plants. I hope this will set an example for other States and the Federal Government as well.

Well, this is what has been happening while you and others have been working to advance the cause of conservation.

This is what has been happening while our State legislatures and the U.S. Congress have been meeting regularly to protect the public interest in its natural resources.

This is what has happened because everything we have done has been too little and too late. As William H. Whyte so pungently said it, "Man has an infinite capacity for fouling his environment."

Against this grim background, what are the chances for the future? What can we do to take advantage of this great new opportunity for conservation—this reawakening of the national conscience?

Well, first of all, we must look at conservation of our resources as a great national and international problem. All of our organizations and all of our public officials must view the problem in its broadest outlines. This is a life or death battle to save the natural environment in which we live. It is not a petty squabble between different forms of recreation.

One useful way to broaden our view of the problem would be to call an International Conference on Natural Resources.

Such a Conference would show that, all over the world, our priceless natural resources are being systematically destroyed in the name of human progress. In some parts of the Middle East and Far East they have already been destroyed. In other areas, such as Africa, a rich storehouse of wildlife and unspoiled beauty is about to be torn to pieces and ruined by political fragmentation and lack of conservation knowledge. And in America we are dissipating and despoiling our resources at a pace never matched by any other country in the world. Natural resources are a critical world problem, and we should look at them that way.

Secondly, we can move ahead immediately at the State and Federal level on the major legislative proposals which are ready for action.

Conservation always will be a controversial field. But there are many proposals on which a broad consensus has been developed. We should move swiftly to resolve these issues.

Our States must develop comprehensive statewide plans—in which I am happy to say that the State of Wisconsin has pioneered—and use them to make the most imaginative use of land and water conservation funds which will now be available from the Federal Government. Without a comprehensive plan it is impossible to do the most effective job.

Congress should move swiftly to approve the President's major proposals in the field of conservation:

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act has passed the Senate twice now and is awaiting House action.

The badly needed additions to our system of national parks and recreation areas—Assateague Island and Sleeping Bear Dunes and the Indiana and Oregon Dunes projects and many others.

Bills to tighten control of pesticides; to set up a national system of hiking trails; to help cities build more parks; to clean up the Potomac.

We have bills ready to go which would use the scenic easement device to preserve the beauty on our highways. It would cost something, of course, but it would be a modest investment to save a great portion of the beautiful Nation which millions of Americans see from their car windows, and which is steadily falling victim to the worst forms of ugliness.

We have legislation ready to put millions of unemployed men to work on local and State work projects in the field of conservation. We have reports from almost every Governor and State conservation agency in the Nation testifying to the tremendous backlog of work which could be done by such a creative new program. The jobs are there, the men are there, the political support is there. All that is needed is the boldness to seize the opportunity.

Even though a substantial number, most of our rivers have been seriously damaged if not destroyed, we have legislation now to save many of the remaining wild rivers and to keep them from being turned into sewers. The Interior Department will propose a network of national wild rivers to be retained in their natural state. These things need to be done today.

Then, with these immediate goals accomplished, why don't we push on into the more difficult and more controversial problems which lie at the heart of our natural resource crisis?

Although down through the decades conservationists have recognized the problem as big and important, they have not been willing to propose big and important solutions. I suppose the reason is that at no stage in the past has the political climate appeared to be right for the acceptance of big solutions.

I think the time is fast approaching when the public will understand what Teddy Roosevelt meant when he told the Governors' conference in 1906 that there was no other domestic issue in America more important than the preservation of our resources. What looked to Teddy Roosevelt like a crisis in conservation a half century ago has in fact become a catastrophe.

Now is the time to face up to it. We are a rich nation and the stake is so vital that we need only shy away because of the apparent enormity of the task.

We are spending nearly $50 billion a year for national defense because we believe it is vital to our security; almost $50 billion on an interstate limited access highway network because we believe it is vital to our transportation system; $5 billion a year because we think it is vital to explore the moon and space beyond; several billion on agricultural programs because we believe it is vital to the agricultural industry and the economy of the Nation to do so; a billion in Appalachia because we believe it is vital to our Nation to improve the economic situation in that region.

Is there anything really more vital in the long view of history than the proper protection and conservation of our fresh water lakes, rivers, and streams, our wilderness, the soil and forests, the air we breathe, the bugs and birds and animals and the habitat in which they live? I think not.

To do the kind of job that needs to be done will require the passage of some tough legislation and the appropriation of several billion dollars a year for the next 25 or 30 years. I think it is important to emphasize that this is not an expenditure for operating costs but a capital investment in the resources of the Nation. It will not only pay dividends by the enhancement of the quality of living in our country, but it will pay hard economic dividends to private enterprise far in excess of the cost in tax dollars.

The recreation industry is now huge. It will become and remain the largest business in America if the resources upon which it depends are protected.

I will not attempt anything in the nature of a definitive list of things that urgently need to be done. The list is too long and the priorities too difficult to decide.

However, I think everyone will agree that a massive assault on water and air pollution is among the highest priorities for action. This will require $20 to $30 billion to separate storm and sanitary sewers; a greatly expanded program of research and pilot testing of better methods of waste disposal; substantial Federal aids to industry in the nature of accelerated depreciation for pollution control devices and probably other direct aids; air and water pollution laws and enforcement must be greatly strengthened. Los Angeles proved that a tough air pollution law could be made to work. Now it is time for a national law that is just as tough.

I would guess that an effective job of cleaning up our rivers and lakes and the air around us would cost $50 to $60 billion in the next 25 years—the equivalent of about 1 year's defense budget.

Another very high priority is acquisition. The availability of land is diminishing while the cost is rapidly rising. The land and water fund is a fine step in the right direction but it is inadequate to do the job. Seashore, wetlands, wildlife habitat, park space and green areas have a particular urgency about them. If they are not acquired during the decade ahead, the cause is critically damaged if not lost because there will be little left to acquire. This means that a substantial increase in Federal matching funds should be made to the States and the cities for acquisition as well as an expanded Federal acquisition program.

I want to suggest at this point that funds for acquisition of green areas should be contributed to cities and metropolitan areas on a nonmatching basis—that is, 100 percent of acquisition funds paid by Federal grants based upon an approved comprehensive city or metropolitan plan. These green areas and open spaces are national assets wherever they may be and it should not be left to chance that they be preserved.

I think it is necessary for Congress to pass legislation to control strip mining. The damage to the countryside is a national scandal and obviously no State is going to pass adequate legislation to protect itself. Ironically we are now spending Federal funds in the Appalachia bill to restore mine scarred lands in that region.

Finally I think we ought to address ourselves to the question of whether we should create a U.S. Department of Natural Resources. Quite frankly, I think we should. This, it would seem to me, is the best way to develop and maintain a coordinated, consistent, long-range conservation program and policy.

The cause is right. The time is here for bold action. With public understanding we can and, I trust, we will prevail.

FULBRIGHT'S VIEWS ON FOREIGN AID

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the New York Times magazine published a fine article by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations on March 21. Senator Fulbright has long been a champion of sensible foreign aid, but he does make a convincing case that improvements can be made in the present program. In his article, entitled "Foreign Aid? Yes, But With a New Approach," Senator Fulbright makes some constructive suggestions concerning the nature of our expenditures on foreign aid.

One of his suggestions is to reduce the number of American AID missions. As Senator Fulbright wisely notes:

> There is often far more to be gained by a conspicuous American absence from a country than by an American presence. It is just about inevitable that any small and weak but proud country will view any great power that snuggles too close as a threat to its dignity and independence. I think we would be wise indeed to respect that feeling by vacating those many American "aid" missions whose function is not aid at all, and certainly not development aid, but merely the maintenance of an irritating and unnecesary American presence.

Senator Fulbright also makes a cogent case for greater multilateralism in our aid programs.

I ask unanimous consent to have this article printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FOREIGN AID? YES, BUT WITH A NEW APPROACH

(By J. W. Fulbright)

Washington.—Difficult as the effort might be, it would be salutary for Americans to try to imagine exactly how they might feel as recipients of economic aid—and all that goes with it—from foreign countries.

How, for example, would the management and employees of the bankrupt New Haven Railroad feel if they were placed under the tutelage of a mission of, say, German transportation experts—who, for all they might do to show us how to run a railroad, would also be living purveyors of the message that "we Germans know how to do something you Americans don't know how to do"?

Or consider how a Texas rancher might feel as the pupil of a group of agronomists from Colombia assigned to teach him how to grow coffee. Would he be humbly and touchingly grateful? Or would his gratitude be tinged with a touch of rancor toward his benefactors because his pride was injured by the feeling of being a suppliant and a recipient?

Imagine, to take another example, how the recent flood victims of Oregon and California might have felt, having lost their homes and possessions and perhaps members of their families, if they were then asked to participate in little picture-taking ceremonies with beaming foreign ambassadors dispensing food and blankets labeled "Gift of the French People" or "Gift of the Russian People." If we can imagine ourselves in this position, I think we might agree that it is not an altogether heart-warming experience to be confronted with a gift of food whose label seems to convey the message that "the soup which you are about to consume is a charity from the great and generous and affluent people of someplace or other."

Several years ago, during a visit to a country which was then receiving American aid, I attended an informal supper with some local officials and American diplomats. One of the Americans favored us with an explanation of the costs and logistics of an impending disaster-relief mission in which American supplies were involved. As he warmed to his subject, I noticed our hosts becoming increasingly preoccupied with their soup. The American official was clearly well-informed on all the details of our mission of mercy, but the local officials did not seem to appreciate it.

I do not think they were ungrateful for our relief supplies. I think what they failed to appreciate was the strong and clear suggestion that they were our wards and we their patrons, that they were benighted and we were blessed, that they were incompetent and needy while we were rich and happy and very tenderhearted besides. They did not seem to appreciate this at all, and I did not appreciate it either. In the course of a recent trip to Yugoslavia, I had the honor to decline to participate in an airport ceremony at Zagreb, where American planes were arriving with bedding supplies for victims of a major flood.

These are extreme examples of what might be called extreme bilateralism in relations between a rich country and a poor country. They are by no means representative of how most of our aid is extended and received but they do, I think, illustrate the psychological problem that is inherent in every manifestation of direct American assistance to underdeveloped countries.

It is a problem of pride and self-respect, which has everything to do with a country's will and capacity to foster its own development. There is an inescapable element of charity in bilateral aid, and charity, over a long period of time, has a debilitating effect on both the recipient and the donor. It fosters attitudes of cranky dependency or simple anger on the part of the recipient and of self-righteous frustration on the part of the donor—attitudes which, once formed, feed destructively upon each other.

There have been abundant manifestations in recent months and years of the negative attitudes that are bred by the client-ward relationship. In the face of repeated threats by the United States to "reconsider" its involvement in the Vietnamese war, the politicians or generals who happen to be in power in Saigon at a given moment simply threaten us with their own collapse and it usually brings us to heel.

Because we do not like President Nasser's Congo policy, we threatened to cut off surplus food products (which are assumed to give us some leverage on the recipient's policy), and Nasser, as a matter of personal and national pride, told us we could take our aid programs and jump in the lake. Few Americans admired this response, even though it has the ring of something like "millions for defense but not 1 cent for tribute."

The complement of these jaundiced attitudes abroad has been the development of no less jaundiced attitudes in the American Congress. Year by year, the debate over foreign aid has become more rancorous and protracted as Congressmen have failed to see the promised breakthrough to self-sustaining economic growth in the underdeveloped countries, and instead have seen American generosity rewarded with turbulence and insults and ingratitude. The result of this feeling of frustration has been an accelerating war of attrition against foreign aid, interrupted in 1964 only because the administration conceded much of the issue in advance of submitting a drastically reduced request.

In addition to reducing the size of the foreign-aid program—or, more precisely, the part of the program that pertains to economic development as distinguished from military assistance and special categories intended for short-term political objectives—Congress has fallen into the habit of using the annual foreign-aid debate as the occasion to air extraneous grievances ranging from Ecuadorian views on American fishing rights to the mistreatment of Jews in the Soviet Union. Few of these issues have any direct bearing on the problems of economic development in underdeveloped countries, which is what foreign aid is supposed to be about.

The ill-tempered debates which these extraneous issues foster in Congress have had two principal consequences. First, they have produced an avalanche of proposals and a number of successful efforts to write unwarranted restrictions on the President's authority in foreign affairs into the foreign-aid bill. Second, they have insulted and offended, and complicated our relations with, a growing list of foreign countries which do not understand, and cannot be persuaded, that the fulminations of Senators are not the official policy of the United States.

If foreign aid had ceased to be a useful instrument of American policy, the problems connected with it could easily be resolved simply by abandoning the program. I believe, however, that, despite all difficulties, American foreign aid has been largely successful and that it will continue for the indefinite future to be an essential instrument of American foreign policy. The question that I wish to raise is not one of foreign aid as such but of a particular approach to foreign aid. I believe that our present approach—which combines various kinds of aid having diverse purposes in a single package, and administers them for the most part bilaterally—has been useful and productive in the past but is no longer adequate to meet the changing needs of American foreign policy in a changing world.

Nor do my reservations about the present program have anything to do with its management and execution. Mr. David Bell is a talented and highly competent Administrator. The Agency for International Development (AID), which he heads, is staffed both in Washington and in the field by able and dedicated public servants, many of whom bring not only technical competence to their jobs but an extra measure of devotion necessary to withstand the barbs of congressional criticism and public mistrust. Nor is there any reason to believe that there is more waste in our foreign-aid program than in any other governmental function; there may indeed be less. The question then is of our approach to foreign aid.

We must broaden and deepen our understanding of the profound transformation that is taking place in the less developed nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America and recognize, as a group of more than 50 American development experts recently pointed out, in a statement published by Indiana University, that the time horizons in our thinking about aid have been too short and that: "We are dealing with the development century and not the development decade."

The continuing need for the rich countries to assist the poor countries is a matter of both political and moral compulsion. It is difficult to see how the world's less developed nations can overcome their enormous social and economic problems without generous assistance from the more favored nations, and it is difficult to see how the rich countries can expect to be secure in their affluence as islands in a global sea of misery. But beyond the social and economic and political and strategic reasons for the rich aiding the poor is the simple motive of humanitarian conscience.

This is, I think, one which commands itself to most Americans more than they may care to admit. During and immediately after World War II, our idealistic impulses led us into some costly errors and many Americans since then, including some distinguished statesmen, have been expending a great deal of energy on efforts to show how tough and mean and hardheaded they are. The foreign-aid debate in the Senate often sounds like a contest as to whether it is more coldly self-interested and hard boiled to grant aid or to deny it.

I think we could take a long step toward resolving the present debate over foreign aid by expunging from it the vocabularly of puerile toughness in which we have come to take such tiresome pride, and which, I believe, is fundamentally alien to our national character. It would do us no harm to recognize that there is a moral as well as a political and economic case for foreign aid and that there is nothing wrong with human decency as a motive in our foreign policy.

Of all the changes that are needed in our foreign aid, the most important is a change in our own attitude. In the long run, no policy can be sustained by the sole force of coldblooded self-interest. We do not provide social security to the unemployed simply because it helps to quiet them and makes the possessing classes more secure in their affluence, although social security undoubtedly does contribute to that end. We do it because it seems decent and proper, because we feel some sense of responsibility. If we are at all sincere in our aspiration to achieve a world community of nations, we must bring something of the same spirit to our modest efforts to assist the poor nations in their struggle for a decent life. We must recognize that aid is a humane as well as a practical program, that, as Woodrow Wilson said of the League of Nations, there is a "pulse of sympathy in it" and "a compulsion of conscience throughout it."

The difficulties with foreign aid which we are now experiencing are attributable to the fact that the authorization of American aid has become deeply involved in congressional politics and controversy, while the disbursement of our aid has involved the United States too deeply in the politics of too many countries. A new approach is needed. To this end, I propose the three following fundamental changes in our foreign-aid program.

I. PUT ECONOMIC AID ON A LONG-TERM BASIS

Congress should cease its annual reviews of foreign aid and place the program under long-term authorizations. The case for doing so is both familiar and persuasive, and just about everybody involved with foreign aid agrees to it—except Congress.

A long-term authorization would not, of course, remove the foreign-aid program from direct congressional authority; the funds authorized would still have to be appropriated annually. It might be possible, however, by putting the authorizing legislation, which sets maximum amounts and is intended to govern policy, on a 3- or 4-year basis, to insulate the program from transitory waves of emotion.

A long-term authorization might have the effect of reversing the pernicious tendency to write binding restrictions into law in response to some transitory irritation, such as an insult from Nasser or Sukarno or a vote in the United Nations that displeases us. Such annoyances are genuine enough but they are often forgotten very quickly as events move on, while the legislative proscriptions to which they gave rise remain to govern—or to frustrate—policy.

Economic development is a long-term process which does not lend itself to the 1-year legislative cycle of the American Congress. The conventional short-term approach greatly impedes planning by the aid recipient while the donor is denied the opportunity to offer incentives to recipients to make necessary internal economic reforms. There has been a tendency in the experience of AID and its predecessor agencies to hasten to commit funds as the end of a fiscal year approaches with the result that recipients may be pushed into premature commitments.

The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, which in my opinion was the best aid bill we have ever enacted, provided long-term authorizations both for the Alliance for Progress and for development lending to Asian and African countries. The Congress, most unwisely, has been tampering with these legislative provisions ever since, so that we are in effect back on a year-to-year basis.

The very nature of the economic development process requires the casting of foreign aid in a new time perspective. The Congress of the United States could make an important contribution to this end by adopting foreign-aid authorization bills of 4 or 3 or, at least, 2 years.

II. DON'T CONFUSE ECONOMIC AND MILITARY AID

My second proposal is the separation of the economic and military components of foreign aid—or, more exactly, of those forms of aid which pertain to the economic development of underdeveloped countries from those which pertain to the maintenance of armed forces, supporting assistance for security purposes, and political loans which are really designed to influence a country's posture in the cold war or the outcome of its next election.

The distinction, in any case, is not merely a legislative one; it is an operative distinction of great importance, pertaining to functions which are quite distinct and not always even compatible.

The fundamental distinction between economic and military-political assistance—and it could hardly be more fundamental—is that one is designed to alter a status quo and the other is usually designed to preserve it. The relationship between the two is that politico-military assistance is intended, or should be intended, to buy time for the more fundamental purpose of developing the nation.

Military assistance is administered by the Department of Defense with the Secretary of State and the Administrator of AID acting as policy coordinators. Military and economic assistance are thus overlapping in operation and merged in legislative authorization, giving rise to the constant possibility that recipients will suspect—perhaps rightly—that conditions attached to one form of aid are in reality intended to advance the purpose of the other. I believe that the two functions should be separated to the greatest possible extent, because of the vital importance, for purposes of economic growth, of maintaining the economic integrity of economic programs—both in the mind of the recipient and in the policy of the donor.

The same considerations apply with even greater force to those forms of aid which are designed to have nothing more than short-term political effects. I have no firm opinion, frankly, as to whether the United States has any business—or can be expected to gain in the long run—in trying to buy a vote in the United Nations or influence the election of a government. But even if we grant that political bribery is a necessary part of foreign policy, it is perfectly clear that it has nothing to do with economic development, that it is much more nearly a proper function for the CIA than for AID.

As a Democrat, I do not make a habit of supporting my positions on issues with Republican campaign materials. In this case, however, I find myself impressed with a cogent case made in a 1964 publication of the Republican Critical Issues Council for separating economic-development aid from aid for short-term political purposes. The latter, says the Republican task force on foreign aid, should be provided from a special emergency fund at the disposal of the President. "It should not be confused with economic and technical assistance directed toward what we believe is foreign aid's appropriate role in achieving constructive longer-range purposes."

A corollary to the need for separating development assistance from military and short-term political assistance is the need for even greater selectivity—although this principle has in fact been accepted and to a great extent implemented by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

The United States nonetheless maintains aid programs in about 90 countries. Few of these contribute appreciably to economic development or to our security. Many are token programs designed to maintain an American "presence," which I take to be a euphemism for the exertion of one form or another of political leverage.

It is an open question whether an American aid "presence" gains any more leverage than it gives. Recent events in Egypt and Indonesia, where we have carefully cultivated our "presence," suggest that when a nationalist leader is feeling angry toward the United States he is unlikely to be deterred by a token or even a substantial American aid program and, further, that a threat to cut off our aid is far less likely to restrain a proud nationalist like Nasser than to goad him into further statements or actions hostile to the United States.

I was recently visited by the American Ambassador to an African country who expressed the view that the best way we can maintain friendly relations with the smaller African countries is by maintaining no "presence" whatever in them except normal diplomatic representation.

There is often far more to be gained by a conspicuous American absence from a country than by an American presence. It is just about inevitable that any small and weak but proud country will view any great power that snuggles too close as a threat to its dignity and independence. I think we would be wise indeed to respect that feeling by vacating those many American aid missions whose function is not aid at all, and certainly not development aid, but merely the maintenance of an irritating and unnecessary American presence.

I think that the President—the President, not the Congress—would be well advised to terminate aid programs, such as that in Indonesia, which contribute nothing to economic development and exert far more leverage in arousing the ill temper of Congress than in influencing the political behavior of the recipient. If we take these steps, we may find that we have saved some libraries, some embassy windows, a small amount of money and a large amount of goodwill.

III. MAKE ECONOMIC AID AN INTERNATIONAL AFFAIR

My third and, I believe, most important proposal for a new approach to foreign aid is that we cease to administer our economic development assistance on a bilateral basis. Let us instead place most, or all, of the funds made available for this purpose at the disposal of the international lending agencies, notably the World Bank and its affiliate, the International Development Association.

The fundamental difference between bilateralism and multilateralism in foreign aid is psychological. The one carries a connotation of charity, of patron and ward, of arrogance and humiliation; the other has the more dignified connotation of a community organized to meet its common and rightful responsibilities toward its less fortunate members. The one is appropriate to a world of nation states with unlimited sovereignty, the other to a world that is at least groping toward a broader community.

Unlike any single nation, an international agency like the World Bank is capable of entering in an institutional relationship with the recipient of its aid. It is true, of course, that the international agencies draw most of their resources from the same countries that provide bilateral aid, but, as the former president of the World Bank, Eugene Black, has pointed out, "the act of generosity is one stage removed, and this is quite enough to draw its sting."

Greatly as they want our aid, the poor nations of the world want our respect no less. Above all, they need the self-respect that will enable them to go forward confidently in building their own societies. I believe we can help to make this possible by multilateralizing our aid. And in so doing, we will also be advancing our own security by the cultivation of stable and mutually respectful relations.

By the reckoning of the Johnson administration, 85 percent of U.S. development loans in Asia and Africa will be committed under international arrangements in the next fiscal year, and, it is pointed out, most U.S. aid to Latin America is provided through the international channels of the Alliance for Progress. This is fine as far as it goes, but that is not really very far toward true multilateralism. The arrangements referred to consist largely of procedures of consultation and coordination, while final decisions about kinds and amounts of aid and the execution of programs remain bilateral.

The kind of multilateralism which is needed is one which will vest in an international agency such as the World Bank full authority to determine, according to objective economic criteria, who will receive aid and the amounts, kinds, and conditions of aid. The United States and other donors would, of course, reserve to themselves final decisions as to the amounts of money they were prepared to contribute to the international agency, although it would be useful and proper for the international organ to suggest equitable contributions by the participating countries.

Specifically, I suggest that all development loan funds now administered by our Agency for International Development be turned over to the World Bank's International Development Association (IDA) to be used for long-term low-interest development lending for programs that cannot be financed by conventional loans. This is precisely the purpose for which our development loans are intended and precisely the purpose for which the IDA was set up.

I think that the assignment of these funds to the IDA should be accompanied by an effort to persuade other countries to do the same thing, or at least to increase their contributions to IDA. I would not, however, make this a condition of our own contributions, because I believe it is in our interests to channel our development lending through an international agency whether others do so or not.

It should be understood that while the Bank and the IDA are independent international agencies, the influence of the United States on their policies is considerable because decisions on loans are made by votes weighted according to contributions. As the largest single contributor, the United States has the greatest voting power. In channeling its development loans through the IDA, therefore, the United States would be renouncing exclusive control, with its attendant disadvantages, while retaining great influence on the disposition of its contributions.

The fundamental and, I think, inescapable limit on bilateral aid programs is that, however well and honestly they are administered, they cannot escape political pressure—or, what is just as bad, the suspicion of political pressure.

The problem was succinctly stated by Eugene Black in an address to the Board of Governors of the World Bank shortly before his retirement as its president. "Economic priorities are inevitably confused," he said, "when economic objectivity is lost—and economic objectivity is not easy when aid is influenced by political ends."

As to the Bank and the IDA, Mr. Black pointed out that they have the great advantage not only of being economically objective but of being known to be so. "Because they are known to have no ulterior motive," he said, "they can exert more influence over the use of a loan than is possible for a bilateral lender: They can insist that the projects for which they lend are established on a sound basis, and—most important—they can make their lending conditional upon commensurate efforts being made by the recipient country itself." This is not to say that bilateral lenders cannot and do not attach requirements of self-help and internal reform to their loans but only that it is easier for an international agency to insist on certain conditions being met without offending nationalist sensibilities and without arousing suspicions that the conditions have a political rather than a development purpose.

In addition to its salutary effects on relations between donors and recipients, the multilateralization of aid would contribute to the same domestic ends that I described in connection with my proposal for multiyear legislative authorizations of foreign aid. Without compromising the ultimate authority and responsibility of Congress, the channeling of our development loans through international agencies would remove the most important, most promising, and most politically vulnerable part of our aid program from the pressures of partisan politics, special interests, and transitory political preoccupations.

Even if all development lending were placed under the IDA and the Inter-American Development Bank, other forms of foreign aid would remain under bilateral administration. Military assistance, agricultural assistance, supporting assistance for short-term political or budgetary purposes, the use of the President's contingency fund and various forms of technical assistance would continue to be administered by the U.S. Government. They would, however, be clearly identified for what they are—programs whose objectives are largely political and military and only partially or indirectly economic.

The emergence of the majority of the human race from poverty, and the assistance of the privileged minority in bringing that about, may one day be remembered as one of the bright chapters in human history. Economic assistance may become at the same time an instrument of hope for a better life in the poor countries and an instrument of peace and community among all countries.

This is a distant vista, to be sure, but a journey of a thousand miles must begin with a single step. I believe that America can take that step now by committing itself to a renewed effort in the field of foreign aid and by recognizing that economic development is a distinct and necessary objective of our policy which can best be advanced by separating it from lesser objectives and that this separation in turn can most effectively be achieved by transferring the management of our development aid from national to international auspices.

It can be argued that it is inappropriate for America to commit itself to such a program until and unless others do. For myself, I should be proud to see my country take the lead in a policy of intelligent example.

SENATOR MOSS ATTACKS APARTHEID

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I have had the good fortune to travel to Africa and other parts of the world with the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss]. I can personally testify to the fact that he is a perceptive observer of international affairs in general and African affairs in particular.

On March 23, the Senator from Utah, made a fine speech on the current racial crisis in the Union of South Africa before the National Conference, South African crises and the American action, at the Willard Hotel, and the requirements of U.S. policy in this situation. As he accurately pointed out:

> In the long run, there is no practical alternative to the adoption of policies which will lead to the orderly granting of the political, social, and economic rights for all citizens regardless of race or color. Whether South Africa can face this fact in time to avoid an inevitable violent alternative is a question we cannot answer. But we must keep trying to avert it.
>
> If we believe that we should exert a certain amount of persuasion, backed by certain types of pressure to end apartheid—then I believe we should be ready to move ahead on this even at the risk of unpopularity abroad. Popularity should never be our basic goal. Human dignity should.

I ask unanimous consent to have the speech of the Senator from Utah printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Speech of Senator Frank E. Moss, Democrat of Utah, Before the National Conference, South African Crisis and American Action, Washington, D.C., March 23, 1965

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a privilege to be here today. The call of your conference is a heartening portent in a troubled world.

Five years ago I was a Member of a Senate study mission to Africa. We covered 22,000 miles, and although we did not visit the southern end of the continent, we did get the feel of Africa as a whole.

Starting from Morocco, we flew east over the Mediterranean to Libya and Egypt; South to Ethiopia, Kenya, Tanganyika, and Rhodesia, northeast to Elizabethville and Leopoldville in the Congo; north to Nigeria; west along the Ivory Coast, and then to Togo, Ghana, Liberia, Guinea, Mali, and Senegal.

We traveled constantly for 5 weeks. This is a short time to form valid judgments on a land so vast and a subject so complex as Africa. In the time we had, however, we studied Africa and her peoples intensely. We talked with opposition politicians, educators, labor officials, newspapermen, and ambassadors of foreign nations, as well as government leaders; we were questioned in numerous press conferences. We conferred frequently with members of U.S. missions on diplomatic, economic, and social questions. Again and again, the sharp troubles in South Africa came into our conversations, and although we did not go to South Africa, we were very much aware of the explosive situation which exists there.

This area, as well as the newly emerging, independent nations, was very much in our thoughts when we stated in our report: "It is clear to us that the United States and the whole free world face some very troubled and dangerous times ahead in the continent of Africa. The antagonism felt by Africans toward the European colonial powers will certainly continue to plague western efforts to assist Africa with its problems. Even when an African territory gains its independence gradually, and with a minimum of pressure against the colonial governments, its new leaders seldom can afford to give up the unifying force provided by the battle cries of anticolonialism. The United States must do a great deal more to express its distinctive views on self-determination and to disassociate itself from the policies of the few colonist countries left in Africa which preserve 19th century attitudes.

This, of course, is an overall judgment, and I realize that the overall approach has its shortcomings, but it is obviously becoming more and more necessary as a basis of policy formulation affecting the many components of the sprawling continent that is Africa today. That inspection mission was a most rewarding experience. It has helped me make broad comparative judgments at a time when such judgments are increasingly needed.

I deeply regret that time did not permit us to visit South Africa on that 1960 trip. Most, perhaps all, of you leaders participating in this conference have African expertise far greater than mine. Others of you may have become more fully conscious of the growing pace of African development only recently, but for all of you, I am sure this conference has provided a more basic understanding of the dilemma which South Africa poses for the United States.

This dilemma can be simply put. On the one hand we face the increasingly frustrated drive and desire on the part of 32 independent African nations, and of all Negro people everywhere, to bring an end to white domination and an end to colored political servitude in South Africa. On the other hand, we confront the abiding determination of those currently in power in South Africa to resist any change at any cost.

Our dilemma is deepened by the recognition that an acceptable, enduring, peaceful, solution in South Africa can only be brought about by the South Africans themselves—by all races, from all walks of life, working together.

And our fears are heightened by the conviction that if South Africa does not soon face the inescapable fact that the nonwhite population groups are an integral part of their society—does not soon accept this conclusion, however searing—nonwhites will not be forever stopped from gaining economic, political and social rights. The situation there could become even more violent. It could explode into a threat to international peace.

I will not take the time here to chronicle the currents and cross currents in this complex situation. You have already spent considerable time on them—and are undoubtedly still feeling the shock.

I want to speak instead on America's position and convictions on South Africa, and on the painful dilemma in which we find ourselves in trying to support that position and those convictions.

Our Government has made it clear that we are uncompromisingly and irrevocably opposed to injustice. We have repeatedly and publicly denounced South Africa's racial segregation. We have shown that we have no intention of jeopardizing our own national interests by defending or condoning those racial policies.

We have stated that the Government of South Africa has certain international responsibilities and obligations to the world community, as well as to the people of South Africa.

Those responsibilities and obligations are:

First, to abandon the practice of apartheid.

Second, to recognize immediately the right of the people to self-determination and participation in their government, and to proceed to move in that direction.

Third, to promote to the utmost the material and moral well-being and social progress of all of the people of South Africa.

It is one of the tragedies of world history, of these mid-1960's, that the Government of South Africa has failed to live up to these responsibilities and obligations.

Now, in making this statement, I do not want to belittle the economic, technical, and scientific progress which has been made in South Africa, or to ignore the fact that this progress has to some degree benefited the entire population. The enterprise, energy and know-how of the 3½ million whites has been one of the major factors in shaping a modern, thriving economy.

But this does not justify their rigorous treatment of all people as "racial groups" and not as individuals. Nor does it condone the establishment of more and more rigid apartheid laws, accompanied by ever more stringent security laws and action. The South African Government has gone to extremes which simply cannot be equated with the laws of Western democracies or the values of Western civilization.

Now, what of America? What can and should we do?

We are a Nation with heavy responsibilities around the world. We have had to take into account fully the real consequences and costs of forceful punitive action in South Africa. We also had to give grave thought to the very real possibility that forceful measures could heighten white resistance. The white government of South Africa is in absolute and militant support of apartheid as a national policy. Forceful measures could result in more extreme internal controls, and worsen the lot of the majority of people without achieving any desirable results. Besides, our whole national policy and international policy rejects imposition into the internal affairs of a sovereign country. This is a form of aggression which we reject actively.

We have also had to consider the limits to what we or a group of powers can do. Short of war, to impose solutions or principles on another sovereign power. Evidences of these limits can be read every day in the dispatches from Cyprus, from the Congo, and from Vietnam (where we have some legal right to be, where we have entered by invitation of the government).

And finally, we have had to steer a course which would not impinge on our position and interests outside southern Africa. We have had to consider our position and interests in the United Nations, and our relations with our NATO allies. These are all very real problems which cannot be ignored.

But these considerations have not kept—and must not keep—us from urging and supporting decisions and actions directed toward intelligent, just, and peaceful solutions to present injustices in South Africa.

We know that we cannot dictate a solution, but we can as a minimum press where we can effectively toward that end.

So far our efforts have taken the course of persuasion, backed by selective pressures. Probably our most effective action has been in the field of arms shipments and sales. More than 2 years ago we adopted a policy of stopping the sale of arms that could be used to repress the nonwhite population. A year later, we supported an arms embargo adopted by the Security Council. In December of that year we supported another Security Council resolution which called on all nations to cease the sale and shipment to South Africa of equipment and materials for the sale and manufacture of arms and ammunition.

For the past few months we have participated in the work of the Security Council Committee which has considered a broad range of questions on the feasibility of steps which could be taken within the framework of the United Nations Charter. The report of this Committee made available to the Security Council is a technical study on sanctions and other measures.

This report neither commits the United States to sanctions nor closes the door to their possible application—despite some press reports to the contrary. Political decisions as to whether and under what circumstances any additional measures should be taken will rest with the Security Council itself.

We have also used both pressure and persuasion to urge dialog among South African groups which would enable them to work out a mutually acceptable solution to their problems through their own efforts. In the long run, there is no practical alternative to the adoption of policies which will lead to the orderly granting of the political, social, and economic rights of all citizens, regardless of race or color. Whether South Africa can face this fact in time to avoid an inevitably violent alternative is a question which we cannot answer. But we must keep trying to avert it.

Our role must continue to be imaginative and responsible in the choice and means and methods designed to help bring about a transition to government by the consent of the governed in South Africa.

And furthermore, if we are convinced that our policies are right—if we believe that we should exert a certain amount of persuasion, backed by certain types of pressure to end apartheid—then I believe we should be ready to move ahead on this even at the risk of unpopularity abroad. Popularity should never be our basic goal—human dignity should.

But we must do more than urge and press, more than denounce and deplore.

I believe the United States should consider taking at least some limited economic measures which would reinforce our position against apartheid, and make more creditable our condemnation of it.

As I have already pointed out, the committee on measures of the United Nations Security Council recently completed, with U.S. participation, a careful study of the effects of economic sanctions. Every economic implication, we must assume, was considered, including the costs and sacrifices to the countries which would apply economic measures, as well as the chances of achieving any concrete results in South Africa. For example, the present economic boom in South Africa is a factor; sanctions are less effective against a booming economy. But, despite this, I believe we should give serious thought to employing various pressures and economic measures, short of major sanctions, at this stage, or in the near future.

I also feel that, backed by the U.N. Security study, the U.S. Government should review the question of new American investment in South Africa. The administration has already directed the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Commerce to enlist the leaders of American business in a national campaign to limit direct investments abroad.

This we must do to stop the flow of American dollars overseas. Why not encourage American business particularly to bypass South Africa—to rap out some special rules for this area where apartheid is such a deep-rooted way of life. Retrenchment of American investment in South Africa would at once benefit our international balance of payments and assert through concrete action—not just rousing words—our strong disapproval of racial policies practiced there.

We should also turn our eyes homeward—and look at our own racial policies. We cannot censure when we have not yet cleaned up our own house.

America has been anguished and sickened these past weeks by the senseless assault on civil rights demonstrators in Selma. It is unbelievable that here in this country State troopers would employ tear gas and riot clubs and bullwhips and ropes on citizens who were only exercising their constitutional rights of petition. It is even more unbelievable that a group of white self-ordained vigilantes would club down several visiting clergymen, inflicting mortal injuries on one of them. But this has happened. It is not just a nightmare.

Until we can assume that there will be no more Selmas in America, we cannot, in good conscience, be too critical of those in other countries who are also denying basic human rights to some of their citizens.

We must continue our concern about inequities in South Africa, and we must do what we can to stimulate their removal, but we must also right similar wrongs here in America. How can we hope to speak and act and press effectively for justice half way around the world when we have not achieved it at home? We must set an example for the world if we are to wield power in the world.

I am glad to report that there is a growing will among the nations of the world to take a stronger stance against the denial of economic, political, and social rights in South Africa. West Germany is now observing a general arms embargo against South Africa, and the United Kingdom has recently instituted such an embargo. There seems to be a new atmosphere—a new willingness to take effective action—and this is progress. We must take advantage of it.

I believe there is reason to hope that South Africa will come to recognize the full measure of the dependence of us all on one another. I believe they will realize before it is too late that short-range, makeshifts which mask the preservation of minority privileges are no substitute for true, long-range national interests. I trust that in the interest of South Africa's own future, they will move together to bring about political involvement of all South African peoples in the affairs of their country.

Ahead could lie a great, and scarcely explored opportunity for South Africa, the most productive nation on that continent. The bright promise and adventure of a broad new frontier could open up to whites and nonwhites alike. South Africa's current isolation from the continent of which it is a part could give way to a new era of mutually beneficial Inter-African relations in this most significant and formative period of African history.

Before closing, I feel I should say a very brief word on southwest Africa—the large territory to the west of the Republic and south of Angola over which South Africa exercises administrative control under a former League of Nations mandate.

By next fall a mandatory judgment of the International Court of Justice is expected on the long drawn out contentious case brought before the World Court by Ethiophia and Liberia. At issue in this are basically two things: first, the applicability of U.N. supervision to the territory, which South Africa has refused to accept, and second, the compatibility of apartheid with the interests of the inhabitants as set forth in the mandate.

U.S. policy, in support of the rule of law, has been to urge compliance with the decisions of the ICJ. Should South Africa flout that decision, there could be confrontation between this nation and the United Nations. Peace could be threatened. At the very least, America's relations with the unhappy nation in southern Africa could be furthter strained, and our opportunity to be of any influence greatly lessened.

We recognize that there is no easy solution to South Africa's problems. We recognize particularly the difficulties inherent in a situation where those in power determinedly resist any change. This is dramatized for us here at home in the Selma story which unfolds each day in one glaring headline after another.

To a considerable degree the desire for change, for promotion of justice and human rights in South Africa is shared by most nations of the world. The principles involved are fundamental to our own heritage, to our own way of life, to our own strivings for social, economic, and political justice.

A meeting such as this—a mighty gathering of individuals and organizations and groups dedicated to justice—is one of the most effective ways to arouse interest and formulate a plan of action in a democracy.

I assure you that your recommendations will be given consideration—that your thinking and your observations and your conclusions will be studied carefully for ways to solve the painful American dilemma on South African policy.

RECOGNITION FOR AN IDAHO CONSERVATIONIST

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, recently it was my pleasure to participate in the presentation of an award to the Idaho Wildlife Federation for its outstanding endeavors in the field of conservation. While the award was made to the entire State federation, the man who came to Washington to receive it on behalf of the State organization, is himself an outstanding example of the type of men who are dedicated to the preservation of America's rich heritage and natural resources and beauty.

Mr. Ernest Day has championed every cause to keep our natural lakes and mountains intact and pristine for future generations. When he speaks out for these conservation measures, he does so from a lifetime of personal experience. Although he is a busy and successful businessman, almost all of his free time is spent amidst the wild splendor he battles to preserve. He is an outdoorsman in the truest sense of the word. His feet have covered more miles in the great wilderness areas than perhaps any other man in recent Idaho history.

He was the subject of a recent editorial profile published in the Idaho Observer, and I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

If you wanted to get away from it all and commune with nature far from the company of any other human being, don't make the mistake of fleeing to Idaho's Sawtooth primitive area. Beneath some frosty crag of that remote wilderness you would be likely to run right smack into Ernest E. Day.

"I've hiked over 90 percent of the trails in the Sawtooths," says Day, who operates Day Realty of Boise with his brothers, Don and Bob. "I go there every chance I get."

Day is a member of a growing breed of men who like nature in its raw and pure form. And, as is the case with other ardent conservationists, his interest has led him into more battles than he can remember, mostly with other people who have other designs on nature.

The issue is usually over what is to be done with untouched regions of the Nation, such as the Sawtooths, where trees, rivers, minerals and pastures beckon the commercial developer. Day believes the most valuable resource is often to be found in the region's natural state—a resource which is gone forever once the others are exploited.

"The wilderness is a rugged thing, but it is also a delicate thing," says Day. "Build one road and it is destroyed." As the Nation becomes more urbanized and crowded, he believes it becomes more important that some of the Nation's resources be preserved in their natural state for the enjoyment of all Americans.

The Idaho Wildlife Federation, which Day once headed as president and still serves as delegate to the national federation, has won a few battles and lost a few in his cause. The federation lost its fight to prevent the damming of the North Fork of the Clearwater River at Bruces Eddy but has been successful so far in keeping the Salmon River free of obstructions.

Two years ago it won its battle for a Federal law preserving substantial sections of the Federal domain as wilderness areas. But it had to compromise on mineral exploration and development within the wildernesses, and it was unable to have the Idaho primitive area and the Sawtooth primitive area included.

The federation now hopes that the Sawtooths will be protected by creation of a Sawtooth Wilderness National Park, a bill championed by Idaho's Senator FRANK CHURCH, a Democrat, whom Day, a Republican, regards as "the best conservationist to come down the pike in many a year."

While not fighting for the Sawtooths, or the other natural resources of the West, Day is out taking pictures of them. He is an ardent photographer and hopes some day to publish the best of his pictures in a book showing Idaho's natural splendors.

He and Mrs. Day, the former Lois Hulser, have two children, Dan, 11, and John, 5.

THE GUFFEY PROJECT—JOINT RESOLUTION OF LEGISLATURE OF IDAHO

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, it has been many years since I first became interested in a project under study by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Guffey project for the deserts above and north of the Snake River in southeast Idaho. It has a great potential which I hope will soon result in a request for its authorization from the Department of Interior to the Congress.

The Idaho State Senate, which recently completed a successful biennial session, has detailed the advantages of the Guffey project and the need for quick authorization. I ask unanimous consent that the memorial to the Senate from the Idaho State Senate be included in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 7

Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress assembled

We, your memorialists, the members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 38th session thereof, do respectfully represent that:

Whereas it is known that one of the most pressing problems facing all areas of the United States and in fact all areas of the world today is the securing of the maximum beneficial use of land and water resources for the further progress of our people, of our State, and of our Nation, not only to realize the most from our present resources for the immediate problems of today, but also to meet our future needs for the long-range future; and

Whereas the area of southwestern Idaho known as the Mountain Home Snake River plain area contains a large body of land which is both economically and engineeringly feasible for the development of a highly productive and economically desirable potential for the further development of the people of this area and of the Nation, and which would add greatly to the overall economy and assist in stabilizing the existing economy of this State and of the Nation, and would present many opportunities to stimulate the economic growth of the State and of the Nation; and

Whereas adjacent to this fine body of potential irrigated land there are adequate supplies of water in the Snake River which are now running off and unused in the State of Idaho to the detriment of the State and Nation's economy; and

Whereas upstream developments have been demonstrated to be in the long-range interest for providing the best and most comprehensive plan of development for the utilization of the water and land potential of our river basins; and

Whereas the Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with local interests, has made engineering, water resource, and land classification studies, which studies have given conclusive evidence of the economic and engineering feasibility of a development of this area under a plan known as the Guffey Plan of Development; and

Whereas the orderly continued investigation and ultimate construction and development of a water resource program for the irrigation of this potentially productive area of the State of Idaho will inure to the benefit of the State and of the Nation at large: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, (the senate and house of representatives concurring), That the Congress and President of the United States be respectfully petitioned to give early authorization to the construction of the Mountain Home Division, Snake River project, Guffey Plan of Development; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Department of the Interior, the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

W. E. DRESLOW,
President of the Senate.
PETE N. CENARRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
ARTHUR WILSON,
Secretary of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VOTING RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the text of a resolution passed by the court of common council of the city of Hartford on March 22.

It commends and praises the President on his forthright and courageous stand on the need for a strong voting rights bill.

I want to assure the council that I certainly will vigorously support this proposed legislation, just as this resolution urges me to do.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

City of Hartford,
Hartford, Conn., March 23, 1965.

Whereas President Lyndon B. Johnson in his recent address to a joint session of the Congress of the United States proposed Federal legislation which, when enacted, would guarantee and insure that the basic and fundamental right to register and vote of all Americans throughout this Nation will be protected and upheld: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this court of common council commends and praises our President on his forthright and courageous stand on this vital issue and we do further urge our Senators and Representatives in the Congress to vigorously support this proposed legislation.

Robert J. Gallivan,
City Clerk.

SUPPORT ON THE PRESIDENT'S STATEMENT CONCERNING THE KU KLUX KLAN

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, on Friday, March 26, the President announced to the public that four members of the Ku Klux Klan had been arrested and charged in Birmingham, Ala., for the terrible murder of Mrs. Viola Liuzzo.

Appropriately, J. Edward Hoover was standing beside the President at that press conference and I say this because Mr. Hoover's outstanding agents in the field worked throughout the night to find the perpetrators of this outrage.

And it was especially appropriate to have Mr. Hoover there, because what better reply could there have been to the charges that the FBI has not been zealous enough in protecting civil rights proponents and in fighting the Ku Klux Klan.

Only a short while earlier, the two astronauts had been honored and the President commented:

> In this historic room where a few minutes ago we honored brave men and great achievements, we come now to talk about a tragedy and a stain on our great American society.

I strongly endorse and second the President's warning to klansmen "to hear my voice today, let it be both an appeal—and a warning—to get out of the klan now and return to a decent society—before it is too late."

I ask unanimous consent that the President's statement, and also a brief statement I issued in support of the President's comments, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement and comments were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

President Warns Klan

Note.—The text of President Johnson's statement announcing arrest of four members of the Ku Klux Klan in Birmingham, Ala., today follows:

In this historic room where a few minutes ago we honored brave men and great achievements, we come now to talk about a tragedy and a stain on our great American society.

I am certain by now that all of you know of the horrible crime which was committed last night between Selma and Montgomery, Ala. I have been in constant touch with the Attorney General and Mr. J. Edgar Hoover throughout the night on this matter.

CHARGED WITH CONSPIRACY

Due to the fast and efficient work of special agents of the FBI who worked all night long starting immediately after the tragic death of Mrs. Viola Liuzzo, on a lonely road between Selma and Montgomery, Ala., arrests were made a few minutes ago of four Ku Klux Klan members in Birmingham, Ala., charging them with conspiracy to violate the civil rights of the murdered woman.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, who is standing here by me, has advised me that the identities of the men charged with this heinous crime are as follows:

Eugene Thomas, aged 43, of Bessemer; William Orville Eaton, aged 41, also of Bessemer; Gary Thomas Rowe, aged 31, of Birmingham; and Collie Leroy Wilkins, Jr., aged 21, of Fairfield, Ala.

PRAISES FBI, KATZENBACH

I cannot express myself too strongly in praising Mr. Hoover and the men of the FBI for their excellent work in handling this investigation. It is in keeping with the dedicated approach that this tireless organization has shown throughout the turbulent era of civil rights controversies.

This Nation and its President are also grateful for the energetic efforts of the Attorney General and his many assistants who have carried the Government's fight to insure the rights of all citizens guaranteed to them under the Constitution.

The four members of the United Klans of America, Inc., Knights of the Ku Klux Klan, will, of course, be arraigned immediately. They will later stand trial.

Mrs. Liuzzo went to Alabama to serve the struggle for justice. She was murdered by the enemies of justice, who for decades have used the rope and the gun, the tar and the feathers, to terrorize their neighbors.

THREAT TO PEACE

They struck by night, as they generally do. For their purposes cannot stand the light of day.

My father fought them in Texas. I have fought them all my life, because I believe them to threaten the peace of every community where they exist. I shall continue to fight them because I know their loyalty is not to the United States but to a hooded society of bigots.

Men and women have stood against the Klan at times and places where to do so required a continuous act of courage.

If Klansmen hear my voice today, let it be both an appeal—and a warning—to get out of the Klan now and return to a decent society—before it is too late.

I call on every law enforcement officer in our land to insist on obedience to the law and respect for justice. No nation can long endure, either in history's judgment or in its own national conscience, if hoodlums or bigots can defy the law and get away with it. Justice must be done, in the largest city as well as the smallest village—on the dirt road as well as the interstate highway.

WILL NOT BE INTIMIDATED

We will not be intimidated by the terrorists of the Ku Klux Klan anymore than we would be intimidated by the terrorists in North Vietnam.

We will redeem the sacrifices of those who suffer now in a society free of the Klan and those who support its vicious work.

I am asking and directing the Attorney General to proceed at the earliest possible moment to develop legislation that will bring the activities of the Klan under effective control of law.

In connection with new legislation, congressional committees may wish to investigate the activities of such organizations and the part they play in investigating violence.

Senator Dodd Supports President's Request for KKK Legislation

I believe that President Johnson speaks for the overwhelming majority of the American people in urging legislation to control the subversive activities of the KKK.

Freedom of association is assured by the Constitution. But freedom of association does not mean freedom to organize secret conspiratorial brotherhoods committed to terrorism, sabotage, and murder, and to the subversion of Federal statutes.

The need for such legislation has been underscored beyond challenge by the tragic shooting of a dedicated woman who had made the pilgrimage from Detroit to Alabama to participate in this historic movement for civil rights.

The KKK is just as subversive, just as un-American, just as repugnant, as the Communist Party. It is past time that legislation be devised to deal with the KKK and with similar conspiratorial terrorist organizations.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE DR. ROBERT H. GODDARD—SPEECH BY MILTON LEHMAN

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues in the Senate an address given at Worcester Polytechnic Institute on March 16. The occasion was the dedication of the original laboratory in which Robert H. Goddard carried on his initial rocket experiments. As we all know, Dr. Goddard waited long and bitter years for recognition of his work which most certainly helped to usher in the space age.

The tragedy of his life was that America was the last to recognize his genius. And because of this fatal error, the Nazi rocket technicians, using Goddard's principles, were able to develop the deadly V–2 rocket.

The address honoring this great man by Milton Lehman is personal, penetrating, humorous, and yet profound. It deals with Goddard's life and his associates at Worcester Tech in a way that makes the great scientist and his work come alive for all of us. I commend this fine address to my associates in the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the address be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Remarks at an Old Laboratory Building[1]

(By Milton Lehman, biographer of "This High Man: The Life of Robert H. Goddard," Farrar, Straus & Giroux)

I am happy to be back in Worcester at this new launching of an old building, to be with old friends and new—good friends of Robert H. Goddard—whom we honor here today.

This is indeed a busy week for Worcester and for your late Worcester citizen. As President Harry Storke has told us, it is 39 years since Robert Goddard launched the first liquid fuel rocket on a snow-covered cabbage patch at the Effie Ward farm in Auburn, about a half dozen miles from here.

While the frail forerunner of today's mammoth rockets reached only 41 feet, barely clearing its pipe launching frame, the flight brought our world into the space age just as surely as the Wright brothers' flight at Kitty Hawk brought us into the air age more than six decades ago.

---

[1] At the dedication of a former Goddard laboratory, Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, Mass., Tuesday morning, Mar. 16, 1965.

As the late Henry Sachs, then Goddard's crew chief, remarked, it was amazing that his contrivance had flown at all. Sachs said then, back in March 1926: "You could throw a baseball a lot higher."

Remembering that day in 1926, we have come to dedicate this stone building where Dr. Goddard did rocket research early in this century.

The building today is the residence of your Skull Society, the honorary fraternal order of the upper classman at Worcester Tech. But we might as well recall that there were more secrets here in Goddard's time than even Skull has dreamed of.

If we feel somewhat belated in recognizing Bob Goddard and his work here, we are still early compared to many Americans beyond Worcester and Worcester Tech, who have still to know far more of your fellow townsman.

Today, Robert Hutchings Goddard is at last a prophet with honor in his own city—and this is a reverse of one of his own favorite stories. This is his story of the Ohio citizen who, on hearing praise for Ulysses S. Grant, remarked: "Why, he can't be all that wonderful. He comes from my own hometown."

But this is a great season for Bob Goddard and we may all, with you, take proper Yankee pride. At the White House, President Lyndon B. Johnson has dedicated this day to his memory and to ours of him.

In recent weeks and years, we have seen Goddard medals, Goddard stamps, Goddard busts, Goddard trophies, plastic models of early Goddard rockets, and even Goddard biographies.

At this ceremony, however, I suspect there may be fundraising implications. There often are at our American universities. But if so, these fiscal aspects are not really amiss.

Dr. Goddard, of all Tech graduates, knew the need to raise funds in order to raise his rockets. He knew the blessings as well as the delays of the funding process.

I think that he, from the class of 1908, would bless your efforts here at Tech a half century later. He knew that funds can be a sometime thing. But, through the insights and vision of Charles Abbot and Wallace Atwood, of Charles Lindbergh and John Merriam, of Daniel Guggenheim and Harry Guggenheim, this fiscal effort turned out for him to be a mysterious affair we might call Goddard luck.

Goddard luck, to be sure, is what has always amounted to New England luck, maybe going back as far as Plymouth Rock.

I think most of us here have also shared in Goddard luck. Worcester Tech has known it, both its ups and downs. Your neighbor, Clark University, which began as Clark College and was the second oldest of America's graduate schools, has also known Goddard luck. I'm sure all of us wish Clark more of it in greater quantities than ever before.

Bob's crew members—from the late Nils Riffolt to the late Al Kisk, from Oley Ljungquist to George Bode to Calistro Sanchez—have all known Goddard luck. Henry Sachs and the Mansur brothers and Lowell Randall and Al Campbell have also known Goddard luck. And so, assuredly, has Esther Kisk Goddard.

Esther Goddard was Bob's wife, his helpmate, his strength—and his successor during these 20 years since his death in August 1945, the week of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

With all of us, I think Esther will join in stating as scientific fact that Goddard's luck is now, at last, coming up all roses—and that Bob himself would be delighted at what is happening here today.

He would be pleased, for one thing, that we no longer speak of him as an eccentric loner, or a sad, or unrecognized, or unfulfilled pioneer. He was none of these at any time in his life. Through his diaries and his notes of experiments clearly emerges a man who knew that this day of space flight would come—that it would come if only we had the patience to work at it.

Today, then, we celebrate space travel as we celebrate Robert Hutchings Goddard—from this old nonmagnetic laboratory at Worcester Tech, to the jet landing fields at Lake Muroc, Calif., to the astronauts in training near Houston, Tex., to the giant gantry perching Gemini toward the skies at Cape Kennedy, Fla., preparing to launch one more flight before the world in a sequence that has seen only one American injured—another great Ohio citizen named John Glenn who slipped in a bathtub after orbiting the earth.

Near here, at Auburn, golfers are pausing, perhaps, on the 9th fairway of the Pakachoag golf course, a dogleg to the left. There they may note a simple granite marker laid by the American Rocket Society at the site of the world's first liquid fuel rocket flight on March 16, 1926.

In Washington, at the Smithsonian Institution's Air Museum, Americans are standing today before Goddard's 1939 rocket, the rocket that was translated 2 years later, in 1941, into the German V–2.

Near Washington, D.C., at the Goddard Space Flight Center, 17 young high school scientists—scientists-to-be from all over the country—are preparing to read original papers in physics, chemistry, and biology to hundreds of young Washington high school students. They are doing so in honor of Bob on Goddard Day.

Last week, one of NASA's officials asked me what Bob Goddard might say about our Nation's Goddard Space Flight Center. At Goddard today, one sees massive teamwork for space flight undreamed of in Goddard's own day. I suggested to the NASA official—and I think rightly—that Goddard would say to NASA and to this new generation of rocket pioneers: "God bless you in your work. And Godspeed."

Today, on Goddard Day, virtually all of our major missile companies have young scientists who learned from Goddard's work and older scientists who knew Goddard himself during his sojourn among us. You'll find them at Douglas and at General Dynamics. You'll find them in Aerojet and Thiokol, and North American Aviation. You'll find them at every rocket and missile complex in this country and every other country.

Others will remember Goddard at Mount Wilson Observatory in California, where he built and tested solid propellant rockets during World War I, at Indianhead, Md., where he built solid-fuel antitank rockets before World War II, and nearby, at Clark, where he first turned to liquid-fuel flight.

Still others will remember him at Aberdeen Proving Grounds, where he demonstrated the first of bazookas to an interested ordnance staff 5 days before the end of World War I, and at the Pentagon, where privates first class, now become generals, will recall using bazookas against the Panzers in Tunisia in World War II.

In Roswell, N. Mex., a community will honor him as a warm and distinguished friend. There, near his prairie proving ground and launching tower, he is remembered by cattle breeders, oil drillers, artists, and recovering tuberculars in that bright, bland climate. And there he created the devices which led, straight as an arrow, to V–1, V–2, X–15, Sputnik—and all the way up to Gemini.

But above all, here in Worcester, are those who possibly knew Bob best—as a professor, as student, as friend, and as fellow citizen.

It is a privilege to be with you today at your dedication.

ALASKA DEPARTMENT OF AMERICAN LEGION ENDORSES COLD WAR GI BILL

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, of the many organizations which support the cold war GI bill (S. 9), I am always proud when a veterans' organization lends its endorsement to this needed legislation.

I recently received a letter from the Department Adjutant of the Alaska American Legion, Mr. Joseph M. Broines, in which he enclosed a copy of a resolution adopted by the Alaskan Department of the American Legion supporting this bill.

To emphasize the gathering support of veterans' organizations for the cold war GI bill, I ask unanimous consent that this letter, as well as the resolution signed by Department Commander Walter B. Bolling, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The American Legion,
Department of Alaska,
Juneau, Alaska, March 13, 1965.

Dear Senator Yarborough: Again through the great efforts of our distinguished Senators from Alaska, E. L. Bartlett and Ernest Gruening and the merits of your Senate bill, the American Legion Department of Alaska supports the passage of S. 9.

Wishing you lots of success, I am,

Sincerely,

Joseph M. Briones,
Department Adjutant,
The American Legion, Alaska.

Resolution W. D. 65–9

Resolved, That the Executive Committee of the American Legion Department of Alaska, in regular meeting assembled in Ninilchik, Alaska, this 13th day of March 1965, does hereby endorse the principles embodied in U.S. Senate bill 9, cold war GI bill, and urges the American Legion Department of Alaska to support this measure; and, be it further,

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Governor of Alaska, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, State of Alaska, our congressional delegation, Washington, D.C., and the national organization of the American Legion.

Walter B. Bolling,
Department Commander, 1964–65.

Attest:

Joseph M. Briones,
Department Adjutant.

ONLY 10 PERCENT OF THE DISABLED RECEIVED REHABILITATION IN 1963

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, this morning the Subcommittee on Health of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare opened hearings on S. 1525, the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1965.

Very few people realize the extent of the need for vocational rehabilitation. Dr. William A. Spencer, president of the Association of Rehabilitation Centers and chairman of the Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation of Baylor University Medical School in Houston, pointed out to our subcommittee that the 300,000 disabled persons served by 400 rehabilitation facilities in the United States in 1963 represent only 10 percent of an estimated 3 million disabled persons. The National Health Survey, for a 2-year period ending June 1961, identified a total of at least 14.1 million people who reported an inability or reduced ability to work, keep house, or attend school due to chronic illness or impairment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a footnote from Dr. Spencer's testimony be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the footnote was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The 300,000 disabled persons served by 400 rehabilitation facilities in the United States in the 12-month period, 1963–64, represent 10 percent of an estimated 3 million disabled persons. (Data are from the Association of Rehabilitation Centers Reporting Project, sponsored in part by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and published in the 1964 Directory of Rehabilitation Facilities, May-June, issue, Journal of Rehabilitation, vol. XXX, No. 3, 1964.) The National Health Survey, for a 2-year period ending June 1961, identifies a total of at least 14.1 million who reported an inability or reduced ability to work, keep house, or attend school due to chronic illness or impairment. Chronic diseases accounted for 88 percent of all disablement. (Data from National Center for Health Statistics.)

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Dr. Spencer further testified that the vocational rehabilitation program in the United States is one which has been developed soundly and cautiously. Now we are at a point where we are able to move ahead on a considerably expanded basis in order to meet a crying need.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Times of March 28, 1965, by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, be printed in the RECORD. Dr. Rusk is another leading authority on vocational rehabilitation and was a member of the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 28, 1965]

LEGISLATING FOR HEALTH—SENATE OPENS HEARINGS TOMORROW ON VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION BILLS

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

With a strong first-round victory in its fight for medicare achieved, the Johnson administration will turn its attention this week to the second most important legislative proposal of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

It is a series of amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act that would greatly expand services, particularly for the severely handicapped.

Hearings on the legislation will begin tomorrow before a Senate subcommittee headed by Senator LISTER HILL, Democrat, of Alabama.

One part of the legislation would authorize the provision of vocational rehabilitation services to the severely disabled for up to 6 months to determine their vocational potentials. In the case of the mentally retarded this evaluation could extend to 18 months.

Currently, State rehabilitation agencies can provide services only if there is a reasonable chance the individual served may become employable.

This cannot easily be determined for many severely handicapped persons with complex social, educational, and emotional problems.

Those who need services the most are, therefore, often denied services. This paradoxical situation would be remedied by this provision.

CONSTRUCTION AID

Another provision would authorize a 5-year program of Federal grants to public or other nonprofit groups for the construction of rehabilitation facilities and workshops.

A similar grant program for medical rehabilitation centers in existence for 10 years has provided the basis for a rapid expansion of such facilities.

Unfortunately although the need has been equally great, the development of vocational centers and workshops has lagged behind.

Orderly development and growth of workshops would be insured by requiring the States to assess and determine statewide needs.

Provision is also made for grants for initial staffing of facilities for a maximum of 4 years and 3 months.

Federal funds would be available for a maximum of 75 percent for the first 15 months decreasing annually to a maximum of 30 percent in the final period.

GRANTS TO WORKSHOPS

A third part of the legislation would authorize a 5-year program of Federal grants to public and other nonprofit workshops to strengthen their programs.

A significant and greatly needed feature of this section would be authority to provide training allowances for disabled trainees. Such allowances would not exceed $25 a week plus $10 for each dependent to a maximum of $65.

The primary purpose of this provision would be to provide an incentive, particularly for persons on public assistance to rehabilitate themselves into employment and leave public assistance rolls.

Another section of the legislation would authorize a 5-year program of project grants to workshops to pay part of the cost of improving their professional and administrative services. Technical consultants would also be made available for limited periods to advise and guide such workshops.

A 12-member National Policy and Performance Council of vocational rehabilitation experts would be established to advise the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on all aspects of the new workshop provisions.

The legislation also would authorize the establishment of a National Commission on Architectural Barriers to Rehabilitation of the Handicapped.

An organized effort began a few years ago to reduce the architectural barriers to the free use of buildings by severely handicapped persons.

Through the joint efforts of many groups, such as the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults (the Easter Seal agency), President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, American Institute of Architects, American Standards Association, Vocational Rehabilitation Administration, and many other groups, substantial progress has been made.

Despite this, Samuel L. Lefrak, New York builder, pointed out at a meeting last Thursday, many of our handicapped that were still "back door citizens," as the vast majority of buildings are not accessible to them.

Mr. Lefrak was recently appointed to the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

There are a number of other provisions of the proposed legislation that are primarily technical.

AUTOMATED DATA SYSTEM

Another provision would authorize the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration to develop an automated data system to link in with such groups as the National Science Foundation to secure the latest research findings which might have application to rehabilitation.

The planned system would also be used for a national information service to collect, store, analyze, retrieve, and disseminate information on all aspects of rehabilitation.

Emphasis in the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1955 was placed on medical rehabilitation services, the training of personnel and research. The results have been overwhelmingly successful.

In the proposed 1965 amendments, emphasis is placed on vocational rehabilitation and workshops to permit more widespread application of what has been learned during the last decade through research and experience.

In almost every community in America, there is a crying need for more workshops for the handicapped and particularly the mentally retarded.

Despite their dedication and hard work, voluntary agencies cannot raise sufficient funds to expand their programs.

Paradoxically a workshop success increases its financial problems.

As workers with higher vocational potentials are trained and leave for competitive employment, the percentage of workers in the shop with lower production rates increases.

Operational costs, therefore, increase and leave no funds for improvement or expansion. The new legislation is designed to break this cycle.

A GOAL UNREACHED

Ten years ago the Federal Government for the first time adopted a national objective of restoring 200,000 physically handicapped, mentally retarded and mentally restored citizens to employment annually.

At that time around 55,000 disabled men and women were rehabilitated annually under the State-Federal vocational rehabilitation program.

Last year this number rose to nearly 120,000. This is far short of the national goal of 200,000 annually.

Ten years of experience, however, has pointed out clearly the roadblocks that must be overcome if this goal is to be achieved.

The new legislation is designed to overcome these obstacles.

Rehabilitation authorities are convinced that experience under these proposals, if enacted, will parallel past experience in that every dollar the Federal Government spends on these services will be returned many times over in taxes on the earnings of those rehabilitated into employment.

The economic values of the proposals are obvious.

For many disabled Americans, President Johnson's dream of the Great Society is now personally unattainable.

With the enactment of these proposals, personal participation of the handicapped in the Great Society can become a reality.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Dr. Rusk writes:

Rehabilitation authorities are convinced that experience under these proposals, if enacted, will parallel past experience in that every dollar the Federal Government spends on these services will be returned many times over in taxes on the earnings of those rehabilitated into employment. The economic values of the proposals are obvious.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

POPULATION CONTROL

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am happy to note the presence on the floor of the Senate of my friend the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], because I intend to speak briefly this morning on the subject of the status of methods for controlling the growth of population in this country and abroad.

My attention has been called, over the weekend, to a long and interesting article which appeared in the New York Times, for Sunday, March 28, 1965, under the heading "Tax Support for Birth Control Is Increasing Across the Nation."

I ask unanimous consent that the article may be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. CLARK. The article pays tribute to the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING]. There appears, along with the article, a picture of the Senator from Alaska. It does not do justice to his manly beauty; nevertheless, his face gives an indication of his character and his wisdom.

I should like to take a few minutes to summarize the article.

It is pointed out that:

> Tax-supported birth-control assistance in the form of advice, drugs, and devices is increasing in all parts of the country.
>
> Public facilities for giving information and materials have been set up or are in the process of being organized in cities and counties of 33 States and the District of Columbia.
>
> In his state of the Union message, President Johnson called for "new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population."
>
> But even before this spur, the Federal Government had been rapidly expanding its role and encouraging local birth-control activities.
>
> Yet there is no explicit congressional authorization to do so, except in the District of Columbia, nor is there an exact accounting of how Federal money is spent on birth control.
>
> * * * * *
>
> According to the Information Center on Population Problems, there were 450 public birth-control clinics 2 years ago, and now there are 700. In 1963, a total of 11 States had tax-supported programs, now 33 States and the District of Columbia either have or will have public birth-control clinics serving 200,000 medically indigent women.
>
> * * * * *
>
> At Notre Dame University, George N. Shuster, assistant to the president, wrote in the introduction of the Notre Dame Press Book on Population published this week:
>
> "The population problem has two aspects, one of them statistical and the other moral. All demographers, whether they be Catholic or not, are agreed that mankind must henceforth limit its power to procreate."
>
> * * * * *
>
> Nonetheless, in the light of past attitudes, Catholic opposition has generally shown a marked softening. In Massachusetts, where State law prohibits the sale, distribution, and advertising of contraceptives, Richard Cardinal Cushing has lent support to repeal, saying contraception was a question of private morality.
>
> The organized medical profession itself has shifted its attitude. Last December the American Medical Association's house of delegates dropped its neutral stance and backed both private and public birth-control clinics, provided doctors ran them.
>
> The chairman of the AMA human reproduction committee, which implements the policy, is Dr. Raymond T. Holden, a professor of obstetrics, at Georgetown University in Washington. A Catholic, he said recently:
>
> * * * * *

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for not more than 3 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator may proceed.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, the article points out:

> Doctors, the committee said, had a major responsibility in this area because of the "increasing demand by the public for a simple, inexpensive, and effective method" of birth control.
>
> * * * * *
>
> There has also been a sociological shift. The baby boom after World War II has given way at all social levels to a desire for smaller families.
>
> * * * * *
>
> Nationally, the illegitimacy rate has tripled since 1940, and the children's aid program, heavily burdened by unwed mothers, has grown to 4 million cases, costing $1.5 billion. In 1955 there were $639 million. In short, there is a tax saving in birth control.
>
> In Mecklenberg County, Charlotte, N.C., which has a birth-control clinic considered a model of its kind, Wallace Kuralt, the county welfare director, has said that a pill program has saved taxpayers $250,000 in children's aid since 1960. "We are spending a dollar to save $25," he said.
>
> What is the Federal role in this social change?
>
> In the foreign field, the Agency for International Development, aware that aid to underdeveloped countries was outpaced by new babies, stands ready to give other nations almost any birth control help they seek, other than contraceptives or equipment to make them.
>
> ### POLICY FOUND FUZZY
>
> The Agency has just granted $44,800 to the Jamaica Family Planning Association, a private group, for two trucks and related equipment to be used in an educational effort.
>
> * * * * *
>
> ### THE FEDERAL ROLE
>
> This is how the Federal Government operates in the birth-control field:
>
> The Office of Economic Opportunity:
>
> Approval has been given for use of funds for birth control in Corpus Christi, Tex., Oakland, Calif., and the District of Columbia.
>
> At least 10 other places have applied for this kind of help, although the Agency declines to discuss them. The grant to Milwaukee has been stalled by Catholic opposition. The money is on a 90-percent grant basis, and the Agency must take responsibility for the projects, in effect. The bulk of the birth-control projects are proposed by existing planned parenthood organizations.
>
> The Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA)—the domestic peace corps—also stands ready to help in birth control.
>
> In either program the Agency insists on wide community acceptance as a precondition for a grant.
>
> The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:
>
> There are three major avenues.
>
> One is that of "special projects" under a $15 million appropriation last year for aid to maternal and child health and mental retardation.
>
> It was from this appropriation that Dr. Lesser of the Children's Bureau approved family planning services in New York City, Chicago, Baltimore, Detroit, West Virginia, San Juan and Ponce, P.R.; Minneapolis, Philadelphia, Portland, Oreg., and Augusta and Atlanta, Ga.
>
> The grants vary from $73,723 for Minneapolis to $1,748,614 for New York, and the purposes also vary. Minneapolis, for example, will only make referrals to the local planned parenthood chapter.
>
> ### STATES RECEIVE MONEY
>
> Secondly, there is a Children's Bureau maternal and child health program that dates back to 1935 when the Social Security Act was passed. The current appropriation is $35 million, and it is primarily to enable States to improve a variety of services to mothers and children.
>
> This money is channeled without strings to States. Although it has rarely caused comment, Dr. Lesser said that to his knowledge for at least 20 years Virginia and North Carolina had used Federal money for birth-control clinics. Other experts believe this was true also for many years in Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina.
>
> There is, however, no record in Washington because the States are free to use the funds for general health purposes without giving details to Washington.
>
> * * * * *
>
> "The purpose is to promote health, not to promote birth control. It is a decision by doctors on the scene, subject to local restraints."
>
> * * * * *
>
> Thirdly, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare supports a farflung research program through its National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. Its goal is high-quality offspring. Its starting point is behavior patterns prior to mating, and the terminus is the baby at 8 weeks of age.
>
> There are 280 research projects for which slightly more than $7 million has been earmarked.
>
> In 1962, a report on this activity was suppressed for a time. Then it came to light that the Federal Government was financing more than half of the known research dealing directly or indirectly with birth control.

Mr. President, I hope that, as a result of this encouraging project in this most important field, we shall find the population explosion both at home and abroad can be brought under control within the next 10 years.

EXHIBIT 1

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Mar. 28, 1965]

TAX SUPPORT FOR BIRTH CONTROL IS INCREASING ACROSS THE NATION

(By Austin C. Wehrwein)

CHICAGO, March 27.—Tax-supported birth-control assistance in the form of advice, drugs and devices is increasing in all parts of the country.

Public facilities for giving information and materials have been set up or are in the process of being organized in cities and counties of 33 States and the District of Columbia.

A few years ago, the issue of governmental involvement in birth control was considered to be political dynamite. Today, all levels of government—Federal, State and local—are engaged in birth-control aid.

The change is due to several factors: subtle shifts in the Roman Catholic viewpoint, the increasing role of the Federal Government and the development of oral contraceptive pills.

[In New York City, because of a recent infusion of Federal funds and a more liberal interpretation of criteria for maternal health, birth-control services for needy families are growing dramatically.]

In his state of the Union message, President Johnson called for "new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population."

But even before this spur, the Federal Government had been rapidly expanding its role and encouraging local birth-control activities.

Yet there is no explicit congressional authorization to do so, except in the District of Columbia, nor is there an exact accounting of how Federal money is spent on birth control.

This week Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat, of Alaska, moved to tidy up the situation. He drafted a bill "to coordinate the information available on birth-control research in all nations."

"Our approach at the Federal level should be positive, not permissive," he said, adding:

"Individuals have the right to know what information and aids are available to them upon request."

Mr. GRUENING's move illustrated a feeling among some authorities that the change, which amounts to a social upheaval, is still too slow and confused. For others, it is much too fast.

In California, Dr. Leslie Corsa, chief of the State Board of Maternal and Child Health Bureau, said in a telephone interview:

"Everywhere birth control has been pushed, it has moved. But the speed is relative. The absolute speed is moderate."

In Milwaukee, alderman Richard B. Nowakowski, an opponent of a proposed $59,980 Federal grant for five birth-control clinics, said:

"We will have 'sexmobiles' moving around the streets passing out birth-control information to whomever wants it—just like popcorn wagons."

CHICAGO TO START PROGRAM

Here in Chicago, whose population is 45 percent Catholic, the board of health, using Federal funds, will start next month the voluntary dissemination of birth-control advice and pills to married and unmarried women who want them.

"There is no opposition because we aren't going to pass out pills on street corners, and the program is medically oriented," an official said.

A similar program was approved yesterday in New York, where the State board of social welfare voted to make birth control information available to unmarried welfare recipients if they were the heads of families.

The ruling, which was opposed by Catholic leaders, will provide help to unwed mothers and fathers as well as to unmarried persons who are responsible for other members of their households. It also made explicit the board's policy of providing free birth-control service to all welfare clients who seek it on their own.

Only 2 years ago in Illinois a proposal for a similar State program was attacked by Catholics as one to promote "adultery, fornication and prostitution," and an avenue to later sterilization, legalized abortion and even mercy deaths.

In Corpus Christi, Tex., where the first birth-control program was approved under the antipoverty program, the first month saw the establishment of four neighborhood planned parenthood clinics in the "poverty strip," a section embracing 52,000 of that seaport's 190,000 population.

In Detroit, which has a Catholic mayor and which is also the recipient of Federal funds (like Chicago, from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare), social workers may initiate the subject.

Said one of them:

"How can we teach survival and advance freedom of knowledge of our poor, all voters mothers, all fathers responsible for directing their young, if they are not to be trusted with biological facts relating to their socio-economic plight?"

In the State, the four-member Michigan Welfare Commission, which includes a Catholic priest, adopted a policy last week similar to that of Detroit. It is aimed at the 41,000 women receiving aid for dependent children.

PILL CALLED SIGNIFICANT

The development of oral contraception—the pill—and other simplified devices have made birth-control practice easier, especially among the poor, social workers say.

Along with this has been a liberalizing of the medical indications for birth control. This contrasts to the policy a few years ago in most tax-supported hospitals of withholding birth-control therapy unless life was endangered. Medical indications now cover the whole family environment.

According to the Information Center on Population Problems, there were 450 public birth-control clinics 2 years ago, and now there are 700. In 1963, a total of 11 States had tax-supported programs, now 33 States and the District of Columbia either have or will have public birth-control clinics serving 200,000 medically indigent women.

Symbolic of a turn in Catholic thinking, the Duluth (Minn.) Catholic Service Agency has just set up a family planning service for all faiths. Although it is confined to the church-approved rhythm method, the step was taken because of exploding population around the world and the problems of individual families here at home.

The switch is in part, but not entirely, due to the shift in the Catholic viewpoint. The effect of that change is still uneven.

At Notre Dame University, George N. Shuster, assistant to the president, wrote in the introduction of the Notre Dame Press Book on Population published this week:

"The population problem has two aspects, one of them statistical and other moral. All demographers, whether they be Catholic or not, are agreed that mankind must henceforth limit its power to procreate."

But in Milwaukee, Dr. John Brennan, a spokesman for Catholic opposition, advocated in a telephone interview an individual and strictly local approach, commenting:

"The worst catastrophe would be a sudden drop in the birth rate. It would be bad for the automobile business and homebuilding."

In Cleveland, the spokesman for the Catholic diocese, Msgr. Francis W. Carney, has denounced Dr. John A. Rock, the codeveloper of a contraceptive pill, as a moral rapist using his strength as a man of science to assault the faith of his fellow Catholics.

Nonetheless, in the light of past attitudes, Catholic opposition has generally shown a marked softening. In Massachusetts, where State law prohibits the sale, distribution and advertising of contraceptives, Richard Cardinal Cushing has lent support to repeal, saying contraception was a question of private morality.

The organized medical profession itself has shifted its attitude. Last December the American Medical Association's House of Delegates dropped its neutral stance and backed both private and public birth-control clinics, provided doctors ran them.

The chairman of the AMA human reproduction committee, which implements the policy, is Dr. Raymond T. Holden, a professor of obstetrics at Georgetown University in Washington. A Catholic, he said recently:

"The fact that we can begin to talk about this within the church—and recognize a problem exists—was helpful to me."

When the AMA changed its view last December it was said that the increasing use of birth control pills was a major cause. This week the AMA maternal and child care committee said that the use of plastic intrauterine contraceptive devices was generally recognized as "inexpensive and effective."

Doctors, the committee said, had a major responsibility in this area because of the "increasing demand by the public for a simple, inexpensive and effective method" of birth control.

In Albuquerque, N. Mex., which has applied for a $17,600 Federal grant for birth-control clinics, a planned education program (including movies) among the community's 69,000 Latin Americans, Indians and Negroes would stress both the intrauterine and the rhythm methods.

SMALLER FAMILIES SOUGHT

There has also been a sociological shift. The baby boom after World War II has given way at all social levels to a desire for smaller families.

"Women say they can take better care of the children they have when they know they're not going to become pregnant again this year, as they have in so many other years," said a public nurse in rural Williamson County, Tenn., where one of the State's 18 clinics is located.

There has been, too, a complicated set of coincidences related to the rapid urbanization of the country and the spread of the Negro ghettos.

In Cook County (Chicago) for example, annual aid to dependent children costs $90 million, and 90 percent of those receiving such aid are found among 25 percent of the Negro population.

Nationally, the illegitimacy rate has tripled since 1940, and the children's aid program, heavily burdened by unwed mothers, has grown to four million cases, costing $1.5 billion. In 1955 there were $639 million. In short, there is a tax saving in birth control.

In Mecklenberg County (Charlotte) N.C., which has a birth-control clinic considered a model of its kind, Wallace Kuralt, the county welfare director, has said that a pill program has saved taxpayers $250,000 in children's aid since 1960. "We are spending a dollar to save $25," he said.

What is the Federal role in this social change?

In 1959, President Dwight D. Eisenhower said that birth control was not a proper governmental function. Since then, and into the Kennedy administration, the population expansion has been more and more a matter of governmental concern.

In the foreign field, the Agency for International Development, aware that aid to underdeveloped countries was outpaced by new babies, stands ready to give other nations almost any birth control help they seek, other than contraceptives or equipment to make them.

POLICY FOUND FUZZY

The agency has just granted $44,800 to the Jamaica Family Planning Association, a private group, for two trucks and related equipment to be used in an educational effort.

Although millions in Federal money is already flowing into a variety of birth-control activities directly and indirectly, there is no plain record of the total amount, nor is there a clear high-level policy.

In fact, the program, of which Chicago is a part, was authorized last April by Dr. Arthur J. Lesser, deputy chief of the Children's Bureau, without asking the approval of Anthony J. Celebrezze, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. In an interview in Washington, Dr. Lesser said:

"The decision I made was consistent with the policy followed over the years."

He insisted that any "family planning" involvement of the Department was a "clinical activity in accordance with the policy of State and local health departments."

Last June Mr. GRUENING asked Mr. Celebrezze, a Catholic and a former mayor of Cleveland, to detail the extent to which Department funds were used for family planning. A Celebrezze assistant wrote this to the Senator:

"We have regarded the question of family planning as one for individual decision and would raise no question about the provision of such service by a physician to his patient within the normal scope of the doctor-patient relationship. Whether or not a State chooses to include such services as part of the scope of medical care for which the State will pay, using Federal-matched funds, is entirely a matter of State discretion."

The Senator's staff said that other efforts to get more details had failed.

THE FEDERAL ROLE

This is how the Federal Government operates in the birth-control field:

The Office of Economic Opportunity: Approval has been given for use of funds for birth control in Corpus Christi, Tex., Oakland, Calif., and the District of Columbia.

At least 10 other places have applied for this kind of help, although the agency declines to discuss them. The grant to Milwaukee has been stalled by Catholic opposition. The money is on a 90-percent grant basis, and the agency must take responsibility for the projects, in effect. The bulk of the birth-control projects are proposed by existed planned parenthood organizations.

The Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA)—the domestic Peace Corps—also stands ready to help in birth control.

In either program the agency insists on wide community acceptance as a precondition for a grant.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

There are three major avenues.

One is that of "special projects" under a $15 million appropriation last year for aid to maternal and child health, and mental retardation.

It was from this appropriation that Dr. Lesser of the Children's Bureau approved family planning services in New York City, Chicago, Baltimore, Detroit, West Virginia, San Juan and Ponce, P.R.; Minneapolis, Philadelphia, Portland, Oreg., and Augusta and Atlanta, Ga.

The grants vary from $73,723 for Minneapolis to $1,748,614 for New York, and the purposes also vary. Minneapolis, for example, will only make referrals to the local Planned Parenthood chapter.

STATES RECEIVE MONEY

Secondly, there is a Children's Bureau maternal and child health program that dates back to 1935 when the Social Security Act was passed. The current appropriation is $35 million, and it is primarily to enable States to improve a variety of services to mothers and children.

This money is channeled without strings to States. Although it has rarely caused comment, Dr. Lesser said that to his knowledge for at least 20 years Virginia and North Carolina had used Federal money for birth control clinics. Other experts believe this was true also for many years in Mississippi, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina.

There is, however, no record in Washington because the States are free to use the funds for general health purposes without giving details to Washington.

"We can't get the cost (of birth control) any more than we can get the cost of taking a blood count," Dr. Lesser said.

Speaking for Mr. Celebrezze, Dr. Edward W. Dempsey, a special assistant for medical affairs, said in an interview:

"The purpose is to promote health, not to promote birth control. It is a decision by doctors on the scene, subject to local restraints."

The department does have a record of 25 States where local clinics provide family planning services. Dr. Lesser and Dr. Dempsey think all use the Children's Bureau money in this area to some degree.

RESEARCH IS SUPPORTED

(The Planned Parenthood Federation said that as recently as 2 years ago birth-control programs were operated in tax-supported institutions only in about a dozen States, most of them in the South.)

Thirdly, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare supports a far-flung research program through its National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. Its goal is high quality offspring. Its starting point is behavior patterns prior to mating, and the terminus is the baby at 8 weeks of age.

There are 280 research projects for which slightly more than $7 million has been earmarked.

In 1962, a report on this activity was suppressed for a time. Then it came to light that the Federal Government was financing more than half of the known research dealing directly or indirectly with birth control.

The official position is that the research, most of which is farmed out to universities, is concerned with the whole process of reproduction and that birth control is only a part of it.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I thank my good friend the senior Senator from Pennsylvania for his helpful remarks and his support of what I am convinced is a cause and a movement which will have increasingly wide and effective support. The population explosion has presented the whole world—and, indeed, our Nation—with very grave problems. Those problems are not confined to underdeveloped nations, so-called backward nations, nations whose economy cannot adequately support their present population, but even less a rapidly growing one; and it is a problem that also confronts us here at home, for our population is nearing 200 million, will by the end of the century have doubled. I think that most of us would agree that the United States, with 400 million people at the close of this century and 35 years later with 800 million people, would only in a much diminished sense be "America the Beautiful" the land that we love. It would have become an asphalt jungle, with a continuation of motor slums and urban sprawl. Our resources would be inadequate to take care of such a population, in consonance with the needs of the Great Society.

So I am planning within a few days to introduce legislation which I hope will enable us to grapple realistically with this problem, and to do so with full consideration of all the sensibilities, and reservations which any groups, religious or other, may have on this subject. I hope that it will have wide support because it will be couched in such a way that it will contain no element of compulsion or pressure, but merely be an endeavor to provide the information and the action which the situation calls for.

COSTS OF HOSPITAL SERVICES OF RADIOLOGISTS, PATHOLOGISTS, PHYSIATRISTS, AND ANESTHESIOLOGISTS UNDER MEDICARE

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, together with many others, I am greatly pleased that the House Ways and Means Committee has reported the so-called medicare bill and that in all probability it is destined for passage. I am also glad that they have added to the basic plan a supplementary plan which will provide for voluntary insurance with costs equally shared by the insured person and the Federal Government to take care of doctors' services and surgical services.

There are, however, defects in the House bill which should be remedied by the Senate. These shortcomings include provisions relating to the administration of the program, as well as the arbitrary exclusion of certain vital and customary hospital services. I expect that the Senate Finance Committee will study in detail these and other questions.

I think it is important to initiate discussions immediately, however, of a most serious and significant defect in the bill as reported by the House committee. This serious defect is an exclusion of hospital services, which, if permitted to become law, would constitute nothing less than direct Federal interference with customary hospital practice.

A cartoon appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch a few days ago which showed a Member of the other body in a surgeon's gown. He had extracted from the patient lying on the operating table a whole series of internal organs. He had them in a glass container, and was displaying it with jubilation to the doctors who were in the surgical amphitheater with the comment, "I got everything out."

One of the fundamental parts of the patient which was taken out—and which should be restored—is payment under the basic plan of the costs of the hospital services of radiologists, pathologists, physiatrists, and anesthesiologists. This is a very serious defect in the bill. Along with others, I hope to seek to restore this feature and others of the original King-Anderson bill as the components of the compulsory system.

Under the basic portion of the House committee's bill, the costs of the hospital services of radiologists, pathologists, physiatrists, and anesthesiologists are excluded as expenses for which the hospital may be reimbursed. I believe this prohibition is unique. It is not found, so far as I can determine, in any other hospital insurance program in this country—public or private. Up to the present, where a hospital bill includes the expense of services rendered by any of the four medical specialists I have mentioned: First, Blue Cross will pay for it; second, private hospital insurance will pay for it; third, Kerr-Mills public assistance will pay for it; fourth, the Federal employees' health insurance programs will pay for it; and, fifth, the medicare program for dependents of members of the Armed Forces will pay for it.

If we enact the provision now in the committee bill which excludes these services, consistency and logic would seem to demand that we exclude payment for the services of these four specialists from all the health care programs involving Federal financing.

There are only two apparent reasons for the exclusion of the services of these specialists as a reimbursable hospital expense. Both reasons are inadequate in my opinion. The first of the reasons for this exclusion apparently involves the gratification of the American Medical Association which has made it clear it does not want to see the services of any physician covered under health care for the aged—regardless of whether that physician is an employee of a hospital who renders a basic hospital service. The second motivation may be a desire to reduce the cost of the basic health care plan.

The American Medical Association and certain of the specialty boards have had a longstanding dispute with the hospitals of this country over the methods of compensating medical specialists. At the present time, such services are billed for in a variety of ways—including direct billing by the specialists or the inclusion of these services in the cost of hospital care as a routine hospital expense. If we permit the exclusion now in the House bill to stand, we simply would be taking the side of the American Medical Association and in effect the Congress would join the AMA in its battle with the Nation's hospitals.

To show the full deficiency of this provision in the House committee bill, it is sufficient to point out that the services of these specialists will be paid for under the House bill only under the voluntary insurance portion of the bill and only if a specific fee is charged by the doctor involved. As I have indicated a number of different methods are now employed in paying for these services. The Congress is being asked to dictate a single method which is contrary to the usual practice and opposed by the hospitals.

Approval of these exclusions would also create a situation which would have an inflationary effect on the costs of health care, an inflationary effect which will probably cost far more in the long run than any savings now apparent in the cost of the basic health care plan.

A principle of the King-Anderson bill has been that hospitals will be reimbursed for the care they provide to beneficiaries of the program on the basis of the costs of services—and not on the basis of hospital charges. This principle is similar to that practiced by many Blue Cross plans. Accordingly, the original King-Anderson bill would reimburse the hospital for the cost of the services of the medical specialists as a routine item, just as do most of the Blue Cross plans. But this accepted and normal method of reimbursement would go out the window if the committee exclusion were permitted to stand. Instead, payment would be made for these services under the voluntary insurance portion of the program on the basis of the fees charged by specialists for each individual patient. In other words, we would be committed to paying whatever charge the specialists might want to make—and not necessarily the actual cost of the service. The inflationary possibilities of this are apparent. Moreover, these provisions of the House committee bill are inconsistent. They would prohibit the hospital from collecting payment for the expenses involved in furnishing the services of some of its physicians, but would pay the hospital part of the salaries of other doctors through the reimbursement of costs in connection with services rendered by interns and residents—all of whom are graduate physicians. And, many of these doctors—whose salaries the bill would pay—are functioning in the fields of pathology, radiology, physiatry, and anesthesiology. Recent studies show, for example, that only 1,550 doctors of the 7,300 in the specialty of pathology are engaged in private practice, but some 1,800 of these doctors are involved in training programs in pathology. The bill would pay the hospitals for the services of those 1,800 doctors but not for the more than 3,000 pathologists who are either on the hospital payroll or have some other reimbursement agreement with the hospital. This is indeed inconsistent and inequitable.

There is another aspect of this discriminatory exclusion which I find unsatisfactory. It will reduce controls on the quality of care. For example, at the present time, the hospital pathologist can go into a medical staff meeting and tell Dr. Feesplitter that 25 percent of the tissue he removed was normal and that the surgeon had better be more careful in his selection of candidates for surgery. The pathologist has this freedom to criticize because he is paid by the hospital, and his responsibility is to the hospital. This freedom of action would be seriously impaired by the present House provision. The pathologist would be dependent upon referrals from physicians such as Dr. Feesplitter for his income. How critical can he be under such conditions?

I suggest that the Senate consider the following recommendation as one way to resolve the problem I have discussed. This suggestion would have the effect of essentially preserving the variety of methods presently employed in paying for the services of radiologists, pathologists, physiatrists, and anesthesiologists, and it is essentially parallel to the method employed by Blue Cross and Blue Shield in paying for these services. I would recommend that where the hospital provides the services of the four specialties, the cost of those services should be reimbursable to the hospital under the basic portion of the program. Where the specialist bills the patient directly for his services that charge can be covered under the voluntary insurance section of the program. The status quo would thereby be maintained and the hospitals, doctors, the elderly, and the Nation would benefit.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GRUENING. I wish to associate myself with the views on this subject of my good friend from Illinois. I have long felt that while the proposed legislation was highly desirable—and I am a cosponsor of it—it did not go far enough. It was inappropriately named a medicare bill. It has never been a medicare bill; it has been a hospital care bill, and a limited one. It should have been called hospicare.

I am hopeful that when the bill comes to the Senate not only will those excisions of the surgery performed in the House be remedied and that it may survive conference, but that we may have a bill that will have some elements of related medicare as well as hospital care.

Of course, I do not share the propaganda views that come from the American Medical Association that this is some horror called socialized medicine. It will not impose any restrictions on the medical profession and of course it should not. It is proposed legislation designed to provide long overdue relief for our aged citizens, the great majority of whom cannot afford out of their savings the high costs of hospital care when incapacitating illnesses of long duration strike one or both in an elderly couple. I know that the country will support it overwhelmingly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I thank the Senator from Alaska, who is the one "doctor in the house," so to speak, although he is a Member of the Senate. He comes from a distinguished medical family and had a fine career in medicine before he went into journalism and then into politics. He knows the real "inside" on this subject.

I may not go for the total range of medical services to be provided, but I protest against the elimination of payment for the costs of the in-hospital services of radiologists, physiatrists, pathologists, and anesthesiologists from the the original, basic plan of hospital benefits.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial from the New York Times of yesterday, entitled "Universal Stake in Medicare."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNIVERSAL STAKE IN MEDICARE

The expanded medicare program approved by the House Ways and Means Committee promises benefits that go far beyond more adequate medical and hospital service for the elderly. It will ease emergency charges that have wrecked the budgets of millions of American families; relieve Blue Cross plans of the most expensive item in their cost spiral—the heavy bill for patients over 65—and open the way for badly needed improvements in nursing-home care.

The committee, for so long the graveyard of medicare, has now greatly strengthened the original administration program. Most notable, of course, is its decision to supplement the basic hospital protection with a voluntary program for insuring doctor and drug bills.

However, some surgery in the Senate or on the House floor will make the measure still better. One retrogressive feature in the Ways and Means draft is the exclusion from the general social security coverage of physician fees for radiology, pathology, and other services now normally billed as part of hospital charges. Such a change will have an inflationary effect on all hospital costs; it will also undermine the trend President Johnson seeks to foster, through his overall national health program, toward establishing more comprehensive medical centers with full-time professional staffs. Tighter controls over quality, cost and utilization also are needed in the medicare program, both for its own sake and for its inevitable impact on general medical economics.

With these desirable changes, the program can more fully accomplish its enormous potential for contributing to the Great Society.

FORMULA FOR BROTHERLY LOVE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, never during my 32 years of service in the Congress has so much emotionalism been stirred up and so much animosity been engendered against the South as has resulted from the recent request of the President for the enactment of a law that would take from six Southern States their constitutional right to determine the qualifications for their voters. Even the historic Harper's magazine, in an April supplement, has reverted to its sectionalism and bitterness of the Civil War period, when it advocated the doctrine of the Abolitionists of Massachusetts, whose theme song was the abolition of slavery through the killing of slaveowners—"As He died to make men holy, let us die to make men free." Naturally, I hope that as the normal good sense of the people of this Nation reasserts itself the current sectionalism now being manifested in some quarters can be curbed before it plays into the hands of the Communists, whose objective is anarchy and revolution.

I wish more of the extremists could know about the remarkable career of a former Virginia slave named John Jasper, who for a period of nearly one-half of a century was perhaps the most popular man in our capital city of Richmond. He was in his prime as a preacher in Richmond when my father was a student at Richmond College. My father delighted in hearing him preach and often told me about hearing John Jasper preach his most famous sermon entitled "De Sun Do Move."

There is one thing about John Jasper of which this Nation needs to be reminded, as we attempt to promote brotherly love by statutory enactment. Because of his native ability and his wonderful Christian character, John Jasper not only was admired but he was loved by all people, both white and colored, who were privileged to know him in his home city.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time an article from the Richmond News Leader by one of its topflight reporters, Charles Houston, on the life and character of John Jasper.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Sixty-four years ago next Tuesday John Jasper died in his 89th year at his home on St. James Street and thus passed, what I consider, one of Richmond's greater men.

The mayor of Richmond today raps city council to order with a gavel turned from the timbers of Jasper's home, and the Richmond-Petersburg Turnpike's bulldozers veered from their course to spare the Sixth Mount Zion Baptist Church he founded.

John Jasper was a Negro preacher born on July 4, 1812, the 24th child of Philip and Tiny Jasper, slaves of the Peachy family in Fluvanna County.

Isaac James, who was ordained a minister from Sixth Mount Zion, has just republished a life of John Jasper, written originally as his thesis at Virginia Union University.

It tells the Jasper story, clearly and simply, but in it the sermons are presented in poetry-spoiling grammatical form, thus losing the beauty of the Homeresque utterances of a man whose eloquence transcended the straitjacket of mere pedant-decreed grammar and classical enunciation.

Jasper's most famous sermon, "De Sun Do Move," became world renowned, and was repeated no less than 253 times by request, once before the General Assembly of Virginia by invitation.

Mr. James' version is fully informative, but for my part I like the sermon in the full-force of its flowing poetry as presented by Giles B. Jackson and D. Webster Davis, Negro lawyer and schoolmaster, respectively, in their "Industrial History of the Negro Race," which was published in 1908.

EDUCATION THE HARD WAY

Jasper's text was Exodus 15:3, "The Lord is a man of war; the Lord God is his name," and in the Jackson-Davis text (dialectical spelling omitted) he began with this preface:

"Allow me to say that when I was a young man and a slave, I knowed nothing worth talking about concerning books. They was sealed mysteries to me, but I tell you I long to break that seal. I thirsted for the bread of learning.

"When I seen books I ached to get into them, for I knowed they had the stuff for me, and I wanted to taste their contents, but most of the time they was barred against me.

"By the mercy of the Lord a thing happened. I got me a room-fellow. He was a slave, too, but he had learned to read. In the dead of night he give me lessons out of the New York spelling book. It was hard pulling, I tell you; harder on him for he knowed just a little, and it made him sweat to try to beat something into my hard head. It was worse with me * * * up the hill every step. * * *

"De consequence was that I crept along mighty tedious getting a crumb here and there until I could read the Bible by skipping the long words, tolerable well. * * *"

HIS PROOF OF THE POINT

There was more along that line that should be an inspiration to any aspiring student from any race of any time. * * * And then, after much more in the 90-minute epic, came the crux of the sermon. The battle was on:

"As a fact, Joshua was so drunk with the battle, so thirsty for the blood of the enemies of the Lord, and so wild with the victory that he told the sun to stand still 'till he could finish his job.

"What did the sun do? Did he glare there in his fiery wrath and say: 'What you talk about my stopping for, Joshua? I ain't never started yet. Bin here all the time, and it would smash up everything if I was to start.'

"Naw, he ain't said that. But what the Bible say? That's what I ask to know. It says it was at the voice of Joshua that it stopped. I don't say it stopped; 'tain't for Jasper to say that, but the Bible, the Book of God, say so.

"But I say this: nothing can stop until it has started, so I knows what I'm talking about. The sun was traveling long there through the sky when the order come. He hitched his red ponies and made quite a call on the land of Gideon. He perch up there in the skies just as friendly as a neighbor where has come to borrow something, and he stand up there like he enjoyed the way Joshua waxes them wicked armies. And the moon, she wait down in the low grounds there, and pour out her light and look just as calm and happy as if she was waiting for her escort. They never budged, neither of them, long as the Lord's army needed a light to carry on the battle. * * *

"I done showed you that this part of the Lord's word teaches that the sun stopped, which showed that it was moving before that and that it went on afterwards.

"I told you that I would prove this and I's done it, and I defies anybody to say that my point ain't made."

EXPORT BENEFITS VERSUS IMPORT DAMAGE

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, a few weeks ago Mr. O. R. Strackbein, chairman of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, delivered a most interesting and illuminating speech on the problem of beef imports and our domestic market for beef before the National Livestock Feeders' Association meeting in Chicago.

In his speech Mr. Strackbein emphasizes the opportunities for continued growth in the consumption of beef, but he points out how vulnerable the market is to oversupply, particularly if it arises from a surge in imports of beef, such as we have experienced in recent years.

His remarks are well considered and well documented in all of their aspects.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this speech be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPORT BENEFITS VERSUS IMPORT DAMAGE

(Address of O. R. Strackbein, chairman, the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, before the National Livestock Feeders' Association, Chicago, Ill., Feb. 18, 1965.)

As feeders of livestock your members are engaged simultaneously in helping to feed the people of the United States. Foodstuffs are an important part of the family budget and meat is an important element of the American diet.

Needless to say, your industry is closely knitted with the economic pulse and well-being of the economy of this country. The amount of meat consumed per capita is affected by the income of the country's consumers. Even though the demand for food remains far more constant than the demand for many other goods, such as the nonessentials, a shift in consumption of food products is a common phenomenon.

In recent years the proportion of total food consumption accounted for by meat has risen substantially. Even among the various meat products themselves, shifts have taken place. Beef and poultry, I need hardly tell you, have gained in per capita consumption. Of course, increasing consumption can also come from the growing population. Consumption of a given food product may thus increase even if consumption per capita declines, so long as the decline falls short of the increase in population.

The fact that meat is food gives it several characteristics that set it off from the consumption of nonfood products. All food consumption anywhere is limited by human stomach capacity. This capacity, to be sure, is capable of some stretch, as clothing cutters well know; but the limit is still quite rigid. While, for example, we have only two feet, we may nevertheless own several pairs of shoes simultaneously. I have heard of people having, not wearing 50 or more pairs of shoes at the same time. It is hardly possible to do this type of multiplication with food. You may stock your larders, deep freezers and refrigerators with much more food than you can eat at one time; but unless you let the food spoil, your consumption will proceed only at a quite rigid rate. You may eat twice as much in 1 day as another, but your weekly or monthly consumption will remain quite steady unless you are on a special diet.

It is a fact that as consumer income rises far beyond the subsistence level, the share of consumer expenditures devoted to food declines. In 1950, for example, 30.6 percent of consumption expenditures in this country went for food, beverages and tobacco. In 1963 this had declined to 25.9 percent. To get a little better idea of the magnitude of this decline, we can say that if the percentage had remained at 30.6 as it was in 1950, consumers would have spent $16.7 billion more on food, beverages and tobacco in 1963 than they did.

They did actually spend $32 billion more on these items in 1963 than in 1950, but would have spent half as much again, if the expenditures in this field had kept up. Instead, proportionately more was spent on housing, medical care and burials—seemingly somewhat contradictory—private education and research and personal business, foreign travel, etc.

Meat consumption, i.e., beef, veal, pork, lamb, and mutton, increased very substantially between 1930 and 1963, an even 15 percent since 1950. It grew from 129 pounds per capita in 1930 to 169.9 pounds in 1963, or a little over 30 percent. Half of the growth took place since 1950. This was aside from population growth.

The big lead in this expansion occurred in beef consumption. It rose from 48.9 pounds per person in 1930 to 63 pounds in 1950 and sharply up to 95 pounds in 1963. This represented a virtual doubling since 1930 and an increase of 50 percent since 1950. All the other items, veal, pork, lamb, and mutton, declined slightly since 1930, per person.

The consumption of poultry also increased, the poundage of chickens doubling since 1930, thus keeping pace with beef. Turkey consumption rose even more sharply, going from 1½ pounds per person in 1930 to 6.8 pounds in 1963. Yet, the two combined represented only 37.4 pounds in 1963 compared with 170 pounds for meat, or less than a quarter as much. I may add that fish consumption per capita has remained steady at 10 to 11 pounds through the three decades.

I am sure that you are quite familiar with these trends and that I have brought you no news.

You also know that the per capita consumption of wheat flour and cornmeal have declined sharply per person since 1930. At that time more wheat flour was consumed, by quite a margin, per person than meat. Now it is the other way around. Among the more striking shifts in the national diet, of course, has been the trend of recent decades toward canned and frozen fruits, fruit juices, and vegetables.

The point of all this is that the food intake, assuming some stability in terms of calories, may indeed change in shifts from one type of food to another, but on the whole the per capita consumption of food remains quite steady. This fact, as we have seen, does leave room for a rising per capita consumption of the foods that consumers prefer and will buy, if their income permits. More of the higher cost foods will be consumed as income rises. Choice and prime beef fall into this category.

It is a fact that in Europe today the same trend is developing, but it is slow. Man as a food consumer prefers to have the quadrupeds process the grains and grasses for him and present them to him in the form of proteins instead of doing it for himself, when he has an alternative. While man is omnivorous, his tastes lean toward the carnivorous if his pocketbook supports him.

It must not be assumed from what I have said, that all meat is expensive, or that eating meat is uneconomical. Some meat, to be sure, is more expensive but not all meat; and feeders know something about this. The consumption of more of the better cuts is a matter of consumer income. A fatter pocketbook allows consumers to exercise more of their preferences; and that they prefer beef of a high grade, if they can afford it, has been demonstrated conclusively.

We have here two preferences. One is meat over other foods, up to a point. The past 35 years have demonstrated this. Once more, this shift toward meat went hand in hand with rising incomes. The other preference is for choice meat over commercial or inferior grades. This preference can be exercised more broadly as income rises still more.

This is not to say that the market for commercial and utility beef necessarily declines as consumers are able to buy more of the higher grades of meat. The incomes of some consumers are only beginning to reach the level at which they can afford meat of any kind. The low income groups move away from beans, bread and potatoes, so to speak, as the income rises.

Family income in this country has been rising more at the bottom levels than at the top. In 1935–36 the top 5 percent of families received 26.5 percent of total income. In 1963 this dropped to 19.6 percent.

The lowest fifth had come up only a little in its share of total income. In dollars it went from $617 in 1935–36 to $1,333 in 1963 but its share of the total went only from 4.1 to 4.6 percent. The second fifth went from 9.2 to 10.9 percent; the third, from 14.1 to 16.3 percent, etc. The highest fifth dropped from 51.7 to 45.5 percent in its share of the total income.

This trend, it might be observed, made meat-eaters out of more people, especially in the lower levels; and that is where a growing market may be anticipated. The same trend in the middle ranges also meant a graduation of eaters of commercial grades to the level of steaks and roasts. The highest levels of income, while suffering a shrinkage in their share of the total income nevertheless enjoyed an increase in income from $15,582 per year to $22,840, thus permitting an increase in the number of Choice- and Prime-beef eaters. And when I refer to beef eaters I refer to meat.

These statistics mean a great deal to your industry. They indicate a growing market all along the line but with accent on the lower grades because that is where most incomes fall. They have also a profound bearing on the matter of imports. In considering this question we should keep two things in mind. One is that the market for beef increases from the bottom up. The lowly hamburger and the hotdogs have as good a claim as any to representing the first ventures into meat consumption. Therefore they represent a considerable market and one that will recruit more consumers as incomes rise in the lowest levels.

Second, and also important, is the fact that the demand in the upper levels; i.e., the demand for Choice and Prime grades, is more sensitive than the demand for the run-of-the-mill grades. As in all other fields of consumption, the higher priced goods will be the first to suffer from a shrinkage in consumer purchasing power; and, mark this, higher grades will also be more sensitive, pricewise, to a crowding supply where there is no shrinkage in purchasing power. People do not have to buy; or they may postpone their buying, or they may buy less than before, of any goods they do not need. If the supply of luxury or semiluxury goods grows larger at a faster rate than new consumers are recruited, the price will crumble faster than it would if the goods were essential and had to be bought.

This fact is not always understood.

The supply may encroach too heavily on the demand as a result of one of a number of factors, or a combination of them. There may simply occur a rather sharp rise in production. There may be a chill in consumer buying, caused by some event that clouds the economic horizon. There may be, as you experienced in the past few years, a rising flow of goods from the outside.

You were among those who felt the consequences, along with the growers.

It was said in rebuttal that the swelling imports really did not compete with domestic beef; that they supplied a market not reached or not fully reached by the domestic industry. This argument is often heard about imports, not only with respect to meat but other products. They supply the low-price market, it is said.

Two or three observations should be sufficient to dispose of that contention. One is especially true of food products and has to do with the limit, rather inelastic, of the national stomach. Each stomach will hold so many ounces of food, with a limited tolerance on the higher side. If you will fill it with any one combination of food or drink, you cannot fill it with other food or drink. If hamburger fills the stomach's meat requirement no steak will be gorged on top of it. This then becomes a matter of competition between this food and that food, or even grades of food.

A butchered steer or cow does not yield only steaks. You, of course, will be surprised to learn this, I am sure. Some Government economists, at least, have not learned this fact. As I understand it, packers seek to dispose of all parts of the carcass. This automatically calls for a market for meat other than steaks and roasts. As competition fills up in the lower levels, from whatever source, prices will drop in those levels also. I do not know what share of a steer will butcher out as prime or choice beef, but I am sure the percentage is low enough to leave a high poundage of other meat to sell from the same carcass.

If the market gets glutted from the bottom, the pressure rises toward the higher levels and meets at the middle levels. The price of the whole steer must therefore fall if the packer is to make a profit, and that is the purpose of his business. If human stomachs would expand to let in all the additional meat without crowding away the surplus, it could then be said that the imports do not compete with the domestic product; but that is not the nature of the stomach.

There can therefore be no doubt that when meat production was already adequate to the demand in this country, rising imports could produce only one effect; and that is what they did cause in 1963 and 1964. Prices tobogganed.

Let me, as one who has been on the Washington scene long enough to have some familiarity with the pitfalls, say that the cattle industry took the only course that was open to it and pressed vigorously on the Congress. The course taken showed a thorough appreciation of the deployment of power in Washington and of the only approach that had a chance of success. The campaign was energetic, unrelenting, and it produced results that few old hands on the scene would have thought possible.

This is not to say that everything was accomplished that you need; but if politics is the art of the possible, the cattle industry earned a high mark.

At this point I would like to sketch for you as accurately as I can some elements of the Washington scene as it relates to the subject of import competition.

I should not have to tell you that since the last war and even before, a shift has taken place in the seat of power so far as the tariff and imports are concerned. Congress under the Constitution is to regulate our foreign commerce and also to make the tariff. In recent decades, Congress has shown an inclination to shift this power to the executive branch, and the latter has been more than eager, in fact quite greedy, to receive it—all of course without changing the Constitution.

The fact is that today Congress has been set to one side as far as its function in foreign commerce regulation is concerned. That is another reason why the cattle industry's success in 1964 was all the more remarkable. But let us not deceive ourselves. The State Department is not happy over any exceptions that are made to the principles of GATT (the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) to all of which the United States subscribes and in fact initiated. One of these is the establishment of import quotas. These are outlawed by GATT. Several exceptions are allowed but none of them applies in your case. Should an actual quota be set up under the legislation, GATT would contest its legality under the general agreement.

The whole sweep and force of State Department policy is against quotas or continuing tariff protection and in the direction of dismantling what is left of the tariff and other trade restrictions. The Kennedy round of further tariff reduction is getting underway and the 50-percent cut authorized under it has the full support of State Department policy behind it.

I need hardly tell you that under the circumstances any measure of protection that now exists will be the object of disfavor and a candidate for removal as soon as it becomes politically feasible to do so. It is for this reason that I wish to impress on you the imperative need for joint effort, all across the front, among all the industries that face the common problem of import competition.

There are scores of such industries, and the number is growing as the other industrial countries, armed with modern technology and low wages, draw a bead on this market.

On this side many of our industries are lured by the view of export markets; but I think it can be demonstrated that total benefits from exports under existing international deployment of competitive forces cannot outrun the damage that would be inflicted on home industry by further reduction of our tariff and elimination of import quotas.

Our economy in the past generation and even more so since the war has become more dependent for its prosperity on the production and consumption of goods that are nonessential, goods that lie above the subsistence level. This fact has greatly increased the sensitivity of our economy to outside competition and to unfavorable or uncertain business outlook.

There is no worse offender in this respect than imports that are armed with a cost advantage that cannot be met by our own producers without going broke. We need to maintain our consumer purchasing power and even to expand it if production is to expand—something that will be necessary if we are not to be swamped with unemployment.

Lower tariff or absence of import quotas will expose our sensitive industries to a type of competition that will chill their confidence in the market and cause retrenchment rather than expansion. It will press them to install more laborsaving machinery in order to remain competitive, and this will produce unemployment. More and more of our large firms will open up overseas and do most of their expanding there. This country will be left behind, holding the bag of unemployment while other countries suffer from labor shortages.

The stake of the cattle industry in the economic prosperity of this country is not merely indirect. It is direct. Your interests intertwine with all the other agricultural and industrial groups that find themselves in the same boat. This means working with them through Congress for the preservation of our domestic market.

The notion that rising exports will come to the rescue is doomed to failure for years to come. As more of our capital goes overseas, it automatically shrinks our foreign markets for many products. But for subsidization of exports we are running a deficit in our foreign trade account today. Therefore that road is blocked.

A sharp modification of the national foreign trade policy bringing it into focus of present-day national and international competitive realities is long overdue. You have a part to play in this task, and you have already demonstrated your competence.

CONSERVATION OF NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, the great resources of America—the soil, the timber, the minerals, the wildlife—have sustained us for hundreds of years. But now we have to think about sustaining them.

The frontier is gone and any examination of our resources will show that during the past 100 years we have wrought more wanton destruction of our landscape than any previous civilization accomplished in 1,000 years.

We cannot continue to use up our land and still be the land of our children. If we continue to destroy our rivers and lakes, if we continue to plunder our forests and rip up our mountainsides, and if we continue to foul our air and water, there will be no new green paradise awaiting us over the horizon.

A few days ago, more than 1,500 conservationists from the United States, Canada, Mexico and several other countries came to Washington for the 30th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference.

Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY, a long-time leader in the fight to conserve this Nation's resources, made a most thoughtful plea for the conservation of our natural and human resources. I think all of us should have a chance to read this superb presentation.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY (Vice President of the United States). Thank you very much, Mr. Brooks.

My old friend, "Pink" Gutermuth and Ira Gabrielson and my fellow conservationists: In these days of electronics, modern inventions, it is getting difficult to see the audience over the contraptions. [Laughter.] But I know you are there and I'm delighted.

Gathered here in this great assembly at the Nation's Capital are some of the most peaceful people, some of the most constructive people that will ever come together at one time in this city and it is rather hard to realize, having said that, that we are about to rejoin a great struggle and, indeed, join in revolt or revolution, but the fact is that we are—and, by the way—our Government is helping to lead that revolt.

I'm speaking of the century-long war, a century-long revolt against the waste of our natural bounty; against the desecration and the ugliness of our beautiful land. We meet here in Washington and of all the places that we need to have meet, it's here, to add new fervor to that cause of conservation and development which, having reached a critical stage, needs your fire, daring and dedication more than ever before.

I know that you have heard a powerful address from the minority whip of the U.S. Senate, one of the finest gentlemen in the Congress of the United States—a progressive-minded, forward-looking man and a real conservationist—and might I add that in this area of conservation that there is no room for partisanship; all there's room for is dedication and constructive action.

We are here to talk about the conservation of resources and, of course, we emphasize what we call natural resources—those resources of land and water, of timber and minerals, of wildlife—but we are also here to emphasize the conservation of another resource—the human resource—because the land and the man go together.

I can say to this audience that this Government and this administration headed by President Johnson and with his partner, HUBERT HUMPHREY, and his Cabinet and this Congress, is a conservation administration, dedicated to the conservation of natural resources and human resources and dedicated to their development for the good and the use of mankind. I am proud to be a part of this—proud to have stood alongside of your own resources managers in the ranks of this great conservation movement; and this meeting holds much of the pleasure and nostalgia perhaps of a family reunion for me—we have been together on other occasions.

Now, we have labeled our cause, and I hope you will permit me to join you and say "our" cause, "conservation." To many, that term speaks only of the quiet glades, the smooth waters of Minnesota lakes and wild creatures that inhabit the forests, but some say—"Are we not a nation of builders? Nature is fine but now let's move on to important business." These are supposed to be the practical ones that say these things.

Well, we reply that buildings must stand on firm foundations and in the long run, this, our Nation, has no business more important than conserving her great basic resource, the earth, that sustains all life, because land and man should be and in fact are inseparable.

Resources are not fixed objects on a fixed plot and resource conservation is not a matter of tending to a changeless garden. We apply this term of resources to whatever men demand from the earth at any given time. As these demands change, so must our concept of conservation change.

Oil was not much of a resource before the automobile and wildlife today satisfies other hungers than those of the stomach. Nothing on earth is eternal or fixed. As an old Greek philosopher once said: "You cannot step twice into the same river for fresh waters are ever flowing upon you."

The conservation movement in America must understand change—the ever widening rush of these new waters—and that is what has expanded our movement from the dreams of a few idealists to a great national crusade and that is what makes it uniquely an American revolution, for we are leading a movement still unique in our national experience.

Conservation as we know it is an American phenomenon, born of social reform, weaned by a dynamic national spirit and shocked to its maturity by a recognition that we, the people, have defiled a bountiful and beautiful land. Conservationists are trying to demonstrate that free people can act in their own behalf, voluntarily, willfully, and can dedicate their lands not to the profit of the few but to the good of the many—and this is the principle—the good of the many—the greatert good for the greatest number—that I want to reaffirm today.

Oh, but how slow and agonizing has been the establishment of this principle; how frustrating it has been to see private empires built on public lands; how hard to watch resources exploited to the point of depletion and how heartbreaking it has been to witness the assault on our wildlife and the withering of our land's natural beauty, and how painful, oh, how painful, the illusion that the land was limitless and its products inexhaustible. Sometimes, my friends, we have acted like gluttons—just devouring all that which God created. But then, how thankful—how thankful we must be that the land was not easily pauperized, it didn't give up, and how grateful for the courage and the vision of those early conservation pioneers, because it was they who made possible the great progress that we're making today.

Now, these valiant pioneers reminded us that a nation stands or falls on the firmness of its resource base, and we meet tothat a peoples' spirit and its will to greatness can be sapped by a barren land and we meet here today to perpetuate that spirit.

There is, my dear fellow Americans, something spiritual about conservation effort and dedication to conservation because a true conservationist is a steward of the Lord—he truly protects that which God has created. That's why I have always felt that the conservation movement extended far beyond the commonplace of politics, far beyond even economics; it is a communion of the soul, it is a unity of the spirit.

Now, these valiant conservation pioneers began what is indeed a battle, a war, a call to arms against three malignant forces and masters—first, the overexploitation of the land and its products; an ancient adversary, yes, whose subjects or results through history had been decline and decay. You know it to be a true fact. Nations that have withered away into oblivion, into weakness and nothingness, first exploited their land, then exploited their people and soon were forgotten.

The second malignant master that we must wage war upon is corruption of the landscape, the countryside, the highways, the wild and the scenic spots, which denies us pleasure in the natural world and, my fellow Americans, we ought to bow our heads in shame, our beautiful countryside is being made into a junkyard and don't tell me we can't do something about that; don't tell me that the mayor of a city—I was once one—cannot keep his streets clean, his boulevards well cared for. Don't tell me that Governors and legislatures are helpless to see to it that there are rules and regulations that prevent the defiling of the landscape, the corruption of it—or does America want to show that its main objective in life is the piling up of scrap iron, or of garbage pits or dump grounds? Have we no pride? I'd like to arouse in this country almost a feverish emotional outburst against this defiling of the countryside, this corruption of the landscape. The least that a people ought to have that live almost encased in asphalt and concrete is that when they leave the environs of the city they can see nature and commune with God without having to look over a pile of all-worn-out automobiles. [Applause.] I have a lot of these ideas that I could share with you. [Laughter.] My wife says I scold when I talk like that; well, I do, because there are some things that can be done so easily.

There is a third malignant master that we need to conquer—the overgrowth and the underplanning of our cities, where population pressures damage not only the tranquillity of our people, but the air they breathe and the water that they drink.

Once again I say that it is possible, through the enforcement of zoning ordinance and health codes, to see to it that our cities are more beautiful; to see to it that the landscape (yes, the yards, for lack of a better phrase, the front lawn and the backyard) looks a little bit more like we loved the land that is ours.

Now, more importantly, these erie prophets led us to learn that our land is a community of all living things—not just a series of human subdivision. We have learned—at least some of us have—that nature will care for us only if we care for it as a part of life within the natural context. This is our lesson—to learn and teach—and history will not forgive us for a failure but for all the headway that we have made. Our greatest challenges lie ahead because our population is growing rather fast too.

By the year 2000—and that's not long, it's just around the corner—the population of the United States will be over 300 million people; daily water needs will increase from 345 to at least 560 to 600 billion gallons a day. Needs for agricultural products will double and if my friend Secretary Freeman can last as Secretary until the year 2000, he will have licked the surplus problem—there will be no doubt about that. [Laughter.]

In a country where people have ever more leisure time—and we will have more—and, we trust, more money to enjoy it, the burden on parks and on recreation areas will double or triple. The number of big game hunters, for example, could well grow from the present 6,300,000 in 1960 to well over 12 million by 1980, if we maintain the species and the spaces for them to hunt.

Thus the forces that united us in the conservation cause will have to be replenished because the task is so much greater and one of these forces and, I think, the most powerful of all, is the love of our people for the land. Americans have always been people of the land and while building a nation—a great republic from forests and plains—the pulse of the wild, of the natural, of the native so to speak, beats in the American bloodstream.

While most of us today live, as I mentioned, in concrete and asphalt environments, we remember our youth—our own and our Nation's youth—the time of the open land and broad horizons. My, how I like to talk about those days when I could walk down the creek—old Timber Creek out in South Dakota—when I could go pheasant hunting, when I could dream dreams like boys do. Like most of you, I knew this world as a boy, when I could be a Robinson Crusoe in my mind's eye and in my imagination, or a Daniel Boone, frankly, almost right in my own back yard or at least in the nearby community. I sympathize with youngsters today, who are literally imprisoned in asphalt and concrete. Is it any wonder that there becomes a harshness in our society, a coldness at times? How can you really feel the sweetness and gentleness until you can touch the grass with your hands and toes? You remember when you used to like to go barefooted earlier than your mother would want you to? You remember how you would like to just feel the grass and you still do. Well, let's save some of it. [Laughter.] Let's save some of it, for this memory, this imagination is something to be cherished, isn't it, but also to be encouraged and made possible as a memory for generations yet unborn.

But an opposing force was the American will to conquer this same land, to tame the wild, and loving this land, yet we abused it. Thriving on its challenges, we demanded total surrender and it took us long years to learn restraint and moderation; to teach ourselves to turn away from wanton waste. We were like that little boy that got into the watermelon patch—just dig into the heart of the melon—never intend at any time nibbling close to the rind.

Meanwhile growth, which was our goal and almost our ideal, became our nemesis. Our natural bounty allowed us to expand in huge numbers but booming numbers, even in a bounteous land, can drain that bounty and drain it dangerously.

Witness the sprawling of our suburbs. People sought a cleaner and less confining life than in the cities and by their numbers, moving out helter-skelter to the suburbs, many times without plan or without any order at all, they destroyed these very values.

Cities, the cradles of social progress, all too often became prisons for those who could not escape even in the less crowded suburbs. This afternoon I am going to be meeting with the mayors of the largest cities of this Nation and I'm going to talk to them about making our cities livable. Cities ought not to be merely bedrooms so that we can get up and go to work. Cities ought to be citadels of culture; they ought to be places that make life enjoyable—the thrill of the good life—and they should not be without the birds, the parks and the grass and the hill and the open spaces.

So you see, we seek now a new conservation, one of people as well as land and resources; one of metropolitan areas as well as open country. Our times demand it.

We enter a new phase of the continuing revolution in an urbanized, industrialized society. The first phase began when the great journey of Lewis and Clark lifted our eyes to the West; it reached fruition in the bold and strong hands of Teddy Roosevelt. It was Teddy Roosevelt who first consolidated Federal powers on ground broken by such men as Shures, Marsh, Powell, and Pinchot. It was time for awakening the American conscience; for recognizing that this land had limits after all for protecting public lands from ruthless exploitation; and Teddy Roosevelt will be remembered, as will Governor Pinchot and others, not for just some of the political decisions, like the war on the trusts and the monopolies, but, more importantly, for the love of the land; for setting the example and for conserving, at least starting the fight to conserve our great heritage.

It was also time, and that time was growing short, to heed the words of John Muir. You will remember what he said—everyone needs beauty as well as bread, places to play in and pray in, where nature may help and cheer and give strength to the body and the soul. That is some of the best therapy that you can have. I think we just ought to repeat that time after time. Everyone needs beauty as well as brains, places to play in and pray in, where nature can help and cheer and give strength to the body and soul; and also somewhere recalling what Sir Thomas Brown once said—nature is the art of God. This is why I said before that conservation should have a religious impulse to it.

The conservation movement was carried a giant step forward under Franklin Roosevelt, who made it an instrument of public welfare with such projects as the TVA, the Great Plains shelter belts, the soil conservation program, the Civilian Conservation Corps. The spur of his leadership drove us to find better ways of utilizing our resources, new means of using and managing them, and he broadened the definition of what we mean by resources.

Then, during the post-World War II years, with our major attention still focused on international turbulence, our conservation forces had to be gathered anew for a new thrust and one that is now underway—and may I say were it not for the people in this room, right here, you and your leaders and your spokesmen, we would have lost this war, lost this fight for conservation, because the war years, understandably took our minds off it and in the postwar years of international tension and crisis, without our thinking of the land and human and physical resources of this country, we could have been like a ship without a rudder—lost, storm tossed.

Our late, beloved President John F. Kennedy set the theme for this modern period when he told Congress in 1962, and I quote him, "we depend on our natural resources to sustain us but in turn, their continued availability depend on our using them prudently, improving them wisely, and, where possible, restoring them properly."

Just 1 month ago, President Lyndon B. Johnson amplified the theme in his message to Congress on natural beauty, and what a beautiful message. "Our conservation," he said, "must be not just a classic conservation of protection and development but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation. Its concern is not with nature alone but with the total relation between man and the world around him. Its object is not just man's welfare but with the dignity of man's spirit."

But whose business is this, I ask? Some in this great enterprise ask the same. Who should take the lead? Who should take the first step, which is the longest journey?

This administration answers that the concerns of conservation are the concerns of every American in and out of government.

Nearly a year ago, in his first delineation of America's internal problems, President Johnson said that solution to these problems does not rest on a massive program in Washington, nor can it rely solely on the strained resources of local authority—they require us to create new concepts of cooperation, a creative federalism between the National Capital and the leaders of local communities.

So you see, we can no longer afford to think of conservation as the special province of conservationists or preservationists; nor is it the exclusive domain of our resource developers—it is clearly the concern of everyone.

Conservation is a patchquilt of needs and problems; the patches come in all shapes and sizes, but each is vital to the finished work. The true conservationist can no more ignore problems outside his narrow interest than the seamstress can leave out center patches because she is a specialist on edges. [Laughter.]

The common thread running through all conservation work is a concern with this American land of ours—this American continent—using it for the maximum public benefit today while maintaining its value for the tremendous needs of tomorrow. Conservation today, more than ever, insists therefore upon cooperation between all levels of government and all segments of the population but let us remember that this word "cooperation" like conservation itself, can be used by some as a pious title for uncooperative and unproductive ends. Even among men of good will, great injustices can be done in the name of good causes. Progress is often stymied by bureaucratic bickering, by question of who owns the land and who is responsible for what job. We have spent more time arguing about that than we have about conserving.

I say that where conservation is concerned land titles are irrelevant. When a water table falls it doesn't matter really who owns the surface—the important thing is to get the table restored and that ought to be a challenge to us. Erosion and fire attack land without consulting the clerk of courts or the registrar of deeds or ownership records. All of us lose when one of us loses soil, or when a deer dies of a damaged habitat, or when the bass dies from water pollution. Our real question is not who owns it, not who should do it first, but who can do the job.

The job begins with this question, and this is where the public, private, local, and Federal interests begin to merge and it was this philosophy that moved the recent 88th Congress to become the most effective Congress in history for conservation legislation, and I shall ever be grateful for the opportunity that I have had as a Member of that Congress and as a majority whip of the U.S. Senate to help make that record. I know that in passing more than 30 important conservation bills in one Congress that the 88th Congress was responding to the will of the majority of our people and to the needs of this Republic. As a result, we have today a whole new charter of conservation; a new land and water conservation fund to help States and cities preserve areas of beauty and health for the pleasure of all; a Wilderness Act—oh, I remember my old friend Zahnheizer, this was one of my major proposals as a Senator. I can remember the heat we took. My, you would have thought that we were going to deny certain interests in this country a chance to even make a nickel. I was one of those fellows that was wanted. They had my picture posted in certain places—private enemy, I think it was, No. 1. [Laughter.] Yes, we took the early heat. They took a little bark off me once in a while, a little skin here and there, but I am happy to tell you that the bill is passed and the Wilderness Act will guarantee that future Americans will be able to touch the majesty of untrammeled land that our forebears knew.

Then there is the water research and planning funds to prepare for tomorrow's sorry needs and we began construction on more than 200 water resources projects with 70 more scheduled for this year. More than 5,500 miles of new transmission lines and an increase of flood control funds of more than 50 percent was the record of that Congress.

A Public Law Review Commission to study the laws and the administration of our public domain and the Classification and Multiple-Use Act under which the administrators can finally determine which lands should be retained in Federal ownership and which disposed of and then began long-range programs on the retained lands. Now, this act is creating federalism in action for it demands the closest coordination and consultation between Federal and local authorities and then, among the most important of all conservation acts, we have the Economic Opportunity Act, the War on Poverty Act, which establishes amongst many other things a Job Corps conservation program, or Job Corps conservation camps, a goal I may say that I set in 1957. That patricular aspect of that bill went past the Senate three times and, my dear friends, on the issue of racism, youth and the land, human resources and natural resources were denied attention for year after year and finally, in this last Congress, we passed the Youth Opportunity Act, we passed this Economic Opportunity Act, and we have set in motion today a tremendous new program that is going to be of benefit to millions and millions of Americans yet unborn. Here is an example of how the conservation concept has expanded, by bringing young men, many of whom have never known the feel of earth or the shade of trees; by bringing them to work on the land we do more than repair the damage that is done to the land. We believe that the land can help repair the damage that society has done to the youth.

We are in one of the greatest healing programs. We are binding up wounds that have been opened for far too long and I can tell you, my dear friends, when I witnessed the opening of that first camp, when I read about it and when I saw all the films, I am not ashamed to tell you that the tears flowed down my face because I saw there young men that had never had a chance, getting a chance, and what bothers me is why did we wait so long? Why all this self-righteousness about the evil of our young and the delinquency of our youth while the adults bickered over how to get the job done? And today, my fellow Americans, we have room in these camps, in this first year for only a few thousand and hundreds, yea thousands and thousands, over a hundred thousand young men already, have pleaded with this Government, this rich country, for a chance to work in a camp. Youngsters that are 16, 17, and 18 years of age, are saying to camp counselors, "this is my last chance, if I can't make it here, I will go down in defeat"; a step away from disaster, and yet we parade around talking about our stock market and our wealth, while we forget the real wealth of the Nation all too often, the youth.

I will be eternally grateful to the President of the United States for his leadership in this fight. An NYA boy in his youth, National Youth Administration, a little country schoolteacher, President of the United States. And he's made up his mind that this country is going to see to it that every boy and girl, regardless of race, color, creed, or economic station, has an opportunity for the best education that this Republic can offer at any time in its history. That's the commitment of your President and I hope it's yours. [Applause.]

While you are here, call on your Congressman. Don't just talk to each other—you're all together anyway. [Laughter.] Because we have these programs before the Congress. I have attended too many meetings where we went around patting each other on the back. I'm the biggest meeting attender that this country ever had. [Laughter.]

What this country needs right now is a good shot of conscience adrenalin. Just get busy. Get these cities of ours rebuilt; get these illiterates taught; get these young men and women—and some of them older—that have no skills, get them some training. Conserve and develop human resources at the same time that you conserve and develop the great physical resources—man and the land.

Government's role, indeed its obligation, is to put this people power into action programs wherever conservation needs have been neglected. Always the need must determine the program's scope and shape.

Government's role is—its real reason for even being is the welfare of its citizens and with tomorrow's citizens threatened with a blighted landscape and environment, of congestion and ugliness, the Government that fails to act swiftly and effectively will have failed in its sacred trust.

My fellow Americans, by the year 1980, 85 out of every 100 Americans will be living in large cities; and we have to teach people who live in the cities to love the land that surrounds the cities and not to exploit it. We are going to have to teach one another to keep the water clean and pure. There won't be a river left in America that isn't polluted—I doubt that there are many now—when I think of my own beloved State of Minnesota with what some people call its ten thousand lakes, depending on who you are sometimes you call it 20,000. [Laughter.] But be that as it may, why don't they tell you how many of them are already polluted. The land of the sky-blue water, but the water in all too many instances is contaminated by man. Now we can't do this and be a strong country and be worthy of our heritage. Can we do less, I ask, than to pass on to the next generation the natural legacy that we were left? In fact, each generation owes a little something more to the one that succeeds it. Does man have a right to destroy that which God created or don't you talk about that in church, or at your family altar or in the quietness of your own conscience?

What is it that gives us the feeling that somehow or another we have a right to destroy that which we say we believe came from the Divine?

President Johnson's proposals to conserve that legacy are of historic importance. He has asked Congress for sweeping programs to create open spaces in our cities—providing space for wild animals—protecting air and water from pollution—beautifying the highways—increasing our park and recreation systems—developing new systems of wild rivers and scenic hiking trails—reducing the harmful effects of pesticides—researching the still mysterious relationship between man and his environment.

By 1970, my fellow Americans, 90 million automobiles on our highways—90 million. It seems to me that we have something to be concerned about in air pollution, in beautification. In short, this Government is acting to insure that as we increase the quantity of our goods, we do not diminish the quality of our lives.

So now we have this new impetus—new laws and new proposals. It's time to put them into effect in a joint effort. To do this, we need foresight, hindsight and we need some insight to see that our cause is a historic one. And that we must ride with the tide of history. Yesterday's traditions may be today's myths. Such is the legend of the America, the horn of plenty. Such is the legend that all good comes to those who merely tend to their own gardens.

We conservationists cannot and do not claim to have a special pipeline to eternal verities but I think that we do have a moral mission to protect the dignity and the wellbeing of our people and this requires more than Federal funds and programs—money won't do it alone. It requires that Americans of all walks of life and interest speak out against complacency; against the mischievous idea that conservation problems will somehow be solved by someone else; for the problems will not be solved by someone else—we cannot let George do it because maybe George isn't there—maybe George doesn't even hear us—he may have a hearing defect. [Laughter.]

And we are not going to let someone else do it either—not Fred or John. We are just going to have to buckle down and get going and do it ourselves and I think we are firmly on that course—that's why I came here.

You who administer these conservation programs; you who outline them and feed them, you know your program goals but let us work together in moving more rapidly toward those goals—be a little bit restless, be anxious to see that this job is done.

You who are missionaries in this vital cause of conservation, may I suggest that you work with a missionary zeal. Let us together in the love of this great land of ours, this America that we herald in that beautiful song, "America the Beautiful"—let us build our land into a cathedral of beauty and of conservation and then let us call all the people to its portals. Thank you. [Rising applause.]

U.S. OVERSEA BOOK PROGRAMS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered in New York City on November 18, 1964, before the 51st National Foreign Trade Convention of the National Foreign Trade Council, Inc., by Mr. Curtis G. Benjamin, chairman of the board of McGraw-Hill Book Co. Entitled "Books As Forces in National Development and International Relations," the speech is an outline of some of the problems faced by our oversea book programs.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOOKS AS FORCES IN NATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

(An address by Curtis G. Benjamin, chairman of the board, McGraw-Hill Book Co., before the final general session, 51st National Foreign Trade Convention, the National Foreign Trade Council, Inc., New York City, November 18, 1964)

Let me confess that as I address this audience I feel like a pygmy among giants. I say this because I represent an industry which among the great American export industries is truly a pygmy in size. We book publishers have a fierce pride in our product—a fact that you will observe as I go along. Yet we must ruefully note that our industry in sales volume ranks way down on the national scale, down somewhere between the dog food industry and the peanut industry. We must sorrowfully face the fact that our fellow Americans spend annually more on food for their dogs' stomachs than on food—or our particular brand of food—for their own minds. However, we do find some solace in the fact that we have somehow managed each year to stay just ahead of peanuts.

But size is not everything. Books have a large seminal importance that far exceeds their small dollar value as a commercial product at home or an export commodity abroad. Let me describe briefly just how books can serve as powerful forces in national development and international relations. If in doing this I may seem to be reciting a panegyric to books and their high uses and values, then so be it. Of books—of books at home, of books abroad, of books of every kind everywhere—of thee I proudly sing.

First, I sing of books serving a basic role in keeping English as the lingua franca of the free world. It is difficult to exaggerate the importance of our having English as the international language of education, science, industry, and commerce, or to exaggerate the power of books in keeping it as such.

Second, I sing of books as vehicles for international understanding of political, social, and cultural ideas and institutions. I think it no exaggeration to say that next to people, books are the best ambassadors of international enlightenment and good will. Let me elaborate this theme, this second stanza of my song, a bit.

In the area of political knowledge and motivation, U.S. book publishers are happy to note that, matching their export sales with the political graph in each of the 80 or 90 countries where American books are sold, we can observe that American books and tyranny appear to live together in inverse proportion.

In most countries of the world the students are the revolutionaries of today and the leaders of tomorrow. As events of the recent past have proved in Korea, Turkey, Japan, and several Latin American countries, the political power of the student can be ignored by a government only at its own peril. American books abroad—and especially American textbooks—are thus directed to the hands of men who are vital both to the future of their country and to the future of relations between their country and ours. Many years ago F.D.R. made this point dramatically when he said, "Books are bullets in the battle for men's minds." As we shall see later, this fact has not escaped either the U.S. Government or the U.S. book industry.

In the area of international cultural understanding, the book is, again, both basic and powerful. This is an obvious fact, but the need abroad for more knowledge and appreciation of the cultural achievements of America is not so obvious as it should be to many of our citizens. Our books serve not only as direct evidence of our literary achievement but also as reflectors of our achievements in all the other arts. We should not underestimate the critical nature of this particular battlefield of the cold war.

Next let me sing, in my third stanza, of books as basic tools for education and training—or to use the newer catch-phrase, for "the development of human resources." In Washington and almost all other capital cities of the world, one hears much talk these days of the urgent and universal need for greater "development of human resources." While this phraseology is new, the need itself is both old and familiar. In more simple and conventional terms, the need is for more and better education and training.

Now all this urge to both national and international action for more and better education and training is very heartening to book publishers. For books have always served in all countries as the best and most essential of tools for the development of human resources. Of the place of the U.S. textbook in the international scene and of the problems peculiar to its distribution abroad, I shall have more to say later.

Meanwhile, let me sing my fourth stanza in praise of books as basic guides in the development of national economic resources and in the extension of international trade. I take it that everyone here knows the essentiality of books—of operating manuals, of technical handbooks, of how-to-do-it guides, of professional treatises—in the improvement of agriculture, commerce, and industry. I also take it that most of you know the desperate need for adequate supplies of such books in the developing nations of the world. Almost all these nations are looking to us to supply their needs. They want our own editions in English at the higher professional levels and they want translations and adaptations of our books at the vocational levels. They want lots and lots of both kinds and they need them now, this year, not next year or 5 years from now.

Further, these emerging nations are prepared to import along with our books, our ideas, our methods, our technology. Thus do books serve in the vanguard of international trade. Thus do they serve in a correlative way as pioneers and conditioners of emerging new markets for U.S. materials, designs, products, and services.

Obviously this conditioning of markets may take years and years in some areas of the world. The student of chemical engineering in Asia, Africa, or Latin America today will 10 or 20 years hence be the manager of a new plant, a man in the market for new designs, machinery, and equipment. His textbooks and handbooks of today, and his later professional reading, will lead him to tomorrow's source of supply. The Nigerian professor setting up a new course in agricultural technology, the Peruvian businessman seeking an answer to a management problem, the Turkish salesman trying to improve his technique, the Burmese official wishing to study an aspect of public sanitation—everyone with a problem involving knowledge looks first for a book. The country which insures that its books are at hand is forging strong links for the development of international trade.

The British understood this well when many years ago they coined the slogan "Trade Follows the Book." The Germans also have well understood this principle for many years. Today both the British and the Germans, the two leading exporting nations of the Western World, work hard at exporting their books. Last year the British exported 43 percent of their national book production, while the Germans exported about 36 percent. Both figures are well ahead of those of any other industrialized nation, and far,

far ahead of the export ratio of the U.S. book industry.

The Soviets in more recent years also have come to understand that trade follows the book. Recognizing the very limited use of the Russian language abroad, they have mounted an enormous program for the distribution of their books in low-priced translated editions throughout the world. This Soviet book-export program started seriously about a decade ago, and it was stepped up in recent years when the Soviets started their world trade drive. Working in their usual single-minded, monolithic way, they have achieved impressive results in Asian, African, and Latin American book markets. They have stated frankly that they look upon exported books as the advance guard of the Soviet economic challenge, and herein lies a great threat to the exporting nations of the free world.

As the final idea in my shameless praise of books, I submit that of all media for information, education, and persuasion in underdeveloped countries, books are the most penetrating and permanent. Radio and TV, though powerful in impact, are of course very ephemeral. Newspapers are also here today and gone tomorrow. Magazines, though usually passed from hand to hand, are here this month and gone the next. But books, battered and frayed as they often are, do hold together and stay around year after year. Often they are passed down even from generation to generation.

Now, having heard my recital of the many uses and high values of our U.S. books abroad, and knowing the desperate need for more of them in most countries of the world, you would be justified in assuming that we should be exporting books by the shipload. Certainly we should be, but unfortunately we are not. In actual fact we as a nation are doing poorly at book exporting. Total sales of the U.S. book publishing industry in 1963 were approximately $1,650 million, of which only 7 to 9 percent were export sales. This performance is very poor as compared with that of the United Kingdom or West Germany, or for that matter with any of the other countries of Western Europe. How it compares with the export figure for the U.S.S.R. no one knows. As we shall see later, there a book is not always a book, and the export price is a fiction.

Why is it that in such a favorable situation of international demand, American books do not fare better in export markets? There are several reasons and they can be simply stated.

First, to put it bluntly, not enough American book publishers are seriously interested in international markets. Too many of us have listened to wise voices saying over the luncheon table that export sales require a lot of extra work and bother and that they are not very profitable anyway—half of which is true, of course. Too many of us have pointed with satisfaction to the fact that U.S. book exports have increased fourfold in the last 15 years, forgetting to mention that they were almost nil at the start of this period.

But some of us have worked hard, very hard, at book exporting. We have tried to make the most of what we consider to be very fortunate opportunities for our books and our authors around the world. But every Eden has its serpent, and we have found a two-headed monster in our gardens of opportunity abroad. The first head we call cost, while our would-be customers abroad call it price. The second head is currency—available and convertible currency. Without this monster the business of exporting American books would be all profit and glory; with it the going is pretty rough. What we need, of course, is a St. George, or a dozen St. Georges. In any case, the U.S. book industry alone and unassisted cannot hope to cope with this two-headed monster. We need help, and we need it most in those countries of the world where books are indeed serving as bullets in the battle for men's minds.

Two possible answers to this problem of price have been explored. One is subsidy, public or private. The old ICA and the new AID have done most in this direction, recognizing books as tools in aid programs and helping to make them available in foreign libraries. The USIA, though not so directly oriented to educational and economic development, also has done much with programs of the same kind. Several foundations also have similar but much smaller programs for library assistance.

In a more direct way, the USIA has for several years subsidized a low-priced book program in English. In this effective program the agency covers certain basic costs for paperback book publishers so as to make possible very low retail prices of American paperbacks abroad, prices as low as 15 to 20 cents for books that sell here for 50 to 75 cents. This direct subsidy is applied to distributional costs as well as production costs, something that I ask you to note because the high cost of distributing low-priced books in export markets has been too often overlooked with disastrous consequences. At the end of 8 years of operation, the USIA program reached total production of 10 million copies, most of which have been distributed in the low-income markets of the Far East, the Near East, and Africa. The titles included are general books rather than textbooks or professional books. Naturally, all of them have been books that support our international aims, policies, and postures. Not a "Lolita" or an "Ugly American" can be found in the lot.

Another partial solution to the price dilemma has been sought in Japan, where several American publishers have produced photo-offset editions at costs that allow the pricing of these reprint editions in Asian markets at 30 to 40 percent of U.S. prices—which means the equivalent of $2 to $5 or $6. These reprinted English-language editions (mostly of college textbooks and professional books) were first sold principally in Japan, the Philippines, Indonesia, and India; more recently in the Near East, Africa, and Latin America, and in some cases in Europe as well.

These Japanese-produced reprints have been successful in more ways than one. First, they have provided plus sales and have earned acceptable rates of dollar profits. Second, they have helped us to save Asian markets, and especially university markets, for English-language books. In fact, they afford the only means we have for staying competitive with the even lower priced English-language translations of Soviet textbooks that are now flooding southeast Asia. Our Japanese reprints are produced in good quality at costs that are less than half the cost of comparable production in the United States. The quality of paper and printing is not high, but it is good enough; and most of these Asian student editions are bound in paper covers, of course.

Now that I have mentioned them, what about paperbacks? Expatriate Americans and government officials traveling abroad bitterly ask U.S. publishers why our industry cannot produce very cheap paperback textbooks for export when it can and does produce "Lady Chatterley's Lover" and "Peyton Place" at 75 cents a copy. This is a good question, and there are some good, but not very agreeable, answers to it.

First is the size of the print run. Mass-market paperback reprints are printed by the hundreds of thousands on large, high-speed presses. By contrast university-level textbooks are reprinted in runs of 3,000 to 10,000 copies on smaller, slower presses, and consequently their unit costs are much, much higher. For example, the average printing of one publisher's Asian student editions last year was 4,000 copies. (The wide variety and narrow specialization of university courses are responsible for such small printings, of course.)

Second is the kind of materials used in manufacture. Mass-market paperbacks are printed on cheap, lightweight paper stock, and the sheets are glued together to make a book. Textbooks are printed on more costly stocks of machine-finished or coated paper. This is necessary because they contain halftone engravings and other kinds of graphical and mathematical matter that cannot be printed on unfinished stocks of paper. And since the volumes are heavier and get much harder use, the folded pages must be stitched together and given sturdy backing at the spine. All this costs much more and, of course, is worth much more in books that are used over and over again.

Third is the difference in distribution costs. The paperback edition of a popular book such as "Peyton Place" can be sold by the hundreds, even by the thousands, in a mass-market self-service outlet. Ship them out by the carload and the panting public snaps them up in a way that produces distributional costs of only a few cents per copy. Not so with textbooks, for which select markets must be served on seasonal and spot demand. For example, a recommended text in enzyme chemistry will be needed for a course starting at Bandung University in Indonesia next spring. Probably 15 to 20 students will enroll, but no one can be sure of the number until the term starts. Maybe half of the enrolled students can afford to buy the recommended text, but one can only guess at this. Three or four dealers will want to stock copies. It takes no marketing expert to see that servicing this kind of demand is a very costly business. And the saddest part of the situation is this: Even if by some economic miracle a paperback text in enzyme chemistry could be priced at 75 cents, and even if the publisher were to give the bookseller a 90 percent discount on this list price, there would not be nearly enough margin in the transaction to pay any dealer to stock 10 copies. When this harsh reality of distributional costs is put clearly before the inquiring expatriate American or the traveling Government official, it usually provokes incoherent muttering, even some flecks of foam at the mouth. Ah, paperbacks. What frustrations are caused by your image and your promise in the book-hungry nations of the world.

Now let me get on with our monster's second head—currency. As everyone here well knows, U.S. dollars usually are least available in the less developed countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America—the very countries where our U.S. books are most needed. In spite of this need, dollars for book purchases often must be sharply restricted. At times the import of U.S. books may be totally suspended in a country where the battle for men's minds is the hottest. In such a situation the exporting American publisher is hogtied, for unfortunately he cannot find uses for local currencies—an old story to most of you, I know.

For a number of years the U.S. book industry has had a St. George which rescued it, at least partially, from this agony. This is an ingenious program in the USIA called the informational media guarantee program, or IMG for short. While it has not lopped off the dragon's second head, it has hacked away very effectively since 1949, the year when it was established under authority of the Marshall plan legislation.

The IMG program has enabled foreign countries with serious dollar shortages to import U.S. books, periodicals, and films to a total of $74 million since the program started. Under the program, foreign importers make payments in their own currency to American exporters, who then exchange the foreign currency for U.S. dollars through application to USIA. Most of the foreign currencies acquired under the program are later sold to other U.S. Government agencies which use them to meet local operating expenses. Dollars acquired from such sales are credited to a revolving fund for reuse under the IMG program. Moreover, the fund pays interest to the U.S. Treasury on "loans" made to it as far back as 1949, and this interest is counted into operating cost—a most unusual, if not unique, accounting practice in governmental operations.

Theoretically this program should not cost a cent, as the U.S. exporter pays 1 percent of sales value to defray its administrative expense. But unfortunately the USIA can seldom recover its dollars at the official rate of exchange and often cannot reconvert foreign currencies even at unfavorable rates. So the revolving fund has gotten smaller and smaller each year, though Congress has from time to time restored some of the depletion.

As an inevitable result of this depletion, the size and effectiveness of the program have declined sharply in recent years. By comparison, contracts issued in 1958 totaled more than $11 million, while those for fiscal 1964 totaled only $4 million. The program for 1965 will be maintained at the $4 million level with operations in only eight countries: Korea, Vietnam, Guinea, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Turkey, Poland, and Yugoslavia. After 1965 even these operations face the rather sure prospect of being phased out. This is because the present Congress, following a decision taken by the Appropriations Committees of both Houses, refused last August to replenish the revolving fund. So it appears that this very useful program will surely die on the vine unless it is somehow revived under strong sponsorship in the administration and in both Houses of Congress.

I suggest that some of you in my audience may want to interest yourself in this matter when new legislation is presented in the next Congress. I can objectively recommend that you do so because I am convinced that, despite its fairly substantial cost (about $25 million net for 15 years of operation), IMG still is the most economical method for accomplishing its purpose effectively.

Closely allied with the shortage of dollar exchange is the question of credit—a matter which is certainly well known to all of you. The booksellers of the world, the thousands of our small accounts, are not heavily capitalized. Their turnover is not rapid, and most of their customers are slow to pay. In recognition of these facts, the American book industry gives terms of foreign credit and takes risks that would be considered lunatic by the steel and automotive industries. Often when our customers are willing to pay currency restrictions or political disaffections make it difficult for them to do so.

Now you may ask: Why does not the American book publisher use the benefits of FCIA coverage of his credit risks? The answer is in most cases that FCIA limitations and requirements all but nullify the potential benefits to our particular kind of export business in the particular countries where we have serious problems. In short, the FCIA boilerplate policy, designed as it was for the industry that has only a few large accounts in each country, does not take into consideration the peculiarities of the book export business. This is not stated as a criticism of FCIA; rather it is merely an explanation of the book publisher's unfortunate position. Ah, FCIA. What frustrations have been caused by your image and your promise to the book exporters of the United States.

Thus cost, currency, and credit have been cited as three major hindrances to the flow of U.S. books to the developing countries of the world. To this can be added a fourth and more universal hindrance—competition. In the friendly sense, our principal international competitors are the British, of course. They not only lead the world in book exports, but they are solidly entrenched in their former colonies and protectorates. Moreover, they have the advantages of lower costs and prices, and they enjoy more assistance with problems of credit. (It is interesting to note here that the British have decided to exempt books from their new across-the-board import tax. Obviously they agree with my thesis on the special importance of books, and I suspect that they also are sensitive to the fact that in this instance of trading their quo is noticeably larger than their quid.)

The book industries of several other European countries are also competitors in varying ways and degrees. For example, some of the larger German and Scandinavian houses now publish goodly numbers of books in English for export markets. But except for the British, there is only one country that gives us serious competition, and that country is the U.S.S.R. And naturally competition from this source cannot accurately be described as friendly.

Now, even in an audience as well informed as mine there may be some surprise when I tell you that in the past 5 years the Soviets printed over 70 million books in English. In the same period they printed over 122 million in the other international languages of Western Europe—German, French, and Spanish. And the annual rate of their production is rising rapidly in all these languages, and especially in English. In the 5-year period their English language production rose from 10 million to over 17 million copies.

All these books were produced in the U.S.S.R., but these were not all by any means. Though the Soviets publish no statistics on extra-national production they boast that every year they cause to be printed abroad more copies of their foreign-language translations than are printed at home. In 1 recent year they claimed that over 100 million such copies were printed outside the U.S.S.R That is, of course, a very large and very round number of books in any language. But knowing something of the way the Soviet publishing system works and something of their statistical methods in this particular field, I do not doubt the validity of this claim.

Confronted for the first time with these astonishing figures, a person usually asks two questions: What kinds of books are they? What on earth do the Soviets do with so many of them?

As to kinds of books, they cover almost every conceivable subject. Over 400 titles were translated into English last year. They range from the most blatant propaganda tracts to very good scientific textbooks; from Communist theoretical works to books for pre-school-age children. One book, "The National Liberation Movement," written by a once-honored Soviet writer named Khrushchev, was published last year in 100,000 copies. A similar title, "Friend and Brother of the People," subtitled "A Collected Volume of Material About the Friendship and Collaboration Between the U.S.S.R. and the Peoples of the East," was also published in 100,000 copies in English for consumption in Asia—which is not so surprising when you come to think of it.

One of the largest categories of Soviet books translated into English is technical books—texts in science, engineering, medicine, economics, management, and other areas of applied science. These are printed in editions that are larger on the average than our printings of similar texts produced for both home and export sales.

Another large category of English editions is belletristic literature—translations of both modern Soviet and classical Russian writers. Of course all these translations are made to reflect their government's propaganda line on domestic and foreign affairs. For example Pushkin's "The Tales of Ivan Belkin" was put out last year in a new English translation which is labeled as "a vivid portrayal of the tragic position of the little man in 19th century Russia." Tolstoy's "Resurrection" was republished as "a bitter criticism of the judicial and penal system of old Russian society." And so on and on, in the same vein of propaganda in books by hundreds of thousands of copies in English, in German, in French, in Spanish.

Now, what kinds of books are these in another sense—how do they stack up against ours in terms of size and quality? In size many of them are not books at all by our standards. The Soviets count as a book any publication in book format of more than four pages, while we follow the UNESCO standard of 49 pages or more. Thus many of their foreign-language publications are no more than leaflets by our standard. But on the other hand many of them are large, solid, well-printed tomes—very good books by any standard. And on a page-for-page basis they are priced at 30 to 35 percent of the prices of our books. Since they are somewhat smaller than our books—and this is so of their technical and professional books especially—they are even cheaper, title for title. Thus an engineering student in India or Indonesia can buy a Soviet text in English at about 20 to 25 percent of the price of one of our texts on the same subject. But even if he had the extra money, this student probably would have no opportunity to exercise a choice. For neither India nor Indonesia has enough hard currency for the import of more than a fraction of the needed number of our technical books. But ironically enough, the Soviets are now in both India and Indonesia with currency programs that have been copied after our IMG program, which is no longer active in either country.

This sad observation brings me to the second question: What do the Soviets do with these vast numbers of foreign-language translations? A part of them they use at home for foreign-language instruction, perhaps 15 to 20 percent. Another part is distributed magnanimously to their captive satellites, to their "Sister Socialist Republics," as they call them. But by far the largest part is pushed out into the developing nations of the world. Here the greatest thrust is, of course, in the politically critical nations of Asia and the Near East, somewhat less to date in those of Africa and Latin America.

They are pushed out in vast quantities through controlled distribution systems, with no regard for cost, currency, credit, or competition. When they cannot be sold, they are given away in one guise or another, and Moscow foots the bill for everything.

One naturally asks how effective this large Soviet effort is in comparison with its size and costs. It is difficult to know, but I do know for sure that it is giving fits to both our Government and our book export industry in many areas of the world. True, most of their propaganda-laden publications are recognized more often than not as being exactly what they are. (Even the translated editions of their scientific and technical books contain a great deal of disguised propaganda.) Still they are widely read by book-hungry people in many, many countries because they can be had cheaply or for nothing.

Moreover, the Soviet books are in themselves powerful propaganda—just the fact that they are there, readily available in the marketplace, in adequate numbers and at low prices. They say to millions of poor readers, "See what a socialistic society can do for the students and workers of the world. Observe that the bloated capitalistic nations must charge three or four times more for their books." Yes, it is clear that the Soviets are using books to win friends as well as influence people.

Further, it is interesting to note that the Soviets make much propaganda hay both at home and abroad of their widely touted preeminence as a publishing and reading, hence educated and informed, nation. For example, they boast that they published last year some 45,000 titles as compared with about 26,000 in the United States, and the same number in Great Britain. Unfortunately this staggering statistical comparison is swallowed whole throughout the world by people who know no better and even by many people who should know better.

I have already indicated one reason why this particular Soviet statistic is greatly exaggerated—the fact that the Soviet count anything over five pages as a book. They also count every reprint as another publication, while most other major publishing nations count only brandnew books and major revisions. Further, they count every translation as a new book, as we also do, but in their case this practice is peculiary inflationary. For example, when Mr. Khrushchev made a short political speech, it would be published in Russian as a "book" of eight pages—and I suppose he did make a speech that short now and then. What is more, that book would appear in translations into all the other 72 official languages and vernaculars of the U.S.S.R., each counted as a new book. You can see how fast this would add up. And you can guess what will now happen with the new Messrs. B. & K. team making twin speeches all over the place. So one has to keep a sharp eye on Soviet statistics in this area, and a sharp eye can see that on a directly comparable basis their annual rate of production is no greater than ours.

In passing it may also be interesting to note that the Soviets also boast that their society produces books for students and the people's workers at prices that are far lower than the capitalistic societies can manage. This is true in absolute terms, but in terms of national economy and purchasing power it is not true. The worker in each country has to work about the same number of minutes to earn enough to buy the average book.

Now I hasten to assure you that in downgrading their claims, I am not downgrading the U.S.S.R. as a nation of book producers and book users. It would be both stupid and dangerous to do so. All I am saying is that they are not so far ahead of the rest of world as they say they are—and really believe they are. Yet they are indeed a great nation of publishers and readers, and they are making massive use of books abroad as forces to promote their kind of national development and their brand of international policy. Here the slope of their effort is sharply upward while ours, sadly enough, is little better than level.

This observation brings us squarely to the central question: Just how well do our international book programs stack up against what the Soviets are doing? On the Federal front and by measurements of expenditures, the comparison is shocking.

First, let us try to measure the cost of the Soviet effort—which can be done only by some very rough calculations and which for comparative purposes should be done only in terms of what our U.S. costs would be for the same effort. Assuming that their foreign production matched their home production and that 20 percent of their home production was used at home, their total production of books for foreign use appears to be about 85 million copies in 1963. Adding up estimated minimum unit costs of production, distribution, and overhead, then deducting an estimate of very low income, we find that the total net cost of their 1963 program was at least the equivalent of $212 million.

In comparison, what is our Government spending annually on international book programs? Here I shall use fiscal 1964 figures because they are more representative of the level of our current effort and are slightly higher than the 1963 figures. Not counting the deficiency cost of the IMG program to the USIA, the Agency spent a total of approximately $8,400,000 on all its other book programs. The IMG deficiency cost was roughly $350,000, so the USIA total was $8,750,000. In AID the stated expenditures on both centrally and regionally funded programs totaled about $6,750,000. Expenditures of other Federal agencies have been fairly small, and one can only guess at the total. An old Washington hand guessed that $1 million would be a liberal amount for all the minor programs in 1964.

Putting together all these totals, we arrive at $16,500,000 as the grand total of U.S. Federal expenditures on international book programs in 1964—a far cry from the $212 million of equivalent expenditure by the U.S.S.R. On the face of it, this is a shocking comparison, but this is not, I hasten to add, the whole story. Here, as in many other matters vis-a-vis the U.S.S.R., a direct government-to-government comparison is not valid. On our side the activity of the private sector—of the book industry, of the foundations, even of private individuals—forms an important part of the total national effort. This private activity goes far to lessen the gap between our national effort and the U.S.S.R. governmental effort, which in their case is the total effort, of course.

For example, there is in the private sector a very effective organization called Franklin Book Programs, Inc. This is a nonprofit organization formed 12 years ago by a group of public-spirited educators, businessmen, and publishers. It has worked to establish and strengthen book publishing capacity in several developing countries and now has offices in 13 cities of Asia, Africa, the Near East, and Latin America. In all these areas Franklin has helped native publishers to bring out more than 42 million copies of over 400 U.S. titles translated into 7 languages. In the past 2 years, with the benefit of a Ford Foundation grant of $1 million, Franklin has further expanded its good work into sub-Sahara Africa and Latin America.

Everywhere Franklin offices are managed by nationals and all the workers are natives. Further, all books published with Franklin cooperation are chosen by local advisers—they are books wanted by local publishers for local consumption, and they are sold through regular commercial channels at going commercial prices. Thus, in its relation to each indigenous book industry Franklin seeks to work in the framework of normal publishing economics, believing that to help build a book industry that will produce needed books in the future is even more important than to supply needed books for the present. The Franklin plan, in fact, is to serve both ends at once. It has been highly successful, I am happy to say, in almost every area where it has operated.

While the USIA has been from the start a large and stanch supporter of this privately operated organization, Franklin now receives most of its financial support from foundations, corporations, individuals, and its own operating income. (Last year the Government's contribution was only 22 percent of the total.) Much of the private support has resulted from the interest of several prominent businessmen who have served with publishers, college presidents, and other public-interest individuals on Franklin's board of directors—such men as Eugene Black, Antonie Knoppers, Clarence Randall, and Juan Trippe, all of whom are now directors. I am bold enough to suggest that Franklin Book Programs, Inc., merits the support of many other like-minded and public-spirited business leaders. (If any of you should be interested, don't call them. Call me and I'll ask them to call you.)

Also, I am bold enough to ask you, in your role as world traders and world travelers, to take an interest in our governmental book programs. I have described the USIA low-priced book project and the IMG program. Better known to you, I am sure, are the USIS libraries and book displays. The former have served nobly around the world as centers of interest and information on American culture and the American way of life. But they have had two regrettable limitations: They are not adequately stocked nor staffed to serve the needs of professional people, and many of them are not conveniently located for student use. Unfortunately they have served all too often as convenient targets for anti-American demonstrators. Let someone start a riot, and the mob usually is directed to the nearest USIS library. This is unfortunate, of course, but it does point up that fact that books are certainly in the front line of battle in the cold war.

Another major USIA activity is its book translation program, which has helped in the production of some 9,000 translated editions. Still another is its sponsorship of courses and instructional materials in teaching English as a second language. I have already emphasized the importance of this effort in promoting English as the lingua franca of the free world.

Since there is not time enough for even summary comment on similar programs in AID, I shall merely remark that in my opinion that agency has had a much more difficult and demanding task in funding and managing its book programs. This is due partly to its basically unwieldy pattern of organization and partly to its much broader mission, which has invited almost limitless demands on its limited resources and capability in this area.

Last month in Washington I heard a seasoned AID officer—a man who had spent several years on the firing line—sigh wearily and say, "We can't hope to fill the book gap abroad with books." I knew exactly what he meant. He was referring, of course, to U.S.-produced books of the kinds needed for educational and economic development. He meant that the gap is already too big and that it is, alas, growing faster in both width and depth than is our ability—or our willingness—to try to fill it.

In this all-but-impossible position, AID is properly giving more attention to helping developing countries to establish their own book publishing industries, so that they may eventually be able to fill their own book gaps. Our American book industry is giving full support to these efforts, for we believe that a free society cannot endure without a free and viable publishing industry. I suggest that you world traders and world travelers can be especially helpful in this kind of effort in behalf of books for education and economic development in the countries where you have some business and would like to have more.

So I beseech you to seize every opportunity to drop into our USIS libraries and see what they are now doing and what more they are trying to do. Visit our binational centers and our technical aid centers and give them your interest and support whenever you can. For it is only with Government and private enterprise working side by side that we can hope ever to get this job done as it needs to be done. And remember that if the job does get done properly, you will be the big gainers in the end.

GENERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AID PROGRAMS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, the last Congress enacted into law an amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act giving the President authority to appoint a committee to review our aid programs in different countries around the world, and this past weekend, President Johnson announced appointment of the General Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance Programs. As one who has spoken often of the need of such an evaluation—and I think it fair to say that this provision was included as a result of the Senate adopting my amendment for this purpose in 1963—I am very pleased that the President has established this Committee and selected 14 of our most outstanding citizens to serve on it.

The members of this Committee have wide experience which can result in strong and effective evaluations, and I think it is of the greatest importance that the Committee will make on-the-spot examinations of our aid programs in specific countries. Mr. David Bell, the very able Administrator of the Agency for International Development, has told me that the Committee will survey our most important country programs to determine the extent to which they are effective in serving U.S. objectives. This kind of country-by-country review, which I have urged in the Congress for several years, is the only way in which we can determine that good programs are maintained and that bad programs are ended.

I know that the President will insist that this Committee go to the very bottom of our aid programs, because these kinds of evaluations cannot only help end waste, but they can insure that the programs of U.S. aid are kept under our own control and direction throughout the world. I am sure other Members of Senate will welcome, as I do, this action by the President, and I hope the work of this Committee will result in the Congress and the country being carefully and fully advised as the future of our foreign aid programs is being determined.

I ask unanimous consent that the membership of the President's General Advisory Committee on Foreign Assistance Programs, headed by Dr. James A. Perkins, the president of Cornell University, and an article by Felix Belair, Jr., which appeared in the New York Times of March 27, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the membership and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GENERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

Dr. James A. Perkins (Chairman), president, Cornell University.

Mr. Dwayne O. Andreas, executive vice president, Farmers Union Grain Terminal Association.

Mr. Eugene R. Black, former president, International Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Mrs. Everett N. Case, chairman, board of trustees, Skidmore College.

Dr. Luther H. Foster, president, Tuskegee Institute.

Mr. John W. Gardner, president, Carnegie Corp.

Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, former president, American Red Cross.

Dr. J. George Harrar, president, Rockefeller Foundation.

Mr. William R. Hewlett, executive vice president, chairman, Hewlett-Packard Co.

Mr. Sol M. Linowitz, chairman of the board, Xerox Corp.

Prof. Edward S. Mason, department of economics, Harvard University.

Mr. George Meany, president, AFL–CIO.

Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, chancellor, University of California at Los Angeles.

Mr. Arthur K. Watson, president, IBM World Trade Corp.

PRESIDENT MEETS AID ADVISERS AND BIDS THEM WEIGH PROGRAM

(By Felix Belair, Jr.)

WASHINGTON, March 26.—President Johnson named a 14-member advisory committee of prominent educators and business executives to make on-the-ground evaluations of U.S. foreign aid programs and to recommend steps to improve them.

He named James A. Perkins, president of Cornell University, as chairman of the permanent group. In the course of an hour-long meeting in the White House Executive Office, he told the nine members present to write down their own directive and to travel anywhere in the world in carrying out their mission.

But it was clear from the President's remarks that what he wanted most from the Panel was greater public understanding, confidence and support of the economic and military assistance programs for which he has asked Congress to authorize $3.4 billion in the fiscal year beginning July 1.

"Yon know, of course, that no Government program has been more controversial or more misunderstood that this one," President Johnson told the group. "Extreme charges have been made against it. Extreme claims have been made for what it can do.

"Yet the fact remains: Over the past two decades the use of a portion of our national resources to help free countries build their strength and their independence has been one of the most important elements of our foreign policy."

It appeared that the advisory group would be concerned mainly if not entirely with the economic aid programs, for which the President has asked an authorization of $2.2 billion.

The President did not mention military aid directly, and his only reference to it was by implication when he mentioned Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara along with Secretary of State Dean Rusk and Foreign Aid Administrator David E. Bell as officials whom he had directed to make available all information bearing on the committee's function.

Mr. Perkins said on leaving the President's office that as far as he was concerned the group would report only to the President and that it would be for him to decide what if any further use was made of its findings and recommendations.

In this respect, the operation of the committee falls far short of the congressional directive inserted in the Foreign Assistance Act 2 years ago.

This provision, sponsored by Senator SHERMAN COOPER, Republican, of Kentucky, contemplated that Congress as well as the public would have the benefit of the country-by-country evaluations.

Members named by the President to the advisory group, in addition to Mr. Perkins, were the following:

Dwayne O. Andreas, executive vice president, Farmers Union Terminal Association; Eugene R. Black, former president of the World Bank; Mrs. Everett N. Case, chairman of the board of trustees, Skidmore College; D. Luther Poster, president, Tuskegee Institute; John W. Gardner, president, Carnegie Corp., and Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, former president, American Red Cross.

Also, Sol Linowitz, chairman of the board of Xerox Corp.; Prof. Edward S. Mason, Department of Economics, Harvard University; Dr. George Harrar, president, Rockefeller Foundation; William R. Hewlett, chairman, Hewlett-Packard Co.; George Meaney, president, AFL–CIO; Dr. Franklin D. Murphy, chancellor, University of California, Los Angeles, and Arthur K. Watson, president, International Business Machines World Trade Corp.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

ALASKA'S CALL FOR PROMPT ACTION TO INSURE VOTING RIGHTS FOR OUR COLORED FELLOW CITIZENS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, recent events in Alabama during the past few weeks and months reek to high heaven. They outrage the conscience of mankind. Lawlessness is not a new phenomenon is our natural life, however deplorable it may be. The President recently sent to Congress an important message designed to call our attention to the extent of crime, and indicating the administration's purpose to seek whatever remedies may be necessary.

But when we find law-enforcement officers actually partaking in and instigating violence, violence resulting in murder, and when their actions appear to be condoned, if not approved, by the Governor of a State, it is not only unprecedented in indecency and loathsomeness, but calls for more drastic action by the only authority which, under the circumstances, can remedy such infamous performances.

We have now seen repeatedly that murder has gone unpunished in that region. The list of these unpunished crimes grows longer. These crimes arise from the long overdue determination of our colored citizens to obtain their constitutional and elementary rights to vote. This determination is firmly supported by President Johnson, who in his moving, historic message to Congress assembled in joint session on March 15, 1965, outlined proposals for legislation which will secure these rights. I am confident that his high purpose and essential objective have the support of the overwhelming majority of Americans, regardless of race, color, or creed.

I am hopeful that the legislation which, under a Senate agreement, will be reported to the Senate by the Committee on the Judiciary not later than April 9 will be promptly approved. The bill, S. 1654, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], had no fewer than 67 cosponsors, among whom are my colleague from Alaska, Senator BOB BARTLETT, and myself.

I have received from Anchorage, Alaska, addressed to Alaska's congressional delegation, an impressive petition, 12 feet long, signed by more than 500 citizens, asking for prompt action to enact the proposed legislation.

The petitioners' list is headed by the name of Mrs. Blanche McSmith, president of the Alaska branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and a former member of the Alaska Legislature. The petition reads as follows:

We the undersigned, mindful of those engaged in the voters' registration struggle in

Alabama and Mississippi, respectfully urge you to press for immediate passage of the legislation outlined by President Johnson to insure equal voting rights to all Americans.

Further, we protest all brutality shown those demonstrating for equal rights, and we hereby register our sympathy and support for these, our fellow Americans, who are daring even death in this struggle to realize the ideals of American democracy.

It gives me great satisfaction that the bill in behalf of elementary justice to our fellow citizens has received such substantial support from the people of Alaska.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the petition with the signatures appended thereto be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks an excellent editorial entitled "There Are Some Things Worth Marching For," dealing with the situation in Selma, Ala., and published in the Anchorage, Alaska, Daily News of March 22, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

Senator ERNEST GRUENING,
Senator E. L. BARTLETT,
Congressman RALPH RIVERS.

GENTLEMEN: We the undersigned, mindful of those engaged in the voters' registration struggle in Alabama and Mississippi, respectfully urge you to press for immediate passage of the legislation outlined by President Johnson to insure equal voting rights to all Americans.

Further, we protest all brutality shown those demonstrating for equal rights, and we hereby register our sympathy and support for these, our fellow Americans, who are daring even death in this struggle to realize the ideals of American democracy.

Mrs. Blanche McSmith, Anchorage; Frank J. O'Neill, Anchorage; George Kehkboner, Ronc E. Bell, Anchorage; Leif Selkregg, Willard Bowman, Clifford J. Groh, Anchorage; Olin McGrath, Anchorage; Auila McGrath, Emma A. Love, William Love, Howard H. Call, Anchorage; Shelly J. Call, Anchorage; M. R. Halsard, Nathaniel Neal.

Violet M. Brooks, Anchorage; Sheila D. Clark, Fort Rich; Jan Clark, Fort Rich; Doris Van Alen, Anchorage; Walter J. Vaudim, Anchorage; Elba Akings, Anchorage; Pete J. Funkhouser, Anchorage; Dorothy N. McCullough, Anchorage; Freddie Walden; R. Sylurtz; Theresa Hayes, Fort Rich; Amy Kollenbach, Anchorage; Nancy Szanam, Anchorage; Cecila Selkregg, Anchorage; Freda Friedman; Joyce Munson; Oscar Cordose; Joe Rychetnik, Anchorage; Mary A. White; Kathryn Munson; Sylvia Smith; Sheila Selkregg, Anchorage; Betty L. Clark, Mountain View, Alaska; Milkie G. Burns, Mountain View; Justine B. Johnson; G. Franklin; Bernice Jordan; Ola Mitchell; Eula Cleveland; Charles Stevens, Anchorage.

A. E. Palich; Brian Kjera; Beatrice Pearson, Anchorage; Michelle Pearson, Anchorage; Mattie Brown, Anchorage; Renee Mary Pearson, Anchorage; Mark Anthony Pearson, Anchorage; Michael Ivan Pearson, Anchorage; Wanda Sue Hawkins; Alfred J. Middleton, Sr., Anchorage; Mae Dell Zackery, Anchorage, Alaska; Mary Lou Harry, Anchorage; Emily Ferguson, Elmendorf Air Force Base; Adelia Teague; Margaret Rasamond; J. H. William, Vallejo, Calif.; Joanne Cain; Loomis Hodges; Mrs. A. Dearman; Jane Manning, Elmendorf, Alaska; Susan Jennings, Mountain View, Alaska; Dallas Green; Bessie M. Youngblood; Leonard D. Johnson, Elmendorf; Marion F. Johnson, Elmendorf; Mrs. Marley L. Cover; Marley L. Cover; Rubie L. Payne, Spenard; Lawrence E. Lee; Wilbert Sdan; Ed Stevens.

Laura Fulls; Beatrice Taylor; Sidney Bixler, Anchorage; Rev. Alexander C. Zabrizkie, Anchorage; Marguerite M. Zabriskie, Anchorage; Glenn Groth, Anchorage; Norma Groth, Anchorage; Holly Huber, Anchorage; Hrohs Selkregg; Robert Lake, Anchorage; Jeannie Lajole, Anchorage; Mary Loften, Anchorage; Margie Fitzpatrick, Anchorage; Anita Gaudette; Sheila D. Clark, Fort Rich; Jan Clark, Fort Rich; Michael F. Barn, San Leandro, Calif.; Charlotte Sewell; Dennis Markel, Spenard, Alaska; Alice Markel, Spenard, Alaska; Daniel M. Grogan, Turnagain, Alaska; Mrs. Nellie Washington; Mr. Victor Daniel, Sr.; Mrs. Don De Woody; Leonard A. Binion; Robert Manson; Hale W. Huber, Anchorage; C. McRae; Harry Varnova; Mary A. Schenker, Anchorage; Sylvia P. Schuler, Anchorage; William E. White;

Jack O. Smith; Mary O. Smith; Margaret M. Marlin; Robert M. Marlin; Oscar Cordozo; Letitia Lamp, Anchorage; Rosanne Carey; Karel Libbly; Johnnie M. Henderson; Colbert; Flo Burton; Anita Baldwin, Elmendorf AFB; Richard A. Baldwin, Elmendorf AFB; Charles E. Strong, Clotilde M. Strong; Georgia Stewart; Spenard; Clonel L. Stewart, Spenard; Otha F. Agee, Anchorage; Myron Q. Agee; Steven Agee; Taya Agee; Edna Ripter; Claine Petrie; Annette Cale; Richard J. Watts, Sr., Nuscka; Mrs. Anna Watts; Mrs. B. S. Mears;

Mrs. Betty Lou (Charles) Stevenson, Anchorage; Mrs. J. Sonnentag, Spenard; Elizabeth E. Jungherr, Anchorage; Lydia Van Alen, Anchorage; Karen Jungherr, Anchorage; Lisa Jungherr, Anchorage; John Jungherr, Anchorage; Willie Owein, Anchorage; Merryl Allen, Anchorage; Frans T. Taylor; Elmendorf; J. W. Menletstive, Anchorage; Louis Bardwell, Anchorage; Mrs. J. W. Van Alstine; John J. O'Shea, Anchorage; Mr. and Mrs. John S. Havelock, Anchorage; Benjamin J. Grant; Mr. and Mrs. Jon H. Garley; Fred Utensley; Lee Campbell; Mrs. T. Ross Paden, Anchorage; Constance Nichel, Donald H. Cook; Robert F. Lynch, Anchorage; Frank H. DeWitt, Anchorage; Harold F. Allwas, Anchorage; Joseph M. Jackson, Anchorage; Harold L. Simpson, Jr., Alaska; Larry F. Mahony, Alaska; Mary A. White, Anchorage; Chester S. Chapman, Anchorage; Mrs. Ritane Broussard; Charles M. Williams, Anchorage; Jane J. Dean;

Mrs. Grant; Mrs. M. Willis; Raymond Watkin; Vance Robinson, Anchorage; Jim Henry; Manuel Lopec; Robert Looney; Delores Timkin; Mrs. Scottie L. Ellis; Mr. Predennis Washington; Andrei D. Walton; Mrs. Sylvia Cowan; Mrs. Violet Swancy; Rev. Kenneth L. Heflin; Fred M. Schuge, Anchorage; Lentes M. Palye, Spenard; James E. Malone; T. Ross Paden; James Reeney; Chas. U. "Chic" Sewell; Horace Macklin; Thomas J. Moore; Sara O'Malley; Ruthie O'Malley; Geff L. Simpson; Larry F. Maberry; Thomas Strickland, Anchorage; James Yokely; Harry Bogan; James J. Lee;

Mrs. A. Broussard, Michael Smith, Al Kurchbaum, Nathaniel Leslie, Jerrie Payne, Furn Cleghorn, Velma Snow, Anchorage; George Allen, Joe Rothstein, Anchorage; E. M. Howard, Harvis Blackwell, Lorenzo Wilson, Anchorage; John Thyson, EAFR; Hewitt L. Peete, Anchorage; Mrs. June Howard, Anchorage; Mrs. Matial McCurry, Anchorage; Mrs. O. M. Palmer, Anchorage; R. L. Wise, EAFB; A. W. Hardrick, Fort Rich; Mrs. Mary Robinson, Anchorage; Mrs. Georgia L. Lewis, Anchorage; Kimberly McSmith, Anchorage; Willie Belle Patterson, Miles Nuetts, Susie C. Bates, Tommie Oursland, Miriam S. Woodring, Jessie Wilson, Jr., Tony Outs, Anchorage; Mrs. Tony Ortiz, Anchorage.

Ralph A. Johnson, Anchorage; Marion L. Johnson, Spenard; Paul E. Alexander, Anchorage; Charles Smith, Anchorage; Vernon Brown, Anchorage; Frank J. O'Neill, Anchorage; Bernice Jordan, Anchorage; Florence C. Brown, Anchorage; Mr. W. C. Duehari, Anchorage; Mrs. Fannie Masduchari, Anchorage; Mary D. Totten, Anchorage; Irene E. Ryan, Anchorage; John E. Ryan, Anchorage; Jerome Murphy Jr., Anchorage; Neill Caffel, Anchorage; Laura O'Malley, Anchorage; Tracy Bushue, Anchorage; Peggy O'Malley, Anchorage; Danna Povich, Anchorage; William Van Alen, Anchorage; Juanita Runestad, Anchorage; Jewel Berger, Anchorage; Grace Ormand, Spenard; Will Sceryard, Anchorage; W. Allen, Anchorage; John Bedford, Anchorage; Katrina Stonorov, Anchorage; Bill Smith, Anchorage; Mary P. Brudie and children, Anchorage;

Eddie Berkley, Anchorage; James Vesterfelt, Anchorage; S. Walker, Cincinnati, Ohio; Robert Patterson, Anchorage; Harry E. Bates, Elmendorf, A.F.B., Alaska; Ann Brown, Anchorage, Alaska; Mattie McGuire, Anchorage, Alaska; Alvin F. Browder, Clinton, Alaska; Phyllis Argo, Sepnard; Janie Yearsley, Rhonda; Hattie Mae Baines; Mrs. Toby Gamble, Anchorage; Toby Gamble, Anchorage; Donald W. Holton, Anchorage; Corinne Jones, Anchorage; S. Armand Michell; David M. Sims, Shiloh Baptist Church; Rodney I. Burton, Shiloh Baptist Church; Margaret Burton, Shiloh Baptist Church; D. S. Osbourne; James T. Smith, Anchorage; Albert T. Martin, Anchorage; Alan Merson, Unitarian Fellowship; Bessie M. Youngblood; Mrs. Betty Lou (Charles) Stevens, Anchorage; Charles Stevens, Anchorage; Shelby J. Fall, Anchorage; Harriett C. Jones, Anchorage; Clarence O. Coleman, Anchorage; Mervis Bowman, Spenard; Annie P. Zimmerman;

Fred Zimmerman, Anchorage; Claude A. Mitchell, U.S.A.F.; Leo A. Josey, Sr.; Rev. B. E. Rodgers; Merlyn M. Runestal, Anchorage; Mary E. Hall, Fairbanks; Richard E. Hall, Fairbanks; Emma Stokes; Pink Stokes; Mrs. E. L. Berkley, Anchorage; Cammie L. Watkins; Jesse L. Jones; Kermit L. Matthews; Bennie B. Burton; E. M. Johnson; John L. Maakestad, Anchorage; Bill M. Lark; Cora Bogan, Anchorage, Alaska; Antoinette Chubb, Anchorage; Alice S. Green, Anchorage; Marie Murray; Lois Simon; Greg Simon; Anne M. Lockhart, Anchorage; Parnell Lockhart, Anchorage; Jessie Lockhart; Marian Lenys; Rufie Payne, Spenard Nathaniel Leale; Janet Walker, Elmendorf; Shirley Cody, Anchorage.

Edward H. Smith, Anchorage; Mrs. Ollie E. Smith, Anchorage, Alaska; Bill Madden, Anchorage; Pat Coleman; Rev. Clarence W. Davis; Ernestine Burdilte, Anchorage; Robert J. Davis, Sr.; Louis G. Howard; Bessie Higgins; Les Campbell; H. C. Wiley; R. C. McFarland; J. Smith; T. E. Jarman, Elmendorf; H. Jackson, Elmendorf; J. L. Clark; E. E. Clark; Linda Lake; Dennis P. P. Lee; L. Anderson; Jean Haine, Anchorage; Katie M. Bates, Anchorage; E. A. Kennedy, Anchorage; Mr. and Mrs. Dan Hawkins; Nellie Harrison, Anchorage; Percy B. Bell, Seattle, Wash.; Eva Duncan, Anchorage; Abraham Hopen; Eddie Hawkins, Anchorage; Ida Mae Patterson, Anchorage; Mike Fresh, Anchorage, Alaska.

Arthur Nukline; Laura O. Joyce, Anchorage; George M. Parkzo, Anchorage; Indz M. Parkko, Anchorage; Roscoe Batte, Anchorage; June Robinette; Laura M. Adams, Metlakatle, Alaska; Wm. Adams, Metlakatla, Alaska; Thomas J. Walkee, Jr.; Mr. and Mrs. Henry Burton; Mr. and Mrs. Herbert Hancock, Anchorage, Alaska; Mr. and Mrs. Merrill Gilmore, Anchorage; Mr. Ella Goldin, Spenard, Alaska; Louis G. Howard, Anchorage; Rev. J. L. Steward, Anchorage; Mr. and Mrs. John C. Kelly, Anchorage; Sjlady S. Funkhouser, Anchorage; Walter L. Wathe; Mrs. Martha Fair; Mrs. David Ruskin, Anchorage; Herbert D. Soll, Anchorage; Patricia Soll, Anchorage; Cecil J. Lewis, Elmendorf; Cleosta L. Lewis, Elmendorf; Jacqueline N. Sewell, Spenard; Norman Burnside, Fort Rise; John A. Murray, Harrison.

Kathleen Owens; Robert E. Massy; Mrs. Robert E. Massy; Mrs. L. H. Johnston, Jr.; L. H. Johnston, Jr.; E. S. Lott, Helen W. Thomas; Nancy H. Rice; Alberta Pennywell; Edna Rifter, Mrs. Carroll Colvin; Mrs. Kittie Cherry; James Stewart; Willie Edward; Carl M. Hendersen; Inez Buxton; David M. Sims; Blanche G. Brown; E. R. McDonnell; Mickey McLaughlin; Thomas J. Moore; R. C. McFarland; Mr. O. F. Agee; Greg Simon; Cora Bogan; Peter Delduke; Mrs. Future M. Walton.

J. O. Rice; James Parker, Jr., Elemendorf AFB; Henry Atkins, Jr., Elemendorf AFB; Ronald L. Moore; Leroy J. Smith, EAFB; M. E. Reese, Anchorage; Roberta Smith, Anchorage; Gregory W. Govan, Anchorage; Herbert J. Turner, EAFB; Russell L. Flood, EAFB; Arlin G. Rose, Anchorage, Alaska; Lillie M. Wright, Anchorage, Alaska.

EXHIBIT 2

THERE ARE SOME THINGS WORTH MARCHING FOR

Why hold a civil rights march in Anchorage? Why not?

Are the people of Anchorage any less concerned with or involved in the current struggle for individual liberty in the United States than Americans elsewhere?

There were no "incidents" during yesterday's march. But in the days preceding it many had questioned the wisdom of holding such a demonstration.

The day is long past due when we should consider what is taking place in Alabama or Mississippi or elsewhere in the United States as local disturbances.

There are more Negroes in Selma, Ala., than whites. Yet the white voters of Selma outnumbered the Negroes more than 90 to 1. The power of the State, enforced through local government, has been used to deny American citizens the right to vote. Two weeks ago, Alabama State troopers beat and tear gassed unarmed men, women, and children. They did so with the full authority of the State behind them.

Is this a local problem? Does a State have the right to strip from some of its people rights and protections guaranteed them by the Constitution of the United States? Certainly not. The Governor of Alabama, in taking the oath of office swore to uphold the U.S. Constitution as well as that of the State of Alabama.

That is why people marched in Alaska yesterday. They wanted to demonstrate their concern. They wanted to express the conscience of America. They wanted to pay tributed to some people who have died so senselessly in a battle that should have been decided within our Nation's boundaries a century ago.

What is taking place today is not an Alabama problem. It is not a southern problem. It is a problem—and concern—of freemen protesting State-imposed injustice.

As the director of the Anchorage Council of Churches so clearly put it yesterday, we march to call attention to Memorial Day and St. Patrick's Day and Fur Rendezvous. Who can seriously object to men marching in favor of human rights?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. GRUENING. I suggest the absense of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM—VIII

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the news from Vietnam continues to be highly disturbing but not unexpected in view of the facts underlying our engagement in that area.

The Washington Post for March 27, 1965, contained a story from Saigon by Jack Foisie which begins as follows:

> The United States is rapidly reaching the day it must ask South Vietnam to surrender some of its sovereignty—at least temporarily.

Little by little the facade surrounding our involvement in South Vietnam crumbles.

First we clung to the fabrication that our military men were in South Vietnam only as "advisers" teaching the South Vietnamese how to fight a jungle war. But little by little that fabrication eroded until it became apparent that our advisers were frontline troops. With the air strikes into North Vietnam by U.S. planes, manned solely by U.S. military personnel, the truth stood out plainly for all to see.

We have repeatedly stated that the United States is militarily involved in South Vietnam only at the specific request of the duly constituted South Vietnamese Government. Mr. Foise's article indicates that we may soon "go it alone" and take over the war in the new role as a "cobelligerent." This certainly means we are coming out into the open.

For 2 months now we have steadily escalated the war in Vietnam, carrying our air strikes into North Vietnam.

As the New York Times put it in its lead editorial entitled "Something More Than Bombs" on March 28, 1965:

> Military pressure alone—which implies a demand for unconditional surrender—is unlikely to win the balance in the Hanoi leadership toward a negotiated settlement. Positive American proposals, which suggest a way out and a viable future for North Vietnam, are the essential complement.

The time has long since passed for rethinking our position in Vietnam. The continued escalation of the war in Vietnam—carrying the war further and further into North Vietnam—can only have disastrous consequences for the world.

Unbiased observers of the scene have repeatedly pointed out that the war in Vietnam can be settled only by political means. It is a political struggle which we have erroneously assumed could be settled by bombs alone.

It is a basic struggle of South Vietnamese against South Vietnamese. One side is aided by men and weapons from the United States. The other side is aided by men and weapons from North Vietnam. But, as has also been repeatedly pointed out, while the Vietcong are aided and advised by Hanoi, that does not necessarily mean that Hanoi can press a button and cause the Vietcong to desist from their fight to gain control over South Vietnam. Even if Hanoi agreed to stop aiding the Vietcong, the latter would still continue to fight even as many of the South Vietnamese whom we are aiding would continue to fight if we withdrew every fighting man and every last piece of U.S. military equipment.

I have long proposed that the war in Vietnam be brought to the conference table. That will inevitably be done—why not now?

Without adequately explaining our ultimate aims, we have escalated the war by air strikes into North Vietnam.

Do we seek the overthrow of the government of Hanoi? Our actions seem to indicate this.

Do we seek to destroy and conquer all of North Vietnam? Our actions seem to indicate this.

We have ignored the proffers of intercession by the Pope, the Secretary General of the United Nations and others—all of whom have counseled against further escalation of this conflict. We should promptly accept one of these offers of assistance to arrange for an immediate cease-fire in all of Vietnam. Once the shooting has ceased—once men are no longer being killed and maimed—we should offer to negotiate the issues and to arrange for supervised elections in Vietnam, offering the people of Vietnam at those elections the various choices open to them as to the type of government they desire.

The image of the United States has become badly tarnished in the past months. We should work as hard as we can to regain our position in the world as a peace-loving, peace-seeking nation. Our present posture as a war-seeking nation is not at all in keeping with the will of our own people. We should change that posture and change it now.

In his article yesterday in the New York Times entitled "The Taylor Mission on Vietnam," Mr. James Reston stated:

> The President's decision to bomb North Vietnam has not achieved its objective. It has not persuaded the Communists to stop their infiltration and military subversion in South Vietnam. It has committed the prestige and power of the United States in a war against the North Vietnamese Communists without success, and the question now is whether to increase the pressure or withdraw.

I ask unanimous consent that the news story by Mr. Jack Foisie in the Washington Post for March 27, 1965, and the editorial entitled "Something More Than Bombs," and the James Reston column entitled "The Taylor Mission on Vietnam" in the New York Times for March 28, 1965, be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 27, 1965]

United States May Ask South Vietnam To Give Up Some Sovereignty

(By Jack Foisie)

Saigon.—The United States is rapidly reaching the day it must ask South Vietnam to surrender some of its sovereignty—at least temporarily.

America's involvement here is becoming too substantial for its representatives to remain junior partners in all aspects of the conduct of the war. As American troop strength continues to grow, and it now includes combat troops such as the Marines at Da Nang Air Base, the need will increase for American command of the operations to which they are committed.

This will involve not only direction of U.S. units but some higher command positions, it was learned. Eventually, the Vietnamese may remain supreme only at the very highest staff levels, where grand strategy is made and where American advice is needed.

Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and others in the Pentagon prefer to say that American units now here are not committed to combat. But, as a matter of fact, the rule of shoot only when shot at has gone out the window.

The 4,000 Marines of the 9th Expeditionary Brigade are guarding the Da Nang Base—but they are doing so in the most aggressive way possible, for that is their order.

In theory their orders come from the Vietnamese joint general staff. But actually they come from Gen. William Westmoreland, America's four-star adviser in Vietnam.

The next step is to formalize this chain of command. It will provide the fast reaction time the marines may need someday.

Many in the Vietnamese hierarchy understand that the United States has become a cobelligerent with the right to demand the command of American troops. In some cases, Americans will command Vietnamese units as well.

The war is about at that stage.

The United States already has assumed virtual command of the air war. It is an open secret that for months American-flown Skyraiders have been as active as Vietnamese Skyraiders in strikes against the Vietcong. In a recent meeting with correspondents, an Air Force spokesman admitted this.

Since American jets went into action against Vietcong targets a few weeks ago, the need for quick decisions and coordination found the Vietnamese unready for sophisticated air operations. So the Americans took over to plan and execute jet bombing strikes.

Occasionally there are ruffled feelings. A Vietnamese unit commander may want a strike to soften up the enemy. The American adviser overrules him, saying the target is not suitable. But generally the new relationship is being worked out very well at the field level. The same accord at the staff level is yet to come.

The American mission here also needs to ask the Vietnamese to surrender sovereignty in another field—censorship of foreign press reports. There is none now. But an American meeting of high government press officers last week considered the adoption of such press censorship.

The immediate block to such a plan is the Vietnamese Government. Its censorship of Vietnamese newspapers is severe and is imposed on political as well as military grounds.

The American involvement, and the predominance of U.S. reporters on the scene, has caused our own military to provide press facilities and assistance.

Can the American command talk the Vietnamese into letting the Americans censor their own press?

If the government of Prime Minister Phan Huy Quat agrees, it represents another crack in the sovereignty which the prideful Vietnamese regard so highly.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 28, 1965]

Something More Than Bombs

The limited American air war against North Vietnam is now entering its eighth week. It is not too soon to ask what it has accomplished—and why it has not accomplished more.

The aim of the continuing air offensive, accompanied by threats of further escalation, was to persuade the North Vietnamese Communists to halt their armed infiltration into South Vietnam. When it was undertaken, one of President Johnson's highest advisers predicted privately that the Communists' will to fight would be weakened in 2 months. So far, there is no indication that he was right; on the contrary, there clearly has been a stiffening of Communist positions, as Secretary Rusk has admitted.

The Soviet Union has announced that arms aid is on its way to North Vietnam. More important, a direct Soviet-American confrontation in southeast Asia through the use of Soviet "volunteers" in North Vietnam has been publicly threatened by the top Soviet leader, Communist Party First Secretary Brezhnev.

The Vietnamese and Chinese Communists have stiffened their positions even more. Hanoi, which a few weeks ago privately indicated agreement to French and United Nations proposals of negotiations—while refusing a cease-fire—now rejects such proposals. Backed by Moscow, the North Vietnamese insist that there can be no talks while American bombing continues. Peiping has taken the most extreme position of all. It insists there can be no negotiations before the "complete, unconditional" withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam. The Vietcong, which shows some signs of independence from Hanoi, has enthusiastically adopted the Peiping line.

Meanwhile, the American bombing—not to mention use of nonlethal gas—has significantly alienated world opinion. Concern about the danger of a major war is widespread. Equally important, there is profound puzzlement about Washington's objectives and tactics.

The trouble is that President Johnson, a master of domestic politics, had until last week seemed to forget that war is politics too, even if pursued by "other means." He launched a military offensive, but neglected his diplomatic offensive.

Now the President has promised American aid for "wider and bolder programs" of regional economic development benefiting all of southeast Asia, including North Vietnam. Despite its vague terms, this promise indicates that Washington is beginning to face up to the need to offer its opponents in southeast Asia a diplomatic, political, and economic exit from the military cul-de-sac in which we as well as they are now entrapped.

Persuasive peace proposals can be a political weapon not only toward world opinion, at a time when Americans are bombing Asians, but in presenting moderate Communists with an alternative they can support within the Communist camp. That camp is divided, not only along national lines but within each national capital. And nowhere are the divisions more critical than in Hanoi.

Neither the Vietcong nor the Chinese Communists can be swayed by the bombing of North Vietnam, which causes them no direct pain. They are pressing to intensify the war. The Vietcong, particularly, has made major military gains in recent months and sees every successive Saigon coup as another nail in the coffin of its enemies. It will not be easy for Hanoi, in these circumstances, to shift course and seek a negotiated settlement, even with Soviet backing.

Military pressure alone—which implies a demand for unconditional surrender—is unlikely to swing the balance in the Hanoi leadership toward a negotiated settlement. Positive American proposals, which suggest a way out and a viable future for North Vietnam, are the essential complement.

President Johnson's statement last week could be the precursor of proposals offering Hanoi, once peace is restored, access to the rice of South Vietnam, trade with the West, an end of the embargo and diplomatic boycott that Washington and Saigon have imposed since 1954, and entry to international development assistance. Area development schemes covering the entire Mekong Valley could be pushed. These, linked with concrete proposals for negotiations and firm offers of a phased American withdrawal from South Vietnam in accordance with the Geneva agreements, could not fail to influence events.

An immediate Communist response might not be forthcoming. But the words would be heard both within the Communist regimes and outside. World opinion would be rallied. That support will be needed, especially if the war in Vietnam is about to enter a new and more virulent phase.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 28, 1965]

Washington: The Taylor Mission on Vietnam

(By James Reston)

Washington, March 27.—In the next few days, President Johnson will go through another critical review of his policy on Vietnam. It is one of those moments in history when the decisions taken by a few men here in Washington could have a profound effect on the history of the next generation.

The immediate question is clear enough. The President's decision to bomb North Vietnam has not achieved its objective. It has not persuaded the Communists to stop their infiltration and military subversion in South Vietnam. It has committed the prestige and power of the United States in a war against the North Vietnamese Communists, without success, and the question now is whether to increase the pressure or withdraw.

THE RECALL OF TAYLOR

Gen. Maxwell Taylor, the U.S. Ambassador in Saigon, and former head of the Joint Chiefs of Staff in Washington, has been brought home to participate in the decision. He will be in consultation here next week on a number of critical questions. Should the

United States begin attacking the transportation system—the bridges and tunnels on the railroads closer and closer to the North Vietnamese capital of Hanoi? Should the U.S. bombers go farther north to destroy the new North Vietnamese industries around Hanoi and Haiphong?

If such raids bring the American bombers into the range of the North Vitnamese Mig fighters, should the United States attack the bases from which these bombers come north of Hanoi and even in South China?

General Taylor's mission to Washington is described officially as "routine," but there is nothing "routine" about the decisions to be made, for they involve the risk of war with China which controls one-quarter of the world's people.

In the face of this difficult situation there has been a lot of talk about the wisdom of negotiating a compromise settlement over Vietnam, but the capitals of the world have little encouraging information.

The British explored the prospect of a Vietnamese settlement with Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei A. Gromyko in London, but he brushed them off. The administration has made many more private inquiries about a negotiated settlement than it cares to admit, but these have been rebuffed.

President Johnson has been in touch with Prime Minister Lester B. Pearson of Canada, who has a representative on the International Control Commission in Vietnam, on the prospect of useful negotiation; but Mr. Pearson has had to report to the President that the North Vietnamese are not interested, at least for the present.

Even the French, who have been leading the campaign for a negotiated settlement in Vietnam, concede privately that they received no encouragement either in Hanoi, or in Peiping.

The issue, therefore, is not whether President Johnson is ready for negotiations. The North Vietnamese Communists have been rejecting a negotiated settlement for months.

As long ago as last July the North Vietnamese official daily newspaper Hoc Tap said:

"The liberation of South Vietnam can be settled only by force. To that end it is necessary to smash the reactionary administrative machinery and the imperialists' mercenary army. This revolution can and should be decided only by revolutionary action, using the force of the masses to defeat the enemy forces; it cannot be settled by treaties and agreements."

COMPLICATED ISSUE

The issue before the President and his associates, including General Taylor, is therefore much more complicated than the national argument about negotiations would make it seem. In fact, the North Vietnamese insist on seeing the struggle as a test of the cold war all over the world.

For example, North Vietnam's Premier Pham Van Dong recently was quoted in a Hanoi newspaper as follows:

"With rudimentary equipment, the population of South Vietnam is victoriously fighting the U.S. imperialists armed with the most modern weapons. This experience of our compatriots in South Vietnam attracts the attention of the world, especially the peoples in South America. Our South Vietnamese citizens are teaching other peoples that they are certainly capable of defeating the U.S. imperialists and can rely on their own strength to liberate themselves."

GENERAL GIAP'S VIEWS

The leader of the North Vietnamese Communist army, General Giap, has been even more specific. He is the man who defeated the French army in Vietnam in the fifties, with a loss of 176,000 French casualties. He recently commented:

"South Vietnam is the model of the national liberation movement of our time * * *. If the special warfare that the U.S. imperialists are testing in South Vietnam is overcome, this means that it can be defeated everywhere in the world."

On this point, incidentally, the Johnson administration tends to agree. They see the war in Vietnam as a critical test of the Communist technique of military subversion, which must be defeated now or faced in many other places in the world, including the Western Hemisphere. This is what the return of General Taylor is all about. The bombing of North Vietnam is not achieving its objectives. The Communist attack on South Vietnam is not subsiding. So new decisions have to be made in the next few days, and they may be among the most important political and military decisions since the last world war.

MEETING OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION OF THE CONGRESS

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the Record, the minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday, March 17, 1965, by the Joint Committee on the Organization of the Congress.

There being no objection, the minutes were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Minutes of the Meeting of the Joint Committee on Organization of the Congress

The organizational meeting of the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress was held at 10 a.m. on March 17, 1965, in the old Supreme Court chambers of the Capitol Building. All members of the committee were present.

Motion was duly made, seconded and unanimously adopted that Senator A. S. Mike Monroney be elected chairman to represent the Senate membership of the joint committee. Motion was duly made, seconded and unanimously adopted that Congressman Ray Madden be elected chairman to represent the Members of the House of Representatives on the joint committee. Senator Monroney and Congressman Madden shall act as cochairmen for purposes of conduct of subsequent committee meetings, committee hearings and the like.

It was called to the attention of the joint committee that under the terms of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2, a chairman must be designated for the committee for purposes of handling disbursements from the Senate contingency fund and other administrative matters. On motion duly made, seconded and unanimously adopted, Senator Monroney was elected chairman of the joint committee for these purposes and Congressman Ray Madden was elected vice chairman to act as cochairman of the committee.

The committee then discussed staffing requirements and the necessity of obtaining office space for the staff and space for subsequent committee hearings and meetings. Senator Clifford Case and Congressman Jack Brooks were appointed a subcommittee to obtain space for these purposes.

It was agreed that the cochairman of the committee would call another committee meeting and recommend an agenda for hearings and committee work after the staff had been selected.

The cochairmen of the committee were authorized to insert the minutes of the organizational meeting in the Congressional Record as notice of the formation of the committee and the appointment of officers as set forth herein.

There being no further business to come before the committee, it was on motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

A. S. Mike Monroney,
Cochairman.
Ray J. Madden,
Cochairman.
John Sparkman,
Acting Secretary.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL THURSDAY AT NOON

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, if there is no further business, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next, at noon.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the previous order, until Thursday, April 1, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 29, 1965:

Postmasters

ALABAMA

Walker E. Morris, Cherokee.
L. D. Stapp, Epes.

ALASKA

Lester Suvlu, Barrow.

ARKANSAS

Dee R. Robbins, Norman.

CALIFORNIA

Patrick F. Chevreaux, Elverta.
Frank J. Noli, Madera.
Gerald J. Stephens, Stirling City.
Mary E. Rogers, Summit City.
Thomas J. McCaffrey, Vallejo.

CONNECTICUT

Wilfred O. Racicot, Dayville.

DELAWARE

Albert B. Carter, Camden-Wyoming.
Alfred R. Smith, Greenwood.

FLORIDA

Robert H. Wetzel, Sr., Babson Park.
Philip A. Crannell, Titusville.

GEORGIA

Jack B. Smith, East Point.
Lillie T. Boswell, Greensboro.
Edward P. Anderson, Grovetown.
Lowell D. Morgan, Springfield.
Ralph C. Martin, Uvalda.

ILLINOIS

Walter J. Malackowski, Calumet City.
Stanley H. Cowan, Dundee.
John B. Reis, Fairbury.
Robert T. Elgin, Fairmount.
Maurine C. Brown, Gardner.
William L. Parker, Genoa.
Harold L. Morrison, Hoopeston.
William F. Knobbs, La Harpe.
George B. Murphy, Odin.
Edward A. Schroeder, Pekin.
Roman J. Mazurowski, Tinley Park.
Glenard E. Miller, Willow Hill.

INDIANA

Harold L. Shepard, La Porte.
Rex L. Tobias, Warren.
Stanley P. Switt, Westville.

IOWA

Evelyn P. Lupkes, Kesley.
Wallace L. Sheehy, Lawler.
Lawrence G. Phillips, Stratford.

KANSAS

Willena J. Martin, Chase.
Raleigh J. May, Haven.
Loyd L. Baughman, Longton.

Paul W. Wade, Mayfield.
Charles H. Seller, Mulvane.
Earl D. Medlen, Rantoul.
Myron L. Van Gundy, Reading.
Robert A. Franken, Troy.

KENTUCKY

Bobbie T. Hunter, Providence.
James P. Edwards, Russellville.
Doris K. Burns, Sanders.

LOUISIANA

Roger Frere, Madisonville.
Henry L. Parham, Mangham.

MARYLAND

Albert A. Phillips, Hampstead.
Margaret A. Stotler, Hancock.
Hilda B. Free, New Market.
Nicholas S. Price, Sparks.
Thomas H. Wallace, Street.
Evelyn F. Lednum, Tilghman.

MASSACHUSETTS

Frank Zalot, Jr., Hadley.
James I. Keyes, Sharon.
Lawrence B. Connelly, Sherborn.
John J. Kelley, Jr., Truro.

MICHIGAN

Robert L. Hunsberger, Bloomingdale.
Kenneth G. Klenitz, Ithaca.
James M. Stubbert, Mason.
Theodore Russ, New Buffalo.
John L. May, Paris.
George E. Smith, Sand Lake.
Gerald A. Farnan, Shepherd.
Donald F. Gillard, Spruce.

MINNESOTA

Hjalmar Hulin, Aitkin.
Michatel C. Rooney, Benson.
Marcellus J. Simonson, Wood Lake.

MISSOURI

Emmet R. Carey, Brookfield.
Wilson S. Tally, Clinton.
Robert F. Reddick, Crystal City.
Janet K. Lewis, Des Arc.
Edward C. Grimes, Gallatin.
Martha F. Mead, Harrisburg.
Thomas G. Williams, Lathrop.
Robert W. Burford, Leeton.
V. Wayne Shroyer, Mercer.
Don O. Baker, Newburg.
William J. Blanton, Norwood.
George T. Lipscomb, Wellsville.

NEBRASKA

Ella E. Jackson, Crookston.
Robert D. Nealon, Wolbach.

NEW JERSEY

Jeanne L. Tamplin, Hewitt.
Warren T. Moulton, Rahway.

NEW YORK

Philip J. Dittmeier, Manorville.
Francis P. Secor, Otego.
Louis P. Kriss, West Islip.

NORTH CAROLINA

Howard Young, Bakersville.
Paul E. Buck, Burnsville.
Ann F. Watts, Germanton.
Anne B. Collins, Laurel Springs.
Elma P. Drew, Magnolia.
Mildred A. Crowder, Peachland.
James W. Jenkins, Pendleton.
Sybil M. Biconish, White Oak.

NORTH DAKOTA

Thelma A. Hovet, Buxton.

OHIO

Miles S. Snyder, Jr., Brookfield.
Thomas R. Armstrong, Mendon.
Thelma M. Schneider, Middle Bass.
C. Thomas Sharp, Pleasant Plain.
Harold W. Kinney, Richmond.

OKLAHOMA

Ruth M. Philips, Gore.
Beatrice H. Jones, Porter.

OREGON

Mabel E. Pounds, Adrian.
Max E. Gardner, Springfield.
Lavonne H. Moe, Sweet Home.
Elizabeth A. Barber, Ukiah.

PENNSYLVANIA

Ernest E. Roberts, Bechtelsville.
Harry P. Snyder, Columbia.
Paul B. Robinson, Concordville.
Phares C. Cramer, Conestoga.
Arthur E. Smith, Crooked Creek.
Abram B. Lauver, Dalmatia.
Raymond G. Mathews, Doylestown.
Charles C. Kerlin, Falls.
Walter E. Lucas, Fleming.
Ruth L. Funk, Glenwillard.
Harvey A. Baddorf, Halifax.
James J. Kelly, Herminie.
Charles L. Gilmore, Lahaska.
William E. Nolan, Lake Ariel.
Herbert A. Hall, Lakewood.
Warren B. Stapleton, Lewisburg.
Edward B. Henning, Mehoopany.
Alice H. Bustin, Milan.
Ernestine C. Buttorff, Millmont.
Althea M. Best, Neffs.
Raymond E. Hausman, New Tripoli.
Norma A. Stoudt, Palm.
Ralph S. Meyer, Pocopson.
George Novak, Sayre.
Robert L. Clink, Snow Shoe.
Lloyd S. French, Starrucca.
Walter H. Hoffman, Strasburg.
Everett A. Holmes, Thompson.
Walter P. Quintin, Thornton.
George P. Kraft, Washington Boro.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Douglas E. McTeer, Early Branch.
Farrell E. Rodgers, New Ellenton.
John W. Rogers, Pelzer.
Vertie Lee Salley, Salley.
Milledge D. Penn, Ward.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Leonard H. Nelson, Miller.

TENNESSEE

Joe F. Corlew, Bruceton.
Avos B. Halsell, Moss.

TEXAS

Sam A. Kelley, Alvarado.
Annie M. Whittley, Barksdale.
Edwin Zajicek, Buckholts.
Robert L. Baldridge, Jr., Clifton.
Walter Kutzer, Comfort.
Evaline W. Bartlett, Glen Flora.
Leonard W. Pierce, Gordon.
Katherine B. Carter, Hawley.
Ramon G. Amaya, San Diego.
O. C. Sewell, Jr., Sulphur Springs.
Sammie O. Smith, Telephone.

VERMONT

Francis H. Eddy, East Wallingford.
James D. O'Brien, Shelburne.

VIRGINIA

Agnes M. Allen, Goshen.
Norman J. Hogge, Hayes.
Charles R. Jordan, Haymarket.
Stuart M. Petke, West Point.

WEST VIRGINIA

Charles G. Robison, Fairview.
Glenn W. Hammer, Weston.
George A. Fahey, Wheeling.

WISCONSIN

Lawrence J. Vandehey, Auburndale.
Vernon A. Plamann, Greenville.

◆

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 29, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used these words of the psalmist: Psalm 37: 23: *The steps of a good man are ordered by the Lord; and he delighteth in His way.*

Eternal God, Who art ever near unto us and never far away, Thou knowest how much we need Thy wisdom and counsel for the solution of the many hard and difficult problems which must be our chief and ceaseless concern.

We acknowledge that Thou hast given us a large and responsible share in determining our own life and the state of society and hast evoked within us a sense of discipline which makes for nobility of character.

Grant that we may feel Thy presence within us, stirring our minds and hearts with lofty visions and mighty hopes; overruling our many blunders and guiding our energies in the ways of the Lord.

We thank Thee for the high and faithful efforts of our President, our Speaker, and the Members of the Congress to help all humanity achieve the life that has eternal worth and meaning.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, March 26, 1965, was read and approved.

WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION ACT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture; which was read and together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D.C., March 25, 1965.

Hon. JOHN. W. MCCORMACK,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture on March 25, 1965, considered the work plans transmitted to you by executive communication and referred to this committee, and unanimously approved each of such plans. The work plans involved are:

New Mexico: Executive communication No. 2536, 88th Congress, Cass Draw watershed.

Connecticut: Executive communication No. 2536, 88th Congress, Farm Brook watershed.

Wisconsin: Executive communication No. 2536, 88th Congress, Plum Creek watershed.

Kansas: Executive communication No. 705, 89th Congress, Rock Creek watershed.

North Dakota: Executive communication No. 705, 89th Congress, Willow Creek-Park River watershed.

Arkansas: Executive communication No. 705, 89th Congress, Big Slough watershed.

Nebraska: Executive communication No. 705, 89th Congress, Rock Creek watershed.

Nebraska: Executive communication No. 705, 89th Congress, Spring Creek watershed.

Utah: Executive communication No. 705, 89th Congress, Minersville watershed.

West Virginia and Pennsylvania: Executive communication No. 641, 88th Congress, Harmon Creek watershed.

Vermont: Executive communication No. 2427, 88th Congress, Jewell Brook watershed.

Sincerely yours,
HAROLD D. COOLEY, *Chairman.*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BARRETT], who I understand has cleared this matter with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL], I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency may be permitted to sit during general debate for the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would the distinguished majority leader limit that to a day-by-day request please.

Mr. ALBERT. I will be glad to.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee may sit while the House is engaged in general debate today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 54]

Abbitt
Andrews, Glenn
Ashbrook
Ayres
Baldwin
Berry
Bolling
Bolton
Bonner
Brock
Buchanan
Cahill
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Cramer
Culver
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Dent
Derwinski
Dickinson
Diggs
Donohue
Downing
Dulski
Edwards, Calif.
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Farnsley
Feighan
Fino
Flood
Ford, Gerald R.
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Gibbons
Grabowski
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Halpern
Hathaway
Hawkins
Holland
Horton
Hull
Hungate
Ichord
Irwin
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Kastenmeier
Keogh
King, Calif.
Kluczynski
Laird
Long, Md.
Love
Macdonald
MacGregor
Mackie
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Miller
Mink
Moore
Moorhead
Morse
Nelsen
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Neill, Mass.
Pepper
Philbin
Powell
Randall
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Ronan
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
St Germain
Saylor
Scheuer
Shipley
Sikes
Springer
Teague, Tex.
Todd
Toll
Vanik
Vivian
Watkins
Wilson, Charles H.
Wydler

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 334 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Irrigation and Reclamation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be permitted to sit this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 245 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 245

Resolved, That, effective from January 3, 1965, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, be authorized to conduct full and complete studies and investigations as required in connection with all matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee, including, but not limited to the following matters:

(1) The classification of all mail, postal rates, fees, and size and weight of all classes of mail.

(2) The administration, management, and operation of the Postal Establishment, mailability of articles and printed matter, generally including, among other things, the mailing of obscene matter and the mailing of unsolicited articles with request for payment or contribution.

(3) Personnel requirements and manpower utilization throughout the Federal civil service.

(4) The purchase, lease, rental, use, and modernization of land, buildings, vehicles, and equipment for the Postal Establishment, including research, development, and engineering programs related thereto.

(5) Compensation and other emoluments of Federal civil officers and employees.

(6) The administration of the civil service retirement, insurance, and health benefits programs.

(7) The United States Civil Service Commission and the Federal civil service generally.

(8) The activities of the Bureau of Census, National Archives, and the collection, reporting, and data processing activities of the Government generally.

The committee shall not undertake any investigation of any subject which is being investigated by any other committee of the House.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session), at such time or times during the present Congress as it deems appropriate, the results of its investigations and studies, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized to do so by the chairman of the committee, or subcommittee, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places, whether the House has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of such books, records, correspondence, memorandums, papers, and documents as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman of the committee or any subcommittee or any member of the committee or subcommittee designated by such chairman and may be served by any person designated by such chairman, or member.

Funds authorized are for expenses incurred in the committee's activities within the United States; and in compliance with section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provision of law, local currencies owned by the United States in foreign countries shall be made available to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for expenses of its members or other Members or employees traveling abroad.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, line 5, after the word "places" insert the words "within the United States".

On page 3, line 11, delete the words "or any subcommittee".

On page 3, line 12, delete the words "or subcommittee".

On page 3, line 19, after the word "shall" insert the word "not".

On page 3, line 11, after the word "chairman" insert "or, in his absence, the vice chairman".

On page 3, line 13, after the word "chairman" insert "or, in his absence, the vice chairman".

On page 3, line 14, after the word "chairman" insert ", or vice chairman,".

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN] cares to yield time on his side at this time, he may do so inasmuch as we have only one speaker on this side.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS].

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the House the passing of our former colleague, Noah Mason, of Illinois, and to let you know that on tomorrow we hope to make some remarks on the life and services of this great and outstanding Member of the Congress for so many years.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, this resolution, House Resolution 245, provides investigative and travel authorizations for the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

The original resolution was reported on February 2, 1965, House Resolution 104. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MURRAY] asked that it not be brought up.

On February 25, 1965, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] submitted House Resolution 245. This resolution provided for unrestricted foreign travel. It also permitted the chairman of any subcommittee to issue subpenas. In hearings, the Committee on Rules did not want to give this power, not because of any feelings toward the committee but in order to be consistent.

The policy of the Rules Committee is that only specified committees may have unrestricted foreign travel. The committee policy always has been to grant requests for such travel to any committee for any specific necessary purpose.

It is also the Rules Committee policy to limit the power to grant subpenas. The committee has felt the power must be limited to the chairman generally or someone specifically named by him. As the Post Office and Civil Service Committee has named a vice chairman, the Rules Committee has decided, in the absence of the chairman, he may issue subpenas.

It should be noted that both of these issues came up in other resolutions this year. They have been handled in the same general manner. These limitations upon House committees are felt by the Committee on Rules to be consistent with an economically and a well run House. All committees are treated in exactly the same manner.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution. I have nothing whatsoever against it. But I would like just a little information from either the gentleman on the Committee on Rules or from some member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Mr. Speaker, there was recently established by joint action of both the House and Senate a nonpartisan Joint Committee for the Reorganization of the Congress, and specifically set out therein was instruction to look into many matters relating to the legislative branch of our Government and other branches, executive and judicial, many of which would obviously overlap the list of eight points listed on pages 1 and 2 of House Resolution 245.

I believe this is good. Certainly, this is within the area of jurisdiction of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

It is well to point out at this time, perhaps, that the Committee on the Reorganization of the Congress can glean valuable information from the developments of this committee and subcommittees thereof, and vice versa. In certain areas, as to which the Committee on the Reorganization of the Congress will be in session, in the old Supreme Court chambers, with its staff, directly beneath here in the U.S. Capitol Building, undoubtedly they will turn up material which might be of value to this committee.

Though I cannot speak for the chairman or the cochairman of that committee, as we pass this resolution today, I should like to point out the need for and ask that there be a spirit of understanding and cooperation in these areas, particularly as they relate to functions where the jurisdiction of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee is not so great as the special committee on the reorganization of Congress might well be of additive value thereto.

Mr. Speaker, I have a second question, insofar as lines 7 and 9 of page 1 of House Resolution 245 are concerned. I wonder if this would encompass an inquiry by the very respected Committee on Post Office and Civil Service into what is happening to our carriers? Specifically, I am thinking of the railway post offices on the private railways of the country at this particular time.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that railways are asking to merge, and specifically they are asking public service commissions and the Interstate Commerce Commission to remove passenger trains, largely predicated on the fact that the railway post offices are being pulled out, apparently by executive fiat or announcement in the Federal Register.

I wonder if it is the intent of the respected Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to look into this area and other areas, such as the discontinuing of postal service of certain classes of mail on Tuesdays and Thursdays in various regional areas.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] to answer.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I believe I can answer the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

This problem does come under the jurisdiction of the committee, and particularly the subcommittee on postal operations, as well as related postal subcommittees. We will be having hearings, after Easter recess, as to the postal service generally.

I am sure that will include the railway postal office cars. Many railway post office cars, under the last three Postmasters General, have been discontinued, and this has resulted in the discontinuance of many thousands of trains thoughout the country, because, on many branch lines, the trains were losing money but the fact that there was a railway post office car on the train gave them a small margin of profit. When the Post Office Department began removing the railway post office cars, beginning with Postmaster General Summerfield, and continuing the practice since then by other Postmasters General this has caused many of the lines to lose money and they have had to present petitions for discontinuance of service. It is a serious problem.

I serve on three of the subcommittees which have to do with the Postal Department, and I assure the gentleman we are going into this subject.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's answer. I hope we can come up with a solution as to "which comes first, the hen or the egg," so far as the railway post offices are concerned; because certain passenger trains are being withdrawn because and after the fact that the railway post offices are being withdrawn.

This is vital not only to the "feeder lines" but also to some main lines or larger railway systems, because it is indisolubly tied up with the question of whether there are to be some mergers of the great systems in the United States, in my opinion.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is a good question; which comes first, the chicken or the egg?

Postmaster General Summerfield maintained that the railroads were discontinuing these trains and therefore he had no choice other than to take off the railway post office cars. I have evidence to the contrary. Right now, in the State of Nebraska, running through the State and into Wyoming—Congressmen and Senators, both Democrats and Republicans, are concerned about this—railway post office cars are being taken off two or three different lines, which is going to result in crippling the regular rail transportation system in our State. This is true throughout the country.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa such time as he may desire.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, for 16 years I have been a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Through those 16 years the committee operated under the rules of the House. This year the committee adopted a sweeping set of new rules. Among others, it established for the first time a vice chairman to take over in the absence of, or perhaps in the presence of, the chairman. I do not know. The rules have not been applied with full force and effect as yet. At any rate, in the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service we have a long list of new rules despite the fact that for 16 years it has functioned quite well. I note in the pending resolution this language:

> Subpenas may be issued over the signature of the chairman or, in his absence, the vice chairman of the committee.

My question is this: What constitutes the absence of the chairman? Is it absence from the city of Washington? Is it absence from the committee itself? What constitutes the absence of the chairman?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I have to disagree with my distinguished colleague from Iowa. This set of rules and new procedures of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service has really been a Godsend to the operation of that committee. It will make it more efficient and proficient and bring this committee up to the standards of the other committees. So far as the gentleman's question is concerned, if the chairman should be out of the city or should be hospitalized, I should think then that would be in the absence of the chairman. I do not think that is any great problem to work out.

Mr. GROSS. I know it is the hope of the gentleman from Nebraska that there will be what he suggests as an improvement in the committee. That is his hope and his assumption. However, the committee has not really functioned under the new rules and there is no way by which he may know what the change means to the committee. I still have no answer to the question as to whether the vice chairman takes over and under what circumstances he takes over.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. If the gentleman will yield further, it is true, as I said, that the chairman might be out of town or he might be ill. We are just beginning with this new set of rules. I do not foresee any big problem in that regard, and if there is a need for subpenas and the chairman is not available to do it, the vice chairman has that authority. I would say further that the gentleman is in error when he says we have not had a chance to function under these new rules, because we have. We have had committee meetings already where we are now taking up actual legislation in our subcommittees which we were not allowed to do before. It has been working very well.

Mr. GROSS. I would point out to the gentleman that meetings of the subcommittees were being held before the new rules were adopted. There was a lot of backing and filling on their adoption, as the gentleman will recall. As yet I have no answer to the question as to whether, if the chairman should absent himself from the committee for 15 minutes in order to answer the telephone, whether the vice chairman could take over and exercise all the powers of the chairman as he could do under the new rules of the committee. If that constitutes absence, I would like to know it.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is something we can face in the committee and not have to take the time of the House to try to solve that detail.

Mr. GROSS. From what I have seen of the rules and the taking away of authority that most chairmen of House committees have, I would assume something like that could very well happen.

I thank the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN] for yielding.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was one of the usual resolutions which the House gives to the committees at the beginning of the Congress to make investigations, and so forth. There was some little difficulty about this and some controversy about it and finally the matter was ironed out. In the meantime the Committee on Rules had reported a resolution, House Resolution 104, which is now on the calendar and I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that that resolution be laid upon the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONSENTING TO COMPACT ON TAXATION ON MOTOR FUELS

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 306 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 306

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 824) granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit. After the passage of H.R. 824, it shall be in order in the House to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 307 and consider the same.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 306 provides for consideration of H.R. 824, a bill granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate, with the further provision that, after the passage of H.R. 824, it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table S. 307 and consider the same.

The purpose of H.R. 824 is to grant the consent of Congress, as contemplated by article I, section 10, of the Constitution of the United States, to the action of specified States in entering into an interstate compact, and to direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into the compact.

Title I of the bill involves a compact recently entered into by Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, relating to State taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses.

Under this compact, an owner or operator of interstate buses would pay a motor fuel tax to a party State in which his buses operated, in an amount determined by applying that State's fuel tax rate to the number of gallons consumed in the firm's bus operations within the State. The amount of fuel consumed would be determined by dividing the number of miles traveled by the firm's buses within that State by the average mileage per gallon obtained by all of the firm's operations, both within and outside of the State. The fuel tax paid within the party State by the bus firm would be adjusted by appropriate additional payments or refunds to conform to the actual tax due under the proposed tax formula.

Title II of the bill involves an agreement recently entered into by Maine, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and New York, relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity.

Under this compact, parties agree to prorate bus registration fees so that any owner of a fleet of buses may register the buses of that fleet in any compacting State by paying to that State total registration fees in an amount equal to that obtained by applying the proportion of in-State fleet miles divided by total fleet miles, to the total fees that would otherwise be required for regular registration of all the vehicles in the compacting State.

Both titles of the bill grant the consent of Congress to the action enumerated and direct the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia to enter into the compacts.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 306.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCENTIVE PAY FOR SUBMARINE DUTY

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 308 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 308

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5571) to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 308 provides for consideration of H.R. 5571, a bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 5571 is to clarify the entitlement of certain personnel assigned duties on the staffs of submarine operational commanders to continuous incentive pay for submarine duty.

The Department of the Navy has paid certain members assigned duties on staffs of submarine operational commanders continuous incentive pay for submarine duties under the authority contained in section 301 of title 37, United States Code.

The award of this incentive pay to these staff personnel has been made since 1944. However, the Comptroller General, by a decision dated October 30, 1964, has ruled that the language of the present statute does not permit the continued payment of this incentive pay to such staff personnel unless a majority of their assigned duties are actually performed on board a submarine.

The Comptroller General further stated that exceptions would be made to these payments after March 1, 1965. Subsequently, the Departments of Defense and Navy indicated their desire to request clarifying legislation so as to permit the continuation of this incentive payment of these staff personnel.

Accordingly, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee requested the Comptroller General to further extend the deadline date so as to permit the Congress an adequate opportunity to act on the Departments' request for clarifying legislation. The Comptroller General, in reply, advised that he would extend the cutoff date until June 1, 1965, and indicated that, in the event legislation had not been enacted by that time, he did not believe there was justification for further extension of time.

Therefore, the Congress must act affirmatively on the legislation not later than June 1, or further entitlement to this pay will be lost by these personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 308.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

House Resolution 308, has to do with incentive pay for work on submarines.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the bill or to this rule under consideration now.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 307, INCENTIVE PAY

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 307 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

H. Res. 307

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3044) to authorize payment of incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Smith], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 307 provides an open rule with 1 hour of debate on H.R. 3044, a bill to authorize payment of incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier.

The rate of incentive pay for the hazardous duty performed by these personnel as proposed by H.R. 3044 would be $110 for officers and $55 for enlisted personnel per month. It would be paid only for those months during which an individual was actually subjected to the stated hazard, and would not be given to personnel already receiving incentive pay for other hazards.

These personnel, some of whom are members of the carrier's crew and some of whom are attached to aircraft squadrons operating from the carrier, include the flight deck catapult and arresting gear crews, plane directors and handlers, phone talkers, and elevator operators. Also included are those members of the crash crew, fueling crew, ordnance crew, hospital corpsmen, squadron maintenance and ordnance personnel, and plane captains whose duties require their presence on the flight deck during flight operations.

Flight deck personnel perform their duties during flight operations around, under, and in close proximity to moving aircraft. They are exposed to hazards from jet intake, jet blasts, propeller wash, whirling propellers, flying objects detached from aircraft in faulty landings, aircraft crashes and fires, and accidents caused by breakage or faulty operation of components of the catapult or arresting gear. The hazards are increased by the conditions under which flight deck personnel must perform their duties.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 307.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I think it is well that we have a little explanation of this particular matter.

I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that as the resolution states, it calls for 1 hour of general debate under an open rule or the consideration of H.R. 3044.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill which I think is quite important, inasmuch as the purpose of this legislation is to authorize incentive pay for personnel who perform these hazardous duties on the flight decks of aircraft carriers. It ranges from about $110 a month to officers and $55 a month for enlisted men.

Mr. Speaker, let us hope that through this means more of the officers and enlisted men will continue to reenlist, particularly the enlisted men, and carry on these important duties.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that this will cost approximately $5,326,000 per year. It is tied down, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, so that they will receive this extra remuneration only if they actually do perform hazardous work and this represents an effort to pay these men additional sums of money.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no objection to the rule and I know of no objection to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, to those who might be interested I am provoked to make some remarks that I would prefer to refrain from making. But every time this House has met here within the past few months someone arises on the floor and makes a vicious attack upon either the State of Mississippi or the State of Alabama or some other State which is blessed with God's bountiful sunshine lying immediately to the south of this particular area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this morning what provoked me again, I repeat, into making these remarks is that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Yates] rose and made another attack upon the Ku Klux Klan.

Now, let me say before anyone forms any conclusions that I do not arise in behalf or in defense of the Ku Klux Klan, nor do I rise to castigate or denounce the NAACP, CORE, SNIC, or any other organization. Least of all, Mr. Speaker, do I rise to condemn the Negro race. However, Mr. Speaker, I must be honest as one who has lived in the South all of my life, to confess that I entertain serious doubts whether those who lead these organizations are rendering any real contribution to the objectives which they profess to attain.

What disturbs me deeply is that there are so many, apparently, who for reasons of their own, and that is up to their conscience, would revive among our people the fratricidal strife of a century ago. I had thought, and I hope, and I pray, that we can all have one Union, that we can all live under the same flag, that we can all continue to be devoted to the greatest document ever conceived by the minds of men, the great Magna Carta of American liberty, the Constitution of the United States.

Demands are made now for an investigation of the Klan. All right, let us investigate the Klan. I have no objection. But if we are going into that, why stop with the Klan? Why not investigate some of these other organizations, some of whom are responsible for the unfortunate strife that has arisen in the country, and again unfortunately is growing daily.

Why, there is an organization that flourishes in my friend's city of Chicago, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Yates], known as the Black Muslims. Of all the accusations that have ever been made against the Klan, and again, I hold no brief for it, and let no one impute that to me, but I did not hear the gentleman from Illinois, nor do I recall having heard anybody else, rise on the floor of this House and ask for an investigation of the Black Muslims, which, if I understand correctly from what I have read in the press, teaches hatred of the white man. Surely it is not necessary to remind my colleagues who honor me here today with their attention that the bombings, the riots, and the murder that occurred recently in the great city of New York were not instigated or performed by people of the white race.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of this House for more than 32 years I state upon my honor and integrity as a Member of this body that there may be, and undoubtedly are members of the Klan in my State, but I could not name you one if my neck were on the block in order to save it. In fact, I seriously doubt whether there are as many Klansmen in my State as there are members of the Black Muslim organization in the city of Chicago.

Moreover, I doubt with equal sincerity if there are as many members of the Klan in the country as a whole as there are members of this race-hating organization.

Mr. Speaker, there is another organization in this country that has been sending its representatives and beguiling many innocent people of undoubtedly good will into my State of Mississippi and other States of the South for the past year or more known as SNIC. This organization is headed by one James Farmer, who has repeatedly been named by congressional investigating committees for his subversive activities and cited because of his communistic associations. Another leader in this organization is a white man by the name of William Higgs described by Messrs. Rowland Evans and Robert Novak in an article in yesterday's Washington Post as being "William Higgs, a leftist radical white lawyer from Mississippi who is an expert at the art of disruption." And I might add that this same William Higgs was convicted of a most nauseating crime and ran out of the State of Mississippi.

This organization—SNIC—has been most active in Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi in the so-called voter drive registration. It is undoubtedly communistic controlled.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the Congress is going into the business of investigating organizations let it not stop with the Klan. Personally I would have no objection, in fact I would welcome an investigation of both the Klan, SNIC, Black Muslims, and any other that the Congress so desired. In fact, I would gladly join with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] in a mutually sincere effort of this sort.

Who revived all of this Klan business anyway? It is these people from these other States like the people from my good friend's State of Illinois. I am certainly not blaming the people of Illinois or of Chicago. I am not being critical of them because an organization of that nature is permitted to grow; I was going to use the word "flourish," but I do not think that would be quite accurate. I know that the good people of Illinois, New York, and America are against that kind of business. They do not want to see one race arrayed against the other any more than you and I do.

But again it is a question of which is fish and which is fowl. If a person is killed—a Negro or an outstater is killed in either Alabama or one of the other Southern States—it makes glaring headlines. The people are shocked that such a thing happens as are all of the good people in the State of Alabama shocked. Why one of the most unfortunate tragedies that has occurred recently was the killing—the murder if you please—of this good woman from Detroit. I assume she was a good woman. I have every reason to assume she was a good woman. She should never have been shot down in cold blood. Whoever perpetrated that, whether they belong to the Ku Klux Klan or the NAACP or the White Citizens Council, or any other group, or whether they do not belong to any group except the group of the human race, they should be prosecuted to the full extent of the law and pay the fullest penalty of the law.

There was a minister of the gospel—some people may doubt whether he was best serving the cause that he claimed to be serving when he went into the State of Alabama and was brutally beaten to death. I am not judging here today on this floor whether he was justified in going there or not. But he was slain. He was beaten to death. Of course, whoever perpetrated that ought to pay the full penalty of the law.

That has been played up in the press—and appropriately so, we will say. But on Saturday night four Negroes down in my congressional district riding in an automobile were attempted to be stopped by a young constable, a young white man 29 years of age, with a young wife and son 9 years of age. This man had done no wrong, if we can believe the meager press report. I doubt if you could find it reported in the local papers. He attempted to stop these people.

This was no question of civil rights involved here. He was a young officer performing his duty.

With the exception of the testimony of two young Negro children, 9 and 13, the facts might never have been known. They might have died there on the sod of Forrest County, Miss.

There will not be any hysteria all over the country about this young constable being killed. Oh, no; there will be no demand for investigations and legislation.

There will be no national effort made to raise funds for this young widow and her infant son.

But I do want to say that one of my colleagues—I must give him whatever credit there is for it—has suggested to me this morning that a fund should be started and raised for the widow and small child this young man left. My friend who made the suggestion is none other than the distinguished, patriotic Member of this House, the able Representative from Louisiana [Mr. PASSMAN], who says that he will start the fundraising by making his own contribution, and that he will act as treasurer for the receipt of any other funds which anyone else might want to make available to help this young widow and her young son as they travel alone through the long dark avenues of life.

Of course, I shall be very happy to make my own contribution, within my means, because it so happens that I knew this young man, this young constable, and I know something of his economic circumstances as well as the fact that he was a fine, splendid, outstanding young man.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] made some reference here today, in a 1-minute speech, to the interview of the Nobel Peace Prize winner, Doctor King, on yesterday, and paid his respects to the objectives of the great disciple of peace.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I, too, heard this interview on "Meet the Press." I am sure that hundreds of thousands of other people who witnessed this remarkable performance were amazed at some of the statements made by the great peace prize winner. Possibly the most amazing part of the performance was the statement of the nonviolence leader to the effect that good laws should be obeyed and bad laws should be ignored. In other words, he, Doctor King, decided which laws should be obeyed and which disobeyed. This coming from undoubtedly the foremost leader of the so-called Negro movement is not only amazing but it is dangerous doctrine.

In another phase of the interview this great friend and leader of the Negro race would boycott the whole industrial fabric of the State of Alabama. Under this approach the wheels of industry would stop, Federal funds would be withdrawn and the whole economy of the State of Alabama stifled.

I ask you, my colleagues, who would suffer most from such a procedure? Would it be the white citizens or the Negro people of Alabama? The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GATHINGS] very aptly pointed out a few moments ago the answer to this question. He pled with the advocate of this policy that the poor Negro school children be permitted to continue to receive their free lunches.

What are we trying to do here? Are we trying to build up another barrier that will destroy the good relations between the sections of the country and between the races? I stood in the well of this House when the first civil rights bill was under consideration. You will find in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD where I pointed out then that one of the chief results of this would be the breaking down of the good relations and the contact between the races. That is happening today, and it is so sad, it is so regrettable, it is so unfortunate.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my friend from Louisiana.

Mr. PASSMAN. I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] for yielding to me so that I may assure him of my full cooperation in helping to create a fund for the widow and young son of a Mississippi law enforcement officer, Frederick L. Humphrey, who was murdered at Hattiesburg, Miss., on Friday night last, in the performance of his duty.

It would appear that this is another case of disrespect for law enforcement officials which, apparently, is running rampant throughout the Nation. The 29-year-old officer was slain by a 20-year-old Negro while carrying out his duty as a peace officer.

I ask the Members of this House and the American people to join with me in extending heartfelt sympathy and financial aid to the unfortunate widow and young son in the true American spirit. I am sure the press of America will give this appeal the same coverage it has given to similar appeals, remembering that this young widow and child are equally as deserving of our prayers and financial assistance as the families of other slain public officials or, for that matter, the families of other individuals who are victims of similar incidents. I have no doubt but that the press will give full coverage to this appeal.

Certainly I shall contribute to this fund, as I have to others, and it is a privilege for me to act as treasurer of the fund. I shall see that Mrs. Frederick L. Humphrey, of Hattiesburg, Miss., is furnished with the name and address of each contributor as well as the amount of each contribution. I shall insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names of all donors with the exception, of course, of those who wish to contribute anonymously. I shall not list the amounts of the contributions individually in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but this information will be available at the depository, to be named in a subsequent insertion in the RECORD.

Please mail your contribution to OTTO E. PASSMAN, Member of Congress, 2108 Rayburn Office Building, Washington, D.C., or to WILLIAM M. COLMER, Member of Congress, 2307 Rayburn Office Building, Washington, D.C. Make checks payable to the Mrs. Frederick Humphrey Fund.

I wish to thank the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] for bringing this matter to the attention of the House. I shall also thank the American press in advance for any coverage they may give to this meritorious appeal.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLMER. Finally, Mr. Speaker, I regret the necessity for having to take the time of the House to make this statement. I have refrained time after time from replying to these inflammatory attacks made upon the people of my section of our great common country. Whatever the objectives of these provocative speeches may be and how well intentioned they may be motivated, the truth is inescapable. The wedge of dissension between the races is being driven deeper and deeper to the irreparable injury of both races in our great common country.

CONSENTING TO COMPACT ON TAXATION OF MOTOR FUELS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 824) granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 824, with Mr. UDALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill gives the consent of Congress—as contemplated by article I, section 10 of the Constitution—to two interstate compacts, and also directs the District of Columbia to enter into each compact. The bill has two titles. Title I deals with taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses; title II deals with interstate bus registration.

The States involved are:

Title I motor fuels: Maine, Maryland, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and Massachusetts.

Title II bus registration: Maine, Maryland, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and New York.

The compact involved in title I, which relates to State taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses, would prorate motor fuel taxation on the basis of miles operated within each compacting State. The tax would be based on the number of gallons used in the State. The number of gallons used would be obtained by dividing the number of miles operated within the State by the average mileage per gallon achieved by the bus in all operations.

The compact involved in title II which relates to bus registration proration and reciprocity, would prorate State registration fees on the basis of miles operated within each compacting State. The registration fee would be computed on the basis of the proportion of miles traveled within the State to the total annual miles traveled by the bus.

Both compacts would thus base taxation on the actual use of a State's highways.

In accordance with committee policy and with a recommendation of the Department of Justice with respect to an earlier bill, consent is limited to those States that have already entered the respective compacts. The bill also contains the usual reservation of the right of Congress to alter, amend, or repeal the consent granted.

The Department of Commerce and the Interstate Commerce Commission approve the legislation. The Department of Justice has no objection when consent is limited, as in H.R. 824, to the States which have actually elected to join the compacts.

The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia recognize and support the objects of the legislation, but object to being directed to join the compacts. They indicate that enactment will result in loss to the District of $68,000 per annum in registration fees and about $250,000 in fuel tax revenue.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I associate myself fully with the very concise and complete explanation that has been given of this bill by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILLIS].

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Louisiana has fully explained the nature of the bill.

The principle that underlies the compact to which the Congress is asked to give approval is an equitable principle and it is one which is in force in many areas of our economy. It is applied in this case to bus transportation.

I am happy to say, Mr. Chairman, that there was unanimous support for this bill in the committee on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I urge that the House approve this bill.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 824

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

SECTION 101. The consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, and to the District of Columbia to enter into a compact on taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses. But before any other State, any Province of Canada, or any State or territory or the Federal District of Mexico shall be made a party to such compact, the further consent of Congress shall first be obtained. Such compact shall be in substantially the following form:

"COMPACT ON TAXATION OF MOTOR FUELS CONSUMED BY INTERSTATE BUSES

"Article I—Purposes

"The purposes of this agreement are to—

"(a) avoid multiple taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to assure each State of its fair share of motor fuel taxes;

"(b) establish and facilitate the administration of a criterion of motor fuel taxation for interstate buses which is reasonably related to the use of highway and related facilities and services in each of the party States; and

"(c) encourage the availability of a maximum number of buses for intrastate service by removing motor fuel taxation as a deterrent in the routing of interstate buses.

"Article II—Definitions

"(a) State: State shall include the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the territories of the United States, the Provinces of Canada, and the States, Territories, and Federal District of Mexico.

"(b) Contracting State: Contracting State shall mean a State which is a party to this agreement.

"(c) Administrator: Administrator shall mean the official or agency of a State administering the motor fuel taxes involved.

"(d) Person: Person shall include any individual, firm, copartnership, joint venture, association, corporation, estate, trust, business trust, receiver, syndicate, or any other group or combination acting as a unit.

"(e) Bus: Bus shall mean any motor vehicle of a bus type engaged in the interstate transportation of passengers and subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce

Commission or any agency successor thereto, or one or more State regulatory agencies concerned with the regulation of passenger transport.

"(f) Gallon: Gallon shall mean the liquid measure containing 231 cubic inches.

"Article III—Governing principle

"For purposes of this compact, the primary principle for the imposition of motor fuel taxes shall be consumption of such fuel within the State. Motor fuel consumed by buses shall be taxed on the existing basis, as it may be from time to time, and under the procedures for collection of such taxes by each party State, except that to the extent that this compact makes provision therefor, or for any matter connected therewith, such provision shall govern.

"Article IV—How fuel consumed to be ascertained

"The amount of fuel used in the operation of any bus within this State shall be conclusively presumed to be the number of miles operated by such bus within the State divided by the average mileage per gallon obtained by the bus during the tax period in all operations, whether within or without the party State. Any owner or operator of two or more buses shall calculate average mileage within the meaning of this article by computing single average figures covering all buses owned or operated by him.

"Article V—Imposition of tax

"Every owner or operator of buses shall pay to the party State taxes equivalent to the amount of tax per gallon multiplied by the number of gallons used in its operations in the party State.

"Article VI—Reports

"On or before the last business day of the month following the month being reported upon, each bus owner or operator subject to the payment of fuel taxes pursuant to this compact shall make such reports of its operations as the State administrator of motor fuel taxes may require and shall furnish the State administrator in each other party State wherein his buses operate a copy of such report.

"Article VII—Credit for payment of fuel taxes

"Each bus owner or operator shall be entitled to a credit equivalent to the amount of tax per gallon on all motor fuel purchased by such operator within the party State for use in operations either within or without the party State, and upon which the motor fuel tax imposed by the laws of such party State has been paid.

"Article VIII—Additional tax or refund

"If the bus owner or operator's monthly report shows a debit balance after taking credit pursuant to article VII, a remittance in such net amount due shall be made with the report. If the report shows a credit balance, after taking credit as herein provided, a refund in such net amount as has been overpaid shall be made by the party State to such owner or operator.

"Article IX—Entry into force and withdrawal

"This compact shall enter into force when enacted into law by any two States. Thereafter it shall enter into force and become binding upon any State subsequently joining when such State has enacted the compact into law. Withdrawal from the compact shall be by act of the legislature of a party State, but shall not take effect until one year after the Governor of the withdrawing State has notified the Governor of each other party State, in writing, of the withdrawal.

"Article X—Construction and severability

"This compact shall be liberally construed so as to effectuate the purposes thereof. The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence, or provision of this compact is declared to be contrary to the constitution of any State or of the United States or the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstances shall not be affected thereby. If this compact shall be held contrary to the constitution of any State participating herein, the compact shall remain in full force and effect as to the remaining party States and in full force and effect as to the State affected as to all severable matters."

SEC. 102. As used in the compact set forth in section 101 with reference to the District of Columbia—

(1) the term "Legislature" shall mean the Congress of the United States; and

(2) the term "Governor" shall mean the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 103. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall enter into the compact authorized by section 101 of this title without further action on the part of the Congress, and issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the implementation of such compact. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, nothing herein shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners (other than the entry into a compact authorized by this Act) or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

SEC. 104. All provisions of law applicable to the District of Columbia shall, to the extent they are inconsistent with the compact authorized by this title, be inapplicable to the taxation of buses (as that term is defined in the compact) in the District of Columbia during such time as the District is a party to such compact.

SEC. 105. The right is hereby reserved by the Congress or any of its standing committees to require the disclosure and the furnishing of such information and data by the parties to this compact as is deemed appropriate by the Congress or such committee.

SEC. 106. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this title is expressly reserved.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and New York, and to the District of Columbia to enter into a compact providing for bus taxation proration and reciprocity. But before any other State, any Province of Canada, or any State or territory or the Federal District of Mexico shall be made a party to such compact, the further consent of Congress shall first be obtained. Such compact shall be in substantially the following form:

"BUS TAXATION PRORATION AND RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT

"Article I—Purposes and principles

"SEC. 1. Purposes of agreement: It is the purpose of this agreement to set up a system whereby any contracting State may permit owners of fleets of buses operating in two or more States to prorate the registration of the buses in such fleets in each State in which the fleets operate on the basis of the proportion of miles operated within such State to total fleet miles, as defined herein.

"SEC. 2. Principle of proration of registration: It is hereby declared that in making this agreement the contracting States adhere to the principle that each State should have the freedom to develop the kind of highway user tax structure that it determines to be most appropriate to itself, that the method of taxation of interstate buses should not be a determining factor in developing its user tax structure, and that annual taxes or other taxes of the fixed-fee type upon buses which are not imposed on a basis that reflects the amount of highway use should be apportioned among the States, within the limits of practicality, on the basis of vehicle miles traveled within each of the States.

"Article II—Definitions

"(a) State: State shall include the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the territories of the United States, the Provinces of Canada, and the States, Territories, and Federal District of Mexico.

"(b) Contracting State: Contracting State shall mean a State which is a party to this agreement.

"(c) Administrator: Administrator shall mean the official or agency of a State administering the fee involved, or, in the case of proration of registration, the official or agency of a State administering the proration of registration in that State.

"(d) Person: Person shall include any individual, firm, copartnership, joint venture, association, corporation, estate, trust, business trust, receiver, syndicate, or any other group or combination acting as a unit.

"(e) Base State: Base State shall mean the State from or in which the bus is most frequently dispatched, garaged, serviced, maintained, operated, or otherwise controlled, or also in the case of a fleet bus the State to which it is allocated for registration under statutory requirements. In order that this section may not be used for the purpose of evasion of registration fees, the administrators of the contracting States may make the final decision as to the proper base State, in accordance with article III(h) hereof, to prevent or avoid such evasion.

"(f) Bus: Bus shall mean any motor vehicle of a bus type engaged in the interstate transportation of passengers and subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or any agency successor thereto, or one or more State regulatory agencies concerned with the regulation of passenger transport.

"(g) Fleet: As to each contracting State, fleet shall include only those buses which actually travel a portion of their total miles in such State. A fleet must include three or more buses.

"(h) Registration: Registration shall mean the registration of a bus and the payment of annual fees and taxes as set forth in or pursuant to the laws of the respective contracting States.

"(i) Proration of registration: Proration of registration shall mean registration of fleets of buses in accordance with article IV of this agreement.

"(j) Reciprocity: Reciprocity shall mean that each contracting State, to the extent provided in this agreement, exempts a bus from registration and registration fees.

"Article III—General provisions

"(a) Effect on other agreements, arrangements, and understandings: On and after its effective date, this agreement shall supersede any reciprocal or other agreement, arrangement, or understanding between any two or more of the contracting States covering, in whole or in part, any of the matters covered by this agreement; but this agreement shall not affect any reciprocal or other agreement, arrangement, or understanding between a contracting State and a State or States not party to this agreement.

"(b) Applicability to exempt vehicles: This agreement shall not require registration in a contracting State of any vehicles which are in whole or part exempt from registration under the laws or regulations of such State without respect to this agreement.

"(c) Inapplicability to caravaned vehicles: The benefits and privileges of this agreement shall not be extended to a vehicle operated on its own wheels, or in tow of a motor vehicle, transported for the purpose of selling or offering the same for sale to or by any agent, dealer, purchaser, or prospective purchaser.

"(d) Other fees and taxes: This agreement does not waive any fees or taxes charged or levied by any State in connection with the ownership or operation of vehicles other than registration fees as defined herein. All other fees and taxes shall be paid to each State in accordance with the laws thereof.

"(e) Statutory vehicle regulations: This agreement shall not authorize the operation of a vehicle in any contracting State contrary to the laws or regulations thereof, except those pertaining to registration and payment of fees; and with respect to such laws or regulations, only to the extent provided in this agreement.

"(f) Violations: Each contracting State reserves the right to withdraw, by order of the administrator thereof, all or any part of the benefits or privileges granted pursuant to this agreement from the owner of any vehicle or fleet of vehicles operated in violation of any provision of this agreement. The administrator shall immediately give notice of any such violation and withdrawal of any such benefits or privileges to the administrator of each other contracting State in which vehicles of such owner are operated.

"(g) Cooperation: The administrator of each of the contracting States shall cooperate with the administrators of the others and each contracting State hereby agrees to furnish such aid and assistance to each other within its statutory authority as will aid in the proper enforcement of this agreement.

"(h) Interpretation: In any dispute between or among contracting States arising under this agreement, the final decision regarding interpretation of questions at issue relating to this agreement shall be reached by joint action of the contracting States, acting through the administrator thereof, and shall upon determination be placed in writing.

"(i) Effect of headings: Article and section headings contained herein shall not be deemed to govern, limit, modify, or in any manner affect the scope, meaning, or intent of the provisions of any article or part hereof.

"(j) Entry into force: This agreement shall enter into force and become binding between and among the contracting States when enacted or otherwise entered into by any two States. Thereafter, it shall enter into force and become binding with respect to any State when enacted into law by such State. If the statutes of any State so authorize or provide, such State may become party to this agreement upon the execution thereof by an executive or administrative official thereof acting on behalf of and for such State.

"Article IV—Proration of registration

"(a) Applicability: Any owner of a fleet may register the buses of said fleet in any contracting State by paying to said State total registration fees in an amount equal to that obtained by applying the proportion of in-State fleet miles divided by the total fleet miles, to the total fees which would otherwise be required for regular registration of each and all of such vehicles in such contracting State.

"All fleet pro rata registration fees shall be based upon the mileage proportions of the fleet during the period of twelve months ending on August 31 next preceding the commencement of the registration year for which registration is sought: Except, that mileage proportions for a fleet not operated during such period in the State where application for registration is made will be determined by the Administrator upon the sworn application of the applicant showing the operations during such period in other States and the estimated operations during the registration year for which registration is sought, in the State in which application is being made; or if no operations were conducted during such period, a full statement of the proposed method of operation.

"If any buses operate in two or more States which permit the proration of registration on the basis of a fleet of buses consisting of a lesser number of vehicles than provided in article II(g), such fleet may be prorated as to registration in such States, in which event the buses in such fleet shall not be required to register in any other contracting States if each such vehicle is registered in some contracting State (except to the extent it is exempt from registration as provided in article III(b)).

"If the administrator of any State determines, based on his method of the operation thereof, that the inclusion of a bus or buses as a part of a fleet would adversely affect the proper fleet fee which should be paid to his State, having due regard for fairness and equity, he may refuse to permit any or all of such buses to be included in his State as a part of such fleet.

"(b) Total fleet miles: Total fleet miles, with respect to each contracting State, shall mean the total miles operated by the fleet (1) in such State, (2) in all other contracting States, (3) in other States having proportional registration provisions, (4) in States with which such contracting State has reciprocity, and (5) in such other States as the administrator determines should be included under the circumstances in order to protect or promote the interest of his State; except that in States having laws requiring proration on the basis of a different determination of total fleet miles, total fleet miles shall be determined on such basis.

"(c) Leased vehicles: If a bus is operated by a person other than the owner as a part of a fleet which is subject to the provisions of this article, then the operator of such fleet shall be deemed to be the owner of said bus for the purposes of this article.

"(d) Extent of privileges: Upon the registration of a fleet in a contracting State pursuant to this article, each bus in the fleet may be operated in both interstate and intrastate operations in such State (except as provided in article III(e)).

"(e) Application for proration: The application for proration of registration shall be made in each contracting State upon substantially the application forms and supplements authorized by joint action of the administrators of the contracting States.

"(f) Issuance of identification: Upon registration of a fleet, the State which is the base State of a particular bus of the fleet shall issue the required license plates and registration card for such bus and each contracting State in which the fleet of which such bus is a part operates shall issue a special identification identifying such bus as a part of a fleet which has fully complied with the registration requirements of such State. The required license plates, registration cards, and identification shall be appropriately displayed in the manner required by or pursuant to the laws of each respective State.

"(g) Additions to fleet: If any bus is added to a prorated fleet after the filing of the original application, the owner shall file a supplemental application. The owner shall register such bus in each contracting State in like manner as provided for buses listed in an original application and the registration fee payable shall be determined on the mileage proportion used to determine the registration fees payable for buses registered under the original application.

"(h) Withdrawals from fleet: If any bus is withdrawn from a prorated fleet during the period for which it is registered or identified, the owner shall notify the administrator of each State in which it is registered or identified of such withdrawal and shall return the plates and registration card or identification as may be required by or pursuant to the laws of the respective States.

"(i) Audits: The administrator of each contracting State shall, within the statutory authority of such administrator, make any information obtained upon an audit of records of any applicant for proration of registration available to the administrators of the other contracting States.

"(j) Errors in registration: If it is determined by the administrator of a contracting State, as a result of such audits or otherwise, that an improper fee has been paid his State, or errors in registration found, the administrator may require the fleet owner to make the necessary corrections in the registration of his fleet and payment of fees.

"Article V—Reciprocity

"(a) Grant of reciprocity: Each of the contracting States grants reciprocity as provided in this article.

"(b) Applicability: The provisions of this agreement with respect to reciprocity shall apply only to a bus properly registered in the base State of the bus, which State must be a contracting State.

"(c) Nonapplicability to fleet buses: The reciprocity granted pursuant to this article shall not apply to a bus which is entitled to be registered or identified as part of a prorated fleet.

"(d) Extent of reciprocity: The reciprocity granted pursuant to this article shall permit the interstate operation of a bus and intrastate operation which is incidental to a trip of such bus involving interstate operation.

"(e) Other agreements: Nothing in this agreement shall be construed to prohibit any of the contracting States from entering into separate agreements with each other for the granting of temporary permits for the intrastate operation of vehicles registered in the other State; nor to prevent any of the contracting States from entering into agreements to grant reciprocity for intrastate operation within any zone or zones agreed upon by the States.

"Article VI—Withdrawal or revocation

"Any contracting State may withdraw from this agreement upon thirty days' written notice to each other contracting State, which notice shall be given only after the repeal of this agreement by the legislature of such State, if adoption was by legislative act, or after renunciation by the appropriate administrative official of such contracting State if the laws thereof empower him so to renounce.

"Article VII—Construction and severability

"This compact shall be liberally construed so as to effectuate the purposes thereof. The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phase, clause, sentence, or provision of this compact is declared to be contrary to the Constitution of any State or of the United States or the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. If this compact shall be held contrary to the constitution of any State participating herein, the compact shall remain in full force and effect as to the remaining party States and in full force and effect as to the State affected as to all severable matters."

SEC. 202. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have the power to make such exemptions from the coverage of the agreement as may be appropriate and to make such changes in methods for the reporting of any information required to be furnished to the District of Columbia pursuant to the agreement as, in its judgment, shall be suitable: *Provided*, That any such exemptions or changes shall not be contrary to the purposes set forth in article I of the agreement and shall be made in order to permit the continuance of uniformity of practice among the contracting States with respect to buses.

SEC. 203. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall enter into the agreement authorized by section 201 of this title without further action on the part of the Congress, and issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the implementation of such agreement. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, nothing herein shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners (other than the entry into a compact authorized by this Act) or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

SEC. 204. All provisions of law applicable to the District of Columbia shall, to the extent they are inconsistent with the agreement authorized by this title, be inapplicable to the taxation and registration of buses in the District of Columbia during such time as the District is a party to such agreement.

SEC. 205. Unless otherwise provided in any statute withdrawing the District of Columbia from participation in the agreement, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be the officer to give notice of withdrawal therefrom.

SEC. 206. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this title is expressly reserved.

Mr. WILLIS (interrupting reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I move that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

On page 19, line 24, strike out "his" and insert in lieu thereof "its."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. WILLIS

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 7 strike out lines 18 through 22 and on page 7, line 23, renumber "SEC. 106" to read "SEC. 105."

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment which would strike out section 105 and renumber the present section 106 to read "section 105."

Section 105 would reserve the right of Congress or its committees to require disclosure of information and data. It was ordered struck out of last year's bill as unnecessary, inasmuch as the compact does not create any commission, authority, or other operating body.

An identical provision was, in fact, omitted from title II of the present bill. The failure to delete section 105 was a clerical error.

I emphasize that the right of Congress to alter, amend, or repeal this consent to the compact continues to be reserved in both titles of the bill. I therefore move adoption of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. UDALL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 824) granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity, pursuant to House Resolution 306, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table for immediate consideration the bill (S. 307) granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity, a similar measure passed by the other body.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 307

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

TITLE I

SECTION 101. The consent of Congress is hereby given to any of the several States and to the District of Columbia to enter into a compact on taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to the participation in such compact of the Provinces of Canada and the States, territories, and Federal District of Mexico. Such compact shall be in substantially the following form:

COMPACT ON TAXATION OF MOTOR FUELS CONSUMED BY INTERSTATE BUSES

Article I—Purposes

The purposes of this agreement are to—

(a) avoid multiple taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to assure each State of its fair share of motor fuel taxes;

(b) establish and facilitate the administration of a criterion of motor fuel taxation for interstate buses which is reasonably related to the use of highway and related facilities and services in each of the party States; and

(c) encourage the availability of a maximum number of buses for intrastate service by removing motor fuel taxation as a deterrent in the routing of interstate buses.

Article II—Definitions

(a) State: State shall include the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the territories of the United States, the Provinces of Canada, and the States, territories, and Federal District of Mexico.

(b) Contracting State: Contracting State shall mean a State which is a party to this agreement.

(c) Administrator: Administrator shall mean the official or agency of a State administering the motor fuel taxes involved.

(d) Person: Person shall include any individual, firm, copartnership, joint venture, association, corporation, estate, trust, business trust, receiver, syndicate, or any other group or combination acting as a unit.

(e) Bus: Bus shall mean any motor vehicle of a bus type engaged in the interstate transportation of passengers and subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission or any agency successor thereto, or one or more State regulatory agencies concerned with the regulation of passenger transport.

(f) Gallon: Gallon shall mean the liquid measure containing 231 cubic inches.

Article III—Governing principle

For purposes of this compact, the primary principle for the imposition of motor fuel taxes shall be consumption of such fuel within the State. Motor fuel consumed by buses shall be taxed on the existing basis, as it may be from time to time, and under the procedures for collection of such taxes by each party State, except that to the extent that this compact makes provision therefor, or for that matter connected therewith, such provision shall govern.

Article IV—How fuel consumed to be ascertained

The amount of fuel used in the operation of any bus within this State shall be conclusively presumed to be the number of miles operated by such bus within the State divided by the average mileage per gallon obtained by the bus during the tax period in all operations, whether within or without the party State. Any owner or operator of two or more buses shall calculate average mileage within the meaning of this article by computing single average figures covering all buses owned or operated by him.

Article V—Imposition of tax

Every owner or operator of buses shall pay to the party State taxes equivalent to the amount of tax per gallon multiplied by the number of gallons used in its operations in the party State.

Article VI—Reports

On or before the last business day of the month following the month being reported upon, each bus owner or operator subject to the payment of fuel taxes pursuant to this compact shall make such reports of its operations as the State administrator of motor fuel taxes may require and shall furnish the State administrator in each other party State wherein his buses operate a copy of such report.

Article VII—Credit for payment of fuel taxes

Each bus owner or operator shall be entitled to a credit equivalent to the amount of tax per gallon on all motor fuel purchased by such operator within the party State for use in operations either within or without the party State, and upon which the motor fuel tax imposed by the laws of such party State has been paid.

Article VIII—Additional tax or refund

If the bus owner or operator's monthly report shows a debit balance after taking credit pursuant to article VII, a remittance in such net amount shall be made with the report. If the report shows a credit balance, after taking credit as herein provided, a refund in such net amount as has been overpaid shall be made by the party State to such owner or operator.

Article IX—Entry into force and withdrawal

This compact shall enter into force when enacted into law by two States. Thereafter it shall enter into force and become binding upon any State subsequently joining when such State has enacted the compact into law. Withdrawal from the compact shall be by act of the legislature of a party State, but shall not take effect until one year after the Governor of the withdrawing State has notified the Governor of each other party State, in writing, of the withdrawal.

Article X—Construction and severability

This compact shall be liberally construed so as to effectuate the purposes thereof. The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phase, clause, sentence, or provision of this compact is declared to be contrary to the constitution of any State or of the United States or the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. If this compact shall be held contrary to the constitution of any State participating herein, the compact shall remain in full force and effect as to the remaining party States and in full force and effect as to the State affected as to all severable matters.

SEC. 102. As used in the compact set forth in section 101 with reference to the District of Columbia—

(1) the term "legislature" shall mean the Congress of the United States; and

(2) the term "Governor" shall mean the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 103. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall enter into the compact authorized by section 101 of this title without further action on the part of the Congress, and issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the implementation of such compact. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, nothing herein shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners (other than the entry into a compact authorized by this Act) or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

SEC. 104. All provisions of law applicable to the District of Columbia shall, to the extent they are inconsistent with the compact authorized by this title, be inapplicable to the taxation of buses (as that term is defined in the compact) in the District of Columbia during such time as the District is a party to such compact.

SEC. 105. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this title is expressly reserved.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The consent of Congress is hereby given to any of the several States and to the District of Columbia to enter in a bus taxation proration and reciprocity agreement and to the participation in such agreement of the Provinces of Canada and the States, territories, and Federal District of Mexico. Such agreement shall be in substantially the following form:

BUS TAXATION PRORATION AND RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT

Article I—Purposes and principles

SECTION 1. Purposes of agreement: It is the purpose of this agreement to set up a system whereby any contracting State may permit owners of fleets of buses operating in two or more States to prorate the registration of the buses in such fleets in each State in which the fleets operate on the basis of the proportion of miles operating within such State to total fleet miles, as defined herein.

SEC. 2. Principle of proration of registration: It is hereby declared that in making this agreement the contracting States adhere to the principle that each State should have the freedom to develop the kind of highway user tax structure that it determines to be most appropriate to itself, that the method of taxation of interstate buses should not be a determining factor in developing its user tax structure, and that annual taxes or other taxes of the fixed-fee type upon buses which are not imposed on a basis that reflects the amount of highway use should be apportioned among the States, within the limits of practicality, on the basis of vehicle miles traveled within each of the States.

Article II—Definitions

(a) State: State shall include the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the territories of the United States, the Provinces of Canada, and the States, Territories, and Federal District of Mexico.

(b) Contracting State: Contracting State shall mean a State which is a party to this agreement.

(c) Administrator: Administrator shall mean the official or agency of a State administering the fee involved, or, in the case of proration of registration, the official or agency of a State administering the proration of registration in that State.

(d) Person: Person shall include any individual, firm, copartnership, joint venture, association, corporation, estate, trust, business trust, receiver, syndicate, or any other group or combination acting as a unit.

(e) Base State: Base State shall mean the State from or in which the bus is most frequently dispatched, garaged, serviced, maintained, operated, or otherwise controlled, or also in the case of a fleet bus the State to which it is allocated for registration under statutory requirements. In order that this section may not be used for the purpose of evasion of registration fees, the administrators of the contracting States may make the final decision as to the proper base State, in accordance with article III(h) hereof, to prevent or avoid such evasion.

(f) Bus: Bus shall mean any motor vehicle of a bus type engaged in the interstate transportation of passengers and subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or any agency successor thereto, or one or more State regulatory agencies concerned with the regulation of passenger transport.

(g) Fleet: As to each contracting State, fleet shall include only those buses which actually travel a portion of their total miles in such State. A fleet must include three or more buses.

(h) Registration: Registration shall mean the registration of a bus and the payment of annual fees and taxes as set forth in or pursuant to the laws of the respective contracting States.

(i) Proration of registration: Proration of registration shall mean registration of fleets of buses in accordance with Article IV of this agreement.

(j) Reciprocity: Reciprocity shall mean that each contracting State, to the extent provided in this agreement, exempts a bus from registration and registration fees.

Article III—General provisions

(a) Effect on other agreements, arrangements, and understandings: On and after its effective date, this agreement shall supersede any reciprocal or other agreement, arrangement, or understanding between any two or more of the contracting States covering, in whole or in part, any of the matters covered by this agreement; but this agreement shall not affect any reciprocal or other agreement, arrangement, or understanding between a contracting State and a State or States not party to this agreement.

(b) Applicability to exempt vehicles: This agreement shall not require registration in a contracting State of any vehicles which are in whole or part exempt from registration under the laws or regulations of such State without respect to this agreement.

(c) Inapplicability to caravaned vehicles: The benefits and privileges of this agreement shall not be extended to a vehicle operated on its own wheels, or in tow of a motor vehicle, transported for the purpose of selling or offering the same for sale to or by any agent, dealer, purchaser, or prospective purchaser.

(d) Other fees and taxes: This agreement does not waive any fees or taxes charged or levied by any State in connection with the ownership or operation of vehicles other than registration fees as defined herein. All other fees and taxes shall be paid to each State in accordance with the laws thereof.

(e) Statutory vehicle regulations: This agreement shall not authorize the operation of a vehicle in any contracting State contrary to the laws or regulations thereof, except those pertaining to registration and payment of fees; and with respect to such laws or regulations, only to the extent provided in this agreement.

(f) Violations: Each contracting State reserves the right to withdraw, by order of the administrator thereof, all or any part of the benefits or privileges granted pursuant to this agreement from the owner of any vehicle or fleet of vehicles operated in violation of any provision of this agreement. The administrator shall immediately give notice of any such violation and withdrawal of any such benefits or privileges to the administrator of each other contracting State in which vehicles of such owner are operated.

(g) Cooperation: The administrator of each of the contracting States shall cooperate with the administrators of the others and each contracting State hereby agrees to furnish such aid and assistance to each other within its statutory authority as will aid in the proper enforcement of this agreement.

(h) Interpretation: In any dispute between or among contracting States arising under this agreement, the final decision regarding interpretation of questions at issue relating to this agreement shall be reached by joint action of the contracting States, acting through the administrator thereof, and shall upon determination be placed in writing.

(i) Effect of headings: Article and section headings contained herein shall not be deemed to govern, limit, modify, or in any manner affect the scope, meaning, or intent of the provisions of any article or part hereof.

(j) Entry into force: This agreement shall enter into force and become binding between and among the contracting States when enacted or otherwise entered into by any two States. Thereafter, it shall enter into force and become binding with respect to any State when enacted into law by such State. If the statutes of any State so authorize or provide, such State may become party to this agreement upon the execution thereof by an executive or administrative official thereof acting on behalf of and for such State.

Article IV—Proration of registration

(a) Applicability: Any owner of a fleet may register the buses of said fleet in any contracting State by paying to said State total registration fees in an amount equal to that obtained by applying the proportion of in-State fleet miles divided by the total fleet miles, to the total fees which would otherwise be required for regular registration of each and all of such vehicles in such contracting State.

All fleet pro rata registration fees shall be based upon the mileage proportions of the fleet during the period of twelve months ending on August 31 next preceding the commencement of the registration year for which registration is sought: Except that mileage proportions for a fleet not operated during such period in the State where application for registration is made will be determined by the Administrator upon the sworn application of the applicant showing the operations during such period in other States and the estimated operations during the registration year for which registration is sought, in the State in which application is being made; or if no operations were conducted during such period a full statement of the proposed method of operation.

If any buses operate in two or more States which permit the proration of registration on the basis of a fleet of buses consisting of a lesser number of vehicles than provided in article II(g), such fleet may be prorated as to registration in such States, in which event the buses in such fleet shall not be required to register in any other contracting States if each such vehicle is registered in some contracting State (except to the extent it is exempt from registration as provided in article III(b)).

If the administrator of any State determines, based on his method of the operation thereof, that the inclusion of a bus or buses as a part of a fleet would adversely affect the proper fleet fee which should be paid to his State, having due regard for fairness and equity, he may refuse to permit any or all of such buses to be included in his State as a part of such fleet.

(b) Total fleet miles: Total fleet miles, with respect to each contracting State, shall mean the total miles operated by the fleet (1) in such State, (2) in all other contracting States, (3) in other States having proportional registration provisions, (4) in States with which such contracting State has reciprocity, and (5) in such other States as the administrator determines should be included under the circumstances in order to protect or promote the interest of his State; except that in States having laws requiring proration on the basis of a different determination of total fleet miles, total fleet miles shall be determined on such basis.

(c) Leased vehicles: If a bus is operated by a person other than the owner as a part of a fleet which is subject to the provisions of this article, then the operator of such fleet shall be deemed to be the owner of said bus for the purposes of this article.

(d) Extent of privileges: Upon the registration of a fleet in a contracting State pursuant to this article, each bus in the fleet may be operated in both interstate and intrastate operations in such State (except as provided in article III(e)).

(e) Application for proration: The application for proration of registration shall be made in each contracting State upon substantially the application forms and supplements authorized by joint action of the administrators of the contracting States.

(f) Issuance of identification: Upon registration of a fleet, the State which is the base State of a particular bus of the fleet, shall issue the required license plates and registration card for such bus and each contracting State in which the fleet of which such bus is a part operates, shall issue a special identification identifying such bus as a part of a fleet which has fully complied with the registration requirements of such State. The required license plates, registration cards, and identification shall be appropriately displayed in the manner required by or pursuant to the laws of each respective State.

(g) Additions to fleet: If any bus is added to a prorated fleet after the filing of the original application, the owner shall file a supplemental application. The owner shall register such bus in each contracting State in like manner as provided for buses listed in an original application and the registration fee payable shall be determined on the mileage proportion used to determine the registration fees payable for buses registered under the original application.

(h) Withdrawals from fleet: If any bus is withdrawn from a prorated fleet during the period for which it is registered or identified, the owner shall notify the administrator of each State in which it is registered or identified of such withdrawal and shall return the plates, and registration card or identification as may be required by or pursuant to the laws of the respective States.

(i) Audits: The administrator of each contracting State shall, within the statutory authority of such administrator, make any information obtained upon an audit of records of any applicant for proration of registration available to the administrators of the other contracting States.

(j) Errors in registration: If it is determined by the administrator of a contracting State, as a result of such audits or otherwise, that an improper fee has been paid his State, or errors in registration found, the administrator may require the fleet owners to make the necessary corrections in the registration of his fleet and payment of fees.

Article V—Reciprocity

(a) Grant of reciprocity: Each of the contracting States grants reciprocity as provided in this article.

(b) Applicability: The provisions of this agreement with respect to reciprocity shall apply only to a bus properly registered in the base State of the bus, which State must be a contracting State.

(c) Nonapplicability to fleet buses: The reciprocity granted pursuant to this article shall not apply to a bus which is entitled to be registered or identified as part of a prorated fleet.

(d) Extent of reciprocity: The reciprocity granted pursuant to this article shall permit the interstate operation of a bus and intrastate operation which is incidental to a trip of such bus involving interstate operation.

(e) Other agreements: Nothing in this agreement shall be construed to prohibit any of the contracting States from entering into separate agreements with each other for the granting of temporary permits for the intrastate operation of vehicles registered in the other State; nor to prevent any of the contracting States from entering into agreements to grant reciprocity for intrastate operation within any zone or zones agreed upon by the States.

Article VI—Withdrawal revocation

Any contracting State may withdraw from this agreement upon thirty days' written notice to each other contracting State, which notice shall be given only after the repeal of this agreement by the legislature of such State, if adoption was by legislative act, or after renunciation by the appropriate administrative official of such contracting State if the laws thereof empowered him so to renounce.

Article VII—Construction and severability

This compact shall be liberally construed so as to effectuate the purposes thereof. The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phase, clause, sentence, or provision of this compact is declared to be contrary to the constitution of any State or of the United States or the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. If this compact shall be held contrary to the constitution of any State participating herein, the compact shall remain in full force and effect as to the remaining party States and in full force and effect as to the State affected as to all severable matters.

SEC. 202. The Board of Commissioners shall have the power to make such exemptions from the coverage of the agreement as may be appropriate and to make such changes in methods for the reporting of any information required to be furnished to the District of Columbia pursuant to the agreement as, in his judgment, shall be suitable: *Provided*, That any such exemptions or changes shall not be contrary to the purposes set forth in article I of the agreement and shall be made in order to permit the continuance of uniformity of practice among the contracting States with respect to buses.

SEC. 203. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall enter into the agreement authorized by section 201 of this title without further action on the part of the Congress, and issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the implementation of such agreement. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, nothing herein shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners (other than the entry into a compact authorized by this Act) or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

SEC. 204. All provisions of law applicable to the District of Columbia shall, to the extent they are inconsistent with the agreement authorized by this title, be inapplicable to the taxation and registration of buses in the District of Columbia during such time as the District is a party to such agreement.

SEC. 205. Unless otherwise provided in any statute withdrawing the District of Columbia from participation in the agreement, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be the officer to give notice of withdrawal therefrom.

SEC. 206. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this title is expressly reserved.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WILLIS: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 307 and insert the provisions of H.R. 824, as passed, as follows:

"TITLE I

"SECTION 101. The consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, and to the District of Columbia to enter into a compact on taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses. But before any other State, any Province of Canada, or any State or territory or the Federal District of Mexico shall be made a party to such compact, the further consent of Congress shall first be obtained. Such compact shall be in substantially the following form:

" 'COMPACT ON TAXATION OF MOTOR FUELS CONSUMED BY INTERSTATE BUSES

" '*Article I—Purposes*

" 'The purposes of this agreement are to—

" '(a) avoid multiple taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to assure each State of its fair share of motor fuel taxes;

" '(b) establish and facilitate the administration of a criterion of motor fuel taxation for interstate buses which is reasonably related to the use of highway and related facilities and services in each of the party States; and

" '(c) encourage the availability of a maximum number of buses for intrastate service by removing motor fuel taxation as a deterrent in the routing of interstate buses.

" '*Article II—Definitions*

" '(a) State: State shall include the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the territories of the United States, the Provinces of Canada, and the States, territories, and Federal District of Mexico.

" '(b) Contracting State: Contracting State shall mean a State which is a party to this agreement.

" '(c) Administrator: Administrator shall mean the official or agency of a State administering the motor fuel taxes involved.

" '(d) Person: Person shall include any individual, firm, copartnership, joint venture, association, corporation, estate, trust, business trust, receiver, syndicate, or any other group or combination acting as a unit.

" '(e) Bus: Bus shall mean any motor vehicle of a bus type engaged in the interstate transportation of passengers and subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission or any agency successor thereto, or one or more State regulatory agencies concerned with the regulation of passenger transport.

" '(f) Gallon: Gallon shall mean the liquid measure containing 231 cubic inches.

" '*Article III—Governing principle*

" 'For purposes of this compact, the primary principle for the imposition of motor fuel taxes shall be consumption of such fuel within the State. Motor fuel consumed by buses shall be taxed on the existing basis, as it may be from time to time, and under the procedures for collection of such taxes by each party State, except that to the extent that this compact makes provision therefor, or for any matter connected therewith, such provision shall govern.

" '*Article IV—How fuel consumed to be ascertained*

" 'The amount of fuel used in the operation of any bus within this State shall be conclusively presumed to be the number of miles operated by such bus within the State divided by the average mileage per gallon obtained by the bus during the tax period in all operations, whether within or without the party State. Any owner or operator of two or more buses shall calculate average mileage within the meaning of this article by computing single average figures covering all buses owned or operated by him.

" '*Article V—Imposition of tax*

" 'Every owner or operator of buses shall pay to the party State taxes equivalent to the amount of tax per gallon multiplied by the number of gallons used in its operations in the party State.

" '*Article VI—Reports*

" 'On or before the last business day of the month following the month being reported upon, each bus owner or operator subject to the payment of fuel taxes pursuant to this compact shall make such reports of its operations as the State administrator of motor fuel taxes may require and shall furnish the State administrator in each other party State wherein his buses operate a copy of such report.

" '*Article VII—Credit for payment of fuel taxes*

" 'Each bus owner or operator shall be entitled to a credit equivalent to the amount of tax per gallon on all motor fuel purchased by such operator within the party State for use in operations either within or without the party State, and upon which the motor fuel tax imposed by the laws of such party State has been paid.

" '*Article VIII—Additional tax or refund*

" 'If the bus owner or operator's monthly report shows a debit balance after taking credit pursuant to article VII, a remittance in such net amount due shall be made with the report. If the report shows a credit balance, after taking credit as herein provided, a refund in such net amount as has been overpaid shall be made by the party State to such owner or operator.

" '*Article IX—Entry into force and withdrawal*

" 'This compact shall enter into force when enacted into law by any two States. Thereafter it shall enter into force and become binding upon any State subsequently joining when such State has enacted the compact into law. Withdrawal from the compact shall be by act of the legislature of a party State, but shall not take effect until one year after the Governor of the withdrawing State has notified the Governor of each other party State, in writing, of the withdrawal.

" '*Article X—Construction and severability*

" 'This compact shall be liberally construed so as to effectuate the purposes thereof. The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence, or provision of this compact is declared to be contrary to the constitution of any State or of the United States or the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstances shall not be affected thereby. If this compact shall be held contrary to the constitution of any State participating herein, the compact shall remain in full force and effect as to the remaining party States and in full force and effect as to the State affected as to all severable matters.'

"SEC. 102. As used in the compact set forth in section 101 with reference to the District of Columbia—

"(1) the term 'Legislature' shall mean the Congress of the United States; and

"(2) the term 'Governor' shall mean the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

"SEC. 103. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall enter into the compact authorized by section 101 of this title without further action on the part of the Congress, and issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the implementation of such compact. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, nothing herein shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners (other than the entry into a compact authorized by this Act) or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

"SEC. 104. All provisions of law applicable to the District of Columbia shall, to the extent they are inconsistent with the compact authorized by this title, be inapplicable to the taxation of buses (as that term is defined in the compact) in the District of Columbia during such time as the District is a party to such compact.

"SEC. 105. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this title is expressly reserved.

"TITLE II

"SEC. 201. The consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and New York, and to the District of Columbia to enter into a compact providing for bus taxation proration and reciprocity. But before any other State, any Province of Canada, or any State or territory or the Federal District of Mexico shall be made a party to such compact, the further consent of Congress shall first be obtained. Such compact shall be in substantially the following form:

" 'BUS TAXATION PRORATION AND RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT

" '*Article I—Purposes and principles*

" 'SEC. 1. Purposes of agreement: It is the purpose of this agreement to set up a system whereby any contracting State may permit owners of fleets of buses operating in two or more States to prorate the registration of the buses in such fleets in each State in which the fleets operate on the basis of the proportion of miles operated within such State to total fleet miles, as defined herein.

" 'SEC. 2. Principle of proration of registration: It is hereby declared that in making this agreement the contracting States adhere to the principle that each State should have the freedom to develop the kind of highway user tax structure that it determines to be most appropriate to itself, that the method of taxation of interstate buses should not be a determining factor in developing its user tax structure, and that annual taxes or other taxes of the fixed-fee type upon buses which are not imposed on a basis that reflects the amount of highway use should be apportioned among the States, within the limits of practicality, on the basis of vehicle miles traveled within each of the States.

" '*Article II—Definitions*

" '(a) State: State shall include the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the territories of the United States, the Provinces of Canada, and the States, Territories, and Federal District of Mexico.

" '(b) Contracting State: Contracting State shall mean a State which is a party to this agreement.

" '(c) Administrator: Administrator shall mean the official or agency of a State administering the fee involved, or, in the case of proration of registration, the official or agency of a State administering the proration of registration in that State.

" '(d) Person: Person shall include any individual, firm, copartnership, joint venture, association, corporation, estate, trust, business trust, receiver, syndicate, or any other group or combination acting as a unit.

" '(e) Base State: Base State shall mean the State from or in which the bus is most frequently dispatched, garaged, serviced, maintained, operated, or otherwise controlled, or also in the case of a fleet bus the State to which it is allocated for registration under statutory requirements. In order that this section may not be used for the purpose of evasion of registration fees, the administrators of the contracting States may make the final decision as to the proper base State, in accordance with article III(h) hereof, to prevent or avoid such evasion.

" '(f) Bus: Bus shall mean any motor vehicle of a bus type engaged in the interstate transportation of passengers and subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or any agency successor thereto, or one or more State regulatory agencies concerned with the regulation of passenger transport.

"'(g) Fleet: As to each contracting State, fleet shall include only those buses which actually travel a portion of their total miles in such State. A fleet must include three or more buses.

"'(h) Registration: Registration shall mean the registration of a bus and the payment of annual fees and taxes as set forth in or pursuant to the laws of the respective contracting States.

"'(i) Proration of registration: Proration of registration shall mean registration of fleets of buses in accordance with article IV of this agreement.

"'(j) Reciprocity: Reciprocity shall mean that each contracting State, to the extent provided in this agreement, exempts a bus from registration and registration fees.

"'*Article III—General provisions*

"'(a) Effect on other agreements, arrangements, and understandings: On and after its effective date, this agreement shall supersede any reciprocal or other agreement, arrangement, or understanding between any two or more of the contracting States covering, in whole or in part, any of the matters covered by this agreement; but this agreement shall not affect any reciprocal or other agreement, arrangement, or understanding between a contracting State and a State or States not party to this agreement.

"'(b) Applicability to exempt vehicles: This agreement shall not require registration in a contracting State of any vehicles which are in whole or part exempt from registration under the laws or regulations of such State without respect to this agreement.

"'(c) Inapplicability to caravaned vehicles: The benefits and privileges of this agreement shall not be extended to a vehicle operated on its own wheels, or in tow of a motor vehicle, transported for the purpose of selling or offering the same for sale to or by any agent, dealer, purchaser, or prospective purchaser.

"'(d) Other fees and taxes: This agreement does not waive any fees or taxes charged or levied by any State in connection with the ownership or operation of vehicles other than registration fees as defined herein. All other fees and taxes shall be paid to each State in accordance with the laws thereof.

"'(e) Statutory vehicle regulations: This agreement shall not authorize the operation of a vehicle in any contracting State contrary to the laws or regulations thereof, except those pertaining to registration and payment of fees; and with respect to such laws or regulations, only to the extent provided in this agreement.

"'(f) Violations: Each contracting State reserves the right to withdraw, by order of the administrator thereof, all or any part of the benefits or privileges granted pursuant to this agreement from the owner of any vehicle or fleet of vehicles operated in violation of any provision of this agreement. The administrator shall immediately give notice of any such violation and withdrawal of any such benefits or privileges to the administrator of each other contracting State in which vehicles of such owner are operated.

"'(g) Cooperation: The administrator of each of the contracting States shall cooperate with the administrators of the others and each contracting State hereby agrees to furnish such aid and assistance to each other within its statutory authority as will aid in the proper enforcement of this agreement.

"'(h) Interpretation: In any dispute between or among contracting States arising under this agreement, the final decision regarding interpretation of questions at issue relating to this agreement shall be reached by joint action of the contracting States, acting through the administrator thereof, and shall upon determination be placed in writing.

"'(i) Effect of headings: Article and section headings contained herein shall not be deemed to govern, limit, modify, or in any manner affect the scope, meaning, or intent of the provision of any article or part hereof.

"'(j) Entry into force: This agreement shall enter into force and become binding between and among the contracting States when enacted or otherwise entered into by any two States. Thereafter, it shall enter into force and become binding with respect to any State when enacted into law by such State. If the statutes of any State so authorize or provide, such State may become party to this agreement upon the execution thereof by an executive or administrative official thereof acting on behalf of and for such State.

"'ARTICLE IV—PRORATION OF REGISTRATION

"'(a) Applicability: Any owner of a fleet may register the buses of said fleet in any contracting State by paying to said State total registration fees in an amount equal to that obtained by applying the proportion of in-State fleet miles divided by the total fleet miles, to the total fees which would otherwise be required for regular registration of each and all of such vehicles in such contracting State.

"'All fleet pro rata registration fees shall be based upon the mileage proportions of the fleet during the period of twelve months ending on August 31 next preceding the commencement of the registration year for which registration is sought: Except, that mileage proportions for a fleet not operated during such period in the State where application for registration is made will be determined by the Administrator upon the sworn application of the applicant showing the operations during such period in other States and the estimated operations during the registration year for which registration is sought, in the State in which application is being made; or if no operations were conducted during such period a full statement of the proposed method of operation.

"'If any buses operate in two or more States which permit the proration of registration on the basis of a fleet of buses consisting of a lesser number of vehicles than provided in article II(g), such fleet may be prorated as to registration in such States, in which event the buses in such fleet shall not be required to register in any other contracting States if each such vehicle is registered in some contracting State (except to the extent it is exempt from registration as provided in article III(b)).

"If the administrator of any State determines, based on his method of the operation thereof, that the inclusion of a bus or buses as a part of a fleet would adversely affect the proper fleet fee which should be paid to his State, having due regard for fairness and equity, he may refuse to permit any or all of such buses to be included in his State as a part of such fleet.

"'(b) Total fleet miles: Total fleet miles, with respect to each contracting State, shall mean the total miles operated by the fleet (1) in such State, (2) in all other contracting States, (3) in other States having proportional registration provisions, (4) in States with which such contracting State has reciprocity, and (5) in such other States as the administrator determines should be included under the circumstances in order to protect or promote the interest of his State; except that in States having laws requiring proration on the basis of a different determination of total fleet miles, total fleet miles shall be determined on such basis.

"'(c) Leased vehicles: If a bus is operated by a person other than the owner as a part of a fleet which is subject to the provisions of this article, then the operator of such fleet shall be deemed to be the owner of said bus for the purposes of this article.

"'(d) Extent of privileges: Upon the registration of a fleet in a contracting State pursuant to this article, each bus in the fleet may be operated in both interstate and intrastate operations in such State (except as provided in article III(e)).

"'(e) Application for proration: The application for proration of registration shall be made in each contracting State upon substantially the application forms and supplements authorized by joint action of the administrators of the contracting States.

"'(f) Issuance of identification: Upon registration of a fleet, the State which is the base State of a particular bus of the fleet shall issue the required license plates and registration card for such bus and each contracting State in which the fleet of which such bus is a part operates shall issue a special identification identifying such bus as a part of a fleet which has fully complied with the registration requirements of such State. The required license plates, registration cards, and identification shall be appropriately displayed in the manner required by or pursuant to the laws of each respective State.

"'(g) Additions to fleet: If any bus is added to a prorated fleet after the filing of the original application, the owner shall file a supplemental application. The owner shall register such bus in each contracting State in like manner as provided for buses listed in an original application and the registration fee payable shall be determined on the mileage proportion used to determine the registration fees payable for buses registered under the original application.

"'(h) Withdrawals from fleet: If any bus is withdrawn from a prorated fleet during the period for which it is registered or identified, the owner shall notify the administrator of each State in which it is registered or identified of such withdrawal and shall return the plates and registration card or identification as may be required by or pursuant to the laws of the respective States.

"'(i) Audits: The administrator of each contracting State shall, within the statutory authority of such administrator, make any information obtained upon an audit of records of any applicant for proration of registration available to the administrators of the other contracting States.

"'(j) Errors in registration: If it is determined by the administrator of a contracting State, as a result of such audits or otherwise, that an improper fee has been paid his State, or errors in registration found, the administrator may require the fleet owner to make the necessary corrections in the registration of his fleet and payment of fees.

"'*Article V—Reciprocity*

"'(a) Grant of reciprocity: Each of the contracting States grants reciprocity as provided in this article.

"'(b) Applicability: The provisions of this agreement with respect to reciprocity shall apply only to a bus properly registered in the base State of the bus, which State must be a contracting State.

"'(c) Nonapplicability to fleet buses: The reciprocity granted pursuant to this article shall not apply to a bus which is entitled to be registered or identified as part of a prorated fleet.

"'(d) Extent of reciprocity: The reciprocity granted pursuant to this article shall permit the interstate operation of a bus and intrastate operation which is incidental to a trip of such bus involving interstate operation.

"'(e) Other agreements: Nothing in this agreement shall be construed to prohibit any of the contracting States from entering into separate agreements with each other for the granting of temporary permits for the intrastate operation of vehicles registered in the other State; nor to prevent any of the contracting States from entering into agreements to grant reciprocity for intrastate operation within any zone or zones agreed upon by the States.

"'*Article VI—Withdrawal or revocation*

"'Any contracting State may withdraw from this agreement upon thirty days' written notice to each other contracting State, which notice shall be given only after the repeal of this agreement by the legislature of such State, if adoption was by legislative act, or after renunciation by the appropriate administrative official of such contracting State if the laws thereof empower him so to renounce.

"'*Article VII—Construction and severability*

"This compact shall be liberally construed so as to effectuate the purposes thereof. The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phase, clause, sentence, or provision of this compact is declared to be contrary to the constitution of any State or of the United States or the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. If this compact shall be held contrary to the constitution of any State participating herein, the compact shall remain in full force and effect as to the remaining party States and in full force and effect as to the State affected as to all severable matters.'"

SEC. 202. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have the power to make such exemptions from the coverage of the agreement as may be appropriate and to make such changes in methods for the reporting of any information required to be furnished to the District of Columbia pursuant to the agreement as, in its judgment, shall be suitable: *Provided*, That any such exemptions or changes shall not be contrary to the purposes set forth in article I of the agreement and shall be made in order to permit the continuance of uniformity of practice among the contracting States with respect to buses.

SEC. 203. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall enter into the agreement authorized by section 201 of this title without further action on the part of the Congress, and issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the implementation of such agreement. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, nothing herein shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners (other than the entry into a compact authorized by this Act) or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

SEC. 204. All provisions of law applicable to the District of Columbia shall, to the extent they are inconsistent with the agreement authorized by this title, be inapplicable to the taxation and registration of buses in the District of Columbia during such time as the District is a party to such agreement.

SEC. 205. Unless otherwise provided in any statute withdrawing the District of Columbia from participation in the agreement, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be the officer to give notice of withdrawal therefrom.

SEC. 206. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this title is expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 824) was laid on the table.

INCENTIVE PAY FOR SUBMARINE DUTY TO CERTAIN PERSONNEL

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5571) to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 5571, with Mr. UDALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, this bill, I am sure, will be considered as a noncontroversial measure. It actually makes no change in any existing practice. It makes no addition to the cost of submarine pay now being paid.

The only purpose of this legislation is to clarify a hiatus that developed because of the Comptroller General's ruling where some confusion developed in the language of the existing law that has been in effect for 20 years. That is the purpose of it. So there is nothing new and there is no additional cost involved. But it is highly necessary that this action be taken because of the ruling by the Comptroller General.

However, for the purpose of the RECORD I shall make a brief statement clarifying the problem and the objectives of this bill.

H.R. 5571 is a Department of Defense legislative recommendation which the Bureau of the Budget advises is in accord with the program of the President. Its purpose is to clarify the entitlement of certain personnel assigned duties on the staffs of submarine operational commanders to continuous incentive pay for submarine duty.

The Department of the Navy has paid certain members assigned duties on staffs of submarine operational commanders continuous incentive pay for submarine duties under the authority contained in section 301 of title 37, United States Code.

The award of this incentive pay to these staff personnel has been made since 1944. However, the Comptroller General, by a decision dated October 30, 1964—B154092—has ruled that the language of the present statute does not permit the continued payment of this incentive pay to such staff personnel unless a majority of their assigned duties are actually performed on board a submarine.

The Comptroller General further stated that exceptions would be made to these payments after March 1, 1965. Subsequently, the Department of Defense and the Department of the Navy indicated their desire to request clarifying legislation so as to permit the continuation of this incentive payment to these staff personnel.

Accordingly, the chairman of the Armed Services Committee had, by letter dated February 25, 1965, requested the Comptroller General to further extend the deadline date so as to permit the Congress an adequate opportunity to act on the Department's request for clarifying legislation.

On March 8, 1965, the Committee on Armed Services received a letter from the Comptroller General advising that he would extend the cutoff date until June 1, 1965. However, he further indicated that "in the event Congress has not enacted legislation by June 1, 1965, we do not believe we could justify any further extension of time."

It is evident, therefore, that Congress must act affirmatively on this proposal not later than June 1, 1965, or further entitlement to this pay will be lost by these personnel.

The Committee on Armed Services was advised that there are approximately 22,000 personnel presently attached to our submarine forces in the Atlantic and Pacific, of which approximately 1,061 are staff members. However, of these 1,061 members serving on submarine command staffs, only 857 are serving in designated billets for which submarine pay has been authorized. Approximately 350 of these personnel are officers and 507 are enlisted personnel.

The committee appreciated the concern of the Comptroller General in denying the award of this incentive payment to personnel not actually engaged in seagoing submarine operations. Therefore, the committee was desirous of establishing a minimum performance requirement before these personnel would be considered eligible for this entitlement.

Testimony received by the committee indicated that these staff personnel presently eligible for this incentive pay do, in fact, participate in seagoing submarine operations to a very substantial degree. However, it was persuaded that inclusion of a statutory minimum performance requirement might create unforeseen administrative problems. Therefore, the committee agreed that the legislative history relating to this bill would include the minimum performance requirement for eligibility for this incentive payment.

The committee stipulated that a minimum performance requirement acceptable to it would provide that personnel participate in submarine operations for a minimum period of 4 hours of submerged time per month, compounded quarterly. This requirement would be similar to the operational requirement for eligibility for flight pay.

Submarine incentive pay is established at the same rates as flight pay; that is, the monthly rates for officers range from $100 to $245, and the rates for enlisted men range from $50 to $105 per month.

The annual cost of continuation of this incentive payment is approximately $1.4 million.

The Committee on Armed Services, a quorum being present, unanimously recommended favorable action on this bill.

In view of these circumstances, the committee unanimously recommended favorable action in order to correct this hiatus which has developed, and the confusion, based upon the Comptroller General's letter of last October.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In the past, there have been abuses of flight pay. Since this is patterned on a flight pay system, I would hope that we could rely upon the Navy Department to be careful not to repeat some of the abuses which have taken place in the Air Force. Would the gentleman care to comment on that?

Mr. FISHER. I believe the gentleman's point is well taken. Undoubtedly, there have been abuses, as the gentleman referred to. The committee is quite aware of them. We have every assurance, and every reason to believe, that we will not experience that kind of difficulty with respect to the operation of this rule on the pay for hazardous submarine duty.

Mr. GROSS. I have no quarrel with incentive and hazardous pay, but it must not be abused.

May I ask whether this is cumulative? In other words, can benefits, under the 4 hours, be accumulated, say at one time up to 48 hours of undersea duty?

Mr. FISHER. The cumulative feature is on a quarterly basis. There is a 4-hour per month minimum, which would be 12 hours for 3 months.

I might point out that this is the minimum requirement. We had to arrive at some figure, to put in a minimum. In actual practice, the vast majority—in fact, practically all—who will participate in this hazardous pay will serve many times the 4-hour minimum.

Mr. GROSS. So that over a period of one-quarter, if a cruise extended for a 12-hour period, the individual would be covered for hazardous pay?

Mr. FISHER. That is right. That would be the minimum requirement, before he would be considered for the hazardous pay.

Mr. GROSS. I thank my friend from Texas for yielding to me.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5571 and recommend the unanimous approval of the House of this legislation.

As indicated by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which handled this bill, the purpose of the legislation is simply to clarify the existing entitlement of certain personnel assigned duties on the staffs of submarine operational commanders to the continuous receipt of incentive pay for submarine duty.

For the past 20 years, such pay has been a proper expectation of the career submariner. Continuation of this long-established practice is essential in maintaining the vitality and responsiveness of the submarine force to the national needs.

As a matter of practice, the commanders and staff members attached to submarine operational commands, are required to perform duties on submarines, participate in submerged operations, and make periodic operational cruises on submarines as necessary for the effective performance of their duties. The amount and duration of this participation must, of necessity, vary with the operational command, the responsibilities of the commander, and the duties of the individual staff member.

Testimony received by the Committee on Armed Services indicates that these personnel do, in fact, perform a substantial portion of their duties aboard submarines. For example, Admiral Fluckey, who is the commander of Submarine Forces in the U.S. Pacific Fleet, appeared before the committee in connection with this legislation, and pointed out that his duties required considerable time on board submarines. For purposes of the record, I think it worthwhile to include this portion of his statement, which is as follows:

> Now, my aide here just happened to bring my own record to give you an example. In last June I had 14 days in submarines in port and 2 days underway.
>
> In July I had 6 days on submarines in port and 5 days underway.
>
> In August I had 19 days in port and 2 days underway.
>
> In September I had 4 days on submarines in port and 5 days underway.
>
> In October I had 5 days in port and 4 days underway.
>
> In November I had 1 day in port and 2 underway.
>
> In December I had 2 underway and 1 in port.
>
> In January I had 5 in port and 1 underway.
>
> In Feburary I had 4 in port and 1 underway.
>
> In March, so far, I have had 4 in port and 1 underway.

Admiral Lowrance, who is commander, Submarine Force, Atlantic Fleet, also appeared before the committee in support of this legislation and pointed out that among the personnel lost on the USS *Thresher* was a member of his submarine operational command staff.

It is evident to me, therefore, that these people have every entitlement to the continuous receipt of submarine pay and I therefore urge your support of this clarifying legislation.

Mr. Chairman, having no requests for time, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5571, a bill to authorize payment of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders.

This legislation comes before the House at the request of the Secretary of the Navy. It appears to me to be an entirely reasonable request, designed to promote the efficiency of a most important arm of our national defense, the submarine force.

The submarine force of the U.S. Navy has for many years been staffed with a select group taken only from volunteers. The purpose of this bill is to maintain the efficiency and morale of the personnel of this force, which has served our country so well in the past, and which is of continuing paramount importance to our national defense.

The commanders and staff members of all branches of the submarine force must frequently participate in submerged operation, and make periodic operational cruises in submarines in the course of their normal duties. Moreover, even an operational commander and his staff must necessarily perform some of their duties at submarine bases or on board submarine tenders. The discontinuance of incentive pay during these periods would necessarily create a very unstable family financial situation.

The objective of an incentive pay system is to obtain the best qualified volunteer personnel. The requirements of our national interest demand that the incentive pay system be placed on a firm and certain basis.

We in Hawaii, being situated as we are in the Pacific, are deeply conscious of the sudden and unexpected demands which this particular arm of the service can make upon its members—yes, even those who are attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders, for it is at Pearl Harbor that we have the headquarters of the commander, submarine forces, Pacific. The submarine base, Pearl Harbor, which is a part of the local command, is also a very important adjunct to the Navy's submarine operations in the Pacific.

I urge that this bill be given a favorable vote.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5571

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 301(a) (2) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by inserting after the words, "personnel qualified in submarines" the words, "as a member of a submarine operational command staff,".

SEC. 2. The amendment made by the first section of this Act shall take effect March 1, 1965.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. ALBERT, having assumed the chair, Mr. UDALL, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5571) to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders, pursuant to House Resolution 308, he reported the bill back to the House.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCENTIVE PAY FOR FLIGHT DECK DUTY

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3044) to authorize payment of incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3044, with Mr. UDALL in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, this bill is, I am sure, a noncontroversial measure which is highly justified and for which there is a very pressing and urgent need.

For the purposes of legislative history I shall explain briefly what the purpose is and how this legislation will operate—H.R. 3044.

This is a Department of Defense legislative recommendation which the Bureau of the Budget advises is in accordance with the program of the President.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is to authorize incentive pay for personnel who perform hazardous duties on the flight decks of aircraft carriers.

The rate of incentive pay for these personnel performing hazardous duty would under the proposal be $110 per month for officers, and $55 per month for enlisted men.

These personnel, some of whom are members of the carrier's crew, and some of whom are attached to aircraft squadrons operating from the carrier, include the flight deck catapult and arresting gear crews, plane directors and handlers, phone talkers, and elevator operators. Also included are those members of the crash crew, fueling crew, ordnance crew, hospital corpsmen, squadron maintenance or ordnance personnel, and plane captains whose duties require their presence on the flight deck during flight operations.

The Department of the Navy advises that extension of hazardous duty pay to these personnel is essential for two primary reasons:

First. Compilation of fatality and injury statistics shows that duty on the flight deck of an attack or antisubmarine aircraft carrier during flight operations is one of the most hazardous types of duty in the Navy. As to fatalities, it ranks next after duty involving flying. As to injuries, it ranks first by a wide margin.

Second. The reenlistment rate for these flight deck personnel, most of whom are newly rated third class aviation boatswain's mates—E-4—or nonrated personnel—E-3 or E-2—is about one-third the overall Navy first reenlistment rate. For example, the first term reenlistment rate for these personnel is approximately 8.3 percent. The inevitable result of the failure of these personnel to reenlist is a dangerous reduction in the experience level required of these personnel to insure maximum safety and efficiency during flight deck operations.

The Navy hopes, by extension of hazardous duty pay to these personnel, to substantially increase the reenlistment rate and thereby directly increase the experience level of these personnel with a subsequent reduction in fatalities, injuries, and property damage along with an increase in the combat potential of naval air power.

The Navy advises that enactment of this legislation would affect an estimated 9,400 persons who would become eligible for hazardous duty pay. It is estimated that over 97 percent of this group is enlisted personnel.

The Navy estimates that the additional annual cost to the Department of the Navy of this legislation is approximately $5,326,200.

The Committee on Armed Services unanimously agreed that enactment of this legislation is completely justified. It, however, is mindful of the possibility that indiscriminate award of this entitlement could be made under the proposed authority.

Therefore, it clearly established in the record its desire that reasonable minimum monthly performance criteria be established by the Secretary of the Navy for personnel to become eligible for this hazardous duty payment. The committee was assured that this would be done and this legislative intent was clearly and fully developed during the hearings.

It is estimated that under this proposal flight deck crewmen assigned to the carrier will qualify on the average not more than 10½ months per year; and flight deck crewmen assigned to air units operating from the carrier will qualify on the average approximately 9 months per year.

In view of these circumstances, Mr. Chairman, I urge approval of this legislation.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to congratulate the able gentleman from Texas [Mr. FISHER] and the Committee on Armed Services for favorably reporting this bill and by its recommendation making possible the first step toward hazardous pay for men who serve on flight decks.

Mr. Chairman, anyone who has been aboard an aircraft carrier during operations at sea cannot help but be impressed by the heroism that is displayed almost as a matter of course by the men who work on the flight decks with the catapults, with the arresting gear, and with the handling of aircraft across the decks, often under conditions that are as dangerous as it is possible to have at sea.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the committee has done a wise thing in recommending the adoption of this bill.

I have no doubt it will be approved unanimously by the House of Representatives.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON]. The records show that the record of fatalities and injuries for those who are engaged in this sort of mission exceed by far any others, other than the fatalities for actual flying service and some three times as much in terms of injuries as is true of any other branch of the naval service.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISHER. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I vigorously support this legislation.

There is a pressing need for incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier, and I rise in support of this much-needed legislation, H.R. 3044, which has the full support of the House Armed Services Committee, of which I am a member.

These officers and enlisted men who perform duties on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier during flight operations are constantly in danger of injury or even loss of their lives.

A study has been made on this proposed pay increase for those military personnel who work in close proximity to moving aircraft, and who are exposed to jet intake, jet blasts, propeller wash, whirling propellers, flying objects, and aircraft crashes and fires.

The record is full of incidents where these men have been involved in accidents which have resulted in loss of eyesight, limbs, and other damage to their bodies, including many fatalities. Statistics compiled during 1960 and 1961 show that duty on the flight deck of an attack carrier or an antisubmarine carrier during flight operations is one of the most hazardous types of duty in the Navy. As to fatalities it ranks next after duty involving flying, and as to injuries it ranks first.

Several hundred men would fall into this category at the Mayport Naval Station, in the Second Congressional District of Florida, where 3 carriers are based, while some 9,400 individuals, of which 97 percent are enlisted personnel, would be covered.

I vigorously support this legislation, which has the support of the Department of Defense and the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman I rise in support of this legislation, H.R. 3044. I want to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

Having served as a carrier pilot during World War II, I can certainly vouch for the additional hazards these gentlemen of the carrier crew are subjected to.

The problems in Vietnam and potentially around the world quite emphatically point up the continuing role that only an aircraft carrier and its complement can handle. The training and recruiting requirements demand our establishing adequate incentives for the personnel serving this Nation under extremely hazardous duty.

I strongly urge the House and this committee to pass this long-overdue bill. The security of our Nation is dependent upon the finest in trained personnel manning the naval task forces throughout the world. This bill is designed to offer the necessary incentives.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3044 and recommend unanimous approval by the House.

The bill has been explained to you by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee which conducted public hearings on this legislation. However, I would like to emphasize again the importance of this legislation and the hazards which are encountered by these personnel who would be the beneficiaries of this hazardous duty pay under the terms of this proposal.

This bill is directed to the recognition of, and compensation for, the hazards encountered by personnel whose duties require their presence on the flight decks of attack and antisubmarine aircraft carriers during flight operations.

Many of the Members of the House are acquainted, through personal observations, with the functions performed on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier, and the hazards to which the men on duty there are exposed.

The performance of a flight deck crew requires the integration and blending of numerous skills into a group evaluation which must be executed with speed, precision, and sound judgment in the face of multiple dangers.

Inasmuch as the effectiveness of the sea-based strike forces and the carrier-based antisubmarine forces depends on the number of aircraft which can be launched, serviced, rearmed and relaunched, it can be said that the effectiveness of these forces is directly dependent on the efficiency of the personnel who work on the flight deck.

The physical environment on the flight deck is invariably one of cramped space, high winds, continuous movement, and noise. These factors are constant, but the variables introduced by darkness, roll and pitch, weather, accidents, and emergencies, severely increase the already hazardous conditions.

In short, the working environment for these personnel is characterized by exposure to weather, wind, extremes of temperature, noise, propellors, jet blast, heat, motion, and the consequences of an unguarded moment when senses are not peaked to caution.

The extremely dangerous conditions under which these personnel work, coupled with long hours, fatigue, and poor pay has, as has been explained to you, resulted in an absolutely unacceptable low reenlistment rate of 8.3 percent. This is understandable.

We hope by enactment of this legislation to substantially increase the reenlistment rate of these personnel, thereby increasing the experience level of the personnel performing these duties on flight decks with a consequent reduction in injuries and deaths occurring in connection with flight deck operation, and also with a desired increase in the efficiency of flight deck operations.

I cannot see how anyone in this House could question the entitlement of these personnel to this additional hazard duty pay.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me. I should like to join him in his unrelenting support of H.R. 3044, and simply add that I, too, believe it is a long time in coming.

Anyone who has had any service duty as a pilot or otherwise on one of our aircraft carriers knows the patriotism and sheer devotion to duty, that money cannot buy, that is required of these men during operations, because of the conditions under which they work: The exposure to jet blast and propwash, to say nothing of the pitch and roll at a high rate of speed, particularly on the new atomic carriers or the attack carriers and the others.

As one of the physicians in the Congress and on the Armed Services Committee, I have oftentimes been taken to the sick bay when going aboard carriers in line of duty. I have seen the 65- to 70-foot falls as one is blown over the side as a result of being caught in jet blasts. This is a modern complication or new development. Not only is the "Mickey Mouse," as the men are called because of the red, brown, yellow, or blue, uniforms they wear, burned by the blast before he goes over the side, but much of his skin and his hands are burned by grasping the deck in order to try to keep from going over. They are badly burned in the process and look like mummies in the sick bay if, indeed the man survives the impact of hitting the water below.

There is little question but that this is needed hazardous duty pay. It will result in the signing over—reenlisting—of many men, whether they be carrier personnel themselves or in the aircraft squadrons aboard.

For this purpose, we can only reward the dedication to duty and the patriotism that these fine young men show in servicing our capital ships. I certainly hope the bill passes.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. In connection with what the gentleman has just said, I should like to tell my colleagues of the House that several years ago I was with the gentleman from Missouri as we went aboard an aircraft carrier of the 6th Fleet, in the Mediterranean. Upon arrival the ship's physician was awaiting Dr. Hall and invited our colleague from Missouri to consult with him with reference to the injuries sustained by a member of the flight deck crew who had been blown over the side by jet blast just shortly before we came aboard. I say to you that our colleague has intimate knowledge of the hazards of the flight deck and I share his view that this is an area that needs our prompt attention. It would be my hope that after we conclude our action here today the other body will also act promptly in approving this needed legislation.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Chairman, I too would like to rise in strong support of this legislation, H.R. 3044. I had the occasion to witness at firsthand, having served on a carrier during World War II, the very hazardous duties and occupations that my able colleague, the genleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall] has just so well described. I have seen at firsthand, not only the injuries but the fatal injuries that the people who handle the planes on the carriers have to endure. I think this is much needed legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Chamberlain], and urge prompt enactment of this legislation.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, having no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3044

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 301(a) of title 37, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking out the word "or" at the end of clause (10);

(2) by striking out the period at the end of clause (11) and inserting a semicolon and the word "or" in place thereof; and

(3) by adding the following new clause at the end thereof:

"(12) involving frequent and regular participation in flight operations on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier."

Sec. 2. Section 301(c) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "or (11)" and inserting the words "(11), or (12)" in place thereof.

Sec. 3. Section 301(f) of title 37, United States Code, is amended by striking out the words "subsection (a)(1)–(11)" and inserting the words "subsection (a)(1)–(12)" in place thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. Albert, having assumed the chair, Mr. Udall, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3044) to authorize payment of incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier, pursuant to House Resolution 307, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMERCIAL BANKS—SUPERVISION, EXAMINATION, AUDITING TO BE TRANSFERRED TO U.S. TREASURY DEPARTMENT ACCORDING TO H.R. 6885

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to vest in the Secretary of the Treasury all functions relating to the examination and supervision of federally insured banks.

The purpose of this bill H.R. 6885 is to simplify and streamline Federal bank supervision by eliminating the overlapping jurisdiction of the Federal Reserve Board, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

The present unsatisfactory system reflects the fact that the major banking laws—the National Bank Act of 1863, the Federal Reserve Act of 1913, and the Federal Deposit Insurance Act of 1933—were placed on the statute books over a span of many years with little regard for a coordinated body of Federal law on the subject of bank supervision. It is high time that this archaic situation was corrected and our banking code modernized.

My bill would accomplish this great reform without disturbing certain attributes of the present system which many deem desirable and necessary. The Federal Deposit Insurance fund would be preserved as a separate fund and national banks would continue to contribute toward the cost of their supervision. Furthermore, this bill would, if anything, strengthen our dual banking system.

Coordinating all Federal activities under the Secretary of the Treasury is, I believe, the ideal solution to our problem. Placing Federal bank supervision within an organic department of the executive branch with its direct responsibility to the electorate cannot help but benefit the banking industry and the general public as well.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is the product of many, many months of study and deliberation. It is my hope that all Members will take an interest in it and follow the hearings very closely.

The bill is 77 pages and will not be inserted herein but it will be available at the document room tomorrow morning, March 30.

Following are the first seven sections of the bill which include all of the substantive changes that would be made:

TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Chapter 1

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Banking Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. There are transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the "Secretary") all functions of the Comptroller of the Currency and all functions of all agencies, officers, and employees of the Bureau of the Comptroller of the Currency.

SEC. 3. All bank examining, auditing, and other banking supervisory functions (except with reference to the twelve Federal Reserve banks) of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Reserve banks are transferred to the Secretary.

SEC. 4. All functions of the Board of Directors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and all agencies, officers, and employees of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation are transferred to the Secretary.

SEC. 5. (a) The Secretary may from time to time make such provisions as he may deem appropriate authorizing the performance by any other officer, or by any agency or employee, of the Department of the Treasury of any function of the Secretary transferred to or conferred upon him by the provisions of this Act or by any amendments to other Acts made by this Act.

(b) The Secretary may from time to time effect such transfers within the Department of the Treasury of any of the records and personnel of such Department as he may deem necessary in order to carry out the provisions of this Act.

(c) The Secretary may appoint, subject to the civil service laws, and fix the compensation of, subject to the Classification Act of 1949, such personnel as may be necessary to carry out the functions transferred to provisions of this Act.

(d) In order to promote uniformity and efficiency in Federal service, the President is requested to exercise his authority, conferred by the proviso of section 11(1) of the Federal Reserve Act, to place employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System in the classified service.

SEC. 6. The costs and expenses of performing any function transferred to the Secretary by this Act, and all costs and expenses of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, other than for the payment or liquidation of insurance losses or for materials or services supplied by it on a reimbursable basis, shall be paid out of such sums as may be appropriated for the purpose.

SEC. 7. The Secretary shall make a report to the Congress of his activities and recommendations with respect to the functions transferred to him by this Act as soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year.

The following release which further explains the bill is included in these remarks:

REPRESENTATIVE PATMAN INTRODUCES BANKING ACT OF 1965, A BILL TO MODERNIZE EXAMINATION AND SUPERVISION OF FEDERALLY INSURED BANKS

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, Democrat, of Texas, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee, today introduced a bill to vest in the Secretary of the Treasury all functions relating to the examination and supervision of federally insured banks.

The important results of this bill, entitled the "Banking Act of 1965," are as follows:

1. All of the statutory powers of the Comptroller of the Currency, as well as the employees of his office, are transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury.

2. All Federal examination and supervisory authority over banks is transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury, including the employees of the FDIC. This bill also abolishes the Board of Directors of the FDIC.

3. The relative burden of the expense of Federal bank supervision and examination would not be in any way affected by this bill. National bank assessments would be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts and the expenses of their examination and supervision would be accomplished by the use of appropriated funds.

4. The independence of the FDIC Insurance Fund would be retained in its present form.

5. All employees transferred to the Treasury Department by this bill would be under civil service.

WHY DID HE GO DOWN THERE, ANYWAY?

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago Casper, Wyo., held a memorial tribute to a hometown boy—the Reverend James J. Reeb, who was murdered at Selma, Ala. Three men spoke—each was a boyhood friend—each had attended Natrona County High School, each had graduated with him in the class of 1945. They were Casper's mayor, Patrick H. Meenan; Dr. Joseph Murphy, a Casper physician and surgeon; and Frank L. Bowron, a Casper attorney and one-time U.S. Senate employee under the patronage of the late Lester C. Hunt.

I commend to my colleagues the following which is Mr. Bowron's eulogy to his late friend:

Friday evening, after I had accepted Reverend Koopman's invitation to speak here today, I was in a restaurant having a cup of coffee when I heard a woman at the next table talking about the murder of Jim Reeb.

"Why did he go down there anyway," she said. "He had no business getting involved."

This, then, is the question I want to try to answer this afternoon—and at the same time attempt to tell you something about Jim Reeb.

Jim Reeb and I went through high school together, belonged to the same church and attended the same Sunday school class. He was a sensitive boy, and intensely idealistic.

There was a war and he was not old enough to go, but he watched the fathers and mothers of his town endure the pain of losing sons—sons dying for the cause of freedom. And he learned that these parents, and these sons, if they were asked to repeat that sacrifice, would say: "Yes, I would do it again."

There was a teacher in high school—a dedicated woman of intelligence and vigor—who instilled in him a strong feeling for honesty and justice and who by her dedication to teaching made an example of her very life of helping others. And if you asked her today: "Would you give these principles to Jim Reeb if you had it to do over again." She would say: "Yes, I would do it again."

There was a minister in our church, who through those years, with infinite patience and dedication, encouraged Jim Reeb to choose the ministry as his career, and who by his own sacrifice and love, set before Jim an example of what such ministry can mean. And if we could ask that man today if he would do this again, he would say: "Yes, I would do it again."

There was a succession of Sunday school teachers, all of them sincere Christian men and women, who taught Jim Reeb the message of love for his fellow men and love for God—and each of these, if you asked them today: "If you had it to do over again, would you guide Jim Reeb by these teachings?" Each would answer: "Yes, I would do it again."

There are his parents, who taught him their own standards of honor and decency, love and respect, and who guided him by the same code by which they have lived. And if you asked them today if they would do that again, they would have to answer: "Yes, I would do it again."

And there is a wife, whose qualities of understanding and compassion, and whose courage matched his own, and who could say to him: "Do what you feel you must; do what you know is right."

And no greater demonstration of their union could be found than when that wife was asked, during the vigil in Birmingham, whether Jim Reeb would go back to Selma if he had it to do over again, and she answered without pause or hesitation—for Jim—"Yes, I would do it again."

Jim Reeb was taught, right here in Casper, Wyo., that his going to Selma was the right thing, the decent thing, the Christian thing to do. And it is because he accepted our teaching and believed our truths and adopted our principles—it is because we helped shape his tragic destiny, that Casper, Wyo., must share the shame of Selma, Ala.

Our guilt was expressed by the woman in the restaurant when she said: "He had no business getting involved."

That woman spoke for millions of Americans whose creed has been: "I don't want to get involved—let them solve their own problems."

Today, most of these voices are silent—struck dumb by the human sacrifice of Jim Reeb on the altar of bigotry and hate.

But tomorrow, they will begin again: "We don't have the problem here. I don't want to get involved." And soon it will resolve itself again into that simple, ageless answer that Cain gave the Lord: "Am I my brother's keeper?"

How appropriate to this moment is the answer of the Lord: "What have you done? The voice of your brother's blood cries to me from the ground."

Today all America is standing trial for the murder of James Reeb.

Today, by the murder of James Reeb, the mark of Cain is written across the face of the Nation.

If we fail Jim Reeb at this moment, we forfeit our highest aspirations to truth and honor and love.

If we fail Jim Reeb, we forsake all that is noble in our lives and we profane our hopes for our children.

If we fail Jim Reeb, may God have mercy on our souls.

MY REACTION TO THE FAVORABLE PASSAGE OF THE 1965 ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHISLER. Mr. Speaker, as a former schoolteacher and principal who now has the rare privilege of serving in this distinguished Chamber, I would like to describe my reaction to the favorable passage on March 26 of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The passage of this act by the House of Representatives truly serves as a landmark in the history of American education.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I who voted for this measure did so because it goes a long way toward satisfying a need that has remained too long unsatisfied in America. The favorable vote for this bill is especially meaningful for me because of my background both as a classroom teacher and as an administrator in the public schools in my hometown of London Mills, Illinois.

I am fully aware of the problems and needs confronting educators all across the country. Actually, they confront all of our citizens, and that is why this bill is so important. At long last we have elevated education to the point of national concern that it deserves. It gives me a great feeling of accomplishment to vote yes when we are asked to do something effective for our Nation's youngsters. Our children, after all, are the ones who are really going to benefit from this program.

This bill deserves to be considered as more than just another act passed by the House of Representatives. I regard it as an act heralding a new era in American education. It marks the end of a long road toward elevating education to the proper place it deserves at the pinnacle of everything else we do. It puts education in the spotlight as probably the single most important element in our society.

Mr. Speaker, passage of this act will probably prove to be one of the outstanding events in the history of American education. I am extremely proud to have played a part in this event.

Everyone recognizes that education will not solve all of our problems. But it is far, far ahead of whatever is second in meeting the needs of our society and our citizens. Without education, our Nation simply cannot prosper and grow.

Mr. Speaker, I, along with my colleagues in the world of education, followed the education bill from the time it was introduced until it was reported by the Committee on Education and Labor for consideration by the House of Representatives. The bill represents an imaginative approach to some of the Nation's most pressing educational problems. Approval of this legislation confirms my belief that the American public is determined to build the level of education up to a standard rather than to push it down to the level of a price. Education is too valuable a commodity to label with a price tag.

Speaking as a teacher and school administrator, Mr. Speaker, the next step I would like to see taken would be the completion of the picture in the education field by the creation of a Department of Education with a Secretary of Education in the President's Cabinet. With a Secretary of Education sitting at the President's elbow, we would then have final recognition by our Nation's citizens of the importance of education in our national life. I cannot think of anything more fitting than the establishment of a Department of Education in the President's official family at a time when the destiny of our Nation is in the hands of the President who himself once gave proud public service in the ranks of education as a teacher of our Nation's youth.

LEGISLATION DESIGNED TO ENFORCE THE 15TH AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 6614, a bill I introduced on March 23, 1965, to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

I regard it as a great honor to become a cosponsor of the voting rights legislation that President Johnson has so urgently requested us to enact.

The cause of equality for all Americans is one that I have been associated with throughout my career in public life. And I know that any progress in this field can only be achieved by overcoming the most bitter resistance.

In 1949, when I was serving as Illinois director of labor I issued bulletin No. 2190, eliminating discrimination in the State employment service; and I well remember the antagonism this step aroused among the reactionaries and the bigots.

It will be no different with this voting rights measure. Many reasons will be advanced for not enacting this legislation. But cutting through the fog of legalisms and theories, the real issue clearly emerges—that is, whether all Americans will be guaranteed the right to exercise the full privileges of American citizenship.

There is no doubt in my mind as to how this issue will ultimately be resolved. Just a little over a week ago, we sat in this Chamber and listened to the President of the United States deliver one of the most eloquent statements of American idealism in the history of our Nation.

The case for speedy action as he stated it is clear. The need is urgent. I sincerely hope that we can move to a favorable consideration of the bill in the very near future.

THE FIRE STILL BURNS

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, certainly one of the happiest men in the Nation as the result of the action of this body last Friday in passing the elementary and secondary education bill was our former colleague, Cleve Bailey, of West Virginia.

There is a wonderful article about Cleve Bailey in the Charleston Gazette entitled "Cleve Bailey—The Fire Still Burns."

I know my colleagues in this body will be interested in seeing this article because Cleve always spoke out for what he believed in. He was one of the first Members of this body to push education legislation which we successfully brought to passage on last Friday.

The article to which I refer follows:

Cleve Bailey—The Fire Still Burns

(By James A. Haught)

"I was in public service 40 years and they haven't got me in jail, so I guess I was a pretty good fellow."

"Nobody ever told Bailey what to say on the floor of the House or told him how to vote. It's wonderful to have that feeling."

"They wanted me to run for Governor in 1952, and—you know that story on Marland the other day? It wouldn't have turned out that way, because I'd have licked hell out of him. But I never had any desire to come back to the statehouse, and I'll tell you why: the house of delegates might go liberal sometimes in those days, but the Senate always lined up with the big nonresident coal interests. I would have been at their throats 24 hours after I took the oath."

"It's no little job for a man from West Virginia to go out in the House and lead a floor fight against both the Democratic and Republican leadership. It takes a lot of guts and you have to know what you're talking about. I'm glad I licked them at least one time."

"Around big men, you learn a lot. You don't even have to keep your eyes open—just keep the pores of your skin open."

"My health had something to do with my retirement, but the major reason was Mr. (Arch) Moore."

"These youngsters coming up now—I don't know any of them any more."

Cleveland Monroe Bailey is 78 years old now, and he's gaunt and stiff with the pain of ill health. But he hasn't lost the crusty candor that carried him through 16 years as the dean of West Virignia Congressmen.

He and his wife live in quiet obscurity in a small frame home in Kanawha City they bought 8 years ago. (Their main home has been in Charleston since the 1930's—to the constant chagrin of political foes Bailey repeatedly trounced in his upstate congressional district.)

The old Congressman rarely goes out, and he hasn't made a trip away from Charleston since last fall. His telephone is listed in his wife's name to insure privacy.

The only mark that distinguishes their one-story bungalow from others along Washington Avenue is a special automobile license mounted beside the door like a nameplate. It says "CMB—U.S. Congress."

Bailey was reluctant to talk to the press, but he finally agreed last week and met newsmen at his door wearing a dark suit and snappy bow tie.

"I don't want any booster-type story," he said, but admitted with a grin that any politician is willing to talk about his record, even if he has no more political plans.

He recounted his public life, from his years as a Clarksburg newspaper editor, city councilman, and school superintendent, to his arrival in Charleston in 1933 as an assistant State auditor, his service as State budget director during World War II, his 8 terms in the U.S. House of Representatives, and finally his failing health and five major operations that left him too weak to fight an effective campaign against Republican Arch Moore when the merging of congressional districts pitted them against each other in 1962.

"I wasn't up to that campaign," he said. "I shouldn't have made the race. Both the national and State administrations urged me to go ahead, but neither was able to help me much. Sixty percent of the inhabitants of those four panhandle counties were born in Ohio or Pennsylvania and moved in. They don't even talk like West Virginians, and they weren't about to vote for an oldtimer from down in the hills."

Bailey hesitated occasionally, and apologized that he "can't concentrate like I used to when I was a youngster." Then he talked on, giving dozens of precise figures such as the Republican and Democratic voter registration totals for three-county State senate districts in the election of 1922, or the exact balances, right to the penny, of various State funds during his 8 years of budget work.

When reminded that this showed remarkable acuity, he shrugged and said enigmatically: "You never forget things like that."

Bailey's record as a Democratic politician was one of general support for liberal, New Deal-type legislation. As assistant auditor during the depression, he drew up an unsuccessful depletion tax bill that would have taxed all coal and other natural resources removed from West Virginia, and he also won a moratorium on tax foreclosure sales in 1933 to save depression victims from losing their property.

In Congress, he fought for Federal aid to schools, increased minimum wage laws, medicare, the Youth Conservation Corps, greater benefits to the elderly and similar liberal measures. His only departure from the New Deal pattern was in a long-term battle against the relaxing of international trade barriers, which he said endanger West Virginia jobs.

He sponsored and was floor manager for numerous aid-to-education bills and was regarded as the father of the "impacted areas" school program that allowed the Federal Government to help school systems where U.S. installations caused a population boom.

He was regarded as a national leader—perhaps the No. 1 advocate—of Federal aid to schools, and he received frequent recognition and awards from like-minded groups.

But he also led other fights.

"When I became chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor in 1949, the national minimum wage was only 40 cents an hour," he said. "Think of that. Only 16 years ago, 3.5 million workers in this country were earning 40 cents an hour, or $16 for a 40-hour week. Prices had gone up and it was tough for them to live.

"I started my fight in 1949 and finally got a bill through in 1950 that raised the minimum wage to 75 cents. In one step, I raised those people's pay from $16 to $30 a week.

"Do you see what I did for the national economy by increasing the purchasing power? Besides the 3.5 million who were making the lowest wage, there were 1.9 million others earning less than 75 cents, so they all were raised."

He explained that he helped increase the minimum wage to $1 in 1955, and later helped bring it up to its present level of $1.25.

"You begin to understand why labor was so strong for me," he said. "I was the mouthpiece for most of the unions on the House floor—particularly the UMW. If there was a speech to be made for labor in the House, I did it, and I picked others to join me * * *."

In his work for Federal aid to schools he recalled several bills he had pushed to within a few votes of victory.

"This school bill the House passed just a few days ago is almost an exact replica of my bill in 1940," he said.

In his battles for high trade barriers, he sometimes had to fight his own party leadership, as in 1956 when he organized resistance to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act. In the first balloting, he defeated it by one vote, but it passed by one vote in a second rollcall.

It was in regard to that first vote, in which he outmaneuvered the leadership of both sides of the House aisle, that he said he "licked them at least one time."

The old politician still keeps close check on the work of Congress. He receives the Congressional Record and Washington newspapers every day, and reads them in his well-worn reclining chair, where he also listens to television newscasts.

He says he has no more political aspirations. "I just want to live in a house by the side of the road—you know," he said.

The Baileys receive $707.29 a month from his congressional retirement fund. "That's not bad," he said. "It's plenty for us to live on, and it would have been more except that I had it set up so Mrs. Bailey could continue to receive payments after my death. She may live 8 or 10 years longer than I, so I fixed it so she would be taken care of as my widow."

The Baileys are visited occasionally by their 3 surviving children and 11 grandchildren. One granddaughter lived with them while attending Morris Harvey College, until last June when she moved to Washington to work for the Commerce Department.

"She's the only one of my family who ever got a Government job," Bailey said. "Nobody could accuse me of nepotism."

Last May at the age of 77, Bailey filed for delegate at large to the Democratic National Convention. Of 50 aspirants, he drew 102,407 votes and placed second, just behind Jennings Randolph.

"That was the first time I ever ran in any statewide race," he said. "It made me feel pretty good to know that many West Virginians were still behind old Cleve Bailey."

AMERICAN HISTORIANS ON HISTORIC MARCH

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, among the thousands participating in the last lap of the historic march from Selma to Montgomery in Alabama were some 40 or 50 distinguished American historians organized on short notice by my constituent, Dr. Walter Johnson, Preston and Sterling Morton professor of American history at the University of Chicago. The group joined the march as it reached the birthplace and first capital of the Confederacy.

Mr. Johnson said:

The response to my suggestion that U.S. historians join Dr. Martin Luther King and the other marchers was impressive. Many more would have joined us had we had time to arrange transportation.

As teachers of American history, authors and interpreters of the American past, we view the march as one of the great turning points in American history. For too long, Negro Americans have been deprived of their voting rights. The purpose of American society has always been to provide an equal chance for all. The right to vote is an essential step toward equal opportunity in American life.

We historians were honored to be present to demonstrate our support of the spirit of President Lyndon B. Johnson's dramatic speech to the Congress, calling for congressional action to guarantee every citizen's right to vote. The 15th amendment must be implemented—it is 95 years since it was adopted.

I include here a partial list of the American historians who participated in the march in Montgomery:

Daniel Beaver, professor of American history, University of Cincinnati.

Thomas N. Bonner, chairman, Department of History, University of Cincinnati.

Stuart Bruchey, professor of American history, Michigan State University.

Donald Campbell, professor of American history, Dartmouth College.

John Caughey, professor of American history, University of California, Los Angeles.

Robert B. Cross, chairman, Department of History, Columbia University.

Herbert J. Daugherty, professor of American history, University of Florida.

David Denker, assistant to the president, Rutgers University.

Martin Duberman, professor of American history, Princeton University.

John Hope Franklin, professor of American history, University of Chicago.

Joseph Gusfield, professor of sociology, University of Illinois.

Mark Haller, professor of American history, University of Chicago.

Louis Harlan, professor of American history, University of Cincinnati.

Samuel P. Hays, chairman, Department of History, University of Pittsburgh.

Selden Henry, professor of American history, University of Florida.

John Higham, professor of American history, University of Michigan.

Richard Howstadter, DeWitt Clinton professor of American history, Columbia University.

J. Rogers Hollingsworth, professor of American history, University of Wisconsin.

Harold Hyman, professor of American history, University of Illinois.

Walter Johnson, Preston and Sterling Morton professor of American history, University of Chicago.

Mark M. Krug, professor of education, University of Chicago.

William Leuchtenberg, professor of American history, Columbia University.

Elsie Lewis, professor of American history, Howard University.

Gene Lewis, professar of American history, University of Cincinnati.

Shaw Livermore, Jr., professor of American history, University of Michigan.

Arthur Mann, professor of American history, Smith College.

August Meier, visiting professor of American history, Roosevelt University.

R. W. Patrick, professor of American history, University of Florida.

Bradford Perkins, professor of American history, University of Michigan.

James P. Shenton, professor of American history, Columbia University.

Roger Shugg, director of the University of Chicago Press.

E. B. Smith, professor of American history, Iowa State University.

Kenneth Stampp, professor of American history, University of California at Berkeley.

Warren Susman, professor of American history, Rutgers University.

Bennett H. Wall, professor of American history, University of Kentucky.

Bernard W. Weisberger, chairman, Department of History, University of Rochester.

Henry R. Winkler, editor, the American Historical Review, Rutgers University.

C. Vann Woodward, professor of American history, Yale University.

THE KU KLUX KLAN OF ALABAMA

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the events of the weekend in Alabama have cast another pall on the orderly processes of justice. The Ku Klux Klan has reared its ugly hood not only to defy the President of the United States but to smear, as well, the name of a lady who was seeking only to do justice and whose death tragically emphasized again the activity of vigilantes in Alabama. According to yesterday's newspapers, the imperial wizard of that organization said that the Klan bureau of investigation was investigating the lady from Detroit for possible Communist connections.

Mr. Speaker, what is this Klan bureau of investigation? Is it an organization that puts its finger on people and gives them the kiss of death?

The outrageous statements made by the Klan leader Saturday throwing down the gauntlet to the President, hurling abuse at our President and our system of justice, clearly indicates that there are other elements in Alabama than the millions of law abiding, decent, God-fearing Alabamians lauded by the gentleman from that State [Mr. ANDREWS].

I say now, Mr. Speaker, that the good people of Alabama have a choice. They can now support the President of the United States against the Klan.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an investigation of the Klan by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House as promptly as possible.

A REQUEST TO ALL FEDERAL AGENCIES TO HALT THE USE OF PERSONALITY TESTS AND PSYCHOLOGICAL QUESTIONNAIRES ON GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES AND JOB APPLICANTS

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, for several months, the House Committee on Government Operations has been engaged in an investigation of invasion of privacy matters involving the Federal Government. One of the matters currently under inquiry is the use of personality tests and psychological questionnaires on Federal employees and job applicants. These tests and questionnaires have a good purpose—namely, to uncover persons with psychological problems—but they constitute a gross invasion of privacy into the lives and thoughts of our public workers. In fact, I believe that tests actually violate their civil rights.

In addition, the reliability and validity of such tests are still a matter of great controversy within the fields of psychiatry and psychology. But even if they were infallible, there would remain the question of whether or not the Government should be engaging in such an activity. In my opinion, these tests are an insidious and illegal search of the human mind. They smack of "1984" and should be halted by all Federal agencies immediately. Otherwise, I think the Government may be involved in a gross violation of the fourth amendment to the Constitution, and perhaps the fifth amendment as well as others, depending on the facts in each case.

A number of Federal agencies now utilize such tests to supposedly help them in selecting personnel for various assignments. They also are used in the job applicant process. Thirdly, they have become one of the principal means to weed out persons who are allegedly unfit for Government duty in specific jobs or generally.

That list includes the Labor Department, the Defense Department, the Peace Corps, the Export-Import Bank, and the Health, Education, and Welfare Department which has financed the use of intrusive personality tests on school youngsters for research purposes.

Mr. Speaker, I was very pleased to be informed Friday that the Department of State has ordered the immediate discontinuance of such tests. The Department should be commended for this action and it is my hope that other Federal agencies will follow their lead in this matter. Following is the text of a letter regarding this decision:

DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF
STATE FOR ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1965.

Hon. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER,
House of Representatives.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GALLAGHER: There have been numerous questions raised as to whether our use of psychological testing in our regular medical examinations was an appropriate test for a government agency to impose upon its personnel. We have used this type of testing whenever our medical division determined whether it might assist in the proper treatment for the individuals.

We have now decided to discontinue this policy and will substitute instead a requirement that personnel seek their own psychiatric counsel whenever the medical examination indicates psychiatric treatment is necessary. We expect that this psychiatric care would be carried on in a personal relationship between the employee and doctor of his choice. In this way I think we can insure that the Department of State does not violate the rights of individuals while at the same time fulfills its responsibilities to the individual employee by calling attention to problems as well as protecting the national interest. The individual employee will seek assistance from his own doctor.

I would like to discuss this whole matter with you as we move forward with our new regulations.

I appreciate your help and assistance.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM J. CROCKETT.

A similar letter also was sent to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS], the distinguished chairman of the House

Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on State Department Organization and Foreign Operations, who also has been greatly concerned about this matter.

Mr. Speaker, so that Members of the House may become acquainted with the nature of these tests, I am including with my remarks samples of the questions commonly asked of Federal employees on some of the written examinations.

TRUE OR FALSE

I feel sure there is only one true religion.

My father was a good man.

My sex life is satisfactory.

During one period when I was a youngster I engaged in petty thievery.

I enjoy reading love stories.

I go to church almost every week.

I have very few quarrels with members of my family.

I believe in the second coming of Christ.

I believe women ought to have as much sexual freedom as men.

I believe in a life hereafter.

My mother was a good woman.

I am worried about sex matters.

Christ performed miracles.

I am against giving money to beggars.

Children should be taught all the main facts of sex.

There is very little love and companionship in my family as compared to other homes.

I loved my mother.

I pray several times a week.

I gossip a little at times.

I have been disappointed in love.

I dream frequently about things that are best kept to myself.

I believe there is a God.

Once in a while I laugh at a dirty joke.

I wish I were not bothered about thoughts about sex.

There is something wrong with my sex organs.

This particular test contains 566 such questions. The test not only examines into a person's intimate views on sex life, but also on private family and religious matters.

In addition, Government employees, both married and unmarried, have been asked to give written answers to such questions as whether they are troubled by such things, according to the questionnaire, as:

Deciding whether I'm really in love.

In love with someone of a different religion.

Disappointed in a love affair.

Too deeply involved in a love affair.

Petting and necking.

Wondering how far to go with the opposite sex.

Being too inhibited in sex matters.

Lacking in sex appeal.

Afraid of being found out.

Bothered by sexual thoughts or dreams.

Worried about the effects of masturbation.

Federal workers also have been asked to complete a number of statements in which just the first few words were given. Examples of these are:

I feel ashamed when ———.

God is ———.

I secretly ———.

My childhood ———.

Love ———.

I am ashamed ———.

I love ———.

These questions certainly transgress upon one's right to hold private and personal one's own religious beliefs. There seems to be a recurring pattern that one cannot hold deep religious beliefs and be emotionally stable or intellectually sound. If a person finds security in strong religious beliefs, the tests appear to attack him as being psychologically unstable and a potential national security risk.

But beyond this there remains many perplexing questions such as why a Jewish person or a non-Christian should be quizzed on their views of Christ. There are equally untenable questions that Christians are called upon to answer. These answers resting in a personnel file place a person in jeopardy if someone adverse to their beliefs is a reviewing officer about to pass judgment on their career.

Another very uncertain question is the jeopardy in which one is placed when this type of test remains part of a Federal employee's file. Since most of these questions are two-edged swords, what happens if a Federal employee should at some future date seek public office and his answers somehow become public knowledge? We have had too many cases where supposedly confidential files are passed from one agency to another for this not to happen. One can have no real assurance that his written answers to such intimate questions will not come back to haunt him in the future. There is no guarantee that these files will not fall into the wrong hands 5, 10, or 20 years from now.

One of the results of the American Revolution was the Bill of Rights. This erected a constitutional wall to protect the rights and privacy of the individual to keep his thoughts and beliefs locked in his secret mind and heart.

There can be no justification for the continuing assaults on this wall, nor can there be a justification for an indirect penetration of this wall under the guise of personality testing or scientific research.

OUR VISITING CLERGY AND SELMA

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include several editorials.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial appeared in the March 10 issue of the Opelika Daily News, Opelika, Ala. I am pleased to bring it to the attention of my colleagues under leave to extend my remarks. No one I have heard has taken issue with the "good samaritan" intentions of the visiting clergy in Selma, Ala., recently; nor has their faith in divine guidance been questioned. What is of great concern to many moderate Alabamians is, have we lost our deep abiding faith in the ability of the American court system to enact our duly legislated laws?

Before the staged confrontation in Selma, the city and Dallas County, of which it is a part, were complying with the court orders on registration—and at a rate that was satisfying to the court. Religious fervor is good for the sake of conviction, but when not tempered at the forge of reason this same zeal becomes a detriment to the cool, clear attitude of judicial impartiality so necessary when men do not yield to the whims of men—but rather to the rules of law.

The editorial follows:

OUR "VISITING" CLERGY AND SELMA

We would hope that all the ministers reported enroute to Selma in response to a plea from Rev. Martin Luther King and National Council of Churches would choose to bring their Bibles, unbiased minds and certificates from their congregations indicating that their members and communities are so sin-free that the pastors have ample time to come and cure Alabama's sins.

We would hope, also, that they'd take time to hold a few religious services in Selma—services featuring the Bible instead of TV lights and aimed at the individual worshippers inside the church rather than the television audience outside even though the publicity and the dollars will be considerably less and fewer.

But, we realize, this is too much to hope for. They'll come—just as did the others in other fields earlier in Reverend King's Selma campaign when the script called for 'em. They'll do just what the orders of the day call for as far as demonstrating, praying, and interviewing is concerned; they'll see and hear just what the campaign leaders want them to see and hear; and then they'll go back home at the proper time convinced they are now experts on Alabama's sins and feeling amply justified in their trip to such a sinful place and people.

Alabama and Selma, of course, are not sin-free like all the communities from which our visiting ministers come. There are some things that Alabama and Selma ministers deplore about the racial situation in our State, too, and speak out to correct—but most of them see motes in the eyes of members of both sides of the controversy and not just one side as do the visiting ministers from faraway places.

And most lay Alabamians deplore the violence and racial unrest, too. But most of them occupy the roles of heretics in Reverend King's scripts and performances because they also deplore the actions of King and his cohorts which contribute to and often cause the violence and racial animosity which King must have to maintain his public image as well as his appeal for raising funds.

Whether we agree with Governor Wallace's decision to ban the proposed march from Selma to Montgomery or not, we do agree that he had the right and the responsibility to make a decision in the matter as head of this sovereign State.

And no matter what his decision was, the leaders of the march as well as everyone else in Alabama should have obeyed those orders until such a time as they were either rescinded or knocked down by a court of authority.

That the marchers deliberately chose to defy the legal order of the State and refused to obey the commands of the representatives of the State charged with upholding the law and maintaining the peace has been politely pushed aside and completely forgotten by some—especially those who now loudly cry "police brutality" and "storm trooper tactics."

And, we might add, forgotten and ignored also by those who have ears only for such loud criers—and the list contains many ecclesiastical and governmental names we are sorry to say.

Mr. Speaker, the editorial that follows is the opinion of many, many people who witnessed the so-called March on Montgomery. Although many of the eyewitnesses were in sympathy with the purpose of the affair and went to Montgomery to participate themselves, they soon saw events for what they were. The well-written story below by Editor Bonnie Hand, of the LaFayette, Ala., Sun, deserves wide attention and should be a matter of great concern to all thinking Americans who still hold a code of personal morality dear:

THAT "MORAL" CROWD

The Alabama Legislature Tuesday passed a resolution critical of the conduct of the "so-called preachers" in the Selma rabblerousers club. The resolution was introduced by Representative Gus Young, of Randolph County, himself a minister. The resolution charged that some of the ministers had been seen drinking strong drink promiscuously and heard using profanity. It also claimed that the demonstrators had been sexually promiscuous during their stay in Alabama.

One northern preacher who had been sincere in his trip to Alabama went back home to Ohio and scalded the farce at Selma and Montgomery as a bunch of beatniks looking for trouble. "They wanted dead bodies—our bodies," he told the wire services. That old war horse, Harry Truman, who never hesitates to let them know how he feels, said that the Selma march was downright silly. "They aren't accomplishing a damned thing, and all they want is publicity," he allowed.

All this hollering about morality is enough to evoke a horselaugh. Take Marlon Brando, the movie mogul. His star must be fading because he came to Gadsden last year to lend his assistance. "A moral issue" he growled. Well, how moral is that man? Recently he admitted he married two of his wives because they were pregnant and admitted to the press he entertained many women in his home. Then this louse has the gall to come to our State to help push what he calls a "moral" issue. Gary Merrill, another often-married movie star, had to come down to get his share of the publicity. His morality would probably lend a lot to any cause. Then there is a member of the Kingston Trio who also wanted to get in on the publicity. Not the least is the rabblerousing leftwing National Council of Churches, which has long been more interested in getting Red China in the United Nations and stirring up trouble than in carrying the Gospel to their congregations. No wonder the legitimate church organizations are rushing to let it be known they aren't affiliated with that crowd. Most of the so-called ministers in Selma today are from that pink group.

The filthy, vulgar people who sprawl in the way of honest, law-abiding people call themselves moral. The only demonstrators we hope keep doing what they were doing is the beatnik crowd that sprawled around President Johnson's house and kept his daughters from getting a good night's sleep. There was a time when southerners would be appalled at that insult to the President of the United States and the White House, but now some sarcastically protest the "brutality" used to remove them. Yes, it's brutality when we remove them in the South. It's enforcing the law when they are pitched out of the White House.

No wonder respect for law and order and the National Government is at an all-time low. Democrat and Republican—the rush to get in on the publicity and rabble-rousing is almost crushing, and certainly disgusting.

DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, America has its orders. Every person throughout the land should take heed. On last evening Dr. Martin Luther King addressed the Nation on TV. He laid down the King "decree" as follows: That all business firms cease dealings with Alabama industry, that all trade unions cease transporting or using Alabama goods, that all Alabama people refuse to pay State taxes and give promissory notes instead, and that Secretary of the Treasury Dillon withdraw all Federal funds on deposit in Alabama banking institutions.

There are two unresolved issues in which clarification should be made. I implore Dr. King to please permit the schoolchildren of Alabama to participate in the school lunch program by the utilization of surplus food commodities, and by all means I do trust that Dr. Martin Luther King will exempt from his decree, and permit the Nation the use of the facilities, and products thereof, of the George C. Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville, Ala.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will remember and that the Members of this House will remember that last December Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, one of the greatest Americans of all time, said that this Martin Luther King was the most notorious liar in this country, and Mr. Hoover until this day has not retracted that statement.

THE BOBBY BAKER INVESTIGATION

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, according to the Sunday Washington Star, Ellen Rometsch, the German call girl who was deeply involved in the Bobby Baker scandals, now admits being a member of Communist organizations in East Germany before she came to this country.

Many months ago, as the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will show, I raised the question of her associations in East Germany and pointed to the fact that she was spirited out of Washington virtually in the dead of night apparently to prevent her from being questioned or interviewed.

The grave question is why the whitewash investigating committee or other officials in Washington did not stay her deportation until she could be questioned about her activities in East Germany as well as in Washington.

It is not enough for West German officials to say she was considered a security risk because of her morals; that there was no indication she had any intelligence connections. This should have been determined by the proper authorities in this country, including the so-called investigating committee.

The latest revelation is but another of the many reasons why the alleged probe of the Bobby Baker activities is a mockery in the name of an investigation.

The Washington Star article follows:

BAKER CASE PARTY GIRL ADMITS BEING EX-RED

(By Paul Hope)

Ellen Rometsch, the German party girl mentioned prominently in the Bobby Baker case, has admitted being a member of Communist organizations in East Germany.

The Star has learned that Mrs. Rometsch, whose connections with the Baker case the Senate Rules Committee refused to look into, told investigators that prior to 1955 she was a member of a Communist youth organization and a Communist adult group.

Mrs. Rometsch denied having any Communist sympathies, however, and said she joined the two organizations to keep her job in East Germany. The nature of her work there was not disclosed. She went to West Germany in 1955.

Mrs. Rometsch, who came to the United States in April 1961 with her husband, a German Army sergeant, denied having operated as an intelligence agent for any country.

SPYING ROLE DISPUTED

A West German security agency, which made a check after her alleged sex activities in the Washington area became known, said there was no indication that she had any intelligence connections. The agency said she was considered a security risk because of her moral weakness.

Her husband, Rolf Rometsch, who was attached to the German Embassy in Washington, was ordered back to Germany in August 1963 because of his wife's activities. They were divorced later.

Mrs. Rometsch has said she wanted to come back to the United States to marry a staff member of an important congressional committee. The committee staffer, who has said he had no connection with Baker, admitted dating Mrs. Rometsch when she was in this country, but said he thought she was single.

Republicans on the Senate Rules Committee have tried to get the committee to go into the so-called party girl issue of the Baker case, but the Democratic majority has steadfastly refused.

Last December, the Justice Department showed some members and staff personnel of the Rules Committee an FBI file on Mrs. Rometsch. The committee incorporated a summary of the file in its minutes, but the Democrats voted against going any further into the matter. This portion of the committee's proceedings has not been made public and is not expected to be.

The Star has learned that a number of women were mentioned in the file, at least four of whom were actively engaged in play-for-pay activity.

One woman, who described herself as the ringleader of the group, said the clients included Congressmen, public relations men, a dozen Senators, a couple of judges, and some members of the executive branch of Government. She refused to name them.

This woman, who said she never received money for arranging engagements for the women, named four who, she said, filled "dates" at the apartment of a man who has figured prominently in the Baker case. The man has been questioned extensively by the committee about other matters but not about girls.

A $50-A-NIGHT INCOME

The woman said the women in the group didn't limit themselves to arranged dates, but also worked on their own and never earned less than $50 a night.

Another of the women said she attended a social function at the Southwest Washington townhouse Baker bought and which was occupied by his secretary and another Capitol Hill secretary.

The same woman said she made a trip to Germany in 1963 for which free transportation was provided by a man whose name has been mentioned in the Baker case testimony in connection with at least two business deals but who has never been called to testify. She also said she met two Congressmen at the apartment where she and the others filled dates.

As the person to be notified in case of her death, she listed in one document a member of a prominent Washington law firm. The lawyer said he met the woman at a social function and thought she was a "lady" until the Baker case broke.

SEX RELATIONS REVEALED

Another of the women said she had sex relations with a Governor and with a man who, she said, worked for the District of Columbia government.

The man whose apartment was referred to by the women told investigators he was a good friend of a Senator, whom he mentioned by name. He also listed as friends a House Member from New York, another from Massachusetts, and a high-ranking military man with political connections.

Mrs. Rometsch was involved in what was described as a messy divorce case in Germany. She was first married to a West German army officer who said he lived with her 2 months until he found she was running around with another man. After they were divorced, the officer was killed in an auto accident.

She married Sergeant Rometsch in 1958.

PARTYING WITH BAKER ALLEGED

Mrs. Rometsch claimed that while she was in the Washington area, she had no sexual contacts with diplomats, Congressmen, Senators, or Cabinet officers.

The self-styled ringleader said she and three other women mentioned were personally acquainted with Baker, former secretary to the Senate Democratic majority. But she said that Baker never asked her to provide any services for his acquaintances.

It has been brought out in Rules Committee testimony that a Baker acquaintance, a Puerto Rican businessman named Paul Aguirre, told a committee investigator he spent several days partying in New Orleans in May 1963 with Baker, Mrs. Rometsch and Baker's secretary, Carole Tyler.

This was in an interview prior to Aguirre's appearance before the Rules Committee. Aguirre invoked the fifth amendment against self-incrimination and refused to testify when called at a public session. Aguirre told the investigator, according to a memorandum read into the record, that Baker brought Mrs. Rometsch and Miss Tyler with him from Washington to New Orleans.

One German girl who stayed with Mr. and Mrs. Rometsch for a short time at their Arlington, Va., home, said Baker called the Rometsch house twice while she was there.

She also said Mrs. Rometsch said she knew someone who could get her a good job. She said she went with Mrs. Rometsch to the office of a friend of Baker where she met Baker and another man who has been mentioned often in the Baker case. She said nothing came of the interview and she got a job on her own.

OPERATION STARKVILLE PROJECT

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a statement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, this weekend several residents from my district will be going to Starkville, Miss., to distribute food and clothing to the underprivileged of that area. I have informed you in the past of this laudable project and I come to you now to express my concern over the safety of these citizens. The following is a statement I have sent to the Justice Department requesting the fullest possible protection for these people:

MY DEAR MR. ATTORNEY GENERAL: This coming Friday and Saturday several citizens from my district will be in the Negro community of Starkville, Miss., to distribute funds, food, and clothing that have been raised through an inspiring program conducted by a number of Democratic clubs from my district.

I am informing you of this matter to ask that these citizens be given the fullest possible protection. My concern over their safety springs not only from a knowledge that the violence that has ripped through Selma, Ala., during these past few weeks could erupt anywhere in this race-torn South, but from the deplorable incident of last January when it became necessary for me to enlist your aid for the protection of Mr. Ron Bridgeforth, one of my constituents engaged in preliminary investigations connected with this project. Mr. Bridgeforth and a Mr. Ronald Carver were arrested on the trumped-up charge of stealing their own automobile and Mr. Carver was subsequently beaten very severely. It was only through your intervention that a similar fate did not befall my constituent.

The present project representatives will arrive at the Holiday Inn in Columbus, Miss., on Friday night, March 26. They will be in Starkville at 8 a.m. on Saturday morning. The food and clothing is being shipped via Mason-Dixon Line trucks and will be in the lot of the Griffin Methodist Church on Saturday morning also.

These citizens offer a stirring example of the kind of unity of Negro and white that can bring a greater fulfillment for all members of our society, and it is the responsibility of our Government to see that, in the course of their work, they are not subjected to the forces of hate and violence.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the administration, I am introducing today, for appropriate reference, a bill to extend and expand title III of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, to authorize establishment of a special grant-in-aid account for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes.

I am enclosing as a part of my remarks the letter of transmittal which I have received from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
March 26, 1965.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Enclosed is a draft of a bill "To extend and expand title III of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, to authorize establishment of a special grant-in-aid account for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes."

This bill carries out the recommendations of the President.

I should appreciate it if you would introduce the bill and have it considered at the earliest time convenient to your committee.

Sincerely,

WILBUR J. COHEN,
Assistant Secretary.

PROF. CHARLES K. ORSBORN

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the 1964–65 collegiate basketball year came to a close last Saturday with the All-Star game at Lexington, Ky., and with it the season brought an end to the outstanding coaching career of Charles K. "Ozzie" Orsborn, of Bradley University, Peoria, Ill., which not only is located in my congressional district, but is also my alma mater. The Bradley Braves finished their 1964–65 season with an 18–9 mark and wrapped up Coach Orsborn's 9-year tenure with a mark of 195–56. Professor Orsborn has retired to step up to athletic director, effective next September 1, and he has been replaced by his assistant and freshman coach, Joe Stowell. "Ozzie" will take over the duties vacated by John I. "Dutch" Meinen, who after 41 years, has achieved the highest degree of respect and recognition in his field. I am happy to add that "Dutch" will remain a Republican precinct committeeman in Peoria County.

Professor Orsborn began the pursuit of his interest in athletics at Deerfield-Shields—Highland Park—High School, Illinois, back in 1931. By the time he graduated in 1935 he had earned varsity letters in four major sports. He continued his success at Bradley and became a starter on the "Famous Five." The Braves played the first game of the first National Invitational Tourney, the oldest of all postseason tournaments. One year later, in 1939, "Ozzie" led the Braves to a third-place finish in the NIT which was considered an upset to say the least. Even though Bradley was a very small school, when considering the enrollment of many of the powerhouses in that tournament, the Braves established themselves a lasting reputation and affection among the coaches and fans throughout the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, Professor Orsborn entered the service in World War II and has since retired from the Air Force Reserve as a lieutenant colonel. In 1947, he joined the staff at Bradley as freshman basketball coach and became the head mentor in 1955. "Ozzie's" record includes seven trips to the NIT with three Championships and one second-place finish. Professor Orsborn's basketball program has been the most successful in the history of the school. In nine seasons, his teams have once finished in first place in the rugged Missouri Valley Conference; six times second in the MVC; and never finished below third. Within the MVC, "Ozzie" won 86 and lost only 32. He has been the successful coach of the East All-Star squad and previously was twice named "Coach of the Year" in perhaps the Nation's most outstanding basketball conference. He was also a three-time clinic speaker overseas for the Department of the Army.

To this father of three children, and his wife Janet, I extend my heartiest congratulations and best wishes for the future. And, as "Ozzie" would so desire, Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to congratulate this year's tournament champions; UCLA in the NCAA and St. John's in the NIT. Although this season has come to a close and Professor Orsborn has left the coaching scene, "Ozzie" has left behind many fond memories for his fans and recollections of hair-raising moments for his opponents.

As Dr. A. G. "Frenchy" Haussler, vice president of Bradley, member of the U.S. Olympic Committee, and a great athlete in his day, put it, "Ozzie was a great competitor as an athlete and at the helm of his teams; and although his opponents in the coaching ranks will now breathe a sigh of relief as he steps up, he was able to command that rare respect and admiration from his adversaries to the point where Coach Orsborn's presence will be missed by all his colleagues of the hardwood."

Mr. Speaker, the many communications I received in Professor Orsborn's behalf support Dr. Haussler's statement completely. As I rise in tribute today to this fine gentleman, educator, and molder of young men, I wish to call attention to the remarks of those who worked with and sometimes against Coach Orsborn. Under unanimous consent, beginning with the letter from the president of Bradley University, Dr. Talman Van Arsdale, I include their comments for the RECORD:

BRADLEY UNIVERSITY,
Peoria, Ill., March 22, 1965.

Congressman ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MICHEL: I think you may have heard that Prof. John I. Meinen, Bradley University's esteemed Director of Intercollegiate Athletics and Head of the Department of Physical Education, has chosen to retire after 41 years of distinguished teaching and service to the university. Intercollegiate athletics, professor physical education, and Bradley University will miss him much.

Promoted to both of Mr. Meinen's responsibilities is Professor Charles K. Orsborn of Bradley University's staff and nationally known coach of the varsity basketball team. In assuming his new duties, Professor Orsborn has elected to retire from active coaching and will hand over those responsibilities to the university's freshman basketball coach, Prof. Joseph Stowell.

In retiring from active coaching, Professor Orsborn leaves behind him an enviable record of 196 wins and 56 losses over a 9-year period. He also coached three of his varsity teams to National Invitation Tournament championships.

Sincerely,
T. W. VAN ARSDALE, Jr.
President.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
March 12, 1965.

CHARLES K. ORSBORN,
Care of Hon. ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The NCAA and I personally extend our congratulations and compliments upon your outstanding achievements in intercollegiate basketball. May the same success be yours in administering the athletics program at Bradley University.

ARTHUR J. BERGSTROM.

KANSAS CITY, MO.,
March 11, 1965.

Coach CHARLES ORSBORN,
Care of ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I regret your retirement from active coaching but offer my sincere congratulations on your promotion to the directorship at Bradley University. Many of your problems have not been solved but on August 31 you will acquire new ones. Best of luck to a straight forward guy.

NORVALL NEVE,
Commissioner, Missouri Valley Conference.

LEXINGTON, KY.,
March 25, 1965.

CHUCK ORSBORN,
Care of ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations to you on the many fine years that you had as basketball coach at Bradley University, and to your appointment as athletic director to that fine institution. I have known you for a great many years. I enjoyed my trip with you through Europe and will never forget the many fine memories of our trip to the Orient. May you and your charming wife have many more happy days at Bradley.

ADOLPH F. RUPP,
University of Kentucky.

MARQUETTE, MICH.,
March 26, 1965.

Representative ROBERT MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

It was a privilege to play for Ozzie as a freshman basketball player as he taught me the value of heart, hard work, honor and humility. It was an honor and pleasure for me as a college coach to match wits with Ozzie for four games when Northern Michigan University played in Peoria, however my wit couldn't beat his forces but we did have one accomplishment, we finally shot a 1 and 1 this season. Ozzie mellowed in his final year. Congratulations and best wishes for your continued success in your new role as athletic director of Bradley University. P.S. When are the Braves coming to NMU.

Cordially,
STAN ALBECK,
Basketball Coach, NMU.

TEMPE, ARIZ.,
March 27, 1965.

CHUCK ORSBORN,
Care of ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations upon your retirement to the greener pastures of administration. Best wishes always to a great coach and a fine friend. I am sure Bradley fans will always remember the records both in season and postseason that you were responsible for.

NED WULK,
Head Basketball Coach, Arizona State University.

CHICAGO, ILL.,
March 26, 1965.

CHUCK ORSBORN,
Care of ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Very sorry to see you leaving the coaching profession. Loyola University, Arthur Morse, and myself wish you the best of luck.

GEORGE M. IRELAND,
Loyola University.

TOLEDO, OHIO,
March 26, 1965.

ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations, Chuck Orsborn, on your wonderful career as a basketball coach. A tough and respected opponent. Best of luck for the future.

EDDIE MELVIN.

TUCSON, ARIZ.,
March 26, 1965.

Mr. CHUCK ORSBORN,
Care of ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on the excellent basketball you have given Bradley through the years and for your contributions to the coaching profession.

BRUCE A. LARSON,
Basketball Coach, University of Arizona.

LEXINGTON, KY.,
March 26, 1965.

CHUCK ORSBORN,
Care of Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations for a great coaching career. All of us who have been closely associated with you during your years as a head coach will miss you not only as a coach but as a gentleman and a friend. We are proud that a great basketball man has been promoted to athletic director and we know that you will give great leadership to your program. The very best of everything to you and yours in the future.

DOGGIE JULIAN.

NORMAN, OKLA.,
March 25, 1965.

ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations to Chuck Orsborn on this special occasion to a fine gentleman and outstanding coach and a man that has made a great contribution to this game of basketball. Chuck was always interested in young men and was good for the young men that he handled. We need outstanding men in our profession like Chuck Orsborn and I hate to see him leave the basketball coaching profession. He is very deserving of the many honors that he has received and I know will continue to do an outstanding job as athletic director at Bradley University. Chuck has been a personal friend of mine for many years and I would like to extend my congratulations on this special occasion and wish him continued success in life in the field of athletics.

BOB STEVENS,
Basketball Coach, University of Oklahoma.

IOWA CITY, IOWA,
March 26, 1965.

CHUCK ORSBORN,
Care of Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations upon the fine honor bestowed upon you at this time. The distinction was well deserved for your efforts, upon behalf of Bradley, Peoria, the State of Illinois and the game of basketball. Best wishes for continued success in your new duties.

RALPH H. MILLER,
Basketball Coach, University of Iowa.

STILLWATER, OKLA.,
March 25, 1965.

CHUCK ORSBORN,
Care of ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations on a great coaching job. You were always a credit to the game and we will miss you. Best of luck always.

HENRY IBA,
Oklahoma State University.

CINCINNATI, OHIO,
March 15, 1965.

ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations to Chuck Orsborn on his wonderful record as basketball coach at Bradley University; a credit to the MVC and to basketball everywhere. I believe that if it were not for Orsborn and his great coaching job Bradley would not be known as it is throughout the country today. Basketball will miss a great man. Best wishes to Chuck for continued success in the future.

ED JUCKER,
Basketball Coach, University of Cincinnati.

PROVIDENCE, R.I.,
March 26, 1965.

CHUCK ORSBORN,
Care of Illinois Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations to a wonderful person and outstanding coach. May your success continue in your new position as athletic director at Bradley.

JOE MULLANEY,
Basketball Coach, Providence College.

MADISON, WIS.,
March 25, 1965.

Representative ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Basketball will miss Chuck Orsborn. He has enjoyed fine success and his teams have brought fame to Bradley University and Peoria.

JOHN ERICKSON,
Basketball Coach, University of Wisconsin.

PEORIA, ILL.,
March 25, 1965.

CHUCK ORSBORN,
Care ROBERT MICHEL,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHUCK: I have followed your career for many years. I want to join the thousands of admirers in wishing you continued success in your new venture.

Respectively,

RUDY RAUSCHKOLB,
Beverly Hills, Calif.

DETROIT, MICH.,
March 25, 1965.

CHUCK ORSBORN,
Care ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

Congratulations for a job well done on your retirement as the Bradley Braves' basketball coach. Although the coaching profession will miss you we are confident that your new assignment as director of athletics will bring Bradley greater stature in all sports. You were a great player, a greater coach, and a real credit to our game of basketball. May I offer my most sincere best wishes for many years of continued success.

BOB CALIHAN,
Director of Athletics, University of Detroit.

ST. LOUIS, MO.,
March 17,1965.

ROBERT H. MICHEL (for CHUCK ORSBORN),
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

It is with somewhat mixed emotions that I write this because I, for one, am sincerely going to miss competing against you. You were indeed an honor to the coaching profession and you will be greatly missed in the basketball field. Basketball is going to miss the many contributions that you have made. Bradley University and the young men there are also going to miss greatly the fine influence you have had upon them. Your coaching record will remain as one of the finest that has ever been compiled. I am sure that you will continue your outstanding work in your new position as athletic director. Congratulations Chuck, on your outstanding coaching ability; my every wish for the best of success in your new job.

JOHN E. BENINGTON,
St. Louis University Athletic Director.

NEW YORK, N.Y.,
March 29, 1965.

CHUCK ORSBORN,
Care ROBERT MICHEL,
House Office Building, Washington, D.C.:

The basketball world will lose not only a great coach but also a genuine friend upon your retirement. New York University sends congratulations and best wishes.

LOU ROSSINI,
New York University Basketball Coach.

DES MOINES, IOWA,
March 30, 1965.

CHUCK ORSBORN,
Care ROBERT H. MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHUCK: We will miss you in the coaching fraternity. Your contributions to basketball and especially Missouri Valley and Bradley basketball will always be remembered. Have always valued your friendship. My best wishes to you in your new position.

MAURICE E. JOHN,
Basketball Coach, Drake University.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.,
March 29, 1965.

CHUCK ORSBORN,
Care of ROBERT MICHEL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Always enjoyed competing against Chuck Orsborn and his Bradley teams. Never had much luck beating him but learned a lot of basketball. Chuck has contributed much to basketball and a real credit to the coaching profession.

JOHN KUNDLA.

ECONOMIC BOYCOTT OF ALABAMA WILL HARM CIVIL RIGHTS CAUSE

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, I have always been a firm supporter of those seeking civil rights for all our people.

I served on my local school board—when it integrated its school system—even before the Supreme Court decision requiring this action.

I served on the first Kansas Antidiscrimination Commission.

I served on President Eisenhower's Commission on Civil Rights for Kansas for a time.

I abhor the murder of Mrs. Liuzzo. Like all Americans, I hope her murderer, or murderers, will be brought to swift justice.

However, when I heard Dr. Martin Luther King, on "Meet the Press" Sunday afternoon, practically condemn all the citizens of Alabama for what has gone on down there recently and ask for massive economic boycott, I think he has done the entire cause of the promotion of civil rights serious damage.

Among other reasons why this latest move of his is hysterical and childish is the fact it will do more harm than good.

One of the problems in much of the Deep South is lack of a good industrial base to provide enough good jobs to furnish adequate employment for its people. Causing any further pressure on a depressed economic area only compounds a problem.

I believe the "reign of terror" Dr. King referred to would now diminish considerably—and possibly stop altogether—if demonstrations and marches would be halted and give the Congress and the administration an opportunity to finally give his people the civil rights they are seeking.

I can assure Dr. King that I fully intend to vote for a voter registration requirement law which will be constitutional and have the support of the vast majority of the Congress.

LET US BE FAIR ABOUT FARM CONDITIONS

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, in order to fulfill previous commitments, rather than to ascertain facts, Labor Secretary Wirtz, during a recent visit to California, made a surprise predawn visit to a farm labor camp in my district, labeling it "filthy" and wondering aloud that anyone would eat the food.

The Secretary should have reported more facts and fewer conclusions. The camp he visited was one of, if not the oldest, in the area. It is inspected regularly, however, by State and county health and sanitation authorities.

Washington restaurants are not subject to any more rigid inspections or more stringent regulations. Government-run camps in the area are considerably inferior.

The Secretary arrived as the workers finished their breakfast, which was nutritionally far superior to any meals they eat when not doing farmwork. Used dishes, utensils, and usual food debris remained on the tables, because the meals are served, the mess is cleared, and the dining room scrubbed after each meal for the workers after they leave for work. Some people, including the Secretary, who are totally unfamiliar with the personal living and eating habits of the transient workers and derelicts, which the growers are now being forced to hire for farmwork, cannot appreciate the messy and enormous task of cleaning up after their meals. I cannot adequately describe the table manners and eating habits and the resulting conditions. Few can believe when they see.

The debris left after a Labor Department breakfast for 90 persons, served with tablecloths, fancy china, and silver hollowware is not an attractive sight. But few would call such conditions filthy. The Secretary saw no filthy facilities, as unsightly and disorderly as the place may have been. Some of the men may have been filthy in their person and clothing, in spite of adequate bathing and laundry facilities.

The Secretary could have reported that he saw 6 of the 92 men still in bed, with their work clothes still on—for perhaps many days—2 with their hats still on from the night before; all drunk or hungover; several clutching empty or half-empty wine bottles. Few of them try or care to keep themselves or their surroundings clean or orderly.

The Secretary did not see the food being prepared, served, or eaten—only the leftovers remaining—never a pretty sight. Diets and food preparations are carefully watched. Menus comply with the desires of the workers. Maybe the Secretary does not like hot cakes or oatmeal for breakfast, but these workers do. He heard no complaint from the workers about the palatability or adequacy of the food nor about the cleanliness of the preparation or service of the food.

How or why the Secretary picked this old, half-empty camp, at just after the breakfast meal, with a wholly transient, mostly derelict complement of workers was not by chance.

Very little mention or publicity was given to the Church Co. camp which the Secretary found spic and span when he inspected it after the breakfast cleanup.

The "bleeding hearts," the ignorant, and those who purposely misinform to promote their goals have never disputed that these farmworkers earn more on the California farms than they can at any other work at any other place, nor that their food and housing is superior to the food and housing they have anywhere else when they are not doing farmwork.

The California farmworker is many steps up the work- and living-condition ladder. The present Department of Labor attitude and policy is affecting adversely the farmworker and workers in all allied industries.

The Secretary after a quick inspection of a specially selected camp may try to disparage a whole industry, but no other industry upgrades the working and living conditions of their workers as much as the California farmer.

Although the California agricultural business can and must improve, if there is another industry which provides the worker with a comparatively better, cleaner bed; better, more nutritious, more appetizingly served food; better laundry and bathing facilities; than he enjoys at home—I would like to know of it.

BYELORUSSIA SEEKS SOVEREIGNTY

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, 20 years after the close of World War II, two decades after the so-called peace was won in Eastern Europe, there is an ethnic people within the borders of the Soviet Union that is still subject to continued deportations and regional oppression. The people are the Byelorussians, who in the past have been a sovereign and independent nation.

It is a long and sad history. It goes back to the early Middle Ages. It goes back to 1795, when Byelorussia was taken over totally by the Russian Empire in the adjustments that accompanied the partitions of Poland. It goes back to 1863–64, when the Byelorussians revolted against the czar and were crushed by czarist military power.

The Byelorussians took their opportunity during World War I, when the czarist armies crumbled, to seek a restoration to their independent nation They were crushed by the armies of the Soviet Union, the new power that had taken over where the czars once ruled. The First Byelorussian Congress elected a council that proclaimed a democratic republic but the end was futility.

Again, in 1944, the Byelorussians attempted to assert their sovereignty and independence through a Second Congress. The Soviet armies moved in. There is a pretense that Byelorussia is represented in the United States but in fact her representatives are chosen by the central government in Moscow.

I will not dwell any longer on the history. What matters is the present.

During the 10-year period from 1964 to 1973 some 300,000 Byelorussians are scheduled to be removed bodily, without their consent, from their homeland to other locations within the Soviet Union. The population of the region is smaller already than it was in 1940.

There is a doctrine of human rights, Mr. Speaker, that should be binding on the rulers of the Soviet Union as it is most assuredly binding on this Nation. There is an extremity of ruthlessness, exercised by a predominant power, that violates humanity. I most earnestly hope that our diplomatic representatives will be able to find a way to convey to the Soviet state the suggestion that free nations can only be revolted by persecutions and expulsions intended to terrorize a whole population.

TASK FORCE STUDY OF ADMINISTRATION BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, earlier in the year the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Appropriations appointed a task force on the budget and charged this task force with making a detailed analysis of the budget submitted for the fiscal year 1966. That is the budget now under consideration. The task force was charged further with making recommendations to the minority members of the House Committee on Appropriations indicating the areas in which, if any are found, we feel that budget cuts can be made.

The Member now speaking, senior Republican member of the Subcommittee on Independent Offices, was named chairman of the task force. Members from other subcommittees are: GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, of California, Defense; ROBERT H. MICHEL, of Illinois, Agriculture; ODIN LANGEN, of Minnesota, legislative; FRANK T. BOW, of Ohio, State-Justice-Commerce.

Ex officio members are GERALD R. FORD of Michigan, minority leader, and JOHN J. RHODES, of Arizona, chairman of the Republican Policy Committee.

For several weeks now this task force has been giving the new budget close study. Results of our efforts have been reported to minority members of each subcommittee for use in connection with study of their own bills. They will listen to Government witnesses seek to justify budget requests, have an opportunity to examine them and study the detailed, written justifications. These Government witnesses have a right to be heard and have their testimony considered, and it is after all this consideration that subcommittee members will seek to make cuts where they seem to be justified. Our responsibility is to give the subcommittees the benefit of our own investigations and study—theirs to propose specific cuts.

The members of this task force are in unanimous agreement on the following points:

First. This is not a tight budget and it can be cut substantially.

Second. The subcommittees should propose cuts on a line-item basis instead of using a meat-ax approach.

Third. The subcommittee should examine appropriation requests with these guidelines in mind: Is the request essential and should it be approved even though it must be financed out of borrowed money? Is the request for something we can postpone until the budget is balanced and the national debt is reduced?

Fourth. Budget cuts should not be proposed just to embarrass the administration or to make political hay, but only in good faith and in areas where cuts are possible without endangering national security or abandoning essential programs.

Fifth. It is ludicrous to brag about high prosperity and at the same time be borrowing money to pay current bills. It is high time that our Government begins to practice some fiscal discipline and start living within its means.

Sixth. In view of the increased tempo of military action in Vietnam, it may be necessary to increase some items in the defense budget to support the military buildup there. Any such increases should be compensated for by budget cuts in civilian items.

Seventh. If we had the votes, we would say that more than $5 billion could be cut from the President's budget. But we do not have the votes. We were able to cut the last budget and we will do our best to trim this one. But we would be foolish to predict how much.

Some myths have grown up around this budget and they should be exposed:

Myth No. 1 is that the President and his aids labored long to bring forth a budget under $100 billion.

The fact is that after all the tumult and shouting have died away it is clear that this budget calls for new appropriations of $106.4 billion—not $99.7 billion.

Moreover, if you add the supplemental requests for approximately $6 billion, it is clear that President Johnson is asking this Congress to vote his administration $112.4 billion new dollars. Then if you add to this the $94.8 billion in the drawing account accumulated from previous appropriations, the administration will have $207.2 billion in unspent appropriations.

Myth No. 2 is that spending will be held to $99.7 billion in fiscal year 1966.

The fact is that this is only an estimate and should be considered in the light of the administration's record of holding spending to original estimates. That record shows that the administration is inefficient in estimating expenditures. An example: last year officials of the Department of Agriculture requested $975 million less than in the previous year for the Commodity Credit Corporation. This enabled administration spokesmen to claim credit for great reductions in the budget. But the estimates were wide of the mark and the present Congress was barely organized this year when it was requested to provide $1.7 billion in supplemental appropriations for CCC.

Moreover, the budget does not limit spending to $99.7 billion next year. That sum represents only estimates of cash withdrawals from the Treasury. The significant point is that the President proposes to obligate a total of $108.2 billion next year—not $99.7 billion. This is the same as estimated obligations to be incurred in the current year but is $9.5 billion more than was obligated in fiscal year 1964. The sum obligated in a given year is the true measure of spending and not cash withdrawals. The situation is analogous to the one which confronts you when your wife returns from a shopping trip and states that she only spent $50 but upon questioning it develops that she paid out $50 cash but charged another $50. That trip cost you $100 instead of $50—the only difference is that you pay out $50 today and the other $50 when the bills come in.

The third myth is that this budget shows a downward trend in spending.

The fact is that the 1966 budget sets the stage for future spending at much higher levels. The previously mentioned proposal to obligate $108.2 billion next year is one example. Another example is the proposed use of the $6 billion in supplemental appropriations sought in 1965. Only $1.5 billion of this sum is programed for spending in 1965 and only $296 million in 1966. The balance is carried over into the pipeline for future spending. Accumulated unspent appropriations in this pipeline will amount to $101.5 billion at the end of 1966. This is a drawing account for the President which he can tap almost at will.

The fact is that this budget calls for increases in future spending all up and down the line. There are 215 budget items that are increased by $1 million or more and 125 that are decreased by $1 million or more. However, of the 125 decreases about 70 result automatically from completion of projects or programs, or from transfers of funds between programs, or from other bookkeeping transactions—leaving about 55 items of actual reductions against more than 200 increases in appropriation requests.

The fact is that new programs proposed for 1966 require initial appropriations of $3.2 billion but of this amount only $920 million is reflected in spending proposed for 1966. The difference therefore represents built-in growth in spending which will be reflected in budgets for future years.

While members of this task force recognize that some leadtime is necessary in programs involving construction and some procurement, we do not agree that the President needs a pipeline with $101 billion of unspent funds in it. The following will show how funds in this pipeline have increased in only 4 years: Start of 1964, $87.8 billion; start of 1965, $89.3 billion; start of 1966, $96.7 billion; start of 1967, $101.5 billion.

While we do not believe it would be advisable for this task force to itemize proposed budget cuts now, because we have not heard the Government witnesses or as a group had any opportunity to study all the detailed, written justifications. So our recommendations have been limited to the identifying of broad areas which should receive close attention by the subcommittees. We are willing to cite several areas which offer opportunities for substantial cuts:

First. Substantial reductions can be made in carryover pipeline funds by using more of the money previously appropriated and thereby reducing the requests for new obligational authority. The fact that the budget proposes to use $27.6 billion from unspent appropriations of prior years in its spending program of $99.7 billion for 1966, and proposes to carry $34.4 billion of the new obligational authority requested for 1966 into spending programs for future years, shows that these unexpended balances can be tapped. We think they can be tapped for more than $27.6 billion.

Second. The budget calls for more than $1 billion for travel next year. This is far more than to us seems necessary. By making more effective use of the postal service, the Government-wide communications system and even the telegraph and telephone facilities, the travel bill can be reduced substantially.

Third. The budget contemplates an increase in civilian employees of 26,680 persons. Based on average civil service salaries, this will add about $200 million a year in salaries alone, to say nothing of the cost of personnel benefits, such as Government contributions toward retirement, insurance, et cetera.

If civilian employment in the Department of Defense can be reduced by 19,000 in the light of the stepped-up fighting in Vietnam, and if employment in the Department of Labor, the Federal Aviation Agency, the Civil Service Commission, and the USIA can be reduced, what, pray, is the excuse for increasing employment in the Department of Agriculture by 2,880?

We believe that Federal employment should be held to current levels, particularly in view of the fact that the President himself proposed to reduce civilian employment in DOD by 20,000. This would justify substantial cuts in new appropriations requested.

I have never seen a budget that could not be cut. The Appropriations Committee has cut about $40 billion out of the requests in the decade that I have served on it.

A mere recital of the burden to taxpayers of interest on the national debt should suffice to prove to all concerned that this astronomical debt should be reduced. The only way to force this action is to reduce the spending authority of the President.

Administration spokesmen like to relate interest on the national debt to gross national product. It would be better to relate interest to net budget receipts. When this is done, you find that 12 cents on every dollar of net receipts goes to pay interest on the national debt. This leaves only 88 cents out of the dollar to pay for national security and the numerous programs of the Government. You have to go all the way back to 1950 before this high ratio is exceeded. And it has been exceeded only 10 times during the last 45 years.

The total Federal expenditures in 1920 were $6.4 billion. In 1940 they were $9.1 billion. Yet now just the interest on the national debt exceeds $11 billion annually.

Representative Clarence Cannon, the late beloved chairman of our committee, frequently said that the time has come when in our own interest we should stop borrowing money to pay for things we do not need or can do without until the budget is in balance and payments can begin on the national debt.

The objective of this task force is to hasten the day when this takes place.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include certain tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, we owe the gentleman from North Carolina a debt of gratitude for his effort to keep the record straight as regards spending and the budget, and along the same line I would like to comment about a news story last week in which the President was quoted as claiming credit for savings of $1.9 billion in the first 8 months of the fiscal year.

The newsmen down at Johnson City reported that story as follows:

"The reduction was made up of savings throughout the various Government agencies—including the White House, President Johnson told newsmen in an hour-long informal discussion after a formal news conference today."

Perhaps the newsmen misunderstood the President, for the operation of the White House during the first 8 months of this fiscal year cost more, not less than in the comparable period of the prior fiscal year. Almost every item in the Executive Office increased. Even completely omitting the Office of Economic Opportunity, a new $25 million dollar item, the total for 1965 is considerable above that for 1964. I am attaching a chart showing that the Executive Office of the President spent $1,294,508 more this year, excluding the Office of Economic Opportunity. If that Office is included, the White House spending has increased $28,391,142 over the first 8 months of 1964.

Going further, it is interesting to analyze the $1.9 billion saving claimed for the Government as a whole. The Defense Department was cut $2.4 billion in these 8 months and this, together with sizable reductions in military assistance and agricultural programs, made it possible to show a $1.9 billion saving even though almost every other agency of the Government spent more, not less, in the first 8 months of the fiscal year. In short, the economy drive was almost entirely a reduction in spending for defense for ourselves and our allies. Of the 24 independent agencies that spent more than $3 million in this period, 15 spent considerably more than in the previous year and only 9 showed reductions, many of them slight reductions.

Monthly statement of receipts and expenditures of the U.S. Government for the period from July 1, 1964, through Feb. 28, 1965

	Fiscal year 1965 to date	Corresponding period, fiscal year 1964	Comparison
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT			
Compensation of the President	$100,000	$100,000	
The White House Office	1,894,259	1,830,318	+$63,941
Special projects	737,687	860,061	−122,374
Executive Mansion and Grounds	474,540	460,074	+14,466
Bureau of the Budget	4,327,078	4,209,468	+117,610
Council of Economic Advisers	415,790	392,179	+23,611
National Aeronautics and Space Council	287,608	290,638	−3,030
National Security Council	422,848	354,343	+68,505
Office of Emergency Planning:			
Emergency preparedness functions of Federal agencies	2,193,803	1,134,693	+1,059,110
Other	3,481,426	3,719,705	−238,279
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT—continued			
Office of Science and Technology	$609,349	$510,774	−$98,275
Special representative for trade negotiations	341,985	239,642	−102,343
Other	−162,571	−272,597	−110,026
Subtotal	15,123,809	13,829,301	+1,294,508
Office of Economic Opportunity:			
Economic opportunity program	25,498,030		+25,498,030
Public enterprise funds (net)	1,599,142		+1,599,142
Total, Executive Office of the President	42,220,981	13,829,301	+28,391,680

Summary of the Treasury Department monthly statement of receipts and expenditures of the U.S. Government for the period from July 1, 1964, through Feb. 28, 1965—Administrative budget

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1965 to date	Corresponding period, fiscal year 1964	Comparison
Net administrative budget receipts	52,662,927	54,165,629	−1,502,702
EXPENDITURES			
Legislative	99,738	104,471	−4,733
The judiciary	46,402	42,118	+4,283
Executive Office of the President	42,221	13,829	+28,392
Funds appropriated to the President:			
Disaster relief	17,952	12,849	+5,103
Emergency fund	736	279	+457
Expansion of defense production (net)	−17,532	79,453	−96,984
Expenses of management improvement	229	114	+115
Peace Corps	50,683	36,460	+14,224
Subscription to International Development Association	61,656	61,656	
Public works acceleration	261,813	215,007	+46,806
Transitional grants to Alaska	339	2,708	−2,369
Other	484	379	+105
Mutual defense and development:			
Military assistance	462,305	730,764	−268,460
Economic assistance	1,322,403	1,330,065	−7,662
Total, mutual defense and development	1,784,708	2,060,825	−276,117
Total, funds appropriated to the President	2,161,067	2,469,729	−308,661
Agriculture Department	5,671,719	6,204,621	−532,901
Foreign assistance and CCC	(3,679,214)	(4,287,022)	(−607,808)
Forest Service	(259,232)	(237,579)	(+21,654)
Commerce Department	519,685	473,917	+45,769
Department of Defense	30,568,609	32,956,019	−2,387,410
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	3,803,219	3,592,538	+210,682
Office of Education	(434,158)	(399,719)	(+34,439)
Welfare Administration (includes grants for public assistance)	(2,276,464)	(2,097,421)	(+179,042)
EXPENDITURES—con.			
Department of the Interior	840,479	803,397	+37,082
Less:			
Bureau of Reclamation	226,962	234,915	−7,953
Bonneville, Southeastern, and Southwestern Power Administrations	43,308	36,035	+7,273
Department of Interior in appropriation bill	570,209	532,447	+37,762
Department of Justice	240,912	219,947	+20,965
Labor Department	300,581	242,441	+58,140
Post Office Department net postal fund	512,591	365,270	+147,321
State Department	312,564	302,364	+10,199
Treasury Department	8,385,872	7,867,728	+518,144
Interest on the public debt	(7,492,267)	(7,024,352)	(+467,915)
Atomic Energy Commission	1,792,279	1,845,429	−53,150
Federal Aviation Agency	537,819	510,716	+27,103
General Services Administration	409,240	398,413	+10,826
Housing and Home Finance Agency	194,661	332,972	−138,311
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	3,163,327	2,528,482	+634,845
Veterans' Administration	3,656,687	3,666,589	−9,902
Other independent agencies	332,874	421,766	−88,893
Agencies spending $3,000,000 or more:			
Civil Aeronautics Board	61,215	62,150	−935
Civil Service Commission	106,671	102,801	+3,870
Export-Import Bank (net)	−528,545	−287,193	−241,352
Farm Credit Administration	−13,577	−11,295	−2,283
Federal Communications Commission	11,076	11,294	−218
Federal Home Loan Bank Board (net)	−60,573	−14,249	−46,324
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	4,098	3,706	−391
Federal Power Commission	8,485	8,330	−155
Federal Trade Commission	9,143	8,286	−857

Summary of the Treasury Department monthly statement of receipts and expenditures of the U.S. Government for the period from July 1, 1964, through Feb. 28, 1965—Administrative budget—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1965 to date	Corresponding period, fiscal year 1964	Comparison
EXPENDITURES—con.			
Agencies spending $3,000,000 or more—Con.			
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	33,014	3,195	+29,819
General Accounting Office	29,621	30,004	−383
Interstate Commerce Commission	17,200	15,787	+1,413
National Labor Relations Board	17,140	14,932	+2,208
National Science Foundation	204,712	193,500	+11,212
Railroad Retirement Board, military service credit	13,834		+13,834
Securities and Exchange Commission	9,878	9,391	+487
Selective Service System	27,769	25,334	+2,436
Small Business Administration	207,095	84,112	+122,983
Smithsonian Institution	18,111	13,422	+4,689
Tennessee Valley Authority (net)	37,154	35,434	+1,720
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	5,314	4,019	+1,294
U.S. Information Agency	99,661	96,485	+3,177
District of Columbia	43,736	45,708	+1,972
Interfund transactions	−722,187	−563,355	−158,832
Net administrative budget expenditures	62,914,095	64,845,110	−1,931,015
Deficit	−10,251,169	−10,679,481	−428,313

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I join in heartily commending the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS] and my other distinguished colleagues who have worked so diligently to submit this initial study on the administration's budget for fiscal 1966.

This is a realistic and responsible presentation by the minority and it is deserving of serious consideration by all Members of Congress, regardless of political affiliation.

Each of us has a responsibility to support economies in Federal spending following the guidelines recommended by the task force subcommittee:

First. Is the request essential and should it be approved even though it must be financed out of borrowed money?

Second. Is the request for something we can postpone until the budget is balanced and the national debt is reduced?

Much publicity has been given to the fact that the President has submitted a budget for 1966 under $100 billion. However, we know that the administration's budget calls for new appropriations of $106.4 billion.

The growing number of supplemental budget requests also is a matter for scrutiny and concern. While the publicity spotlight is on the initial massive budget request of $99.7 billion, less attention seemingly is focused on these supplemental requests to make up budget deficiencies. We may have to act on supplemental requests for approximately $6 billion this year.

This is a very significant matter which helps emphasize the inefficient estimation of expenditures by the administration.

My able colleague, Mr. JONAS, has pointed out that 12 cents on every dollar of net receipts goes to pay interest on the national debt. Early this year, the Appropriations Committee, of which I am privileged to be a member, was informed that the interest on the record Federal debt accrues at the rate of $22,000 per minute, every minute of the day.

In the past decade interest payments on the national debt have increased about 70 percent from $6.8 billion in 1956 to $11.6 billion in 1966.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the American taxpayers who now are engaged in the yearly chore of figuring their income tax may have the impact of Federal spending brought home more dramatically this year.

Many taxpayers are going to be forced to borrow money to pay income taxes which were underwithheld in 1964 as a result of the administration's insistence to reduce the withholding rate below the actual taxing rate. While I personally regretted that action, the experience of going into debt to pay Federal taxes may bring forth a greater public realization of the cost of letting Uncle Sam do it.

Indeed, we may be faced with a growing public clamor to effect the economies which have been recommended today by the Republican policy task force subcommittee.

We have in the past been successful in reducing the administration's budget requests without damaging the operation of the Federal Government. This budget can and should be cut.

Mr. JONAS. I am very grateful for the comments of my colleague from Kansas. I made a little arithmetical computation here while the gentleman was speaking, when reminded of the $22,000 per minute interest charge. Figuring that we have been discussing this matter for about 15 minutes, this means that while we have been speaking the Government's interest bill has been $330,000.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. I am sorry I did not arrive in time to hear the gentleman's entire presentation, although I did hear him make some reference to the supplemental requests that will total something in the neighborhood of $6 billion.

Did the gentleman make the point that some of these supplemental requests will actually not be spent in the current fiscal year, and will not reflect themselves in the total picture of what the President said in his budget message we would be spending?

Mr. JONAS. I did comment on that—the $6 billion request for supplementals in 1965. Only $1.5 billion of the $6 billion is projected to be spent during the remainder of this fiscal year. Most of that money in the supplemental requests will not be spent until following 1966.

Mr. MICHEL. That is true.

Mr. JONAS. By grouping them all into 1965, of course, it gives the appearance of a downward trend in spending when the contrary is the case.

Mr. MICHEL. Of course, next year will be another election year and it will look better on paper then; will it not?

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Gordon in his testimony before the full committee recently stated that the administration had discretionary power to charge these funds to one year or the other. My response to that is that it is obvious the administration used that discretion to put all of these supplemental requests in 1965 in order to make 1966 look good in comparison.

Mr. MICHEL. Did the gentleman address himself to some of the phony figures presented in this budget? For example, in the Department of Agriculture where for the past 6 or 7 years in that all-important area of soil conservation, the Congress has seen fit to provide or authorize to be spent in the neighborhood of $250 million for the ACP, agricultural conservation payments. And in this budget we have that item for the coming year at $100 million less than what the Congress has seen fit to authorize during past years. There is no question in my mind that unless there is a drastic change in the sentiment of the Congress that we will probably put that money back in at the current level. Of course, here we have a situation where the President comes up with a lower figure knowing that the Congress will raise it because it is such a popular program. This is an on-going, current program and so the onus attaches to the Congress for raising the President's figure. Does the gentleman have any comment on that?

Mr. JONAS. I would say that is a tactic that was used throughout this budget to give it the appearance of being cut when, as a matter of fact, we all know that the budget points toward much higher expenditures in the future.

Mr. MICHEL. There is also another item for the benefit of the consumer. We have had programs providing for meat inspection and poultry inspection where the Federal Government has funded these programs. It is my understanding that the administration would like to shift the burden of this expenditure to the processors and to business, and that reflects itself in a lower figure in the budget, when as a matter of fact, it will require some legislation before we could reduce the appropriation in this area. The lower budget figure in this item of proposed inspection fees is $68.2 million, and I personally do not believe the Congress is going to thrust the entire burden of these inspection fees on the processors and businesses involved. And so again I say that without any new legislation enacted, the budget would have to reflect an expenditure of $68.2 million, which is not in the budget now.

And referring to another item for the rural electrification loan program, the President's budget reflects a reduction of $102 million, but here again legislation would be required to provide for a revolving fund, and there is some question as to whether the Congress would deem it wise and appropriate to set up this revolving fund, rather than appropriating for this purpose each year.

Mr. JONAS. I thank the gentleman. And I also suggest it would be helpful to some of our colleagues if the gentleman would refer to our experience with the $1.7 billion supplemental request for the CCC this year after the administration last year voluntarily reduced the funds requested by nearly a billion dollars below the previous year's appropriation. One of the first things we had to do this year was to consider a request for another $1.7 billion for this program; is that not correct?

Mr. MICHEL. That is true. That was our prediction last year—we were not kidding anybody—and the first supplemental request we predicted last year that would come before this Congress would be one in the nature of something over a billion dollars to restore the capital impairment of the Commodity Credit Corporation. The truth of the matter is that when the request came to us, it was not only a billion dollars but it was for $1.7 billion as the gentleman indicated and the committee saw fit to arrive at a figure of $1.6 billion. It just dramatizes particularly what chicanery can be involved here in coming up with some phony figures when the budget is presented and then coming back later for supplemental appropriations which never seem to get the same spotlight of publicity.

Mr. JONAS. The gentleman is quite correct. I think it is most unfortunate that the impression has been gained by the public generally, as the gentleman from Illinois says, that this is a budget that is under $100 billion. As a matter of fact, by no stretch of the imagination could it be construed as being under $100 billion when the request for new spending authority is $106 billion. The budget itself says the administration proposes to obligate $108 billion next year. When you consider all of the spending, it amounts to $127 billion total, which is $9 billion more than the previous year.

Mr. MICHEL. I am reminded that a Member of the other body has introduced legislation which has come to be known as the truth in lending bill. It would seem to me very appropriate that we might very well give consideration to passage of a resolution calling for "Truth in spending" so that the American people might be fully apprised as to what the spending level of the Government is.

Mr. JONAS. We believe they deserve to know all the facts about the budget, and not just what is in the headlines.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I certainly compliment the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. JONAS], in the well of the House, who is heading this budget-cutting task force, and the task force, for this report.

Certainly, at the beginning of the session of the last Congress, the so-called Bow task force, which this one succeeds, proved not only that all budgets can be cut in the interest of the Union but also that time has overtaken events, and perhaps even that was not cut enough.

Le me compliment the gentleman for so clearly and succinctly differentiating between spending and obligational authority. This comes at a good time, when we are considering paying and calculating our taxes for the last calendar year. I certainly hope it will be driven home in this exercise on the floor of the House today.

I was interested in what the gentleman said about the pipeline and the carryover of appropriations. I have been concerned for some time, not as a member of the Appropriations Committee but as a member of the Armed Services Committee, which has to deal with the authorization of practically 50 percent of our annual budget, with the fact that certain appropriations are carried over rather than go through the process of Congress each year. We are gradually correcting that by line item review of all procurement of missiles, tanks, planes, and ships, as well as adding last year research and development, but I believe it could be applied on a line item basis to many other departments in the legislative committees.

I wonder if the gentleman would agree that we might solve the so-called pipeline problem by incorporating in all legislation not only ways and means but also a termination date. I am not speaking only of appropriations actions on the part of the Congress. I believe the old saw of authorizing and therefore having policy established, with something becoming a "must" for appropriations, or the reverse, is something the new committee on the reorganization of the Congress might well study.

Mr. JONAS. I appreciate that comment from the gentleman from Missouri.

One of the real handicaps we face in the Appropriation Committee is the fact that Congress has authorized these new programs. We are not a legislative committee. We do not have the power, unless it is exercised arbitrarily, to kill programs or to change the law. We are somewhat limited, at least, by the authorizing legislation.

The first place to start economizing is when the authorizing bills are on the floor. The argument is always made to us, "Congress authorized this program; we have to implement it." Then we must implement it." Then we must decide whether to accept their word as to how much it will cost to implement, or to cut down. That would be a job which another task force might well consider and on which it might well spend some time—time that would prove of value to the House in giving careful scrutiny and study of the funds authorized to be appropriated at a subsequent date.

The pipeline I have been talking about is not money simply authorized but money which has been appropriated. It requires no further action on the part of the Congress before it can be spent. The only action required is for the Treasury to go out and borrow the money and pay the bills, that part of the money we do not fund from receipts. We have been operating on a deficit basis so long it has come to be a habit, which should be discontinued in my opinion.

That is one reason why the task force was created—to see if we could not strike a blow in the interest of cutting down spending which is beyond our means, in the hope of getting our fiscal affairs in better condition.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. JONAS. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I would like to say that I think you have struck a blow for liberty and certainly one for domestic financial responsibility in your report here today. In the spirit only of adding thereunto and trying to help the gentleman and the task force, which has wrought so well, I would like to say that I thought you brought up this matter of the myths of the submitted budget in a particularly lucid way. I wonder if we could not add an additional myth to that, namely, the promise that was made in one of the messages which came here from the executive branch of the Government for increased domestic economy if we would but allow a lifting of the one-third of the gold cover for the deposit of commercial banks in the Federal Reserve so that we could meet our obligations in gold overseas, as erroneous as that theory might be, while not demanding payments from those nations that owe us. However, then having made this promise in successive weeks, we voted to continue our delivery of wheat to Nasser and appropriated an additional three-quarters of a billion dollars for the Inter-American Development Bank, as worthy as that might be, and $1.2 billion for the Appalachia bill and then took up the Supreme Court Justices' raise, which did not pass the House but was presented to us. I am speaking of the lack of veracity in carrying out the promised economy. Then finally we had the elementary and secondary education bill which passed the House late last Friday night to the tune of an additional $1.3 billion.

It seems to me that this myth could be summarized in that we cannot have our cake and eat it, too. I compliment the gentleman and the task force for what they have said.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONAS. I will be glad to yield to the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], who headed up this task force for the 2 preceding years and is a member of the current one.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to say to the gentleman that the question has been raised here about authorizing legislation and appropriations. It would seem to me a very advantageous thing for the Congress if the legislative committees would spend a little more time with agencies which come before them for legislation, delving into the question as to what the cost of the program is going to be. We have a very classic example in the subcommittee that I sit on of the Committee on Appropriations where the legislative committee was told that the cost would be somewhere around $7,500 for a particular item. There is now a request before us for around $250,000 for that $7,500 item. I think if we had more time and effort devoted to the detail of the authorizing legislation, then we in the Committee on Appropriations could follow through on it and it would be helpful, because it is very apparent when you read the record that the agencies who come before the committees of Congress come to the authorizing committees with the lowest figure and then come to the Committee on Appropriations with the highest figure. If we could have more of a study made with respect to the authorizing committees and a closer scrutiny of the testimony given there, it seems to me it would be helpful to us in trying to cut this down.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican task force chairman on budget reduction has noted alarming trends in our national financial picture during the past 4 years. These trends, when analyzed from the standpoint of the individual citizen, cast grave shadows over the deficit spending policies pursued since 1960.

It is common knowledge that the national debt has risen $26.2 billion in those 4 years. It is also common knowledge that the interest on that debt has risen from a little over $9 billion a year to over $11.2 billion a year during that same length of time. It is also easy to determine that Federal spending was over $21 billion more at the close of fiscal 1964 than at the close of fiscal 1960. But we must look beyond these bare statistics for the full story of what is happening.

We of the Republican task force have heard arguments that spending is bound to go up because our population continues to increase. But the facts show that per capita Federal spending increased by $86 during the last 4 years—leaping well ahead of the population increase. In fiscal 1964 we spent $514.13 for every man, woman, and child in the United States, whether they were wealthy or on welfare.

The Federal debt shows a similar trend. The per capita share of that debt increased by $45 since 1960, and every man, woman, and child in the Nation now owes $1,644.87 in Federal debt.

Take just the interest on that debt. In 1960 the per capita share of it amounted to $50 per person. In 1964 it jumped to $59.

These figures can be readily calculated from the statistics that appear in the Budget Bureau's own publications, and represent the last year for which official figures are available.

There is a startling similarity in all of these cases. Whether you consider the Federal expenditures, the national debt or even the interest on the national debt, all have risen on a per capita basis faster than the population has increased. We on the Republican Task Force on Budget Reduction consider these facts not only to be significant, but to warrant close scrutiny and tighter fiscal policies by this Government. It is apparent that while the Government spends more, we are going further into debt at the very time when prosperity is heralded across the land.

The sad part of this picture is that it would have been even worse had it not been for the prudent actions and recommendations taken by previous Republican task forces and conveyed to the House Committee on Appropriations. These actions resulted in the committee reduction of administration spending requests by $19 billion during the past 4 years, and with the final actions of Congress resulting in net reductions of $8.5 billion. These are the reductions they said could not be made. But they were made, and now our greatest critics are bragging about the prosperity of the country. If those reductions had not been made, per capita spending by the Government might well have increased by another $45 per man, woman and child. The national debt and interest payments also would have been increased correspondingly.

This is why the Republican Task Force on Budget Reduction is resisting current efforts to further increase spending and to recommend further reductions so that our debt does not rise even more.

Mr. Jonas, our chairman, has surely performed a real service to this House and the Nation in presenting these facts.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of economy in Government.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

DEMOCRATIC PARTY OBLIGATED TO RESIST HIGH INTEREST RATES

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, the platform of the 1964 Democratic National Convention calls upon our party to recognize the importance of low interest rates.

It is the solemn duty of every Democratic Member of this body to uphold the platform pledge so that this country will have an adequate money supply to meet the needs of a growing economy.

The low interest rate platform is not new to the Democratic Party. In 1960 we promised to put an end to the present high interest, tight money policy. It is our job to follow through with our promises.

Last Thursday the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman], addressed this body concerning the formation of a Democratic steering committee to resist high interest rates. Because of the length of the session that day, only a small portion of his address was given orally. I would like to refresh the memories of my Democratic colleagues with regard to the steering committee. The committee has no function except to resist high interest rates that would saddle the American people with a severe economic hardship. By joining the committee you commit yourself to nothing more than upholding a promise we have made in our platforms. I ask that you read copies of platform for 1964 and 1960 and then contact Chairman Patman asking that your name be added to the list of those who want to make good on a promise to the people of this Nation.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT'S PROGRAM OF COMMUNITY ADVISORY SERVICES

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Cederberg] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I had the occasion to sit down and discuss with the Honorable William J. Crockett, Deputy Under Secretary of State for Administration, the extremely interesting and valuable program of community advisory services which the State Department is conducting.

I am sure that other Members of this body will be as interested as I was in learning more of the details concerning the State Department's efforts to reacquaint members of our Foreign Service returning on home leave from foreign assignments with American life and thinking. This is a double-barreled program in that it not only helps the Foreign Service officers to know their own country and its citizens better, but it helps Americans, particularly at the grassroots, to get a better understanding of world problems and to hear firsthand the task in which our representatives to the more than 100 foreign countries are engaged.

The Department of State is making an effort to see that a maximum of its officers and their families get the richest and broadest experience possible during their approximately 60-day home leave provided them by law.

Not only does the State Department try to encourage maximum geographic coverage of their travel to and from their stateside homes, but to confer with as broad a segment of the American public as possible. In 1964, the State Department reports that 390 returning officers made almost 500 speeches and gave almost a thousand newspaper and TV interviews in 47 States.

Recently, the Department was provided the use of three cars and trailers to permit officers and their families to revisit America and to acquaint themselves with areas of the country which were unfamiliar to them. These trailers get repeated use as officers complete their home leave and others are ready to begin theirs. I ask permission to insert a report from one of the first Foreign Service officers to take a trailer trip. I will submit it at the close of my remarks.

The enthusiasm of the officers and their families upon return from their leave is matched only by the praise and requests for more such visits which come from the communities where the officers and their wives have spoken. In my own State of Michigan, in recent months, nine Foreign Service officers on home leave have spoken to school, church, and civic groups and have been interviewed by newspapers, radio, and TV. For many people in Michigan, this was the first time they had ever heard a Foreign Service officer talk about his day-to-day activities. I have learned from the Foreign Service officers that these appearances have provided them an opportunity to participate for the first time in local community activities in the United States. This program should be encouraged.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Department of State is to be commended for this excellent project. The more our Foreign Service officers are permitted to become reoriented to, and made currently and intimately aware of, American thinking, American problems, and American achievements, the greater will be their value in representing their Government abroad. The more our people throughout the country and, particularly in the less metropolitan areas, can learn firsthand the problems and living conditions which our Foreign Service officers and their families face and the services which they must perform, the greater will be our public understanding of America's role among the nations of the world.

I know all Members of Congress will support this program energetically.

The travel report to which I referred earlier follows:

TRAILER TRAVEL REPORT: A FOREIGN SERVICE FAMILY REVISITS AMERICA

(By Samuel G. Wise)

The thought of home leave this time produced more than the usual misgivings in my family. What with both sets of parents having recently disposed of large, comfortable houses and possessing no home of our own, we were frankly dismayed at the idea of being cast adrift in the homeland for up to 2 months with three children (ages 8 and 6 years, and 18 months)—surviving, if at all, in cheap hotels or on the largess of some insanely hospitable friends.

Adding to the bleak picture, I harbored a further disappointment that the size of our family, coupled with a resounding lack of wherewithal, seemed certain to preclude any extensive travel around the United States—to my mind one of the most important purposes of any home leave.

I felt particularly strong about this as we had been away for 4 years and the children, all born and reared abroad, needed to see and experience at firsthand the country they knew only vicariously through books, films, and the conversation of their parents.

What an exciting surprise it was, then, when I learned clandestinely of the trailer program recently launched by the Department's Office of Community Advisory Services. As soon as I heard the news, I hied up to O/CAS on the seventh floor to learn the details and to see if I were eligible. It turned out that I was not only eligible but welcome.

Fred Kelley, O/CAS officer in charge of the Department's trailer program, gave me some background on the operation. The Department has procured on a long-term loan basis three travel trailers and three powerful tow cars.

Officers assigned trailers are expected to accomplish two broad objectives: reacquaint themselves and their families with a portion of the United States and provide information about the Department and the Foreign Service to interested communities at selected points along the way. The cost to the officer is minimal since the trailer, the tow car and even the gas and oil are provided gratis. The trailers accommodate up to six persons.

The beauty of the program at this point is that an officer can plot an itinerary covering any section of the United States he chooses and lasting up to a month.

I selected a route that took us out to Grand Junction, Colo., across the States of Maryland, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and Nebraska. On the return trip we also crossed Kansas, Missouri, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia.

Together with Mr. Kelley, I scheduled speaking stops in North Platte, Nebr.; Grand Junction, Colo.; Dodge City, Kans.; Columbia, Mo.; Frankfurt, Ky.; and Charleston, W. Wa.

Letters were sent from the Department to the various news media in each of these cities announcing my arrival and spelling out the purposes of the trailer program. All my scheduled stops had less than 100,000 population for two reasons: (1) larger cities most likely have been or will be visited by FSO's under different auspices and for a longer period of time; (2) maneuvering the trailer is a lot easier in smaller cities.

Mastering the trailer itself, I found, was a continuous process. Completely self-contained with separate equipment for auto-operation and hookups, the trailer was a miracle of design and convenience. Although I learned something new every day about its operation, someone else with greater mechanical facility could catch on considerably quicker. Pulling the trailer was the biggest surprise of all—it was so effortless that concentration was occasionally demanded to remember that it was behind the car.

On the way out to Colorado, we traveled far on the magnificent thruways of the North Central States alternating our overnight stops between trailer camps and national parks. We also made several side trips to visit friends along the way and to take in national monuments, areas of unusual natural beauty or interest, and other sights recommended by several guides.

The children particularly enjoyed the Indiana State Dunes Park on Lake Michigan and the traces of the old West preserved in such places as Pioneer Village in Minden, Nebr.; Central City, Colo.; and Dodge City, Kans.

Mary and I also enjoyed the great beauty of the Rocky Mountains, the seemingly bottomless canyons of Colorado and the magnificent fall colors in the blue grass country of Kentucky and the West Virginia hills. A particularly enjoyable experience for all of us was a Sunday picnic high in the Colorado Rockies hosted by the city editor of the Grand Junction Sentinel.

The public appearance aspect of the trip proved to be one of its highlights for it afforded an additional opportunity to meet with various cross-sections of the population and, where interest was shown, to talk about foreign affairs and the Foreign Service.

We found everywhere we went that the most important concerns were (a) local affairs, (b) the world series, and (c) the national elections. But we also discovered that throughout the country at all levels there is a far greater knowledge of and interest in foreign affairs than we had believed.

Local news media we perused gave surprisingly good coverage to the world scene and people seemed to sense the connection between foreign developments, particularly involving the United States, and their domestic concerns.

We were in Columbia, Mo., when the news broke of the Khrushchev ouster and the Communist Chinese nuclear explosion, and I can personally testify that developments of the magnitude of these really have the power to move the man in the street and set him to wondering about their consequences.

The majority of my public appearances were limited to radio, television, and newspaper interviews. At several stops, however, I spoke informally with small groups about the Foreign Service and in Columbia I had a chance to chat with University of Missouri students and to address a foreign affairs workshop of high school teachers. On several occasions my wife and the children got into the act, and we were amazed to hear our voices on a recorded radio tape as we slipped out of Frankfort in the early hours of the morning.

The questions asked us covered a broad spectrum ranking from our purpose in running around the country in a trailer to what it is like to live abroad to what is the outlook for Sino-Soviet relations.

For a variety of reasons, including Khrushchev's removal and my previous service in Moscow, many of the interviewers concentrated on the Soviet Union. Their second interest was evidenced by a barrage of queries about life in Italy and Americans abroad.

Somewhat surprisingly, I didn't run into one hostile inquisition during my entire trip. Everyone seemed honestly interested to hear what I had to say and to learn more about the Department of State and the Foreign Service. If there were embarrassing questions, they were held in reserve for another occasion.

Al in all, the trailer trip turned out to be a great experience. Not only was it a lifesaver as far as home leave lodgings were concerned, but it also enabled us to visit a great deal of America that we had never seen.

I modestly hoped that, in a small way, we were able to increase public knowledge and appreciation of the work of the Department and the Foreign Service.

STONE INDUSTRY—A THREATENING TREND

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have recently had called to my attention what seems to be a trend in the design of Government buildings here in the Nation's Capital and throughout the United States and what seems to be a trend in the directed use of specified materials for construction under Federal contracts.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Grounds of the Committee on Public Works, the subcommittee which has jurisdiction over the authorization of construction of public buildings, I am sincerely concerned that the Federal Government, in the interests of new architectural vogues, may be employing inferior materials in the construction of new Government buildings. This would unquestionably result in higher building maintenance cost.

I refer specifically to the substitution of concrete for the time-tested stone exteriors of our new Federal Government buildings. Four structures which would have concrete exteriors have recently been authorized for construction in Washington, at a total cost of $120 million. These four buildings are the Federal Office Building No. 5, the National Air and Space Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, the Federal Bureau of Investigation Building, and a new headquarters for the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

There are reports in Washington that architects submitting designs for new Federal buildings must specify concrete exteriors, if they hope to get approval from the Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. Speaker, this is not to criticize the use of concrete as an architectural expression, but rather to caution against its misuse in a manner thoroughly incompatible with the image of architectural beauty that Washington has presented for so many years to America and the world.

Mr. Speaker, I represent one of the greatest natural stone producing areas in this Nation. The quality of New Hampshire granite is known throughout the world. My constituents are concerned about this trend, since they have understandable interest in the use of stone in building construction.

The American people and the Members of this body are entitled to know what considerations dictated this change in our Federal architecture that has now been approved by the Commission of Fine Arts.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I would like to include in the RECORD at this point a brochure entitled "Our Beautiful Capital, Will It Be Marred by the New Trend in Federal Building?" and I commend it to every Member of this body for his careful consideration.

OUR BEAUTIFUL CAPITAL: WILL IT BE MARRED BY THE NEW TREND IN FEDERAL BUILDING?

Washington has justly been called one of the most beautiful cities of the world, a city of magnificent vistas and tree-shaded avenues, graced with a monumental architecture that proclaims the grandeur and dignity of a great nation. It is a city steeped in history and tradition. It is the common heritage of all Americans.

Because we take pride in our National Capital and are concerned that its beauty be preserved for the future, we must now speak out against a vogue in Federal architecture which may well distort or destroy the character of Washington. Whether through misdirected zeal for innovation or a desire to try cut "contemporary" art forms, approval has been given recently to the substitution of concrete for the time-tested stone exteriors of our new Government buildings. Four such structures presently are approved for construction in the heart of the Capital City, at a cost of over $120 million, and there is reason to fear that many more will follow if this dubious innovation is permitted to proceed. Indeed, there are persistent reports in Washington that architects submitting designs for new Federal buildings must specify concrete exteriors if they hope for approval by the Commission of Fine Arts.

The new buildings currently authorized are: Federal Office Building No. 5; the National Air and Space Museum of the Smithsonian Institution; the Federal Bureau of Investigation Building, and a new headquarters for the Housing and Home Finance Administration.

This is not to criticize the use of concrete as an architectural expression, but rather to caution against its misuse in a manner thoroughly incompatible with the image that Washington has presented for so many years to America and the world. The architectural harmony, the continuity of appearance, which are so much a part of Washington's enduring splendor, will be lost, perhaps forever, if these concrete structures are thrust into the great Mall and historic Pennsylvania Avenue. The end result could only be architectural discord, a chaotic clash with the quiet dignity of the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials, the National Gallery of Art, and all the great monuments of the Nation's Capital.

Federal architecture cannot and should not be bound by outmoded convention or held unchangeably to the forms of the past. But surely architectural freedom does not mean license to mar the beauty of our Capital by using it as a testing ground for each passing fad. Surely the American people and their elected representatives are entitled at least to know what considerations dictated this revolutionary change in our Federal architecture that has now been approved by the Commission of Fine Arts. Surely a matter so directly affecting our national heritage is too important to be decided behind closed doors by a Federal Commission whose changing likes and architectural philosophies can leave a lasting imprint on the Capital of the United States.

Over many centuries, stone has weathered every test of time, surmounted every trial of changing architectural form. It is as contemporary as today, as lasting as the earth itself.

We submit that this beautiful and enduring material should not be supplanted in the Federal architecture of the Capital City.

Answers should be provided promptly to these and other questions of concern to all who are interested in the future of Washington:

Are architects being pressured by agencies of the U.S. Government to employ concrete exteriors in the design of Federal buildings?

Does Congress have full, accurate information on the long-term maintenance cost of concrete-faced buildings?

Are the four new Government buildings currently scheduled an experiment in the application of concrete or the first step in a program to eliminate stone entirely from the Capital of the future?

Mr. Speaker, this trend toward specifying the materials to be used in the construction of Federal buildings seems to be an integral part of a growing trend within the Federal Government to specify the types of materials to be used in the construction of projects, if one expects to be awarded a contract.

The most shocking example of this trend was a subsection in the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 bill which stated that for the purposes of research and development in the use of coal and coal products in highway construction and maintenance, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized to require—get that—require each participating State, to the maximum extent possible, to use coal derivatives—whatever they may be and no one testifying before the Committee on Public Works seemed to know—in the construction of not to exceed 10 percent of the roads authorized under this act.

This means that regardless of the quality of the materials for road construction purposes, and regardless of the costs, these coal derivatives must be used in highway construction. If other materials are more easily obtainable, less expensive, and of superior quality to the coal derivative materials, the coal derivatives would still be used.

This, I suggest, is an alarming trend in the letting of contracts by the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, it would be wise for the General Services Administration and the Commission of Fine Arts to reexamine their procedures and recommendations relative to the specifications of specific materials for construction of new Government buildings. It might also be wise for the Federal government to reexamine in depth any trend toward specifying the use of specific materials in any project.

GOVERNOR OF TENNESSEE PROTESTS CUTBACK OF FUNDS FOR SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ANDERSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from the Governor of Tennessee, the Honorable Frank G. Clement, protesting the proposed cutback in appropriated funds for the soil and water conservation programs of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. Governor Clement's arguments against these cuts make sense and I hope the Members of the House will restore these funds and prevent another economic setback to the small and poor farmer who so desperately needs our help.

The letter follows:

NASHVILLE, TENN.,
March 18, 1965.

HON. WILLIAM R. ANDERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ANDY: Many leading citizens have expressed concern over the proposed reduction in the Federal budget appropriations for the soil and water conservation programs of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

This service, for the past 30 years, has been afforded the farmers without charge and it would seem that the plan under consideration—that a certain percentage of the operating funds be raised from soil conservation districts and farmers—would penalize the small and poor farmer least able to pay for the technical assistance they so badly need. This would place an unjust burden on the farmer as well as undue hardship on other groups who are already bearing heavy financial obligations.

Since the soil conservation service assistance programs were fostered by the Democratic Party, they have meant much to agriculture in Tennessee, and I hope that these practices can be stimulated and intensified as a reduction will do great damage to the soil and water conservation programs in our State.

I will give my support to all moves to get these funds restored and your careful consideration of this matter is respectfully requested.

Sincerely,

FRANK G. CLEMENT.

WHAT TOILETS?

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz, deserves the praise and compliments of this House and the people for bringing forth the facts about farm labor in this country. He has now completed his 4-day on-the-ground investigation of farm labor conditions in California and the evidence is conclusive that the shift in that State from Mexican braceros to domestic labor has been accomplished so far with minimal disruption of farming, despite the loud protests to the contrary by the large growers.

Perhaps of even greater importance is the manner in which Mr. Wirtz' trip dramatized the miserable conditions that farm workers are subjected. It is incredible that in the middle of the 20th century farmworkers in America are treated on many large farms no better than serfs and slaves were treated in the middle of the 18th century.

In part, the Federal Government must share the responsibility for this. For the Government has in many ways encouraged or permitted these conditions to exist. Minimum wage protection has not been extended to farmworkers. Workman's compensation has not been extended to farmworkers. And, worst of all, through the bracero program the Government handed the growers a club with which to beat domestic workers over the heads and a crutch for themselves to lean upon. So long as the semislaves could be carted in from Mexico there could be no improvement in working conditions. Why should wages be negotiable with domestic workers when the Government guaranteed a foreign labor supply to the growers?

During his trip, Secretary Wirtz while observing asparagus harvesting in northern California asked the ranch owner, "Where are the toilets?" The ranch owner replied in astonishment "What toilets?" He might also have replied, "What decent housing? What decent food? What decent wages? What workman's compensation?"

With unanimous consent I am inserting in the RECORD an article from the Washington Star, March 26, 1965, by Doris Fleeson entitled "Wirtz' Lonely Battle on Poverty," and an article from this morning's New York Times, March 29, 1965, by Gladwyn Hill, entitled "Day of Alien Labor Over":

DAY OF ALIEN LABOR OVER, WIRTZ TELLS COAST FARMERS: GROWERS MUST COMPETE FOR DOMESTIC WORKERS, HE SAYS AFTER TOUR

(By Gladwin Hill)

[Special to the New York Times]

LOS ANGELES, March 28.—Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz has proclaimed the advent of a new era in a major segment of American agriculture.

Mr. Wirtz declared this weekend, after making a 4-day investigation of California's vast farming industry, that the day of a Government-sponsored "guaranteed and assured" farm labor supply, through the seasonal importation of cut-rate alien field hands, was over.

Henceforth, he said, agriculture will have to get its workers through direct wage competition in the domestic labor market.

He predicted that even major increases in farm wages would bring only insignificant increases in retail food prices.

To facilitate this far-reaching transition to domestic labor, Mr. Wirtz indicated that he was strongly inclined to press for two innovations long considered radical in agricultural economics: a national minimum wage and unemployment insurance for farmworkers.

MINIMUM WAGE STUDIED

The Secretary is also considering the development, under Federal-State auspices, of a national network of trailer parks, with full community facilities, as bases from which migrant farmworker families could follow the crop cycle and live decently.

Many of these families still live in battered automobiles or shacks on ditch-banks in the "grapes of wrath" fashion of the 1930's.

A score of States, mainly in the West, have made extensive use of alien labor, chiefly Mexican braceros, imported annually by the hundreds of thousands on grounds of domestic labor shortages.

This importation was ended by law December 31. Since then there has been mounting clamor from farm quarters, and pressures on Congress and the administration, to revive the traffic.

The system has long been opposed by organized labor and social welfare organizations as a wage-cutting device. The so-called shortages of domestic labor, in the face of large-scale unemployment, have been attributed to farm employers' refusal to offer enough pay as long as they could get dollar-an-hour alien labor.

LITTLE DISRUPTION SEEN

Mr. Wirtz concluded that in California, the biggest agricultural State and the biggest user of braceros (Spanish idiom for manual laborers), the shift to domestic labor had been effected thus far with minimal disruption of farming, although there might be very limited and selective transitional needs for some aliens in this fall's harvest peak.

The Secretary presented his conclusions at an airport news conference last night as he headed back to Washington, his shoes daubed with mud from tramping through dozens of vegetable fields, fruit groves and labor camps during a thousand-mile tour of the State by plane and car.

In four 16-hour days, he talked with hundreds of workers, employers and officials. In collaboration with an entourage of Federal and State agricultural and labor experts, he probed farm economics down to fractions of a cent.

California's large-scale farm employers had hoped the visit would be an occasion for continuation of the long-simmering argument about the asserted indispensability of a "supplementary alien labor supply," which critics have likened to the garment industry's onetime dependence on a flow of immigrants from Europe.

But Mr. Wirtz, after his investigation, rejected this notion as a dead issue. He emphasized that in terminating Public Law 78, which authorized federally regulated importation of labor, Congress had expressed its will that this labor source be ended.

The only question now, he said, is how to achieve the transition to a stable, and economically and socially satisfactory, domestic supply.

The will of Congress, he added, likewise precluded reviving any large-scale admission of foreign labor under section 414 of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, on which many farm employers have been pinning their hopes.

Under this provision, foreign labor can enter the United States temporarily to work in a certain area if the Labor Department agrees that the area has a labor shortage.

"Some people have felt that section 414 would replace Public Law 78," Mr. Wirtz said. "It will not."

"I see the situation moving from the recriminations and absolutes of the last several months of discussions," he said, "into a period where we face squarely the fact that Public Law 78 has been terminated. What lies ahead is a longer-range challenge to meet the changeover in California's agriculture."

"A fully guaranteed, assured labor supply will no longer be the case," Mr. Wirtz said. "It will be up to employers, with the cooperation of public and private agencies, to provide adequate incentives. A basic decision implicit in the action of Congress was that labor should find its price on a competitive basis."

He declared, "There has been substantially no bargaining power between employees and employers over wages and working conditions. From here on there'll be a competitive factor in the situation."

"Under Public Law 78," he continued, "at least one-fifth of California agricultural work was performed by single individuals, from a foreign country, living apart from their families, in a network of bachelor labor camps. In the future this portion of the work well be performed by people of this country who travel with their families."

"There will be problems of providing family housing, and such things as schools, churches and other community facilities. But it's clearly within the area of achievable accomplishment," he said.

"There is no question whatsoever," Mr. Wirtz said, "that we can end the anomaly, the paradox of there being 400,000 to 500,000 unemployed in California and there still being difficulty recruiting labor for farms."

The normal farm employment in California at this time of the year is around 275,000. Against this, Mr. Wirtz observed that there were pending only three emergency applications for supplementary alien labor—which he can still authorize under section 414—totaling only about 8,000 workers.

These applications report shortages for 5,100 workers for lettuce harvesting around Salinas, 2,900 for tomatoes around Stockton, and 250 for date-palm pollination at Indio.

Department of Labor officials and growers' representatives will discuss these areas this week in Washington.

Mr. Wirtz's tour took him from the asparagus ranches of northern California to the citrus groves around Los Angeles and the various crops of the Imperial Valley, where lettuce alone brought in $39 million last year to a small number of ranchers.

HEARS BOTH SIDES

From employers Mr. Wirtz heard countless explanations of why U.S. citizens could not do the stoop labor on farms, although a good deal of it admittedly has been done by them all along, and how the domestic labor supply was undependable.

From workers he heard equally numerous accounts of having been denied jobs, up to January, in favor of aliens, and of wages below the subsistence level.

"I observed that the most serious reports of labor turnover came from farm operations where conditions were bad," he commented, "and the fewest complaints from places that obviously were well operated."

A memorable vignette occurred as the Secretary surveyed asparagus harvesting in northern California.

"Where are the toilets?" he asked.

The ranch owner blurted out in astonishment: "What toilets?"

Wirtz' Lonely Battle on Poverty

(By Doris Fleeson)

Minus bands, television, or even a theme song, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz is fighting a battle for human rights in territory as obstinately hostile to the goals of the Great Society as is the Deep South.

Wirtz is slogging through some of the richest farmlands in the United States, listening to the complaints of its corporate owners that they cannot harvest their crops without the transient Mexican labor they call "braceros." This is big, rich California, which likes to think it leads the civil rights parade.

The braceros are one pocket of poverty Congress banned after a long struggle. Last year it cut off the importation of braceros and Wirtz, obedient to their word, took appropriate action. Last January 1, he ruled that foreign workers could not be imported unless it could be proved that domestic labor could not be had if offered a decent wage and good working conditions. He also fixed pay standards of $1.25 an hour, to rise in April to $1.40 an hour in conformity with national minimum wage standards.

The growers, despite their advance notice of the shape of things to come, promptly set up a clamor that impressed State politicians, who in turn appealed to the White House. Hence Wirtz' journey.

On his first day this week Wirtz discovered to his astonishment that the growers complained little about the higher pay scale. With considerable frankness many said the Mexicans worked harder and didn't talk back.

It became clear to him also that the growers value greatly their lack of responsibility for their workers. Braceros have been coming to California when needed, collecting pay at times agreeable to the growers and meekly going home when not wanted. To opponents of the system, this is "renting slaves" as opposed to southern slave holding, which demanded year-round support.

The Secretary also found in the corporate farmers a remarkable power of detachment from the problem of California's 400,000 unemployed. This detachment is accompanied by demands upon the Federal Government for help with their labor situation.

Yet this is territory where Washington is regarded as the enemy and welfare with all its costs is considered a foible on the part of politicians. The theory accepted by most of industry that its workers are also its consumers has not trickled down.

Bracero employment at its peak was only 65,000. Wirtz is not convinced that more could not be done to tap the pool of the idle, though it is, of course, not easy to transplant city dwellers, however destitute, to the hard manual labor of the farm.

Wirtz has aces in the hole, including congressional sanction. The President's war on poverty does not contemplate exemptions that would relieve special groups from responsibility for putting Americans to work and lightening relief costs. Wirtz has reports showing that California used 10,000 foreign workers in January and February last year and none this year. Yet there have been no significant losses.

Perhaps the major importance of the Secretary's lonely pilgrimage is that it brings him—and through him the President—face to face with the realities of the poverty war. There will be other engagements of this nature where the immediate economics of a situation is made the paramount issue.

SEE THE U.S.A.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ULLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in August of 1964, House Joint Resolution 658 was enacted and signed by the President. As the sponsor of the resolution, I considered it a promising vehicle for accomplishing two important objectives: first, a better understanding by Americans of the country they live in; and second, slowing the mounting deficit in our balance of payments attributable to foreign travel.

This joint resolution, as many of my colleagues will remember, was an expression of Congress encouraging Americans to travel in United States and authorizing the President to appoint a national chairman to assist in coordinating the efforts of private business and industry in carrying out the intent of the resolution. The program became known as "See the U.S.A."

Some travel writers and intellectual sophisticates have taken the opportunity to make this legislative child of mine an object of satire and sarcasm. We should always keep our sense of humor about America's shortcomings, but they should remember that, although this Nation does have industrial and human slums, they can be multiplied a thousandfold by every other section of the world. We are saying: "Get out beyond the smokestacks and see 'America the Beautiful.' It is there, it is real, and it is deep in the hearts of all Americans."

I think those writers would do well to recall that, at the time I introduced my resolution, serious consideration was being given to some very drastic restrictions on foreign travel by Americans. I rejected this approach as not being consistent with our traditional concepts of freedom of travel, and instead offered a truly voluntary program involving better promotion of the benefits of domestic travel. There was even concern in some quarters that we might offend by this mild program. It would make as much sense to suggest that American auto manufacturers stop their advertising programs because it offends the makers of Volkswagens.

I am elated and greatly encouraged by recent developments, and by the obvious support that the President is giving the program. President Johnson has assigned the Vice President to head up a task force to carry out the provisions of the resolution. At a meeting of the Magazine Publishers' Association last week, I heard Mr. HUMPHREY make a most eloquent plea for promotion of travel in the United States. I know of no one who is more dedicated to the better knowledge and understanding of our great American heritage of beauty and history than is our Vice President. Under his able direction I have every confidence that the "See the U.S.A." program will accomplish the objectives that I had hoped for and which the Congress supported. Other indications of strong administration support have recently been heard from the new Secretary of Commerce, John Connors, and from the Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall.

I applaud all of these as a healthy indication of a revitalized concern over the roll that the imbalance in tourism has played in our gold outflow. There is no other method of relieving our balance-of-payments deficit that will bring with it so many attending benefits.

We are not asking that Americans forgo all foreign travel, but merely that they devote more of their travel dollars and more of their vacation time to travel within the United States. How much better prepared they will then be as ambassadors of good will throughout the world. Recently, I have read the words of columnists poking fun at American tourist meccas—comparing them unfavorably with Paris, Rome, and some of the other more popular tourist objectives in Europe. That is like comparing apples with oranges.

How much better a person can enjoy Paris after having seen New Orleans, or the Alps after having seen America's western mountains. I wonder how many American tourists abroad have been asked to compare the Louvre with our own great museums, and have had to admit that they have never visited an art museum before arriving in Paris? How many have had to tell inquiring Europeans that they have never visited some of the greatest natural wonders in the world—the Grand Canyon, Glacier National Park, or Crater Lake? Can you imagine a Frenchman who has never seen the Eifel Tower, or an Italian who has not visited the Roman amphitheater?

Mr. Speaker, I see this resolution and the resulting "See the U.S.A." program as a great opportunity for America to overcome the inferiority complex that we evidently feel about promoting our own rich history and unparalleled beauty. Much needs to be done, but we are here provided with the vehicle to get the job underway. One of the most significant benefits that I am able to foresee is an awakening within the domestic tourist industry to the changing desires and needs of the traveling public, which will lead to an improved accommodations and higher standards of service. Another benefit could be the development of a new concept of "traveling packaging" in the United States. My distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CHARLES A. VANIK], referred last week to the fact that airlines charge considerably more per mile for travel within the United States than for the same kind of travel abroad. The travel package would give incentive to airlines and other transportation mediums to institute service that is appropriate to the various needs of the public—in price, scheduling, and degree of personal service.

To help bring this about, Mr. Speaker, I am encouraging the adoption of the three-point program to bring about a better understanding between Government and private industry of the particular needs in these areas. I am proposing this program for consideration by Vice President HUMPHREY and his Task Force on Travel, and hope that my colleagues will also see the merit in this approach to a nagging problem.

First. I propose that the President call for regional travel conferences with State travel promotion officials, local chambers of commerce, travel organizations, tourist industry representatives, and every segment of private business affected by tourism to develop a concerted plan of promotion and to begin a voluntary program of improvement in standards of service.

Second. I urge that private industry and business associations themselves stress in their publications and in their services to members that a good neighbor policy be instituted on the American scene. An American should be made to feel at home in his own country, and the hand of welcome and friendship should be readily extended to foreign visitors.

Third. Mr. Speaker, I urge that new concepts of management be incorporated into the public sector of recreation. Administrators on every level of government—local, State, and Federal—should exercise imagination in the enhancement of these natural recreation resources that contribute so much to the novelty and beauty of America. Innovation should be a byword rather than something to be feared. Barriers to cooperation between private business and public agencies should be broken down, but rules for the preservation of esthetic values must be maintained for the mutual benefit of all—visitor and entrepreneur alike. A major objective should be the construction of adequate resort facilities throughout scenic America.

In closing, I want to say that I am proud of the part I played in getting this program underway. My resolution, House Joint Resolution 658, was introduced in July 1963 in answer to President Kennedy's message to Congress on the balance of payments. It was approved by the Judiciary Committee under the able direction of the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] and our now-retired colleague, Mr. Forrester, of Georgia. The House passed it in December of 1963. It languished in the Senate committee for many months before receiving a new breath of life and going to its final passage. I had great hopes then, Mr. Speaker, for the success of the "See the U.S.A." campaign, and though that hope has sometimes wavered, I feel confident in expressing to you today my optimism that we are on our way toward making travel in America a pastime that is both enjoyable and respectable.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT PARES UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr Speaker, the 87th Congress can be proud of its record if for no other reason than the enactment of the Manpower Development and Training Act. This act is beginning to see the fruits of the efforts that went into its birth.

In many parts of the Nation, we are seeing the effects of this bill in reduced unemployment. True we still have a long way to go. The proposed amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act, which are scheduled to be before the House this week, represent another step in the right direction.

The Detroit News, in an article by Mr. Asher Lauren in its edition of Sunday, March 7, details how the Manpower Development and Training Act has helped "make a sizable dent in the ranks of the jobless."

For those who may have some doubts in their minds about the program authorized by the Manpower and Development and Training Act, I urge that they read the following article:

JOB TRAINING PARES STATE'S IDLE TOLL

(By Asher Lauren)

Government training programs in Michigan are starting to make a sizable dent in the ranks of the jobless.

The Labor Department reported Saturday that more than 1,700 unemployed got jobs in fiscal 1964, which ended in June, after learning new skills under training programs financed through the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Nationally, 115,000 persons qualified for the courses in 1964, according to Elmer L. Babb, field director in Detroit of the Office of Manpower, Automation, and Training of the Labor Department.

He said 2,101 persons in Michigan completed training last year and that 1,710 of them found jobs.

HUGE INCREASE

The 1,700 represent a 400-percent increase over 1963, he said.

Women are well represented in the training classes. There were 1,461 women trainees last year in Michigan out of a total enrollment of 3,755 unemployed persons.

Another type of training program that appeals to auto plant workers fearful of losing their jobs as a result of automation also is taking hold, particularly in the Detroit area.

It is on-the-job training and is designed to upgrade the skills of workers whose jobs are threatened in the auto plants. Such training, also financed under the Manpower Act, is supervised by the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training of the Labor Department.

FIRST IN THE NATION

One of the outstanding training projects in this field in the Detroit area is conducted jointly by Local 412 of the UAW, the Chrysler Corp., and the Bureau.

More than a year ago local 412, in cooperation with the Bureau, opened the first union-sponsored training center in the Nation to train plant workers for white-collar jobs. The success of these classes in clay modeling, mechanical drafting, and graphic illustrating led to a new training project just announced by the Labor Department.

In the new 33-week classes, 40 workers will learn production detailing, 20 will study graphic illustrating, and 20 will be taught clay modeling. Local 412 will be reimbursed $19,190 for training costs from U.S. funds.

TRAINING SPREADS

"Sometimes we have difficulty persuading workers to enroll even though their jobs may ultimately be eliminated by automation," Ray Sullivan, president of the local, said. "The starting wage rates on new jobs are sometimes below the hourly rates on the jobs they hold."

The on-the-job-training classes are spreading, the Labor Department said.

A contract has just been signed by the Artistic Furniture Co. here with the Bureau of Apprenticeship calling for training of 16 unemployed persons and 4 employees of the company.

WILL PAY TRAINEES

The Bureau said half the group will be trained for 10 weeks as operators of machines sewing upholstery fabric. The other half will study upholstering for 28 weeks, after which they should qualify as apprentices.

The firm will be reimbursed $5,144 from U.S. funds for training costs, the Bureau said. The company, in turn, will pay the trainees $27,000 in wages during the training periods, the Bureau added.

These training classes differ from youth training programs and others authorized under the Economic Opportunities Act of 1964.

NEW ERA IN FARM LABOR

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, after 4 days of field inspections, of meetings with both growers and workers, Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz has quite correctly reaffirmed the decision of Congress in ending Public Law 78; of ending the day when the farming industry can count on a guaranteed, Government-sponsored supply of cheap, captive, cutrate foreign farm labor.

As the New York Times pointed out in an editorial on March 27:

> Every device short of outright refusal to accept domestic farmworkers has been used to discredit the Labor Department's recruitment efforts.

Frank Porter, reporting on the Secretary's factfinding trip to California has stated:

> In many ways the farm economy here resembles American industrial development a century and more ago when wave after wave of foreign immigrants provided a source of cheap and unorganized labor for the New England mills. No other industry in the United States—not steel, not autos, not coal mining—receives the special consideration given agriculture in the past decade as regards importation of labor.

And among his other statements reported in the New York Times of March 29, Secretary Wirtz has made it clear that:

> There is no question whatsoever that we can end the anomaly, the paradox of there being 400,000 to 500,000 unemployed in California and there still being difficulty recruiting labor for farms.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that these articles be read by all who are concerned with this problem:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 27, 1965]

SQUEEZE ON THE MIGRANTS

After years of successful sabotage by the corporate farm lobby, Congress finally was able to slam the door last December 31 on the legal importation of hundreds of thousands of low-wage Mexican laborers to harvest American crops. Now California growers are engaged in a callous, rear-guard action to reopen the migration floodgates and thus to condemn American farmworkers to continued exploitation.

Every device short of outright refusal to accept domestic farmworkers has been used to discredit the Labor Department's recruitment efforts. The growers' aim is to prove that crops will rot if Secretary Wirtz does not authorize the emergency admission of large numbers of braceros from Mexico. State officials already have thrown their support behind the farmowners in the Salinas area, and pressure for a wholesale breakthrough is mounting in the rest of California.

Thus far Mr. Wirtz has stood fast—as he should. He is making a personal inspection of the obstacles to getting enough workers in California. Already he has discovered that one answer is the survival of abysmal living conditions in some migrant labor camps. He said the filth at one camp near Salinas made him "ashamed" that anything so bad existed in America.

In line with his duty under the general immigration law, Mr. Wirtz has held hearings and established $1.40 an hour as the prevailing rate California growers must offer domestic laborers before he will certify any shortage requiring the importation of foreign help. This wage standard is scheduled to become effective April 1, and certainly no need for braceros should be assumed until it has had a comprehensive test. And, if this wage proves insufficiently attractive, there is no reason why the law of supply and demand in the labor field should not bring a higher one.

Once growers are compelled to recognize the necessity for paying a living wage, America's highly profitable corporate farms will cease to be "sweatshops in the sun" and no shadow of excuse will exist for the mass import of cheap foreign labor.

[From the Washington (D.C.), Post, Mar. 29, 1965]

WIRTZ'S DECISION JOLTS GROWERS IN CALIFORNIA

(By Frank C. Porter)

LOS ANGELES, March 28.—As O. W. Fillerup, of the Council of California Growers, was leaving the Hyatt House Hotel at Salinas last Wednesday a broadly grinning associate came up and put a hand on his shoulder.

"Well, I think we saved the day," said the associate.

The day referred to is the day of the bracero, legislatively terminated when Congress let Public Law 78 die on December 31.

Fillerup had just presided over a 3-hour presentation in which a dozen allies from canning, food processing, transport, and banking industries and the Teamsters Union sought to persuade Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz that the California economy would go to pot without importation of Mexican workers.

Fillerup's friend obviously thought the Secretary had been persuaded. But inside the motel's opulent bar, other colleagues were less sanguine.

Their misgivings were substantiated last night when Wirtz, just before flying back to Washington from Los Angeles, bluntly declared, "the bracero program is over."

LIMITED USE

He did indicate there might be some limited spot use of braceros to ease the transition to 100 percent domestic labor. Under Public Law 414, the Secretary may certify importation of foreign workers when insufficient Americans are available at fair rates of pay and under adequate working conditions.

But this is not what the growers wanted. They were shooting for the resumption of a program under which Mexican nationals accounted for one-fifth of the State's farm-labor needs.

Wirtz has consistently argued that sufficient domestic workers can be found if competition is allowed to return to the farm labor market, if reasonable wages are paid and if decent housing and food are maintained for field hands. He considers it an anomaly that a State with 400,000 unemployed should import 100,000 Mexican laborers.

Though Wirtz went out of his way to praise working conditions on some farms, the former labor law professor was outraged at the misery and squalor in which many of the laborers live in the midst of a booming economy.

He got his back up when canning executives threatened to move their operations to Mexico, throwing thousands of Americans out of work, unless the flow of braceros is resumed. Later he said their argument "leaves me cold."

MESSAGE CLEAR

When he left Los Angeles, Wirtz' message to the growers was clear: Treat your domestic workers right and you will never lack for them. And if you don't treat them right, there will be no certification of foreign workers to ease the transition. Higher wages may mean some slight increase in retail prices but the American housewife should be willing to pay a half-cent more for a head of lettuce to improve the lot of farm labor, he indicated.

The California growers, of course, cannot be blamed for trying to preserve the status quo. The braceros were a source of cheap, efficient, docile labor. Unionization is expected to accelerate as Americans take over their jobs. Costs will go up. Profits may be shaved.

But it is difficult to see catastrophe for the growers if they follow Wirtz' advice. The total volume of California's agricultural output amounts to $3.5 billion a year. Earnings estimates are hard to come by but some farm economists put the State's net earnings after taxes on farm products as high as $1 billion annually—a return of nearly 30 percent on sales. And this figure averages the bad years in with the good.

In many ways the farm economy here resembles American industrial development a century and more ago when wave after wave of foreign immigrants provided a source of cheap and unorganized labor for the New England mills. No other industry in the United States—not steel, not autos, not coal mining—receives the special consideration given agriculture in the past decade as regards importation of labor.

Change is in the air.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 29, 1965]

DAY OF ALIEN LABOR OVER, WIRTZ TELLS COAST FARMER—GROWERS MUST COMPETE FOR DOMESTIC WORKERS, HE SAYS AFTER TOUR

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, March 28.—Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz has proclaimed the advent of a new era in a major segment of American agriculture.

Mr. Wirtz declared this weekend, after making a 4-day investigation of California's vast farming industry, that the day of a Government-sponsored "guaranteed and assured" farm labor supply, through the seasonal importation of cut-rate alien field hands, was over.

Henceforth, he said, agriculture will have to get its workers through direct wage competition in the domestic labor market.

He predicted that even major increases in farm wages would bring only insignificant increases in retail food prices.

To facilitate this far-reaching transition to domestic labor, Mr. Wirtz indicated that he was strongly inclined to press for two innovations long considered radical in agricultural economics: A national minimum wage and unemployment insurance for farm workers.

MINIMUM WAGE STUDIED

The Secretary is also considering the development, under Federal-State auspices, of a national network of trailer parks, with full community facilities, as bases from which migrant farm-worker families could follow the crop cycle and live decently.

Many of these families still live in battered automobiles or shacks on ditch banks in the "Grapes of Wrath" fashion of the 1930's.

A score of States, mainly in the West, have made extensive use of alien labor, chiefly Mexican "braceros," imported annually by the hundreds of thousands on grounds of domestic labor shortages.

This importation was ended by law December 31. Since then there has been mounting clamor from farm quarters, and pressures on Congress and the administration, to revive the traffic.

The system has long been opposed by organized labor and social welfare organizations as a wage-cutting device. The so-called shortages of domestic labor, in the face of large-scale unemployments, have been attributed to farm employer's refusal to offer enough pay as long as they could get dollar-an-hour alien labor.

LITTLE DISRUPTION SEEN

Mr. Wirtz concluded that in California, the biggest agricultural State and the biggest user of braceros (Spanish idiom for manual laborers), the shift to domestic labor had been effected thus far with minimal disruption of farming, although there might be very limited and selective transitional needs for some aliens in this fall's harvest peak.

The Secretary presented his conclusions at an airport news conference last night as he headed back to Washington, his shoes daubed with mud from tramping through dozens of vegetable fields, fruit groves, and labor camps during a thousand-mile tour of the State by plane and car.

In four 16-hour days, he talked with hundreds of workers, employers, and officials. In collaboration with an entourage of Federal and State agricultural and labor experts, he probed farm economics down to fractions of a cent.

California's large-scale farm employers had hoped the visit would be an occasion for continuation of the long-simmering argument about the asserted indispensability of a supplementary alien labor supply, which critics have likened to the garment industry's onetime dependence on a flow of immigrants from Europe.

But Mr. Wirtz, after his investigation, rejected this notion as a dead issue. He emphasized that in terminating Public Law 78, which authorized federally regulated importation of labor, Congress had expressed its will that this labor source be ended.

The only question now, he said, is how to achieve the transition to a stable, and economically and socially satisfactory, domestic supply.

The will of Congress, he added, likewise precluded reviving any large-scale admission of foreign labor under section 414 of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, on which many farm employers have been pinning their hopes.

Under this provision, foreign labor can enter the United States temporarily to work in a certain area if the Labor Department agrees that the area has a labor shortage.

"Some people have felt that section 414 would replace Public Law 78," Mr. Wirtz said. "It will not."

"I see the situation moving from the recriminations and absolutes of the last several months of discussions," he said, "into a period where we face squarely the fact that Public Law 78 has been terminated. What lies ahead is a longer-range challenge to meet the changeover in California's agriculture."

"A fully guaranteed, assured labor supply will no longer be the case," Mr. Wirtz said. "It will be up to employers, with the cooperation of public and private agencies, to provide adequate incentives. A basic decision implicit in the action of Congress was that labor should find its price on a competitive basis."

He declared, "There has been substantially no bargaining power between employees and employers over wages and working conditions. From here on there'll be a competitive factor in the situation."

"Under Public Law 78," he continued, "at least one-fifth of California agricultural work was performed by single individuals, from a foreign country, living apart from their families, in a network of bachelor labor camps. In the future this portion of the work will be performed by people of this country who travel with their families."

"There will be problems of providing family housing, and such things as schools, churches, and other community facilities but it's clearly within the area of achievable accomplishment," he said.

"There is no question whatsoever," Mr. Wirtz said, "that we can end the anomaly, the paradox of there being 400,000 to 500,000 unemployed in California and there still being difficulty recruiting labor for farms."

The normal farm employment in California at this time of the year is around 275,000. Against this, Mr. Wirtz observed that there were pending only 3 emergency applications for supplementary alien labor—which he can still authorize under section 414—totaling only about 8,000 workers.

These applications report shortages of 5,100 workers for lettuce harvesting around Salinas, 2,900 for tomatoes around Stockton, and 250 for date-palm pollination at Indio.

Department of Labor officials and growers' representatives will discuss these areas this week in Washington.

Mr. Wirtz' tour took him from the asparagus ranches of northern California to citrus groves around Los Angeles and the various crops of the Imperial Valley, where lettuce alone brought in $39 million last year to a small number of ranches.

HEARS BOTH SIDES

From employers Mr. Wirtz heard countless explanations of why U.S. citizens could not do the "stoop labor" on farms, although a good deal of it admittedly has been done by them all along, and how the domestic labor supply was undependable.

From workers he heard equally numerous accounts of having been denied jobs, up to January, in favor of aliens, and of wages below the subsistence level.

"I observed that the most serious reports of labor turnover came from farm operations where conditions were bad," he commented, "and the fewest complaints from places that obviously were well operated."

A memorable vignette occurred as the Secretary surveyed asparagus harvesting in northern California.

"Where are the toilets?" he asked.

The ranchowner blurted out in astonishment: "What toilets?"

BANK PROBLEMS IN PERSPECTIVE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, since the maturing of the programs of the Federal Deposit Insurance; the sophisticated restraints of the Federal Reserve System; the upgrading of criteria and requirements of the office of Comptroller of the Currency, and the improvement, albeit not uniform or complete, in the quality of State bank supervision, the people of the United States have tended to look upon banking institutions as being immune to failure. Such, of course, is not and has not been the case. It is true that in the light of experience prior to 1932, the modern banking institutions are comparatively unassailable bastions of depository protection. There is still stupidity and cupidity at work in our society and some of each gets into banking. To the great credit of our banks, their management, and to the credit of the agencies under which they operate, the impact of poor judgment and of mischievous intent have been minimized.

Currently our society is under terrific stress occasioned by the dynamics of growth and the dynamics of change. In the climate of both, the quality of operations from every activity within society is challenged and threatened. This is true of the American home as well as the American bank. In the light of such challenge and change the stability and dependability of our national banking system is to be admired and appreciated.

There have been a number of headlines recently, calculated to implant the impression that bank regulation is in wild disarray; that banking is generally infused with unsound practices, and that politics has an unhealthy influence in bank charters and bank regulation. Facts to bear out any such impressions are conspicuous in their scarcity or in their total absence. On the contrary, evidence is clearly available to show that banking had one of its most productive and profitable years last year. All signs are for another good year in 1965. To set the true picture of bank failures into perspective, we insert below the table of bank failures for the period of 1952 through March of 1965, as prepared and released by the Comptroller of the Currency:

U.S. commercial bank failures, 1952–65 [1]

Year	Number of bank failures				Bank failure rate per 10,000 banks		Business failure rate per 10,000 firms
	National	State insured	State non-insured	Total	National	State insured	
1952	0	3	1	4	0	3.5	28.7
1953	0	2	1	3	0	2.3	33.2
1954	0	2	2	4	0	2.3	42.0
1955	2	3	0	5	4.3	3.5	41.6
1956	1	1	1	3	2.2	1.2	48.0
1957	0	1	1	2	0	1.2	51.7
1958	1	3	5	9	2.2	3.5	55.9
1959	0	3	0	3	0	3.5	51.8
1960	0	1	1	2	0	1.2	57.0
1961	2	3	4	9	4.4	3.5	64.4
1962	0	0	2	2	0	0	60.8
1963	0	2	0	2	0	2.3	56.3
1964	1	6	1	8	2.1	6.9	53.2
1965 (2 months)	2	2	----------	[2] 4	----------	----------	----------
Total	9	32	19	60	----------	----------	----------

[1] For insured banks, the figures show the number of cases requiring FDIC disbursements. For noninsured banks, the figures show the number of cases described by the FDIC as "noninsured bank failures."

[2] Failures of noninsured banks are not included in the first 2 months of 1965.

Sources: FDIC, annual report, 1952 through 1963, for bank data for those years. Bank data for 1964 and 1965 from FDIC, "Report to the Comptroller of the Currency of Liquidation and Insurance Expenses, Nov. 30, 1964," and supplement. Business failure data from "Economic Report of the President, 1965."

As can be seen by the table, the number of State-chartered banks failing far outnumbers those of national orgin. However, taken together, the figures are favorable when compared with general business failures as, of course, they should be. The failure rates of 2.1 per 10,000 national banks and 6.9 per 10,000 insured State banks in 1964, may be compared with business failure rates of 53.2 per 10,000 firms. It would be foolish and irresponsible to just shrug off recent bank failures. The increased agitation and friction over Federal supervision is also a significant problem.

These problems are best understood in the light of the change James Saxon wrought by his fresh approach and new programs for the banking community. What is interpreted by some as a chaotic condition is merely the fact that old policies and old guidelines are no longer predictable patterns in the face of the new philosophy. The Comptroller, better and clearer than any other source, has spoken out his basic belief and the foundation for his program of change. We quote him from his recent testimony before a Senate committee and ask that his actions be judged in the light of the merit and soundness of his expressed beliefs:

> The single fact to bear in mind throughout is that we live in a private enterprise economy. This means that we place primary reliance on the individual to choose his own occupation, to spend his income as he wishes, and to undertake such ventures as he cares to risk. The presumption is against governmental restriction of this free discretion unless there is a clear public need which the Government can satisfy better than the individual.
>
> These precepts have a particular bearing on the basis, and the bounds, of public regulation of banking.
>
> Under our public policy, we control entry into banking, and we place certain limits on the operating powers of bankers. In administering these restrictions, the banking agencies have certain discretionary authority. When we place this fact in the context of a basic public policy which favors individual initiative, it seems clear that the banking agencies should exercise their discretionary powers in a way which will avert needless impediments to the initiative and enterprise of the individual banker.
>
> This is the principle we have followed in the reforms we have undertaken. Our aim has been to make the National Banking System a more effective servant of the people. We have sought this objective by enlarging the operating discretion of bankers, by responding more sensitively to the demands for additional banking facilities, and by pursuing a full disclosure policy.

It is our observation that Mr. Saxon has been following with the acts of his office the principles for which he stands. For example, on the 19th of March this year, he released proposed regulations dealing with the full disclosure and public notice of changes in control of bank management. In doing so he follows a long line of respectable tradition of retaining maximum judgment in the hands of business leaders with public concern being protected by full disclosure. We ask that a letter of commendation to the Comptroller from the National Editorial Association be set forth below marking the public acknowledgment of the wisdom of such a move:

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., March 23, 1965.

Mr. ROBERT BLOOM,
Comptroller of the Currency,
U.S. Treasury, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BLOOM: On behalf of the National Editorial Association may I state that the members of this association—representing more than 6,500 weekly and daily newspaper publications—feel that the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency has taken a step that will receive commendation from the press of this country.

Your recognition of the need for public notice advertising in helping solve a problem created by change in ownership on national banks is indicative of the value of this means of communicating vital information to the public.

The fact that nearly everybody in this country reads a newspaper has made public notice advertising in newspapers of general circulation the accepted means of informing the public.

It will be my privilege to send a copy of your announced amendment to the Regulations of December 1962 regarding national banks to the six members of the NEA public notice committee for their individual comment to you.

Sincerely,

THEODORE A. SERRILL.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the time of growth is the time of opportunity. But not always are we prepared with management and skill to meet the demands of growth and this poses a problem. The need for change threatens stability and the possibility of carefully controlling all aspects of action are less present. In the face of fuller opportunity and less stable conditions, the undesirable elements see great advantage and to the degree there is vulnerability they will attack. Their presence in a few places is to be deplored and the early expulsion of their influence is to be desired. The bad and sometimes illegal practices they engender stand as a threat to the money market. The examples of the damage they have created in several banks reflects widely against the good name of banking and its position of solid confidence with the American public. No stone should be left unturned in rooting out such persons and such influences.

On the other hand the growth has not stopped and the instability created by change has not subsided. In this situation let us not look to personalities but to principles to adjust to the growth and reestablish stability. The Comptroller has not been always right, and never perfect, which is only to say that he is human. He is following a course based on a commitment to certain principles he has announced and, I believe, attempted to follow. Those who would be critical should debate the merits of his principles and objectively measure the actions of his office. At the same time, friend and adversary alike should seek the best solutions to carry an important, even vital, economic activity through the trouble of our times.

THE CHALLENGE OF WATER CONSERVATION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the very excellent statement by my colleague, Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK, chairman of the Subcommittee on Rivers and Harbors, Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE CHALLENGE OF WATER CONSERVATION

(By Congressman JOHN A. BLATNIK, Chairman, Committee on Industrial and Municipal Water Use and Pollution Abatement)

The basic tenet of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress philosophy is the adequate, orderly, and prudent development of the use, control, and conservation of national water resources. It is a philosophy of conserving for future generations, of utilizing for our present generation, of harnessing the forces of nature to effectively serve mankind, and of preserving the delicate balance of nature from destruction by those who see only the immediate gain. And within the scope of this Committee on Industrial and Municipal Water Use and Pollution Abatement are some of the most vital aspects of water resources development.

The problems of water conservation have become more acute as our population rapidly expands and as our consumer-oriented society makes greater and greater demands on existing supplies. From 1946 to 1963 our population increased 50 million. In the next 10 years the increase will be the equivalent of adding to our country the population of New York and Pennsylvania.

Water is the key to our future, and we must expand all efforts to protect and utilize this vital resource. Water usage is expanding at a phenomenal rate, at an even greater rate than the expansion of the population. In 1900 Americans were using 40 billion gallons per day. In 1963 this figure rose to 355 billion gallons per day. By the year 2000 our needs will be 1 trillion gallons per day in the face of an available supply of only slightly more than half that amount. Thus, we must intensify our efforts to abate water pollution to permit reuse of water on a far larger scale than practiced today.

In 1956 Congress initiated and passed the Federal Water Pollution Control Act providing for grants-in-aid for construction of municipal waste treatment facilities, Federal enforcement actions in pollution cases, and a variety of cooperative Federal-State programs to combat pollution. In 1961 amendments to the Pollution Control Act were enacted, and since that time 16 enforcement actions have been undertaken as the first step in cleaning up thousands of miles of polluted streams.

The States and local interests have primary responsibilities for the development of water supplies for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other purposes. The role of the Federal Government is one of cooperation and support, for it is the declared policy of the Congress in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to recognize, preserve, and protect the primary responsibilities and rights of the States in preventing and controlling water pollution.

Construction of municipal waste treatment facilities, which was barely chugging along at the rate of $222 million per year before passage of the 1956 act, has increased since then to $820 million in 1963. Significantly, $170 million of that amount was generated by the Accelerated Public Works Act, which has helped many communities to obtain such facilities, which they otherwise might not afford. Without an extension of the APW program we will suffer a sharp setback in our efforts to keep current in construction of waste treatment facilities.

In spite of the remarkable progress to date, we are barely keeping up with our needs—much remains to be done. There are still over 3,000 communities and uncounted industries discharging untreated or inadequately treated sewage into our streams. Further, there are 2,746 unsewered communities with almost 6 million persons, requiring sewer systems. Ground water pollution is among the serious problems which result from individual disposal units in areas lacking sewer systems. It is estimated that the cost of meeting our present needs for municipal sewage treatment facilities is excess of $2 billion. In addition, the abatement of pollution becomes more difficult as we are faced with increasingly complex detergents, pesticides, and petrochemicals which cannot be effectively removed through normal treatment methods.

The progress we have made in the last few years fighting municipal pollution can only be considered as a starting point for more concentrated future efforts. In an effort to administratively upgrade and otherwise strengthen the Federal Water Pollution Control Act I have introduced a bill, H.R. 3166, which was the subject of hearings before the House Public Works Committee in December and February. A similar bill, S. 649, introduced by Senator MUSKIE, passed the Senate last October by an overwhelming vote. Passage of this legislation during this session of Congress will provide the momentum needed to keep our pollution abatement activities in high gear.

Industrial wastes present increasingly complex pollution problems. Recent Public Health Service studies indicate that organic industrial pollution is approximately twice that of municipal waste discharges.

New chemical wastes are adding to the volume and the complexity of industrial pollution. These reflect the rapid growth of the chemical industry—a 90-percent production increase between 1947 and 1960 as contrasted to an overall industrial production rise of 40 percent. Many synthetic chemicals defy treatment by known methods, and some actually interfere with the effectiveness of treatment processes. The spotlight lately seems to have moved from detergents to agricultural pesticides as the prime object of public attention in this area.

The prospect of vast increases in production to meet burgeoning population demands a stepped-up drive to construct treatment works and to reduce the load through new processes and new industrial plant design.

That industry is stepping forward to meet its problems is nowhere better shown than in a recent address before a pulp and paper industry meeting in New England, where an industry leader acknowledged industry's dependence on high-quality water and its stake in the conservation of our water resources. He proposed a joint Government-industry attack to find the scientific breakthrough which will supply the answers to heretofore unanswerable pollution problems. I welcome this sign of fresh thinking to industrial pollution abatement.

We have a responsibility to aid industry in this regard. We have to recognize that expenditures for industrial pollution control are made in the public interest, and that we have a responsibility to provide an incentive to purchase this badly needed equipment.

In 1963, I introduced a bill to allow the deduction from taxable income of expenditures for the construction of industrial waste treatment works to control water pollution. As part of the tax cut bill, the Senate passed a somewhat more limited measure which would have doubled the existing 7 percent investment credit to 14 percent for purchases of pollution control equipment. Unfortunately this provision was dropped in the House-Senate conference, but I shall continue to push for enactment of this type of legislation.

The problems of water supply and pollution should be the concern of all Americans. The National Rivers and Harbors Congress cares. This committee cares. Let us join with President Johnson "to prevent an ugly America. For once the battle is lost, once our natural splendor is destroyed, it can never be recaptured."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows to:

Mr. WATKINS (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through April 1, on account of death of close personal friend.

Mr. BALDWIN (at the request of Mr. GERALD R. FORD), through April 15, on account of illness.

Mr. SAYLOR (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, on account of official business.

Mrs. MINK (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for today and tomorrow, on account of official business.

Mr. SCHISLER, for March 30, 1965, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PATMAN, for 30 minutes, on Wednesday, March 31, 1965, on the 100th anniversary of the Banking and Currency Committee; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BUCHANAN (at the request of Mr. HALL), for 30 minutes, on March 30; to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. O'KONSKI.

Mr. BENNETT and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. PELLY.

Mr. SWEENEY.

Mr. ADAMS.

Mr. COLMER and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HALL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. SCHWEIKER.

Mr. CALLAWAY.

Mr. GUBSER.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. ROOSEVELT.

Mr. GALLAGHER.

Mr. WHITENER.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 30, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

816. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting a report on defense procurement from small and other business firms for the period July 1964 to January 1965, pursuant to section 10(d) of the Small Business Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

817. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on wage rates for federally financed housing construction improperly determined in excess of the prevailing rates for similar work in the Dallas-Fort Worth, Tex., area, Department of Labor; to the Committee on Government Operations.

818. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

819. A letter from the Attorney General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 4082 of title 18, United States Code, to facilitate the rehabilitation of persons convicted of offenses against the United States"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

820. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

821. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Maj. Donald B. Powers, U.S. Air Force"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

822. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Col. Frank D. Schwikert, U.S. Air Force"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

823. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

824. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 39b of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit a part-time referee from acting as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

825. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on the application of the Gulf Oil Co. for refund of excess oil royalties (barging costs) paid by them on lease OCS-0455, pursuant to section 10(b) of 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

826. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill relating to the use by the Secretary of the Interior of land at La Jolla, Calif., donated by the University of California for a marine biological research laboratory, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committee were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MILLS: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 6675. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the

Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 213). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 6869. A bill to consolidate the two judicial districts of the State of South Carolina into a single judicial district and to make suitable transitional provisions with respect thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 6870. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to reimburse the immediate families of certain veterans hospitalized in Veterans' Administration facilities for the expenses of visiting such veterans, and to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to hospitalize certain veterans in non-Veterans' Administration facilities for emergency care or treatment of non-service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 6871. A bill to permit cancellations of waivers of insurance under the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954 without regard to age; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BENNETT:

H.R. 6872. A bill to provide assistance to individuals with low incomes by reducing the amount of income tax on individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 6873. A bill to provide time off duty for Government employees to comply with religious obligations prescribed by religious denominations of which such employees are bona fide members; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 6874. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 6875. A bill to direct the Administrator of General Services to convey to Kenton County, Ky., all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain real property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin:

H.R. 6876. A bill to amend section 3402 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the recognition by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, Inc., for the prosecution of veterans' claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 6877. A bill to provide for a voluntary wheat domestic parity program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 6878. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 6879. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Auburn-Folsom South unit, American River division, Central Valley project, California, under Federal reclamation laws; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6880. A bill to add certain lands to the Kings Canyon National Park in the State of California, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 6881. A bill to extend and expand title III of the Mental Retardation Facilities and Community Mental Health Centers Construction Act of 1963, to authorize establishment of a special grant-in-aid account for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACKAY:

H.R. 6882. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 6883. A bill to provide for improved employee-management cooperation in the Federal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 6884. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 6885. A bill to vest in the Secretary of the Treasury all functions relating to the examination and supervision of federally insured banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 6886. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 6887. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 6888. A bill to provide a percentage deduction for certain expenses paid for the higher education of the taxpayer, his spouse, and his dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SICKLES:

H.R. 6889. A bill to provide for increased Federal Government participation in meeting costs of maintaining the Nation's Capital City and to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to borrow funds for capital improvement programs; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 6890. A bill to amend the Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937 to permit certain payments under milk marketing orders; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 6891. A bill to provide for family winter recreational use of a portion of the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area, San Bernardino National Forest, Calif., without reducing the area set aside for wilderness preservation within such forest, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 6892. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Commission for Elimination of Pornographic Materials; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 6893. A bill to repeal the retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags, and to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on general telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINISH:

H.R. 6894. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.J. Res. 409. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives shall be 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENT:

H.J. Res. 410. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives shall be 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

151. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska regarding the storage of feed grains in Nebraska; to the Committee on Agriculture.

152. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to legislation for a national minimum farm wage equal to the highest statewide minimum farm wage paid in any of the 48 contiguous States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

153. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to protecting and preserving Morro Bay Rock as a point of scenic interest; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

154. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Pennsylvania, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to freedom of worship and in opposition to acts of discrimination by the Soviet Union against Jewish citizens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

155. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging the inclusion of navigation locks in the Asotin Dam project and the appropriation of funds for same; to the Committee on Public Works.

156. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to investigating experimentation in the field of artificial nucleation, or interference by artificial means with the natural precipitations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 6895. A bill for the relief of Ioannis (John) Asimakopoulos and his wife, Maria Asimakopoulos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 6896. A bill for the relief of Minh Son and Kim Phuong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 6897. A bill for the relief of Miao Fu Huang and his wife, Ruminah Huang, and their sons and daughters, Mrs. Mei Lan (also known as Maria Theresia) Liem, Mrs. Mei Hua (also known as Grace Marie Josee) Oei, Shing An (also known as Robert) Huang, Lien An (also known as Edward) Huang, and Yuan An (also known as Albert) Huang, and their son-in-law, Hwie Liong (also known as Howard) Liem, and their grandchildren, Kiem Ho (also known as Thomas) Liem and Sian Lie (also known as Anastasia) Oei; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 6898. A bill for the relief of Yang You Ming; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6899. A bill for the relief of Dr. Myriam de la Caridad Ares y Fernandez de Bosch; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6900. A bill for the relief of Jose Alfredo Martinez-Valdes, Jose Luis Martinez-Garcia, Maria Concepcion Valdes-Moran de Martinez, and Maria de los Dolores Garcia-Sanchez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H.R. 6901. A bill for the relief of Courtney Patrick; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6902. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eurina P. Richards; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 6903. A bill for the relief of Bienvenido V. Sison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 6904. A bill for the relief of Georgios Kitsos, his wife, Asimo Kitsos (nee Doulgegeropoulou), and their minor child, Argio Kitsos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 6905. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the Daughters of the American Revolution in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 6906. A bill to provide for the free entry of one mass spectrometer and one split pole spectograph for the use of the University of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

144. By Mr. RYAN: Petition of Morningside Gardens Civil Rights Committee of New York City urging immediate passage of the voting rights bill containing some 310 signatures; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

145. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Hawaii Island Chamber of Commerce, Hilo, Hawaii, with reference to endorsing the resolution of the county of Hawaii Board of Supervisors in regard to the desire of their community to have Kilauea Military Camp continued as a military rest camp; to the Committee on Armed Services.

146. Also, petition, of the National Conference of State Legislative Leaders, Milwaukee, Wis., with reference to urging the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that anyone elected to the U.S. Congress be a resident of the State or territory which elects him for at least 2 years prior to his election; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Tax Relief Proposal for Low-Income Families

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, a tax reduction to a bare minimum to individuals with low incomes as a substitute for Federal doles and subsidies is what would be accomplished by legislation introduced in the House of Representatives by me today.

My bill would reduce the income tax to $5 for those citizens classed in the poverty status to eliminate the need for handouts from the Federal Government.

This bill, amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 relating to income tax on individuals, including married persons filing joint returns, heads of households and single persons, is a technically drawn bill to halt the tendency of Government to tax those low-income groups, while keeping them in the subsidy and welfare class.

In drafting the legislation, the poverty class definition adopted by the administration which includes those persons making $3,000 or less annually was used.

In taxing the person making $3,000 or less annually, the Federal Government is going to the source of a man's livelihood, and returning to him a dole or subsidy putting him squarely under the thumb of the "Great White Father."

Rather than pay his rent or give him a welfare check, why not eliminate his income tax? My bill would accomplish this and also keep the principle of having every American wage earner pay at least a minimum tax under the $5 feature of this legislation.

The legislation would not cost the Federal Government a great deal of money, but would be offset by a decrease in welfare doles. There were 10,500,000 taxpayers in the poverty category who paid only $1.6 billion in taxes in 1962, about 3.6 percent of the total individual income tax collected for the year.

This bill could take the place of a major new spending program, for example, the Appalachian bill or the proposed new housing program, and make the individual less dependent on a paternal Federal Government and more dependent on himself.

Outgoing Secretary of the Treasury, Douglas Dillon, in his final public speech last Friday urged a further tax reduction for the Nation's low-income families, adding support to this legislation.

I am hopeful that the bill will have very early hearings and departmental reports, because it is vitally needed.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES ROOSEVELT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, Byelorussians are one of the little known Slavic peoples whose homeland in the northwest of Russia and east of Poland has been part of the Russian Empire for centuries. These sturdy and stouthearted people, never numerous or strong enough to cope with their more powerful foes, the Russians in the east and the Poles in the west, had been overwhelmed by the Russians. For centuries they endured all sorts of hardships under the czarist regime, and when that regime was no more, they then saw their chance to attain their national goal early in 1918.

On March 25 of that year Byelorussian leaders proclaimed Byelorussia's independence of Russia and established the Byelorussian Republic. They formed their own democratic government, began rebuilding their war-torn country and were doing their utmost to rebuild the shattered fabric of their social, economic, and political life. At the outset they were faced with the numerous insurmountable difficulties, and the defenses of the country were in a sad state, wholly inadequate to protect it against its powerful foes. It became an easy prey for the Red army of Communist Russia late in 1918, and thus the Byelorussian people enjoyed their freedom for only a very brief period before they were robbed of it.

But the idea of freedom has never deserted the Byelorussian people, and they still cling to it in the firm hope that some day they will attain it in their historic homeland. Nearly half a century of Soviet domination has not caused despair among the Byelorussians; they still feel that since theirs is a righteous and sacred cause, it will in the end win out against Communist totalitarianism. On the 47th anniversary of Byelorussian independence let us all hope and pray that their just cause will prevail against the forces of Communist oppression.

Progressive Growers' Association Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the Progressive Growers' Association in my congressional district has just completed a survey of its membership of 700 farmers. This survey shows that a drastic curtailment of planted acreage in tomatoes, strawberries, miscellaneous vegetables, brussels sprouts, cucumbers, and beans will result if supplemental foreign labor is not available for California farmers. Obviously, this will create extreme hardship for the employees in canneries and other allied industries, many of whom are Mexican-Americans. It is ironic that certain propaganda groups are fighting the realism that crops simply will not be planted without supplemental labor and in so doing are hurting the minority groups they profess to be helping.

Below is a table showing the planting intentions of 700 farmers with or without supplemental foreign labor:

Crops	Acreage	1965 crop survey	
		With supplemental foreign labor	Without supplemental foreign labor
		Percent	*Percent*
Tomato	3,579	94.8	33.3
Strawberry	234¾	66.2	25.7
Miscellaneous vegetables	674½	102.4	51.7
Brussel sprouts	1,218	99.7	35.3
Cucumbers	157	67.5	19.1
Beans	65	69.2	----------
Total, all crops	5,928¼	94.5	34.7

It should be pointed out that though the survey indicates that one-third the usual tomato acreage, 3,579, will be planted for a total of approximately 1,200 acres that these plants are predicated in 98 percent of the cases upon the possibility of harvesting by machine. Thus, jobs for human beings will be sacrificed in favor of the inferior quality which will result from machine picking. This, too, will have an adverse effect upon Mexican-Americans and other domestic workers.

The 47th Anniversary of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, the courageous people of the formerly independent Byelorussian Democratic Republic marked the 47th anniversary of the Proclamation of Independence. In the United States, a convention of Americans of Byelorussian descent was held on March 21, 1965, to commemorate this date. Although their former compatriots remain under the iron rule of Communist Russia, there is no doubt that the citizens of present-day Byelorussia joined silently, but forcefully, in this observance.

For the flame of freedom burns deep within the Byelorussian people. The successful effort at independence in 1918 was the culmination of many attempts to secure for themselves a national identity over the years. But self-determination is a word that is not in the Communist lexicon, and this independence was shortlived. Despite this fact, the traditions, customs, and spirit of a Byelorussian nation continues on. The importance of this national group, and its ability to identify as a national group, is underscored by the fact that their Communist masters feel the need for a separate "puppet" state within the borders of the Soviet Union.

By marking the anniversary of the independence movement of these brave people, we expose the fiction of this puppet regime and encourage the legitimate aspirations of Byelorussians everywhere for self-determination in their homeland. Those of us who have the benefits of freedom can do no less than this.

The New Proposal for Health Insurance for the Aged

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important issues before Congress is medical care for our senior citizens.

After thorough consideration the House Ways and Means Committee has reported H.R. 6675, a bill introduced by Chairman Wilbur Mills, providing in place of the original medicare bill a combination of three proposals: First, an expanded Kerr-Mills program for hospital and medical assistance to the indigent aged and for other public assistance; second, an insurance program for hospital care for senior citizens as in the former King-Anderson bill; and third, a voluntary plan to cover the cost of physician's fees and drug costs along the line of the eldercare plan.

Also this legislation includes a 7-percent (minimum $4) across-the-board increase in old-age survivors and disability insurance.

The cost of this new legislation for 1967 for its first full year of operation would be $5 billion from general revenue, $500 million from premiums collected for the voluntary health care plan and the remainder from increased payroll taxes.

These latter taxes would be raised by a change in the taxable annual earnings from the present $4,800 to $5,600 January 1, 1966 and to $6,600, January 1, 1971, and also a rate increase.

The voluntary doctor's fee insurance would be financed by persons over 65 paying monthly premiums of $3 each deducted from their monthly retirement benefits. The Federal Government would match this $3 premium out of general revenue.

Private insurance carriers would carry out, under contract, the administrative functions of this part of the bill.

The expansion of Kerr-Mills medical assistance for the indigent aged would require participation of States in the program—and requires these States to provide an income test to determine eligibility, but not with rigid income standards to adversely affected persons with large medical bills.

Members of the Ways and Means Committee say this new bill is fiscally on a sound basis in that it would not endanger the existing social security system as it was said the original medicare plan would have done.

Certainly the legislation remains controversial in that it is a combination of eldercare, medicare, and Kerr-Mills. When it is considered by the House, there will be no changes or amendments, so House Members must take it or leave it as it came out of committee. Republicans may have one opportunity, if they desire, to offer an alternate plan.

Already, the AMA has expressed opposition, but I can find few colleagues who do not feel the bill's good outweighs its less desirable features and therefore who do not plan to vote for it. They say and I agree there is a need for a program, although, of course, this proposal does not completely satisfy everyone.

Meanwhile, however, there is little doubt but that this bill will pass with a large majority and in due course be signed by the President into law because he has praised the bill.

Finally, I might add that in my opinion this legislation has much more to recommend it than the original medicare plan over which there was so much disagreement.

Byelorussian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, today 10 million Byelorussians are not allowed to celebrate their national holiday. But Americans remember and praise the brief spark of freedom which excited these people 47 years ago; for it is a symbol of the liberty sought by all men.

Throughout its long history, the Byelorussian nation has suffered and resisted domination. In 1965, however, it is subjected to the cruelest of all imperialisms: communism. In the name of that sterile and hyprocritical ideology, Byelorussians have been forced to give up their national aspirations, speak a foreign tongue, and adopt a new religion.

In 1918, with the fall of the autocratic czarist regime, Byelorussian leaders proclaimed the independence of their nation. For 3 brief years they were to experience liberty. Then, in 1921, the Red army attacked and occupied this newly born state. Ravished to fit Soviet designs for world domination, the Byelorussian National Republic has been forced to lose its strong cultural, political, and economic ties with the West. Even during the darkest hours of this brave nation, however, the Soviets were unable to stifle the true spirit and pride of a noble people.

Standing firm against Soviet domination, the great Byelorussian poets added their voices against the alien yoke which had descended upon them. Yanko Kupala sounded the lament for all Byelorussians with these touching words:

My fatherland—it is the whole world,
I have torn myself away from my native soil.
Yet still I am not free from it—in sleep
I dream of Byelorussia.

A Reasonable Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD H. CALLAWAY

OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I had occasion to appear before the House Committee on the Judiciary today. In my testimony I urged a reasonable approach which would assure voting rights to all qualified citizens throughout the country and which would not single out some States for special treatment. The formal testimony is as follows:

A Reasonable Approach

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, I thank you for the opportunity to appear here today.

I am here, gentlemen, because I consider the bill before this committee, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, a bill of utmost importance to all Americans. Proof of its importance is the interest that this subject has generated throughout the country. Like all Americans, I wholeheartedly agree with the aims and objectives of this bill as stated in section 2, that "no voting qualifications or procedure shall be imposed or applied to deny the right to vote on account of race or color."

The right to vote is already a basic American right guaranteed to all qualified citizens by our Constitution and our laws. To deny this right to a single person because of race is unthinkable.

In looking at the complaints before the courts, I believe that the problem is less one of adequate laws than one of expeditious enforcement of the laws that we have. In some cases deliberate roadblocks have been placed to thwart or at least delay justice. This is wrong; we cannot condone it; I do not condone it. We have a duty to correct it. But in correcting what is clearly wrong, let us not create further wrongs. Let us attack the problem; let us analyze each complaint; let us examine what went wrong and then enact corrective legislation.

I am here to wholeheartedly support any reasonable legislation that attacks the real problem of voting rights—legislation that eliminates delays in procedure, to assure every qualified citizen the right to vote regardless of race or color.

But I cannot support H.R. 6400 as it stands. I cannot support this bill because, though I agree with its stated end, I do not agree with its means. For, in pursuing its proper goal of assuring voting rights, H.R. 6400 would establish a dangerous precedent, and would be discriminatory in application.

I base my first objection that it would establish a dangerous precedent, on section 4(a) of the bill—that section pertaining to the appointment of Federal examiners or registrars. Under this section the Attorney General would have the power to authorize the appointment of Federal registrars for National, State, and even local elections; not only upon the complaint of 20 residents, but in addition he could do so without any complaints, when "in his judgment the appointment of examiners is otherwise necessary to enforce the guarantees of the 15th amendment."

Let us consider this subsection for a moment. The Attorney General is here given what appears to be total discretion and power. With no rules set forth to guide his judgment, he, alone, at his own whim, can impose Federal registration control at any time, and the people have no recourse. His decision shall be final. His power is absolute, and it has been said that absolute power corrupts absolutely.

Therefore, before this extreme step is taken, let us consider the nature of this office of Attorney General. We do not have to look far to see that during 11 of the last 15 years, the Attorney General has been a key campaign figure for the successful presidential candidate.

The Attorney General from 1949 to 1952 was J. Howard McGrath, chairman of the Democratic National Committee during the 1948 campaign. In 1953, the appointment went to Herbert Brownell, a former Republican National Committee chairman and one of the top directors of three Republican presidential campaigns. And Attorney General Robert Kennedy was the successful manager of his brother's presidential campaign. These men had the highest responsibility of getting out the vote for their party. Clearly then, the Attorney General can be a man whose mind is not entirely free of partisan politics.

Keeping in mind the unlimited authority given to him in section 4(a) of this bill, it is not impossible that, some day, some politically minded attorney general—Republican or Democrat—could decide to use this power for political gain.

Let us suppose "that in his judgment the appointment of examiners is necessary to enforce the guarantees of the 15th amendment" in an area that he knows to be sympathetic to his party. Could he then appoint the county campaign chairman as chief registrar with strong precinct bosses as his deputies, and send them into that area to register voters door to door? The answer is "Yes," he could, because there are no specifications for methods of registering, and there are no tests or rules involved in the selection of examiners.

If you are now thinking that my suppositions are farfetched, let me ask you to indulge me one more time by extending your imagination even a little farther. Consider with me the possibility that this bill, once the precedent is established, is only a first step. Could it then lead beyond Federal control of registration to complete Federal control of polling officials and polling places? Of course it could, and, in taking that chance, this Nation of freemen could conceivably lose the very basis of its freedom.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to direct your attention to that portion of H.R. 6400 which I consider to contain the greatest injustice, section 3(a). This section would single out selected States for punitive treatment.

Section 3(a) of the bill divides this Nation into two groups of States. Group 1 consists of States which "the Attorney General determines maintained on November 1, 1964, any test or device as a qualification for voting and with respect to which the Director of the Census determines that less than 50 per centum of the persons of voting age residing therein were registered on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 per centum of such persons voted in the presidential election of November 1964." Group 2 consists of all other States.

Under this bill the second group of States may require a voter to read or write. The first group may not. The second group may require a voter to have a sixth grade education or its equivalent. The first group may not. Group 2 may require a voter to have good moral character. Group 1 may not. This bill would result in dividing our Nation into two different kinds of States, some with more rights than others.

I do not speak at this time on the question of the merits of literacy tests or the tests of moral character, but only on the question as to whether it is right to have different sets of rules for different States.

Obviously, there is no constitutional or moral basis for giving certain States more rights than others. The only claim of constitutionality lies in the contention that the formula in H.R. 6400 is a reasonable way of separating the States that are discriminating because of race in violation of the 15th amendment from those that are not. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a valid contention.

The formula separates States where the 1964 presidential vote was more than 50 percent of the persons of voting age from those States where the vote was less than 50 percent. The assumption is that a low percentage of voters must be due to the discrimination that is prohibited under the 15th amendment.

But is this assumption true in fact? Or are there other factors—perhaps even more important factors—contributing to the low voter turnout in the Southern States. I say that there are.

The report of the President's Commission on Registration and Voting in November 1963 discussed psychological and legal causes of a low voter turnout. Particularly significant to me is a paragraph on page 1 of the summary of this report as follows: "The Commission strongly believes that effective two-party competition in all areas of the Nation will build and maintain interest in public affairs and lead to greater voter participation."

In 1949, a Texas scholar, Dr. V. O. Key, former head of the political science departments of Johns Hopkins, Yale, and Harvard, noted that "the low level of participation in southern voting can by no means be attributed entirely to Negro disfranchisement. Nonvoting by Negroes does not alone produce the low turnout percentages; in most States in the South the rate of participation by whites falls far below the rates of the total voting population in two-party States."

Mr. Chairman, here we have the key. Look at the seven States singled out by the Attorney General as the only complete States affected by the formula—Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia, and Alaska. Of these States six are Southern States with a low voter turnout due primarily to the one-party system. The seventh, Alaska, has a low turnout apparently because of the problems of cold weather and isolation of voters. We may not like the one-party system of the South or the cold of Alaska, but these reasons for low voter turnout have nothing to do with the 15th amendment or racial discrimination.

It is a well-known fact that Democratic primary victories in the South have been tantamount to election and that in most instances Democratic primaries far outdraw the general elections that follow. For example, in the last Governor's race in my own State of Georgia, the Democratic primary drew 852,000 voters while the general election for that office drew only 312,000.

Similar figures for presidential elections are of course not available, since they are not preceded by popular primaries. But there is ample evidence to show that a two-party system, with its consequence of many contested elections on the same ballot, brings out a much larger presidential vote.

Let me quote again from the President's Commission on Registration and Voting: "When an election is expected to be close, the strong partisan is even more inclined to vote."

I ask you, gentlemen, how many elections are expected to be close in a State where 90 percent of all candidates run unopposed? The report goes on: "A great ally in the long-range fight against apathy is politics itself—the two-party system. Effective two-party competition prompts political involvement, spurs interest in politics and campaigns, and strengthens a person's feeling that his vote counts. We believe that two-party competition is essential to build and maintain interest in public affairs, and consequently leads to greater voter participation."

The President's own Commission obviously felt this point to be tremendously important—yet, it was apparently overlooked by the framers of H.R. 6400.

Competition is the basis of active politics. It is a truism to say that with more contested elections more people vote. But, in the Southern States affected by this bill, there were few contested elections. In my own State of Georgia, at the time of the November 1964 presidential election and on the same ballot with the presidential electors, 4 of 10 congressional seats were uncontested; 32 of 54 State senate seats were uncontested; 191 of 205 State house seats were uncontested, and 34 of 35 candidates for solicitor general were uncontested.

There were uncontested State elections for 37 superior court judges, 2 public service commissioners, 3 supreme court justices, and 2 appellate justices. Thus you see in Georgia that in our congressional, general assembly, and statewide races 305 out of 348 State elections were uncontested.

Also on the ballots of the various counties were a total of more than 1,000 local officials such as county commissioners, city commissioners, mayors, clerks, ordinaries, and justices of the peace. While no figures are available to me at this time on the number of contested local races, I would estimate that there were no more than 25 of the more than 1,000 local elections.

It doesn't take a strong imagination to see how many more voters would have presented themselves to the polls in November 1964 if each of these thousands of posts were contested.

Let me return for a moment to the report of the President's Commission on Registration and Voting participation. Their study found that "it is no coincidence that the growth of the Republican Party in the South has impelled many more voters of both parties toward the polls."

This is true, but our Republican Party in Georgia is still weak. It is still struggling, but the progress of this struggling party has been remarkable.

In the 1960 presidential elections, there were only four congressional Republican candidates and very few local Republican candidates. The total vote in Georgia in this election was 728,759. In 1964 with the increase in the number of contests, both in congressional races and in local races, the total presidential vote rose to 1,139,352. An increase of 56 percent. My own district increased its congressional vote turnout by 43 percent over 1960 when given a good two-party fight in which to vote. By 1968, with the growth of the Republican Party in Georgia, I have no doubt that the figure will rise above 50 percent of those of voting age. But of course, under this bill which is based only upon the November 1964 election, Georgia would still be singled out as a State not having the right to determine its own voter qualifications.

Let me point out one other fallacy in relating voting percentages to racial discrimination. The fallacy is that figures on voting age population do not actually reflect the number of persons who might be reasonably expected to vote. These figures include transients, noncitizens, military personnel, and others who would not normally vote in the areas where they are recorded. Now, this may not make a significant difference in some areas, but in my district, the Third Congressional District of Georgia—the home of Fort Benning and Warner Robins Air Force Base—it makes a great deal of difference.

Let me cite the example of Chattahoochee County. In Chattahoochee County, only 4.4 percent of those of voting age voted in the 1964 presidential election. Surely, if the percentage of those voting is a valid criteria for racial discrimination, this county must be the most discriminatory county in the Nation.

But is this the case? There have been no complaints of racial discrimination in Chattahoochee County. What then is the situation? It is simply this: The military base of Fort Benning covers approximately three-fourths of the county. Included, therefore, in the voting-age population of Chattahoochee County, are thousands of troops and students at the infantry school who do not vote there. So this county, which voted 86 percent of its registered voters in the 1964 election, is credited with voting only 4.4 percent of those of voting age. The problem is compounded by the fact that, even in so obvious a case of injustice, there can be no appeal from the census statistics. This is one more example of why I say that H.R. 6400 is based on an unsound, unfair formula.

Mr. Chairman, let me reiterate my position.

1. The right of an American citizen to vote is basic and must not be abridged because of race or color.

2. The present problem is not one of inadequate laws, but rather one of enforcement of the laws that we have. The problem is particularly one of delay in proceedings.

3. Any voting rights legislation should be aimed at speeding up proceedings and guaranteeing registration of all qualified voters throughout the country.

4. The granting of uncontrolled authority to the Attorney General and Federal registrars sets a dangerous precedent.

5. The fact that a State voted less than 50 percent of those eligible in the 1964 election is more likely to be caused by a one-party system rather than by discrimination under the 15th amendment.

Gentlemen, my closing plea is this: Do not attempt to end voting discrimination among the races by setting up deliberate discrimination among the States. Do not report favorably a bill that picks out one section of the country and treats it differently from all others. Remember, as the President said, that those affected by this bill still have to live and work together. Therefore, give us a bill that all responsible elements—North and South, Democrat and Republican, white and Negro—can support. By doing this you will see all States and all races united and working together to forever end voting discrimination wherever it is found.

Philadelphia Naval Shipyard Wins President's Citation for Cost Reduction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues will recall past reports that the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard would be closed. Fortunately those of us who had been fighting long and hard to keep the shipyard open were able to prove conclusively to Secretary McNamara that it should remain open because of its excellent record of efficiency in the Nation's service.

I call the attention of my colleagues today to the outstanding record of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard employees in cutting costs—a record so fine that the yard has now been awarded a Presidential citation for its support of DOD cost reduction programs. The Philadelphia Naval Shipyard saved $27 million during fiscal year 1964, more than four times the amount assigned by the Bureau of Ships.

Mr. Speaker, employees of the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard are entitled to a hearty vote of thanks for their important contribution not only to the Nation's defense but also to its economic well-being. I am inserting a clipping from the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard Beacon which tells of the recent much-deserved honor accorded to the Philadelphia yard.

Secretary McNamara's decision late last fall not to shut down the Philadelphia shipyard came as an unexpected but welcome surprise and appeared to bring with it an assurance that the Philadelphia Naval Shipyard, for the first time in several years, is not in danger of abandonment in the immediate future.

With increasing frequency during the last 4 years the Defense Department has been reported ready to close the Philadelphia yard.

In the past 2 years Pennsylvania Congressmen waged a continual battle in Washington to save the yard but many were not optimistic about Philadelphia's chances to escape McNamara's list of 95 dying defense installations.

The Navy's shipyard complex is over 160 years old and reached its present level of 11 yards during World War II when public and private shipbuilding and ship repair facilities were greatly expanded.

The end of World War II brought a contraction in shipbuilding activity. Many private shipyards closed. The Defense Department reports that the Navy's 11 yards were only being utilized at 63 percent of capacity last June.

During World War II, employment in the Navy yards reached 353,000. Now it is about 85,000, with some 7,100 employed at Philadelphia.

McNamara in 1963 appointed a blue-ribbon Defense Department Shipyards Policy Board to determine the extent of excess shipyard capacity and recommend which naval shipyards should be closed. Reports circulated repeatedly indicating McNamara would close Philadelphia.

Shipyard employees and Philadelphia area Congressmen agreed that the shipyard had an excellent record and felt it could be saved if a clear presentation of the facts could be made to the Defense Department.

Assistance was obtained from the Pennsylvania Congressional Steering Committee, a bipartisan group of five Pennsylvania Congressmen appointed by Governor Scranton to assist the State's interests in Washington.

In addition, James E. Van Zandt, special representative of Governor Scranton, Congressman JAMES A. BYRNE, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, and I, as Pennsylvania members of the House Armed Services Committee, worked with the steering committee in numerous presentations to Defense Department officials in behalf of the shipyard.

Efforts of the group were aimed both at informing the responsible officials of the many factors in Philadelphia's favor, and attempting to obtain additional assignment work to the Philadelphia shipyard to prevent further employee layoffs.

Arguments in behalf of the yard were based on the simple fact that the Philadelphia shipyard has about the best record of performance and efficiency of any of the 11 naval shipyards.

The Defense Department special study completed last fall indicates that our arguments in Philadelphia's behalf were well founded.

The high-level study panel sought to close two yards on the east coast. It considered the yards at Philadelphia, Boston, Brooklyn, and Portsmouth, N.H.

The study group found that "Philadelphia stands out as the single best shipyard to retain under all factors evaluated, while Portsmouth and New York rate lowest as the shipyards warranting retention."

Next to Philadelphia, Boston was found the most desirable to retain because of its proximity to north Atlantic sailing routes and because its closing would produce the smallest cost savings.

The Defense Department study gave no indication of further shipyard closings in the foreseeable future. Needs were projected through 1972.

The fact that Philadelphia's retention was found even more desirable than that of another yard still left open was seen as an implied assurance that the immediate threat of closings has at long last been removed.

A number of Congressmen and I for long have sought to have the Navy provide the Philadelphia shipyard with the capability to overhaul nuclear submarines since this appears an important Navy function in the future which would help assure higher employment levels.

Although our efforts until last fall have not seemed to meet with success, the possibility of obtaining this additional responsibility at Philadelphia now seems greater.

The study group determined the Navy strategic need for three east coast shipyards capable of nuclear submarine overhaul. The yards at Portsmouth, Norfolk, and Charleston now have this capability but Portsmouth will be closed.

Philadelphia was the only east coast yard found by the study group in a position to readily acquire this nuclear capability with minor charges.

The article follows:

YARD WINS PRESIDENTIAL CITATION FOR COST REDUCTION

Philadelphia Naval Shipyard has won a Presidential Citation for its outstanding support of the Department of Defense cost reduction program.

The award was presented to the Shipyard Commander on March 10 by Rear Adm. W. F. Petrovic, Assistant Chief of the Bureau of Ships for Field Activities, at a management luncheon last week.

The shipyard was cited for its reported savings of $27 million during fiscal year 1964, an amount 400 percent above the goal assigned by the Bureau of Ships and without parallel in any other activity under Bureau of Ships management.

The citation reads:

"In special recognition of an outstanding contribution to greater economy and improvement in Government operations during the 10th anniversary year of the Federal incentive awards program." It is signed by the President.

Under the cost reduction program, savings had to be capable of documentation and measurement in terms of quantity, unit price and dollar value, and verifiable by audit.

Objectives of the program were: buying only what is needed, buying at the lowest sound price, and reducing operating costs.

To help achieve these objectives, a cost reduction organization was formed in September 1963 in the shipyard, headed by the comptroller, Capt. H. C. Milliren, as coordinator, assisted by J. J. Cona of the Internal Review Division. A representative of every department helped to coordinate the cost efforts within departments.

Export Expansion Act of 1965

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BROCK ADAMS

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Senate Commerce Committee on March 17, 1965:

EXPORT EXPANSION ACT OF 1965

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate very much the opportunity to be here this morning. I thought that I might start as a witness in this proceeding by generally outlining the problem as we see it. I will leave the specifics mentioned by the chairman to the industry witnesses who will follow me. These industry witnesses can develop much of the detailed information sought by the committee.

I would like to emphasize first that we are trying to bring about a condition in the world that will allow our private industries to compete on an equal basis with other nations for business opportunities.

We have had a change in the complexion of world affairs in the last 10 years. As we are all aware, our task immediately after World War II was to help rebuild the shattered, war-torn nations of Europe and Asia. These nations were industrialized countries with long histories of commercial enterprise. We conceived it to be our duty to help them back on their feet, to get their economies operating again to the point where they no longer needed our aid. That job is done. The industrialized, commercial nations are humming. We did our job so well that those very nations now are competing with us to capture the commercial markets in the remaining portions of the earth.

So we are shifting course—turning a corner—to a new concept of world trade and foreign relations. Basically, we are looking to the newly emerging nations for new markets, for new customers for our wares.

Many of the new emerging nations are now approaching the point that, with a little financial help, they could become very good customers indeed. We have to understand this new concept—we have to analyze the situation to determine where our best opportunities lie. We have to go after the business. That means giving our salesmen both the understanding and tools to work with.

It is clear that one of the biggest problems is in the field of finance. These young nations want to buy. We want to sell. But they are not rich. In some cases they may not look like good credit risks at this moment. An underdeveloped but emerging nation is in the position of needing heavy capital goods, but does not have the money to buy directly from U.S. manufacturers. I'm talking about a country, for example, that wants jet aircraft, heavy farm equipment, and other types of industrial machinery, buses, trucks, and so on.

So what happens? Unable to buy from U.S. firms, the struggling young country looks for easy credit terms on which it can finance the machinery of progress and the tools of modernization. The young country has no choice. Even though it might prefer to deal with U.S. firms because the products are of superior quality, delivery schedules are better, and other ancillary services are topnotch, the impecunious nation is forced to go where it can make any kind of deal at all.

In our own economy, many groups of people could not buy the products they want if they could not get good credit for installment purchases.

That is one of the key purposes of title II of this bill, the Export Expansion Act of 1965. Under title II, our Government could provide a mutually satisfactory meeting ground for our sellers and other nations' buyers. The Export-Import Bank of Washington could provide this meeting ground. This bill would make it possible for the Eximbank to follow through on making financing of the type I have been discussing a reality.

Let me offer a simple example, Mr. Chairman. Take company X, which manufactures an item we will call a widget. Let us say that the widget costs $1 million. It is in prime demand in an up-and-coming nation. But that country, like the young couple, has no money, only a good future.

We talk about credit. The nation is interested. Company X wants to sell. But the company does not feel it is in a position to assume the economic and political risks involved with selling a relatively expensive item to customers in this new nation. The American company does not know the country well. The company looks to our Government for advice and assistance.

The type of governmental assistance we think that can be applied, and would be developed from this measure, is a broadening of the role of the Export-Import Bank. The Bank could move to guarantee a much broader kind of lending by private banking institutions which service our export trade.

It is a very simple concept, but a very important one. Company X sells its widget on much the same basis that it does to a customer in the United States. The Eximbank guarantees the financing, with the backing of the Government. The wheels of commerce roll.

The key portion of this bill is the part that in some measure changes the concept of financing by Eximbank that helps make our manufacturers fully competitive with other industrial exporting nations of the world.

I trust that during the course of these hearings you will hear a number of specific examples of what is being faced by our people as they attempt to sell abroad. I'm sure that a number of exact sets of figures will be offered to you by other witnesses. I will give you one good example of the need for this legislation.

It is estimated, for example, in the aerospace industry alone there is a potential market for $2 billion worth of sales in countries that presently cannot purchase our products because they are inadequately financed.

When you begin to examine this in terms of the jobs that are produced in the United States, you begin to see the significance of selling abroad.

A second item is in terms of our balance of payments. Improving our sales abroad offers the only long-term solution to the vital balance-of-payments problem our Nation faces right today.

We can make short-term, stop-gap gestures at shifting the balance back in our favor. But over the long pull, the only thing that will produce credits for us with foreign nations is to trade with them. In this way, the money they owe us for the products they buy here tips the scales in our favor. We must have a favorable balance in order for us to meet our present commitments abroad.

At present we are exporting more than we import. But we do not export enough to also cover our military operations and assistance commitments in other nations. We must increase our foreign trade. Our national interest demands it.

I would like to make one more general point. In title I of this bill we are attempting to set up ancillary machinery to help carry out the principles set down in title II. In other words, our Government must help get enough trained people out into the markets of the world to do an effective job of promoting our trade with the other nations.

There are about 135 centers around the globe, either capital cities, or having a population in excess of 1 million people. In only 93 of these do we have any commercial attache at all. Anything we do in the other centers is largely hit and miss.

We can very successfully aid our private businessmen in developing the markets of the world, if we exhibit the will to do so. The mechanisms for achieving that end are clearly spelled out in title I of the act.

Gentlemen, this is what we hope to accomplish through the bills Senator MAGNUSON and I have introduced. I would like to emphasize again that we, as a nation, must help these younger nations to finance their purchases with our own U.S. companies. If we don't we will fail in the competition for world trade.

If we fail in the competition for world trade, we will not only injure ourselves in the political and diplomatic relationships that we have with these countries, but we will also see our economy falter. We need that share of world trade that we aren't getting now to maintain our trade momentum. It will provide us with the percentage which is necessary to keep us moving.

The difference beween the business that we lose without the credit mechanisms in this bill and the trade we enjoy if this concept is adopted spells for many industries the difference between profit and loss, prosperity and depression.

The prospering of a business means jobs, this means development of our country, and finally, it means the kind of friendly, peaceful relations with the emerging nations of the world we want and need.

Gentlemen, in my opinion this is a key way to produce world peace. We help develop friendly allies rather than hostile enemies. We do it not by merely handing them money—but by trading with them, respecting their ability to do business and grow. Through this act we say to them: "We give you a hand now to get you over the rough spots. The day will come when you don't need our credit guarantees. When that day comes, Godspeed, and we will be pleased to continue doing business with you on any other mutually advantageous basis."

I appreciate having had the opportunity to appear before your committee to testify on this most important matter. I would also be most happy to answer any questions that the committee might have.

The Closing of Veterans Facilities and Hospitals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT E. SWEENEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, for more than a month now, hearings have been underway before the Veterans' Affairs Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives concerning the Executive order closing certain veterans facilities and hospitals.

As Congressman at Large for the State of Ohio, I am sorry to note that the regional office of the Veterans' Administration is contemplated to be closed. This closing, in my humble judgment, will have a serious and disabling effect upon the service rendered to veterans in my State and, further, this order closes what is known as the Broadview Heights Hospital at Broadview Heights, Ohio. I certainly feel that there is no justification for this closing and that it is being proposed notwithstanding the staggering waiting list of veterans who seek medical treatment in VA facilities.

I attach, Mr. Speaker, the statement I made March 26, 1965, before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee on this subject.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE ROBERT E. SWEENEY, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, CONGRESSMAN AT LARGE, FOR THE STATE OF OHIO BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, 89TH CONGRESS, 1ST SESSION

Mr. Chairman and members of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, I wish to express my sincere appreciation to your committee for the opportunity being afforded me here today of appearing before you in connection with the decision of the Veterans' Administration to close the veterans hospital at Broadview Heights, Ohio.

As Congressman at Large for the State of Ohio, I am particularly concerned about this decision as it affects veterans in my State and I wish to direct my remarks specifically to the decision to close the Broadview Heights Hospital.

In my State, as in the Nation, this decision has precipitated much attention and discussion and there has been great speculation with respect to the impact this closing would have on the broad medical program of the Veterans' Administration insofar as Ohio was concerned. I strongly submit that the program to close veterans facilities that has been initiated is but an economy measure, ordered in the name of economy by the agency head in response to the direction of the Bureau of the Budget.

Upon receipt of the Administrator's public relations release with regard to the VA program in Ohio, I was moved to support the Administrator's decision to close this particular facility, as the release suggested that this facility was in fact surplus and that it would be economically unwise to continue its operation.

With all respect to the agency and its personnel, the original propaganda release was excellent, but most incomplete. While the propagandist for the agency made pious claim that this decision was being made to effect a better public understanding of the VA program and what the agency is doing throughout its system, it very clearly and most intentionally masked over the fact that existing Veterans' Administration facilities in the State of Ohio were not doing the job for the veterans of northeastern Ohio, and the additional fact that there is a backlog and waiting list in excess of 500 veterans waiting for hospital beds in veterans facilities in my State.

In the light of such propaganda, is it any wonder that the distinguished Senator from Montana, the majority leader of the other body, reacts violently to this agency decision.

I, too, feel compelled to reverse my original feeling of support and oppose this closing as I was originally advised that, of the 92 some-odd veterans being treated at the facility that was being considered for closing, 18 of this number would be transferred to the Brecksville Neuropsychiatric Hospital and the balance would be transferred to nearby veterans facilities.

This was most reassuring, as on this basis a great case could be made in support of the Administrator's decision. However, since the receipt of that memoranda, I have had an opportunity to read the transcript of Dr. Joseph H. McNinch, Chief Medical Director of the Veterans' Administration, when he appeared before this committee on February 23, and again on February 25. In that testimony, Dr. McNinch advised the committee that on occasions there are as high as 240 eligible veterans waiting on lists for beds at the Neuropsychiatric Hosital at Brecksville—which has a capacity of 994 beds.

Dr. McNinch again testified that there were over 308 eligible veterans as of December 1, 1964, awaiting admittance to the Cleveland Veterans Hospital, which has a bed capacity of 800. I cannot, in good conscience, support a decision to close a Veterans' Administration hospital in a district of some 477 beds, and to reassign 92 patients presently in that hospital, when there is a waiting list of some 500-plus veterans seeking medical treatment.

It is incomprehensible that the Veterans' Administration would suggest that the veterans of northern Ohio be directed for treatment all over the United States, encountering traveling expenses and in an ailing condition, before they could receive care, while we have a veterans hospital at our door. This decision would result in veterans of northeastern Ohio being sent to Butler, Pa.; Coatesville, Pa.; Dearborn, Mich.; and Downell, Ill., to receive the treatment that the Government has guaranteed them. I believe that Dr. McNinch's testimony before this committee not only confirms that it would be unwise to close this particular hospital, but that it would be inconsistent with good medical judgment.

I sincerely believe that the Veterans' Administration ought to turn this facility into a nursing care, domiciliary institution. This would free beds in both the Cleveland and the Brecksville hospitals and would permit veterans whose conditions are somewhat static to be transferred nearby to this new domiciliary-type institution.

I do not support the plan that the Veterans' Administration ought to be patronizing outside nursing homes in northeastern Ohio, when they can retain a facility of their own for this use which would be ideal by way of location and service.

I believe that a survey should be undertaken to determine whether or not Ohio veterans who are undergoing care in other places would prefer to come back to Broadview Heights, Ohio, for treatment and to be closer to their homes and their loved ones.

The ill-advised decision to close this hospital has caused a mad scramble in Ohio by State, county, local, and private authorities, all of whom are interested in taking over this splendid facility. Each interest that is petitioning for this hospital has a very meritorious plan in mind for its use. Without gettting into the respective merits of each proposal, I am prone to point out that the veterans who have fought in the defense of this land in all its wars have an absolute priority of entitlement on this institution.

This hospital is located in one of the most expanding areas of the Nation. The growth potential of this area is immense. The need for greater veterans' facilities can be clearly foreseen.

My conscience does not permit me to overlook those veterans who are suffering and—yes—dying on waiting lists and who are being overlooked by this decision to close this hospital.

This is the 100th anniversary of the second inauguration of President Lincoln, and I believe that the Administrator of the Office of Veterans Affairs would do well to address himself to the closing paragraph of President Lincoln's remarks on that occasion, to the effect:

"Let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the Nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle."

I quite understand the effort being advanced here in Washington to economize. I quite understand the President's budgetary position, and I sympathize with his efforts and the efforts of the VA Administrator to hold down the cost of Federal expenditures; but, I respectfully suggest to this administration that there must certainly be some other area of Federal spending that can be trimmed without taking it out of the veterans' budget.

This Nation has a moral commitment on this subject which must be fulfilled without equivocation. In short, I do not join in the Administrator's conclusion that the VA is affording fair medical service to the Ohio veterans by this proposal.

Thank you very much.

Extremists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, immediately after the President, in an unusual night appearance before a joint session of the Congress on March 15, requested the Congress to pass without delay his so-called voting rights bill, I made a brief statement. In that statement I pointed out not only the unconstitutionality of the proposal but its punitive provisions against certain States of the Union. I emphasized, among other things, that New York State, requiring certain educational qualifications, was exempt while several Southern States, among them my own Mississippi, would be punished by having its election machinery taken over by the Federal Government.

My brief statement was:

COLMER RAPS PRESIDENT'S VOTING RIGHTS BILL

It is difficult to comprehend how any student of the American Constitution and devotee of American institutions could endorse the so-called voting rights bill today submitted to the Congress by the White House. Obviously it was hastily conceived in an atmosphere of hysteria produced by a series of demonstrations, many of which were undoubtedly unlawful. Nothing as drastic, short of the occupation of the Southland by Federal troops at the conclusion of the unfortunate fratricidal War Between the States, has ever been proposed by a President of the United States.

The proposed bill is aimed at a particular section of the country and is, therefore, class and geographical legislation.

It proposes among other things that different criteria be set up for qualifications for voting in the different States of the Union. For instance, there are some 20-odd States whose election laws provide for certain educational qualifications. Among these are New York as well as several Southern States.

If this proposed bill is enacted into law a citizen of New York would be required to take a literacy test while a citizen of one of the affected States, at which the bill is aimed, would only have to show that he was a resident of the State, was of legal age and had not been convicted of a felony. To understand that the bill is unquestionably unconstitutional one need only to read article I, section 2 of the Constitution of the United States which provides, "The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second year by the people of the several States, and the electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." This provision was also carried forward in the election of U.S. Senators.

Moreover, this bill provides for the first time for Federal control of State primaries in all Federal and local State elections.

Of course, the proposal for Federal registrars is a flagrant, punitive and highly provocative assault upon the constitutional rights of the citizens of the States to conduct their own elections.

We have indeed arrived at a sad state of affairs when the Congress is requested to pass such far-reaching and unconstitutional legislation. But possibly even more tragic is the fact that the so-called liberal complexion of the present Congress is such that this repugnant proposal, like all others that the President requests, will pass.

REVIEW AND OUTLOOK—AN IMMORAL LAW

Being a Congressman from Mississippi, the current whipping boy, along with Alabama, of the false liberals I recognized that I would be suspected of bias.

However, on March 22 the Wall Street Journal, certainly no extremist or suspect of regional views, carried a most scathing attack upon the President's voting rights proposal under the title "Review and Outlook—An Immoral Law."

The editorial is as follows:

When President Johnson last Monday asked Congress for a new law to safeguard the voting rights of Negro citizens he rested his case on the Constitution and on a basic principle of morality.

What he has now proposed that the Congress do is enact a law which would violate that Constitution he asks us not to flout and, more, which is itself immoral.

If you think not so, consider:

The administration bill offers a formula—a complicated one, which we will come to in a moment—to prohibit certain States from using any test of a citizen's ability to read and write our language as a qualification for voting.

The argument for doing this is the 15th amendment to the Constitution, which provides, clearly enough, that neither the Federal Government nor any State shall deprive a citizen of his vote "on account of" his race or color.

But the proposed bill does not stop with providing means against the violation of the 15th amendment. It does not aim at insuring that any such State literacy test shall be fairly drawn and impartially administered so that it may not be used as an excuse to deprive anyone of his vote "on account of" his race.

The effect—and indeed the purpose—would be to abolish such tests entirely in the affected States. And that flies squarely in the face of this self-same Constitution which the President professes to uphold.

The very first article of that Constitution authorizes the individual States to decide the qualifications of voters in both Federal and State elections, subject only to the proviso that whoever is deemed qualified to vote for "the most numerous branch of the State legislature" is automatically qualified to vote in Federal elections.

Making this a State function was no casual decision. It was reaffirmed in identical language in the 17th amendment—adopted, incidentally, more than 40 years after the 15th amendment, which provided that all such qualifications should be impartially applied among all citizens.

This principle in the Constitution has been repeatedly upheld and affirmed by the U.S. Supreme Court, not merely in dusty antiquity but as recently as 1959 by judges presently sitting upon that bench.

Now we are well aware that there are a good many people, and perhaps the President is included, who oppose any literacy requirement. They say that a man's illiteracy is irrelevant to the question of having his judgment counted in public affairs. No man can quarrel with the right of such people to argue their case and, if persuasive, to alter the Constitution so as to prohibit them.

But the requirement that voters be able to read and write is by no means restricted to those Southern States now the object of this special legislation. Many others—including New York State—require that qualification, as the Constitution entitles them to do.

If it is immoral, as the President says, to deprive a qualified citizen of his right to vote "under color of a literacy test," is it moral to violate one part of the Constitution under the color of upholding another which is in no wise in conflict?

Nor does the question end there, for what this bill proposes to do is to set up a double standard. Some States would be permitted to keep their literacy requirement. Others would not.

The formula prescribed is that of a ratio between the number of persons of voting age within a State and the number of voters in an election. If 50 percent or more of the voting age inhabitants do vote, then the State is absolved. The Federal authorities will keep out, and the State may set its own qualifications for voters, including literacy tests. Otherwise, no.

The formula has been carefully devised so that in practice it is expected to apply only to six States, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Georgia, South Carolina, and Virginia. In these States the Federal authorities would not only have the right to supervise voter registration but to abolish the voter qualifications they don't like.

A few moments reflection on this formula will suggest such weird paradoxes, and the possibility of such strange discriminations, as to stagger the mind.

A minor one is that a strict application of a formula would probably make it applicable to Alaska. However, a way has been devised to exempt it, which as much as anything suggests that the intent is not to write a general rule of law but to subject certain States to special laws.

Not so minor, but certainly weird, is the provision that a person once registered as a voter by the Federal authorities will be stricken from the list if he fails to vote "at least once during 3 consecutive years while listed." In short, you have to vote or you can't.

Of more consequence is the fact that if we have this law a citizen, white or Negro, can be entitled to a vote in Alabama no matter how illiterate he is, or for that matter even if he is a moron. But if the same citizen, white or Negro, lives in New York State he will not be entitled to vote.

This would create a truly ingenious paradox. The illiterate citizen, Negro or otherwise, would find himself with more "rights" in Alabama and her five outcast sister States than in the great State of New York. More, the educational level of the voting citizens of Alabama, the low level of which is part of the general complaint against it by civil rights leaders, would be further reduced. And this by Federal sanction.

Unfortunately, the irony is not funny. Beneath the paradox lies a serious question. Is it moral that our national laws should apply one rule to one State and another to another, requiring that the people of one State abolish qualifications for voters while the people of another State may uphold their standards?

It makes no difference whether 99 percent of his neighbors vote or whether only 20 percent do. It makes no difference whether he has voted in the last three elections, or in none at all before he presents himself at the polls. His right is to vote or not vote as he pleases.

That is the whole of the moral issue. And the whole duty of Government, insofar as it touches this matter, is to see that all equally can exercise this right.

The constitutional duty of the Federal Government is to see that this right is not abridged—anywhere, populous States or sparse States, Northern States or Southern States, where many go to the polls or where few take the trouble to. The means of assuring this—everywhere—is what any Federal voting law ought to do, and all it ought to do.

To play with complicated formulas, to measure justice by percentages, and to aim punitive laws at some States, not only violates both the letter and the spirit of the Constitution but buries the real moral question in sophistry.

Nor is that the end of the consequences of that weird formula. Recall that it permits the Federal Government to put all this machinery in motion, the takeover of the whole voting procedure by Federal authorities, only when the voting percentage of a State falls below 50 percent of the voting age population. If there was ever a device open to what President Johnson calls manipulation, this is it.

So long as a State contrives that one-half of its adults vote, it is free of the formula. This will not be overlooked by ingenious men who can contrive many things when justice is measured by percentages.

And this brings us to what we think is the fundamental immorality of this proposed law, unintended though it may be by those who drew it.

Any citizen, white or Negro, has the right to be treated by the law like all other citizens. If he has to meet qualifications to vote—age or any other—they must be only the qualifications asked of all. If he qualifies like any other he has the right to vote, and to deny him that right is to deny him what is inalienably his.

Following this on March 29 another highly respected publication, the U.S. News & World Report, in an editorial by its editor, David Lawrence, under the title "Bowing to the New Extremists," made even another strong assault upon the proposal.

Mr. Lawrence's editorial is as follows:

BOWING TO THE NEW EXTREMISTS

(By David Lawrence)

The Government of the United States appears to have bowed to a new set of extremists.

The President, in an emotional address to a joint session of both Houses of Congress, described in general terms an unprecedented piece of legislation on voting rights and demanded that it be promptly passed. The text of the bill, however, wasn't even made public until later in the week. Members of the Supreme Court, attired in their judicial robes, sat in the front row in the House Chamber during the proceedings and joined in the applause for the President's speech.

The sweeping proposals which the President virtually ordered Congress to pass were pressured by street demonstrations, violent and nonviolent, sit-ins and lie-ins in many parts of the country and even inside the White House, as well as the Capitol, and other Federal buildings. All this was designed to stampede the Chief Executive and Congress to brush aside the Constitution and to accept the extremist doctrine that "the end justifies the means." The tactics of the demonstrators triumphed.

The Constitution explicitly gives to each State the power to determine the qualifications of voters in national, State, and local elections. The Constitution also declares that the right of citizens to vote shall not be denied or abridged on account of race or color.

The new proposal arbitrarily singles out those States in the Union which, on November 1, 1964, happened to have registered less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age residing in the State or in any political subdivision, or in which less than 50 percent of such residents voted in the presidential election last November.

This is a statistical yardstick which would automatically adjudge as guilty of discrimination a State which had used any literacy test if in such a State less than half of the population of voting age had been registered to vote or if "any person acting under color of law" had in the previous 10 years engaged in any act denying the right to vote because of race or color.

An appeal to a three-judge court—only in Washington—would be allowed. Instead of the usual presumption of innocence for a defendant, the bill would establish a presumption of guilt for the suspected State or county. The governmental body not only would have to prove that it was not guilty of an act of discrimination on a specific date but also of any other such act on any other date in the preceding 10 years.

The bill, moreover, would strike down in those States any "test or device" that may have been used in past years, even though State laws may have sought to establish whether or not an applicant had the ability to read and write, or may have prescribed some other standard test of literacy such as the Supreme Court of the United States itself upheld as recently as 1959.

To select certain States or areas and apply one kind of law to them while permitting other States and subdivisions to be immune from such interference is a conspicuous violation of the Constitution.

The whole controversy has revealed a disregard of basic constitutionalism. It is motivated by the reasoning of those who have argued that two wrongs make a right. It grows out of the rationalization, which so many people are making today, that, because injustices have been committed and discrimination has once been practiced on a wide scale in certain areas of the country, it is permissible now to diminish the rights of the States themselves.

Have we come to the point where the Congress of the United States may decide on whether a State will be permitted to remain in the Union? Have we reached a position where the national legislative body will do again what it did 100 years ago after the War Between the States had ended? The same State legislatures which had ratified the 13th amendment, abolishing slavery, were suddenly declared illegal by Congress when they rejected the 14th amendment. New legislatures were ordered to assemble and in some instances Federal troops were sent into the legislative chambers to compel "ratification" of the 14th and later the 15th amendment.

This was what happened in the Reconstruction period in American history. Are we to go through another such tragic era because of the submissiveness of both a Congress and a President to the dictates of pressure groups whose emotional demonstrations cause friction and disorder?

It is a sad story. Organized incitement to violence has swept many areas of the country. To yield to such demonstrations is to weaken the whole fabric of democracy and to encourage mobocracy.

It is a time for the processes of reason to supersede the hysteria of impassioned groups of citizens. For, granting that they have been unjustly treated, are there no ways to accomplish effective reforms except by violent demonstrations and a distortion of the basic provisions of the Constitution? Or must we continue to bow to the new extremists?

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge my colleagues in both the House and the Senate not to permit themselves to be stampeded in this emotional and hysterical atmosphere into enacting this unwise, punitive, and unconstitutional legislation. I make this appeal not as a Mississippian, not as a southerner, but as an American who respects and has repeatedly taken the oath in this House to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

Christian Education—America's Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BASIL L. WHITENER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. WHITENER. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentlewoman from Washington, the Honorable JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, honored my congressional district on March 20, 1965, by appearing at Gardner-Webb College at a convocation held throughout an entire weekend. Mrs. HANSEN was one of several outstanding Americans appearing at the several functions sponsored by Gardner-Webb College at Boiling Springs, N.C. Others participating were Gov. Dan K. Moore of North Carolina; Mr. D. W. Brosnan, president of the Southern Railway System; and Dr. T. W. Wilson who substituted for Dr. Billy Graham due to illness of Dr. Graham.

The address of Mrs. HANSEN was one of the outstanding features of the entire weekend of activities and meant much to the people who were privileged to hear her presentation. The appreciation of the faculty, students, and suporters of Gardner-Webb College was evident to all present.

I take this opportunity to express again my appreciation to Mrs. HANSEN and insert her address as a part of the RECORD today:

CHRISTIAN EDUCATION—AMERICA'S SECURITY

(By JULIA BUTLER HANSEN, Member of Congress, at convocation ceremonies, Gardner-Webb College, Mar. 20, 1965)

Mr. WHITENER, Mr. Chairman, President Poston, reverend clergy, distinguished alumni, and faculty of Gardner-Webb College, and friends of the college, thank you very much, Mr. WHITENER, for your cordial and gracious introduction. May I say in response to you that the House of Representatives of the United States has no more distinguished Member than yourself. It has been a great pleasure to serve with Congressman WHITENER, and I shall never forget the remark of another colleague of ours who, when I first came to Congress, said to me, "BASIL WHITENER is one of our finest and ablest Members and reflects much credit upon his State and this House." This has been exemplified many times.

It is also a genuine pleasure to return this morning to North Carolina. I had never been in your State until 2 years ago when Congressman WHITENER persuaded me, very easily, to speak at your great university at Chapel Hill for the status of women's conference held by your federation of business and professional women's clubs.

Immediately I fell in love with your State; with its beauty, people, and hospitality.

My own district has many North Carolinians. One of North Carolina's ablest Congressmen, ROY TAYLOR, was born in my district, and when I entered the legislature many years ago, our very distinguished and probably the finest highway director we have ever known was Lacey Murrow, formerly from North Carolina.

The chairman of my very first campaign committee for the legislature was born and raised in North Carolina and is the descendant of soldiers who fought here during the Revolutionary War.

I am deeply honored that you have asked me to participate in your convocation today—to be present during the award of honors earned for achievement of service and to share in the reaffirmation of our college's goals.

Probably at no time in the history of the world has there been such a need for total education or as much demand. On every campus in America there are discussions about tomorrow's educational future.

You are particularly fortunate here to live in a smaller collegiate world than many do, for on campuses such as yours, there is time to thoughtfully and prayerfully appraise the future—to measure the steps necessary for you to take in advancing the American struggle against the tyranny of ignorance, and finally, to provide that spiritual strength for life which you have so well experienced as "Christian education—the extra dimension."

I would never have been in politics at all if it had not been for my desire years ago to support and assist education in my own State. It is an old story, but as the depression drew to its close, our schools were almost bankrupt. I felt that I, who had had the privilege of a good education at my own State university, owed some portion of my life to service so that others too might share in a better preparation for living.

It was my great fortune and privilege as a member of our legislature, to serve for 22 years as a member of the education committee of our house of representatives and spend 8 of those years as chairman of the committee.

I note in our audience today—many women, distinguished alumnae of your college, friends of your college; women who, I am sure are serving in every known capacity as outstanding members of school boards, PTA's, community school council groups.

It gives one a warm feeling of pride in the achievement and accomplishments of these women and all of us must be deeply grateful for the thought, time, and energy that they give to community service. I am glad that it is part of your college goal.

Your theme "The Decade of Advance To Assure the Extra Dimension—Christian Education," seems to me a particularly fitting topic on this lenten morning in our restless, tumultuous, rebellious spring of 1965 and it is also particularly appropriate that you have set aside this weekend on your campus to plan and pray.

The story of your college is a distillate of the romance belonging to all educational growth and progress. It is a reflection of self-sacrifice and struggle and the deep concern manifested by your people long ago for America's future. That you began here, determined to expand the horizons of the mind, was a deed as valiant as any done by those who have carried our flag into battle.

I was fascinated by the book, "Lengthened Shadows," which President Poston so kindly forwarded me. On its pages is not only your story, but that of education. It brought back to me the early struggle in my own State to establish our academic institutions. I could see on these pages, almost as if they were alive, the figures, minds, and souls of those young men and women who, not too many years ago, came to your early institution with their precious $76.05 as payment for 9 months attendance here. Those boys and girls kindled their own wood fires and one can almost see them at their desks as winter dusks fell—reading, writing, thinking, dreaming.

I salute their parents who must have gone without many luxuries to spend even that $76, for money was not plentiful in that era. It took courage and faith in what Christian education would mean in the years to come for parents to put aside, bit by bit, money to invest in education.

I am reminded of one of our own institutions of learning in a neighboring State, founded by a woman who crossed the plains in the forties, whose tuition fees were a variety of commodities—sacks of potatoes, firewood, eggs, chickens, fish, venison. Like your own college, that institution still stands as a symbol of service.

In accepting an invitation to speak anywhere one does it very humbly, always asking, "What may I say that will have meaning, not only for the hour of the speech, but what may be left behind for later thought?" This was true when President Poston asked me here. I tried to assess today's problems and the challenges of this tumultuous world about us.

Finally the last question I asked myself was, "What is the deep meaning of this March morning in this year 1965?

"What challenges does it bring?

"What part of the answer will education here at Gardner-Webb make?"

Unfortunately I could not shut myself away in an ivory tower of silent contemplation and withdrawal from this world to formulate my thoughts.

Congressmen have no such hidden place other than their own hearts and minds. Our offices are filled day and night with problems affecting not only the destiny of our immediate districts, but with those of the entire Nation and the world around us.

Old boundaries of time and space are gone. We are inextricably, whether we like it or not, woven into the fabric worn by all mankind. We are part and parcel of a great and stirring world.

For more than 6 weeks I have sat on a Subcommittee of Appropriations in the House of Representatives working on a multiplicity of human affairs. These vary over a wide range of apparently unrelated subjects—the quality and quantity of educational training necessary to grant fulfillment for the Indian youth of our own continent; schools in far-off Samoa where they are utilizing the first complete TV classrooms in the world; schools and teachers for the mandated trust territories at the fringe of the Pacific; erosion control; recreation for the people of your State and mine; forest development from Louisiana to Michigan—Maine to Oregon. Gigantic research programs were presented for our review.

Indeed you may be interested to know that 13 percent of the Department of Interior's budget is research.

One small example—upon the development of a saline water program may rest the future of wide areas of this Nation and the welfare of many people.

A complete understanding of the relationships of pesticides to people has barely begun.

We had to ask ourselves many times to evaluate the answers which will be formulated in research.

How may future exploration of the world's surface guide us to the better placement of buildings in far-off Alaska so that another earthquake will not be disastrous?

What are the answers to proposed Indian Tribe termination?

What economic programs based on natural resource development will improve our national economy?

How can we preserve for the never-ceasing stream of people along the highways of our Nation the forests and wild rivers?

Have we an answer to the acres of junked cars I saw lying in a far-off spot on the upper Missouri River in Montana?

I am sure America can be no less ingenious about the disposition of its rubble, the preservation of our beauty than we have been in finding the composition of the moon's surface.

Congress is also constantly involved with each full national day. Rising tides of passion and demands for solutions wash and roll against us.

I want you all to know this, your Congress debates each issue with good conscience and with care remembering you, the individual, your dignity, hopes and aspirations, your freedoms. It remembers too that deep in the heart of every person is the ever-searching and demanding call for peace on earth; yet at the same time preserving our national integrity.

Congress, too, remembers the final total—our Nation's dignity and the Nation's responsibility of living within its constitutional structure of democracy.

I have told many people in my own district through the years of my public service to remember one thing always—this is a government of the people. You are inescapably part of this Nation.

Government is not a giant monster in some remote place—it is you. The sum total of the American mark upon history, time, and civilization will be the total of our collective aspirations and accomplishments.

This is a restless era we share. You know as I, that morning after morning our newspapers are filled with such stories as:

"Across the Nation crimes of violence rose 9 percent for murder, 18 percent in aggravated assault, 19 percent in rape, 12 percent in robbery."

"The situation in Vietnam grows more serious."

"Congestion increases on highways and streets."

"School dropouts face job scarcity."

"Berkeley students revolt."

These are not gentle headlines and I know that you, even as I, often feel a sense of frustration, anger, resentment, and weariness.

You ask, as I, what has happened? What has gone wrong in our affluent, once comfortable, secure society—a society which probably has the highest standard of living ever known in the world?

Are we at once both rich and poor?

And there is the question which you and I are deeply concerned with at this convocation.

Where are we going?

Will the march of national progress like an invading army trample our souls into the dust?

This is a time also for perspective, for a glance behind those headlines.

In 1789, the year in which North Carolina ratified the U.S. Constitution, the population of the United States was 3,791,342.

I cannot pass the ratification of our Constitution without saluting the patriots of North Carolina who before affixing their signatures to that great instrument of government, demanded inclusion of our Bill of Rights. Forever this Nation will owe a debt of gratitude to North Carolina.

In 1800 there were 5,308,487 people in 16 States, many of them wilderness.

In 1900 there were 76,212,000 people in 45 States.

In 1965 there are 50 States with 193,145,000 people.

Perhaps very few women in this room realize that until the year 1837 no woman was admitted to a coeducational institution. Today out of a total of 4,987,867 students working toward college degrees 1,936,106 are women.

Very simply, our Nation has suddenly grown beyond its wildest dreams and it has grown before we have had a chance to solve all of the problems caused by that growth. We face terrific economic changes and at the same time the basic problem of food, clothing, and shelter for our millions and understanding of their dilemmas.

We are a nation searching daily for its own soul—as we have searched before in other times and other places through the centuries.

We do have the courage, faith, and perseverance to weather the gales of frustration, insecurity, the tides of anger and injustice, the sharp knife of fear, and to find eternal peace.

At Plymouth Rock, Concord, Lexington, Kings Mountain, the Marne, and Iwo Jima, in a thousand despairing moments we transformed discouragement into splendor and dedicated that splendor to the American principles of justice and right.

In the years that are now gone, in thousands of cabins from coast to coast nights were filled with arrows, fires, threats of death.

Thirteen struggling tiny colonies sat down to defy their king, to declare the tenets of the people's belief in the rights of man with the Declaration of Independence.

We have lived with strife and evil and have overcome it.

It will happen again.

However, in this year of 1965 we, knowing of the keen necessity for education, can ill-afford not to set forth our problems, and proceed to solve them with the full processes of democracy in accomplishment of our goals.

We are a nation well aware of our natural resources and deeply devoted to their best possible use.

Our most precious resource, however, is our young people, many of whom will, within the next decade, begin to assume their responsibilities for the management of America.

No sensible person today can fail to realize that since we have come to live within the ugly shadow of the atom, we must recognize more than ever before in the world's history the fundamental importance of education to our development and to the welfare and security of you and me as well as every other human being on the face of this earth.

Total education is the life blood of democracy, and democracy is the life blood of the free world. The United States, in a brief 170-odd years, has risen, as I pointed out a moment ago, from a colonial revolutionary movement to a position of world power and prominence.

Unless we use that power wisely and well, we shall fail not only ourselves and the vision of our forefathers, but also the hopes and aspirations of countless other people.

It is equally axiomatic that every person in our society should be developed to the fullest extent of his or her potential, for the individual, the Nation, and the world are all beneficiaries of such a program.

Our beloved late President Kennedy wisely said in a message to Congress:

"Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education. Our requirements for world leadership, our hopes for economic growth, and the demands of citizenship itself in an era such as this all require the maximum development of every young American's capacity."

It is usually easy to build a case for the intellectual elite. No one will deny an education to a great scientist, or a great mathematician. I would like to reverse the question and ask—are we as willing to thoughtfully train those who will not plan flights to the moon but whose most deadly capacity can be his unintelligent vote at the ballot box.

I have always been interested in our gifted children and in programs for these children, but I would like to suggest that the neglect of any of our children is at our peril.

You would not, I am sure, vaccinate only one child in a community for smallpox.

The inquiring mind of genius can only function to its fullest potential in a solid, educated society which values it, and it cannot flourish on the quicksand of illiterate surroundings of unhappy, misfitted people, angry at their impotence and waiting only for a moment to strike at rewards that belong to the gifted and energetic.

This, I think is becoming of increasing concern to thoughtful people, and it may now be the proper time to ask ourselves this morning a basic question—why do we educate?

1. For citizenship, which involves not only an awareness and appreciation of all facets in our society, but also of concomitant responsibilities. Man living in the shadow of his own doom, must make answer. It is imperative, in the exercise of his rights and performance of his duties, that every individual act on the basis of well-informed judgments rather than prejudice and ignorance.

2. We educate for parenthood, so that the lasting benefits of education—moral and spiritual as well as intellectual—may be passed on and become part of our national fabric.

3. We educate to develop a society which prizes decency and integrity, the dignity of the individual, and which works to further man's contribution to understanding and solving the problems of the world in which he lives.

There may have been a time when these goals could have been accomplished with little formal education. That is not now true. You recognized it at Gardner-Webb years ago.

We live in a complex society in which technology is highly developed.

Our population is increasingly urban, extremely mobile, and the pace of life generally much swifter than that of our fathers and mothers.

The more complicated the practical business of living becomes, the darker the headlines, the more necessary our educational programs and educational consciences at all levels.

There is no longer a large market for young, uneducated labor. Out automated society requires increasingly well-trained workers. Statistics show that while unskilled factory production workers have been unable to find jobs, the U.S. Employment Service at the same time has been unable to fill thousands of specialized positions, ranging from chemists and physicists to toolmakers and other technicians.

As automation becomes the rule rather than the exception, positions involving little more than manual labor will decrease even further.

Unless students are early inculcated with a desire for this necessary education and an awareness of its value, they will not pursue it, and here lies part of the reason for some of today's turbulence.

I wonder if many of us realize that 3 out of every 10 children entering the ninth grade fail to finish high school. Elementary school is their total educational experience.

Yet at that elementary level, our classrooms are overcrowded, teaching is all to often incompetent, and facilities are inadequate.

Many classrooms are so packed that children can only attend half a day—700,000 of them in the United States.

Apart from the basic educational lack in this situation to the child, it has two grimmer results for society: the encouragement of juvenile delinquency, particularly when both the child's parents work a full day, and it gives less education at the lower levels at the precise time when more is needed if we are to produce citizens adapted to our complex society.

It is not only in our elementary fields that a lack exists. Universities are jammed. This exploding growth of many of our great institutions is possibly causing much of today's student restlessness. These was a time when all colleges assumed that each enrollee was an individual and that faculty members lived within the realm of the collegiate experience to assist young people in preparing their way into adulthood.

My own State university has 26,000 students. There is now little opportunity for individual discussions.

This experience is repeated on a hundred campuses.

Be grateful that yours still offers the opportunity for human communion.

At the same time our universities mushroom, we see another startling situation. No one knows its full precise cause, but there is a determined search for the answers. However, we do know that it is small comfort to a nation which has achieved jet airliners, cake mixes and the secrets of outer space to find it necessary to increase numbers of institutions for mental illness.

Once we were a nation moving onward—looking ever forward at the frontiers of unconquered land beyond the high mountains, across wide western rivers.

We have now reached the outer fringes of that land—possessed, settled and developed it.

Today we face the problem of living peacefully upon it.

For this we have the energy and talent and with the assistance of colleges such as yours we shall understand and solve:

The problems of our cities.

Provide for the betterment of living within them.

Root crime and crime's causes from its dark caves.

Obliterate ignorance.

Reaffirm our faith in God and diligently continue the eternal search for peace on earth, good will to men.

We shall rewrite the ugly headlines and tell instead the story of a nation devoted to its responsibilities, a nation thoughtfully determined to find the best and finest answers to its problems and challenges.

We shall, like all those others who have gone before, through our prayers and with God's help, call upon our Nation to reclaim all her beauty, her glory, and acknowledge through our loving service, our joyous hope for life eternal.

Government Patent Infringements—Erosion of American Patent Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, March 29, 1965

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a bill today to do something about the infringement and the erosion of the American patent rights by foreign concerns.

This bill will at least put the Congress of the United States on record concerning the purchase by the Government of the United States of products from foreign countries where there is an infringement of our Government patent rights. The least that the Government of the United States can do to protect its own interests is to stop encouraging foreign producers from infringing on American patent rights by purchasing their products.

In support of the bill which I have introduced, I wish to point out the reasons for my doing so.

(1) FEDERAL AGENCIES BEGIN PURCHASES OF INFRINGING DRUG PRODUCTS

For many years, purchasing agencies of the Federal Government bought patented drug products only from the owners of the pertinent U.S. patents or their licensees. It was not until December 1959, that the Military Medical Supply Agency, a branch of the Department of Defense, departed from this policy by buying unlicensed tetracycline, a broad-spectrum antibiotic effective against a wide range of infectious diseases, from an Italian source. Since that time, other Federal purchasing agencies, principally those associated with the Department of Defense, have purchased several drug products covered by U.S. patents, from unlicensed foreign sources, principally Italian, for use in the United States in direct and deliberate violation of U.S. patents.

In purchasing unlicensed drugs from foreign sources for use in the United States, the Federal Government has not limited itself to situations where the patent has been involved in litigation or where the patented product has been involved in Federal antitrust litigation. Suggestions to the contrary are untrue. Mere involvement in litigation of a patent or a patented product would, in any event, provide a poor rationale for deliberately violating patents.

The validity of several of the patents covering drug products purchased from unlicensed foreign sources by the Federal Government has never been contested, and several patented drug products so purchased have never been involved in Federal antitrust litigation.

The Federal Government's purchases of unlicensed Italian drug products have been facilitated by the fact that Italy provides no patent protection for either drug products or processes. It is the only major country in the free world which does not provide such patent protection.

(2) LEGAL LOOPHOLE CITED IN JUSTIFICATION

Certain purchasing agencies of the Federal Government have found a loophole in Federal law that they say permits them to violate U.S. patents. The pertinent statute provides that whenever an invention covered by a U.S. patent is used or manufactured by or for the United States, without license of the owner thereof or lawful right to use or manufacture the same, the patent owner's remedy shall be by action against the United States in the Court of Claims. (28 U.S.C. 1498.)

It will be noted that in this situation the patent owner does not have his primary patent right to put a stop to the Federal Government's violation of his patent rights. The patent owner cannot obtain an injunction from the court, even at the end of successful litigation. It is unfortunate that the patent holder is limited in all cases to the recovery of damages—court action is expensive, compensation is long delayed, and adequate recovery is unlikely since the extent of the damage suffered may be very difficult to establish.

It is unjust that the Federal Government should have what amounts to a preferred position with respect to its own violation of patents issued by it. The legislative history of 28 U.S.C. 1498, shows that it was contemplated that the statute as amended in 1918 was intended to insure the Federal Government's having clear access to inventions during wartime emergency situations. However, no such limitation is expressed in the statute and this has offered a temptation to purchasing agencies of the Federal Government to violate U.S. patents even in the absence of an emergency situation.

Purchases of patented products by the Federal Government from unlicensed sources have by no means been limited to drug products, but have extended to the products of many other industries as well. The net result has been a serious erosion of the rights of U.S. patent owners.

(3) NO LOOPHOLE FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

The erosion of American patent rights in connection with Federal purchases now threatens to extend to local governments as well. While this erosion depends upon a loophole in the law where Federal purchases are concerned, there is no such loophole whatsoever for local governments which attempt a similar action. We know of no statute which would permit infringements of U.S. patents by local governments and no statute preventing patent owners from obtaining court orders to stop further violation of their patent rights by local governments, as well as obtaining damages for patent infringement.

(4) ATTEMPTED JUSTIFICATION FOR GOVERNMENT PATENT VIOLATIONS

An attempt has been made to justify the violation of U.S. drug patents by Government agencies on the ground that the prices quoted by suppliers of unlicensed foreign-made drugs are lower than those quoted by American patent owners and their licensees.

Of course, patent-infringing, Italian-made tetracycline can be sold at lower prices. The reasons why this is so are clear and simple. Unfortunately, they are also inconsistent with the demands of the American system: the Italian producers of tetracycline pay wages that are one-fourth of the rates prevailing in the United States; they have had to bear no research costs for the development of tetracycline or other new drugs; they have incurred no costs in developing the market for tetracycline in this country; they pay no Federal, State, or local taxes. In brief, they are exploiting a readymade situation.

In this connection, it is important to note that the prices quoted by Pfizer to Federal and local government agencies on tetracycline are less than 50 percent of the prices quoted when the product was introduced. Similarly, Pfizer's prices to the trade generally have declined by 43 percent. Even with such substantial price reductions, Pfizer's prices for tetracycline products are not as low as those for products produced from patent-infringing Italian-made tetracycline.

(5) UNLICENSED FOREIGN-MADE DRUG PURCHASES ARE "PENNY WISE AND POUND FOOLISH"

The attempted justification for infringing Government purchases on the ground that the prices quoted by suppliers of unlicensed foreign-made drugs are lower ignores both the short-range and long-range adverse consequences of these purchases to the American economy and can well be characterized as "pennywise and pound foolish."

Such purchases of unlicensed Italian-made drugs can cause loss of jobs by American workers; encourage additional dumping of Italian-made products in the United States at prices lower than those charged in the regular Italian market; discourage American drug research; hurt the unfavorable American balance of international payments; and reduce tax revenues for Federal, State, and municipal governments. Each of these adverse consequences will now be briefly discussed.

(A) LOSS OF JOBS BY AMERICAN LABOR

Purchases of unlicensed foreign-made drugs by Federal and local government agencies cannot help but adversely affect American workers. The reduction in sales volume represented by these purchases and the further patent violations they encourage have already resulted in the loss of jobs by American workers, and this job loss can be expected to increase. To this must be added the so-called economic multiplier effect—the further jobs these wage earners would have created for other workers by spending their wages.

General production costs in Italy are lower than those in the United States. It should be recalled, for example, that there is a very substantial difference between wage rates in this country and in Italy—that wages in Italy are approximately one-fourth of those paid in the United States. Thus, the effect of extensive purchasing of Italian-made drugs for use in the United States is to displace highly paid American workers with low paid Italian workers.

(B) DUMPING OF ITALIAN-MADE PRODUCTS ENCOURAGED

The term "dumping" applies to the practice of making sales for export to another country at lower prices than those charged for the same product in the home market. Dumping is a form of price discrimination and unfair competition generally condemned in international trade in the free world.

Prices on tetracycline products to large government hospitals in Italy are over twice the prices offered to the U.S. Government for unlicensed foreign-made tetracycline. Having no stake in the U.S. market and having spent nothing to develop this market, Italian suppliers have no hesitancy in selling tetracycline for the U.S. market at dumping prices.

(C) AMERICAN DRUG RESEARCH DISCOURAGED

The American prescription drug industry is characterized by unusually high research expenditures. From the time a promising compound is first spotted in a research laboratory until the time it may finally be marketed, several years of work are likely to be involved. The cost of research and development of a single new drug has been estimated to average $6 million by Dr. Austin Smith, president of the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, in testimony before the House of Representatives Subcommittee on Intergovernmental Relations on April 8, 1964.

Money is, of course, spent on promising new drugs which are ultimately discarded and never reach the market for one reason or another. For the drug industry as a whole, the Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association has said that the odds are more than 6,000 to 1 that a newly discovered drug will never reach the market. In spite of these odds, the American drug industry has nevertheless gained over 340 new drugs from 1941 through 1962, and these drugs have saved millions of lives.

Comparisons of deaths from several diseases between the year 1935, when the United States had a population of 127 million persons, and 1962, when there were 187 million persons, are significant. In 1935, 70,000 people in the United States died of tuberculosis; in 1962, fewer than 10,000. More than 100,000 Americans died of pneumonia and influenza in 1935; in 1962, about 61,000. Syphilis took the lives of almost 20,000 in 1935; in 1962, fewer than 3,000. More than 4 million Americans living today would be dead if the 1937 death rate had continued.

The American system is strengthened by its patent structure, provided for by the U.S. Constitution to advance science by protecting inventors. More drugs have been discovered in the United States under the protection of a strong patent system than in any other country. Italy, with no product or process patent protection in the drug field, has produced no important drug discoveries.

Expensive as it is, drug research is no dispensable luxury. It is the very lifeblood of an industry devoted to saving lives and promoting health. Further vital discoveries undoubtedly will be made as intensive industrial medical research continues. To diminish the sources of funds for its support would be a distinct disservice to humanity.

(D) AMERICAN BALANCE OF PAYMENTS ADVERSELY AFFECTED

While this country's overall balance-of-payments situation has reportedly been somewhat alleviated, this remains a serious problem which deservedly continues to receive intense attention in Washington. The purchase of foreign-made drugs and other products and their importation to the United States for use in violation of U.S. patents should be more carefully scrutinized for their direct and adverse impact upon our unfavorable international balance-of-payments situation.

(E) AMERICAN TAX REVENUES REDUCED

What the overall loss to Federal, State, and local governments is as a result of the Federal Government's practice of purchasing foreign-made drugs and other products from unlicensed sources for use here in violation of U.S. patents cannot be precisely estimated; nor can the extent of loss, should the practice become more widespread, be accurately predicted. It is clear, however, that the loss in taxes has been substantial and that if this practice continues and spreads to local governments, such losses will increase.

Purchases by Federal, State, and local governments of products made in the United States put money to work within this country and produce tax revenues for Federal, State, and local governments. When products made abroad are purchased from a foreign company, no such tax revenue is generated.

Over the past decade, Pfizer has paid more than 112 millions of dollars in Federal income taxes, as well as additional millions of dollars for State and local taxes. Other American drug companies have paid comparable amounts in Federal, State, and local taxes. Pursuit of a policy which would diminish these tax revenues would be indeed shortsighted.

(6) DISCOVERY AND LICENSING OF TETRACYLINE

The discovery and development of tetracycline, one of the drugs now being purchased by the Federal Government from unlicensed Italian sources, is a typical example of the "risks and rewards" of pharmaceutical industry research.

It originally stemmed from an attempt by Pfizer scientists to determine the chemical structure of the then existing broad spectrum antibiotics, oxytetracycline and chlortetracycline.

For over 2 years, a team of seven Pfizer chemists—joined by Dr. Robert B. Woodward of Harvard University, codiscoverer in 1944 of the synthesis of quinine, and in 1951 of one of the major steps in the total synthesis of cortisone—worked to determine the structures of these two compounds. This long and expensive research work ultimately led to the discovery of tetracycline by one of the Pfizer chemists and the filing of a patent application on tetracycline in the U.S. Patent Office.

Following two Patent Office interference proceedings, the basic pioneer patent on tetracycline was issued to Pfizer. Pfizer has granted licenses on tetracycline to four companies: American Cyanamid Co., Lederle Laboratories; Bristol Laboratories, Inc.; Olin Mathieson Chemical Co., Squibb; and the Upjohn Co.

It is a violation of this tetracycline patent for anyone to make, use, or sell tetracycline in the United States without a license, and a subsequent reseller or user of unlicensed tetracycline also violates this patent.

(7) LITIGATION INVOLVING TETRACYCLINE

In 1958, the Federal Trade Commission issued a complaint against Pfizer and its licensees, containing antitrust charges, principally relating to tetracycline. After extensive hearings covering more than 11,000 pages of testimony and 8,000 pages of documents, the hearing examiner, a member of the Federal Trade Commission staff, cleared Pfizer and its licensees of all the charges and ordered that the complaint be dismissed. He held that the discovery of tetracycline was patentable; that false or misleading information was not submitted to the Patent Office; that Pfizer's tetracycline patent is valid; that the licenses issued by Pfizer under this patent are valid; and that there was no agreement or conspiracy to fix prices and no attempt to monopolize.

This decision was appealed by the Commission attorneys to the full Federal Trade Commission, which in August 1963 reversed the hearing examiner in part. The Commission did not pass upon the validity of Pfizer's tetracycline patent, but it did, among other things, order Pfizer to grant additional royalty-bearing licenses under its patent to domestic applicants. Pfizer has appealed this order to the Federal Court of Appeals, strongly contesting any requirement that Pfizer grant additional licenses, and has not granted any additional licenses. The order will never become effective unless it is affirmed by the Federal courts.

Pfizer's tetracycline patent was not held invalid by the Federal Trade Commission. Indeed, the validity of this patent is not an issue in any litigation between Pfizer and the Federal Government.

Pfizer has instituted suit for infringement of its tetracycline patent against all companies preparing tetracycline dosage forms in the United States from unlicensed Italian-made bulk tetracycline. The order of the Federal Trade Commission, which is now being appealed to the Federal court, does not affect Pfizer's right to continue to enforce its tetracycline patent against infringers.

In August 1961, an antitrust suit was filed by the Federal Government against Pfizer and others in the Federal Court for the Southern District of New York, charging that the defendants had conspired to restrain trade, monopolize antibiotic production and sales, and fix prices. These charges were similar to those asserted in the Federal Trade Commission antibiotics litigation and contained nothing new. It should be emphasized that the filing of this suit was merely a presentation of charges, not the decision of a court. We have denied the charges, we are vigorously contesting them, and we are confident of ultimate vindication.

(8) THEFT OF TETRACYCLINE CULTURES AND PROCESS INFORMATION

In January 1964, a decision was made in a civil suit in the New York State Supreme Court instituted by the American Cyanamid Co., a Pfizer licensee, involving the theft from that company by one or more of its ex-employees, of cultures and process information pertaining to three broad spectrum antibiotics—tetracycline, chloretetracycline, and demethylchlortetracycline. The court found that several Italian companies had received delivery of confidential tetracycline process information and had also received delivery of tetracycline cultures stolen from American Cyanamid Co.

It is a matter of public record that several individuals are under Federal indictment in New York for transporting to Italy stolen tetracycline cultures and for conspiracy, three of whom have pleaded guilty. While those in this country who were involved in this violation of law can be punished, many of the Italian companies which received delivery of the confidential tetracycline process information and stolen cultures are producing and marketing tetracycline. Tetracycline produced by these companies is continuing to find its way into the American market through firms which prepare tetracycline dosage forms here from bulk material supplied by such companies.

(9) IMPORTANT ISSUE AT STAKE

There is an important issue at stake in the matter of governmental purchases of foreign-made drugs for use here in violation of U.S. patents. The laws of the United States have provided a strong patent system for the precise purpose of encouraging long and expensive research work of the very type which led to the discovery of tetracycline. We cannot stand aside while erosion occurs to patent rights which help to provide the funds necessary for the continuance of important medical research, the kind of research that has made the United States the world leader in the discovery and development of lifesaving products.

The issue here goes far beyond Pfizer's patent rights on tetracycline. If local governments and others are allowed to violate drug patents with impunity, they will be encouraged to violate any and all patents. This may well have the effect of discouraging research in many other industries, as well as in the pharmaceutical industry.

Finally, we can emphatically state that if we are to continue to spend millions of dollars a year on drug research; if we are to pay American wage scales; if we are to maintain a sales and marketing organization to promote the fruits of Pfizer research in keen competition with others in our industry in a free enterprise system; if we are to pay significant sums by way of Federal, State, and local taxes—if we are to do all of these things, and at the end of the year's activity turn over a little better than 4 cents to our shareholders for every dollar of sales, we will never be in a position to compete with antibiotic pirates who contribute nothing to the development of a drug and find their haven in a country that does not give any recognition to drug patents, who pay wages and offer working conditions which are substandard in comparison to those in this country, and finally, who contribute nothing in the way of taxes to support our democratic institutions.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 30, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Dr. G. Ousley Brown, Cove United Presbyterian Church, Weirton, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

Let us invoke God's blessing.

Almighty God, King of kings, and Lord of lords, from whom comes all power and dominion in heaven and earth; most sincerely do we beseech Thee to look with favor upon these servants, the Members of the House of Representatives.

Imbue them with the spirit of wisdom, goodness, and truth. So rule their hearts, and bless their endeavors and deliberations, that law and order, justice and peace may everywhere prevail.

Preserve us from public calamities; from pestilence and regrettable crisis; from war and private conspiracies, and sordid rebellions. May we, by Thy holy direction, be kept from national sins and crippling corruption.

Make the Members of this House of Representatives strong and great in the fear of God and in the love of righteousness.

We beseech Thee, our Heavenly Father, to direct these chosen leaders so that their corporate actions may bring blessings to our Nation and to all peoples, and to the praise of Thy holy name.

We humbly ask and pray for Thy divine direction in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment concurrent resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. Con. Res. 7. Concurrent resolution to authorize the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 103 of the 86th Congress;

H. Con. Res. 83. Concurrent resolution to print the proceedings in connection with the acceptance of the statue of the late Speaker of the House of Representatives, Sam Rayburn, of Texas;

H. Con. Res. 125. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of inaugural addresses from President Washington to President Johnson, and providing for additional copies;

H. Con. Res. 153. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing as a House document of the tributes by Members of Congress to the life, character, and public service of the late Sir Winston Churchill;

H. Con. Res. 167. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of a study of compensation and assistance for persons affected by real property acquisition in Federal and federally assisted programs; and

H. Con. Res. 338. Concurrent resolution authorizing the publication as a House document of the Department of State white paper relating to North Vietnam's campaign to conquer South Vietnam (Department of State publication No. 7839).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 165. Concurrent resolution authorizing reprinting of House Document No. 103 of the 88th Congress.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a concurrent resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 390. An act to extend to volunteer fire companies the rates of postage on second-class and third-class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations;

S. 1000. An act to amend the act of July 29, 1954, as amended, to permit transfer of title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions;

S. 1462. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; and

S. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of a committee print entitled "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments—Supplement, January 4, 1965."

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to Public Law 88–271, had appointed Mr. JACKSON as a member of the United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico in lieu of Mr. ANDERSON, resigned.

THE LATE HON. NOAH M. MASON

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I announce to the House the passing yesterday of our former colleague from Illinois, Noah M. Mason. I have lost one of the finest friends anyone could possibly have. And I know this loss is shared by all who were privileged to know him.

Noah exemplifies what we mean when we say that these United States of America is the land of freedom and opportunity. He was born in Glamorganshire, Wales, July 19, 1882. He came here at the age of 6 with his parents, who settled in La Salle, Ill.

His parents knew, and their son Noah knew, that anyone who diligently worked to improve himself would find opportunity without limit. After finishing public schools, he attended Dixon College and graduated from Illinois State Normal University, which is in my district.

He became a teacher and subsequently principal of schools at Oglesby, Ill. From 1908 to 1936 he served as superintendent of schools. And during this period, from 1918 to 1926, he also served as city commissioner of Oglesby.

The people of the area saw in Noah Mason what we in Congress saw in him—a man of high principle, a man of integrity, a man with convictions and the courage of his convictions. They elected him to represent them in the State senate. After serving there for 6 years, from 1930 to 1936, they elected him to the Congress. He served here with distinction for 26 years, until his retirement in 1963.

His contribution to the work of the Congress, particularly as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, is beyond measure. He was endowed with an analytical mind. Time and time again he would take the floor of the House to pierce through all manner of technicalities and present the basic issue to be resolved. He could reduce the most complicated matter to the terms all could readily understand. He was a teacher by profession and, indeed, while serving in this body he taught us many things about taxes.

Noah Mason also exemplies what we mean when we refer to someone as being a "rugged individualist." That does not mean he was uncooperative. No one could be more cooperative, more willing to help and to obtain unity of purpose and effort. He was a "rugged individualist" in the sense that he stood firm for what he believed, however great the opposition. He never concerned himself with the political consequences to himself for the position he took on any issue. No man has served in this Congress who was more forthright and more outspoken. And that is one of the reasons he was held in such high regard by all of us who have served with him.

A good illustration of Noah's "rugged individualism" was the fact that at the end of July he would return to his district whether Congress had adjourned or not. He took the position that inasmuch as the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1947 provided for adjournment by July 31 that was the day to adjourn. And so he did.

Mr. Speaker, there are no words adequate to express the loss I feel with the passing of Noah Mason. At the age of 83 the Lord in His wisdom has called him to his great reward.

I express my deepest sympathy to his wife and family. I share their great loss.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, Noah Mason had been a Member of this body for a number of years before I arrived, but it did not take me long to learn to know of his many superb qualities, to appreciate his great character, his individuality, and his integrity. All of us who served with him, Democrats and Republicans, quickly realized that he was a person of deep conviction and complete frankness. Although at times Noah Mason seemed brusque and unapproachable in reality he was a thoughtful and considerate colleague. He was a most constructive influence in the House of Representatives for over a quarter of a century. He left a record of high achievement.

It was with deep regret that all of us felt very strongly that he left us, and it is with deeper regret we learned yesterday of his passing. I join the gentleman from Illinois in expressing my sorrow on his passing.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the late Noah Mason and I developed a very close friendship which I valued very much during our years of service in this body together. He was one of the hardest working Members of this body, a dedicated legislator, and with an intense love for our country.

He was one of the Members who, born abroad, came to America and recognized and took advantage of the opportunities that exist under American institutions of government.

Noah Mason was a man of strong convictions, a man who served in accordance with the strong convictions he had, and while we were in disagreement at times in connection with the outlook on legislation brought before this body, I thoroughly respected his views because I knew he sincerely entertained his views. In disagreement we had a profound respect one for the other.

He was a man of intense mind in carrying out his duty, but a man with a sweet temperament, a man who while he fought hard, he fought impersonally and with an understanding mind. He was one who had a love of his fellow man, a man who in his relationships to other human beings possessed a mind that was an inspiration for all of us to follow.

Mr. Speaker, I had a very deep affection and attachment for Noah Mason. The question of agreement or disagreement is not involved in my mind in our friendship. For him I entertained a deep feeling of respect and a feeling of friendship.

I join with my colleagues from Illinois in the sorrow felt by the Illinois delegation and by those who served with Noah Mason in this body in the passing on of our dear and beloved late friend.

To Mrs. Mason and her beloved ones I extend the profound sympathy of both Mrs. McCormack and myself.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois [Mrs. REID].

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heart full of sorrow that I join with my colleagues today in paying tribute to Noah Mason and to extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Mason and family.

I have always admired and respected Mr. Mason tremendously, and his demonstrated courage to stand by his convictions has served as an inspiration to me as I have represented the 15th Congressional District of Illinois since his retirement. He was truly a great American who devoted his entire adult life to selfless and dedicated service to his country and to his fellow man—in the educational field for 33 years, in the Illinois State Senate, and finally as Member of Congress for 26 years, 1937 through 1962. He was a man of great principle and stood by his convictions without faltering.

Mr. Mason once told me that he took great pride in his lung power. He was, in fact, one of the few Members of Congress who was ever able to speak on the House floor and be heard without using a microphone—and he never hesitated to use that lung power to speak out on issues in which he felt strongly and to support a cause which he felt was right and in the best interests of his Nation.

I take this opportunity to express the grief and the gratitude of everyone in the 15th District whom he served conscientiously and faithfully for so many years.

The **SPEAKER** resumed the chair.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I am saddened to learn of the death of my old and dear friend, Noah Mason, for whom I had a deep and real and sincere affection.

Those of us here who were privileged to know him well will remember Noah Mason as an outspoken champion of the American taxpayer. As a distinguished member of the great Committee on Ways and Means, he waged a constant war on what he considered waste and extravagance in the conduct of Government.

Proud of his Welsh ancestry, the Noah Mason I knew was fiercely proud, too, of his adopted country. He was a fighter and a rugged American of the first magnitude.

But you did not have to scratch Noah Mason very deep to find that he was, above all, a gentle person, kind and considerate to everyone.

It was my privilege, on at least two occasions, to visit his home territory back in Illinois and to address testimonial dinners given for our late colleague by his loyal and devoted friends.

On such occasions it was most obvious that Noah Mason was loved and respected by the people who elected him as their Representative time after time, even as he was loved and respected by those of us here in the House of Representatives who knew him.

Noah Mason lived a rich and rewarding life. Even before he began his long and distinguished career in the Congress of the United States, he had given 33 years of his life to the cause of education.

I was sorry to see him retire from the Congress, but after well over a half century of service to his fellow men, Noah Mason had well earned a respite from his labors.

I remember, Mr. Speaker, as I am sure you do, the Noah Mason who sat right in that particular seat. He had rather preempted that place. Nobody dared take it away from him on any occasion here in the House of Representatives.

And well do I remember his alert response time after time on matters of great consequence here in the House of Representatives.

So with his passing, I have lost a great friend, the country has lost a great statesman, and his State has lost an able representative.

To all of his family, I express my deep sympathy.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman from Illinois who is now in the well of the House as well as my colleagues on both sides of the aisle in expressing our deep regret on the passing of our former colleague, Noah Mason. I had known of him and knew him personally for a long time before I came to this House because for a number of years, I think prior to 1954, he had represented here in the Congress of the United States the old 12th District of Illinois, which included Rockford, Ill., my home community. So he leaves many dear and devoted friends in that city.

Noah Mason was often referred to as an arch conservative, and I suppose that he did meet the commonly accepted definition of that term. He was a truly outstanding exponent of a conservative philosophy of government. Yet, that term alone does not begin to describe adequately his service in this Chamber for more than a quarter of a century. He believed in economy in Government and he practiced what he preached. He constantly urged in this House, and I heard him on many occasions, and so did many of you who are present, the virtues of national thrift, and we heard his solemn warning about the dangers of a profligate fiscal policy.

Noah Mason was respected by his colleagues as a hard working and effective member of the House Committee on Ways and Means. He was respected even by those who did not entertain his views. The record of his service in the House of Representatives will be remembered as the record of a distinguished public servant who stood steadfastly and courageously for the principles of constitutional government in which he believed.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Mrs. Mason and to the members of his family.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH].

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, our late distinguished colleague, Noah Mason, and I took our oaths of office as Members of the House of Representatives for the first time on the same day. Thereafter he and I served together on the same committee for 10 years, until that committee on claims was absorbed by the great Committee on the Judiciary under the provisions of the Legislative Reorganization Act. I was fortunate later to renew my association with him when I was elected to the Committee on Ways and Means. I think, therefore, Mr. Speaker that I served intimately with him over a longer period of time than most, if not all, of the Members of the House of Representatives.

I came to know him well and to respect him deeply. He brought to the committee meetings, and, of course, to this Chamber, a keen and perceptive mind which was a tremendous asset when explaining his strong convictions. While we seldom agreed politically, in the words of our great Speaker of the House of Representatives, he was never disagreeable. And I believe that he felt that I reciprocated in kind. This was typical of the relationship that Noah Mason had with most Members of this House.

This Nation will always require legislators with the stature of Noah Mason regardless of party affiliation. The courage of one's convictions is essential to proper exposition of the legislative problems that face any great nation. Everyone knew exactly where he stood on everything and everyone knew exactly how he voted on difficulties issues because he never shirked his obligation to record his convictions. I shall, Mr. Speaker, miss him a great deal as will the Members who value these fine attributes of character in their colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

I extend to his family my deep sympathy.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for a quarter of a century I had the high and unusual privilege of serving in this body with Noah Mason. I learned to know him intimately and well. Born in Wales, every fiber and sinew of his body was completely American and he gave to this country and to this Republic a devotion that few American-born citizens have ever been able to give.

Noah Mason was a man of conviction, and of strong beliefs. There are those in the House who may have disagreed with him at times on some of the positions he took on the important issues of the day. But no one ever questioned his integrity or where he stood on any of the important issues which came before this body. Instead, as the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], has pointed out, he sat here in front of where I stand for many, many years, and always that voice of Noah's rang out like a trumpet sound to inspire, if you please, some of those Members who were weaker of heart and of lesser courage than he. He always took his stand for good government, for sound fiscal policy, for the things in which he believed and in which he convinced many of us we should also believe.

Noah Mason helped to write American history. He helped to make it. He will go down in the pages of time, so far as this House is concerned, as one of the truly great men who has served in this body since its inception.

I join with all the others in extending to his family my deepest sympathy. With his passing not only they, be we, and the American people generally, have suffered a great loss.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARENDS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, the passing of former Congressman Noah M. Mason, who served as Representative in Congress from the 15th District of Illinois for 26 years, marks, in a sense, the passing of an era which he represented.

It was my privilege to know Congressman Mason for many years as a public leader and as a friend. In representing what was formerly the 15th Congressional District of Illinois, he included among his constituents the residents of Boone County, now part of the 12th District of Illinois which I have the honor to serve.

In stating that Congressman Mason's passing witnesses the passing of an era, I address myself principally to his basic philosophy of government in which he adhered rigidly to the vitality and the authority of the local community and the State. His voice in this Chamber was unrelenting in opposition to the steady growth of national authority and power.

Congressman Mason's earlier experience as a teacher and in local and State government before his arrival on Capitol Hill, provided him with the background of experience and confidence in local government which contributed to the development of his philosophy.

Notwithstanding that Congressman Mason worked assiduously against the tide of Federal expansion and growth, his voice brought balance and moderation to the legislative enactments as they occurred during his 26 years in this House.

In addition to his great contributions to our Nation, Mr. Mason was respected and beloved by all those who knew him in this Chamber and throughout the land.

In joining with others on this occasion to bereave his passing, I want also to extend sympathy to his widow, his children, and to other members of the family.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, Noah Mason was about my age and Noah was so bouyant and full of bounce and vigor that I expected him to outlive me many years as well as many much younger. When I learned yesterday that he was gone, the world in which I live was narrowed.

Mr. Speaker, I feel now that I should speak for one who no longer is with us in the flesh, the late beloved dean of our delegation, Tom O'Brien.

Noah Mason and Tom O'Brien had different political philosophies but they were of the same type of character and they were bound together by ties of mutual respect and warm affection. Never did Tom O'Brien break his word. Never did Noah Mason break his word.

Noah Mason lived by the highest traditions of the State of Illinois, to which he came as a child from his native Wales, and to the welfare and glory of which he gave a long lifetime of dedicated service.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for the entire Illinois Democratic delegation in saying that we are heartbroken at the death of Noah Mason. To his widow and children we extend our deepest sympathy.

Mr. **FINDLEY**. Mr. Speaker, Noah Mason was one of the very first persons I met when I first arrived as a Member of the House of Representatives in 1961.

In many ways he was like a father to me, and helped to ease those early days when I badly needed guidance, advice, and encouragement.

On several occasions Mr. Mason referred to me—acknowledging the frequency with which we voted together—as Noah Mason, Jr. To me, this was a cherished compliment.

His warm friendly manner and his steady consistent good humor were an inspiration to all of us. He was a man of high idealism, rugged character, and unflinching courage. He was cut from the good rock of constitutional government, and he served his country well.

Mr. **GROSS**. Mr. Speaker, I am indeed sorry to learn of the death of my friend and former colleague, the Honorable Noah Mason.

No Member of the House with whom I have had the privilege of serving displayed more consistency, deeper conviction, or greater courage. Noah Mason never wavered in a position which he thought to be in the best interests of the people he represented as well as the citizens of this Nation.

The House lost an outstanding Representative when he retired a few years ago.

I join in extending sympathy to the members of his family.

Mr. **DERWINSKI**. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in mourning the death of our most distinguished former member, Noah Mason, of Illinois. Those of us who were privileged to serve with him recognized him as an extremely dedicated legislator who, throughout his entire service, fought to maintain the integrity and independence of the legislative branch of government.

Noah Mason was especially recognized in Illinois as a dedicated public servant whose long career enhanced the effectiveness and dignity of the Congress.

Noah Mason was a man of strong conservative political principles. He was also known to us as a wonderful human being with a wholesome sense of humor and with genuine interest in the welfare of his fellow man. He was an extremely valuable member of the Ways and Means Committee and a rock of Gibraltar in support of sound principles in the legislative area covered by his committee.

Mrs. Derwinski joins me in expressing our sympathy to Mrs. Mason and the family. We miss Noah since he retired less than 3 years ago and will always remember him as a true friend, understanding colleague, and, above all, dedicated American.

Mr. **MILLS**. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to receive word of the passing from this life of one of our most beloved former colleagues, the Honorable Noah Mason.

I was privileged to serve with Noah Mason in the House for 24 years, and more particularly, it was my rare privilege to work with him perhaps as closely as any Member because of the respective positions which we held on the Committee on Ways and Means as chairman and ranking member for a period of several years.

Mr. Mason was one of the most beloved individuals who ever sat in the House of Representatives. His Welsh humor, his disarming candor, his unquestioned integrity, his high personal standards, his Rock of Gibraltar character were qualities well known and appreciated by all of us. We regretted his decision at the end of the 87th Congress to retire from the House because we realized how his presence in the Committee on Ways and Means and on the floor of the House would be missed from day to day. We did have the privilege of seeing him from time to time and, on rare occasions, he did come back to the Committee on Ways and Means and visit with all of us in committee. We are all saddened by his death because men of his stature and men of his stamp are few and far between. With the greatest of sincerity, I can say that when I received this sad word, in my mind's eye I began to review the significant contributions which this great man made to his State and his Nation and to the work of this body over the many years of his service here. They are far too numerous to relate on this occasion but I can assure you they were many in quantity and significant in quality. My deepest sympathies go to his wife, children, and other loved ones.

Mr. **FISHER**. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the recent death of our former colleague, the Honorable Noah Mason, of Illinois. It was my privilege to serve with him for many years. He was a tower of strength, a dedicated American who fought for those principles which he considered good for the country. He was a disciple of good government. This Nation is better off because he served here.

Mr. Mason was a friend. He was humble, modest, and affable. Universally respected, Noah had a way of commanding the good will and understanding of his contemporaries. Since his decision to retire he has been missed. The Nation sorely needs more men of his caliber, who are willing to stand up and be counted on the side of right and honor.

To his surviving widow and children I extend my deepest sympathy in their bereavement.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. **ARENDS**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their remarks on the life and service of Noah Mason.

The **SPEAKER**. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY, SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency be permitted to sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. **PELLY**. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The **SPEAKER**. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. **ALBERT**. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 55]

Ashley
Baldwin
Blatnik
Bonner
Brademas
Cahill
Conable
Conyers
Cooley
Dent
Diggs
Edwards, Calif.
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Fulton, Tenn.
Gathings
Gibbons
Hagan, Ga.
Hawkins
Holland
Hull
Hungate
Ichord
Jones, Ala.
Karth
Leggett
Love
MacGregor
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Miller
Mink
O'Neill, Mass.
Pepper
Pool
Powell
Redlin
Resnick
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
St Germain
Schisler
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Stalbaum
Teague, Tex.
Todd
Toll
Watkins
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

The **SPEAKER**. On this rollcall 377 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. **DENTON**. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 6767) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 2 hours, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] and one-half to be controlled by myself.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The **SPEAKER**. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 6767, with Mr. PRICE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON] will be recognized for 1 hour, and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. REIFEL] will be recognized for 1 hour. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we are dealing today with the 1966 appropriation bill for the Interior Department and related agencies. In handling this bill I feel very much like an intruder in view of the fact that our good friend, the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, is here. He has been chairman of this committee for 14 years, and we consider him "Mr. Interior" himself. Fortunately, the gentleman from Ohio, MIKE KIRWAN, has been on our committee and has been a great help in our consideration of the bill, as have been the other members of the committee. I want to thank the other members of the committee and our staff for the assistance they have given us in considering this bill.

We examined every item in this bill carefully and critically, and I think the amount proposed is the minimum needed by the various departments and agencies that came before our committee to carry out properly the various functions of Government.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have a good bill. I say this because the amount of funds recommended is not only below the budget request, but is also below the amount appropriated last year. Let me give you some figures on that. The budget estimate for direct appropriations was $1,102,625,500. That was about $41.5 million more than the appropriation last year. It was a 4-percent increase. The amount appropriated last year was $1,061,121,270, including anticipated pay act supplementals. The bill we present here today is for $1,045,866,300 in direct appropriations. That is $15.2 million below the amount appropriated last year, and is $56.7 million below the budget recommendation.

This bill also includes appropriation of receipts, borrowing authorization, and annual contract authority. If we include these, the total of the bill is $1,200,090,300. That is about $70 million below the budget request or a reduction of 6 percent. A particular merit of this bill is that it will generate receipts of about $862 million. That is an increase of $253 million over last year. Estimated receipts are about $183 million below the direct appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. How much of the alleged saving that the gentleman speaks of is due to nonrecurring costs?

Mr. DENTON. A considerable amount. Of course, all items of construction are nonrecurring and we have new items of construction. So it is pretty hard to judge that in dollars and cents, but approximately $34 million of the decrease is due to nonrecurring items.

As I said, this bill will generate receipts of $862 million.

We recommend a total of about $277 million for the Indians. We have a debt that we owe to the Indians which we can never repay. This sum is only an installment on the debt. If you take into account only the direct appropriations, this bill generates receipts of about $90 million more than the direct appropriations if Indian funds are excluded.

We prided ourselves in the last session of the Congress on the fact that we had a great record for conservation. We said we were going down in history as a great conservation Congress, but conservation causes extra expense. We passed legislation which required additional appropriations, and I will speak of these briefly. The first is one that does not generate extra expense—the land and water conservation fund. I have had a great many people talk to me about this bill. Income for this fund is derived from several sources. Bumper stickers are sold for $7 each.

They will permit the owner of the automobile and all occupants of the car to enter all national park and national forest areas. Then the money received from the tax on the sale of gasoline for motorboats, goes into this fund as well as the proceeds of sale of certain land.

The budget recommended that the States match the funds on a 40 to 60 basis; that it, for every $40 contributed by the Federal Government the States would contribute $60.

The committee had a great deal of complaint about the proposed formula from many people who wrote us about it, and many Members of Congress have talked to the committee about it. I do not think there is a doubt in the world that it was the intent of Congress when it passed this legislation that the contributions would be on a 50 to 50 basis. The committee investigated this very carefully. There was a good possibility that perhaps the more wealthy States could match on a 60 to 40 basis but it might be a real hardship on the poorer States. So we have recommended a 50 to 50 formula for matching grants under this fund.

The committee reduced by $15.8 million the amount requested for use by the Federal Government. This sum was transferred to the fund for assistance to States; providing a total of $90 million State funds. There is considerable advantage in allotting these funds to the States, because in that way we get two for one. They have to match the funds, and the recreation projects are closer to the people. The Federal Government can use the funds only to buy real estate. The States can acquire the land and also develop recreation facilities.

Another item of new legislation passed last year was a bill to aid commercial fisheries. The act authorized an appropriation of $5 million. The budget recommended $2 million. There was strong demand to increase the funding for this activity from $2 to $5 million. We have recommended an appropriation of $4 million for this activity.

There was one other item of new legislation which provided subsidies for the construction of fishing vessels. A fishing vessel must be bought in the United States and it costs more to build vessels in this country than to buy them overseas. The current legislation is applicable to all States of the Union and the amount of the subsidy was raised from 33⅓ to 50 percent. For this program, $5 million is recommended.

Public Law 88–379, approved July 17, 1964, provided for various grants to the States for water research. This bill provides $4,425,000 for that program in 1966. The largest increase in this bill is for the Indians—about $14 million. Other major items of increase included:

For accelerating the saline water research program	+$10,235,000
To liquidate additional obligations under the contract authorities carried in the Federal-Aid Highway Act for forest, public land, and Indian roads	+11,100,000
For additional management, protection, and maintenance costs in the National Parks	+3,954,000
For geological surveys and investigations, development of mineral resources, and coal research	+2,498,220
For earthquake damage to the Alaska Railroad	+3,000,000
For additional requirements of the U.S. Forest Service, including State and private forestry cooperation	+8,213,000
For additional operating and research of the Smithsonian Institution	+4,626,000

Let us consider, on the other hand, the cuts that the committee has recommended. The largest item was in the construction of Indian schools. The budget provided for the construction of three Indian schools at a cost of about $24 million. As far as we could determine there had been no specific planning for these large construction projects. We applied to these Indian schools the same rule of construction that generally prevails in other construction appropriations. That is, for the first year, only planning funds will be approved. One million one hundred thousand dollars was recommended for the planning of those three schools.

Then there was a proposed construction of an Indian high school in Albuquerque, N. Mex. There was a good deal of dissatisfaction with this proposal among the local people in Albuquerque. They thought a separate Indian school should not be constructed but that the Indians should be integrated within the available public schools. The budget estimate for this school was about $13 million. We disallowed that.

Those were the major items of reduction that we had. An increase of $12½ million was requested for additional contract authority for the helium program. This was denied.

The present law authorizes $47.5 million in contract authority.

There are currently contracts with five companies.

Under existing contracts we are getting about a 100-year supply of helium and it certainly will do no harm to delay this request until more experience is gained on what it actually costs to produce helium.

Mr. Chairman, on the saline water program in which the President is very interested, the Bureau of the Budget recommended the sum of $26.5 million. That was done on the theory that legislation would be passed which would extend and enlarge this program. Of course, such legislation has not as yet been enacted. Considering the supplemental appropriation now pending for this item, the amount appropriated through this fiscal year will be $35 million. There are 2 more years remaining under current authorization and $40 million constitutes the remaining authorization for this period.

Mr. Chairman, we recommended $20 million this year, which leaves $20 million available next year. That represents a reduction of $6.5 million, and $10 million more than last year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, with reference to the Public Land Law Review Commission for which $1 million was budgeted, we did not recommend this amount since this Commission has not yet been organized. We passed over this item without prejudice.

Likewise, at the request of the Budget Bureau, we passed over without prejudice the item of $6,500,000 for transitional grants to Alaska.

Mr. Chairman, we are recommending an appropriation of slightly over $1 billion. That is a very large sum of money, but this bill covers extensive activities. Activities under this bill include:

Conservation and administration of 464 million acres of public domain land involving forest, range, mineral, and water resources.

Provision of educational assistance, facilities, and services to over 59,000 Indian children in Federal day and boarding schools and assistance to over 53,000 Indian children in the public schools; welfare and guidance services to 22,000 needy Indians; management and protection of nearly 50 million acres of Indian-owned forest and range lands; construction, operation, and maintenance of 300 irrigation systems serving about 864,000 acres; and maintenance of about 17,000 miles of roads on Indian reservations.

Management, protection, maintenance, and construction of facilities, including 18,000 miles of roads and trails in 218 national parks and other areas comprising about 26 million acres with an estimated 118 million visitors in 1966.

Provision under the Geological Survey for topographic surveys and mapping of the United States; geologic and mineral resource surveys and mapping; water resources investigations; and supervision of 125,000 properties leased for oil, gas, and other minerals valued at $1.6 billion.

Conservation, evaluation, and development of our mineral resources under the Bureau of Mines, including inspection of 8,000 coal mines and the production, conservation, and sale of the Nation's helium.

The conduct of research, management, and demonstration programs to conserve and restore fish and wildlife resources for both recreational and commercial use, including the operation and maintenance of 91 fish hatcheries and 315 national wildlife refuges consisting of 28.8 million acres.

The management, protection, and development of 186 million acres of land in the national forests, including an estimated sale of 11.4 billion board feet of timber in 1966 with a value of $132.7 million; provision of recreation facilities for an estimated 154 million visitors; grazing for 6 million livestock; and cooperation with States in fire control, tree planting, and forest management and processing.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. Yes.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has just referred to the appropriations for the health and education of the Indians.

Mr. DENTON. Yes.

Mr. BOW. I think it would be interesting if the gentleman could advise us whether or not, if the medical care bill passes which will be here on the floor of the House very shortly, the Indians will be included under that medical care bill and also in view of the education bill which we passed last week, whether they are covered under that bill.

Mr. DENTON. On the reservations they are not. About half of these Indians are in the public schools and receive the benefit of all these programs. However, on the reservation they do not.

With respect to the public health program, the Federal Government does pay for that.

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will yield further, would they come under the new medical care bill?

Mr. DENTON. In some instances they may and in some they would not.

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will yield further, under this bill we have about $75 million for Indian health activities and public service. This represents an increase of $29.4 million or almost 40 percent since 1960. It is costing us about $143.61 each for health care during the year.

I felt that if the medicare bill should pass, we might take a look at this.

Mr. DENTON. That is correct. I am very interested in that program because several years ago when I was on the Education and Labor Committee we learned that the Indians were very susceptible to tuberculosis. They had a mortality rate far above that of other people throughout the country. However, the Bureau has done, I believe, a remarkable job in helping the Indians.

There is $100,000 in this bill for a pilot project on mental health. There is a great deal to be done. The infant mortality rate has been lowered tremendously, especially as long as they are in the hospital and before they have to go home. But there is a great deal to be done.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman feels we are making progress?

Mr. DENTON. I think we are making tremendous progress so far as the health of the Indians is concerned.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Along the line of the questioning developed by the gentleman from Ohio, I would like to express appreciation to the committee for what has been done not only in improving the Indian hospitals and their capacity to care for Indian patients, but also in the sanitation field. I think in that area the program has been carried on by the Public Health Service and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in cooperation with the Department of the Interior, making elementary sanitation facilities available on trust land and in reservation areas has meant a tremendous improvement in the general welfare picture of the Indians.

It has a great deal to do with the improvement in the tuberculosis mortality rate, and improvement in the infant mortality rate. This is an area in which we particularly express appreciation to the committee.

I am impressed by what the committee is trying to do to get some orderly approach to the construction problem that we have in connection with these Indian schools and facilities. The gentleman will recall that I appeared before him on behalf of a very urgently needed dormitory to replace a dormitory building that burned down at the Indian school at Eufaula, which served the Creek Indians, and a number of other Indian tribes in eastern Oklahoma. We had a sympathetic hearing from the members of the committee who, I think, are among the most distinguished and able members of the great Appropriations Committee, but I note funds have not been provided for that item. It is my understanding from the chairman that the Bureau of Indian Affairs was not ready with a plan to move ahead.

Mr. DENTON. That is correct. I do think the gentleman's efforts will bring results, and we appreciate the contribution he is making.

There were 68 Indian girls who came from broken homes in the dormitory. The building they are now in is not adequate, and it is said that the building will have to be condemned, it will have to be replaced.

There are two other Indian dormitory schools in that part of Oklahoma. The Bureau of Indian Affairs was not able to give us a cost estimate on the replacement of this building at the present time. The Bureau will make a study to determine what should be done to replace these three dormitories. This is a serious problem, and we think they will give us some information. We could not make an appropriation at this time, however, because we did not know how much they would need.

Mr. EDMONDSON. The gentleman is correct about the different schools in the area. But this is the only school that has no dormitory. The dormitory burned completely to the ground. Anything the chairman can do to help me get some plan by the Bureau of Indian Affairs will be deeply appreciated.

Mr. DENTON. We have asked the Bureau of Indian Affairs to give us an estimate. They want to include this in one overall program, however.

Mr. EDMONDSON. With regard to that school, may I say this is the school which has placed its children in the public schools of the community, and it is serving as a home environment for these children, a place where they can get the care which they are unable to get at home while they attend the school at Eufaula. This has proven to be an ideal arrangement, and I certainly hope these children will not be using this building for too long, which is intended to be the recreation and office building area of the institution.

Mr. DENTON. The committee is quite interested in having this situation corrected.

Mr. EDMONDSON. I thank the gentleman.

In bills of this type, I realize you cannot please everybody, but we believe we have covered all the projects for which there is a need and with which the agencies are ready to proceed. The money appropriated in this bill is not spent in foreign countries. Every place this money is spent the American flag will fly. This is an American bill. It is an investment in the future of America, so that not only you and I, but our children and our grandchildren can enjoy the wonderful resources we have in the United States, and with which we are so richly endowed.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I appreciate what the gentleman is saying. I believe I understand his intent. I have no fault to find whatsoever with the bill in general, but I would call attention to page 32 of the report, and page 39, line 5, of the bill, which has to do with the "archeological research and excavation, special foreign currency," program. This is the use of counterpart funds that I know we have in storage and banks overseas, which helps our imbalance of payments, and so forth.

But in the report the chairman has said that the item is to provide for the use of the special foreign currency program to award grants to American universities, museums, or other institutions of higher learning interested in conducting research and excavation in archeology and related disciplines in foreign countries including, among others, Egypt, Pakistan, Yugoslavia, and Poland. Included in this amount is $555,000, and it is listed as over $1 million in the bill itself, I believe $1.3 million. Then it says "for projects previously financed by State Department grants."

The gentleman knows I have a personal interest and have traveled in the land of the Nubian monuments, and explored them. I realize perhaps why we are in there. I wonder if this is entirely domestic, if it is all-American, and if we should include foreign universities, including universities of Communist Egypt, Poland, and Yugoslavia. Indeed, it seems to me, Mr. Chairman, just as bad as voting wheat to Nasser, on which some in the House walked down the aisle and changed their votes—but certainly not me. Nor to do as we did at the beginning of this session—provide counterpart funds which actually must be replaced by American hard dollars to save Indian monuments or to do work in this area; and especially when it is the State Department function.

Mr. DENTON. The program of giving grain to Poland and Czechoslovakia and Egypt has gone on for a good many years.

Mr. HALL. That does not impress me a bit, Mr. Chairman, if it is wrong now it was wrong then.

Mr. DENTON. This money is available in these countries and can only be used in those countries. It is my impression that we are providing these funds only for American universities.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman would then have no objection at the proper place and at the proper time to strike out that part that says "other foreign universities" or those particular countries that are of foreign ideology.

I might say I am not reporting this part of the bill for the reason that they—the State Department—always come up with counterpart funds, with which I am very familiar as a member of the Committee on Armed Services; in these areas that are not ideologically related to the principles of Americanism. Because, we feel that it is involved in the first place with the foreign service of the State Department and that this currency—or these funds—would be deposited in their banks using them only as they might dictate in their own nation.

Mr. DENTON. Of course, that program has gone on for some years before as well as the other programs, and I do think we should use those funds.

Mr. HALL. I do too, but not for foreign universities with a foreign ideology as compared to our ideology. I do hope the gentleman will support an amendment to strike that out.

Mr. DENTON. We have assumed that the program was to be confined to American institutions.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. I believe that on pages 498 and 499 of the committee hearings, you will find a list of excavation programs that are going on. These projects appear to be affiliated with American universities or institutions. Indeed, my own university, the University of Washington is conducting a study with the American Museum of Natural History in this work. These are the people who are doing the work. They are photographing ruins and doing archeological research. It is not my understanding nor was it the understanding of the committee, and I am sure other committee members will verify this, that awards are being made to other than American universities or institutions. This is for American universities to participate in this work.

Mr. HALL. I am sure the distinguished gentlewoman—and I have found that reference—would agree with me, however, that the way the bill is worded it might be easily awarded to other foreign universities in neutralist or Communist countries listed therein.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MORTON. I would like also to commend the gentleman and his committee for their very thorough report that accompanies this bill. There are two things that I think the gentleman and I are both interested in. One is the housing program on the Island of Ebeye alongside of the Kwajalein missile range base. I notice in the report the committee is concerned about this.

Mr. DENTON. Yes, we believe that situation should be corrected as soon as possible. This is the responsibility of the Defense Department. Both the gentlemen from Maryland and I went to Ebeye Island and know what a terrible place it is.

They have had disease there, and because of the housing conditions something has to be done. We have called that to the attention of the Defense Department. I understand funds are included in its 1966 budget for construction of the housing.

Mr. MORTON. Does the gentleman from Indiana have any assurance that this situation has been rectified considerably since we were there?

Mr. DENTON. One group of houses has been built, but additional housing is needed. There is still a very bad sanitary situation. Unless something is done about it, they will not have workmen on Kwajalein.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. I wish to join the gentleman from Maryland in expressing concern over this particular situation. It is the desire of the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to have another committee visit that area this fall, when we finish the work of the Congress.

This situation has existed for too long, and some kind of decision must be made, because this is one of the blights in that particular area. We cannot afford to see it continue.

I assure my friend from Maryland, who is a valuable member of the committee, that we will take care of this and help the Committee on Appropriations to take care of the situation.

Mr. DENTON. One has to see the situation to know how bad it is. Words do not describe it.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. MORTON. There is another thing in which I am much interested. That is the survey recommended to study the feasibility of using a television educational facility, similar to the one at Samoa, throughout the trust territory.

Are there any funds in this appropriation bill for that?

Mr. DENTON. Yes. We have directed that a study be conducted within the amount provided. This would be feasibility study. They have had educational TV on Samoa, which has been very successful. The gentleman and I know, from visits to the islands, the difficulty experienced in getting teachers of English on the islands.

By having educational TV, named for my good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], they can accomplish the task with fewer English teachers at much smaller expense.

The trust territory islands are scattered over an area as large as the United States. This presents a problem. Our committee brought it up with the Commissioner. There is a possibility that small, low-power stations could be used on each island. They are not costly. They are going to study that and report to us next year.

Mr. MORTON. I have been given to understand that the technological problems of covering a large percentage of the trust territory with TV similar to the one made possible through the great work of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN] in Samoa, can be overcome, and the TV can be established to cover a very large portion of the population through the technology already existing.

Mr. DENTON. I believe we can. Of course, the program can be put over all of the stations, not only in Samoa but the other areas also. This offers a great potential. It was at the suggestion of our committee that this was taken up with the Commissioner about the mandated islands.

Mr. MORTON. It seems to me that we should, without further delay, if possible, study the feasibility of this type of educational device, which I believe is the only way we can finally overcome the language problem of the trust territory.

Mr. DENTON. I agree 100 percent.

Mr. MORTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENTON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I have been intrigued by the appropriations for the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Council on the Arts. Can the gentleman tell me the difference between arts and fine arts?

Mr. DENTON. The Commission of Fine Arts is the local agency which passes on the design of structures in the District. It was established by Congress and all buildings, except those on the "Hill," must have its approval.

We have allowed $123,000, the same as the current year.

The National Council on the Arts is the new agency Congress created last year.

The bill to authorize $150,000 annually was defeated here last week, I believe.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. The request was $150,000, and to make it permanent. That was defeated.

Mr. DENTON. That is why we allowed only $50,000. We appropriated $50,000 for the current year, and $50,000 would remain under the present authorization, unless it is changed. The Council is to encourage arts generally, not just specifically in the District of Columbia, but all over.

Mr. GROSS. The fine arts applies only to the District of Columbia, and arts applies all over the landscape?

Mr. DENTON. You can put it that way, but that is the jurisdiction of the two groups.

The Fine Arts Commission has been in operation a long time here in the District. The other was just created by Congress last year.

Mr. GROSS. Is it age that makes it fine arts, or is it something that is developed in Foggy Bottom?

Mr. DENTON. I do not know what the history of it is, but it was done by somebody who was here long before you and I.

Mr. GROSS. Is one of the cultural experts on the floor to help us out with the difference between arts and fine arts?

Mr. DENTON. I am no authority on it, I will have to admit.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Department of the Interior and Related Agencies, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], has discussed fully the actions of our committee and I shall take up little time in summarizing those actions as they affect each individual agency.

Suffice it to say that our committee was handed a reasonably tight set of budget requests and succeeded in cutting it still further by about 6 percent. We have provided what we consider to be adequate funds for essential Department of the Interior and related agencies activities. Yet, we feel it is a budget free of frills and unnecessary expenditures. The American taxpayer will receive a dollar's worth of services for every dollar spent under this budget.

Each agency considered under this bill is delivering a maximum of performance. The many hours of testimony taken before the committee indicates the high degree of service and competence represented in the department and related agencies.

As an example of the type of service, and I might add often unseen service, I would like to discuss some of the activities of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. That agency receives the biggest appropriation in the bill—$202,836,000.

Members may well ask what is the Indian Bureau accomplishing with these annual appropriations running into many millions of dollars? What advances are the Indian people themselves making as a result of these appropriations?

Progress is undeniably slow. To understand this, one must first realize the unique problems facing the Indian Bureau as it attempts to elevate the social and economic standards of the Indian American.

For example, in the field of education 80 percent of the Indian children entering Indian Bureau schools speak little English and many others speak it poorly. Before these students can be taught the ways of our society, they first must be taught to speak the language. Special emphasis is being given in this area.

More Indian students than ever before now are taking advantage of opportunities for higher education as a result of the stimulus provided by our public investments in this area.

Back in 1928, I, as a youth on the Rosebud Indian Reservation of South Dakota, was privileged to receive one of the first educational loans our Government offered. In those days only a handful of Indian youths were able to continue their studies at the college or university level. By contrast, in 1964 there were 5,900 Indian youths enrolled in institutions of higher learning. The Bureau of Indian Affairs provided scholarship assistance to 1,327 students in 1964 at an average cost of $657.

As our investments in scholarship assistance have increased, the number of college dropouts among Indian students has decreased somewhat proportionately. Dropouts still are a sizable problem, but we are providing the means in this bill to continue a study launched at the Concho Demonstration School in 1962. It examines the problem of school dropouts and develops methods for helping the Indian dropouts or potential dropouts to return or adjust to former school situations or to other programs. In its first 2 years of operation that school succeeded in salvaging 139 of 168 students served, a salvage rate of 83 percent.

As a boy on an Indian reservation, I was still in the sixth grade at the age of 16. Today, largely because of our Federal investments, well over 50 percent of Indian students are in their normal grade for their individual age level, a percentage far improved over a few years ago.

Unfortunately, many Americans still think that every Indian receives some kind of a welfare check from Uncle Sam. Such is not the case.

The Indian Bureau does maintain a sizable welfare program to help Indian families and their children to cope with the serious problems facing them. Because of the unique circumstances in which we have placed the Indian people, they have a wide variety of unique problems which require social and welfare assistance. These services include counseling and guidance, child welfare services, and liaison assistance with State and local agencies.

It was my distinct pleasure yeserday noon down in the House restaurant to find a white family with a little Indian girl at the dining table with them. They were the guests of one of the distinguished members of our Appropriations Committee from Massachusetts. I got up the courage to ask the mother of the family if that was not an Indian girl and she said yes, she was a little Sioux Indian girl from South Dakota.

I am sure that the new home for this child grows out of a program that was started in the Bureau of Indian Affairs a few years ago with child adoption agencies across the Nation, to find the kind of homes that would make an Indian child feel at home so the child will grow up to become a meaningful part of our American society as we hope it will be possible for children all across our land to do in the long months and years to come.

One of the brighter spots has been in the vocational training program. Since Public Law 959 was enacted in 1956, over 5,000 Indian Americans have completed training in more than 100 different occupations. Noting the advances in placing Indian people in gainful off-reservation employment, the Congress has steadily increased the authorization for this program from $3.5 million at the start to $12 million today. An additional $3 million increase is pending.

The emphasis is on teaching usable skills. For example, under an agreement with the Radio Corporation of America and the Philco Corp., substantial success has been realized in placing graduates in high-skill technician-type jobs at substantial wage rates.

Gratifying progress continues to be made in improving Indian health. Funds provided in this bill will continue the attack on the chief killer of the Indian American, tuberculosis.

Largely as a result of Indian Health Service efforts, we have seen the Indian's life expectancy increased to 63 compared with 42 just 10 years ago.

Much of this progress has come about since the Indian Health Service was transferred to the Public Health Service in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1956.

One of the real gaps in our Indian health care program comes in the area of dental care. The present ratio of dentists in this country is one to every 1,900 persons, but there is only one dentist for every 4,100 Indian Americans. It would be my hope that Congress, working with the Indian Health Service, will take steps providing more adequate preventive and corrective treatment in future years.

Suitable housing remains as one of the great unsolved problems on today's Indian reservations. Nearly 90 percent falls far below any standard of decency.

I would just like to quote from a letter that I received from a Catholic priest, a very dear friend of mine out on the reservation where I was born and where they have a wonderfully fine grade and high school for disadvantaged Indian children. He says:

> Last Friday was cold and as I was making my rounds and taking communion to the sick, the first four places I went to were like iceboxes and in them were old people and children. Several were schoolchildren who did not catch the bus because the house was just too cold for human functions.

And, he goes on to elaborate upon that.

This is related directly, of course, to the problems of high unemployment and very low income for most Indian families. But more and more tribes are participating in the programs of the Public Housing Administration. Here again, progress is being made.

So I think the record is clear that our public investments in these Indian programs are paying bigger dividends every year; however, the road is a long one and we cannot expect to reach our destination overnight. The distance between the world of the Indian past to that of the Indian American today requires a long bridge of understanding and patience.

Too often the general public has the impression that our investments by means of Department of the Interior appropriations are reserved exclusively for inland States with high Indian populations. Perhaps it would be of interest to Members to point out that many of the activities for which we are providing funds in this bill go to benefit every State in the Union.

Take, for example, the land and water conservation fund established to assist States in providing recreational areas; the Forest Service activities aimed at beautifying and protecting the forests of every State; the water resources research centers soon to be located at every State university to assist in meeting the water needs of the future, and the Fish and Wildlife Service investments in every State by means of game refuges, fish hatcheries, and cooperative research units.

There is the National Park Service which maintains recreational and historic parks and sites all across the land. In that connection, it is interesting to note that the Forest Service, also covered by this bill, finds its installations increasingly popular with the traveling public. Visitations to national forests last year were as numerous as those to national parks. In 1966, it is estimated that 118 million persons will visit national parks and 154 million persons will visit national forests.

Thus, it is that we have provided what we feel is the minimum amount to support adequately the work of each of the agencies covered in the next fiscal year. I feel the committee has brought forth a bill which deserves 100 percent support and passage by the House.

I would be remiss if I failed to comment on the wonderful leadership that has been demonstrated by our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Denton], and the chairman of the full Appropriations Committee [Mr. Mahon].

The gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Denton's, great knowledge and experience in this field has been of real inspiration to those of us privileged to serve on his subcommittee.

The distinguished former chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Kirwan] proved himself long ago a real friend of the Indian people and a man most knowledgeable in all phases of the committee's deliberations. We have profited once again this year by our associations with him.

It has been a real privilege to work with the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. Julia Butler Hansen] who has a particular interest in the Indian people because of her firsthand associations with those of her own State.

We have benefited from the able contributions of two new members of the committee this year, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Marsh] and the astute work of my colleague on the minority side, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDade].

This committee has functioned in a hard-working manner with absolutely no references to partisanship of any kind. This is equally true of the fine staff assistance we have enjoyed not only from Mr. George Evans, the able clerk of the Interior Subcommittee, but also from his knowledgeable predecessor, Mr. Gene Wilhelm, who now serves on the Public Works Subcommittee but who has been generous in his assistance to us.

Before concluding, I should like to touch briefly on several of the activities in this bill which apply specifically to my own State.

The committee provided $100,000 for a new mental health unit to be established on the Pine Ridge Reservation. This is a pilot project aimed at solving the problems of adjustment that arise from the cultural differences in the Indian's environment. Through this special arrangement, we shall explore the social changes that give rise to mental health problems and ways in which these problems can be combated as the Indian finds his place in the modern society.

This is research which will benefit the whole Nation as its findings are applied to other reservations and more Indian Americans find it possible to take their places as productive citizens working in off-reservation surroundings.

I am delighted that the committee has seen fit to provide $50,000 in planning funds for a new school system serving the Sisseton Reservation. If local interests are agreeable to accomplishing the necessary school district reorganization, we can establish there one of the finest rural area school systems in America, serving Indian and non-Indian alike.

It has been a real privilege for me to have a part in the work of this committee again this year. As a great, former Member of this body and this committee, the Honorable Ben Jensen of Iowa, used to say: "Here we are building America."

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REIFEL. I am glad to yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

Mr. BOW. The gentleman has made a very fine statement and I congratulate him particularly upon that section which has to do with the Indians.

Mr. Chairman, there is probably no man in this House more familiar with the Indian problems of the United States than the gentleman now in the well.

Mr. REIFEL. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BOW. The gentleman was born and reared on an Indian reservation. His heart is still there. He has tried to do all he can for those people.

I believe it is well, however, to point out that we are not hurting too much in this area of money. We have increased the appropriations.

In order to show that we actually do have a heart in this matter, it seems to me we should point out that contained in this bill is the sum of $202.8 million for the Indian Affairs Bureau. That is up $85 million since 1960.

I think it should be pointed out in round figures what we are doing, because the gentleman has done such an excellent job in his presentation. But I believe we should show the amount we are actually spending.

Now, this is a rather large amount.

What is the present Indian population?

Mr. REIFEL. The Bureau of Indian Affairs presently assumes responsibility for something like 450,000 enrolled members of tribes, tribes for which the Federal Government has some responsibility. There are, of course, large numbers of Indian tribal members who like myself have left the reservation and for whom the Federal Government, after giving me my start in life, assumes no further responsibility.

Mr. BOW. If the gentleman will yield further, I am sure that was one of the best investments this Government has made yet. They gave you that opportunity and you have repaid the money many times over as a result of your services and plus I am sure the taxes which you have paid over the years.

Can the gentleman tell us is the Indian population increasing or decreasing?

Mr. REIFEL. The Indian population in these areas where the Indian Bureau and the Public Health Service assumes responsibility of welfare, and so forth, is increasing.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman again, and congratulate him for his statement.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REIFEL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. It has been a good many years since I had the privilege of serving on the Committee on Indian Affairs. Before that I served with the public health nursing organization when we made a study for the Government of the health conditions that existed on many of the reservations. I have been so interested and relieved to find that we are doing more now than for a long while. I would like to ask why there is nothing in the Appalachia bill or in the education bill for the poverty stricken and educationally deprived Indians.

Mr. REIFEL. I appreciate very much the gentlewoman's contribution, and her interest in the welfare of the Indians.

The Welfare and the Economic Opportunity Acts and the other acts in programs of this kind are designed to reach a different category of need among our national community. The Indian Bureau and the Public Health Service have been readjusting themselves over the years and really reach in and provide services that these other agencies, particularly the newer ones, are not able to reach. But there are some programs that are reaching into the Indian reservations in a helpful manner.

Mrs. BOLTON. I am glad to hear that. I have some very fine Indians in my district who are bankers, insurance men, and so forth. They are wonderful citizens. To our great joy they are keeping alive their tribal dances, and once in a while we can persuade them to come and show these tribal dances to us. They are so beautiful. This preservation for the United States of that background we must not lose. I am grateful to these fine people who are in my district for the work they are doing.

Mr. REIFEL. I agree with the gentlewoman from Ohio, and appreciate her contribution.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman so much.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN].

Mr. KIRWAN. Mr. Chairman, I am down here today not to answer questions, because I do not know much about the details of this year's bill. We have a new chairman, a good chairman, and a good committee, and that applies to the Members on both the majority and minority sides of the aisle.

I am here today to commend Secretary Udall, who has been doing a very good job. I also want to commend the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], chairman of the Committee on Insular Affairs. He and his committee have been responsible for the many excellent legislative bills which guide our committee in its consideration of appropriations requests. The cooperation between the two committees is close and excellent.

I think of the years in the past in reference to our discussion of the Indians. I was on Indian reservations back in 1910. That was a long time ago. When you see with your own eyes what we did to the Indians you know that today's programs to assist them are fully justified.

When I took charge of this committee some years ago there were 25,000 Indian children in this country who never had put their foot in a schoolroom. We claim to be a great race, yet it took us about 170 years to put every Indian child in a schoolhouse.

I can remember years ago when we had amendments to reduce items in this bill. If they had carried, how would we have made the progress we have since then in preserving our great natural resources, including our parks, our forests, and our minerals? And these are basic to our prosperity today.

In the year 1932, and I am not speaking politics now, the gross national product that year was only $56 billion as compared with $620 billion last year.

In 1929, many people did not have electricity in their homes. Until 1955 the Bureau of Reclamation and the power agencies of Interior were included in this bill and we had the annual controversy between private and public power. We have made great progress and today the private utilities and public power agencies are cooperating in solving our power shortages. Over $700 million is now going to be spent for four lines for a Pacific Northwest-Southwest intertie and the private utilities will pay $400 million of the cost. That is the way it should be. Business and the American Government should be working hand in hand. But instead of that, since the day of independence, they have worked against each other. The sooner they realize that they have to work together, the better it will be for all of America.

Every dollar that we appropriate in this bill is to be spent in America. You hear somebody rise up and say, "What are we spending $1 billion for?" If we are going to move forward and keep abreast of the times, we will have to preserve and build America. We have been here for 300 years, and the faster we get on the job and provide for essential requirements of our natural resources, the faster we will have all of the people at work in this country, happiness, and prosperity.

I am happy to see this bill have $1 billion in it. I have said this many times as chairman of the committee, that I have tried to get it up to $1 billion, and it could be well spent. So I congratulate the committee today. You have got it on the $1 billion mark. We are on the right track, and spending it on the greatest country in the world and the greatest form of government. If we continue to do that, we will have not the $600 billion of gross national product but $700 or $800 billion.

If we as Republicans and Democrats put our shoulders to the wheel and work together to appropriate adequate funds to preserve and develop the greatest country on earth, it will be repaid manyfold, for our prosperity starts with land, minerals, wood, and water. I am happy to see what we have accomplished in recent years through this bill. We have made progress, but much still remains to be done.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE], a member of the committee.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, as I noted in my remarks on the District of Columbia appropriation bill 1 week ago, this is my first trip around on the Appropriations Committee. I want to repeat my statement that my experience on the committee, and on this Interior Subcommittee, has given me great pleasure, and deep insight into the workings of Congress.

The bill before us today is of particular interest to a Pennsylvanian, as it should be generally to all Americans. This bill is for America, nobody else. The money provided herein goes to improve and conserve our greatest asset, our national resources.

The Department of Interior is an old-line agency, composed of many bureaus staffed by acknowledged experts. The country can be proud of them.

This is not to say there is no opportunity for it to lapse into bureaucratic weakness. Our hearings, conducted by our able chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON], revealed that as efficiently managed as the Department can be shown to be, nevertheless there are programs which may be outliving their usefulness.

It is my hope that we can terminate some studies, thus eliminating their costs or shifting the costs to newer and more timely pursuits. There is, for instance, an item in here under "Metallurgy" for $320,000 for research on utilization of scrap metals in junked automobiles. That is one way of meeting the President's request to seek means to beautify America.

I am gratified that the subcommittee decided to retain the Anthracite Research Laboratory at Schuylkill Haven, Pa. The committee was not convinced that the proposed move of this facility to Pittsburgh is wise. The fact that it will remain in the anthracite area is good news to all of us in that area.

During our hearings we developed a situation in which some interagency duplication was apparent. The Acting Director of the Bureau of Mines confirmed that the line was sometimes overlapping between areas of responsibility involving both the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Bureau of Mines. Mr. Frank C. Memmott commented thusly in response to my inquiry:

> If I may comment, from my short observation of being here in Washington on the Federal level, where we have the technical know-how, and to have the appropriations go to another agency and they in turn are sifting this and giving it to us, I substantiate also that this seems to be a waste.

One example of duplication occurs in the effort to deal with culm banks. In a memorandum furnished the subcommittee the following excerpt was noted:

> In view of the Bureau's competence in mine- and culm-bank fire control work, sealing and filling underground voids, and in reclaiming and rehabilitating strip mined lands, there appears to be no logical basis for dividing the Federal Government's interests in culm banks between the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior. Therefore, since most of the problems associated with the deleterious effects of coal mining are interrelated, the need for economy and efficiency in Government operations demands that the sole responsibility for all culm-bank work be clearly vested in the Department of the Interior.

I suppose the controlling defense to this sort of overlapping is that it is better to have two agencies doing it than none at all. Avenues of more efficient coordination between the respective agencies should be explored.

In the coming year we expect the Appalachia program to assist materially the work the Bureau of Mines is doing in several fields. I am especially interested in the problem of mine subsidence, a serious matter which has haunted Pennsylvania and other mining areas for the best part of a century. When a program like Appalachia comes along, promising to accelerate research in this area, it deserves my support. I know the Bureau of Mines will cooperate in implementing this program as soon as possible.

One final matter, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to allude to today was revealed in the testimony of a witness from the Bureau of Mines. The situation described is not peculiar to the agency; it could happen anywhere throughout our vast Government. In the matter of travel, which this House will later learn from the able gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Jonas], amounts to more than $1 billion annually in the Government aggregate, an experience related by Bureau Acting Director Memmott might be productive of some action by other Federal agencies, all of them having travel requirements.

At page 211 of our hearings the following comment appears in the testimony of Mr. Memmott:

> We have found cases where we felt judgment was not used in traveling second class. In my own case, when you request second-class travel, why, they say "We do not have an opening."
>
> And when I say "I am not allowed to travel on first class," immediately they find a seat. We have instructed our people that any first-class travel is going to be scrutinized by our office.

I am not suggesting that Mr. Memmott is the only gentleman who shops around for economy travel, but I would hope that budget officers who are trying to hold down agency travel expenses will address themselves to every trick and every dodge employed either by carriers, or by persons using transportation requests, to see that appropriate steps are taken to reduce these soaring costs.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I should like to quote a statement by Theodore Roosevelt, made in an address to the Congress in 1907. In that address he said:

> To waste, to destroy our natural resources, to skin and exhaust the land instead of using it so as to increase its usefulness, will result in undermining in the days of our children the very prosperity which we ought by right to hand down to them amplified and developed.

I am convinced that this is a prudent bill which will implement the programs announced and founded since that statement in 1907.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I take this time especially to commend the appropriating committee on expenditures for the fine work which has been done in this particular department by this particular subcommittee. I should like to mention each member individually, because this is a committee which works very closely with the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

It has been a pleasure to see a new chairman of a subcommittee of any kind take the floor and have at his fingertips the factual knowledge Chairman Denton has had this afternoon in presenting his legislation and in answering questions. He has done an admirable job. He has taken over, of course, from a great American, a great builder of the American land and for the American people, whom we honor every time he gets to the floor and every time we see him in action, the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman Kirwan. It can truly be said that Congressman "Mike" Kirwan is a friend of people.

It is rather interesting to note that the next two Members on the majority side are former members of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the authorizing committee for most of the expenditures handled by this subcommittee. I refer to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. Hansen] and the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. Marsh]. We hated to see them leave our committee. They are doing an admirable piece of work on their new committee.

Over on the other side, it rather does my heart good to hear people stand up and talk about the Indians, and to have Dr. Reifel, the Member from South Dakota, a member of the Indian race, stand up with all the knowledge that he has at his disposal and be able to give us the picture as he, a member of that race, understands it, in the bringing out of a bill which is apparently satisfactory to him. He honors all citizens of our country regardless of race, by the use of his talents.

The new Member from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDade] has taken over on the subcommittee and is learning his position well.

I would be remiss if I did not call attention to the fine services which Mr. Wilhelm has provided in years past as staff member. Now his duties are being taken over by Mr. Evans, who is doing fine work.

I should especially like to commend the committee for bringing so many factual matters into its report. It is an interesting report. It is a report from which many of us can gather facts that will be very useful to us as we go about our everyday work.

I also wish to express my sincere appreciation that the committee has seen fit to follow through with the legislative history of the land and water conservation fund bill as it was written here on the floor of this body. Federal funds in this program were to be used on a 50-50 matching as such funds are to be contributed to the States. The action of this committee keeps that policy intact—50 percent matching and not 40 percent as proposed by the executive department, is to be the criteria.

Many of the people representing the States in their support of the land and water conservation fund bill did so with this understanding. I am glad that the committee has seen fit to go contrary to the recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget in this respect.

Also, I think it is well once again to call to the attention of the members of the committee and of the House generally the fine relationship that the authorizing committee has with the Committee on Appropriations in this legislative situation. Relative to the appropriation for the Office of Saline Water, this committee recognized the fact that what the executive department recommended—and for that matter what even the Bureau of the Budget recommended—was practically all of the money that had been authorized for the saline water program and yet the authorization for the saline water program does not end until the end of fiscal 1967. Keeping that in mind and wishing to have the work of the Office of Saline Water carried on in an orderly and efficient manner, the committee saw fit to divide the appropriations between fiscal 1966 and fiscal 1967. This to me is keeping faith not only with the authorizing committee but also keeping faith with Congress. If this program is to be increased and extended, it is up to this body to do it and not for the executive or administrative department of the Government to defeat our purposes by spending the money before the matter of added and additional has been thoroughly studied and the necessity for the increases in authorization have been proved.

All in all may I say thank you to this fine subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for a job well done.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I will not be repetitious of the remarks made by my distinguished colleague, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], but I will join in his accolades which he had given to this committee which has brought forth this bill. I think it sets a pattern that not only the other subcommittees of the Committee on Appropriations should well follow but also other committees of the House. They have done an outstanding job.

Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time for several reasons. First to join in this tribute to all the members of this subcommittee. Second, I would like to direct some questions to the chairman of the subcommittee.

I notice on page 12 of your report that in the budget estimate for the Forest Service, under this line item "wilderness areas" you have reduced the amount by approximately half a million dollars. I do not question your reduction. My question is with regard to the comment that you have made concerning that reduction, which appears on page 13 of your report. There you state that this reduction is to limit the Forest Service in their acquisition of inholdings which involve major improvements. I believe the purpose of the wilderness bill was, as it was stated in its title, "to preserve sections of this country in their natural state." If there are in our wilderness areas properties that are improved, why does your committee request that the Forest Service not spend money to eliminate the one thing that will make these areas wilderness areas?

Mr. DENTON. They include three dude ranches. We thought it should have further study. Of course, it does keep them from being wilderness, that is true, but they are very expensive. We thought this money ought to be put first where it would do the most good. And if they were to buy these ranches right now with this money it would prevent the money from being spent elsewhere and going further to provide needed recreation areas. We deferred action until further study could be made. We have run into a good deal of that in this bill, especially on the matter of inholdings. There was about $3.5 million in the request that involved hotels, motels, dude ranches, and other expensive improvements. We thought it was a proposition that ought to be studied further and that we ought to go a little more slowly with it. We deleted the purchase of tracts where improvements were valued at over $50,000.

We did recommend that if the prices were too high and they thought they were not getting a fair price that they should use condemnation proceedings.

Mr. SAYLOR. In other words, it was not the intention of the subcommittee or of the Appropriations Committee to keep from acquiring these properties, but the committee felt that further study was required.

Mr. DENTON. In those cases where there was a large price involved we felt that they ought to go more slowly.

Mr. SAYLOR. I have no complaint with that at all. I just wanted to know why this limitation was placed in the report.

Third, I also notice that in prior years there was a ceiling placed on travel funds for the National Park Service. This year you have removed the ceiling for travel, is that correct?

Mr. DENTON. That is right. We placed the limitation on 2 years ago when they overexpended their travel allowance. We did not think that they followed the policy of the committee to economize on travel. So we put the limitation on. But they felt that this was a great handicap to them. They have a number of agencies and they had to allocate travel allowance to each agency—agency A, or B, C, D, or E. Each agency had to be very careful that they did not go over their travel allowance, because there might be some emergency come up. For that reason they felt that the limitation was difficult to administer. They assured us that they would carefully watch travel if we eliminated the legal limitation.

You will note that we kept the travel allowance down to the same figure that they had this year. After having this limitation on for 2 years we thought we would treat them like any other agency and keep the travel allowance down.

Mr. SAYLOR. In that respect I also notice that you have given the Park Service a number of new areas and then in effect you have allowed them no money for travel. Is this the result of the action of the committee?

Mr. DENTON. We did not give them any increase because they did not spend what we had given them before.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I believe the National Park Service has made a case for the increase of $170,000 for travel if they are to do the job that Congress has asked them to do and which this subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee has charged them to do. I hope that this item will be restored by the Senate.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, enactment last year of H.R. 3071, which I was privileged to sponsor, established Fort Larned in Pawnee County, Kans. as a national historic site. This was indeed of historic significance to Kansas.

Public Law 88-541 approved by the President on August 31, 1964, marked the establishment of the first national historic site in Kansas. This event also culminated many years of determined and unrelenting effort on the part of many citizens of the Larned community. Members of the Fort Larned Historical Society have devoted years of tireless effort in reaching the goal now in the final stages of fulfillment. It would be difficult to recognize everyone who assisted but Robert Frizell and the Frizell family, on whose property Fort Larned is located, deserve much credit. They have cooperated over the years with community leaders, members of the Fort Larned Historical Society, and the Fort Larned Belles in preserving this bit of western Kansas history. Others long associated with efforts to preserve Fort Larned are Mr. E. E. Newacheck, Mrs. H. C. Campbell, Mrs. Leslie Wallace, Mr. Robert Taylor, Mr. E. H. Roth, Mr. Hal Evans, and Mr. Kenneth Peters. The late W. H. Vernon during his tenure as president of the Fort Larned Historical Society, also aided materially in maintaining interest.

One widely recognized as an authority on forts of the old West, Sister M. Evangeline Thomas of the Department of History at Marymount College, Salina, Kans., has referred to Fort Larned as one which "exemplifies the role of the temporary, short-lived military posts in opening the West to settlement, protecting the pioneers from Indian attacks as they plied the prairies in Conestoga wagons in search of better opportunity for themselves and their families."

The bill, H.R. 6767 before us today making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, contains an item for the National Park Service including funds necessary to commence land acquisition and other preliminary activities essential to the eventual completion of the Fort Larned project.

The 1966 fiscal year request for Fort Larned covers land acquisition costs in the amount of $329,000; $23,900 maintenance and operation of physical facilities; $22,000 construction of buildings and rehabilitation of historic structures; $26,500 for water rights; and $51,500 was requested for management and protection. The latter item is intended to cover salaries of superintendent, historian, administrative assistant, stenographer—ranger if needed—and any other employees. It is my understanding the committee reduced the management and protection figure for all new park projects, and therefore it is difficult to estimate at the moment what will be allocated to Fort Larned for this item. It is possible, I understand, that the Park Service request may ultimately be restored.

I certainly endorse the recommendations of the Appropriations Committee concerning appropriations for Fort Larned, and urge their adoption.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. HANSEN].

Mrs. HANSEN of Washington. Mr. Chairman, first I want to commend the present new chairman of the Interior Subcommittee for the work this year on the bill which is before you today and which he has so ably presented. Hearings this year were conducted with great depth, care, and thought.

It has been a pleasure to serve on the committee and to work with you. I would also like to commend the staff for the information which they are never too busy to secure for individual members of the committee.

I would also like to commend the former chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio, Chairman MIKE KIRWAN, who has so chaired our committee. I would particularly like to compliment Chairman KIRWAN for the leadership which he gave to education in far-off American Samoa and to the Trust Territories.

The educational program in Samoa has far-reaching implications and it has become one of the most exciting educational programs in the world today. On the committee some of us suggested this year that since it had worked so well in Samoa where there had been a scarcity of teachers and where the necessity for adults as well as young people to learn the English language was imperative, that the educational TV system be studied also by our own Bureau of Indian Affairs. There may be many phases of the Samoan educational program which are adaptable to our schools for young Indian children.

One of the saddest commentaries of our Indian educational program is on page 808 of our hearings when Mr. Philleo Nash of the Indian Bureau says:

> We have had great success in our own boarding school operations in curbing dropouts since we began to deal intensively with the problem about 5 or 6 years ago. A study in 1959 was the first step. We have now brought the dropout rate in the Federal boarding schools up to a point where it is about comparable with that in public day schools for non-Indians. This has been accomplished by counseling with the parents, by the upgrading of teaching, by the improvement of standards with respect to teaching and supplies. I think the school construction program has also had a good effect because the children and the parents take more pride in a good plant than they do in the decrepit plant we have been running in the past.

Then he added:

> In the public schools, I am sorry to say, the Indian dropout rate is not improving. It is getting worse and it is a very serious problem.

We urged at the time of our hearings with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and with Secretary of Interior Udall that he now begin to examine not only the quantity of Indian education, but the quality of Indian education—that we begin to try and understand what impact these pockets of poverty on our Indian reservations are having on our young Indian people who attend our public schools and who have an ever-increasing need for greater guidance and attendance counseling on the reservation itself so that the problems of these young people can be discussed fully and frankly and that assistance be given to them to make possible a better attendance record.

We have in the State of Washington one Indian tribe who has submitted a lengthy and extensive program of suggestions for the betterment of this condition of school dropouts. One of the major facets of the program is the full use of guidance and attendance counseling. Also many home conditions on the reservations which include delinquent adults are contributing to these young people's failure to continue with their education.

We asked that the Bureau of Indian Affairs review and discuss and plan for foster homes—to search every avenue possible to make sure that we reduce these dropouts among our Indians and that we make the kindest, most tolerant, and the easiest integration of these Indian young peoples in our public schools. It can be done in a variety of ways and I have discussed these at great length with the Bureau of Indian Affairs which is so well aware of the problems.

In my home State, young people from reservations are now attending a junior college and studying fisheries. This is a splendid sign of progress for on the particular reservation from which these young people come, fisheries is one of the major resources and not only will our Indian young people's college work assist them on their own reservation, but will also assist them in making their own contribution in an ever-increasing, vital field of natural resource development.

While I am speaking on the Indian problem, I would also like to say that I hope a major effort in the poverty program will be made toward the abolition of poverty from our Indian reservations and from the Indian people. The United States cannot be proud of its record with our Indian peoples.

Yes, during the past few years we have worked constructively to build schools—to assist them, but we are late and also we are not quite keeping up with the obligations we have in this respect.

For example, we do not always recognize that the Indian reservations and that the Indian peoples must be given assistance to improve their economic opportunities and to develop their natural resources—many of them of tremendous potential. We have developed a program; but we have not pushed, nor are we pushing now.

For example, on page 814 of our hearings I asked a question about the reforestation of Indian reservations. Again Mr. Nash, the Commissioner of our Bureau of Indian Affairs said:

> There is practically no timber stand improvement taking place on any of the Indian forested land today except by force of nature, by accident. Timber stand improvement is very costly. When we had the accelerated public works program—to my mind the greatest boon to the reservations to come along in recent years—we divided the first round of that money, which was about $12 million I believe, across three activities: timber stand improvement, which is basically a forestation, irrigation, and soil conservation work. Now this is about the first major piece of reforestation to come along since the CCC days of the depression. So we are very far behind.

I asked Commissioner Nash "Why have they not been kindly? This is a resource that will keep these people from poverty."

Mr. Nash replied:

> Well, when the fellows with the sharp pencils and slide rules get to looking at it and they apply the cost-benefit formula, they can't see where the money is going to come back fast enough or in enough quantity and they say, well, this is money which is down the drain. I don't agree with them, but I haven't been successful in persuading them they are wrong.

In this I think that the Bureau of the Budget is wrong. Perhaps timber is a slow growing crop, but is it not also a crop essentially designed to better the economic status of the Indian and is it not also part of the natural resource program of the United States?

Why is it not possible to have Job Corps work for our young people from Indian reservations in this field of reforestation?

Last fall it was my privilege to spend a day on the Quinault Indian Reservation with its tribal members. This was probably one of the most heartwarming and inspiring days I have had for a long time. I had been there in 1960 and it seemed to me that Indian morale and progress was at a depressingly low ebb. The village was neglected—the needs were many.

During the last 4 years it has been my privilege to work with these Indian people through the Bureau of Indian Affairs and our Secretary of Interior and through their own tribal councils and through the Indian peoples themselves. This fall it was a joy to note the progress and I am going to list here some of the outstanding things I saw:

First. Through my efforts and support, a bridge has been constructed with public lands money across the Quinault River enabling these Indians to become a link with the Queets Village which will enable better public health facilities and also enable the tribe to reach forest lands which are a major support for their people.

Second. I visited their school and saw one of the finest elementary schools I have ever visited. A hot lunch program was being conducted by the use of surplus commodities supplemented by the Indians' own fish and game and entirely prepared by the women of the community. The food was excellent, well served, and could well set a pattern of better food standards for the entire tribe.

Third. I visited classrooms and talked with the children. They have a very exciting program there at Taholah where preschooler's are taken in the summer to learn the customs and ways of the school, of other communities and the world around them. This has been most successful and an outstanding member of the tribe, Mrs. Curley is the educational director of the tribe.

Fourth. I visited with their chosen chief, Jim Jackson, who has done so much in leadership on this reservation. I visited their stream clearance program—streams choked with debris for 50 years—logs left by early-day loggers had been cleared so the fish runs might again make their way up through virgin streams into the forests. In cooperation with the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife Service they are operating a fish weir for the development of fish resources which benefit not only the Quinaults, but every person in the Northwest.

Fifth. Beside the road in the reservation, the Quinaults have begun construction of a public campground available for everyone and you will remember that it was this Congress who passed the bill for Cape Elizabeth. This they plan to develop for use by the public.

Sixth. They are building new canoes to be used by tourists along one of the truly beautiful streams of the Nation.

Seventh. The tribal council is working on a housing project.

Eighth. Young people have been picked up around the reservation and put to work planting trees and cleaning up the village.

Here I want to pay a tribute to the accelerated public works program and the area redevelopment program. Both of these operated in this area with outstanding success.

There are many many other phases of this Interior budget on which I could comment today. There are some dismaying aspects, too.

First. There seems at times to be an incredible amount of lack of exchange of information between bureaus. One bureau will approach the committee and ask for more funds that they may develop valuable information. A few days later another bureau will appear and when asked a question such as, "Have you gone to the Geological Survey, for example, on the type of earth formation which would enable more economical construction of buildings?" they would reply, "No, we have not."

We then asked if at the time of location of certain buildings on earthquake lands, the Geological Survey had been consulted, they replied, "We have not."

I think this situation is bettering, but it could stand much greater improvement.

Let us not ever let our bureaus sprawl into a vacuum of inefficiency that can only result in larger costs not only to the Government but to the lives of our people.

I want to compliment the committee for its great attention also to the growing problems of outdoor recreation. This is a field which has grown by leaps and bounds. In 1953 there were 35,403,000 recreation visits to the national forests. In 1964 there were 135 million estimated visits—a 280-percent increase over 1953.

Not only is the U.S. Forest Service a major contributor to jobs, it is a major backlog of timber for the economic welfare of hundreds of communities.

The 11.4 billion board feet of timber expected to be harvested of Forest Service land in 1966 will result in 700,000 man-years of employment. For every one of the $133 million of receipts this timber harvest produces, it is estimated that $24 of value will be added in harvesting, processing, transportation, marketing, and other items.

But it is again, I point out, in the field of outdoor recreation that this forest service will be in years to come of major importance to the people of this Nation.

I want to commend the committee also in continuing its interests in supplying recreation areas to the densely populated sections of our Nation that so desperately need these streams, forests, and the sense of relaxation which they and they alone will bring.

Time is not going to stand still for us and it never will be that way. We must continue to plan, develop, and program for the open spaces of our land.

I want to commend the Forest Service and the committee also for recognizing the work that the Job Corps may provide in our forests—a combined program that brings into focus jobs, living in the outdoors, and development of educational backgrounds needed in today's world.

I have heard the chairman of this committee, Mr. KIRWAN, say over and over, "This is the all-American bill."

It is indeed. It is for the fullest development dedicated to the service of the people of the United States and it is a great pleasure to serve with the distinguished chairman and members of this committee.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, Federal supervision of the Menominee Reservation in my congressional district ceased on April 30, 1961. At that time the Menominee Termination Act of June 17, 1954—Public Law 83-399—went into effect. The transition period since termination has been an extremely difficult one for the citizens of the new Menominee County of Wisconsin.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that the Federal Government, once it legally terminates its responsibility for the welfare of an Indian tribe, can then abruptly wash its hands of the whole affair.

One who is aware of the deplorable experience the Menominees have undergone since termination would conclude that we seem to be more concerned with helping some newly emerging underdeveloped nations in Africa or Asia even though their dependence on a mother country has been legally terminated. Or consider that our Government reportedly offered to give assistance to Communist North Vietnam if certain conditions are met, and ask yourselves if a Communist country like North Vietnam or Yugoslavia should be given priority over the staggering needs of our own citizens in Menominee County. We should first look to our own problems right here at home and try to resolve some of them before curing the ills of the entire world.

Mr. Chairman, last year, the Bureau of Indian Affairs in the Department of the Interior refused to investigate conditions which existed in Menominee County as a result of the termination order published in the Federal Register by Secretary of the Interior Udall on March 31, 1961. Because of the Bureau's refusal to look into this situation and help me expose it to public view, I as a member of the Appropriations Committee, saw to it that instructions were included in the Department of the Interior Appropriations report of 1965 calling for a complete report to be made on the conditions of the Indians in Menominee County. This report on the Menominee Indians was filed with the Appropriations Committee this past month but has not been released to the public.

There may be valid reasons for the refusal to release this report and thus inform the American people of the deplorable conditions that exist in Menominee County partly as a result of the termination order. The reasons for not releasing this report are not very obvious ones to me or to anyone with whom I am in contact on this very important problem. On the other hand, there are certainly some very understandable reasons why some people might insist on covering up this report.

The Appalachia bill was passed by both Houses of the Congress right around the time that this report was completed. Had this report been released, the question would certainly have been raised in some quarters as to why a truly poverty stricken area like Menominee County was not included in the Appalachia bill.

The minority attempted to amend the Appalachia bill so as to exclude areas of prosperity that do not need help and so as to include those areas throughout the country which are most in need of Appalachia type assistance like Menominee County. As is well known, these efforts were overwhelmingly overridden by the majority.

The lack of recognition of real need is painfully obvious in the two major bills that have passed this Congress so far—the Appalachia bill and the education bill which was passed by the House last week. In the education bill, the 10 richest counties in the United States receive about twice as much Federal assistance as the 10 poorest counties. Menominee County and Florence County in my district will get almost nothing thanks to the application of the discriminatory formula for the distribution of funds that is in the administration education bill.

Mr. Chairman, the report of the Bureau of Indian Affairs on the status of the Menominee Indians is shocking as to the conditions which exist in Menominee County and I hope that it will jar enough people so that my efforts in behalf of the Menominee people will gain support.

Because of the delay in releasing this report to the American people, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks, the full text of the report be inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. Chairman, in the very near future, legislation will be introduced by Senator NELSON and me providing for health, education, welfare, and economic development assistance to the people of Menominee County. This is necessary legislation which is needed to alleviate some very real and very deep poverty, sanitation, and education problems in one area of the country that clearly merits Federal assistance. It is my sincere hope that Congress will act favorably on this legislation, and I shall do everything in my power to appraise the Congress of the very real need in this area.

The State of Wisconsin must also act immediately to protect the equity of the Menominee Indian people in their property. If action is not taken by the State, a few sharp operators could very well control their property within another 5 years.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. DENTON. I want to make it clear that the Appropriations Committee has done all it can in this connection. We called for the report. It is strictly a

I was successful in having added to the HEW appropriation bill $117,000 to start this program which the Public Health Service estimates will cost $555,000. This program should be completed and the grant provided in this bill will do this job.

Mr. Chairman, I urge this House to approve my bill, H.R. 4130. I plead with this Congress to support this most needed legislation.

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Laird. I yield.

Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin. I would like very much to associate myself with the views expressed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird]. I think he brought out the salient features which justify this legislation and the action taken.

I would like also, to pay tribute to the untiring efforts of the gentleman from Wisconsin in working with the Menominee Tribe and with the Department of the Interior, with the committees of Congress involved, in helping solve the many minute problems involved in this whole process that culminates in the action we take today. I think this tribe and all the people involved in this matter owe the gentleman from Wisconsin a great debt of gratitude for his untiring service.

Mr. Laird. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. Brown. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Laird. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Brown. I would like to join, if I may, with my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes], in all he has said about the work of my good friend and colleague, Melvin Laird, who happens to represent the Seventh District of Wisconsin, while I represent the Seventh District of Ohio. He as author of this bill and I as a member of the Committee on Rules, have discussed this legislation many times. He has been unceasingly active in his work in behalf of the Indians of his district, and I think all America owes him a debt of gratitude for the job he has done in perfecting this piece of important legislation.

Mr. Laird. I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. Laird. I yield to my colleague from Wisconsin.

Mr. Thomson of Wisconsin. I would like to associate myself with the gentleman from the Seventh District of Wisconsin and commend him for his devoted efforts on behalf of the Menominee Tribe. I would also like to join with the gentleman from Oklahoma and others who expressed their gratitude for the work this committee has done and the understanding way in which they have worked to solve these problems.

I want to say to the committee that the problems of the Indians will not end with the passage of this legislation, but I and other Members have exceedingly high hopes that it may lead to a policy of having an earlier and more extended transition period for other tribes. We in Wisconsin are proud of the record of the Menominees. The Menominee Tribe has an enviable record in the management of its resources, particularly a sustained yield of timber. That timber has been used for 50 years but there is just as much timber there today as there was 50 years ago, due to good forest management. The Menominee Indians and all of us are very hopeful that their transition to full citizenship will be successful. Certain it is that it could not have been without this legislation; and I join with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Byrnes] in commending the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs for this fine work.

Mr. Saylor. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. St. George].

Mrs. St. George. Mr. Chairman, I want to join with my other colleagues in commending our friend from Wisconsin, Mr. Laird, on introducing this very worthy piece of legislation.

The Speaker. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Speaker. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The Speaker. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to lessen the impact of the termination of Federal services to the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to my friend the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to make an observation of my own. I want to join with the gentlewoman from Washington in her comments in the colloquy between her and the gentleman from Wisconsin.

I think we have to be extremely careful when we consider terminating the responsibilty of the Federal Government toward the Indian tribes. We must remember that they were part of another social world different from our own that has come down through hundreds of generations and which goes back according to some archeologists and anthropologists as far back as 15,000 or 20,000 years. We are trying to merge them into present-day society. This is not easy even for fairly well adjusted American citizens in our time. So I am afraid that this Menominee situation that has been brought up by the gentleman from Wisconsin is illustrative of what we are likely to get into. Indians will adjust if we provide the educational opportunities and by the simple process of attrition once they raise themselves up to the level of living commensurate with the world about them, and then there will be no economic and social problem which can be described as a peculiarly Indian problem.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

The report I referred to earlier is as follows:

The Status of the Termination of the Menominee Indian Tribe

(A report to the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Department of the Interior, February 1965)

The House Committee on Appropriations, in its report of March 13, 1964 (88th Cong., 2d sess., H. Rept. 7237), requested that the Bureau of Indian Affairs submit a detailed report in connection with the 1966 estimates as to the status of the termination of the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin. This report has been prepared in response to that request.

Introduction

The trust responsibility of the United States toward the Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin was brought to a close April 30, 1961, by the Menominee Termination Act of June 17, 1954 (Public Law 83-399). Such termination was to have become effective not later than December 31, 1965, according to the original enactment. Prospective difficulties the Menominee would face after termination prompted two postponements of the date. In 1959 the Wisconsin Legislature memorialized Congress to repeal or amend the law so as to continue the trust relationship indefinitely, expressing the opinion that termination was seriously premature. This change of policy was not agreed to by the Congress.

Measures to help the tribe to meet its new and extended responsibilities were considered as the termination date approached. These included two bills to amend the Menominee Termination Act on which hearings were held in April 1961 by the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. One of these would have authorized postponement of termination to a date found by the Secretary of the Interior to be reasonable. The other would have postponed the termination date to 1969 at latest and have authorized the Secretary of the Interior to make loans to the tribe not to exceed $2,500,000 in aggregate amount.

Assistant Secretary Carver, appearing for the Department of the Interior, identified the basic question that made some modification of the Termination Act desirable. In so doing, he also accurately forecast the difficulties that have caused the Appropriations Committee to request the present report.

"The basic premise of termination," Secretary Carver pointed out, "has come to be a question of whether the lumber industry, as presently constituted on the reservation, is big enough to support the Indians."

"Taking this resource in and of itself," he continued, "it is a very attractive operation. But there is a basic difficulty in translating a single industry operation into all the ramifications and complexities of community and Government activities. Furthermore, we don't really have any way to make a direct conversion of one sawmill operation, which is customarily carried on as a private proposition, into full support of an American community. We just don't have any background for that."

In light of this, Secretary Carver emphasized, "everyone seems now agreed that given the present state of the lumber business, and given the present developments or lack of developments of the mill, itself, the proceeds of the mill won't reach all of the needs which will follow on termination."

Five alternatives were open, Mr. Carver thought, in meeting the need recognized by "almost everyone interested in the welfare of the Menominees" for congressional modification of the act in one form or another. Among these alternatives, the Department recommended what Mr. Carver termed "phased extension of termination." This was set forth in the Department's report on the pending bill:

1. Instead of transferring title to all of the tribal property to Menominee Enterprises, Inc., on April 30, 1961, as now required by law, the Secretary might be authorized, if the Congress so desires after hearing from the State and the Indians, to make the transfer at any time prior to April 30, 1965, that he determines is justified. If this were done, the Secretary could be authorized to enter into a contract with Menominee Enterprises, Inc., which gives the corporation full control of the tribal assets and full responsibility for conducting the business enterprises of the tribe, subject to the right of the Secretary to resume control if he determines that there is a need for doing so. Menominee Enterprises, Inc., could proceed immediately to run the mill, test whether the cut can be increased from

22 to 29 million board feet annually, whether the increased cut can be marketed successfully, and how many Indians properly can be employed in a businesslike operation.

If there is to be any continuation of Federal financial assistance beyond 1961 we believe that it should be based upon a continuation of the Federal trust during the period of assistance, and not be in the form of Federal subsidy after a termination of the trust.

2. In order that the proposed new county may be organized and commenced to function, the contract between the Secretary and the Menominee Enterprises, Inc., could require the corporation to contract with the county for a payment in lieu of taxes for the period prior to the date of actual transfer of title to the corporation.

This procedure would allow the Federal Government to retain its basic authority for a transition period of not to exceed 3 years, and to lend a guiding hand if needed. The corporation and the county would be able to assume their responsibilities immediately, however, and start developing the full potentials of the reservation. This department would be in a position to give advice and assistance as needed. If experience shows that the plan is likely to be unsuccessful, title to the reservation would still be in the Federal Government and no irrevocable decision would have been made.

The Congress declined to adopt this recommendation, choosing instead the alternative of permitting termination to proceed on schedule, but providing financial assistance (Public Law 87–432) for a transitional period of 5 years after April 30, 1961, in a total amount of $660,000 for contributions to joint school costs. The law also authorized expenditures of $438,000 by the Public Health Service for construction of sanitation facilities, bringing the total amount of assistance to $1,098,000.

No provision was made for continuing any degree of Federal supervision during the period in which assistance was presumed necessary. No means was made available whereby the Bureau of Indian Affairs would be kept currently informed of developments, much less enabled to assist the new county and corporation in any way during the admittedly difficult years of transition.

It is in the light of this policy decision by the Congress, the decision to make termination complete as of April 30, 1961, and to retain no remnant of the former Federal responsibility toward the Menominees or supervision of their affairs, that this review has been undertaken.

Menominee affairs: Corporation and county: The experience of the Menominees under termination may be examined first of all in terms of the two entities established by State law as successors to the Menominee Indian Tribe. One of these, a State corporation, was Menominee Enterprises, Inc., to which was conveyed all the tribal land that had comprised the reservation, including the Menominee forest and the sawmill upon which the economic future of the Menominees depended. The other was a new county, Wisconsin's 72d, carved from the two counties in which the reservation had been located and with borders identical to those of the reservation.

Menominee Enterprises, Inc.: Following termination, Menominees whose names were on the final tribal roll were no longer joint owners of Indian trust land, but became bondholders and stockholders in Menominee Enterprises, Inc.

The principal business of the company is the production of lumber and pulpwood and this dependence on the forest has been recognized in provisions both of Federal and of State law. These were drawn with view to safeguarding the prime asset represented by the Menominee forest, through promoting timber harvesting on a sustained-yield basis. Section 7 of the Termination Act was amended (Public Law 84–716 of July 14, 1956) to require "protection of the forest on a sustained yield basis" and chapter 258 of the Wisconsin statutes (enacted July 30, 1959) provides that a forest required by Federal law to be operated on such basis shall have a fair market value, for tax purposes, equivalent to 40 percent of what it would otherwise be.

Total income of Menominee Enterprises, virtually all derived from sales of lumber and forest products, increased from $2,941,000 in the year ending September 30, 1962, to $3,686,000 in 1964. Net operating income increased from $642,000 in 1962 to $692,000 in 1964. The following table discloses rather clearly that, as an operating business, the company has justified the confidence the Menominees had in it. They may well still regard it, in Secretary Carver's words, as "a very attractive operation."

It must be understood, of course, that the information set forth here has been obtained from the published reports of Menominee Enterprises, Inc., supplemented by explanatory detail supplied by company officials. Lacking the sort of continuing close relationship to the corporation that would have prevailed under the plan recommended by the Department, we can bring to the task no special knowledge or familiarity with the situation that has developed since 1961.

[In thousands of dollars]

	1961[1]	1962	1963	1964
Net sales of lumber and forest products	(833)	2,802	3,365	3,596
All other income	(158)	139	153	90
Total income	(991)	2,941	3,518	3,686
Less costs and expenses	(779)	2,299	2,944	2,994
Net operating income	(212)	642	574	692
Less property taxes	(165)	306	233	332
Net profit	(48)	336	341	360
Bond interest payable	(164)	392	386	381
Excess of available earnings over bond interest payable[2]	(-116)	-56	-45	-22

[1] 5 months.

[2] Deficit met out of surplus.

NOTE.—Due to rounding, figures may not add to totals.

Source: Menominee Enterprises, Inc., annual reports.

Appraisal of operating performance: The corporation's bonds were created to represent the capital value of the annual stumpage payments formerly paid, on a per capita basis, to members of the tribe. Accordingly, they were made income bonds, the annual interest approximating in amount the former stumpage payments. Before payment of interest on the income bonds, net profit has improved each year since 1961.

Similarly, it must be borne in mind that 90 percent or more of the annual taxes levied by Menominee County is paid by the company. These comprise State, county, town, and school district taxes, which in Wisconsin are separate items in the total levied and collected by the county. Property taxes have never amounted to less than 40 percent of net operating income and in 1964 absorbed 48 percent. Net operating income amounted that year, before taxes, to 3.5 percent of the combined total of stockholders' equity and outstanding bonds, all of which had been issued to stockholders.

The first full year of operation was the 12-month period ending September 30, 1962. Since then, although adversely affected by market conditions in 1963 and a 6-week shutdown for major repairs in 1964, sales have expanded with the increase in cut of sawtimber and pulpwood. For many years the timber cut had been limited, under the sustained-yield principle, to 20 million board feet a year. Reappraisal of the forest led in 1961 to revision of the limit to 30 million board feet. By 1964 the cut had been increased to 28.9 million board feet and 29 million board feet is expected to be cut in 1965. New attention has been given to production of pulpwood, and pulp and byproducts output has been more than trebled since 1962. The management reports continuing introduction of more efficient methods and exploration of specialized markets, with prospect of further improvement in sales and net operating income at maximum cutting volume.

The increase of sales and net operating income has been modest but well sustained through the difficult initial years. The result is that, despite the heavy burden of local taxation, the need to draw upon surplus to meet bond interest has declined each year, from $56,000 in 1962 to $22,000 in 1964. These charges, totaling $239,000 in 4 years (including $116,000 in 1961), have reduced surplus to $864,000. Despite diminishing deficits since 1962, the prospect for ending this annual drain on surplus must be viewed skeptically in light of recent information that the company's 1965 tax bill, through September 30, is about $395,000, or $63,000 higher than for 1964.

Modernization and stabilized employment: The new corporation promptly entered upon a program of modernization and capital improvement involving a gross sum of about $1.5 million. This was financed largely from the tribal mill's cash balance, to which the corporation had succeeded and which totaled $1,750,000 as of September 30, 1961. The results show in a sharp increase in the asset value (depreciated) of plant and equipment from $498,000 in 1961 to $1,667,000 in 1963 and $1,772,000 in 1964. This increase of nearly $1.3 million in 3 years has been accompanied by regularization of mill employment, on two shifts at all times. Total employment, including supervisors, is currently about 230 and seasonal variation has been eliminated from employment in the mill itself. Work in the woods—logging of sawtimber and cutting of pulpwood—performed under contract, provides additional employment for 65 to 130, according to the season.

Peak employment, about 365, is about 10 percent less than that of 410 reported before termination. Meanwhile the minimum hourly wage paid mill employees increased by 13 percent and the average by 16 percent (from $1.50 to $1.74) between 1961 and 1964. Annual payroll (including contract logging and pulping) has increased to $1,870,000—about 15 percent higher than in 1964 and more than this above pretermination levels.

Capital requirements: The relatively satisfactory current operation of the mill must not be permitted to obscure the fact, looking to the future, that the drain of taxes eliminates the possibility of financing further modernization out of income. Moreover, no further capital improvement can be financed out of cash, which has now been drawn down to minimum operating level. In addition to the lumber operation, the corporation is responsible for the management and development of all the land of the county except that occupied by homesites. This, too, calls for capital, which is not easily attracted by potential over a 40-year development period.

Management: Since its establishment in 1961, Menominee Enterprises, Inc., has experienced its share of administrative difficulties, seriously accentuated by the fact that the stockholders, most of them residents and thus eyewitnesses to operations, have for the most part been as unfamiliar with corporation practices as they were accustomed to those long characteristic of the tribal mill enterprise. These early years have been marked, moreover, by two changes in top management. The fact that so satisfactory an operating record has been achieved despite such initial difficulties suggests that as a business—the impact of property taxes on profit being recognized as wholly abnormal—the company has been basically well managed. The company's third president was secretary-treasurer prior to taking office April 1, 1964. He appears to have both the full support of the board of directors and much better standing than his predecessors among Menominees critical of the new and, as they term it, "outside" management of the "tribal mill."

Menominee County: Upon its creation May 1, 1961, Menominee County, population about 2,500, automatically went to the bottom of the list of Wisconsin counties, in the company of Florence (the only other county with fewer than 5,000 residents) and 6 others with population of less than 10,000 each. Its assessed valuation for tax purposes was $16.7 million in 1962, which made it at the time the second lowest county in assessed value. Only 14 others of the 72 had valuations below $50 million.

Special statutory provisions: It was full awarness of these and other related basic disadvantages under which the new county would operate that led the legislature to include in the law creating Menominee County several provisions which, if not without individual precedent, constitute a wholly unique combination. In general, they provide for the combination of county and town boards, for the consolidation of certain town and county officials, and for the inclusion of Menominee County in the court and school systems of adjacent Shawano County.

Through these extraordinary provisions, the State legislature, recognizing the impossibility of expecting so small and poor a county to establish and support a full structure of county and town government, sought to relieve it of any avoidable burden of costs of government. The law provides, in addition, for review of the new county's experience by the legislature at the end of 4 years and again at the end of 8 years, so that the adequacy of such provisions as these and, more broadly, the wisdom and feasibility of establishing a separate county may be reexamined as a matter of statutory prescription. The first such review is accordingly due this year, 1965.

Demands on local government: The burden of local government has indeed proved fully as serious as the State legislature had feared and as the Department of the Interior had indicated as probable. Net schools costs, financed by the school district tax, have mounted steadily and substantially, as Federal assistance has been reduced each succeeding year. Costs of the treatment of tuberculosis patients and those of public assistance under the Social Security Act and related welfare administration have also mounted rapidly. To meet these latter expenses, financed by the county tax, that tax was forced up to its statutory limit (17 mills per dollar of assessed value) in 1963 and 1964 (for the budget of 1964 and 1965, respectively). A further increase in the school district tax will be necessary next year because Federal assistance will again be reduced, and in fact is scheduled to end with 1966 payment. The following table summarizes tax and budget developments since 1962:

[In thousands of dollars]

	1962	1963	1964 estimate	1965 budget	Change, 1962-65
Total taxes collected by Menominee County	296.7	316.5	450.1	502.6	+205.9
Cost to Menominee County of—					
Schools	.8	44.1	114.6	161.0	+160.2
Sanatorium treatment	.3	12.4	68.8	76.1	+75.8
Public assistance (social security)	14.7	16.2	22.7	40.4	+25.7
Welfare administration	8.4	9.1	12.1	31.0	+22.6
Total	24.3	81.7	218.2	308.5	+284.2
Taxes required for all other purposes	272.4	234.8	231.9	194.1	−78.3

NOTE.—Due to rounding, decimals may not add to totals.

Source: Wisconsin Department of Public Welfare and Menominee County.

The change in the combined tax levy of Menominee County (State, county, town, and school district taxes) between 1962 and 1965 is $206 million. Of this total, 78 percent is accounted for by the $160,000 increase in the school district tax. Of this $160,000, however, only $28,000 is due to the actual increase in the costs of the school district; the balance, of $132,000 (64 percent of the total tax increase), has resulted from the reduction of Federal assistance, from $220,000 in 1962 to $88,000 in 1965.

The second largest increase is that of $76,000 in the cost of sanatorium treatment, which has resulted from a high incidence of tuberculosis. The increase in the cost of public assistance is concentrated in aid to families with dependent children, which increased by $23,800 between 1962 and 1965.

The importance of the continuing reduction in Federal assistance may be illustrated by the fact that if there were no such payments in 1965, additional taxes of $88,000 would be required. This would add 15.5 percent to the total tax bill and would bring the total tax rate (all four taxes combined) to approximately 35 mills, more than double the statutory limit on the county tax iself. Current comparisons are not available, but last year the average combined rate for the entire State was 27.32 mills, as compared with the rate of 29.77 mills levied by Menominee County for 1965.

State assistance: Under Wisconsin law, State aids reduce the cost to the counties of a number of programs that the counties administer. There are also taxes that the State collects, but shares with the counties according to statutory formula. The budget of Menominee County, shown in summary form in the table above, has been presented in net terms, after receipts of such State contributions. In addition to these statutory contributions to meeting the cost of programs administered by the county, two grants were received by Menominee County in 1964. The first of these, in the amount of $17,525, was made under a provision of the statutes (sec. 49.39) authorizing the State also to pay the county's share of welfare costs in cases where the county is unable to do so. When, in 1963, Menominee County raised its county tax to the statutory limit, the way was opened to apply for this form of additional State assistance to cover welfare items totaling $34,838.

The other grant was made under a special if not unprecedented appropriation by the legislature. Amounting to $80,000, this grant was justified in terms of the extraordinary level of tuberculosis treatment required for Menominee County residents. Its payment had the immediate effect, however, of increasing the balance in the general fund, in light of which the department of public welfare found itself obliged to withhold payment of welfare costs beyond the $17,525 already paid.

The general fund is the central one used by Wisconsin counties in their financing of local government. The balance in the fund usually is represented largely by cash and fluctuates with the ebb and flow of receipts and expenditures. During 1964, Menominee County's general fund balance increased to a total of $120,000, or somewhat more (the audit is not yet completed); this was equivalent to 4 months' requirements or so (school costs being funded separately). In light of this fact, the department of public welfare recently denied the county's request for a grant of $76,000 under section 49.39 for the 1965 budget. To fund 1965 requirements, $99,000 has been needed in addition to the maximum taxes that can be levied under the statutory limit of 17 mills. This amount has been appropriated from the general fund; thus, the balance is expected to be reduced to an acceptably modest level by the end of 1965.

A third measure of State assistance vastly overshadows these two grants, but it is one extended to individual Menominees, not to the county. This is the unprecedented special fund of $1 million for direct welfare grants and loans by the State itself, which is discussed in the following section.

Urgent need of extraordinary measures: Two facts dominate the county's immediate financial outlook. One is the fact that $99,000 of 1965 requirements is being financed outside the county tax limit, through drawing the general fund balance down to an operating minimum. The other is the fact of a final reduction of $44,000 in Federal assistance. In combination, these spell additional requirements of about $140,000 as a minimum to be expected in 1966, on top of a tax increase of $52,000 in 1965. Nearly $100,000 of the 1966 increase would have to be financed through the general fund but outside the statutory limit of the county tax. Only part of this amount will represent welfare costs. Thus, even assuming favorable action by the department of public welfare on the county's next application under section 49.39, it is apparent that other extraordinary measures will be needed to avert a result disastrous to both Menominee County and Menominee Enterprises.

Corporation and county experience:

This section, dealing with the administration of Menominee affairs, has highlighted the facts about an industrial enterprise that is achieving steady if modest success, quite in line with early expectations, although gravely handicapped with respect to future growth. It has described a county that has experienced markedly rising demands for the services formerly provided by the Federal Government, entailing difficulties of precisely the sort foreseen in 1961.

These are demands that have brought the county to budgets already exceeding its statutory taxing capacity. They have imposed a tax burden upon the business corporation that, without special relief, will become intolerable next year.

Of the total increase in taxation since 1962, moreover, 64 percent has resulted directly from the need to replace Federal assistance in meeting county school costs, which is being reduced $44,000 each year. One could hardly imagine a set of consequences that more clearly confirms the unwisdom of saddling full responsibility for local government services upon a small and poor community almost entirely dependent upon a single industry of modest scale and profitability.

The Menominee people since termination:

We turn now from the business and governmental machinery that came into operation May 1, 1961, to serve the needs of the Menominees, and consider instead what their situation is nearly 4 years after termination.

The term, "pockets of poverty," has come into general use only since 1961. It is trenchantly and accurately descriptive of a sorry phenomenon of modern American life. Menominee County is a "pocket of poverty." It was such a pocket prior to 1961, it has continued to be a pocket of poverty these past 4 years, and unless very substantial assistance is provided it has no prospect of becoming anything better in the foreseeable future.

In July 1959 the Wisconsin Legislature memorialized Congress to postpone termination "until such time as the Menominee Indian Tribe has achieved a status comparable and equal to the average citizen of the environs in which they live." It was recognition that the Menominees were far below such equality with their neighbors in the State that underlay both the reluctance of the legislature to accept termination and the special provisions that it incorporated in the law creating the new county.

Smallest and poorest county: Menominee County has already been identified as having the smallest population and the second lowest property value of any county in the State. It is also at or near the bottom of the list in terms of average income, of housing, of education, and of sanitation and health. In terms of unemployment and dependence on public assistance its people are at the top of the list.

Low income: Median income in 1959 of Indians living in the Menominee area was reported by the 1960 Census at "less than $1,000." For none of Wisconsin's 71 counties, including both Oconto and Shawano, within whose boundaries the reservation lay, was the comparable figure as low as $2,000. Median family income for the State was reported as $5,926 for 1959. The figure for the subdivisions now comprising Menominee County was $2,638, less than half the State average.

In 1964, a health survey conducted by the State medical society included 382 employees of Menominee Enterprises and 38 of Menominee County (virtually complete coverage in each case). This total of 420 was about 60 percent of the county labor force and included those with highest incomes. Average income of full-time employees was $3,760 at the company and $3,700 in county employment. Part-time corporation employees averaged about $1,100. Average income for all 420 employees was $2,677, a figure that suggests no significant improvement over the 1959 median family income of $2,638 for the total county population. Median family income falling below $3,000—and even further below a level reflecting the needs of the large families that are characteristic of Menominee County—means that more than half the families suffer deprivation and impoverishment.

High unemployment: Through the period since 1961 unemployment has been very serious, running three and four times as high, in percentage terms, as in the State as a whole. In 1963 the county rate was 13.6 percent when the State average was 4.0. In 1964 the corresponding rates were 18.1 and 3.7 percent.

Large families: The State medical society's survey included a total of 2,536 individuals in the 496 families that were identified and interviewed. Large families were found to be the rule, reflecting the birth rate of 43.4, far above the State average of 25. Total children reported, all ages, were 2,491, an average of 5 per family. Of the 496 families, more than half (311) had 4 or more children and 50 had 10 or more children each. (Plainly, 2,491 children in a population of 2,526 means double counting, children in one family being parents in others.)

The population was found to have an unusually high proportion (57.4 percent) under the age of 20 and a low proportion aged 65 and over (4.6 percent). The corresponding State proportions in 1960 were 40 and 10 percent, respectively. Treating the youngest and oldest members of the population as dependent upon those aged 20 through 64, this indicates a dependency ratio of 1.6-to-1 rather than the 1-to-1 ratio characteristic of the State as a whole.

Substandard education: The 1960 Census reported the median years of school completed by the Menominee area Indian population aged 14 and older, as 8.3 years. The corresponding median for the rural nonfarm population of Wisconsin was 9.9 years. This difference of 1.6 years is equivalent to 1 of 3 semesters for everyone, or of more than 7 semesters (bringing the average up through high school) for nearly half of the total population.

Among Menominee residents 25 years of age and older, only one-fourth had attended school beyond the eighth grade; among all nonfarm rural residents of Wisconsin, this proportion was a full one-half. The state of education of the Menominee County population accordingly constitutes a serious handicap to individual and community progress.

The facts covering dropouts do not encourage hope of future improvement. Of 33 pupils enrolled as high school freshmen in 1950, the health survey found that 17 dropped out before graduation, a dropout rate of 51.5 percent. The State department of administration reports a finding that, of 80 Menominee students who enrolled as freshmen in 1960, 37 dropped out before 1964 graduation—a rate of 46 percent. Dropout rates at this level must be regarded as presenting a serious educational problem.

Critically substandard housing: Housing, the State medical society found to be extremely poor, one of the critical problems in the county, characterized by half again as many people per household as the State average; average value of houses in one of the two villages only $4,000; less than one-third of all units in the county in sound condition; one-third in deteriorated condition; and one-third dilapidated.

Poor health: The central focus of the State medical society's survey was, of course, the health conditions in the county. The findings with respect to major health illnesses were summarized as follows:

It was found that diabetes, tuberculosis, and heart disease occur most frequently. An intensive tuberculosis case finding program has resulted in bringing many patients to treatment at an early stage of the disease. Treatment facilities and services are highly adequate. A frequent problem related to the high incidence of diabetes is the relatively high proportion of patients who are not under regular medical supervision. A more intensive type of supervision and instruction of patients in the home seem indicated.

With respect to sanitation: The sanitation in the county is inadequate, with only about one-half the homes having running water and indoor toilets. Many homes do not have wells on the premises.

Alcoholism: Excessive drinking constitutes one of the most destructive elements in family life. Workers who are very familiar with the families estimate that there are 113 problem drinkers among the 496 families in the county. In 11 of the families more than one member has a drinking problem. Twenty-one individuals have been committed to an institution because of drinking; 12 of these have been committed repeatedly. A distressing number of the heavy drinking occurs among mothers which makes the problem especially devastating. There is no organized program in the county to combat or alleviate this problem.

Infant health: "There is a high birth rate, almost double for that of the State and a proportionately high infant death rate combined with low economic status and many families. Since pneumonia, upper respiratory infections and gastrointestinal conditions were among the frequent causes, it may be inferred that unfavorable environmental conditions were a contributing factor."

Because it is so sparsely populated, it is doubtful whether Menominee County could justify establishment there of a hospital meeting modern standards, quite apart from the matter of financial ability to support one. Prior to termination there had been a hospital at Keshena, supported by the tribe and operated by a religious order. It was not a facility of the Division of Indian Health, Public Health Service, and its closing was not part of the withdrawal of Federal service. The circumstances were that, with the advent of State supervision, the hospital was found to be far below public health standards. Its closing, coincidentally with termination of the Federal trust, has understandably caused this loss to be included in complaints about the effects of termination, with that of the services formerly provided by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The medical society, reporting on this aspect of the situation, had this to say: "A rather drastic change in the availability of hospital and medical care occurred when the tribally operated hospital was closed and medical practice in the county was discontinued. At present, medical and hospital care is secured in neighboring communities: Shawano, Gresham, Antigo, and Green Bay. A considerable number of patients are cared for at university hospitals and the veterans facilities.

"Questions about difficulty in obtaining medical care often gave rise to laments about the closing of the Keshena hospital. In exploring this feeling it appeared that the hospital represented to many people a sort of security and status symbol and this, more than serious difficulty experienced in obtaining medical care, caused their regrets. These people had been able to go to the hospital for aspirin, cough medicine, bandages, etc., when they needed them. In wishing for their own "free" hospital these people often do not understand that the cost to the county and to them in taxes of operating a hospital for 2,500 people would be prohibitive."

Concerning the matter of financing medical care, the report observed: "As might be expected, the most pressing problems encountered in regard to hospital and medical care has to do with finances. At the time of the survey, 71 out of 496 families reported that they were receiving welfare and 69 families received social security payments. Of the families surveyed, 201 were covered by some type of hospital and medical insurance. The two types of insurance most frequently reported were provided by either Menominee Enterprises, Inc., or the County Employees Insurance. The insurance programs do not include medical care outside of the hospital, medicines, and other costs frequently associated with illness."

Dependence on welfare: The people of Menominee County receive public assistance almost entirely under the Social Security Act, through the county welfare department. General assistance, provided by the town of Menomonie, has continued at less than $20,000 a year throughout the period. Public assistance, as already noted, has increased substantially in the county budget year by year. In July 1964 analysis disclosed that 14 percent of the population of Menominee County was receiving public assistance, in contrast to an average of 2.6 percent for the State as a whole. If account is taken of the extra welfare grants and the loans for welfare purposes made by the State under special legislation (discussed below), the proportion of the Menominee County population receiving public assistance last July is increased to 45 percent, a situation without parallel in the State. Additional welfare grants and loans have been made since July which have increased this percentage an undetermined further amount.

Bonds pledged to meet welfare needs: The foregoing description of economic and social conditions in Menominee County is by no means exhaustive. It does make clear, however, that the Menominee people are living under conditions of extreme poverty. The starkness of these conditions is further illustrated by the extent to which Menominees have been forced into pledging their income bonds in order to meet urgent cash requirements.

In December 1963, at the end of which month the income bonds of Menominee Enterprises, Inc., became negotiable, the Wisconsin Legislature established a special fund of $1 million, to be administrated by the State department of public welfare, for benefit of the Menominees. Grants and loans for welfare purposes may be made from this fund on the basis of pledged Menominee income bonds. These are the payments referred to above in connection with the high percentage of the county population receiving public assistance of one form or another. As of the end of 1964, this fund was drawn down to less than $200,000, with early exhaustion in prospect.

The Menominee income bonds have par value of $3,000, and the outstanding amount is in excess of $9½ million. Menominee Enterprises, Inc., has first option to buy any that may be offered for sale. The cash position of the company has precluded any purchase since the bonds became negotiable January 1, 1964. The State investment board is empowered to exercise second option, but has decided not to purchase at more than 70 percent of par value, or $2,300. As security for welfare grants or loans, however, the bonds are accepted at par value.

This means, of course, that the neediest Menominees have the privilege of exhausting the full face value of their bonds in meeting extraordinary welfare requirements, while those who are less pressed may retain theirs as a modest source of income. A typical family may have a combined income of $720 or $840 a year from bonds issued to tribal members, but it is families of this size and larger that are most likely to need additional cash and thus to be forced into pledging their bonds.

Early in 1964 it was charged that in administering the newly established fund the State Department of Public Welfare was becoming a "collection agency for medical expenses and old debts." In the ensuing discussion, the deputy director of that department was quoted in the press as saying: "A million dollars isn't even going to scratch the surface. If we wanted to build proper housing and do all the other things we should do for these people, we would need $10 to $20 million."

The assemblymen from the district, observing that the program did not permit bonds to be pledged for loans to construct homes, added: "How can you ever get ahead of the health problems when you have nine kids and their parents living in two or three rooms?"

Termination and public opinion:

The effect of these circumstances and the impact of developments since 1961 on the people of the county cannot be simply characterized. Some Menominees seem to be as demoralized as any poverty-stricken people anywhere. Others, far from demoralized, are highly and vocally indignant, leveling criticism and accusations at all public authorities, Federal, State, and local, and at the management of Menominee Enterprises. There is widespread misunderstanding of the nature of corporate ownership; the Menominee view of land ownership is as tribal today as it ever was before termination. Consequently, protests are heard against the need to give up income bonds in payment for homesites that are regarded as already the family's share of tribal land.

Those who are fortunate enough to have steady employment with the company or the county are naturally more optimistic about the future than many others. Prior to termination, before the business functions of the tribe were separated from its service functions, there was a tendency to maximize mill employment rather than profit. Consequently, there is evidence of bitterness among Menominees who, before termination, were on the payroll but since then have been found unqualified for employment. The officials of the company and other leaders close to its operations maintain their basic confidence in the long-term potential but are soberly realistic about short-term hazards.

A sizable number of Menominees persist in the view not only that termination was unwise, but that it was forced upon the tribe without full discussion or understanding, and that it constitutes a gross violation of treaty rights. The highly vocal exponents of these views are few in number but such opinions may be shared by a substantial number who do not attend public discussions or who remain silent. A related viewpoint is that termination may have been technically legal, but that the Federal Government cut off its services too abruptly and before all appropriate Federal investment in community facilities had been completed.

In April 1964 a petition for repeal of the Menominee Termination Act was addressed to the Congress carrying signatures of 788 persons identifying themselves as Menominee Indians. A duplicate set was sent to the President and receipt was acknowledged by the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The signatures numbered more than one-fifth the total on the final tribal membership roll.

Strong protests against termination and the way it came about were voiced at meetings held by direction of the Governor in Madison on July 27 and August 6, 1964, and again at hearings conducted by the State department of administration in Menominee County during the last week in September. At the Governor's invitation, Bureau representatives attended these meetings and hearings as observers.

Proposals for action:

At the July 27 meeting, the Governor announced a Menominee action program under which each of 13 departments and agencies of the State was assigned responsibility in a general attack on "the severe economic, educational, and health problems of Menominee County." This program represented a broad move by the executive branch to deal with the situation, the seriousness of which had been acknowledged by the legislature in its action in December 1963 establishing the million-dollar Menominee fund.

By mid-September the State agencies were able to report a very impressive list of actions taken or planned. Many of the more significant steps would require additional funds, and these were included in a request submitted by the State on behalf of Menominee County to the Office of Economic Opportunity, totaling $1,600,000.

Education: The proposals of the department of public instruction were numerous and varied, indicative of the very great need for improvement in education in Menominee County. These included measures to be undertaken jointly with the department of public welfare in dealing with the dropout problem. Reportedly, these plans have been reworked and perfected since September, with active participation of Shawano County school officials, the University of Wisconsin, and the Wisconsin State University—Stevens Point.

Industrial development: A disappointing aspect of the Governor's program lay in the finding by the department of resource development with respect to the prospect for industrial and commercial development in the county apart from the Menominee enterprise itself. The conclusion reached was that such development was most unlikely because of a number of factors:

1. The county lacks a minimum of services to attract industry and commercial enterprises.

2. It is very doubtful if the communities in the county can support even the minimum of commercial enterprises.

3. There are no good housing areas where industry or business management could live without residing outside of the county.

4. Capital from non-Government sources is not available.

5. Although there is much evidence to the contrary, the area does not have a good worker dependability reputation. Such a reputation, although unfounded, must be recognized since it tends to adversely effect industrialization.

6. There are not many, if any, available buildings for commercial or industrial development.

7. The established trading centers surrounding the county are close enough to attract the county residents and unless the communities in the county develop a diversity of services and a local buying attitude the services will have difficulty surviving.

8. Local leadership for commercial and industrial development is lacking in enough experience and depth.

Development of recreation:

Additional industry in the county is probably a questionable prospect under any circumstances, but commercial and recreational development, including the lease-sale of sites for summer and year-round homes, has from the outset been envisaged as an important means of supplementing earnings from the mill, increasing the tax base, and lessening dependence on Menominee Enterprises as virtually sole taxpayer. Through September 1964 a total of 75 lease-purchase agreements were reported, with about 20 new homes in place at average value of $12,500. As a part of such a program, the company has responded with a counter offer to the proposal by the State department of conservation to establish a State park in Menominee County.

Under the company's proposed modification, the park would not embrace all the county except for home and business sites, but would instead be limited to about 2,200 of the county's 234,000 acres. The area described is believed by the company to have a potential developed value of nearly $15 million. Such development is regarded as a 40-year process, however. For use as a State park, the company has proposed a 40-year lease-purchase price of $6.5 million.

Recurrent proposals that part or all of Menominee County be made a State park have aroused much vocal opposition. It became apparent at the hearings in September 1964 that there is deep minority opposition to any intrusion by "outsiders" into the "reservation," as such Menominees continue to call the county. According to the company, the conservation department has given assurances that it will not use its power of condemnation to acquire Menominee land for park purposes.

The company's proposal would entail establishment of a trust fund into which annual payments under the lease-purchase agreement would be paid, such fund to be used to retire bonds and stock of Menominee Enterprises, Inc. (including possible repurchase of bonds now encumbered by the department of public welfare) and to pay interest and dividends. The park itself, in the company's view, could "complement other development necessary in Menominee County, for the benefit of all concerned."

CONCLUSION

The foregoing review of developments in Menominee County since termination of the Federal trust in 1961 makes clear how ill-advised were the terms on which the Menominees were deprived of Federal services and supervision. The need for remedial action, by the State or Federal Government, or both, cannot be denied in light of the stark facts concerning the county, with its mounting budget, and the corporation, with its struggle to finance most of that budget and yet keep its head above water.

The Menominee Termination Act is explicit that, upon termination, members of the tribe shall not be entitled to any of the services performed by the United States for Indians because of their status as Indians, all statutes of the United States which affect Indians because of their status as Indians shall no longer be applicable to the members of the tribe, and the laws of the several States shall apply to the tribe and its members in the same manner as they apply to other citizens or persons within their jurisdiction. (Sec. 10.)

In light of this language, the Bureau has had no programs in operation in Menominee County since May 1, 1961, and has no authorization for appropriations to be used in that county. This is not well understood among the Menominees, many of whom are ready to take any evidence of official interest in their situation as an indication that the Bureau is in standby status under a Federal trust responsibility that is only temporarily suspended. This became evident in the course of the meetings and hearings where the Bureau was represented by observers.

The Department of the Interior sees no alternative to combined State and Federal support of the county and its people, who are in desperate circumstances. Continuation of the present trend will threaten the existence of the corporation and lead to decline of county services, to the detriment of the Menominee people and their non-Indian neighbors in Wisconsin. To stand idly by and watch the further growth of such a pocket of poverty is unthinkable.

The State of Wisconsin has been generous in its aid to Menominee County. Federal aid was small and was established on a declining basis; it is now approaching the vanishing point. In our opinion, Federal assistance should be reestablished, in such categories and such amounts as are commensurate with Menominee County's needs. There are two methods by which this may be done.

Grants-in-aid may be provided through new authorizations and appropriations to the Department of the Interior for the use and benefits of Menominee County. If this method should be followed, it would require amendment of the Menominee Termination Act or it would constitute a precedent-setting departure from the principle of trusteeship, which has hitherto governed the conduct of Indian affairs.

Alternatively, the Congress may authorize and appropriate similar amounts to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, to be transferred to the State of Wisconsin for aids to Menominee County.

The responsibility for initiating action to determine what measures are required to meet the urgent Menominee situation is shared by officials of the State of Wisconsin and Menominee County and officers of Menominee Enterprises, Inc. In light of the facts the Bureau's review has disclosed, we are confident that full examination by appropriate legislative committees will amply corroborate these general conclusions and permit appropriate and adequate measures to be drafted for enactment into law. The Department of the Interior will be ready at all times to respond to requests for recommendations with respect to such legislation as may be proposed.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATTIN. Mr. Chairman, in the bill, H.R. 6767, making appropriations for the Department of Interior and related agencies, I had hoped there would be included funds for a Forest Sciences Laboratory at Missoula, Mont.

In the fiscal year 1964 appropriations for the Forest Service, an amount of $28,500 was allowed for planning and architecture for such a laboratory to be built on the Montana State University campus in conjunction with a new school of forestry the university itself plans to build this year.

The money appropriated has been spent on engineering and plans for the laboratory, the university has provided a site adjacent to the new school of forestry on which construction will begin very shortly and, I believe the Forest Service could and would immediately begin construction of the Forestry Sciences Laboratory if the estimated cost of $425,000 was made available.

An expanding program of forestry research in Montana and the Northwest is of unquestioned importance to the State and the Nation. The need for more intensive and extensive investigations in forestry and the wood-using industries is particularly pressing in western Montana, where much of the economy is forest based. This need has been recognized for some time, and there have been a number of preliminary developments, including the recent increase in State appropriations for the experiment station and grant funds to the State universities under the Federal McIntire-Stennis program.

The cooperative effort of the Forest Service and Montana State University to further strengthen the forestry research program in Montana requires the primary implementation of a new laboratory facility, for which reason I emphasize the urgency of completing the planned Forest Service Research Laboratory as soon as possible.

I am hopeful that the other body will add the amount of $425,000 to this bill for constructing this much-needed facility and that this body will support such an amendment when it comes back here.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MARSH].

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

First, it has been a pleasure to serve on the committee that has had such distinguished leadership as the former chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. KIRWAN], and that of the present chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. DENTON]. Under their direction with the assistance of my very able colleagues on both sides of the aisle and the highly qualified staff, a new member of the subcommittee such as myself found many sources of help and information.

It is interesting to note that the total appropriation which we consider today of about $1,045 million is barely above 1 percent of the total Federal budget, or worded another way, approximately 1 cent out of every tax dollar goes into the capital investment of America.

In many ways, the forces of the demographic, communication, and technological revolutions come to a focus in the responsibility of the Department of the Interior. I think it might be said that the resort of American citizens to public lands for recreational purposes might be one of the phenomena of the last decade.

It was my good fortune to have served on the committee chaired by that distinguished gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, which gave me some background of experience whereby I did not find the problems confronting the subcommittee on which I now serve to be entirely new.

However, my short service on the present committee, and in listening to the statements of officials of the Department of Interior, reaffirmed for me the tremendous impact on existing facilities of the national parks and the national forests caused by rapidly increasing visitations by the American public. This increase in visitations in many instances has exceeded the projections and estimates. The sheer numbers involved are staggering to contemplate.

Advances in transportation, increased leisure time brought about by the 40-hour week, vacations with pay and forward-looking retirement programs have caused the vacationing American to look to American public lands for recreational pursuits.

Almost without exception, national parks and national forests authorities testified to the overcrowded campgrounds and existing facilites, including those that are absolutely necessary from the standpoint of health and sanitation. In some instances, individuals who have traveled great distances across the country have had to be denied access to camping areas because they were filled to capacity. To admit additional campers would create health and safety hazards.

I believe that testimony developed in the hearings will confirm that thus far we are not meeting the demand of these visitors but what is even worse are dropping behind projected estimates of visitations in the years ahead.

It is interesting to note that uses of the public lands for recreational purposes are undergoing a very perceptible change in that there is a broadening of activities whereby in addition to the traditional uses of picknicking, camping, and hiking, we find in recent years increased demand in the field of water sports, such as boating, and winter sports, such as skiing.

With the rapid urbanization of our society, the demand on the public lands for recreational purposes will increase in direct proportion to the growth of our urban communities and our population increase. Therefore, it is quite necessary to plan and provide for the development of our public land resources to meet this increasing human need.

We are very fortunate that we have in the Department of Interior some of the finest career people in the entire Government service where there has been developed an expertise and leadership in the broad cross section of areas affecting our natural resources ranging from our island territories to such questions as mining, metallurgy, and water resources research.

I support H.R. 6767 and recommend its passage by the membership of this House.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Ullman].

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this time to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Denton], and each member of the subcommittee.

This subcommittee has a responsibility for the stewardship of our great land, forest, mineral, and wildlife resources.

Since I come from a disttrict which is more than 60-percent owned by the Federal Government, coming under the jurisdiction of this subcommittee, I believe I realize better than most the great responsibility we have to wisely conserve, to develop, and to properly manage these great resources if they are to be maintained adequately for future generations.

Again, I congratulate the subcommittee.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. Olsen].

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the subcommittee, and particularly the gentleman from Indiana, Chairman Denton, for a splendid job.

I should like to point out that, as usual, this subcommittee is looking after its obligation to provide adequate appropriations for the opening up and proper development of the West. This is still the subcommittee which looks after the reclamation States of the West, and is doing a good job. I believe they have done exceedingly well by our Indian population. I hope that in the future they will continue, as they have in the past, to take care of this trusteeship.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and rise in general support of H.R. 6767, a bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. However, I should like to express my keen disappointment over the fact that the Committee on Appropriations has seen fit to recommend the deletion of the $3,114,000 requested by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife for the acquisition of 19,000 acres for wildlife habitat refuges for various endangered species of birds.

Included in such sum was the budgetary allotment of $150,000 for the acquisition of land to provide habitats for rare Hawaiian birds. Of the several disappearing species in Hawaii, the nene goose is perhaps the most outstanding. The sentimental value attached to the nene goose goes back into folklore and the traditions and mythology and ancient rites of the Hawaiians. In the minds of many of the tourists, a certain mystical quality is associated with the nene goose. It would indeed be a tragedy if the bird were to become extinct.

The same comments may be made with respect to each of the other species of Hawaiian birds which are rapidly disappearing. These are the Hawaiian duck, the Hawaiian gallinule, and the Hawaiian stilt.

Habitats would have been provided for all of these birds under this budgetary item for the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife. With its deletion a grave doubt has been cast on the future existence of these rare species. Being a political realist I shall not attempt to offer any amendment to restore the deleted item. However, I do wish to express my fervent hope that the committee will grant it favorable consideration the next time around.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. Abernethy].

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my thanks to the committee for including funds in this bill for the continuation of the Tupelo Fish Hatchery. For your so doing you not only have my thanks but also that of thousands of people in northeast Mississippi and northwest Alabama who depend upon the Tupelo hatchery for minnows and catfish fingerlings to stock their lakes and ponds.

We were shockingly surprised when the announcement came forth in January that this, one of the oldest, largest, and most efficient of fish hatcheries, would be closed at the end of this fiscal year. The announcement evoked a flood of protests, the like of which I have never received on any domestic subject since coming to Congress more than 22 years ago. My files are bulging with several thousand requests from constituents in Mississippi and citizens across the line in Alabama urging that the hatchery and its services be continued.

The Tupelo hatchery was authorized 64 years ago. It serves more than 1,000 lakes and ponds in the midsouth area, particularly in the 24-county area in northeast Mississippi. More than 3½ million fish are produced each year in this hatchery.

Of the three hatcheries in my State, the Tupelo hatchery is not only the largest, but also larger than the other two combined. Furthermore, it serves more territory, more lakes and more people. It consists of 14 lakes and is located on a tract of land consisting of 17.4 acres. And it is really a very beautiful place, quite a tourist attraction. Although not included in the closing announcement, one of the reasons assigned by the Bureau for closing the hatchery was that there is no room for expansion, which is an admission that the hatchery is needed; otherwise expansion would not have been assigned as a reason for closing.

On this point, Mr. Chairman, there is ample room for expansion. Immediately adjacent to the hatchery is a tract of open farmland consisting of more than 200 acres. This land is not only immediately accessible, but I am told by a member of the State game and fish commission of my State that as much thereof as may be needed is available. Actually, there is a great need for expanding the hatchery. For instance, there has been approved for northeast Mississippi several watershed projects, one of which is the largest in the country and which will necessitate the construction of more than 30 lakes. All of these will be stocked with fish. Other watershed projects are in the planning stage and will unquestionably be approved. Scores of other such lakes will be constructed in these projects. The Tupelo hatchery is the only hatchery which will be immediately accessible to these lakes.

Several species of fish are produced in the Tupelo hatchery: bass, bream, channel catfish, and so forth. It is the only hatchery east of the Mississippi which successfully produces in quantity channel catfish. Catfish fingerlings are made available to the other hatcheries from the Tupelo hatchery. Catfish is a great source of food in this area, especially for people whose income is low. It is also a good food, Mr. Chairman, popular among all of our people. It is also a great source of income for commercial fishermen.

The nearest other Mississippi hatchery to the Tupelo area is the Meridian hatchery which is 165 miles away. Indeed, there would be no economy in the additional transportation costs that would come about in closing the Tupelo hatchery and serving the area out of Meridian and other points. The other nearest Mississippi hatchery is at Lyman, on the gulf coast 350 miles away. And certainly this transportation distance would not be very economical and the service would be terrible.

Mr. Chairman, this hatchery is sorely needed in the Tupelo area. To take it away would be a great disservice to thousands of people. I am confident there was nothing punitive on the part of the Department or the Bureau of the Budget in recommending that it be closed. They have simply done that which we all at some time or another have done, that is, made an honest mistake.

Incidentally, Mr. Chairman, authorization of this hatchery by the Congress in 1901 was followed by one of the greatest gems of oratorical humor ever entered on the pages of the Congressional Record. Northeast Mississippi was then represented in this body by the great John M. Allen. The announcement to close the hatchery prompted an interesting story which appeared on Sunday, March 7, 1965, in the magazine section of the Commercial Appeal, a large daily newspaper published in Memphis, Tenn., and which serves the Tupelo area. Permission having been obtained so to do, I include that story as a part of my remarks, as follows:

THE FISH STORY WHICH MADE CONGRESS GUFFAW

(By Thomas E. Michael)

Near the outskirts of Tupelo, Miss., there stands a singularly unimposing building, the John M. Allen Fish Hatchery.

This Government-owned facility has been there now for more than 60 years, and there would be no counting the millions of fish whose lives began there, or their many more millions of offspring which have populated the lakes and streams of Mississippi.

"Now, Mr. Chairman, I only wish to say in conclusion that if there is a Member here who wishes to have his name connected by future generations with that of Judas Iscariot and Benedict Arnold, if he wishes to have himself and his posterity pointed at with scorn, if he desires to be despised by men and shunned by women, let him vote against this amendment (for a fish hatchery at Tupelo) and he will secure all this infamous notoriety."

No Member did vote against the amendment, and so the facility was established. Recently, however, orders were issued from Washington that it be closed.

This is a shame. For its closing would dim one of Tupelo's brightest legends, which is woven around the speech in the House of Representatives which led to the hatchery's establishment.

For some years after its establishment, virtually all who visited or passed the place knew the significance of its name. Just seeing the name in print could evoke a fond memory, an inward laugh.

Even now, most adults who live in Tupelo and its environs know, and delight in, the history of the man whose name the fish hatchery bears. But his memory dims with each passing year and rising generation, and now there are many who see the sign and assume—if they think about it at all—the the name on it is that of some obscure and lackluster Mississippi politician whose place in history warranted some recognition—but not much.

This also is a shame. For the memory of John M. Allen deserves to be long preserved and highly treasured. He could scarcely be ranked as the greatest of Mississippians, although he did have a distinguished career (1885–1901) in the U.S. House of Representatives. But neither could he be fairly outranked as a man of rare good humor and persuasive wit.

Just before he got elected to the House he got the nickname by which he was afterward remembered. This was fairly soon after the Civil War, in which he had served in the Confederate Army as an enlisted man. It was the custom in those days for political candidates to give themselves none the worst of it in recalling their military rank. Some, of course, had actually been generals or colonels, and most of the rest conferred high rank on themselves for speechmaking purposes.

John Allen simply turned the thing around. He asked that all who had been privates vote for him, and conceded the vote of the former generals and colonels to his opponent. He thereupon became, and remained, Pvt. John Allen.

In the House, he was known mostly for his wit. If it was known in advance that he was to speak, on no matter what subject, the House Chamber would be full. And he never failed to start them—and leave them—laughing.

Just before he was to leave the House, he made the speech for which he is remembered. It was to obtain the fish hatchery for Tupelo, his hometown, that he made the speech.

Mr. Chairman, I also include, permission having been previously granted, that part of the proceedings of the House of Representatives on the 20th day of February 1901, which pertained to the bill authorizing the Tupelo hatchery, including the great and entertaining speech of Congressman Allen, as follows:

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 20, 1901]

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 45 of the bill, and after line 20 insert the following amendment, which the Clerk will read; and then I ask unanimous consent for 20 minutes to speak to that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Page 45, at the end of line 20, insert 'for the establishment of a fish hatchery and fish-culture station at the town of Tupelo, State of Mississippi, $20,000.' "

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to returning to this paragraph for the purpose of considering the amendment?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to granting to the gentleman from Mississippi 20 minutes to discuss the amendment? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I do not deem it necessary to take up 20 minutes' time of this committee to pass this amendment, but as this fish hatchery is to be established at Tupelo, and I find among some people in the country—even some newspapermen, who are supposed to impart information to others, and some gentlemen who have been elected to Congress, and who tell me that they have not only been to school, but gone through college—so much ignorance about Tupelo that I think I ought—in justice to them, not to Tupelo—to enlighten them some on this subject. [Laughter.]

If I were willing to avail myself of all the traditions and many well authenticated but not absolutely accurate historical suspicious, I might invest this subject with much more historical and romantic interest. But I propose to confine my remarks to well-authenticated facts, ignoring such traditions, believed by many of our people to be true, as that when Christopher Columbus had his interview with Ferdinand and Isabella of Spain, that in his efforts to persuade them to back him in his expedition that led to the discovery of America, he assured them that an all-wise Creator, creating a world like this, was bound to have made somewhere near its center such a place as Tupelo. [Laughter.]

The first authentic account we have of the section of country that will one day be included in the corporate limits of Tupelo is that the great Indian chief, Chicksa, from whom that great and warlike tribe, the Chickasaw Indians, took its name, was west of the great Mississippi River and that he, with his followers, followed a pole guided and supported by invisible hands across the Mississippi River to the vicinity of Tupelo. There, we are informed, the pole stopped, stood upright, planted in the ground, and there the Chickasaw Indians made their home. No people, Mr. Chairman, were ever directed by a wise providence to a fairer land. 'Twas in the rolling woodland just north of one of the most beautiful prairies on which the eye of man or beast ever rested. The country abounded with all sorts of game; the streams were full of fishes, and on this continent there was no more enticing place for this poetic race of the forest. Here the Chickasaws grew to be, as they are to this time, one of the greatest and most powerful of the Indian tribes.

In 1513 the knightly Ponce de Leon landed upon the coast of Florida, and perverted history has it that he started out to look for the fountain of youth and limitless gold fields, when in truth and in fact he really started to look for Tupelo. [Laughter.] You are all familiar with the disaster that overtook his expedition. Later, in 1540, the great and adventurous discoverer, Hernando de Soto, landed his expedition on the coast of Florida, and finally succeeded in reaching and discovering, for the first time by a white man, Tupelo. [Laughter.]

Here he stopped in the midst of the Chickasaws until attacked by them and driven west to what is now the city of Memphis, where he discovered the great Mississippi River.

The Chickasaws were then left in peaceable possession, so far as the white man was concerned, of this beautiful section for nearly 200 years, when, in 1736, Bienville, with his expedition, came up from Florida, and D'Artaguette from the Illinois attempted to meet and take from the Chickasaws what is now Tupelo. D'Artaguette got there before Bienville, and was defeated by the Chickasaws. He and almost all of his expedition perished at their hands. Bienville arrived later, was also defeated and driven back with great loss to his expedition; and now, in laying out and grading avenues and boulevards for Tupelo, the bones, spurs, weapons, epaulets, etc., of the slain of these ill-fated expeditions are plowed up. [Laughter.]

This is something of the early history of the place about which we find so much ignorance. My colleague, General Catchings, told me not many days ago that some newspaperman had asked him if there really was such a place as Tupelo. [Great laughter.]

I do not assert that all of these historical events to which I have referred took place immediately in the town of Tupelo, but they were in that vicinity and were on territory that we expect to have incorporated into the city some day. To come down to a later period, those of you who know anything of the history of your country will remember the contentions and contest that lasted for many years between the French, English, and Spanish governments for the ownership of the Mississippi territory. I am informed by those familiar with the real designs of those great nations at that time that the real motive of all of them was the ownership of Tupelo. [Great laughter.]

Finally, the United States, appreciating the importance of the position, took advantage of their dissensions and acquired Tupelo. [Renewed laughter.]

About the year 1848 it became a matter of great concern to the Great Northwest to secure a market for their products, so they gave aid and encouragement to the building of the northern end of what is now the Mobile and Ohio Railroad. The city of Mobile, on the Gulf, recognizing also the great advantages of direct connection with Tupelo, helped along this enterprise, and the road was built from Mobile to Tupelo. [Laughter.]

Everything went on very well until about 1861, when the South concluded to secede from the Union. I am reliably informed that when Horace Greeley and others sought Mr. Lincoln and asked him to "let the wayward sisters depart in peace," he shook his head and said, "No; this secession takes from the United States Tupelo [laughter], and we will not submit to it." And it was to rescue to the Union this town that brought on the war. [Renewed laughter.]

The armies of the Union were first directed against the capital of the Confederacy at Richmond, Va., but some obstructions were thrown in the way of that army at Bull Run, and they were persuaded to return to Washington. Another great army was then marshaled under the command of General Grant, who landed at Pittsburg Landing, on the

Tennessee River, and began his operations against Tupelo. [Laughter.]

Gen. Albert Sidney Johnston and myself met General Grant's army at Shiloh [laughter], and for most of the first day we had a real good time with them, and but for General Johnston being killed, and me being scattered on the evening of that day there is no knowing what might have happened or how the history of this country might have been changed. [Great laughter.]

Suffice it to say, I retired on Corinth, and when we were there, sorely pressed, President Davis ordered General Beauregard to fall back to Tupelo, and there make a great and desperate stand for the life of the Confederacy. And it seems that Generals Grant and Halleck were so much impressed with the dogged determination of the Confederate army to defend Tupelo to the death of the last man that they turned away in other directions. [Laughter.] Later, General Sturgis started from Memphis with a well-equipped army, with a view of capturing Tupelo, and breaking the backbone of the Confederacy. But on the road down there, when he had gotten within a few miles of Tupelo, General Forrest, that great cavalry commander, appreciating what the loss of Tupelo would mean to the Confederacy, met Sturgis at Brices Crossroads, took from him all of his artillery and wagons, sent him back to Memphis without an organized company and with the remnant of his army, in about one-fourth of the time that had been consumed in forced marches in going down.

But Mr. Lincoln seemed never to have lost sight of the importance of Tupelo to the Union, and he marshaled another army under that able commander, Gen. A. J. Smith, and started them to capture Tupelo. Gen. Stephen D. Lee and General Forrest, with their commands, were sent to intercept him, but in maneuvering for positions General Smith got between Forrest and Lee and Tupelo and succeeded in capturing the town; and in an effort to dislodge him from there the desperate and bloody battle of Harrisburg, which is in the suburbs of Tupelo, was fought, in which nobody had any decided advantage, but General Smith evacuated the town and went back to Memphis. But the very fact that Tupelo had fallen seems to have broken the spirit of the Confederates, and we never did much good after that. [Great laughter.]

You will find, Mr. Chairman, in the Congressional Library a book the title of which is "Tupelo." It was written by a northern Presbyterian preacher and schoolteacher who happened to be down in that section when the war began. I remember him very well. This book treats of his trials and tribulations about Tupelo, where he was arrested, imprisoned, and would have been shot but for his timely escape from prison; and, as I remember the substance, as he puts it, of his offense was a suspicion that he entertained secret doubts as to the divine origin and right of African slavery.

After the close of the war, when we had returned to our peaceful avocations, one of our brightest and most farsighted young men, having in mind the great future as well as the great past of this town, settled in Tupelo, and afterward became a member of this body and is now about terminating a great career of 16 years here. What this Nation and this House owes to Tupelo for this contribution I leave for others to say. My modesty forbids my speaking of it. [Laughter.] Some 15 years ago Kansas City and Memphis, appreciating the fact that if they ever hoped to do any good as cities they must have direct connection with Tupelo, built a railroad from Kansas City, through Memphis, to Tupelo. Birmingham, realizing that with all of its marvelous resources they could never be developed and properly distributed without direct railroad connection with Tupelo, saw to it that the road was built from Birmingham to Tupelo.

Mr. Chairman, during the discussion on the river and harbor bill in this House recently, I heard so many statistics as to the tonnage of the various cities that were seeking appropriations in that bill that it stimulated me to inquire into the tonnage at Tupelo, and I find that during last year there were about 4 million tons of freight passed through Tupelo. It was only the other day you saw in great headlines in all of our newspapers that the Southern Railroad had purchased the Mobile and Ohio Railroad, running from St. Louis to Mobile, through Tupelo.

The president of the Southern road was in Washington a few days later, and I met him for the first time, and in a conversation I had with him I gathered the reason for this purchase. It was that the Southern system had already about 7,000 miles of railroad, which had cost them hundreds of millions of dollars; they found this great system, after all this expenditure, practically useless to them, because they had no direct connection or terminal facilities at Tupelo. They therefore spent many millions more for 900 miles of railroad that would take them into Tupelo and give them good terminal facilities there. [Great laughter.]

Many of you gentlemen have never been to Tupelo. I hope none of you entertain any idea of dying without going there. I should hate to have it said of any Member of this Congress—for all of whom I have such a kindly feeling—that they did not aspire to visit Tupelo before they died. [Laughter.] I extend you all an invitation to come, and promise you a royal welcome. Come and go with me on College Hill some evening and see one of our Tupelo sunsets. [Laughter.]

Come and see one of our southern, silvery, Tupelo moons. I think it is the only place in the South where we have the same beautiful moons we had before the war. [Laughter.] I have often been asked about the size of Tupelo. I confess I have not been able to get the exact figures from the last census. The tabulating machines do not seem to have been able to work it out yet; but I can say, Mr. Chairman, that by sufficiently extending the corporate limits of our town we can accommodate a population larger than the city of London. [Laughter.] The truth is that our lands about Tupelo have been so valuable for agricultural purposes that we have not yielded them up for building a city as rapidly as we should have done. [Laughter.]

I can say, Mr. Chairman, that while there are larger places than Tupelo, I do not think there is any other place just exactly like it. Tupelo is very near, if not exactly, in the center of the world. The horizon seems about the same distance in every direction. [Laughter.] The sun, when doing business on regular schedule, comes right over the town, and sometimes gives us a hot time in the old town. It is a great place for the investment of capital, where it will be welcomed and protected. Come early, gentlemen, and avoid the rush.

This, Mr. Chairman, is a proposition to establish there a fish hatchery. We have the ideal place for a fish hatchery. Why, sir, fish will travel over land for miles to get into the water we have at Tupelo. Thousands and millions of unborn fish are clamoring to this Congress today for an opportunity to be hatched at the Tupelo hatchery. [Loud laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I only wish to say in conclusion that if there is a Member here who wishes to have his name connected by future generations with that of Judas Iscariot and Benedict Arnold, if he wishes to have himself and his posterity pointed at with scorn, if he desires to be despised by men and shunned by women, let him vote against this amendment and he will secure all this infamous notoriety. [Loud laughter and applause.]

Mr. CANNON. I desire to ask the gentleman—not that my advocacy of his amendment is necessary—but I understand that in point of fact the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries have made a favorable report on this proposition for a hatchery.

Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi. Yes, sir; the Fish Commissioner recommended it; and that great committee of this House, that good committee of this House, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, has unanimously recommended the appropriation. They are enlightened, broadminded men, who know all about Tupelo, and they appreciate the importance of this proposition.

The question being taken, the amendment of Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi was agreed to.

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee has done his usual excellent and thorough job and our colleague from Indiana, who chairs the subcommittee, has presented us with a fair and adequate budget for the Department of the Interior. As a member of the committee, I consider it an honor and pleasure to work with our colleagues.

Although I can appreciate the merits of all the projects in this bill, I am particularly interested in two that involve installations in my district.

The first is a $95,000 item to complete construction of a shellfish research laboratory in Milford, Conn. As many of my colleagues will remember, this project was first brought to the attention of Congress in bills introduced by me in the Senate and by the distinguished former Senator from Connecticut, Mr. Bush.

Authorization of the project was completed in 1961, and funds of which I urge approval will bring this project into reality. Its work will be invaluable to the shellfish industry and to the consumer. To quote from the Fish and Wildlife Service:

> The expansion of the Milford Laboratory is vital to research on the artificial culture of molluscan shellfish. We are convinced that future production of oysters and clams and the maintenance of a healthy shellfish industry will depend upon development of true farming practices. Scientists at Milford have been successful, under laboratory conditions, in artificially spawning and raising to setting stage both oysters and clams The new Laboratory and ponds will allow these studies to be expanded to more nearly simulate commercial operations, to develop methods for raising these shellfish from setting stage to commercial size, to grow and process food for these shellfish and to begin research on selective breeding of shellfish with more desirable characteristics. The new facility will also enable us to provide space at Milford to train members of the shellfish industry and the State conservation departments in these artificial culture practices.

The other item involved is $850,000 for the construction of a new Forest Research Laboratory to replace the one which burned down in April of last year. This lab houses forest insect and disease research programs for the Northeastern United States. The work done at this center is considered by the Department and by many private citizens as vital and should be continued.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I congratulate my committee on their work on this bill and urge its approval by this House.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. The Department of Interior appropriations bill contains funds for the construction and improvements to the visitors center at Everglades National Park. The total of such funds is $414,700, and breaks down as follows:

Construction: Buildings and utilities, which include employees quarters, utilities and ground improvements at the Flamingo area; gulf coast area slated for ranger station; Royal Palm area slated for remodeling of visitor center and comfort stations; Tamiami Trail area in line for ground improvements, signs, and exhibits; Parachute Key slated for alteration of visitors center, $301,000.

Water rights as applied to drinking water from wells, water for utilities, and access to campgrounds, $65,400.

Construction—liquidation of contract authorizations: Roads and trails; improvements slated for Flamingo, where access roads will be built; gulf coast area in line for access roads and parking section at ranger station, and trails; Tamiami Trail portion in line for roads and elevated trail, gates; Shark Valley area in line for observation tower and elevated trail, $48,300.

These funds will do much to improve the beauty of Everglades National Park. This park, managed under the National Park Service, received 792,600 visitors last year from virtually every part of the United States. Adding to the economy of the south Florida area surrounding the park, these visitors also assisted the tourism of other parts of Florida as well. I urge passage of these funds by the Congress, and am pleased to have been among those who have worked so diligently for this appropriation.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to urge that when the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union rises, it rise and report favorably the passage of H.R. 6767, the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriation bill for 1966.

The activities covered by this bill, and the continued well-being of each bureau, agency, and department within the Department of Interior, are of consummate importance to the well-being of every citizen of the United States.

The appropriations for the Bureau of Land Management carry slight increases for cost of forest protection on public domain lands, resource conservation development for wildlife habitat improvement and represent money well spent.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs continues to execute our obligations to the original owners of the public domain of America.

The National Park Service maintenance and rehabilitation expenditures will pay immeasurable dividends for and to the generations to come.

The Bureau of Outdoor Recreation can make sensible plans now to avoid duplication and waste in this vast area in years to come.

The U.S. Geological Survey, known to all as one of the most effective and efficient agencies in our Government, and the Bureau of Mines repay the citizens of America annually in lives saved with its relatively small overall share of this appropriation.

The office of Coal Research, the Office of Oil and Gas, the Bureau of Sport Fisheries, and Wildlife and the Office of Saline Water are conducting programs of vital concern to every citizen of America.

While the particular interests in my district in this appropriation bill deal with the restoration of a modest amount for continued construction of a fish hatchery in Saratoga, Wyo., the best interests of every Wyoming citizen can best be served by the passage of this bill and by continued surveillance by the House of Representatives in the actions of the dedicated professional people who, by and large, make up the personnel of the Department of the Interior.

Mr. MOORE. I am pleased that the committee has seen fit to appropriate $1.5 million to begin construction of the Project Gasoline pilot plant at Cresap, W. Va. On many occasions, I have talked with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Ohio, Congressman MIKE KIRWAN, regarding the importance of undertaking this research program, and it is with much satisfaction that I commend his committee on reporting favorably on it.

It is in keeping with our Constitution that the House of Representatives have the prerogative of initiating appropriation measures, and in this instance, I am happy to have had a hand in helping to bring this project into being.

It is now up to the other body to follow through on the House's action, and I sincerely hope that its approval will be forthcoming very shortly.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to compliment the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies on the fine bill they have reported to the House. I have had the opportunity to appear before the subcommittee on several occasions on behalf of the Forest Products Laboratory which happens to be located at Madison, Wis., in my district. The committee has always been very receptive to requests for appropriations for the Laboratory and has always dealt very fairly with them.

As I said in testimony before the committee earlier in this session, there is a present need for planning funds to provide for the remodeling of the existing Laboratory structure. Two divisions of the Laboratory will move to a new building in 1967 leaving behind space which is desperately needed for other divisions of the Laboratory.

Accordingly, I am taking this opportunity to call the attention of the House to this situation in the hope that, if these funds are added by the Senate, House conferees will give serious consideration to retaining them. Valuable research space will be wasted if these planning funds are not now provided. The research, while conducted in a laboratory located in my district, benefits many wood producing districts throughout the country as well as all users of wood and wood products throughout the country.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out that the U.S. Bureau of Mines has continuously done an outstanding job in serving the solid fuels industry as it applies to Pennsylvania, and particularly to my personal knowledge in studying the serious problems of my congressional district, which is the heart of the anthracite industry.

Both in the research field of developing new uses and methods of use of anthracite coal as well as the operating divisions' attention to vital problems of the anthracite industry such as mine subsidence, the control of coal burning underground and culm or refuse banks burning above ground with consequent serious air pollution problems, it is a certainty that this great segment of our national economy, the coal industry, would find it most difficult to continue without the able assistance and outstanding cooperation of the U.S. Bureau of Mines.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the House Appropriations Committee has deleted the appropriation for the purchase of the Sylvania tract in the Ottawa National Forest in Gogebic County, a part of the 11th Congressional District of Michigan.

I take this occasion to cite the record of study and the importance of acquisition of this area.

This 18,352-acre tract is one of the largest vestiges of the virgin northwoods remaining in the northern Lake States region.

Federal purchase and management of this excellent forest, water and other important resources of this tract, in my opinion, are a must. No other foreseeable single project would do as much to put permanently the hard-pressed western end of the Upper Peninsula of Michigan on the map and to help our economy.

This is an area which, in testimony given before the House Appropriations Committee, was described by Mr. M. M. Nelson, Deputy Chief of the Forest Service, as "the most outstanding possibility that we have for a key recreation property in the Nation today."

The Sylvania tract, which includes more than 37 lakes and numerous ponds, was described by Secretary of Agriculture Orville Freeman as "one of the most beautiful and unspoiled tracts in the Lake States."

Adding this tract to the Ottawa National Forest would not only preserve its natural beauty but would offer an unparalleled opportunity for increasing economic activity in upper Michigan as a result of a greatly expanded tourist attraction.

It has been estimated that the Sylvania forest would accommodate 800,000 visitors a year, each of whom would be expected to spend between $6 and $7 per day.

The Agriculture Department has estimated that development of the tract would require 625 man-years of work and a total expenditure of some $10 million.

The feasibility and desirability of the acquisition of this land has been studied for some time. Its acquisition not only has the strong recommendation and approval of the Department of Agriculture and the Forest Service, but also of Michigan Congressmen and most other groups interested in the preservation of our remaining virgin forests and wildlife areas for the benefit not only of today's citizens but of tomorrow's generations.

The tract lies in the heart of the northern Great Lakes region that comprises 81 counties in northern Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. This region is rich with opportunity. Its wealth in natural resources, particularly suited for outdoor recreation, holds the potential for a better and growing economy. It needs a new direction of effort to rebuild a former economy that was based on mining and old growth timber resources.

The tract's near-virgin forest mantle of high quality hardwoods and conifers is representative of the early-day resource complex upon which great forest industries were built in the early 20th century, and then declined through depletion of the forest resources.

This is lake country, too, typical of the northwoods as this country was known in early days. Interspersed with the forest cover are nearly 4,000 acres of water in numerous lakes and ponds. Muskegs and swamps which lend variety to the forest environment are also found.

Associated with the forests and waters habitat are its fish and wildlife populations which complete the forest scene and which may be enjoyed by people in search of the abundant life or respite from the turmoil of modern-day living.

Within 1 day's drive of the great population centers of the Lake States complex, the tract is strategically located in the western area of Michigan's Upper Peninsula. Chicago is 355 miles to the south and lower Michigan's urban population centers only a short distance farther. U.S. Highway 2, the east-west highway serving the Upper Peninsula, traverses the area about 3 miles to the north of the tract; U.S. Highway 45, a north-south trunk, lies about the same distance to the east. Commercial airports and railroads serve the nearby communities. Construction of the Interstate Highway System and other main State highway arterials are constantly improving access to this vacationland.

I feel quite strongly that money for the purchase of the Sylvania tract should be included in this year's budget, and I am hopeful that the Senate Appropriations Committee will restore this cut.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE OF COAL RESEARCH

Salaries and expenses

For necessary expenses to encourage and stimulate the production and conservation of coal in the United States through research and development, as authorized by law (74 Stat. 337), $6,945,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed $356,000 shall be available for administration and supervision.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to ask the chairman of the committee how much money has been expended on coal research up to this time and how much longer will the Federal Government continue to spend at the rate it is spending for this purpose.

Mr. DENTON. We are currently spending about $7 million a year.

Mr. GROSS. How long has this been going on?

Mr. DENTON. This particular program was started in fiscal year 1961.

Mr. GROSS. Is there any end in sight for this at the present rate of expenditure?

Mr. DENTON. They are making a great deal of progress on coal research. They are experimenting with the possibility of obtaining numerous products from coal. The coal industry, as you know, was a sick industry. There was a great deal of unemployment and hardship and generally bad conditions existing in the coal areas. If we can develop new requirements for coal mines and put people back to work, that is the best thing we can do.

Mr. GROSS. I wondered if the gentleman could see any end in sight to the expenditure of $7 million a year for this purpose.

While I have the floor, Mr. Chairman, and I realize that we have not yet reached that point in the bill, what about the saline water research program? How much has been expended on that up to this time? It is a much larger program.

Mr. DENTON. About $35 million with a 1965 supplemental appropriation of some $3 million pending. There is $40 million remaining of the authorized funds.

Mr. GROSS. Is the atomic energy saline water research in addition to this?

Mr. DENTON. They cooperate a good deal and work together a good deal.

Mr. GROSS. The question is whether the atomic energy saline research is in addition to this?

Mr. DENTON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. There is saline water research going on all over the world, is there not?

Mr. DENTON. Not all over the world. It is going on in Israel. That is the main place outside of the United States that I know of. I believe we are taking the lead on it.

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I imagine we are. We are usually taking the lead in spending money for every purpose. We usually take the lead in all of these projects.

Mr. DENTON. We cut this appropriation $6.5 million.

Mr. GROSS. This year?

Mr. DENTON. Yes. This year.

Mr. GROSS. Was there not some sort of a scandal in the saline water research project in Texas not too long ago?

Mr. DENTON. We went into this matter very thoroughly especially with regard to the Sweetwater contract. We have a duty to see that appropriated funds are properly spent. We went into it for that reason. We did find this situation: The Sweetwater contract was a cost-plus-fixed-fee contract, and as is customary in these cases, the Department had the Army make an audit. They found that some items were not expended as they should have been. There was disagreement with regard to the disallowances made by the Army audit.

Of course, as the gentleman knows, this happens frequently in cost-plus-fixed-fee contracts.

Mr. GROSS. But that does not make it any more palatable.

Mr. DENTON. However, the committee was assured by departmental witnesses, that sufficient funds were withheld to adequately protect the interest of the Government.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman think that the money that has been spent through the years for this purpose has been prudently spent?

Mr. DENTON. They are reducing the cost of purifying water considerably, and the investigation has been very valuable.

You will recall they moved the plant from San Diego to our naval base in Cuba when we needed water there. Considering the supply of water needed, it was a very valuable asset. There are a good many places in the world where they do need this kind of water treatment and we are going to have to do something about it. It is just a question of the expense.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS], has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that I am not opposed to research and the development of new uses for coal, nor am I opposed to research in the matter of saline water. I just want to be sure that this money is being prudently spent.

Mr. DENTON. We went into the matter thoroughly, we think. The Army auditors found some items of cost had been allowed which were not properly allowable items. Some of that is still in dispute. But there is enough money being held in reserve to protect the Government's interest.

Mr. GROSS. Is that the reason the committee reduced this by $6 million?

Mr. DENTON. No. I have explained that. The reason we reduced it is because the program has 2 years to run under existing legislation. The increase was probably included in the budget on the theory that new legislation would be enacted to extend and expand the program. The legislation has not been enacted and that is the reason we reduced the estimate for 1966.

Mr. GROSS. Does not the gentleman think that if there has been some hanky-panky in connection with this research that somebody's knuckles ought to be rapped and that an excellent way to rap knuckles is to cut them down to size in the matter of money appropriated?

Mr. DENTON. We reduced the estimate by $6½ million.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman said that that was cut for another reason, that they were adequately funded without that.

Mr. DENTON. I think we all want this money to be spent wisely and properly on this investigation to make brackish and salt water usable. I think the Department has made a good showing that this amount of money can be spent to good advantage. The President has recommended an expanded program. He made such a recommendation to the legislative committee. I think we have approved an appropriation in the proper amount. I think most people, like the gentleman, want to have this research done, and I think it is imperative that we do it.

Mr. GROSS. But I do not want some chiselers to get away with the money.

Mr. DENTON. Neither does anybody else.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 22:

Construction

For construction and acquisition of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of sport fishery and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein, $5,115,500.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss the matter of the blackbird program with the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Denton].

I will say to the gentleman that we in the areas that have been adversely affected by these birds over the years are most appreciative of the fine work that this subcommittee has done in an effort to eliminate this very bad pest that has caused so much damage in the agricultural regions of the country.

Mr. Chairman, this blackbird menace is one that has been prevalent in some 21 States in the Nation. In my own State the losses have totaled as much as $5 million a year as a result of these birds eating up the grain crops.

I understand that the people in the Midwest have also suffered tremendous damage as a result of the losses caused by these birds to their feeding lot. Also, they have had trouble at airports in the metropolitan areas of the country where these birds fly actually into the motor itself of the plane.

Mr. Chairman, this is a very serious matter.

I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee just what has been done this year in the bill with respect to the blackbird problem?

Mr. DENTON. We have provided the same amount of funds this year that they had last year for this program which the gentleman from Arkansas was very instrumental in getting approved.

They are making some progress but not nearly as much progress as we had hoped for. This is a very stubborn problem. Of course, the problem is to kill these blackbirds and not kill other birds.

As I stated earlier, they are making some progress but not as much as we had hoped for. The only thing to do is to continue working on the problem just as we are on other problems.

Mr. GATHINGS. It does represent quite a problem, I will say to the gentleman, to come up with the type program that would not harm human life, wildlife, as well as the other types of birds that we would like to have around.

Mr. DENTON. I wish I could tell the gentleman that we have the problem solved, but we have not. They are working on it. They are making progress but not as much as we wish they could make. We are going to continue the research. We hope we will have the solution to the problem before too long.

Mr. GATHINGS. I thank the gentleman. I am most appreciative of the work of the subcommittee with regard to this matter.

I just wonder whether or not the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. Reifel] would give us his version of this program? I would like to have the observations of the gentleman from South Dakota with reference to this blackbird depredation problem.

Mr. REIFEL. Yes.

Mr. GATHINGS. As the gentleman will recall, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Goodling] and I came before your subcommittee a year ago. The gentleman from Pennsylvania had been interested in this problem for many years. The area which he represented has suffered extensive depredations from blackbirds over a period of time. Also, the cities have suffered greatly from the bird menace.

In the city of Washington, D.C., we have had tremendous damage as a result of starlings.

I just wondered, since the gentleman from South Dakota is a member of this subcommittee, whether he would give us his opinion of the situation. I am sure he will recall the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Goodling] and I coming before his subcommittee.

Mr. REIFEL. I remember very well when the gentleman from Arkansas came before our subcommittee, along with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Goodling].

Of course, where they are an economic hazard we do the best we can to eliminate them. Of course, this must be done in a way that those who are interested in the conservation of birdlife will not have a legitimate complaint.

Mr. GATHINGS. I asked a farmer a few years ago how his grain crop had made out. It looked so good when I saw it in the spring. He told me that the blackbirds had eaten practically all of his crop. These losses continue despite the effort on the part of the farmers and the Department people to solve it. The population of these birds needs to be reduced greatly if any real relief is attained.

I am most appreciative of the work that this subcommittee has been doing and I hope that the research team will come up with some type of an answer to this problem that will alleviate these serious losses.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GATHINGS. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Maybe they ought to do what some other agency of Government did. I believe they took sparrows a few years ago, and dyed them various pastel colors, and that caused the sparrows to disappear. I never heard anything more about this expenditure of several thousands of dollars.

From what the gentleman has said, maybe we should catch these blackbirds, dye them and turn them loose. Maybe they will disappear along with the money used to dye them.

Mr. GATHINGS. That may be the answer, but I think they should be made impotent. Maybe in that way we will get rid of the difficulty. That is what is needed.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Construction of Indian health facilities

For construction, major repair, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites; purchase and erection of portable buildings; purchase of trailers; and provision of domestic and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2004a); $9,000,000, to remain available until expended.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do this to direct a question to the chairman of the committee handling this bill. I believe previously he had explained that the proposed construction of the $13 million segregated Indian school at Albuquerque was not included in this appropriation. The question I would like to direct is this: Under the broad language of the bill, health facilities or any other part of the bill, would it be possible for the planning for this school to proceed at Albuquerque, N. Mex.?

Mr. DENTON. No. We deleted that in the report.

Mr. HALEY. You deleted any money for planning or construction for this school. Could it be carried on in any of these categories?

Mr. DENTON. I do not think it could.

Mr. HALEY. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk read as follows:

Archeological research and excavation (special foreign currency program)

For payments in foreign currencies which the Treasury Department shall determine to be excess to the normal requirements of the United States, for necessary expenses for carrying out archeological activities under the provisions of section 104(k) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704k), $1,300,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall be available, in addition to other appropriations to Smithsonian Institution, for payments in the foregoing currencies.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Hall: On page 39, line 13, after "expended:" insert "to be available only to United States institutions".

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, let me say at the outset that I do not feel that this should be eliminated. I have as a result of the previous colloquy talked to the Members at the majority desk. I only want to assure that the legislative record is made and that this simple amendment is to make these funds available only under the direction of the Smithsonian Institution, through funds that are to be allotted to new institutions working through these counterpart funds. I think this amendment is self-explanatory. I think other institutions might be used. I hope very much the chairman of the subcommittee handling this bill will agree to accept this amendment.

Mr. DENTON. We understand that, and accept the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVIL WAR CENTENNIAL COMMISSION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the Act of September 7, 1957 (71 Stat. 626), as amended (72 Stat. 1769), $100,000.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I rise to ask how much longer the Civil War is going to be fought in 1965.

Mr. DENTON. This is the last year. This ends the appropriation.

Mr. GROSS. That is definite and final?

Mr. DENTON. Unless Congress extends the act. Under existing legislation, this is all.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PRICE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6767) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. DENTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SECRETARY DILLON PROPOSES TAX REFORMS FOR MIDDLE AND LOW INCOME WAGE EARNERS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include an address made by Secretary Dillon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday of this week, Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon will leave that post to return to private business, completing more than 4 years of outstanding service to the Government.

Last week Mr. Dillon made his last public speech as Secretary of the Treasury, an address before a symposium on Federal taxation held here in Washington. The Secretary, in his address, makes a strong case for reforms in our tax laws regarding the tax burden placed on low and middle income taxpayers. He points out, for instance, that the biggest jump in income tax progressivity is at the lowest end of the income scale. The first income tax bracket jumps from a tax rate of zero all the way to 14 percent. And, as he points out, over a period of time the income tax bite has increased more at lower levels than it has at high levels.

Secretary Dillon also discusses other phases of needed income tax reforms, including capital gains at death and the estate tax. I am happy to include in the RECORD a copy of Secretary Dillon's last public speech, and I sincerely hope that my colleagues will study it carefully:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS DILLON, SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY, BEFORE THE AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION SYMPOSIUM ON FEDERAL TAXATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 26, 1965

I am particularly pleased to make this, my last public speech as Secretary of the Treasury, before a group which has contributed so much to the better understanding of economic issues over the past 4 years.

In the light of our experience during those years, I would like to consider a few of the problems and prospects that may lie ahead.

BUDGETARY POLICY

I have no doubt that, despite our better understanding of economic realities, a great deal of discussion over the next few years will continue to center around the question of budget deficits and balanced budgets. There are still many who hold that the budget should be balanced every year or at least over some very short period of years—no matter what the circumstances. This view usually assumes that a balanced budget is entirely neutral in its economic impact, neither inflationary nor deflationary, and thus has no effect at all upon the private economy.

But when we examine the facts a little more carefully, we discover that some taxes are more deflationary than others and that some expenditures are less inflationary than others—that our economic performance is affected by the structure of taxes and expenditures as well as by their level.

When we scrutinize the administrative budget—which is the budget that most people want to balance—we find a whole host of disparate items. In that budget, a loan is treated as an expenditure in exactly the same manner as wages paid, and the repayment of a debt to the Federal Government is treated as a revenue receipt just as if it were a tax collection. It would certainly be surprising if the achievement of balance between the so-called expenditures and the so-called revenues of such a budget turned out to have a neutral effect upon the private economy.

A far more realistic approach to budget making is to consider first the essential needs that must be met by Federal expenditures. We can then estimate the impact of these expenditures on the economy in the light of foreseeable revenues. Finally, after considering the economic outlook, we can make whatever adjustments appear necessary and so put together a budget that both meets essential national needs and produces an economic impact appropriate to existing conditions.

In 1963, for example, when we first proposed the tax cut, and again in early 1964, when it was about to go into effect, our budgets reflected the imperative need for restraint in public expenditures at a time when we were giving expenditures in the private sector of our economy so large a stimulus through tax reduction.

And in his budget message of this year, President Johnson recognized that, if we are to continue our steady progress toward the twin goals of full employment and balanced budgets, we must move carefully. Thus, while the projected deficit of $5.3 billion for fiscal 1966 was $1 billion less than that projected for fiscal 1965, the President found room to include a prudent amount of excise tax reduction designed not only to remove inequities but also to insure the continued expansion of our economy.

This approach means, as President Johnson has amply demonstrated, that—while, on the one hand, we must provide for essential national needs, whether they be economic, social, or defense—we must also rigorously, even ruthlessly, seek out and eliminate waste and inefficiency wherever we find them.

We see the success of this approach in the fact that, over the past 4 years, we have achieved a substantial improvement in our employment situation at the same time that we have compiled an outstanding record of price stability—a record which stands in striking contrast to the pattern of steadily rising prices in other leading industrial nations.

A proper concern for the level of employment and for the requirements of the economy need not lead to continuing deficits. If we can keep our economy moving steadily ahead, it is perfectly feasible, even after allowing for increases in budget expenditures of about $3 billion a year to foresee a balanced budget in fiscal 1968, just 3 years from now.

In evaluating budget policy—past, present, and future—we must always bear in mind that our stubborn balance-of-payments problems force us to rely less on monetary policy and more on fiscal policy in fostering economic growth. As you know, we are now well launched upon a program to bring our balance-of-payments deficits to a swift and sure end. But there is little likelihood that the success of that program will permit us to shift more of the burden of sustaining domestic economic advance to monetary policy. High interest rates abroad and other structural imbalances in the world's capital markets will force us to continue, for the foreseeable future, to place our chief reliance on fiscal policy to keep our economy healthy and strong.

FLEXIBILITY OF TAX RATES

But fiscal policy will not fulfill—as it must—its potential as a force for strong and stable economic growth, until we can employ it as a weapon to forestall—and not merely react to—recession. Thus, the President recommended in his economic message that the Congress take steps to insure "that its procedures will permit rapid action on temporary income tax cuts if recession threatens." This is a reasonable alternative to the recommendation made by the Commission on Money and Credit that the President be given discretionary authority to reduce tax rates when recession threatens. For, it allows us to deal with the problem of rapid and temporary fiscal adjustments while maintaining unchanged our traditional congressional control over taxes. It requires only the assurance of a prompt congressional vote whenever a temporary tax cut proposal is made by the President. The Congress can adopt whatever procedures it believes necessary to assure prompt action. But prompt action is absolutely essential since delay in the face of oncoming recession could easily cost the Nation billions of dollars in production and hundreds of thousands, or even millions, of jobs.

EXPENDITURE POLICY

No matter, however, how versatile and potent a weapon we make of fiscal policy, we will continue to face critical choices in actually bringing it to bear upon our economic needs and problems. No simple arbitrary formula can tell us how to make those choices. A growing economy inevitably brings rising Government expenditures—and confronts us with difficult decisions on how those expenditures should be made. A normal year's economic growth—such as an increase of $40 billion in gross national product—means that total expenditures in our society will have grown by $40 billion. For that is just what GNP is—the sum of all the final expenditures in our economy. Much of this growth can and should be in the things we buy, privately and individually, for ourselves. But as our economy and our wealth expand, so does our need for public services, and so does the capacity of State, local, and Federal Government to meet these needs. We must decide, each year, how many of our urgent public needs we should meet out of our growing productive capacity, which programs deserve priority, and which can be cut back.

These choices inevitably involve tough decisions like those we have recently made on Navy yards, veterans hospitals, and customs collectors. They also involve programs of enormous promise, such as the Peace Corps, improved education or the war on poverty. Too often in the past such decisions have simply been the accidental byproducts of a confrontation between an alliance of the advocates of various expenditure programs on the one side and the opponents of all expenditure programs on the other. I am not at all sure that this approach, has been very effective in weeding out expenditure programs—and I particularly doubt that it has succeeded in weeding out the least worthy ones.

But here again there is an alternative approach, which is simply the careful analysis of costs and benefits in particular programs. This is the kind of analysis that has gone into the development of our defense programs, into the veterans hospital program and that is now being used in evaluating the supersonic transport program. It is in this direction—rather than in arbitrary budget ceilings—that we must seek for solutions in trying to allocate expenditures between the public and the private sectors of our economy.

Apart from the economic aspect of our fiscal policy, we must also consider its human aspects. That is why we have emphasized both the incentive and the equity aspects of our tax proposals. What we have said about incentives has fallen on fertile soil, but what we have said about equity has often fallen on harder soil.

While we all agree that we should have a tax system that is progressive in its impact, we do not all agree on just how progressive it ought to be. This is not surprising, but it has its unfortunate aspects. For a great deal of our concern about this problem of progression—or "vertical equity"—has unintentionally drawn attention away from the equally serious problem of "horizontal equity"—the unfair tax treatment of different individuals at basically similar income levels.

CAPITAL GAINS AT DEATH AND THE ESTATE TAX

Perhaps the most important problem in this area of "horizontal equity" lies in the treatment of capital gains at death. Under our present law, a man who accumulates wealth during his lifetime from earned income and dividends will pay substantial income taxes during his lifetime on this income—and estate taxes will also be levied on what he has left. Yet a second man whose investment has been in low dividend, high growth stocks may accumulate the same amount of wealth through increasing stock values. If he keeps these securities for his entire lifetime, he will receive the same estate tax treatment as the first man, but will never have paid any income tax on the increase in his wealth.

I see no justification for such widely disparate tax treatment of two individuals who through choice or circumstance happen to follow a different financial strategy for making money. Such treatment distorts the natural pattern of investment by placing a high premium on tax advantage. Why sell an asset whose value has increased and thereby incur a capital gains tax, if that tax can be avoided by holding on to the asset until death? By thus interfering with the free flow of capital in the market we unintentionally sap the vitality of our free enterprise system and harm both the economy and the Nation. In addition, such treatment of capital gains erodes the tax base and increases the tax burden on all who cannot benefit from this provision.

In the light of the administration's unsuccessful efforts to solve this problem in 1963, it seems likely that consideration of possible alternatives for providing more equitable treatment of capital gains at death should be coupled with a thorough review of our taxes on estates and gifts. These taxes have not been subjected to such a review for many years and their modernization deserves a high priority. For one thing, a thorough review of estate tax exemptions and rate schedules seems clearly in order.

TREATMENT OF LOWER INCOME TAXPAYERS

On the problem of "vertical equity"—the treatment of taxpayers at different income levels—there has been much concern over how the tax burden is distributed between the very rich on the one hand and everyone else on the other. As a result, we have given little attention to the progressivity of our system in the middle- and lower-income groups, which include most of our citizens.

The fact is that our tax system involves very little progression between the lowest brackets and those of taxpayers with up to about $15,000 of income. Furthermore, whatever progressivity the individual income tax has at these levels is offset to a considerable extent by regressive taxes elsewhere in our tax system.

Clearly, we do not give adequate tax relief to those with very low incomes. For instance, the biggest jump in progressivity is at the start of the very first bracket, where we jump from a zero rate all the way to 14 percent.

Although it may be surprising to some, the fact is that, over time, the income tax bite increases more at low levels than it does at high levels. In 1955 the poorest one-fifth of American families had an average income tax rate of 2.9 percent. By 1961 this had risen to 3.6 percent. On the other hand, the 5 percent with the highest incomes had an effective tax rate of 18.9 percent in both years even though, in 1955, that 5 percent included all families with incomes of over $13,000, and in 1961 it only included families with incomes of over $16,400. Clearly an income tax with fixed rates and exemptions tends to become less and less progressive with the passage of time.

These considerations bear directly upon our current intention to reduce excise taxes, which are particularly regressive. In the longer run, they require that we give serious thought to the structure of our tax system at the lower income levels. We made a beginning in this direction in the Revenue Act of 1964 with the minimum standard deduction, a new method of lessening the tax burden of those who can least afford to carry it. But both interests of tax fairness, as well as the need to lighten the burden of true poverty, call for further action.

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CORPORATE AND THE INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX

The final issue of tax equity I would like to stress concerns the interrelationship between the corporate tax and the individual income tax. We often hear the claim that dividends are subject to double taxation. But if one devotes any time to this matter, it becomes quite clear that at some income levels and with some dividend distribution policies, the total tax burden on corporate income can be less than the total tax burden on income earned directly, say, through a proprietorship or a partnership.

One serious problem is the question of just who pays the corporate tax. There has been a great deal of theoretical speculation about this very complex problem. Yet even with the careful statistical analyses of recent years we are still far from agreement.

Should we eventually decide that the tax is largely borne by shareholders, the issue of the so-called double taxation of dividends must then be considered hand in hand with the issue of the appropriate treatment of retained earnings. For retained earnings ultimately increase stock values and so contribute to capital gains—which brings us back full circle to issues such as the treatment of capital gains at death.

These, then, are some of the many problems and prospects that lie ahead in fiscal and tax policy. What is clear is that our problems are continually changing. If we are to keep up with the times we must continually attack them with the newest and best tools of analysis in a climate as free as possible of old prejudices. That is the unchanging challenge that is always before us.

USE OF RIOT GAS IN VIETNAM

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting to know how much time has been required of administration spokesmen to explain the use in a few instances of riot control agents—super tear gas—against Communist Vietcong guerrillas. Those who profess so much concern about the use of these agents would do well to remind themselves that we are up to our ears in trouble in southeast Asia, and the chances are that situation is going to get worse before it gets better. I have a lot more interest in seeing the job finished out there and in seeing American boys permitted to come home than I have about what weapons are used against the people who are seeking to kill Americans. The Vietcong have not been particular in their choice of weapons, even against civilians.

The agent which has been used is nonlethal. It is disabling for only a limited time—5 to 15 minutes. It is used by major police forces of the world and was issued to the Vietnamese for riot control. It was humane considerations that caused the nonlethal substance to be used against the Vietcong under circumstances where South Vietnamese also could have been killed or wounded had other weapons been used. It would appear that the bleeding hearts would recognize the fact that the South Vietnamese are doing the Vietcong a favor when they use temporarily disabling nonlethal weapons. Certainly, this is preferable to napalm which burns its victims to death or shrapnel which blows them to bits or nuclear devices which destroy everyone and everything.

True assessment of the situation should show that the more important thing is backing our own country in its world problems.

A PROMISE TO REDEEM

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, 95 years is a very long time. Such a span has seen most of the advances that make our country the world's envy. And that is not so surprising when it is considered that such a period of years takes the Nation back past the Custer massacre into the days when the West was yet untamed.

It is difficult to visualize the world of 95 years ago, and the way Americans of 1870 lived. Their way of life we would call, possibly, primitive. And yet there was nothing primitive about the thinking of Americans who lived then.

They planted the seeds of progress that so many of us enjoy today. Out of their foresight and imagination grew fantastic inventions, great national wealth, fabulous advances in self-government.

Chicago burned and was rebuilt, and rebuilt again. The dark continent of Africa was explored and opened. Great industries to meet needs unknown in 1870 came into being to enrich the lives of all of us.

If we look back 95 years, our chests swell with pride, unless we happen to look at one particular day in our history, March 30, 1870.

Up to that day, America had under consideration a proposition contained in language of beautiful clarity.

> The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

On March 30, 1870, exactly 95 years ago today, America proudly proclaimed the ratification by the necessary 29 States that made the 15th amendment basic law in our land.

In many areas of our Nation, that promise has been redeemed. These areas tend to be the ones most benefited by the forces for progress unloosed by the foresight of our ancestors. It is perhaps significant that the areas which have been most remiss in redeeming their promise tend to be those which have benefited least from the forces set into motion by the men of 1870?

As a nation we are now, almost all of us, embarked on the task of making the promise of 95 years ago the realities of today throughout the 50 States. Let us not falter in the task so long delayed, so that the chains which shackle much of our beloved country may finally and for all time be cast aside.

INVESTIGATION OF THE KU KLUX KLAN

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, on March 1, 1961, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I made the request that the House Committee on Un-American Activities investigate the Klan. At that time I said:

> Furthermore, I believe that the committee has directed its attention to the extremist activities of the left wing to the almost total exclusion of the dangerous activities of such groups as the American Nazi Party, the White Citizens Council, and the Ku Klux Klan of the extreme right wing. I shall urge that the committee shoulder its obligation to look into these disruptive, riot-inciting, hate-mongering, un-American groups.

I am pleased that there is some evidence at long last we are going to get action. Much valuable time has been lost, and we must have the Committee on Un-American Activities conduct a prompt and a thorough investigation of the Ku Klux Klan. As I said on March 1, 1961:

> The committee should consider the circumstances of the organization of these groups and the sources of their financial support.

JOB CORPS COSTS

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, one of the Nation's outstanding public officials is the man who has made the Peace Corps a household word on five continents and who now leads President Johnson's war on poverty as Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

In the Washington Post for March 21, 1965, Mr. Sargent Shriver has replied by letter to a most unfair attack which recently appeared in the columns of the Post, on the subject of Job Corps costs. Mr. Shriver's letter will be of keen interest to all who seek an honest perspective:

> JOB CORPS COSTS
>
> A news report in your paper recently made an adverse comparison between the total costs to the Government of providing 12 months of basic vocational and citizenship training to our disadvantaged youths in residential training centers under the U.S. Job Corps and the costs only to the student of an academic year at Harvard University.
>
> The dollar costs in these two cases are not comparable, and not much else in the comparison is relevant. The comparison, in fact, is superficial, invidious, and inaccurate.
>
> Harvard students are among the most brilliant, self-reliant, and highly trained youth our Nation can produce. Thousands of dollars have been invested in their education before they ever get to Harvard. Most of them come from good schools and good families, and have lived in communities where much training and preparation has been given to them. The very atmosphere they breathe is helpful to them. They are getting advanced training at the top of our academic system.
>
> Job Corps enrollees come from situations exactly the opposite. They have gotten the worst and cheapest training. Very little has been invested in them by their impoverished parents or by society. They frequently come from broken homes and physical environments conducive to everything but good work habits and good citizenship. The fact is that not only are they not qualified for Harvard; they are unqualified for any kind of job with a real future in America today.
>
> These differences would lead an objective critic to anticipate much higher costs for producing useful citizens out of Job Corps enrollees. Surprisingly, the Job Corps costs are significantly lower, per person, per year than the Harvard costs.
>
> At Harvard, according to a study made by Seymour Harris, the noted Harvard economist, in an article entitled "The Economics of Harvard," the tuition actually charged the student is only one-third the educational cost to the university. The cost of tuition and room and board to the student at Harvard is $2,890, according to the 1964 Official Register. Add to this cost to the student the factors outlined by Seymour Harris and you get $6,410 per annum as the cost of an academic-year Harvard education.
>
> On the other hand, the total cost to the Government for a Job Corps enrollee for 9 months is only $4,650—about two-thirds of the cost of a Harvard education, and this figure includes $1,500 for allowances, travel, clothing, and major medical expenses, which are not even included in the Harvard costs cited above. When these items are excluded, the cost of 9 months in the Job Corps is only $3,100, less than half the cost of 9 months at Harvard.
>
> Furthermore, these cost estimates for Job Corps are figured on present enrollment plans and include initial startup expenses. Once the program is in full-scale operation

at full strength, these costs could easily drop substantially.

The real test for both a Harvard education and a Job Corps education is not how much it costs, however, but how successful the graduates are. No one doubts that it is worth the cost of a Harvard education to produce outstanding businessmen, top college professors, and leading Senators. I think it makes just as good sense to take a boy or girl who was born and raised in poverty and, as a result, faces adult life without the education and training needed to get a job, and provide that education and training through the Job Corps.

The real question for taxpayers to decide is not whether the Job Corps costs more or less than a Harvard education, but whether it is worth investing tax revenues in education and training to keep these young men and women off tomorrow's relief rolls, and out of tomorrow's courts, and get them into tomorrow's ranks of productive citizens and taxpayers. That is what the Job Corps is all about.

SARGENT SHRIVER,
Director, Office of Economic Opportunity.
WASHINGTON.

STRAIGHT TALK, DOUBLE TALK

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEORGE W. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, the following editorials recently appeared in the Dothan Eagle, Dothan, Ala., and are followups on the Selma, Ala., situation. Anyone reading the morning papers today will see more evidence of why so much of the goings-on are called "double talk." The Negro leaders in the past have said that Negro "freedom" would lead to more economic goods and opportunity for all, particularly southerners. But the boycott of Alabama goods now called for would bring about just the reverse—thus, "double talk."

STRAIGHT TALK, DOUBLE TALK

Possibly worth saving for posterity are the following samples of straight talk and double talk regarding the Selma-Montgomery parade:

"INDEPENDENCE, Mo.—Harry Truman today termed 'silly' the march of Negroes and their supporters from Selma to Montgomery.

" 'They can't accomplish a darned thing,' he said. 'All they want is to attract attention.' "

Now, the double talk sample:

"PITTSBURGH.—A Catholic priest has taken exception to a rabbi's charge that the Student Non-violent Co-ordinating Committee had lied to Pittsburgh students participating in Alabama civil rights demonstrations.

"Rabbi Richard Rubenstein, chaplain at the University of Pittsburgh, charged last week that SNCC leaders had told 135 college students they had permits to demonstrate 'when they did not.'

"Rubenstein, who accompanied the students to Alabama, said SNCC leaders were 'activists and revolutionaries' who were more interested in stirring up trouble than in furthering civil rights.

"Rev. Xavier Carroll, of Mount Mercy College, said Rubenstein was only 'technically right.' 'We were told things that weren't so but that doesn't mean we were deceived. They said they had a permit to march. They didnt', but we very well suspected they didn't.' "

PROPOSED HUDSON NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAY

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to create the Hudson National Scenic Riverway in the States of New York and New Jersey to preserve and restore the once magnificent Hudson River which is now so shamefully polluted and defaced. This bill would renovate the Hudson River from Beacon and Newburgh south to the Battery and Atlantic Ocean.

In the past, Congress has passed legislation for the preservation of wild and rural rivers but has not addressed itself to urban rivers. The idea embodied in this bill will contribute to the goal of a rich and beautiful urban life which the President outlined in his message on urban affairs.

We are indebted to our colleague, the gentleman from Westchester County, N.Y. [Mr. OTTINGER], who has sponsored legislation to create the Hudson Highlands National Scenic Riverway to preserve the scenic beauty of the Hudson River north of New York City. I believe this concept should be extended to the metropolitan regions of New York City and New Jersey which have so many millions of people who do not have the opportunity to enjoy the natural beauty of the river and who could enjoy it if this concept were approved.

Mr. Speaker, under this bill in the ininterest of conservation in the area of the riverway the Secretary of Interior would have the power to disapprove of projects approved by the Federal Power Commission unless specifically authorized by Congress. For instance, the Secretary would be able to cancel the license granted to Consolidated Edison for the Storm King powerplant.

The Hudson is one of the great natural resources of the Nation. Because of indifference, pollution, and defacement, it is in shameful condition. Once used for swimming, fishing, and boating, the river has become totally polluted. New York City alone pumps more than 500 million gallons per day of raw sewage into the Hudson and East Rivers.

Millions who walk to the river cannot swim in it or safely boat on it; cannot really enjoy its beauty. The richest people in the world should be able to preserve and use one of the most beautiful and usable natural resources in America.

Under the bill the Secretary of the Interior would have the power to acquire scenic and other easements along the riverway. Where the purpose could not be accomplished by easements, he would be able to acquire by donation or purchase not more than 5,000 acres in fee to protect the riverway and not more than 5,000 acres in fee for public access to recreational areas, sites, or points of public use within the riverway. The bill authorizes the establishment of roads and trails to connect the riverway with nearby parks, scenic points, and other recreational sources.

The Secretary of the Interior is also authorized to cooperate with the States of New York and New Jersey and their political subdivisions in formulating comprehensive plans for the riverway and to enter into agreements for implementing them.

Mr. Speaker, any blueprint for preserving the beauty of the United States must take into account the tremendous growth in urban areas accompanied by the choking pollution of the air and surrounding waterways. The urban region from Westchester County south through New York City and New Jersey stretches along a once magnificent river now polluted and defaced by factories, highways, railroad, and signs. A pure and beautiful Hudson River will provide enjoyment for future generations. In an increasingly urbanized America our urban rivers should be neglected no longer.

THE INDEPENDENT OIL PRODUCER—THE FORGOTTEN MAN IN THE OIL INDUSTRY

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the words "poverty amidst plenty" and "pockets of poverty" have become familiar ones these days. The casual observer would hardly look for such pockets of poverty in an industry largely reputed to be among the Nation's wealthiest, but nevertheless, they exist. They exist among the independent oil-producers of this country. We have heard, ever since the New Deal days and earlier, about "the forgotten man." In the oil industry, the forgotten man is the small independent producer—and by its own study of the situation, the Department of the Interior evidently intends that he shall remain forgotten.

In its thoroughgoing study entitled "An Appraisal of the Petroleum Industry of the United States," the Department appraises the work of the independent producer, finds that it is good, and important to the future of the industry—and then virtually forecasts his disappearance from the scene. The report tells us that the independent oil operator "does most of the wildcatting and, according to industry estimates, finds most of the oil, perhaps 80 to 85 percent." But what is happening to this man so important to the future of the industry? The report speaks of a well-defined trend toward fewer and fewer small companies, a shrinkage in their share of the total production, and speaks of "the onset of a long-term trend toward fewer and larger independents." The report tells just how this operates. It says:

> At any point in time, a given producer may determine that his financial interests are better served by sale of oil in place, rather than by continuing to produce.

I might add that—at any point in time—when a producer stops producing and turns to mere selling, then men are thrown out of work, tax supports for our local governments and school systems begin to decrease, and the long-range causes of poverty are on the increase. In Congress we have heard the representatives of every oil-producing area in this Nation, and from all of them the reports are similar. Crude oil prices are declining, the costs of labor and materials are rising, and fewer wells are being drilled. We heard, too, from the coal-producing areas of Appalachia, whose representatives charge that much of the poverty in their areas is caused by the excessive importation of oil from overseas. I submit that the history-making Appalachia law, passed by this Congress, would be greatly strengthened by removing a measure of this competition to one of its most important products.

Twelve of the nineteen counties of my west Texas district list petroleum products as their chief natural resource. In all of the others, oil contributes directly or indirectly to the general prosperity. In my district, the people resent the fact that the importation of oil from overseas is both overwhelming and increasing. They have heard that the Government wishes to halt the flow of American gold overseas, and at the same time they have learned that 40 percent of our balance-of-payments deficit is caused by the inflow of black gold from overseas.

I recognize, and my constituents recognize, that a sound worldwide petroleum economy is important to the future of the industry and the future of our Nation and its allies. We do not ask for a halt to oil imports, but we do ask for a greater measure of control. We support fully the legislation proposed by my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, the Honorable OMAR BURLESON, in H.R. 2177, which would reduce oil imports by 375,000 barrels per day, and would limit Defense Department purchases of foreign oil to 15 percent of the Department's total requirements.

We believe that the passage of this legislation and a full recognition by the Department of the Interior that the future of the independent producer must be assured will do much toward revitalizing a depressed segment of the oil industry. We believe it will go far toward solving our balance-of-payments problem, and that it will contribute materially toward the general prosperity of the area which I have the honor to represent.

DISCRIMINATION IN THE FARM PROGRAM

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, things become stranger day by day in the administration's discriminatory attitude against the upper Midwest. As you know, North Dakotans of both political parties were shocked to hear the President's budget message recommending a cutback from 3½ to 1 million farmers.

We had hoped that we had this attitude corrected, but then just last week the Department of Agriculture granted a sugarbeet acreage permit to a new group in Maine without holding new hearings and giving our farmers in North Dakota a chance to plead their case.

And virtually the same day the Department, which as you know is cutting back the acreage of our growers in North Dakota, announced that they would allow unlimited acreage to New York State farmers who wanted to raise beets. They normally had a 75-acre limitation on new beet growers, but the Department of Agriculture announced, and I am quoting:

> The 75-acre limitation is removed and maximum acreage that can be committed to a farm will be determined by the New York ASC Committee.

The announcement goes on to say, and I quote:

> If farmers in the central New York locality do not contract for all of the 29,500 acres available, the company building the beet sugar factory may wish to plant some of the remaining acreage.

If this is not corporation farming, I do not know what it is.

It seems strange that we are getting more and more into a double standard discriminating against the smaller States. We find that farmers in New York State can plant unlimited acreage of sugarbeets. Corporations are even being encouraged to get into the farming business. Under the education program, a child in New York State is given far more than a child in North Dakota. Our veterans facilities are being shut down in the smaller States and new ones built in the more densely populated areas, although unfortunately people still get sick in small States.

I think it is imperative that all of us from the upper Midwest—Democrats, Republicans, and Independents alike—speak out loud and clear at this discriminatory series of actions which temporarily may benefit a few highly populated States, but in the long run will not benefit America and is not in the best interests of our Nation's future.

LET'S INVESTIGATE ALL UN-AMERICAN GROUPS

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, nearly 2 months ago I asked the President and the Members of this body to use their great influence to bring an end to the defiance of law and order in Alabama. I deplored then, and I deplore now acts of violence and the tearing down of law and order. No decent, self-respecting, law-abiding American condones murder or those who incite to murder. We are against lynching and mob rule and killing whether inspired by cowardly riders in the night or pious hypocrites agitating in the public streets.

I join in asking the Committee on Un-American Activities to conduct a thorough investigation of those organizations responsible for the current trouble in Alabama and the violence and death that has occurred in other States in recent years. On numerous occasions I have pointed out the Communist infiltration of some of the organizations responsible for the demonstrations in Selma and other places. These charges should be investigated, not shrugged off by these leaders as the leaders of the violence did so casually on several TV interviews last Sunday.

Mr. Speaker, I urge that the Un-American Activities Committee conduct a thorough and complete investigation of CORE, the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the Ku Klux Klan, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, NAACP, and the Southern Conference Education Fund.

Then I call upon the American people to stop following false leaders who trade upon our national trait of compassion for our fellow man to engage in un-American pursuits.

FRANK TALK NEEDED ON FRENCH DEBTS TO UNITED STATES

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, recently an Air France jetliner took off from Kennedy International Airport in New York. The jet was on its way to Paris, and French Government agents were on board to guard the more than 10 bars of U.S. gold just obtained by General de Gaulle in exchange for U.S. dollars.

The Treasury Department has just noted that U.S. gold stocks declined $250 million last week, and that $231.5 million of U.S. gold drops were a result of French demands for U.S. gold.

France still owes the United States $6 billion in World War I debts, and has made no payment on them since 1931. France also owes the United States over $600 million in debts for World War II.

This is one account which needs to be balanced. To allow General de Gaulle to escape payments on debts over 34 years old while he continues his onslaught against America's gold reserves is absurd. France is in effect using our own money to attack the American dollar.

Commonsense dictates that gold be exchanged for dollars in order that the faith in American money be upheld. But commonsense also dictates that loans be repaid, particularly by those countries who have so many U.S. dollars that they can exchange them for over $230 million worth of U.S. gold.

I have introduced House Concurrent Resolution 301 which expresses the feeling of the Congress that France's repayments on her World War I debts to the United States be put back on the original schedule. General de Gaulle should be made aware that the feeling of the American people is such that France repay her debts. I urge the State Department to bring this view before the French Government in a clear and forceful manner.

THE NEW YORK DEMOCRATIC CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I was gratified that late last Friday night when the vote on final passage of the education bill came that of the 27 New York Democrats all 27 New York Democrats were present and voted for that bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that those misinformed critics who ascribe exclusive membership in the nonexistent "Tuesday-to-Thursday Club" to New Yorkers took note of that.

I am equally certain, if not more so, that they will make no mention of it.

SHOULD FOREIGN AID BE MOTIVATED BY PHILANTHROPIC IDEALS?

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the softness of American foreign policy, and much more has been said implying that softheartedness or sympathy for our neighbors across the sea is softheadedness.

Rare is the Congressman supporting a foreign aid program who dares risking the cynicism of his colleagues by admitting to a philanthropic motive, however mild. Altruism is for the squares, both in the executive and the legislative branches. We couch our speeches and arguments in terms of fighting communism, or of making money in the long run by increasing the capability of our neighbor nations to buy from us.

Indeed, it seems that any intimation of moving with the philanthropic motive of feeding the hungry, healing the sick, or educating the illiterate out of the goodness of our hearts would constitute a poor argument in the Halls of Congress.

It would be shocking, therefore, to learn that at least one Asian statesman, according to Crosby S. Noyes of the Evening Star, has seen through us and says that we, the United States, will ultimately succeed in his part of the world because we, as a people, want to be loved.

It may develop that despite ourselves, the goodness of hearts and our sincere desire to help others to obtain for themselves the blessings of freedom and prosperity, may show through our smokescreen of self-professed self-interest and discover that our softheartedness is in fact our greatest strength in international affairs. I like to think that deep down in the heart of every Congressman who votes for foreign aid programs there burns a carefully hidden spark of philanthropy—a desire to do good in the world, to express his love for his fellow men, with a faint hope that his own beloved country may be loved in return.

While the arguments of fighting communism and economic self-interest are sound and true, I hope that in the coming debates on the foreign aid bill, it will be permissible to unearth a few teachings from the past to characterize our softheartedness, such as "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you" and "Love thy neighbor as thyself."

Under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the article entitled "The Reluctant Lovers," which appeared in the Evening Star of March 29, 1965:

THE RELUCTANT LOVERS

(By Crosby S. Noyes)

"You know why you will succeed in the end? It is very simple, really. It is because you, as a people, are anxious to be loved."

The idea was so startling in this cynical age that I wondered if my host could be joking. Elder statesmen in Asia—even those with a long record of pro-Americanism—seldom talk this way. For that matter, neither do Americans.

"Take the British," my host went on. "They ran this part of the world for the better part of a century. They may have been smarter than you in many ways, but they never gave a damn. You Americans do, and it is your strength in the long run."

It was most unsettling. Americans have long grown accustomed to being jeered at as a pack of international Boy Scouts. They are also fairly inured to the experience of having some pipsqueak despot telling them to take their foreign aid and jump in the lake.

Their response to these normal international pleasantries has been a self-conscious hardening of the American hide. The image of the bumbling idealist these days is immensely unfashionable. The dreary succession of Quiet Americans and Ugly Americans and assorted, doomed, wanting-to-be-loved Americans has left its imprint on the public consciousness.

Today, Americans much prefer to think of themselves as hard-boiled characters who suffer neither from illusions nor excessive virtue.

We lecture ourselves constantly on our inability to impose our concepts on an alien world. We have developed an awareness of our limitations, both spiritual and temporal, which threatens at times to develop into a kind of cult of impotence.

It has been a long time since sentimentality was a good selling point for American foreign policy. If we give away billions it is always in the name of "enlightened self-interest." Each year, our foreign aid programs are examined with a greater what's-in-it-for-us attitude by a critical Congress.

The commitment of American power around the world is subject to even more skeptical scrutiny. If American troops are in Berlin and Vietnam and Thailand it is not, heaven forbid, that we love Germans, Vietnamese or Thais, but because the threat of Communist imperialism in Europe or Asia raises an intolerable threat to our own security.

Our enemies, at least, consider us anything but lovable. And most people, one feels, would rather prefer to be thought of as imperialist warmongers or even paper tigers than as a bunch of sloppy philanthropists.

Yet here is a shrewd, immensely experienced old man who says it is all because we want to be loved. And, what's more, that we're succeeding. The thought is almost unbearable.

What if he is right? What if there is, after all, some element of idealism in the American mind and the American image which has survived our best efforts to be tough guys and which still comes across to people? What if there really are those who believe the United States stands for things like human decency and justice and freedom, and pray that we will prevail?

Who knows what impossible demands may be made on us by people who believe in us more than we believe in ourselves? How can we coldly define our interests and set tidy limits on our commitments to a world in which we succeed in making ourselves beloved?

Yet the voice of my host whispers on like the rustle of impending disaster:

"What you are doing will take time. You are planting seeds. You may not live to know the shade of the tree that grows, but your children will."

GOOD PROSPECTS FOR EARLY SUGAR LEGISLATION

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the body of the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, to any Member who seeks to gain a working understanding of the world sugar situation in 20 minutes, I recommend a reading of a speech delivered by the gentleman from North Carolina, the Honorable HAROLD D. COOLEY, chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, before the 12th Congress of the International Society of Sugar Cane Technologists in San Juan, Puerto Rico on March 29, 1965. I am happy to note from Mr. COOLEY's address that the sugar industry has arrived at an agreement satisfactory to all concerned. This no doubt means that prospects for the extension of the Sugar Act, which expires at the end of this year, by legislation at an early date appear to be excellent. It is hoped that this might be accomplished prior to May 31 of this year. I include Mr. COOLEY's address in the RECORD:

THE SCIENTIST IN A HUNGRY WORLD

(By HAROLD D. COOLEY)

Let me first tell the wonderful people of Puerto Rico how blessed you are to live on this island. Mother Nature indulges her extravagances here in a measure unsurpassed anywhere in the world, to lavish beauty upon this land.

Then let me say how fortunate are those of us from the States and from the far corners of the world, that the hospitality of Puerto Rico is unbounded and we today enjoy the beauty and charm of your island and the warmth of your friendship.

I last was here in November of 1961, to address the Farm Bureau of Puerto Rico.

As I recall, I said then—and I now repeat—that there is no better place on the face of the earth where a serious thinking person, distraught by the plight of the world in this tragic age of bitterness and conflict, may rekindle his faith—may restore his hope and his confidence—as in this bright place. Friendship and progress, among men and with other nations, is setting an example here for a peaceful and promising future for mankind.

It is especially gratifying to me that I am afforded the opportunity to return to Puerto Rico. I am pleased to speak before the 12th Congress of the International Society of Sugar Cane Technologists.

Sugar is agriculture in Puerto Rico. Agriculture here, as on the mainland of the United States, is the measure of our ultimate progress. Farming is the base of our standard of living and of the strength of the democratic process of government. The same is true all over the world.

The United States could not have become the greatest industrial nation on earth except for the character and efficiency of its farm people. We could not have built a prosperous nation without our farm and food scientists who have explored and blazed the new trails to abundance. Our agriculture underpins our industrial system and our total economy.

Your agriculture here in Puerto Rico is achieving the same goal. Puerto Rico is a vital link in our relationships with other lands of this hemisphere. And today I am pleased to note, in this meeting of scientists from many lands, Puerto Rico is a focal point for important agricultural interests of a large part of the world.

We in the Congress of the United States recognize Puerto Rico not only as an important sugar producing area but also as a part of the overall U.S. sugar industry. This U.S. sugar industry includes Puerto Rico, with the cane areas of Louisiana, Hawaii, and Florida, and the 23 States which produce beet sugar.

Many people think of the United States primarily as a sugar consuming nation. It is that—the world's largest consumer. But it also is one of the world's largest sugar producers.

I should like to discuss here some of the things in which all of you have a deep interest. I want to review the part that scientists, as you who are gathered here, have played in making the United States one of the world's leading cane sugar producers. I should like to mention some of the measures which have been taken in the United States and the world to protect the economy of sugar producers. Then I want to bring into perspective the importance of the farm and food scientist in the world today.

In terms of cane sugar alone, the United States is the fourth largest world sugar producer, being exceeded by Cuba, Brazil, and India in that order. These other areas produce more cane sugar than the United States only because they plant many more acres to sugarcane.

The technical advancement of our domestic producers is largely reflected in the tonnage of sugarcane produced per acre. In 1963–64 the production of cane in domestic U.S. areas averaged 38.8 tons per acre. This compared with a worldwide average of 21.9 tons.

These high tonnages are not an accident. They are the result of intensive work of our very fine corps of sugarcane scientists.

Of particular interest in this regard is the support to research activities given by the Congress of the United States. In the last fiscal year, the Congress provided $1,400,500 for sugarcane research. This, so far as I can ascertain, comprises the world's largest sugarcane research appropriation. And, of course, private research, by the cane producers, is very extensive.

The effects of research in our domestic sugar areas has been dramatic. For example, for the 5-year period, 1955 to 1960, production of cane per acre in the United States increased nearly 39 percent. This is approximately 4 times the increase of the rest of the world.

Of course, in recounting these facts I have no disposition to reflect upon other world areas. My purpose is to show what people in your profession can do. It is very significant that when trends of yields in the different areas of the world are compared, these areas having the highest level of research activities are those which show the greatest increase in the tonnage of cane per acre.

Now let us look for a moment at measures that have been taken, at public policies which have been established, to protect the economy of sugar producers.

The world sugar economy is beset and bedeviled by chronic overproduction in relation to consumption. With only very temporary reversals, this situation has characterized the world sugar picture since the early 1920's despite efforts to stabilize world sugar market conditions.

The first really successful program for maintaining economic sugar markets was the U.S. Sugar Act. This program was approved originally in 1934. The act has been on the U.S. statute books ever since that time, and we now are in the process of revising and extending this program as we have done many times in years past.

This act has operated successfully for 30 years and, for a number of years, it has operated successfully in the larger environment of the International Sugar Agreement.

Basically, the U.S. Sugar Act is intended to do three things: (1) Make it possible, as a matter of national security, to produce a substantial part of our sugar requirements within continental United States and to do this without the consumer-penalizing device of a high protective tariff; (2) assure U.S. consumers of a plentiful and stable supply of sugar at reasonable prices; and (3) permit nearby friendly foreign countries to participate equitably in supplying the U.S. sugar market for the double purpose of expanding international trade and assuring a stable and adequate supply of sugar.

The Sugar Act has been notably successful in attaining all three of these major objectives. Under its protection, more than 60 percent of our total consumption of sugar is supplied by domestic growers in the continental limits of the United States and in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, and the Virgin Islands.

The Sugar Act has given us this security in supplies and has done so at a minimum cost to the consumer and taxpayer. Retail sugar prices in the United States have been remarkably stable since the enactment of the Sugar Act. Moreover, our Sugar Act has been nearly as successful in attaining its third objective—the sharing of part of our market equitably among friendly nations.

However, no system is immune to changed conditions. With severance of diplomatic relations between the United States and Cuba, the United States chose to look elsewhere for approximately one-third of its total sugar requirements. So drastic a change in conditions naturally caused dislocations in the movement of sugar supplies.

One of the mechanisms adopted to meet these changed conditions was the so-called global quota. Under this concept, a substantial portion of the quota previously assigned to Cuba was established as a common pot which foreign suppliers might fill. This had the effect of putting the United States into the world market for about one-sixth of its supplies. Much of the runup in U.S. prices occurring in the spring of 1963 was attributable to this fact.

The foreign quota provisions of the U.S. Sugar Act expired as of December 31 last year. In their place, quotas for foreign countries have been established by the Secretary of Agriculture under the general administrative powers accorded him by the act. The Secretary's exercise of these powers, while necessary under the circumstances, must be regarded as a temporary expedient. A matter of such significance, not only to the U.S. cane refining industry but also to individual supplying countries, should not permanently be left to administrative discretion but should be spelled out in legislative enactment. It is essential, therefore, that the U.S. Sugar Act be revised at an early date.

In addition to the matter of foreign sugar imports and the pricing conditions under which such sugars enter the U.S. market, there are other needed amendments relating to the quotas for domestic beet and mainland cane areas. In a time of world sugar scarcity, these areas sharply expanded their production to a point beyond the marketing opportunity afforded by presently existing quotas. Accordingly, these areas need some relief.

Efforts to achieve such relief failed last year, due to inability of the domestic industry to reconcile differences among its various segments.

I am pleased to report to this distinguished gathering today that these conflicting interests now have settled their differences and have agreed upon recommendations which they will make to the executive departments and to the Congress with respect to new sugar legislation. Details of the agreement were announced and published in Washington this morning.

I cannot commit a majority in the Congress or myself at this time to support all the details of their proposition, but I will say that it is encouraging, indeed, that this industry, the producers—beet and cane—and refiners have settled their differences and have come forward with a common proposal.

The Sugar Act of the United States perhaps is of such interest to this group that you may wish to know some of the details of the agreement reached in our domestic industry.

The industry proposal would provide relief for the mainland beet and cane industries from their surplus production of 1963 and 1964 by giving them, in effect, an advance on their anticipated growth for the next 5 or 6 years. It would increase mainland cane quotas by 205,000 tons, and beet quotas by 375,000 tons, effective as of January 1, 1965. These are the quota levels that these areas would reach when total consumption in the United States reaches 10.4 million tons—probably about 5 years from now. Until the consumption of the United States reaches this level, all the annual growth will go to foreign countries—none to the domestic areas.

When consumption reaches 10.4 million tons, domestic and foreign areas would again share the annual growth under the same terms as in the present law.

With respect to the Cuban quota, which Cuba is not permitted to fill as long as that country and the United States are not in diplomatic relations, the industry group recommends that this be allocated on a temporary basis to other foreign countries in proportion to their shipments of sugar to the United States in some representative recent period.

Their recommendations also contain the following provisions: (1) Each year a country that provided its part of the Cuban quota on a temporary basis would receive 10 percent of that amount as an addition to its permanent quota and the Cuba quota would be reduced accordingly; (2) when, and if, diplomatic relations are resumed with Cuba, it would receive one-third of its remaining quota the year following, two-thirds the next year, and the full quota the third year; and the temporary quotas of other countries would be reduced proportionately;

(3) Pending the return of its full quota, Cuba would be assigned all of the deficits which normally would be divided among all foreign countries, but not in excess of its remaining permanent quota;

(4) Failure to fill the temporary quota assigned to any country, in a year when world prices are above U.S. prices, would result in the same permanent quota forfeiture as would failure to fill a permanent quota.

I believe that, in general, the agreement reached by the various segments of the U.S. sugar industry is a statesmanlike proposal and that it will bring the reestablishment of a firm and workable U.S. sugar policy a long step closer.

I must report that there is one aspect of the sugar industry's recommendations with which I find myself in personal disagreement. They recommend that an import fee of not to exceed 50 percent of the difference between the world price and the statutory price objective of the Sugar Act, but in no event more than 1 cent per pound, be assessed against sugar from all countries except the Philippines. I do not believe in an import fee in any amount.

Now, let us go to the main point I want to make in this discussion. This does not relate to sugar specifically, but to agricultural science generally. I want to stress the power of your science and then to speak through you to all farm scientists wherever they may be.

Before a hungry world, agriculture is America's greatest success story. On agriculture, all else depends.

The accelerating progress of science in our agriculture during this century has exploded into a full-scale revolution, and has set into motion a great proliferation of new ideas that have profoundly changed our Nation.

Our scientists, men and women of your profession, have worked side by side with our farmers to master the arts of abundance so that today in the United States the average farmer produces enough farm products to supply 33 persons, 4 of them citizens of other countries supplied through our agricultural exports.

This efficiency, through science and by the willing hands of our farm people, now is such that only about 7 percent of our total labor force is engaged in agriculture. This has released 93 percent of our working people to manufacturing and merchandising and performing other services to create a standard of living for the average citizen unmatched anywhere.

I recount these facts to emphasize to you what can be done by people in your profession, when farmers apply your knowledge and your arts.

While in the United States, 1 farmer feeds and clothes 33 persons, in Europe, according to the latest figures available to me, the average farmer produces enough for 10 persons, and in Russia, under a collectivist system, 1 farmworker's production feeds only 4 or 5 persons. In most of the world more than half the population is required in agriculture.

Now look at what your science has done for people.

Food costs represent only 18.8 percent of the average family's income, after taxes, in the United States. This contrasts sharply with food costs in other parts of the world. By the latest figures available from the United Nations, consumers in the United Kingdom spend 29.5 percent of their income for food, in Russia 53 percent, in France 30 percent, Greece 46 percent, Italy 44 percent, and so it goes.

There are many places in the world with land and climate equal, and perhaps superior, to the land and climate of the United States.

I am thinking what a wonderful place this world would be if the knowledge and arts of you farm and food scientists could be brought to bear in all places around the world.

I am thinking what this would do to banish hatred and war from the face of the earth.

I am thinking about the universal tranquility of mankind.

This is my message through you to all the farm scientists around the world:

The four horsemen of the Apocalypse—hunger, war, pestilence, and death—still ride the face of the earth. Mankind now has the power through science, if we have the will, to annihilate hunger and war. By banishing the cause of hunger, we can obliterate a cause for war. To you agricultural scientists I say that no other group of men and women the world over has greater opportunity for service to humanity. Yours is an unlimited horizon. Let us get on with the challenge and to the task that lies before us.

I wish you Godspeed.

PATMAN PLEADS FOR LEGISLATIVE AND ECONOMIC AIDS FOR EACH CONGRESSMAN TO SAVE THE TAXPAYER MONEY; AND FOR A BUILDING TO BE CALLED THE JOHN McCORMACK OFFICE BUILDING

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, nearly a year ago, I made a speech in which I pointed out that big government, like big business and big labor, was here to stay. I noted that it could be efficient and responsible to the will of the people or that it could unfortunately be something else not as desirable. A weak government cannot deal with big business and big labor.

I stated then, and I want to repeat now, that one way to make the Congress responsible to the will of the people and efficient would be to permit by law that each Congressman have an adequate staff so that he could have the advantage of specialized screening which he so sorely needs today.

I suggested a year ago, and I reiterate now, that I think every Representative should have at least one qualified economist in his office and a qualified legislative aid as well; responsible to the Member and selected by him; assistants upon whom he can rely for information to enable him to vote more intelligently.

Our tremendous workload makes it imperative that we have such assistance. Without such help, the Congress will continue to bear the brunt of a lot of criticism that we could and should avoid.

Because of our limited abilities due to our inadequate staffing, some of our home States are, mistakenly I believe, opening up legislative offices in Washington. I look upon this move by our States, which are only acting out of sheer desperation, I am sure, as perhaps a potential evil that could certainly negate any good that such an office might perform. If each of the 50 States opens up a lobbying office, each one looking after their particular interests, they may be working at cross purposes to another State's Washington lobby. This will not facilitate or simplify the passage of good legislation benefiting all the people, but can very easily pile a new set of lobbyists on top of those we have.

If each representative had adequate help, State governments would not be frustrated; they could work with our legal and economic specialists and thus not be forced to resort to the unnecessary expense of carrying on State lobbying offices. Further, these lobbyists representing States will not be able in nearly all instances to call upon the proper governmental leaders and bureau chiefs for service the way the tried and true Congressmen and Senators are able to do.

MY OWN EXPERIENCE IS YOURS, TOO

Now let us look into my own experience, which is the same as yours as far as workload is concerned.

For more than 36 years I have tried to provide every legitimate service and honor every legitimate request from my constituents. Though I have had an extremely able staff, this has taken a great deal of my time. I am not complaining, I am merely stating a fact.

On top of this workload, I am confronted with voting on one piece of legislation after another. Every one of my 434 colleagues has the same problem that I do. We must take care of our constituents' legitimate needs; we must entertain or at least give time to constituents when they come to Washington; and besides all this, we are supposed to have the knowledge of Einstein and the wisdom of Solomon when we legislate. When the roll is called on an issue, it often happens that many Members are uninformed on it and have no one available to turn to who has the knowledge and whom he is willing to completely trust.

In a Government such as ours, we are under constant pressure from well-organized lobbies. Some represent people, many represent privilege. Too frequently we take the presentations of the lobbyists as facts when such information is really a lopsided plea from selfish interests. Consequently, we get some legislation that never should be passed—and never would be passed if the Members of the Congress had the screening specialists that I hope we will all have in the not-too-distant future.

SOME MAY DISAGREE

There are those who may disagree and say, "Well, our committees do a good deal of screening for us and we have the benefit of committee reports." Many of these run 300 or 400 pages. Unless he is particularly interested in the subject covered by one of these reports, will the average Member read it and digest it? Of course not. He literally does not have the time, even if he had the energy.

It is a fact which I readily acknowledge that many Congressmen have lawyers in their offices who are qualified to study legislation, but as my colleagues well know, these legal aids double in brass for all kinds of chores that come up and there being nobody else to perform them, they are drafted.

What I proposed a year ago, and I again say is absolutely necessary for an efficient and responsible Congress, is the passage of legislation that will add to the personnel of each Representative a legal adviser and an economist.

And there must be room for this additional personnel. More about this in a moment.

HOW MANY LAWS DID THE 88TH CONGRESS PASS?

In the last Congress, the 88th, there were almost 13,000 bills introduced. In addition, Members offered 1,200 resolutions. Altogether, 987 bills and resolutions passed the House of Representatives; 666 bills that the House approved ultimately became public laws. How many costly sleepers were there in those laws? How many costly sleepers would have been eliminated if there were many watching who were qualified to watch? How many billions could we have thus saved the taxpayer?

In the last Congress major tax legislation was enacted. Every American and every business, large and small, was affected one way or another by this legislation. Hearings on the tax legislation ran into seven volumes covering 4,000 printed pages. What a splendid opportunity for shenanigans. I wonder how many of my colleagues read the 4,000 pages. Who really knows what that legislation was all about unless they read it? How many sleepers are there in it? How many cases of petty and grand larceny are involved? Who really knows the answers to these questions?

I am not in any way criticizing the extremely able gentleman who is chairman of the Ways and Means Committee that handles tax matters or any member of that committee. I merely state that they—as I am—are forced to rely too often upon information from lobbyists who have axes to grind, and it is physically impossible for the members of the committee or the Congress to know whether or not there are sleepers in some of these "Whereases" and the "Therefore be it enacted's" that infect our legislation.

HISTORY REPEATS ITSELF

In my speech of a year ago, I said and I repeat, "It is my belief that Congress needs a vast increase in the number of technical consultants and legal and economic advisers to report directly to the Congressman they work for * * *. In my * * * experience in the Congress, I have come to the conclusion that practically all Members desire to be more knowledgeable than they are * * *."

LET'S SUPPOSE AND SUPPOSE AND SUPPOSE

Do you suppose, if each Congressman had had proper personnel to study legislation and properly evaluate it that the Congress would have abdicated its constitutional authority over money matters the way it has for the last three decades?

Do you suppose, if Congress were properly serviced by competent economists and legislative specialists it would have permitted a small group of private bankers, banking institutions, and combines to gain control of America's central bank, the Federal Reserve System?

Do you think for one minute that if the individual Members of Congress had competent help to study matters such as money supply and interest rates that are vitally important to every single one of nearly 200 million Americans that a handful of men who are totally independent of the Government of the United States could tighten or ease the money supply, and raise or lower interest rates, whenever their own caprice or prejudice tells them to?

Do you suppose that if each individual Congressman had other advice and counsel than that of the lobbyists for the biggest fat cats in America, the American Bankers Association, they would have permitted an exclusive club, which I will call the "Money Bags 21 Club of New York City"—not to be confused with the saloon-restaurant—to have, in violation I believe of antitrust laws, the sole right to purchase and sell Government securities? I refer, of course, to the 21 dealers who represent the Open Market Committee.

Do you suppose if we had qualified legislative and economic advisers on each Congressman's payroll we would have permitted a situation to arise whereby the head of America's central bank, the Federal Reserve System, could say at a public hearing that he and his Federal Reserve heirarchy had the authority to act totally independent of the President and the Secretary of the Treasury if they felt it necessary in formulating monetary policy?

Do you suppose that the public debt of the United States would be as ridiculously high as it is, $320 billion, were it not for those independent of any branch of the U.S. Government who, when interest rates were low and reasonable on long-term Government securities screamed about eliminating the debt, while today with interest rates near the ceiling and threatening to go higher now we say we need not worry about a greater public debt? They love a bigger debt with higher interest.

Would such errant nonsense have been permitted by the Congress if every individual Member had the proper staff to devote to studying this type of problem?

The answer to each and every one of these question is a resounding "Nay."

AN HONOR BEFITTING A GREAT AMERICAN

I am dropping into the hopper today a bill that is not an extravagant but a saving bill. It calls for the creation of two specialist positions in the office of every Member of the House of Representatives, as indicated in my remarks a moment ago.

It would be folly to pass a law granting each Member the needed aids if he has no place to put them. Therefore, a new building will be required.

Certainly, if you go into any Member's office today, he does not have space for the help he already has. Therefore, I propose an office building be erected on the space that is already cleared on Independence Avenue, adjacent to the Cannon House Office Building and across from the Library of Congress. I suggest that this building be erected to honor a man who has so ably taken the place of my near lifelong friend, the late Speaker Sam Rayburn.

From the time John McCormack came to the Congress in 1928 to the present day, he has proven to be both a gentleman and a scholar. As Speaker of the House, he ranks with the alltime greats, with Speakers Joe Cannon, Nicholas Longworth, and Sam Rayburn.

Since a new building will be necessary it is only fitting that we honor this great American, John McCormack. It is fitting that we give him the honor he richly deserves while he is so much alive. Therefore, I ask that the proposed new building be called the John McCormack Office Building, to highlight for all time his consuming ambition that the Congress, which he loves so dearly, achieve superiority and excellent in government.

In closing, I would say that we cannot obtain too much knowledge when we consider the intricacies and difficulties of the scientific age in which we live. We cannot better accelerate the passage of worthwhile legislation desired by most of the American people than by giving each legislator the additional personnel my bill calls for. Any money paid these additional aids will come back to the taxpayer tenfold, or even a hundredfold or a thousandfold. And if my proposal becomes law, we must make sure that every Congressman has adequate quarters for his legislative scholars, counselors and advisers. I say as I said a year ago, "Let there be more light—and let there be room for the lamplighter."

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an editorial that appeared in the Waco, Tex., News of June 19, 1958, under the heading, "House Members Seeking Administrative Assistants."

It is as follows:

HOUSE MEMBERS SEEKING ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANTS

In an effort to meet their growing responsibilities in a constantly expanding National Government, Members of the U.S. Senate created in 1946 96 posts—one for each Senator—known as administrative assistants to be filled by energetic, trusted aids who could speak and act for the Senator on many occasions and who could serve as ears and eyes for him in keeping track of legislation and constituents demands.

Now 131 Members of the House of Representatives have indicated in a poll that they need the same kind of administrative assistants. A decision may come this summer.

A hot debate now is going on among Members of the House over the question. There will be a showdown soon on the issue in the House Rules Committee.

Senators have had administrative assistants for 12 years. An administrative assistant has been characterized as a Senator's "alter ego." When the job was created in 1946, it was anticipated that the Senate administrative assistants would handle Washington problems for their Senators' constituents.

In actual practice most administrative assistants run their Senators' offices, dig up facts on legislation and constituents' problems, see visitors, attend conferences and social functions as standins for their Senators. Base pay is $8,800. Top is $14,800.

Under a bill introduced by Representative SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL, Maryland Democrat, and pending before the House Rules Committee, a House administrative assistant would get a base pay of $7,500, a top pay of $12,874.

Some Congressmen would have their administrative assistants do research for them, study legislation, and answer questions posed by their constituents.

Representative Albert Morano, Connecticut Republican, says that he gets requests from Connecticut students to write "practically their entire term papers."

Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texarkana, thinks each Representative ought to have not one, but two, administrative assistants, one to run his office, the other to keep the House Member up to date on legislation.

In a recent speech PATMAN said that "the blunt truth is that many House Members vote on bills without really knowing what is in them." He predicted that administrative assistants for House Members could save the taxpayers billions of dollars. Wisely used, they probably could.

MARCH ON MONTGOMERY—THE UNTOLD STORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DICKINSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, last week Alabama witnessed the climax to weeks of civil rights activities in my State. It was a week which brought literally thousands of men and women of many races, colors, and creeds to participate in what has been widely considered as a kind of holy crusade for human rights. During this period there were scores of confrontations between demonstrators and law enforcement agencies—resulting in many arrests. There was discord, there was violence, there was death, all of which we deplore. From all of this a completely distorted picture of the State of Alabama has been painted. It is a picture of a place peopled by vicious, racist bigots whose only joy is found in the suppression of the Negro race; in the denial of the Negro's right to vote and to participate as a first-class citizen of his State and his Nation; a place where the Negro's search for simple human dignity must go forever unrewarded; a place where the Negro must live out his days in constant terror of police brutality and bombs that explode in the night.

Mr. Speaker, this is an image of Alabama widely accepted as accurate by many people in this Nation and the rest of the world today. It is, however, an image which has been deliberately, knowingly, and purposefully contrived. I have pointed this out before on this floor. It is, in short, but a part of an effort to divide and to conquer this Nation—and if this effort goes unchallenged, it may well accomplish its purpose.

There is a story here, however, that has been untold and, for the most part, is unknown. While I have but one small voice and what I say here may go unheeded, I would be remiss in my duties if I did not speak the facts for all of America to know—and the facts which I am about to relate are true and I can substantiate every fact. Mr. Speaker, if you think these facts are vile and obscene and are unpleasant to hear, I agree. But think what it is like to have witnessed them and had them occur in your community.

First and foremost there was not one big group of moralists and Negro sympathizers that invaded Selma and marched on Montgomery. There were four distinct and usually identifiable groups intermingled and participating in a common effort but each for its own motives.

This has been characterized by some and depicted as a type of holy crusade. Let me read you a circular actually handed out to the marchers by some of those participating in the march:

WELCOME FREEDOM MARCHERS TO HOLLYWOOD BURLESQUE

(Produced by Paul Moscowitz and Peggy Anne)

GIRLS—GIRLS—GIRLS—GIRLS—GIRLS—GIRLS

Entertainment and refreshments furnished free to all freedom marchers by the Hollywood 10 Committee in cooperation with the Coed Committee To End Bigotry and Censorship.

(Note to ministers: We appreciate the cooperation given this spectacular, modern adventure in person-to-person entertainment by some of you who have cast off the chains of the past. Several of you, including perhaps the leader himself, are trying to make you look too pious and too old-fashioned. Please prevail upon the holdbacks to let the show go on in all of its unrestricted glory, fun, frolic, and warmth.)

TENT 9 NIGHTLY

Tent 9 will be pitched each evening ahead of the march, and the gala burlesque review will begin when the crowd arrives. Let every good man arrive.

(Note to southern girls: Come join in the fun if you can cast off the old-fashioned ideas, whether of racial bigotry or medieval moronic morality. Hollywood's greatest tradition beckons you. Come, meet Paul and the boys.)

Is this circular out of character with the rest of the march? Look at the participants.

One group was the Alabama Negro who participated to help secure rights and privileges which he felt had been withdrawn from him illegally. And there are many instances where this has been so—especially historically. This is not universally so in Alabama, however—only in isolated areas and none of these areas recently.

A second group are the do-gooders—those from outside our State who have no personal interest or involvement but who, out of compassion for those whom they are convinced need help and, although misinformed and misguided as to both the full facts and how those whom they seek to help can best be helped, come and participate in the marches, demonstrations, and even serious civil disturbances. This group, for the most part are serious, sincere, educated people such as the clergy, nuns, teachers, and other professional people. While their purpose may be noble, to a large extent they defeat their own aims because they worsen the condition they seek to improve. Let me hasten to add, however, that not all men who profess to be men of God and who don the clerical garb participate for altruistic reasons. Many are the type Jesus had in mind when he said:

> And when thou prayest, thou shalt not be as the hypocrites are: For they love to pray standing in the synagogues and in the corners of the streets, that they may be seen of men. Verily I say unto you, they have their reward. But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to the Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly.

We of our State do not condemn the first group. Perhaps we would react similarly in like circumstances. We can recognize the good intentions of the second group even though we know their method is wrong.

These two groups, however, make up only a small part of the total effort. Both of these groups are in fact being victimized and used as unknowing tools of the other two groups involved. In the final analysis the Alabama Negro will not achieve what he seeks by the means he now employs, nor will the do-gooders have helped him permanently.

The third group, also a tool being used by the fourth group, are human flotsam: adventurers, beatniks, prostitutes, and similar rabble. They flock to the standard of civil rights because this clothes them with a morality and a purpose which they otherwise lack. The fact is that they are recruited to be full-time demonstrators. They are promised $10 per day, free room and board and all of the sex they want from opposite members of either race. Free love among this group is not only condoned; it is encouraged. It is a fact and their way of life. Only by the ultimate sex act with one of another color can they demonstrate they have no prejudice.

Do I exaggerate? The pamphlet I have read at the beginning of my talk was distributed among the marchers from Selma to Montgomery. Drunkenness and sex orgies were the order of the day in Selma, on the road to Montgomery, and in Montgomery. There were many—not just a few—instances of sexual intercourse in public between Negro and white. News reporters saw this—law enforcement officials saw this, and Mr. Speaker, photographs were taken of this, I am told. I have not seen the actual photographs, but they are being processed and compiled.

Negro and white freedom marchers invaded a Negro church in Montgomery and engaged in an all-night session of debauchery within the church itself. The leadership of the church had to get help to have these freedom marchers put out of their church and even had to have the telephone disconnected because of the long-distance calls. Urinating in the street was not uncommon during demonstrations and more than one of these freedom marchers was arrested for indecent exposure in a public place.

Has anyone stopped to ask what sort of people can leave home, family and job—if they have one—and live indefinitely in a foreign place demonstrating? This is no religious group of sympathizers trying to help the Negro out of a sense of right and morality—this is a bunch of godless riffraff out for kicks and self-gratification that have left every campsite between Selma and Montgomery littered with whisky bottles, beer cans, and used contraceptives. I am prepared to prove these facts.

If you wonder why the Reverend Norman C. Turesdell, of Dubuque, Iowa, Rabbi Richard Rubenstein, chaplain of the University of Pittsburgh, and many other ministers and religious leaders left the so-called freedom march in disgust, this is the reason.

Who then, is the one or group that puts these groups together—that gives it cohesiveness, strength, money, and direction? Who or what can weld this diverse group together into a formidable force that can—and has—overcome? The answer is this: the Communist Party.

There are those that make a living out of seeing a Communist behind every bush or tree—or some Communist conspiracy or plot in every action of the State Department or foreign diplomacy. Let me assure you that such is not the case with me. I have not wanted to believe it—but I have been convinced. There are some in the Congress that do not want to believe it—and will not listen to the facts.

A few weeks ago a group of 14 Members from this House made themselves a committee to go to Selma to look into the situation there. In the course of the testimony that was given there, Judge Bernard Reynolds, probate judge of Dallas County, started mentioning the fact that there were Communist influences at work in the streets of Selma. He was interrupted by one of the visiting gentlemen with the remark:

> We don't care anything about that. Let's leave the Communists out of this.

I was later impressed with the evident truth of this statement when a vote of the Congress was taken to give or deny an appropriation to the House Un-American Activities Committee. Thirteen of these same fourteen Members voted against the House Un-American Activities Committee—the very committee of this body whose job it is to find out about communism in the U.S.A.

I am sure there are others here and elsewhere that "don't want to hear about Communists." But the facts are here for anyone that has eyes to see. The Communist Party and the Communist apparatus is the undergirding structure for all of the racial troubles in Alabama for the past 3 months.

Look at the speakers on the platform in front of the capitol in Montgomery or participating prominently in the march and demonstrations.

First. Carl Braden: A well-known Communist who has been active in civil rights activities for several years. Carl Braden has been active in so-called civil rights efforts for several years in the South. He was once convicted for conspiring with Negroes in Kentucky to bomb other Negroes' houses.

Second. Abner Berry: One of the directors of the Communist Party in the United States was in and out of the Selma-Montgomery area—and was photographed, I am told. I have not seen the photograph.

Third. James Peck: Field secretary for CORE. He has a Federal criminal record. Mr. Peck and a group of demonstrators once tried to prevent the launching of our first nuclear submarine. Later, he was forcibly removed from a nuclear test area in the Pacific where he had sailed with another group of demonstrators in an attempt to halt our Government's nuclear test program. Does anyone honestly believe that Mr. Peck is interested in Alabama Negroes' civil rights?

Fourth. Bayard Rustin: Rustin heads an organization known as the War Resisters League—which is the U.S. branch of an international organization known as War Resisters International. The purpose of this organization, in other words Mr. Bayard Rustin's chief business, is to persuade and to aid young men to avoid compulsory military service to their country. As recently as 2 years ago, Bayard Rustin's War Resisters League shared offices in New York City with the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Council—otherwise known as Snick. Snick was cosponsor, along with Martin Luther King's Southern Christian Leadership Conference of the Montgomery march. Bayard Rustin, by his own admission in the Saturday Evening Post, was a Communist Party organizer for 12 years.

Fifth. And what about the king himself—King Martin Luther. The only man in America that can announce when he will see the President—and it becomes a fact. Martin Luther King himself has amassed the staggering total of more than 60 Communist-front affiliations since 1955. In spite of which Dr. King has been quoted as saying last summer in Greenwood, Miss., that "there are no more Communists in the Mississippi summer project than there are Eskimos in Florida." With King at the time he made this statement was Bayard Rustin, who served as King's executive secretary for 3 years. King has also said that there are no Communists in the Southern Christian Leadership Conference. Hunter Pitts O'Dell, who took the fifth amendment before the House Un-American Activities Committee, and who was identified by witnesses as a Communist Party member, worked for more than a year with King's SCLC movement. King repeatedly denied that O'Dell was connected with his organization until the facts were proven otherwise, then he admitted that O'Dell had been employed by the SCLC. When King promoted the demonstrations in Birmingham in the summer of 1963, police identified and photographed a number of known Communist and suspected Communist sympathizers in King's supporting groups. His chief of staff at that time was Wyatt T. Walker. Mr. Walker is today editorial advisor to the Progressive Labor Movement, which has been described by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover as a Marxist-Leninist group following the more violent Chinese Communist line. The fact is that Martin Luther King has been virtually surrounded by Communists or Communist-fronters since 1955. No man in America has received more praise or more space coverage in such Communist newspapers as The Worker and People's World as Martin Luther King.

The logical question follows, Why would the Communists want to do this? What will they gain? The answer is that years ago a systematic plan was started by the Communists to divide the Deep South from the rest of the Nation by the very tactics they are now using. Divide and conquer. They are being eminently successful. The most disturbing thing about it is that the U.S. Government knows all these facts. That the FBI has a file on King Martin Luther and all the others I have mentioned. Yet the Government helped promote the occurrences in Alabama and even had an Under Secretary of State participate on the program with known Communists. Leroy Collins, Director, Community Relations Service, U.S. Department of Commerce, participated in the march. Government officials participate in such activities, and the Justice Department assists in their promotion, all with knowledge and consent of the President.

Mr. Speaker, I implore this body to cast aside all prejudice by color—pro or con. Forget race and look at all the facts objectively. Recently the American public has been made colorblind to the point that black makes red white. America must substitute reason and fact for emotion. We must wake up before it is too late. It may be too late now.

AFFIDAVIT

I, Karl Prussion, a former counterspy for the Federal Bureau of Investigation from 1947 to 1960, do hereby swear under oath and under penalty of perjury, that from the years 1954 through 1958 I attended five county committee meetings of the Communist Party of Santa Clara County, Calif. (A county committee meeting of the Communist Party consists of one delegate representing each Communist cell in a county.) The meetings were held during the aforementioned period in the following locations: The residence of Robert Lindsay, Communist, in San Jose, Calif., 1954; the residence of Mary Field, Communist section organizer, Palo Alto, Calif., 1955; the residence of Isobel and Edwin Cerney, both Communists, Menlo Park, Calif., 1956; the residence of Gertrude Adler, Communist, Palo Alto, Calif., 1957; the residence of Karl Prussion, counterspy for the FBI, Los Altos, Calif., 1958; the residence of Myra White, Communist, Mountain View, Calif., 1959.

I hereby further solemnly state that at each and every meeting as set forth above, one Ed Beck, Communist, who is presently secretary of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People of San Mateo County, Calif., and a member of the Congress on Racial Equality (CORE), presented the directive from the district office of the Communist Party in San Francisco to the effect that: "All Communists working within the framework of the NAACP are instructed to work for a change of the passive attitude of the NAACP toward a more militant, demonstrative, class struggle policy to be expressed by sit-ins, demonstrations, marches, and protests, for the purpose of transforming the NAACP into an organization for the achievement of Communist objectives."

I further swear and attest that at each and every one of the aforementioned meetings, one Rev. Martin Luther King was always set forth as the individual to whom Communists should look and rally around in the Communist struggle on the many racial issues.

I hereby also state that Martin Luther King has either been a member of, or wittingly has accepted support from, over 60 Communist fronts, individuals, and/or organizations, which give aid to or espouse Communist causes.

KARL PRUSSION.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 28th day of September 1963.

GEORGE E. SEARLES,
Notary Public.

My commission expires September 17, 1966.

MORE CHEEKS OR LESS AGITATORS IN ALABAMA

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. **BUCHANAN**. Mr. Speaker, one of my constituents has given me a very provocative thought for today. Mr. Lynn K. Parkman, of Birmingham, sent to me the following telegram:

Alabama out of cheeks to turn. Request Federal aid for more cheeks or less agitators.

Mr. Speaker, since these words of wisdom express my feelings precisely, I yield back the balance of my time.

FAILURE OF ADMINISTRATION FARM PLANS

Mr. **WYDLER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **LANGEN**. Mr. Speaker, the Republican Party is cogently concerned over the fact that the farmer is caught in a price-cost squeeze. It is also concerned that present-day farm programs are not designed to promote both a short-run and longrun benefit for the farmer.

Because the Republican Party feels that the American farmer very definitely and very properly has a place in the highly automated American economy, it has resolved to investigate into certain things of interest to the farmer.

One such instrument of investigation is the House task force on agriculture. This task force was created in the early part of this month, and in order to acquaint my colleagues with its nature and function, I am inserting into the RECORD a press release issued at the time of the task force's institution:

HOUSE REPUBLICAN GROUP CITES FAILURE OF ADMINISTRATION FARM PLANS—OUTLINES PLANS FOR FARM POLICY REVIEW

WASHINGTON, March 1.—The newly created House Republican task force on agriculture held its first formal meeting today to outline plans and functions of the group. Named last Tuesday by the House Republican conference, the task force was appointed in connection with the newly formed research and planning committee.

The task force chairman, ODIN LANGEN, of Minnesota, outlined a number of suggested areas of study for the group. "The present administration's apparent lack of concern for the future of agriculture has created great alarm throughout rural America," said LANGEN, "necessitating a long, hard look at every phase of U.S. farm policy."

LANGEN pointed out to his colleagues that statements from the administration have ignored the basic problems of income and markets. "The state of the Union message devoted just one small paragraph to agriculture, the budget message did nothing except cut a half-billion dollars from the agriculture budget and told our farmers that 2½ million of them would have to leave the land. And the agriculture message was a maze of generalities and repeated references to so-called 'efficient' farmers.

"Just what is an 'efficient' farmer?" LANGEN asked his task force colleagues. "Is it just a statistical figure determined by the Budget Director or the Secretary of Agriculture?" LANGEN noted that it is impossible to set up gross income limitations as a criteria of efficiency. "Gross income is no more an indication of efficiency in farming than it is in determining a level of poverty. There are too many variables that haven't even been considered by the administration."

LANGEN also outlined a number of other areas for consideration by the task force, emphasizing that they were but a few of the subjects to be discussed:

The contradiction of Appalachian type programs: Developing 50-acre plots for the development of marginal farms while telling farmers in other areas that they must get off the land.

Tariff negotiations and American agriculture: Realistic study needed on the effect of our trade negotiations on the well-being of U.S. farmers. Current suggestions by Common Market countries to freeze price supports would hurt American agriculture since Common Market countries now have support prices two or three times as high as ours.

Imports of meat: Excessive beef and other meat imports have lowered domestic beef prices.

Effects of CCC sales on grain prices: It has been noted that past sales have actually derpessed farm grain prices.

Income situation: The American farmer continues to receive an ever-decreasing percentage of the American food dollar, and the parity ratio today stands at 74, the lowest level since 1939.

The task force also will consider such subjects as opportunities for new markets overseas, the consumer's stake in agriculture, improving the future of the family farm, the problem of low farm prices, and such related items as commodity programs, farm credit, research, and the possibility of streamlining the ever-growing Department of Agriculture.

"The farmer in this country is in real economic trouble," said LANGEN, "and we intend doing everything possible to direct attention to his problems. This Nation's producers of food and fiber have done an excellent job and deserve their rightful position in our economic system."

The task force members noted that there has been a heavy volume of congressional mail from constituents concerned with the farm situation. They further noted that the task force will provide a forum for a complete analysis, better understanding, and a determination of the future role of the American farmer in the Nation's economy. The group welcomes any new proposal or fresh idea developed by the Congress, in the universities, by farm organizations, by foundations, by businessmen, by farmers themselves, or any citizen who has a suggestion on farm policy.

Members of the Republican task force on agriculture in addition to Chairman LANGEN are PAUL B. DAGUE, of Pennsylvania; DELBERT L. LATTA, of Ohio; ALEXANDER PIRNIE, of New York; JAMES F. BATTIN, of Montana; ROBERT DOLE, of Kansas; BURT L. TALCOTT, of California; and GEORGE V. HANSEN, of Idaho.

KU KLUX KLAN

Mr. **WYDLER**. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. **CONTE**. Mr. Speaker, events in Alabama during the past few days have served more graphically than any words to expose the senseless brutality and covert terrorism that are the hallmarks of the Ku Klux Klan. We must search back through the dark days of Nazi Germany and the grisly activities of Adolph Hitler's brown-shirted Gestapo to find a parallel.

We are horrified by the murder of Mrs. Viola Liuzzo. And while still reeling from that shock, we are dealt a second blow by the incredible reaction of Ku Klux Klan leaders who offer no better explanation of this frightful incident than the juvenile whine that this courageous women would never have gotten into trouble if she had stayed out of Alabama.

We can no longer kid ourselves that we are dealing with responsible human beings or that there are reasonable, intelligent motives for the activities of the Ku Klux Klan. We have no alternative but to conclude that we are dealing with human jackals, huddling together in the shadows, striking out in vicious fury at those who would seek to clean away the carrion upon which they feed.

I am, like most Americans, appalled by the brutish insensitivity of this act and the reaction of the Ku Klux Klan in the wake of it. But I must say also that I am not completely surprised by it. Any act of violence must always come as a shock to civilized men. But the fact that those who stand accused of this deed are members of the Klan comes as no shock to me.

What the Klan represents, what it advocates, and how it operates have long been a source of deep personal concern to me. I have spoken out over the years not only against the Klan but against hate groups of all kinds who would seek to inhibit the free machinery of our democracy through intimidation, bigotry, and terror.

The time is long overdue for men of all faiths, all colors, and all political convictions to lay siege to the Ku Klux Klan—to cut off the Klan from civilized society and let it starve to death behind the moat it has dug for itself with hatred and bigotry.

I eagerly join with my fellow Republicans who, on Saturday, March 27, 1965, issued a joint statement in support of all efforts by the executive branch to eliminate the evil influence of the Ku Klux Klan. And I urge all of my colleagues to open their eyes to the stinking cesspool of hatred, bigotry, violence, and terror upon which the Klan is founded. It is high time we were rid of the stench caused by these hooded reptiles who, in the name of law and order, make a mockery of these very words. In my opinion, we cannot act swiftly enough.

REDUCED POSTAGE RATES FOR VOLUNTEER FIRE AND AMBULANCE COMPANIES

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCHWEIKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to give volunteer fire companies and volunteer ambulance and rescue companies the same reduced postage rates now available to religious, educational, scientific, labor, fraternal, and veterans groups.

In addition, I am introducing a bill to exempt the fundraising and social activities of volunteer fire companies from Federal income and excise taxes when the proceeds from such activities are used exclusively in connection with the group's firefighting purpose. The measure also exempts such activities from Federal admission and cabaret taxes.

The essential contribution made to the welfare of our communities by thousands of selfless volunteer firemen and volunteer ambulance and rescue crews saves the taxpayers millions of dollars annually. The two bills which I have introduced would provide an equitable means of easing the increasingly difficult fundraising problem faced by these volunteers.

It seems unfair that our volunteer fire companies should be asked to pay Federal income taxes on the proceeds of such fundraising activities as annual carnivals or fairs when the proceeds are being used to buy necessary firefighting equipment.

The bill permitting use of reduced postage rates would lower the cost of conducting essential fundraising appeals. A mailing which has been costing these volunteer companies $1,000 using first-class rates, for example, would cost approximately $250 after this bill became law.

FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SKUBITZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a resolution adopted March 23, 1965, by the Kansas Corporation Commission urging the repeal of the Federal excise tax on communication services. Frankly, I think the time has come when all the wartime excise taxes should be repealed.

The resolution follows:

> Whereas users of telephone communication services have been and are now subjected to a Federal excise tax; and
>
> Whereas said tax was adopted during World War II to discourage the use of the telephone communications system for purposes unrelated to the successful prosecution of war, and to raise revenue therefor; and
>
> Whereas the manifest intention of Congress was to adopt said tax as a wartime expedient for limited purposes and for a limited life; and
>
> Whereas the war and emergency conditions which made necessary the imposition of said tax have long since ended; and
>
> Whereas in the absence of those vital adjustments which war makes necessary, said tax is unjust and discriminatory in that telephone communication is a necessity and is the only such necessity used by the public in the prosecution of its daily personal and business affairs subjected to such a tax; and
>
> Whereas this commission, having due regard for its statutory duty and moral obligation to ensure to the public of this State adequate and efficient telephone communications service at the lowest possible cost, is of the firm conviction that said tax is inimical to the public interest and the functions of this commission: Now, therefore, be it
>
> *Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be urged to repeal said tax on communications services; and be it further
>
> *Resolved*, That the Congress of the United States be memorialized by forwarding copies of this resolution to the Kansas congressional delegation, to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, and to the Senate Finance Committee, and that copies hereof be sent to the Federal Communications Commission, the several State regulatory commissions, to the secretary of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners, and to the telephone companies operating in the State of Kansas.
>
> By the commission it is so ordered.
>
> RAYMOND B. HARVEY,
> *Secretary*.
>
> Dated at Topeka, Kans., this 23d day of March 1965.

CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. QUILLEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, no Veterans' Administration facility will be closed in my district as a result of the order announced on January 13, yet I wish nevertheless to register my objection to these closings. The Wall Street Journal remarked that:

> It is difficult for anyone not directly affected to quarrel with the VA action.

I disagree.

In its original press release on the subject, the Veterans' Administration talked about annual savings as a result of the closings of more than $23 million, and said that these closings were "in consonance with the President's appeal to Government departments and agencies to increase operating efficiency and reduce spending." A mild assurance was given in this release that service to veterans would not be impaired by the closings.

Appeals to economy such as this one have a hollow ring when bills are being rushed to the House and Senate asking authorization and appropriation of tax dollars for every conceivable purpose. But even if it is assumed that economy in the care and treatment of the veterans of this country is a desirable thing at a time when we are giving so much to those who never did anything to help the country or even to help themselves, and when we are continually being asked to give more, where is the economy in a Federal budget in which the Veterans' Administration has asked for $62 million more—not less—for veterans' medical care?

The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has given the clue to this mystery by explaining for the benefit of those not used to the ways of bureaucratic doublethink and doubletalk, that the only way in which $23 million would be saved by the closings is this: If the old services and facilities were maintained, and new services, designed for the most part to replace old ones, were added, the total bill would then be $23 million higher.

The Veterans' Administration softpedaled its economy tune when it began emphasizing an alleged improvement in service that the closings would bring about. But abandoning perfectly good hospital facilities in order to build new ones in large cities where medical schools are located will not overcome the burden placed on veterans who must be moved long distances from home. The policy of regional hospitals that the Veterans' Administration was once so proud of has proved to work pretty well.

The new policy of centralization of hospital facilities in large metropolitan centers adjacent to medical schools will require the construction of four or five new VA hospitals. Such a policy is wasteful and does not consider the problems of morale involved. In a Great Society conducting a war against poverty there should be room for a small "skirmish against dirty tricks." Relatives of the veterans will have to travel great distances, and employees of the abandoned hospitals will be discharged or forced to accept a job at a distant and new location.

The sick veterans themselves may even doubt that their new proximity to these highly touted medical schools will mean any bonanza in the medical care they are receiving. No doubt about it, the medical schools will be happy about their access to the new VA hospitals; their students and inexperienced practitioners will be able to gain valuable experience in dealing with the sick veterans; the medical schools' researchers will have new subjects at hand. The veterans may lie ill or die, secure in the knowledge that they are contributing to the onward march of organized medicine.

In its anxiety to forestall criticism, the VA listed criteria for picking the hospitals chosen for closing. In several cases the listed criteria have been proved almost totally inapplicable, or the facts on which they were invoked were open to challenge. The hearings held before a subcommittee of the Senate have left the distinct impression that the Veterans' Administration has gathered its information on this critically important matter in a careless and superficial way.

The closings will do no good, and they will do a lot of harm. If the administration intends to doubletalk by hurting veterans while preaching heaven on earth as its legislative goal, I, for one, intend to be heard objecting.

Before closing, please let me say that the VA Hospital at Mountain Home in Johnson City, Tenn., is one of the best operated in the United States. According to a report of your committee, Mountain Home operates at a per diem cost of $22.45, less than half as much as the VA hospital in Washington, D.C.

I am proud of the VA facility in my district and the wonderful work it does for veterans. My congratulations to Col. Lee B. Harr, the members of his staff, and all the workers for the outstanding job that they are doing.

KATYN MASSACRE

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Derwinski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago Soviet Union officials perpetrated the Katyn massacre, in which approximately 15,000 Polish prisoners of war were murdered in cold blood. The scene was the Katyn forest area of the Ukraine.

On December 22, 1952, the select Committee of the House on the Katyn Massacre made its final report. Since that time there has been occasional discussion of the subject, but the committee's groundwork has never been effectively implemented.

It is necessary, Mr. Speaker, for us to persistently remind the American public by maintaining public discussion of Soviet crimes such as the Katyn massacre so that the true nature of communism can be recognized.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, three members of that select committee are still serving: the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Madden], the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood], and the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. O'Konski]. I would urge all the Members to review the report of the committee and to apply its message to current problems in the cold and semihot wars against communism. May I also direct the attention of the Members, Mr. Speaker, to the remarks I made on this subject 3 years ago. They appear in volume 108, part 6, pages 8279–8281 of the permanent Record for 1962.

MRS. VIOLA GREGG LIUZZO

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDade] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, a whole Nation—indeed a whole world—looked upon the events in Selma, Ala., last week. We deplored the brutality which had preceded the march. We deplored the spectacle of a part of America disenfranchised because of its color. But for too many of us, the issue was something that they were debating; the fight, one that they were fighting. Too many of us did not realize that it was our fight.

Then the hand of death reached out in the form of an assassin's bullet, and that hand reached from the road outside Selma to the 10th Congressional District of Pennsylvania. It was very suddenly our issues, our fight.

This morning in Detroit, Mrs. Viola Gregg Liuzzo was buried. She was murdered by the bullet of a despicable coward in the State of Alabama. She had gone there to do her part in a cause which she knew to be greater than that of the Negroes in Selma. She had come, not to lead a parade, not to make speeches, but to do whatever humble part she might be told to do. She was prepared to do her little part and to go home, unknown, unhonored, and unsung. She died on the road from Selma, and in her death she is known, honored, and sung by thousands of voices.

But she did not have to die. It is an awful tragedy. It has taken away the wife of Anthony Liuzzo, from the city of Carbondale in my district. It has left five children without a mother. And it has left unanswered the question of 6-year-old Sally who asked, "Why could not Mommy have just died from being old?"

Yesterday and today were proclaimed as days of mourning in the State of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, they are days of mourning across this entire Nation. Just as surely as if she had died on the field of battle, Viola Liuzzo died for this country, and her name should be so remembered in the roster of American heroes. And just as truely as we owe a countless debt to our American soldiers who died for the country, so do we all owe a debt to Mrs. Liuzzo.

Above all, we cannot let her death to have been in vain.

She went to Selma, and she took the humble task she was assigned, because she understood something very important very clearly. She understood that the vote of the Negro in Selma was vastly more significant than just that.

We have sent and are sending Negroes out to the ends of the earth to die for freedom. She knew that. And we have taken the families, the relatives, the brothers and sisters in color of these same Negroes and have deprived some of them of their most fundamental right as Americans. She saw that.

She saw that if the Negro can be deprived of his vote in Alabama, or Mississippi, or Georgia—if he can be deprived of any of his rights anywhere—then what right of any of us is safe? This she saw, and for this she died.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to honor Viola Liuzzo, but I do so in the knowledge that what she has done will honor her far above anything I might say here. I rise also to make my own pledge to her, and to her husband Anthony. I do not have eloquence that might console him or the five children for whom he must now care. There are no words that can do that.

I pledge to him, and to her, and to their children, that I will make their cause my cause. I pledge to them that I will do all in my power to make all of us realize the terrible significance of this for every American. It is not their fight. It is our fight, whether we be black, or brown, or white, or red, or yellow.

There is a passage in the "Meditations of John Donne" from which the title of a noted book was taken. We know the title, but too few of us remember what the passage means; too few of us recall that it speaks also of what happened in Selma, Ala.:

> No man is an island entire unto himself. Every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main. If a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less, as well as if a promontory were, as well as if a manor of thy friend's or of thine own were. Any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore, never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.

We have all been diminished by the death of Viola Liuzzo. We will mourn her in Pennsylvania as she is mourned in Michigan, and Alabama, and across the Nation.

But on the floor of this House, Mr. Speaker, we can make her death more meaningful, and I trust that we will do so. If we do, then perhaps some day, a long time from now when she is grown from childhood, Anthony Liuzzo may sit with Sally and may be able to answer the question, the question it is impossible for any of us to answer today.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM AND THE MINORITY NO. 1: GERRY FORD'S PROPOSAL DESERVES CONSIDERATION

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, in a concise and eloquent address, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], described to the National Press Club the motivations of the Republican Party in the House as it seeks to carry out its functions as the party of opposition.

The minority leader described the difficulties faced by the party, reduced in numbers as it is, fighting to get its message across to the country in the face of an almost overwhelming combination of facilities enjoyed by the majority party. This combination includes the nearly infinite resources of the White House to generate publicity and to modulate it to its purposes. It also includes control over spending policies and governmental policies affecting nearly every interest in the land.

Although this session is still relatively young, we have been presented with numerous proofs that the majority party cannot function as its own critic, and this is proof of the vital importance of an effective minority not only to good legislation but to the freedom of every American.

ABUSE OF MAJORITY POWER

We saw this proof during consideration of the Appalachia development bill, when we were not permitted to change a single period or comma in the bill, not even to make technical changes recommended by the administration. We saw it during the consideration of the education bill, when the majority wielded its power in such a way that we could not even explain our amendments on the floor. More than that, when a member of the majority party, one long devoted to the cause of education, sought to improve the bill, she was cut down and frozen out ruthlessly by her own party for daring to suggest that something might not be quite perfect with legislation ordained from above.

These are but two examples from a growing catalog of cases.

They all bear out the need for an active, alert minority equipped with the parliamentary tools to do its job.

We are in a period of legislation by labels. Programs are sent to Congress, attractively packaged and bearing appealing titles, and few dare to take the wrappings off and look inside. Is the Congress afraid? In a sense, perhaps it is; perhaps, as politicians, Members are afraid to challenge labels; afraid to take up a battle against a slogan that has been attached to a program by the Chief Executive over national television. This is probably a legitimate fear. It is not easy to gain the public ear long enough to detach the labels and the slogans so the real substance can be seen. Who can be blamed for wanting to avoid the task when the chances of success appear so slim?

SLOGANS AND LABELS

We are in a period of slogans and labels, when the sloganeering and the labelmaking is in the control of one party—one man, really. There is nothing that says totalitarianism seizes a country only overnight in a revolutionary thunderclap. History is replete with examples of totalitarian regimes that have coasted almost silently to power on growing waves of carefully fostered fear beginning first with neglect by fearful officials then, as the waves grow larger, engaging their active participation. The French Revolution and the takeover of Germany by Hitler are laboratory cases of this insidious, disastrous process. And interestingly enough, it was liberals in each case who were most guilty of neglect and who were tragically the first to be obliterated by the new regimes.

Can it happen here? Not so long as there is an effective minority party. It is the role of a minority party to resist the waves of fear, to challenge, and to offer counterproposals. It is the minority's solemn responsibility to take on this task even when the risks are as high as the odds and the chances of success are slim. A special burden falls upon the minority leader. His is a difficult task, but our minority leader is doing it well. Without seeking to impose conformity upon his own ranks, he is fighting for the rights of the minority as a whole, and in doing this he is fighting for all Americans.

In order to improve the parliamentary tools available to the minority, the minority leader proposes a plan by which the Government Operations Committees of the Senate and House would be controlled by the minority party whenever the same political party dominated both the executive and legislative branches. This proposal, if adopted, would be an invaluable guarantor of responsible, representative government. It deserves careful consideration. Under unanimous consent, I offer the text of the minority leader's address at this point in the RECORD.

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, REPUBLICAN, OF MICHIGAN

Let's take a look at the Republican Party in the House of Representatives. It's true that the new House Republican leadership hasn't won any spectacular legislative successes. This has been appropriately noted by some. But we never campaigned on a platform that—by some strange sleight of hand or magic potion—we could double our numbers and slice the opposition in half before November 1966.

As you well know, the numbers on each side of the aisle in the House have remained the same since November 3—140 Republicans to 284 Democrats. The odds are rough. But, to coin a phrase—with a little different twist—we shall overcome.

You in your profession and those of us in my profession face the same powerhouse—but in a different way.

The White House and all its troops try to spoonfeed you—and they try to clobber us. The President has virtually unlimited resources for working his will—a veritable army of experts, authorities, researchers, propagandists, and the like.

He is also king pin of the branch of government that employs 2½ million civilians and controls the destiny of 2,600,000 military personnel. These two groups have a payroll cost totaling $28 billion—and together they will spend over 127 billion tax dollars in fiscal 1966.

This awesome power and the vast apparatus, if used improperly, could mean the withering away and eventually the death of the two-party system.

There is nothing constitutionally ordained about running our Government through two great political parties.

But almost from the start our Nation made such a choice. It was a wise decision. We avoided the chaos of a multiparty government. We avoided the loss of freedom of the single party system. And we built into Government an additional set of checks and balances.

Not only does a strong second party provide the electorate with legislative alternatives but also with a remarkably high level of honesty and frankness.

Our American news media have a noble tradition in demanding the facts, bursting the bubble of propaganda, unstuffing the shirt and exposing the corrupt. You of the news media can perform your job better if the relative strengths of our two parties are more nearly in balance and not so far out of kilter.

When both the executive and legislative branches are dominated by the same political party, the Committees on Government Operations of the House and Senate, which have broad investigating authority, should be under the control of the minority party. Is smacks of legalized collusion when we find the suspect and the district attorney are blood relatives. To make our Federal Government function better, to help you get the facts, Republicans in Congress believe this new idea would be a step in the right direction.

Here would be a genuine vehicle to assure that the voice of the minority would be heard, that the majority would be constantly on notice that its actions or inactions were subject to effective and critical review. Here would be an assurance the public through your help would know that any coverup or wrongdoing would be improbable if not impossible.

It is safe to speculate that with such a setup there would be more public confidence that the real Bobby Baker story had been told.

The Democrats certainly have us overwhelmed numerically in Congress. We could say, "What's the use?" That's no answer for the American people, for you or for ourselves. Fortunately there is a constructive ferment right now in the Republican Party.

We have already made some reorganization of our internal machinery. The research and planning committee is working at long-range policy. We are creating special task forces on major substantive issues in such rapid succession that one observer said we were setting up "an antipoverty program for Republican intellectuals."

John Rhodes, with a beefed-up staff, is policy committee chairman, and this reorganized group will deal with current, day-to-day legislative problems.

On the basis of simple mathematics, the administration can pass about everything it wants to in this Congress, particularly if it twists a few arms as it did in the Nasser victory on an appropriation bill a few weeks ago. Nevertheless we will win on some issues in this Congress. More importantly, Republicans will build a record for a substantially stronger representation after November 8, 1966.

The Republican strategy in the House will be diversified. We'll be grateful for any Democratic support, North or South. To compete with the administration, we will offer:

1. Opposition to administration's aims and methods when we think both are wrong, but never obstructionism just for its own sake.

2. Constructive alternatives to administration schemes when we feel they are tackling the right problems at home or abroad, in the wrong way. House Republicans have already recommended responsible proposals this year in medicare, education, housing, and Appalachia.

3. Workable programs, developed through our task forces, to meet the many problems the administration is ignoring or neglecting. We refuse to concede that Democrats have a monopoly on ideas for the solution of domestic or foreign difficulties.

4. Wholehearted support for the President when we think he is right. Vietnam policy in the last few weeks is the prime example. More and more Republicans have stanchly backed the President while more and more Democrats have changed their tune to favor immediate negotiation and tail-between-our-legs withdrawal.

On the domestic scene we recall that the Congress has enacted three laws on civil rights since 1957. Progress has been made in the South because there is a growing public conscience and sense of justice.

Yet even in 1964 far too many eligible Negroes of voting age were not registered to vote in 11 southern States. For some part of the 2,800,000 who are unregistered, the franchise is unattainable regardless of their qualifications. In some islands of resistance, the 15th amendment to the Constitution is still being flouted.

The Republican leadership insists this violation of constitutional rights must end prior to the 1966 election.

The achievement of this goal requires a new and strong Federal voting rights law. This legislation should:

1. Effectively and speedily end the unconstitutional denial of the right to vote everywhere in the United States.

2. Terminate unreasonable standards for registration and voting without interfering with the reasonable requirements established by the States.

3. Terminate any discriminatory application of requirements for registration and voting.

4. Should not penalize areas which are not guilty of discrimination.

The voting rights bill which the administration has submitted to the Congress falls short of meeting these standards.

This bill appears to affect only the 18, possibly 20, States which have some kind of literacy test as a qualification for voting. It does not apply to four southern States in which are found 25 percent of the unregistered Negroes of the South—Arkansas, Florida, Tennessee, and Texas. It does not apply to Smith County, Tex., with low voter turnout among a population of 27 percent Negro. On the other hand, it does apply to Aroostook County, Maine, where only 1 percent of the population is nonwhite.

This bill ignores those discriminatory practices used in the States that do not employ literacy and similar tests.

In the literacy-test States it largely ignores discrimination that touches less than 50 percent of the population.

This bill introduces a strange kind of geographical discrimination. It nullifies the literacy test in Martin County, N.C., where 49.9 percent of the voting-age population went to the polls in 1964, but it leaves the literacy test in full effect in Guilford County, N.C., which registered a turnout of 52.5 percent of its voting-age population.

This bill leaves untouched too much discrimination in too many places. If it is passed as drafted, the Congress will find itself struggling with yet another voting rights bill in 1966 or 1967.

The administration's bill will not accomplish all that must be done. Under the leadership of Congressman WILLIAM MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, I believe there will be a Republican voting rights bill in the House of Representatives that will be more comprehensive in its application. The Republican members of the House Judiciary Committee, the members of the House Republican task force on the right to vote and others have been at work on such a bill for several weeks. They are considering, among other proposals, those made by Republican Members of the Congress before the President presented his bill. This more effective proposal will be ready for consideration by the House Committee on the Judiciary.

This overall blueprint for Republican legislative action is based on what we conceive to be our duty to the 43 percent of the American electorate who put us in office, and to the people as a whole who face ever-increasing Federal domination and erosion of their liberties unless an articulate opposition functions effectively.

It is based on the hard truth that the Republican Party to win in 1966 must earn and regain the respect of many millions of voters—and it can't do this by sitting on the sidelines and waiting for an international or domestic catastrophe to produce a call for a change of leadership.

It is based also on a profound conviction that something more than talk of unity and consensus is demanded by the challenges of our times.

We subscribe to the observation of Senator Robert A. Taft in 1951, endorsed by John F. Kennedy in 1960, that, if you permit appeals to unity to bring an end to criticism, we endanger not only the constitutional liberties of our country, but even its future existence.

We raise the question of whether it is enough in these days of danger and turmoil for our President to continue to act as a consensus politician instead of a statesman who leads.

Waiting for a consensus can and often does mean ignoring little problems until they become big ones.

It can and does mean inaction until the riots start—whether in Saigon or in Selma.

As recently as January, the President was referring with satisfaction—according to some well known columnists—to our policy in South Vietnam as one of "creative inaction."

To me this is a fantastic concept—better described, perhaps, as "dynamic paralysis."

Yet this attitude was reflected in the state of the Union message, which suggested that the international scene was so improved that we could all but forget it in favor of domestic affairs.

The disarray of NATO is all but ignored by the administration. Nasser and Sukarno thumb their noses with seeming impunity.

And the disruptive voices in the Democratic Party not only undercut the President in his conduct of foreign affairs at a time of national crisis they also raise the very grave danger of a Communist miscalculation as to our intentions in Vietnam and southeast Asia.

We believe in keeping the ball on the enemy's goal line—not back-pedaling to our 20-yard line before starting the next play.

The President can always count on Republican support when his foreign policy is firm and decisive on the side of freedom and in the national interest.

But if ever there was a time for broadgaged revival of genuine bipartisanship in foreign policy in the spirit of the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, that time is now.

Senator Vandenberg, who was my fellow townsman, was largely responsible for my getting into politics.

He arrived at a thoughtful concept of the Nation's best interests in foreign policy matters which served the American people magnificently well—and it is a concept which I would be honored to help to expand beyond current policy in South Vietnam.

But foreign policy bipartisanship in the Vandenberg pattern means genuine consultation across party lines in determining policy—not just using the Republican for afterthought window dressing.

It does not mean merely a summons to the White House in a moment of crisis, and then calling in the photographers and announcing Republican endorsement of an administration policy already determined.

Nor does it mean foreclosure of Republican criticism of foreign policy when we are convinced the administration is wrong.

Some of our problems, particularly a lack of unity, have been created by Republicans. On behalf of America's future, I suggest that the present political imbalance—however self-inflicted—is not a good thing.

Under our system no party can be doctrinaire, sectarian, narrow in its appeal or misrepresented to have such an image, however unfair the charge might be—and still attract the majority of the electorate.

The high ground of modernation with unselfish unity is not only common horsesense for a political party—it is also representative of the people and in keeping with the underlying genius of the American political system.

The day-to-day rebuilding of Republican policy and the party must begin in the Congress—and because all the House must face the voters next year, the heaviest burden of the task must be carried in the House.

We aim to correct that imbalance—to reestablish two-party government. Far from lamenting our fate, House Republicans are wide open to fresh ideas and confident that new approaches, full participation, and renewed dedication can earn new friends for the Republican Party and make an important contribution to the future of America.

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM (BLATNIK COMMITTEE) OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS OPENS HEARINGS ON PRACTICES IN LOUISIANA

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, today the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program of the House Committee on Public Works, sometimes known as the Blatnik committee, opened hearings on construction practices in Louisiana. Although these hearings are concerned specifically with questionable practices in the State of Louisiana, they have a larger implication.

The subcommittee will investigate allegations of wrongdoing and slipshod workmanship in the highway program in Louisiana, but in so doing we hope to establish constructive guidelines and warning signals for other State highway departments.

This investigation is emphasizing the secondary highway program and has been in preparation for many months. Hundreds of millions of Federal tax dollars go into the secondary highway program and are currently running at the rate of about $300 million a year.

This investigation has important implications for the whole country. We shall be interrogating witnesses from the Louisiana Highway Department, the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, the U.S. General Accounting Office, and members of the subcommittee's staff who were assigned to investigate in Louisiana.

Because of general interest in this program, I am enclosing at this point in the RECORD the concise and constructive opening statement of Representative JOHN A. BLATNIK, chairman of the committee, and also my own opening statement.

I commend them to my colleagues and feel it will be helpful to familiarize themselves with the broad outline of the important hearings that are now being conducted by this subcommittee:

OPENING STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE JOHN A. BLATNIK, CHAIRMAN, SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE FEDERAL-AID HIGHWAY PROGRAM, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Before we begin these hearings on construction practices in Louisiana, I would like to say some things which I, as chairman of this subcommittee, feel ought to be said.

While I speak only for myself, I hope my colleagues will share some of my views.

I recall that in 1959, while the interstate program was still in its infancy, Congress had to consider increasing the gasoline tax 1 cent, to insure completion of the system as originally conceived. The alternative was to accept the suggestion from some quarters that the program either be curtailed or drawn out over a longer period of time. None of us who are familiar with this program wanted a cutback.

At least some of the opposition to the program stemmed from a lack of confidence that it was being carried out properly.

There were charges made, some on the floor of the House, that the program was fraught with mismanagement, overdesign, incompetence and waste, and there were even suggestions of fraud and corruption.

Although these allegations were generally unsubstantiated and vague, they posed a serious threat to the program.

Charges of this nature cannot be ignored. They have to met and resolved. To do otherwise would lead to a continual weakening of congressional and public confidence. In time this would seriously jeopardize the continuation of a program which our great country desperately needs in order to keep pace with our expanding economy and growth.

It was in this climate, a little more than 5 years ago, that this subcommittee came into being.

Our mandate was clear: inquire into the practices, policies, and procedures followed in the Federal-aid highway program.

I think it should be recognized that this necessary inquiry was entrusted to members whose dedication to this fine program is not surpassed by anyone. It has been with this same spirit of dedication and with a determination that our work be fair and objective, that this subcommittee has gone about its task.

In this way the subcommittee has helped to bolster confidence in the program. Some proof of this, which shouldn't pass unnoticed, is the fact that since the establishment of the subcommittee there has been no outcry on the floor of the House against the program such as there was in 1959.

We have proceeded on the theory that things can always be done better. That is not to say we are not aware of the tremendous achievements which have been made and which have made this country the recognized leader in roadbuilding throughout the world. That is as it should be, and is consistent with this country's leadership in many other fields.

I am convinced that the real appreciation for the construction of our highways will flow naturally and easily through the years as the American economy reaps the benefits from them, and as the American motorist conserves his time and money and broadens his horizon through their use.

The first step toward bringing about improvement is to define the problem. That is basic. We help to do this through our hearings; highlighting situations by developing them factually; choosing for subjects those matters which are of importance and which have broad application, even though the applicability varies in degree in different places.

In previous hearings we have heard testimony from a number of witnesses about falsification of tests and samples, and building projects in a substandard fashion. These witnesses came to Washington, usually with some personal embarrassment, frequently with considerable courage, and testified as to what they had done.

We can't console ourselves by saying that these people are not representative, and that the vast majority of people engaged in this work are sincere and dedicated. I am not suggesting that they are not. What I do wonder is how many less than the "vast majority" do we need before this kind of activity should properly concern us.

It doesn't suffice to simply discharge employees or suspend contractors after there has been proof of bad practices. That is too easy a solution and does not do justice to the problems which have brought these matters to pass. It only treats the symptom and ignores the illness.

We need to go behind these happenings and discover their underlying causes—why did they happen?

If projects are not being built to specifications because the specifications are not good, let's improve the specifications; if contractors are being required to work to unreasonable and costly limits, let's find out what the proper requirements should be and incorporate them in the specifications; if there is not a sufficiency of able, competent people to provide the engineering services and testing required by both the contractor and the State, then let's train them and assign them in sufficient numbers so they will be able to do their work.

These are some of the real problems that concern the subcommittee. They go to the very heart of highway construction.

We must admit they exist and address ourselves to their solution.

We must allow for wholesome, healthy evaluation of what is done, particularly when it is offered in an honest spirit of helpfulness and cooperation.

We cannot be so sensitive that the price to be paid for harmony is silent acquiesence of the status quo.

The hearings we begin today will be about practices in Louisiana. The testimony will readily be seen to be of great interest to that State. It should be a matter of concern elsewhere.

The extent to which these disclosures are applicable anywhere else is moot; without there having been an inquiry of the same type as conducted in Louisiana.

We should realize that the problem areas defined at our hearings in the past have generally existed without the responsible officials being aware of them. The deficiencies had occurred in spite of the existence of controls and checks which were thought to be adequate. It would just seem to make good sense for officials in other States to take heed of the hearings and to critically assess their own departments to discover to what degree they ought to be concerned about the same things.

The transcripts of these hearings and the reports of the subcommittee have been used as a working tool by a number of highway officials with significant and gratifying results. Situations which might have bred mischief or waste were corrected. This is all to the credit of those who have done so.

I feel a sense of pride in having seen a number of these improvements instituted and to know that our committee has contributed to their accomplishment.

I also know that considerable effort is constantly being made by the Bureau of Public Roads, AASHO, the States individually and other fine organizations, independently of any suggestion made by this committee, to better the administrative and technical aspects of roadbuilding.

This is most gratifying, and I have confidence it will continue.

All of us, each in our own way, need to operate and cooperate on the premise that improvements can and will be made.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES C. CLEVELAND AT THE OPENING OF PUBLIC HEARINGS OF THE BLATNIK COMMITTEE ON HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES IN LOUISIANA

I would like to congratulate the chairman for his fine opening statement, and to express my general agreement with what he has said.

The Federal aid highway program has been tremendously successful. We have the finest network of highways in the world. Continuation of the program—particularly the prompt completion of the Interstate System—is of urgent importance to the Nation. This subcommittee has made valuable contributions to that end.

The Federal aid highway program is a massive undertaking—apportionments of Federal funds amounting to some $3.8 billion for fiscal year 1966 alone. In a program of this size, it would be surprising indeed if there were no instances of fraud, mismanagement, and improper practices. We must never relax our efforts to learn about such instances and to eliminate them to the greatest degree possible.

One of the most encouraging aspects of the Federal aid highway program is that although the Federal participation is massive, the State highway departments have been left reasonably free to meet their own problems themselves. At a time when Federal aid is all too often confused with full Federal control that stifles initiative, I think it fair to suggest that a good deal of the success of the program has been due to a full utilization of the skills and energies of State highway departments. Federal supervision is necessary, of course, because we are spending Federal money—but not to the extent that it deadens or distracts, and, in this program, it has not.

The majority of highway officials and employees are honest and capable persons who would not knowingly tolerate fraud, mismanagement or improper practices for one moment. But the workload imposed upon them by the accelerated highway program makes it almost impossible for them to check personally on every detail and every activity of every employee. The burden of performing their own duties leaves little time for scrutinizing the performance of others. In the time-honored phrase, it becomes difficult to see the forest because of the trees.

Under the circumstances, an objective and realistic review of the program, such as that conducted by this subcommittee, becomes a necessity. The investigations of this subcommittee do not relieve highway officials of the responsibility of closely scrutinizing their own operations. But they do furnish information and provide guidelines and direction for inquiries by the highway officials.

I am mindful of the fact that some highway officials consider excessive Federal regulation as a time-consuming and sometime unnecessary obstacle. For this reason, I was encouraged by the testimony of Mr. M. L. Shadburn, president of the American Association of State Highway Officials, that he did not feel that excessive Federal regulation was impeding the progress of the Federal interstate program. I am also mindful of the fact that some State highway officials feel that our committee, insofar as it has uncovered abuses by highway officials, has tended to destroy public confidence in State highway organizations. For this reason, I was encouraged also by the testimony given this committee in the Arizona hearings when the head of the Arizona Highway Department informed me that he felt these hearings were tremendously helpful to him in the performance of his duties. It is my hope that our hearings will continue to be constructive and helpful.

I do not consider the past roadbuilding practices in Louisiana to be typical of those followed in other States. Nevertheless, the transcript of the hearings and the reports of the subcommittee can be and have been of great value to all highway officials by alerting them to possible problem areas. The State highway departments have done a good job. I think that this subcommittee can help them do an even better job.

I am looking forward to the testimony to be given during these hearings—not because a pleasant picture will be painted, but because it will show us and the highway officials where improvements are needed and how they can be best made.

ADDRESS BY REPRESENTATIVE HUGH L. CAREY BEFORE THE FRIENDLY SONS OF ST. PATRICK, PROVIDENCE, R.I.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, over the course of the past 25 years as a Member of Congress and for a number of years prior to that it has been my fortune, and sometimes good fortune at that, to attend a great many St. Patrick's Day affairs. I have heard innumerable speakers—good, bad, and indifferent—extoll the virtues of the day and the saint. Never, however, have I listened to a finer speech or one more forcefully delivered than that of our colleague, the gentleman from New York, HUGH CAREY, on last St. Patrick's evening.

The people of Providence, R.I., and its surrounding plantations were privileged to host the appearance of Congressman CAREY at the annual dinner of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick on March 17. In turn the Congressman responded to the toast—"The Day We Celebrate"—in just the right mood, interweaving delicate humor with the more important message he carried to the members present.

To those of us who know HUGH CAREY, this was no more than expected. Just this past week we had the opportunity to observe at firsthand his great ability in the historic passage of the general aid to education bill. This is an area in which he has unusual competence and where he has been able to bring particular understanding and leadership. There is general agreement that Congressman CAREY's work on the floor of the House during debate on the bill pointed up this competence and had much to do with the successful passage of the bill. It must be a great satisfaction to him to know that he was instrumental in bringing the benefits of this much-needed legislation to the country as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, in the time intervening since St. Patrick's Day I have heard many favorable comments on Mr. CAREY's talk. In the thought that it might be of interest to some of our colleagues here in the House, under unanimous consent, I include the speech with my remarks at this point in the RECORD:

THE DAY WE CELEBRATE

(Address by Representative HUGH L. CAREY before the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, Providence, R.I., Mar. 17, 1965)

Greetings, Friendly Sons of the North Bronx, South Black Valley, and Divine Providence.

There are three great islands in all the world—Ireland, Long Island, and Rhode Island—and if Senator PELL has his way they will all be linked together when we finish the Giant's Causeway.

The true names of these islands, I am told, are Innisfail, Innisfada, and Innis-Fogarty.

Now there is great strength in this man, FOGARTY. Hence I did not fear to travel north with him this day through the Connecticut pale and such hazardous places as New Britain, New London, and across the River Thames. But we never met William of Orange along the way—although I hear he now has black stripes on him and calls himself Bradley of Princeton. Oh what he did to Providence. But wait until next year when Reardon of New York comes north again as a Providence junior to play the game of basketball.

It is the fashion to come north this year. HUBERT HUMPHREY is coming north to the Hotel Astor tonight to tell the Friendly Sons of New York how they owe their fair complexions to the Norwegians.

Sean Lemass is going north to Ulster to chat with O'Neill and I hope they search him for brick or they'll start one the U.N. will never settle.

And the Governor of Alabama went north to Washington. That fellow reminds me of the loudmouth who went into Moriarity's on the "Day We Celebrate" and shouted at the top of his lungs: "I can lick any man from County Cork," and no one bothered him.

Then he said: "I can lick any man in the United States," and no one paid any attention.

Then he raved: "I can lick any man in the world."

With that a quiet man rose and hit him a wallop, and down he went in the sawdust. He got up and said: "I guess I just took in too much territory."

May it ever be. As long as Friendly Sons gather for "That friendly bowle, the feast of reason and the flow of soul" that we will never forget what kind of man we honor.

We honor a slave saint—a man who broke his chains and ours, a migrant laborer who threw off his yoke—yes, a man who demonstrated against the Druids' tyranny. He did it with the new fire of truth and love and freedom.

For the Friendly Sons in the United States there cannot be two kinds of freedom—one of the North and one of the South—only that freedom which is part of the dignity of the human person as an individual and creature of God.

Let us be reverent tonight for there are saints among us, and the more Irish we feel (or should I say "take") the more saintly we become.

Our colleague, FERNAND ST GERMAIN, the Gaelic Celt, is among the blessed. Not only is he married to Rachel O'Neal but he has the good sense to have only Irish children, so that although his household originally was one-half Irish and one-half French, now it is three parts Irish and one part French—sort of a Gaelic martini.

Why is it spirits keep popping up like corks in an Irish speech on "The Day We Celebrate"? Perhaps it is the way we celebrate that is the glory of our heritage, and history in the Friendly Sons. Toast away though we may, we can't raise a goblet in the same league with our ancestors.

A brief description in the New York Packet and Advertiser tells us about the first dinner of the Friendly Sons in Cape's Tavern in 1784: "The day—mind you—the day and evening was spent in festivity and mirth and a number of suitable wine toasts were drunk upon this joyful occasion."

It says a number of toasts were drunk, but nothing about the Friendly Sons. On that you can paint your own picture because it is legend that 35 hails were felt to be a good number and they were all bottoms up.

For that matter, what is wrong with a little shake for St. Vitus on the morning after, providing you've done enough for St. Patrick the night before?

So it was with Aloysius McHale, the barber in Grand Central Station one morning on the 18th of March, when he opened his shop. His first customer was Reverend Donahue, who needed a shave—having been up all night tending to wild Gaels in various stages of rigor mortis.

McHale bore down upon the good father and his hand was as firm as a lemon meringue. In no time at all the good father's face was full of divots and his blood was running like the Boyne waters. He could stand no more and cried in pain: "Drink is a terrible curse."

"Ah yes." said McHale, "It do make the skin tender."

But enough of Cork—for I am a son of Galway on one side and Tyrone on the other—something like Moses in the bullrushes, or a herring choker in the bushes to be more precise. And on both sides my family has a great love of the law and respect for authority as all we Irish have as descendents of kings—their being no other kind of Irish.

Therefore, it is hard to understand how my uncle Amethyst O'Malley ran afoul of the law.

Amethyst was an architectural assistant—a hod carrier—who gave his boss a great deal for the little he got. He had great forbearance and respect for his foreman who was from Ulster. He had forbearance when the foreman called him lazy and he had humility when he called him a loafer and he had a brick in his hand when the foreman called him a latecomer because that hurt him in the envelope and he hit him once for each injustice.

In the morning there was humble O'Malley respectful as ever up before a magistrate who you might guess was an A.P.A. Not only did he refuse to listen to the tale of O'Malley's provocation but without batting an eyelash he fined him 30 days' pay.

O'Malley was speechless for fully 2 seconds. Then he said: "Your Honor, could I have a receipt for the fine assessed here today." The judge said: "A receipt—why of course not. I never head of such a thing; why would you want a receipt."

O'Malley said, "Well, judge, you asked for it, and I'll tell you. It is my firm religious conviction that when I die I shall first appear before St. Peter and there in the great book of life he will have a full record of all the good and evil I have done here below. But just before he swings wide the pearly gates to usher me in, he will ask me to state for the record the good and evil done to me by others. And when I tell him of the mischief that befell me here today maybe he will think I am after making a mistake. Accusing someone unjustly. And like as not he will say to me: "Come now, O'Malley, what proof have you of this. And, judge, what proof have I because, mind you, there'll be no time then to go searching all through hell to find you and get a receipt."

All of which proves that the Irish have no faults, merely an excess of virtues.

There being too little time as we near the end of "The Day We Celebrate" for recounting all these virtues, let us talk only of Irish minds and Irish mothers—of hedgerow scholars and Kathleen ni Houlihan and dark Rosaleen.

The fire which Patrick ignited and Brigio tended at the Hills of Slane has blazed through the ages against all shades of error and shadows of doubt.

Wasn't it Peter of Ireland who taught St. Thomas Aquinas of whom Pope Leo XIII said, "Reason borne on the wings of Thomas can scarcely rise higher."

When Irish scholars saw Thomas shred superstition and heresy in his disquisitions that faith is the continuation of reason and that philosophy and revelation therefore harmonize, they digested it like bacon and kale. They studied and spread this great body of theistic reason to the borders of earth and they taught it in the hedgerows like smugglers during the days of banishment. For when Sarsfield was thrown back at Limerick where Irish women fought in the breach, the faith of St. Patrick was exiled in Ireland.

In 1698 after the siege, an act was passed designed to brutalize the Irish Catholic people by ignorance. They made a law that no Catholic was to teach, no Catholic was to send his son to a Catholic school or to a Catholic teacher. No Catholic child was to be sent out of Ireland to receive a Catholic education elsewhere. And if any parent or guardian was found sending money, clothing, or anything else to a Catholic child, in a Catholic school, there was forfeiture, imprisonment, or a fine, and for a second offense he was treated as guilty of high treason and was liable to be put to death for doing it.

But the fire of Slane would not be dimmed and the scholars in rags came back from Salamanca and Paris without book or parchment in bog and hedgerow. Because of their teaching, 200 years later stable boys and shepherds in the wilds of Kerry were quoting Ovid by heart. Small wonder that the Herald Tribune Weekly now reports that illiterates who have never read or written throughout most lands have a vocabulary of 500 words while the illiterates of Ireland today can use 5,000 words. I might say I knew an Irish washerwoman who couldn't read or write and she could gesticulate 5,000 words with a mouth full of clothespins.

Such is the Irish love of learning and praise Kathleen ni Houlihan that love lives today in Catholic education.

Yes, there have been those abroad in this land who have called our parochial hedgerows divisive, unmodern, undemocratic, and unneeded. Thank God for the good of America these schools where children learn of all things in heaven and earth without restriction are not only strong but are growing and gaining.

Let Kathleen ni Houlihan take heart for today on the Feast of St. Patrick there was presented to the Rules Committee of the Congress the President's bill to aid all children of this Nation, in any school, public or nonpublic. Kathleen would not choose among her children—preferring one against the other—and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1961 recognizes the existence of the private school and the right of these children to participate with all other children in its benefits.

I pay homage to Rhode Island tonight for the title of that bill which I have sponsored for the loan of textbooks is modeled on the law of your own State and your lawmakers deserve an American accolade for preserving and extending the tradition of Roger Williams against religious discrimination in this Plantation State.

The fire of Slane is bright and by its light academic freedom must gain in this land.

What is the source and origin of Western academic freedom? Was it not born under Clement, the Irish scholar whom Charlemagne named to head the great University of Paris.

This was the first great adventure of freedom of inquiry, of conscience, of reason—all toward the pursuit of absolute truth.

How different is this order of scholarship respecting authority and acknowledging absolute and ultimate knowledge in the divine source. How different from the campus anarchy which sees freedom only in human relationships.

Thinking of Irish motherhood: Is Kathleen ni Houlihan just a mystical, unreal spiritual name for Ireland? No more than love of music, love of culture, love of grace are unreal. Kathleen is real and now, not an ancient spirit for I saw her in the faces and heard her in the voices of the Irish schoolteachers JOHN FOGARTY and your great New England delegation brought to our land and our Capital for a cultural exchange visit in 1963. Their culture and scholarship and intellects were a revelation.

But most memorable of all their voices were those of the angels as they sang "Curishkeen Lawhn, O'Donnel Abou," and best of all "Mother Ireland."

Kathleen came to life for us and came to life for the gallant, gracious young Irish-American President for whom they sang one shining hour in the White House.

And what of Dark Rosaleen—does she live also? Yes, she lives in the person of every Irish-American mother and grandmother. We have our own Dark Rosaleens living among us as they lived at Tara and Connaught, at Dingel Bay and Limerick. We need not hark back for the Gaelic ethos to the days of the past. Irish-American mothers live today to scorn those who prattle about family planning when they really mean planning to have no family but the one they deem fashionable.

Even our Secretary of Labor (of all people) finds fault with families over five in number. Doesn't he realize that when Adam was a family of one he wasn't happy until he found a side issue? When he and Eve were a family of two they couldn't even agree on the menu (and ate the wrong thing.) And when they had a "fashionable" family of two didn't one tinker brain the other?

It ill becomes this land built by immigrant grandmothers who bore 10 children so 5 could live, to talk about using the State to set up a vertical national origin system, a perpendicular McCarren-Walter Act to keep babies from coming down from Heaven.

If you want to see the spirit of Dark Rosaleen in the flesh, look at the brave, the handsome, the poised and compassionate Rose Fitzgerald Kennedy. Only last week I saw her on television counseling young mothers that the birth of one retarded child—as she had borne one—was no reason to fear having more children.

It is Dark Rosaleen Fitzgerald Kennedy who had nine children and taught them all to "finish first." She trained her sons and daughters in Christian dignity and she campaigned through three generations of American politics. Her 24 grandchildren are a guarantee that for generations to come, Kennedys will "finish first."

She has that rare quality of quiet courage. Her husband said, "I know that she has been sick because other people have told me. But she never has."

Dark Rosaleen has the faith that is the renewal of the flame of Slane and with that faith she held herself firm and brought comfort to others when she gave us first her son, Joseph, and then her son, John. John Fitzgerald Kennedy demonstrated once and for all that not only is an Irish-American Catholic good enough to be President, he established that no man with his time on earth is ever going to be a better one.

Here is the new flame of Slane for all to see. It is the fire of Arlington burning across all the lands of freedom—leaping from mountain to mountain—across the seas of hate and the valleys of ignorance. The flame of John Fitzgerald Kennedy, son of Dark Rosaleen and husband of a Gaelic Queen, is the answer to those who would quench the ancient and new fires of Ireland. He gave us, with his special grace, the enthusiasm and excitement not only of a new day but a day to celebrate forever—whenever Irish men and free men gather.

He saw this land as did George Berkeley, an Anglican clergyman and one of the most famous Irishmen to come to Rhode Island. It was George Berkeley, of Kerry, who lived in Newport from 1729 to 1731, whose child, Lucia, is buried in Trinity Churchyard, who gave us these lines which truly portray the role of the immigrant Irish in the New World:

"There shall be sung another golden age,
The rise of empire and of arts,
The good and great inspiring epic rage,
The wisest heads and noblest hearts.

"Not such as Europe breeds in her decay,
Such as she bred when fresh and young,
When Heavenly flame did animate her clay,
By future poets shall be sung.

"Westward the course of empire takes its way,
The four first acts already past,
A fifth shall close the drama with the day,
Time's noblest offspring is the last."

Friendly Sons of Providence, time's noblest offspring, by the Trinity above and the shamrock below, by the faith of our fathers and the love of our mothers, let us thank God for St. Patrick and the Great Gaels of Ireland on this "The Day We Celebrate."

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XXVIII

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article on "New York City in Crisis," which appeared in the February 17, 1965, edition of the New York Herald Tribune.

The article concerns the almost tragic consequences in the Whitmore case.

The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: "HORROR" OF WHITMORE CASE SPURS THREE STATE LAW CHANGES

(By Richard L. Madden)

ALBANY.—The Whitmore case came to the legislature yesterday.

Assemblyman Bertram L. Podell, Brooklyn Democrat and law partner of Stanley J. Reiben, defense lawyer for George Whitmore Jr., took the assembly floor to plead for "immediate action" on three bills which would:

Abolish capital punishment.

Do away with "blue ribbon juries."

Require a defense lawyer to be present when a confession is taken.

The bills, introduced yesterday, stemmed from what Mr. Podell called the "shock and horror" of the Whitmore case.

Whitmore, described by the assemblyman as "a feebleminded, penniless Negro," was recently cleared in the slaying of Janice Wylie and Emily Hoffert, Manhattan career girls, after his confession was discredited.

He previously was convicted of attempted rape and felonious assault on a Brooklyn practical nurse, and is slated to stand trial in April in the slaying of a Brooklyn charwoman.

Mr. Podell said the case had "aroused national concern as to the administration of criminal justice," and told the assembly: "I don't have to highlight to you * * * the terrible effect Whitmore's execution would have had if the falsity of his confession and the tactics used in securing it had come out after the switch had been pulled, instead of before."

As for the confession, Mr. Podell said, "A 61-page completely detailed confession was manufactured and force-fed to this accused. On the basis of this confession, this defendant not only could have been, but probably would have been, executed."

The assemblyman contended that blue ribbon juries should be abolished. Since 1963, he noted, jurors can impose life imprisonment instead of death in first-degree murder cases. He said the need for a blue ribbon jury had been eliminated in capital cases since the crime is no longer necessarily punishable by death.

Mr. Reiben who sat in the assembly chamber as Mr. Podell spoke, has sought to block Brooklyn District Attorney Aaron E. Koota from convening a blue ribbon jury in the case pending against Whitmore, on the ground that women, Puerto Ricans and Negroes are excluded from such special panels. A blue ribbon jury consists of persons regarded as qualified to hear complicated or technical cases, including some capital cases and stock fraud charges.

Mr. Podell said he had not discussed the prospects for passage of his bill package with Assembly Speaker Anthony J. Travia. Bills to abolish capital punishment are perennial in the legislature, and have never been enacted.

Other bills introduced yesterday would:

Permit therapeutic abortions by physicians in cases where the was substantial risk that the pregnancy would impair the mother's physical or mental health, where a child would be born with grave defects, or where pregnancy resulted from forced rape or incest. The bill's sponsors, Assemblyman Percy E. Sutton and Senator Manfred Ohrenstein, both Manhattan Democrats, said there has been no fundamental change in the State's abortion law since 1881.

Create a new State agency, known as the identification and intelligence system, to gather information on criminal offenders, and require holders of pistol licenses to be at least 18 years old. The measures are part of Governor Rockefeller's anticrime program.

Permit news media to publish the facts about juvenile crimes, including the names of the youthful offenders and their families. Senator John H. Hughes and Assemblyman John H. Terry, both Syracuse Republicans, said the publicity might be useful in curbing juvenile crime.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XXIX

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following two articles from the series on New York City in crisis which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 18, 1965.

The first deals with the tragic crime situation in New York City and the second deals with the crisis developing in New York City's wholesale food business.

The articles follow:

"PRISONER IN THE CITY"—TERROR INVADES HOME

"When you never know when, or where, you'll be attacked, by day or by night, and then when it happens in your own home, then you've become a prisoner in the city. And then it's time to leave."

(By Marshall Peck)

Lee Stanley, at 68, is a sturdily built man, trim after a 40-year career as a salvage expert and service at sea in two world wars. He and his wife, Minerva, 65, live in a tastefully furnished third-floor apartment at 285 East 35th Street, in a doorman-served building in Brooklyn's Flatbush section.

After he retired in 1961, Mr. Stanley finally took a job in a brokerage house to avoid oppressive idleness. It has been his custom to rise every morning at 6:30, prepare himself a light breakfast while his wife slept on, and then leave for Broad Street with nautical-like precision, at 20 minutes to 8.

Yesterday morning, he had put on his coat, hat and scarf, and was ready to go. He went into the bedroom, bent over, kissed his wife—"see you later," he said softly.

At just about his usual hour, he opened his apartment door without a worry in the world. Seconds later, he was battered and bleeding, his head broken open by the butt of a gun, his wife had been slapped into submission and gagged, and his home—traditionally man's castle and sanctuary—was being rifled by two thieves.

This was a viciously flagrant case of criminal activity at work in New York City, but there are many, many cases, some far worse, that challenge the guardianship of law and order.

The Stanleys were not the only people who faced armed thugs in Brooklyn yesterday—other men and women were similarly, if not so harshly plundered on the streets. Perhaps it was an extraordinary day; the weather was milder, and some say that brings on the drifters—but in a few brief hours, as the city went ahead, there were also nine holdups across the borough.

In the ordinary run of events, a spate of holdups and robberies might be noted down as unusual, and hopefully not an everyday occurance, but in recent days there have been indications—official announcement that the crime rate is soaring and the mayor's search for 1,100 more police—that the crime on the streets situation is worsening.

Even with Borough President Abe Stark away on vacation, official Brooklyn protested at the rampant breakout of crime yesterday.

A spokesman for Mr. Stark issued this statement:

"The mounting number of holdups, muggings, and purse snatching in the street, or the subways, and even in private homes, is a matter of growing concern to the Brooklyn community. The community must step up its protection so that it is prepared for any emergency."

Yesterday's crime wave in Brooklyn started about 1:45 a.m., just a few minutes before taxi driver Michael Frankenstein was due to close out his shift. On East 32d Street, near Avenue M, two passengers drew a gun and took his cash receipts of $40.

Gas station attendant David Boorapacki was robbed of $72 by a lone bandit at 2955 Cropsey Avenue at 5:10. At 5:25, Leroy Ford, minding a gas station at 2001 Cropsey Avenue, was held up and forced to give up $80.

At 5:30, Milton Strum, garage attendant at 1873 Coleman Street, was held up by two men, who took $91. About the same time, Bert Klein, in a candy store at 1006 Fourth Avenue, was held up by two men, who grabbed $5 and as much merchandise as they could carry.

At 5:55, a woman, Rae Golden, 60, was alone in her candy store at 597 Fourth Avenue, when a man held out a gun and took $80 from her. At 6:10, attendant Zeb Porter was forced to give up $9 to two armed men at a gas station at 995 McDonald Avenue.

Some of the crimes appeared the work of the same team, and police fanned out in search of suspects. Most of them were small crimes, most of those affected were small people. But it hurt them just as much as it hurts the biggest bank or the richest of us all.

It hurts in many ways—perhaps most of all, it hurts others to know that these things have happened, that innocents have been accosted and faced possible death at the point of a gun.

Lee Stanley, who was marine salvage superintendent with Merritt-Chapman & Scott, sat in his pleasant living room yesterday afternoon, a stunned man. His shirt was caked with dried blood. His head was bandaged. He hadn't had a chance to change. His wife, who suffers from severe migraine attacks, had needed four sedation administrations to finally bring her rest in late afternoon.

There was the blood on the carpet where he had been flung. The tie that had been used to bind his feet and the scarf that had bound his hands were nearby. The interlopers had flung papers about, ransacked every nook and cranny. They had taken diamond rings, a mink stole, suits, and cash amounting to more than $5,000 in value.

MARKETS SNAFU—A THIRD STUDY?

(By Barry Gottehrer)

It was in 1960 that Mayor Wagner first requested a study of the future development of the city's wholesale food markets.

One study—paid for and conducted by the U.S. Department of Agriculture—was completed in 1962 and offered three different approaches for future development.

According to the Federal study, the city could redevelop its currently declining areas in lower Manhattan, the city could do nothing and the markets could relocate in New Jersey, or the city could consolidate all its wholesale markets in Hunts Point, an area in the Bronx where the city had already begun building a new wholesale produce center.

The Federal report favored the Hunts Point site.

The second study—paid for with $95,000 in city funds and conducted by Madigan-Hyland, Inc., a New York engineering-architectural firm—was completed in April of 1964.

This study—concentrating on the future of the city's two meat markets, the large 160-dealer Gansevoort market in lower Manhattan, the smaller in the Brook Avenue section of the Bronx—also concluded that building a new market in the Hunts Point area would probably prove less costly and better in the long run.

The Gansevoort market, which has 180 dealers who employ nearly 5,000 workers and account for 75 percent of the city's wholesale meat sales, now occupies 35 acres bounded generally by 14th, Gansevoort, Hudson, and West Streets.

The city has studied these two reports for more than a year, but yesterday seemed no closer to solving its market problems, or to satisfying the vast majority of its meat dealers.

It's not the city that disagrees with these studies or the conclusions. City housing officials already have indicated urban-renewal plans for both the lower Manhattan and Bronx areas now occupied by the markets.

And the mayor's advisory committee on market development has been on record as favoring a move to Hunts Point as soon as possible.

It's the meat dealers themselves, those who would be most affected, who oppose the move.

Meeting with Markets Commissioner Albert S. Pacetta yesterday, representatives of the Gansevoort market meat dealers demanded, of all things, not action but another study.

Commissioner Pacetta said he would submit their request—without recommendation—to the mayor's advisory committee on market development within the next 7 or 8 days. Commissioner Pacetta, chairman of the advisory committee, refused to say whether he favored a third study.

The Marketmen's Association of the Port of New York, which represents more than half of the Gansevoort dealers who chart more than 75 percent of the 14th Street-Gansevoort area's annual gross sales of $1.5 billion, criticized both studies.

Herbert Berliner, association spokesman, complained that neither study made an effort to survey the possibility and costs of renovating the present market. He contended that some 60 percent of the Lower Manhattan market dealers had modern facilities, and that the others could be modernized for some "$5 million."

He said that the Madigan-Hyland survey was not as convinced about the proposed move as city officials have indicated. To support this, he cited two sections of the report:

"It should also be mentioned," said the report, "that many 14th Street merchants seem to favor a project for local improvements in the 14th Street area. In their opinion, the market could be rehabilitated at relatively small expense and put into condition that would be satisfactory to the trade for many decades to come.

"Consideration of such an alternative (rebuilding the present lower Manhattan area) would depend on the city's judgment as to the long-term development prospects of the 14th Street area and is not within the scope of the current market study."

The Madigan-Hyland survey also indicated that 76 percent of all merchants in the Gansevoort market expressed satisfaction with their present location while 68 percent of the Bronx dealers were satisfied.

A spokesman for the Bronx dealers said yesterday, however, that the majority of them now favored the move. Their present area was designated as an urban renewal project by the City Planning Commission last October.

Though he refused to be drawn into an open controversy with the wholesalers (the meeting was closed to the press), Commissioner Pacetta said, "The city feels it would be beneficial to all concerned to get the meat dealers out of their dilapidated buildings."

Gansevoort representatives warned, however, that dealers who currently produce more than 20 percent of the area's sales volume would move to New Jersey before moving to Hunts Point.

If another study were made, he said, these dealers might be "less disgruntled."

He added, however, that some might still refuse to move to Hunts Point if a new study showed that renovations would prove too costly.

Those increases, he said, would "naturally have to be pushed on to the consumer."

Commissioner Pacetta conceded that some costs would rise but said more would decrease. The dealers say the gains, if any, would not be realized for many years.

The Commissioner expressed confidence that the meat dealers would follow the lead of producemen, who originally opposed an earlier move to the same Bronx area. "We certainly don't want to make a move * * * if it's going to be fatal to any industry or any part of it," he said.

He added that he would withdraw the proposal now before the site selection board to acquire the Hunts Point acreage, if the advisory committee calls for another study.

If the committee decides against the third study, the site selection board is expected to act on the land acquisition at its March 15 meeting.

VIOLA GREGG LIUZZO—IN MEMORIAM

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Michigan [Mrs. GRIFFITHS] may extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker for the benefit of those who would like to know how the leadership of Detroit felt about the death of Mrs. Viola Liuzzo, I would like to spread upon the RECORD the editorials of the Detroit News and the Detroit Free Press:

[From the Detroit Free Press, Mar. 27, 1965]

AS WE SEE IT—WHAT ANSWER TO GIVE A WOMAN'S MARTYRDOM?

It was Victory Day for the Alabama marchers. Freedom songs overpowered the off-and-on rain. The words of Dr. Martin Luther King and Ralph Bunche drowned out the objections of Gov. George Wallace.

To 25,000 flag-waving Americans, in the most massive demonstration in the history of the Deep South, it was a pulse-stopping moment.

And then Mrs. Viola Gregg Liuzzo was murdered.

Alabama was finding a cause for pride, too. Sure, some youngsters shouted "Jigaboo Day," but no heads were bashed. Wallace was bragging to the Nation, saying the absence of any incidents was a credit to Alabama.

And it was. Integrationists had walked, unharmed, across the heart of the Black Belt.

And then Mrs. Viola Gregg Liuzzo was murdered.

The time had come to secure the rights for which the demonstrators had marched. The change was from protest to progress. An aid of Dr. King's said major demonstrations in Alabama were to end a while.

Human rights groups were to take up the hard work of securing education, jobs, and voting rights in local Alabama communities. Congress was working on President Johnson's voting bill.

And then Mrs. Viola Gregg Liuzzo was murdered.

The flag waving, the pride of Alabama and the movement ahead have all been overshadowed by a woman's death. She was one of us. She was a Detroit woman. Her husband and five children are our neighbors.

How do we react?

Are we angry? This is easy. The murderers who drove alongside Mrs. Liuzzo's car and shot a bullet into her back are easy to hate. But the returning of hate for hate will only lead to future and more bitter violence.

Do we give in to northern pride? This, too, is easy. The proud slogans of the South, the futile Confederate flag floating atop the Selma Courthouse, have a hollow ring when that flag is drenched in the blood of an innocent woman.

Are we philosophical? Do we recognize that when the traditions of a section of the country are challenged, no matter how wrong those traditions, it will fight back? And that in its struggle, unbalanced fanatics will be driven to extreme acts of brutality?

Are we historical? Do we see the death of Mrs. Liuzzo as the latest in a list of martyrs which contained thousands of names before we became aware of Medgar Evers, Jimmie Lee Jackson, the Reverend James A. Reeb?

Or are we prayerful? Do we ask that Mrs. Viola Gregg Liuzzo might have died for something? Do we ask that from this incredible act we might all see the destructive danger of hatred, be it in the North or the South?

These are questions each must answer for himself.

[From the Detroit News, Mar. 27, 1965]

VIOLA GREGG LIUZZO, 1925–65—IN MEMORIAM

William L. Moore.
Addie Mae Collins.
Denise McNair.
Carol Robertson.
Cynthia Wesley.
The Reverend James J. Reeb.

Now add to the Book of the Dead the name of Viola Gregg Liuzzo, 39, of Detroit, mother of five, shot to death on U.S. Highway 80 in the State of Alabama, while driving along that highway in a lawful manner for a lawful purpose.

Moore was walking along an Alabama highway, lawfully, when he was shot to death. The Misses Collins, McNair, Robertson, and Wesley were in Sunday School, lawfully, in an Alabama city when they were blown to death by a bomb. The Reverend Mr. Reeb was walking the sidewalk of an Alabama city, lawfully, when he was clubbed to death.

The roll covers only the recent record of shame in Alabama. It does not include Medgar Evers, shot from ambush in Mississippi, or James Chaney, Andrew Goodman, and Michael Schwerner, abducted and murdered in Mississippi, or Lemuel Penn, waylaid and shot in the manner of Mrs. Liuzzo's murder, in Georgia.

It does not include any of the unheralded deaths of Negroes in Deep South States, with or without a civil rights aspect, at the hands of those with "superior" skin, unworried about the law because local law and mores do not concern themselves much with the death of "some nigger."

Most of the dead (though not the four schoolgirls) were "outsiders," certainly, and there are those who, in hate or in self-delusion, insist that they courted disaster by not "staying at home and minding their own business."

The argument scarcely deserves an answer. To note that Mrs. Liuzzo courted death by driving along a U.S. highway in Alabama in a car with Michigan plates—with a Negro by her side to boot—is to note what is wrong with Alabama, not with Mrs. Liuzzo or her fellow martyrs.

Alabama—notwithstanding the Confederate flag which flies over her capitol in place of the flag of the United States of America—is a part of this Nation. And these people were citizens of this Nation.

Injustice was their legitimate business, in Alabama or Detroit or anywhere else in this country. If more of their fellow Americans had felt that way in time—or even now—our Nation's racial agony might by this time have been buried.

Gov. George C. Wallace, of Alabama, sitting under his Confederate flag, is suitably saddened by the death of Viola Liuzzo, as he has been after all the outrages which have gone before.

But he clings to the comforting defense that "it is still safer to ride the highways of this State than the subways in New York."

The claim itself is open to debate. If crime and terror can be found on occasion in New York's subways, it can be found as well in rural Alabama, and could be before "civil rights" ever became a household word. How would the balance tilt if assaults and murders were of much moment to Alabama law when the victims are black?

There is a more important difference between Alabama and New York. The Governor of the State of New York does not play brinkmanship with violence, does not by word and deed tell the lawless of his State that their lawlessness is really in defense of a noble way of life.

Policemen in New York do not routinely show by ruthless example that any violence is justified if one dislikes the victim. Juries in New York do not strain conscience and credulity to exonerate subway criminals.

Arrests came swiftly in the case of Mrs. Liuzzo, and in their wake a pledge by President Johnson to wage unrelenting war on skulking Klansmen and their ilk. It is tragic that it has taken so much blood to fully rouse the Nation's conscience. But such, apparently, is the way of this world. It takes shock to move the comfortable.

That Viola Liuzzo did not die in vain can be but small comfort to her grieving family in the first shock of their loss, as it is for those who love anyone fallen in battle.

But they will be able, on some future day, to remember her as a fine, decent woman, and to take pride in the epitaph composed for her by the President of the United States: "She served the cause of justice."

FOREIGN AID DISCUSSION

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the third in a series of bipartisan meetings on foreign aid sponsored by three Democrats and three Republicans from the Foreign Affairs Committee.

This week the meeting will be on foreign aid and communism in southeast Asia. The speakers will be William Bundy, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs; Rutherford M. Poats, Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Far East, AID; and Leonard Unger, who until recently was Ambassador to Laos, and is now Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Far East and Chairman, Vietnam Coordinating Committee.

The meeting will be at 3 p.m., Wednesday, March 31, in the Speaker's Dining Room.

I hope my colleagues will be able to stop by for a stimulating discussion.

INTEROCEANIC CANALS COMMISSION

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Anderson] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, 1965, our esteemed and distinguished colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the Honorable Daniel J. Flood, introduced H.R. 4871, a bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission. This proposal reflects the high quality of statesmanship characteristic of Mr. Flood during his long career of public service.

The Panama Canal has been a prime facet of our national and international well-being for many years. Now the time is at hand when we must make plans regarding the future position of the United States in the matter of canals between the Atlantic and Pacific. Decisions must be made in the face of very complex political and technical considerations—decisions involving the national security and well-being for generations to come—decisions involving the expenditure of billions of dollars.

A wise nation will not make such a decision without having a most thorough, searching and fundamental examination of the matter by a highly competent, responsible, and open-minded team. Such a team must not be encumbered by lodgment in the confines of the conventional executive structure.

Mr. Flood's bill provides for just such an independent commission.

Last session there was enacted a law—Public Law 88-609—"to provide for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a sea-level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific." This law seems to imply that Congress has already decided there must be a sea level canal and that the Panama Canal must be downgraded both technically and politically. I do not believe the House has made such a judgment and favorable action on Mr. Flood's bill will confirm this. It will confirm our national need for a complete appraisal of all methods of ship movement across Central America based on truly objective considerations of the economic, political, and security factors involved.

I have today introduced a bill identical to Mr. Flood's, and I most earnestly urge the Members to support it.

INTERIOR APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Interior Appropriations Subcommittee has done an excellent job on the bill before us today. Chairman Denton has handled this complicated legislation with efficiency and dispatch.

I was most gratified to note that due consideration was given needed items in Dade and Monroe Counties of Florida totaling $1,596,865. However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to comment on one greatly needed item which the committee deleted from the bill. That is, additional acreage within the boundaries of Everglades National Park.

There are approximately 150 landowners remaining within the boundaries of the park—some owning only a few acres, others owning more than 10,000 acres. The situation is becoming more critical each year owing to the phenomenal growth of south Florida. The southeast coast is saturated with commercial buildings, small industries, apartment dwellings, and housing developments—the only way left to go is west and it is going west as far as it can. The price of land is steadily increasing and it is entirely possible that one day we will see the development of some of this remaining acreage within the park.

I cannot understand the Department of Interior's position in this matter in placing the acquisition of this remaining acreage at the bottom of their priority list. Consequently, Everglades National Park was one of only two park areas which were not included by the committee for at least partial funding for the acquisition of inholdings.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to go on record as stating that I believe this is an inequitable situation and that I would hope that the other body will include the $1,125,000, and that the conferees will give this item understanding consideration.

REPEAL THE FEDERAL EXCISE TAX LEVIED ON COMMUNICATION SERVICES AND FACILITIES

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Fascell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to make a few comments in support of the bill I am introducing today which will repeal the Federal excise tax levied on communication services and facilities.

Our internal revenue laws now impose a 10-percent tax on general and toll telephone service, telegraph, cable and radio messages and leased wires, and an 8-percent tax on wire and equipment service.

With the exception of the local telephone tax, which was first levied in 1941 to discourage telephone usage during the war years, all of these taxes have been on our statute books since 1932.

At the present time the communications excise tax yields nearly $1 billion annually in revenue for our Federal Government. In the latest fiscal year, which ended on June 30, 1964, collections from this source amounted to $910,196,000.

Now that the President and many of us here in the Congress are seeking repeal or reduction of a number of these nuisance taxes, I believe that the one imposed on communication services and facilities should be among the first to be eliminated.

My reasons for urging prompt enactment of my bill abolishing this tax are as follows:

First. This tax is discriminatory and exerts an unfair burden upon industries providing these services as well as on the consumers who actually must pay for them.

While other utilities or modes of communications such as gas, electricity, and rail or water transportation escape such taxation, those levied on telephone calls, telegraph messages, and so forth, continue as part of our tax system and thereby continue to impose an unjust burden.

Since these taxes are ultimately passed on to the consumer, they only add to the cost which he must pay for the use of the telephone and these other services. Furthermore, business firms find it necessary to raise the price of the goods and services which they market in order to cover their telephone and other operating costs. Thus the consumer is doubly penalized by this tax.

Second. The continuation of this excise tax cannot be justified on the grounds that the services taxed are luxuries which the average person can do without. On the contrary, use of the telephone is an absolute necessity in these busy days, not only for the business firm, but for every American family. In times of emergency, which we all face at one time or another, when we must call the doctor, the police or the fire department, the telephone is absolutely indispensable.

Third. These taxes are regressive and exert the heaviest burden upon those in the lower income groups who are least able to pay them. Hence, they tend to restrict usage of these services. Today about one-fifth of American homes are without telephones. Repeal of this tax will enable more families to enjoy the convenience of this service.

Fourth. Repeal of these taxes will provide our economy with the additional stimulus which it needs. The individual and corporation income tax reduction bill enacted early in 1964 has been given much credit for the strong upsurge in economic activity which took place last year and which is continuing this year. Abolition of these taxes will release an additional $1 billion into the hands of consumers which will be available for expenditure for the necessities of life. This increased demand for consumer goods and services will encourage industries to increase production, creating new job opportunities and putting more of our unemployed back to work. Retailers, in the expectation of increased sales, will also be able to expand operations and hire more people. Thus our entire economy will stand to benefit from enactment of my bill.

Fifth. Repeal of these taxes would free telephone, telegraph, and other companies from much of the redtape which now harrass them in collecting and reporting these taxes.

In view of these considerations, I urge support of my bill which will repeal these unfair and discriminatory taxes.

In closing, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the March 8, 1965, issue of the Miami News, which further states the case against continuation of these nuisance taxes:

NUISANCE TAXES NEED REVIEW

The present Congress, spurred by President Johnson, is expected to review nuisance taxes, that is, Federal excise taxes and probably will reduce or eliminate several of them.

Among these Federal levies, usually imposed as a wartime measure, but continued year after year, one of the most annoying to those who realize they are paying it is the excise tax on telephone service.

At present a tax of 10 percent is levied for your use of a telephone and while directed against you it is collected by the telephone company on your bill and paid to the Government.

In this day and age a telephone is a necessity, not a luxury. No business could get along without telephones and the tax on large users is passed on to customers. Originally this was a 15-percent tax levied in World War II. It was reduced in 1954 and was supposed to end in 1959. Two Congresses since then have extended it and it is now supposed to die on June 30.

There are other annoying excess taxes, but Congress would do well to abolish this one which affects everybody.

I would also like to include resolutions calling for the repeal of this tax adopted by the Commission of the City of Miami, the South Miami Chamber of Commerce, the Hialeah-Miami Springs Chamber of Commerce, the Florida Public Utilities Commission, and the Florida Telephone Association.

The resolutions follow:

RESOLUTION 36484

Resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to repeal the 10-percent excise tax on telephone communication services, requesting the Board of County Commissioners of Dade County, Fla., and the other municipalities to adopt similar resolutions, and authorizing the city clerk to disseminate copies of this resolution to the proper officials

Whereas a 10-percent excise tax was placed on telephone communication services for the purpose of raising additional revenue during World War II; and

Whereas this tax can no longer be justified, as it places an unfair and unjust burden on the citizens and small businesses of all the communities throughout the country, and particularly those in large metropolitan areas; and

Whereas President Johnson and Congress have indicated that there is a need to repeal such discriminatory tax measures in order that there will be more money available to the businessmen and citizens to stimulate consumer purchases and production; and

Whereas telephone communication services are no longer a luxury, and under the complex system in modern day communities this type of service is a necessity, therefore all people contribute to this tax regardless of their financial status: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Commission of the City of Miami, Fla.:

SECTION 1. That the Congress of the United States is hereby respectfully requested to repeal the 10-percent excise tax on telephone communication services as presently imposed.

SEC. 2. That the Board of County Commissioners of Dade County, Fla., and other municipalities within the Dade County area are hereby requested to pass and adopt a resolution embodying the provisions of section 1 hereof, or similar or like terms.

SEC. 3. That the city clerk is hereby directed to send copies of this resolution to the Honorable SPESSARD HOLLAND and GEORGE SMATHERS, U.S. Senators, the Honorable DANTE FASCELL and CLAUDE PEPPER, U.S. Representatives, the chairman of the board of county commissioners, the county manager, and the mayor of each municipality in the Dade County area.

Passed and adopted this 17th day of March 1965.

Attest:

F. L. CORRELL,
City Clerk.

RESOLUTION IN THE MATTER OF THE REMOVAL OF FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

Whereas a Federal excise tax was imposed on the users of local and long-distance telephone communication services during World War II as a war measure to discourage the nonessential use of such services and produce additional revenues during a time of national emergency; and

Whereas this tax was intended to be temporary in nature and to be repealed at the end of the national emergency; and

Whereas this tax has been continued for a period of more than two decades following the termination of the emergency, long after the stated purposes for its imposition no longer exist; and

Whereas the continuation of this tax amounts to a gross discrimination against telephone users in that it is the only common household utility so taxed; and

Whereas the conditions of daily life have now caused the use of telephone service to be a necessity in the transaction of urgent business and the obtaining of emergency medical, police, fire protection, and similar services, and cannot be considered a luxury service even though it is taxed like one; and

Whereas telephone customers have with just cause constantly and insistently demanded the repeal of this tax as unjust and discriminatory; and

Whereas the Federal excise tax restricts the use of telephone services, impairs the growth and improvement of telephone services, and discriminates against users of telephone services, and bears heavily on low-income groups, those least able to afford it: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the South Miami Chamber of Commerce, That it strongly urges the Congress of the United States to repeal the Federal excise tax on communication services; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Florida congressional delegation, to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, to the Senate Finance Committee, to the several State regulatory commissions, to all telephone companies operating in Florida, and to the Federal Communications Commission.

L. B. HEDGPETH,
President.

RESOLUTION IN THE MATTER OF THE REMOVAL OF FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON COMMUNICATIONS SERVICE

Now, therefore be it resolved by the Hialeah-Miami Springs Chamber of Commerce, That it strongly urges the Congress of the United States to repeal the Federal excise tax on communication services.

Whereas a Federal excise tax was imposed on the users of local and long distance telephone communication services during World War II as a war measure to discourage the nonessential use of such services and produce additional revenues during a time of national emergency; and

Whereas this tax was intended to be temporary in nature and to be repealed at the end of the national emergency; and

Whereas this tax has been continued for a period of more than two decades following the termination of the emergency, long after the stated purposes for its imposition no longer exist; and

Whereas the continuation of this tax amounts to a gross discrimination against telephone users in that it is the only common household utility so taxed; and

Whereas the conditions of daily life have now caused the use of telephone service to be a necessity in the transaction of urgent business and the obtaining of emergency medical, police, fire protection, and similar services, and can under no circumstances be considered a luxury service; and

Whereas telephone users have with just cause constantly and insistently demanded the repeal of this tax as unjust and discriminatory; and

Whereas the Federal excise tax restricts the use of telephone services, impairs the growth and improvement of telephone services, and discriminates against users of telephone services: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the Florida congressional delegation, to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, to the Senate Finance Committee, to the several State regulatory commissions, to all telephone companies operating in Florida, and to the Federal Communications Commission.

BING KOSSOFF,
President.

MARCH 11, 1965.

RESOLUTION IN THE MATTER OF THE REMOVAL OF FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON COMMUNICATION SERVICES, BEFORE THE FLORIDA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION

At a regular meeting duly called and attended by all members of the Florida Public Utilities Commission on the 8th day of March, 1965, at Tallahassee, Fla., the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Whereas this commission has consistently opposed the continuation of the Federal excise tax on all communication services; and

"Whereas telephone rates are established by the various regulatory commissions throughout the Nation, after careful consideration of all relevant facts, with objectives of the full development of the industry and provision of the maximum service to the public at the least possible cost; and

"Whereas the levying of Federal excise taxes distorts such rates, has a restrictive effect on the use of communication services, is discriminatory, adversely affects the earnings potential of communication companies and thereby impairs the growth and improvement of such services; and

"Whereas it has long been recognized by regulatory agencies of government at all levels that all Federal excise taxes, together with other Federal, State, and local laws and regulations place the communications industry in position of competitive disadvantage with other industries not so taxed and which offer goods and services to the general public; and

"Whereas operations of all telephone companies are affected by such tax; and

"Whereas the excise tax, a Federal emergency luxury tax, was imposed upon telephone subscribers during World War II; and

"Whereas in modern day society telephones are a necessity and should not be considered as a luxury: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Florida Public Utilities Commission,* That it urgently requests the Congress to repeal the Federal excise tax on all communication services at the earliest practicable time; be it further

"*Resolved,* That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the congressional delegation from Florida; to the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives; to the Senate Finance Committee; to the secretary of the National Association of Railroad and Utilities Commissioners; to the several State regulatory commissions; to each telephone company operating in Florida; and to the Federal Communications Commission.

"Made and entered at Tallahassee, Fla., this 8th day of March 1965.

"FLORIDA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION,
"EDWIN L. MASON,
"*Chairman.*
"JERRY W. CARTER,
"*Commissioner.*
"WILLIAM T. MAYO,
"*Commissioner.*

"Attest:
"BOLLING C. STANLEY,
"*Executive Secretary.*"

RESOLUTION OF FLORIDA TELEPHONE ASSOCIATION IN THE MATTER OF REMOVAL OF FEDERAL EXCISE TAX ON COMMUNICATION SERVICES

Whereas a Federal excise tax has been, and is still being, imposed on the users of communication services, including local and long distance telephone service, for over 22 years; and

Whereas this excise tax on telephone service was imposed originally as a measure to discourage usage of vital communications during a time of national emergency and to yield additional revenues to the Federal Government during such time; and

Whereas this tax was intended and construed to be temporary in its nature and yet has been continued in existence all these years since the termination of the emergency; and

Whereas such continuation is grossly unjust to telephone users in that telephone service is the only household service so taxed; and

Whereas the imposition of this excise tax on residential telephone service is most regressive and works unreasonable hardships on lower income families; and

Whereas since there is direct relationship between family income and household telephone development, and between farm income and farm telephone development, the reduction in cost of service by elimination of the excise tax would promote telephone development in this State; and

Whereas since telephones today are a necessity, the elimination of the excise tax takes precedence over the elimination of taxes on less essential needs; and

Whereas telephone subscribers, both as individuals and through various groups, have repeatedly expressed hope that the Federal excise tax on telephone service would be terminated and have made these views widely known; and

Whereas it has long been recognized by regulatory agencies at all levels that this Federal excise tax, together with other Federal, State, and local laws and regulations, places the communications industry in a position of competitive disadvantage with other industries not so taxed, and which offer goods and services to the general public; and

Whereas the operation of all telephone companies in the State of Florida and in the Nation is affected by such a tax: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Florida Telephone Association, That it does hereby petition the legislative delegation of the State of Florida to lend its support to legislation to repeal the excise tax levied on communication services; and be it further

Resolved, That if Federal budget considerations prevent complete abolishment of this tax in 1965, the excise tax on residential and competitive telephone service be now removed, with the remainder removed in two or more annual steps; and

Resolved further, That copy of this resolution shall be directed to each member of the Florida delegation to Congress.

FRED D. LEAREY,
President.

FEDERAL REINSURANCE OF PRIVATE PENSION PLANS

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to provide Federal reinsurance of private pension plans.

The purpose of this legislation is to insure the worker against the loss of anticipated benefits in the case of termination of an inadequately funded private pension plan. The bill would provide insurance against the loss of pension benefits in much the same way as the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation insures against loss of an investor's savings.

It is my hope that the introduction of this legislation will encourage discussion of the entire question of protecting pension rights and the means by which to do so. I am sure that there are several possible approaches to meet this need and the bill I today introduce suggests but one.

The need for some form of protection of pension rights has been demonsrtated in the recent past in my own city of South Bend, Ind., in the case of the closing of the Studebaker Corp.'s automobile plant. When Studebaker ceased its South Bend operation, the pension plan which the company had established for its employees was not sufficiently funded to provide benefits for any but those workers 60 years of age and over.

The result was that men and women who had worked for the company for 25 to 30 years, but had not yet reached age 60, were left without a pension or a job.

My proposal, which parallels that introduced in the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana, the Honorable VANCE HARTKE, provides:

First. A nine-member Federal Advisory Council for Insurance of Employees' Pension Funds, working with the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Advisory Council members would be appointed by the President.

Second. Participation by all pension plans upon payment of premiums fixed by the Advisory Council. Private pension plans not participating in the program would not qualify for the special tax treatment provided under the Internal Revenue Code.

Third. Self-financing, with no expenditure of public funds required. The premiums paid by participating pension plans would be placed in a revolving fund from which all liabilities would be paid.

I urge my colleagues to consider this matter most seriously and to offer their suggestions in the course of our discussion of the proposal. The need for insuring workers against loss of pension rights is real. Let us delay no longer in searching for a just response to that need.

Mr. Speaker, the text of the bill follows:

H.R. 6944

A bill to establish a self-supporting Federal reinsurance program to protect employees in the enjoyment of certain rights under private pension plans

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Federal Reinsurance of Private Pension Plans Act".

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 2. As used in this Act—

(a) The term "pension fund" means a trust, pension plan, or other program under which an employer undertakes to provide, or assist in providing, retirement benefits for the exclusive benefit of his employees or their beneficiaries. Such term does not include any plan or program established by a self-employed individual for his own benefit or for the benefit of his survivors or established by one or more owner-employees exclusively for his or their benefit, or for the benefit of his or their survivors.

(b) The term "eligible pension fund" means a pension fund which meets the requirements set forth in section 401 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to qualified pension plans.

(c)(1) The term "insured pension fund" means an eligible pension fund which has been in operation for not less than three years and, for each of such years, has met the requirements set forth in subsection (b) and has been insured under the program established under this Act.

(2) Any addition to, or amendment of, an insured pension fund shall, if such addition or amendment involves a significant increase (as determined by the Secretary) in the unfunded liability of such pension fund, be regarded as a new and distinct pension fund which can become an "insured pension fund" only upon compliance with the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF INSURANCE PROGRAM

SEC. 3. There is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a program to be known as the Federal insurance program for private pension plans (hereinafter referred to as the "program"). The program shall be administered by, or under the direction and control of, the Secretary.

CONTINGENCIES INSURED AGAINST UNDER PROGRAM

SEC. 4. (a) The program shall insure (to the extent provided in subsection (b)) beneficiaries of an insured pension fund against loss of benefits to which they are entitled under such pension fund arising from—

(1) failure of the amounts contributed to such fund to provide benefits anticipated at the time such fund was established, if such failure is attributable to cessation of one or more of the operations carried on by him in one or more facilities of such employer; or

(2) losses realized upon the sale of investments of such fund if the sale is required to provide benefits payable by such fund.

(b) The rights of beneficiaries of an insured pension fund shall only be insured under the program to the extent that such rights do not exceed—

(1) in the case of a right to a monthly retirement or disability benefit for the employee himself, the lesser of 50 per centum of his average monthly wage in the five-year period for which his earnings were the greatest, or $500 per month;

(2) in the case of a right on the part of one or more dependents, or members of the family, of the employee, or in the case of a right to a lump-sum survivor benefit on account of the death of an employee, an amount found by the Secretary to be reasonably related to the amount determined under subparagraph (1).

In the case of a periodic benefit which is paid on other than a monthly basis, the monthly equivalent of such benefit shall be regarded as the amount of the monthly benefit for purposes of clauses (1) and (2) of the preceding sentence.

(c) If an eligible pension fund has not been insured under the program for each of at least the three years preceding the time when there occurs the contingency insured against, the rights of beneficiaries shall not be insured and in lieu thereof the contributions made on behalf of such pension fund during such period shall be returned to the pension fund.

PREMIUM FOR PARTICIPATION IN PROGRAM

SEC. 5. (a) Each eligible pension fund may, upon application therefor, obtain insurance under the program upon payment of such annual premium as may be established by the Secretary. The Secretary shall establish separate premium rates for insurance against each of the contingencies described in section 4(a)(1) and section 4(a)(2). In establishing such premium rates for insurance against the contingency described in section 4(a)(2), the Secretary shall provide that the rate shall vary, to whatever extent is appropriate, for different classes of investments. Premium rates established under this section shall be uniform for all pension funds insured by the program and shall be applied to the amount of the unfunded obligations and assets or class of assets, respectively, of each insured pension fund. The premium rates may be changed from year to year by the Secretary, when the Secretary determines changes to be necessary or desirable to give effect to the purposes of this Act; but in no event shall the premium rate established for the contingency described in section 4(a)(1) exceed 1 per centum for each dollar of unfunded obligations, nor shall the aggregate premium payable by any insured pension fund for the contingency described in section 4(a)(2) exceed one-quarter of 1 per centum of the assets of such fund.

(b) The Secretary, in determining premium rates, and in establishing formulas for determining unfunded obligations and assets of pension funds, shall consult with, and be guided by the advice of, the Advisory Council (established by section 8).

(c) If the Secretary (after consulting with the Advisory Council) determines that, because of the limitation on rate of premium established under subsection (a) or for other reasons, it is not feasible to insure against loss of rights of all beneficiaries of insured pension funds, then the Secretary shall insure the rights of beneficiaries in accordance with the following order of priorities—

First: individuals who, at the time when there occurs the contingency insured against, are receiving benefits under the pension fund, and individuals who have attained normal retirement age or if no normal retirement age is fixed have reached the age when an unreduced old-age benefit is payable under title II of the Social Security Act, as amended, and who are eligible, upon retirement, for retirement benefits under the pension fund;

Second: individuals who, at such time, have attained the age for early retirement and who are entitled, upon early retirement, to early retirement benefits under the pension fund; or, if the pension fund plan does not provide for early retirement, individuals who, at such time, have attained age sixty and who, under such pension fund, are eligible for benefits upon retirement.

Third: individuals who, at such time, have attained age forty-five;

Fourth: individuals who, at such time, have attained age forty; and

Fifth: in addition to individuals described in the above priorities, such other individuals as the Secretary, after consulting with the Advisory Council, shall prescribe.

(d) Participation in the program by a pension fund shall be terminated by the Secretary upon failure, after such reasonable period as the Secretary shall prescribe, of such pension fund to make payment of premiums due for participation in the program. Participation by any pension fund in the program may be terminated by such fund at any time by giving not less than sixty days' notice of termination to the Secretary.

REVOLVING FUND

SEC. 6. (a) In carrying out his duties under this Act, the Secretary shall establish a revolving fund into which all amounts paid into the program as premiums shall be deposited and from which all liabilities incurred under the program shall be paid.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to borrow from the Treasury such amounts as may be necessary, for deposit into the revolving fund, to meet the liabilities of the program. Moneys borrowed from the Treasury shall bear a rate of interest determined by the Secretary of the Treasury to be equal to the average rate on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States as of the period such moneys are borrowed. Such moneys shall be repaid by the Secretary from premiums paid into the revolving fund.

(c) Moneys in the revolving fund not required for current operations shall be invested in obligations of, or guaranteed as to principal and interest by, the United States.

AMENDMENT TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

SEC. 7. (a) Section 401(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of qualified pension and other similar plans) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(11) Notwithstanding the preceding provisions of this subsection, no pension fund which, for any taxable year is insurable under the Federal Reinsurance of Private Pension Plans Act, shall be a qualified pension plan under this section if such fund is not insured for such year under the program established under such Act."

(b) Section 404(a)(2) of such Code (relating to deductibility of contributions to employees' annuities) is amended by striking out "section 401(a) (9) and (10)" and inserting in lieu thereof "section 401(a) (9), (10), and (11)".

(c) The amendments made by this section shall be effective with respect to taxable years which begin not less than six months after the date of enactment of this Act.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

SEC. 8. (a) There is hereby created a Federal Advisory Council for Insurance of Employees' Pension Funds (hereinafter referred to as the "Advisory Council"), which shall consist of nine members, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The President shall select, for appointment to the Council, individuals who are, by reason of training or experience, or both, familiar with and competent to deal with, problems involving employees' pension funds and problems relating to the insurance of such funds. Members of the Council shall be appointed for a term of two years.

(b) Members shall be compensated at the rate of $100 per day for each day they are engaged in the duties of the Advisory Council and shall be entitled to reimbursement for traveling expenses incurred in attendance at meetings of the Council. The Advisory Council shall meet at Washington, District of Columbia, upon call of the Secretary who shall serve as Chairman of the Council. Meetings shall be called by such Chairman not less often than twice each year.

(c) It shall be the duty of the Advisory Council to consult with and advise the Secretary with respect to the administration of this Act.

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY REMARKS AND STATEMENTS

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FLOOD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, Members of the House who do not wish to have their remarks, statements, and insertions on Lithuanian Independence Day, 1965, reprinted in pamphlet form, should so notify the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Clerk, Mr. Raymond Noyes, in the Capitol Building.

Otherwise, they will be reprinted as requested by the American Lithuanian Information Center in New York City.

A BILL TO MODIFY FEDERAL BAIL PRACTICES

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MCVICKER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today designed to modify Federal bail procedures so that they are more equitable and consistent with attaining a more just, efficient system of criminal justice. For some time now, scrutiny has been focused upon certain inequities in our Federal bail procedures. As it operates today, the Federal bail system is repugnant to the spirit of the Constitution and in direct conflict with the basic tenets that a person is presumed innocent until proven guilty by a court of law, and that justice should be equal and accessible to all.

The purpose of bail in the United States is to assure that the accused be present to stand trial. Under rule 46 (a)(1) of the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure, accused persons arrested for a noncapital offense have an absolute right to bail. This rule is justly beneficial to accused persons whose guilt has not yet been proven by a court of law, since the accused may prepare his defense and retain his employment. Furthermore, this rule avoids subjecting the accused to the influence of convicted persons already serving their jail sentences and protects him and his family from needless public derision.

Yet, each year thousands of citizens are confined not because they are guilty of the commission of a crime, but because they cannot afford to post bond. Sadly enough, our Federal bail laws demonstrate that an important phase of the administration of criminal justice has been deposited into the hands of professional bondsmen, or in their absence, depends on the financial status of the accused.

Federal bail procedures which inhibit an accused person from securing his entitled release pending trial also impose a severe financial burden upon the taxpaying public. The high cost of pretrial detention depletes public funds which otherwise could be used to furnish counsel for indigent defendants.

Since measures are needed to revise existing Federal bail practices so that our Federal courts might provide a more efficient, equitable justice, I am introducing a bill designed to accomplish the following:

First. To provide Federal courts with additional methods of releasing persons accused of criminal offenses.

Second. To provide an appeal for persons aggrieved by the conditions of release imposed by the court.

Third. To provide credit for pretrial confinement against any fine imposed by the sentencing court.

This bill provides the court with express authority to release an accused person on his personal recognizance, including a written promise to appear as required by the court. This aspect of the bill makes bail decisions contingent upon more relevant considerations, such as his character, employment, residence, or other community ties, rather than irrelevant factors such as the financial status of the accused. The Manhattan bail project in New York produced evidence that this measure will be highly successful. In its first 3 years, that project released 2,195 selected defendants solely on their promises to return for trial, and only 15 failed to comply. The rate of default for those freed on bail was three times as great.

This bill authorizes a Federal court to permit a person to deposit cash, or other security, with the court in an amount equal to 10 percent of the amount of the bail set. This security will be refunded when the accused complies with the terms of his release. Since this deposit is returnable, the accused will be less likely to flee the jurisdiction of the court, and the return will assist the accused to cover the expenses involved with the criminal litigation.

The bill provides any person aggrieved by an order of a judge—except a judge of the U.S. district court, court of appeals, or the Supreme Court—the right to appeal the court order to the U.S. district court. Any appeal would be determined within 10 days after it is filed. This would provide a means of insuring that qualified persons would be released prior to trial and that such release be conducted according to law.

Further, the bill would assure persons convicted of offenses against the United States credit toward their sentence term for time they spent in custody prior to sentencing by the court. It would also allow credit to persons for pretrial custody against any fine imposed by the court.

This bill is, of course, intended only to modify Federal bail practices, but it is certain that numerous inequities occur on the State level as well as the Federal. One such case began in Adams County, Colo., on June 3, 1964. A 21-year-old youth named Peter Gomez was accused of assaulting an officer of the law. He was arrested and kept in custody under $10,000 bail. Unable to raise bail, Mr. Gomez remained in jail for a period of 8 months. Peter Gomez had had no adult criminal record. After 8 months' imprisonment, the accusing policeman finally confessed that he had falsely named Mr. Gomez in the assault charge. Mr. Gomez is now free, but this 21-year-old youth had lost much—his time, his good name, the companionship of his family, and the money he might have earned had the bail system in Colorado excluded an irrelevant—but now controling—factor, namely, the financial status of the accused.

As I have said, my bill could modify only Federal bail practices, but the motivation of this bill and that of at least 11 studies being conducted in this country is the desire to see justice done and constitutional rights preserved, in fact as well as in theory. It is my hope that the Congress will enact the measures suggested in this bill, and that in so doing, the Congress will provide a model on which State legislatures will enact similar measures so that all citizens may be assured of quick, equal, and accessible justice.

MIDLAND COOPERATIVES TO BUILD DOMINICAN REFINERY

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, the Export-Import Bank has approved a loan of $5.5 million to Midland Cooperatives, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn., which owns and operates a refinery in Cushing, Okla. As an Oklahoman I am proud of this event because it means that a city in my State is going to play a vital part in a unique people-to-people program in cooperation with the people of the Dominican Republic. An added significance to this event is the fact that President Johnson has proclaimed this year an International Cooperation Year, which is being celebrated throughout the world as a result of a proclamation passed unanimously by the United Nations. President Johnson has called on his executive staff and all Government agencies to do everything in their power to encourage and develop projects and activities that will prove to the world that this country believes that through cooperation peace and good will can be maintained and developed throughout this globe. The cooperative movement has always played a vital role in the development of our country to the point where now over $20 billion worth of business is done by cooperatives each year.

It is of special interest in Oklahoma that Midland Cooperatives, Inc., was awarded an oil refinery concession by the Dominican Government. The refinery agreement between the Dominican Government and Midland is a document that reflects true cooperation negotiated in an environment of friendly understanding and a desire to help the people of the Dominican Republic. Midland is loaning the Cooperative Institute of the Dominican Republic the equity capital whereby the latter can be a full and equal partner in the ownership of the refinery. Midland is also setting aside a sum that will amount to approximately $500,000 a year that will be used to promote and finance the cooperative movement of the Dominican Republic. Midland will operate the refinery and plans to train Dominican nationals in its refinery in Cushing, Okla.

Nothing happens by accident in this world and this refinery concession was the result of many months of negotiation and dedication on the part of both Americans and Dominicans. I particularly want to commend Mr. Murray D. Lincoln, founder and board chairman of CARE, and president emeritus of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., and his oil consultant, Mr. John K. Evans, who developed the proposal and handled the preliminary negotiations. Midland's board of directors is to be commended for its vision and courage in supporting and endorsing the Midland team which negotiated the final agreement. The team consisted of General Manager A. J. Smaby, Milton D. Zeddies, and J. A. Bierbaum. Finally, I commend Dr. Donald Reid Cabral, President of the Triumvirate of the Dominician Government, who made the final decision that the Dominican people would have the first cooperatively owned refinery of its type in the world.

The recent decision by the Export-Import Bank to approve a $5.5 million loan to help finance the construction of this refinery is of particular credit to the initiative of Mr. Harold Linder, President of the Bank, and his staff.

It is always difficult to pioneer and break precedent and everyone concerned with this unique event has been pioneering and breaking precedent. This is appropriate for a project with which, Oklahoma, a pioneer State, is associated.

Finally, I read into the record the text of a letter addressed to President Johnson by Mr. Murray D. Lincoln under date of March 2, and I quote:

> I have your letter of February 23, and I am pleased to inform you that I have accepted membership on the National Citizens Commission to support International Cooperation Year.
>
> I am most interested in the International Cooperation Year, and would like to draw your attention to a project that is a good example of what American cooperatives are doing in the field of international cooperation.
>
> Nearly 3 years ago, when I was directly connected with Nationwide Insurance Co., and president of the Cooperative League of the U.S.A., I retained the services of an international oil consultant, Mr. John K. Evans. Mr. Evans had the responsibility of keeping me informed on events and activities in the international oil fields with a view of possibly developing joint cooperative ventures involving the production, refining, or marketing of petroleum products in the lesser developed countries of the world.
>
> In the interval several projects submitted by Mr. Evans were looked at and one was an oil refinery in the Dominican Republic. I will not bother you with the details but, after months of negotiations between Midland Cooperatives, Inc., of Minneapolis, Minn., and the Dominican Government, a refinery project has matured to the point where formal construction activities will start within a very short time.
>
> This project is unique since it is the first venture of its type in the world. It is the first joint venture refinery involving American and foreign cooperatives. It will make a very definite contribution to the well-being and development of the Dominican Republic since it will save several million dollars of foreign exchange each year and makes it possible for the Dominican people, through the Cooperative Institute, to have a share in the ownership of the refinery. Midland Cooperatives is setting aside a sizable sum each year out of profits for research, development, and technical assistance in the overall area of the cooperative movement in the Dominican Republic. In addition, Midland Cooperatives is loaning money to the Dominican Cooperative Institute to enable the latter to purchase a 50-percent interest in the refinery. Here is an example of what American cooperatives can and are doing to support your program further in the development of cooperatives in foreign countries as part of our program to not only economically develop these countries but also to make it possible for the people to reap material benefits under an environment of democracy and private enterprise.
>
> My purpose in drawing your attention to this project is with the thought in mind that here is an outstanding event in this International Cooperation Year that dramatically exemplifies what can be done through cooperatives in the international field.

In summation, here is a project that represents a truly international cooperation participation involving both public and private sectors. It necessitated every cooperative support from the United States and Dominican Governments and the public agencies involved; plus the cooperation of the engineering firm—Foster Wheeler Corp.—in the fact that the staff of this firm extended every effort to cooperate with the principals; and, finally, it required the close working relationship of the Midland and Dominican cooperative groups. Mr. Murray D. Lincoln supplied the original initiative and Mr. Arthur Smaby, on behalf of his Midland cooperative organization, followed through in a pioneering venture that required not only initiative but courage. Mr. Smaby has been an active participant in the international cooperative field for many years and is chairman of the board, International Cooperative Development Association; member of Board, International Cooperative Development Fund; member of Central Committee, International Cooperative Alliance; member of Inter-American Cooperative Finance Institute; and member of board, Cooperative League of the U.S.A.

GEMINI SPACE FLIGHT

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. STAGGERS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, for a long time Chet Huntley has been known and admired for his brilliant reporting on the National Broadcasting System. Last Tuesday evening, after Gemini Astronauts Grissom and Young had completed successfully their historic flight, Mr. Huntley paid a tribute that may be comparably historic. Half poetic in style, its imaginative insight into what we are doing may make of it a modern classic. Doubtless it will be preserved in other places, but I feel that it should have a few lines in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> We have had occasion, again, to contemplate vicariously—and with envy, perhaps—the calm serenity of space. Borders, boundaries, and disputed territories are meaningless; and the limitless reaches of distance, which go beyond comprehension, assert an ideology of their own. The earth, silently clutching with gravitational possessiveness, blends into alternating patches of cloud, land, and sea. Continents and oceans drift by—the shaving cream ads of space travel. No reassuring signs here that 17 miles ahead at exit 35 is the Planetary Motel, 100 rooms, air conditioned, TV, restaurant, and bar.
>
> From the detached advantage of space, neither man nor his works are discernible. Selma is so very inconspicuous—so is Harlem, Saigon, Leopoldville, and the Gaza strip. Somewhere on that generous and accommodating orb, men are hunting other men, hating, fearing—and for what?
>
> The law of gravity, once immutable as the seasons, has been defied like a village traffic ordinance. Into the hostile environment of space man has brought his own. He streaks about a planet riding a hairline balance of gravity, speed, tangent, and mass. But terrestrial problems, dangers, and dilemmas are unchecked—war, pestilence, crime, ignorance, and want.
>
> Ah that a man's reach should exceed his grasp.
>
> We reach for the stars but our grasp on human well-being is less than satisfactory. Our human systems are less than all go while we navigate the infinite turnpikes of the solar system, where the toll charges, by the way, are presently $15,805 million.
>
> This, by Walt Whitman, somehow seems appropriate:
>
> "Darest thou now, O soul,
> Walk out with me toward the unknown region,
> Where neither ground is for the feet nor any path to follow?
> No map there, no guide,

Nor voice sounding, nor touch of human
hand,
Nor face with blooming flesh, nor lips, nor
eyes, are in that land.

"I know it not, O soul,
Nor dost thou, all is blank before us,
All waits undreamed of in that region, that
inaccessible land.

"Till when the tie is loosened,
All but the ties eternal, time and space,
Nor darkness, gravitation, sense, nor any
bounds bounding us.

"Then we burst forth, we float,
In time and space, O soul! prepared for
them,
Equal, equipped at last, O joy! O fruit of
all! them to fulfill,
O soul!"

MANPOWER ACT OF 1965

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the 89th Congress has been going a relatively short time but already the Select Subcommittee on Labor has held hearings and reported out amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act. These amendments are scheduled to be taken up on the House floor on Thursday of this week.

The training programs authorized under the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, and the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 have represented impressive strides toward reducing our unemployment rolls and in helping this country continue the fight for full employment.

Gerald G. Somers of the University of Wisconsin and Ernest W. Stromsdorfer of the University of Tennessee, in December of last year presented a paper entitled "A Benefit-Cost Analysis of Manpower Retraining," at a meeting of the American Economic Association-Industrial Relations Research Association in Chicago.

That analysis, Mr. Speaker, was the result of lengthy surveys and studies by the authors. The results of their work are noteworthy.

While no one in the past has said that the Manpower Development and Training Act or the Area Redevelopment Act or the trade expansion retraining programs would bring us full employment, it has been my contention, and the contention of many supporters of these programs, that this was the way to move.

I think the results of the work by Mr. Somers and Mr. Stromsdorfer confirm that belief. They conclude that the preponderance of evidence leads to the belief that retraining experiences brought about by these various programs play "an important role in the relative post-training success of these workers."

Critics ask: "Is retraining of the unemployed a sound social investment?" The answer of this analysis is, "Yes."

I readily admit that retraining is only a partial answer to the problem of unemployment. However, in the words of Mr. Somers and Mr. Stromsdorfer:

> Individual trainees have obviously benefited economically from retraining, quite aside from any social and psychological gain. Additions have been made to the Nation's skill and income. Even if it could be shown that retrained workers merely find employment that might otherwise go to the untrained, there are important political, economic, cultural and social values in the demonstration that individual workers can gain through retraining.

In conclusion they answer the arguments often advanced by the critics of our Federal retraining programs:

> The dollars-and-cents focus of this evaluation has been necessarily limited; but even within this narrow framework, there is evidence that the benefits and potential benefits of manpower retraining substantially outweigh the costs.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conclusions of Mr. Somers and Mr. Stromsdorfer be printed in the RECORD, and I commend these conclusions to both supporters and critics of our manpower retraining programs:

CONCLUSIONS OF MR. SOMERS AND MR. STROMSDORFER

Government-sponsored retraining of the unemployed began to emerge as a foremost Federal labor market policy in 1961. The infancy of the movement makes evaluation difficult, but the formative years are also the most important for an objective appraisal. The ARA and AVP programs in West Virginia, which are evaluated in this paper, were among the first to be initiated in the current move to retraining in the United States.

The West Virginia surveys indicate that the trainees enjoyed notable advantages in employment and earnings relative to comparable nontrainees. This was especially true for males, and less so for females. For the average male trainee, the costs of retraining were quickly repaid in increased earnings; and high capital values and rates of return followed the retraining investment—for the trainee and for society.

Three obvious questions arise: First, can the demonstrable benefits employed by the trainees be wholly attributed to their retraining? Since the control groups of nontrainees were not otherwise identical with the trainees and since many special efforts were made to place the trainees, other nontraining factors undoubtedly intervened. The limitations of the survey have been discussed in detail. However, careful efforts have been made to control for these other variables whenever possible; and the preponderance of various types of evidence pointing in the same direction leads to the view that the retraining experience played an important role in the relative post training success of these workers.

Second, can the favorable West Virginia experience be generalized for the Nation as a whole, for the Manpower Development and Training Act and other programs? Because of the peculiarities of the West Virginia situation, there are obvious hazards involved. At the same time, the background of the trainees was similar to that of many other displaced and unemployed workers; and the courses studied were typical of those established elsewhere. If the training costs were unusually low, so were the employment opportunities unusually meager in the depressed West Virginia communities. Certainly, there is little evidence in national data or studies in other areas which would lead to the conclusion that the favorable West Virginia experience was unique.[1]

Finally, is retraining of the unemployed a sound social investment? In view of the small number of trainees relative to the number of unemployed in West Virginia and the Nation as a whole, it is clear that retraining is only a partial answer to the problem of unemployment.[2] But individual trainees have obviously benefited economically from retraining, quite aside from any social and psychological gain. Additions have been made to the Nation's skills and income. Even if it could be shown that retrained workers merely find employment that might otherwise go to the untrained, there are important political, economic, cultural and social values in the demonstration that individual workers can gain through retraining.

The dollars-and-cents focus of this evaluation has been necessarily limited; but even within this narrow framework, there is evidence that the benefits and potential benefits of manpower retraining substantially outweigh the costs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MAILLIARD, for next week, on account of official business away from Washington.

Mr. DAGUE (at the request of Mr. CORBETT), for March 30 and 31, on account of death in family.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. FARNUM), for 60 minutes, on March 31, 1965; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. O'KONSKI.

Mr. ABERNETHY to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter in remarks made by him in general debate on the Interior Department appropriation bill.

Mr. LAIRD to revise remarks made by him in Committee of the Whole today on the Department of the Interior appropriation bill and to include a report from the Department of the Interior on the Menominee Indian problem.

---

[1] See, for example, the case studies of retraining programs in Connecticut, Illinois, Massachusetts, Michigan, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee, in "Retraining the Unemployed," op. cit.

[2] Only 43,684 workers had completed Area Development Act and Manpower Development and Training Act training by January 1964, at a time when there were 4,300,000 unemployed. Data provided by the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Employment Security, and "Manpower Research and Retraining," op. cit., page 33.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WYDLER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. FINO.

Mr. LAIRD.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FARNUM) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GATHINGS.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois.

Mr. CALLAN.

Mr. PEPPER.

SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 390. An act to extend to volunteer fire companies the rates of postage on second-class and third-class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

S. 1000. An act to amend the act of July 29, 1954, as amended, to permit transfer of title to movable property to agencies which assume operation and maintenance responsibility for project works serving municipal and industrial functions; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. 1462. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservatory District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 27. Concurrent resolution to print additional copies of a committee print entitled "Catalog of Federal Aids to State and Local Governments—Supplement, January 4, 1965"; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 31, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

827. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the request for appropriations for the fiscal year 1966 for the Inter-American Development Bank (H. Doc. No. 127); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

828. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to expand, extend, and accelerate the saline water conversion program conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes" (H. Doc. No. 128); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

829. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to repeal section 7043 of title 10, United States Code"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

830. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of failure to collect forfeitures of pay imposed by court-martial sentences, Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

831. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report of the activities of, expenditures by, and donation to the Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory of the Bureau of Mines at Grand Forks, N. Dak., for calendar year 1964, pursuant to 62 Stat. 85; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

832. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

833. A letter from the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide for the registration of names assumed for the purposes of trade or business in the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 6907. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication service or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 6908. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 6909. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYAL:

H.R. 6910. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to facilitate sales of one- to four-family residences in locations adversely affected by airports constructed or expanded with Federal financial assistance furnished under the Federal Airport Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 6911. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson National Scenic Riverway in the States of New York and New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6912. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GUBSER:

H.R. 6913. A bill to amend title 37 of the United States Code to provide for the payment to survivors of certain deceased members of the uniformed services of a lump sum on account of such member's unused accrued leave; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 6914. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall be bound by decisions of certain Federal courts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6915. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Ellis Island National Historic Site, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JONAS:

H.R. 6916. A bill to amend section 331 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 in order to continue the indemnity payment program for dairy farmers; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 6917. A bill to provide for a flat fee for services performed in connection with the arrival in, or departure from, the United States of a private aircraft or private vessel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 6918. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6919. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide that World War II and Korean conflict veterans entitled to educational benefits under any law administered by the Veterans' Administration who did not utilize their entitlement may transfer their entitlement to their children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 6920. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson National Scenic Riverway in the States of New York and New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 6921. A bill to extend the term during which the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make fisheries loans under the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 6922. A bill for the relief of the town of Bremen, Ind.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 6923. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 6924. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide a 20-percent increase in benefits with a minimum primary benefit of $70, to permit both men and women to retire thereunder with full benefits at age 60, and to authorize payment of widow's insurance benefits regardless of age in the case of widows (otherwise eligible) whose income is within specified limits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORMAN:

H.R. 6925. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 6926. A bill to strengthen the financial condition of the employees' life insurance fund created by the Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954, to provide certain adjustments in amounts of group life and group accidental death and dismemberment insurance under such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FASCELL:

H.R. 6927. A bill to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FRIEDEL:

H.R. 6928. A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 6929. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson National Scenic Riverway in the States of New York and New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAGEN of California:

H.R. 6930. A bill to establish a National Spelling Commission to reform the spelling of English words, to publish the U.S. Official Dictionary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. HARVEY of Michigan:

H.R. 6931. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the retailers excise taxes on jewelry, furs, toilet preparations, and luggage and handbags, and to provide for the gradual reduction and eventual elimination of the tax on general telephone service; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H.R. 6932. A bill to increase the limitation on emergency relief for the repair or reconstruction of highways under section 125 of title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 6933. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the State of Utah; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H.R. 6934. A bill to authorize release on a personal recognizance of persons otherwise eligible for bail, to credit time spent in custody for lack of bail toward service of sentence, and to further implement the constitutional right to bail; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 6935. A bill to amend chapter 67 of title 10 of the United States Code to entitle certain individuals to retired pay for nonregular service even though they do not perform 20 years of service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. MURPHY of Illinois:

H.R. 6936. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 6937. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 6938. A bill to authorize two professional legislative assistants for each Member of the House of Representatives and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 6939. A bill to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. POAGE:

H.R. 6940. A bill to provide that, in connection with transactions under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, Commodity Credit Corporation shall not incur additional costs for the purpose of complying with the Cargo Preference Act unless it has received funds to cover such costs from the Secretary of Commerce; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

H.R. 6941. A bill to extend to volunteer fire companies and volunteer ambulance and rescue companies the rates of postage on second-class and third-class bulk mailings applicable to certain nonprofit organizations; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 6942. A bill relating to the status of volunteer fire companies for purposes of liability for Federal income taxes and for certain Federal excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 6943. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act in order to correct an inequity in the application of such act with respect to the U.S. Botanic Garden, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 6944. A bill to establish a self-supporting Federal reinsurance program to protect employees in the enjoyment of certain rights under private pension plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H.J. Res. 411. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.J. Res. 412. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives shall be 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H.J. Res. 413. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the 7-day period beginning April 9 of each year as National Family Health Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 414. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives shall be 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. Con. Res. 374. Concurrent resolution to insure equal rights and self-determination for the peoples of Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 375. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress against the persecution of persons by Soviet Russia because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KREBS:

H. Con. Res. 376. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States bring the Baltic States question before the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS:

H. Res. 310. Resolution authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the additional expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ASHBROOK:

H. Res. 311. Resolution authorizing the expenditure of certain funds for the additional expenses of the Committee on Un-American Activities; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

157. By Mr. REIFEL: Memorial of South Dakota State Legislature memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose and kill the proposed revolving fund through which farmers and ranchers would make $20 million in payments to the Soil Conservation Service for technical assistance; to the Committee on Agriculture.

158. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to suggesting a method eliminating administrative costs, and adding such costs to any returned part of Federal income tax to the States related to expenditures for health, education, and welfare; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 6945. A bill for the relief of Janina Dziuba; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6946. A bill for the relief of Zora Secivanovic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 6947. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Takuhi Manuelyan and Eva Manuelyan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6948. A bill for the relief of Miss Lola Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 6949. A bill for the relief of Michael T. McGarry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 6950. A bill for the relief of Arina de Sousa Gouveia and Alda Maria Santos Gouveia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6951. A bill for the relief of Dr. Michael Hanna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6952. A bill for the relief of Lina Silva; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6953. A bill for the relief of Ibrihim Zeytinoglu, Zeynep Zeytinoglu, and Fusun Zeytinoglu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 6954. A bill to exempt from taxation certain property of the National Society Colonial Dames XVII Century in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROONEY of New York:

H.R. 6955. A bill for the relief of Angelo Ferranti; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 6956. A bill for the relief of Eduardo Brum and his brother, Alfredo Brum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WHITE of Texas:

H.R. 6957. A bill for the relief of Miss Blasa Arreola Rodriguez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A Look at the Republican Party in the House of Representatives

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, on March 25, our distinguished minority leader and my close friend, Mr. GERALD FORD of Michigan, was the guest speaker before the National Press Club of Washington, D.C. This was an outstanding and well-articulated statement concerning the shortcomings of the present administration and the efforts of the House Republicans to discharge their responsibilities as an effective minority party.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD] before the Press Club in the RECORD:

SPEECH BY REPRESENTATIVE GERALD R. FORD, REPUBLICAN, OF MICHIGAN, BEFORE THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

Let's take a look at the Republican Party in the House of Representatives. It's true that the new House Republican leadership hasn't won any spectacular legislative successes. This has been appropriately noted by some. But we never campaigned on a platform that—by some strange sleight of hand or magic potion—we could double our numbers and slice the opposition in half before November 1966.

As you well know, the numbers on each side of the aisle in the House have remained the same since November 3—140 Republicans to 294 Democrats. The odds are rough. But, to coin a phrase—with a little different twist—we shall overcome.

You in your profession and those of us in my profession face the same powerhouse—but in a different way.

The White House and all its troops try to spoon-feed you—and they try to clobber us. The President has virtually unlimited resources for working his will—a veritable army of experts, authorities, researchers, propagandists, and the like.

He is also kingpin of the branch of Government that employs 2½ million civilians and controls the destiny of 2,600,000 military personnel. These two groups have a payroll cost totaling $28 billion—and together they will spend over 127 billion tax dollars in fiscal 1966.

This awesome power and the vast apparatus, if used improperly, could mean the withering away and eventually the death of the two-party system.

There is nothing constitutionally ordained about running our Government through two great political parties.

But almost from the start our Nation made such a choice. It was a wise decision. We avoided the chaos of a multiparty government. We avoided the loss of freedom of the single party system. And we built into government an additional set of checks and balances.

Not only does a strong second party provide the electorate with legislative alternatives but also with a remarkably high level of honesty and frankness.

Our American news media have a noble tradition in demanding the facts, bursting the bubble of propaganda, unstuffing the shirt, and exposing the corrupt. You of the news media can perform your job better if the relative strengths of our two parties are more nearly in balance and not so far out of kilter.

When both the executive and legislative branches are dominated by the same political party, the Committees on Government Operations of the House and Senate, which have broad investigating authority, should be under the control of the minority party. It smacks of legalized collusion when we find the suspect and the district attorney are blood relatives. To make our Federal Government function better, to help you get the facts, Republicans in Congress believe this new idea would be a step in the right direction.

Here would be a genuine vehicle to assure that the voice of the minority would be heard, that the majority would be constantly on notice that its actions or inactions were subject to effective and critical review. Here would be an assurance the public through your help would know that any coverup or wrongdoing would be improbable if not impossible.

It is safe to speculate that with such a setup there would be more public confidence that the real Bobby Baker story had been told.

The Democrats certainly have us overwhelmed numerically in Congress. We could say, "What's the use?" That's no answer for the American people, for you or for ourselves. Fortunately there is a constructive ferment right now in the Republican Party.

We have already made some reorganization of our internal machinery. The research and planning committee is working at long-range policy. We are creating special task forces on major substantive issues in such rapid succession that one observer said we were setting up "an antipoverty program for Republican intellectuals."

JOHN RHODES, with a beefed-up staff, is policy committee chairman, and this reorganized group will deal with current, day-to-day legislative problems.

On the basis of simple mathematics, the administration can pass about everything it wants to in this Congress, particularly if it twists a few arms as it did in the Nasser victory on an appropriation bill a few weeks ago. Nevertheless we will win on some issues in this Congress. More importantly, Republicans will build a record for a substantially stronger representation after November 8, 1966.

The Republican strategy in the House will be diversified. We'll be grateful for any Democratic support, North or South. To compete with the administration, we will offer:

1. Opposition to administration's aims and methods when we think both are wrong, but never obstructionism just for its own sake.

2. Constructive alternatives to administration schemes when we feel they are tackling the right problems at home or abroad, in the wrong way.

House Republicans have already recommended responsible proposals this year in medicare, education, housing, and Appalachia.

3. Workable programs, developed through our task forces, to meet the many problems the administration is ignoring or neglecting. We refuse to concede that Democrats have a monopoly on ideas for the solution of domestic or foreign difficulties.

4. Wholehearted support for the President when we think he is right. Vietnam policy in the last few weeks is the prime example. More and more Republicans have stanchly backed the President while more and more Democrats have changed their tune to favor immediate negotiation and tail-between-our-legs withdrawal.

On the domestic scene we recall that the Congress has enacted three laws on civil rights since 1957. Progress has been made in the South because there is a growing public conscience and sense of justice.

Yet even in 1964 far too many eligible Negroes of voting age were not registered to vote in 11 Southern States. For some part of the 2,800,000 who are unregistered, the franchise is unattainable regardless of their qualifications. In some islands of resistance, the 15th amendment to the Constitution is still being flouted.

The Republican leadership insists this violation of constitutional rights must end prior to the 1966 election.

The achievement of this goal requires a new and strong Federal voting rights law. This legislation should:

1. Effectively and speedily end the unconstitutional denial of the right to vote everywhere in the United States.

2. Terminate unreasonable standards for registration and voting without interfering with the reasonable requirements established by the States.

3. Terminate any discriminatory application of requirements for registration and voting.

4. Should not penalize areas which are not guilty of discrimination.

The voting rights bill which the administration has submitted to the Congress falls short of meeting these standards.

This bill appears to affect only the 18, possibly 20, States which have some kind of literacy test as a qualification for voting. It does not apply to four Southern States in which are found 25 percent of the unregistered Negroes of the South—Arkansas, Florida, Tennessee, and Texas. It does not apply to Smith County, Tex., with low voter turnout among a population of 27 percent Negro. On the other hand, it does apply to Aroostook County, Maine, where only 1 percent of the population is nonwhite.

This bill ignores those discriminatory practices used in the States that do not employ literacy and similar tests.

In the literacy-test States it largely ignores discrimination that touches less than 50 percent of the population.

This bill introduces a strange kind of geographical discrimination. It nullifies the literacy test in Martin County, N.C., where 49.9 percent of the voting-age population went to the polls in 1964, but it leaves the literacy test in full effect in Guilford County, N.C., which registered a turnout of 52.5 percent of its voting-age population.

This bill leaves untouched too much discrimination in too many places. If it is passed as drafted, the Congress will find itself struggling with yet another voting rights bill in 1966 or 1967.

The administration's bill will not accomplish all that must be done. Under the leadership of Congressman WILLIAM MCCULLOCH, of Ohio, I believe there will be a Republican voting rights bill in the House of Representatives that will be more comprehensive in its application. The Republican members of the House Judiciary Committee, the members of the House Republican task force on the right to vote and others have been at work on such a bill for several weeks. They are considering, among other proposals, those made by Republican Members of the Congress before the President presented his bill. This more effective proposal will be ready for consideration by the House Committee on the Judiciary.

This overall blueprint for Republican legislative action is based on what we conceive to be our duty to the 43 percent of the

American electorate who put us in office, and to the people as a whole who face ever-increasing Federal domination and erosion of their liberties unless an articulate opposition functions effectively.

It is based on the hard truth that the Republic Party to win in 1966 must earn and regain the respect of many millions of voters—and it cannot do this by sitting on the sidelines and waiting for an international or domestic catastrophe to produce a call for a change of leadership.

It is based also on a profound conviction that something more than talk of unity and consensus is demanded by the challenges of our times.

We subscribe to the observation of Senator Robert A. Taft in 1951, endorsed by John F. Kennedy in 1960, that if you permit appeals to unity to bring an end to criticism, we endanger not only the constitutional liberties of our country, but even its future existence.

We raise the question of whether it is enough in these days of danger and turmoil for our President to continue to act as a consensus politician instead of a statesman who leads.

Waiting for a consensus can and often does mean ignoring little problems until they become big ones.

It can and does mean inaction until the riots start—whether in Saigon or in Selma.

As recently as January, the President was referring with satisfaction—according to some well-known columnists—to our policy in South Vietnam as one of creative inaction.

To me, this is a fantastic concept—better described, perhaps, as "dynamic paralysis."

Yet this attitude was reflected in the state of the Union message, which suggested that the international scene was so improved that we could all but forget it in favor of domestic affairs.

The disarray of NATO is all but ignored by the administration. Nasser and Sukarno thumb their noses with seeming impunity.

And the disruptive voices in the Democratic Party not only undercut the President in his conduct of foreign affairs at a time of national crisis; they also raise the very grave danger of a Communist miscalculation as to our intentions in Vietnam and southeast Asia.

We believe in keeping the ball on the enemy's goal line—not backpedaling to our 20-yard line before starting the next play.

The President can always count on Republican support when his foreign policy is firm and decisive on the side of freedom and in the national interest.

But if ever there was a time for broadgaged revival of genuine bipartisanship in foreign policy in the spirit of the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg, that time is now.

Senator Vandenberg, who was my fellow townsman, was largely responsible for my getting into politics.

He arrived at a thoughtful concept of the Nation's best interests in foreign policy matters which served the American people magnificently well—and it is a concept which I would be honored to help to expand beyond current policy in South Vietnam.

But foreign policy bipartisanship in the Vandenberg pattern means genuine consultation across party lines in determining policy—not just using the Republicans for afterthought window dressing.

It does not mean merely a summons to the White House in a moment of crisis, and then calling in the photographers and announcing Republican endorsement of an administration policy already determined.

Nor does it mean foreclosure of Republican criticism of foreign policy when we are convinced the administration is wrong.

Some of our problems, particularly a lack of unity, have been created by Republicans. On behalf of America's future, I suggest that the present political imbalance—however self-inflicted—is not a good thing.

Under our system no party can be doctrinaire, sectarian, narrow in its appeal, or misrepresented to have such an image, however unfair the charge might be—and still attract the majority of the electorate.

The high ground of moderation with unselfish unity is not only common horsesense for a political party—it is also representative of the people and in keeping with the underlying genius of the American political system.

The day-to-day rebuilding of Republican policy and the party must begin in the Congress—and because all the House must face the voters next year, the heaviest burden of the task must be carried in the House.

We aim to correct that imbalance—to reestablish two-party government. Far from lamenting our fate, House Republicans are wide open to fresh ideas and confident that new approaches, full participation, and renewed dedication can earn new friends for the Republican Party and make an important contribution to the future of America.

World's Image

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the public image on which the United States spends millions of dollars annually is suffering from malnutrition as a result of the actions in Selma, Ala. The shock of brutality in Alabama has vibrated to all parts of the world. The nonwhite populations in foreign countries are listening and viewing these events with consternation. The police assaults on the marchers in Selma must make foreigners wonder if democracy practices what it preaches.

The primary reason why we must attack the problems of discrimination is rooted in our basic commitments as a nation and people. Discrimination due to race, color, and religion should be eliminated not to make others think better of us but because it is incompatible with the principles to which our democratic society is dedicated.

As a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and in my travels abroad, I have been asked by foreign correspondents in African nations why a democratic country like the United States portrays a global image that the white race is superior or entitled to special privileges because of race. The Soviets and particularly the Red Chinese are using the Selma incidents to propagandize the nonwhite nations that the color of people is the determining factor for classifying citizenship in Alabama. Pictures showing scenes of brutality in Selma are being distributed in Asia by the Red Chinese.

The United States is widely regarded as the home of democracy and the leader of the struggle for freedom, for human rights, and for human dignity. We are expected to be the model and no higher compliment could be paid to us. So our failure to live up to our proclaimed ideals are noted and magnified and distorted.

Racial discrimination and its exploitation by the Communists have injured our international position. The reason we have not suffered greater damage is that we have made progress in removing discriminatory laws and practices and have advanced to full equality. We must regain our lost image by demonstrating to the world that our Nation will not tolerate racial and social injustices among its citizens.

Water Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, in the face of greatly increased demands for pure water in the future, we also face the fact that our total supply of available water is strictly limited by nature except for negligible amounts which can be obtained from desalinization of sea water.

The average annual precipitation in the United States is about 30 inches which amounts to about 4,300 billion gallons a day. But not all of this water is available for our use. The total streamflow from surface runoff and ground water amounts to about 8.5 inches per year which is about 1,200 billion gallons a day. It is this amount which is available for our use.

One of the problems here is that not all of this water is where the people are. Because the fact that our available supply of water is not evenly distributed with the population we face the problems of reusing water several times in large population centers.

This means that we must concentrate our efforts on reducing the water which is allowed to flow down our streams during periods of heavy rainfall. By building reservoirs, both large and small, it is possible to eliminate the possibility that rainfall will go down our streams in such volume that it cannot be used.

But the building of reservoirs is far from the only measure which will insure that streamflows are even the year around. The farmer, by proper conservation practices, can help in this struggle to eliminate huge streamflows during rains and small or no streamflows when there is no rain. By farming in such a way that millions of tiny reservoirs are formed by his tilling, the farmer contributes to the maximum utilization of our available supply of water. The water held in these millions of tiny reservoirs is delayed on its trip downstream insuring that it can be used by cities and towns along the stream instead of rushing in an unusable torrent immediately after it falls.

I will discuss later the steps that have been and must be taken in the future to insure that we make the best possible use of our water supply.

Voting Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I was honored to appear before the Honorable EMANUEL CELLER, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, which is now conducting the hearings on the voting rights proposed legislation and to have inserted my remarks at the Wednesday, March 24, evening session. I do not want to seem vain, but by putting my own testimony into the RECORD I wanted the Members of the Congress and the people of the country to know how I stand on this issue because it is of paramount importance to myself as well as the whole country. We are facing today the greatest experiment in democracy in the history of the world.

The remarks follow:

THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

(Statement of the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER, Representative of Florida, before the House Judiciary Committee, Hon. EMANUEL CELLER, chairman)

The CHAIRMAN. Representative PEPPER, of Florida, our distinguished Member from the great State in the South. We are very glad to have you here, Mr. PEPPER.

Mr. PEPPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and gentlemen of the committee. I appreciate the privilege of appearing before this committee upon this momentous issue. Like most of you here on this committee, I am not a stranger to this struggle to try to remove bars and barriers from the fair exercise of the voting privilege for the people of the country.

I think it was in the late 1930's I introduced the first bill to outlaw the poll tax in Federal elections on the theory that it was at the present time as a requirement that the proposed voter pay a sum of money, a condition and not a qualification.

I introduced a similar bill later on in the 1940's, after President Truman recommended his civil rights proposal and I believe we got it out of the Judiciary Committee of which Senator Norris was the chairman twice, but it died as a victim of the well-known filibuster in the Senate.

I have also had bitter experience ever since I entered public life in being politically victimized for trying to stand up for what was decent for the Negro citizens of our country.

I remember in the Florida House of Representatives in 1929 a member who had moved to Florida from Georgia introduced a bill to condemn Mrs. Hoover, President Hoover then being President, for including in an invitation to a White House tea the wife of the Negro Congressman from Chicago, Ill., Mr. DePriest, and I was bitterly attacked for that vote. I was one of the 13 in the house who voted against that resolution, and as I said, I was severely attacked for it when I ran for reelection to the house and then again when I ran for the senate for the first time in 1934.

I recall one occasion I was in California speaking for the Democratic ticket and I made a talk one afternoon in a Negro Baptist church—that happens to be my faith—something that I had often done in both Alabama and Florida.

Pictures were taken as I was walking down the aisles and speaking in the pulpit and walking out of the church. About 2 weeks after that, I found that a very violent anti-Roosevelt publisher in the State published 200,000 copies of a paper and disseminated it all over the State with my picture in that Negro church.

Somehow these critics excluded the Lord from that Negro pulpit. In every election in which I have been engaged since I ran for the house of representatives in the Florida Legislature in 1929, I have had to face the so-called race issue as many of you have, in trying to stand up for what I thought was good and right for America as well as for the people, particularly of the South.

The CHAIRMAN. That only proves what Andrew Jackson once said, "One man with courage is oftentimes a majority."

Mr. PEPPER. You are very kind, Mr. Chairman.

So I, like so many of our citizens in America, view this as a historic bill and this as a momentous occasion in which we are all privileged to have a part.

When Thomas Jefferson wrote the words in the Declaration of Independence that all men were created equal by God, he was well aware, of course, that there were many Negro slaves in the United States. I have always surmised that he did not intend to be describing the condition of his country, but was laying down the ideal for the new Nation that was coming to birth.

Nearly a hundred years elapsed before the bonds of physical slavery were stricken from the Negroes of many parts of the country. Up until that time, Negroes were bred and worked and sold like cattle. Finally, the bonds were broken in a terrible struggle.

Incidentally, if I may say so, I was not only born in Alabama myself but I am proud to be the grandson of two Confederate soldiers, one of whom was captured at Vicksburg by a general named Grant who seemed to have acquired considerable fame thereafter.

So I come of a heritage that stretches back beyond the Revolutionary War without an ancestor born or living outside the South. I mean I come of a Southern family. I am not a newcomer to the South. I think I have roots deep enough to be able to speak as a southerner and I am proud to speak as a southerner in support of this bill.

Mr. DONOHUE. But you graduated from Harvard.

Mr. PEPPER. Pardon.

Mr. DONOHUE. But you graduated from Harvard.

Mr. PEPPER. I think that made me a better southerner, I learned a little more. I notice that we southerners who came out of the South and went to better schools did better thereafter. I commend the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts for having that great institution in his State. This is why I want to see the South offer the very best educational opportunities to all of its boys and girls.

Mr. Chairman, in the early days of this country a white man had to be what we would almost call a millionaire today in some States to be eligible for the office of Governor, and, of course, the poll tax prevailed up for a little while ago and still prevails in some of the States in respect to State voting.

Women did not have the right to vote until 1920, a long time after Thomas Jefferson wrote those stirring ideas of equality into the Declaration of Independence.

During the years after the Civil War, the War Between the States, if they want to call it that, the Congress did make commendable efforts toward trying to implement the 15th amendment.

The courts, not as understanding or as sympathetic as they have been in late years, basically struck down those amendments and political compromise or something else led the Congress to the repeal of many of the acts that were designed by Congress to implement the provisions of the 15th amendment.

However, as I said on the floor the other day, I thank God for the decisions of the U.S. Supreme Court in the last decade or two.

The Federal courts under the admonition and direction of the U.S. Supreme Court, have whittled away one and another of the impediments which have barred so many people from the exercise of all or many of their civil rights, not only the voting right.

The CHAIRMAN. I heard that speech of yours and it was admirable.

Mr. PEPPER. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I was certainly very much inspired by yours; you touched me off to want to say something and I just wanted to try to speak in the same spirit in which you spoke so movingly.

In late years, the Congress has made further efforts to progress this cause. In 1957—and great credit goes to our eminent and distinguished President for the leadership of that fight—and again in 1960 he played a large part; and finally last year, we passed the Civil Rights Act which contained a weakened, if not an emasculated provision relative to the enforcement of voting rights for Negroes, particularly.

There have always been these ingenious devices which have been contrived by clever and capable hands; as soon as the courts would strike down one they would come up with another and if necessary, the Governor would call a special session of the legislature to put some more on the statute books. That meant more long and tedious litigation, because if you are going to have any trial at all and any judicial hearing at all, you have to conform to the basic requirements of due process, an opportunity to be heard and so on.

So there have always been these various obstructions that have been put in the path of the efforts we have designed. Thus, while some progress is detectable, not a great deal has been made and surely not enough has been accomplished.

Then in late weeks, the Nation has been shocked and shamed at what has happened in my native State of Alabama. I cannot in good conscience other than condemn it in the most severe sentiments that I am able to express, nor can I refrain from saying that I think a part of it was calculated and politically conceived by a Governor who thought to fasten his political power upon a State by the attitude and the position that he took. That is just my opinion, others have a right to theirs.

Anyway, we have seen the spectacle of people being denied the right effectively to register. We had two of our distinguished colleagues before the Rules Committee who came up in behalf of a resolution that there be a committee of the Congress to investigate what had happened in Selma, Ala. I asked one of our distinguished colleagues how many days of the week the registration offices remained open and he said, "Two." Well, I said, "How many do they register a day?" Well, he said they have got up to 70. Well, twice 70 is 140, and I said, "How many would you say there are in the county who are eligible?" I understood him to say some 16,000.

Well, it is not very difficult to make a quick calculation as to how long it would take that many people or even a few of that number, thousands of people, to register at that rate.

So the whole registration machinery was designed apparently to limit the number of people who could register.

The facts speak for themselves as to the number of people who have voted, and therefore the implication is deducible that they were prevented from voting by either the denial of the right of registration or intimidation against their exercising the right to vote.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we are the greatest experiment in democracy in the history of the world. I realize how many of my fellow Alabamians and many southerners feel about changing a pattern to which they are accustomed, but we are living in an age when our democracy is on trial before the world and people are questioning the integrity of our democracy, whether we mean what we say when we tell them that we want to help them to have a democracy, a democratic form of government.

Here with spectacles such as we had in Birmingham—and I only mention them now (it has not been so long since there were other States that exhibited a shameful practice before the country and before the world now quieted to a large or total degree); but the spectacle of dogs being set upon human beings who did nothing more than walk peacefully down the street; or denying men and women the right to walk two abreast along a four-lane highway without telling them, "You will have to walk on the side of the road if you walk or we are going to go along to see that you don't obstruct traffic"; giving them 2 minutes to disperse and then on the expiration of 1 minute charging them with horses, beating them over the heads with bludgeons, trampling women and children in the name of the law and by the authority of the highest law officer of the State, the chief magistrate of the State, and then brutalizing those people with tear gas as they did—for what?

They dared to try to get out of what some white men call "their place." Some of them say, "A Negro is all right if he will stay in his place." They presume how to describe him and to determine his place.

Well, Mr. Chairman, it just happens that the Constitution of the United States fixes the place of all of us in America and God fixes the place of all men white or Negro, or those of any color, born or naturalized in the United States, are citizens of America under one flag, dying if need be, for one cause, supposedly protected by one Constitution, dedicated to the principles of our democracy, all brethren under the fatherhood of God.

So the time has come at long last when we have got to come to grips with this problem, painful in some respects as it is to those who are immediately affected. There are some white citizens who say "yes, you have an ignorant Negro majority you are going to put me under in my country."

Well, how did those Negroes come to be ignorant? To a large degree because the white man did not provide the schools and the opportunity for them to get an education. Indeed, there have been those who did not want the Negro to get an education for he would want more money as compensation for his labor; he would want more rights; he would be more impatient of restraint or restriction.

When I was in the Senate and before, I lived in one of our noble and beautiful places in Florida, Tallahassee, our State capital. To show you how sentiment of our people in the South is changing (and many of you know that Tallahassee is a fine, old southern town and the southern ways are still their way of life)—let me give an example. Three or four years ago they had a terrible controversy in Tallahassee over whether Negroes could ride other than in the back end of a city bus.

One day a Negro woman went in and there was not a vacant place and she sat down in the middle of the bus. The busdriver told her to get back to the rear and she refused to do it and he had her arrested. The Negroes boycotted the busline and it nearly went broke; and there were a lot of demonstrations and acts of violence. The city was in turmoil for a long time over whether or not Negroes who paid the same fare that anybody else paid could ride in any part of the bus where there was a vacant seat.

Fortunately, that matter was settled and now when you go to Tallahassee anybody rides anywhere in the bus that he can find a seat and if he can't, he stands anywhere he wants to stand. That is illustrative of what is going on in the South.

I am proud of the way the South has accepted the civil rights law. I voted for it and I am proud that eight of us who voted for it lived in the South, and one of them is the distinguished gentleman on this committee, Mr. Brooks; four from Texas and two from Tennessee and our distinguished colleague, Mr. Weltner, from Atlanta. I am proud to say that every single one of us was reelected.

Mr. Rogers. Mr. Chairman, I do not think we will have much trouble getting your vote to send a strong bill from the Rules Committee to the House.

Mr. Pepper. I think I am going to look very sympathetically upon this legislation and I think that every man should conscientiously follow his conscience and his good judgment and both are going to be on the side of the support of this bill as far as I am concerned.

Mr. Chairman, you have done a great service to your country in presenting this bill. I won't go into the details of the bill. It has been carefully prepared. There are points that probably will be raised and will be clarified in the course of the debate in your able explanation of the bill which I am sure you will give.

We are bent upon great business and I want to congratulate this fine committee for what it has done to produce this splendid bill.

I am privileged and proud to be here to assure you of my support for it in every way that I can help.

Thank you very much.

The Chairman. Any questions?

Mr. Donohue. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for his splendid remarks which I share with him wholeheartedly. It is my privilege to have developed a very keen and friendly relation with him since he returned to the Congress.

Thank you very much. I share with you in all your views.

Mr. Pepper. I thank you very much. I appreciate those kind words from my able and good friend from Massachusetts.

The Chairman. Mr. Brooks?

Mr. Brooks. I thank the distinguished gentleman for his kind remarks. My great-grandfathers also fought on the southern side on both sides of my family. They survived that and I survived the 1964 bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. Pepper. I am sure our able friend from Texas will survive all the tests of the long future. Thank you.

The Chairman. Any other questions?

Mr. Corman. No questions.

Mr. Conyers. No questions.

The Chairman. Mr. Lindsay?

Mr. Lindsay. Our colleague, Congressman Pepper, has handled himself extremely well, made a very good statement. It does appear a Harvard education has not hurt you at all.

Mr. Pepper. I thank my distinguished friend from New York.

Equal Rights for Men and Women

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my resolution to amend the Constitution to provide specifically for equal rights for men and women.

My reason for introducing this resolution is simple. I feel that equality should not be a question of sex, and that women should enjoy the economic and occupational rights of their male counterparts.

I urge the Congress to take this opportunity to make women's equality a matter of law.

Necessary Steps To Be Taken for Successful Bargaining in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, this is a detailed and comprehensive study covering the marketing of agricultural products. Information and data included in this study is based on U.S. Department of Agriculture statistics and reports, studies and information gathered from colleges and universities, information compiled by an NFO Research Committee and on an analysis prepared by this committee. The NFO Research Committee was made up of NFO leaders with varied backgrounds and experiences, including men with degrees from some of the Nation's leading colleges and universities.

FARM PROBLEM GETTING WORSE

It has become quite apparent in the last 12 years that general economic conditions in agriculture are worsening.

The Nation's economy has made tremendous growth in the last 20 years. The national gross product has made spectacular gains almost without interruption. Agricultural producers are the only major segment of the economy that have not shared in this continually increasing prosperity of the Nation.

Every farmer, through his own personal experience, is familiar with the fact that the price of the products he has to sell has been steadily decreasing with the exception of an occasional upturn, while the prices of the products he has to buy in order to continue farming in a modern agriculture have been continually rising. This condition cannot continue to exist without serious repercussions for all farmers.

The percentage of parity received by farmers is at the lowest level since 1939. If farmers lived in an industrial area they would be considered in the poverty class if they did not receive $3,000 per year moneyed income, or in other words, spendable income. By these standards, 47.1 percent of all the farmers are in the poverty class. The following table points at the percentage of farm families in major agricultural States that were in the poverty class in 1963—this means families with below $3,000 moneyed income:

	Percent
Colorado	34.4
Illinois	38.9
Iowa	44.8
Indiana	34.1
Kansas	40.1

	Percent
Kentucky	58.5
Minnesota	48.5
Missouri	53.7
Nebraska	46.1
North Dakota	43.1
Ohio	35.3
Oklahoma	45.1
Michigan	31.5
Pennsylvania	32.6
Tennessee (1.2 percent are colored farmers)	62.0
South Dakota	52.5
Wisconsin	38.4
Wyoming	30.6

National average: 47.1 percent of all the farmers in the poverty class. Forty-six percent of all families in rural America are in the poverty class, this includes the farmers and all small towns of 5,000 and under.

Comparison of per capita farm income with nonfarm income

Per capita nonfarm income	$2,181
Per capita farm income from farming	903
Off farm income	473
Total farm income from both sources	1,376

The $903 per capita farm income from farming is only 41.4 percent of the $2,181 per capita nonfarm income.

Source: Economic Research of the USDA.

The above documented figures should make any farmer who feels he is a good businessman, stop and think. These conditions did not just happen. There had to be a reason or reasons.

How did these conditions come about? Certainly not because farmers do not produce a needed product. Food and fiber produced on the farms of America are the most essential commodities in the Nation. On the producing end, the agricultural industry is the most efficient industry in America. This means something must be wrong in the pricing of agricultural products.

The agricultural industry has changed from the horse and buggy days of 25 to 30 years ago to the modern automated industry it is today. But while this has happened the farm producers have done practically nothing about changing their marketing structure. Other segments of the economy have not only automated, they have also organized.

The industrial segment of the economy puts a price tag on its products. Labor bargains for fair wages. But the farmers go to the marketplace as individuals and ask the buyer, "What will you give me?"

As the economy becomes better and better organized, the groups that have organized get in a stronger and stronger position and the groups that have not organized get in a weaker and weaker position. The farmers have remained in the position of the unorganized.

GOVERNMENT PROGRAMS WILL DWINDLE

Many proposals have been advanced in the past to meet the problems of agriculture. These proposals can really be considered in five categories: Government programs, use of cooperatives, increasing efficiency, reducing the number of farmers, and depending on the law of supply and demand.

The depression of the early thirties brought about a general realization that low prices had been a part of the beginning of the depression. Government farm programs were then initiated and farmers turned to these programs to meet their critical problems. At the same time, labor stepped up its organizational efforts and soon started bargaining successfully. Industrial corporations got larger and stronger and soon were successful in establishing profitable price levels for their commodities before the commodities were even manufactured. While the other segments of the economy started trying to meet as many of their problems as they could through their own efforts, farmers started relying almost entirely on Government farm programs.

This worked rather successfully until the early 1950's. Then the Government programs came under attack both from within and from outside of agriculture. The political power of farmers started diminishing as prices went down and more and more farmers were forced to leave the farm. It was probably a foregone conclusion that as farmers turned to more modern equipment, fewer farmers would be needed—but lower prices accelerated the movement of farmers from the farms.

Today, only a skeleton remains of Government programs. They are in disrepute because of two basic reasons—constant and, many times, unfair attacks, and governmental costs which, in most cases, are given unfair publicity. Farmers cannot expect the Government to meet all their problems for them. This is not the function of the Government. Farmers, themselves, must first do all they can to meet their own problems. It is then the responsibility of the Government to assist the farmers in meeting any problems they have been unable to meet themselves. This, the Government has done for all other segments of the economy. The Government gave farmers the tools they need to meet many of their problems when the Capper-Volstead Act was passed in 1922. But farmers have never used their legal rights to any great degree.

Farmers can expect Government farm programs to continue to dwindle away in the near future. This fact is pointed out by reliable and informed publications such as the Kiplinger Letter. Behind-the-scene observers also know this to be a fact. But despite this fact, farmers should support any legislative proposals or administrative policies that will assist farm income because all studies made by leading universities point out that there would be a drastic drop in farm prices without Government programs. But in the meantime, farmers should do everything possible to meet their own problems, because the political strength of farmers has reached an alltime low and they will soon be largely on their own. A congressional district is not considered a farm district unless 20 percent or more of the voters are farmers. By this standard, there were 251 farm districts 40 years ago; 165 farm districts 10 years ago; and today, an alltime low has been reached with only 53 congressional farm districts.

COOPERATIVES MUST INCREASE

Farmers produce 100 percent of the food produced in America and their real economic power lies in this production. This economic power is worthless unless farmers use it together.

There are basically two kinds of cooperatives. There is the service cooperative and the marketing cooperative. The chief function of the service cooperative has been largely one of keeping prices in line on the products farmers have to buy. This is a worthwhile service but not one that can accomplish much more than it already has, and certainly it can do very little more about closing the income gap for farmers.

The marketing cooperative will vary somewhat by the commodity it represents. Marketing cooperatives have been formed more in the milk industry than in any other part of the agricultural industry. They were originally set up for several purposes, but mainly to develop an additional outlet for the sale of milk. And, of course, some were set up with the hope of bargaining for a fair price. These cooperatives have, however, developed largely into sales groups with practically no bargaining power, and since there are so many of them, they have become competitive with each other—thus dividing farmers' bargaining power. The milk cooperatives remain as a sales outlet for farmers but they have not changed their structure to meet very many pricing problems for farmers. This is proved by the prices dairy farmers receive for their products. No one should ever indicate, however, that the milk cooperatives do not perform important services in handling milk production, because they do. The time and efforts farmers have put into their cooperatives have not all been wasted. The experience farmers have gained can be very useful and the services the cooperatives perform must be used to a great extent.

Today, we do have several grain cooperatives, but they, too, have become largely competitive with each other; thus dividing farmers' bargaining power. Still, they do perform some necessary services.

Cooperatives in the livestock field have generally been small. Some packing plants have been started but with very little success.

In summing up, cooperatives do perform many necessary services, but their individual structures make it impossible for them to effectively compete with organized, volume buyers. No one can argue against the theory of cooperatives but their fixed structures and lack of volume keep them from meeting modern day agricultural pricing problems.

FARM EFFICIENCY MUST INCREASE

Farmers are applying new and more efficient methods to their operations and this they should. They must continually be on the alert for new and better, more efficient methods of production. The research done in various institutions and farm suppliers has added to the efficiency of the agricultural industry. To make the best use of new methods, it ofttimes becomes necessary to enlarge the farm operation. This is considered by many to be the solution to the farm problem.

Efficiency alone, however, will not give the farmers equal status with the rest of the economy, unless they also have a favorable margin of profit. Efficiency is necessary and it is an integral part of a successful agriculture picture—but alone, it has not brought a profit level to agriculture enjoyed by the other major business segments in our Nation's prosperous economy. Efficiency can be successful only to a point. For example—if a product is bringing a given price which is below the cost of production plus a reasonable profit, greater efficiency can help; but, after efficiency has been improved to the maximum and still a cost of production plus a reasonable profit price is not received, then something must be done about increasing the price of the product. Agriculture has already proven it is the most efficient industry in America. Still profit returns for the agricultural industry are far below the profit returns of other, less efficient industries.

A solution for the farm problem has been offered in the form of bigger and fewer farms. The object being, to raise the per capita income of farmers by having fewer farmers divide the net income of agriculture. The success of this approach, however, depends upon the disappearance from the scene of large numbers of farmers in order to insure the survival of the remainder.

This approach is based on the assumption that the profit level in agriculture will get so low that smaller farmers cannot live on their profit and will be forced to leave the farm. The fallacy in this reasoning is that a high percentage of the farmers already have outside income. Their farm income is secondary or, in plain words a sideline.

NO CHANCE FOR OUTSIDE INCOME

The larger the farm operation gets, the less chance a farmer has of subsidizing his income with outside work, because if he leaves his operation under the management of hired labor, he will soon be broke. His operation requires his management. When there is no profit left in his operation because of lower and lower prices and he starts losing money, the bigger the farm the more he loses and the quicker he is out of business. His neighbor, who has stayed a smaller operator subsidizing his farming operation with outside income, will be farming long after the bigger operator is broke. Any business, in order to remain sound financially, must sell its products for a profit. A good businessman will not stay with a business that does not return a profit on the investment, comparable to that of other businesses.

The law of supply and demand is advanced as a solution to farm problems. There was a time in agriculture back when buyers and sellers had almost equal strength, that supply and demand could determine a fair price for farmers, but by its very nature, this is no longer true. For the available supply and available demand to determine a fair and equitable price, no producer can be large enough to significantly affect the total supply and no one firm or source of demand can be large enough to affect the total demand for any given commodity. Of course, we still have this situation on the supply side, but no longer do we have it on the demand side.

EXAMPLE

Largest farmers: First, 5,000 acres—more or less; second, 50,000 cattle; third, and so forth, only fraction of percent of total supply.

Largest processors: First, handle 18 percent of total production; second, handle 12 percent of total production; third, and so forth.

The two are not similar. Must be for supply and demand to determine a fair price.

GOVERNMENT WILL PUSH SURVIVAL OF THE FITTEST

Some say what agriculture needs is a free market; letting supply and demand correct any and all problems. This really means survival of the fittest. The theory behind this is when there is an oversupply the price will go down until it becomes unprofitable to produce the given commodity, and then production will be decreased and the price will come back to a fair level. The business segments of the economy threw the complete use of this theory out the window a long time ago. They manufacture, maybe, a 60-day supply ahead but this supply is kept in inventory either at the manufacturer level or retailer level, and, a fair price level is maintained. In other words, this means that the business interests control the supply and create the demand by letting on to the market only that amount of their production for which they can get their price. This gives business interests stability.

If agriculture is to operate with stability it must follow the same practice. Supply and demand, of course, must be a factor but not a sole price determining one. If agriculture is to use the theory of supply and demand to its advantage then a surplus disposal system must be set up to take care of any surplus that exists or develops. This would be using supply and demand factors to the advantage of the agricultural industry.

The present marketing system has kept the consumer supplied with food after the farmers have produced it. In the early history of our Nation, the buyer and seller met and bartered. Then as the population increased and the country grew in size, the producers had to start delivering to centralized points. The buyers came to these points. Buyers increased in numbers and competition grew. The prices paid to agricultural producers generally lagged behind the prices paid to the rest of the economy, but still followed general prosperity to a great degree driving prosperous periods.

The present marketing system was developed largely for, and in many cases by, the buyers. Times and economic factors have changed, but the marketing system has not. New forces have appeared. The present marketing system is really only a distribution system. The services rendered are inefficient and costly to the producer.

CHAINSTORES RULE THE ROOST

Today, the chainstores rule the roost. They tell the processors the price they are paying. This means that when a farmer delivers his products, the price he is going to be paid has already been determined, and the buyers only reflect in their bids the price the chainstore is going to pay. This means the present marketing system does practically nothing about price. The producer has wasted his money when there are more delivery points than the farmers really need or any charges are paid for anything other than handling. The farmers, therefore, are the victims of many living off them by charging for services which are only a waste of time, money, and effort. The present marketing system only serves to allow the buyer to pit one farmer against another individual farmer. Small outlets are pitted against each other and the larger volume markets pit one area against another area.

The present marketing system is a buyers' market, with the buyers naming the price to be paid as the farmer delivers his products and says, "What will you give me?" Under the present marketing system, instead of marketing his product the farmer takes his product to the marketplace and pays the penalty.

The only answer to present-day agricultural problems must be a modern marketing system that will bring equity of income to agricultural producers and meet the marketing problems of the agricultural industry.

MARKETING SYSTEM IS THE KEY TO SUCCESS

Let us study the basic requirements for a successful modern-day marketing system. This system must make it possible for producers to establish bargaining power equal to or greater than the strength of the buyers. Until this is done the producers will continue to take the prices offered by the buyer. The producers must get in the position and be ready and willing to cut off their available supply to the buyers in order to back up farmers' bargaining power.

Bargaining between two strong economic forces is a battle between two giants. In a battle of this nature, you can expect strong disagreements to arise and these disagreements will not always be settled without a struggle. The producers cannot make their bargaining power felt and will always be forced to yield, unless they can and do cut off the available supply to the processor. This means the producers must be willing to keep their products on the farm until buyers are willing to bargain in good faith. This fact has been substantiated by some university studies on farmers' bargaining power. For example, the pamphlet from Purdue University, "Group Bargaining Power for Farmers," had this to say:

> In order to secure beneficial results at the bargaining table, the group must have some degree of power with which it can force concessions from the opposing side in order to secure a favorable solution to the negotiation.

Buyers are strong and well organized. Some of the larger processors in each commodity have plants or facilities in all major agricultural producing areas. This means producers must have one centralized bargaining organization which bargains industrywide, or the buyers cannot be dealt with successfully. Any division of bargaining power only lets the buyers pit group against group. It is also necessary for one centralized bargaining organization to cover all major commodities. Otherwise, any gains made will soon be lost, because farmers will shift to producing the commodities for which the gains were made. However, if gains are made on all major commodities and these are gains kept in relative balance, then there will be no added incentive for producers to shift from producing one commodity to another commodity.

FARMERS MUST ORGANIZE TO SURVIVE

In order for producers to achieve the desired success in the bargaining field, they must first have an organization. The following statement taken from Special Report No. 10, entitled "Agricultural Bargaining Power: Some Factors To Consider," published by the University of Minnesota, points out this fact:

> Apparently if farmers are to achieve greater bargaining power it must come about through group action, since the individual farmer has little or no bargaining power.

Bargaining cannot be carried out successful unless the organization that represents the producers, has the proper structure. The organization must have stability of membership. This can be accomplished only through the use of membership agreements which are binding on both the organization and the producer. This membership agreement should cover the rights and obligations of the producer as a member, as well as the responsibility of the organization. There must be enough teeth in the membership agreement to make it possible for the organization to be able to make and carry out marketing obligations for its members. The membership agreement should clearly define the bargaining procedures so the rights of the members will always be protected. A program to take care of excess production must be authorized under the membership agreement. This is necessary because farmers must not only be concerned about getting fair prices for their products, they must also be willing and ready to meet all the marketing problems of the agricultural industry in order to be successful.

A careful balance of control must be maintained in the organization because an organization such as this would be very powerful. All major decisions on marketing conditions and prices bargained for should always be made by the members—not by one individual or a board of directors, and these decisions should require a high percentage approval of the members affected.

There must be enough centralized control in the organization to build effective bargaining power industrywide, with the ability to combat organized and well financed opposition. Democracy must always be maintained within the organization so it will always work for the benefit of farmers.

The organization must be adequately financed. In the initial phases, dues will be necessary, but after the organization is in full operation there should be a percentage checkoff on all sales made in benefit of the members. This is the only fair way to finance the organization because this way, each member will pay his proportionate share based on benefits received.

ORGANIZE OR PERISH

The organization should have one goal and one purpose—meeting the farmers' marketing problems. If the organization is in business, then there is a conflict of interest. The leaders are likely to be more interested in making a profit on the business than in getting fair prices for farmers. This has caused the downfall of past efforts.

The organization must operate in such a manner that there will be close cooperation and understanding between the members and the leaders. The goals, objectives, and methods should be clearly understood by both so there will be the least possible wasted effort. A clear understanding of these points will also make it more difficult for organized opposition to divide the efforts of the organization.

Contracts with processors must be secured if prices are to be stabilized and marketing problems met. Contracts protect gains made and assure continuity of programs. A contract is necessary because this is the only method that can be used to spell out the obligations of both the processors and the bargaining organization.

EFFECTIVE PROGRAMS TO HANDLE EXCESS PRODUCTION MUST BE DEVELOPED

There must be an efficient system for supplying the processor and, in turn, the consumer needs.

The organization must be a dependable source of supply for the processors. This is the reason the membership agreement must have enough teeth so when contracts are signed with processors, the products will be delivered.

A continued educational program should be carried on to keep the consumers informed about the farmers' problems and to keep the farmers informed of the desires and needs of the consumers.

Price incentives should be paid for quality production. The producer who produces a quality product, should be paid accordingly.

The organization should be fair and always ready to listen to the problems of the processors and others. However, its prime responsibility is to meet the needs of its members and this should never be forgotten.

Success of the organization will largely depend upon the cooperation and support of its members and the members must continually keep increasing the strength of their organization through the signing of new members.

This concludes the part of the study relating to the economic conditions of agriculture, the past proposed solutions, the advantages and disadvantages of the present marketing system, and the basic requirements of a successful modern day marketing system. We have sincerely tried to be unbiased in this frank analysis of what has been happening in agriculture as far as marketing is concerned. The points that we have made on the weaknesses of past efforts were not intended to be derogatory in nature. They were intended to be constructive in nature, so pitfalls of the past can now be avoided. It is our belief that the experiences of the past can be used to meet the challenge that American agriculture faces today. It seems to us that thinking farmers will agree with the basic requirements outlined for a successful modern day marketing system. We must forget the animosities of the past and build together, as producers, for the future.

NFO PROGRAM MEETS FARMERS' NEED

The structure of the NFO collective bargaining program meets all the basic requirements necessary to put a successful modern day marketing system into operation.

The NFO collective bargaining program was developed by farmers and offers all farmers the only opportunity they ever had to solve their pricing and marketing problems in a businesslike manner that will bring stability to their industry. There is a great deal of misunderstanding about the NFO collective bargaining program and the methods the NFO is using in its efforts to secure fair and stable prices for the American farmers. We want to take time to generally discuss the structure of the NFO, the progress it has made, the purpose and use of holding actions, the signing of contracts with processors and the job yet to be done.

The most misunderstood part of the NFO program is the purpose and use of holding actions. Therefore, we will have a thorough discussion on holding actions and on the organization's stand and policy concerning violence. The biggest unanswered question in the minds of many farmers concerning the NFO program is what will be done with surpluses when NFO is successful. Very few nonmembers realize that the NFO has a detailed plan that will prevent surpluses from developing in several commodities and has a structure ready to put into operation that will take care of any surpluses that may exist or develop in the other commodities. All of these points will be thoroughly discussed and a clear explanation will be given.

NFO—FOR FARMERS BY FARMERS

The NFO is made up entirely of farmers and run by farmers. Only producers of farm commodities can be members of the NFO. This means the NFO is truly a farm organization. The bylaws of the organization prohibit it from going into business. Therefore, it is a service organization. It has only one service to offer farmers and that is the opportunity for farmers to join together to meet the one problem that has never before been met for farmers; a way in which they can start pricing their products at the marketplace using the same principles and methods that everyone else in the economy uses to price their products or services.

Farmers do not have a choice. They are either going to price their products together and meet the marketing problems of their industry, or they are going to continue to go to the marketplace and say, "What will you give me?" and let the buyers determine the prices that are going to be paid.

If farmers choose to sit back and do nothing about their marketing problems, then they can expect to receive lower and lower prices for their products. No one else will solve their problms for them. There may be an occasional upturn in price, but it will be short lived, and the next drop in prices will reach even lower levels. This has been the general price pattern for the last 12 years. Every farmer who has been farming since 1952 knows this to be true.

On the other hand, farmers do have the opportunity to meet their pricing problems through the NFO. NFO members and leaders honestly believe that almost every farmer who will take time to study the NFO collective bargaining program with an open mind, will join and will be an active member because he will realize he has nothing to lose and everything to gain.

The NFO has always stressed that the first and always the most important step farmers must carry out in order to price their products at the marketplace is to organize. Nothing can be substituted for strength at the bargaining table. Many farmers have been fearful of the NFO membership agreement. It is hard to understand why this has happened, because the membership agreement is written in plain, everyday language and is easy to understand. It very clearly points out the obligations of both the NFO and the member. The membership agreement must be used to unite farmers' bargaining strength under the NFO collective bargaining program and give stability to the organization.

The best way to get a clear picture of the meaning of the membership agreement is to pick out the most important points and study them. They are as follows:

When a farmer joins the NFO, he authorizes the NFO to be his bargaining agent for all the commodities marketed from his farm with the exception of those already covered by marketing contracts.

FARMERS MUST BE FREE TO MARKET

He is free to market as he chooses until such time as a contract is consummated with a processor, and the only way a contract can be consummated with a processor is by a two-thirds vote of approval by members attending a meeting for which they have been given a 10-day written notice sent by first-class mail, giving the date, time, place, and purpose of the meeting. This is the greatest protection a member could have because two-thirds of the members will never vote to bind themselves to market under the NFO until they know the terms of the contract with a processor including price, delivery points, and all the marketing requirements expected of them.

The membership agreement is a legal and binding document. The member signs the membership agreement for a period of 3 years and agrees to pay $25 per year for dues and fees. If, during this period of time, a contract is consummated with a processor and a member sells under this contract, then 1 percent of his gross sales will replace his membership dues and fees. This will be the cheapest marketing cost a farmer has ever paid and he will be getting a fair price for his products. The NFO is not saying "Pay 1 percent and we will get you a price." It is saying "We will get you a fair price and then you will have to pay 1 percent to keep the program operating in the future."

A member may terminate his membership in the NFO at the end of his 3-year period. In order to do so, he must give written notice of his desire to do so not more than 20 days nor less than 10 days prior to his expiration date. If no notice is given, then his membership will automatically be renewed for another 3-year period. This is the same type of termination clause that is carried in many marketing arrangements.

No contract or agreement can be effective unless it contains a penalty clause. Therefore, the membership agreement specifies that when a contract has been consummated with a processor covering a member's commodity and the member sells his commodity to a processor other than the one specified by the contract, the member shall be assessed 10 percent of the gross sale of the commodity for liquidated damages. This clause was put in the membership agreement largely to give assurance to processors that they will receive the supply they have contracted for when their contracts with the NFO are in effect. It is not expected that the penalty clause will ever have to be used against NFO members because, certainly, they will never give their two-thirds vote approval to put contracts with processors into effect until they know they are going to receive many advantages. Therefore, they should have no desire to market elsewhere.

Provisions are contained in the membership agreement for a surplus disposal program that can meet the problems of any surpluses that may exist or develop.

NFO BARGAINING ESSENTIAL

The other provisions of the membership agreement clearly establish the obligation of the NFO in bargaining—how it is to be done while keeping all the major pricing and marketing decisions in the hands of the members. The responsibilities of both the NFO and the member are clearly defined. The farmer joining the NFO does not sign a membership agreement that can be easily changed, because no changes can be made without the two-thirds vote approval method by the members, as has been outlined for ratification of contracts with processors. Certainly, the NFO membership agreement is democracy at its best. It makes it possible for NFO members to keep control of the organization and still bring their production together in an effective manner for the purpose of bargaining. The most any member could lose would be $25 a year because he is completely protected through the two-thirds vote approval requirement. Twenty-five dollars a year is a small investment, indeed, to protect the large investment a farmer has in his business. A farmer joining the NFO has nothing to lose and everything to gain.

A member is bound to the organization by the membership agreement. The bylaws in the NFO cover the administrative end of the NFO. The rights and obligations of the members are spelled out in the membership agreement and cannot be changed through the bylaws. The only mention of the bylaws in the membership agreement has to do with the processing of complaints and payment of dues and fees. The bylaws of the organization set a system of checks and counterchecks to keep proper administrative balance in the organization.

The officers are responsible for picking the best qualified personnel they can find to carry out the functions of the organization. It is their obligation to see that the efforts are coordinated and that the organization keeps moving forward as fast as possible toward complete victory which is so vital to the future of agriculture. They must keep informed and carefully analyze every situation so mistakes and pitfalls can be avoided. It is their duty to keep the membership informed, as much as possible, on the activities and progress of the organization. They must give the best advice they can to the members on steps to be taken and strategy to be used in bargaining. Cooperation between members and officers at all levels of the organization is of vital importance to the success of the NFO.

A farmer should not join the NFO with the same attitude that he has had many times when he joined other organizations. In other organizations, perhaps he just joined and paid his dues to have somebody else do something for him. NFO cannot be successful that way. Every NFO member should look upon the NFO as the only tool he has to meet the most pressing problem he has in his business—taking unfair prices for his products.

POWER LIES IN NUMBERS

This means members must work to get new members. This is what will bring success. Members should attend their county meetings and accept responsibility. When they are called upon to do a specific job, they should do it to the best of their ability. The NFO is only as strong as the members make it. Members must realize that in an economic battle like the NFO is waging, gains are not given away freely or easily—they must be earned. We will not win every time something is tried, but we must profit by every mistake and take advantage of every opportunity. A quitter never wins and a winner never quits, so the philosophy of all NFO members must be "We will not quit until complete victory is secured."

The next part of the NFO collective bargaining program to consider is the four basic steps that must be taken in order for farmers to price their products at the marketplace.

First. Organizing is the key to success. This is always the most important thing to do. When a farmer joins the NFO he adds his production to the strength already built. Production is what really counts at the bargaining table.

Second. A sufficient amount of the total production of any given commodity must be brought together so buyers cannot fulfill their needs from other sources.

Third. Farmers must make their bargaining power felt, and the only really effective way to do this is through the use of a holding action.

Fourth. The ultimate goal must be contracts signed and activated with processors, which will mean fair prices for farmers and make it possible for them to set up a structure whereby they can put a successful modern day marketing system into operation that will meet the marketing problems of the agricultural industry and take care of any surpluses that exist or develop.

The necessity of organizing speaks for itself. Certainly, any thinking farmer knows he cannot do anything by himself. A large number of marketing groups or marketing agencies only divide the bargaining power of farmers. Even two groups would do that. Processors must have agricultural production to stay in business. Their processing plants are only worth junk price unless they have agricultural production to process. Therefore, all farmers have to do is to bring enough of the total production together for the purpose of bargaining together and selling together, and they can price their products together.

The size of processors varies greatly, but in each commodity there are always a few, very large processors. These processors have plants or facilities in many areas. Therefore, in order to have the maximum effect on these processors, your organization must cover all the productive agricultural areas.

PROBLEMS MANY—POWERS OBSTACLES

One marketing practice not generally known is that processors and handlers in all commodities assist each other when any of them are short of supply. Two methods are used to do this.

First. Some of the production to be delivered is directed to a processor who is short of supply. In meat, this may be done from buying stations or from a plant's supply. In milk, this is done with one plant buying from another plant. In grain, it is done from elevator to elevator and by interception of grain in transit.

Second. Direct sales made from one processor or handler to another.

These facts prove first, the necessity of affecting the total supply and second, the necessity of bargaining industrywide in order to really have an effect on the processors.

Every farmer in the United States could belong to one organization but if that organization did not make it possible for the farmers to make their bargaining power felt, then the buyers would still name the price and instead of that organization being a bargaining group, it would only be another marketing agency. The real test of an organization is whether it goes to the buyers and asks them what they will give or whether a price tag is put on the products. If any group or organization uses the first approach, then that is a group or organization that is doing collective begging not collective bargaining.

FARMERS MUST SAY I WANT SO MUCH

The NFO is proud to be in the latter group: Everyone else in the economy except agriculture puts a price tag on their products or services. Farmers, too, must put a price tag on their products. If the processors will not pay the fair price the farmers have determined they must have in order to sell their production, then if an organization is really a bargaining group it must make its members' bargaining power felt. The only really effective way to make farmers' bargaining power felt is to use a holding action. This is the same principle that everyone else in the economy uses today—except the farmers. Industry puts their price tag on the products they manufacture and you either pay their price or you do without the product. That, in reality, is a holding action and it takes place every day. Labor strikes when they cannot get a fair wage.

The purpose of a holding action is to temporarily reduce the available supply so processors cannot fulfill their needs from other sources and must sign contracts that will make it possible for farmers to price their products at the marketplace and set up a marketing structure that will take care of any surpluses that exist or develop. Those who oppose the NFO efforts, of course, try to convince farmers they should not hold. One of the points they talk about is tonnage buildup during a holding action. Let us look at some interesting figures on this matter.

RESULTS OF WITHHOLDING

Amount of tonnage gained in a 30-day holding action if 100 percent of cattle and calves were held off the market: Average number of cattle marketed per day, 365 days per year in the United States, in 1963, 74,608; 74,608 head of cattle gaining 2.5 pounds per day would gain in 1 day, 186,520 pounds; 74,608 head of cattle gaining 2.5 pounds for 30 days would gain 5,595,600 pounds; 74,608 head of cattle gaining 2.5 pounds for 29 days would gain 5,409,080 pounds; 74,608 head of cattle gaining 2.5 pounds for 28 days would gain 5,222,560 pounds; and so on. All cattle held off the market are not gaining for a full 30-day period. One day's kill will only be gaining extra weight for 1 day. Total amount of live weight gained in a 30-day holding action if all cattle and calves were held, 86,723,301 pounds. Total amount of live weight marketed per day on the average during a normal period of marketing on a 365-day average, 76,413,700 pounds.

The total amount of extra tonnage gained in a 30-day holding action if all cattle and calves were held off the market and would make a daily gain of 2.5 pounds each, just a little more than 1 day's kill would be built up. On the total year's supply, this would be an increase in tonnage of less than one-third of 1 percent. The total tonnage build of pork if 100 percent of the pork was held off the market in a 30-day holding action, would be less than 1 percent increase on the total year's supply.

The average weight cattle slaughtered in 1962, was 1,005 pounds. This was 12 pounds lighter than in 1961, and 19 pounds lighter than in 1963. NFO had a holding action in 1962, proving that the processors were forced to slaughter lighter weight cattle during the holding action to get their supply, thereby bringing the yearly average weight down. The average dressed weight in 1962 was 574 pounds per carcass. Ten pounds lighter than in 1961 and 16 pounds lighter than in 1963. The yearly average price paid for cattle in 1962 was $22.95 per hundred compared to $21.41 in 1961 and $21.10 in 1963. The high for the year in 1962 was in the month of September when the market reached $24. This was the month NFO had the holding action. The high for the year 1961 was January when it reached $22.49, and the high in 1963 was also in the month of January for a price of $23.11 which was still showing the effects of the holding action, because in February it dropped to $21.73 and in March to $20.75.

Let us say that in a 30-day holding action we were holding 50 percent of the normal supply off the market. This means that 37,304 head would be going to market every day on the average. Let us say that the last 15 days of the holding action the processors were forced to get half of this 50 percent supply in a weight bracket of 70 pounds. This would cut the tonnage being processed by 90,648,720 pounds which means that in a holding action you cut the total tonnage, not add to it.

REASON MUST PREVAIL

The above figures need to be understood by farmers because it does take at least 2 weeks to really get into the core of a meat holding action. The reason for this is that the buyers always have some captive cattle they can get their hands on and there are marketing interests that can influence and/or force the sale of a certain number of cattle, hogs, and sheep. There is other organized opposition that can influence some farmers to ship their livestock. All of this livestock will be sold anyway, so the quicker it goes to market the better off the NFO is in a holding action because then the production that has not been sold is in stronger hands. Those who are opposing the NFO effort with the supply they control or are able to influence, must continually keep trying to convince more and more farmers to sell if they are to break the holding action. The only way they can do this is by making them think that the holding action is having no effect and that it is useless to hold.

Farmers should always remember that in a holding action, there is no middle ground. They are either going to support the buyers and marketing interests, or they are going to join the NFO and support the effort. If they sell, they are supporting the very people who have helped keep farm prices down.

A short holding action can accomplish very little, if anything. At the best, it can only be of a little nuisance variety. It takes several days before a holding action can really affect the buyers because of their captive sources of supply.

If you will notice, the opposition always attacks holding actions. They never mention any other part of the NFO program. The reason for this is that they know they must convince farmers a holding action will not work, because they realize that if farmers keep their production on the farm in sufficient quantities, the battle is over and the NFO has won. Afterall, what else is there to eat besides food? The processors must have agricultural production for their plants. If they cannot get enough production from other sources and NFO is the only source they can get it from, then they will be forced to sign contracts with the NFO for the production they must have. And these contracts will return farmers fair prices and make it possible for them to meet their marketing problems.

Demonstrations are often held in a holding action. Many are started by individuals. There are a few points to remember about demonstrations. First, they must always be peaceful. Demonstrations are important, but must be used for two purposes—first, to show the strength of the organization; and, second, to prove to the buyers that farmers are united and have organized to sell together and that they are going to price their products at the marketplace.

A holding action is a voluntary action. All the NFO does is advise its members to hold for the prices they have determined they must have. NFO members are asked to contact nonmembers for the purpose of explaining the NFO collective bargaining program and asking nonmembers to join the NFO and support the efforts.

This economic battle will never be won on the highways of the Nation or on someone else's business property. It must be won through reasoning and persuasion in the barnyard. Anytime the production leaves the farm, it is too late as far as that production is concerned.

NFO DOES NOT ADVOCATE VIOLENCE

The NFO policy concerning violence is very clear and emphatic. The NFO does not advocate or condone violence. In a holding action, you have a situation where opponents of NFO will do everything possible to blacken the name of the organization. There are many times when an inflamatory situation develops because a farmer has decided to hold and has promised his neighbor that he will hold, and then he lets a buyer or a market representative convince him that he should sell and he sells. The one that really causes trouble like this to develop is the buyer or the market representative who convinced the farmer to sell, but, of course, he has already headed back to town or perhaps he just called the farmer from a telephone many miles away. These situations call for cool heads and good reasoning.

Many times false promises are made or false information is given to get the farmer to sell. When this is done, it is very obvious that the buyer or market representative is only trying to keep farmers at his mercy so he can continue to make his profits off of the farmers or keep collecting his commissions. It is time farmers wake up. Just where have these buyers and market representatives been and what have they been doing while farmers' prices have continued to go down? Have they not been making their profits and collecting their regular commissions? Farmers had better realize that their only real friends are other farmers with the same problems and that it is time they supported each other. Farmers must start running their own business instead of letting someone else run it for them.

As the NFO has continued to make great progress, it has become obvious to the processors, even the largest, that the NFO is representing many times the volume of production that any other source of supply represents. This turns their attention to the NFO. They are also realizing more and more, that unless they get in on the ground floor their competitors can get a source of supply they can never get.

SOME SUCCESS NOTED

Because of these reasons, the NFO has been successful in setting up some marketing arrangements with some of the Nation's largest meat processors. These marketing arrangements are of great importance to the NFO, to the processors, and to the farmers in general. As far as the NFO is concerned, they are important because:

First. It is recognition by the processors.

Second. This is setting up the initial phase of the NFO structure for a successful, modern-day marketing system which will go into operation when the master contracts are activated.

Third. It gives the NFO an opportunity to prove that it can do what it says it can do. This means getting a flow of livestock to the participating processors in an orderly manner and in the quantity they need.

Fourth. It starts members actively cooperating in marketing and gains experience in the marketing field for the NFO.

Fifth. It helps build NFO's bargaining power and puts pressure on nonparticipating processors. If a nonparticipating processor has been getting a high percentage of his supply in one area and much of that supply starts going to a participating processor, then the nonparticipating processor must go farther to get his supply. As his procurement costs rise, he will soon see the advantages of becoming a participating processor.

In the meantime, the job of the NFO is to get more and more nonmembers to join the NFO so we have enough production to fill the processors' needs, as more and more of them look to the NFO for their supply. This is a race of time for the NFO. We are getting close to setting off a chain reaction where processors will be changing their procurement methods if NFO members really cooperate in marketing together because we now have enough of the total production signed to do this. The race of time means we must sign every nonmember we can now, so we can keep ahead of this chain reaction. This can only be done if NFO leaders and members keep working and signing new members.

These marketing arrangements are of great importance to processors because: First. Today we have a very inefficient marketing system. Many times, processors get their supply a long ways away from their plants. They do this because of past business practices. This costs the farmers because, in the end, it is taken off of the general price level. Under the NFO marketing arrangements, the supply will come from close by into the plants. This will cut transportation costs, cut down on bruises, and reduce procurement costs.

Second. This will develop into a dependable and even flow source of supply.

OTHERS NOW DETERMINE PRICES FOR FARMERS

Today, farmers are paying many marketing costs that do not help them at all pricewise. Livestock prices, today, are almost entirely determined by the chainstores. They let the prices be known, in many instances 2 to 4 days ahead of purchases. Therefore, the price the farmers receive for their products only reflects the price the chainstores are paying, which is usually a rather uniform price. The processors receive information each day on the general price being paid for fresh meat cuts. They get this information by teletype and it is put out by the packers' organization. This is called the yellow sheet. Let us use an example—suppose $30 a hundred is being paid for a given carcass. This is a price based on a central point. The buyers then figure the transportation difference and their prices are established. Any costs paid by farmers other than absolute necessary handling costs are wasted. Marketing arrangements will save market costs. There, of course, will be specified delivery points. Existing facilities will be used when possible, but the number of facilities used will be greatly reduced from the present number used today.

On cattle, the NFO members will usually be able to sell on a grade and yield basis, if they desire. Present marketing interests have fought this. However, when farmers can be certain an accurate grade and yield is being given them, they will benefit by selling on this basis. Here is why: A buyer must buy under what an animal will grade out much of the time, because he will soon lose his job if he buys very much livestock that does not dress out. Packers keep a record on each lot purchased. The NFO has made arrangements at several plants where a member can see his own cattle on the hook. This can make the member a little additional money. Farmers, in general, are already benefiting from marketing arrangements in some areas without realizing it. As the marketing arrangements start working, existing groups start cutting marketing charges and raise prices. Watch for this and let people know why it is happening. Do not sell marketing arrangements on the basis of getting a price advantage because it is not legal for buyers to pay a price advantage. Savings in marketing costs can, however, result in a better price for members at times. Present marketing groups will fight hard and raise prices abnormally in trying to break the NFO effort. Do not let this confuse you. Marketing arrangements must never be considered our goal. They must be used to pave the way for contracts that will get fair prices for farmers, and they are very important for this purpose.

NFO is working along the same line in grain. Plans are underway to move some dairy products under more favorable conditions. All these efforts are making other groups more active. Cooperatives which, in the past, have fought each other, have now merged. The more pressure NFO builds, the faster we will have complete victory.

WE MUST BUILD TO SUCCEED

All efforts take the full cooperation of members. They must realize that they will make a little sometimes and then, they may lose a little. But, we must always keep our ultimate goal in sight. All of the steps NFO is taking are necessary to lead to our ultimate goal—contracts with processors that make it possible for farmers to price their products and set up a marketing structure that meets the problems of the agricultural industry, including taking care of any surpluses that exist or develop.

Contracts with processors is the only way to maintain the gains made. A master contract is necessary because bargaining must be done industrywide. One processor can no more pay a fair price for agricultural products than one farmer can establish bargaining power for agriculture by himself. Farmers must establish enough bargaining power to be the controlling factor in the industry and on all major commodities. This also means that minor commodities can either help lead the battle or follow the major commodities.

The NFO has already signed many processors of dairy, grain, and meat to master contracts. These contracts stipulate the price based on quality products, that NFO members have decided they must have; incentives to be used where possible to reduce the supply; take seasonal variations in cost of production into consideration; meet processors' supply needs; have a services-rendered clause making it possible for NFO members to receive an advantage over nonmembers because of services rendered, and sets up a surplus disposal fund and a promotional fund.

MASTER CONTRACTS ESSENTIAL

In order for NFO members to start pricing their products under the master contracts, enough processors must have signed the contract to have reached the 60-percent activation figure of NFO members must be in a position to market 60 percent of the designated production, which means that enough of the industry and producers have been signed up to be the controlling factor in the market. With processors signing master contracts with the NFO, it means that NFO is well into the last phase of its collective-bargaining program. All it takes to activate the contracts is for enough more farmers to join the NFO and add their production to the present strength already built by NFO members, and the economic battle for farmers has been won. The only thing holding up final success is farmers, themselves, because the NFO collective-bargaining program is sound and the NFO is well on the way to complete victory. Complete victory is assured because of the strength of the NFO. How soon this comes about depends on the efforts NFO members exert and on farmers themselves.

When farmers price their products at fair levels they must also meet the marketing problems of their industry in order to maintain their gains. All major commodities must be brought up in relative balance. This is a vital part of the NFO collective-bargaining program. If this is not done, just as soon as victory is won in one commodity many of the farmers producing other commodities would start producing that commodity, and the gains made would soon be destroyed. However, if all commodities are brought up in relative balance, then there is no more incentive to shift production of one commodity to another commodity than there is today. Therefore, the production of the entire agricultural plant must increase before any increased surplus production problem will develop. This could not come about overnight, and besides the population is rapidly increasing.

NFO HAS SURPLUS SOLUTION

Very few people, except NFO members, realize that the NFO collective-bargaining program covers the taking care of any surplus that may exist or develop. Let us look at the basic principles of the NFO program that covers any surplus production. First, in the past, the problems on surplus production have usually developed before anything was done about the surplus. The problem is much easier taken care of before it develops. The NFO cannot set quotas on individual producers—only the Government can legally do this. So then, how will NFO do it? Production can be in balance with consumption: First, before it is produced; second, after production has started; or third, after it is completed. In order for NFO to use step 1, it will take a vast educational program and great producer support. The reduction of production on livestock, after it is started, can be accomplished through contracts with processors using incentives to sell hogs, cattle, and sheep at lighter weights. Example: Butcher hogs are normally marketed at a 230-pound average. Before tonnage got too heavy the spread between lighter and heavy weight hogs could be increased until it became unprofitable to sell at heavier weights. Incentives could be used to get bred beef heifers sold which would break the cattle cycle. Incentives could be paid on choice veal dairy heifer calves to reduce future milk production. These would not be expensive programs when done industrywide.

On grain, a 12-month supply becomes available for market in a 30- to 60-day period of time at harvest time. This means the grain must be stored and storage charges must be added to the price. Any production left over at the end of each year must be disposed of because the building up of supply with storage costs rising would wreck the entire effort. The problem of one commodity cannot be considered just a problem of that commodity because if this is done, it will soon affect other commodities. A surplus disposal fund will be set up when contracts are activated. The 2 percent to go into this surplus disposal fund will be more than taken care of as far as net to the NFO member is concerned from money received from the processors for services rendered. This will be largely derived from savings over the present marketing system and from improvements in procurement for processors, as well as many other improvements for processors. A large portion of the surplus disposal fund will be used to buy burdensome supplies from normal market channels. Poorer quality products will be bought in order to cheapen the total cost. This would be comparable to the inventory always kept by industry. The products bought could be sold back into market channels as needed. Other methods of disposal could be diverting the products bought to worthwhile welfare work—a humanitarian service by agriculture. These products could also be used for the development of new foreign markets overseas by reducing prices. This cannot be done under present methods of marketing. Remember, when discussing agricultural surpluses, there has seldom been more than a 2- or 3-percent surplus produced in any given year.

MILK PROBLEM CAN BE SOLVED

In milk bargaining, it must always be remembered that approximately 50 percent of the milk production goes into bottled milk and 50 percent is manufactured. A fairly high percentage of the milk bottled is sold by producers under marketing agreements. These cannot be disturbed while in effect. This means we must organize all producers we can who are selling milk going for manufacturing purposes and sign all manufacturing plants possible. We must also sign all other milk producers to the NFO membership agreement; thus bringing their production, other than milk, under the NFO. As these producers see NFO working, they will, undoubtedly, urge their existing groups to form legal structures to sell together and this will, in the end, bring about the setting up of a legal structure with the NFO that will unite farmers bargaining power. This will mean using existing groups, experience and facilities to assist all commodities in meeting the needs of agriculture. These steps are to be taken when master contracts are activated. If additional problems arise concerning surpluses the NFO has the structure through which those problems can be met. The NFO is setting up a vast oversea sales network. Contacts have already been set up in 52 foreign countries.

NFO GROWTH PHENOMENAL

The NFO's growth has far surpassed any previous efforts in agriculture. This has come about because thinking farmers know the NFO's collective-bargaining program is sound. The bargaining of NFO is many times greater than that which previously has been achieved in agriculture. This is the reason NFO is making great strides in bargaining with processors. Processors will learn that the NFO collective-bargaining program will also solve many of their problems and establish stability in the entire industry.

The challenge to agriculture is clear. Are farmers ready to stop their punishment at the marketplace or do they want more? They can stop it. The NFO collective-bargaining program is the answer. The formula is simple:

First. Organize into the NFO for the purpose of bargaining together, selling together, and pricing agriculture production together.

Second. Use holding actions when necessary to get sufficient contracts signed by processors.

The challenge to NFO is to give leadership to farmers to finish up the job. No one else can or will do it. Other feeble efforts will be made as NFO gets closer to its goal but NFO has the only program that can do the entire job. The strength of the NFO is now so great that a continuous battle will be waged until complete victory is achieved. This means holding actions will come at frequent intervals with periods in between being used to set up marketing arrangements and to carry on negotiations with processors.

The most important job at hand as always is to organize. This means every NFO member working to sign up nonmembers. Production brought together under the NFO membership agreement is what it takes to win. The NFO is calling on all nonmembers to join the NFO now so we can all start pricing our products at the marketplace like business men and women.

Public Opinion Poll: First Congressional District of Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 30, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, for a number of years I have sent out a questionnaire covering major national issues to the people of the First Congressional District of Arkansas. I find that these observations, views, and opinions are most beneficial to me, even though the responsibility of favoring or opposing legislative proposals belongs to me.

Especially is it gratifying to use this system of poll taking because I am the beneficiary of obtaining the participant's views expressed in the form of comments written upon the ballot or on the back of it. Many times a question-by-question analysis was written, which offers a clear insight into the thinking of the person I am privileged to serve.

The tabulation of the latest poll has been completed and I am pleased to share with other Members the information contained in it. The response to the poll was highly gratifying as 19.5 percent of those who received ballots participated as compared with 16 percent in 1964 and 17 percent in 1963. This poll reflects an excellent cross section of opinion in the 10-county eastern Arkansas district. Farmers, bankers, wage earners, housewives, and people in all walks of life favored me with their replies to these questions. Arkansas newspapers printed copies of the questionnaires, which were clipped out by many people and mailed to me. Area radio stations publicized the questions and cooperated in the effort. The interest in their Government and the problems that face the Nation has resulted in a definitive and significant expression of opinion.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the results of the poll, as follows:

	In percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
Do you favor—			
1. Changing our immigration laws by the elimination of the national origins quota system and providing entrance for persons with needed talents and skills?	39	46	15
2. A Federal law that would call for the registration of firearms?	46	48	6
3(a) Medical care for the eligible citizens over 65 to be financed by social security taxes?	18	76	6
(b) Such hospitalization for the elderly if the money to pay for it were deposited into a separate and distinct fund?	47	41	12
4. Federal aid for:			
(a) Public school construction?	45	49	6
(b) Public school teachers' salaries?	31	62	7
(c) Private or ecclesiastical (church) schools if based solely upon individual needs?	19	74	7
5. Continuation of the so-called right to work laws?	80	12	8
6. Increasing the Federal minimum wage rates to $1.25 per hour and time and ½ for a workweek of over 40 hours?	32	59	9
7. Strengthening the laws to prevent crippling strikes such as the recent walkout by members of the Longshoremen's Union?	89	7	4
8. The Appalachia area aid program?	22	58	20
9. Government aid in the building of mass transportation facilities to relieve highway congestion in urban areas?	41	46	13
10. Generally the President's overall plan known as the Great Society?	19	66	15
11. The manner in which President Lyndon B. Johnson is handling the Vietnam conflict?	31	49	20

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 31, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., used this verse from Malachi 3: 12: *All nations shall call Him blessed.*

Almighty God, in the great adventure of life, may our minds and hearts be purged of all fear and enable us to carry on with the virtue of an indomitable and courageous spirit.

Grant that we may also be blessed with the healing grace of sympathy for a world scarred by grief and graves and where so many are going about with bruised and broken hearts.

We penitently confess that in our selfishness we so often demand so much from life and from our fellow men and seldom realize that we are giving so little.

Inspire us to open widely the door of our souls with a wider sympathy and service and may we feel the pressure of lofty impulses to extend a helping hand to needy humanity.

Hear us in the name of our blessed Lord who gave Himself so sacrificially for all mankind. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SPACE SCIENCES AND APPLICATIONS

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Space Sciences and Applications have permission to meet this afternoon for 1 hour during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency have permission to sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House Committee on Public Works may have until midnight tonight to file a report on the bill S. 4, which amends the Water Pollution Control Act.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

OPERATIONS UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480, 83D CONGRESS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 130)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed with illustrations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am sending to the Congress the annual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the calendar year 1964. The report outlines in some detail the significant role of the United States through the years in helping to battle hunger in the world. The record is an impressive one.

The food-for-peace program is one of the most inspiring enterprises ever undertaken by any nation in all of history—and every American can be proud of it, without regard to partisanship or political persuasion.

In cooperation with the developing countries, food for peace is directly benefiting more people than ever before. And more importantly, the operating agencies are reaching these people with more meaningful programs. Increasingly the emphasis is on using our agricultural commodities to support projects that help eliminate the need for continued food aid. Today about 40 percent of our Government's economic development assistance overseas is in the form of agricultural commodities and local currencies received from their sale. To achieve this record, food-for-peace exports reached a new high in 1964 of 18 million tons of agricultural commodities with an estimated export market value of $1.7 billion.

IMPORTANCE OF NUTRITION

The food-for-peace program has made a significant contribution to the world attack on hunger and malnutrition—still the most grave health problem of the world. We now recognize that food deficiencies are most serious in infants, the preschool age and, to a lesser degree, school-age children. Not only does malnutrition result in high child death rates and widespread disabling diseases, but research has now established that it produces permanent retardation of mental as well as physical development. Studies suggest that in some developing countries as high as 70 percent of preschool children are undernourished or malnourished.

Thus, increasing attention is being given to nutrition in food for peace. Its importance is underscored by the fact that, of the 100 million recipients of our donated foods, 70 million are children, including more than 40 million in organized national school lunch efforts.

The Agency for International Development recently authorized funds which will be used, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture, for vitamin enrichment of nonfat dry milk distributed overseas. Experiments will also be undertaken to help developing countries find the techniques and skills needed to process and distribute grain-based high protein foods for children.

MEETING HUMAN NEEDS

While the effort goes on to increase the nutritional balance in our commodity use, food for peace continues to seek the humanitarian goal of using our food to meet human needs:

During 1964, more than 3 billion pounds of commodities were programed through U.S. and international oversea relief agencies under title III of Public Law 480 for donation to 67.3 million people. As part of the Alliance for Progress, Operation Ninos school-lunch programs in Latin America are currently feeding 13 million children—compared to fewer than 4 million when this special emphasis was initiated only two and a half years ago.

Food-for-work community development projects are expanding to broaden and strengthen the base of country development. In 1964, 9 million people benefited from programs providing a supplementary wage of food—through food for peace—as payment for participation in local self-help projects.

There were fewer large-scale disasters in the world during 1964 than in previous years, which accounts for the fact that food for peace was called upon to assist only 4 million victims under title II emergency relief programs—the smallest number since the inception of the program. However, an additional 1 million refugees benefited from these food-for-peace-supported emergency relief programs.

U.S. commodities are being supplied to 50 of the 72 projects sponsored on a multilateral basis through the world food program. Seventy countries share in supporting these development projects now reaching 2.7 million recipients. U.S. support of multilateral programing is also exemplified by food-for-peace commodities provided to UNICEF and UNRWA.

DEVELOPING COMMERCIAL MARKETS

As food for peace embarks on its second decade, there is growing indication of the program's substantial contribution to the development of commercial markets for our farm products as well as purely humanitarian efforts. Commercial sales of U.S. agricultural commodities overseas reached a new high of $4.6 billion during this year, more than double the commercial agricultural exports of 1954 when Public Law 480 was first enacted.

The Public Law 480 sales programs are designed to strengthen the economies of the recipient countries and thus hasten the day when they can finance their import requirements on commercial terms. Following are highlights of these sales programs.

Food-for-peace exports under title I (sales for foreign currencies) reached a record high in 1964 of almost $1.2 billion. Shipments amounted to more than 14 million tons, surpassing the previous peak of 13.9 million tons set in 1963.

Public Law 480 generated currencies are paying U.S. oversea expenses, conserving dollars, and strengthening our balance-of-payments position. Reimbursements to the Commodity Credit Corporation through 1964 by U.S. Government agencies utilizing these currencies totaled almost $1.1 billion. Additional reimbursements also resulted from barter programs as U.S. agencies financed overseas procurement of goods and services with Public Law 480 commodities. Such reimbursements from both programs totaled over a third of a billion dollars in 1964.

Our balance-of-payments position is also benefiting from increased activity under title IV, long-term dollar credit sales. Almost 1 million tons of agricultural commodities at an export market value of $93 million, were shipped overseas in 1964 under title IV, also a new record. Title IV dollar repayments on principal and interest from previous sales are being made in increasing volume. Repayments during 1964 totaled $5.4 million, compared to $2.3 million in 1963.

PUBLIC LAW 480 SUPPORTS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Agricultural commodities continue to serve as one of our principal assets in international economic development, contributing substantially to the total U.S. oversea aid effort.

Planned uses of local currencies provided in title I sales agreements concluded during 1964 totaled $580.5 million for economic development—$553.5 million in loans; $27 million in grants. In addition, agricultural commodities sold to foreign governments on long-term dollar credit under title IV provided financing for economic purposes. These currencies are being used to supplement capital investment funds and technical assistance support in a wide range of industrial, agricultural, and socioeconomic development projects.

Fifty-seven million dollars in local currencies generated by title I sales of food-for-peace commodities were loaned in 1964 to U.S. and local private enterprise for business development and trade expansion in 11 countries.

CHALLENGE OF THE FUTURE

These are only some of the accomplishments of food for peace during the past year. The program has come a long way since 1954 when it was so generally considered only as a temporary means to dispose of "burdensome" agricultural surpluses. Food for peace has proved its worth as an important means to meet human need, encourage economic development and support U.S. foreign policy. It has helped demonstrate to the world that human hunger is no longer an inevitable fact of life. Its elimination is within our grasp.

Yet for all of the many efforts and accomplishments by the United States and other richly endowed countries, millions still suffer from some form of hunger or malnutrition. We have long recognized that an insufficient food supply is one of the leading contributors to human misery and political instability. More recently we have begun to recognize that it is also a major deterrent to economic and social development. The resulting loss, in both human and economic terms, is one of the great tragedies and shortcomings of the 20th century.

The long-range solution to the hunger problem rests in improving the productive capacity of the developing nations themselves. In my messages to the Congress this year on agriculture and foreign assistance, I pointed to the need for increased attention directed to the agricultural sectors of less-developed countries—specifically, to help overcome obstacles such as the present deficiency of fertilizer, the lack of adequate Government policies in establishing sufficient incentives for the farmer, and the general insufficiency of education so vitally needed to improve farming methods and technology.

Our efforts on these matters must continue but we must also continue to utilize our own agricultural resources until the day these other countries become self-sufficient. That will be a number of years away—but food for peace can shorten this time.

Food for peace is an important tool for development. It is good international policy and sound domestic policy. Food for peace is, above all, a program which expresses the great and generous heart of the American people—and is a worthy expression of the compassion always so much a part of America's character. It deserves the continued support of the Congress and of all Americans.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 31, 1965.*

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary or any subcommittee thereof may sit while the House is in session this afternoon during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 56]

Ashley
Baldwin
Bonner
Casey
Clausen,
  Don H.
Conyers
Cooley
Dague
Derwinski
Diggs
Edmondson
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Flood
Fraser
Fulton, Tenn.
Green, Oreg.
Harsha
Hawkins
Holland
Ichord
Jones, Ala.
Kastenmeier
Long, Md.
Love
McMillan
MacGregor
Murray
Pepper
Pickle
Pool
Powell
Purcell
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Roosevelt
Senner
Smith, Iowa
Sweeney
Todd
Toll
Watkins
Willis

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 388 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

U.S. DELEGATION TO CANADA-UNITED STATES PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of section I, Public Law 86–42, the Chair appoints as members of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group for the meeting to be held in Ottawa, Canada, from May 20 to May 23, 1965, the following members on the part of the House: Mr. GALLAGHER, of New Jersey, chairman; Mrs. KELLY, of New York; Mr. DULSKI, of New York; Mr. MURPHY of Illinois; Mr. GIAIMO, of Connecticut; Mr. JOHNSON of California; Mr. ST GERMAIN, of Rhode Island; Mr. TUPPER, of Maine; Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota; Mr. WHALLEY, of Pennsylvania; Mr. STAFFORD, of Vermont; Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin.

OLDER AMERICANS ACT OF 1965

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 284 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 284

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3708) to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging". After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 284 provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate on H.R. 3708, a bill to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the Administration on Aging.

The Administration on Aging will serve as a clearinghouse of information on problems of the aged and aging; will assist the Secretary in all matters pertaining to the aging; will administer grants provided by the act; will develop, conduct, and arrange for research and demonstration programs in the field of aging; will provide technical assistance and consultation to State and local government; will prepare and publish educational materials dealing with welfare of older persons; will gather statistics in the field of aging; and will stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 284.

This is an authorization for $5 million for the next fiscal year and an additional $3 million for the fiscal year following.

This bill originally was filed by the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I know that through the years we have listened to Mr. FOGARTY, the able chairman of that subcommittee, with rapt attention because we admire his skill and his knowledge concerning all of those problems that have come before us.

He has given considerable study to this particular matter, having been chairman of that committee for many, many years, and he feels that this type legislation is necessary. Being the expert that we know him to be on the subject, all committees have been unanimous in their reports on this bill.

With that statement, Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me at this point?

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. I do.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to join the gentleman from Massachusetts in his remarks concerning the interest of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] in this type of legislation.

We went into this in some detail before our subcommittee in its hearings during each of the last 2 years. I believe that the record which was made before our subcommittee regarding the need for this separate agency is very clear.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding to me at this time.

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think it can be said at the outset that this bill has a very appealing title. It is called the Older Americans Act of 1965.

Mr. Speaker, there are undoubtedly some very excellent provisions that are contained in this proposed legislation.

In the scheme of things it is a rather modest bill as far as authorizations are concerned. As I understand it, a total of $12.5 million would be authorized in the first 2 years of this program for various types of grants.

I believe it is important to note this, however, at this time: There is what I believe can be termed an open-end authorization for the last 2 years of the 5 years' operation provided for under this bill.

Mr. Speaker, we have seen grants to the States in this country grow during the last decade from something like $3.5 billion to $13 billion at the present time.

So in order to be quite realistic, we would have to assume that this bill, if enacted, would have some part to play in a further increase in various grants to the States and communities.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other point that I would make. Perhaps, this can be discussed during the general debate that will follow.

I note that the bill does provide for grants as I said to the States for community planning and coordination and also for grants to public and private agencies for various purposes, as they are stated in the bill.

It is my impression that at the present time much of the community planning and coordination, demonstration projects, and pilot programs relating to community planning and coordination with respect to the older Americans are presently being carried on within the Housing and Home Finance Agency in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

I wonder whether or not it can be brought out during the general debate on this bill whether this bill envisions setting up new programs that might possibly overlap or duplicate programs already being administered by the HHFA?

I would sincerely hope that that would not be the case, as one of the avowed purposes of this bill is to coordinate what is described in this report as an already bewildering profusion of Federal programs in this particular area.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, it might also be profitable to direct our attention to the extent to which this bill would have any impact on the programs that I understand will be carried on under title II of the Antipoverty Act, community action programs, and so forth. I think it might be worthwhile to consider the extent to which program grants carried out under this particular act might tend to duplicate programs that will be carried out under title II of the Antipoverty Act.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird] has already commented on the fact that this proposed legislation would have the effect of setting up a new separate agency head who would be a Commissioner appointed by the President of the United States and confirmed by the Senate, I think this is an eminently desirable provision of this bill.

There was, as I understand it, some opposition from the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Secretary Celebrezze, on the matter of appointing a Commissioner which would replace the Office of Aging which now exists in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under a Commissioner of Welfare.

However, the report says a great majority of the witnesses who testified were in favor of a commissioner with jurisdiction in this field.

Mr. Speaker, I support the granting of a rule and urge the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Laird].

Mr. LAIRD. I rise in support of H.R. 3708, the "Older Americans Act of 1965."

In January 1961 the White House Conference on Aging was held and under the responsible leadership of the Honorable Arthur S. Fleming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; the Honorable Bertha S. Adkins, Under Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare; and the Honorable Robert W. Kean, former Congressman from New York, brought forth vital information on the problems of aging.

The Older Americans Act, like the White House Conference on Aging legislation, provides for the execution of its provisions through the States by encouraging the States, through their own programs, to actively participate in the search for solutions to the problems of the aged. This legislation, like the White House Conference on Aging legislation, recognizes, as we always have, that the problems of the aged, like so many other problems, are not just Federal problems that can be solved by Federal action only, but are problems that must be approached through combined Federal-State action.

This legislation is an outgrowth and a logical extension of the White House Conference on Aging which has served to augment the rising awareness of the growing problems of the aged and of the magnitude of the effort that will be required to meet them. This legislation not only encompasses the purposes and functions of the Conference, it goes several steps further, by utilizing the information obtained by the Conference to first, establish a full-time, high-level agency in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—an Administration on Aging—that would devote its full attention to the developments of solutions to the social and economic problems of the aged; second, give the aged a full-time representative in the upper echelons of the Federal Government; third, authorize grants to the States for community planning, demonstration projects, training of personnel, and related programs; and fourth, authorize grants to public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, or institutions for research, training, and demonstration projects in the field of aging. Only by so utilizing all of the information available can we build a legislative framework which will provide adequate means to cope with the problems of the aged.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the continuation of the present bipartisan support that is being given this legislation. A separate agency not under the direction of the Commissioner of Welfare is needed now. The present agency should be transferred and given the independent status provided in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Where are the hearings on this bill?

Mr. LAIRD. The hearings on this bill, as I understand it, were conducted some 16 months ago by the Committee on Education and Labor. I would like to hand the gentleman a copy of the hearings to look at at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman mean there have been no hearings on this subject for a year and a half? The bill was brought here without up-to-date hearings?

Mr. LAIRD. The hearings were held some 16 months ago before the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, while this bill holds the title of Older Americans Act of 1965, I notice it is known also as the "Fogarty Act." Fitting tribute will be paid to a man who has done so much for the children of America, the needy of America, and the aged of America.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 3708) to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging."

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 3708, with Mr. Daddario in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 7308 is known as the Older Americans Act of 1965. The history of the bill tells us that it was introduced in the 88th Congress by the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty]. Hearings were held in 1963 for 3 days. It was ordered reported to the full committee with amendments on January 29, 1964, and ordered reported to the House on June 11, 1964. A rule was requested on June 12, 1964.

The committee also considered bills introduced by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Rodino], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Bennett], the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Long], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Zablocki].

Mr Chairman, the Older Americans Act is the product of an evolution which began in 1958, when the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr.

FOGARTY], became concerned about this very important subject and asked the question, "What are we going to do about the problems of the aged?" He introduced a bill known as the White House Conference on Aging Act which became law in August of that year. The purpose of that bill was to convene a national forum of the most knowledgeable people in the field of aging to distill their combined experience into a blueprint for action in aging. This forum convened in 1961 and a workable and carefully prepared plan for action was developed. The Conference made many specific recommendations. It is noteworthy that H.R. 3708 is an embodiment of the most significant of these recommendations.

Mr. Chairman, the older American has nearly 18 million individual faces. And, on each, the 20th century has drawn the lines of its progress and its troubles, its achievements and its failures; lines of worry over two world wars, a massive depression, a cold war; lines from work on brilliant medical and scientific successes, bountiful agricultural production, and amazing technical progress.

The faces are those of two ex-Presidents; nearly 10 percent of the entire U.S. population; nearly 1½ million people living on farms; more than one out of four U.S. Senators; almost 2 million people working full time; two of the nine U.S. Supreme Court Justices; more than 10,000 people over 100 years old; over 12½ million people getting social security benefits; over 2.3 million war veterans; more than 3 million people who migrated from Europe to the United States.

These are some of the faces of the older American. Behind them are the brains, the strengths, and the weaknesses of the men and women who have had a major part in bringing America into the jet and missile age.

There can be no composite picture drawn of the older American, but we know these facts about him:

He may be between 65 and 70, but he is probably older. He may have an adequate income, but probably not. He may be working, but it is unlikely. He may have a high school education, but probably does not.

He may be in good health, but probably is not. He may not receive social security, but probably does. He would like to have more to do, but the opportunities do not exist. He may collect a private pension, but probably does not. He may have adequate health insurance, but probably does not. He may live alone, but probably not.

How do we know these things about the older American?

Probably no other group in America has been more thoroughly studied in the past 15 years than the aging—his health, his housing, his employment, his happiness, his habits. Nearly everything about him. And more research is constantly being started, and still more will follow.

This study has not been prompted by idle curiosity. It grew mainly out of a recognition, shortly after World War II, that this country was developing a sizable population of older people, that they had unique problems and interests, and that very little was really known about them as a group.

Is there any doubt as to need for a centralized authority with its primary function and duties oriented to the problems of the aged? This is what we hope to accomplish with this legislation—H.R. 3708.

Mr. Chairman, the history of this legislation can therefore be said to date back many years. In the last Congress, the Select Subcommittee on Education held extensive hearings on the Fogarty bill and ordered it reported favorably. The Committee on Education and Labor likewise ordered the bill reported, and with overwhelming bipartisan approval. The bill, however, did not receive a rule in the rush of unfinished business toward the close of the session. It was therefore quite natural when this legislation received the high-priority attention and subsequent approval of the Committee on Education and Labor this year.

Mr. Chairman, it is the basic purpose of H.R. 3708 to create an operating agency known as the Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under the direction of a Commissioner on Aging who will be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

This new agency will serve as a clearinghouse of information on problems of the aged and aging; will assist the Secretary in all matters pertaining to the aging; will administer grants provided by the act; will develop, conduct, and arrange for research and demonstration programs in the field of aging; will provide technical assistance and consultation to State and local governments; will prepare and publish educational materials dealing with welfare of older persons; will gather statistics in the field of aging; and will stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services.

The bill authorizes $5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; $8 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; and such sums as the Congress may appropriate for the next 3 fiscal years in grants to the States for community planning and coordination, demonstration programs, and training of special personnel.

It further authorizes $1.5 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966; $3 million for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967; and such sums as the Congress may appropriate for the next 3 fiscal years in grants by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, and institutions, for study, development, demonstration, and evaluation projects relating to the needs of older persons, and for the specialized training of individuals in carrying out such projects.

And finally, the bill provides for the establishment of a 16-member Advisory Committee on Older Americans with the Commissioner on Aging as Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, at the aforementioned hearings it became clear—particularly after testimony by Secretary Celebrezze of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Congressman FOGARTY—that the major point at issue was the creation of an operating agency within HEW, headed by a Commissioner, as opposed to the continued vestige of authority in HEW, under the Commissioner of Welfare, as an Office of Aging. During the hearings, 17 witnesses placed themselves on record as being in favor of creating a new operating agency in HEW to be known as the Administration on Aging. It is significant that 17 of the 18 witnesses who testified favored such a proposal. These witnesses came from local, State, and National organizations on aging, and they included representatives of unions, voluntary and professional organizations, and religious organizations.

In fact, the only dissenting witness favored the complete bill, but opposed only the necessity for creating the new agency—this was, of course, Secretary Celebrezze. At that time, the Secretary quite naturally was partial to the administration bill for the aged and aging—a bill introduced in the House by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS] and a bill which involved the expenditure of millions of dollars more than did the Fogarty bill. It is significant to note, however, that this same administration bill was not introduced in this Congress, and that in fact, the administration is no longer offering an alternative solution.

Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would now like to address myself to some of the criticisms which have been directed at this legislation. As aforementioned, the hearings showed that the central source of controversy was the creation of a new Administration on Aging in HEW.

Mr. Chairman, the problem is basically one of planning and coordination so as to maximize the contribution which all agencies of Government, as well as those in the voluntary segment of our society, can contribute to the development of services and programs for older people with a minimum of duplication, overlapping, and confusion, and with a maximum contribution of their own resources and activities, not necessarily engendered by great amounts of additional money but a genuine and committed concern for doing something to bring older people back into our society and into our community and to provide for them a meaningful plan and a meaningful role.

Mr. Chairman, in this context, the question of organization becomes extremely important. It must be recognized that there are many facets of Federal and State programing and local activities which are not in the welfare context and which cannot respond well to leadership which generates basically from the concept that public welfare is the central coordinating point around which these activities should be conducted. I submit that attention to the aging is one of these facets, and one that should be completely divorced from the welfare concept.

Mr. Chairman, we must remember that the organization of this program on the Federal level will set a pattern which the various States will tend to follow. If we acknowledge the older American as a welfare case on the national level, can we expect the States and communities to do otherwise?

Mr. Chairman, attempting to administer this program under the auspices of the Welfare Administration, and therefore inevitably in most places through the State welfare department, will mean we will be very seriously limiting the range and scope and effectiveness of the utilization of the total resources available to serve these people.

Mr. Chairman, an alternative solution is for the Secretary of HEW to establish an Administration on Aging within his Department—by Executive order—like that called for in this bill. This would truly accomplish the same administrative purpose as would the bill. We must remember, however, that the next Secretary may have different administrative ideas about the older American, and with another Executive order, put this organization back under welfare.

This is why it is necessary for the Congress to meet this issue head-on. This is why a legislative authority must be created in this instance. We do not propose to go into every executive department to organize the department the way we think best. The departmental administrators are far more familiar with the peculiarities and subtleties of their individual departments. What we do propose, however, is to recognize a great need and provide for that need when it is not properly being met. In this context, it is not the right, but the responsibility of the Congress to act.

Mr. Chairman, there is criticism—which stems from misunderstanding—that the bill does not provide for matching funds from the States. This is entirely incorrect.

Section 302(c) in the bill expressly states that Federal funds will only be available to pay for State programs to the extent of 75 percent in the first year of the program, 60 percent in the second year, and 50 percent in the third year—after which a State program is the financial responsibility of the State.

In addition, section 304 provides that not more than 10 percent or $15,000 of a State's allotment—whichever is the larger—shall be available for paying one-half of the costs of the State agency in administering the State plan.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to address myself to one other issue before concluding my remarks. It has been asked—as though it were necessary—whether this legislation would put "bread into anyone's mouth." It is amusing to me that those who ask this question are the same Members who oppose so violently Federal funds being used for this purpose.

The answer to this question, Mr. Chairman, is obviously negative. It is not the intent of the bill to do so—not directly at least. This legislation is but a start in the direction of opening new avenues of opportunity for older citizens so that they will be in a position to help themselves—or, as some of my colleagues prefer, to "put bread in their own mouths."

Mr. Chairman, there is great support for this legislation. In the appendix of the report, you will note several letters of approval from various State commissions on aging. These are but representative of the many that have been received.

Mr. Chairman, let us now look at areas of concern to the older American.

HEALTH

Millions of older Americans enjoy relatively good health and many of them can be almost as active as they were when they were years younger. Many of those with disabilities have learned to live with them and accept their limitations.

But, most have become the prey of at least one disease that will stick with them as long as they live. It is part of the toll the years have taken. It is grim evidence that the causes and cures are still to be found for the diseases that come with age.

And it is dramatic proof of the health-care problem faced by older Americans who are caught between rising medical and hospital costs and their low, relatively fixed incomes.

Statistically, here is the health report of today's older Americans:

More than 12 million have at least 1 chronic condition such as high blood pressure, arthritis, diabetes, heart disease, or mental disorder.

More than half of those with a chronic ailment have some limitation on their activities.

More than 800,000 older people are in institutions.

About 1,250,000 elderly people are invalids who, though not in institutions, are unable to get along without help from others.

Tragically, many of those with serious conditions would be better in health if known preventive and restorative services had been promptly used. Until more is known about the causes and cures of chronic diseases, the most potent weapon against them is early detection and prompt treatment.

Part of the problem lies with the older people themselves. They delay going to a physician until it is too late. This is obvious from one of the studies of the National Health Survey which showed one out of four people 65 or over had not been to a physician for 2 years or more.

Sole responsibility, however, cannot be placed on the older people for this. They have not been made fully aware of the need for regular checkups, the dangers of self-doctoring, or the methods of accident prevention.

Many older Americans do not get the care they need because they are too proud to accept charity or other outside financial help. And they do not want to be a burden on their families.

Many make the mistakes of treating themselves when they really need to see a doctor. Others use medications which have worked on similar symptoms in neighbors or friends. They want to avoid the cost, or they may be afraid of treatment and hospitals.

Others are the victims of poor nutrition because they are caught by food fads, poor food habits, or lack of interest in eating, primarily because they have to eat alone.

Accidents—many of them preventable—also take a high toll among older people. They have nearly twice as many home accidents as the average adult and three times as many fatal accidents.

Part of the fault for the poor health of many of the aged also must be borne by physicians, communities, States, and the Federal Government, which have been slow in starting health programs for them.

A positive recent step was the passage of the Community Health Services and Facilities Act of 1961, designed to help States and communities start or expand comprehensive care services outside hospitals for the chronically ill.

But for this generation, as well as future generations or older Americans, much remains to be done both in detecting chronic diseases early and in finding their causes and cures.

A great deal of research is already underway. With the brilliant success of science during the 20th century in controlling infectious disease and in improving nutrition and sanitation, the main spotlight of research has now been trained on the diseases of the later years.

In the past 10 years, hundreds of millions have been spent by Federal, State, and local governments and by scores of voluntary agencies for research on diseases affecting older people.

Surgery, medicines, and medical care never dreamed of in 1900 are now in use. They have done much to ease the pain and sufferings of illness. And, they have helped to add 21 years to the average life expectancy at birth since 1900. But these marvels of science have also made the treatment of illness—both for the old and for the young—increasingly complex and costly.

EMPLOYMENT

Employment plays varying roles in the lives of older Americans. For many, it is a principal source of income to provide the necessities of life. For others, it provides the therapy of usefulness, belonging, and well-being. To many older people, employment is the badge of status in the family and the community and the center from which social contacts radiate. To some, it is one of these things and to others it may be all of them.

Employment, thus, has different meanings for different older Americans, depending upon their individual needs and wants. It means full-time remunerative work for one; for another, a part-time job to supplement a pension income; for still another, voluntary work in his home community or even abroad in the Peace Corps. To others, employment means a place to go everyday—and the paycheck is a minor consideration.

As the needs and wants relating to employment differ among older Americans, so do the opportunities for satisfying those needs and desires. For the opportunities of obtaining or retaining employment are subject to many severe restrictions. A major restriction lies in the practices in our society. Many older persons are barred from work by age discrimination in hiring or in selection for retraining. Others are forced to quit work because of compulsory retirement policies.

A sample survey in 1956 of job orders placed in State employment service offices showed that 58 percent had an upper-age restriction. A new survey is now being conducted and hopefully will show some improvement. According to recent surveys of firms with pension plans, 9 out of 10 companies employing 1,000 or more workers have mandatory retirement policies, and there appears to be little or no inclination on the part of employers to discontinue these policies. In fact, available evidence points to an increasing number of employers who are establishing compulsory retirement at a fixed age—this in an era when the span of life is growing.

Opportunities for employment are limited also by the climate of the labor market. There is the increasing competition from mounting numbers of young jobseekers for whom new jobs cannot be created fast enough in an economy which has experienced an average annual unemployment rate of 5.5 percent for the past 5 years. Complicating the situation are new job requirements created by new technology, geographical movements of industry, and the accompanying movements of jobs and plant mergers.

Limitations in job opportunities arise also from the qualifications of the elderly person himself. They may include such factors as declining health and physical ability on the part of some, limited skill or skills no longer in demand in the fast-changing labor market, lack of sufficient education for many of the new jobs, and waning ability to move about to seek work where it may be. Many an individual creates his own restrictions by the limitation he puts on wages, hours, working conditions, and the location of work.

If the problem of employment of older Americans is to be dealt with adequately we must understand not only their varying needs for employment but also the many obstacles and difficulties standing in their way. To make opportunities in employment available for elderly persons, we need to do two things. First, we need to identify those elderly persons who want to earn money and concentrate our job development efforts for this group. Second, we need to provide opportunities for other elderly Americans to satisfy their needs for useful activity through community, public service, and other kinds of noncompensatory activities.

Enlarging work opportunities for older people will require action on a number of fronts. It will involve—

Gaining acceptance of the principle of employment on the basis of ability rather than age.

Gaining an understanding on the part of employers of the qualifications of many older persons for available employment.

Providing opportunities for retraining older workers and upgrading their skills and providing more opportunities for vocational rehabilitation.

Encouraging the adoption of flexible retirement policies based on an individual's capabilities, needs, and desires, rather than his age.

Developing part-time employment opportunities for those who need or desire work but who cannot or do not wish to work full time.

Steps also need to be taken to provide more adequate counseling, placement, job development, physical restoration, and other services to assist older people in choosing and retraining or reentering employment. To often such services are denied the older work on the erroneous premise that age alone makes such help fruitless.

A more positive outlook is needed on the part of those serving older persons and on the part of the older persons themselves.

HOUSING

A suitable place to live—a house, an apartment, whatever it may be—is necessary for the older American who wants to live a useful and independent life, just as it is for a younger person.

Housing for older people today is for active, self-reliant persons who are living longer, healthier, and more meaningful lives. It is designed for efficient, dignified living and avoids the needless struggle to maintain large homes.

But, an adequate home for an older person is often quite different from what would be adequate for a younger person. Older people have smaller incomes, their health is usually poorer, and, of today's nearly 18 million people 65 or over, nearly one out of four lives alone.

It is important, therefore, that older people have access to housing which is adequate but low cost, is modest in size and efficient to maintain, and is so designed that it will help them avoid accidents.

It is also particularly important that their homes be close to public transportation, since many of them do not have cars; that it be close to adequate shopping facilities, so that normal activity is sustained; and that it be near recreational, church, cultural, and other community centers, so that they can be active in community life.

By these basic standards, much of today's housing for older people is far from adequate.

Of the people 65 or older who head households, about one-third live in dilapidated housing, deteriorated housing which may or may not have all plumbing facilities, or in housing that, though sound, lacks some or all plumbing facilities.

In addition, many older Americans live in housing units which are too large, too costly, or too inefficient or unsafe for the special needs which come with age.

A recent foundation-financed study of quality of housing of persons receiving social security payments showed that—

Forty-five percent of all aged living in households were classified as being in need of better accommodations, based on the quality of the housing or the living arrangements with relatives.

Eighty percent were living in houses at least 30 years old, and 40 percent living in houses at least 51 years old.

The aged in poorest health, by and large, occupied the poorest housing.

Despite the unpleasant view these facts conjure, the outlook for improvement is bright. For in no area of Federal housing programs has progress during the past 2 years been more dramatic than in housing for the elderly. The progress has been based on cooperation between private groups and governmental agencies with emphasis on local initiative and local action.

RETIREMENT PLANNING AND COUNSELING

The adjustments many older Americans face when they retire are as drastic as any they have ever faced in their lives.

Consider, for a moment, the adjustments an older person would need to make if his income was cut at least in half; leisure time replaced the hours he worked; the regularity of his work no longer existed; his association with coworkers ended; he no longer had his work to occupy his mind.

Many of today's older people have successfully made the adjustments associated with retirement. Many others have not.

Recognizing the difficulties in getting used to retirement, some of the Nation's employers, unions, and civic and government leaders have set up retirement planning and counseling programs in recent years.

The programs have generally had two purposes: To tell the people nearing retirement about the adjustments they will have to make and to help change their attitudes about retirement; and to give them factual information about social security, health, housing, social welfare, investments, recreation, civic activities, legal matters, community resources, and other matters with which they may have had no previous experience.

How extensive retirement planning and counseling are among employers and unions is difficult to measure. But it has been estimated that about one-third of the large employers have some type of program. Two of the Nation's biggest unions have a full-time staff working on such programs. Local school systems, recreation departments, and libraries have offered assistance.

Several of the Federal Government's agencies have retirement preparation programs and others are considering them.

The development of retirement preparation has been led by a dozen or so universities, which have been influential in getting employers and unions interested.

The results are hard to measure because the programs have been in operation only a short time and because they vary considerably in quality. But there is no doubt these efforts have been helpful in many cases and should be expanded.

EDUCATION

Education offers many opportunities for an adult to continue as part of the community. One of the less obvious but important values of preretirement education is the reminder to persons approaching full retirement that education for education's sake can be stimulating and enjoyable. Some older people welcome the chance to learn a new language, to be guided into greater appreciation of music or art, or to experience for the first time the joy of painting, modeling, orchestration, or discussion. Basic elementary education, when classes are offered in convenient neighborhood locations, is eagerly accepted by older adults who lacked educational opportunities when they were growing up.

Colleges and universities, community colleges, and public school adult education agencies in several States are offering courses especially designed to meet these increased needs. Many libraries have developed special services and programs for their older patrons.

For the majority of older Americans, the financial barriers to continuing education must be removed—or drastically lowered—if all who want to follow this road to a place in the community are to have the opportunity to do so.

CREATIVE ACTIVITY AND RECREATION

Retirement offers unlimited opportunities to enjoy old hobbies or to develop new ones. Retirement also means that people have time to learn and practice new skills in a wider range of arts and crafts, home repair, maintenance, and beautification—things that many people have wanted to do before but never had the time to do until they retired.

Travel, participation in organizations, and recreation also open up ways for older people to make new friends and meet new people. One of the demonstrated values of senior citizen centers is the chance they offer many older persons to find new interests after retirement. Many persons no longer feel at loose ends after being welcomed into an activity center. The companionship, acceptance, and interest of his peers are often all that an older person needs to renew interest in life and the world around him.

For some, the extent of their participation is limited by fear of involvements that will make too many personal demands on their time or energies. They may go no further than thumbing through the available reading material or listening to a discussion or watching a movie. But gradually, the warmth of others' interests brings more response. A card game may be tried—or a simple responsibility accepted. Soon, a satisfying activity is found, and some degree of community participation follows. For many, the centers become the doorways to an active, outgoing role in their community, as a volunteer there or elsewhere, as a participant in political activity, as a student, or as an active church member.

There are now over 700 senior activity centers in the country offering opportunities in arts and crafts, education, and recreation. Similar opportunities are offered by approximately 3,000 clubs sponsored by welfare and recreation departments, local chapters of national voluntary organizations, religious groups, and labor organizations. While there has been a phenomenal increase in the number of such centers since the White House Conference on Aging in January 1961, many more are needed to provide bridges to community participation for the older Americans who have not yet discovered a way to adjust to their newfound leisure.

One fact stands out as we grow older: The years force our body to pay a toll. We may be rich. We may be poor. We may have the best medical care. We may have none. We may carefully choose our diet. We may not.

But, the toll for each added year is inevitable, and the effect is at least a gradual decline in our ability to be active.

Medical science and the other sciences each year are discovering new ways to slow down the decline and new ways to rehabilitate us if we are incapacitied by sickness or injury. But scientific inquiry is a slow and painstaking process, and many of the secrets of life and health are still locked in the vault of time.

Thus, we see among our older Americans several million—mostly in their seventies, eighties, and nineties—whom the toll of the years has made frail and disabled. They need special care and attention to be active at all or to regain lost strength and ability. They need someone to care.

Out of their needs and the needs of other older people in the past, special kinds of health services and living arrangements have grown—nursing homes for the aged, home health care, homemaker services, foster homes.

Unfortunately, the need for such services and home arrangements far exceeds the supply, and those available are often very inadequate or too expensive.

The result: Many disabled older Americans are in their own homes when they should be in homes for the aged, or in nursing homes, getting more care and medical attention. At the same time, some are in nursing homes or other institutions when they could be at home if help were available there. Others live with their families because help in their own homes is lacking.

But, with the growth in the number of older people and the realization that they have special needs, the situation is gradually improving.

This is mainly due to an increased interest in disabled older people on the part of States, communities, and private organizations.

The kinds of services and living arrangements for the dependent older person vary widely.

In some cities, a wide variety of service is available to the older person who is well enough to stay at home but too disabled to do such chores as cook, clean, or shop.

Examples of good services, excellent care, effective rehabilitation, coordination of programs and facilities could be cited. But for the most part such services are spotty, fragmentary, not nearly adequate to the need.

CARE FOR AGED

Services in the home should include such aids as homemaker services, meals on wheels, shopping aid, visiting-nurse services, and counseling and other social services.

Homemaker services usually consist of sending a trained woman into private homes to help with the shopping, cooking, and cleaning, perhaps to help the older person dress and get about the house, and to provide a friendly link with the outside world. The homemaker may be needed only a few hours several times a week, or she may come more regularly.

It is a flexible service and a beacon of hope to many aged people.

But there are homemaker services for the aged in only 40 States and in only 134 communities. Even where the service exists, the number of homemakers actually available is often very small.

The prospects of expanding these services appear encouraging, through both voluntary organizations and public agencies. Starting July 1, 1963, 75 percent of the costs of such programs can be provided by Federal funds in local public assistance programs. Also, funds for research and demonstration projects in this field are available to health and welfare agencies.

A homemaker program for older people in every community is now a reasonable goal, a justifiable hope.

"Meals on wheels" is the usual term given a variety of portable meal services by which warm meals are made available to older people in their own homes, usually once a day. But at the last count, only 25 of these programs were in effect.

This service is sometimes combined with shopping aid and homemaker service. The combination makes it possible to help both those who like to prepare their own meals and those who need to have them prepared.

Visiting-nurse services have been provided in most urban communities since 1900, but many more visiting nurses are needed. Their job is to check on the physical condition of the older person, to be sure his medicine prescription has not run out, or to provide any other care that might be needed and that they can professionally give.

In a few communities, coordinated home-care programs are offered in order to extend many hospital services directly into the home. Under such programs, the older person's needs are met primarily by his family, with the help of a team of professionals—nurse, doctor, social worker, nutritionist, and physical or occupational therapist. In 1960, however, only 33 such programs had been established in the United States.

Even broad home-care services do not assure everything a disabled older person might need. He may require a friendly visitor, or legal protection of one kind or another. If he is receiving public assistance or other financial aid, such help may be readily available, but, otherwise, he or his family may have difficulty in finding it.

Information and referral services are of great assistance to older persons and their families, but again complete services of this kind are offered by only a few communities. For the older person, more is frequently needed than the information and advice. He may also need help in getting to the agency which can assist him, or he may need guidance in order to avail himself of the services set up for him.

Casework services, while a part of the total welfare program, are only beginning in many places to be extended to persons who are not currently receiving public assistance.

Recent changes in the social security law have broadened the possibility of these services reaching people whose needs are not complicated by lack of money for the basic necessities. But in far too many places today no casework or counseling services exist for other older people or those concerned with their care.

Even if adequate community services were available—which would permit many older Americans to remain in their homes long after their physical abilities had diminished—some would eventually need more supervision or more intensive care than can be brought into their homes.

The next step for some would be a special type of home, such as a boarding home, group-care residence, foster home, or home for the aged—or in many cases a nursing home.

HOMES FOR THE ILL OR DEPENDENT

Homes for the aged, foster homes, and other group residences today give hope that a much better situation will exist in the future than we have seen formerly—when all too often the home was institutional in character and provided little more than basic shelter and food to the residents. We see, today, experimental designs and imaginative architecture, and the development of programs of services that show much more regard to the very real needs of older people—to enable them to live with dignity and in comfort.

Church groups and fraternal orders have been leaders in pioneering new concepts and designs in varied types of housing for the elderly. The Federal Government has played an important role in the program of mortgage insurance for residential facilities, in working with local housing authorities to build public housing especially designed for the elderly, and in the direct loan program of the Community Facilities Administration to assist in construction for low-income residents.

In 1961, more than half a million older Americans lived in 23,000 nursing or other types of homes providing nursing or supportive services.

Many of these nursing homes, unfortunately, are unsatisfactory by any modern standard. Many are converted residences. Many are deteriorated and actually unsafe. The number of "acceptable" nursing home beds is far short of the need.

All States have licensure programs for nursing homes. Because of the shortage of well-designed, well-equipped, and well-staffed homes, however, the licensing standards often represent scarcely minimal requirements.

The Public Health Service defines the various kinds of homes serving the aging according to type of care provided:

Skilled nursing homes which provide skilled nursing care as their primary and predominant function. In 1961, there were 9,700 of this type with 338,700 patients.

Personal care homes which primarily provide domiciliary or personal-care functions but may also provide some skilled nursing care. In 1961, there were 11,100 with 207,100 residents.

Residential care homes which have primarily residential or sheltered care functions, but which also provide some skilled nursing care. In 1961, there were 2,200 with 47,000 residents.

Very few of even the best skilled nursing homes provide restorative and rehabilitative services.

Yet, there is evidence that physical rehabilitation for chronically ill bed patients over 65 could restore many within a year to ambulation and partial self-care and that many so restored would not require continued institutional care.

Some of the inadequate medical-care and restorative service in nursing homes are due to the traditional attitude toward them as the last stopping place, the point of no return.

Mr. Chairman, our approval of this legislation is the careful result of years of study. Much of this study was conducted by the Committee on Education and Labor; and printed in testimony and report form. A Special Committee on Aging was created in the Senate, and this body has been responsible for much of our useful information. Outside the legislative branch, the late President Kennedy, by Executive order, created the President's Council on Aging to report annually and to make related information available to interested parties. The total of these instances undoubtedly represents the largest and most authoritative body of information on older citizens ever developed, assembled, and published. It is time to take these ideas from the books and translate them into programs of action.

Mr. Chairman, there are presently some 18 million Americans who collectively share the problems of the older American. This represents nearly 10 percent of our population. It is estimated that by 1975, as many as one out of every eight Americans will be aged 65 or over. It is time to acknowledge the existence of these good citizens with an agency, not associated with welfare, but singular and responsible. There are now some 10 departments or agencies of Government who in some small way are concerned with the older American. No one of them ventures from its bailiwick. The needs demand one agency with the authority and ability to speak on all matters of interest to the aged; and the capability to initiate and foster programs designed for the benefit of the older American.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I am happy to yield to the chairman of our committee.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for his work on this legislation and on this problem, and above all the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], the author of this bill for the years that have been put into this piece of legislation.

Hearings were held under our former colleague, Mr. Bailey, and the hearings that have been held recently are all indisputable proof that the Nation is waiting for this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, over 6 years ago, in September of 1958, Congress passed the White House Conference on Aging Act. The following 2 years were devoted to studies, meetings, and planning at the local and State levels in preparation for the National Forum which was held in Washington, D.C., January 9 to 12, 1961.

An estimated $3 million was reported to have been spent for the Conference. The final report included over 600 major recommendations for positive action to meet the needs of America's 18 million older persons.

Mr. Chairman, 4 years—wasted years—have elapsed with the promises still unfulfilled. Funds have not been available for training programs and demonstration projects. Many of the States that were ready to move forward have faltered and their commissions of councils on aging have terminated or become inactive.

The entire field of aging suffered a serious setback when the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reorganized and downgraded the programs on aging by placing them under the direction of a Commissioner of Welfare. This announced to the Nation that hereafter "all older persons shall be regarded as welfare clients."

Mr. Chairman, the Older Americans Act is the answer to the recommendations of the White House Conference on Aging, the considered judgment of national leaders in the field of aging, and national organizations of older persons.

In summary the act would achieve the following:

First. Working together on problems of mutual interest to the Federal, State, and local programs, grants would be available for training, demonstration programs, and research.

All of the grants would be made on the basis of the program or project becoming self-supporting or continuing as a shared responsibility among appropriate agencies.

Second. The appointment of a Commissioner on Aging would give the Federal program a statutory basis that would make it possible for it to work with Congress and other Federal agencies at an administrative level that would prevent or eliminate the bureaucratic stalemates that exist under the present organization.

Third. Removing the program on aging from the welfare setting would create a more favorable attitude toward appropriate action that would not be regarded as public assistance on the welfare level.

Private industry as well as public agencies have indicated their reluctance to be associated with welfare activities.

The older person also has been rightfully resentful to be cast in the role of a second-class citizen. Most of them have never been and are not now welfare clients.

Fourth. The Advisory Committee would bring together the top administrators of departments with programs affecting the aging and representatives of leading organizations working in the field to give a dimension of citizen participation and cooperation not before known in the national program on aging.

Fifth. An Administration on Aging would give a focal point to the broad Federal program that has not existed in spite of attempts to rename or revitalize the Federal Council on Aging now known as the President's Council on Aging. There has not been a dynamic, positive program on an interdepartmental basis at the Federal level.

Sixth. Passage of the Older Americans Act would establish an organization and set an example that State and local governments could adapt to give meaning to the added years and make available the manpower reserve that is vital.

Mr. Chairman, let us not waste any more years by delaying positive action on this bill. The numbers of our elderly do not wait until the Congress is ready to act. The problem is a present one. Let us acknowledge our responsibility to these citizens who have contributed so much. Let us acknowledge that responsibility here and now.

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I want to say that throughout all the hearings and debates and discussions and work on this up until the moment of having this opportunity to present this bill to the House of Representatives for consideration, the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. POWELL] has given us every consideration and every cooperation, unstintingly.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this bill and to commend the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee that brought this bill to the floor for his leadership and diligence on behalf of the legislation. I had the privilege to serve with him during the 88th Congress on this subcommittee where we held extensive hearings on the bill.

This is certainly timely legislation. Many groups of people and many of our aged people helped to put this bill together. Of course, no one deserves more credit and commendation than our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] for his great leadership and direction.

So we are pleased that on this day the people who are in the aged group and who are looking forward to the passage of this legislation can now see the great interest of the Congress in their behalf, and to see this legislation being put into law.

Mr. Chairman, I wish also to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] who is now in the well.

Mr. DENT. I thank the gentleman from New York. I want to say I appreciate his efforts and the work that he has contributed toward the successful conclusion of this operation.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, this bill should not even be on the floor of the House today for consideration by the Members. There are nine members of the subcommittee which considered this bill, six on the majority side and three on the minority side. Five of these nine members are first-termers. One additional member of the subcommittee did not serve on this subcommittee in the last Congress. As a consequence, there were only three of us who were familiar with this legislation when it was considered in the subcommittee, in the Congressman from Pennsylvania's office one morning. We gave a total amount of consideration to the reporting out of this bill, without any hearings in this Congress—we gave a total amount of 5 minutes' time to reporting this legislation out, six members of the subcommittee not even being familiar with it. The only hearings which were held—and I have them right here in my hand—were in September 1963. We are considering legislation here without any hearings being held in the subcommittee and without any consideration or very little consideration given in the full committee before this bill was reported out to the floor of the House.

Now, let me read you some of the objectives of this bill. This is a foot-in-the-door approach. This seems to be a subject like motherhood. We are all in favor of helping these people. From title I of this bill, here are the objectives:

> (1) An adequate income in retirement in accordance with the American standard of living.
>
> (2) The best possible physical and mental health which science can make available and without regard to economic status.
>
> (3) Suitable housing, independently selected, designed and located with reference to special needs and available at costs which older citizens can afford.
>
> (4) Full restorative services for those who require institutional care.
>
> (5) Opportunity for employment with no discriminatory personnel practices because of age.
>
> (6) Retirement in health, honor, dignity—after years of contribution to the economy.
>
> (7) Pursuit of meaningful activity within the widest range of civic, cultural, and recreational opportunities.
>
> (8) Efficient community services which provide social assistance in a coordinated manner and which are readily available when needed.
>
> (9) Immediate benefit from proven research knowledge which can sustain and improve health and happiness.
>
> (10) Freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that covers the entire waterfront. True enough, there is a $17.5 million authorization for the first 2 years, but if you look carefully at these objectives, this program could come out from this commission in future years to the tune of a program running to hundreds and thousands of millions of dollars and even billions of dollars, if we are to go into all of the 10 points covered by the objectives of this legislation.

The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Celebrezze, testified before us. He had some very definite objections to one section of this bill which has not been changed. I quote from his testimony:

> Establishment by statute of the internal organizational arrangements of the department would deprive the Secretary of that control and flexibility, and accordingly I recommend that section 201 be deleted and deferred for further consideration.

In addition to this, there is no recommendation nor approval that has been submitted in the report from the Bureau of the Budget for this legislation.

Because of the testimony of Mr. Celebrezze in regard to section 201, which has not been changed in the bill of the House, and because of the fact that no hearings were held and no consideration was given in this Congress to this legislation and because it was reported out in a matter of a few moments' consideration in subcommittee with a majority of the members not even familiar with the legislation—for these reasons I feel this legislation should be rejected by this body.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. I just wanted to correct one statement that the gentleman made and that was with reference to the budget. I have before me the correspondence which states that the Bureau of the Budget advises that the enactment of H.R. 3708 is in accord with the program of the President.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. Why was not that included in the report? Was that received just recently?

Mr. DENT. I might say to the gentleman that I would have been happy to have it in the report if we had received it in time, but it arrived on March 31, 1965, which is as of today.

Mr. MARTIN of Nebraska. That goes along with the manner in which this bill was considered. There was so much rush to get it out so that it could be reported by the full committee that we did not have time for hearings or proper consideration.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. BELL].

Mr. BELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3708, the Older Americans Act of 1965, assuming, of course, that the amendments to be offered by my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY], are approved.

Since the White House Conference on Aging, convened by President Eisenhower in January 1961, an ever-growing awareness of the varied problems of the aged has become noticeable. Yet this awareness has not brought forth the means for seeking, or coordinating, possible solutions for the mitigation of the problems of the elderly.

Almost every branch of the Government is concerned with these problems, since they involve health, employment, recreation, education, income maintenance, and housing. Yet at the present time, no Government agency effectively devotes its full attention to the development, or coordination, of the social and economic problems of the aged. The Office of Aging is not suited to this task because, among other reasons, of its subordinate position under the jurisdiction of the Commissioner of Welfare.

The program contained within the Older Americans Act is not a welfare program and should not be administered by any agency under welfare jurisdiction. This legislation is designed to provide a representative for the elderly in the Federal Government and to provide a means to gain an insight or a perspective into the problems of a responsible and respected segment of our population by, first, establishing a high level agency—an Administration on Aging—that would devote its full attention to the developments of solutions to the social and economic problems of the aged, and, second, authorizing funds for a 5-year period for research and training programs designed to promote the well-being of our older citizens.

Since the problems to be dealt with in this area are as complex and as significant as those dealt with by the other agencies within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Administration on Aging should be on a coequal basis with these other agencies. Thus, the Administration on Aging must have coequal status with the Social Security Administration and the Welfare Administration so that the older population can be meanfully represented in the upper echelons of the Federal Government. In the words of the Committee on Education and Labor:

> The proposed Administration on Aging would establish a specific high-level agency with power and responsibility to take action. It would have full-time responsibility, backed by professional knowledge and ability, and the strong desire to represent effectively in the Federal Government our 18 million older Americans.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation was reported from the Committee on Educaion and Labor with strong bipartisan support. Considering the ever-increasing need for this legislation, I hope it continues to receive strong bipartisan support.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty], the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to thank the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent] for its consideration of this legislation. I wish also to thank the full Committee on Education and Labor as well as the Committee on Rules for permitting this bill to come before the House today.

Mr. Chairman, I do not see anything unusual in bringing this bill to the floor of the House today. This legislation has been in the mill since 1958. For the past 6 or 7 years we have been talking about legislation along this line.

Mr. Chairman, the first bill for holding a White House Conference on Aging was introduced and passed by this House by unanimous vote back in 1958.

Then after all of the 53 States and territories had held meetings at the local community and State levels on the White House Conference, nearly 3,000 delegates from all over the country assembled in Constitution Hall here in Washington in January 1961. They had over 300 voluntary organizations dealing with this aging legislation at this Conference. Out of the Conference came over 600 positive recommendations as to what to do in this particular area.

It was then, Mr. Chairman, after that Conference was held, that same month, I introduced this legislation, back in 1961.

In 1962 under the leadership of our former colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. Bailey, complete hearings were held for a period of 4 or 5 days. The only person who appeared before that subcommittee at that time with any opposition at all to the proposed legislation was the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. He did not want a separate agency. He had relocated the office of aging problem under the Welfare Administration in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Mr. Chairman, older Americans in this country do not want to be dealt with as welfare cases. They do not like the word "welfare," and I do not blame them. This bill was reported out unanimously in 1962 and then again in 1963 under the very able leadership of my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent], and complete hearings were held. Again, the only one who had any question about this kind of legislation was the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Mr. Celebrezze. He voiced this opposition because he had placed the Office of Aging under Welfare and preferred it kept there. That was the one reservation which he had at that time, and the hearings will so show.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say that after 6 years of working on this particular subject we have basic legislation here that will help in this field of aging. The administration has changed its mind and the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has endorsed all of the provisions contained in this bill. But he did say that he would prefer that the administration of this program be left in the Secretary's office.

Mr. Chairman, a request for a report on this legislation was made on the first of February this year and was not received by the committee until this morning. That is why the recommendations of the administration were not included in the committee report.

Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent] covered about everything that I was going to say in regard to this program. I think he did an excellent job. I do not want to keep the House any longer or the membership.

Mr. Chairman, I believe this is a very clean basic piece of legislation.

I know that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley] has two or three amendments to offer. It is my understanding that some accord has been reached between the minority side and the majority side on these amendments. I am pleased to go along with them. This would represent a truly bipartisan measure passed by the Congress this year to do something for the older Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that when we have 18 million people in our country today over the age of 65 and 1,000 more being added every day, we owe something to them. They deserve it. This is their kind of legislation. Almost every major organization dealing with the elderly people in our country has endorsed this legislation. This is their preference.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the House will pass this bill today, and by a unanimous vote.

Mr. Chairman, today we have an opportunity to act on a bill that will restore the 18 million Americans over 65 years of age to their rightful places as citizens, first class. We shall also reclaim their wisdom, knowledge, and experience so essential if we are to achieve and maintain the aims of a truly great society.

The Older Americans Act of 1965, H.R. 3708, is basic legislation. It will, for the first time, create a foundation for practical action programs that will add purpose and dignity to the later years. I regret that we have been so long delayed in bringing such a bill before the Congress for your consideration.

The need for a dynamic organization to devote full time to the complex, compelling problems of aging was well documented by the White House Conference on Aging held here in Washington, January 1961.

More than 2,500 delegates participated in this forum. Behind them lay nearly 2 years of preconference study and analysis by thousands of professional and lay persons in the States and communities. The delegates represented 53 States and territories, and more than 300 national voluntary organizations interested or active in the field of aging.

In the foreword of the report of the White House Conference, Robert W. Kean, its Chairman wrote:

> The report will have real and enduring value only to the extent that it is used by these groups and individuals as a guide to action in the coming years. It is these people who now must convert the Conference findings into specific actions that will help America's older citizens cope with their problems, fulfill their potentials, and make their full contribution to the life and strength of the Nation.

This report, a clear mandate for action has been to date ignored or so inadequately implemented as to be little more than a token effort.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 would salvage this $3 million expenditure and convert it into the blueprint for action—many times promised—but never produced because there was not an organization in aging at the Federal level sufficiently independent, properly financed or action-oriented.

An examination of the Older Americans Act of 1965 will reveal how closely it adheres to the recommendations made in the conference report:

> It is recommended that the Federal coordinating agency in the field of aging should be given—
>
> (a) A statutory basis and more independent leadership;
>
> (b) Adequate funds for coordination and other assigned functions through a "live item" appropriation;
>
> (c) Responsibility for formulation of legislative proposals for submittal to Congress; and
>
> (d) Responsibility for periodic reviews of and reports on the various Federal programs, departments and agencies working in behalf of older people to achieve their effective coordination and operation.

In determining the ratio of State funds that must match Federal funds used to finance Federal-State programs in behalf of older people, the Federal Government has a responsibility to take into consideration the varying degrees of fiscal capacity or ability of the several States of the Union as related to the program.

Without attempting to detail the six titles of the Older Americans Act, it will be helpful to understand how each meets a need that not only complies with the directives of the Conference report—but which have since been endorsed by every major organization of older persons, religious groups, labor and industry leaders, and by State and local commissions and committees on aging.

Title I contains a 10-point declaration of objectives "in keeping with the traditional American concept of the inherent dignity of the individual under democratic society."

The governments at the Federal, State, and political subdivision levels have a duty and responsibility to assist older people to secure equal opportunity to the full and free enjoyment of the objectives outlined in the bill.

Title II corrects one of the greatest injustices and misrepresentations perpetrated against the older American.

For reasons unknown nor made clear to me in hearings on the subject, the Office of Aging was relocated from the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and demoted to a subordinate place in the Welfare Administration, thereby attaching a label of "welfare" to the Nation's older persons and the programs planned for them.

Admittedly there is and will always be a need for old age assistance programs but the Nation's aging have rightly resented the connotation or inference that they were socially underprivileged, or public assistance recipients.

Under title II the Administration on Aging will be established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It will be under the direction of a Commissioner on Aging to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

This new Administration on Aging will give prestige, balance, strength, continuity, and visibility to Federal activities in aging. It is intended to stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services both within and without the Federal Government.

An Administration on Aging will at long last establish a focus and organization that will not be dominated or overshadowed by programs assigned higher priorities or lower interest. The renaming, revitalizing, and reviving of units, committees, and councils on aging have been the history of such programs to date.

Surely any activity of Government that touches the lives of 10 percent of its citizens is deserving of greater recognition and stability.

Grants for community planning services and training are provided in title III.

A 5-year grant program will be carried out with $5 million to be appropriated for the year ending June 30, 1966, $8 million on 1967 and sums for the next 3 years to be appropriated by the Congress.

It should be noted that the sums appropriated under this title will bear the same ratio as the population aged 65 or over in the State bears to the total population aged 65 years or over in all of the States.

There is a matching provision in this title that reduces the States allotment from 75 percent of the cost of a project for the first year, to 60 percent for the second year of such project and to 50 percent for the third year.

From State's allotment for a fiscal year not more than 10 percent or $15,000, whichever is larger, shall be available for paying one-half of the costs of the State agency designed to administer the plan.

The project grants for research and development project under title IV and training projects under title V require the recipient to contribute money, facilities or services for carrying out the grants. Because of the nature of the projects and their broad national implications a matching grant forumla was not used.

An Advisory Committee on Older Americans consisting of the Commissioner and 15 persons not otherwise in the employ of the United States will be established under title VI. Members shall be selected from among persons who are experienced in or have demonstrated particular interest in special problems of the aging. They shall hold office for a term of 3 years.

It must be obvious that this is a bill without frills, directed toward practical action, nonwelfared centered administration with modest but limited appropriations and grants and provisions for citizen participation.

This bill is urgently needed to compensate for the omission of a meaningful place for older persons in the provisions of the Economic Opportunity Act, and will serve as a companion piece of legislation to a health care bill which does not in any way duplicate or overlap the purposes and objectives of the Older Americans Act of 1965.

The hearings held by the Select Subcommittee on Education, chaired by Representative DENT in September 1963 resulted in overwhelming bipartisan approval by both the subcommittee and the Committee on Education and Labor.

I cannot imagine any bill that could do more to encourage, stimulate and assist States, territories, and local communities as well as organizations both public and private in the field of aging to assume their fair share of responsibility in initiating and promoting programs that will create opportunities for meaningful living in the later years.

To the 1,000 persons who join the ranks of those persons 65 years of age or over each day we will add a new spark of hope and aspirations for a responsible role in the Great Society.

It has been said that if that spark goes out of the breast of its citizens nothing can save the Nation. When a civilization is on its way to greatness, the individuals are growing.

Your favorable vote on H.R. 3708, the Older Americans Act of 1965, might well achieve the goal that the late President Kennedy had in mind when he said:

> We shall be judged in the eyes of the world not only by what we do in outer space, but also by what we do here on earth for our older population.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOGARTY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding. Mr. Chairman, I rise in a spirit of bipartisanship to commend the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], who is now in the well of the House, for his leadership in connection with this legislation which I am glad to support.

In particular, I favor the reorganization features of the bill—the establishment of an Administration of the Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This new office will remove the welfare stigma from the activities of the office dealing with these problems. To establish an Administration for the Aging is an important step in the right direction. Furthermore, it is my understanding that the overall cost to the taxpayers of the activities contemplated in this bill will not exceed by any substantial amount the sums already being expended for similar purposes.

With the amendments that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] will offer, which will be accepted, I am pleased to support this legislation.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ST GERMAIN].

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak in favor of H.R. 3708, The Older Americans Act of 1965, which was introduced in the House by my colleague and fellow Rhode Islander, Hon. JOHN E. FOGARTY, who has long had a deep interest in this area.

This bill will create the framework for the most constructive approach to the problem of the Nation's elderly since the White House Conference on Aging.

The establishment of an Administration on Aging—removing the responsibility for the programs of aging out of the Welfare Administration will restore dignity and independence to those who have resisted and resented the "welfare label" that has downgraded their status as responsible citizens.

The grants available under H.R. 3708 allocated through a single State agency will promote a coordinated and integrated program to meet the needs that are characteristic and peculiar to each State.

With the matching of funds there will be a partnership approval to positive action that has been very much needed and will indeed stimulate and promote projects and programs that will bring security and meaning to the later years.

The benefits to society that will accrue from the harnessing of the wasted resources of the Nation's 18 million older adults will more than repay the modest investment that H.R. 3708 authorizes. Not only will society be enriched by the experience and abilities of the older

Americans—we will have restored the faith of each of these individuals in his government—and his role as a responsible individual.

I urge your support of the Older Americans Act of 1965.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to take this opportunity to go on record in favor of H.R. 3708.

This legislation under the sponsorship of the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] has been before the House Committee on Education and Labor for several years. The bill makes provisions for grants to the States for community planning and coordination in order to enable our older people to secure better community facilities and enjoy an adequate income on retirement. To my way of thinking, the legislation is properly entitled, "The Older Americans Act of 1965," and I am delighted to support legislation making available funds in the nature of demonstration programs for the training of special personnel for work with the elderly.

Likewise, I wish to compliment my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for the great work he has done as chairman of the subcommittee, and for the thorough study that he has given this great piece of legislation in steering it to the floor today.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Hawaii [Mrs. MINK].

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Chairman, I wish at this time to thank the chairman for granting me this privilege to participate in the discussion of this great bill. I am one of the new members on the subcommitte and, therefore, consider it a great privilege to be able to participate in the inauguration of this great program.

Mr. Chairman, this bill we are considering today would inaugurate a great advance toward recognition of the needs of our senior citizens.

In the past few years, the Nation has become highly aware of the mounting problems that face 18 million Americans who are over 65 years of age.

Although advances in medicine have lengthened our life span, the failure of parallel advances in our progress and attitudes toward the elderly has left all too many of our senior citizens in dire straits of loneliness, apathy, and unheeded misery. This situation will worsen as the years go by unless we act now to refashion these archaic patterns of the past.

At the present time, nearly 10 percent of our population is over 65 years of age. The best estimates available indicate that this will grow to one in every eight persons by 1975.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 would seek to meet the needs of these persons by setting up a clearinghouse for information on problems of the aged and aging, and coordinating efforts to solve them. This Commission would broaden and strengthen the efforts now being made to develop meaningful effective programs of help to our senior citizens.

The needs of the aging are indeed many. Many of these people, still able to contribute to this society, are now cruelly shunted aside from all meaningful activity.

Forced to retire from their jobs, they not only face a drastic cut in income but they are cut off from the meaningful and worthwhile activities that formerly filled their lives.

Many of them find the infirmaties of age hastened by the disheartening effect of idleness and neglect. Their efforts to find new jobs are balked by arbitrary age limits, lack of guidance and training activities, and by ignorance of the inadequate aids now available to them.

Lack of income forces many into grossly inadequate housing, and curtails their opportunities for recreation and other leisure opportunities.

Some efforts have been made to correct this deplorable situation. The very scope of the needs of the elderly is reflected in the multitude of experimental programs to help the aging that have sprung up across the Nation. States and cities, voluntary agencies, unions and large business firms have tried to help.

There are programs designed to ease the impact of retirement. Special housing has been developed to meet their particular requirements, including special recreation and educational programs.

All too often funds have been lacking to insure that the knowledge gained from experimental programs can be disseminated. The facilities themselves are too limited to do more than ameliorate slightly the lot of relatively few persons.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 can go far in helping to meet this challenge by serving to coordinate this upwelling of concern and activity into a meaningful and cohesive national program.

For the first time, a national agency will be established with the principal aim of developing solutions to the social and economic problems of the elderly. This, in itself, will be a great advance. It would prepare and publish badly needed information and statistics, which could be distributed to local agencies as well as the elderly themselves.

It could, for instance, correlate and help advance efforts to identify those elderly who want to and are able to continue working. And it could help those now trying to provide opportunities for useful service to older Americans who want to take part in community and public services.

And, very importantly, this new Administration on Aging, would stimulate more effective use of the existing resources and available services for the aged and aging.

This bill would provide a 5-year system of Federal grants with $13 million authorized in the first 2 years, to allow the States to set up community plans and coordinate programs of help for the aged within their borders. It would allow the establishment of demonstration programs and the training of needed personnel to broaden the scope of successful activities.

In addition, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be authorized to initiate other studies on the problems and needs of the aging.

This bill is not a cure-all. But it does enable the Nation to start on a well-coordinated, cohesive program. This program could broaden the scope of current activities to help the aged, speed the pace of such activities and allow rapid dissemination of the information acquired through them.

It would be of tremendous benefit to the growing numbers of our aged Americans in need of assistance. It could also help return to the national mainstream many of those now forced into unwanted idleness by directing their energies and interest into many meaningful programs.

This is a bill of high and noble purpose. I urge my colleagues to support it and join in this great program.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I wish to announce that when we get back into the House I shall ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MEEDS].

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Chairman, by 1975, 1 out of every 8 people in America will be over 65. Since 1900 the population of persons over 65 has grown from 3 million to nearly 18 million today. In terms of percentages we are talking about 9.2 percent or almost one-tenth of our total population.

After 65 can be the golden era of a person's life, or it can be a period of frustration, desperation, and apathy toward life itself. Today in America all too many of our senior citizens face it as the latter.

While medical science has added years to the lives of our citizens, we as a society have largely failed to fill those added years with purpose and dignity.

Recognizing this shortcoming, in 1958 Congressman JOHN H. FOGARTY introduced a bill, the purpose of which was to convene a national forum of the most knowledgeable people in the field of aging. After study and work, this group convened as the White House Conference on Aging and brought forth some very specific recommendations that President Kennedy presented to the Congress in his message on elderly citizens. Among other things he said:

> The Federal Government can assume a significant leadership role in stimulating such actions. To do this, I recommend a 5-year program of assistance to State and local voluntary organizations for planning and developing services; for research, demonstration, and training projects leading to new or improved programs to aid older people; and for construction, renovation, and equipment of public and nonprofit multipurpose activity and recreational centers for the elderly.

The legislation before us today embodies these suggestions and others, Mr. Chairman.

I do not think there is a Member who does not want to help with this problem, but how is the best way to do it? Certainly we all know from personal experience that to adequately cope with a complex situation we must know precisely what that problem is and then coordinate our efforts toward solutions. Today many programs are dedicated to helping our elderly citizens, but unfortunately they are uncoordinated efforts.

One of the most important aspects of this legislation is that it creates a high level agency whose whole attention can be directed at these problems. The agency can act as a clearinghouse of information and coordination of programs so that our knowledge of these problems will not only be enlarged but our efforts at solution will be precisely directed.

Mr. Chairman, studies have amply demonstrated that much of the frustration and apathy of many older people come from a feeling of hopelessness; hopelessness created when they no longer go to work each day, when they no longer associate daily with fellow workers. Above all, Mr. Chairman, there is a hopelessness born of a feeling that they are no longer useful in society.

Retirement brings major adjustments that must be made if the years after 65 are to be rich and rewarding rather than despised and degrading.

Recognizing this very real need, this bill authorized grants for programs designed to facilitate this adjustment, grants for community planning, reconstruction projects, training of personnel and related programs.

I would like to quote from a letter I received from Glen F. Hallman, one of my constituents.

> As chairman of the northwest area committee of the Governor's council on aging and codirector of our local community services for older adults projects, I feel passage of this act will meet a great need that exists in local communities of our State. The technical and financial assistance this act could provide would assist local senior citizens' groups to establish effective and vitally needed programs for its senior citizens. Whatcom County, and particularly Bellingham, has struggled to provide services and opportunities for its older people since 1940 and particularly 1957 when the Whatcom County Council on Aging was established. I feel that the Older Citizens Act of 1965 will enable many communities in our State to provide for the needs and opportunities of its older citizens at the grassroots level by local community effort if they can obtain a relatively small amount of financial assistance to enable them to get started. We are particularly interested in section 301, paragraph 4, page 6 of H.R. 3708 because it would provide financial assistance to help establish and expand such a center as ours.

I know many of these people personally and I have visited their golden hour clubs and witnessed their efforts to enrich their own lives. They need our assistance to do this. The passage of this bill would provide a strong helping hand.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TUNNEY].

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my support for the bill now before the House, H.R. 3708, known as the Fogarty Act of 1965. This legislation which I am hopeful will be passed today, will mark an important step forward in identifying and meeting the needs of the elderly citizens of our Nation.

This bill has two separate facets. First, the bill creates an operating agency to be known as the Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Second, it provides grants to States and public and nonprofit private agencies for the development of new or improved programs to help aged citizens.

There has been a longstanding need for such a department. Our Nation has grown both large and complex and so have the problems of our senior citizens. During the last 40 years the number of persons in the United States over 65 has jumped from 5 million to 18 million. By 1970 there will be over 20 million persons 65 years of age or older. By the year 2000 our aged population will more than double. Most of our senior citizens have contributed a great deal to our Nation's development during their lifetime. This large, heterogeneous group can continue to contribute a great deal to our country. In fact if we do not attempt to tap this resource of talent and experience, we can only hurt the Nation now and in the future. As Henry Wadsworth Longfellow once said:

> For age is opportunity no less
> Than youth itself, though in another dress,
> And as the evening twilight fades away
> The sky is filled with stars, invisible by day.

Because the Administration on Aging will be operating under legislative authority, it will be able to focus on the future as well as on the present—to make present plans for future needs. Activities pertaining to the problems of our ever-increasing number of senior citizens can be coordinated. This will provide better opportunities for investigation and meaningful studies.

As all of you know, the problems of the aged are many and varied. The most important include problems of maintaining health, of assuring adequate income, of finding employment, of engaging in productive and rewarding activity, of securing proper housing, assistance, and protection.

The average median income of married couples over 65 is a very low $2,700. The problem of inadequate income is clear, but the solution is not clear. This is one of the matters that can be taken up by a coordinating agency for the aged.

Lack of decent housing is another major problem that must be examined and a solution found. Over 30 percent of all deficient housing is occupied by persons 65 or older.

There is also a great need to expand employment opportunities for our senior citizens. Adequate employment is probably the key to a decent standard of living.

One thing that I feel has emerged from all of the studies on the aged is their desire for independence and a feeling of being able to make a continued worthwhile contribution to their society and country.

The needs of 18 million aged citizens deserve the same consideration now being received by any other group in our society.

This bill recognizes that States as well as public and nonprofit private agencies can make a substantial contribution to improving the lot of senior citizens at the local level. Over a 2-year period, $13 million in grants to States are authorized so that States may train personnel and develop and demonstrate their own programs to enhance the lives of the aged. An additional $4½ million is authorized over 2 years in grants to public and nonprofit private agencies for essentially the same purpose.

By involving States and public and private nonprofit agencies in the struggle to promote well-being amongst elderly persons, the legislation before us takes cognizance of the fact that individual communities have to shoulder local responsibilities. It seeks uniform solutions, yet recognizes a diversity of problems. It stimulates research and development of programs at local levels, while providing for assimilation, coordination, and dissemination of information at the Federal level. It is, in sum, effective legislation which can help remove many of the uncertainties and frustrations that shroud the lives of 18 million Americans who are in or approaching their twilight years.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. GLENN ANDREWS].

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I was somewhat taken aback in my first committee assignment when this bill was not discussed and was quickly voted out without any discussion in our subcommittee.

I do not rise in opposition to the bill at all. As a matter of fact, I am rather attracted to it, and I am pleased to find that the other new members of our committee seem to have studied the bill and are themselves enthusiastic in their praise of the bill.

There are, however, some questions which have been posed in today's comment to which I should like an answer, if I may have it.

I am impressed by Mr. ANDERSON's inquiry about whether or not there are a lot of duplications in this bill with regard to programs which already exist, such as in the poverty program.

May I address my question to the chairman of the subcommittee [Mr. DENT]?

Mr. DENT. So far as I can see, there are no duplications, since there are no particular programs today under any act of Congress which are specifically oriented to the problems of the aged.

We recognize, I believe, that their problems are different and separate from those that come under the general operations of the poverty bill, or the veterans legislation, or Appalachia, or any other all-encompassing legislation that has been passed to date.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Do you believe and could you assure me that in your opinion this bill, which really has as its main thrust the final coordination of programs, which is the same question I just posed, would in effect work toward that end?

Mr. DENT. I think this is the only way that we can start toward the complete unification of a departmental agency that will take all of the problems and handle all of the situations which arise pertaining to the aged without having to run helter-skelter to the many different departments.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. One more question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I am impressed by the inquiry and by the opposition expressed early in the development of this legislation by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. I am wondering if the method of appointment of this Commission as a separate commission in HEW under this bill without the direct supervision of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare the way it is being done by this bill, and having the Commissioner appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate, would not confuse the operation of that Department of Health, Education, and Welfare itself. Also, is the Secretary in accord with this matter now?

Mr. DENT. No. The situation is exactly as it was before. We have no official sanction nor agreement by the Secretary himself to the creation of a commission type of agency with the approval of the Senate.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 more minutes in order to answer the question.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DENT. The purpose and the main thrust of any legislation designed such as this is, is to give continuity to the activities within the agency. As you know, Secretaries change at the will and the whim of the Executive. You can say that a commission does, too, but there is the conformation safeguard. There is that entity and singleness of purpose in a commission designed strictly for this purpose. If a Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare at this moment has a feeling that there ought to be many activities in the field dealing with the problems of the aged, then he would select the type of agency that he would want that would follow that line. However, if the next Secretary happens to be one who does not believe that the problems of the aged and aging are paramount and important, then he could name somebody to head that agency who would take exactly the opposite point of view and the programs and all of the studies and work that have been done heretofore would go for naught. We believe we are creating an agency that will have a continuity to it and which will have some substance to it and become recognized by all of the aged people as the place which they can apply to for redress of any wrongs they may fancy they have or actually may have done to them or any problems that arise.

Mr. GLENN ANDREWS. Then, in the gentleman's opinion, the extra Commissioner appointed over and above and separate from the Secretary himself, you think, will help to coordinate all of the affairs of the Secretary even with the independent type of appointment given in this bill?

Mr. DENT. Yes, I do believe that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES].

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] for yielding to me this time. I rise today in support of H.R. 3708, the Older Americans Act of 1965. Nineteen hundred and sixty-five is the year in which this Congress was given the opportunity to fulfill the promise of the poet Browning when he said: "Grow old along with me. The best is yet to be." This is the year in which we are given the opportunity to see that some of the needs—the most important ones—of our senior citizens are being met. A bill establishing health insurance for the aged, medical care for the needy, and social security benefit increases will soon be brought before this body. But today we are here to consider another facet of the needs of our elderly; we are seeking to establish a program of grants to the States, to public or nonprofit agencies, institutions or individuals for study, development, demonstration, and evaluation projects that will enhance the objectives set forth in title I of the bill. These objectives are: an adequate income; the best possible physical and mental health; suitable housing; full restorative services; opportunity for employment without age discrimination; retirement in health, honor, and dignity; pursuit of meaningful activity; efficient community services when needed; immediate benefit from proven research knowledge; and freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative.

These objectives might be regarded as a bill of rights for our senior citizens. They include most of the things that most of us in this Nation take for granted as part of our rights as Americans. I do not think it is too much to ask that we give our elderly the chance to obtain them. As President Kennedy said in his message to the Congress on February 21, 1963:

> Place, prestige, status cannot be legislated. But we can see that legislation enhances the opportunity to obtain them.

President Kennedy began his message with a quotation from the historian Toynbee which I should like to repeat here today. Toynbee wrote that a society's quality and durability can best be measured, and I quote, "by the request and care given its elderly citizens." As of 1963, our Nation's elderly population—by that I mean those individuals 65 years or over—numbered some 17½ million. By 1980, this figure is expected to increase to 25 million. Thanks to the wonders of modern medicine, our life expectancy at birth has been increased to 70 years. Thanks to modern medicine, those of us who live to be 65, if we are men, can be expected to live an additional 13 years. If we are women, we will outlive men by an additional 2 years. The medicare bill, if passed, will see to it that our senior citizens are given the opportunity to take advantage of the wonders of modern medicine without sacrificing every cent they have earned and have saved. The bill we are considering today will see to it that our senior citizens find it possible to live their "golden years" with the services and the opportunities they deserve as citizens of this great Nation.

Let us briefly examine some of the needs of our elderly and the services that might be utilized under this bill to meet those needs. The average annual income of a couple over 65 is approximately one-half that of a younger two-person family. Roughly 50 percent of our elderly citizens have incomes of less than $1,000 a year. If you examine this figure rather closely you see that it amounts to less than $20 a week to be spent on food, housing, medical expenses, clothing, transportation, and recreation. Twenty dollars a week does not go far in a country where the cost of living has increased almost steadily since 1958. Thirty percent of the elderly live in inferior housing—housing which lacks a private bath, toilet, hot running water or is dilapidated or deficient in some other respect. These are the physical needs; it is not possible to calculate the needs that can be categorized as emotional. I sometimes think that it is a shame that the days of the extended family have disappeared with the modern age. It used to be that there was a definite place for grandmothers and grandfathers in the home. Their services were useful in caring for the children and in helping with the household chores. But the days of the vacuum cleaner, the self-cleaning oven, the dishwasher have eliminated the need for this kind of help. And the modern generation prides itself on its independence.

But grandma and grandpa find themselves excluded from places other than their children's homes. They find the doors of employment are also closed to them. They find compulsory retirement laws that rob them of their sense of usefulness besides depriving them of their usual income. It is a fact that the number of persons over 65 has doubled since 1940. But in 1940, 50 percent of them were in the labor force. In 1965, only 13 percent remain in the labor force. Retirement should be a matter of choice, not of necessity, and it is high time we realized what an extravagant waste of manpower is going on by this discrimination against employment of the elderly. In 1963, President Kennedy issued a directive to all Federal agencies to consider job applicants and employees on the basis of ability rather than of age. There is much to be said for a society that can place some trust in the wisdom of its ancestors. There is much to be said for a society that is not fearful of some respect for its elders.

We have made many strides in the past few years with legislation to benefit the elderly. But there is still much that remains to be done. Enactment of this bill will be a great stride in the right direction. It will enable each State to develop a State plan to coordinate the State programs on aging. It can support community planning and coordination of programs for the aged; set up pilot projects to develop new programs; train professional and technical personnel needed to meet the terrible shortage of those trained to work with the aged. Pilot projects could be developed and existing programs improved in such areas as preretirement education, the staffing and operation of multipurpose activity centers, the teaching of creative skills in the arts and crafts, social and recreational programs, provision of meal centers and home-delivered meals. Grants to organizations and communities for demonstration and research projects could include educational and recreational programs, concerted social services, and other services in senior housing projects to determine what services are most effective in maintaining independence, mental health, community participation, and good family relationships among older people.

The bill before us today establishes an Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. We have had a Children's Bureau to coordinate programs dealing with the needs of children for many years now. It is time we recognized and accepted the fact that as people get older, their needs change, and they must be given the same opportunity to meet those needs that they were given as children. This does not seem to be too much to ask. Let us enact this bill so that our golden years, our parents' and our children's may be happy and comfortable years without the loneliness and emptiness and discomfort that so often accompany advanced age today.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. Matsunaga].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend the chairman of the subcommittee and its members for the expeditious action taken on this bill; and I rise in support of H.R. 3708, the "Older Americans Act of 1965."

I submit that the bill before the House is in many respects similar to the legislation we passed a few days ago after vigorous debate. I refer to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. That particular legislation is intended to give hope and self-respect to the young who come from impoverished homes. The present bill is intended to provide hope and self-respect to another segment of our population—Americans of advanced age. Both bills are designed to make useful and productive citizens of those Americans who come within their scope.

It is a well-known paradox of our modern society that, on the one hand, medical science and technology has made noteworthy advancements in combatting disease and increasing the lifespan of our citizens, while on the other hand, our science and technological advancements have been such that the young and vigorous applicants now occupy preferred status in the quest for employment. The older workers are often rejected on the basis of age alone. I use the term "older" in a relative sense, for industry has come to look upon the man or woman of 40 as being too old. No longer is it true that "life begins at 40"; it generally ends at 40 for the unfortunate person who, at that age, is compelled by circumstances to look for a new job.

The fallacy that productivity and usefulness in life necessarily declines with advancing age is refutable by overwhelming evidence. For example, we have only to look around us today and note the presence of our esteemed senior colleagues in this august body. How fortunate for the Congress and the United States of America that we have the benefit of their wisdom and experience. How tragic it would have been if age alone had kept them from these revered halls.

The committee's report indicates a need for the proposed legislation. A rapidly changing world has created sociological, psychological, and economic problems which the older Americans particularly have found difficult to solve without technical assistance. These problems exist in our island State of Hawaii just as they do elsewhere in these United States. These Americans need our help just as much as, if not more than, the youngsters from impoverished homes.

The proposed legislation embodies a recognition of the fact that the so-called "oldsters" have a definite role to play in our present-day society. It should not by any means be a passive role. It should not be marred by a feeling of rejection and dejection. Rather, it should be characterized by a sense of belonging, of contributing to our complex and rapidly advancing society.

Many States, including Hawaii, have recognized the growing problems of the elderly and have recently instituted limited assistance programs. These programs, however, have already shown a need for implementation and coordination. I firmly believe that the problem is national in scope and that any attempted solution will be meaningful to elderly Americans only by the enactment of national legislation such as this.

I respectfully urge that we give H.R. 3708 a favorable vote.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I take great pride and pleasure in having played some small part in this effort, which the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent] and the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNamara] have done so much to advance over the years. I can recall being a member of the subcommittee that recommended passage of this bill several years ago. But it is because of the efforts of these three gentlemen that we have this bill before us today.

Mr. Chairman, this is the Congress of the older American. We have the opportunity, and the responsibility, to see that justice is given to the aged. The past few years have shown a tremendous increase in concern for, and information about, the problems of our citizens over 65. We have, in previous Congresses, given the aged special tax relief, help in finding adequate housing, new opportunities for employment, and service through VISTA, and necessary assistance in paying medical bills through the Kerr-Mills program. We have found that this is not enough. The income of senior citizens still does not cover necessities, and hospital costs are rising steeply with no end in sight. Our older citizens have fewer resources with which to pay the bills which result from the more common illnesses and accidents of old age. Retirement, instead of meaning years of sunshine and pleasant activity, brings growing financial fear and often anxiety and loneliness. Employment opportunities are slight, even though many of the elderly are capable and willing to work—only 17.3 percent of those over 65 are in the work force. Too often our old people have nowhere to go—no recreation centers where they might meet and make friends, and only the bare four walls of a small apartment or nursing home room to keep them company.

We will pass a medicare bill this session, which will give the elderly new hope that their later years can be relatively free from want. They will have the assurance that a part of their medical bills will be paid—and without charity—through the assistance of a country which is grateful for the prosperity that their generation has brought us.

We are considering H.R. 3708, the Older Americans Act of 1965, which will help the elderly solve many more of their pressing problems. We must give adequate and long-needed recognition to the growing role of the elderly in our society, and their need for certain basic assistance.

We have discovered, in recent years, that problems can best be solved through a comprehensive attack on the causes for the problem: Through research, training of special personnel, projects to develop new resources. The Older Americans Act should give efforts to improve the conditions of the aged the added impetus they need. It has been under consideration since we first began to study the living conditions of the aged, and it is time that we acted on these well-drawn, thoughtful provisions.

The Older Americans Act would create an Administration on Aging, which would be located within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. This seems only sensible. The Administration of Aging would coordinate and supervise all existing programs in the field of aging, thus insuring that there would be no duplication of effort and expenditure. The Administration would also provide the necessary information and studies on the problems of the aging, especially advising State and local governments.

The bill authorizes, for the first 2 years, a total of $13 million in grants to the States for community planning and coordination, demonstration programs, and the training of special personnel. The bill further authorizes a total of $4.5 million in grants to public or nonprofit private agencies organizations and institutions for study, development, demonstration projects relating to the needs of older persons and the best ways of satisfying these needs. Through the Older Americans Act we will assure our senior citizens the kind of retirement years they deserve—years filled with independent activities, the warmth of good friends and people who care, and freedom from harsh financial problems. Let us make this a year of great achievement, a year that Congress recognized the duty we owe our older citizens.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Garmatz].

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the bill H.R. 3708. I think this legislation is overdue. I want to compliment the sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty], and also the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent], for their fine work in handling this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is an auspicious occasion. The creation of an operating agency, known as the Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, with a total of $13 million in grants to the States for the first 2 years, for community and other activities on their behalf—and for activities in which they will directly participate—marks a major step forward in American life. For we face a new situation in our country today—one which our older Americans could hardly have anticipated when they were young. The fact that the number of people 65 and over has more than quadrupled since 1900 is viewed with alarm in some quarters. But to my mind, this increase represents a largely untapped natural resource of knowledge, skill, and demonstrated courage which can add immeasurably to the wealth and wisdom of our country. By establishing an Administration on Aging, under a Commissioner concerned solely with the varied programs they need we can help to create a new and better life for them—the veterans of a half century of unparalleled industrial development who are, today, too often relegated to the obscurity and loneliness of a furnished room—their lives constricted by inadequate income and illness.

We know that indifference to these new problems of older peoples creates its own form of erosion not only for the aged themselves but for all members of the community. We know, too, that many American communities are becoming aware of their obligation to these senior citizens—that they are finding that senior service centers, adult education projects, improved health facilities, and increased job opportunities for older people are demonstrating that retirement years can be years of creative activity and community service.

The enactment of this legislation is, therefore, a broad step forward in Federal recognition of our national responsibilities for developing more opportunities for more abundant and rewarding life for older Americans. There have been proposals that we "study" the aged. I am glad to say that this legislation takes the far more positive approach that we must also do something.

We know that the problem of income maintenance for the elderly of the Nation has become one of the serious problems of our century. This is because a smaller percentage of over-65 population is in the work force at the same time that life expectancy has been increased by astonishing proportions. In 1900, 36.2 percent of those over 65 were in the work force. By 1963 this had declined to 17.3 percent. In 1900, the life expectancy of 65-year-old American men was 11.5 years, and that of 65-year-old American women was 12.22 years. By 1962, it had lengthened to 12.9 years for men and 15.9 years for women. If this trend continues it means, for most Americans, more years of living after they reach the age of 65, in which they will not be able to depend upon gainful employment as a source of income.

We know that there are problems of housing. According to the 1960 census data nearly 2,750,000 households where the head was 65 or over were deficient; that is dilapidated, deteriorating, or lacking some or all plumbing facilities. And these are just two of the many problems they face.

The declared objectives of this legislation suggest the broad scope of its goals to meet the multiple problems of older men and women. These objectives are: First, an adequate income; second, the best possible physical and mental health; third, suitable housing; fourth, full restorative services; fifth, opportunity for employment without age discrimination; sixth, retirement in health, honor, and dignity; seventh, pursuit of meaningful activity; eighth, efficient community services when needed; ninth, immediate benefit from proven research knowledge; and tenth, freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative.

The new Administration could serve as a clearinghouse of information and on problems of the aged and aging; administer grants provided by the act; develop, conduct, and arrange for research and demonstration programs in the field of aging; provide technical assistance and consultation to State and local governments, and stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services, among other activities.

This legislation is concerned with a problem which, in one way or another, reaches every family in the Nation. It is legislation written in terms of the particular problems which face our parents, our grandparents, our in-laws, our uncles, or our aunts. I believe that the Congress will recognize that creating an Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is in the interest of each one of us, and of our Nation as a whole. I think we will enact this legislation.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Friedel].

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in accord with this wonderful bill, H.R. 3708. I concur in the remarks made by the very able sponsor of the bill, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty].

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Farnum].

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Chairman, in rising to the support of H.R. 3708 it might be more fitting to say I rise in support of the Honorable John E. Fogarty, my esteemed colleague from Rhode Island, and in support of the philosophy that guides his service to the Nation.

As a new member serving under him on the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, it has been my privilege to watch him in untiring hours, both by day and by night, laboring to serve the well-being of his fellow men.

I have come to the realization in this process that they were not exaggerating who had told me that his service in this century to the common good would be almost impossible to duplicate in another individual.

With this background I have watched carefully, and studied, the manner in which he approached an objective dear to the hearts of both of us. This is relief for the person with sociological, psychological, or economic problems growing out of the passing of the years.

As I would expect in anything involving Mr. Fogarty, the preparation that led to the bill we consider today has been painstaking and thorough. It has resulted in proposals at once concrete, practical, creative, and imaginative.

The bill is, in effect, a new declaration of independence—a declaration that those who helped build the Nation that is the wonder of the world are not to be cast aside to wither and wait for an unappreciated end.

The key to the bill, and enough excuse for passing it, is in the declaration accompanying it that "the older people of the Nation are entitled to freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives."

That is a statement that I believe would have won applause from the architects of our Nation. For it is a new way of saying what the bill insures, which is that the pursuit of happiness is not to be curtailed by reason of the mere passage of years.

Others have told of the debt we owe those who preceded us in building our country and have either directly or by inference discussed the technicalities of income, health, housing, employment, community services, research, and all the rest covered in H.R. 3708.

In the course of this discussion some areas of possible weakness have been explored and some possible faults pinpointed.

Less than this would hardly be expected from this body with its vast experience in meeting governmental problems. But my hope would be that all of us will be able, amid these justifiable and necessary distractions, to ever keep our eyes on the main goal: Mr. Fogarty's splendid and yet entirely practical proposal that age not be allowed to dilute the right of Americans to enjoy the full rights of citizenship in our democracy.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Scheuer].

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Chairman, may I say on behalf of the freshman members of this subcommittee what a pleasure and a privilege it has been for us to work with and enjoy the guidance and leadership of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent]. His knowledge in depth, his keen insight into the whole panoply of the problems of the elderly, his human compassion, has been a source of inspiration to all of us. We have greatly enjoyed not only his high professionalism, but the warmth of his friendship as well.

In adopting the Older Americans Act we are not just discussing another welfare program. We are considering how we can provide a meaningful role in our society for our senior citizens to make sure that their talents and accumulated wisdom are employed to the full, and at the same time make sure that those who are infirm and ailing do not fall into poverty but are helped to live out their allotted years in moderate comfort and real happiness.

In my lifetime, the average span of life in the United States has increased from 54 years to more than 70. At the turn of the century there were 3 million U.S. citizens over 65 years of age; in 1961 there were 16 million, and in 1985 there will be an estimated 25 million. People whose lives have been prolonged by the enormous strides of the revolution in science and technology should be offered other alternatives to the sorry prospect of simply existing in lonely isolation apart from the mainstream and frequently on the borderline of poverty and dependency.

Mr. Chairman, title IV of the Older Americans Act of 1965 promises that our program will be more than a series of welfare handouts.

One of the most obvious needs of the aging is for more money to spend both on the very necessities of life and for a few of life's comforts as well.

Almost half of those over 65 living alone receive $1,000 a year or less and three-fourths receive less than $2,000 a year.

Mr. Chairman, the main source of income for the great majority of those over 65 is one or more of the public benefit programs.

Seven out of ten elderly folk now receive earned social security insurance payments averaging about $76 per month for a retired worker, $66 per month for a widow and $129 per month for an elderly worker and spouse.

With proper imagination we can find paid and nonpaid jobs, full time and part time, for many of our senior citizens who have much to offer in skill and experience. We can do this without in any way narrowing the total job market. Productive jobs of many kinds can be found for our elderly in the antipoverty program, in private industry, in nonprofit community, civic, and welfare organizations.

Mr. Chairman, as one who has been active in the professions, in a wide variety of civic and community organizations, and in business, I can state from my own knowledge that many elderly folk who have passed the age of 65 and finished their active full-time working careers, are nevertheless rich in knowledge and insight; in highly useful management and executive skills, and in deep understanding of their fellow citizens as well as the problems of their communities.

We should take advantage of these talents, of the wisdom and insight which only age and experience can bring, and we should mobilize these talents, and exploit them in the drive in which the Congress and our Nation is engaged in today in the fields of mass education, and in the eradication from our national life of the blight of poverty.

This knowledge and insight, compassion and wisdom can and must be harnessed productively and richly to help us achieve these great national goals.

Mr. Chairman, this is a program in which a small investment can pay large dividends in knowledge and insight into how to channel the skills and talents of the elderly into useful, productive activities. In thus honoring and ennobling our senior citizens, we honor and ennoble our own society.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we have heard a good deal this afternoon that one of the prime purposes of this bill is to provide for coordination; to bring all of the numerous activities in behalf of the aged under one tent, one umbrella, or whatever you want to call it.

I wonder if we could have from the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee who, I assume, will be dealing with this subject in the matter of funds, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty], assurance that he will tighten the purse strings when he has the opportunity in order to stop some of the proliferation that obviously will take place if this bill is passed, and if the gentleman will lend a hand toward bringing about the coordination that we hear so much about this afternoon?

Mr. Chairman, could we have some assurances from the gentleman that he will cut back on funds already being expended to support councils, advisory boards, and other similar functions and concentrate this in the hands of one agency?

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, we are going to take a good look at it, I will tell the gentleman from Iowa, but I cannot guarantee that there will be a savings in something like this. The budget which we are considering now I believe is too frugal and I think we ought to spend more money in many of these areas such as education and health and other areas, as the gentleman from Iowa knows.

Mr. GROSS. I am talking about the advisory bodies; the administrative functioning of this thing. I am not talking about the specific programs. I am talking about the administrative end of it. I believe the gentleman can do much better than to say he hopes his committee will be able to do something.

Mr. FOGARTY. The administrative expenses will not be much. There is only a commissioner. We do provide for a 15-member advisory committee.

Mr. GROSS. What is the $17 million to be expended for?

Mr. FOGARTY. That is to be expended in the gentleman's State, in my own State, and every State in the Union where they have adopted a State plan. They have these demonstration projects in every State. This money is not going to be spent in Washington. This is going to be at the State level. This is a real State rights bill.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to hear that, but I want to know that we are not going to compound a bureaucratic setup and spend the taxpayer's money for more duplication.

Mr. FOGARTY. I cannot say now we are going to save a certain amount of money, but we are going to save some money.

Mr. GROSS. Why could we not have in this bill a repeal of some of the functions presently carried on? I find no language repealing or restricting any activity that is being presently carried out even in a year or 2 years from now. I am fearful that we may be adding another layer of fat.

Mr. FOGARTY. I do not know of any legislation that could be repealed.

Mr. GROSS. Do we not already have a multiplicity of bureaucrats administering related programs now?

Mr. FOGARTY. We have a group on aging at HEW putting out pamphlets and other things. That probably will be cut back, yes.

Mr. GROSS. I would like to have all the assurance I can possibly get from the gentleman that he is going to tighten the purse strings now being carried on if we are going to set up another agency in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare dealing with this subject.

Mr. FOGARTY. I think I can agree with the gentleman, but I am not going to recommend spending more money than the President has asked to be spent for Health, Education, and Welfare. I think the gentleman knows my position over a long period of time, anyway. I happen to think we can save money by spending money in some of these areas.

Mr. GROSS. That is a new twist, that you can save money by spending it. I do not find in my personal affairs that I have been able to save very much by spending. Maybe it can be done in the Great Society.

The list of objectives is quite interesting. No. 1 is "an adequate income in retirement in accordance with American standards." I would like to see that written in every bill. I am glad to have the aging enjoy an American standard of living, but I would like to see every American enjoy an American standard of living, whatever that may mean.

Then No. 10 of the objectives is this: "Freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives."

Almost every day around here we pass another law that delegates authority to the executive branch in this huge, Central Government taking from our citizens their freedom and independence. The words sound fine, but they are meaningless in the light of what we do almost every day, taking freedom and independence from the people of this country, concentrating control and the dictation in the hands of the bureaucrats and others in Washington. They are delightful words, but I am afraid they are meaningless in the light of what we are doing around here.

Above all, let us not kid the aging and aged into believing that this or any other program handed down from Washington will be free from controls and regimentation. This is implicit in the road we are traveling and it is unfair to try to make people believe otherwise.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Findley].

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, as the ranking member on the minority side of the subcommittee which has been dealing with this legislation, I should like to pay my respects to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent], the chairman of the subcommittee, and to thank him for his never-failing courtesy and cooperation with the minority side, and to extend the same greetings to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty], the author of the bill.

Mention was made earlier about this legislation being a foot in the door. We ought to acknowledge that the foot is already in the door to the extent of several billions of dollars by way of programs dealing with problems of the elderly people in our population.

One of the purposes of this legislation is to try to coordinate and correlate already existing multibillion-dollar programs and bring about a little more efficiency and better direction.

Mention was also made of the danger of duplication between what is authorized in this bill and what has been previously authorized in the poverty programs and in similar programs. Let there be no doubt about it, there is a very distinct danger of duplication.

One reason why I consulted with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent] and the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty] about an amendment which I shall offer later was to bring about as much coordination as possible among programs, those initiated at the State and Federal levels in this bill and those authorized through the Federal poverty program and any other programs.

The effect of two of these amendments will be to provide that before any contracts or grants for whatever purpose can be consummated, the approval of the appropriate State agency will be required. Therefore, these amendments hopefully will help to avoid to some degree, at least, the duplication of present efforts in this field.

Mention was also made of the fact that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is anything but enthusiastic about this proposal. I believe the record will show that he is less than enthusiastic and probably opposed to it, especially the proposed reorganization within the Department he heads. We should accept his attitude as prima facie evidence that there is anything wrong with the proposal. In fact, I think it is a healthy sign. The Congress in this instance is showing a bit of independence and demonstrates that it is possible for Congress to act without always taking directions from the other end of the avenue.

I have been here 4 years now. I cannot recall another piece of legislation that has gotten this far on the floor of the House of Representatives which did not actually originate in the White House. So I think this is a historic amendment. We can take a little bit of pride in the fact that Congress is showing some initiative in the legislative field.

I want to compliment my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent] on the success our subcommittee has had on a couple of measures. The bill dealing with school problems in Puerto Rico went through without objection, and now it looks as if we are going to have as good success with this bill. I certainly hope so.

I noticed with delight that my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent], has introduced a farm bill which I am in accord with. The Committee on Agriculture this morning had a very, very brief chance to discuss it and similar measures. I want to wish my colleague from Pennsylvania every bit of success with his farm bill. I hope it is going to equal the success I am sure he is going to have with this bill.

The purposes of the bill have been adequately presented. The only additional item I should like to call to your attention is the statement of objectives that appears on pages 2 and 3. Reading this statement more carefully than was the case when the bill was before the committee, I discovered that the language seems actually to commit the Congress in blood, so to speak, to very sweeping objectives stated. I am sure no one, certainly not the author of the bill, intended that this legislation would commit the Congress to undertake full responsibility to achieve the goals set forth.

So for this reason at the appropriate time I will offer an amendment to soften the language of the bill so it will not be quite as apparent that the Congress is authorizing services and programs to bring about the stated goals objectives.

I think it is appropriate that we show a concern for the problems of the elderly citizens and that we participate with the States in helping to study these problems.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3708, the Older Americans Act of 1965, is the culmination of years of expert study initiated under President Eisenhower and carried forward by his successors. This legislation represents a sound, realistic response to the multiple needs of the substantial and growing segment of our population of citizens over the age of 65.

This legislation creates a central place at the Federal level for concentrating statistics and for coordinating programs for the aged. This new center, the Administration for Aging, within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, will administer grants and develop, conduct, and arrange for research and demonstration programs in the field of aging; provide technical assistance and consultation to State and local governments; prepare and publish educational materials dealing with the welfare of older persons; gather statistics in the field of aging; and, generally, will stimulate the most efficient use of all available resources and services.

The bill also authorizes funds for a 5-year period for programs to help our older citizens. The major part of these funds would be used for grants to the States for community planning, demonstration projects, training of personnel, and related problems. A smaller percentage of the money would be used for grants to public or nonprofit private agencies for the same sort of work.

The special problems of our 18 million older citizens merit permanent attention at the Federal level. I am pleased to support this legislation, which is the product of bipartisan cooperation in dealing with an urgent national need.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Patten] such time as he may require.

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Chairman, when Robert B. Meyner was Governor of New Jersey, the division of aging was created in our State in 1957.

I am familiar with that program, because it was under my jurisdiction as New Jersey secretary of state. Mrs. Eone Harper is doing a fine job directing the program and I am proud to inform the House that the division is of tremendous help to the senior citizens of New Jersey.

The recommendations made by the White House Conference on the Aging, and also by the President, are incorporated in this necessary and meritorious bill.

I believe very strongly that all levels of government—local, State, and Federal—should provide the vigorous leadership needed to help our senior citizens live a healthier, longer, and happier life.

The senior citizens of this Nation—which consists of almost 19 million persons—are one of our most valuable assets. Unfortunately, they are often taken for granted—or ignored.

The Older Americans Act, sponsored by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. Fogarty], would help our senior citizens in such vital fields as good physical and mental health, housing, employment, community activities, freedom and independence through individual initiative, and several others.

I am confident that this program would succeed and benefit not only our senior citizens, but also our Nation.

I also believe that if we do the right kind of job for our older people under the numerous opportunities this program presents, the benefits—physical, mental, spiritual, and financial—will exceed the cost.

If this bill is enacted, the United States would indeed be a more healthier, happier, wealthier, and compassionate Nation.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to congratulate my colleagues on the passage of H.R. 3708, better known as the Older Americans Act.

This act, as we know, will help older persons by providing limited grants to the States for community planning, research, and demonstration. It will also establish training projects for sound and efficient implementation of the act.

These gains, by themselves, would make the act worthy of passage. But what makes the act particularly noteworthy to me is that it removes Federal programs for our older people from the Welfare Administration and puts them under a new agency, known as the Administration on Aging, also in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It means more than just the creation of another agency. It represents a breakthrough in enabling our senior citizens to retire in health, honor, and dignity after years of meaningful contribution to our economy.

I particularly want to emphasize the words honor and dignity. Too often, as we well know, many senior citizens have been reluctant to take advantage of the services available because of their uneasiness over seeking out an agency which includes the word "welfare" in its title. Considering the onus this word has come to have in the public mind, we can hardly blame them.

Now, hopefully, this barrier will be lowered and 18 million older adults will be able to take advantage of opportunities for independent and purposeful living in a manner that will reaffirm our belief in the concept of the inherent dignity of the individual.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3708. We have before us today a remarkable measure—an enlightened contribution to the letter and spirit of the Great Society.

For too long we have let our elderly citizens live in neglect and loneliness. Every so often, the Congress passes measures designed to improve their material condition. Every so often programs are proposed in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Every so often private organizations representing the interest of the elderly succeed in arousing the conscience of the country to the special and compelling needs of older Americans.

And then, for a while, the concerns of the aged return to the area of neglect where so many of our social problems wait for attention.

The legislation before the House today will make certain that our attention to the elderly will not be cursory and erratic.

By establishing an Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, this bill will set up a permanent office of concern for the aged—designed to anticipate as well as alleviate needs.

We ought to realize that the needs of our elderly citizens are not static. They develop in conjunction with the development of the entire society. It would be irresponsible and remiss for the Government not to recognize this truth. For it is a sobering fact that the problems of an old person do not allow for tardy replies and late solutions.

H.R. 3708 attempts to introduce into the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an office designed to promote comprehensive planning for the aged. Such planning will make sure that the contributions of the Federal Government are not disparate and disorganized.

Such planning should attempt to coordinate programs which provide for income benefits, health services, housing facilities, leisure activities, employment opportunities and so on. Only with such coordination can we assure that the good life we hope to promote for the aged will reveal systematic and interdependent benefits. This coordination will involve the sort of planning that can only be accomplished by a Federal agency with full financial resources and the authority to supervise the full cooperation of all relevant organizations, public and private, local and national.

The measure's request for funds is modest. Its goals are idealistic yet practical. Its spirit is that of the Great Society. It should be passed without delay.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, the problems confronting both our younger and older citizens are among the most critical facing any Americans today. This last week we passed a long-needed and farsighted bill to improve the educational opportunities of many of our children. Today we are offered a significant opportunity to improve the future prospects of many of our older Americans.

The problems of our aged and aging are not limited to a single area. If they were, solutions might be easier to find. They are not limited either to the more than 18 million persons in this country today who are 65 and over. These problems are of concern to the many young people with aged parents to support; to the middle aged who find employment opportunities closing to them; and to those who are about to step over the threshold into the new and often uneasy world of retirement.

These problems range the entire span of our daily existence. They include health care, housing, employment, income, and the productive use of time.

In the area of medical care, studies show that our senior citizens go to the hospital more frequently and stay longer than their younger neighbors; that their physical activity is limited by six times as much disability as the rest of our population; and that their annual medical bills are twice that of persons under 65, although their average annual incomes are only half as high.

In the area of employment, data developed by the U.S. Department of Labor provides ample evidence of discrimination because of age, and of the irrelevant nature of such discrimination. This discrimination is not only degrading for the able individual, it is a severe and unwarranted loss to our economy and to our society as well.

The average annual income received by aged couples is half that of younger two-person families. Almost half of those over 65 and living alone receive $1,000 or less a year, and three-fourths receive less than $2,000 a year.

A far greater proportion of our senior citizens live in inferior housing than is true of the houses occupied by younger people. According to the 1960 census, one-fourth of those aged 60 and over did not have households of their own but lived in the houses of relatives, in lodging homes or in institutions. Of the remainder, over 30 percent lived in substandard housing which lacked a private bath, toilet or running hot water or was otherwise dilapidated or deficient, and many others lived in housing unsuitable or unsafe for elderly people.

During the last 65 years the life expectancy of Americans has increased from an average of 49 to 70 years. But these and other sobering statistics make it clear that our remarkable scientific achievements prolonging the life span have not been translated into effective human achievements. It is not enough for a great society merely to have added new years to life—our objective must also be to add new life and new purpose to those years.

The primary responsibility of seeking solutions to these grave problems quite properly rests with State and local governments, with private organizations, and individual citizens but because the problems are nationwide they entail a Federal responsibility as well.

This legislation, Mr. Chairman, will enable us to meet that responsibility. It quite properly recognizes that the problems of older people are not isolated; that they are in fact closely related and intertwined. And it will enable us to coordinate our efforts and mount the comprehensive plans which are essential if we are to be effective in this field.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this legislation.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3708, one of the most important measures to be considered in this session of the 89th Congress.

Since 1900, the number of persons in this Nation over the age of 65 has risen from about 3 million to almost 18 million in 1965. This, I think, gives substance to the claim that the number of senior citizens merits a separate agency of the Federal Government to handle their needs.

Two years ago, the late John F. Kennedy sent this first Presidential message ever given to the Congress on the problems of the aging, indicating clearly, the fact that the problems of the older Americans was reaching serious proportions.

In this message, the late President noted that the average income received by couples over 65 was half that of younger couples and that half of those individuals living alone after 65 have an income of $1,000 a year or less. Three-fourths, he pointed out, of the latter bracket receive less than $2,000 a year. How much more convincing argument do we need?

Several investigations have been conducted by committees of both Houses of Congress and by Presidential study groups as well. Each of these study groups has underscored the need for action to coordinate and strengthen the various programs for the aging.

The basic purpose underlying this bill is to provide cohesiveness to the many programs for the aged which at present are administered by various agencies whose responsibilities cut across jurisdictional lines. Further, this bill will provide more leadership in this area than can be accomplished under the present system of administration.

H.R. 3708 would set up a separate agency, the Administration on Aging, to handle the various problems which beset our senior citizens.

This agency could provide a vital service by functioning, on the one hand as a line agency of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in administering departmental programs, and, on the other hand, a staff agency preparing statistics and performing research into the problems of the aging.

The Administration set up by this bill would be headed by a Commissioner appointed by the President, subject to confirmation by the Senate. The Administration would be on a par with the Social Security and Welfare Administrations.

Further, the bill sets up a 16-member Advisory Committee on Older Americans with the Commissioner on Aging as the Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, the need for this bill has been amply demonstrated. There is no question about the number of people involved nor about their need. An impressive case has been presented for the passage of this bill. I strongly urge passage of H.R. 3708. Our senior citizens deserve, at very least, this much consideration from us.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to lend my support to H.R. 3708—the Older Americans Act of 1965. We are spending billions of dollars a year to develop our natural resources and I consider our people to be the best of our natural resources. We need to be concerned with a most precious and largely untapped human resource—the skills and experience of our senior citizens.

I am therefore glad to see that the legislation before us today recognizes this problem. Only a cruel society takes the best out of a man for 65 years and then abruptly consigns him to an occupational scrap heap. Why should we herd these Americans into senior citizen compounds where they are forced to live out their remaining years in sustained idleness? Do we contend that President Kennedy's stirring inaugural challenge—"ask what you can do for your country"—applies only to Americans under 65? I think not.

We must find ways and means to draw upon the skills and knowledge of older persons for our benefit as well as theirs. A beginning has already been made. Many companies have started gradual retirement programs which permit a worker to reduce his activities over a period of years. The contribution of elder Americans has also been recognized and proven in Federal programs such as the Peace Corps. Undoubtedly the program of demonstration grants authorized by the bill now before us will come up with many new ideas for realizing the full potential of our senior citizens.

This bill, Mr. Chairman, will establish a separate agency within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to concentrate upon the problems of the aging. The bill will authorize $6.5 million in the next fiscal year for grants to State and private institutions. These funds will be used to develop programs that will meet all of the needs of our senior citizens, including those of health, welfare, housing, employment, meaningful activity, and participation in community affairs.

Mr. Chairman, in 1951 I introduced a resolution calling for a special committee to study the problems of the aging. Since then, we have had numerous studies, committee reports, White House conferences and the like. The time now is for action. We must build into our machinery of government, a permanent agency charged with the job of finding solutions to the problems of the elderly. We already have huge bureaucracies addressed to the problems of the farmer, the veteran, or the businessman. Surely the needs of the elderly are no less compelling. I therefore urge my colleagues in support of this important bill.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to express my full support for the Older Americans Act of 1965, which I hope will be known as the McNamara-Fogarty Act. This bill is the product of long study and dedicated work by my good friend, the senior Senator from Michigan, PAT MCNAMARA, and by my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island, Representative JOHN E. FOGARTY.

I want to commend these two distinguished Members of Congress for their work on this much-needed legislation, which would create an Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

As a member of the House Committee on Education and Labor, I supported the McNamara-Fogarty bill in committee meetings, and I urge its approval by the House of Representatives.

There are some 18 million senior citizens in our country, and their social and economic problems have gone unrecognized for too many years. This bill will enable the Federal Government to begin an immediate program to study these problems and seek solutions to them.

The Administration on Aging, proposed in this bill, would serve as a clearinghouse of information on problems of the aged and aging; it would administer grants provided by the act; promote research and gather statistics in the field of aging; publish educational material dealing with the welfare of older persons; provide technical assistance and consultation to State and local governments, and seek more effective use of existing resources and facilities.

I speak to you today to urge your support of the Older Americans Act of 1965. This legislation presents us with an opportunity to serve America's elderly, a group who often find their later years less than happy and more than bitter.

The problems of aging have been too little considered in this young Nation. We have been so concerned with our national coming of age that the maturity of a large segment of our population has been virtually ignored. In this modern society, for example, scientific and technological innovations have granted many of the elderly immunity from the diseases and chronic ailments that once cut short the life span. But this precocious technology has not given us the answer to one very important question: How do we assure that a longer life will be a fuller life, free from the pressures and fears caused by the fact of being old? Are we granting added years to people's life spans only to allow them to live them out in bitterness, deprivation, and loneliness?

This legislation which we consider today proposes to create an agency called the Administration of Aging to study the problems of the elderly and to propose and support solutions to these problems. To achieve this purpose, the Administration would be empowered to award grants to States for community planning, demonstration programs and personnel to serve the elderly and seek to alleviate the hard conditions under which many of them live. Public and private organizations are also eligible to receive grants for this purpose.

With a growing number of older citizens in the population, we can no longer afford to ignore their welfare. We can no longer cherish the illusion of old age as peaceful, golden years. We can no longer be blind to the problems and the adversity that confront older citizens just because they are old.

The Older Americans Act of 1965 will speak for the interests of aged citizens. For example, the aged of this richest of all nations constitute a large proportion of the poverty stricken. There are 6.8 million heads of families over age 65 in this country. Half of them have incomes of less than $3,000 annually. And half of those with incomes below $3,000 support themselves and their families on less than $1,000 yearly. One cannot afford dignity, health, and honor on this income. One cannot afford to grow old gracefully on $1,000 or less a year.

The elderly also lack other important elements in their old age. They can generally not afford the amount and intensity of medical treatment they need. Older Americans need twice as much health care as the average citizen, yet they are in little position to afford this care. Older Americans lack adequate housing, community services tailored to their needs, and a respect for their capacities and abilities as well.

We have not used the talents and skills of the aged as we should. Elder citizens are discriminated against when they seek employment; they are not encouraged to use the experience they have gained through their long lives to serve the community and to help each other. This is an area where change is needed. This is an area ripe for experimentation. For this is not only a program to give aid to the elderly. There is much we hope to gain from them as well. The demonstrations and grants under this legislation could show us many ways in which we can utilize the powers of the elderly.

The Older Americans Act is an essential adjunct of the Great Society. The problems of the elderly should be a matter of deep concern to a nation which feels rich enough to assure a full life for all of its people. We must have a focus for the elderly, a spokesman within the Government. The Older Americans Act fills these needs and I urge that we give it our full support.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as supporting my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY], and his bill H.R. 3708 because I want it known I am in favor of its enactment. I feel it is extremely important to provide Federal funds for, first, community planning and services; and, second, research, training, and demonstration grants to enable the States and local communities to provide better services.

I would like to have added to H.R. 3708 the Federal grant provisions of my bill H.R. 4409 which permits the construction and operation of senior activity centers or, as an alternate, I would like to see early enactment of this additional important legislation, which will make it possible for our older people to enjoy more meaningful, useful, and independent lives in their later years.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I wholeheartedly support H.R. 3708, the Older Americans Act of 1965. I think that this legislation is long overdue and should be an integral part of a comprehensive program of assistance to our older citizens. I trust that, within the next few weeks, we shall pass a comprehensive medical assistance program for our older citizens. In the future, perhaps the data and knowledge made possible through H.R. 3708 will help to diminish patterns of employment discrimination based on age.

The Older Americans Act establishes an Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, headed by a Commissioner. It would provide a new departure in development of assistance to the elderly by coordinating programs now in existence; arranging for research and demonstration projects; collecting data, and giving technical assistance to State and local governments for demonstration projects to aid the aging.

This bill authorizes modest grants to the States for programs designed to deal with the problems that are unique to the elderly, and also authorizes grants to public or nonprofit private agencies for research, demonstration projects, and training of special personnel.

Finally, it calls for the establishment of a 16-member Advisory Committee on Older Americans.

The sums of money in this bill are not so great that we can reasonably look for any dramatic improvement in the life of our older citizens. The legislation really looks to development of a body of information and of new techniques for providing programs for the aging. If our effort is successful over its 5-year term, we must anticipate that there will be new requests for Federal, State, and municipal programs to effectuate the recommendations that should flow from these studies. It is at that point that our elderly citizens will really reap the benefits of the bill we are considering today.

I am gratified that two of the objectives of the bill are to help our older people in their "pursuit of meaningful activity within the widest range of civic, cultural, and recreational opportunities," and in their quest for "freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives." These objectives, coupled with the other aims of the bill—which look to development of programs dealing with the income of retired people and housing and health services—promise a more balanced approach to a severe social problem.

I have long been concerned about the fact that, at best, most of the existing programs for the elderly have been designed only to extend their lives and to maintain and protect their physical health. I am not satisfied with a world in which retirees have only the steady diet of television, movies, chess and checkers to fill their hours. They have earned the right to an opportunity to participate in more dynamic activities, compatible with their physical limitations.

The inability to pursue active employment does not mean that the retiree has lost all physical facility or is ready simply to vegetate. I look forward to a society in which the man or woman nearing retirement can anticipate new activities and a rewarding life. Retirement should be a promise—not a threat. I think this bill is a notable start in achieving that goal.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my particular approval of the actions of the House of Representatives today in passing H.R. 3708, the Senior Citizens Act of 1965.

Because of my belief that such legislation was necessary, I have myself introduced a similar measure, known as the Senior Citizens Act of 1965.

While the aged, to some extent, have always had difficulties with housing, health care, and employment, these problems have become of acute national concern in recent years because the number of older Americans has risen sharply, and continues to rise.

According to census statistics, the population of the United States has increased 2½ percent since 1900. At the same time the population of those 65 years old and older has increased six times.

It is estimated that the number of persons over 65 increases by 1,000 each day. By 1980 they will number nearly 25 million.

My own State of Wisconsin provides an excellent example of projected increases in this segment of our society. In 1961 there were some 412,000 persons over 65 in Wisconsin.

In 1970, according to estimates, there will be 482,000 such persons in the State, marking a 20-percent increase in just 10 years.

These figures indicate the danger that existing programs to assist the aged soon may become inadequate or outmoded.

The Older Americans Act, in my opinion, is a modest start toward solving some of the problems which beset our aged.

This legislation authorizes Federal project grants to the States, to local communities, and to private nonprofit groups for the study and improvement of programs intended to assist older persons in securing—

Proper medical care and nutrition.

Equal opportunity to find gainful employment which they are physically and mentally able to perform.

Adequate housing within their means.

Retirement planning and counseling and, where necessary, rehabilitation and assistance.

Assistance in achieving fuller, richer lives through participation in the life of their community.

Mr. Chairman, I was proud to have supported and voted for the legislation before the Congress today. It will be a concrete step toward making the lives of our senior citizens more fruitful and rewarding.

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I was proud to have the opportunity to support H.R. 3708, the Older Americans Act of 1965. In my judgment, with approval of this bill we will be entering upon a new era of security and happiness for our older citizens.

Earlier this year I had the privilege of introducing H.R. 674, the Senior Citizens Act, which has substantially the same provisions as this bill we considered. So I was particularly happy to support H.R. 3708.

This measure represents the essential first step in achieving our objective of assuring older citizens of full participation in all the benefits and pleasures of American life.

Under H.R. 3708 there will be established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a new operating agency, the Adminstration on Aging. This action has long been overdue. Up to now responsibility for dealing with the complex and myriad problems of our senior citizens has been dispersed through numerous Government departments and agencies. There have also been complicated interrelationships between Federal and local programs, as well as between governmental agencies and private organizations.

A high-level agency giving complete attention to the problems of our aged will enable us to most effectively develop and coordinate efforts to solve them.

The 5-year program of grants to the States and to public and nonprofit agencies will be of significant help in developing the community programs which President Kennedy, in his special message in 1963, called "the heart of our program for the elderly."

While the primary responsibility for caring for and working out the problems of our senior citizens rests with State and local governments, with the new Administration on Aging and the grant program we can provide the leadership and what I would consider "seed money" to attack these problems.

The policy we have outlined declares that the Nation's older people deserve adequate retirement income, the best possible health, suitable housing, restorative services, opportunity for employment without discrimination, and meaningful activity. A most important element of this policy, however, is that it recognizes the responsibility of governments at all levels to secure these needs for our senior citizens and at the same time emphasizes that they are entitled to "freedom, independence, and the exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives."

Mr. Speaker, very soon we will take the next, and undoubtedly the most major, step to carry out this policy when the House acts on the bill to provide a landmark health benefits program for the aged within the social security system. We have within sight a program we have sought for years, one vital to achievement of the goals we have determined essential for our older Americans. The President has rightly termed the Ways and Means Committee action "an historic one."

At long last we are beginning to act to meet the needs of those who have given so much of themselves in the development of our great country.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Chairman, the increasing number of elderly people in our communities reflects a profound change in the composition of our population. In 1900, life expectancy at birth was 49 years; today, it averages over 70 years.

But, as President John F. Kennedy said:

> It is not enough for this great Nation to have added new years to life—our objective must be to add new life to those years.

In establishing an Administration within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, this bill recognizes the need for a high-level agency that will command the respect and pay full attention to the needs of our elderly, so that the social and economic problems of nearly 20 million aged citizens can receive the attention they deserve.

For many years, the office handling aging affairs has moved from one HEW department to another—with wasteful results. It will also be more efficient and less expensive to have two or three fewer levels of bureaucracy through which to pursue the useful aims of this program.

Among these aims are an adequate income; the best possible physical and mental health; suitable housing; full restorative services, opportunity for employment without age discrimination, retirement in health, honor, and dignity; pursuit of meaningful activity; efficient community services when needed, immediate benefit from proven research knowledge; the free exercise of individual initiative.

It would seriously handicap these programs to seek to operate them from a base subsumed under the Welfare Administration which is where current aging affairs are located. Old people dread being on welfare. They do not want to be led or served by the Welfare Administration—Federal, State or local—unless, as a last resort they have to go on old-age assistance.

The number of our citizens over 65 continues to increase at the rate of nearly 1 million a year. In the first half of the 20th century there were 3 million over 65, representing 4 percent of the population; today, the nearly 20 million represent 10 percent of the population; in 15 years, 1 in every 4 citizens will be 65 or over.

The provisions of H.R. 3708 will permit this House to take proper steps to meet the challenge of the future. This bill gives the problems of our older Americans a high priority within the Federal Government. It will enable us as a nation to build a better standard of life for our aged as well as enable them to achieve a useful and more meaningful role in a society which owes them much and can still learn much from them.

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 3708, introduced by the gentleman from Rhode Island, Representative JOHN FOGARTY, is one of the most all-inclusive and satisfactory pieces of proposed legislation in the field of aging to come before this House.

I rise to support H.R. 3708 because I believe this proposed legislation takes a major step in moving the sometimes ponderous bureaucracy of the Federal Government toward efficient management and practical programs in the field of aging affairs.

There are plenty of things about the attitude of all elements of our communities toward the elderly which cannot be legislated. Their place and participation in society, for example, and their health and dignity.

But isolation and misery can be prevented or reduced. We can provide the opportunity and means for proper food, clothing, and housing, for productive employment or voluntary service, for insuring that society can catch up with science.

All levels of government have the responsibility—in cooperation with private organizations and individuals—to act vigorously to improve the lot of our aged.

This bill encompasses many programs to pursue these goals, but most significantly it starts out with investing the entire program with proper dignity by setting up a special Administration on Aging within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

This will be of enormous help to the Secretary of the Department, it will add great prestige to concept of serious programs of benefit to our older people. Our urbanized and industrialized way of life has often removed useful and satisfying roles which the elderly played in the smalltown family life of an earlier American era.

But we must see to it that the skills and talents of our older people are not discarded. The bill H.R. 3708 will help older Americans toward a more meaningful life.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

I want to take a minute or so just to say that as chairman of this committee I have had the utmost cooperation from the minority side, and the ranking member particularly, the gentleman from Illinois, the Honorable PAUL FINDLEY, who has been very cooperative and helpful. Every suggestion that he has made to me and to others on the committee, I found to be constructive, rather than the usual type of a delaying nature and of a destructive nature. I think all of us have worked together, and I assure the gentleman from Illinois while we have had two successes, I have a third bill, as he knows, in the Committee on Agriculture. It is a well-known rule on the farm that you do not get a crop from all the seed you plant. Some of it falls on foul ground. So I will just do the best I can with the two that I have.

However, at this time, Mr. Chairman, if no more time is required for debate, I want to thank all of those who have helped us in this work on this legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Older Americans Act of 1965".

TITLE I—DECLARATION OF OBJECTIVES: DEFINITIONS

Declaration of objectives for older Americans

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds and declares that, in keeping with the traditional American concept of the inherent dignity of the individual in our democratic society, the older people of our Nation are entitled to, and it is the joint and several duty and responsibility of the governments of the United States and of the several States and their political subdivisions to enable our older people to secure equal opportunity to the full and free enjoyment of the following objectives:

(1) An adequate income in retirement in accordance with the American standard of living.

(2) The best possible physical and mental health which science can make available and without regard to economic status.

(3) Suitable housing, independently selected, designed and located with reference to special needs and available at costs which older citizens can afford.

(4) Full restorative services for those who require institutional care.

(5) Opportunity for employment with no discriminatory personnel practices because of age.

(6) Retirement in health, honor, dignity—after years of contribution to the economy.

(7) Pursuant to meaningful activity within the widest range of civic, cultural, and recreational opportunities.

(8) Efficient community services which provide social assistance in a coordinated manner and which are readily available when needed.

(9) Immediate benefit from proven research knowledge which can sustain and improve health and happiness.

(10) Freedom, independence, and the free exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their own lives.

Definitions

SEC. 102. For the purposes of this Act—

(1) The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(2) The term "Commissioner" means the Commissioner of the Administration on Aging.

(3) The term "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Guam, and American Samoa.

(4) The term "nonprofit institution or organization" means an institution or organization which is owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual.

TITLE II—ADMINISTRATION ON AGING

Establishment of Administration

SEC. 201. (a) There is hereby established within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Administration to be known as the Administration of Aging (hereinafter referred to as the "Administration").

(b) The Administration shall be under the direction of a Commissioner on Aging to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Functions of office

SEC. 202. It shall be the duty and function of the Administration to—

(1) serve as a clearinghouse for information related to problems of the aged and aging;

(2) assist the Secretary in all matters pertaining to problems of the aged and aging;

(3) administer the grants provided by this Act;

(4) develop plans, conduct and arrange for research and demonstration programs in the field of aging;

(5) provide technical assistance and consultation to States and political subdivisions thereof with respect to programs for the aged and aging;

(6) prepare, publish, and disseminate educational materials dealing with the welfare of older persons;

(7) gather statistics in the field of aging which other Federal agencies are not collecting; and

(8) stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services for the aged and aging.

TITLE III—GRANTS FOR COMMUNITY PLANNING, SERVICES, AND TRAINING

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 301. The Secretary shall carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years, a program of grants to States in accordance with this title. There are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $8,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law, for—

(1) community planning and coordination of programs for carrying out the purposes of this Act;

(2) demonstrations of programs or activities which are particularly valuable in carrying out such purposes;

(3) training of special personnel needed to carry out such programs and activities; and

(4) establishment of new or expansion of existing programs to carry out such purposes, including establishment of new or expansion of existing centers providing recreational and other leisure time activities, and informational, health, welfare, counseling, and referral services for older persons and assisting such persons in providing volunteer community or civic services; except that no costs of construction, other than for minor alterations and repairs, shall be included in such establishment or expansion.

Allotments

SEC. 302. (a)(1) From the sum appropriated for a fiscal year under section 301 (A) the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa shall be allotted an amount equal to one-half of 1 per centum of such sum and (B) each other State shall be allotted an amount equal to 1 per centum of such sum.

(2) From the remainder of the sum so appropriated for a fiscal year each State shall be allotted an additional amount which bears the same ratio to such remainder as the population aged sixty-five or over in such State bears to the population aged sixty-five or over in all of the States, as determined by the Secretary on the basis of the most recent information available to him, including any relevant data furnished to him by the Department of Commerce.

(3) A State's allotment for a fiscal year under this title shall be equal to the sum of the amounts allotted to it under paragraphs (1) and (2).

(b) The amount of any allotment to a State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year which the State notifies the Secretary will not be required for carrying out the State plan (if any) approved under this title shall be available for reallotment from time to time, on such dates as the Secretary may fix, to other States which the Secretary determines (1) have need in carrying out their State plans so approved for sums in excess of those previously allotted to them under subsection (a) and (2) will be able to use such excess amounts for projects approved by the State during the period for which the original allotment was available. Such reallotments shall be made on the basis of the State plans so approved, after taking into consideration the population aged sixty-five or over. Any amount so reallotted to a State shall be deemed part of its allotment under subsection (a).

(c) The allotment of any State under subsection (a) for any fiscal year shall be available for grants to pay part of the cost of projects in such State described in section 301 and approved by such State (in accordance with its State plan approved under section 303) prior to the end of such year or, in the case of allotments for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, prior to July 1, 1967. To the extent permitted by the State's allotment under this section such payments with respect to any project shall equal 75 per centum of the cost of such project for the first year of the duration of such project, 60 per centum of such cost for the second year of such project, and 50 per centum of such cost for the third year of such project; except that (1) at the request of the State, such payments shall be less (to the extent requested) than such percentage of the cost of such project, and (2) grants may not be made under this title for any such project for more than three years or for any period after June 30, 1972.

State plans

SEC. 303. (a) The Secretary shall approve a State plan for purposes of this title which—

(1) establishes or designates a single State agency as the sole agency for administering or supervising the administration of the plan, which agency shall be the agency primarily responsible for coordination of State programs and activities related to the purposes of this Act;

(2) provides for such financial participation by the State or communities with respect to activities and projects under the plan as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe in order to assure continuation of desirable activities and projects after termination of Federal financial support under this title;

(3) provides for development of programs and activities for carrying out the purposes of this Act, including the furnishing of consultative, technical, or information services to public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations engaged in activities relating to the special problems or welfare of older persons, and for coordinating the activities of such agencies and organizations to the extent feasible;

(4) provides for consultation with and utilization, pursuant to agreement with the head thereof, of the services and facilities of appropriate State or local public or nonprofit private agencies and organizations in the administration of the plan and in the development of such programs and activities;

(5) provides such methods of administration (including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis, except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, and compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods) as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan;

(6) sets forth principles for determining the priority of projects in the State, and provides for approval of such projects in the order determined by application of such principles;

(7) provides for approval of projects of only public or nonprofit private agencies or organizations and for an opportunity for a hearing before the State agency for any applicant whose application for approval of a project is denied; and

(8) provides that the State agency will make such reports to the Secretary, in such form and containing such information, as may reasonably be necessary to enable him to perform his functions under this title and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

The secretary shall not finally disapprove any State plan, or any modification thereof submitted under this section without first affording the State reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing.

(b) Whenever the Secretary, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of a State plan approved under subsection (a), finds that—

(1) the State plan has been so changed that it no longer complies with the provisions of subsection (a), or

(2) in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any such provision,

the Secretary shall notify such State agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this title (or, in his discretion, that further payments to the State will be limited to projects under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure), until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply. Until he is so satisfied, no further payments shall be made to such State under this title (or payments shall be limited to projects under or portions of the State plan not affected by such failure).

(c) A State which is dissatisfied with a final action of the Secretary under subsection (a) or (b) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which the State is located, by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary, or any officer designated by him for that purpose. The Secretary thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or to set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently, but until the filing of the record, the Secretary may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Secretary as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Secretary shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Secretary's action.

Costs of State plan administration

SEC. 304. From a State's allotment under section 302 for fiscal year, not more than 10 per centum or $15,000, whichever is the larger, shall be available for paying one-half (or such smaller portion as the State may request) of the costs of the State agency (established or designated as provided in section 303(a)(1)) in administering the State plan approved under section 303, including the costs of carrying on the functions referred to in subsection (a)(3) thereof.

Payments

SEC. 305. Payments under this title may be made (after necessary adjustment on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments, as the Secretary may determine.

TITLE IV—RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Project grants

SEC. 401. The Secretary is authorized to carry out the purposes of this Act through grants to any public or nonprofit private agency, organization, or institution and contracts with any such agency, organization, or institution or with any individual—

(a) to study current patterns and conditions of living of older persons and identify factors which are beneficial or detrimental to the wholesome and meaningful living of such persons;

(b) to develop or demonstrate new approaches, techniques, and methods (including multipurpose activity centers) which hold promise of substantial contribution toward wholesome and meaningful living for older persons;

(c) to develop or demonstrate approaches, methods, and techniques for achieving or improving coordination of community services for older persons; or

(d) to evaluate these approaches, techniques, and methods, as well as others which may assist older persons to enjoy wholesome and meaningful living and to continue to contribute to the strength and welfare of our Nation.

Payments of grants

SEC. 402. (a) To the extent he deems it appropriate, the Secretary shall require the recipient of any grant or contract under this title to contribute money, facilities, or services for carrying out the project for which such grant or contract was made.

(b) Payments under this title pursuant to a grant or contract may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine.

TITLE V—TRAINING PROJECTS

Project grants

SEC. 501. The Secretary is authorized to make grants to or contracts with any public or nonprofit private agency, organization, or institution for the specialized training of persons employed or preparing for employment in carrying out programs related to the purposes of this Act.

Payment of grants

SEC. 502. (a) To the extent he deems it appropriate, the Secretary shall require the recipient of any grant or contract under this title to contribute money, facilities, or services for carrying out the project for which such grant or contract was made.

(b) Payments under this title pursuant to a grant or contract may be made (after necessary adjustment, in the case of grants, on account of previously made overpayments or underpayments) in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine.

TITLE VI—GENERAL

Advisory committees

SEC. 601. (a)(1) For the purpose of advising the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare on matters bearing on his responsibilities under this Act and related activities of his Department, there is hereby established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an Advisory Committee on Older Americans, consisting of the Commissioner, who shall be Chairman, and fifteen persons not otherwise in the employ of the United States, appointed by the Secretary without regard to the civil service laws. Members shall be selected from among persons who are experienced in or have demonstrated particular interest in special problems of the aging.

(2) Each member of the Committee shall hold office for a term of three years, except that (A) any member appointed to fill a vacancy occurring prior to the expiration of the term for which his predecessor was appointed shall be appointed for the remainder of such term, and (B) the terms of office of the members first taking office shall expire, as designated by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare at the time of appointment, five at the end of the first year, five at the end of the second year, and five at the end of the third year after the date of appointment.

(b) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to appoint, without regard to the civil service laws, such technical advisory committees as he deems appropriate for advising him in carrying out his functions under this Act.

(c) Members of the Advisory Committee or of any technical advisory committee appointed under this section, who are not regular full-time employees of the United States, shall, while attending meetings or conferences of such committee or otherwise engaged on business of such committee, be entitled to receive compensation at a rate fixed by the Secretary who appointed them, but not exceeding $75 per diem, including travel time, and, while so serving away from their homes or regular places of business, they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by section 5 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Administration

SEC. 602. (a) In carrying out the purposes of this Act the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to provide consultative services and technical assistance to public or nonprofit private agencies, organizations, and institutions; to provide short-term training and technical instruction; to conduct research and demonstrations; and to collect, prepare, publish, and disseminate special educational or informational materials, including reports of the projects for which funds are provided under this Act.

(b) In administering their respective functions under this Act, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to utilize the services and facilities of any agency of the Federal Government and of any other public or nonprofit private agency or institution, in accordance with agreements between the Secretary concerned and the head thereof, and to pay therefor, in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be provided in the agreement.

Authorization of Appropriations

SEC. 603. The Secretary shall carry out titles IV and V of this Act during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the four succeeding fiscal years. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $1,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, such sums may be appropriated as the Congress may hereafter authorize by law.

Mr. DENT (during the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS OFFERED BY MR. FINDLEY

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have three amendments at the Clerk's desk and ask unanimous consent that they be considered en bloc.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. FINDLEY: Page 2, line 10, strike out "enable" and insert in lieu thereof "assist".

Page 14, insert after line 24 the following:

"(c) The Secretary shall make no grant or contract under this title in any State which has established or designated a State agency for purposes of section 303(a)(1) unless such agency has approved such grant or contract."

Page 15, insert after line 19 the following:

"(c) The Secretary shall make no grant or contract under this title in any State which has established or designated a State agency for purposes of section 303(a)(1) unless such agency has approved such grant or contract."

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, the first amendment that was read is self-explanatory.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FINDLEY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Chairman, after discussing the amendments with the committee and those on the committee at the table here, and with the sponsor of the act, we see no objection to the amendments and the committee accepts the amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, since the gentleman from Illinois now in the well is the oldest Member of this body in point of accumulated years, I trust there will be no question raised as to his qualifications to speak on the pending legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I might need the time to unfold fully my reflections, and therefore I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am proud that I will be 83 years old next month.

I have felt a little chastened, however, as I have listened to the problems of the aged being discussed and analyzed. I do not like to think of them as problems. I like to think that for all of the aged—and that includes this youngster of almost 83—what is ahead is a world of promise and of richness, and not of problems, and one does not reach the western slope merely to look back over his shoulder.

I have asked for this time because I am concerned. This is a good bill. It is one of the good works of that messenger of God on earth, the gentleman from Rhode Island, JOHN FOGARTY. I believe JOHN FOGARTY has done more for mankind than any other man I have known in my lifetime. This is one of his good works.

I know the gentleman from Nebraska is a fine and able legislator. He raised a question about the promise of this legislation, the objective, the language of the bill that promises an abundant life for the aged. What is wrong with that? What is wrong with a fair compensation for the aged? What is wrong with opening the door for a new, a fuller, a richer life for all the aged?

Oh, youth of America, you have much on your conscience, as have I, who once was young. You have been so anxious to get ahead. You could not wait. You have been so anxious to reach out and take the jobs and the offices. How many hearts you have broken, how many lives you have put in shambles, how grievous the mischief you have wrought by compulsory retirement systems that forced into unwanted idleness by an arbitrary rule of age all, one and all, just because they have reached an age after which you in your self-esteem said they were worthless and unfit.

Yes, you lawyers want to be judges before your time. So in some States you have laws passed that after a certain age a person cannot be a judge. Some of our greatest judges have been 90 and past. That you know but try to forget.

Well, they did not do that in Illinois. Thank God for the Bar Association of Chicago and the lawyers of Chicago who every time they are asked to vote their rating of the judges place on top the judges who are old in years and experience and rich in knowledge. Judge Hugo Friend will be 88 or thereabouts when his present term expires, and he is one of the most respected and able judges in Chicago and in Illinois. I am told that everytime the Chicago bar takes a poll the names of Judge Friend and others of advanced years top the lists.

Some of the newspapers are saying there should be an age limit on service in the Congress of the United States. One-tenth of American citizens are past the age of 65, yet some newspapers and some people are saying they should have no representation in the Congress of the United States. I wonder if they understand the meaning of democracy.

Yes, the issue was raised against me last November. Perhaps someone got tired waiting for me to die. I do not know. Someone said to me: "BARRATT, when you are getting senile, will you know it?" "Oh," I said, "Of course I will know it. Whenever I split an infinitive, I will know I am getting old."

Then some of the newspapers which had previously supported me, fine newspapers, said, "BARRATT O'HARA has been a pretty good Congressman, but he is getting pretty old. Why, he is 81 and soon he will be 82, and he talks about running again in 1966; and then, my goodness, he will be 84, and he is going to run 2 years after that. We have to stop it."

Well, I am going to run in 1966. I am going to run in 1968. Now, I am not making any plans ahead of that, but I hope I will keep going on.

You know, when I was a young fellow, Blaine's book "Twenty Years in Congress" was the talk of America. I read every word of it, still have the old volume in my library and now and then reread some of the pages. I resolved then if I ever went to Congress I was going to stay here as long as Blaine did, and I was 67 when I reached here.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Certainly I will yield to my good friend.

Mr. FINDLEY. As a colleague of the gentleman from the great State of Illinois, I want to wish you many years of health, happiness, and service.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank my good and able friend from Illinois, and I appreciate his words from the bottom of my heart.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I yield to the great and beloved Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. As a matter of fact, the gentleman from Illinois is the youngest Member of the House that I know of. The gentleman is looking ahead 10, 15, 20 years in terms of public service, in terms of his outlook on life, and in terms of his relationship to his fellow man. The gentleman is young because he is young in mind. That is the important thing in terms of public service.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. I thank the Speaker. Mr. Chairman, I am going to take advantage of the Speaker, although I should not do this, but he has laid himself wide open. If I am to have any contest next year, I am going to ask Speaker McCORMACK to come out and save the day for me.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do want to get this in the RECORD. The issue of age was raised in my last campaign. These downtown newspapers, and mind you they had been my friends and I deeply respected them, all said that O'HARA was too old. Ordinarily newspaper endorsements carry weight. This was especially true in the last election when there was so much scratching because of the Presidential situation. Frankly, I was worried. No one wants to be carried by his ticket. Yet this was the end sought by this strategy. If I ran way below my running mates someone figured my nomination in 1966 would be more difficult. I did not know what was going to happen to me, but I wished the people to decide. In reality they were voting on BARRATT O'HARA and the age issue forced upon them. I think you will be interested in the official figures in my congressional district. President Johnson got a majority of 66,000. Now, mind you, the President got 10,000 votes that no other candidate got. In other words, 10,000 people voted just for the President. I am humbly grateful that the voters gave me the largest majority of any one of the candidates next to our great President of the United States. And in this I found a rebuke by the voters of the injection of the vicious poison of discrimination on the issue of age.

Here, Mr. Chairman, is a tabulation of the official vote in November of 1964 in the Second Congressional District of Illinois:

Official returns, 1964 election, 2d Congressional District

For President:	
Johnson	117,012
Goldwater	50,493
Johnson majority	66,519
For Congress:	
O'HARA	107,795
Scannell	52,416
O'Hara majority	55,379
For state's attorney:	
Ward	107,618
Bickley	53,484
Ward majority	54,134
For Lieutenant Governor:	
Shapiro	106,581
Altorfer	54,223
Shapiro majority	52,355
For secretary of state:	
Powell	102,992
Hoffman	55,359
Powell majority	47,633
For State auditor:	
Howlett	102,189
Kirby	57,891
Howlett majority	44,298
For attorney general:	
Clark	102,532
Sandquist	58,577
Clark majority	43,945
For recorder of deeds:	
Olsen	100,923
Schall	57,882
Olsen majority	43,041
For clerk of the circuit court:	
McDonough	100,318
Kucharski	58,886
McDonough majority	41,431
For coroner:	
Toman	99,467
Osmanski	59,651
Toman majority	39,816
For Governor:	
Kerner	100,726
Percy	64,759
Kerner majority	35,967

Many Republicans who supported President Johnson supported Percy for Governor, hence the reason for the difference in the gubernatorial majority.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Surely. I yield to my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman that I go by the saying you are only as old as you feel, and so far as the gentleman in the well is concerned, he is still a very young man.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. In such presence and living in the perfume of such rich friendship, I feel like sweet 16.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DADDARIO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3708) to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as "Administration on Aging" pursuant to House Resolution 284, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 394, nays 1, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—394

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashley
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—1

Martin, Nebr.

NOT VOTING—38

Ayres
Baldwin
Bonner
Byrnes, Wis.
Casey
Clausen, Don H.
Cooley
Dague
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Flood
Fulton, Tenn.
Giaimo
Gray
Hanna
Hawkins
Hébert
Howard
Jones, Ala.
Kastenmeier
Love
MacGregor
Michel
Pepper
Pickle
Purcell
Reid, N.Y.
Roosevelt
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Thompson, La.
Todd
Toll
Walker, Miss.
Watkins
Wilson, Charles H.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Cooley with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Dague.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Smith of California.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Todd with Mr. Reid of New York.

Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Love with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Kastenmeier.

Mr. Everett with Mr. Gray.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.

Mr. Pickle with Mr. Giaimo.

Mr. Purcell with Mr. Hanna.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Hawkins.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend and revise their remarks and to include extraneous matter on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight, Thursday, April 1, 1965, to file a report on the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill for 1966.

Mr. CONTE reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Appropriations may have until midnight, Friday, April 2, 1965, to file a privileged report on the second supplemental appropriation bill, 1965.

Mr. BOW reserved all points of order on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

WATER RESOURCES PLANNING ACT

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 309 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

> *Resolved,* That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1111) to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and pending that, Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 309 provides for consideration of H.R. 1111, a bill to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The purpose of H.R. 1111 is to encourage and make possible the prudent development of the Nation's water and related land resources through sound, comprehensive, and coordinated planning. To accomplish this purpose, the bill establishes a Cabinet-level Water Resources Council in the executive branch; authorizes the President to establish river basin planning commissions when and where they are needed; and provides for financial assistance to the States for water resources planning.

The Council will be composed of the Secretaries of the Interior, the Army, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. It will have the responsibility for guiding the Nation's planning effort in the water resources field and keeping the President and the Congress informed on the water needs of the Nation.

The river basin commissions will be established upon the basis of need and at the request of the States involved or of the Council. They will prepare and keep up to date comprehensive, integrated joint plans for Federal, State, interstate, local, and nongovernmental development of water and related land resources.

The financial assistance to the State for which H.R. 1111 provides would be on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis, and would enable them to play a more effective role in planning the development and conservation of their water and related land resources.

Existing laws will not be modified or superseded by this legislation, and commissions will not be established where adequate planning is already being accomplished by some other means.

The cost of carrying out the provisions of title I of the bill is estimated at from $120,000 to $150,000 per year. The cost of the assistance program to the States would be $5 million per year for 10 years, assuming that the full amount authorized is appropriated. The cost of administering title III is estimated at $300,000 to $400,000 per year for the 10-year period. The cost of carrying out the provisions of title II should not exceed $5 or $6 million per year at the peak, with the maximum number of commissions, and not more than $2 million after the basin plans have been completed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 309.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order under 1 hour of general debate and an open rule, the Water Resources Planning Act, which calls for an appropriation on a 5-year basis of around $7 million a year to establish a Water Resources Council and also certain commissions within different river basin areas. Our water resources have become extremely important to the people of this Nation. There has been complete support of this bill, as I understand it, within the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs which reported it out unanimously and in the Committee on Rules. I believe this is a worthy piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1111) to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a Water Resources Council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning, and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members of the House have permission to revise and extend their remarks on this piece of legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1111, with Mr. DADDARIO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman and Members of the House, this legislation comes before you today after 6 years of study and consideration in the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee. Long before that, basinwide comprehensive planning of the Nation's water resources was a matter of study in the executive branch and by various commissions and committees. The approach set out in H.R. 1111 was recommended in the 1951 report of the Water Resources Policy Commission appointed by President Truman and in the 1955 report of the Presidential Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy appointed by President Eisenhower.

Legislation similar to H.R. 1111 was developed in my committee and introduced in 1959. We studied the legislation in cooperation with representatives of the Bureau of the Budget and other affected Federal agencies. Out of these cooperative studies came the legislative proposal of President Kennedy which was introduced and considered in the 87th Congress, but on which there was no final action in either body. H.R. 3620 and S. 1111 of the 88th Congress were revised versions of President Kennedy's proposal, reflecting particularly suggestions made by representatives of the States that river basin commissions be truly Federal-State in character and that river basin planning be a partnership venture with not only the Federal Government and the States participating but including also local agencies and private enterprise. S. 1111 passed the Senate in the 88th Congress and was reported by my committee. In the rush for adjournment last year, the legislation was not called up in the House. With minor changes, the legislation we bring before you today is the same as that approved by the Senate and by my committee last year. A similar bill, S. 21, has already passed the other body.

During the period that the committee studied this legislation, we worked very closely with the States in order to be sure that the rights of the States and local interests are protected and that the planning, development, and use of our available water resources is a joint venture. Initially, many of the States were concerned that this legislation would give the Federal Government additional authority and jurisdiction over water distribution and use. This, of course, was never intended and legislation that we have developed makes this abundantly clear. Not only would the legislation not give the Federal Government expanded authority for water resources development but, through the 10-year financial assistance program provided until title III, it will permit the States to play a more important and effective role in planning the development and conservation of their water and related land resources. From a position of disinterest or downright opposition, the States have become the most ardent supporters of this legislation. Last year the committee received the personal endorsement of 23 Governors and the endorsement of many additional State water agencies and groups. The legislation has the full backing of the Council of State Governments, which represents all the States.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1111 will make possible the prudent development of the Nation's water and related land resources through sound, comprehensive, and coordinated planning. It involves planning only, and the construction and operation of works of improvement will continue to be the responsibility of appropriate Federal agencies, States, municipalities, local groups, or nongovernmental entities. The present responsibilities of the Federal Government or of the States relative to the development, control, or use of water will be neither expanded nor diminished by the enactment of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, no major responsibility of the Federal Government is so divided as that relating to the conservation, development, and utilization of the Nation's water and land resources. With water use in this Nation expected to double in the next 20 years and as our limited water supplies dwindle in relation to our national needs, choices among alternative uses will have to be made. It is, therefore, becoming increasingly important that some effective means be established for water resources management which will achieve maximum beneficial use of our limited supplies. We believe that comprehensive planning as contemplated by H.R. 1111 is a key element in resolution of the problems of water supply and water-use requirements which face this Nation in the years ahead, and that the enactment of this bill will materially assist the Nation in developing, managing, and utilizing its basic water supply to best meet demands as they arise both in terms of quantity and in terms of quality.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers], chairman of the subcommittee responsible for the hearings and study given to this legislation, will discuss provisions of H.R. 1111 and the committee amendments thereto.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor].

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, there can be no doubt in the minds of any of us that the handling of water resources development by the United States, by the States and by private enterprise is very confusing. We see this right here on Capitol Hill. Legislative authority in this field is split between the Interior Committee, the Public Works Committee, the Agriculture Committee, the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, the Commerce Committee, and even sometimes the Foreign Relations Committee. Executive authority is split in just as confusing fashion between the Bureau of Reclamation, the Corps of Engineers, the Soil Conservation Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, the State Department acting through the American section of the International Boundary and Waters Commission, the Geological Survey, the Weather Bureau, the Public Health Service, and heaven knows what other agencies.

I have hopes that enactment of H.R. 1111 will help to overcome some of the executive confusion, even if it does not help much here on the Hill. I have hopes, too, that it will serve to bring into focus, river basin by river basin, who is doing what and who ought to be doing what. For we have not only the problem of interagency and intercommittee confusion here in Washington, we also have confusion between what is properly State and what is properly Federal, between what is properly local and what is properly State, between what is properly nongovernmental and what is properly governmental. To sort out all these factors and to produce workable and feasible plans for our river basins is going to be a monumental task. H.R. 1111 can help get that job done, and, therefore, I am all for it.

For there is no question about the necessity of utilizing our water resources to their utmost. I am not going to burden the Record at this point with detailed figures on how our population is increasing, on how much water it takes per man per day in our economy, on the number of hundreds of gallons it takes to make a ton of steel, on how our rivers are getting polluted and how we need to freshen them up and keep them clean, on the growing demand for water for recreation, on how much food our people will need a quarter of a century from now, and how there will not only—I say this hopefully—be no farm surplus but a great need to increase the acres we use for agriculture and, therefore, a need for draining our wet places and irrigating our dry places.

We all know, even without statistics, that these things are so and we all know that to meet the challenge of the future is going to take the best efforts of all of us, including, particularly, the millions of citizens who are in what we grandiloquently refer to as the private sector of our economy. For make no mistake about it—great as Hoover Dam is as an engineering achievement, millions of acres more have been irrigated through private efforts than through Federal expenditure, and great as is Grand Coulee Dam, the private power companies outproduce the Federal power installations many, many times.

I am laying stress on this for one reason—to call attention to the importance of a number of committee amendments to H.R. 1111 that I am proud to have been associated with. I refer, for instance, to the rewritten statement of policy on page 2 of the bill with the emphasis it lays on private enterprise and on the contribution which "individuals, corporations, business enterprises, and others concerned" can make to comprehensive and coordinated planning of our water resources. I refer again to page 9 of the bill where the reference to Federal, State, and interstate plans for the development of water resources has been enlarged to include "local and nongovernmental plans" for the same. And I refer to page 22 of the bill where the Water Resources Council is enjoined to approve State programs for comprehensive water resources planning only if they make "adequate provision for coordination with all Federal, State, and local agencies, and nongovernmental entities having responsibilities in affected fields."

With the full cooperation of private enterprise and without full attention being paid to what it can and should do, the best river basin plans that could be provided would be sadly lacking. I am glad that the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has recognized this by the adoption of the amendments I just referred to.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is enough to indicate my feelings on H.R. 1111. I urge its passage by the House.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania tell the committee how this bill ties in with the water resources research bill which we did pass last year? Was that a companion piece of legislation to this?

Mr. SAYLOR. That was a companion piece of legislation to H.R. 1111. This will try to direct its attention principally to the executive branch of the Federal Government to see to it that the Federal agencies will eliminate duplication.

Mr. JONAS. I was just getting to that. Will the gentleman in the well assure the Committee that there is no overlapping in the two programs?

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to me?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. To the gentleman from North Carolina I would say that last year's water resource bill had to do with the study of water as a natural resource. This has to do with the planning for the collection and the capture and the use of the water and the spreading of it around to the various uses. There is no correlation insofar as the research and development effort and planning efforts are concerned, except they are both water programs.

Mr. JONAS. If the gentleman will yield further, they will complement each other instead of being in opposition?

Mr. ASPINALL. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Just how does this fit in now with the bill that apparently we are coming to fairly soon, S. 4, the so-called water pollution bill?

Mr. SAYLOR. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin if the House will pass S. 4 as reported by the House Public Works Committee, and when the House and Senate conferees go to conference, if the House will be able to maintain its position there will be absolutely no duplication in these two bills, and they will complement each other and help solve this water problem.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to associate myself with the statement just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR]. It is necessary that we remember if we are not careful in this matter of water pollution under the jurisdiction of HEW, and the committee that handles it in this body as well as the other body, we will get ourselves into a duplicatory situation that it would be difficult for us to disentangle ourselves from.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I want to thank the gentleman, chairman of the committee, for his answer. I gather an inference from a statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that there may be a difference in the Senate and House versions with respect to S. 4. The gentleman from Pennsylvania mentioned if we can sustain the House position. Are we to infer that the Senate version contains provisions that are duplicatory of the provisions of H.R. 1111?

Mr. SAYLOR. No. The Senate version will cause duplication as far as eliminating the States' right to participate. May I say from reading the report on S. 4 as reported by the House Public Works Committee, both majority and minority sides are to be complimented on the manner in which they took this very important problem and worked out a very excellent bill. The mere fact this committee worked its will and has reported such a good bill when they bring that bill to the floor of the House it should require the complete cooperation of Members on both sides so that when the House conferees go to conference they will be in a position to tell the Senate that they have unanimous support in the House of Representatives.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I take it that S. 4 in the form in which it has been approved by the Public Works Committee and the House does have the approval of the ranking minority member of the committee?

Mr. SAYLOR. It has my full support.

Mr. JONAS. I appreciate the gentleman's answer to the question I raised, the answer on the part of the gentleman from Pennsylvania as well as the gentleman from Colorado. It is important to have the record clear because nothing is more important than water, and it would be a mistake to have a half-dozen separate pieces of legislation on the subject. I wanted to be sure that there is no duplication, and that this bill now before the Committee would actually complement the bill we passed last year.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. REINECKE. I wish to ask the gentleman a question.

Title I, section 104, indicates that the report of the Council shall be transmitted to the President for his review, and transmitted to Congress. Section 204, title II, indicates that the report of the river basin commission, not the Council, but the commission, shall be submitted to the Governors or representatives of each State. Is it the intent of the committee that the report of the Council, the first part, shall also be submitted to the Governors or appointed representatives of the individual States as well as the President, or do the representatives of the States have to wait until the President has reviewed the report and referred the report to the appropriate agency before they will hear about those particular plans or proposals for the river basin?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Let me answer the gentleman from California this way: It is anticipated in the river basin commissions that the States participate with membership in these commissions. There will be the Federal members and also State members. Those river basin commissions in any report they make, they will make that to the Governors of the several States involved who are participating in the river basin commission aspect. Then, of course, this will also be made to the Council. The Council in turn will make the report on its recommendations to the President and the President in turn to Congress. The only way a river basin commission can be formed is by request of the Governors of the States or by the Council itself. There must be accord between half of the States affected before they can have a commission.

It is anticipated, let me say, and I think the committee understands this and I want the entire membership of the House to understand it, that this is all public information and that it will be available to the Governors of the States or to the water commissioners of the States or to anyone else interested in the States that are affected. Although there is no specification that this be submitted to the Governors, that is because this Council itself is a national organization rather than a State organization, and the matter is submitted to the President, but it will be available to the Governors of the States and to the appropriate officials of the States at all times.

Mr. REINECKE. I thank the gentleman. I wanted the clarification as to the members of the river basin commission. I appreciate the information the gentleman has given.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAYLOR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, the citizens of my district in Massachusetts and throughout New England this year find themselves once more at the mercy of the uncontrollable forces of nature. We are on the verge of the third drought year in a row—a circumstance that threatens to produce the worst drought problem in New England in over 70 years.

We have had neither enough snow this past winter nor enough rain so far this spring to produce more than a trickle in our reservoirs. Many of the reservoirs in Massachusetts right now are two-thirds empty, instead of being two-thirds full which would be the normal for this time of year. The ground water level is estimated at 2 feet below normal—this means 2 feet beyond the reach of root systems for trees and plants.

Our State officials over in Boston estimate that 5 inches of rainfall are needed before April 15 in order to bring the ground water level up to normal for the start of the growing season. They also estimate that 20 inches of rainfall will be needed to bring our reservoir in Pittsfield up to normal.

Our people are already hearing the warnings—a scant 6 months since they heard it last—to conserve water; to stop washing cars; stop watering the lawn; stop wasting water wherever possible. I do not have to tell you what this means on the very eve of the spring growing season. The restaurants in Massachusetts have already been advised to stop serving water unless their patrons request it. That may be good news for the dairy farmers, but not for their cows who must also have water.

These pleas have an all too familiar ring for me. They are being made on a statewide basis now by Governor Volpe and the officials of the Massachusetts Water Resources Commission. Community officials in my hometown of Pittsfield were making the same pleas and the same warnings last fall in the wake of one of the driest summers on record.

The Weather Bureau advises that there is small hope of the kind of drenching downpour we need in Massachusetts in the next few weeks. This means the prolonged dry spell which has already stretched over two parched years is entering a third year. Last year the mean annual rainfall throughout the State of Massachusetts was 10 inches below its normal 43 inches. Any farmer will tell you that a dry summer followed by a dry spring is bad news for crops.

It all adds up to the fact that Massachusetts faces a worse drought in the summer of 1965 than we had back in 1941. And the statisticians told us in 1941 it was the worst drought they had had in 50 years.

The odd fact of our drought problem is that the metropolitan areas will be the hardest hit from the point of view of human consumption. It is the areas that must depend on runoff—on surface water—that will suffer most. These are the people in the cities whose water must come from reservoirs. The people who rely on so-called ground water—from wells and springs—will not be hit as hard.

Of course the farmer takes small consolation from the fact that he can get a drink from the well out front while his crops are drying to dust in the fields out back.

The people of Massachusetts need help. And they need the help proposed in the legislation, H.R. 1111—the Water Resources Planning Act.

As I understand this act, it proposes some pretty thorough machinery for planning and executing State and areawide water conservation and storage programs. This hits at the very heart of our problem in Massachusetts. While we are prepared to make the necessary sacrifices to conserve water for vital requirements such as firefighting, sanitation, hygiene, and other necessities, this will not solve our basic problem. The answer lies in development of vast new water supply systems, new reservoirs, new conduit and ducting systems, new collection and storage facilities.

While New England has its drought problem, the question of adequate water resources is certainly not limited to any region of the country. It may be raining like crazy somewhere else but unless that rainfall is stored up and controlled, it will not quench the thirst of our growing population. We read and hear a lot about desalting processes to convert sea water to potable drinking water. Most of these involve expensive, complicated industrial methods; huge plants and and costly materials.

It seems to me a simpler approach is embodied in the spirit of H.R. 1111. A system of matching study and development grants, administered through appropriate State and local officials should provide the soundest solutions for each region of the country and by letting nature do most of the work—converting sea water to rainfall by her own peculiar evaporation, and running it into our reservoirs.

I urge my colleagues to give this legislation serious consideration, and to weigh its merits in terms of the future requirements for water in each of their districts as well as the consequences of the kind of severe drought we New Englanders are currently facing.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, as the distinguished chairman of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee has indicated, the purpose of H.R. 1111 is to encourage and make possible maximum use of this Nation's available water resources through basinwide, comprehensive, and coordinated planning. To accomplish this purpose, H.R. 1111 provides for establishment of a cabinet-level Water Resources Council, authorizes river basin planning commissions and provides financial assistance to the States for water resources planning.

The Water Resources Council will be composed of the Secretaries of Interior, Army, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The Council will have the responsibility for guiding the Nation's planning effort in the water field and keeping the President and the Congress informed on the water needs of the Nation.

The river basin commissions will be established upon the basis of need and at the request of the States involved or of the Council. They will prepare and keep up-to-date comprehensive, integrated joint plans for Federal, State, interstate, local, and nongovernmental development of water and related land resources.

The financial assistance to the States for which H.R. 1111 provides would be on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis, and would enable them to play a more effective role in planning the development and conservation of their water and related land resources.

Mr. Chairman, in order that Members may better understand what is involved in this legislation, I shall briefly explain it title by title.

The first three sections of the bill include a statement of policy and the effect on existing laws. Section 2 states as broad congressional policy the encouragement of the conservation, development, and utilization of water and related land resources on a comprehensive and coordinated basis with the cooperation of all affected Federal, State, and local agencies, as well as private enterprise and other nongovernmental entities. Section 3 makes it clear that this legislation is not to be construed as expanding or diminishing either Federal or State jurisdiction, responsibilities, or rights in the field of water resources development. Other disclaimers set out in section 3 relate to interstate compacts, the authority of the Congress to authorize and fund projects, the responsibilities of Federal officials, the jurisdiction of any international joint commission, and the jurisdiction of Federal and State courts over matters in controversy affecting water.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

Title I provides for the establishment of the Water Resources Council and defines its duties and responsibilities. As I have already indicated, the Council would be composed of the Secretaries of the Interior, Agriculture, Army, HEW, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The Chairman of the Council will be designated by the President. The heads of other departments and agencies will participate with the Council when matters affecting their responsibilities are being considered?

Section 102 requires the Council to maintain a continuing study of the water situation throughout the United States and to make recommendations with respect to policies and programs relating to the Nation's water needs. Under section 103 the Council will be responsible for establishing principles, standards, and procedures for Federal participation in the preparation of river basin plans. Section 104 requires the Council to review the comprehensive plans prepared by the river basin commissions and transmit them together with its recommendations to the President for his review and submission to the Congress. Section 105 gives the Council the administrative authority it needs to carry out its responsibilities.

The committee believes that, in addition to these basic responsibilties, the Water Resources Council will be an effective mechanism for bringing the agency heads together, for coordinated planning and resolution of interagency conflicts.

TITLE II—RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS

Title II provides for the establishment by the President of river basin water resources commissions. Section 201 describes the membership and the manner of organization, sets forth the duties of the commissions as well as their powers and administrative authority. The President may establish a commission upon the request of the Governor of one or more of the affected States or of the Council. Not less than half the affected States must concur. In addition, a commission involving the Upper Colorado River Basin or the Columbia River Basin could not be established without the concurrence of three out of four States specifically named in the legislation. The area which may be studied by a commission may consist of a region, a major river basin, or a group of related river basins.

The commissions will be responsible for coordinating Federal, State, local, and nongovernmental plans for the development of water and related land resources. They will also be responsible for preparing and keeping up to date a comprehensive integrated joint plan for the basin or area under study. The commissions will also recommend long-range schedules of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data and for the investigation, planning, and construction of projects.

Each river basin commission would be composed of a chairman appointed by the President, a representative of each Federal department or agency having a substantial interest, a representative from each State lying wholly or partially within the area to be studied and, where appropriate, representatives of any interstate compact commission and any international commission.

Section 203 includes language providing for the organization of the commissions, the provision for termination, and procedure for filling vacancies.

Section 204 sets out the duties of each river basin commission which include, first, conduct of studies and investigations; second, development of a comprehensive plan for the area studied; and third, the submission of such plan to the States and to the Council. If a consensus is not reached on all issues, full opportunity is to be afforded for the presentation of individual views.

Section 205 confers on each commission general administrative authority necessary for its study and preparation of plans.

Section 206 covers the compensation of members of the commission and section 207 provides for the sharing of the expenses of the commission between the Federal Government and the States. The Federal share of the commission's expenses would have to be approved by the Council. The commission is required to keep an accurate account of all receipts and disbursements, and these accounts are to be open for inspection by appropriate officials.

The river basin commissions will be established only where their need is clearly demonstrated. The language set out in title II makes it completely clear, as indicated by Chairman ASPINALL, that these are truly Federal-State commissions and that the planning effort will be a joint venture with not only the Federal Government and the States participating, but also local public agencies and private enterprise.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES

Title III authorizes annual appropriations of $5 million for a period of 10 years for grants to States to assist them in developing comprehensive water resources plans and in participating in the work of the river basin commissions. The States would be required to submit a proposed program to the Council for its approval and the Federal grant would be limited to not more than 50 percent of the cost of carrying out the program.

Allotments to the States would be made on the basis of population, land area, need for planning, and financial need of the respective States.

The State programs would be subject to continuous review and payments could be suspended if a State failed to properly follow through with the required work.

Section 305 provides the basis for making payments to the States and section 307 requires that records be kept relative to the use of the funds, and that they be accessible to the Council and the GAO. For purposes of this act, the term "State" would include the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

Title IV authorizes appropriations for titles I, II, and for the administration of title III. A ceiling is placed on the amount authorized to be appropriated under each title. The cost of carrying out the provisions of title I, which relates to the Water Resources Council, cannot exceed $150,000 per year. The cost of carrying out the provisions of title II, which relates to the river basin commission, cannot exceed $6 million a year or $750,000 a year for any single river basin commission. The $6 million estimate is based upon a maximum 10 or 12 commissions. The committee believes that five or six commissions is a more reasonable estimate of the number which may be needed.

The assistance program provided in title III, which would be for 10 years only, would be $5 million per year plus not to exceed $400,000 for administration.

The cost of this program would be more during the initial years when the basin plans are being developed. It is expected that the cost will level off after the 10-year study period at not more than $2 million per year.

Any discussion of the cost of administering this legislation would not be complete without pointing out the possibility of savings in effort and money which would result from coordinated planning. The committee believes substantial savings will accrue to the Federal Government due to elimination of duplication and waste among the Federal agencies involved in water resources planning.

Section 402 authorizs the Council to make rules and regulations for carrying out the provisions of the act. Section 403 authorizes the delegation of administrative functions and section 404 empowers the Council to utilize the services of officers and employees of other Federal agencies.

Mr. Chairman, the committee amended H.R. 1111 in several respects. I have already mentioned the language added which places a ceiling on the costs. I would like to mention two other changes. Language was added in several places in the bill to make it clear that comprehensive and coordinated planning of the Nation's water resources involves all segments of our economy—Federal, State, and local agencies as well as private enterprise and other non-Federal entities.

The committee modified the requirements for establishing a river basin commission in the Columbia River Basin so as to require concurrence by three of the four States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington. This places the Columbia River Basin on the same basis as the Colorado where, by language in the original bill, any commission involving the Upper Colorado River Basin would have to be concurred in by three of the four States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. In both instances, this language will protect the interest of the States primarily affected.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I want to reiterate that I believe we have developed legislation which will go far in encouraging and assisting best and maximum development of this Nation's water resources.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am happy to yield to my colleague from Colorado.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I understand one of the objectives of this is to permit the commission to hire independent consultants and that they do not have to rely entirely on Government engineers who may already be on the payroll although they may be called in for consultation.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. On page 16 of the bill at line 8, it reads as follows: "employ and compensate such personnel as it deems advisable, including consultants, at rates not to exceed $100 per diem."

I would like to ask the gentleman of the subcommittee if in his opinion the word "personnel" as therein used would make it possible for this commission to secure the services of professional or technical service firms?

Is the word "personnel" all inclusive, so that a corporation or a firm which might be employed could render work under that basis?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. It is the understanding of the chairman that the answer to the gentleman's question is in the affirmative. They could be employed under this provision, and it was so intended.

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. The firm itself could be designated under the word "personnel"?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes. I would anticipate that the services of many of the technical and professional firms particularly would probably be obtained under contract under other provisions of the bill, but if the services were needed on a consultation basis under the provision to which the gentleman is addressing himself, the answer would be "Yes."

Mr. ROGERS of Colorado. I thank the gentleman. I appreciate his comment.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the genleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I have listened with interest to the statement of the gentleman, and I can fully appreciate the need to give attention to this area. The gentleman and I and many others have been interested in watershed programs, flood control, flood prevention, and all other aspects of the problem.

Recently my attention was called to a bill which passed the other body having to do with pollution and providing for control and standards and other things. As I understand it, the Department of Agriculture was not represented in the control or in the setting of standards and things of that sort. Therefore, things could easily be fixed so that it would not be possible to produce any agricultural crops in this country, if carried to the *n*th degree.

I realize that this is a planning bill. I am not trying to put one department ahead of another, but I ask whether the gentleman believes all of those which have an interest in the public would be represented on any commission or with regard to any planning to carry out this program.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is exactly the case. Let me say to the gentleman from Mississippi, who has had such a deep interest in the water problems, that one of the difficulties we have had in this country and one of the things which makes this type of legislation so necessary has been the fragmentation of effort in the proper development of all water resources, especially the surface resources at hand, to prevent waste. We wish to work this out so that there will be a coordination of effort among the various departments and so that the President will have at his fingertips full knowledge, in order to make a recommendation to the Congress as to handling these problems.

Mr. WHITTEN. I thank the gentleman. I congratulate him for sponsoring the legislation.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS].

Mr. HARRIS. Like other Members, I wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the distinguished chairman of this great committee, and all members of the committee, for the attention and study they have given to this problem. I have listened with interest to the explanation.

I observe that there is no intention to interfere with any program already underway.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. HARRIS. In the explanation as to how the water conservation program might very well be carried out by recommendations under this program, there is, as the gentleman well knows, a program under the authority of the Congress and the work of the Corps of Engineers, involving certain projects by which water supply has been added. Pursuant thereto, water districts in various areas have been established by the laws within the various States as to the handling of water supply, and there have been arrangements with the Corps of Engineers, as an example, under some projects, by which contracts have been entered into in the carrying out of the programs. Some of these projects have been virtually completed and are, one might say, ready to operate.

In listening to the gentleman's explanation and the explanation of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member, I am led to wonder if there would be any conflict. Is there any way that this could interfere with the contracts which have been entered into between the water districts and the Corps of Engineers or the Department of the Interior, as the case might be, whichever agency might be involved?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I will say to the gentleman from Arkansas that it is the intention or was the intention of the author of the bill, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs that handled this bill that these conflicts would not be present and that there would be no conflict.

I would like to yield to the author of the bill, the chairman of the full committee, so he can make whatever statements he desires to make on this subject.

Mr. HARRIS. If the gentleman will permit me to make one additional comment, I understood from the gentleman—and it was confirmed by the distinguished chairman and the gentleman from Pennsylvania—that what brought this on was the fragmentation—I believe that was the word used by the gentleman—or the lack of coordination with everyone having their finger in the pie, so to speak. The purpose of this, I understood, is to bring them all together. Here are projects which have been already developed throughout the years. In recent years, I think in the 1957 or 1958 act, they provided for additional water supply by which certain areas and certain water districts could enter into contracts, and some have entered into them pursuant to authority of State law. I want to be sure there is no interference with these programs or, if there is, that there will be ample opportunity to carry out whatever was intended when it started.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I am going to yield to the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Colorado, the author of the bill, on this, and I think we will have an excellent answer from him.

Mr. ASPINALL. May I say to my friend from Arkansas there is certainly no intention here that there should be any interference whatsoever. It is basic to western water law, and I think to eastern water law, that you cannot upset the rights we are conveying anyhow. No matter what you tried to do. This is purely a planning operation. First you get your councils formed on a statutory basis so that the President has somebody there to whom he can say, as the gentleman from Texas pointed out, "You get them together." After that is done, then there is the question of forming the basin commissions. After that is done there is the provision for the granting of certain matching funds to help expedite the planning; not any development or any construction or any interference with any water right already in existence or anything like that at all. I see no chance at all for what the gentleman seems to have in his mind possibly taking place.

Mr. HARRIS. I thank the gentleman for his comment, and if the gentleman will yield further, I would like to ask an additional question.

It does seem to me that unless there is some overall authority in connection with these programs in the future I cannot see how this arrangement is going to be effective. It would seem to me—and the gentleman from Colorado probably knows more about this as to the details than I do, as well as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN], who just spoke—it seems to me we do have a Mississippi River Commission. That Commission has certain authority under the law. As I understand it, this bill would provide that the President may establish a commission for any river basin in the United States. Is that not true? The President may, on request of the Council, establish such a commission?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The Council can form these basin commissions, but the Governors of at least half of the States must concur in the formation.

Mr. HARRIS. If that be the case, these river commissions would have a similar responsibility, for example, as the Mississippi River Commission, which has been a part of our procedure over the years.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. It was discussed in the committee, let me say to the gentleman from Arkansas, and it is treated in the report, that there was no intention to interfere with present commissions or present interstate compacts or any other organization having to do with the development of these resources. I think whatever contracts are in existence today or whatever commissions are in existence today it is anticipated that this will be planning for the future. If there are to be any changes made or any interference with those contracts, it will be on a voluntary basis where the entire basin will be planned for future development to the point where the people who are now parties to these contracts or commissions will profit in the future. Rather than lose any rights, they will gain more.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, I do appreciate the study and the attention the committee has given to this. What gives me some concern is the establishment of all these councils and river commissions, and so forth, and they might have some State planning program and we would have a situation just as now when we are concerned with a Bureau of the Budget directive to all of these people developing these projects as to how they shall in the future carry out that development. We had the same proposition with the Bureau of the Budget directive back in the late forties or early fifties—I believe it was No. 847. We thought then and many of us still feel that that Executive order was contrary to what the Congress had provided and what was the law, and we are getting into another situation which the committee has been trying to straighten out for the last year or so.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. The gentleman understands that there is only one council.

Mr. HARRIS. But there are several commissions.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. There will be river basin commissions only in those areas that want to form these river basin commissions. I think it is anticipated that there will be probably 5 or 6 of those and at the outside it might go as high as 10 river basin commissions. But you now have the machinery to work in many of these areas which will be used, rather than a river basin commission. In other words, they would have a river basin commission only where it would serve a better purpose and where the States agree.

For instance, in the upper Colorado you would have a river basin commission formed and three of the four States must agree before a river basin commission can be formed. The same is true in the Columbia River Basin.

Mr. HARRIS. Or in the Red River Basin, I assume, in the gentleman's State and in my State and in Oklahoma, and they would have to agree to the establishment of such a commission; is not that true?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Half of the States affected would have to agree to the commission and the commission's recommendations, the gentleman understands, would not be binding. It would be a matter of development and planning and then the final encroachment, let us say, on water resources, if there were any encroachment, would be a matter for the legislative process later on.

Mr. HARRIS. I am perfectly satisfied with the gentleman's answer and I do not intend to indicate by these questions that I interpose objection. But I want to be sure that we will not find ourselves in the middle of certain developments and projects at this time by changing the signals again. That is what is happening.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his comments and his answers.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Bow.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to address a question, if I may, to the gentleman from Texas. The Susquehanna River originates in New York

State, as the gentleman knows, runs through my congressional district into Pennsylvania and Maryland and the Chesapeake Bay. Presently that river basin is being studied by the Corps of Engineers under a general survey resolution. It is also being studied by a group of private utilities, using their own funds; and also by an organization of private citizens known as the Susquehanna River Basin, of which the mayor of Wilkes-Barre, Mr. Frank Slattery, happens to be president. I am a dues-paying, card-carrying member of that association. It has spent a good deal of time and effort in preliminary planning on a river basin.

The committee has inserted by way of amendment some language in subdivision 1 of section 201(b) with respect to local and nongovernmental plans.

Is this the sort of thing that the committee is thinking about?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I would say that the answer would be "Yes"; that we had intended to include in here the participation by the nongovernmental groups that wanted to participate so there would be an optimum development of the resource itself.

Mr. ROBISON. And that a river basin commission, if one were created for our Susquehanna River Basin, might serve as a coordinating body and also be of some financial assistance to this independent group that is performing the same sort of work; is that correct?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes; and provision is made for the acceptance of grants or private contributions by the commission.

Mr. ROBISON. I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding.

I would like to say that I support this legislation. I believe it is very good legislation.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] 3 additional minutes.

Mr. BOW. I shall not take that amount of time.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to ask a technical question of the committee, and I would like to have the attention of the chairman of the committee, if I may.

Under your section 401 which is the authorizing appropriation on page 26, the bill as it is now written says there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $150,000 with respect to carrying out the provisions of title I of this act, $6 million annually to carry out the provisions of title II, and $400,000 annually for the administration of title III.

The question I have is whether the gentleman would object to our inserting on line 8 after "this Act," "not to exceed $6 million," and on page 9 after "and" insert "not to exceed" $400,000, so there would be no question of interpretation, since there is no question of interpretation as to the amount of money involved to carry out title I of the act; that is, not to exceed $150,000. But there might be some confusion on the question of the $6 million figure and the $400,000 figure.

Would the gentleman object to an amendment which would provide "not to exceed $6 million and not to exceed $400,000"?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. No, I would not.

Mr. BOW. I will offer that amendment.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. That is exactly what we mean.

Mr. BOW. I am quite sure it is what the gentleman meant, but I am always fearful where we have it in the one place for one title that it might be considered that there was a directive of the House that we appropriate up to $6 million, which might not be necessary.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. No. Let me say this in furtherance of the thought being brought out by the gentleman from Ohio: We on the Interior Committee know this as the "Haley amendment."

Any time there has been a bill before our committee with an open end appropriation our good friend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] has offered the amendment of "not to exceed" so many dollars.

Mr. BOW. I would be glad to yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY], but I think it should be in this language.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I have no objection to it and the chairman of the full committee advises me that he has no objection to it.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I shall not take very much itme.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize for the purposes of the legislative history that at the time of the hearings on this bill it was felt that this Council should address itself to a subject of vast national interest—and it does—and the bill does so indicate. My fear was that the Council—being composed of the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of the Department of the Interior, the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, and the Secretary of HEW—might deteriorate into one of these outfits where someone down about six levels below on the steps of the ladder actually performs the functions and duties of the Council. This fear was fed slightly by the fact that the only Secretary who came to testify on behalf of the bill was the Secretary of Interior. The other high officials sent their underlings. This was thrashed out in the committee, however, and I am satisfied that the necessary serious respect for the duties of the proposed Council does exist at the Secretary level and these offices mentioned in making up the Council.

I only hope in future years this Congress may continue to insist that the high-level attention be given by the Secretaries and the chairman of our committee that this deserves.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I want to rise in support of this legislation that is presented. I am not interested in the jurisdictional question, but I am well aware of the fact that we need to conserve this resource, both as far as our land and water supply is concerned and for human needs. I have operated for water on the knee, I have plumbed for water elsewhere in the human body—94 percent of the human body is made up of water, so it is obvious it is essential to all of us. I have also drilled for water in the land.

I wonder if the gentleman handling the bill on the minority or majority side would advise me, because I am interested also, since there are 11 impoundments of natural river waterfalls within a hundred miles of my hometown and county in southwest Missouri, if all of this is directed to big dam impoundments, whether it is under the Corps of Engineers, whether it is under public works, whether it is reclamation, or whether, indeed, much of it can under this coordinating bill—which I understand it to be—work along with Public Law 566 for upstream conservation of soil and water through the Department of Agriculture representatives, and whether or not it will address itself in its studies made possible in this bill to the general level of the water table, which is constantly going down into the outer crust of this old sphere?

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado for a reply to the question.

Mr. ASPINALL. I thank the gentleman from California. We have to go to the basis of the formation of the Council itself. We have included within the Council membership the Secretaries of Interior and Agriculture. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HILL] has mentioned direct reference to that operation, the Secretary of the Army, the Corps of Engineers, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. This provides for a study of all these matters affecting water within the areas which might be covered by a basin. We have nothing in this legislation, and it was never considered by the committee so far as impoundments or making of reservations are concerned; but we do feel in the planning operations whatever is necessary to bring about the ultimate optimun of the use of water would have to be considered by the Planning Commission and the Council.

Mr. HALL. In other words, if I may query the distinguished chairman from Colorado further, for those of us who believe that the ultimate in water conservation comes from storing it or sorting it at its recyclical effect on the earth would feel just as much in favor of that study, whether that be by group structure in this watershed or basin shed, or whether it was brought about by contour or terracing or any other water and soil process, as would those who are committed to and believe in impoundment?

Mr. ASPINALL. My answer would be "Yes," because those of us who are interested in this question of reservoir development are not only interested in that, we are also interested in underground water, we are interested in the transportation of water, water from trees and other places in the planned operation. The gentleman is right. The gentleman from Missouri is exactly right. This Council will have to pay rather close attention to how far you can go in detailed considerations.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. He has made the legislative record exactly as I would like to hear it.

I should like to add that I am in favor of this coordinating effort and I thoroughly believe that he gave an epitome of our future civilization, be it with or without a population explosion, retaining water with all of these developments, whether they are underground tunnels or whatever there may be, manmade or not, rather than washing our silt downstream and impairing our Nation's economy which was given to us by the Almighty.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOSMER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] for yielding to me. I am happy to support this legislation—H.R. 1111—the Water Resources Planning Act, and I commend the members of the committee for their careful consideration and wise recommendation of this proposal.

This bill makes it possible to employ, to a maximum, the talents of our many Federal, State and local agencies and officers who are concerned with the conservation of our water resources.

The establishment of river basin commissions will enable the various departments of our Federal Government, which, are concerned with our water resources, to coordinate their efforts and to join in long range and comprehensive planning for the best possible use of our existing water resources. This will include both surface and underground water sources and will afford appropriate recognition of the manifold uses to which our Nation's waters can be put.

While pure water is essential to sustain human life, there are a great many legitimate uses of water other than the human need to quench the thirst, to promote cleanliness and to receive treated human wastes. Water power, irrigation, industrial use of water, water transportation, and recreation all occupy their proper place in water resource planning. Indeed, the multiple use of our water resources and even the reuse of our waters are essential considerations in programs which may be adopted under this legislation.

It was my privilege to serve during the 88th Congress as ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Natural Resources and Power of the House Committee on Government Operations. In this capacity an opportunity was afforded for me to investigate the broad subject of water pollution and its effect on our Nation's water resources. The subcommittee conducted extensive investigations in most parts of the Nation and received constructive testimony from regional, State, and local water pollution control officials, as well as from various civic and public-spirited citizens.

The subcommittee prepared and issued various reports in behalf of promoting a more careful use of our waters and made numerous recommendations for abating various types of pollution. One conclusion that I reached was that there is a need for comprehensive planning of the use of our water within the various river basins and a need for increased coordination between the various Federal, State, and local water pollution control agencies.

The provisions of this bill (H.R. 1111) directed as they are toward a joint Federal-State effort, are consistent with my views for promoting a careful use of our water resources. I look for effective results from the enactment of this measure.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 1111, the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965, establishes a Water Resources Council in the executive department; authorizes the President to establish river basin planning commissions where they are needed; and provides financial assistance to the States for water resources planning.

The Council is to be composed of the Secretaries of the Interior, the Army, Agriculture, and Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission.

The river basin commissions are to be set up according to need, either at the request of the States concerned or of the Council itself.

Money provided to the States is to be furnished on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis.

This legislation has been urged at least since the administration of President Truman and reendorsed by every administration since then.

H.R. 1111 brings these recommendations to fruition and will enable a coordinated, cooperative approach to the problem of conserving our precious water supplies. At the present time, the Federal responsibility relating to conservation and water resources is one of the most chopped up and diversified of all Federal operations. This legislation will make it possible to pull all programs together, eliminate duplication, and achieve the maximum possible results.

I support H.R. 1111 and strongly urge its passage by the House.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dow].

Mr. DOW. Mr. Chairman, the Water Resource Planning Act, H.R. 1111, is a more remarkable piece of legislation than many bills of wider renown and greater outlay.

This bill touches in the broadest way the vital question of America's water resources in a program that is comprehensive for the Nation. Within its scope are plans that relate not only to conservation of our natural waters for myriad purposes, but also to the protection of our waters from further pollution.

These two considerations are of major concern nationwide. In my single district they are paramount considerations for three great rivers traverse the district or course along its borders. These are the Hudson, the Delaware and the Susquehanna. Every one presents acute problems in water conservation, flood control, and pollution.

Now, I further submit that the bill has to commend it still another notable fact. It is that the sums suggested in the bill for oversight upon these great waterways across our Nation, are small sums, are tiny sums, for achieving the great purposes intended. No one should scruple to grant this pittance of a few million dollars for the objective here before us.

But perhaps the most remarkable feature of the bill now offered, is the fact that it does for the first time in any bill I have seen, set a standard pattern for interstate agencies. The Nation is freckled with various interstate committees, commissions, authorities, and districts, all of them ad hoc, for the curing of specific problems. None of them fits a wider pattern or envisions conformance with a policy broader than the specific job to be done at a time and place.

To the great credit of the authors of this bill, let it be said that here we have the beginnings of a standard pattern for interstate coordination as well as State and Federal cooperation. This is obtained through the concept of river basin commissions which the new bill provides for along with standard practices for such commissions. I submit that this is a kind of pioneering in the sphere of government, just as it is a marked progression in the area of water conservation.

Here is a striking combination of advances in several ways. I do endorse this legislation and urge all others to do the same.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman from New York for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. KING].

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to speak in support of the Water Resources Planning Act.

It is traditional for a Congressman from my part of the country to have a great interest in the protection and development of water resources. Our statements concerning water are almost cliches, so often have we sung the refrain: Water is our lifeblood.

However, I am particularly happy that my position today is not that of a regional partisan, and that my remarks will not contribute to sectionalism.

The Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 is a national bill. It is designed to provide protection for all of our citizens. It recognizes the right and responsibility of the Federal Government to provide leadership when problems of planning the use of our resources transcend State lines. Yet the act recognizes the rights of States and regions and of private, nongovernmental groups of people whose interests deserve to be considered.

The committee hearings concerning this and related legislation considered over the past decade have established the need for "prudent development" of our water resources, through "sound, comprehensive, and coordinated planning."

The need for planning for optimum development of water and related land resources is universally acknowledged in our country. We are all well aware that our present use of 300 billion gallons daily will double in 20 years. We need more water. More urgent is the need for a more equitable distribution of the water we do have.

It is my conviction that this bill, when enacted, will dramatize the importance of the problem of water use, and that it can provide the machinery for the wise planning of water utilization. I am pleased that the machinery proposed for this legislation makes a distinction between the need for overall centralized, planning, and the need for localizing the solution to local problems.

Title I provides for establishment of a Water Resources Council composed of members of Cabinet rank.

The status of the Council will emphasize the high importance of water planning in the national interest and will provide machinery whereby agencies concerned with similar or overlapping problems can coordinate their planning responsibility. Duplication by and competition between agencies should be eliminated because of the Council's work.

Title II guards against overcentralization in water planning by providing for the establishment of commissions in the river basins and subbasins—usually at the request of the States involved—where such commissions are desired, and are felt to be in the national interest. It is in the regional commissions that much of the very important work contemplated by the authors of this bill will be done. Here will be collected the research data needed and here will be conceived and incubated plans to be presented to State legislatures and to Congress for action.

The bill recognizes too that planning is an ongoing process, that plans once conceived often must be revised and modified to keep them up to date.

One very appealing feature of this part of the act is that it visualizes a new era of Federal-State-local cooperation. It effects a decentralization of Federal power, and a renewal of constitutional federalism that many critics of our allegedly monolithic Central Government have long sought.

There is the Federal presence provided for in title II, but that Federal presence is regionalized, and is identified with the just desires of the States and local agencies.

I am not so naive as to expect the millenium at this juncture, but I do anticipate this to be a bold experiment in decentralization. The experiment deserves a trial. Local money, local ideas, local interests will have a fighting chance to be reflected in the arrangement contemplated in this bill. Cooperation and not dictation is the watchword.

I urge the passage of H.R. 1111.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Chairman, this measure represents further recognition by this body of the paramount importance of planning, on a regional and basic level, to meet the ever-mounting problems of water supply in our Nation.

While some may disagree as to detailed features of this bill, no one can properly question the urgency of the Nation's need for improved planning and cooperation between and among the States—and between the Federal Government and the States—in this important field.

I support H.R. 1111 and urge its approval.

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Chairman, it has been my privilege to serve on the Banking and Currency Committee for a little over 2 years under the able and dedicated leadership of the gentleman from Texas, WRIGHT PATMAN.

I was extremely pleased at the beginning of the 88th Congress to be appointed to the Banking and Currency Committee. This committee handles matters of the utmost importance to the Nation, and it has been a rewarding period of service.

It was my privilege to have served with the distinguished former member of the Banking and Currency Committee, the Honorable Albert Rains of Alabama. Mr. Rains' determination to find solutions to urban problems has been an inspiration to all his colleagues. His service on the Housing Subcommittee will provide guidance in this field for a long time to come. We shall continue to miss him.

As the Banking and Currency Committee enters its second century, its work will be increasingly significant. I am glad to be a part of it.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge approval of the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965, which would establish a Water Resources Council, river basin planning commissions, and also provide grants to States for water resources planning.

This is a multifaceted bill aimed at curbing one of America's most pressing problems—the pollution and waste of our most precious resource.

It has been pointed out by Senator PAT MCNAMARA, chairman of the Senate Public Works Committee, that the correction of pollution is much more difficult and costly than its prevention.

I have cosponsored Water Resources Planning Act as one of many Congressmen who have introduced identical proposals. I feel strongly that we must take action now to prevent further deterioration of our lakes and rivers.

This bill will bring about better coordination among Federal water agencies, and will stimulate joint planning between Federal agencies and State governments in solving the problem of pollution.

The League of Women Voters of the United States and many other organizations have lent their support to this important legislation. And I call upon the Members of this House to pass this much-needed and long-overdue legislation now. We cannot tolerate or explain further delay of a real solution to the pressing problems of water conservation.

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my vigorous support for H.R. 1111, the Water Resources Planning Act. This bill wraps up in one legislative package a number of ideas that have been developed over the past several years to improve the Nation's ability to deal with its water resources problems in the decades ahead.

Demands for water and water-related activities are rising inexorably toward an essentially limited supply. The population explosion, increasing urbanization, and industrial growth in the United States serve to overtax water supplies in many areas and cause pollution which decreases the value of the water we have. The Great Society provides more and more people with leisure time and enough money to permit them to seek water-based recreation. Conflicting demands on the same water resources thus create ever-increasing problems that must be coped with through the concentrated efforts of Federal, State, and local governments, and many segments of our private enterprise economy. The organizational pattern provided in this act will provide the framework for accomplishing this.

Title I of the Water Resources Planning Act establishes the Water Resources Council as a Cabinet-level coordinating agency of the Federal Government. The Council will be composed of the Secretaries of the Federal Departments of Agriculture, Army, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. Problems of water resource coordination are such that a similar group has, in fact, been operating on an informal basis for more than 20 years, as the Federal Interagency River Basin Committee from 1943 to 1954, and as the Interagency Committee on Water Resources from 1954 to the present. Additionally, under Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, there has been convened an Advisory Committee on Water Policy, or an ad hoc Committee of Cabinet Secretaries to deal with the responsibilities of the President for coordination of the activities of the many departments and agencies of the United States that have responsibilities in the field of water resources.

Under this act, the heads of these agencies will be brought together on a statutory basis, and provided with a professional staff. A great improvement in the efficiency of Federal activities in the water resources field can be expected to follow. This is a broad field, and the Federal Government has a large program scattered among many agencies. Larger programs will be needed in the future as the water situation becomes more stringent. The Council, by maintaining continuing studies and periodic assessments of the adequacy of water supplies in the United States to meet water requirements, will assure that the full resources of the U.S. Government are brought to bear on the problems, with minimum dilution of effort because of interagency differences of opinion and conflicts, that, in the absence of the Council, now have to go to the President for resolution.

Title II provides for the establishment of river basin commissions to coordinate the efforts of all responsible agencies in the preparation and keeping up to date of comprehensive plans for the development of water and related land resources. These will be Federal-State commissions, with Federal members appointed by the President, and State members appointed by the Governors of their respective States. The commissions thus will be patterned somewhat along the lines of the Delaware River Basin Commission created by the Delaware River Basin Compact in 1961, but will have responsibilities similar to those of the U.S. study commissions in the southeast river basins and the Texas basins. There have been many other types of river basin planning organizations since the idea was first broached in 1949 by the late Senator Robert S. Kerr, of Oklahoma, for the Arkansas-White-Red Basins. This bill incorporates all of the best and most recent thinking on the subject. The gentleman from Colorado, Congressman Aspinall, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, deserves a great deal of credit for title II, since congressional consideration of blanket authorization for creation of river basin commissions stems from provisions of a bill which he introduced in the 86th Congress, H.R. 3704. This was 2 years before the Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources, under the chairmanship of the late Senator Kerr, made its recommendation for coordinated river basin planning in 1961.

One of the most significant and important aspects of title II is that it sets up a mechanism for Federal, State, local governmental, and nongovernmental cooperation in the achievement of coordinated water resources plans. The water resources development tasks which lie ahead are so great that only by the mobilization of all interests can we assure that the job will be done.

In recognition of the fact that the States have an important role to play in the water resources planning field, and that some of them have inadequate resources for this purpose, title III of the Water Resources Planning Act establishes a matching grant program whereby Federal funds will be made available to assist them in comprehensive water resources planning activities. Inability of some of the States to respond adequately to previous attempts at coordinated Federal-State planning has held back some attempts to achieve coordinated planning in the past. This proposal to cope with this situation stems from a recommendation by Senator Kerr's Committee on National Water Resources, which reported in 1961. All of the programs and ideas covered by H.R. 1111 have been under intensive discussion since 1961. Largely through the efforts of such public-spirited bodies as the Interstate Conference on Water Problems, and the League of Women Voters, with its chapters in every State, this bill has been brought to fruition in the 89th Congress.

I believe it may well be the most important conservation legislation in this Congress. Problems of water supply and distribution, water pollution, flood control, increased use of bodies of water for recreation, the increasing pressure on fish and wildlife resources, all point to the fact that we must better organize our efforts to cope with these problems. This bill is the answer, and I wish to pledge my wholehearted support to its objectives, as well as to commend the distinguished chairman of the Interior Committee and his colleagues for their efforts in bringing the bill up for action at this time.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, H.R. 1111, the Water Resources Planning Act. The prerogatives of local, State, and basin entities are well protected and the national water resource interests greatly enhanced by this measure. The objectives of this bill, to make possible the coordinated and prudent development of the Nation's water and related land resources through sound and comprehensive planning, are extremely important. The Nation must achieve them.

In my remarks in the Record on February 4, I brought to the attention of the House—

That all sectors of American life are counting on a continuing and even substantial growth in our economy;

That to support this necessary growth, we assume that there will be enough natural resources to go around and fill the needs of our country and people;

That as of today I feel this to be an ill-founded assumption—we have no sound reasons for believing that our country's soil, water, timber, grassland, wildlife, and other natural resource needs will be adequately met in the future; and

That as a nation and as a government we are not pursuing a sufficient and deliberate course to meet these resource needs.

I continued by making reference to this bill, H.R. 1111, as a part of the required beginning in this country of a full-scale national effort of natural resource planning, coordination, development, utilization, and direction.

This measure, H.R. 1111, is truly a great stride forward in our national resource endeavor, but it must not be considered as a panacea for all of the policy and management ills besetting the Nation in this area.

I continue to be particularly concerned, as others of my colleagues are, with an ever-growing proliferation of natural resource activity and the development of diverse criteria for similar purposes within the Federal agencies; a lack of coordination between economic and social policy and natural resource policy; and most important, the entrenchment of separate interests within the agencies of the Executive and within the committees of the Congress which prevent the welding together of resources, economic and social policy, and which hinder the meaningful direction, purpose, and priority of natural resource endeavor.

We must follow up the step forward achievable through this legislation with further measures designed to develop the kind of coordinated direction to which I refer. In this connection I suggest the House examine H.R. 4430, a bill to declare a national policy on conservation development and utilization of natural resources, which I have introduced as a companion measure to S. 938 introduced by Senator McGovern and 15 of his colleagues in the other body.

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my wholehearted support for this measure which is so extremely important to the development of our Nation's vital water resources.

Through the centuries we have constantly faced the problem of developing and conserving this most precious of all our natural resources. Even today, with all the knowledge that we have, with all the facts at hand from countless studies and research programs, more than 1,100 billion gallons of water flows to the sea each day in the rivers of America.

Much work remains to be done—much planning for the many unforeseen problems of the future. The demand for water is increasing in even greater proportions than our population growth. Failure to develop our water resources will most certainly jeopardize our future and stunt our economic growth.

H.R. 1111 will go a long way toward increasing State participation in a coordinated water-planning program. It has the support of many groups concerned with water problems, and I am hopeful the Members of the House will pass the bill without delay.

We in Texas already are taking bold and imaginative steps to develop and conserve our water resources. Yet, we recognize the need for coordinating the work in our State with those on the national level; and I want to see my State extend a cooperative hand in this effort.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1111

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

Section 1. This Act may be cited as the "Water Resources Planning Act".

STATEMENT OF POLICY

Sec. 2. In order to meet the rapidly expanding demands for water throughout the Nation, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to encourage the conservation, development, and utilization of water and related land resources of the United States on a comprehensive and coordinated basis with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, and others concerned.

EFFECT OF EXISTING LAWS

Sec. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(a) to expand or diminish either Federal or State jurisdiction, responsibility, or rights in the fields of water resources planning, development, or control; nor to displace, supersede, or limit any interstate compact or the jurisdiction or responsibility of any legally established joint or common agency of two or more States, or of two or more States and the Federal Government; nor to limit the authority of Congress to authorize and fund projects;

(b) to expand, diminish, or change in any particular the authority or responsibility of any Federal or State official or officials, elective or appointive, in the discharge of the duties of his or their office;

(c) as superseding, modifying, or repealing existing laws applicable to the various Federal agencies which are authorized to develop or participate in the development of water and related land resources, or to exercise licensing or regulatory functions in relation thereto; nor to affect the jurisdiction, powers, or prerogatives of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, or of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

SEC. 101. There is hereby established a Water Resources Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") which shall be composed of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The Chairman of the Council shall request the heads of other agencies to participate with the Council when matters affecting their responsibilities are considered by the Council. The Chairman of the Council shall be designated by the President.

SEC. 102. The Council shall—

(a) maintain a continuing study and prepare a biennial assessment of the adequacy of supplies of water necessary to meet the water requirements in each water resource region in the United States and the national interest therein; and

(b) maintain a continuing study of the relation of regional or river basin plans and programs to the requirements of larger regions of the Nation, and of the adequacy of administrative and statutory means for the coordination of the water and related land resources policies and programs of the several Federal agencies; it shall appraise the adequacy of existing and proposed policies and programs to meet such requirements; and it shall make recommendations to the President with respect to Federal policies and programs.

SEC. 103. The Council shall establish, with the approval of the President, principles, standards, and procedures for Federal participants in the preparation of comprehensive regional or river basin plans and for the formulation and evaluation of Federal water and related land resources projects. Such procedures may include provision for Council revision of plans for Federal projects intended to be proposed in any plan or revision thereof being prepared by a river basin planning commission.

SEC. 104. Upon receipt of a plan or revision thereof from any river basin commission under the provisions of section 204(a)(3) of this Act, the Council shall review the plan or revision with special regard to—

(1) the efficacy of such plan or revision in achieving optimum use of the water and related land resources in the area involved;

(2) the effect of the plan on the achievement of other programs for the development of agricultural, urban, energy, industrial, recreational, fish and wildlife, and other resources of the entire Nation; and

(3) the contributions which such plan or revision will make in obtaining the Nation's economic and social goals.

Based on such review the Council shall—

(a) formulate such recommendations as it deems desirable in the national interest; and

(b) transmit its recommendations, together with the plan or revision of the river basin commission, and the views, comments, and recommendations with respect to such plan or revision submitted by any Federal agency, Governor, interstate commission, or United States section of an international commission, to the President for his review and transmittal to the Congress with his recommendations in regard to authorization of Federal projects.

SEC. 105. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Council may: (1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable; (2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary; (3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States; (4) employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the civil service laws and Classification Act of 1949, as amended; (5) procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals; (6) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; and (7) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this Act.

(b) Any member of the Council is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by a majority of the Council that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

(c) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of the Council may be made available for public inspection during ordinary office hours.

(d) Upon request of the Council, the head of any Federal department or agency is authorized (1) to furnish to the Council such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with such Council on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(e) The Council shall be responsible for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel, (2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditure of funds.

TITLE II—RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS

Creation of commissions

SEC. 201. (c)(a) The President is authorized to declare the establishment of a river basin water and related land resources commission upon request therefor by the Council, or request addressed to the Council by a State within which all or part of the basin or basins concerned are located if the request by the Council or by a State (1) defines the area, river basin, or group of related river basins for which a commission is requested (2) is made in writing by the Governor or in such manner as State law may provide, or by the Council, and (3) is concurred in by the Council and by not less than one-half of the States within which portions of the basin or basins concerned are located, or, in the event the Upper Colorado River Basin is involved, by at least three of the four States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming. Such concurrences shall be in writing.

(b) Each such commission for an area, river basin, or group of river basins shall, to the extent consistent with section 3 of this Act—

(1) serve as the principal agency for the coordination of Federal, State, interstate, and local plans for the development of water and related land resources in its area, river basin, or group of river basins;

(2) prepare and keep up to date, to the extent practicable, a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan for Federal, State, interstate, and local development of water and related resources: *Provided*, That the plan shall include an evaluation of all reasonable alternative means of achieving optimum development of water and related land resources of the basin or basins, and it may be prepared in stages, including recommendations with respect to individual projects:

(3) recommend long-range schedules of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data and for investigation, planning, and construction of projects; and

(4) foster and undertake such studies of water and related land resources problems in its area, river basin, or group of river basins as are necessary in the preparation of the plan described in clause (2) of this subsection.

Membership of commissions

SEC. 202. Each river basin commission shall be composed of members appointed as follows:

(a) A chairman appointed by the President who shall also serve as chairman and coordinating officer of the Federal members of the commission and who shall represent the Federal Government in Federal-State relations on the commission and who shall not, during the period of his service on the commission, hold any other position as an officer or employee of the United States, except as a retired officer or retired civilian employee of the Federal Government;

(b) One member from each Federal department or independent agency determined by the President to have a substantial interest in the work to be undertaken by the commission, such member to be appointed by the head of such department or independent agency and to serve as the representative of such department or independent agency;

(c) One member from each State which lies wholly or partially within the area, river basin, or group of river basins for which the commission is established, and the appointment of each such member shall be made in accordance with the laws of the State which he represents. In the absence of governing provisions of State law, such State members shall be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the Governor;

(d) One member appointed by any interstate agency created by an interstate compact to which the consent of Congress has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the area, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is created;

(e) When deemed appropriate by the President, one member, who shall be appointed by the President, from the United States section of any international commission created by a treaty to which the consent of the Senate has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the area, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is established.

Organization of commissions

SEC. 203. (a) Each river basin commission shall organize for the performance of its functions within ninety days after the President shall have declared the establishment of such commission, subject to the availability of funds for carrying on its work. A commission shall terminate upon agreement of the Council or agreement of a majority of the States composing the commission. Upon such termination, all property, assets, and records of the commission shall thereafter be turned over to such agencies of the United States and the participating States as shall be appropriate in the circumstances: *Provided*, That studies, data, and other materials useful in water and related land resource planning to any of the participants shall be kept freely available to all such participants.

(b) State members of each commission shall elect a vice chairman, who shall serve also as chairman and coordinating officer of the State members of the commission and who shall represent the State governments in Federal-State relations on the commission.

(c) Vacancies in a commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointments were made: *Provided,* That the chairman and vice chairman may designate alternates to act for them during temporary absences.

(d) In the work of the commission every reasonable endeavor shall be made to arrive at a consensus of all members on all issues; but failing this, full opportunity shall be afforded each member for the presentation and report of individual views: *Provided,* That at any time the commission fails to act by reason of absence of consensus, the position of the chairman, acting in behalf of the Federal members, and the vice chairman, acting upon instructions of the State members, shall be set forth in the record: *Provided further,* That the chairman, in consultation with the vice chairman, shall have the final authority, in the absence of an applicable bylaw adopted by the commission or in the absence of a consensus, to fix the times and places for meetings, to set deadlines for the submission of annual and other reports, to establish subcommittees, and to decide such other procedural questions as may be necessary for the commission to perform its functions.

Duties of the commissions

SEC. 204. Each river basin commission shall—

(1) engaged in such activities and make such studies and investigations as are necessary and desirable in carrying out the policy set forth in section 2 of this Act and in accomplishing the purposes set forth in section 201(b) of this Act;

(2) submit to the Council and the Governor of each participating State a report on its work at least once each year. Such report shall be transmitted through the President to the Congress. After such transmission, copies of any such report shall be sent to the heads of such Federal, State, interstate, and international agencies as the President or the Governors of the participating States may direct;

(3) submit to the Council for transmission to the President and by him to the Congress, and the Governors and the legislatures of the participating States a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan, or any major portion thereof or necessary revisions thereof, for water and related land resources development in the area, river basin, or group of river basins for which such commission was established. Before the commission submits such a plan or major portion thereof or revision thereof to the Council, it shall transmit the proposed plan or revision to the head of each Federal department or agency, the Governor of each State, and each interstate agency, from which a member of the commission has been appointed, and to the head of the United States section of any international commission if the plan, portion, or revision deals with a boundary water or a river crossing a boundary, or any tributary flowing into such boundary water or river, over which the international commission has jurisdiction or for which it has responsibility. Each such department and agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and United States section of an international commission shall have ninety days from the date of the receipt of the proposed plan, portion, or revision to report its views, comments, and recommendations to the commission. The commission may modify the plan, portion, or revision after considering the reports so submitted. The views, comments, and recommendations submitted by each Federal department or agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and United States section of an international commission shall be transmitted to the Council with the plan, portion, or revision; and

(4) submit to the Council at the time of submitting such plan, any recommendations it may have for continuing the functions of the commission and for implementing the plan, including means of keeping the plan up to date.

Powers and administrative provisions of the commissions

SEC. 205. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, each river basin commission may—

(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable;

(2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary;

(3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States;

(4) employ and compensate such personnel as it deems advisable, including consultants, at rates not to exceed $100 per diem;

(5) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or the United States, or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency;

(6) make arrangements, including contracts, with any participating government, except the United States or the District of Columbia, for inclusion in a suitable retirement and employee benefit system of such of its personnel as may not be eligible for or continuing in another governmental retirement or employee benefit system, or otherwise provide for such coverage of its personnel;

(7) purchase, hire, operate, and mantain passenger motor vehicles; and

(8) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this Act.

(b) The chairman of a river basin commission, or any member of such commission designated by the chairman thereof for the purpose, is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by a majority of the commission that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

(c) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of each river basin commission shall be made available for public inspection during ordinary office hours.

(d) Upon request of the chairman of any river basin commission, or any member or employee of such commission designated by the chairman thereof for the purpose, the head of any Federal department or agency is authorized (1) to furnish to such commission such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with such commission on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(e) The chairman of each river basin commission shall, in accordance with the general policies of such commission with respect to the work to be accomplished by it and the timing thereof, be responsible for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed by such commission, (2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditures of funds available to such commission.

Compensation of commission members

SEC. 206. (a) Any member of a river basin commission appointed pursuant to section 202 (b) and (e) of this Act, shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of his membership on the commission, but shall continue to receive, from appropriations made for the agency from which he is appointed, the salary of his regular position when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the commission.

(b) Members of a commission, appointed pursuant to section 202 (c) and (d) of this Act, shall each receive such compensation as may be provided by the States or the interstate agency respectively, which they represent.

(c) The per annum compensation of the chairman of each river basin commission shall be determined by the President, but when employed on a full-time annual basis shall not exceed the maximum scheduled rate for grade GS-18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; or when engaged in the performance of the commission's duties on an intermittent basis such compensation shall be not more than $100 per day and shall not exceed $12,000 in any year.

SEC. 207. (a) Each commission shall recommend what share of its expenses shall be borne by the Federal Government, but such share shall be subject to approval by the Council. The remainder of the commission's expenses shall be otherwise apportioned as the commission may determine. Each commission shall prepare a budget annually and transmit it to the Council and the States. Estimates of proposed appropriations from the Federal Government shall be included in the budget estimates submitted by the Council under the Budgeting and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended, and may include an amount for advance to a commission against State appropriations for which delay is anticipated by reason of later legislative sessions. All sums appropriated to or otherwise received by a commission shall be credited to the commission's account in the Treasury of the United States.

(b) A commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions, appropriations, donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials, and services from any State or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, or intergovernmental agency, and may receive, utilize, and dispose of the same.

(c) The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The accounts shall be audited at least annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified or licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State, and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

(d) The accounts of the commission shall be open at all reasonable times for inspection by representatives of the jurisdictions and agencies which make appropriations, donations, or grants to the commission.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING GRANT AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 301. (a) In recognition of the need for increased participation by the States in water and related land resources planning to be effective, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Council for the next fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for the nine succeeding fiscal years thereafter, $5,000,000 in each such year for grants to States to assist them in developing and participating in the development of comprehensive water and related land resources plans.

(b) The Council with the approval of the President, shall prescribe such rules, establish such procedures, and make such arrangements and provisions relating to the performance of its functions under this title, and the use of funds available therefor, as may be necessary in order to assure (1) coordination of the program authorized by this title with related Federal planning assistance programs, including the program authorized under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 and (2) appropriate utilization of other Federal agencies administering programs which may contribute to achieving the purpose of this Act.

Allotments

SEC. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year the Council shall from time to time make allotments to the States, in accordance with its regulations on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the land area, (3) the need for comprehensive water and related land resources planning programs, and (4) the financial need of the respective States. For the purposes of this section the population of the States shall be determined on the basis of the latest estimates available from the Department of Commerce and the land area of the States shall be determined on the basis of the official records of the United States Geological Survey.

(b) From each State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year the Council shall pay to such State an amount which is not more than 50 per centum of the cost of carrying out its State program approved under section 303, including the cost of training personnel for carrying out such program and the cost of administering such program.

State programs

SEC. 303. The Council shall approve any program for comprehensive water and related land resources planning which is submitted by a State, if such program—

(1) provides for comprehensive planning with respect to intrastate or interstate water resources, or both, in such State to meet the needs for water and water related activities taking into account prospective demands for all purposes served through or affected by water and related land resources development, with adequate provision for coordination with all Federal, State, and local agencies having responsibilities in affected fields;

(2) provides, where comprehensive statewide development planning is being carried on with or without assistance under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, for full coordination between comprehensive water resources planning and other statewide planning programs and for assurances that such water resources planning will be in conformity with the general development policy in such State;

(3) designates a State agency (hereinafter referred to as the "State agency") to administer the program;

(4) provides that the State agency will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Council from time to time reasonably requires to carry out its functions under this title;

(5) sets forth the procedure to be followed in carrying out the State program and in administering such program; and

(6) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for keeping appropriate accountability of the funds and for the proper and efficient administration of the program.

The Council shall not disapprove any program without first giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering such program.

Review

SEC. 304. Whenever the Council after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State agency finds that—

(a) the program submitted by such State and approved under section 303 has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement of such section; or

(b) in the administration of the program there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement, the Council shall notify such agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this title until it is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until the Council is so satisfied, it shall make no further payments to such State under this title.

Payments

SEC. 305. The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to this title shall be as follows:

(1) The Council shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by it, estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of this title for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Council may find necessary.

(2) The Council shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by it for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which it finds that its estimate of the amount to be paid such State for any prior period under this title was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such State for such prior period under this title. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, at such times and in such installments as the Council may determine.

Definition

SEC. 306. For the purpose of this title the term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

SEC. 307. (a) Each recipient of a grant under this Act shall keep such records as the Chairman of the Council shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition of the funds received under the grant, and the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which the grant was made and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Chairman of the Council and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient of the grant that are pertinent to the determination that funds granted are used in accordance with this Act.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 401. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $10,000,000 annually as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of titles I and II and the administration of title III.

Rules and regulations

SEC. 402. The Council is authorized to make such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary or appropriate for carrying out those provisions of this Act which are administered by it.

Delegation of functions

SEC. 403. The Council is authorized to delegate to any member or employee of the Council its administrative functions under section 105 and the detailed administration of the grant program under title III.

Utilization of personnel

SEC. 404. The Council may, with the consent of the head of any other department or agency of the United States, utilize such officers and employees of such agency on a reimbursable basis as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas (during the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be open for amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc and that they be open for amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the committee amendments.

The Clerk read the following committee amendments:

Page 2, lines 2 to 8, inclusive, strike out all of section 2 and insert the following:

"SEC. 2. In order to meet the rapidly expanding demands for water throughout the Nation, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to encourage the conservation, development, and utilization of water and related land resources of the United States on a comprehensive and coordinated basis by the Federal Government, States, localities, and private enterprise with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, individuals, corporations, business enterprises, and others concerned."

Page 2, lines 20 to 23, inclusive, strike out all of subsection (b) and insert the following:

"(b) to change or otherwise affect the authority or responsibility of any Federal official in the discharge of the duties of his office except as required to carry out the provisions of this Act with respect to the preparation and review of comprehensive regional or river basin plans and the formulation and evaluation of Federal water and related land resources projects;".

Page 3, line 7, change the period to a semicolon.

Page 3, after line 7, add a new subsection to read as follows:

"(d) to deprive any court of the United States or of any State of jurisdiction over a matter in controversy affecting water or any water course."

Page 3, line 15, after the word "other" insert "Federal".

Page 3, lines 20 to 24, inclusive, strike out all of subsection (a) and insert the following:

"(a) maintain a continuing study and prepare an assessment biennially, or at such less frequent intervals as the Council may determine, of the adequacy of supplies of water necessary to meet the water requirements in each water resource region in the United States and the national interest therein; and"

Page 4, line 10, after "establish," insert "after public notice and hearing, and".

Page 4, line 21, strike out "204(a)(3)" and insert "204(3)".

Page 7, line 12, strike out "SEC. 201. (e)" and insert "SEC. 201. (a)".

Page 7, line 23, to page 8, line 2, inclusive, strike out "or, in the event the Upper Colorado River Basin is involved, by at least three of the four States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming." and insert the following: "and, in the event the Upper Colorado River Basin is involved, by at least three of the four States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming or, in the event the Columbia River Basin is involved, by at least three of the four States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington."

Page 8, line 7, strike out "and local" and insert "local and nongovernmental".

Page 8, line 12, strike out "and local" and insert "local and nongovernmental".

Page 10, lines 22 and 23, strike out "agreement" and insert "decision".

Page 11, line 4, strike out "resource" and insert "resources".

Page 18, line 22, strike out "State" and insert "State,".

Page 21, line 8, after "agencies" insert ", and nongovernmental entities".

Page 21, line 13, after "1954," insert "or under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965,".

Page 23, between lines 23 and 24, insert the heading "RECORDS".

Page 24, lines 17 through 19, strike out all of section 402 and insert in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 401. There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $150,000 annually to carry out the provisions of title I of this Act, $6,000,000 annually to carry out the provisions of title II, and $400,000 annually for the administration of III; *Provided*, That, with respect to title II, not more than $750,000 annually shall be available for any single river basin commission."

Mr. ASPINALL (during the reading of the committee amendments). Mr. Chairman, it is pretty well agreed what the committee amendments are and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered as read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, on page 26 of the bill.

The Clerk reads as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow to the committee amendment: On page 26, line 8, after the word "Act" insert "not to exceed" and in line 9, after the word "and" insert "not to exceed".

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] is recognized in support of his amendment.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ASPINALL. This was the intent of the committee and we are agreeable to accepting the amendment on this side.

Mr. BOW. I appreciate the gentleman's statement.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment on this side.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendments.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DADDARIO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1111) to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning, pursuant to House Resolution 309, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 384, nays 0, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 58]

YEAS—384

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis,Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long La.
Long, Md.
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
St Germain
St. Onge
Satterfield
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Wilson, Bob
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—52

Andrews, Glenn
Ashley
Ayres
Baldwin
Bonner
Casey
Clausen, Don H.

Cooley
Curtis
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnsley
Flood
Fulton, Tenn.
Garmatz
Gibbons
Griffiths
Hawkins
Hébert
Holland
Jacobs
Jones, Ala.
Kastenmeier
Kluczynski
Landrum
Love
McMillan
MacGregor
Madden
Martin, Mass.
Michel
Pepper
Pickle
Pool
Purcell
Reid, N.Y.
Resnick
Roncalio
Roosevelt
Smith, Iowa
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Todd
Toll
Watkins
Watts
Willis
Wilson, Charles H.

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Watkins.

Mr. Evins with Mr. Andrews of Alabama.

Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Reid of New York.

Mr. Fallon with Mr. Michel.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Curtis.

Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Pepper with Mr. McMillan.

Mr. Todd with Mr. Kluczynski.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Farnsley.

Mr. Willis with Mrs. Griffiths.

Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Madden with Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Ashley.

Mr. Landrum with Mr. Holland.

Mr. Casey with Mr. Resnick.

Mr. Flood with Mr. Fulton of Tennessee.

Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Purcell.

Mr. Pool with Mr. Jacobs.

Mr. Watts with Mr. Pickle.

Mr. Love with Mr. Gibbons.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 21) to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning, a bill similar to the one just passed by the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The **SPEAKER**. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 21

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Water Resources Planning Act".

Statement of policy

SEC. 2. In order to meet the rapidly expanding demands for water throughout the Nation, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to encourage the conservation, development, and utilization of water and related land resources of the United States on a comprehensive and coordinated basis with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, and others concerned.

Effect on existing laws

SEC. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

(a) to expand or diminish either Federal or State jurisdiction, responsibility, or rights in the field of water resources planning, development, or control; nor to displace, supersede, limit, or modify any interstate compact or the jurisdiction or responsibility of any legally established joint or common agency of two or more States, or of two or more States and the Federal Government; nor to limit the authority of Congress to authorize and fund projects;

(b) as superseding, modifying, or repealing existing laws applicable to the various Federal agencies which are authorized to develop or participate in the development of water and related land resources, or to exercise licensing or regulatory functions in relation thereto; nor to affect the jurisdiction, powers, or prerogatives of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, the Permanent Engineering Board and the United States Operating Entity or Entities established pursuant to the Columbia River Basin Treaty, signed at Washington, January 17, 1961, or of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico.

TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

SEC. 101. There is hereby established a Water Resources Council (hereinafter referred to as the "Council") which shall be composed of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The Chairman of the Council shall request the heads of other agencies to participate with the Council when matters affecting their responsibilities are considered by the Council. The Chairman of the Council shall be designated by the President.

SEC. 102. The Council shall—

(a) maintain a continuing study and prepare a biennial, or at such less frequent intervals as the Council may determine, assessment of the adequacy of supplies of water necessary to meet the water requirements in each water resource region in the United States and the national interest therein; and

(b) maintain a continuing study of the relation of regional or river basin plans and programs to the requirements of larger regions of the Nation, and of the adequacy of administrative and statutory means for the coordination of the water and related land resources policies and programs of the several Federal agencies; it shall appraise the adequacy of existing and proposed policies and programs to meet such requirements; and it shall make recommendations to the President with respect to Federal policies and programs.

SEC. 103. The Council shall establish, with the approval of the President, principles, standards, and procedures for Federal participants in the preparation of comprehensive regional or river basin plans and for the formulation and evaluation of Federal water and related land resources projects. Such procedures may include provision for Council revision of plans for Federal projects intended to be proposed in any plan or revision thereof being prepared by a river basin planning commission.

SEC. 104. Upon receipt of a plan or revision thereof from any river basin commission under the provisions of section 204(3) of this Act, the Council shall review the plan or revision with special regard to—

(1) the efficacy of such plan or revision in achieving optimum use of the water and related land resources in the area involved;

(2) the effect of the plan on the achievement of other programs for the development of agricultural, urban, energy, industrial, recreational, fish and wildlife, and other resources of the entire Nation; and

(3) the contributions which such plan or revision will make in obtaining the Nation's economic and social goals.

Based on such review the Council shall—

(a) formulate such recommendations as it deems desirable in the national interest; and

(b) transmit its recommendations, together with the plan or revision of the river basin commission, and the views, comments, and recommendations with respect to such plan or revision submitted by any Federal agency, Governor, interstate commission, or United States section of an international commission, to the President for his review and transmittal to the Congres with his recommendations in regard to authorization of Federal projects.

SEC. 105. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Council may: (1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable; (2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary; (3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States; (4) employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the civil service laws and Classification Act of 1949, as amended; (5) procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals; (6) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; and (7) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this Act.

(b) Any member of the Council is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by a majority of the Council that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

(c) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of the Council may be made available for public inspection during ordinary office hours.

(d) Upon request of the Council, the head of any Federal department or agency is authorized (1) to furnish to the Council such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with such Council on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(e) The Council shall be responsible for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel, (2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditures of funds.

TITLE II—RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS

Creation of commissions

SEC. 201. (a) The President is authorized to declare the establishment of a river basin water and related land resources commission upon request therefor by the Council, or request addressed to the Council by a State within which all or part of the basin or basins concerned are located if the request by the Council or by a State (1) defines the area, river basin, or group of related river basins for which a commission is requested, (2) is made in writing by the Governor or in such manner as State law may provide, or by the Council, and (3) is concurred in by the Council and by not less than one-half of the States within which portions of the basin or basins concerned are located: *Provided,* That for the purposes of this Act, the Upper Colorado River Basin shall be considered a separate river basin. Such concurrences shall be in writing.

(b) Each such commission for an area, river basin, or group of river basins shall, to the extent consistent with section 3 of this Act—

(1) serve as the principal agency for the coordination of Federal, State, interstate, and local plans for the development of water and related land resources in its area, river basin, or group of river basins;

(2) prepare and keep up to date, to the extent practicable, a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan for Federal, State, interstate, and local development of water and related resources: *Provided*, That the plan shall include an evaluation of all reasonable alternative means of achieving optimum development of water and related land resources of the basin or basins, and it may be prepared in stages, including recommendations with respect to individual projects;

(3) recommend long-range schedules of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data and for investigation, planning, and construction of projects; and

(4) foster and undertake such studies of water and related land resources problems in its area, river basin, or group of river basins as are necessary in the preparation of the plan described in clause (2) of this subsection.

(c) The provisions of this title II shall not apply in the Columbia River Basin.

Membership of commissions

SEC. 202. Each river basin commission shall be composed of members appointed as follows:

(a) A chairman appointed by the President who shall also serve as chairman and coordinating officer of the Federal members of the commission and who shall represent the Federal Government in Federal-State relations on the commission and who shall not, during the period of his service on the commission, hold any other position as an officer or employee of the United States, except as a retired officer or retired civilian employee of the Federal Government;

(b) One member from each Federal department or independent agency determined by the President to have a substantial interest in the work to be undertaken by the commission, such member to be appointed by the head of such department or independent agency and to serve as the representative of such department or independent agency;

(c) One member from each State which lies wholly or partially within the area, river basin, or group of river basins for which the commission is established, and the appointment of each such member shall be made in accordance with the laws of the State which he represents. In the absence of governing provisions of State law, such State members shall be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the Governor;

(d) One member appointed by any interstate agency created by an interstate compact to which the consent of Congress has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the area, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is created;

(e) When deemed appropriate by the President, one member, who shall be appointed by the President, from the United States section of any international commission created by a treaty to which the consent of the Senate has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the area, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is established.

Organization of commissions

SEC. 203. (a) Each river basin commission shall organize for the performance of its functions within ninety days after the President shall have declared the establishment of such commission, subject to the availability of funds for carrying on its work. A commission shall terminate upon agreement of the Council or agreement of a majority of the States composing the commission. Upon such termination, all property, assets, and records of the commission shall thereafter be turned over to such agencies of the United States and the participating States as shall be appropriate in the circumstances: *Provided*, That studies, data, and other materials useful in water and related land resource planning to any of the participants shall be kept freely available to all such participants.

(b) State members of each commission shall elect a vice chairman, who shall serve also as chairman and coordinating officer of the State members of the commission and who shall represent the State governments in Federal-State relations on the commission.

(c) Vacancies in a commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointments were made: *Provided*, That the chairman and vice chairman may designate alternates to act for them during temporary absences.

(d) In the work of the commission every reasonable endeavor shall be made to arrive at a consensus of all members on all issues; but failing this, full opportunity shall be afforded each member for the presentation and report of individual views: *Provided*, That at any time the commission fails to act by reason of absence of consensus, the position of the chairman, acting in behalf of the Federal members, and the vice chairman, acting upon instructions of the State members, shall be set forth in the record: *Provided further*, That the chairman, in consultation with the vice chairman, shall have the final authority, in the absence of an applicable bylaw adopted by the commission or in the absence of a consensus, to fix the times and places for meetings, to set deadlines for the submission of annual and other reports, to establish subcommittees, and to decide such other procedural questions as may be necessary for the commission to perform its functions.

Duties of the commissions

SEC. 204. Each river basin commission shall—

(1) engage in such activities and make such studies and investigations as are necessary and desirable in carrying out the policy set forth in section 2 of this Act and in accomplishing the purposes set forth in section 201(b) of this Act;

(2) submit to the Council and the Governor of each participating State a report on its work at least once each year. Such report shall be transmitted through the President to the Congress. After such transmission, copies of any such report shall be sent to the heads of such Federal, State, interstate, and international agencies as the President or the Governors of the participating States may direct;

(3) submit to the Council for transmission to the President and by him to the Congress, and the Governors and the legislatures of the participating States a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan, or any major portion thereof or necessary revisions thereof, for water and related land resources development in the area, river basin, or group of river basins for which such commission was established. Before the commission submits such a plan or major portion thereof or revision thereof to the Council, it shall transmit the proposed plan or revision to the head of each Federal department or agency, the Governor of each State, and each interstate agency, from which a member of the commission has been appointed, and to the head of the United States section of any international commission if the plan, portion or revision deals with a boundary water or a river crossing a boundary, or any tributary flowing into such boundary water or river, over which the international commission has jurisdiction or for which it has responsibility. Each such department and agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and United States section of an international commission shall have ninety days from the date of the receipt of the proposed plan, portion or revision to report its views, comments, and recommendations to the commission. The commission may modify the plan, portion or revision after considering the reports so submitted. The views, comments, and recommendations submitted by each Federal department or agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and United States section of an international commission shall be transmitted to the Council with the plan, portion or revision; and

(4) submit to the Council at the time of submitting such plan, any recommendations it may have for continuing the functions of the commission and for implementing the plan, including means of keeping the plan up to date.

Powers and administrative provisions of the commissions

SEC. 205. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, each river basin commission may—

(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable;

(2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary;

(3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States;

(4) employ and compensate such personnel as it deems advisable, including consultants, at rates not to exceed $100 per diem;

(5) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or the United States, or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency;

(6) make arrangements, including contracts, with any participating government, except the United States or the District of Columbia, for inclusion in a suitable retirement and employee benefit system of such of its personnel as may not be eligible for or continuing in another governmental retirement or employee benefit system, or otherwise provide for such coverage of its personnel:

(7) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; and

(8) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this Act.

(b) The chairman of a river basin commission, or any member of such commission designated by the chairman thereof for the purpose, is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by a majority of the commission that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

(c) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of each river basin commission shall be made available for public inspection during ordinary office hours.

(d) Upon request of the chairman of any river basin commission, or any member or employee of such commission designated by the chairman thereof for the purpose, the head of any Federal department or agency is authorized (1) to furnish to such commission such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with such commission on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

(e) The chairman of each river basin commission, with the approval of the vice chairman, in accordance with the general policies of such commission with respect to the work to be accomplished by it and the timing thereof, shall be responsible for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed by such commission, (2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditures of funds available to such commission.

Compensation of commission members

SEC. 206. (a) Any member of a river basin commission appointed pursuant to section 202 (b) and (e) of this Act shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of his membership on the commission, but shall continue to receive, from appropriations made for the agency from which he is appointed, the salary of his regular position when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the commission.

(b) Members of a commission, appointed pursuant to section 202 (c) and (d) of this Act, shall each receive such compensation as may be provided by the States or the interstate agency respectively, which they represent.

(c) The per annum compensation of the chairman of each river basin commission shall be determined by the President, but when employed on a full-time annual basis shall not exceed the maximum scheduled rate for grade GS-18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; or when engaged in the performance of the commission's duties on an intermittent basis such compensation shall be not more than $100 per day and shall not exceed $12,000 in any year.

SEC. 207. (a) Each commission shall recommend what share of its expenses shall be borne by the Federal Government, but such share shall be subject to approval by the Council. The remainder of the commission's expenses shall be otherwise apportioned as the commission may determine. Each commission shall prepare a budget annually and transmit it to the Council and the States. Estimates of proposed appropriations from the Federal Government shall be included in the budget estimates submitted by the Council under the Budgeting and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended, and may include an amount for advance to a commission against State appropriations for which delay is anticipated by reason of later legislative sessions. All sums appropriated to or otherwise received by a commission shall be credited to the commission's account in the Treasury of the United States.

(b) A commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions appropriations, donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials, and services from any State or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, or intergovernmental agency, and may receive, utilize, and dispose of the same.

(c) The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The account shall be audited at least annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified or licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State, and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

(d) The accounts of the commission shall be open at all reasonable times for inspection by representatives of the jurisdictions and agencies which make appropriations, donations, or grants to the commission.

TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING GRANT AUTHORIZATIONS

SEC. 301. (a) In recognition of the need for increased participation by the States in water and related land resources planning to be effective, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Council for the next fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for the nine succeeding fiscal years thereafter, $5,000,000 in each such year for grants to States to assist them in developing and participating in the development of comprehensive water and related land resources plans.

(b) The Council, with the approval of the President, shall prescribe such rules, establish such procedures, and make such arrangements and provisions relating to the performance of its functions under this title, and the use of funds available therefor, as may be necessary in order to assure (1) coordination of the program authorized by this title with related Federal planning assistance programs, including the program authorized under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 and (2) appropriate utilization of other Federal agencies administering programs which may contribute to achieving the purpose of this Act.

Allotments

SEC. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year the Council shall from time to time make allotments to the States, in accordance with its regulations on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the land area, (3) the need for comprehensive water and related land resources planning programs, and (4) the financial need of the respective States. For the purposes of this section the population of the States shall be determined on the basis of the latest estimates available from the Department of Commerce and the land area of the States shall be determined on the basis of the official records of the United States Geological Survey.

(b) From each State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year the Council shall pay to such State an amount which is not more than 50 per centum of the cost of carrying out its State program approved under section 303, including the cost of training personnel for carrying out such program and the cost of administering such program.

State programs

SEC. 303. The Council shall approve any program for comprehensive water and related land resources planning which is submitted by a State, if such program—

(1) provides for comprehensive planning with respect to intrastate or interstate water resources, or both, in such State to meet the needs for water and water related activities taking into account prospective demands for all purposes served through or affected by water and related land resources development, with adequate provision for coordination with all Federal, State, and local agencies having responsibilities in affected fields;

(2) provides, where comprehensive statewide development planning is being carried on with or without assistance under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, for full coordination between comprehensive water resources planning and other statewide planning programs and for assurances that such water resources planning will be in conformity with the general development policy in such State;

(3) designates a State agency (hereinafter referred to as the "State agency") to administer the program;

(4) provides that the State agency will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Council from time to time reasonably requires to carry out its functions under this title;

(5) sets forth the procedure to be followed in carrying out the State program and in administering such program; and

(6) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for keeping appropriate accountability of the funds and for the proper and efficient administration of the program. The Council shall not disapprove any program without first giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering such program.

Review

SEC. 304. Whenever the Council after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State agency finds that—

(a) the program submitted by such State and approved under section 303 has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement of such section; or

(b) in the administration of the program there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement, the Council shall notify such agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this title until it is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until the Council is so satisfied, it shall make no further payments to such State under this title.

Payments

SEC. 305. The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to this title shall be as follows:

(1) The Council shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by it, estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of this title for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Council may find necessary.

(2) The Council shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by it for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which it finds that its estimate of the amount to be paid such State for any prior period under this title was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such State for such prior period under this title. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, at such times and in such installments as the Council may determine.

Definition

SEC. 306. For the purpose of this title the term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

SEC. 307. (a) Each recipient of a grant under this Act shall keep such records as the Chairman of the Council shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition of the funds received under the grant, and the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which the grant was made and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Chairman of the Council and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient of the grant that are pertinent to the determination that funds granted are used in accordance with this Act.

TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 401. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $10,000,000 annually, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of titles I and II and the administration of title III.

Rules and regulations

SEC. 402. The Council is authorized to make such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary or appropriate for carrying out those provisions of this Act which are administered by it.

Delegation of functions

SEC. 403. The Council is authorized to delegate to any member or employee of the Council its administrative functions under section 105 and the detailed administration of the grant program under title III.

Utilization of personnel

SEC. 404. The Council may, with the consent of the head of any other department or agency of the United States, utilize such officers and employees of such agency on a reimbursable basis as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF TEXAS

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROGERS of Texas: Strike out all after the enacting clause of S. 21 and insert the provisions of H.R. 1111 as passed, as follows:

"SHORT TITLE

"SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the 'Water Resources Planning Act'.

"Statement of policy

"SEC. 2. In order to meet the rapidly expanding demands for water throughout the Nation, it is hereby declared to be the policy of the Congress to encourage the conservation, development, and utilization of water and related land resources of the United States on a comprehensive and coordinated basis by the Federal Government, States, localities, and private enterprise with the cooperation of all affected Federal agencies, States, local governments, individuals, corporations, business enterprises, and others concerned.

"Effect on existing laws

"SEC. 3. Nothing in this Act shall be construed—

"(a) to expand or diminish either Federal or State jurisdiction, responsibility, or rights in the field of water resources planning, development, or control; nor to displace, supersede, or limit any interstate compact or the jurisdiction or responsibility of any legally established joint or common agency of two or more States, or of two or more States and the Federal Government; nor to limit the authority of Congress to authorize and fund projects;

"(b) to change or otherwise affect the authority or responsibility of any Federal official in the discharge of the duties of his office except as required to carry out the provisions of this Act with respect to the preparation and review of comprehensive regional or river basin plans and the formulation and evaluation of Federal water and related land resources projects;

"(c) as superseding, modifying, or repealing existing laws applicable to the various Federal agencies which are authorized to develop or participate in the development of water and related land resources, or to exercise licensing or regulatory functions in relation thereto; nor to affect the jurisdiction, powers, or prerogatives of the International Joint Commission, United States and Canada, or of the International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico;

"(d) to deprive any court of the United States or of any State of jurisdiction over a matter in controversy affecting water or any water course.

"TITLE I—WATER RESOURCES COUNCIL

"SEC. 101. There is hereby established a Water Resources Council (hereinafter referred to as the 'Council') which shall be composed of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Army, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission. The Chairman of the Council shall request the heads of other Federal agencies to participate with the Council when matters affecting their responsibilities are considered by the Council. The Chairman of the Council shall be designated by the President.

"SEC. 102. The Council shall—

"(a) maintain a continuing study and prepare an assessment biennially, or at such less frequent intervals as the Council may determine, of the adequacy of supplies of water necessary to meet the water requirements in each water resource region in the United States and the national interest therein; and

"(b) maintain a continuing study of the relation of regional or river basin plans and programs to the requirements of larger regions of the Nation, and of the adequacy of administrative and statutory means for the coordination of the water and related land resources policies and programs of the several Federal agencies; it shall appraise the adequacy of existing and proposed policies and programs to meet such requirements; and it shall make recommendations to the President with respect to Federal policies and programs.

"SEC. 103. The Council shall establish, after public notice and hearing, and with the approval of the President, principles, standards, and procedures for Federal participants in the preparation of comprehensive regional or river basin plans and for the formulation and evaluation of Federal water and related land resources projects. Such procedures may include provision for Council revision of plans for Federal projects intended to be proposed in any plan or revision thereof being prepared by a river basin planning commission.

"SEC. 104. Upon the receipt of a plan or revision thereof from any river basin commission under the provisions of section 204(3) of this Act, the Council shall review the plan or revision with special regard to—

"(1) the efficacy of such plan or revision in achieving optimum use of the water and related land resources in the area involved;

"(2) the effect of the plan on the achievement of other programs for the development of agricultural, urban, energy, industrial, recreational, fish and wildlife, and other resources of the entire Nation; and

"(3) the contributions which such plan or revision will make in obtaining the Nation's economic and social goals.

Based on such review the Council shall—

"(a) formulate such recommendations as it deems desirable in the national interest; and

"(b) transmit its recommendations, together with the plan or revision of the river basin commission, and the views, comments, and recommendations with respect to such plan or revision submitted by any Federal agency, Governor, interstate commission, or United States section of an international commission, to the President for his review and transmittal to the Congress with his recommendations in regard to authorization of Federal projects.

"SEC. 105. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Council may: (1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable; (2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary; (3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as other departments and agencies of the United States; (4) employ and fix the compensation of such personnel as it deems advisable, in accordance with the civil service laws and Classification Act of 1949, as amended; (5) procure services as authorized by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), at rates not to exceed $100 per diem for individuals; (6) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; and (7) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this Act.

"(b) Any member of the Council is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by a majority of the Council that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

"(c) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of the Council may be made available for public inspection during ordinary office hours.

"(d) Upon request of the Council, the head of any Federal department or agency is authorized (1) to furnish to the Council such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with such Council on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

"(e) The Council shall be responsible for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel, (2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditure of funds.

"TITLE II—RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS

"Creation of commissions

"SEC. 201. (a) The President is authorized to declare the establishment of a river basin water and related land resources commission upon request therefor by the Council, or request addressed to the Council by a State within which all or part of the basin or basins concerned are located if the request by the Council or by a State (1) defines the area, river basin, or group of related river basins for which a commission is requested (2) is made in writing by the Governor or in such manner as State law may provide, or by the Council, and (3) is concurred in by the Council and by not less than one-half of the States within which portions of the basin or basins concerned are located and, in the event the Upper Colorado River Basin is involved, by at least three of the four States of Colorado, New Mexico, Utah, and Wyoming or, in the event the Columbia River Basin is involved, by at least three of the four States of Idaho, Montana, Oregon, and Washington. Such concurrences shall be in writing.

"(b) Each such commission for an area, river basin, or group of river basins shall, to the extent consistent with section 3 of this Act—

"(1) serve as the principal agency for the coordination of Federal, State, interstate, local and nongovernmental plans for the development of water and related land resources in its area, river basin, or group of river basins;

"(2) prepare and keep up to date, to the extent practicable, a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan for Federal, State, interstate, local and nongovernmental development of water and related resources: *Provided,* That the plan shall include an evaluation of all reasonable alternative means of achieving optimum development of water and related land resources of the basin or basins, and it may be prepared in stages, including recommendations with respect to individual projects;

"(3) recommend long-range schedules of priorities for the collection and analysis of basic data and for investigation, planning, and construction of projects; and

"(4) foster and undertake such studies of water and related land resources problems in its area, river basin, or group of river basins as are necessary in the preparation of the plan described in clause (2) of this subsection.

"Membership of commissions

"SEC. 202. Each river basin commission shall be composed of members appointed as follows:

"(a) A chairman appointed by the President who shall also serve as chairman and coordinating officer of the Federal members of the commission and who shall represent the Federal Government in Federal-State relations on the commission and who shall not, during the period of his service on the commission, hold any other position as an officer or employee of the United States, except as a retired officer or retired civilian employee of the Federal Government;

"(b) One member from each Federal department or independent agency determined by the President to have a substantial interest in the work to be undertaken by the commission, such member to be appointed by the head of such department or independent agency and to serve as the representative of such department or independent agency;

"(c) One member from each State which lies wholly or partially within the area, river basin, or group of river basins for which the commission is established, and the appointment of each such member shall be made in accordance with the laws of the State which he represents. In the absence of governing provisions of State law, such State members shall be appointed and serve at the pleasure of the Governor;

"(d) One member appointed by any interstate agency created by an interstate compact to which the consent of Congress has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the area, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is created;

"(e) When deemed appropriate by the President, one member, who shall be appointed by the President, from the United States section of any international commission created by a treaty to which the consent of the Senate has been given, and whose jurisdiction extends to the waters of the area, river basin, or group of river basins for which the river basin commission is established.

"Organization of commissions

"SEC. 203. (a) Each river basin commission shall organize for the performance of its functions within ninety days after the President shall have declared the establishment of such commission, subject to the availability of funds for carrying on its work. A commission shall terminate upon decision of the Council or agreement of a majority of the States composing the commission. Upon such termination, all property, assets, and records of the commission shall thereafter be turned over to such agencies of the United States and the participating States as shall be appropriate in the circumstances: *Provided,* That studies, data, and other materials useful in water and related land resources planning to any of the participants shall be kept freely available to all such participants.

"(b) State members of each commission shall elect a vice chairman, who shall serve also as chairman and coordinating officer of the State members of the commission and who shall represent the State governments in Federal-State relations on the commission.

"(c) Vacancies in a commission shall not affect its powers but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointments were made: *Provided,* That the chairman and vice chairman may designate alternates to act for them during temporary absences.

"(d) In the work of the commission every reasonable endeavor shall be made to arrive at a consensus of all members on all issues; but failing this, full opportunity shall be afforded each member for the presentation and report of individual views: *Provided,* That at any time the commission fails to act by reason of absence of consensus, the position of the chairman, acting in behalf of the Federal members, and the vice chairman, acting upon instructions of the State members, shall be set forth in the record: *Provided further,* That the chairman, in consultation with the vice chairman, shall have the final authority, in the absence of an applicable bylaw adopted by the commission or in the absence of a consensus, to fix the times and places for meetings, to set deadlines for the submission of annual and other reports, to establish subcommittees, and to decide such other procedural questions as may be necessary for the commission to perform its functions.

"Duties of the commissions

"SEC. 204. Each river basin commission shall—

"(1) engage in such activities and make such studies and investigations as are necessary and desirable in carrying out the policy set forth in section 2 of this Act and in accomplishing the purposes set forth in section 201(b) of this Act;

"(2) submit to the Council and the Governor of each participating State a report on its work at least once each year. Such report shall be transmitted through the President to the Congress. After such transmission, copies of any such report shall be sent to the heads of such Federal, State, interstate, and international agencies as the President or the Governors of the participating States may direct;

"(3) submit to the Council for transmission to the President and by him to the Congress, and the Governors and the legislatures of the participating States a comprehensive, coordinated, joint plan, or any major portion thereof or necessary revisions thereof, for water and related land resources development in the area, river basin, or group of river basins for which such commission was established. Before the commission submits such a plan or major portion thereof or revision thereof to the Council, it shall transmit the proposed plan or revision to the head of each Federal department or agency, the Governor of each State, and each interstate agency, from which a member of the commission has been appointed, and to the head of the United States section of any international commission if the plan, portion, or revision deals with a boundary water or a river crossing a boundary, or any tributary flowing into such boundary water or river, over which the international commission has jurisdiction or for which it has responsibility. Each such department and agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and United States section of an international commission shall have ninety days from the date of the receipt of the proposed plan, portion, or revision to report its views, comments, and recommendations to the commission. The commission may modify the plan, portion, or revision after considering the reports so submitted. The views, comments, and recommendations submitted by each Federal department or agency head, Governor, interstate agency, and United States section of an international commission shall be transmitted to the Council with the plan, portion, or revision; and

"(4) submit to the Council at the time of submitting such plan, any recommendations it may have for continuing the functions of the commission and for implementing the plan, including means of keeping the plan up to date.

"Powers and administrative provisions of the commissions

"SEC. 205. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this title, each river basin commission may—

"(1) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, take such testimony, receive such evidence, and print or otherwise reproduce and distribute so much of its proceedings and reports thereon as it may deem advisable;

"(2) acquire, furnish, and equip such office space as is necessary;

"(3) use the United States mails in the same manner and upon the same conditions as departments and agencies of the United States;

"(4) employ and compensate such personnel as it deems advisable, including consultants, at rates not to exceed $100 per diem;

"(5) arrange for the services of personnel from any State or the United States, or any subdivision or agency thereof, or any intergovernmental agency;

"(6) make arrangements, including contracts, with any participating government, except the United States or the District of Columbia, for inclusion in a suitable retirement and employee benefit system of such of its personnel as may not be eligible for or continuing in another governmental retirement or employee benefit system, or otherwise provide for such coverage of its personnel;

"(7) purchase, hire, operate, and maintain passenger motor vehicles; and

"(8) incur such necessary expenses and exercise such other powers as are consistent with and reasonably required to perform its functions under this Act.

"(b) The chairman of a river basin commission, or any member of such commission designated by the chairman thereof for the purpose, is authorized to administer oaths when it is determined by a majority of the commission that testimony shall be taken or evidence received under oath.

"(c) To the extent permitted by law, all appropriate records and papers of each river basin commission shall be made available for public inspection during ordinary office hours.

"(d) Upon request of the chairman of any river basin commission, or any member or employee of such commission designated by the chairman thereof for the purpose, the head of any Federal department or agency is authorized (1) to furnish to such commission such information as may be necessary for carrying out its functions and as may be available to or procurable by such department or agency, and (2) to detail to temporary duty with such commission on a reimbursable basis such personnel within his administrative jurisdiction as it may need or believe to be useful for carrying out its functions, each such detail to be without loss of seniority, pay, or other employee status.

"(e) The chairman of each river basin commission shall, in accordance with the general policies of such commission with respect to the work to be accomplished by it and the timing thereof, be responsible for (1) the appointment and supervision of personnel employed by such commission, (2) the assignment of duties and responsibilities among such personnel, and (3) the use and expenditures of funds available to such commission.

"Compensation of commission members

"SEC. 206. (a) Any member of a river basin commission appointed pursuant to section

202 (b) and (e) of this Act, shall receive no additional compensation by virtue of his membership on the commission, but shall continue to receive, from appropriations made for the agency from which he is appointed, the salary of his regular position when engaged in the performance of the duties vested in the commission.

"(b) Members of a commission, appointed pursuant to section 202 (c) and (d) of this Act, shall each receive such compensation as may be provided by the States or the interstate agency respectively, which they represent.

"(c) The per annum compensation of the chairman of each river basin commission shall be determined by the President, but when employed on a full-time annual basis shall not exceed the maximum scheduled rate for grade GS–18 of the Classification Act of 1949, as amended; or when engaged in the performance of the commission's duties on an intermittent basis such compensation shall be not more than $100 per day and shall not exceed $12,000 in any year.

"Sec. 207. (a) Each commission shall recommend what share of its expenses shall be borne by the Federal Government, but such share shall be subject to approval by the Council. The remainder of the commission's expenses shall be otherwise apportioned as the commission may determine. Each commission shall prepare a budget annually and transmit it to the Council and the States. Estimates of proposed appropriations from the Federal Government shall be included in the budget estimates submitted by the Council under the Budgeting and Accounting Act of 1921, as amended, and may include an amount for advance to a commission against State appropriations for which delay is anticipated by reason of later legislative sessions. All sums appropriated to or otherwise received by a commission shall be credited to the commission's account in the Treasury of the United States.

"(b) A commission may accept for any of its purposes and functions, appropriations, donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials, and services from any State or the United States or any subdivision or agency thereof, or intergovernmental agency, and may receive, utilize, and dispose of the same.

"(c) The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements. The accounts shall be audited at least annually in accordance with generally accepted auditing standards by independent certified or licensed public accountants, certified or licensed by a regulatory authority of a State, and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

"(d) The accounts of the commission shall be open at all reasonable times for inspection by representatives of the jurisdictions and agencies which make appropriations, donations, or grants to the commission.

"TITLE III—FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING GRANT AUTHORIZATIONS

"Sec. 301. (a) In recognition of the need for increased participation by the States in water and related land resources planning to be effective, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Council for the next fiscal year beginning after the date of enactment of this Act, and for the nine succeeding fiscal years thereafter, $5,000,000 in each such year for grants to States to assist them in developing and participating in the development of comprehensive water and related land resources plans.

"(b) The Council with the approval of the President, shall prescribe such rules, establish such procedures, and make such arrangements and provisions relating to the performance of its functions under this title, and the use of funds available therefore, as may be necessary in order to assure (1) coordination of the program authorized by this title with related Federal planning assistance programs, including the program authorized under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954 and (2) appropriate utilization of other Federal agencies administering programs which may contribute to achieving the purpose of this Act.

"Allotments

"Sec. 302. (a) From the sums appropriated pursuant to section 301 for any fiscal year the Council shall from time to time make allotments to the States, in accordance with its regulations on the basis of (1) the population, (2) the land area, (3) the need for comprehensive water and related land resources planning programs, and (4) the financial need of the respective States. For the purposes of this section the population of the States shall be determined on the basis of the latest estimates available from the Department of Commerce and the land area of the States shall be determined on the basis of the official records of the United States Geological Survey

"(b) From each State's allotment under this section for any fiscal year the Council shall pay to such State an amount which is not more than 50 per centum of the cost of carrying out its State program approved under section 303, including the cost of training personnel for carrying out such program and the cost of administering such program.

"State programs

"Sec. 303. The Council shall approve any program for comprehensive water and related land resources planning which is submitted by a State, if such program—

"(1) provides for comprehensive planning with respect to intrastate or interstate water resources, or both, in such State to meet the needs for water and water related activities taking into account prospective demands for all purposes served through or affected by water and related land resources development, with adequate provision for coordination with all Federal, State, and local agencies, and nongovernmental entities having responsibilities in affected fields;

"(2) provides, where comprehensive statewide development planning is being carried on with or without assistance under section 701 of the Housing Act of 1954, or under the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act of 1965, for full coordination between comprehensive water resources planning and other statewide planning programs and for assurances that such water resources planning will be in conformity with the general development policy in such State;

"(3) designates a State agency (hereinafter referred to as the 'State agency') to administer the program;

"(4) provides that the State agency will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Council from time to time reasonably requires to carry out its functions under this title;

"(5) sets forth the procedure to be followed in carrying out the State program and in administering such program; and

"(6) provides such accounting, budgeting, and other fiscal methods and procedures as are necessary for keeping appropriate accountability of the funds and for the proper and efficient administration of the program. The Council shall not disapprove any program without first giving reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering such program.

"Review

"Sec. 304. Whenever the Council after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to a State agency finds that—

"(a) the program submitted by such State and approved under section 303 has been so changed that it no longer complies with a requirement of such section; or

"(b) in the administration of the program there is a failure to comply substantially with such a requirement, the Council shall notify such agency that no further payments will be made to the State under this title until it is satisfied that there will no longer be any such failure. Until the Council is so satisfied, it shall make no further payments to such State under this title.

"Payments

"Sec. 305. The method of computing and paying amounts pursuant to this title shall be as follows:

"(1) The Council shall, prior to the beginning of each calendar quarter or other period prescribed by it, estimate the amount to be paid to each State under the provisions of this title for such period, such estimate to be based on such records of the State and information furnished by it, and such other investigation, as the Council may find necessary.

"(2) The Council shall pay to the State, from the allotment available therefor, the amount so estimated by it for any period, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum (not previously adjusted under this paragraph) by which it finds that its estimate of the amount to be paid such State for any prior period under this title was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to such State for such prior period under this title. Such payments shall be made through the disbursing facilities of the Treasury Department, at such times and in such installments as the Council may determine.

"Definition

"Sec. 306. For the purpose of this title the term "State" means a State, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, or the Virgin Islands.

"Records

"Sec. 307. (a) Each recipient of a grant under this Act shall keep such records as the Chairman of the Council shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition of the funds received under the grant, and the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which the grant was made and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Chairman of the Council and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient of the grant that are pertinent to the determination that funds granted are used in accordance with this Act.

"TITLE IV—MISCELLANEOUS

"Authorization of appropriations

"Sec. 401. There are authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $150,000 annually to carry out the provisions of title I of this Act, not to exceed $6,000,000 annually to carry out the provisions of title II, and not to exceed $400,000 annually for the administration of title III: *Provided,* That, with respect to title II, not more than $750,000 annually shall be available for any single river basin commission.

"Rules and regulations

"Sec. 402. The Council is authorized to make such rules and regulations as it may deem necessary or appropriate for carrying out those provisions of this Act which are administered by it.

"Delegation of functions

"Sec. 403. The Council is authorized to delegate to any member or employee of the Council its administrative functions under section 105 and the detailed administration of the grant program under title III.

"Utilization of personnel

"SEC. 404. The Council may, with the consent of the head of any other department or agency of the United States, utilize such officers and employees of such agency on a reimbursable basis as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 1111) was laid on the table.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 57 I was unavoidably detained attending a meeting of the Special Highway Investigating Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Works. Had I been present I would have voted "aye."

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOWARD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HOWARD] was unavoidably detained at the committee hearing, which was necessary in order to complete testimony from and accommodate witnesses who had traveled a great distance, and to avoid extra expense to them.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the proceedings of the House reflect that on the bill just passed, H.R. 1111, as I got into the Chamber the final vote had just been taken. If I had been here, I would have voted "yea."

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 312), and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 312

Resolved, That, effective April 1, 1965, the compensation of the Legislative Counsel of the House of Representatives shall be at a gross per annum rate which is equal to the gross per annum rate of compensation of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate. The additional sums necessary to carry out this resolution shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHAPLAIN OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution (H. Res. 313), and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 313

Resolved, That, effective April 1, 1965, the compensation of the Chaplain of the House of Representatives shall be at a gross per annum rate which is equal to the gross per annum rate of compensation of the Chaplain of the Senate. The additional sums necessary to carry out this resolution shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House until otherwise provided by law.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Subcommittee No. 5 of the Committee on the Judiciary may sit while the House is in session tomorrow and engaged in general debate.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the subcommittee considering the voter legislation?

Mr. ALBERT. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object, Mr. Speaker.

C. P. (PECK) TRUSSELL

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to advise Members of the House that a distinguished newspaper reporter and correspondent, C. P. Trussell, generally known as Peck Trussell, is retiring today from the New York Times at the age of 72.

Mr. Trussell has covered Congress continuously during the past 33 years—for the Baltimore Sun for 9 years and for the New York Times for 24 years.

Mr. Trussell is noted particularly for the objectivity and impartiality of his reports on congressional affairs and on national conventions of both great political parties, many of which he has covered over the years.

In 1949 he was awarded a Pulitzer Prize for distinguished reporting on national affairs. I believe he is the only reporter ever to be awarded a Pulitzer Prize for the day-to-day excellence of his work in covering Congress and national politics.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure I speak the sentiments of all Members when I say that the Congress and the country are grateful to Mr. Trussell for the fine job he has done over the years in reporting the activities of the Congress and of the National Government generally.

All the Members of the House, I am sure, wish Peck Trussell life's richest satisfactions in his retirement.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished majority leader has set forth the outstanding record of Peck Trussell, who for so many years has covered the Congress with distinction and merit. Those of us on our side join with the majority leader in wishing Peck Trussell the very best as he retires. We have been the beneficiaries of his searching eye and his discerning pen and we feel that he has set an enviable record in his profession. We hope and trust that he will not leave us entirely but will stop by and renew his many friendships and acquaintances in the months and years ahead. He will always be most welcome as a friend and a helpmate to the Congress.

Mr. ALBERT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to extend their remarks on the life and service of Peck Trussell.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FRANCE SHOULD PAY ITS DEBTS TO THE UNITED STATES

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, we are all justly concerned over the decline in U.S. gold stocks. American currency has been the mainstay of world commerce, and for this Nation to remain strong, our dollar must remain strong.

We are justifiably concerned with an announcement by the Treasury Department that U.S. gold stocks declined $250 million last week, and that $231.5 million of that drop was a result of demands by France for U.S. gold, in exchange for dollars.

Here is a nation that we have sustained in two World Wars, here is a nation that we have helped to get back on its feet economically, and a nation which owes this Nation a great deal of money.

France owes the United States $6 billion in World War I debts, and has made no payment on them since 1931. France also owes the United States over $600 million in debts for World War II.

I am today introducing a House concurrent resolution which expresses the feeling of the Congress that France's repayment of her World War I debts to the United States be put back on their original schedule. General de Gaulle should be made to realize the great moral and legal debt which his nation owes to the American people.

While on the one hand draining our gold stocks, he ignores the fact that his nation owes a great financial debt to these United States.

I hope that Congress will pass this resolution and that the State Department will tell the French Government that we want these just debts paid. This is only right and proper.

BEAUTIFICATION PROGRAM

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter dealing with the beautification program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I was privileged to participate in a special ceremony in my offices at which Edwin R. McDonald, Sr., one of the most public-spirited citizens of Newellton, La., which is in my district, was presented with the Award of Achievement of the Netherlands Flower Bulb Institute.

This ceremony had special significance for me because of the recognition it afforded to "Mr. Ed" McDonald who has for many years drawn upon his own imagination and resources to take a leading part in the beautification of the State of Louisiana.

The award of the Netherlands Flower Bulb Institute generously presented by Dr. Abe S. Tuinman, agricultural attache, Embassy of the Netherlands, was in particular recognition of the creation of the Louisiana Dutch Gardens by Ed McDonald. These gardens, which all of us believe will become one of the most outstanding gardens in the South and the United States, are already abloom with beauty. The initial planting of some 80,000 Dutch tulips and other spring-flowering bulbs is to be followed by gorgeous arrays of roses and other summer annuals throughout the entire season. The creation of the garden flowed from a concept of natural beautification about which we hear much these days, but which was already being put into practice by Ed McDonald long before it enjoyed national support. Some years ago Ed McDonald, having retired from the management of his large farms in the Newellton, La., area, became aware that people are hungry for beauty. He sought in a small way to bring this beauty into their lives through the simple technique of planting tulips and other spring flowers in the fields along the Great River Road which passes through the McDonald plantations. Thus, people could and did come to appreciate the magic of flowers as they travel along the road, and proved Ed McDonald's theory that more beauty must be brought into the lives of all our people.

The Louisiana Dutch Gardens, opened to the public for the first time on March 19, 1965, has already been visited by more than 40,000 people from 46 States of the Union, and a number of foreign countries. As Dr. Tuinman said in his remarks on the occasion of the presentation of the institute's award, Louisiana and the Netherlands have certain similarities in that they are both low-lying lands which reap the benefits of the rivers and sea, and he said:

> Such similarities extend also to more lofty areas, such as the love for flowers. It is expressed in the serene magnolia as your State flower, and in the contents of the song of Louisiana, where it says: "where the mocker sings the sweetest and the land is filled with flowers."
>
> Gardening—

Dr. Tuinman said—

> balances the strain and stress of the day to day life. Gardening gives a feeling of partnership with nature, and the satisfaction of creating something; and it can be done with little financial means * * * it is a happy marriage where the gifts of nature and man's ingenuity in perfecting its flowers, yield ever more beautiful results. The favorite subject of the Dutch flower growers is the tulip, and the variety of colours and forms that exist, have amazed the lovers of flowers all over the world.

Mr. Speaker, it was with the greatest of pleasure that I participated in this ceremony honoring my old friend and associate, Ed McDonald, and I sincerely commend to every Member of this House this beautiful manmade wonder of nature that he has brought to pass in Newellton.

I request unanimous consent that the remarks of Dr. Tuinman, who presented this award on behalf of the Netherlands Flower Bulb Institute, and those of Ed McDonald in accepting it, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

STATEMENT OF MR. E. R. MCDONALD AFTER THE PRESENTATION OF THE AWARD BY MR. TUINMAN OF THE EMBASSY OF THE NETHERLANDS

Thank you Mr. Tuinman, and I wish to thank the Netherlands Flower-Bulb Institute for bestowing on me this great honor. I love the soil, flowers, and everything out of the ground, and which has given me lots of joy to add to the beauty of the highway through my plantation. Your great country should have the compliments I have received here. I had no idea that when I extended my project on the highway, it would cause this sensation. May I say, it showed me the hunger of my people for beauty. Last Easter Sunday afternoon I had 6,000 people who signed the book from 42 States and 4 foreign countries, and the only thing that perturbed them was "is this yours, or is this the Department of Highway's?" I said it is a story too long to tell. To you and to the fine Dutch people I extend every good wish, and I would be happy to have you visit our garden in Louisiana, and by all means, visit northeast Louisiana, Mr. PASSMAN's district. We feel honored and privileged to own land in that great delta country. Thank you very kindly.

REMARKS BY DR. ABE S. TUINMAN, NETHERLANDS AGRICULTURE ATTACHÉ, AT PRESENTATION OF NETHERLANDS FLOWER BULB INSTITUTE AWARD TO MR. E. R. MCDONALD, SR.[1]

Congressman PASSMAN, Mr. McDonald, ladies, and gentlemen, it is a most pleasant duty for me to be here this morning.

The very fact that I, as a foreigner, representative of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, have been asked to present a certificate to a citizen of the State of Louisiana, in the office of a U.S. legislator, demonstrates how close, pleasant, and friendly our Atlantic relationship is.

When I had the pleasure of visiting Louisiana not so long ago, I was impressed by the fact how many things Louisiana and the Netherlands have in common. Both consist largely of a river delta with flat lowlands, and the fields are lined with trees. Both Louisiana and the Netherlands must constantly be on the alert against the perils of the surrounding water, both are protected by levees, we call them dikes, but they are also reaping the benefits of the sea around them.

The impressive and extensive establishments of the Louisiana petro-chemical industry reminds one of the industrial complexes in the harbor of Rotterdam.

Such similarities extend also to more lofty areas, such as the love for flowers. It is expressed in the serene magnolia as your State flower, and the contents of the song of Louisiana, where it says: "Where the mocker sings the sweetest and the land is filled with flowers."

The beautiful flower gardens in your plantation mansions, which I visited only a few months ago, bring memories to mind of the estates in my home country with colorful surroundings.

These were the cradle of the Dutch flower industry which expanded through the centuries and which resulted in so many ties with those who love flowers, all over the world.

Life in this present world and age is complicated and difficult. The pursuit of objectives of a material nature tends to require more and more of our attention and time. Thus, the counterbalancing influence of nature becomes evermore needed.

Flowers are the ultimate expression of the beauty that nature offers humanity.

Gardening, more than anything else, balances the strain and stress of the day-to-day life. Gardening gives a feeling of partnership with nature, and the satisfaction of creating something; and it can be done with little financial means. It is within the reach of almost anybody, and fortunately it seems to be rapidly becoming an important part of the American way of life.

It is a happy marriage where the gifts of nature and man's ingenuity in perfecting its flowers, yield evermore beautiful results. The favorite subject of the Dutch flower growers is the tulip, and the variety of colors and forms that exist, have amazed the lovers of flowers all over the world.

One of them is Mr. E. R. McDonald, who has enhanced the beauty of Newellton by the creation of the Louisiana Dutch Gardens.

I take great pleasure in presenting to you, on behalf of the Netherlands Flower Bulb Institute, their award for distinguished achievement, to honor you for your leadership in creating these gardens.

I would like to extend all good wishes from the Netherlands in connection with Newellton's forthcoming first annual tulip festival, and it is my great pleasure to wish you well in your future endeavors.

PROTECTION OF THE FARM FAMILY

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RESNICK. Mr. Speaker, the evidence brought out at preliminary hearings, conducted by the House Subcommittee on Dairy and Poultry showed conclusively that unless there is some legislative remedy, most of the family farmers producing eggs in this country will be forced out of business.

Most of the eggs produced so far this year were sold for less than the cost of their production. Adding to the problems of the family-type farmer is the development of so-called egg factories owned and operated by large feed and grain companies. Some of these egg factories already have flocks in the neighborhood of 2½ million chickens. As the United States only requires 300 million chickens to produce its egg needs it can easily be deduced that virtually all of the 1½ million farm families engaged in egg production will be driven off the land in the near future.

---

[1] Presentation made at Capitol Hill, Washington D.C., Thursday, Mar. 11, 1965.

In order to protect our farmers I am introducing today a bill which will offer relief to this segment of our vital farm industry. This bill would establish a nationwide marketing order for table eggs that will, if adopted, establish a fair market price for eggs, assure the farmer a relatively stable market and at the same time protect him from the depredation and monopolistic practices of the large grain and feed companies.

President Johnson, Vice President HUMPHREY, and the Secretary of Agriculture, Orville Freeman, have reiterated time and time again, we must keep our family farm system. This marketing order, if established, will go a long way in seeing that this aim is accomplished.

AN EXCELLENT STAFF SUMMARY OF THE NEW SOCIAL SECURITY BILL

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Chairman WILBUR MILLS, of the Ways and Means Committee, and the members of the staff of that committee, under Mr. Leo H. Irwin, for the fine job which has been performed for the Congress in the "Summary of Major Provisions of the New Social Security Bill." This 17-page summary not only lists all of the important provisions of one of the most complex and important bills we will deal with in this Congress, but makes the information readily understood and easily located.

I think we are well served in the House by the caliber of work done by the professional and clerical staffs of our committees, but this summary is one of the best of its kind I have ever seen on any bill of such magnitude. I think, therefore, that the staff people who did this job deserve our thanks and some recognition for the work. I only wish there were copies available to send out to all of the people in my district I know would find this pamphlet informative and useful.

Mr. Speaker, while commenting on the excellent staff work of the Committee on Ways and Means, I would like to add that whenever the people in my office have occasion to call that committee for information, they are always impressed by the manner in which the young ladies who answer the committee telephones seem to have the answers to even the most complicated questions.

SETTLEMENT OF INDEBTEDNESS OF FRANCE TO UNITED STATES

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the settlement of the indebtedness of the French Republic to the United States be completed within the period as extended by statute.

This concurrent resolution further expresses the sense of Congress that the President should take such steps as may be necessary, including the renegotiation of current terms of settlement, to effect final payment of this indebtedness due us from France by June 15, 1987.

I am one of several Members of the House of Representatives and one of several million citizens of my country who risked his life to defend America, and preserve the French Republic. It is not with pleasure that I now see the leadership of France engaged in irritating acts of quasi contempt toward the allies who aided its very existence just one short generation ago. Week after week we read of the policy of gold drain demands by General de Gaulle, yet the French war debt to us of over $6 billion, goes unpaid.

I believe in the sound principles of good business, and of being a good neighbor. One of the requisites of both these positions is that bills should be paid. In this regard I hope this resolution will win the early and favorable support of my colleagues, the Ways and Means Committee, and of the whole House.

OUR BANKS ARE SOUND

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this time to assure any and everyone who may be interested that our banks and our banking system is sound, that deposits are safe and that bankers generally are decent, honest, and honorable Americans.

Unfortunately, there has been too much loose talk of late about banks and bankers, as well as about the Government officials who supervise them.

There is always room for disagreement as to details of operation and supervision. But let us not indulge in rumor and suspicion. Let us avoid scandalmongering. Let us devote ourselves to fact and not to fiction.

The business failure rate in our country in 1964 was 53.2 per 10,000 firms. In the same year the failure rate for State insured banks was 6.9 per 10,000 and only 2.1 per 10,000 for national banks—all of which are insured.

Of the nine national bank failures during the period 1952–65, only three occurred since 1962. All three were chartered prior to 1920. Only two of the nine were chartered since 1948 and only one was chartered by Comptroller Saxon.

None of those failures was related to chartering volume or change of regulatory policies but all were caused by misconduct of bank officers and employees.

That is a mighty good record when we keep in mind that there are 8,700 insured State banks and 5,028 National banks—all insured.

The important thing for the American public to know, however, is that in every instance of failure of an insured bank, the total amount of insured deposits was paid and paid promptly. In every failure in the period from January 1961, to July 1964, not only was the full amount of insured deposits paid out promptly but 45 percent and more has already been paid on account of uninsured deposits—the sum in excess of $10,000 in any one account is not insured. It is too early in the process of liquidation to determine how much will be paid on account of uninsured deposits in the banks closed since July 1964.

It is also interesting to note that the total amount of uninsured deposits in all banks closed since July 1964 aggregates less than $25½ million out of total nationwide bank deposits of $344 billion.

The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is sound.

I want to repeat—our banks are sound and our depositors need lose no sleep about the overall situation.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE CELEBRATES ITS CENTENNIAL

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, this month the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives celebrates its 100th anniversary. The committee was created in March 1865 when the House amended its rules to provide for the establishment of a Committee on Banking and Currency. Prior to that time, matters and legislation relating to banking and currency were handled by the Ways and Means Committee. Because of the increased importance of banking, it was felt that a separate committee should be formed. Several plans were offered to recognize the new status of banking. One plan that was discussed would have enlarged the Ways and Means Committee and designated subcommittees to handle the preliminary work on legislation. However, this plan was rejected in favor of forming a Banking and Currency Committee.

The rule setting up the Banking and Currency Committee provided:

> It shall be the duty of the Committee on Banking and Currency to take into consideration all propositions relative to banking and currency as shall be presented or shall come in question and be referred to them by the House, and to report therein by bill or otherwise.

It was with this brief guideline that the committee launched into its first year of existence.

BANKING GROWTH CHANGES GUIDELINES

As the committee sets forth on its 100th year of operation, its guidelines have been expanded from one meager paragraph to nearly two full pages of printed material. Under rule XI of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Banking and Currency is now charged with the following responsibilities: Banking and currency generally; control of price of commodities, rents, or services; deposit insurance; Federal Reserve System; financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule; gold and silver, including the coinage thereof; issuance of notes and redemption thereof; public and private housing; and valuation and revaluation of the dollar.

The committee jurisdiction, as set forth in rule XI, is of necessity listed in general terms. An enumeration of specific subjects contained in bills referred to, or acted upon by, the committee in the past will give a better understanding of the subject matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee. The enumeration as listed in the Legislative Calendar of the Banking and Currency Committee covers more than 120 areas. The enumeration does not cover all subject matter that the committee has dealt with in the past or may deal with in the future, but rather is an attempt to summarize matters that pertain to banking and currency jurisdiction. I am including for the RECORD a copy of the enumeration as published in the latest calendar of the Banking and Currency Committee.

PUBLICATION HONORS ANNIVERSARY

Mr. Speaker, in honor of its 100th anniversary, the Banking and Currency Committee will shortly publish a list of all publications produced by the committee from its founding during the 39th Congress through the close of the 88th Congress. Requests for publications of the committee are being received with a frequency that indicates an increasing interest in the subjects which come before the Banking and Currency Committee. The list of publications—the first complete cataloging in the committee's 100-year history—is issued in response to this demand. It has been prepared with the thought that such a reference source would be helpful to Members of Congress, universities and colleges, the banking community, and others interested in the field of banking and international finance. Completely indexed alphabetically, and also by Congresses for ready references, the list includes hearings, reports, and other committee prints.

Although the majority of the earlier publications are out of print and available only as reference material, recent prints are available for distribution from the committee. Other publications may be obtained from the Government Printing Office at a nominal charge.

EIGHTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS ACCOMPLISHMENTS

The list of publications is far more than a library tool. In a sense, it is a condensed version of the 100-year history of the committee. A casual reading of the document quickly reveals the growing importance of banking on the history of our country. It also shows that for more than 50 years the committee was, for the most part, inactive, but in its second half century of operation increased its tempo of activity, reaching a high point in the 88th Congress. The Members of the House who served on the House Banking and Currency Committee during the 88th Congress can look with pride on their achievements accomplished during that 2-year session, for it can truly be said that this committee was the most active of any Banking and Currency Committee. During 1963 and 1964 the Banking and Currency Committee held 35 hearings and published 60 reports and committee prints. These are both records for Banking and Currency Committee operation. The 35 hearings held by the committee during the 88th Congress were more than all hearings held by the Banking and Currency Committee during its first 54 years of existence.

NOT DUST COLLECTORS

The publications of the Banking and Currency Committee during the last Congress were not the types that would be filed in basement storerooms to gather dust and ultimately be thrown out as surplus material. On the contrary, these publications are being used as textbook material for students of banking and finance all over the world. One of these publications, "Primer on Money," ranks as a best seller among documents printed by any committee. More than 16,000 copies of the primer have been made available to the public, and the requests for the booklet still continue to pour in to the committee office as well as the Government Printing Office. The GPO alone has sold nearly 11,000 primers directly to the public. These figures are even more impressive because the primer was only made available less than 6 months ago. Other committee prints and reports have had similar successes.

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS

The present Banking and Currency Committee has wasted no time in picking up the pace established by its predecessor group. Although the 89th Congress is less than 3 months old, the committee has already held six hearings and has reported out three important pieces of legislation. Two of these measures, the gold cover legislation and an increase in the authorization of the Inter-American Development Bank, have already been signed into law by President Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, many changes have taken place in the banking scene over the past 100 years, both on the domestic and foreign level. It is the sincere desire of the Banking and Currency Committee to continue and aid the growth of banking and finance by keeping constantly aware of the needs of the banking industry and to construct legislation that will aid the industry in its growth plans.

In order to fully appreciate the volume of work conducted by the committee during the 88th Congress, I am including in the RECORD a table of the number of hearings and publications issued by the Banking and Currency Committee—based on congressional year—from 1865 through 1964:

LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

The jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking and Currency is set forth in part 4 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives as follows:

"RULE XI.—POWERS AND DUTIES OF COMMITTEES

"All proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the subject listed under the standing committees named below shall be referred to such committees, respectively:

* * * * *

"4. Committee on Banking and Currency:

"(a) Banking and currency generally.

"(b) Control of price of commodities, rents, or services.

"(c) Deposit insurance.

"(d) Federal Reserve System.

"(e) Financial aid to commerce and industry, other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees under this rule.

"(f) Gold and silver, including the coinage thereof.

"(g) Issuance of notes and redemption thereof.

"(h) Public and private housing.

"(i) Valuation and revaluation of the dollar."

* * * * *

ENUMERATION OF SPECIFIC SUBJECTS UNDER COMMITTEE JURISDICTION

The committee jurisdiction as set forth in rule XI is of necessity listed in general terms. An enumeration of specific subjects contained in bills referred to, or acted upon by, the committee in the past will give a better understanding of the subject matters coming within the jurisdiction of the committee. The following enumeration is not intended to be all inclusive but merely attempts to list the subjects generally. In this respect the National Bank Act, Federal Reserve Act, Defense Production Act, Banking Acts of 1933 and 1935, National Housing Act, Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act, Small Business Act, several sections of the Revised Statutes and other acts, all within the jurisdiction of the committee, contain a great number of provisions which are not separately enumerated. The purpose here is not to summarize the provisions of statutes emanating from the committee, nor to include the subject matter of all bills referred to the committee over the years, but only to illustrate in a more specific manner than does rule XI the different subjects within the committee's jurisdiction. The enumeration follows:

Banks and banking: National Bank Act; Federal Reserve Act; Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation Act; Reserve requirements of Federal Reserve member banks; bank holding companies; mergers, consolidations, and conversions of insured banks; chartering, regulation, conservation, and liquidation of national banks; insurance of bank deposits; examination of national banks, insured banks, and Federal Reserve member banks; investments by national banks; branches of national banks; unclaimed deposits in national banks; capital requirements of State banks for membership in Federal Reserve System.

Coins and coinage: commemorative coins; denominations, value, and weight of coins; metals used in coinage; U.S. mints.

Creation of Government corporations: Commodity Credit Corporation; Federal Minerals Corporation; Federal National Mortgage Association; International Finance Corporation; National Disaster Relief Corporation; War Damage Corporation.

Currency: Denominations, value, and designs; issue and redemption; printing.

Economic stabilization and defense production measures: Redevelopment of economically distressed areas; encouraging maximum employment; price controls on commodities and services; wage controls; rent controls; credit controls; consumer and installment credit terms; real estate credit terms; allocations and priorities; Government requisition and condemnation of commodities and facilities; rationing; dispersal of defense plants; hoarding; guarantee of bank loans; business loans; Government purchase or resale of metals, minerals, and other raw materials; installation of Government-owned equipment in private plants; subsidy payments; voluntary agreements regarding prices, wages, service, or credit.

Export controls.

Federal credit unions: Chartering, regulations, examination, and supervision.

Government lending: Flood and catastrophe loans; housing loans in Alaska; slum clearance and public housing loans; loans to small business; loans to small business investment companies; loans to State and local development companies; Export-Import Bank loans; defense production loans; CCC loans; municipal loan program; loans community facilities; loans for prefabricated housing; loans for college housing.

Housing: FHA insurance of single family, and multiple unit rental projects; FHA insurance of repair and improvement loans; FHA insurance of disaster housing; FHA insurance of servicemen's housing; FHA insurance of housing in urban renewal areas; FHA insurance of defense housing; FHA insurance of military and atomic energy installation housing; FHA insurance of cooperative housing; FHA insurance of equity investments in rental housing; FHA insurance for elderly family housing; construction, operation, and disposition of Government-owned permanent and temporay war and defense housing; low-rent public housing; prefabricated housing; trailers and trailer camps; veteran preferences in housing occupancy; college housing; Alaska housing program; farm housing; housing census; housing research; moderate income housing; slum clearance and urban renewal; construction warranties.

Insurance: Against loss caused by war or expropriation of U.S. commodities stored abroad; against political and credit risks of loss arising in connection with U.S. exports; against property damage caused by floods; of deposits in national banks; of share accounts in savings and loan associations.

International finance: Bretton Woods Agreements Act; International Bank for Reconstruction and Development; International Monetary Fund; International Finance Corporation; International Development Association; Inter-American Development Bank.

International Wheat Agreement.

Mass transit.

Medals, commemorative: Issuance and striking.

Monetary policies: Valuation and revaluation of the dollar; gold and gold standard; support of Government bonds; general price level; bank reserves; operation of Federal Open Market Committee; Federal Reserve rediscount rates; issue of, and reserves behind, Federal Reserve notes; gold payments and ownership; credit terms; establishment of a National Monetary Commission; interest rates on bank deposits.

Residential mortgage credit, insurance, and guarantee: FHA insurance programs; Government secondary mortgage market (FNMA); national bank real estate loans; voluntary home mortgage credit program.

Savings and loan associations: Federal Home Loan Bank System; chartering and supervision of Federal savings and loan associations; savings and loan holding companies.

Silver: Coinage, value, and use.

Small business: Small Business Act; Small Business Investment Act.

Tin: Texas City tin smelter; Government purchase and sale.

Tabulation of publications of committee by Congresses

88th Cong.:	
Hearings	35
Reports	42
Committee prints	28
87th Cong.:	
Hearings	24
Reports	46
Committee prints	13
86th Cong.:	
Hearings	22
Reports	41
Committee prints	3
85th Cong.:	
Hearings	16
Reports	16
Committee prints	7
84th Cong.:	
Hearings	26
Reports	48
Committee prints	3
83d Cong.:	
Hearings	18
Reports	38
82d Cong.:	
Hearings	8
Reports	33
Committee print	1
81st Cong.:	
Hearings	22
Reports	58
80th Cong.:	
Hearings	21
Reports	58
79th Cong.:	
Hearings	16
Reports	34
78th Cong.:	
Hearings	11
Reports	14
77th Cong.:	
Hearings	16
Reports	23
76th Cong.:	
Hearings	9
Reports	23
75th Cong.:	
Hearings	15
Reports	21
74th Cong.:	
Hearings	14
Reports	17
73d Cong.:	
Hearings	7
Reports	29
72d Cong.:	
Hearings	8
Reports	19
71st Cong.:	
Hearings	7
Reports	20
70th Cong.:	
Hearings	3
Reports	13
69th Cong.:	
Hearings	2
Reports	11
68th Cong.:	
Hearings	6
Reports	8
Committee print	1
67th Cong.:	
Hearings	15
Reports	19
66th Cong.:	
Hearings	10
Reports	5
65th Cong.:	
No hearings	---
Reports	14
64th Cong.:	
No hearings	---
Reports	10
63d Cong.:	
Hearings	3
Reports	6
62d Cong.:	
Hearings	2
Reports	6
61st Cong.:	
Hearings	3
Reports	6
60th Cong.:	
Hearings	7
Reports	5
59th Cong.:	
Hearing	1
Reports	8
58th Cong.:	
No hearings	---
Reports	3
57th Cong.:	
Hearing	1
Reports	6
56th Cong.:	
Hearing	1
Reports	6
55th Cong.:	
Hearings	2
Reports	6
54th Cong.:	
Hearing	1
Reports	7
53d Cong.:	
Hearing	1
Reports	6
52d Cong.:	
Hearing	1
Reports	14
51st Cong.:	
No hearings	---
Reports	5
50th Cong.:	
No hearings	---
Reports	10
49th Cong.:	
No hearings	---
Reports	18
48th Cong.:	
No hearings	---
Reports	19
47th Cong.:	
No hearings	---
Reports	13
46th Cong.:	
No hearings	---
Reports	13
45th Cong.:	
No hearings	---
Report	1
44th Cong.:	
No hearings	---
No reports	---
43d Cong.:	
Hearings	2
Reports	6
42d Cong.:	
No hearings	---
Report	1
41st Cong.:	
Hearing	1
Report	1
40th Cong.:	
No hearings	---
No reports	---
39th Cong.:	
No hearings	---
Reports	3

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point a list of members of the committee, as well as a list of the subcommittee and the members thereof.

The materials is as follows:

U.S. House of Representatives, Committee on Banking and Currency

Hon. Wright Patman, of Texas, chairman, 89th Congress, 2129 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Wright Patman, of Texas, chairman; Abraham J. Multer, of New York; William A. Barrett, of Pennsylvania; Leonor K. Sullivan, of Missouri; Henry S. Reuss, of Wisconsin; Thomas L. Ashley, of Ohio; William S. Moorhead, of Pennsylvania; Robert G. Stephens, Jr., of Georgia; Fernand J. St Germain, of Rhode Island; Henry B. Gonzalez, of Texas; Joseph G. Minish, of New Jersey; Charles L. Weltner, of Georgia; Richard T. Hanna, of California; Bernard F. Grabowski, of Connecticut; Compton I. White, Jr., of Idaho; Tom S. Gettys, of South Carolina; Paul H. Todd, Jr., of Michigan; Richard L. Ottinger, of New York; Earle Cabell, of Texas; Thomas G. McGrath, Jr., of New Jersey; John R. Hansen, of Iowa; Frank Annunzio, of Illinois; William B. Widnall, of New Jersey; Paul A. Fino, of New York; Florence P. Dwyer, of New Jersey; Seymour Halpern, of New York; James Harvey, of Michigan; W. E. "Bill" Brock, of Tennessee; Burt L. Talcott, of California; Del Clawson, of California; Albert W. Johnson, of Pennsylvania; J. William Stanton, of Ohio; and Chester L. Mize, of Kansas.

Paul Nelson, acting clerk and staff director; telephone: 225-4247.

Subcommittees of the Committee on Banking and Currency

DOMESTIC FINANCE

Wright Patman, of Texas, chairman; Joseph G. Minish, of New Jersey; Charles L. Weltner, of Georgia; Richard T. Hanna, of California; Compton I. White, Jr., of Idaho; Tom S. Gettys, of South Carolina; Paul H. Todd, Jr., Michigan; Frank Annunzio, of Illinois; William B. Widnall, of New Jersey; James Harvey, of Michigan; W. E. "Bill" Brock, of Tennessee; and Del Clawson, of California.

SMALL BUSINESS

Wright Patman, of Texas, chairman; Abraham J. Multer, of New York; William A. Barrett, of Pennsylvania; Leonor K. Sullivan, of Missouri; Bernard F. Grabowski, of Connecticut; Tom S. Gettys, of South Carolina; Richard L. Ottinger, of New York; Earle Cabell, of Texas; Burt L. Talcott, of California; Del Clawson, of California; J. William Stanton, of Ohio; and Chester L. Mize, of Kansas.

BANK SUPERVISION AND INSURANCE

Abraham J. Multer, of New York, chairman; William S. Moorhead, of Pennsylvania; Fernand J. St Germain, of Rhode Island; Joseph G. Minish, of New Jersey; Charles L. Weltner, of Georgia; Bernard F. Grabowski, of Connecticut; Thomas C. McGrath, Jr., of New Jersey; John R. Hansen, of Iowa; W. E. "Bill" Brock, of Tennessee; Burt L. Talcott, of California; Del Clawson, of California; and Albert W. Johnson, of Pennsylvania.

HOUSING

William A. Barrett, of Pennsylvania, chairman; Leonor K. Sullivan, of Missouri; Thomas L. Ashley, of Ohio; William S. Moorhead, of Pennsylvania; Robert G. Stephens, Jr., of Georgia; Fernand J. St Germain, of Rhode Island; Henry B. Gonzalez, of Texas; Henry S. Reuss, of Wisconsin; William B. Widnall, of New Jersey; Paul A. Fino, of New York; Florence P. Dwyer, of New Jersey; and James Harvey, of Michigan.

CONSUMER AFFAIRS

Leonor K. Sullivan, of Missouri, chairman; Robert G. Stephens, Jr., of Georgia; Henry B. Gonzalez, of Texas; Joseph G. Minish, of New Jersey; Richard T. Hanna, of California; Bernard F. Grabowski, of Connecticut; Paul H. Todd, Jr., of Michigan; Frank Annunzio, of Illinois; Florence P. Dwyer, of New Jersey; Paul A. Fino, of New York; Seymour Halpern, of New York; and J. William Stanton, of Ohio.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCE

Henry S. Reuss, of Wisconsin, chairman; Abraham J. Multer, of New York; Thomas L. Ashley, of Ohio; William S. Moorhead, of Pennsylvania; Henry B. Gonzalez, of Texas; Richard T. Hanna, of California; Compton I. White, Jr., of Idaho; Richard L. Ottinger, of New York; Seymour Halpern, of New York; William B. Widnall, of New Jersey; James Harvey, of Michigan; and Burt L. Talcott, of California.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Thomas L. Ashley, of Ohio, chairman; Robert G. Stephens, Jr., of Georgia; Fernand J. St Germain, of Rhode Island; Charles L. Weltner, of Georgia; Tom S. Gettys, of South Carolina; Earle Cabell, of Texas; Thomas C. McGrath, Jr., of New Jersey; John R. Hansen, of Iowa; Seymour Halpern, of New York; Burt L. Talcott, of California; Albert W. Johnson, of Pennsylvania; and Chester L. Mize, of Kansas.

"The chairman and the ranking minority member of the full committee shall be members ex officio of each subcommittee, with the right to vote, except that the ranking minority member shall not have the right to vote on any subcommittee of which he is not a member and of which the chairman of the full committee is chairman" (committee rule).

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer].

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman], for taking this time to draw attention to the fact that this is the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives.

With the exception of the able and distinguished chairman [Mr. Patman], no other Member presently serving on the committee has served as long as I have. Other Members of the House have served on that committee with me and then moved on to other committee assignments. All those who have served with us will attest to the fact that there is no more rewarding, no more interesting, no more important work that can be performed. Although our jurisdiction closely touches that of almost every other committee, we have never had any jurisdictional disputes but have cooperated with and have had the cooperation of every other committee.

This is in large part due to those fine Americans who have served as chairmen. I remember with great pleasure serving under the distinguished gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable Jesse Walcott, when I first arrived here. And then under the distinguished gentleman from Kenutcky, the Honorable Brent Spence, and now under the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Honorable Wright Patman.

I am certain that in the years ahead this committee will continue to earn the respect of all of our colleagues. I am sure they will evidence that respect in the future as they have done in the past by supporting the important legislation that we bring to the floor.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. Sullivan].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, it was a source of great pride to me 10 years ago, in my second term in the House, to be named to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I have deeply enjoyed serving on the committee ever since. Under the chairmanship first of the Honorable Brent Spence, of Kentucky, and now of the gentleman from Texas the Honorable Wright Patman, I have been privileged to have had the opportunity to learn from two outstanding public servants who achieved distinction in the Congress for their great knowledge in the fields of legislation in the jurisdiction of our committee.

In Mr. Patman's case, I would say, further, that he knows more about more aspects of the legislative process, and of economic legislation in particular, than any Member of Congress I have ever known. He is a real student of the congressional process, and all of us have learned much from him.

Mr. Speaker, the Banking and Currency Committee handles some of the most important bills which come before the Congress in every session. I would say our extremely healthy economic situation would not be as dynamic and as prosperous today if it had not been for the legislation we enacted in recent years in the fields of housing, area redevelopment, urban renewal, international finance, community facilities, small business promotion, and so on. But in periods of great national emergency our national economic stability comes to a focus in the Committee on Banking and Currency as we undertake the stabilization of living and production costs, and the assurance of adequate supplies of necessities for both military and civilian needs.

Service on the committee has been stimulating, sometimes exciting, always rewarding. I join our distinguished chairman in noting this anniversary, and I congratulate him for the manner in which he has been seeking, as chairman of the committee, to maintain the highest traditions of dedicated service to the American public which has been characteristic of this committee as long as I have known of its work—since I came to Washington as a congressional bride in 1941.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Annunzio].

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, I applaud the chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee for his superb presentation honoring the 100th anniversary of the Banking and Currency Committee.

It is an honor for me to serve as a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee, and a privilege as well as an honor to serve under such an outstanding chairman as the gentleman from Texas. The gentleman from Texas has devoted his life to the studies in the field of banking, and he has performed his tasks admirably. In the few brief months that I have been a Member of this great body, I have heard numerous colleagues comment that no man knows more about money and banking than the gentleman from Texas, Wright Patman.

Even those people who do not always agree with the gentleman from Texas on financial matters readily admit that he is the acknowledged authority in the field.

It must be noted in the chronicles of this great body that the outstanding job performed by the House Banking and Currency Committee during the 88th Congress was accomplished under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas. I feel confident that under his guidance and endowed with his experience the Committee during the 89th Congress will prove equally as effective as its predecessor group.

Mr. Speaker, many great men have served on the Banking and Currency Committee during its first 100 years of existence and there will be great men serving as committee members in future years. But when the final history of the Banking and Currency Committee is written, the gentleman from Texas, Wright Patman, will rank as one of the greatest legislative leaders of all times.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Reuss].

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, when I came here 11 years ago I had the great good fortune to be assigned to the House Committee on Banking and Currency. It has been a most meaningful and rewarding experience for me. It is moving to hear the history of this great committee unfolded by its distinguished chairman and to realize the jurisdiction of the committee today includes so many important areas going way beyond the essential nucleus, the jurisdiction of banking and currency proper; matters of international finance; matters dealing with housing in the development of our cities, which is now engaging the attention of one of the important subcommittees of our committee; and matters affecting the consumer and the small businessman.

As I contemplate the very sweeping jurisdiction of the committee today I am very grateful that it is headed by the gentleman from Texas who is surely the hardest working Representative in the U.S. Congress today. How many times have other Members come to their office at 8 o'clock in the morning only to find that the chairman of the committee was already at work and anxious to do business with them.

So, Mr. Speaker, with great respect for the deep learning of our chairman, with constant delight in his ready humor, and with tremendous admiration for his patriotism, I would like to join in wishing the happiest of birthdays and many happy returns to the Committee on Banking and Currency and to its distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Patman].

Mr. PATMAN. Thank you, Mr. Reuss. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Widnall].

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, since 1951 I have had the privilege of serving on the House Committee on Banking and Currency under three very able chairmen. It has indeed been a privilege to serve on that committee with the personnel we had all the way through and with the colleagues who served on both sides of the aisle. We do have very significant legislation in our charge and we have to assume some major responsibilties in handling that legislation. I think we have been extremely fortunate in the chairmen that we have had who have spent their full time and effort and have dedicated themselves to the service of their country and toward moving that important legislation. It is a pleasure for me to second the remarks of my chairman and to wish the Committee on Banking and Currency well for the next 100 years. May they have the same type of leadership they have had in the past 100 years. I thank the chairman for this opportunity.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Harvey].

Mr. HARVEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to join with our distinguished chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, the Honorable Wright Patman, in observing the 100th anniversary of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am certain that we will all agree that this committee has, over these many years, fulfilled its purpose on special monetary problems and programs in the best interests of the Congress and our Nation.

As I start my fifth year of service on this committee, I am extremely hopeful that we shall continue to develop constructive and sound legislation when and where deemed necessary. On a personal note, I was particularly honored back in January 1961 to become the fifth member from Michigan's Eighth District selected to serve on this committee.

It is interesting to note, through a research study by the Library of Congress, that 19 Michigan Congressmen have served on this committee, starting with the Honorable Henry Waldron, of Hillsdale, in 1871. I am particularly honored to point out that the Honorable Jesse P. Walcott, of my congressional district, served as chairman of the committee in the 80th Congress. He is the only Michigan member so honored. He retired in 1956 after 13 terms in Congress.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the complete list of all Michigan members who have served and contributed to the work of the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Henry Waldron, 1871–77, Hillsdale.
J. A. Hubbell, 1873–83, Houghton.
G. W. Webber, 1881–83, Ionia.
George L. Yaple, 1883–85, Mendon.
George Spalding, 1895–99, Monroe.
Henry McMorran, 1903–13, Port Huron.
Frank D. Scott, 1915–27, Alpena.
Arthur B. Williams, 1921–25, Battle Creek.
Joseph L. Hooper, 1925–34, Battle Creek.
Prentiss M. Brown, 1933–36, St. Ignace.
Jesse P. Wolcott, 1931–57, Port Huron.
Andrew J. Transue, 1937–39, Flint.
Fred L. Crawford, 1935–53, Saginaw.
George D. O'Brien, 1937–39, Detroit.
Charles G. Oakman, 1953–55, Detroit.
Martha W. Griffiths, 1955–62, Detroit.
Charles E. Chamberlain, 1957–60, Lansing.
James Harvey, 1961 to present, Saginaw.
Paul H. Todd, Jr., 1965 to present, Kalamazoo.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Grabowski].

Mr. GRABOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I cannot permit the month of March to go by without rising to say a few words in commemoration of a highly significant event in the history of this great legislative body. I am referring to the 100th anniversary of the establishment of one of the most important committees of the House of Representatives; namely, the Banking and Currency Committee.

It was on March 2, 1865, that the Congress recognized that the business of the House Ways and Means Committee had become too large and that it was necessary to lessen its burdens. Jurisdiction was divided by giving the appropriation bills to a newly created Appropriations Committee, and banking and currency bills to a newly created Committee on Banking and Currency.

Ever since its establishment, the Banking and Currency Committee has had to face some of the toughest economic problems confronting our Nation.

With the close of the Civil War, the United States resumed its rapid industrial growth so that our gross national product has about doubled every 20 years since the 1870's. But this growth was accompanied by long stretches of periods of relative stagnation and by financial crises and panics. The post-Civil War industrial advance was accompanied by long-time changes in the price level—a downward trend from 1873 to the end of the century, and a rising trend in the first three decades of the 20th century—and inflationary price rises associated with wars and their aftermaths—the Civil War, World War I, and World War II.

And apart from the influences of war, there were the periodic recurrences of the business cycle which plagued the American economy all throughout the period—with such relative severe peacetime business contractions as 1873–79, 1882–85, 1893–94, 1907–08, 1920–21, 1929–33, and 1937–38. However we view the occurrence of business cycles and crises, as well as price fluctuations, there is little doubt that the monetary factor, including the banking structure, has played an important role in business and price movements.

Monetary controversies continued over decades as supporters of easy and tight credit clashed over greenbacks, free silver, and national banking. The recurring financial panics intensified debates centering around reforms of the banking system. The inadequacies of the National Banking Act which continued from 1864 to 1913 finally resulted in the creation of the Federal Reserve System. But as the 1930's showed, the Federal Reserve System did not eliminate the occurrence of severe business depressions. The collapse of the American banking system in the 1930's and the great depression revealed the necessity for correcting basic weaknesses in our economic organization. The shortcomings were particularly manifest in the banking structure and in the securities and real estate markets.

Much of the reform legislation of the 1930's and thereafter fell within the jurisdiction of the Banking and Currency Committee. The reforms in the financial sphere included legislation that strengthened the banking system against failure, established programs to insure or guarantee mortgages and to encourage the use of the amortized mortgage, insured deposits of commercial banks and savings banks, and of share accounts in savings and loan associations, and regulated the security exchanges and margin requirements for security purchases. Not the least important development was the passage of the Employment Act of 1946, which declared it to be a continuing policy and responsibility of the Federal Government to promote maximum employment, production and purchasing power.

What vast changes have occurred in the areas of responsibility of the Banking and Currency Committee. It is not only concerned with banking and currency generally, but with the control of price of commodities, rents or services; deposit insurance; the Federal Reserve System; gold and silver, including the coinage thereof; public and private housing; valuation and revaluation of the dollar; and financial aid to commerce and industry other than matters relating to such aid which are specifically assigned to other committees.

During most of the history of the committee a laissez faire philosophy generally prevailed in the country. Compatible with that philosophy was the desire to achieve a sound currency and a healthy banking system. But it was not until the last three decades that the country adopted the view that Government must play a more important role in maintaining economic stability and in promoting economic growth. To achieve these objectives requires the timely and adequate use by the Government of a variety of tools, prominent among which are monetary, fiscal, and debt management policies.

The Banking and Currency Committee has played a major role in forging new legislation to meet the changed requirements of the times.

I am sure that it will continue to manifest the spirit of adaptability and flexibility to meet the needs of social change under the leadership of its chairman and my colleague, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS].

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the chairman of the committee for taking this time to recognize the great service extending over 100 years that the Committee on Banking and Currency has given to the House of Representatives and to the people of the United States. I have a very peculiar interest in the Committee on Banking and Currency. Not only because of my membership on it but due to the fact that for five-sevenths of the 100 years since this committee was founded, there has been a Georgian on the committee. The record shows that we have only been eligible for representation on the committee for 98 years. The first 2 years of the existence of the committee, 1865 to 1867, we had no representation in the Congress. But, for 68 of those 98 years a Georgia Member has set with this group. I do not think you will find on any other committee a record like that. I would also like to say that the peculiar interest I have in the Committee on Banking and Currency is also due to the fact that for 52 of the 68 years, the Member from Georgia who has been on the Committee on Banking and Currency has been from the 10th District of Georgia.

The man who served the longest term from Georgia on this committee was the late Honorable Paul Brown who served for almost 28 years—just a little short of 28 years. He was my friend and immediate predecessor from the 10th District. Nobody from our State has equaled that record on the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The first member from Georgia, that I know of, was back in the 45th Congress, when Hiram Bell served. This was 1877. Then Allen D. Candler; James C. C. Black, who served for 4 years. He was from Augusta, Ga., and from the 10th District.

Then we have Elijah B. Lewis from Georgia; Charles L. Bartlett and Charles H. Brand, who served for 16 years. Judge Brand was from my hometown and the 10th District.

Mr. Speaker, I have always felt most appreciative of the fact that I was elected to this committee when I first came here, because I had felt it was the outstanding committee of the House of Representatives and because of the association that my district and my State had had with it.

Also I want to say that since I have been on this committee our chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has performed one of the most remarkable services that I know of in Congress. He gave us, when he became chairman, the opportunity really to learn about the financial institutions and problems of this country through the great number of hearings that he held in the 88th Congress, covering the whole gamut of activities of this Committee on Banking and Currency and bringing them to us in such fashion that we could all understand them.

I think as a result of that that our committee may begin this second 100 years much better prepared to serve the Congress and the people of the United States than we were when I came here in the 87th Congress.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA].

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to include my remarks on this subject matter.

Mr. Speaker, some years ago there was a little fat country boy who went to the State legislature, where they had very active lobbying interests and were known for their dinners and their luncheons. When he went back home after his first election, one of his friends met him on the street and said, "Clem, what was it we elected you to here in this last election?" He looked over his shoulder, drew his friend confidentially up to him and he said, "The best damn boardinghouse in the State."

I would say this if I were asked what I have been elected to. I have been elected to one of the finest universities in the world, where I have had the opportunity to work with the dean of the Committee on Banking and Currency. It has been an outstanding experience in my life to have this opportunity, as has been pointed out by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEPHENS], to become so intimately acquainted with the many ramifications of the financial and money interests of this great country and the dynamic and dramatic history and development of nations. It has been a great experience for me and I am sure to every member of the committee. It has been carried out in a tradition that has been set in this great committee and in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, appreciate greatly the leadership that has been given by the present chairman and look forward to seeing him for many years in the position he now holds, giving the fine quality of leadership that he is now giving.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CABELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to be associated and to associate myself with the chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency and the dean of the Texas delegation which, of course, made him competent to fulfill this position which he now holds.

Mr. Speaker, while in his remarks he has and will provide you with information with reference to the effectiveness and the importance of this committee, I am sure that the gentleman's modesty will prevent him from telling the Members of the House of the great contributions that he has made to the success of this committee during his service upon it. He is certainly a worthy successor to the other very able committee chairmen who have served the committee.

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be associated with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] on that committee.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. McGRATH. Mr. Speaker, I also want to commend our chairman for obtaining this time in which we might mark the 100th anniversary of the creation of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am indeed honored to have been assigned to this committee as a freshman Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I for one, appreciate the fair manner in which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] made the assignments of the new members to the various subcommittees of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the fair manner in which the gentleman conducts the hearings which permits all of the new members an opportunity to participate in important matters that come before the committee.

I am also appreciative of the assistance and encouragement given to me by all of the senior members of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. HANSEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank our chairman for the pleasure of joining other Members today in speaking on the occasion of the 100th anniversary of the Committee on Banking and Currency. Started during the Presidency of Abraham Lincoln, this committee has been chaired by some of the finest men in Congress.

The responsibilities of this committee have multiplied and expanded over the years so that now its influence is felt in all sectors of our economy.

The present chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, has given added stature to the work of the committee. His independence of thought and fairness of action have made it possible to secure legislation that has benefited our whole Nation.

During the many years I headed a small manufacturing firm in my home town of Manning, Iowa, I was made aware of his concern for the welfare of small business on many, many occasions.

A very good mutual friend, W. F. (Francis) Powers of Sun City, Ariz., introduced me to the work of our present chairman a good number of years ago when Mr. Powers lived in Des Moines and was an extremely active member of the National Small Businessmen's Association. In a recent letter, speaking of the gentleman from Texas, he commented:

> I have worked with him for over 30 years on legislation that would be beneficial to small business and he has never deviated from his policy of helping the little businessman.

It was because of the high regard I have held for the chairman and his concern for small business that I was gratified to be assigned to the Banking and Currency Committee When the final record on his accomplishments has been written, he will be referred to in the language of his native Texas as a "squareshooter." I am pleased to be associated with our distinguished chairman in this important work.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman from Iowa.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the subject of the 100th anniversary of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIELS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, would the distinguished gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that I was called off the floor of the House when the gentleman from Texas made his remarks. However, I do not want this opportunity to pass without joining with others who are congratulating one of the great committees of the House of Representatives on its 100th anniversary.

Mr. Speaker, over the years the Committee on Banking and Currency has had under its jurisdiction some of the most vital sectors of American life and has monumental legislative contributions in these areas.

The activities of this great committee are entwined in practically every phase not only of the American economy but of the American well-being. This committee has handled matters not only of a local nature, such as housing, but matters that have worldwide impact through legislation affecting the various types of banks over which it has jurisdiction.

On this committee have served many of the most renowned Members of the House. Today it has one of the great Members of the House presiding over it as its chairman. He and his colleagues comprise certainly one of the most distinguished and constructive groups of legislators ever to sit in the U.S. House of Representatives. I congratulate the gentleman who serves as the distinguished chairman of a great and distinguished committee.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency on the 100th anniversary of the establishment of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I would like to associate my remarks with those of our distinguished majority leader. As he has said so well, as your committee goes, so goes America.

Mr. Chairman, you as chairman of this committee have given hope to the investor and protection to the incorporators. You have given encouragement to our very way of life, and you have given impetus to the mainspring of our economy. Your committee has saved the free enterprise system, and the congratulations, the good wishes and the sincerest hopes for your continued distinguished future as you have under your magnificent leadership is the hope of each and every one of us.

I associate myself with the remarks of those who have taken note of this important milestone in your illustrious history.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I came to the Congress and was sworn in in January 1949. I was at that time assigned to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I have a great debt owing to the distinguished gentleman from Texas who, when I came to that committee, was No. 3 on the committee, and now is its great chairman. He counseled me, he guided me, and I became one of his disciples.

Mr. Speaker, there is no man in the world who knows money and is a greater authority on money than the outstanding chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I could not let this occasion pass without giving utterance to that sentiment and that appraisal of one of the alltime greats of the Congress of the United States.

I am deeply touched and I am proudly privileged to be here on the 100th anniversary of a committee of which I was once a member and to recall how many, many times in those golden years I explained to my constituents that while the Ways and Means Committee raised the money and the Appropriations Committee voted it out it remained for the great Banking and Currency Committee to decide how the money once raised and appropriated should be spent.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of our distinguished majority leader and the previous speakers in paying tribute today on its 100th anniversary of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and its very distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Texas.

It has been my great privilege during the 6 years I have been here to join with the gentleman from Texas on many occasions in speaking out on many issues that he has watched so carefully for all of us. Certainly he has done a great service to this country in leading this committee.

I also want to take this opportunity to note the fact that in this centennial year the Illinois delegation on the majority side are pleased and happy to see our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Chicago, FRANK ANNUNZIO, joining this distiguished committee. It has been many years since there has been a Representative from Chicago on this committee. Mr. ANNUNZIO represents one of the great banking districts in America in his district, which is the Loop in Chicago. There are probably more banks there representing more investments than in any other single congressional district in the country. We Congressmen from Illinois on the majority side are certainly proud of Mr. ANNUNZIO and his great knowledge. We know he is going to make a great contribution to the committee. It is fitting that during this centennial year Illinois should have a Representative on the committee.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and

include extraneous matter, including a list of the committee and the subcommittees and the members of the subcommittees, and the legislative activity of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, and also the history for the last 100 years, a tabulation of publications by this committee of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

NINTH WORLD FESTIVAL OF YOUTH AND STUDENTS FOR SOLIDARITY, PEACE AND FRIENDSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, of the entire population of the earth, more than one-half is 25 years of age or under. There can be no doubt that the youth of today will determine the future course of events tomorrow. Today there is a worldwide battle for the minds and hearts of men, a battle between communism and freedom, between dictatorship and democracy. We young Americans accept and welcome the challenge of that struggle. We ourselves are the product of a revolutionary process, strengthened by the principle that human progress derives from free discussion, tempered by the kind of freedom of dissent that has taken place so often in this very Chamber.

For 11 days this summer, from July 28 through August 7, approximately 25,000 youth and students from all over the world will gather in Algeria for the so-called Ninth World Festival of Youth and Students for Solidarity, Peace and Friendship.

Free discussion has no place in this event. It is an event whose primary objective is to stress the spirit and momentum of international communism. As its predecessors, the festival cloaks a highly partisan political event with the appearance of cultural and athletic festivity. In so doing, it attempts to reinforce the faith of the party faithful, engender pro-Communist support in the host country, and subvert the unwary and uncommitted of the world's youth. It is part of the battle for the minds of young men and women, and it is therefore worthy of our concern and attention.

Let us look for a moment at the history of these festivals. The first of the festivals was held in Prague in 1947. Since that time, they have been held consecutively in Budapest, East Berlin, Bucharest, Warsaw, Moscow, Vienna, and the last one in Helsinki in 1962. It is instructive to note that each event has reflected the mirror image of Soviet foreign policy, from the hard-line approach under Stalin to increasingly persistent overtures to the unalined nations of the world. The festival organizers credit the 1955 Warsaw festival with having weakened the Polish population's potential resistance to the Soviet presence in that country.

The Communists have achieved some success with the festivals behind the Iron Curtain, but not without great cost in image as well as money. Indeed, the organizers lavished more than $100 million on the Moscow festival, which is more than the U.S. Information Agency budgets for an entire year. Such one-sided events soon made it abundantly clear, however, that the festivals were exclusively propaganda activities. In 1959, the organizers moved the festival to Vienna, to more neutral territory outside of the Eastern European bloc. The design was clear; the organizers hoped to convey a more respectable image to appeal to those people throughout the world who earnestly sought a meeting place between East and West.

This year there has been no change in the festival orientation or purpose, only a change in geographic location. The World Federation of Democratic Youth—WFDY—whose headquarters are in Budapest, and the International Union of Students—IUS—located in Prague—both international Communist front groups, continue to be the organs through which funds and professional organizers are channeled, and by which effective control is exercised.

The cynicism of the festival organizers cannot be overstated. They imposed the festival in Vienna despite the vociferous opposition of every representative student and youth organization in Austria. The same was true in Helsinki, where the single Finnish youth organization to support the presence of the festival in Finland was the youth affiliate of the Communist Party. Sponsors broke the traditional pattern of a festival every 2 years and moved into Finland, 3 years after Vienna, during an election year, providing added leverage for compelling cooperation from the Finnish Government.

This year marks the first time the festival will take place in Africa, a fact which emphasizes the zeal with which the Communists are pursuing the allegiance of youth leaders from the unalined world, and, in particular, those from the new nations of Africa. The host Algerian youth organizations, the youth section of the FLN and the National Union of Algerian Students, believe that this festival will be a departure from the lopsided propaganda thrust of past events.

We share the wish of the Algerians that this might be the case but, regrettably, the ninth festival promises to be no different from its predecessors. As in the case of Vienna and Helsinki, the festival organizers, by packing the festival secretariat with a majority of their own, by maintaining control of the purse strings, by supplying technicians and even a majority of participants, have the leverage to bring well-intentioned opposition to its knees, or to overwhelm it. No, Mr. Speaker, there is no freedom of dissent in the Communist marketplace of ideas.

The festival represents the cruelest kind of Communist hoax. In their courtship of the leaders of the world's youth, they lavish millions of dollars on this propaganda circus, when the true needs of the new nations lie in areas far removed from song and games. I believe this is more than regrettable; it is insidious. No one disputes the compelling need for peace and friendship in the world. But how are such noble goals advanced by a wholly partisan event spanning only 11 days, costing an estimated $30 million; an event whose only high point is a display of fireworks, and whose low is reached, as in Vienna and Helsinki, in pushing dissenters to the ground?

In the very shadow of the emotional indulgence of the festival lurk the enemies of all men—poverty, illiteracy, and disease. Surely $30 million would be far better spent on health and educational programs, on the development of human and material resources—even on dues to the United Nations.

In glaring contrast to the millions of dollars squandered on this empty event are more than 9,000 Peace Corps volunteers working hand in hand with our friends all over the world—at a wage rate of approximately 11 cents per hour. Were the $30 million festival costs applied to a program similar to that of the Peace Corps, more than 270 million man-hours, or 31,000 man-years of work for real peace and friendship would result. But the festival organizers place a higher premium on propaganda than on peace.

No representative student or youth organization in the United States has ever sent a delegation to a festival. To do so would be to give credence to the false claims of the festival organizers that the Festival is representative of world youth opinion, and that the youth of the United States support the festival as a useful means of achieving world understanding.

The responsible, representative youth organizations of the United States are not alone in their assessment of the festival. Representative youth and student groups in Western Europe and elsewhere, as well as responsible international youth groups, have long been aware of the true nature of the festival and will this year, as in the past, refrain from participation.

I should like also to call attention to a group of young Americans who, at the time of the Vienna and Helsinki festivals, undertook to prepare and make available accurate information for all those interested in the festival. This group, known as the Independent Research Service, will serve the same purpose this year with regard to the festival in Algiers. Under the direction of Eugene Theroux, a 26-year-old Georgetown University law student—and past national associate director of the Young Citizens for Johnson-Humphrey—the group has three objectives:

First. To discourage festival participation on the part of representative American student and youth organizations whose presence at the festival would give it the appearance of legitimacy.

Second. To provide objective, accurate, and timely information to young Americans, and to youth from other nations, concerning the history and true purpose of the festival.

Third. To provide, to those young people who intend to participate as individuals—not representing youth organizations—materials with which to inform themselves on topics likely to be discussed in Algiers.

The Independent Research Service, a nonprofit organization supported by donations from public-spirited Americans, has taken on a large responsibility, but experience gained at the past two festivals indicates that they are equal to the challenge. Largely by their efforts, the truth about the festivals in Vienna and Helsinki reached most every campus, social, political, and religious group in America. In addition, they helped enable several young Americans, fully aware of the nature of the festivals but anxious to set the record straight wherever possible, attend the festival. As our distinguished Vice President—then Senator—HUMPHREY said of these young people:

> They breathed the fresh air of freedom into the seventh Communist-sponsored youth festival. They were equipped not only with enthusiasm for their ideals, but with the facts and know-how to present the truth about communism and its destruction of human freedom with vivid clarity.

A statement which represents the opinion of responsible American youth regarding the youth festival has come to my attention from Mr. W. Dennis Shaul, international affairs vice president of the United States Youth Council, whose member organizations include such organizations as the Young Men's Christian Association, National Federation of Catholic College Students, and the Young Democratic Clubs of America. Mr. Shaul is past student body president at the University of Notre Dame, a Rhodes scholar, and currently at Harvard Law School.

As a former president of the United States Youth Council, I am proud that as in the past, the youth council will not participate in any way in the festival. Mr. Shaul reports:

> This decision which is consistent with the United States Youth Council's traditional position of having never attended any previous festivals, is based upon our conclusion that this event will be little changed from its eight predecessors. All festivals have been blatant extensions of Soviet foreign policy and each has mirrored the shifting tactics but unaltered objective of indoctrinating the world's youth.
>
> The festivals have always been anti-Western and specifically anti-America. They have always been prodigously expensive, so expensive that the cost of one would go a long way to erasing the debt of the U.S.S.R. to the United Nations. The festivals have always been anti-intellectual, divisive, egocentric conceits of the Soviet Union and its followers. Rather than furthering the lofty aims of peace and friendship, they have produced disillusionment, discord, and propaganda.
>
> It is particularly regrettable that the festival will take place in Algeria. The Algerians have recognized the partisan nature of previous festivals, and say they hope that this festival, the first in Africa, will be different. But it is the ninth festival, not the first. The same groups, the same individuals, the same sources of funds are behind this festival—only the location is different.
>
> We start from the belief and we still hold to the belief that Algerian youth like American youth desire a free and frank discussion which is not based on a predetermined ideology or predetermined conclusions. We know that Algerian youth share our goals of meeting to discuss and overcome real problems that cry for real solutions. Above all else, the festival represents a serious, but we hope only a temporary, frustration of these goals. We can only hope that the future offers the youth of the world something more than this exercise in manipulation and futility.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, there are some among our youth who have allowed themselves, either unwittingly or by design, to be used by the festival's Communist sponsors. Here I am speaking of the American Youth Festival Committee, an irresponsible, unrepresentative group, a group which has permitted itself to become the Soviet's recognized recruitment organ in the United States for the festival's preparatory committee. They have already begun to solicit participants from our college campuses. Even they admit that the festival is financed by the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the International Union of Students. Even they admit that the festival is a lopsided, monolithic propaganda event. Why, then, can they not see that the only purpose this group will serve will be to bear our national flag in festival processions, thereby creating the false impression of American support for the festival? One would think that those who know the nature of a disease would renounce and avoid it, and not expose themselves to it for the weak and dangerous reason that they do so "because it is there."

No one will prevent, nor should they prevent, the participation of those who wish to attend the festival. But let those who feel they must go, for reasons of curiosity, scholarship, or whatever—let them go with their eyes open.

We object to the festival not only because it is a waste of money, though that it is; not only because it is propaganda, though that it is; not only because it is unswervingly anti-America, though that it surely is. We raise our voices in objection because the festival has locked out truth, objectivity, and freedom of dissent. Indeed, freedom itself has been locked out. It is a fruitless purpose to seek peace and friendship without allowing freedom of inquiry and debate. For that reason each festival has been doomed ultimately to fail before it begins.

Those who cherish freedom of speech, of belief and of the press will find them alien and provocative notions at the Communist youth festival. Indeed, those who dared protest in Vienna and Helsinki were not only verbally, but physically set upon.

To Algerian youth and to the youth leaders of the new nations who will try valiantly to make the festival a free and open marketplace of ideas, we express our profound hope for success. They will be immersed in the largest of Communist-front meetings. They will be pawns in the cold wars which divide East and West. We regret that they will be drawn within a circle which has shut out the most basic freedom of all, the freedom to dissent.

There is, of course, a continuing need for a free and open dialog among young people the world over who are concerned about their future, but obviously the festival is not an appropriate forum. There must continue to be exchange programs and meetings where an opportunity exists for young men and women to discuss their problems and challenges in an atmosphere free of fear. With such programs currently in being, we can be confident that no number of festivals will ever erase this central fact: mutual understanding will never be achieved so long as freedom to inquire, debate and dissent is barred at the door.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I speak for all patriotic American youth when I say we welcome the challenge of the future. We do not shirk from our responsibilities. We shall meet them with the historic courage of America to preserve and extend freedom for ourselves and future generations.

Mr. Speaker, the youthful men and women of our younger generation of America are dedicated to their faith in democracy and the inalienable rights of man and say with Thomas Jefferson: "I have sworn upon the altar of God eternal hostility against every form of tyranny over the mind of man."

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will be delighted to yield to my distinguished colleague, the majority leader of the House.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, certainly I want to join those who by their applause have shown their appreciation for the maiden speech of my colleague from Oklahoma. There is one thing significant about this maiden speech: it was a speech of substance which brought information to the House; it was a contribution to the House, and I congratulate my colleague for making this contribution. This comes very appropriately from him, too, because not only is he the youngest Member of the House but the youngest ever to serve in the House. It comes very appropriately that he should expose the efforts of Communist countries to exploit youth and youth organizations in their vicious attempt to control the minds of men. My colleague, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, has made a real contribution. I know of no person in the House or elsewhere who has been more diligent in his efforts to expose the subtle intentions of communism than my colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], and I commend him for it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would like to thank my distinguished majority leader and colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. Speaker, I will be delighted to yield now to my chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, I wish to say that our committee is quite privileged to have the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] as a member. The concern he has shown for the security of this country and its military departments and the vital need we have for securing America against all enemies from a military standpoint has been expressed today in showing a similar concern for the minds of American youth for whom he speaks with authority. His accurate appraisal of the pitfalls ahead for American youth and, indeed, the youth of the world and his estimate of what is ahead in the Communist campaign to vilify youth and degrade their hopes and destroy their ambitions and, Mr. Speaker, indeed to banish freedom from their minds and keep discussion from their festivals, is a wonderful thing.

He has spoken with authority; he has spoken with concern and, Mr. Speaker, as his maiden speech, he is warning the youth of America with a clarity which I commend to every Member of this House.

He has done a fine service for his country and the youth which he represents. I think his purpose will bear fruit in the days ahead. The Committee on Armed Services is privileged that a man of his character, his understanding, his concern, holds membership on our committee. We welcome him as a man; we welcome him as a Member of the House of Representatives; we welcome him for what he is doing for his country.

I have known his father before him. I am not surprised that he speaks as he does. He is a true member of the Jed Johnson family that has done so much for America.

I congratulate his State, I congratulate his district, and I congratulate this House of Representatives that we have him as a Member of our body.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, permit me to thank the chairman and to say how grateful I am to him for his very generous and gracious remarks.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. While not as young as the distinguished gentleman in the well, I am not much older; and as the youngest Member of the House on the Republican side of the aisle I certainly, with the gentleman from Oklahoma, share some of the same hopes and aspirations for this world, as do other young people across the globe.

I am pleased to join my colleagues in commenting on the forthcoming Ninth World Festival of Youth and Students for Solidarity, Peace and Friendship.

I believe it is reasonably well known at this point in history that this festival is little more than a Communist-financed, Communist-directed propaganda fair.

It is a healthy thing we all know for young people to come together and interest themselves in the problems of their nation and the world. However, solutions to those problems in their respective nations and in this world are not to be found in this world festival. They are not to be found in totalitarianism but in freedom, in free and open debate and discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for documenting the facts concerning this festival.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Record at this point a statement by Mr. Buz Lukens, national chairman of the Young Republican National Federation, with regard to the forthcoming Ninth World Youth Festival.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

STATEMENT OF MR. BUZ LUKENS, NATIONAL CHAIRMAN OF THE YOUNG REPUBLICAN NATIONAL FEDERATION, WITH REGARD TO THE NINTH WORLD YOUTH FESTIVAL

The following statement with regard to the Ninth World Youth Festival has been issued by Mr. Buz Lukens, national chairman of the 500,000-member Young Republican National Federation.

"Again this year, thousands of young people will gather at the most colossal of Communist propaganda events—the Ninth World Festival of Youth and Students for Solidarity, Peace, and Friendship. The first six of the festivals were held behind the Iron Curtain, but this year the organizers have optimistically moved the festival to the African Continent. The festival will take place in Algiers from July 28 through August 7, 1965.

"It is general knowledge that all finances for this instrument of Soviet propaganda are funneled from the Soviet Union through the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the International Union of Students, known front groups, who exercise control over the form and content of the festival events.

"Many of the festival participants are already followers of the Marxist-Leninist ideology. But many more will come with the misplaced hope that a new basis might be found for mutual understanding and, particularly, that solutions might be found to problems besetting the various troubled and underprivileged young nations.

"It is an insult to the intelligence of the many who seek peace and friendship to attempt to persuade them that the festival has any substantive value whatsoever. In 10 days of a propaganda carnival, masquerading as an athletic and cultural gathering, only the hopelessly naive can believe that even a minimum of world understanding can be achieved.

"In past years, young people who have conscientiously tried to ask questions through honest and open debate are threatened and in some cases, have been caused bodily harm. This festival is used only as a propaganda tool by the Communists and cannot achieve anything but further propaganda value for the Communists.

"Young Republicans all over America share and work for our universal hope of lasting peace. We will undertake any effort to achieve understanding if such an effort contains even the barest promise of success. But we stand with every single responsible youth organization in the United States in opposition to the festival and to the attendance at the youth festival by American young people."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his very pertinent and worthwhile comments and want to say to him how much I appreciate what he has just said to the House.

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am delighted to yield to my good friend and colleague from Colorado [Mr. Evans].

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join in the remarks made by the gentleman from Oklahoma and bring to the attention of the House with regard to this ninth World Festival a statement by Mr. J. Albert House, Jr., national president of the Young Democratic Clubs of America in which he urges all youth organizations and young Democrats of America not to attend this meeting. I think it is a good statement and I should like to have it inserted at this point in the Record.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

STATEMENT BY MR. J. ALBERT HOUSE, JR., NATIONAL PRESIDENT, YOUNG DEMOCRATIC CLUBS OF AMERICA

The Ninth World Festival of Young and Students for Solidarity, Peace, and Friendship will take place this summer in Algiers, Algeria, from July 28 through August 7. The Young Democratic Clubs of America have been asked to participate by the international preparatory committee of the festival and by the American Youth Festival Committee. We decline these invitations, as we have declined them in the past, for the basic reason that the festival is a propaganda invention of the Soviet Union, whose objectives it serves at the expense of truth and objectivity.

This festival, no different from its predecessors, is being financed and manipulated by the World Federation of Democratic Youth and the International Union of Students, two international Communist front organizations. So widely is this fact known, and so obvious has been the propaganda character of past festivals, that it is hard to understand how any representative youth organization of any country would allow itself to become associated with this event.

The festival, by its nature, contradicts its own stated objectives of solidarity, peace, and friendship. It represents an outrageous waste of money. Millions of dollars will be squandered over barely more than 1 week of sloganeering, followed by postfestival tours of Eastern Euorpe and Communist China, for participants eager to indulge themselves.

More importantly, the slogans used are ones that are universally known and understood, but used by the Communist leadership to serve their own purposes of distortion and fraud. Many youths who go, especially from the emerging nations of Africa, Latin America, and the Near and Far East, will be bitterly disappointed at the sham that the Communists make of peace and friendship.

Young Democrats at the national level and in every section of this country, close to 1 million strong, have consistently supported worthy mediums of international youth cooperation. But we urge other representative youth organizations in the United States to join us again this year in refusing to accept invitations to this propaganda festival. Our absence will give testimony for all to see that we want no part in an event which invests in the gullible, and not the hungry, of the world's youth.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I should like to thank the distinguished gentleman from Colorado for his remarks.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to my good friend, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Adams].

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma on a very fine speech to the House and join with him in presenting to the American public the true picture of the Communist-sponsored Ninth World Youth Festival.

As one who participated as a representative of the University of Washington in the organizational efforts of the National Student Association in 1947, I want to state that I have discussed the matter of the Communist-sponsored Ninth World Youth Festival with the present leaders of the National Student Association and want to emphasize the position of the National Student Association that it "cannot support world youth festivals as long as they are conducted in a manner which is inconsistent with the U.S. National Student Association basic policy declaration on international student cooperation." I am asking to have included in the RECORD as a portion of my remarks a statement from the National Student Association clearly outlining their opposition to American participation in what have been basically propaganda weapons of the Soviet Union.

It should be made completely clear that the National Student Association is not involved with the recently self-constituted American youth festival committee. The use of U.S. National Student Association's name on a letterhead of this organization was done without prior consultation or authorization by the U.S. National Student Association.

I join with Congressman JOHNSON in his challenge to the Soviet Union to apply the estimated $30 million cost of this event to its long overdue United Nations debt.

In conclusion, I am including a statement of policy from the U.S. National Student Association so that the organization's position will be clear on the record. Under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement at this point:

The National Student Association wishes to reemphasize its position, adopted by the National Student Congress, that it "cannot support world youth festivals as long as they are conducted in a manner which is inconsistent with the USNSA basic policy declaration on international student cooperation." This resolution points to the emotional atmosphere which inhibits meaningful examination of the issues; to the international preparatory committee's domination by people who wish to use the festival for partisan political purposes; to the distribution of inaccurate information by the IPC about the festival; to the direction of meetings toward certain political conclusions; and to the lack of any public financial records of income or expenditures.

USNSA feels a responsibility to American students to point out that past world youth festivals have been financed by the Soviet bloc, operating through its front groups, the International Union of Students (IUS), and the World Federation of Democratic Youth (WFDY), to the extent of some $10 to $20 million per festival. In our judgment, the partisan nature of the present international preparatory committee indicates that there has been little change in the event's orientation.

We also wish to make completely clear that we are not involved in the recently self-constituted American youth festival committee (AYFC). The above-mentioned letter lists as chairman of the AYFC Jeffrey Segal, who is identified as the Illinois-Wisconsin regional chairman of USNSA. Mr. Segal is not chairman of the region, is not a student, and does not live in Illinois or Wisconsin. The use of USNSA's name on the letterhead of this letter was done without prior consultation with or authorization by USNSA. No permission would have been granted if it had been so requested.

To suggest that Mr. Segal in some way represents USNSA is as misleading as the impression that AYFC in some way represents American youth and students. In fact, the AYFC for this festival did not even go through the motions of calling a public meeting to form an open festival committee. Rather, it met privately and constituted itself as the body sponsoring American participation in the festival. It did so without consultation with representative American student organizations at the instigation of the international preparatory committee.

In conclusion, USNSA will not participate in the Ninth World Youth Festival because of the partisan nature of the event; the obvious direction of this festival for partisan political purposes does not permit the meeting to serve as a genuine forum for international student cooperation and understanding.

Sincerely,

STEPHEN J. M. ROBBINS,
President.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Washington for his very pertinent remarks.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will be delighted to yield to my colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud as an Oklahoman of the splendid speech we have just heard by our young and able colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma, JED JOHNSON, JR.

Congressman JOHNSON has brought to our continuing fight against the Communist conspiracy an informed mind, a solid understanding of the true nature of the Communist threat, and some wise advice for the young people of America.

I congratulate him upon his splendid address, and upon the fine record which he is making in his first term in the House. I know his constitutents in Oklahoma's Sixth District share our delegation's great pride in the job he is doing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me thank my colleague for his kind remarks and say that it is a great honor and personal privilege for me to serve with the gentleman in the House of Representatives and to serve with him on the Oklahoma delegation.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to my colleague from Oklahoma.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I join in complimenting my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] on his maiden speech here in the House of Representatives. He is following appropriately in the same tradition of representation that was set here by his distinguished father for 20 years in this body.

Mr. Speaker, today in leading off with this very forceful, hard-hitting informative speech the gentleman from Oklahoma has made an important contribution to our efforts to meet the Communist challenge around the world.

Mr. Speaker, I compliment the gentleman upon his fine speech today.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me thank the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JARMAN], my good friend, and say I am also very glad to serve with him in the House of Representatives and also to serve with him on the Oklahoma delegation.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, it has been a high privilege to be able to sit here in this Chamber and to listen to a fine maiden speech by one who is already proving himself a splendid legislator.

Mr. Speaker, in any view of the average age of the Members of this body, one has to realize that in order to have an average you have to have some Members who are somewhat older and some Members who are somewhat younger. I can attest as one who has watched the performance of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] in these months since he has been here that he is holding up his end of the spectrum magnificently.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] brings to his subject matter today not only a warm interest but some special fields of expertise. No one should know better than the gentleman from Oklahoma the opportunity of a group of young people getting together and the tragic sense that comes to one when he sees those opportunities for the free interchange of ideas being lost as they are in this Communist-dominated world conference.

He brings to us this afternoon the experience be has had on behalf of the great work of that force for world peace, the United Nations.

I was so interested when the gentleman from Oklahoma called attention to the irony that some $30 million is being spent on this conference which, were it put into the United Nations coffers, could do so much in paying past obligations to enable the United Nations once again in the current world crises to perform the role envisaged for it by those who gathered at San Francisco 20 years ago. It has been a memorable occasion this afternoon, and I have been privileged to sit here and hear this very wise and discerning maiden speech.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, my good friend, and want to say how pleased I am that he has made the remarks which he has. I pay tribute to him as one who has stood and will always stand for the freedom of dissent.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would also like to join in congratulating the gentleman from Oklahoma on this very stirring maiden speech, and particularly on the subject matter he has selected for this very important presentation today. I think it is extremely important at this time of the year for the Congress to take note of the fact that the Ninth World Youth Festival is a Communist-dominated propaganda stunt. Particularly is it important because right now, as the gentleman has pointed out, the festival organizers are recruiting throughout this country, at the universities and at the colleges, young men who in their great desire to make some contribution to better world understanding can be so easily misled and beguiled by the slogans being put out by the sponsors of this festival.

The gentleman deserves the highest commendation for bringing this matter to the attention of the Congress, and it would be my hope that the press throughout the country in America's universities and colleges would certainly report his remarks so that the young people in these institutions of higher learning will be properly forewarned of the real purpose of the Ninth World Youth Festival. We know, as the gentleman has pointed out, that there are going to be starry-eyed young Americans who are going to sign up to attend the festival. They have in the past, and they are going to do it again, somehow, naively thinking that they can make some sort of contribution.

In past years I have asked young people why they attended the festival, and they said, "Is it not better we are represented there than to ignore the thing?"

As the gentleman has pointed out, and because of his own youth and his experience with young people, and has properly pointed out that persons carrying the American flag in parades and demonstrations gives the world the false impression that somehow the young people of this country are supporting that fallacious, misleading festival.

So, for this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the gentleman has taken this opportunity and has called the true meaning of this festival to the attention of the young people of America. It is my sincere hope they will heed and be warned.

I would like to point out that the people of his congressional district certainly can find a great deal of pride in knowing that the gentleman is watching these things and has the courage to stand up. There will be those in some quarters in America who are going to criticize him for this attitude, and unquestionably he will draw wrath in some quarters. I think it takes a great deal of courage to stand up and be counted as he has stood up in the well of the House, and I congratulate him. It speaks well for the great record he is going to write in this Congress as a Member from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his very kind remarks.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am delighted to yield to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, I should like to compliment the distinguished and able gentleman from Oklahoma on a most timely and eloquent address. I compliment the people of Oklahoma on having the good judgment and the foresight to send my distinguished and able colleague to join us here in this, the world's greatest deliberative body. I predict for him a great future.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. May I thank the gentleman from South Carolina, who so well bears the great name of William Jennings Bryan.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to be on the floor on this occasion while the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma has made the address he has just made, particularly so when it is his first address to the Members of the House as a new Member of this great body.

In 1934 I was chairman of the select committee of this great body that investigated communism, nazism, and fascism. Out of my committee came the Foreign Registration Act. My committee made the recommendation for what is now known as the Smith Act, as well as several other pieces of legislation which have been enacted into law during the past years. I think I had an opportunity then of looking into the evil mind of the Communists and the evil intent and purposes of the Communists.

I am so happy the gentleman from Oklahoma has addressed himself to this great body on such a subject, a subject which really divides the world, the world of love and the world of hate, communism represented by the origin of hate and our own way of life represented by the origin of love.

The gentleman from Oklahoma has made a marked contribution to the thought and action not only of the youth of America but all Americans without regard to their age. His first address has shown tremendous research and keenness and a powerful ability to analyze and interpret. His address is most timely, one that, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] said, will be widely publicized.

I congratulate the gentleman from Oklahoma and I congratulate the people of his district for sending him here, because his maiden speech shows the great character of service he will render during the years ahead as a Member of this body, always reflecting great credit upon the people of his district.

I know his late father, with whom I served, and who was one of my dear friends, is looking down from heaven today with great pride in the fact that his son, his boy, as a Member of this body has made this great and dramatic speech.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me thank our distinguished and great Speaker of the House of Representatives for his very generous remarks and say how proud and happy I am to have the honor to serve in the same legislative body with him.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

IRS CENTRAL FILING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DANIELS). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, any time a Congressman can find a way to save money for the Government, all he should have to do is rise in this Chamber and state where and how much. The rest of us ought not seek any additional details—we should accept the idea without further ado.

Of course, this cannot be done in all cases where a substantial saving can be realized. We have such questions as the public welfare and national security to consider, to name just two.

But if we can come up with a program that will pass all these tests—and save money in the bargain—then I would say we really have something.

Such a program, I believe, is the Internal Revenue Service's new central filing system for individual income tax returns. This program, the first major revision in tax filing procedures since people began paying income taxes back in 1914, is expected to save taxpayers some $7 million a year outright when it is fully operational. The savings it will generate through greater efficiency and accelerated processing of returns alone are inestimable.

The plan will greatly expedite the handling of taxpayer returns by permitting them to be filed directly to 1 of the 7 regional offices instead of mailing first to 1 of the 58 district offices. It will eliminate one time-consuming step in the processing of returns, although the other functions such as taxpayer counseling, return auditing, and adjustments will continue to be performed by the district offices. Thus full services will continue to be maintained for taxpayers at the local level, while paperwork will be centralized.

When it is fully operational, the program will eliminate the delays and waste motions inherent in current procedures. I have seen for myself, as a member of the Treasury and Post Office Appropriations Subcommittee, the ludicrous spectacle of men dumping returns out of one bag at a district office and dropping them into another bag for shipment to a regional office.

Back in the leisurely days preceding World War II, this procedure was not the bottleneck it has become today. Only 8 million Americans were filing annual income tax returns in those days. The returns themselves were simple, straightforward forms which did not require the skills of a certified public accountant to fill out and to analyze.

Today more than 100 million Americans file income tax returns every year. And I need not point out how complex and cumbersome these returns have become. Yet we continue to cling to the old procedure of filing directly to a district office which must, in turn, reship all the returns to a regional center.

One of the reasons is simply that there has never been an adequate definition of a taxpayer's legal venue when he files his return. In order to make certain his venue remained in his community, he was required to file his return at a district office—even though the district office did nothing more than transfer that return from one mail bag to another.

Today I am pleased to join with my distinguished colleague from Arkansas in introducing legislation which will make clear that a taxpayer's legal venue remains in his community even if the regional center to which he mails his return is outside his district.

This will eliminate the need for mailing to a district office, thus eliminating the need for district offices altogether. The taxpayer files directly at the regional center where his return will be processed immediately through electronic equipment.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this measure will pave the way to full implementation of the central filing system which, I might add, has been a pet project of mine almost since I first came to the Congress.

For the last 2 years I have strongly advocated conversion to the central system where application of automatic data processing methods will speed processing of returns, spot errors, and make refunds more rapidly. Over half of all the taxpayers in the country claim some sort of refund every year. I am certain they will all welcome the improved service which the ADP centers will provide.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN EXCISE TAXES

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, today I am filing legislation which will repeal most of the "emergency" excise taxes that were imposed during World War II. The Government, in an effort to curb their sales, put taxes on so-called luxury goods; and, as is the case with many things in Government—long after the emergency has passed—the taxes remain.

My bill will repeal these taxes in the retail, manufacturer's, and services categories. It will become effective July 1, 1965.

On the retailer level, taxes on jewelry and related items, furs, cosmetics, luggage, and handbags would be eliminated. As far as I am aware, we are not in the midst of an austerity program; therefore, I do not believe that there is any necessity to discourage the sale of these items.

As far as manufacturer's taxes are concerned, my bill will remove excise taxes on refrigeration equipment, electric, gas, and oil appliances, radio and television sets, phonographs and records, electric light bulbs, photographic equipment, certain sporting equipment, business machines, pens and mechanical pencils, and lighters.

There are also certain taxes that are imposed on services that I would remove. For example, the 10-percent tax on communications would be repealed. Would anyone consider the telephone a luxury? I think not—it is a necessity both in business and private everyday living. I would also repeal the theater admissions tax, as well as those on club dues and the transportation of persons. The occupational tax on bowling alleys would also be repealed.

There are certain types of taxes, Mr. Speaker, that I feel should remain in effect. They are those which fall into a "users tax" category. The revenues that are derived from these taxes are used for the benefit of the taxpayer. For example, the Federal excise tax on gasoline would remain in effect because these revenues are used to support our Federal highway program. Another which would remain on the books would be the Federal tax on certain sporting goods such as fishing tackle. These revenues also accrue to the benefit of the taxpayer—a "user" type of tax.

In filing this bill, Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that I can remind the administration of its promise to the American people of 3 months ago. I supported efforts in the last Congress to reduce or eliminate these taxes. I do so again now and urge my colleagues to give my bill serious consideration and support.

SURVIVAL OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. EDWARDS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing two bills today designed to give our country's private enterprise more opportunity for surviving and prospering in its relationship with Government.

Business today is caught in a gigantic squeeze between the two pincers of rising costs and big government. On the one hand, increased costs are a matter of constant concern to private enterprise. On the other, Government regulation and restrictions imposed by the growing tangle of Federal Government activities serve to further inhibit the businessman's ability to make good on his responsibilities to investors.

My first bill today would prevent the Federal Government from engaging in activities in direct competition with private enterprise. It is designed to take the Government out of many business activities where there is direct conflict with private enterprise.

The Bureau of the Budget has in the past issued directives designed to help prevent Government competition with private enterprise. But under the Johnson administration, there are no signs that these directives are being implemented. On the contrary, this competition is being sharply increased.

It is both unfair and unjust for the Federal Government to compel private companies to pay taxes which are used to subsidize Federal competition against themselves. Estimates of Government's capital investment in business operations range widely from $30 billion upward.

My bill first declares it a policy of the Federal Government to provide for the termination of Federal Government activities in competition with private enterprise to the maximum extent compatible with national security and the public interest.

Second, it gives to the Secretary of Commerce responsibility for examining reports of Government competition with private enterprise and working for an end to unnecessary competition.

Third, it requires that before any new business-type activities can be undertaken by the Government, the Bureau of the Budget must attest that the new activity complies with provisions of this act.

And it requires that the President make an annual report to the Congress on action taken pursuant to this act.

My second bill today would require procurement of certain services by Government agencies from commercial suppliers whenever a savings in cost would result.

The proposal is designed to reverse a continuing trend toward interagency dealings in competition with private enterprise. Too often, Government agencies have gone ahead to deal with other Government agencies for procurement of services without any attempt to find out if the job could be done more economically outside the Government.

My bill provides that no Federal agency may procure from any other Federal agency on a reimbursable basis any service until the cost has been ascertained and until it is determined that a service of like quality cannot be obtained at a comparable cost from a private source.

The bill provides exceptions in cases where the national security is involved, or where other legal provisions pertain.

Enactment of these bills, Mr. Speaker, will help to free the Government of unnecessary activities. It will give at least some elements of private enterprise a better opportunity to prosper, and it will give our entire country assurance that Congress, as representative of the people, is making an effort to limit the expansion of Federal Government activity and its growing authority over the lives of all of us.

STUDY OF THE REPUBLICAN HOUSE TASK FORCE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican House task force on agriculture, organized at the beginning of this month, is currently in the process of a thorough study of the agricultural situation in this country. The amount of research required in this area is enormous, and it will be some time before the task force study progresses to the point where it could be used as a basis for any legislative recommendations. The task force will, however, from time to time issue progress reports, pointing up new facts and concepts which have developed along the way.

Mr. Speaker, last week the task force issued such a report, stating preliminary findings and outlining some of the more important areas in which research must be conducted. For the information of my colleagues, I am inserting it in the RECORD:

GOVERNMENT IS SPENDING MORE NOW, BUT FARMER AND TAXPAYER ARE ENJOYING IT LESS—REPUBLICAN AGRICULTURAL TASK FORCE SAYS GOVERNMENT IS INEFFICIENT, NOT FARMER

WASHINGTON, March 24.—"Confused, inadequate, expensive farm programs, and conflicting farm policy objectives result in loss of income for the farmer and increased expenditures for the consumer through taxes," said Congressman ODIN LANGEN today, speaking as chairman of the House Republican task force on agriculture. "The administration has implied that 2½ million U.S. farmers are inefficient, but we find that, in actuality, Government farm programs, not farmers, are inefficient."

Task force members, in a joint statement, pointed out that a clue to this confusion can be found by taking a look at the farm income situation. "Ten years ago the farmer received 42 cents from every consumer food dollar—today he receives only 37 cents, less than in the depression days of 1935. Retail food prices have increased 29 percent in the past 16 years, while the net income of agriculture has gone down 29 percent. Yet, farm production and the number of consumers have risen."

From Internal Revenue Service analysis of farm tax returns, the task force found that the number of farmers reporting a net loss increased from 29.8 percent in 1962 to 34 percent in 1963. Only 15.4 percent of the business and professional group showed a net loss for 1963.

The minority House Members also noted that farm production expenses in 1947 averaged 57.6 percent of cash receipts from marketings. "Production expenses last year were 80.1 percent and rising, a level almost as high as during the depression, when, in 1933, the figure was 80.9 percent.

"Further evidence of this sad income situation is found in the parity ratio, a Department of Agriculture index which weighs the prices a farmer receives against the costs of the things he buys. The parity ratio has dropped from 80 in 1960 to 75 in 1964, the lowest level since the black depression days of 1934."

FARM PROGRAM COSTS EXCEED BENEFITS

"The costs of Federal farm programs to the consumer and taxpayer far exceed the benefits of the program to anyone, including the farmer," task force members stated. "Even a cursory examination of the administration's farm programs shows that things are topsy-turvy—something very definitely is wrong.

"Federal expenditures for stabilization of farm prices and income have increased enormously in the past few years. For every dollar spent for this purpose in 1948, $25 is being spent today. Expenditures in 1957 were $1.6 billion for price supports—last year they were $2.6 billion. During the last 3 years the present administration spent more than twice as much as was spent for this purpose during the entire period from 1932 through 1941, the beginning of the war."

The task force noted that, although the cost-price squeeze is forcing more and more farmers off the land, the cost of running the Department of Agriculture is not going down. "Back in fiscal year 1933, for instance, there was 1 USDA employee for every 203 farmers in the United States. In 1961, the ratio was 1 to 37. Today, there is 1 USDA employee for every 32 farmers.

"As an accurate summary of the situation," concluded task force members, "it can be said that the administration is paying more and more, while the farmer, taxpayer, and consumer are enjoying it less and less."

FOREIGN POLICY AND THE FARMER

U.S. assistance through the Agency for International Development has been provided to enable competitors (Americans and foreigners) to increase their production overseas, and to compete successfully for U.S. markets, observed the Republicans.

"It is interesting to note that from 1947, shortly after the war, to 1964, total U.S. imports of foreign agricultural products in competition with U.S. farm-produced commodities, amounted to $31.1 billion. During this same period, Federal expenditures for stabilization of farm prices on competitive crops, amounted to $23.4 billion."

The task force cautioned that we should not retreat to "isolationism" with respect to agricultural trade. "Exports are a very pertinent item in the present and future U.S. economy," they said. "However, present U.S. policy on foreign trade is pursued in almost complete disregard of the U.S. farmer, with agriculture often being sacrificed in order to gain industrial trade. The balance must be restored if agriculture is to survive."

ARE LAND RETIREMENT AND IRRIGATION PROJECTS COMPATIBLE?

The disregard for agriculture is not limited to the State Department, said the task force members. "While there are many irrigation projects that are beneficial and do not produce surplus commodities, the fact remains there are many that do."

It was pointed out that while the Federal Government has been spending billions on programs of land retirement and acreage diversion, it has at the same time been spending billions encouraging production of crops covered by price stabilization programs, on new irrigation projects. For example, in 1963 the total Commodity Credit Corporation realized loss on the cotton program was $171 million. The value of the total federally irrigated cotton crop for 1963 was $189 million. That same year, the Federal Government spent $311 million on the soil bank program, while forage crops irrigated by Federal projects were valued at $266 million.

"Another interesting comparison is the fact that the total value of price supported commodities raised during the past 12 years on land irrigated by Federal projects is roughly equivalent to the present total CCC investment in price support loans and inventories, about $7.6 billion," they said.

"Clearly something is wrong when costly programs are simultaneously pursued to cross purposes. No individual Government program should be operated at the expense of another. Overall policy must be coordinated.

"The results of such policy deficiencies have meant not only a loss of income to the farmer, but also a very real loss of freedom for the farmer to make his own choices in the operation of his own farm."

THE FARMER AND THE CONSUMER

Since the farmer has absorbed increasing production costs and Government restrictions to his own loss, "it becomes obvious that any additional food costs to the consumer have been the result of increases in the costs of food processing, rather than in the costs of production." The task force added that "even with these increased costs of processing, the U.S. consumer spends a smaller portion of his income for food than consumers in any other country." They noted that the average U.S. family spends less than 19 percent of its income on food, compared with 29.5 percent in the United Kingdom, 46.9 percent in Japan, and 53 percent in Russia. "U.S. farm efficiency has increased to the point where today, each farmer produces enough for himself and 29 others. In 1949 he produced enough for himself and 15 others. Surely it can be said that the production of food is the most efficient part of the total cost of food to the consumer.

"These facts," the task force pointed out, "are the result of but a preliminary study of the U.S. agricultural situation. However, they do provide an indication of the need for a complete and thorough study in depth of the farm problem. Many other areas must be explored in detail in order to provide a sound basis for any recommendations for improvement of the situation in agriculture."

Chairman LANGEN noted that requests have been made of all House Republican Members for suggestions and information which they may have in regard to the farm problem. "Many communications have been received—all will be considered. It is the desire of the House Republican task force on agriculture that similar suggestions from all interested individuals or groups be conveyed to the task force."

(All data obtained from official U.S. Government sources.)

IMPROVED TAX TREATMENT OF TEACHERS

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHRIVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which has as its purpose the correction of certain inequities in rulings by the Internal Revenue Service relating to tax deductions for educational expenses of teachers.

This legislation is important and necessary to the teaching profession. Enactment would go a long way toward encouraging better qualified teachers to remain within their profession.

The Internal Revenue Service is limited by the present language of the Internal Revenue Code. Within the limits fixed by the law, the IRS has tried to provide fair interpretations; however, there remains an abundance of confusion and controversy.

For example, at the present time, a teacher may deduct educational expenses incurred to maintain his current position; but a deduction is denied if the additional education leads to a promotion.

If my bill were enacted, teachers would no longer be required to rely upon IRS interpretations. They could look to precise language in the Revenue Code. Under this bill, deductible expenses would include: tuition and fees, expense of travel away from home, and up to $100 per year for books and related materials. Such deductions could be claimed by part-time or full-time teachers who undertake academic work in accredited institutions of higher learning.

All deductions now available to teachers under the present regulations would be continued. However, my bill would provide important and needed improvements in the present tax treatment of teachers.

The House has just passed education legislation which is aimed at assuring adequate and quality educational opportunities for our young people in the elementary and secondary schools. Higher education legislation now is under consideration in committee.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when our Nation is becoming increasingly aware of the need for more and better trained teachers, our tax regulations actually penalize the very teachers who are most interested in self-improvement and advancement.

We must remember that the good teacher is the keystone of a successful educational system. The legislation will help place the teaching profession on an equitable basis with other professions insofar as tax treatment is concerned. It also will help encourage voluntary continuing education among those who work with America's most precious resource—our children.

A GREAT AMERICAN—NOAH MASON

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, those who have been privileged to know Noah Mason, who for 26 years served as Representative in Congress from the 15th District of Illinois, mourn his passing and pay honor to his memory. Although not American-born, Noah Mason personifies all that America stands for. He dedicated himself to service to his community, to his State, and to his country and stood steadfastly throughout his life by his convictions and his high ideals. Particularly as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives and as a distinguished and hard-working member of the Committee on Ways and Means, he fought courageously against waste and extravagance in Government and was ever mindful of the burden that the taxpayers of this country have to bear. He was loved and respected by the people of his district who returned him to the Congress time after time, knowing that their interests would be well served.

Noah Mason has gone from our scene but he will be long remembered as a dedicated American and a warm friend of the people of the United States. I join my colleagues in extending my deep sympathy to the members of his family.

GOLD FOR NOTHING

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Rumsfeld] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, many thoughtful constituents of the 13th Congressional District of Illinois, which I have the honor of serving, are asking why our Government accedes to the demands of France for U.S. gold in exchange for dollars—which has resulted in an appreciable decline in U.S. gold stocks—while making no demands on France to resume payment of her debt to the United States totaling in the billions of dollars. The following report which appeared recently in the Chicago Sun-Times reflects the puzzlement of many Americans with respect to this question:

Needed: Another J. Ham Lewis

James Hamilton Lewis, a picturesque and somewhat eccentric gentleman of undetermined age, was U.S. Senator from Illinois in the 1930's. He was somewhat obsessed with the idea that those European nations, particularly France and Great Britain, which had borrowed huge sums from the United States with which to conduct World War I, should be required to pay their obligations.

Despite various arrangements into which they had entered with the United States for meeting those debts, they weren't doing so, and Old Jim Ham, as many referred to him, was disturbed by their delinquencies. Not only was he disturbed by them but he also discovered that Midwesterners generally, and Illinoisans in particular, were pleased with his frequent Senate speeches demanding settlement. At the time I was a reporter assigned to covering the Senate. I had noticed the frequency of the Senator's pay-the-war-debts speech. But it was some time before I knew the reason for the frequency. I ultimately discovered that every time there was a delegation of his constituents in the galleries Old Jim Ham, he of the pink whiskers, sartorial perfection, and Chesterfieldian manners, took the floor and gave America's wartime allies unshirted hell.

Old Jim Ham died soon after. he was reelected in 1936. And no longer hearing the Senator's frequent fiery demand for collection of those debts, I soon forgot about them.

So imagine my surprise the other day when I read that Treasury Secretary C. Douglas Dillon, testifying before a House committee, reported that the U.S. Treasury still holds something in the neighborhood of $20.4 billion in virtually worthless I O U's given us by our esteemed allies when they ran out of cash in World War I.

The Secretary is a banker, a gentleman who would not refer to an international commitment as an I O U or describe one of them as worthless.

But the Secretary did say that the Treasury had all but abandoned hopes of collecting those debts contracted nearly half a century ago.

That $20.4 billion doesn't include $17 billion that those same nations and a few others obtained subsequently. Neither does it include any of the many billions the United States gave after each war in efforts to revive their economies.

Along with Secretary Dillon, I, too, have abandoned all hopes of the United States collecting the $20.4 billion.

Running down the list of World War I debts still unpaid, I noticed that France owes the United States $7.1 billion in debts and interest incurred for prosecution of World War I. France has done better on its World War II debts. It was able to do so after its economy had been revived by the injection of multiple billions into its economy—multiple billions given outright—by the United States.

Nonetheless, the fact remains that France, a nation that has yet to pick up its World War I tab, and still hasn't retired its World War II loans, is one which, under the presidency of Charles de Gaulle, uses the extra dollars it accumulates in foreign trade to drain off American gold reserves and, at the same time, devotes much of its energy to wrecking U.S. policy wherever the opportunity arises.

Helping a debtor stave off bankruptcy so that he may ultimately pay his debts is sometimes good business practice. Helping a debtor stave off bankruptcy so that he may set up store in the same neighborhood in an attempt to put his creditor out of business doesn't seem to make much sense. But international finance is very complicated, exceedingly esoteric and isn't to be understood by ordinary mortals, you know. A bad debt may be a bad debt and the debtor a deadbeat so far as you and I, just ordinary taxpayers, are concerned. And it was to Old Jim Ham, too. But to almost everyone else in Washington it seems to be a good credit rating which permits the debtor to borrow again and again, especially if the debtor is seeking to put you out of business by merging with your competitors.

"We have never waived our claim to payment."

So Secretary Dillon told the House Appropriations Committee. That, presumably, is good news, ma cherie. It would be better news if the Secretary would figure out a way to send De Gaulle some of France's I O U's instead of gold every time the French President raids our reserves by shipping over dollars for collection. But that, I assume, would be taking unfair advantage of the old gentleman who has devoted much of his Presidency to attempts to kick the United States out of Europe, to complicating the hazardous situation in Vietnam, and to wooing Soviet Russia which, incidentally has I O U's in the U.S. Treasury for World War II commitments amounting to $840 million.

TEENAGE DRINKING

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the April 10 issue of the Saturday Evening Post contains an article entitled "Teenage Drinking," which I should like to bring to the attention of our colleagues.

This article, written by Post Editor at Large Bill Davidson, provides additional documentation—if more is needed—of the seriousness of the teenage drinking problem, especially as it is compounded by virtue of New York State's legal drinking age of 18.

On February 25, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 319, expressing the sense of the Senate and House of Representatives that the State of New York should raise its minimum legal drinking age from 18 to 21 in conformity with the laws of its five neighboring States and Canada and in the interests of interstate cooperation, highway safety, and the health and welfare of young people.

Sixteen of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, joined with me on that occasion in introducing identical resolutions. Others have done so since that time. I am sure I speak for these colleagues when I express the hope that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the distinguished gentleman from New York, will soon take appropriate action to assure consideration of our concurrent resolution.

The Post article, which I include as a part of my remarks, makes convincingly clear why an expression of congressional concern about teenage drinking could be so important.

Mr. Davidson has contributed greatly toward establishing more firmly these fundamental considerations:

That teenagers have lower blood-alcohol levels and thus lower alcohol tolerances than older persons.

That teenagers are much more emotionally immature and thus more susceptible to questionable influences stemming from feelings of inadequacy.

That teenage drinking, as a result of these physical and psychological factors, frequently leads to other forms of antisocial behavior, all the way from delinquency to murder.

That youngsters under 18 find that New York's drinking age of 18 is more easily circumvented than the drinking age of 21 which governs in all adjoining States.

That the teenage drinking problem is particularly acute in the States adjacent to New York because of the regularity with which youngsters flock to New York borderline taverns to do the drinking prohibited by their own States and return home as serious law enforcement and safety problems for their own police officials.

That New York State deliberately caters to the teenage drinking trade by means of licensing excessive numbers of taverns in communities bordering on other States and sanctioning taverns and night clubs which blatantly advertise carefully designed teenage attractions.

The Post article follows in full:

TEENAGE DRINKING

(They start for kicks, for status, for the thrill of rebelling. Today one third of a million young Americans are in serious trouble with alcohol. A report on a major national problem.)

(By Bill Davidson)

Shortly after 7 o'clock one evening last May, Gary Hanlon and another 17-year-old boy left Southbury, Conn., to drink in nearby Putnam Lake, N.Y. For a 17-year-old, New York's minimum-drinking age of 18 is more easily circumvented than Connecticut's minimum of 21; the boys, in fact, had already made three drinking expeditions across the State line that day.

At 7:34 p.m. a gas-station attendant saw Hanlon's car speed up Connecticut's winding Route 39 at about 75 miles an hour, approaching from the south a dangerous curve known as Taylor's Corner. At the same moment, a New Fairfield, Conn., banker named Louis Tanzella was heading into Taylor's Corner from the north, driving his brand-new automobile at a sedate 35 miles an hour. With him were his wife and daughter.

Hanlon's car couldn't make the curve. It hurtled into the left lane, out of control. Tanzella, seeing the car coming at him headlong, tried to steer up the steep bank beside the road. Hanlon hit him broadside. The crash was heard half a mile away. Tanzella and his wife were killed instantly; their daughter died the next morning. It took hours of work with blowtorches to free Tanzella's body from the wreckage. Scanning the banker's blood-soaked driver's license, a highway patrolman noted that it was Tanzella's 54th birthday.

Hanlon's companion survived the crash; Hanlon did not. "A sample of Hanlon's blood," the coroner reported, "revealed a blood-alcohol level of 0.14, a high reading. It was the equivalent of nearly 7 ounces of 86-proof whiskey in his system."

The Hanlon tragedy made headlines in the local newspapers, but it received almost no notice elsewhere. A month later, however, a similar case—that of 18-year-old Michael Smith—did get national attention. After drinking 12 scotches at a party in the affluent New York City suburb of Darien, Conn., Smith wrecked his car; his date, 17-year-old Nancy Hitchings, was killed. The incident gained notoriety not because of the teenage drinking so much as because the parents and other adults who had supervised the party were arrested under an unusual and seldom-enforced law.

For every celebrated case such as Michael Smith's there are a thousand obscure cases like Hanlon's tucked away in police files across the Nation. Perhaps because the statistics are hard to get at, the phenomenon of adolescent drinking has not been intensively researched. In the past 20 years there have been perhaps five major studies by outstanding sociologists, and all have tended to play down the problem.

The studies acknowledge that a good many teenagers drink—as few as 50 percent of teenagers in some parts of the country and as many as 86 percent in others. But the studies maintain that, as one authority put it, "most of them don't drink much." Dr. Selden D. Bacon, of the Rutgers University Center of Alcohol Studies likes to point out that more 12- and 13-year-old drunks were admitted to New York City's Bellevue Hospital in 1890 than have been brought in for drunkenness in any recent year. When learned societies discuss the subject, one speaker or another is sure to elicit chuckles by quoting an ancient Egyptian or Sumerian inscription that laments youthful imbibing in the same alarmed phrases used by the press today.

The social scientists say that since 7 out of 10 American adults (or nearly 80 million people) drink, it should not be surprising if proportionately large numbers of children follow the adult example. Nevertheless, they add, the percentage of teenage drinkers hasn't changed much in the last 20 years. Of the 10.9 million American youngsters between the ages of 15 and 20 who are users of alcohol, only about 3 percent have difficulty with drink—that is, only about 3 percent are prealcoholics or turn to alcohol because of deep-rooted emotional problems.

To the social scientist this percentage is not statistically significant. To the average American, however, it most certainly is. As one Pennsylvania educator put it: "That so-called statistically insignificant 3 percent means that a third of a million kids are running around the United States capable of killing themselves or innocent people and causing millions of dollars' worth of damage. Statistically insignificant? I wonder what the smug sociologists would say if we had an invading army of about a third of a million men loose in our country with the same potential of causing death and destruction."

It is the behavior of this troublesome 3 percent that has stirred most of the new national concern over teenage drinking. The problem drinkers, of course, are not evenly distributed across the country. There are fewer, for instance, in midwestern communities with Baptist-Methodist traditions of abstinence, and more in east and west coast communities where the country club ethic prevails. But few areas have escaped altogether the rampages of young drinkers.

For example, the much-publicized case of the socially prominent youngsters who ransacked a Long Island mansion after a coming-out party in 1963 was matched several months ago in little Hastings, Nebr., where some 40 boys and girls commandeered a vacant farmhouse for a drinking party. Before the night was over they had wrecked the place in an orgy of wanton destruction. In the exclusive Portola Valley suburb of San Francisco 13 boys—aged 12 to 17 and all from wealthy families—engaged in a yearlong alcoholic spree in which they set a school on fire, shoplifted, broke into a dentist's office to find Novocain, robbed houses, and stole the hubcaps and smashed the windows of parked cars.

In California teenagers often induce derelicts to buy alcoholic beverages for them. Not long ago three boys in their midteens paid a bum to buy them a case of beer. After they had drunk with the old fellow for an hour or so, the boys got rambunctious and started to stone his shack. When the derelict tried to chase them away, the youngest boy threw a brick at the old man, hitting him on the head. The police found his body several hours later, his skull bashed in. Capt. W. L. Richey, commander of the juvenile division of the Los Angeles police, said, "This is a clear case of where teenage drinking led directly to murder."

More and more concerned Americans are coming to realize that underage drinking frequently leads to murder of a sort—to slaughter on the highways. In the last 2 years more than 10,000 persons have been killed in accidents caused by drunken drivers; and more than 4,000 of those fatalities were caused by teenaged drunks. In 1963 there were 112 such fatalities in California alone.

Social scientists who study adolescent drinking tend to deplore the recitation of statistics like these. They say that since 97 percent of drinking teenagers drink moderately, the misdeeds of the immoderate 3 percent should not be emphasized. Some argue that the 3 percent are emotionally disturbed and would be getting into trouble even if they didn't drink.

Sociologist George L. Maddox, of Duke University, disagrees. "If a youngster is in trouble," he says, "with drinking he's in worse trouble." Another dissenter is Dr. Robert E. Gould, head of adolescent services of the psychiatric division at Manhattan's Bellevue Hospital. "With the widespread and socially accepted pattern of teenage drinking in America today," Gould says, "you can never tell when deviant or pathological drinking is going to develop out of emotional disturbances and pressures already within the adolescent. If the soil is ready, problem drinking will grow out of it."

There are several reasons why teenage drinking has become so widespread and so accepted in recent years.

"This current crop of teenagers," says sociologist Harold Hodgkinson, dean of Bard College, "was born in the period following World War II. Their fathers had recently returned from the horror and boredom and deprivation of military life, and their mothers, too, were suddenly released from the overall tension of war. The result was a feeling of elation and relief, and a compulsion for wanting everything to be pleasant. This led to an unusual relaxation of discipline by parents in the governing of their own lives and also in their rearing of their children. We went through a period of extreme permissiveness in dealing with youngsters; the drinking went along with that. Parents drank more themselves, and as their kids grew up the parents didn't seem to care whether their youngsters were experimenting with alcohol or whether they were setting a bad example for their children."

Richard J. Hughes, who as Governor of New Jersey has crusaded for firmer controls on teenage drinking, explains the increase somewhat differently. "It seems strange," says Hughes, "to blame a situation like this on the general prosperity we're all enjoying in America today, but I'm afraid that's at the heart of the problem. In the 1930's, during the depression, youngsters didn't have the money to buy beer or whiskey or cars. In the early 1940's most of our young men were at war; and those who reached adolescence after the war were struggling along in family situations in which their fathers were still trying to reestablish themselves economically after serving in the military. It wasn't until the 1950's and 1960's that the trouble started. With good times, kids got sizable allowances, or they got well-paying jobs after school. Suddenly they had money to experiment with things like drinking. The wealthier kids got cars from their parents; the poorer kids had enough money of their own to buy a jalopy. So for the first time on a large scale we had that very dangerous combination of inexperienced drinking and inexperienced driving."

(Medical authorities have discovered why the combination of drinking and driving is especially dangerous for young people. "The younger age group," says Dr. Johan Lofthus of Norway, one of the world's leading experts on alcoholism, "has on the whole a lower blood-alcohol level. This seems to mean that the younger people [who drink] tend to get into trouble more easily while driving a car, since they have a lower alcohol tolerance than older drivers.")

A third and important explanation for the surge in teenage drinking is that our adolescents are reflecting the persistent tensions of American society itself. Today's youngsters have never known a world at peace. The boys face the military draft and also increasingly bitter competition to get into college or to get and hold good jobs. Many girls, too, face the struggle of getting into college, and many drift into unhappy early marriages. Like the adults around them, these boys and girls often resort to alcohol to help them cope with their tensions.

Even for the vast 97-percent majority of youngsters who drink without incident, drinking becomes what Duke University's Dr. George Maddox calls a natural form of "adult role playing." Battling to be recognized as adults and not children, the youngsters seize upon drinking as a widely recognized symbol of American adulthood. Maddox points out that when a drinking teenager proves his maturity in more substantial ways, such as marrying happily or acquiring and holding a good job, he is likely to stop drinking.

Nearly all experts agree that "adult role-playing" is the key factor in today's widespread teenage-drinking phenomenon. Sometimes it takes extreme forms. In San Francisco, for example, a 15-year-old boy, having observed his parents drinking heavily every night, assembled six of his friends, found a bottle of bourbon in his father's liquor cabinet and downed it all at once. Nothing happened, so his friends suggested he try "cocktails." The boy then drank two water glasses filled to the brim with a mixture of Scotch, bourbon, and vermouth. An instant later the boy fell to the floor unconscious, and his friends rushed him to Junipero Serra Hospital. He was in danger of drowning in his own vomit, and so a doctor performed a tracheotomy, opening a hole through his throat into his windpipe, enabling him to breathe. Eighteen hours later the boy finally came out of his coma and survived, but just barely. Sixteen normal drinks of whisky taken at once can be a fatal dose. This boy had swallowed the equivalent of nearly 50.

"Teenage drinking," says Dr. Maddox, "usually follows the old adage, 'Like father, like son.' If the child sees his parents drinking excessively and compulsively, he'll believe that's the way adults act, and in his adult role playing he'll act accordingly. If the parents drink just socially and in moderation, the chances are the child will drink that way too.

Most psychiatrists agree, but they point out that the adolescent's concept of the adult role is also affected by what he reads in books and sees in movies and on television. The fictional drunk is often a romantic figure—the surgeon who could be the best in the world if he didn't tipple; the attractive, comical life-of-the-party drunk; and the very masculine, hard-drinking hero of the James Bond stripe. "The danger of these influences on a teenager who has feelings of inadequacy," says Bellevue Hospital psychiatrist, Dr. Robert E. Gould, "is that the youngster will drink as an excuse for his deficiencies, like the drunken doctor; or he will drink because maybe that will make him the life of the party, which he couldn't hope to be ordinarily; or he will drink to prove his masculinity. He doesn't realize that excessive drinking frequently connotes just the opposite of masculinity. Often it is used by adults to coverup latent homesexuality or sexual impotence."

These, in sum, are the major findings of the experts. Do these views coincide with those of the individuals directly involved—the teenagers themselves? In hundreds of interviews all over the United States, startlingly similar opinions were repeatedly expressed by youngsters who had never heard of the experts or their opinions.

Take, for example, these three young residents of Danbury, Conn. Seventeen-year-old Mary Lou Chambers unwittingly documented the adult-role-playing theory when she said, "The kids I've seen drinking hard liquor don't really like it. They take a deep breath and force the stuff down their throats. They're just doing it because they're trying to prove how grownup they are." Paul Carroccio, 16, seemed to echo Gov. Richard Hughes' speculations about automobiles and prosperity: "Overall," he said, "I think that kids who become heavy drinkers are also heavily indulged by their parents. For example, one of my former friends was given an allowance of $20 a week—at the age of 17. His parents also gave him a new car. When he started in high school, he was a straight-A student. Then he began driving over the New York border to drink with his friends. By the time he was 19 he had smashed up a couple of cars, he had dropped out of school, and now his parents have thrown him out of the house." And 17-year-old Dorothy Battista gave a perfect illustration of Dr. Gould's "life-of-the-party" theory: "This girl friend of mine was very unpopular. She started to go over to New York to drink in bars so boys would pay attention to her. Now she goes with a divorced man, and I think she's beginning to sniff dope. Her grades have dropped so that I don't think she'll ever finish school."

In Chicago, an 18-year-old boy unknowingly admitted drinking to cover up for sexual inadequacy. "I don't know what's wrong with me," he said. "When I go with a girl and it's getting serious, and I have a big date with her, I'll go out with my friends and get drunk and I never make the date."

No social scientist could ask for a better example of drinking to excuse failure than that of the 17-year-old in Lansing, Mich., who said, "You gotta have straight A's to get into any of the good engineering schools. This year, when the cops picked me up for drunk driving after that accident I had, I figured I'd never get into a good school anyway, so I gave up even though I'm sure I could have made it without that black mark on my record."

The interviews with young drinkers compellingly depict the failure of State laws prohibiting the sale of alcoholic beverages to minors. Every single youngster told of the ease with which he was able to obtain whisky, wine or beer through various stratagems. The situation is particularly acute in the States adjacent to New York, which allows 18-year-olds to buy all forms of alcoholic beverages. Teenage spas have sprung up all along the border—in towns like Port Chester and Brewster, N.Y.—to which adolescents from neighboring States flock to drink. Governor Hughes of New Jersey and Gov. John Dempsey of Connecticut are leading an intensive and so far unsuccessful campaign to get New York to raise its drinking age, too, to prevent the slaughter of out-of-State teenagers returning home in their cars from drinking bouts across the border.

Recently the New York border situation has deteriorated into near-open warfare, with State police roadblocks sometimes making border crossings as complicated for teenagers as those at Berlin's Checkpoint Charlie. Not long ago a New England Governor's conference in Boston passed a fiery resolution deploring the "ever widening impact of personal tragedy," and calling on the New York Legislature to see the error of its ways. Last month Gov. Nelson Rockefeller, of New York, reluctantly declared that he would sign a bill raising the State's minimum drinking age to 21, if the legislature passed one; at this writing, the legislature is considering several.

Throughout the Nation there is a trend toward more stringent legal solutions to the teenage drinking problem. In Redwood City, Calif., last January, Municipal Court Judge Roy Seagraves sentenced Mr. and Mrs. James Melton to spend 10 days in jail and a year on probation for allowing their teenage sons to give a beer party. After the death of the Hitchings girl in the Darien tragedy, Judge Rodney S. Eielson levied stiff fines against adults who had served liquor to the teenagers. Ohio now has a law imposing a fine and even a jail sentence on any teenager misrepresenting his age to a bartender through "false identification or other information"; other States are following suit. Several States now suspend a car's registration if a teenager drives it while drunk. This causes the parent as well as the youngster to lose the use of the car, and it is proving to be a serious deterrent.

Complicating the job of controlling teenage drinking are the tavern and nightclub owners in many parts of the country who cater to the teenage trade. On Long Island, for example, there are clubs that aim directly at the teenager with cash to spend. They even advertise on rock 'n' roll stations, assuring listeners that teenagers' clothing is perfectly acceptable and promising the best in whambam music. The tough, young crowd they draw suggests that they are favorite rendezvous for local dropouts.

Many places have set up nonalcoholic nightclubs exclusively for young people. These clubs seldom last long. Notable exceptions are southern California's Cinnamon Cinder clubs (there are four of them). Waitresses serve cola drinks and coffee, and certain informal clothing (levi's and capri's) is outlawed. Still, despite the restrictions, the clubs are always jammed.

The success of the Cinder clubs notwithstanding, it seems strongly apparent to most observers that the best answers to the teenage drinking problem is sanity in the home. Few authorities suggest that parents practice total abstinence. Most psychiatrists believe that social drinking by parents is harmless so long as it does not become a fetish, and so long as the child is brought up reasonably well. The strong family unit, they say, is the strongest defense against problem drinking. It is a recorded phenomenon, for example, that the children of Italian-American and Jewish parents begin sipping wine ceremonially with their families at an extremely early age. And yet problem drinking is rare in these groups because of the strong parental influence that frowns on excesses of any kind.

"Unfortunately," says Dr. Selden Bacon of Rutgers, "not too many American parents apply this sort of restraint on themselves, let alone their children. Today, most Americans are afraid to tell anyone he is drinking too much, for fear of being called a square or a bluenose. We're the only Nation in the world where it is not a disgrace for someone to be sloppy drunk in public. If parents rid themselves of this attitude, it would immediately reflect itself in their children. The tragedy of the Darien, Conn., incident was not that the boy got drunk and killed the girl in the car crash, but that not a single adult had the courage to stop him when he was getting drunk."

SPEECH OF GEN. CURTIS E. LeMAY

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. GROVER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for the RECORD the following excellent speech by a great American, Gen. Curtis E. LeMay:

ADDRESS BY GEN. CURTIS E. LEMAY, U.S. AIR FORCE, RETIRED, NATIONAL SECURITY INDUSTRIAL ASSOCIATION, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 25, 1965

Mr. Stevenson, Mr. Beach, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I am very grateful for the honor you have paid me tonight in presenting me with the James Forrestal Memorial Award. The career of Secretary Forrestal was one of remarkable achievement, and his personal characteristics of dedication, integrity, and uncomprising adherence to principle were in the highest tradition of public service. That you are tendering me an award which bears his name is an extremely high compliment.

I am also grateful for the opportunity to speak with you for a few minutes tonight because I want to express again—as I have on a number of occasions—my respect and admiration for the leaders of American industry and for the contributions that they have made to our Nation's security. All of us in the Armed Forces are intensely aware that America's military might is largely based upon the strength of America's industry. And we feel a strong sense of obligation to those who, through their leadership, have given this country its unquestioned industrial supremacy.

This Nation should never allow itself to forget that according to Communist doctrine it is American industry and the free enterprise system that is the antagonist—the true enemy of communism.

Recently I came across a memorable address by the late Gen. "Hap" Arnold which he delivered to the Institute of Aeronautical Sciences in July of 1946. In his address, General Arnold paid tribute to the incredible output of American industry during World War II, and then he urged the continuation of the alliance that had been forged during the war years between the military, industrial, and scientific communities. In particular he was concerned about losing the full services of the scientific element in the alliance, because he realized that our victory in World War II was not just a victory for American mass production. In no small measure, it was a victory won by the technical superiority of our weapons. The crowning achievement of the scientific community, of course, was the harnessing of atomic energy, an achievement which brought about the rapid conclusion of the Pacific phase of the war.

Today, fortunately, the spirit of alliance between the military, industrial, and scientific communities is still in evidence. Through all the changes in the military, political, and economic environment this unofficial but essential alliance has held together, despite lack of a formal charter. I see no reason for assuming that the alliance has anything but a long-term task ahead of it. What I am concerned about is that the next few years may be very discouraging ones to all three members. I would like, therefore, to discuss with you a few of the problems the members face, and suggest to you some thoughts that might be helpful.

In the past 20 years of cold war, of hectic vibration between crisis and calm, this alliance—this friendly confederation—of military, industrial, and scientific communities has given this country the greatest military strength in history. Our forces have been equipped with an abundance of weapons of such technical superiority that a giant of a nation, committed to a course of militant aggression, has been deterred and forced to alter its course. We cannot assume that the Soviet Union has established a less threatening goal for the world Communist movement, but at least for the present it has chosen less violent means of reaching its goal.

Despite this apparent success, the alliance finds itself today in a strange condition. In the struggle for technical as well as numerical superiority in weapons, we have created for ourselves a dilemma. We now have the ability to design and build many highly desirable, technically superior weapon systems but they each cost so much that we must pass up more than we can elect to build. Indeed, we must do without many systems that everyone agrees it would be to our military advantage to build. In short, we have a financial condition that demands that we be conservative, when the promises offered by technology call for us to be bold.

I am not suggesting that the military budget is too small, or that our security is being unduly risked in the name of economy. We have a very large military budget. I am sure that if the leaders of this Nation believe that the threat to our country has increased, they will propose a larger defense budget. It is becoming increasingly difficult, however, for the individual Services to content themselves with the weapon systems that are authorized, when they are aware of how much more security is available for this Nation through new systems that are not being implemented. On the other hand, it is also becoming increasingly difficult at the Department of Defense level to decide to implement some multibillion-dollar weapons program, when it is almost certain that a still more effective system is sure to be proposed in a few more weeks or months.

The current conservatism in the Department of Defense growing out of economic consideration has been accompanied by calls for conservatism from other quarters.

There are those in and out of uniform, for example, who are advocating a closer look at the weapons we already have to insure that we do not overlook their full potential. They believe it would be more economical to invest a little more in improving existing weapons, rather than in developing new ones. A current case that is often cited in support of this point of view is Minuteman II, in which a relatively small investment in a new guidance system greatly increased the accuracy and effectiveness of the system.

Some of the more conservative scientific voices even add the note that they see little possibility in the immediate future for new breakthroughs of major proportions in weapons technology, and they suggest that the scientific community needs a short breathing spell in which to search out the limits of military potential in the discoveries they have already made.

Some political voices offer another set of reasons for a conservative approach to new military weapons. There is the argument, for example, that new U.S. weapons will automatically trigger the U.S.S.R. to undertake still more costly programs for countering our weapons, and we, in turn, would then have to try to offset these developments, and so on up the never ending spiral. Those who argue along this line advocate that the United States should try to establish a condition of military stability between the two great powers, and that from this condition of balance we might be able to steadily and mutually lower ourselves to more peaceful plateaus. This school, therefore, classifies all new weapon systems as destabilizing, and it urges that we hold off investing in radical new systems.

Another argument, primarily from the political quarter, tending to lead to a conservative approach to new weapons developments, stresses that the Soviet Union has in recent years come to a more realistic appraisal of the dangers in large-scale aggression and that the threat of a major Soviet aggression has greatly diminished. The argument goes on that our chief need today is for conventional weapons to deal with small-scale crises and insurgent activities.

I'm sure all of the members of the military industrial and scientific communities appreciate the merits in these points of view, even though we may not unanimously agree with them. In general, I am sure we also applaud the current effort to run the Defense Establishment in a more businesslike manner, though we may at times find the degree of centralized control somewhat excessive. There is unquestionably a great deal of justification for the conservative trend in defense activities.

I would like to suggest, however, that there are several developments we should watch with great care during the coming years. Each would represent a serious threat to the security of this country, and each, in my opinion, would call for a reappraisal of our present defense policies—especially in regard to the procurement of new weapon systems.

Though I am convinced that our national defense policymakers would react rapidly to any developments that threaten our security, I feel strongly that it is the patriotic duty of the military, industrial, and scientific communities to speak out firmly if they feel the danger signs are not being heeded. I am not contending that the military, industrial, and scientific communities bear the official responsibility for interpreting to the people the peaceful or aggressive intentions of the nations of the world. But we do have a right and duty to express opinions along these lines in direct proportion to the responsibility we bear for defending the country. Our American system provides adequate and proper channels for the expressions of these opinions. I advocate that we use these channels vigorously whenever we feel the security of our Nation is in jeopardy.

In my opinion we must watch three developments with special care. First, new space developments by the Soviet Union that are more in keeping with aggressive than peaceful objectives. Already there is considerable reason for concern about Soviet capabilities in space. Many of the techniques the Soviet Union has developed so far point strongly toward a military space effort. The development of a capability by the Soviet Union to deliver strategic weapons from near space or to deny to the United States the opportunity to continue its present programs in space would amount to a serious threat and would negate our present favorable balance of military power. It is in the arena of space that Soviet technological developments are most likely to bypass this generation of U.S. weapon systems.

At the present time, the United States is busily attempting to assess Soviet intentions in space. Are they peaceful or aggressive?

Our national record during the past 20 years in evaluating Soviet intentions has not been outstanding. Very nearly all Soviet acts of aggression have had an element of surprise attached to them. The Soviet space program is being conducted today in the same secrecy that is used to protect military operations, and it too has been characterized by surprises.

Under the circumstances, then, we would do well to keep a watchful eye on the Soviet space program, and to give the benefit of all doubt to our national security and not to unsubstantiated Soviet statements of peaceful intentions.

The second development we should keep under surveillance is Red China's nuclear weapons capability. The implications of the recent detonation of a nuclear device by Red China are ominous from a free world point of view.

Though the Red Chinese do not at present possess an intercontinental delivery system for carrying out a surprise nuclear attack upon this country, the development by them of such a system is within their technical competence. Any effort on their part to develop such a delivery system along with a continuing effort to develop a nuclear weapon would have to be viewed as an extremely serious threat to the United States.

We must recognize that a delivery system for a preemptive nuclear attack by Red China could be very unsophisticated, as compared with one that would have to withstand an initial attack and operate in retaliation.

We should also bear in mind that Red Chinese leaders have often declared that they do not fear a nuclear war and that they believe their massive population could absorb the losses from such a war.

In a related political vein we should also consider the following. At this moment the primary value of Red China's nuclear development is in enhancing its influence in Asia. If, however, Red China's nuclear capability stirs the world to agree to a ban on all nuclear weapons, Red China would gain a major strategic victory by emerging as a leading conventional power in a world of weakened conventional nations.

All signs, therefore, warn us to maintain the strictest watch over Red China's nuclear development and the policies which she will adopt as a nuclear nation.

Finally, we should give very serious consideration to world developments that would result in a further deterioration of the power of the United Nations or of its related regional defense organizations to maintain peace throughout the world. In recent years Communist bloc countries have tried with some success to undermine the efforts of the United Nations and the several regional defense groups in their attempts to apply their legitimate international police powers.

The United States and the free world nations have all endorsed the principle that aggression anywhere is a threat to world peace, and they have supported international police action as a proper means for halting aggression. If the U.N. and the regional defense organizations, however, continue to lose their effectiveness in discouraging aggression, or in suppressing it if it breaks out, then the United States will have to consider adjustments in its defense policies.

An obvious alternative to reliance on the U.N. is a greater reliance on our own power and on the collective power of smaller alliances in which the members share a genuine sense of common interest with us and are prepared to defend that interest. It is my sincere hope that the U.N. and the other regional defense alliances will be able to survive the current degradation of their purpose and authority.

Each of the three developments that I have briefly discussed could amount to a serious threat to the United States and the free world, and I urge that the members of the military, industrial, and scientific communities be especially alert to these developments.

Today U.S. military power is supreme in the world. Though we are being challenged in many areas of the globe, our intent and our resolve are more in question than our strength.

The pace of technology, however, threatens our military superiority. To the Nation which has the vision and purpose to capitalize on the promises of technology must fall the military superiority of the future.

To the alliance of the military, industrial, and scientific communities, the promises and opportunities of technology are, therefore, accompanied by a special challenge. And that is the challenge to make more determined and longer ranged plans and commitments. In research, production, and strategy, we must look further into the future to foresee the threats that lie ahead and to provide the means to protect our land and people from those threats. It will take a special courage to make the long-term commitments we will have to make to extend our military supremacy into the next decade and the next generation.

I am confident, however, that those Americans who make up the military, industrial, and scientific communities are competent to make these commitments. I am also sure that their dedication to this country and to the cause of freedom are equal to their competence.

I thank you again for the honor you have paid me tonight, and for this opportunity to have spoken with you.

JOHN J. McLAUGHLIN

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, the Woonsocket Call carries a column, entitled "This Week 50 Years Ago," which is read by a great many people in my State of Rhode Island. In this column in a recent issue, reference was made to a group of distinguished citizens who, back in 1915, called on the then Governor R. Livingston Beeckman, at the statehouse to protest against the methods in vogue in connection with the hoof-and-mouth disease of cattle. Included in this group was a gentleman by the name of John J. McLaughlin, of Cumberland.

While I did not have the pleasure of knowing this John J. McLaughlin personally, I have heard much about him over the years and have come to learn that he was a man whose talents and integrity adequately matched the size of his physical being. He was a big man—big in body, in spirit, in character, and of most importance, big in his desire to aid his fellow man in every possible way. I am told that whenever a situation arose where action could add to the well-being of his neighbors, John J. was always in the forefront with his not inconsiderable powers of eloquence and strength.

Although I did not have the opportunity to know this great Christian man, I have been privileged to have as one of my oldest and closest friends, a classmate at LaSalle Academy years ago and a trusted confidant ever since, his son, the younger John J. McLaughlin. Younger John, more affectionately known as "Gedger," is indeed the son of the father. All the attributes commonly accredited and so often heard in connection with the father have been exemplified to an even greater degree in the son. An activist and a bundle of nervous energy, with little regard for his own health, John "Gedger" McLaughlin is in the vanguard of many of the charitable drives in Rhode Island, on the committee of most testimonials, a selfless and energetic worker on all programs for civic improvement, and a stalwart supporter of anything which will benefit our youth, the downtrodden, or the handicapped. A successful businessman, he is the epitome of everything that is best in that often maligned profession.

I consider myself fortunate to have had him for a friend for so many years. It is my earnest hope that the good Lord allows us all to have the benefit of John McLaughlin's goodness for many years to come. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the column from the Woonsocket, R.I., Call, entitled "This Week 50 Years Ago":

THIS WEEK 50 YEARS AGO

William L. Whipple, Elmer L. Cook and Henry S. Darling of East Woonsocket and Aldege Menard and John J. McLaughlin of Cumberland called upon Gov. R. Livingston Beeckman at the statehouse to protest against the methods in vogue in Rhode Island in connection with the handling of the hoof-and-mouth cattle disease.

By a vote of 3 to 2, the board of aldermen passed an ordinance amendment increasing the salary of the superintendent of schools from $2,000 to $2,500 per annum. Aldermen Telesphore Desrosiers and Adrien Sylvestre cast dissenting votes.

Chief A. J. Cote and members of hose 5 and truck 2 were hosts at a housewarming at fire station 5 on Social Street on the second anniversary of the occupancy of the station. Clam chowder was served, cigars were distributed, and the Eagle Band performed.

The Bellingham Handkerchief Co.'s shop and the residence of the owner, Hadley D. Perkins, at Crooks Corner, South Bellingham, were destroyed by an incendiary fire. The blaze attracted several thousand spectators. Damage was estimated at $14,000.

Attorney Raphael L. Daignault, chief school census enumerator, reported the number of children in the school age in the city was 9,258, an increase of 786 over the previous year.

Employees of the cloth department of the Globe Cotton Mill presented a purse of gold to William J. Carrigan, retiring after 18½ years of service as overseer of the department.

Miss Christiana Caya, Woonsocket soprano, carried off first honors in a singing competition held in Memorial Hall, Providence, under the auspices of the Rhode Island branch of the National Federation of Music Clubs.

The Winnesuket Canoe Club voted to disband at a meeting in Martin O'Toole's rooms on Main Street. The move was prompted by the destruction of its clubhouse twice within 18 months.

Mr. and Mrs. J. Robert Beckwith of 344 Second Avenue were guests at a farewell reception and supper sponsored by the Ladies' Union of Globe Congregational Church. Beckwith, formerly employed at the Woonsocket Machine & Press Co. as a machinist, was preparing to leave to assist his brother in the operation of a large truck farm in Clinton, N.Y.

One new member was admitted at a meeting of the Jolly Rovers in the home of Edward Monk, 410 Summer Street.

The Woonsocket Cricket Club made plans for its annual banquet at a meeting at the YMCA.

Police Chief Frederick Coe was heading an investigation into the theft of yarn at the Lippitt Mill.

Mrs. Alphonse Lammertyn of 14 Newland Avenue received an official communication announcing the death of her husband, an infantryman in the French Army, who was killed in the battle of Bermeiul-sur-Aisne.

Mrs. Wesley F. Morse of Woonsocket read a paper on the life and works of Henrik Ibsen at a meeting of the Emerson College Club of Rhode Island in Providence.

Harry L. Kearnan, 20-year-old Whitinsville youth, was signed by Earle Mack, son of Connie Mack, to a contract to play for the Raleigh, N.C., baseball club.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965 SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, for several years now, I have thought that it was timely for the Congress to take a new hard look at the adequacy of the Federal legislation on vocational rehabilitation underpinning the cooperative work that the Federal and State Governments undertake together to restore disabled people to employment.

In my capacity as chairman, for 15 years, of the subcommittee that deals with appropriations for vocational rehabilitation, I have had a unique opportunity to become familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of the enabling legislation, and the operating programs that have been undertaken by the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration with the money we have entrusted to their administration. They have built an impressive record of accomplishment in rehabilitating constantly increasing numbers of people each year. The totals increased from 56,000 in 1954; to 88,000 in 1960; to more than 102,000 in 1962; to 110,000 in 1963; and up to 120,000 in 1964. We anticipate even greater progress in 1965. Good as this record is, it has not been possible to keep up with the disabled being added each year to the backlog of previous years. We must do more to reach and rehabilitate all who can be helped.

The record will show that I have constantly urged and encouraged the Commissioner, Mary Switzer, and the various Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, both Democratic and Republican, to ask for more money and to put more effort into this program. I have proposed measures to expand its responsibilities and coverage where appropriate. I have supported all appropriate means of encouraging the States to provide matching funds to be used to put disabled people back to work. The alternative, which no one really advocates, is to leave these disabled people untrained, and hopelessly dependent upon private or public charity for the satisfaction of their elementary needs for food and shelter. I prefer, and the Congress as a whole has shown by its support of this program that it prefers to give the Secretary and the Commissioner better legislation and more money to accomplish the vocational rehabilitation of substantially larger numbers of people that have been served and rehabilitated in the past.

Ten years of experience under the Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1954 demonstrate that additional authority and some new approaches are needed if we are to reach and surpass the goal we set of 200,000 rehabilitated each year. I introduced legislation in the 88th Congress to expand and improve the vocational rehabilitation program which, I want to point out, is one of the first and best of the Federal Government's efforts to train and return unemployed and underemployed people to wage-earning, taxpaying status. Other Members did the same, including the gentlewoman from Oregon [Mrs. GREEN] and the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] and, of course, our colleague in the other body, Senator LISTER HILL.

I am today introducing a bill, sponsored by the administration, to achieve some of the same improvements that I have recommended in previous years. In so doing, I join my associate, Mrs. GREEN of Oregon, who introduced the administration's proposal on March 18. These amendments have been developed with the advice and consultation of many groups concerned with the rehabilitation of disabled people.

The report of President Johnson's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke calls for the prompt enactment of legislation to put into effect what we now know about rehabilitating people who have suffered from these diseases. The late President Kennedy's task forces and commissions on mental illness and mental retardation emphasized the need for greatly expanding the provision of both medical services and vocationally oriented services including counseling, training, job tryouts, and other specialized help that will enable these people to return to productive activity.

This bill is timely. It is aimed at the rehabilitation of the hard core of the unemployed—the disabled. This bill is consistent with the effort of the administration under the manpower training programs and the Appalachia and antipoverty programs to upgrade the basic training and education of our citizens so that they may enjoy and contribute to the fruits of the better society we are trying to create under President Johnson's inspired leadership.

The bill contains a series of proposals, including many amendments that I recommended last year. One of the most significant is the establishment of a new grant program to States with 75-percent Federal funds to help pay the cost of evaluation services to determine whether a person can be vocationally rehabilitated. Another series of recommendations will enable the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration to construct and equip new workshops, to help improve existing workshops and training services which are so vitally needed in the rehabilitation of increased numbers of disabled people.

I am submitting for the RECORD the text of the bill and a fact sheet which describes each section.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965—SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1. Short title: This section provides that the act may be cited as the "Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1965."

Section 2. Determination of vocational rehabilitation potential:

(a) This subsection would replace the obsolete transition provisions in section 12 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act with provisions authorizing a new program of grants to States for vocational rehabilitation evaluation services to determine rehabilitation potential.

Under subsection (a) (1) (A) of the amended section 12, from the sums available for any fiscal year for grants to States to assist them in meeting the costs of providing vocational rehabilitation evaluation services each State would be allotted an amount which bears the same ratio to such sums as the product of its population and its allotment percentage (as defined in section 11(h)) bears to the sum of the corresponding products for all the States.

Under subsection (a) (1) (B) of the amended section 12, each State would be assured a minimum allotment of $5,000 for each fiscal year, or such other amount as may be specified as a minimum allotment in the appropriation act for that year. The amount necessary to provide each State with the minimum allotment would be derived by proportionately reducing the allotments of States having been allotted more than the minimum.

Subsection (a) (2) of the amended section 12 provides for reallotment of any part of a State's allotment not required by that State.

Subsection (b) (1) of the amended section 12 provides that the Secretary shall pay, out of each State's allotment under subsection (a) for any fixed year the Federal share, or 75 percent, in the case of any State which provides assurances satisfactory to the Secretary that its expenditures from State or local sources for vocational rehabilitation services under its plan (except for expenditures pursuant to sec. 3) will not be less than such expenditures for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1964, of the State's costs of providing vocational rehabilitation evaluation services to substantially handicapped individuals (including costs of administration) under the State's plan.

Subsection (b) (2) of the amended section 12 precludes dual payment with respect to any cost.

Subsection (c) of the amended section 12 defines "vocational rehabilitation evaluation services" to mean those services provided to any individual under a physical or mental disability constituting a substantial handicap to employment, during the period determined in accordance with regulations of the Secretary to be necessary for, and for the purpose of, ascertaining whether it may reasonably be expected that such an individual will be rendered fit to engage in a remunerative occupation through the provision of vocational rehabilitation services, and which would constitute vocational rehabilitation services if his disability were of such a nature that he would be a physically handicapped individual; however, the period during which evaluation services could be provided could not exceed 18 months for individuals who are mentally retarded or who have some other disability designated by the Secretary, or 6 months for any other disabled individual; and the services that could be provided could not include placement services, management services and supervision for any business, the acquisition or provision of tools, vending stands or other equipment, stocks, or supplies for use in any business or remunerative occupation, or the establishment of rehabilitation facilities or workshops.

(b) and (c) These subsections would amend section 1 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to authorize appropriations for grants to States under section 12 to assist them in meeting the costs of vocational rehabilitation evaluation services, and would amend references in sections 1 and 5 of the act to the section 2 or section 3 grant programs so that they would also refer to the new section 12 program.

(d) This subsection would make the amendments made by the preceding subsections effective for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1966.

Section 3. Construction of rehabilitation facilities; workshop improvement; experimental projects; removal of architectural barriers: This section would redesignate section 13 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act as section 17, and would insert after section 12 the following new sections:

Section 13. Grants for construction of rehabilitation facilities and workshops: subsection (a) would authorize the Secretary, for fiscal years beginning after June 30, 1965, to make grants to assist in meeting the costs of construction of public or other nonprofit workshops and rehabilitation facilities.

Subsection (b) provides that, in order to be approved, an application for a grant for a construction project must contain or be supported by reasonable assurances that the facility will be used for the purposes for which constructed for at least 10 years after completion of construction, that sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal share of the facility's cost of construction and to meet the cost of operating the facility, and that minimum standards of construction and equipment will be complied with. The application must also be approved by the State agency, and must contain or be supported by reasonable assurances that laborers or mechanics employed in the construction will be paid prevailing wages.

Subsection (c) provides that the amount of a grant under this section shall be equal to the same percentage of the cost of the project as the Federal share determined for rehabilitation facilities (as defined in section 625(g) of the Public Health Service Act) in the State; except that if the State elects to provide for variations in the Federal share among projects under subparagraph (A) of section 625(b)(1) of the Public Health Service Act, the percentage of the cost shall be determined in accordance with regulations of the Secretary designed to achieve results comparable to the results obtained under that subparagraph.

Subsection (d) provides that upon approval of any application for a construction grant the Secretary shall reserve the amount of the grant, and may pay the amount reserved in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as he may determine.

Subsection (e) provides that if, within 10 years after completion of any workshop or facility for which funds have been paid under this section, the facility shall cease to be a public or other nonprofit workshop or rehabilitation facility, the United States may recover from its owner the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value of the workshop or facility as the amount of the Federal participation in the cost of construction bore to the total cost of construction.

Subsection (f) would authorize the Secretary to make grants with respect to any workshop or rehabilitation facility for which a grant for a construction project has been made under this section to cover part of the costs of compensation of professional or technical personnel of such workshop or facility for 4 years and 3 months after the month in which the workshop or facility commenced operation. Such grants may not exceed 75 percent of these costs for the 15-month period following the month in which operation commenced, 60 percent of such costs for the first year thereafter, 45 percent of such costs for the second year thereafter, and 30 percent of such costs for the third year thereafter.

Subsection (g) would authorize the Secretary to make grants to the State agency to assist in meeting the cost of determining the State's needs for workshops and rehabilitation facilities and, upon application approved by the State agency, to public or other nonprofit agencies, institutions, or organizations to assist them in meeting the costs of planning workshops and rehabilitation facilities and the services to be provided thereby.

Subsection (h) provides that payment of grants under subsection (f) or (g) may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments and on such conditions, as the Secretary may determine.

Subsection (i) would authorize appropriation of such sums as may be necessary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the next 4 fiscal years for carrying out this section, and provides that sums appropriated shall remain available for payment with respect to construction or staffing projects approved under this section prior to July 1, 1970.

Subsection (j) contains the following definitions:

"(1) 'Construction' is defined to include construction of new buildings and expansion, remodeling, alteration, and renovation of existing buildings, and initial equipment of such new, expanded, remodeled, altered, or renovated buildings;

"(2) The 'cost' of construction is defined to include the cost of architects' fees in connection with construction, but it does not include the cost of acquisition of land or off-site improvements;

"(3) A project for construction of a workshop may include such construction as may be necessary to provide residential accommodations for use in connection with the rehabilitation of mentally retarded individuals."

Section 14. Workshop improvement: This section would authorize, during the period beginning July 1, 1966, and ending June 30, 1971, grants to States and public and other nonprofit organizations and agencies to pay 75 percent of the cost of projects for providing training services to physically handicapped individuals in public or other nonprofit workshops. Training services would include training in occupational skills; related services, including work evaluation, work testing, occupational tools and equipment required by the individual to engage in training, and job tryouts; and payment of weekly allowances to individuals receiving training. Allowances could not be paid to any individual for more than 2 years and could not exceed, for any week, $25 plus $10 for each of the individual's dependents, or $65, whichever is less. In determining the amount of such allowance, consideration would be given to the individual's need for an allowance, including any expenses reasonably attributable to training, the extent to which an allowance would help assure entry into and satisfactory completion of training, and other factors as specified by the Secretary which would promote the individual's fitness to engage in a remunerative occupation. The Secretary would make a grant for such a project only after his determination that the purpose of the project is to prepare physically handicapped individuals for a remunerative occupation, that the individuals will be only those who have been determined to be suitable for and in need of such training services by the State agency or agencies designated in section 5(a)(1) of the State in which the workshop is located, that the full range of training services will be available to each such individual as needed, and that the project will meet such other requirements as the Secretary may prescribe. Payments could be made in installments, and in advance or by way of reimbursement, as determined by the Secretary, and on such conditions as he finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

Subsection (b) would authorize the Secretary to make grants to workshops during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and the next 4 fiscal years to pay part of the cost of projects to analyze, improve, and increase their professional services to handicapped individuals, their business management, or any other part of their operations affecting their capacity to provide employment and services for handicapped individuals. Grants could not be used to pay costs of acquiring, constructing, expanding, remodeling, or altering any building. Payment of grants could be made in installments, in advance or by way of reimbursement, on such conditions, as the Secretary finds necessary to carry out the purposes of this subsection.

Subsection (c) would authorize the Secretary to provide technical assistance to workshops directly or by contract. It would also authorize compensation of experts or consultants employed in providing technical assistance at rates not exceeding $100 per diem, including travel time, plus travel expenses

Subsection (d) would establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Policy and Performance Council, consisting of 12 members, appointed by the Secretary from among leaders in the vocational rehabilitation or workshop fields, State or local government, and business and from among representatives of related professions, labor leaders, and the general public. The Secretary would also appoint one of the members to serve as Chairman. Each member would hold office for a term of 4 years, except that, of the 12 members first appointed, 3 would hold office for a term of 3 years, 3 would hold office for a term of 2 years, and 3 would hold office for a term of 1 year, as designated by the Secretary at the time of appointment. None of the 12 members would be eligible for reappointment until a year elapsed after the end of his preceding term. The Council would advise the Secretary with respect to the policies and criteria to be used by him in determining whether or not to make grants for projects for training services under subsection (a), make recommendations to the Secretary with respect to workshop improvement and the extent to which this section is effective in accomplishing this purpose, and perform such other services with respect to workshops as the Secretary might request. The Secretary would provide the Council with appropriate technical, administrative, and other assistance, and members of the Council would receive compensation, while attending meetings or conferences or otherwise serving on Council business, at rates not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time, plus travel expenses.

Section 15. Waiver of statewideness requirements for locally financed activity: Section 15 would authorize Federal participation in the cost of vocational rehabilitation services furnished as part of any activity which, in the Secretary's judgment, is likely to assist in promoting the vocational rehabilitation of substantially larger numbers of physically handicapped individuals or the vocational rehabilitation of individuals with particular types of disabilities, if the non-Federal share of the cost of such vocational rehabilitation services is met from local public funds (including, to the extent permitted by regulations, contributed funds) even though the activity is not in effect in all political subdivisions of the State, to the extent and for such period as may be provided in accordance with regulations prescribed by him.

Section 16. National Commission on Architectural Barriers to Rehabilitation of the Handicapped: Subsection (a) would establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Commission on Architectural Barriers to Rehabilitation of the Handicapped, consisting of the Secretary, or his designee, who would be Chairman, and not more than 15 members appointed by the Secretary and representative of the general public, and of private and professional groups having an interest in and able to contribute to the solution of architectural problems which impede the rehabilitation of handicapped individuals.

Subsection (b) would direct the Commission to determine how and to what extent architectural barriers impede access to or use of facilities in buildings of all types by handicapped persons; determine what is being done to eliminate such barriers from existing buildings and to prevent their incorporation into buildings constructed in the future; and prepare plans and proposals for such further action as may be necessary to achieve the goal of ready access to and full use of facilities in buildings of all types by handicapped persons.

Subsection (c) would authorize the Commission to appoint special advisory and technical experts and consultants, to establish committees, to make studies, and to contract for studies or demonstrations to assist it in performing its functions. The Secretary would make available to the Commission any necessary technical, administrative, and other assistance.

Subsection (d) provides that members of the Commission and special advisory and technical experts and consultants appointed by the Commission would receive compensation, while attending meetings or conferences or otherwise serving on Commission business, at rates not exceeding $100 per day, including travel time, plus travel expenses.

Subsection (e) would require the Commission to submit interim reports as requested by the Secretary and, prior to January 1, 1968, to submit a final report of its activities and recommendation to the Secretary for transmission by him together with his recommendations to the President and then to the Congress.

Subsection (f) would authorize the appropriation of $250,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the next 2 fiscal years for carrying out the purposes of this section.

Section 4. Duration of extension and improvement projects: This section would authorize Federal participation in extension and improvement projects under section 3 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act for a period not to exceed 5 years rather than 3 years as at present.

Section 5. Special programs and comprehensive planning to expand vocational rehabilitation services:

Effective July 1, 1965, this section would renew temporary, expired authority in section 4(a) (2) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (which would become section 4(a) (2) (A)) for project grants to States and public and other nonprofit organizations and agencies for planning, preparing for, and initiating special programs to expand vocational rehabilitation services in those States where, in the judgment of the Secretary, such action holds promise of yielding a substantial increase in the number of persons vocationally rehabilitated. Sums appropriated for special programs to expand vocational rehabilitation services would remain available until the close of June 30, 1971, but no sums appropriated for grants under section 4 for any fiscal year beginning after June 30, 1970, would be available for such programs.

Section 5 would also add a new clause 2(B) to section 4(a) of the act, authorizing grants to States (not to exceed $50,000 for any State for any fiscal year) to meet the cost of planning for the development of a comprehensive vocational rehabilitation program in each State, with a view to achieving the orderly development of vocational rehabilitation services in the State, and making vocational rehabilitation services available to all physically handicapped individuals in the State by July 1, 1975. Sums appropriated for planning of comprehensive programs would remain available until the close of June 30, 1968, but no sums appropriated for grants under section 4 for any fiscal year beginning prior to July 1, 1965, or ending after June 30, 1967, would be available for such programs.

Section 6. Raising of limitations on training: This section would replace existing 2-year time limitations (and exceptions thereto) on training in sections 4(a) and 7(a) (3) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act with 4-year limitations.

Section 7. Research and information: This section would add a new subsection (c) to section 7 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to authorize the Secretary directly or by contract to conduct research, studies, investigations, and demonstrations, and to make reports, with respect to the abilities, aptitudes, and capacities of physically handicapped individuals, development of their potentialities, and their utilization in gainful and suitable employment. Similar, but less explicit authority in subsection (a) of section 7 would be deleted. New subsection (c) would also authorize the planning, establishment, and operation of an information service to make information on rehabilitation resources, research, and other matters which may be helpful in promoting the rehabilitation and employment of physically handicapped individuals available to concerned groups and persons. There would be authorized appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each succeeding fiscal year, in such sums as might be necessary to carry out subsection (c).

Section 8. Flexibility in State administration: Subsection (a) of this section would amend paragraph (1) of section 5(a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, providing that a State vocational educational or rehabilitation agency may be designated to administer or supervise the administration of a State's plan for vocational rehabilitational services, to permit, in addition the designation of the State education agency, or of an agency which includes one or more of the major public health, public welfare, or labor programs of the State.

Subsection (a) of this section would also amend paragraph (2) of section 5(a) of the act, requiring that if the agency designated is a unit of a State vocational educational agency, the head of that unit be subject only to the supervision of that agency, to require, instead, that the unit of whatever agency is designated as the State agency have a full-time director, be staffed completely or substantially with personnel who work full time on vocational rehabilitation, and be located at an organizational level and have an organizational status comparable to that of other major units of the agency (or, if the State agency is a State education or vocational education agency, that the director of the unit be the executive officer of the agency).

Appropriate provision would be made in paragraphs (1) and (2) as amended to allow for separate administration of that part of the State plan that relates to services for the blind, as is now the case.

Subsection (c) of this section provides that the amendments that would be made by subsection (a) would be effective July 1, 1967, but would allow States that chose to do so to comply with the new provisions sooner.

Section 9. Special services for the blind and the deaf: This section would amend section 11(a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, defining vocational rehabilitation services, to add reader services for physically handicapped individuals who are blind and interpreter services for such individuals who are deaf, regardless of economic need.

Section 10. Management services and supervision of business enterprises of the disabled: This section would amend section 11 (a) (7) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to include within the meaning of vocational rehabilitation services, for small businesses operated by severely handicapped individuals and whose operation can be improved by management services and supervision by the State agency, the provision of such services and supervision, either alone or together with the acquisition by the State agency of vending stands or other equipment and initial stocks and supplies for use in such businesses.

Section 11. Technical amendment: This section would amend section 4(d) (3) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, authorizing compensation of members of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Rehabilitation at rates to be fixed by the Secretary but not to exceed $50 per day, plus travel expenses, to allow Council members to be paid up to $100 per day plus travel expenses.

FACT SHEET ON PROPOSED LEGISLATION: THE VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1965—S. 1525; H.R. 6476

Determination of vocational rehabilitation potential: This would authorize grants to States to assist in meeting the cost of providing vocational rehabilitation services to handicapped individuals to determine whether they can reasonably be expected to become able to engage in remunerative employment. Services under this section could be provided up to 6 months, except that 18 months would be authorized for mentally retarded individuals and for such others as may be designated by the Secretary. Funds would be allotted on a formula reflecting population and per capita income, with reallotment. The Federal share would be 75 percent. Effective July 1, 1966.

Notation: Under present law, State rehabilitation agencies are expected to determine, after initial diagnostic workup—but before any services are rendered—whether or not a handicapped person can reasonably be expected to become employable after a program of services is completed. For large numbers of handicapped persons, with severe disabilities or complicated problems or both, this is virtually impossible. As a result, many of these handicapped individuals do not receive services. This provision of the bill would authorize the State rehabilitation agency to render services up to a maximum of 6 months (or 18 months in the case of the mentally retarded and any other subsequently designated by the Secretary), observe the handicapped person's response to services, and then determine whether further services could be expected to result in employment. For this part of the total Federal-State program, special Federal financing (above) would be authorized.

Grants for construction of rehabilitation facilities and workshops: This would authorize a 5-year program of project grants to assist in the cost of construction of rehabilitation facilities and workshops by public or other nonprofit organizations. Grants would be available for new construction, expansion, remodeling, alteration and renovation, and for initial equipment. Financing would be the same as Hill-Burton financing. Rehabilitation facilities would be those primarily of a vocational nature. Planning grants of two types and purposes would be authorized: (1) Grants to assist States in the cost of assessing and determining statewide needs for facilities and workshops in vocational rehabilitation, as a basis for orderly development and growth; (2) planning grants where necessary to assist in the cost of planning for such a facility or workshop. Provision is also made for grants for initial staffing in connection with a construction project, with a maximum period of 4 years and 3 months, and with Federal funds to be available for a maximum of 75 percent of the initial staffing costs for the first 15 months and decreasing annually to a share of 30 percent in the final period. Provisions are also included covering safeguards for the Federal investment in the project, standards of construction and labor practices (Davis-Bacon Act), and for residential accommodations in the case of workshops for mentally retarded individuals. Effective fiscal year 1966; appropriations authorized for fiscal 1966 and the 4 succeeding fiscal years.

Notation: This proposal would help determine and meet the urgent need for new rehabilitation centers and workshops in various places in the country, offer aid for centers and workshops planning to expand their institutions, and give assistance with staffing during the initial years of a project. State vocational rehabilitation agencies would conduct continuing studies for surveillance of relative needs within States.

Workshop Improvement—Grants for projects for training services in workshops: This would authorize a new 5-year program of project grants to States and public and other nonprofit organizations and agencies to help provide training services to handicapped persons in public or other nonprofit workshops. The Federal share of the cost of such projects would be 75 percent. Grants would be made only to the State vocational rehabilitation agency for a project in cooperation with a workshop, except where unusual circumstances call for other arrangements. The "training services" in such a project would include (1) training in occupational skills, (2) other services directly related to training such as work evaluation, work testing, occupational tools and equipment required by the trainee to engage in the training, and job tryouts, and (3) payment of a weekly allowance to the trainee. Such allowances (1) could not exceed $25 per week plus $10 for each dependent, with a maximum payment of $65 weekly to any individual trainee, and (2) could not be paid to any trainee for more than 2 years. In determining the amount of such allowance for an individual, consideration would be given to his need for such an allowance (including any expenses reasonably attributable to his engaging in training), the extent to which such an allowance would help assure entry into and satisfactory completion of training, and such other factors, specified by the Secretary, as would promote such individual's fitness to engage in a remunerative occupation. To be approved, a project would have to show that the training can be expected to lead to a remunerative occupation; that the individuals to be trained will be those found suitable for and in need of training by the State vocational rehabilitation agency; that the full range of training services authorized will be made available, as needed on an individual basis; and that the project will meet other requirements prescribed by the Secretary. In administering this grant program, projects would be approved only where the participating workshop meets the policies and criteria established by the National Policy and Performance Council (below). Effective July 1, 1966.

Notation: This proposal is designed to assist handicapped persons and workshops in several ways, to encourage more severely disabled people to undertake and complete training; to provide a broader and more specific basis of cooperation between State rehabilitation agencies and workshops; to furnish a more planned and stable arrangement for use of workshops as training resources by the State agencies; to increase the number of disabled people vocationally rehabilitated and, in conjunction with the proposals for workshop improvement grants and for the National Policy and Performance Council, to help improve and elevate the effectiveness of workshops generally.

Workshop improvement—workshop improvement grants: This would authorize a 5-year program of project grants to workshops to pay part of the cost of analyzing, improving, and increasing professional and technical services to handicapped individuals, business management, and other parts of the workshop operations as they affect employment and services for handicapped clients. (Funds would not be available for acquiring, constructing, expanding, remodeling, or altering buildings.) Effective on enactment.

Notation: This proposal would offer project grants to help workshops analyze, improve, and elevate the quality and quantity of services they provide to disabled persons. In making grants, the State vocational rehabilitation agency would, in connection with its continuing survey of facilities and workshops, advise and recommend to VRA on the need for such a grant, and the extent to which a workshop improvement grant would help a workshop to meet the standards and criteria established by the National Policy and Performance Council (see below), plus various other considerations.

Workshop improvements—technical assistance to workshops: This would authorize the provision of technical assistance of various kinds to aid workshops in solving their operating and technical problems. Individuals, panels, or groups would, at the request of a workshop, be detailed for a limited period to consult with a workshop to give highly skilled professional and technical advice in professional, business, and related aspects of workshop improvement. Effective on enactment.

Notation: This proposal responds to many expressions of workshop directors on the need for expert professional and technical assistance. The VRA would secure the cooperation of experts in various phases of professional services; similarly, the VRA would arrange for the assistance of experienced businessmen in several fields, particularly management (plant layout, personnel, production, equipment, supplies, work simplification, sales, accounting, etc.). They would be made available for short periods of time, without cost to the workshop.

Workshop improvement—National Policy and Performance Council: This would establish a National Policy and Performance Council of 12 members appointed by the Secretary, with a chairman appointed from among the membership. Members would be selected from among leaders in vocational rehabilitation, workshops, government, business, organized labor, related professions, and the general public. Members would have a term of 4 years, with automatic rotation. The Council would be primarily concerned with helping to initiate and carry out the program of grants for projects for training services in workshops (above). The Council would (1) develop and recommend to the Secretary the policies and criteria to be observed in making grants for training services, (2) advise the Secretary on workshop improvement generally, and the extent to which the workshop improvement section of the act is accomplishing its purpose, and (3) perform such other services with respect to workshops as the Secretary may require. Effective on enactment.

Notation: This proposal would provide a basis for securing the collective views of workshop directors and others directly concerned with the operation and use of workshops and their service programs, with respect to requirements for an adequate training services program in which disabled individuals may receive allowances while undergoing training. The Council would be concerned with both the general factors in a workshop operation and in the adequacy of an organized training program for such trainees. The Council would be advisory to the Secretary and would, in addition, be available for such other advice regarding workshops as the Secretary may request.

Waiver of statewideness requirements for locally financed activity: This would authorize Federal financial participation (under secs. 2 and 3 of the act) in activities which are financed with local public funds made available to the States to make vocational rehabilitation services more widely available to residents of local jurisdictions. For this purpose, the existing State plan requirements for statewideness would be waived. Effective on enactment.

Notation: At present, the services provided to handicapped persons are financed primarily by a combination of State and Federal funds. This proposal would offer a means by which cities and counties which wish to augment the services presently being provided could make city or county funds available to the State and have them matched with Federal funds to carry out an expanded or specialized vocational rehabilitation program for residents of the community. Such services would be provided within the overall operation of the State vocational rehabilitation program.

National Commission on Architectural Barriers to Rehabilitation of the Handicapped: This would establish in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare a National Commission on Architectural Barriers to Rehabilitation of the Handicapped, consisting of the Secretary or his designee as chairman, and not more than 15 members from among the general public and private and professional groups concerned with, and capable of aiding in the solution of, architectural problems which impede the rehabilitation of physically handicapped individuals. The bill specifies the Commission's functions in this field, authorizes appointment of advisory and technical experts and consultants, and studies or demonstrations under contract, as necessary. The Commission would have a life of 3 years beginning July 1, 1965. Annual appropriations of $250,000 would be authorized.

Notation: Beginning several years ago, an organized effort was made to reduce the architectural barriers to the free use of buildings by seriously handicapped people (mainly, but not exclusively, those in wheelchairs or on braces and crutches). Steps which the handicapped cannot climb, narrow doorways which will not accommodate a wheelchair, cramped cubicles in restrooms, telephones and water fountains placed too high for use from a wheelchair—these and many other architectural features often defeat a seriously disabled person in his efforts to go to school, work at a job, attend church, or join in various other civic and social activities. Because of the concerted efforts of numerous public and voluntary groups—the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, the National Society for Crippled Children and Adults (the Easter Seal Society), the Vocational Rehabilitation Administration and cooperating State rehabilitation agencies, the American Standards Association, the American Institute of Architects and many others—great progress has been made in reducing this problem. However, the vast majority of buildings still are not accessible to handicapped men and women, and a tremendous number of new buildings are being erected without regard for the relatively simple design features which would render the new buildings accessible and usable. Experience has shown that virtually all persons concerned with constructing or operating buildings will promptly cooperate once they understand the problem and what needs to be done about it. The proposed National Commission will give concentrated, high-level national attention to this problem for 3 years, secure the attention and cooperation of National, State, and local government, the building industry, organized labor, and the many other professional, commercial and civic groups which can help bring this problem under control during the next few years.

Duration of extension and improvement projects: This would extend from 3 to 5 years the maximum period of Federal financial participation in an extension and improvement project (sec. 3) by a State vocational rehabilitation agency. Effective on enactment.

Notation: At present, Federal grants to States for projects for the extension or improvement of State agency services or programs are available for not more than 3 years for any one project. Experience has shown that some types of projects require a somewhat longer period of time to secure maximum benefits. (Most of these projects, on completion, are incorporated into the regular State agency program functions.) The proposal would permit projects to be supported for 5 years where needed.

Special programs and comprehensive planning to expand vocational rehabilitation services: This would amend section 4 to authorize two new types of grants for limited periods of time: (a) Grants to pay part of the cost of projects to expand vocational rehabilitation programs with the objective of increasing the number of handicapped persons vocationally rehabilitated. This program would be authorized for a 5-year period beginning July 1, 1965. (b) A 2-year program of grants to States to assist in planning for the development of comprehensive vocational rehabilitation programs in each State. Maximum annual grant to any State would be $50,000. Planning would be directed at the orderly development of vocational rehabilitation in the State, including vocational rehabilitation services provided by private, nonprofit agencies, with an overall objective in each State of making vocational rehabilitation services available to all physically handicapped individuals needing services in the State by July 1, 1975. Grants would be available to the State vocational rehabilitation agency or to a planning agency established by the Governor for this specific purpose. Funds made available for the first 2 years would remain available for a third year. Effective July 1, 1965.

Notation: This would, first, reenact what was popularly known as the "Expansion grant program" in the 1954 act, but for somewhat different purposes, with emphasis on projects which would result in the vocational rehabilitation of increased numbers of handicapped persons. Grants would be made to State rehabilitation agencies primarily but would also be available to voluntary agencies for projects designed to rehabilitate more disabled people into employment, usually in a cooperative program with the State agency.

The second provision would make possible an organized statewide planning program in each State to assess needs, programs and other resources for vocational rehabilitation and to develop a plan for increasing resources and services, with the objective of being able, by 1975, to provide rehabilitation services to all disabled persons needing services.

Raising of limitations on training: This would amend section 4(a) to authorize a maximum period of 4 years of Federal financial assistance to any individual pursuing a course of professional study in rehabilitation. The law presently limits this assistance to 2 years (except that 3 years are authorized for physicians in training in physical medicine and rehabilitation). Effective on enactment.

Notation: In the training program administered by VRA, in which students pursue degree work (most of it at the master's degree level) in preparation for a career in rehabilitation, financial assistance (traineeship) for the student can be provided only for 2 years in any one course of study. As the demand for more personnel qualified for teaching, research and administration duties has grown, the need to assist some students through additional study beyond the basic 2 years has increased. This amendment would meet this need.

Research and information: This would amend section 7 to make specific the authority for (1) the conduct, directly or by contract, of research, studies, investigations, demonstrations and reports pertaining to the rehabilitation of the physically handicapped and their greater use in suitable employment, and (2) the planning, establishment and operation of an automated data system for vocational rehabilitation programs and related rehabilitation activities. Effective July 1, 1965.

Notation: Under this proposal, the VRA would be able to initiate certain research in the form of intramural programing or through contracts with established institutions. It also contemplates making arrangements to enable VRA to secure the benefits of research and research findings in such major science agencies as the National Aeronautics and Space Agency, Federal Aviation Agency, National Science Foundation and others, to monitor new breakthroughs which can be adapted to use in solving problems of disability and rehabilitation. The second provision of the proposal would permit, after the extensive planning and preparation required, the establishment and operation of a national information service in rehabilitation, using modern automated data equipment, to collect, store, analyze, retrieve and disseminate information on the Federal-State program, research, training, prosthetics and orthotics, centers and workshops, etc., as a service to agencies and individuals.

Flexibility in State administration: Present law provides that a State vocational rehabilitation agency may be located, within State government, either under the State board of vocational education or as a separate agency or commission. This amendment would broaden the choice to also permit location in a major department of health, welfare or labor, or combinations of these, with provisions for maintaining the organizational and operating identity and effectiveness of the vocational rehabilitation agency. This would be effective July 1, 1967, except where a State has an approved State plan incorporating this provision at an earlier date.

Notation: This proposal is designed to permit more flexibility with respect to how State governments organize to carry out State programs.

Special services for the blind and the deaf: This would authorize State vocational rehabilitation agencies to use available Federal grants-to-States funds to furnish reader services for blind clients and interpreter services for deaf clients. Effective on enactment.

Notation: This amendment would permit the use of Federal funds for such reader or interpreter services at any time a blind or deaf person is a client of the State vocational rehabilitation agency regardless of the other services being received, without regard to economic need.

Management services and supervision of business enterprises of the disabled: This would authorize the use by the States of Federal grants-to-States funds to pay the cost of management and supervisory services for vending stands operated by blind persons under the Randolph-Sheppard Act, and small business enterprises operated by other severely handicapped persons, to help improve their operations. Effective on enactment.

Notation: Under this amendment, State vocational rehabilitation agencies could use available Federal grant funds to help establish or improve a system of supervisory services to help increase efficiency of operation in vending stands operated by blind persons and other small business operated by disabled persons.

Technical amendment: This would amend section 4(d)(3) of the act to authorize not to exceed $100 per day compensation for members of the present National Advisory Council on Vocational Rehabilitation. (Present law authorizes $50 per day.) Effective on enactment.

Notation: Self-explanatory.

THE U.N. CONGO MISSION

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I was one of those who regretted the termination of the U.N. peacekeeping role in the Congo in 1964 at a time when it was evident that instability would seriously jeopardize the future of that important government. Yet there were many views about this peacekeeping operation. As it now becomes history, we need to draw from that experience all it can offer as a guide to the future.

A study of the Congo operation was recently published by the Brookings Institution. Because Members may wish to avail themselves of this important study, under unanimous consent, I place in the Record a review of that study recently published in the Brookings Bulletin:

Complex, Controversial, and Inconclusive, The U.N. Congo Mission Served the Cause of Peace

Whether the United Nations peacekeeping operation in the Congo from 1960 to 1964 was successful may appear to be a moot question while the country remains wracked by a bloody civil war. Yet as the largest and most difficult operation ever administered by an international organization, it is "rich in lessons and warnings for the future" which are analyzed in a new Brookings book by Ernest W. Lefever to be published in March.[1]

The volume provides the first full account of the Congo peacekeeping mission, and is based on firsthand observation by the author in 1962 and 1963. Mr. Lefever also interviewed scores of persons directly involved in the action. His analysis places in new perspective many obscure and confusing aspects of the complex story.

Certainly the Congo experience was the most controversial, as well as the largest, of the dozen or so peacekeeping missions which have engaged the United Nations (the much larger Korean effort, while under U.N. aegis, was a "sanctions" as opposed to a "peaceful settlement" force, and was under the operational command of the United States). It was undertaken in a strategically located and rich country almost the size of Western Europe which had overnight become a new arena in the stuggle between the Communist bloc and the West. The Congo quickly became a major foreign policy problem for all the great powers and many other governments. Thirty-four states sent a total of 93,000 soldiers to man the U.N. Force, and 126 of them lost their lives in the operation. It cost $402 million, of which the United States contributed 42 percent. It established new procedural and legal precedents, it was used by the Soviets to precipitate a constitutional and financial crisis for the world body, and it was the overwhelming preoccupation of the Secretariat for its duration.

---

[1] Crisis in the Congo: A United Nations Force in Action, about 200 pages, cloth $3.50, paper $1.95.

The peacekeeping effort was complicated by internal conflict in the Congo, the lack of preparation for self-government, and the abrupt and premature withdrawal of Belgian authority which caused the breakdown of law and order in the summer of 1960. The mandate given the operation was vague and ambiguous. The member governments of the United Nations held conflicting interpretations of what the Security Council resolutions meant. There was an unbridgeable gap between the far-reaching goal of restoring the peace and maintaining territorial integrity in the Congo and the limited legal authority of the "peaceful settlement" force operating with the consent of a divided and incompetent host government. The U.N. Force was operationally less than efficient, it made many small mistakes, and it suffered from hostile and unfair propaganda which was carried by much of the world press.

Nevertheless, Mr. Lefever finds that the U.N. Congo operation was largely successful in its basic mission of contributing to peace and security in Central Africa and in the wider world. It curtailed Soviet attempts to exploit the crisis by direct intervention. It helped end Katangan secession, thus preserving the territorial integrity of the Congo. It made a positive contribution to internal stability by its support of a united Congo with a moderate constitutional government representing all factions. It was a major factor in maintaining law and order and deterring the spread of tribal warfare.

In spite of four years of U.N. peacekeeping, disorder still characterizes the Congo. The situation today appears little better than it was in 1960. Despite political changes, the Central Government is still weak, faction-ridden, inexperienced and assailed by tribal and provincial revolts. It would be unrealistic to expect the U.N. to have brought lasting order, given the situation, but does it share responsibility for the failure to create greater stability?

Partly, Mr. Lefever finds: The U.N. Force did not succeed in one of its most important assignments—to train and reorganize the 35,000-man Congolese Army. The army is still almost as irresponsible and unreliable as it was in 1960, and this is a principal reason for the Government's inability to maintain order. However, the blame must be shared by the Congolese Government which failed to cooperate with U.N. efforts to retrain the army. These efforts were also handicapped by lack of specific legal authority.

The U.N. Force also did not do anything to contain the insurrections supported by Red China which today are a principal cause of continuing disorder. Here, however, the Force itself cannot be blamed. When the rebellions broke out in early 1964, the Congo and the other governments had already agreed to disengage the Force as quickly as possible. Many of the neutralist states were interested primarily in decolonization, and not the preservation of law and order or stability in central Africa as such. Their support for the operation in the first place was based primarily on their desire to end Western colonialism in the Congo. With the end of Katangan secession in early 1963 and the expulsion of the Belgian "imperialists" and the mercenaries, they felt the job was completed and their interest in the operation subsided.

In the final analysis, the U.N. Congo operation must be judged as having served the interests of the Western governments and the moderate neutralist states which sought stability in central Africa and a united Congo under a responsible government. Consequently it served the broader interests of international peace. Ironically, Russia and many neutralist states which supported the operation initially as a means of expelling Western influence later found that the U.N. mission frustrated their efforts to install an extreme nationalist or pro-Communist regime in Leopoldville.

Ironies abound in the Congo story. The operation served British and French interests in African stability, although both nations opposed the operation in part or in whole. In retrospect, it clearly served the interests of the United States, although at times American support of the operation was seriously questioned in responsible quarters in and out of the Government.

A member of the foreign policy studies senior staff at Brookings, the author was formerly on the staff of the Institute for Defense Analyses (which provided substantial support for the study) and head of the Foreign Affairs Division of the Library of Congress Legislative Reference Service. His book was prepared under the special program of U.N. policy studies made possible by a Ford Foundation grant. Among other projects in progress under the program is a study of the U.N.'s civil and conciliatory operations in the Congo.

AGONY OF SELMA

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, the agony of Selma became the agony of America. Out of thousands of personal commitments we have experienced a national anguish. Individuals in personal and group conflict, black and white, confronted each other in Alabama to produce moments of truth for themselves and for all of us.

I was profoundly moved by the journal of one man who was there to report his experience, Mr. Hoke Norris, literary editor of the Chicago Sun-Times. I commend his "Pilgrims' Progress in Alabama." He has recorded vividly the human mechanics of those significant days in Selma and Montgomery and between, the strategy and tactics of both sides; but he has also captured the spirit of the men and women who moved history in that torturous arena.

Mr. Norris, himself a native of the South, brought to his journal a sensitivity that gave substance and poignancy to his description of the white man's world on Selma's Broad Street and the Negro's world on Sylvan Street. Between them, he captured the texture of the old South confronted with the demands of the new South. I submit Mr. Norris' report to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PILGRIMS' PROGRESS IN ALABAMA—WITH ACHING FEET, THEY VOTE FOR FREEDOM

(By Hoke Norris, Sun-Times Staff Correspondent)

MONTGOMERY, ALA.—This is the cradle of the Confederacy, and may be its grave. Here Jefferson Davis was inaugurated as President of the nation that was not to be, and here was its capital in the first bright, joyful days of the Civil War.

But now Montgomery has been marched upon and, if not captured, at least subdued and shaken. The past, if not dead, is dying here in the Alabama spring with the redbud blooming, and the trees gray with winter but faintly green in their upper reaches. There will be other springs, but perhaps never again another like this one in Alabama. This is the spring when the impossible, the unthinkable, the preposterous became the reality. The Negroes marched upon Montgomery and demanded the right to vote.

How did it happen? What was it like, in Montgomery, in Selma, and on the concrete and piney-wood miles between? It isn't a tidy story to tell. The march on Montgomery was often conducted with more enthusiasm and dedication than efficiency and dispatch. Meetings were announced but never held, or were held without announcement. Here were many amateurs, undertaking a vast professional job, and the few professionals among the thousands were often overwhelmed by the numbers, by the magnitude of the task and the sheer logistics of getting from here to there. But it did happen, and this, roughly, as one man saw it, is how it happened.

You can't get to Selma without first coming to Montgomery. This is where the airlines land, and the cars are rented. Whatever your preconceptions about the city, and the South, arrival in Montgomery is as ordinary as arrival anywhere. Montgomery might be anybody's hometown, or Peoria. The rented car rolls along a divided highway into town—the much-marched Highway 80—past that same sort of scenery that most towns choose to exhibit to newcomers, and to sons coming home again. Filling stations, garages, warehouses, motels, restaurants, used car lots, here and there a farm that has somehow withstood the encircling city—these are the greetings. But there is a Holiday Inn—in fact, two of them, and soon to be a third. The swimming pool is empty, the mist falls out of a gray sky, the wind is April in Chicago, and the lobby is busy. The clerks are brisk with unsouthern briskness; they have many guests. Later, at dinner, there is no southern cornbread to eat with the pompano, but the baked potato is splendid and serves, after a fashion.

I found myself remembering Mississippi—there was a motel there, too, with a swimming pool, and surly, sullen cops that snarled and sneered, and at least one that may have fingered three young men for the murdering Kluxers. But I found to my amazement that the Montgomery police had established a press trailer where reporters could come for information, telephones, coffee and pleasant conversation.

A young police officer named Dick Payson was the official greeter. He did a splendid chamber of commerce job. "Welcome," he said, "and have a seat. If you will just let me see your credentials, please * * *. Have some coffee while I copy this off * * *. If you have any trouble, show this card, and if you still have trouble, call us or come to see us. Glad to have you with us."

Not only was there coffee, but it was good coffee. An assistant police chief, George Owens, acknowledged my compliments and appreciation, bowed and said, laughing, "Well, it gives us a chance to get in out of the wind. Have some more coffee."

From the trailer the visitor could see the capitol, through March mist and drizzle, it is a long, immaculately white building, Georgian, with a small romanesque dome and a neo-Greek porch. Two black ironwork balconies hang at the upper floors, beyond six fluted columns. It is set among pines, oaks, and magnolias, at the center of a circle of equally white and clean office buildings. Fifteen gray cars stood in line at the curb, at the foot of the long, wide marble steps. Each car bore a red dome light, the words "State Trooper" and a Confederate flag of tin where other cars would exhibit a front license plate.

"Only 15 of them?" Payson said, with a laugh. "You should have been here yesterday. They were everywhere."

A reporter hurried in, and to a telephone. "They just arrested 43 more up there," he said.

"Did it go smooth?" Payson asked.

"It went smooth."

"Thank God."

In Montgomery, a white-columned mansion is now the office of the Mutual Savings Life Insurance Co., and if one can forget the words of the Governor, and what has happened here, and in Selma, he might believe that this capital of Alabama has somehow found the mainstream.

Nobody knows, yet.

Two other men on the plane from Atlanta didn't know. They were both from Ipswich, Mass., William Wasserman, Jr., the publisher of three weekly newspapers, and the Reverend Goldthwaite Sherrill, rector of the Episcopal church in Ipswich and son of Bishop Henry Sherrill, once presiding bishop of Episcopal Churches in the United States and once president of the World Council of Churches.

"I waited until just before I left before I called my father," Sherrill said, "so he wouldn't get involved in what I was going to do. I told him, and he said, 'Well, son, I thought you might be planning that.' "

They were going to join the march. "We'll do whatever they tell us." Wasserman said.

"I plan to call the bishop in Birmingham," Sherrill said. "He's a fine old gentleman, and he'll say to me, 'Well, son, how's your father?' "

(Later the Episcopal bishop, the Roman Catholic bishop, and the Methodist bishop, with ecumenical unanimity, of a sort, issued statements deploring the march, the Catholic bishop called the marching nuns and priests "eager beavers.")

"I want to talk also to one of the Episcopal lay leaders in Selma, a prominent banker," Sherrill said. "It was the Selma Episcopal Church, you remember, St. Paul's, that turned away Malcolm Peabody and his group the other day. He's the brother of the former Governor, Endicott Peabody, of Massachusetts, and his mother was arrested down here in the South some time ago in a civil rights demonstration.

"I understand that 19 of them went to St. Paul's. The pastor was away—his ulcers were bothering him. The vestrymen told them that the white laymen and all the rectors, Negro and white, would be admitted, but not the Negro laymen. I think they were violating a canon of our church."

Wasn't this, he was asked, the first cause to bring together large numbers of the clergy—Protestant, Jewish, and Roman Catholic?

"It is," he said. "I don't suppose that it's ever happened before. And I think that President Kennedy brought it about. You know how it was before he was elected. But he was elected, and he did a splendid job of bringing us people together. That—and Pope John. What a great thing his election was. It almost makes you believe in the Holy Spirit again, doesn't it?"

And so they came to Montgomery, and to Selma.

Selma, Saturday, March 20—March day minus one.

The Hotel Albert, on Broad St., was built by slave labor just before the Civil War. It was modeled after the Doges Palace in Venice—ornately Italian, its brick the red of Alabama soil, its lobby rich in carved oak, carved marble fireplaces, and the crystal of a chandelier hanging from a high-paneled ceiling. But, unfortunately, it had no rooms left for arriving reporters. I had made arrangements through M. L. Miles, secretary of the Selma and Dallas County Chamber of Commerce. The clerk, a pleasant young man who holds open house in an upstairs bar for newspapermen and other visitors, was very sorry; he had told Mr. Miles that he would accommodate me if he could. He could not, just now. There was a waiting list.

M. L. Miles had done his pleasant best, the day before. I went to see him. He came out from his office in agitation, a newspaper clipping in his fingers. "Did you see this?" he demanded. I looked down upon a cartoon by Jacob Burck, the Sun-Times cartoonist, showing death presiding at a scroll bearing the names James Reeb and Jimmie Jackson—the preacher and the Negro killed in Alabama shortly before.

Miles looked at me in pain and exasperation. "What're you doing about the 12,000 unsolved murders a year in Chicago?" he demanded. "Why don't you clean up your cities before you come down here? I know how it is up there. I managed the Coca-Cola exhibit at your World's Fair in 1933, and lived at 66th and Kenwood. It was all white then. Now it's all black. You know what happens—Negroes move in, the whites move out, and you have your riots. Why don't you print that? And why don't you print the truth about us? I don't agree with violence, and most of us don't. We've got as much Americanism as anywhere, more than most places. Why don't you tell the truth about us?"

He was angry, but soft voiced. He asked about the hotel; he was sorry about the room. He had done what he could. We shook hands.

What do they want us to write? What can we write, when a preacher is beaten to death on the streets of Selma? But it is an oversimplification—so I reflected, making my way to the headquarters of the march—to divide this southern world into good and evil. The southerners believe in their cause; they are as hospitable and helpful as tradition tells us they are; they believe that the southern way of life, meaning segregation, is best for all; and they are determined, just as determined as the whites and Negroes, I found on Sylvan Street in Selma's Negro area.

If you are white and asked the way to the First Baptist Church of Selma, you would certainly be directed to a large, gray-stone gothic structure at Lauderdale and Dallas. This is the white First Baptist. If you were Negro, you would be directed to a red-brick structure on Sylvan, next to the railroad yards. This is the colored First Baptist. Inside, I found one of the endless orientation meetings in progress. The wearers of the clerical collar, the nun's habit, the blue jeans and the overalls, and here and there a beard—all were here, getting instructions. Members of the staff of the march stood at a pulpit beneath the gold of a pipe organ, and a broken stained-glass window picturing a baptismal scene.

An Episcopal clergyman from Chicago—the Rev. Earl Neil, vicar of Christ Episcopal Church at 65th and Woodlawn—was giving sober advice: "It's wise to avoid getting in conversation with local white citizens, because they can detain you while others gather around to beat you."

He was followed by the Rev. Morris Samuel, an Episcopalian from Los Angeles: "In facing eyeball to eyeball, the practical way to protect yourself is to lace your fingers behind your head, and draw the forearms forward to protect the temples. Don't duck. If you do, the guy behind you is going to get it all. If a group is going to charge you, fall to the ground and double up, like this."

I walked out into the cool, blue day. A block away stood another church—Browns Chapel A.M.E. All about stretched blocks of a Federal housing project, plain brick buildings erected along the lines of the white frame barracks that distinguished wartime Army posts. In the yards the wind whipped laundry of all hues, pastel and blues, reds, greens, yellows, and whites. It was, of course, a "Negro" project. Here too were the marchers, black and white, clergyman and layman and unbeliever, and the trucks that would supply them upon the march.

And here were many Chicagoans.

The Reverend William Hogan, assistant pastor of St. Martin Roman Catholic Church, at 59th and Princeton, Chicago: "A delegation of us went to see the bishop in Mobile, but he wouldn't see us. But we did think that we may have accomplished something. Maybe the younger priests, seeing and hearing us, will be influenced and remember us when they got to places of authority."

The Reverend William Boli, rector of St. George's Episcopal Church, at 76th and Drexel: "We were going to walk to St. Paul's, where they turned some of us away the other day. There weren't enough cars, and we were walking up Sylvan Street, but Wilson Baker (Selma safety director) stopped us. We couldn't march without a permit. We wanted to show our disapproval of the vestrymen turning away our people. Before we returned we read the penitential office, an act of sorrow and sin."

Mrs. Narcissa King, wife of the Chicago artist Clinton King, who was frying chicken for all comers to the basement of First Baptist: "I was taken into protective custody yesterday, in that march on the mayor's house. They took us to the Negro community center, which is conveniently located next to the jail, and told us to leave. I and four others chose to leave, for personal reasons, but about 300 sat-in there, all night. We had to stand for 2 hours, lined up, before we left. Have you heard the speeches? Have you heard the singing? This is the most inspiring, the greatest experience of my life."

The singing, yes. They sing at every opportunity. Browns Chapel was the rallying hall. Saturday night Dick Gregory spoke, and they sang. They have instant lyrics, for any occasion and any person.

They sang for the commander of the State troopers:

I love Al Ringo.
I love Al Ringo.
In my heart I love Al Ringo.

There was a piano, and a sweet trumpet. Two nuns sang and clapped with everybody else. A leader shouted: "What do you want?"

"Freedom."

"I don't hear you. What do you want?"

"Freedom."

"When do you want it?"

"Now."

"How much of it do you want?"

"All of it."

Saturday night Sherrill, Wasserman and I spent in the home of a Negro, in the project. We sat up talking late into the night. We had the apartment to ourselves—the family had gone elsewhere. I asked Sherrill why he was here.

"I've been interested in civil rights for a long time. My father was, too. He was on President Truman's Civil Rights Commission. At Yale I took a Negro friend of mine to Mory's for dinner, and they wouldn't serve us. There were Jewish waiters there, and they were indignant, but they had their orders. The captain of the waiters later took me to the only boxing match I've ever attended. He wanted to show how he felt. I've been a member of the NAACP, and in North Dakota, where my wife and I lived for a time, we tried to find housing for Indians. It wasn't an easy job.

"But I think that what really decided me on coming down here was the news report of those people turned away from St. Paul's last Sunday. That did it. Of course, there are wrong reasons for being here. I was talking to Wilson Baker this morning—he seems a decent fellow, far better, of course, than the sheriff, Jim Clark—and Baker said, 'The trouble with you fellows is that you all want to be martyrs. You all want to be Jim Reebs.' I told him he might be right, and that I thought he was sincerely trying to do his job. He said, 'Then why don't you go home?' "

The next morning the tenant of the apartment returned and cooked breakfast for us. He served us eggs, biscuits, bacon, sausage, and coffee. We ate it all. This was the day of the march.

It was another cool, bright, blue day. The soldiers were here, in jeeps and afoot, and Wilson Baker, unshaven and red eyed. Overhead flew an Army helicopter and an observation plane. Mostly we waited. The crowd before Brown's Chapel sang:

"Before I be a slave
I be buried in my grave,
And go home to my Lord and be free.
This little light of mine,
I'm going to let it shine;
Let it shine,
Let it shine.
Everybody wants freedom,
Everybody wants freedom,
Freedom, freedom * * *
George Wallace wants freedom."

And the anthem of the movement:

"We shall overcome,
We shall overcome;
We shall overcome some day;
Oh deep in my heart, I do believe
We shall overcome some day."

They crossed arms and locked hands with neighbors, and rocked side to side, singing. It is an optimistic song, but melancholy, too. It is rich with the melancholy of the slave. It seems to say, "We may gain our goal some day, but remember those who never had it."

There was unity here before Browns Chapel, but one remembered the stories of disagreement in the movement. They seem to be true. The Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, leader of SCLS, seems a genuine man of nonviolence, but I remembered what a newspaperman had said the night before about James Forman, the head of SNCC. "Jim Forman rather frightens me," he said. "Dr. King is a nonviolent man, but Jim Forman seems a violent man of nonviolence. Or he could be." Dr. King and his followers preach love for your enemies; present, they say, "your bare bodies" as a 'witness' of the cause. James Forman spoke on the church steps Sunday morning and he sounded somewhat defensive.

"I maintain," he said, "that if we cannot sit down to the table of democracy, we have a right to knock the legs from under that table * * *. We're saying that certain props that hold up that table are bad legs, and we have a right to knock out the bad leg * * *. Our position is that it doesn't matter whether you love Jim Clark, but that 58 to 60 percent of the people can't vote, and we have a right to run a man for sheriff and elect him if we can."

But it was Dr. King's day. "There he is," cried a voice. "He's here." They sang "We Shall Overcome," and the service began. Protestant, Jewish, and Roman Catholic clergymen read scripture lessons, and a Negro clergyman prayed, "Bless the governor of this State. Give him the vision of the Man of Galilee."

Dr. King drew the historical parallels: The Children of Israel, Gandhi, and the civil rights movement, sometimes clothed in sociological language. "The children of Israel were oppressed," he said, "and exploited economically by the power structure. We too have known Egypt * * *. We don't have much, but thank God we do have our bodies, we do have souls, we do have feet. Now is the time."

Amen, they said, and they sang "We Shall Overcome."

The march began at Sylvan and Alabama Avenue. In the first rank were Dr. King, Ralph Bunche, the 82-year-old grandfather of Jimmie Jackson, and several clergymen, including a rabbi with a magnificent beard and hair of grizzled gray. They wore leis given them by a delegation from Hawaii. The line moved slowly.

The problem now, as one reporter said, was not Governor Wallace but the press. Television, radio and periodicals were there in cars and trucks and afoot. But gradually the long line—3,000 to 4,500, ran the estimates—walked down Alabama to Broad Street, and turned to the bridge that arches over the Alabama River like a miniature bridge in a Japanese garden. Selma's streets were almost deserted. Evidently most citizens heeded their Governor's advice to stay away.

But at the Selma end of the bridge stood a small group of white citizens. Nearby, a loudspeaker broadcast "Dixie" and "Bye Bye Blackbird." Here was heard the first heckling.

"There's a priest. He's a disgrace to religion."

"Turn your collar around, priest."

"Hey, beatnik, I'd hide my face too."

The hecklers were all fierce old women. A police car moved up. "All right," shouted an officer, "let's break it up. Let's go on home."

The line moved on, past the site at the east end of the bridge where they had been twice turned back, once with violence. This time they marched among soldiers, Federal marshals and State troopers. A group of white teenagers before a restaurant called the Glass House shouted at the marchers, but they laughed as they did so. The fierce old women never laughed. At an intersection a Negro MP sergeant waved the traffic on. Cars rolled by slowly in the other lane of the divided highway. Sunday in the South was once a day of church, a big dinner, baseball in a pasture, and visiting about. Now it had become a day of march-watching. The line was surprisingly quiet. There was only a murmer of voices and the whisper of leather on pavement.

I came upon my friend, Father Sherrill, marching beside a Negro woman. "I saw my friend the banker this morning," he said. "He showed us his bishop's statement telling us to go home. I said that the Episcopal Church of the United States is our home, and he shook his head and said he knew our intentions were good but after 9 weeks of tension he could not cooperate with us. I saw him again at the bridge. He was waving his hands down, like this, telling us to go home. I told him that when I come back I'd like to go to his church, and he said, 'Like hell you will.' "

A Volkswagen drove past in the other lane, encrusted with signs: "Go home scum." "Welcome to Coonsville USA." A Selma policeman took pictures of the marchers. To a group of Negro children in the line he said, "I'll see you again." One of them replied, "You will." A State trooper took motion pictures (he did so throughout the march, for some reason).

We reached open country—the country of broomstraw and scrub pine. The medical vehicles cruised beside the line. So did the sanitation trucks—privies on wheels. The reporters came upon LeRoy Collins, head of the Federal Community Relations Service; John Doar, chief of the Attorney General's civil rights division; Ramsey Clark, the Deputy Attorney General; Chief U.S. Marshal James McShane, who had been at Oxford, Miss., for the matriculation of James Meredith; Jack Rosenthal, the Attorney General's press officer; and generals, colonels, majors, lieutenants, captains, privates—all enforcing an order of the courts of the land. There were 10-minute breaks for rest and eating. Here was a blind man from Georgia, and a one-legged man from Saginaw, Mich. A heckler shouted at the one-legged man, "When you get out of jail, hobo, you're going to lose that other leg."

Sometimes they sang, a soprano or tenor voice leading, and sometimes there was heckling: "Y'all walk just like you work."

At 5:10 p.m., about 8 miles from Selma, the line turned off on a narrow paved road that curved up and over a piney ridge. The sun was going down. In a pasture, two helicopters were parked beside a small pond of still water. We topped the ridge. There, in a shallow valley, stood four tents. We marched through a gate to the first bivouac. The pilumenia flowers of the leis were faded and wilted. The floodlights came on, and the stars came out. Stars may have fallen on Alabama, but there were plenty left up there. The fires burned along the picket lines. There would now be a meal, and rest.

I returned to Selma. On a wall at Browns Chapel there was a message in hasty writing: "Joan Borden—J. Dodson called and calmed your parents. Call him. Alameda, Calif."

At 6 o'clock the next morning Monday, the Reverend Andrew J. Young, executive assistant to Dr. King, stuck his head into the men's tent and shouted, "Are you cold?"

"Yes," shouted the men.

"Tired?"

"Yes."

"But does the glow of freedom warm your heart?"

"Yes."

It had been a cold night. Frost coated cars, and ice filmed puddles in the Alabama earth. Breakfast was oatmeal, and the march was at 8. The blind man wore a scarf over his sightless eyes; the one-legged man swung along beside a Negro. To Sister Patrice of San Mateo, Calif., a heckler cried "You white nigger-loving' ——." A Presbyterian clergyman, in an exhibition of rage and spontaneous ecumenity, said, "Don't pay any attention to him, Sister." She replied, "I didn't hear him."

"I got to march when the spirit says march," sang the young people.

"I got to vote when the spirit says vote."

Faces were now burned red by the sun. The day was warming up. It was again a bright blue day.

At 10:45 the Confederate air force dropped leaflets. Most of the leaflets were wide of the target, falling into a field of broomsedge and scrub pine. Marchers were sternly called back to ranks when they ran to gather up some. One pamphlet asked for donations for the defense of three Selma residents "accused of beating three agitators that patronized a Negro restaurant"; the other announced "Operation Ban"—"selective hiring, firing, buying, selling—An unemployed agitator ceases to agitate * * *. This message was brought to you by the world's smallest air force—Confederate air force."

At 10:55 the line halted and Andrew Young announced, "This is the most difficult part of the march. Here we have to cut out all but 300. The State of Alabama would like nothing better than to haul us into court and accuse us of having more than the 300 marchers allowed by the court order setting up this march. * * * The question has been raised why couldn't all the white people go back. There are two reasons they cannot. First, the white people are our protection. The National Guard wouldn't be here if the white folks weren't. And second, this is not a Negro problem. It's important that we all be together."

Painfully, with much counting and disappointment, the line dwindled to 300. The Reverend Robert G. Long of the Elk Grove United Presbyterian Church, representing the Presbytery of Chicago and the Synod of Illinois, lost out to Robert B. Long of San Francisco. "I think they ought to let a former Marine chaplain march, don't you?" he asked a friend. But among the chosen were Father Sherrill, Sister Patrice, Sister Leoline of Kansas City, and the blind man and the one-legged man—redheaded, stocky, ruddy, jovial James Michael Francis Lether, director of We the People's Freedom House in Saginaw. Sister Leoline applied ointment to his blistering face. "I'll probably get arrested for practicing medicine without a license," she said.

"Pray for me, Father," Lether shouted to a friend.

"I'll see you on the other side."

"Sure. Talk to that fellow upstairs for me."

The highway narrowed here to two lanes, and the line entered Lowndes County on a march between swamps and gray trees hung with gray moss. There would be 21 miles of this narrow road, and then the divided highway again, with unlimited numbers permitted. The marchers were now out of the jurisdiction of Sheriff Jim Clark.

Again I caught up with Sherrill. "I've got one parishioner," he said, "who won't come to church any more after this. Well, he didn't come much anyway, after I expressed my views. He's a southerner, and feels rejected. But the church hasn't rejected him. He has rejected the church. Our doors are always open to him."

There was lunch, of sandwiches, chocolate, and apples, and on we went. There were halts beside pastures and still waters, and Black Angus and white-faced Herefords that galloped about beneath the threshing helicopters, and finally camp again, in still another pasture. The young folks—and most of the marchers were young, and Negro—sang their songs. Sherrill sat on his sleeping bag and massaged his feet with ointment. "I think they'll be all right, if I keep off of them tonight," he said. "If they're not I'll crawl for a while."

Outside, in the beams of floodlights and fires, stood Jim Lether with three Catholic priests. "While we're all here, Fathers," he said, "will you give me your blessing?"

The three priests touched his red hair. "May the blessing of Almighty God, the Father, Son and Holy Spirit descend upon you and remain with you, forever. Amen." They made the sign of the cross.

"If I don't make it," Lether said, "you've lost the connection up there."

"So that's it," said one of the priests. They laughed together.

On Tuesday, while the Astronauts Virgil I. (Gus) Grissom and John W. Young flew at 16,500 miles an hour above the world, the marchers walked at a mile and a half an hour upon it.

I missed that rainy, muddy part of the march because I had some work to do in Montgomery. But my friend, Father Sherrill, told me about it Wednesday morning.

"We sang in the rain," he said. "I think we sang harder than when we were dry, and we got along all right. The mud was sticky and deep, but some of us went barfooted through it, and at least we made it to the next camp. The camp was muddy too, but some of us found dry places and slept pretty well."

His face was smeared with sunburn ointment. So was many another face, white, and Negro. It was a hot, breezy day, somewhat overcast.

Sister Patrice had had to return to her home in San Mateo, but Sister Leoline was still marching, her forehead blistered and peeling. This blind man was still there too, with his white cane, his arm linked into a Negro's. So was Jim Lether, swinging along on his crutches. He was haggard and sweating, his voice weakened and roughed.

"Don't tell the people," he said. "I was riding for a while. I'm out of it, I'm gone." He thought a moment, swinging along, and said, "but I'm going to keep on walking."

Dr. King was back now, with his wife. He had left the day before to attend a dinner in his honor in Cleveland. He and others at the head of the line sang as they walked. They sang "Swing Low, Sweet Chariot." The limit was now off—any number could march. The newcomers were distinguished by their clean shoes. At one point, I clocked the progress and counted the marchers. There seemed to be 1,360 of them, and it took them 6 minutes to pass a stationary point. They walked a mile in 35 minutes.

Father Sherrill was thinking of getting home. "I've got to be in the pulpit at 8 o'clock Sunday morning," he said.

And what did he plan to tell his congregation?

"I've been considering that," he said. "I've been thinking about a quotation from Robert Penn Warren. He said that before real peace can come in the South, both communities, black and white, will have to die a little. As a text I'd use, 'Except as a grain of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abides alone.' That's from John's Gospel, I think. I don't have my concordance with me just now, of course, and can't check it, but I think that's right. 'Know ye not that ye are baptized in the death of Jesus?' The New Testament is full of that thought. The new life we talk about is not something we adopt after a course in theology. It's the dying of the old person and the rising of the new. Forget about one's possessions, one's property values, and live in a new relationship with people everywhere—that's what it means.

"In race relations now we have to do more than talk about how we can solve this problem painlessly for both sides. We have almost the same thing in ecumenism. Catholics and Protestants are talking together now, and we can't go on until both sides are willing to accept some pain and some surrender."

He paused and laughed. "I can see that this is going to be an awfully windy sermon unless I can get it organized."

He had about 8 miles left in which to organize it.

And so they came to Montgomery.

And in Montgomery, Wednesday evening, two young white women stopped on the sidewalk at the ancient Greystone Hotel. "Isn't that Harry Belafonte?" said one of them. It was; he would lead a group of personages that night in a rally and entertainment program at the marchers' campsite. The two women pressed their noses against the window of the hotel.

"Have you bought his last record?" one of them asked.

"Yes. Have you?"

"Yes. But don't tell anybody we saw him."

One taxi driver: "There're a lot of fruitcakes in town. I hope something real nice happens to them."

Another taxi driver: "I believe everybody's got a right to vote that is qualified. I don't believe in this violence. They've all got a right to vote. Yet they just can't register 600 or 700 of them in a day, with just 3 or 4 people on duty. Commonsense would teach a dumb man that."

A young white man, shouting from his car at a Negro taxi driver with three white passengers: "You got any of them marchers in there?"

A major in the military police—a huge, ruddy Alabamian in Army fatigues and combat boots, before a small impromptu audience in a barbershop: "I agree, they've got some grievances, and they ought to be corrected. But I still think we could have worked it out ourselves, without all this outside interference. What we can't make the Nation see is the Communist element in this thing, and in the country. We've got more Communists in the Government right now than there were in Russia when they took over there. We've got two Communists on the Supreme Court right now, and had three, until one of the son-of-a-bitches retired. And that Reeb, the preacher that was killed. Preacher my ———. He was no more of a preacher than I am. He was a Communist."

A southern white lady in her 70's, leading visitors about her garden, among azaleas, quince, and flowering peach: "My cook used to come home from church crying over how they'd treated her on the bus. They were always shouting at them, 'get to the back, Nigger.' When they had the bus boycott, they couldn't have picked a better issue. It brought them all together, because they'd all been abused on the buses."

This southern lady brought a group together, some Alabamians, some outsiders. They agreed on the civil rights program—it must succeed. How many of her neighbors agreed with her? Very few, she said. Had she discussed it with them? Of course not. One didn't talk about it.

At the campsite the program proceeded—or failed to proceed—with the chaos and the confusion that marked much of the planning for the march. The crowd was too large; people fainted in the crush. The electricians were still at work. The entertainers waited to be called. The crowd waited to be entertained.

Perhaps, one spectator mused, this is one symptom of the tragedy: many of them have had so little opportunity to plan and lead, so little training—their lives have been so regimented, their education so neglected, their expectations so fragile and slender. But they did get this far—from Selma 50 miles to the open field behind the city of St. Jude—and tomorrow they would go to the capitol. Perhaps that was all one should ask, just now, and that was asking a great deal.

And so they came to the capitol of Alabama.

Dr. King led the way, beside Ralph Bunche—two winners of the Nobel peace prize. Behind them came the blind man and the one-legged man ("I am all right now. I'll make it"), and Sister Leoline, and Harry Belafonte, Clinton King, Walter Johnson, John Hope Franklin, many children, and Father Sherrill.

"I'm on a plane leaving Saturday," he said. "But first I'm going back to Selma, to see the children there. I'll make it to my pulpit at 8 o'clock Sunday."

Did he have his sermon ready?

"I'm working on it."

From the head of the line we couldn't see its end. It moved past Negro shacks and into a white area. A fierce old white woman screeched from a porch, "Go home, you dirty ———." A white man did a bump and grind, and held up clinched fists, forefingers extended. But for the most part they were silent watchers who stood on the sidewalks. They simply watched.

The marchers turned from Montgomery at Court Square, and saw before them, down the wide thoroughfare of Dexter Avenue, the white capitol. They marched past the Jefferson Davis Hotel—white watchers stood at windows, and a second-floor balcony—and on to the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church, where Dr. King proclaimed the Montgomery bus strike nearly 10 years ago now. One more block, and the leaders stood at the foot of the steps of the capitol.

The sky was overcast, and there was thunder. A double file of State conservation officers, in green helmets and new uniforms, guarded the capitol at the first landing, and everywhere were soldiers, the Alabamians with replicas of the Confederate flag sewn above the left pockets of their jackets. On the dome of the capitol flew the red-and-white flag of Alabama and the stars and bars of the Confederacy. The only American flags in sight were carried by marchers.

The entertainers sang.

"Go tell it on the mountain,
Over the hills and everywhere;
Go tell it on the mountain,
To let my people go."

The people sang too. The voices echoed, lagging and lingering, among the State buildings. We Shall Overcome; Michael Row the Boat Ashore; Got To Move When the Spirit Say Move; This Little Light of Mine I'm Going To Let It Shine. There were 50,000 people out there, one of the officials said.

Probably not 50,000—but many. There were many speeches, too, and Dr. King began speaking at 3:30 and finished at 4. Now a committee would attempt to deliver a petition. That was why they were here—citizens petitioning their government. The march was over.

And now I wonder what my obliging, exasperated friend, Mr. Miles of Selma, would want me to write about his city and his State, his capitol, and his way of life?

Would he want me to write about the outside agitators, and the inside irritators? Well they do agitate, and they do irritate. Or about how satisfied the Negroes were until the agitators moved in on them? Well, they did seem satisfied. At least they were silent. About the Negro shacks we walked past that Thursday morning, or the white mansions we did not walk past? They are both there, and some Negroes have fine homes too. A few of them. Or about what one, or both, of the taxi drivers said? Or the white southern lady in her garden, among her blossoming shrubs, with her silent frustration? Or about James Reeb and Jimmie Jackson? Or about the sincere anger of white southerners, their steadfast belief in their cause, their silence before the might of the Federal Government? Or about the singing Negroes?

I don't know. I still don't know what Mr. Miles would want me to write. I do know he would like one question answered, and I believe I could answer it, if he would ask. Why do all these people come to Alabama?

Because it's there. That's why.

POSTLUDE

And now—on Friday—now what would they have a writer write about Alabama?

It rained on Alabama, and on Lowndes County, and there was fire in the sky. It rained on St. Paul's Episcopal Church, and on Browns Chapel, on the just and the unjust on the Negro and the white, alike.

It rained even harder than it did on Tuesday, when the marchers were marching through Lowndes, past the place where one of them was to die. It rained on the signs (Martin Luther King at Communist Training Center," "Get the United States Out of the UN"), and on the swamps and the fields, on the Black Angus and the white-faced Herefords, and the shacks and the mansions.

It rained on the gray trees and the gray moss, and the redbud and the flowering peach. It rained on Highway 80, on the sidewalk where James Reeb was beaten to death, and on Jimmie Jackson's grave.

It rained on a blue car still parked against a post it had knocked down, and the wind blew the rain in through the broken window on the driver's side, and it covered the blood there.

The lightning flashed, the thunder rolled, and it rained. But the water could not wash away, nor the fire burn away, the blood in the car, nor the blood on the soil and the hands of bloody Alabama.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce today the President's bill, the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

There are areas of this Nation that do not share in the economic growth and prosperity enjoyed by the Nation as a whole. Some of these areas have had an uneven pattern of development which has not permitted a self-sustaining economy. There are other areas of this Nation that are just beginning to slip behind. If these areas are not assisted, they will soon become trapped in the mire of economic and social decay.

This Nation cannot afford the burden of the underdeveloped economic resources and the underemployed human resources. It does not make sense for this Nation to permit pockets of poverty and economic decay to continue to exist. It does not make sense to continue to waste valuable human and potential economic resources. It does not make sense to permit opportunities to be closed to people because of the circumstances of the area in which they live.

The President, drawing from the vast experience of the accelerated public works program and the experimental area redevelopment program has proposed the bill I introduce today, the "Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965." In his message on area and regional economic development presented to the Congress on Thursday, March 25, 1965, the President stressed the three basic principles guiding the proposed legislation:

> First, we will devote maximum effort to providing the conditions under which our private enterprise system can provide jobs and increased income. It is up to private business to take advantage of improved conditions for making profits by expanding present business or starting new ones, thereby increasing opportunity for the people of the region.
>
> "Second, no Federal plan or Federal project will be imposed on any regional, State or local body. No area will be declared distressed by Federal decree. No economic development district will be designated unless the State and local people want it to be designated. No plan will be approved unless it also has the approval of State and local authorities. No programs or projects will be originated at the Federal level. The initiative, the ideas, and the request for assistance must come to Washington, not from Washington.
>
> "Third, the Federal Government will seek full value from every dollar spent or loaned under this program. Every proposal will be tested to see if it offers substantial promise of increasing economic development commensurate wtih the Federal funds involved. Only if a project meets this test will it be approved. Over the years the increased economic activity stimulated by this program will return its cost many times to the Federal treasury"

I believe these principles are necessary to the success of the proposed Public Works and Economic Development program because they are the fundamental principles of this great Nation. There is the recognition and the resolution that the development of the depressed areas of the Nation depends upon the highest degree of cooperation between the public and private enterprise. In order to attract new industry to these areas there must be adequate public works and economic development facilities. This bill provides the vehicle by which private and public resources work together toward a common goal.

The bill also stresses the partnership of officials at every level of government, local, State, and Federal, in working toward this goal. The bill also guarantees that there will be no waste of the development resources, and, indeed, provides that such resources will be used as investments for present and future economic growth.

The bill attacks the problem of development in a variety of ways and provides a well-rounded program of meeting the needs of the depressed areas. It provides a direct and supplemental grant program for public works facilities related to economic development; it encourages private investment in economic depressed areas; and it provides special assistance for the preparation of long-range regional economic development programs.

I have always supported programs designed to improve the economic conditions of the distressed areas. I know that the special grants for public works facilities related to economic development will enable many communities to attract commercial and industrial enterprises. The special feature of the supplemental grant for public works is most important to the community that has suffered from long periods of decline and decay. I am pleased that this is part of the bill because I have long advocated additional Federal assistance for public works to those communities that need it most.

I am also pleased with the provisions of the bill that recognize the need of Federal assistance for regional programs of planning and growth. Just as we have approved action for Appalachia, this bill permits us to begin to act for the other needy regions of the Nation.

Members of the House, this bill is a good bill. It is a carefully prepared program designed at helping resourceful people to help themselves. The bill offers the hope that, as the President stated in his message:

> These conditions of our depressed areas can and must be righted. In this generation they will be righted.

I strongly urge your immediate and thorough consideration of this bill and its enactment into law.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The proposed bill is entitled the "Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965."

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

Section 2 declares that it is the purpose of the act, in order to maintain the national economy at a high level and to avoid wasting invaluable human resources, to provide Federal financial assistance, including grants for public works and development facilities, to areas and regions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment to enable them to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic development.

TITLE I—GRANTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES

Section 101 replaces section 8 of the Area Redevelopment Act, which deals with grants for public facilities, with a section which would broaden the Secretary's authority to make grants for needed public works, public service, or development facilities in accordance with criteria identical with those set forth in the new development facility loan section (sec. 201). It would also authorize a new program of supplementary grants to assist with local shares of other Federal grant-in-aid programs. The 100-percent direct grant authority of the Area Redevelopment Act would be replaced by a provision authorizing 50-percent grants; however, supplementary grants, which would vary in amount according to needs of areas and types of projects, would also be authorized for development facility projects directly assisted under the new program. Maximum Federal grant assistance for any project would not exceed 80 percent of project cost, with supplementary grants also being reduced by the amount of loan assistance which could be repaid from such revenues as the project itself might produce, in excess of those which would amortize the local share and provide for the successful operation and maintenance (including depreciation) of the facility. No assistance would be extended for any facility which would compete with an existing privately owned utility.

Section 102 contains an appropriation authorization of $250 million annually for public works and development facility grants.

TITLE II—OTHER FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Public Works and Development Facility Loans

Section 201 replaces section 7 of the Area Redevelopment Act, which deals with loans for public facilities, with a section which would broaden the Secretary's authority to make loans, in order to enable him to assist needed public works, public service, or development facilities which either directly or indirectly assist in the creation of additional long-term employment opportunities or else primarily benefit the long-term unemployed and members of low-income families. Loan criteria would remain the same, except that a new interest formula would be substituted which would vary interest rates according to Federal borrowing costs, less one-half of 1 percent. Pending a change in Federal borrowing costs, the actual interest rate charged to borrowers on such projects would be 3⅝ percent. An annual authorization of $170 million for both business and development facility loans replaces the limitation on loans outstanding of the Area Redevelopment Act.

Loans and Guarantees

Section 202 replaces section 6 of the Area Redevelopment Act, which deals with business loans, with a section which would authorize the Secretary (1) to make industrial and commercial loans in accordance with the purpose criteria of the present act, (2) to guarantee loans for working capital made to private borrowers by private lending institutions in connection with projects in redevelopment areas otherwise assisted under the act, and (3) to contract to pay to or on behalf of business entities locating in redevelopment areas a portion of the interest costs which they incur in financing their expansions from private sources. The new section would retain the loan conditions of the Area Redevelopment Act (including a prohibition against aiding relocations, which would apply to all assistance under this section), except that the requirements of subsections 6(b)(9)(B) and (C), dealing with the subordination and deferment of certain non-Federal funds, would be modified (1) to reduce the community share from 10 percent to 5 percent, (2) to enable concurrent repayment with the Federal loan of the subordinated 15 percent funds, and (3) to allow the Secretary to waive the community participation requirement in accordance with standards prescribed by regulations where the necessary funds are not reasonably available to the project because of the economic distress of the area. A minimum 15 percent investment subordinate to the Federal loan would continue to be required in all cases. The new section authorizes the Secretary to require periodic revisions of overall economic development programs and deletes the present limitation on loans outstanding in favor of a single appropriation authorization (placed under the proposed new sec. 201) for both business and development facility loans. Interest rates would be determined in accordance with a new formula based on Federal borrowing costs, which would increase the rate of interest currently charged from 4 to 4⅛ percent.

Economic Development Revolving Fund

Section 203 establishes an economic development revolving fund in the Treasury of the United States for funds obtained by the Secretary under section 201, for loan funds under section 403, and for collections and repayments. The fund would be available to the Secretary for the purpose of extending loan assistance under sections 201, 202, and 403. Repayment of obligations outstanding under the Area Redevelopment Act would be credited to the fund, and it would pay interest to the Treasury on the amount of the total loans outstanding, based on current average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturities.

TITLE III—TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, RESEARCH, AND INFORMATION

Technical and administrative assistance

Section 301 authorizes the Secretary to provide technical assistance in accordance with the criteria of the Area Redevelopment Act. In addition, it authorizes grants-in-aid both for technical assistance and for economic planning and administrative expenses to appropriate public or private nonprofit State, area, district, or local organizations. No grant for economic planning and administrative expenses would exceed 75 percent of the undertaking involved. However, non-Federal contributions in cash and in kind would be authorized. The Secretary would have discretion to require repayment of technical assistance where appropriate, and would take into consideration grants available from other sources (such as urban planning grants and highway planning grants) in determining the need for planning funds. An annual appropriation authorization of $20 million is provided.

Research

Section 302 authorizes the Secretary to establish and conduct a continuing program of study and research. This section is identical with that contained in the Area Redevelopment Act.

Information

Section 303 directs the Secretary to aid redevelopment areas and other areas by furnishing technical and similar information to such areas.

TITLE IV—AREA AND DISTRICT ELIGIBILITY

Part A—Redevelopment areas

Area Eligibility

Section 401 establishes standards for the designation of "redevelopment areas." It replaces section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act with a section having more precisely-defined unemployment and low-income criteria. The new criteria are: (1) unemployment standards for all areas identical with those in the present act for the designation of predominantly urban areas; (2) designation on the basis of low-family income for those additional areas which have a median family income not in excess of 40 percent of the national median; (3) those additional Federal and State Indian reservations which the Secretary after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior determines manifest the greatest need; and (4) those areas experiencing a sudden rise in unemployment due to an economic emergency, such as a major plant closing. However, no area would be eligible for designation if it (1) has a population less than 1,500 persons; (2) is smaller than a "labor area" (as defined by the Secretary of Labor), a county, or a municipality with a population of over 250,000 whichever in the opinion of the Secretary is appropriate; or (3) does not have an approved overall economic development program. In addition to the four types of areas listed, areas eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act would continue to be eligible for assistance until the first annual review of eligibility under section 402, at which time they would be required to qualify under the regular provisions of the act. The Secretary would be authorized to prescribe necessary rules and regulations for the designation of areas, to review such designations annually, and to obtain from the heads of other agencies on a reimbursable basis the data upon which to base area designations.

Annual Review of Area Eligibility

Section 402 replaces section 13 of the Area Redevelopment Act, which deals with the termination of eligibility of areas, with a section which would (1) prescribe an annual review of eligibility of areas, (2) require a currently approved overall economic development program as a condition for continued eligibility, (3) provide 30 days' notice prior to termination of eligibility, and (4) explicitly allow applications filed prior to area termination to be considered by the Secretary.

Part B—Economic development districts

Section 403 authorizes the Secretary to designate new multicountry economic development districts, with the concurrence of the States affected, for the benefit of the districts as a whole and of the redevelopment areas situated in such districts. The districts must include two or more designated redevelopment areas, be of sufficient size and potential to foster economic growth on a scale involving more than a single area, and contain one or more economic development centers. Where the centers were not already designated redevelopment areas, the Secretary would be authorized to designate such centers as he deemed appropriate, as eligible for loan and grant assistance under the act on the same basis as redevelopment areas. Recommendations for such designations would be contained in approved district overall economic development programs, which would be required prior to the designation of the district. To encourage redevelopment areas to participate in multicounty economic development activities, the Secretary would also be authorized to increase development facility grants for projects in redevelopment areas within designated districts by an amount equal to 10 percent of the cost of the project assisted. To insure adequate time for effective planning, no district would be designated and no development center would be eligible for financial assistance until one year after the enactment of the section. However, the Secretary would be authorized to invite the several States to draw up proposed district boundaries and to identify potential economic development centers as soon as practicable.

The total authorization for financial assistance to economic development centers and for 10 percent bonuses to redevelopment areas within designated districts is limited to $50 million annually.

TITLE V—REGIONAL ACTION PLANNING COMMISSIONS

Establishment and Coordination

Section 501 authorizes the Secretary to invite and encourage the several States to establish appropriate multistate regional action planning commissions for the purpose of advising and assisting him in the identification of practical boundaries for multistate economic development regions, and for performing various other enumerated functions in preparation for the formation of successful multistate economic development regions. A region would be composed of two or more designated or potential economic development districts in two or more contiguous States. State members of the commissions would be appointed by the Governors of the States, and Federal members would be appointed by the President. The Secretary would present the plans and proposals of the commissions first for review by the Federal agencies primarily concerned and then to the President with the agencies' recommendations. The Secretary would provide liaison between the Federal Government and each regional commission, and each Federal agency is directed to cooperate with the commissions to assist them in carrying out their functions.

Program Development Criteria

Section 502 establishes program development criteria for the guidance of the Commissions.

Regional Technical and Planning Assistance

Section 503 authorizes the Secretary to provide technical assistance to the Commissions in carrying out their functions, either directly, through other agencies or private contractors, or through grants-in-aid to the Commissions. The Secretary would have discretion to require repayment of technical assistance in appropriate cases. Administrative expenses of the Commissions for the first 2 years could be paid by the Federal Government, and in subsequent years by the Federal Government and the States in each Commission equally. Non-Federal contributions both in cash and in kind are authorized. An annual appropriation authorization of $15 million is provided.

TITLE VI—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATOR

Administrator for Economic Development

Section 601 authorizes the appointment by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, of an Administrator for Economic Development in the Department of Commerce, who shall perform such duties in the execution of the act as the Secretary of Commerce may assign.

Advisory Committee on Regional Economic Development

Section 602 directs the Secretary to appoint a National Public Advisory Committee on Regional Economic Development consisting of 25 representatives of labor, management, agriculture, Government, and the general public, to make recommendations to him with respect to the program.

Consultation with other Persons and Agencies

Section 603 authorizes the Secretary to call together and confer with any persons who can assist in meeting the problems of area and regional unemployment and underemployment. It also provides for consultation by the Secretary with other interested departments and agencies.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

Powers of Secretary

Section 701, dealing with the powers of the Secretary, is identical with section 12 of the Area Redevelopment Act, except that subparagraph (10) has been revised to give the Secretary the same authority to use experts and consultants which is customarily available to Federal agencies.

Savings Provisions

Section 702 is a standard savings provision, which is required to effect administrative continuity between the Area Redevelopment Act and the new Economic Development Act.

Transfer of functions and effective date

Section 703 provides that the transfer of functions from the Area Redevelopment Administration to the Secretary of Commerce shall take effect upon enactment except where otherwise explicitly provided. It provides that appropriations available for the purposes of the Area Redevelopment Act shall be available for the purposes of the new act, and it authorizes the President to designate any person to act as Administrator of the new agency until the office is formally filled.

Separability

Section 704 is a standard clause providing that the invalidation of one part of the act by any court shall not invalidate any other part of the act.

Application of act

Section 705 defines the term "State" to include both the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

Annual report

Section 706 requires the Secretary to make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to the Congress for each fiscal year ending after June 30, 1965.

Use of other facilities

Section 707 is similar to section 24 of the Area Redevelopment Act and requires the Secretary to use the available services and facilities of other Federal agencies to the fullest extent practicable in carrying out the provisions of the act.

Appropriation

Section 708 authorizes to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of the act, and provides that appropriations may remain available until expended.

Penalties

Section 709 contains a standard penalty clause for the falsification of information by any applicant for financial assistance.

Employment of expediters and administrative employees

Section 710 is the same as section 19 of the Area Redevelopment Act and requires the certification to the Secretary of the names of persons hired to expedite applications. It also requires applicants to agree to refrain from tendering employment to agency officials for a period of 2 years after assistance is rendered by the Secretary.

Prevailing rate of wage and 40-hour week

Section 711 is similar to section 21 of the Area Redevelopment Act in requiring the payment of prevailing wage rates under the Davis-Bacon Act to all laborers and mechanics employed on projects assisted by the Secretary. It applies Davis-Bacon wage rates to private as well as public applicants.

Record of applications

Section 712 requires the Secretary to maintain the same record of applications as is required by section 20 of the Area Redevelopment Act.

Records and audit

Section 713 requires each recipient of assistance under this act to keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe. It also authorizes the Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States, or their representatives, to have access to pertinent documents for the purpose of audit.

Conforming amendment

Section 714 is intended to conform the provisions of other acts (dealing with assistance to redevelopment areas) to the changes made by this act.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Establishes an agency for public works and economic development, within the Department of Commerce, to provide Federal financial assistance in areas and regions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment to enable them to take effective steps in planning and financing economic development.

TITLE I. GRANTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES

[Annual authorization (in millions)]

Sec. 101 provides for direct and supplemental grants (up to 80 percent) for public works and development facilities	250

TITLE II. OTHER FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Sec. 201 provides for loans to assist in financing public works or development facilities	---
Sec. 202:	
(a) Provides industrial and commercial loans to purchase and develop land and facilities, purchase machinery and equipment and construct and rehabilitate buildings	---
(b) Provides for a guarantee of working capital loans made in connection with loan projects	---
(c) Provides 2 point interest subsidies to companies which obtain their financing from non-Government sources and locate within redevelopment areas. Total new subsidy contracts not to exceed $5 million annually	5
Total authorization for secs. 201 and 202 loans and guarantees	170
Sec. 203 establishes an economic development revolving fund in the U.S. Treasury to receive collections and repayments and to extend financial assistance under secs. 201, 202, and 403	---

TITLE III. TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, RESEARCH, AND INFORMATION

Sec. 301 provides for technical assistance studies and for grants (up to 75 percent) for planning and administrative expenses	20
Sec. 302 authorizes a continuing program of study and research	---
Sec. 303 provides for information to redevelopment and other areas useful in alleviating unemployment	---

TITLE IV. AREA AND DISTRICT ELIGIBILITY

Sec. 401 establishes the criteria for designation of "redevelopment areas"	---
Sec. 402 provides for annual determination of each area's initial or continuing eligibility under the act	---
Sec. 403 authorizes the designation of economic development districts containing two or more redevelopment areas and one or more centers (which also become eligible for loan and grant benefits). Increases grants for redevelopment areas within districts up to 10 percent	50

TITLE V. REGIONAL ACTION PLANNING COMMISSIONS	
Sec. 501 provides for the establishment of Regional Action Planning Commissions to identify boundaries and prepare multistate economic development plans. State members would be appointed by State Governors, Federal members by the President	---
Sec. 502 establishes program development criteria for the guidance of the commissions	---
Sec. 503 provides Federal technical assistance for multistate commissions and permits the Federal Government to pay up to 100 percent of commission administrative expenses for 2 years, and 50 percent thereafter	15
TITLE VI. ADMINISTRATIVE	
Sec. 601 provides for an Administrator for Economic Development within the U.S. Department of Commerce	---
Sec. 602 establishes a representative 25-member National Public Advisory Committee on Regional Economic Development	---
Sec. 603 authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to confer with individuals and agencies or departments which can assist in alleviating unemployment and underemployment	---
Other sections of this bill contain technical and administrative provisions	---
Total	510

SENATOR THOMAS J. DODD

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. Monagan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, a very penetrating and well-rounded article "Strong on Advice, Cautious on Consent" on Senator Thomas J. Dodd, by Holmes Alexander, appeared in the New Haven Register on Friday, March 19, 1965. Since this article furnishes highlights of Senator Dodd's career and provides information as to his advice on foreign policy and the respect with which this advice is received in Washington, I append Mr. Alexander's article herewith for the broader circulation which it deserves:

STRONG ON ADVICE, CAUTIOUS ON CONSENT

(By Holmes Alexander)

WASHINGTON.—Senator Tom Dodd, of Connecticut, has become the good, gray eminence of American foreign policy. This is, I think, a unique position in our politics.

Many Senators, like Humphrey under President Kennedy, become spokesmen for an administration. Some are White House cronies. Others are moved by flattery or their own vanity to think they are. Many believe that the Constitution gives the Presidency such initiative and authority that the Senate is only a Chamber of echo and approval. All such Senators usually agree with the President in power and often get credit for sharing in his foreign policy leadership.

FORCEFUL BRIEFS

But Dodd fits none of these categories. Throughout the Kennedy-Johnson years, he has been an untiring writer of memorandums to the White House. They could be described as his briefs for the arguments he usually, but not always, presents later in a Senate speech. The briefs often contain material too sensitive for public disclosure. They are forceful, succinct, and substantiated by Dodd's personal research from sources in this country and abroad. The memos and the speeches, when they are fired off in close sequence, are powerful explosions with repercussions literally heard round the world.

Dodd has resisted cronyism and sponsorship at the White House. He dislikes the glib assumption that he speaks for the President on matters where they happen to be in agreement. Dodd is a strict conformist to the doctrine of division of powers between the executive and legislative branches. He often receives, but rarely originates, White House telephone calls. As traveler, reader, interviewer and cogitator, he keeps a tight schedule that leaves little time for anything that doesn't add to his knowledge.

DOCUMENTS INTERCEPTED

At first Dodd's memos did not reach President Kennedy. The men had not been close friends in the House or Senate. The palace guard which surrounded J.F.K. intercepted the documents. Dodd finally bypassed channels and reached Mrs. Evelyn Lincoln, Kennedy's personal secretary. After that, J.F.K. came to know in advance what the Connecticut Senator was thinking—and getting ready to say. Toward the end of Mr. Kennedy's life, Dodd's ideas had made their way into meetings of the Cabinet and National Security Council.

Dodd's relationship with President Johnson stands on the bonhomie of old congeniality. As a Senator, L.B.J. was an authority on everything except foreign affairs. He has told third persons in deep respect that Dodd has an astonishing record of being right in long-term appraisals of international situations. When a Dodd memo reaches the White House these days, it gets instant and wide attention in the advisory circles. As many as 50 persons with whom the President consults on policy matters now know about the Dodd letters.

SHAPE POLICY

Their effect of hit or miss cannot be averaged up like a batting average. Dodd's advance positions on Vietnam and the Congo have become the administration positions. But the Senator was not able to dissuade either Kennedy or Johnson from making the wheat deal with Russia. Dodd's aversion to trading with the Communist enemy, in the absence of pro-American concessions, seems to be on a collision course with the President's hope that East-West traffic may improve our dollar balance. But all of these are matters which have to be weighed rather than counted in any calculation of their importance.

With Fulbright, chairman of Foreign Relations, out of sympathy with several White House policies, it has been erroneously reported that Dodd sometimes serves as the Presidential "voice" on the Senate floor. This could never be. Dodd's belief in the separation of powers would forbid it. In February he refused to vote for the bill which gave the President discretionary power to lend food to Egypt. Dodd said "it makes no sense" to empower the Executive to do something of which Congress disapproves. When it comes to the expenditure of public funds, "Congress should not and cannot waive its authority and responsibility," the Senator said.

Dodd is copious on advice, wary on consent. He works in the shadows, not from necessity but from choice. His pipeline runs to the White House on one-way valves. He carries weight on foreign policy without throwing it around. His eminence, good and gray, is something different in our time and place.

IN A FEW WORDS, A BIG MESSAGE

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Farnum] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, an influential Michigan journalist, Mr. Will Muller, of the Detroit News, in the process of giving credit to three Members of the Congress for their fight for clean water, has also made an eloquent summation of a problem of great importance to the Nation and one of particular importance to Members of this honorable body.

My reference is to Mr. Muller's column, titled "Unsung Heroes," which appeared on the editorial page of the Detroit News on March 29, 1965.

Using a veteran journalist's skill at condensation, and taking advantage of his ability to put words together colorfully, Mr. Muller has put into a short space a great amount of commonsense. I have read his column with interest and I commend its message to all Members of this honorable body.

Mr. Muller's column follows:

UNSUNG HEROES

(By Will Muller)

There is little glory for the leaders of long wars even if their victory is vital to man's survival.

This applies with special emphasis to those who, in 3 years of trial and failure, have cleared the way for congressional approval of a new antipollution measure to guard the Nation's waters.

To Maine's Senator Edmund Muskie goes credit for dedication and skill and sober determination. He and his enlightened allies got the bill through the U.S. Senate.

To Representative John A. Blatnik of Minnesota, goes credit for the perseverance and industry and leadership which won approval for the measure in the House Public Works Committee.

DINGELL HELPED

And to Representative John Dingell, of Detroit, goes credit for 3 years of unceasing battle in the legislative jungle without which the bill would have had little muscle.

The spotlight of recognition is fickle. Had Muskie, Dingell, and Blatnik been leading the crusade for civil rights or for a moon flight, they would be shining now in the public's appreciation.

They only fought for a glass of clean water for 200 million Americans. They asked only that coming generations, freed of filth, might enjoy uncontaminated inland oceans and see clean rivers running unpolluted to the sea.

The new bill would take administration of antipollution laws away from the frustrated muddling of the Public Health Service and put it under a new agency in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. Blatnik and a few hardheaded colleagues like Dingell are determined the new agency won't be loaded with procrastinators from the past.

The new measure gives the HEW Secretary authority to set up water quality standards as minimum guides for States and communities pushing pollution abatement projects. Here is a new and telling weapon, for it precludes the threats of industrial polluters to move across State boundaries to escape pollution control enforcement.

Proponents of the measure credit President Johnson with bolstering their cause. He has submitted to Congress a proposal for preserving and enhancing the natural beauty of America. Clean water is the first requisite to beauty anywhere.

The President himself is a little hardheaded about pollution. In his message he reminded Congress that 25 percent of Lake Erie already is so choked with the bloom of algae, due to pollution nutrients, that it will not support fish life.

While polluters and bureaucrats and legislators have been fighting the battles of delay, rivalry, and politics, the Nation's streams have become choked, its beaches filth littered, its boating water contaminated. A House committee recently estimated that immediate construction of 4,000 filtration plants and the modernization of 1,700 more would only bring the country abreast of its problem.

DINGELL recently told a House committee: "After yet another year with the pollution under the dead hand of the Public Health Service, we have fallen 12 rivers deeper on the debit side. Let no one accuse our pollution program of stagnating; it is moving quite determinedly in the wrong direction."

MEN OF DEVOTION

DINGELL is in his 10th year of concentrated attack on pollution problems. BLATNIK has an equal record, and MUSKIE's devotion to conservation goes back to his record as Maine's Governor.

Men of equal devotion, equally aware of a swiftly developing emergency that hazards the future, work with them without national recognition. Their work may not be dramatic. But water does not become dramatic until people are dirty and thirsty and quite possibly ill because there is no clean water to be had.

WHY WE NEED THE MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Manpower Development and Training Act has been in existence only since 1962, but in that short time it has left its mark in many corners of the United States.

One of the marks it has left is in Detroit, Mich. There a former marine who is the father of four children was, as are many Americans, in the doldrums of unemployment. He described his situation this way:

> You almost get to believe you don't belong in this world.

Today, thanks to the Manpower Development and Training Act, Harry Darnell holds his head up high and says:

> I'm living. And for a long time I was dying.

On Thursday of this week, Mr. Speaker, the House will be asked to approve the Manpower Act of 1965 which embodies amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act.

For those who may have some doubts about the merits of this program, I urge them to read the story of Harry Darnell as it was told in the March 1965 issue of UAW Solidarity. The story of Harry Darnell is just one of many examples of what the Manpower Development and Training Act program has been doing to help the unemployed.

Mr. Speaker, under consent I include the article, "The Comeback of Harry Darnell," in the RECORD at this point:

THE COMEBACK OF HARRY DARNELL

You know who considers himself the luckiest man in all Detroit—and maybe even the luckiest man east of the Mississippi?

His name is Harry Darnell.

"I'm living! And for a long time I was dying!"

Ten million red-blooded, salary-earning American men would wonder if Harry's really living and the moment they wondered, they'd betray themselves. Because who really understands what living is until they've been to the brink?

Harry Darnell was at the edge.

"Man," he said, "for a long time I thought there was no place in this world for me."

Then he'd look at his four youngsters and start knocking on doors all over again. His wife, Betty, prayed for him.

With all the national energy going into President Johnson's war against poverty, the man in the White House might like to know the first human being saved. Mr. President, meet Harry Darnell!

And, Mr. President, over there beside Betty Darnell is Kim, who's 9, Cory who's 8, Karen Annette who's 7 and the little guy is Steven. He's 4.

Harry Darnell will tell you of times he cried after putting the youngsters to bed. Because an unemployed man has few places to go, Harry would stare at the television screen, seeing nothing through tears of weariness, the kind that comes with despair.

"You almost get to believe you don't belong in this world," is the way Harry put it.

When Harry was 17, he enlisted in the Marine Corps. By the time he was 19, he'd seen Bougainville, the Russell Islands, Guadalcanal and New Caledonia. Not bad for a guy who'd never been able to travel before—except someone kept shooting.

He returned to Detroit after the war, ready to face peacetime with a 10th grade education. He picked up jobs at Ford, Chevrolet, then Kaiser-Fraser but he was always low man on the seniority list. Each breeze of recession blew him out the door.

For Harry Darnell there were long years of "just holding on"—a job here, then the layoff. The scramble to meet debts, the hope that tomorrow, maybe, one of his many job applications would get to the top of the pile.

Desperate in the summer of 1957, he applied for city welfare. It was one application that someone finally looked at. For 6 years, until May of 1963, the Darnell family lived on the $60 the city gave them every 2 weeks.

And for 6 years, Harry Darnell, ex-Marine, ex-lightweight boxer, "didn't feel like a man."

There are no vacations for a man or his children on welfare. No nights at the ballpark. No time hurts more than Christmas.

He found he was staying away from his friends because an unemployed man has a sixth sense, right or wrong: "You feel they feel you could do better. And you know you're trying."

He was 10 years too old to try fighting professionally, but he thought about it.

When welfare was terminated, Harry Darnell found he could make a few dollars washing walls. He'd simply ask someone if they wanted their walls washed. In warmer weather, he wanted to try cutting lawns but lawns are out in the suburbs. And how do you get a lawnmower on a city bus? And how do you pay the fare?

When Detroit became the first city to team up with the Federal Government in the struggle to save hard-core unemployed men, Harry Darnell was about first in line.

The Nation was—and still is—desperate for male practical nurses. Here was an experimental project under the new Manpower Development and Training Act, now giving hope to thousands of unemployed but then an infant program nursed by the U.S. Department of Labor.

"I always wanted to be a doctor," Harry said.

For 52 solid weeks, often until 4 in the morning, Harry Darnell studied. In training, he received $37 a week. Later, $48. Finally, he and 13 of his classmates graduated.

"Betty and I and the kids had dinner out that night."

In his well-worn wallet, the newest thing is a card kept on top of all other cards. It's his badge of dignity. The State of Michigan licensed him as a practical nurse. Few people can boast a license to do what they do.

From his rented flat just off a Detroit freeway, Harry sees new horizons, has new dreams; but he's not plunging out into the world that for so long didn't want him.

All of his training was done in Detroit's Sinai Hospital and, on graduating, he stayed on although there are other hospitals that pay better. He receives $69 a week.

Every day is a new thrill.

"It's really something," Harry said. "You watch a person walk out the door after shaking hands with you and you remember the days when you held him and fed him and gave him medication and changed his bandages and dressed him. And you remember how close he was to death. And you remember how he talked to you like you were the only man in the world.

"And then he's well and on his way home."

Harry Darnell—ex-marine. Now 40 and now doing well himself. And, Mr. President, the pride of a long string of nurses and doctors who have no idea they're working with "a saved man."

THE FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA SERVE TODAY AND PREPARE FOR TOMORROW

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. NATCHER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, America has many resources, many blessings. As Americans we take great pride and satisfaction in all our gifts, indeed, we cherish them. To me, one of the greatest assets we possess is the youth of our Nation. These young people—these citizens of tomorrow, if you will—face a world so vast, so complex, so unlike the world faced even a generation ago. Yet our young men and our young women alike, embrace with confidence the challenges ahead and with equal confidence accept the responsibilities of today.

I want to speak to you today of the Future Homemakers of America. I want you to hear their creed. I want you to know their objectives for this coming year. You cannot but then agree that this is an exemplary group of young ladies.

Their beautifully written credo calls to mind the statement made by Bernard Baruch on the occasion of his last birthday. Mr. Baruch was asked who, in his opinion was the greatest person he had encountered in his experiences. One would naturally expect to hear from this elder statesman the name of a president, a prime minister, or some prominent personage. Instead, with the wisdom of his years, he began to speak of everyday people, and in the course of his little talk he included "the mother who has children, and gets up and gets their breakfast, and keeps them clean, and sends them off to school." Indeed, this type of greatness should be recognized.

The Future Homemakers of America subscribe to such purposes and beliefs. They are embodied in their creed which reads:

> We are the Future Homemakers of American. We face the future with warm courage and high hope. For we have the clean consciousness of seeing old and precious values. For we are the builders of homes. Homes for America's future. Homes where living will be the expression of everything that is good and fair. Homes where truth, love, security and faith will be realities—not dreams.

This year is the 20th anniversary of the Future Homemakers of America. It was incorporated in June 1945 as a voluntary, nonprofit organization. It remains so. It is supported wholly by membership dues and is open to all home economics students in the junior and senior high schools throughout the country.

The program that will guide them for the coming year is an ambitious one, covering five areas which will prepare them for creative leadership in their homes in the future. They are: First, you and your values; second, focus on family friendship; third, marriage calls for preparation; fourth, stay in school; and fifth, action for citizenship.

I particularly want to commend the 550,000 members of the Future Homemakers for their efforts in helping the school dropout. This is a critical problem in our Nation today and I can think of no stronger influence than that exerted by one in the same age group. By conducting stay-in-school campaigns and working with the individual student, who for one reason or other, has forgone the opportunity for an education, these girls are contributing to the betterment of their world and to the development of a fellow human being.

In Kentucky, we have many chapters of the Future Homemakers of America, all working toward the common goal of improving personal, family, and community living. I am proud of these girls, not only as responsible members of their own family unit, but as responsible residents of their cities and towns.

Not every good deed of theirs is publicized. I have learned where, in one instance, the Future Homemakers have given clothing to a less fortunate girl in order that she might remain in school. Another group saved scraps of material from sewing classes and made laprobes for wheelchair patients at a veterans hospital. One chapter organized a babysitting service on election day so that busy young mothers, who might have otherwise been unable to get to the polls, could vote.

I could go on, Mr. Speaker, for my admiration for these young ladies is unbounded. I know you share my feelings and join with me in praising them for their endeavors and wishing for every Future Homemaker of America success, happiness, and "everything that is good and fair."

GETTING TO WORK AND BACK

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. IRWIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, I recommend for the attention of the House the third article in Consumer Reports' informative and thorough series on the cost and convenience of metropolitan transportation, "Getting to Work and Back." Since many of our major urban centers are facing key decisions on mass transportation, I know my colleagues will be interested. The article follows:

GETTING TO WORK AND BACK

(By Ruth and Edward Brecher)

Before a new expressway or transit route can be built, it must be planned. Most of the planning has been done by highway engineers employed in State highway departments. The plans have been designed to get people from place to place in their own automobiles—with relatively little concern for the areas through which the roads run or for other means of transportation. Since most of the money for new urban expressways has come from Washington, and most of the planning from the State capitols, local communities have had relatively little voice in their own transportation futures.

But a change is underway. The 1962 amendment to the Federal-Aid Highway Act declares that, beginning in July 1965, plans for new urban expressways shall be drawn up with "due consideration" of their probable effect on the cities through which they run, and shall be "properly coordinated with plans for improvements in other affected forms of transportation."

There are teeth in this amendment, moreover. For the bulk of the money for new urban expressways—90 percent in the case of Interstate System routes—is allocated by the Secretary of Commerce; and, beginning in July, the Secretary is forbidden to give approval to new urban freeway routes "unless he finds that such projects are based on a continuing comprehensive transportation planning process carried on cooperatively by the States and local communities."

In other words, no more freeway funds will be coming from Washington after July unless an areawide planning study is underway. Federal funds to assist in comprehensive regional planning are available through the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

The new planning studies are being sponsored by the U.S. Bureau of Public Roads, and the BPR has established a laudable framework for them. The Bureau is insisting, for example, that planners give full consideration to all transportation facilities, "including those for mass transportation," instead of just to new highways; the factors analyzed are to include "zoning ordinances, subdivision regulations, building codes, etc."; and area planners are instructed to consider "social and community-value factors, such as preservation of open space, parks and recreational facilities; preservation of historical sites and buildings; environmental amenities; and aesthetics."

The boundaries of the new planning areas are based on Census Bureau maps; in general, each city or cluster of cities with its suburbs is considered a single area. Each local government within the area is expected to participate in the planning process. "The State highway department," the BPR states, "will be expected to show by suitable evidence that scrupulous efforts have been made to carry out the intent of the act with respect to cooperative action by all political subdivisions. If there is an unwillingness on the part of a local political unit within the entire urban area to participate in the transportation planning process in such area, a determination shall be made as to whether the percentage of the urban area affected is such as to negate an effective planning process for the whole area"—and thus warrant curtailment or withholding of Federal highway funds.

An exciting feature of both the BPR and HHFA approaches is that Washington is not dictating solutions to local problems, but rather insisting that local machinery be established to solve them.

WHERE THE CITIZENS GROUPS COME IN

The mere establishment of these new transportation planning studies, of course, is no guarantee that urban transportation problems will be more effectively solved in the future than in the past. As CU noted in February, the new planning projects could prove to be mere facades, behind which the same old highway engineers will continue to make the same old highway-oriented decisions from a regional planning office. Here is where a vigilant citizens group comes in. It can start by asking questions.

Is your community, for example, properly represented on the body that is preparing a comprehensive plan for your urban area? Is your spokesman an impartial representative concerned primarily with the community—or is he a highway contractor, a gasoline company executive, or someone else with a personal ax to grind? If your local government office can't answer these questions, you can get the name and address of the body making the transportation study for your urban area from the State highway department; and you can then check with the planning agency itself to learn whether your community has an authorized spokesman. If it doesn't, urge your local officials to establish effective liaison with the agency at once.

Next a citizens group should ask the local representative to explain how the planning agency is going about its task. Planning a sound transportation network for a metropolitan area is so complex a job that planners necessarily make use of electronic computers to aid them in their work. What counts is how they are used—what questions are asked and what data is given the machine to use in arriving at its answers.

The first primitive attempts to use computers in transportation planning were woefully inadequate. The planners divided an urban area arbitrarily into 10-block or 20-block zones and determined by a survey what trips were being made by the residents of each zone. These trip data were fed into the computer along with population predictions, automobile ownership trends, land-use trends, travel time figures, and other such statistics. The computer then produced a set of desire lines showing how many people would want to drive from A through B to C a decade or two hence, and multilane expressways were bulldozed through to carry the anticipated traffic. Local protests were ignored, on the theory that the computer knows best. This approach may still survive in a few local projects.

A much better approach, however, is now in common use. The computer no longer dictates an expressway plan; instead it is fed alternative plans, and their cost and adequacy are compared. Thus, planners, elected officials, and local voters can make the final choice on the basis of the helpful findings emerging from the computer.

Despite this improvement, there remain many pitfalls. One results from the fact that computer estimates of future traffic are generally based on recent trends toward an automobile-dominated society. Thus the worst features of our past decade of urban chaos are projected into the future on an inflated scale.

Moreover, many of the planners in control of the urban planning projects were trained in automobile-oriented university engineering schools; and many are former employees of highway planning departments. Thus the alternatives with which they are most familiar are expressway alternatives. They are less likely to program for the computer a thoroughly detailed evaluation of a modern, highspeed rapid-transit system like the San Francisco BART system, described in the February Reports (with its 80-mile-an-hour top speeds, scheduled speeds of 50 miles an hour including stops, abundant and convenient peripheral parking, average platform waits of only a minute or two at rush hour, comfortable seats, low noise levels, air conditioning, and other amenities).

Finally, the computer is generally asked about getting travelers from neighborhood A through neighborhood B to neighborhood C. The rights, wants, and needs of the residents of neighborhood B are seldom consulted in advance, much less reduced to a form that the computer can assimilate. But this lack can be remedied. And citizens groups can provide the drive if it is not initiated by the regional planning office. How they can participate is very well illustrated by what is now going on in the Boston area.

HOW BOSTON IS DOING IT

Under the Boston Regional Planning Project (BRPP), a thorough transportation planning study is currently underway in the Boston area, comprising the city itself and scores of its suburbs. This study is supported by the Massachusetts Department of Public Works and Department of Commerce & Development. Its director is a community-minded regional planner, Donald M. Graham. And its incomparable virtue is that Graham and his staff are consulting local community representatives before rather than after the computers are put to work. Researchers for this series of reports attended a meeting called by BRPP, one of a series of 10 for representatives of 6 suburbs 30 miles northwest of Boston. The meetings were held in the evening so that ordinary citizens could participate. Graham himself presided.

The communities represented learn from one another at these meetings. "My town isn't interested in better rail service to Boston," one representative may remark. "Our commuters own at least two cars and drive one in."

A representative from a neighboring town disagrees. "How do you know your commuters wouldn't be delighted to sell their second car and take the train if more comfortable, convenient, and speedy service were available?"

"My town's a mess every morning and evening when the trains come in," someone remarks. "The cars around the station tie our downtown district up in a knot until it looks like Boston."

"My town, too. Why not tear down both miserable old stations and build a new one in the country halfway between?"

"Good idea. Then we would have enough room to park near the station instead of five blocks away."

Out of such local exchanges, new ideas—and new projects—are born. BRPP is holding a similar series of meetings in each of its 18 districts. Later these expressions of local concern and need can be included among the data fed into the BRPP computers.

The meetings work in the other direction, too. The BRPP men bring news of projects that may affect local interests. A new freeway is being planned around Boston, for example—even further out than the famous Route 128, once touted as the solution to the area's traffic snafus but now itself congested. Where should the interchanges along the new beltway be located? One suburb may welcome an interchange because of the boom in land values it will generate; another may be horrified by the destruction to a settled community the interchange will bring. If neither knows of the plans, neither can speak up while there is still time.

Some traditional planners are appalled by Graham's cards-on-the-table approach. They warn that if plans become known in advance, land speculators will reap windfall profits; and they predict that if so much time is allowed for opposition to mobilize, nothing will ever get built. Graham disagrees. Windfall profits are only possible, he point out, when knowledge of plans is limited to a few insiders who can then prey upon the ignorance of their neighbors. And he predicts that if the BRPP plan is devised from the start with adequate consideration for community needs and wants, support rather than opposition will be engendered through most of the area.

"The way to recognize a sound urban-area planning program," Graham told CU, "is by its approach to your own community. Do the planners come in with a completed plan and try to sell you on its merits? Or do they come in with an open ear to learn in advance your community's needs and wants—and then try, with the help of their computers, to reconcile your needs and wants with those of the rest of the area?"

Where official planning projects fail to do their work well, a citizens group with sufficient determination—and the necessary talent—can do a great deal of investigating and publicizing on its own. A CU subscriber Ernest Ratterman, has reported one unusually comprehensive effort of a few years ago in Cincinnati.

Concerned with the traffic jams and commuter delays that were plaguing the city of Cincinnati back in 1957, Ratterman and a handful of his friends—most of them professional engineers like himself—asked why a high-speed rapid transit system could not be built with a modest investment to operate along an existing, little-used railroad right-of-way into the city. As a contribution to the city's progress, this citizens group, headed by Alvin L. Spivak, submitted a study of the possibility, including "data on costs for rights-of-way, electrification, new trackage, purchase price of rolling stock, operating costs, and income." Then, they organized themselves as the "Rapid Transit Study Committee" and published their full report. "We dug deeply into Cincinnati's transportation picture both past and present," Ratterman recalls. "As engineers we were able to present well-thought-out plans and ideas to generate interest in our goals. * * * At no time during our many presentations did we encounter any dispute about our facts or questioning of our conclusions about Cincinnati's transit needs. Ordinary citizens * * * showed their eagerness for something new and better in urban transportation. What they lacked, however, was a strong, coherent leadership which could achieve action on their wants."

Inevitably, the Cincinnati committee came into conflict with the local highway lobby. One issue that evoked the clash was a controversial plan to build a four-level underground parking garage in the downtown district.

"Building such an enormously expensive facility struck us as foolish," Ratterman writes, "unless it could be planned to accommodate mass transit facilities at some future date. We made proposals to the city council on this subject and even developed plans for using the first deck of this garage as a central point of a modern downtown subway system integrated with surface lines to the suburbs. We studied the downtown parking facilities and their location, cost, utilization, rate structure, and financing. These studies cast grave doubt on the feasibility of the proposed new structure.

"But we soon learned that politics rather than facts would decide the parking-garage issue. Our proposals and recommendations were graciously received by the city government—and blissfully ignored.

"We were handicapped rather seriously * * * by being unable to garner the support of some business and professional groups. Individuals in these groups privately lauded our work and expressed envy of our freedom of expression; but the groups themselves were dominated by many conscious and some unknowing supporters and members of the highway lobby. * * * The expressway and parking plans which the city had developed, and the ease with which Federal funds could be secured to finance the expressways, blocked serious consideration of more effective approaches to the city's transport problems. One city councilman told us candidly that, until the Government passes out transit money as it passes out expressway money, there would be no rapid transit in Cincinnati."

The Cincinnati committee broke up in 1961 when Spivak, Ratterman, and several other key members moved to other cities. Cincinnati still lacks a rapid transit system. But Ratterman does not regret the effort expended on the project. "I am sure other members would agree," he writes, "that it was a great personal experience."

Such a committee if launched today, it should be added, would have working in its favor many factors that the Cincinnati committee lacked from 1957 to 1961. Among these factors are:

San Francisco's successful adoption of the BART plan for high speed, comfortable, convenient rapid transit of a quality that should exceed any now available in the United States. When it is in operation, the precedent may engender a demand for better transportation in other areas.

The likelihood of Federal funds for transit systems (see last month's article in this series) so that cities will no longer be faced with a Hobson's choice between federally supported freeways and transit systems that must be financed at home.

The existence of areawide planning programs, which at least provide a forum for presenting ideas.

Finally, even some urban interests that would normally form a part of the highway lobby now realize that mass transportation must be improved and expanded to unclog the expressways. The Jenney gas station chain with 600 filling stations in the greater Boston area, to cite one example, has taken full-page advertisements urging public support of transit expansion there. The Standard Oil Co. of California and the California State Automobile Association both endorsed San Francisco's BART transit plan.

With such new factors affecting the situation, committees like the one in Cincinnati should have a considerably better chance of success in the future.

Some are already at work. Examples are the District of Columbia Rapid Rail Citizens Committee, the Bergen County (N.J.) Transit Association, the Intermunicipal Group for Better Rail Service (New Jersey), the Westchester Commuter Association (New York), and the Committee for Better Transit of Greater New York. Also important are the long-established planning groups such as the Regional Plan Association of Greater New

York. If there is a sound organization of this kind in your community or region, by all means join and support it.

If a city's residents do not value it they are of course free to move out. But much of the shift to the suburbs today is not the result of an innate dislike of the cities. Rather, it is being forced on families and business concerns alike by the failure of the cities to solve their most pressing problems, including the transportation. Thus, willy-nilly, we are drifting toward a future of urban sprawl.

At least four major North American urban areas—San Francisco, Montreal, Toronto, and Philadelphia—are bucking this trend toward sprawl by investing in high quality rail transportation that will link city to suburbs for balanced growth. The residents of other areas may prefer different patterns. If so, they are free to plan differently, but let them get what they really want, not merely what the requirements of automobile transportation dictate.

The new comprehensive planning projects now underway or soon to be launched in every urban area make it possible to plan for the future of people, rather than just for automobiles. Let us make the most of this opportunity.

THE STAKES ARE HIGH

Much more is at stake in such local efforts than merely an opportunity to get to work and back a few minutes faster or for a few cents less each day. The entire future of American cities hangs in the balance.

An increasing number of people today, looking at our blighted central cities and traffic jams, have concluded that large cities are obsolete. They therefore envision a future in which all of us will both live and work in suburbs, surrounded by vast parking lots, and linked together by multilane freeways along which we can all whizz in uncongested private-car luxury.

One objection to such plans is that they leave out of account the many services that people want and need but that each suburb cannot possibly supply for itself—a symphony orchestra, to cite a striking example.

TEXAS AND SOUTHWESTERN CATTLE RAISERS ASSOCIATION ADOPTS RESOLUTIONS

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Teague] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, livestock production is the major segment of our agricultural economy which is not involved in the price support programs. Cattle raisers have shown great determination in keeping the industry free of Government support and Government control. The Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association adopted several resolutions in its recent convention at El Paso, Tex. Since several of these deal with legislative proposals pending before the Congress, I feel that the resolutions will be of interest to Members of Congress:

Resolution —

Whereas monthly cattle on feed reports have been available for Texas since January 1964; and

Whereas these reports prepared by the Statistical Reporting Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture are important to the Texas Cattle Feeding Industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association reaffirms the desire of the cattle industry to have these reports continued and commends the Statistical Reporting Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the good job it is doing in compiling the monthly reports.

Resolution —

Whereas the selling of fed cattle on a carcass-weight basis has become increasingly important in the marketing structure; and

Whereas it is extremely important that the weighing of the carcasses be conducted on accurate scales and by competent personnel: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association express encouragement to the Packers and Stockyards Division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture that it intensify its effort to assure livestock producers that scales used in these transactions are accurate and that the individuals operating the scales are certified weighers; be it further

Resolved, That the Packers and Stockyards Division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture be urged to require the packer purchasing cattle on a carcass basis to furnish the seller with an accurate and complete accounting of the transaction.

Resolution —

Whereas it is anticipated that there will be introduced into this session of Congress proposed legislation that would transfer the cost of Federal meat inspection from the Federal Government to the meat processing industry; and

Whereas processors operating interstate are obliged by law to have Federal inspection performed; and

Whereas inspection of meat is done primarily in the interest of the public at large: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association inform the Members of Congress of its opposition to any such proposed legislation when introduced, and urge that meat inspection be continued at Government expense and not be charged to processors.

Resolution —

Whereas the Congress of the United States and most State legislatures were originally and deliberately apportioned one house by population and one house by area; and

Whereas this legislative structure has been the basis of the strength of our Republic and the hope of the free world; and

Whereas a recent Supreme Court decision, if permitted to stand, would destroy this American concept of fair representation; and

Whereas the members of the Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association believe that this decision was based on considerations other than constitutional law: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress, State legislatures, and the citizenry of the United States be alerted to the dangers inherent in this decision and be urgently petitioned to adopt a constitutional amendment that will preserve our present legislative structure.

Resolution —

Whereas the 88th annual convention of the Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association has been advised of the necessity for additional screwworm eradication program funds: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the entire membership of the association be urged to give its wholehearted and aggressive support to the effort to provide sufficient funds which will insure the successful completion of private participation in this important program.

Resolution —

Whereas it is anticipated that certain bills will be introduced in the current session of Congress to extend the minimum wage and hour law to farm and ranch labor; and

Whereas such legislation would create serious problems in the operation of farms and ranches: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association notify the Members of Congress of its strong opposition to the extension of the wage and hour law to farm and ranch employees.

Resolution —

Whereas the farm and ranch labor situation has deteriorated rapidly; and

Whereas there is an ever-increasing need on U.S. farms and ranches for supplemental foreign workers: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association recommends that administrative procedures be adopted by the Federal Government to permit the admission of such workers into the United States under existing provisions of the immigration laws.

Resolution —

Whereas eradication of screwworms in the South and the five States of the Southwest has been accomplished and demonstrated for a period of 13 months; and

Whereas State and producer funds have supported 50 percent of the costs of a holding action and movement of the program into an international area; and

Whereas the screwworms program has become a Federal responsibility on the basis of dangers of reentry only: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to make provision for the financing of a program to protect the livestock and wildlife of the United States for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965.

Resolution —

Whereas the 89th Congress of the United States has before it a request for a supplemental appropriation for the continued operation of the screwworm eradication program in the Southern and Southwestern States and Mexico; and

Whereas the State of Texas and the livestock producers of the several States are contributing $550,000 in matching, non-Federal funds; and

Whereas the continued success or failure of this important program depends upon the availability of these Federal funds requested: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Members of Congress be urged to take prompt action in providing the necessary Federal funds at the earliest possible date and be informed that the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association considers this matter to be of maximum importance.

Resolution —

Whereas we commend our regulatory officials for their excellent work in preventing entry of foot-and-mouth and other exotic and highly contagious diseases into the United States, to the end that the health status of cattle in the United States is the envy of the world; and

Whereas the Canadian Department of Agriculture has announced it will allow direct importation of live cattle from countries known to be infected with foot-and-mouth and other highly contagious diseases: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we express grave concern over the Canadian action and urge our Federal officials to protest and request the Canadian Government to rescind its action; and be it further

Resolved, That we strongly urge the U.S. Department of Agriculture not to permit entry of cattle from countries which open their borders to cattle from countries known to be infected with foot-and-mouth or other highly contagious diseases.

RESOLUTION —

Many fellow cattlemen whom we loved and respected have been taken from us since our last annual meeting. They pioneered the trails which it is our privilege to follow. Their passing is a great loss to the association and to the cattle industry. We express to the families of each of our departed friends our sincere sympathy.

RESOLUTION —

The membership of the Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association has once again enjoyed the hospitality extended to it by El Paso on the occasion of its 88th annual convention. The acts of neighborliness and friendship by El Paso and its citizens have contributed much toward making the convention both pleasant and rewarding. We thank its citizens, and look forward to visiting this friendly city again.

RESOLUTION —

Whereas the ranch and farm producer is suffering severely from an increasingly narrowing profit margin; and

Whereas this condition is due primarily on the one hand to a low sale price for his product and on the other hand to a high cost of production resulting from an increasing cost of labor, equipment, supplies, and increasing State and local taxes, particularly ad valorem taxes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Texas be urged to adopt legislation which would provide that, as the urban population of the State expands into areas in which the land historically has been used for farming and ranching purposes, the tax assessing agencies be required to evaluate for tax purposes lands historically and currently used for agricultural and livestock purposes on the basis of the agricultural productive value of the land rather than on an inflated value related to the speculative growth of urban development onto the land at some future date.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XXX

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following installment of "New York City in Crisis."

This article concerns New York City's urban renewal program and appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on February 19, 1965.

The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: URBAN RENEWAL AND HUMAN HAVOC

(By Marshall Peck, of the Herald Tribune staff)

Two years ago, the city administration decided to study how it was doing in the massive upper West Side urban renewal project—the pride of its so-called and much publicized human renewal program.

Yesterday, New Yorkers finally got a look at this study of the city's relocation and treatment of some 7,000 people.

The look was shocking.

In impressively detailed case histories, the 150-page report documents the continued failure of the city's urban renewal program despite the good intentions of many of the men who run it.

In an area which the city continues to point to as a dramatic example of human renewal—as opposed to urban removal—at work, the city has obviously lost touch with the human element.

The case histories on which the year-long, $230,000 study was based were taken by staff members of Greenleigh Associates. They personally inspected and held interviews with 2,500 tenant households.

Recommendations offered by the report focused on the conditions of confusion, poor communication, and redtape uncovered by the Greenleigh staff 6 to 10 months after the city took title to properties in the 20-block West Side area.

The survey emphasized the need for foresight, contact, and centralization of services when urban renewal swings into action.

Along with the report, the city issued a press release saying that remedial action was being taken.

Some samples from the case history reports:

A family of 11 in 6 dilapidated rooms. Broken refrgerator, faucets, and gas burners missing, flames shooting up when stove was lit. Rats, mice, roaches. A fire as well as a health hazard.

A family of five sleeping in one room. Apartment rodent-infested. Landlord in this rehabilitation building refused to provide exterminator service.

A woman with $19 a month left after she paid her rent. Didn't want to move because of happy years in the building with her husband. No one had talked to her about a new place to move to.

The interest in the survey centers around the subject it investigated: The West Side urban renewal area, which runs from 87th to 97th Streets between Amsterdam Avenue and Central Park West. This $230 million project, the largest in the country, was unveiled by the city as a massive attempt to make urban renewal work on the human level.

It was proposed that the community would be renewed for those who lived there—that in contrast to past slum clearance projects—the affected people would not be swept out and forced to find a new home on the edges of another ghetto.

This was the city's lofty—and laudable—intention. But since it took title to the urban renewal area on February 1, 1963, problems of communication bogged down the high hopes.

Instead of close contact and efficient application of the city's good intentions, ineptness and red tape turned the community's cooperation into criticism.

The department of relocation created a citizens' advisory board. And 1 year afterward, last April, the citizens' group blasted the department for "promises that had never gotten off the ground."

There were problems of coordination between city agencies—relocation and real estate kept different totals of how many people they were dealing with for almost a year before relocation finally gave into real estate's IBM machines.

But at the heart of the matter were the people: Could families who had made this neighborhood their home over the years be relocated during the renewal, then brought back into the refurbished atmosphere?

The key here was keeping track of the people, and here again there have been problems. A sizable percentage of the tenants have been lost. They have moved away, for good, for one reason or another. Their departure defeats, according to planning experts, the whole purpose of urban renewal.

Relocation Commissioner Herman Badillo had taken realistic appraisal of the upheaval; he says that getting even 10 percent of the original tenant families to return will be an achievement.

The Greenleigh survey was initiated by the mayor's executive committee on housing with the avowed goal of analyzing and identifying the problems of human beings who are affected by urban renewal. Specifically, the study was aimed at the West Side project; in a larger way, it can be used as background for other urban renewal ahead.

The preliminary draft was submitted to the housing and redevelopment board last October.

Arthur Greenleigh, president of Greenleigh Associates, noted in an introductory letter to Milton Mollen, Housing and Development Coordinator, that "this final report, as you know, is a revision of a preliminary draft submitted to the (housing and redevelopment) board on October 19, 1964, and through it to the city agencies involved. In it are incorporated most of the suggestions made for improving the report. These were made over a period of some 10 days of consultation with representatives of the major agencies of the city."

"I think there was real unhappiness by some because of the case illustrations," was one informed comment. "Perhaps they felt it went beyond the terms, that it hit below the belt."

Some people thought the city was delaying the issuance of the report. The Strycker's Bay Neighborhood Council, which represents 50 groups and institutions in the urban renewal area, said in its January news letter that the whereabouts of the Greenleigh Survey "was one of the mysteries of the West Side."

However, Mr. Mollen said on February 5 that the report was undergoing review by the mayor's executive committee and was to be released thereafter.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XXXI

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article from the New York Herald Tribune of February 19, 1965, which gives the response of the City Club of New York to the continuing crisis in New York City.

The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—CITY CLUB SALVO: "WORST CRISIS"

(By Barrett McGurn, of the Herald Tribune Staff)

The City Club of New York, which has sparked half a dozen major municipal reform movements over the last seven decades, said yesterday that the city is now "facing the worst crisis of its life."

It also said it opposed the reelection of Mayor Wagner because of his politics of drift and get by.

The club, whose members are business and professional men and city, State, and national officeholders of both parties, published a 15,000-word "blue book" on the city's many-sided crisis, proposed a detailed master plan for financial and other reforms and announced that a series of further booklets on specific city problems will follow shortly.

The first of these brochures, according to I. D. Robbins, president of the club, will be "How to Waste Money Without Even Trying."

"It will be a digest of what I call the Wagner principles of administration," Mr. Robbins said.

At city hall, Mayor Wagner's spokesmen pointed out that Mr. Robbins was nominated recently by Republicans for borough president of Manhattan, but added that there would be no formal comment at this time because of the mayor's trip to Puerto Rico.

The City Club made clear its hopes that a broad civil movement can be formed to tackle New York's long-range problems and to force an end to what it called the temporizing and incompetence of the present city administration.

Mr. Robbins praised the Herald Tribune's city crisis series as a first-class contribution to a knowledge of New York's root problems. He said it was the City Club's hope to carry the paper's study a step forward now toward solutions.

The club's attempt to organize civic effort in behalf of an attack on central difficulties is the third since the beginning of the Herald Tribune series.

The 198-year-old New York Chamber of Commerce and the 3,500-member Commerce and Industry Association already are at work trying to form committees of 50 to 100 top business leaders to back needed reforms. One city agency, the department of commerce and industrial development, has made a similar appeal for civic cooperation, but limited to the problem of fighting the flight of small industry.

The City Club's overall proposal for an attack on the New York crisis concentrated on three areas: Education, housing, and economic development.

According to Mr. Robbins, the educational ideas outlined by the club were very much like those already advocated by the Public Education Association and those on jobs and industrial development paralleled reports of the Commerce and Industry Association.

A critical problem in the city so far, the club president added, is that civic interest has been broken into small pieces by groups eager to struggle for civil rights, for local parks and playgrounds, for public housing, and so forth, but without the overall view which the club has now attempted to provide. The booklet is called "Goals for New York: A Challenge to Greatness in the Life of Our City."

Mr. Robbins and other club officers with him at a press conference at their comfortable 11th-floor headquarters at 6 West 48th Street had stinging words for many of Mayor Wagner's policies and appointments.

Peter M. Stanford, an executive of the Ogilvy, Benson Mather Advertising Agency, singled out Welfare Commissioner James Dumpson as an arch example of "city commissioners who have no conception of what their jobs are about."

Mr. Stanford said that Mr. Dumpson is a man he finds personally charming, but "when you ask him what's being done to rehabilitate the 500,000 on relief—what's being done to graduate them to meaningful lives—he doesn't know, he doesn't think that's his province."

Mr. Stanford, a former fellowship student of welfare and public administration at Harvard and in England, had a harsh phrase for what he called a widespread official New York approach: "ad hoc boobery."

The "Challenge to Greatness" booklet opens with a statement from Walter M. Weis, a lawyer and member of the small group that founded the Fusion Party in 1932, preparing the way for the ouster of Tammany and the election of Mayor F. H. La Guardia. Mr. Weis has been a City Club member since 1914.

The club's new master plan for New York reform came out of a "crisis of faith" in New York's future which struck many club members last summer, Mr. Weis said. He added:

"Too many people were giving up on the city. Too many believed that the leadership of government was in the hands of donothings and that no power could shake their grip. The alternatives seemed to be more of the political same."

The booklet said that large numbers of New Yorkers live today in a hopelessness more cynical than that which Jacob Riis found in the city's slums 70 years ago. The booklet cited those who find New York "violent, dirty, noisy" and those who "have given up all hope of having responsive, efficient city government." It continued:

"We are challenged to provide the citizen leadership to overcome a politics which battens on the ignorance, ethnic divisions, fears and dependence of the dispossessed in our city today. We are challenged to revolt against a politics which is satisfied to make do, to elect and forget."

On education, the club said an enormous sum was needed—$7 billion in the next 5 years to cope with needs from prekindergarten to college, a 50-percent increase in present educational costs by 1970. The club said the whole public education problem may have to be transferred from the city's shoulders to that of the State.

On housing, the club called for 75,000 new units a year under city, Federal and private programs.

On jobs, the club pointed out that information is a business now taking up a third of the gross national product, and that New York must maintain itself as an attractive area for that booming industry.

The club also urged the building of the proposed World Trade Center super-skyscraper, and advised that New York should woo the automotive and metalworking industries as a partial replacement for vanishing textile sweatshops.

A redesigning of Manhattan to replace tens of millions of square feet of commercial slums along desirable subway lines is also needed, the club said.

In the hospital area, the club suggested dramatically that the city might better go out of that business altogether, transferring the burden to Federal, State, and private agencies.

Unless these steps are taken the city budget will go up another 50 percent to $5 billion a year, the statement warned.

The City Club pledges to stay out of partisan politics, but it has several times attacked Tammany with success, and has been the staging ground from which politicians have gone on to city power.

The club launched the boom for Mayor Seth Low at the turn of the century. Mayor John Purroy Mitchel came from its ranks. Mr. Weis, who wrote the foreword to yesterday's booklet, was one of those who presented charges against Mayor James J. Walker to Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt a generation ago.

The club offered free copies of the booklet to anyone who is interested.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Hosmer, for Thursday and Friday, on account of official business.

Mr. Foley, for April 1, 1965, on account of official business.

Mr. Purcell (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today and the balance of the week, on account of official business.

Mr. Kastenmeier (at the request of Mr. Zablocki), for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. White of Idaho, for 1 hour, on April 6; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.

Mr. Buchanan, for 30 minutes, on April 1.

Mr. Conte, for 15 minutes today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Wydler) and to include extranous matter:)

Mrs. May.

Mrs. Reid of Illinois.

Mr. Fino.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. White of Texas) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Gathings.

Mr. Matsunaga.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WHITE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 1, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

834. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions" (H. Doc. No. 131); to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed.

835. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the implementation of the agreement concerning automotive products between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes (H. Doc. No. 132); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

836. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the state of the finances for fiscal year ended June 30, 1964, pursuant to section 262 of title 5 of the United States Code (H. Doc. No. 3); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

837. A letter from the Secretary of the Treausry, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the U.S. Governor to agree to amendments to the Articles of Agreement of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation,

and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

838. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to furnish subsistence, living quarters and laundry in lieu of salary to certain persons who, although not employees of the District of Columbia, are authorized by the Commissioners to work in facilities of the government of the District of Columbia for the purpose of securing training and experience in their future vocations"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

839. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to promote health and safety in metal and nonmetallic mineral industries, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

840. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting a report on manpower research and training under the Manpower and Training Act of 1962, as amended, for calendar year 1964, pursuant to section 309(a) of Public Law 88-214; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

841. A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of July 8, 1940, relating to the transportation of the remains, families, and effects of Federal employees dying abroad, so as to restore the benefits of such act to employees dying in Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Operations.

842. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary rental costs incurred because of delay in purchasing components of two automatic data processing systems, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on Government Operations.

843. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary grant approved to assist in financing the development of the Keystone Industrial Park of the Scranton Lackawanna Industrial Building Company, Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

844. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive allocation of costs of publicly owned parking facilities to urban renewal projects in the San Francisco region, Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

845. A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1003 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize common carriers under the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Federal Maritime Commission, and Interstate Commerce Commission to enter into joint rates, provide for their regulation by a joint board, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

846. A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend sections 2072 and 2112 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the scope of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and to repeal inconsistent legislation"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

847. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to promote savings under the Internal Revenue Service's automatic data processing system"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BONNER: Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H.R. 4346. A bill to amend section 502 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, relating to construction differential subsidies; without amendment (Rept. No. 214). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLATNIK: Committee on Public Works. S. 4. An act to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended, to establish the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration, to provide grants for research and development, to increase grants for construction of municipal sewage treatment works, to authorize the establishment of standards of water quality to aid in preventing, controlling, and abating pollution of interstate waters, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 215). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6958. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to promote savings under the Internal Revenue Service's automatic data processing system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 6959. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to promote savings under the Internal Revenue Service's automatic data processing system; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS:

H.R. 6960. A bill to provide for the implementation of the agreement concerning automotive products between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 6961. A bill to promote health and safety in metal and nonmetallic mineral industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H.R. 6962. A bill to promote health and safety in metal and nonmetallic mineral industries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee:

H.R. 6963. A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 6964. A bill to amend section 4082 of title 18, United States Code, to facilitate the rehabilitation of persons convicted of offenses against the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6965. A bill to amend section 39b of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit a part-time referee from acting as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H.R. 6966. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to place the Federal Housing Administration cooperative housing mortgage insurance program on a mutual basis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 6967. A bill to require the procurement of certain services by Government agencies from commercial suppliers whenever economy will result from such procurement; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 6968. A bill to establish a Federal policy concerning the termination, limitation, or establishment of business-type operations of the Government which may be conducted in competition with private enterprise, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 6969. A bill authorizing the modification of the Trinidad Dam on Purgatoire River, Colo., in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 6970. A bill granting to persons in the classified (competitive) civil service the right to a hearing before removal or suspension, and the right to a judicial review of a removal or suspension; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 6971. A bill to amend the Vocational Rehabilitation Act to assist in providing more flexibility in the financing and administration of State rehabilitation programs, and to assist in the expansion and improvement of services and facilities provided under such programs, particularly for the mentally retarded and other groups presenting special vocational rehabilitation problems, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 6972. A bill to provide an exemption from the draft for persons serving in the Peace Corps or Volunteers in Service to America; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 6973. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 6974. A bill to amend the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959 to provide that the entire cost of health benefits under such act shall be paid by the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HANSEN of Idaho:

H.R. 6975. A bill to protect the domestic economy, to promote the general welfare, and to assist in the national defense by providing for an adequate supply of lead and zinc for consumption in the United States from domestic and foreign sources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONAS:

H.R. 6976. A bill to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 6977. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the retailers excise taxes, certain manufacturers excise taxes, the taxes on admissions, dues, communications, and transportation of persons, and certain other excise taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG of Maryland:

H.R. 6978. A bill to extend the application of the Classification Act of 1949 to certain positions in, and employees of, the executive branch of the Government; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 6979. A bill to enforce the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 6980. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLER:

H.R. 6981. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication service or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 6982. A bill to amend section 312 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to exempt certain additional persons from the requirements as to understanding the English language before their naturalization as citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RESNICK:

H.R. 6983. A bill providing for a nationwide marketing order for table eggs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 6984. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 6985. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 6986. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Assateague Island National Seashore in the States of Maryland and Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SHRIVER:

H.R. 6987. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide for deduction of certain education expenses of teachers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TUTEN:

H.R. 6988. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 6989. A bill to establish a nationwide marketing order for chicken table eggs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H.R. 6990. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with respect to strike at the sites of construction projects; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 6991. A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 6992. A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GRAY:

H.R. 6993. A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLARK:

H.R. 6994. A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EDMONDSON:

H.R. 6995. A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 6996. A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H.R. 6997. A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 6998. A bill to provide for a national cemetery at Fort Custer, Mich.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 6999. A bill to authorize a 3-year program of grants for construction of veterinary medical education facilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRABOWSKI:

H.R. 7000. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HANLEY:

H.R. 7001. A bill to amend section 3402 of title 38, United States Code, to provide for the recognition by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of the Italian American War Veterans of the United States for the prosecution of veterans' claims; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 7002. A bill to authorize each Member of the House of Representatives to employ annually, on a temporary basis, student congressional interns; to the Committee on House Administration.

H.R. 7003. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Hudson National Scenic Riverway in the States of New York and New Jersey, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7004. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McEWEN:

H.R. 7005. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for the completion of the improvement of the Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway authorized by the act of August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H.R. 7006. A bill providing for a nationwide marketing order for table eggs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 7007. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to prohibit the sales of alcoholic beverages to persons under 21 years of age; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 7008. A bill providing for a nationwide marketing order for table eggs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas (by request):

H.R. 7009. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to increase the rates of pension payable to widows of veterans of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 7010. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROCK:

H.R. 7011. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 with respect to per diem allowances of officers and employees of the Tennessee Valley Authority; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TEAGUE of Texas:

H.R. 7012. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, to provide to the maximum extent consistent with the national interest, U.S. firms shall be engaged to furnish engineering, procurement, and construction services for certain projects abroad financed by the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.J. Res. 415. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives shall be 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H. Con. Res. 377. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the settlement of the indebtedness of the French Republic to the United States made by the World War Foreign Debt Commission and approved by the President; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H. Con. Res. 378. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H. Con. Res. 379. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the settlement of the indebtedness of the French Republic to the United States made by the World War Foreign Debt Commission and approved by the President; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAIR:

H. Con. Res. 380. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the enforcement of the provisions of article 19 of the United Nations Charter; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

159. Mr. MORRIS presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico requesting a review of overly severe grazing regulations enforced by the U.S. Forest Service; and asking for a congressional hearing, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS (by request):

H.R. 7013. A bill for the relief of Adelina L. Bayonito; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 7014. A bill for the relief of Mario Buffa; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia (by request):

H.R. 7015. A bill for the relief of Antonio Janse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7016. A bill for the relief of Clavelina Roma; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DULSKI (by request):

H.R. 7017. A bill for the relief of Sister Adelina Mucilli; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 7018. A bill to provide for the granting of patents with respect to certain desert land entries; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H.R. 7019. A bill for the relief of Erika David; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAILLIARD:

H.R. 7020. A bill for the relief of Omer Penner; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 7021. A bill for the relief of Antonio Giuseppe Agozzino; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 7022. A bill for the relief of Bernard F. Reardon; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 7023. A bill for the relief of Calogero Davi; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7024. A bill for the relief of Calogero Modica; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7025. A bill for the relief of Roberto Mora; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 7026. A bill for the relief of Nathan Levine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WIDNALL:

H.R. 7027. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Georgette Barchechath and her two minor children, Alain and Michel Barchechath; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

147. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the San Juan Lions Club, San Juan, P.R., with reference to repudiating brutality used against citizens demonstrating for their civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

148. By Mr. WOLFF: Petition of City Council of the City of Glen Cove, N.Y., unanimously condemning the acts of the Governor of Alabama and the law enforcement officers at Selma in denying American citizens their constitutional right peaceably to assemble and petition for a redress of grievances, and fully supporting Federal legislation to secure the right to vote for all citizens disenfranchised by discrimination in any part of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

In compliance with Public Law 601, 79th Congress, title III, Regulation of Lobbying Act, section 308(b), which provides as follows:

> (b) All information required to be filed under the provisions of this section with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate shall be compiled by said Clerk and Secretary, acting jointly, as soon as practicable after the close of the calendar quarter with respect to which such information is filed and shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate jointly submit their report of the compilation required by said law and have included all registrations and quarterly reports received.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following reports for the third calendar quarter of 1964 were received too late to be included in the published reports for that quarter:

A. Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees Association, Post Office Box 2189, South Portland, Maine.
D. (6) $94. E. (9) $70.90.

A. Actors' Equity Association, 226 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,500.

A. Francis L. Adams.
B. Pacific Power & Light Co., Public Service Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Miss Milner Alexander, 320 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

A. Nicholas E. Allen and Merrill Armour, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Music Operators of America, Inc., 128 East 14th Street, Oakland, Calif., and 228 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $41.87.

A. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $358. E. (9) $358.

A. American Civil Liberties Union, Inc., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,754.48. E. (9) $1,754 48.

A. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,133.55. E. (9) $3,133.55.

A. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $8,355.89. E. (9) $8,355.89.

A. American Humane Association, 896 Pennsylvania Street, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $1,325.

A. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $467.32. E. (9) $10,957.09.

A. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $623.97. E. (9) $52.64.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2,018.99.

A. American Podiatry Association, 3301 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $191.52.

A. American Surveys, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Allentown Portland Cement Co., Seventh Street at Thruway, Allentown, Pa., et al.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $151.61.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, care of E. C. Connor, Whitin Machine Works, Whitinsville, Mass.
D. (6) $11.35.

A. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $10,290.06. E. (9) $20,139.63.

A. American Veterinary Medical Association, 600 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $818.67.

A. Robert E. Ansheles, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consolidated International Trading Corp., Empire State Building, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $312.25. E. (9) $43.99.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
D. (6) $167.40. E. (9) $734.10.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Commissioner of Baseball, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $429.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Lever Bros. Co., 390 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $45.

A. Arnold, Fortas & Porter, 1229 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Arthritis & Rheumatism Foundation, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,178.01.

A. Association of Oil Pipe Lines, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $500.

A. Atlanta Committee for Democratic Republican Independent Voter Education, 2540 Lakewood Avenue SW., Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $1,586.50. E. (9) $2,734.38.

A. Douglas B. Bagnell, Box 486, Fairhope, Ala.
B. Maine Potato Council, Presque Isle, Maine.
D. (6) $75.

A. Frank Baird-Smith, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Irvin L. Barney, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood Railway Carmen of America, 4929 Main Street, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $3,600.

A. William G. Barr, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Parking Association, 1101 17th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

A. James F. Bell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Carl H. Berglund, 607 South Pine, Tacoma, Wash.

A. Big B Ranch of Belle Glade, Fla., a division of the Osceola Operating Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $7,182.77.

A. Leon G. Billings, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $225.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, 537 Cherry Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.

B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, 537 Cherry Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Sam Boyce, 414 Second Street, Newport, Kans.

B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill., and National Association of Taxicab Owners, 803 Leader Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $1,300.

A. Col. A. E. Brackett, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Florence I. Broadwell, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,432.73.

A. Wayne L. Bromley, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,950.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $125.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,365. E. (9) $2,365.

A. Charles H. Brown, 1701 K Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $876.50.

A. Charles H. Brown, Inc., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D. C.

B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D. C.

D. (6) $937.50. E. (9) $937.50.

A. Robert J. Brown, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $133.

A. William R. Brown, Post Office Box 149, Jefferson City, Mo.

B. Missouri State Chamber of Commerce, Post Office Box 149, Jefferson City, Mo.

D. (6) $2,850. E. (9) $1,320.31.

A. James E. Bryan, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $1,031.43.

A. Henry N. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

B. The Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 803 Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Henry N. Buckman, 54 Buckman Building, Jacksonville, Fla.

B. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. John J. Burke, Finlen Hotel, Butte, Mont.

B. Pacific Northwest Power Co., Post Office Box 1445, Spokane, Wash.

E. (9) $125.

A. Charles S. Burns, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $584.50. E. (9) $170.37.

A. Robert M. Burr, 105 Mansfield Avenue, Darien, Conn.

D. (6) $2,166.68. E. (9) $136.42.

A. George H. Buschmann, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Allentown Portland Cement Co., Allentown, Pa.

E. (9) $6,287.29.

A. Canal Authority of the State of Florida, 803, Rosselle Street, Jacksonville, Fla.

A. Col. John T. Carlton, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Carretta & Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Bicycle Manufacturers Association of America, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Casey, Lane & Mittendorf, 26 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. South African Sugar Association, Norwich Union House, Durban Club, Durban, South Africa.

E. (9) $1,252.30.

A. Hal M. Christensen, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Dental Association, 808 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,250.

A. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $9,653.16. E. (9) $8,396.85.

A. Roger A. Clark, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Wine Conference of America, 1100 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $581.55.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington 6, D.C.

B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc. (Trade Association) 919 18th Street NW, Washington, D.C.; and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $510. E. (9) $107.05.

A. Washington I. Cleveland, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. D.C. Division, American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph Cohen, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $500.

A. Nicholas S. Collins, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $240. E. (9) $9.82.

A. Committee on Constructive Price, 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Committee for Time Uniformity, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $27.40.

A. Bernard J. Conway, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,281.25.

A. Edward M. Corneaby, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,748.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $632.08. E. (9) $632.08.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Corn Millers' Federation, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $42.40.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Classroom Periodical Publishers' Asso-tion, 38 West Fifth Street, Dayton, Ohio.

A. Donald M. Counihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Writing Instrument Manufacturers Association, 1405 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Cuba Claims Association, Inc., 407 Lincoln Road, Miami Beach, Fla.

D. (6) $948.13. E. (9) $965.02.

A. C. B. Culpepper, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.

B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.

A. John Curran, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,640. E. (9) $989.20.

A. Michael P. Daniels, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $600.

A. F. Gibson Darrison, Jr., 4810 Fort Sumner Drive, Washington, D.C.

B. New York State Association of Railroads, 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. S. P. Deas, Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

A. Merritt S. Deitz.

B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Ronald W. De Lucien, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $250. E. (9) $168.

A. George E. Diethelm.

B. American Sugar Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Westlands Water District, Post Office Box 4006, Fresno, Calif.
D. (6) $780.79. E. (9) $60.79.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Tulelake Irrigation District, Post Office Box 737, Tulelake, Calif.
D. (6) $1,899.46. E. (9) $99.46.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Thurman & Wright, 1208 Latham Square Building, Oakland, Calif.

A. Timothy V. A. Dillon, 1001 15th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Sacramento Municipal Utility District, 6201 S Street, Sacramento, Calif.
D. (6) $1,215.31. E. (9) $165.31.

A. Division of Federal Relations, National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $16,432.50.

A. Carlyle M. Dunaway, 1922 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Life Underwriters, 1922 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $825. E. (9) $579.69.

A. Henry I. Dworshak, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $553.14. E. (9) $4.30.

A. J. C. B. Ehringhaus, Jr., Post Office Box 1776, Raleigh, N.C.
B. Southern Railway System, Post Office Box 1808, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $1,192.63.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. Warren G. Elliott, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $44.03.

A. Otis H. Ellis, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Oil Jobbers Council, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,500.

A. John W. Emeigh, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $817.51. E. (9) $15.10.

A. Lawrence E. Ernst, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. National Star Route Mail Carriers Association, 301 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $810.

A. Clinton M. Fair, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,640. E. (9) $385.83.

A. Robert L. Farrington, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chinese Government Procurement and Services Mission, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $57.46.

A. Arthur S. Fefferman, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Joe G. Fender, 2033 Norfolk Street, Houston, Tex.
B. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc.
D. (6) $1,903.93.

A. Mello G. Fish, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,835. E. (9) $300.

A. Florida Inland Navigation District, Citizens Bank Building, Bunnell, Fla.

A. James F. Fort, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $433.

A. George R. Frankovich, Providence, R.I. and Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America, Inc., 207–11 Sheraton Biltmore Hotel, Providence, R.I., and Jewelry Industry Tax Committee, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,623.72. E. (9) $473.72.

A. David C. Fullarton, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $196.

A. Henry T. Gage, 110 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Wine Institute, 717 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Mary Condon Gereau, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association—Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,308.12. E. (9) $469.19.

A. Royce L. Givens, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Conference of Police Associations, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,275. E. (9) $1,615.

A. Jack Golodner, 1301 Delaware Avenue SW., Washington, D.C.
B. Actors' Equity Association, 226 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $310.

A. John A. Gosnell, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,833.34.

A. James A. Gray, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street, Washington, D.C.

A. J. S. Grigsby, Jr., 1107 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103–1111 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.
D. (6) $2,250.

A. John F. Griner, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,835.90. E. (9) $583.59.

A. Harold F. Hammond, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America.

A. William B. Harman, Jr., 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $120.72.

A. W. Gibson Harris, 815 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Household Finance Corp., 3220 Prudential Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $7.34.

A. Douglas W. Hartman, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fischer Bearings Manufacturing Ltd., Post Office Box 280, Stratford, Ontario, Canada.
E. (9) $56.81.

A. Robert B. Heiney, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $2,054.02.

A. Noel Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Carey W. Hilliard, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $662.49. E. (9) $8.40.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $61.40.

A. Frank N. Hoffmann, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. David Paul Houlihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Floyd E. Huffman, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $906.78. E. (9) $19.20.

A. Vester T. Hughes, Jr., 2800 Republic National Bank Building, Dallas, Tex.
B. American Life Insurance Co. of Alabama, Birmingham, Ala., et al.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $6,464.90.

A. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $269.11.

A. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,886.65.

A. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $17,190.56.

A. Investors Diversified Services, Inc., Minneapolis, Minn.
E. (9) $35,000.

A. Rear Adm. Alexander Jackson, Jr., 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles E. Jackson, 715 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $856.25. E. (9) $170.89.

A. Ralph K. James, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $440. E. (9) $33.79.

A. Philip F. Jehle, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Glendon E. Johnson, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $251.25. E. (9) $30.19.

A. Ned Johnston, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Charlie W. Jones, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Carpet Institute, Inc., 350 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $32.16.

A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Guatemala Sugar Producers Association, Guatemala City, Guatemala.

A. Karelsen & Karelsen, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $187.29.

A. Jerome J. Keating, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. Howard B. Keck, 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $300.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Kenneth L. Kimble, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $507.50. E. (9) $10.16.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $875.

A. William L. Kohler, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $356.25.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Board of Commissioners, Port of New Orleans, Post Office Box 60046, New Orleans, La.
E. (9) $124.01.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $560.55.

A. Kominers & Fort, 529 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marine Transport Lines, Inc., 60 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $4,125. E. (9) $4,381.33.

A. Dillard B. Lasseter, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $525.

A. Thomas B. Lawrence, 917 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Licensed Beverage Association, 420 Seventh Street, Racine, Wis.
D. (6) $650.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL–CIO, 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,875. E. (9) $1,570.52.

A. Maj. Gen. George O. N. Lodoen, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold O. Lovre, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $705.62.

A. Charles Emmet Lucey, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Support Group for Progressive Banking, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. John M. Lumley, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,388.10. E. (9) $538.15.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 11th & L Building, Sacramento, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,340. E. (9) $1,112.20.

A. J. A. McCallam, 1507 M Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $818.67.

A. McClure & Trotter, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Coca-Cola Export Corp., 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stanley J. McCutcheon, 709 13th Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Marathon Oil Co.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. William J. McDonald, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
B. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.

A. Stanley J. McFarland, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $476.44. E. (9) $19.38.

A. Joseph B. McGrath, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $1,209.21.

A. William H. McLin, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,325.98. E. (9) $531.72.

A. Ralph J. McNair, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $340.75. E. (9) $6.57.

A. Don Mahon, 1127 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,243.52.

A. Manufacturing Jewelers & Silversmiths of America, Inc., 207–11 Sheraton Biltmore Hotel, Providence, R.I.
D. (6) $20,640. E. (9) $4,465.71.

A. Edwin E. Marsh, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $3,099.99. E. (9) $613.02.

A. Albert E. May, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $340. E. (9) $17.46.

A. George E. Meagher, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Government Employees, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,181.54. E. (9) $68.40.

A. Mehler, Smollar & Buschman, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Steering Committee for Rebuilders of Automotive Parts.
D. (6) $878.19. E. (9) $28,259.54.

A. M. Barry Meyer, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $743.35.

A. Joseph L. Miller, 918 16th Street, Wash-Washington, D.C.

A Joseph L. Miller, 918 16th Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Northern Textile Association, et al.

A. Clarence Mitchell, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $2,328.33.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, 536 First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif., et al.

A. Harry L. Moffett, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,737.50. E. (9) $14.10.

A. Joseph E. Moody, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Clarence W. Moore. 421 New Jersey Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Cuba Claims Association, Inc., 407 Lincoln Road, Miami Beach, Fla.

A. Mrs. Jennelle Moorhead, Eugene Continuation Center, Eugene, Oreg.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $1,325.

A. Curtis Morris, Premier Building, 1725 Eye Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $632.25. E. (9) $632.25.

A. National Associated Businessmen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $630.60. E. (9) $958.52.

A. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. National Association of Blue Shield Plans, 425 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,031.43.

A. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $24,694.28. E. (9) $11,658.55.

A. National Association of Insurance Agents, Inc., 96 Fulton Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $3,500. E. (9) $8,424.36.

A. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $693,558.50. E. (9) $14,400.42.

A. National Association of Life Underwriters, 1922 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,647.53. E. (9) $2,472.53.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers.

A. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago Ill., and 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $10,012.48.

A. National Association of Social Workers, Inc., 2 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y., and 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $450.

A. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $2,701.83. E. (9) 3,889.84.

A. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $550,934.67. E. (9) $6,565.11.

A. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $4,999.83.

A. National Conference of Non-Profit Shipping Associations, Inc., 26 Auburn Avenue, Post Office Box 1736, Atlanta, Ga.
D. (6) $3,425.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Council of Naval Air Stations Employee Organizations, 3005 Fernside Boulevard, Alameda, Calif.
E. (9) $32.76.

A. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $431,061.75. E. (9) $2,777.34.

A. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $82,447.80. E. (9) $12,162.90

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 920 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,689.87. E. (9) $17,689.87.

A. National Parking Association, 17th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.

A. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D. C.
D. (6) $11,292. E. (9) $15,313.70

A. National Rehabilitation Association, Inc., 1029 Vermont Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,057.12. E. (9) $894.70

A. National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $16,127.52.

A. National Small Business Association, 1225 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $2,562.52.

A. National Tax Equality Association, 100 Connecticut Avenue Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $11,101.17. E. (9) $8,286.38.

A. National Telephone Cooperative Association, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $329.

A. National Wool Growers Association, 600 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $7,078. E. (9) $3,787.76.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,583.32. E. (9) $2,816.30.

A. George R. Nelson, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Machinists, Machinists Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $386.65.

A. New York & New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) $1,459.37. E. (9) $2,274.08.

A. Joseph A. Noone, 514 Madison Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. N. C. Cotton, Post Office Box 5425, Raleigh, N.C.

A. Graham T. Northrup, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,666.66. E. (9) $4,910.99.

A. O'Connor, Green, Thomas & Walters, 508 Federal Bar Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Upper Mississippi Towing Corp., 3033 Excelsior Boulevard, Minneapolis, Minn.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $41.59.

A. John A. O'Donnell, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,800.

A. Order of Railway Conductors and Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
E. (9) $5,160.45.

A. J. Allen Overton, Jr., 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. R. Wally Petersen, Lakeview, Mich.
B. National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts.

A. Andrew A. Pettis, 100 Indiana Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Industrial Union of Marine and Shipbuilding Workers of America, GEB, 534 Cooper Street, Camden, N.J.
D. (6) $4,235. E. (9) $1,988.36.

A. James F. Pinkney, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $153.90.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.

A. J. Francis Pohlhaus, 100 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, 20 West 40th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William C. Prather, 221 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $347.50. E. (9) $56.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $125. E. (9) $12.50.

A. James H. Rademacher, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Letter Carriers, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Robert E. Redding, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee for Time Uniformity, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $27.40.

A. Robert E. Redding, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Geo. L. Reid, Jr., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,199.98. E. (9) $106.38.

A. Reserve Officers Association of the United States, 333 Pennsylvania Avenue SE., Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Respess, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $55.58. E. (9) $2.24.

A. F. Marion Rhodes, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.

B. New York Cotton Exchange, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John J. Riley, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,661.46. E. (9) $115.41.

A. William Neale Roach, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $109.40.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $177.

A. J. T. Rutherford, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $380.31.

A. Francis J. Ryley, 519 Title and Trust Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Standard Oil Co. of California, San Francisco, Calif., et al.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Associated Business Publications, 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $471.28.

A. David P. Seaman, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Big B Ranch of Belle Glade, Fla., a division of the Osceola Operating Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $2,000.

A. Clayton A. Seeber, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Education Association—Division of Federal Relations, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,382.22. E. (9) $287.51.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.; and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,275. E. (9) $126.94.

A. William L. Shea, 1026 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Big B Ranch of Belle Glade, Fla., a division of the Osceola Operating Corp., 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $4,500. E. (9) $682.77.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $300.

A. Laurence P. Sherfy, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $575.

A. Henry M. Shine, Jr., 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Home Builders of the United States, 1625 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,875. E. (9) $1,065.36.

A. Max Shine, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $992.50. E. (9) $20.

A. Shipley, Akerman & Pickett, 1366 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Management Co., Westminster at Parker, Elizabeth, N.J.

A. Shipley, Akerman & Pickett, 1366 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Insurance Securities, Inc., 100 California Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Shipley, Akerman & Pickett, 1366 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Fiduciary Counsel, Inc., 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Shipley, Akerman & Pickett, 1366 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Bluejay Oil Co., National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Shipley, Akerman & Pickett, 1366 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Realty Trust, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Shipley, Akerman & Pickett, 1366 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National FHA Apartment Owners Association, Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Shipley, Akerman & Pickett, 1366 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Pet Shop Management, Inc., Post Office Box 109, Fond du Lac, Wis.

A. Sidley, Austin, Burgess & Smith, 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Harold S. Skinner, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

B. Continental Oil Co.

A. Irvin A. Smith, North Dakota Railway Lines, 418 East Rosser Avenue, Post Office Box 938, Bismarck, N. Dak.

B. Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn., et al.

E. (9) $83.38.

A. Milan D. Smith, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dr. Spencer M. Smith, Jr., 1709 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Va.

B. Citizens Committee on Natural Resources, 712 Dupont Circle Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,818.38. E. (9) $1,946.71.

A. W. Byron Sorrell, 1100 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mobilehome Dealers National Association, 39 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,025. E. (9) $303.33.

A. Southern Pine Industry Committee, 520 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.

D. (6) $2,386.45. E. (9) $3,560.12.

A. Southern States Industrial Council, 1103–1111 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tenn.

D. (6) $2,697.55. E. (9) $5,486.32.

A. Lawrence Speiser, 1101 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Civil Liberties Union, 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Chester S. Stackpole, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Karl Stecher, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Karl Stecher, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Douglas K. Warner, Warner Research Laboratories, 1937 Panama Drive, Sarasota, Fla.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $26,952.13. E. (9) $4,984.03.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. American Council of Flatware Importers, Inc., 241 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Association to Acquire Compensation for Damages Prior to Peace Treaty, Naha, Okinawa; Association of Landowners of Okinawa, Naha, Okinawa.

E. (9) $300.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Hitachi New York, Ltd., 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $75.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters' Association, No. 2, 3-Chome, Nihonbashi, Muromachi, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

E. (9) $374.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Japan General Merchandise Exporters Association and Japan Rubber Footwear Manufacturers' Association of Tokyo, Japan; Miscellaneous Goods Division, Japanese Chamber of Commerce of New York, Inc. and Imported Footwear Group, National Council of American Importers, New York, N.Y.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. Japan Steel Wire and Wire Products Exporters' Association, 36, Hisamatsucho, Nihonbashi, Chuo-ku, Tokyo, Japan.

E. (9) $25.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. National Silver Co., 241 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $75.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. New York Merchandise Co., 32 West 23d Street, New York, N.Y., importers and Japan General Merchandise Exporters Association, c/o Japan Trade Center, 393 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y., trade association.

E. (9) $60.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. A. D. Sutton & Sons, 1 West 37th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $35.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Toyoshima & Co., Inc., 303 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $75.

A. Stitt and Hemmendinger, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Vernon Photographic Corp., 114 East Kingsbridge Road, Mount Vernon, N.Y.
D. (6) $360. E. (9) $62.

A. Nelson A. Stitt, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Francis W. Stover, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $217.75.

A. C. Austin Sutherland, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 224 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Natonal Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $24.50.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street N.W., Washington, D.C.
B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.
E. (9) $89.

A. Julia C. Thompson, 1030 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Nurses' Association, Inc., 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,376.93.

A. Eugene M. Thoré, Life Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $406.25. E. (9) $3.81.

A. Transportation Association of America, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Hattie B. Trazenfeld, 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., 2012 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Paul T. Truitt, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Plant Food Institute, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
A. Trustees for Conservation, 251 Kearny Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $3,492.43. E. (9) $2,021.14.

A. Ernest A. Tupper, 1420 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Can Co., 100 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. United Cerebral Palsy Association, 321 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $1,308.88.

A. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,800. E. (9) $1,800.

A. F. Bourne Upham III, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $580.

A. Arvin E. Upton and James A. Greer II, 1821 Jefferson Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, U.S. Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,490. E. (9) $4.34.

A. Charles R. Van Horn, 17th and H Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Baltimore & Ohio Railroad Co., Charles and Baltimore Streets, Baltimore, Md.

A. Richard E. Vernor, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Life Convention, 230 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $252. E. (9) $22.45.

A. Harold S. Walker, Jr., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Gas Association, Inc., 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul H. Walker, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Life Insurance Association of America, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $12.50. E. (9) $1.14.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,052.50. E. (9) $378.35.

A. Watters & Donovan, 161 William Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York and New Jersey Dry Dock Association, 161 William Street, New York City.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. William E. Welsh, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Reclamation Association, 897 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750.

A. Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., 604 Mission Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $14,803.75. E. (9) $10.

A. Don White, 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
B. National Audio-Visual Association, Inc., 1201 Spring Street, Fairfax, Va.
D. (6) $693.17. E. (9) $1,404.99.

A. John C. White, 838 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $113.84.

A. Robert P. Will, 989 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, 1111 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,525. E. (9) $850.52.

A. Franz O. Willenbucher, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,250.

A. W. A. Williams, Jr., Santa Fe, N. Mex.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Kenneth Williamson, One Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Hospital Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,278.84. E. (9) $399.59.

A. Gene M. Woodfin, 42 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5,032.76.

A. John H. Yingling, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Support Group for Progressive Banking, 905 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $5.

A. Sidney Zagri, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,998.

QUARTERLY REPORTS

The following quarterly reports were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1964:

(NOTE.—The form used for reports is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19_______ ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

P	QUARTER			
	1st	2d	3d	4th

(Mark one square only)

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report. ◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1 ◄

Note on Item "D."—(*a*) *In General.* The term "contribution" includes *anything of value*. When an organization or individual uses printed or duplicated matter in a campaign attempting to influence legislation, money received by such organization or individual—for such printed or duplicated matter—is a "contribution." "The term 'contribution' includes a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money, or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make a contribution"—Section 302(a) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) **If This Report Is for an Employer.**—(i) *In General.* Item "D" is designed for the reporting of all receipts from which expenditures are made, or will be made, in accordance with legislative interests.

(ii) *Receipts of Business Firms and Individuals.*—A business firm (or individual) which is subject to the Lobbying Act by reason of expenditures which it makes in attempting to influence legislation—but which has no funds to expend except those which are available in the ordinary course of operating a business not connected in any way with the influencing of legislation—will have no receipts to report, even though it does have expenditures to report.

(iii) *Receipts of Multipurpose Organizations.*—Some organizations do not receive any funds which are to be expended solely for the purpose of attempting to influence legislation. Such organizations make such expenditures out of a general fund raised by dues, assessments, or other contributions. The percentage of the general fund which is used for such expenditures indicates the percentage of dues, assessments, or other contributions which may be considered to have been paid for that purpose. Therefore, in reporting receipts, such organizations may specify what that percentage is, and report their dues, assessments, and other contributions on that basis. However, each contributor of $500 or more is to be listed, regardless of whether the contribution was made solely for legislative purposes.

(*c*) **If This Report Is for an Agent or Employee.**—(i) *In General.* In the case of many employees, all receipts will come under Items "D 5" (received for services) and "D 12" (expense money and reimbursements). In the absence of a clear statement to the contrary, it will be presumed that your employer is to reimburse you for all expenditures which you make in connection with legislative interests.

(ii) *Employer as Contributor of $500 or More.*—When your contribution from your employer (in the form of salary, fee, etc.) amounts to $500 or more, it is not necessary to report such contribution under "D 13" and "D 14," since the amount has already been reported under "D 5," and the name of the "employer" has been given under Item "B" on page 1 of this report.

D. Receipts (Including Contributions and Loans):

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the space following the number.

Receipts (other than loans)

1. $________Dues and assessments
2. $________Gifts of money or anything of value
3. $________Printed or duplicated matter received as a gift
4. $________Receipts from sale of printed or duplicated matter
5. $________Received for services (e.g., salary, fee, etc.)

6. $________**Total** for this Quarter (Add items "1" through "5")
7. $________Received during previous Quarters of calendar year

8. $________**Total** from Jan. 1 through this Quarter (Add "6" and "7")

Loans Received

"The term 'contribution' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(a).

9. $________**Total** now owed to others on account of loans
10. $________Borrowed from others during this Quarter
11. $________Repaid to others during this Quarter

12. $________"Expense money" and Reimbursements received this Quarter

Contributors of $500 or more (from Jan. 1 through this Quarter)

13. Have there been such contributors?

Please answer "yes" or "no": ________

14. In the case of each contributor whose contributions (including loans) during the "period" from January 1 through the last days of this Quarter total $500 or more:

Attach hereto plain sheets of paper, approximately the size of this page, tabulate data under the headings "Amount" and "Name and Address of Contributor"; and indicate whether the last day of the period is March 31, June 30, September 30, or December 31. Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Name and Address of Contributor*
	("*Period*" from Jan. 1 through ________________, 19____)
$1,500.00	John Doe, 1621 Blank Bldg., New York, N.Y.
$1,785.00	The Roe Corporation, 2511 Doe Bldg., Chicago, Ill.
$3,285.00	**Total**

Note on Item "E".—(*a*) *In General.* "The term 'expenditure' includes a payment, distribution, loan, advance, deposit, or gift of money or anything of value, and includes a contract, promise, or agreement, whether or not legally enforceable, to make an expenditure"—Section 302(b) of the Lobbying Act.

(*b*) **If This Report Is for an Agent or Employee.** In the case of many employees, all expenditures will come under telephone and telegraph (Item "E 6") and travel, food, lodging, and entertainment (Item "E 7").

E. Expenditures (Including Loans) in connection with legislative interests:

Fill in every blank. If the answer to any numbered item is "None," write "None" in the spaces following the number.

Expenditures (other than loans)

1. $________Public relations and advertising services
2. $________Wages, salaries, fees, commissions (other than item "1")
3. $________Gifts or contributions made during Quarter
4. $________Printed or duplicated matter, including distribution cost
5. $________Office overhead (rent, supplies, utilities, etc.)
6. $________Telephone and telegraph
7. $________Travel, food, lodging, and entertainment
8. $________All other expenditures

9. $________**Total** for this Quarter (Add "1" through "8")
10. $________Expended during previous Quarters of calendar year

11. $________**Total** from January 1 through this Quarter (Add "9" and "10")

Loans Made to Others

"The term 'expenditure' includes a . . . *loan* . . ."—Sec. 302(b).

12. $________**Total** now owed to person filing
13. $________Lent to others during this Quarter
14. $________Repayment received during this Quarter

15. Recipients of Expenditures of $10 or More

In the case of expenditures made during this Quarter by, or on behalf of the person filing: Attach plain sheets of paper approximately the size of this page and tabulate data as to expenditures under the following heading: "Amount," "Date or Dates," "Name and Address of Recipient," "Purpose." Prepare such tabulation in accordance with the following example:

Amount	*Date or Dates—Name and Address of Recipient—Purpose*
$1,750.00	7–11: Roe Printing Co., 3214 Blank Ave., St. Louis, Mo.—Printing and mailing circulars on the "Marshbanks Bill."
$2,400.00	7–15, 8–15, 9–15: Britten & Blaten, 3127 Gremlin Bldg., Washington, D.C.—Public relations service at $800.00 per month.
$4,150.00	**Total**

A. Charles D. Ablard, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, Inc., 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $75.85.

A. Actors' Equity Association, 226 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $2,500.

A. Clarence G. Adamy, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $25.

A. Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, 4650 East-West Highway, Bethesda, Md.

A. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $800. E. (9) $759.

A. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,785.02. E. (9) $2,785.02.

A. Miss Milnor Alexander, 320 Constitution Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue, NE., Washington, D.C.

A. George Venable Allen, 4370 Quebec Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Louis J. Allen, 1121 Nashville Trust Building, Nashville, Tenn.
B. Class I, railroads in Tennessee.

A. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. American Claims in Cuba Committee.
D. (6) $84.50. E. (9) $84.50.

A. American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,181.64. E. (9) $4,758.61.

A. American Committee for Flags of Necessity (a business league), 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill., and 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $33,397. E. (9) $33,397.

A. American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $41,077.

A. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,279.60. E. (9) $3,717.67.

A. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $311,638.08. E. (9) $5,235.77.

A. American Finance Conference, Inc., 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $600.

A. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Humane Association, 896 Pennsylvania Street, Denver, Colo.
E. (9) $3,580.02.

A. American-Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,223.50. E. (9) $2,886.58.

A. American Justice Association, Inc., Defense Highway, Cambrille, Md.
D. (6) $2. E. (9) $2.

A. American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $453.67. E. (9) $29,547.16.

A. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y. and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700. E. (9) $367.71.

A. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (6) $7,762.79.

A. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $526.45.

A. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $3,385.30. E. (9) $3,385.30.

A. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $506.85. E. (9) $506.85.

A. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (9) $9,571.02. E. (9) $490.74.

A. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,878. E. (9) $10,918.

A. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $472.90. E. (9) $472.90.

A. American Surveys, 2000 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Allentown Portland Cement Co., Seventh Street at Thruway, Allentown, Pa., et al.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $166.19.

A. American Taxpayers Association, Inc., 326 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,405. E. (9) $1,736.34.

A. American Textile Machinery Association, Whitin Machine Works, Whitinsville, Mass.
D. (6) $9.72.

A. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $11,629.54. E. (9) $11,629.54.

A. American Warehousemen's Association, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,811.09. E. (9) $1,811.09.

A. Jerry L. Anderson, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Walter M. Anderson, Jr., Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. David Apter, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of the Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1477 West Pender Street, Vancouver, British Columbia.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $338.40.

A. W. B. Ardery, Washington, D.C.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Arkansas Railroad Committee, 1100 Boyle Building, Little Rock, Ark.
B. Class 1 railroads operating in State of Arkansas.

A. Carl F. Arnold, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,750. E. (9) $2,020.10.

A. Associated General Contractors, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. Associated Third Class Mail Users, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $525. E. (9) $525.

A. Association of American Railroads, 929 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $991.12. E. (9) $991.12.

A. Association On Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,219.30. E. (9) $726.94.

A. Association of Casualty & Surety Cos., 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,512.85. E. (9) $2,512.85.

A. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. The Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Robert L. Augenblick, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Michael H. Bader, 1735 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association On Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mr. Harry S. Baer, Jr., 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National AeroSpace Services Association, 1725 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $44.

A. Douglas B. Bagnell, Post Office Box 486, Fairhope, Ala.
B. Maine Potato Council, Presque Isle, Maine.
D. (6) $75.

A. Mr. Charles B. Bailey, Sr., 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railway and Steamship Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and Station Employees.

D. (6) $2,568.55. E. (9) $679.63.

A. Frank Baird-Smith, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald Baldwin, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $637.86.

A. Robert C. Barnard, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Arthur R. Barnett, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) 310.42.

A. Thomas C. Barringer, 301 Harvey Road, McLean, Va.

B. Simon Enterprises, Inc., 595 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $321.20.

A. A. Wesley Barthelmes, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Insurance Company of North America, Life Insurance Company of North America, 1600 Arch Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) $453. E. (9) $138.02.

A. Laurie C. Battle, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Roy Battles, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Beattie, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,050.

A. James F. Bell, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $500.

A. Ernest H. Benson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

D. (6) $5,250.

A. Walter J. Bierwagen, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leon G. Billings, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John H. Bivins, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

B. American Petroleum Institute.

A. James C. Black, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Republic Steel Corp., Republic Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $500.

A. Wm. Rhea Blake, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $3,236.17.

A. Fred F. Bockmon, 405 Luhrs Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif., and The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway, 121 East Sixth Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

D. (6) $250. E. (9) $453.

A. Maurice G. Boehl, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Eugene F. Bogan, 1108 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Joseph L. Borda, 918 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers.

A. Lyle H. Boren, Seminole, Okla.

B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. Joseph Borkin, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Record Industry Association of America., Inc., 1 East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert T. Borth, General Electric Co., 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $145.50.

A. Robert Bosch Corp., 40–25 Crescent Street, Long Island City, N.Y.

E. (9) $3,412.77.

A. G. Stewart Boswell, 407 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 407 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $52.50. E. (9) $5.

A. J. Wiley Bowers, 537 Cherry Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.

B. Tennessee Valley Public Power Association, 537 Cherry Street, Chattanooga, Tenn.

A. Sam Boyce, 414 Second Street, Newport, Ark.

B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,000. E. (9) $1,700.

A. Charles N. Brady, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Brady, Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.

B. National Coordinating Committee of the Beverage Industry, Sheraton Gibson Hotel, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. W. Kenneth Brew, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Parke C. Brinkley, The Madison Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association.

A. W. S. Bromley, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Wayne L. Bromley, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,950.

A. Milton E. Brooding, 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. California Packing Corp., 215 Fremont Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $500. E. (9) $50.

A. Derek Brooks, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $600. E. (9) $410.56.

A. J. D. Brown, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Brown & Lund, Cafritz Building, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American & Foreign Power Co., Inc., 100 Church Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $800. E. (9) $48.89.

A. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $843.56.

A. Robert W. Bruce, 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

B. The Pacific Telephone & Telegraph Co., 140 New Montgomery Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Lyman L. Bryan, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Institute of Certified Public Accountants, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. George S. Buck, Jr., 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Norman D. Burch, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.

E. (9) $58.51.

A. George J. Burger, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Burger Tire Consultant Service, 250 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y., National Federation Independent Business, 921 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. C. P. Burks, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Burley & Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.

D. (6) $19,896.75. E. (9) $1,298.22.

A. Gustave Burmeister, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,385. E. (9) $19.68.

A. George B. Burnham, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. Numerous stockholders of the Burnham Chemical Co., 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $165. E. (9) $165.

A. Orrin A. Burrows, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO–CLC, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,999.99.

A. Hollis W. Burt, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Supervisors of State Banks, 1101 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $55.

A. George H. Buschmann, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Allentown Portland Cement Co., Allentown, Pa., et al.
E. (9) $357.32.

A. Dan L. Butler, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Monroe Butler, 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $671.23. E. (9) $608.22.

A. Robert B. Byrnes, 1703 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Railroad Pension Forum, Inc., 2403 East 75th Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $6.52.

A. C. G. Caffrey, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N.C.
D. (6) $760.20. E. (9) $50.

A. Gordon L. Calvert, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Investment Bankers Association of America, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $205.

A. Carl C. Campbell, Ring Building, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. The Camping Club of America, Inc., 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ronald A. Capone, The Farragut Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of European Shipowners, 30–32 St. Mary Axe, London, E.C. 3, England.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $282.56.

A. James R. Carnes, 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,500.

A. Braxton B. Carr, 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. The American Waterways Operators, Inc., 1250 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,400. E. (9) $125.28.

A. Robert S. Carr, 1220 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hiram Walker & Sons, Inc., 8323 Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. H. Allen Carroll, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $291.

A. Eugene C. Carusi, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Central Arizona Project Association, 642 Security Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

A. Channing Service Corp., 85 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Alger B. Chapman, Jr., 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Taxicab Association, Inc., 4415 North California Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $182.96.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Bruynzeel Fabricken, Zaandam, Holland.
D. (6) $8,567. E. (9) $1,464.41.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Strohmeyer & Arpe Co., 139–141 Franklin Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $625. E. (9) $1.50.

A. Chapman, Friedman, Shea, Clubb & Duff, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Union Nacional de Productores de Azucar, S.A. de C.V., Balderas 36 Primer Piso, Mexico D.F., Mexico.
D. (6) $8,625. E. (9) $150.81.

A. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.
E. (9) $1.02.

A. A. H. Chesser, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,131.25. E. (9) $4,131.25.

A. Citizens Committee on American Policy in the Near East, Box 368, McLean, Va.
D. (6) $1,013.37. E. (9) $1,156.47.

A. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Allen C. K. Clark, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Earl W. Clark, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,194. E. (9) $184.52.

A. Robert M. Clark, 1710 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fe Railway Co., 80 East Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

A. Clay Pipe Industry Depletion Committee, Post Office Box 2028, Kansas City, Mo.
D. (6) $17,830.93. E. (9) $646.39.

A. Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, 532 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building. Washington, D.C.
B. The Colonial Sugar Refining Co., Ltd., 1–3 O'Connell Street, Sydney, Australia.

A. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Oil Shale Corp., 680 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,925.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $90. E. (9) $2.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $332.88.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Williamson Tobacco Corp.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $332.88.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Liggett & Myers Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $332.88.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. P. Lorillard Co.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $332.88.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Philip Morris Inc.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $332.88.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $332.88.

A. Earle C. Clements, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Superior Oil Co.

A. Washington I. Cleveland, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph Cohen, National Press Building.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, One East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Coles & Goertner, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of American Tanker Owners, Inc., One Chase Manhattan Plaza, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $4.55.

A. J. I. Collier, Jr., General Counsel & Secretary-Treasurer, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $38.75.

A. Collier and Shannon, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Shoe Manufacturers Association, Inc., 342 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $400.

A. Collier and Shannon, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tool and Stainless Steel Industry Committee, c/o Carpenter Steel Co., Reading, Pa.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $6.60.

A. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing, 50 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $695. E. (9) $900.

A. Committee on Constructive Price, 3 Gateway Center, Post Office Box 2276, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. R. T. Compton, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Paul B. Comstock, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John C. Cone, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pan American World Airways, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Raymond F. Conkling, 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward Cooper.
B. Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., 1600 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 15th & New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. New York Stock Exchange, 11 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. J. Milton Cooper, 15th & New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. R. J. Reynolds Tobacco Co., Winston-Salem, N.C.

A. John Shepherd Cooper, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pacific Gas and Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $142.50. E. (9) $1,941.48.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries, 550 Burrard Street, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Mitchell J. Cooper, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Footwear Division of Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., 444 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $4,375. E. (9) $5.50.

A. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edward M. Corneaby, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,706.55.

A. Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $62,340.38. E. (9) $46,789.21.

A. Council of Mechanical Specialty Contracting Industries, Inc., 610 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (7) $843.41.

A. Council of State Chambers of Commerce, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $235.52. E. (9) $235.52.

A. Edsall Lee Couplin, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
B. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $1,545. E. (9) $49.25.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Allentown Cement Co., et al.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Machine Tool Distributors' Association, 1500 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. A. P. Møller, 8 Kongens Nytorv, Copenhagen, Denmark.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Tool, Die & Precision Machining Association, 1411 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Savings and Loan Bank of the State of New York, 60 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Covington & Burling, 701 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Traveler's Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn.

A. A. Harry Crane, 303 New England Building, Topeka, Kans.
B. Southern Railway System, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $20.25.

A. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $820.97. E. (9) $820.97.

A. William A. Cromartie, One North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Park Sherman Co., 1200 Park Avenue, Murfreesboro, Tenn.

A. Robert E. Cronin, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Henry Ashton Crosby, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Council for a Livable World, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,846.17.

A. H. C. Crotty, 12050 Woodward Avenue, Detroit, Mich.

A. Leo J. Crowley, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Bernard Cushman, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO.

A. John R. Dalton, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.
B. Associated Railways of Indiana, 1508 Merchants Bank Building, Indianapolis, Ind.

A. John C. Datt, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $817. E. (9) $21.39.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., 901 West 22d Street, Oak Brook, Ill.
E. (9) $5.95.

A. Charles W. Davis, 1 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $462.05.

A. Lowell Davis, 601 Ross Avenue, Mart, Tex.
D. (6) $174.50. E. (9) $174.50.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. D. C. Transit System, Inc., 36th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hilton Hotels Corp., Chicago, Ill.

A. Donald S. Dawson, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Laundry Dry Cleaning Association of D.C., 2300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Variable Annuity Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Variable Annuity Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Virgin Islands Gift & Fashion Shop Association, Inc., St. Thomas, Virgin Islands.
D. (6) $2,000.

A. John F. Dawson, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. Tony T. Dechant.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. The Inter-State Manufacturer's Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $1,500.

A. L. E. Deilke, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
B. National Association of Direct Selling Companies, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. James J. Delaney, Jr., 220 Central Building, Anchorage, Alaska.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Max A. Denney, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Finance Conference, Inc., 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $600.

A. Leslie E. Dennis, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $540.

A. Cecil B. Dickson, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,687.50. E. (9) $79.91.

A. George S. Dietrich, 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 De Sales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $134.56.

A. Disabled American Veterans National Service Headquarters, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $7,591.44.

A. Robert H. Distelhorst, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $312.50.

A. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $34,320.50. E. (9) $31,464.56.

A. Robert C. Dolan, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $381.62.

A. Paul R. M. Donelan, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. James L. Donnelly, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Manufacturers' Association, 200 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. Dewey Dorsett, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Jasper N. Dorsey, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. C. L. Dorson, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,455.39. E. (9) $122.

A. Leonard K. Dowiak, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. R. Michael Duncan.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William E. Dunn, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Eastern Railroad Presidents Conference, 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N.J.

A. Herman Edelsberg, 1640 Rhode Island Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 315 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $140.

A. Wallace Edgerton, 1762 Church Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Anchor Corp., Westminster at Parker, Elizabeth, N.J., et al.
D. (6) $3,000.

A. Harold E. Edwards, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. Walter A. Edwards, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chrysler Corp., 341 Massachusetts Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $100.

A. James B. Ehrlich, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $320. E. (9) $127.65.

A. John Doyle Elliott, 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
B. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $732.77.

A. John M. Elliott, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL–CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Clyde T. Ellis, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $65.

A. Perry R. Ellsworth, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Milk Industry Foundation and International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ely, Duncan and Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan and Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Coachella Valley County Water District, Coachella, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely, Duncan and Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Department of Water and Power of the City of Los Angeles, 207 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $1,600.

A. Ely, Duncan and Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. East Bay Municipal Utility District, 2130 Adeline Street, Oakland, Calif.
D. (6) $1,200.

A. Ely, Duncan and Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Imperial Irrigation District, El Centro, Calif.
D. (6) $2,100.

A. Ely, Duncan and Bennett, 1200 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $3,585.

A. Myles W. English, 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Highway Users Conference, Inc., 966 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grover W. Ensley, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $191.57. E. (9) $25.60.

A. John D. Fagan, 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,922. E. (9) $25.20.

A. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia Pa.
E. (9) $536.67.

A. Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. and 404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $67,448.62. E. (9) $22,071.43.

A. Bonner Fellers, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Foreign Aid Committee.

A. Maxwell Field, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
B. New England Shoe and Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $400. E. (9) $140.82.

A. Herbert A. Fierst, 607 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Forest Industries of British Columbia, 1477 West Pender Street, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $25.

A. Mello G. Fish, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $2,835. E. (9) $300.

A. William J. Flaherty, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $2,625. E. (9) $2,625.

A. Roger Fleming, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,233. E. (9) $12.75.

A. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.
E. (9) $1,200.

A. James W. Foristel, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $58.90. E. (9) $24.80.

A. Harold F. Forsyth, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ronald J. Foulis, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John G. Fox, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C. and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone & Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $112.50.

A. Morley E. Fox, Hotel Congressional, Washington, D.C.
B. Central Arizona Project Association, 642 Security Building, Phoenix, Ariz.

A. Charles A. Francik, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y.
D. (6) $420.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Book Manufacturers' Institute, Inc., 25 West 43d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James H. French, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corn Starch Industry Committee, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Milton Fricke, Papillion, Nebr.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Philip P. Friedlander, Jr., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $29,912.57. E. (9) $7,956.16.

A. Garrett Fuller, 836 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. West Coast Steamship Co., 1210 Standard Plaza, Portland, Oreg.

A. Lawrence H. Gall, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $975.

A. M. J. Galvin, 207 Union Depot Building, St. Paul, Minn.
B. Great Northern Railway Co., Great Northern Building, St. Paul, Minn., et al.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $50.

A. Marion R. Garstang, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $25.

A. Aubrey D. Gates, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $170.

A. Joseph S. Gill, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.
B. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Neal P. Gillen, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ginsburg & Leventhal, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Plastic and Chemical Corp., Metuchen, N.J., and Haverstraw, N.Y.
D. (6) $316. E. (9) $76.37.

A. Royce L. Givens, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Conference of Police Associations, 132 Third Street SE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,275. E. (9) $1,615.

A. Jack Golodner, 1301 Delaware Avenue SW., Washington, D.C.
B. Actors' Equity Association, 226 West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $310.

A. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 640 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Florists' Telegraph Delivery Association, 900 West Lafayette Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. Lawrence L. Gourley, 1757 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Osteopathic Association, 212 East Ohio Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $500.

A. Government Employees' Council, AFL–CIO, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $17,405.56. E. (9) $6,745.04.

A. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Grand Lodge of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen & Enginemen, 318–418 Keith Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Cornelius R. Gray, Legal Department, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Virginia M. Gray, 3501 Williamsburg Lane NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50. E. (9) $8.06.

A. Samuel A. Grayson, 611 Idaho Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Union Pacific Railroad Co., 1416 Dodge Street, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financal Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. Jerry N. Griffin, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Variable Annuity Life Insurance Co., Washington, D.C.

A. Ben H. Guill, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Automobile Dealers Association, et al.
D. (6) $4,200. E. (9) $1,910.

A. Seymour S. Guthman, Woodward Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Syndicat des Distillateurs et Producteurs de Sucre de Madagascar, 282 Boulevard, St. Germain, Paris, France.
D. (6) $1,875.

A. Robert W. Haack, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. AFL–CIO Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $692.30. E. (9) $135.53.

A. Hoyt S. Haddock, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,194. E. (9) $143.66.

A. Hal H. Hale, 421 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Andrew G. Haley, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold T. Halfpenny, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. J. G. Hall, Detroit, Mich.
B. General Motors Corp., 3044 West Grand Boulevard, Detroit, Mich.

A. E. C. Hallbeck, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,875.10.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Council of Private Lending Institutions, Inc., 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hamel, Morgan, Park & Saunders, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (Indiana), 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $6,650. E. (9) $98.72.

A. W. C. Hammerle, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Eugene J. Hardy, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Bryce N. Harlow, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Procter & Gamble Manufacturing Co., 301 East Sixth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Herbert E. Harris II, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

A. R. A. Harris, 38 South Dearborne Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborne Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $2,750.06.

A. W. Gibson Harris, 815 Mutual Building, Richmond, Va.
B. Household Finance Corp., 3220 Prudential Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

A. Burr P. Harrison, Graichen Building, Winchester, Va.
B. Household Finance Corp., 3220 Prudential Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

A. Douglas W. Hartman, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Fischer Bearings Manufacturing, Ltd., Post Office Box 280, Stratford, Ontario, Canada.
D. (6) $1,030. E. (9) $92.54.

A. Walter A. Hasty, Jr.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo. and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,800. E. (9) 160.98.

A. Paul M. Hawkins, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hays & Hays, 920 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Motor Commerce Associations, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $2,500. E. (9) $13.

A. Joseph H. Hays, 280 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.
B. The Association of Western Railways, 224 Union Station Building, Chicago, Ill.

A. John C. Hazen, 1317 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $120.10.

A. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $95.31. E. (9) $95.31.

A. Patrick B. Healy, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $175. E. (9) $34.10.

A. George J. Hecht, 52 Vanderbilt Avenue, New York, N.Y.; 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Parents Committee, Inc., 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Comite de Productores de Azucar, Antonio Miro Quesada 376, Lima, Peru.
D. (6) $10,000. E. (9) $171.55.

A. Hedrick & Lane, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Committee on Constructive Price, 3 Gateway Center, Post Office Box 2276, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Kenneth G. Heisler, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Edmund P. Hennelly, 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
B. Socony Mobil Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $259.63.

A. John K. Herbert, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Magazine Publishers Association, 575 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $766.28.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Boston Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $106.86.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Wool Manufacturers, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Growers Association, 414 Crandall Building, Salt Lake City, Utah.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $17.25.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Wool Trade Association, 263 Summer Street, Boston, Mass.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Wool Trade Association, 155 West 44th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Philadelphia Wool and Textile Association, Post Office Box 472, Station S, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. Hester, Owen & Crowder, 432 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Brewers Association, 535 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $102.15.

A. M. F. Hicklin, Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.
B. Iowa Railway Committee, 507 Bankers Trust Building, Des Moines, Iowa.

A. Robert L. Higgins, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Electrical Contractors Association, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John W. Hight, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James A. Hirshfield, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Brig. Gen. J. D. Hittle, USMC (Ret.), 200 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.
D. (6) $1,166.67. E. (9) $30.30.

A. Lawrence S. Hobart, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ralph D. Hodges, Jr.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Irvin A. Hoff, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $47.50.

A. Frank N. Hoffman, United Steelworkers of America, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $4,000. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Lawrence J. Hogan, 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Joint Committee on Transportation for Metropolitan Washington (composed of Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, Federal City Council, Washington Board of Realtors, National Capital Downtown Committee.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) 98.15.

A. Lawrence J. Hogan, 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Apartment Owners Association.

A. Lawrence J. Hogan, 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Specialty Contractors' Association, Inc., 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $59.72.

A. Fuller Holloway, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Toilet Goods Association, Inc., 1270 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $5,100. E. (9) $541.21.

A. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $1,000.

A. Edwin M. Hood, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Shipbuilders Council of America, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Samuel H. Horne, 1145 Munsey Building, Washington, D.C
B. Park Sherman Co., 1200 Park Avenue, Murfreesboro, Tenn.

A. Donald E. Horton, 222 West Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Warehousemen's Association.

A. Charles L. Huber, 1701 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Disabled American Veterans, 1425 East McMillan Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.
D. (6) $3,375. E. (9) $4,966.44.

A. W. T. Huff, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $275.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Ashland Oil & Refining Co., 1409 Winchester Avenue, Ashland, Ky.

A. William J. Hull, 326 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ohio Valley Improvement Association, Inc.

A. Frank N. Ikard, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Illinois Railroad Association, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,193.89.

A. Bernard J. Imming, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,167.54. E. (9) $5,167.54.

A. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $5,744.29.

A. Institute of Appliance Manufacturers, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) 75 cents.

A. International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $1,875.

A. The Inter-State Manufacturers Association, 163–165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $2,975.

A. Iron Ore Lessors Association, Inc., 19 Summit Court, St. Paul, Minn.
D. (6) $29,731.23. E. (9) $12,184.62.

A. Robert C. Jackson, 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Textile Manufacturers Institute, Inc., 1501 Johnston Building, Charlotte, N. C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $248.35.

A. Walter K. Jaenicke, 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated General Contractors of America, Inc., 1957 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Daniel Jaspan, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,222.52. E. (9) $18.75.

A. Philip F. Jehle, National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Association of Retail Druggists, 1 East Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Joe Jenness, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert G. Jeter, Dresden, Tenn.
B. H. C. Spinks Clay Co., Paris, Tenn., et al.

A. Gilbert R. Johnson, 1208 Terminal Tower, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. Lake Carriers' Association, 305 Rockefeller Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Hugo E. Johnson, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.
B. American Iron Ore Association, 600 Bulkley Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. Reuben L. Johnson.
B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America (National Farmers Union), 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,646.02. E. (9) $243.17.

A. Ned Johnston, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. George Bliss Jones, Alabama Railroad Association, Montgomery, Ala.
B. Alabama Railroad Association, 1002 First National Bank Building, Montgomery, Ala.

A. L. Dan Jones, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $24.20.

A. Lyle W. Jones, 3206 Ferndale Street, Kensington, Md.
B. Illinois Association of Consulting Engineers, Post Office Box 1202, Springfield, Ill.

A. Phillip E. Jones, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Beet Sugar Association, 920 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. John E. Kane, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,187.50. E. (9) $265.35.

A. Sheldon Z. Kaplan, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Guatemala Sugar Producers Association, Guatemala City, Guatemala.

A. Karelsen & Karelsen, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $230.28.

A. William J. Keating, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Howard B. Keck, 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $300.

A. W. M. Keck, Jr., 9864 Wilshire Boulevard, Beverly Hills, Calif.
E. (9) $275.

A. Charles C. Keeble, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.
E. (9) $237.71.

A. Francis V. Keesling, Jr., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. West Coast Life Insurance Co., 605 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. John T. Kelly, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association.

A. I. L. Kenen, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Israel Public Affairs Committee, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold L. Kennedy, 420 Cafritz Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Marathon Oil Co., Findlay, Ohio.
E. (9) $140.70.

A. Franklin E. Kepner, Berwick Bank Building, Berwick, Pa.
B. Associated Railroads of Pennsylvania, Transportation Center, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. William J. Kerwin, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 907 Ring Building, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $50.

A. Ronald M. Ketcham.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Jeff Kibre, 1341 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Longshoremen's and Warehousemen's Union, 150 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $2,624.16. E. (9) $1,507.77.

A. Edward W. Kiley, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ludlow King, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. National Machine Tool Builders' Association, 2139 Wisconsin Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. T. Bert King, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Mr. and Mrs. Harry L. Kingman.
D. (6) $202.50. E. (9) $202.50

A. Clifton Kirkpatrick, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $315. E. (9) $17.68.

A. James F. Kmets, 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,552.

A. George W. Koch, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sears Roebuck and Co., 925 South Homan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Louis C. Krauthoff II, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Germaine Krettek, 200 C Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. American Library Association, 50 East Huron Street, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $3,810.87.

A. Herman C. Kruse, 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Pacific Gas & Electric Co., 245 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. June Kysilko, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Labor Bureau of Middle West, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Labor-Management Maritime Committee, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $7,990. E. (9) $7,314.25.

A. Kenneth C. Landry, 1735 New York Avenue N.W., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $100.

A. Richard H. Lane, 1511 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Committee for Broadening Commercial Bank Participation in Public Financing.

D. (6) $900.

A. J. Austin Latimer, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $900.

A. George H. Lawrence, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $312.50 E. (9) $126.54.

A. John V. Lawrence, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Trucking Associations, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $4.

A. Robert F. Lederer, 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

B. American Association of Nurserymen, Inc., 835 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $35. E. (9) $96.55.

A. Leonard F. Lee, 402 Solar Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Tennessee Gas Transmission Co., Post Office Box 2511, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) $29.

A. Legislative Committee for the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $110. E. (9) $4.50.

A. G. E. Leighty, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edith M. Lesser, 2924 Rittenhouse Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,206.66.

A. Roy T. Lester, M.D., One Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $375. E. (9) $15.25.

A. Morris J. Levin, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., Six Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) $500.

A. Hal Leyshon, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Federation of Musicians, 641 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $901.39.

A. Lawrence J. Linck & Co., 53 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $1,755.34.

A. Lester W. Lindow, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles B. Lipsen, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Retail Clerks International Association, AFL–CIO, 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $9,173.07. E. (9) $1,429.76.

A. Robert G. Litschert, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $382.50. E. (9) $145.36.

A. Basil R. Littin, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

B. Continental Oil Co.

A. Fred Livingston, 802 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Record Industry Association of America, Inc., One East 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John J. Long, 711 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. International Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union of North America, Pressmen's Home, Tenn.

D. (6) $1,300.

A. Paul H. Long, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Humble Oil & Refining Co., Post Office Box 2180, Houston, Tex.

E. (9) $41.20.

A. R. C. Longmire, Pauls Valley, Okla.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.

B. National Canners Association, 1133 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,500.

A. Otto Lowe, Cape Charles, Va.

B. Norfolk and Western Railway Co., Roanoke, Va.

D. (6) $600.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Mobile Homes Manufacturers Association, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $750.

A. Scott W. Lucas, 1028 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Medical Corp., 415–423 West Pershing Road, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. Milton F. Lunch, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Society of Professional Engineers.

D. (6) $750.

A. John C. Lynn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,458. E. (9) $24.13.

A. LeRoy E. Lyon, Jr., 11th & L Building, Sacramento, Calif.

B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

D. (6) $2,340.

A. Breck P. McAllister, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. John A. McCart, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Government Employees' Council, 100 Indiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,365.56.

A. Albert L. McDermott, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Hotel & Motel Association, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Angus H. McDonald.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,069.25. E. $177.78.

A. Joseph J. McDonald, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.

D. (6) $3,370. E. (9) $300.

A. Joseph T. McDonnell, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William F. McKenna, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $68.

A. Marvin L. McLain, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,267. E. (9) $12.77.

A. W. H. McMains, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William F. McManus, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $900. E. (9) $159.25.

A. Clarence M. McMillan, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Candy Wholesalers Association, Inc., 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William P. MacCracken, Jr., 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.

D. (6) $1,000.

A. David I. Mackie, 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N.J.

B. Eastern Railroad Presidents Conference, 1 Exchange Place, Jersey City, N.J.

A. H. E. Mahlman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.

D. (6) $687.50. E. (9) $36.54.

A. Don Mahon, 1127 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $644.92.

A. Carter Manasco, 4201 Chesterbrook Road, McLean, Va.
B. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,800. E. (9) $95.82.

A. D. L. Manion, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Short Line Railroad Association, 2000 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $188.13.

A. Manufacturing Chemists' Association, Inc., 1825 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,000.

A. Olya Margolin, 1637 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Council of Jewish Women, Inc., One West 47th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,242.02. E. (9) $151.15.

A. James Mark, Jr., 1435 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Mine Workers of America, 900 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,052.

A. Rodney W. Markley, Jr., Wyatt Building Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Raymond E. Marks, 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 65 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Robert O. Marritz, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue., NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $40.

A. David M. Marsh, 837 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, 110 William Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $150.

A. Winston W. Marsh.
B. National Tire Dealers and Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Fred T. Marshall, 1112 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The B. F. Goodrich Co., 300 South Main Street, Akron, Ohio.

A. J. Paull Marshall, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $33.29. E. (9) $35.

A. Thomas A. Martin, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mid-Continent Oil & Gas Association, 300 Tulsa Building, Tulsa, Okla.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $75.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association on Japanese Textile Imports, Inc., 551 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Mike M. Masaoka, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Japanese American Citizens League, 1634 Post Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Walter J. Mason, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Building and Construction Trades Department, AFL-CIO, 815 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,490.70. E. (9) $1,242.

A. David Mathews, Jr., 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.
B. Pittsburgh Coal Exchange, 345 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. P. H. Mathews, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $352.08. E. (9) $249.93.

A. Charles D. Matthews, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $99.16.

A. C. V. and R. V. Maudlin, 1111 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Secondary Material Industries, Inc., 271 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John S. Mears, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,916. E. (9) $4.50.

A. Donald Melvin, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $175.

A. Metropolitan Washington Board of Trade, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Michigan Hospital Service, 441 East Jefferson Avenue, Detroit, Mich.
E. (9) $1,546.50.

A. Midland Cooperative Dairy Association, Shawano, Wis., and Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. John R. Miles, 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.A., 1615 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Capt. A. Stanley Miller, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Committee for Flags of Necessity, 25 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $100.

A. Miller Associates, Inc., 1705 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The League of New York Theaters, Inc., and the National Association of the Legitimate Theater, Inc., 137 West 48th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $227.69.

A. Miller & Chevalier, 1001 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,850. E. (9) $148.86.

A. Edwin Reid Miller, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Nebraska Railroads Legislative Committee, 1004 Farnam Street, Omaha, Nebr.
D. (6) $3,465.

A. Lloyd S. Miller, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. American Telephone and Telegraph Co., 195 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250.

A. Luman G. Miller, 424 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.
B. Oregon Railroad Association, 424 Henry Building, Portland, Oreg.

A. Claude Minard, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.
B. California Railroad Association, 215 Market Street, San Francisco, Calif.

A. Othmer J. Mischo, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Missouri Railroad Committee, 906 Olive Street, St. Louis, Mo.

A. M. D. Mobley, 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Vocational Association, 1025 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Willis C. Moffatt, 536 First Security Building, Boise, Idaho.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, Pillsbury, Madison & Sutro, Standard Oil Building, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif., et al.

A. Marion S. Monk, Jr., Batchelor, La.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. G. Merrill Moody, 925 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Jennelle Moorhead, Eugene Continuation Center, Eugene, Oreg.

A. Jo V. Morgan, Jr., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Humane Association, Post Office Box 1266, Denver, Colo.
D. (6) $1,250. E. (9) $56.35.

A. Morison, Murphy, Clapp & Abrams, the Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Sperry & Hutchinson Co., 330 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Motor Commerce Association, Inc., 4004 Versailles Road, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $395.

A. Bernard R. Mullady, 1200 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.
D. (6) $2,730.

A. T. H. Mullen, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Paper & Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Pulpwood Association, 605 Third Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. T. H. Mullen, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pulp, Paper & Paperboard Institute (U.S.A.), Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Ray R. Murdock.
B. American Maritime Association, 17 Battery Place, New York, N.Y., and 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $700.

A. John J. Murphy, Wilelinor Estates, Route 2, Box 113-D, Edgewater, Md.
B. National Customs Service Association.

A. Robert F. Murphy, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.
D. (6) $2,397.60. E. (9) $35.70.

A. William E. Murray, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Augustus Nasmith, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.
B. Associated Railroads of New Jersey, Pennsylvania Station, Raymond Plaza, Newark, N.J.

A. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Associated Businessmen, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $900. E. (9) $735.24.

A. National Association of Direct Selling Cos., 163-165 Center Street, Winona, Minn.
D. (6) $13,750.

A. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $541.49. E. (9) $9,999.93.

A. National Association of Food Chains, 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250. E. (9) $250.

A. National Association of Frozen Food Packers, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,301.59. E. (9) $1,301.59.

A. National Association of Postal Supervisors, Post Office Box 1924, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $15,000. E. (9) $7,039.53.

A. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $18.05.

A. National Association of Social Security Beneficiaries, 1000 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.
D. (6) $696.86. E. (9) $503.75.

A. National Automobile Dealers Association (NADA), 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $9,310.63. E. (9) $9,310.63.

A. National Coal Association, Coal Building, Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for International Development, 1762 Church Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Committee for Research in Neurological Disorders, 386 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $5,000.

A. National Congress of Parents and Teachers, 700 North Rush Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Box 23, Memphis, Tenn.

A. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $1,061.76. E. (9) $1,061.76.

A. National Council of Agricultural Employers, 407 Union Trust Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $98.47. E. (9) $60.25.

A. National Electrical Contractors Association, Inc., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Electrical Manufacturers Association, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $296.36. E. (9) $296.36.

A. National Federation of Independent Business, Inc., 920 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $18,446.35. E. (9) $18,446.35.

A. National Fisheries Institute, Inc., 1614 20th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National League of Insured Savings Associations, 18th and M Streets NW., Washington, D.C.
B. First Federal Savings & Loan Association, Phoenix, Ariz., et al.
D. (6) $1,793.78. E. (9) $368.

A. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,311.89. E. (9) $1,813.10.

A. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,457.50. E. (9) $4,457.50.

A. National Multiple Sclerosis Society, 757 Park Avenue South, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $835.48.

A. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.; 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $9,654.10. E. (9) $9,654.10.

A. National Retail Furniture Association, 1150 Merchandise Mart, Chicago, Ill.

A. National Retail Merchants Association, 100 West 31st Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $8,699.04.

A. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5,587. E. (9) $7,411.08.

A. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
E. (9) $992.75.

A. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $74,088. E. (9) $3,636.

A. National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, 1343 L Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Utility Contractors Association, Inc., 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert R. Neal, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Health Insurance Association of America, 1701 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Alan M. Nedry, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Southern California Edison Co., Post Office Box 351, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $350.

A. Samuel E. Neel, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $2,205.85.

A. New England Shoe and Leather Association, 210 Lincoln Street, Boston, Mass.
D. (6) $540.82. E. (9) $540.82.

A. Sarah H. Newman, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Consumers League, 1029 Vermont Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George L. Nichols, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $1.60.

A. Patrick J. Nilan, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,374.96. E. (9) $245.19.

A. Stanley D. Noble, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Council of Profit Sharing Industries, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Charles M. Noone, 1209 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $360.47.

A. Mr. Joseph A. Noone, 514 Madison Building, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Agricultural Chemicals Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. O. L. Norman, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Companies, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $184.07.

A. Robert H. North, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers and Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Harry E. Northam, 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
B. Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, Inc., 185 North Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. Graham T. Northup, 1707 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Mortgage Bankers Association of America, 111 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $5,000. E. (9) $3,417.79.

A. E. M. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Michael J. Norton, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $100. E. (9) $187.75.

A. Ira H. Nunn, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $2,000.01. E. (9) $250.

A. William B. O'Connell, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen, 2247 West Lawrence Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. American Paper and Pulp Association, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. R. E. O'Connor, 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Pulp, Paper and Paperboard Institute (U.S.A.), Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. John B. O'Day, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Insurance Economics Society of America, 11 East Adams Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $6,922.63.

A. Jane O'Grady, 815 16th Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, 15 Union Square, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $1,625. E. (9) $191.62.

A. The Ohio Railroad Association, 16 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio.

A. Alvin E. Oliver, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Grain & Feed Dealers National Association, 400 Folger Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Clarence H. Olson, 1608 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The American Legion, 700 North Pennsylvania Street, Indianapolis, Ind.

D. (6) $3,888. E. (9) $75.65

A. Morris E. Osburn, Central Trust Building, Jefferson City, Mo.

B. Missouri Railroad Committee.

A. Kermit Overby, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $150.

A. John A. Overholt, 10315 Kensington Parkway, Kensington, Md.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,038.48.

A. Raymond S. Page, Jr., Mill Creek Terrace, Gladwyne, Pa.

B. Campbell Soup Co., 375 Memorial Avenue, Camden, N.J.

A. Walter Page, Box 128, Cazenovia, N.Y.

A. Everett L. Palmer, 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

B. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co., 901 Hamilton Street, Allentown, Pa.

A. Lew M. Paramore, Town House Hotel, Post Office Box 1310, Kansas City, Kans.

B. Mississippi Valley Association, 121 South Meramec, Clayton, Mo.

A. J. D. Parel, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Holcombe Parkes, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $9,750.

A. James D. Parriott, Jr., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

B. Marathon Oil Co., 539 South Main Street, Findlay, Ohio.

A. Robert D. Partridge, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $118.75.

A. James G. Patton.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo., and 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,375. E. (9) $223.14.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. Charitable Contributors Association, 100 Old York Road, Jenkintown, Pa.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. Family Tax Association, 2110 Girard Trust Building, Philadelphia, Pa.

D. (6) $400. E. (9) $133.85.

A. Philip C. Pendleton, Second Street Pike, Bryn Athyn, Pa.

B. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.

A. Peter J. Pestillo, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Restaurant Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 1530 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,699.96. E. (9) $125.

A. R. Wally Petersen, Lakeview, Mich.

B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Ervin L. Peterson, 1104 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Milk Industry Foundation and International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.

B. Florida Citrus Mutual, Lakeland, Fla.

D. (6) $1,200. E. (9) $43.50.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.

B. Florida Fruit & Vegetable Association, Post Office Box 6787, Orlando, Fla.

E. (9) $7.50.

A. J. Hardin Peterson, Post Office Drawer BS, Lakeland, Fla.

B. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Courthouse, Bradenton, Fla.

D. (6) $1,600. E. (9) $21.

A. Kenneth T. Peterson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Hotel & Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, 6 East Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

D. (6) $2,499.98.

A. Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard N. Philleo, 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,275.30. E. (9) $171.19.

A. Tom Pickett, 944 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $20.

A. T. E. Pinkston, 101 East High Street, Lexington, Ky.

A. James H. Pipkin, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Texaco, Inc., 135 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $700. E. (9) $1,203.

A. The Pitcairn Co., 100 West 10th Street, Wilmington, Del.

A. Plains Cotton Growers, Inc., 1720 Avenue M, Lubbock, Tex.

D. (6) $29,460.58. E. (9) $1,350.

A. Milton M. Plumb, Railway Labor Building, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Railway Labor Executives' Association, Railway Labor Building, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. James K. Polk, 522 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

B. Consolidated Edison Co. of New York, Inc., 4 Irving Place, New York, N.Y.

A. Robert R. Poston, 908 Colorado Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, 200 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $900. E. (9) $136.81.

A. Ramsay D. Potts, 910 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $4,999.98. E. (9) $83.85.

A. William J. Potts, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association on Broadcasting Standards, Inc., 1741 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Richard M. Powell, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, 1210 Tower Building, Washington, D.C.

A. William I. Powell, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Independent Petroleum Association of America, 1110 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $3.20.

A. Graydon R. Powers, Jr., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Maximum Service Telecasters, Inc., 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William H. Press, 1616 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,500.

A. Forrest J. Prettyman, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $125. E. (9) $3.

A. Pulp, Paper and Paperboard Institute (U.S.A.), Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Luke C. Quinn, Jr., 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Cancer Society, New York, N.Y., et al.
D. (6) $13,250.01. E. (9) $7,763.68.

A. Alex Radin, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Public Power Association, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Bermuda Trade Development Board, Hamilton, Bermuda.
D. (6) $1,666.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Sea-Land Service, Inc., Post Office Box 1050, Elizabeth, N.J.
D. (6) $900.

A. Ragan & Mason, 900 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Seatrain Lines, Inc., 595 River Road, Edgewater, N.J.
D. (6) $900.

A. Edward F. Ragland, 6917 Marbury Road, Bethesda, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Labor Executives' Association, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Railway Progress Institute, 38 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Alan T. Rains, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Donald J. Ramsey 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Silver Users Association, 1725 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $450. E. (9) $30.76.

A. James A. Ransford, 1701 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Tidewater Oil Co., Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Stanley Rector, 520 Hotel Washington, Washington, D.C.
B. Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.
D. (6) $1,000.

A. Otie M. Reed, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,549.97. E. (9) $4,799.67.

A. W. O. Reed, 6254 Woodland Drive Dallas, Tex.
B. Texas railroads.

A. J. A. Reidelbach, Jr., 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Home Manufacturers Association, 1117 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $200.

A. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $124,905.33.

A. Retired Officers Tax Credit Committee, Box 1965, Annapolis, Md.
D. (6) $2,256.50. E. (9) $2,018.76.

A. Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the U.S. Government, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $4,488.20. E. (9) $8,897.43.

A. F. Marion Rhodes, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.
B. New York Cotton Exchange, 60 Beaver Street, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Richards, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,133.34. E. (9) $15.96.

A. Dorsey Richardson, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
B. Investment Company Institute, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Harry H. Richardson, 335 Austin Street, Bogalusa, La.
B. Louisiana railroads.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. C.I.T. Financial Corp., 650 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Committee of Consumer Finance Companies, Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Entertainment Law Committee, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Indian Sugar Mills Association, Calcutta, India.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Mutual Benefit Health & Accident Association, Omaha, Nebr.

A. James W. Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., Bloomington, Ill.

A. Richard J. Riddick, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Freight Forwarders Institute, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,750. E. (9) $192.95.

A. Siert F. Riepma, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers, Munsey Building, Washington, D.C.

A. C. E. Rightor, 7211 Cedar Avenue, Takoma Park, Md.
B. Committee for Study of Revenue Bond Financing, 149 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

A. Gloria Riordan, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, AFL–CIO, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. John Rippey, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Credit Union National Association, Inc., 1617 Sherman Avenue, Madison, Wis.
D. (6) $550. E. (9) $95.97.

A. Paul H. Robbins, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Society of Professional Engineers, 2029 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $250.

A. Clyde F. Roberts, Jr., 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Manufacturers, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Roberts & Holland, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. I.O.S., Ltd. (S.A.), 119, rue de Lausanne, Geneva, Switzerland.

A. Charles A. Robinson, Jr., 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $179.

A. Rogers & Cowan, Inc., 598 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. and 250 North Canon Drive, Beverly Hills, Calif.
B. Robert Bosch Corp., 4025 Crescent Street, Long Island City, N.Y.
E. (9) $3,153.28.

A. Donald L. Rogers, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Association of Registered Bank Holding Companies, 730 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $437.50.

A. Frank W. Rogers, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Western Oil & Gas Association, 609 South Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.
D. (6) $526.

A. T. J. Ross & Associates, Inc., 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
B. Committee of American Steamship Lines.
D. (6) $6,000. E. (9) $2,950.54.

A. Raymond A. Rourke, 333 Medford Street, Charlestown, Mass.
B. Revere Sugar Refinery, 333 Medford Street, Charlestown, Mass.

A. Edmond F. Rovner, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Union of Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers, AFL–CIO, 1126 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,250.

A. Royall, Koegel & Rogers, 1730 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Pinkerton's National Detective Agency, Inc., 154 Nassau Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $2.36.

A. John Forney Rudy, 902 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., Akron, Ohio.

A. Albert R. Russell, 1918 North Parkway, Memphis, Tenn.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Oswald Ryan, 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Air Traffic Control Association, Inc., 528 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500. E. (9) $27.10.

A. William H. Ryan, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. District Lodge No. 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $3,000.36. E. (9) $60.

A. Kermit B. Rykken, 1712 G Street, NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Automobile Association, 1712 G Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert A. Saltzstein, 1300 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Associated Business Publications, Inc., 205 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. O. H. Saunders, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Retired Officers Association, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,112.50.

A. William H. Scheick, 1735 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The American Institute of Architects, 1735 New York Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $100.

A. C. Herschel Schooley, 815 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Bankers Association, Sauk Centre, Minn.
D. (6) $12,000. E. (9) $2,440.

A. Durward Seals, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Hollis M. Seavey, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Broadcasters, 1771 N Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Leo Seybold, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. 6) $665. E. (9) $195.70.

A. Alvin Shapiro, 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Merchant Marine Institute, Inc., 919 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 Broadway, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $375. E. (9) $59.45.

A. David C. Sharman, 1025 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. American Optometric Association, Inc., 100 West Pine Street, Selinsgrove, Pa.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $445.03.

A. A. Manning Shaw, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brown & Lund, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $604.

A. Carroll M. Shaw, 6326 Southcrest Drive, Shreveport, La.
B. Amalgamated Transit Union, AFL-CIO, 5025 Wisconsin Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. John J. Sheehan, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United Steelworkers of America, 1500 Commonwealth Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $3,000. E. (9) $300.

A. Ira Shesser, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Max Shine, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $992.50. E. (9) $20.

A. Robert L. Shortle, 306 International Trade Mart, New Orleans, La.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 121 South Meramec, Clayton, Mo.

A. Charles B. Shuman, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $750.

A. Sidley, Austin, Burgess & Smith, 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill., and 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Inland Steel Co., 30 West Monroe Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Silver Users Association, 1725 Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $220. E. (9) $1,260.74.

A. Six Agency Committee, 909 South Broadway, Los Angeles, Calif.
E. (9) $3,585.

A. Jack C. Skerrett, 717 South 19th Street, Arlington, Va.
B. The Camping Club of America, Inc., 945 Pennsylvania Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Harold S. Skinner, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.
B. Continental Oil Co.

A. Carstens Slack, 1625 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Phillips Petroleum Co., Barttesville, Okla.

A. Harold Slater, One Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.
B. American Medical Association, 535 North Dearborn Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $875. E. (9) $40.90.

A. Stephen Slipher, 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $3,125.

A. T. W. Smiley, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
B. Illinois Railroad Association, 135 East 11th Place, Chicago, Ill.
E. (9) $1,193.89.

A. Gordon L. Smith, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Edward Gottlieb & Associates, Ltd., 640 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold Arden Smith, 605 West Olympic Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. Standard Oil Co. of California, 225 Bush Street, San Francisco, Calif.
D. (6) $200. E. (9) $125.

A. Irvin A. Smith, 418 East Rosser, Box 938, Bismarck, N. Dak.
B. Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn., et al.
E. (9) $66.

A. James R. Smith, 1060 Omaha National Bank Building, Omaha, Nebr.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 121 South Meramec, Clayton, Mo.

A. Lloyd W. Smith, 416 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Chicago, Burlington & Quincy Railroad Co., 547 West Jackson Boulevard, Chicago, Ill. and Great Northern Railway Co., 175 East Fourth Street, St. Paul, Minn.

A. Robert B. Smith, 41 D Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. Wallace M. Smith, Pennsylvania Building, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. Wayne H. Smithey, 1200 Wyatt Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

A. Lyle O. Snader, 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Frank B. Snodgrass, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Post Office Box 860, Lexington, Ky.
D. (6) $325. E. (9) $151.50

A. Edward F. Snyder, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,918.27.

A. J. R. Snyder, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen.

A. Society for Animal Protective Legislation, 745 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $2,585.40. E. (9) $2,285.46.

A. William W. Spear, 214 Fremont National Bank Building, Fremont, Nebr.
B. Standard Oil Co., 910 South Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $729.17. E. (9) $8.58.

A. John F. Speer, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.
B. International Association of Ice Cream Manufacturers & Milk Industry Foundation, 1105 Barr Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Marian S. Stafford, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Employment Association, 2000 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300.

A. Mrs. Nell May F. Stephens, Post Office Box 6234, Northeast station, Washington, D.C.

A. Russell M. Stephens, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Federation of Technical Engineers, 900 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $240. E. (9) $20.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Claims in Cuba Committee, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $80. E. (9) $4.50.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Hamilton Watch Co., and Elgin Watch Co.
D. (6) $100.

A. Steptoe & Johnson, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. U.S. Foreign Investment Committee, 1100 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $60. E. (9) $3.

A. Mrs. Alexander Stewart, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, 120 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $23,722.44. E. (9) $7,340.34.

A. Sterling F. Stoudenmire, Jr., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

B. Waterman Steamship Corp., 61 Saint Joseph Street, Mobile, Ala.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Federation of American Scientists, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Hualapai Tribe of the Hualapai Reservation, Peach Springs, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Salt River Pima-Maricopa Community, Post Office Box 907–X, Scottsdale, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The San Carlos Apache Tribe, San Carlos, Ariz.

A. Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank & Kampelman, 1700 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. The Seneca Nation of Indians, 25 Main Street, Salamanca, N.Y.

A. Ronnie J. Straw, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William A. Stringfellow, 6004 Roosevelt Street, Bethesda, Md., 827 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Mutual Insurance Agents, 827 Investment Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Norman Strunk, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

B. United States Savings & Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,875.

A. Garn S. Studebaker, Tipp City, Ohio.

B. National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Walter B. Stults, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, 537 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $600.

A. Barry Sullivan, 536 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of River and Harbor Contractors, 3900 North Charles Street, Baltimore, Md.

A. Roger H. Sullivan.

B. American Sugar Co., 120 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Frank L. Sundstrom, 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

B. Schenley Industries, Inc., 1290 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. C. Austin Sutherland, 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Tank Truck Carriers, Inc., 1616 P Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Noble J. Swearingen, 224 East Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

B. National Tuberculosis Association, 1790 Broadway, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $250.

A. Russell A. Swindell, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.

B. North Carolina Railroad Association, Post Office Box 2635, Raleigh, N.C.

D. (6) $2,753.88. E. (9) $787.47.

A. Charles P. Taft, 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Legislative Committee of the Committee for a National Trade Policy, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Glenn J. Talbott.

B. The Farmers' Educational and Co-Operative Union of America, 1575 Sherman Street, Denver, Colo.; 1404 New York Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. C. M. Tarr, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Retired Civil Employees, 1625 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $1,846.14. E. (9) $14.10.

A. John I. Taylor, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,500. E. (9) $13.29

A. J. B. Thayn, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,469. E. (9) $16.36.

A. J. Woodrow Thomas, 1000 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Trans World Airlines, Inc., 10 Richards Road, Kansas City, Mo.

E. (9) $48.75.

A. Oliver A. Thomas, 1 East First Street, Reno, Nev.

B. Nevada Railroad Association, 1 East First Street, Reno, Nev.

A. William B. Thompson, Jr., 244 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

B. Association of American Railroads, Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.

A. J. R. Timmins & Co., 37 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

A. William H. Tinney, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. M. S. Tisdale, 2355 Alameda Street, Vallejo, Calif.

B. Armed Services Committee, Chamber of Commerce, Vallejo, Calif.

D. (6) $147.50.

A. Tobacco Associates, Inc., 1025 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,349.

A. H. Willis Tobler, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. National Milk Producers Federation, 30 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $3,125. E. (9) $110.65.

A. John H. Todd, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

B. National Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association, 1085 Shrine Building, Memphis, Tenn.

A. Bert Tollefson, Jr., 1 Farragut Square South, Washington, D.C.

B. Blue Cross Association, 840 North Lake Shore Drive, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $917. E. (9) $320.31.

A. Dwight D. Townsend, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Cooperative League of USA, 59 East Van Buren Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Townsend Plan, Inc., 808 North Capitol Street, Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $6,480.15. E. (9) $2,357.77.

A. F. Gerald Toye, 777 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. General Electric Co., 570 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

D. (6) $750. E. (9) $40.40.

A. Trade Relations Council of the United States, Inc., 122 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Matt Triggs, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,867. E. (9) $19.81.

A. Glenwood S. Troop, Jr., 812 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

B. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

D. (6) $1,875.

A. Joel B. True, 1800 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

B. The Tobacco Institute, Inc., 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. G. Douglas Trussell, National Association of Manufacturers, 918 16th Street, Washington, D.C.

B. National Association of Manufacturers, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dick Tullis, 607 Maple Terrace, Dallas, Tex.

B. Superior Oil Co., Houston, Tex., and Los Angeles, Calif.

A. John W. Turner, Railway Labor Building, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers Building, Cleveland, Ohio.

A. William S. Tyson, 821 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. Western Range Association, 375 North Fulton Street, Fresno, Calif.

E. (9) $41.92.

A. Union Producing Co., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.

E. (9) $820.45.

A. United Federation of Postal Clerks, 817 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $323,409.44. E. (9) $35,661.55.

A. U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association, 1001 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

E. (9) $1,836.78.

A. U.S. Foreign Investment Committee.

D. (6) $63. E. (9) $63.

A. United States Savings and Loan League, 221 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

E. (9) $19,190.11.

A. Valicenti, Leighton, Reid & Stock, 70 Pine Street, New York, N.Y.

B. Channing Service Corp., 85 Broad Street, New York, N.Y.

A. Theodore A. Vanderzyde, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

B. District Lodge 44, International Association of Machinists, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.

D. (6) $2,500.30. E. (9) $15.

A. John E. Vetter, National Legislation Committee, American Collectors Association, 635 F Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. R. K. Vinson, 1400 20th Street NW., Post Office Box 19128, Washington, D.C.
B. Machinery Dealers National Association, 1400 20th Street NW, Post Office Box 19128, Washington, D.C.

A. B. J. Viviano, 1223 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Pennsylvania Railroad Co., 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. The Voice of the People in Action (The Society of the People, Inc.), 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
B. Dr. Russell Forrest Egner, 621 Sheridan Street, Chillum, Md.
D. (6) $191. E. (9) $170.24.

A. Stephen M. Walter, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Electric Cos., 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $298.75.

A. William A. Walton, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.
B. Kansas Railroad Committee, 920 Jackson Street, Topeka, Kans.

A. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $6,107.50. E. (9) $3,001.21.

A. Jeremiah C. Waterman, 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Southern Pacific Co., 205 Transportation Building, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $500.

A. Waterways Bulk Transportation Council, Inc., 10 East 40th Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $250.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Atlantic Refining Co., 260 South Broad Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
D. (6) $100.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Eastern Meat Packers Association, Inc., 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $5. E. (9) $2.24.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The National Independent Meat Packers Association, 1820 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $225. E. (9) $24.61.

A. Weaver & Glassie, 1527 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. J. R. Timmins & Co., 37 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $21.92.

A. William H. Webb, LaSalle Building, Washington, D.C.
B. National Rivers and Harbors Congress, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $2,813.04. E. (9) $405.51.

A. Peter P. Weidenbruch, Jr., 510 Shoreham Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Socony Mobile Oil Co., Inc., 150 East 42d Street, New York, N.Y.
D. (6) $1,125. E. (9) $187.72.

A. Dr. Frank J. Welch, 3724 Manor Road, Chevy Chase, Md.
B. The Tobacco Institute, 1735 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Joseph E. Welch, 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.
B. Wellington Management Co., 1630 Locust Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. West Coast Inland Navigation District, Court House, Bradenton, Fla.
E. (9) $601.30.

A. Marc A. White, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Securities Dealers, Inc.

A. Louis E. Whyte, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Independent Natural Gas Association of America, 918 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Claude C. Wild., Jr., 1120 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Gulf Oil Corp., Pittsburgh, Pa.
D. (6) $1,000. E. (9) $250.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Society of Travel Agents, Inc., 360 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.
E. (9) $32.76.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Arapahoe Indian Tribe, Fort Washakie, Wyo.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Quinaielt Tribe of Indians, Taholah, Wash.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Frank B. Rowlett, 143 Chatham Road, Ellicott City, Md.
E. (9) $8.85.

A. Wilkinson, Cragun & Barker, 1616 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Spokane Indian Tribes, Wellpinit, Wash.

A. Harding deC. Williams, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $1,833. E. (9) $83.30.

A. Robert E. Williams, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Air Transport Association of America, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $465. E. (9) $202.95.

A. John C. Williamson, 1300 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Real Estate Boards, 36 South Wabash Avenue, Chicago, Ill.
D. (6) $4,167. E. (9) $85.25.

A. Clark L. Wilson, Associations Building, 1145 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Consultant to Emergency Lead-Zinc Committee.
D. (6) $750. E. (9) $190.07.

A. E. Raymond Wilson, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
B. Friends Committee on National Legislation, 245 Second Street NE., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $1,687.18.

A. Henry B. Wilson, 1612 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), 30 Rockefeller Plaza, New York, N.Y.

A. Richard W. Wilson, 41 D Street SE., Washington, D.C.
B. National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, 2000 Florida Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $150.

A. W. E. Wilson, 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
B. Union Producing Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La., and United Gas Pipe Line Co., 1525 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La.
D. (6) $600. E. (9) $220.45.

A. Morton M. Winston.
B. Cleary, Gottlieb, Steen & Hamilton, 224 Southern Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Everett T. Winter, 121 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.
B. Mississippi Valley Association, 121 South Meramec, St. Louis, Mo.

A. Richard F. Witherall, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.
B. Colorado Railroad Association, 702 Majestic Building, Denver, Colo.

A. Lawton B. Wolfe, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. Distilled Spirits Institute, 1132 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Venlo Wolfsohn, 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Institute of Scrap Iron & Steel, Inc., 1729 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
D. (6) $300. E. (9) $0.75.

A. Russell J. Woodman, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers, 3860 Lindell Boulevard, St. Louis, Mo.

A. J. Banks Young, 1200 18th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Cotton Council of America, Post Office Box 12285, Memphis, Tenn.
D. (6) $204. E. (9) $42.54.

A. Gordon K. Zimmerman, Washington, D.C.
B. National Association of Soil & Water Conservation Districts, League City, Tex.

A. Zimring, Gromfine and Sternstein, 1155 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C., and 11 South LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

The following registrations were submitted for the fourth calendar quarter 1964:

REGISTRATIONS

(NOTE.—The form used for registration is reproduced below. In the interest of economy in the RECORD, questions are not repeated, only the essential answers are printed, and are indicated by their respective letter and number.)

FILE ONE COPY WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE AND FILE TWO COPIES WITH THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES:

This page (page 1) is designed to supply identifying data; and page 2 (on the back of this page) deals with financial data.

PLACE AN "X" BELOW THE APPROPRIATE LETTER OR FIGURE IN THE BOX AT THE RIGHT OF THE "REPORT" HEADING BELOW:

"PRELIMINARY" REPORT ("Registration"): To "register," place an "X" below the letter "P" and fill out page 1 only.

"QUARTERLY" REPORT: To indicate which one of the four calendar quarters is covered by this Report, place an "X" below the appropriate figure. Fill out both page 1 and page 2 and as many additional pages as may be required. The first additional page should be numbered as page "3," and the rest of such pages should be "4," "5," "6," etc. Preparation and filing in accordance with instructions will accomplish compliance with all quarterly reporting requirements of the Act.

Year: 19------ ◄

REPORT

PURSUANT TO FEDERAL REGULATION OF LOBBYING ACT

	QUARTER			
P	1st	2d	3d	4th

(Mark one square only)

NOTE ON ITEM "A".—(a) IN GENERAL. This "Report" form may be used by either an organization or an individual, as follows:

(i) "Employee".—To file as an "employee", state (in Item "B") the name, address, and nature of business of the "employer". (If the "employee" is a firm [such as a law firm or public relations firm], partners and salaried staff members of such firm may join in filing a Report as an "employee".)

(ii) "Employer".—To file as an "employer", write "None" in answer to Item "B".

(b) SEPARATE REPORTS. An agent or employee should not attempt to combine his Report with the employer's Report:

(i) Employers subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their agents or employees.

(ii) Employees subject to the Act must file separate Reports and are not relieved of this requirement merely because Reports are filed by their employers.

A. ORGANIZATION OR INDIVIDUAL FILING:

1. State name, address, and nature of business.

2. If this Report is for an Employer, list names or agents or employees who will file Reports for this Quarter.

NOTE ON ITEM "B".—*Reports by Agents or Employees.* An employee is to file, each quarter, as many Reports as he has employers, except that: (*a*) If a particular undertaking is jointly financed by a group of employers, the group is to be considered as one employer, but all members of the group are to be named, and the contribution of each member is to be specified; (*b*) if the work is done in the interest of one person but payment therefor is made by another, a single Report—naming both persons as "employers"—is to be filed each quarter.

B. EMPLOYER.—State name, address, and nature of business. If there is no employer, write "None."

NOTE ON ITEM "C".—(*a*) The expression "in connection with legislative interests," as used in this Report, means "in connection with attempting, directly or indirectly, to influence the passage or defeat of legislation." "The term 'legislation' means bills, resolutions, amendments, nominations, and other matters pending or proposed in either House of Congress, and includes any other matter which may be the subject of action by either House"—§ 302(e).

(*b*) Before undertaking any activities in connection with legislative interests, organizations and individuals subject to the Lobbying Act are required to file a "Preliminary" Report (Registration).

(*c*) After beginning such activities, they must file a "Quarterly" Report at the end of each calendar quarter in which they have either received or expended anything of value in connection with legislative interests.

C. LEGISLATIVE INTERESTS, AND PUBLICATIONS in connection therewith:

1. State approximately how long legislative interests are to continue. If receipts and expenditures in connection with legislative interests have terminated, ☐ place an "X" in the box at the left, so that this Office will no longer expect to receive Reports.

2. State the general legislative interests of the person filing and set forth the *specific* legislative interests by reciting: (*a*) Short titles of statutes and bills; (*b*) House and Senate numbers of bills, where known; (*c*) citations of statutes, where known; (*d*) whether for or against such statutes and bills.

3. In the case of those publications which the person filing has caused to be issued or distributed in connection with legislative interests, set forth: (*a*) Description, (*b*) quantity distributed; (*c*) date of distribution, (*d*) name of printer or publisher (if publications were paid for by person filing) or name of donor (if publications were received as a gift).

(Answer items 1, 2, and 3 in the space below. Attach additional pages if more space is needed)

4. If this is a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) rather than a "Quarterly" Report, state below what the nature and amount of anticipated expenses will be; and if for an agent or employee, state also what the daily, monthly, or annual rate of compensation is to be. If this is a "Quarterly" Report, disregard this item "C4" and fill out item "D" and "E" on the back of this page. Do not attempt to combine a "Preliminary" Report (Registration) with a "Quarterly" Report.◄

AFFIDAVIT

[Omitted in printing]

PAGE 1◄

A. Mrs. Donna Allen, 3306 Ross Place NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Committee To Abolish HUAC, 555 North Western Avenue, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. William E. Amlong, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Club Association, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. William J. Belknap, Corning, N.Y.
B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y.

A. Robert J. Bird, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.
B. Paul Revere Life Insurance Co., Worcester, Mass.

A. Samuel E. Boyle, 6519 Elgin Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Christian Amendment Movement, 804 Penn Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pa.

A. Monroe Butler, 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.
B. The Superior Oil Co., 550 South Flower Street, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. W. W. Carson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Order of Railway Conductors & Brakemen, O.R.C. & B. Building, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

A. John D. Conner, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. General Time Corp., 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. John Jay Daly, 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Direct Mail Advertising Association, Inc., 20 Chevy Chase Circle NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles A. Darnell, 1917 11th Avenue, Huntington, W. Va.
B. Sheet Metal Workers' International Association, 1000 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, D.C.

A. F. Gibson Darrison, Jr., 1010 Pennsylvania Building, Washington, D.C.
B. New York Central Railroad Co., 466 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Dawson, Griffin, Pickens & Riddell, 731 Washington Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Nursing Home Association, 1346 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert F. DeLay, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. Henry G. Fischer, 1735 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Educational Television, 10 Columbus Circle, New York, N.Y.

A. Harold F. Forsyth, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Lumber Manufacturers Association, 1619 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Charles A. Francik, 1629 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Corning Glass Works, Corning, N.Y.

A. General Time Corp., 355 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y.

A. R. B. Gerrie, 110 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. Morton Salt Co., 110 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill., and Salt Institute, 33 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Carey W. Hilliard, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The National Rural Letter Carriers' Association, 1040 Warner Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Lawrence J. Hogan, 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Apartment Association of America, Inc., 1022 15th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Lee B. Holmes, Pennsylvania Building, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Mutual Insurance Alliance, 20 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.

A. David Paul Houlihan, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. United States-Japan Trade Council, 1000 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. George H. Lawrence, 1625 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Petroleum Institute, 1271 Avenue of the Americas, New York, N.Y.

A. Edith M. Lesser, 2924 Rittenhouse Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Washington Home Rule Committee, Inc., 924 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. L. M. McBride, 110 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill.
B. Morton Salt Co., 110 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill., and Salt Institute, 33 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Stanley J. McFarland, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Edmund McIlhenny, 1500 National Bank of Commerce Building, New Orleans, La.
B. Morton Salt Co., 110 North Wacker Drive, Chicago, Ill., and Salt Institute, 33 North LaSalle Street, Chicago, Ill.

A. Joseph R. MacLaren, Four Linden Drive, Hudson Falls, N.Y.
B. Potlatch Forests, Inc., Lewiston, Idaho.

A. Carlos Moore, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.
B. International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 25 Louisiana Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

A. National Club Association, 1522 K Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. J. Ronald Nowland, 425 13th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. American Farm Bureau Federation, 1000 Merchandise Mart Plaza, Chicago, Ill.

A. Kenneth T. Peterson, 400 First Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, 6 East Fourth Street, Cincinnati, Ohio.

A. Purcell & Nelson, 888 17th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. Insular Lumber Co., Boulevard Building, 1819 John F. Kennedy Boulevard, Philadelphia, Pa.

A. James W. Respess, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Education Association, 1201 16th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert L. Smith, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.
B. National Federation of Federal Employees, 1737 H Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. F. Bourne Upham, III, 1102 Ring Building, Washington, D.C.
B. American Mining Congress, Ring Building, Washington, D.C.

A. Mrs. Lois W. Van Valkenburgh, 1673 Preston Road, Alexandria, Va.
B. Citizens Committee for UNICEF, 20 E Street NW., Washington, D.C.

A. Robert P. Will, 989 National Press Building, Washington, D.C.
B. The Metropolitan Water District of Southern California, 1111 Sunset Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.

A. Gene M. Woodfin, 42 Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Judicial Review of Dismissal or Suspension of Classified Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have reintroduced my bill to give persons in the classified civil service a right to a hearing before removal and suspension and a right to judicial review of dismissal or suspension in the Federal judicial district where they were employed.

Under this bill, a dismissed or suspended employee may have judicial review of his dismissal or suspension in the judicial district where he was employed. Under present law, employees must come to Washington, and this expense deprives many of their day in court.

My bill would humanize this presently unjust and unfair law.

This remedial legislation should receive the more serious and favorable consideration of the Congress.

Public Opinion Poll—15th Congressional District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the results of my request for the opinions of residents of the 15th Congressional District of Illinois on some of the problems facing our Nation. I was gratified by the tremendous response to my poll—with a total of 18,745 completed questionnaires returned to me and tabulated as of March 26.

The results of the poll are as follows:

Results of Representative CHARLOTTE T. REID'S *public opinion poll*

	Percent		
	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you feel that fiscal responsibility demands that the Federal Government must operate within a balanced budget?	89.7	9.0	1.3
2. Because of deficit financing, the temporary national debt limit has been increased by $31,000,000,000 in the last 4 years. Do you favor the administration's request for a further increase in the national debt limit beyond the present $324,000,000,000?	7.8	90.3	1.9
3. President Johnson is asking Congress to approve a greatly expanded program of Federal aid to education at all levels—preschool to graduate—increasing the fiscal year 1966 education budget to a total of $8,600,000,000, with $1,500,000,000 of this in completely new programs.			
(a) Do you favor this greatly expanded Federal aid to education program?	36.9	58.9	4.2
(b) Do you favor aid to students in both private and parochial schools?	26.2	69.1	4.7
4. Do you favor the administration's compulsory plan to provide limited hospital and nursing home care for people over 65, regardless of need, to be financed through new payroll taxes on present employees and employers covered by social security?	12.1	85.7	2.2
5. Do you favor a constitutional amendment which would allow prayer and Bible reading on a voluntary basis in our public schools, thereby rescinding recent Supreme Court decisions?	82.4	15.6	2.0
6. Do you favor a constitutional amendment to return to each individual State its right to apportion 1 house of its bicameral legislature on factors other than population if its citizens so desire?	75.2	17.3	7.5
7. Sec. 14B of the Taft-Hartley Act permits the individual States to pass "right to work" laws if they so desire. Do you favor repeal of sec. 14B, thereby making it illegal for a State to pass a "right to work" law?	20.6	71.7	7.7
8. Do you favor the administration's proposal to revise the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act to abolish the national origin quota system, to establish a general quota pool not based on country of origin, and to increase the total number of immigrants coming to the United States?	16.6	77.4	6.0
9. Do you favor an agricultural program which would provide a gradual reduction in the level of price supports and production controls?	80.4	14.1	5.5
10. Do you favor—			
(a) U.S. aid to Communist-bloc nations?	6.1	80.3	13.6
(b) Expanded trade with Communist-bloc nations?	23.7	70.5	5.8

Walla Walla, Wash., To Honor Naval Hero

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, this coming May 15 the citizens of Walla Walla, Wash., will dedicate a public park to the memory of one of the outstanding Naval heroes of World War II, Capt. Albert Harold Rooks.

I bring this event to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress because many Members of Congress may well recall the extraordinary heroism and courage displayed by Captain Rooks while commanding the cruiser U.S.S. *Houston* during World War II. Facing overwhelming odds Captain Rooks gave his life to the cause of liberty when he was killed by enemy fire as he directed the *Houston's* final fight. Prior to that time, in a series of engagements between February 4 and 27, 1942, Captain Rooks displayed extraordinary heroism, outstanding courage, gallantry in action, and distinguished service as commanding officer of the *Houston* while in action against superior Japanese enemy aerial and surface forces. He was posthumously awarded our Nation's highest recognition, the Congressional Medal of Honor. I would like to read the accompanying citation:

> For extraordinary heroism, outstanding courage, gallantry in action, and distinguished service in the line of his profession, as commanding officer of the U.S.S. *Houston* during the period February 4 to 27, 1942, while in action with superior Japanese enemy aerial and surface forces. While proceeding to attack an enemy amphibious expedition, as a unit in a mixed force, *Houston* was heavily attacked by bombers; after evading four attacks, she was heavily hit in a fifth attack, lost 60 killed and had 1 turret wholly disabled. Captain Rooks made his ship again seaworthy and sailed within 3 days to escort an important reinforcing convoy from Darwin to Koepang, Timor, Netherlands East Indies. While so engaged, another powerful air attack developed which by *Houston's* marked efficiency was fought off without much damage to the convoy. The commanding general of all forces in the area thereupon canceled the movement and Captain Rooks escorted the convoy back to Darwin. Later, while in a considerable American-British-Dutch force engaged with an overwhelming force of Japanese surface ships, *Houston* with H.M.S. *Exeter* carried the brunt of the battle, and her fire alone heavily damaged one and possibly two heavy cruisers. Although heavily damaged in the actions, Captain Rooks succeeded in disengaging his ship when the flag officer commanding broke off the action and got her safely away from the vicinity, whereas one-half of the cruisers were lost.

I am proud to state, Mr. Speaker, that Capt. Albert Harold Rooks was born in Whitman County of my congressional district, educated at Walla Walla High School and graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1914.

Dedication of the park by Walla Walla citizens to the memory of Captain Rooks is a fitting memorial. It should help remind all of us of not only the heroism of Captain Rooks, but the sacrifice of the thousands of other Americans who fought and died in the cause of liberty.

Fukumoto Brothers Display Great Public Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, on March 9 of this year I inserted in the daily RECORD an article from the Honolulu Star-Bulletin on February 10. That article, Mr. Speaker, described one of the sources of the strength and vitality of our great State of Hawaii—the willingness of its citizens to assist one another in times of chaos and disaster.

One of the unsung heroes which upheld this great tradition during the recent floods at Keapuka was Delivery Service, Inc., owned and operated by these brothers, Richard, Rikino, and Harold Fukumoto. With no thought of the economic loss which they would sustain, the Fukumoto brothers volunteered their trucks, drivers, and helpers to transport the water-damaged appliances between Keapuka and the service shops. Indeed, this was no small effort and expense on their part. I take pride in being personally acquainted with the Fukumoto brothers and pleasure in commending them for their action.

Seasonal Use of Foreign Workers in Fruits, Vegetables, and Other High Labor Crops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 31, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, a telegram was sent to Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, on March 30 by a large number of Members of the House of Representatives. The full text of the wire and list of Members sending it follows:

MARCH 30, 1965.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
The Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.:

Members of Congress interested in agriculture are shocked by your reported attitude that seasonal use of foreign workers in fruits, vegetables, and other high labor crops is unnecessary and will not be approved. Planting time is here and thousands of acres will not be planted because there is no assurance of labor to tend and harvest crops. This is particularly harsh on small farmers who cannot carry out on their own extensive, expensive, and repeated recruitment campaigns to try to obtain domestic workers. Perhaps consumers will be able to afford the increase in prices which will inevitably result from your reported attitude but packinghouse and cannery workers, truckers, and producers cannot afford the loss of their jobs and their income. The clear intent of Congress in permitting the Mexican labor law to lapse was that existing provisions of the immigration law should be used to meet seasonal labor shortages. This is clear from committee reports and from debate in the House and Senate. American farmers will gladly use American workers if your Department can provide them and give assurance that they will stay on the job. But until you can provide such workers and such assurance your clear duty is to permit the entry of foreign workers where they are needed.

Harold D. Cooley, North Carolina; Graham Purcell, Texas; Watkins M. Abbitt, Virginia; E. C. Gathings, Arkansas; Ralph J. Scott, North Carolina; Thomas G. Abernethy, Mississippi; John L. McMillan, South Carolina; D. R. Matthews, Florida; James A. Haley, Florida; A. S. Herlong, Jr., Florida; Tom Murray, Tennessee; William M. Tuck, Virginia; Robert L. F. Sikes, Florida; Charles M. Teague, California; Charles S. Gubser, California; John F. Baldwin, Jr., California; J. Arthur Younger, California; James B. Utt, California; Burt L. Talcott, California; Glenard P. Lipscomb, California; Don H. Clausen, California; Edward J. Gurney, Florida.

SENATE

Thursday, April 1, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Robert Lewis Townsend, district superintendent of the Methodist Church, Kearney, Nebr., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whose light and love hath brought us to this very hour, and without which we could not live or care too long, we bow before Thee in preparation for the mighty tasks Thou hast given us this day. Be ever present and very real to these on whom the weight of legislative decision has been placed, that they may be Thy instruments, and equal to this hour.

Through the dense overgrowth of many words and long debate, let Thy light shine until the issues are clearly seen and the pathway to Thy fuller sunlight is made plain.

Where the circles of our world concerns are limited by our human loyalties, teach us to love as Thou dost love, that we may do as Thou wouldst do, and draw them larger according to Thy plan.

And when the load grows more than can be borne—

Teach us the strength that cannot seek
By deed or thought, to hurt the weak;
That, under Thee, we may possess
Man's strength to succor man's distress.

In the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord, who gave himself that God's kingdom might come. His will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, March 29, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on March 29, 1965, the President had approved and signed the following joint resolutions:

S.J. Res. 47. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the week of May 2 through May 8, 1965, as "Professional Photography Week"; and

S.J. Res. 48. Joint resolution to provide for Bennett Place commemoration.

REPORT ON ACTIVITIES UNDER PUBLIC LAW 480—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 130)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on activities under Public Law 480, received on March 31, pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 29, which, without objection, will be printed in the Record, without reading, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am sending to the Congress the annual report on activities carried on under Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, outlining operations under the act during the calendar year 1964. The report outlines in some detail the significant role of the United States through the years in helping to battle hunger in the world. The record is an impressive one.

The food-for-peace program is one of the most inspiring enterprises ever undertaken by any nation in all of history—and every American can be proud of it, without regard to partisanship or political persuasion.

In cooperation with the developing countries, food for peace is directly benefiting more people than ever before. And more importantly, the operating agencies are reaching these people with more meaningful programs. Increasingly the emphasis is on using our agricultural commodities to support projects that help eliminate the need for continued food aid. Today about 40 percent of our Government's economic development assistance overseas is in the form of agricultural commodities and local currencies received from their sale. To achieve this record, food-for-peace exports reached a new high in 1964 of 18 million tons of agricultural commodities with an estimated export market value of $1.7 billion.

IMPORTANCE OF NUTRITION

The food-for-peace program has made a significant contribution to the world attack on hunger and malnutrition—still the most grave health problem of the world. We now recognize that food deficiencies are most serious in infants, the pre-school-age and, to a lesser degree, school-age children. Not only does malnutrition result in high child death rates and widespread disabling diseases, but research has now established that it produces permanent retardation of mental as well as physical development. Studies suggest that in some developing countries as high as 70 percent of pre-school children are undernourished or malnourished.

Thus, increasing attention is being given to nutrition in food for peace. Its importance is underscored by the fact that, of the 100 million recipients of our donated foods, 70 million are children, including more than 40 million in organized national school lunch efforts.

The Agency for International Development recently authorized funds which will be used, in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture, for vitamin enrichment of nonfat dry milk distributed overseas. Experiments will also be undertaken to help developing countries find the techniques and skills needed to process and distribute grain-based high protein foods for children.

MEETING HUMAN NEEDS

While the effort goes on to increase the nutritional balance in our commodity use, food for peace continues to seek the humanitarian goal of using our food to meet human needs:

During 1964, more than 3 billion pounds of commodities were programed through U.S. and international oversea relief agencies under title III of Public Law 480 for donation to 67.3 million people. As part of the Alliance for Progress, "Operation Ninos" school lunch programs in Latin America are currently feeding 13 million children—compared to fewer than 4 million when this special emphasis was initiated only 2½ years ago.

Food-for-work community development projects are expanding to broaden and strengthen the base of country development. In 1964, 9 million people benefited from programs providing a supplementary wage of food—through food for peace—as payment for participation in local self-help projects.

There were fewer large-scale disasters in the world during 1964 than in previous years, which accounts for the fact that food for peace was called upon to assist only 4 million victims under title II emergency relief programs—the smallest number since the inception of the program. However, an additional 1 million refugees benefited from these food-for-peace supported emergency relief programs.

U.S. commodities are being supplied to 50 of the 72 projects sponsored on a multilateral basis through the world food program. Seventy countries share in supporting these development projects now reaching 2.7 million recipients. U.S. support of multilateral programing is also exemplified by food-for-peace commodities provided to UNICEF and UNRWA.

DEVELOPING COMMERCIAL MARKETS

As food for peace embarks on its second decade, there is growing indication of the program's substantial contribution to the development of commercial markets for our farm products as well as purely humanitarian efforts. Commercial sales of U.S. agricultural commodities overseas reached a new high of $4.6 billion during this year, more than double the commercial agricultural exports of 1954 when Public Law 480 was first enacted.

The Public Law 480 sales programs are designed to strengthen the economies of the recipient countries and thus hasten the day when they can finance their import requirements on commercial terms. Following are highlights of these sales programs:

Food-for-peace exports under title I (sales for foreign currencies) reached a record high in 1964 of almost $1.2 billion. Shipments amounted to more than 14 million tons, surpassing the previous peak of 13.9 million tons set in 1963.

Public Law 480-generated currencies are paying U.S. oversea expenses, conserving dollars and strengthening our balance-of-payments position. Reimbursements to the Commodity Credit Corporation through 1964 by U.S. Government agencies utilizing these currencies totaled almost $1.1 billion. Additional reimbursements also resulted from barter programs as U.S. agencies financed oversea procurement of goods and services with Public Law 480 commodities. Such reimbursements from both programs totaled over a third of a billion dollars in 1964.

Our balance-of-payments position is also benefiting from increased activity under title IV, long-term dollar credit sales. Almost 1 million tons of agricultural commodities at an export market value of $93 million, were shipped overseas in 1964 under title IV, also a new record. Title IV dollar repayments on principal and interest from previous sales are being made in increasing volume. Repayments during 1964 totaled $5.4 million, compared to $2.3 million in 1963.

PUBLIC LAW 480 SUPPORTS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Agricultural commodities continue to serve as one of our principal assets in international economic developments, contributing substantially to the total U.S. oversea aid effort.

Planned uses of local currencies provided in title I sales agreements concluded during 1964 totaled $580.5 million for economic development—$553.5 million in loans; $27 million in grants. In addition, agricultural commodities sold to foreign governments on long-term dollar credit under title IV provided financing for economic purposes. These currencies are being used to supplement capital investment funds and technical assistance support in a wide range of industrial, agricultural, and socio-economic development projects.

Fifty-seven million dollars in local currencies generated by title I sales of food-for-peace commodities were loaned in 1964 to United States and local private enterprise for business development and trade expansion in 11 countries.

CHALLENGE OF THE FUTURE

These are only some of the accomplishments of food for peace during the past year. The program has come a long way since 1954 when it was so generally considered only as a temporary means to dispose of "burdensome" agricultural surpluses. Food for peace has proved its worth as an important means to meet human need, encourage economic development and support U.S. foreign policy. It has helped demonstrate to the world that human hunger is no longer an inevitable fact of life. Its elimination is within our grasp.

Yet for all of the many efforts and accomplishments by the United States and other richly endowed countries, millions still suffer from some form of hunger or malnutrition. We have long recognized that an insufficient food supply is one of the leading contributors to human misery and political instability. More recently we have begun to recognize that it is also a major deterrent to economic and social development. The resulting loss, in both human and economic terms, is one of the great tragedies and shortcomings of the 20th century.

The long-range solution to the hunger problem rests in improving the productive capacity of the developing nations themselves. In my messages to the Congress this year on agriculture and foreign assistance, I pointed to the need for increased attention directed to the agricultural sectors of less developed countries—specifically to help overcome obstacles such as the present deficiency of fertilizer, the lack of adequate Government policies in establishing sufficient incentives for the farmer, and the general insufficiency of education so vitally needed to improve farming methods and technology.

Our efforts on these matters must continue. But we must also continue to utilize our own agricultural resources until the day these other countries become self-sufficient. That will be a number of years away—but food for peace can shorten this time.

Food for peace is an important tool for development. It is good international policy and sound domestic policy. Food for peace is, above all, a program which expresses the great and generous heart of the American people—and is a worthy expression of the compassion always so much a part of America's character. It deserves the continued support of the Congress and of all Americans.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 31, 1965*.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, notified the Senate that, pursuant to the provisions of section 1, Public Law 86–42, the Speaker had appointed Mr. GALLAGHER of New Jersey, Mrs. KELLY of New York, Mr. DULSKI of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. GIAIMO of Connecticut, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. ST GERMAIN of Rhode Island, Mr. TUPPER of Maine, Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota, Mr. WHALLEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STAFFORD of Vermont, and Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin as members of the U.S. delegation of the Canada-United States Interparliamentary Group, for the meeting to be held in Ottawa, Canada, from May 20 to May 23, 1965, on the part of the House.

The message announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 307) granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3044. An act to authorize payment of incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier;

H.R. 3708. An act to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging";

H.R. 5571. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders; and

H.R. 6767. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 3044. An act to authorize payment of incentive pay for the performance of hazardous duty on the flight deck of an aircraft carrier; and

H.R. 5571. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to authorize payment of incentive pay for submarine duty to personnel qualified in submarines attached to staffs of submarine operational commanders; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 3708. An act to provide assistance in the development of new or improved programs to help older persons through grants to the States for community planning and services and for training, through research, development, or training project grants, and to establish within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare an operating agency to be designated as the "Administration on Aging"; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

H.R. 6767. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. **Mansfield**, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. **Mansfield**, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and subcommittees thereof were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate.

On request by Mr. **Mansfield**, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Roads of the Committee on Public Works and the Subcommittee on Permanent Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

Automotive Products Trade Act of 1965

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the implementation of the agreement concerning automotive products between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

Amendment of Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Acceleration of Saline Water Conversion Program

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to expand, extend, and accelerate the saline water conversion program conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

Adjustment of Certain Contracts by National Aeronautics and Space Administration

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on the adjustment of certain contracts by that Administration; to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

Report on 1964 Soil Bank Conservation Reserve Program

A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the 1964 Soil Bank Conservation Reserve Program (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Report on National Industrial Reserve

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the National Industrial Reserve, dated April 1, 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Certain Projects To Be Undertaken for the Army National Guard

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (Properties and Installations), reporting, pursuant to law, on the nature and estimated cost of certain nonarmory facilities projects proposed to be undertaken for the Army National Guard (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Repeal of Section 7043, Title 10, United States Code

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal section 7043 of title 10, United States Code (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Armed Services.

Report on Defense Procurement From Small and Other Business Firms

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on defense procurement from small and other business firms, for the period July 1964–January 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Amendment of Small Business Act, Relating to Certain Loans

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Small Business Act to authorize issuance and sale of participation interests based on certain pools of loans held by the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report of Small Business Administration

A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Administration, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Amendment of Section 6(b) of Securities Act of 1933

A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Report of Maritime Administration

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Maritime Administration, for the fiscal year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Statutes Relating to Fixing or Prohibiting Collection of Fees for Certain Services Under the Navigation Laws

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to repeal and amend certain statutes fixing or prohibiting the collection of fees for certain services under the navigation laws (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Use of Certain Land by Secretary of the Interior

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to the use by the Secretary of the Interior of land at La Jolla, Calif., donated by the University of California for a marine biological research laboratory, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Federal Aviation Act of 1958

A letter from the Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, and Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 1003 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 to authorize common carriers under the jurisdiction of the Civil Aeronautics Board, Federal Maritime Commission, and Interstate Commerce Commission to enter into joint rates, provide for their regulation by a joint board, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

Amendment of Act Relating to Transportation of the Remains, Families, and Effects of Federal Employees Dying Abroad

A letter from the Deputy Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Act of July 8, 1940, relating to the transportation of the remains, families, and effects of Federal employees dying abroad, so as to restore the benefits of such act to employees dying in Alaska and Hawaii, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

Proposed Legislation Relating to District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to furnish subsistence, living quarters, and laundry in lieu of salary to certain persons who, although not employees of the District of Columbia, are authorized by the Commissioners to work in facilities of the Government of the District of Columbia for the purpose of securing training and experience in their future vocations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the registration of names assumed for the purposes of trade or business in the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Report of Secretary of the Treasury

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report on the state of the finances, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

Amendment of Internal Revenue Code of 1954, To Promote Savings Under the Internal Revenue Service's Automatic Data Processing System

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to promote savings under the Internal Revenue Service's Automatic Data Processing System (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

Reports on Applications for Refund of Certain Excess Oil Royalties

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipt of an application from the Gulf Oil Corporation for the refund of excess oil royalties (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the receipt of an application from the Phillips Petroleum Co. for the refund of excess oil royalties (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Proposed Amendments to the Articles of Agreement of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the U.S. Governor to agree to amendments to the Articles of Agreement of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development and the International Finance Corporation, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Report on Audits of Government Services, Inc.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on audits of Government Services, Inc., and of its employee retirement and benefit trust fund and supplemental pension plan, year ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Reports of Comptroller General

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs resulting from the failure to obtain competition for the procurement of power-unit clamps, U.S. Coast Guard, Treasury Department, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on failure to collect forfeitures of pay imposed by court-martial sentences, Department of the Army, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the relocation of highways at the Amistad Dam project, U.S. section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred for commercial protective service used for shipments of classified material, Department of the Army, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs resulting from inadequacies in the administration of the Inter-American highway program in the Republic of Panama, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on weaknesses in negotiation and administration of contracts for resettlement of Cuban refugees, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on review of financial condition and operations, fiscal years 1963 and 1962, U.S. section, International Boundary and Water Commission, United States and Mexico, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on wage rates for federally financed housing construction improperly determined in excess of the prevailing rates for similar work in the Dallas-Fort Worth, Tex., area, Department of Labor, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive allocation of costs of publicly owned parking facilities to urban renewal projects in the San Francisco region, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary grant approved to assist in financing the development of the Keystone Industrial Park of the Scranton Lackawanna Industrial Building Co., Area Redevelopment Administration, Department of Commerce, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary rental costs incurred because of delay in purchasing components of two automatic data processing systems, Social Security Administration, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on U.S. problems pertaining to the operations of radio terminals, radio relays and associated generators in selected units of the 7th U.S. Army in Europe (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive allocation of costs of streets and roads to the Queensgate I Urban Renewal Project, Cincinnati, Ohio, Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on excessive costs incurred in the procurement of ball powder for .30 caliber blank ammunition from Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., East Alton, Ill., Department of the Army, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

Report of Governor of Guam

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Governor of Guam to the Secretary of the Interior, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report on Activities of, Expenditures by, and Donation to the Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory, at Grand Forks, N. Dak.

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on the activities of, expenditures by, and donation to the Charles R. Robertson Lignite Research Laboratory, at Grand Forks, N. Dak., for the calendar year 1964; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Report of the American Academy of Arts and Letters

A letter from the Assistant to the President, the American Academy of Arts and Letters, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Academy for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Identical Bidding in Public Procurement

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on identical bidding in public procurement, for the calendar year 1963 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amendment of Section 4082, Title 18, United States Code

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4082 of title 18, United States Code, to facilitate the rehabilitation of persons convicted of offenses against the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Proposed Legislation Relating to Department of the Air Force

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Major Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Col. Frank D. Schwikert, U.S. Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Maj. Donald B. Powers, U.S. Air Force (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amendment of Section 39b of Bankruptcy Act

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 39b of the Bankruptcy Act so as to prohibit a part-time referee from acting as trustee or receiver in any proceeding under the Bankruptcy Act (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Appointment of Additional Circuit and District Judges

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Amendment of Sections 2072 and 2112, Title 28, United States Code

A letter from the Director, Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, Washington, D.C., transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend sections 2072 and 2112 of title 28, United States Code, with respect to the scope of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and to repeal inconsistent legislation (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Report on Manpower Research and Training

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on manpower research and training, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Report of Girl Scouts of the United States of America

A letter from the president and national executive director, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, New York, N.Y., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that organization, for the fiscal year ended September 30, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Federal Metal and Nonmetallic Mine Safety Act

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote health and safety in metal and nonmetallic mineral industries, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Reports of Atomic Energy Commission

A letter from the Chairman, United States Atomic Energy Commission, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of that Commission entitled "Annual Report to Congress for 1964" and "Fundamental Nuclear Energy Research—1964" (with accompanying reports); to the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Disposition of Executive Papers

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 14

"Joint resolution relative to the San Francisco Mint

"Whereas the current shortage of coins, which is hamstringing business and industry in this Nation, is particularly acute in the San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area; and

"Whereas the rapid increase in the population of the San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area, with the boom in business and industry which has accompanied it, has skyrocketed the demand for coins in this area; and

"Whereas the 12th Federal Reserve district, with headquarters in San Francisco, now receives and distributes more coins than any other Federal Reserve district; and

"Whereas the Philadelphia and Denver Mints, which are the only two mints in the country that are presently producing coins, are already working day and night, 7 days a week, and still have not been able to produce sufficient coins to satisfy the need for them; and

"Whereas the reopening of the San Francisco Mint would reduce the costs of minting and distributing coins and make sufficient coins available to eliminate the current shortage of coins in not only the San Francisco-Oakland metropolitan area, but throughout the Nation: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to reopen the San Francisco Mint; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Assembly Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution relative to agricultural workers

"Whereas the production, processing, and sale of agricultural commodities constitutes a substantial portion of the economic life of the State of California and our Nation; and

"Whereas the ready availability of wholesome, reasonably priced agricultural commodities is essential to the continued physical health of the citizens of this State and of the United States; and

"Whereas without sufficient experienced, and competent agricultural workers, our farmers cannot grow enough agricultural products to provide the raw materials necessary to maintain the required level of production of these agricultural commodities; and

"Whereas an adequate wage for agricultural workers is essential to secure and maintain the sufficient, experienced, and competent force of agricultural workers necessary to produce our agricultural products; and

"Whereas in the past agricultural workers in many areas of this country have not received wages adequate to induce sufficient workers to secure and continue in agricultural employment and thus our necessary force of agricultural workers is endangered; and

"Whereas, because of the keen competition which exists between the various producers of agricultural goods for sale throughout the United States, this lack of uniformity in the payment of agricultural wages in the various areas of the United States also has a seriously detrimental effect upon the economy of those areas, of which California is one, wherein higher wages are paid agricultural workers because it places these areas wherein higher wages are paid at a competitive disadvantage in their efforts to market their agricultural commodities: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Assembly and the Senate of the State of California (jointly), That the California State Legislature respectfully memorializes the Congress of the United States to enact a national minimum farm wage equal to the highest statewide minimum farm wage paid in any of the 48 contiguous States; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly be hereby directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Joint Resolution 20

"Joint resolution relative to Morro Bay Rock

"Whereas while title to Morro Bay Rock has been conveyed to the State by the Federal Government, the grant deed reserved to the United States the right to resume ownership, possession, and control, for Government purposes, of any of the property, at any time, without the consent of the State; and

"Whereas in view of this reservation of interest by the Federal Government, the State now has little control over Morro Bay Rock; and

"Whereas the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has removed quantities of material from Morro Bay Rock for repair to a harbor jetty which is causing the disfiguration of its natural value; and

"Whereas the Corps of Engineers is considering resumption of quarrying operations on Morro Bay Rock; and

"Whereas any extra cost which may be incurred from using an alternate source of rock for harbor projects would be small compared to the esthetic loss which would be caused through further quarrying of this landmark; and

"Whereas in order that Morro Bay Rock can be preserved and protected as a point of scenic interest for all peoples it is imperative that the Federal Government convey its remaining interest to the State: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Congress of the United States is respectfully requested to enact such legislation as may be necessary to convey the remaining interest of the United States in Morro Bay Rock to the State of California; and be it further

"Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

"Concurrent Resolution 95

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress to amend the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, increasing the minimum wage thereunder to $1.50 per hour

"Whereas it is the sense of the people of the State of New York, as manifested by the considered judgment of their duly elected representatives in the State legislature, that the welfare of the people is involved in the soundness of this State's economic condition, as well as that of other States, and depends on the establishment and enforcement of national standards designed to protect, preserve and promote the soundness of the economy of the entire Nation; and

"Whereas employers in this State are placed in an unfavorable competitive position by reason of lower wages paid in States which are subject only to the Federal minimum wage of $1.25 per hour, a rate considerably below that which generally prevails in the industries of this State; and

"Whereas it is believed by the executive and legislative branches of the government of the State of New York that an immediate increase in the Federal minimum wage to $1.50 per hour is necessary to eliminate such substandard wages as now prevail in many States of the Nation and to protect the employers of this State and other States with high labor standards against unfair competition: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved* (*if the assembly concur*), That the President and the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully memorialized to establish with all convenient speed a nationwide minimum wage of $1.50 per hour, in order to avoid an increase in unemployment in States with high labor standards, prevent unfair competition from industries in States having low labor standards and wages to preserve, protect and permit the soundness of the Nation's economy; and be it further

"*Resolved* (*if the assembly concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Congress of the United States by forwarding one copy thereof to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, one copy to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and one copy to each Member of the Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

"By order of the Senate:
"GEORGE H. VAN LENGEN, *Secretary*.
"In assembly March 24, 1965.
"Concurred in without amendment.
"By order of assembly:
"JOHN T. MCKENNAN, *Clerk*."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 8

"Joint memorial to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, the U.S. Corps of Engineers, and all interested or affected agencies or instrumentalities of the United States

"We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

"Whereas the U.S. Corps of Engineers presently has under study a multipurpose dam proposed for construction upon the Snake River approximately 6 miles upriver from Lewiston, Idaho, to be known as the Asotin Dam; and

"Whereas the present proposal for construction of such dam does not include navigation locks, nor any method for the passage of waterborne carriers past such dam; and

"Whereas the completion of lower Granite Dam on the Snake River approximately 33 miles downriver from Lewiston, Idaho, which is anticipated in 1971, will bring all-year, all-weather slack water navigation from Lewiston, Idaho, to coast ports, thereby placing Idaho in the direct stream of world commerce; and

"Whereas there exists in the areas adjacent to the potential slack water pool of the said Asotin Dam, vast quantities of metals and minerals, including high-grade limestone, the potential of which can only be realized by the inclusion of such navigation locks in Asotin Dam; and

"Whereas the timber, agricultural, and livestock industries in the areas adjacent to such slack water pool would be greately enhanced and benefited by the decreased shipping costs available through barge and tug transport; and

"Whereas the slack water pool of said dam can provide to the general public virtually unlimited potential for boating and other forms of recreation; and

"Whereas the inclusion of navigation locks in Asotin Dam will make all of these benefits possible, and will thereby provide great economic benefit not only to the State of Idaho, and its sister State of Washington, through the facilities of the twin ports of Lewiston, Idaho, and Clarkston, Wash., but also will benefit tourists and visitors from all the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session* (*the Senate and House of Representatives concurring*), That we most respectfully urge the Army Corps of Engineers and all interested or affected agencies or instrumentalities of the United States to work toward the inclusion of navigation locks in the Asotin Dam project; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to appropriate the moneys necessary for inclusion of such navigation locks in the Asotin Dam project; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing the State of Idaho and also those representing the State of Washington in the Congress of the United States, and to the Chief of Engineers, U.S. Corps of Engineers, and to the heads of any other interested or affected agencies or instrumentalities of the United States."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

"RESOLUTION —

"The General Assembly of the Commonwealth protests the wrongs and sufferings imposed by the Soviet Union upon its Jewry. Its enmity of religion is a matter of historical record and its discrimination against synagogues and Jewish worshippers is well known. Jewish congregations there are forbidden to organize a central body or contact Jewish groups outside Russia. Yiddish language institutions and other Yiddish cultural institutions have not been restored since their destruction by Stalin.

"Article 18 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states 'Everyone has the right to freedom of thought, conscience, and religion; this right includes freedom to change his religion or belief, and freedom, either alone or in community with others and in public or private, to manifest his religion or belief in teaching, practice, worship, and observance.'

"A public protest against Soviet anti-Semitism is scheduled to be held Sunday, March 28, 1965, at 3 o'clock p.m. at Independence Square in Philadelphia. In protesting against the ill treatment of Soviet Jewry the general assembly should encourage participation in the rally by citizens of all religions in our Commonwealth as part of its effort to call the attention of the world to the plight of our brothers: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That people of all religions in this Commonwealth be encouraged to attend and participate in the public rally to protest Soviet anti-Semitism to be held in Philadelphia at Independence Square at 3 o'clock p.m., Sunday, March 28, 1965; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the Department of State be hereby respectfully memorialized to request of the Soviet Union that it grant to its Jewish citizens the right to freedom of worship; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the President of the United States restate the position of the United States in opposition to these acts of discrimination against Jewish citizens and that he instruct the U.S. delegation to the United Nations to make known the sentiments expressed in this resolution in every possible manner; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded by the secretary of senate of the Commonwealth, to the President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, each Member of Congress from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the legislatures of the States in the United States, the Honorable Adlai E. Stevenson, the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, and the Soviet Ambassador to the United States.

"MARK GRUELL, JR.,
"*Secretary, Senate of Pennsylvania.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 1004

"Memoralizing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to prevent discrimination in the registration of electors and voting in elections

"Whereas discrimination based upon race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry destroys the rights of citizens to register and vote in local, State, and Federal elections; and

"Whereas such discrimination threatens the rights of all citizens and weakens the foundations of democratic government; and

"Whereas such discrimination requires acts of intimidation, evasion, and equivocation by those who practice it; and

"Whereas article XV of the Constitution of the United States specifically guarantees that the rights of citizens to vote shall not be denied because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the 45th General Assembly of the State of Colorado* (*the senate concurring herein*), That the Congress of the United States be memorialized to enact legislation which will forthwith cause such discrimination to cease and desist; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, and each Member of Congress from the State of Colorado.

"ALLEN DINES,
"*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*
"EVELYN T. DAVIDSON,
"*Chief Clerk of the House of Representatives.*
"ROBERT L. KNOUS,
"*President of the Senate.*
"MILDRED H. CRESSWELL,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works:

"HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 27

"*To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled, and to the U.S. Corps of Engineers:*

"We, your memorialists, the House of Representatives and Senate of the State of Washington, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

"Whereas the 2d session of the 87th Congress, authorized the construction of a $100 million multipurpose dam on the Snake River near the town of Asotin, to be known as the Asotin Dam; and

"Whereas the present proposal for construction of the Asotin Dam does not include navigation locks, nor any method for the passage of waterborne carriers past the dam, and the Corps of Engineers has under study the feasibility of including these locks; and

"Whereas the completion of Lower Granite Dam on the Snake River approximately 33 miles downriver from Clarkston, Wash., which is anticipated in 1971, will bring all-year, all-weather slack water navigation from Clarkston, Wash., to coast ports, thereby placing southeastern Washington in the direct stream of world commerce; and

"Whereas there exists in the areas adjacent to the potential slack water pool of the said Asotin Dam, vast quantities of metals and minerals, including high-grade limestone, the potential of which can only be realized by the inclusion of such navigation locks in Asotin Dam; and

"Whereas the timber, agricultural and livestock industries in the areas of Washington, Oregon and Idaho adjacent to such slack water pool would be greatly enhanced and benefited by the decreased shipping costs available through barge and tug transport; and

"Whereas the slack water pool of said dam can provide to the general public virtually unlimited potentials for boating and other forms of recreation; and

"Whereas the inclusion of navigation locks in Asotin Dam will make all of these benefits possible, and will thereby provide great economic benefit not only to the State of Washington, and its sister States of Idaho and Oregon, through the facilities to be constructed on the pool, but also will benefit tourists and visitors from all the United States: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the 39th session of the Legislature of the State of Washington now in session, the Senate and House of Representatives concurring, most respectfully urges the U.S. Corps of Engineers and all interested or affected agencies or instrumentalities of the United States to work toward the inclusion of navigation locks in the Asotin Dam project; and

"*Resolved,* That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to appropriate the moneys necessary for inclusion of such navigation locks in the Asotin Dam project; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be transmitted by the secretary of state to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, to the Senators and Representatives representing the State of Washington, to those representing the States of Idaho and Oregon in the Congress of the United States, and to the Chief of Engineers of the U.S. Corps of Engineers.

"Passed the house March 17, 1965.

"ROBERT M. SCHAEFER,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"Passed the senate March 21, 1965.

"JOHN A. CHERBERG,
"*President of the Senate.*

"I hereby certify this to be a true and correct copy of House Joint Memorial 27.

"S. R. HOLCOMB,
"*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*"

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Whereas the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways is being carried rapidly toward completion by the scheduled date of October 1, 1972; and

"Whereas the Federal Highway Trust Fund expires on that date; and

"Whereas the continuing growth of the Nation's population and economy, and of its related transportation needs give evidence of need for continuing highway programs after that date; and

"Whereas the Federal aid highway program because of sound financing, long-range planning, and orderly construction has been a vital force in the dramatic expansion of the Nation's productive capacity and in enhancing the well-being of the citizens of this State and the Nation for over 40 years; and

"Whereas it is in the national interest that the Federal-State relationship that has made this program possible be not terminated in 1972 but rather continued and strengthened;

"Now, therefore, we, the members of the House of Representatives of the State of Washington, do respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to authorize and direct the Secretary of Commerce, with the cooperation of the State highway departments and through them, with the cooperation of the cities and counties, to undertake immediately a study to determine highway needs after 1972, and to recommend to the Congress a Federal policy with respect to highways to meet these needs most effectively; and further, that

"The study include, but not be limited to, a review of the desirable extent of the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, the requirements by State of Federal aid primary and secondary or other systems of highways, the street and highway needs in urban areas, the most appropriate basis of sharing the costs among the several levels of government in relation to the interest of each in the several highway systems, the problem of reimbursement for toll or other roads included in the National System of Interstate and Defense Highways, and such other matters as the Secretary or the States believe appropriate; and further, that

"The study be completed and reported to the Congress no later than January 1, 1967: And be it

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the clerk of the house to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States, the President of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from the State of Washington.

"Adopted March 20, 1965.

"I hereby certify this to be a true and correct copy of resolution adopted by the house of representatives, March 20, 1965.

"S. R. HOLCOMB,
"*Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.*"

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Commerce:

"SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 41

"Whereas the State of Texas, through Texas A. & M. University cooperates with the U.S. Department of the Interior in the control of wolves, coyotes, mountain lions, bobcats, and other predatory animals and rodents with funds appropriated out of the State Treasury when matched by the Congress; and

"Whereas ranchers, stockmen, county commissioners courts, livestock organizations, and wolf clubs financially support the program individually and collectively to prevent depredations upon their livestock; and

"Whereas the State of Texas has supported the Bureau of Fisheries and Wildlife and its predecessor agencies; and

"Whereas the control of predatory animals in Texas has increased the game supply to the extent that it now provides revenue for the landowners and sport for an ever increasing number of sportsmen; and

"Whereas control of certain wild animals is necessary for the prevention of rabies in humans, wildlife and livestock: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved, by the Senate of Texas (the House of Representatives concurring),* That the Legislature of Texas express its approval of the request by the Bureau of Fisheries and Wildlife for the continuation of the predator and rodent control program which has effectively aided sportsmen, ranchers, stockmen and the general economy, and oppose any reduction or lessening of adequate support thereof; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the U.S. Senate, to the U.S. Senators from Texas, to the Speaker of the U.S. House of Representatives and to the dean of the Texas delegation in the U.S. House of Representatives.

"PRESTON SMITH,
"*Lieutenant Governor, President of the Senate.*

"BEN BARNES,
"*Speaker of the House.*

"I hereby certify that Senate Concurrent Resolution 41 was adopted by the senate on February 23, 1965.

"CHARLES SCHNABEL,
"*Secretary of the Senate.*

"I hereby certify that Senate Concurrent Resolution 41 was adopted by the house on March 11, 1965.

"DOROTHY HALLMAN,
"*Chief Clerk of the House.*"

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 48

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:*

"Whereas the Congress in 1964 approved S. 627 which became the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964 (Public Law 88–309, 78 Stat. 197) which included a provision authorizing the appropriation each year of $5 million for apportionment to the States to carry out the purposes of that act; and

"Whereas it is the purpose of Public Law 88–309 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cooperate with the States in carrying out projects designed for the research and development of the commercial fisheries resources of the Nation; and

"Whereas the Legislature of the State of Alaska is now in session and considering the authority and budgeting for this program on the state level since the Alaska fishery resource is the greatest in the nation and an accelerated effort in research and development is needed if we are to catch up and compete with foreign fishing enterprises; and

"Whereas it is essential that Congress provide the full amount of funds authorized for this essential research and development of the national fishery through Federal and State cooperation: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the Congress is urged to appropriate the full amount of research and fishery funds authorized by the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate and chairman, Senate Appropriations Committee; the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable GEORGE H. MAHON, chairman, House Appropriations Committee; the Honorable WINFIELD K. DENTON, chairman, House Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior and Related Agencies; and the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT and the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. Representative, Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Alaska; to the Committee on Public Works:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 53

"*Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:*

"Whereas Port Frederick and Tenakee Inlet on Chichagof Island in southeast Alaska are separated at one point by only a low isthmus less than 100 yards wide at high water; and

"Whereas a canal through this isthmus would permit the passage of fishing vessels at all times and thereby eliminate the need for these vessels to sail through the exposed waters of Icy Straight and Chatham Straight; and

"Whereas a canal through this isthmus would benefit the residents of Hoonah and Tenakee; and

"Whereas the 1964 convention of the Alaska Native Brotherhood has endorsed the construction of this canal; and

"Whereas there is presently in the U.S. Congress a resolution approved by the Senate Public Works Committee, directing the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to make a survey of the feasibility of dredging a waterway to connect Tenakee Inlet and Port Frederick: Be it

"*Resolved,* That the Legislature of the State of Alaska urges Congress to approve this resolution; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Hubert H. Humphrey, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate; the Honorable John W. McCormack, Speaker of the House of Representatives; and the Honorable E. L. Bartlett and the Honorable Ernest Gruening, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Ralph J. Rivers, U.S. Representative, Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress."

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of West Virginia; to the Committee on Commerce:

"House Concurrent Resolution 6

"Requesting the Congress of the United States to investigate experimentation in the field of artificial nucleation, or interference by artificial means with the natural precipitation of rain, hail, snow, moisture, or water in any form in the atmosphere

"Whereas experimentation in the field of interference by artificial means with natural precipitation is being conducted in several States, including the State of West Virginia; and

"Whereas the public interest, health, safety and welfare require that the effects of such experimentation be analyzed and evaluated by competent scientific investigation; and

"Whereas evaluation of the gain or loss occurring from such activities is in the national interest as well as in the interest of the people of the State of West Virginia: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of West Virginia,* That the Congress of the United States investigate experimentation in the field of artificial nucleation, or interference by artificial means with the natural precipitation of rain, hail, snow, moisture, or water in any form in the atmosphere; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That the clerk of the house of delegates is hereby directed to forward attested copies of this resolution to the President and Secretary of the U.S. Senate, the Speaker and Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each member of the West Virginia delegation in the Congress of the United States."

Two resolutions of the General Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolutions Memorializing Congress To Enact Legislation To Provide for an Increase in the Emphasis on Desalination Research and To Provide Greater Aid and Expansion for Metropolitan Reservoirs

"*Resolved,* That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide for an increase in the emphasis on desalination research and to provide greater aid and expansion for metropolitan reservoirs; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to the Members thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted, March 22, 1965.

"Thomas A. Chadwick, *Clerk.*

"House of representatives, adopted in concurrence, March 24, 1965.

"William C. Maiers, *Clerk.*

"A true copy. Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

"Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact Legislation Establishing Prospect Hill Park in the City of Somerville as a National Historic Site

"Whereas Prospect Hill Park in the city of Somerville is a site of great importance in American history: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the General Court of Massachusetts respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to enact legislation establishing Prospect Hill Park in the city of Somerville as a national historic site and providing qualified personnel for the maintenance thereof; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the secretary of the Commonwealth to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officer of each branch of the Congress, and to each Member thereof from the Commonwealth.

"Senate, adopted, March 22, 1965.

"Thomas A. Chadwick, *Clerk.*

"House of representatives, adopted in concurrence, March 24, 1965.

"William C. Maiers, *Clerk.*

"A true copy. Attest:

"Kevin H. White,
"Secretary of the Commonwealth."

A resolution of the Common Council of the City of Detroit, Mich., relating to the failure to designate the city of Detroit as a site of one of the six new regional offices of the reorganized Federal Bureau of Customs; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Public Utilities Commission of the State of Ohio, relating to the repeal of excise taxes on telephone and telegraph services; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution adopted by the Common Council of the Borough of Kenilworth, N.J., favoring the enactment of the pending civil rights bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Lions Club of San Juan, P.R., relating to civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Citizens' Study Club of Oahu, Honolulu, Hawaii, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 500, to change American immigration policies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago, Ill., favoring the enactment of legislation for open registration and voting rights for all American citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted at the sixth district convention of the Veterans of World War I, department of the State of Texas, at Hearne, Tex., protesting against the closing of certain veterans facilities, and urging the removal of the Veterans' Administration from the control of the executive branch, and placing it under the control of the Congress; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of Hammond, Ind., favoring the enactment of legislation to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

S. 693. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended (Rept. No. 143).

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND PAY

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, I submit a report on Federal employment and pay for the month of February 1965. In accordance with the practice of several years standing I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the Record, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Federal Personnel in Executive Branch, February 1965 and January 1965, and Pay, January 1965 and December 1964

PERSONNEL AND PAY SUMMARY

(See table I)

Information in monthly personnel reports for February 1965 submitted to the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures is summarized as follows:

Total and major categories	Civilian personnel in executive branch			Payroll (in thousands) in executive branch		
	In February numbered—	In January numbered—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)	In January was—	In December was—	Increase (+) or decrease (−)
Total [1] [2]	2,459,595	2,464,012	−4,417	$1,391,993	$1,610,923	−$218,930
Agencies exclusive of Department of Defense	1,441,886	1,446,993	−5,107	823,424	989,664	−166,260
Department of Defense	1,017,709	1,017,019	+690	568,569	621,239	−52,670
Inside the United States	2,300,350	2,305,058	−4,708			
Outside the United States	159,245	158,954	+291			
Industrial employment	540,418	539,948	+470			
Foreign nationals	131,678	132,113	−435	25,895	[3] 26,657	−762

[1] Exclusive of foreign nationals shown in the last line of this summary.

[2] February figure includes 886 employees (enumerators, clerks, supervisors, crew leaders, etc.) of the Department of Commerce engaged in taking the 1964 Census of Agriculture, as compared with 6,860 in January.

[3] Revised on basis of later information.

Table I breaks down the above figures on employment and pay by agencies.

Table II breaks down the above employment figures to show the number inside the United States by agencies.

Table III breaks down the above employment figures to show the number outside the United States by agencies.

Table IV breaks down the above employment figures to show the number in industrial-type activities by agencies.

Table V shows foreign nationals by agencies not included in tables I, II, III, and IV.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1965, and comparison with January 1965, and pay for January 1965, and comparison with December 1964*

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	February	January	Increase	Decrease	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):								
Agriculture	96,597	97,580		983	$53,293	$58,719		$5,426
Commerce [1]	32,347	38,040		5,693	23,192	27,779		4,637
Health, Education, and Welfare	83,803	83,542	261		47,699	50,737		3,038
Interior	61,720	61,635	85		37,776	41,810		4,034
Justice	32,366	32,376		10	23,103	25,093		1,990
Labor	9,018	9,002	16		6,267	6,825		558
Post Office	591,419	594,320		2,901	310,735	438,910		128,175
State [2] [3]	40,799	40,666	133		24,065	25,633		1,568
Treasury	93,464	89,981	3,483		56,333	60,030		3,697
Executive Office of the President:								
White House Office	322	327		5	257	274		17
Bureau of the Budget	478	481		3	496	538		42
Council of Economic Advisers	45	47		2	53	47	$6	
Executive Mansion and Grounds	74	73	1		38	57		19
National Aeronautics and Space Council	32	32			26	30		4
National Council on the Arts	3	2	1		1	1		
National Security Council	41	42		1	40	44		4
Office of Economic Opportunity	634	580	54		399	250	149	
Office of Emergency Planning	348	358		10	338	365		27
Office of Science and Technology	48	47	1		43	50		7
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	27	28		1	30	31		1
President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy		1		1	3	5		2
President's Committee on Consumer Interests	11	11			8	12		4
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	11	11			9	9		
Independent agencies:								
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	25	31		6	25	24	1	
American Battle Monuments Commission	416	414	2		71	97		26
Atomic Energy Commission	7,195	7,235		40	6,036	6,624		588
Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission [4]	1		1					
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	634	635		1	453	504		51
Civil Aeronautics Board	832	831	1		716	778		62
Civil Service Commission	3,729	3,745		16	2,413	2,705		292
Civil War Centennial Commission	4	5		1	5	5		
Commission of Fine Arts	6	5	1		5	9		4
Commission on Civil Rights	92	93		1	63	67		4
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2			3	3		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	297	297			232	251		19
Farm Credit Administration	232	231	1		175	197		22
Federal Aviation Agency	44,768	44,778		10	36,609	38,128		1,519
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7			5	5		
Federal Communications Commission	1,510	1,516		6	1,120	1,268		148
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,461	1,384	77		978	1,053		75
Federal Development Planning Committee for Appalachia	8	5	3		5	5		
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,239	1,245		6	1,036	1,006	30	
Federal Maritime Commission	240	240			205	221		16
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	412	412			400	442		42
Federal Power Commission	1,122	1,116	6		864	953		89
Federal Radiation Council	5	5			5	5		
Federal Trade Commission	1,141	1,151		10	919	1,015		96
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	190	192		2	125	143		18
General Accounting Office	4,171	4,189		18	3,084	3,358		274
General Services Administration	35,086	34,884	202		19,589	19,677		88
Government Printing Office	7,352	7,375		23	4,437	4,559		122
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,553	13,613		60	9,222	10,212		990
Indian Claims Commission	20	19	1		26	21	5	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,383	2,392		9	1,832	1,988		156
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	33,075	33,023	52		27,020	28,912		1,892
National Capital Housing Authority	420	429		9	214	239		25
National Capital Planning Commission	51	52		1	42	45		3
National Capital Transportation Agency	32	32			31	35		4
National Commission on Food Marketing	34	22	12		13	9	4	
National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress [5]	17		17					
National Gallery of Art	310	310			148	164		16
National Labor Relations Board	2,109	2,111		2	1,651	1,789		138
National Mediation Board	132	129	3		117	112	5	
National Science Foundation	1,010	936	74		735	819		84
Panama Canal	15,492	15,170	322		8,969	5,984	2,985	
President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy	2	2			2		2	
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	59	58	1		42	48		6
Railroad Retirement Board	1,750	1,749	1		1,118	1,206		88
Renegotiation Board	186	188		2	186	203		17
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	161	158	3		100	116		16
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,387	1,392		5	1,050	1,169		119
Selective Service System	7,272	7,264	8		2,439	2,646		207
Small Business Administration	3,546	3,538	8		2,493	2,461	32	
Smithsonian Institution	1,749	1,715	34		936	1,031		95
Soldiers' Home	1,095	1,098		3	419	381	38	
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	27		1	29	33		4
Tariff Commission	276	278		2	223	243		20
Tax Court of the United States	150	150			148	159		11
Temporary Alaska Claims Commission		1		1	1	1		
Tennessee Valley Authority	16,173	16,301		128	10,671	11,462		791
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	158	161		3	148	180		32
U.S. Information Agency	11,764	11,774		10	6,373	5,910	463	
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico	14	11	3		9	10		1
Veterans' Administration	171,381	171,364	17		83,143	91,640		8,497
Virgin Islands Corporation	314	320		6	142	105	37	
Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission	1	1			(6)	(6)		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,441,886	1,446,993	4,885	9,992	823,424	989,684	3,757	170,017
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense				5,107				166,260

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE I.—*Consolidated table of Federal personnel inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1965, and comparison with January 1965, and pay for January 1965, and comparison with December 1964*—Continued

Department or agency	Personnel				Pay (in thousands)			
	February	January	Increase	Decrease	January	December	Increase	Decrease
Department of Defense:								
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,111	2,122		11	$1,929	$2,152		$223
Department of the Army	360,575	360,769		194	196,098	213,175		17,077
Department of the Navy	325,652	325,387	265		188,683	204,363		15,680
Department of the Air Force	291,792	291,064	728		160,211	178,479		18,268
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,008	2,001	7		1,063	1,098		35
Defense Communications Agency	956	941	15		715	809		94
Defense Intelligence Agency	2,162	2,151	11		1,627	1,747		120
Defense Supply Agency	31,912	32,048		136	17,922	19,067		1,145
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	40			39	42		3
Interdepartmental activities	8	8			5	6		1
International military activities	55	54	1		44	46		2
Armed Forces information and education activities	438	434	4		233	255		22
Total, Department of Defense	1,017,709	1,017,019	1,031	341	568,569	621,239		52,670
Net change, Department of Defense			690				$52,670	
Grand total, including Department of Defense [7] [8]	2,459,595	2,464,012	5,916	10,333	1,391,993	1,610,923	3,757	222,687
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			4,417				218,930	

---

[1] February figure includes 886 employees (enumerators, clerks, supervisors, crew leaders, etc.) engaged in taking the 1964 Census of Agriculture, as compared with 6,860 in January, and their pay.

[2] February figure includes 15,414 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 15,397 in January and their pay. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The February figure includes 4,187 of these trust fund employees, and the January figure includes 4,193.

[3] February figure includes 1,170 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 1,136 in January and their pay.

[4] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 87-759.

[5] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 88-444.

[6] Less than $500.

[7] Exclusive of personnel and pay of the Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Agency.

[8] Includes employment in the Job Corps by Federal agencies under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-452), as follows:

Agency	February	January	Change
Agriculture Department	283	174	+109
Interior Department	243	155	+88
Total	526	329	+197

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1965, and comparison with January 1965*

Department or agency	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	95,346	96,307		961
Commerce	31,729	37,407		5,678
Health, Education, and Welfare	83,139	82,865	274	
Interior	61,080	61,002	78	
Justice	32,008	32,017		9
Labor	8,946	8,928	18	
Post Office	589,813	592,731		2,918
State [1] [2]	11,048	10,874	174	
Treasury	92,768	89,289	3,479	
Executive Office of the President:				
White House Office	322	327		5
Bureau of the Budget	478	481		3
Council of Economic Advisers	45	47		2
Executive Mansion and Grounds	74	73	1	
National Aeronautics and Space Council	32	32		
National Council on the Arts	3	2	1	
National Security Council	41	42		1
Office of Economic Opportunity	634	580	54	
Office of Emergency Planning	348	358		10
Office of Science and Technology	48	47	1	
Office of the Special Representative for Trade Negotiations	27	28		1
President's Commission on the Assassination of President Kennedy		1		1
President's Committee on Consumer Interests	11	11		
President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in Housing	11	11		
Independent agencies:				
Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations	25	31		6
American Battle Monuments Commission	7	7		
Atomic Energy Commission	7,161	7,201		40
Battle of New Orleans Sesquicentennial Celebration Commission [5]	1		1	
Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System	634	635		1
Civil Aeronautics Board	832	831	1	
Civil Service Commission	3,726	3,743		17
Civil War Centennial Commission	4	5		1
Commission of Fine Arts	6	5	1	
Commission on Civil Rights	92	93		1
Delaware River Basin Commission	2	2		
Export-Import Bank of Washington	297	297		
Farm Credit Administration	232	231	1	
Federal Aviation Agency	43,635	43,652		17
Federal Coal Mine Safety Board of Review	7	7		
Federal Communications Commission	1,506	1,512		6
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1,459	1,382	77	
Federal Development Planning Committee for Appalachia	8	5	3	
Federal Home Loan Bank Board	1,239	1,245		6
Federal Maritime Commission	240	240		
Independent agencies—Continued				
Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service	412	412		
Federal Power Commission	1,122	1,116	6	
Federal Radiation Council	5	5		
Federal Trade Commission	1,141	1,151		10
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	179	181		2
General Accounting Office	4,116	4,135		19
General Services Administration	35,059	34,858	201	
Government Printing Office	7,352	7,375		23
Housing and Home Finance Agency	13,344	13,399		55
Indian Claims Commission	20	19	1	
Interstate Commerce Commission	2,383	2,392		9
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	33,059	33,008	51	
National Capital Housing Authority	420	429		9
National Capital Planning Commission	51	52		1
National Capital Transportation Agency	32	32		
National Commission on Food Marketing	34	22	12	
National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress [4]	17		17	
National Gallery of Art	310	310		
National Labor Relations Board	2,076	2,077		1
National Mediation Board	132	129	3	
National Science Foundation	1,005	931	74	
Panama Canal	148	153		5
President's Advisory Committee on Labor-Management Policy	2	2		
President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity	59	58	1	
Railroad Retirement Board	1,750	1,749	1	
Renegotiation Board	186	188		2
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	161	158	3	
Securities and Exchange Commission	1,387	1,392		5
Selective Service System	7,116	7,112	4	
Small Business Administration	3,478	3,472	6	
Smithsonian Institution	1,726	1,695	31	
Soldiers' Home	1,095	1,098		3
Subversive Activities Control Board	26	27		1
Tariff Commission	276	278		2
Tax Court of the United States	150	150		
Temporary Alaska Claims Commission		1		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	16,170	16,298		128
U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency	158	161		3
U.S. Information Agency	3,468	3,477		9
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico	10	8	2	
Veterans' Administration	170,405	170,382	23	
Woodrow Wilson Memorial Commission	1	1		
Total, excluding Department of Defense	1,379,105	1,384,477	4,600	9,972
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			5,372	

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Federal personnel inside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1965, and comparison with January 1965*—Continued

Department or agency	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	2,064	2,074		10
Department of the Army	312,831	313,217		386
Department of the Navy	302,721	302,279	442	
Department of the Air Force	266,122	265,404	718	
Defense Atomic Support Agency	2,008	2,001	7	
Defense Communications Agency	907	894	13	
Defense Intelligence Agency	2,162	2,151	11	
Defense Supply Agency	31,911	32,047		136
U.S. Court of Military Appeals	40	40		
Interdepartmental activities	8	8		
International military activities	33	32	1	
Department of Defense—Continued				
Armed Forces information and education activities	438	434	4	
Total, Department of Defense	921,245	920,581	1,196	532
Net increase, Department of Defense			664	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	2,300,350	2,305,058	5,796	10,504
Net decrease, including Department of Defense			4,708	

[1] February figure includes 2,980 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 2,947 in January.

[2] February figure includes 761 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 733 in January.

[3] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 87-759.

[4] New agency, created pursuant to Public Law 88-444.

TABLE III.—*Federal personnel outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1965, and comparison with January 1965*

Department or agency	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	1,251	1,273		22
Commerce	618	633		15
Health, Education, and Welfare	664	677		13
Interior	640	633	7	
Justice	358	359		1
Labor	72	74		2
Post Office	1,606	1,589	17	
State [1] [2]	29,751	29,792		41
Treasury	696	692	4	
Independent agencies:				
American Battle Monuments Commission	409	407	2	
Atomic Energy Commission	34	34		
Civil Service Commission	3	2	1	
Federal Aviation Agency	1,133	1,126	7	
Federal Communications Commission	4	4		
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	2	2		
Foreign Claims Settlement Commission	11	11		
General Accounting Office	55	54	1	
General Services Administration	27	26	1	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	209	214		5
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	16	15	1	
National Labor Relations Board	33	34		1
National Science Foundation	5	5		
Panama Canal	15,344	15,017	327	
Selective Service System	156	152	4	
Small Business Administration	68	66	2	
Independent agencies—Continued				
Smithsonian Institution	23	20	3	
Tennessee Valley Authority	3	3		
U.S. Information Agency	8,296	8,297		1
United States-Puerto Rico Commission on the Status of Puerto Rico	4	3	1	
Veterans' Administration	976	982		6
Virgin Islands Corporation	314	320		6
Total, excluding Department of Defense	62,781	62,516	378	113
Net increase, excluding Department of Defense			265	
Department of Defense:				
Office of the Secretary of Defense	47	48		1
Department of the Army	47,744	47,552	192	
Department of the Navy	22,931	23,108		177
Department of the Air Force	25,670	25,660	10	
Defense Communications Agency	49	47	2	
Defense Supply Agency	1	1		
International military activities	22	22		
Total, Department of Defense	96,464	96,438	204	178
Net increase, Department of Defense			26	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	159,245	158,954	582	291
Net increase, including Department of Defense			291	

[1] February figure includes 12,434 employees of the Agency for International Development as compared with 12,450 in January. These AID figures include employees who are paid from foreign currencies deposited by foreign governments in a trust fund for this purpose. The February figure includes 4,187 of these trust fund employees and the January figure includes 4,193.

[2] February figure includes 409 employees of the Peace Corps as compared with 403 on January.

TABLE IV.—*Industrial employees of the Federal Government inside and outside the United States employed by the executive agencies during February 1965, and comparison with January 1965*

Department or agency	February	January	Increase	Decrease
Executive departments (except Department of Defense):				
Agriculture	3,618	3,591	27	
Commerce	5,409	5,629		220
Interior	9,455	9,528		73
Post Office	264	262	3	
Treasury	5,523	5,411	112	
Independent agencies:				
Atomic Energy Commission	256	257		1
Federal Aviation Agency	2,565	2,565		
General Services Administration	2,175	2,156	19	
Government Printing Office	7,352	7,375		23
National Aeronautics and Space Administration	33,075	33,023	52	
Panama Canal	7,588	7,364	224	
St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation	156	157		1
Tennessee Valley Authority	13,060	13,220		160
Virgin Islands Corporation	314	320		6
Total, excluding Department of Defense	90,810	90,858	436	484
Net decrease, excluding Department of Defense			48	
Department of Defense:				
Department of the Army:				
Inside the United States	[1] 133,093	[2] 133,259		166
Outside the United States	[1] 4,323	[2] 4,306	17	
Department of the Navy:				
Inside the United States	183,108	182,961	147	
Outside the United States	1,270	1,272		2
Department of the Air Force:				
Inside the United States	125,405	124,869	536	
Outside the United States	871	875		4
Defense Supply Agency:				
Inside the United States	1,538	1,548		10
Total, Department of Defense	449,608	449,090	700	182
Net increase, Department of Defense			518	
Grand total, including Department of Defense	540,418	539,948	1,136	666
Net increase, including Department of Defense			470	

[1] Subject to revision.

[2] Revised on basis of later information.

TABLE V.—*Foreign nationals working under U.S. agencies overseas, excluded from tables I through IV of this report, whose services are provided by contractual agreement between the United States and foreign governments, or because of the nature of their work or the source of funds from which they are paid, as of February 1965 and comparison with January 1965*

Country	Total		Army		Navy		Air Force	
	February	January	February	January	February	January	February	January
Crete	81	81					81	81
England	2,457	2,470	102	107	100	95	2,255	2,268
France	14,816	14,911	11,557	11,637	10	9	3,249	3,265
Germany	65,992	66,274	55,501	55,615	70	[1] 70	10,421	10,589
Greece	311	313			38	38	273	275
Japan	41,620	41,674	14,188	14,226	12,336	[1] 12,322	15,096	15,126
Korea	5,448	5,425	5,448	5,425				
Morocco	534	546			534	546		
Netherlands	53	53					53	53
Trinidad	366	366			366	366		
Total	131,678	132,113	86,796	87,010	13,454	13,446	31,428	31,657

[1] Revised on basis of later information.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Executive agencies of the Federal Government reported civilian employment in the month of February totaling 2,459,595. This was a net decrease of 4,417 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of January. The February decrease includes 5,974 temporary employees of Commerce Department engaged in taking the 1964 Census of Agriculture.

Civilian employment reported by the executive agencies of the Federal Government, by months in fiscal year 1965, which began July 1, 1964, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
1964			
July	2,492,061	10,479	
August	2,495,606	3,545	
September	2,461,376		34,230
October	2,470,330	8,954	
November	2,493,837	23,507	
December	2,485,771		8,066
1965			
January	2,464,012		21,759
February	2,459,595		4,417

Total Federal employment in civilian agencies for the month of February was 1,441,886, a decrease of 5,107 as compared with the January total of 1,466,993. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in February was 1,017,709, an increase of 690 as compared with 1,017,019 in January.

Civilian agencies reporting larger decreases were Commerce Department with 5,693 and Post Office Department with 2,901. The largest increase was reported by Treasury Department with 3,483.

In the Department of Defense the larger increases in civilian employment were reported by the Department of the Air Force with 728 and the Department of the Navy with 265.

Total employment inside the United States in February was 2,300,350, a decrease of 4,708 as compared with January. Total employment outside the United States in February was 159,245, an increase of 291 as compared with January. Industrial employment by Federal agencies in February totaled 540,418, an increase of 470.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures.

FOREIGN NATIONALS

The total of 2,459,595 civilian employees certified to the committee by Federal agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 131,678 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during February who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in January was 132,113. A breakdown of this employment for February follows:

Country	Total	Army	Navy	Air Force
Crete	81			81
England	2,457	102	100	2,255
France	14,816	11,557	10	3,249
Germany	65,992	55,501	70	10,421
Greece	311		38	273
Japan	41,620	14,188	12,336	15,096
Korea	5,448	5,448		
Morocco	534		534	
Netherlands	53			53
Trinidad	366		366	
Total	131,678	86,796	13,454	31,428

REPORT OF JOINT COMMITTEE ON REDUCTION OF NONESSENTIAL FEDERAL EXPENDITURES—FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Mr. BYRD of Virginia. Mr. President, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures I submit a report on Federal stockpile inventories as of January 1965. I ask unanimous consent to have the report printed in the RECORD, together with a statement by me.

There being no objection, the report and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL STOCKPILE INVENTORIES, JANUARY 1965

INTRODUCTION

This is the 62d in a series of monthly reports on Federal stockpile inventories. It is for the month of January 1965.

The report is compiled from official data on quantities and cost values of commodities in these stockpiles submitted to the Joint Committee of Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures by the Departments of Agriculture, Defense, Health, Education, and Welfare, and Interior, and the General Services Administration.

The cost value of materials in inventories covered in this report, as of January 1, 1965, totaled $13,396,502,200 and as of January 31, 1965, they totaled $13,236,183,096, a net decrease of $160,319,104 during the month.

Different units of measure make it impossible to summarize the quantities of commodities and materials which are shown in tables 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5, but the cost value figures are summarized by major category, as follows:

Summary of cost value of stockpile inventories by major category

Major category	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1965	End of month, Jan. 31, 1965	Net change during month
Strategic and critical materials:			
National stockpile [1]	$5,558,329,400	$5,539,247,000	−$19,074,400
Defense Production Act	1,426,418,900	1,424,948,300	−1,470,600
Supplemental—barter	1,395,282,549	1,399,569,506	+4,286,957
Total, strategic and critical materials [1]	8,380,022,849	8,363,764,806	−16,258,043
Agricultural commodities:			
Price support inventory	4,599,788,344	4,452,548,700	−147,239,644
Inventory transferred from national stockpile [1]	57,301,993	56,800,834	−501,159
Total, agricultural commodities [1]	4,657,090,337	4,509,349,534	−147,740,803
Civil defense supplies and equipment:			
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense	11,878,731	11,861,075	−17,656
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare	200,824,479	200,820,272	−4,207
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	212,703,210	212,681,347	−21,863
Machine tools:			
Defense Production Act	45,300	45,300	
National Industrial Reserve Act	88,643,000	88,684,100	+41,100
Total, machine tools	88,688,300	88,729,400	+41,100
Helium	57,997,504	61,658,009	+3,660,505
Total, all inventories	13,396,502,200	13,236,183,096	−160,319,104

[1] Cotton inventory valued at $128,409,100 withdrawn from the national stockpile and transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation for disposal, pursuant to Public Law 87-548, during August 1962.

Detailed tables in this report show each commodity, by the major categories summarized above, in terms of quantity and cost value as of the beginning and end of the month. Net change figures reflect acquisitions, disposals, and accounting and other adjustments during the month.

The cost value figures represent generally the original acquisition cost of the commodities delivered to permanent storage locations, together with certain packaging, processing, upgrading, et cetera, costs as carried in agency inventory accounts. Quantities are stated in the designated stockpile unit of measure.

Appendix A to this report, beginning on page 6500, includes program descriptions and statutory citations pertinent to each stockpile inventory within the major categories.

Table 1: Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), January 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during

the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month).

Table 2: Agricultural commodities inventories, January 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 3: Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, January 1965 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 4: Machine tools inventories, January 1965 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

Table 5: Helium inventories, January 1965 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity).

NEW STOCKPILE OBJECTIVES

The Office of Emergency Planning is in the process of establishing new stockpile objectives for strategic and critical materials. Table 1 of this report reflects the new objectives established between May 1963 and April 1964, based on essential needs in the event of a "conventional war emergency."

Appendix B, beginning on page 6501, contains excerpts from Office of Emergency Planning statements setting forth the new policy and current studies with respect to objectives for strategic and critical materials required for "conventional war emergency" and "nuclear war emergency."

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), January 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1965	End of month, Jan. 31, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1965	End of month, Jan. 31, 1965	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Aluminum, metal:									
National stockpile	$487,680,600	$487,680,600		Short ton	1,128,988	1,128,988			
Defense Production Act	401,780,800	401,660,300	-$120,500	do	796,892	796,656	-236		
Total	889,461,400	889,340,900	-120,500	do	1,925,880	1,925,644	-236	450,000	1,475,644
Aluminum oxide, abrasive grain:									
Supplemental—barter	15,717,600	15,717,600		Short dry ton	50,905	50,905		(2)	50,905
Aluminum oxide, fused, crude:									
National stockpile	21,735,100	21,735,100		Short ton	200,093	200,093			
Supplemental—barter	22,747,400	22,747,400		do	178,266	178,266			
Total	44,482,500	44,482,500		do	378,359	378,359		160,000	218,359
Antimony:									
National stockpile	20,356,300	19,814,700	-541,600	do	30,092	29,320	-772		
Supplemental—barter	13,550,500	13,550,500		do	22,704	22,704			
Total	33,906,800	33,365,200	-541,600	do	52,796	52,024	-772	25,500	26,524
Asbestos, amosite:									
National stockpile	2,637,600	2,637,600		do	11,705	11,705			
Supplemental—barter	10,004,912	10,004,950	+38	do	39,918	39,918			
Total	12,642,512	12,642,550	+38	do	51,623	51,623		40,000	11,623
Asbestos, chrysotile:									
National stockpile	3,356,200	3,356,200		do	6,224	6,224			
Defense Production Act	2,102,600	2,102,600		do	2,348	2,348			
Supplemental—barter	5,001,054	5,001,054		do	7,576	7,576			
Total	10,459,854	10,459,854		do	16,148	16,148		13,700	2,448
Asbestos, crocidolite:									
National stockpile	702,100	702,100		do	1,567	1,567			
Supplemental—barter	10,515,475	10,827,262	+311,787	do	40,342	41,588	+1,246		
Total	11,217,575	11,529,362	+311,787	do	41,909	43,155	+1,246	(2)	43,155
Bauxite, metal grade, Jamaica type:									
National stockpile	13,925,000	13,925,000		Long dry ton	879,740	879,740			
Defense Production Act	18,168,000	18,168,000		do	1,370,077	1,370,077			
Supplemental—barter	94,689,502	95,316,163	+626,661	do	6,147,490	6,195,489	+47,999		
Total	126,782,502	127,409,163	+626,661	do	8,397,307	8,445,306	+47,999	5,000,000	3,445,306
Bauxite, metal grade, Surinam type:									
National stockpile	78,552,500	78,552,500		do	4,962,706	4,962,706			
Supplemental—barter	45,197,400	45,197,400		do	2,927,260	2,927,260			
Total	123,749,900	123,749,900		do	7,889,966	7,889,966		5,300,000	2,589,966
Bauxite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	11,347,800	11,347,800		Long calcined ton.	299,279	299,279		173,000	126,279
Beryl:									
National stockpile	9,768,400	9,768,400		Short ton	23,230	23,230			
Defense Production Act	1,425,600	1,425,600		do	2,542	2,542			
Supplemental—barter	23,049,952	23,049,900	-52	do	12,277	12,277			
Total	34,243,952	34,243,900	-52	do	38,049	38,049		28,000	10,049
Beryllium metal:									
Supplemental—barter	18,703,500	18,703,500		do	153	153		(2)	153
Bismuth:									
National stockpile	2,674,300	2,674,300		Pound	1,342,402	1,342,402			
Defense Production Act	52,400	52,400		do	22,901	22,901			
Supplemental—barter	5,536,700	5,536,700		do	2,506,493	2,506,493			
Total	8,263,400	8,263,400		do	3,871,796	3,871,796		3,600,000	271,796
Cadmium:									
National stockpile	15,148,700	15,148,200	-500	do	7,699,716	7,699,481	-235		
Supplemental—barter	12,326,600	12,326,600		do	7,448,389	7,448,389			
Total	27,475,300	27,474,800	-500	do	15,148,105	15,147,870	-235	5,100,000	10,047,870
Castor oil:									
National stockpile	45,164,600	44,902,900	-261,700	do	177,609,264	176,562,924	-1,046,340	22,000,000	154,562,924

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), January 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1965	End of month, Jan. 31, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1965	End of month, Jan. 31, 1965	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Celestite:									
National stockpile	$1,412,300	$1,412,300		Short ton	28,816	28,816			
Supplemental—barter	827,486	893,735	+$66,249	do	19,225	20,968	+1,743		
Total	2,239,786	2,306,035	+66,249	do	48,041	49,784	+1,743	10,300	39,484
Chromite, chemical grade:									
National stockpile	12,288,000	12,288,000		Short dry ton	559,452	559,452			
Supplemental—barter	21,993,100	21,993,100		do	699,644	699,644			
Total	34,281,100	34,281,100		do	1,259,096	1,259,096		600,000	659,096
Chromite, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	264,565,500	264,565,500		do	3,795,291	3,795,291			
Defense Production Act	35,879,900	35,879,900		do	985,646	985,646			
Supplemental—barter	227,010,900	227,010,900		do	1,558,054	1,558,054			
Total	527,456,300	527,456,300		do	6,338,991	6,338,991		2,970,000	3,368,991
Chromite, refractory grade:									
National stockpile	25,149,300	25,149,300		do	1,047,159	1,407,159			
Supplemental—barter	5,039,000	5,039,000		do	179,775	179,775			
Total	30,188,300	30,188,300		do	1,226,934	1,226,934		1,425,000	(3)
Cobalt:									
National stockpile	169,225,700	169,228,500	+2,800	Pound	76,067,015	76,068,771	+1,756		
Defense Production Act	52,075,300	52,075,300		do	25,066,651	25,066,651			
Supplemental—barter	2,169,000	2,169,000		do	1,065,398	1,065,398			
Total	223,470,000	223,472,800	+2,800	do	102,199,064	102,200,820	+1,756	42,000,000	60,200,820
Coconut oil:									
National stockpile	1,014,000	984,200	-29,800	do	6,694,027	6,517,421	-176,606	(2)	6,517,421
Colemanite:									
Supplemental—barter	2,636,400	2,636,400		Long dry ton	67,636	67,636		(2)	67,636
Columbium:									
National stockpile	24,818,900	24,845,500	+26,600	Pound	7,364,642	7,364,642			
Defense Production Act	58,238,900	50,238,900		do	7,966,341	7,966,341			
Supplemental—barter	799,100	799,100		do	371,426	371,426			
Total	75,856,900	75,883,500	+26,600	do	15,702,409	15,702,409		1,176,000	14,526,409
Copper:									
National stockpile	524,384,400	524,503,100	+118,700	Short ton	1,008,471	1,008,474	+3		
Defense Production Act	41,964,100	41,942,800	-21,300	do	74,630	74,591	-39		
Supplemental—barter	8,252,100	8,252,100		do	12,382	12,382			
Total	574,600,600	574,698,000	+97,400	do	1,095,483	1,095,447	-36	775,000	320,447
Cordage fibers, abaca:									
National stockpile	37,034,300	37,034,100	-200	Pound	146,933,858	146,933,033	-825	100,000,000	46,933,033
Cordage fibers, sisal:									
National stockpile	41,866,600	41,858,500	-8,100	do	309,558,837	309,500,206	-58,631	300,000,000	9,500,206
Corundum:									
National stockpile	393,100	393,100		Short ton	2,008	2,008		2,500	(3)
Cryolite:									
Defense Production Act	5,482,900	5,402,200	-80,700	do	19,855	19,563	-292	(2)	19,563
Diamond dies:									
National stockpile	592,100	599,300	+7,200	Piece	19,052	19,248	+196	25,000	(3)
Diamond, industrial, crushing bort:									
National stockpile	61,601,800	61,601,800		Carat	31,109,411	31,109,411			
Supplemental—barter	15,800,500	15,800,500		do	5,550,579	5,550,579			
Total	77,402,300	77,402,300		do	36,659,990	36,659,990		24,700,000	11,959,990
Diamond, industrial, stones:									
National stockpile	100,509,400	100,509,400		do	9,319,183	9,319,183			
Supplemental—barter	186,341,500	186,341,500		do	15,425,827	15,425,827			
Total	286,850,900	296,850,900		do	24,745,010	24,745,010		16,500,000	8,245,010
Diamond tools:									
National stockpile	1,015,400	1,015,400		Piece	64,178	64,178		(2)	64,178
Feathers and down:									
National stockpile	31,454,300	31,216,400	-237,900	Pound	7,591,685	7,534,338	-57,347	3,000,000	4,534,338
Fluorspar, acid grade:									
National stockpile	26,167,500	26,167,500		Short dry ton	463,049	463,049			
Defense Production Act	1,394,400	1,394,400		do	19,700	19,700			
Supplemental—barter	33,531,100	33,531,100		do	673,232	673,232			
Total	61,093,000	61,093,000		do	1,155,981	1,155,981		540,000	615,981
Fluorspar, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	17,332,400	17,332,400		do	369,443	369,443			
Supplemental—barter	1,508,100	1,508,100		do	42,800	42,800			
Total	18,840,500	18,840,500		do	412,243	412,243		850,000	(3)

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), January 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1965	End of month, Jan. 31, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1965	End of month, Jan. 31, 1965	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Graphite, natural, Ceylon, amorphous lump:									
National stockpile	$937,900	$937,900		Short dry ton	4,455	4,455			
Supplemental—barter	341,200	341,200		do	1,428	1,428			
Total	1,279,100	1,279,100		do	5,883	5,883		5,500	383
Graphite, natural, Malagasy, crystalline:									
National stockpile	6,732,400	6,725,000	−$7,400	do	32,677	32,640	−37		
Supplemental—barter	232,500	232,500		do	1,908	1,908			
Total	6,964,900	6,957,500	−7,400	do	34,585	34,548	−37	18,000	16,548
Graphite, natural, other, crystalline:									
National stockpile	1,894,400	1,894,400		do	5,481	5,481		2,800	2,861
Hyoscine:									
National stockpile	30,600	30,600		Ounce	2,100	2,100		(3)	2,100
Iodine:									
National stockpile	4,082,000	4,082,000		Pound	2,956,713	2,956,713			
Supplemental—barter	1,412,300	1,412,300		do	1,333,563	1,333,563			
Total	5,494,300	5,494,300		do	4,290,276	4,290,276		8,000,000	(3)
Iridium:									
National stockpile	2,525,800	2,525,800		Troy ounce	13,937	13,937		17,000	(3)
Jewel bearings:									
National stockpile	4,564,600	4,564,600		Piece	52,435,065	52,435,065		57,500,000	(3)
Kyanite-mullite:									
National stockpile	725,700	721,400	−4,300	Short dry ton	8,393	8,344	−49	4,800	3,544
Lead:									
National stockpile	307,062,400	305,368,000	−1,694,400	Short ton	1,010,132	1,004,387	−5,745		
Supplemental—barter	78,398,500	78,398,500		do	327,998	327,998			
Total	385,460,900	383,766,500	−1,694,400	do	1,338,130	1,332,385	−5,745	0	1,332,385
Magnesium:									
National stockpile	124,437,300	124,281,700	−155,600	do	171,383	171,168	−215	145,000	26,168
Manganese, battery grade, natural ore:									
National stockpile	21,025,500	21,025,500		Short dry ton	144,485	144,485			
Supplemental—barter	14,076,600	14,076,000		do	142,245	142,245			
Total	35,102,100	35,102,100		do	286,730	286,730		80,000	206,730
Manganese, battery grade, synthetic dioxide:									
National stockpile	3,095,500	3,095,500		do	21,272	21,272			
Defense Production Act	2,524,700	2,524,700		do	3,779	3,779			
Total	5,620,200	5,620,200		do	25,051	25,051		6,700	18,351
Manganese, chemical grade, type A:									
National stockpile	2,133,300	2,133,300		do	29,307	29,307			
Supplemental—barter	7,922,100	7,922,100		do	117,607	117,607			
Total	10,055,400	10,055,400		do	146,914	146,914		68,500	78,414
Manganese, chemical grade, type B:									
National stockpile	132,600	132,600		do	1,822	1,822			
Supplemental—barter	6,669,800	6,669,800		do	99,016	99,016			
Total	6,802,400	6,802,400		do	100,838	100,838		64,000	36,838
Manganese, metallurgical grade:									
National stockpile	248,240,900	248,240,900		do	5,852,191	5,852,191			
Defense Production Act	172,122,100	172,122,100		do	2,980,257	2,980,257			
Supplemental—barter	263,061,197	266,280,404	+3,219,207	do	3,945,112	3,987,110	+41,998		
Total	683,424,197	686,643,404	+3,219,207	do	12,777,560	12,819,558	+41,998	7,900,000	4,919,558
Mercury:									
National stockpile	33,077,100	33,077,100		Flask	184,456	184,365	−91		
Supplemental—barter	3,446,200	3,446,200		do	16,000	16,000			
Total	36,523,300	36,523,300		do	200,456	200,365	−91	200,000	365
Mica, muscovite block:									
National stockpile	27,627,600	27,627,600		Pound	11,622,775	11,622,775			
Defense Production Act	40,689,700	40,689,700		do	6,432,569	6,432,569			
Supplemental—barter	6,668,411	6,665,744	−2,667	do	1,950,682	1,950,810	+128		
Total	74,985,711	74,983,044	−2,667	do	20,006,026	20,006,154	+128	6,000,000	14,006,154
Mica, muscovite film:									
National stockpile	9,058,100	9,058,100		do	1,719,308	1,719,308			
Defense Production Act	633,300	633,300		do	102,681	102,681			
Supplemental—barter	1,060,200	1,060,200		do	116,556	116,556			
Total	10,751,600	10,751,600		do	1,938,545	1,938,545		2,000,000	(3)

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), January 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1965	End of month, Jan. 31, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1965	End of month, Jan. 31, 1965	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Mica, muscovite splittings:									
National stockpile	$40,598,300	$40,598,300		Pound	40,040,169	40,040,169			
Supplemental—barter	6,225,800	6,225,800		do	4,826,257	4,826,257			
Total	46,824,100	46,824,100		do	44,866,426	44,866,426		22,200,000	22,666,426
Mica, phlogopite block:									
National stockpile	303,600	303,600		do	223,239	223,239		17,000	206,239
Mica, phlogopite splittings:									
National stockpile	2,580,500	2,580,500		do	3,079,062	3,079,062			
Supplemental—barter	2,501,800	2,501,800		do	1,986,902	1,986,902			
Total	5,082,300	5,082,300		do	5,065,964	5,065,964		1,300,000	3,765,964
Molybdenum:									
National stockpile	74,926,600	74,869,500	−$57,100	do	72,077,936	72,052,882	−25,054	68,000,000	4,052,882
Nickel:									
National stockpile	181,737,000	181,737,000		Short ton	166,761	166,761			
Defense Production Act	95,045,500	94,103,700	−941,800	do	50,241	49,779	−462		
Total	276,782,500	275,840,700	−941,800	do	217,002	216,540	−462	50,000	166,540
Opium:									
National stockpile	13,661,700	13,661,700		Pound	196,364	196,364		141,280	55,084
Palladium:									
National stockpile	2,079,000	2,079,000		Troy ounce	89,811	89,811			
Supplemental—barter	12,170,200	12,170,200		do	648,124	648,124			
Total	14,249,200	14,249,200		do	737,935	737,935		1,300,000	(3)
Palm oil:									
National stockpile	1,852,100	1,776,700	−75,400	Pound	10,290,233	9,871,585	−418,648	(2)	9,871,585
Platinum:									
National stockpile	56,879,900	56,879,900		Troy ounce	716,343	716,343			
Supplemental—barter	4,024,500	4,024,500		do	49,999	49,999			
Total	60,904,400	60,904,400		do	766,342	766,342		450,000	316,342
Pyrethrum:									
National stockpile	415,100	415,100		Pound	67,065	67,065		25,000	42,065
Quartz crystals:									
National stockpile	67,473,900	67,075,300	−398,600	do	5,470,013	5,437,702	−32,311		
Supplemental—barter	3,519,200	3,519,200		do	232,352	232,352			
Total	70,993,100	70,594,500	−398,600	do	5,702,365	5,670,054	−32,311	650,000	5,020,054
Quinidine:									
National stockpile	1,846,000	1,846,000		Ounce	1,600,428	1,600,428		2,000,000	(3)
Quinine:									
National stockpile	2,617,000	2,617,000		do	4,137,733	4,137,733		4,130,000	7,733
Rare earths:									
National stockpile	7,134,900	7,134,900		Short dry ton	9,969	9,969			
Supplemental—barter	5,830,900	5,830,900		do	5,810	5,810			
Total	12,965,800	12,965,800		do	15,779	15,779		3,000	12,779
Rare earths residue:									
Defense Production Act	657,200	657,200		Pound	6,079,983	6,079,961	−22	(2)	6,079,961
Rhodium:									
National stockpile	78,200	78,200		Troy ounce	618	618		(2)	618
Rubber:									
National stockpile	665,404,900	658,578,100	−6,826,800	Long ton	860,551	851,773	−8,778	130,000	721,773
Ruthenium:									
Supplemental—barter	559,500	559,500		Troy ounce	15,001	15,001		(2)	15,001
Rutile:									
National stockpile	2,070,100	2,070,100		Short dry ton	18,599	18,599			
Defense Production Act	2,725,100	2,725,100		do	17,385	17,385			
Supplemental—barter	1,061,300	1,061,300		do	11,632	11,632			
Total	5,856,500	5,856,500		do	47,616	47,616		51,000	(3)
Sapphire and ruby:									
National stockpile	190,000	190,000		Carat	16,187,500	16,187,500		18,000,000	(3)
Selenium:									
National stockpile	757,100	757,100		Pound	97,100	97,100			
Supplemental—barter	1,593,560	1,659,294	+65,734	do	289,290	306,603	+17,304		
Total	2,350,660	2,416,394	+65,734	do	386,399	403,703	+17,304	475,000	(3)
Shellac:									
National stockpile	8,221,300	8,204,800	−16,500	do	16,398,690	16,365,883	−32,807	8,300,000	8,065,883

See footnotes at end of table.

TABLE 1.—*Strategic and critical materials inventories (all grades), January 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity, and excesses over stockpile objectives in terms of quantity as of the end of the month)*—Continued

Commodity	Cost value			Quantity					
	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1965	End of month, Jan. 31, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1965	End of month, Jan. 31, 1965	Net change during month	Stockpile objective [1]	Excess over stockpile objective
Silicon carbide, crude:									
National stockpile	$11,394,500	$11,394,500		Short ton	64,697	64,697			
Supplemental—barter	26,803,600	26,803,600		do	131,805	131,805			
Total	38,198,100	38,198,100		do	196,502	196,502		30,000	166,502
Silk noils and waste:									
National stockpile	1,232,100	1,232,100		Pound	979,924	979,924		(2)	979,924
Silk, raw:									
National stockpile	486,600	486,600		do	113,515	113,515		(2)	113,515
Sperm oil:									
National stockpile	4,775,400	4,775,400		do	23,442,158	23,442,158		23,400,000	42,158
Talc, steatite block and lump:									
National stockpile	494,800	494,800		Short ton	1,269	1,269		200	1,069
Talc, steatite ground:									
National stockpile	231,200	231,200		do	3,901	3,901		(2)	3,901
Tantalum:									
National stockpile	12,104,200	12,104,200		Pound	3,148,556	3,148,556			
Defense Production Act	9,734,400	9,734,400		do	1,536,023	1,536,023			
Supplemental—barter	21,100	21,100		do	8,036	8,036			
Total	21,859,700	21,859,700		do	4,692,615	4,692,615		3,400,000	1,292,615
Thorium:									
Supplemental—barter	17,991,700	17,991,700		do	3,965,461	3,965,461		500,000	3,465,461
Thorium residue:									
Defense Production Act	42,000	42,000		do	848,354	848,354		(2)	848,354
Tin:									
National stockpile	732,503,900	723,811,500	−$8,692,400	Long ton	301,236	297,661	−3,575		
Supplemental—barter	16,404,000	16,404,000		do	7,505	7,505			
Total	748,907,900	740,215,500	−8,692,400	do	308,741	305,166	−3,575	200,000	105,166
Titanium sponge:									
Defense Production Act	175,871,900	175,871,900		Short ton	22,339	22,339			
Supplemental—barter	32,097,700	32,097,700		do	9,021	9,021			
Total	207,969,600	207,969,600		do	31,360	31,360		20,500	10,860
Tungsten:									
National stockpile	369,128,100	369,128,100		Pound	120,014,398	120,013,898	−500		
Defense Production Act	315,808,100	315,501,800	−306,300	do	77,434,549	77,351,978	−82,571		
Supplemental—barter	18,651,400	18,651,400		do	5,774,827	5,774,827			
Total	703,587,600	703,281,300	−306,300	do	203,223,774	203,140,703	−83,071	44,000,000	159,140,703
Vanadium:									
National stockpile	31,567,900	31,567,900		Short ton	7,865	7,865		1,400	6,465
Vegetable tannin extract, chestnut:									
National stockpile	10,076,600	9,988,300	−90,300	Long ton	36,123	35,800	−323	15,000	20,800
Vegetable tannin extract, quebracho:									
National stockpile	48,858,500	48,858,500		do	197,472	197,472		86,000	111,472
Vegetable tannin extract, wattle:									
National stockpile	9,826,900	9,826,900		do	38,962	38,962		15,000	23,962
Zinc:									
National stockpile	342,729,700	342,598,600	−131,100	Short ton	1,181,338	1,181,076	−262		
Supplemental—barter	79,588,400	79,588,400		do	323,896	323,896			
Total	422,318,100	422,187,000	−131,100	do	1,505,234	1,504,972	−262	0	1,504,972
Zirconium ore, baddeleyite:									
National stockpile	710,600	710,600		Short dry ton	16,533	16,533		(3)	16,533
Zirconium ore, zircon:									
National stockpile	113,300	113,300		do	1,920	1,920		(3)	1,920
Total:									
National stockpile	5,558,321,400	5,539,247,000	−19,074,400						
Defense Production Act	1,426,418,900	1,424,948,300	−1,470,600						
Supplemental—barter	1,395,282,549	1,399,569,506	+4,286,957						
Total, strategic and critical materials.	8,380,022,849	8,363,764,806	−16,258,043						

---

[1] Stockpile objectives for strategic and critical materials are determined pursuant to the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h). The Office of Emergency Planning is currently in the process of revising stockpile objectives. (See app. B, p. 6501.)

[2] No present objective.

[3] Not in excess of stockpile objective.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration and the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 2.—*Agricultural commodities inventories, January 1965 (showing by commodity net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Commodity	Cost value			Unit of measure	Quantity		
	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1965	End of month, Jan. 31, 1965	Net change during month		Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1965	End of month, Jan. 31, 1965	Net change during month
Price-support inventory:							
Basic commodities:							
Corn	$1,018,873,562	$990,987,974	−$27,885,588	Bushel	835,426,048	810,035,515	−25,390,533
Cotton, extra-long staple	33,300,077	32,612,591	−687,486	Bale	126,319	123,813	−2,506
Cotton, upland	1,267,429,095	1,240,208,449	−27,220,646	do.	7,666,277	7,506,558	−159,719
Peanuts, farmers' stock	9,301	9,301		Pound	78,291	78,291	
Peanuts, shelled	4,685,629	5,089,622	+403,993	do.	26,797,547	29,628,627	+2,831,080
Rice, milled	176,221	100,520	−75,701	Hundredweight	17,626	12,102	−5,524
Rice, rough	5,411,857	4,738,994	−672,863	do.	1,042,687	914,241	−128,446
Wheat	1,457,765,451	1,396,020,762	−61,744,689	Bushel	711,529,727	679,213,858	−32,315,869
Wheat flour	428,497	663,758	+235,261	Pound	7,711,000	11,704,300	+3,993,300
Total, basic commodities	3,788,079,690	3,670,431,971	−117,647,719				
Designated nonbasic commodities:							
Barley	19,492,785	19,090,756	−402,029	Bushel	22,624,057	22,165,809	−458,248
Grain sorghum	661,266,306	649,474,592	−11,791,714	do.	587,274,248	574,794,144	−12,480,104
Milk and butterfat:							
Butter	29,110,540	22,069,628	−7,040,912	Pound	50,065,848	37,919,036	−12,146,812
Butter oil	8,283,408	8,208,357	−75,051	do.	10,719,252	10,622,100	−97,152
Cheese	12,519,189	7,853,405	−4,665,784	do.	32,645,432	20,413,640	−12,231,792
Milk, dried	22,930,031	23,117,306	+187,275	do.	150,830,074	154,047,490	+3,217,416
Oats	19,636,510	19,362,206	−274,304	Bushel	32,514,253	32,029,357	−484,896
Rye	517,029	477,381	−39,648	do.	465,298	424,390	−40,908
Tung oil	3,556,314	3,556,366	+52	Pound	14,818,194	14,818,194	
Total, designated nonbasic commodities	777,312,112	753,209,997	−24,102,115				
Other nonbasic commodities:							
Beans, dry, edible	4,691,482	2,807,283	−1,884,199	Hundredweight	671,828	395,562	−276,266
Cottonseed oil, refined, other	9,138,869	7,667,302	−1,471,567	Pound	81,387,761	68,283,871	−13,103,890
Cottonseed oil, refined, salad oil [1]	1,880,176	877,827	−1,002,349	do.	9,942,990	4,784,843	−5,158,147
Flaxseed	8,533,733	8,127,063	−406,670	Bushel	2,878,285	2,738,980	−139,305
Linseed oil	8,995,663	9,330,758	+335,095	Pound	75,889,780	78,648,000	+2,758,220
Soybeans	1,156,619	96,499	−1,060,120	Bushel	497,109	42,092	−455,017
Total, other nonbasic commodities	34,396,542	28,906,732	−5,489,810				
Total, price support inventory	4,599,788,344	4,452,548,700	−147,239,644				
Inventory transferred from national stockpile: [2]							
Cotton, Egyptian	34,729,705	34,530,328	−199,377	Bale	41,109	40,873	236
Cotton, American-Egyptian	22,572,288	22,270,506	−301,782	do.	44,878	44,278	−600
Total, inventory transferred from national stockpile	57,301,993	56,800,834	−501,159	do.	85,987	85,151	−836
Total, agricultural commodities	4,657,090,337	4,509,349,534	−147,740,803				

[1] Reported as "Cottonseed oil, refined," prior to February 1964.

[2] Transferred from General Services Administration pursuant to Public Law 85–96 and Public Law 87–548. (See app. A, p. 6500.)

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Agriculture.

TABLE 3.—*Civil defense supplies and equipment inventories, January 1965 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Unit of measure	Quantity		
	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1965	End of month, Jan. 31, 1965	Net change during month		Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1965	End of month, Jan. 31, 1965	Net change during month
Civil defense stockpile, Department of Defense:							
Engineering equipment (engine generators, pumps, chlorinators, purifiers, pipe, and fittings)	$10,080,635	$10,063,183	−$17,452	10-mile units	45	45	
Chemical and biological equipment	1,798,096	1,797,892	−204	(1)			
Total	11,878,731	11,861,075	−17,656				
Civil defense medical stockpile, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare:							
Medical bulk stocks, and associated items at civil defense mobilization warehouses	117,719,157	117,504,941	−214,216	(1)			
Medical bulk stock at manufacturer locations	5,090,353	5,090,353		(1)			
Civil defense emergency hospitals	71,323,061	71,554,585	+231,524	Each	2,186	2,187	+1
Supply additions (for packaged disaster hospitals)	6,691,908	6,670,393	−21,515	(1)			
Total	200,824,479	200,820,272	−4,207				
Total, civil defense supplies and equipment	212,703,210	212,681,347	−21,863				

(1) Composite group of many different items.

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of Defense and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

TABLE 4.—*Machine tools inventories, January 1965 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1965	End of month, Jan. 31, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1965	End of month, Jan. 31, 1965	Net change during month
Defense Production Act:							
On loan	$45,300	$45,300		Tool	7	7	
National Industrial Reserve Act:							
In storage	75,867,500	75,912,100	+$44,600	do	6,590	6,610	+20
On lease	27,500	27,500		do	1	1	
On loan to other agencies	14,900	14,900		do	3	3	
On loan to school programs	12,733,100	12,729,600	−3,500	do	3,030	3,029	−1
Total	88,643,000	88,684,100	+41,100	do	9,624	9,643	+19
Total, machine tools	88,688,300	88,729,400	+41,100	do	9,631	9,650	+19

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the General Services Administration.

TABLE 5.—*Helium inventories, January 1965 (showing by item net changes during the month in terms of cost value and quantity)*

Item	Cost value			Quantity			
	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1965	End of month, Jan. 31, 1965	Net change during month	Unit of measure	Beginning of month, Jan. 1, 1965	End of month, Jan. 31, 1965	Net change during month
Helium:							
Stored aboveground	$236,463	$213,989	−$22,474	Cubic foot	21,400,000	18,800,000	−2,600,000
Stored underground	57,761,041	61,444,020	+3,682,979	do	5,433,500,000	5,771,100,000	+337,600,000
Total, helium	57,997,504	61,658,009	+3,660,505	do	5,454,900,000	5,789,900,000	+335,000,000

Source: Compiled from reports submitted by the Department of the Interior.

Appendix A

Program Descriptions and Statutory Citations

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

National stockpile

The Strategic and Critical Materials Stock Piling Act (50 U.S.C. 98–98h) provides for the establishment and maintenance of a national stockpile of strategic and critical materials. The General Services Administration is responsible for making purchases of strategic and critical materials and providing for their storage, security, and maintenance. These functions are performed in accordance with directives issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning. The act also provides for the transfer from other Government agencies of strategic and critical materials which are excess to the needs of such other agencies and are required to meet the stockpile objectives established by OEP. In addition, the General Services Administration is responsible for disposing of those strategic and critical materials which OEP determines to be no longer needed for stockpile purposes.

General policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling are contained in DMO V–7, issued by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning and published in the Federal Register of December 19, 1959 (24 F.R. 10309). Portions of this order relate also to Defense Production Act inventories.

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration is authorized to make purchases of or commitments to purchase metals, minerals, and other materials, for Government use or resale, in order to expand productive capacity and supply, and also to store the materials acquired as a result of such purchases or commitments. Such functions are carried out in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

Supplemental—barter

As a result of a delegation of authority from OEP (32A C.F.R., ch. I, DMO V–4) the General Services Administration is responsible for the maintenance and storage of materials placed in the supplemental stockpile. Section 206 of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1856) provides that strategic and other materials acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation as a result of barter or exchange of agricultural products, unless acquired for the national stockpile or for other purposes, shall be transferred to the supplemental stockpile established by section 104(b) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1704(b)). In addition to the materials which have been or may be so acquired, the materials obtained under the programs established pursuant to the Domestic Tungsten, Asbestos, Fluorspar, and Columbium-Tantalum Production and Purchase Act of 1956 (50 U.S.C. App. 2191–2195), which terminated December 31, 1958, have been transferred to the supplemental stockpile, as authorized by the provisions of said Production and Purchase Act.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The price-support program

Price-support operations are carried out under the charter powers (15 U.S.C. 714) of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, in conformity with the Agricultural Act of 1949 (7 U.S.C. 1421), the Agricultural Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1741), which includes the National Wool Act of 1954, the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 U.S.C. 1442), the Agricultural Act of 1958, and with respect to certain types of tobacco, in conformity with the act of July 28, 1945, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1312). Under the Agricultural Act of 1949, price support is mandatory for the basic commodities—corn, cotton, wheat, rice, peanuts, and tobacco—and specific nonbasic commodities; namely, tung nuts, honey, milk, butterfat, and the products of milk and butterfat. Under the Agricultural Act of 1958, as producers of corn voted in favor of the new price-support program for corn authorized by that act, price support is mandatory for barley, oats, rye, and grain sorghums. Price support for wool and mohair is mandatory under the National Wool Act of 1954, through the marketing year ending March 31, 1966. Price support for other nonbasic agricultural commodities is discretionary except that, whenever the price of either cottonseed or soybeans is supported, the price of the other must be supported at such level as the Secretary determines will cause them to compete on equal terms on the market. This program may also include operations to remove and dispose of or aid in the removal or disposition of surplus agricultural commodities for the purpose of stabilizing prices at levels not in excess of permissible price-support levels.

Price support is made available through loans, purchase agreements, purchases, and other operations and, in the case of wool and mohair, through incentive payments based on marketings. The producers' commodities serve as collateral for price-support loans. With limited exceptions, price-support loans are nonrecourse and the Corporation looks only to the pledged or mortgaged collateral for satisfaction of the loan. Purchase agreements generally are available during the same period that loans are available. By signing a purchase agreement, a producer receives an option to sell to the Corporation any quantity of the commodity which he may elect within the maximum specified in the agreement.

The major effect on budgetary expenditures is represented by the disbursements for price-support loans. The largest part of the commodity acquisitions under the program result from the forfeiting of commodities pledged as loan collateral for which the expenditures occurred at the time of making the loan, rather than at the time of acquiring the commodities.

Dispositions of commodities acquired by the Corporation in its price-support operations are made in compliance with sections 202, 407, and 416 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, and other applicable legislation particularly the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (7 U.S.C. 1691), title I of the Agricultural Act of 1954, title II of the Agricultural Act of 1956, the Agricultural Act of 1958, the act of August 19, 1958, in the case of cornmeal and wheat flour, and the act of September 21, 1959, with regard to sales of livestock feed in emergency areas.

Inventory transferred from national stockpile

This inventory, all cotton, was transferred to Commodity Credit Corporation at no cost from the national stockpile pursuant to Public Law 85-96 and Public Law 87-548. The proceeds from sales, less costs incurred by CCC, are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts; therefore, such proceeds, and costs are not recorded in the operating accounts. The cost value as shown for this cotton has been computed on the basis of average per bale cost of each type of cotton when purchased by CCC for the national stockpile.

CIVIL DEFENSE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT

Civil defense stockpile

The Department of Defense conducts this stockpiling program pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as amended. The program is designed to provide some of the most essential materials to minimize the effects upon the civilian population which would be caused by an attack upon the United States. Supplies and equipment normally unavailable, or lacking in quantity needed to cope with such conditions, are stockpiled at strategic locations in a nationwide warehouse system consisting of general storage facilities.

Civil defense medical stockpile

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare conducts the stockpiling program for medical supplies and equipment pursuant to section 201(h) of Public Law 920, 81st Congress, as delegated by the President following the intent of Reorganization Plan No. 1, of 1958. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare plans and directs the procurement, storage, maintenance, inspection, survey, distribution, and utilization of essential supplies and equipment for emergency health services. The medical stockpile includes a program designed to pre-position assembled emergency hospitals and other medical supplies and equipment into communities throughout the Nation.

MACHINE TOOLS

Defense Production Act

Under section 303 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2093) and Executive Order 10480, as amended, the General Services Administration has acquired machine tools in furtherance of expansion of productive capacity, in accordance with programs certified by the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning.

National industrial equipment reserve

Under general policies established and directives issued by the Secretary of Defense, the General Services Administration is responsible for care, maintenance, utilization, transfer, leasing, lending to nonprofit schools, disposal, transportation, repair, restoration, and renovation of national industrial reserve equipment transferred to GSA under the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. 451–462).

HELIUM

The helium conservation program is conducted by the Department of the Interior pursuant to the Helium Act, approved September 13, 1960 (Public Law 86–777; 74 Stat. 918; 50 U.S.C. 167) and subsequent appropriations acts which have established fiscal limitations and provided borrowing authority for the program. Among other things, the Helium Act authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to produce helium in Government plants, to acquire helium from private plants, to sell helium to meet current demands, and to store for future use helium that is so produced or acquired in excess of that required to meet current demands. Sales of helium by the Secretary of the Interior shall be at prices established by him which shall be adequate to liquidate the costs of the program within 25 years, except that this period may be extended by the Secretary for not more than 10 years for funds borrowed for purposes other than the acquisition and construction of helium plants and facilities.

This report covers helium that is produced in Government plants and acquired from private plants. Helium in excess of current demands is stored in the Cliffside gasfield near Amarillo, Tex. The unit of measure is cubic foot at 14.7 pounds per square inch absolute pressure and 70° F.

APPENDIX B

NEW STOCKPILE OBJECTIVES

The Office of Emergency Planning is in the process of establishing new objectives for strategic and critical materials. Table 1 of this report reflects the new objectives established between May 1963 and April 1964 for 79 materials (including 3 removed from stockpile list), based on essential needs in the event of a "conventional war emergency." The new objective for each material has been noted in the reports, beginning with June 1963, for the months in which the respective objectives were established.

The following excerpts from OEP statements dated July 11 and 19, 1963, February 28, 1964, March 6, 13, 20, and 27, 1964, and April 3 and 10, 1964, set forth the new policy with respect to objectives for strategic and critical materials:

"The Office of Emergency Planning is now conducting supply-requirements studies for all stockpile materials which will reflect current military, industrial, and other essential needs in the event of a conventional war emergency. On the basis of recently completed supply-requirements studies for the foregoing materials the new stockpile objectives were established with the advice and assistance of the Interdepartmental Materials Advisory Committee, a group chaired by the Office of Emergency Planning and composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, and the General Services Administration, the Agency for International Development, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Small Business Administration participate as observers.

"These new objectives reflect a new policy to establish a single objective for each stockpile material. They have been determined on the basis of criteria heretofore used in establishing maximum objectives, and reflect the approximate calculated emergency deficits for the materials for conventional war and do not have any arbitrary adjustments for possible increased requirements for other types of emergency.

"Heretofore, there was a 'basic objective' and a 'maximum objective' for each material. The basic objectives assumed some continued reliance on foreign sources of supply in an emergency. The former maximum objectives completely discounted foreign sources of supply beyond North America and comparable accessible areas.

"Previously, maximum objectives could not be less than 6 months' normal usage of the material by industry in the United States in periods of active demand. The 6-month rule has been eliminated in establishing the new calculated conventional war objectives.

"The Office of Emergency Planning also announced that the present Defense Mobilization Order V-7, dealing with general policies for strategic and critical materials stockpiling, was now being revised to reflect these new policies. When finally prepared and approved, the new order will be published in the Federal Register.

"New conventional war objectives for the remaining stockpile materials are being developed as rapidly as new supply-requirements data become available. They will be released as they are approved.

"The Office of Emergency Planning is also making studies to determine stockpile needs to meet the requirements of general nuclear war and reconstruction. Stockpile objectives for nuclear war have not previously been developed. Some commodity objectives may be higher and others may be lower than the objectives established for conventional war.

"After the nuclear war supply-requirements studies are completed, stockpile objectives will be based upon calculated deficits for either conventional war or nuclear war, whichever need is larger.

"The Office of Emergency Planning stressed that any long-range disposal programs undertaken prior to the development of objectives based on nuclear war assumptions would provide against disposing of quantities which might be needed to meet essential requirements in the event of nuclear attack. While the disposal of surplus materials can produce many problems which have not heretofore arisen, every effort will be made to see that the interest of producers, processors, and consumers, and the international interests of the United States are carefully considered, both in the development and carrying out of disposal programs. Before decisions are made regarding the adoption of a long-range disposal program for a particular item in the stockpile, there will be appropriate consultations with industry in order to obtain the advice of interested parties."

The OEP statement of April 17, 1964, contained the following excerpts:

"Today's action completes supply-requirements studies for all stockpile materials based on current military, industrial, and other essential needs in the event of a conventional war emergency. Objectives for 79 materials in the stockpile were established with the advice and assistance of the Interdepartmental Materials Advisory Committee, a group chaired by OEP and composed of representatives of the Departments of State, Defense, the Interior, Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, and the General Services Administration, the Agency for International Development, and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Representatives of the Bureau of the Budget, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the Small Business Administration participate as observers.

"These new objectives reflect a new policy which accords with the recommendation of the Executive Stockpile Committee to establish a single objective for each material in the national stockpile. These new objectives will be reviewed and revised as necessary each year. Because military requirements and estimated emergency supplies of stockpile materials are constantly shifting, the supply-requirements balance for any material that is now or may become important to defense must be kept under continuing surveillance. Supply-requirements studies of the conventional war needs of approximately 20 other strategic and critical materials, which do not have stockpile objectives, are underway and are expected to be completed in the next few weeks. At the same time, studies on supply-requirements for nuclear war are going forward. No definite date for completion of these studies has been established as yet.

"OEP stressed that long-range programs for disposal of identified surpluses would take into account the interests of producers, processors, and consumers, as well as the international interests of the United States. Appropriate consultation with industry will precede all decisions for the adoption of every disposal program and the advice of interested parties will be sought."

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

The cost value of Federal stockpile inventories as of January 31, 1965, totaled $13,236,183,096. This was a net decrease of $160,319,104, as compared with the January 1 total of $13,396,502,200. Net changes during the month are summarized by major category as follows:

Major category	Cost value, January 1965	
	Net change during month	Total. end of month
Strategic and critical materials	−$16,258,043	$8,363,764,806
Agricultural commodities	−147,740,803	4,509,349,534
Civil defense supplies and equipment	−21,863	212,681,347
Machine tools	+41,100	88,729,400
Helium	+3,660,505	61,658,009
Total	−160,319,104	13,236,183,096

These figures are from the January 1965 report on Federal stockpile inventories compiled from official agency data by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures, showing detail with respect to quantity and cost value of each commodity in the inventories covered.

STRATEGIC AND CRITICAL MATERIALS

So-called strategic and critical materials are stored by the Government in (1) the national stockpile, (2) the Defense Production Act inventory, and (3) the supplemental-barter stockpile.

Overall, there are now 94 materials stockpiled in the strategic and critical inventories. Stockpile objectives—in terms of volume—are presently fixed for 76 of these 94 materials. Of the 76 materials having stockpile objectives, 63 were stockpiled in excess of their objectives as of January 31, 1965.

Increases in cost value were reported in 10 of the materials stockpiled in all strategic and critical inventories, decreases were reported in 25 materials, and 59 materials remained unchanged during January.

National stockpile

The cost value of materials in the national stockpile as of January 31, 1965, totaled $5,539,247,000. This was a net decrease of $19,074,400 during the month. The largest decreases were $8,692,400 in tin, $6,826,800 in rubber, and $1,694,400 in lead.

Defense Production Act inventory

The cost value of materials in the Defense Production Act inventory as of January 31, 1965, totaled $1,424,948,300. This was a net decrease of $1,470,600. The largest decrease was in nickel.

Supplemental barter

The cost value of materials in the supplemental-barter stockpile as of January 31, 1965, totaled $1,399,569,506. This was a net increase of $4,286,954.

OTHER STOCKPILE INVENTORIES

Among the other categories of stockpiled materials covered by the report the largest is $4.5 billion in agricultural commodities. Major decreases in agricultural commodities during January were reported for wheat, corn, and cotton.

Inventories of civil defense supplies and equipment showed a net decrease; the machine tools inventories showed a net increase; and the helium inventories showed a net increase during January.

REPORT ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. JOHNSTON, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments, to which was referred for examination and recommendation a list of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, dated March 24, 1965, that appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted a report thereon, pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NELSON:

S. 1643. A bill to provide that tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use on motor vehicles shall comply with certain safety and labeling regulations; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1644. A bill to protect civil rights by providing that it shall be a Federal offense to kill any person in connection with his advocacy, encouragement, or support of civil rights, or while such person is engaged in exercising or enjoying any of his civil rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Nelson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 1645. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Celestina P. Respicio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BENNETT:

S. 1646. A bill to establish Arches National Monument as Arches National Park; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BASS:

S. 1647. A bill for the relief of Kim Sung Jin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself, Mr. Mr. McNamara, Mr. Gruening, and Mr. Morse):

S. 1648. A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Douglas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. Kennedy of New York):

S. 1649. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for the completion of the improvement of the Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway authorized by the act of August 30, 1935; to the Committee on Public Works.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1650. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1651. A bill for the relief of Augustine Y. M. Yao;

S. 1652. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Kirk Patch; and

S. 1653. A bill for the relief of Coyle D. Bennett and Myrtle A. Bennett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. Case, Mr. Kuchel, and Mr. Scott):

S. 1654. A bill to amend sections 241 and 242 of title 18, United States Code, to specify the punishment, if personal injury or death results from a violation of such sections; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McNAMARA (for himself and Mr. Kuchel):

S. 1655. A bill to amend section 8(b)(4) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, with respect to strike at the sites of construction projects; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. GORE:

S. 1656. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the importation free of duty of technical yellow oxide of mercury from Mexico; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1657. A bill to provide flood control on the Big South Fork, Cumberland River Basin; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. Clark):

S. 1658. A bill relating to the appointment of the Architect of the Capitol; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. Douglas when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MOSS:

S. 1659. A bill providing an equitable basis for the sale to collectors of standard silver dollars now held in the Treasury; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DIRKSEN (for himself, Mr. Case, Mr. Clark, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy of Massachusetts, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Pastore, Mr. Pell, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Scott, Mr. Williams of New Jersey, and Mr. Young of Ohio):

S. 1660. A bill to incorporate the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States, Incorporated; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AIKEN:

S. 1661. A bill for the relief of Samuel C. Neiburg; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COTTON:

S. 1662. A bill for the relief of William B. Plumer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLOTT:

S. 1663. A bill for the relief of Maria Kryjanovskaja; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON:

S. 1664. A bill for the relief of Panagiotis Tsaprazis; and

S. 1665. A bill for the relief of Ilias Panagakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON (by request):

S. 1666. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1667. A bill to repeal the provisions of law relating to the fixing by the Postmaster General, with the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission, of rates of postage on fourth-class mail, and for other purposes; and

S. 1668. A bill to provide for a 5-day workweek for postmasters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Johnston when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH:

S. 1669. A bill for the relief of Col. John H. Awtry; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself, Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bible, Mr. Boggs, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Cannon, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Inouye, Mr. Kuchel, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McIntyre, Mr. Miller, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Tydings):

S. 1670. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Ribicoff when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

S. 1671. A bill to amend the Consolidated Farmers Home Administration Act of 1961 in order to increase the amount for which loans may be made under such act for fish farming; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (by request):

S. 1672. A bill to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Fulbright when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YARBOROUGH (for Mr. Hartke):

S. 1673. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in honor to the memory of Ernie Pyle; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BIBLE:

S. 1674. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Bible when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 1675. A bill creating a commission to be known as the Presidential Commission on Simplification of the Income Tax Laws; to the Committee on Finance.

(See the remarks of Mr. Miller when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GRUENING (for himself, Mr. Tydings, Mr. Bass, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Moss, Mr. Bartlett, and Mr. Yarborough):

S. 1676. A bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

(See the remarks of Mr. Gruening when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. HILL (for himself and Mr. Sparkman):

S. 1677. A bill to designate the lake formed by the Walter F. George lock and dam, Alabama and Georgia, as Lake Eufaula; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1678. A bill for the relief of Guillermo Macalintal Madrigal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 1679. A bill for the relief of Lugarda Losoya Damian-Ruiz; and

S. 1680. A bill for the relief of Gaudencio Bati Braceros; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUSKIE:

S. 1681. A bill to provide for uniform, fair, and equitable treatment of persons, businesses, or farms displaced by Federal and federally assisted programs; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Muskie when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BREWSTER:

S. 1682. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide severance pay for postal field service employees; and

S. 1683. A bill to bring the Government Printing Office within the purview of the act of September 26, 1961, relating to allotment and assignment of pay and other matters; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Brewster when he introduced the first above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1684. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to adjudicate a claim to certain land in Marengo County, Ala.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. Hill):

S. 1685. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities, and for other purposes; and

S. 1686. A bill to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to eliminate the reduction in annuity elected for a spouse when such spouse predeceases the person making the election; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Sparkman when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

S. 1687. A bill for the relief of Albert Scott; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1688. A bill to validate certain payments made to employees of the Forest Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture; and

S. 1689. A bill to amend paragraph (a) of the act of March 4, 1913, as amended by the act of January 31, 1931 (16 U.S.C. 502); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. DOMINICK:

S. 1690. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain land within the National Capital parks system in Washington, District of Columbia, for construction of a building by the Bureau of Water Resources of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(See the remarks of Mr. Dominick when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. FONG:

S. 1691. A bill for the relief of Man Loi Chu;

S. 1692. A bill for the relief of Tak Hing Kwan and his wife, Yut Chur Chun Kwan;

S. 1693. A bill for the relief of Vincent Thomas Foo, his wife Nelly Hyacinth Foo, and their minor children, Merle Ann Foo and Michael Jon Foo; and

S. 1694. A bill for the relief of Hyun Ok Shin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASE (for himself, Mr. Allott, and Mr. Morse):

S.J. Res. 68. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim the last week in October of every year as National Student Council Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. Case when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

PROPOSED WITHDRAWAL OF SOVIET FORCES FROM LATVIA, LITHUANIA, AND ESTONIA

Mr. FONG submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 31); which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas the United States has consistently recognized and upheld the right of the peoples of the Baltic States to national independence and to the enjoyment of all individual rights and freedoms; and

Whereas the charter of the United Nations declares as one of its purposes the development of friendly relations among nations based "on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples"; and

Whereas the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has by force of arms suppressed the freedom of the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia and has continued to deny these peoples the right of self-determination by free elections: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (*the House of Representatives concurring*), That the President is hereby requested, through the United States delegation to the United Nations, to take such action as may be necessary to bring before the United Nations for its consideration the question of the suppression of freedom in the Baltic States, and to request adoption by the United Nations of a resolution declaring that—

(a) The Soviet Union shall withdraw all Soviet troops, agents, colonists, and controls from Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia;

(b) The Soviet Union shall return all citizens of the Baltic States to their homelands from places of exile in Siberia, and dispersion in prisons and slave-labor camps throughout the Soviet Union; and

(c) The United Nations should conduct free elections in Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia under the direct supervision of the United Nations in order to permit the peoples of these countries to make their own choice of government.

MINIMUM SAFETY AND PERFORMANCE STANDARDS FOR MOTOR VEHICLE TIRES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to set minimum safety and performance standards for motor vehicle tires and to prescribe a system of grading and labeling for tires.

The tire manufacturing and marketing industries today contain the seeds of a national scandal. In the last year recognition of this fact has come from a variety of groups: State and Federal legislators and agencies, the industry, the press, and the private consumer. A consensus has emerged, I think, that some constructive action must be taken to protect the life and the pocketbook of the consumer.

The problem we are facing is twofold: We do not have accurate information on tire safety and the consumer has no way of appraising existing hazy and contradictory information.

The evidence speaks for itself:

Many new cars come equipped with tires which are not adequate even for normal use.

Six-passenger sedans with big trunks are tested for tire purposes with only three passengers and no luggage.

Some compact station wagons require eight-ply tires; yet many firms are shifting from four- to two-ply tires.

Tire sizes stamped on the tires do not tell the actual size and were never intended to do so.

Ply rating labels have no understandable meaning within the industry.

The bill I am introducing today would assure the consumer that the car he buys is equipped with sound, safe tires by prescribing minimum safety and performance standards.

Tire production is dominated by the automobile industry which has a great incentive to reduce unit costs in every possible way This discourages both the production and the purchase of really high quality tires, which many motorists should be using.

Mr. A. J. White, director of Motor Vehicle Research of New Hampshire has done a great deal of research in this area. He states:

> It is generally accepted that approximately 3 percent of all tires manufactured are substandard and will fail prematurely * * *.

> Tire research already has greatly improved tire life, safety, and vehicle stability. Enough is known about tire design today to improve almost every tire safety property further.

In addition, the bill would clarify the present confusion of tire nomenclature and guide the consumer in differentiating between a good and a bad tire.

Present tire labels do not indicate the exact size, the load capacity or the quality of the tire. However, both the automobile and tire industry say that tires are the responsibility of the motorist. So we need a system which will enable any reasonably intelligent man to look at a new car and determine whether the tires on it are adequate for the use he has in mind. We need a system under which a man shopping for replacement tires can get the size and the quality of tire which he wants.

In January 1964, Senator Humphrey's Subcommittee on Retailing, Distribution, and Marketing Practices issued a report on the automobile tire industry, recommending the introduction of such a system of quality rating in the tire industry. I quote from this report:

> The currently used complex methods of naming different brands or lines of tires is misleading and confusing to the public. The FTC "Tire Advertising Guide" proscribes misleading terminology in advertisements, yet it does not provide for an objective standard of quality rating to be applied to all tires. Such a standard is needed as the average buyer is not equipped to rate the quality of tires. A system whereby tires are rated according to Government standards of safety, endurance, general quality, and construction, such as is done in the meat industry, would let the consumer know exactly what he is buying. Your subcommittee recommends that a system of quality rating would be in the interest of safe transportation and should be enacted.

I would like to briefly review some of the recent actions taken in this area to further prove the general and widespread concern over tire safety. A great deal of credit must go to the New York State Joint Legislative Committee on Motor Vehicles and Traffic Safety and its former chairman, Senator Edward Speno. The legislation prepared by the Committee and by former Congressman Kenneth Roberts of Alabama in the House has done much in bringing this problem to the fore.

Contrary to the popular feeling that there is no public interest in this problem, Mrs. Esther Peterson, special assistant to the President for consumer affairs, informs me that her office daily receives many complaints about faulty tires and misleading advertising. In a letter to me, Mrs. Peterson said:

> The continuing number of traffic fatalities proves the need for further investigation of tires and some positive action to protect the consumer from any shoddy tire construction and deceptive tire advertising * * *. The public wants and has a right to know that what they are buying is safe.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a copy of Mrs. Peterson's letter be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, striking proof of public concern over this problem is evidenced in the response I have been receiving since I introduced my safe standards tire bill in the last session of Congress. In addition to letters from private citizens with personal complaints, I received endorsements from purchasing agencies throughout the country. I would like to quote from several of these letters.

The Association of Purchasing Agents:

> It is very gratifying to know that someone "at the top" is interested in automobile tire standards. This is certainly one of the bigger headaches of the purchasing agent for a large municipality such as the city of Houston and we shall have our eyes upon the progress of this bill.

The California Association of Public Purchasing Officers:

> You have our wholehearted support and that of many other purchasing organizations throughout the country.

City Purchasing Agency for Milwaukee, Wis.:

> I heartily applaud your announced program to set certain standards on automobile tires to improve the safety and reduce the appalling death rate on the highways * * *. The National Institute of Government Purchasing, the Wisconsin Association of Public Purchasers and this buying agency heartily endorse and back your program for some adequate standards in the tire industry * * *. With many confusing terms and claims by the manufacturers of tires, the consumer has been in a quandary, especially the public buyers, for whom I am speaking, who are in an endless search to get specifications covering their tire requirements so that they can purchase these intelligently and competitively.

I think I should call attention to one more group which has been instrumental in this area: the National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association. This organization, a trade group of approximately 3,400 tire dealers, has worked tirelessly for improvement of tire safety and has continually reaffirmed its support of uniform safety standards for tires. Dr. Warren W. Leigh, NTDRA marketing consultant, said recently:

> The tire industry spends altogether too much time juggling tire names, qualities and prices. It should wake up, establish some quality standards, and get away from the eternal higgling and bargaining.

In response to various pressures exerted on it, the industry through the Rubber Manufacturers Association issued last July a set of minimum tire safety standards which became effective January 1, 1965. To enforce these standards the association has contracted with an independent testing agency to conduct tests at random on the more than 900 tires which have been certified by RMA.

I am pleased to see the industry moving forward in this area but at the same time I am disturbed by the reception these new standards have received. Their adequacy has been questioned by many experts in the field.

The National Tire Dealers & Retreaders Association, at its annual conference in September, passed a resolution acknowledging the RMA standards but calling them "inadequate to prevent the marketing of automobile tires and truck tires of undersized outside diameter, low quality, and questionable safety."

In reply to a request from me as to the effectiveness of the new standards, the Department of Commerce points out that many of the tests included in the Federal specifications for tires developed over 10 years ago are not part of the RMA standards. This raises a number of serious questions. But specifically it shows that the standards are not adequate because they have been formulated on superficial evidence. The Department maintains that "an extensive program of testing and evaluating would be needed to produce complete and reliable data on the numerous types and quality levels of tires now available to the public."

These are technical questions and it would seem we must rely to a great extent on the opinions of experts in forming judgments. And in this case the experts do not seem to be satisfied.

In January the Federal Trade Commission held very excellent hearings on tire marketing practices. Representatives from the tire industry, the Rubber Manufacturers Association, business associations and noted experts in the safety field presented testimony and answered the questions of the Commissioners. Last week I spoke in the Senate on the explosive testimony presented at these hearings and I have urged FTC Chairman Dixon to publicly release this material to the American public and press.

After reading the FTC testimony, it is my judgment, and I feel would be the judgment of any concerned citizen, that we need a national system of tire grading and labeling and minimum safety standards. And I would think that the automobile and tire manufacturers would welcome this type of legislation. It will simply set reasonable guidelines for an industry which has life and death importance for the American public.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record at this point, and that the bill lie on the table for cosponsors until April 16.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bill (S. 1643) to provide that tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use on motor vehicles shall comply with certain safety and labeling regulations, introduced by Mr. Nelson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1643

To provide that tires sold or shipped in interstate commerce for use on motor vehicles shall comply with certain safety and labeling regulations

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of Commerce shall prescribe and publish in the Federal Register regulations prescribing minimum safety and performance standards and a grading and labeling system for motor vehicle tires. Such regulations shall be designed to provide the public with safe tires so that motor vehicle accidents caused by tire failure can be kept to a minimum. Regulations first established under this section shall be prescribed and published not later than one year after the date of enactment of this Act.

Sec. 2. (a) The manufacture for sale, the sale, or the offering for sale, in interstate commerce, or the importation into the United States, or the introduction, delivery for introduction, transportation, or causing to be transported, in interstate commerce, or for the purpose of sale, or delivery after sale, in interstate commerce, of any tire manufactured on or after the date this section takes effect shall be unlawful unless in compliance with the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to the first section of this Act.

(b) Whoever knowingly and willfully violates this section shall be fined not more than $1,000, or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

Sec. 3. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "interstate commerce" includes commerce between one State, territory, possession, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and another State, territory, possession, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

(2) The term "motor vehicle" includes any vehicle or machine propelled or drawn by mechanical power and used on the highways.

Sec. 4. This Act shall take effect on the date of its enactment except that section 2 shall take effect on such date as the Secretary of Commerce shall determine, but such date shall be not less than one hundred and eighty days nor more than one year after the date of publication of regulations first prescribed pursuant to the first section of this Act. If such regulations first prescribed are thereafter changed, such regulations as so changed shall take effect on such date as the Secretary of Commerce shall determine, but such date shall be not less than one hundred and eighty days nor more than one year after the date of their publication in accordance with the provisions of the first section of this Act.

Exhibit 1

Executive Office of the President,
President's Committee
on Consumer Interests,
Washington, D.C., January 4, 1965.

Hon. Gaylord Nelson,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Nelson: Thank you for your letter requesting information on tire safety. I was very pleased to learn of your interest in this field.

The continuing number of traffic fatalities proves the need for further investigation of tires and some positive action to protect the the consumer from any shoddy tire construction and deceptive tire advertising. Perhaps, Federal safety standards such as you proposed in your bill would be the answer.

Another solution to the problem might come from the Federal Trade Commission hearings to be held on January 13 and 14. The fact that such hearings are to be held is further recognition that a problem does exist, and I shall be very interested to learn of the Commission's proposals.

My own experience with tire safety has been limited. I cannot offer you any technical information, but, from the consumer's standpoint, I can tell you that my office receives a great many complaints about faulty tires and misleading advertising. The public wants and has a right to know that what they are buying is safe.

I want to emphasize my pleasure at the national recognition that this problem is receiving and assure you that I will do whatever I can to help in finding a solution.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Esther Peterson,
Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs.

Mr. YARBOROUGH subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record a statement prepared by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke], relating to the bill (S. 1643), introduced today by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson], which concerns the minimum safety and performance standards for motor vehicle tires.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement by Senator Hartke is as follows:

Statement by Senator Hartke

I welcome the opportunity to associate myself with the bill of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Nelson] to improve safety for the motoring public by the requirement of adequate standards for automobile tires. More than a year ago, I had an exchange of correspondence with a tire dealer in my own State, who detailed at some length the chaotic situation with regard to tire standards. The nomenclature applied by manufacturers gives no clue to quality; a "super-quality" tire may be inferior to a "standard" quality tire. But worse than the impossibility of deciphering the meaning of terms in the industry is the use, which this bill would correct, of inadequate tires. The recent Federal Trade Commission hearings have presented adequate justification for the proposed legislation introduced today.

The only Federal requirements by way of specifications which appear to exist today are those set by the National Bureau of Standards in 1952. But since 1952 there has been much change in the making of tires as well as in the construction of roads. The Bureau of Standards itself considers the 1952 tests outdated. Yet, in tests conducted last summer under auspices of a New York State committee headed by State Senator Edward J. Speno, application of even these outdated tests to tires bought on the open market resulted in failure only halfway through a 24-hour test. Broken cords, separated plies, hollow spaces between the carcass and the tread—these were some of the troubles with low-priced tires labeled "Nylon" and "Safety Special." Even premium tires proved defective under tests.

These facts are brought out in an article which was published in the New Republic for January 30, 1965, written by James Ridgway, entitled, "The Super-Quiet, Squishy Ride." The article follows:

"That Super-Quiet, Squishy Ride

(By James Ridgeway)

"A six-passenger automobile is equipped with tires designed to support only the weight of three occupants, not including their baggage. This startling admission was made at hearings before the Federal Trade Commission, where rubber manufacturers were asked to unravel the knotted strands of their business.

"Neither the tire nor the automobile industries ever have developed maximum loads for auto tires, declared Mr. M. A. Wilson, chief of tire engineering at Goodyear. (Rather belatedly they now are trying to come up with such specifications.) Instead, a usual practice in equipping cars with tires, he indicated, is to go by the handbook of the Tire & Rim Association, a technical advisory group, that recommends tire sizes and loads on the curb weight of the car plus three passengers.

"In a statement to the Commission, Harry C. McCreary Jr., chairman of McCreary Tire & Rubber Co., a small producer, said that auto companies had cut down so much on the amount of tires designed into their vehicles that some vehicles are sitting overloaded before anyone gets into them; others, particularly station wagons, are running dangerously around the highways 50 to 70 percent overloaded. McCreary said Detroit had saved a lot of money by cutting back on the amount of rubber used in tires.

"Commissioner Philip Elman said that he owned a compact station wagon which during the summer he would load up with his wife, five children, pets and baggage, then head toward New England over 500 miles of clear expressway. What assurance did he have that the tires were safe? Elman never got a straight answer. "Essentially your question is directed to the automobile industry," suggested one expert. "I cannot say that all tires for all cars are safe in all conditions," said another vaguely. Mr. Elman was urged to go to his tire dealer and state his needs; he was advised to buy tires that would take up the full load. "What bothers me," Elman said, "is that these standards suggest it is abnormal to fill up the car."

"As the hearings wore on, the manufacturers were prodded into offering up other driblets of information:

"Mr. Ross R. Ormsby, president of the Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., a trade group that speaks for the industry, said the size printed on the side of the tire really isn't the size at all, but an approximate measurement called the name size. For instance, if you went to replace a tire bearing a name size of 8.20 (8.20 inches in width), the new tire might range in actual size from 8.50 to 7.95 inches in width. In other words, every automobile is being driven around with four different sized tires, and the possibility of a good deal of difference between the sizes at that. On big trucks, where tires must be paired, their selection must present a ticklish problem.

"After New York State Senator Edward J. Speno put the screws to the tire crowd last year, threatening them with tough legislation, the industry brightly announced a voluntary program for setting minimum safety standards. These were based on specifications set for the Government in 1952 by the National Bureau of Standards; members of the industry agreed to have their tires put through tests at independent laboratories. The tires then would be certified as meeting the specifications. It all sounds very progressive. But since 1952 autos go faster, roads are improved and tires are differently made. The National Bureau of Standards considers the 1952 tests outdated, and Mr. Wilson, of Goodyear, himself referred to them as rather 'ancient.' Even if a tire manufacturer should fail to be certified, he could go right on selling the tires. In fact, probably nobody would ever know the difference.

"Pretty Big Mess

"The manufacturers, of course, don't care to get the Federal Government into the act. But it's a pretty big mess by now; and the FTC could well propose to the Commerce Department that the Government's tire standards be brought up to date, and, should the industry refuse to go along with them, Members of Congress, Senator Nelson, for one, are all set to ram legislation down the industry's throat.

"Mr. John F. Floberg, secretary and general counsel for Firestone, was undoubtedly reflecting a good deal of the industry's feeling when he declared: 'Probably the worst thing the Commission could do from the standpoint of customer protection would be to attempt to establish grades of quality, as has sometimes been suggested, on the basis of physically measurable dimensions or mathematically countable characteristics. * * * I submit that the best standard, the time-tested and proved standard and the appropriate free enterprise standard of quality should be the one that has in the case of tires, as in the case of other consumer products, worked most satisfactorily; namely, the discriminating and sophisticated taste of the American consumer.'

"By a stroke of splendid good fortune, Mr. Henry Wakeland, a consultant to Speno's committee, was able to tell the Commission precisely how well the sophisticated American consumer fared in the hands of Firestone.

"Last summer the Speno committee wanted to see just how badly tire buyers were being treated. It purchased tires and tubes based on price advertisements of a department store. While the tires didn't carry the manufacturer's name they were marked 'safety special' and 'nylon.' The committee sent them off to the National Bureau of Standards to see whether they would meet the Government's tests, which is already indicated are ancient.

"Both tires failed the laboratory tests which simulate highway conditions. About half way through the 24-hour testing period, they suddenly lost air and collapsed. The test run produced broken cords and separated plies to such an extent that the tubes were abraded through. One tire was cut open and proved to have voids, tunnellike hollow spaces, between the carcass and tread. The National Bureau of Standards said 'poor workmanship' was involved. 'Those tires looked like swiss cheese,' Wakeland remembers. The committee traced the manufacturer from a shipping tag, found it to be Dayton Tire & Rubber Co., a subsidiary of Firestone.

"Speno's committee had just as much trouble with high-priced tires. A New York State automobile club purchased premium tires for 20 vehicles. Complaints that the tires seemed to skid easily at first were brushed aside. It just couldn't be true, such was the reputation of the manufacturer and the price of the tire. The club's technical personnel conducted further testing, discovering that in stopping tests the tires produced skid marks on dry pavement 20 to 80 percent longer than those for comparable manufacturers. The club went to the manufacturer, who then changed the type of tread rubber in the tire specification and eventually replaced all the tires the club bought. The club was a big customer, in a position to develop its own facts. But the manufacturer never advised individual automobile owners that their tires, too, were unsafe.

"In Europe automobile owners can obtain charts where the make of car and its intended use can be matched with various tire brands. Nothing like this exists in America. In explaining why not, Mr. Edwin H. Sonnecken, director of corporate planning and research at Goodyear, said the European tire market was different. For one thing, it was smaller, dominated by one grade of tire. Distribution was much more highly controlled. There was no mass distribution of tires. And anyway, European car owners looked at things differently. They regarded owning a car as a specialty, as a sport. Unlike Americans, they didn't take things for granted. And they kept their cars longer. Or was Mr. Sonnecken only describing how very successful the tire manufacturers have been in turning America into the biggest sucker market of all time?

"While the Commission made hash of the tire people, it hauled up well short of taking on the automobile manufacturers, the real culprits. 'This is like a performance of "Hamlet" without the Prince of Denmark,' Mr. Elman remarked in exasperation.

"Detroit is the rubber factories' biggest customer. It demands of them tires of very small diameter for very low cars, tires with a soft and squishy ride that won't squeal on corners and are superquiet on the highway. One way to make a compact car look bigger is to put small tires on it.

"When Commissioner Mary Gardiner Jones asked why automobile tires weren't loaded for six instead of three people, the experts said she wouldn't like that. The ride would be too hard."

TO MAKE MURDER COMMITTED TO DEPRIVE ANOTHER OF ANY FEDERAL RIGHT AN OFFENSE AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, tens of thousands of Americans are now rising up to lay claim to their rights as American citizens. These Americans who have been discriminated against are joined by innumerable others. Thousands of Americans are demonstrating in order to secure to themselves the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment and the right to vote guaranteed by the 15th amendment.

Simply by demonstrating, they are attempting to exercise their rights under the 1st amendment—guaranteed against State infringement by the 14th amendment—to assemble peaceably and to petition government for the redress of grievances.

These are rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. They are Federal rights. And rights which are established by the Constitution are necessarily meant to be protected, and the obligations corresponding to these rights are meant to be enforced by judicial procedures and executive action. Fundamental rights established by the Constitution which cannot adequately be protected by the courts and by the Executive would present us with an intolerable anomaly.

These demonstrations by American citizens to secure to themselves their indubitable rights under the Constitution have been undertaken in the face of opposition and hostility on the part of State officials and other citizens in local communities. Regulations of demonstrations, like other laws and ordinances designed to protect the rights of persons and property and to insure the orderly flow of traffic, falls within the jurisdiction of the States under their police power. This is proper under our constitutional separation of powers between the States and the Federal Government.

But because there are Federal rights involved, the opposition between demonstrators on the one hand and officials and citizens in local communities on the other has brought the United States to virtual confrontation with certain of the States.

This is inescapable because the Federal Government must act to guarantee the Federal rights of U.S. citizens.

The ultimate means to which opponents of Federal civil rights have resorted is murder.

Last week, on March 25, 1965, Viola Gregg Liuzzo, wife of a Detroit, Mich., teamster, was shot to death while driving her car in rural Alabama after having taken a load of civil rights marchers from Montgomery to Selma.

A week earlier, the Reverend James J. Reeb, a Unitarian minister, died in Alabama of multiple skull fractures and a large blood clot over the brain. Mr. Reeb left his religious and humanitarian service in Boston for the time being in order to be present with those who have been demonstrating in Selma, in order to stand with them and to walk beside them in the cause of civil rights. In the end, he gave his life for that cause, joining a host of martyrs who have given their lives for the cause of man's rights.

On the night of February 18, 1965, about 500 demonstrators participated in a voter registration campaign in Marion, Ala., assembled at the Zion Methodist Church and commenced a peaceful and orderly march to protest the arrest of one of their leaders, who had been conducting the registration drive. State troopers met the demonstrators and violently forced them to return to their church. In the course of the retreat one young civil rights worker, Jimmie Lee Jackson, was shot twice in the stomach. His life also, like that of James Reeb, was lost in the fight for civil rights.

Last spring, the Council of Federated Organizations, made up of workers from the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, the Congress of Racial Equality, the Southern Christian Leadership Conference, and the NAACF, undertook the Mississippi summer project. The project consisted of opening a number of freedom schools in Mississippi to provide Negroes with the opportunity both to qualify themselves for skilled jobs and to qualify themselves to exercise the fundamental right of democratic citizenship—the right to vote.

Mike and Rita Schwerner, a young husband and wife from New York, opened one of the first two freedom schools in Meridian, Miss. They opened their school in a five-room suite, and they offered a collection of something like 10,000 books to those who wished to enhance their education for citizenship or for personal self-realization.

There were men in the area to whom the cause of civil rights which Mike Schwerner represented appeared as a specter threatening the political status quo. These men killed Mike Schwerner and two of his coworkers, Andrew Goodman from New York and James Chaney, a young Negro civil rights advocate from Meridian. The three young men disappeared on the night of June 21. They were last reported as having been in the custody of Deputy Sheriff Cecil Price, of Neshoba County, who had taken them in allegedly for speeding and had then released them. Their whereabouts was reported next on August 4, when the FBI discovered their bodies in an earthen dam near Philadelphia, Miss. After months of investigation, the FBI stated on December 4 that the Ku Klux Klan had planned the murder of the three civil rights workers, and arrested 21 men, including Sheriff Lawrence A. Rainey, of Neshoba County, and Deputy Sheriff Price. The FBI arrested these men not for murder, since no Federal statute made murders like those a Federal crime; but merely for conspiring to deny others their civil rights, an offense punishable by a Federal statute.

Medgar W. Evers was a young field secretary for the NAACP in Jackson, Miss. He worked to increase voter registration by Negroes. He conducted peaceful demonstrations against segregation. He was respected by white officials with whom he had dealings.

On June 12, 1963, a man who hated the cause of civil rights for all Americans hid in a bush near Medgar Evers' home and shot him in the back with a high-powered rifle as he walked from his car to his house.

Since April 1963 there have been 13 highly publicized killings in connection with civil rights cases. None have been solved. No one could have been indicted for murder under Federal law. How many other unreported cases there are we can only speculate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at the end of my remarks a list of these killings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McIntyre in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. NELSON. In none of these instances of murder, Mr. President, has the U.S. Department of Justice been able to prosecute a charge of murder. Except in rare instances, as when it is committed on Federal property or when a Federal official is killed while performing his duty, murder has not been made a Federal offense.

Murder, as such, is not legally a Federal offense. And yet, in each of the instances which I have cited, murderers have killed men for no other reason than that their victims represented the cause of federally guaranteed civil rights.

It would seem unreasonable, Mr. President, that the Constitution or the Congress should establish Federal rights which the Justice Department and the Federal courts cannot back up with the full force of law. We have authorized the Attorney General to initiate civil actions in the Federal courts to secure injunctive relief against deprivations of the right to vote, the right to equal treatment in places of public accommodation and in public facilities, the right to equal opportunity in public education, the right to equal opportunity in employment. Indeed, we have authorized the Attorney General to intervene in any action brought to secure relief from denial of equal protection of the laws on account of race, creed, or color.

But the Justice Department is powerless to take action against a murderer even when he has killed to deny to others their federally guaranteed civil rights. The murderer has struck the ultimate blow against affectation of Federal rights, and the Federal Government cannot counteract in defense of these rights.

The Justice Department may take legal action under title 18, section 241, of the United States Code, which provides for penalties against those who conspire to deprive another "of any right or privilege secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States," or under section 242, which establishes penalties against one who under color of law deprives another "of any rights, privileges, or immunities secured or protected by the Constitution or laws of the United States." But prosecution under either of these sections falls far short of prosecution for murder.

I am today introducing legislation, Mr. President, to make murder committed as a means to deprive another of any federally guaranteed right an offense against the United States. This legislation is not intended to extend the power of the Federal Government beyond its constitutional limits, but rather to preserve those constitutional rights which are Federal in character or federally guaranteed, and hence must be protected by Federal action. By virtue of this legislation, no man would be able to strike with impunity against the Federal rights of citizens of the United States. It is my hope, moreover, that the legislation will allow us to strike at the heart of the Ku Klux Klan and other hate groups.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the Record, that it lie on the desk for 10 days for the addition of cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record and held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The bill (S. 1644) to protect civil rights by providing that it shall be a Federal offense to kill any person in connection with his advocacy, encouragement, or support of civil rights, or while such person is engaged in exercising or enjoying any of his civil rights, introduced by Mr. Nelson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1644

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) chapter 13 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following new section:

"§ 245. Killing in Connection with Advocacy, Encouragement, or Support of Civil Rights, or Exercise or Enjoyment of Civil Rights

"(a) Whoever, under color of law or otherwise, kills or attempts to kill any person—

"(1) who, by his presence or activities, is engaged in giving his advocacy, encouragement, or support toward or in favor of the free exercise or enjoyment of any right, privilege, or immunity secured to him or another by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or

"(2) who, by his presence or activities, is engaged in exercising or enjoying any right, privilege, or immunity secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States

shall be punished as provided under sections 1111, 1112, and 1113 of chapter 51 of this title, except that in no case shall a conviction of an offense under this subsection be punishable by death.

"(b) Whoever, under color of law or otherwise, kills or attempts to kill any person—

"(1) whom the defendant knows, at the time of the killing or attempt to kill, has been recently, or is about to be, engaged in giving his advocacy, encouragement, or support toward or in favor of the free exercise or enjoyment of any right, privilege, or immunity secured to him or another by the Constitution or laws of the United States, or

"(2) whom the defendant knows, at the time of the killing or attempt to kill, has been recently, or is about to be, engaged in exercising or enjoying any right, privilege, or immunity secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States

shall be punished as provided under sections 1111, 1112, and 1113 of chapter 51 of this title, except that in no case shall a conviction of an offense under this subsection be punishable by death.

"(c) Whoever, under color of law or otherwise, kills or attempts to kill any person with intent to hinder, intimidate, or prevent any other person in the free exercise or enjoyment of any right, privilege, or immunity secured to him by the Constitution or laws of the United States shall be punished as provided under sections 1111, 1112, and 1113 of chapter 51 of this title, except that in no case shall a conviction of an offense under this subsection be punishable by death."

(b) The analysis of chapter 13 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"245. Killing in connection with advocacy, encouragement, or support of civil rights, or exercise or enjoyment of civil rights."

Sec. 2. If any provision of the amendment made by this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the amendment and the application of the provision to other persons not simililarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Exhibit 1

Recent Murders in Connection With Civil Rights Activities

The adequacy of present Federal criminal legislation is illuminated by its application to a few recent examples of violence directed against civil rights activities:

1. On April 23, 1963, near Keener, Ala., W. L. Moore, a Baltimore postman, was shot and killed on an interstate highway while marching through the South with a sign espousing racial equality. No trial or conviction in either State or Federal courts resulted from this murder.

2. On June 23, 1963, Medgar Evers, Mississippi State field director of the NAACP, was shot from ambush while entering his house in Jackson. Byron de la Beckwith was twice tried in Mississippi State courts without a verdict being reached. No Federal indictment was requested.

3. On September 15, 1963, Denise McNair, Addie Mae Collins, Cynthia Wesley, and Carol Robertson, four Negro children, were killed in a church bombing in Birmingham, Ala. No State or Federal court tried anyone for these murders.

4. On June 21, 1964, James Chaney, Michael Schwerner, and Andrew Goodman, three civil rights workers, were killed by gunshot and/or beating in Philadelphia, Miss. Federal felony indictments were recently dismissed because of inapplicability of the statute. Federal misdemeanor indictments still stand. No State action has been taken.

5. On July 11, 1964, Lt. Col. Lemuel Penn, a Negro officer traveling under Army orders on an interstate highway, was shot and killed near Colbert, Ga. His accused killers were acquitted in a State trial and a Federal indictment was dismissed because of inapplicability of the statute.

6. On February 19, 1965, James Lee Jackson, a Negro civil rights demonstrator, was killed in Marion, Ala., by a State trooper. Witnesses reported that the trooper was attacking Jackson's mother (also a demonstrator) with his nightstick and Jackson interfered. No State or Federal action has been taken against the trooper.

7. On March 8, 1965, the Reverend James Reeb, having just arrived to aid the civil rights drive in Selma, Ala., was beaten to death on a city street. Those allegedly responsible have been arrested by both State and Federal authorities, but no Federal indictment has yet been tested in court.

8. On March 25, 1965, Viola Gregg Liuzzo, wife of a Detroit, Mich., teamster, was shot to death while driving her car in rural Alabama after having taken a load of civil rights marchers from Montgomery to Selma.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, it is my privilege to introduce in the Senate, on behalf of Senator PAT McNAMARA and myself as joint sponsors, the administration's bill on Public Works and Economic Development. I am confident that there are many other Members of this body who will wish to cosponsor this bill with Senator McNAMARA and myself; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk until the close of business on Monday, April 5, so other Members may join in cosponsoring it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be held at the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 1648) to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, many Members of this body will remember vividly the long hours of hearings and debate which preceded the passage of the first major legislative proposal to assist distressed areas, the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, which I had the honor to introduce in the Senate, and which was signed into law by President Kennedy in May of 1961 following 6 years of effort which included two vetoes by President Eisenhower, and one last minute strangle by the Republican leadership in the House. Vital as that bill was at the time, it was nevertheless, as its cosponsors stated, only a first major step or pilot program. As the President suggests in his message, it was essentially an experimental program to determine the extent to which the redevelopment concept could be made to work in this country and to determine the best methods by which the Federal Government could help areas and communities of this country in economic stress to help themselves regenerate their local economies.

We now know from the experience of the Area Redevelopment Administration that this concept has worked. Since the act was passed in 1961, 115,000 new jobs have been created, and many more indirect jobs have been created as a result. However, one should face the fact that progress has been slow and often difficult, primarily because ARA was given too big a job without adequate means to accomplish it. But we should not forget that the ARA program was the forerunner of other much-needed legislation which has come about since its passage.

For example, the Area Redevelopment Act contained a modest program provision for Federal aid for the training of unemployed workers on a very small scale. On the basis of this program, we were able to enact 1 year later the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, which will be augmented and improved by S. 974, passed by this body only a few weeks ago. That program involves the expenditure of over $400 million annually to train the unemployed to assume new jobs.

Second, last year we passed the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, which is intended to elevate the neediest persons from a condition of poverty so that they can take full advantage of the opportunities which our Great Society has to offer. This program goes further by offering help to young people from deprived backgrounds, the working poor, and those lacking in opportunity so that they can become wage earners and assume their rightful role as self-respecting human beings and productive members of society.

Third, the original Area Redevelopment Act also contained a provision to assist in the construction of needed public works, such as, water and sewer facilities to serve industrial parks, and municipal water systems. A little more than a year after its enactment, and on the basis of the Area Redevelopment Act, Congress passed the Accelerated Public Works Act, which provided nearly $900 million to facilitate the early construction of essential public works in labor surplus areas and put men back to work. That program was highly useful, but the total number of jobs it could provide are nearly exhausted, and its funds are exhausted. What it showed, however, was the existence of a tremendous backlog of needed public-facility projects, particularly in areas of economic stress.

Fourth, we have just enacted the Appalachian program—a program to help generate economic development on a regional basis. ARA's own experience has confirmed the need for this type of regional aid, for ARA soon found that the lack of modern public facilities was a major obstacle to the orderly economic development of any area. Because the ARA program alone did not have the authority or funds to do the job adequately, the States in the Appalachian region, where the lack of public facilities and adequate transportation was most apparent, banded together to urge the formation of the President's Appalachian Regional Commission. It was the work of this Commission which ultimately led to the passage of the recent Appalachia Act as a means of providing these basic needs. Other bills to aid regions have since been proposed in anticipation of similar programs in the future for other regions with severe economic problems. This bill offers benefits on a regional basis without county-by-county restrictions.

The President's proposed bill on public works and economic development which Senator McNAMARA and I have the privilege of introducing will help solve the problem of unemployment and poverty in the midst of plenty. The present bill will not only continue and improve programs begun under the Area Redevelopment Act, but will also provide a greatly expanded program for the construction of waterlines, streets, sewers, and industrial parks, the social capital which is necessary if communities and regions are to flourish and grow.

As the President stated in his message to the Congress last week on area and regional economic development:

> This program will be based primarily upon the experience of the accelerated public works program, the Area Redevelopment Administration, and the Appalachian Regional Development Commission.

As the chief sponsor of the existing area redevelopment program, I should like to make it clear that I am pleased that the administration has taken the ARA idea and has proposed to expand and enlarge this original concept.

In my opinion, this new program of public works and economic development assistance will work. It will bring jobs and conditions to communities and areas which need them the most.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, together with the text of the bill, be printed following the statement by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I am happy to be able to join with the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois in introducing and sponsoring the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965.

I compliment the administration on its message on economic development and on forwarding this bill to the Congress for its consideration.

This measure grows out of the practical experience gained in both the Kennedy and Johnson administrations from fighting to eliminate pockets of depression and high unemployment.

It combines in a coordinated fashion the basic approach of the highly successful accelerated public works programs, the best aspects of the Area Redevelopment Act, and the new approach of solving economic problems on a regional or multistate basis.

I am particularly pleased that this bill to revitalize areas, which are not sharing in the general level of prosperity, contains the regional development concept.

I have since 1963—at the same time the Appalachia regional development approach was started—worked to establish regional commissions for such areas as the northern Great Lakes region.

The Appalachian Regional Development Act has served as a pilot measure.

It has given good legislative experience on how to best undertake economic improvement of areas—cutting across State lines.

Many of my colleagues here recognized the value of regional approach in solving economic problems—and 33 of them joined with me in sponsoring S. 812—which would have allowed the President to set up regional development commissions.

The concepts of S. 812 are included in this bill we are introducing today, thereby keeping the commitment that the administration made at the time of passage of the Appalachia Act.

It promised then it would submit legislation extending the means of improving economic conditions in such areas.

The need to create jobs, of course, is basic, but they cannot be created in areas which lack the necessary physical structure to support new jobs.

This is why accelerated public works was so important.

It not only created temporary employment, but it created needed works, thereby creating a condition in which economic activity could be generated.

Title I of this bill makes this principle available to redevelopment areas in conjunction with long-term planning.

It also makes help available to areas which are expecting sudden upheavals in employment.

Last year the Congress adopted the Economic Opportunity Act which was designed to help wipe out poverty by developing our human resources.

This year we will pass this Public Works and Economic Development Act, which will help eliminate poverty by developing our physical resources.

The Committee on Public Works will move rapidly to consider this measure.

EXHIBIT 1

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965

The proposed bill is entitled the "Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965."

Statement of Purpose

Section 2 declares that it is the purpose of the act, in order to maintain the national economy at a high level and to avoid wasting invaluable human resources, to provide Federal financial assistance, including grants for public works and development facilities, to areas and regions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment to enable them to take effective steps in planning and financing their economic development.

TITLE I—GRANTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES

Section 101 replaces section 8 of the Area Redevelopment Act, which deals with grants for public facilities, with a section which would broaden the Secretary's authority to make grants for needed public works, public service, or development facilities in accordance with criteria identical with those set forth in the new development facility loan section (sec. 201). It would also authorize a new program of supplementary grants to assist with local shares of other Federal grant-in-aid programs. The 100-percent direct grant authority of the Area Redevelopment Act would be replaced by a provision authorizing 50-percent grants; however, supplementary grants, which would vary in amount according to needs of areas and types of projects, would also be authorized for development facility projects directly assisted under the new program. Maximum Federal grant assistance for any project would not exceed 80 percent of project cost, with supplementary grants also being reduced by the amount of loan assistance which could be repaid from such revenues as the project itself might produce, in excess of those which would amortize the local share and provide for the successful operation and maintenance (including depreciation) of the facility. No assistance would be extended for any facility which would compete with an existing privately owned utility.

Section 102 contains an appropriation authorization of $250 million annually for public works and development facility grants.

TITLE II—OTHER FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Public Works and Development Facility Loans

Section 201 replaces section 7 of the Area Redevelopment Act, which deals with loans for public facilities, with a section which would broaden the Secretary's authority to make loans, in order to enable him to assist needed public works, public service, or development facilities which either directly or indirectly assist in the creation of additional long-term employment opportunities or else primarily benefit the long-term unemployed and members of low-income families. Loan criteria would remain the same, except that a new interest formula would be substituted which would vary interest rates according to Federal borrowing costs, less one-half of 1 percent. Pending a change in Federal borrowing costs, the actual interest rate charged to borrowers on such projects would be 3⅝ percent. An annual authorization of $170 million for both business and development facility loans replaces the limitation on loans outstanding of the Area Redevelopment Act.

Loans and Guarantees

Section 202 replaces section 6 of the Area Redevelopment Act, which deals with business loans, with a section which would authorize the Secretary (1) to make industrial and commercial loans in accordance with the purpose criteria of the present act, (2) to guarantee loans for working capital made to private borrowers by private lending institutions in connection with projects in redevelopment areas otherwise assisted under the act, and (3) to contract to pay to or on behalf of business entities locating in redevelopment areas a portion of the interest costs which they incur in financing their expansions from private sources.

The new section would retain the loan conditions of the Area Redevelopment Act (including a prohibition against aiding relocations, which would apply to all assistance under this section), except that the requirements of subsections 6(b)(9)(B) and (C), dealing with the subordination and deferment of certain non-Federal funds, would be modified (1) to reduce the community share from 10 to 5 percent, (2) to enable concurrent repayment with the Federal loan of the subordinated 15-percent funds, and (3) to allow the Secretary to waive the community participation requirement in accordance with standards prescribed by regulations where the necessary funds are not reasonably available to the project because of the economic distress of the area. A minimum 15-percent investment subordinate to the Federal loan would continue to be required in all cases. The new section authorizes the Secretary to require periodic revisions of overall economic development programs and deletes the present limitation on loans outstanding in favor of a single appropriation authorization (placed under the proposed new section 201) for both business and development facility loans. Interest rates would be determined in accordance with a new formula based on Federal borrowing costs, which would increase the rate of interest currently charged from 4 to 4⅛ percent.

Economic Development Revolving Fund

Section 203 establishes an economic development revolving fund in the Treasury of the United States for funds obtained by the Secretary under section 201, for loan funds under section 403, and for collections and repayments. The fund would be available to the Secretary for the purpose of extending loan assistance under sections 201, 202, and 403. Repayment of obligations outstanding under the Area Redevelopment Act would be credited to the fund, and it would pay interest to the Treasury on the amount of the total loans outstanding, based on current average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturities.

Technical and Administrative Assistance AND INFORMATION

Technical and Administrative Assistance

Section 301 authorizes the Secretary to provide technical assistance in accordance with the criteria of the Area Redevelopment Act. In addition, it authorizes grants-in-aid both for technical assistance and for economic planning and administrative expenses to appropriate public or private nonprofit State, area, district, or local organizations. No grant for economic planning and administrative expenses would exceed 75 percent of the undertaking involved. However, non-Federal contributions in cash and in kind would be authorized. The Secretary would have discretion to require repayment of technical assistance where appropriate, and would take into consideration grants available from other sources (such as urban planning grants and highway planning grants) in determining the need for planning funds. An annual appropriation authorization of $20 million is provided.

Research

Section 302 authorizes the Secretary to establish and conduct a continuing program of study and research. This section is identical with that contained in the Area Redevelopment Act.

Information

Section 303 directs the Secretary to aid redevelopment areas and other areas by furnishing technical and similar information to such areas.

TITLE IV—AREA AND DISTRICT ELIGIBILITY

Part A—Redevelopment areas

Area Eligibility

Section 401 establishes standards for the designation of "redevelopment areas." It replaces section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act with a section having more precisely defined unemployment and low income criteria The new criteria are: (1) Unemployment standards for all areas identical with those in the present act for the designation of predominantly urban areas; (2) designation on the basis of low family income for those additional areas which have a median family income not in excess of 40 percent of the national median; (3) those additional Federal and State Indian reservations which the Secretary after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior determines manifest the greatest need; and (4) those areas experiencing a sudden rise in unemployment due to an economic emergency, such as a major plant closing. However, no area would be eligible for designation if it (1) has a population less than 1,500 persons; (2) is smaller than a "labor area" (as defined by the Secretary of Labor), a county, or a municipality with a population of over 250,000 whichever in the opinion of the Secretary is appropriate; or (3) does not have an approved overall economic development program. In addition to the four types of areas listed, areas eligible under the Area Redevelopment Act would continue to be eligible for assistance until the first annual review of eligibility under section 402, at which time they would be required to qualify under the regular provisions of the act. The Secretary would be authorized to prescribe necessary rules and regulations for the designation of areas, to review such designations annually, and to obtain from the heads of other agencies on a reimbursable basis the data upon which to base area designations.

Annual Review of Area Eligibility

Section 402 replaces section 13 of the Area Redevelopment Act, which deals with the termination of eligibility of areas, with a section which would (1) prescribe an annual review of eligibility of areas, (2) require a currently approved overall economic development program as a condition for continued eligibility, (3) provide 30 days' notice prior to termination of eligibility, and (4) explicitly allow applications filed prior to area termination to be considered by the Secretary.

Part B—Economic development districts

Section 403 authorizes the Secretary to designate new multicounty economic development districts, with the concurrence of the States affected, for the benefit of the districts as a whole and of the redevelopment areas situated in such districts. The districts must include two or more designated redevelopment areas, be of sufficient size and potential to foster economic growth on a scale involving more than a single area, and contain one or more economic development centers. Where the centers were not already designated redevelopment areas, the Secretary would be authorized to designate such centers as he deemed appropriate, as eligible for loan and grant assistance under the act on the same basis as redevelopment areas. Recommendations for such designations would be contained in approved district overall economic development programs, which would be required prior to the designation of the district. To encourage redevelopment areas to participate in multicounty economic development activities, the Secretary would also be authorized to increase development facility grants for projects in redevelopment areas within designated districts by an amount equal to 10 percent of the cost of the project assisted. To insure adequate time for effective planning, no district would be designated and no development center would be eligible for financial assistance until one year after the enactment of this section. However, the Secretary would be authorized to invite the several States to draw up proposed district boundaries and to identify potential economic development centers as soon as practicable. The total authorization for financial assistance to economic development centers and for 10-percent bonuses to redevelopment areas within designated districts is limited to $50 million annually.

TITLE V—REGIONAL ACTION PLANNING COMMISSIONS

Establishment and Coordination

Section 501 authorizes the Secretary to invite and encourage the several States to establish appropriate multi-State regional action planning commissions for the purpose of advising and assisting him in the identification of practical boundaries for multi-State economic development regions, and for performing various other enumerated functions in preparation for the formation of successful multi-State economic development regions. A region would be composed of two or more designated or potential economic development districts in two or more contiguous States. State members of the Commissions would be appointed by the Governors of the States, and Federal members would be appointed by the President. The Secretary would present the plans and proposals of the Commissions first for review by the Federal agencies primarily concerned and then to the President with the agencies' recommendations. The Secretary would provide liaison between the Federal Government and each regional Commission, and each Federal agency is directed to cooperate with the Commissions to assist them in carrying out their functions.

Program Development Criteria

Section 502 establishes program development criteria for the guidance of the Commissions.

Regional Technical and Planning Assistance

Section 503 authorizes the Secretary to provide technical assistance to the Commissions in carrying out their functions, either directly, through other agencies or private contractors, or through grants-in-aid to the Commissions. The Secretary would have discretion to require repayment of technical assistance in appropriate cases. Administrative expenses of the Commissions for the first 2 years could be paid by the Federal Government, and in subsequent years by the Federal Government and the States in each Commission equally. Non-Federal contributions both in cash and in kind are authorized. An annual appropriation authorization of $15 million is provided.

TITLE VI—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATOR

Administrator for Economic Development

Section 601 authorizes the appointment by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, of an Administrator for Economic Development in the Department of Commerce, who shall perform such duties in the execution of the act as the Secretary of Commerce may assign.

Advisory Committee on Regional Economic Development

Section 602 directs the Secretary to appoint a National Public Advisory Committee on Regional Economic Development consisting of 25 representatives of labor, management, agriculture, government, and the general public, to make recommendations to him with respect to the program.

Consultation With Other Persons and Agencies

Section 603 authorizes the Secretary to call together and confer with any persons who can assist in meeting the problems of area and regional unemployment and underemployment. It also provides for consultation by the Secretary with other interested departments and agencies.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

Powers of Secretary

Section 701, dealing with the powers of the Secretary, is identical with section 12 of the Area Redevelopment Act, except that subparagraph (10) has been revised to give the Secretary the same authority to use experts and consultants which is customarily available to Federal agencies.

Savings Provisions

Section 702 is a standard savings provision, which is required to effect administrative continuity between the Area Redevelopment Act and the new Economic Development Act.

Transfer of Functions and Effective Date

Section 703 provides that the transfer of functions from the Area Redevelopment Administration to the Secretary of Commerce shall take effect upon enactment except where otherwise explicitly provided. It provides that appropriations available for the purposes of the Area Redevelopment Act shall be available for the purposes of the new act, and it authorizes the President to designate any person to act as Administrator of the new agency until the office is formally filled.

Separability

Section 704 is a standard clause providing that the invalidation of one part of the act by any court shall not invalidate any other part of the act.

Application of Act

Section 705 defines the term "State" to include both the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

Annual Report

Section 706 requires the Secretary to make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to the Congress for each fiscal year ending after June 30, 1965.

Use of Other Facilities

Section 707 is similar to section 24 of the Area Redevelopment Act and requires the Secretary to use the available services and facilities of other Federal agencies to the fullest extent practicable in carrying out the provisions of the act.

Appropriation

Section 708 authorizes to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of the act, and provides that appropriations may remain available until expended.

Penalties

Section 709 contains a standard penalty clause for the falsification of information by any applicant for financial assistance.

Employment of Expediters and Administrative Employees

Section 710 is the same as section 19 of the Area Redevelopment Act and requires the certification to the Secretary of the names of persons hired to expedite applications. It also requires applicants to agree to refrain from tendering employment to agency officials for a period of 2 years after assistance is rendered by the Secretary.

Prevailing Rate of Wage and 40-Hour Week

Section 711 is similar to section 21 of the Area Redevelopment Act in requiring the payment of prevailing wage rates under the Davis-Bacon Act to all laborers and mechanics employed on projects assisted by the Secretary. It applies Davis-Bacon wage rates to private as well as public applicants.

Record of Applications

Section 712 requires the Secretary to maintain the same record of applications as is required by section 20 of the Area Redevelopment Act.

Records and Audit

Section 713 requires each recipient of assistance under this act to keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe. It also authorizes the Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States, or their representatives, to have access to pertinent documents for the purpose of audit.

Conforming Amendment

Section 714 is intended to conform the provisions of other acts (dealing with assistance to redevelopment areas) to the changes made by this act.

EXHIBIT 2

S. 1648

A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965."

STATEMENT OF PURPOSE

SEC. 2. The Congress declares that the maintenance of the national economy at a high level is vital to the best interests of the United States, but that some of our regions, counties, and communities are suffering substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment; that such unemployment and underemployment cause hardship to many individuals and their families, and waste invaluable human resources; that to overcome this problem the Federal Government, in cooperation with the States, should help areas and regions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment to take effective steps in planning and financing their public works and economic development; that Federal financial assistance, including grants for public works and development facilities to communities, industries, enterprises, and individuals in areas needing development should enable such areas to help themselves achieve lasting improvement and enhance the domestic prosperity by the establishment of stable and diversified local economies and improved local conditions, provided such assistance is preceded by and consistent with sound, long-range economic planning; and that under the provisions of this Act new employment opportunities should be created by developing and expanding new and existing public works and other facilities and resources rather than by merely transferring jobs from one area of the United States to another.

TITLE I—GRANTS FOR PUBLIC WORKS AND DEVELOPMENT FACILITIES

Sec. 101. (a) Upon the application of any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public nonprofit organization or association representing any redevelopment area or part thereof, the Secretary of Commerce (hereinafter referred to as the Secretary) is authorized—

(1) to make direct grants for the acquisition or development of land and improvements for public works, public service, or development facility usage, and the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of such facilities, within a redevelopment area, if he finds that—

(A) the project for which financial assistance is sought will directly or indirectly (i) tend to improve the opportunities, in the area where such project is or will be located, for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities, (ii) otherwise assist in the creation of additional long-term employment opportunities for such area, or (iii) primarily benefit the long-term unemployed and members of low-income families or otherwise substantially further the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964;

(B) the project for which a grant is requested will fulfill a pressing need of the area, or part thereof, in which it is, or will be, located; and

(C) the area for which a project is to be undertaken has an approved overall economic development program as provided in section 202(b)(10) and such project is consistent with such program;

(2) to make supplementary grants in order to enable the States and other entities within redevelopment areas to take maximum advantage of designated Federal grant-in-aid programs (as hereinafter defined) for which they are eligible but for which, because of their economic situation, they cannot supply the required matching share.

(b) Subject to subsection (c) hereof, the amount of any direct grant under this section for any project shall not exceed 50 per centum of the cost of such project.

(c) The amount of any supplementary grant under this section for any project shall not exceed the applicable percentage established by regulations promulgated by the Secretary, but in no event shall the non-Federal share (including assumptions of debt) of the aggregate cost of any such project be less than 20 per centum of such cost. Supplementary grants shall be made by the Secretary, in accordance with such regulations as he shall prescribe, by increasing the amounts of direct grants authorized under this section or by the payment of funds appropriated under this Act to the heads of the departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government responsible for the administration of such grant-in-aid programs. Notwithstanding any limitation on the use of supplementary grants that may otherwise be applicable to the grant-in-aid program involved, funds so allocated shall be used for the sole purpose of increasing the Federal contribution to specific projects in redevelopment areas under such programs above the fixed maximum portion of the cost of such project otherwise authorized by the applicable law. The term "designated Federal grant-in-aid programs," as used in this subsection, means such existing or future Federal grant-in-aid programs assisting in the construction or equipping of facilities as the Secretary may, in furtherance of the purposes of this Act, designate as eligible for allocation of funds under this section. In determining the amount of any supplementary grant available to any project under this section, the Secretary shall take into consideration the relative needs of the area, the nature of the project to be assisted, and the amount of such fair user charges or other revenues as the project may reasonably be expected to generate in excess of those which would amortize the local share of initial costs and provide for its successful operation and maintenance (including depreciation).

(d) The Secretary shall prescribe rules, regulations, and procedures to carry out this section which will assure that adequate consideration is given to the relative needs of eligible areas. In prescribing such rules, regulations, and procedures the Secretary shall consider among other relevant factors: (1) the severity of the rates of unemployment in the eligible areas and the duration of such unemployment and (2) the income levels of families and the extent of underemployment in eligible areas.

(e) No financial assistance shall be extended under this section with respect to any public service or development facility which would compete with an existing privately owned public utility rendering a service to the public at rates or charges subject to regulation by a State regulatory body, unless the State regulatory body determines that in the area to be served by the facility for which the financial assistance is to be extended there is a need for an increase in such service (taking into consideration reasonably foreseeable future needs) which the existing public utility is not able to meet through its existing facilities or through an expansion which it agrees to undertake.

Sec. 102. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $250,000,000 annually for the purposes of this title.

TITLE II—OTHER FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE

Public Works and Development Facility Loans

Sec. 201. (a) Upon the application of any State, or political subdivision thereof, Indian tribe, or private or public nonprofit organization or association representing any redevelopment area or part thereof, the Secretary is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans to assist in financing the purchase or development of land and improvements for public works, public service, or development facility usage, and the acquisition, construction, rehabilitation, alteration, expansion, or improvement of such facilities, within a redevelopment area, if he finds that—

(1) the project for which financial assistance is sought will directly or indirectly—

(A) tend to improve the opportunities, in the area where such project is or will be located, for the successful establishment or expansion of industrial or commercial plants or facilities,

(B) otherwise assist in the creation of additional long-term employment opportunities for such area, or

(C) primarily benefit the long-term unemployed and members of low-income families or otherwise substantially further the objectives of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964;

(2) the funds requested for such project are not otherwise available from private lenders on reasonable terms, or from other Federal agencies on terms more favorable to the Government which would permit the accomplishment of the project;

(3) the amount of the loan plus the amount of other available funds for such project are adequate to insure the completion thereof;

(4) there is a reasonable expectation of repayment; and

(5) such area has an approved overall economic development program as provided in section 202(b)(10) and the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program.

(b) Subject to section 701(5), the maturity date of any such loan shall be not later than forty years after the date such loan is made. Such loans shall bear interest at a rate not less than (i) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the average maturities of such loans, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of one per centum, less (ii) not to exceed one-half of one per centum per annum.

(c) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section and section 202; provided, however, that annual appropriations for the purpose of making and guaranteeing loans shall not exceed $170-000,000.

(d) No financial assistance shall be extended under this section with respect to any public service or development facility which would compete with an existing privately owned public utility rendering a service to the public at rates or charges subject to regulation by a State regulatory body, unless the State regulatory body determines that in the area to be served by the facility for which the financial assistance is to be extended there is a need for an increase in such service (taking into consideration reasonably foreseeable future needs) which the existing public utility is not able to meet through its existing facilities or through an expansion which it agrees to undertake.

Loans and Guarantees

Sec. 202. (a) The Secretary is authorized (1) to purchase evidences of indebtedness and to make loans (which for purposes of this section shall include participations in loans) to aid in financing any project within a redevelopment area for the purchase or development of land and facilities (including, in cases of demonstrated need, machinery and equipment) for industrial or commercial usage, including the construction of new buildings, the rehabilitation of abandoned or unoccupied buildings, and the alteration, conversion, or enlargement of existing buildings; (2) to guarantee loans for working capital made to private borrowers by private lending institutions in connection with projects in redevelopment areas assisted under subsection (a)(1) hereof, upon application of such institution and upon such terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe; provided, however, that no such guarantee shall at any time exceed 90 per centum of the amount of the outstanding unpaid balance of such loan; and (3) to contract to pay, and to pay annually, for not more than ten years, to or on behalf of private business entities amounts sufficient to reduce by 2 percentage points the interest paid by such entities on loans which are obtained from non-Government sources, which are not guaranteed by any Government agency, which provide for annual amortization of principal, and the proceeds of which are used for purposes for which the Secretary is authorized to purchase evidences of indebtedness or make loans under this section: *Provided, however,* That subject to limitations in annual appropriation acts, the annual cost of new contracts approved in any one year shall not exceed $5,000,000.

(b) Financial assistance under this section shall be on such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines, subject, however, to the following restrictions and limitations:

(1) Such financial assistance shall not be extended to assist establishments relocating from one area to another: *Provided, however,* That such limitation shall not be construed to prohibit assistance for the expansion of an existing business entity through the establishment of a new branch, affiliate, or subsidiary of such entity if the Secretary finds that the establishment of such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary will not result in an increase in unemployment in the area of original location or in any other area where such entity conducts business operations, unless the Secretary has reason to believe that such branch, affiliate, or subsidiary is being established with the intention of closing down the operations of the existing business entity in the area of its original location or in any other area where it conducts such operations.

(2) Such assistance shall be extended only to applicants, both private and public (including Indian tribes), which have been approved for such assistance by an agency or instrumentality of the State or political subdivision thereof in which the project to be financed is located, and which agency or instrumentality is directly concerned with problems of economic development in such State or subdivision.

(3) The project for which financial assistance is sought must be reasonably calculated to provide more than a temporary alleviation of unemployment or underemployment within the redevelopment area wherein it is, or will be located.

(4) No loan or guarantee shall be extended hereunder unless the financial assistance applied for is not otherwise available from private lenders on reasonable terms, or from other Federal agencies on terms more favorable to the Government which would permit the accomplishment of the project.

(5) The Secretary shall not make any loan without a participation unless he determines that the loan cannot be made on a participation basis.

(6) No evidences of indebtedness shall be purchased and no loans shall be made or guaranteed unless it is determined that there is a reasonable assurance of repayment.

(7) Subject to section 701(5) of this Act, no loan, including renewals or extension thereof, may be made hereunder for a period exceeding twenty-five years and no evidences of indebtedness maturing more than twenty-five years from date of purchase may be purchased hereunder: *Provided,* That the foregoing restrictions on maturities shall not apply to securities or obligations received by the Secretary as a claimant in bankruptcy or equitable reorganization or as a creditor in other proceedings attendant upon insolvency of the obligor.

(8) Loans made and evidences of indebtedness purchased under this section shall bear interest at a rate not less than (i) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the average maturities of such loans, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of one per centum, plus (ii) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Secretary may determine to be consistent with its purposes.

(9) Loan assistance shall not exceed 65 per centum of the aggregate cost to the applicant (excluding all other Federal aid in connection with the undertaking) of acquiring or developing land and facilities (including, in cases of demonstrated need, machinery and equipment), and of constructing, altering, converting, rehabilitating, or enlarging the building or buildings of the particular project, and shall, among others, be on the condition that—

(A) other funds are available in an amount which, together with the assistance provided hereunder, shall be sufficient to pay such aggregate cost;

(B) not less than 15 per centum of such aggregate cost be supplied as equity capital or as a loan repayable in no shorter period of time and at no faster an amortization rate than the Federal financial assistance extended under this section is being repaid, and if such a loan is secured, its security shall be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing such Federal financial assistance: *Provided, however,* That except in projects involving financial participation by Indian tribes, not less than 5 per centum of such aggregate cost shall be supplied by the State or any agency, instrumentality, or political subdivision thereof, or by a community or area organization which is nongovernmental in character, unless the Secretary shall determine in accordance with objective standards promulgated by regulation that all or part of such funds are not reasonably available to the project because of the economic distress of the area or for other good cause, in which case he may waive the requirement of this provision to the extent of such unavailability, and allow the funds required by this subsection to be supplied by the applicant or by such other non-Federal source as may reasonably be available to the project;

(C) to the extent the Secretary finds such action necessary to encourage financial participation in a particular project by other lenders and investors, and except as otherwise provided in subparagraph (B), any Federal financial assistance extended under this section may be repayable only after other loans made in connection with such project have been repaid in full, and the security, if any, for such Federal financial assistance may be subordinate and inferior to the lien or liens securing other loans made in connection with the same project.

(10) No such assistance shall be extended unless there shall be submitted to and approved by the Secretary an overall program for the economic development of the area and a finding by the State, or any agency, instrumentality, or local political subdivision thereof, that the project for which financial assistance is sought is consistent with such program: *Provided,* That nothing in this Act shall authorize financial assistance for any project prohibited by laws of the State or local political subdivision in which the project would be located, nor prevent the Secretary from requiring such periodic revisions of previously approved overall economic development programs as he may deem appropriate.

Economic Development and Revolving Fund

SEC. 203. Funds obtained by the Secretary under section 201, loan funds obtained under section 403, and collections and repayments received under this Act, shall be deposited in an economic development revolving fund (hereinafter referred to as the "fund"), which is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States, and which shall be available to the Secretary for the purpose of extending financial assistance under sections 201, 202, and 403, and for the payment of all obligations and expenditures arising in connection therewith. There shall also be credited to the fund such funds as have been paid into the area redevelopment fund or may be received from obligations outstanding under the Area Redevelopment Act. The fund shall pay into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury, following the close of each fiscal year, interest on the amount of loans outstanding computed in such manner and at such rate as may be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury taking into consideration the current average market yield on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States with remaining periods to maturity comparable to the avegare maturities of such loans, adjusted to the nearest one-eighth of one per centum, during the month of June preceding the fiscal year in which the loans were made.

TITLE III—TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE, RESEARCH, AND INFORMATION

Technical and Administrative Assistance

SEC. 301. (a) In carrying out his duties under this Act the Secretary is authorized to provide technical assistance which would be useful in alleviating or preventing conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment (1) to areas which he has designated as redevelopment areas under this Act, and (2) to other areas which he finds have substantial need for such assistance. Such assistance shall include studies evaluating the needs of, and developing potentialities for, economic growth of such areas. Such assistance may be provided by the Secretary through members of his staff, through the payment of funds authorized for this section to other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purposes, or through grants-in-aid to appropriate public or private nonprofit State, area, district, or local organizations. The Secretary, in his discretion, may require the repayment of assistance provided under this subsection and prescribe the terms and conditions of such repayment.

(b) The Secretary is authorized to make grants for economic planning staff and administrative expenses to organizations which he determines to be qualified to receive grants-in-aid under subsection (a) hereof; provided, however, that no such grant shall exceed 75 per centum of the aggregate costs of the undertaking for which the assistance is rendered, or of the administrative expenses of any qualified organization in any one year. In determining the amount of the non-Federal share of such costs or expenses, the Secretary shall give due consideration to all contributions both in cash and in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to space, equipment, and services. Where practicable, grants-in-aid authorized under this subsection shall be used in conjunction with other available planning grants, such as urban planning grants authorized under the Housing Act of 1954, as amended, and highway planning and research grants authorized under the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1962, to assure adequate and effective planning and economical use of funds.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $20,000,000 annually for the purposes of this section.

Research

SEC. 302. To assist in the long-range accomplishment of the purposes of this Act, the Secretary, in cooperation with other agencies having similar functions, shall establish and conduct a continuing program of study and research designed to assist in determining the causes of unemployment, underemployment, underdevelopment, and chronic depression in various areas and regions of the Nation and in the formulation and implementation of National, State, and local programs which will raise income levels and otherwise produce solutions of the problems resulting from these conditions. The Secretary shall include in his annual report under section 706 a detailed statement concerning the study and research conducted under this section together with his findings resulting therefrom and his recommendations for legislative and other action.

Information

SEC. 303. The Secretary shall aid redevelopment areas and other areas by furnishing to interested individuals, communities, industries, and enterprises with such areas any assistance, technical information, market research, or other forms of assistance, information, or advice which would be useful in alleviating or preventing conditions of excessive unemployment or underemployment within such areas. The Secretary may furnish the procurement divisions of the various departments, agencies, and other instrumentalities of the Federal Government with a list containing the names and addresses of business firms which are located in redevelopment areas and which are desirous of obtaining Government contracts for the furnishing of supplies or services, and designating the supplies and services such firms are engaged in providing.

TITLE IV—AREA AND DISTRICT ELIGIBILITY

Part A—Redevelopment areas

Area Eligibility

SEC. 401. (a) The Secretary shall designate as "redevelopment areas"—

(1) those areas in which he determines, upon the basis of standards generally comparable with those set forth in paragraphs (A) and (B), that there has existed substantial and persistent unemployment for an extended period of time. There shall be included among the areas so designated any area—

(A) where the Secretary of Labor finds that the current rate of unemployment, as determined by appropriate annual statistics for the most recent available calendar year, is 6 per centum or more and has averaged at least 6 per centum for the qualifying time periods specified in paragraph (B); and

(B) where the Secretary of Labor finds that the annual average rate of unemployment has been at least—

(i) 50 per centum above the national average for three of the preceding four calendar years, or

(ii) 75 per centum above the national average for two of the preceding three calendar years, or

(iii) 100 per centum above the national average for one of the preceding two calendar years.

The Secretary of Labor shall find the facts and provide the data to be used by the Secretary in making the determinations required by this subsection.

(2) those additional areas which have a median family income not in excess of 40 per centum of the national median, as determined by the most recent available statistics for such areas;

(3) those additional Federal or State Indian reservations which the Secretary, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, determines manifest the greatest degree of economic distress on the basis of unemployment and income statistics and other appropriate evidence of economic underdevelopment;

(4) upon request of such areas, those additional areas in which the Secretary determines that the loss, removal, or closing of a major source of employment, has caused or is about to cause an unusual and abrupt rise in unemployment or underemployment of such magnitude that the area can reasonably be expected to become eligible for designation under the other provisions of this Act within three years unless assistance is provided. Notwithstanding any provision of this section to the contrary, an area may be designated at any time under the authority of this subsection and may be given a reasonable time after designation in which to submit the overall economic development program required by subsection 202(b)(10) of this Act;

(5) notwithstanding any provision of this section to the contrary, those additional areas which were designated redevelopment areas under the Area Redevelopment Act on the date of the enactment of this Act; provided, however, that the continued eligibility of such areas after the first annual review of eligibility conducted in accordance with section 402 of this Act shall be dependent on their qualification for designation under the standards of economic need set forth in subsections (a)(1) through (a)(4) of this section.

(b) The size and boundaries of redevelopment areas shall be as determined by the Secretary; provided, however, that—

(1) no area shall be designated until it has an approved overall economic development program in accordance with subsection 202(b)(10) of this Act;

(2) any area which does not submit an acceptable overall economic development program in accordance with subsection 202 (b)(10) of this Act within a reasonable time after notification of eligibility for designation, shall not thereafter be designated prior to the next annual review of eligibility in accordance with section 402 of this Act;

(3) no area shall be designated which does not have a population of at least 1,500 persons; and

(4) except for areas designated under subsections (a)(3) and (a)(4) hereof, no area shall be designated which is smaller than a "labor area" (as defined by the Secretary of Labor), a county, or a municipality with a population of over 250,000, whichever in the opinion of the Secretary is appropriate.

(c) Upon the request of the Secretary, the Secretary of Labor, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of the Interior, and such other heads of agencies as may be appropriate are authorized to conduct such special studies, obtain such information, and compile and furnish to the Secretary such data as the Secretary may deem necessary or proper to enable him to make the determinations provided for in this section. The Secretary shall reimburse when appropriate, out of any funds appropriated to carry out the purposes of this Act, the foregoing officers for any expenditures incurred by them under this section.

(d) As used in this Act, the term "redevelopment area" refers to any area within the United States which has been designated by the Secretary as a redevelopment area.

Annual Review of Area Eligibility

SEC. 402. The Secretary shall conduct an annual review of the eligibility of all areas designated or under consideration for designation in accordance with section 401 of this Act, and on the basis thereof may terminate or modify the designations of such areas in accordance with objective standards which he shall prescribe by regulation. No area previously designated shall retain its designated status unless it maintains a currently approved overall economic development program in accordance with subsection 202(b) (10). No termination of eligibility shall (1) be made without 30 days' prior notification to the area concerned, (2) affect the validity of any application filed, or contract or undertaking entered into, with respect to such area pursuant to this Act prior to such termination, or (3) prevent any such area from again being designated a redevelopment area under section 401 of this Act if the Secretary determines it to be eligible under such section. The Secretary shall keep the departments and agencies of the Federal Government, and interested State or local agencies, advised at all times of any changes made hereunder with respect to the classification of any area.

Part B—Economic development districts

SEC. 403. (a) In order that economic development projects of broader geographical significance may be planned and carried out, the Secretary is authorized—

(1) to designate appropriate "economic development districts" within the United States with the concurrence of the States in which such districts will be wholly or partially located, if—

(A) the proposed district is of sufficient size or population, and contains sufficient resources, to foster economic development on a scale involving more than a single redevelopment area;

(B) the proposed district contains two or more redevelopment areas;

(C) the proposed district contains one or more redevelopment areas or economic development centers identified in an approved district overall economic development program as having sufficient size and potential to foster the economic growth activities necessary to alleviate the distress of the redevelopment areas within the district; and

(D) the proposed district has a district overall economic development program which includes adequate land use and transportation planning and contains a specific program for district cooperation, self-help, and public investment and is approved by the State or States affected and by the Secretary;

(2) to designate as "economic development centers," in accordance with such regulations as he shall prescribe, such areas as he may deem appropriate, if—

(A) the proposed center has been identified and included in an approved district overall economic development program and recommended by the State or States affected for such special designation;

(B) the proposed center is geographically and economically so related to the district that its economic growth may reasonably be expected to contribute significantly to the alleviation of distress in the redevelopment areas of the district; and

(C) the proposed center does not have a population in excess of two hundred and fifty thousand according to the last preceding Federal census;

(3) to provide financial assistance in accordance with the criteria of sections 101, 201, and 202 of this Act, except as may be herein otherwise provided, for projects in economic development centers designated under subsection (a)(2) above, if—

(A) the project will further the objectives of the overall economic development program of the district in which it is to be located;

(B) the project will enhance the economic growth potential of the district or result in additional long-term employment opportunities commensurate with the amount of Federal financial assistance requested; and

(C) the amount of Federal financial assistance requested is reasonably related to the size, population, and economic needs of the district;

(4) subject to the 20 per centum non-Federal share required for any project by subsection 101(c) of this Act, to increase the amount of grant assistance authorized by section 101 for projects within redevelopment areas (designated under section 401), by an amount not to exceed 10 per centum of the aggregate cost of any such project, in accordance with such regulations as he shall prescribe, if—

(A) the redevelopment area is situated within a designated economic development district and is actively participating in the economic development activities of the district; and

(B) the project is consistent with an approved district overall economic development program.

(b) In designating economic development districts and approving district overall economic development programs under subsection (a) of this section, the Secretary is authorized, under regulations prescribed by him—

(1) to invite the several States to draw up proposed district boundaries and to identify potential economic development centers;

(2) to cooperate with the several States—

(A) in sponsoring and assisting district economic planning and development groups, and

(B) in assisting such district groups to formulate district overall economic development programs.

(c) The Secretary shall by regulation prescribe standards for the termination or modification of economic development districts and economic development centers designated under the authority of this section.

(d) As used in this Act, the term "economic development district" refers to any area within the United States composed of cooperating redevelopment areas and, where appropriate, designated economic development centers and neighboring counties or communities, which has been designated by the Secretary as an economic development district.

(e) As used in this Act, the term "economic development center" refers to any area within the United States which has been identified as an economic development center in an approved district overall economic development program and which has been designated by the Secretary as eligible for financial assistance under sections 101, 201, and 202 of this Act in accordance with the provisions of this section.

(f) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $50,000,000 annually for financial assistance extended under the provisions of subsections (a)(3) and (a)(4) hereof.

(g) In order to allow time for adequate and careful district planning, subsections (a) and (f) of this section shall not be effective until one year from the date of enactment.

TITLE V—REGIONAL ACTION PLANNING COMMISSIONS

Establishment and Coordination

SEC. 501. (a) The Secretary is authorized to invite and encourage the several States to establish appropriate multi-State Regional Action Planning Commissions for the purpose of—

(1) advising and assisting him in the identification of optimum boundaries for multi-State economic development regions,

(2) initiating and coordinating the preparation of long-range overall economic development programs for such regions,

(3) fostering surveys and studies to provide data required for the preparation of specific plans and programs for the development of such regions,

(4) advising and assisting him and the States concerned in the initiation and coordination of economic development districts, in order to promote maximum benefits from the expenditure of Federal, State, and local funds,

(5) promoting increased private investment in such regions,

(6) preparing legislative and other recommendations with respect to both short-range and long-range programs and projects for Federal, State, and local agencies, and

(7) receiving, reviewing, and commenting on all tentative plans or proposals concerning multi-State regional economic development, and transmitting such plans and proposals with appropriate comments and recommendations to the Secretary and the heads of other interested Federal and State agencies.

(b) As used in this Act, the term "region" refers to any area within the United States which includes two or more designated or potential economic development districts in two or more contiguous States.

(c) The State members of such Commissions shall be as determined and appointed by the Governors of the States concerned. The President shall appoint the Federal member or members of such Commissions, if any, who shall report through the Secretary and be compensated at a rate not in excess of that authorized by section 701(10) of this Act.

(d) The Secretary shall present such plans and proposals of the Commissions as may be transmitted and recommended to him (but are not authorized by any other section of this Act) first for review by the Federal agencies primarily interested in such plans and proposals and then, together with the recommendations of such agencies, to the President for such action as he may deem desirable.

(e) The Secretary shall provide effective and continuing liaison between the Federal Government and each regional Commission.

(f) Each Federal agency shall, consonant with law and within the limits of available funds, cooperate with such Commissions as may be established in order to assist them in carrying out their functions under this section.

Program Development Criteria

SEC. 502. In developing recommendations for programs and projects for future regional economic development, and in establishing within those recommendations a priority ranking for such programs and projects, the Secretary shall encourage each regional Commission to follow procedures that will insure consideration of the following factors:

(1) the relationship of the project or class of projects to overall regional development including its location in an area determined by the State to have a significant potential for growth;

(2) the population and area to be served by the project or class of projects including the relative per capita income and the unemployment rates in the area;

(3) the relative financial resources available to the State or political subdivisions or instrumentalities thereof which seek to undertake the project;

(4) the importance of the project or class of projects in relation to other projects or classes of projects which may be in competition for the same funds;

(5) the prospects that the project, on a continuing rather than a temporary basis, will improve the opportunities for employment, the average level of income, or the economic and social development of the area served by the project.

Regional Technical and Planning Assistance

SEC. 503. (a) The Secretary is authorized to provide to the Commissions technical assistance which would be useful in aiding the Commissions to carry out their functions under this Act and to develop recommendations and programs. Such assistance may be provided by the Secretary through members of his staff, through the payment of funds authorized for this section to other departments or agencies of the Federal Government, or through the employment of private individuals, partnerships, firms, corporations, or suitable institutions, under contracts entered into for such purposes, or through grants-in-aid to the Commissions. The Secretary, in his discretion, may require the repayment of assistance provided under this subsection and prescribe the terms and conditions of such repayment.

(b) For the period ending on June 30 of the second full Federal fiscal year following the date of enactment of this Act, the administrative expenses of each Commission may be paid by the Federal Government on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may approve. Thereafter, not to exceed 50 per centum of such expenses may be paid by the Federal Government. In determining the amount of the non-Federal share of such costs or expenses, the Secretary shall give due consideration to all contributions both in cash and in kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to space, equipment, and services.

(c) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated $15,000,000 annually for the purposes of this section.

TITLE VI—ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ADMINISTRATOR

Administrator for Economic Development

SEC. 601. There shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, an Administrator for Economic Development in the Department of Commerce, who shall receive compensation at the annual rate applicable to level V of the Federal Executive Salary Act of 1964. The Administrator shall perform such duties in the execution of this Act as the Secretary may assign.

Advisory Committee on Regional Economic Development

SEC. 602. The Secretary shall appoint a National Public Advisory Committee on Regional Economic Development which shall consist of twenty-five members and shall be composed of representatives of labor, management, agriculture, State and local governments, and the public in general. From the members appointed to such Committee the Secretary shall designate a Chairman. Such Committee, or any duly established subcommittee thereof, shall from time to time make recommendations to the Secretary relative to the carrying out of his duties under this Act. Such Committee shall hold not less than two meetings during each calendar year.

Consultation With Other Persons and Agencies

SEC. 603. (a) The Secretary is authorized from time to time to call together and confer with any persons, including representatives of labor, management, agriculture, and government, who can assist in meeting the problems of area and regional unemployment or underemployment.

(b) The Secretary may make provision for such consultation with interested departments and agencies as he may deem appropriate in the performance of the functions vested in him by this Act.

TITLE VII—MISCELLANEOUS

Powers of Secretary

SEC. 701. In performing his duties under this Act, the Secretary is authorized to—

(1) adopt, alter, and use a seal, which shall be judicially noticed;

(2) hold such hearings, sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as he may deem advisable;

(3) request directly from any executive department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, independent establishment, or instrumentality information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics needed to carry out the purposes of this Act; and each department, bureau, agency, board, commission, office, establishment, or instrumentality is authorized to furnish such information, suggestions, estimates, and statistics directly to the Secretary;

(4) under regulations prescribed by him, assign or sell at public or private sale, or otherwise dispose of for cash or credit, in his discretion and upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any evidence of debt, contract, claim, personal property, or security assigned to or held by him in connection with loans made or evidences of indebtedness purchased under this Act, and collect or compromise all obligations assigned to or held by him in connection with

such loans or evidences of indebtedness until such time as such obligations may be referred to the Attorney General for suit or collection;

(5) further extend the maturity of or renew any loan made or evidence of indebtedness purchased under this Act, beyond the periods stated in such loan or evidence of indebtedness or in this Act, for additional periods not to exceed ten years, if such extension or renewal will aid in the orderly liquidation of such loan or evidence of indebtedness;

(6) deal with, complete, renovate, improve, modernize, insure, rent, or sell for cash or credit, upon such terms and conditions and for such consideration as he shall determine to be reasonable, any real or personal property conveyed to, or otherwise acquired by, him in connection with loans made or evidences of indebtedness purchased under this Act;

(7) pursue to final collection, by way of compromise or other administrative action, prior to reference to the Attorney General, all claims against third parties assigned to him in connection with loans made or evidences of indebtedness purchased under this Act. This shall include authority to obtain deficiency judgments or otherwise in the case of mortgages assigned to the Secretary. Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (41 U.S.C. 5), shall not apply to any contract of hazard insurance or to any purchase or contract for services or supplies on account of property obtained by the Secretary as a result of loans made or evidences of indebtedness purchased under this Act if the premium therefor or the amount thereof does not exceed $1,000. The power to convey and to execute, in the name of the Secretary, deeds of conveyance, deeds of release, assignments and satisfactions of mortgages, and any other written instrument relating to real or personal property or any interest therein acquired by the Secretary pursuant to the provisions of this Act may be exercised by the Secretary or by any officer or agent appointed by him for that purpose without the execution of any express delegation of power or power of attorney;

(8) acquire, in any lawful manner, any property (real, personal, or mixed, tangible or intangible), whenever deemed necessary or appropriate to the conduct of the activities authorized in sections 201, 202, 301, 403, and 503 of this Act;

(9) in addition to any powers, functions, privileges, and immunities otherwise vested in him, take any and all actions, including the procurement of the services of attorneys by contract, determined by him to be necessary or desirable in making, purchasing, servicing, compromising, modifying, liquidating, or otherwise administratively dealing with or realizing on loans made or evidences of indebtedness purchased under this Act;

(10) employ experts and consultants or organizations therefor as authorized by section 15 of the Administrative Expenses Act of 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a), compensate individuals so employed at rates not in excess of $100 per diem, including travel time, and allow them, while away from their homes or regular places of business, travel expenses (including per diem in lieu of subsistence) as authorized by section 5 of such Act (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently, while so employed; *Provided, however,* That contracts for such employment may be renewed annually;

(11) sue and be sued in any court of record of a State having general jurisdiction or in any United States district court, and jurisdiction is conferred upon such district court to determine such controversies without regard to the amount in controversy; but no attachment, injunction, garnishment, or other similar process, mesne or final, shall be issued against the Secretary or his property. Nothing herein shall be construed to except the activities under this Act from the application of sections 507(b) and 2679 of title 28, United States Code, and of section 367 of the Revised Statutes (5 U.S.C. 316); and

(12) establish such rules, regulations, and procedures as he may deem appropriate in carrying out the provisions of this Act.

Savings Provisions

Sec. 702. (a) No suit, action, or other proceeding lawfully commenced by or against the Administrator or any other officer of the Area Redevelopment Administration in his official capacity or in relation to the discharge of his official duties under the Area Redevelopment Act, shall abate by reason of the taking effect of the provisions of this Act, but the court may, on motion or supplemental petition filed at any time within twelve months after such taking effect, showing a necessity for the survival of such suit, action, or other proceeding to obtain a settlement of the questions involved, allow the same to be maintained by or against the Secretary or the Administrator or such other officer of the Department of Commerce as may be appropriate.

(b) Except as may be otherwise expressly provided in this Act, all powers and authorities conferred by this Act shall be cumulative and additional to and not in derogation of any powers and authorities otherwise existing. All rules, regulations, orders, authorizations, delegations, or other actions duly issued, made, or taken by or pursuant to applicable law, prior to the effective date of this Act, by any agency, officer, or office pertaining to any functions, powers, and duties under the Area Redevelopment Act shall continue in full force and effect after the effective date of this Act until modified or rescinded by the Secretary or such other officer of the Department of Commerce as, in accordance with applicable law, may be appropriate.

Transfer of Functions and Effective Date

Sec. 703 (a) The functions, powers, duties, and authorities and the assets, funds, contracts, loans, liabilities, commitments, authorizations, allocations, and records which are vested in or authorized to be transferred to the Secretary of the Treasury under section 29(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act, and all functions, powers, duties, and authorities under section 29(c) of the Area Redevelopment Act are hereby vested in the Secretary.

(b) Any appropriations available to the Secretary for the purposes of the Area Revelopment Act on or after the date of enactment of this Act shall be available for the purposes of this Act.

(c) In the event that the Administrator required by this Act to be appointed by and with the advice and consent of the Senate shall not have entered upon office on the effective date of this Act, the President may designate a person to act in such office until the office is filled as provided in this Act or until the expiration of the first period of sixty days following said effective date, whichever shall first occur. While so acting such person shall receive compensation at the rate provided by this Act for such office.

(d) The provisions of this Act shall take effect upon enactment unless herein explicitly otherwise provided.

Separability

Sec. 704. Notwithstanding any other evidence of the intent of Congress, it is hereby declared to be the intent of Congress that if any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any persons or circumstances, shall be adjudged by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of this Act or its application to other persons and circumstances, but shall be confined in its operation to the provision of this Act, or the application thereof to the persons and circumstances, directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been rendered.

Application of Act

Sec. 705. As used in this Act, the terms "State", "States", and "United States" include the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

Annual Report

Sec. 706. The Secretary shall make a comprehensive and detailed annual report to the Congress of his operations under this Act for each fiscal year beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966. Such report shall be printed and shall be transmitted to the Congress not later than January 3 of the year following the fiscal year with respect to which such report is made.

Use of Other Facilities

Sec. 707. (a) To the fullest extent practicable in carrying out the provisions of this Act the Secretary shall use the available services and facilities of other agencies and instrumentalities of the Federal Government, but only with their consent and on a reimbursable basis. The foregoing requirement shall be implemented by the Secretary in such a manner as to avoid the duplication of existing staffs and facilities in any agency or instrumentality of the Federal Government. The Secretary is authorized to delegate to the heads of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government any of the Secretary's functions, powers and duties under this Act as he may deem appropriate, and to authorize the redelegation of such functions, powers and duties by the heads of such departments and agencies.

(b) Departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall exercise their powers, duties, and functions in such manner as will assist in carrying out the objectives of this Act.

(c) Funds authorized to be appropriated under this Act may be transferred, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, between departments and agencies of the Government, if such funds are used for the purposes for which they are specifically authorized and appropriated.

Appropriation

Sec. 708. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act. Appropriations authorized under this Act shall remain available until expended unless otherwise provided by appropriations acts.

Penalties

Sec. 709. (a) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any financial assistance under section 101, 201, 202, or 403 or any extension thereof by renewal, deferment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Secretary, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this Act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Secretary, in the administration of this Act (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to him or pledged or otherwise entrusted to him, or (2) with intent to defraud the Secretary or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Secretary, or without being duly authorized to refrain from employing, tendering any office or employment to, or retaining for professional services, any person who, on the date such assistance or any part thereof was rendered, or within one year prior thereto, shall have served as an officer, attorney, agent, or employee, occupying a position or engaging in activities which the Secretary shall have determined involve discretion with respect to the granting of assistance under this Act.

Prevailing Rate of Wage and Forty-Hour Week

SEC. 711. All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors or subcontractors on projects assisted by the Secretary under this Act shall be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a—5), and every such employee shall receive compensation at a rate not less than one and one-half times his basic rate of pay for all hours worked in any workweek in excess of eight hours in any workday or forty hours in the workweek, as the case may be. The Secretary shall not extend any financial assistance under section 101, 201, 202, or 403 for such a project without first obtaining adequate assurance that these labor standards will be maintained upon the construction work. The Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this provision, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 64 Stat. 1267; 5 U.S.C. 133z—15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

Record of Applications

SEC. 712. The Secretary shall maintain as a permanent part of the records of the Department of Commerce a list of applications approved for financial assistance under section 101, 201, 202, or 403, which shall be kept available for public inspection during the regular business hours of the Department of Commerce. The following information shall be posted in such list as soon as each application is approved; (1) the name of the applicant and, in the case of corporate applications, the names of the officers and directors thereof, (2) the amount and duration of the loan or grant for which application is made, (3) the purposes for which the proceeds of the loan or grant are to be used, and (4) a general description of the security offered in the case of a loan.

Records and Audit

SEC. 713. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this Act shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and the disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, and the amount and nature of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipient that are pertinent to assistance received under this Act.

Conforming Amendment

SEC. 714. All benefits heretofore specifically made available (and not subsequently revoked) under other Federal programs to persons or to public or private organizations, corporations, or entities in areas designated by the Secretary as "redevelopment areas" under section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act, are hereby also extended, insofar as practicable, to such areas as may be designated as "redevelopment areas" or "economic development centers" under the authority of sections 401 or 403 of this Act; provided, however, that this section shall not be construed as limiting such administrative discretion as may have been conferred under any other law.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name be added as a cosponsor of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], has also asked that his name be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I heartily join in the bill sponsored by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Michigan. I think it is essential, if the war on poverty is to succeed, if our economy is to be developed, that there be jobs. This proposed legislation, which I am glad to cosponsor, is necessary and long overdue.

The Great Society so earnestly sought by President Johnson lies in the future. To achieve it, we must rally behind the leadership of the President and aid him in every possible way to achieve for the people of the United States of America not only his dream but what has become, in addition, our dream. In this work, the President will find me at his side.

But just as the Great Society lies in the future there are tasks which must be performed in the present. And the greatest of all these tasks is that of providing jobs for our unemployed men and women. That cannot wait. A man must earn money to support his wife and children today. That cannot wait.

It is for this reason that I am glad to see that the President's proposed program includes an accelerated public works program. I applaud him for that recommendation. It is what I have been recommending for many years now—in this Congress and in the 88th Congress.

Early in this session I introduced S. 110 to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the accelerated public works program by $1.5 billion. That bill has also been referred to the Senate Public Works Committee and was cosponsored by the able and distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] and the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH]. I hope that when the measure which has just been introduced by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA], is called up for hearings; my bill, S. 110, will be called up for hearings at the same time.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at the conclusion of my remarks; the statement and insertions I made on January 7, 1965, when I introduced my bill, S. 110, to increase the amount authorized for the accelerated public works program.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN IMMEDIATE ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM WOULD ACHIEVE MANY OBJECTIVES OF THE PRESIDENT'S PROGRAM

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, one of the basic goals enunciated by the President in his admirable and forceful state of the Union message Monday night was stated by him as follows: "We seek full employment opportunity for every American."

I commend the President for the establishment of full employment as the No. 1 goal of the Nation. That is as it should be. Nothing can be more distressing than the plight of a breadwinner seeking employment and being unable to find it. Such an individual is not interested in high levels of gross national product or in total numbers of employed. He is interested in securing employment so that he can provide for his family adequately and decently.

In the past I have spoken out repeatedly of the need for immediate action to relieve the distress in the many—far too many—pockets of serious and chronic unemployment in the United States. I know whereof I speak, for my own State of Alaska has for years now suffered in this manner. And suffered sorely. It still suffers, and ways must be found to alleviate the immediate need while fighting the war against poverty on a more permanent and lasting scale.

I was pleased to note the President's words that "special funds for job-creating public programs should be made available for immediate use if recession threatens." But here I hope that the word "recession" will not be given too narrow a construction. The chronically idle, in a pocket of severe unemployment in an otherwise prosperous State, are not threatened by a recession. The recession is already upon them. They are not concerned with statewide or nationwide averages or in industrywide statistics. All they know is that they are unemployed and cannot find—and have for some time been unable to find—employment, however diligently they may seek it.

A persistent unemployment rate of over 5 percent is not a healthy sign, however glowing the other economic statistics may be. Those other statistics are scant comfort to those comprising the more than 5 percent unemployed.

What is needed is an immediate revival of the accelerated public works program which has exhausted all its funds, even though there are at least $700 million worth of sound public works projects ready to go.

Testifying before the Senate Committee on Public Works last March, Mr. Andrew J. Biemiller, on behalf of the AFL–CIO stated:

"The overriding economic challenge to the United States today is jobs—jobs for the unemployed, jobs for those who are displaced daily by the advance of automation, jobs for the flood of newcomers entering the labor force. This is beyond dispute.

"Equally beyond dispute is that fact that public works programs have proved to be a most effective weapon for creating jobs—good jobs on needed public facilities of permanent worth.

"Therefore it would be a tragedy to allow the accelerated public works program to die. It is the conviction of the AFL–CIO that this job-creating program—which also provides vitally needed public facilities of lasting worth—should be both extended and strengthened.

"We are advised that there are on file already, here in Washington, some $800 million in such projects which were submitted after all the authorized Federal funds, under the 1962 act, had been committed. This is despite the fact that, as early as January 1963, Federal officials discouraged the submission of further requests because it was apparent that the number on hand exceeded the funds available.

"It is unquestionable, then, that a vast number of equally worthy and equally needed projects remain which have never been submitted. There is no doubt that there is work to be done; all that is lacking is the wherewithal to do it.

"We know that this committee, which worked so hard on behalf of the original public works acceleration program 2 years ago, is fully aware of the need. We urge your prompt approval of an extension of the existing program, backed by a Federal appropriation of $2 billion."

With these remarks, I agree.

During the 88th Congress, I introduced an amendment to the Accelerated Public Works Act to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated. A bill (S. 1856) to authorize an additional appropriation of $1.5 billion—slightly smaller than the one I proposed—was reported favorably by the Senate Committee on Public Works, but was not acted on by the Senate as a whole.

To meet a serious, immediate need, I am introducing on behalf of myself and the able senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH] who has labored so diligently to combat unemployment, a bill to increase the amount authorized under the accelerated public works program by $1.5 billion. I ask unanimous consent that this bill lie at the table for 10 days and that its text, as well as the full testimony of Mr. Biemiller and the committee report on S. 1856, be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the table as requested by the Senator from Alaska, and will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 110) to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Public Works Acceleration Act, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and Mr. RANDOLPH), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 3(d) of the Public Works Acceleration Act (Public Law 87–658; 76 Stat. 542) is hereby amended to read as follows:

" '(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $2,400,000,000 to be allocated by the President in accordance with subsection (b) of this section, except that not less than $800,000,000 shall be allocated for public works projects in areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce as redevelopment areas under subsection (b) of section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act.' Appropriations made pursuant to this authorization after the date of enactment of this sentence shall remain available until expended."

The testimony of Mr. Biemiller and the committee report on S. 1856 are as follows:

"STATEMENT OF ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF LEGISLATION, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR AND CONGRESS OF INDUSTRIAL ORGANIZATIONS, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS OF THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, MARCH 11, 1964

"Mr. Chairman, my name is Andrew J. Biemiller. I am director of the department of legislation of the AFL–CIO and I am appearing here today on behalf of that organization.

"We are here to support the continuation of the Public Works Acceleration Act, and to endorse the purposes of S. 1856, introduced by Senator MCNAMARA.

"But our appearance is not only merely a pro forma expression of approbation for a generally desirable piece of legislation. We are here because in our view this program is an essential element in the broad and varied campaign that must be undertaken to insure the security of the Nation, at home and abroad.

"The overriding economic challenge to the United States today is jobs—jobs for the unemployed, jobs for those who are displaced daily by the advance of automation, jobs for the flood of newcomers entering the labor force. This is beyond dispute.

"Equally beyond dispute is that fact that public works programs have proved to be a most effective weapon for creating jobs—good jobs on needed public facilities of permanent worth.

"Yet the accelerated public works program is now expiring. Unless the Congress moves quickly, the 200,000 jobs it is currently providing will vanish. This must not happen.

"When this committee conducted hearings on the Public Works Acceleration Act almost 2 years ago, the AFL–CIO testified to its great importance as a means of providing jobs and creating public improvement of long-term worth. Experience has verified that testimony. The benefits of the program are unquestionable. But the need is as great today as when the program was initially proposed.

"The tax cut hopefully will prevent, this year, an economic downturn and the sharp rise in unemployment it would bring. However, as the AFL–CIO executive council recently pointed out, 'There is no sound basis for anticipating anything more than a small reduction of joblessness in 1964. By next year, the economic stimulus of the tax cut will be wearing out—with the possibility of a renewed upward movement of unemployment.'

"Let us frankly face the facts about unemployment in the United States.

"1. Unemployment has been in a rising trend for 10 years—up from 1.9 million, or 2.9 percent of the labor force, in 1953 to 4.3 million, or 5.7 percent of the labor force, in 1963.

"2. There were fewer full-time jobs in private, profitmaking business last year than there were 10 years ago.

"3. Unemployment actually increased more than 150,000 in 1963—a year of general prosperity for most Americans—despite a $30 billion rise in total national production.

"4. America's job needs are accelerating. While productivity continues to increase at a rapid pace, with the spread of automation, the growth of the labor force is also speeding up—from an average of 900,000 a year in the last decade to an expected 1.4 million a year during the remainder of the 1960's.

"The growth of unemployment over the last 10 years, and its persistence even during years of so-called boom, is statistically demonstrated by the table attached to this testimony. This problem is far more serious than most Americans realize. The waste of manpower, the loss of personal income and dignity, the sharpening of labor-management and race relations conflicts, the tremendous social costs are greater than the Nation can safely endure for long. And without decisive action on many fronts, these costs will mount.

"In 1963, a record production year, an average of 4.2 million Americans were unemployed and 2.3 million additional workers were compelled to work part-time because full-time jobs were not available. Moreover, an estimated 1.5 to 2 million people had given up seeking work; people who want to work, people who would return to the labor force if jobs became available again.

"In order to achieve and sustain reasonably full employment in the United States more than 4 million new job opportunities must be created each year through the remainder of the 1960's, or more than 80,000 jobs every week.

"It would be a dangerous illusion to believe that the tax cut, or any other single measure, could alone achieve this goal. Nor will any amount of wishful thinking achieve it. What the Nation needs is action, not just one action but many.

"Therefore it would be a tragedy to allow the accelerated public works program to die. It is the conviction of the AFL–CIO that this job-creating program—which also provides vitally needed public facilities of lasting worth—should be both extended and strengthened.

"Since President Kennedy signed the Public Works Acceleration Act in September 1962, thousands of workers in areas of substantial unemployment have gone back to work building public facilities of long-term value. Additional thousands have been at work providing material and equipment for those construction projects. At a time like the present, when the private sector of the economy is failing to utilize the Nation's full manpower and production resources, this is an unsurpassed way to put people to work and, at the same time, permanently enrich the Nation.

"Let me summarize the record:

"All of the $880 million in Federal funds made available by the Congress under this act have now been committed. As a matter of fact, by January 1963—more than a year ago and after the program had been in effect for less than 4 months—the backlog of project requests already exceeded the $900 million originally authorized for this program by the Congress.

"The $280 million ultimately appropriated is helping to finance about half of the cost of nearly 8,000 projects in more than 3,000 communities where unemployment is most severe. These projects are not only putting people to work; they are also helping to create the basis for future economic growth and well-being.

"These 8,000 job-creating projects are public investments of enduring value. They include about 1,200 badly needed water supply improvement and expansion projects, about 650 waste treatment works, about 600 sewer projects, and over 300 new public buildings such as fire and police stations, courthouses, and libraries. In addition, they include over 500 long-needed health and recreation projects, 1,150 street and road improvements, and 1,650 conservation and natural resource undertakings.

"These projects, on completion, will not only have generated 220,000 more years of work in onsite employment and in the production of materials and supplies. In addition, many of the facilities made possible by the program—like airports, libraries, water purification plants, and hospitals—will establish permanent jobs.

"When State and local matching funds are added to the $880 million Federal outlay, the total adds up to almost $1¾ billion in important public improvements. Had it not been for the Public Works Acceleration Act, these improvements would not be under construction; the manpower and industrial resources they are using would otherwise have remained idle.

"Within the next month or two the peak job impact of these projects will be reached. Thereafter, the number of jobs will quickly dwindle as the projects are completed. This I repeat, would be a tragedy.

"A tremendous backlog of essential public works still exists in areas of substantial unemployment. If the act is extended, these job-creating projects will move forward, providing employment for thousands of workers. If the act is not extended, most of this backlog of projects will remain on the shelf.

"We are advised that there are on the file already, here in Washington, some $300 million in such projects which were submitted after all the authorized Federal funds, under the 1962 act, had been committed. This is despite the fact that as early as January 1963, Federal officials discourage the submission of further requests because it was apparent that the number on hand exceeded the funds available.

"It is unquestionable, then, that a vast number of equally worthy and equally needed projects remain which have never been submitted. There is no doubt that there is work to be done; all that is lacking is the wherewithal to do it.

"As the recent report of the Committee on Public Works of the House of Representatives pointed out in urging continuation of the accelerated public works program:

"'It would be unrealistic to expect these huge backlogs to be eliminated in the immediate future, but it would be even more unrealistic to ignore the urgency of accelerating our efforts to meet these needs. The accelerated public works program is directing the economic potential of our idle resources toward that goal.'

"The value of the Public Works Acceleration Act to the jobless, to the communities that are obtaining lasting improvements, and to the Nation as a whole has been clearly demonstrated. At its recent constitutional convention, the AFL–CIO unanimously voiced its support for the extension of that act and for an additional authorization of $2 billion in order to increase its job-creating impact. Our proposed authorization is $500 million higher than the amount proposed by S. 1858.

"A Federal effort of this magnitude, plus the supplemental State and local matching funds, would stimulate almost $4 billion in construction projects, at the right time and in the right places. Moreover, according to U.S. Department of Labor studies, this $4 billion outlay would directly create about 400,000 badly needed jobs in onsite construction and in the production and distribution of building materials and equipment. What is more, as these funds are spent by working people and businesses, another 200,000 to 400,000 jobs would be created indirectly. These jobs that America badly needs.

"In a sense, Mr. Chairman, what we are talking about is one avenue toward the implementation, at long last, of the Employment Act of 1946.

"The tax cut, just signed into law, is one such avenue. But it is only one of the many that are required. The Public Works Acceleration Act of 1962 was another; it must not now be closed.

"We in the AFL–CIO are deeply convinced that the principles of the Employment Act of 1946—committing the Federal Government to use its resources to reach and sustain maximum production, employment, and purchasing power in the United States—are more important today than they were when the law was passed.

"They can no longer be honored more in the breach than in the observance. The unprecedented growth in the American work force, the mounting impact of automation, confront us with an employment problem which few envisioned a decade and a half ago.

"We must solve these problems, for even more compelling reasons than could then be seen. The economic strength of this country is no longer a matter of concern to Americans alone; it will determine the future of freedom on earth.

"We know that this committee, which worked so hard on behalf of the original public works acceleration program 2 years ago, is fully aware of the need. We urge your prompt approval of an extension of the existing program, backed by a Federal appropriation of $2 billion.

"This is not a time for half measures, or even three-quarter measures; the need is immediate and growing, and it can be met only by imaginative, decisive action."

Years	The unemployed		Long-term unemployed			
			Jobless 15 weeks or more		Jobless 27 weeks or more	
	Number of jobless	Percent of labor force	Number	Percent of total unemployment	Number	Percent of total unemployment
1953	1.9	2.9	211,000	11.3	72,000	4.2
1954	3.6	5.6	812,000	22.7	317,000	8.9
1955	2.9	4.4	703,000	24.2	336,000	11.6
1956	2.8	4.2	533,000	18.9	232,000	8.2
1957	2.0	4.3	580,000	19.1	239,000	8.2
1958	4.7	6.8	1,482,000	31.0	667,000	14.5
1959	3.8	3.5	1,040,000	27.3	571,000	15.0
1960	3.9	5.6	956,000	24.3	454,000	11.1
1961	4.8	6.7	1,532,000	31.9	504,000	16.7
1962	4.0	5.0	1,119,000	27.9	585,000	14.6
1963	4.2	5.7	1,068,000	26.1	553,000	13.3

Source: U.S. Department of Labor.

ACCELERATED PUBLIC WORKS PROGRAM

(Report together with individual views)

The Committee on Public Works, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1856), to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the Public Works Acceleration Act, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendment and recommend that the bill as amended to pass.

The amendment is indicated in the bill as reported and is shown by italic.

Summary of the bill and amendment

S. 1856 would amend section 3(d) of the Public Works Acceleration Act to provide authorization of $2,400 million inclusive of the original authorization of $900 million, the increase of $1,500 million to be available until expended. The new authorization contains the same formula of distribution as the original, providing one-third of the funds for areas designated under subsection 5(b) of Public Law 87–658.

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY OF PUBLIC LAW 87–658

The present accelerated public works program was generated from President Kennedy's desire to have standby authority to combat a recession before it might become fully developed. Among the arsenal of economic weapons devised for such a purpose, he requested authority from the Congress to commit $2 billion in Federal funds for public works projects whenever unemployment reached a critical level as defined in the draft bill the President submitted to the Congress.

On February 19, 1962, President Kennedy in a letter to the Congress requested standby authority to commit $2 billion in Federal funds to stimulate the economy whenever seasonally adjusted unemployment rates had risen 3 out of 4 or 4 out of 6 consecutive months by a total of at least 1 percentage point during that period, and whenever the President determined that use of the standby authority was necessary to realize the goals of the Full Employment Act of 1946.

Under the proposal, the President could, after determining that the requisite conditions existed, declare a 12-month "capital improvement acceleration period" during which he could commit, without further congressional approval, $750 million in direct Federal expenditures previously authorized, $750 million for grants-in-aid to State and local governments, $250 million in loans to the States and localities, and $250 million additional among the three categories.

The proposal called for automatic termination of the President's authority at the end of 12 months unless extended by Congress or previously terminated by the President. After a waiting period of months, he could declare another 12-month capital improvement acceleration period, commit another $2 billion, and repeat the cycle without further limitation.

The $750 million for grants-in-aid was to be used either to accelerate work on existing Federal-State grant projects, or initiate Federal grants for projects not otherwise eligible under existing statute.

Transmitted with the President's message was a draft bill—the Standby Capital Improvements Act of 1962—which was introduced in the House (H.R. 10318) on February 21, 1962, and in the Senate (S. 2965) on March 8, 1962.

On March 26, in letters to the House and Senate Public Works Committees, the President stated that the economy had not recovered as well as had been expected during the first months of 1962, and requested the Congress to amend H.R. 10318 to permit immediate commitment of $600 million for capital improvement programs in areas designated for redevelopment under the Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, and areas which had an unemployment rate of over 6 percent for a year or longer.

The Senate Public Works Committee conducted hearings on April 12–13, 1962, and on April 25, 1962, reported, with amendments the administration bill (S. 2965, S. Rept. 1358) containing a $2 billion standby authority and a $600 million immediate acceleration program.

On May 28, 1962, the Senate passed an amended version of S. 2965, authorizing the President to spend $750 million for immediate acceleration of public works projects in areas of heavy unemployment, and also authorizing appropriation after June 30, 1963, of $750 million for a standby public works program.

The Senate measure provided that the standby authority could be triggered only when the adjusted unemployment rate had risen 1 percentage point over a 3- to 9-month period.

The House Public Works Committee conducted hearings from March 26 to April 6, 1962, on the administration bill (H.R. 10318) to authorize a $2 billion standby program and a $600 million immediate acceleration program, and a bill (H.R. 10113) to authorize a $2 billion standby program and an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration. On June 2, 1962, the House Public Works Committee reported, with amendments, H.R. 10113, authorizing appropriations of $900 million for immediate acceleration of public works through both direct Federal projects and grants-in-aid to State and local governments. It also provided for an Office of Public Works Coordination and Acceleration, but no authority for a standby program.

The House passed H.R. 10113 on August 29, 1962, by a voice vote, authorizing appropriation of $900 million for immediate acceleration of public works and deleting the provision for a special Office of Coordination and Acceleration. The House then vacated passage of H.R. 10113, amended S. 2965 to conform to the House-passed version, and substituted S. 2965 for H.R. 10113.

On September 10, 1962, the Senate agreed to the House amendments by a 45 to 22 rollcall vote and the bill was signed into law by President Kennedy on September 14, 1962.

Summary of Public Law 87–658 and implementing regulations

The Public Works Acceleration Act includes specific provisions for designation of the areas eligible for accelerated public works projects, the requirements for State and local governments to participate, and the rules of equity to be followed by the Federal Government in approving the projects. Eligible areas, as defined in the statute, exist in each of the 50 States, in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa.

The principal features of Public Law 87–658 are:

First, all designated redevelopment areas under sections 5(a) and 5(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act are eligible for accelerated public works assistance. (Sec. 5(a) areas are urban areas of high unemployment; sec. 5(b) areas are rural and semirural areas of high unemployment, underemployment and low income designated by the Secretary of Commerce, and all Indian reservations.) Also eligible are those areas designated by the Secretary of Labor as having had substantial unemployment for at least 9 of the preceding 12 months, substantial unemployment being defined as above 6 percent.

Second, Federal public works projects in eligible areas which have been authorized by the Congress can be initiated or accelerated.

Third, public works projects of State and local governments for which Federal financial assistance is authorized in other legislation can be initiated and accelerated. For such projects, grants up to 50 percent of the total cost are authorized, and up to 75 percent if the State or local government lacks the financial capacity to assume the full additional financial obligation.

Department of Commerce regulations have established firm and objective criteria for relating grants of above 50 percent to local financial capacity. Areas eligible for 58-percent grants are those with median family incomes between $1,700 and $1,800 per year or twice the national unemployment rate for 3 of the last 4 years.

Areas with median family annual incomes of $1,600 to $1,700 or twice the national unemployment rate for all of the last 4 years qualify for 66-percent grants.

Areas with median family incomes under $1,600 per year or three times the national unemployment rate for all of the last 4 years are eligible for 75-percent grants. All of the 54 Indian reservations fall within this category.

The fourth main provision of the act declares that no State may receive more than 10 percent of the funds allocated, and no less than $300 million of the $900 million originally authorized must be allocated for the nonurban small labor market areas, low-income areas, and Indian reservations designated under section 5(b) of the Area Redevelopment Act. The new authorization of $1,500 million recommended by the committee retains this formula of distribution, allocating an additional $500 million to areas designated under section 5(b).

Fifth, adequate consideration must be given to relative needs of eligible areas, and criteria are established which the selected projects must meet. These criteria assure that projects—

(a) Can be initiated or accelerated within a reasonably short period of time, this period having been interpreted as within 120 days after the obligation of funds;

(b) Will meet an essential public need;

(c) Will have a substantial portion (51 percent) completed within 12 months after initiation;

(d) Will contribute significantly to the reduction of local unemployment;

(e) Are not inconsistent with locally approved comprehensive plans for the areas affected, where such plans exist.

It may be noted at this point that during the committee hearings testimony was submitted in criticism of the presumed failure of Federal administrative officials to fulfill two of the above five conditions. Evidence was received which would indicate that in certain instances, despite Department of Commerce requirements designed to assure the maximum employment of local labor, contractors have imported labor from outside the local labor market. Indications are that this may be due to the lack of requisite skills within the local labor market. However, the committee would urge administering officials to exert every effort to assure the employment of local labor, and to give particular priority to those qualified persons who have undergone the longest periods of unemployment.

The second criticism of administering of accelerated public works which was brought to the attention of the committee during its hearings was raised by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce in its attack upon recreation projects on the presumption that such projects fail to satisfy the condition of "essential public need." Representatives of the chamber declined to offer a systematic evaluation on any specific project on this ground, and their testimony was not supported by any of the local chambers of commerce or Government officials queried by the committee.

Hearings

The Special Subcommittee for Accelerated Public Works conducted hearings on S. 1121 and S. 1856 on December 10, 11, 12, and 13, 1963, and March 11, 12, and 13, 1964. During the 7 days of hearings the special subcommittee received testimony from more than 60 witnesses, including Members of the Senate and House of Representatives, elected officials from the great metropolitan areas, as well as from smaller cities and rural and semirural communities throughout the Nation, from labor, farm, and management organizations, and from scholars and economists.

The evidence adduced was overwhelmingly in support of the accelerated public works program as it has been administered and was in favor of an extension of the program under a new authorization.

The following tables and charts set forth the distribution of the $880 million thus far appropriated and demonstrate the categories of projects for which the funds have been obligated.

Table I presents the allocation of funds among the departments and agencies, which material is also presented on a percentage basis (as of December 1, 1963) in chart I.

Chart II presents the distribution of funds among categories of projects (as of December 1, 1963); and table II presents the allocation of funds to the individual States (as of April 1, 1964).

Chart III offers a comparative representation of total allocations, the value of projects approved, and the value of funds put in place.

It should be noted with reference to the following charts that an amount in excess of $12,800,000 has been allocated but will not be used on specific projects. Due to the appropriation period deadline and the failure of certain communities to fulfill their commitments, some funds were allocated which were not used and which were "returned" too late to be reallocated. These funds amounted to a lapse of $8,900,000 from the first appropriation of $450 million and as of March 31, 1964, $3,900,000 from the second appropriation. And it is expected that there will be additional funds lapsing from the second appropriation. It is for this reason that the committee has recommended amending the bill to provide that the funds be available until expended.

TABLES AND CHARTS

TABLE I.—*Accelerated public works program—Allocation of funds*

Agency	*Amount (thousands)*
A. Direct Federal projects:	
Agriculture	$59,690
Interior	50,979
Commerce	15,570
Defense (Engineers)	10,450
General Services Administration	3,000
Post Office	2,950
Justice	1,800
Tennessee Valley Authority	800
Treasury (Coast Guard)	800
Veterans' Administration	350
Total, direct Federal projects	146,389
B. Grants-in-aid projects:	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	475,635
Health, Education, and Welfare	229,845
Interior	13,021
Agriculture	3,110
Commerce	2,845
Total, grant-in-aid projects	724,456
C. Administrative costs:	
Housing and Home Finance Agency	5,600
Commerce	1,325
Health, Education, and Welfare	1,195
Interior	485
Agriculture	400
Labor	150
Total, administrative costs	9,155
D. Grand total:	
Direct Federal projects (16.6 percent)	146,389
Grant-in-aid projects (82.4 percent)	724,456
Administrative costs (1.0 percent)	9,155
Total (100 percent)	880,000

(Chart I and II omitted from printing.)

TABLE II.—*Number, estimated accelerated public works cost, and man-months of on-site employment, by States, accelerated public works projects approved through Apr. 1, 1964*

State	Number of projects	Estimated cost (thousands)		Estimated on-site man-months[1]
		Accelerated public works	Total	
Alabama	193	$27,135	$59,910	33,556
Alaska	66	7,684	12,691	7,191
Arizona	83	9,417	10,559	12,295
Arkansas	291	17,491	35,286	22,820
California	264	31,939	59,066	32,820
Colorado	57	3,575	5,242	3,413
Connecticut	55	7,392	16,229	7,978
Delaware	18	1,131	3,083	2,047
Florida	108	15,313	31,848	17,068
Georgia	203	17,005	34,665	19,849
Hawaii	9	2,733	6,097	3,366
Idaho	106	6,404	8,293	6,466
Illinois	226	21,675	40,339	23,515
Indiana	121	12,499	26,576	14,605

See footnote at end of table.

TABLE II.—*Number, estimated accelerated public works cost, and man-months of on-site employment, by State accelerated public works projects approved through Apr. 1, 1964*—Continued

State	Number of projects	Estimated cost (thousands)		Estimated on-site man-months[1]
		Accelerated public works	Total	
Iowa	3	$551	$855	628
Kansas	12	953	1,928	835
Kentucky	339	45,060	102,720	60,169
Louisiana	177	32,096	73,739	39,297
Maine	55	4,614	12,719	7,582
Maryland	39	3,531	8,355	4,834
Massachusetts	103	21,240	49,403	23,746
Michigan	714	67,538	146,254	85,613
Minnesota	290	14,998	25,306	22,949
Mississippi	168	13,873	29,317	18,760
Missouri	214	11,881	28,907	16,447
Montana	101	7,369	9,023	9,097
Nebraska	28	1,729	2,739	1,817
Nevada	13	1,020	1,140	1,070
New Hampshire	23	2,116	5,668	2,794
New Jersey	121	42,410	102,579	46,320
New Mexico	229	14,363	19,516	17,306
New York	209	36,295	77,763	40,316
North Carolina	228	20,749	43,098	27,155
North Dakota	22	1,335	1,608	1,868
Ohio	173	27,510	66,718	35,389
Oklahoma	222	18,515	33,597	21,720
Oregon	114	12,917	19,744	12,372
Pennsylvania	512	81,759	169,563	87,409
Rhode Island	43	12,438	38,222	18,525
South Carolina	162	11,108	28,125	18,678
South Dakota	25	2,111	2,432	2,691
Tennessee	161	21,451	48,080	28,730
Texas	184	24,437	49,958	28,774
Utah	108	7,218	10,847	8,598
Vermont	13	1,399	3,578	1,765
Virginia	61	5,491	10,258	7,181
Washington	190	15,425	26,067	16,130
West Virginia	301	43,020	78,053	43,051
Wisconsin	207	9,171	20,779	14,543
Wyoming	43	2,415	3,553	3,121
American Samoa				
Guam	2	134	160	166
Puerto Rico	345	29,525	43,335	25,793
Virgin Islands	8	724	1,008	875
Total	7,762	851,882	1,741,598	1,011,123

[1] Estimated months of employment for the HHFA-CFA projects were computed by ARA on the basis of the latest data available from BLS studies of construction costs for various types of public works projects.

(Chart III omitted from printing.)

GENERAL STATEMENT

The committee has addressed the two main arguments advanced against the authorization of new funds for accelerated public works, the first of these being predicated on the assumption that the stimulus of the income tax reduction will reduce unemployment sufficiently, without an additional investment in public works projects. A corollary to this argument is the presumption that the Congress—by voting for the tax reduction—pledged itself against enacting other legislation to stimulate the economy.

In this regard, the committee would draw attention to President Kennedy's plea when recommending the original program as a further Federal effort "* * * to provide useful work for the unemployed and underemployed, and to help these and other hard-pressed communities, through improvement of their public facilities, to become better places to live and work."

Thus, it is evident to the committee that neither in its conception nor in its design has the accelerated public works program been justified solely as a countercyclical economic measure. It has been designed and administered to provide additional employment and improved community facilities in those areas of greatest economic and social need. Despite the progress achieved to date, the conditions of excessive unemployment and community need still prevail in some 1,300 areas comprising one-third of the Nation.

Acknowledged the full economic stimulus of the tax reduction that its proponents claim, this will be a necessary though not a sufficient condition for fulfillment of the needs of the 1,300 designated areas of greatest distress.

Speaking with reference to the multiplicative effect of the tax cut, Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, informed the Special Subcommittee on Accelerated Public Works that the $10 billion tax cut could create an additional stimulus of $35 billion and employ "something over 2 million people." However, stated Senator DOUGLAS, "* * * this is a general demand and the accelerated public works is a rifleshot increase in demand in the areas where it is most needed."

Referring to production and employment trends during the past 15 years, Dr. Leon Keyserling, former Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers under President Truman, pointed out to the special subcommittee that: "The true level of unemployment or the full-time unemployment as officially recorded, has increased about 50 percent over 5 years, or 100 percent over 10 years, [and] we face the alarming prospect of another 50-percent increase over 5 years, or doubling over 10 years, under the impact of policies now in being, and under active consideration."

Other witnesses, taking an even more pessimistic view of the employment effect of the tax cut, referred to the prospect of additional technological unemployment growing from the plant modernization which will be stimulated by the tax cut.

In summary, it is the view of the committee that neither the tax cut nor other domestic programs now in being or submitted to the Congress are a substitute for filling the precise needs toward which the accelerated public works program is oriented.

The second major criticism against the accelerated public works program has been leveled against the inaccuracy of the early estimates of on-site employment. Overestimates of on-site employment were acknowledged by administrative officials as a result of their failure to anticipate the degree of prefabricated work involved in some construction projects. However, the committee was also informed of a corresponding increase of off-site employment over the early estimates, and in summation, Dr. Johannes U. Hoeber, Acting Deputy Administrator for Public Works Acceleration, declared that: "As far as we know at this time, our estimate that the entire $880 million program, when completed, will generate 220,000 man-years of on-site and off-site employment should come very close to what the program will actually produce."

The committee has also taken note of the fact that these estimates do not include the permanent employment created directly by the new facilities and the indirect employment created in industries which are dependent upon some of the facilities constructed.

In the former category, for example, are the thousands of permanent hospital jobs created by the construction of new hospital and clinical facilities. As of March 1964, 256 hospital and nursing home projects had been assisted under the accelerated public works program with a total Federal expenditure of $102 million and a total expenditure from all sources of $253 million. According to the American Hospital Association, it requires approximately $25,000 investment for each new hospital bed, and hospitals require an average of 2.8 employees for each bed served. Thus, the $253 million in hospital and nursing home projects represents approximately 10,000 new hospital beds and 28,000 new permanent jobs, many of which are of a highly skilled and technical nature. At approximately $9,000 capital investment for each new job, this compares favorably with the general increase of $15,000 to $20,000 in the gross national product which is required for each new job.

For many of the individual communities, however, the most significant achievement of the accelerated public works program is in the construction of vital water and sewage facilities on which local industries depend. These facilities may mean the difference between whether a local industry leaves the community or remains and expands; thus, in many instances noted before the committee, specific accelerated public works projects have been the critical factors in providing for a viable local economy. Table III below presents several such examples.

TABLE III

Project No.	Location	Type	Grant	Employment effect
APW-Ga-17G	Sandersville, Ga	Water	$61,000	2 new industries employing 74 persons result from these 2 projects.
APW-Ga-22G	do	Sewer	84,000	
APW-Ga-34G	Blairsville, Ga	Water and sewer	61,200	400 new jobs result from new shoe plant and pepper plant.
APW-Ga-38G	Sylvania, Ga	Water	30,000	230 new jobs in new industrial area.
APW-Miss-5G	De Kalb, Miss	do	375,500	75 jobs in lumber industry saved.
APW-SC-1G	Blaney, S.C	Water and sewer	175,000	250 new jobs.
APW-Tenn-10GL	Camden, Tenn	Water	248,700	Water to industrial park made possible 200 new jobs with Genessee Shoe Co.
APW-Tenn-19G	Big Creek Utility District, Tenn	do	640,000	400 new jobs.
APW-Tenn-28G	Springfield, Tenn	do	173,500	400 new jobs in 3 industries result from water to industrial park.
APW-Ky-70GL	Quicksand Water District, Jackson, Ky.	do	117,000	Water needed for University of Kentucky Wood Utilization Center to develop new uses for wood and long-term employment and for eastern Kentucky resource development project.
APW-Wash-6G	Skagit County	Dam	418,000	Made possible retention of 3 canneries otherwise forced to leave by poor water quality.

With reference to both categories of permanent employment mentioned above, it is evident that considerable benefits accrue from the accelerated public works program which are not revealed in the statistics of on-site employment created. Due to rather stringent limitations established by the Congress for administrative costs of the program, the Area Redevelopment Administration has not been able to conduct impact studies to measure the extent of such benefits on a nationwide basis. Such studies would, however, be essential for an accurate assessment of the effect of the accelerated public works program on the national economy.

Backlog of unfilled needs

As noted earlier in this report, the Public Works Acceleration Act was signed by President Kennedy on September 14, 1962. Yet, within less than 4 months the applications for assistance to State and local projects surpassed the $900 million authorization. In January 1963, it was announced that applications received after January 24, 1963, would not be processed except for those from high distress areas which qualified for grants in excess of 50 percent, applications from areas which had received nothing under the first appropriation or were newly designated, applications which had been filed earlier but with insufficient data, and applications for projects that balanced the program better than applications filed earlier.

Despite this official discouragement, as well as unofficial discouragement from many congressional offices, communities have continued to apply for accelerated public works assistance, with a present backlog, after obligation of all appropriated funds, in excess of $700 million. Table IV presents a State-by-State summary of pending projects which would be eligible for assistance under a new authorization.

TABLE IV.—*Estimated accelerated public works cost of pending projects as of May 20, 1964*

State	Accelerated public works cost (thousands)
Alabama	$12,620
Alaska	5,417
Arizona	4,011
Arkansas	9,117
California	22,987
Colorado	3,484
Connecticut	3,228
Delaware	1,138
Florida	17,758
Georgia	7,654
Hawaii	49
Idaho	246
Illinois	19,819
Indiana	4,954
Iowa	469
Kansas	3,775
Kentucky	29,884
Louisiana	22,023
Maine	960
Maryland	2,457
Massachusetts	27,748
Michigan	19,401
Mississippi	4,626
Missouri	7,386
Montana	6,429
Nebraska	2,517
Nevada	0
New Hampshire	2,315
New Jersey	36,903
New Mexico	7,024
New York	40,770
North Carolina	7,212
North Dakota	666
Ohio	20,884
Oklahoma	9,556
Oregon	5,342
Pennsylvania	96,561
Rhode Island	4,380
South Carolina	3,140
South Dakota	3,193
Tennessee	19,888
Texas	22,270
Utah	6,007
Vermont	1,450
Virginia	2,787
Washington	5,044
West Virginia	18,775
Wisconsin	6,764
Wyoming	1,053
American Samoa	
Guam	
Puerto Rico	27,975
Virgin Islands	100
Total	624,090
Pending projects for which specific data are not available	93,193
Total	717,283

It should be emphasized, however, that the preceding table does not accurately reflect the effective demand for Federal assistance on State and local projects. In view of the fact that applications were received prior to the announcement of January 1963, at an average volume of $200 million per month, dropped to $35 million a month and then rose to $113 million when the second appropriation of $400 million was made, it is safe to infer that the present level of demand would increase markedly with the authorization of new funds.

Committee recommendations

The committee noted one particular problem in the administration of the accelerated public works program which is more appropriately the subject of administrative action than legislature. The practice of importing labor from outside the local labor market has occurred, to the committee's knowledge, in the States of Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, and there have doubtless been other instances not brought to the committee's attention. The committee acknowledges the high quality of administrative effort and the dedication of officials in charge of the accelerated public works program; yet we urge administration officials to exert every effort, by administrative procedure and by promulgation of new regulations, if necessary, to assure the maximum employment of local labor, with particular priority being given to the long-term unemployed and those who have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits.

Committee views

It is the opinion of the committee that extension of the accelerated public works program by authorizing an additional $1.5 billion will benefit the national economy and provide more adequate public facilities in hundreds of communities. In order to achieve full utilization of the funds appropriated the committee also recommends that the funds be available until expended. It therefore recommends enactment of the bill as amended.

Changes in existing law

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill as reported are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

"PUBLIC WORKS ACCELERATION ACT

(76 STAT. 542)

"SEC. 3. * * *

"(d) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated not to exceed [$900,000,000] *$2,400,000,000* to be allocated by the President in accordance with subsection (b) of this section, except that not less than [$300,000,000] *$800,000,000* shall be allocated for public works projects in areas designated by the Secretary of Commerce as redevelopment areas under subsection (b) of section 5 of the Area Redevelopment Act. *Appropriations made pursuant to this authorization after the date of enactment of this sentence shall remain available until expended."*

INDIVIDUAL VIEWS OF SENATOR COOPER

The Public Works Acceleration Act established a good and helpful program, which has provided employment and assisted many worthwhile local development projects in the last 2 years. It has helped depressed communities, many of them rural, build the water and sewer systems which are necessary for the health of their people, and a condition for the establishment of almost any type of industry.

Following enactment of the tax cut, however, and at a time when additional expenditures will increase the deficit, we have the responsibility to limit spending authorizations to what is essential. For this reason, and because I want to see the accelerated public works program continued as long as it is needed to provide employment, I offered an amendment in the Special Senate Subcommittee for Accelerated Public Works, and also in the full Committee on Public Works, to reduce from $1.5 billion to $900 million the additional authorization proposed by S. 1856. I will again offer my amendment when S. 1856 comes before the Senate.

The amount I propose—$900 million—is the same as the amount originally authorized by the Public Works Acceleration Act, which proved acceptable to the Appropriations Committee and the Congress which must provide funds for this program. I do not wish to see the program lost because of requests for $600 million more than the original authorization, or for more than can efficiently be used. I believe extension of the accelerated public works program we have had for the last 2 years is the reasonable course for the Congress to adopt at this time.

I hope the expansion of private industry will soon be able to take up the slack in unemployment—which is one of the chief purposes of the tax cut. But until it does, we must continue measures to help those who are out of work through no fault of their own.

I approve the recommendation of the committee, which I urged, that in administering the program strong efforts be made to provide maximum employment in the communities and areas for which projects are approved, and that priorities be established for those who have been longest out of work and have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits.

With the adoption of my amendment, I can strongly support S. 1856 an extension of the accelerated public works program which is now providing jobs and useful public works in Appalachia, throughout Kentucky, and in hundreds of other areas throughout the country where unemployment is high and development projects can help build a better future.

JOHN SHERMAN COOPER.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, at this point, I wish to stress two points.

In his state of the Union message on Monday, President Johnson stressed the need for:

"New programs of help for basic community facilities and neighborhood centers of health and recreation;

"A new and substantial effort must be made to landscape highways and provide places of relaxation and recreation wherever our roads run.

"Within our cities imaginative programs are needed to landscape streets and transform open areas into places of beauty and recreation."

These are only a few of the many public needs stressed by the President in the satisfying of which an accelerated public works program can play an important part.

But, the question will be asked, where will the money come from? The President himself has reported that in the past year alone $3½ billion in wasted Government expenditures have been eliminated. And, he went on, "I intend to do better this year."

I am asking, Mr. President, that less than one-half of this savings be expended on needed public works which may give needed, immediate employment to at least some of our unemployed.

Is this too much to ask?

IMPROVEMENTS TO THE GREAT LAKES-HUDSON RIVER WATERWAY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a bill, on behalf of myself and my colleague from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] to authorize an additional appropriation of $5 million for the completion of the improvements to the Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway in the State of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1649) authorizing additional appropriations for the completion of the improvement of the Great Lakes-Hudson River Waterway authorized by the act of August 30, 1935, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY of New York), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Woks.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that Governor Rockefeller has just announced the appointment of a 10-member Hudson River Valley Commission to develop plans and recommendations for the best protection and preservation of the resources of the Hudson River and its present and future use and enjoyment.

Laurance S. Rockefeller, who will be a Chairman of the President's White House Conference on Natural Beauty, is the chairman of the State committee.

As the junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY] and I both said when the bill was introduced seeking Federal action with respect to the Hudson River Valley, we would be glad to cooperate with the State. The State is now acting, and I hope very much that we may devise some Federal method to effectively cooperate with the State as the State takes the lead.

I ask unanimous consent that the announcement of the creation of this commission may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the announcement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In announcing his appointment of the commission, the Governor said:

"The Hudson River, through the centuries, has been one of America's finest and most important scenic, historic, and commercial rivers. It is one of New York State's proudest assets, with its headquarters in the world-renowned Adirondack Forest preserve and its mouth at New York City, the world's great metropolis.

"In this day of advancing technology, expanding population, urbanization, and rising standards of living, it is vital that we plan carefully to preserve and intelligently use our precious natural resources in order that our society may grow and prosper not only materially but in an environment rich in natural beauty, historic ties, and esthetic values as well.

"The Hudson River is such a natural resource, wholly within our State. The State of New York, as part of its proper responsibility under our Federal system of government and with its tradition of pioneering action as exemplified by such things as the Erie Canal, the forest preserve, and the more recent park bond program for open space, must act to assure and protect the future benefits to the people which flow from this great resource. The State must plan now to assure these benefits which cover a wide range of concerns—recreational, industrial, historic, scenic, commercial, cultural, residential, and esthetic.

"The commission which I am appointing is charged with the development of an action program to enhance the river's values in all of these fields and to preserve these values for the future in the interests of the State's community, social, economic and esthetic growth. The commission's guidelines and recommendations for action will relate to the entire length of the Hudson and will cover needed administrative and legislative action at all levels of government.

"Clearly, this is an outstanding opportunity for a productive Federal-State-local relationship. A number of Federal programs, such as the land and water conservation fund administered by the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation and the open space program of the HHFA, can contribute very effectively to this joint effort, and I am asking the commission to work closely with the various Federal agencies in this comprehensive effort.

"An advisory council representing the board spectrum of interests within the Hudson Valley will be appointed shortly to assist the commission.

"I am directing all agencies of State government to assist the commission in its important work so that it may develop its action program expeditiously. The commission will coordinate its work with the State council of parks and with the office for regional development, which is developing a comprehensive planning program for the State on a regional basis. I am asking the commission to submit its findings to me at the earliest opportunity in order that we may move forward as quickly as possible."

In addition to Mr. Laurance S. Rockefeller, Governor Rockefeller announced the following appointments to the commission:

Henry T. Heald, of New York City, president of the Ford Foundation, and former president of New York University.

William H. Whyte, of New York City, conservationist and author of "The Organization Man."

Mrs. Marion Sulzberger Heiskell, of New York City, director of special activities, the New York Times, member of the national parks advisory board, and former member of the Federal Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission.

Frank Wells McCabe, of Rensselaer, president of the National Commercial Bank & Trust Co. of Albany.

Lowell Thomas, of Pawling, author, and radio and television commentator.

George Yerry, Jr., of Kingston, president of the Ulster, Sullivan, Delaware and Greene Counties Building and Construction Trades Council, AFL-CIO.

Ambassador at Large W. Averell Harriman, of Harriman, former Governor of New York, and longtime member of the Palisades Interstate Park Commission.

Dr. Alan Simpson, of Poughkeepsie, author, and president of Vassar College.

Thomas Watson, Jr., of New York City, chairman of the board of directors of International Business Machines Corp., and director of the American Museum of Natural History.

Conrad Wirth, former Director of the National Park Service, will serve as executive director of the commission.

Representatives of the State and Federal Governments will be invited to participate as ex officio members.

INCREASED CRIMINAL PENALTIES IN CIVIL RIGHTS CASES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the civil rights laws to make it a Federal crime to interfere with the exercise of federally protected constitutional rights. The bill would allow the court to impose penalties more in keeping with the crimes committed, including life imprisonment for conviction of a crime which resulted in death.

The bill is, frankly, an effort to deal with the situation under existing law by amending the penalties which are imposed by sections 241 and 242 of title 18, so that they may more nearly make the punishment fit the crime.

We are all aware of the terrible terror deaths of the Reverend James Reeb, Jimmy Lee Jackson, and Mrs. Viola Liuzzo in connection with the voting rights drive in Selma; and also of the deaths, last year, of three civil rights workers—Andrew Goodman, Michael Schwerner, and James Chaney. In the year before last, the most prominent victim of the racists, Medgar Evers; he and countless others who were murdered for the same reason, were martyrs to this cause.

In not one of the cases I have cited, has anyone been convicted for the crime in either the Federal or the State courts. And the public quite properly wants to know, "Why not?"

While Federal laws exist to prevent violation of civil rights, the drafters did not contemplate that tactics such as murder would be employed to keep citizens from voting. The 1870 law, therefore, provided only for a maximum penalty of 10 years in prison or a $5,000 fine. Together with what I believe to be millions of my fellow citizens, I believe that the time has come to make the punishment fit the crime.

For too long, we have seen murderers set free because of the failure to obtain criminal indictments or the failure of juries to convict for these kinds of crimes. For too long we have contented ourselves with charging killers under the old Federal statute where only the minimal penalty is available. We must now revise that statute in light of the atrocities and injustices which have occurred.

The bill I am introducing would draw on the precedent of the antibombing law which was incorporated in the 1960 Civil Rights Act. That law provides three levels of penalties dependent upon the nature of the act and its consequences.

The bill which I introduce today would amend both title 18, United States Code, section 241—which can be applied to any individual—and title 18, United States Code, section 242 which applies to those acting under color of law. Where the prohibited actions resulted in personal injury, a penalty of 20 years and $10,000 could be imposed by the court. Where death results, any term of years, including life imprisonment, could be imposed.

The bill would provide for appropriate penalties in murder cases, but we must realize that our efforts will not be successful until southern communities awaken fully to the dreadful cost to themselves and the Nation when such crimes go unpunished. Only when the rate of convictions for racial crimes begins to be consistent with the more realistic rate of convictions for all other crimes will the criminal laws fulfill the function which all citizens rely on them to fulfill. For our entire code of criminal justice is based upon faith in the jury system, but that system can work only when the passions of a community about racial or other considerations do not override the higher duty to dispense justice evenhandedly.

I hope, together with the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], who has seen fit to act upon this matter, too, that the very earliest hearings may be had upon these bills and that Congress may act quickly to close what is obviously a serious loophole in the law.

I realize that Southern juries are loath to convict; but perhaps when faced with a penalty which is really apposite to the crime, their patriotism and their desire to have fair administration of justice in the country may prevail over any local prejudice.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may lie at the desk for 5 days to permit the addition of cosponsors.

The bill is introduced for myself and on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT].

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the requests of the Senator from New York are granted.

The bill (S. 1654) to amend sections 241 and 242 of title 18, United States Code, to specify the punishment, if personal injury or death results from a violation of such sections, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1654

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 241 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and inserting the following: "; and if personal injury results they shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than twenty years, or both; and if death results they shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life."

SEC. 2. Section 242 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by deleting the period at the end thereof and inserting the following: "; and if personal injury results shall be subject to imprisonment for not more than twenty years or a fine of not more than $10,000, or both; and if death results shall be subject to imprisonment for any term of years or for life."

THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL SHOULD BE A QUALIFIED ARCHITECT AND SHOULD BE APPOINTED BY THE CONGRESS

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, with reference to remarks I have made in the Senate today about the third House office building, I introduce for appropriate reference on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] a bill to require that the Architect of the Capitol shall be a qualified architect and that he be appointed by the Congress.

This bill is identical with S. 1800 which the Senator from Pennsylvania and I introduced June 26, 1963, and it follows earlier bills with the same purpose which I introduced in previous Congresses. It would seem to me that the evidence in support of this legislation—particularly that strong testimony now standing directly southwest of the Capitol—has been steadily mounting.

The main provision of this bill simply would require that no person shall hold the office of Architect of the Capitol unless he is a qualified architect. This is surely a reasonable requirement, and I point out that it makes no stipulation as to membership in or recognition by any particular professional association of architects.

The secondary provision would provide for appointment of the Architect by officials of the Congress, namely, the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives acting jointly, for a 4-year term. Strangely enough, and I doubt that many people realize this, the Architect now is appointed by the President. I wish to point out that there may be constitutional problems with respect to congressional appointment of an officer of the Congress, but I believe this proposal deserves the full consideration of the responsible committee.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be left at the desk for additional cosponsors until the close of business April 9.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

The bill (S. 1658) relating to the appointment of the Architect of the Capitol, introduced by Mr. DOUGLAS (for himself and Mr. CLARK), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, by request, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to provide for the appointment of 28 additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the Director of the Judicial Conference of the United States, requesting the proposed legislation, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and without objection, the letter will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1666) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The letter, presented by Mr. JOHNSTON, is as follows:

MARCH 26, 1965.

Hon. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is transmitted herewith, on behalf of the Judicial Conference of the United States, the draft of a bill embodying the recommendation of the Conference, adopted at its recent session, March 18 and 19, for additional circuit and district judgeships in the U.S. courts.

The bill would create a total of 42 judgeships, of which 3 are permanent circuit judgeships, 29 are permanent district judgeships; 4 circuit judgeships and 6 district judgeships are created on a temporary basis with the provision that the first vacancy occurring, after the creation of such temporary judgeship for that district, shall not be filled.

The bill would also create two additional judicial districts in the State of California, authorize the appointment of four additional district judges for this State, and provide for the holding of district court at Redding, Oakland, and San Jose. The provisions in the draft bill with respect to California are similar to those set out in H.R. 4534 of the 89th Congress, introduced by Congressman DON EDWARDS on February 8, 1965, which was approved by the judicial conference, with minor modifications. If the two additional districts for the State of California recommended by the conference and included in the provisions of this draft bill are not enacted, then the conference recommends the creation of one additional judgeship for the northern district of California, and two for the southern district of California.

In addition to the above provisions, the draft bill would make the existing district judgeship for the northern, middle, and southern districts of Florida, as provided for in section 133 of title 28, U.S. Code, a district judgeship for the middle district of Florida, and further provide that the present incumbent of such judgeship henceforth hold his office under section 133, as amended by this act.

The recommendations contained in the proposed bill are the product of a comprehensive study of the situation of the Federal courts conducted by the Judicial Conference Committee on Judicial Statistics and Court Administration, with the assistance of the Division of Procedural Studies and Statistics of the Administrative Office, and reflect the present needs of the U.S. courts.

Sincerely yours,

WARREN OLNEY III,
Director.

ECONOMIC INCENTIVES FOR POLLUTION CONTROL

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, for myself and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. BAYH], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BIBLE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CANNON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. FONG], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. MILLER], the Senator from Maine [Mr. MUSKIE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks and lie on the desk for 5 days in order that Senators who wish to, might join as cosponsors.

In his state of the Union message President Johnson challenged us all to "increase the beauty of America and end the poisoning of our rivers and the air that we breathe." In a subsequent message on the natural beauty of our country he spelled out a number of programs and proposals to make this dream a reality. He called for increased Federal research, regulation, and technical assistance in the pollution control field. But what is more he directed the Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers to "study the use of economic incentives as a technique to stimulate pollution prevention and abatement."

Two years ago I introduced for myself and a number of other Senators a bill to provide such economic incentives to industry to encourage the installation of needed industrial waste disposal and treatment facilities. The Senate adopted a revised version of that bill as an amendment to last year's tax cut bill. Unfortunately, the amendment was dropped in conference. I am encouraged by the President's reference to the use of economic incentives in this field and am hopeful that this 89th Congress will at long last adopt legislation along the lines I propose today.

Actually, economic incentives to encourage installation of industrial waste treatment facilities is not a new idea. It was first proposed in the form of a bill in 1947 and has been frequently introduced since in succeeding Congresses. In addition, a number of States have recently moved forward and adopted measures to ease State and local taxes in order to encourage good pollution control practices by industry. I ask unanimous consent to insert at the end of my remarks a digest of State legislation providing financial assistance to industries for waste treatment facilities.

The problems of dirty air and dirty water can no longer be ignored. We are finally making some progress in this area, but if we are to clean up our air and our water, a large part of the job must be done by private industry. We cannot simply point the finger at private industry and say, "You are causing some of the pollution—do something about it." We must frankly recognize that the purchase and installation of equipment to control pollution is a big expense. Control costs money. At the 1962 National Conference on Air Pollution it was pointed out that the cost of air pollution control equipment, on the average, is approximately 25 percent of the cost of the basic production equipment. Unlike many capital outlays that ultimately produce new profits, these costs basically serve the health and safety of the public. Therefore, it is entirely appropriate that there be some public sharing with private industry of the economic impact of these expenditures.

Our tax laws already provide economic incentives in related areas. For instance:

First. Section 174 permits research and experimental expenditures to be deducted currently. However, these expenditures do not include amounts paid for the acquisition or improvement of land or depreciable property.

Second. Section 175 permits soil and water conservation expenditures and expenditures for the prevention of erosion of land used in farming to be deducted currently. However, the total deduction cannot exceed 25 percent of the gross income derived from farming. These expenditures are not deductible if they are incurred to purchase, construct, or improve structures or facilities which are depreciable.

Third. Section 180 permits capital expenditures paid by farmers to be deducted currently where they are incurred to purchase or acquire fertilizer, lime, ground limestone, marl, or other materials to enrich, fertilize, or condition land used in farming.

Fourth. Section 182 permits capital expenditures for the clearing of farmland to be deducted currently. However, the amount deductible for any 1 year cannot exceed the lesser of, first, $5,000 or, second, 25 percent of taxable income derived from farming, and such expenditures do not include those for the purchase, construction, or improvement of structures or facilities which are depreciable.

Fifth. Section 615 permits exploration expenditures paid for ascertaining the existence of any deposit of ore or other mineral to be deducted currently to the extent that they do not exceed $100,000 in any taxable year with an overall limit of $400,000. However, expenditures for the acquisition of depreciable property do not qualify.

Sixth. Section 616 permits development expenditures incurred for the development of a mine or other natural deposit (other than an oil or gas well) to be deducted currently but the section does not apply to the acquisition of depreciable property.

Mr. President, it is time we give equal tax treatment to the quality of the air and water which sustain our lives as we do the quality of farm soils or mineral deposits.

That is what my bill will do. It will help us obtain cleaner air and water by permitting taxpayers who buy expensive treatment equipment to deduct its cost over 36 months.

Under present law, a taxpayer who buys equipment designed to abate air or water pollution may take a depreciation deduction for such equipment; that is, he may deduct its cost over the same period of years as the useful life of the equipment.

However, since some of this equipment has a useful life of 20 years or more, in many cases it will be a long time before the deductions taken for tax purposes are equal to the expenditure outlays made by the taxpayer. The bill provides that a taxpayer may elect to deduct the entire cost of the treatment equipment acquired over 36 months rather than over its useful life.

To qualify for this special treatment, the appropriate State pollution abatement authority must certify to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that the equipment is in conformity with the State requirements and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare must certify to the Secretary of the Treasury that the equipment is in furtherance of the U.S. policy in this regard as expressed in the legislation relating to pollution abatement. In addition, he must certify that it meets minimum performance standards he has promulgated. From time to time, the Secretary is to promulgate new minimum performance standards taking into account the advances in technology. The bill also provides that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is not to certify any property for the special tax writeoff to the extent it appears that the operation of this property will recover its cost over its useful life.

It is difficult to arrive at meaningful estimates of the extent to which water and air pollution abatement equipment will be installed when a tax benefit is provided. This difficulty arises in part from inadequate data at this time as to the extent of this equipment and in part because of the difficulty in forecasting the extent to which additional equipment will be installed because of the tax benefit provided by this bill. Last year the Treasury Department and the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, in connection with my bill which permitted a 1-year writeoff with respect to this equipment estimated that this provision would result in an initial revenue decrease from $200 to $500 million a year. In subsequent years, the revenue loss would have been much smaller as the initial writeoff gradually merely replaces the depreciation charge which in any event would have occurred. The 3-year writeoff of this bill, according to estimates of the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation, can be expected to result in an initial decrease of $50 to $150 million. Similar additional losses could also be expected in the second and third years such a provision is in effect. After that time, the revenue losses would gradually decline until the amount each year—apart from growth in the installations of the equipment—merely reflects the depreciation charge with respect to such items.

Mr. President, we are presently investing $100 million to help our cities construct needed municipal waste treatment facilities. We can invest at least that much through our tax structure to help and encourage industry—especially the small, marginal producer—to install similar equipment in their plants. It is a small enough investment to make America beautiful and to protect the health and safety of our people.

I ask unanimous consent to insert at this point a detailed explanation of the bill prepared by the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation and a series of articles on the problem of air pollution, by John G. Mitchell, which appeared recently in the New York Journal-American.

DETAILED EXPLANATION OF THE BILL

The bill adds a new section 183 to the Internal Revenue Code providing a special 3-year writeoff.

Subsection (a) of this new section provides that the taxpayer may, at his election, take a deduction with respect to depreciable water or air pollution abatement works which are certified as described below. The deduction provides for the writeoff, on a straight-line basis, of the cost of these works over a period of 36 months. The deduction is to be taken beginning with the first month in which the depreciation deduction would otherwise be taken.

Subsection (b) provides that the taxpayer may elect the writeoff previously described no later than the time for filing a return for the taxable year in which the certifications are obtained. The form of the election is to be prescribed by the Secretary and the elections, once made, can only be revoked with the consent of the Secretary.

Subsection (c) provides the method of certification. Actually there are two certifications. First, the State authority must certify to the Secretary of HEW that the equipment is in conformity with the State program and requirements. Second, the Secretary of HEW must also certify to the Secretary of the Treasury that the equipment meets certain minimum performance standards and is in furtherance of the general policy of the United States as expressed in the statutes dealing with water and air pollution. The State authority for this purpose is the authority designated in the Federal acts dealing with water pollution or with air pollution.

Subsection (d) provides the Secretary of HEW is to promulgate minimum performance standards for water and air pollution equipment, for purposes of the certification. These will be modified from time to time to take into account advances in technology. This subsection also provides that the Secretary of HEW is to certify equipment only to the extent that it is expected the operation of the equipment will not produce sufficient income to recover its cost over its useful life.

Appropriate technical amendments are also made. One of these amendments makes it clear that the eligibility of water and air pollution abatement works for the investment credit is not to be adversely affected because of the 3-year writeoff allowed here. Another of these amendments adds appropriate language to section 1245 to make it clear that both amortization and depreciation will be recaptured, on a sale or other disposition of the equipment in the manner provided in that section, as to any property which is certified under the new section provided here.

The amendments made by the new section providing the 3-year writeoff are to apply to taxable years ending on or after the date of enactment of the bill but only with respect to property for which a depreciation deduction would otherwise first be allowable on or after the date of enactment.

STATE LEGISLATION PROVIDING FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO INDUSTRIES FOR WASTE TREATMENT FACILITIES

Arkansas: Allows a credit on severance taxes to oil producers who install underground salt water disposal systems. House bill No. 102, approved February 18, 1959.

Idaho: Exempts from taxation any facilities, installations, machinery, or equipment, attached or unattached to real property and designed, installed, and utilized in the elimination, control, or prevention of water or air pollution. If other beneficial processes and uses are served, exempt such portion of the assessed valuation as may be reasonably calculated to be necessary for and devoted to, elimination, control, or prevention of water or air pollution. Any portion of any facilities which have value as the specific source of marketable byproducts is not included in the exemption.

Maine: Exempts from property tax industrial disposal systems that produce no byproducts which are marketed or used in the process of production. Public Laws 1961, chapter 333.

Massachusetts: Exempts from taxation any equipment, facility, or device installed on or attached to real property for the purpose of abating or preventing pollution of any stream, pond, lake, tidal water, or flats. Laws of 1961, chapter 539.

New Hampshire: Exempts industrial waste treatment facilities from local taxation for 25 years. Laws of 1955, chapter 196.

North Carolina: Provides for rapid amortization for tax purposes of industrial waste treatment works permitting their writeoff in 5 years and in addition, exempts industrial waste treatment facilities from local taxation forever. Laws of 1955, chapter 1100.

Vermont: Exempts from property tax any real and personal property exclusively installed and operated for the abatement of pollution of waters within the State or within the purview of the New England Interstate Water Pollution Control Compact in accordance with engineering principles approved by the Vermont Water Resources Board. Exemption for this property continues as long as its operation meets with the approval of the Vermont Water Resources Board. Laws of 1961, house bill 148.

Virginia: Provides for accelerated amortization for tax purposes of industrial waste treatment facilities which would permit their writeoff in 5 years. Laws of 1954, chapter 516.

Wisconsin: All equipment installed to abate or eliminate water or air pollution is exempt from local taxation for 5 years, provided the operation of the facilities does not produce a new income during that period. This law also provides for accelerated amortization for tax purposes of industrial waste treatment facilities allowing the cost to be written off in 60 months. Laws of 1953, chapters 183, 648.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and other material will be printed in the Record and the bill will be held at the desk, as requested by the Senator from Connecticut.

The bill (S. 1670) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the abatement of water and air pollution by permitting the amortization for income tax purposes of the cost of abatement works over a period of 36 months, introduced by Mr. Ribicoff (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1670

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to itemized deductions for individuals and corporations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 183. Amortization of Works To Abate Water and Air Pollution.

"(a) Allowance of Deduction.—Every taxpayer shall, at his election, be entitled to a deduction, in lieu of the deduction provided by section 167, with respect to the amortization, on the straight line method, of the adjusted basis (for determining gain) of any certified water pollution abatement works or any certified air pollution abatement works based on a period of 36 months. The 36-month period shall begin as to any such works with the first month for which a deduction under section 167 would (without regard to this section) be allowable.

"(b) Election.—

"(1) Time.—The election provided by subsection (a) shall be made with respect to any certified abatement works not later than the time prescribed by law (including extensions thereof) for filing the return for the taxable year in which the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare makes a certificate with respect to such works as provided in subsection (c)(1)(B).

"(2) Manner; revocation.—The election provided by subsection (a)—

"(A) shall be made in such manner as the Secretary or his delegate shall prescribe by regulations; and

"(B) may not be revoked except with the consent of the Secretary or his delegate.

"(c) Certified Water or Air Pollution Abatement Works.—

"(1) In general.—For purposes of this section, the terms 'certified water pollution abatement works' and 'certified air pollution abatement works' mean so much of any property of a character subject to the allowance for depreciation provided in section 167 which is used to abate water or atmospheric pollution or contamination, respectively, by removing or altering pollutants, contaminants, and wastes from any type of manufacturing process, as—

"(A) the State certifying authority has certified to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as having been constructed, erected, installed, or acquired in conformity with the State program or requirements for abatement of water or atmospheric pollution or contamination; and

"(B) the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare has certified to the Secretary or his delegate as meeting the minimum performance standards described in subsection (d), and as being in furtherance of the general policy of the United States for cooperation with the States in the prevention and abatement of water pollution under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, as amended (33 U.S.C. 466 et. seq.), or in the prevention and abatement of atmospheric pollution and contamination under the Clean Air Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1857 et. seq.).

"(2) State certifying authority.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'State certifying authority' means, in the case of water pollution abatement works, the State water pollution control agency as defined in section 11(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and, in the case of air pollution abatement works, the air pollution control agency as defined in section 9(b) of the Clean Air Act.

"(d) Authorization of Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare To Set Standards, etc.—

"(1) Performance standards.—The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall from time to time promulgate minimum performance standards for purposes of subsection (c)(1)(B) taking into account advances in technology and specifying the tolerance of such pollutants and contaminants as shall be appropriate.

"(2) Profitmaking abatement works.—The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall not certify any property under subsection (c)(1)(B) to the extent it appears that, by reason of profits derived through the recovery of wastes or otherwise in the operation of such property, its cost will be recovered over its actual useful life.

"(e) Allocation of Basis.—In the case of property a portion of which is certified water or air pollution abatement works for which an election has been made under subsection (a), the adjusted basis of such property shall, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary or his delegate, be properly allocated between the portion which is certified abatement works and the portion which is not a certified abatement works.

"(f) Cross Reference.—

"For special rule with respect to certain gain derived from the disposition of property the adjusted basis of which is determined with regard to this section, see section 1245."

(b)(1) The table of sections for part VI of subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"Sec. 183. Amortization of works to abate water and air pollution."

(2) Section 46(c) of such Code (relating to qualified investment) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(5) Water and air pollution abatement works.—For purposes of paragraph (2), the useful life of any property shall be determined without regard to section 183."

(3) Section 642(f) of such Code (relating to special rules for credits and deductions of estates and trusts) is amended—

(A) by striking out "Amortization of Emergency or Grain Storage Facilities" in the heading of such section and inserting in lieu thereof "Amortization Deductions"; and

(B) by inserting after "169" in the first sentence of such section ", and for amortization of certified water or air pollution abatement works provided by section 183,".

(4) Section 1245(a) of such Code (relating to gain from disposition of certain depreciable property) is amended—

(A) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraph (2)(A);

(B) by inserting "or" at the end of paragraph (2)(B) and by inserting after such paragraph the following new subparagraph:

"(C) with respect to any property referred to in paragraph (3)(D), its adjusted basis recomputed by adding thereto all adjustments, attributable to periods beginning with the first month for which a deduction for amortization is allowed under section 183,";

(C) by striking out "section 168" each place it appears in paragraph (2) and inserting in lieu thereof "section 168 or 183";

(D) by striking out "or" at the end of paragraphs (3) (A) and (B);

(E) by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (3)(C) and inserting in lieu thereof ", or"; and

(F) by adding at the end of paragraph (3) the following new subparagraph:

"(D) so much of any real property (other than any property described in subparagraph (B)) as it is a certified water or air pollution abatement works which has an adjusted basis in which there are reflected adjustments for amortization under section 183."

(c) The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years ending on or after the date of the enactment of this Act but only with respect to property as to which the first month for which a deduction would be allowable under section 167 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 ends on or after such date.

The material presented by Mr. Ribicoff is as follows:

[From the New York Journal-American, Mar. 14, 1965]

Our City's Polluted Air: 35 Pounds a Day for Each of Us

(Of all the blights mankind has stamped upon his world in the inexorable march of technology, none today poses a greater threat to our welfare than the knife-edged pestilence of polluted air. And nowhere in America is the problem more severe than in the New York metropolitan area. With today's special report, the Journal-American begins a new and revealing series of articles on "Our Asphyxiated Society: the Problems, the Politics, the Perpetrators." Documented during weeks of exhaustive research here and in Washington, D.C., the series reappraises: health and economic aspects, the problems of interstate abatement, the dilemmas of reducing sulfur in fuels, of waste disposal and of automotive exhausts. If the statistics of "Our Asphyxiated Society" seem startling, you're right; they are. But they also are authentic, having been called in the main from government agencies and from testimony before the U.S. Senate Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution.)

(By John G. Mitchell, Journal-American staff writer)

(First of a series)

We call ourselves the affluent society, but there is soot on our shirt sleeves. We brag of the net economic growth and become stunted by it; cherish our mobility, and choke on it; worship industry, and wince in the west winds.

We also die. Prematurely, the old and the very sick perish under sullen skies, and the killer is always listed scientifically: cancer, emphysema, heart disease, pneumonia.

Never air pollution.

Never air pollution because air pollution is only an accessory to the crime, a collaborator. Never air pollution because the very phrase itself conjures up a public yawn and a professional question mark.

But foul, toxic, abusive air exists. Every day we yawn, or ask another question, we swallow 15,000 quarts of it—35 pounds of it, five times our daily intake of food and water.

Every day in New York City and in 7,200 other communities across the Nation, our hydrocarbonized affluence brings us closer and closer not to a Great Society, but to a ghastly one of gradual asphyxiation.

The sea of air around us is most vital of all our national resources. It is the supreme requirement of life: for breathing, as a source of oxygen for heat and power, as armor and insulation against the broiling bombardment of sunlight and the freezing siege of night.

We need air to survive, yet we destroy it as wantonly as the buffalo hunter decimated the bison and the lumber baron denuded the hills. We suck a ton of it through our imperfect carburetors with every tankful of gasoline; flue it into our sulfurous furnaces and incinerators; fan it into the sooty embers of our barbecue pits and illegal trash fires, as if pristine air today were as expendable as buffalo 100 years ago, before the western plains became white with bleached skulls.

The rate at which we are polluting our atmosphere is already outstripping the growth of population. In the last quarter century, urban populations in America have tripled, but the use of energy (which requires fuel) has increased fourfold and net per capita disposable income (which now maintains 75 million motor vehicles on America's highways and daily produces 640 million pounds of rubbish) has soared a sensational—and smoggy—60 percent.

More and more our energy, income, autos, and waste (and, consequently, our pollutants) are becoming concentrated where the action is—in the super cities. New Yorkers live dead center on the belly of the biggest of them all, which stretches today from Boston south to the suburbs of Richmond, Va.

Some call this sprawling monster Atlanticopolis.

The effect of megalopolitan crowding on the eastern seaboard has finally forced many political jurisdictions to regard fresh air as a precious commodity. Connecticut, for example, having long tolerated black smoke over Bridgeport and other industrial cities, now worries not only about its own filthy effluents but also about exhaust emissions from motor vehicles rushing along its interstate turnpike 65 million times a year.

Within Atlanticopolis, Connecticut forms the eastern flanks of the New York metropolitan region, which embraces 22 counties in the tri-state area. Air pollution authorities speak much of the Los Angeles basin problem, but when it comes to weighing priorities against future perils, the talk turns quickly to these 22 counties astride the Hudson River.

By 1980, the New York metropolitan region's population is expected to increase 25 percent—from 17 to 21 million. Power consumption by home and industry will have doubled. Oil consumption will have increased fourfold to nearly 300 billion barrels a year—three-eighths of the entire Nation's present annual demand.

By 1980, no one knows how many more million tons of sulfur dioxide, of hydrocarbons and oxides of nitrogen will be swirling through our environment. We only know that unless adequate controls, abatement and research are initiated soon, the air over metropolitan New York, New Jersey and Connecticut (and their 1,400 political subdivisions) may very well be—in 1980—unable to sustain life as it is lived today.

"The dozens of jurisdictions into which we fragment our metropolitan areas," said U.S. Surgeon Gen. Luther Terry at the 1962 National Conference on Air Pollution, "trouble the air not at all. What troubles the air is the burden of pollutants we ask it to carry.

"This burden promises to become greater, ironically, in direct proportion to our success in increasing our general prosperity."

Political fragmentation of the New York metroregion does, however, trouble those public officials who recognize the interstate and intrastate characteristics of foul air. Attempts to marshal action on a broad, regional basis—as in the delegation of air pollution survey authority to the Interstate Sanitation Commission—have generally lacked the very thing that is most needed: legal enforcement powers.

Aware that the polluted metropolis is the decisive community of today, but that it lacks the government machinery to cope with its problems, many observers of the supercity are beginning to call for a breakdown of the old fragmentary concepts. Writing in Harper's magazine, New York University Business Administration Prof. Peter F. Drucker sounds the battle cry:

"Our system is built on the old preindustrial units of town, county, and State. No attack on the problems of the metropolis is possible without attacking at the same time these most deeply entrenched political bodies of our tradition and laws."

If urban air pollution were merely a matter of sooty shirt sleeves and smarting eyes, radical calls for reform might be dismissed with nary a second thought. But they cannot be dismissed because air pollution is more than a nuisance. It is a proven menace to our health and welfare.

There is no coincidence in the fact that the lung cancer rate is higher near Manhattan's Murray Hill than it is near Mount Marcy in the Adirondacks, higher in Staten Island than in Schroon Lake.

In cities with more than 1 million of population, mortality rates from cancer of the trachea, bronchus, and lung (among white males) are twice those of rural areas. The difference is not in the victims but in the air they breathe. Benzpyrene, a known cancer producer, is prevalent in the air over cities at levels eight times greater than those measured out on the farm.

Still, many doubt there is a firm relationship between cancer and bad air. Publicity attendant on the Surgeon General's report on cigaret smoking left most Americans with the impression that the lungs' only enemy is the "evil weed." Evidence is accumulating that it is not.

Dr. Frank L. Rosen, Maplewood, N.J., allergist and expert witness at congressional hearings on air pollution, reports that "a person breathing the air of some cities over a year's time might inhale as much benzpyrene as from smoking two packs of cigarets daily."

Moreover, he adds, Sloan-Kettering researchers have discovered that gasoline engine exhaust condensate contains agents that produce tumors on mouse skin. The tumor potency from the exhaust tar was found to be twice that of the condensate from cigaret smoke.

"Thus," says Dr. Rosen, with inferential logic certain to be challenged by scientific purists, "one can see that air pollution is just as important, if not more so, than cigaret smoking in the causation of lung cancer. Unfortunately, one can give up smoking but one cannot give up breathing polluted air."

And Maj. Alexander de Seversky, who advocated "Victory Through Air Power" when our generals were still talking horse cavalry, recently found his own answer to the question of airborne cancer at the Philadelphia Zoo.

"It has been found," said De Seversky, "that like their human brethren, the (animals) also suffer from lung cancer, emphysema, and other respiratory diseases. As a matter of fact, the mortality among these animals has increased sixfold in the last 10 years, yet as far as I can ascertain, they did not smoke cigarets, pipes or even cigars."

The literature of air pollution is replete with examples of what happens to some humans when the cards of aerial waste and weather are stacked against them: death in Donora, the Meuse Valley, and London. Enough has been written about these three episodes alone to fill an encyclopedia.

What many people do not realize, however, is that New York City has had the cards stacked against her, too. In November 1953, a temperature inversion clamped a lid over the city, held down thousands of tons of pollutants for 10 days while authorities prayed for a wind strong enough to disperse the fumes laterally.

By the time the winds came, nearly 200 New Yorkers were dead (a figure obtained by former air pollution control commissioner, Leonard Greenberg, M.D., who studied mortality records for the same 10-day period in the 5 years on either side of 1953). Most of the excess deaths occurred among those over 45 and under 1.

The vulnerability of the old, the infirm, and the very young poses what may well be our supreme challenge in restoring the slattern atmosphere to a semblance of its long-lost purity. Says Dutch scientist P. Joosting:

"The only acceptable criterion is that we must work for the survival of the unfittest."

In working for survival, the first step is control. It would have been easy 50 years ago when industrial smokestacks were the major felons. But not today. Today the sources of pollution are so numerous and so complex that adequate control may never be possible short of a socioscientific breakthrough as epochmaking as the industrial revolution itself.

Consider the daily tempo of life today in New York City:

One hundred thousand tons of fuel under combustion (including 10 million gallons of No. 6 oil).

Two and one-half million motor vehicles on the streets (burning 4 million gallons of gasoline).

Nearly 8 million people each producing 4 pounds of solid waste and garbage—32 million pounds of it topped off with another 4 million pounds of construction scrap, enough to fill a freight train 7 miles long; and half of it goes up in smoke through 25,000 incinerators.

This is New York. Not every year. Every day.

And consider the effluents in the air we breathe; consider the daily legacy of our tremendous prosperity: of sulfur dioxide, 3,500 tons; of carbon monoxide, 8,000 tons; of hydrocarbons, 900 tons; of oxides of nitrogen, 250 tons.

Of all the sources of trouble in our air, none makes quite so notable a contribution as the automobile and its ubiquitous exhaust. "It is," reads a report by the Special Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, "in many respects the most important and critical source of air pollution."

In Los Angeles, where, as legend has it, there is a chicken in every pot and three cars in every garage, the automobile is regarded as 75 percent of the problem; and yet the density of motor vehicles in that city (1,350 per square mile) is far less than it is in New York (2,200 per square mile). Only Philadelphia, Washington, D.C., and Detroit exceed New York in the internal congestion sweepstakes.

Following the example of California, New York State 3 years ago required by law that new cars (starting with 1963 models) must be equipped with crankcase devices to eliminate blowby gases." But this is by no means a panacea for automotive pollution.

It eliminates only 30 percent or less of the auto's total emission of hydrocarbons (the remainder pours out through the exhaust, in evaporation, and because of misfiring sparkplugs and malajusted points).

Now the automotive industry, under the spur of a new California law and pending Federal legislation is working to control emissions from the tailpipe as well as from the crankcase. Although four afterburner devices have already been tested and proven successful under the chassis, manufacturers are leaning instead toward design changes under the hood. Redesign would be less costly to the consumer.

In the meantime, warns the Senate subcommittee, automotive pollution is "increasing in seriousness despite preliminary and isolated efforts to control it."

Air pollution control in the United States today is 50 years behind its twin sister—water pollution control. It is still a crude and unsophisticated science, and it has plenty of rough edges.

But if anything heralded a renaissance for fresher air, it was passage in December 1963 of the Clean Air Act—the creation of Maine's indefatigable Democratic Senator EDMUND S. MUSKIE.

MUSKIE's law had two immediate effects; first, it committed the Federal Government to a larger front in the war against pollution; secondly, with the offer of U.S. financial assistance, it inspired grassroot politicians to take a closer look at the sootfall, and a sharper sniff at the stench in their own backyards.

Though the Bureau of the Budget in 1964 did not see fit to allocate the $5 million authorized by Congress for air pollution program grants, there is, this fiscal year, a similar appropriation up for grabs—and from MUSKIE's Maine to the choking shores of California, hundreds of communities are reaching today for a piece of that pie.

In New York State, grants have already gone out through the U.S. Public Health Service to Erie, Broome, Chemung, Dutchess, and Nassau Counties. Tiny Mount Vernon and New Rochelle have grabbed off $6,000 each. In New Jersey, the State health department has doubled its pollution control budget with a $250,000 clean air bonanza.

A few communities, however, have been slow on the draw. Says Thomas F. Williams of the USPHS Division of Air Pollution: "What we have to do, evidently, in addition to hanging the carrot from the stick, is to wave a lollipop in the other hand."

The carrot and the lollipop came to New York City on February 18, 1964, during field hearings conducted by Senator MUSKIE's subcommittee. Mayor Wagner and the city's Air Pollution Control Commander Arthur J. Benline testified that Gotham's problem was indeed a serious one, and would the Federal Government be able to help?

"Certainly," said the mayor, "there is enough undeniable evidence on hand to move us to act with zeal and speed * * *. I might say that we can take advantage of any money available from the Clean Air Act * * *."

Inside a month, however, the only zeal and speed displayed at city hall was the budget director's hatcheting of $62,000 from Mr. Benline's modest budget request for fiscal 1965—a 6-percent trim which automatically made New York City ineligible for a U.S. program grant, and deprived Mr. Benline of a potential $240,000 in State and Federal matching funds.

Stunned, Senator MUSKIE whisked off a letter to Mayor Wagner, reminding him of his February testimony. The $62,000 was tardily restored, and in Washington last week officials were finally having a look at New York City's belated application for $188,000 in clean air money.

Expected approval: early April.

Delay, apathy, and indecision—but most of all, an unwillingness to commit hard cash—have historically hamstrung the best efforts of dedicated men (like Mr. Benline) to abate the asphyxiating elements in our metropolitan air. But now, on the smazeveiled horizon, promises of performance await only the pressures of public demand. Already pending:

Adoption of a metroregion air pollution alert system.

A $1,500,000 interstate survey of pollution sources, concurrent with stepped-up abatement programs.

Amendment to the Clean Air Act which would (1) see through research a low-cost method of removing sulfur from fuels, (2) authorize U.S. financial assistance for the construction of municipal waste disposal systems, and (3) compel the automotive industry to reduce exhaust emissions on new model vehicles.

In June, a special city council committee to investigate air pollution will begin public hearings in New York City. Its chairman, Councilman Robert Low, of Manhattan, is determined to avoid the old pitfalls of smoke-chasing and prattling platitudes.

"What we have to do," says Mr. Low, "is to get the big minds worrying."

Those big minds to which Mr. Low refers are the captains of industry, the consumers of mass quantities of fuel. Here, too, attitudes are beginning to change. To most responsible industrialists, smoke no longer means profit. Smoke means waste, inefficiency, and poor public relations.

In an effort to convert even more big minds to the responsible philosophy of cleaner air, Senator ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democrat, of Connecticut, has been trying for 2 years to legislate a "carrot"—in the form of tax writeoffs or increased investment credits for industries installing expensive pollution control devices in their shops and factories. But the Treasury Department, more concerned with revenues than with the Nation's physical health, managed to kill at least two Ribicoff proposals (though it is now seeking a compromise on a third).

Short of a miracle our ultimate hope is neither the writeoff, nor the survey, nor the summons to the violator of some specious antismoke ordinance. Our ultimate hope is research.

In 1964, the Congress appropriated $157 million for mental health research, training, and fellowships; $75 million for the study of cancer. But for air pollution research, our legislators authorized only $6 million—and more Americans are suffering the ill effects of foul air today than those presently afflicted with mental illness and cancer combined.

The little that is being done today in the field of air pollution sciences may often smack too much of esoteria and too little of genuine long-range applicability. This, in any event, is the opinion of Dr. Morris Jacobs, former chief of the New York City Air Pollution Laboratory and now professor of industrial toxicology at Columbia University.

"The U.S. Public Health Service," says Dr. Jacobs, "has no interest in long-range research. Most of its analytical work is a waste of time."

The doctor cites an example: "Fifty-two spectrophotometric methods for the determination of nitrate—applications to air pollution," and adds, "So what? This is the kind of claptrap they waste their time on."

Dr. Jacobs is not concerned about spectrophotometric determinations of nitrate. He is concerned about the use of organic fuels, and about the future.

"It's absolutely essential," he says, "that we work on the utilization of nonfuel sources of energy—the energy of sunlight, wave energy, geothermal energy (under the crust of the earth).

"Of course, despite air pollution, it's easier to keep using the same kinds of conventional fuels. But if we want to clean up our atmosphere, I think we'd better stop piddling around."

PRESIDENTIAL CONCERN

The modern technology, which has added much to our lives, can also have a darker side. Its uncontrolled waste products are menacing the world we live in, our enjoyment, and our health. The air we breathe, our water, our soil, and wildlife are being blighted by the poisons and chemicals which are the byproducts of technology and industry. * * * To deal with these problems will require a new conservation. * * *

(President Lyndon B. Johnson, in a White House message on natural beauty, 1965.)

OUR DIRTY AIR: A CITY PLAYING RUSSIAN ROULETTE—IS GROWTH SUICIDAL?

(Every time an urban American takes a deep breath, he may be playing a kind of Russian roulette.—Mayor Robert F. Wagner, in testimony to a Senate subcommittee on air pollution.)

(By John G. Mitchell, Journal-American staff writer)

(Second of a series)

The supreme irony of urban America, where breathing is a game of Russian roulette, is that in dying for growth the city is also growing to die.

Populous and prosperous, it sprawls ever outward, crowding the suburb into the farm and the farm into oblivion. The smokestack replaces the haystack. The highway obliterates the trail. Smog smothers the sunrise. Sootfall sullies the sky.

As the density of metropolitan man (and machines) increases, as more people live a more abundant life, the air on which we depend for survival becomes less suited to sustain our health and our hopes for the golden years. More people, more abundance mean more air pollution.

EXPERT'S WARNING

That is the legacy of our self-asphyxiating affluence.

Dr. Richard A. Prindle, former deputy chief of the U.S. Public Health Service's Division of Air Pollution, warned a German clean air commission in Dusseldorf in 1962:

"One of the best documented facts in the whole complex field of air pollution is that it can, in certain circumstances, result in acute illness and sudden death."

It not only can. It has.

FATAL STATISTICS

Donora has been documented: 20 dead, 6,000 ill in 1948.

London has been documented: 4,000 dead in 1952 and 1962.

New York City, too, has been documented: 200 "excess" deaths during a 10-day smog episode in 1953.

Evidence that air pollution contributes to (but not, necessarily, causes) chronic respiratory disease today is overwhelming:

Drs. Leonard Greenberg and Frank Field of Albert Einstein College of Medicine found significant increases in upper respiratory infections reported among emergency clinic patients during the 1953 air pollution episode here, and also among residents of old-age homes in New York during a similar episode in 1962.

Morbidity researchers in Donora, Pa., discovered 340 persons who had certified cases of bronchial asthma before the 1948 killer-smog episode. Of these 88 percent were made acutely ill by the smog, as compared with 43 percent of the total population.

A survey in a Maryland community indicates that residents living in an area of high dustfall suffer more common colds than those living in cleaner sections of the city.

In Great Britain, where bronchitis kills 1 of every 10 persons, mortality rates for this affliction have been found to increase in direct proportion to the levels of sulfur dioxide measured in the atmospheres of selected cities.

And in the United States, recent investigations have linked air pollution to emphysema, a respiratory disease in which the very fine air sacs of the lung become abnormally distended.

RATE INCREASES

Some 10 million Americans suffer from emphysema today, and its death rate among U.S. males has increased fourfold since 1950.

"It is estimated," says a report by the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, "that the (social security disability) payments to individuals for whom emphysema is the primary medical diagnosis is about $60 million a year."

"Air pollution," the report adds, "is suspected of being responsible for much of this * * *."

CANCER LINK

It is also suspected of being responsible, to some extent, for cancer of the respiratory system. Says U.S. Surgeon General Luther Terry:

"A considerable body of evidence makes it unmistakably clear that air pollution is associated with * * * lung cancer * * *."

In New York City, where atmospheric levels of carcinogenous (cancer-producing) pollutants continue to rise, the death rate from cancer of the respiratory system increased from 32.5 deaths per 100,000 of population in 1959 to 38.9 per 100,000 in 1963.

DAILY ASSAULT

But in the long run, it is not the dramatic and critical episode of air pollution that haunts U.S. and city health officials, but rather the sustained daily assault of toxic air on the urban citizen.

"Of more importance," reads a Public Health Service document, "are the repeated insults to man, and particularly to his respiratory system, which * * * make people less effective at their jobs, absent more frequently from work and school, less healthy, and shorter lived."

In a 3-year, eight-city study of job absenteeism among female employees of the Radio Corp. of America, Dr. F. C. Dohan (University of Pennsylvania) found the incidence of respiratory disease among workers in Harrison, N.J., (across the Hudson from populous New York City) was five times greater than among employees in Lancaster, Pa., and four times greater than in Cincinnati.

HIGH CORRELATION

There was also noted a "high correlation" between the atmospheric sulfur concentrations and the rates of respiratory illness-induced absenteeism. In both categories metropolotanized Harrison won first prize.

Another study of absenteeism conducted by Dr. Thomas Gocke, of Seton Hall University, found respiratory infections were responsible for 20 percent of employee absences lasting 7 days or longer at Western Electric Co.'s Kearney, N.J., cable shop. The survey, covering 418 men, discovered that the average length of respiratory absence was 16 days.

OTHER EFFECTS

Unofficially, it has been estimated by other sources that respiratory infections cost Western Electric Co.—the Nation's sixth biggest employer—some $5 million a year in unearned wages and sickness benefits.

While man's breathing apparatus is the most vulnerable target of toxic air, it is by no means the only one. In 1962, U.S. physicians reported 1,600,000 cases in which air pollution was an apparent factor—cases involving nausea, fatigue, diarrhea, heart-strain, and stinging eyes. (One stinger: acrolein, which comes from automotive exhaust and the burning of fats in incinerators, was the basic ingredient of tear gas in World War I.)

Now there is new evidence that air pollution may even attack the pysche. Belgian scientists have discovered that traffic cops in Brussels, exposed to high levels of carbon monoxide, become irritable toward the end of the day and hand out excessive numbers of summonses.

Despite the accumulated testimony and the annotated indictments of polluted air, a large body of opinion seems resolved to do nothing until "all the facts are in."

RISKY WAIT

Let's wait and see, say the proponents of research without control. Let's have more proof that toxic air is killing us and costing us billions of dollars.

At the 1962 National Conference on Air Pollution, a representative of the National Association of Manufacturers declared:

"Be sure there is a real problem * * * make certain that we know what the problem really is * * *."

To which Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, of New Jersey, replied:

"Research somehow has a way of becoming an end in itself, and of course those who really don't want to face the hard issues of taking action can always think up endless questions that deserve further study.

"I think our goal ought to be the elimination of air pollution by the end of the sixties, and not just the elmination of our ignorance about the problem."

[From the New York Journal-American, Mar. 16, 1965]

Our Dirty Air: The Purple People Eaters

"I think," said U.S. Senator Harrison A. Williams, Democrat, of New Jersey, at the 1962 National Conference on Air Pollution, "we ought to clear the air if only because it sometimes smells bad * * * and in general mocks our efforts to achieve a safe, decent, and attractive living environment for a large majority of the American people."

Just how badly we are being mocked is explored in today's installment of "Our Asphyxiated Society: The Problems, the Politics, the Perpetrators."

(Third of a series)

(By John G. Mitchell, Journal-American staff writer)

Andrew Flora, faintly bruised, came out of his two-family house in Jersey City one morning last week and announced that the place was for sale. "I've had it," he said sourly. "If I can find a buyer, I'm moving out."

Across the street, looking as if they had just been laundered in beet juice, bedsheets flapped from a clothesline, and down the block the children of Jack and Carole Brown played in a backyard with purple particles in their hair.

Faint bruises, beet-colored laundry, and purple fallout are not uncommon in this particular section of Jersey City: Andrew Flora and his neighbors have been taking a daily beating from the effluents of a nearby dye manufacturing plant.

SIX-BLOCK AREA

Borne invisibly on the air, waste particles from the factory permeate an area of 6 square blocks, sift even through sealed windows to stain both fabric and human flesh alike. The purple particles drove Andrew Flora's upstairs tenants out of town 3 months ago, and 3 months' rent out of Flora's pocket.

"Can't blame them," he said last week. "Who wants to live next door to a purple people eater?"

Today in the cities of the New York metropolitan area, and in 7,000 other communities across the Nation, dyes, dusts, and dioxides are turning our skies into sewers and our urban landscapes into eyesores.

In our determination to achieve a fuller, richer life through technology, we have blindly created a cannibal which feeds not only on us, the people, but more specifically upon our property and pocketbooks.

DIRECT LOSSES

Air pollution is costing each and every one of us $65 a year in direct economic losses; and yet, in New York City, we spend less than 11 cents per capita to abate the destruction. Last year alone, Government officials estimate, dirty air stole $11 billion out of the gross national product.

How were we robbed? We were robbed through higher medical bills, because dirty air can make us ill. We were robbed through reduced labor output, because the ill stay home from work; through lower agricultural yields and smaller livestock returns, because pollution can destroy crops and kill cattle; through depressed real estate values, higher cleaning and illumination costs, and the extra expense of maintaining property which is constantly bombarded by aerial garbage.

In New York City, the great corroder of property is sulfur dioxide, of which an estimated 3,500 tons escape into the atmosphere every day we burn our imperfect fuels.

WREAKS HAVOC

By itself, or reacting with moisture to form sulfuric acid, this particular pollutant eats into iron and steel, leaches limestone and marble, rots leather and upholstery, pulverizes nylon (including women's stockings).

Not so many years ago, says New York Air Pollution Control Commissioner Arthur J. Benline, the city shelled out $4 million to replace corroded marble on the facade of city hall.

Citywide, SO^2 damage to rainspouts, roofing, and other exposed surfaces is impossible to estimate accurately, though some observers take $6 million a year as a conservative figure.

Another sulfur compound, hydrogen sulfide, can discolor the paint on a house overnight—if the exposure is intense enough.

MOTTLED PAINT

Journal-American reporters in 1962 traced a pattern of this type of property damage across the breadth of Staten Island, from Rossville on the Kill Van Kull to Huguenot. The survey found one house after another where white paint had turned gray and mottled on the windward walls facing the smokestacks of heavily industrialized New Jersey.

A 1964 report by the U.S. Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution declares that the frequent repainting of homes "and the more frequent cleaning of clothes and home furnishings"—expenses for which air pollution is largely responsible—"can easily add up to substantial amounts each year."

But, warns the staff report, "in neighborhoods where residents are unable or unwilling to incur such expenses, the resultant depreciation of property values may cost even more, to both individual and the community."

HAZARDOUS CONDITIONS

Stagnant air is not only costly but hazardous. By reducing visibility, it poses a very real danger to land and air transportation.

The New Jersey Turnpike Authority, for example, is compelled to close that super highway at least 20 times a year when smog aggravates conditions already worsened by weather. And where the Turnpike swings through the industrialized northeast section of the State, smog causes motorists to overshoot their desired exits.

Last November, a two-car collision on the Turnpike was blamed directly on poor visibility. The blinder: smog.

Reduced visibility in eastern New Jersey has also hampered aircraft operations out of Newark airport. A survey there as long ago as 1946 found that smoke, alone or in combination with fog, lowered visibility to less than 6 miles every second day of the year.

"Even when planes have the best available instruments," reads the Senate report, "the aggravation of poor weather conditions by pollution results in delays in landings and departures at busy airports. This is costly to people traveling on business, and very expensive to the carrier."

(There are no applicable records of delays at La Guardia Airport, but Commissioner Benline—not without irony—notes that the boiler in the new terminal there is one of the city's most frequent sources of black smoke.)

Of all the ways in which dirty air affects our economy none is so widely documented as the estimated $2.5 billion a year havoc wrought upon agriculture. Rachel Carson's "Silent Spring" of pesticidal destruction is as nothing compared to the searing fall of poisoned particles on the flora of urban America.

Fluorine alone is responsible for nearly $50 million in damage suits filed by angry farmers every year in U.S. civil courts.

In New Jersey, Rutgers Plant Pathologist Robert Daines reports ozone has seriously injured crops of endive, spinach, and chicory.

On Staten Island, where sulfur dioxide 6 years ago was costing flower growers as much as $10,000 per exposure, interstate sanitation commission investigators have found new evidence of photochemical injury to ornamental crops.

This latter type of damage (the corrosive interaction of hydrocarbons and sunlight) has become so prevalent in the metropolitan area that the 1963 Yearbook of Agriculture lists it as a problem rivaling southern California's "for extent, severity, and economic loss to agriculture."

LATERAL EFFECTS

Overlapping the economic effects of air pollution are three other vital considerations: recreational, esthetic, and psychological.

"The growing of green things that is one man's income," says the Senate report, "is another man's recreation. * * * When ozone blights a pine forest, it may not only destroy industrial resources but also ruin the forest for vocationers and sportsmen * * *.

"A man may touch a soot-coated window ledge * * * and then the cuff of his freshly laundered shirt. The economic effect of the resulting black smudge may be no more than a few pennies * * * but the effects on his disposition and peace of mind may be substantial * * *."

In one way or another, then, all of us share with Andrew Flora, of Jersey City, the same frustrating fate: We all live in the shadow of a "purple people eater."

This may mean, for some, only soot on the shirt sleeve, delay at the airport, a vacation campsite, a sniff of rotten egg as ethyl mercaptans assail the nostrils.

Whatever the irritation and the economic drain, modern metropolitan man has only himself to blame. For 50 years, he has been intervening in the natural world.

Now, says U.S. Surg. Gen. Luther Terry, we must "Learn to accept responsibility for (our) individual acts."

Unfortunately, the body politic of the New York metropolitan region is a reluctant learner.

[From the New York Journal-American, Mar. 17, 1965]

Our Dirty Air: Interstate Pollution Control—The Toothless Tiger

(By John G. Mitchell)

(This is the fourth in a series of special reports on "Our Asphyxiated Society: the Problems, the Politics, the Perpetrators.")

City, State, and Federal officials are playing political football today on the air-polluted fields of the New York metropolitan region.

While 17 million citizens choke on the vapors of increasing productivity and togetherness, the appointed executors of cleaner air bodyblock each other over interstate pacts, fiscal appropriations, and air-pollution monitoring systems.

Albany threatens New York City with monetary penalties.

Washington moves against Trenton, and Trenton hollers "offside."

Middlesex County mousetraps the fresh-air aspirations of Staten Island.

A New York-New Jersey Interstate Sanitation Commission pleads for Federal funds, then, invoking States rights, tells the U.S. Government to stay on the sidelines, for the situation is well in hand.

The facts, unfortunately, indicate otherwise. Though specific industrial point-sources of pollution may now be reducing their toxic emissions under public pressure, the great air mass over the tristate area is worsening. Its progressive contamination, in fact, outstrips all efforts at control and abatement.

And politics, as well as pollutants, are further fouling the air.

The futile record of attempts to clear the interstate air mass is best exemplified by our failure—after 4 long years—to enact a regional pollution warning system. Los Angeles, always the pioneer in cleaner air, has had such a system in operation since 1954.

But it wasn't until June of 1961 that a warning system was even considered seriously in the tri-State area. By unanimous vote, the Metropolitan Regional Council carried the ball, then lateralled it off to the New York-New Jersey Cooperative Committee on Interstate Air Pollution, which spent the better part of a year drafting a proposal.

REGIONAL WARNING: A 5-STAGE PLAN

Finally, on February 15 of this year, a copy of that proposal arrived on the desk of New York City air pollution commissioner, Arthur J. Benline. It carries about as much legal authority as a new year's resolution. Says Commissioner Benline:

"A proposal is fine, but where is the law?"

Basically, a regional warning system would work like this:

1. Air monitors measure the levels of sulfur dioxide, carbon monoxide, and smokeshade 24 hours a day.
2. The levels are correlated to meteorological data supplied by the U.S. Weather Bureau.
3. First alert stage—when two of the three pollutants exceed prescribed standards and when weather forecasts indicate stable air conditions will persist, mass consumers of fuel are asked to reduce operations voluntarily, as are large industries and operators of commercial incinerators.
4. Second alert stage—as pollutant levels increased, limitations are set on the heating of private buildings, and motorists are urged to leave their cars at home.
5. Third alert stage—control activities of the prior alerts are continued; stringent limitations are imposed on vehicular traffic, and industry is compelled to reduce its operation.

Informally, such a warning system, with all its restrictions on the individual, could be invoked today in New York City by order of the board of health and the mayor's emergency control board. But, as Mr. Benline points out, "it would have no teeth without formal legality."

POLLUTION DOESN'T STOP AT BORDERS

And it would have no effect beyond the boundaries of the five boroughs. The cooperative committee itself underscores the futility of unilateral action.

"Air pollution," it says in its proposal, "does not stop at the borders of any municipality * * *."

The very same day that message crossed Mr. Benline's desk, another contradictory declaration was issued from the Albany office of Dr. Hollis S. Ingraham, commissioner of the New York State Department of Health.

"The City of New York," said the health commissioner, "will be asked to install a permanent air pollution warning system as a condition for continued State air for air pollution control."

The wording of the press release was bland, but between the lines was an implied threat that unless New York City got busy installing five additional air monitoring stations (it already has one in Harlem) Albany would pull back its matching money, which amounts to some $460,000 in the current budget of the city's air pollution control department.

And though Dr. Ingraham discoursed at length about "joint action by the States of New York and New Jersey," there was no reference in this statement as to what Albany might be demanding of Nassau, Westchester, and Rockland Counties, which are not only Republican bastions but also essential outposts of any metro-area monitoring system.

Apparently no demands were made; Nassau, Westchester, and Rockland Counties, say Alexander Rihm, executive secretary of the New York State Air Pollution Control Board, "are simply studying the feasibility of establishing monitoring stations."

The initial cost of installing five additional monitors in New York City may run as high as $125,000.

Of this, however, the State would pay only $40,000—one-third instead of the usual 50 percent—because of legislative limitations on the total amount of air-pollution money for which the city is eligible.

CEILING ON AID CUTS ABATEMENT

As a result of Albany's threat and her ceiling on State aid, Commissioner Benline has been forced to earmark for air monitoring (rather than abatement) a large chunk of his application to the Federal Government for $188,000 in "clean air" money.

"What else can we do but comply," shrugs Mr. Benline. "Albany holds the pursestrings."

Nominally responsible for appraising, but not abating, the dirty air over Metropolitan New York is the Interstate Sanitation Commission, whose request for regulatory powers was quietly stifled in Trenton 3 years ago by an industry oriented legislature.

So now, with a pathetic budget of $34,000 (one-sixth its allocation for water pollution control), the ISC sends its part-time air pollution engineer and his two technical assistants about the countryside, sampling here, sampling there while two populous States, trade lethal blows on the shifting winds.

In the works, however, pending a "clean air" grant from the U.S. Public Health Service, is a $1,500,000 ISC-administered survey of the metropolitan air mass, its sources of pollution, its effects on human health, property, visibility, and vegetation.

Participating in the survey will be control agencies from both States and representatives of the Public Health Service; and for once, it seems, a source-study will not be used as an excuse for deferring action. New Jersey Health Commissioner Roscoe Kandle has let it be known that personnel currently engaged in abatement programs will not be shifted to the survey.

In outlining the proposed area survey at a hearing of the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, the cooperative committee declared:

"While it is generally agreed that air quality in the metropolitan area is unsatisfactory much of the time, and virtually intolerable on some days, there is no really adequate definition of the severity and impact of the situation.

"Such data as are available indicate that concentrations of some pollutants, such as carbon monoxide and sulfur dioxide, are rising."

Exactly 6 months later, on August 18, 1964, representatives of the cooperative committee's member agencies reversed this position.

Faced with the prospect of Federal air pollution abatement proceedings under section 5 of the Clean Air Act, New York, New Jersey and ISC officials vehemently denied that the situation was ever "intolerable," and even questioned the truth of their earlier statement that sulfur concentrations were on the rise.

"Suddenly," says a U.S. health official, "the old foes (New York and New Jersey) were acting like good neighbors. Well, it only goes to show that politics make strange bedfellows."

What finally removed the old bundling board between Albany and Trenton was a letter sent to U.S. Health Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze last July 8 by Representative JOHN MURPHY, Democrat, of Staten Island.

Citing the historic plight of his constituents, who reside downwind from the petrochemical complex of Middlesex County, N.J., Representative MURPHY demanded that the Secretary initiate Federal abatement as prescribed by law.

Mr. Celebrezze complied.

On August 18, State and Federal officials (but none from the city) met in a conference room on lower Broadway to "consult" each other about the need for U.S. abatement.

Speaking for Mr. Celebrezze, Vernon MacKenzie, the chief of the U.S. Division of Air Pollution, informed the State officials there was "ample reason to believe" that pollutants discharged in New Jersey were "endangering the health and welfare of persons in the State of New York."

"I don't believe we have any evidence to substantiate that," said Dr. Kandle of New Jersey.

And with a symbolic hand across the Hudson, New York State Deputy Health Director Granville Larimore, M.D., concurred.

Later in the consultation, after Dr. Larimore had stated his belief that sulfur dioxide concentrations had declined substantially on Staten Island, ISC Executive Secretary Thomas Glenn disclosed that 1964 studies showed the island with an annual average of 0.1 part of SO^2 per million parts of air.

OUT OF THE TALKS—A DEADLOCK

"Tom," asked Dr. Kandle, "is there any question that the SO^2 level in Staten Island has been reduced?"

Mr. Glenn replied:

"I think it's down, but how much I wouldn't want to state."

The August consultation thus ended in a deadlock. Both States, backed by the ISC, agreed there was no need for a U.S. abatement program in the interstate area, but the Public Health Service is nevertheless proceeding with steps in that direction. About to be put on the agenda: Step No. 2, an interstate air pollution conference.

If it seems to the casual observer that these steps are being taken too slowly, there are reasons.

First, the Government is reluctant to stomp on the toes of two powerful States, and the Public Health Service is extremely squeamish about assuming the role of bullyboy over local agencies.

But second, and more importantly, the Health Service itself is in no position today to initiate an abatement program.

Mr. Megonnell's abatement section is 50 percent understaffed, with 19 positions begging for qualified candidates—and the funds to pay them.

[From the New York Journal-American, Mar. 18, 1965]

OUR DIRTY AIR: RAGTAG BATTALION BATTLING LONG ODDS

(Fifth in a series)

(By John G. Mitchell, Journal-American staff writer)

Arthur J. Benline, New York's apocalyptic-voiced air pollution control commissioner, sits today in a Park Row office high above city hall, where the slow corrosion of marble by sulfur dioxide continues imperceptibly outside the window of his long-time friend and mentor, Robert F. Wagner.

But Mr. Benline's worries extend beyond city hall. They extend to the 320 square miles of land and 570 miles of waterfront where his ragtag battalion of 36 inspectors is expected to enforce the law upon millions of potential pollution sources.

In that respect alone, Mr. Benline is like the little Dutch boy. His finger is plugging a hole in the dike of dirty air, and he is helpless to stem the spillover elsewhere.

"I've got news for you," the commissioner will say to those who complain that New York's air is the Nation's dirtiest. "I've been in all the big cities and they are all the same."

If money is any measure of air quality, the commissioner is wrong about the sameness of big cities. New Yorkers spend about 10½ cents per capita for cleaner air, while in Los Angeles County, the per capita contribution is more than half a dollar. Philadelphians spend 18 cents; Chicagoans, 22 cents.

THE RELUCTANCE TO INVEST CASH

New York may not be the dirtiest city, but it is certainly the most reluctant to invest cash for cleaner air. By U.S. Public Health Service standards, Mr. Benline today should be operating with a budget of $3,700,000. The actual budget: $931,000.

Because of such impoverished financing, Commissioner Benline is besieged by endless administrative problems, not the least of which is the hiring and holding of good men. In fiscal 1963–64, the city's air pollution control department lost six skilled chemists to other agencies where the salaries were higher and the challenge of accomplishment more dynamic.

Accomplishment by the department is sorely limited by available funds. While big-budgeted Los Angeles pioneers new methods of control and air resource management, New York City's program remains basically what it was 10 years ago—a smoke-chasing, summons-issuing operation with its laboratory housed in a crumbling Harlem courthouse.

A lesser man would find such conditions unmanageable. But somehow Mr. Benline, a big, square-jawed ex-housing inspector, rises above the frustrations of budgetary neglect and gets on with the job. He is, perhaps, the city's most conscientious commissioner.

Dilligence also runs in the Benline family. In the commissioner's 12th-floor apartment on West 72d Street, Mrs. Benline is said to spend a good part of each day scanning the skyline through a pair of binoculars.

Spotting a plume of black smoke, she plots the offender on an improvised map, notes the time of day exactly. Thus, when the commissioner arrives in the evening, he is greeted by a wife holding neither pipe nor slippers, but a carefully documented dossier on perpetual polluters who may, and occasionally have, ended up in a courtroom.

Smoke chasing alone, however, will never restore the city's air to a level of reasonable purity, and Mr. Benline knows it. In the hope of broadening his program, he is conferring informally with U.S. Public Health Service officials. Possible result: a technical assistance grant under the U.S. Clean Air Act.

Although Mr. Benline is reluctant to speculate as to where such assistance might lead, it is generally understood in Washington that should technical aid be granted the entire city air pollution program will be open to reappraisal and hard-nosed evaluation by U.S. officials.

BOARD IS FAULTED ON MEMBERSHIP

A similar appraisal by the Public Health Service in Trenton last year was critical of the New Jersey Air Sanitation Department's prosecution of offenders, and faulted the State's air pollution control board for packing its membership with representatives of industry.

Pending Federal scrutiny of the New York program, a second appraisal will soon be in the works. Councilman Robert Low's special council subcommittee of air pollution will conduct public hearings in June, and the emphasis will be on the city's smog abatement efforts. Says Mr. Low:

"We're not out for scalps. We just want to find out what's being done, and if what's being done is enough."

Anyone who takes a deep breath in New York City today already knows the answer to that one. What is being done is not enough.

A 1964 report to the academy of medicine by its committee on public health warns:

"The situation in this city is critical. Though the department of air pollution control is charged with the heavy responsibility of protecting the health of millions of New York residents and additional millions of visitors, it lacks trained personnel and funds needed to carry on its activities.

"Furthermore, much of its equipment is old. Facing a crisis in its essential daily operations, the department cannot be expected to carry on adequately and effectively in providing protection to the health of citizens."

Our Dirty Air: Apathy Widening the Wasteland

(Sixth and last of a series)

(By John G. Mitchell)

We are 17 million strong, packed into 22 counties astride the Hudson River, and every smoggy day we switch on our lights, start our cars, and carry our garbage to the curb we are helping to turn the New York metropolitan region into a wasteland.

Each of these common, everyday acts (see below)—acts that are necessary in our urban society—contributes directly to the mass devastation of our most vital natural resource, fresh air, and to our own self-asphyxiation.

Air pollution today is costing each of us an estimated $65 a year in damage to our property and health, and yet in New York City we are spending less than 11 cents per capita to reduce the staggering debt to dirty air.

The trouble is that too many people do not care and therefore their political leaders do not care.

NO COMPLAINTS

Who complained, for example, when $3 million allocated in the capital budget for installation of pollution control devices at the West 57th Street municipal incinerator was arbitrarily shifted last year to the city's gift to the World's Fair? (Ironically, the $3 million was spent on the fair's Science Building.)

And who complained when $62,000 was shaved from the budget of the city's air pollution control department in 1964? Only one complained effectively, and he was a U.S. Senator from Maine, Edmund Muskie, the author of the Clean Air Act.

We are surrounded not only by dirty air but by apathy.

Can nothing be done?

In addition to committing larger and more adequate funds to control agencies, much can be done. For a healthier, richer life under cleaner skies, we must:

Demand mandatory control on automotive exhaust emissions, which may well account today for 50 percent of our pollution.

Find ways of reducing the sulfur content of fuels, and begin to explore the possibilities of tapping new and revolutionary sources of nonfuel energy.

Solve the problems of waste disposal in such a way as to end forever the overburdening of our public incinerators and the open burning of rubbish.

To stop short of achieving these goals is to assure not only the arrival of the wasteland, but its eventual conversion into a potter's field for the world's first and only self-asphyxiating society.

BRETTON WOODS AGREEMENTS ACT AMENDMENT

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, by request, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 286–286k–1), and for other purposes.

The proposed legislation has been requested by the President and I am introducing it in order that there may be a specific bill to which members of the Senate and the public may direct their attention and comments.

I reserve my right to support or oppose this bill, as well as any suggested amendments to it, when the matter is considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed in the Record at this point, together with the letter from the President, dated March 17, 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and letter will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1672) to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States, introduced by Mr. Fulbright, by request, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1672

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 286–286k–1), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"Sec. 20 (a) The United States Governor of the Fund is authorized to consent to an increase of $1,035,000,000 in the quota of the United States Fund.

"(b) In order to pay the increase in the United States subscription to the Fund provided for in this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated $1,035,000,000, to remain available until expended."

The letter presented by Mr. Fulbright is as follows:

The White House,
Washington, March 17, 1965.

Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: The International Monetary Fund has played a key role in the flourishing economic growth experienced by the free world in the last two decades. An expansion of the Fund's resources is now needed if it is to continue to contribute effectively to free world growth in the future. The United States has given its firm support to the Fund since its creation in the Bretton Woods agreements of 1945. This support must continue.

I recommend to the Congress that the quota of the United States in the International Monetary Fund be increased by 25 percent along with the similar or greater increases proposed for other members. The increases proposed for all members will raise Fund quotas by about $5 billion and bring total quotas to $21 billion. This expansion is vital to the United States. It will:

Promote the orderly and stable growth of free world trade and payments in which we so importantly participate.

Maintain the strength and central position of the Fund in the evolution of the international monetary system;

Help finance the temporary swings in balance of payments associated with the growing volume of international transactions.

Support the expansion of bilateral credit facilities which have contributed to the development of the international monetary system; and

Provide to the Fund other major currencies to meet drawings that have mainly been financed by dollars in the past, and thus strengthen the present payments system.

Demands on the Fund's resources have steadily risen as the volume of world trade and financial transactions has grown. In the past 5 years drawings on the Fund have averaged over $1 billion per year; during the period 1955–59, the annual average was $440 million. This increased use of the Fund reflects both the great expansion of current international transactions since 1959 and the increasingly large international movement of capital since the return to convertibility of the major European currencies. Increased use of the Fund has been especially marked among the large industrial countries. Since 1962 Canada, Italy, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States have either drawn on Fund resources or entered into standby arrangements or both.

A significant change in the holdings of the Fund has also occurred. For many years the U.S. dollar was the only currency extensively drawn by other member nations. But because of our balance-of-payments deficits, the Fund has increasingly provided other currencies to drawing members. As a result its holdings of major currencies other than dollars and sterling have declined by over $1 billion since 1959. The proposed quota increase will substantially enlarge the Fund's holdings of these currencies.

Moreover, the Fund's credit facilities have been directly useful to the United States. Prior to 1958, the United States attained a large creditor position because of the extensive lending of dollars by the Fund. From 1958 to 1963 reversal of our earlier Fund creditor position financed over $1 billion of our payments deficit; and since 1963, we have made net drawings of $260 million of the Fund's resources for this same purpose.

I am transmitting legislation which would authorize the U.S. Governor of the Fund to agree to an increase of $1,035 million in the U.S. quota, bringing our total quota to $5,160 million. Three-fourths of the increase, or $776 million, will be obligated in dollars but will be expended only as needed by the Fund. The remaining $259 million will be payable in gold. In return for this gold payment, the United States will receive a substantially equivalent reserve asset in the form of a virtually automatic drawing right on the Fund. Arrangements have been made both to minimize the amount of gold sales by the United States to other Fund members for their gold subscription payments, and to mitigate the impact of any purchases that may occur.

The National Advisory Council on International Monetary and Financial Problems has prepared a report which is being sent separately to the Congress. The report will provide background information for the use of the Congress, and strongly endorses the proposed quota increase.

The increased Fund quotas will contribute importantly to the economic health of the free world. The increase is clearly in the interest of the United States. I urge that Congress give prompt and favorable consideration to this legislation.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

A bill to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Bretton Woods Agreements Act, as amended (22 U.S.C. 286–286k–1), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 20 (a) The United States Governor of the Fund is authorized to consent to an increase of $1,035,000,000 in the quota of the United States in the Fund.

"(b) In order to pay the increase in the United States subscription to the Fund provided for in this section, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated $1,035,000,000, to remain available until expended."

DISPOSITION OF GEOTHERMAL STEAM AND ASSOCIATED GEOTHERMAL RESOURCES

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate referral a bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1674) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make disposition of geothermal steam and associated geothermal resources, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. BIBLE, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. BIBLE. Mr. President, the purpose of this proposed legislation is to provide authority for the Secretary of the Interior to lease the public domain for purposes of development of geothermal resources. Impetus for enactment has come from members of an infant industry concerned with the utilization of this resource, largely found on the public domain. The resources and uses of geothermal steam have been only slightly explored; however, there is sufficient experience to warrant interest in further development. Of primary importance at this time is the possibility of use of geothermal steam, produced from ground waters heated to very high temperatures by bodies of hot residual volcanic rock, for the production of electric power. In addition to its use as a source of energy, geothermal steam has been found to contain valuable quantities of mineral byproducts such as gold, silver, rare metals, and salt.

At present, there is no legislative provision for the leasing of public domain lands on which geothermal resources exist for development of these resources. Consequently, commercial developers of the new industry have attempted to obtain interests in the public domain for this purpose by application for rights under other provisions of law, with particular reference to the Mineral Leasing Act and by the staking of mining claims. Oil and gas leases have been issued under the Mineral Leasing Act to private interests not intending to develop these resources at all but, rather, having as a primary interest the exploration and development of the land for its resources of geothermal energy and assorted byproducts. In the case of another group, the route to rights to geothermal steam resources has been sought through staking mining claims, although the mining laws do not, at present, make any provision for patenting of such claims for geothermal products.

In the United States, there is now only one operating geothermal steam electric generating plant and transmission company. This is a privately operated development in Sonoma County, Calif., at which Magma Power Co., operating in association with Thermal Power Co., produces power from geothermal steam and sells it to the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. which operates a geothermal steam electric generating plant and transmission project under terms of a certificate of public convenience and necessity from the Public Utilities Commission of California. Production of electric power from geothermal steam has proved commercially feasible and is in operation at installations in other countries, notably Italy, New Zealand, and Iceland.

A similar measure, S. 883, was favorably reported last year by the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs and was approved by the Senate on August 21, 1964. Unfortunately, it did not receive the approval of the other body.

I trust that favorable action by the Congress this season will permit private industry to proceed with the development of this very important potential for cheap power development.

PROPOSED PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION ON SIMPLIFICATION OF THE INCOME TAX LAWS

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill creating a commission to be known as the Presidential Commission on Simplification of the Income Tax Laws. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk through April 9 for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Iowa.

The bill (S. 1675) creating a commission to be know as the Presidential Commission on Simplification of the Income Tax Laws, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

UNIFORM RELOCATION ACT OF 1965

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to achieve consistency and equity in the treatment of those forced to relocate by Federal and federally aided public improvement programs.

Relocation is a serious and growing problem in the United States. Thousands of people and businesses are forced to move every year because of Government projects, particularly urban renewal and highways. All indications are that this pace of displacement will accelerate with increased urbanization and the consequent mounting demands for urban services. It has been estimated that in the next 4 to 8 years, Federal and federally aided programs will displace an average of about 111,000 families and individuals, 18,000 businesses and nonprofit organizations, and 4,000 farm operators each year. The federally assisted programs alone—mostly urban renewal and highway programs—are estimated to displace about 106,000 or 96 percent of the families and individuals, 17,000 or 96 percent of the businesses and nonprofit organizations, and 1,350 or 34 percent of the farms. The highway program alone will account for 37,000 families and individuals, 4,000 businesses and nonprofit organizations, and 1,400 farm operations.

Recently, both the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, on which I serve as a member from this body, and the staff of the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition, of the House Public Works Committee, issued reports documenting the case that the Federal, State, and local governments are falling far short of equity in treatment of those displaced by governmental programs. In its report, "Relocation: Unequal Treatment of People and Businesses Displaced by Governments," the Advisory Commission recommends legislative and administrative action by the Federal Government, the States and local governments to achieve reasonable consistency among governmental programs and ease the disruptive effects of forced displacement. This legislation which I am introducing today is designed to implement the Commission's recommendations applicable to Federal and federally assisted programs.

In its study, the Advisory Commission cooperated with the U.S. Conference of Mayors in surveying the relocation practices and problems of the Nation's 131 largest cities. The Commission found great inconsistencies among Federal and federally assisted programs with respect to the amount and scope of relocation payments, advisory assistance, and assurance of the availability of standard housing. The urban renewal program makes the most comprehensive provision for relocation assistance; the Federal aid highway program is appreciably less generous. Thus, a homeowner whose property is taken for a federally aided urban renewal project is entitled to moving costs up to $200. His neighbor, whose property is taken for a federally aided highway program, is also entitled to $200, but only if the State has authorized participation in the Federal relocation program. Twenty-eight States had not authorized such payments as of December 1964, and even among the States that had, an appreciable number had not authorized payments up to the Federal limit, or not for tenants and lessees. Inconsistency in payment of business moving expenses is even greater, since the Federal Aid Highway Act allows such expenses only up to $3,000, whereas displacement by a federally aided urban renewal project entitles the businessman to as much as $25,000 for moving costs. Finally, Federal urban renewal provides fairly comprehensive advice and counseling to displacees; the Federal highway program provides no such service to businesses and individuals.

Among the other findings in the Commission study is the fact that the single greatest problem in relocating families and individuals is the shortage of standard housing for low income groups. Nonwhites have the great problem of all population groups, but large families and the elderly also present special housing problems.

Among business displacees, small businesses—particularly those owned and operated by the elderly, such as "Mom and Pop" grocery stores—are major casualties. They have less capital, find it more difficult to secure outside financing, and have little energy or spirit to resume business in a new location.

Advisory assistance is of growing importance in the relocation process. The poor, the nonwhite, the elderly, the small business people need intensive counseling to prepare them for displacement and to help them carry out their moves.

Finally, the relocation process often discloses the social and economic needs of displaced persons. This provides a unique opportunity for effective application of local, State, and Federal programs dealing with the less privileged social and economic groups, such as housing, public assistance, education, employment, and job training.

With the continual growth of Government property acquisitions—particularly in the urban renewal and Federal highway programs—there has been more and more concern that something be done to make Federal relocation programs more uniform and ease the impact of forced moves. Both President Kennedy and President Johnson have expressed concern over the human costs and the lack of uniformity in relocation of both families and businesses. The 1962 Federal Aid Highway Act was passed at President Kennedy's urging that we "move toward equity among the various federally assisted programs causing displacement." He recommended bringing the highway provisions up to the urban renewal provisions; but, although relocation payments and assistance were authorized in the 1962 highway act, they still fall far short of the urban renewal program. Groups of public officials, like the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors, have consistently urged uniformity among Federal programs. Finally, the House Committee on Public Works in late 1961 set up the Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition to examine the problem of relocation as part of its study of the broad question of problems arising from governmental property acquisitions.

The bill I am introducing would establish uniformity of relocation payments and advisory assistance programs for those displaced by Federal and federally assisted programs. Compliance with these relocation requirements would be a condition of Federal grants to State and local governments. The bill would impose on all federally assisted programs the present urban renewal requirement that no property acquisition project may proceed until there is assurance of available standard housing for all those displaced.

Finally, for federally aided programs the bill would provide full Federal reimbursement of all individual relocation payments up to a maximum of $25,000, and above that, Federal sharing according to the project's cost-sharing formula. Urban renewal and public housing now pay up to $25,000, fully reimbursed by the Federal Government, for business moving expenses. The Federal highway program now allows only up to $3,000 for individual businesses, reimbursed by the Federal Government on a 90–10 basis for interstate and 50–50 for primary-secondary highways. The bill would thus make Federal reimbursement 100 percent up to $25,000 and would assure that relocation payments will be made in the 28 States where highway displacees are not now entitled to such payments.

The bill's provisions with respect to uniformity of relocation payments and advisory assistance, the assurance of availability of standard housing, and Federal reimbursement in grant-in-aid programs, carry out recommendations of the Advisory Commission. The provisions on the level of relocation payments are my own recommendations and are essentially similar to the recommendations of the House Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition. They would, I believe, provide an adequate and yet not overly generous level of compensation for the costs of moving and related expenses for those displaced by all types of Federal Government activity, many of whom presently receive little or no compensation.

It has been roughly estimated that this bill would increase Federal cost of relocation payments by about $28 million. I submit that this will be a small price to pay to finally obtain just and adequate treatment of those who happen to be in the way of Government projects. We must constantly bear in mind here that those most often displaced are just those who are least able to move and find adequate housing or a new business location—the poor, the nonwhite, the elderly, and the small businessman.

This bill is consistent in most respects with the goals of the draft legislation prepared by the staff of the House Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition and introduced by my esteemed colleague, Senator SPARKMAN, as S. 1201. The Senator's bill deals not only with relocation policies but with such matters as Federal policies on acquisition of property under eminent domain procedures, determination of the fair value of property acquired, litigation expenses, and assistance offered to displacees by such programs as the Manpower Development and Training Act and the Social Security Act. My bill concentrates on relocation issues, and once and for all establishes a uniform Federal policy of requiring all federally assisted programs to assure the availability of adequate housing as a condition of a Federal grant-in-aid. It also offers greater assurance that State and local governments will make adequate payments for moving businesses by providing full Federal reimbursement up to $25,000 for each displaced business, and reimbursing above $25,000 on the basis of the project's cost-sharing formula.

I look forward to prompt and thorough hearings on this important legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that a section-by-section analysis be printed with the bill following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and the section-by-section analysis will be printed in the RECORD as requested by the Senator from Maine.

The bill (S. 1681) to provide for uniform, fair, and equitable treatment of persons, businesses, or farms displaced by Federal and federally assisted programs, introduced by Mr. MUSKIE, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Uniform Relocation Act of 1965."

Declaration of policy

SECTION 1. The purpose of this Act is to establish a uniform policy for the fair and equitable treatment of owners, tenants, and other persons displaced by the acquisition of real property in Federal and federally assisted programs, by code enforcement activities undertaken in connection with an urban renewal project, or by a program of voluntary rehabilitation of buildings or other improvements in accordance with an urban renewal plan. Such a policy shall be as uniform as practicable as to (1) relocation payments, (2) advisory assistance, (3) assurance of availability of standard housing, and (4) Federal reimbursement for relocation payments under federally assisted programs.

PART A. FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Relocation payments

SEC. 2. (a) If the head of any Federal agency acquires real property for public use in a State, or the District of Columbia, he shall make fair and reasonable relocation payments to displaced persons in accordance with the regulations established by the President under section 5 of this Act.

(b) If any displaced person who moves or discontinues his business elects to accept the payment authorized by this subsection in lieu of the payment authorized for such business by subsection (a) of this section, the head of such Federal agency shall make a fixed relocation payment to such person in an amount equal to the average annual net earnings of the business, or $5,000, whichever is the lesser. No payment shall be made under this subsection unless the head of such agency is satisfied that the business (1) cannot be relocated without a substantial loss of its existing patronage, and (2) is not part of a commercial enterprise having at least one other establishment, not being acquired by the United States, which is engaged in the same or similar business. For purposes of this subsection, the term "average annual net earnings" means one-half of any net earnings of the business, before Federal, State, and local income taxes, during the two taxable years immediately preceding the taxable year in which such business moves from the real property acquired by the United States and includes any compensation paid by the business to the owner, his spouse, or his dependent children during such two-year period. Such earnings and compensation shall be established by Federal income tax returns filed by such business and its owner and his spouse and dependent children for such two taxable years.

(c) If any displaced person who moved from a dwelling elects to accept the payments authorized by this subsection in lieu of the payments authorized by subsection (a) of this section for moving from such dwelling, the head of such Federal agency shall make the following fixed relocation payments to such person:

(1) A moving expense allowance, determined according to a schedule established by the head of such agency, not to exceed $200;

(2) A dislocation allowance equal to the amount paid under paragraph (1) of this subsection or $100, whichever is the lesser; and

(3) An additional payment of $300 if the displaced person owned the fee title or a life estate in the real property occupied.

(d) If any displaced person who moves or discontinues a farm operation elects to accept the payment authorized by this subsection in lieu of the payment authorized for such farm operation by subsection (a) of this section, the head of such Federal agency shall make a fixed relocation payment to such person in the amount of $1,000. In the case where the entire farm operation is not acquired by such Federal agency, the payment authorized by this subsection shall be made only if the head of such agency determines that the remainder property is no longer an economic unit.

(e) In addition to any amount under subsections (a), (b), (c), and (d) of this section, the head of such Federal agency may pay on behalf of any displaced family, displaced elderly individual, or displaced handicapped individual, monthly payments over a period not to exceed twenty-four months an amount not to exceed $1,000 to assist such displaced family or individual to secure a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling. The additional payment shall be an amount which, when added to 20 per centum of the annual income of the displaced individual or family at the time of displacement, equals the average annual rental required for such a decent, safe, and sanitary dwelling of modest standards adequate in size to accommodate the displaced individual or family in areas not generally less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities: *Provided,* That such payment shall be made only to an individual or family who is unable to secure a dwelling unit in a low-rent housing project assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937, or under a State or local program found by the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to have the same general purposes as the Federal program under such Act.

(f) No provision of this section shall be construed to give any person a cause of action in any court, nor may any violation of this section be raised as a defense by such person in any action.

Relocation assistance programs

SEC. 3. (a) If the head of any Federal agency acquires real property for public use in a State, or in the District of Columbia, he shall provide a relocation assistance program for displaced persons which shall offer the services described in subsection (b) of this section. If the head of such agency determines that other persons, occupying property adjacent to the real property acquired, are caused substantial economic injury because of the public improvement for which such property is acquired, he may offer such persons relocation services under such program.

(b) Each relocation assistance program required by subsection (a) of this section shall include such measures, facilities, or services as may be necessary or appropriate in order (1) to determine the needs of displaced families, individuals, business concerns, and farm operators for relocation assistance; (2) to assist owners of displaced businesses and displaced farm operators in obtaining and becoming established in suitable business locations or replacement farms; (3) to supply information concerning the Federal Housing Administration home acquisition program under section 221(d)(2) of the National Housing Act, the small business disaster loan program under section 7(b)(3) of the Small Business Act, and other programs offering assistance to displaced persons; (4) to assist in minimizing hardships to displaced persons in adjusting to relocation; and (5) to assure, to the greatest extent practicable, the coordination of relocation activities with other project activities and other planned or proposed governmental actions in the community or nearby areas which may affect the carrying out of the relocation program.

Federal programs with local cooperation

SEC. 4. Whenever real property is acquired by a State agency for a Federal public improvement project, such acquisition shall, for purposes of this Act, be deemed an acquisition by the Federal agency having authority over such project and such Federal agency shall make relocation payments, provide relocation assistance, and provide assurance of availability of housing as required in the case of acquisitions of real property by a Federal agency.

Authority of the President

SEC. 5 (a) To carry into effect the provisions of this Act, the President shall make such regulations as he may determine to be necessary to assure:

(1) That relocation payments authorized by section 2 shall be fair and reasonable and as uniform as practicable;

(2) That a displaced person who makes proper application for a relocation payment authorized for such person by section 2(a)—

(A) shall be reimbursed for his actual and reasonable expenses in moving himself, his family, his business, farm operation, or other personal property, and in the case of a farm operation, for his actual and reasonable expenses in searching for a replacement farm; and

(B) shall, if he disposes of personal property on moving his business or farm operation and replaces such property at the new location, be paid an amount equal to the reasonable expenses that would have been required in moving such personal property to the new location.

(3) That a displaced person who makes proper application for a relocation payment authorized for such person by this Act shall be paid promptly after a move;

(4) That any person aggrieved by a determination as to eligibility for a relocation payment authorized by this Act, or the amount of a payment, may have his application reviewed by the head of the agency; and

(5) That a displaced person shall have a reasonable time in which to apply for a relocation payment authorized by this Act.

(b) The President may, by regulation, establish a limitation on the amount of a relocation payment authorized by section 2(a) with due consideration for the declaration of policy in this Act and the provisions of subsection (a) of this section and section 7(d).

(c) In order to prevent unnecessary expense and duplication of functions, and to promote uniform and effective administration of relocation assistance programs for displaced persons, the President is authorized to require that any Federal agency make relocation payments or provide relocation services, or otherwise carry out its functions under this Act, by utilizing the facilities, personnel, and services of any Federal agency, or by entering into appropriate contracts or agreements with any State agency having an established organization for conducting relocation assistance programs.

(d) The President may make such other rules and regulations consistent with the provisions of this Act as he deems necessary or appropriate to carry out this Act.

Fund availability

SEC. 6. Funds appropriated or otherwise available to any Federal agency for the acquisition of real property or any interest therein shall be available also for obligation and expenditure to carry out the provisions of this Act.

PART B. FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS

Relocation payments and assistance; assurance of availability of housing

SEC. 7. (a) If a State agency acquires real property, and if

(1) Federal financial assistance is available to pay the cost in connection with the acquisition of such real property or of the improvement for which property is acquired, and

(2) Such State agency has agreed with the head of the Federal agency responsible for the administration of such Federal financial assistance to provide to displaced persons for moves from such real property—

(A) fair and reasonable location payments as described in section 2 of this Act and in accordance with regulations established by the President under section 5 of this Act,

(B) fixed relocation payments in the same amounts and under the same terms and conditions as are required to be made by a Federal agency by subsections 2(b), 2(c), and 2(d) of this Act,

(C) relocation assistance programs offering the services described in section 3(b) of this Act, and

(D) a feasible method for the temporary relocation of families and individuals displaced from the property acquired, and assurance that there are or are being provided, in areas not generally less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities and at rents or prices within the financial means of the families and individuals displaced, decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings equal in number to the number of and available to such displaced families and individuals and reasonably accessible to their places of employment,

then Federal financial assistance shall be available to share the cost of such relocation payments and relocation assistance programs in accordance with subsection (d) of this section. However, no State agency need agree to make any relocation payment in excess of $25,000 to any displaced person in order to receive the assistance authorized by this subsection or to meet the requirements of section 8.

(b) In order to prevent unnecessary expenses and duplication of functions, and to promote uniform and effective administration of relocation assistance programs for displaced persons, any agreement by a State agency under subsection (e) of this section shall provide that such agency may make relocation payments or provide relocation assistance or otherwise carry out its functions under this Act by utilizing the facilities, personnel, and services of any other State agency having an established organization for conducting relocation assistance programs.

(c) Any contract or agreement with a State agency executed before the effective date of this Act, under which Federal financial assistance is available to pay the cost in connection with the acquisition of real property, or of the improvement for which such property is acquired, may be amended to include an agreement as described in subsection (a) of this section.

(d) The cost to a State agency providing the payments and services described in subsection (a) of this section may be included as part of the costs of the project for which Federal financial assistance is available to such State agency, and shall be eligible for Federal financial assistance in the same manner and to the same extent as other project costs, except that the Federal agency providing such assistance shall contribute the first $25,000 of the cost of providing a relocation payment to any displaced person.

(e) If the head of a Federal agency determines that it is necessary for the expeditious completion of a public improvement for which a State agency has entered into an agreement, as described in subsection (a) of this section, to make relocation payments to displaced persons, he may advance the Federal share of such relocation payments to such State agency. Upon determination by the head of such Federal agency that any part of the funds advanced to a State agency under this subsection are no longer required, the amount which he determines not to be required shall be repaid upon demand. Any sum advanced and not repaid on demand shall be deducted from sums otherwise available to such State agency from Federal sources.

Requirements for approval of contracts or agreements for Federal financial assistance

SEC. 8. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, on and after the effective date of this Act, no contract or agreement with a State agency, under which Federal financial assistance will be available to pay the cost in connection with the acquisition of real property or of a public improvement for which real property is to be acquired, may be approved by the head of the Federal agency responsible for the administration of such Federal financial assistance unless such State agency has entered into an agreement in compliance with the requirements of section 7(a).

Displacement by code enforcement for urban renewal project or voluntary rehabilitation under urban renewal plan

SEC. 9. A person who moves his business or other personal property, or moves from his dwelling, on or after the effective date of this Act, as the direct result of code enforcement activities undertaken in connection with an urban renewal project or a program of voluntary rehabilitation of buildings or other improvements in accordance with an urban renewal plan, which project or plan receives Federal financial assistance under the Housing Act of 1959, shall, for the purposes of this Act, be deemed to be a displaced person.

PART C. GENERAL PROVISIONS

District of Columbia and National Capital Housing Authority eligible for Federal financial assistance

SEC. 10. Whenever, in connection with the acquisition of real property, the District of Columbia or the National Capital Housing Authority, provides to a displaced person any relocation payment or advisory service required by this Act, and Federal financial assistance is available to pay the cost in connection with the acquisition of such real property, or of the public improvement for which such property is acquired, the cost to such agency of providing such payments or services shall be eligible for Federal financial assistance in the manner provided for in section 7(d).

Definitions

SEC. 11. As used in this Act—

(1) The term "Federal agency" means—

(A) any department, agency, or instrumentality in the executive branch of the Government including the National Capital Housing Authority and any wholly owned Government corporation;

(B) the District of Columbia, and any agency or instrumentality thereof, including the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency; and

(C) the Architect of the Capitol.

(2) The term "displaced person" means—

(A) any person who is the owner of a business which moves from real property or is discontinued on or after the effective date of this Act as a result of the acquisition or imminence of acquisition of such real property, in whole or in part, by a Federal or State agency;

(B) any person who is the owner of a farm operation which moves from real property or is discontinued on or after the effective date of this Act as a result of the acquisition or imminence of acquisition of such real property, in whole or in part, by a Federal or State agency;

(C) any individual who is the head of a family which moves from real property occupied as a dwelling on or after the effective date of this Act, as a result of the acquisition or imminence of acquisition of such real property, in whole or in part, by a Federal or State agency, or which moves from such dwelling as a result of the acquisition or imminence of acquisition, by such Federal or State agency, of other real property on which such family conducts a business or farm operation;

(D) any individual, not a member of a family, who moves from real property occupied as a dwelling on or after the effective date of this Act, as a result of the acquisition or imminence of acquisition of such real property, in whole or in part, by a Federal or State agency, or who moves from such dwelling as a result of the acquisition or imminence of acquisition by such Federal or State agency, of other real property on which such individual conducts a business or farm operation; and

(E) any individual, not described in paragraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of this section, who moves his personal property from real property on or after the effective date of this Act as a result of the acquisition or imminence of acquisition of such real property, in whole or in part, by a Federal or State agency.

(3) The term "business" means any lawful activity conducted primarily (A) for the purchase and resale of products, commodities, or any other personal property; (B) for the manufacture, processing, or marketing of any such property; or (C) for the sale of services to the public. Such term does not include the activity of an investor in acquiring or holding real property for resale for gain.

(4) The term "farm operation" means any activity conducted solely or primarily for the production of one or more agricultural products or commodities for sale and home use, and customarily producing such products or commodities in sufficient quantity to be capable of contributing materially to the operator's support.

(5) The term "family" means two or more individuals living together in the same dwelling unit who are related to each other by blood, marriage, or adoption.

(6) The term "State" means each of the States of the United States, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States, and any political subdivision thereof.

(7) The term "State agency" means any agency or instrumentality created by a State or by a compact between two or more States approved by Congress.

(8) The term "Federal financial assistance" does not include any annual payment by the United States to the District of Columbia authorized by article VI of the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1947 (D.C. Code, secs. 47–2501a and 47–2501b).

(9) The term "head of a Federal agency" or "head of a State agency" includes a duly designated delegate of such agency head.

(10) The term "elderly individual" means a person, not a member of a family, who is sixty-two years of age or over.

(11) The term "handicapped individual" means a person, not a member of a family, who is handicapped within the meaning of section 202 of the Housing Act of 1959.

(12) The term "displaced," when used in relation to any person, means any person moved or to be moved from real property on or after the effective date of this Act as a result of the acquisition or imminence of acquisition of such property for a public improvement constructed or developed by or with funds provided in whole or in part by the Federal Government.

(13) The term "person" means any individual, and any partnership, corporation or association.

Applicability of Administrative Procedure Act

SEC. 12. No provision of the Administrative Procedure Act shall apply to this title except section 3 (5 U.S.C. 1002), which shall apply to section 4 of this Act.

Severability

SEC. 13. If any provision of this Act, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of this Act and the application of the provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Acts repealed

SEC. 14. (a) The following laws and parts of laws are hereby repealed:

(1) The Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to reimburse owners of lands required for development under his jurisdiction for their moving expenses, and for other purposes," approved May 29, 1958 (43 U.S.C. 1231–1234).

(2) Paragraph 14 of section 203(b) of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2473).

(3) Section 2680 of title 10, United States Code.

(4) Section 133 of title 23, United States Code.

(5) Section 7 of the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 305).

(6) Section 105(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 (78 Stat. 786).

(7) Sections 114(b) and 114(c) of the Housing Act of 1949 (78 Stat. 788–789).

(8) Paragraph (8) of section 15 of the United States Housing Act of 1937 (78 Stat. 795), except the first sentence of such paragraph.

(9) Section 2 of the Act entitled "An Act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to pay relocation costs made necessary by actions of the District of Columbia government, and for other purposes," approved October 6, 1964 (78 Stat. 1004), and in the second sentence of section 4 of such Act the following words: "administer the payments authorized by section 2 of the Act."

(b) Any rights or liabilities now existing under prior Acts or portions thereof shall not be affected by the repeal of such prior Acts or portions thereof under subsection (a) of this section.

Effective date

SEC. 15. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the fourth month beginning after the date of enactment of this Act.

The section-by-section analysis presented by Mr. MUSKIE is as follows:

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED FEDERAL LEGISLATION, "UNIFORM RELOCATION ACT OF 1965"

Declaration of policy

Section 1. The purpose is to establish a uniform policy for fair and equitable treatment of persons displaced by Federal and federally aided programs. Uniformity applies to relocation payments and advisory assistance and, for federally aided programs, assurance of availability of standard housing and Federal reimbursement for relocation payments.

A. FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Relocation payments

Section 2. Heads of Federal agencies are required to make relocation payments in accordance with regulations established by the President. The displaced person is given the choice of reimbursement (1) according to actual and reasonable expenses, or (2) according to a fixed schedule. In the case of fixed schedule payments, (a) independent businesses that cannot be relocated without loss of patronage are entitled to an amount equal to their net earnings, or $5,000, whichever is less; (b) persons moving from a dwelling are entitled to a moving expense allowance of up to $200, plus a dislocation allowance not greater that the moving expense allowance, or $100, whichever is less, and an additional payment of $300 if the displacee owned the real property occupied; and (c) farm operators are entitled to a fixed payment of $1,000. Low-income displaced families, elderly individuals, or handicapped individuals for whom public housing units are not available are entitled to additional monthly payments totaling not more than $1,000 over not more than 24 months, for relocation in dwellings of modest standards.

The alternative of reimbursement by fixed payment would (a) recognize the economic impact of displacement on a business owner who must establish a business at a different location, buy an established business, or discontinue business operations; (b) grant those moving from a dwelling the same moving allowance now provided under the urban renewal and highway programs, provide additional reimbursement for loss of property and out-of-pocket costs, and, for the homeowner, recognize to some degree the closing costs and financing charges required for purchase of a replacement home; and (c) allow a farm operator a moderate allowance for loss of property and related costs in securing a replacement farm.

A major effect of this section would be to require payments by displacing agencies not now authorized to make them, such as GSA and the Post Office Department.

Relocation assistance programs

Section 3. Requires heads of Federal agencies to provide a relocation assistance program for displaced persons, businesses, and farm operators, and for persons occupying adjacent property if they are caused economic injury. The assistance program must include (a) determining needs for assistance, (b) assisting businesses and farm operators in relocating, (c) supplying information regarding FHA, SBA, and other assistance programs, (d) helping in minimizing readjustment problems, and (e) coordinating relocation with other project activities and governmental activities in the community or nearby areas. This provision applies present urban renewal requirements to all direct Federal programs.

Federal programs with local cooperation

Section 4. Provides that the same requirements for relocation payments and assistance programs shall apply to cases where a State agency acquires real property for a Federal public improvement project.

Authority of the President

Section 5. Vests responsibility for relocation regulations in the President to assure Government-wide uniformity and compliance. Authorizes reimbursement equal to cost of moving personal property if displacee chooses to dispose of it rather than move it. Permits Federal agencies to use established relocation facilities of other Federal agencies or State and local agencies.

Fund availability

Section 6. Stipulates that funds available for property acquisition shall be available to finance provisions of the act.

B. FEDERALLY ASSISTED PROGRAMS

Relocation payments and assistance; assurance of availability of housing

Section 7. Provides that a State or local government using Federal funds for property acquisition or improvement may receive Federal reimbursement of 100 percent of the cost of providing relocation payments up to $25,000 for any displaced person provided that the State or local government agrees to follow requirements as to relocation payments and advisory assistance; provides temporary housing for relocated families and individuals; and assures that standard housing is or is being made available for those displaced. Federal agencies would contribute to the cost of any relocation payment above $25,000 according to the project's cost-sharing formula. State and local governments are authorized to utilize the facilities and services of other agencies established to administer relocation assistance programs. Federal agencies are authorized to advance the Federal share of relocation payments if necessary to expedite completion of a federally assisted public improvement.

The principal effect of this section and section 8 would be on the federally assisted highway program. The "before and after" situation in the highway program may be compared as follows:

Present	*Proposed*
Relocation payments are optional with the States. Twenty-two States have elected to make payments.	Relocation payments are required as a condition of grants.
Federal reimbursement of relocation payments is according to the project's cost-sharing formula: 90 percent on interstate programs; 50 percent on primary and secondary programs.	Full Federal reimbursement up to $25,000 for any move; Federal-State sharing on project's cost-sharing formula (90–10 or 50–50) for the portion of individual payments above $25,000.
Advisory assistance required for families displaced.	Advisory assistance required for families, businesses, individuals, farm operators, and to be similar to present urban renewal provisions.
No assurance of availability of housing required.	Requires that supply of adequate standard housing be provided or in process of being provided.

As regards the other major federally assisted programs causing or likely to cause substantial displacement in the foreseeable future—public housing and urban mass transportation—the law would require provision of advisory assistance to persons and businesses; none is now required. The present public housing law already requires assurance of available standard housing; the present urban mass transportation law requires it only for families, not individuals.

The Federal-Aid Highway Act already encourages States to use existing public agencies to administer the relocation program. The proposed act would extend the encouragement to the urban renewal, public housing, mass transportation, and other federally aided programs that might cause displacement.

Requirements for approval of contracts or agreements for Federal financial assistance

Section 8. Requires State or local government agency conducting federally assisted program to agree to provide relocation payments, services, and housing assurances described in section 7 as a condition of payment of Federal funds.

Displacement by code enforcement for urban renewal project or voluntary rehabilitation under urban renewal plan

Section 9. Makes clear that persons or businesses displaced by urban renewal code enforcement or voluntary rehabilitation activities are considered displaced persons within the meaning of the act.

District of Columbia and National Capital Housing Authority eligible for Federal financial assistance

Section 10. Extends to District of Columbia and National Capital Housing Authority eligibility to be reimbursed for relocation payments in same manner as State and local governments covered in section 6.

Definitions

Section 11. Defines "Federal agency," "displaced person," "business," "farm operation," "family," "State," "State agency," "Federal financial assistance," "head of a Federal agency," "head of a State agency," "elderly individual," "handicapped individual," "displaced," and "person."

Applicability of Administrative Procedure Act

Section 12. Specifies application of Administrative Procedure Act.

Severability

Section 13. States that invalidity of any provision shall not affect other provisions.

Acts repealed

Section 14. Repeals relocation sections of statutes applicable to Departments of Interior and Defense, National Aeronautics and Space Agency, Federal-aid highway program and urban mass transportation program, and certain parts of relocation provisions of Housing Act of 1937, Housing Act of 1949, and 1964 act authorizing District of Columbia to pay relocation costs.

Effective date

Section 15. Act to take effect on first day of fourth month beginning after date of enactment.

SEVERANCE PAY FOR POSTAL FIELD SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, one of the plans spreading throughout industry is the one based on severance pay upon the termination of the employment relationship. According to a report published in January 1965 by the W. E. Upjohn Institute "severance pay plans have been increasing: by the end of 1963 about 35 percent of all workers under union agreements were covered by such plans."

In addition to severance pay plans, many industries have other benefits for their employees, such as bonuses, full payment of insurance coverage, both life and health, and profit-sharing plans. Salaries in industry are usually ahead of comparable salaries in Government.

Even with the rapid progress toward true comparability between salaries in Government and salaries in industry, there now remains a time lag of between 2 and 5 years. The intended legislation would not close this gap, since it is a modest bill, but it would be helpful. It would not be a handout for those retiring, but would help make the transition between a salary status and awaiting the first annuity payment—a period ranging from 6 to 10 weeks—less of a hardship.

The proposed bill is intended to encourage making a career of the postal services. Severance pay would not be granted to any employees with fewer than 20 years of service. Beginning with the 20th year, at which time the severance pay would be $1,000, the amount would be increased by $50 for each additional year of service. It would be applicable only to those employees entitled to an immediate annuity. This means that, except for those employees who reach age 62 with 20 years of service, all others would have to be at least 55 years of age with 30 years service, except those involuntarily retired.

Generally, the Government follows industry in new ideas. Even if this bill were enacted into law immediately, the same would be true. However, the interval would be smaller than usual. The passage of this bill would do much to provide an incentive to staying in the postal service and would provide a small reward for long and faithful service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1682) to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide severance pay for postal field service employees, introduced by Mr. BREWSTER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT TO PROVIDE FOR ADJUSTMENT OF INEQUITIES

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, it is time for us to give attention to the sad plight of thousands of former employees of the United States, now struggling to live on meager annuities, who are falling behind in the race with inflation. In my home State of Alabama, the last report of the Civil Service Commission shows that there are 7,777 retired Federal employees with total annuities of $1,220,504 per month. This is an average of only $157 per month for each of these retirees, many of whom have one or more dependents. The plight of survivor annuitants—the widows of former employees who died in the service or after retirement—is even more deplorable. The records of the Civil Service Commission show 2,892 survivor annuitants in Alabama who are receiving a total of $228,355 per month, an average of $78.

Last year the Congress approved substantial pay increases for almost every civilian employee of the Government, in the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, but gave no consideration to the plight of these annuitants who gave their all in devoted service to their country. In the past 10 years when salaries have risen from 35 to 42 percent, there has been only one general annuity increase of 5 percent. We note that legislation is now well advanced to increase the benefits under the social security system. I am happy to introduce this bill, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], which would give an increase of 10 percent on each annuity up to $3,000, and a 5-percent increase on the amount of any annuity over $3,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1685) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to provide for the adjustment of inequities, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

AMENDMENT OF CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT ACT, RELATING TO SURVIVOR PROVISIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, many of our retired employees have appealed to me for the correction of a great inequity in the survivorship provisions of the civil service retirement system. Prior to April 1, 1948, there was no effective method of providing an annuity for a widow of a retired Federal employee. On April 1, 1948, the law authorizing a retiring employee to elect a reduction in his annuity and to designate his spouse to receive an annuity upon his death was passed. In order to do this the retiree would lose 10 percent of his whole annuity, plus an additional three-fourths of 1 percent for each year his wife was under 60 years of age, limited to a total reduction of 25 percent, and his wife would receive one-half of his unreduced annuity. A year and a half later, on September 30, 1949, the reduction was changed to 5 percent on up to $1,500 of annuity, and 10 percent on the balance, plus the three-fourths of 1 percent for each year the spouse was under age 60, but the liberalization was not made retroactive. In 1956, the plan was again changed to permit a person to designate a survivor annuity with a reduction of only 2½ percent on up to $2,400 of annuity, the survivor annuity to be 50 percent of the amount designated. Again in 1962, the plan was again liberalized by permitting a retiree to take a reduction of only 2½ percent on up to $3,600 of his annuity, and awarding his wife a survivor annuity of 55 percent of this amount. None of these changes was made retroactive.

As a consequence, we now have retired people losing up to 25 percent of their annuities for less survivor benefits than present retirees can now provide for a cost of only 2½ percent. The tragic part of it is that the persons who retired 10 and 15 years ago when salaries were lower, and who now receive annuities only a fraction of those awarded today, are paying up to 10 times as much for survivor annuities that are 10 percent lower.

I am pleased on behalf of myself and my colleague, Mr. HILL, to introduce legislation to correct this situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1686) to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to eliminate the reduction in annuity elected for a spouse when such spouse predeceases the person making the election, introduced by Mr. SPARKMAN (for himself and Mr. HILL), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

NATIONAL STUDENT COUNCIL WEEK

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and Senators

Allott and Morse, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution requesting that the President of the United States proclaim the last week of October of every year as National Student Council Week.

The student councils of our secondary schools now represent a national institution and merit nationwide recognition by all our citizens. Many of our Nation's future leaders are to be found in these student organizations.

The student council is an organization of students, elected by students, to serve them as their official representatives in matters of concern to the entire school. Student council self-government is a valuable training ground for democracy. It provides a medium through which student opinion may be heard, and a forum for student consideration of common school problems. The members of these councils and the students who are represented by them are learning at an early stage of their lives how to run the affairs of a community. It is, in effect, a proving ground providing a living lesson in the duties and responsibilities of citizenship.

As Gerald M. Van Pool, director of student activities, National Association of Secondary School Principals, has stated:

> One of the best ways to learn to do anything is to do it. Thus, by providing an opportunity for high school students to do the things which a good citizen does, the student council teaches good citizenship. It encourages students to become interested in civic matters and to take significant steps to alleviate a situation or to suggest ways and means of improvement. The main purpose of the student council is to teach good citizenship, and thus the student council becomes, in reality, a laboratory of citizenship, an organization that teaches our young people to be good citizens by doing the things which a good citizen does.

At a time when in the Congress and in the country we are vitally concerned with improving the education of our youth, the celebration of a National Student Council Week is one way we can show our confidence in the ability and sense of responsibility of American youth.

My own State of New Jersey was the first to proclaim a statewide Student Council Week and has done so annually for 13 years. Since then, many other States have joined our ranks. In 1963, the New Jersey Association of High School Councils was given the responsibility at the annual national association convention of encouraging a National Student Council Week. I am happy to support this effort.

With this in mind, I ask unanimous consent that the entire text of our proposed resolution be inserted in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks, and further I ask unanimous consent that it lie on the table for 7 days so that others may join in cosponsoring it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the Record and will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from New Jersey.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 68) requesting the President to proclaim the last week in October of every year as National Student Council Week, introduced by Mr. Case (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S.J. Res. 68

Whereas the several states have had statewide student council weeks; and

Whereas the National Association of Student Councils in convention at Ann Arbor, Michigan, in June of 1963 approved the student council week project; and

Whereas the student council more than coordinates student activities and contributes to orderly administration of our secondary schools, but also fosters a sense of citizenship and provides a training ground for youngsters interested in participating in democratic government; and

Whereas the values acquired within the student council have great significance when carried over into adult life; and

Whereas the need for efficient and responsible government is even more urgent in these days of strife, it is especially fitting that student councils receive recognition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the last week in October of every year is designated as National Student Council Week, and the President of the United States is authorized and directed to issue annually a proclamation setting aside that week as a public occasion and inviting the people of the United States to observe that week with appropriate ceremonies.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SECRETARY OF SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES DURING ADJOURNMENT, ETC.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session, until April 5, 1965, the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President and the House of Representatives; that committees be authorized to file reports; and that the Vice President or President pro tempore be authorized to sign duly enrolled bills or resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion of Mr. Simpson, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Government Operations was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1387) to authorize the payment to local governments of sums in lieu of taxes and other revenues lost by such governments by reason of certain actions on the part of the United States in connection with recreation, and it was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, RELATING TO ACREAGE-POUNDAGE MARKETING QUOTAS—MINORITY AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to file individual and minority views on H.R. 5721, a bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, when it is reported.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, RELATING TO ACREAGE-POUNDAGE MARKETING QUOTAS FOR TOBACCO—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENTS NOS. 59 AND 60)

Mr. TALMADGE submitted two amendments (Nos. 59 and 60), intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H.R. 5721) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

FURTHER AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1961—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 61)

Mr. MORSE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 1524) to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PROTECTION OF PATENT RIGHTS—AMENDMENTS (AMENDMENT NO. 62)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 927) to authorize appropriations to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for research and development, construction of facilities, and administrative operations, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, and ordered to be printed.

STRENGTHENING OF EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES — AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 63)

Mr. LONG of Louisiana submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (S. 600) to strengthen the educational resources of our colleges and universities and to provide financial assistance for students in postsecondary and higher education, which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing of the bill (S. 327) to provide assistance to the States of Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho for the reconstruction of areas damaged by recent floods and high waters, the name of the Senator from California [Mr. Murphy] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 561, the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1965, the name of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of S. 812, a bill to provide for the creation of a regional development commission, the name of the senior Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] be listed as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing the name of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. Brewster] be added as a cosponsor of S. 1200, a bill to establish a Court of Veterans' Appeals.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, when S. 1506 is again printed, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the Senator from Utah [Mr. Moss] and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. Gore] be added as cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at its next printing, the names of the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Williams] and the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. Javits] be added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 65, a joint resolution to establish a Commission on Art and Antiquities of the Capitol.

I also ask, Mr. President, that the name of the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. Pell], be included. His name was inadvertently omitted on the first printing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills and joint resolution:

Authority of March 22, 1965:

S. 1591. A bill to amend the National Firearms Act to impose special (occupational) taxes with respect to engaging in the business of importing, manufacturing, and dealing in destructive weapons such as bombs, grenades, rockets, missiles, bazookas, and antitank guns, to impose taxes with respect to the making and to the transfer of such weapons, and to increase the rates of special (occupational) tax, transfer tax, and making tax imposed by the act, and for other purposes: Mr. Hartke, Mr. Kennedy of New York, and Mr. Tydings.

S. 1592. A bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act: Mr. Hartke, Mr. Kennedy of New York, and Mr. Tydings.

S.J. Res. 65. Joint resolution establishing the Commission on Art and Antiquities of the Capitol, and for other purposes: Mr. Bayh, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Brewster, Mr. Burdick, Mr. Cooper, Mr. Fong, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Hayden, Mr. Hill, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Miller, Mr. Mondale, Mr. Randolph, Mr. Ribicoff, Mr. Saltonstall, Mr. Scott, Mr. Simpson, and Mr. Yarborough.

Authority of March 25, 1965:

S. 1599. A bill to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes: Mr. Brewster, Mr. Clark, Mr. Dodd, Mr. Douglas, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hart, Mr. Javits, Mr. Kennedy of New York, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Muskie, Mr. Pell, Mr. Tydings, and Mr. Williams of New Jersey.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of March 18, 1965, the names of Mr. Brewster, Mr. Gruening, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McGee, Mr. Morse, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Young of Ohio were added as additional cosponsors of amendment No. 56, intended to be proposed by Mr. Bartlett, to the bill (S. 500) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes, submitted by Mr. Bartlett (for himself and Mr. Inouye) on March 18, 1965.

AUTHORIZATION THAT S. 1628 LIE ON DESK AN ADDITIONAL WEEK

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, recently I introduced S. 1628, dealing with a change in custom relations. I asked permission that it lie on the desk until today, I believe. I ask unanimous consent, since we were not able to contact Senators who were interested in this bill as we did last year, that it may lie on the desk for 1 additional week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON S. 1366, TO UPDATE AND PERFECT ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, on May 12, 13, and 14, 1965, the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure will hold hearings on S. 1336, a bill to update and perfect the Administrative Procedure Act. This bill was introduced by our distinguished minority leader—for himself and for me—on March 4, 1965.

S. 1336 might be described as an omnibus bill, because it contains in section 3 the substance of the freedom of information bill—S. 1666 of the 88th Congress—and in section 6(b) the substance of the lawyers practice bill—S. 1466 of the 88th Congress. Both of these bills passed the Senate unanimously in the last session of Congress. The freedom of information bill has been reintroduced as S. 1160 of this Congress. The lawyers practice bill will be reintroduced very soon.

During the May hearings, we would hope to hear from all witnesses who are desirous of testifying on any aspect of S. 1336, including freedom of information or lawyers practice. Such persons who desire to testify should contact Mr. Bernard Fensterwald, Counsel to the Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, room 3214, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., telephone 225-5617.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATION BEFORE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nomination has been referred to and is now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Lawrence Gubow, of Michigan, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Michigan for the term of 4 years (now serving under an appointment which expired March 16, 1965).

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in this nomination to file with the committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, April 8, 1965, any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nomination, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON EXPANSION AND ACCELERATION OF SALINE WATER PROGRAM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on March 29 President Johnson transmitted to Congress a letter and a draft of proposed legislation relating to the expansion and acceleration of the saline water conversion program.

Each Member of this body who had the privilege to serve with the President when he was our distinguished majority leader is well aware of his deep interest in our Nation's efforts to successfully and economically convert salt and brackish water into fresh water supplies. As President of the United States he has renewed his support for this tremendously important program. Under existing authority he has recommended to Congress $29 million for this program for the coming fiscal year, more than double the amount appropriated in 1965. The present authority under which the Department of the Interior operates its saline water conversion program was enacted in 1961, the Anderson-Aspinall Act. That was a $75 million authorization which will expire in 1967. The President's legislative proposal would increase by $200 million the present authority of the Department to carry out its efforts in desalting technology. It also would extend the time through 1972.

No resource is more precious to our people than an adequate supply of fresh, potable water. The economic well-being and growth of our Nation depend upon adequate supplies of usable water. Not only does this desalting program in which we are now engaged offer great opportunities for our own people in the water-short areas of this Nation, but, as the President points out in his letter, there are untold opportunities for promoting the betterment of mankind throughout the world if a successful breakthrough can be accomplished.

It is true that this will be an expensive and costly program. It is also true that our Nation cannot long survive unless new sources of water supply are found and utilized to meet the growing needs of our people. The saline water conversion program is in a relative infant stage. Much progress has been made in the past dozen years or so of its existence, but we recognize that much more needs to be learned in basic research and technology.

It reminds me of an analogy that might be drawn if we examined the progress that had been made in space travel 12 years after the Wright brothers had flown their first airplane. Fortunately for our Nation we did not stop our progress in that scientific and engineering field, but instead we have progressed to the point where last week our astronauts reflected great honor upon our scientists and our Nation by their accomplishments.

We hope to make a comparable achievement in water resources. The President stated in his letter to Congress:

> The seas around us offer an inexhaustible reservoir to help meet this need.

I am confident that the Congress will rise to the challenge that the President has presented to us in this important and timely message.

The bill submitted by the President to extend and expand the program is identical to S. 24, a bill introduced by Senator ANDERSON and others, now pending before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. I would like to announce that hearings will be held by our committee on S. 24 and other aspects of the program on April 29 and 30. All those who are interested in expressing their views on the saline water conversion program will have an opportunity to do so. The committee is interested in hearing from the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Office of Saline Water on the status of Interior's program, including accomplishments made thus far and plans for the future. In addition, we intend to have officials from the Atomic Energy Commission present to testify who will bring the committee up to date on plans relating to the use of atomic energy for desalting. We also cordially invite individuals from private industry, universities, or other interested groups and organizations who may wish to present their views to the committee on this program. It is my intent that these hearings will provide a forum for our committee and the Senate to be brought up to date fully on the state of progress of the desalination program. I invite each Member of the Senate to attend and participate to the extent he may desire.

At this point in the RECORD, I ask unanimous consent that the letter from the President to the President of the Senate be included in full, together with the draft of the legislation he has recommended, the language of which is contained in Senate bill 24.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, March 29, 1965.

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Past generations of Americans have been blessed with an abundance of sparkling, clean water. But in recent years we have become careless in our stewardship of this vital resource—polluting, wasting, and carelessly exploiting it.

Water shortages—real as well as prospective—already plague some regions of our land. Other areas and communities will soon be threatened. Yet, we must have an abundance of fresh water if we are to continue to grow and prosper.

Action to conserve what nature has so generously provided has often been inadequate and too late. We are determined not to make this mistake again. I have already pledged full support for cleaning up our rivers—and keeping them clean. We will continue to foster conservation by planning for the wisest possible use of all existing water supplies and by curbing and eliminating wasteful and uneconomic uses of water.

But these steps are not enough. New sources of supply at competitive costs are also required if we are to stay abreast of the ever-mounting demand for water. The seas around us offer an inexhaustible reservoir to help meet this need in coastal areas while vast quantities of brackish water are available to supplement the supplies of many inland areas. We must spare no effort in learning how to desalt these waters economically.

For the past 12 years the United States has been engaged in a program of research and development which has brought desalting technology to a point where it shows promise of economic application in the future. To stimulate the translation of this promise into reality, I requested the Department of the Interior last July to develop, in close collaboration with the Atomic Energy Commission, a proposed program which would significantly advance large-scale desalting technology.

The resulting report entitled "Program for Advancing Desalting Technology" was completely promptly and released to the public on October 26, 1964. It recommended—and I am transmitting with this letter draft legislation to accomplish—expansion, extension, and acceleration of the salt water conversion research and development activities now being conducted by the Department of the Interior under authority of the Anderson-Aspinall Act of 1961.

This legislative proposal would increase by $200 million the $75 million appropriation authorization provided in the 1961 act and extend through 1972 the time during which the authorized funds would be available to support this important program. Enactment of this legislation is vital if the Department of the Interior is to mount and lead the substantial sustained effort necessary to achieve truly economical desalting of sea and brackish waters.

In the meantime, I have already transmitted to the Congress a request for a supplemental appropriation of $3.9 million in 1965 to enable the Department, through a reorganized Office of Saline Water, to accelerate its research and development activities along the general lines outlined in the report mentioned above. Desalting activities will receive continuing emphasis in 1966. My budgetary recommendations to Congress for the coming fiscal year amount to $29 million for the Office of Saline Water, more than double the amount appropriated for 1965.

By pressing ahead with a vigorous program of economic desalting to meet our ever-growing domestic needs for water, we will at the same time provide the technology which can be shared with other nations. This technology could prove to be the key that will unlock the door to economic growth for many of these nations.

It would be difficult to exaggerate the power for good, the palliative effect on age-old animosities and problems that would result from providing an abundance of water in lands which, for countless generations, have known only shortage. To stimulate cooperation in the field with such great potential for the good of mankind, the United States will convoke a symposium of interested nations in October 1965 to exchange information on desalting technology.

In recommending this measure to the Congress, I wish to acknowledge the foresight of such able legislators as CLINTON ANDERSON, WAYNE ASPINALL, and the later Clair Engle. Our present efforts in desalting rest in substantial measure upon the sound foundation they laid and on which we intend to build. I earnestly hope that their leadership and the progress which it has inspired can be carried forward without interruption by the prompt enactment of the bill I am transmitting today.

Sincerely,

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

JOB CORPS CAMP IN THE OUACHITA NATIONAL FOREST, ARK.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last week Arkansas was privileged to be host to our distinguished Secretary of Agriculture on two occasions. Early in the week Secretary Freeman dedicated the new Job Corps camp in the Ouachita National Forest and made several other stops in Arkansas to view the progress which is being made in the development of many of our small towns and rural areas.

He again traveled to my State on Saturday to address the annual meeting of the Central Arkansas Milk Producers Association in Conway, Ark. His speech to the dairymen was an excellent review of the problems facing American agriculture, particularly as they challenge Arkansas dairymen. His remarks will be of interest to my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Freeman's address be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN BEFORE ANNUAL MEETING OF CENTRAL ARKANSAS MILK PRODUCERS ASSOCIATION, ARKANSAS STATE TEACHERS COLLEGE, CONWAY, ARK., SATURDAY, MARCH 27, 1965

I have spent nearly half of this week in the State of Arkansas.

When I reported that fact to Congressman MILLS, he simply replied this would be a better world if everyone could spend at least half his time in Arkansas.

In the light of my experience, I could not argue the point. I've had a happy time. I've been with hospitable, well-informed articulate men and women and youngsters. I've been charmed by the natural beauty of of this State. But most of all I've been inspired by the spirit that prevails in Arkansas. In agriculture, in industry, in business, in recreation—in all the areas of opportunity development—the people of Arkansas are moving with a vigor, enthusiasm and purpose that provides a good working model for the whole of the society.

Yet, my own State loyalty demands that I at least try to make a deal with Congressman Mills on where folks spend their travel-time—like maybe half in Arkansas and half in Minnesota. And perhaps I can claim another vote for this proposition from Ann Landers, who shares with me a Minnesota background.

Both States have very special qualities. And they also have much in common—fine citizens, good dairy farmers, progressive cooperatives and attractive scenery.

I am grateful for the opportunity to have a little part in this annual meeting of the Central Arkansas Milk Producers Association, and particularly pleased to share in a homecoming visit of your Congressman. This does not mean I do not see him, or hear from him, in Washington. Wilbur Mills has a very deep, and continuing dedication to the welfare of Arkansas agriculture—and I can assure you he regularly communicates this interest and concern to the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Yet, you all know—just as I know—that Wilbur Mills is a nationally recognized congressional leader. And, as a nonresident of his district, I want to thank you in behalf of men and women throughout the Nation who appreciate quality in government for sharing him with us.

A little more than 4 years ago, when I became Secretary of Agriculture, I believed the primary responsibility of the Department of Agriculture was to help farm families exercise more muscle in the markets where their products are sold. And I recognized then—as now—that farmer owned and operated cooperatives could play an increasingly effective role in that area.

Cooperatives were in operation, of course, long before any of us was born. But by reconstituting the Cooperative Advisory Committee and other actions, I hoped to achieve a higher degree of mutually helpful communication between co-ops and Government and better implement the legislative mandates of the Congress affecting cooperatives, in the light of modern problems and potentials.

I believe significant progress has been made in these areas. And I can assure you my confidence in the continuing contributions of cooperatives to the advancement of agriculture's well-being is strengthened by the growth and effectiveness of the cooperative movement in Arkansas.

I have been made familiar with the history, the present activities, and the goals of the Arkansas cooperative movement through association with such leaders as David Parr and Harry Oswald. I want the members they represent to know what a great privilege it is for a Secretary of Agriculture to work with two men who are so fully dedicated to the organizations they represent, and at the same time so understanding of the interests and problems and objectives of other groups in their own and other States. Wherever they represent you, you are represented with distinction.

American agriculture, by and large, is made up of commodity interest areas. The majority of the farmers here at this annual meeting are, naturally, farmers who earn all or most of their incomes through dairying.

Yet, just as no man is an island, neither is any segment of agriculture. Each is a part of the whole—and they sink and swim together.

In his recent farm message to the Congress and our people, President Johnson said: "Farm policy is not something separate. It is part of an overall effort to serve our national interest, at home and around the world."

By the same token, a successful dairy policy cannot be something separate. It must be a part of an overall effort to serve wheat and feed grains and cotton and rice and tobacco farmers, and all the others who may need cooperative action by Government in the areas of price support and supply management.

In that light, let's take a look at the farming and food situation that exists today.

No segment of the productive part of our society can match the record made by the families living on our free enterprise, commercial family farms. All around the world, their achievement in creating an era of food abundance is considered miraculous.

American consumers buy more of a greater variety of quality foods, at less cost in terms of take-home pay, than any other food buyers anywhere else in the world. For example, an American industrial worker—using 1 hour's pay—can buy a good, normal meal for four persons. In Germany and England it takes 2 hours work to buy the same meal; in Austria, 4 hours; in France, 4½ hours; in Italy, more than 5 hours.

If the rise in the cost of food in recent years had been as great as the rise of other things, the American housewife would be spending $1.17 for the food she now gets for a dollar.

The biggest beneficiary of the utilization of technological advances by farmers, and their increased investments of skills and work, is the consumer. If American farmers operated their farms today the way they did just before World War I, food would cost our consumers $17 billion more a year—about $300 per family.

In addition to providing all the foods our consumers want to buy, and maintaining adequate reserves, our farms produce enough more to make healthful diets available to those who cannot pay at all or can meet only part of the cost. These consumers, through school lunch and school milk and food stamp and direct distribution programs, receive around $750 million worth of food each year.

And there's still another chapter to this story of food abundance. Our farms produce so well we can bring $4.5 billion back into our economy from overseas through export sales. And we can use an additional $1.7 billion worth of food a year as an instrument of our Nation's foreign policy through food for peace.

All Americans know a better life because of this tremendous achievement in production of food and fiber.

But that's not all farm families contribute to the general welfare. They are good customers for the products and services that provide incomes for families of cities and towns. They spend over $29 billion a year on goods and services related to agricultural production. Farming uses more petroleum than any other industry. Farmers take 6 percent of all the rubber consumed in the United States each year, and use 5 million tons of steel a year—a third as much as the automotive industry. They consume about 4 percent of the Nation's electric power—which, incidentally, they managed to obtain by their own efforts through such achievements as creating organizations like those included in the Arkansas State Electric Cooperative. In addition to the $29 billion they spend on goods and services related to farming, our farm families spend another $12 billion a year on family living—for food, clothes, cars, furniture, medicine, and household appliances.

Farming employs 6.1 million workers, and 3 out of every 10 jobs in other employment are related to agriculture. Approximately 10 million Americans have jobs storing, transporting, processing, and merchandising products of agriculture. Manufacturers of food and related products alone employ nearly 2 million workers.

There's a close tie between what farmers earn and spend and nonfarm employment. The $4.9 billion increase in gross farm income in the 4-year period since 1960 generated approximately 300,000 additional jobs in places ranging from rural trading centers to major industrial areas.

Now, let's look at the other side of the coin. In return for their vital contributions to the general well-being of the people of our Nation, what do farm families experience in the way of rewards?

Fewer than 400,000 farmers are earning a wage comparable to that of a skilled industrial worker ($2.46 an hour) and as much as a 5 percent return on investment. Between 2 and 3 million farmers are shy of a 5 percent investment return while failing to earn as much as the minimum national wage of $1.25 an hour.

Those statistics prevail in the face of the fact that in each of the last four years total net farm income has been running about a billion dollars higher than in 1960, and realized net income per farm in Arkansas last year was 7 percent better than in 1963.

Our farmers simply have not achieved parity of income opportunity with other areas of a national economy that will—next May 1—achieve a new longevity record for peacetime growth. The per capita disposable personal income of the farm population in 1964 remained at about three-fifths of the average disposable personal income per capita of the nonfarm population.

That's not just bad for farm people. It is bad for the Nation, socially as well as economically. It is not in keeping with the free-enterprise tradition of balance between contribution and reward.

There are four words, designed to give comfort, that I could never find comfort in: "Things could be worse."

So it isn't with the aim of giving comfort, but to emphasize a fact determined by economists in and out of Government, that I use those words.

Without farmer-Government cooperation in the commodity programs we now have—programs designed to support farm income—the more than $12 billion net return farmers earned last year would have been cut at least in half. We would have seen the end of the free-enterprise commercial family farm system. And we would have seen the total economic growth not moving toward a new record, but stymied by a sharp recession—if not an all-out depression.

This Nation simply cannot afford failure to provide free-enterprise, commercial family farms with opportunity to bring the families which operate them parity of income with the rest of the society.

In the weeks ahead we shall, through the Congress, be determining the food and farming policies that will decide the income opportunities on adequate, commercial family farms through the remainder of the sixties.

Sound, positive, progressive policy must have its roots in commodity programs that provide price supports for producers and make possible a reasonable balance between supply and demand in the marketplaces.

But these programs, and the purpose of them, are constantly under attack. It is charged they are no longer necessary, or are too expensive, or are helping the wrong farmers, or are relief efforts no longer necessary, or are a combination of all these.

I am not a defender of the status quo in commodity programs. We must constantly strive to improve and strengthen them. The mechanics of their operation must be adjusted whenever new needs, new opportunities, develop.

But I urge you to join me in making clear to all our fellow nonfarm Americans in Arkansas and throughout the Nation—who have the power to out-vote us in decision-making—these facts about farm price support programs:

1. They are essential to all Americans—to every area of the society—because all our people realize substantial benefits from efficient commercial family farms.

2. If we abandon the principles of supply management and price support now, we shall sound the death knell of the family farm and bring an end to the era of abundance as we now know it.

3. While the goal of reducing the cost of commodity programs is a sound objective, one that can and must be achieved, we must constantly measure gains in Government savings against possible economic losses and social setbacks to the whole of the society. Efforts to cut costs must not diminish the opportunity for many thousands of farm families to achieve parity of income.

4. Commodity programs are not welfare programs—not a dole—but an investment in good management of national resources.

5. Our commodity programs have in the main been working effectively. Designed to improve earning opportunities for family farmers, they've helped add around a billion dollars a year more to net farm income than was being realized in 1960. Designed to bring supplies into better balance with demand and move surpluses into consumption, they have brought big reductions in the excessive supplies of wheat and feed grains that existed in 1960. Designed to provide consumers with an abundance of food at fair prices, they've been doing just that.

Let me say a direct word about dairying, which is of special concern to the members of this great cooperative.

The proposals for farm and food legislation which will be sent to the Congress soon do not—as matters now stand—include a specific program for the dairy industry.

This does not imply a lack of appreciation for the great contributions dairy farmers make to the physical health of the Nation, to the farm economy and the total economy, and to food exports for dollars and the food-for-peace program.

Neither does it imply a lack of concern for the very real disparity in income opportunity that afflicts the dairy farmers of this and other States.

No farmers have a better record in productive efficiency than dairy farmers. In the past 10 years the number of milk cows on farms has dropped from 21 to 16 million. Over the same period, however, milk production increased from 123 to over 126 billion pounds. While the number of milk cows was going down 25 percent, the volume of production moved upward by 3 percent. The drop in cow numbers continued into 1964, when milk production was rising to a new record of 126.6 billion pounds. Experts of dairy products also hit a new high last year, and stocks held by the Government as a result of price support purchases were substantially reduced.

But—and I say this in candor, not in criticism—we have not so far had in the dairy industry sufficient basic agreement to provide a reasonable promise of legislative success for any program that has been developed.

The leaders of this association are working hard to develop a working consensus among dairymen. They recently conferred with me in Washington, D.C. I want to reassure them, and you, the Department of Agriculture is anxious to help in every way possible to develop a sound legislative approach.

Meanwhile, the dairy price support program we now have—which, I should point out, contains just as many if not more benefits for consumers as it holds for producers—will be operated just as effectively as we know how.

We shall continue to seek, through legislation and through Government-industry efforts, expanded use of American dairy products overseas.

But I am confident you share my belief that the future of the dairy industry, in legislation and in growth, is closely tied to the food and farm policy determined during the present session of the Congress.

Unless we can maintain the principle of Government-farmer cooperation in price support programs geared to accomplish parity of income, the future is dim for all commodities—and all farmers.

I am not pessimistic.

Farm families are a distinct minority of our total population—but the history of this democracy proves you don't need the most votes to achieve justice and fair play if you have the right reasons for them, and make the reasons known.

If we give the majority the truth, it will make the commercial family farmers of this Nation free to achieve parity in income opportunity.

NEGRO REGISTRATION IN NEWTON COUNTY, ARK.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, those of us in the Congress who are getting on in years view with envy the zeal of some of our young colleagues in the pursuit of right and justice. Some of us, I suppose, have come to feel that some small sins of society must be forgiven and overlooked as being inherent in the fallible nature of man. We have come to compromise principle where the consequences are slight even though the principle is important. But occasionally we are called to account by some of our younger colleagues who stand up for the right no matter what the price.

Now, Mr. President, no less a young crusader than Congressman JOHN V. LINDSAY, of New York, rumored to be presidential timber, has caused me to recognize the importance of principle at all costs, and no less a newspaper than the New York Times has backed him up. In a poignant and moving editorial in yesterday's edition, the Times, bristling with righteousness, commended Congressman LINDSAY for his ardent efforts to broaden the voting rights bill now before the House Judiciary Committee, to cover States which now lie beyond its limits. The need for a broader, more comprehensive, more effective bill was fully documented as the Times cited Mr. LINDSAY, an unimpeachable source, on the discrimination that has permeated the registration process in my own State of Arkansas. Who can question the need for broader legislation when such oracles as Mr. LINDSAY and the New York Times note:

> In Newton County, Ark., for example, 78 percent of the whites are registered and not one Negro.

Who, I say, Mr. President, would dare to oppose broader legislation in the face of these shocking statistics?

It is laudable that it matters not to the Times and Mr. LINDSAY that no more than two nonwhites of voting age reside in Newton County out of a total nonwhite population of eight and that there is some question even in the collective mind of the Census Bureau as to whether either of them is a Negro. Many among us would lay the failure of these two poor disenfranchised souls to register to apathy or accident, but not such stalwarts of justice as the Times and Mr. LINDSAY who know discrimination when they see it and who hold firmly to the conviction that it must be fought wherever it exists, even if only two lonely souls are beset by the slings and arrows of prejudice. Some of us might wonder how successful Federal registrars would be in signing up even 50 percent of the nonwhite population of voting age inasmuch as the hills and gullies of Newton County, which lie deep in the Ozark Mountains, have often shielded residents of the area from Federal officers who in the past have sought to aid the local populace in computing their excise tax liabilities. Even if the Federal officers whom the Times and Mr. LINDSAY would dispatch to the county should be totally successful in their mission, one might wonder what the impact would be on future elections there inasmuch as the total registration of the county would be increased from 2,680 to 2,682. It is true that in many counties in Arkansas, and Newton County is no exception, elections are sometimes close and perhaps these new voters would hold the balance of power. Who can foresee the totally new political climate which might come if the Times and Mr. LINDSAY are successful in their crusade to bring the right of the ballot to the oppressed and disenfranchised minority in Newton County?

As I have said, Mr. President, this example of adherence to principle is an inspiration to me, as I am sure it is to all Members of Congress and indeed to the country as a whole. Were it not for the sharp-eyed vigilance of the Times and Mr. LINDSAY, the country might have continued on its way oblivious to the cruel discrimination in Newton County so fully documented by the irrefutable statistics cited by the Times and Mr. LINDSAY.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD at this point, although I fear the national reaction will be so strong that indignant citizens from across the country, and particularly from Manhattan, will rise up as one to demand the enactment of whatever legislation the Times and Mr. LINDSAY feel must be passed to eradicate once and for all this insidious evil in Newton County, Ark., and provide liberty and justice for all.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 31, 1965]

GUARANTEEING THE VOTE

The voting rights bill now before Congress is, in its essentials, admirably drawn. In those six Southern States where discrimination has been severe, the bill provides standards for Federal intervention that are clear and that go into effect automatically. Moreover, the bill is comprehensive, covering local and State as well as Federal elections.

However, friends of the bill such as Representative JOHN V. LINDSAY, of Manhattan, have pointed out that the proposed law would fail to correct discrimination in many counties in Tennessee, Florida, Texas, and Arkansas because those States do not impose a literacy test. In Newton County, Ark., for example, 78 percent of the whites are registered and not one Negro. In several Florida counties, fewer than 5 percent of the Negroes are registered.

Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach concedes that the bill would not eliminate all discrimination, but argues that the Justice Department can clean out these pockets of injustice through the court suits provided for in previous legislation. It would be more straightforward to revise the present bill along the lines of the proposal offered by Senators Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois, and Clifford Case, of New Jersey.

Such an amendment would provide for Federal registrars in those counties where fewer than 25 percent of Negroes of voting age were registered. If the deprivation of voting rights is severe enough in Georgia and Alabama to justify the prompt passage of this emergency bill—and it certainly is—then comparable deprivations in neighboring States should also be remedied at the same time and by similar procedures.

THE BALANCE OF PAYMENTS AND PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S PROGRAM

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the Subcommittee on International Finance of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency is conducting hearings on the balance-of-payments problem. One of the principal questions raised in connection with these hearings is the effectiveness of President Johnson's voluntary program to curb the outflow of American dollars. European financial experts have been openly skeptical, as have been some of our own economists, bankers, and businessmen.

A report by Bernard D. Nossiter in the March 31 Washington Post indicates that the President's program is having an effect and that the Europeans are recognizing that fact.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Mr. Nossiter, "Europe Admits Effect of U.S. Payments Plan" be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

EUROPE ADMITS EFFECT OF U.S. PAYMENTS PLAN

(By Bernard D. Nossiter)

Paris, March 30.—European financial officials ate some crow here today.

They told Frederick Deming, U.S. Under Secretary of the Treasury, that they had misjudged the power of President Johnson's appeal to curb the outflow of dollars.

One financial aid put it this way: "I was skeptical, but now much of my skepticism has been dissipated."

Deming listened to all this with evident delight. Just 6 weeks ago, these same officials had told him that the administration's appeal for voluntary restraint on foreign lending and investing wasn't likely to work.

The forum for both gatherings was a meeting of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development. This body brings together leading officials from central banks and finance ministries nearly every month to discuss balance-of-payments problems.

In fact, Washington's appeal to banks and corporations to hold back their oversea investment has worked so well that dollars have started to flow back from Europe.

This has led some authorities here to wonder whether they might not run into a dollar shortage by the end of the year. But that prospect was not mentioned at today's meeting.

Another significant feature of the gathering was the change in tone toward American interest rates. It has become an article of European faith that the United States won't solve its payments problem without tighter money.

Today, however, the Europeans did not push this line so hard. According to one source, they even acknowledged that Washington's monetary policy was not as loose as they had intimated in the past.

All this is setting the stage for an expected American initiative on the international monetary front. The United States has not yet put forward its own plan to revamp the world money system. But there were clear hints today that such a plan would be forthcoming when the American payments are clearly nearing balance. That could happen toward the end of the year.

The officials discussed the British position in only a cursory manner. Continental money men are waiting to see what the British budget, due next week, looks like before committing themselves to further aid for the pound.

The money men also agreed to make still another study. This one will examine how leading nations meet their balance-of-payments problems.

WATER QUALITY STANDARDS AND S. 4

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, on January 28, 1965, the Senate passed S. 4, the Water Quality Act of 1965. The House committee has now reported its version of S. 4, which does not contain the section pertaining to water quality standards. This provision was approved by the Senate in two votes in 1963 on S. 649 and three votes on S. 4, this year. The members of the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution consider this provision central to any effective legislation this year.

On March 8, 1965, Richard H. Stroud, executive vice president of the Sports Fishing Institute, delivered a paper to the American Society of Civil Engineers Water Resource Engineering Conference at Mobile, Ala., titled, "What Is Pollution—to a Conservationist?" I commend his remarks by my colleagues, particularly as his comments relate to water quality standards. I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Stroud's remarks be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

WHAT IS POLLUTION—TO A CONSERVATIONIST?

(Richard H. Stroud)

Most conservationists, whether so by vocation or by avocation, would consider the question, "What is pollution?" as being at least academic, if not actually facetious. It happens that my views may differ somewhat from those of a few of my colleagues in conservation, both as to the academic nature and the facetiousness of that simple query.

To provide a frame of reference, I shall answer the question as follows: Water pollution is the specific impairment of water quality by domestic, industrial, or agricultural wastes (including thermal and atomic wastes) to a degree which has an adverse effect on beneficial use of water, yet which does not necessarily create an actual hazard to the public health. Under this definition, contamination is merely an aggravated impairment of water quality by those wastes to a degree which creates an actual hazard to the public health through poisoning or the spread of disease.

Surface water limited: For many years, as a nation, we have heard repeated over and over the refrain of the professional educators that children are America's most precious natural resource. The truth of the matter is that we can have neither children nor anything else unless we have water—plenty of clean, potable water—the essential material for nourishment of life's processes.

It is well known to most folk that rainfall averages 30 inches over most of our country, especially the "southern 48." I'm confident it is equally well known to sanitary engineers, if not to the general public, that only 27 percent of the total precipitation runs off the surface via streams to our adjacent seas. Too, one-fourth of the total streamflow is diverted to human use, nearly one-third each is used for irrigation and for industrial purposes, while the remainder (about one-tenth) is used for municipal or domestic purposes.

Although only about 2 percent of total annual precipitation sinks into the ground (leaving 71 percent lost to evapotranspiration), the underground fresh water supplies have been estimated to amount to about 10 times the volume of the average annual precipitation. This moves through the ground so slowly that it is estimated not to reenter the solar distillation cycle in less than 300 years. Very little is known about how water moves through the ground and in what way and how long it takes to recharge depleted aquifers. Neither is much known about pollution of underground supplies though this is receiving current attention in view of needs for practical means of disposing of high-level radiation wastes.

Focus for outdoor recreation: For all beneficial uses, including needed outdoor recreation, the United States south of Alaska depends chiefly upon its 73 million acres of surface fresh waters. These include 6 million acres of free-flowing rivers plus 10 million acres of river impoundments (1.5 million river-miles, collectively), and 9 million acres of natural lakes and ponds plus 36 million acres of the Great Lakes (U.S. jurisdiction). Alaska, alone, adds over 12 million more acres of lakes, streams, and reservoirs. In addition, the United States is bordered (out to the 3-mile limit) by about 27 million acres of coastal salt waters (including Alaska's 2 million). Thus, about 100 million acres of water have outdoor recreational significance and are of major concern to conservationists.

This supply of surface water is the focus for many kinds of outdoor recreation, vitally important to millions of Americans, which is therefore one of the major beneficial uses of water. This has been recognized from time to time in recent years by various State public health commissioners as well as by the U.S. Surgeon General.[1] Such growing official recognition reflects a hard fact reported in 1962 by the Presidentially appointed Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, from findings of its monumental studies, that "44 percent of the population prefer water-based recreation over any others." The Commission also concluded (not surprising) that much land-based recreation, such as camping, picnicking, and hiking, is oriented toward or around water areas.[2]

The major waterborne recreational activities include swimming, fishing, and boating. To the surprise of no one, the incidence of participation was found by the ORRRC to differ decidedly for each activity. Much to the surprise of a great many social planners and political scientists, however, swimmers made up 45 percent of the population, anglers constituted 38 percent of the population, while boaters accounted for 28 percent. That a high degree of duplication of people is involved among these activities goes without saying (for example, about half of all fishing is done from boats and about 80 percent of all boat use is for fishing, but this fails to lessen their impact upon official thinking. Much unsatisfied demand remains in the population for these same activities in spite of the high degree of active participation. For example, ORRRC found that 8 percent more of the population (who do not now participate) would like to take up sport fishing, given the opportunity. Moreover, about one-third of current anglers (13 percent of the total population) would like to fish more often than they do now.

---

[1] "The Surgeon General's Report to the House Committee on Appropriations, PHS, HEW, January 1960," Report on Environmental Health Problems, 86th Cong., 2d sess., p. 11, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1960.

[2] "Outdoor Recreation for America," by Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, U.S. GPO Catalog No. 43, Ou 8: 2R24, January 1962, 245 pages.

Pollution diminishes recreation supply: Unfortunately, among others, water pollution is a major factor deterring the aspirations of up to 21 percent of Americans wanting to participate more often in recreational fishing (13 percent) or to take it up as a preferred new activity (8 percent). In this context, results of an ORRRC special survey[3] of State conservation agencies to evaluate the role of water pollution takes on added significance. Survey findings revealed that abatement of water pollution ranks among the four leading factors considered necessary in 42 States for significant improvement in suitability of fish habitat for the betterment of sport fishing. In 21 States it ranks either as the first or second most important factor. In 10 of these States it is considered the most important single means of expanding fishing opportunity.

That it actually is this significant finds further support in the continuing, widespread, and extensive fish kills that occur annually, only a fraction of which are probably reflected in the USPHS reports on "pollution-caused fish kills." I'm confident that an efficient nationwide monitoring system would show that such kills collectively involve some hundreds of millions of fish instead of the few million that are reported. Nevertheless, the fish-kill reports, highly significant as they are, may be taken as symptomatic of the much larger problem.

If any further comment is needed, to make my point that water pollution substantially diminishes the supply of recreation, I can cite results of a survey made several years ago of the membership of the Izaak Walton League of America. That survey revealed that the amount of fishing by league members would be doubled if the polluted fishing waters were cleaned up.

Water pollution is national disgrace: At this point, I believe it may be appropriate to rephrase my opening definition of water pollution. In the simplest terms, then, it might be said that water is polluted when there is anything in it that keeps people from drinking it, swimming in it, fishing in it, boating on it, or using it, as is, for industrial processes. In any event, water pollution has received bipartisan accolade, from two recent U.S. Presidents, as "A national disgrace." More than that, I believe that it is one of the gravest challenges facing our Nation today.

Water pollution has hit us with rocketing acceleration. In 1945, the national daily water use was 160 billion gallons per day. After a little less than two decades (in 1963), that use has more than doubled to 355 billion gallons per day. After less than two decades more (in 1980), use is expected to nearly redouble to 600 billion gallons per day. By another two decades hence (at century's end), it may nearly double again to 1,000 billion (1 trillion) gallons per day.

Unfortunately, available water amounts to only 650 billion gallons of water per day, and that's very unevenly distributed. Therefore, available supplies of water must be used over and over and over again—we may well find it necessary to reuse it as much as six or more times by 1980. It is quite imperative, therefore, that we clean up what we have, to make this repeated reuse possible. If we are to meet projected needs, we doubtless must learn to desalinize coastal waters in large volume both cheaply and efficiently, just as we must also learn to manage surplus runoff from high-altitude forested watersheds for piping to low-altitude cities.

Pollution abatement methods obsolete: A big clean-up program is finally underway, although it is still far short of needs. The Federal Water Pollution Control Act passed in 1956 and amended in 1961 started the ball rolling with a powerful one-two punch: (1) Sewage treatment plant construction grants to municipalities, and (2) real threat of court action. I will omit any recital of details of developments under the act on the premise that the record is clear. I'll merely note in passing that conservationists are already pushing in this session of Congress for a further redoubling of the construction grants to the level of $200 million annually. To a great extent, we continue to fight an essentially rear-guard type of action against an ever more massive war of resource attrition. In my opinion, though badly needed on an intensified scale, municipal sewage treatment plants are not the cure-all that some of my colleagues in conservation blissfully assume. For one thing, organic wastes from industrial sources are estimated to double the volume of such wastes from cities. For another, even the most advanced sewage treatment processes remove only 90 percent of organic waste materials.

Even if universally achieved, this level of treatment would still leave 10 percent of the organic matter untouched, not to mention an increasing multitude of other unaffected pollutants. The 10 percent unremoved organics is the equivalent of the raw sewage of 10,000 people out of a population of 100,000. This residue added to the enriching nutrients resulting from the wastes of the other 90,000 would continue to produce nuisance algae and extensive fish kills. Chicago is an example of a city using the most modern treatment. Chicago, nevertheless, is said to be discharging effluent into the Illinois River that is the equivalent of the raw sewage from a million people daily.

Our waste-treatment processes are simply out of date. They cannot remove the complex wastes resulting from manufacture of such substances as plastics, detergents, synthetic fibers, pesticides, and medicines. Some synthetic chemical wastes cause objectionable tastes and odors. A large number are highly toxic to fish and other aquatic life. Many do not respond to biological treatment and persist in streams for great distances.

Many conservationists are convinced, in this connection, that greatly accelerated research in aquatic biology will yield substantial future progress in water renovation technology. What is needed, and is occurring belatedly but slowly, is a recognition that no single discipline holds the key to solution of the complex and difficult water pollution abatement problem. I submit, with increasing concurrence by my conservation colleagues, that pollution abatement is largely a problem in applied ecology. Physicochemical methods of water renovation have proven their worth, but the equally great importance that living organisms have to play in the process remains poorly appreciated by comparison. Problems of harvesting and using algae as well as the dissolved substances, and of disposal of materials removed in the renovation process, represent a few that may be expected to yield to this approach.

Sensitive aquatic organisms need protection: It has long been my contention, now gaining increasingly strong and widespread support in conservation circles, that one of the most pressing requirements for positive pollution abatement is the watershed-by-watershed development of standards of water quality criteria for protection from pollution of the most sensitive species of aquatic organisms. Fish conservation interests were directly responsible, indeed, for organization of the expanding program of research in this field now being staffed within the USPHS.

According to Dr. Clarence M. Tarzwell,[4] chief architect of the program within the water supply and water pollution control division of the USPHS, the prime objective of aquatic biologists in setting up water quality standards is "to assure the survival, growth, reproduction, and general well-being of aquatic organisms * * * based on a thorough knowledge of the environmental requirements of those organisms which we seek to protect * * * such as desirable levels of DO, pH, CO_2, temperature, alkalinity, and hardness. In addition, the concentrations of wastes and other potential toxicants which are not harmful to aquatic life under conditions of continuous exposure must also be determined. In doing this, the requirements of the most sensitive species and the most sensitive stages in their life history must be considered. Obviously, it avails nothing to protect the adults if reproduction is prevented."

Knowledgeable conservationists are not interested in levels at which aquatic life can merely survive. They cannot deal in terms of average conditions because average conditions are very poor measures of the suitability of an environment and they can be very misleading. For any form of life, it is the extremes of the environmental conditions which are controlling. In this connection, we must not overlook the growing significance of thermal pollution. For example, even though temperatures in a stream may be lethal for trout for only 2 hours on only 1 day of the year, that stream ceases to be a trout stream. Standards for water quality criteria must, therefore, protect against the extremes and assure that environmental conditions are favorable for the most sensitive organisms in the biota we seek to protect.

Standards would provide needed clean-water goals. Such an approach is not to be confused with the old stream classification system, which in effect condemned certain streams—indeed, whole watersheds—to the role of permanent cesspools for receipt and transport elsewhere of municipal and industrial wastes. That system not only gave license to pollute, thereby serving to downgrade all water quality, it brought us to the brink of national disaster. On the contrary, with proper application on a watershed-by-watershed basis, an aggressive program to develop and refine water quality standards will provide an effective tool for keeping water resources in a condition to meet the needs of all the beneficial uses of water. For the first time, through provision of specific goals of cleanliness, it will give meaning and substance to the hitherto nebulous philosophy of keeping water as clean as possible. For practical purposes, it defines what "possible" is. For the first time, too, we shall have a firm basis for legal action. It would be necessary to show only that a polluter violated the standards—not that he killed fish, as at present. It appears, as things stand now, that legal actions rest otherwise on a sort of negotiated definition of pollution that is compromised case by case. This appears to accomplish little of lasting value while requiring tremendous expenditures of time and money. The trouble with this approach is that decisions are based on opinions that can be successfully challenged by smart lawyers, rather than being based on a clear body of scientific facts that will withstand courtroom grilling.

---

[3] "Sport Fishing—Today and Tomorrow," by W. King, J. Hemphill, A. Swartz, and K. Stutzman, ORRRC Study Report 7, U.S. GPO, 1962, 127 pages.

[4] "Aquatic Life Needs Protection," Chem. Eng. Prog., vol. 59, No. 11, November 1963, pp. 27–28.

Unfortunately, all information essential for attaining these objectives is not now at hand. Although there is a large amount of knowledge regarding the environmental requirements of certain aquatic forms, a great deal more such knowledge is needed. This will require long-term research. Since new wastes are continually appearing, since there is a great backlog of work to be done, and since there are many thousands of species of aquatic organisms to be considered in many hundreds of watersheds, work of this nature will scarcely ever be completed.

Responsible conservationists have emphasized repeatedly, however, that we cannot and need not wait until all the answers are in hand before tentative water quality standards become established for the protection of aquatic life. Conservationists urge that we use the knowledge and experience that is presently available, so that much aquatic life which would otherwise be lost can be protected and saved now. Standards for water quality criteria should be set up now with the idea that they are tentative and that they will be modified, strengthened, or confirmed by findings of future research. Too, as I see it, we must have such standards in order to establish the objectives of advanced waste treatment.

In sum: Conservationists are generally confident that water pollution is a manageable problem, provided that: (1) Sufficient funds are invested in municipal and industrial water treatment (perhaps as in some European countries, a tax should be placed on industrial wastes, with proceeds dedicated to pollution abatement); (2) substantial research is undertaken to develop methods of advanced waste treatment (presently unavailable), to develop improved standards for water quality criteria to protect delicate aquatic life (thus defining water quality goals for industry and making true multiple use of water possible), and to develop improved techniques for detecting and measuring the presence in trace amounts of exotic chemicals (as was done in the case of endrin in the lower Mississippi fish kills case); and (3) the administration of water pollution control is reorganized under a new Federal Water Pollution Control Administration and a new Assistant Secretary in the Health, Education, and Welfare Department. An alternative might be to transfer it to such a new setup in the Interior Department.

AGING LAKES AND OUR WATER POLLUTION PROBLEMS

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, the problems of water pollution control and abatement have been known for many years on our major rivers. Today, however, we are learning that pollution is affecting our lakes, creating mammoth problems which are far more difficult than those we have encountered on rivers and streams.

On Tuesday, March 30, the Washington Post carried an excellent article by Jean M. White, entitled "Five States Show Worry Over Aging Lake Erie," describing the impact of pollution on Lake Erie and the relationship of that situation to our water pollution control and abatement problem. This is one of the problems the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution will study later this year. It is one of the circumstances which has strengthened our resolve to press for enactment of effective water pollution control legislation this year. I ask unanimous consent that the article by Jean M. White, "Five States Show Worry over Aging Lake Erie" be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Five States Show Worry Over Aging Lake Erie

(By Jean M. White)

Lake Erie is slowly dying of old age.

This is deeply worrying water supply and pollution experts, bathers, fishermen, and lake-shore property owners.

A lake gets older as it gets richer. Both are bad, at least for lakes.

Enrichment of a lake leads to biological excesses that defile the clear, clean waters. Manmade pollution, loaded with the fertilizing nutrients of nitrogen and phosphorus, is dangerously speeding up the natural aging cycle in many of the Nation's lakes.

One of the visible signs of an aging lake is an overgrowth of aquatic weeds and algae, leaving a green scum that turns clear blue water into split-pea soup. Odorous, slimy masses pile up on beaches and clog water treatment filters. Fish die. Insects breed. Unpleasant odors and tastes follow in the wake.

AGING FASTER THAN OTHERS

Lake Erie is aging faster than the other Great Lakes. But the others and many more lakes have shown signs of the degenerative disease of eutrophication (aging of water)—parts of Lake Michigan, Maine's Lake Sebasticook, Lake Washington, Connecticut's Lake Zoar, Oregon's Lake Klamath, and Wisconsin's Lakes Monona, Waubesa, and Kegona.

The premature aging of Lake Erie has been a major part of a still-uncompleted, 2½-year study by Public Health Service specialists.

GLIRB (Great Lakes-Illinois River Basin) is one of eight comprehensive studies of major water basins in the United States being made by the PHS.

Today, community leaders from five States in the Lake Erie basin will meet in Cleveland for a 3-day seminar on land and water use sponsored by the League of Women Voters Education Fund.

So far, the premature aging of Lake Erie has not had any significant effect on the water supply for man and industry.

AGING IS SUBTLE THREAT

But that is small comfort for the swimmer who finds beaches closed, the commercial fisherman whose business has disappeared with the walleyed pike, the cottage owner who finds stinking weeds turning his white paint to tattletale gray and the waterworks operator whose filters are fouled up.

When people talk about polluted waters, they are usually thinking of floating grapefruit rinds, domestic sewage and industrial wastes.

But pollution-accelerated lake aging is a subtler and more complex threat to clean water. In the end, it can be far more dangerous.

Even if man had never set foot on the shores of Lake Erie, the waters would have slowly aged. There are natural sources of enriching nutrients—rainfall, the atmosphere and duckways from which nutrients are "bombed in."

But man has thrown in his pollutants and speeded up the cycle with long-term consequences for generations ahead. In some places, there has been so much acceleration that the effects can be seen in a life span.

Pollutants can put more fertilization in a lake than goes on upland crops. This leads to overproduction of aquatic plants and algae. This, in turn, depletes the supply of dissolved oxygen—the most important single measurement of water quality. An adequate oxygen supply is needed for the best fish and for natural decomposition.

FISH CATCH DROPS

The President's call for a clean America and clean water has put emphasis on a new dimension in water pollution. The new tack goes beyond floating grapefruit rinds and disease prevention.

It takes a big view of water uses, including recreational demands for boating, swimming, skindiving, fishing and water skiing.

For Lake Erie's commercial fishermen, it is not so much a matter of recreation as one of economic survival. The commercial fish catch for Lake Erie has dropped from more than half of the Great Lakes total to less than the catch from Lake Michigan alone.

"Great harm has been and is being done to many waters, and nature's repair process is slow even after the underlying cause is partially or completely corrected," says Kenneth M. Mackenthun, a biologist on the staff of the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati.

But the outlook is not altogether pessimistic.

"It depends on what people want and how much they are willing to pay for it," says James B. Coulter, chief of water projects of the PHS's Division of Water Supply and Pollution Control.

STEPS NECESSARY

The first step, he points out, is to clean up the tributaries that are carrying nutrient-rich sewage and industrial wastes into the waters of the lake. This would slow down the aging acceleration, but that is about all.

The second step would be to maintain the water quality at present levels.

This would mean cutting down as much as possible on the nitrogen and phosphorous going into the water. Sewage treatment would have to be stepped up—at one-quarter to one-half over present costs—to remove nutrients. Studies have shown phosphorous is the principal culprit, Coulter said.

A repair job—perhaps lasting 10 years—would involve dredging out bottom sediment high in phosphates and isolating those wastes in land dumps. It would involve harvesting of crops of algae and aquatic growths. It would involve massive catches of the "rough" fish in the lake, whose bodies contain phosphorus.

It would cost money, but it can be done.

PARTICIPATION OF NEW HAMPSHIRE CLERGY IN THE NATIONAL CIVIL RIGHTS MOVEMENT

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, as a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, I have taken a great deal of pride at the active participation of members of the New Hampshire clergy in the national civil rights movement.

In particular, I have been very pleased with the courageous participation of representative members of the New Hampshire clergy in the recent march from Selma, Ala., to Montgomery.

It seems to me that these men have followed their unquestioned responsibilities as men of God, concerned with the treatment of their fellow man.

There were many issues at stake in Selma. Some of them, such as the right of American citizens to vote, are issues which are properly the concern of every American, and specifically the concern of the Congress. So it is with the issue of man's treatment of his fellow man. This, too, is an area of concern to all humanity, but it is more specifically an area of immediate concern to all our clergy.

Thus, as religious leaders from all America, from all sects and denominations, came to Alabama last month, they, too, were doing their duty in a way which I must commend. And it was truly with pride and appreciation that I learned that clergymen from New Hampshire were among them.

There are those today who say that the clergy had no place in Alabama. These people, whom I frankly suspect of no higher motive than the stirring up of mischief for their own personal gratification, have singled out members of the New Hampshire clergy in their attacks.

Mr. President, I know of no more unfounded attacks than these. They would have the clergy take the stand of Cain, who claimed that he was not his brother's keeper. But the propriety, the correctness, the essential morality of the clergy in this context stands as its own defense. I can only add my own respect and support.

JOB CORPS CENTERS FOR WOMEN

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, one of the projects of the Government's war-on-poverty program is the establishment of Job Corps centers for women. The purpose of these residential centers is to provide young women between the ages 16 and 21, many of whom are school dropouts, with instruction in basic education, vocational training, home and family life, and citizenship responsibility.

Thus far, contracts totaling $8½ million have been awarded by the Office of Economic Opportunity for the establishment of the first three women's centers. Ultimately 25 centers will be set up to accommodate 6,500 young women.

The groups operating the centers will receive $530 a month to feed, house, and give instruction to each girl. The OEO will also give each young woman and her family an allowance of $105 a month. This adds up to $635 a month or $7,620 a year. In addition, the OEO will pay transportation costs estimated at $75 to $100 per girl.

It may be wondered why it costs the taxpayers almost $8,000 a year per young woman to operate these Government job centers when a girl can be sent to any one of the country's leading colleges for the academic year at a cost of less than one-half that amount and to a State institution of learning at a cost of less than one-fourth that amount.

In my opinion, the expenditure of nearly $8,000 a year to train a young woman in reading, writing, mathematics, how to manage money, and to become a capable mother and citizen is completely out of reason and beyond the realm of justification even by the most ingenious mind and the most extravagantly disposed person. I simply cannot understand it.

If the general program is good, the spending of $8,000 a year to train a dropout cannot be justified.

I find this newest expenditure of the taxpayers' money even more fantastic when consideration is given to the fact that at a cost of almost $32 billion in fiscal year 1964, the Federal Government is already involved in 42 individual programs designed to combat and overcome the causes of poverty. And for the same year an additional $35.9 billion was expended by State and local governments on social welfare activities, including education.

A further weakness in this program is that a volunteer may drop out anytime she wishes. The dropout rate of the manpower program for 1964 was about 33 percent, and authorities feel that this figure is a reliable estimate of the dropout rate for programs of this nature. To what good use have these Job Corps "dropouts" put the taxpayers' money?

In conclusion, Mr. President, I cannot emphasize too strongly my opposition to the establishment by the Federal Government of the women's Job Corps for the following reasons:

First. It is an outrageously expensive program.

Second. The Federal Government is already involved in 42 programs designed to combat poverty.

Third. It is another glaring example of the Federal Government usurping State and local authority and taking over their duties.

Fourth. There is no guarantee that volunteers will not drop out before completing the training program.

THE WAR IN VIETNAM

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, every day the crisis in Vietnam appears to grow worse. We are concerned about its acceleration. I have been supporting the program and the policy of the President on the ground that constitutionally he is responsible for the day-to-day conduct of our foreign affairs. I have great confidence in his wisdom, capacity, and understanding with respect to these complicated matters.

Nevertheless, there is another point of view, and I believe that point of view should be carefully considered.

Accordingly, I ask unanimous consent that two excellent recent columns written by Walter Lippmann, one published in the Washington Post of March 30, and the other in the Washington Post of April 1, be printed in chronological order at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 30, 1965]

TODAY AND TOMORROW—ON THE WAY TO THE BRINK

(By Walter Lippmann)

The war in Vietnam has reached the point where the President is wrestling with momentous and fateful decisions. For what has happened is that the official theory of the war, as propounded by Gen. Maxwell Taylor to President Kennedy and by Secretary McNamara to President Johnson, has proved to be unworkable. The government in Siagon has not been able to pacify South Vietnam even with the help of American munitions, money, and 25,000 military advisers. The crucial fact today is that for all practical purposes the Saigon government has lost control of the countryside, and its followers are increasingly holed up in the cities.

The roads and the railroads connecting the cities have been cut by the Vietcong. The cities now have to be supplied in great measure by air and by sea. This condition of affairs has been well reported by Mr. Richard Dudman in a series of reports to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and his findings are confirmed in all essentials, though not yet publicly, in the well-informed quarters in Washington.

The surest evidence that Mr. Dudman's reports are substantially correct is that in the Pentagon and the State Department there is mounting pressure for the commitment to southeast Asia of American infantry. The current estimate is that the President should be prepared to send 350,000 American soldiers, even though this would compel him to order a mobilization of Reservists and draftees.

This call for American ground forces is the logical and inevitable consequence of the virtual collapse of the Saigon government in the villages. Having lost the countryside, Saigon has lost the sources of military manpower. This deprives it of the means for winning the war. The official estimates today are that the Saigon government commands forces superior to the Vietcong by a ratio of not quite 5 to 1. Experience shows that no guerrilla war has ever been subdued with such a low ratio of superiority. It is estimated that in Malaya, the British and the Malayans, who were fighting the indigenous Chinese guerrillas, reached a superiority of 50 to 1. In Cyprus, which they gave up, the British had overwhelming force. In Algeria, though the French Army had unmistakable superiority, the country became untenable. It is the deficiency in South Vietnamese military manpower which explains why the pressure is now on to put in Americans to fill it.

After 2 months of bombing North Vietnam, it has become manifest also that the bombing has not changed the course of the war. As a result of this disappointment, the President is now under pressure to extend the bombing to the populated centers around Hanoi and Haiphong.

There is no doubt that American air power can devastate North Vietnam and, if China intervened, could do great damage in China. But if we had an American Army of 350,000 men in South Vietnam, and extended the war in the air, we would have on our hands an interminable war without the prospect of a solution. To talk about freedom and national independence amidst such violence and chaos would be to talk nonsense.

In order to rationalize, that is to sell, the wider war, we are being told by Secretary McNamara and others that this war is a decisive test for the future. It will decide the future of "wars of liberation." This is a profoundly and dangerously false notion, and it shows a lamentable lack of knowledge and understanding of the revolutionary upheavals of the epoch in which we live. It assumes that revolutionary uprisings against established authority are manufactured in Peiping or in Moscow, and that they would not happen if they were not instigated, supported, and directed from one of the capitals of communism. If this were true, the revolutionary movements could be suppressed once and for all by knocking out Peiping or Moscow. They little know the hydra who think that the hydra has only one head and that it can be cut off.

Experience shows that there is no single central source of the revolutionary upheavals of our epoch. What is there that is common to the Irish rebellion, to the Jewish uprising in Palestine, to the civil war in Cuba, to the

Arab rebellion in Algeria, to the Huk revolt in the Philippines? What is common to them all is violent discontent with the established order and a willingness of a minority of the discontented to die in the attempt to overthrow it.

What has confused many well-meaning Americans is that in some of these rebellions, though not by any means in all of them, Communists have become the leaders of the rebellion. But that does not mean that they have owned the rebellion. The resistance to the Nazis in France and Italy contained a high proportion of Communists among the active partisans. But 20 years later it is General de Gaulle who presides over France.

It would be well to abandon the half-baked notion that the war in southeast Asia will be decisive for the future of revolutionary upheavals in the world. Revolution is a homegrown product, and it could not be stamped out decisively and once for all—supposing we had such delusions of grandeur—by stamping out Red China. In southeast Asia we have entangled ourselves in one of the many upheavals against the old regime, and we shall not make things any better by thrashing around with ascending violence.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 1, 1965]

TODAY AND TOMORROW—THE BASIS OF NEGOTIATION

(By Walter Lippmann)

The cardinal defect of the administration's conduct of the war in Indochina has been pointed out by a Republican Senator John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky. In a statement last week (March 25), Senator Cooper said that the U.S. Government, like its adversaries in Peiping and Hanoi, is "prescribing conditions as a prerequisite to negotiations which will not be accepted." The Communinsts are making it a condition of a negotiation that the United States must withdraw from Vietnam; we are making it a condition of a negotiation that North Vietnam must withdraw from South Vietnam. This is, said Senator Cooper, "a kind of demand from both sides for unconditional surrender."

It is, therefore, highly important that the administration put itself in a position where negotiation is possible, granting that even if it did so, Hanoi and Peiping may gamble on winning the war in order to overrun South Vietnam and inflict a smashing defeat on the United States. But regardless of what they do, we must come into court with clean hands. The administration needs to clarify its own position—in order to set in motion a movement for negotiation and, failing that, to put the onus of prolonging and widening the war unmistakably on our adversaries.

There is a mistaken impression in this country that we are ready and willing to negotiate but that the other side is imposing intolerable conditions; namely, that we should withdraw our forces before the negotiation begins. Senator Cooper rejects the Communist condition, as do all of us who have been actively interested in this question. We cannot withdraw our forces until there has been a political settlement in Indochina, a settlement which promises to last because it serves the primary interests of all concerned.

But what, as a matter of fact, is our position? It is that before negotiations can take place, the North must demonstrate its readiness "to leave its neighbors alone." Secretary Rusk has avoided a precise definition of that phrase. We know that "illegal infiltration of military personnel and arms" is considered to violate that condition. That "leaving your neighbors alone" means also withdrawal of infiltrators who are already there has at times been suggested but never formally stated.

Senator Cooper says of this position: "I think it unlikely that the Communists will agree to this condition for negotiations, as we will not agree to their condition that the United States withdraw."

What Senator Cooper is asking the administration to do is what was done in the Korean war: "no such conditions were imposed by either side prior to negotiations, but a cease-fire was sought." Until the administration comes around to this position, its diplomacy will be confused.

Last week (March 25) the President issued a statement that "we have said many times—to all who are interested in our principles for honorable negotiation—that we seek no more than a return to the essentials of the agreements of 1954—a reliable arrangement to guarantee the independence and security of all in southeast Asia."

This is rather puzzling. The agreements of 1954 were reached at Geneva in a conference in which there participated not only the Indochinese states but also Russia, Red China, Britain, France, and the United States. The agreements ended the fighting between the French Union forces and the Vietminh in Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. These states were to become independent countries, with Vietnam partitioned at the 17th parallel into two zones pending general "free elections" to be held by January 20, 1956.

The cease-fire agreement was signed by the military commanders. But in addition, the Geneva Conference issued a final declaration, dated July 21. This declaration contained the following principles of settlement. One of the principles was that the cease-fire prohibited the "introduction into Vietnam of foreign troops and military personnel as well as of all kinds of arms and munitions." The Geneva declaration went on to say that "the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary." Furthermore, the declaration said that "general elections shall be held in July 1956 under the supervision of an international commission."

The United States did not sign the final declaration. But the Under Secretary of State, Gen. Bedell Smith, made a "unilateral declaration" which said that the United States supported the agreements and that "in connection with the statement in the declaration concerning free elections in Vietnam, my Government wishes to make clear its position which it has expressed in a declaration made in Washington on June 29, 1954, as follows: "in the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections supervised by the United Nations to insure that they are conducted fairly."

The United States encouraged the Diem government in Saigon to refuse to hold the elections of 1956, almost certainly for the quite practical reason that they would have been won by the Communists.

Considering the essentials of the 1954 agreements, it is not easy to understand what it means to say now that "we seek no more than a return to the essentials of the agreements of 1954." I am afraid it means that in the diplomatic conduct of the war in Vietnam, the diplomatists have not been doing their homework.

THE UNITED STATES AND THE COMMUNIST GIANTS

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the Record a lecture delivered by Hon. George F. Kennan, at Princeton University, on February 25, 1965. The lecture is entitled "The United States and the Communist Giants."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this lecture may be printed in ordinary type, not in small, most unreadable type in which insertions are usually printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There being no objection, the lecture was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

"THE UNITED STATES AND THE COMMUNIST GIANTS

"(By the Honorable George F. Kennan, Walter E. Edge Lecture, Princeton University, Feb. 25, 1965)

"When the invitation to deliver this lecture reached me, some months ago, and I was obliged, according to established custom, to select a title for a lecture I had not yet even thought about, the one selected was the one you see on the program this evening: "The United States and the Communist Giants." What I had in mind, in selecting this title, was a relatively detached and relaxed discourse on the nature of the three great powers: Russia, China, and the United States, at this historical juncture, an examination of their respective ideologies and the compulsions that most strongly affect their governments, and perhaps the hazarding of some speculative thoughts about how they all related to one another. Little did I realize that by the time the day for delivery of this lecture came around, the Vietnam situation would have brought precisely these relationships to such a state of cruciality as to make them a burning topic of the hour, and would threaten, in fact, to predetermine at any moment, perhaps even beyond the point of no return, the answers to the very questions I had thought to discuss. Things being this way, I hope you will forgive me if I dispense with all the customary academic and forensic preliminaries and proceed at once to the burden of the thesis I have to present.

"I want first to ask you to note certain things about the nature and position, at this time, of our two major Communist adversaries. Let me take first the Soviet Union and recall to your minds certain features of this great political society which affect importantly its interests and reactions as a power on the world scene.

"First of all, the Soviet regime is a Marxist regime which has now been in power for 47 years, and which has carried its country, during this period, to a fairly advanced, if rather uneven, state of industrial development. One of the things this means is that the weaknesses and contradictions of the Marxist doctrine have now had time to become not only visible but even embarrassingly evident in the experience of the Soviet state. Not only have they had time to become thus evident, but that relative state of industrial advancement to which the Soviet Union has now attained has made these weaknesses and contradictions all the more conspicuous; for insofar as Marxism, or even Marxism-Leninism, still has any relevance in our age, this relevance would be primarily, I should think, to the problems of societies in the same incipient stage of industrialization as was the Germany of Marx' time, or the Russia of Lenin's—societies in which the great problem was still that of the distribution of a scarce wealth among individuals, not the social employment of an abundant wealth to the benefit of an entire people. Aside from the fact that the Marxist doctrine has proved wholly inadequate as an approach to the problems of Russian agriculture, even its achievements in respect to the raising of the living standards of the so-called masses (a function which lay, after all, at the very basis of its claim to superiority as a social and political doctrine) compare unfavorably with those of the hated and despised free enterprise system of the West. All this means not only that the Soviet regime now faces very difficult decisions of domestic policy, in the effort to reconcile its Marxist principles to the demands of an advanced industrial society, but that it cannot easily refrain from looking westward both for trade and ideas. Outside the field of agriculture, where the Russians have a very specific problem partly inherited from the past, Russia's present problems and needs, economic and social, are much more similar to those of the advanced nations of the West than to those of the underdeveloped societies in which Moscow is politically so interested.

"Second, Russia, looking back on these 47 years, faces a serious crisis of conscience arising out of the historic phenomenon of Stalinism and the role it played in the development of Soviet society. This is more than an academic problem; it has serious implications for policy today. The regime is in a difficult situation. It cannot fully condone the excesses of Stalinism without estranging vitally important segments of Soviet society, notably the intellectuals and even certain echelons of the party membership, to whom the memories of Stalinism are humiliating and intolerable. But it also cannot fully condemn Stalinism, either; because to do so would be to destroy the myth of the party's infallibility and thus to provide justification for past movements of internal party opposition, as well as for present and future ones. This would mean opening up the party to a process of real democratization. But anything of this sort would involve the forfeiture of that monopolization of power in the name of an allegedly infallible party which has endured since Lenin's days; and for this, the present leaders are wholly unprepared. Out of this dilemma have come serious divisions of educated and authoritative opinion within Soviet society, notably between those who are affected by shame and doubt over the memory of Stalinism, and those who are more affected by anxiety over what would occur should the principles of Stalinism be entirely abandoned. And it is clear that the first of these attitudes—that of the people who cannot stomach the memory of Stalinism—is now associated with a general inability to tolerate the Stalinist pattern of intellectual regimentation. One has to do here with the breakthrough of a new curiosity, powerful and insistent: curiosity about the West, about Russia's own past, about all those areas of reality concerning which the regime has tried in the past to maintain artificial, rigid and often preposterous official myths. People who have this curiosity turn naturally to the West for its satisfaction. Where else could they turn? It is not that they are enthused over Western values and examples; very often they dislike these and reject them. But they want to know nevertheless about Western ideas and conditions; for they find them relevant to their own problems.

"A similar influence, we ought to note, is brought to bear on the Soviet leaders by the Eastern European Communist regimes and the European Communist parties in general. Not only would important elements in these regimes and parties be quite unwilling to see a complete return to Stalinism in the Soviet Union, but to them, too, it is important that intellectual, cultural, and economic contacts be furthered between the Communist countries and the West. Should the Moscow leaders go too far in the direction of a return to Stalinist internal practices, and should they, in particular, try to reimpose the Stalinist system of complete isolation from the West, they would run the risk of alienating these other regimes and parties to a degree which, particularly in the face of the existing disarray in the Communist world, could be very serious indeed.

"Returning to the situation within Russia proper, we should not forget that all these divisive tendencies operate within a political system which has important constitutional defects. I cannot take time to describe these defects in detail. They lie largely in the clumsy arrangement of parallel bureaucracies of party and government, and above all in the fact that reasonable provision for the allotment and transfer of supreme personal power exists only in the constitution of the governmental apparatus, where power does not really reside, whereas the constitution of the party, where power does reside, affords no such arrangements and makes provision only for collective leadership. I assure you: these are dangerously imperfect arrangements for a great modern society. Their imperfection was concealed in earlier years only because the powerful personalities of Lenin and Stalin and, to a certain degree Khrushchev, were able to transcend them. In the absence of such personalities, they could easily lead at any time to serious troubles. Their importance is already such that the regime is unable to reconcile, on any basis other than that of delicate compromise, the deep division of outlook and opinion that now exists.

"Now one more thing. The greatest results the Soviet Government has to show for all the sacrifices and sufferings it has required of the Soviet peoples over these 47 years are to be found in the industries, the cities, the physical installations it has constructed. The standard of living of the people and the power of the regime itself, are dependent on the continued existence and functioning of all this new plant and infrastructure. A nuclear war that resulted in the large-scale destruction of these things could wipe out at one blow the entire achievements of 47 years of Soviet socialism. Added to this, we have the fact that the Russian people have only the most horrible memories of past wars. Nobody in Russia wants another major war; and the regime has gone very far in assuring the people that it will not start one. All this means that not only does the Soviet regime have every conceivable selfish reason to wish to see a major war avoided, but it has committed itself seriously before its own people, much more seriously than is generally realized in our country, to do all in its power to avoid one.

"For all these reasons, the Soviet leaders need both peace and reasonably good relations with Western countries, including outstandingly the United States. Not only do they need these things, but they can see, when they look westward alone, no compelling reason why it should not be possible to have them. The great outstanding problems in Russia's relations with the West are those of Germany and nuclear armaments. In both fields, the difficulties are obviously very great; but the respective positions are not logically irreconcilable, and eventual agreement seems not to be beyond the limits of possibility. Thus the attraction of better relations with the United States, as a force operating on the Soviet leadership, is not only something founded in the deeper requirements of Soviet society and in the self-interest of the regime, but is buttressed by the fact that its realization is theoretically conceivable, even in terms of the present situation.

"On the other hand, Moscow is plainly faced today with Chinese pressures of the heaviest possible sort which run in precisely the opposite direction: which not only demand an immediate deterioration in Russia's relations with the West but obviously have as their concealed aim the provocation of actual hostilities between Russia and the West at the earliest possible moment. The Soviet leaders are well aware of this. They understand its dangers. They propose, I am sure, to resist these pressures to the best of their ability. But there is one area of world affairs where they are extremely vulnerable, where the Chinese have important tactical advantages, and where the Soviet leaders can be, and are being, pressed constantly into positions and actions that compromise their relations with the United States in particular. This is the area of the so-called anti-imperialist movement. What is involved here is the question of leadership among the various anti-Western and anti-American political forces now competing for ascendancy in the newer or less developed countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. To the extent these conflicts, these so-called anti-imperialist struggles, are highlighted before world opinion; to the extent they engage the attention of the great powers and become theaters and testing grounds of great-power rivalries; to the extent that it becomes impossible for the Soviet Union to ignore or remain aloof from them—Moscow sees no choice but to come down strongly on the anti-Western side, even at the cost of damage to its relations with leading Western countries.

"One may well ask why this should be so—what importance these new countries have for Moscow that could justify so costly a reaction. I can give you only a partial answer, because I myself believe this reaction to be exaggerated, oversensitive, and not fully warranted even by the political self-interest of the Soviet regime. Nevertheless, to a certain extent one can see and understand, if not approve, its rationale.

"In Europe and North America the Communist movement, as a dynamic advancing political force, is dead. If it has a future anywhere, it is in these developing areas and particularly in the new states, where firm political traditions and institutions have not yet formed; and here the possibilities, from Moscow's standpoint, lie less in the prospect of creating real Communist systems—for this, the prerequisites are lacking—than in the possibility of dominant influence being exerted from some Communist center over these inexperienced regimes, of their being developed as instruments of major Communist policy in the game of international politics. Moscow believes—Moscow is almost obliged by doctrinal conviction to believe—that these anti-Western forces, euphonistically referred to as the anti-imperialist ones, are bound to be generally successful politically, on the local scene, at least in the struggle against Western influences; and noting the fumbling, ineffective quality of our own responses, I must say I think they have some reason for this belief, insofar as it is we Americans who are primarily involved at the Western end. The great question, in their view, is: Which Communist center is to preside over these various victories and to reap the various fruits. To abandon this field of political contest, or even to neglect it, means, as they see it, to present it on a silver platter to the Chinese. For this, they are not prepared. Their foreign relations operate in three great areas: the world Communist movement, the underdeveloped and new nations, and the Western World. In the Communist movement, their position is already under heavy and effective Chinese attack. Their relations with the West, while valuable to them, cannot, at this historical juncture at any rate, be expected to carry the entire burden of their international position. A Soviet foreign policy based exclusively on relations with the West would practically undermine the rationale for the maintenance of Soviet power in Russia itself. Aside, therefore, from the fact that they regard the governments of the new nations as their natural and traditional clients, the Soviet leaders cannot afford, for wider reasons, to stand aside from the struggle for predominance over them. Any such passivity could easily be made to look like indifference to the prospering of the Communist cause generally and would at once be exploited by the Chinese as a means of discrediting Soviet policy, and completing the destruction of Moscow's influence and leadership in the world Communist movement. And beyond that, it would risk the loss of access to this entire theater of international politics, where a continued Soviet presence could alone make the difference between effective Soviet participation in world affairs and a total and ruinous isolation.

"In summary, then, we have before us, in the person of the Soviet leadership, a regime enmeshed in a veritable welter of contradictions and problems, internal and external; torn by conflicting compulsions it is unable to resolve or to contain except by the most delicate sort of political compromise; profoundly in need of peace; subject to strong compulsions toward better relations with the West; yet conscious of having an extremely sensitive flank in Asia and Africa which it can protect only at the expense of its relations with the West; walking a very narrow tightrope among these conflicting pressures; vacillating, weaving this way and that; responsive to the shifts in the world scene; its behavior, for this reason, in part the product of the way we ourselves play our hand and in this sense susceptible in some degree to our influence.

"Compare this now with what we have before us when we look to the regime in Peiping. Here is a political entity still young to the experience of power. The country it controls is still in an early stage of industrial development. The directing of the Chinese economy by the regime still proceeds in an atmosphere analogous to that which existed in Russia in the early period of the so-called "war communism." Primarily concerned, still, with the destruction of every form of opposition to itself, intellectual or spiritual, conscious or subconscious, the Peiping regime requires not war itself, in the physical sense, but the atmosphere of war: a state of tension and of alleged external danger, by which alone this sort of pressure can be justified. So much is the country still involved in the social upheaval occasioned by the transition to a Communist system that the contradictions of the Marxist ideology, as a blueprint for the administration of an advanced economy, have not yet had time to become fully apparent.

"By the same token, Communist China has as yet no body of physical achievement comparable to that of Soviet Russia; no great fund of new industrial and urban and technological construction to be placed in jeopardy and to constitute a vulnerability in the case of nuclear war. Those interpretations which see Peiping as quite indifferent to nuclear destruction are certainly exaggerated; but the Chinese vulnerability to this kind of destruction is definitely less, and the apprehensions of its leaders presumably that much smaller, than in the case of the Soviet Union.

"If there are imperfections in the constitutional setup of the Chinese Communists, which is quite possible, these are so to speak still inoperable and invisible behind the dominating personality of a single great revolutionary leader. And while Mao's regime, to be sure, yields little to that of Stalin in the rigorousness of its political and intellectual discipline, its authority has never assumed those truly pathological and nightmarish forms which characterized that of Stalin after 1934. For this and other reasons, the Peiping regime faces no such crise de conscience as that which racks Soviet officialdom and the Soviet intellectual world. I am sure there is plenty of curiosity among the Chinese about foreigners and about the world outside. But one sees no evidence of anything comparable to that combination of compelling doubt and curiosity—doubt about one's own revolutionary past and curiosity about the outside world which now so consumes the young people and the intellectuals of Russia. Here, national differences surely play an important part. The Russians have, traditionally, a species of love-hate complex toward the West. They feel obliged to react in many ways against the West; but it is absolutely essential to them that it be there to be reacted to. It is something to which they have to relate themselves, whether sympathetically or antagonistically. It would be hard, I think, for them to conceive of a world without it.

"I see no evidence of anything quite comparable to this in China. China developed, over the centuries, as a far more self-sufficient civilization than did Russia. The decisive phase in Russia's intellectual and cultural development occurred in the 18th and 19th centuries, and it proceeded in close association with similar developments in the West. In China, this appears to be true only in small measure; and there is abundant evidence that the shaking off of Western patterns and modes of thought, which Communist power has everywhere involved and demanded, has been far more drastic and effective in China than in the Soviet Union.

"For all these reasons, we find in the case of China nothing comparable to those compulsions and interests that determine both Russia's need for peace and her need for better relations with Western countries. I do not doubt that over the long run the Chinese Communists, too, will experience a stronger sense of need for both these things. But as of today they have other and more urgent concerns.

"Particularly is this true when it comes to relations with the United States. It must surely be apparent to the Chinese Communist leaders that better relations with this country would be conceivable, in present circumstances, only if they were to relinquish their demand for liquidation of the Chiang regime and for the total inclusion of Formosa into their political system. But so violent and insistent have been their pretentions in this respect that the abandonment of them would involve serious loss of prestige. Yet to them, prestige is of enormous importance, both for traditional psychological reasons and because it has to compensate for their relative military weakness: their deficiency, that is, in advanced forms of weaponry, their lack of amphibious power. Similar considerations present themselves, of course, with regard to Korea and Vietnam, not to mention Japan. In none of these places does

Peiping have any idea of recognizing the legitimacy of the American presence; and the concessions it would have to make to stand any chance of real accommodation with the United States over these issues are ones quite irreconcilable, as things stand today, with that image of itself as the overriding, inspiring, and organizing power of the eastern world which Peiping has so insistently cultivated and around which it has constructed the edifice of its international pretentions and ambitions.

"Not only do the Chinese view accommodation with the United States as something conceivably purchasable only at an exorbitant price, but they see—I feel sure—no present necessity of paying any price at all. The wickets on which they are today standing, which are those of incitement of distrust of American influence and hatred of the American presence among the populations locally affected, are not bad wickets. They are not very effective, thus far, in Japan and Formosa; but this, too, could change. Meanwhile, they are extremely effective in Vietnam; and if they yield there the success they are expected to yield, their effectiveness will certainly increase in other areas. Peiping not only sees at the moment little to be gained by accommodation with us, but sees a good deal to be gained, particularly from the standpoint of its own prestige, by the continuation of sharpest, most ruthless and unscrupulous sort of political attack against us. It may be true that this situation is partly the result of our own mistakes. There may be things we can do over the long run to alter it. There is very little we can do to alter it in the short term.

"Now Communist China obviously has a compelling need for foreign capital on a vast scale, as a means to its own industrialization. Such assistance is, in fact, practically indispensable to any early realization of the dreams and plans of the regime in this respect, for the accumulation of the necessary capital from the indigenous resources would be a slow business. Theoretically, such capital could come either from the West, and outstandingly from the United States or from the Soviet Union. It would scarcely be available, however, from the Western side in adequate amounts except on terms which the Chinese leaders would view as unacceptable from the standpoint of their pride and their political independence. What the Chinese need, actually, are gifts, not loans, and very large gifts at that. Gifts in such amounts are not likely to be forthcoming from ideological adversaries. The Chinese have no choice, therefore, but to continue to center their hopes on Moscow. But transfers of capital from the Soviet Union to China on the requisite scale could take place only to the detriment of the development of the Soviet economy itself, and the Soviet leaders, as past experience has shown, can be brought to provide this kind of assistance only under compulsion; only, that is, if they are deprived of other alternatives. A tolerably good relationship with Western countries and particularly one which permits them to trade freely and extensively with the West, represents just such an alternative. So long as the Soviet leaders have this alternative, so long as they have this line to the West, they have bargaining power vis-a-vis the Chinese. In these circumstances there are limits beyond which the Chinese cannot push them, especially in the field of economic assistance, for the Russians are always in a position to turn to them and say: 'Look here. Close association with you is not the only way we can live. We have other possibilities. You may not be in a position to arrange your affairs with the West, and for this reason you may be dependent on us, but we are quite able to arrange our affairs with the West, and we are not dependent on you.'

"This explains, of course, the almost desperate intensity of the Chinese attack on the theory of coexistence, of the Chinese determination to disrupt Russia's relations with this country. For only if these relations can be disrupted; only if this alternative can be destroyed, can Russia be put into a position where it has no choice but to give Peiping what it wants, on Peiping's terms.

"So much, then, for the Chinese position. Now let us try to take stock of these circumstances from the standpoint of U.S. interests.

"We are confronted here with two great Communist powers. The attitude and behavior of the one; namely, the Chinese, with respect to ourselves is pretty well determined and predictable, at least for the immediate future. There is little we can do to influence it. The attitude and behavior of the other is still a variable, susceptible at least in part to influence by ourselves.

"Two possibilities now present themselves. One is that our relationship with Moscow deteriorates; that Moscow, as a consequence, finds it necessary to hold more closely to Peiping, in order to compensate for the loss of its Western card; that Moscow then throws itself even more franticaly and, having little to lose, even more recklessly and wholeheartedly, into the anti-imperialist struggle, heedless of the effect on Soviet-American relations, coming to regard as its major objective not the preservation of an effective balance between the Chinese and ourselves as factors in Russia's external situation, but rather: successful competition with the Chinese for leadership in the political struggle for our destruction. This alternative would not satisfy in all respects Chinese desiderata, for the Chinese-Soviet rivalry would continue to be operable in many forms. But it represents in general the direction in which the Chinese, as well as many neo-Stalinists in the Soviet Union, would like to see Soviet policy move. It would militate for increased unity throughout the Communist bloc as well as for sharper and more uncompromising tactics toward the West. It would compound the effectiveness of the forces now marshaled against it. It is difficult to see what ultimate conclusion it could have other than a world war.

"The other possibility is, of course, a continued improvement of Russia's relations with ourselves. This is one that would strengthen the hands of both powers with relation to the Chinese—the Russian hand, because the value of the Soviet alternative to the acceptance of Chinese pressures would be enhanced; our own hand, because the intensity of the forces ranged against us would be reduced and because Soviet interests might even work in many ways to reinforce our own position.

"In drawing the picture of these alternatives, I should like to avoid the impression that they are absolutes. There is nothing I can conceive of, short of a world war, which could throw the Russians entirely into the Chinese camp. Conversely, any improvement in Russia's relations with the West should not be expected to go so far as to produce any total break with Peiping. What I am talking about here are tendencies rather than finalities; but they are tendencies of great importance, and the fact that neither would be likely to be carried to a point of absolute finality does not obviate the enormous significance that attaches to the choice between them.

"We should recall at this point that the present unhappy state of our relations with China, hopelessly anchored as it appears to be in the circumstances of the moment, should not and must not be regarded as a final and permanent state of affairs. The Chinese are one of the world's great peoples, intelligent and industrious, endowed with enormous civilizing power and with formidable talents, cultural and otherwise. It is wholly unnatural that the relations between such a people and our own should be as they are today. Dismal as are the immediate prospects, we must look forward to the day when we come to terms in some way with the prevailing political forces on the Chinese mainland. This, however, like any other adjustment of international relations, will take bargaining and compromise; and if the final relationship is to be a sound one and to bear weight, both sides must have a reasonable bargaining power when they finally sit down to accommodate their differences. Only if the Soviet Union is kept in the running as an independent force in world affairs, enjoying and valuing a constructive relationship with the West and thus being not solely dependent on the Chinese connection and not helpless in the face of Chinese demands—only if these conditions prevail will we have a chance of working out our long-term relationship to China on a basis reasonably satisfactory to ourselves. A well ordered relationship with Moscow is, in other words, essential to the constructive and healthy adjustment of our long-term relations with China. If in place of the preservation and encouragement of Russia's independent role, we force the Russians back into a closer relation with the Chinese, or even into an intense and exclusive competition with the Chinese for leadership in the destruction of our world position, we will not only intensify the effectiveness of the forces ranged against us at this particular moment, but we will complicate greatly, and not to our own advantage, the problem of the eventual composition of our differences with both the Russians and the Chinese.

"If this view be accepted, it becomes, as you see, an urgent requirement of American policy to ease in every proper and constructive way the relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States. This has nothing to do with fatuous one-sided concessions, designed to win gratitude on the Soviet side. As one of my Foreign Service colleagues used to say, you can't bank good will in Moscow; and I would be the last to advocate anything of that sort. But what you can do is to hold out to Moscow a plausible prospect of accommodation in those issues that are theoretically susceptible of solution in this way, and avoid the accenting of those that are not. This, as I see it, means serious effort on our part to provide a reasonable basis for accommodation in the great issues of Germany and of nuclear weapons control—in those issues, in other words, that affect primarily the European theater and are central problems of Russia's relationship with the West; and at the same time to deemphasize wherever possible conflicts that fall under the Communist category of the anti-imperialist struggle, conflicts in the face of which Moscow, when its hand is forced, is bound to come down formally on the anti-American, if not the pro-Chinese side.

"It does not appear to me that American policy of recent years stacks up very well in relation to this requirement. I have not seen the evidence that we have done all we could do to find agreement with the Soviet Union in matters of Germany and disarmament. Needless irritations, such as the captive nations resolution and various antiquated trade restrictions, are still permitted to impede the development of Soviet-American relations. And our present involvement in Vietnam is a classic example of the sort of situation we ought to avoid if we do not wish to provoke in Moscow precisely those reactions that are most adverse to our interests. It is largely as a consequence of these strategic errors that we find ourselves in the dangerous and unpromising position we occupy today.

"It will be asked of course, particularly in connection with the problem we now have on our hands in Vietnam, what else we could do than what we have done in situations of this sort. We cannot, it will be argued, simply walk away and fold our hands and watch such countries slide irrevocably into the Communist orbit.

"I would be the last to generalize about such situations, or to suggest that a hands-off policy is everywhere possible and desirable. But there is one thing we might usefully bear in mind. The surest way to invite a strong and effective Communist involvement in situations of this nature is to involve ourselves heavily, particularly in a military way. Where we lay off, the road may be open, ostensibly, to Communist intrigue and penetration—it is usually open, no matter what we do—and there may well be takeovers by political forces that make a pretense of Marxist conviction and look to Moscow or Peiping for economic aid and political support. But this is not always so intolerable to our interests as we commonly suppose. The less we are in the picture, the less is there any excuse for actual military intervention on the part of the Communist powers, and the greater are the chances for rivalry between Moscow and Peiping for political predominance in the region concerned. But in the absence of a Communist military presence, and where the Chinese-Soviet rivalry exists, the local regimes, whether nominally Communist or otherwise, are almost bound to begin to act independently in many ways—to develop, in other words, Titoist tendencies. And this is not always the worst solution, from our standpoint. It is harder for either Moscow or Peiping to interfere extensively with a regime that calls itself Communist than with one that does not. And since we have not engaged our prestige extensively, the situation affords to the Communist powers no such opportunities for political gains at our expense as those the Chinese and North Vietnamese Communists are now reaping in Vietnam.

"I can think of nothing we need more, at this stage, than a readiness to relax, not to worry so much about these remote countries scattered across the southern crescent, to let them go their own way, not to regard their fate as our exclusive responsibility, to wait for them to come to us rather than our fussing continually over them. The more we exert ourselves to protect them from communism, the less the exertion they are going to undertake, themselves. We are not, after all, their keepers. They have in general much more to demand than they have to give. And others, even the Communists, are not apt to derive much more profit than we or former mother countries have derived in the past from the effort to keep them.

"In the complexities of our international situation, the hour is late and the difficulties enormous. But it seems to me that I now detect in many quarters in this country voices inspired by an increasing awareness of the realities I have been discussing. It is still not too late to turn events in a more hopeful direction. If we will bear these overriding strategic considerations in mind—if we will be concerned to reduce to a minimum our existing conflicts with the Soviet Union and to extract ourselves at the earliest possible moment from involvements which leave that power no choice but to join Peiping in opposing us—if, in other words, we will opt for one great Communist opponent at this historical juncture rather than two, then I am hopeful that peace can be preserved; and I can see the possibility of international life beginning to move in that direction which is my own fondest dream and which I think should be a basic objective of American foreign policy, which is the eventual constructive ordering of our relations with both of these two great peoples now under Communist control, to whom we have so much to give, and from whom we have so much to receive."

PROBLEMS CONFRONTING IDAHO POTATO INDUSTRY

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, on February 9 of this year, the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. Church] and I introduced legislation which would require fresh potatoes purchased or sold in interstate commerce to be labeled according to the State in which such potatoes were grown. At that time we both emphasized the importance of the Idaho potato to the economy of our State and the urgent need for the enactment of this legislation.

This week the Idaho editor, Mr. M. C. Noyce, of the Salt Lake City Deseret News, called my attention to a feature article in the Friday, March 26, issue of that newspaper entitled "King Russett Faces Battle To Retain Throne." This article was written by Mrs. Elayne Bybee of Idaho Falls, Idaho, and is an excellent piece on the problems which confront the Idaho potato industry.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have just alluded be printed in the Record at this point and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, in particular that portion which emphasizes the urgent need for enactment of the national potato labeling bill, S. 1058.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Salt Lake City (Utah) Deseret News, Mar. 26, 1965]

King Russett Faces Battle To Retain Throne

(By Elayne Bybee)

Idaho Falls.—Potatoes may have eyes, but they are not for seeing into the future.

The answer to whether King Russett will retain his throne or be toppled into a collective spud bin with the rest of the tubers from throughout the country is as hazy and unpredictable as a farmer's guess as to the yield of the hill after squinting at the potato blossoms.

If the Russett is to retain its regal title, three things may be necessary to its immediate future.

First, a year-around storage program, making possible a year-around market for fresh potatoes.

Second, continued increase of potato processing and the processors entry into the retail consumer market.

LABEL SPUDS

Third, and most important of all, a program of labeling both fresh and dehydrated potatoes as to the State of origin.

The potato industry in Idaho is moving on several fronts to insure a rosy future for Idaho's No. 1 product and the State's leading industry. Research on storage is under way at the University of Idaho's Aberdeen Branch Experimental Station in the heart of the potato producing area. To complete the necessary work, a larger $350,000 potato research center is under construction at Aberdeen. Funds for the new center are coming from Idaho's general building fund, Idaho Potato and Onion Commission and the potato industry, including processors.

STORAGE FEASIBLE

Walter C. Sparks, horticulturist, of the Aberdeen storage project, says year-round storage is now feasible and can be recommended to growers. Sparks has been experimenting in one form or another with the storage problems for 15 to 17 years and concentrated his studies at Aberdeen for the past 5 years.

Some of the problems being solved in the quest for a year-round market are types of storage facilities needed, costs involved, air movement, and application of sprout inhibitors.

Will storage to hold the crop year round add greatly to growers' cost? Sparks says, "It shouldn't if the grower has the storage facilities he already needs to improve his product. If a grower has an air distribution system he is halfway there, and has only to add a little refrigeration and apply sprout inhibitors."

CHEMICALS OK'D

"Two chemicals for sprout inhibition have been approved by the Food and Drug Administration. One may be applied during the growing season, the other after storage. Costs range from 3⅓ to 5 cents per hundredweight," says Sparks.

"The most outstanding thing we've learned is that we can maintain a very high quality product, while one of the drawbacks is a noted weight loss," he declared.

While some problems are being solved, others are just coming to light. Ed Moore, executive secretary of Idaho Growers-Shippers, asks "who is going to merchandise the spuds all the way through for Idaho?"

MARKET CROP

At present Idaho's crop is marketed in definite seasons with a gap from early June till August. When the famed Russets leave the market for lack of supply, potatoes grown in other States are coming onto the market, thereby filling consumers' needs. So, in going to a year-round market Idaho could take potato markets now utilized by other States, and the industry would undoubtedly run into considerably opposition from other potato producing States.

Last year was a good year for the potato because of short supply which kept prices high.

Industry leaders are predicting an increased spud crop for the coming year.

IMPORT POTATOES

Increased acreage is needed because of many factors, one of them being increased consumption by processors. Processors had to import potatoes to Idaho from other States this year to complete their orders. With more and more Idaho potatoes going into the processing industry, an increased acreage is needed to insure potatoes for fresh shipment. Actually, according to industry leaders there hasn't been enough potatoes to fill Idaho orders for the past 5 years.

According to a recent USDA statistical report fall potato stocks in the hands of Gem State growers and shippers as of February 1 were the lowest since 1958. The supply nationwide was 16 percent less than a year before. In the nine Western fall producing States stocks were 29.6 million cwt this year compared with 37.2 million cwt of 1963–64.

One problem facing the immediate future of the potato and most particularly this year's crop is the lack of certified seed. The Crop Reporting Board says production of 1964 certified seed potatoes in the United States is 8 percent below 1963 and 3 percent below the 1958–62 average.

Idaho produces 9 percent of the Nation's total certified seed, and only rarely is seed brought from other areas for Idaho plantings.

Not included in the Idaho or the Nation figures, however, is the certified seed that many growers produce each year on their own plots for their own use.

EFFECTS OF SHORTAGE

What would be the effect on the industry if there is a shortage of certified seed at planting time? Growers would be forced to use what is known in the industry as 1-year-cut potatoes. Which means seed which is 1 year away from certification. Certification was begun in the United States back in 1915 to provide growers of tablestock with disease-free seed true to varietal name. The enforcement of more and more rigid standards has helped to improve the quality of certified seed.

There is a growing trend in the industry for potato shippers to be potato growers. "It's for protection," say shippers. The producer only wants to sell once a year. Mrs. Housewife is not willing to put up with on-again-off-again type of arrangements and puts potatoes regularly on her menu. To protect accounts, a shipper failing to contract enough acreage plants the difference. Shippers are currently growing about a third of the crop being marketed. It takes 10 acres of potatoes to produce one car of fresh potatoes.

CONSUMPTION UP

Potato consumption is on the rise. Nationally it's estimated at 112 pounds per capita. Of that amount 79 to 80 pounds are fresh. Idahoans who know their spuds point proudly to the fact that the Russet-Burbank tubers account for about 50 of that 80 pounds. With some 300 varieties of potatoes grown today, this is no small feat.

Great strides have been made in the potato processing industry. While not confined to Idaho, the industry was largely developed in the Gem State. Products, processing techniques, and specialized equipment are results of Idaho research.

PROVIDE JOBS

The processing industry is important to Idaho's overall economy. The industry provided 6,921 jobs from July 1, 1963, to June 20, 1964, expending an annual payroll of $20,459,000.

Since 1949 new acreage converted from sagebrush land to potato fields amounted to nearly 1 million acres. Principal contributing factor to this increased acreage was the demand for potatoes for processing. Idaho processors used about 50 percent of the 1963 crop. The national average of potatoes diverted into processing is about 28 percent.

THIRTEEN COMPANIES

At present 13 companies in Idaho are engaged in manufacture of processed potato products with 20 plants. Plant investment is $50,831,000. During the past 2 years new construction has increased by better than $5 million, while plant investment has increased $9 million.

Processing is a fairly new industry, starting during the world war * * * were 111 dehydration plants * * * processor Rogers Bros., Inc., entered processing in 1920. At the end of World War I there were 111 dehydration plants in the United States, yet 3 years later, all except four had been closed. Rogers, headquartered at Idaho Falls, was one of those remaining.

ENTER FIELD

During the years that followed, Rogers and other processors who entered the field worked to improve the product and make it adaptable to the food industry. Today dehydrated potatoes are used widely in the institutional food field.

The processor uses processor grade potatoes, known to farmers as culls. The use at the processing house depends on quality. Higher qualities made into potato flakes, dices, slices, shreds, flour, while lower grades are diverted to starch plants and for cattle feed. Some potato alcohol is also made in the State.

DEVOTE SPACE

While more and more of the grocers shelves are devoted to dehydrated potato products, the principal users at this point are the institutional users and the baking industry. The retail consumer field is still virtually untapped. Competition is increasing. In 1960 Idaho produced 63.7 percent of all processed potatoes in the United States, but in 1963 the figure dropped to 58.1 percent. Maine, New York, Michigan, Wisconsin, North Dakota and Washington have all entered the potato processing field.

The Idaho potato farmer faced with the problems of production, increased competition, and the cost-price squeeze is quick to recognize that the future of the potato industry may depend partly upon the protection of the Idaho potato image.

PUSH BILLS

Potato leaders have labored for years to get bills passed protecting the Idaho potato name. A bill currently in Congress would require potato labeling as to State of origin. The bill is considered by many to be the most important piece of legislation to the industry in years. Why? It is highly suspected that quantities of potatoes are sold each year as Idaho Russets and the closest the spuds came to Idaho is the name stamped on the sack.

The labeling of potatoes would help the housewife who is paying for Idahos whether she gets them or not.

SAME GRADING

Here in Idaho a bill in the State legislature would require the same grading for potatoes sold in Idaho as those shipped out of the State. If passed, the bill could solve somewhat the lament of the Idaho housewife, "Why can't I buy as good Idaho Russets in Idaho as in another State?" Potato men agree, however, that there is a certain tolerance in grading potatoes that probably even with the law the best spud would be shipped out of State, and the leftovers used by the natives.

The labeling of potatoes via a stamping or branding machine is being considered by the entire industry. The Idaho Potato and Onion Commission in July of 1963 decided to make individual potato stamping compulsory on all No. 1's shipped out of the State as of September of last year.

Certain hurdles, however, have prevented the plan from being activated. A satisfactory stamping machine and satisfactory ink are just two of the problems currently being studied. Some stamping is going on on an individual basis but stamping or branding is not yet industrywide.

Idahoans are pretty proud of the potato as Joseph G. Leggett of the Janss Corp., new operator of Sun Valley, learned when he suggested removing the Famous Potatoes slogan from the license plates. Leggett found he had grabbed a hot potato. The hue and cry arose from every potato community from one end of the State to the other.

A bill that would have removed the slogan was defeated in the Idaho Senate 32 to 12, which is indicative of the esteem for the State's leading industry.

The potato industry charts its future March 16 and 17 at the Green Triangle in Pocatello at an industrywide conference.

PAYING MEAT INSPECTION COSTS

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the cost of Federal meat inspection has been paid from appropriated funds since the Meat Inspection Act was passed in 1906. It is a public health service to assure consumers that meat shall be derived from disease-free animals and shall be wholesome and clean in every respect. It is for the direct benefit of consumers and should be paid for by all the people from general funds.

President Lyndon Johnson said that "those who enjoy special benefits should bear a greater share of the cost," in commenting on his proposal to charge the cost of the meat inspection program to the meatpacking industry.

Packers have no practical way of absorbing these costs and they would be transferred either to the consumer or to the producer in any event. But, the people who receive the benefit, the consumers themselves, should pay the cost of this important service.

I believe that it would not be wise for the person policed to pay the policeman. The inspector should always identify himself with the public interest.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Monday, March 22, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PAYING INSPECTION COSTS

A quiet move is underway in Washington and in some of the States to shift the cost of meat inspection from the taxpayer to the packers. The idea has a superficial appeal because of the budgetary savings it would permit, but it is also arousing much opposition. Many observers believe that it would bring about a deterioration in the service and accentuate fluctuations in the price of meat.

In a strong market, it is assumed that meat-inspection costs assessed against the packers would be passed on to the consumers, causing prices to rise more than they otherwise would. In a weak market, packers would deduct the cost of inspection from prices paid to livestock producers, thus adding to the troubles of an industry which has been under pressure in recent years. Congress will doubtless be wary of approving a possible depressant to livestock prices.

More serious is the underlying principle of paying for public services out of the public purse. Meat inspection is required for the protection of people against disease. It is said that 30 diseases which afflict human beings may be derived from animals. Rigid and independent inspection of all meat put on the market is imperative to protect the public from these sources of infection. This work is as much a public function as the quarantining of individuals with communicable diseases.

If the cost of meat inspection were charged against the packers, inspectors would almost inevitably feel some obligation to those who paid their salaries. Businessmen are not asked to pay the policeman who patrols the street. Importers are not asked to pay the customs official who checks over their purchases abroad. It is the public in general that benefits from impartial and thorough inspection of meat, and we think the public should continue to pay for it from the public purse.

NAVIGATION LOCKS IN INITIAL DESIGN OF THE ASOTIN DAM

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the Asotin Dam on the Snake River which is the boundary between the States of Idaho and Washington has been authorized and a review of design is now under consideration by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. One of the principal features being studied is the economic feasibility of including navigation locks. Hearings on this matter were held at Lewiston, Idaho, on March 24, 1965, to give ample opportunity for all those interested to furnish information and to present pertinent facts. It is gratifying to me to know that support for the inclusion of these locks is not only forthcoming from the locality around Lewiston but is generally favored by all Idahoans. With the completion of the Lewis-Clark Highway, the formation of a port district and a possibility of creating the Nez Perce National Historic Site in that general area, the entire locality is gaining in importance and interest. If the locks are included in this project deposits of lime on each side of the river at Lime Point near the Asotin site will make it possible to economically mine large deposits of high-grade lime that may be processed and shipped.

Mr. President, the Board of City Commissioners of Lewiston, Idaho, adopted a resolution in favor of including navigation locks in the Asotin Dam project at its meeting on March 22, 1965. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this resolution be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 65–21

Resolution adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Lewiston favoring construction of navigation locks in the proposed Asotin Dam project

Whereas the Board of Commissioners of the City of Lewiston recognize the need for navigation locks in the proposed Asotin dam in order to make the upper reaches of the Snake River and the natural resources adjacent thereto accessible to slack water naviagtion; and

Whereas the Board of Commissioners of the City of Lewiston feel that it would be in the best interest of the city of Lewiston and the surrounding area, as well as the entire State of Idaho, for this proposed dam to include navigation locks; now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Lewiston, That the city of Lewiston make known by this resolution that said city endorses and is in favor of the inclusion of navigation locks in the proposed Asotin Dam project and recommends to those concerned that said navigation locks be approved and constructed as a part of the Asotin Dam project; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be furnished to the Governor of the State of Idaho, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and Members of the Congress of the United States representing the State of Idaho.

Adopted by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Lewiston this 22nd day of March 1965.

PAUL H. WISE,
Chairman.

Attest:

WAYNE D. RUDD,
City Clerk.

AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION'S EFFORT TO DISCREDIT ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRAM OF HEALTH CARE FOR THE ELDERLY

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, just a week ago I called the attention of the Senate to the latest effort of the American Medical Association to discredit the administration's program of health care for the elderly.

I referred to a 171-page book published by the AMA entitled "U.S. Newspapers Comment on Health Care for the Elderly."

The book purported to reprint editorials from newspapers around the country criticizing the medicare proposals.

In glancing through the book, I was struck by an odd coincidence. It seemed that many of the editorials, appearing in widely separated newspapers, were identically worded.

How curious it was, for example, that the views of the editor in Modesto, Calif., could coincide precisely with those of the editor in Roanoke, Va.

After using that as just one example of what I called the "managed editorial," I received the following telegram from the editor of the Roanoke Times & World News:

> Call your attention to an error made by the American Medical Association in its book, "U.S. Newspapers Comment on Health Care for the Aged," with reference to the Roanoke Times. We have never published the editorial attributed to us on page 156. Neither of the other Virginia papers cited is known to us as identified. Your comments with reference to Roanoke as reported today by the Associated Press are in error. We invite your correction.

The telegram was signed by Barton W. Morris, Jr., executive editor of the Times & World News, of Roanoke, Va.

Mr. President, I am delighted to correct the RECORD in this regard by reporting the denial of the Roanoke Times that it had printed the editorial which the AMA said it did.

However, this simply adds more mystery to the puzzle of how so many newspapers could use the same editorials.

I had selected the Roanoke editorial completely at random simply to demonstrate how 3,000 miles could separate two editors with but a single thought.

As it turns out, the editor of that paper denies he ever published the editorial so proudly flaunted by the AMA.

I cannot help but wonder now how many of the other newspapers cited by the AMA really carried the editorials attributed to them, or how many of the papers actually exist.

Perhaps the AMA is not above doing a little "tombstone voting" in its campaign to defeat medicare.

Therefore, it might be in order for the newspapers listed to check up on the AMA's use of their names.

Of course, those which actually did use the canned editorials must answer to their own consciences.

A reporter for the Washington Post has explored this situation in some detail.

According to his article in today's issue, he has traced some of the canned editorials to a publishing service in Portland, Oreg., which distributes them "free" to newspapers.

According to the Post reporter, this organization admits that it receives funds from the American Medical Association.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the article entitled "AMA Promotion of Eldercare Examined" published in the Washington Post on April 1, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Apr. 1, 1965]

AMA PROMOTION OF ELDERCARE EXAMINED

(By Morton Mintz)

Some behind-the-scenes aspects of the promotion of the eldercare bill by the American Medical Association have come to light as a result of a Senator's discovery of "a curious pattern" in editorials published in weekly and other small newspapers across the Nation.

The Senator, PAT MCNAMARA, Democrat, of Michigan, discovered the pattern in an association publication recently distributed to Members of Congress. The "canned" editorials in question are republished in the 171-page booklet, "U.S. Newspapers Comment on Health Care for the Elderly."

Last Thursday MCNAMARA told the Senate that one of the republished editorials was used—usually without a word being changed—in at least 11 newspapers. Another editorial was used by at least 10 papers, and another was carried by 10 additional papers.

All told, MCNAMARA said, he found 6 "AMA-slanted" editorials published in more than 50 newspapers.

Yet, he said, the association says in its foreword to the publication that the editorials are "a cross-section" of newspaper opposition to medicare and support of eldercare and "reflect the viewpoint of a majority of the American people."

An editor has full liberty to "parrot the views" of an organization, the Senator said, "but shouldn't he owe it to his readers to tell them he is doing so?"

MCNAMARA said he found that the views of the editor of the Modesto, Calif., Tribune "coincide precisely with those of the editor" of the Roanoke (Va.) Times.

However, the executive editor of the Virginia daily, Barton W. Morris, Jr., wired the Senator and the AMA that neither the Times nor its sister paper, the World-News, had published the editorial attributed to it. MCNAMARA plans to correct the record.

From the AMA in Chicago came a telegram from Jim Reed, director of communications, telling Morris that a company that sends clippings to the association apparently had erred. The telegram also said that MCNAMARA "has slanted his remarks to imply editorials were sent out by the AMA. This is untrue. * * * the AMA did not send out editorials to any newspaper."

A reporter phoned Claude Fouracre, editor of the Middletown (Del.) Transcript to ask where he had gotten the two editorials his paper had published and that are reproduced in the AMA publication.

Fouracre said they came from the Industrial News Review, a weekly service of E. Hofer and Sons, Publisher, of Portland, Oreg. He said he agreed with the editorials and added that the Review is "free, and there's no obligation."

Lawrence Hofer, a partner in the Portland firm, said in a phone interview that the Review, which contains editorials on many subjects, is supplied without charge, and is offered for reproduction "with or without credit."

Hofer said the AMA is "one of several professional and industrial groups that we have worked with. We do believe what we write in their behalf."

He acknowledged that the association pays his firm, but refused to say how much or give other information about the arrangement.

Reed was asked in a phone interview how he could explain the almost simultaneous appearance of pro-AMA editorials all over the country. He said, "I've been in the newspaper business 25 years" and thus knows that papers "pick up from each other and subscribe to editorial services."

In his telegram to the Virginia editor Reed said that in November 1963, MCNAMARA "let his name be used in a canned editorial distributed to newspapers by the National Council of Senior Citizens, an organization formed to lobby for medicare."

An aide to the Senator said the reference was to an article that MCNAMARA signed. "There's absolutely no comparison," the spokesman said. "If they were just as forthright in signing their name to their editorials there would be no quarrel."

Each issue of the Industrial News Review carries a statement of purpose saying that its distribution of comment "is supported financially by industry, business and professions * * * who believe that community prosperity and growth, sound government and reasonable taxation must accompany individual and corporate prosperity."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. News about that Portland group comes as no surprise to the Senator from Oregon. For a long time it has been distributing attacks against the senior Senator from Oregon. By so doing I hold them responsible for thousands of votes on my own behalf.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNAMARA. I yield.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, this is the group which for 35 years has been sending us propaganda in favor of private utilities. They are on the wrong side on this question. I exposed them in the publication, "The Public Pays," published 35 years ago, now reprinted.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session, as long as the Senator from Michigan [Mr. MCNAMARA] is present in the Chamber.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider excutive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Sam Zagoria, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

R. Watkins Greene, of Louisiana, and Ralph K. Cooper, of Arizona, to be members of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration.

By Mrs. SMITH, from the Committee on Armed Services:

Stanley R. Resor, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably the nominations of 74 flag and general officers in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and ask that these names be printed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations are as follows:

Brig. Gen. Robert Rigby Glass, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army), and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States;

Brig. Gen. Maurice Lynn Watts, Army National Guard of the United States, for appointment as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army, in the rank of major general;

Col. William Fahy Sheehan, Army National Guard of the United States, for promotion as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army, in the rank of brigadier general;

Lt. Gen. Verdi Beethoven Barnes, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), and Lt. Gen. Russell Lowell Vittrup, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army), to be placed on the retired list in the grade of lieutenant general;

Major Gen. Vernon Price Mock, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, in the grade of lieutenant general;

Charles H. Hayes and James P. Berkeley, to be placed on the retired list of the Marine Corps, in the grade of lieutenant general;

Richard C. Mangrum and Alpha L. Bowser, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving;

Vice Adm. Alfred G. Ward, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving;

Rear Adm. Edward E. Grimm, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy; and

Rear Adm. Bernard F. Roeder, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John L. Sweeney, of Michigan, to be Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Maj. Gen. Hobart Hewett, U.S. Army, to be a major general in the Regular Army of the United States, and as temporary major general in the Army of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate return to legislative session.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

OUR SICK RAILROADS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it has been said that the strength of a nation can be measured by its rail transportation system. This applies to both military strength and economic strength of a nation. In our country railroads are in trouble—big trouble. With our population growing by more than a million people every year, our railroads should be expanding each year instead of eliminating or diminishing their services.

Crowded, poorly ventilated, dirty coaches give convincing evidence that railroad officials regard passengers as necessary evils, and make their money carrying freight. Many coaches on our passenger lines are candidates for the junk heap. An undue length of time is consumed in traveling from one city to another and schedules are poorly observed. Trains invariably arrive at their destinations behind schedule time.

Recently, three of my constituents, a couple and their grown daughter, whom I know personally, made a trip to California. Although they usually travel by air, they decided that it would be an enjoyable change to take the scenic route advertised by the Great Northern Railway. They anticipated a very leisurely, relaxed, and enjoyable trip. May I relate their actual experience.

The bedrooms assigned to them on the train were so cramped that it was necessary for all three to take sleeping pills in order to have a decent night's sleep. They informed me that the food was not as good as that purchased in a moderately priced restaurant in Cleveland, but that the prices were exorbitant. The coaches were untidy and uncomfortable. As if this were not enough, the train arrived in San Francisco 7 hours late. This is just one example of thousands which I am sure could be related by other railroad passengers. It is no wonder that people shy away from traveling by train whenever possible and utilize more comfortable and reliable modes of transportation.

In contrast, in Italy it is a pleasure to ride on the Rapido, a bullet-shaped train making the long trip from Rome to Milan in 6 hours. This train is beautifully decorated, has new coaches with artistic panels, and passengers are offered espresso coffee. The cost of making this 400-mile trip is less than air fare. It is a trifle more than passengers pay on slow trains.

One would think that under our free enterprise system railroad presidents would be ahead of officials of government-operated Italian railroads. In efficiency and comfort, there is no comparison.

In the State of Ohio, railroads employ nearly 55,000 men and women. Their annual payroll is $80 million. An important part of this industry's materials and supplies, totaling a billion and a half dollars annually, are manufactured in Ohio. Their contribution to the welfare and prosperity of the State is important. To Ohioans, and to all Americans, it is of the utmost importance that railroad problems be solved—that railroad officials respond to the demands of the times, offer good and fast service to people, attempt to accommodate prospective passengers, and go all out to keep travel on a reasonably accurate schedule.

Mr. President, in the Washington Post on January 9, 1965, there appeared an excellent article entitled "The Tokaido Line: Portrait in Speed." It describes the magnificent new train service inaugurated last October in Japan between Tokyo and Osaka, the most modern system of rail transportation in the world. This line requires only 4 hours to travel the more than 400 miles between the two great urban centers of Japan. It constitutes the ultimate in efficiency and economy in passenger train service. Considering the time required to travel from cities to their airports, this train can transport 978 passengers between these two cities in the same length of time that a Boeing 727 jet can fly 124 passengers. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TOKAIDO LINE: PORTRAIT IN SPEED

When the new Tokaido line officially opened last October 1, the event was a historic point in the history of transportation. More than the simple linking of Tokyo and Osaka, the event marked the inauguration of the world's most modern system of rail transportation. The new line makes other railway systems as dated as the original Tokaido route depicted in woodblock prints.

It took at least 2 weeks to travel between Tokyo and Osaka, then known as Edo and Naniwa, a century ago. The construction of the Tokaido Railway cut this to 6½ hours, but now only 4 hours will be required to travel the more than 300 miles between the two great urban centers of Japan.

The new trains, powered by electricity, will be 12 cars long, and will travel at a top speed of 125 miles an hour. This high speed has been made possible by a number of factors. The construction of tunnels to eliminate the need to climb inclines, the complete elimination of grade crossings, aerodynamically styled trains and a large standard radius for all curves are among them.

Because of the trains' high speed, conventional signals are not usable. Therefore, an automatic train control system coupled with a signal board in the cab has been devised. All data are immediately indicated on the board. Other safety devices include a centralized traffic control system. This system enables men in a central control room in the new Tokyo station to transmit information and instructions to all stations and engineers in an instant via ultrashortwave wireless.

As one means of providing passengers with a comfortable trip, the familiar click-clack sound of wheels running over joints has been virtually eliminated. Rail sections were made in longer lengths than usual and then welded when installed. Joints are to be found at intervals of 1 mile. Improved switches are used throughout and concrete ties have been used in place of the traditional wooden ones. Rubber pads and other devices provide heavy-duty cushioning between the rails and ties. The gage is wider than other Japanese railway lines, at 4 feet and 8½ inches.

Each passenger train will have two first-class cars, two combined second-class and buffet cars and eight second-class cars. Each train can carry 978 passengers.

Super express trains are capable of making the run in only 3 hours, but for technical reasons the length of time used will be increased to 4 hours. Limited expresses make the trip in 5 hours. Trains depart at 30-minute intervals, starting at 6 a.m. daily.

Super expresses will stop only at Nagoya, while the limited expresses will stop at Yokohama, Odawara, Atami, Shizuoka, Hamamatsu, Toyohashi, Nagoya, Gifu-Hajima, Maibara, and Kyoto, far fewer than the classic 53 stations of Hiroshige's series of prints.

The present Tokaido line encompasses only 3 percent of the length of track of the Japan National Railways but carries 25 percent of the annual national JNR total of 5.6 million passengers and 200 million tons of freight. The New Tokaido line is meant to alleviate this overcrowding.

Construction work began in 1959. In addition to technical problems, obtaining land for the right-of-way proved difficult, but as the project nears completion, all phases of work are being completed on time.

When the project was first announced and later authorized, there was criticism from some quarters on the basis that rail transportation is outmoded in comparison with intercity trucking and the expansion of air routes. Nevertheless, such claims may be easily disproved by an examination of the pertinent facts.

Regarding the transportation of passengers, for example, a Boeing 727 can fly only 124 persons between Tokyo and Osaka. When the time needed to go to and return from airports is considered, it becomes evident that a single train of the New Tokaido Line can move many more passengers than can the plane, and in approximately the same time.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, evidently our railroad officials should ask our Government to invite officials of Italy and Japan to send a reverse of the Peace Corps to the United States to teach our backward railway operators how to take proper care of passengers, and thereby earn money for dividends for their stockholders. Why, in a country which sent men into outer space and returned them safely, have we failed to provide comfortable railroad trips from Cleveland to Cincinnati, and from New York to Washington, and from Washington to San Francisco, to cite examples?

Our highways become overcrowded as fast as we build them. Passenger train service is more and more becoming a greater necessity, especially in our large metropolitan areas. Unless railroad executives immediately begin taking action to improve and expand this service, we may soon find ourselves in a transportation crisis of great severity.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE KANSAS SOCIETY OF THE DAUGHTERS OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution at their 67th annual State conference in Wichita, Kans., on March 9 adopted resolutions expressing their views in regard to education, world peace, the Federal budget, and power of Executive orders.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be made a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS AMERICAN REVOLUTION ADOPTED AT 67TH ANNUAL STATE CONFERENCE, MARCH 9, 1965, WICHITA, KANS.

EDUCATION

Whereas too many experiments in educational methods have been carried out in our schools in the guise of progressive education, over a period of years, to the great detriment of our youth and their educational standard; and

Whereas the general public is awakening to this sad condition by which our children have been cheated of vital knowledge in critical times, and efforts are now being made in many places to rectify; and

Whereas J. Edgar Hoover has said that the battlefield for the minds of men may well be staged in the classrooms of the Nation; that Communist strategists realizing this have made the conquest of youth one of their urgent goals; and

Whereas with the elimination of God from the classroom and with the widespread unrest being fermented upon our college campuses by innocent appearing youth organizations teaching Communist ideology: Be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Society, Daughters American Revolution, commend those educators, school leaders and administrators that have expressed their intention to present their schools with organized and disciplined subjects; better history books, teaching love of country to elementary children, and a general determined effort toward the making of dedicated American citizens; and be it further

Resolved, That the States and communities maintain control of the subject matter and direction of their children's instruction—that the American birthright of our youth not be released to bureaucratic Federal commissioners in return for financial school aid.

FOR WORLD PEACE

Whereas there is a need for prayer, as never before, for the preservation, survival and future of our Nation; and

Whereas we believe in the effectivness of concerted prayer: Be it

Resolved, That a moment of silent prayer be observed in each Kansas chapter at the conclusion of the national defense report given at chapter meetings for peace in the world without concessions, away from our American heritage and national honor.

FEDERAL 1965–66 BUDGET

Whereas the largest peacetime Government deficit ever deliberately planned, by any administration, was presented to the 89th Congress of the United States in the 1965 Federal budget; and

Whereas men from both political parties in high positions of our Government as well as businessmen, in all phases of endeavor, have shown great concern over such unlimited spending in the face of an already towering deficit and national debt; and

Whereas our silver and gold reserves, at West Point and Fort Knox, have been drawn upon almost to the diminished point and is being hoarded by foreign nations (in their planned program of ruining our Nation) by not accepting the American dollar in our "giveaway" foreign aid program: Be it

Resolved, That we, of the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, commend the Kansas congressional delegation in their stand for a more realistic budget. And that we also commend the chairman of the powerful Appropriations Committee who has stated that, "We are spending money we do not have for things we do not need."

POWER OF EXECUTIVE ORDERS

Whereas among the facts obtained from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are laws made by Congress, and among the facts obtained from the Federal Register are laws made by the rules and regulations of the executive branch of the Federal Government. Such laws are made by the various commissions, boards, and departments of the Federal Government, but are possible only because the Congress has delegated its lawmaking authority to nonelected members of these said agencies; and

Whereas there are four times as many laws passed by the executive branch than laws passed by Congress, and these laws and regulations touch every phase of our daily lives; and

Whereas Executive orders are issued by the President under authority of existing laws and he assigns emergency functions to the various governmental departments: Be it

Resolved, That it should be the duty and responsibility of each citizen to obtain and to study the Executive orders which offer the means of achieving unprecedented and dictatorial power if the Executive deems it necessary to declare an emergency; and be it further

Resolved, That members of the Kansas Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, request their elected Congressmen to keep a vigilant watch that in such nonelected governmental laws the rights of American citizens are fully protected.

DEDICATION

Whereas the United States is opposed throughout the world by a foe, openly boasting its intent to destroy this Government and to replace it with a Godless system, controlled, not by the people, not for the people, but by a few ruthless power-hungry atheists; and

Whereas this Government was founded upon Christian principles and the rights of free independent men and so has prospered greatly, and has grown in strength because our Government was established and has flourished by those who believed that "Men's affairs do little prosper when God's work is neglected": Be it

Resolved, That we strengthen our dedication to the preservation of this sacred heritage by a closer alliance with the only power that can defeat this growing peril, that we foresake not this divine power and that our Nation remain "under God" and so continue to exist, a light to its own people and a hope to the downtrodden of the earth. "For the people who know their God shall stand firm and take action."

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS LIVESTOCK CONVENTION

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, the Kansas Livestock Association at its convention meeting in Wichita, March 11–13, adopted resolutions expressing its interest in pending legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolutions be made a part of these remarks.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE 52D ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE KANSAS LIVESTOCK ASSOCIATION, MARCH 13, 1965, WICHITA, KANS.

APPORTIONMENT

Whereas the Congress of the United States and most State legislatures were originally and deliberately apportioned one house by population and one house by area; and

Whereas this legislative structure has been the basis of the strength of our Republic: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association urgently recommends a constitutional amendment that will allow States to apportion one house of their legislature on factors other than population.

ELIMINATION OF CARGO PREFERENCE CLAUSE

Resolved, That the Kansas Livestock Association favors the elimination of the cargo preference clause from any commercial sales in export trade.

COMPACT RELATING TO TAXATION OF CERTAIN MOTOR FUELS

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 307) granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

TITLE I

SECTION 101. The consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, and Maryland, and to the District of Columbia to enter into a compact on taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses. But before any other States, any Province of Canada, or any State or territory or the Federal District of Mexico shall be made a party to such compact, the further consent of Congress shall first be obtained. Such compact shall be in substantially the following form:

"COMPACT ON TAXATION OF MOTOR FUELS CONSUMED BY INTERSTATE BUSES

"Article I—Purposes

"The purposes of this agreement are to—

"(a) avoid multiple taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to assure each State of its fair share of motor fuel taxes;

"(b) establish and facilitate the administration of a criterion of motor fuel taxation for interstate buses which is reasonably related to the use of highway and related facilities and services in each of the party States; and

"(c) encourage the availability of a maximum number of buses for intrastate service by removing motor fuel taxation as a deterrent in the routing of interstate buses.

"Article II—Definitions

"(a) State: State shall include the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the territories of the United States. the Provinces of Canada, and the States, Territories, and Federal District of Mexico.

"(b) Contracting State: Contracting State shall mean a State which is a party to this agreement.

"(c) Administrator: Administrator shall mean the official or agency of a State administering the motor fuel taxes involved.

"(d) Person: Person shall include any individual, firm, copartnership, joint venture, association, corporation, estate, trust, business trust, receiver, syndicate, or any other group or combination acting as a unit.

"(e) Bus: Bus shall mean any motor vehicle of a bus type engaged in the interstate transportation of passengers and subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission or any agency successor thereto, or one or more State regulatory agencies concerned with the regulation of passenger transport.

"(f) Gallon: Gallon shall mean the liquid measure containing 231 cubic inches.

"Article III—Governing principle

"For purposes of this compact, the primary principle for the imposition of motor fuel taxes shall be consumption of such fuel within the State. Motor fuel consumed by buses shall be taxed on the existing basis, as it may be from time to time, and under the procedures for collection of such taxes by each party State, except that to the extent that this compact makes provision therefor, or for any matter connected therewith, such provision shall govern.

"Article IV—How fuel consumed to be ascertained

"The amount of fuel used in the operation of any bus within this State shall be conclusively presumed to be the number of miles operated by such bus within the State divided by the average mileage per gallon obtained by the bus during the tax period in all operations, whether within or without the party State. Any owner or operator of two or more buses shall calculate average mileage within the meaning of this article by computing single average figures covering all buses owned or operated by him.

"Article V—Imposition of tax

"Every owner or operator of buses shall pay to the party State taxes equivalent to the amount of tax per gallon multiplied by the number of gallons used in its operations in the party State.

"Article VI—Reports

"On or before the last business day of the month following the month being reported upon, each bus owner or operator subject to the payment of fuel taxes pursuant to this compact shall make such reports of its operations as the State administrator of motor fuel taxes may require and shall furnish the State administrator in each other party State wherein his buses operate a copy of such report.

"Article VII—Credit for payment of fuel taxes

"Each bus owner or operator shall be entitled to a credit equivalent to the amount of tax per gallon on all motor fuel purchased by such operator within the party State for use in operations either within or without the party State, and upon which the motor fuel tax imposed by the laws of such party State has been paid.

"Article VIII—Additional tax or refund

"If the bus owner or operator's monthly report shows a debit balance after taking credit pursuant to article VII, a remittance in such net amount due shall be made with the report. If the report shows a credit balance, after taking credit as herein provided, a refund in such net amount as has been overpaid shall be made by the party State to such owner or operator.

"Article IX—Entry into force and withdrawal

"This compact shall enter into force when enacted into law by any two States. Thereafter it shall enter into force and become binding upon any State subsequently joining when such State has enacted the compact into law. Withdrawal from the compact shall be by act of the legislature of a party State, but shall not take effect until one year after the Governor of the withdrawing State has notified the Governor of each other party State, in writing, of the withdrawal.

"Article X—Construction and severability

"This compact shall be liberally construed so as to effectuate the purposes thereof. The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence, or provision of this compact is declared to be contrary to the constitution of any State or of the United States or the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstances shall not be affected thereby. If this compact shall be held contrary to the constitution of any State participating herein, the compact shall remain in full force and effect as to the remaining party States and in full force and effect as to the State affected as to all severable matters."

SEC. 102. As used in the compact set forth in section 101 with reference to the District of Columbia—

(1) the term "Legislature" shall mean the Congress of the United States; and

(2) the term "Governor" shall mean the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

SEC. 103. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall enter into the compact authorized by section 101 of this title without further action on the part of the Congress, and issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the implementation of such compact. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, nothing herein shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners (other than the entry into a compact authorized by this Act) or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

SEC. 104. All provisions of law applicable to the District of Columbia shall, to the extent they are inconsistent with the compact authorized by this title, be inapplicable to the taxation of buses (as that term is defined in the compact) in the District of Columbia during such time as the District is a party to such compact.

SEC. 105. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this title is expressly reserved.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. The consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Maine, New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Maryland, and New York, and to the District of Columbia to enter into a compact providing for bus taxation proration and reciprocity. But before any other State, any Province of Canada, or any State or territory or the Federal District of Mexico shall be made a party to such compact, the further consent of Congress shall first be obtained. Such compact shall be in substantially the following form:

"BUS TAXATION PRORATION AND RECIPROCITY AGREEMENT

"Article I—Purposes and principles

"SECTION 1. Purposes of agreement: It is the purpose of this agreement to set up a system whereby any contracting State may permit owners of fleets of buses operating in two or more States to prorate the registration of the buses in such fleets in each State in which the fleets operate on the basis of the proportion of miles operated within such State to total fleet miles, as defined herein.

"SEC. 2. Principle of proration of registration: It is hereby declared that in making this agreement the contracting States adhere to the principle that each State should have the freedom to develop the kind of highway user tax structure that it determines to be most appropriate to itself, that the method of taxation of interstate buses should not be a determining factor in developing its user tax structure, and that annual taxes or other taxes of the fixed-fee type upon buses which are not imposed on a basis that reflects the amount of highway use should be apportioned among the States, within the limits of practicality, on the basis of vehicle miles traveled within each of the States.

"Article II—Definitions

"(a) State: State shall include the States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the territories of the United States, the Provinces of Canada, and the States, Territories, and Federal District of Mexico.

"(b) Contracting State: Contracting State shall mean a State which is a party to this agreement.

"(c) Administrator: Administrator shall mean the official or agency of a State administering the fee involved, or, in the case of proration of registration, the official or agency of a State administering the proration of registration in that State.

"(d) Person: Person shall include any individual, firm, copartnership, joint venture, association, corporation, estate, trust, business trust, receiver, syndicate, or any other group or combination acting as a unit.

"(e) Base State: Base State shall mean the State from or in which the bus is most frequently dispatched, garaged, serviced, maintained, operated, or otherwise controlled, or also in the case of a fleet bus the State to which it is allocated for registration under statutory requirements. In order that this section may not be used for the purpose of evasion of registration fees, the administrators of the contracting States may make the final decision as to the proper base State, in accordance with article III(h) hereof, to prevent or avoid such evasion.

"(f) Bus: Bus shall mean any motor vehicle of a bus type engaged in the interstate transportation of passengers and subject to the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission, or any agency successor thereto, or one or more State regulatory agencies concerned with the regulation of passenger transport.

"(g) Fleet: As to each contracting State, fleet shall include only those buses which actually travel a portion of their total miles in such State. A fleet must include three or more buses.

"(h) Registration: Registration shall mean the registration of a bus and the payment of annual fees and taxes as set forth in or pursuant to the laws of the respective contracting States.

"(i) Proration of registration: Proration of registration shall mean registration of fleets of buses in accordance with article IV of this agreement.

"(j) Reciprocity: Reciprocity shall mean that each contracting State, to the extent provided in this agreement, exempts a bus from registration and registration fees.

"Article III—General provisions

"(a) Effect on other agreements, arrangements, and understandings: On and after its effective date, this agreement shall supersede any reciprocal or other agreement, arrangement, or understanding between any two or more of the contracting States covering, in whole or in part, any of the matters covered by this agreement; but this agreement shall not affect any reciprocal or other agreement, arrangement, or understanding between a contracting State and a State or States not party to this agreement.

"(b) Applicability to exempt vehicles: This agreement shall not require registration in a contracting State of any vehicles which are in whole or part exempt from registration under the laws or regulations of such State without respect to this agreement.

"(c) Inapplicability to caravaned vehicles: The benefits and privileges of this agreement shall not be extended to a vehicle operated on its own wheels, or in tow of a motor vehicle, transported for the purpose of selling or offering the same for sale to or by any agent, dealer, purchaser, or prospective purchaser.

"(d) Other fees and taxes: This agreement does not waive any fees or taxes charged or levied by any State in connection with the ownership or operation of vehicles other than registration fees as defined herein. All other fees and taxes shall be paid to each State in accordance with the laws thereof.

"(e) Statutory vehicle regulations: This agreement shall not authorize the operation of a vehicle in any contracting State contrary to the laws or regulations thereof, except those pertaining to registration and payment of fees; and with respect to such laws or regulations, only to the extent provided in this agreement.

"(f) Violations: Each contracting State reserves the right to withdraw, by order of the administrator thereof, all or any part of the benefits or privileges granted pursuant to this agreement from the owner of any vehicle or fleet of vehicles operated in violation of any provision of this agreement. The administrator shall immediately give notice of any such violation and withdrawal of any such benefits or privileges to the administrator of each other contracting State in which vehicles of such owner are operated.

"(g) Cooperation: The administrator of each of the contracting States shall cooperate with the administrators of the other and each contracting State hereby agrees to furnish such aid and assistance to each other within its statutory authority as will aid in the proper enforcement of this agreement.

"(h) Interpretation: In any dispute between or among contracting States arising under this agreement, the final decision regarding interpretation of questions at issue relating to this agreement shall be reached by joint action of the contracting States, acting through the administrator thereof, and shall upon determination be placed in writing.

"(i) Effective of headings: Article and section headings contained herein shall not be deemed to govern, limit, modify, or in any manner affect the scope, meaning, or intent of the provisions of any article or part hereof.

"(j) Entry into force: This agreement shall enter into force and become binding between and among the contracting States when enacted or otherwise entered into by any two States. Thereafter, it shall enter into force and become binding with respect to any State when enacted into law by such State. If the statutes of any State so authorize or provide, such State may become party to this agreement upon the execution thereof by an executive or administrative official thereof acting on behalf of and for such State.

"Article IV—Proration of registration

"(a) Applicability: Any owner of a fleet may register the buses of said fleet in any contracting State by paying to said State total registration fees in an amount equal to that obtained by applying the proportion of in-State fleet miles divided by the total fleet miles, to the total fees which would otherwise be required for regular registration of each and all of such vehicles in such contracting State.

"All fleet pro rata registration fees shall be based upon the mileage proportions of the fleet during the period of twelve months ending on August 31 next preceding the commencement of the registration year for which registration is sought: Except, that mileage proportions for a fleet not operated during such period in the State where application for registration is made will be determined by the Administrator upon the sworn application of the applicant showing the operations during such period in other States and the estimated operations during the registration year for which registration is sought, in the State in which application is being made; or if no operations were conducted during such period a full statement of the proposed method of operation.

"If any buses operate in two or more States which permit the proration of registration on the basis of a fleet of buses consisting of a lesser number of vehicles than provided in article II(g), such fleet may be prorated as to registration in such States, in which event the buses in such fleet shall not be required to register in any other contracting States if each such vehicle is registered in some contracting State (except to the extent it is exempt from registration as provided in article III(b)).

"If the administrator of any State determines, based on his method of the operation thereof, that the inclusion of a bus or buses as a part of a fleet would adversely affect the proper fleet fee which should be paid to his State, having due regard for fairness and equity, he may refuse to permit any or all of such buses to be included in his State as a part of such fleet.

"(b) Total fleet miles: Total fleet miles, with respect to each contracting State, shall mean the total miles operated by the fleet (1) in such State, (2) in all other contracting States, (3) in other States having proportional registration provisions, (4) in States with which such contracting State has reciprocity, and (5) in such other States as the administrator determines should be included under the circumstances in order to protect or promote the interest of his State; except that in States having laws requiring proration on the basis of a different determination of total fleet miles, total fleet miles shall be determined on such basis.

"(c) Leased vehicles: If a bus is operated by a person other than the owner as a part of a fleet which is subject to the provisions of this article, then the operator of such fleet shall be deemed to be the owner of said bus for the purposes of this article.

"(d) Extent of privileges: Upon the registration of a fleet in a contracting State pursuant to this article, each bus in the fleet may be operated in both interstate and intrastate operations in such State (except as provided in article III(e)).

"(e) Application for proration: The application for proration of registration shall be made in each contracting State upon substantially the application form and supplements authorized by joint action of the administrators of the contracting States.

"(f) Issuance of identification: Upon registration of a fleet, the State which is the base State of a particular bus of the fleet shall issue the required license plates and registration card for such bus and each contracting State in which the fleet of which such bus is a part operates shall issue a special identification identifying such bus as a part of a fleet which has fully complied with the registration requirements of such State. The required license plates, registration cards, and identification shall be appropriately displayed in the manner required by or pursuant to the laws of each respective State.

"(g) Additions to fleet: If any bus is added to a prorated fleet after the filing of the original application, the owner shall file a supplemental application. The owner shall register such bus in each contracting State in like manner as provided for buses listed in an original application and the registration fee payable shall be determined on the mileage proportion used to determine the registration fees payable for buses registered under the original application.

"(h) Withdrawals from fleet: If any bus is withdrawn from a prorated fleet during the period for which it is registered or identified, the owner shall notify the administrator of each State in which it is registered or identified of such withdrawal and shall return the plates and registration card or identification as may be required by or pursuant to the laws of the respective States.

"(i) Audits: The Administrator of each contracting State shall, within the statutory authority of such administrator, make any information obtained upon an audit of records of any applicant for proration of registration available to the administrators of the other contracting States.

"(j) Errors in registration: If it is determined by the administrator of a contracting State, as a result of such audits or otherwise, that an improper fee has been paid his State, or errors in registration found, the administrator may require the fleet owner to make the necessary corrections in the registration of his fleet and payment of fees.

"Article V—Reciprocity

"(a) Grant of reciprocity: Each of the contracting States grants reciprocity as provided in this article.

"(b) Applicability: The provisions of this agreement with respect to reciprocity shall apply only to a bus properly registered in the base State of the bus, which State must be a contracting State.

"(c) Nonapplicability to fleet buses: The reciprocity granted pursuant to this article shall not apply to a bus which is entitled to be registered or identified as part of a prorated fleet.

"(d) Extent of reciprocity: The reciprocity granted pursuant to this article shall permit the interstate operation of a bus and intrastate operation which is incidental to a trip of such bus involving interstate operation.

"(e) Other agreements: Nothing in this agreement shall be construed to prohibit any of the contracting States from entering into separate agreements with each other for the granting of temporary permits for the intrastate operation of vehicles registered in the other State; nor to prevent any of the contracting States from entering into agreements to grant reciprocity for intrastate operation within any zone or zones agreed upon by the States.

"Article VI—Withdrawal or revocation

"Any contracting State may withdraw from this agreement upon thirty days' written notice to each other contracting State, which notice shall be given only after the repeal of this agreement by the legislature of such State, if adoption was by legislative act, or after renunciation by the appropriate administrative official of such contracting State if the laws thereof empower him so to renounce.

"Article VII—Construction and severability

"This compact shall be liberally construed so as to effectuate the purposes thereof. The provisions of this compact shall be severable and if any phrase, clause, sentence, or provision of this compact is declared to be contrary to the Constitution of any State or of the United States or the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person, or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. If this compact shall be held contrary to the constitution of any State participating herein, the compact shall remain in full force and effect as to the remaining party States and in full force and effect as to the State affected as to all severable matters."

SEC. 202. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have the power to make such exemptions from the coverage of the agreement as may be appropriate and to make such changes in methods for the reporting of any information required to be furnished to the District of Columbia pursuant to the agreement as, in its judgment, shall be suitable: *Provided*, That any such exemptions or changes shall not be contrary to the purposes set forth in article I of the agreement and shall be made in order to permit the continuance of uniformity of practice among the contracting States with respect to buses.

SEC. 203. The Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall enter into the agreement authorized by section 201 of this title without further action on the part of the Congress, and issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary for the implementation of such agreement. Notwithstanding any provision of this Act, nothing herein shall be construed so as to affect the authority vested in the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia by Reorganization Plan Numbered 5 of 1952 (66 Stat. 824). The performance of any function vested by this Act in the Board of Commissioners (other than the entry into a compact authorized by this Act) or in any office or agency under the jurisdiction and control of said Board of Commissioners may be delegated by said Board of Commissioners in accordance with section 3 of such plan.

Sec. 204. All provisions of law applicable to the District of Columbia shall, to the extent they are inconsistent with the agreement authorized by this title, be inapplicable to the taxation and registration of buses in the District of Columbia during such time as the District is a party to such agreement.

Sec. 205. Unless otherwise provided in any statute withdrawing the District of Columbia from participation in the agreement, the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall be the officer to give notice of withdrawal therefrom.

Sec. 206. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this title is expressly reserved.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary recommends concurrence in the amendment made to the compact by the House. However, we wish to make it very clear that we are not adopting as a matter of policy a proposal that open-ended interstate compacts will not be permitted. Indeed, instances may arise in which that is desirable.

In the instant case, the amendment, which has the effect of requiring States to obtain congressional approval before they enter into this compact, is not out of order.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

MILES CITY VETERANS HOSPITAL FACILITY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if I may have time in my own right for the first time today, I should like to discuss the Veterans' Administration facility at Miles City, Mont.

My distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. Metcalf], and I appeared before the House Veterans Affairs Committee last Thursday, at which time the junior Senator from Montana presented to that committee rebuttal to allegations made by the Veterans' Administration covering the closing of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Miles City.

Of those allegations, five in number, four were untrue and the fifth was partially true. Other allegations were raised since the original ones and they, too, were answered by my colleague.

On Sunday morning last, probably as a result of the House hearings, quite unexpectedly Mr. W. A. Driver, the Administrator of Veterans' Administration, visited the hospital at Miles City, Mont. He spent 4 or 5 hours there, and then I believe he went to the hospital at Grand Junction in Colorado. I believe—although I am not certain—that from there he went down to some facility in either Texas or New Mexico. However, while he was in Miles City, he had the following to say:

> We are determined to make the greatest possible use of Veterans' Administration facilities, using them to the fullest extent, which Miles City is not doing. This is a drag on the whole system.

On Sunday last, during Mr. Driver's visit, it happened that 72 of the 96 beds were occupied. I suppose that was one of the reasons which Mr. Driver had in mind for making his unnecessary and uncalled-for remark about Miles City being a "drag on the whole system."

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a list of patients by days and months. In the year 1964, in January, the hospital had a 91.9-percent patient average. In February it was 97.1 percent; March 94.3 percent; April 95.2 percent; May 84.4 percent; June 85.1 percent; July 71.5 percent; August 78.4 percent; September 80.7 percent; October 64.9 percent; November 84.6 percent; and in December 77.3 percent.

For the year 1964, the average was 83.8 percent.

For 1965—and remember, the directive was issued on January 13—in January, the monthly average was 81.7 percent; in February, 72 percent; and in March, up to midnight of March 30, 82 percent.

It seems to me that when we keep in mind the fact that on January 13 an order was issued stating unequivocally that the Miles City facility would be closed on May 1, and that a week or so later the order was partially rescinded so that patients could be taken in because of weather and geography; further, when we consider the fact that the chief of the hospital staff, Dr. Matousek, was transferred out of the hospital on February 15, and not replaced; and further, that Dr. Carson, one of the full-time surgeons, was on military leave, without replacement, at the time of Mr. Driver's visit; when we consider the psychological fact that because of the order issued by the Veterans' Administration many veterans will now go to community hospitals or stay at home, I believe that it is about time to look into this matter thoroughly.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield at that point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. If I may finish this part of my remarks first, I shall then be glad to yield.

Yesterday, I was informed by Mr. Driver's assistant that a GSA team will be going to Miles City on April 8. I do not know for what purpose, but I have a suspicion why. This morning, I sent a letter to Mr. Driver in which I stated in part:

> I would appreciate knowing in detail and specifically why this GSA team is being sent to Miles City and for what purpose. An answer from you at your earliest convenience, and in detail, will be most appreciated.

On the basis of the statement made in Miles City, Mr. Driver might just as well have stayed at home, because in my opinion, his mind was made up and his judgment already made before he left.

We have not heard the end of the Miles City Hospital affair. When my colleague and I appear before the Independent Offices Subcommittee on Appropriations on Friday week, we intend once again to lay the whole story bare, because we are right.

The Miles City facility should not be closed. To close it would be doing a great disservice to the veterans to whom we have given our solemn pledge that they would be cared for when they came back from the wars.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Suprise Inspection—National VA Chief Visits Miles City," from the Montana Standard of March 29, 1965.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Surprise Inspection: National VA Chief Visits Miles City

Miles City.—Director William J. Driver and several other Veterans' Administration officers made a surprise inspection of the Miles City VA Hospital Sunday.

One official said the trip to Miles City and other VA facilities that are to be closed soon was on the orders of President Johnson.

There was no immediate indication whether the inspection was a sign of weakening on the decision to close the Miles City hospital June 30. The Miles City closure and 13 others across the Nation have kicked up a storm of protest in Congress.

Learning of the visit, Representative James Battin, Republican of Montana, issued the following statement from Washington, D.C.:

"I was most pleased to learn that Mr. Driver and his party of high-ranking officials has made a firsthand inspection of the Miles City hospital. I am convinced that after he sees this wonderful VA installation for himself, he cannot find justification for its closing."

Driver found one-fourth of the hospital empty and said failure to make greatest possible use of the facility "is a drag on the whole system."

Driver spent 2 hours in the hospital.

He was accompanied by his administrative aid, Ed Kelly, Dr. M. J. Musser, deputy chief medical director; F. R. Hood, director of information service; and Joe Moody, General Services Administration, all of Washington.

The group arrived about 10 a.m., having flown by jet to Glasgow and transferring to a smaller plane for the flight on to Miles City. They left at noon for a visit to the VA hospital at Grand Junction, Colo. Four or five other hospitals were also on the tour schedule, Driver indicated.

Dr. Turner Camp, St. Paul, Minn., the area medical director, flew to Rapid City, S. Dak., and rented a car there to drive on to Miles City.

The group met with Miles City residents, veteran group representatives Mayor Herb Crone, Russel Shore, and Herb Lathrop, Shore, Lathrop, and Robert Scanlan, publisher of the Miles City Star and president of the Miles City Chamber of Commerce, protested the closing at a hearing in Washington earlier last week.

Driver told the group he wanted a firsthand look at the hospitals and said the VA plans to provide the best possible care for veterans. In doing this, he said, the VA must look at veterans' problems on a national basis even though this might conflict with local interests.

"If the hospital is closed," he said, "We will make sure facilities are available elsewhere. I appreciate your problems and I hope you will appreciate ours."

"We are determined to make the greatest possible use of the VA facilities, using them to the fullest extent, which Miles City is not doing. This is a drag on the whole system," Driver said.

At the time, 72 beds of the total 96 available at the hospital were occupied.

The party toured the entire hospital, including the morgue. Driver made the tour without comment but did ask questions about the operations.

Hospital officials and a few others learned of the impending inspection Saturday night.

Plans were announced in January to close 11 hospitals, 3 veterans' homes and 17 regional offices around the Nation, at a saving of $23.5 million annually. The Miles City facility opened in August 1951.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad now to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President——

Mr. SIMPSON. I defer to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I concur in everything that my distinguished colleague has stated.

Let me point out that when Mr. Driver went out to Miles City, Mont., he arrived in a jet, which was flown to Glasgow Airbase. He then transferred to a smaller plane for the flight to Miles City. He was joined there by Dr. Turner Camp, of St. Paul, Minn., the area's medical director, who flew to Rapid City, S. Dak., and rented a car to drive on to Miles City. This gives a good indication of the distances and the transportation problem involved.

The ordinary veteran does not have the facility of a jet airplane in which to fly to a military base. A veteran who goes to Miles City for hospitalization does not have the facilities to rent a car and drive 400 or 500 miles to a veterans hospital.

The other day, when I appeared with my distinguished collegue before the Veterans' Affairs Committee in the other body, I analyzed the reasons given for the initial closure of the veterans hospital at Miles City. They were five in number. Four of them were completely and totally false, and the fifth was partially untrue. Then, when Mr. Driver moved over and testified before the Veterans' Affairs Committee in the other body, he changed his ground and made several other statements as to the reason for the closure.

I analyzed the first of them before the committee at that time, and I analyzed the others, and they were all untrue—all completely and totally false. Thus, every reason heretofore that Mr. Driver has given for the closure of the hospital, either in his first statement or his subsequent statement, has proved either untrue or partially untrue.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Let me point out that the junior Senator from Montana and I spoke out against and voted against confirmation of Mr. Driver's nomination. We forewarned the Senate at that time that he had already proved, by his testimony before Congress, that he was untrustworthy, and that the nomination should not be confirmed.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. METCALF. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado, if my distinguished colleague will permit me.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLOTT. The fact that Mr. Driver flew out to Miles City indicates that what the Government has done is for its own purposes.

Is the Senator aware, or does he know, whether the Veterans' Administration can afford a jet for the transportation of an administrator around the country?

Mr. METCALF. I cannot answer that, but there is another sidelight on that situation. He landed at Glasgow Air Base, which is closed, and soon no one will be able to land there.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have just now noted in the Montana press that this year, as an indication of the terrible weather conditions we have had this winter, for 75 days this winter it was below zero at Glasgow.

Mr. METCALF. The Senator is correct.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement I made before the House Veterans' Affairs Committee be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, MILES CITY, MONT.

REASONS FOR CLOSING

Generally, the statements printed by the Veterans' Administration as the justifications or considerations for closing the VA hospital at Miles City are either untrue or only partially true.

Justifications for closing per VA	*Analysis*
1. The hospital operates less than 100 beds and its average daily patient load has been approximately 80 patients.	Factual statement as to size.
(a) Thus it is a high-cost operation.	Basically untrue. 1. The cost per patient treated at Miles City for fiscal year 1964 was $646.85. This is the 9th lowest for any of the 54 G.M. & S. nonaffiliated hospitals and the 14th lowest in the VA system of 129 G.M. & S. hospitals. The average was $925 for G.M. & S. hospitals. 2. As to efficiency, the Miles City Hospital has increased the number of patients treated from 595 patients in 1952 to 1,169 in 1960 to 1,543 in 1964 with an increase in professional medical staff of about one full-time surgeon, one full-time nurse, and a part-time radiologist. For fiscal year 1965 the hospital had anticipated treating about 1,600 patients. As to the number of patients treated compared with the capacity (turnover) Miles City is the fourth highest in the VA system. 3. The operating costs (primary fund allocation for all medical programs) for fiscal

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, MILES CITY, MONT.—Continued

REASONS FOR CLOSING—continued

Justifications for closing per VA

(b) Miles City has a very limited range of professional activity.

2. Patients requiring extensive or skilled care must be transferred to neighboring VA hospitals.

3. Staffing is recurrently difficult, making planning for patient care difficult.

4. In some instances, it has been necessary to transfer residents from VA hospital, Minneapolis, Minn., in order to care for patients.

5. From demand and patient load statistics, it is apparent that the hospitals at Fargo, N. Dak., Hot Springs, S. Dak., and Sioux Falls, S. Dak., can absorb the VA hospital, Miles City, patient load.

6. Miles City VA Hospital was selected for closure because on the basis of waiting list history and bed occupancy rates, it is an area of low demand contrasted to other regions served by VA hospitals.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, MILES CITY, MONT.—Continued

REASONS FOR CLOSING—continued

Analysis

year 1965 for Miles City are estimated at $1,088,026, the lowest operating costs of any G.M. & S. hospital in the system. Grand Junction is second with $1,475,589.

4. As to per diem costs (costs per patient per day) Miles City costs for fiscal year 1964 showed $32.27 per patient per day. This is $3.89 higher than the national average. Eighteen hospitals show higher per diem costs. The nearest hospitals to Miles City show Cheyenne, $37.79 with 133 beds; Fort Harrison, $35.53 with 160 beds; and Fargo, N. Dak., $31.36 with 228 beds. Thus, two of these hospitals exceed Miles City in per diem costs.

Meaning of the VA statement is uncertain. As to the staff conducting research and attending classes at medical schools the statement is true. As to the specialists available to the hospital who are board certified or board eligible it is less than true.

Untrue. From January 1, 1964, to February 22, 1965, not one such transfer was made and to the knowledge of the staff such transfers have never been made. About 7 percent of patients are transferred to nonneighboring affiliated and special hospitals for such treatment as TB, paraplegic, psychiatric, and special treatment beyond the capability of Miles City. Patients were not transferred to any of the hospitals scheduled to absorb the Miles City patient load.

Partially true. Staff is not easy to recruit and requires listing the opening in the Journal of the American Medical Association in advance of the expected need. Actual vacancies have been very few. Of the five full-time physicians during the past 5 years, representing 300 man-months, vacancies have existed for 25 man-months. Nursing vacancies have always been less than 1 month. Nonprofessional help has been no problem. We found no evidence of difficult planning for patient care.

Untrue. According to the Miles City Hospital director (Mr. Randall) this type of help has never been needed nor sent.

According to the maps and schedules prepared by VA showing the counties in the Miles City area and to which hospital the veterans should apply from these counties, the following hospitals are expected by VA to absorb the patient load: Fort Harrison Mont., Fargo, N. Dak., and Cheyenne, Wyo. Most of the patients are to be absorbed by Fort Harrison.

During the 91-day period, January 1 to March 31, 1964, the VA hospitals at Fort Harrison, Cheyenne, and Fargo had insufficient space to absorb the Miles City patient demand on 80 days. On 9 days in this period there were over 50 patients at Miles City who could not have been admitted at the remaining hospitals.

Waiting list: It is true that Miles City has had no waiting list for the past 3 years and that the hospitals to absorb the Miles City patients do have waiting lists. In view of the fact that for the last year, fiscal year 1964, the Miles City Hospital was practically filled to capacity (87.5 percent occupancy rate), yet it maintained no waiting list, shows that the patients were being treated and discharged in a minimum length of time, thus turning over the use of the beds rapidly (turnover rate for fiscal year 1964 was 145 percent per month). The other hospitals scheduled to absorb the Miles City patients have waiting lists and turnover rates as follows: Fort Harrison, 13.7 patients per 100 beds, turnover of 113.3 percent; Fargo, 5.3, turnover of 119.0 percent; Cheyenne, 1.5, turnover of 104.9 percent. This could indicate that the other hospitals are not in as good a position to handle the Miles City patient load as Miles City has been

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, MILES CITY, MONT.—Continued

REASONS FOR CLOSING—continued

Justifications for closing per VA — *Analysis*

and that some delay in getting admitted to the hospitals may be incurred.

Bed occupancy rates: Miles City bed occupancy rates for the past 5 fiscal years were: 1960, 83.3 percent; 1961, 82.3 percent; 1962, 79.2 percent; 1963, 82.3 percent; 1964, 87.5 percent; and for 1965 it was estimated prior to the closing announcement to be about 83 percent. The VA claims that to provide the best possible care of patients and to provide for the most efficient and effective distribution the bed occupancy rate should be 85 to 92 percent. (From VA Pamphlet 10–53.)

Low demand contrasted with other regions: One important measure of patient demand would be the number of patients treated each year. A comparison of the neighboring VA hospitals follows:

	Bed capacity	Patients treated		
		Fiscal year 1963	Fiscal year 1964	Estimated, fiscal year 1965
Miles City	96	1,414	1,543	1,600
Fort Harrison	160	2,070	3,100	2,000
Fargo	228	2,706	3,042	3,418
Cheyenne	133	1,416	1,504	1,640

7. Census data shows a migration of war veterans from Montana.

The 1955–60 migration figures show a net decrease in veteran population in Montana of 3.5 percent. Montana and Wyoming were the only Mountain States showing a veteran population decrease. All other Mountain States showed a slight increase. Projected figures, based on this percentage, show veteran population decreasing from the 1960 figure of 84,000 to 72,000 in 1970 (a decrease of 14.1 percent), to 59,000 in 1980 (a decrease from 1960 of 29.8 percent).

Although the veteran population decreased from 1955 to 1960 by 3.5 percent (according to the Census Bureau) the Miles City number of patients treated increased from 595 in fiscal year 1952 when the hospital opened to 1,462 in fiscal year 1964 with an estimated 1,600 for fiscal year 1965.

8. Because of its small size, the services available in Miles City Hospital are limited, in contrast to other hospitals, in the region which can reasonably absorb the patient load.

This could only be interpreted to mean that medical services at Fort Harrison, Fargo, and Cheyenne exceed those of Miles City. This is untrue because the doctors at Miles City explain that the degree of care offered is comparable at all four hospitals and probably slightly better at Miles City. None of the hospitals offer the "broad spectrum of specialties" offered at a hospital affiliated with a medical school. All four hospitals transfer patients requiring highly specialized care to the hospitals affiliated with medical schools for treatment and do not transfer patients to each other.

D.M. & S. hospital evaluation report of VA, attached hereto, rates Miles City as outstanding on medical service and highly satisfactory for surgical service.

9. The funds saved by the closing of this hospital can be used advantageously to increase the range of modern medical and diagnostic services available to the veterans served in these hospitals, including those from Montana.

VA has no specific plans to expand the degree of medical services or the range of modern medicine at Fort Harrison, Fargo, or Cheyenne, thus the veterans to be absorbed from the Miles City closing will receive no better care than they are now receiving.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. METCALF. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I compliment the majority leader and his junior colleague from Montana on the outstanding work they have done with respect to the Veterans' Administration fiasco. I do not know what kind of camouflage vacuum the Veterans' Administration is using in bringing to the attention of the American people that they are trying to close out not only hospitals, but also executive offices at many Veterans' Administration facilities in the West, but it is quite evident to me that they are trying to supplant these facilities with additional and more expensive installations in urban areas, in utter disregard of the needs of the rural areas of the country.

The majority leader has read into the RECORD a list of the occupancy at the Miles City Hospital. I point out that Wyoming sends many veterans into that facility, as well as the one at Fort Harrison, Mont.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct.

Mr. SIMPSON. I say to the Senator from Montana, as well as to his junior colleague, that I was glad to appear with them before the subcommittee headed by the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS]. I propose to follow the leadership of the majority leader with respect not only to the Veterans' Administration facility at Miles City, but also the one at Cheyenne, Wyo.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I predict that the new statement of Mr. Driver, giving reasons for the closings, and the third group of statements, will prove to be as indefensible as the first were, once we have the opportunity to analyze them, as my senior colleague from Montana has done, and that we shall be able to demonstrate, for example, that the psychological effect of the imminent closures has resulted in a smaller number of patients in the hospital.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the hospital director, at Miles City, of February 23, 1965, in which he analyzes the psychological impact of these closures, and in which he predicts that there will be fewer patients as a result; and I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a list of the number of patients in the hospital from January 1964 to the present day.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL,
Miles City, Mont., February 23, 1965.

At the present time we are admitting all eligible applicants, consistent with our ability to render necessary professional care, until May 1, 1965. Should the decision be made, at the expiration of the May 1, 1965, date, to continue operation beyond June 30, 1965, it would be extremely difficult to staff the hospital.

The recruitment of professional staff has always been somewhat of a problem at this station. We have six physician positions on the staff. Currently, the chief of staff position and a surgeon position are vacant. The chief of medicine and the remaining physician on the medical service have been selected for positions at other hospitals. They will leave whether the hospital remains open or not. Thus we would be left with only two physicians and would be faced with the task of rebuilding professional staff. Recruiting for one position at a time has been difficult enough. To attract four qualified, competent physicians at the same time would be a formidable job.

Further, the psychological problem, not only for physicians, but for all other employees as well would be great. It would seem that employees would feel that once the hospital had been marked for closing, it would probably be closed eventually whether it be now, 1 year later, or several years later. I feel it would be extremely difficult to induce local employees to give up jobs in the community to fill vacancies. In addition, even longtime employees would probably be seeking the first job opportunity available.

At the time the closing was announced, this station contacted other Federal, State, and local agencies in an attempt to place employees in their own home region. Three employees have already accepted other jobs. Nine engineering and housekeeping employees have applied for vacancies with another Federal agency. Six of these are longtime engineering employees. Their loss will make it difficult to operate even until the May 1 date. We feel certain that additional employees will be accepting employment outside VA prior to May 1. Thus, a decision to continue operation after the May 1 deadline might find us in the position of having to rebuild the entire staff. Further, in the eyes of remaining employees and prospective employees, we would be offering insecure and unstable employment.

It would seem that there would also be a psychological impact on veterans who normally would apply for hospitalization. Based on past experience, we should be receiving approximately 36 applicants per week at this time of year. Despite the fact that admissions have again been opened, we are receiving an average of only about 20 applicants per week. We can only assume that the difference are applying at other VA hospitals nearest to them, are being hospitalized in community hospitals, or, because of the inconvenience of reaching another VA hospital, are not seeking medical care for elective conditions. If the decision is made to continue operating the hospital, we could conjecture that these present patterns would continue, and that patient demand would not be as high as in the past. This condition would probably continue for a year or so.

MALCOM RANDALL,
Hospital Director.

Patients remaining (daily), Veterans' Administration hospital, Miles City, Mont.

Calendar year	Number of days hospital was full	Day of month																															Average
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	
																																	Percent
1964																																	
January	16	69	70	68	70	70	72	88	97	89	88	92	93	96	104	105	103	99	98	97	101	102	105	103	96	95	95	95	97	104	97	92	91.9
February	19	94	94	100	100	101	102	98	99	97	98	100	102	98	95	94	97	106	105	102	99	93	94	97	95	99	100	94	83	81	----	----	97.1
March	15	80	80	86	88	92	89	88	90	97	107	107	103	98	96	93	95	101	103	102	95	98	98	99	102	103	97	89	85	85	86	91	94.3
April	14	97	101	97	95	97	100	97	95	98	91	88	89	91	88	97	95	94	95	96	92	96	97	96	94	94	94	94	99	101	98	----	95.2
May	5	95	96	99	102	97	98	93	88	86	86	88	85	83	81	76	76	79	80	83	85	79	74	74	74	77	76	83	80	82	81	82	84.4
June	69	83	86	89	87	82	83	81	93	90	88	90	89	88	91	93	92	89	81	78	80	81	84	93	93	85	76	79	79	75	76	----	85.1
July	----	75	72	76	75	76	74	70	73	73	74	72	72	68	73	72	69	69	68	68	67	66	69	69	62	63	66	71	80	84	80	72	71.5
August	----	73	74	78	86	88	84	81	79	80	76	81	81	80	78	77	78	75	71	74	78	77	75	75	79	82	79	80	78	78	79	78	78.4
September	----	80	74	73	76	76	76	78	88	91	89	89	89	91	86	86	88	85	81	84	87	86	88	85	77	71	68	71	67	73	70	----	80.7
October	----	60	55	53	53	59	60	64	67	62	61	63	66	66	67	65	66	66	68	68	67	68	67	62	63	63	67	72	73	70	75	75	64.9
November	----	69	69	73	76	80	79	82	81	75	83	85	89	93	92	93	91	92	95	94	98	98	94	89	89	79	78	79	81	81	84	----	84.6
December	----	85	85	80	78	78	80	82	87	91	85	81	78	77	75	78	78	78	82	81	79	77	75	68	65	65	69	69	75	73	73	71	77.3
1964 average	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	83.6
1965																																	
January	----	68	[1]68	[1]70	75	81	86	87	90	[1]90	[1]92	95	98	101	103	102	[1]98	[1]99	96	90	89	81	73	[1]70	[1]69	65	69	70	66	63	[1]65	[1]64	81.7
February	----	67	67	70	69	66	[1]64	[1]65	67	71	74	77	75	[1]75	[1]75	80	78	80	76	70	[1]68	[1]68	72	71	75	76	72	[1]73	[1]76	----	----	----	72.0
March	----	85	82	87	89	85	[1]87	[1]87	90	96	99	91	87	[1]88	[1]89	93	91	88	83	77	[1]72	[1]71	70	70	71	73	70	[1]72	[1]72	72	73	----	82.0

[1] Weekend.

NOTE.—Dr. Matusik, chief of staff, transferred out of the hospital about Feb. 15. Dr. Carson is on military leave from Mar. 20, 1965, to Apr. 4, 1965. These absences may affect scheduling patients for admission.

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, I should like to identify myself with the majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD], in his fine statement on the subject of the Veterans' Administration proposal to close certain hospitals and facilities, not only in his own State, but throughout the country. I have seen the suggestion made by Mr. Driver and the Veterans' Administration that there be a termination of the hospital facilities which are available on an emergency basis at Rutland Heights, outside Worcester, Mass.

I wish to be identified with the remarks of the majority leader and to indicate my complete support for the leadership he has again demonstrated in the Senate, which is so forthright and honest, and exemplary of the kind of public service he has rendered throughout his service in the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. ALLOTT subsequently said: Mr. President, while the distinguished majority leader is still in the Chamber, I should like to support his statement with respect to veterans. The reasons given by Mr. Driver in the first, second, and third instances for the closing of veterans facilities over this country have proven spurious and misleading. His reasons totally fail to set forth and to recognize the fact that the veterans facilities are scattered around the country for the specific purpose of taking care of veterans—people who have become injured and have given their health in the service of our country. Those facilities have been provided in many locations so that these hospitals would be reasonably near to their homes, their loved ones, and their friends.

Previously I have pointed out the great burden that the proposed closing would place upon the veterans of Colorado with relation to the Grand Junction, Colo., facility.

I have received a report of the GAO and a report of the Appropriations Committee combined. It is a very fine report.

I did not intend to speak on it and analyze it today. I shall do so at a later time. But when I speak on that report, I shall answer every single question that the Veterans' Administrator has raised, because there is no justification for his action.

Finally, I remind Senators that time is growing short. Today is April 1, known as Fool's Day. We have 1 month before May 1. The facilities affected are already making final plans for closing down. If we are going to stop this authoritarian decision by the Veterans' Administration, we shall have to act in the Senate and in the House, and we shall have to act speedily.

I, for one, do not intend to see this period pass and let this arrogant abuse of power and authority be foisted upon the one group of people in this country to whom we owe the most. Those are the veterans who have given of their health and their opportunity to lead a full life, and who have to be confined in hospitals. If we owe anything to anyone, those people should be our first concern. God help us if we reach the day that we have lost the sensibility that we do not make them our first cause of concern.

Mr. TYDINGS subsequently said: Mr. President, I have heard our distinguished floor leader speak on a number of occasions about the problem of the closing of the Veterans' Administration hospitals. I support the arguments which he has presented.

Coming from a State which is a medical center not only of this country but of the world, I point out that there is a problem related to the closing of these hospitals which I believe is very important and which should be considered by the Senate. In this country there is a great shortage of adequate medical facilities, particularly hospitals, in most of the areas of the Nation, if not all. That shortage is growing more critical day by day. On the one hand a program has been introduced in Congress which would provide for the expenditure of many millions of dollars to erect medical facilities to pursue medical research. On the other hand, another agency of the Government is proceeding to close hospitals which are needed in the communities in which they are located.

Mr. President, those programs do not seem consistent to me. At the very least, the Veterans' Administration should be prevented from closing a hospital in any community where it could be shown that there is any need for a medical facility until such time as the community itself has an opportunity to determine whether or not the people in the community can band together to support that facility.

To date my State has not been tapped for the closing of a VA hospital, but that makes no difference. The problem of adequate medical facilities is a national problem. I believe that the approach which the Veterans' Administration is following is a blind approach and completely bypasses the realities of our medical needs in this country. I think that is a grave error. I commend our distinguished majority leader for carrying on the fight.

Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to add a word about our distinguished majority leader. As the 100th Senator in seniority in this body, I can appreciate why the majority leader has been termed an outstanding and great leader. I base that statement upon the consideration which he has accorded to the most junior Member of this body. He has accorded me the same courtesy, understanding, and assistance that he would accord the most senior Member.

Mr. GRUENING subsequently said: Mr. President, I commend the majority leader, the distinguished Senator from Montana, for his continuing and effective fight in behalf of the veterans. I have joined him in this endeavor before, but I wish to take this occasion, now that the time is drawing close for a decision by the Federal Government to be made, to tell him not only that I support him warmly, but that I feel that the entire country, and this body in particular, supports him.

Alaska, regrettably, does not have a veterans hospital. Our veterans have to travel a thousand miles from the southernmost point of Alaska to a veterans hospital. From farther away, they have to travel 2,000, sometimes 2,500 miles. We do have a veterans facility office, where other veterans' needs can be taken care of, in our capital, Juneau; but under the ruthless diminution and elimination of veterans facilities, that office has been ordered closed, and its services removed a thousand miles to the south. I protested this action, as did my colleague from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], and as did officials of the government of Alaska, the American Legion, and the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

I am hopeful, whether we succeed in retaining this facility or not, that in some substantial degree the fight which the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] is waging will prove successful. He has demonstrated conclusively that the action of the Veterans' Administration is wrong, misguided, unnecessary, and contrary to the interests of those American citizens whose welfare should be our first concern—the veterans. I hope his view will prevail.

Mr. MORSE subsequently said: Mr. President, I join the majority leader and other Senators in the comments made with regard to the veterans hospital situation.

Even if there were not a hospital problem in the State of Oregon, I would be speaking on this matter. I have demonstrated in my many years in the Senate that a problem does not have to affect my State, if I think there is wrong involved, for me to come to the support of another State that does have a problem.

In my State there is a domiciliary veterans institution at Medford, Oreg. There is no domiciliary in the country that has the same legislative base as this institution. The domiciliary institution at Medford, Oreg., is the result of a bill that I introduced in the Senate many years ago. The bill was passed by Congress, signed by the President, and became the law of the land.

That institution, having been created by Congress itself, really is placed in a somewhat singular class. Congress should know of the arbitrary discretion of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Mr. Driver, in whom I had no confidence at the time his nomination was up for confirmation. I spoke against him and voted against him. I do not believe that Mr. Driver is justified in exercising his discretion against this facility, which was created by a bill passed by Congress.

I am perfectly willing to have the matter determined on the question of the merits of the institution. Here is a home for old veterans. It is the only home those old veterans have. There is no question about the effectiveness and efficiency of the home. The veterans have been there for years. They are a part of the community. Yet that institution is going to be closed. Physically, it is a wonderful facility. Yet it is going to be closed, and the old veterans, if they are willing to go, are to be scattered all over the country.

That may be the view of a bureaucracy, but, Mr. President, it cannot be justified from the standpoint of human values and their protection.

Let no one tell me that this Government is going to be so coldblooded, even if the figures are granted to show some dollar savings, as to justify this act of inhumanity. Of course it will not. We cannot put the dollar sign ahead of the veterans. That is, granting the figures of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs Mr. Driver as being correct. And I do not grant it. I shall show, when I appear before the committee once again that his statements are erroneous. That was the reason I voted against him. I knew he was given to making erroneous statements.

When we think of the happy environment in which the veterans are living, when we think of the shock to them psychologically if they are moved, I am amazed that an Administrator of Veterans' Affairs would propose to distribute those veterans to other facilities, almost as though they were livestock, without consideration of the human values involved.

I put a value on this facility from the standpoint of the economy of our country. I am satisfied, on the basis of the evidence submitted, that it is in the economic interest of the United States, as well as in the interest of carrying out our moral obligations to the veterans.

But, says the Veterans' Administration, there is no hospital facility connected with the domiciliary home; therefore, if they become seriously ill they have to be transported to Portland. Whose fault is that? That is the fault of the Veterans' Administration. We tried for many years to have it use a hospital facility that was right there. This facility is a part of Camp White, a military camp with all the facilities of a wartime camp.

We tried to get the Veterans' Administration to use these facilities, without moving the veterans 200 or 250 miles. The alibi then was that they did not have enough doctors and medical personnel to send them to. We stopped that alibi because we offered them an agreement or arrangement with the Jackson County Medical Association of Medford, Oreg., under which the doctors agreed to supply them with what medical services they needed, in order to treat the veterans in Medford, if they would implement and equip the hospital facilities, most of the equipment having been moved out when Camp White was closed.

We called their bluff. I am satisfied they had plans for a long time to close this facility.

So we not only have the Montana hospital case; we not only have the Massachusetts case, on which the Senator from Massachusetts spoke earlier this afternoon; we not only have the problem in New York, but we have need for a thorough congressional investigation of the entire program of the Veterans' Administration. If there is an investigation that deals with the facts, the Administrator will be reversed, on the merits of the case, in my judgment, not only in connection with the Montana case, but also in connection with the domiciliary facility at Camp White, the Massachusetts case, the New York case, and the others brought forth by Senators, which show that this is an example on the part of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs of unjustifiable and arbitrary discretion.

INCOME TAX BENEFITS AND MILITARY PERSONNEL IN VIETNAM

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, a recent article by Jim Lucas in the Washington Daily News for March 16 titled, "Army Hero Battles for Tax Break," describes the plight of our men in Vietnam, who know all too well that we are engaged in combat there, being told by the Internal Revenue Service that tax exclusion for combat pay is not available to them.

This situation arises because section 112 of the Internal Revenue Code, which provides for exclusion of certain pay received in a combat zone, requires that for the provision to become operative, the President must designate an area as a combat zone. This has not been done in the case of Vietnam.

The men who served in Korea were accorded this tax relief, and I find it difficult to distinguish that situation from the action in Vietnam. Combat is combat and no matter what we may call it, the action is no less hazardous and the bullets no less deadly.

I have today addressed a letter to the President asking that Vietnam be declared a combat zone so as to make section 112 applicable to that area, in order that we may treat the men serving there with as much approbation and fairness as that extended to the men who served this country in Korea.

I was particularly interested in the fact that the Army flier referred to in the article was Capt. Floyd R. Kendrick of El Dorado, Ark. Captain Kendrick could become the most decorated man in Vietnam, having received three decorations from the Vietnamese and one from the United States. I salute Captain Kendrick for his brave deeds and the service he is rendering his country.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter to the President, along with a copy of the article referred to above, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the letter and article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

March 29, 1965.

The Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson,
The President,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

My Dear Mr. President: You will recall that Congress provided in the Internal Revenue Act of 1954 for excluding from gross income certain pay received by members of our military forces while serving in a combat zone (26 U.S.C. 112). Congress further provided that this section would become operative only upon designation of an area as a combat zone by the President of the United States.

As you know, such treatment was accorded our men who served in Korea, and it would seem equally appropriate to have similar benefits extended to those serving in Vietnam. The situation in Vietnam appears to come well within the precedent established in Korea, and most certainly the hardships endured by our men are indistinguishable.

I am aware that sensitive foreign policy questions are raised when an area is designated as a combat zone. It would seem to me, however, that we have a fundamental obligation to treat our servicemen in Vietnam with as much fairness as that extended to the men who served this country in Korea.

My attention was drawn to this matter by an article by Jim Lucas in the March 16 Washington Daily News about Capt. F. R. Kendrick of Arkansas, who is seeking to have this tax relief made available to our men in Vietnam. The article notes that Captain Kendrick, a helicopter pilot, has been decorated three times by the Vietnamese and once by the United States.

With highest personal regards, I am,

Respectfully yours,

John L. McClellan.

War? What War? IRS Asks—Army Hero Battles for Tax Break

(By Jim G. Lucas)

Vinh Long, South Vietnam, March 16.—A much-decorated Army flier in the Vietnam war is asking Uncle Sam to give him the same tax break given to the men in Korea a dozen years ago.

Capt. Floyd R. (Pete) Kendrick, of El Dorado, Ark., and Killeen, Tex., is invoking a section of the Internal Revenue Code which permits officers to deduct $200 a month from their taxable income for time served in a combat or hostile-fire zone. This would mean $500 to $600 for most officers.

The section also provides that warrant officers and enlisted men pay no taxes on income earned in a hostile-fire or combat zone. Officers and enlisted men who served in Korea got those tax privileges. Men serving in Vietnam so far have been denied them, presumably because the United States does not admit it is actively involved in the war.

Captain Kendrick will send the Internal Revenue Service 10 pay vouchers from March to December 1964. Each voucher lists $55 a month for "hostile-fire pay."

Captain Kendrick's attorney will argue that as a helicopter pilot decorated three times by the Vietnamese and once by the United States, Captain Kendrick is in no sense an adviser but an active participant in the war against the Communists. Also, that with escalation of the war against North Vietnam, the fiction that Americans are here merely as "advisers" no longer is valid.

The chances Captain Kendrick will get the tax relief he seeks are slim. Says an IRS spokesman:

"In order for this section to apply, an area must be designated a combat zone by the President by Executive order. As of now, Vietnam has not been so designated, therefore the exclusion is not available."

A bill was introduced in the Senate (S. Res. 459) on last January 12 by Senator John Tower, Republican, of Texas, which would designate Vietnam a combat zone for Federal tax purposes.

NOTHING

However, the Tower bill would do nothing for the likes of Captain Kendrick and his young sidekick, Lt. Jerry Thiels of Alexandria, La., who also plans to claim the exemption, Lieutenant Thiels piloted one of the helicopters which was sent in at Da Ngai on December 27 to pick up the crew of a downed chopper, a rescue operation in which I took part.

If all of the decorations for which he has been recommended are approved, Lieutenant Thiels could become the most decorated man in Vietnam. The Tower bill, however, is not retroactive and would favor men serving after its enactment over those who already have served, been wounded, or have died in Vietnam.

POSITIVE PROGRAMS OF ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, some 2 months ago, on the Senate floor, I called for legislation which would give New England, and other regions of the country, the opportunity to develop positive programs of economic growth. It was my feeling, and that of many of my colleagues, that where Appalachia may have required a legislative priority in obtaining special Federal assistance, other areas of our Nation should be similarly benefited by Federal economic planning and development funds.

For New England, I recommended that a regional development commission be established to make a broad economic study of the region's needs. This study would concern unemployment, poverty, education, health, housing, transportation, and the development of our industrial and material resources. From it, we could fashion a long-range, multistate development program on the one hand, and special multicounty, subregional programs on the other.

This suggestion was reaffirmed in my recent address to the Massachusetts Legislature, and in many discussions which I have had with representatives from government, industry, labor, and the academic world. The response to this concept of regional and subregional planning and special funding was tremendous.

I am therefore delighted that the administration's economic development bill introduced in the Senate today, goes as far as it does, in meeting these needs for regional planning and economic improvement.

First. It recognizes the need for regional and subregional planning. It provides for the establishment of regional action planning commissions to prepare long-range development programs within the context of overall industrial, transportation, recreation, and other natural resources planning, on a multistate basis. It also provides planning funds for multicounty development districts to foster economic growth programs over large areas of redevelopment.

This will give the New England States an excellent opportunity to study their needs and come up with viable economic improvement programs.

Second. It provides for an expanded and more flexible grant and loan program for public improvements and industrial development, including supplementary grants to help the most needy communities. Of particular interest to New England is the provision for grants and loans to areas where there is a sudden plant shutdown or closing of a military installation.

Third. It emphasizes the importance of concentrating funds on projects which will do the most good for an overall growth plan for groups of areas. In my speech in the Senate on regional development, I suggested:

> Our main concern is to concentrate Federal and State funds in a manner which will do the most good on a long-range basis. This can only mean that we cannot stop at borders of our communities, or of our counties, or even our States, to bolster areas of lagging economy. We must coordinate the potential of regions and subregions to lift up and stimulate the distressed and underdeveloped centers that are the logical ones for future growth.

I am very pleased that this regional approach to improving our distressed and underdeveloped areas has been incorporated in the legislation.

My particular concern with the bill lies in the moderate amount of money authorized. I believe an effective growth program of the dimension contemplated in this bill must have substantial funds. One of the major problems with Area Redevelopment Act and accelerated public works programs in the past was too little funds spread over too large an area. I would support efforts by Congress to increase the authorizations here.

There are sections of the bill which will need to be strengthened and clarified, but, by and large, the approach of the legislation is a good one, and it will receive my support. I am hopeful that New England and other regions of our country will lend their support to this bill, so that we can get on with the job of preparing a good regional economic program.

TAXPAYERS SURPRISED TO FIND THAT 1964 TAX REDUCTION WAS NOT AS GREAT AS THEY HAD BELIEVED

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, there appeared an article in yesterday's issue of the Washington Star entitled "Nineteen Hundred and Sixty-four Trap Closes—Loans Boom in Tax Lament."

I shall read the first paragraph of that article:

> Loan companies and banks are enjoying an unprecedented bonanza from cash-short taxpayers who failed to heed the warning that last year's tax cut had a built-in pitfall.

The fact is that the taxpayers never had a chance. That pitfall was built in by an administration which wanted to give the American taxpayers the impression that they were getting a greater tax cut than that which they were actually getting. As a result, the withholding rate was reduced to 14 percent although the administration knew at the time it was inadequate. The administration even insisted that it be reduced to 14 percent, effective on all payrolls following the date of the enactment of the bill. The administration insisted that the employers withhold only the 14 percent. Taxpayers were encouraged by the administration to spend the difference in order to stimulate the economy on the eve of the election. They wanted everything booming at the time of the election and expressed no concern as to the ultimate consequences.

While it is true that the Internal Revenue Service warned the taxpayers, at the same time it is also true that the leaders of the administration were countermanding that warning and were telling the people, "Spend your money. Put it out into circulation. This is a bona fide tax cut the Great Society has given."

President Kennedy had originally recommended a withholding rate of 15 or 16 percent. The House approved the bill with the withholding rate fixed at 15 percent. Upon direct orders from the White House the majority of the Finance Committee reduced the rate to 14 percent. Then the Treasury Department even rushed out instructions to employers to use this lower rate on all payrolls even though they represented payment of wages in earlier weeks.

Now the taxpayers are finding that the tax cut was not as much of a reduction as they were told it was, and many people are having to go to finance companies to borrow. They are being required to pay exorbitant rates of interest in order to finance this unexpected obligation with which they have been confronted. This is not the fault of those people. They were misled by the administration for what was obviously a political motive. Therefore, I believe the administration has a responsibility to recognize that fact and to provide a more convenient repayment formula on the part of those who were caught in this box through no fault of their own.

During the last few days I have had several meeting with representatives of the Internal Revenue Service and the Treasury Department. They recognize that this is a serious problem and is one which will get worse as April 15 approaches. Around $500 million is involved in this underwithholding.

We are hopeful that through administrative procedures some correction will be made. I recognize that the Department is trying to devise a plan, so I shall wait until next week to see if the problem cannot be solved administratively. I join in the hope that some relief can be granted, because large numbers of taxpayers are affected. The individual amount involved may be only $50, $60, or a couple hundred dollars, but if they do not have it available it represents a large sum.

Furthermore, if the $400 or $500 million that is involved is taken out of the economy in one 30-day period, just as that amount may have stimulated business as it entered the economy last year, it certainly could cause a jolt to the economy right now.

Therefore, I think the administration would be well advised to correct the situation so far as it involves the taxpayers. The difficulty in which the taxpayers find themselves is not their fault; it is one which was created for them by the administration.

However, if a satisfactory plan is not announced by next week I shall offer a resolution which I think will remedy the condition.

I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred, written by Philip Shandler and published in the Washington Star on March 31, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY-FOUR TRAP CLOSES—LOANS BOOM IN TAX LAMENT

(By Philip Shandler)

Loan companies and banks are enjoying an unprecedented bonanza from cash-short taxpayers who failed to heed the warning that last year's tax cut had a built-in pitfall.

Citizens were warned by the Government that withholding rates were being reduced more sharply than taxes, which would cause trouble unless the wage earner arranged to have more of his paycheck withheld by his boss.

Now the time for accounting has come, and taxpayers are expressing shock and dismay over the need to pay $100 or $150 more than they did last year.

OTHERS DELAY

Many are seeking loans from banks and finance companies—some for the first time—to cover the unplanned-for tax bill.

Others, the Internal Revenue Service reports, seem to be putting off until the very last minute the filing of their returns. The deadline is April 15.

Still other taxpayers declare ruefully that they'll now have to defer making big purchases for the home or other major expenditures.

This complaint is a bit ironic. The announced intention of the Government's plan was to give taxpayers more money to spend, thereby boosting the economy.

The action was planned as temporary. After cutting taxes $11.5 billion, the Government dropped the paycheck deduction rate last March from 18 to 14 percent, instead of doing it gradually, as first planned. This year the tax cut, which was enacted in stages, has settled to the level of the withholding rate.

In the long run, few wage earners are paying more taxes as a result of the plan.

"But you can't tell that to a man who finds himself with a bill he hadn't planned for," one consultant, Mrs. Sarah Brown, commented.

"And it doesn't do much good either to tell him everything will be back to normal next year," she added.

MANY AGHAST

Mrs. Brown operates the tax center at 2 Thomas Circle, one of the oldest consulting firms in Washington. She said she has encountered more harassment this year than ever before.

"The people coming in now are getting the word about what to expect," she said.

"But a few weeks ago it was murder. They just wouldn't believe they owed so much."

"They insisted I had made a mistake, or that their bosses hadn't deducted enough. Some of them criticize the administration," she said.

One of the biggest nationwide consulting firms, R & H Block, Inc., has prepared cards that the client sees as soon as he sits down for advice. In the form of a television set, it reassures him that the "network trouble" will clear up this year.

The assistant manager for the Washington area, Jack Wenzell, says his men are comparing the taxpayer's 1963 and 1964 returns to show him that he really isn't paying more this year—unless he got a raise or had additional income.

WORST IMPACT AREA

But some of the clients merely mourn that they'll have to pay the tax collector the money they thought he was permitting them to save for a trip or new gadget.

A spokesman for the Greater Washington Board of Trade said small businessmen were blaming the tax plan for a decline in business, but that no pattern could be seen.

The impact of the underwithholding is being felt mainly by taxpayers who earn between $7,500 and $20,000, the consultants report. Mrs. Brown said most of these clients are finding they have to pay between $100 and $200 more than they did with their 1963 returns.

Smaller wage earners are feeling the difference in reduced refunds, she added.

The new setup has generated increased interest in the services of consultants, in an effort to offset the higher payments with more thorough analysis of possible deductible expenses.

But many of the callers are seeking appointments as close to April 15 deadline as possible, the consultants said.

"I suppose some of them are sore at the Government and want to make it hard on them," one said.

"But most people are just putting off their own pain as long as they can," he said.

Internal Revenue Service figures show that returns are being filed about 7 percent slower this year than last. Refunds are off about 14 percent in volume, and 25 percent in amount of money.

DELAYED PAYMENT DEVICE

One consultant said he was advising his clients who lack funds to file their returns in time but to send no money.

"The Government bills them later, with a 6-percent penalty. But this way they don't have to get a loan," he explained.

Banks and loan companies reported an increase in applications, however. The Suburban Trust Co., for example—the biggest suburban bank—said the percentage of people giving tax payment as a reason for the loan has jumped about 20 percent this year, from 75 to 95 percent.

A spokesman added that the bank for the first time is promoting tax-payment loans in its advertising. Other banks said they have been stimulated by the present situation to intensify such advertising.

One banker said he expected to see more reaction in the next week or two, when the procrastinators face up to the need to pay.

A spokesman for the Household Finance Corp., one of the larger loan companies, said applications had increased this tax season by as much as 8 percent in some of its offices here, all of which are in the suburbs.

But the Internal Revenue people minimize the significance of the complaints and the borrowing and the deferred payments and purchases.

NO EXTRA COST, HE SAYS

"Things may look bleak at the moment," a spokesman said "but it's only temporary."

"After the taxpayer settles down and really takes stock, he will realize that the underwithholding has not cost him any money," he said.

He said that the underwithholding as a result of 1964 law could not have left the married taxpayer with two children and an income of $20,000 a year an end-of-the-year bill of more than $149. For the $10,000-a-year man this could not have exceeded $83, he said.

If the taxpayer found himself with a much bigger tax bill, the IRS man said, it probably was because he got a raise in the past year, or did a little moonlighting, or put his wife to work—all of which could have boosted him to a higher tax bracket and left him more underwithheld.

"Don't forget," the IRS man said, "that about half of our taxpayers make less than $7,000 a year. They hardly felt a thing.

"The rest had plenty of warning," he added.

SENATOR PAT McNAMARA, OF MICHIGAN, CHAMPION OF NATION'S OLDER CITIZENS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, we who are familiar with his activities know that my colleague, the senior Senator from Michigan, Pat McNamara, has been a constant and effective champion of our Nation's older citizens.

Pat McNamara has sponsored legislation, conducted studies, and directed congressional inquiries—all with the view of defining the problems of Americans 65 and over—and then proposing reasonable and realistic solutions.

For several years, he has been known throughout the country as an ardent advocate of hospital insurance for the elderly under social security—a dream that promises to become a reality this year.

For several years, Senator McNamara also has cosponsored with the Honorable John Fogarty, Member of Congress from Rhode Island, a bill called the Older Americans Act, which would establish an Administration on Aging in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and provide a 5-year program of Federal grants to the States for research on problems of aging.

This bill, which I have the honor to cosponsor in the Senate along with 22 of my colleagues, also promises to become a reality this year. The House approved it yesterday by a large margin.

It now comes before the Senate where I hope it will receive equally swift and favorable action. Senator McNamara has been designated chairman of a Special Subcommittee on Aging to handle the bill in the Senate and Public Welfare Committee, and I know he will act on it expeditiously.

Most of us in this Chamber know of Pat McNamara's distinguished record in the field of aging. But it is always pleasant to see this record recognized elsewhere.

For this reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article entitled "McNamara's Bill on Aged Near Passage," written by James Robinson and published last Sunday, March 29, in the Detroit Free Press, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Detroit Free Press, Mar. 29, 1965]

McNamara's Bill on Aged Near Passage

Washington.—Congress appears ready to add another major achievement to Senator Pat McNamara's record as a champion of the 18 million Americans over 65.

In addition to the medical insurance program which the Michigan Democrat has been pushing for many years, Congress is expected to pass the Older Americans Act of 1965.

Also known as the McNamara-Fogarty Act after its two chief sponsors, the bill has been cleared by the House Education and Labor Committee and is scheduled to come to a vote this week.

In the Senate, where McNamara has lined up 22 other Senators as cosponsors, the bill is ready for approval by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, of which the Michigan Senator is a member.

Committee sources say the bill is assured of passage in both Houses, partly because of the strong bipartisan support of members of the House committee.

The bill would create an agency in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, giving the old folks equal status with the Welfare Administration, under which their affairs now are handled. The idea is to get away from the "welfare approach" which has been present in most Government programs for the aged.

The agency will be called the Administration on Aging and will be headed by a Commissioner on Aging appointed by the President. The Commissioner also will serve as Chairman of a 16-member Advisory Committee on Older Americans.

The objective, as spelled out by the act, is to enable our older people to secure equal opportunity in 10 areas of concern to them.

These are: An adequate income in retirement; the best possible physical and mental health; suitable housing at costs which older citizens can afford; full restorative services for those who require institutional care; opportunity for employment without age discrimination.

Retirement in health, honor, dignity—after years of contributing to the economy; pursuit of meaningful activity within the widest range of civic, cultural, and recreational opportunities; efficient community services providing social assistance which are available and freedom, independence and the free exercise of individual initiative in planning and managing their lives.

This is a large order, and it isn't likely that the new agency will get the job done soon.

The act provides a 5-year program of Federal grants to the States, with an authorized appropriation of $13 million for the first 2 years.

In addition, $4.5 million is provided for grants to public or nonprofit private agencies for research and demonstration projects relating to the needs of older persons.

Included with the State grants is authority to finance the community centers providing opportunities for recreational and other leisure activities.

There are now more than 700 such centers in the Nation offering opportunities in arts and crafts, education and recreation. The McNamara-Fogarty bill is designed to enlarge the number and finance new types of social centers.

Long a goal of senior citizens groups, the Older Americans Act was one of the principle recommendations of the White House Conference on the Aging held in 1961.

President Kennedy included the bill's provisions in his special message to Congress 2 years ago.

But the origin of most of the bill's provisions generally is conceded to be the special

Senate Subcommittee on Problems of the Aged which McNamara headed from 1958 to 1960.

The Michigan Senator pioneered Congress concern with problems of the aged. He expanded his efforts in 1961 when the Senate established its special Committee on Aging, with McNamara as chairman.

The committee now is headed by Senator George Smathers, Democrat, of Florida, but McNamara continues as a member and chairman of the Subcommittee on Health Problems of the Aged.

As a result of his committee activity, McNamara is known in Washington as the Senate's expert on problems of the aged.

He also has become a popular figure with old folks and their organizations, a fact that probably had much to do with his reelection in 1960.

DEDICATION OF LIBERAL ARTS BUILDING AT CHARLOTTE COLLEGE, NORTH CAROLINA—ADDRESS BY HARRY GOLDEN

Mr. HART. Mr. President, few—if any—Americans speak with more understanding and compassion of the contributions made to our Nation by immigrants than the distinguished author and editor, Harry Golden.

A few days ago, at the dedication of a new liberal arts building at Charlotte College, Mr. Golden recalled some of these contributions both to North Carolina and to our national culture.

As Congress looks again to the question of "whom we shall welcome," we have in Mr. Golden's remarks a timely reminder of our true heritage.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Golden's address be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Harry Golden's Dedication of New Liberal Arts Building, Charlotte College, March 3, 1965

We participate today in a typical American story.

In this city which we may rightfully call the most "native born" society on the continent, we are dedicating a new liberal arts building of the Charlotte College which will soon become the fourth university complex of our State. This has been the fulfillment of a dream of every citizen of our community, and which enables us to add to such terms as "distribution center," and "bursting at the seams," the most noble of all phrases, "university town."

And what is the story? We have what I consider to be the best of all omens for a great future, the answer to the question: "How long does it take to become an American?"

Indeed the Liberal Arts Building of this university will produce the future leaders of this society, and they will remember the story into the next century. The story that this building was dedicated by a man whose parents had come to America in 1905 from a ghetto in Eastern Europe in the empire of Kaiser Franz Josef.

Indeed this occasion with its human interest story tells us a good deal about America. It tells us about the one area in which America has contributed a new idea in human relations, an idea that has had no parallel in history.

It is the American idea which offers the opportunity to enter this open society based on individual effort, talent, ambition, and character. Not even our sister democracy, Britain, has been able to eliminate the social and economic stratification which prevent this wide freedom of movement. The apprentice to the tailor in England will invariably grow up to be a tailor and a boy who throws the peanuts at the cricket game will very likely grow up to be the foreman or manager of the boys who throw the peanuts at the cricket game.

In our country we have this tremendous mobility, a mobility not only from place to place but from one income level to another income level, from one social level to another social level, from a tenement to a suburb, from the ghetto of the lower East Side of New York to the most American society on this continent dedicating the most important institution of our society, the Liberal Arts Building of the University.

But there is more to this symbol than meets the eye. The philosophers have offered us a basic truth; the less satisfaction we derive from being ourselves the greater is our desire to be like others, and we therefore are more inclined to imitate those who have found such great favor in our eyes.

It is to the particular good fortune of the United States of America that she welcomed 17 million immigrants of what some of our legislators have regarded as "less desirable." America was very lucky that this happened. Had all our millions of immigrants to this country continued to come from the more superior cultures or what we call "superior cultures," there would have not been one United States of America, but a balkanized string of lingual and cultural groups right up to World War I. The more desirable immigrants from Northern Europe insisted, for example, that their old world languages be taught in our public schools. They asked, how could this new country compare with Goethe and Shiller, and Mozart, and Charles Dickens went home after a visit and felt terribly sorry for us—no Henry VIII, no Queen Elizabeth, no Shakespeare, we were dippers of snuff, is what he said.

But God was on our side and while some were not looking there came these 17 million, the lowest, the poorest, the despised and the rejected. But who came here with the ardent desire to shed their old world identity. True they had no Goethe or Magna Carta to give them that necessary sense of belonging, and so they came here with an unbounded capacity to adopt the new. The strangeness of the new country attracted rather than repelled them, they craved a new identity and a new life, they were strangers and they had the enthusiasm that comes to the man who is born again. To the non-Anglo-Saxons the strangeness of the language was the added attraction, to have to learn to speak again enhanced this illusion of being born again. They were people in a hurry and people who are in a hurry will imitate more readily than people who are at leisure. These "less desirable" people came not to sneer or to look at America in a way to enhance their home country. The "less desirable" had no Goethe, Shiller, Shakespeare, Milton, and Gustavus Adolphus.

And so what did these less-desirable immigrants, these 17 million who came—what did they do? They came off the gangplank, looked into the face of the first American they saw and said the same thing in 11 different languages, "Ah, when will I be like him?" And the result of this was a great intellectual vitality. Gov. Zebulon Vance of North Carolina had this amazing perception even before it happened when he called this less-desirable immigration, "A gulfstream of vitality, which is like the river that runs through the Atlantic Ocean."

And indeed, this gulfstream of vitality came into being because these less-desirable immigrants knew they must make good. They knew they dared not relax within the society.

Their tremendous success, the operations they performed in our hospitals, the pupils they have taught in our schools in literature, and the abstruse sciences, the styles they created and manufactured, the songs they wrote and sang from stage and orchestra, the books they wrote, the lives they gave; they did not think they were as good as the native. This is the advantage they had over the more-desirable immigrants from Northern Europe who believed they were better than the native. Thus the "less-desirable" immigrant knew that the only way he can escape from being forever alien was to achieve a special individual worth. He knew that a stethoscope in his ear would be one solution to the problem, that he could jump from the 15th century Eastern European village into the American 20th century with a stethoscope in his ear. His patients would no longer call him alien, they would merely say, "My doctor has such a cute accent."

But God still holds this civilization in special esteem. Because just when the restrictions against immigration would make of us a torpid mass, God was good to us and soon within our own borders we will find 22 million new "immigrants" of the less-desirable variety whose great need will also be to make good, and these 22 million Negroes will soon become as ubiquitous in these halls and buildings of education as did those 17 million from Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean. God is indeed kind to the United States of America. And it must be for a purpose.

It is fitting to dedicate a liberal arts building in our university in terms of this American story. Because when we dedicate a liberal arts building we think in terms of intellectual vitality. In a sense it is a building dedicated to blasphemy, not religious blasphemy, but the blasphemy that does not hold the status quo forever sacrosanct. The Anglo-Calvinists who came to this country and carved a civilization out of a wilderness blasphemed against nature. Nature created this wilderness but I don't like this wilderness, we said, I will carve a civilization out of it and build cities and schools and universities and I will do it in this wilderness. Just as truly as other peoples have changed the course of a river, and blasphemed against nature, just as people looked upon a desert and said, "I don't like this desert, I will have trees growing in this desert, that is what I will do. * * *" And this is the field of the liberal arts department of the university.

It has become a cliche to say that technology has outstripped the humanities. But the fact that it has become a cliche does not mean that it is error. Let us go to the moon by all means and explore outer space, but let us also realize that the ideas will come out of the liberal arts building, just as they came out of the Academy in Athens. Words and sentences and ideas will continue to determine the destiny of a man, "We the people * * * in order to form a more perfect union." And out of this building will come the blasphemy with the new ideas, during the generations to come when we will have passed from the scene.

"Don't tell me the answers," says the first great philosopher Socrates. "Just find me the questions. If I know the questions, I will make it a better world."

Herman Melville gave us the idea of our struggle against nature. He was willing to die and even have all those around him die in order to combat the terrible force of nature pitted against man, to find a way to control the force as represented by the whale.

But along came Jules Verne who said, "There's no need to die. There's no need for any of the others dying—let's live inside the whale and see how things go, and so Mr. Verne built himself a whale and looked around the bottom of the seas, and he called his whale Nautilus; and now we have a real *Nautilus*, an atomic submarine, and the Founding Fathers, too, could be forgiven for not having realized that we would discover the Mesabi Range in Minnesota which would become United States Steel and turn an agrarian culture into an industrial culture and turn a rural and farm civilization into an urban-industrial complex with a million new challenges every day, challenges which have had no parallels; we have nothing to go by as we ponder the questions from transportation to delinquency, and from slum clearance to building a university.

And so let us dedicate this building of ideas, new ideas to meet these new challenges because this is where the challenges will be met and for me this is an occasion which I will cherish for the rest of my life. And with all my heart I thank those who were responsible for this bit of imagination, this honor accorded to me.

SEE AMERICA FIRST—STATE DEPARTMENT PROGRAM FOR FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, at the suggestion of President Johnson, renewed efforts are being made this year to encourage travelers to see the United States. In line with this suggestion, I recently learned of a program inaugurated last fall by the State Department for its Foreign Service officers.

In cooperation with the Wally Byam Foundation and the Ford Motor Co., the Department provides these officers and their families returning to this country on home leave with trailers and cars to enable them to visit those areas of our country new to them.

Advance arrangements are made for the officers and their wives to meet with civic groups and to participate in as many speaking engagements as possible along the route.

In 1964, in 47 States, 390 officers made 489 speeches and gave 821 newspaper, radio, and TV interviews. And, since the program was started, 9 officers and their families have used the trailers, and have traveled and spoken in 39 States, covering more than 40,000 miles.

The Secretary of State and his staff are to be congratulated for this program, and the companies who have generously provided the automobiles and trailers are to be highly commended for their public service.

Certainly, we all realize the importance of having our representatives abroad familiar with the customs and thinking of the people with whom they work. Of no less importance is the need for as many Americans as possible here at home to become acquainted with our diplomatic and consular officers and their work.

Hopefully, this program may be expanded to permit a large number of returning officers to avail themselves of its opportunities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two recent articles appearing in the Department of State newsletter which describe this important new program.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRAVEL TRAILERS ARE AVAILABLE TO FSO'S FOR REVISITING AMERICA

Foreign Service officers and their families returning to the United States on home leave will now be able to take 3 or 4 weeks' trailer trips to sections of the country where they have never been before.

During their cross-country treks the FSO's will address various groups and will discuss the Foreign Service and their experiences in it. At the same time they will refresh their knowledge of America.

The new 2-year project is part of a continuing community relations program under the direction of Deputy Assistant Secretary Katie Louchheim, Director of the Office of Community Advisory Services.

The year-round project was launched on August 27 when FSO Richard G. Johnson, his wife, and two children left Washington on a 3-week trip to San Francisco.

The Wally Byam Foundation and the Ford Motor Co. are providing the needed vehicles. The Byam Foundation has given the Department the use of three air stream trailers for 2 years at no charge. The Ford Motor Co. is providing three automobiles to tow the trailers. The foundation is also providing gasoline and oil for the cars.

Foreign Service officers will pay for food, toll charges, and incidentals.

Mr. Johnson, who joined the Foreign Service in 1947, has just returned from Paris where he was a senior officer trainee detailed to the NATO Defense College. He has served in Italy, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Algeria, and Ethiopia; he speaks German, French, Italian, and Polish.

Both Mr. and Mrs. Johnson hold degrees from the Johns Hopkins School for Advanced International Studies. She speaks French and Italian. The Johnsons were accompanied on the trip by their children, Susan, 14, and Richard, 12.

A FOREIGN SERVICE FAMILY REVISITS AMERICA

(By Samuel G. Wise)

The thought of home leave this time produced more than the usual misgivings in my family. What with both sets of parents having recently disposed of large, comfortable houses and possessing no home of our own, we were frankly dismayed at the idea of being cast adrift in the homeland for up to 2 months with three children (ages 8, and 6 years, and 18 months)—surviving, if at all, in cheap hotels or on the largess of some insanely hospitable friends.

Adding to the bleak picture, I harbored a further disappointment that the size of our family, coupled with a resounding lack of wherewithal, seemed certain to preclude any extensive travel around the United States—to my mind one of the most important purposes of any home leave.

I felt particularly strongly about this as we had been away for 4 years and the children, all born and reared abroad, needed to see and experience at first hand the country they knew only vicariously through books, films, and the conversation of their parents.

What an exciting surprise it was, then, when I learned clandestinely of the trailer program recently launched by the Department's Office of Community Advisory Services. As soon as I heard the news, I hied up to OCAS on the seventh floor to learn the details and to see if I were eligible. It turned out that I was not only eligible but welcome.

Fred Kelley, OCAS officer in charge of the Department's trailer program, gave me some background on the operation. The Department has procured on a long-term loan basis three travel trailers and three powerful tow cars.

Officers assigned trailers are expected to accomplish two broad objectives: reacquaint themselves and their families with a portion of the United States and provide information about the Department and the Foreign Service to interested communities at selected points along the way. The cost to the officer is minimal since the trailer, the tow car, and even the gas and oil are provided gratis. The trailers accommodate up to six persons.

The beauty of the program at this point is that an officer can plot an itinerary covering any section of the United States he chooses and lasting up to a month.

I selected a route that took us out to Grand Junction, Colo., across the States of Maryland, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Iowa, and Nebraska. On the return trip we also crossed Kansas, Missouri, Kentucky, West Virginia, and Virginia.

Together with Mr. Kelley, I scheduled speaking stops in North Platte, Nebr.; Grand Junction, Colo.; Dodge City, Kans.; Columbia, Mo.; Frankfort, Ky.; and Charleston, W. Va.

Letters were sent from the Department to the various news media in each of these cities announcing my arrival and spelling out the purposes of the trailer program. All my scheduled stops had less than 100,000 population for two reasons: (1) larger cities most likely have been or will be visited by FSO's under different auspices and for a longer period of time; (2) maneuvering the trailer is a lot easier in smaller cities.

Mastering the trailer itself, I found, was a continuous process. Completely self-contained with separate equipment for auto-operation and hookups, the trailer was a miracle of design and convenience. Although I learned something new every day about its operation, someone else with greater mechanical facility could catch on considerably quicker. Pulling the trailer was the biggest surprise of all—it was so effortless that concentration was occasionally demanded to remember that it was behind the car.

On the way out to Colorado, we traveled far on the magnificent throughways of the North Central States, alternating our overnight stops between trailer camps and national parks. We also made several side trips to visit friends along the way and to take in national monuments, areas of unusual natural beauty or interest, and other sights recommended by several guides.

The children particularly enjoyed the Indiana State Dunes Park on Lake Michigan and the traces of the old West preserved in such places as Pioneer Village in Minden, Nebr.; Central City, Colo., and Dodge City, Kans.

Mary and I also enjoyed the great beauty of the Rocky Mountains, the seemingly bottomless canyons of Colorado, and the magnificent fall colors in the Blue Grass country of Kentucky and the West Virginia hills. A particularly enjoyable experience for all of us was a Sunday picnic high in the Colorado Rockies hosted by the city editor of the Grand Junction Sentinel.

The public appearance aspect of the trip proved to be one of its highlights for it afforded an additional opportunity to meet with various cross-sections of the population and, where interest was shown, to talk about foreign affairs and the Foreign Service.

We found everywhere we went that the most important concerns were (a) local affairs, (b) the world's series, and (c) the national elections. But we also discovered that throughout the country at all levels there is a far greater knowledge of and interest in foreign affairs than we had believed.

Local news media we perused gave surprisingly good coverage to the world scene and people seemed to sense the the connection between foreign developments, particularly involving the United States, and their domestic concerns.

We were in Columbia, Mo., when the news broke of Khrushchev's ouster and the Communist Chinese nuclear explosion, and I can personally testify that developments of the magnitude of these really have the power to move the man in the street and set him to wondering about their consequences.

The majority of my public appearances were limited to radio, television, and newspaper interviews. At several stops, however, I spoke informally with small groups about the Foreign Service, and in Columbia I had a chance to chat with University of Missouri students and to address a foreign affairs workshop of high school teachers. On several occasions my wife and the children got into the act, and we were amazed to hear our voices on a recorded radio tape as we slipped out of Frankfort in the early hours of the morning.

The questions asked us covered a broad spectrum ranging from our purpose in running around the country in a trailer to what it is like to live abroad to what is the outlook for Sino-Soviet relations.

For a variety of reasons, including Khrushchev's removal and my previous service in Moscow, many of the interviewers concentrated on the Soviet Union. Their second interest was evidenced by a barrage of queries about life in Italy and Americans abroad.

Somewhat surprisingly, I didn't run into one hostile inquisition during my entire trip. Everyone seemed honestly interested to hear what I had to say and to learn more about the Department of State and the Foreign Service. If there were embarrassing questions, they were held in reserve for another occasion.

All in all, the trailer trip turned out to be a great experience. Not only was it a lifesaver as far as home leave lodgings were concerned, but it also enabled us to visit a great deal of America that we had never seen.

I modestly hoped that, in a small way, we were able to increase public knowledge and appreciation of the work of the Department and the Foreign Service.

REAPPORTIONMENT—STATEMENT BY AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the AFL-CIO Executive Council, meeting in Bal Harbour, Fla., on February 22 adopted a statement on reapportionment. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL-CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON REAPPORTIONMENT, BAL HARBOUR, FLA., FEBRUARY 22, 1965

In common with most Americans who understand and cherish the principles of representative democracy, the AFL-CIO hailed last year's decision by the Supreme Court that State legislatures must, under the U.S. Constitution, be apportioned as closely as possible in conformity with the standard of "one man, one vote."

The Court's decision, of course, promised a welcome end to an ancient injustice, under which in most States a majority of the people had no hope of winning a majority voice in their legislature.

But more than that, equitable apportionment offers the hope that State governments, at long last, will fully play their proper role on the stage of national progress. It is true that for two generations the effective power of the States, relative to the Federal Government, has dwindled. But the cause has not been Federal rapacity or aggrandizement; it has been the abdication by the States of their responsibilities, due largely to flagrantly unrepresentative legislatures.

Today, the principles of "one man, one vote" is under attack by a coalition of conservatives, rightwing extremists and obstinate traditionalists. The goal of the coalition is a constitutional amendment that would negate the Supreme Court decision.

Their attack takes these forms:

1. An attempt to have the Congress enact, for submission to the States, a constitutional amendment that would permit any State to apportion one house of its legislature, if approved by referendum, on a basis other than population.

The AFL-CIO will fight against this measure to the utmost of its resources. The referendum provision gives the proposal an air of self-determination that is as deceptive as the campaign itself. In a mobile and ever-changing society, no group of voters, in any year, should be able to impose upon a State for years to come a legislative structure in which a minority of the people is assured of control.

2. A campaign to bypass Congress by having two-thirds of the State legislatures adopt a similar amendment, which would then force a constitutional convention to draft a constitutional amendment to be submitted to the State legislatures.

This is clearly a last-gap effort by malapportioned legislatures to save themselves and already 16 legislatures have enacted such a measure.

Both efforts must be vigorously opposed. Fairly apportioned State legislatures are as essential as a fairly apportioned Congress. Indeed, 50 legislatures that truly represented the people of their respective States could revolutionize the whole approach to social progress in America.

Therefore we call upon all affiliated AFL-CIO unions, and all State and local central bodies, to throw their full support behind the decision of the Supreme Court, and against all efforts, whether in Congress or the State legislatures, to subvert that decision.

It is our deep conviction that equal representation is the very heart of representative government at every level. And representative government is the basic precept of American democracy.

SCANDAL-PEDDLING PUBLICATIONS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, the Nation's press recently has contributed a great deal of admiring comment on the courageous fight of the senior Senator from California against scandal-peddling publications.

Certainly, it is not difficult to imagine the Senator's dilemma. Is it best to ignore irresponsible charges or to meet them head-on and take the chance of drawing more attention to them.

Senator KUCHEL met them head-on and won hands down. Not long ago, I was pleased to note that the Detroit News agreed—as I do—that the Senator made the right decision. I ask unanimous consent that the Detroit News editorial be printed at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A SENATOR'S RARE COURAGE: TRIUMPH OVER RADICAL RIGHT

Senator THOMAS H. KUCHEL, Republican, of California, marked himself several years ago as a target for the paranoid right. In 1961 he had the temerity to denounce the John Birch Society and its kingfish, Robert Welch, for spreading Welch's amazing notion that a long list of American leaders—up to and including Dwight D. Eisenhower—somehow took orders from the Kremlin.

And in 1963 KUCHEL exposed some of the printed tripe the ultraright crackpots dump into the mails in the name of what they choose to call "patriotism."

He could have expected, therefore, that the ultras would work overtime to destroy him. He probably could not have guessed how low they might go to try.

Since last June they have been gleefully circulating hints and reports, based on an affidavit from Norman Krause, a former Los Angeles policeman, that KUCHEL and another man were arrested in 1950 in a drunk-driving and homosexual incident. The case never came to trial, the affidavit added darkly.

When the tale finally reached KUCHEL in October he asked for an investigation, which has now produced indictments for conspiracy to commit criminal libel against the ex-cop, another officer who resigned last week, an ex-public relations man for the Eversharp-Schick Safety Razor Co., who also resigned last week, and a rightwing patriot publisher.

The affidavit erred in a few respects, it turns out. The police blotter mentions no morals charge. The two men arrested were charged with drunkenness and fined. And neither of them was KUCHEL.

He really thought it was KUCHEL until now, says Krause—which sounds pretty lame, since the younger of the two men involved is 20 years older than KUCHEL. It takes a lot of effort to mistake an identity that far.

The affair raises fascinating questions. The rightwing pamphleteer in the case, for instance, was an "investigator" in the thirties for sheriffs and district attorneys in the New York-New Jersey area and a personnel man for two defense contractors during World War II, doing security work, he says. What peculiar notions about loyalty and security did he bring to such work, and how many people might have been affected by them?

Has the case raised any questions about rightwing verities in the mind of Patrick J. Frawley, Jr., head of Eversharp-Schick, who has been a general angel for the frenetic anti-Communist movement and for whom the deposed PR man worked?

Has it raised any such doubts, for that matter, in the minds of any prominent respectable conservatives who, following their leader's dictum that "extremism in the defense of liberty is no vice," have for so long managed to live with, and sometimes apologize for, the paranoid rightwing zealots who trot alongside them under the cloak of patriotism?

No matter, perhaps. The main lesson to be learned is for those who, like KUCHEL, recognize the subversive strain in the preachments of the radical right. Many men in KUCHEL's shoes would have been inclined to let such a dirt story die out by itself, for fear of spreading it further in the very attempt to combat it.

KUCHEL has demonstrated that the best way to deal with the hatemongers is to fight them toe to toe whenever they crawl out of the woodwork. In no other way can they be exposed to the light of day.

THE PHARMACIST: A KEY PERSON IN COMMUNITY PSYCHIATRY—ADDRESS BY MIKE GORMAN

Mr. HART. Mr. President, over the years, one of the most effective voices in the development of ideas and programs to meet compelling health needs in this country, has been Mike Gorman. The Michigan State Pharmaceutical Association was the audience which heard his voice most recently on the occasion of their convention in Detroit on February 2. As always, his comments contribute substantially to the development of sound programs and response, and I welcome the opportunity of bringing them to the attention not only of my colleagues, but to the country. For this reason I ask unanimous consent that the speech delivered by Mr. Gorman on that occasion be made a part of the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Pharmacist: A Key Person in Community Psychiatry

(Speech at midseason convention, Michigan State Pharmaceutical Association, February 2, 1965, Statler Hilton Hotel, Detroit, Mich., by Mike Gorman, Washington, D.C., executive director, National Committee Against Mental Illness; member, National Advisory Mental Health Council, USPHS; fellow, American Psychiatric Association (honorary); fellow, American Public Health Association)

The major theme of the final report of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health—a congressionally appointed body which spent the 6 years subsequent to its formation in 1955 in a study in depth of all aspects of the care of the mentally ill in this country—was that the whole State mental hospital system was antiquated and in need of replacement. The report argued that the isolation of the mentally ill in large institutions located far from the mainstream of modern medicine perpetuated a second-rate level of care.

President Kennedy, after a year's study of the Commission's findings by a special task force, recommended in February 1963 a new program of Federal matching grants for the construction and operation of mental health centers in the heart of the community. The legislation was passed in October 1963, but the proposal for limited Federal matching funds for operation of these centers was deleted by the House of Representatives.

I sit as 1 of a 12-member jury known as the National Advisory Mental Health Council which evaluates all projects which come before the National Institute of Mental Health from all parts of the country for support. I have been to a number of States recently, and I confess in sorrow that many States and communities are not applying for Federal matching aid for the construction of community mental health centers because they don't want to build hollow shells bereft of the staff personnel needed to treat people. Empty buildings don't cure people—they merely cater to the edifice complexes of some of our more unenlightened State mental health commissioners.

In his stirring health message to the Congress on January 7 of this year, President Johnson took up the torch passed on by President Kennedy in the field of mental illness in these moving and eloquent words:

"Mental illness afflicts 1 out of 10 Americans, fills nearly one-half of all the hospital beds in the Nation, and costs $3 billion annually. Fortunately, we are entering a new era in the prevention, treatment, and care of mental illness. Mere custodial care of patients in large, isolated asylums is clearly no longer appropriate. Most patients can be cared for and cured in their own communities.

"An important beginning toward community preparation has been made through the legislation enacted by the 88th Congress authorizing aid for constructing community mental health centers. But facilities alone cannot assure services.

"It has been estimated that at least 10,000 more psychiatrists are needed.

"Few communities have the funds to support adequate programs, particularly during the first years.

"Communities with the greatest needs hesitate to build centers without being able to identify the source of operating funds.

"Most of the people in need are children, the aged, or patients with low incomes.

"I therefore recommend legislation to authorize a 5-year program of grants for the initial costs of personnel to man community mental health centers which offer comprehensive services."

Those of us who had a part in the drawing up of the guidelines describing the community mental health center had a very clear idea of its structure and function. Through its various components—a 24-hour facility, day and night hospital, emergency psychiatric service, aftercare service, etc.—it would guarantee to the patient continuity of care. In other words, it would break away from the old system in which a patient was sent to a State hospital and then, upon discharge, hurled into a community which had no resources for his care. Furthermore, the new mental health center would not be an isolated psychiatric facility—it would be located near, and work closely with, general medical facilities and general practitioners of medicine.

Policy on the use of drugs is very directly related to the concept of the community mental health center. While the tranquilizing and antidepressant drugs have been rather widely accepted in State mental hospitals, they have encountered strong resistance in mental health clinics and other community facilities. In a carefully documented paper given to the 1961 convention of the American Public Health Association, Dr. Nathan Kline, director of research at New York's Rockland State Hospital, told his colleagues that most of the 1,600 mental health clinics in the country did not use drugs as a form of treatment.

Let me quote Dr. Kline:

"The whole generation of psychologists and social workers who now carry the brunt of community clinic treatment have been raised and trained in a gospel which has in no way prepared them intellectually or practically to accept pharmacotherapy. * * * In the more than 1,600 psychiatric outpatient clinics, over 3,000 psychologists and even more thousands of social workers are administering psychotherapy under the nominal supervision of harassed psychiatric administrators who have gone into community mental health because of their convictions as to the psychosocial origins of mental disease. Who then is to administer drugs? * * * There is not the slightest doubt but that the disgraceful 2-year waiting lists and the exclusion from clinic treatment of all but the most select patients could be corrected to a great extent by the appropriate addition of pharmacotherapy."

There are impressive statistics as to the effectiveness of the drugs, not only in reducing State mental hospital populations appreciably during the past decade, but also in reducing the readmission rates to State hospitals through their use on an outpatient basis. However, these statistics have not convinced a majority of the States to develop a policy whereby the mental patient would be eligible for drugs both while hospitalized and while under care in the community. As a result, drug policy from one State to another varies widely and inexplicably; in some States, drug distribution is restricted to welfare recipients; in others, patients are carried on convalescent status by State hospitals for varying periods of time in order to be eligible, and in still other States, no policy has ever been enunciated.

At the root of this confusion over drug policy is the primary question of ability to pay. It is my firm conviction that the mental patient who cannot afford drugs—or any other form of treatment for that matter—should be provided same through public tax moneys and that, furthermore, the public responsibility for the provision of these drugs and other treatments does not end at the State hospital door. In fact, it is more important that these treatments be paid for in the community—for both economic and humanitarian reasons.

This whole question of ability to pay concerned President Kennedy deeply, and he therefore instructed the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to appoint a task force on health insurance to explore more complete coverage of mental illness. Late last year, the task force released a set of guidelines which urged voluntary health insurance to cover not only partial hospitalization and outpatient psychiatric care in a mental health center or in a psychiatrist's office, but also "prescribed drugs for ambulatory, as well as for hospitalized, patients."

I am happy to note that these are not just academic guidelines. In the new contracts concluded last year with the auto manufacturers, the United Auto Workers negotiated not only coverage of partial hospitalization and outpatient services up to $400 a year, but also all prescribed drugs and medications dispensed by a community mental health center and used by the patient either in or outside of the facility.

I submit that during this exciting period of change and ferment in the mental health movement, you pharmacists can play a very significent role. Comprehensive community mental health plans are being hammered out in all 50 of the States—you should be a very definite part of this process. Policies are being hammered out as to what kind of community mental health center we will construct in the years to come—will it be a pallid extension of the present mental health clinic, or will it be a true medical facility guaranteeing continuity of care and enlisting the support of medicine generally?

The whole question of payment for these new services will be part of a continuing debate. Those of us who have worked at developing this new legislation over the past decade believe very strongly in the private profit system and in the private sector of medicine. We do not like State medicine and its handout philosophy. On the other hand, we want the mentally ill to have equal time with the physically ill in the use of our general hospitals and in coverage of their expenses by private health insurance or other third-party arrangements. We do not agree with the American Medical Association that limited Federal support for the staffing of community mental health centers is socialized medicine. On the contrary, it is the only viable alternative to the almost 100-percent socialized medicine which exists in the field of hospitalization for mental illness today.

I therefore respectfully suggest that you do a little thinking about these problems. We who are trying to bring psychiatric treatment into the private sector of medicine, which includes the family physician and the corner pharmacy, can only succeed if we have your help. If you take an unreasonable position against any and all provisions to pay through public tax moneys for psychiatric treatment for those who cannot afford it, then you will doom all of us to failure. If this occurs, the people will not be denied—they will see that government takes up the slack.

May I now relate some of the foregoing observations to the fast-changing picture in which the new community psychiatry is rapidly making obsolete all of the past economic witchcraft which doomed the mentally ill to almost total dependence upon penurious government charity.

Over the past few years, I have familiarized myself with a great deal of the literature on the economics of drug distribution. I am a compulsive reader of many of your drug trade publications, and I note that you devote an inordinate amount of attention to the dispensation of drugs to welfare recipients. Your concentration upon this area is not purely humanitarian; I am aware that the pharmacists of America were reimbursed to the tune of more than $100 million last year by State governments for the vendor sale of drugs to welfare recipients.

In some of your publications, you are quite critical of the failure of State legislatures to vote sufficient funds to finance adequate drug distribtuion to mental patients. As an illustration, I quote from a recent issue of "The Voice of the Pharmacist":

"These programs start out with the most noble of motives and the most liberal requirements and then the squeeze comes. Usually the legislators are sold a bill of goods on the costs of these programs and initial funds appropriated are not sufficient. Thus the administrators of these programs are forced to seek additional appropriations and/or impose restrictions on the programs which result in changes in medical practices and inadequate compensation for those providing the services."

The aforementioned publication cites the recent happenings in Oregon. The State adopted a vendor program within the private sector of medicine and budgeted drug expenses at 1 percent of the total mental health budget—about $42,000 per month. However, billings from pharmacists far exceeded this figure and the State welfare department was forced to reduce its allocation to pharmacists to 65 percent of the total charges. The pharmacists of Oregon set up an anguished howl, but the publicity resulting from these outcrys was hardly favorable to pharmacy. The Oregon pharmacists were accused of refusing to dispense drugs to welfare recipients; a distinguished U.S. Senator from Oregon took to the Senate floor to chastise you for this alleged indifference and for the high cost of drugs.

I was in Florida less than a month ago, and ran into the same problem in my discussions with State mental health and welfare officials. Due to inadequate legislative appropriations, the Florida Welfare Department on January 1, of this year was forced to lower the maximum monthly drug allowance per patient from $40 to $20.

The pharmacists of Florida were roundly excoriated for this situation. For example, the president of the 70,000-member Florida Council of Senior Citizens was quoted on the front pages of the two Miami newspapers to the following effect:

"Private pharmacies are profiting while the Florida Welfare Department has had to halve its drug allotment for public assistance patients," he charged. "The prices that members of the pharmaceutical association are charging the indigent are entirely out of proportion to what you can get at cutrate stores in Miami."

The Florida Council of Senior Citizens argued that if drug distribution was handled directly through the welfare department, the amount of drugs received by welfare recipients could be doubled. The council also attacked the existing system under which the Florida Pharmaceutical Association receives $200,000 of the $7 million a year in State drug costs for processing payments for the welfare department.

I could cite many more examples of this kind of thing, but I think you get the point. The real question is who is responsible for these inadequate State appropriations for drugs.

I speak with some feeling on this matter for much of my time over the past decade has been devoted to attempts to convince State legislatures that it is both wise and economically sound to provide drugs not only for hospitalized mental patients, but for patients discharged into the community. I have been criticized over these years by some distinguished members of the psychiatric hierarchy for my aggressive advocacy of the psychiatric drugs.

As an illustration, may I quote an excerpt from the testimony I delivered before the late Senator Kefauver's Senate Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee more than 5 years ago:

"Alarmed at the bitter resistance to these drugs, I began late in 1954 to write a book which would try to explain the importance of the so-called psychiatric drug revolution.

"May I quote the initial two paragraphs of chapter 7 of 'Every Other Bed':

" 'In the entire history of the physiological attack upon mental illness, no development has been more significant than the recent introduction of new drugs in the treatment of a wide variety of mental illnesses.

" 'The surface story of the remarkable achievements of these new drugs has been told in scores of technical and popular articles. Yet beneath the surface, there is a deeper story which illustrates in a graphic manner the thesis of this entire book—that physiological treatments must still fight an uphill battle for recognition among the high priests of psychiatry. This writer has witnessed, during the past several years, a set of resistances to the new drugs running the scale from downright ignorance and bureaucratic apathy to vicious, bitter attacks upon every researcher reporting success in using them. And this resistance was not, and is not, confined to the psychoanalysts, many of whom were rushing to second-hand dealers with their sagging couches. In its initial phases, it included a number of tax-supported Federal and State mental health officials whose bounden duty it is to support any treatment which holds promise of alleviating the miseries of the mentally ill.'

"Mr. Chairman, I think no responsible figure in American psychiatry today would dispute the fact that the tranquilizing drugs have had the greatest therapeutic impact upon mental illness in this country since the establishment of the first mental hospital at Williamsburg, Va., in 1773."

I therefore have a right to ask you: Have you been doing your share in helping those very few of us who have continually testified and fought for increased public allocations for drugs, particularly for patients on an aftercare or outpatient status? I know what my answer is, but let me give you the frank view of Dr. Robert Abrams, the distinguished pharmacist who serves as executive secretary of the American College of Apothecaries:

"This is one of the first places we pharmacists have fallen down," Dr. Abrams wrote recently. "We recognize the need for more realistic payments in these areas, but have we ever organized to seek more realistic appropriations from the legislature?"

In your somewhat compulsive and narrow concentration upon welfare recipients, you have given those of us in the mental health field the impression that you are unaware of the fact that welfare recipients are only a minuscule portion of the number of Americans being treated for mental illness each year.

A recent issue of Blue Cross Reports estimates that more than 3 million people received psychiatric care in this country in 1962. The authors of this report admit that this figure is probably very low; it is generally agreed that approximately one-half of the patients treated by physicians in private practice have predominantly psychiatric complaints or suffer from a physical illness with psychiatric complications. The report also notes, bearing out the general conclusions of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, that the 3 million who received care are only a small portion of the 19 million Americans who need it.

But a most interesting observation of this Blue Cross study is predicated upon a number of solidly documented figures pointing up the dramatic trend away from total Government care of mental patients to the increasing care of these patients in the private sector of medicine.

In 1962, more than 50 percent of all mental patients cared for were treated in general hospitals, in private psychiatric hospitals or in the private offices of medical practitioners. For example, in 1962, 1,300,000 Americans received private office psychiatric care—an increase of 23 percent over the comparable figure in 1956.

The State hospital, once the major locus of psychiatric treatment for most Americans, now cares for only one in four mental patients, as against three out of four mental patients just 20 years ago.

Most mental patients are now being treated in private facilities or in tax-supported community mental health facilities.

In 1962, for example, 665,000 patients received outpatient care in tax-supported community mental health facilities—a dramatic 62-percent increase over the comparable figure in 1956. If the figure was available for 1964, I am confident that it would show a 100-percent increase since 1956 in the number of patients being treated on an outpatient basis in community mental health facilities.

You and I must adjust our thinking to this fantastically rapid change in the locus of psychiatric treatment. When we realize that two out of every three mental patients being treated today receive such treatment on an outpatient basis, can we not agree that the almost total past concentration upon the public mental hospital and upon the welfare recipient is somewhat archaic in light of these changing trends?

For example, a recent survey completed by the American Hospital Association and the National Institute of Mental Health reported that 1,005 general hospitals in the United States admit psychiatric patients for diagnosis and treatment. In 1963, according to this comprehensive survey, general hospitals discharged 412,000 psychiatric patients—far more than those discharged in the same period by all tax-supported State and community mental hospitals.

These basic trends in the relocation of psychiatric treatment are reflected in a number of economic indexes. To cite just one: Expenditures for general hospital and other private psychiatric care in 1962 exceeded $500 million—a remarkable increase of 62 percent over the comparable figure for 1956.

All of the foregoing documentation has a most direct bearing on payment for professional psychiatric services, including drugs. As the Joint Commission's voluminous study noted, most patients treated in the private sector now have great difficulty in meeting the high costs of such intervention. Several million additional Americans who seek such psychiatric treatment are unable to obtain it because it is far beyond their economic reach.

I could spend the rest of the afternoon citing various studies emphasizing the failure of commercial and nonprofit health insurance carriers in meeting the increasing public demand for coverage of psychiatric illness. I will restrict myself to one citation. The previously mentioned comprehensive Blue Cross Association study of the economic aspects of mental illness, while noting some improvement in coverage of psychiatric illness by its member Blue Cross plans, is frank to admit that insurance benefits for mental illness are still far more limited than those for physical illness. I quote from the Blue Cross study:

"Restrictions on these benefits are common and among those covered for mental illness the proportion with full coverage (the same benefits as any other illness) was somewhat less than one-third of those covered."

This invidious discrimination against the mentally ill has resulted in severe humanitarian and economic losses in our continuing attempts to strengthen this democracy. The folly and cruelty of these discriminatory practices was recently castigated by Walter J. McNerney, president of the Blue Cross Association, in this frank observation:

"The tendency of many communities in the past to turn their backs on mental illness was regrettable. The afflicted and their families have been treated in a way unbecoming to human dignity and to the capabilities of a resourceful economy and a maturing society. Equally important, the lack of purchasing power on the part of patients, due to the low priority for mental illness compared with other prepayment benefits, has adversely affected both the supply of manpower and progress in classification, diagnosis, research, and treatment."

Statistics tell part of the story, but they do not begin to suggest the heartrending experiences of thousands upon thousands of families who go into literal bankruptcy in an attempt to provide adequate psychiatric care for their loved ones. Last year, I received more than 300 letters from people begging me to find some economic solution to the problem of providing psychiatric care within their means.

Let me give just one example of so many I could cite. On January 6 of this year, I received a letter from a woman whose husband, a distinguished cardiologist, has had serious emotional problems over the past 15 years. When the distinguished doctor was first hospitalized for mental illness in the late 1940's, the three health policies he had with Mutual of Omaha were immediately canceled by the company. Over the ensuing years, she has cashed in all her life insurance policies and finally was forced to sell their home. A very proud woman, she was finally reduced to appealing to the State welfare department for aid. The State welfare department replied that her husband was ineligible because their combined income from a small pension exceeded $1,300 a year. Let me read just one paragraph from her letter to me:

"Medical care for the older person who is not financially able to meet it? Will any bill that has so far been introduced or is under consideration be adequate? What do people do who haven't even a small pension and not any insurance policies to be used as a last resort. They do have social security which the practicing physician has not, but this does not insure good medical care. Finally, what is the use of making sacrifices to pay for Blue Cross insurance if you can't collect on it?"

We in the mental health field are deeply concerned about the inability of most Americans to pay for adequate psychiatric care. Those of us who helped to draft the landmark health legislation recommended in 1963 by the late President Kennedy had clearly in mind the creation of a broad network of community mental health centers strongly rooted in the private sector of medicine. Some wilfully, and for their own reasons, misunderstood our intentions, but anyone who has studied the legislation and the record of the congressional hearings cannot but come to the same conclusion as the Blue Cross Association in this recent comment:

"Although Federal funds will play a key role in the construction of these centers, their initial staffing and ultimate functioning will depend upon the contributions made by the State and local communities and on both public and private purchasers of care, with the latter source of funds buttressed by voluntary prepayment and other forms of health insurance."

We want these community mental health centers to be first-rate psychiatric facilities—not welfare substations doling out token care to the indigent. We want them to be focal points for the practice of community psychiatry, closely tied to the general practitioner and, yes, to the pharmacist. Wherever possible, as we have stated time and time again, we want them supported by health insurance payments and other third party payments.

By the same token, we will not neglect those who are too poor to have health insurance policies or other means of paying for psychiatric care.

In order to enable these community centers to bring treatment to the low-income groups, President Kennedy proposed a limited Federal contribution to support these facilities during their initial period of operation. All of us in the mental health field are delighted that President Johnson is equally insistent upon a limited national responsibility in this area. Furthermore, just 2 weeks ago Senator LISTER HILL, chairman of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, and Congressman OREN HARRIS, chairman of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee which has public health under its jurisdiction, introduced identical bills to carry out the original objectives of the Kennedy-Johnson legislation.

I therefore ask of you pharmacists that you evaluate these proposals very carefully before taking a position. I know that in the past year you have sometimes been associated with State medical association lobbyists in opposition to various pieces of progressive health legislation. I suppose you have to be nice to doctors who send you their prescriptions to fill, although may I note in passing that you don't have to be too nice to the many doctors who own pharmacies and compete with you in a rather unfair way.

I have little respect for the position of the American Medical Association on this issue of limited Federal support for the operation of community mental health centers. We tried to explain to their leaders that, like them, we were against total Government medicine and in favor of a return of psychiatric treatment to the private sector of medicine. However, I suspect there is a rampant epidemic of mental retardation in the leadership of the American Medical Association; they opposed the operating provisions in 1963 and they won a temporary delay.

However, the day is ending for the dinosaurs in Chicago and elsewhere. I am confident that the Hill-Harris mental health legislation will pass the Congress this year by an overwhelming majority. In the light of these facts, I earnestly beseech you of the pharmaceutical industry to take a long second look before you join with the American Medical Association in trying to repeal the 20th century.

Finally, what is the role of the pharmacist in this existing new era of community mental health?

Back in 1953 Dr. Robert Felix, then director of the National Institute of Mental Health, wrote this in the American Pharmaceutical Association Journal:

"The American pharmacist is, for most of our population, one of the most readily accessible professional persons in the community. Because he is a professional person whose advice and assistance are sought by large numbers of people daily, the pharmacist often plays a large part in civic affairs. He is more than a private citizen—he is a key citizen and as such must stand ready to be consulted on matters of public interest. The pharmacist is in the forefront of the civic-minded whose daily contacts offer them continuous opportunities to inform themselves and to speak with authority on matters of public importance such as mental health."

Eleven years after this appeal to you from Dr. Felix, I had the privilege of appearing with Dr. Abrams on a panel at the National Conference of State Pharmaceutical Association Secretaries. Here is what Dr. Abrams had to say then of your response to the challenge laid down by Dr. Felix:

"This was the challenge that Dr. Felix placed before pharmacy back in 1953 and we, you and I, as leaders of pharmaceutical associations on local, State, and National levels have failed miserably in accepting it."

In his talk to the San Francisco meeting, Dr. Abrams referred to a U.S. Public Health Service-supported American Pharmaceutical Association study on the pharmacy as a potential health education center. The results of that experiment indicated beyond question of doubt that the pharmacist can play a vital role in the dissemination of information on mental illness to the general public. As Dr. Abrams put it:

"Most pharmacists can disseminate mental health literature; can make an effort to see that drugs are handled properly; can support efforts to insure adequate community mental health facilities and be conversant with developments in the mental health area."

We can only succeed in this exciting effort to bring a new day to the mentally ill if, as Dr. Jack Ewalt, the Director of the Joint Commission on Mental Illness and Health, pointed out recently, "we can keep in mind that its primary object is to bring a help to the mentally ill that hitherto has been generally denied them. If we are to accelerate the mental health movement, reduce mental illness and improve mental health, we must rise above our self-preservation functions as members of different professions and different social classes and adherents of different economic philosophies and illuminate the means of working together out of mutual respect for our fellow man. We each have our roles and our sense of duties and obligations, but also we each have one kind of responsibility that is common to all and transcends all others. This is our responsibility as citizens of a democratic nation founded out of faith in the uniqueness, integrity, and dignity of human life."

DEATH OF DR. GORDON SEAGRAVE, THE "BURMA SURGEON"

Mr. HART. Mr. President, on Monday most of the Nation's newspapers carried small items announcing the death of Dr. Gordon Seagrave, the "Burma Surgeon" who died at the jungle hospital where he served since World War II.

The item had a special impact on me because I am a member of the Committee for the American Medical Center in Burma, the doctor's hospital. This committee was formed 3 years ago. President John F. Kennedy was its honorary chairman and other members include Senator Prescott Bush, Senator JOSEPH CLARK, Senator JOHN COOPER, Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Senator LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Assistant Secretary of State Harlan Cleveland, Dr. Milton Eisenhower, and Dr. Paul Dudley White.

Not many days ago, I respectfully suggested that President Johnson confer the Freedom Medal on Dr. Seagrave, but, unhappily, the doctor died before the White House could take action. I am still hopeful that some posthumous recognition can be given.

Dr. Seagrave's history is one of remarkable dedication.

He was born in Ohio, and received his medical training at Johns Hopkins University. Immediately upon graduation 43 years ago, with his wife, Marion, and with a wastebasket of discarded medical equipment, he left for Burma where he built with his own hands what was the only modern hospital within hundreds of miles.

During World War II Dr. Seagrave volunteered to serve with the American forces and was commissioned a colonel in our Medical Corps. With a group of Burmese nurses from this hospital, he joined General Stilwell's historic retreat on foot across the foothills of the Himalayan Mountains from Burma into India. He was in the front lines during Stilwell's equally historic and triumphant return across Burma to the China border. These troops built the Ledo Road as they went to its junction with the Burma Road at Mankaham, the site of Dr. Seagrave's hospital which the Japanese armies had turned into a command post.

For its action, Dr. Seagrave's medical unit was awarded a special citation by President Roosevelt, 23 nurses were awarded Bronze Stars, and several Silver Stars also were awarded. Through a military quirk, Dr. Seagrave personally was given no official recognition although his three best-selling books and a series of Life magazine articles had made him world famous.

Dr. Seagrave remained in Namkaham after the war, rebuilding his bombed-out hospital and constantly modernizing its facilities until today when the hospital treats well over 10,000 patients yearly. The uniqueness of the hospital lies not in its location or in its modern facilities or in the doctor's four decades of devotion and the unusual continuity that implies, but in his unparalleled training program.

In an area of diverse races, religions, and languages, since the end of World War II, Dr. Seagrave trained 100 young Burmese girls a year in 4½-year courses leading to an internationally recognized registered nurse's degree. Since the war, 1,200 girls have graduated and are carrying on his work and, incidentally, making friends for the United States throughout Burma.

In the words of Chester Bowles:

> Here in the life of one man is a rare combination of brotherhood and patriotism, of service and courage, that seems to be distinctly American. The story of Dr. Seagrave is the story of the best of America overseas.

We cannot allow this man to die unwept, unhonored, and unsung.

TRIBUTES TO DAVID O. McKAY, PRESIDENT OF CHURCH OF JESUS CHRIST OF LATTER-DAY SAINTS

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, recently David O. McKay, 91-year-old president of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints and beloved, spiritual leader of 2½ million Mormons throughout the world was the subject of two very fitting tributes.

One of these appeared in the March issue of Guideposts magazine and was written by the noted clergyman Dr. Norman Vincent Peale. Dr. Peale spoke of the overwhelming impression he has of President McKay as a man with a tremendous zest for living and the utmost concern and consideration for others. He characterizes President McKay's outlook in the words of Poet Edwin Markham:

There is a destiny which makes us brothers;
  None lives to self alone;
All that we send into the lives of others
  Comes back into our own.

The other tribute appeared in an editorial in one of Utah's leading newspapers, the Ogden Standard-Examiner. It spoke of President McKay as "A Man Among Men—A Man of Inspiration."

I heartily concur in these tributes to President McKay. It has been my privilege to know President McKay for many years. Undaunted by recent illnesses which have limited his activities, President McKay continues to radiate a spirit of love and kindness which is felt everywhere by members and nonmembers of the Latter-day Saints Church alike.

Many of my colleagues recently have asked about President McKay's health and I can report that even though he has suffered a series of mild heart attacks he still meets daily with the first presidency of the Latter-day Saints Church and also plans to attend the opening session of the semiannual conference of the church this Sunday.

He is well enough to see people and is feeling quite well.

Mr. President, in the belief that the tributes published in Guideposts and the Ogden Standard-Examiner will be of wide interest, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the tributes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Ogden (Utah) Standard-Examiner, Feb. 25, 1965]

DAVID O. MCKAY: MAN AMONG MEN

It is particularly fitting that our community should set today as David O. McKay Honor Day.

During his 92 years, the venerable president of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints has traveled hundreds of thousands of miles to all parts of the world.

But there is no area more closely associated with President McKay than Weber County in general and Ogden Valley in particular.

His native Huntsville has always been "home" to David O. McKay. During his active years, his favorite form of relaxation was to head for the family home, saddle a horse, and ride across the tranquil countryside.

Horses have always played an important part in the McKay scheme of things. His first job was carrying the mail to a remote mining camp above Huntsville. When he first joined the faculty of Weber Academy, he rode his horse daily to the Ogden campus.

These early days in the life of President McKay were retraced this afternoon in a display presented at the Ogden Institute of Religion on the Weber State College campus, arranged by the Huntsville War Relief Society.

Tonight, further tribute will be paid the Latter-day Saints leader in a special program at the Ogden Tabernacle.

Featured address of the evening will be delivered by Elder Hugh B. Brown, first counselor in the church first presidency.

Because of illness, President McKay will be unable to participate personally in the proceedings. But his spirit will be there—the spirit that has proven such an inspiration to thousands all over the world.

The community should be grateful to those who arranged David O. McKay Honor Day. Particular credit goes to Dr. P. Wendel Johnson and Neil J. Flinders of the Ogden Institute of Religion.

They could not have picked a more appropriate theme for the occasion. Its words describe well the feeling of so many Latter-day Saints Church members and nonmembers alike, when they think of President McKay: "A Man Among Men—A Man of Inspiration."

[From Guideposts, March 1965]

DAVID O. MCKAY: A MAN WITH A SECRET

(By Norman Vincent Peale)

The last time I saw David O. McKay I took away with me one overwhelming impression. I suppose this spiritual leader of 2½ million people might have affected me in many ways. Wise, saintly, humble, witty—these are words often used about the president of the Mormon Church. But I carried away with me above all a warm affection for a man who has a tremendous zest for life.

This quality is a great one in any man but I was particularly moved because, at the time, President McKay was 91 years old. His delight in things bubbled over in his laughter, his optimism, his warm and ready smile and especially in the prayer with which our visit ended. As I stood up to leave his office in Salt Lake City, he slipped his arm through mine and, in fatherly tones, voiced what I can only call a hymn of thanks—for human friendship, for the saving love of Christ, for the privilege of being His disciples.

Later when my wife Ruth and I were talking about our visit with the Mormon leader, I said, "You know I think he is one of the happiest men I've ever met."

Ruth was intrigued. "A man of his age and responsibilities must have some kind of secret behind his vitality."

His secret. What a wonderful thing it would be if there were such a secret, and all of us could discover and use it to make our lives the joyous walk with God that his has been. I thought over what I knew of the man for a clue to this quality. I remember his secretary, Miss Clare Middlemiss, saying that in the 29 years she'd worked at his elbow she had never heard a cross word.

And I recalled a heart-stopping moment a few months before when, as President McKay mounted the platform to address a group, he tripped on the stairs. There was a gasp from the people. But he stood up and faced the audience with that irrepressible smile. "It's awful to grow old," he said ruefully, "but I prefer it to the alternative."

When I returned to New York, I called several of my Mormon friends and told them I was interested in learning more about their leader. In a matter of days my desk was piled high with copies of President McKay's speeches, books written about him, letters from people who knew him—and a picture of the man was forming before me.

David O. McKay was born in Huntsville, Utah, on September 8, 1873, the eldest son of 10 children of pioneer parents. His life followed the traditional Mormon pattern: hard work, a home built around religious faith, a period of missionary work ahead, then the beginning of a teaching career which led him to the very top position in his church.

It was the little glimpses, though, more than the broad outlines, which revealed the quality of the man.

On one occasion President McKay was walking into an auditorium to conduct a service when an eager-faced girl of 8 or 9 pressed through the crowd and asked for his autograph. He started to oblige, but there was an interruption and when he turned to find her she was gone.

Now it might have seemed a small matter, but not to President McKay. Shunting aside questions about his talk, he said to those around him, "I've got to find that little girl." Nor would he turn to matters of business until she was found and he had signed her program.

Examples of this kind of caring for other people are especially frequent among his own family. His son Llewelyn, today a professor at the University of Utah, admits that if any of the six McKay children were on the rebellious side, he was the one. Llewelyn remembers the time as a teenager when he came home from the store one day bringing the wrench he had been sent to purchase, plus a wide grin.

"The store clerk was so dumb he gave me $5 extra in change," Llewelyn told his father elatedly.

David O. McKay studied his son for a moment. "They won't miss it, Dad," Llewelyn continued more defensively. "That store makes all kinds of money."

"You are probably right; the store may not miss that $5," his father said. "But if the clerk has to make it up from the salary on which he's supporting a family, he will miss the $5, won't he, Son?"

The boy nodded reluctantly.

"But let us suppose that the clerk is not held responsible," he continued. "Let us suppose that no one knows that you have the $5. You know. And you know it does not belong to you." There was a long pause. "It's up to you, Son, to decide what is the right thing to do."

Llewelyn returned the $5 the next day. His father could have made it a cut-and-dried matter of law but, instead he chose to respect the young personality before him, to give him principle to go on but not a command, to make the decision his.

Indeed, thinking over what I had read and observed of this man, it seemed to me that this consideration for other people shone through everything he did, whether he was dealing with his son or a small girl he'd never seen. I wondered if perhaps that was a clue to the joy he so evidently found in life.

Llewelyn wrote that nowhere is the esteem in which his father holds other people more evident than in his treatment of Mrs. McKay. After 64 years of marriage, President McKay still rises when she enters the room and, recently in a pouring rain, he was seen holding the car door open for her, his shock of white hair blowing in the storm.

Such concern extends to the very animals of the household. One night while he was away on a trip the family was wakened in the middle of the night by a telegram. Frightened, they tore open the envelope. The message read, "Water Caesar." Caesar was their boar pig and, in his hotel room hundreds of miles away, President McKay's training as a farm boy kept him from sleeping for fear the animal had been neglected.

And then one day, in a speech by the beloved churchman, I found the answer to my question: four lines of a poem by Edwin Markham that President McKay long ago committed to memory as a guide for everyday living.

"There is a destiny which makes us brothers;
None lives to self alone;
All that we send into the lives of others
Comes back into our own."

All that we send. If what went out from David O. McKay into other lives was concern and respect and love, what wonder that joy and peace and affection come back. It reminded me of an episode which became something of a cause célèbre in Salt Lake City 2 or 3 years ago. Each year on July 24, the city stages a great parade in memory of the coming of the first pioneers to the Salt Lake Valley on that day in 1847. This particular year, though, something happened which set tongues wagging: for the first time girls in bathing suits appeared on several floats. A group of starchier church people called on the president to protest.

But the saintly gentleman closed the discussion with a comment which sums up perfectly the principle I am referring to. "I didn't see anything in that parade," he said, "which was not beautiful."

Isn't this what all of us see in the world around us: not what it is, but what we are? Looking for the good, the worthwhile, the beautiful in others, David O. McKay finds it there. This is what makes life so good for him at 91—and the secret will work at any age.

THE NECESSITY FOR LAW AND ORDER

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I rise to call my colleagues' attention to the address which my close friend and distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] delivered on March 26 to the graduating class of the Inter-American General Course of the International Police Academy.

This course, which was given under the sponsorship of the Agency for International Development, was attended by police officers from throughout Latin America. It was most fitting that Senator MONTOYA, who has a deep interest in and understanding of inter-American affairs, was invited to give the graduation address.

The Senator from New Mexico [Mr. MONTOYA] emphasized the fact that the best way to insure the maintenance of law and order and prevent social unrest and civil disturbance is to remove the underlying causes of such unrest. We all believe in freedom. But true freedom has a broad and inclusive meaning, encompassing opportunity for economic self-improvement, as well as basic civil and political rights.

The necessity of law and order for the enjoyment of political freedom, and the necessity of social justice as a foundation of law and order are important lessons, applicable to our own society as well as to the societies of our neighbors to the south. Since Senator MONTOYA's address is of such broad general interest, I ask unanimous consent that it should be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JOSEPH M. MONTOYA, U.S. SENATOR, NEW MEXICO, AT GRADUATION EXERCISES, INTER-AMERICAN GENERAL COURSE, INTERNATIONAL POLICE ACADEMY, OFFICE OF PUBLIC SAFETY, MARCH 26, 1965

Distinguished members of the Diplomatic Corps, distinguished Government officials, members of the graduating class, ladies and gentlemen, I am particularly honored to be here today to participate in this graduation ceremony at the International Police Academy.

On behalf of the Government of the United States I extend heartiest congratulations to each of the 75 outstanding graduates of this 11th Inter-American General Course from 12 Latin American countries. Believe me, we take great pride in having had you here. I congratulate also our U.S. representative who attended the course of instruction as a class counselor, representing AID's Office of Public Safety.

Today, the members of this course stand on the threshold of new achievements. Each of you was specially selected to attend the course, and I am confident you are greater assets to your government and your fellow citizens for having completed it. I hope that each of you will return to your countries determined to exercise an even higher quality of leadership in the police and related fields. In this role, you will be serving as a vital and valuable arm of your countries.

During the past 12 weeks you have undergone a period of hard work, self-discipline and personal deprivation. The curriculum of the Academy required continuous attention to detail, personal sharing of knowledge and abilities, as well as hours of study. I know, however, that your efforts will pay rich dividends in the years to come.

Our age is frequently referred to as one of constant change. These changes we see around the world are usually expressed in material and economic terms, namely, better homes, more jobs, more schools, and better health conditions. In Latin America, a whole generation of economists is at work. They have been given the name "fomentistas," and they are moving into greater positions of authority, not only economic but political as well.

A vital element in the economic progress of any nation is internal security. Maintenance of peace and order is the first requisite to orderly and progressive government

This is particularly true in democratic societies, where respect for latitude in individual behavior is an absolute necessity.

Unfortunately, we live in an era of successive crises, and each of these presents grave new responsibilities for men like you who are charged with enforcing the law.

As members of democratic societies, it is our duty to control crime and violence with a minimum use of force, and that is never easy.

Many years ago, Gilbert and Sullivan said in one of their wonderful operettas: "A policeman's lot is not a happy one." You find yourselves damned if you do and damned if you don't.

One certain way to make the lot of you policemen a happier one is to push forward with programs which will reduce the causes of lawlessness and disorder. Elimination of the causes of crime is every bit as important as perfecting the concepts of criminal justice, and in the long run, it will be much more important.

The signing of the charter of Punta del Este in 1961 was a major step in the direction of achieving an improvement in the condition of underprivileged classes, and so removing one of the root causes of disturbances and lawbreaking.

In the Americas, our tradition has long been one of freedom. Our North American Revolution was closely followed by the revolutions of Latin America under Bolivar, San Martin, Santander, Mora, and Hidalgo. I do not know of any nation in Latin America today, whatever its political leadership may be, where the goals of freedom and individual liberty are not stronger than they were 150 years ago.

Freedom, however, no longer has purely a political context. It now means there must be economic freedom and opportunity. It means there must be social freedom—freedom to move up in society. It means there must be cultural freedom—the chance to contribute to national unity through diversity of opinion. These concepts, although still not clearly defined nor fully understood are growing in our nations. Freedom can be likened to an indivisible web; and our New World must be not only "one world" but a free world.

Your nations, your governments, your peoples are all seeking an opportunity to determine their own destiny. You are seeking national security, a freedom from threat and interference from the outside. You demand the right of choice—to set your own national goals, select your own national leaders, and make your own decisions on how best to achieve the goals on which you are agreed.

Running counter to all your national goals is the specter of international communism, a force committed without reservation to expansionist conquest. In spite of some recent internal divisions, international communism is as demanding as ever that national goals play second fiddle to directives from the Kremlin or Peiping.

A technique of this force has been to exploit the vulnerable points, the soft spots, in the societies which it seeks to conquer. All our nations, including my own, have these soft spots. The technique is to utilize these soft spots—the peasants' desire for land, the frustrations of young army officers, the shortage of jobs—to create dissension within a target nation, to use those who are its dupes to operate illegally and outside the national will, in an effort to subvert that national will.

Therefore, in the final analysis, your freedom and our freedom depends on the ability of our governments to maintain internal security. Unless internal security can be maintained in the face of this small but aggressive adversary, all our hopes for freedom will be frustrated. The strength of a nation lies in its ability to maintain internal security and not become prey of those forces which would destroy the fabric of the society which we seek to build.

Admittedly, this is difficult in a world in which various revolutionary and other insurgent forces are at work—in a world in which there are so many efforts to change the established order. It sometimes is difficult to separate those who seek justifiable change from those who are using legitimate grievances for their own ends.

It is within this concept that the International Police Academy was founded. The programs here are designed to provide the students with further knowledge in the concepts and techniques of law enforcement, in the maintenance of public order with a minimum use of force, in countering subversion and insurgency, and particularly in improving the character and image of the civil police, so as to bind them more closely to their communities.

Although the training you are receiving is concerned naturally in large part with North American experience, we are not seeking to have you create a police force, or a society, like our own. We believe that in our experience, there are some valid lessons. You may consider them, and adapt or modify them as you wish.

We are firmly of the belief that each society must find its own development in its own way. That is why a great part of the instruction has been in the form of seminars to give you the opportunity to learn from one another through an expression of your own experiences.

What we want is that you build mechanisms—satisfactory to yourself—which will enable you to determine your own future in the field of law enforcement as in other fields, without outside influences destroying what you are seeking to build. Our interests as a country do not require satellites or colonies or people subservient to us. Our purposes, and yours, are well served if the other countries of the world are truly independent and serving their own interests. We can live comfortably in a world of diversity. We are confident you share this view.

The International Police Academy functions in consonance with the larger aims of the Alliance for Progress, founded at Punta del Este.

The basic aim of the Alliance—now nearly 4 years old—is to help bring Latin American nations to levels of growth at which further growth can be supported by those nations themselves—without extraordinary external help. For this purpose, the ministers who met at Punta del Este agreed on a number of very general objectives, including more homes, more schools, better health programs, and greater social justice.

The decision on how these objectives were to be met, was left up to the individual countries, through a provision for the preparation of national plans. In other words, it is you yourselves who are determining what you will do under the Alliance, and the priorities within it are your priorities.

The Alliance has already prompted some very significant changes. If the progress at times seem slow, this is because the nature of the change which the Alliance calls for is slow. It involves the development of institutions, planning, the training of people, and in many instances, protracted construction. In 1964, for example, notable gains were made in increasing per capita income and in laying the basis for more rapid progress toward the social justice goals of the Alliance since 1961.

We have witnessed the beginning of progress. Many problems remain. The population grows faster in Latin America than anywhere else in the world. At the present rate of growth, the population of Latin America will double every 18 years.

The entire process of institution building, however, is only one of the features of the Inter-American system, of which the Alliance for Progress is a relatively recent manifestation. The process had its beginnings, as you know, many years ago in the Congress of Panama, called by Bolivar, in 1826. There the delegates agreed on a treaty of union, league and confederation. The object of the league was a defensive and offensive alliance to preserve the sovereignty of the participating nations against foreign aggression. It is notable, that the treaty contemplated contingents of troops from each of the signatory states. Unfortunately, the league was never ratified, but it has remained a symbol of continental unity.

The next effort toward unifying the Americas came in 1882, and formal invitations to a conference of American States went out in 1888. The meeting convened in Washington in late 1889. One of the results was the creation of an international union of the American Republics—the forerunner of the Pan American Union.

Over the 75 years since the first Conference, eight other Inter-American Conferences have been held. It is interesting that a continuing theme through almost all of these meetings has been how to achieve a more perfect rule of law and joint action against foreign intervention within the hemisphere.

For instance, the third Conference in Mexico City in 1906 drafted a convention on the status of nationalized citizens; the fifth Conference in Santiago in 1923, prepared a treaty on the prevention of conflicts; the sixth Conference at Havana, in 1928, approved a code of international law; and the eighth Conference, at Lima in 1938, expressed a reaffirmation of the American States to defend themselves against all foreign intervention.

My point is that the International Police Academy is in large measure a natural outgrowth of our system—the inter-American system—which has provided a pattern for other developing nations. This system permits us all to work together in a variety of ways for our joint benefit, including maintenance of law and order.

Your essential role as police leaders is that of a stabilizing force in national life—a force which can assure the maintenance of the rule of law by the duly appointed civil authorities—a force which can prevent an aggressive minority from imposing its will upon a divided majority.

But let us not forget that the police are more than a law keeping and law enforcement agency. They are also the mirror of the government—the face of the government, to the people. If the police are just, then the people whom they contact daily will regard the government as just. If the police are brutal or contemptuous of human rights, it is the government which will appear brutal. If the police are corrupt, it is the government which will appear corrupt. If the police are inept, then the government will appear incompetent and unfit to maintain the rights and privileges of its people.

What we are all seeking, then, is a recognition by the people and by police executives such as yourselves that the proper maintenance of law and order is necessary for freedom, and for harmony in a free society. People cannot be truly free without law and order, nor can there be harmony within a society if that fact is not recognized by the people and the police. The role of the police is a vital key in the progress of a society.

If the police are able to maintain an atmosphere of freedom, law and order; if they have a true understanding of the social, economic and political pressure and trends within the country, and their relationship to good law enforcement, they can deal with crime and insurgency in such a way that freedom in its true sense can be maintained. Societies can then develop in a progressive and democratic manner.

Accordingly, yours is a grave responsibility. We hope that your work here will help you further in fulfilling this responsibility—which is not only for the benefit of your own nation, or this hemisphere, but for the entire free world.

PROPOSED REGULATIONS TO IMPLEMENT THE CLASSIFICATION AND MULTIPLE USE ACT OF 1964 AND THE PUBLIC SALES ACT OF 1964

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, last year we enacted two far-reaching measures which, although they grant only temporary authority, will have lasting effects upon our public land laws and policies. They were the Classification and Multiple Use Act and the Public Sales Act.

On March 25, 1965, hearings were held in Washington on the regulations proposed by the Department of the Interior to implement these laws. Mr. Leonard Horn of Wolcott, Colo., made an important contribution to those hearings in the very fine statement he made.

Mr. Horn is a man of considerable experience in public land matters and range management, and his advice is widely sought by Federal, State and local officials. In recognition of his expert knowledge and past accomplishments Mr. Horn was recently named "Livestock Man of the Year." This honor was richly deserved. I could not begin to recount his long list of accomplishments, but I would like to mention a few representative ones.

Mr. Horn heads the range improvement program of the Colorado Cattlemen's Association, a post for which he is particularly well qualified as he has put theory into practice on his own ranches with outstanding success.

He is chairman of the Public Lands Committee of the American National Cattlemen's Association.

He was selected to represent Colorado on the National Advisory Board Council to the Bureau of Land Management, which deals with grazing policies on public domain.

And recently, Secretary Freeman selected Mr. Horn to serve on a special committee on the multiple use of national forest lands.

I believe Mr. Horn's statement is particularly timely in that he reminds us of the reasoning behind our public land policies, and how and where our national objectives have been achieved through these policies. He has also pointed out that in recent years we have lost sight of some of those objectives, and suggests that a review of history in this regard would be helpful in regaining our direction.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Horn's statement be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF LEONARD HORN, CHAIRMAN OF THE AMERICAN NATIONAL CATTLEMEN'S ASSOCIATION PUBLIC LANDS COMMITTEE, BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR HEARING, WASHINGTON, D.C., MARCH 25, 1965

Before making specific comments about the proposed rules to implement the Classification and Multiple-Use Act and the Public Sales Act, we should like to give a brief account of the development of public land use in the West. It is easy to forget the chain of events that has led to today's use of the public domain by permittees, and it is well to be reminded of a bit of land history in any consideration of public land problems.

You know, of course, about the overlapping and sometimes conflicting administration of the various Government agencies controlling Federal lands. The many aspects of Government ownership are the outgrowth of the changing will of Congress over the years.

In the early homestead and scrip selections, the fee title generally passed except for some right-of-way reservations. Early land sales were the same. These sales and grants were made to pay bills, expand and settle the West, or to encourage development.

As the population moved west, the best land was taken first by the homesteaders. Certain lands were set aside as Indian reservations. Next, the national forests were reserved. These were some of the best lands, but were, in many cases, rather inaccessible and had not been homesteaded. They were generally not suited to farming. Most of the private land within national forests is in the valleys and is farmed or used for hay production. The last land to be homesteaded was in the more arid parts of the West, where a living was impossible on the regular 160-acre homestead. This was due to a semidesert type of land and weather, and an almost total lack of water. Thus, the expanded Homestead Act, or Stockraising Act, was passed.

Settlers were told they could file on the land and then use the public land around them to support their livestock during the time that they could not support them on their own land. This land, now generally referred to as the "public domain," is the residue of all the public lands and of the least economic value. It was of no value until people were encouraged to settle on it, to work, to spend money and to make the land produce.

This land may have mineral value or recreation value, but it is generally used for grazing, in that usually nothing but forage will grow on it. There is little or no water, and it is remote and physically inaccessible. It became customary of nomadic bands of sheep and cattle to winter in the plains and deserts, and summer in the forests. There was no incentive to conserve the grass, so the land was grazed clean as the herds moved. If one man did not get the grass, the next one would.

These herds would clean out all pasture around a small homestead, and drink up the stock water. The homesteader would be ruined. This resulted in a demand for a degree of control from the responsible and stable operators. The Forest Service started first, and set out allotments for the use of individuals, with regulations for conservation, and fees for use.

The users of the public domain observed this and felt there was a better way. This led to the passage of the Taylor Grazing Act. This act has been termed that greatest revolution in land use in the history of the world, short of war and conquest. The act is unique in that it does not attach the use of the land to a person, but to other land or water. It is set up to keep faith with the promise of the United States, made to homesteaders, that they could use the lands around them for their livestock. It recognizes that a man has settled, labored, and invested to make something out of nothing.

The settler has created a base in the form of either a farm to grow winter feed, or water development where there was no water, so that the grass may be harvested by livestock. In the case of water development, a game habitat has been created where no game could exist before.

This act allots and ties certain privileges for grazing a given area to certain base property or water. The "base" carries a right—but the right is to a privilege only, and this privilege may be withdrawn at any time for a higher use.

The permittee on these lands has made a substantial investment in order to use them. His investment lies generally on his base property, as it is the heart and reason for the use of the land in the first place. It is designed to served livestock. The investment per cow unit will run to $500 and more. This investment is worthless in the event of a loss of grazing privileges.

The supervision of this land by the Bureau of Land Management originally amounted to allotting the privileges and protecting the land from abuse. The users, at their own expense, have done most of the conservation work. However, in recent years, the Congress has appropriated some additional money for this purpose.

The permittee has only the privilege of harvesting the forage that is available. He may be put off at any time for a higher use, and has no control of anyone else wishing to use the surface or subsurface of the land. He doesn't even have the right to question anyone on the land as to why he is there. It is most difficult to prevent theft, and to control people driving across the land thus setting up erosion channels.

Since the passage of the Taylor Grazing Act, it has been the hope of the permittees that Congress would eventually take the next step in settling the problem of public lands—take the step spelled out in the act which says: "pending their final disposal."

We believe the effect of such a step—private ownership—was expressed by President Lyndon B. Johnson in his state of the Union message in January 1965, when he said:

"The answer was waiting for me in the land where I was born.

"It was once a barren land. The angular hills were covered with scrub cedar and a few large live oaks. Little would grow in that harsh caliche soil of my country, and each spring the Pedernales River would flood our valley. But men came, and they worked, and they endeavored, and they built.

"And now that country is abundant—abundant with fruit and cattle, and goats and sheep, and there are pleasant homes, and lakes, and the floods are gone."

The original concept of the Taylor Grazing Act, we believe, has been lost sight of in the proposed public land rules for classification that are the subject of this hearing. The inference throughout the proposed rules is that only a Federal agency can determine the long-time management policies and set up criteria for disposition of lands classified as primarily valuable for grazing. With this approach, the original intent of the Taylor Grazing Act with respect to final disposal is abrogated.

There can be little doubt that the final disposal clause was prompted by the wish of Congress that the public lands States should have a pattern of land ownership comparable to that of the remainder of the United States; that through disposal of the public lands for eventual private ownership, the public land States would be put on an equal footing with other States; that State tax bases and economies would benefit, lessening the burden on the Federal Treasury. It is abundantly demonstrated all over the world, both historically and currently, that private ownership produces the greatest development.

We do not believe it should be a primary objective of the Department of the Interior to retain as much of Federal land as possible for continued management, as seems to be the tenor of the proposed rules.

It should be understood, however, that the objective of the Congress and the Department of the Interior should not be pointed toward disposal of all of the Federal residue lands. In many instances, Federal ownership for certain aesthetic wildlife and recreational purposes may be in the public interest.

Apart from this, it is imperative that human values first must be considered in any actions involving land classifications. Human values were certainly in the intent of Congress with the enactment of the Classification and Multiple Use Act. We contend that human values, along with effect on communities, are virtually ignored in the proposed criteria for land classification.

We are in accord with the concept that family owned and operated ranch units must be preserved. However, land speculators already are anticipating a fat profit by application for Federal land purchases. These people have no concern for human values or the adverse effect their greed would have upon countless communities and counties throughout the West.

The prime objective of any land classification or public land law should be to keep the people on the land to make a living thereon and protect it for future generations. In many instances, this should mean Federal land moving into private ownership. But in other instances, the human values should be given due consideration and long-term tenure on the Federal lands provided for.

It has been our understanding that the proposed regulations should provide a temporary or interim plan of classification for disposal or management of the public lands, since the classification act refers to "pending the implementation of recommendations to be made by the Public Land Law Review Commission." We do not believe that the classification itself should envision any long-range plan which would determine disposal or retention of public lands by the Government.

If lands are suitable for both disposal and retention, then it follows that they are suitable for disposal and if such can be accomplished under existing public land laws, it is the intent of Congress that it be done. The proposed rules vest almost complete discretion in the Secretary to retain them, even if suitable for disposal, upon nebulous principles of scarcity of values involved, alternative sites, etc.

As to outdoor recreation, it is our position that States or local governmental units may well be found to have the best facilities for management.

Therefore, we believe the classification should be directed toward an inventory of such available lands, with the ultimate ownership and/or management of the lands to be considered by the Public Land Law Review Commission.

Use of water is controlled by the States. Therefore, we submit that the consideration of water for stability of flow, downstream municipal purposes, irrigation, etc., should be left to the States. In other words, we are concerned about the broad implications here which infer that the Federal Government could undertake a program of regulating runoff, subsurface flows, municipal water supply, etc., on its own initiative. Unless requested by the State, it seems to us the only interest of the Federal Government in this field is to prevent a clear and present danger of damage to Federal land.

Lands may be managed for wilderness preservation as provided in the existing wilderness law. Otherwise, this seems to contemplate a new and additional method by which the Interior Department could set aside wilderness areas other than and in addition to the method prescribed by existing legislation.

We do not agree with the inference that Federal ownership is necessarily required to preserve the multiple uses available. We think the law contemplates a factual finding and classification as to the best use of the land, considering past use, present use, local economies, etc.

Therefore, we submit that the complete text of the criteria for land classification goes beyond the intent of Congress, prejudges the findings of the Public Land Law Review Commission, and should be revised to make it clear that classifications are not made solely on the basis of multiple use which in itself implies retention of all the lands in Federal ownership.

A GAIN FOR EPILEPTICS

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. Mr. President, nearly 2 million of our fellow citizens are victims of epilepsy, which makes this common neurological disorder a serious public health menace of concern to us all. Prevalent in every part of our country, among all age groups and races—nobody is immune—epilepsy poses a multitude of complex problems which I feel can best be met by a concerted national effort.

I am glad to report to you the recent consolidation of three national voluntary health agencies working in the epilepsy field into a single organization, known as the Epilepsy Association of America. Representative of all parts of the Nation, this newly welded organization is the designated national spokesman for thousands of volunteers everywhere who have joined hands in a dedicated endeavor to help persons with epilepsy, their families, and their communities.

This unified national approach brings unprecedentedly sharp attention, massive strengths, and influence to bear directly on epilepsy through comprehensive programs in research, clinical diagnostic and treatment centers, public and professional education, and services to persons with epilepsy and their families. All parts are designed not only to gain new knowledge but to close the gap between discoveries in medicine and their application to the elimination of misery.

In no place is this gap more commonly found than in public attitudes. Although the medieval but still prevalent notions about epilepsy are a universe apart from modern medical knowledge, these various archaic misconceptions do our society grave disservice by standing in the way of legitimate inclusion of the person with controlled epilepsy in the normal community.

For over three-fourths of today's patients, modern medicine can control seizures sufficiently for these individuals to hold jobs. Yet in every community they are unjustifiably denied their fundamental right of gainful employment, a major obstacle to successful vocational rehabilitation. It is public opinion which maintains this bar. It is public opinion which must remove it.

It is common knowledge that unproductive manpower may become an insatiable tax burden. Few of us realize the cruelty to the unjustly unemployed when he and his dependents are forced to live by public assistance. You will understand the reasons for my concern, therefore, when I say that, because he is able to do so, the person with controlled epilepsy must be allowed to be a contributing member of our national labor force; that the willing and medically able must be put to work.

For myself, I welcome this national organization of public-spirited volunteers, unselfishly dedicated to the removal of these costly, humiliating, and totally unnecessary barriers to understanding and helping so many of our fellow Americans.

Because I am convinced that the Epilepsy Association of America brings abundant fresh hope to these millions, I ask unanimous consent that the article by Dr. Howard A. Rusk, entitled "A Gain for Epileptics," which appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, March 21, 1965, be printed in the Record following my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

A Gain for Epileptics: Merger of Three National Health Agencies May Resolve Chaos in Effectiveness

(By Howard A. Rusk, M.D.)

Within the last few weeks there has been a development of extreme significance to about 1 percent of the population in the United States.

The development is the merger of the assets and activities into the Epilepsy Association of America, Inc., of three formerly separate national voluntary health agencies.

The three groups that have merged under the aegis of the National Health Council are the American Epilepsy Federation, National Epilepsy League and the United Epilepsy Association.

The 1 percent of the population of our Nation includes about 1,854,000 persons who suffer epilepsy to some degree.

These may range from very minor manifestations, in which only an occasional brief, unseeing stare may be involved, to major, grand mal seizures with generalized convulsions. These are manifestations of an underlying pathological condition influencing cellular activity in the brain.

In an affected person, brain nerve cells become overactive from time to time and, instead of charging and discharging electrical impulses in a regular manner, they are discharged in erratic explosions.

GENESIS OF A SEIZURE

A local disturbance of this nature can spread to neighboring areas, jump to distant ones or influence the entire brain. When such an irregularity becomes generalized and involves the centers that control muscle action, the seizure results.

Usually, in a very short period, a minute or two after the explosive discharge, the overactive neurons settle down to regular harmonious function. When they do, the physical manifestations of the unusual release of energy also come to an end.

Epilepsy is a condition long known to mankind. The name of the disorder, for example, comes from the Greek word for seizure. It was only a few years ago, however, that medical science made it clear that this condition is not necessarily inherited. Fewer than 10 percent of the cases are due to genetic defects.

It is also only in recent years that effective medication has been developed to treat this condition.

Prior to 1939, the only two antiepileptic drugs of any value were bromides and phenobarbital.

It is interesting historically that in World War I epilepsy sufferers depended on Luminal, which is really phenobarbital, produced under a patent in Germany. Deprived of the seizure-controlling drug, many patients went into continuous convulsions (status epilepticus) and some died.

CARGO OF MERCY

When a German submarine emerged off Hampton Roads, Va., at the end of World War I, the first cargo landed was several precious boxes of Luminal. These were immediately distributed to institutions caring for epileptics all over the country.

However, in the last 25 years a number of new anticonvulsant drugs have been introduced and successfully employed against seizures. In certain selected cases, surgical treatment is effective.

Among all types of disabilities there is none in which the sufferer is discriminated against more unjustly than in epilepsy. Prejudice has labeled the epileptic as handicapped, though the majority are not.

Wounds that show no scars are often the deepest and most difficult to understand.

Today, 50 percent are so amenable to modern medical treatment that all manifestations of their problem can be completely eliminated. In this group are thousands of people, now employed, who successfully keep their impairment secret. A fully controlled epileptic cannot be distinguished from anybody else; he appears, and acts, perfectly normal.

In addition to the fully controlled cases, another 30 to 35 percent of epileptics under today's modern medical treatment have only very rare seizures. According to authoritative studies, they seldom occur on the job.

EIGHTY PERCENT CONTROLLED

From an employer's viewpoint, therefore, 80 percent of all epileptics who may be considered "controlled" can be counted on for reliable work performance.

Because of misunderstanding (persons with epilepsy are so misunderstood), few receive the benefits of modern medical care and rehabilitation.

The number of epileptics rehabilitated in our State-Federal vocational rehabilitation program has remained at a comparative standstill despite the dramatic growth over the last 10 years in the total number of persons rehabilitated.

A major focus of the newly integrated effort of the Epilepsy Association of America will be in the areas of rehabilitation.

This newly merged group has its offices at 111 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y.

The new organization has the wholehearted support of the American Epilepsy Society, the important medical-scientific organization whose principal objectives are to report progress in research and related disorders with the aim of finding a cure. The American Neurological Association also welcomes the new agency.

WIDE-RANGING BOARD

Its board of directors represents epilepsy interests in all parts of the country. Its professional advisory council consists of more than 50 of the country's leading epileptologists, neurologists and other specialists concerned with eliminating epilepsy as a major public health problem.

In his book "Voluntary Health and Welfare Agencies in the United States," Robert H. Hamlin wrote, "As Government continues to expand its efforts, voluntary agencies should identify and strengthen those areas where health and welfare services remain weak."

Until the new merger, there were four organizations claiming to be national in scope, dedicated to fighting epilepsy. The result was chaotic in effectiveness.

Three of the four have now merged into the new Epilepsy Association of America. They are to be congratulated.

The door has been opened for the fourth, the Epilepsy Foundation to join them.

Commonality of interest should lead to unity for action. Only through unified efforts can the mystery of misunderstanding and prejudice that surrounds epilepsy give way to enlightenment and understanding.

PROPOSED ERNIE PYLE COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. Hartke] is unavoidably away today.

I, therefore, on behalf of the Senator from Indiana ask unanimous consent to have a statement by him printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without, objection, it is so ordered.

Statement by Senator Hartke

On September 22 of last year, I introduced a bill, S. 3202, providing for the issuance of a postage stamp to honor the memory of a famous and well-loved American, a native son of Indiana, who met death by enemy fire 20 years ago next month.

Ernie Pyle was a noncombatant, a journalist, but he followed the enlisted man to the frontlines in order to bring the closeup warm sympathy which was his to a fruitful combination with his high skills of description. The result during the years of the war in Europe, in North Africa, and then in the Pacific, was a greater understanding of war from the human standpoint of its most beleaguered participants, an understanding of the heartbreak, the poignancy, the heroism, and the foulness of war. His inimitable and intimate reporting was eagerly read by millions, to whom his death on Ie Shima on April 18, 1945, was in many cases accompanied by deep feelings of personal loss.

Ernie Pyle was born in Indiana, in the town of Dana, on August 3, 1900. My bill, which parallels that of Congressman Roudebush of Indiana's Sixth District, provides for first-day sale of the Ernie Pyle commemorative stamp in Dana. It was at Indiana University that he studied journalism, and it was there that he edited the Daily Student and the senior yearbook. It was in La Porte, Ind., that he began his professional career as a reporter on the La Porte Herald. Later, he served with New York and Washington papers, and for 3 years he was managing editor of the Washington Daily News.

Ernie Pyle won the Pulitzer Prize in 1943. Before he left for the Pacific, he received an honorary doctor of letters from Indiana University.

The honor of a commemorative stamp should be accorded to Ernie Pyle not because of his connections with Indiana, but because of his connections with the hearts of Americans everywhere—with the GI Joe of the war, whom he sought out in the worst of circumstances, as well as behind the lines; with his fellow journalists, who admired his craft; and with the millions who read his unique personalized reports as though reading the well-written letters of a personal friend.

I hope that a commemorative stamp may be issued in honor of this man, this greatly compassionate reporter of a war he hated, this unique figure of American journalism, who was, incidentally, a Hoosier.

FARM SITUATION IN SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the extreme seriousness of the farm situation in South Dakota, is very well depicted in an article which appeared in the January issue of the Guardian, the monthy publication issued by the East River Electric & Power Cooperative of Madison, S. Dak.

Not only the farmers in the State are suffering, the towns and cities are feeling the pinch of low-farm income, unpaid bills, and a declining economy.

We are going to be considering farm legislation shortly. When we do, I hope that Members of the Senate will have a clear understanding both of the situation in agriculture, and of the off-farm consequences which will affect their urban constituencies. I ask unanimous consent to put the Guardian article in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

South Dakota's Farm Situation Brought to Light

Wherever one travels in South Dakota, he sees the farm crisis. Whomever he talks to, he hears an earful about it.

One can readily see the farm predicament is twofold. The silent transition or gradual change in the physical aspects of rural farms and communities has been taking place since the depression.

The other facet is one of abruptness or immediacy:

Crops were poor. Rainfall was slight.

Costs are high. Prices received for commodities are low.

Farmers are not paying their bills.

The little guys are in trouble. The big boys are making it.

FHA and bank loans are being made daily to keep farmers out of debt.

The list is endless.

"At least half of my patrons are not paying their bills," said the manager of a cooperative store in a little rural community near Madison. "The big problem is the farmers don't have any money. And the two-thirds who do aren't spending it.

"We had good crops until last year. Last year's was probably the worst since the depression years," said Max Farrar, a retired farmer near Hurley.

"It's been pretty rough on us cattle feeders," Allen Benson of Hurley said. "It's just about as poor as the early thirties. And it doesn't look very good ahead of us."

Benson said he lost $30,000 last year on cattle feeding and about the same amount the year before. He has been in the cattle feeding business for 35 years, he said, and 1958 was the last year he made a profit.

Bob Benson, Hurley, said, "I think most of the farmers will stay with us. Maybe some of them are in serious trouble. But when a guy's farmed for 10 or 15 years and he can't go through a couple of bad years, he had better get out."

A motel operator in Mitchell, a retired farmer who now rents his farm, said farming costs a tremendous amount of money nowadays with cost spiraling every day. Crops south of Mitchell, especially corn, he said, were poor and farmers are in financial trouble. "It isn't as bad as the depression years when the grasshoppers ate the roof off your house, but things aren't good either."

Everett Kogel, a farmer near Lane. He noted a half-dozen farm sales in the past year, with the land sold being made into larger farms.

"There was a fellow here last week. He had to sell his farm because his landlord is making two farms out of three. They claim they have to have bigger farms to come out on it.

"Most crops around here were poor last year, caused by a lack of moisture and being too hot. The corn just burned up. My yield was 7 or 8 bushels."

Everybody noticed the increase in farm sales. The sellouts were not a great amount in most cases, they said, but a few here and a few there, adding to a substantial number throughout the State in a year's time.

More than 1,500 South Dakota farmers sold their farms last year.

The Farmers Home Administration at Huron is probably more aware of the farm crisis than any State agency.

"For some of them, we are a last chance."

"The main problem," says one FHA man, "is they don't have enough income when expenses are going up. They have to net a little more. But the big operators are in trouble too. So we question whether getting larger is necessarily the answer.

"I guess we'd have to say a lot of them are in trouble. A lot of them need help. Usually, we don't get these people soon enough. By the time a bad-off farmer comes to us for a loan, he has little or no equity. If we would have got him 2 or 3 years ago, we might have been able to save him."

A supermarket manager in Huron admits farmers are not buying as many groceries as they would if they had more money.

Rod Rodman, a Huron John Deere salesman, said his machinery sales are down 60 percent. Rodman said his firm is selling more used machinery this year, and he commented on how much of the used machinery is being financed by loans.

"Financially, it was probably the worst year since the depression," he said.

Although the sale of machinery is down 60 percent, the sale of parts has increased 50 percent for January and February, the machinery salesman noted, indicating, perhaps, farmers are repairing their machinery instead of purchasing new items.

"The small farmer is having trouble. The question is how long he can keep going on credit," said a cattle buyer and seller near Lane. "Anyone who thinks we're on the verge had better wake up. We're in a recession."

A weekly newspaper editor near Aberdeen who has seen and been through many farm recessions evaluated the farm situation this way: "I personally think we are in a recession. But we can also talk ourselves into one. I'm afraid we're headed that way all right. But we don't want to get a defeatist philosophy."

He said farmers are greatly disturbed about President Johnson's recent farm report that said the Nation would soon have only a million farmers, eliminating in the years ahead more than 2 million others.

An implement dealer in Milbank reports sales down only slightly, but more farmers buying on terms.

This implement dealer had taken 90 names off the subscription list for the firm's magazine. He had added 28 names, for a net loss of 62 farmers. Twenty-three were deleted in the past year.

Four out of every ten customers were not paying their bills.

Dwight Dickason, a farmer outside of Castlewood, put the farming situation in a nutshell:

"In my opinion, we need price supports at 90 percent of parity on grains. I blame the cattle situation on Secretary of Agriculture Freeman. He dumped the excess grain on the market, causing cheap feed and thereby increasing the tonnage of cattle."

Many indicated dissatisfaction with Government farm programs. The programs were either failures, they benefited only the large farmers, or else they are not adequate were the most frequent complaints.

Nevertheless, Government payments made the difference whether many marginal farmers ate or starved.

RISING COSTS

The cost-price squeeze—a situation whereby farmers are paying more for their machinery and operating items and receiving less for their commodities—is recognized as a major factor causing the farm crisis.

The "pinch," as it is sometimes referred to by South Dakota farmers, is known in all segments of the State's farming society.

A farmer outside of Redfield put it best: "Seven years ago a calf brought me $135. Now I get about $80. Wheat was about $2.10 to $2.15 and now it's down to $1.65. Machinery has gone up to 40 to 50 percent. Eight years ago a tractor cost me $2,500. Now it costs $4,000 to $5,000.

"The whole trouble in this country is the middleman is taking too much profit. If they can do something about that, maybe they can straighten things out. It should be investigated," a Farmer's Union co-op manager points out. "My profit managing this co-op is maybe 20 or 25 percent. But that guy across the street has a 100 percent or more markup on the eggs he's selling."

Eggs in his area were selling for 43 cents per dozen. The farmers were selling them for 10 cents per dozen.

A cattle buyer and seller near Bath makes this comparison: "Machinery prices have tripled. A No. 8 plow cost $419 12 years ago. The price is now $1,159. Yet a bushel of wheat brought $2.60 then and last year it was down to $1.30.

This cattleman had been in the dairying business. The amount of work was not worth the amount of money he was receiving, he said. "We're getting by all right, but if it weren't for selling cows, I'd be in trouble."

A good cow brought him $300 to $325 3 years ago. This had decreased to $260 to $300, a drop of 15 to 20 percent. He reports his fixed costs at $400 or more a month for operating expenses, $125 of this being taxes, and continually rising.

An implement dealer in Milbank said a combine cost a farmer about $7,325 last fall and about $6,566 in 1963, an increase of about $500 or $600 in 1 year's time.

FARM YOUTH

South Dakota farm youth, trained and untrained, find little future in remaining in the State. This statement is verified over and over by both those in farming and many others.

Few South Dakota farm youths are inheriting their fathers' farms. Few have the financial backing to begin their own farms. Few have the confidence farming will give them an adequate or substantial living.

The large operators and medium-sized farmers are sending their sons and daughters to college. Some return home with college degrees. Most don't.

Those farm youths who have earned either a degree or have learned a valuable skill will probably do all right in the cities. Untrained young men and women may be added to the expanding welfare lists.

The farm problem, then, is also affecting the cities.

A 25-year-old service station operator in Redfield, an ex-farmer had gone to the west coast States to look for work. They have trouble adjusting to that way of life where no one cares about you and you don't care about anyone else.

A newspaper publisher said, "The bundles of newspapers going to Minneapolis, Sioux Falls, Chicago, Rapid City, and other large metropolitan centers in this area are becoming larger every year. Large numbers are going to the west coast."

The editor reported he now has 384 subscriptions going to east and west coast States; former residents who have moved in recent years.

Many persons question whether small farm and rural schools in South Dakota are adequately preparing farm youth for the rigors and hardships of big-city life. Reorganization of the schools is generally accepted by most farmers. They realize it will result, in most instances, in better and more complete education for their children.

There are many complaints about teachers not staying in their communities long enough to build either an educational tradition or an academic continuity.

"Because of the teacher shortage, we are finding it more and more difficult to maintain even a mediocre school here in Elkton," said the Reverend Louis Miller, a Catholic priest.

Father Miller and others noted farm youths are good workers. They are raised knowing they must toil hard. They expect to devote many hours of their lives working. City youth, however, may not have these ideals, they noted.

The absence of trade schools in South Dakota disturbs many associated with education and business.

"I think we need one or two vocational colleges in South Dakota. Our young men go to Minnesota and surrounding States to obtain this type of an education," D. Wayne Meyer, a De Smet banker, noted.

The training of every farm youth is certainly directed and encouraged by his mother.

A farm housewife near Aberdeen laments that more and more farm mothers and housewives within the last 2 or 3 years are becoming employed in the nearby cities. When this reporter asked her why, she replied: "They're keeping their standard of living by doing this."

"A lot of the farm wives are dissatisfied with the social school systems," she continued, "so they work to raise the tuition money to send their children to school elsewhere. Many of our smaller schools can't afford to hire either enough or properly trained teachers."

"We farm wives want our children to have the same advantages in school as the city kids are receiving. Farm folks are probably more aware of getting their children a good education. A larger percentage of farm youth in this area probably goes to college than in other areas of the State," she speculated.

FHA PROJECTS

Rural development grazing and recreational associations, financed by the Farmers Home Administration, are gaining popularity in South Dakota.

Four or five grazing associations in the East River area are in the process of being formed, and all of them look favorable, an FHA official in Huron reported.

An FHA-sponsored grazing association is a group of 10 or more farmers who agree to increase their livestock numbers by converting or shifting cropland into pasture or hay land. The members of the association agree to pay long-term interest and payments for the conversion (loans are available up to 40 years at 5 percent interest). The association is managed and run by the members, who in turn elect a board of directors.

In the long run, FHA officials say, the association farmers pay no more in interest and payments than they would through the years in grazing and pasture fees.

"In 40 years, the farmers will own the land and will have built up a sizable equity, which, in some cases, could be a larger amount of money," an FHA official emphasized. "In the meantime, the farmers are assured of pasture for so many cows. The pasture is not necessarily allotted on an even basis, but determined by the numbers a man can provide feed for during the winter months."

A grazing association near Woonsocket consists of 1,900 acres and is controlled by 10 farmers. Eventually, it will be supporting 605 animal units, although initially the number of cattle will be less.

Another phase of the FHA's rural development work is to finance recreational facilities in the rural areas and small towns with less than 2,500 population. The recreational associations are organized similar to the grazing associations, although they probably will have more members. They mainly pertain to golf courses, swimming pools, baseball and softball courts, and camping areas. Again, the participants must agree to a shift in cropland over to recreation.

A recreation association that will construct a golf course near Dell Rapids is being formed.

Other recreational associations have been approved for construction near Clear Lake, De Smet, Wessington Springs, and Alcester.

The FHA also sponsors water development, pasture development, and fencing in connection with the grazing associations. For small communities, financing is provided for the drilling of wells and installation of supply and distribution water systems. The FHA, however, doesn't have the authority to finance sewage facilities.

Water development proposals have been initiated at Rapid Valley, Whispering Pines, and Amherst.

The businessmen need the farmers and the farmers need the businessmen.

The two groups depend on each other for their livelihoods. When this system is disrupted, the small towns will wither away with the farms.

This is the thought of D. Wayne Meyer, De Smet banker and businessman intent on preserving what is left of the rural way of life in South Dakota.

"We business people in the small towns need farmers and farmers need us," Meyer continued. "I think we're more interested in their livelihood than they realize.

"If the present trends in farming continue, we can see the possibility small farmers, small businessmen, and small banks won't be needed in the future.

"When you lose all the little guys, it means you have large businesses buying large quantities of merchandise from the large metropolitan centers. Hence, it's only a matter of time before you don't need small-business men."

Meyer is vice chairman of the agricultural committee of the Independent Bankers Association, an institution representing 6,400 banks. He has worked closely with church and political groups to call attention to and make an effort to solve the serious farm problems.

"The farmer at the very minimum has to have a 25 percent increase for the price of his commodities if he is to survive," Meyer emphatically says. "Every time we have an economic collapse in this country, it's because of underpayment to agriculture."

Without sounding like an alarmist, Meyer says there are many signs pointing to an economic collapse of farming.

The bankers association recently issued a statement saying it fears a farm depression is in the making. Rural banks cannot much longer continue to support the credit needs of rural America because many farmers are overloaded with debts, it said.

Present trends not only threaten the economic life of the communities, Meyer claims, but also seriously affect their spiritual well-being.

"These farming trends are a deterioration of the traditional rural way of life in America. It is claimed for every 100 farmers who move to the city, only 40 percent attend church again. Of this 40 percent, only 20 percent join a church again."

Church organizations and the bankers association, Meyer said, have started working together in an effort to get all the divergent farm organizations to stop fighting, sit around a table, and work out a solution to raising farm income.

"We must sit down as bankers, farm organizations, church groups, and other interested persons to come up with a one-idea solution rather than working against one another," Meyer emphasized.

Getting back to the economic side of the farm picture, Meyer says "I see no sense to the farmers selling their eggs for 10 cents and the consumer having to pay over-the-counter prices of 35 to 45 cents, a markup of more than 100 percent.

"What's wrong? Depressions are usually started in farming areas. When farm incomes start to decline and costs keep going up and up, something is out of balance."

Meyer says he does not believe raising the income of farmers will greatly increase the cost to the consumers, as many economists have predicted.

FATHER MILLER INTERVIEW

Corporate farming is jeopardizing the farm family system and is a major factor contributing to the dissolution of South Dakota and Midwest farms, Rev. Louis Miller, Catholic priest at Elkton, contends.

Father Miller, an outspoken advocate of retaining traditional rural ways of life in South Dakota farm communities, makes his opinions on this subject known with a thunderous roar wherever he speaks.

"Big money and chainstores are on public record to go out and capture agriculture," he tells his listeners. And in the wake of this farm revolution, some difficult human problems are occurring.

"It is no longer a secret among the chainstore executives. They say they must have a direct link with their source of supply. So one chainstore starts this process. For the others to compete, they, too, will soon follow."

Father Miller noted, "It's fantastic the power these corporations have. They have learned agriculture technology. Most average-sized farmers have not been able to put this technology to work because they work hard the year around and don't have the time. Every other segment of the economy, except the farmer, can put a price tag on its products. Farm people are always the last persons to receive the benefits of their labors.

"If we permit this mass production agriculture to take over, we'll soon have nothing but colonies to supply the food products.

"What does this mean for our State? It means 50 percent of the farmers in South Dakota, who are in the gross income class of $10,000 or less, are in danger."

Father Miller wonders what the chamber of commerce is doing about it—implying small-town business interests are ignoring the farm crisis.

"What amazes me is the complacency of the business people. They think things will get better in some way."

The main social problem, resulting from this corporate takeover, Father Miller noted, is the farm family, as we know it, is in danger of extinction.

"Is big money going to own the land or are families going to own it?

"It's setting the stage for the takeover of land by absentee might. These boys recognize a good economic unit when they see one. They'll hire managers to oversee these large farms and the remainder will be workers."

Father Miller questions whether corporations would adequately support community projects, schools, and churches. "Their main concern," he said, "will be to make a tidy profit, with little of it revolving back into the small communities.

"Farm organizations," he contends, "must present a common front to solve this crisis. They don't realize the desperate need to work together. The most tragic thing is the terrible disunity among farm groups.

"This is why the church groups recently met in Chicago to discuss this farm problem. We're still working on it, trying to get these people together for the salvation of rural America.

"It has to be a grassroots deal, however. How about the farm organizations taking a look at themselves? Maybe these groups are a little too traditional. There's a need for reassessment on the part of all farm organizations on how to fight the farm revolution."

FOOD FOR PEACE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the annual report of the activities of the food-for-peace program for calendar year 1964 is an encouraging document. Since its origin in 1954, the food-for-peace program has grown from a relatively modest effort to dispose of products surplus to U.S. use into an extremely significant effort, encompassing 40 percent of our Government's economic development aid overseas. Now, as the report points out, food-for-peace exports have reached a new high of 18 million tons which have an estimated export market value of $1.7 billion.

Mr. President, when I was Director of the food-for-peace program I saw all around the world the great impact that food for peace could have in underdeveloped countries. Not only have we made available our food abundance, but also we have devised methods of using the local currencies we receive to support specific economic development programs, educational efforts, and U.S. market development that can be expected to reap dividends in the future. One of the most important operations of our food-for-peace program is the school lunch program, which now includes more than 40 million children. This project has a tremendous impact. By providing lunches for children at their school, we are encouraging greatly increased school attendance—since this may be the only nutritious meal that many children get each day—and at the same time we are making it possible for the children to improve their physical health and mental alertness. There can be no doubt that malnutrition creates mental as well as physical retardation. We are helping the minds as well as the bodies of those we assist under the food-for-peace program. For the children of the underdeveloped countries, who will be their nation's leaders in the years to come, there is no effort more important or more worth while.

Mr. President, the food-for-peace program has come a long way since 1954, but I believe there is still a great deal we can do to make it more effective and to promote still greater use of our farm abundance to meet the needs of less developed nations. I am very glad to note that the Agency for International Development has made available additional funds to be used to enrich the vitamin content of non-fat, dry milks distributed overseas. This is an important step and can, I believe, be carried even further by including other protein rich or enriched items among the foods we make available. I would also strongly recommend efforts to plan food-for-peace programs into the future, making a conscious effort to meet the specific needs of the developing countries as well as simply disposing of products that happen to be surplus in the United States at any given time.

Mr. President, I welcome the President's praise for the food-for-peace program and his strong reaffirmation of the value of this program on the international scene. It is my sincere hope that in the years to come the food-for-peace program will become an even more significant contribution to the economic development of other nations and at the same time that it will, as in the case of Japan, lead to even greater commercial markets for American agricultural produce, when these nations are able to stand on their own feet economically.

Mr. President, I would also like to make special mention of the fine work of the present food-for-peace Director, Richard Reuter. He has brought knowledge, dedication, and imagination to this program and part of the tremendous success of the food-for-peace program over the last year must undoubtedly be attributed to his work. Words of praise are also in order for the able public servants in the Department of Agriculture and AID who conduct the operations of food for peace.

ST. LOUIS AND A UNIQUE CONTRACT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, an unusual contract has just been awarded by the Defense Department's Advanced Research Projects Agency.

This contract will establish organization and management mechanisms to link the output of science to technology in selected fields of materials research.

Monsanto Research Corp. of St. Louis, Mo., will join with Washington University, also of St. Louis, to conduct a 2-year program of research on polymer and oxide composites.

Great credit for this unique contract is due Dr. Carroll Hochwalt, president of the St. Louis Research Council, and one of the great practical scientists of our time.

The participants assume the responsibility for advancing the specified field of technology in question, covering the gamut from pure science almost to end-product work. They will attempt to become the worldwide centers of excellence in these fields.

For three reasons, I am especially pleased at this announcement. First, at one time or another, all of us have been concerned that the vast quantity of basic research data generated under Government contracts be brought into use as soon as possible. While it is true that these data are widely published, there is often the possibility that in certain cases the applied researcher may not get the word.

ARPA has reduced this possibility in this field by the creation of this relationship.

Second, and I have made this a matter of record many times in Armed Services Committee hearings, it would appear that a disproportionate share of the defense research dollar is being invested without enough consideration for the vast research potential of the industries and universities of the central area of the United States. We are gratified, therefore, by this recognition of the potential of Missouri; it is our sincere hope that this action is only the beginning.

Monsanto research, for many years under the guidance of Dr. Hochwalt, also for many years has been a leader in the industrial sponsorship of research. It is my understanding the company is conducting research in areas closely allied with this program, at company expense, so the program overall will be well rounded.

In selecting Washington University as a partner, Monsanto has guaranteed the availability of some of our best academic minds. This university has always been highly rated. Its reputation continues to grow.

All of us will watch this program develop with great interest. The Defense Department should be congratulated for initiating an outstanding pioneering effort.

LOWER UNEMPLOYMENT RATE

Mr. McNAMARA. Mr. President, the Labor Department's news that unemployment in this country has dropped to a 7½-year low of 4.7 percent is the best indication yet of the fact that we are headed in the right direction.

The strengthening job picture is indeed promising. Since the first quarter of 1961 we have gained 4.7 million jobs.

Certainly, this gives solid evidence that the programs developed in these past few years have been wise. We have had tremendous problems to attack. And we have attacked them. But we have gone about this with well-considered, finely coordinated, and fully developed plans.

The job is by no means finished. It has been begun and it is now moving at rapid rates of speed. There is much left to do, however.

There is a serious and stubborn teenage unemployment problem. We are in the midst of meeting that one head on. The President's antipoverty programs—the Job Corps, the Neighborhood Youth Corps, VISTA—have taken dead aim at this kind of joblessness.

We can be proud of the strength and vitality our Nation shows under inspired leadership.

SPRUCE KNOB-SENECA ROCKS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA, WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I was extremely pleased to testify today before the Subcommittee on Soil Conservation and Forestry of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry in support of my bill S. 7, which would establish the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in West Virginia.

Because of the outstanding natural beauty of this area and its potential as a recreational site, I ask permission that my statement be inserted in the Record.

There being no objections, the statement was ordered to be printed as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE ROBERT C. BYRD, SENATOR FROM WEST VIRGINIA, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF SOIL CONSERVATION AND FORESTRY OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY ON APRIL 1, 1965, REGARDING S. 7, A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE SPRUCE KNOB-SENECA ROCKS NATIONAL RECREATION AREA IN THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. Chairman, in his inspiring message of February 8, 1965, to the Congress on natural beauty of our country, President Johnson stated "for centuries Americans have drawn strength and inspiration from the beauty of our country. It would be a neglectful generation indeed, indifferent alike to the judgment of history and the command of principle, which fails to preserve and extend such a heritage for its descendants." In this message, also, the President proposed the establishment of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in West Virginia using appropriations from the land and water conservation funds to acquire the needed lands.

I believe that the principle embodied in the President's message expresses the desires of most Americans, but we must give it practical application through feasible and forwardlooking programs.

The bill which I introduced and which is now before you, S. 7, is the same in content as the bill which I introduced in the 88th Congress, S. 1022. It is a desirable and practical application of the President's program to conserve the natural beauty and the recreation resources of our country for the inspiration, enjoyment, and beneficial use not only for those of us who are living today but also for succeeding generations of Americans. S. 7 carries out the President's proposal for the establishment of the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in my State and provides for its consolidation in public ownership, development for public use and enjoyment, and for the conservation and wise use always of its many natural resources. Additionally, it will help promote the administration's program for a clear and beautiful Potomac River.

The projected national recreation area is located in the upper reaches of the Potomac River. It embraces portions of the South Branch of the Potomac, the North Fork of the South Branch of the Potomac, and some of the attractive tributaries of these streams. These are beautiful and unspoiled waterways, and they should be kept so in line with President Johnson's urgent desire to make the Potomac River, "rich in history and memory, which flows by our Nation's Capital," a model of scenic and recreation values for the entire country. The lands which adjoin this river system are rough and rugged in large part, high in scenic beauty, productive of wildlife and forests and waters, and replete with numerous and varied opportunities for great numbers of our citizens to obtain healthful and enjoyable outdoor recreation.

The Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area is, as its name suggests, comprised of two units operated in close proximity, but it also has a third part, of impressive natural beauty—the Smoke Hole country. The Seneca Rocks, a spectacular formation located in the North Fork of the South Branch of the Potomac River, are known throughout the Eastern United States. These rocks form one of the most interesting natural wonders east of the Mississippi, and many travelers who view the formation as it rises more than 900 feet above the river say that it looks like a ruined ancient castle. The rocks are themselves a gleaming, bulky mass of Tuscarora quartzite 1,000 feet high, and rest on the western shoulder of the North Fork Mountain that forms the western boundary of the Smoke Hole Valley. This area was once the scene of many annual gatherings of the Seneca Indian Tribe, for which Seneca Rocks was named, and legends of the area are a famous part of the Indian folklore of our country.

In the same vicinity are Seneca Caverns, one of the famous West Virginia caves open to the public. The winding and picturesque halls of these caverns are all well lighted with electricity.

The land area to be included with Seneca Rocks totals 74,000 acres, of which 20,000 acres are now a part of the Monongahela National Forest, having been acquired under the Weeks law over the years.

Spruce Knob, 4,860 feet above the sea, is West Virginia's highest mountain and is located approximately 10 miles southwest of Seneca Rocks. It lies slightly elevated above the general level of the crest ridge of Spruce Mountain in Pendleton County. The recreation area would encompass 26,000 acres adjacent to Spruce Knob, of which 19,000 acres have been acquired as part of the Monongahela National Forest. In total, the national recreation area boundaries would encompass 100,000 acres, of which 39,000 are now owned by the United States. Most of this country was logged over prior to and during World War I. About that time, the restoration program of the Forest Service was launched with protection against forest fires, timber stand improvement, forest plantations, wildlife habitat improvement, and other measures which have rebuilt and enhanced the attractiveness of the area and the natural resources it offers. The restored cover in the Spruce Knob area is a testimony to the effectiveness of this program because as late as 1929 it was almost barren from fires that swept over it.

As I have indicated, the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area will include two major tributaries of the Potomac River—the South Branch and the north fork of the South Branch. Feeding into these tributaries are dozens of clear, cold, spring-fed streams flowing from forested watersheds, creating scenic attractions as they cascade out of the high mountains into the valley below. To view these forests and streams is to become absorbed in their beauty.

Many features of public interest, in addition to Spruce Knob and Seneca Rocks, would be included in this recreation project in the area known as the Smoke Hole country. The Smoke Hole is actually a canyon, an S-shaped slice gouged through the Allegheny Front for 22 miles, and rained by the South Branch of the Potomac River. It has long been noted for its extraordinary geological formations. The Smoke Hole begins 1 mile north of the village of Upper Tract on United States Route 220 and extends more than 20 miles to the point where the South Branch joins North Fork a few miles south of Petersburg.

Strange plants grow in this section, and an accurate estimate of the variety of floral life to be found is suggested by the report of a botanist who in 1933 found 283 species of flora in a ground space of only 4½ acres, in the area known as Hermit Island. Many nature-study groups make treks into the valley to collect rare plants. Game and fish are numerous and varied, but, strangely enough, there are few insects and no objectionable vermin.

One early American pioneer, after he first stood and viewed the gigantic heights and immense reaches of the Smoke Hole country, scratched a line on a stone wall at his feet, "Paradise Discovered, October 23, 1725." A recent writer has said, "Today, as when first discovered, the Smoke Hole country lies in almost untouched beauty, a haven of escape, a Shangri-la where topography still grants seclusion, and the virgin perfection of all things—trees, flowers, animal life, scenic vistas, and climate—provides a retreat from the disturbing noises of expanding American industrialism."

As the Potomac River winds its way down between the rocky cliffs of the gorge of the South Fork, it creates some of the most spectacular fishing water and scenic beauty to be found in the eastern United States. Two commercially developed caves are already in existence and the Smoke Hole country is rich in caverns which attract spelunkers and other outdoor enthusiasts. Among these, Smoke Hole Cave, high in a mountain top overlooking the river, is a circular chamber about 40 feet high and 15 feet in diameter with several corridors leading from the main room. The cave was so named because of its use by the Indians as a smoke-curing chamber for preserving meat. Later, early white settlers adopted this practice, curing venison and buffalo and bear steak. From this usage came the name "Smoke Hole Country."

Another cavern, Big Cave, is formed in solid rock at an altitude of 2,200 feet on Cave Mountain, and is the best known of the many caves in the Smoke Hole. In it, early settlers and Confederate soldiers dug nitre which they boiled in iron kettles and used in manufacturing gunpowder. Big Spring, at the base of Cave Mountain, is a famous fishing ground, as trout gather there where the water is always cool. The Shawnee Indians first used the area, but were driven out by the Seneca, who eventually ruled all of the region now contained in Pendleton County.

The high country around Spruce Knob is a bit of Canada transplanted into the West Virginia countryside, with native red spruce and other forest tree species being unique in the typically Appalachian hardwood area.

The South Branch of the Potomac River is a noted fishing and white river water canoeing stream. The many other streams also provide excellent fishing and there is good hunting in season. The scenery in this part of the Allegheny Mountains is superb and there are opportunities without limit for hiking, for camping and picnicking, for riding and touring, and for simply enjoying the forest and pastoral scenes.

The Spruce Knob unit is heavily timbered, but the Seneca Rocks unit is less so, although there is good timberland within it. Other uses now are livestock grazing, and some farming. There has been some exploration for minerals, but there is no current production. All of these uses will continue under the National Recreation Area to the extent compatible with public development, use, and enjoyment of the recreational resources.

The Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area will be within a few hours' drive of such metropolitan centers as Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Charleston, Richmond, and others. Over 27 million people live within a 150-mile radius of this area. Over 60 million people live within a 300-mile radius. New highways and continued improvement of present highways and access roads, as envisioned in the Appalachian Regional Development Act, will make the attractions of this beautiful land more and more accessible to the millions of people in cities, towns, and surrounding countryside who find in the beauty of our great, unspoiled outdoor areas the inspiration, health, and spiritual renewal so essential to modern living. We in West Virginia are happy to have people come to our State to enjoy the beauties and recreational opportunities in which the Mountain State abounds.

To accommodate the users of this land, however, and to make this area truly an outstanding public asset, there will need to be increased ownership of recreation lands and increased public development to assure safe and enjoyable use to permit visitors to get to and enjoy the many unique and attractive opportunities for outdoor recreation. The Forest Service currently is managing and developing recreation facilities and wildlife on the lands which it controls. More must be done, and quickly, if we are indeed to preserve the natural beauty of this area for, and to make it available to, public use.

There must be more trails, and there are splendid opportunities for scenic drives or recreation ways. Several hundred additional public camping and picnicking units will be necessary in the near future to protect public health and the natural resources and to guard against pollution of the waters. Trails for hiking and riding will greatly increase the enjoyment of the area by people who favor these types of recreational pursuits; and, in fact, they should be one of the first uses of these lands. The propagation of game and fish can be increased. The many observation points from which inspiring and soul-satisfying views of the Appalachian Range can be obtained should be made accessible to the visiting public.

As a matter of tremendous importance to West Virginia, this recreational project will be of great economic benefit to the citizens of the State. Scenic beauty and opportunity for outdoor recreation are among the great undeveloped assets of this portion of the Mountain State, which is the only State wholly located in the Appalachian Region for which the Congress has recently provided an extensive and forward-looking program of economy betterment. This national recreation area will complement other measures in the Appalachian Regional Development Act, will be in harmony with its purposes, and will contribute much toward lifting the economic level of this area as well as providing broadened opportunities for its citizens.

The Forest Service estimates that by 1970, at the end of the first 5 years of operation, if the recreation area is established this year, there will be an annual use of the area amounting to 1 million visitor-days and that by the year 2000 this use will have increased to from 3 to 5 million visitor-days. Each visitor contributes to the economic welfare of the area where he goes for recreational benefits. Overnight visitors, or tourists, will each spend several dollars per day in a recreational area. The potential yearly expenditure aggregates $6,500,000 to $10 million. This estimate is based on records of average expenditures in 1958 and 1959 in similar areas in Minnesota, Oregon, Tennessee, and North Carolina. Furthermore, projected estimates into the year 2000 offer an expectation of 3 to 5 million visitors annually, with a $32,500,000 potential expenditure believed possible.

I visualize a growing recreation industry oriented around the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area which will result in more hotels, motels, restaurants, service stations, and other service industries, and, consequently, in an enhanced level of employment for West Virginians and a greatly enlarged tax base.

These facts are of prime importance to my economically depressed State and to all West Virginians, most especially to the citizens living in the area. The opening of their lands to tourism will mean a long-delayed, much-needed expansion of their personal horizons and the coming of opportunities scarcely dreamed of.

Basically, however, I believe that this national recreation area is in the long-term interest of all the people of the United States. It will conserve and develop the natural beauty of a lovely sector of our country. It will conserve and develop and make available to increasing numbers of people opportunities for healthful and enjoyable outdoor recreation. It will help conserve our natural resources so that we will pass on to those who follow us not ugliness, or depleted and misused lands, or polluted and dull streams, but enhanced beauty, well-managed lands and forests and waters, more wildlife, and sparkling water—a section of the Potomac River which truly will "serve as a model of scenic and recreation values for the entire country."

Additionally, I wish to point out that the U.S. Department of Agriculture has indicated its approval of this proposed bill, S. 7, with a recommended amendment germane to the funding process. This measure has been favorably commented upon by the U.S. Department of the Interior, and the Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the presentation of these departmental reports from the standpoint of the administration's program.

Thank you.

RETIREMENT OF U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE DAVID A. PINE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on April 2, Hon. David A. Pine, dean of the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia, will retire from active service on the 25th anniversary of his appointment to the bench.

Admitted to the District of Columbia bar in 1913, following graduation from Georgetown Law School, Judge Pine held legal positions in the Department of Justice and engaged in private practice until his appointment in 1938 as U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia. It was from this position that he was appointed to the bench in 1940. From 1959 to 1961 he was chief judge of the court.

A notable event in Judge Pine's career occurred early in 1952, when the famous steel seizure case came before his court. To avert a strike at a time when an impairment of defense production was threatened, the President had ordered the seizure of the steel industry. Opposing the steel companies' motion for an injunction, the Government urged the doctrine of broad residuum of power as the President's authority to direct the seizure of the steel plants.

In his opinion, Judge Pine rejected this doctrine, traced the history of the grant of Executive power under the Constitution, declined to consider the political and economic repercussions feared by the Government, and decided the case in favor of the steel companies on the fundamental issue whether the seizure was or was not authorized by law. A month later, Judge Pine's opinion was affirmed by the Supreme Court.

In 1954, a bust of George Wythe, eminent lawyer and scholar of colonial Virginia, was unveiled at the College of William and Mary, in Williamsburg. In a masterly address delivered on that occasion, entitled "Remove Not the Ancient Landmark," Judge Pine showed his deep devotion to the Constitution. In a time when strange philosophies of government abound, it is refreshing to read again the wisdom contained in his speech. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, as Judge Pine retires from active judicial service, I express the wish that he and Mrs. Pine may together enjoy many years of happiness.

EXHIBIT 1

REMOVE NOT THE ANCIENT LANDMARK

(Address by Associate Justice David A. Pine)

You have been surfeited with speeches. Words. Words. More words. And if words be tyrants, you have indeed become their liege subjects by remaining throughout the day, although in a slightly modified sense from that intended by the author of that expression, or my recollection of it. But perhaps it is good training, and designed to put you in condition so to speak, for President Chandler has informed me that today's proceedings are but a prelude to a series of programs during the ensuing year, rededicating the bench and bar to the traditions of representative constitutional government. Indeed, he has asked me to select a topic bearing some relation to that general theme, and one which might serve as a basis for further discussion. That would seem to give me wide latitude, but I take it he means a discussion on the Constitution.

And I am happy that he asked me to speak on the Constitution, because that is a speaker's paradise. Although innumerable volumes have been written and countless words have been spoken concerning it, the Constitution seems never to pall and, I am glad to say, insures audience interest, regardless of the speaker. Small wonder that I accepted your kind invitation with such eagerness, as I was provided, so to speak, with a captive audience. And there is another reason—a secret reason. Lawyers and judges are peculiarly susceptible to the temptation of a discourse on the Constitution.

Of course, one has to be selective in a discussion of the Constitution, because even that great document has a limit to its antidotal capacity to resist audience boredom; and selection generally presents difficulties on account of its many fascinating possibilities.

But here I have an added burden. Admiral Chandler has also stipulated that my topic must be of "broad interest to the layman as well as to * * * the legal profession." Apparently the layman comes first, but my topic must be suitable for both. And that presents an almost insuperable obstacle, for no lawyer worthy of the name, at least none of my acquaintance, certainly no member of the faculty or graduate of this institution, would admit to a status beneath that of an expert on the Constitution, in court or out. The lawyer generally acquires that distinction at graduation, or shortly before, and never questions his title. How, then, may I say anything of interest to a man of his scholarship which would be within the meager understanding of the layman? And by the same token, how may I say anything of interest to the layman which would be other than commonplace to my learned former brother at the bar? I have no answer to these questions, and the two conditions seem to be mutually exclusive, but I have not allowed the obstacle to stand in my way and have come before you nevertheless, in the hope, perhaps born of optimism, that what I shall say will be of some interest to the layman and not too shallow for polite attention of the expert.

And in casting about in my mind for some phase of the general subject which perhaps is not too shopworn, it occurred to me that you might be interested in an analysis of the mental state of the men who assembled in Philadelphia to salvage something from the wreckage of the Articles of Confederation—a sort of psychoanalysis without therapy or need for therapy, if I can use the term in that nontechnical manner, for Heaven knows that these giants needed no therapy. In other words, what emotions gripped them? What dominated their thinking and their actions? What were their compulsions?

Of course, such an analysis will have to be based on what they said and what they did in the light of their background and surrounding circumstances. It cannot be comprehensive, as such an inquiry would add another volume to the sagging shelves, and indeed I know that you will be glad to hear that I am not prepared for any such undertaking. My text, therefore, if I need one, might be, "By their fruits, ye shall know them," and at the end I shall be orthodox and point a moral, if you will permit.

These men will have to be considered collectively, and not individually, as their achievement was collective, and individual consideration would be beyond the scope of my remarks. Indeed, what I have to say might not be wholly applicable to each one and might be more applicable to one than to another. With a few exceptions, notably Jefferson, John Adams, and Patrick Henry, who were absent, they constituted the leading citizens of the erstwhile Colonies. Lawyers predominated, although there were a number of doctors, educators, bankers, merchants, and others in attendance. There were some who had served as soldiers in the Revolution, and a number who had signed the Declaration of Independence. Six were Members of the Continental Congress of 1774. Six were signers of the Articles of Confederation, one of whom had drawn it, 43 had been Members of the Continental Congress, and 2 had been presidents of the Congress.

They were men of deep learning, scholarly attainments, and wide experience in statecraft. They had been brought together under a resolution passed by the expiring Congress under the Articles of Confederation, for the purpose of revising the articles. The Government established by it had utterly failed, because of its weakness. The country was in a desperate condition. Radical measures were being agitated. The French Revolution was just around the corner, and its spirit was in the air. The currency was of uncertain value. Credit was practically nil. Life, liberty, and property were not safe. Chaos was imminent.

With their background and under those circumstances, I have no hesitancy in saying that fear dominated them, and that the object of their fear was first a lack of government. Before them loomed disunion, disorder, and anarchy, which in my evaluation produced profound fear in their hearts. This would seem to be obvious.

On the other hand, I think the record shows that they had a competing fear, equally consuming and tending to counteract the other. They knew that to remove the fear of lack of government, it was necessary to establish one of sufficient strength to cope with the situation, and that equated strength on a national scale which was far from palatable. They were devoted to their local self-governments, and they had distrust and hatred for absentee authority. The list of grievances in the Declaration of Independence is ample evidence of this, and they were fearful that a strong Federal Government might, in time, produce a counterpart for that which the sacrifices of the Revolution had sought to destroy. They feared it would be an instrument of tyranny, despotism, and oppression; and my conclusion that they were possessed by this fear can be found, as I shall later show, in the Constitution of the United States, without looking elsewhere.

And so, when they assembled in Philadelphia, as they later said, "to form a more perfect union," ignoring the mandate of the resolution appointing them to revise the Articles of Confederation, which incidentally could not be amended except by unanimous vote of all the States, it is my view that collectively they were controlled by fear, or more accurately, two competing, incompatible fears: A fear of government and a fear of a lack of government. Nevertheless, with such dismaying premise, and actuated by such warring emotions, a miracle was performed, and by a strange and unique adventure in the science of government they did the impossible—they reconciled the irreconcilable, they squared the circle. In the oft-repeated words of Gladstone they forged "the most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man." They found a formula by which the hard-won freedom of the people and the sovereignty of the States could be preserved and at the same time a national government of sufficient strength to provide order and security and perform national functions could be created.

In their plan of government, they took the totality of sovereign power residing in the people, a theory on which there was no disagreement, and vested a portion of it in the United States, reserving the remainder to the States and the people, a distribution, but not an equal distribution, of sovereign power. They made the United States supreme in its national sphere, without detracting from the supremacy of the States within their respective State spheres, except for the imposition of several restraints deemed necessary in the national interest for the protection of individual or property rights, for example, the restraint upon the States against the passing of any bill of attainder, ex post facto law, or law impairing the obligation of contract. They thereby formed a duality of sovereignty within the same orbit, a device, I believe, without exact historical precedent.

They created the United States as a sovereignty, and granted it those powers considered necessary for the proper conduct of national functions, but they granted no more than necessary, and thereby lessened its capacity for harm to the States and the people whose powers were only diminished to the extent of those granted away or prohibited. And then, to make assurance doubly sure, the people, when it came to ratification, apparently entertaining the same fear, but probably more fervently than that which actuated the delegates to the convention, insisted on the incorporation of the 9th and 10th amendments, which provided that the enumeration of powers in the Constitution were not to be construed to deny or disparage the others retained by the people, and that the powers not delegated or prohibited were reserved to the States or to the people.

Next, as showing the fear of tyranny and despotism incident to the creation of a strong central government, I cite to you the first eight amendments to the Constitution.

As you know, they guarantee freedom of religion, speech, and press; secure the people against unreasonable searches and seizures; require indictment in felony cases; forbid a person to be compelled to be a witness against himself; and prohibit the deprivation of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, along with the other restraints for the protection of rights inherent in freemen. These are all restraints placed upon the Federal Government, not upon the States. Could anything more eloquently demonstrate the fear alluded to than these amendments which were so uppermost in the minds of the people that it was necessary to agree to add them formally to the Constitution in order to be sure of its ratification? And if this fear was in the minds of the people, is it not reasonable to presume that it was in the minds of the delegates who represented them, but who felt that the amendments were unnecessary because the Constitution itself was so scrupulously careful to enumerate and delimit the granted powers?

Next, fearful of wrongful or excessive exercise of such powers as were necessarily granted to the Federal Government, the founders diluted their strength by distributing them among three departments of government: the legislative, executive, and judicial. In this they were probably influenced by the teachings of Locke and Montesquieu, particularly the latter, who advocated some separation of powers as a measure of safety, and also by the historical excesses of monarchs and parliaments when powers were concentrated in one. They therefore granted the powers because of necessity, but weakened their exercise by distribution; and as a further safeguard, in certain categories they set up a system of additional checks by one branch of the Government against another. For example, the treatymaking power of the Executive is conditioned on the concurrence of two-thirds of the Senate present; the appointive power of the Executive in specified cases requires the consent of the Senate; the lawmaking power of the legislative is subject to the veto of the Executive, which again is subject to circumvention by two-thirds of the votes in both Houses, and although not expressly provided therein, implicit in the language granting the judicial power is its power to nullify acts of either of the other branches and of the States which go beyond or are in contravention of the constitutional authority. This was made certain by the historical opinions of Chief Justice Marshall, to whose memory we do honor today. Even within the legislative branch alone, there is a similar check in the creation of two Houses of Congress, which convincingly shows the fear of government, including a fear of government by an unbridled democracy as well as a fear of king or parliament.

There are many other roadblocks, some express and some implicit in the practical operation of government, growing out of this fear of government because of tyranny and despotism, always inherent therein, unless curbed. But I shall not elaborate the point further, and shall pass on to several quotations on the subject.

The first is from Washington's Farewell Address, in which he said: "The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all governments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism."

The second is from the 47th paper of the Federalist, written by Madison, where he stated: "The accumulation of all powers, legislative, executive, and judicial, in the same hands, whether of one, a few, or many, whether hereditary, self-appointed, or elective, may justly be pronounced the very definition of tyranny."

The third is from John Adams, who was not a delegate to the Convention because of his absence abroad as envoy to Great Britain, but whose views can surely be considered as a reflection of those who were present. In volume I of his works, at page 186, he wrote: "It is by balancing one of these three powers against the other two that the efforts in human nature toward tyranny can alone be checked and restrained and any degree of freedom preserved."

I shall not call other witnesses, although many more are available, but rest on what I have said to establish that fears of the kind I have described dominated the delegates. The marvel is that this experiment in government, novel in so many respects, has worked so efficiently that this Nation is now the envy of the rest of the world. Starting as a weak, struggling, uncertain group of States calling themselves a Union, it has been transferred into the most powerful of all nations. Instead of 13 debt-ridden colonies emerging into statehood after a devastating war for independence, there are now 48 sovereignties, strong and robust, some virtually empires in themselves, 2 Territories, the District of Columbia, and possessions beyond the seas. Instead of a population of 4 million inhabitants, there are now 40 times that number. Instead of a national wealth too insignificant to evaluate, it is now estimated at close to a thousand billion dollars; and the legal basis for this phenomenal accomplishment, and the legal basis for the protection of your most priceless possessions—your life, your liberty, and your property—is that single parchment document containing some 4,000 words emanating from those inspired men who assembled in Philadelphia in the summer of 1787.

Now, what is the moral to which I said I would point before concluding my remarks? It is this: Follow the example of the Founding Fathers and be as alertly fearful as were they of usurpation of power, the forerunner of tyranny and despotism. Oh, you might say, that is seeing ghosts, the Constitution stands in the way, it is no jeopardy, and is held in such high esteem and reverence as to be immune from destruction. I agree, if you refer to frontal attack; but what I ask you to fear are attacks on the flanks, made in the cause of expediency and supported by vast popular demand of the moment. The technique will be the argument that the Constitution is a living thing and therefore susceptible of growth, and must be adaptable and flexible enough to meet changes in the social and economic life of the country.

There can be no doubt as to the validity of that argument when properly applied, but I ask you to take heed when its application would be destructive in fact, but not in name, of the very foundations and pillars of our constitutional government.

In recent years there has been a trend toward enhancement of the powers of the Federal Government. This has been accomplished by the expansion of what was formerly believed to be the limits of the interstate commerce power and the taxing and spending powers, and the Federal Government has thereby taken over the control of great fields of activities formerly considered the province of the States.

There has also been a disposition in the Federal Government itself toward encroachment by one department upon the powers of another, particularly the executive upon the legislative and judicial. This is not to say that the legislative has not cast covetous eyes toward the executive, nor that the judicial has been demurely free from flirtations with the legislative powers, but, at the moment, as I see it, the executive advances predominate.

I could cite many examples, but time will not permit. Suffice it to say that any encroachment by one department upon the powers of another gives added power to the trespasser and diminishes the balance accordingly.

Take heed that the barriers so carefully constructed are not eroded by subtle means, sometimes not immediately discernible, but, to my mind, more dangerous than a direct attack.

If conditions require a change in the Constitution in its basic provisions, let it be done by amendment in the manner provided therein, and stand out against the plausible but insidious argument of flexibility induced by expediency or the pressures or rewards of the moment.

I am aware that the view I express has vocal opponents, but on consideration of their utterances, I detect, beneath their reasoning, a predisposition to authoritarian government, hidden by a facade of constitutional form. So often such people are willing to exchange liberty for efficiency, and freedom for temporary security or reward.

And as I read the opinions of the great Chief Justice, the incomparable John Marshall, to whom we pay tribute today, he would not, as they sometimes contend, support their point of view, but would challenge it with every ounce of his unconquerable spirit and persuasion. To be sure, he is known as the great nationalist, the anti-States-rights exponent, the liberal expounder of the Constitution, but these appellations came at a time when the pendulum was swinging toward its nullification. They were applied to the man who bravely stood foremost in opposition to theories which would have vitiated the plain purpose of the Constitution to establish a National Government supreme within its sphere, theories which would have reduced it to the same state of impotency as had descended upon the Articles of Confederation which it supplanted. Now, when the pendulum is pointing the other way, it is useful to recall his words in *McCulloch* v. *Maryland*, that "no political dreamer was ever wild enough to think of breaking down the lines which separate the States and of compounding the American people into one common mass." And I believe Marshall, also known as the Guardian of the Constitution, today would be equally fervent in opposing a nationalism or liberalism in construction which would imperil duality of sovereignty or separation of powers, or both, because that in the long run would be as destructive of his cherished Constitution as was the narrow, debilitating States-rights doctrine of his day. The latter spelled national dissolution and chaos; the former, if pursued to its logical end, spells totalitarianism and tyranny.

"Remove not the ancient landmark, which thy fathers have set" (Proverbs 22: 28).

SOIL CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am deeply interested in Government economy and efficiency, but some of the recommendations on soil conservation in the administration's January budget message are neither economical nor efficient.

Of all the welfare and subsidy programs this Congress will approve, I doubt if any of them will require any State, county, city, or group of citizens to contribute as much toward the success of those programs as the farmers are already putting into soil conservation.

Therefore, I am opposed to the new legislation recommended by the Budget Bureau, under which conservation districts, farmers, and landowners would be required to make payments into a newly created revolving fund for technical services that have been free since the conservation program began.

I am also opposed to the renewed Budget Bureau recommendation proposing to knock $100 million off of the current $220 million authorization for the existing agricultural conservation program—which requires 50-50 cost sharing by participating farmers.

Under this program the farmers are already required to put up 50 percent of the cost of a project, and in some cases they put in an even larger share when more is needed to complete a project.

I oppose any slowdown in this important work. And that is just what the budget proposal means—slowdown. Virginia landowners already have invested more than $70 million of their own money in applying conservation on the land.

Without the technical assistance they now receive from the Soil Conservation Service they either will not continue to apply conservation measures, or they will operate less effectively and may even do damage to the land.

The effects of the budget-induced slowdown would not be confined to landowners. Conservation contracting, a big business created by the program we launched in 1935, would lose $160 million worth of business. The slowdown would mean 15,000 fewer equipment operating and servicing jobs. Equipment purchases totaling $20 million to $30 million a year would not be made.

I hope Congress will provide a level of funds that will enable the Soil Conservation Service to move forward—not backward. Virginia needs 56 more man-years of SCS technical assistance just to meet the current backlog of requests.

The Nation, according to the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, needs 1,518 additional man-years of help. The proposed cut would reduce the present field staff by about one-third.

The NACD is asking to increase the Soil Conservation Service fund for technical assistance from $104.1 million in the budget to $115 million; the item for watershed planning, from $5.7 million to $10 million, and the estimate for water construction from $67.1 million to $85 million. These requests will have to be studied and weighed by the Appropriations Committee.

In connection with the proposed new legislation to require farmers to contribute up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance they receive from the Soil Conservation Service, the President is reported to have told Gov. Frank Morrison, of Nebraska, recently he believes every farmer has to contribute something to the program himself. The President was represented as feeling Federal programs work better when they help people help themselves.

But I believe the farmers are already bearing a fair share of the cost of soil conservation, which benefits every American by preserving the base of food production to meet future needs.

I was a Member of the 74th Congress in 1935 when it enacted the law to create a national policy of preservation and improvement of our resources. For three decades I have watched the soil and water conservation program develop with great interest.

I have seen its effects on the land. Where conservation measures have been applied the landscape is brushed with new beauty. More of our precious soil is on the fields and not clogging our streams, reservoirs, roadsides, and homes.

I have seen conservation's effect on our wildlife. More and better plants for food and cover and much more surface water area provide habitat in which wildlife abound.

Fertile topsoil washed from the land for want of a conservation project carries away an asset worth more over a period of years than the temporary saving from a reduced appropriation in 1 fiscal year.

In Virginia alone wildlife developments have been made on 31,178 acres, including 2.5 million feet of field borders and hedgerow plantings. Some 22,000 farm ponds have been stocked with fish. We now are blessed with as much wildlife as our forefathers found when they first came to this country.

AN ALABAMA BOYCOTT

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on yesterday a New York-based corporation that deals in Government and municipal bonds announced it would boycott all Alabama municipal bonds. This company, which is a minor factor in the bond market, is outranked by 50 or more dealers in municipal bonds on a national level.

In a word, you could put in your left eye the Alabama municipal bonds that would be handled in future by this company. Consequently, its boycott announcement was an effort to get some cheap publicity, but, in my opinion, a very contemptible one.

INTERINDUSTRY AGREEMENT ON SUGAR QUOTAS

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, in the past week, meetings were concluded between representatives of the domestic beet sugar industry, the mainland cane sugar industry, Hawaiian sugar industry, Puerto Rican sugar interests, and the U.S. Cane Sugar Refiners' Association at which encouraging progress was reached for an interindustry agreement on sugar quotas for the next 5 years.

As the Senators from the 23 sugar-producing States know, the industry has been engaged in a long series of meetings designed to develop a reasonable program for the future needs of producers with the hope that Congress could use the guidelines for modification of the Sugar Act. I am heartened by the results of these discussions, for now it is quite clear that we shall have a base upon which to discuss the future needs of the sugar industry, both at home and abroad.

The present Sugar Act will expire next year. However, Congress must decide on the future of the program this year to protect the producers of both cane and beet sugar who will have crops ready for harvesting and planting before the expiration of the act next year.

You will remember that last year I submitted legislation intended to aid the beet sugar industry market surplus sugar accumulated as a result of increased production by domestic beet growers who were asked to increase production a year earlier to offset a world shortage of available cane sugar. It was necessary to defer legislation because it was obvious there was a lack of agreement within the administration over requirements for future marketing quotas. With this tentative agreement on requirements for cane and beet sugar, I am hopeful we will be able to complete work on sugar legislation before the close of this session of Congress.

Although details of this industry agreement still are being approved by interested producers, industry spokesmen have indicated the recommendations will call for some revisions in the Sugar Act so as to strengthen the assurance to U.S. consumers of adequate sugar supplies at all times at stable and reasonable prices.

I am informed the industry will recommend an extension of the present act for a period of 5 years beyond its present expiration date of December 31, 1966. To assure marketing quotas of sugar presently on hand, domestic beet sugar quotas would be raised to 3,025,000 tons and the mainland cane quota would be raised to 1,100,000 tons. These quotas would remain static until domestic consumption surpassed 10,400,000 annually. The industry generally agrees that this consumption figure will be reached by the end of the recommended 5-year extension to the Sugar Act.

My State of Kansas, as many know, has realized great benefits from the production of beet sugar, and it is my hope that we can protect the gains we have made and guarantee additional production in the future. Our producers have accepted initial cutbacks in production to conform with the Department of Agriculture's present policy, thus I do not feel our producers should be called upon to make additional cutbacks of other than a reasonable nature within the scope of the industry recommendations. I am sure our Kansas growers will be fair in their requests and I shall expect to give a report on their views in the near future.

Mr. President, my intention today was to give the Senate a report on the latest developments within the sugar industry itself, and to assure you that once again, private industry has recognized the attendant problems and is showing a willingness to propose changes without the need for Government intervention.

THE RIVER AND ST. LOUIS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, St. Louis grew up on the banks of the Mississippi. Sentimentally the city has always been attached to the great river.

But today the attachment is more than nostalgic for the proud old Mississippi is now rolling by carrying four times more cargo in and out of the city than it did in the best year of the steamboat era.

Once again the slumbering, muddy Mississippi has become a vital factor in the commercial and industrial life of St. Louis.

An exceptionally well written story of the revival of river transportation in St. Louis has been told by David Brown in the St. Louis Globe Democrat Sunday Magazine of March 28. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe Democrat, Mar. 28, 1965]

THE RIVER

St. Louis has returned to the river.

Broad, murky and timeless, the river made the city what it is today. It brought the fur traders who gave the city its start, and then it brought the steamboats which made the city great in commerce and wealth. The packets clogged the levee three deep and the horsedrawn drays clattered over the granite cobblestones with their heavy loads. St. Louis was the foremost inland riverport in the Nation.

But times changed, and the steamboat era was no more. The broad, murky, timeless Mississippi no longer brought trade and riches. It just went on moving to the southland and the sea. And ungratefully the city forgot about it.

Now St. Louis has returned to the river. It is building a steel arch 630 feet high near the water's edge. It is making the long neglected riverfront beautiful—as a memorial to the city's and the river's role in the growth of the Nation. In a spirit of renaissance it is rebuilding with many fine new structures the decadent area adjacent to the river on which it had so long turned its back.

But the city has returned to the river for much more than sentimental or esthetic reasons. Or to purge itself of ingratitude.

Again the river is bringing commerce and wealth and prestige to the city. It is also bringing profitable industry. Again the Mississippi and its tributaries have become great highways for the transport of cargoes by boat. But the craft bringing these rich payloads are not the fancy packets of yore that looked like floating wedding cakes. They are fuctional, workmanlike towboats pushing rows of low-slung, boxlike barges. Sometimes acres of them in one cluster.

The latest figures are not yet complete but it is expected they will show that the port of St. Louis handled more than 10 million tons of river transportation last year.

This would be a new alltime record. It would be more than four times as much as was handled here during the best year of what has been called the golden era of the Mississippi, when the steamboat was queen of the rivers.

The railroads which spanned the Nation north and south and east and west after the Civil War ruined the steamboat. Later the motor trucks and concrete highways finished the job. For close to half a century traffic on the rivers dwindled until it amounted to almost nothing.

And then it began to rise again. For more than 30 years the number of boats on the rivers carrying cargo have been increasing. World War II was followed by a great resurgence of traffic on the inland waterways and in the past 10 years the amount of waterborne freight has gone rapidly upward.

St. Louis is again a great river port—a busier river port than it ever was in its previous history. For the past 6 years more than 9 million tons of freight has been shipped annually into and out of the St. Louis harbor. And the trend has been upward.

In 1963, the last year for which records are complete, 9,089,769 tons of cargo were loaded or unloaded at the St. Louis harbor, according to the U.S. Corps of Army Engineers. Barges brought in 3,089,769 tons, and 5,282,616 tons were shipped out. Transport by river within the local area added up to another 1,131,454 tons. It is estimated by knowledgeable sources that 1964 (records for last year will be completed in May) will show an 8-percent increase over 1963.

The brisk activity at St. Louis is part of a great revival of water transportation over the entire length of the Mississippi and its tributaries, which include the Ohio, Missouri, Illinois, Tennessee, and many other rivers and waterways. In fact, all over America the rivers and waterways, totaling 28,600 navigable miles, are again becoming important freight highways.

The entire Mississippi River system, which covers the midcontinent and embraces 19,000 navigable miles, carried cargoes totaling 271,319,518 tons in 1963, the latest year for which complete water traffic figures are compiled.

The Mississippi alone, which has a navigable channel at least 9 feet deep winding from Minneapolis-St. Paul to the Gulf of Mexico, bore 157,807,291 tons of this. During the year 35,726,911 tons of this total cargo were carried on the Mississippi over the 185 miles from the mouth of the Missouri at St. Louis to the mouth of the Ohio at Cairo, Ill. This stretch of Old Man River is known as the middle Mississippi.

In the 10 years between 1953 and 1963, according to records of the Army Corps of Engineers which maintains the Nation's navigable streams, commerce over the entire length of the Mississippi increased 97 percent. Between St. Louis and Cairo, the middle section of the river, it grew 124 percent. And it has continued to go up.

Almost unnoticed, the silent, workmanlike tows slide past St. Louis or put in at terminals here day and night. The tows range from a towboat pushing a single barge to a cluster of 20 or more barges. Rivermen say the average tow comprises about five barges. In the course of 24 hours a person standing on the St. Louis levee may see anywhere from 25 to 50 tows nowadays.

The capacious barges, which are built in many special ways to carry various dry, liquid, and gaseous cargoes, may hold from 1,000 to 2,500 tons each, and they are unequaled for carrying heavy bulk loads cheaply. They bring to St. Louis petroleum and its products from the oil fields of Texas and Louisiana. They float great masses of Illinois and Kentucky coal to the fires of industry. They haul huge amounts of grain downriver, much of it to New Orleans for overseas shipment. They traffic in sand and gravel, iron, steel, and other metals, and cement, fertilizers, sulfur, chemicals, and other raw materials and manufactured products.

As it was in the day of the packet boat, St. Louis is again the great river port of the Nation. It is roughly halfway up the Nation's principal river, at the hub of a system of water highways which provide transport and water for much of the midcontinent of America, from the industrial East to the agricultural Midwest. Within easy barge reach of this river capital are 9 major cities and 30 sizable industrial centers. The great system of river highways goes up the Mississippi to Minneapolis-St. Paul, down it to New Orleans and the sea. Westward it goes up the Missouri to Kansas City and Omaha and eastward by way of the Ohio to Pittsburgh. Southeastward it goes by way of the Tennessee to Knoxville and northeastward over the Illinois waterway to Chicago, the Great Lakes, and the St. Lawrence Seaway.

Holding again its dominance on the rivers in the new era of water transport, St. Louis is the headquarters for perhaps a hundred large and small bargelines. Among them are two of the Nation's three biggest common carriers—the Mississippi Valley Barge Line Co. and the Federal Barge Lines, Inc. The rest are large and small private and contract bargelines. It has the world's largest shipbuilding yard, operated by the St. Louis Shipbuilding-Federal Barge, Inc., which also owns the Federal Barge Lines. It launched in 1960 what is still the world's most powerful towboat—the $2 million, 9,000-horsepower *America*. It has moved a downstream tow of 52 barges bearing 43,000 tons of cargo, a tow that was 1,500 feet long, 245 feet wide and 7 acres in area.

The mile-long old levee at St. Louis is idle today. The muddy river still laps at its granite cobblestones but the towboats pass it by and put in at 49 large and small terminals on both sides of the river. Nearly all are privately owned, but three are public terminals. One is the new $2,500,000 municipal dock at the foot of North Market Street which St. Louis built with bond funds, and the other two are on the east side of the river.

Many factors have contributed to the revival of river transportation. The modern diesel-driven steel-hulled towboat was powerful, durable, efficient. It was equipped with electronic depth-finder, radiotelephone communication, and radar that could keep it moving day and night and in all kinds of weather, at the good speed of 7 miles an hour upstream, 10 miles down. Thus a tow could travel from 168 to 240 miles in a day's time. Today the towboat averages 3,000 horsepower and ranges up to 9,000. The steel barges, too, are modern and efficient and adapted to specialized tasks.

But most important was the improvement of the rivers. Congress in the 1920's authorized the Federal Government—much of the work was done by the Army Engineers—to make the neglected river more effectively navigable for tows. So dams and locks were built and channels dredged deeply and other improvements and aids to navigation provided. Harbor and terminal facilities were installed. It was like building new highways.

Industry was drawn to the banks of the rivers. It needed water; it also needed cheap transportation of raw materials.

The barges could carry heavy bulk cargoes cheaply—at one-third the cost of railroads, one-seventh the cost of common carrier trucks. This was important to industry, since the price of everything bought and sold these days is affected by transportation costs.

So, the Mississippi and its tributaries are again influencing the economic growth of mid-America. Since World War II basic industries have poured billions into the areas served by this great mid-Atlantic river system.

In 1947 the barges on the inland waterways of the Nation carried 3.5 percent of America's freight as measured by dollar volume. By 1962 the share of river transport had increased to 6.2 percent and has been going up, says Everett T. Winter, executive vice president of the Mississippi Valley Association, an organization devoted to the development of the Nation's waterways. But, he continues the rebirth of river traffic has added to, rather than having taken way from, the rail and truck transportation. Industries bring in raw material cheaply by water, and then ship out their manufactured products by railroad and highway.

St. Louis has returned to the river. This year and in future years more towboats and more acres of cargo-filled barges than ever before will pass the old levee where the city is building a 630-foot steel arch and a historic memorial and many fine new buildings.

The golden age of the Mississippi is not gone with the steamboat. It is still ahead.

PROGRESS TOWARD FULL EMPLOYMENT

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, announcement today that the unemployment rate dropped from 5 percent in mid-February to 4.7 percent on March 15 is a milestone in the march toward one of the goals of the Great Society.

This reduction in unemployment to the lowest point since October of 1957 means that one-half million men and women, unemployed on February 15, had jobs a month later.

Throughout America, under the leadership of this administration, we are engaged in an all-out effort to upgrade the skills of our work force, to find jobs for men and women.

In a recent message to the Congress, President Johnson said, "Unemployment is still the No. 1 problem." This is true in many areas of America and in pockets of unemployment in my own State. Further efforts must be made to try to wipe out such pockets, but we can take encouragement from the report today as we all work for full employment.

TRUTH IN PACKAGING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Senator PHIL HART has done a superlative job in protecting consumer interests. As author of the truth-in-packaging bill he has worked long and hard to eliminate from the marketplace questionable packaging practices which have misled many an American housewife.

Unfortunately consumers never have and never will be able to bring the pressures to bear on Congress that many special interest groups exert. That is why the advocacy of a Senator of high integrity and intelligence who is thinking of the best interests of all the people is so important. That is why I congratulate Senator HART for the fine job he has done in working for truth-in-packaging legislation.

Some powerful figures in the food industry have objected vigorously to the Hart bill. They contend that the housewife enjoys playing roulette with her food dollars—that trying to outguess companies that use misleading packaging and labeling adds spice to the housewife's daily chores. The other side of the coin, Mr. President, is that it also can mean less food on the table and less money in the bank.

April's Coronet featured an excellent article by Senator HART which explores the deceptive packaging practices that his bill will outlaw. Of particular interest to those who fear that the special interests will forever block the passage of this legislation is the following statement from Business Week, which appears in the article:

> The bill may never be passed. But its mere introduction, after extensive hearings has already achieved much of what the bill set out to do—to prohibit "the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities * * *" Ever since HART started stirring things up a couple of years ago, executives of companies manufacturing products found on supermarket shelves have been running to Washington to protest the bill. But at the same time, they have been busily changing packaging that HART might object to.

One of the outstanding consumer magazines has also focussed its spotlight on the Hart bill. The March issue of Consumer Reports has an illuminating report on the efforts of the food industry to torpedo the bill. Both the articles will help my colleagues and the general public to understand the excellence of this legislation as well as the forces working against it. I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article and report were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DON'T BE FOOLED BY DECEPTIVE PACKAGING—A NEW LAW WOULD PROTECT THE SHOPPER FROM BEING CHEATED

(By Senator PHILIP A. HART, Democrat, of Michigan)

Not long ago a consumers' organization received a plaintive cry in its mailbag. It read:

"Does a label on a can mean anything? A short time ago I purchased a number of small cans of Brand G's pork and beans. I have as yet not found any pork in any of said cans. The last can I opened, I took particular care—I practically looked behind every bean—but the pork was absent or I have lost eyesight or sense of taste."

The picture of this man peering hopefully behind each bean, invariably to meet with disappointment, is a poignant one, calculated, one would presume, to wring the heart of the most insensitive food manufacturer.

And yet, one wonders how much the fellows who make and merchandise the products that pour out of our wonderful American cornucopia really care. Lincoln said, "You can't fool all of the people all of the time," and I'm sure certain manufacturers at their most optimistic would never attempt such a feat. But Lincoln tacitly was admitting that you can fool a significant number of people a significant part of the time, and it seems to me this has become all too often one of the guiding principles of a significant portion of our business community.

So, on behalf of men who search wearily among the beans for pork where there is no pork; for housewives in supermarkets who gaze glassily at labels that shout "Full Quart" or "Jumbo Quart" or "Giant Quart" and wonder just what the quart is coming to; on behalf of the consumers who buy "extra long" asparagus spears in cans 5½ inches tall only find, too late, that the longest of the "extra long" spears measures a scant 4 inches. In order to help these consumers. I introduced 2 years ago a bill that has become known—notorious in some circles—as the "truth in packaging" bill.

We live today in a complicated world. Our standard of living is at a level that often dazzles even we who live with it so closely. And it strikes me that one of the most dramatic examples of our glittering way of life is the supermarket.

When I was a child, my mother chose her grocer only after weeks of tentative dealing. Most of the packages she took home were ones that he had filled himself out of his bins of sugar, beans, and cookies. There was no nonsense about weight or volume; things came in pints, pounds, or pecks. There were no fractional ounces, and no one had ever heard of a "giant quart."

But the old-fashioned grocer exists today only in pockets of resistance. And he too must carry much prepackaged food. He survives largely by being available—he's there on Sundays, on holidays, or if you develop an overpowering yearning for pineapple chunks at 9:30 in the evening. But it's a losing battle.

Supermarkets now account for more than 70 percent of food sales, not to mention more than a fifth of all retail sales. There are well over 30,000 supermarkets in the country today, and each has on its shelves an average of 7,500 items. It particularly interests me, and I think it will you, to know that last year about $10 billion—a fifth of all consumer supermarket expenditures—went to pay for packaging.

Why such a staggering amount of money just to wrap things up? During hearings on my bill in the Senate Subcommittee on Antitrust and Monopoly, of which I am chairman, Economist Irston R. Barnes of Columbia University said something that I have thought of many times with fascination. He remarked:

"The supermarket today is largely a display depot where buyers come to select * * * the products they desire. It is essentially engaged in selling shelf space, and makes its money by achieving the largest possible total of rental payments for the space provided for the products which it handles."

He went on to point out that the supermarket does little "selling." The package and the label do the selling. So the manufacturer, understandably enough, is eager to use the package to create some advantage for his product. The result is that forced by intense competition many manufacturers tend to drift toward contrived advantages, while disguising any facts that might influence the housewife not to buy. That is what all the shouting—and what the truth-in-packaging bill—is about. Let's get down to some cases:

You want to buy some cookies. Browsing among the cookie boxes you see one that contains chocolate chip cookies. You can tell by the illustration on the label that the cookies are just chock full of chocolate chips. However, when you get the box home you find that chocolate chips are not nearly as evident in the cookies inside as they are in the ones on the label. My bill would require that illustrations do not deceive the buyer as to the nature and quality of the product.

You come across a can of coffee on the label of which is emblazoned the inviting message, "7 Cents Off." The question is, off what? "Cents off" offers are stamped on at the factory, and they usually don't mean a thing. The manufacturer has no control over retail prices. Too often there is no saving at all. The truth-in-packaging bill would prohibit such claims which the manufacturer cannot guarantee.

A druggist whom I know has read of my bill in the newspapers, and the other day he showed me a certain brand of toothpaste. It came in four sizes, marked "Large," "Giant," "King," and "Family." The "Large," as you probably have guessed, is the smallest. There is admittedly a slightly comic aspect to this sort of thing, but after you've smiled wryly you realize that the money involved is in the millions, and it comes out of the pockets of consumers.

My friend the druggist was rather wrought up about the whole packaging and labeling business. "We retailers," he told me, "have no control over this sort of thing, but we're the people the public sees, and it rubs off on us. The other day my son wanted to buy some perfume for his girl and he asked me which size of a particular brand was the better buy. I looked at the two boxes. The larger was marked 1½ drams; the smaller was marked 0.275 fluid ounces. Being a pharmacist, and knowing that a dram is one-eighth of an ounce, I could do a little quick figuring and inform my son which would give him more for his money. But can you imagine the customer's going through that sort of translation?

"Look," he said, taking two packages of a well-known talcum powder from a shelf behind him, "here is the old package." It was a squarish, rather uninspired-looking container. Then he showed me the other one "This is the new package," he said. It was prettier, more graceful, a definite improvement. Then he showed me the small print tucked away in an inconspicuous corner of the container. The old package held 6½ ounces; the new, 5 ounces. And they sold for the same price.

These examples illustrate two specific practices the truth in packaging bill would correct. The Federal Trade Commission or the Food and Drug Administration would be authorized, after a finding of confusion and industry hearings, to set up weights and measures in which a particular type of product might be sold. Instead of competing brands selling, for example, in 13½, 14½, and 17½ ounce packages, it would be easier for the houswife to figure her best buy if more standard sizes were offered—1 pound, a half-pound, and so on. This would also eliminate the phony bargains—the "large economy size" that has nothing to do with economy, that's just gimmicked up with strange fractional sizes till it would take a mathematical genius to figure it out.

The other practice I refer to is the manner in which the net amount of the product is indicated on the package. If you need reassurance as to the inventiveness of the human brain, when it really goes to work, just try to find the net weights on some of these packages. Borders and bottoms are popular places to put these figures. You'd better take along your bifocals, too, and a magnifying glass just to be sure. And it's interesting how often light blue figures show up on a dark blue background, or some such combination, showing that some enterprising package designer has been doing his optics homework.

My bill would require that the figures that tell how much is really in there be prominently displayed, in readable type, on the front of the package.

Like my corner druggist, the fellows in the supermarkets have their problems with this merchandising world they never made. "It's rough," the harassed young manager of a supermarket told me, "The manufacturers keep making their boxes bigger and bigger to get shelf space. They make them high and wide and thin so as to give their product as big a display as possible. One time I rebelled and stacked them endwise on the shelves, but I didn't get away with it for long."

This brings us to another abuse my bill would correct. While the manufacturers are outdoing each other in increasing the size of the packages, are they also increasing the amount of the product? In the words of Eliza Doolittle, heroine of "My Fair Lady"—"Not bloody likely." When you get a bigger package and the same amount inside, you get what is known in the trade as "slack fill." Just go around any market jiggling packages and you'll see what I mean, although you're no doubt conscious of it already.

Cases often play an important part in this sort of deception. I'm sure you've bought what looked to be a 6-inch candy bar only to find there were only 4 inches of candy—the rest was cardboard tray.

Penny ante stuff, some say. After all, "Let the buyer beware" is an old warning that still holds good. But I don't believe this at all. The consumer deserves both protection and information. These nickels and dimes adds up to 30 percent of the family budget, and to $70 billion annually in retail sales. I do not believe that all responsibility should be passed along to the shopping housewife.

During the hearings on my bill, some opponents said, for example, that the housewife is smart enough to know that when a label says, "serves eight" what it really means is "serves four." But what did it cost her before she realized this "truth"? And must the housewife adjust her thinking to deceptions?

I well remember something Marya Mannes, a New York writer and housewife, said at the hearings:

"Without trust, a civilized society cannot endure. When the people who are too smart to be good fool the people who are too good to be smart, then society begins to crumble."

You have probably gathered by now that the truth-in-packaging bill has run into some formidable opposition. The industries that oppose it represent minimum yearly sales of $100 billion—or approximately one-sixth of the gross national product. And money is power. Millions of sheets of paper have been consumed in press releases and reports sent to anyone industry thought could be convinced the bill was frightful legislation. One group of business home economists was told to get out and work against the bill or they might lose their jobs. There are editorial services in Washington, supported by business, that send out editorials against truth in packaging which are used by hundreds of small newspapers across the Nation, papers that rely on canned editorials. A little truth in canning might be apropos in this particular product.

What national forum do we have? Two large-circulation magazines retained writers to do stories on truth in packaging, but the stories somehow have never seen print. Three times I have had television appearances canceled and have been told privately it was because advertisers had protested.

We do have the support of the major unions, the National Consumers League, the Cooperative League, National Federation of Business and Professional Women, National Retired Teachers Association and American Association of Retired Persons, among others. But this is part-time aid, while our opponents have highly skilled, highly paid forces working consistently and full-time against us.

What are their arguments? Government interference is one, as you might expect. The Wall Street Journal said in an editorial:

"Behind the idea that the consumer is not very bright and that only the Government can make rational decisions lies a sort of arrogance that might itself be called inexcusable."

Well, I'm sure people were saying the same thing when the battles for child-labor laws and legislation that would protect the stock market investor were going on.

On the Antitrust and Monopoly Subcommittee, two Republican Senators have opposed the bill. Each is an effective legislator and holds his view strongly.

Senator EVERETT DIRKSEN, of Illinois, has said:

"Good Housekeeping survey says 95 percent of women read labels and are informed. The standardization and regimentation provisions of the bill will cause such great increase in costs of production that the consumer will have to pay higher prices. The consumer will be denied new, better, and greater variety of products. The proposed law would curtail the employment of engineers, draftsmen, designers, molders of glass, plastics, steel and tinplate, machinery workers, tool and die workers, and many others needed in the innovation and expansion of packaged products."

Senator ROMAN L. HRUSKA, of Nebraska, has said:

"The measure's approach regards our people as childlike, as helpless, as so confused that they require, for their own protection, benevolent, firm guidance from the Government. Behind this bill is a thinly veiled accusation. It holds that, if not in every instance, then in unacceptable numbers, the businessmen of our country are corrupt, exploitive, and conniving. They are disposed to cheat or lie. Driven by dollar lust they wantonly transgress all rules of fairplay. If enacted, such a bill would make the consumer pay substantially more for the same products. It seeks to expand uniformity and shrink variety. It is a bill which cavalierly bestows broad areas of congressional responsibility upon appointive officials insulated from direct citizen control."

Of all the things that have been written or said about the bill, one of the most interesting to me was an article in Business Week, hardly a publication that could be expected to be partial to our side of the story. It said in part:

"Next time you're in a supermarket, take a close look at the packages on the shelves. There are a lot of changes going on—quietly * * *. Statements of net weights are in bigger letters * * *. Large economy sizes are now referred to as simply large. Much of this is the result of the so-called truth in packaging bill introduced by Senator PHILIP A. HART and currently being kicked around in the Senate Judiciary Committee. The bill may never be passed. But its mere introduction, after extensive hearings, has already achieved much of what the bill set out to do—to prohibit 'the use of unfair and deceptive methods of packaging or labeling certain consumer commodities * * *.' Ever since HART started stirring things up a couple of years ago, executives of companies manufacturing products found on supermarket shelves have been running to Washington to protest the bill. But at the same time, they have been busily changing packaging that HART might object to."

Well, I'm happy that the mere threat of the bill has had such a wholesome effect, but I still think we need a truth-in-packaging law, and I think we're going to get it. President Johnson is strongly in favor of it. Not long after he took office, following John F. Kennedy's assassination, he held to the policy of President Kennedy by giving a speech before Congress called the message on consumer interests, in which he said: "For far too long, the consumer has had too little voice and too little weight in Government." An entire section of that historic message was devoted to truth in packaging. President Johnson pointed out that in July 1962, President Kennedy had established the Consumer Advisory Council, and that in 1963, he himself had appointed a Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, as well as a President's Committee on Consumer Interests.

So the administration is very much with us. In the House of Representatives, my colleague, Representative EMANUEL CELLER, has introduced a companion bill, and we have high hopes that the bills will have smoother sailings in this session of Congress.

Not all packaging is misleading or deceptive. But honest packagers feel the pressure of competition with the gimmick-type packagers. Our bill can aid not just the consumer but honest businessmen as well. The truth-in-packaging bill is a pioneering piece of legislation, and this is one reason it has had such a rocky road so far. For there is no big money behind this bill; there are only people. People like you.

A STORY FOR OUR TIMES—OR, WHAT IS THE CHAIRMAN OF GENERAL FOODS REALLY TRYING TO SAY TO MARY JONES?

It will soon be 4 years since Senator PHILIP A. HART began the exhaustive inquiry that led to the proposed truth-in-packaging bill. With five volumes of hearings and a favorable subcommitte report behind it, that legislation is to have another chance in this session of Congress. But something has been added to the legislative outlook. This year the food industry has succeeded in pulling its pressure groups together for an all-out, no-holds-barred drive to defeat truth in packaging.

It has taken time to orient fully such a behemoth as this $80 billion industry can command. There are over a hundred separate national trade associations in the food processing business alone, among them such giants in their own right as the National Canners Association. Then there are the organizations of the industries selling packaging supplies and equipment to food processors—the bottlers, box makers, glass manufacturers, paperboard suppliers, packaging machinery manufacturers, and the like. There are also the many trade associations of food brokers, wholesale, retailers, and supermarket chains. And there are those in the allied industries selling in food outlets—branders of soft drinks, paper products, household supplies, etc. Beneath this array of national groups are thousands of State and local replicas. At the peak of the pyramid is the Grocery Manufacturer's Association, known in the trade as GMA. And finally, there are the two superpeaks—the Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the National Association of Manufacturers.

DESIGN FOR POWER

Despite its proportions, communication throughout this commercial network is fairly effective. A trade press serves each particular group. National, regional, and State conferences are held annually, and between times trade association secretaries at all levels can keep in close touch with their members. Thus any one of the organizations at any time, or all of them at once, can be deployed in a legislative drive. Local bottler associations, for example, can take over the job of talking to Congressmen in their home areas while chambers of commerce whip up a letter-and-telegram campaign to Washington, D.C., where the bigtime GMA lobbyists pinpoint the pressure on the leaders of both the House and Senate.

There is nothing new or unknown about all this, of course. The struggle for consumer legislation usually encounters opposition in depth. The novel thing about truth in packaging is that a fortuitous set of circumstances gave the consumer an early edge, which so alarmed the industry that it has come right out into the open with one of the most shameless power plays in some time. The story of how it happened is a most instructive tale of our times.

A DIVIDED BEGINNING

The consumer's initial advantage derived from the division that deceptive packaging had wrought in the ranks of the food giants. As self-service in supermarkets came to dominate food retailing, the package became an important brand-switching device—that is, a means for diverting customers, at the point of sale from brand A to brand B. In this respect, packaging functioned as brand advertising always has; but unlike advertising, over which some controls exist, the use of packaging as a promotional weapon was practically uncontrolled. In any hard-sell game lacking rules and a referee, the play is bound to get rough. And so it did in packaging. As the pace of sharp practices succeeding sharp practices speeded up, the packagers themselves were harried by the rat race. Thus when Senator HART launched his inquiry into deceptive packaging, some elements of the food industry were not too unhappy.

The consumer testimony at those hearings, however, came as a dreadful surprise to the industry. Sellers, preoccupied with their own aggravations had ignored the effect of their conduct on consumers. However, as one witness after another cited packaging malpractices in baby foods, cereals, cooking oils, canned goods, cake mixes, detergents, frozen foods, cookies, candy, crackers, scouring pads, paper napkins, soft drinks, fruit juices, bread, toothpaste, bacon, et al., the point got across. Advertising Age was moved to comment:

"There are a good many things about governmental probes that we don't like, and we have the continuing feeling that the investigators can do better with their time and energies in most instances, than by fooling around with relatively minor points in marketing or advertising.

"Yet we must confess that, as consumers, our sympathy lies with the statements of Senator HART's subcommittee which concern deception, and particularly deceptive packaging. It would be nicer, we think, to live in a simple world in which "pound" packages contained 16 ounces and not 15 or 14½; in which "quart" bottles were actually quarts, not fifths, or even maybe 25 ounces; in which packages containing the same weight or volume didn't look as though one were twice as big as another * * * and so on.

"Individual sizes and shapes, we suspect, have been created to the point where they no longer serve any useful purpose, even as merchandising devices. A little standardization might help everyone."

Other trade papers were also impressed. Food & Drug Packaging, for example, described the testimony as the "rumblings of consumer discontent" erupting "into a full-blown packaging controversy." But it was not the trade comment that jolted the food industry. It was what occurred in the public press, and on radio and television.

Consumer issues, especially those dealing with such economic cheats as deceptive packaging, seldom receive much attention from the mass media. This time it was different. Although no one could say that the Nation's news services were swept off their feet, they did report the issue. Moreover, deceptive packaging made good pictures. So deceptive packages were shown before a few television cameras to illustrate what consumers were complaining about, and headlines like "The grocery cart is being used to take shoppers for a ride" topped news stories. Columnists took up the theme to produce copy like this, from "Our Man Hoppe," in the San Francisco Chronicle:

"My trouble is I'm a good shopper. And I demand the best buys. Which is really very simple. Because the law says the net contents must be labeled on every package of edibles. * * * So all you do is divide contents into price * * *. So I look at my list and it says "1 pound rice." Fine. Did you know you can't buy 1 pound rice? Not in my supermarket, you can't. You can buy 14 ounces for 29 cents, 12 ounces for 25 cents, 1 pound, 12 ounces for 35 cents, 1 pound, 8 ounces for 47 cents or 2 pounds, 10 ounces for 59 cents.

The rational way to approach this is to figure the cost of each per pound. Simple. A pound is 16 ounces. Thus our formula in the first example is: 14 is to 16 as 29 is to x. So 14x equals 16x29, which is * * *. Well, you know. And so forth."

It hardly needs saying that many newspaper editorials called Senator HART silly ("our housewives are too smart to be fooled") or sinister ("regulation will curb the freedom of enterprising packagers"). But the food industry, so long accustomed to a docile press, was not looking for a dialogue. The trade paper Packaging pointed to the industry's objective when it wrote in the August 1962 issue, "If we don't smother all this talk about how the consumer is being deceived and cheated, our whole economy will emerge sell shocked."

By that time, more than a year after the first hearings, a second set of hearings was in the offing, this time on the legislation that had developed out of the investigation. The food industry had meanwhile pulled itself together. It was opposed to any packaging law. And it was even more opposed to any further exposure of its misdoings.

It fell to the lot of the president of the Grocery Manufacturers Association to make the food industry's position unmistakably clear to the Nation's news media. So a few months before the second set of hearings began in March 1963, GMA's President Paul Willis laid it on the line in a speech at the Television Bureau of Advertising's annual convention. He told his audience that he had met with 16 top management people from national magazines. "We wanted to discuss with them the facts of life covering advertising-made relationships," he said. He reported that he had suggested to the publishers "that the day was here when their editorial department and business department might better understand their interdependency relationships as they affect the operating results of their company; and as their operations affect the advertiser—their bread and butter."

The magazine people, he continued, had understood. They had begun to run articles to create a favorable public attitude toward food advertisers. He regretted, however, that he could not say "similar nice things about the relationship of our advertisers with television." "Television stations received, he pointed out, "about 65 percent of their advertising revenue from GMA members." These advertisers, he said, "have seen some television newscasts where they seemingly took great delight in bellowing out stories that were critical of this industry." He referred to Senator HART's hearings specifically in complaining of critics who "used isolated cases as examples of wrongdoings and smudged the entire food industry." And he closed his remarks with a question: "What can you do additionally that will influence your advertiser to spend more of his advertising dollar with you?"

The broadcasters, it appeared, knew the answer. Except for a mention on NBC's "Huntley-Brinkley Report" and a reference on that network's program "Calendar," television, so far as CU has been able to find, paid no attention to the 1963 packaging hearings. On radio, only the labor-sponsored commentator, Edward P. Morgan (ABC) gave news about them. And since then, several scheduled television appearances of Senator HART have been canceled. "Off the record, I was told advertisers had objected," he said.

THE NEW PHASE

So the food industry enters the 1965 legislative year with its trade groups coordinated and the news media under control. A new phase begins in the campaign against a deceptive packaging law. An article in a recent issue of Look may suggest what this new phase is.

Look was named by GMA's Paul Willis, along with Reader's Digest, Life, Saturday Evening Post, Ladies' Home Journal, Good Housekeeping, and others, as being among the magazines whose editorial departments had agreed to cooperate with food advertisers. In the January 26, 1965, issue, Look's editorial pages displayed the byline of an advertiser, Charles G. Mortimer, chairman of General Foods Corp., as the author of an article, "Let's Keep Politics Out of the Pantry."

Mr. Mortimer's essay elaborates familiar themes. He salutes the American housewife, whom he calls Mary Jones. He finds her a shrewd and happy woman—shrewd because when it comes to clever buying she can give lessons to a Yankee horse trader and happy because she takes it for granted that what she has bought is the purest, most nutritious, easiest-to-prepare food the world has ever seen. He pays handsome tribute to the laws safeguarding our food in making his point about how confident Mary Jones can be when she shops, evidently assuming her (and the reader's) unawareness of the fight the food industry waged against the passage of the very laws he praises. (Recorded against his own company, incidentally, are 28 violations in the last 25 years against one of those laws, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.)

What disturbs him deeply, Mr. Mortimer writes, is that Mary Jones probably does not know that her great good fortune as a food shopper results from the machinery of free competition—a free competition that is the heart of our free-enterprise system. The sophisticated reader will find Mr. Mortimer's eulogies to competition even more intriguing than his fond protestations on behalf of existing governmental regulations over food. For he is, after all, the chairman of a food combine that is the Nation's largest and a prime example of what the Federal Trade Commission has called economic power and market concentration created by the great merger movement. General Foods was created in the 1920s by mergers; it grew into a huge empire by still other mergers (it markets 250 products); it is currently challenging an FTC order, issued under the antimonopoly law, to dissolve a more recent merger; and the earnings from its many merger acquired companies are such that it commands over $100 million worth of market-manipulative advertising power a year.

Yet the chairman of the General Foods Corp. finds competition endangered by, you guessed it, Senator HART. The sequence of his thought gets a bit fuzzy as he develops that idea. It seems to go like this: Competition is good. The food industry has made Mary Jones happy and that is a good thing. So the food industry is good. Therefore the food industry is competitive. Ergo anything that might upset Mary Jones is an attack on competition. And that is what "some Government officials * * * 'playing politics in the pantry'" are up to. They are causing "consumers to question the very system the Mary Joneses of this country find so satisfactory," Esther Peterson, the President's Special Assistant for Consumer Affairs, is the only Government official named, aside from Senator HART. When she urged housewives to send in complaints to her, she "created doubts in the minds of consumers where none had existed," thereby threatening the happy, but apparently fragile, confidence of Mary Jones. Senator HART's threat is, of course, truth-in-packaging.

IF INTEREST SHOULD PROVE HIGH

After the article appeared, Senator HART wrote to Look's publisher and editor in chief, Gardner Cowles, pointing out that the legislation had been inaccurately described, suggesting that there was another side to the packaging issue, and asking whether he (Senator HART) might not be given the opportunity to clarify some of these matters for the readers of Look. Mr. Cowles replied, saying: "I will be interested to see how much attention the general public pays to this subject in the next several months." If interest should prove high, he might consider asking the Senator to do something on the subject, he indicated. He went on to say, however: "It is my present guess that the public does not feel any strong need for reform in the area Mr. Mortimer was discussing; but I could be wrong."

Look added a final fillip to its latest venture into cooperative publishing by taking full-page ads in other magazines, including a number of the trade journals read by GMA members, to publicize its sponsorship of "this compelling article." And very likely Look will pull out the plums that go with being such a good boy. The comic opera aspects of Mr. Mortimer's overtures to Mary Jones and Look's unabashed exploitation of them, however, cannot lighten the somber implication of this story for our times.

MISSOURI JACKSON DAY ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE ORVILLE L. FREEMAN

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, one of the traditional highlights of the year for the Democratic Party in Missouri is our Jackson Day dinner. This widely known event, held in Springfield, regularly attracts hundreds of Missourians from throughout the State to enjoy good Democratic fellowship.

This year our gathering had the great honor and pleasure of hearing an excellent address by the distinguished Secretary of Agriculture, Orville L. Freeman.

Mr. President, I would like to ask unanimous consent to have the Secretary's fine remarks, "Democrats and the Great Society," printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEMOCRATS AND THE GREAT SOCIETY

(Address by Orville L. Freeman, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture, at Jackson Day banquet program, Shrine Mosque, Springfield, Mo., Mar. 27, 1965)

My fellow Democrats, for hundreds of years the words most frequently repeated to signal the arrival of spring are these from "The Songs of Solomon":

> "The winter is past, the rain is over and gone;
> The flowers appear on the earth; the time of the singing of birds is come, and the voice of the turtle is heard in our land."

Another voice heard in the spring is the voice of the Democratic Party, calling the faithful together in the name of the party's legendary heroes, such as Andrew Jackson.

Across the Midwest, the Jackson Day rally is as much a sign of the new season as the first robin, the first burst of blossoms, a boy swinging a bat, or a girl skipping rope.

For the first time in many years I was unable to attend the observance held a couple of weeks ago in my home State. I knew genuine disappointment. I missed the transfusion of enthusiasm, the sense of belonging, that comes from being at the same place at the same time with other Democrats.

You have erased that disappointment. You have restored my sense of participation by inviting me to join in this nationally known rally of Missouri Democrats. For the joy, the excitement, the challenge contained in being a member of the Democratic Party are not based in geography. Rather, they have their roots in the spirit and the purpose of people—and wherever Democrats are gathered a Democrat is on familiar, homelike ground.

I feel at home tonight. I have a renewed sense of being in—and of—the Democratic Party. It is a good feeling, and I am grateful to you for giving it to me.

I am grateful, too, for the privilege of being in Missouri at a homecoming time for your U.S. Senators. During much of each year, when their duties keep them in Washington, I probably see STUART SYMINGTON and ED LONG more often than do you—and I am the better for it. I am constantly enriched by their wise and kindly counsel, inspired by their dedication to public service, and warmed by their friendship.

And, as a former member of the club, I know a feeling of kinship with Governor Hearnes. There are few greater honors a man can know than election as Governor of one of the United States. By the same token, there are few greater responsibilities a man can carry.

It is good to rub shoulders with U.S. Senators, Governors, State and county officials, and legislators. Yet, on an occasion such as this, only two titles really are important and they are best used in combination: American and Democrat.

One can be an American citizen without being a Democrat. But the history of our Nation shows you can double your contribution to our society's progress by wearing both titles with pride and purpose.

Republicans, as their speeches during the last campaign proved, can be pretty funny. But Democrats have most of the fun. Of course, in that connection, I think Democrats have some built-in advantages over Republicans.

We don't have to figure out who President Eisenhower favors for our Presidential nominations. We don't have to read whodunits written by Dean Burch. We don't have to tell George Romney that the Republicans went thataway. We don't have to give engineering lessons to Bill Scranton so he'll know why the roof caved in at the Cow Palace. Nor do we have to find new homes for Richard Nixon.

So I intend to be tactful in relationship to Republicans—tactful like the stewardess in a highflying jet plane who had among her passengers a rambunctious little boy.

This youngster sort of took the plane over. He rompted up and down the passageway, fired his water pistol at the other passengers, scattered the magazines and—as the stewardess was moving down the aisle with a tray of coffee—he threw a football block that dropped her to the deck. The young lady calmly picked herself up, recovered the scattered cups, looked with a smile upon the little boy and—with a gentle pat on his head—suggested: "Sonny, why don't you run outside and play?"

I want to be tactful in relationship to the Republican Party, and concede that we must have a strong two-party system in our Government, with a proper ratio of Republicans and Democrats elected to public office.

And I would concede the ratio the voters established in the 1964 elections is just about right.

I hope it is maintained—even improved in some congressional districts—until more of the unfinished business of Government is finished.

Our Democratic Party, here in the great heartland of America, knew its finest hour on election day in 1964. The great majority of our fellow citizens made it clear they want to maintain—even accelerate—the momentum of progress. And while our party is always more concerned with the challenges ahead than achievements recorded, a political victory of such magnitude merits celebration.

And Missouri is the proper place for celebrating.

Missouri won admission to the Union earlier than its sister States to the west and the north. It started statehood by setting a good example for those which were to come along later. The first U.S. Senator elected from Missouri for a 6-year term, Thomas Hart Benton, was a Democrat. He thought like a Democrat, talked like a Democrat, voted like a Democrat.

So Missouri was setting a good example in the philosophy of government for the Midwest long before those States which came along later in the 1800's caught the hang of it. For example, the Democratic Party of today in Minnesota is a creation that occurred in my own lifetime.

I can remember when the future for a Democrat in Minnesota, or Iowa, was about the same as the prospect for collecting a world's series cut as a member of the Kansas City A's or the Washington Senators. It was as a boy on my grandfather's farm I learned what political martyrdom meant.

There was a man in grandfather's township who had grown old in the service of the Democratic Party. Year after year he enthusiastically carried its banner into the elections, and year after year he met defeat. One day, not feeling well, he dropped in to see his doctor and have a physical examination. The doctor reported his heart was in bad shape, and could stop beating any minute.

The man grabbed his hat and coat and raced toward the door. "Where are you going in such a hurry," the doctor inquired, "to write your will?"

"No sirree," was the reply. "I'm going to the courthouse to change my party affiliation from Democrat to Republican. If somebody's got to go, I want it to be one of them!"

But today Minnesota is more like Missouri. We're writing our political record in registration and voting statistics—not in the vital statistics. And last November my State took another leaf from Missouri's political history book—it provided our Nation with a Vice President.

I am content to give the Republican Party tactful attention. The other thing they need to be given from time to time is given best by Harry S. Truman—and you know what it it is and so do the Republicans.

We have a right to celebrate the Democratic Party's achievements of the 1960's—not just because we've been winning elections, but because we've been winning for the right reasons and turning promise into performance.

Let's look at the record:

The steady growth of our economy is moving into its fifth year. Judged by longevity, the growth period will establish a new peacetime record in a little more than a month—on the first day of May.

Since February 1961, the real gross national product has risen at an average rate of 5 percent per year.

The rate of unemployment has fallen from almost 7 to 5 percent. Compared with a year ago, in January 1965 we had in our economy 1,750,000 more jobs, and about a half- million fewer names on the list of unemployed.

We are headed toward a record 10-million-unit year in automobile production. I know those of us who are in cities have the feeling all 10 million of them are already on the streets where we work and live, but they aren't—not yet.

Net farm income has been running about a billion dollars a year above the last Republican year, 1960.

We have fired the first big gun in the effort to wipe out poverty with the Economic Opportunity Act.

Not even in the dynamic New Deal days of Franklin Delano Roosevelt, and the dramatic decisionmaking days of Harry Truman, did this Nation know more daring and doing than marked the 1961-64 era under the leadership of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson.

The voters went to the polling places on election day 1964 liking what they had seen and experienced.

And they told the Democratic Party, with their ballots, to get on with the building of the Great Society.

They elected Lyndon B. Johnson to serve as the leader. They elected enough Democratic Representatives and Senators to make sure the building tools would be provided.

But now mark this down:

They'll hold the Democratic Party responsible for the quality of the construction.

Our party's success in the elections of 1966 and 1968 will be determined by how well we perform, not only as Democratic Party members, but as responsible citizens determined to make democracy work in the days of this odd-numbered year.

They can be the best days in the best year of our lives.

This is a nation with power to match every potential.

At no other time in history has a people been audacious enough to wage all-out war on poverty and demand unconditional surrender.

We're doing it.

At no other time in history has a people been imaginative enough to look at life in terms of quantity and quality simultaneously.

At no other time in history has a nation resolved that everyone shall know equality of opportunity—equality of opportunity not only in the acquisition of things, but also in the enrichment of spirit through the arts and enjoyment of beauty and outdoor recreation.

We have that imagination, we have that determination.

And things are happening all around us.

With the year 1965 less than a hundred days gone, and with the inauguration of the President and Vice President and the beginning of the new Congress still fresh memories, a fantastic record of achievement is already in the record.

On the economic opportunity front Job Corps camps are functioning—communities are buzzing with action projects—and the Department of Agriculture has already made 2,000 loans to low-income rural families to help them improve their earning powers.

The concept of regional development has been made a reality in Appalachia, and we are committed to carry it into other areas of the Nation.

Out from the Rules Committee and into the House of Representatives this week came the most sweeping proposals for health care of the aged and upgrading the quality of social security this Nation has known since the Democratic Party invented social security three decades ago. All Americans, of every age, will experience a greater sense of decency in this concern for the dignity of our senior citizens.

The Congress is acting on the President's great program for improving the scope and quality of education, beginning with the preschool child.

We are making corrective and constructive actions in the fields of mental health, mental retardation, water pollution, and beautification of both city and countryside a part of continuing national policy.

We are implementing the great Civil Rights Act of 1964 and now—in response to the great call for action by the President that won warm response not only in this Nation but throughout the world—we shall make freedom truly ring in the voting places for every man and woman regardless of race or color or creed.

All this—and spring is only 7 days old.

Of course, there are always some who lag back. They are the fainthearted, the unimaginative, the weary in mind and spirit who cite the hazards—belittle human nature—and discount the call to greatness that can make deeds out of dreams. We've always had them. But look here.

There was a time, not too long ago, when nearly every county in the Midwest had a poorhouse, a place where the poor—particularly the elderly poor—could be kept out of sight and out of mind. But only this week, in Little Rock County, Ark., I visited new homes for elderly citizens—nice, neat, personalized homes—they were buying at the rate of $20 a month. A society which rid itself of poorhouses can rid itself of poor housing in the cities and on the countryside.

There was a time—a recent time—when you and I and every parent faced the constant fear that polio would strike our sons and daughters. That fear has been erased. And a society that can stop the crippling of children's bodies by polio can provide—for all children—the kind of education that will prevent ignorance and illiteracy from crippling their lives.

When you and I were youngsters we would look at the full moon on a summer night and wonder if there really were a man up there. The children of today will see a real man there—and for some of them it will be a man who usually lives right next door. A society that can send its men into clean, clear space can take pollution from its streams and ugliness from its streets and highways.

There was a time when the average American farm could produce only enough food and fiber each year for himself and five others. Now, because he has fully utilized technological advances and increased his skills and knowledge, he can provide enough each year for himself and 30 others.

America's farm families have created an era not known before in all the world's history—an era of food abundance. They made possible the breakthrough into the Great Society, because a nation that has to devote the major share of its resources and energies to just getting enough to eat has little left over to invest in the climb to the Great Society.

A society that knows this abundance can do what it isn't doing now: Make it possible for the farmers who provide it to realize parity of income. And it will.

In this year of 1965 we are on the move.

A cabdriver in Washington took a foreign tourist to the Archives Building one day, and waited for him to complete his visit. When the man returned to the cab he pointed to the words engraved on the building—the words reading "The Past Is Prologue"—and asked their meaning.

The cabdriver scratched his head, thought a minute, then replied: "Those words mean this: 'You ain't seen nothin' yet.'"

So let us resolve here tonight that the year 1965 shall go down in history as the year of horizons unlimited.

But that can be done, and the Great Society advanced, only if you and I care and lead and act.

The power to do the necessary things come from the same source as the strength for victory in political campaigns—from people, at the precinct level.

The Democratic Party wins because, in every community, there are men and women who canvass, who carry the facts about issues to their neighbors, who encourage full utilization of political freedom.

Victory over poverty—the injection of greater quality into life at physical and cultural and spiritual levels—will be achieved by the people, for the people, where the people are—in every community and on every farm, big and small, across the land.

Our President can lead. He can show us the way. But only the people can make it happen.

Once there was a good and great teacher, admired and loved by his students. In his lectures he quite often referred to his garden, and the students concluded that garden must, indeed, be a lovely place. One day they asked if they might see it, and he took them there. They were disappointed.

"It is not very wide," said one.

"Nor very long," added another.

The kindly teacher smiled, and agreed. "No," he said, "it is not very long—this garden. Nor very wide. But look up—look up and see how high it is."

Sometimes, within the boundaries of our jobs and our homes, we are tempted to feel our opportunities for service to our country are not very wide, or very long.

Let's keep looking up—so we'll know how high they can go.

Like the horizons, the future is unlimited if we will it—and make it—so.

Last fall the voters told Democrats to be about making it great.

So, let's be about it.

PUBLIC POLICY FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I am submitting to the Senate today an up-to-date selected bibliography of recent articles, books, monographs, and documents which deal with "Public

Policy for Research and Development." This bibliography will, I hope, be of use to Members of the 89th Congress and their staffs. And perhaps it can be of use to the rapidly growing constituency of American citizens who are deeply interested in the future of Federal policy for research and development.

I ask unanimous consent that this bibliography be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, since the Second World War, the Federal Government has become increasingly involved in making policies which affect the research and development of new ideas and new products. Today, the executive departments and the Congress bear heavy responsibilities in formulating policy for research and development.

According to the President's budget for fiscal year 1966, we are being asked to authorize the spending of more than 15 billion research and development dollars for the next fiscal year. The budget calls for $9.9 billion in obligations for development and $5.5 billion in obligations for research.

While development spending is leveling off, the $5.5 billion for research will mean a $0.5 billion increase over fiscal year 1965. This important increase reflects programs of basic and applied research to accomplish the long-range mission objectives of the Department of Defense. It also reflects the medical, environmental health, and educational research programs of the Department of Helath, Education, and Welfare and general support of basic research through the National Science Foundation. Compare the budgeted 5.5 billion research dollars with the 1.1 billion research dollars we obligated for fiscal year 1958—a 500-percent increase in just 7 years.

Therefore, in my opinion, this Congress must spend more time than ever before in creating and improving public policy for science. This Congress will recognize, I am sure, the tremendous opportunity research and development offers for improving the social and economic vitality of this Nation.

We must give more attention to the challenge of research for improving public health and for combatting disease. We must give more attention to research on urban and transportation problems—as well as to the need for space and defense research. We must take action on proposals for supporting research in the humanities as well as in the basic sciences.

As changes and shifts in defense spending occur, we must give careful attention to the reallocation of research and development resources from defense to civilian needs. And we must respond to the clogged flow of scientific information by acting to promote the dissemination and utilization of technical information.

It remains our task to establish the priorities in Federal spending for research and development. It is our task to sort out the competition and confusion which is evolving among agencies and departments whose research and development missions overlap. And it may well be our task to effect some government reorganization in order to smooth out the total Federal research and development process.

Devising policy for Federal support and financing of research and development is a complicated business. Yet it is this task which links us with the future, which helps guarantee that our economy will never stagnate, that America will not be blind to new avenues toward progress and prosperity.

Mr. President, the astonishing brilliance of American science and technology has already earned a prominent place in the history of civilization. With science and technology, we stand today at the very edge of time, straining every sinew of mind and body into the winds of future. With science and technology stand the unspoken hopes of generations to come. And with science and technology stand our dreams for a material and spiritual world, which through its search for knowledge finds wisdom, through the toil of its hands finds creativity, and through the call of its conscience finds cooperation, unity and peace among nations.

Exhibit 1

Periodical Articles

Abelson, Philip Hauge. A critical appraisal of goverment research policy. Robert A. Welch Foundation Research Bulletin, No. 14, November 1963; whole issue.

A scientist in the White House [interview with George Kistiakowsky] International Science and Technology, No. 34, October 1964, pp. 49–57.

Caldwell, Lynton K. Biopolitics: science, ethics, and public policy. Yale Review, v. 54, Autumn 1964, pp. 1–16.

Cooper, Arnold C. R & D is more efficient in small companies—in the sense of getting more results per dollar of expenditure. Harvard business review, v. 42, May–June 1964: 75–83.

Collier, Donald W. A civilian looks at government-sponsored R & D. Armed forces management, v. 10, Jan. 1964. 29–32.

Daddario, Emilio Q. Setting technological goals in a pluralistic society. Air Force and space digest, v. 47, Apr. 1964: 53–56.

A $5 million search for answers. Business week, July 4, 1964: 84–86.

Fubini, Eugene C. Down-to-earth research. Ordnance, v. 48, Mar.–Apr. 1964: 521–525.

Fubini, Eugene C. Pentagon research leader hits "gloom and doom" talk about budget cuts. Army, Navy, Air Force journal register, v. 101, July 18, 1964: 16–17, 24.

Fusfeld, H. I. Effect of government expenditures on long-range industrial research. Research management, v. 7, Mar. 1964: 107–128.

The economics and politics of arms reduction. Bulletin of the atomic scientists, v. 20, Apr. 1964: 6–23.

The federal government in behavioral science. The American behavioral scientist, v. 7, May 1964: whole issue.

Federal support of science: a formula for cooperation. Science, v. 143, Mar. 20, 1964: 1300–1303.

Greenfield, Reg. Science goes to Washington. Reporter, v. 29, Sept. 26, 1963, 20–26.

Gross, Paul M. The fifth estate in the seventh decade. Science, v. 143, January 3, 1964, pp. 13–20.

Haase, Peter and Frank Lynn. Technology and the industrial future. Frontier, v. 25, Spring 1964: 14–17.

Hornig, Donald F. The President's Special Assistant for Science and Technology addresses the American Physical Society. Physics Today, v. 17, July 1964, pp. 34–38.

Johnson, President Lyndon B. Remarks at the 18th annual dinner of the Weizmann Institute of Science, New York, February 6, 1964. [In extension of remarks of Hon. Leonard Farbstein, Congressional Record, vol. 110, pt. 3, pp. 2297–2298.

Kirk, Grayson. University research—testimony on federal aid to education. Columbia University forum, v. 7, Winter 1964: 38–47.

Klaw, Spencer. The nationalization of U.S. science. Fortune, v. 70, Sept. 1964: 158–160, 180, 182, 185.

Letters. Government and science; how science policy is developed, by J. Herbert Hollomon. Science, v. 143, January 31, 1964, pp. 427–429.

Margolis, Howard. R and D on Capitol Hill. Bulletin of the atomic scientists, v. 20, May 1964: 33–37.

Merbaum, Richard. RAND: technocrats and power. New university thought, v. 3, Dec.-Jan. 1964: 45–57.

Meathene, Emmanuel G. Can only scientists make government science policy? Science, v. 145, July 17, 1964: 237–240.

Nelson, Richard R. Adjusting R and D. Bulletin of the atomic scientists, v. 20, Apr. 1964: 15–19.

Penetration aids: a Space Aeronautics staff report. Space aeronautics, v. 41, Feb. 1964: 47–59.

Roberts, Edward B. How the U.S. buys research. International science and technology, no. 33, Sept. 1964: 70–77.

Schwarz, Urs. The Rand Corporation: Portrait of an American research institute. Swiss review of world affairs, v. 14, Aug. 1964: 12–15, 25.

Seitz, F. A twenty-five year look into the future of research in the Nation—from the point of view of government and academic research. Research management, v. 7, Jan. 1964: 1926.

Shannon, James A. Science and federal programs; the continuing dialogue. Science, v. 144, May 22, 1964: 976–978.

Sherwin, Chalmers W. The management of science in the public interest. Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, v. 20, June 1964; 9–12.

Solo, Robert A. Gearing military R & D to economic growth . . . in order to get the greatest benefit out of our national defense and space effort. Harvard business review, v. 40, Nov.-Dec. 1962: 49–60.

Stearns, John F. National Referral Center for Science and Technology. College and Research libraries, v. 25, May 1964: 205–208.

Stover, Carl F. Technology for cities. National civic review, v. 53, June 1964: 297–300.

Tishler, Dr. Max. The Government's role and the future of discovery. [In extension of remarks of Hon. Thomas B. Curtis, Congressional Record (daily ed.), January 15, 1964, pp. A143–146.]

Tonkin, Leo S. Federal research and the universities. Johns Hopkins magazine, Oct. 1964: 4–32.

Waterman, Alan T. The changing environment of science. Science, v. 147, January 1, 1965, pp. 13–18.

Weidenbaum, Murray L. Building a new age on the scientific discoveries emerging from research—as defense industry adjusts to change. Magazine of Wall Street, v. 114, May 30, 1964: 264–267, 300–302.

What's happening to the Middle West? U.S. news & world report, Oct. 14, 1963.

Wheeler, Harvey. The challenge of "bureaucratized" science. Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, v. 20, January 1964, pp. 14–17.

White House superstructure for science. Chemical and Engineering News, v. 42, October 19, 1964, pp. 78–92.

Wiesner, Jerome B. Science in the affluent society. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, Centennial Celebration, October 23, 1963, v. 50, pp. 1201–1210.

Williamson, Merritt A. A look at national scientific policy. Research development, v. 15, June 1964: 25–26.

Winston, Ellen. Research and public welfare. Welfare on review, v. 2, Sept. 1964: 1–4.

U.S. Government Publications

U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. Reference Research Staff. Synopses of research projects on arms control and disarmament sponsored by the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, February 1962–October 1964. 45 p.

U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. Annual report to Congress for 1963. January 1964. 512 p.

U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. Fundamental nuclear energy research. December 1963. 407 p.

U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. 1963 financial report. October 1963. 57 p.

U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Scientists, engineers, and technicians in the 1960's prepared by Howard V. Stambler for the National Science Foundation. 1964. 68 p.

U.S. Bureau of Public Roads. Highway research and development studies; using Federal-aid research and planning funds; calendar year 1963 or fiscal year 1964. March 1964. 177 p.

U.S. Bureau of the Budget. Report to the President on Government contracting for research and development. May 17, 1962. 92 p. (87th Cong., 2d sess. Senate. Document No. 97.)

U.S. Dept. of Commerce. Office of Technical Services. Scientific and technological communication in the government, by James H. Crawford and others. 1964. 81 p.

U.S. Dept. of Commerce. Office of the Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Science and Technology. Studies in scientific and engineering manpower. Parts I and II. 50 p.

U.S. Federal Council for Science and Technology. 1962 Annual Report, Washington, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President, 1963, 21 p.

——— Federal water resources research activities; memorandum of the chairman to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, United States Senate, transmitting the report to the President on water resources research. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963, 213 p.

——— Federal water resources research program for fiscal year 1965; a progress report of the Committee on Water Resources Research. Washington, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President [for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office] 1964, 65 p.

——— Status report on scientific and technical information in the Federal Government. [A Government research report. Washington, U.S. Department of Commerce, Office of Technical Services] 1963, 18 p.

——— Committee on Natural Resources. Research and development on natural resources; report. Washington, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President [for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office] 1963, 134 p.

——— Interagency Committee on Oceanography. National oceanographic program, Fiscal Year 1965. ICO Pamphlet No. 15, March 1964, 50 p.

——— Interagency Committee on Oceanography. Oceanography—The ten years ahead. A long range national oceanographic plan, 1963–1972. ICO Pamphlet No. 10, June 1963, 58 p.

——— Interdepartmental Committee for Atmospheric Sciences. National atmospheric sciences program, fiscal year 1965. ICAS Report No. 8, October 16, 1963. Washington, Office of Science and Technology, 46 p.

U.S. Federal Council for Science and Technology. Patent Advisory Panel. Progress report to the Federal Council for Science and Technology. June, 1964. 38 p.

U.S. Forest Service. Focus on research: a look into wood utilization.

U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. (Title 14) Aeronautics and space: patent waiver regulations. In U.S. Federal Register, 1. 29, no. 168, August 27, 1964: 12273–12275.

U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Annual and semiannual procurement reports; fiscal year 1961, fiscal year 1962, fiscal year 1963, and July 1, 1963 through December 31, 1963.

U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Conference on New Technology, Lewis Research Center, Cleveland, Ohio, June 4–5, 1964. 156 p.

U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Conference on Space-Age Planning, Chicago, Illinois, May 6–9, 1963. 301 p.

U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Conference on Space, Science, and Urban Life: Dunsmith House, Oakland, California, March 28–30, 1963. 254 p.

U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. NASA and the universities: principal addresses at the general sessions: NASA-University Conference On the Science and Technology of Space Exploration, Chicago, Illinois, November 1, 1962. 91 p.

U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. NASA-Industry Program Plans Conference, Washington, D.C., February 11–12, 1963. 231 p.

U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. NASA installations. September, 1963. 29 p.

U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Proceedings of First National Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space, Tulsa, Oklahoma, May 26–27, 1961. 184 p.

U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Proceedings of the Second National Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Space, Seattle, Washington, May 8–10, 1962. 282 p.

U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Scientific and technical aerospace reports: a semi-monthly abstract journal with indexes, v. 2, no. 18, Sept. 23, 1964. 10 p.

U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Selling to NASA. April 1964. 42 p.

U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Technology utilization program. 1963. 12 p.

U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Ad ministration. Office of Grants and Research Contracts. Grants and research contracts: active grants and contracts. July 1964 (two editions) 59 p. and 103 p.

U.S. National Institutes of Health. Research for health; a report. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1964. 80 p. (U.S. Public Health Service. Publication 1205)

U.S. National Science Foundation. Federal funds for research, development and other scientific activities, fiscal years 1962, 1963, and 1964. v. 12. 1964. 180 p.

U.S. National Science Foundation. Federal organization for scientific activities, 1962. 1963. 598 p.

U.S. National Science Foundation. National trends in R & D funds, 1953–1962. September 1963. (Reviews of data on research and development.)

U.S. National Science Foundation. Profiles of manpower in science and technology. 1963. 36 p.

U.S. National Science Foundation. Research and development in American industry, 1963. September, 1963. (Reviews of data on research and development.)

U.S. National Science Foundation. Research and development in industry, 1961. 1964. 123 p.

U.S. National Science Foundation. Research and other activities of private foundations. 1960.

U.S. National Science Foundation. Science and engineering professional manpower resources in colleges and universities, 1961. January 1963. (Reviews of data on research and development.)

U.S. National Science Foundation. Scientific and technical personnel in industry, 1961. 1963. 84 p.

U.S. National Science Foundation. Scientific research and development in colleges and universities: expenditures and manpower, 1958. 1962. 140 p.

U.S. National Science Foundation. 13th annual report, 1963, year ended June 30, 1964. January 1964. 374 p.

U.S. National Science Foundation. Office of the Comptroller. National Science Foundation grants and contracts awarded fiscal year 1964. (mimeographed)

U.S. Office of Education. Cooperative research projects: 7 year summary.

U.S. Office of the Secretary of Defense. Five year trends in defense procurements, 1958–1962. June 1963. 62 p.

U.S. President, 1961–1963 (Kennedy). White House memorandum from the President addressed to the heads of the Executive departments and agencies on government patent policy with statement attached. October 10, 1963.

U.S. President, 1963– (Lyndon B. Johnson) Message from the President of the United States. United States Aeronautics and Space Activities, 1963: a report for the calendar year 1963 . . . pursuant to the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, Jan. 1964. 148 p.

U.S. President, 1963– (Lyndon B. Johnson) Release on National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. November 14, 1964. 1 p. [Also in Washington Post, Sunday, November 15, 1964, A6.]

U.S. President, 1963– (Johnson) Report to the Congress from the President of the United States: United States Aeronautics and Space Activities 1964. Washington, Executive Office of the President, National Aeronautic and Space Council, 1965. 161 p.

U.S. President's Science Advisory Committee. Strengthening American science, a report. Washington, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1958, 36 p.

——— Introduction to outer space; [an explanatory statement. Washington] 1958, 15 p.

——— Education for the age of science. Washington, 1959, 36 p.

——— Scientific progress, the universities, and the Federal Government; statement. Washington [U.S. Government Printing Office] 1960, 33 p.

——— Report of the panel on food additives [Washington, 1960] 16 p.

——— Life Sciences Panel. Strengthening the behavioral sciences; statement by the Behavioral Sciences Subpanel. Washington 1962, 19 p.

——— Meeting manpower needs in science and technology, a report. Washington, the White House; [for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office] 1962. [No. 1. Graduate training in engineering, mathematics, and physical sciences.]

——— Science, government, and information: the responsibilities of the technical community and the Government in the transfer of information; a report. Washington [for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office] 1963, 52 p.

——— Use of pesticides, a report. Washington, the White House [for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office] 1963, 25 p.

——— Life Sciences Panel. Some new technologies and their promise for the life sciences. Washington [for sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office] 1963, 22 p.

U.S. Public Health Service. A guide to Public Health Service grants and awards. October, 1963. 20 p.

U.S. Public Health Service. Research grants and awards, U.S. Public Health Service, announced during. (Published monthly.)

U.S. Small Business Administration. Research and development: a list of small business concerns interested in performing research and development. May, 1963. 678 p.

U.S. Small Business Administration. Small business guide to government research and development opportunities. 1962. 59 p.

MEMORANDA AND BOOKS

American Council on Education. Special report on federal programs: NASA University Program offers assistance for space research, graduate training of scientists. August 1964. 12 p.

American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research. Special analysis: The Federal Government in behavioral sciences fields, methods, and funds. Washington, 1964. 43 p. (88th Cong., 2d sess. Report no. 4—May 11, 1964)

Barber, Richard J. Economic and legal problems of government patent policies; report prepared for the Subcommittee on Monopoly of the Select Committee on Small Business, United States Senate, June 15, 1963. (88th Cong., 1st sess.) Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1963. Committee print.

Berkner, Lloyd V. The scientific age: the impact of science on society. New Haven, Yale University Press, 1964, 137 p.

Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America. Committee on Science and Technology. Criteria for Federal support of research and development. [Washington, 1964] 17 p.

Cox, Donald William. America's new policy makers; the scientists' rise to power. Philadelphia, Chilton Books, 1964, 298 p.

Current and emerging problems in property rights to R and D and related information. (Kettering Award Address, Founders' Panel) Idea, v. 8, Conference number 1964. [Published by the Patent, Trademark, and Copyright Research Institute of the George Washington University.]

Denver. University. Denver Research Institute. The commerical application of missile/space technology. Prepared by John G. Welles [and others] Parts 1 and 2. Denver, 1963. 253 p.

Evans, Marjorie W. Science, society, and individuals. Menlo Park, California, Stanford Research Institute, 1962, 15 p.

Gilpin, Robert, and Christopher Wright, eds. Scientists and national policy-making. New York, Columbia University Press, 1964. 307 p.

Haskins, Caryl P. The scientific revolution and world politics. New York, Harper & Row, 1964, 115 p.

Loweth, Hugh F. Federal support of research in Midwest colleges and universities. Bureau of the Budget. January 10, 1964.

Martini, Carl H. Impacts of scientific and technological innovations on the role of politics and government. 2d ed. New York, 1964. 106 p.

Massell, Benton F. and Richard R. Nelson. Research and economic growth; the role of public policy. rev. Rand Corporation. August 10, 1961. 17 p.

Midwest Research Institute. Utilization of NASA-generated space technology by Midwestern industry: quarterly progress report. Numbers 8–10. November 1, 1963–July 31, 1964.

Miller, Thomas G., Jr., Strategies for Survival in the Aerospace Industry. Arthur D. Little, Inc., Cambridge, Mass. 1964. 54 p.

Mills, Edwin S. The economics of technical change. Council of Economic Advisors. September 23, 1964. (Memorandum) 11 p.

Murry, Donald A. Scientific research in Missouri. Columbia, Mo., University of Missouri, School of Business and Public Administration, Research Center, 1965. 93 p. (Missouri economic study, 5)

National Academy of Sciences. Committee on Utilization of Scientific and Engineering Manpower. Washington, 1964. 153 p. (Its Publication no. 1191)

National Academy of Sciences. Committee on Science and Public Policy. Federal support of basic research in institutions of higher learning, 1964. 98 p.

National Academy of Sciences. Committee on Science and Public Policy. Panel on Astronomical Facilities. Ground-based astronomy: a ten year program. November 1964. 105 p.

National Academy of Sciences, Committee on Utilization of Scientific and Engineering Manpower. Toward better utilization of scientific and engineering talent: a program for action, 1964. 153 p.

National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council. A review of space research. Report of the summer study at State University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa, June 17–Aug. 10, 1962.

National Security Industrial Association. Proceedings of R and D symposium: The impact of government research and development expenditures on industrial growth. Washington, 1963. 257 p.

Nelson, Richard R. The economics of parallel R and D efforts. Rand Corporation. August 24, 1959. (Rand Corporation. P 1774)

Nelson, Richard R. The economics of parallel R and D efforts: a sequential-decision analysis. Rand Corporation. November 12, 1959. 40 p. (Rand Corporation. RM 2482)

Nelson, Richard R. The effect of research and development on the economy. Rand Corporation. September 1963. 11 p. (Rand Corporation. P–2787)

Nelson, Richard R. Science, the economy, and public policy. Rand Corporation. Santa Monica, Calif., 1964, 21 p.

Nelson, Richard R. Technological advance, economic growth, and public policy. Rand Corporation. 1963. 19 p.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Ministerial Meeting on Science Agenda Item III. Background paper: Science, economic growth and government policy. Paris, October 1963, 66 p.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Science and the policies of governments. * * * O.E.C.D., 2 rue Andre-Pascal, Paris–XVI, No. 16, 277, September 1963, 55 p.

Orlans, Harold. The effects of federal programs on higher education: a study of 36 universities and colleges. The Brookings Institution. October 1962. 361 p.

Schrader, Rudolf. Science and policy on the interaction of scientific and political affairs. Oxford, New York, Pergamon Press, 1963, 81 p.

Shapero, Albert, Richard P. Howell, and James R. Tombaugh. An exploratory study of the structure and dynamics of the R and D industry. Stanford Research Institute. June 1964. 144 p. (Stanford Research Institute. R and D study series)

Smull, Thomas L. K. (Director, Grants and Research Contracts: NASA) Statement before the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences, United States Senate, November 22, 1963. (Mimeographed) 28 p.

Southern Interstate Nuclear Board. SIBN progress, 1964; from organizational to operational. Report to the Southern Governors' Conference, San Antonio, Texas, October 12, 1964. October 1964. 16 p.

Stanford Research Institute. The industry-Government Aerospace relationship. Prepared for Aerospace Industries Association of America, Inc., Washington, D.C. Menlo Park, Calif., 1963. 2. v.

Stires, David M., and Raymond P. Wenig. Concepts, principles, applications, PERT/COST, for the new DOD and NASA requirements. Boston, Industrial Education Institute [c1964] 398 p.

Terleckyj, Nestor E. Research and development: its growth and composition, by Nestor E. Terleckyj, assisted by Harriet J. Halper. [New York, National Industrial Conference Board 1963] 115 p. (National Industrial Conference Board. Studies in business economics, no. 82)

U.S. CONGRESS

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Appropriations. Dept. of Agriculture appropriations for 1965. Hearings before a Subcommittee . . . 88th Cong.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Armed Services. Authorizing defense procurement and research and development; report to accompany H.R. 9637. [Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off.] 1964. 57 p. (88th Cong., 2d sess. House. Report No. 1138)

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Armed Services. Negotiation and award of research contracts by the Air Force; a case study. Hearings before the Subcommittee for Special Investigations of the Committee on Armed Services, House of Representatives, Eighty-eighth Congress, first session, under the authority of H. Res. 84. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1964. 388 p.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. The Federal Government and education. 88th Cong., 1st sess. 178 p. (88th Cong., 1st sess. House. Document No. 159)

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Education and Labor. National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. Report with 11611. 88th Cong., 2d sess. Report No. 1554.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on House Administration. Establishment of a congressional science advisory staff. Hearing, 88th Cong., 1st sess. on H.R. 6866 and H.R. 8066.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Science and Astronautics. Scientific and technical manpower: supply, demand, and utilization; staff study . . . 87th Cong., 2d sess. Sept. 13, 1962. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1963. 9 p.

U.S. Congress House. Committee on Science and Astronautics. Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development. Government and science, 1963. Hearings, 88th Cong., 1st sess. October and November, 1963. 477 p.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Science and Astronautics. Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development. Government and Science, 1964: Distribution of federal research funds, indirect costs re federal grants. Hearings. May and June 1964. 88th Cong., 2d sess. 1964. 888 p.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Science and Astronautics. Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development. Government and Science no. 1: report. 14 p.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Science and Astronautics. Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development. Government and Science no. 2: Fiscal trends in federal research and development. Report. 1964. 16 p.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Science and Astronautics. Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development. Government and Science no. 3: Scientific-technical advice for Congress; needs and sources. August 1964. 86 p.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Science and Astronautics. Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development. Government and science no. 4: Geographic distribution of federal research and development funds. October 1964. 82 p.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Science and Astronautics. Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development. Obligations for research and development, and R & D plant, by geographic divisions and states, by selected federal agencies, fiscal years 1961–1964. September 1964. 639 p.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Science and Astronautics. Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development. Progress report. 88th Cong., 2d sess. March 30, 1964. 3 p.

U.S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Government Research. Administration of research and development grants; report. 88th Cong., 2d sess. July 31, 1964. 106 p.

U.S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Government Research. Federal research and development programs. First progress report. February 17, 1964. 18 p.

U.S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Government Research. Federal research and development programs. Hearings, 88th Cong., 1st sess. parts I, II, and III, November, December 1963 and January 1964. (Summary and index in part III)

U.S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Government Research. Study number II: Manpower for research and development, report. 88th Cong., 2d sess. September 29, 1964. 71 p.

U.S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Government Research. Report: study number III, Federal facilities for research and development. 88th Cong., 2d sess. November 19, 1964. 246p.

U.S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Government Research. Study number IV: documentation and dissemination of research and development results: report. 88th Cong., 2d sess. November 20, 1964. 148 p.

U.S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Government Research. Study number V: Federal student assistance in higher education. 88th Cong., 2d sess. December 14, 1964. 100 p.

U.S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Government Research. Impact of federal research and development programs: study number VI; report * * * 88th Cong. 2d sess. under the authority of H. Res. 504, as amended by H. Res. 810. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1964. 265 p. (88th Cong. 2d sess. House report no. 1938)

U.S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Government Research. Contract policies and procedures for research and development; study number VII; report * * * 88th Cong., 2d sess. under the authority of H. Res. 504, as amended by H. Res. 810. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1964. 154 p. (88th Cong. 2d sess. House report no. 1942)

U.S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Government Research. Interagency coordination in research and development: Study number VIII; report * * * 88th Cong., 2d sess. under the authority of H. Res. 504, as amended by H. Res. 810. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1964. 70 p. (88th Cong., 2d sess. House report no. 1939)

U.S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Government Research. Statistical review of research and development: Study no. IX; Report * * * 88th Cong., 2d sess. under the authority of H. Res. 504, as amended by H. Res. 810. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1964. 231 p. (88th Cong., 2d sess. House report no. 1940)

U.S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Government Research. National goals and policies: Study number X—part I; report * * * 88th Cong., 2d sess. under the authority of H. Res. 504, as amended by H. Res. 810. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1964. 64 p. (88th Cong., 2d sess. House report no. 1941)

U.S. Congress. House. Select Committee on Government Research. Staff résumé on the activities of the Select Committee on Government Research: Study number X—part II; report * * * 88 Cong., 2d sess. under the authority of H. Res. 87, 89th Congress. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1965. 78 p. (88th Congress, 2d sess. House Report No. 1941)

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Armed Services. Authorizing appropriations during fiscal year 1965; report to accompany H.R. 9637. 1964. (88th Cong., 2d sess. Report no. 867)

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Armed Services. Investigation of the preparedness program; report by Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee * * * under S. Res. 75. 88th Cong., 2d sess. Committee print.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Commerce. National Economic Conversion Commission. Hearings, 88th Cong., 2d sess. May and June 1964. 157 p.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Government Operations. Establishment of a commission on science and technology; report on S. 816; 1964. 62 p.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Exploring the dimensions of the manpower revolution, compiled for the Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower * * * Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1964. 586 p. (Selected readings in employment and manpower, v. 1)

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Indemnification of research contractors; H.R. 8611.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower. Convertibility of space and defense resources to civilian needs: a search for new employment potentials. 1106 pages. (Selected readings in employment and manpower, v. 2.)

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower. Hearings. November and December 1963. 88th Cong., 1st sess. Parts 8 and 9.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Subcommittee on Employment and Manpower. National Commission on Automation and Technological Progress. Hearings, Part 10. 88th Cong., 2d sess. July 6, 1964.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Select Committee on Small Business. Impact of defense spending on labor surplus areas, 1964. 88th Cong., 2d sess. August 13, 1964.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Select Committee on Small Business. The role and effect of technology in the nation's economy. Parts 1 through 6. May, June, and December, 1963.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Select Committee on Small Business. Subcommittee on Monopoly. Economic aspects of government patent policies, Hearings, impact of Government patent policies on economic growth, scientific and technological progress, competition, monopoly, and opportunities for small business. March 7–14, 1963. 88th Cong., 1st sess. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1963. 391 p.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Select Committee on Small Business. Economic aspects of government patent policies. Hearings before a subcommittee * * * 88th Con., 1st sess. Impact of government patent policies on economic growth, scientific and technological progress, competition, monopoly, and opportunities for small business * * * Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1963. 391 p.

U.S. Congress. Senate. Select Committee on Small Business. Economic and legal problems of government patent policies, prepared by Richard J. Barber, for the Subcommittee on Monopoly * * * Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1963. 21 p. At head of title: 88th Cong., 1st session, Committee print.

Selected Organizations Which Publish Material Related to Public Safety for R and D

Stanford Research Institute Menlo Park, Calif., Laboratories: Menlo Park, Calif., 820 Mission Street, South Pasadena, Calif.

Denver Research Institute, University of Denver, Denver, Colo.

Brookings Institution, 1775 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Midwest Research Institute, 425 Volker Boulevard, Kansas City, Mo.

Arthur D. Little, Inc., 35 Acorn Park, Cambridge, Mass., Washington office: 1725 I Street NW., Washington, D.C.

The Rand Corp., Santa Monica, Calif.

Institute for Defense Analysis, 1666 Connecticut Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Southwest Research Institute, 8500 Culebra Road, San Antonio, Tex.

National Planning Association, 1606 New Hampshire Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

Aerospace Industries Association of America, 1725 DeSales Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Battelle Memorial Institute, 505 King Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, Washington office: 1775 Massachusetts Avenue NW., Washington, D.C.

National Security Industrial Association, 1107 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy, 1012 14th Street NW., Washington, D.C.

Reference Aids

Science Policy Research Division, Legislative Refernece Service, Library of Congress.

Rand Corp. index.

Public Affairs Information Service (PAIS).

Air University Index.

Business Periodicals Index.

International Index.

Index to Legal Periodicals.

Index to Economic Periodicals.

Congressional Record Index.

National Referral Center for Science and Technology.

Selected Magazines Frequently Dealing With R and D and Public Policy

Bulletin of Atomic Scientists.

Research Management.

Ordnance.

Aerospace.

Aviation Week.

Scientific American.

Air Force and Space Digest.

Missiles and Rockets.

Army.

International Science and Technology.

Science.

THE GREAT SOCIETY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I have had called to my attention a most impressive and eloquent sermon as preached to the Shandon Methodist Church by the minister of that church, Dr. John M. Younginer, on March 21, 1965. The sermon is entitled "The Greater Society." I commend this sermon to every Member of the Congress, particularly as we give consideration to many legislative programs that are being advanced under the label of the Great Society, and particularly during this time when street demonstrations and anarchy seem to be the order of the day.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this outstanding sermon be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREATER SOCIETY

(By Dr. John M. Younginer, preached from the Shandon pulpit, Mar. 21, 1965, Shandon Methodist Church, Columbia, S.C.)

"Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that built it."—Psalm 127: 1.

You and I constitute a society of human beings across the earth numbering more than 3 billion souls. As a group of people of divine creation living under the same general climate we find ourselves a homogeneous unit marked only by differing nationalities, races, and creeds.

While the general climate under which we live is supposed to be conducive to our mutual growth and happiness it is admittedly true that the social, political, and moral climate of the world continues unsettled and stormy. Here in America this climate foments such social unrest and hatred among many as to produce unwarranted bloodshed and conflict on our streets and highways. The present period in our national history may well be recorded as an age of civil unrest and organized mass street demonstrations inspired and led by fanatical agitators. In the so-called clamor for civil rights the melee has turned into civil disobedience.

Scientifically, we have learned how to travel under water, through the air, and into outer space. But morally and spiritually we have done little to learn how to walk on the earth like men. At a time of domestic frustration the administration in Washington proposes to inaugurate for Americans what it calls the Great Society. This utopian desire for our people on the part of national leaders is a worthy goal provided the means toward its accomplishment be economically sound, morally fair, and spiritually inspired. It is at this point that thinking Americans have their serious doubts. There seems too much being done for simple reasons of political expediency and weak leaning to the fanatical demands of small pressure groups inspired by unpatriotic agitators.

No worthy or enduring society for the American people can be built by a political dictatorship that uses coercion through arbitrary law or military force for carrying out an ideological purpose. The only way to build a society of peace and tranquility among people with justice and human dignity for all is to build it first in the hearts of people through Christian love and understanding. This is a long and gradual process requiring each individual to examine his own heart and mind in the light of Christian duty and truth. The process is sometimes painful as it was to Paul when he finally saw the light that melted his prejudices on the Damascus road.

This is the job the church has been working at through the centuries. Its primary aim is to develop Christian discipleship among all people based on love for God and love for one's fellow man. Such a society is what I conceive as the greater society. It is a society built from within, with hearts made new by the transforming love of Jesus Christ. To try to build any other way is to build in vain. We must remember the affirmation of the psalmist when he said, "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it."

ALLEGIANCE TO ALMIGHTY GOD

If you and I are to have a part in trying to build a greater society, in the first place, it must be a society with allegiance to Almighty God. We were off to a good start when our Pilgrim fathers came to these shores motivated by Christian faith. Tired of the tyranny and crippling regulations imposed upon them by their European masters they faced perils of travel and disease in order to found a homeland of religious freedom and individual opportunity. As they blazed across the rugged frontiers of the new world, making a living for themselves and their families, they gave to America a lesson of industry and courage destined to make a country great. The young Nation proposed to reach a pinnacle of economic development and democratic form of government unequaled by older nations of the world. Proudly today we can join with Katherine Lee Bates as she sings:

> "O beautiful for pilgrim feet,
> Whose stern impassioned stress
> A thoroughfare for freedom beat
> Across the wilderness."

Other explorers at the same time came to South America for a different purpose. They went in search of gold. It is no strange circumstance that the vast continent of South America remains yet today a broad expanse of undeveloped resources. The great human potential of that continent is far from what it might have been if religion had been the founding principle. Basically the reason North and South America vary so widely today in their development is because those who went to South America went there in search of gold while those who went to North America went in search of God.

TODAY'S TREND

It is with deep sorrow that Christians in America today are becoming disturbed at the trends toward secularism seen in government and many other areas of national life. For example, the recent tamperings with our precious doctrine of separation of church and state by the Supreme Court places upon it rational interpretations never intended by our Founding Fathers. This doctrine when properly understood simply prescribes that no denomination be established as a state religion. It was never intended to forbid the free exercise of religious faith in the administration of government nor to make public officials immune to constructive criticism by the church. Neither was it intended to prevent the church from exercising its influence and leadership in the affairs of state.

We are in danger of losing our attainment of the greater society for God's people when we begin placing restrictions on religion and the free exercise of religious faith by God's people. In our lifetime we have seen the attempt by dictators to form a "society" regulated by manmade philosophies. A definition of some of these foolish ideologies has been suggested as follows:

Socialism: You have two cows and give one to your neighbors.

Communism: You have two cows, the government takes both, and gives you the milk.

Fascism: You have two cows, the government takes both, and sells you the milk.

Nazism: You have two cows, the government takes both, and shoots you.

New Dealism: You have two cows, the government takes both, milks one, shoots the other and throws the milk away.

Someone has suggested that what we need in America is to get back to our former kind of Americanism when a man can have two cows, sell one and buy a bull. Then he's in private business exercising initiative and skill to make a living for himself—and to make a country great. We are never on our way to any kind of great society when constitutional authority speaking through its Surgeon General tells us smoking causes cancer and through its Department of Agriculture goes on paying larger and larger subsidies to tobacco growers. We are on the wrong track to a great society when constitutional powers advocate the best kind of education for every American youth and at the same time cripples educational institutions by luring away the best professors to higher paying governmental projects. At a national conference on higher education in Chicago 2 weeks ago bringing together 2,000 college presidents, deans, and educators from across the country the unanimous cry of the educators was for freedom from pressure exerted upon their institutions by State and Federal powers. When academic freedom is lost we destroy our ability to give the best kind of education to American youth.

Consistency is a rare jewel and this kind of jewel is seldom found in constitutional authority bent on gaining more and more political power. While such authority outwardly advocates abolishing juvenile delinquency in every American community the same authority through its relief programs encourages illegitimacy by offering a bonus for illegitimate children as relief rolls grow bigger and bigger and delinquency mounts. Resulting also is increasing voter power in favor of the magical Santa Claus forming a vicious circle of national economic disaster.

A SOCIETY WITH INCENTIVE

In the second place, the greater society is a society with incentive to achieve. Former college president and Pulitzer Prize Winner Felix Morley, writing in the March Nation's Business, says: "The more adequate the support provided for the workless, the less will be their incentive to support themselves." Near St. Augustine, Fla., years ago sea gulls were found dying by thousands. It was explained that the gulls were dying from starvation caused by the shrimp boats moving away to other waters. For years the gulls had learned to rely on food thrown out from the boats. When the boats left they had lost their native ability to provide for themselves. The same can happen in a human society. If people begin depending more and more on relief programs for support they will soon lose the ability to provide for themselves when the inevitable emergency comes.

LIKE A CANCER

This false philosophy of getting something for nothing is like a cancer that grows into all areas of human life. The disease is contracted by youth who think in the course of pursuing an education they can get something for nothing. Recent reports of cheating found on major college campuses is a symptom of the disease in just another form. Three weeks ago I visited a big university campus in Georgia and found it impossible to get a place to park my car. "Where did all these cars come from?" I asked. "They belong to the students," I was told. It's a strange society that demands for its students a car and a checkbook. When a student thinks more about his checkbook than he does his textbook he's failing to prepare himself for the right kind of society for the future. And following a policy of cheating will only relegate a college diploma to be worth no more than the paper on which it is written.

In America we need a rebirth of the incentive to work, to achieve, to develop human dignity and ingenuity. If these incentives be lost through dependence upon relief programs and cheating we are heading for a decadent society. The population problem poses still another threat to our achievement of the proper goal. Total population in the United States at present is approximately 200 million. It is estimated that in the next 35 years it will double to 400 million. Unless we keep alive our incentives and skills the next 35 years might find us in a society similar to that of India where millions go hungry and people die on the streets every day from starvation.

MOTIVATED BY LOVE

In the third place, this greater society we are concerned about is a society motivated by Christian love. You simply can't build a satisfactory society by the passage of arbitrary laws. Such laws based on the political whims of some who happen to be in power at the time are often contradictory to the thinking of others who have the welfare of country at heart. Laws enacted out of political expediency are detrimental rather than helpful to a healthy society. No law should be enacted which would allow a minority group to enslave a majority nor allow a majority group to intimidate a minority.

Our greater society, if it is to be realized, must be motivated by unbiased Christian thinking. Agitators whose minds are prejudiced actually destroy rather than aid the cause of freedom. Down in Selma, Ala., today we have the greatest concentration of extremists to be found anywhere in the United States. In Selma the issue is not race. The real issue is extremism and prejudice. Northern whites concentrated there are prejudiced against southern whites. In the minds of some northern agitators the lowest breed of humanity to be found anywhere is to be born a southern white. Southerners resent the inference made by such northern extremists. An entire situation develops which is devoid of love and mutual understanding. The extremist northern bigot claims he is crusading for a great society little realizing he is creating a spectacle disastrous to the whole dignity of man. The kind of society we as Christians sincerely want is God's greater society founded on the law of love formulated by Jesus when he said, "You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with all your mind * * * And a second is like it, You shall love your neighbor as yourself." The process is slow and sometimes painful for the white southerner. He is gradually overcoming his prejudices and seeing the better way for himself and for all of God's people. With a broader love and understanding developing in his heart and mind he is grieved at the injustices he sees administered by whites against Negroes concentrated in other areas including the North. He realizes that the problem of race is not restricted to the South alone, but is found in any area where love starves among two or more races constituting a major portion of the population.

HOW THE KINGDOM COMES

Jesus had much to say in his teachings about the kingdom of God. Dr. James Moffatt speaks of it in his translation as "the realm of heaven." Still another connotation would be to speak of it as "the society of heaven." The society of heaven here on this earth is not to be accomplished outwardly by means of organized street demonstrations nor passage of controversial arbitrary laws in Washington. Jesus said, "The kingdom of God is not coming with signs to be observed * * * for behold, the kingdom of God is in the midst of you." Every time we sincerely pray our Lord's model prayer, "Thy kingdom come," we are desiring his spirit and love to flood our individual hearts and the hearts of all people. When each individual personally experiences the transforming and renewing power of Christ's love in his heart he becomes a citizen of the greater society of God's people. That is our greatest need and should be the object of our daily prayer.

Unless we build this greater society on the principles laid down by Jesus in His Sermon on the Mount we are building in vain. If history can teach us anything it should teach us that "Unless the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it." As Jesus was finishing His Sermon on the Mount He warned: "And every one who hears these words of Mine and does not do them will be like a foolish man who built his house upon the sand; and the rain fell, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat against that house, and it fell; and great was the fall of it."

THE RENEWAL WITHIN

When a missionary was teaching his boys to memorize bits of Scripture, the assignment one day was the Golden Rule: "So whatever you wish that men would do to you, do so to them." After several days the brightest boy in the class had failed to recite it. The teacher said to him, "Jepsun, I know you've learned it by now. Come on, let me hear you say it." Jepsun replied, "Oh, yes, me know how to say it but me ain't yet learned how to do it." That boy had caught the true secret. As workers together with God in helping build a greater society on earth we must strive every day to do more than just know how to recite the Golden Rule. We must know how to do it and live it.

Then, by God's help, our effort will not be in vain and we will be on our way toward helping Him build a truly greater society here on earth. May that be our daily purpose and prayer. Amen.

RECREATION AREA IN WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. BYRD or West Virginia. Mr. President, during a hearing today before a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on Senate bill 7, which I have introduced to establish the Spruce Knob-Seneca Rocks National Recreation Area in West Virginia, an interesting newspaper magazine feature was brought to my attention.

It appeared in the Cleveland, Ohio, Plain Dealer on May 17, 1964, and dealt with the wonders—both historical and scenic—of the Seneca Rock in Pendleton County, W. Va.

I believe the newspaper has performed a worthy public service in bringing this area to the attention of its readers. I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWELVE ON A MOUNTAIN: CLEVELAND CLIMBING CLUB TRAINS AT SENECA ROCK

Down through the ages a lot of people, most of them the kind who get dizzy on stepladders, have wondered why anybody would want to climb a mountain.

And for just as long the climbers have been trying to explain why they're that way. "Spiritual release," they say. "Escape from everyday tensions." "Physical poetry."

Statistics back their argument that climbing by the experienced is far safer than driving on the highway. And one becomes skilled in the science of climbing, they emphasize, only by learning under the tutelage of experts, and unhurriedly. That's the usual program for the Cleveland Mountaineers who, having found mountains in short supply hereabouts, remedy that by traveling.

A sports-loving ex-soldier, Bill Braden, of Mentor, hit upon the idea of a mountaineering club in Cleveland in a moment of disenchantment with Lake Erie's short boating season. He climbed a mountain when he was 10 years old and had his bottom warmed when he got home for doing it. The spanking hadn't erased the urge.

How does one go about finding other people interested in learning how to climb mountains? Braden found his answer at the library. He compiled a list of books on climbing and copied the library card numbers of frequent borrowers. These numbers became names—and he sent out a few letters. Quite a few replied that they would like to have a go at it. And that's how Cleveland Mountaineers—22 charter members and the only mountaineering club in Ohio—got started. Braden, inescapably, was named president.

Along the way, the group gained a couple of members who are thoroughly at ease on precipices. One is Dr. John Edwards, formerly of New Zealand and, along with Sir Edmund Hillary, a member of the New Zealand Alpine Club. The other is Kurt Jenny, a native of Switzerland, a master cabinetmaker who now lives in Bedford. He is a member of the Swiss Alpine Club. Both are climbers of great experience. Dr. Edwards, a physiologist, is assistant professor of biology at Western Reserve University.

Other members—and the roster grows steadily—include a boatbuilder, a metallurgical technician, a city recreation director, welders, pipefitters, mechanical and electrical engineers, an artist, and an accountant. What they lacked in mountain climbing credentials they have made up with willingness to learn.

Finding a mountain to climb was another matter. They found that there are places in the Cleveland area to serve as "classrooms." Rock outcroppings at Whipps Ledges in Medina County, Tinker's Creek in Cuyahoga County, and Gildersleeve Ridge and Thompson's Ledges in Lake County let the beginners apply climbing techniques. Here they become familiar with ropes, knots, pitons, carabiners and the jargon of the sport.

Interspersed with climbing activities are long hikes, winter and summer, campouts and field trips, all calculated to keep the climbers in shape. Club members are classed as beginners, intermediates, and, finally, advanced mountaineers. Only the most experienced lead a tough climb.

A favorite of the local group is Rock of Seneca, a 1,000-foot quartzite formation at Mouth of Seneca, W. Va., near the Maryland border. It is considered by climbers to be the best rock climb in the East and it becomes an objective for climbers every weekend. A frequent climber there is Barry C. Bishop, a member of the American team that conquered Mount Everest last year. During World War II it was the training ground for the Army's mountain troops. In fact, they left so many pitons imbedded in one sheer face that it is called "Face of 1,000 Pitons."

There are various routes to the top, varying in surfaces and degree of skill required. And they have names that will stick as long as climbers struggle up them. Old Man's Route, Old Maid's Route, Conn's West Face, Lower Skyline Traverse, Breakneck Route, and Tony's Nightmare are part and parcel of mountaineering at Seneca Rock.

Individual physical characteristics along the several routes have names, too—Gunsight, Cockscomb, Windy Notch, and Humphrey's Head.

Twelve in the Cleveland party assaulting the peak on a recent weekend expedition encountered climbers from Pittsburgh, Washington, D.C., and way stations. All deplore horseplay—that can exact a steep price.

"Climbing the extremely dangerous shale cliffs and faults of rotten rocks in the metropolitan parks and other local sites is foolhardy," says Braden. "Climbing is very dangerous when attempted by the untrained. Youngsters using old clothesline to play mountain climbers are inviting disaster."

Climbs are rated No. 1 to No. 6, according to the degree of difficulty. A No. 1 climb would be one the individual could walk up. A No. 6 means the climber has to have exceptional skill, experience, and artificial aid. According to Braden and his companions, too many untrained youthful climbers try a No. 6 climb when they have only the capabilities for a No. 1.

POWER FOR PEOPLE—WITHOUT DAMAGE TO DUCKS

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, at the recent silver anniversary convention of the Northwest Public Power Association, Mr. Alex Radin, general manager of the American Public Power Association, delivered an address demanding attention from all who are interested in wise conservation and use of our natural resources. Analyzing the present-day position of publicly owned electric power facilities throughout the Nation, Mr. Radin called special attention to the decreasing emphasis given in recent years to development of hydropower resources. Federal hydroelectric power facilities have, for many years, provided the only means by which many municipally owned electric utilities and rural co-ops could secure low cost power to their customers, but future development of such facilities is in serious danger of curtailment by unwise policies of the agencies of government responsible for this important function.

As Mr. Radin's address indicates, a major obstacle to progressive development of low-cost hydropower by the Federal Government is the increasing clamor of what might be described as "extremist" conservation groups. These individuals and organizations have a worthy purpose of conserving our natural resources, as do all wise individuals. Unfortunately, their zeal leads them to unreasoning opposition to extremely valuable hydroelectric power facilities that will provide immeasurable benefits to the species known as homo sapiens.

Alaskans have had a full share of opposition to developments vitally necessary to my State from would-be protectors of fish, fowl, and furry four-footed animals. Mr. Radin's address calls attention to the current misguided campaign of the Fish and Wildlife Service, and others who follow its lead, against construction of the Rampart Dam on the Yukon in Alaska. Time and again I have called attention of the Senate to the immense contribution Rampart will make not only to Alaska but the Nation as a whole. It is the site at which can be produced the lowest cost electric power of any from any source in the free world and can supply this necessary utility in a quantity unmatched by any other source.

On behalf of Alaskans, I thank Mr. Radin for calling attention to the importance of Rampart and the danger to its achievement, and others, from uninformed criticism.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Alex Radin's address at the Northwest Public Power Association convention be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW DIRECTIONS IN PUBLIC POWER

(By Alex Radin, general manager, American Public Power Association, Washington, D.C., before the silver anniversary convention, Northwest Public Power Association, Sheraton Motor Inn, Portland, Oreg., Mar. 11, 1965)

I am proud to play a part in the Northwest Public Power Association's silver anniversary convention and to offer congratulations from the members of APPA. Our association, too, was formed in 1940, and we have fought many battles together during the first 25 years of our history.

A great deal could be said about the achievements of the past 25 years in the Northwest, and there are people on your program who will detail the progress which you have made. However, I believe that special mention should be made of some of the things you have accomplished, such as start of construction of the world's largest atomic powerplant at Hanford, the development of the Nation's greatest hydroelectric power system, and the industrial complex that has grown up around it, and the high standard of electrical living which has been brought to your consumers through their own electric utilities. These are just a few of the accomplishments of which you can be justly proud, and I offer you our congratulations.

Rather than dwell on the accomplishments of the past, however, I would like to take a look at some of the problems that lie ahead.

Changes are brewing in the electric industry, and in the resource development picture as well. Some of these can be dangerous for public power, and some can portend evil days for water resource development. These dire results may not come about, but they are possible, and I want to suggest that we reshape our thinking somewhat in order to take advantage of change, rather than letting it take advantage of us.

One of the major problems facing you in the years ahead is the orientation of your power supply program. For the past 25 years you have been living through what, in retrospect, has been the golden age of hydro development in the Pacific Northwest. Some 15 million kilowatts of hydropower have been developed in this region, and the recently concluded treaty with Canada will make possible the fuller utilization of existing resources.

HYDRO'S ROLE WILL CHANGE IN FUTURE

It is obvious that new and more complex patterns of power supply will have to be developed in this region in the next 25 years, and that you will have to turn to steam-generated power for a large share of your needs. But having relied so successfully in the past on hydro power, should you now be forced to give up consideration of the remaining hydro resources of this region—resources which amount to some 40 million kilowatts, exclusive of Alaska?

I raise this question, because there is an alarming growth in sentiment throughout the country against the building of new hydroelectric power projects, and at the same time there is also an increasing tendency to downgrade the importance of the Nation's remaining undeveloped hydro resources, despite the fact that only some 21 percent of our hydro resources, including those of Alaska, have been developed.

It is said, for example, that hydro development destroys valuable recreation resources—wild rivers, wilderness areas, and the like; that it is incompatible with the preservation of natural beauty; that it destroys wildlife before the sportsmen have a chance to destroy it in their own way, and that it is a useless appendage to unnecessary reclamation development.

Such criticism, if allowed to go unanswered, can have a disastrous influence on the Nation's water resources development program. Already, in recent years, a proportionately declining percentage of the Federal Government's budget has been spent for water resources projects. For example, from a high of 1 percent of the total Federal budget expenditures in 1952, such expenditures dropped sharply to a low of only 0.45 percent in 1956 and, while increasing slightly, has hovered around 0.6 percent of the total budget since 1960. From a high of over $700 million in 1953, Federal investment in power and related development suffered a sharp drop to $300 million in 1956 and now hovers around $600 million, including revenue bond financing by the Tennessee Valley Authority.

It is not surprising that the role of Federal power has declined in proportion to appropriations. Between 1955 and 1961, Federal generating capacity increased 37.5 percent. During the same period, the generating capacity of the privately owned utilities increased 57.4 percent, and that of the local public systems by 81.7 percent not including the huge Niagara and St. Lawrence projects of the New York Power Authority. To indicate the magnitude of the decline, the Federal share of the Nation's generating capacity dropped from 15.2 percent in 1956 to 12.7 percent in 1962.

Despite the fact that during the past 4 years we have had an administration in Washington that has been generally sympathetic to water resources development, the number of new starts on large multipurpose projects has been disappointingly small. This year's Federal budget includes only three multipurpose new starts of significance, Libby Dam, Lower Granite Dam, and the West Point Dam in Georgia.

OPPOSITION BY WILDLIFE GROUPS INCREASING

An example of the type of senseless criticism of water resources development that is hurting the Federal program can be found in the opposition to the Rampart Canyon project which has been proposed for the Yukon River in Alaska.

Having flown over the Rampart Canyon site several years ago with a Senate delegation that included Senator GRUENING of Alaska, it seems incredible to me that anyone would want to preserve in its natural state an area as wild and bleak as Rampart Canyon. Yet, as you know, there are loud screams from the friends of fish and wildlife about alleged damage which would be inflicted on migratory wildfowl. Ironically, some of these screams come from people who want to preserve the duck breeding grounds in the Rampart Canyon only so that they can shoot down the Alaskan-bred ducks as they fly south to the lower 48 States.

The screams of the wildlife protectors have been translated into an incredible proposal by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that more than half a billion dollars be included in cost estimates of Rampart, primarily to purchase new wetlands for development of duck breeding grounds. This sum is called a "partial offset" for the loss of fish and wildlife. If this cost is added, the cost of Rampart power, according to a field report released last month, will go up from an estimated 2 to 3 mills to an estimated 3.68 to 5.54 mills, at the busbar.

It seems to me, on the face of it, that this fish and wildlife mitigation can tip the scales on Rampart. Five million kilowatts of 2-mill power can have an impact all over the West, and particularly in Alaska itself, which badly needs the stimulus to its economy which could be provided by low-cost power. Five million kilowatts of five-and-a-half-mill power may well go begging, however.

Now, I have nothing against migratory waterfowl, and would be perfectly happy to let them take their chances with the rest of us. It does seem a little extravagant, however, to spend $500 million to mitigate their environment, when the same amount of money would build over 100,000 public housing units, or almost 40,000 school classrooms, or perhaps 500 miles of 4-lane interstate highway.

It may be that we can work out something a little more reasonable, if we invite the ducks to sit down at the negotiating table with us.

Make no mistake about it, however, this is a serious matter, though spoken in jest. We are in serious danger of being classified as antiwildlife, antirecreation, anticonservation, and perhaps even antibeauty.

Certainly such a charge is invalid, on its face. One need only look at the beautiful Skagit development of Seattle City Light, the Cowlitz Dams of Tacoma or the lake behind Chelan PUD's Rocky Reach project to see how much the recreation opportunities of an area can be enhanced by man-made lakes.

As a native of the Tennessee Valley, I am particularly conscious of what the Tennessee Valley Authority has done to create enormous new recreational facilities in connection with its man-made lakes. The same is true at many of the lakes created by the Bureau of Reclamation and Corps of Engineers. Power dams and recreation are entirely compatible, but somehow we have missed the boat in getting this story across to the public.

POWER AND RECREATION GO TOGETHER

If we don't begin to do a better job of getting across the story of the campatibility of water resources development with recreational opportunities, we are in serious danger of losing much of the potential of the Nation's water resources development—a potential that includes, among other things, some 95.3 million kilowatts of electric power capacity.

Although it might be wise to set aside certain rivers as "wild rivers" and not develop them, before such a decision is made some hard questions should be asked. A "wild river" assuredly provides a different type of recreation than a river on which large reservoirs have been created; but which river provides the best recreational opportunities for the large masses of people in our fast-growing urban population centers? Would the nondevelopment of certain rivers result in flooding that would destroy human lives and property? Would the lack of regulation of a river leave communities without an adequate water supply? Is it desirable to burn up valuable energy resources such as coal or oil while we fail to utilize a renewable resource such as the power of falling water?

These are some of the questions that should be answered before we turn our backs on future water resource development programs.

We also need to consider new approaches to the problem of cost allocations and the economic justification for various projects. If recreation is to be of increasing value, a larger share of the cost of projects should be assigned to recreation, and more realistic values should be placed on other aspects of multipurpose projects, too. For example, experience has already shown that we have underestimated the value of flood protection afforded by certain projects.

Still another problem that merits careful thought is the question of firming up the supply of hydropower. As peaking power becomes more valuable, more Federal projects may have to be designed as peaking projects, but to do so presents very real problems for the smaller local public power systems and rural electric cooperatives which do not have generation of their own and could not use peaking power, as such.

NEW APPROACH TO HYDRO NEEDED

We must, therefore, give consideration to new ways to obtain the maximum benefit from hydro projects, while at the same time not detracting from the value of these projects for the local public agencies and rural cooperatives.

I have dwelt at some length today on the future of the Federal hydroelectric power program because it has been the only means by which many of the municipally owned electric utilities and rural co-ops have been able to secure a low-cost source of wholesale power, and I believe that we must be sure that, for various reasons, this program is not phased out of existence. If this program is closed out, we may well find that the future of many local public power systems and rural co-ops is endangered, unless the utilities which have depended upon this program can find new means to provide bulk power supply on a regional basis.

In stressing the importance of continuing the hydropower program, I am not saying that this program should be continued only to provide power for the so-called preference customers. To the contrary, the Nation's critical need for new water supplies, the need to provide new recreational facilities for masses of people, and other factors indicate that wise and comprehensive development of our water resources will be more rather than less important in the future.

At the same time, it is also clear that the development of these water resources in the next 25 years will be carried on differently, in many respects, than has been the case during the past 25 years, and I believe it is important to adapt ourselves to these changes and to up-date the program to meet changing conditions.

ESTHETICS IMPORTANT IN ELECTRIC FACILITIES

Directly related to the problem of development of our water resources and the building of all future power facilities is the question of esthetic considerations. The importance of this problem is highlighted by the fact that President Johnson has called a special Conference on Natural Beauty for the latter part of May, and the development of our water resources and the problem of underground transmission facilities will be two of the prime subjects for discussion at this meeting.

I believe that the President should be applauded for his determination to enhance the Nation's beauty, and I hope that everyone concerned with public power will take an active part in the program. It is a natural for us, as citizens, as public servants, and as trustees of public enterprises.

Just after the President announced his plans for a Conference on Natural Beauty I wrote him to offer the services of APPA in making the Conference a success, and pointed out that power development has made great contributions as a paying partner to multipurpose use of our water resources.

I noted that APPA members have supported the preservation of fish and wildlife and natural beauty as a matter of policy, and favor including recreation as a prime project purpose at Federal reservoirs. We have supported the right-of-way regulations of the Departments of Interior and Agriculture which help avoid unnecessary and wasteful employment of land for electric transmission lines, and our members increasingly are attempting to improve urban environment through building distribution facilities underground and improving the appearance of substations and other public facilities.

I believe that there is a new awareness on the part of many public power officials of the importance of esthetics in designing utility facilities, and I hope that this awareness will become more widespread through increased emphasis, for example, on underground distribution facilities. The same public that demands first-class electric service increasingly is demanding attractive surroundings, and in this respect the publicly owned utilities have a special obligation to lead the way.

REGULATION CAN BE KEY TO LOW-COST POWER

Another problem which will be of growing concern to public power and to the entire electric industry in the next 25 years is the manner and extent of regulation of this vast industry, which today is the biggest single industry in the United States. Increased pooling of power through interconnected systems makes mandatory the exercise of greater control over the industry by the Federal Power Commission.

In fact, I believe that the principal issue for public power today is the effective regulation of the huge power pools which are coming to characterize the private power industry. The importance of effectively regulating these pools is indicated by the fact that nearly 1,000 local publicly owned electric systems—primarily the small municipal systems—buy power at wholesale from the private power companies. The price they pay and the conditions under which they are able to obtain wholesale power will depend to a large extent on the ability of the Federal Power Commission to regulate these sales.

Although the Federal Power Act gives FPC jurisdiction over wholesale sales of electricity in interstate commerce, this jurisdiction was not exercised until the present Commission took office. Many municipal systems already have received direct benefits from this regulation—as a result of complaints which they have filed with FPC, and because of the silent presence of FPC at the bargaining table during contract negotiations.

The companies have lost no time in attacking FPC jurisdiction, and having lost in the courts, they have taken their cause to Congress. Senators HOLLAND and SMATHERS, of Florida, and Congressman PICKLE, of Texas, have introduced legislation which would effectively eliminate FPC jurisdiction over most wholesale sales of electricity.

I hope that APPA will have the support of the Pacific Northwest in our efforts to defeat the Holland-Smathers bill, the Pickle bill, and any other legislation which will remove the power companies from wholesale rate regulation. Since many State commissions make no attempt to regulate such sales, the Federal agency is the only forum to which the municipal power distributors can turn for a fair shake on wholesale rates.

The increasingly interstate character of the electric industry also makes Federal regulation more necessary in the building of interstate extra high voltage transmission lines. It seems clear that sometime in the very near future legislation will have to be enacted along the lines of the Moss-Engle bill, in order to assure that the public obtains the maximum benefits from such vast transmission highways.

In looking ahead to the future, I am sure you are also reexamining the role of the various associations which serve you. The purposes and character of these groups undoubtedly will undergo important changes in the future, in order to keep pace with the changing problems of the utilities they serve.

APPA BOARD PLANS 5-YEAR PROGRAM

I would not attempt to tell you what plans your excellent local associations should make for the future, but I thought you might be interested to hear briefly about the 5-year program which APPA's board of directors recently adopted, after very considerable study of the long-range objectives and obligations of APPA to its members. The purpose of our study was to key our staff and services to the challenges which we see ahead.

The foremost problem, for public power generally, will be power supply. This single item accounts for about two-thirds of the total electric operation and maintenance expense of public power systems, on the average, and it is therefore essential that local systems maintain alternative sources of low-cost power.

APPA is working along several different routes to assist member systems in maintaining these alternatives. We have attempted to encourage joint action among groups of municipal systems to provide their own generation and transmission through consultation and publication of a book called "Joint Action," which covers some of the possible approaches. Incidentally, the creation of the Washington Public Power Supply System provides one of the most farsighted means for effective joint action of local utilities.

For systems purchasing their power requirements from private utilities, APPA is preparing a manual dealing with wholesale power contract negotiations and at the same time is watching the situation with respect to FPC jurisdiction over wholesale rates.

A "small generation study" is in the works for systems generating their own power, and will provide guidelines on the economics of various types of generation, timing, and appropriate plant sizes.

Our concern with the Federal power program, support for new projects, and consideration of new patterns of economics, of course, is directly related to the power supply question.

The No. 2 problem on the APPA board's priority list for the next 5 years is the need for improved public relations. While APPA members are not likely to indulge in multimillion-dollar nationwide advertising programs, they are able to do much to inform their consumer-owners about their utilities at the local level. APPA plans to prepare materials for the member systems to use—a new series of bill stuffer-type leaflets, new sets of institutional ad mats, among other things. More important, APPA has added a new man to the staff—Mark Anson, former executive director of the Kansas Association of Municipal Utilities—to handle the stepped-up public relations program and to provide consulting help to individual utilities upon request.

Management training stands next on the APPA board's priority list for local public power systems. Electrical technology and the operating practices of utilities are changing from month to month, and this means that if we don't keep learning and moving with the times, we're out of date.

We are planning a program of management training built around a comprehensive manual we are now working on—sections are being prepared by several APPA committees, the firm of R. W. Beck & Associates, and our own staff. As parts of the manual are completed, we expect to sponsor training programs built around sections of the manual. We intend to work through regional and State associations to bring these important training sessions as close to your communities as possible.

The fourth priority item on the APPA board's list is a strong power sales program. As you have discovered here in the Northwest, the key to lowering distribution costs lies in building up power use per consumer. This can be done by small and large systems alike, and is perhaps the greatest factor in cutting costs in any utility system. APPA has some tools to help build load—a regular newspaper ad mat service, radio spots, bill stuffers, and more services coming.

A lot of us are fond of saying that we must operate our public service enterprises, in the final analysis, for the benefit of our consumer-owners. But I would like to broaden this to include all of the people in our organizations, both on the sending and receiving ends of the electric wires.

However we advance technology, our utilities will be only as strong as the people who operate them. So let us not overlook the most important resource that is available for development—the human resource. The trends in automation and mechanization—important as they may be to the efficient functioning of modern organizations—should not make our operations so impersonal that we forget that electric utilities are run by human beings, for the benefit of human beings.

In the years I have been with APPA I have been tremendously impressed by the sense of dedication, sincerity and honesty of the men who operate the Nation's public power systems. They are our greatest asset. I therefore believe we have an obligation to search constantly for new ways to make the electric industry an even more satisfying vocation for its employees, and ever more useful for those it serves. To achieve that goal we can well dedicate ourselves for the next 25 years.

RISING U.S. MARKET IN FAR EAST

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, Mr. John N. Thurman, very capable vice president of the Pacific American Steamship Association, recently pointed out the almost limitless economic opportunity for this country in expanding trade with non-Communist countries of Asia and the southwest Pacific.

Noting that this area has a population in excess of 900 million people and that the standard of living is slowing rising, he points out the economic benefits that the United States could achieve by the expansion of trade.

During my recent campaign, I alerted America to the vast trade potential of the area when I called for a partnership for the Pacific. Mr. Thurman's remarks support my contentions.

Since the article is so timely, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Journal of Commerce, Mar. 22, 1965]

PASSA OFFICIAL SAYS RISING U.S. MARKET IN FAR EAST

(By John N. Thurman)

There can be no question but that the non-Communist countries of Asia and the southwest Pacific represent an area of great economic and commercial importance to the west coast steamship companies and to the whole of the United States. A population of 900 million people living in this vast region stretching from India in the west to Japan in the east and Australia and New Zealand in the south constitute an enormous market for American products and services.

These countries are also important suppliers of vitally needed import raw materials which contribute to our economic needs and well-being. In basic products, Asian countries supply almost 90 percent of the world's natural rubber and over 60 percent of the world's supply of tin with substantial shares of the world's output of oil, wool, copra, hemp, jute, and spices.

SHIP MARKETS

Low levels of per capita income in the underdeveloped areas of this part of the world have tended to limit the market potential for U.S. goods. But the requirements for the developing nations have nevertheless brought about a substantial increase in imports from the United States. Asia and the southwest Pacific are growing markets for many of our important export goods, primarily machinery, chemical products, cotton, and to India and Pakistan large quantities of grain.

Throughout the Far East economic expansion is slowly taking place and the standard of living is increasing with the result that new and better export opportunities develop each day.

In recent years, to illustrate the importance to PASSA member lines, California has exported more U.S. goods than any other State. Annually exports from California are near the $2 billion mark and it is estimated by State authority directly provide employment for over 400,000 persons.

Studies show that in the west coast seaport areas every ton of cargo moved generates $15 in new purchasing power and $1 out of every $3 in circulation there is directly related to our world trade.

U.S. Government official figures from the Maritime Administration show that in the calendar year 1963 U.S.-flag liner vessels lifted 5,519,000 long tons of export commodities from California and Pacific Northwest ports. U.S. tramp vessels from the west coast accounted for 11,590,000 long tons of exports.

In the import trades, U.S.-flag liners carried 3,054,000 and U.S. tramp vessels, 2,819,000 long tons. Statistics have not yet been fully compiled for the calendar year 1964, but Marad estimates indicate an increase over the tonnage figures from 1963.

Today Japan is the second most important importer of U.S. goods following Canada. The United States exports to Japan nearly $2 billion worth of U.S. goods, or nearly 10 percent of our total exports. Japan has ranked second or third among U.S. markets for the majority of the last 10 years. Also the United States is now Japan's largest foreign market and source of supply with a potential for increased U.S. sales due to the rapidly expanding Japanese economy.

India, through a series of 5-year plans for economic development, may soon become an attractive market for a wider range of U.S. goods. Potentially this is one of the greatest mass markets in the world with a population of over 450 million people growing at a rate of about 9 million per year. To date nearly all U.S. exports to India have been in the nature of foodstuffs and grain generated under Public Law 480; but with industrialization the steamship industry hopes that within the next few years, opportunities will increase for the sale of capital goods and industrial raw materials.

TRADE RISING

After Japan and India, the Philippines is the most important trading partner of the United States in near Asia. While our share of the Philippine market is still high, it has been declining in recent years as a result of intense Japanese and European competition. More U.S. capital has been invested in the Philippines than in any other country in Asia, and it is hoped by the U.S.-flag west coast steamship operators that revised trade agreements between the United States and the Philippines for mutual preferential tariff treatment will alter the present trend of this nation as a declining market.

Australia and New Zealand in the Southwest Pacific differ economically and culturally from the other countries in nearby Asia. They have one of the highest standards of living in the world and because of this they provide a great potential for the American export market. At the present time the Department of Commerce is pressing for the liberalization of Australian import restrictions and a reduction in the high level of tariffs. If this endeavor is successful, a potentially rich market for U.S. shipping is bound to develop.

To turn to the military value of this locality, as a nation we must not underestimate our stake in the defense of the Southeastern Pacific and the necessity for the development of stable economies in this area. The United States has expanded billions of dollars to stem the rush of communism into southeast Asia and the Pacific. American lives are being lost to protect the democratic society.

Military action alone is fruitless unless the United States continues to contribute to the economic development to insure stability in much of this region. A solid trade system between the United States and the Pacific reaches is imperative to the well-being of our Nation.

VESSEL SERVICES

Ordinarily steamship companies are not considered in the same category as the exporter, but the actual facts are that every American-flag shipping company is an exporter of American transportation services. It is not well enough known by the general public how these transportation services contribute significantly to the U.S. balance of payments and stem the outflow of gold.

In his recent balance-of-payments message to Congress, President Johnson said that as a part of the program to bring an end to the payments deficit his administration will strive to eliminate "such artificial barriers to U.S. exports as discriminatory freight rates on ocean traffic."

What the President failed to realize or at least to so state in his message is that if American manufacturers would make greater use of U.S.-flag vessels to carry items manufactured for export to world markets, the balance-of-payments deficit could be reduced as much as $20 million annually.

Recently the Honorable WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD, ranking minority member of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, introduced a House concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 310) calling upon American businessmen to voluntarily join with the Government to reduce the balance-of-payments deficit through making greater use of American-flag vessels. The Mailliard proposal is most commendable and it is hoped will be successful.

A very simple method to carry this out could be used by American businessmen as is done in many foreign countries, and this is to quote prices on export materials C. & F. (cost and freight charges) or c.i.f. (cost, insurance and freight). The shipper would then completely control the routing of his cargo from the manufacturing plant to the consumer's home port and thereby could insist upon the use of U.S.-flag vessels.

PASSA member lines engaged in the Far East trade are embarked on building programs to furnish the American exporter the finest, fastest, most efficient vessels available anywhere in the world. We stand ready to supply a service not only to the American manufacturers and exporters, but to do our part to aid the American economy and protect our national interest.

EROSIONS OF MORAL STANDARDS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, earlier this year, an editorial appeared in the San Francisco Examiner discussing the moral standards of our society. The public response to this editorial was overwhelming and many reprints were requested.

As the editorial points out:

> If the public is as deeply disturbed as we are by the decline in national moral and national pride let it speak out.

I am convinced that through the efforts of an aroused America, we can upgrade the standards of our society.

I think the Nation should applaud my good friend, Mr. Charles Gould, the publisher of the San Francisco Examiner, for rendering this public service.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the San Francisco (Calif.) Examiner]

THE APPALLING EROSIONS OF MORAL STANDARDS

What has happened to our national morals?

An educator speaks out in favor of free love.

A man of God condones sexual excursions by unmarried adults.

Movies sell sex as a commercial commodity.

Bookstores and cigarstands peddle pornography.

A high court labels yesterday's smut as today's literature.

Record shops feature albums displaying nudes and near nudes.

Night clubs stage shows that would have shocked a smoker audience a generation ago.

TV shows and TV commercials pour out a flood of sick, sadistic, and suggestive sex situations.

A campaign is launched to bring acceptance to homosexuality.

Radio broadcasts present discussions for and against promiscuity.

Magazines and newspapers publish pictures and articles that flagrantly violate the bounds of good taste.

Four letter words once heard only in barroom brawls now appear in publications of general distribution.

Birth control counsel is urged for high school girls.

Look around you. These things are happening in your America. In the two decades since the end of World War II we have seen our national standards of morality lowered again and again.

We have seen a steady erosion of past principles of decency and good taste.

And—we have harvested a whirlwind. As our standards have lowered, our crime levels and social problems have increased.

Today, we have a higher percentage of our youth in jail * * * in reformatories * * * on probation and in trouble than ever before.

Study the statistics on illegitimate births, on broken marriages, on juvenile crimes, on school dropouts, on sex deviation, on dope addiction, on high school marriages, on crimes of passion.

The figures are higher than ever, and going higher.

Parents, police authorities, educators, and thoughtful citizens in all walks of life are deeply disturbed.

They should be. For they are responsible. We of the older generation are responsible.

Our youngsters are no better and no worse than we were at the same age. Generally, they are wiser. But—they have more temptations than we had. They have more cars. They have more money. They have more opportunities for getting into trouble.

We opened doors for them that were denied to us. We encouraged permissiveness. We indulged them. We granted maximum freedoms. And we asked for a minimum in respect * * * and in responsibility.

Rules and regulations that prevailed for generations as sane and sensible guides for personal conduct were reduced or removed, or ignored.

Prayer was banned from the schoolroom and the traditional schoolbooks that taught moral precepts as well as reading were replaced with the inane banalities of "Dick and Jane."

Basically, there are just two main streams of religious thought in these United States. Those who believe in a Supreme Being and those who do not.

The first group far outnumbers the second. But this Nation that was founded on the democratic concept of majority rule now denies the positive rights of many to protect the negative rights of a few.

As prayer went out of the classroom, so, too, did patriotism.

No longer are our children encouraged to take pride in our Nation's great and glorious past.

Heroes are downgraded. The role played by the United States in raising the hearts and hopes of all enslaved peoples for a century and a half is minimized.

We believe this is wrong. We are convinced that a majority of our citizens would welcome an increase in patriotism and prayer and a decrease in the peddling of sex, sensationalism, materialism, and sordidness.

In a few days the Examiner will present the first in a series of profiles of our Nation's heroes. We will salute the men and women who contributed so much to our national legacy in valor, science, education, religion, and art.

In the months ahead we will also intensify our efforts to fight back against the appalling vulgarization of sex.

We do not propose prudery. Neither do we propose wild-eyed, fanatical patriotism.

In both areas, we propose to address ourselves to the problems as we see them with calm reason and respect for the rights of those with views contrary to ours.

As a newspaper we have an obligation to reflect life as it is, not as it ideally might be. We will, therefore, continue to print all the news. That which is sordid and tawdry we will treat in a manner suitable for a family publication.

Over the years we have refused to accept advertising which we felt exceeded the bounds of good taste. We will pursue this course with greater dedication in the future.

Our test will be our own standards of good taste. We do not claim infallibility. Readers have felt we erred in the past. Others will undoubtedly feel we do so in the future. Such errors of excess—if they occur—will be in spite of our efforts. Not because of them.

If the general public is as deeply disturbed as we are by the decline in national morals and in national pride, let it speak out.

Together we can put down the sex peddlers without lifting the bluenoses. And, with God's help, we can put prayer and patriotism back in our classrooms. And in our hearts and homes, as well.

FORTY-SEVENTH ANNIVERSARY OF BYELORUSSIANS

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, on March 25 the Byelorussian people marked their 47th anniversary of independence. The freedom of these brave and determined people was unfortunately shortlived. Like other small nations, it was overrun by Russian aggression in 1921.

The Byelorussians, having experienced freedom's blessings, will never rest while the yoke of totalitarianism bears upon them. I say to oppressed people everywhere, "Do not lose faith. Continue to inculcate within the sanctuary of your children's hearts freedom's message."

You may be assured that the day will come when people everywhere will achieve freedom and self-determination. History clearly is on freedom's side.

SENATOR RANDOLPH PRAISES REDUCTION IN UNEMPLOYMENT FOR MARCH

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the March unemployment rate of 4.7 percent is heartening to every American—not only because it is the lowest rate in over 7 years but also because it indicates we are making progress, under an able and progressive President, toward the eventual attainment of our goal of maximum employment.

We have rightly fixed unemployment as a priority item of domestic concern, and have approached this problem vigorously with the results that we see today.

The President asked the Congress for action, and the Nation received the largest tax cut in our history; it received programs to train the unskilled, to educate jobless youth, and to open new horizons for the disadvantaged. We have pushed ahead with fiscal policies that stimulated the economy while preserving the stability of the dollar. The Manpower Development and Training Act has provided training in every State in projects approved for over 400,000 men and women. The Youth Corps and the Job Corps were authorized in the Economic Opportunity Act to reduce the still alarmingly high rate of unemployment among our young people.

I am proud to participate in this kind of government. These are programs which will lead to a better life for all Americans. We have one indication today that progress is being made in preventing the waste of human talents—a situation that has plagued our economy for too long. I want to take this opportunity to commend the President and to pledge my active support in meeting the challenge of unemployment, thereby fully utilizing the vast human resources of our Nation.

NEW DIMENSIONS OF DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the new dimensions of the Department of the Interior were discussed with eloquence and clarity recently by Kenneth Holum, Assistant Secretary, at the recent annual Farmers Union convention in Chicago.

The speech is both an excellent summary of the Department's water and power development and objectives, and the new conservation which is challenging us not only to save the beauty of our countryside, but to restore that of our cities.

I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Holum's inspiring speech be carried in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY KENNETH HOLUM, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR, WATER AND POWER DEVELOPMENT, BEFORE THE 63D ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE NATIONAL FARMERS UNION, CHICAGO, ILL., MARCH 16, 1965

In 1949, I was a freshman member of the South Dakota State Legislature—a position I attained incidentally, only because farmers in my home county were great admirers of President Harry S. Truman and I ran with a firm grip on his coattails.

Farmers Union helped a young and green farmer learn the legislative process. More important, it helped me identify the public interest.

Since that time, two of my former colleagues—one a Republican and the other a Democrat—and both very able, have retired from the South Dakota Legislature to give the State Farmers Union day-to-day leadership. Meanwhile, I have learned to know most of your State and national leaders.

Jim Patton is not only president of my farm organization, he is an esteemed personal friend. He is a respected national and international leader.

Farmers Union is my farm organization because I believe in its program. It is a people's organization, responsible, vigorous and courageous. Farmers Union is dedicated to the achievement of a nationwide and worldwide community where men may live in peace under freedom and law, and where each individual has the opportunity to earn an adequate living in return for his labor and talent.

Except for the past 4 years, my life has been spent on a family-size farm in South Dakota. Since January of 1961, I have bequeathed to my associates in the Department of Agriculture, the responsibility for grappling with farm problems and concerned myself with challenges in the water and power field of your Department of the Interior.

Farmers Union has always been vitally concerned with these matters and your Washington representatives and national president have made me understand that your interest has not diminished. I shall discuss these programs in a few moments.

President Johnson has added a new and exciting dimension to our national life. He has challenged us as never before to protect the quality of our environment. In his February 8 message on natural beauty, the President said:

"To deal with these new problems will require a new conservation. We must not only protect the countryside and save it from destruction, we must restore what has been destroyed and salvage the beauty and charm of our cities. Our conservation must be not just the classic conservation of protection and development, but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation. Its concern is not with nature alone, but with the total relation between man and the world around him. Its object is not just a man's welfare but the dignity of man's spirit."

For 46 years, I lived with nature and know both its beauty and cruelty—real and potential. I know the beauty of the freshly turned furrow, corn that is knee high on July 4, and golden fields of wheat under the summer sun.

The most elegant country club cannot surpass the beauty of a newborn calf, lambs playing in fresh, spring pastures or a pen of prime beef sleek, and ready for market.

No city slum can be more ugly than an April prairie dust storm. No environment is more unattractive than a South Dakota farm when the rains fail to come and crops die. I have survived prairie dust storms, total crop failures, and experienced with my neighbors the heartache of liquidating a carefully developed herd of breeding stock because neither forage nor pasture was available.

Now for 4 years, I have been a temporary resident of our Nation's Capital—one of America's largest cities. My family has seen the ugliness of city slums and the problems they produce.

With millions of others we breathe air that often hangs heavy with contamination. We look at the Potomac and its potential grandeur and mourn its polluted state. If we plan a picnic in one of the public areas we have learned to reserve a table a week in advance. A Sunday afternoon drive means multilane highway and a monotonous sucession of suburban subdivisions interspersed with acres of asphalt parking lots surrounding garrish shopping centers.

Utilitarian? Yes. Beautiful? Seldom.

Too often this is the case in city after city, where the mad rush to meet the basic demands of a burgeoning population makes us lose sight of the aesthetic qualities we so badly need to bring to the planning tables.

Washington is one of our most beautiful cities. Yet we have been unable to find a single place within reasonable driving distance, where a weekend family outing is possible with any normal degree of privacy.

Each of us is a product of our environment. Poverty is a depressant, not a stimulant. It rots the soul as well as the will because it robs a person of that all-essential ingredient—hope. A few prairie dust storms may, as some have suggested, strengthen the citizen's moral fiber, but their repetition is more likely to produce discouraged adults and unhappy children.

Polluted rivers are a disgrace. Clean rivers are a necessary national goal. Contaminated air is a major health hazard. Is it too much to expect here in the world's richest nation, where we pride ourselves so much on human rights, that every child born in America has the right to inherit clean air in his community?

As a South Dakota farmboy there were many things I didn't have, and didn't miss, But I did have clean air—and lots of it. The James River wasn't spectacular—but it wasn't polluted either. We had plenty of open spaces for family wiener roasts. This is a great deal—something that farmers usually take for granted.

Some of you may wonder why I have devoted so much of my time before an assembly of family farmers to stress President Johnson's concern for cities, natural beauty, clean air and water. It is because above all else, I know the Farmers Union is deeply concerned about people and their welfare. Some of the most critical economic and social problems facing our Nation today lie within the boundaries of our cities. The relationship between the farm family and the city family is well understood by Farmers Union.

Most of you have or will have sons and daughters living in America's cities. You have many reasons to support the President's program enthusiastically, and I know that you do.

Our growth can be measured in many ways as a nation. One is the increased competition for space. Each year for example, we lose 1 million acres of farmland to urban expansion, superhighways and other development. Providing adequate outdoor recreation opportunities for the low- and middle-income families in our towns and cities will require the dedication of substantial quantities of land—both in public and private ownership—to those purposes.

Our planning to meet this aspect of the "quiet crisis" as Secretary Udall has referred to these problems, must be carried out at all levels of government. Our most imaginative thinking must be applied over the long range. This suggestion of retiring substantial acreages of cropland for recreation purposes has already been proposed. Other plans will be discussed as well you can be sure, as America more and more realizes that the millions of "Johnnies, Bettys, and Marys" living in New York, Philadelphia, Chicago, Los Angeles and other great metropolitan centers need to know and experience the freedom of open areas, walks in the woods, green trees, birds and animal life—the serenity of being able to be alone with nature.

Over the years no organization has more heavily underscored its belief in the great principles of conservation than the Farmers Union. No organization has more consistently related conservation programs to the national welfare.

My responsibilities, as you know, lie in the area of our water and power programs, which very substantially affect the daily lives of millions of farm families and communities.

You have a keen interest in the multiple-purpose water resource development programs of the Department of the Interior. You have been stanch and unwavering in your support. You are vitally concerned with the policies that affect these programs and the marketing of electric power.

When you met in Washington 4 years ago I told you that the no-new-start policy would be reversed. Tonight I can report to you that 25 new starts on reclamation and power projects have been put under construction since that time. Four more are programed under the fiscal year 1966 budget request. Five of these new starts will utilize water for power generation as well as irrigation and other purposes. They will add some 577,100 kilowatts of generating capacity to the Bureau of Reclamation system, when completed.

Nearly $1.3 billion have been appropriated by Congress in fiscal years 1962 through 1965 to advance an orderly program of land and water resource development by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Between June 30, 1961, and June 30, 1964, more than 600,000 kilowatts of capacity were completed by Reclamation and 1,700 miles of transmission lines were added to distribute power to rural electric cooperatives and other consumer-owned systems.

Many hundreds of thousands more kilowatts are being added this year and are budgeted for 1966 along with associated transmission facilities.

The Bonneville Power Administration in the period from January 1961 to date has added 1,160 miles of transmission lines. Total circuit miles of transmission line under construction by BPA at this moment are 2,196 of which nearly 900 miles are for the huge Pacific coast intertie.

In the Southwest Power Administration marketing area, 346 miles of line are now under construction and we have proposed an additional 546 miles of line in the 1966 budget now before the Congress.

So we have built a total of 2,880 miles of additional heavy transmission line to provide service to our customers and are adding thousands of miles more.

We have vigorously carried out the policies of Congress in marketing Federal power at the lowest possible cost to as many systems as possible, serving rural and domestic consumers.

As a matter of fact we have extended service to 165 more preference customers in the past 4 years. The Government has a vital and continuing role to play in providing future power supply to these systems. We shall meet these responsibilities.

Of course the most dramatic and significant achievement of all in the power field came about last year, when the giant Pacific Northwest-Pacific Southwest intertie was approved.

It is the biggest single electric power transmission program ever conceived in the United States, with privately owned companies, municipal, State, and Federal entities pooling their resources to build an interconnection capable of carrying more than 4 million kilowatts of power from the Northwest to southern California and Arizona—and back again.

Most of you have read about this tremendous undertaking where the first 750,000-volt lines will be built in this country, and the longest anywhere.

Consumers in 11 Western States will benefit from this program, including customers of 248 rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, and public power systems. Our objective has been to include every cooperative and publicly owned system that we possibly could in the benefits of this interconnection. It continues to be our objective.

Any attempt by me to go into detail on this enormous undertaking would consume more time than we have available this evening. What is important to you, however, is the fact that the Federal interest and that of its preference customers has been completely protected.

Of equal significance is the fact that the Government, privately owned companies and public bodies were able to harmonize their efforts in this enormous undertaking, for the good of so many Americans.

Certainly more of this kind of joint effort must be made if America is to meet the demands of 300 million people in the year 2000 who will consume as much as 10 times the amount of electricity we now use.

There is much talk today about power pooling between systems. President Kennedy's directive to the Department of the Interior in early 1961 stimulated a lot of thinking. You will recall he told us to develop plans for the early interconnection of areas served by Interior's marketing agencies, and to plan for further national cooperative pooling between both private and public systems.

President Kennedy's directive was most timely. The growth of power systems, technological developments in extra-high-voltage transmission lines and large generating units had brought the power industry to the point where interconnections and pooling was very much in order—if full advantage was to be taken of the potential economies.

A sharp upswing has occurred in large plant construction. Many new pooling arrangements have been announced. New fuel sources have been tapped. Plans for long transmission lines have been reported widely. If all of these things are done and done properly, participating utility systems will be able to cut back necessary reserves and effect great economies by utilizing various kinds of diversities between systems. The American consumer should benefit substantially.

Will the small publicly owned systems be able to share in this promise of more economically produced power? Will they be able to join in these new pooling arrangements?

The Federal Government has an important and continuing role to play in this field. We must do the best possible job with our own systems. We must encourage interconnections of Federal and contiguous non-Federal systems, and in the sharing of the economic benefits throughout the power industry.

If the basic purpose of the power industry—irrespective of ownership—is to provide the American people with the best possible electric service at the lowest cost, then this must be done.

Insofar as rural electric cooperatives are concerned, real progress has been made in the Missouri Basin. These cooperatives, municipal utilities, public power districts, and the Bureau of Reclamation have organized a pool called the Missouri Basin systems group. The extensive Federal transmission system provides a real opportunity for cooperative arrangements.

Now the co-ops and other preference customers as well in that area will be able to join together and build large, efficient plants at sources of low-cost fuel. The basin steam, owned by farmers and financed by the Rural Electrification Administration, will be the largest lignite burning steam generation plant in the hemisphere.

In other areas where the Government has built transmission lines similar arrangements to meet the needs of our customers have been, or will be worked out.

But this is only the beginning. The task of small systems elsewhere will be more difficult. Successes will not only depend upon Federal leadership, but also upon recognition by the power industry that each segment has a job to do, and that the pluralistic pattern of ownership we have has been good for the Nation and will continue.

Because farmers throughout this Nation who are served through their cooperatives have such a vital stake in this matter, Farmers Union will I know, be in the vanguard of leadership to protect the interest of rural America.

On a number of occasions this evening I have referred to preference customers. I do not have to explain to Farmers Union members, the meaning of the preference clause and its importance.

Time after time you have stood strong and unyielding with other like-minded groups to protect the preference clause against efforts to destroy it. You have been successful and America is stronger for your efforts.

Your interest in preserving the 160-acre limitation provisions of reclamation law have been just as strongly exhibited. It is deeply rooted in the belief that Federal investment shall benefit the many, not the few. Your position is shared by many other organizations as well.

We believe strongly in this principle as well. You understand why I am proud to work for a Secretary of the Interior who has the courage to begin to right the wrongs that were done 32 years ago, when a predecessor erroneously ruled that the rich lands of California's Imperial Valley were not subject to the excess land provisions of Reclamation law.

This is not an easy job that we have assumed. Enormous acreages are involved. Much of the land is held by absentee owners. Major policy questions remain undecided. But excess lands in the Imperial irrigation district receiving water through Federal facilities will be brought into compliance with the law.

Certainly this historic decision, along with those on the Westlands Water District contract and the sale of Di Giorgio Fruit Corp. lands, clearly establishes the Department of the Interior's determination to push forward vigorously with a reclamation program geared to the family farm concept.

No administration has more firmly embraced this principle in its acts and deeds.

We intend to offer new proposals to Congress that will, we believe, adapt the reclamation program even more to family farm needs.

During the first 4 years of the Kennedy-Johnson administration some 341,800 acres of land were brought under irrigation through the Federal program. Another 127,800 acres will be added in fiscal 1965 and nearly 83,000 more are programed for the coming fiscal year budget.

The value of the Federal reclamation program in developing the West is well documented in the prosperous towns, cities, and rural communities which have been built on projects from Nebraska to the State of Washington.

That there is a continued need for an orderly program of land reclamation, and full water resource development is a sound economic judgment in my view.

You have seen such a program promulgated under the Kennedy-Johnson administrations and you will continue to see these programs advanced as part of the President's Great Society program.

But the very basis for full multiple-purpose development will have been seriously eroded, if we do not constantly adhere to the great principles that have been established by the Congress. We must always jealously guard the public interest.

Farmers Union is doing its job well. With your help and that of millions of other Americans, we shall continue to do ours to the best of our ability.

NOTICE TO SENATORS CONCERNING REPRINTING OF REMARKS ON LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, have been informed by Representative DAN FLOOD that the American Lithuanian Information Center, in New York City, wishes to have reprinted the remarks and statements of Members of the Congress concerning Lithuanian Independence Day. The purpose of this notice is to let Senators know of their plan, so that any Senator who prefers not to have his remarks on this matter reprinted can so notify the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD

Clerk, Mr. Raymond Noyes, in the Capitol.

Senators who do not object to the reprinting of their remarks on this matter need not call Mr. Noyes; Senators who do object to the reprinting of their remarks should so inform Mr. Noyes. Otherwise, their remarks will be reprinted at the request of Representative FLOOD.

"THE HIGHER PATRIOTISM"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR DODD

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, in a day when patriotism is often a camouflage for the vicious and undemocratic procedures of the growing lunatic fringe in our country, and a rationalization for extremism, it is inspiring and reassuring to call attention to an event that took place at Princeton, N.J., several weeks ago. My distingished colleague and friend, Senator DODD, the senior Senator from Connecticut, accepted the annual patriotism award from the Knights of Columbus in Mercer County, N.J. I ask unanimous consent that Senator DODD's remarks, entitled "The Higher Patriotism," delivered at this function be printed in the RECORD.

His excellent speech is particularly significant, for it gives us a practical expression of patriotism:

> The true test of patriotism is not whether a man or woman stands on the corner, beating a drum or waving a flag; nor is it the bearing of arms in war * * * but is what we do from day to day to foster the realization of those national ideals that form the heart of Americanism—

As well as restating some of the values and goals of Americanism, such as—

> seeking to preserve and expand freedom and equality, because we believe that our national experience has revealed something universal about the nature of man and we want to share that experience with the entire human family.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HIGHER PATRIOTISM

(Remarks of Senator THOMAS J. DODD at the Mercer County Knights of Columbus annual patriotic ball, Princeton, N.J., Feb. 20, 1965)

I am deeply appreciative of the honor paid me tonight by the Knights of Columbus.

I have always taken pride in my own membership in this great organization—and pleasure in taking part in its activities.

And so I put a special value on your award and shall treasure it as a responsibility to be lived up to.

We live at a time when accepted values and modes of thought are being questioned and disputed on all sides. So it is with the concepts of Americanism and patriotism.

The phrase Americanism evolves mixed responses: A favorable response that calls to mind the beloved image of our country to which we are all devoted; and an unfavorable response, perhaps, in that it also calls to mind a type of bellicose, flag waving, superpatriotism that scorns honest criticism of our country and its institutions.

I understand Americanism to be the truer patriotism which enlightened men feel for this country. It is at once the most elevated, the most complex, and the most difficult of all patriotisms.

For it is one thing to love your country because you and your forefathers were born there, because it is the center of your experience, because you are bound to it by childhood scense, by family ties, by friendships, and by a sense of belonging.

It is another thing, a higher thing, a harder thing to love your country because it stands for something, something of not just blood and soil, but something to do with ideals, with conduct, with a basic approach to life. I say this kind of patriotism is higher and harder because it requires of our country not just that it exist, but that it live up to the high ideal we have of it.

We in America should expect patriotism to mean much more than the love of the homeland which inspired men to give their lives for mother Russia, or for the German fatherland, or for the Japanese Emperor, in World War II. And the reason for this goes back to the formation of our country.

Americanism is a patriotism that has something necessarily unique about it, because our history has had something unique about it. The love of country which has for centuries drawn peoples of other lands together and welded them into nations was derived from many sources: From a love of things old and familiar, family histories in a town or province which could be traced for hundreds of years, a common tongue, a common nationality, perhaps a common religion, a national literature and music and art, a consciousness of having done certain things together as a people since the days of Charlemagne and Roland.

To the peoples of Europe, then, patriotism has its roots in the past and represents a love of all the similarities and things shared in common with their countrymen. But we in America, in the early years of our Nation, had no past. We had more differences than similarities. Our people had no common history except that of escape from the histories of a score of other nations.

We had no common religion except a heritage of seeking religious freedom. We had no common tongue, no common nationality, no national music or art, no folk tales, no national literature except for the political writings of our Founding Fathers.

All that we had in common with which to mold a united Nation, was a new set of ideas, of attitudes, of institutions; untried, unproved, yet having the universality of expressing the ancient hopes and yearnings of mankind for a better and fuller life. And we share together a new, virgin continent upon which we could try out our experiment.

It is these concepts, then, none of them fully realized or perfected, yet none repudiated or abandoned, which have ever marked off this Nation; concepts that are so familiar to us that perhaps we lose sight of their revolutionary impact upon the world of the 18th century and their place at the heart of the struggle that is taking place today between the forces of freedom and communism.

These concepts, briefly and inadequately expressed, are, it seems to me, the following: That the state exists to serve man and that man's liberty, his property, his family and his individual rights are above and beyond the reach of the state; that every man should have a fair chance to succeed or to fail on his own, a square deal, a clear field; that every man should be able to speak his piece without fear or reprisal; that every man should have an equal voice in choosing those who govern him; that every man should be held innocent of wrongdoing until proved guilty; that every man should be free to worship as he pleases; that every man has the right and should have the opportunity to own property and capital and to use these, within reasonable limits, as he chooses, free from tribute to any baron or monopoly, and secure from confiscation by government; that other men from other lands, with their troubles and their hopes, are welcome to come here to our shores and try their hand at building a new life; that the normal relationship between men is not one of artificial division, by class or by trade or by race or by religion, or by education, but one of democratic equality, of cooperation, of equal opportunity for all, of working together to tame a continent and build a nation; that the habitual attitude of men need not be fear and foreboding but confidence and optimism; that a nation, our Nation, can conduct itself toward other lands with honor, with friendship, without aggression, without predatory designs.

These ideas are our national patrimony. They took the place of all the unifying forces which centuries of living together had provided for the peoples of other lands. They are the heart of Americanism. They are all that there is to Americanism. And we may say truly that every person who shares these ideals, wherever he may live, is in his heart an American.

Our country, therefore, must constantly justify itself through its gradual, but ceaseless approach to the realization of these ideals.

What does the patriot feel in his heart when he sees our country fail to pursue its ideals and to make progress toward them?

The self-styled superpatriot is undisturbed because what he means by patriotism is not a devotion to certain ideals, but the love of self, the love of a status quo which he finds agreeable.

But the true patriot is filled with anguish at such failings, not because he loves the country less, but because he loves it more. This disappointment may turn into a cynicism which gives up on America and which decides that patriotism is a sham and a hypocrisy.

This is a needless tragedy, for a free country is not an independent organism that operates by itself while we look on critically.

A free nation is really the sum total of the people who dwell in it, added to the inheritance of those who have gone before. A free nation is what its people make of it, working through the institutions which they have inherited.

Thus the true test of patriotism is not whether a man or woman stands on the corner beating a drum or waving a flag; nor is it the bearing of arms in war. The real test is what we do from day to day to foster the realization of those national ideals that form the heart of Americanism.

In the back of our minds we should always remember that ours is the finest and most successful society that ever existed. But in the front of our minds we should keep the image of our failures to realize our ideals and we should dedicate ourselves to the task, not only of conserving the good, but of eliminating the bad that separates us from the full realization of the ancient American dreams.

What shall we do about racial or religious discrimination in housing or in education or in employment, in our community and in the Nation?

What shall we do about substandard conditions in housing and health which deprive young people growing up in our communities of a reasonably fair start in life?

What shall we do about migratory farm laborers, 2 million of them in the country and, perhaps thousands, in New Jersey, people who are being deprived of the basic rights, privileges, and benefits accorded to other Americans?

What shall we do about the arbitrary use of power by businesses or by unions, power that seeks to place its own selfish ends above the national interest or above common justice?

All of these abuses are assaults on the real substance of patriotism.

These are some of the questions that test our devotion, some of the challenges that elevate American patriotism above mere self glorification or the worship of a dead past and transform it into a call to duty.

Americanism is too vast, too dynamic, too unfulfilled to be confined to the borders of the status quo, and so also is it too universal to be confined within the narrow borders of nationalism.

We want the free system to prevail everywhere.

Part of the reason for this is practical and part of it idealistic. And in this case, as in most cases, there is such a harmony between true realism and true morality that it is hard to separate the one from the other.

We believe in maintaining freedom in the world where it exists, and in attempting to implant it where it does not exist, because we know instinctively that this is essential to the preservation of our own freedom. Yet, we also seek to preserve and expand freedom and equality, because we believe that our national experience has revealed something universal about the nature of man and we want to share that experience with the entire human family.

That is why we stand in Berlin today. That is why we are in Korea. That is why we are in South Vietnam—and that is why we must stay there and see the job through.

South Vietnam sometimes seems a pretty poor place on which to stake the hope of freedom in Asia. But it has one great virtue—it is better than any other place we could retreat to.

China was once the testing ground (but it was called the wrong place at the wrong time) and we failed the test. Then it was Korea, and we settled for stalemate instead of victory—then it was North Vietnam and we acquiesced in neutralization instead of independence.

To those who now say that South Vietnam is the wrong place at the wrong time—I say that we have listened to them so long we have run out of places. South Vietnam will have to do—the next place and the next time will be worse.

Each new line of defense is the harder to defend—because the aggressor has grown stronger through victory and the defender weaker through defeat and demoralization. If we intend to defend freedom in Asia at all—the time is now, and the place is South Vietnam. And if we at home can muster the same zeal and perseverance and faith that distinguish our soldiers in South Vietnam today—then victory will be ours, and the freedom of a continent preserved.

Our Ambassador to the United Nations, Adlai Stevenson, in a notable address at Notre Dame University, said that "today for a man to love his country truly, he must also know how to love mankind."

The history of our country in recent decades is the history of a nation that has been trying to translate charity and brotherhood into international political terms.

True enough, as we are constantly reminded, we have frequently failed. Too often our prodigious gifts to other nations have been squandered or used for narrow, even evil, purposes. Too often our ventures to translate brotherhood into political terms have resulted in alliances that are more paper than substance.

The superpatriot pounces upon these failures with glee, for he sees in them proof that the idealistic approach to Americanism is a mirage.

The true patriot is grieved by these failures, but not discouraged. For he sees the larger picture; a picture of Western Europe preserved and rebuilt and renewed with our help; a picture of a flourishing commerce among the nations of the free world, brought on in part by our national magnanimity, a picture of a thousand projects in Africa, Asia, and South America which are beginning to bear immediate fruit for the people in these areas and lasting fruit for the causes of freedom and national independence.

Out of our great national abundance, out of our measureless vitality, out of our noble but unschooled passion to create a world of justice and freedom, a new order is emerging, wracked by growing pains, but alive and kicking.

We live at a time when American patriotism faces its supreme challenge; a challenge at home from those who do not understand it in all of its lofty implications; a challenge abroad from enemies who reject its fundamental principles and who are dedicated to destroying not only this country, but the ideals which these enemies rightly perceive as the motivating force of our society.

This is a time when patriotism must be proved through works rather than words. This is a time when patriotism is not the emotion of the moment, but the dedication of a lifetime.

It is largely in our hands, in this generation, to decide whether Americanism will flower into a universal tree, whether it will wither and die from within, or whether it will be hewn down from without.

The need of our time is for that unique love of country that is unreservedly committed to our national ideals, that is intolerant of blots upon our national purpose, that is impatient with failures to reach our national goals.

We must be advocates, not spectators.

We must view the inevitable mistakes and failures of our country, not with the indifference of one who does not care nor with cynicism of one who no longer cares, but with the deep concern of one who is committed to seeing Americanism prevail in his community, in his country, and in the world, one to whom patriotism is indistinguishable from personal responsibility for participating in the effort to make our eternal causes prevail.

And we must see Americanism not only as the fulfillment of our national goals of freedom, equality, opportunity, and social justice at home, but also as the pursuit of that universal brotherhood without which universal peace and progress is impossible.

We have undertaken a great search, a search for world peace through world law; a search to transform the U.N. into a truly effective instrument of peace; a search for effective disarmament which disarms our enemies as well as ourselves; a search to restore freedom and independence to a host of enslaved nations; and a search to build upon stronger, more lasting foundations, the temple of man's honor, man's dignity, and man's freedom.

If our faith be strong, we shall find what we seek.

PRESIDENT SIGNS RESOLUTION COMMEMORATING THE BENNETT PLACE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I am happy to report that the President of the United States has approved Senate Joint Resolution 48. As requested by Senate Joint Resolution 48, President Johnson has issued a proclamation calling upon the Nation to join North Carolina in ceremonies to commemorate the spirit of national unity that stemmed from the negotiations undertaken at the Bennett Place, near Durham, N.C., 100 years ago.

It was at the Bennett Place that opposing military commanders, Gens. Joseph E. Johnston and William T. Sherman, met to seek peace; actually, they sought more than mere peace. These two professional soldiers, who had fought each other in long and deadly combat, negotiated as statesmen for national unity under honorable conditions for the South. They met with the hope of setting a new course of progress and common purpose for our people and to salve the Nation's wounds. It is in this spirit of national unity that these ceremonies will be held on April 25, at the historic homeplace of James Bennett.

We urge all who can do so to come to Durham and to be with us at the Bennett Place ceremonies. To those who cannot do so, we say: Join us in spirit, wherever you are.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President's proclamation be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENNETT PLACE COMMEMORATION: A PROCLAMATION BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The true unity of our Nation is more than a union of States. It is a unity of spirit, of human hearts, and aspirations and hopes. It is not static but is every growing, for its work is never done.

The true spirit of American unity is one of challenge, of new goals to be sought and won. It is the spirit of ceaseless striving by all of us—by Americans of every generation—to attain those great common purposes that spring from our rich and marvelous diversity and yet transcend it.

A moving and poignant example of this spirit occurred nearly 100 years ago in the peace negotiations between Gen. William T. Sherman and Gen. Joseph E. Johnston, held at the Bennett Place, near the city of Durham, N.C. Those opposing generals sought more than a mere cessation of hostilities, more than a reunion of States. They looked to the future. They sought a peace for a reunited people, a peace that would be nationwide in scope, permanent in duration, and based on mutual understanding, fraternal affection, and concord of purpose.

By a joint resolution approved March 29, 1965, the Congress of the United States has requested the President to issue a proclamation reminding the American people of the spirit of national unity that is symbolized by the Bennett Place, near the city of Durham, N.C., and of commemorative ceremonies to be held there by the Governor and people of the State of North Carolina on April 25, 1965.

Now, therefore, I, Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States of America, hereby call upon the American people to remember and to reflect upon that spirit of national unity; and I urge those who can do so to attend the centennial ceremonies to be held at the Bennett Place, near the city of Durham, N.C., on April 25, 1965, pursuant to the cordial invitation of the Governor and people of that State.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 29th day of March in the year of our Lord 1965, and of the independence of the United States of America the 189th.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

By the President:

DEAN RUSK,
Secretary of State.

THE VOTING BILL AND VOTING STATISTICS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the height of paradox is presented by the formula proposed in the administration's voting rights bill, S. 1564, to establish the presumption that the 15th amendment had been violated. New York, which uses a literacy test, had 74.5 percent of its citizens registered, while North Carolina, which also uses a literacy test upheld by the Supreme Court, had 76 percent of its voters registered. Given these facts, any reasonable man would think that a voting bill designed to secure the right of citizens to register and to vote would touch both New York and North Carolina. Yet, Mr. President, the State of New York is untouched by S. 1564, while 34 counties in North Carolina are presumed guilty of voter discrimination under the 15th amendment.

Section 3(a) of S. 1564 creates a presumption that any State or political subdivision using a literacy test has violated the 15th amendment if 50 percent or less of those of voting age were not registered on November 1, 1964, or did not vote in the 1964 presidential election. Volume 12 of American Jurisprudence states that "facts may be prima facie evidence of other facts if there is a rational connection between what is proof and what is to be inferred, and if the rule is not arbitrary."

There is no rational connection, however, between the fact that less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age in a State failed to vote and the presumption that this low voting percentage is due to a violation of the 15th amendment. Lack of participation in elections is brought about by many factors: A strong one-party system, a confidence in victory, dissatisfaction with both candidates, or a plain lack of concern. For instance, under the proposed bill, a single county in Maine would be affected. Yet as the Attorney General pointed out, "A snow storm could have kept the voters away from the polls."

I am in favor of any law that is constitutional and operates on a fair basis to end violations of the 15th amendment; but I think this bill does not do it. The absurdity of the 50-percent tests contained in section 3(a) of the bill is exhibited by reference to my own State.

Almost 52 percent of all the North Carolinians of voting age voted in the last general election. Had the percentage fallen below 50 percent, then every one of the 100 counties in North Carolina would have been subjected to the sanctions of this bill. Thirty-four counties did vote, less than 50 percent in the 1964 elections; therefore, these counties will be presumed to have violated the 15th amendment. It is also noteworthy that North Carolina's literacy test, which is a simple test of reading and writing, has been held constitutional in the case of *Lassiter* v. *Northampton Board of Elections* (360 U.S. 45). New York County, N.Y., which uses a literacy test, has a population of almost one-half that of North Carolina. The percentage of the voting age population of New York County that participated in the 1964 presidential election was 51.3. What kind of logic would accuse Hyde County, N.C., which voted 49.7 percent of its voting age population, of violating the 15th amendment, but leave New York County untouched?

In the District of Columbia during the last election only 38.4 percent of the residents voted, and only 42.6 percent were registered. This resulted despite the fact that the Constitution had been amended to permit District residents to vote in presidential elections and a strong drive had been made to increase voter registration. Special registration booths were established and kept open evenings and weekends, to facilitate voter registration. In the District there is no literacy test, and the only requirement is that the applicant be 21 years or older and have resided in the District for at least a year. Yet, if the District had a literacy test, the bill would condemn District officials for discrimination on the basis of race or color.

These voting figures strongly indicate that considerations—other than discrimination—may cause low voting statistics. In short, voting statistics alone do not demonstrate that the 15th amendment has been violated by use of a literacy test.

Florida has no literacy tests; there, in 1964, 52.7 percent of the voting age population voted. In five Florida counties the voting percentage was less than 50 percent. In one Florida county, only 36.6 percent voted—a smaller percentage than that for any North Carolina county. Yet 34 of North Carolina's counties are covered by this bill, whereas no Florida county is covered.

Arkansas has no literacy tests; but in 1964, only 49.9 percent of the voting age population voted. Arkansas would not be covered by this bill; but North Carolina, which voted 51.8 percent of its voting age population, would be.

Kentucky has no literacy test; and in the last election, 52.9 percent of the residents voted. In 13 counties, however, less than 50 percent voted. Kentucky, like Arkansas, would not be covered by this bill; neither would any of the 13 counties which voted less than half of their voting age populations.

Maryland has no literacy test; and while the State achieved a statewide percentage of 56 percent, there were three counties where less than 50 percent voted. But these counties are not covered by the bill.

The absurdity of using percentages is further illustrated by comparing North Carolina, which has a literacy test, with its neighbor Tennessee, which does not have a literacy test. North Carolina's voting percentage was 51.8 percent, while the voting percentage of Tennessee was 51.1 percent or slightly lower. In North Carolina, 34 out of 100 counties had a percentage of less than 50 percent; in Tennessee 22 out of 95 counties had a voting percentage of less than 50 percent. Was it literacy tests that caused the low percentage, or just the general apathy of voters, both white and Negro? Can it be demonstrated by any law or logic that North Carolina is guilty of discrimination under the 15th amendment, while Tennessee is not, simply because the latter does not have a literacy test?

In Louisiana, to take another example, 47.3 percent of the people voted; in Texas, only 44.4 percent voted. Under the proposed bill, these statistics would be used to justify the conclusion that there were violations of the 15th amendment in Louisiana, but none in the State of Texas.

According to the bill, 34 counties in North Carolina have been violating the 15th amendment. There are 137 counties in Texas which voted less than 50 percent, but these counties are not covered by the bill. The State of Texas, which voted 44 percent, is deemed not to be guilty of violating the 15th amendment simply because it had no literacy test. Nineteen of North Carolina's condemned counties actually had a higher voting percentage than the "guiltless" State of Texas. The State of North Carolina voted over 50 percent, and yet one-third of the State is deemed to have violated the 15th amendment simply because it does have a literacy test, which has been held constitutional by the U.S. Supreme Court.

According to statistics submitted by the Attorney General, 76 percent of the voting age population in North Carolina are registered. This is a greater percentage than in at least 13 States not covered by the bill:

Registered voters

	Percent
Arizona	66.0
Arkansas	56.0
California	75.0
Florida	54.0
Hawaii	60.6
Kentucky	51.0
Maryland	70.6
Michigan	72.0
Nevada	67.0
New York	74.5
Oregon	75.0
Tennessee	72.7
Texas	56.3

Yet one-third of the State of North Carolina, through the illogical inferences sanctioned and compelled by section 3(a) of the voting bill, would be singled out by Congress and pronounced guilty of violating the 15th amendment.

In view of these facts, it becomes clear that the criteria developed under the administration's bill for determining violations of the 15th amendment are illogical and discriminatory, and represent a vivid example of hurried draftsmanship.

It would be well for our country if those who advocate this hasty legislation would pause and ponder these words of Mr. Justice Davis, speaking for the Court in Ex parte Milligan:

> The Constitution of the United States is a law for rulers and people, equally in war and in peace, and covers with the shield of its protection all classes of men, at all times, and under all circumstances. No doctrine, involving more pernicious consequences, was ever invented by the wit of man than that any of its provisions can be suspended during any of the great exigencies of government.

PRESS NOW UNDERSTANDS THE VOTING BILL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, after the contents of the administration's voting bill became known to the public and its full import became understood by the members of the press, there has been strong criticism of the bill all over the country.

I ask unanimous consent that certain editorials and an article representative of the criticism of S. 1564 be printed at this point in the Record. They are: an editorial entitled "L.B.J.'s Voting Bill Ignores Basic Law of Democracy," from the Nashville (Tenn.) Graphic of March 18, 1965: an editorial from the National Observer of March 29, 1965; an editorial entitled "Debating the Rights Bill," from the Washington Post of March 29, 1965; an article entitled "But Vote Bill Does Need Analysis," from the Chicago Daily News of March 26, 1965; and an editorial entitled "A Speech and a Bill," from the Charlotte News of March 16, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorials and the article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Nashville Graphic, Mar. 18, 1965]

Editorially Speaking: L.B.J.'s Voting Bill Ignores Basic Law of Democracy

Political observers predict that President Johnson's voting rights bill will have easy sailing through the Congress.

Its purpose, according to the President, is to "help rid the Nation of racial discrimination" at the ballot box.

There is nothing wrong with this purpose. The color of a man's skin should have nothing to do with his eligibility to vote.

But there is something wrong with a bill that eliminates all restrictions on voting, including a simple literacy test.

How can any voter, regardless of his color, cast an intelligent ballot if he does not have the ability to read the names of candidates that are listed on the ballot form?

Without the ability to read, it will be quite possible for a citizen to vote for Barry Goldwater, or some other Republican candidate for President, when he really intended to vote for Lyndon Johnson and the Great Society.

Must there be another politically-inspired bill to eliminate any such horrendous possibility as this?

And where will control by the Federal Government end?

The President's bill provides that the Government may appoint registrars in any voting district where less than half the eligible voters are registered or failed to vote in the preceding general election. The Federal registrars will have the authority to register any protesting citizen without applying the literacy test.

The bill ignores the fact that the U.S. Constitution reserves to the individual States the right to establish their own voting laws.

It ignores the fact that there are already laws on the books under which discrimination in voting may be eliminated through the courts.

Most important of all, it violates the basic premise of democracy which holds that there can be no individual rights without individual responsibilities.

But the voting bill will become law because we are living in a time when political expediency takes precedence over all other considerations.

States' rights are fading into the limbo of an age that is dying. And with it, many fear, may also be dying the last best hope of democracy on this earth.

[From the National Observer, Mar. 29, 1965]

A Punitive Bill

Emotions—even in a highly educated, 20th century, automated democracy—can run so high that men fear to speak their minds.

So it has been for almost a month, as the voting rights heat has built ever higher. Most of those voices who assert that men should be denied a vote because of the color of their skins were stilled long ago. The only question for most citizens has been how to bring about Negro suffrage in those places where it is denied.

But so high has the heat been built, so pellmell the push to accommodate the marching thousands, that sensible questions are being overlooked. This is so even in the Congress, that body created to deliberate over the drafting of the laws, to deliberate so that correcting one injustice does not sow others in its place.

The voting bill now before Congress is plainly punitive legislation. If that is the intent of the Congress and the Nation, even under emotional duress, so be it. But let there be no mistake that this is what it is.

It is directed against six States—Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia. The record of these States on Negro voting is bad indeed, viewed over the past 100 years. But Georgia, Virginia, and South Carolina have been moving to liberalize, slow though the movement may sometimes be. And in each of the six States there are citizens who do not oppress, citizens who in scores of quiet ways work to keep southern society together as a segment of American society—including increasing the Negro vote. That aside, what is the intent—to get the Negro his vote or to punish for the sins of the past?

It is understandable that there should be a desire to punish, particularly among Negroes, particularly among the more emotional, both Negro and white. But what of the bulk of the population—is that its intent? Does it know what this voting bill provides?

For one thing, in effect, it provides these six States can have no literacy qualifications for voting, whereas the other States can if they so wish.

And there is no doubt that this is aimed specifically at these six States; a complicated formula has been devised to make it so. If 50 percent or more inhabitants of voting age in a State have been voting, Federal authorities will stay out.

The voter himself is put under strictures, apparently to force him to vote. For if a person once registered to vote in these States fails to vote "at least once during 3 consecutive years while listed," he is stricken from the register. This may be the politician's dream, but it is hardly in the mainstream of the Nation's democratic history.

One essential reason the Nation is in an uproar—a belated uproar—over voting rights is that what can be denied a Negro in South Carolina can perhaps be denied a Swede in Minnesota or a Jew in Kansas or an Anglo-Saxon in New York. Thus the drive to equalize the vote, everywhere.

But if six Southern States can be made to conform to unusual voting standards, why not Minnesota and Kansas and New York? And why, some sad day, limit this punitive conformity to mere matters of the vote?

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 29, 1965]

Debating the Rights Bill

Opponents of the civil rights bill are getting less attention at the moment than supporters who wish to improve it. Since the bill has been subjected to critical analysis a number of shortcomings have come to light. Several outstanding advocates of civil rights, such as Senator Javits, Representatives McCulloch and Lindsay, and Roy Wilkins, executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, are concerned about the pockets of discrimination that the bill would not reach. The questions they raise are serious ones which should be thoughtfully debated.

Attorney General Katzenbach has testified that the bill would prohibit discriminatory educational tests and devices in Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, Virginia and Alaska, 34 counties in North Carolina and 1 county in each of 3 States—Arizona, Maine and Idaho. But Texas, Tennessee, Florida, Arkansas and Kentucky would not be covered, because they have no literacy tests, although some of their counties have low Negro registrations.

Ideally, the bill should apply wherever the vote is denied on racial grounds. As a practical matter, it is doubtless necessary to limit the areas into which Federal registrars may be sent. But there is nothing sacrosanct about the formula provided in the present bill. It would outlaw voter-qualification tests in States, or their subdivisions, in which less than 50 percent of the voting-age population was registered or voted in the last November election. Congress may be able to devise a better (and more inclusive) formula.

It has also been suggested that, instead of abolishing State literacy tests, where a pattern of discrimination is found, it would be enough to provide fair administration of those tests. Some of the States literacy tests have been outlawed by the courts because they have been found, as in the Alabama case, to be merely a device to make racial discrimination easy. Others will doubtless be thrown out by the courts, but this does not necessarily mean that all literacy tests are bad. In the absence of such court decisions, discrimination could be arrested by naming Federal registrars to apply the tests impartially. This would ease the constitutional argument about the bill, and it might accomplish about the same result as the banning of all literacy tests in the areas to be covered.

At least it is salutary to have the Judiciary Committees examine these aspects of the bill with great care. The necessity for enactment of a strong bill to end denial of the franchise on racial grounds has been established beyond challenge. The details of the bill are still open to debate. We hope that Congress will substitute Federal action for State action so far as it is necessary to guarantee equality at the polls, without any unnecessary encroachment upon the right of the States to fix the qualifications of voters.

[From the Chicago Daily News, Mar. 26, 1965]

But Vote Bill Does Need Analysis

In his speech at Cleveland Wednesday, the Reverend Martin Luther King expressed hope that President Johnson's bill on voting rights would not suffer "paralysis from analysis."

Nevertheless, various researchers outside the Government have analyzed it, including Congressional Quarterly, Inc., I am indebted to it for most of the statistics I shall refer to.

If many Congressmen analyzed the bill with equal care, they might agree with Monday's Wall Street Journal that it is an "immoral bill." In my opinion, it needs revision, and its passage should be "paralyzed" long enough for that purpose.

The formulas for applying the proposed remedies for voter discrimination certainly do not establish uniform, nationwide standards. In fact, they establish new discriminations between States which, in turn, invite discrimination between persons. The new discriminations themselves seem to violate the letter and the spirit of the Constitution.

Most obvious of these discriminations is the outlawing of every kind of literacy tests in a few States, while leaving them in force in other States. Certainly, no State should be permitted to manipulate literacy tests to discriminate against literate Negroes, as some Southern States have done, most noticeably, at the moment, Alabama.

But the Supreme Court has repeatedly declared, and in recent years, that States have the right to exclude abjectly illiterate people from voting, whatever their race or color. In fact, all Northern States with literacy tests would be permitted to keep them, so far as the Johnson bill is concerned.

In my opinion, such tests represent good public policy when reasonably drafted and honestly applied. Total illiteracy should no more be a qualification for voting than feeblemindedness or mental irresponsibility. The new bill recognizes the right of States to exclude felons and legally committed mental defectives.

This bill provides for Federal takeover of registration and vote counting only where both of two conditions exist simultaneously. One condition is that less than half the voting-age population of a State or subdivision shall have voted in the 1964 election. States may still set the voting age. The number of the voting age population, for the bill's purpose, is the Census Bureau estimate for November 1, 1964. The second condition is the existence in such a State of any literacy test whatever.

One of the illogical discriminations built into the new bill is the different treatment provided for some subdivisions, such as counties, where both conditions for Federal intervention prevail. Take a literacy-test State where more than half the voting-age population of the whole State voted in 1964. Then the Federal treatment applies only to subdivisions where less than half voted.

But the rule is different in a literacy-test State where less than half the voting-age population of the whole State voted in 1964. In such a State, Federal authority may take over in every county, including counties where more than half the voting-age population may have voted.

If the State has no literacy test at all, no part of its area is subject to the new law no matter how small the proportion of actual voters to the number of voting age.

There is an appeal procedure through which some States or subdivisions might escape from the proposed Federal controls. Such a unit might file suit before a three-judge court in the District of Columbia to prove that it had not actually discriminated against any potential voters on account of their race or color at any time within 10 years.

This is the provision under which it is now being assumed that Alaska could get out from under. It might also rescue the one county in Maine, the one county in Arizona, and the one county in Idaho which appear to be threatened by the double-barrelled formula.

Previous court findings of discrimination make certain that Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Georgia, would immediately get the full Federal treatment. By coincidence—or is it?—all these States cast their electoral votes against Lyndon B. Johnson last November.

Two other States within the formula—South Carolina and Virginia—have no court findings of racial discrimination on the record. But the Government, it is reported, is prepared to produce evidence that they have discriminated against Negroes in registration and voting.

South Carolina delivered its electoral votes to Senator Barry Goldwater, Virginia to Mr. Johnson. Presumably the Government would press its case for a finding of actual discrimination with equal zeal against both.

However, the six Southern States mentioned above were not the only ones where less than half the people of voting age voted in 1964. In Texas the vote was only 44.4 percent—which is less than the 47.3 percent in Louisiana and only a fraction more than Georgia's 43.2. In Arkansas, the percentage was 49.9 percent.

The vote was less than 50 percent in each of 137 counties in Texas, but neither the counties nor the State would be disturbed because there is no literacy test. They would be treated like Alabama if they had tests like California's or New York's, which the new bill does not propose to void.

Both Texas and Arkansas delivered their electoral votes to Mr. Johnson. The Attorney General tells Congressmen that the low rate of voting in these two States was due to voter apathy, rather than discrimination.

Still, it is only 16 months since an important part of Texas was widely denounced as a very hell-hole of racism and bigotry. It is only a few years since Federal troops were in Arkansas to put a few Negro children in a school.

Can one honestly assume that no traces of bigotry linger in either of these States to restrict the turnout of voters or the honesty of the count? So Mr. Johnson seems to assume. At any rate, the power structure of his home state would not be touched by his proposed law.

[From the Charlotte News, Mar. 16, 1965]

A SPEECH AND A BILL

Lyndon Johnson's most powerful speech as President of the United States raises a single, deeply troubling question: How can the President's stirring words be reconciled with what is known about the civil rights bill he proposes to introduce to Congress?

On the one hand, there is a speech full of the stuff of unity, alive with a rhetoric of freedom all Americans can applaud. On the other hand, there are the outlines of one of the most divisive pieces of legislation ever sent to a Congress of the United States. How can the words be squared with the means?

As a piece of speechmaking, the President's address to Congress last night is hard to fault. If it lacked the eloquence of a Roosevelt or the burnished phrasemaking of a Kennedy, it did a Johnson proud. It was simple, direct, and, above all, forceful. It conveyed the unmistakable impression of a President who knows his mind and means to have his way. It was weakest at the end, overlong and inclining, finally, to tedium and the pseudopiety of some of the President's less fortunate Great Society speeches. Still, the overall effect was one of raw, impressive power.

Much in the speech stands without contest. It is true that Americans have been denied the right to vote. It is true that there is no cause for pride in the events that have taken place in Selma this past week. It is true—above all, it is true—that what we confront is not a northern or a southern problem, but an American problem. And it is true that to evade this problem is to deny America and much that has made this country great.

The President went beyond the self-evident to confront the hard task of understanding this diverse and sorely divided country. He bade Americans remember that the people of our Buffalos and our Birminghams see their problems differently and that in each city men and women of both races must behave in such a way that they can live together afterwards. He recognized that the issues are not quite so clear cut as the professional civil rights forces would have us believe: That there are grave issues of keeping order and peace in our country, and that free speech and free assembly are not licenses to irresponsibility. All this the President noted; all this needed badly to be noted.

But what of his central purpose before the Congress? What of the civil rights bill he proposes? Only sharp edges, cloaked in shadow, where visible. He would establish "a simple, uniform standard" for voting "in all elections—National, State, and local." He would "provide for voters to be voted by officials of the U.S. Government if local officials refuse." His manner was grim, at times almost menacing. "Experience has shown this is the only path. * * *" And he brought the Congress to its feet, catching the mood of steamrolling assent: "There must be no delay, no hesitation, no compromise without purpose."

The President's tone was of a man who does not wish to quibble over details: Pass a bill that will allow Negroes to vote everywhere and be done with it, he seemed to say. He was no more specific than that.

But the bill that administration officials have been discussing scarcely sounds like a measure designed to unite all Americans. It would single out Southern States or counties by the single, all-obliterating fact that they have fewer than 50 percent of "eligible" people voting or registered in the November 1964 elections. It would strip these States or counties of virtually all standards for voting except age and residence. It would provide for selecting Federal officials to see to it that everyone regarded as eligible by these standards was registered.

So the President's "single, uniform standard" apparently amounts to a Federal voting rule applied to all elections from the most humble local office on up. Standards of literacy—even the broad sixth-grade educational standards embodied in the Civil Rights Act of 1964—would go out the window. The States so treated would cease to shoulder any responsibility for their voters. Uncle Sam would do it all.

The bill thus described amounts to the most arrant discrimination against a few States in the name of the many. It would excuse any infringement of voting rights in most States while removing all control of voting from some States. It has the flavor of doubtful constitutionality. Worse, it is bitterly divisive by nature; it would set the Buffalos and the Birminghams farther apart rather than pull them closer together.

President Johnson plays the American people false when he says that "experience has plainly shown this is the only path." This bill did not spring out of experience with the voting mechanisms of the several States. It sprang hot and straight from the streets of Selma. It was written in the streets, out of the substance of angry protest. It is an invitation to retaliate against the Nation's Selmas with punitive law.

The President touched on the history of voting rights legislation in his speech. He told of the 1957 law that empowers the Attorney General to seek injunctions against obstruction of voting rights. He mentioned the difficulties of enforcement and the 1960 law that broadened enforcement powers, enabling courts to act more swiftly when a "pattern of discrimination" was found.

But he said nothing about the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which lies virtually unused on the statute books. Under this law State officials are required to set the same standards for all people seeking registration, to disregard minor errors and omissions and to presume that a person with a sixth grade education is literate. The Atorney General is empowered to bring voting suits before a three-judge court with appeals going directly to the Supreme Court to speed the process.

This law has not been tried out seriously. What might have been a legal test in Selma turned out instead to be a test of power, a desperate political contest that has set the stage for the wide-ranging legislation the President now seeks.

By asking for that legislation in the peremptory language he used last night, President Johnson has succumbed to that pressure. He has allowed the office of the Presidency to be used as a pawn in the struggle that is going on. He has allowed the ardent demonstrators and the foolish Governor Wallace to set the stage for blind law. And he has urged the Congress to pass this blind law without so much as a hard look.

Let us hope that Congress refuses to pass this sort of bill. If the great mass of statutes now on the books is not sufficient to give every American who can meet reasonable State qualifications the right to vote—then the law needs to be amended.

But the answer is not to impose an iron Federal rule on a few Southern States, to invite the ghosts of occupation to revisit their old haunts. Such a law would not be a charter of freedom but a bill of indictment against a section of the country. It would do infinite harm.

OPPOSITION TO CLOSING OF VETERANS HOSPITALS AND OFFICES

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the commissioners court of Grayson County, Tex., recently adopted a resolution condemning the closing of veterans hospitals and offices. I share the views expressed by the commissioners; and in order that other Senators may be advised of the seriousness with which thoughtful Texans regard this matter, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF COUNTY OF GRAYSON, STATE OF TEXAS

Whereas the commissioners court of Grayson County, Tex., being in a regular meeting in the city of Sherman, Tex., this the 23d day of March A.D. 1965; and

Whereas the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has proposed that a number of hospitals and other facilities, including the McKinney Veterans' Administration Hospital, be closed as an economic measure; and

Whereas we feel that the veterans of this county will be greatly inconvenienced in that they will have to travel a great distance to receive hospitalization, and we also feel that the closing of the hospitals and/or other veterans' facilities would be inconsistent with the President's program of total war on poverty: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we do strongly condemn the closing of any of the hospitals and/or other facilities and urge that this proposal be rescinded; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, a copy to the President of the United States of America, a copy to each Member of Congress from this district, and that a copy be spread upon the minutes of this court.

LES TRIBBLE,
County Judge.
M. C. HESTAND,
Commissioner, Precinct No. 1.
THOMAS MCKEE,
Commissioner, Precinct No. 2.
J. B. WALKER,
Commissioner, Precinct No. 3.
O. L. WILSON,
Commissioner, Precinct No. 4.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Sixth District Convention of the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Texas Department, recently adopted a most important and thoughtful resolution concerning the administration's proposed closing of veterans' hospitals and offices. I fully agree with the convention members that the closings are unwise; and in order that other Senators may be advised of the views of the convention, I ask that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE VETERANS OF WORLD WAR I OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, INC., DEPARTMENT OF STATE OF TEXAS

Whereas the Veterans' Administration announcement of January 13, 1965, in Washington, D.C., that it would close 11 hospitals, 4 domiciliary homes, and 17 regional offices in 23 States by June 30, 1965, met sharp reaction and strong protest by the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc., as well as other veterans' organizations; and

Whereas a number of Members of Congress, including our two U.S. Senators and most all other Members of Congress from Texas, have brought promises of action with regard to the closing of hospitals and regional offices in McKinney, Lubbock, and San Antonio; and

Whereas the delegates and membership of the Veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc., at this convention assembled at Hearne, Tex., support the stand taken by the Senators and Congressmen from Texas in delaying the closing of the stated facilities in Texas: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this convention go on record as favoring the removal of the Veterans' Administration from the control of the executive branch of our Government and place it under the supervision of the U.S. Congress, who created it and represents the people from all 50 States of this Union; and be it further

Resolved, That A—the veterans of World War I of the United States of America, Inc., in convention of the Sixth District of Texas do hereby express our appreciation for the action taken by the Texas Legislature in the passing of a memorial resolution opposing the closing of the Veterans' Administration regional offices and hospitals in Texas; and B—that these resolutions be spread upon the minutes of this convention, and copies mailed to the President of the United States, and Vice President, members of the Texas congressional delegation and department commander, Veterans World War I of the United States of America.

Signed at Hearne, Tex., this the 21st day of March 1965.

Attest:

S. B. PICKARD,
Sixth District Quartermaster and Adjutant.
W. C. HENDRIX,
Sixth District Commander.

FIREARMS LEGISLATION

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I was happy to join the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD] in sponsoring S. 14, a bill to amend the Federal Firearms Act. The major provisions of that bill, as Senators know, are designed to keep mail-order guns from criminals, narcotic addicts, mental defectives, and juveniles. It does not prohibit interstate commerce in firearms, but does require notification of the proper local authorities when a gun is ordered by mail. It specifically omits serial numbers from the notification to local authorities, in keeping with my feeling that no Federal law should require registration of firearms.

As Senators also know, the President of the United States on March 8 sent to Congress a message in which he called for a flat prohibition on shipment of firearms in interstate commerce, except among importers, manufacturers, and dealers licensed by the Treasury Department, and for limits on importation of firearms. The President's proposals obviously would go much further in regulating firearms than would S. 14, which I cosponsored. I was somewhat distressed to find that the senior Senator from Connecticut on March 22 introduced the President's proposed legislation. It had been my sincere hope that S. 14 would be favorably acted upon in this Congress. I believe that S. 14 is a moderate, workable, and effective approach to a very serious problem; and I was both pleased to be a cosponsor and prepared to work with Senator DODD in perfecting and passing the measure.

I sincerely hope that the introduction of the President's bill by the Senator from Connecticut does not signify a withdrawal of his support for S. 14 and an intention to push the President's much more stringent measure. I cannot believe that it is necessary or desirable to completely ban interstate traffic in firearms or to establish the prohibitions on sales by retail dealers which the President's bill asks, at least until the more moderate approach of S. 14 has been tried for a reasonable length of time. If this is tried and is proven not sufficient to cope with the serious problem at which it is aimed—that of keeping guns out of the hands of those who are most likely to abuse this privilege—then I would be willing to consider alternatives. But I will resist proposed legislation which would be a deterrent to the ownership of firearms by responsible citizens, as the Presidential proposal is.

Mr. President, while I am on the subject of firearms legislation, let me set the record straight on S. 14, since there seems to be abroad a good deal of misinformation about that bill.

First, I believe that there is a necessity for some type of legislation in this area. FBI figures for 1963, the last year for which it has its complete figures, show 8,500 homicides during the year. Of that number, 56 percent were committed by the use of firearms. Those were 4,760 deaths in 1963 in the United States attributable to misuse of firearms. Furthermore, guns accounted for 96 percent of the deaths of police officers incurred in line of duty. In light of the growing traffic in mail-order guns and the testimony linking those guns much too often to individuals who abuse gun ownership, I believe that something like S. 14 is now a must.

It has been said by some that S. 14 would outlaw, license, or otherwise impede the sportsman or other legitimate user of guns in acquiring a firearm. In fact, the bill is aimed at keeping guns out of the hands of criminals, mental defectives, narcotic addicts, and juveniles. It would perhaps be a inconvenience to a would-be purchaser of a mail-order gun to execute an affidavit and have it notarized, as would be required. But approval of the order by some Government official is not required before the gun can be shipped, as has been stated by some persons. All that is required is that the seller wait until he is informed that the affidavit has been delivered to the local law-enforcement officer.

Furthermore, S. 14 does not require registration of guns. There was included in S. 14 a specific provision that the seller would not furnish the serial number of a mail-order gun with the information he sends to the local police. I understand that this provision was inserted in the bill at the request of the National Rifle Association, a group which I am sure shares my feeling that no Federal law should require the registration of firearms.

Some have said that S. 14 is unconstitutional, infringing on the right of the people to keep and bear arms. On the contrary, it is my judgment that S. 14, since it deals only with interstate sale or shipment of guns, is clearly within the power of Congress, under the commerce clause. It does not even attempt to deal with local determinations of who may own a gun. It leaves State and local governments free to handle their problems in this area as they may see fit, and sets no prohibition on purchase of a gun by anyone, other than through interstate commerce. I point out, too, that New York's very stringent Sullivan law, requiring a police permit to own a handgun for any reason, has been held constitutional by both New York courts and the U.S. Supreme Court.

Some opponents of S. 14 have even said that it is hasty and ill conceived. The fact is that this bill is a product of 3 years of thorough study and discussion with legislators, law-enforcement officers and agencies, representatives of the firearms industry, importers, representatives of common carriers, and others. I quote from the March issue of Guns magazine:

> Senator Dodd did invite representatives of many branches of the firearms industry and of the shooting sports to Washington to discuss measures of firearms control—those discussions were long, outspoken on both sides. They included word-by-word study of the existing statutes as well as the proposed amendments, including testimony from leading law-enforcement agencies—the discussions were fair, and—subcommittee members were amazingly amenable to deletions of or changes in their proposals.

Contrast this with the slapdash, blanket approach of the administration's bill, S. 1592, which took form within 2 weeks.

It is also said, as an argument against S. 14, that if a criminal wants a gun badly enough, he has ways to acquire it. This may be true; but such a statement sounds to me more like an argument in favor of the President's blanket approach outlawing all interstate shipments of guns to individuals, rather than an argument against S. 14. I personally do not believe that either approach will absolutely cut off the availability of guns to criminals; but if a proposed law will make it more difficult for a criminal to acquire a weapon, without unduly infringing on the rights of legitimate users, then I favor it. S. 14 seems to me to fit this description; but the administration proposal does not.

Mr. President, I hope the Commerce Committee will hold hearings on S. 14, if further hearings on this approach are needed, and will report the bill out of the committee. I believe it is a good bill, and certainly much preferable to S. 1592.

NEW TRENDS IN THE FEDERAL PRISON SYSTEM

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, on February 25 of this year, the Capitol Hill Chapter of the Federal Bar Association heard an address by Mr. Myrl Alexander, the new Director of the U.S. Bureau of Prisons.

I recently read a copy of his address, and was impressed by the wide variety of responsibilities and programs involved in the management of our national penitentiary system. I was particularly pleased by Mr. Alexander's interest in the work-release program adopted by some States, under which penitentiary inmates are employed outside the prison during the day, if they are evaluated as suitable for such release.

As chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, I held hearings last week on S. 1319, the District of Columbia Work Release Act. Mr. Alexander's interest in this program, for possible adoption by the Federal prison system, is particularly timely.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record biographical data on Myrl E. Alexander and the text of his address before the Capitol Hill Chapter of the Federal Bar Association.

There being no objection, the memorandum and the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Biographical Data: Myrl E. Alexander, Director, U.S. Bureau of Prisons

Myrl E. Alexander was sworn in as Director of the Bureau of Prisons, U.S. Department of Justice, on August 29, 1964. He has had more than 30 years experience in the Federal prison service, including 14 years as Assistant Director, from 1947 to 1961.

Mr. Alexander served as professor of correctional administration and director of the Study of Crime Delinquency and Corrections at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale, from 1961 to 1964.

He was born in Dayton, Ohio, on August 23, 1909. He obtained an A.B. degree from Manchester College, North Manchester, Ind., in 1930, pursued graduate studies in sociology at Bucknell University, Lewisburg, Pa., and also holds an LL.D. degree from Manchester College.

Mr. Alexander joined the prison service as warden's assistant at the Atlanta, Ga., Federal Penitentiary in July 1931. He worked as a parole officer at the Lewisburg, Pa., penitentiary, supervisor of parole for the Bureau of Prisons, and associate warden at Lewisburg, before his promotion to warden of the Federal Correctional Institution at Danbury, Conn., in May 1943.

In 1945 and 1946, he was on special assignment as chief of prisons for the Office of Military Government in Germany. In March 1947, he assumed the post of Assistant Director of the Bureau of Prisons which he held until retiring to assume his academic duties in 1961.

Mr. Alexander was president of the American Correctional Association in 1956. He is author of the book "Jail Administration," a survey of good practices of jail management published in 1957, and is a frequent contributor to professional journals. He has served as special consultant to many State correctional systems. In 1961 he represented the United States at the International Study Group on Correctional Institution Design and Architecture in London.

He is a member of the Professional Advisory Council of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency. Among his other affiliations are the American Correctional Association, American Society for Public Administration, American Academy of Political and Social Science, and the National Jail Association.

Mr. Alexander was married in 1934 to the former Lorene Shoemaker of Mifflinburg, Pa. They have two children and three grandchildren.

"If I Had the Wings of an Angel"

(Address by Myrl E. Alexander, Director, U.S. Bureau of Prisons, to the Capitol Hill chapter, Federal Bar Association, Feb. 25, 1965)

I am pleased to be here on Capitol Hill to discuss our Federal correctional system. My esteemed predecessor, Jim Bennett, whom many of you know, came to the Hill many times during his 27-year tenure as Director of Prisons to state his case for improved programs and facilities, and to report on progress and innovations. I am, of course, continuing that policy, and am glad to have this extracurricular Capitol Hill forum.

As we move into age of moonshots and cybernetics, we in corrections are struck by some stark contrasts that require attention from concerned citizens everywhere.

The world has become extremely small in terms of travel and communication. Colonial countries are emerging into new nations without the experience of growth accomplishment during the industrial revolution. Old concepts are being tested and tried. Human rights and human dignity are emphasized and accelerated. Economic relocation of all kinds is taking place. New discoveries in medicine and public health have produced a world population explosion. Within a decade or two, knowledgeable people prophesy that 10 percent of the people will be capable of producing all food and products needed to sustain life on earth. Leisure time will increase beyond even our present imagination.

But today we are confronted by problems of unemployment, school dropouts, poverty in the midst of plenty, and an increase in our social problems including crime and delinquency.

We can no longer accept slow correctional evolution. Nor can we afford to await change through natural attrition and delvelpoment. We must produce change in corrections by planned design. Planned change is the key to the corrections of tomorrow—beginning today.

When I was a boy and lived on an Ohio farm, we were satisfied with production of 40 or 50 bushels of corn per acre. We were satisfied with hogs that produced one-third lard at slaughter time. But phenomenal changes in agriculture were produced when genetics laws were applied. The development of species by natural evolution was outmoded. We must likewise produce planned change in corrections by application of the same principle.

This need for an accelerated correctional change is the challenge before us today. It is a part of the larger effort to reduce or eliminate our major social problems of overpopulation, food, mental illness, alcoholism, poverty—all of which produce crime and delinquency as their ultimate products. And so we in corrections, confronted by new and emerging problems in our society, need to take inventory and evaluate corrections' role in the emerging social order. Early in that re-evaluation of corrections several critical facts will become abundantly clear.

First, the causes of crime and delinquency lie deep within the community. Behavorial problems are usually symptoms of grave problems in early life. Therefore, we in corrections need to have far greater insights into the causes of delinquency and criminal behavior if we are to successfully treat and train offenders.

2. We will recognize that corrections is a continuous and closely interwoven process, no one element of which can be successfully isolated from the other. We have often subscribed to this fact, but mostly in principle. Juvenile detention, the jail, the court, probation, halfway houses, juvenile institutions, penitentiaries, parole, work release problems, prerelease programs, academic education, vocational training, group therapy, are inseparable in their total impact on de-

linquent and criminal behavior. Yet, in practice, these correctional processes are all too often separate and disparate; only the client as he passes from one process to another senses the discordant and uncoordinated procedures involved in correctional practice.

3. Again, a critical self-examination will reveal that corrections, unit by unit and process by process, is usually self-satisfied. We simply aren't willing to critically examine the true results of our work. All too often a correctional institution operates on the implied principle that the institution is managed and exists for its own sake. If our correctional institutions were to serve as a guide and a model to the automobile industry, the Ford Motor Co. today would be struggling to move from production of the model T to the model A Ford. Honest research and development—in the same sense that it is used in industry or the defense establishment—would produce phenomenal and explosive results in corrections. We must face the fact that our work today is grossly inefficient.

4. We will also discover that our standards for personnel recruitment, training and development are grossly inadequate to meet the challenge of tomorrow. In institution after institution we seem to assume that the challenge of adverse human behavior can be met if the institution is headed by a warden who has had some years of practical experience in corrections; if the staff includes some caseworkers, a few schoolteachers, a clinical psychologist, a part-time psychiatrist, a medical officer, and a few practical on-the-job vocational training instructors; all of whom are buttressed by a guard force representing 75 to 85 percent of personnel. If this same staffing policy was applied to a general hospital, a psychiatric hospital, or a school system, we would be horror stricken. A correctional institution, like a school or a hospital or an industry, simply can't be any better and more efficient than the people who operate it. This very year there are 25,000 jobs in the correctional field open to persons who have bachelor's and/or master's degrees but which are now unfilled or filled with people with inferior qualifications—simply because the trained manpower isn't immediately available. And we do all too little about subprofessional training for the lineworkers in corrections.

5. We will discover that even as the roots of criminal and delinquent behavior lie deep within the community, so must we look to the community for broadened use of its resources. Much of corrections stands withdrawn and isolated from the normal resources of community life. We must prepare and guide and control our clientel for community adjustment rather than adjustment to probation or to the correctional institution, or to parole.

Those are five critical and important discoveries which will be soon apparent, if and when we have the guts to examine and appraise our correctional processes. And when these recognitions occur, then we will be ready to begin the most difficult task ever faced in corrections: Directing realistic planned change to eliminate and overcome these longstanding and deep-rooted problems which thwart and confuse us.

What is the real significance of these discoveries about corrections? What changes can we produce?

I believe that we must have some clear understandings of the causes of crime and delinquency. It is no longer sufficient for a probation officer, or a jailer, or a warden, or a judge, or a correctional officer to assume that a convicted offender stole a car and therefore we must rehabilitate him. Indeed, we want to do anything but rehabilitate the offenders committed for correctional treatment and training. If "rehabilitate" means to restore to a state of former usefulness, ability, or performance, we're kidding ourselves about rehabilitation. As a matter of fact, the job of corrections is almost inevitably one of reestablishing and accelerating the development, the education, the training, and the emotional maturation of people who have been socially, educationally, and emotionally retarded.

And we really can't correct human behavior, unless we understand why our clients behave as they do rather than as normally mature persons. This is what the work of the President's Committee on Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime is all about.

And here in the spring of 1965 this is a substantial part of President Johnson's war on poverty. Think for a moment: Do the current discussions about school dropouts, unemployed youth, deteriorated slum areas of large cities, aid to dependent children, public welfare—do these have a familiar ring to you? Of course they do, because we in corrections have spent our lives dealing with the behavior of children, youth, and adults who are the products of these social problems which have now been discovered anew and publicized. The great majority of delinquents and criminals have been school dropouts. They have come from socially inadequate families. They have come from the ranks of the unemployed. They are the social misfits who are the products of these conditions and influences.

Yes, all correctional workers must become increasingly understanding and knowledgeable about the causes of crime and delinquency. This is not a static body of knowledge, but one which is growing and expanding and developing. The modern correctional worker must keep current with new facts, new insights, and new theories of delinquency causation as they develop and are proven or disproven. We do not treat the car thief, we treat the undeveloped and deprived youth. We do not treat the check forger, we treat the alcoholic, the unemployed, the uneducated. We cannot work from the limited perspective of symptomatic behavior. We cannot meet emotion with emotion. We can no longer afford to treat symptoms.

Corrections is rarely practiced as a continuous process in this country. An offender is arrested and placed in a jail. The jail may be—and often is—the most socially infectious place in the community. He may be there until trial if he is indigent and without resources, even though he might be quite responsible for appearance at the time of trial. If he has means or friends, or influence, he will be out on bond awaiting trial. When guilt has been determined he may be immediately sentenced. On the other hand he may await a presentence investigation by a probation officer before commitment. If he lives in a rural area, probation may be nominal or even not available. If in another area, he may be under the guidance and control of a skilled probation officer. He may be committed back to a county jail for a short sentence or to a workhouse.

Then, too, he may be committed to a major penitentiary or reformatory. Sometimes the probation office will make the results of a presentence investigation available to the institution which he is sentenced. More often than not when received at an institution he may answer a few cursory questions on his vital statistics. He may or may not be tested. He may be given a fair diagnostic interview by a caseworker, or he may not. He may be assigned to work the first day he is there or he may be held in admission-orientation unit awaiting complete social and diagnostic studies.

He may learn more about the institution and how to get along in it from inmates than he ever does from the staff. He may be assigned a realistic vocational training program, but more likely will be assigned to something called meeting institutional needs and placed on a nebulous waiting list for some time. He may be enrolled in school and taught by another inmate in certain routine subjects at the elementary or high school level. He perhaps will be tested. He may even pass a general education development test and get a high school diploma. But more likely if he does, he will never have been in a class taught by a skilled teacher who brings to him a sense of the wonder of science in an orderly world, the beauty of a poem, an appreciation of man's long histories and struggles, the meaning of life in a free democratic society, or any other of those facets of education which meet and attack and solve the problems of the educationally and emotionally deprived persons. He may see a psychiatrist on entrance and again sometime if he exhibits some kind of bizarre behavior. On the other hand, he may never see a psychiatrist.

When he reaches parole eligibility he may have a hearing before a part-time parole board member who is able to spend only a few minutes taking a look at his case. He may appear before a full-time parole board member, interested and skilled in evaluating the applicant's probabilities of parole adjustment based on behavior attitudinal changes and accomplishments within the institution.

He will probably be released without any real preparation for the job secured for him and placed under the supervision of a parole officer whom he has never seen before and who on the first contact makes sure the releasee is fully aware of the fact that he can be sent back for any of a whole series of violations, many of which are ludicrous in a contemprary society. Or he may on the other hand have spent part time during the last few months in the institution attending prerelease meetings, may have met his parole officer and may have found in that officer, a counselor, a friend and guide.

But the very real probability is that beginning with arrest through the jail until final release from probation or parole, he will have had an experience which reflects nothing of a continuous, meaningful, supervision and experience. All too little of his experiences will have been with anyone except other offenders and officers of the court or institution. He will have very little feeling that he has undergone a kind of social process in which he has relationships with normal people leading normal lives in a normal community. With few exceptions, we have a long way to go in this country to create, develop, and administer a continuous correctional process which is designed to retrain, redevelop, and create maximum impact toward social adjustment of offenders.

When I referred earlier to the need for research and development I perhaps sounded a little too academic and you may well have wondered: Can we really apply the principle of research and development to corrections? I think so. If a correctional administrator genuinely and seriously wants to determine the extent to which his system is succeeding or failing in reaching accepted goals then he needs research. He will then want to determine whether more effective techniques, methods and programs can be designed than those which have been traditionally used. This means setting up new kinds of approaches and measuring the results against those which have been traditionally used. This may apply to a wide range of program elements. It may mean a complete reexamination of the philosophy on which traditional approaches have been based. Results of self-study, and research, and demonstration projects may, in turn, have tremendous impact upon modifying, revising, and changing the philosophy of correctional administration.

What new kinds of development can we foresee? Let's examine together for a moment one recent major development in corrections: a rising interest in the halfway house. Community groups—including several religious organizations—saw the need for a bridge between institutions and the community. Halfway houses were established in a number of cities including Los Angeles, Chicago, Minneapolis, Wilmington, Del., St. Louis, and others. These took a variety of forms from small family residential units to larger come-one-come-all programs. An institution in New York State for delinquent girls developed several halfway houses which were in reality residential facilities within a city supplementing the residential programs at the institution.

In our Federal correctional system, we now have four prerelease guidance centers for youthful offenders, in New York, Detroit, Los Angeles, and Chicago. A fifth will open this spring here in Washington, D.C.

I believe the halfway house concept should be extended to selected adult prisoners, now that it has proven its worth among youthful offenders.

Another imaginative new program that I believe would prove successful for Federal prisoners is a work-release program similar to those employed in such State systems as Wisconsin and North Carolina. This plan was conceived as the Huber law in Wisconsin. Under the plan, penitentiary inmates are employed outside the prison during the day, after suitability has been determined by staff evaluation.

In a visit to North Carolina last year, I learned that of 10,000 prisoners committed to the North Carolina prison system, nearly 1,000 work under this work-release program, paying expenses for board and room at the prison, supporting families, sometimes saving money and maintaining and developing skills. Transfers from institutions to the community become almost a paper transaction.

The entire State of North Carolina, as represented by newspaper editorials, accepts and is extremely proud of its development. I learned recently that California is now creating an extensive work-release program. In this kind of change we can foresee changes in philosophy as the result of evaluation and demonstration projects which may well pinpoint a revolution in our field.

Professor Glaser's study of inmates released from Federal institutions which has been carried on for the past 5 years under a grant from the Ford Foundation, is resulting in revision of institutional programs in the Federal system. All of us are acquainted with the California research on probation officer caseloads, on intensive parole supervision, in administration. Although I cite only a few examples, I hope they are perceptible as indexes of the kind of correctional administration which can produce planned change.

The need for completely new concepts of management in personnel training and development is becoming abundantly clear. I suggested earlier that we are inclined to think we have a good correctional institution if we have an experienced warden and some staff people who have been trained in the behavioral sciences. But thus far, our training of line personnel—that is the people who have the regular day to day contacts with institution inmates—is restricted usually to not more than high school graduation. Inservice training is devoted primarily to correctional skills such as counts, locks, locking devices, use of gas, riot plans, escape plans. Yet these are the people who deal most directly and have the greatest impact upon the inmates of our institutions. Because of the compelling need for this kind of training, our center at Southern Illinois University is designing a subprofessional training curriculum for correctional officers. Briefly, this is planned to be a 2-year subprofessional curriculum, designed to instill insights and understandings from the behavioral sciences and some skills in dealing with behavior problems. We can't possibly insist that every correctional worker must have a college degree. As a matter of fact, unemployed youth and young adults can be remotivated and given training for jobs in corrections. This will elevate the base competence of the whole body of correctional personnel.

Moreover, we need extended and continuous training in public administration for our administrators. We need training at the supervisory level and continuous development of people working in the behavioral disciplines. It is from this kind of philosophy of personnel administration that we can accelerate the evolution of corrections.

Finally, I have spoken of our failure to use community resources. All too often we think that in corrections we can't get on with the job unless we have all the staff needed on our immediate payroll. This simply isn't true. A new trend to build correctional institutions in close proximity to universities is a case in point. Universities offer tremendous resources which have been used all too rarely and all too little in years gone by; and yet, in terms of personnel training and development, research in the behavioral sciences and consulting services in sociology, in education, in special education, and vocational training are available in the larger universities. This conference is evident of the fact that universities are available as resources for correctional development.

But beyond this there are available a wide variety of other resources. Talent can be brought into the institution from the community. Inmates can be taken from the institutions into the community for purposes other than a work-release program. I need only mention League of Women Voters, or women's clubs, various professional societies who are always willing to help in public institutions; libraries, recreation associations and so on through a long list of community resources which we have rarely attempted to use. In probation and parole, I like these recent experimental programs which bring small groups of probationers and parolees together under the guidance of psychologists and group therapists, or skilled probation officers who can discuss with a group their common problems. This I think will one day lead to the development of new kinds of community correctional facilities based right in the community as contrasted to our present jails and prisons all too often off in some far part of the community or the State. Yes, we must look to the use of community resources in a way never dreamed of up to this time.

I am convinced that one of our serious mistakes is to try to rehabilitate everyone. We extend the same processes, procedures, and programs to all. I get a little weary sometimes of going to large penitentiaries and seeing old, recidivistic offenders being given vocational training, education, and the gamut of our treatment processes for the third, fourth, or fifth time. Now this is a little dangerous to say. I don't mean that we should return to the old bighouse philosophy. On the other hand, I think we must begin to be selective in the use of our resources, particularly personnel and funds. When we try to give the same kind of education, treatment, and therapy to the old lugs that we give to the youthful and young adult offenders, we usually wind up with the youth and young offenders getting a pretty skimpy program. Realistic administration must concentrate the resources on those offenders and in those areas which are most promising. This, coupled with research and development, would suggest that we can become much more realistic than we have up to now.

I told you of my recent visit to North Carolina. I asked Mr. George Randal, commissioner of corrections, how he was able to accomplish all these interesting new developments in his State. He leaned back in his chair, "Well, I am tired of hearing correctional administrators declare 'I have nothing to do with politics in my system'." Says Randal, "That's not at all realistic. I have to look to the legislature and to State officials for support, for understanding, for funds, for personnel, and for the means to accomplish about everything I want to. I'm one of the most active politicians in my State."

"I know everybody in the legislature. I see them frequently. I don't go through a State senator's county without stopping to say hello. I argue the hard facts of corrections with them. I do everything in my power to influence them to support corrections and they are supporting it. And it does pay off."

I suggest that Commissioner Randal has a convincing approach to the relationship between corrections and political realities.

Another fact I have seen demonstrated in a number of places around the country, not only in North Carolina, is that correctional administrators all too often underestimate the public. If we give them the information and spell out the public's stake in good corrections, we may well discover that they're far ahead of us in accepting new approaches in corrections. The Huber law, under which jail inmates work in the community and return to the jail at night, is fully accepted in Wisconsin. When the public understands the issues involved, they are intrigued with the human approaches and will insist upon them. In North Carolina the new kind of program which places a thousand working inmates in the community each day is accepted editorially by every newspaper in the State. I am coming to believe that the old saw that "we can't move very far ahead of the public" is a delusion and is perpetuated by many of us in corrections as an alibi for our own failures to get on with the job which the future demands.

LIBERALIZATION OF VETERANS PENSION LIMITATIONS—RESOLUTION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a most thoughtful and important resolution was recently adopted by Maco Steward Post No. 20 of the American Legion, Galveston, Tex. In order that this matter may be more fully understood by other Senators, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas existing legislation (sec. 503 of title 38, United States Code) sets limits on war veterans' incomes for eligibility to draw the veterans pension well below the "poverty" level now recognized as a basis for economic opportunity needs;

Whereas many pensioners and annuitants, because of the poverty income level set by existing law, are not eligible to enjoy the benefits of cost-of-living increases granted to an individual under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment or similar type plans or programs, and some veterans must either forgo or waive such paid-in benefits as those offered under certain public or private retirement plans; and

Whereas veterans with only the small pension for support find themselves in utterly dire circumstances and are all but humiliated by a government pledged to give reasonable recognition for services rendered in the interest of national security: Be it

Resolved, That either the aforementioned income limitations be raised to more reasonable levels, so as to remove the "poverty" penalty and stigma, or that a law be enacted by the Congress to amend section 503 of title 38 of the United States Code to exclude from consideration as income for the purpose of determining pension eligibility, all amounts paid to an indivdual under public or private retirement, annuity, endowment, or similar type plans or programs. (Attention is invited to H.R. 5677 already offered and scheduled for study by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. It is recommended that this bill be amended to afford relief for veterans who are ineligible for retirement pay under programs other than the pension legislation.)

C. E. Blakeman,
Commander.
Thad A. Law,
Adjutant.

The above resolution was adopted by this post on March 18, 1965, at a regular meeting of this post.

REAPPORTIONMENT OF THE STATE LEGISLATURES

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, a well-known and respected columnist, Doris Fleeson, has written a revealing article concerning the current effort to stop the reapportionment of both houses of the State legislatures on the basis of population.

With her usual no-nonsense approach, Miss Fleeson has dug into the core of the proposals to reverse the Supreme Court decisions that the equal protection of the laws guaranteed by the 14th amendment require that each citizen's vote not only count, but count equally, in both houses of his State legislature. She points out, correctly, that Congress gives the appearance of having one hand not know what the other is doing: while Congress appears intent on enforcing the constitutional right of Negroes to register and to vote, through the new Voting Rights Act, a large number of its Members appear anxious to permanently deprive Negroes and many other citizens of the constitutional right to have their vote count equally with that of other citizens.

This article should be widely read. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Efforts To Blunt the Urban Vote," from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 30, 1965, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Doris Fleeson—Efforts To Blunt the Urban Vote

Washington.—A Senate preparing to pass a voting rights bill with a whoop and a holler is simultaneously engaged in wrapping up a stupendous lollipop for the status quo not only in the South but all over the country.

It will cut down the value of the Negro's vote when he gets it together with that of other minorities and all the voters who cram the urban areas where 85 percent of Americans now live. This will be the effect, and not very heavily disguised intent, of the sweetmeat which will nullify the Supreme Court's "one man, one vote" ruling of June 15, 1964.

A constitutional amendment wrapper has been fixed upon, and a judiciary subcommittee on such moves is holding hearings on what form it should take. However, the yea votes were there at the start in that citadel of conservatism of which Senator James Eastland is chairman.

The central structure embraces the principle that States should be permitted to apportion one house of their legislatures on a basis other than population. This immense latitude is qualified by the proviso that a majority of the people must vote for the change. How this would work out in practice is unclear.

The project, and especially the timing, is again from the hand of the old master, Republican leader Everett Dirksen. Dirksen is at the peak of his popularity for his civil rights services. President Johnson's close relations with him in the practice of consensus lend him a helpful coloration in the matter of prestige.

Dirksen has a valid and 100 percent Republican reason for his efforts. His party's rural roots are vital to its power in many States, including New York. That is why the liberal Senator Jacob Javits is going along part of the way.

Also, Dirksen senses the need for haste even on such a large and significant question. The battle to get fair reapportionment by the Court's standard has hardly been joined. As it progresses, if it is allowed to, the public's understanding of what is at stake will mount. This is especially true of the civil rights forces, who stand to gain the most under the voting rights bill which now preoccupies them.

There are many extraordinary aspects of the Senate's haste to fall in line behind Dirksen's banner.

The big States with their great cities are the base of the Democratic Party's strength and must continue to be. The topheavy majorities that they have enabled the party to gain in Congress seem to have no place in the thinking of Senate Democratic Leader Mike Mansfield, who once more is prepared to swing along with his opposition leader.

Really staggering, however, is the Senate's near-total indifference to the true condition of the State legislatures in today's world. Even casual readers of newspapers must observe their many internal weaknesses. Experts have come to question their capacity to deal with new and complex questions.

Their conflicts of interest are a cliche. These arise out of the poor support they get from home as well as their poor pay.

It would appear that the Senate should be welcoming the winds of change to air the stale legislative chambers and give the States a better chance. Instead, it seems bent on defending the indefensible, and it is a charge upon the whole Senate to explore what is really being defended.

FREEDOM ACADEMY SUPPORT PYRAMIDING

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, recently the Atlanta Constitution editorially sought reason for the decline in the strategic position of the United States in southeast Asia. Editors of the paper view our air strikes in North Vietnam as evidencing our ineptitude in the type of warfare we have faced there, causing policymakers to shore up our position by resort to quite a different type warfare—one in which we excel. But these editors warn that in order to realize our policy goals in Asia, we have still to solve the fundamental problem: How to win in nonmilitary warfare.

> We may win battles in the name of peoples, but unless we win the peoples themselves they will go their own way regardless of how the battles went. Most South Vietnamese care little about ideological terms like communism and democracy. They'll go with the government that offers them the best system for meeting their own needs.

It is more clearly stated. The Atlanta Constitution identifies the area of our weakness:

> Bombing may end the shooting, but the Vietcong may win the war. If our counterinsurgency effort in South Vietnam was insufficient, then we must value the lessons learned and perfect the system, not overlook the lessons and abandon the system.
>
> * * * Our failure in Vietnam has been primarily political, not military, and superficial bombing cannot erase the need for some long-range learning on the part of the United States. * * * Political effectiveness must accompany it, or the decisions will be unfavorable ones, and communism can still take the underdeveloped world.

This states the problem very plainly. Strategic computations indicate that we can hold on militarily in southeast Asia. But a military holding action is only temporary. Real victory will be achieved by one side or the other through superior application of techniques of nonmilitary warfare—persuasion, popular conviction that either one governing system or the other "offers them the best system for meeting their own needs."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the editorial entitled "United States Must Not Quit Too Easily on Basic Problem in Vietnam," from the Atlanta Constitution of March 6, 1965, be printed in the Record at this point in my remarks.

The Atlanta Constitution, incidentally, has editorially endorsed the Freedom Academy bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Atlanta (Ga.) Constitution of Mar. 6, 1965]

United States Mustn't Quit Too Easily on Basic Problem in Vietnam

Our American tendency to leap to wholehog conclusions may yet dissipate and destroy the hard lessons we have learned in Vietnam.

The current bombing of North Vietnam has reconstituted the U.S. position in South Vietnam. It has probably made negotiations for a cease-fire possible.

If luck runs well, the United States may soon be able to sit down across the table from the Communists and settle the war as we have known it.

If this had been tried a month ago, the Communists would have been able to derogate U.S. demands and ask, "If we don't agree, what are you going to do about it?" Under the old rules the United States could only have said, "We will fight you in the paddies for 10 more years," and might have had to.

Now, if negotiations come to pass, and the Communists ask, "What are you going to do about it if we don't agree?" the United States can reply, "We are going to remove a dozen more of your North Vietnamese towns from the map of Asia." Thus the bombing has presented to the Communists a wholly new encouragement to talk seriously about peace.

This is altogether to be desired. And if negotiations now come to pass, an end to the guerrilla war may be in sight.

But we Americans will be throwing away everything we have learned in Vietnam if we jump to either of two assumptions: First, that this means South Vietnam will stay non-Communist, and second, that this means U.S. military counterinsurgency in the paddies is a failure and that bombing alone is decisive.

The fact is that while bombing in conjunction with the years of counterinsurgency may bring the war to a decision point, the decision may be delusive. For if we assume that a mere guaranteed cease-fire and a graceful U.S. withdrawal can settle the Communist issue for the South Vietnamese, we're probably wrong; they may promptly opt for communism themselves, under the various prevailing pressures.

We may win battles in the name of peoples, but unless we win the peoples themselves they will go their own way regardless of how the battles went. Most South Vietnamese care little about ideological terms like communism and democracy. They'll go with the government that offers them the best system for meeting their own needs.

Communism has long assumed it can meet southeast Asia's needs better than free systems can, and even if the Vietcong is forced by our bombing to make a surface peace now, their long-range assumption will persist. The only real answer to the Communist assumption is to prove our own assumption—that free systems can excel communism in meeting the needs of people. This has been a major part of our 10-year ground effort in South Vietnam, with the military spearheading it. It has been inconclusive. Otherwise the bombing of North Vietnam wouldn't have been needed. While it has failed in many areas of the country, however, it has succeeded in many areas. It also is the really meaningful combat out there. It has been a start along the right track.

Yet if bombing of North Vietnam proves superficially effective in bringing a surface end to the short-range shooting in the south, Americans may be tempted to writeoff the counterinsurgency, civic action, and special forces techniques on the ground, and assume bombing is all we need. There are indications within the U.S. Army itself that this mistake is about to be made. It would be a dangerous mistake. Bombing may end the shooting, but the Vietcong may win the war. If our counterinsurgency effort in South Vietnam was insufficient, then we must value the lessons learned and perfect the system, not overlook the lessons and abandon the system.

No matter what short-term papers the bombers may force the Communists to sign, the long-term dispositions in southeast Asia will be decided by the people who live there. And if communism offers them more effective political, economic, social, and military systems than we can muster, our failures on the ground will endure long after our heroics in the air have been forgotten. Our failure in Vietnam has been primarily political, not military, and superficial bombing cannot erase the need for some long-range learning on the part of the United States. The start we made over the past 10 years in Vietnam may have been one of the most valuable strides toward realistic competition with communism that this Nation has undertaken. Military power is required to force decisions, as we have learned. But political effectiveness must accompany it, or the decisions will be unfavorable ones, and communism can still take the underdeveloped world.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a recent New York Times article concurs in the contention of our inadequacy in psychological warfare. Written by Seth S. King, the article quotes an American adviser to the South Vietnamese:

> They [the Vietcong] always take the initiative and we can only try to run around and put out the fires.
>
> To be perfectly honest, the Army of South Vietnam just isn't interested in psychological warfare. They think it's a waste of time even if we are willing to make most of the effort for them.

I ask unanimous consent that this article, entitled "Vietcong Ahead in Propaganda War", from the New York Times of March 17, 1965, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 17, 1965.]

VIETCONG AHEAD IN PROPAGANDA WAR

(By Seth S. King)

BANMETHUOT, SOUTH VIETNAM, March 15.—Rejoin your loved ones who are longing to see you. You are only being used as bullet shields by the Communists. Your Government will help you return to your homes."

Leaflets bearing this message have been floating down on towns and villages in the sparsely populated but strategically vital Central Highlands of South Vietnam.

The leaflets have been aimed at persuading young Vietnamese who have joined the Vietcong guerrillas to desert and return to their families.

The effort is part of a new campaign of psychological warfare inspired and financed by the United States and pressed upon the South Vietnamese Army by young American military advisers.

The United States is planning to expand the large information force already in South Vietnam and to provide it with more money.

In the last 6 weeks as the struggle for control of the highlands has moved into a new phase as the Vietcong try to cut South Vietnam in two. The propaganda war that has accompanied this drive has also been stepped up, and once again the Vietcong appear to have sped past the Government.

Vietcong agents have been matching the Government at every turn, even in the distribution of expertly printed leaflets in two colors.

Where the Government must fly over the sector in American planes equipped with loudspeakers, the Vietcong go into the villages and spend several days employing the "three withs"—eating with, sleeping with, and working with the people.

Communist guerrillas have shown unexpected speed and dexterity in spreading their propaganda in the highlands.

REGIME EFFORT ASSAILED

A Vietcong leaflet picked up at Quaingduc, near the Cambodian border, contained on one side the following: "Struggle for better pay and guarantee of long life. Do not support the Government in its fighting. If you do you will die and your life will be wasted."

On the other side of the leaflet was a brief newsletter telling of Vietcong successes in the attack on the American billet at Quinhon and in closing Route 1 along the coast. It ended by saying that members of the Government "are fighting each other in Saigon even now."

The leaflet was dated February 19, the day of the most recent coup d'etat attempted in Saigon.

Other leaflets have been found all over the area promising "help and kind treatment" to regular soldiers who are "anti-American" and who "throw down their weapons."

The Vietcong have been equally quick to turn the Government's propaganda to their own advantages. Government troops recently found booklets in a number of villages. The cover was the same as that of a Government booklet explaining the protected-hamlet program; inside was a Vietcong propaganda tract.

Since the first week in February, when the Vietcong opened their drive in the Central Highlands, the guerrilla influence has trebled in Darlac Province, an American adviser said.

"They always take the initiative and we can only try to run around and put out the fires," he said.

"To be perfectly honest," he went on, "the Army of South Vietnam just isn't interested in psychological warfare. They think it's a waste of time even if we are willing to make most of the effort for them."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, if we had instituted something like the Freedom Academy when the concept was first approved by the Senate in 1960, we would have had a facility at which to familiarize Vietnamese officials with the art of nonmilitary warfare. One can marvel at their hesitancy to utilize psychological techniques in their fight against Communist subversion, but one must also marvel at why our Government has been so hesitant to recognize that our failure to provide pertinent training in this field for foreign nationals who want it is opening a void in total defense against Communist and other totalitarian aggression.

Sponsors of the Freedom Academy bill in the Senate, Senators CASE, DODD, DOUGLAS, FONG, HICKENLOOPER, LAUSCHE, MILLER, PROUTY, PROXMIRE, SCOTT, SMATHERS, MURPHY, and myself, have, in introducing the bill, asked Congress to appraise U.S. global strategy in its entirety. We perceive critical fault in this country's appraisal of contesting world forces. As a Government, we refuse to accredit sincerity to the long-range challenge we face.

As I have discussed this matter in recent weeks — CONGRESSIONAL RECORD pages 4165–4166, 4882–4884, 5436–5440—a whole new academic discipline concentrated around nonmilitary aggression has grown to maturity over the last generation, and is functioning under Communist direction; but the United States has not kept apace. By section 2(a) (2) of the Freedom Academy bill, Congress would recognize this inadequacy. We state:

> The Communist bloc and the various Communist parties have systematically prepared themselves to wage a thousand-pronged aggression in the nonmilitary area. Drawing on their elaborate studies and extensive pragmatic tests, Communist leaders have developed their conspiratorial version of nonmilitary conflict into an advanced, operational art in which they employ and orchestrate an extraordinary variety of conflict instruments in the political, psychological, ideological, economic, technological, organizational and paramilitary areas enabling them to approach their immediate and long-range objectives along many paths. This creates unique and unprecedented problems for the United States in a conflict that is being waged in student organizations, peasant villages, labor unions, mass communication systems, in city and jungle, and institutions and organizations of every description, as well as in the world's chancelleries. Recognizing that nonmilitary conflict makes extraordinary demands upon its practitioners, the Communists for several decades have intensively trained their leadership groups and cadres in an extensive network of basic, intermediate, and advanced schools. The Sino-Soviet conflict capacity has been immeasurably increased by the mobilization of

> research, science, industry, technology, and education. * * *

Now one of the great American authorities on military affairs, Hanson W. Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times, has contributed his evalution of total U.S. strategy; and his evaluation is consistent with these findings in the Freedom Academy bill. Writing in the November–December 1964 issue of Ordnance, Mr. Baldwin says of our position:

> * * * the threat [we face] is opportunistic, massive, and unrelenting, and it takes many forms—ideological, political, economic, psychological, and military. We must be prepared for a spectrum of conflict from such nuclear power confrontations as the Cuban missile crisis to a twilight war against Communist puppets.
>
> But by far the greatest threat—one that has so far frustrated us—is the so-called "war of national liberation," the kind of guerrilla, terrorist, and insurgency conflict now being waged in South Vietnam.

By establishing something like the Freedom Academy, Congress would move meaningfully toward squarely confronting this threat. We propose intensive research into a new spectrum of warfare about which we know so little. We propose to train our people and our allies' people in knowledge about the new spectrum, to improve their effectiveness in resisting nonmilitary aggression where it occurs. Our defense depends on these people. They should be fully knowledgeable about tactics used against us.

We do not propose to imitate Communist methods. We do propose to understand Communist methods, in order to be more effective against them.

Hanson Baldwin concisely assesses our strategic situation.

> A great many of the new nations * * * [are] almost certainly destined to disappear from the map of history. Many * * * do not have the political, economic, or military power, or the population, skills, and resources to continue to exist * * * as independent countries.

There is underway a contest to determine where allegiances in these nations will be directed. Communist powers remain dedicated to world revolution.

> Moscow's expansionist philosophy has not been abandoned, though the methods of achieving it have changed. And a new and far more aggressive Communist power—Red China—has complicated the global picture and worsened it.
>
> Thus the political world we live in is still dominated by a major struggle between communism and anticommunism. But now there are several brands of communism, and many kinds of anticommunism and noncommunism.

Where is the contest waged?

> * * * in Africa, Latin America, and, most threatened, the Middle East and southeast Asia. Hundreds of millions of uncommitted peoples—passive, ignorant, poverty-stricken, with no sense of identification with either side, no real sense of national loyalties—are the weathervanes of tomorrow's history.
>
> The stakes are huge * * *.

He identifies our antagonists:

> Over and above all other considerations, we face a continuing struggle, with no end in sight—against an aggressive, expansionist Communist Russia and Communist China, and against plain "have-not" nations, intent on acquiring what we have.

Yet, among the millions of uncommitted whom Baldwin discusses are leadership groups friendly to us. They are friendly to us at least to the degree that they do not want their own governments undercut and taken over by Communists.

We have mutual interest with these people. To the degree that the Communist stance would be strengthened by converting these people and their resources to the Communist cause, so the Communist potential for strength is weakened as we help these leadership groups maintain their own national independence from Communist subversion.

They do not understand the method of aggression against them. We do not fully understand it. It is in our interest, as well as in theirs, to familiarize them as well as we can with the challenge they face, while at the same time acquiring full comprehension of the threat ourselves.

The problem calls for dual effort: Intensive research and extensive training. This is what we propose in S. 1232.

What works against enactment of this bill? Mr. Baldwin's discussion of domestic factors affecting our global strategy affords some insight:

> The quality of idealism in the American people, which is reflected in our foreign policies * * * [is] an essential and desirable part of the American dream. But it has found expression in such unrealistic terms as "to make the world safe for democracy"; a "war to end war"; "the Four Freedoms"; "universal and complete disarmament." And it can and often does mean a trend toward "do-goodism," toward unrealistic, extreme aims or naive goals.

Perhaps this quality explains the State Department contention that Freedom Academy sponsors propose to imitate Communist methods. We emphatically do not.

We propose to understand Communist methods, in order to prepare our people to counteract those methods more effectively.

Mr. Baldwin poses, and then answers, several final questions:

> Where does all this lead us? What should our national strategy be? What should be the principles that govern it * * *?
>
> The principles should be:
>
> 1. Collective security—not isolation. * * *
>
> 2. Flexibility—the avoidance of frozen thoughts and ideas and structures.
>
> 3. A national and Presidential will and determination to defend our vital interests. Power is of little value without the will to use it.

Establishment of the Freedom Academy would be consistent with, and responsive to Mr. Baldwin's understanding. It would lead to better comprehension of the struggle we are in and to far superior dissemination of this understanding among people who need it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the full text of the Hanson W. Baldwin's article, entitled "U.S. Global Strategy," appearing in Ordnance for November-December 1964, be printed in the RECORD after my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Ordnance, Nov. 12, 1964]

U.S. GLOBAL STRATEGY

(Hanson W. Baldwin)

National strategy is the utilization of all elements of a nation's power to achieve its objectives. It must be couched in the active, not the passive, tense. It implies the implementation of a course of action—not merely the formulation of it.

The equations produced in the process of strategy formulation do not lend themselves to computer solutions, or to percentage calculations. For we are dealing, in the last analysis, with human beings. Whether human beings are rational or not is a matter of debate, but certainly it is true that the emotions which make human beings tick are intangibles. How, for instance, do you crank anger into a calculating machine?

This is simply to suggest that we must beware of too great a dependence upon the tools of the trade; we must not make these tools our rules. As aids to problem solving, computers, qualitative, quantitative and operational analyses, cost-effectiveness yardsticks, and the like are useful and proper. But do not confuse the means with the ends.

There should be one other cautionary caveat before we consider the factors that might go into the formulation and implementation of a national strategy. This is, of course, a statement of the obvious, but nevertheless a rule which history sometimes has disregarded. That is that no sound national strategy can spring fully armed from the brain of one man. It must, unless it is to be dangerously oversimplified or grossly distorted, represent the efforts of many, the input of scores of professional disciplines and thousands of facts distilled from a nation's treasure house of experts. It must be the product of many ideas and of the labor of many men—strategy, if you like, by committee or group action.

Such strategy may not appear to be as brilliant or as bold as the imaginative and ambitious unilateral plans of an Alexander, a Genghis Khan, a Napoleon, a Hitler. But where are those conquerors, and what were the bequests—save corpses unlimited—they left their nations?

Not even the President of the United States should have—nor is he likely to want—absolute power in the formulation of national strategy. This is too great a grant of power to entrust to the hands of any human, no matter how selfless and capable.

The formulation and the implementation of national strategy, then, must be a collective, a group effort, and human judgment, experience, knowledge, and emotion, as well as all the computers and technical tools and methods available to modern science, must be used in its formulation.

Strategy—like war—is an art and not a science. A long view of history is essential to sound strategy.

Consider some of the factors that influence or govern the formulation and implementation of an national strategy for the United States in the year 1964. First and most important of these is:

1. The global political situation: A situation of dangerous instability exists. World War II continued a process started in World War I—the destruction of the old order, the upset of the balance of power, the unleashing of revolutionary forces. Empires, dynasties, great states, and great princes fell from power; nations that were once great were all but destroyed; others were diminished in influence.

Vacuums of power resulted, and a bipolar world emerged from the ashes of conflict, with the United States and Soviet Russia so far superior to other powers that they could only be called superstates.

But this bipolar condition has changed. There have been splits and defections in the Western World, and cracks in the monolithic edifice of communism. Today we face a multipolar world—a world of infinite complexity.

The United States and the U.S.S.R. are still the major nations of the world in terms of power, but neither can count on complete support from its friends and allies. In the West, France, intent under De Gaulle in achieving once again the sense of "grandeur" and "greatness" which has always been an inseparable part of French achievements, is pursuing an individual—sometimes a solitary—course. The United States plays largely a lone hand in Asia.

But Russia's Eastern European satellites—notably, at the moment, Poland and Rumania, are restive. They are inspired to greater aspirations for national independence by the example of Tito's brand of national communism—as distinct from the international brand dominated by Moscow—and particularly by Mao Tse-tung's opposition to the Khrushchev policy.

The Sino-Soviet split is serious, and probably lasting. It started as a conflict of personalities and ideologies. It is possible that at some future time the split may be "papered over." But lasting causes of friction—in terms of real power rivalries—will continue to exist: border problems—Central Asia, Mongolia, Manchuria; pressures of tremendous Chinese population—700 million to a billion people close to the sparsely settled areas of Soviet Siberia; the obvious dangers to Russia of a China industrialized and equipped with atomic weapons.

In the last decade—particularly in the past 5 years—new political power centers have been created in our turbulent world—Peiping, Tokyo, New Delhi, Cairo, Latin America, Africa.

A great many of the new nations—such as most of the African states—are nations in quotes, incapable of governing themselves—countries almost certainly destined to disappear from the map of history.

Many of them do not have the political, economic, or military power, or the population, skills, and resources to continue to exist as they are now constituted as independent countries.

Anticolonialism, one of the great political factors of the postwar period, has so far been a great unsettling and destabilizing influence.

The diplomat George Kennan, under the pseudonym of "Mr. X," was the original author—in a famous article in Foreign Affairs—of our "containment" policy. He wrote that the seeds of communism contain within themselves their own destruction, that if we could hold or "contain" Russian power within its frontiers, the forces of change would be bound to leaven Soviet society and reduce the aggressive expansionism of Moscow.

It didn't work. Communism expanded to Czechoslovakia, Red China, North Vietnam, and Cuba. And though Soviet communism has changed, Moscow's expansionist philosophy has not been abandoned, though the methods of achieving it have changed. And a new and far more aggressive Communist power—Red China—has complicated the global picture and worsened it.

Thus today the political world we live in is still dominated by a major struggle between communism and anticommunism. But now there are several brands of communism, and many kinds of anticommunism and noncommunism.

There are many kinds of neutralist, and there are all kinds of local and regional problems which complicate the main stream of conflict—the Kashmir problem for instance; the ambitions of the demagog Sukarno; the machinations of Castro; Nasser's Pan-Arabism; the tribal warfare of Yemen; religious frictions and racial problems.

All these local problems are influenced and may be exploited by communism or anticommunism, with resultant back currents, eddies, whirlpools, rapids.

In today's complex world the frontiers of freedom are rather well defined in Europe. Except for divided Berlin and its access approaches there is little room for political ambiguity. Communist transgressions to the west of the Iron Curtain would mean war.

But there is no such clearly defined frontier in Africa, Latin America, and, most threatened, the Middle East and southeast Asia. Hundreds of millions of uncommitted peoples—passive, ignorant, poverty stricken, with no sense of identification with either side, no real sense of national loyalties—are the weathervanes of tomorrow's history.

The stakes are huge—rubber, tin, oil, minerals, strategic position. More and more the tides of history have been sweeping to the full in Asia; we shall forget at our peril the alleged dictum of Lenin—that the road to Paris lies through Peiping.

Over and above all other considerations, we face a continuing struggle, with no end in sight—against an aggressive, expansionist Communist Russia and Communist China, and against plain have-not nations, intent on acquiring what we have.

2. The nature of the threat: Put tersely, the threat is opportunistic, massive, and unrelenting, and it takes many forms—ideological, political, economic, psychological, and military. We must be prepared for a spectrum of conflict—from such nuclear power confrontations as the Cuban missile crisis to a twilight war against Communist puppets.

But by far the greatest threat—one that has so far frustrated us—is the so-called war of national liberation, the kind of guerrilla, terrorist, and insurgency conflict now being waged in South Vietnam.

3. Technological revolution: A third factor is the technological revolution, still unended: A-bombs, radar, nuclear power, etc.

The military meaning of the revolution is plain—for the first time since the days of the Indian wars we face the danger of devastating surprise attack—an attack which could eliminate us as a nation. The technological revolution has caused a shrinkage of maps; a major change in the time-space factor; foreshortened distances; rapid communications.

The technological revolution has obvious political, economic, and educational importance. The smaller world has political disadvantages as well as advantages. The crisis is on your doorstep every morning. It hasn't made all men brothers and is unlikely to do so. Economically, the technological revolution requires great sums to keep abreast in the technological race; a nation must have industrial power and superb skills.

The technological revolution means we must steer between the twin rocks of disaster—the garrison state—a state so militarized and guarded that liberties are sacrificed in the name of security—and the bankrupt state—a state bled white by expenditure for technological advance.

Yet we must steer the middle passage, since a major factor in the formulation of a strategy for our times is that the technological revolution is still unfinished.

4. A fourth factor which must be considered in the formulation of strategy is an economic one: It can be compressed into two phrases—"the revolution of rising expectations" and the "industrialization of hitherto undeveloped nations."

Many of the backward peoples of the world, lured by the promises of both communism and capitalism and vulnerable because of modern communications to new ideas, expect far more than their fathers had. They want what others have.

Some of them, to accomplish this, are attempting to industrialize hitherto agrarian, or undeveloped, economies, as in India, Egypt, and Cuba. The mixture is both politically and economically explosive.

5. A fifth factor is the population explosion: The world's population has increased from 1.2 billion in 1850 to 3.2 billion today, and there are no signs of any immediate leveling off. One may argue all one wants about the world's ability to feed and clothe and employ this vast and teeming mass; the plain fact of the matter is that the world isn't doing it, and the immense problems—religious taboos in India, for example—between the dream and the accomplishment make its realization unlikely. This, too, causes world instability, and the pressure of population increases the pent-up and revolutionary forces against every government.

6. The increasing dispersion of nuclear weapons: This factor is, of course, interrelated with all the others. It might be described as a "political" and a psychological factor, but more properly its importance is such that it stands alone as a factor which can well increase international instability.

France today has joined the "nuclear club" in a small way; in time, Paris will achieve a significant capability. Red China recently detonated her first atomic device. Now that she has, the political and psychological effects will reverberate through the Orient.

It will be a long time before Peiping achieves a really important or significant nuclear delivery capability, but when this occurs the world may be in real danger.

Other nations soon may join the atomic club. With each new membership the world's power balance, particularly in the regions affected, shifts slightly.

7. A seventh factor is the growing challenge of Soviet aerospace power and particularly of Soviet maritime power.

Soviet strategic thought has grown from the introverted "heartland" concept of warfare to the extroverted global and extraterrestial "new look."

In the past, danger had always come to Russia by land. Hitler, and Napoleon before him, almost—but not quite—conquered Russia. The land marshals until relatively recently dominated Soviet strategic thinking; the buffer states of Eastern Europe attested to Moscow's fear of land invasion.

Today, Russia is looking upward to sky and space, and outward toward the seven seas. Her space achievements need no chronicling; they will continue, and if we have any doubts about Soviet determinaton to put a "comrade" on the moon, we may awake one morning to another disagreeable surprise. Russia already has become a major air and space power—ahead of us in the utilization of man in space.

Not so well know are her accomplishments at sea. She is second in total naval power, first in numbers of submarines, first in numbers of small craft, such as minesweepers, motor torpedo boats, and coastal defense vessels. (The United States has nothing like the missile-equipped Komar torpedo boats.)

Russia is first in deep-sea fishing fleets—both in numbers and quality. She already operates more ocean-going merchant ships than we do, and her total tonnage is expected to pass our declining merchant marine within the next two years.

Moscow plans a tremendous merchant fleet—which can only be used for global trade purposes and for the export of subversion as well as goods—which may approximate 20,000,000 to 25,000,000 gross tons by 1975–1980—the largest in the world.

The United States and all the maritime nations of the non-Communist world face major competition on the seas and in world trade.

So much for some—but by no means all—of the international factors that must be considered in the formulation of our objectives and our strategy.

What are some of the domestic factors?

First and perhaps of greatest long-term importance is the lack of national homogeneity in the American Nation. We are no longer "one people" in the old sense of 50 years ago. There are now major religious, ethnic, and racial—as well as political—differences which cannot be easily healed (e.g., civil rights and the school-prayer issue).

The growth of big government and the trend toward centralization of power, with all the difficulties and delays that size, redundancy, and bureaucracy imply, make the formulation of policy—and sometimes its implementation—exceedingly slow.

Command and control systems of uncanny global capabilities can conn a destroyer off Cuba or direct a battalion in Vietnam, but it has yet to be proved that this centralized Washington command post can win wars.

Never in the history of human conflict have so many been able to say "No"—so few to say "Yes."

The tremendous increase in the power of the Presidency and the decline in the power of Congress is another factor to be considered. Congress is supposed to have the constitutional power to declare war and to raise and maintain armies and navies. But in the age of the technological revolution and of $50 billion defense budgets, the effective power has passed from the hands of Congress to the hands of the Executive. The President can put us into war overnight by action, or inaction; Congress can only countersign.

The power of the Presidency—partly because of modern communications—trancends today by an immense margin what our Founding Fathers intended it to be. And, correspondingly, the personality, and the character of the President, his strength of will, his purpose and judgment, are major—perhaps decisive—factors in strategy formulation and particularly in implementation. Leadership and personality are the *x* factor in history.

The quality of idealism in the American people, which is reflected in our foreign policies. Make no mistake, this is an essential and desirable part of the American dream. But it has found expression in such unrealistic terms as "to make the world safe for democracy"; a "war to end war"; "the four freedoms"; "universal and complete disarmament." And it can and often does mean a trend toward "do-goodism," toward unrealistic, extreme aims or naïve goals.

The need for explanation. The American public's "right to know" is not only a constitutional safeguard to our system of government and a monitor of government, but public information about and explanation of national objectives is essential to the attainment of these objectives.

This is particularly true in the kind of war we are most likely to have to fight—the type of counterinsurgency conflict we are now waging in Vietnam.

Public support for any long-drawn-out war of attrition is essential to success. A frank, comprehensive, and reasoned public-information policy on the part of all branches of government is essential to enlistment of that support for the duration. Otherwise public frustration or apathy or even opposition is bound to develop.

Washington, which so successfully enlisted Madison Avenue in the domestic political hustlings, has made a botch of retaining public support for some of its national policies.

The quality of our peoples is another factor of importance to our consideration of strategy. What has been called the "crisis of values" has influenced contemporary history—and particularly Western civilization.

The loss of old values, the lack of faith in ancient symbols and old loyalties, are reflected in our rising crime rate, juvenile delinquency, inflated divorce statistics. And the draft rejection rate of 40 to 50 percent reflects the physical as well as the mental softness of too many American youths.

Slums, the problems of automation, unemployment, our decaying cities, our obsolescent railroads, depressed areas, inadequate education—all of these factors will influence the capability of the peoples of the United States for democratic self-government and for the projection of national power.

There are, of course, other domestic factors, which need not even the briefest elucidation. For instance: the capabilities of our economy and our industrial base; its strengths and limitations; the capabilities of our Armed Forces; their strengths and limitations, including the effects of current trends upon their morale and leadership and the downgrading of professional experience and judgment; the "civilianization" of the military profession; and, most important, our interpretation of foreign and potential enemy strengths and capabilities—our global intelligence system.

So much for some of the factors that go into the formulation of our objectives and our strategy.

Here are some of our national objectives which will, of course, influence the formulation of our strategy:

1. Economic prosperity and political freedom. This implies a vigorously expanding gross national product and some accommodation for the racial problem, for the problem of automation, and for depressed areas.

2. Maintain our global lead in industrial power, particularly in the capital-goods industries. Easier said than done; there are some serious lags now—machine tools, shipbuilding.

3. Stress educational quality, rather than quantity—particularly at collegiate levels; extend technical and trades training and physical fitness to lower age levels.

4. Foster educational, historical, religious, civic, and other appropriate programs for inculcation into the body and mind politic of the lasting values that have, in the past, made us great.

5. Extend the program of Peace Corps activities and civic action—including construction, training, and health programs by the Armed Forces.

6. Maintain—and if possible extend—the overall U.S. lead in the technological revolution, particularly in weapons applications.

7. Lead the world in the exploration and exploitation of space and the ocean depths.

8. Maintain and improve a global and space reconnaissance, surveillance, and intelligence system.

9. Maintain qualitative and quantitative naval and air superiority, and qualitative superiority on land.

10. Maintin U.S. entree to the Eurasian "rimlands"—the islands and coastal regions of Europe and Asia.

11. Delay, and if possible prevent, the industrialization and modernization of Communist China.

12. Exploit frictions and strains in the Communist world.

13. Weaken and ultimately eliminate Communist government in Cuba.

14. Revitalize and strengthen the Monroe Doctrine; i.e., prevent Communist coups and conquests in the Western Hemisphere.

15. Strengthen the Western and anti-Communist position in southeast Asia.

Fundamentally the Nation's objectives might be summed up as follows:

Globally—a more stable world (note I do not say a peaceful world).

Domestically—a nation where government and machine serve humanity.

It may be said that these objectives represent merely the old formula of being against sin and for God and country. This may be a fair criticism. But a nation's objectives must, "like a man's reach exceed his grasp, or what's a heaven for?"

Objectives, too, should be accorded priorities. What is clearly vital to the Nation's survival and welfare must be so identified; what is attainable in the short-term view must be so labeled; and more distant objectives must be so itemized. Too often we tend to label as "vital," interests which actually are remote.

Certainly what happens in many parts of Africa is not immediately vital to the United States and is not likely to become so unless there is a threat of Communist domination of the entire continent.

It may even be argued that we assumed too casually the obligations of power when we interviewed in southeast Asia. Is Laos vital to the United States? Is South Vietnam? These are the $64 million questions which policymakers must answer when they enunciate national objectives.

Where does all this lead us? What should our national strategy be? What should be the principles that govern it—the principles derived from the factors considered and the national objectives just summarized?

The principles should be:

1. Collective security—not isolation. (The day of isolation is ended—the world needs us, we need the world.)

2. Flexibility—the avoidance of frozen thoughts and ideas and structures; no Maginot Line concept, no static defense.

3. A national and Presidential will and determination to defend our vital interests. Power is of little value without the will to use it.

RESOLUTIONS OF RICHARDSON, TEX., CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Chamber of Commerce of Richardson, Tex., has recently adopted three resolutions with which I am pleased to find myself in complete agreement. In order that other Senators may be advised of the views of this active and dedicated chamber, I ask unanimous consent that the three resolutions be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE RICHARDSON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE BOARD OF DIRECTORS RE COMMENDING POLICY DECLARATIONS OF THE PRESIDENT AND PROPOSING A JOHNSON COMMISSION FOR IMPLEMENTING THEM

The board of directors of the Richardson Chamber of Commerce commends President Johnson upon his strong policy declarations for strict economy and an all-out campaign against waste and inefficiency in the Federal Government; for his proposal to reshape and reorganize the executive branch to meet more effectively the tasks of the 20th century; for his resolve to keep our Nation prosperous, militarily strong, and a leader in seeking peaceful relation with the other nations of this world; for his plans to pursue relentlessly our advances toward the conquest of space; his proposed new efforts to control and prevent crime and delinquency; and for the translation of these policies and plans into recommendations submitted to Congress.

To implement the goal or strict economy in the Federal Government and thus to aid in the attainment of all its goals, the board of directors of the Richardson Chamber of Commerce suggests that the President and Congress consider jointly the creation of a strong nonpartisan commission to be organized in the spirit of the Hoover Commissions of the past; that it consist of citizens of experience in Federal, State, and local governments but without other offices in any of such governments; that this commission be given a modest staff and authority to consider the physical records of the office of the budget and all other Federal offices and be charged with a duty to recommend to the President any and all reductions of current expenses in any such office which, in the opinion of that commission, could be made without adversely affecting policies of the administration with reference to the functioning of that office and the services to be performed by it. We suggest that such a commission be organized with expected continuity of office assured by overlapping terms of the members of the commission. It is submitted that an expansion of services of the Federal Government now under consideration will substantially increase the need of such an independent study of the operations of each department and agency of the Federal Government to the end that the dollar value of each dollar spent may be assured; accordingly, it is

Resolved, (1) The Richardson Chamber of Commerce urges the establishment of such a nonpartisan Johnson commission to implement the policies of this administration for strict economy; (2) the appropriate officers of the Richardson Chamber of Commerce shall transmit this resolution to appropriate Texas Members of the U.S. Congress.

(Unanimously adopted in regular meeting, Mar. 15, 1965.)

Resolution of the Richardson Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors Re Amending Taft-Hartley Act

Whereas it has been and is an American precept that man is a being with a free will, so endowed by his Creator; and

Whereas the system of free enterprise is peculiarly and especially a cherished American tradition, applying alike to the business enterprise and to the individual, to the employee, and to the employer; and

Whereas expressions of these propositions are included in many acts of social legislation; they are particularly emphasized, for example, in the Federal Civil Rights Act of 1964:

"Sec. 703(a). It shall be unlawful employment practice for an employer—(1) to fail or refuse to hire or to discharge any individual with respect to his compensation, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of such individual's race, color, religion, sex, or national origin.";

Whereas these propositions are a fundamental part of the laws of Texas, as seen in sections 1 and 2 of article 5207a of Vernon's Annotated Civil Statutes of Texas, which was enacted in 1947 by the Legislature of the State of Texas in reliance upon section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act (Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, 29 U.S.C. 164(b)).

Taft-Hartley Act, section 14(b): "Nothing in this subchapter shall be construed as authorizing the execution or application of agreements requiring membership in a labor organization as a condition of employment in any State or territory in which such execution or application is prohibited by State or territorial law."

Article 5207a, Vernon's Annotated Texas Civil Statutes:

"Section 1. The inherent right of a person to work and bargain freely with his employer, individually or collectively, for terms and conditions of his employment shall not be denied or infringed by law, or by any organization of whatever nature.

"Sec. 2. No person shall be denied employment on account of membership or nonmembership in a labor union."; and

Whereas there now are before the Congress of the United States proposals aimed at repealing 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, quoted in part hereinabove, so that laws of this State of Texas guaranteeing to individuals the right of free determination whether to join or refrain from joining, a labor union, would be preempted: Therefore be it

Resolved, (1) The Richardson Chamber of Commerce opposes the repeal of section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, quoted above; (2) the appropriate officers of the Richardson Chamber of Commerce shall transmit this resolution to appropriate Texas Members of the U.S. Congress.

(Unanimously adopted in regular meeting Mar. 15, 1965.)

Resolution of the Richardson Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors re Adequate Health Care for Elder Citizens

The provision and the utilization of adequate health services to citizens above 65 years of age is a matter of interest and concern to all public spirited citizens.

Studies, including the 1963 Report of the President's Council on Aging, indicate that elderly citizens as a group meet their costs of living, including health care, much better than the younger ages and enjoy remarkably good health for the most part. Over sixty percent of the 18 million elderly in the United States carry some form of voluntary prepayment health insurance; 72 percent of Texas' elderly citizens are so covered.

Yet many citizens do need additional aid such as those on old age assistance, or others who become really burdened in meeting the costs of an unexpected or major illness. Those who need assistance and only those, can get it under the Kerr-Mills law passed in 1960. We in Texas amended our constitution in November 1964, so as to increase the benefits obtainable under this 1960 law, by those needy and elderly in Texas. Governor Connally stated in his annual message to the Texas Legislature in January 1965, that he favors this solution of the problem. It gives aid only to those in need whereas the social security approach assures aid to all employed, when they become ill in elder years, regardless of need and at much greater cost to all.

On January 27, 1965, Congressman Herlong and Congressman Curtis introduced identical bills, H.R. 3727 and H.R. 3728 known as the Eldercare Act of 1965. Aid to those in need under the Herlong-Curtis Eldercare Act of 1965, would consist of medical, surgical, dental, hospital, nursing home, and drug benefits rather than being limited to hospital and nursing home care. State and Federal funds would be provided on a sliding scale basis, to persons aged 65 or older who are in need, as defined by their incomes, the defining limits being set by the individual States. Recipients would obtain policies providing a wide spectrum of medical, surgical, and hospital benefits from health insurance companies or from Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans. Under the proposal an individual would pay all, part, or none of the cost of the policy, depending upon his total income. Individuals whose incomes are under specified minimums would have the entire cost of the policy paid by the State agency that would administer the program. Eligibility for benefits would be determined solely by use of a simple information return in which the applicant would list his income from all sources.

The Herlong-Curtis Eldercare Act of 1965 would thus maintain the basic principles that persons 65 years or older who need help in paying for health care should receive help, but only they; that maximum responsibility and authority for providing such help should be retained by the States; and that funds from the Federal source should be from general tax revenues; and that voluntary health insurance and prepayment principles should be utilized whenever possible.

All this is in sharp contrast with the proposed King-Anderson principle of a compulsory health insurance plan whereby social security taxes or payroll taxes on all ages of working citizens would provide certain limited hospital and nursing home benefits to the elderly.

Meanwhile, the provisions of the Kerr-Mills law have been accepted to greater or lesser degree by approximately 45 States and territories. There have been inequities and difficulties, but such problems existing in some States can be rapidly overcome. In Texas, our legislature is expected to provide quickly for those elderly citizens in need of further assistance by legislation under the Kerr-Mills Act: Therefore, be it

Resolved, (1) The Richardson Chamber of Commerce favors the enactment by Congress of the Herlong-Curtis Eldercare Act of 1965 and by the legislature of Texas of legislation implementing assistance to the elderly in Texas in need, under the Kerr-Mills Act; and opposes the pending King-Anderson bill in Congress or other like measures; (2) the appropriate officers of the Richardson Chamber of Commerce shall transmit this resolution to appropriate Texas Members of the U.S. Congress.

(Adopted in regular meeting, March 15, 1965.)

SOVIET PERSECUTION OF THE JEWS

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, 20 years ago the most terrible war ever fought by mankind came to an end. With it there came the hope that religious persecution would forever be banished from the face of the earth. The shocking discovery of the scope of Jewish persecution under Hitler initiated vows by all men never to allow such events to happen again.

These vows were founded on something more than naive idealism, for while such action is against every conceivable code of moral order and decency, it is also a fact that such persecution will bring about the degeneration of a country by excluding from the national life a valuable portion of the intellectual and manpower resources of the country. It has become increasingly evident, however, that the Soviet Union is in the process of throwing these beliefs and hopes against the rocks with all the force its totalitarian strength can bring to bear.

The Soviet Union has extreme methods to hide events in its country that it feels might not be considered in good taste by those outside the Iron Curtain. Yet all of its suppression has not been sufficient to hide its dastardly acts toward its Jewish population. For the past 20 years, free people everywhere have hoped that persecution of religious peoples had ended for all time; yet, at this very instant, the persecution in Russia is looking distressingly similar to the persecuton that took place during the Third Reich.

We see the singling out of the Russian Jews for allegations that have no basis whatsoever. As under the tyrannical regime of Hitler, the Jews in the Soviet Union have been singled out as the cause of the country's economic failures.

The propaganda that has been aimed at the Jewish population of the Soviet Union has been of the most vulgar nature, depicting the Jews in the same stereotype that was used by Goebbels, under Hitler, for the vilification of religion and all those who practice it.

There has also been widespread exclusion of the Jews from the same educational, cultural, and employment opportunities that the other Soviet citizens have been offered.

Mr. President, in view of these facts, I think the time has come for all good people to unite and, in a voice that will shatter the stone walls of the Kremlin, demand that these practices of persecution, bigotry, and hate be put to an end.

We have before us a concurrent resolution, submitted by the able Senator from Connecticut, that will inform the dictators of the Soviet people of our determination to put a stop to religious persecution in all its forms, wherever it occurs on earth. I have cosponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 17 in the belief that the United States has an obligation, as the leader of free peoples, to step forward and condemn these malicious practices.

The resolution is clear in its intent. It states, in brief, that because we steadfastly believe in the freedom of all peoples to practice their religion, without interference of any sort; because the evidence overwhelmingly points to purposely vicious persecution of its Jewish population; and because the Soviet Constitution clearly defends religious freedom; we, therefore, condemn the Soviet Union for its betrayal of the principles of human rights and decency, in the hope that the Soviet Union will restore the rights of the Jews to practice their religion, free from harassment, and to maintain their culture as they have done throughout their history.

At this time, I urge every Senator to support this resolution reaffirming our belief in human rights; I urge all Members of the House of Representatives to join their Senate colleagues in the support of this resolution; and I urge all freedom-loving people the world over to join hands with the American people in asking freedom and dignity for the Jewish citizens of the Soviet Union.

LOW UNEMPLOYMENT GOOD NEWS

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, we are now entering the fifth year of continued improvement in our economy. This is the longest sustained economic expansion in the postwar period. As the employment statistics announced by the Labor Department today show, this fifth year promises to be one of the brightest.

The unemployment figures for the breadwinners of the country have been cut almost in half since the first quarter of 1961. At that point married men had an unemployment rate of 4.8 percent and today it has dropped to 2.6. This is equal to the low level recorded during the 1955–57 expansion period.

The economic growth since March a year ago—1,650,000—has meant jobs for 800,000 more adult men, 700,000 more adult women, and 200,000 more teenagers.

This is truly good news. It demonstrates that bold leadership, given the tools to work with, can keep the Nation on a prosperity-bound course.

We are indeed "continuing" toward the Great Society President Johnson seeks.

RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING: STAR-SPANGLED ARCHITECTURAL BLUNDER

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, Members of the Congress apparently are so well aware of the barbarian architectural qualities—if one can use the word "qualities" in this regard—of the third House office building that it is hardly necessary to bring to their attention additional informed judgments. Nevertheless, I think the RECORD should include a recent appraisal of the Rayburn Building by Miss Ada Louise Huxtable, as published in the New York Times of March 30, 1965.

Miss Huxtable concludes her lament about this artless and unbelievably expensive structure with a reference to a saying that "there's no point in crying over spilled marble." But if we should not cry, we must at least be severely embarrassed, and should resolve to halt these economic and architectural atrocities on Capitol Hill.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 30, 1965]

THE RAYBURN BUILDING: HOUSE OFFICE STRUCTURE IS DESCRIBED AS A DULL, VULGAR, CORRUPT BLUNDER

(By Ada Louise Huxtable)

It is moving time on Capitol Hill for 169 Congressmen eligible for space in the new Rayburn House Office Building. The structure's three-room suites complete with refrigerators and safes are being raffled off to applicants who may have a view of the Capitol dome or an interior court, depending on seniority. Even seniority, however, does not give any legislator a door leading from his office, or his aid's office, to his working staff without passage through a waiting room full of constituents and special pleaders. To correct this small planning error would add $200,000 to costs already estimated at anywhere from $86 million to $122 million for the expensive and controversial building.

Some Congressmen are moving in reluctantly. Representative THOMAS L. ASHLEY, Democrat, of Ohio, for one rejected his office on sight. But he is making the move anyway this week because his present quarters are too small.

"This layout could paralyze us," he said during his inspection tour. "It's an ugly building."

Mr. ASHLEY is not alone. The professional architectural press has been bitterly critical as construction progressed. (The building has taken 7 years and $22 million more to complete than originally estimated largely as the result of expensive miscalculations; change orders have reached 300 percent over Government average; bid estimates on contracts have been as much as $45 million off.)

There have been accusations of secret planning, pork barrel commissions and possible misuse of public funds. The fact that the general contractor was Matthew J. McCloskey, Democratic Party stalwart of Philadelphia, has not escaped notice. But the storm swirls uselessly around a behemoth that is obviously here to stay.

DEFECTS ARE NUMEROUS

Architecturally, the Rayburn Building is a national disaster. Its defects range from profligate mishandling of 50 acres of space to elephantine esthetic banality at record costs. The costs are now being investigated by the General Accounting Office.

Equal to the question of costs, however, is the question of what Congress and the capital have received for the investment. It is quite possible that this is the worst building for the most money in the history of the construction art. It stuns by sheer mass and boring bulk. Only 15 percent of its space is devoted to the offices and hearing rooms for which it was erected.

Forty-two percent of the floor area is used for parking. Endless corridors have been likened to "Last Year at Marienbad." Stylistically, it is the apotheosis of humdrum.

It is hard to label the building, but it might be called Corrupt Classic. Its empty aridity and degraded classical details are vulgarization without drama, and to be both dull and vulgar may be an achievement of sorts.

The structure's chief design features are hollow exercises in sham grandeur. A supercolossal exterior expanse of stolid, Mussolini-style pomp is embellished with sculpture that would be the apogee of art in the Soviet Union, where overscaled muscles and expressions of empty solemnity are still admired.

A monumental entrance at second floor level is reached by pretentious steps that will never be used. The real entrance, on the ground floor just below, abandons false dignity for no dignity at all.

The formal marble front with its blank, machine-stamped look sits on a gargantuan base of informal, random-cut granite of obviously miscalculated proportions, an effect comparable to combining a top hat with blue jeans. Groups of columns meant to dress up the drab, flat facade not only fail to suggest that columns are traditionally supporting members, but they also terminate incongruously on balconies that appear to support the columns—a neat combination of structural illogic and stylistic flimflam.

ARTLESS CENTRAL COURT

Inside, a pedestrian statue of Sam Rayburn presents the seat of its pants to entering visitors. It faces a huge landscaped central court that is an artless cliche. Embracing Mr. Sam is another cliche, a two-story, curved, double stair fated to be not only useless but graceless.

In the hearing rooms, coarse, lifeless, classical cornices and moldings are joined to stock modern acoustic ceilings and panel lighting for a state of esthetic warfare tempered only by their matching mediocrity. This model comes in red, green, gold, and blue.

Behind the scenes, the classic false front is abandoned, and working subcommittee rooms use ordinary partitions and fittings of the lowest commercial common denominator. Throughout the building, the design level is consistent: Whatever is not hack is heavy-handed.

For $100 million, give or take a few million (the cost of New York's mammoth Pan Am Building) the gentlemen of the House have got a sterile, stock plan of singularly insensitive design and detailing that was moribund more than half a century ago. Even the basic functional requirements have been insufficiently studied. The making of useful and beautiful public spaces with the power to inspire and symbolize as well as to serve—the timeless aim of architecture and one that is mandatory for Washington—is conspicuously absent.

The Rayburn Building is the third solid gold turkey in a row to come out of the office of the Architect of the Capitol, J. George Stewart, who is not an architect, but who picks them for Congress. For this one he selected Harbeson, Hough, Livingston & Larson of Philadelphia. He is also responsible for the ill-advised remodeling of the Capitol's east front and the construction of the New Senate Office Building.

There are no controls or reviews for Mr. Stewart's work, and none for the House committee that authorized the Rayburn Building's construction and appropriations, generally behind closed doors.

An old architectural saying has it that there's no point in crying over spilled marble. Seven million pounds of it has been poured onto Capitol Hill in this latest congressional building venture, and there is nothing quite as invulnerable as a really monumental mistake. The Rayburn Building's ultimate claim to fame may well be that it is the biggest star-spangled architectural blunder of our time.

GULF OF MEXICO FISHERIES—RESOLUTION OF GULF STATES MARINE FISHERIES COMMISSION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, a most thoughtful resolution recently was adopted by the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission. It calls attention to the vitality of the gulf fisheries and the desirability of additional State Department attention to the problems and needs of this area. In order that other Senators may share these important views, I ask that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the commercial fisheries of the United States of America rely heavily upon the Department of State for timely and continued attention to national and international matters affecting the commercial fisheries; and

Whereas it is fitting and proper that there be maintained in the Department of State adequate officers and offices giving their primary attention to the problems of commercial fisheries and the resolution of such problems; and

Whereas the U.S. fisheries in the Gulf of Mexico produce some 30 percent of the tonnage and 25 percent of the value of all domestic U.S. fisheries, and the fishing industry in the five Gulf States is of sufficient importance to those States to warrant a special and continuing interest in all matters affecting their fisheries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission, assembled in regular spring meeting in Mobile, Ala., That it request the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, to reexamine and reappraise the office of Special Assistant for Fisheries and Wildlife in the Department of State, in view of its utmost importance to the fisheries of the United States, in the light of the increased scope of activity both domestic and international and the heavy duties of that office, and with the purpose of adding a sufficient staff and personnel to cope with the many increasing fishery problems and matters of great and vital interest to the domestic fisheries; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, to the congressional delegations of the Gulf States and to the Governors of Alabama, Florida, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Texas.

Done at Mobile, Ala., this 19th day of March 1965.

TED MILLETTE,
Chairman.

Attest:

WALTER O. SHEPPARD,
Vice Chairman.

SEWARD'S DAY, 1965

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, last Tuesday was a day of special importance to all Alaskans. On March 30, 1867, 98 years ago, U.S. Secretary of State William H. Seward and Baron Edouard de Stoeckl, representative of Czar Alexander II, arrived at 4 o'clock in the morning at agreement on the terms of a simple document transferring Russian America to the United States. For the sum of $7,200,000, the United States became the purchaser of what, in 1959, was to become the 49th State.

ALASKA PURCHASE CENTENNIAL IN 1967

In two years, we in Alaska will commemorate this event with elaborate ceremonies. A State commission has been established, and has been hard at work on plans for the centennial year. Most of the cities in the State are planning local activities in coordination with the State's program. The people of Alaska extend an open invitation to the Members of the Senate and to all their constituents to began to make plans to come to Alaska for the events of 1967.

NEW BOOK ON RUSSIAN-AMERICA

During the last 30 years, Hector Chevigny, despite the substantial handicap of blindness, has been a student of the Russian colonization of North America. In past years he has produced two books on the subject. One, "Lost Empire," is the story of the life of Nikolai Rezinov. Another, "Lord of Alaska," tells the life of Aleksander Baranov.

In February of this year, a third book by Mr. Chevigny was published. Its title is "Russian America: The Great Alaskan Venture, 1741–1867." Through its 263 fascinating and eminently readable pages of narrative, Chevigny weaves tales of the hunters, traders, adventurers, priests, ship captains, Indians, Eskimos, diplomats, and czars who contributed to what was to be Russia's only oversea colony.

Toward the end of the book, he recounts the details of the winding up of the Russian-American Company and the sale of the vast territory which it had been established to administer. The hurried events which resulted in this magnificent real estate transaction are best studied in detail in the 15th chapter of the book. However, something of their nature and the part played in them by William H. Seward can be seen from certain following excerpts. Because I believe they will be of interest to Members of the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By the time Baron de Stoeckl was back in Washington, in March of 1867, the outlook for administration measures in Congress was even poorer than before and growing worse. He had, nevertheless, to pin his hopes on the ambitions of Seward, whose influence was practically gone. No longer was there a Senator Gwin, his southern sympathies having long since removed him from the political scene. Seward's eagerness was boundless when he understood that Alaska was for sale. For him the proposal was in time's nick. The Canadians might be given second thoughts about proceeding with their confederation. And what a territory to be able to claim to have added to the United States—bigger even than Texas. Congress surely would not refuse to accept this one, not if the proposal was put as a favor to Russia.

Enjoining great secrecy on everyone, Seward obtained the approval of Johnson and the Cabinet, lukewarm in both cases, then go back to Stoeckl with an offer of $5 million. Stoeckl got him up to $7,200,000, which was still little enough; in Russia the Navy alone cost twice as much each year. Seward was to offer $300,000 more for two small Danish islands in the Atlantic. The price made Alaska practically a gift.

Seward was in a great hurry, wanting the treaty passed before the Canadians took the final step toward confederation. That called for asking the Senate, which was about to adjourn, for an extended session. And that in turn called for writing and signing the document in a single night; Seward, Stoeckl, and their aids worked until 4:00 in the morning of March 30. The Senators reared back on learning that they had been held over to consider a treaty negotiated in secrecy and haste. They were unimpresesd by the argument about Canada, and few among them knew anything, or cared, about Alaska, which was the less appealing for the fact it was noncontiguous territory.

Atop everything was the feeling against the administration. Senators went to Stoeckl to say they were sorry but they could support nothing proposed by Seward. The measure might simply have died in the Foreign Relations Committee had it not been for the chairman of that body, Massachusetts' brilliant Charles Sumner, whose view was that, despite the circumstances, Russia had to be obliged. Having gathered all available information on the worth of Alaska—he it was who proposed the name—Sumner gave a 3-hour oration with all the force at his command, concluding with the one argument that had real weight: "Even if you doubt the value of these possessions, the treaty is a sign of amity. It is a new expression of that entente cordiale * * * which is a phenomenon of history."

Alaska was, nevertheless, bought by only one vote above the two-thirds required for passage of a treaty; of the 39 Senators present, 12 dissented. Another vote was taken, following a plea for unanimity, but two held out. The vote of record is 37 to 2. The news of the purchase left the Canadians unmoved.

* * * * *

Nothing in all his 26 years in Washington had prepared Stoeckl for the ordeal of getting the United States to pay. As his lawyer and lobbyist he had to retain no less a personage than a former Secretary of the Treasury. The honor of the United States went by the board as Thaddeus Stevens weasled on his promise to see the appropriation through the House. There was even an attempt, in which Stevens took part, to besmirch both Russia and Stoeckl by resurrecting a disreputable old claim against the legation, which the American courts themselves had disallowed.

The bill was 15 months reaching the House floor, the delay due in part to the attempt to impeach Johnson, which failed by one vote. During the long wait, the press built up a body of highly adverse criticism in key with the minority report of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, which categorically damned as worthless the timber, the fish, the minerals, and all the other resources of Alaska down to the furs, adding that it was "unfit for civilized men." There had been vigorous support from some of the press, but not enough to drown out the catchy catcalls invented by the opposition notably "Seward's Icebox" and "Seward's Folly," which did damage from which the territory was to suffer for many a year.

It made no difference to the opposition that Alaska had been in American hands for

8 months when the bill finally came up in late June of 1868. The debate lasted 2 weeks, the sessions extending far into gaslit nights, despite the humid heat of the Washington summer and the fact the House was behind with all its business. Nothing about the measure was left undenounced, speaker after speaker dwelling in particular on the doubt as to the value. A suspicion had arisen that the territory had been bought to compensate Russia for sending her fleet during the war. One Representative proposed that she be simply given the money and told to keep her colony.

Then, all of a sudden, in mid-July, the debate ended, the vote was taken. It showed 113 in favor of payment, 43 against, and 44 not voting. Had Stoeckl finally resorted to bribery? So great was the suspicion that a committee investigated but, to its "regret and disappointment" without success at persuading Stoeckl to let himself be questioned. Nor would he allow anyone to explain in his behalf what had become of over $125,000 missing from his bank account. Johnson was told by Seward that bribery was used, or so the bitter ex-President wrote in a note he left to be discovered after his death.

Stoeckl returned to Saint Petersburg unacclaimed. He asked for but was not given another post. Pensioned off, he lived out his years in Paris with his family. The wish to forget him is evident in the failure of Russian reference works even to mention his name.

A nation having small desire to sell did so to a nation that was not eager to buy, their motives the belief they would please each other. History does not invariably make sense.

ANNIVERSARY OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, it was on March 25, 144 years ago, that a band of freedom-loving Greek patriots marked the first European echo of the American Revolution. Although it was one attempt of many during more than four centuries of foreign domination, the rising in 1821 was destined to succeed. In spite of the incredible odds and the price exacted by alien rulers in property and blood, these gallant remnants of the brave Greek nation toiled 8 long years and won, as the Americans had won earlier, the right to self-determination.

The first American to sponsor the cause of Greek liberty and to initiate a crusade against the reactionary and oppressive policy of the Holy Alliance in Europe was a Harvard University professor of Greek, Edward Everett. In his oration for the degree of master of arts, in 1814, 6 years before the outbreak of the Greek revolution, Edward Everett called for the "Restoration of Greece." Everett's interest in Greece was an impetus to the other institutions of higher learning which soon rallied to the cause of liberty and justice for Greece.

The enthusiasm of Everett and the Harvard campus spread in the 1820's to other students in public schools, colleges, and universities, who were holding meetings, adopting resolutions, and writing expressions of support for the Greek cause.

At first there was token support from other European governments, who were more concerned with the balance of power and the support of Turkey, than with allowing the Greek subjects of the Turk to gain freedom. But the justice of the Greek cause prevailed; the example of the American Revolution had sown seeds that were then bearing fruit.

Prior to the time when the Greeks rose against the Turkish Empire to throw off a yoke of nearly 450 years, Greece to many of us was either a geographically remote country in Europe or an ancient, picturesque world of philosophers and kings. However, in 1821 Greece became an immediate and real entity. The Greek struggle for freedom stirred the American press, aroused American orators, and stimulated a neoclassic trend in American literature and arts. A unanimous American opinion declared that a people whose tradition was a source of inspiration to American democracy and a nation fighting for its liberty should be free.

This increasing public support, which was officially reflected a year later in President Monroe's annual message to Congress, was received by the Greeks with hope and admiration. One of the first acts of the first Greek Senate in May 1821, was the delivery of an address to the American people, beginning:

> Friends, fellow citizens, and brothers: Having formed the resolution to live or die for freedom, we are drawn toward you by just sympathy, since it is in your land that liberty has fixed its abode * * * though separated from us by mighty oceans, your character brings you near us * * * our interests are of such nature as to cement more and more an alliance founded on freedom and virtue.

Over 100 years ago, America felt that she could not remain isolated. There was more than a mere passive interest; young men such as George Jarvis, Jonathan Miller, and Samuel Howe felt that their own ideals and lives were involved. They volunteered to serve in the Greek armed forces, and distinguished themselves on the Greek battlefields.

Eventually, the heroic sacrifices of the Greeks could no longer be ignored. Public opinion in the civilized world was revolted by the brutal suffering of a small heroic nation that was obviously determined to die fighting, rather than live in bondage; and the great European powers swung their weight behind the Greeks, who, at last, obtained for themselves the benefits of freedom, an idea that they gave to the world.

ECONOMIC EXPANSION AND EMPLOYMENT

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I was delighted to learn today from the Department of Labor that the Nation's unemployment rate is down to a 7½-year low of 4.7 percent and the jobless rate for married men, at 2½ percent, is registering an 8-year low. National employment in March reached an alltime high of 70.2 million. In Maryland, the rate of unemployment has held steady at 4.6 percent since January 1965. Maryland's situation is thus slightly better than the national average.

These statistics were released today among the March employment and unemployment figures.

They form part of an exceptionally good report card to the American people about how the Nation, under this administration, is moving ahead socially and economically.

The record speaks for itself, loud and clear.

In January 1961, the Nation's unemployment rate stood at a tragic 6.7 percent of the work force.

But today, following more than 4 years of uninterrupted economic expansion and a series of human salvage programs, that rate is down to 4.7 percent.

That is a reduction of 30 percent in slightly over 4 years. And since only last month the jobless rate has fallen 6 percent.

We are making progress on our road to full economic and social justice but our task is just beginning.

RESOLUTIONS OF TEXAS AND SOUTHWESTERN CATTLE RAISERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association adopted a number of important resolutions at its 88th annual convention in El Paso.

The resolutions deal with such pressing matters as cattle prices, reapportionment, screwworm eradication, farm wages, bracero workers, and hoof-and-mouth disease. In order that other Senators may share the views of this well-informed association, I ask that the resolutions be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT THE 88TH TSCRA CONVENTION

Whereas monthly cattle on feed reports have been available for Texas since January 1964; and

Whereas these reports prepared by the Statistical Reporting Service of the United States Department of Agriculture are important to the Texas Cattle Feeding Industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association reaffirms the desire of the cattle industry to have these reports continued and commends the Statistical Reporting Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture for the good job it is doing in compiling the monthly reports.

Whereas the selling of fed cattle on a carcass weight basis has become increasingly important in the marketing structure; and

Whereas it is extremely important that the weighing of the carcasses be conducted on accurate scales and by competent personnel: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association express encouragement to the Packers and Stockyards Division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture that it intensify its effort to assure livestock producers that scales used in these transactions are accurate and that the individuals operating the scales are certified weighers: Be it further

Resolved, That the Packers and Stockyards Division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture be urged to require the packer purchasing cattle on a carcass basis to furnish the seller with an accurate and complete accounting of the transaction.

Whereas it anticipated that there will be introduced into this session of Congress proposed legislation that would transfer the cost of Federal meat inspection from the Federal

Government to the meat processing industry; and

Whereas processors operating interstate are obliged by law to have Federal inspection performed; and

Whereas inspection of meat is done primarily in the interest of the public at large: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association inform the members of Congress of its opposition to any such proposed legislation when introduced, and urge that meat inspection be continued at Government expense and not be charged to processors.

Whereas the Congress of the United States and most State legislatures were originally and deliberately apportioned one house by population and one house by area; and

Whereas, this legislative structure has been the basis of the strength of our Republic and the hope of the free world; and

Whereas a recent Supreme Court decision, if permitted to stand, would destroy this American concept of fair representation; and

Whereas, the members of the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association believe that this decision was based on considerations other than constitutional law: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress, State legislatures and the citizenry of the United States be alerted to the dangers inherent in this decision and be urgently petitioned to adopt a constitutional amendment that will preserve our present legislative structure.

Whereas the 88th annual convention of the Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association has been advised of the necessity for additional screwworm eradication program funds: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the entire membership of the association be urged to give its wholehearted and aggressive support to the effort to provide sufficient funds which will insure the successful completion of private participation in this important program.

Whereas it is anticipated that certain bills will be introduced in the current session of Congress to extend the minimum wage and hour law to farm and ranch labor; and

Whereas, such legislation would create serious problems in the operation of farms and ranches: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association notify the Members of Congress of its strong opposition to the extension of the wage and hour law to farm and ranch employees.

Whereas the farm and ranch labor situation has deteriorated rapidly; and

Whereas there is an ever increasing need on U.S. farms and ranches for supplemental foreign workers: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Texas & Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association recommends that administrative procedures be adopted by the Federal Government to permit the admission of such workers into the United States under existing provisions of the immigration laws.

Whereas eradication of screwworms in the South and the five States of the Southwest has been accomplished and demonstrated for a period of 13 months; and

Whereas State and producer funds have supported 50 percent of the costs of a holding action and movement of the program into an international area; and

Whereas the screwworm program has become a Federal responsibility on the basis of dangers of reentry only: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States be urged to make provision for the financing of a program to protect the livestock and wildlife of the United States for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965.

Whereas the 89th Congress of the United States has before it a request for a supplemental appropriation for the continued operation of the screwworm eradication program in the Southern and Southwestern States and Mexico; and

Whereas the State of Texas and the livestock producers of the several States are contributing $550,000 in matching, non-Federal funds; and

Whereas the continued success or failure of this important program depends upon the availability of these Federal funds requested: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Members of Congress be urged to take prompt action in providing the necessary Federal funds at the earliest possible date and be informed that the Texas and Southwestern Cattle Raisers Association considers this matter to be of maximum importance.

Whereas we commend our regulatory officials for their excellent work in preventing entry of foot-and-mouth and other exotic and highly contagious diseases into the United States, to the end that the health status of the cattle in the United States, is the envy of the world; and

Whereas the Canadian Department of Agriculture has announced it will allow direct importation of live cattle from countries known to be infected with foot-and-mouth and other highly contagious diseases: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we express grave concern over the Canadian action and urge our Federal officials to protest and request the Canadian Government to rescind its action; and be it further

Resolved, That we strongly urge the U.S. Department of Agriculture not to permit entry of cattle from countries which open their borders to cattle from countries known to be infected with foot-and-mouth or other highly contagious diseases.

Whereas the ranch and farm producer is suffering severely from an increasingly narrowing profit margin; and

Whereas this condition is due primarily on the one hand to a low sale price for his product and on the other hand to a high cost of production resulting from an increasing cost of labor, equipment, supplies, and increasing State and local taxes, particularly ad valorem taxes: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of Texas be urged to adopt legislation which would provide that, as the urban population of the State expands into areas in which the land historically has been used for farming and ranching purposes, the tax assessing agencies be required to evaluate for tax purposes lands historically and currently used for agricultural and livestock purposes on the basis of the agricultural productive value of the land rather than on an inflated value related to the speculative growth of urban development onto the land at some future date.

VIETNAM—THE BASIS FOR NEGOTIATION

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, last Thursday the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER] performed an important service to the country when he spoke on Vietnam. He pointed out that while we speak of our willingess to go to honorable negotiations, at the same time we prescribe "conditions as a prerequisite which will not be acceptable." We are demanding, in fact, something close to unconditional surrender.

Walter Lippmann, in his article published today, gives the Senator's speech the attention it deserves.

Consistently over the darkening months of the Vietnam crisis, Walter Lippmann has spoken in clear and reasoned tones. He has not simplified the complex, nor has he avoided the unpleasant. Our policymakers would not lightly dismiss what this wise man says. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that his article of today, April 1, be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW: THE BASIS OF NEGOTIATION

(By Walter Lippmann)

The cardinal defect of the administration's conduct of the war in Indochina has been pointed out by a Republican Senator, JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky. In a statement last week (March 25), Senator COOPER said that the U.S. Government, like its adversaries in Pieping and Hanoi, is "prescribing conditions as a prerequisite to negotiations which will not be accepted." The Communists are making it a condition of a negotiation that the United States must withdraw from Vietnam; we are making it a condition of a negotiation that North Vietnam must withdraw from South Vietnam. "This is," said Senator COOPER, "a kind of demand from both sides for unconditional surrender."

It is, therefore, highly important that the administration put itself in a position where negotiation is possible, granting that even if it did so, Hanoi and Peiping may gamble on winning the war in order to overrun South Vietnam and inflict a smashing defeat on the United States. But, regardless of what they do, we must come into court with clean hands. The administration needs to clarify its own position—in order to set in motion a movement for negotiation and, failing that, to put the onus of prolonging and widening the war unmistakably on our adversaries.

There is a mistaken impression in this country that we are ready and willing to negotiate but that the other side is imposing intolerable conditions; namely, that we should withdraw our forces before the negotiation begins. Senator COOPER rejects the Communist condition, as do all of us who have been actively interested in this question. We cannot withdraw our forces until there has been a political settlement in Indochina, a settlement which promises to last because it serves the primary interests of all concerned.

But what, as a matter of fact, is our position? It is that before negotiations can take place, the North must demonstrate its readiness "to leave its neighbors alone." Secretary Rusk has avoided a precise definition of that phrase. We know that "illegal infiltration of military personnel and arms" is considered to violate that condition. That "leaving your neighbors alone" means also withdrawal of infiltrators who are already there has at times been suggested but never formally stated.

Senator COOPER says of this position: "I think it unlikely that the Communists will agree to this condition for negotiations, as we will not agree to their condition that the United States withdraw."

What Senator COOPER is asking the administration to do is what was done in the Korean war: "No such conditions were imposed by either side prior to negotiations, but a cease-fire was sought." Until the administration comes around to this position, its diplomacy will be confused.

Last week (March 25) the President issued a statement that "we have said many times—

to all who are interested in our principles for honorable negotiation—that we seek no more than a return to the essentials of the agreements of 1954—a reliable arrangement to guarantee the independence and security of all in southeast Asia."

This is rather puzzling. The agreements of 1954 were reached at Geneva in a conference in which there participated not only the Indo-Chinese states but also Russia, Red China, Britain, France, and the United States. The agreements ended the fighting between the French Union forces and the Vietminh in Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. These states were to become independent countries, with Vietnam partitioned at the 17th parallel into two zones pending general free elections to be held by January 20, 1956.

The cease-fire agreement was signed by the military commanders. But in addition, the Geneva Conference issued a final declaration, dated July 21. This declaration contained the following principles of settlement. One of the principles was that the cease-fire prohibited the "introduction into Vietnam of foreign troops and military personnel as well as of all kinds of arms and munitions." The Geneva declaration went on to say that "the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary." Furthermore, the declaration said that "general elections shall be held in July 1956, under the supervision of an international commission."

The United States did not sign the final declaration. But the Under Secretary of State, Gen. Bedell Smith, made a "unilateral declaration" which said that the United States supported the agreements and that "in connection with the statement in the declaration concerning free elections in Vietnam, my Government wishes to make clear its position which it has expressed in a declaration made in Washington on June 29, 1954, as follows: 'In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections supervised by the United Nations to insure that they are conducted fairly.' "

The United States encouraged the Diem government in Saigon to refuse to hold the elections of 1956, almost certainly for the quite practical reason that they would have been won by the Communists.

Considering the essentials of the 1954 agreements, it is not easy to understand what it means to say now that "we seek no more than a return to the essentials of the agreements of 1954." I am afraid it means that in the diplomatic conduct of the war in Vietnam, the diplomatists have not been doing their homework.

A FEDERAL FISCAL PROGRAM FOR SOUND ECONOMIC GROWTH

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, one of the most distinguished publications in my State, West Texas Today, a magazine of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce, printed in its March issue an article of major importance which I call to the attention of the Senate.

The article is entitled "A Federal Fiscal Program for Sound Economic Growth." It is a result of studies, by the Federal finance committee of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce, of Federal spending and tax policies during the postwar period.

The article makes this sage observation:

> The Nation must choose between uncontrolled Federal spending, chronic budgetary deficits, excessive taxation, continuing price inflation, and the instability of an overheated economy, on the one hand; and rational spending policies, budgets ordinarily balanced, moderate taxation, a dollar with stable purchasing power, and a soundly based, healthy, growing economy on the other.

The article then makes some most worthwhile suggestions about how the second situation described above can be reached. I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD, so that other Senators may be advised of these vital views.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A FEDERAL FISCAL PROGRAM FOR SOUND ECONOMIC GROWTH—FINANCIAL REFORMS NEEDED BADLY, COUNCIL OF STATE CHAMBERS SUGGESTS

INTRODUCTION

This Federal fiscal program for sound economic growth is the result of studies by the Federal finance committee of the Council of State Chambers of Commerce of Federal spending and tax policies during the post-World War II period. It is a revision of similar programs published in 1945, 1948, 1956, 1957, 1960, and 1961.

In the fiscal year 1948 Federal spending fell to $33 billion—the lowest post-World War II level. The Korean war and the attendant rearmament program, together with increased nondefense spending, raised expenditures to $74 billion in 1953. In order to finance this increased spending, Congress twice raised the tax rates on incomes of individuals and corporations, increased various excise tax rates, and imposed a further tax on corporate incomes in the guise of a so-called excess profits tax. After termination of the Korean war, Federal expenditures declined for 2 years to $64 billion in 1955 and some tax relief was accorded individuals and businesses.

Since 1955 Federal spending has risen every year but one. During the 5 years through 1960 spending rose by $12 billion to $76 billion. Then in the next 4 years through 1964, expenditures rose by $22 billion to $98 billion for an average increase of $5½ billion a year. With this spending rise apparently halted for 1965, Congress enacted an overall $11½ billion tax reduction for individuals and corporations effective over 2 years, calendar 1964 and 1965.

The rise in total Federal cash payments, including the social security and other trust fund operations, is even more phenomenal than the growth of the administrative budget. Federal cash payments to the public soared from $36 billion in 1948 to $94 billion in 1960 and to $122 billion in 1964. This latter amount is an increase of 239 percent over 1948 and 30 percent in just the last 4 years.

Also reflecting a tremendous growth during this period is the Nation's indebtedness. Public debt, including Federal, State, and local, rose from $270 billion in 1948 to almost $400 billion in 1963, and over the same period net private debt grew from $201 billion to $753 billion. Thus, the total national indebtedness had reached $1,150 billion in 1963 and is even greater now.

Moreover, the Federal public debt of $315 billion is only a minor fraction of the actual accrued obligations of the Federal Government based on existing legislation and past commitments. The unfunded accrued liabilities include $30 billion for military retirement, another $30 billion for civil service retirement, and the astronomical total of about $400 billion for the social security program. Obligations for veterans' pensions, disability compensation, and other benefits come to about $300 billion. These unfunded commitments together with the Federal public debt total 1 trillion, 75 billion dollars. This is the real magnitude of the Federal obligation for past services.

The national economy has, of course, grown considerably since 1948 but not in proportion to the growth in Federal spending. While administrative budget expenditures and total Federal cash payments had risen 197 percent and 239 percent, respectively, by 1964, the gross national product rose only 141 percent and national income only 130 percent.

FINANCIAL REFORMS ARE NEEDED

The Nation must choose between uncontrolled Federal spending, chronic budgetary deficits, excessive taxation, continuing price inflation, and the instability of an overheated economy, on the one hand, and rational spending policies, budgets ordinarily balanced, moderate taxation, a dollar with stable purchasing power, and a soundly based, healthy, growing economy, on the other.

Our economy seems always to be in a state of crisis. There is never enough employment, many families have inadequate incomes, living costs keep rising, and the unfavorable balance of international payments is always threatening the future of the dollar.

The balance of international trade continues to be favorable because of our export trade. But deficits in the balance-of-payments remain as a serious influence of instability. We have incurred deficits of $2 billion or more in each of the last 6 years, with Government expenditures for economic aid and for defense purposes abroad contributing heavily to this deficit pattern. Now there are some persons who appear to think that we must accept substantial yearly deficits in the international balance of payments as a normal condition.

These deficits result largely from unwise Federal spending policies which have caused an annual outflow of gold to foreign countries and creeping inflation in our own consumer markets. As a result of the last six deficits in the international balance of payments, our gold stock has declined by more than $7 billion. Foreign credits in our banks, which represent potential claims against our dwindling supply of gold, have risen to the point where they now total $21 billion as compared to our entire gold stock of $15 billion. This situation, together with the failure to manage our own national budget without deficits even in times of high prosperity, poses a grave threat to the dollar both at home and abroad.

It is the thoughtful judgment of those who have developed this program that our basic economic and financial problems can never be solved without placing our Federal fiscal house in order. The first step toward this end is a substantial reduction of the Federal budget, and this step should no longer be delayed. Only in this way will the funds diverted into nonessential Federal expenditures become available for investment in the productive private enterprise needed to provide the jobs and output required to attain the maximum economic growth. It is only through substantial Federal expenditure reduction that we can reduce our onerous public debt and restore our taxes to moderate levels.

Some steps have been taken to scale down wartime taxes which were serious impediments to increase investment, production, and consumption. But Federal taxes are still needlessly restrictive to economic growth and further downward revisions and reforms are imperative for a satisfactory and stable rate of economic growth. Giving away more money to meet every domestic and international economic and political problem has served to aggravate, rather than remedy, these problems. At the same time, uncontrolled Federal budgets have saddled the taxpayers with deadening burdens which must be lightened in a program of successive tax reductions.

In the development of a sound, adequate, and equitable financial program conducive to American democracy, free enterprise, and a prosperous and stable economy, the advice of numerous businessmen, economists, accountants, lawyers, leaders in government, research organizations, and the representatives of other business groups has been sought. To all of those representing many branches of business enterprise and many sections of the country who have so thoughtfully and generously contributed their efforts to aid in its work, the committee is deeply grateful.

This program calls for both immediate and long-range reforms in Federal finances. It is predicated on the feasibility of steady advancement of our levels of income, employment, investment, and comsumption through dynamic and productive private enterprise, without creeping inflation in consumer markets. It is conducive to both the immediate and long-range objectives of representative government as well as free enterprise. It assumes that the economic well-being of the consumer, the wage earner, the farmer, and all of our citizens is conducive to the well-being of business; and that a stable and prosperous economy can best be achieved in a climate of free enterprise.

PROMOTING SOUND ECONOMIC GROWTH

We concur with the view, now widely held, that a high rate of economic growth should be maintained. It must be maintained if our economy is to meet the needs of an increasing population, the need for adequate national strength to resist the economic and military challenge of communism, and the need to fulfill the rightful aspiration of consumers for better living.

Our only means for attaining a healthy, sustained, and high rate of economic growth lies in the natural unfettered development of our free enterprise economy. Only with the incentives to initiative, risk-taking, and productive energy provided by private enterprise can we attain our maximum output and our optimum consumption.

But if the necessary economic incentives are to be freed from the shackles of restrictive taxation, the burdens of nonessential spending must be removed. We, therefore, offer a number of constructive proposals for the elimination and prevention of nonessential Federal expenditures.

We are convinced that sufficient reductions can be made from the current level of spending to permit significant tax reforms for economic growth and to provide for some payment on the public debt. This can be done without the impairment of essential Government services.

1. ELIMINATE ALL NONESSENTIAL EXPENDITURES FOR NATIONAL SECURITY WITHOUT WEAKENING OUR DEFENSES

This Nation may have to support a high level of defense expenditures for some years to come. Accordingly, it is imperative that every effort be made to get full defense value for every dollar spent on defense. Toward this end, the administration and Congress should make every effort to:

(a) Eliminate interservice rivalries and duplications of effort among the armed services which lead to acquisition of unnecessary installations and other wasteful practices at high cost to the public.

(b) Dispose of all but essential military installations and land holdings, and utilize existing facilities on an interservice basis wherever possible.

(c) Make fully effective the central purchasing and supply system originally envisioned when the present Defense Department was created.

(d) Eliminate unnecessary costs from the military manpower supply program.

2. REVISE AND REDUCE FOREIGN AID

Over the past 20 post-World War II years Congress has provided almost $113 billion for grants and loans under our foreign aid programs and only $12 billion of that amount has been repaid. In addition to the burden imposed on our taxpayers by these expenditures, they have been a causative factor in the sharp shrinkage of our gold reserves which threatens the soundness of our currency.

The economies of our major allies have been strengthened to the level that the United States should no longer have to continue alone to carry this international burden on behalf of the free world. So, with the exception of assistance clearly and directly related to our national security or relief in areas of disaster and famine, liquidation of our existing unilateral aid programs should be started promptly and should be completed within 3 years.

American participation in the economic development of underdeveloped nations should be a function of private enterprise first and Government second. Moreover, our Government's participation should be on a loan basis and should be limited to pro rata contributions through existing international development financing agencies. Private enterprise should be encouraged to furnish technical assistance and investment capital in foreign areas and Government insurance of long-term credits should be provided.

To the extent that foreign economic aid programs are continued, the aid should be provided in the form of American goods and services to eliminate the impact of such aid on the international balance of payments.

3. REVIEW UNEXPENDED APPROPRIATIONS

The Congress should set up procedures to review thoroughly the huge balances of unexpended appropriations provided in prior years, especially those for defense, space programs, and foreign aid, to determine whether the purposes for which they were provided are still valid under present conditions. Any of these unexpected appropriations which cannot currently be fully justified should be rescinded.

4. STOP BACK-DOOR FEDERAL SPENDING

The administration should refrain from recommending and Congress should discontinue the use of legislative devices which permit so-called back-door obligation of Treasury funds without clearance through the Appropriations Committees of Congress.

5. REVERSE GROWTH OF GRANT-IN-AID PROGRAMS

As much of the Nation's government as possible should be restored to our town halls, our country courthouses, and our State capitols, because in local self-government lies the real strength of our free institutions. All existing grant-in-aid programs should be carefully reviewed and reduced or eliminated whenever such programs can be better carried out at the State or local level. Any newly proposed grant-in-aid programs should not be adopted if they are more properly and efficiently the functions of the State and local governments. Congress should enact legislation which will assure the carrying out of this policy. This will relieve the Federal budget of continuing and new expenditures which more properly belong to our State and local governments.

6. LIQUIDATE FEDERAL LENDING PROGRAMS

The administration and Congress should resist proposals for the creation of any new Federal lending programs. Immediate action should be taken by both to insure the liquidation of the Federal participation in existing loan programs as fast as practicable. Until the existing programs are liquidated, the subsidy features involved in many of them should be eliminated by provision of interest charges sufficient to cover the cost of long-term Treasury borrowing plus administrative expenses of the programs.

7. LEAVE THE FINANCING OF EDUCATION TO THE STATES AND COMMUNITIES

Traditionally, local and State governments have provided the facilities and instruction for public education in America. Consequently, our public education system has remained relatively free from control by agencies outside the community and it should so remain.

Since Federal financial assistance involves Federal control, as well as additional cost to taxpayers generally, all proposals for nationwide educational aid to the States of any kind at any school level should be rejected.

8. REEXAMINE AGRICULTURAL AID PROGRAMS

The ultimate objective of research and legislation dealing with the problem of farm production and prices should be an agricultural industry standing on its own feet in a free market economy without the necessity for Federal subsidies. The administration and Congress should now begin to move toward this goal by reducing farm surpluses and the cost of farm price supports.

9. LIMIT PUBLIC WORKS TO THOSE WHICH ARE ESSENTIAL AND FEASIBLE

To the greatest possible extent civil public works projects should be financed locally. The Federal Government should not finance any civil works project which private industry is willing to finance or which is not vitally needed and which cannot be justified by sound standards of economic feasibility and public interest. The Congress and the executive branch should avoid any action which would weaken existing feasibility standards for Federal projects and, instead, should seek to strengthen such standards. Where the Congress does appropriate funds for public works, it should provide assurance that expenditures will be made under conditions which will insure fair and equal treatment among competing forms of enterprise.

Public works projects involving the production of electric energy should be limited to multipurpose projects in which electric power is only incidental.

10. STOP CONSTRUCTION OF FEDERAL PUBLIC HOUSING

There is no justification for the Federal Government to supplement its vast housing credit programs by federally subsidized public housing. Congress should, therefore, provide no further authorization for such subsidized housing.

11. REJECT FEDERAL HEALTH INSURANCE PROPOSALS

Congress should reject any general health insurance program because such insurance is not a proper function of the Federal Government. Insurance against medical and hospital expenses is a matter of private responsibility and, furthermore, existing welfare programs provide for those who are unable to meet such expenses or pay insurance premiums covering them.

12. ELIMINATE THE POSTAL DEFICIT

Notwithstanding the fact that postal rates were increased by the 87th Congress, the Post Office Department continues to incur huge annual deficits, now approximating $½ billion. Congress should take whatever action is necessary to eliminate these deficits. This should include action leading to greater efficiency and economy in operation of the postal service, a review of the allocation of expenses among the various classes of mail in order to improve the allocation and then, to the extent necessary, a further increase in postal rates to provide additional revenues.

13. EQUALIZE THE COMPETITION OF FEDERAL BUSINESS-TYPE ENTERPRISES

The Federal Government should discontinue operating business-type enterprises in competition with privately owned enterprises. Until such enterprises are liquidated, Congress should require them to:

(a) Pay taxes to local and State subdivisions and to the Federal Treasury on the same basis and to the same extent as taxes are paid by the privately owned enterprises with which they compete.

(b) Pay annually to the Federal Treasury the interest on the money invested in such enterprises at the cost of that money to the Government.

(c) Repay to the Treasury Department, within a reasonable time, the taxpayers' investment in such enterprises.

14. REDUCE FEDERAL CIVILIAN PERSONNEL

The number of Federal civilian employees can be substantially reduced without adverse effect upon the essential functions of Government. This has been demonstrated on several occasions over the past decade when the executive branch, on its own initiative or on insistence of Congress, has absorbed significant portions of Federal pay increases by reductions in force. The President and Congress should continue to take whatever action is necessary to effect sizable reductions.

15. VETERANS' SERVICES AND BENEFITS

While the principle of liberality should be made to apply in the case of all veterans who were war casualties, greater care should be used to limit current benefits to those suffering disabilities directly on account of the incidents of war. Congress should avoid creating any new benefits or services. It certainly should initiate no readjustment benefits program for peacetime ex-servicemen. Such a program would tend to defeat the very purpose of the costly incentive measures that have been enacted to induce servicemen to make military service a career.

16. ADOPT OTHER ECONOMY MEASURES

We urge continuing studies by the administration and Congress of all possible measures for increasing efficiency in government, and reducing Federal expenditures; and we urge the prompt adoption of such measures.

THE FEDERAL BUDGET, DEBT, AND MONETARY POLICY

Congress should devote its early attention to legislation which, except in time of national emergency, would require the executive branch to submit balanced budgets and would require the Congress to make provision for a balanced budget prior to the adjournment of each session.

For the immediate future, the executive branch should submit reduced expenditure budgets to permit tax reduction within the existing statutory debt limit. Further, a plan for orderly reduction of the debt should be inaugurated.

Debt reduction is essential for bringing order out of the Federal fiscal chaos, which has engendered chronic deficits, a rising national debt with its inflationary dangers, and increasing interest costs. Heavy interest charges require high taxes, and debt management is made more difficult because of the impact of debt operations and interest payments on the economy. Furthermore, in the event of an international or other emergency requiring large additions to the debt, our debt problems will become even more serious.

The Treasury Department should not be hampered in debt management with the handicaps of statutory interest rate ceilings. Easy credit and low-interest rates in periods of prosperity invite wasteful public and private spending and increase inflationary pressures.

The Federal Reserve Board should remain independent of control by the executive branch in its determination and conduct of monetary policies and activities.

A PROGRAM OF FEDERAL TAX REDUCTION

Together with our Federal spending and debt proposals, our tax recommendations are advanced to strengthen the economy, increase its stability, and promote the maximum continuing economic growth. These proposals will permit provision for all essential Government services while removing the blight of wasteful Federal spending and repressive taxation.

The national total of Federal, State, and local taxes now exceeds $155 billion. Federal taxes, including social security charges, account for $108 billion, or approximately 70 percent of this huge sum. Furthermore, the individual and corporation income taxes, in spite of recent reductions in rates, account for almost 70 percent of the total Federal taxes. So far as individuals and employers are concerned, the payroll taxes to finance old-age insurance continue to increase in rate and would be further increased by proposals to include medical and other services in the social security program.

To make matters worse, State and local governments have been increasing existing taxes and adopting new taxes. The reduction of Federal income taxes has served as an invitation to some of these governments to levy additional burdens on the taxpayers.

The American tax structure is notably heavy on investment, the real key to economic growth. Our Nation has been raising relatively more revenue from its income taxes, with their highly graduated rates, than any of the other leading nations. Our income tax rates have also been comparatively high, exceeding the rates applied in many other nations.

Observers have pointed to the faster growth rates of other countries. Among the factors influencing the growth of the American economy has been the hampering effect of taxation on investment and economic initiative. The Nation's tax burden is too heavy for the competitive private enterprise system to provide the rising national income, and high level employment, and the price stability required for sustained national prosperity. Our taxes, with their added pressures on business costs, are also unfavorable to the maximum development of American exports and to effective competition with foreign firms not burdened with similar costs.

High progressive tax rates on incomes, estates, and gifts confiscate both income and property. They make virtually impossible the accumulation of the venture capital needed by new enterprises for their growth in a competitive economy. They make the survival of small business more difficult. And they stimulate the temptation to evade taxes. Moderation of the Federal tax burden is clearly essential if the American economy is to operate effectively and meet its potentialities for growth. It is particularly important if the State and local governments are to be able to finance public education and other essential services without becoming enslaved to Federal aid and domination.

This program is directed toward immediate and continuing reductions from our excessively high Federal tax rates. The taxload still continues at a level that seriously restrains investment and productive economic activity. But unless Federal spending is checked and reduced, tax reductions will be of little avail in promoting sound economic growth.

The economic expansion that the tax and other fiscal reforms recommended here will create—by increasing the funds available for productive private investment and lessening tax restrictions on economic incentives—can be expected to generate a rapidly rising total of revenues as tax rates are lowered. This conclusion is reinforced by recent experience with the economic and revenue effects of Federal tax revisions.

INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RATES SHOULD BE LOWERED

Even after the rate reductions provided by the Revenue Act of 1964, the individual income tax rates are sharply progressive. They rise rapidly and steeply on the middle and upper incomes which supply much of the investment needed to finance economic growth. These high tax rates are costly to the economy as they adversely affect economic incentives as well as capital information.

The progressive element in the rate structure adds relatively little to the income tax revenues. The basic 14 percent tax rate, which applies to all taxable income, produces over 75 percent of the revenue from the individual income tax. Only the remainder is obtained from the progressive portion of the total tax rates which, in 1965, will range up to 70 percent. Even under the new rates effective in 1965, progression rises so rapidly that if the Federal Government took all of every individual taxable income above $26,000 a year, it would add only 1 percent to the total revenues derived from the 1965 tax structures.

Our huge programs of Federal spending necessitate mass participation in the raising of revenue. Federal spending can be brought under control only if the millions of income taxpayers insist on its control. In order to secure adequate revenues for essential Government services and the wide popular distribution of the costs of Government needed for the control of Federal spending, a policy of low income tax exemptions must be maintained.

Both as a measure of equity and as a means of making possible the maximum economic growth and employment, the scale of rate progression in the income tax should be lowered by successive rate reductions. A maximum rate below 50 percent should be our goal. At the same time, the untoward bulge in the tax rates on the middle incomes should be removed. With rational control of Federal spending and the increase in revenues with growth of the economy, it should also be possible to lower the minimum tax rate.

The reform of the individual income tax rate structure along the lines proposed here would help recreate individual incentives which are being discouraged by our oppressive rates. The cumulative effect of our high Federal tax rates on individuals has contributed to the difficulties encountered by many concerns in obtaining equity capital. Shortages of equity capital in critical areas can be alleviated by reductions of the high progressive rates. This reform, moreover, would minimize the necessity of borrowing funds to finance capital improvements and would reduce the possibility of business firms acquiring a top-heavy debt structure in seeking to expand output and employment.

COMMUNITY PROPERTY PRINCIPLE

The Congress, in its 1948 tax legislation, wisely dealt with the longstanding problem of equalizing the Federal taxation of the incomes, estates, and gifts of married couples in all States. Any efforts to nullify this reform should be resisted.

DOUBLE TAXATION OF INDIVIDUALS

Congress alleviated somewhat the double taxation of dividends in 1954. The amount of relief granted was so small that the onerous taxation of earnings going into dividends, first as corporate income and subsequently as individual income, very largely remained. Those opposed to encouraging investment and economic growth through the more equitable taxation of dividends were able to secure the adoption of a provision in 1964 which removes the dividend credit and allows only a very modest dividend exclusion.

No other type of income is exposed to such double taxation. Other nations, whose economic growth records are considered more satisfactory than the American, commonly eliminate or greatly alleviate the double taxation of dividends. Certainly there is no sound economic reason for penalizing dividend income in comparison with interest paid on loans, wages, salaries, and other income. Economic growth is curbed and the whole country is penalized.

The unfair and uneconomic double taxation of dividends has been supported with the fallacious argument that a tax on dividends is essentially a tax on the wealthy who need no income tax relief. A wealthy person may actually invest in tax-exempt State and municipal securities and thereby avoid the taxation of income from funds which might otherwise be invested in productive venture capital in private industry.

Millions of persons, many of whom are heads of families, have invested in stocks of corporations. Over half of the recipients of dividends have incomes under $8,000. These investors may be persons with only small dividend receipts, and an exclusion of $100 of dividend income for an individual and $200 for a married couple, as provided by the 1964 legislation, may largely alleviate or even eliminate the double taxation of their dividends.

This approach to the problem of double taxation is plainly political. If it is equitable to remove the double taxation of dividends for some persons, it is also equitable to remove it for all investors. If it is good for the economy and conducive to high-level investment and employment to remove the double taxation of dividends for some investors, it will be even better to remove it for all investors.

It should be our goal to eliminate the uneconomic and unfair double taxation of dividends. Until this goal can be realized, we should move to substantially reduce it.

After computing the taxes on their incomes, including taxable dividends received from domestic corporations subject to the income tax, shareholders should be allowed to credit against their tax for the payment of corporate taxes on the earnings paid out in dividends. The percentage allowed as a credit presumably would be at least the initial rate for individual incomes.

The proposed method for immediately alleviating double taxation applies the principle recognized in Federal income taxation before 1936. Up to that time dividends were partially exempt from the individual income tax. The remedy suggested here is widely supported by businessmen and tax authorities. This economic and equitable approach to alleviating discriminatory taxation of dividends should be the first step toward completely eliminating it.

REINVESTED CAPITAL GAINS

The attainment of an expanding economy requires an ever-increasing flow of venture capital into jobmaking enterprises. Individuals should be encouraged to invest their savings in productive private enterprises, not only through lower taxes on their incomes and further alleviation of the double taxation of dividends, but also by more favorable treatment of capital gains.

Long-term gains from the sale of capital assets should not be taxed if the proceeds of such sales are reinvested in capital assets within the taxable year. This principle is already recognized in the law with respect to the sale and repurchase of homes.

ESTATE AND GIFT TAXES

In recent years the rates of the Federal estate and gift taxes have been carried to excessive heights with relatively little revenue obtained. The purpose of these taxes is largely regulatory rather than revenue producing and they should be abandoned. As a step toward Federal withdrawal from the estate tax field, the tax rates should now be reduced, with a maximum rate under 50 percent. The gift tax rates should be reduced proportionately and should remain at three-fourths of the estate tax rates. By appropriate technical amendments, the estate and gift taxes should be made consistent with the Federal income tax to the end that the duplicate taxation which now exists may be eliminated. Proposals for the integration of the estate and gift taxes should be rejected.

A SYSTEM OF EXCISES IS NECESSARY

Excise taxes are practicable of administration, productive in the aggregate of large and stable revenues, and acceptable to American consumers because they are paid conveniently in small amounts. The merits of excises as revenues are amply demonstrated in foreign as well as American experience. Among other leading nations they commonly provide relatively more revenue than in this country, considering total Federal, State, and local taxes. Many of these nations are considered to have enjoyed a more satisfactory growth rate than has the United States.

Reforms in our wartime patchwork of excises are long overdue. Excessively high tax rates should be lowered. Obnoxious taxes plainly detrimental to productive business activity or consumption, taxes grossly inequitable in their application, taxes which increase business costs to the detriment of competitive enterprise at home and abroad, taxes, which are difficult to administer and yield little revenue, and taxes which are more properly State than Federal revenues should be removed as fast as revenue requirements will permit.

The relative importance of excises in our tax system should not be diminished. They distribute the costs of public services of benefit to all classes more widely among those able to pay taxes and may be employed to moderate excessive income tax burdens. A system of excises has been and should remain a major source of revenue.

In considering the appropriate role of excises in our tax system, we return to the problems of Federal expenditure control previously emphasized in this program of fiscal reform. If Federal expenditures are not kept in check but outdistance the revenues furnished by reasonably moderate income and excise taxes, it will clearly be necessary to impose additional taxes to avoid dangerous and inflationary deficit financing. But it would obviously be unwise to discard the now widely accepted policy that lower income tax rates are necessary to remove the income tax drag on the economy. Raising such rates would be unthinkable. Departing from the net income concept and moving toward a gross income tax through the disallowance of traditional and desirable deductions would be wholly unacceptable. So if expenditures are not adequately controlled, the only practical alternative will be the adoption of a broad-based, uniform excise tax system adapted to American revenue and economic requirements.

BUSINESS TAX REFORMS ARE NEEDED

A stable and moderate Federal tax structure should be adopted now so that business can plan for the future. Frequently major tax revisions, with their attendant confusion and job delaying uncertainty, can then be avoided.

Steadily increasing investment by both corporations and individuals is essential for steady and satisfactory growth. The heavy corporate income tax falls directly upon production at the very point where decisions are made to promote or reject new inventions, to expand or curtail output and sales, and to hire or not to hire additional workers. Corporate taxes are playing too important a part in these decisions.

THE CORPORATE INCOME TAX SHOULD BE REDUCED

The present corporate income tax rate, although reduced somewhat by the Revenue Act of 1964, is conducive to inefficiency and is detrimental to the achievement of maximum production and employment. It restricts the ability of many corporations to pay the current dividends demanded to attract investments by shareholders, to reserve the funds needed for paying dividends in years of low incomes or losses, and to finance greater production and employment. The tax also places a heavy burden on equity capital and invites borrowing, with its attendant strains on the financial structure.

An early start should be made toward material reduction of the corporate income tax rate beyond the rate reduction enacted in 1964.

A FAVORABLE TAX CLIMATE FOR SMALL BUSINESS

The problems of small business have received much attention because it is desired to encourage the creation and expansion of small concerns as a means of preserving a competitive system of free enterprise. The greatest possible contribution of small enterprises to production and employment is required if the Nation's economic goals are to be realized.

If small enterprises are to be organized and prosper, both the individual and corporate income tax rates must be lowered. The reductions proposed in the rates of the individual income tax will encourage the growth of small proprietorships and partnerships, which are now highly important elements in the competitive economy. In addition to proposed reductions in individual and corporate income taxes, other features of the tax program recommended herein will benefit small business. Unincorporated enterprises, as well as corporations, will benefit from more reasonable allowances for depreciation, and the reforms advocated in taxing capital gains, estates, and gifts.

DISCRETION IN DEDUCTIONS FOR DEPRECIATION AND OBSOLESCENCE

The depreciation guidelines adopted by the Treasury in 1962 and the investment credit enacted by Congress in 1962 have demonstrated that provisions for earlier recovery of capital costs will encourage greater investment. A wider latitude in the allowance of depreciation and obsolescence would further encourage the development of new enterprises, the promotion of new products, and the expansion of production and employment. No tax reform is more imperative if economic growth is to be encouraged.

Business management can best determine the propriety of a particular method of depreciation and absolescence in any given case. Within the limits of sound and consistent accounting, business management should be allowed to exercise discretion in the choice of the method and the rates of depreciation and obsolescence. Congress should enact legislation with this objective in mind for the guidance of both the Internal Revenue Service and the taxpayers. In the meantime, the reserve ratio test in connection with the Treasury's depreciation guidelines should be abolished.

TAXATION OF U.S.-OWNED BUSINESS ABROAD

It has become quite clear that revision of U.S. tax law as applied to American business operations abroad is imperative. Other nations do not impose harsh income tax and other burdens on foreign business operations of their nationals as does the United States. Consequently, substantial segments of U.S.-owned business abroad have been forced to become noncompetitive.

Today it is widely acknowledged that achieving competitive effectiveness for U.S. taxpayers in international business should have the highest economic priority. This is equally applicable to all geographical areas, whether or not designated as economically developed. To achieve this competitive effectiveness, a revision of restrictive U.S. tax law is vital and essential.

The most effective step that could be taken, one which would provide the best possible tax climate abroad for U.S. business, would be for the United States to adopt the principle of territoriality for the taxation of foreign business income. Some profits should be taxed only in the country where earned. This is the effect of the tax systems of a number of home countries which support business in competition with foreign business of U.S. taxpayers.

In the absence of the adoption of the principle of territoriality a less effective—but nevertheless urgently needed—plan would be to eliminate subpart F (secs. 951 to 964) from the Internal Revenue Code, reduce the amount of U.S. tax imposed on foreign income, and appropriately recognize the tax reductions or inducement offered by other nations. Other effective U.S. encouragement must be developed for exports to all nations.

OTHER NEEDED TAX REFORMS

There are many changes of a basic and technical nature which should be made in the Internal Revenue Code. Our program does not attempt to provide an effective treatment of all such changes. However, recommendations are made with respect to certain highly desirable reforms of general interest that should be given prompt consideration.

END THE PREFERENTIAL TREATMENT OF CERTAIN ORGANIZATIONS ENGAGING IN BUSINESS

All organizations engaging in business in competition with private enterprises should be taxed similarly with such enterprises. The exemption from Federal taxation of Government-financed enterprises, cooperatives, and other so-called nonprofit organizations that engage in various business activities in competition with private concerns is not only unfair but also, in this era of high Federal taxation, places heavy handicaps on the private enterprise system. Moreover, it denies to the Government additional sources of revenue. Steps taken in the Revenue Act of 1962 to cope with inequalities in the taxation of cooperatives and other types of business may prove to have a mitigating influence but will only partially remove tax discriminations.

We believe that consumers are entitled to purchase from the sources that most efficiently fill their needs at the lowest prices. But consumers cannot obtain the benefits of free and fair competition among the different types of business if the Government, instead of acting as a referee to make sure that the rules of fair competition are observed, exempts some of the competitors from taxation or extends special favors to them and compels other competitors to operate at a heavy tax disadvantage.

We are not opposed to true cooperation by farmers, consumers, or other groups, but we do oppose the resort to tax-exempt forms of business organization and the enjoyment by such groups of special tax or other advantages provided by legislation or administrative rulings. The tax preferentials given to certain types of cooperatives must be recognized as a subsidy to the undertakings benefiting from them. If it is our purpose to drive private enterprises out of existence, no surer way can be found than by taxing them heavily while relieving their competitors from similar responsibilities.

FEDERAL, STATE, AND LOCAL TAXES AND FINANCES SHOULD BE BETTER COORDINATED

As noted earlier in this program, strong State and local governments are essential if our system of representative government is not to give way to a highly centralized and powerful government wasting the people's resources and disregarding their real needs. Federal taxes must inevitably fall on the same resources and the same people as State and local taxes. The only revenue resources available to Government are the earnings, savings, and expenditures of the people.

The high Federal taxes on personal and corporate incomes have been the greatest barrier to the development of adequate and equitable State and local tax systems. Further reductions in these taxes would both stimulate economic growth and enable the taxpayers to support essential State and local government services. Such reductions would permit tapering off or eliminating Federal grants-in-aid and placing increased responsibility for public education and other domestic functions at the State and local level.

The fiscal resources of the States would further be improved by Federal withdrawal from a number of minor revenue fields. Death and gift taxes should be reserved exclusively to the States. Their laws govern the transfer of property and they entered extensively into inheritance taxation before the Federal estate tax was saddled on the country.

The Federal Government should discontinue taxes on amusements, club dues, and safety deposit box rentals and also the documentary stamp taxes.

Employers should be allowed a 100 percent offset credit against Federal unemployment compensation tax, and Federal grants for administration of State employment security offices should be discontinued.

Conflicts and inequalities in Federal, State, and local taxation should be eliminated, and tax administration and compliance should be facilitated by the better coordination of the taxes imposed by the different levels of government.

As soon as desirable and practicable methods of improved tax coordination can be developed, they should be applied for the benefit of the taxpayers and our governments.

SPENDING, TAXES, AND ECONOMIC GROWTH WITHOUT INFLATION

This program has been published because of our grave concern over rising Government expenditures, the urgent need for further tax reforms and reductions, persistently recurring price inflation, and the plight of the dollar as serious deficits continue in the Federal budget and the international balance of payments. We believe that the basis of natural and sustained economic growth is an expanding free enterprise economy. The artificial bursts of economic activity which are stimulated by ever increasing Government spending and almost continuous deficit financing must inevitably collapse as the instability of inflation gives way to the decay of depression.

The recommendations in the program would reverse the expenditure trend by curtailing wasteful and nonessential spending, and they would alleviate the retarding effects of present tax laws on employment and economic growth.

The threat of further inflation can only be curbed if all groups in our society unite in its control. If the Nation chooses to generate inflation by deficit financing and cheap money, it must accept the serious economic declines which are bound to follow. The Federal Government can best contribute to economic stability by following a fiscal program that will promote sound and steady economic growth through the natural processes of productive private enterprise. To this end, we advocate the prevention and elimination of nonessential Federal expenditures and the immediate moderation and reform of our burdensome and uneconomic Federal taxes.

We believe that our national problems of employment and satisfactory levels of living for all can be solved only with continuous economic growth and improvement generated in a healthy private enterprise economy. More and better goods and services will be produced and supplied to the entire population only if the incentives and investment needed to create and fuel a productive economy are fully active and unrestrained by oppressive taxation and unwise fiscal policies. Poverty and economic blight will give way to prosperity and economic progress as fast as economic growth is achieved through the cooperation of the citizens in the operation of an efficient system of private enterprise.

FISHERY PRODUCTS IN FOOD-FOR-PEACE PROGRAM

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, President Johnson has sent to Congress the annual report on the food-for-peace program, outlining the importance of the program to our agricultural interests and developing foreign trade. The President pointed out that an effort was being made to improve the nutritional balance in the commodities sold under the program. In my opinion, this essential balance cannot be obtained unless the administration implements the law, recently enacted, which permits high-protein fishery products to be added to the food-for-peace program. The fact that this has not been implemented to date has been of grave concern to me. The staff of the Senate Committee on Commerce has been directed to undertake an investigation of whether there is any basis for committee hearings on this failure to implement the amendment. I certainly hope favorable action will be taken to implement the amendment and to satisfy the President's desire to improve the nutritional balance in our present program.

BYELORUSSIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, Byelorussians proclaimed their independence from Russia on March 25, 1918, and enjoyed their freedom for less than a year. But even that very brief period has left such a memorable impression upon them that for each of the last 47 years they have faithfully observed the anniversary of their independence. And even today, Byelorussia remains a captive province of the Soviet Union, and its unfortunate inhabitants are prisoners there.

Sad indeed has been the history of this gallant and gifted people. Centuries ago they were overwhelmed by the Russians, and then had to put up with Russia's autocratic regime. When that regime was overthrown, they thought that their bondage had come to an end, and that they could become masters of their own destiny. Such was their firm belief in 1918; but fate was cruel to them. Within a year of their independence, the Red Army dealt with them cruelly; and eventually the Byelorussians were brought under the unrelenting rule of the Kremlin. And to this day, most of them have no choice but to endure Communist tyranny. Of course they hope for their freedom, and ceaselessly work for it, confident that in the end their cause will win against the forces of oppression. On the 47th anniversary of their independence, my heartfelt wishes are with them.

AFL–CIO STATEMENT ON CONSUMER LEGISLATION

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at its recent meeting in Bal Harbour, Fla., the executive council of the AFL–CIO approved an excellent statement of goals for Congress with respect to consumer legislation.

As a group of citizens, consumers are a diffused influence; and their interests are put before Congress only with difficulty. The more narrow interests, which often are threats to the welfare of consumers, on the other hand, are powerful and concentrated. One of the finest achievements of organized labor, and of the AFL–CIO in particular, is its constant effort to speak for the general interests of the consumer and the little taxpayer. I hope Congress and the administration will pay special heed to the recommendations of the AFL–CIO in this field.

I ask unanimous consent that the statement to which I have referred be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON CONSUMER LEGISLATION

The executive council of the AFL–CIO is hopeful that the 89th Congress will produce a significant advance in the enactment of needed legislation in behalf of the American consuming public. Bills dealing with a number of consumer issues have already been introduced and others will be presented in the near future. We believe the time is ripe for action on these issues, many of which are of long standing and have been thoroughly explored by the committees of the Congress.

The AFL–CIO represents its membership not only with respect to their interests as workers in the job market, but is also well aware of their problems as buyers for millions of households in consumer markets. Organized workers, like the rest of the consuming public, have a right to expect that the goods they buy will be fairly priced, safe to use, and adequately and honestly described.

In particular, we call for prompt action to:

1. Enact a truth-in-lending bill, which will require lenders to disclose to consumers the cost of the credit extended to them, both the dollar cost and the true percentage annual interest rate.

2. Enact a truth-in-packaging bill to stop deceptive labelling and packaging of consumer products and to establish ground rules on reasonable standards for weights and measures in packaged products.

3. Suppress the shameful bootleg market in pep pills and goof balls and other mind-affecting drugs that cause hazards to individuals and the general public.

4. Close the loopholes in the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, especially those which allow cosmetics on the market that have not been pretested for safety and which permit the sale of untested healing devices—useless or dangerous or both.

5. Require Federal inspection of all meat for safety and wholesomeness, whether or not the meat moves in interstate commerce.

6. Establish Federal safety standards for automobile tires.

7. Enable the Federal Trade Commission to put a quick stop to misleading advertising and other abuses by authorizing the Commission to issue temporary cease-and desist orders, pending the outcome of its frequently lengthy proceedings against offenders.

We reiterate our opposition to enactment of any Federal resale price maintenance law, under whatever label it may be offered, whether fair trade, quality stabilization, or other imaginative slogan. Such a law, which would allow manufacturers to fix the price at which their branded or trademarked products may be sold by wholesalers and retailers, would discourage or suppress price competition and result in high prices to consumers.

We ask that the issue of excessive prices for prescription drugs, largely dormant since the death of Senator Estes Kefauver, be reopened in the present Congress.

We also commend the Federal Power Commission for having made possible the reduction of more than $600 million annually in the cost of natural gas services to American consumers.

It is our view that the machinery for consumer representation in the Federal Government continues to be inadequate. We favor a statutory provision for such representation in the executive branch and the establishment of Select Committees on Consumer Affairs in the House and Senate.

We call upon both the Congress and the administration to give vigorous support to these legislative objectives in behalf of the consuming public.

COURAGEOUS STAND OF WILLARD WIRTZ ON FOREIGN FARM LABOR

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, as many Senators know, the Secretary of Labor has recently completed an on-the-spot inspection tour in California, to gain firsthand information on the alleged labor shortage caused by the termination of the bracero program. It is typical of the fairmindedness and honesty of Willard Wirtz that he took the time to see for himself exactly what the situation was.

As a result of this trip, Secretary Wirtz remains convinced that the days of a guaranteed labor supply, imported from abroad are over. According to a dispatch published in the New York Times on March 29, Secretary Wirtz made it plain, at a news conference that "Henceforth agriculture will have to get its labor supply through direct wage competition in the domestic labor market."

Those of us who have carefully studied the migrant farm labor situation have long been convinced that if the farmer will provide decent family housing and decent wages, he will get the good, reliable American workers he needs to harvest his crops. I am glad that so distinguished an expert in the labor field as Willard Wirtz shares that view. As for the prospects that more foreign workers will be brought in through a back door bracero program under Public Law 414, I was pleased to note that Secretary Wirtz is quoted as having said:

> Some people have felt that Public Law 414 would replace Public Law 78. It will not.

I salute Secretary Wirtz for his courageous stand in behalf of American workers, despite the intense political and economic pressures being placed on him.

Secretary Wirtz' trip received excellent press coverage and editorial comment. I ask unanimous consent that an article from the New York Times of March 29, 1965; an article from the Washington Post of March 29, 1965; an article, by Doris Fleeson, published in the Washington Star of March 26; and an editorial from the New York Times of March 27, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial and the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 27, 1965]

SQUEEZE ON THE MIGRANTS

After years of successful sabotage by the corporate farm lobby, Congress finally was able to slam the door last December 31 on the legal importation of hundreds of thousands of low-wage Mexican laborers to harvest American crops. Now California growers are engaged in a callous, rearguard action to reopen the migration floodgates and thus to condemn American farmworkers to continued exploitation.

Every device short of outright refusal to accept domestic farmworkers has been used to discredit the Labor Department's recruitment efforts. The growers' aim is to prove that crops will rot if Secretary Wirtz does not authorize the emergency admission of large numbers of braceros from Mexico. State officials already have thrown their support behind the farmowners in the Salinas area, and pressure for a wholesale breakthrough is mounting in the rest of California.

Thus far Mr. Wirtz has stood fast—as he should. He is making a personal inspection of the obstacles to getting enough workers in California. Already he has discovered that one answer is the survival of abysmal living conditions in some migrant labor camps. He said the filth at one camp near Salinas made him "ashamed" that anything so bad existed in America.

In line with his duty under the general immigration law, Mr. Wirtz has held hearings and established $1.40 an hour as the prevailing rate California growers must offer domestic laborers before he will certify any shortage requiring the importation of foreign help. This wage standard is scheduled to become effective April 1, and certainly no need for braceros should be assumed until it has had a comprehensive test. And, if this wage proves insufficiently attractive, there is no reason why the law of supply and demand in the labor field should not bring a higher one.

Once growers are compelled to recognize the necessity for paying a living wage, America's highly profitable corporate farms will cease to be "sweatshops in the sun" and no shadow of excuse will exist for the mass import of cheap foreign labor.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 29, 1965]

DAY OF ALIEN LABOR OVER WIRTZ TELLS COAST FARMERS—GROWERS MUST COMPETE FOR DOMESTIC WORKERS, HE SAYS AFTER TOUR

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES, March 28.—Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz has proclaimed the advent of a new era in a major segment of American agriculture.

Mr. Wirtz declared this weekend, after making a 4-day investigation of California's vast farming industry, that the day of a Government-sponsored guaranteed and assured farm labor supply, through the seasonal importation of cut-rate alien field hands, was over.

Henceforth, he said, agriculture will have to get its workers through direct wage competition in the domestic labor market.

He predicted that even major increases in farm wages would bring only insignificant increases in retail food prices.

To facilitate this far-reaching transition to domestic labor, Mr. Wirtz indicated that he was strongly inclined to press for two innovations long considered radical in agricultural economics: a national minimum wage and unemployment insurance for farm workers.

MINIMUM WAGE STUDIED

The Secretary is also considering the development, under Federal-State auspices, of a national network of trailer parks, with full community facilities, as bases from which migrant farm-worker families could follow the crop cycle and live decently.

Many of these families still live in battered automobiles or shacks on ditchbanks in the "Grapes of Wrath" fashion of the 1930's.

A score of States, mainly in the West, have made extensive use of alien labor, chiefly Mexican braceros imported annually by the hundreds of thousands on grounds of domestic labor shortages.

This importation was ended by law December 31. Since then there has been mounting clamor from farm quarters, and pressures on Congress and the administration, to revive the traffic.

The system has long been opposed by organized labor and social welfare organizations as a wage-cutting device. The so-called shortages of domestic labor, in the face of large-scale unemployment, have been attributed to farm employers' refusal to offer enough pay as long as they could get dollar-an-hour alien labor.

LITTLE DISRUPTION SEEN

Mr. Wirtz concluded that in California, the biggest agricultural State and the biggest user of braceros [Spanish idiom for manual laborers], the shift to domestic labor had been effected thus far with minimal disruption of farming although there might be very limited and selective transitional needs for some aliens in this fall's harvest peak.

The Secretary presented his conclusions at an airport news conference last night as he headed back to Washington, his shoes daubed with mud from tramping through dozens of vegetable fields, fruit groves and labor camps during a thousand-mile tour of the State by plane and car.

In four 16-hour days, he talked with hundreds of workers, employers, and officials. In collaboration with an entourage of Federal and State agricultural and labor experts, he probed farm economics down to fractions of a cent.

California's large-scale farm employers had hoped the visit would be an occasion for continuation of the long-simmering argument about the asserted indispensability of a "supplementary alien labor supply," which critics have likened to the garment industry's onetime dependence on a flow of immigrants from Europe.

But Mr. Wirtz, after his investigation, rejected this notion as a dead issue. He emphasized that in terminating Public Law 78, which authorized federally regulated importation of labor, Congress had expressed its will that this labor source be ended.

The only question now, he said, is how to achieve the transition to a stable, and economically and socially satisfactory, domestic supply.

The will of Congress, he added, likewise precluded reviving any large-scale admission of foreign labor under section 414 of the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act, on which many farm employers have been pinning their hopes.

Under this provision, foreign labor can enter the United States temporarily to work in a certain area if the Labor Department agrees that the area has a labor shortage.

"Some people have felt that section 414 would replace Public Law 78," Mr. Wirtz said. "It will not.

"I see the situation moving from the recriminations and absolutes of the last several months of discussions," he said, "into a period where we face squarely the fact that Public Law 78 has been terminated. What lies ahead is a longer range challenge to meet the changeover in California's agriculture.

"A fully guaranteed, assured labor supply will no longer be the case," Mr. Wirtz said. "It will be up to employers, with the cooperation of public and private agencies, to provide adequate incentives. A basic decision implicit in the action of Congress was that labor should find its price on a competitive basis."

He declared, "There has been substantially no bargaining power between employees and employers over wages and working conditions. From here on there'll be a competitive factor in the situation.

"Under Public Law 78," he continued, "at least one-fifth of California agricultural work was performed by single individuals, from a foreign country, living apart from their families, in a network of bachelor labor camps. In the future this portion of the work will be performed by people of this country who travel with their families.

"There will be problems of providing family housing, and such things as schools, churches, and other community facilities. But it's clearly within the area of achievable accomplishments," he said.

"There is no question whatsoever," Mr. Wirtz said, "that we can end the anomaly, the paradox of there being 400,000 to 500,000 unemployed in California and there still being difficulty recruiting labor for farms."

The normal farm employment in California at this time of the year is around 275,000. Against this, Mr. Wirtz observed that there were pending only three emergency applications for supplementary alien labor—which he can still authorize under section 414—totaling only about 8,000 workers.

These applications report shortages of 5,100 workers for lettuce harvesting around Salinas, 2,900 for tomatoes around Stockton, and 250 for date-palm pollination at Indio.

Department of Labor officials and growers' representatives will discuss these areas this week in Washington.

Mr. Wirtz' tour took him from the asparagus ranches of northern California to the citrus groves around Los Angeles and the various crops of the Imperial Valley, where lettuce alone brought in $39 million last year to a small number of ranches.

HEARS BOTH SIDES

From employers Mr. Wirtz heard countless explanations of why U.S. citizens could not do the "stoop labor" on farms, although a good deal of it admittedly has been done by them all along, and how the domestic labor supply was undependable.

From workers he heard equally numerous accounts of having been denied jobs, up to January, in favor of aliens, and of wages below the subsistence level.

"I observed that the most serious reports of labor turnover came from farm operations where conditions were bad," he commented, "and the fewest complaints from places that obviously were well operated."

A memorable vignette occurred as the Secretary surveyed asparagus harvesting in northern California.

"Where are the toilets?" he asked.

The ranch owner blurted out in astonishment: "What toilets?"

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 29, 1965]

Wirtz' Decision Jolts Growers in California

(By Frank C. Porter)

Los Angeles, March 28.—As O. W. Fillerup, of the Council of California Growers, was leaving the Hyatt House Hotel at Salinas last Wednesday a broadly grinning associate came up and put a hand on his shoulder.

"Well, I think we saved the day," said the associate.

The day he referred to is the day of the bracero, legislatively terminated when Congress let Public Law 78 die on December 31.

Fillerup had just presided over a 3-hour presentation in which a dozen allies from canning, food processing, transport and banking industries and the Teamsters Union sought to persuade Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz that the California economy would go to pot without importation of Mexican workers.

Fillerup's friend obviously thought the Secretary had been persuaded. But inside the motel's opulent bar, other colleagues were less sanguine.

Their misgivings were substantiated last night when Wirtz, just before flying back to Washington from Los Angeles, bluntly declared, "the bracero program is over."

LIMITED USE

He did indicate there might be some limited spot use of braceros to ease the transition to 100 percent domestic labor. Under Public Law 414, the Secretary may certify importation of foreign workers when insufficient Americans are available at fair rates of pay and under adequate work conditions.

But this is not what the growers wanted. They were shooting for the resumption of a program under which Mexican nationals accounted for one-fifth of the State's farm-labor needs.

Wirtz has consistently argued that sufficient domestic workers can be found if competition is allowed to return to the farm labor market, if reasonable wages are paid and if decent housing and food are maintained for field hands. He considers it an anomaly that a State with 400,000 unemployed should import 100,000 Mexican laborers.

Though Wirtz went out of his way to praise working conditions on some farms, the former labor law professor was outraged at the misery and squalor in which many of the laborers live in the midst of a booming economy.

He got his back up when canning executives threatened to move their operations to Mexico, throwing thousands of Americans out of work, unless the flow of braceros is resumed. Later he said their argument "leaves me cold."

MESSAGE CLEAR

When he left Los Angeles, Wirtz' message to the growers was clear: Treat your domestic workers right and you will never lack for them. And if you don't treat them right, there will be no certification of foreign workers to ease the transition. Higher wages may mean some slight increase in retail prices but the American housewife should be willing to pay a half cent more for a head of lettuce to improve the lot of farm labor, he indicated.

The California growers, of course, cannot be blamed for trying to preserve the status quo. The braceros were a source of cheap, efficient, docile labor. Unionization is expected to accelerate as Americans take over their jobs. Costs will go up. Profits may be shaved.

But it is difficult to see catastrophe for the growers if they follow Wirtz' advice. The total volume of California's agricultural output amounts to $3.5 billion a year. Earnings estimates are hard to come by but some farm economists put the State's net earnings after taxes on farm products as high as $1 billion annually—a return of nearly 30 percent on sales. And this figure averages the bad years in with the good.

In many ways the farm economy here resembles American industrial development a century and more ago when wave after wave of foreign immigrants provided a source of cheap and unorganized labor for the New England mills. No other industry in the

United States—not steel, not autos, not coal mining—receives the special consideration given agriculture in the past decade as regards importation of labor.

Change is in the air.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Mar. 26, 1965]

WIRTZ'S LONELY BATTLE ON POVERTY

(By Doris Fleeson)

Minus bands, television or even a theme song, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz is fighting a battle for human rights in territory as obstinately hostile to the goals of the Great Society as is the Deep South.

Wirtz is logging through some of the richest farmland in the United States, listening to the complaints of its corporate owners that they cannot harvest their crops without the transient Mexican labor they call braceros. This in big, rich California, which likes to think it leads the civil rights parade.

The braceros are one pocket of poverty Congress banned after a long struggle. Last year it cut off the importation of braceros and Wirtz, obedient to their word, took appropriate action. Last January 1 he ruled that foreign workers could not be imported unless it could be proved that domestic labor could not be had if offered a decent wage and good working conditions. He also fixed pay standards of $1.25 an hour, to rise in April to $1.40 an hour in conformity with national minimum wage standards.

The growers, despite their advance notice of the shape of things to come, promptly set up a clamor that impressed State politicians, who in turn appealed to the White House. Hence Wirtz' journey.

On his first day this week Wirtz discovered to his astonishment that the growers complained little about the higher pay scale. With considerable frankness many said the Mexicans worked harder and didn't talk back.

It became clear to him also that the growers value greatly their lack of responsibility for their workers. Braceros have been coming to California when needed, collecting pay at times agreeable to the growers and meekly going home when not wanted. To opponents of the system, this is renting slaves as opposed to southern slave holding, which demanded year-round support.

The Secretary also found in the corporate farmers a remarkable power of detachment from the problem of California's 400,000 unemployed. This detachment is accompanied by demands upon the Federal Government for help with their labor situation.

Yet this is territory where Washington is regarded as the enemy, and welfare, with all its costs, is considered a foible on the part of politicians. The theory accepted by most of industry, that its workers are also its consumers, has not trickled down.

Bracero employment at its peak was only 65,000. Wirtz is not convinced that more could not be done to tap the pool of the idle, though it is, of course, not easy to transplant city dwellers, however destitute, to the hard manual labor of the farm.

Wirtz has aces in the hole, including congressional sanction. The President's war on poverty does not contemplate exemptions that would relieve special groups from responsibility for putting Americans to work and lightening relief costs. Wirtz has reports showing that California used 10,000 foreign workers in January and February last year and none this year. Yet there have been no significant losses.

Perhaps the major importance of the Secretary's lonely pilgrimage is that it brings him—and through him, the President—face to face with the realities of the poverty war. There will be other engagements of this nature where the immediate economics of a situation is made the paramount issue.

ANOTHER FIRST—DR. NANCY DOWNS LE FEVRE

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, nowadays we hear much about "women doers," and I am pleased that this is so. Of course, through all of history it has been true that the really important decisions have been made by women; but only in recent years has man admitted that fact.

This month, in Alaska, and for the first time in its history, the Alaska State Board of Examiners in Optometry elected a woman to be its president. Chosen was Mrs. Nancy Downs Le Fevre, O.D. This is a deserved mark of recognition of Nancy Le Fevre's professional competence; and to many it is more than that. I should like to be counted among the many, because I count myself a personal friend of Nancy Le Fevre, whose personality, fine citizenship, and all-around qualities match her professional abilities.

Dr. Nancy Downs Le Fevre, daughter of the late Dr. A. C. Downs and Mrs. Lela Downs, of Clyde, N.C., received her grammar and high-school education in Clyde, N.C.; completed 1 year of college in Asheville, N.C.; and with her husband, Dr. Walter Le Fevre, received her degree of doctor of optometry from Southern College of Optometry, in Memphis, Tenn., in 1951. The Doctors Le Fevre returned to their home State of North Carolina, passed the examination by the North Carolina State Board of Examiners in Optometry, and opened their practice in Newton, N.C. Having had the desire to move to Alaska, to practice their profession, since they were sophomores in college, they made their move to Fairbanks on June 3, 1953; and they have remained there in practice ever since. They like living in Alaska, and have made themselves an important part of their home city of Fairbanks and the State. Dr. Walter Le Fevre is at this time the assistant majority leader in the Alaska House of Representatives; and he also is serving as the chairman of the State affairs committee, and as a member of the rules committee, and was appointed to the Alaska Legislative Council. While Dr. Walter Le Fevre is serving his State in Juneau, Dr. Nancy remains in Fairbanks, continuing their practice of optometry.

OBLIGATIONS OF CITIZENSHIP—ADDRESS BY MAJ. GEN. ROY LASSETTER, JR.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on February 20, 1965, Maj. Gen. Roy Lassetter, Jr., commanding general of the 15th U.S. Army Corps, delivered a stirring address during the George Washington Commemoration Ceremonies sponsored by the Military Order of the World Wars of Pasadena, Calif. His remarks are entitled "Obligations of Citizenship."

I commend this speech to all Senators and, in fact, to all of my fellow Americans. I believe General Lassetter's speech is truly worthy of the consideration of all Americans; and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OBLIGATIONS OF CITIZENSHIP

(Remarks by Maj. Gen. Roy Lassetter, Jr., commanding general, 15th U.S. Army Corps at the George Washington commemoration ceremonies sponsored by the Military Order of the World Wars, Pasadena, Calif., Feb. 20, 1965)

The man we honor here today was indeed remarkable. Surveyor, soldier, President, George Washington was way ahead of his times in many respects.

He was deeply aware of the responsibilities of citizenship. He wrote: "Every citizen who enjoys the protection of a free government, owes not only a proportion of his property, but even his personal services to the defense of it * * *."

This statement eloquently describes democracy in action. And Americans have been putting it to practice since even before the birth of this Republic, not only during a war when fervor and passion run hot but also during peace when cries for preparedness sometimes fall on deaf ears and lazy shoulders.

Here today we have men and women who have amply demonstrated their allegiance to Washington's concepts of the obligations and responsibilities of citizenship. The uniform these ROTC cadets wear attests to their awareness of the need to be prepared to defend the freedoms you of the 442d Regimental Combat Team protected some 20 years ago.

It's hard to realize that these battles of World War II were fought so many years ago. For those of us who were in the middle of this great war, the memories are still vivid.

These memories should not be allowed to die. The record of the 442d and the 100th Battalion must be remembered as an inspiration for the young men of today and of future generations.

Many of you may have seen the recent CBS program—The Shame and The Glory. Here was the story of the uprooting of the nisei—the story of a proud group of Americans who received shameful treatment from their countrymen. Despite this they wrote the most glorious unit history in the records of World War II.

Turning their cheek to gross injustice, the men of the 442d wanted only to demonstrate that they were Americans—not hyphenated Americans—just Americans.

One Medal of Honor, 52 Distinguished Service Crosses, 588 Silver Stars, 5,200 Bronze Stars and almost 10,000 Purple Hearts tell the story. It is the story of sacrifices of men such as Pfc. Sadao Munemori who gave his life for his friends and his country and received the Medal of Honor, of the maimed, such as the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, who received the Distinguished Service Cross, and the many others who died or were wounded or who suffered the lot of the combat infantryman.

There is no time today to recount the whole story of the seven major campaigns of the 442d. The history of the crossing of the Arno, the invasion of southern France, the relief of the lost battalion of the 36th Division, and the breakthrough of the Gothic line is well known.

We might dwell at some length on the "Second Battle of Rome"—or was this a map exercise? It is said that many serial commanders had some trouble finding their way out of Rome. From what I read this was the only thing that ever really held up the 442d.

Sometimes these events that were so real to us seem so unreal to the young. It's like the stories we heard about World War I when we were young. It was too long ago to seem real.

But if you young ROTC cadets want to emulate raw courage, patriotism, loyalty, and esprit de corps, you will never find a better example than the 442d—and they have the individual and unit medals to prove it.

We hope that you young men will never be called to test your courage and ability in battle. But as I look you over now, I know that you would meet the test.

You have already demonstrated—by participating in the ROTC program—your awareness of your civic responsibility. You are showing your willingness to serve your country in a way that will assure that you and your country get maximum benefit from this service. You have shown that you have the intelligence to serve wisely, rather than blindly. You are showing that your generation of Americans is ready to meet its responsibilities, as did its parents and ancestors.

I can see in this group all kinds of Americans. This is, I think, one of our greatest strengths—the ability to absorb people of different ethnic, racial, and religious backgrounds into a culture and society that is cohesive enough to absorb the traumatic shock of war.

Couriously enough, one of the great miscalculations of the Japanese general staff was their belief that a nation such as ours—made up of so many different ethnic groups—would not hold together for a long, hard war. Japanese military leaders expected their attack at Pearl Harbor to shock America into indecision and inaction in the Pacific theater. How wrong they were.

The World War II leaders of the American armed forces came from every walk of life, from every corner of the country, from every ethnic and religious heritage. Over 100,000 came from ROTC. General Marshall, Army Chief of Staff before and during World War II, credits ROTC for the successful buildup of our World War II Army.

In 1941, a survey of five veteran divisions disclosed that three-fourths of their majors and captains were ROTC graduates.

Today, about 45 percent of the officers in the Army are ROTC graduates. Of the junior officers in today's Army, 65 percent of all first lieutenants and 85 percent of all second lieutenants are ROTC graduates. Looking at the other end of the scale, 91 of the generals of the Army today came from ROTC. I did myself.

So, you can see that the Army and the Nation look to you ROTC cadets for leadership—not in the distant future, but tomorrow.

I want to stress that I am not speaking only of leadership in battle or even just of leadership in a peacetime Army. Every field of business, industry and government can continue to exist only if there is an annual infusion of new leaders. The training and experience in leadership you will gain from ROTC, and later, military service, will benefit you greatly in civilian life. Leadership is the quality which—more than any other—will put you on top of the heap—in civilian life as well as in the armed services.

The man we honor today had that kind of leadership ability. If he had not been a great leader, we might still be British subjects and the history of the world would certainly have been vastly different.

Since George Washington, there has been a succession of great leaders—in government, in the military, in industry, in business, and in the professions. These leaders have made America great. These are the leaders that you young men must replace in a very short time.

We oldtimers will soon want to retire and take a long rest fishing by a quiet lake. Then you young tigers are going to have to assume the responsibility of keeping this world in one piece. It won't be easy but you are better prepared for it than any previous generation. Improvements in our educational system has assured this.

Besides a troubled world, you will be inheriting the greatest country and the purest democracy the world has ever known. And you will be inheriting the job of protecting the freedom of the free world from the encroachment of communism.

And while I'm sitting there fishing, I'll be envying you for being in the midst of history in the making. And, I'll hope that you will remember the lessons of the past.

And I'll hope that you will emulate the great Americans of my generation and of past generations—men like those we have here today—members of the Military Order of the World Wars—the men of the 442d and that you, too, will "go for broke."

And I know that now—and when the torch of leadership is passed to you—you will remember the words of another great American who said: "Ask not what your country can do for you. Ask what you can do for your country."

THE POLAR BEAR: WHERE? HOW MANY?

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, on February 3, I wrote to the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Interior. In my letters, I proposed that the U.S. Government give consideration to calling an international technical meeting on the subject of the polar bear, to pool the world's knowledge of this animal and to coordinate future efforts to expand this knowledge.

I suggested such a meeting because I am determined to see that the polar bear does not follow the buffalo into extinction. I do not say, however, that I belive the polar bear is on extinction road. I do not say that, because I do not know whether it is or is not. I do not know, nor does anyone else, and this is why we need the meeting.

I am informed that at the present time there are no accurate or reliable figures available on the total world polar bear population or on the size of the annual kill. Scientists know very little about the habits or habitat of the polar bear. They know very little about polar bear movements, reproduction, longevity, or population structure. They do not even know the answer to the basic question of whether there is but one population of polar bears moving from nation to nation on the slowly revolving ice pack, or whether there are two or more populations. Are there Soviet bears and American bears, Danish bears and Canadian bears; or are there just the bears of the world?

Polar bears are difficult animals to count and to study. Most of them live most of the time beyond the territorial limits of the polar countries, and thus they do not legally belong to any country; and thus no country has gone to much trouble to find out about them. The American scientist, Scott, and others, have estimated that there are between 17,000 and 19,000. A Russian scientist, S. M. Upsensky, has estimated that there are but 5,000 to 8,000. C. R. Harington, a Canadian, in an excellent article summarizing what is now known of the bears, published in the January-February 1964 issue of Canadian Audobon, states that it is probably safe to say there are more than 10,000. I ask unanimous consent that this article may be made a part of the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, figures on the annual kill are kept by the circumpolar nations; but these, too, are not really reliable. There is considerable poaching; the Arctic is a very large place, very difficult to police adequately. Recently the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife, of the U.S. Department of the Interior, put together the figures it had on polar bear harvests over the last 5 years. These reveal the average annual kill during this 5-year period:

United States	181
Greenland (Denmark)	85
Norway	170
Canada	559

The Soviet Union states that it takes less than 10 polar bear a year, and these are taken only for zoos. In the past, however, it is known that polar bear skins of Russian origin have appeared in European fur markets.

Polar bears are carefully protected by Alaska law. Because most bears live beyond the 3-mile territorial limit, Alaska law cannot reach the actual hunting of the animals. Alaska has overcome this difficulty by carefully limiting the number of killed bear that can be landed on Alaska territory. Bear may be landed only between October 15 and May 10. Only one bear to a hunter is allowed, and nonresidents must pay a $150 gametag fee per animal. Residents may take polar bear for food, if they hunt the animal by foot and sled. No cubs or female accompanied by cubs may be taken.

Although most hunting of polar bear is forbidden by law to all but natives and scientists in Canada, the annual harvest is substantial. The Norwegians limit foreign hunters to one bear per man, but otherwise have little regulation. Greenland residents, of whatever race, are permitted to take what bears they wish, but hunting by outsiders is absolutely prohibited.

Our figures are approximate, and our knowledge is imprecise. As I wrote in my letter to the Secretaries—

> No one—no scientist, no sportsman, no Eskimo—knows for sure whether the numbers of polar bear are increasing, decreasing or constant.

The meeting which I propose would undertake to gather the combined knowledge of the polar bear which has been assembled by the scientists of the circumpolar nations. It is hoped that such a meeting would produce a continuing system for pooling new knowledge and statistics as they become available, and perhaps could establish the framework for an international effort to undertake for the first time a reliable and continuing polarwide census. Such a census would be of immense value in determining what is happening to the polar bear.

I attempted to make clear to the Secretaries—as I attempt to make clear to Senators—that my proposal is not an attempt to hinder the responsible polar-bear hunter. In no way, do I object to the hunting of polar bears in a sportsmanlike manner. I believe that sportsmen and conservationists alike agree that intelligent game management requires a certain annual harvest to insure that the game remains healthy, adequately fed, and in balance with nature. I have no reason to believe that the annual harvest from hunting exceeds this level. I do believe, however, that all of us—hunters and conservationists—would be happier to have solid, positive evidence that the survival of the polar bear is assured.

I am happy to say that Alaskans agree with my position. Recently, the Senate of the State of Alaska adopted a resolution endorsing my call for an international meeting. This resolution was sponsored by four able senators, three of them from polar bear country—Senator Eben Hopson, of Barrow; Senator Pearse Walsh, of Nome; Senator Neal W. Foster, of Nome; and Senator Harold Hansen, of Cordova. Their resolution reads as follows:

SENATE RESOLUTION 4

Resolution relating to an international technical meeting on polar bears proposed by U.S. Senator E. L. BARTLETT, Democrat, of Alaska

Whereas the polar bear inhabits an area in the extreme northern latitudes which is circumpolar and embraces parts of Alaska, Canada, Greenland, Iceland, Norway, Sweden, Finland, and Russia; and

Whereas more and better information, relative to numbers, reproduction, mortality, migration, diseases, life history, general welfare, and the effects of man's activities on the total polar bear population is needed; and

Whereas U.S. Senator E. L. BARTLETT has proposed an international technical meeting on the polar bear: Be it

Resolved, That the Senate endorses Senator E. L. BARTLETT'S request for this vitally needed international technical meeting on the polar bear, which could lead to improved management and assurances that this unique and valuable animal will not be permitted to disappear by man's hand; and be it further

Resolved, That the technical meeting requested be held in an area of polar bear abundance and that a technical representative of the State of Alaska be invited to participate in the deliberations; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Dean Rusk, Secretary of State; the Honorable Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior; the Honorable HENRY M. JACKSON, chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; the Honorable WAYNE N. ASPINALL, chairman of the House Interior and Insular Affairs Committee; and the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT and the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. Representative, Members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

Mr. President, it is with a good deal of pleasure that I tell the Senate today that the Departments of State and Interior also share this concern. Our Government hopes to propose officially the convocation of such a meeting in September 1965. Recently M. N. Sukhoruchenko, Deputy Chairman of the State Committee of the Soviet Union on Fisheries, was in Washington. At that time, the matter of an international meeting on polar bears was discussed with him informally. I am told that American Government officials intend to discuss the matter further with Soviet officials in the near future, and that they are also discussing it with officials of Canada, Norway, and Denmark, the other circumpolar nations.

This is, indeed, good news. The polar bear, great and beautiful, fearless and cunning, is well worth saving. Such a meeting could help to assure its survival.

Senators may be interested in learning a bit about the polar bear. The polar bear is the second largest, or perhaps the largest, bear known. The Alaska Brown, or Kodiak, bear is commonly believed to be the largest carnivorous animal on earth. These are known to have a length of over 10½ feet and a weight over 1,500 pounds. Hunters, however, have reported shooting polar bears weighing over 1,800 pounds, with a body length exceeding 13 feet. If these reports are, in fact, true, the brown bear may be forced to yield to its Arctic cousin the place of honor as largest member of the family.

The great white bears live on the Arctic ice cap, although they are occasionally seen on the shores of Greenland, Siberia, and Alaska. They have been noted as far south as southern Greenland, Iceland, and Newfoundland. At one time, hundreds of years ago, they were found in Japan, Manchuria, and northern Europe. During the last glacial age, polars were as far south as downtown Hamburg. The bears normally live on the icepack, where the sun shines all summer long, and where the dark of night lasts throughout the winter. The great icepack is neither solid nor immovable. It is made up of shifting, grinding, smashing pieces of ice, some large, some small, pushed together by fierce winds and strong tidal currents, always shifting, always moving. It is a world of harsh, remote beauty.

The polar bear swims well, and has been seen on small ice floes as far as 200 miles from the main icepack. It has been seen swimming in the middle of James Bay, 80 miles from land. The most carnivorous of all the bears, only occasionally have they been observed eating grasses, which they graze while standing up like hogs. Normally, they feed on seals, fish, shrimps, mollusks, and other small animals, but occasionally including man.

The polar bear is a patient, wily hunter. It has the keenest eyesight and the most perceptive sense of smell of any bear. It can detect man's presence several miles away. When it approaches its prey, it does so stealthily, like a cat. It creeps along on its stomach, hiding behind the hills and hillocks of the ice, its white fur acting as perfect camouflage against the snowy background. It will attack from the ice or from the water. It is adept at swimming underwater, and then rising out of the sea, to snatch an unsuspecting seal. The sport of hunting a polar bear on foot is a dangerous and exhilarating one. While man is stalking his bear, as often as not the bear, in turn, is stalking his man.

The Eskimos, who are brave hunters and sensible people, treat the polar bear with a great deal of respect. In the old days they would hunt the bear with only a spear or bow and arrow—very dangerous business, indeed. The Eskimos use the bones for utensils, the hide for clothing and the flesh for food; they leave only the liver untouched. This contains extraordinary amounts of vitamin A, and is poisonous to human beings. The meat must be well cooked before eating, because of a reported high incidence of trichinosis.

The polar bear mates in midsummer; and its cubs—normally twins—are born in January. They are tiny, little ratlike things about 9-inches long, under 2 pounds in weight, blind, and naked.

The adult bears do very little hibernating, unlike their cousins to the south. In the Arctic, the male and barren female polar bears do not sleep any more in the winter than they do in the summer. They remain active in hunting from one year's end to the next. The only exception is the expectant female, who will burrow a hole for herself in the snow, and will go to sleep for the winter. The entrance to the hole gradually fills up with new snow and ice; and often the only sign of a sleeping bear is the small air hole in the dome of the ice cave which has formed about her. The cubs are born in this cave, and stay inside it until the spring. They return to a cave with their mother the following winter, and do not strike out on their own until a year and a half after their birth.

Senators who share my interest in this tremendous, beautiful, and unique beast will agree, I am sure, that its continued existence must be insured. International cooperation for this purpose would have value and importance.

The United States and the Soviet Union are the two great Arctic powers. The history of these two countries in the Arctic is one of common and interwoven interests. We know that the Soviet Union has an interest in the preservation of Arctic wildlife. We, too, have such an interest. It is well and proper that these two nations join together to discuss and pool the knowledge they hold on the polar bear and its habits. It would be well and good for these two nations and the other circumpolar nations to discuss ways and means of mounting an Arcticwide census of polar bears, on a regular and continuing basis.

Such a meeting, such a census, would be of value in itself. In its small way, however, this cooperation would benefit far more than the polar bear. It would benefit man. It would provide another way for the Soviet Union and the United States to come together and to work together in a common cause. Surely, there can be no objection to that from any rational man working in the cause of peace.

EXHIBIT 1

POLAR BEARS AND THEIR PRESENT STATUS

(By C. R. Harington)

(NOTE.—Born in Calgary, Mr. Harington secured his B.A. and B. Sc. from the University of Alberta, and his M.S. from McGill University. He spent a year at Hazen Lake on Ellesmere Island, N.W.T. during the International Geophysical Year, 1957–58. He has returned to the Arctic every year since that time, and is at present engaged in a study of the biology and ecology of the polar bear for the Canadian Wildlife Service, which he joined in 1960 as a wildlife biologist. Mr. Harington is a member of the Canadian Association of Wildlife and Fisheries Biologists and writes with the authority of the publications committee of that association.)

One biting cold afternoon in late February on Southampton Island, Pameeoolik, his son Tony, and I punched a narrow hole in the snow roof of a polar bear den. After recording the temperature inside the den by lowering a thermometer, we opened the hole wider to find out more about the occupants. A glistening black eye and twitching muzzle were instantly applied to the aperture by the mother bear. While she paced the den floor beneath us, uttering peevish grunts, we were just able to discern her two young cubs huddled against the far wall of their snowhouse.

These were the first polar bears I had seen in their natural surroundings, and they prompted many questions. What features separated the polar bears from other bears? How had they evolved and adapted to such a rigorous arctic environment? Were they really in danger of extinction?

CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES

Comparing polar bears to brown bears (Ursus arctos), we find that their bodies are less squat and more elongated; their necks and skulls are longer also. In fact their brain cases are much longer than their facial regions. Furthermore, the polar bear's molar teeth are comparatively small, while their piercing, canine teeth are more pronounced. Instead of having the "dished" profile of the brown bears, they possess more of a "Roman nose." Their ears are shorter. In size and weight the largest polar bears differ little from the largest brown bears. Of course color is a diagnostic feature of polar bears and varies from almost pure white in winter to a lemon yellow wash, or almost golden color in summer and autumn. The animals' claws are shorter and less curved than those of brown bears. The fact that thick hair overgrows the pads of the polar bears' feet is also a characteristic of the species, although it may be modified by the degree of wear.

EVOLUTION

Comparative studies of the skulls and teeth of ancient and recent bears by D. P. Erdbrink and Erich Thenius indicate that the polar bears and brown bears (including the renowned cave bear) stemmed from a common ancestor, Ursus etruscus, in the earliest part of the Pleistocene period. Probably by the early to middle Pleistocene, proto-polar bears began drifting into their arctic niche and displaying some of their characteristic features. Thus the large bear of the ice-fields may be regarded as a specialized descendant of the brown bears. This idea is supported by recent serological[1] findings and the frequent occurrence of successful breeding between brown and polar bears in captivity (even to the second generation). At present the most appropriate scientific name for the polar bear seems to be Ursus maritimus.

Unfortunately, there are few unquestionable traces of polar bears in early times. The oldest known fossil was found in Hamburg where the animal had evidently lived in a coastal environment during the early stages of the last glaciation (Würm/Wisconsin). The next oldest fossil of the species is probably not more than 10,000 years old, and was discovered near Hjorring in northern Denmark. Obviously, their habitat extended much farther south during the last ice age than it does at present.

The slim paleontological evidence that exists suggests a dispersal center for the species in Eurasia—perhaps in the Baltic-North Sea region. In any case, the polar bears had spread rapidly to assume their present circumpolar range by the time the last continental glaciers were melting back to their northern sources.

HISTORICAL RECORDS

Some of the earliest historical comments on polar bears are very interesting, and in places indicate alterations in their geographic range within the last two millenniums. Undoubtedly, polar bears were known by the Romans about A.D. 57, for Calpurnius has written: "* * * aequoreos ego cum certantibus ursis spectavi vitulos."[2]

A few of these bears might have been obtained from display by Roman traders in the north. Two famous scholars of oriental literature, Florenz and Aston, in their translations of the Japanese imperial records (Nihongi), reveal that living polar bears and their pelts were known in Japan and Manchuria as early as A.D. 658. Much later, in 1690, Von Siebold reported that polar bears reached the northern island of Japan.

The earliest known northern European record, which concerns the transfer of two captured bear cubs from Iceland to Norway, occurred about A.D. 880. At that time the animals were commonly offered to European rulers, who rewarded the gift bearers on various occasions with ships carrying cargoes of timber or even with bishoprics. Early Scandinavian documents also indicate that white bears must have reached the coast of Iceland in 1274, 1275, 1321, and 1518. Apparently, the last known occurrence of polar bears in Iceland was in the late 19th century.

LATER EXPLOITATION

Intensive hunting of polar bears began in the early 17th century when ships started piercing the core of their range. Initially, whales were the most important lure. By the middle of the 19th century there was evidence of depletion of bears on the west coast of Spitsbergen and Novaya Zemlya, where they had once been commonly encountered by Dutch and English voyagers. The bears were also heavily hunted during this period by whalers in Baffin Bay and northern Hudson Bay, and by the Russians on islands in the Bering Sea.

When the sealing industry began to replace the impoverished whaling industry, a more deadly pressure was exerted on the ice bears, particularly in the waters east of Spitsbergen and Franz Josef Land, the Greenland Sea and the Canadian eastern Arctic. In 1924 Norwegian seal hunters alone killed 714 polar bears. The later-developing fur trade was an additional stimulus to exploitation of this wildlife resource. The polar bears' range has shown signs of significant contraction since the 1930's, at least. This subject will be mentioned later, in connection with the present status of the species.

PRESENT RANGE

In outlining the polar bear's existing range it is advisable to consider first the "core areas"—regions in which the species is most abundant and where it breeds most successfully.

No major concentrations of white bears appear to exist in Alaska, but they may occur seasonally, or den occasionally in the vicinity of the northern and northwestern coasts of that State.

In Canada, a quadrangle (63° N. 75° N. and 60° W. 95° W.) encloses the most productive polar bear areas. Denning seems to be the most common on northern Baffin Island, Southampton Island, Simpson Peninsula, and on the small islands near Cornwallis Island.

In Greenland polar bears are most abundant along its east coast. The fiorded coast of northeastern Greenland is especially attractive to the animals, largely because seals are so abundant there.

Bears are abundant also in Svalbard, a group of islands including West Spitsbergen which belongs to Norway. White bears are often found on the east coast of West Spitsbergen and also den on Kong Karls Land, and Edgeoya.

The best denning areas in the Soviet Union occur chiefly on the archipelagos north of the mainland coast. Those areas include Franz Josef Land, Novaya Zemlya, Severnaya Zemlya, the New Siberian Islands, and Wrangel Island.

Penetrations of bears beyond their usual north-south range are especially evident in such places as Hudson Bay and James Bay (where they are relatively common), the coast of Newfoundland, the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Iceland, northern Scandinavia (Finnmark), and northern Japan. Such deviations result from extraordinarily strong southerly circulations of ice-filled arctic water. Occasionally, in Canada, Alaska, and the Soviet Union, polar bears have been known to penetrate 100 miles or more inland from the mainland coasts. The large carnivores rarely appear in the zone of permanent north polar ice, but have been recorded as far north as 88°.

Understandably, polar bears have an ecological preference for areas that possess suitable combinations of pack ice (a hunting platform and protective cover), open water (where seals are able to reach the surface and are often abundant), and land (for denning, cover, and auxiliary food supplies when seals are not available). Although seals are usually present wherever bears are, bears are not found everywhere that seals exist.

The limiting effect of human hunters on the range of polar bears must also be recognized.

ADAPTATIONS TO ENVIRONMENT

Polar bears are well adapted to an arctic environment. Their thick winter coats of white guard hairs and dense, cottony underfur, together with often thick subcutaneous fat layers, provide protection against both cold air and water. Moreover, the fat layers, which sometimes reach a thickness of 3 inches on the haunches, help to increase the animal's buoyancy in water. Fat is also a source of energy during periods of poor hunting, which frequently occur in the Arctic. The whiteness of the polar bear hair not only decreases heat loss, but also serves as camouflage, resulting in more efficient hunting. The unusually short, furry ears of the bears are similarly well adapted for life in a cold climate.

Polar bear teeth show a most interesting and important adaptation to their environment. There has obviously been a specialization from a formerly omnivorous back to a carnivorous diet (seals). This is indicated by reduction of ridge and tubercle development on the occlusal surfaces of the teeth, and increased elevation of the cusps.

How well do polar bears see and hear? The evidence is conflicting, probably because it is often impossible to tell which sense is being used. In any event the animals rely mainly on their keen sense of smell, which may lead them to food many miles away. Bears have little trouble sniffing out seal dens covered by layers of ice and snow totaling 3 feet or more in thickness.

Polar bears possess great strength and endurance. Their normal gait is a slow, distance-devouring walk, but they may gallop when hunted. Although immature bears can run rapidly for many miles, older bears seem to tire quickly. Shereshevsky and Petryayev recorded a bear's speed over pack ice at between 12 and 18 miles per hour. The bears' ability to scale very rough pressure ridges and steep slopes with apparent ease and their clever use of cover, be it crushed-up ice, land, or water, promote their survival by aiding their hunting or their escape from man. The swimming ability of polar bears can also facilitate their escape from hunters, or help them to approach their major prey, the seals. Their large paws act as powerful oars. Sometimes polar bears can reach a speed of about 6 miles per hour at the surface. When underwater they normally keep their eyes open, their nostrils closed, and their ears flattened back. It is claimed that they can remain underwater for 2 minutes. Their pelts are well adapted to shedding water, because of the slipperiness of the guard hairs. After a swim they usually shake themselves like dogs, thereby decreasing any chill effects. But probably behavioral adaptations of polar bears to their environment can be better related by describing their seasonal habits.

---

[1] Blood serum studies.

[2] "Sea calves (seals) also I beheld with bears pitted against them."

SEASONAL CYCLE

The seasonal cycle of polar bears is a theme with many variations. Deviations from a basic pattern are essentially a result of individual differences among the animals and varying environmental conditions. Only the central theme can be sketched here.

Denning begins about October, when the pregnant females search for deep snowdrifts. Very often they excavate their dens on south-facing slopes of hills or valleys, where prevailing northerly winds have built up thick snowbanks. The dens vary in size, but may be 8 feet by 10 feet by 4 feet high. When occupied, inside temperatures can be about 40° F. warmer than outside air temperature. The bears normally keep a small ventilation hole open.

In late November or early December, females bring forth their young—usually twins, but sometimes a single cub, rarely triplets, and extremely rarely, quadruplets. Young females often produce only single cubs. At birth the cubs are remarkably small, measuring about 10 inches in length and weighing little more than 1½ pounds. They are blind and deaf, being unable to see or hear well until a month or more after birth.

During the first few months, the mothers suckle their young on fat-rich milk. Polar bear milk has the appearance and consistency of cow's cream, smells somewhat like seal, and tastes like cod-liver oil.

The family groups leave their dens in March or April after a short period in which the mothers feed on local vegetation and exercise themselves and their cubs in the surrounding area. When journeying down to the sea ice, the females may stop two or three times a day to rest, feed the cubs, and play with them. They often choose resting spots in the snow which are sheltered from prevailing winds by large rocks, against which they can recline. Such spots are generally chosen to provide a good view of the surrounding country and allow basking in the sun's warmth.

During April and May the young cubs follow their mothers closely while they prowl along leads and fractured ice margins in order to catch scent of snow-covered seal dens. The young seals, or "whitecoats" constitute by far the greatest part of the polar bears' diet in spring. After smashing in the seal dens and scooping out their prizes, the mothers dispatch the seals quickly, gulping down fat and skin which they strip from the carcasses, in order to nourish themselves, and indirectly the cubs through their milk. Generally, bears eat little seal meat.

Mating usually occurs in April, when most polar bears are out on the pack ice and enjoying the tasty "whitecoats." In many cases a lone female in heat is followed by a number of adult males. The strongest or most experienced male is generally the first to mate with her. The period in which they keep company is relatively short—from a few days to a few weeks. The gestation period averages about 8 months, and although there is no scientific proof of delayed implantation in polar bears, there is good reason to believe that it exists and that embryonic development begins about late September or early October. Females becomes sexually mature when they are approximately 3 years old, males when they are 4. Adult females bring forth cubs the third winter after a previous birth, or sooner if her cubs die or are lost. This accounts for the rather slow rate at which depleted populations may revive. It has been estimated that white bears remain fertile to 25 years of age.

Although lactation may continue for 21 months, the cubs are generally weaned by July, when they have acquired a taste for seal blood and fat. As the summer progresses, hunting takes place at the seal holes where the bears wait patiently for their dinner. As the ice begins to drift apart the white bears sometimes stalk seals basking on ice pans, by silently swimming up and pouncing on them. The animals feed most heavily on ringed seals, but also eat other species such as harp seals, bladdernose seals, and occasionally bearded seals. Very rarely, they may kill walruses, white whales, or narwhales. Polar bears are by no means always successful in their hunting.

By August or September, when much of the pack ice has drifted ashore or melted (depending upon regional environmental conditions), the bears often begin to patrol coastal areas for washed-up seal, whale, or walrus carcasses. When confined to the land, the large carnivores may feed on lemmings if they are abundant. Only a few cases are known of bears killing and eating caribou and muskoxen. Arctic hares and foxes are generally too fleet footed. But when food is difficult to obtain, foxes caught in traps set by northern natives are often devoured by bears. In Svalbard, the ptarmigan baits for fox traps are also eaten. Polar bears sometimes feed on seabirds (e.g. eider ducks), their young or their eggs. They have also been reported to eat fish. Another common food item during the late summer is vegetation—seaweed, lichens, moss, mountain sorrel, sedges, and grasses. They seem to be very fond of crowberries, bilberries, and cranberries, where they are available. Sometimes the animals demonstrate a definite need or desire for plant food. Reginald Koettlitz once observed that a polar bear, directly after feeding on seal, traveled 3 miles to obtain grass, which it ate abundantly.

The items that polar bears have eaten since man began to penetrate the Arctic are amazing in their variety: bacon, cheese, tea, apples, engine oil, flour, raisins, biscuits, rope, canvas, cardboard, etc. In extreme situations they will even kill a man—but there are few documented cases. Polar bears will not usually attack a man unless protecting cubs or provoked by hunger or wounds.

Moulting, which begins as early as May, is generally completed by August. Variations in the moult are due to age, sex, and fatness.

In most cases it is in the late summer or autumn that cubs approaching 2 years of age are abandoned, though they may remain longer with their mother. The young bears are extremely vulnerable at this stage, for if they do not starve during the following winter, they may be killed by older bears or human hunters. Young bears weigh about 130 pounds by their first August and about 400 pounds a year later, when they reach approximately 5 feet in length. Although adult females (sows) grow little after their fourth year, and weigh about 700 pounds, adult males (boars) only approach their maximum size by 8 years. Large males measure from 8 to 11 feet in total length, and may weigh over 1,000 pounds.

Completing the cycle, we must return to the subject of denning. This activity is very irregular in occurrence and duration among independent, immature animals. Females with older cubs may den, but do not necessarily do so; occasionally they have been sighted hunting on the pack ice in midwinter. Nonpregnant females den less commonly than pregnant ones. From September to December, or even January, adult males may occupy dens nearer to the coast and at lower average elevations than do sows. Evidence from Northern Baffin Island indicates that for one denning boar there may be 10 denning sows. Male dens are used largely as centers for hunting operations, or as temporary shelter during adverse environmental conditions. Many boars hunt throughout the winter.

LIFE SPAN

Few data are available on this subject. One female in the Washington Park Zoo, Milwaukee, died a natural death at the age of 35. It is recorded that another polar bear lived to an age of 40 years in the Regent's Park Zoo, London. From the appearance of some skulls, and the degree of tooth wear, it seems likely that a few bears attain similar ages in their natural habitat.

INJURIES AND MORTALITY

Many injuries may be sustained by white bears as they grow older. Numerous gashes are received in fights during the mating season. They appear as scars on the bear pelts, and are much commoner in older bears. Small septic wounds in the feet are also common, and have been known to cause inflammatory synovitis, and consequently lameness in walking. Arthritis deformans and osteoarthritis are not unusual. Fractures of the ribs, carpus, tarsus, zygoma, baculum, and the lower mandible have also been observed. The frequency of bone fractures suggests that mechanical damage fatal to bears may occur in the moving ice. Decayed and broken teeth are a normal affliction of very old polar bears, and must cause them severe pain.

Apart from Trichinella worms, which are often embedded in the diaphragms of older animals, internal parasites of polar bears are poorly known. Jennov's report of severe tuberculosis in a bear shot in Greenland is unique.

Such injuries and infections combined with other mortality factors, including cannibalism of young by older bears, starvation, and rare losses to wolves and adult male walruses, plague the species throughout life.

As has been mentioned, man has a great influence on the white bear. He is not only methodically and efficiently hunting the seal, the main prey of the polar bear, but he has also become the primary predator of the bear itself. Thus man is displacing the animal in its ecological niche as a ruling carnivore of the arctic coasts. In discussing economic values, the relations of polar bear and man will be examined in more detail.

ECONOMIC VALUE

Today the economic importance of polar bears depends fundamentally on capturing or hunting restrictions imposed by government. If the animals are deemed too few, and complete legislative protection is imposed, then they can have little more than limited esthetic value. It is certainly to our advantage to see that polar bear population levels are sufficiently maintained for optimum use on a sustained yield basis.

Polar bears are hunted mainly for their skins. The high prices presently paid for good pelts, and their decorative use as rugs and wall hangings, where less expensive material would suffice, suggest that they should be considered as luxury items. But prices have not always been so high. Schwatka remarked that in 1878 a pelt was obtained near the southern tip of Baffin Island for half a plug of tobacco and a few charges of powder. According to Frank Russell, in about 1894, natives of the Mackenzie region received from $5 to $15 in trade for prime skins. By 1956, $40 seems to have been the average price for a large skin in Canada. Today prices vary from $70 to $200 for a good pelt; apparently higher prices are paid in Alaska. In view of the fact that the Canadian polar bear fur production value totaled $34,500 in 1961, the monetary advantage of bear hides to the Eskimos for trading purposes must be acknowledged. Eskimo purchasing power can be augmented significantly by the derived income. Such revenue may be particularly valuable during poor trapping periods.

Not all skins are sold by the natives who kill them, which demonstrates that polar bear commodities also have subsistence value. In the Northwest Territories about 20 percent of the pelts are retained for personal use as sled robes, sleeping platform covers, and occasionally, trousers, boots, or mitts. Fragments of hide are also used in icing sled runners, and commercially for the production of fishing flies (because of the water resistance and buoyancy of the hair). In Scandinavia, pelts with poor fur are often tanned to produce excellent leather. There also, bear fat is processed in factories the same as seal blubber. It is interesting to note that polar bear gall is used as a domestic medicine in northern Norway.

Polar bear meat is especially palatable when taken from younger animals. It has a good flavor, but tends to be stringy and tough. As infected meat can cause trichinosis, it should be boiled thoroughly before being eaten. High vitamin A concentrations in polar bear livers can be poisonous and probably fatal in some cases. Thus the livers should be avoided by man and buried out of reach of sled dogs. In the Northwest Territories approximately half of the meat is consumed by the Eskimos, the remainder being used for dogfood. Until recently, on the northern coast of Ontario, the polar bear was primarily valued as a source of dog food and secondarily as a fur trade item.

In some countries the capture of live polar bear cubs can be very profitable, although they may not rate bishoprics as in medieval days. Odd Lono states that some ships in the Norwegian Arctic have made up to 50 percent of their income from this source. But, in the opinion of a buyer in Tromso, captured cubs average 6 to 8 percent of total catch values. Evidently, live cubs were worth about 1,000 kroner (approximately $150) each in 1961. In the Soviet Union, a captive bear cub is much more valuable than the best bearskin.

PRESENT STATUS

International population estimates—Scott and others in 1959 attempted to estimate the world population of polar bears.

Aerial surveys carried out while hunting bears in Alaska led to the conclusion that about 2,000 to 2,500 existed in a 75-mile-wide strip off the Alaskan coast. On this basis, extending the 75-mile-wide strip around the pole, they arrived at a total polar bear population of 17,000 to 19,000 animals. However, it should be emphasized that local polar bear estimates cannot be extrapolated to cover the entire arctic region without greatly lowering their confidence limits. Although errors might cancel out, basic polar bear range possessing suitable ecological factors would have to be delimited if such estimates are to be more than skillful guesses. The impact of seasonal and annual changes in climatic, pack ice, and possibly oceanographic conditions further complicates the establishment of accurate estimates of this nature.

In 1958, S. M. Uspensky stated that the total number of polar bears in the world did not exceed a few thousand, but he gave no basis for his opinion. In 1961, he estimated the world polar bear population at 5,000 to 8,000 animals—less than half Scott's figure. Once more, this estimate, derived from a calculation of the number of denning bears on Wrangel Island, is open to criticism for extrapolation from a rather tentative base. Although Uspensky rightly tries to cover the major concentrations of polar bears, marginal populations are not accounted for. In addition, I believe he underestimates the potential of Norwegian and Canadian arctic denning territories.

My estimate of 6,000 to 7,000 polar bears for the Canadian Arctic, although worked out roughly on the basis of (a) aerial censuses in Ontario and Manitoba, in conjunction with knowledge of the variations in bear productivity in different regions of the Canadian Arctic (b) Scott's method, (c) an approximation of Uspensky's method, is still only an informed guess. Nevertheless, I believe it is safe to say that the world polar bear population is well over 10,000.

International kill statistics: Recently, the annual Alaskan polar bear kill has been in the vicinity of 200. The Canadian kill has approached 600 (of which about 10 percent are taken in Manitoba, Ontario, Quebec, Newfoundland, and the Yukon Territory). Minimum annual bear kills for Greenland and the Norwegian Arctic are about 150 and 300 respectively. Until 1956, when severe restrictions were imposed on hunting the species in the Soviet Arctic, at least 120 were killed each year. Probably the total annual kill of polar bears now approximates 1,300.

Generally, it seems that Alaska, Canada, and perhaps Norway possess the "healthiest" white bear populations. Significant depletions, attributed to overhunting, have occurred in Greenland and the Soviet Arctic since about the 1930's. Still, environmental and ecological conditions may exert an unknown but powerful influence where such depletions take place. Spärck's figures clearly indicate a decline in polar bear stock which is most pronounced on the western and southeastern coasts of Greenland. Both Sdobnikov and Uspensky have stressed the rarity of polar bears in the Soviet Union, although recently the close protection provided the species there seems to be having beneficial results.

It is fortunate in many respects that polar bears live far away from heavily populated regions and are thus, in part, naturally protected. But increasing ease of human transportation is constantly posing a threat to their security.

International legislation: Polar bear regulations in Alaska have changed little over the past 3 years. The season there is open from October 15 to May 10 and there is a bag limit of one bear. The taking of cubs (bears up to 2 years old) or females accompanied by cubs is prohibited. Residents may take polar bears without limit for food (except cubs and females accompanied by cubs), providing they are not taken by means of aircraft, but licensed hunters may use aircraft to hunt the animals. A nonresident game tag for a polar bear costs $150.

In Canada, only Eskimos, Indians, and the few holders of general hunting licenses may legally hunt this wildlife resource. Polar bear hunting is forbidden to sportsmen in Manitoba, Ontario, and Quebec, as well as in the Northwest Territories. Existing legislation also prohibits the killing of cubs under 1 year of age, or females accompanied by cubs under 1 year of age. Scientific licenses to take polar bears are issued with great care. An export tax of $5 is imposed on each polar bear skin leaving the Northwest Territories. Revisions to present legislation are being considered.

Polar bear hunting has been prohibited from November 1 to May 31 on the northeast coast of Greenland—a frequent denning zone for the species. The taking of cubs, or females with cubs is forbidden, but bears may be shot at any time in self-defense.

Regulations concerning polar bears in the Norwegian Arctic (Svalbard) are few. The bears are protected on Kong Karls Land and in adjacent territorial waters. Trappers are forbidden to capture polar bear cubs unless they have a license from the Ministry of Fisheries and a guarantee from an approved zoological garden that the cubs will be accepted. About 26 cubs are captured annually. Otherwise polar bears can be hunted throughout the year, in any part of the archipelago. There is a bag limit of one bear each to foreigners hunting in the Norwegian Arctic.

The hunting of polar bears was prohibited in the Soviet Union in 1956. Live bear cubs may be captured for zoological gardens. About 20–40 cubs are taken each year for this purpose. A temporary sanctuary (effective for 2 to 5 years) has been established on Wrangel Island, one of the most important denning areas in the Soviet Arctic. The closed season is very strictly enforced there.

Present status of research: There is evidently no specific research being carried out on polar bears in Alaska, although biological specimens are being accumulated and kill statistics are compiled annually by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game.

Prompted by significant depletions in the polar bear population of the Soviet Union and Greenland, and rising kills in Canada the Canadian Wildlife Service initiated a 5-year polar bear project in 1961. The objectives are to review the effectiveness of protective legislation and to integrate, verify, and add to the scattered and often fragmentary information existing on polar bears. Consequently an extensive review of the literature is being undertaken in order to assess the status of research on the subject, and to discover basic problems requiring further investigation.

So far, biological work has involved collection of liver and kidney specimens for vitamin A analysis, and the collection of pathological, reproductive, and skeletal material. Detailed studies have been carried out on lactation in polar bears and the composition of their milk. Emphasis has also been placed on studies of den ecology and life history. A taxonomic investigation is being completed for the Canadian Wildlife Service by T. H. Manning, who is reviewing the relationships of various polar bear populations throughout the species' circumpolar range.

Little or no research directly involving the polar bear is taking place in Greenland, although Christian Vibe is including the species in his studies of the effect of environmental factors, particularly climate, on population cycles in Greenland.

Some polar bear work has been carried out in the Norwegian Arctic during the past few years by Odd Lono. He has been collecting skeletal and reproductive material shipped back from Svalbard by hunting vessels. Although the Norsk Polarinstitutt is very interested in fostering research on white bears, at present they have no biologist on staff for such a study. In connection with its studies of North Atlantic seals, the Fiskeridirektoratets Havforskningsinstitutt is beginning a long-term study of polar bear biology. During the autumn of 1962, a team sponsored by the New York Zoological Society undertook a partial study of polar bear behavior and physiology in the region south of Svalbard. Evidently they were able to drug and handle one or more of the animals.

In the Soviet Union, some interesting work is being directed by S. M. Uspensky on Wrangel Island. With the cooperation of local hunters, both Chukchi and Eskimos, Uspensky has apparently obtained a fairly accurate count of bear dens within a number of hunting areas. Their data have served as a basis for a total estimate of dens on Wrangel Island. Uspensky feels that dens there can be counted at the end of April from an aircraft, and intends to carry out such a count with ground checks in 1964. That study may be of singular importance for assessing the numerical status of polar bear stocks in the future, although areas of very rugged terrain would present difficulties.

FUTURE PROBLEMS

Two of the greatest problems in polar bear research and management involve the establishment on regional, national, and international scales of (1) confident population estimates, and (2) major patterns of population movement. Various methods of estimating polar bear populations should be tested, and the most successful one applied.

There is a definite need for an internationally coordinated program of marking polar bears, once an effective technique is developed. This would indicate how much of an international problem polar bear management is. Pedersen's hypothesis of a continuous, circumpolar bear migration, which has extremely tenuous factual foundations, should be rigorously examined.

Appropriate international meetings on polar bear conservation should be initiated when and if the evidence shows them to be necessary. Meanwhile, until we know enough about the numbers and movements of polar bears to begin really enlightened management programs, each nation concerned should make every effort to protect adequately this valuable and impressive wildlife species.

AFL–CIO STATEMENT ON THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, at its recent Bal Harbour meeting, the executive council of the AFL–CIO adopted a thoughtful statement on the national economy. I think the recommendations of the council deserve thorough consideration, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE AFL–CIO EXECUTIVE COUNCIL ON NATIONAL ECONOMY, BAL HARBOUR, FLA., FEBRUARY 28, 1965

America started down the road toward reducing unemployment in 1964. But to continue down this road will take new job-creating measures in 1965.

High levels of persistent joblessness continue at the beginning of the fifth year of economic expansion since the 1960–61 recession—an unprecedented peacetime record of rising production. The increase in jobs, however, has not been rapid enough to achieve an approach to full employment. With both productivity and the labor force rising rapidly, the decline of unemployment has been at a slow pace.

At 4.8 percent of the labor force, officially reported unemployment now is still about two-thirds greater than it was in 1953, the most recent year of reasonably full employment. Even among married men—the prime group in the labor force—joblessness is approximately 60 percent above the 1953 level. And among young people and Negroes—groups that are most vulnerable to economic dislocation—joblessness is twice as great as it was a dozen years ago.

When the "invisible unemployment" is counted—workers so discouraged they no longer actively seek work because there are no jobs available in their communities and workers condemned to less than a full week's work because full-time jobs are not available—then the true figure of unemployment is about 7 percent.

So the present slow pace of progress on putting America back to work is just not good enough.

Even more important are the forecasts for 1965, which almost uniformly predict even this pace will be halted or reversed, unless strong efforts are now taken to stimulate the economy and create jobs.

Economic expansion is continuing rapidly, at present, under the impetus of the 1964 tax cut, a high volume of auto sales and a buildup of steel inventories. However, the beneficial impact of the tax cut on consumers is wearing off; the accumulation of steel inventories will probably end by midyear; home building is leveling off; and there is a danger that tight money and higher interest rates may be imposed in a mistaken venture to counter the balance-of-payments deficit.

A slower pace of rising sales and production is expected to set in, after the early months of the year. But with business profits soaring, widespread installations of the newest and most modern plants and machines will substantially increase industry's capacity to produce more goods, with fewer workers. And in 1965, about 3.7 million youngsters will reach 18 years of age—a million more than last year—and many of them will seek work. In the face of these conditions, a considerably slower rise of production will generate increasing unemployment.

Early adoption by the Congress of President Johnson's programs—presented in his budget and economic messages—will probably be enough to offset most of the anticipated weakening of economic activities in the latter half of the year. But even if all of the administration's programs are enacted, substantially as presented, the improvement of the unemployment situation will probably be halted and the joblessness may creep up again in the second half of 1965.

Additional measures are needed, if America is to continue down the road of reducing unemployment through 1965 and into 1966. Moreover, until the Government fully implements the Employment Act of 1946, it will not be possible to achieve and sustain full employment.

A $2 billion program of Federal grants-in-aid to the cities should be adopted, for the expansion of job-creating public works to improve and expand community facilities for our rapidly growing urban population—from water and sewage systems to cultural centers and public buildings.

A comprehensive Federal effort of coordination and financial assistance is needed for the planned redevelopment of chronically depressed regions of the country—based on the development of roads, natural resources, and manpower skills to strengthen the economies of such regions as Appalachia, the upper Great Lakes, and the Ozarks.

The Federal minimum wage should be raised to $2 an hour, in addition to the expansion of the Fair Labor Standards Act coverage to bolster consumer markets. The standard workweek should be cut to 35 hours—as well as an increase in the overtime penalty to double time—to increase job opportunities.

A lasting improvement of economic conditions requires a much better balance between the economy's rapidly growing capacity to produce and the lagging ability of consumers to buy. The lack of balance in the economy is all too clearly apparent. Between 1961 and 1964, corporate profits after taxes soared 44 percent and dividends rose 30 percent, while total wage and salary payments increased only 19 percent. Since 1953, the cash flow to corporations has risen 103 percent—in contrast to an increase in after-tax personal income of only 71 percent.

The cash flow to corporations (after-tax profits plus depreciation allowances) has been so great in recent years, that even after the payment of dividends, corporate funds have been in excess of their high and rising investments in new plants and machines. In the past 3 years, this excess has amounted to nearly $8 billion.

Part of this hoard of funds has been used for mergers and the withdrawal of stock from the market. Another part has been invested abroad—a major source of the balance-of-payments deficits and often resulting in the export of American jobs.

Investment income has been rising much faster than income for consumption, and consumer markets have been bolstered by unsustainable sharp increases of installment and mortgage debt. Renewed national emphasis on consumer buying power is overdue.

Adoption of our legislative program can help to achieve a better balance in the economy by adding some strength to consumer markets. But at the base of our economic system are the wages of workers.

To sustain the expansion of the national economy at the pace required by the spread of automation and a growing labor force, substantial increases in wages and fringe benefits are essential. Only such increases can provide the foundation of expanding buying power that is required by the American economy.

THE EXPANDED DISCRIMINATION AGAINST COLD-WAR VETERANS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Defense Department has been undergoing a study of the draft for a year now, and has reported that the study will not be completed by its April deadline, but, instead, will be delayed for a month or so. However, in last Monday's Washington Daily News, some indications of the Defense Department's findings were reported.

Instead of favoring a cold-war GI bill, which would raise the morale of the armed services, provide an inducement to many underprivileged young men, and offer 5 million veterans a chance in life, the Defense Department will choose to further its present discriminatory programs.

First, the maximum drafting age will be lowered, providing those who are wealthy enough to go to college an even better chance to escape the draft, and thrusting on the less fortunate more responsibility to defend our country.

Second, the possibilities of deferment will be enlarged, again making loopholes for the wealthy, and nooses for the underprivileged. Part of this expansion will be deferment of more men in skilled occupations, such as engineers, scientists, and technicians; but the young man who cannot afford to go to college has little chance of ever reaching this level, and he will have to be drafted.

As another example of the discriminatory practices of the Defense Department, and as an illustration of the need for the GI bill, I request unanimous consent that this article from the Washington Daily News of Monday, March 29, 1965, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

For Several More Years—Defense Clings to the Draft

(By Ted Knap)

A Pentagon study of military manpower needs will say that the draft is needed for at least several more years but will recommend major changes and steps toward its eventual elimination, informed sources said today.

The likely changes include:

Draft men younger than the present maximum age of 26 and average age of 22.

With more men available at the younger ages, offer more deferments for occupations in the national interest, such as scientists, engineers, technicians, and teachers.

To make the Armed Forces less dependent on conscription, the report is expected to recommend several steps to encourage enlistment and reenlistment.

Included are higher pay, more inservice education, better housing for families, more aggressive recruiting and perhaps reenlistment bonuses.

DELAY

President Johnson ordered the 1-year study last April. The man in charge, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense, William Gorham, said the study is running a little late and probably won't be finished until May.

The so-called loopholes probably will remain because the administration believes it is in the national interest to exempt married men, bar the mentally deficient and psychiatrically undesirable, and to encourage smart young men to go to college.

President Johnson's policy is to use the draft as little as possible to fulfill military needs and to end it "as soon as possible." But the Armed Forces have needed the draft, now due to end in 1967, to maintain strength.

The military needs 600,000 new men a year. It has been getting 500,000 by enlistment and 100,000 by conscription.

It is conceivable that military service could be made attractive enough to recruit 100,000 additional volunteers. But the hooker is that eliminating the draft would eliminate a large number of the volunteers who sign up to beat the draft.

The current survey shows that about 40 percent of the 500,000 volunteers sign up because they would have been drafted. Therefore, ending the draft would lose 100,000 draftees and about 200,000 volunteers.

In view of that, "the draft certainly cannot be terminated," said Chairman L. Mendel Rivers, Democrat, of South Carolina, of the House Armed Services Committee.

Of the 1.9 million young men turning 18 each year, about a third are not qualified physically or mentally.

That leaves slightly more than 1.2 million eligible, and even a civilian employer would find it extremely difficult to get 600,000 of them to sign up voluntarily.

But it wants some changes.

YOUNGER

Military leaders would like to have their recruits 19 to 21 rather than the present average draft age of just over 22.

The younger men are less likely to be established in civilian careers, less likely to be married, and more likely to reenlist.

Some favor lowering the maximum draft age from 26 to 25 or 24.

Draft calls now start with the oldest men eligible and work down. The Pentagon study is likely to recommend that this be abandoned and that drafting move into the younger ages.

Because all those younger men won't be needed, how do you select?

One way, favored by Representative Lucien Nedzi, Democrat, of Michigan, of the House Armed Services Committee, is by lottery. He points to the World War II drawings as precedent.

Selective Service Director Lewis B. Hershey is opposed to that, preferring a system based on judgment rather than chance.

A likely alternative is to increase the number of occupations in which a young man will qualify for deferment.

EDUCATION AND TECHNOLOGY

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President I am sure most of us do not realize that the 1965 volume for the U.S. education industry will reach $35 billion—well ahead of the amounts for such industries as agriculture, construction, transportation, and metals. However, President Johnson's budgeted $2.6 billion for 1966 educational expenditures, double the level of the past year, cannot keep pace with the rapid student-population explosion.

Education faces a crisis situation because of the inadequacies of its technology. The suggested corrective formula is the implementation of a distinctively American contribution to the field of education—programed learning and instruction. Adequately tested in many of the leading industries across the country, programed instruction has produced greater proficiency for A.T. & T., and has reduced the learning-time factor for a corporation such as Du Pont, to mention only two.

This breakthrough in behavioral technology deserves our thoughtful consideration. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that a recent article entitled "Behavioral Technology: Breakthrough Has Immense Economic Significance," in which David J. Padwa, president of Basic Systems, Inc., deals with the problems of general education and the question of training the disadvantaged, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Behavioral Technology: Breakthrough Has "Immense Economic Significance"

(By David J. Padwa, president, Basic Systems, Inc.)

Education is America's greatest growth industry. Well ahead of agriculture, construction, metals and metal products and transportation, 1965 volume for the U.S. education industry will reach $35 billion. That compares with only $20 billion in 1958.

The incline will remain steep. President Johnson has budgeted the Federal Government's 1966 educational expenditures at $2.6 billion—exactly double the level of 1964. Meantime, the U.S. student population continues to explode. The increase during the 1960's is projected at 30 percent and is to reach a total of 60 million by 1970.

Internationally—particularly among the developing nations—the strain is even greater. India, for example, now has a student population of 60 million, an increase of almost 150 percent in 15 years. Even so, only 40 percent of India's schoolage population is presently in class.

While gravely aggravated by population pressure, the educational challenge clearly must be met by the developing nations. Economic progress is no longer possible based on a reservoir of unskilled, low wage labor. Modern industrialism depends on workers who know how to keep the machines—and computers—going.

Education, in short, faces a crisis situation. And the education industry is, itself, in crisis because of the inadequacy of its technology. In its traditional form, education is the most labor-intensive of all industries. While the student population soars, education's per unit costs remain fixed.

The teacher-student ratio illustrates the rigidity of the system. There is no tampering with that ratio. In a traditional educational system where a teacher is overloaded, "output" deteriorates. One person can only effectively teach so many. Any attempt to increase volume is quickly subject to the law of diminishing returns.

While more and more teachers are required both here and abroad, it is unrealistic to expect that those entering the teaching profession during the next decade will achieve the required doubling and trebling of educational yield. Self-instruction methods must now assume an increasing part of the load.

The technological situation is, in fact, very promising. Just as computers have exponentially increased the utilities of data, new technology is now opening the way to expanded educational output. A chief factor in this has been a breakthrough in understanding the learning process—behavioral technology. Programed instruction, which has excited discussion throughout the educational profession during the last 4 or 5 years, is an outstanding application of behavorial technology.

Programed instruction provides something never previously possible in education: the delivery of specified changes in behavior (i.e., new skills) in a specific group in a specified time and at a specified cost.

Doing just this has been a principal element of the business of Basic Systems, Inc. Since its founding in 1960, sales volume has grown from the four figures well into the seven-figure range.

The initial cost of programed instruction is high, from $1,000 to $3,000 for an hour's instruction. This is a constant, however, no matter the number of students to be trained. Furthermore, American industry has found intrinsic economy in the new technology.

Du Pont tests programed instruction against traditional classroom schooling among employees being trained in mathematics and language. Those in programed instruction had an average score of 91 percent on the final examination, as opposed to 81 percent for those receiving classroom training. Moreover, programed instruction took less time, an average of 12.8 hours, against 17 hours for those conventionally trained. All in all Du Pont reckoned savings for those taking programed instruction at $30 per trainee.

Frederick R. Kappel, chairman of the board, A.T. & T., reports that employees of his firm trained by programed instruction show "greater proficiency than when taught in the conventional manner * * * and we have found too that programed textbooks are just as effective as the so-called teaching machines you have doubtless heard about. This in itself was an important thing to learn. Furthermore, where (programed instruction) has been introduced, it has been possible to do away with formal classes. Students can enter a course when they are individually available for training, and leave when they have completed it."

Other major firms with which Basic Systems, Inc., has worked on programed instruction courses include American Cyanamid, Armco Steel Corp., Chrysler Corp., Dow Chemical Co., Equitable Life Assurance Society, FMC Corp., General Electric, Gulf Oil Corp., Monsanto Chemical Co., Charles Pfizer & Co., Renault, Rolls Royce Ltd., Sears, Roebuck & Co., Standard Oil Co. (New Jersey), Westinghouse Electric Co., Xerox Corp.

Preparation of programed instruction courses requires the work of a number of specialists—subject matter experts, behavior analysts, programers, project administrators, editors, as well as draftsmen, illustrators, and clerical assistants. But, stemming from the breakthrough in behavioral technology, any course of programed instruction will share certain characteristics:

Textual information is organized in small steps, with each step building new knowledge of material just mastered.

Students are not passive receptors, but are required to respond to each step, actively exercising new skills acquired.

New learning responses are immediately confirmed by the right answer in the next frame of the text—thereby strengthening and confirming the new skills.

Greatest training efficiency is attained when students proceed at their own pace.

Efficacy of the new technology has been repeatedly demonstrated by U.S. industry. Programed instruction will bring all students involved in the training to a superior level of skill. IQ and motivation may influence the rapidity with which a given student completes the course, but all can complete programed instruction with a minimum proficiency of approximately 90 percent.

This educational breakthrough is a distinctively American contribution. Modern learning theory derives from the discoveries of the famed psychologist and lexicographer, Edward L. Thorndike in the 1920's and 1930's. B. F. Skinner of Harvard made the climactic findings during the 1950's, most notably with a 1954 paper entitled "The Science of Learning and the Art of Teaching." Practical application of this learning began to move forward quickly in 1960.

The U.S.S.R., Japan, and Sweden have most closely followed the advance of behavioral technology (and the work of Basic System, Inc.). At present, their work in programed instruction compares to that of the United States in 1961–62. Britain, France and West Germany are just beginning to move ahead in the science.

There are, of course, enormous possibilities for the application of programed instruction in the fast-paced economies of Western Europe and Japan. Basic Systems, Inc., has, however, concentrated to developing licensing agreements, etc. Direct export would doubtlessly offend the chauvinism that education inspires in so many nations.

Technical aid has had free play, however. Dr. Francis Mechner of Basic System, Inc., recently worked with 26 physics teachers in a UNESCO project at Sao Paulo, Brazil. The collaboration produced 50 hours of programed instruction in the "Physics of Light." The course, done in Portuguese, totaled 900 pages of text. It was subsequently translated into Spanish (no mere mechanical job in the case of programed instruction) and is being used at the University of Mexico and the University of Cardoba, in Argentina.

Dr. Mechner and Dr. Donald A. Cook have also completed a research project for the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the trade and aid organization of 21 of the major Western powers.

Work of great promise for developing countries is now being proven in "anti-poverty" projects that Basic Systems, Incorporated is conducting here in the United States. Some activities go well beyond the expertise needed to set up courses in programed instruction. For instance, in order to determine what training is needed, comprehensive indexes of social-economic conditions must sometimes be prepared. Under the direction of Harry C. Harris, its vice president for manpower development and urban problems, Basic Systems, Incorporated has undertaken comprehensive demographic surveys for the States of Illinois and Oregon. Even more ambitious, a master plan for antipoverty work was delivered to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in 1964.

Programed instruction in America should soon proceed from its presently strong position in industry to greater utilization in the schools. To date, its use in the schools has been restricted by a shortage of investment capital. New funds apparently to become available during the next few years will permit programed instruction to fill much of the gap caused by teacher shortages.

THE NEED FOR LOWER INTEREST RATES

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, although laws have been passed to protect a borrower from being charged extortionate rates and from being a victim of inhuman foreclosures, a drive is on, by certain interests of this country, to have the amount of interest that Americans are charged by private lending institutions raised.

In an article published in the March 21, 1965, issue of the Washington Post. Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, states that it is time for interest rates to come down and for money to be made more readily available at fair rates to the legitimate borrower.

I request unanimous consent that this thought-provoking article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR LOW INTEREST RATES

(By Representative WRIGHT PATMAN)

America's public and private debt today adds up to the fantastic total of $1.3 trillion.

A raise of but 1 percentage point in interest charges on this incredible sum would add $13 billion a year to the already extravagant aggregate of more than $75 billion that Americans are now paying as interest.

Since Biblical days, interest charges—then called usury—have frequently meant woe for the borrower and joy for the lender. Governments have passed laws to protect the borrower from extortionate rates and inhuman foreclosures.

More than five centuries before Christ, the great Athenian lawmaker, Solon, forbade men being sold into slavery because of unpaid interest charges.

In the year 1545, England removed the prohibition on the lending of money and fixed a legal maximum interest rate. Many continental nations soon followed suit.

Today, it is imperative, as never before, that Americans center their attention on interest charges.

For many months, bankers have been propagandizing to raise the amount of interest Americans are taxed by the private lending institutions. There has been a concerted effort to raise interest rates and to get public acceptance by one pretext or another. This despite pleas from President Johnson to hold the rates down.

The mere fact that bank profits are higher than ever before in history has made no difference. Many independent bankers are willing to let well enough alone. But few dare openly buck the banking establishment which sets policy.

According to a bit of facetious testimony by John Galbraith, the great economist, before the Joint Economic Committee recently: "interest rates are the only price that is never raised in order to give the recipient a greater return." They're always increased "as a somber act of national policy."

One day interest rates must go up because of inflationary threats; then the excuse is "unfavorable balance of payments." Last November 23, which I called the "day of financial infamy," our Federal Reserve System raised our discount rate one-half percent when the British raised theirs 2 percent. The excuse offered was "to keep our investors from sending their money overseas." The very next day, our Government put a billion dollars into a $3 billion fund to support the British pound. If ever a financial policy was working at cross purposes, this was it.

We still get a lot of chatter from the bankers' lobby about unfavorable balance of payments forcing interest rates up. Corporate investments abroad, vast defense expenditures, and foreign aid are ignored as causes for our imbalance of payments. Only higher interest rates will correct the imbalance. To this we say "hogwash."

Within a day of Galbraith's testimony, William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Federal Reserve System, told the Joint Economic Committee that he thought it may be necessary to tighten credit and raise interest rates. When I asked him if he would agree to a 6-percent interest on Government bonds, he didn't bat an eye. Such a raise would lead to a national debt of $600 billion within 15 years, and mean that the American people would pay upward of $36 billion a year on the public debt.

As of now, they are paying $5.5 billion more than they should (over the $11 billion instead of $5.5 billion), thanks to the precipitous increases brought about during the Dwight D. Eisenhower regime.

The tragedy of tight money and high interest rates is that ultimately they bring about economic disaster. In tandem they cause a slackening of our economic growth; the net result—more unemployment.

It would be perfectly absurd for America to pursue monetary policies that have invariably brought disaster in the past.

We had three manmade depressions under Eisenhower. President John F. Kennedy brought the United States out of the last of these in 1961, and there were no recessions during his administration. There is no need to have any under Lyndon Johnson.

To avert disaster, we need adequate credit for the small and large businessman, at reasonable interest charges.

We need a sound money policy so that the farmer won't be soaked on his mortgage, the new homeowner on his split-level. Our school systems should not have to pay unconscionably high rates to private lenders.

Our municipalities are feeling the pinch of high interest rates, as are our county and State governments. Despite denials, interest charges are going up all along the line and money is harder to come by.

I never could understand why it was necessary for Uncle Sam to advance credit to private banking institutions which enables them to purchase Government securities at high interest rates. When interest on Government securities goes up, all types of borrowing costs more to the consumer. A raise of only 1 percent on a 20-year $10,000 mortgage will cost the home purchaser an additional $2,000.

A raise of but a quarter of 1 percent on the national debt will cost all Americans more than $800 million a year additional.

I say it's time to reverse the trend. It's time for interest rates to come down and for money to be available to the legitimate borrower for legitimate business or personal reasons at fair rates. If bankers want to maintain a respectable public image, it would be wise for them to reconsider their drive for a pound of flesh.

OTHER FACTORS SEEN ATTRIBUTABLE TO LUNG CANCER

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, it has come to my attention that reputable German scientists have questioned the validity of the charge that there is a causal relation between smoking and lung cancer. Findings from seven pathological institutes in the Ruhr State of North Rhine Westphalia suggest that air pollution, rather than smoking, is the chief cause of lung cancer. These scientists criticize the U.S. Surgeon General's report, chiefly on the argument that the proof so far has been statistical, not experimental.

I ask unanimous consent that certain articles from the News Call-Bulletin of January 14, 1964, the Medical Tribune of August 12, 1964, and the Chicago American of March 24, 1964, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the News Call-Bulletin of San Francisco, Calif., Jan. 14, 1964]

GERMAN EXPERTS DISSENT: BLAME SMOG, NOT SMOKING—AIR POLLUTION CAUSES MOST LUNG CANCER

DUESSELDORF.—A German scientist says a detailed study soon to be published will prove air pollution—not smoking—is the chief cause of lung cancer.

Prof. Reinhard Poche, of the Duesseldorf Medical Academy, said the study is based on findings from seven pathological institutes in the Ruhr State of North Rhine Westphalia.

"On the basis of our examinations covering many years, I am obliged to state that the importance of smoking in causing lung cancer is certainly not as great as has been suggested," he said.

"Of course, tobacco contains substances which cause cancer. But these tiny quantities play a subordinate role compared with the great masses of cancer-causing agents in polluted air."

Poche said the seven institutes examined 1,229 cases of acute lung cancer during the last 5 years and also analyzed more than 26,000 autopsy reports filed since 1908.

He said analysis show that during the last 50 years the overall percentage of cancer among death causes has not increased, although lung cancer has replaced stomach cancer as the most frequent cancerous disease.

He said lung cancer reaches its highest frequency between the ages of 55 and 60—both for smokers and nonsmokers.

This, he said, has not changed since 1908.

"If one assumes that inhaling of tobacco is responsible for lung cancer, one should also expect that heavy smokers would suffer from bronchial carcinomas at an earlier age than light or nonsmokers," he stated.

"This is not the case."

Poche said the highest rate of lung cancer is among people particularly exposed to car exhausts, including traveling salesmen and traffic policemen.

Office workers and other people least exposed to polluted air had the lowest rate of lung cancer, although these are known to be among the heaviest smokers, Poche said.

[From the Medical Tribune of Aug. 12, 1964]

GERMAN PHYSICIAN DENIES SMOKING ROLE IN LUNG CANCER, BLAMES AIR POLLUTION

DUESSELDORF, GERMANY.—"The frequency of lung cancer is not influenced by cigarette smoking but there is a significant correlation between the air pollution problem and the bronchial carcinoma rate," says Professor Dr. Reinhard Poche, of the Düsseldorf Medical Academy's Pathology Institute.

In fact, Dr. Poche asserts, statistical studies indicate the lung cancer rate is lowest among professional groups in which cigarette smoking is heaviest. These professional groups, however, were subject to the least exposure to air containing potentially cancerogenic substances.

Dr. Poche's views—published in full in the German Journal for Cancer Research—have become the cause of much controversy.

Although his investigation—based on the study of 1,229 bronchial carcinoma case histories from 12 cities and 26,000 autopsy reports dating back to 1908—revealed a sharp increase in the rate of bronchial carcinoma during the past 50 years, there has been no change since the turn of the century in the peak of the age distribution for lung cancer. This lay just under the 60th year of life in 1908 and is in the same place today.

When news about Dr. Poche's investigation and observations was first disclosed, one question was raised immediately: Who sponsored the research project?

Imputations that the tobacco industry was connected were voiced immediately. However, Dr. Poche told Medical Tribune:

"Our investigation was jointly sponsored by the North Rhine-Westphalian Society for Pathology and the Cultural Ministry for the State of North Rhine-Westphalia.

"It is entirely a statistical investigation begun 4 years ago in which the 12 pathology institutes in the state cooperated. We first reported partial results at a meeting of the society in February 1962, and the manuscript of our report was submitted to the cancer journal in early December, a month before anything was known about the American report."

Dr. Poche sent questionnaires to the state-supported pathology institutes at Dusseldorf, Bonn, Bachum, Essen, Solingen, Dortmund, Wuppertal, Bethel, Duisburg, Steele, Detmold, and Cologne, asking for complete case histories on living and dead bronchial carcinoma patients and information about the patients' professional life, residences, military service, and smoking habits.

He received 1,229 replies. Of these, 790 dealt with patients already dead and included not only histologic diagnoses but autopsy results. The other 439 cases dealt with patient records at the various institutes but no autopsy reports. The cases covered a period from 1955 to 1960.

In addition to his observations about smoking and air pollution, Dr. Poche developed two other hypotheses.

A HYPOTHESES AND THEORY

"We call these the equilibration hypothesis and the representation theory.

'We noticed that the total rate of malignant tumors is approximately the same in men and women. But if the frequency of an organ cancer, for example bronchial carcinoma, increases sharply in one sex, then the frequency of other organ cancers, for example, gastric carcinoma, decreases in this sex," Dr. Poche said. "This is the equilibration hypothesis."

This pattern repeated itself in all the statistical evaluations, and Dr. Poche noted that while there is an overall increase in bronchial carcinoma in men, there has also been a steady decline in gastric carcinoma in men.

Dr. Poche said his study showed that as cases of bronchial carcinoma increase in frequency there is a corresponding percentage increase in the number of squamous cell carcinomas and a decrease in the number of undifferentiated carcinomas. The percentage of adenocarcinomas (which constitutes only about 4 percent of all of Dr. Poche's case histories) does not undergo any significant change. The squamous cell carcinomas, therefore, become representative of the collective group.

"This displacement of undifferentiated carcinomas by squamous cell carcinomas is biologically significant," said Dr. Poche.

FIVE OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS

In his evaluation of the statistical material, Dr. Poche established five occupational groups: white-collar workers, tradesmen, sales personnel, and the professions made up the first; artisans employed in small shops comprised the second; people employed in traffic, such as drivers, railwaymen, messengers, and traffic policemen, made up the third; industrial workers and artisans employed in large plants made up the fourth; and outdoor workers, which included construction workers as well as farmers, though primarily the former, made up the fifth group.

The squamous cell carcinoma rate was lowest among the first group (32 percent), second lowest in the second group (42 percent), highest in the third group (54 percent), second highest in the fifth group, (53 percent), and third highest in the fourth group (51 percent).

The study was conducted in North Rhine-Westphalia, West Germany's most industrialized area.

Noting that his study indicated a relationship between bronchial carcinoma and infectious respiratory diseases—to which, incidentally, outdoor workers in the damp, cold climate of North Rhine-Westphalia are especially prone—Dr. Poche commented:

"While I do not believe that squamous cell metaplasias of the bronchial membrane are a precancerous step, I do feel that they become significant when the individual is forced to breathe in cancerogenic air. In such a case cancerogens which have entered the peripheral bronchial areas are transported to the cell metaplasias and form deposits which can reach a cancer-causing volume quicker than in the ordinary bronchial membrane.

"Diseases which lead to squamous cell metaplasias, such as virus influenzas, tend toward bronchial carcinoma whenever the individual concerned must also inhale polluted air."

[From the Chicago (Ill.) American of Mar. 24, 1964]

GERMANS DISPUTE CIGARET-CANCER LINK

(By Effie Alley)

A 5-year study of lung cancer just published in Germany's Journal of Cancer Research presents evidence which conflicts with the conclusion of the U.S. surgeon general that cigaret smoking is a major cause of the disease.

The German researchers indict air pollution—not smoking—as the chief cause of lung cancer.

Their report, based on a study of 1,229 lung-cancer cases at 12 Rhine-Westphalia pathological institutes plus case records going back to 1908, lists the following additional findings:

No significant relationship exists between cigaret smoking and the risk of lung cancer.

No relationship between the incidence of the disease and the number of cigarets smoked could be demonstrated.

ONE-SIDED SURVEY

The heaviest smokers were found in an occupational group with the least occurrence of lung cancer.

The average age at which lung cancer occurs is the same for heavy smokers, light smokers, and nonsmokers.

Meanwhile, an American medical journal, "Growth," criticizes the recent report of the Surgeon General's Committee on Smoking and Health as a "one-sided statistical survey" which fails to take into consideration the complexities of the lung-cancer problem.

At the same time an official of the American Medical Association hit back at Dr. Alton Ochsner, a Tulane University surgeon, who declared that the answers on tobacco and health are all in.

Dr. Ochsner criticized the AMA's program for a long-range study of the effects of smoking on health as "a delaying tactic" and said the organization is derelict for failing to urge that all cigaret packages carry a warning label.

Dr. F. J. L. Blasingame, the AMA's executive vice president, answered: "Dr. Ochsner and those who share his opinion are really advocating that an agency of the Federal Government be granted the power to destroy an $8-billion industry on the extreme theory that the American people need to be protected from themselves."

FIND OCCUPATION LINK

The German researchers, headed by Dr. Reinhard Poche, chief physician of the Dusseldorf Medical Academy, made no specific mention of the Surgeon General's report. However, they noted the arguments advanced by American and English researchers in contending that cigarettes are a causative factor in lung cancer and said serious objections have been raised to their validity.

While they could find no link between cancer and smoking, they stated that the relationship between lung cancer and certain occupations is marked, more cancer occurring among industrial workers, chauffeurs, traffic policemen and others exposed to exhaust fumes, and outdoor workers generally, including those in agriculture, than among domestics, office workers of all kinds, and teachers.

Declaring that this is an approach which must be followed further, the researchers state that air pollution has the greatest practical importance as a cause of lung cancer.

EXPLAIN FARM CASES

In discussing the case of agricultural workers, the researchers note that because of the high degree of industrialization in the North Rhine-Westphalia district outdoor workers there are exposed to polluted air. In addition, they say, diesel motors are being used on farms in increasing numbers and to this must be added the various insecticides and sprays to which such people are exposed.

Outdoor workers also often suffer from respiratory infections caused by exposure to cold, they state and add:

"Viral influenza always predisposes to bronchial carcinoma (a form of lung cancer) when individuals who have had attacks * * * come into contact with atmospheric pollutants."

SEEK "TRIGGER" AGENTS

However, the researchers also state that their work points up the difficulty of finding a specific cause of lung cancer in the environment.

The fact that the peak incidence of this type of cancer has always occurred at about age 60 indicated that all of the factors blamed for the current increase in the disease are triggering rather than causative agents.

And none have so far proven powerful enough to shift the peak incidence toward a younger age.

The findings underscore the objections made by the editorial in Growth to the Surgeon General's report.

The publication, edited by Dr. Irene Corey Diller, of the Lankenau Research Institute, a noted cancer institution, also stresses the importance of the possible role of infection in lung cancer.

Stating that this is one of the areas ignored in the Surgeon General's report, the editorial noted that such infection often precedes the appearance of lung cancer in heavy smokers.

Also criticized is the failure to take into account the part played by certain glands, known to be overactive in many cases of lung cancer; the whole question of individual susceptibility to cancer, and the vast difference in death rates as between men and women.

Such gaps tend to minimize the significance of the report, and may prevent some scientists from considering its conclusions as final, the editorial said.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICES MUST BE KEPT FOR A BEAUTIFUL AMERICA

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the many accomplishments of the 88th Congress earned it two well-deserved titles: the Education Congress and the Conservation Congress. This Congress has before it ambitious programs in both these fields; it, too, by taking strong action toward the goals of conservation and preservation of natural beauty, as outlined in the President's program, can earn itself the accolade of being the Conservation Congress.

However, in order for Congress to make a worthy record on conservation, all aspects and phases of conservation must receive adequate consideration. What have we gained from a few new recreation facilities if we let the topsoil from a hundred thousand farms wash away? This may be the consequence if Congress blindly follows the Budget Bureau proposals to cut back the Soil Conservation Service and agricultural conservation program.

Due to the fine work of the Soil Conservation Service, last year, nearly 2 million farmers were carrying out conservation programs planned by the SCS. Under SCS guidance, over 2 million acres of cropland were converted to other uses. Inevitably, if the appropriation for the SCS technical service is cut by one-third, by $20 million, or if this amount is attempted to be charged to farmers making use of SCS advice, this conservation program will suffer, and more topsoil will wash off the land, perhaps to create an even more expensive pollution problem somewhere downstream.

The agricultural conservation program aids farmers in meeting the costs of applying conservation practices to their land. The proposed cut of $100 million would mean 40 percent less conservation help for the over 1 million farmers who use this program. This is a program that goes to the heart of rural redevelopment and of curing rural poverty, in addition to its preservation of the land.

The agriculture community of Texas shares my concern with these shortsighted proposals. Many individuals and groups in Texas have written to me, testifying of the harmful effects on our farmers if these anti-conservation proposals are adopted. Typical of these expressions is a resolution adopted by the Commissioners Court of Ward County, Tex., which I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"Whereas it has been called to the attention of the Commissioners Court of Ward County that serious changes are proposed by our Government in the soil and water conservation movement in that the Federal Budget Bureau proposes a 20-percent cut in such program and a 40-percent cut in the cost-sharing by the agricultural conservation program; and

"Whereas the farmers and ranchers of west Texas, and possibly this entire country, have been unable in the past few years to make anything like a reasonable return on their investment and for their labors, most of such farmers and ranchers having a serious time of meeting their production costs, much less making a reasonable return for their efforts and investment; and

"Whereas the Commissioners Court of Ward County, Tex., is of the opinion that the soil and water conservation program should be carried on in the manner it has been for the past few years in order that such farmers and ranchers will be able to secure the aid they so sorely need, and this court goes on record as unalterably opposed to any change in the soil and water conservation movement from what it has been over the past many years, as the court feels that the decrease in the work and additional burden placed on the back of the farmers and ranchers would make it impossible to carry on their work and efforts to produce the food for the people and livestock of this country; further the clerk of this court is instructed to send a copy of this resolution to the following named Representatives in Congress from this State and district: Senators RALPH YARBOROUGH and JOHN TOWER, and Congressmen RICHARD C. WHITE and JOE POOL."

I, Mary M. Childs, clerk of the Commissioners Court of Ward County, Tex., do hereby certify that the above and foregoing is a true and correct copy of the resolution passed by the Commissioners Court of Ward County, Tex., in session on the 22d day of March, A.D. 1965.

MARY M. CHILDS,
Clerk of the Commissioners Court of Ward County, Tex.

RESOLUTION OF THE RICE MILLERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, last year 64 percent of the U.S. rice crop was exported both for cash and through the food-for-peace program. The U.S. rice which goes abroad is a strong tie between the U.S. economy and many other sections of the world where rice is a primary staple. In February, the rice industry broke into a new dollar market by concluding an agreement for the export of 50,000 tons of southern medium-grain rice to Japan.

On March 12, 1965, the Rice Millers' Association, meeting in New Orleans, adopted a resolution commending Mr. Joseph C. Dodson, our agricultural attaché in Tokyo, and Mr. Robert Bieber, the rice marketing specialist of the Foreign Agricultural Service, for their assistance in the consummation of this sale. All too often, unfortunately, the efforts of such public servants as Mr. Dodson and Mr. Bieber go unrecognized. So I am pleased that this tribute has been paid to them.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution to which I have referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION OF THE RICE MILLERS' ASSOCIATION

Whereas after long months of effort, the Southern U.S. rice industry last month made a cash sale to Japan of 50,000 tons of southern medium grain rice, which it is believed will pave the way to steady and substantial cash business with Japan; and

Whereas special acknowledgment is due to Foreign Agricultural Service and particularly to the Agricultural Attaché in Tokyo, Mr. Joseph C. Dodson, and the Rice Marketing Specialist, Mr. Robert Bieber, for support and assistance in making this initial sale to Japan, by providing the rice industry with timely and accurate information on Japanese requirements and procurement plans, and conversely by informing the Food Agency of Japan of the supply and quality of our rice, furnishing samples, and encouraging taste tests: Therefore be it

Resolved, That in a meeting assembled this 12th day of March, 1965, members of the Rice Millers' Association unanimously adopted this formal resolution commending and expressing appreciation to Foreign Agricultural Service, and particularly to Mr. Dodson and Mr. Bieber, for effective and valuable cooperation and effort on our behalf; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be conveyed to Hon. Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, and that a copy be conveyed to Mr. Raymond Ioanes, Administrator of Foreign Agricultural Service, Mr. Clarence Eskildsen, Associate Administrator of Foreign Agricultural Service, Mr. Joseph Dodson, Agricultural Attaché in Tokyo, and Mr. Robert Bieber, Rice Marketing Specialist of Foreign Agricultural Service; and that a copy be sent to Members of the Senate and Congress from rice-producing States.

Attest:

D. T. ROWE,
Secretary-Treasurer.
J. R. GAINES,
Executive Vice-President.

RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, we must still be seriously concerned with the fact—as announced this morning by the Department of Labor—that there are 3,740,000 Americans who want jobs, but cannot get them. But we can, nevertheless, take considerable measure of satisfaction in the very dramatic decline in unemployment which occurred during March. We moved to our lowest percentage rate since 1957—4.7 percent; and we now have 550,000 fewer unemployed workers than we had last year at this time.

Several of the figures revealed by the Department are of high significance: The number of long-term unemployed was down by 300,000 from the number a year ago at this time. The rate for adult men went down to 3.3 percent; and for married men, to 2.5 percent. Fewer people were doing part-time work than in any other March since 1956. Of fully 70.2 million jobholders, only 1.9 million were working on a part-time basis; and 1,650,000 more people held jobs this March, as compared with the number a year ago.

Facts such as these suggest clearly that our sustained economic expansion, with us since the spring of 1961, is producing the kind of results we most want to achieve. It was in 1946 that Congress spelled out the objectives involved when it passed the Full Employment Act.

We are approaching a point in our economic history where the goal of a truly full employment economy may, indeed, be within our reach. We must continue to work at maximum effort to attain that goal.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE INDEPENDENT OIL PRODUCER

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, the significance of the independent oil producer has been repeatedly brought to the attention of the Senate. Yet, the past and present actions of the Department of Interior continue to downgrade this portion of our Nation's oil industry. The importation of large quantities of foreign oil is without question encouraging a steady deterioration of that segment of the industry and, along with it, of tax revenue in the once major oil-producing States of the Midwest.

The importation of foreign oil as permitted today by the Department of Interior has caused the major refineries to purchase their oil nearer to the ports where this oil is received. The result has been to decrease the number of exploratory wells developed by the independent oilman in the Midwest. Kansas, alone, has fallen from 149 operating rigs 5 years ago to as few as 42 units operating as of 2 weeks ago. The industry reports that within the next 30 days, some 46 rigs will be auctioned off in Texas.

As these independent drillers are reduced in number, the once major oil-producing States of this Nation suffer a sharp drop in proven reserves. If drilling rigs are not active within the traditional oil-producing areas of this country, these areas cannot be assured of new reserves. New wells must be drilled, in order to obtain new resources.

Although the Department of Defense has authorized the purchase of 30,000 barrels of oil in this country, whereas formerly it was obtained from foreign suppliers, this is entirely inadequate. Independents have asked that a minimum of 100,000 barrels be diverted from foreign producers to American producers so as to give some measure of relief to a once great industry that is being strangled by imports and foreign producers for our military use.

The situation in Kansas is desperate. My State's reserves are dropping at a phenomenal rate.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article, from the March 29 edition of the Wichita, Kans., Eagle, by Ted Brooks. In the article, he describes most vividly the seriousness of the problem.

Mr. President, the information I have submitted today is based on trends in several States throughout the Midwest. Losses in tax revenue to counties and States are not empty predictions. These losses have become realities in the Midwest.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wichita Eagle, Mar. 29, 1965]

OIL RESERVES DROP CONTINUES

(By Ted Brooks)

Kansas and its four neighboring petroleum States are running out of oil.

In its largest decline of recent years, Kansas during 1964 lost in net crude oil reserves 44,808,000 barrels.

For every barrel of new oil discovered and for every five barrels of new oil added by field extensions, Kansas produced and sold 10.5 barrels. It thus reduced its capital resources by nearly 4.5 barrels for every 10.5 barrels sold.

Arkansas lost 20,131,000 barrels; Colorado was down 22,041,000; Nebraska was off 12,482,000; and Oklahoma was a net loser of 42,253,000 barrels.

Those figures were released by the American Petroleum Institute Sunday in its annual assessment of the Nation's crude and natural gas liquid reserves.

Crude oil reserves in the Nation as a whole gained, the API said. They were estimated at 30,990,510,000 barrels, up approximately 21 million from 1963.

Crude oil and natural gas liquid reserves totaled nearly 39 billion barrels, up approximately 93 million from a year earlier.

Equally precarious was the Kansas natural gas position as reported by the American Gas Association in a concurrent report.

The State's gas reserves were reduced by 716,093 million cubic feet.

For every single cubic foot added to Kansas reserves during 1964, approximately 8 cubic feet were sold—diminishing capital gas reserves by 7 cubic feet.

Nationally the Nation's proved reserves of natural gas were increased by 20.3 trillion cubic feet in 1964, bringing total gas reserves to a new high of 281.3 trillion cubic feet.

Kansas gained in one category—natural gas liquid reserves.

That gain, unexplainable in the face of a sharp drop in natural gas, amounted to 40,745,000 barrels to give the State proved reserves of condensate, natural gasoline, and liquefied petroleum gases amounting to 209,986,000 barrels.

It is assumed that the gain was scored on the basis of availability of plants to extract the liquids, which are coproducts of three new helium extraction plants recently put into operation.

Including the extracted liquid, hydrocarbons at the end of 1964 amounted to more than a billion barrels—1,006,527,000.

Both the API and AGA figures are attained by adding to reserves of a year earlier subsequent reserves discovered during the year and plus or minus changes due to field extensions and reappraisal.

Significantly, the figures for 1964 showed that basic additions to reserves scored by new discoveries remained low at a little over 346 million barrels.

Reappraisal of previous discoveries, a matter of opinion and judgment, accounted for a total gain of more than 2.3 billion barrels. That was enough to boost the country as a whole onto the positive side of the ledger.

The API crude oil report, which alarmed conservation-minded Kansans a year ago, this year scored its third consecutive drop showing a loss of more than 10 million barrels. In 1963 the reserve loss amounted to 21 million plus and in 1962 it was 15.6 million plus.

Oil and gas reserves in Kansas, neighboring States as of Dec. 31, 1964

	Oil in barrels	Plus, minus
Kansas	796, 541, 000	−44, 808, 000
Arkansas	205, 160	−20, 131, 000
Colorado	346, 334, 000	−22, 041, 000
Nebraska	71, 101, 000	−12, 482, 000
Oklahoma	1, 585, 885, 000	−42, 253, 000
	Gas in millions of cubic feet	
Kansas	17, 278, 142	−716, 093
Arkansas	2, 100, 092	+307, 448
Colorado	1, 729, 258	−146, 799
Nebraska	93, 383	−6, 659
Oklahoma	19, 757, 235	+618, 415

GEN. WINSTON P. WILSON

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, we in Arkansas are very proud of a native son of our State who has worked his way up through the National Guard system to become chief of the National Guard Bureau. Yesterday, the New York Times paid a fine tribute to Gen. Winston P. "Wimpy" Wilson by devoting its "Man in the News" column to a "recap" of his career and his achievements. It gives me great pleasure to ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the RECORD, and thereby to draw to the attention of Senators the accomplishments of a fine public servant and a good friend of mine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. AIR NATIONAL GUARD—WINSTON PEABODY WILSON

WASHINGTON, March 30.—Maj. Gen. Winston Peabody "Wimpy" Wilson, the 53-year-old chief of the National Guard Bureau, is a friendly, quick-smiling man whose gregarious nature hides a steely determination.

He will need both—large helpings of good-humored friendliness and steely management determination—if the proposed reorganization of the Army Reserve Forces is approved in Congress.

General Wilson's bureau at the Pentagon will be responsible for the delicate needlework involved in creating a new fabric of Ready Reserve Forces from the existing National Guard and Army Reserve units throughout the country.

In the meantime, however, he has already demonstrated his capacity for sensitive assignments. He has issued two stern regulations calling for withdrawal of Federal recognition of any National Guard unit refusing membership to Negroes. And it was made known today that all of the States in the South have made at least token integration of their National Guard units.

The combination of determination and his friendly relations with southern National Guard leaders are cited by his associates as reasons for this quiet integration in the South.

General Wilson, a burly man, with a bald pate and a droopy mustache, likes to make his points with stories. Currently he is admonishing those Reserve leaders who oppose the proposed merger not to make small points at the expense of a large one.

"Like the story of two Arkansas natives who met on a small road," he says, drawing from a vast fund of anecdotes from his native State. "The first Arkansas man noticed the second had a bulge under the bib of his overalls and asked why. And the second said, 'Well, whenever I meet so-and-so, he always hits me in the chest. The next time, he'll be sorry; he'll hit this stick of dynamite and blow his fool hand off.'"

An ardent hunter, General Wilson likes to illustrate his arguments with hunting stories. To show that the obvious is often overlooked, he tells this one:

"A hunter saw his retriever dog fetch a duck by tiptoeing across the water. The hunter was astounded. The next day he invited a friend to accompany him, when the dog again tiptoed across the water to bring back the duck. But the friend said nothing. 'Didn't you notice anything peculiar?' the dog owner asked, and his friend replied, 'Yeah, that fool retriever don't know how to swim.'"

There is more to General Wilson than anecdotes, however, as his associates stress. At the Pentagon, he is known as "Mr. Air National Guard," for his achievement in bringing that force to a state of operational readiness permitting first-line defense missions.

This was demonstrated during the Berlin crisis of 1961, when Air Guardsmen were called to active duty on October 1 and were deployed to Europe and flying missions there before the month was out.

General Wilson, who had headed only the Air Guard, was named head of the National Guard Bureau, responsible for air and ground combat reserves, in September 1963. Many are saying that before long he will be known as "Mr. National Guard," in tribute from both services.

He was born in Arkadelphia, Ark., on November 11, 1911, but grew up in Little Rock and still maintains a residence there. He got his nickname, "Wimpy" at Little Rock High School when his coach called for "Win P. Wilson" to take the field, and his schoolmates ever after called him "Wimpy." He also played football at Hendrix College in Conway, Ark.

He began his military career as a airplane mechanic in the 154th Observation Squadron of the Arkansas National Guard in May 1929, and received his pilot's license in 1936. He served in the Far East and on mapping missions in South America and Alaska during World War II.

After the war, he immediately rejoined the Arkansas Air National Guard and was recalled to active duty during the Korean war, when he became acting chief and then chief of the Air Force Division of the National Guard Bureau. He has now served at the Pentagon about 19 years.

Responsible for the activities of many of the Nation's Guardsmen he has been determined to bring Reserve forces to a stage of readiness comparable with regular forces.

The general, a command pilot with more than 6,000 flying hours, finds his relaxation in flying, hunting and golfing. He resides with his wife in Alexandria, Va. His parents live in Little Rock.

EMPLOYMENT AND UNEMPLOYMENT STATISTICS

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, it is clear from the figures released today on employment and unemployment that the Nation is truly in the midst of the greatest period of economic expansion in its history. There can be no more accurate barometer of the country's economic health than the number of people who are at work, and the number of people who want to work and and cannot get it.

In March, we can note with some degree of pleasure, that there was a decline in the latter category which meant that there were 550,000 fewer jobless workers in our country than there were a year ago. The rate went down to 4.7 percent, our lowest figure in some 7½ years.

To those of us who in 1963 supported the bold and sweeping program of tax revision and reform program, there is another measure of satisfaction. It was in March of last year that the tax cut first made its presence felt in the workers' paycheck. One year later, we find, there were 1,650,000 more jobs in our economy; a record compiled over the course of 1 year. It is clear now that through well-conceived, yet imaginative legislation such as this, the Congress can play an unusually effective role in the development of a vibrant and prosperous economy. And the principal element in that role ought to relate to the business of giving a job to every American who wants one.

There is much more we can do to contribute in a like manner to that same goal. To cite just two examples, there is before us now a bill for expanding our manpower retraining program, and there is the bill for new antipoverty legislation.

Passage of both these measures is an essential element in making certain that unemployment continues its present decline.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

A BILL TO IMPLEMENT PRESIDENT JOHNSON'S PLEDGE TO SEEK NEW WAYS TO DEAL WITH THE POPULATION EXPLOSION

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, earlier this year, for the first time in American history, an American President in his state of the Union message to the Congress and to the people spoke forthrightly about the worldwide population explosion.

In 25 words President Johnson offered mankind new hope. He said:

> I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources.

By lighting a candle to dispel the darkness too long shrouding the population dilemma and its attendant problems, the President pinpointed a bitter truth. We must know the extent of our resources and their growing scarcity. We must make certain that we do not waste them ourselves, thereby depriving future generations of man's great natural heritage.

Use of our knowledge is important.

During the administration of President Kennedy, our Government took important steps nationally and internationally to learn more about population problems here and overseas. During his April 24, 1963, press conference President Kennedy said this Nation could certainly do more to increase our knowledge about the whole reproductive cycle. Such information, he said, should be made available to the world, allowing everyone to make his own judgment.

In the fall of 1963 former President Dwight D. Eisenhower expressed his fear that America's foreign aid program really could not help a nation which raises its productive capacity by 2 percent a year while the population rises 3 percent. Former President Eisenhower would not make birth-control information a condition to our foreign aid, nor would I, but he does believe we should tell nations receiving assistance how population growth threatens them and what can be done about it.

The present world population is approximately 3.3 billion. The world population growth rate is 2 percent per year.

By the year A.D. 2000 our population will have doubled to 6.6 billion persons.

Demographers project our growth rate to the astronomical figure of 150 billion people by A.D. 2150. If man multiplies to that extent, the chances are that life on earth as we know it today will have disappeared. Society will have become the repository for hunger, a lack of privacy, inadequate resources, disease, and all the debilitating afflictions man seeks to overcome.

Obviously such a cosmic calamity should be forestalled. We have the knowledge to prevent this march into oblivion—if we use it.

The population problem confronting us today is staggering. We do not need the bigger problem of tomorrow.

Two-thirds of the world is hungry.

Two billion people are unhappy with their lot, and their number increases by more than 50 million per year.

When I first discussed the population problem in my speech of October 10, 1963, here in the Senate Chamber I said:

> It does us little, if any good to provide economic or technical assistance to nations which show no concern for their population explosion.

Today, 18 months later, I am glad to report that available information proves that an increasing number of nations are concerned about their population growth. Some countries are attempting fertility control programs.

In India a United Nations Family Planning Advisory Mission requested by the Government of India on January 11, 1965, is working with the Indian Ministry of Health and the Planning Commission of India to consider development and coordination of international technical and material assistance in family planning.

Responses to a United Nations population opinion survey which began June 28, 1963, reveal growing concern by most member nations responding. An excellent summary of these replies appears in the October 1964 population bulletin published by the Population Reference Bureau, Washington, D.C.

Jamaica described its situation as one akin to "a demonstration of the race between development and population growth" with the latter in the lead. Jamaica this month is initiating a population control program.

Ceylon told the United Nations:

> The problem facing Ceylon, like other underdeveloped countries, is the acute shortage of capital * * *. The accelerated increase in population imposes a serious strain on the limited resources of the country and prevents any substantial expansion in the economy.

Tunisia said a birth control policy was under study and a campaign in favor of birth control had been launched.

Guatemala, with a birth rate exceeding 3.2 percent, reported that the development of the economy was not keeping pace.

Japan, which controlled its high birth rate after World War II largely by induced abortion, is promoting the use of contraceptives. The nation has shifted its population policy focus to "the need for improving the quality of the population through education and other social programs, and to improve the regional balance of population and economic development."

One debilitating effect of over-population experienced by the nations was unemployment. Countries reporting this dilemma were Ceylon, Pakistan, Jamaica, Jordan, Iran, Turkey, and Chile.

Population growth is a vital factor in determining the extent to which economic development and political stability will prevail in any country, especially in countries which are in the early stages of such development.

We know the need exists to review constantly the health and medical programs of the United States and other nations, particularly as they relate to the problems of population growth and health so that we may coordinate and improve them and determine the need for additional programs.

We know that in a free society information and assistance of a technical, sociological, and medical nature must be available to all upon request.

Yet any summary of what this Government has done to date in the population field will be insufficient because the information is either unavailable or uncoordinated.

We do know local communities, upon request, can receive assistance in working out local population problems under title II providing for the community action programs of the Economic Opportunity Act.

We know, too, that the Children's Bureau of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has for some time been permitting State health organizations to include moneys for family planning as part of their maternity and child welfare programs. The actual extent of that assistance to the States cannot be documented, although I attempted to learn the facts last June.

I asked Health, Education, and Welfare Secretary Anthony Celebrezze which of our States have used Federal funds for family planning and related programs and, more specifically, how much money at the State and Federal levels has been put into such programs.

On June 29, 1964, I was informed that the use of federally matched funds for family planning was entirely a matter of State discretion. Secretary Celebrezze said the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare regards the question of family planning as one for individual decision and would raise no question about the provision of such services by a physician to his patient within the normal scope of the doctor-patient relationship.

The official response I received last June is still the official response given to persons requesting identical information this year.

Consider the news stories written by Reporter Harry Ernst for the Charleston, W. Va. Sunday Gazette-Mail on January 10, 1965. Mr. Ernst, an astute journalist, begins his articles with these two paragraphs:

> Like a nervous parent mumbling about the birds and bees, the Federal Government has been reluctant to face the facts of life about birth control.
>
> Even the war on poverty, which obviously should be concerned with man's ability to outbreed his resources, has failed to produce a realistic Government policy.

Reporter Ernst was drawn into the battle by a debate in his home State about establishing birth control clinics. He reports that bureaucratic confusion in Washington, D.C., indicated that some U.S. officials actually discourage use of Federal funds for birth control clinics even though the State or a community has made such a request.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles by Mr. Ernst appearing in the Charleston, W. Va., Sunday Gazette-Mail on January 10, 1965, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, Jan. 10, 1965]

BIRDS, BEES—AND UNCLE SAM—BIRTH CONTROL QUESTIONS GET HAZY BRUSHOFF FROM AGENCIES

(By Harry Ernst)

WASHINGTON.—Like a nervous parent mumbling about the birds and bees, the Federal Government has been reluctant to face the facts of life about birth control.

Even the war on poverty, which obviously should be concerned with man's ability to outbreed his resources, has failed to produce a realistic Government policy.

Can States and local communities use Federal health, welfare and antipoverty funds to finance birth control services for families that can't afford to pay for them?

The answer is yes, maybe, according to Federal officials who really wish citizens wouldn't ask such controversial questions.

But bureaucratic confusion resulting from West Virginia's debate about establishing birth control clinics indicates that some U.S. officials actually discourage using Federal funds for that purpose.

State and county health officials say Dr. Madeleine E. Morcy, regional medical director of the U.S. Children's Bureau in Charlottesville, Va., told them that Federal health and welfare funds couldn't be used for birth control clinics.

"She also stated that last year (1963) many States included birth control clinics in their State public health plans submitted to the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW)," according to Dr. Page H. Seekford, director of the Kanawha-Charleston Health Department.

"HEW sent the plans back to these States and requested that they be rewritten without the birth control portion in the plans," he quoted Dr. Morcy.

The Kanawha-Charleston Health Department pioneered in establishing West Virginia's first tax-supported birth control clinics although it was discouraged by both Federal and State officials who denied the use of funds they control.

But Dr. Morcy's statements to Dr. Seekford later were challenged by both a spokesman for the Public Health Service here and by what apparently is the Federal Government's timid, three-paragraph white paper on family planning.

It is in the form of a letter to Senator ERNEST GRUENING, Democrat of Alaska, an advocate of worldwide family planning to prevent man from becoming what Sir Julian Huxley calls "the cancer of his planet."

In June 1964, GRUENING wrote HEW Secretary Anthony J. Celebrezze and requested information to include in a speech on the population explosion.

"It is important that the information I have be current, factual, and as complete as possible," the Senator stressed.

"To define properly the congressional role I need to know what is being done by various agencies and bureaus of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare which have programs at the State level.

"Congress, of course, authorizes and appropriates the necessary matching and grant funds. An important element in congressional policy has been the leaving to the discretion of the State the decision as to the utilization of such funds for family planning and related programs.

"Because I believe such programs are valuable, I should like to know which States have used Federal funds for family planning and programs which are related, and how much money at the State and Federal levels has been put into these programs," GRUENING wrote.

HEW's reply was a masterpiece of bureaucratic dodgeball. Celebrezze himself avoided a policy statement by having a subordinate, Dr. William H. Stewart, write Senator GRUENING.

"We have regarded the question of family planning as one for individual decision and would raise no questions about the provision of such services by a physician to his patient within the normal scope of the doctor-patient relationship," Dr. Stewart replied.

"Whether or not a State chooses to include such services as a part of the scope of medical care for which the State will pay, using federally matched funds, is entirely a matter of State discretion.

"Under the circumstances, we have no quantitative data as to the extent to which services are given to individual patients by physicians under Federal-State programs."

HEW in effect declined to give a U.S. Senator the information he requested. The Government's passion for collecting statistics makes it difficult to believe that HEW doesn't know down to the last penny how States are using Federal funds.

Dr. Stewart's reply also clashes with Dr. Morcy's earlier statements. Why would she invent a story about HEW rejecting State requests to use Federal funds for birth control clinics? As a regional officer, she undoubtedly knows the details of State budget requests far better than Dr. Stewart in Washington.

Senator GRUENING said Congress intended to let the States decide whether to use Federal aid for birth control clinics. But the statements of Dr. Stewart and Dr. Morcy indicate HEW pays lipservice to that policy while actually discouraging States from doing it.

A copy of Dr. Stewart's letter to Senator GRUENING was sent to Dr. N. H. Dyer, West Virginia's health director who doesn't think family planning should be a public health function.

Katherine B. Oettinger, chief of the U.S. Children's Bureau, informed Dyer that the Stewart letter "is an expression of our current policy in relation to this matter."

Dr. Morcy, however, told the Associated Press in Richmond, Va., that she wasn't entirely sure just what Dr. Stewart's letter means although she said it "takes precedence" over her previous statements to West Virginia public health officers.

Dr. Dyer also wasn't satisfied with Stewart's letter. He found "a clearer expression of Federal policy" in a 1942 memo from the U.S. surgeon general, which said:

"Should a State department of health decide on its own initiative to undertake a child-spacing program in accordance with the health laws of the State, the Public Health Service would give the proposal the same consideration as would be given to any other proposal in connection with the health program of the State."

The conflicting statements by Federal officials strengthened Dr. Dyer's efforts to block birth control services as a public health function in West Virginia.

"* * * It now seems likely that the official statement of Federal policy permits the expenditure of Federal funds granted to States for birth control clinic activities," he commented.

"It likewise appears that in actual practice the Federal agencies tend to disapprove of State health plans of operation if they contain provisions for birth control clinic activities."

If that's true, HEW is ignoring the intention of Congress as interpreted by Senator GRUENING and by its own actions.

Congress isn't nearly as Victorian about birth control as the executive branch. For example, it appropriated $25,000 to finance 12 public birth control clinics in the District of Columbia that began operation in April 1964.

Dr. Murray Grant, district health director, thinks the Washington program sets an important precedent. But he said continued pressure will be required to develop comparable birth control services throughout the Nation.

Logically, President Johnson's war on poverty should have stimulated Federal agencies to develop a forthright policy about the use of Federal aid to help finance State and local birth control clinics.

No restrictions against birth control services were written into the antipoverty bill although the issue was raised during congressional hearings.

But R. Sargent Shriver, Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), imitated HEW by making a wishy-washy statement that leaves birth control services dangling in the twilight zone of local initiative.

Donald B. Straus of the Planned Parenthood Federation advised Congress that the antipoverty bill gives OEO "the leadership role (and some of the means) in local antipoverty programs and in formulating guidelines to govern their overall shape and content."

Shriver said OEO would evaluate local community action proposals to determine if they propose to attack "the real causes of poverty" and if they promise "effective solution of the problems."

Such an approach, Straus said, can't ignore "the grave problem of the gap between children wanted and children born."

"This gap can only be closed when public health and welfare agencies make available to low-income Americans the same effective voluntary family planning techniques that are now available to, and extensively used by, the rest of the Nation," he observed.

"Such family programs can, indeed must, respect religious convictions by offering a free choice of techniques, one or more of which is acceptable to all faiths."

But OEO hasn't assumed the leadership role envisioned in the antipoverty legislation. It has made birth control services for the poor strictly a matter of local initiative.

"We will be willing to underwrite such programing," Shriver said, if it "meets with the consensus of approval" in communities requesting aid under the community action phase of the antipoverty program.

OEO has approved aid for family planning services in Corpus Christi, Tex., and the District of Columbia, after first rejecting the District of Columbia request while it debated what to do with such applications.

Other cities that are seeking antipoverty funds to provide birth control services include Milwaukee, Wis., and Oakland, Calif.

Such an atmosphere of agonizing timidity about birth control was challenged recently by one of the Cabinet members closest to President Johnson, Secretary of Labor W. Willard Wirtz.

"In the public forum, discussion of one large factor in the manpower area remains blacked out by a taboo," he said at a conference here last December on the manpower implications of automation.

Wirtz observed the taboo by avoiding the use of such controversial words as birth control or family planning.

"There is strong indication that a disproportionate number of the unemployed come from large families—but we don't pursue the evidence that would permit either establishing this as a fact or evaluating its significance," he commented.

"We know that almost half of the boys rejected for military service because of inadequate mental capacity and education come from families with six or more children. These military rejectees are tomorrow's unemployed. But we turn our heads away from the implications of this evidence, whatever they may be.

"We take no account of the evidence that the average income of families with five or more children is lower than the average income of families with fewer children."

Wirtz pointed out that the number of 18- and 19-year olds entering the Nation's work force will increase more this year than it did in the entire decade of the 1950's while the teenage unemployment rate already is 15 percent.

"Automation is one factor in the present employment-unemployment situation," he observed. "The tremendous growth in population is another. * * *

"Responsible, informed parenthood is relevant in any consideration of a responsible, informed position regarding manpower supply and demand."

So is a responsible, informed Federal Government that isn't afraid to encourage the birth control services which would give millions of low-income parents an opportunity to act responsibly.

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, Jan. 10, 1965]

IF WAR ON POVERTY IS TO SUCCEED, TABOOS ON BIRTH MUST BE ERASED

WASHINGTON.—"To fight poverty without birth control is to fight it with one hand tied behind the back," the Planned Parenthood World Population Organization warns.

That's what the Johnson administration has been doing although most population experts think man's rabbitlike breeding swells the ranks of the poor.

"The vicious cycle of poverty persists in part because couples on the lowest rung of the economic ladder tend to produce the largest families," Donald B. Straus of the organization told Congress.

"In 1962, 34 percent of the families with 5 children and 44 percent of those with 6 had incomes below $4,000 compared to 20 percent of the families with 2 children and 22 percent of those with 3," he said.

"Poverty begins when more children are born than families can support and than society can or will care for decently. To ignore this fact is to greatly limit the effectiveness of any attack on poverty and unemployment."

West Virginia is paying a high price in human suffering and welfare payments because it has ignored that fact.

Almost 14 percent of the State's children under 18 years old are in families that depend on welfare grants to survive—the largest percentage in the Nation (the U.S. average is 4.1 percent).

The percentage of West Virginia families receiving aid-to-dependent children (ADC) is generally below the national average for families with five or less members.

Large families on welfare are the State's specialty. Families with 10 members, for example, comprise 3.6 percent of those receiving ADC in West Virginia compared to 1.9 percent nationally.

"The poorest, least-advantaged families tend to have the most children," observed Robert C. Cook, president of the Population Reference Bureau, in a recent speech.

"Through the persistence of archaic laws and even more archaic prejudices and taboos, this sector of our population is still in bondage, deprived of the essential freedom of choice as to how many children they will bear.

"In simple justice, the freedom of choosing must be extended to those now beyond the pale of knowledge and effective decision," Cook said.

"Obviously, if the campaign against poverty is to succeed, this fundamental freedom must be assured to all people."

It isn't now. Only a dozen States and the District of Columbia now offer some birth control services to welfare or other low-income families.

The poor sometimes are berated for having so many children. But as Alvin C. Weingand, a California State senator, observed:

"In California, as elsewhere, upper and middle class families have access to birth control help and contraceptives. However, persons of lower economic and social groups, whose only medical and health care is with governmental agencies, are denied the same help."

Do the poor want such services?

"A number of recent studies have shown, with remarkable consistency, that lower income American families want as few—or fewer—children than the parents with higher incomes," Straus told Congress.

One study challenged the popular notion that families have more children to increase their welfare benefits. They want small families but simply lack information about modern methods of birth control, it concluded.

"The responsibility of the public agencies to offer birth control services is as basic as their responsibility to offer other medical services," the study advised.

"To evade this responsibility—or to place obstacles in the way of dependent families securing these services—is discriminatory and denies to welfare recipients one of the principal means of family health and progress utilized by more affluent couples.

"These prohibitions limit and to some extent even vitiate the effectiveness of programs to help dependent families to help themselves."

Planned parenthood—world population and other organizations have urged President Johnson to make birth control service a basic weapon in his antipoverty campaign.

If he doesn't, they fear the war on poverty will be about as successful as the U.S. effort in South Vietnam.

The 1962 survey of the Southern Appalachian region, financed by the Ford Foundation, warned:

"Family limitation is not sufficient by itself to enable such a region to attain economic equality with the Nation. Used in conjunction with redevelopment and migration, an effective program should enable young couples to marry at a normal age and to postpone having their families until they are established.

"Population growth thus checked is less likely to outrun economic growth and thus endanger the whole range of redevelopment plans."

The survey cited an experimental birth control project conducted in Logan County during the 1930's, which resulted in a 41 percent decline in the birth rate for coal miners' wives who participated.

"Support of the Logan County program indicates its acceptance by the families who need it most—those who are too poor to have their own family physicians and too isolated to know of acceptable means of planned parenthood," the Southern Appalachian survey commented.

"It was shown that the cost of such service can be greatly reduced if it is integrated with county public health services."

Discriminating against the poor by denying them birth control services creates needless personal tragedies. As Cook, president of the Population Reference Bureau, pointed out:

"The tragic dilemma of the unwanted child may well be the point where the conscience of the Nation focuses on the question of responsibility—not only of the individual couple but of society.

"One place to begin is to somehow develop a vivid awareness of the tragedy of the unwanted child. Along with this awareness, there will emerge a sense of the moral responsibility of those who undertake the joys and perplexities of parenthood.

"It is too late to attempt to salvage the unwanted child in the clinic and the court. The time to salvage the unwanted child is before conception.

"The freedom of decision to make this possible is basic to the war on poverty."

[From the Gazette-Mail, Charleston, W. Va., Jan. 10, 1965]

Unfounded Fears About Catholic Opposition Felt Federal Barrier

Washington.—Fear that the Roman Catholic Church would disapprove is the only explanation for the Federal Government's failure to encourage tax-supported birth control services for low-income families.

Ironically, prominent Catholics have endorsed such services and are discussing the issue frankly—something that Federal officials aren't willing to do.

Observed Representative Morris K. Udall, Democrat, of Arizona, in a newsletter to his constituents:

"It should be emphasized that the Roman Catholic Church does not condemn birth control; it raises barriers only on the methods used (it approves of the rhythm method but opposes the use of contraceptives and pills)."

Udall also pointed out that many Catholics disagree with their church's policy.

"A recent national survey found that at least 30 percent of Catholic couples used birth control methods condemned by the church. And a heavy majority of those polled hoped their church would change its attitude toward birth control.

"It should be remembered that of the 11 countries in the world with the lowest birth rates five are predominantly Catholic: Austria, Belgium, France, Italy, and Luxembourg."

The Reverend Robert F. Drinan, dean of the Boston College Law School, recently said Catholics can support tax-financed family planning clinics if adequate provision is made for methods acceptable to their church.

Clinics that instruct Catholic couples in the use of the rhythm method have been established in Buffalo, N.Y., and Chicago by voluntary organizations with the approval of the church.

"The state has the same duty which every parent has—the obligation not to bring into the world more children than a particular parent can reasonably bring up and properly educate," commented Father Drinan.

Dr. John Rock, a Roman Catholic whose research resulted in the birth control pill, offered this advice in his book, "The Time Has Come":

"The basis for an equitable public policy on birth control lies in a honest and forthright examination of where family planning fits appropriately into publicly financed programs.

"Instead of attempting to draw distinctions which are untenable, Catholics would be better advised to sit down with their Protestant and Jewish colleagues and work out the details of a sound public policy for all publicly financed programs—hospitals, health departments, welfare services, foreign-aid programs and medical research."

[From the Charleston (W. Va.) Gazette-Mail, Jan. 10, 1965]

"I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources," President Johnson said in his state of the Union message last week.

Many Americans think of the population explosion as something the Mexicans or Chinese should worry about. But some experts warn that the United States also is headed for an overpopulation catastrophe.

At its present rate of growth, U.S. population will climb from 190 million to 1 billion persons in the next century, predicts Donald J. Bogue, associate director of the population research and training center at the University of Chicago.

"Our lives may not be at stake, but our way of life and standard of living are imperiled," he points out. The population explosion "threatens to devour many of the social and economic gains which the United States has gained, and to which it still aspires."

Runaway population growth results in overcrowded schools, the need for more expensive four-bedroom housing, the cancerous spread of slums. It contributes greatly to unemployment and juvenile delinquency.

Bogue thinks the United States will have to take dramatic action to control its population growth so that it doesn't "blight the lives of our children and grandchildren."

The interpretative articles on this page analyze the Federal Government's policy affecting the use of public funds to provide low-income families with birth control services, the changing attitude of Roman Catholics toward such programs, and the relationship between poverty and family planning.

They conclude that the Federal Government has failed to provide any leadership in developing programs to curb the Nation's population explosion.

If President Johnson is going to change the Government's timid policy, he must shake up those in the Federal bureaucracy that would rather be safe than controversial, as the articles indicate.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, still some progress has been made. New York City alone has requested and received almost $1½ million through the Office of Economic Opportunity to operate clinics where women can receive birth control advice and devices. In Washington, D.C., six city clinics give free birth control information, medical counseling, and contraceptive devices to both married and unmarried women upon request. But it is difficult to determine precisely how many more American communities are receiving Federal funds to help in their local birth control and family planning programs.

We know, of course, that a number of Government agencies, particularly the State Department and the Agency for International Development, have been providing assistance on population and demographic problems to those countries which formally ask for help. However, my research indicates a need for us to let more nations know that we will respond to their requests—if they will ask. It is the old story of which comes first and we must make certain that the requests come in time—not too late.

What we have done is distressingly inadequate.

What we do wish to do, I believe, is to help our Nation and all other nations determine the extent of the population problem, to inaugurate meaningful programs, and to provide man with the technical medical and sociological knowledge for implementing self-determined policies. In some countries, particularly in Latin America and Asia, immediate help is essential. Too much stress cannot be placed on the immediacy of solving the population problems in these areas where yearly population growths range as high as 5 percent.

But right here in the United States, in our backyard, the population explosion today is creating problems.

Our Atlantic seaboard from Boston to the Carolinas is fast becoming a sprawling megalopolis with an asphalt floor.

Our Pacific coast threatens to become a huge motor slum.

Our cities are badly tended.

Constant building with its ever-present noise cannot keep up with the demand for more homes and offices. Homes today go up in the sky. A yard has become a flowerpot or two on a narrow patio. Vacant lots where children once played baseball or kick-the-can now house supermarkets or supermotels or superrestaurants.

And the building has not even really started. Think how our land will look at the turn of the century when our yearly 1.5-percent population increase will have doubled our present population of 194 million. Worse, think how our land will look, if we can see any of it, when our populations of 400 million in A.D. 2000 are 800 million in A.D. 2040.

And remember our population rate is 1.5 percent per year—not the 5.5 percent of Nigeria, nor the 5 percent of Chile, nor the 3-percent average elsewhere in Latin America, nor the 2-percent worldwide average.

The grim facts of overpopulation in the United States are brilliantly interwoven in the book, "Too Many Americans," written last year by Lincoln Day and his wife, Alice, and published by Houghton Mifflin Co., of Boston, Mass. The authors have training in research and sociology which they combine with insight and ability to analyze the statistics available and the trends predictable.

Americans marry early, have two or four children per family. They know their progeny will have a long and fruitful life.

Americans comprise 6 percent of the world's population. They consume one-half of the world's nonrenewable resources. The average American consumes in natural resources as much as 30 residents of India.

In other words—we are using up our capital rather than our interest. We are fast on our way to curbing quality and increasing quantity.

If our population growth does not stabilize, we may reasonably assume that we will lose the freedoms, privileges, and good life we enjoy today.

Our water supplies already are inadequate in many underpopulated areas. The recreation and wilderness areas we are preserving carefully today will not be used as we had hoped. Man, unchecked in growth, will need the parks for homesites, the trees of the forest for homes and furniture, pollution will be difficult to check, privacy will be impossible.

Yellowstone Park and Cape Cod National Seashore, if we save them, will be a mecca for the millions, and a family will no longer simply drive to the park or to the seashore for vacation. Lucky families will have made their reservations many years in advance.

We will experience undreamed-of crowding on the highways, in parks, on the beaches. Our public services will expand in size but offer less to the individual.

Our professional services will be increasingly impersonal and deteriorating.

As our standards decline, the urban sprawl will increase. Today's wait to try personal injury cases which requires nearly 23 months in communities exceeding 750,000 will seem short.

Perhaps I can best illustrate my fears by comparing the advantages of Alaska and its small population with California and its millions of residents. The beautiful California landscape is being covered by thousands of little boxes, called houses. In valley after valley the boxes have replaced nature's charms, are replacing the beautiful citrus groves. Once magnificent arteries of travel from which natural wonders lifted the hearts and spirits of man have now degenerated into motor slums. Even our priceless redwoods are threatened by the rising tide of population growth.

Life in Alaska, by contrast, differs from life in the older States because there the untrammeled wilderness, with all its primeval abundance, beauty, and mystery, is at everyone's door.

Now how do we insure that the health and medical programs of this country and other nations are under constant review?

How do we make certain that the information we have is available upon request to all who seek it?

My research indicates that the knowledge we have is not disseminated.

My research indicates that the research we undertake is not always coordinated.

My research suggests that unless we take the proper steps to coordinate population programs, to share the knowledge amassed by this Nation and other nations of the world in this important area, and try to help those nations and those individuals seeking assistance, we cannot solve the world population explosion. Our approach at Federal, State, and local levels must be positive, not permissive.

Therefore, I introduce today on behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], my colleague, the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT], and the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], a bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be held at the desk through the close of business April 12.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be held at the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 1676) to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GRUENING (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, similar or identical proposed legislation is being introduced in the House of Representatives by Representative MORRIS UDALL, of Arizona, and Representative PAUL TODD, of Michigan.

I have worked on this legislation for several months. I have asked more than 1,000 men and women throughout the United States to give me suggestions as to how my proposal could be most effective. The responses I have received have been most helpful and many of the suggestions made have been incorporated in the bill I have introduced. The replies afford ample evidence that men and women in the United States are concerned about the population problem and want to do something about it.

This bill—

First. Creates an Office for Population Problems in the Office of the Secretary of State which will be headed by an Assistant Secretary for Population Problems to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Second. Creates an Office for Population Problems in the Office of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare which will be headed by an Assistant Secretary for Health, Medical Services, and Population Problems to be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Third. Abolishes the present position of Special Assistant to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Health and Medical Affairs.

Fourth. Authorizes the President to call a White House Conference on Population in January 1967.

The suggested duties of the proposed Assistant Secretary of State for Population Problems are to—

First. Develop and coordinate the U.S. positions on the international aspects of population growth and the problems connected therewith.

Second. Maintain liaison with scientific organizations, philanthropic foundations, and other bodies concerned with international population problems.

Third. Make policy recommendations in the field of population growth to appropriate officials of the Government.

Fourth. Organize and direct a program for the utilization of demographic attachés in embassies and other appropriate diplomatic establishments of the United States.

Fifth. Cooperate with and utilize to the maximum extent feasible the services of the U.S. Information Service in carrying out its various duties with respect to population problems.

Sixth. Coordinate and maintain current data on all foreign population programs whether or not instituted or assisted by the United States.

Seventh. Transmit such information and other data to U.S. diplomatic personnel, as well as other interested officers and employees of the Government, as may be necessary to keep them advised of the policy and programs of the United States with respect to population problems and of their duties in implementing such policy and programs.

Eighth. Devise and recommend to the Secretary of State areas wherein demographic research may more effectively be utilized in formulating and carrying out programs to cope with population problems.

Ninth. Make available in all countries, with which the United States maintains diplomatic relations, information—through publications and other means—with respect to the grants, fellowships, scholarships, and other types of assistance available in the United States to foreign students desiring to carry on studies with respect to demographic and related problems.

Tenth. Make available to recognized scientific and medical authorities in foreign countries, upon the request of the governments of such countries, information and assistance pertaining to medical and other aspects of population growth problems.

Eleventh. Cooperate with, and seek the assistance of, interested public and private institutions, groups, organizations, and individuals in carrying out the policies and programs of the United States relating to international problems of population growth and control.

The bill specifies that the Secretary of State shall submit annually to the President and to the Congress a report—

First. Identifying and describing all programs which foreign governments have carried on in dealing with population and related problems.

Second. Containing a complete summary of U.S. activity in the field of foreign population problems, including, with respect to such problems, reports on all programs instituted or participated in by the United States and on all conferences, symposiums, seminars, or other meetings in which the United States participated.

Third. Containing such other data as may be necessary fully to inform Congress of activities, needs, and developments in the area of population growth problems.

The suggested duties of the proposed Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Health, Medical Service and Population Problems are to—

First. Review continually the health and medical programs of the Department insofar as they relate to the problems of population growth and health with a view to coordinating and improving such programs, as well as to determining the need for additional programs which relate to population growth and health.

Second. Collect and disseminate such data and material, and to perform such functions as may be necessary most effectively to serve as a liaison with scientific organizations, philanthropic foundations, and other bodies concerned with domestic population problems.

Third. Make policy determination in the field of population growth to appropriate offices within the Department.

Fourth. Coordinate and maintain current data on all domestic population programs instituted or assisted in the United States.

Fifth. Keep the personnel of the Department, as well as other interested officers and employees of the Federal, State and local governments, advised with respect to the domestic policies and programs of the Government with respect to population problems and with respect to their duties in implementing such policies and programs.

Sixth. Publish and distribute to interested persons a list of grants, fellowships, scholarships, and other types of assistance available to students and others desiring to carry on studies with respect to demographic and related problems in the United States and abroad.

Seventh. Cooperate with, and seek the assistance of, interested public and private institutions, groups, organizations, and individuals in carrying out the policies and programs of the United States relating to problems of population growth.

My bill specifies that the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare shall submit annually to the President and to the Congress a report—

First. Containing a list of all official indications to the Department of interest and requests for assistance from State and local governments in problems of population growth.

Second. Containing a complete summary of U.S. activity in the field of domestic population growth and control programs.

Third. Containing such other data as may be necessary fully to inform the Congress of activities, needs, and developments in the area of domestic population growth problems.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON POPULATION

The time has come to discuss in detail in every State of the Union the problems caused by unchecked population growth.

As I talk about population growth, America's population grows 1 person every 11 seconds, and the world's population grows 2 persons every single second, or 7,000 every hour, or 60 to 65 million every year.

America has the greatest opportunity yet in her brief history to help guide the course of humankind to a life not of misery but of human dignity, hope, and happiness.

True, this country has been involved in this problem of population for a number of years in many ways, but our involvement has been sporadic, disorganized, and too often inefficient.

But we have an unexpected and welcome ally because among the other current revolutions we are also experiencing a revolution in freedom of thought. We are now able to discuss freely important questions which for too long have been taboo. This truly is one of the heartening revolutions of our time.

A White House Conference on Population will develop recommendations for further research and action. The conference would be planned and directed by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who would be assisted by the various appropriate Federal departments and agencies.

The White House Conference on Population proposed in this bill would be called for January 1967.

Each State would receive a grant of not less than $5,000 nor more than $15,000 for use in planning and conducting a State conference prior to the national meeting. Each State would plan its own meeting but could call on the various Federal departments and agencies for assistance if it wished.

The Advisory Committee to the White House Conference on Population will be named by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. Its members will receive per diem compensation not exceeding $50. The amount authorized to be appropriated for the White House Conference on Population will be determined by the Congress.

Why should specific responsibility be charged to specific men in our Government in the field of population?

Why should a White House Conference on Population be called by the President?

The need becomes increasingly apparent in the statement of findings and the declaration of policy in the bill I introduce today.

In the statement of findings, the Congress would find and declare that—

First. The application of public health measures, and the introduction of modern medical lifesaving and life-prolonging techniques have contributed to a doubling of the annual rate of world population growth within the past 18 years, and may be expected to continue to increase rates of such growth in the future.

Second. Population growth is a vital factor in determining the extent to which economic development and political stability will prevail in any country, especially in countries which are in the early stages of economic and political development.

Third. At present because of the rapid and continued growth in population, hundreds of millions of parents are unable to provide adequately for themselves and their children.

Fourth. Those nations in which population growth is most extreme and where the problems arising from such growth are most acute are, because of economic, technical, and other considerations, also the nations least able independently to cope with such growth and the problems connected therewith.

Fifth. Past and present efforts on the part of the United States in cooperating with and assisting nations desirous of dealing with urgent population problems with which they are confronted have not been sufficiently effective.

Sixth. The President of the United States, in his 1965 state of the Union address, announced that the United States should expand and intensify its efforts to contribute to the solution of the problems connected with rapid world population growth.

And the policy of the Congress as defined is that—

First. There should be made within the departments, agencies and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government such organizational and other changes as may be necessary to enable the United States more effectively to deal with rapid population growth throughout the world and the problems arising from or connected with such growth.

Second. The United States, in dealing with such problems, should, to the maximum extent feasible, cooperate with and assist other nations, the United Nations and other international organizations, and private institutions, organizations, groups, and individuals in their efforts to cope with the problems arising out of rapid population growth.

Perhaps the greatest change in attitudes and open discourse on the population problem is taking place right now within the Catholic Church and between Catholics and others. The winds of this gratifying change are apparent.

Although the third session of the Vatican Council closed on November 21, 1964, without taking steps or making statements on the problem of population growth, Pope Paul VI directed a special papal commission established by him to make a comprehensive study of the problem. The commission subsequently brought together between 50 and 55 experts on all phases of this problem—clerics and laity, Catholic and non-Catholic. The commission will report at the next session of the council. If the council wishes to, it may make recommendations to the Pope, but in the end, only Pope Paul VI will make changes and statements. We cannot stress too much the importance of this work, or the events that have taken place in the church which permit this kind of study to take place.

The February 1965 Population Bulletin, entitled "The Vatican and the Population Crisis" contains three speeches which are in the words of the editor, Mr. Robert Cook, "important historical documents reflecting new currents of thought within the church." In addition to a statement by Paul VI and two other articles, the three brief speeches are by Cardinal Leger, archbishop of Montreal; Cardinal Suenens, archbishop of Malines-Brussels; and Patriarch Maximos IV, Sayegh of Antioch. These speeches while simple and analytical, show the deep feeling some council fathers have for the problem and the church's attending moral dilemma upon which Dr. John Rock, an eminent gynecologist and a Catholic, has commented so thoughtfully in his book "The Time Has Come."

I ask unanimous consent they appear in the RECORD as exhibit 1 at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, here in Washington, D.C., the Georgetown University population study center has been open officially since July 1963. Its principal goal is perfecting the rhythm system. The first man to see need for such a center was the late Dr. Donald J. O'Connor, a farsighted individual, an outstanding economist with whom I worked when I was Governor of Alaska. Don O'Connor as economic advisor to the Governor of Puerto Rico saw the immediate effects there of over population.

An editorial entitled "Population Planning" appearing in the January 22, 1965, issue of Commonweal discusses President Johnson's pledge "to seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources" and suggests the President's action comes because of "the great consensus throughout the world and in the United States that the economic and social well-being of the underdeveloped nations will depend, in great part, on their ability to slow down the population growth rate."

The Commonweal believes most Catholics are now inclined to agree with this consensus.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial appear as exhibit 2 at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, we must begin now to provide for a future that takes into account the growth of human numbers and how this growth affects schools, employment, hospitals, roads, teachers, parks and forests, water supply, air pollution, human affliction, health, food supply, human density, and world tension. In other words, the very things that make the difference between a decent life and a life of desolation, depression, and spiritual catastrophe. There must be awareness on the part of our peoples, direction in our policy, and a commitment to an enriched life for those who are crying for help.

The economic consequences of the present world's population growth mitigate against personal achievement and individual growth in many nations of the world.

The social, mental, spiritual, economic, political, and physical conditions of mankind are of importance to all thinking people.

There is a sense of urgency in the job to be done and the problems with which we must come to grips. John Rock wrote it succinctly in 1963 in his book: "The Time Has Come." Shakespeare wrote it poetically in "Julius Caesar":

> There is a tide in the affairs of men,
> Which, taken at a flood, leads on to fortune;
> Omitted, all the voyage of their life
> Is bound in shallows and miseries.
> On such a full sea are we now afloat,
> And we must take the current when it serves,
> Or lose our ventures.

Under Secretary of State Thomas Mann this year correctly called the population explosion the major problem of South America. The highest birthrate in the world exists in the Latin American countries.

Vision magazine on May 29, 1964, noted:

> Without the successful achievement of fantastic—and up to now unforeseeable—economic development, population growth must inexorably convert Latin America into one of the most unfortunate, miserable, and devastated regions of this planet.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Alaska, as I have done many times in the past, for the leadership he has taken in connection with the whole world and domestic problem of the population explosion. The Senator from Alaska was among the first, if not the first, to speak out on this subject in the Senate. I am delighted that he has now succeeded in acquiring a substantial number of thoughtful Senators as cosponsors of his bill. I regret that I myself have not felt free to cosponsor it. This is only because the Senator and I differ a little with respect to tactics and procedures and not because we are at variance on the broad objectives of what we believe the policy of this Government should be on this subject.

I commend him again for his energy in this regard and wish him well.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania. His modesty forbids him to say that he was the first proponent on this subject in the Senate, with his resolution in the 88th Congress asking the President to appoint a commission, which I cosponsored, so that he was really the pioneer in discussing meaningfully our population problem so far as Congress is concerned. I believe the record should accord him full credit for his priority.

Neither Latin America nor any part of this globe need be dulled, drugged, and deteriorated by the population explosion man created.

The world's population problem is "ours"—not only "theirs," not only "his," not only "hers," not only "yours." We are all involved. As Thomas Huxley wrote in 1874:

> It is futile to expect a hungry and squalid population to be anything but violent and gross.

John Donne said:

> No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main; if a clod be washed away by the sea, Europe is the less, as well as if a promontory were, as well as if a manor of thy friends or of thine own were; any man's death diminishes me, because I am involved in mankind; and therefore never send to know for whom the bell tolls; it tolls for thee.

We are all involved in mankind. We make our life, as good or as bad as we wish. We can step forward, stand still, or go backward.

The choice is ours. The National Academy of Sciences has reported:

> This problem [population] can be successfully attacked by developing new methods of

fertility regulation and implementing programs of voluntary family planning widely and rapidly throughout the world. Other than the search for lasting peace, no problem is more urgent.

In the 88th Congress I cosponsored Senate Concurrent Resolution 56 introduced by my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] which urged the President to step up population growth research and establish a Population Commission. The public response to Senate Concurrent Resolution 56 of the 88th Congress was warm and positive, convincing proof that the public often is far ahead of its elected representatives. Let us catch up with them.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of my bill be printed in the RECORD at this time.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1676) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1676

A bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the application of public health measures, and the introduction of modern medical life-saving and life-prolonging techniques have contributed to a doubling of the annual rate of world population growth within the past eighteen years, and may be expected to continue to increase rates of such growth in the future;

(2) population growth is a vital factor in determining the extent to which economic development and political stability will prevail in any country, especially in countries which are in the early stages of economic and political development;

(3) at present, because of the rapid and continued growth in population, hundreds of millions of parents are unable to provide adequately for themselves and their children;

(4) those nations in which population growth is most extreme and where the problems arising from such growth are most acute are, because of economic, technical, and other considerations, also the nations least able independently to cope with such growth and the problems connected therewith;

(5) past and present efforts on the part of the United States in cooperating with and assisting nations desirous of dealing with urgent population problems with which they are confronted have been sufficiently effective; and

(6) the President of the United States, in his 1965 state of the Union address, announced that the United States should expand and intensify its efforts to contribute to the solution of the problems connected with rapid world population growth.

(b) It is therefore the policy of the Congress that—

(1) there should be made within the departments, agencies and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government such organizational and other changes as may be necessary to enable the United States more effectively to deal with rapid population growth throughout the world and the problems arising from or connected with such growth; and,

(2) the United States, in dealing with such problems, should, to the maximum extent feasible, cooperate with and assist other nations, the United Nations and other international organizations, and private institutions, organizations, groups, and individuals in their efforts to cope with the problems arising out of rapid population growth.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE: DUTIES OF SECRETARY WITH RESPECT TO POPULATION PROBLEMS: CREATION OF AN OFFICE OF POPULATION PROBLEMS: CREATION OF OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR POPULATION PROBLEMS

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of State (hereinafter in this section called the Secretary) to:

(1) develop and coordinate the United States positions on the international aspects of population growth and the problems connected therewith;

(2) maintain liaison with scientific organizations, philanthropic foundations, and other bodies concerned with international population problems;

(3) make policy recommendations in the field of population growth to appropriate officials of the Government;

(4) organize and direct a program for the utilization of demographic attachés in embassies and other appropriate diplomatic establishments of the United States abroad;

(5) to cooperate with and utilize to the maximum extent feasible the services of the United States Information Service in carrying out his various duties with respect to population problems;

(6) coordinate and maintain current data on all foreign population programs whether or not instituted or assisted by the United States;

(7) transmit such information and other data to United States diplomatic personnel, as well as other interested officers and employees of the Government, as may be necessary to keep them advised of the policy and programs of the United States with respect to population problems and of their duties in implementing such policy and programs;

(8) devise and recommend to the Secretary of State areas wherein demographic research may more effectively be utilized in formulating and carrying out programs to cope with population problems;

(9) make available, in all countries with which the United States maintains diplomatic relations, information (through publications and other means) with respect to the grants, fellowships, scholarships, and other types of assistance available in the United States to foreign students desiring to carry on studies with respect to demographic and related problems;

(10) make available to recognized scientific and medical authorities in foreign countries, upon the request of the governments of such countries, information and assistance pertaining to medical and other aspects of population growth problems; and

(11) cooperate with, and seek the assistance of, interested public and private institutions, groups, organizations, and individuals in carrying out the policies and programs of the United States relating to international problems of population growth and control.

(b) The Secretary shall submit annually to the President and to the Congress with respect to the preceding year, a report—

(1) identifying and describing all programs which foreign governments have carried on in dealing with population and related problems;

(2) containing a complete summary of United States activity in the field of foreign population problems, including, with respect to such problems, reports on all programs instituted or participated in by the United States and on all conferences, symposiums, seminars, or other meetings in which the United States participated; and

(3) containing such other data as may be necessary fully to inform Congress of activities, needs, and developments in the area of population growth problems.

(c) There is hereby created in the Office of the Secretary an Office for Population Problems to which the Secretary may delegate such of the duties and functions set forth in section (2)(a) of this Act as the Secretary may determine to be necessary and desirable. Under the direction of the Secretary, the Office for Population Problems shall be under the supervision and control of an Assistant Secretary for Population Problems, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and who shall be compensated at the same rate as are other assistant secretaries within the Department of State.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE: CREATION OF OFFICE FOR POPULATION PROBLEMS; CREATION OF OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH, MEDICAL SERVICES, AND POPULATION PROBLEMS

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this section called the Secretary) to:

(1) review continually the health and medical programs of the Department insofar as they relate to the problems of population growth and health with a view to coordinating and improving such programs, as well as to determining the need for additional programs which relate to population growth and health;

(2) collect and disseminate such data and material, and to perform such functions as may be necessary most effectively to serve as a liaison with scientific organizations, philanthropic foundations, and other bodies concerned with domestic population problems;

(3) make policy determinations in the field of population growth to appropriate offices within the Department;

(4) coordinate and maintain current data on all domestic population programs instituted or assisted in the United States;

(5) keep the personnel of the Department, as well as other interested officers and employees of the Federal, State, and local governments, advised with respect to the domestic policies and programs of the Government with respect to population problems and with respect to their duties in implementing such policies and programs;

(6) publish and distribute to interested persons a list of grants, fellowships, scholarships, and other types of assistance available to students and others desiring to carry on studies with respect to demographic and related problems in the United States and abroad; and

(7) cooperate with, and seek the assistance of, interested public and private institutions, groups, organizations and individuals in carrying out the policies and programs of the United States relating to problems of population growth.

(b) The Secretary shall submit annually to the President and to the Congress with respect to the preceding year a report—

(1) containing a list of all official indications to the Department of interest and requests for assistance from State and local governments in problems of population growth;

(2) containing a complete summary of United States activity in the field of domestic population growth and control programs; and

(3) containing such other data as may be necessary fully to inform the Congress of activities, needs and developments in the area of domestic population growth problems.

(c) There is hereby created in the Office of the Secretary an Office for Population Problems to which the Secretary may delegate such of the duties and functions set forth in section 3(a) of this bill as the Secretary may determine to be necessary and desirable.

Under the direction of the Secretary, the Office for Population Problems shall be under the supervision and control of an Assistant Secretary for Health, Medical Services and Population Problems who (i) shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; (ii) shall be compensated at the same rate as are other assistant secretaries within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and (iii) in addition to the duties set forth herein, shall assume the duties discharged by the Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs), which latter position is hereby abolished.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON POPULATION

SEC. 4. (a) A White House Conference on Population to be called by the President of the United States in January 1967 in order to develop recommendations for further research and action with respect to population problems shall be planned and conducted under the direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who shall have the cooperation and assistance of such other Federal departments and agencies as may be appropriate.

(b) For the purpose of arriving at facts and recommendations concerning the needs for further research and action with respect to population problems, the conference shall bring together professional and lay people working in the field, and of the general public.

(c) A final report of the White House Conference on Population shall be submitted to the President not later than ninety days following the date on which the conference was called and the findings and recommendations included therein shall be immediately made available to the public.

Grants

(d) (i) There is hereby authorized to be paid to each State which shall submit an application for funds for the exclusive use in planning and conducting a State conference on population prior to and for the purpose of developing facts and recommendations and preparing a report of the findings for presentation to the White House Conference on Population, and in defraying costs incident to the State's delegates attending the White House Conference on Population a sum to be determined by the Secretary, but not less than $5,000 nor more than $15,000; such sums to be paid only from funds specifically appropriated for this purpose.

(ii) Payment shall be made by the Secretary to an officer designated by the Governor of the State to receive such payment and to assume responsibility for organizing and conducting the State conference.

Administration

(e) In administering this Act, the Secretary shall:

(1) Request the cooperation and assistance of such other Federal departments and agencies as may be appropriate in carrying out the provisions of the Act;

(2) Render all reasonable assistance to the States in enabling them to organize and conduct conferences on population prior to the White House Conference on Population,

(3) Prepare and make available background materials for the use of delegates to the White House Conference as he may deem necessary and shall prepare and distribute such report or reports of the Conference as may be indicated; and

(4) In carrying out the provisions of this Act, engage such additional personnel as may be necessary (without reference to the provisions of the Civil Service Act) within the amount of the funds appropriated for this purpose.

Advisory committees

(f) The Secretary is authorized and directed to establish an Advisory Committee to the White House Conference on Population composed of professional and public members, and, as necessary, to establish technical advisory committees to advise and assist in planning and conducting the Conference. Appointed members of such committees, while attending conferences or meetings of their committees or otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Authorization of appropriations

(g) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress determines to be necessary for the administration of this section.

EXHIBIT 1

THE VATICAN AND THE POPULATION CRISIS

(By Robert C. Cook)

At the highest levels, the Roman Catholic Church has had growing awareness of the population crisis and of related moral issues for the past 15 years at least. In 1954, when the United Nations met in Rome, the papal representative, the Reverend Father Stanislas de Lestapis, S.J., recognized explicitly the moral obligation of parents not to have more children than they could rear in sound physical and mental health.

Speaking of the need for "fundamental education" in this area, he said:

"Such a fundamental education must be persuaded, completely and before all, that choice of the number of children in the bosom of a family rests absolutely and at last analysis, the sole personal responsibility of the spouses * * * testimony especially worthy of being imitated is given by the spouses who not only take into consideration their personal welfare—health, physical, and psychic energy—but also the welfare of their children, provision for their best possible education, the welfare of the familial community and the nature of its laws of unity and order in intimacy; and finally, the general welfare of the human community, present and future."

The church undeviatingly has maintained this fundamental position that the procreation of children involves heavy moral responsibilities. The question of how to limit reproduction in a morally acceptable manner has been the stumbling block impeding progress toward solving dangerously high rates of population growth in many parts of the world. Church doctrine has sanctioned only two means of checking fertility: complete continence in marriage, or temporary continence during the fertile period (the rhythm method). Total continence is impossible for most married persons; rhythm is ineffective because the safe period cannot be determined exactly.

Since the first Vatican Council in 1961, ever-increasing population problems appear to have been on the fringes of consciousness of the assembled church fathers. Three years later, the problems had become far more than a peripheral concern. On June 23, 1964, Pope Paul VI, addressing a group of cardinals, acknowledged that the leadership of the Catholic Church could not continue to bypass the surpassingly important question of population control:

THE STATEMENT OF POPE PAUL VI

"Thus our speech takes us from looking at the present and the past to the future. And here also we face a wide panorama, full of formidable problems and great events for us.

"We will talk, in conclusion, about only one of these problems, and about only one of the events which the future prepares for us.

"The problem, everyone talks of it, is that of birth control, as it is called; and namely, of population increases on one hand, and family morality on the other.

"It is an extremely grave problem. It touches on the mainsprings of human life.

"It touches on the feelings and interests most close to the experience of man and woman. It is an extremely complex and delicate problem. The church recognizes the multiple aspects of it, that is to say, the multiple competences, among which are certainly in the forefront that of married people, that of their freedom, of their conscience, of their love, of their duty.

"But the church must also affirm her own (competence), namely that of God's law, by her interpreted, taught, favored and defended. And the church, will have to proclaim this law of God in the light of the scientific, social, and psychological truths which in these times have undergone new and very ample study and documentation.

"It is necessary to face attentively this development, both theoretical and practical, of the question. And this is in fact what the church is doing.

"The question is being subjected to study, as wide and profound as possible, as grave and honest as it must be on a subject of such importance.

"It is under study which, we may say, we hope will soon be concluded with the cooperation of many and outstanding experts.

"We will therefore soon give the conclusions of it in the form which will be considered most adapted to the subject and to the aim to be achieved.

"But, meanwhile, we say frankly that up to now we do not have sufficient motive to consider out of date, and therefore not binding, the norms given by Pope Pius XII in this regard. Therefore they must be considered valid, at least until we feel obliged in conscience to change them.

"In a matter of such gravity, it seems well that Catholics should wish to follow one law, that which the church authoritatively puts forward. And it therefore seems opportune to recommend that no one, for the present, takes it on himself to make pronouncements in terms different from the prevailing norm." [1]

Shortly before the third session of the council adjourned in November 1964, the population question was debated under schema xiii, chapter 4, paragraph 21 (On the Dignity of Marriage and the Family). Of the 19 addresses delivered on this paragraph, 3 have been released for publication. These statements, by progressive council fathers, are published here in full as important historical documents reflecting new currents of thought within the church.

The speeches are preceded by a short article by Robert Nowell which appeared in the November 7, 1964, issue of the Tablet, a weekly newspaper and review of Catholic affairs published in London, England. Reprinting of this article has generously been permitted by this Tablet Printing Co., Ltd.

In addition, this Bulletin contains a summary of a 3-day meeting on the population problem, held by the Catholic Association for International Peace in Washington, D.C., in October 1964.

A DELICATE QUESTION—BIRTH CONTROL DISCUSSED IN THE VATICAN COUNCIL

(By Robert Nowell)

So the subject of birth control was debated in the aula after all, despite the implications of Cardinal Agagianian's statement as moderator * * * that there would be no public discussion on the floor of certain points dealt with in chapter 4 of schema 13 so as to avoid possible misinterpretation and misunderstanding outside the council. After what some of the fathers had to say * * * one wonders to what extent they and their colleagues could have been more outspoken on these certain points in the written observations they were asked to submit to the commission concerned.

---

[1] The New York Times, June 24, 1964.

However, the council did not get down to discussing details. Those who were pressing for a reexamination of the church's teaching on this matter contented themselves with the broad general principles that would have to be followed. This was in keeping with the fact, of which the council fathers were reminded by Bishop Guano of Leghorn when replying to the debate on the schema in general and by Archbishop Dearden of Detroit in his introduction to the section on marriage and the family, that the Pope had reserved to himself judgment on the lawfulness of using the pill—an intricate question which could hardly successfully be dealt with in a council debate.

As was fitting, the debate opened with a strong defense of the status quo by Cardinal Ruffini, ably supported the following day by Cardinals Ottaviani and Browne. Perhaps what has really aroused alarm and despondency among upholders of the traditional teaching is the fact that, while the adnexum on marriage and the family specifically condemns artificial means of contraception and mentions the safe period as a legitimate means of family planning ("even though," it adds, "it cannot be asserted that certain very serious difficulties are already resolved by this means alone"), the schema itself skirts round the question of what means may illicitly be employed by Catholic couples in fulfilling their duty of responsible parenthood. Cardinal Ruffini found it a hard saying, and one that opened the door to all kinds of abuses, to state that the final judgment on a problem of this importance was to be left to the individuals concerned: he hoped that, in revising the text, the commission would follow the authentic magisterium found in Pius XI's encyclical "Casti Connubii" and Pius XII's address to midwives.

Cardinal Ottaviani said that the freedom the schema granted to married couples to determine for themselves the number of their children could not possibly be approved and was a doctrine unheard of in the church. He quoted the case of his own family, he being eleventh of twelve children of poor parents. In his view, the text of the schema insinuated that the church had erred in the past on a grave moral problem, and for him any such insinuation was completely out of order. He reminded the bishops of the infallibility that, according to de Ecclesia, they enjoyed as a college in what they taught on faith and morals, and warned them that they should be prudent.

Cardinal Browne advanced a distinction in conjugal love between what had been called the "love of friendship," which desired to promote the welfare of another, and the "love of concupiscence," which aimed at procuring a good for oneself: for him it was the first that assured the balance and the joy of family life, while there was a danger of the second coming into conflict with the first. (One can see what he means, of course, but surely the point is that in a happy and successful marriage the two should become inextricably intertwined.) He also reemphasized the traditional doctrine of the primary end of marriage being the procreation and education of children, while he said we should not lose sight of the secondary ends of mutual help and remedium concupiscentiae.

So much for what can be termed the conservative case on this question: for the views of the "progressive" school, readers are referred to the full texts that follow of the speeches of Cardinal Léger, Cardinal Suenens, and Patriarch Maximos IV Sayegh. In all this, one thing should be borne in mind, and that is that free and open discussion of this problem at a theological level has only just begun, and that consequently it will take some time adequately to carry through the reexamination to which these three (and other) Council Fathers have contributed.

Three Vatican Council Addresses on Marriage and the Family

I. CARDINAL LEGER, ARCHBISHOP OF MONTREAL

Problems concerning the sanctity of marriage are, in our times, one of the principal preoccupations of the church.

Doubts and anxieties about marriage are making their appearance in a great number of countries and among men from every walk of life. Many of the faithful—and often the best among them—daily encounter difficulties and look for solutions in accord with their faith, but find no relief in the answers they are given. Parish priests, particularly confessors, are assailed by doubts and uncertainty and, very often, no longer know what they may or should say in reply to the faithful. Many theologians feel more and more acutely that it is necessary to deepen in a new way the fundamental principles concerning marriage.

All this uneasiness points to the existence of a serious problem and demands of the church that she should examine the doctrine of marriage with great pastoral concern.

The question of marriage has three sides to it: the theological, the casuistic, and the pastoral. I will concentrate here on the theological side. It is, furthermore, this side which would govern all kinds of renewal in this field.

There are those who fear any renewal in the theology of marriage as though it necessarily had its origin in an opportunism that ought to be condemned: those who would see us as looking for accommodating solutions to satisfy popular demand. A renewal of the theology of marriage, if stimulated, and rightly, by the anxieties of Christian people, originates in fact with the theologians from a more complete analysis of the problems, as well as of what are in short quite recent discoveries in biology, psychology, and sociology. The final aim of this renewal is nothing other than to nurture the sanctity of marriage in a deepening of the plan of God.

Many theologians think that the difficulties that are met today in expounding the doctrine of marriage are rooted in an unsatisfactory exposition of the ends of this institution. A certain pessimistic and negative attitude toward human love has prevailed which can be attributed neither to Scripture nor to tradition but to philosophies of the past centuries, and which has obscured the importance and the legitimacy of conjugal love in marriage.

The authors of the present schema have wanted to renew the doctrine of the ends of marriage. They have taken care to emphasize the mutual love and help of husband and wife. We also notice with satisfaction that they have avoided the complex of problems which introduces an opposition between a primary and a secondary end of marriage.

However, although this schema has started off on the right foot, it is still not an adequate reply to present difficulties and has only gone half-way to answering them: it fails to present conjugal love and mutual help as an end of marriage and it in no way tackles the problem of the end of expressions of love in marriage.

This is why I would like to make some observations on ways of talking about the ends of marriage.

1. The schema expresses itself fairly well on fecundity as an end of marriage. It suitably recalls that fecundity should be regulated by prudence and generosity. It would be good, nevertheless, if this duty towards fecundity should be attached less to each act than to the state of marriage itself. It would please me also if the special dignity of parenthood were better expressed. Parenthood is in effect a participation in creation at its greatest: there is something of eternity in it, since it gives birth to a person who will himself see eternity.

2. It is absolutely imperative to propose human conjugal love—and I mean human love, where both body and soul are involved—as an end in itself of marriage, as something which is good in itself and which has its needs and laws of its own. The schema remains too hesitant on this point. It is not much use if the schema avoids the term "secondary end" but can only present love as being at the service of fecundity. In such an important matter, the clear principles should be stated. Otherwise, this fear with regard to conjugal love which has paralyzed our theology for such a long time might persist. Conjugal love is good and holy in itself and should be accepted by Christians, without any false fear, together with its needs and the laws proper to it. Isn't this mutual help and love the very things which husband and wife solemnly swear they will give each other at the time of their marriage? And unless love is declared as an end of marriage, the tie which binds husband and wife together cannot be correctly understood. The partners of a marriage consider each other, not as simple procreators, but as people loved for their own sakes.

3. It is not enough, however, firmly to establish the doctrine which looks at marriage as a state. Unless the end of the actions themselves are touched upon, in their most general principles, the difficulties which worry married couples and parish priests cannot be solved, a profound and adequate renewal of the casuistry of marriage cannot be found.

It must be affirmed that the intimate union of husband and wife has an end in love as well. And this end is the finis operis, legitimate in itself, even if it is not directed toward procreation. By this affirmation, moreover, the council will be doing nothing other than confirming by law the principles and practices which the church has approved of, as we know, for many centuries. For centuries, in fact, the union of husband and wife has been considered legitimate even when procreation has been recognized as being impossible.

Even if it does not imply anything new, the declaration of principle which I propose would be of no small importance in better determining the morality of different cases.

By way of conclusion: May this Council, without fear and without reticence, clearly proclaim the two ends of marriage as equally good and holy. Once this has been established, moralists, doctors, psychologists and other experts will be much better able to determine in particular cases the duties both of fecundity and of love.

II: CARDINAL SUENENS, ARCHBISHOP OF MALINES-BRUSSELS

I would like to make several observations on what concerns article 21, devoted to the dignity of marriage and of the family. All of us know how crucial the question of marriage, and in particular that of the regulation of births, is for the world and for the church. Consequently:

1. It seems indispensable to me to add to the text certain elements of doctrine that are to be found in the adnexa. This implies a revision of the text in order to present a doctrinal synthesis that would be at one and the same time deeper, more coherent, and more biblical. I am submitting an attempt at a synthesis of this nature in writing to the commission.

2. It seems equally indispensable to me that the conciliar commission should work in close cooperation with the commission that the Pope has very fortunately set up with a view to a broad and deep examination of these problems.

3. I hope I may be allowed to express the wish that this commission will conduct a very broad inquiry among moralists of repute from the whole world, among scholars and university faculties of differing fields of study, among lay people, both men and women, and among Christian married people. One would wish that the names of the members of this commission would be made known so that they could receive the broadest possible information and be truly representative of the people of God.

4. So that this commission may know in what spirit the council envisages these problems, it seems essential to me to formulate several fundamental guiding principles for the success of its work.

A. The aspect of faith

The first part of this commission's work concerns the aspect of faith and ought to consist of this: to inquire whether up until now we have sufficiently brought out all the aspects of the church's teaching on marriage.

Of course, there is no question of modifying or challenging the truly traditional teaching of the church. That would be mad. It is a question of knowing if we shall fully open our heart to the Holy Ghost in order to understand the divine truth. The Gospel always remains the same. But no one epoch can boast of having fully perceived the unfathomable riches of Christ. The Holy Ghost was promised us to lead us progressively into the fullness of truth.

Thus the church never has to repudiate a truth that has once been taught, but, to the extent that she progresses in a more deepened examination of the Gospel, she can and she must integrate this truth in a richer synthesis, and reveal the more complete fruitfulness of these same principles. In this way the church brings out of her treasure what is new and what is old.

Having established this, it is essential to examine if we have maintained in perfect equilibrium all the dimensions of the church's teaching on marriage. It could be that we have emphasized the saying of Scripture, "Increase and multiply," to the point where we have left obscured the other divine saying: "And the two shall become one flesh." These two truths are central, and both are scriptural: They should be mutually enlightening in the light of the complete truth which is revealed to us in Our Lord Jesus Christ. St. Paul, in fact, gave Christian marriage as an archetype the very love of Christ for His church. This "two in one" is a mystery of interpersonal communion ratified and sanctified by the sacrament of marriage. And this union is so deep that divorce can never separate those whom God Himself has united.

Thus it will pertain to the commission to tell us if we have not too much stressed the primary end, which is procreation, to the detriment of an equally imperative end, which is growth in conjugal unity.

It also pertains to the commission to meet the immense problem posed by the present demographic explosion and the overpopulation in many regions of the globe. It is the first time that we must enter on such an examination in the light of faith. The matter is difficult; but the world is waiting, in a manner more or less aware, for the church to express its thought in this field and be the light of the nations.

I hope it will not be said that we are in this way opening the way to moral laxity. We are faced with the problem, not because the Christian faithful are attempting to satisfy their passions and their egoism, but because the best among them are attempting with anguish to live a double loyalty, to the church's doctrine and to the needs of conjugal and parental love.

B. The aspect of natural morals and science

The second part of the commission's work concerns the aspect of scientific progress and a more deepened awareness of natural ethics. The commission will have to examine whether the classical doctrine, especially that of the manuals, takes sufficient account of the new insights of modern science. We have made some progress since Aristotle, and we have discovered the complexity of the reality where what is biological interferes with what is psychological and the conscious with the subconscious. New possibilities are constantly being discovered in man in his power to direct the course of nature. Hence there arises a deeper awareness of the unity of man, both in his being as an embodied spirit, and in the dynamism of all his life, a unity that is as it were the heart of Thomist anthropology: there follows equally a more exact estimation of his rational power over the world entrusted to him. Who does not see that thus we are perhaps being led to further inquiries on the question of what is according to or against nature? We shall follow the progress of science.

I beg you, my brothers: let us avoid a new Galileo case. One is enough for the church.

It will pertain to the commission to integrate new elements into the total vision and to submit its conclusions to the supreme magisterium.

And I hope it will not be said that by this new synthesis we are giving way to what is called situation ethics. It is fitting that the exposition of doctrine, which is unchangeable in its principles, should take account of contingent factors that are in evolution in the course of history. That is what was done by the Popes who successively wrote Rerum Novarum, Quadraglesimo Anno, and Mater et Magistra in order to express with greater precision the same principles in terms of a new age.

Venerable brothers, we do not have the right to keep silent. Let us not be afraid of tackling the study of these problems. It is a question of the salvation of souls, of our families as well as of the world. Let us listen to the Holy Ghost, at the same time accepting integrally every fragment of truth that He suggests to us, recalling the words of the Lord: "The truth"—both natural and supernatural, total and vital truth—"will make you free."

III. PATRIARCH MAXIMOS IV SAYEGH, OF ANTIOCH

Venerable fathers: Today I would like to draw the attention of your venerable assembly to one particular point of morality, the regulation of births.

The fundamental virtue that is demanded of us, pastors gathered in a council that wants to be pastoral, is the courage to tackle squarely the problems of the hour, in the love of Christ and of souls. Among the painful and distressing problems that today disturb the masses of humanity there arises that of the regulation of births. It is an urgent problem if ever there was one, since it is at the bottom of a grave crisis of the Catholic conscience. It is a question of a lack of alinement [decalage] between the official doctrine of the church and the contrary practice of the immense majority of Christian couples. The authority of the church is called into question on a large scale. The faithful find themselves driven to live in breach of the law of the church, far from the sacraments, in constant anguish, for want of being able to find the viable solution between two contradictory imperatives: conscience and normal conjugal life.

Then again, in the social field, the demographic pressure in certain countries, especially in large agglomerations, is in the present circumstances in opposition to any raising of the standard of life and condemns hundreds of millions of human beings to a misery that is unworthy and without hope.

The council must provide a valid solution for this. It is part of its pastoral duties. It must be said whether God truly desires this depressing and unnatural dilemma.

Venerable fathers, aware in the Lord, who died and rose again for the salvation of men, of the present painful crise de conscience of our faithful, let us have the courage to tackle it without bias.

Frankly, ought not the official positions of the church on this matter to be revised in the light of modern science, both theological and medical, psychological, and sociological?

In marriage, the blossoming out of the personality and his or her integration into God's creative plan form a whole: The end of marriage ought therefore not to be dissected into a primary end and a secondary end. This consideration opens the horizon on to new perspectives concerning the morality of conjugal behavior considered in its totality.

And moreover are we not in the right to ask ourselves if certain official positions are not to be attributed to outdated conceptions and perhaps also to a psychosis of celibates who are strangers to this sector of life? Are we not, without wishing it, burdened by that Manichaean conception of man and of the world for which the work of the flesh, vitiated in itself, is only tolerated in view of the child?

Is the external biological correctness of actions the sole criterion of morality here, independently of the life of the couple, its moral climate as a marriage and as a family, and the weighty imperatives of prudence, the fundamental rule of all our human activity?

Then again, does not modern exegesis commit us to greater prudence in the interpretation of two passages in Genesis, "Increase and multiply," and the story of Onan, which have for so long been used as the classical scriptural testimonies of the radical reprobation of contraception?

How relieved the Christian conscience felt when Paul VI announced to the world that the problem of the regulation of births and of family morality "is being considered as amply and deeply as possible; that is, in the most serious and honest way as required by such an important matter. The church must proclaim this law of God in the light of scientific, social, and psychological truths which lately have had new and ample studies and documentation."

On this, given the extent and the gravity of this problem that interests the whole world, we ask that this study that is to be made shall be conducted by theologians, doctors, psychologists, and sociologists with the aim of finding the normal solution that is essential. The collaboration of exemplary married Christians also seems necessary. Further, does it not come under the ecumenical aspect of this council to begin a dialog on this subject with the other Christian churches, and even with thinkers of other religions? Why turn in on ourselves? Are we not faced with a problem that is common to the whole of mankind? Ought not the church to open herself to the world both Christian and non-Christian? Is she not the leaven that must make the dough rise? Furthermore, it is necessary that, in this field as in all the other fields that interest mankind, she should reach positive results giving peace of conscience.

Far be it from me to minimize the delicacy and the gravity of the subject, as well as possible abuses; but here as elsewhere is it not the duty of the church to educate the moral sense of her children, to train them to a moral, personal, and communal responsibility that is profoundly mature in Christ, rather than to envelop them in a network of prescriptions and commandments and to ask them purely and simply to conform to this with their eyes shut? Let us ourselves open our eyes and be practical. Let us see things as they are and not as we would wish them to be. Otherwise we run the danger of talking in a wilderness. It is thus a question of the future of the church's mission in the world.

Let us therefore put loyally and effectively into practice the declaration of Paul VI at the opening of the second session of the council: "May the world know: the church looks upon it with a deep understanding, with a sincere admiration, sincerely disposed not to subjugate it but to serve it, not to undervalue it but to give importance, not to condemn it but to sustain it and save it."

WORLD PEACE AND THE POPULATION CRISIS

(By the Reverend George H. Dunne, S.J.)

(On October 22–25, 1964, shortly before the Vatican Council turned its attention to the population crisis, the Catholic Association for International Peace devoted a 3-day session in Washington, D.C., to "Population Growth: Threat to Peace?" A distinguished roster of speakers addressed a notable gathering of Catholic leaders. At the close of the sessions, the Reverend George H. Dunne, S.J., assistant to the president for international affairs, Georgetown University, summarized the high points of the conference. With his permission, this summary is presented herewith. It will appear in slightly different form in the proceedings of the conference to be edited by William E. Moran, Jr., and published in April 1965 by J. P. Kenedy & Sons, New York, as a volume in the "Wisdom and Discovery" series.)

Conference speakers who discussed the problem of the long-range capacity of the world's resources to support future populations agreed with Pope John XXIII that there are insufficient data upon which to reach a certain judgment. Although many authoritative sources at home and abroad contend that the world's potential resources will not be exhausted in the future, all of the conference speakers agreed that there is an immediate, grave problem of shortages in certain parts of the globe. The high rate of population growth in underdeveloped areas, virtually canceling out socioeconomic development, condemns a large part of the world to misery—at a period in history when mankind is becoming increasingly unwilling to tolerate misery.

Now, there are many who labor under the illusion that the population explosion can be solved simply by making contraceptive devices available to the multitudes and teaching the multitudes how to use them. If nothing else, I think the conference papers demolished this myth.

Dr. Bernard Berelson, vice president of the Population Council, was the most optimistic in anticipating great success in limiting population by employing contraceptive devices, specifically the intrauterine coil. He believes that a large proportion of people everywhere want family planning and that they want it now. If they were able to realize their desires in this respect, he said, "a good deal of the population problem would disappear."

Father Robert Drinan, dean, Boston College Law School, did not agree. He pointed out that in vast areas of the world, such as India, the desire for family planning is anything but widespread. It would be an imposition, he said, to attempt to persuade these people to resort to contraception.

There was a more discouraging—or perhaps a more challenging—revelation by Dr. Irene Taeuber, senior demographer, office for population research, Princeton University. She stated that even if the fertility rate were halved in the next 35 years, the population of south Asia would still double itself in those same years. This alone is enough to open our eyes to the many perplexing aspects of the population problem. Obviously, much more is involved in finding a solution than a mere reduction of the fertility rate.

Dr. Herbert Ratner, physician and educator from Oak Park, Ill., warned us that we had better be sure we know what we are doing before we destroy the family patterns and relationships of other peoples. Nearly all of our speakers made this point. They all are aware and, I hope, have made us more aware of how complex this problem really is. Such awareness should lead to determination on our part to mobilize all our forces to attack it more vigorously.

Actually, we did not expect a solution to result from this conference. We had very modest ambitions. We simply hoped to broaden our understanding—to really begin to realize how great the dimensions of the population problem really are. Certainly Father John L. Thomas, professor of sociology, University of St. Louis, did just that when he said:

"Clearly what is needed * * * is a thorough reinterpretation, based on Christian premises of values, of the personal and social significance of human sexuality, together with a careful restructuring of the various relationships relevant to its meaningful development, expression and regulation."

Father Thomas remarked that "no single discipline is adequate for dealing with the complex phenomena involved," and called for the contributions of religion, philosophy, and the various medical and social sciences, adding:

"Yet the point that I would emphasize is that the essential challenge of modern population trends is not primarily explosive numbers or scarce resources but the reformulation of cultural implementation of a conception of human sexuality consonant with the destiny of the person and the needs of society under modern conditions."

Demographers can be—and have been—wrong, but, if there is uncertainty about the long-range future, there can be no uncertainty about the immediate problem of population. A million people do sleep in the streets of Calcutta, and people do live on a mountain of garbage in the slums outside Lima, Peru. And slums do continue to proliferate throughout Latin America and many other parts of the world.

While the search for more reliable and acceptable means of population control must go on, it is essential, as Dr. Taeuber said, that massive efforts be made to hasten the socioeconomic progress of the underdeveloped countries. In this respect, Dr. George Shuster, assistant to the president, Notre Dame University, urged that Catholics can and should "help to improve as rapidly as possible the basic economic and social conditions which breed human despair."

While the experts—theologians, demographers, sociologists, and economists—search for the answers to the problem of population growth, the rest of us can throw our support behind every measure which attacks poverty at home, or which, under the auspices of the United Nations or the U.S. foreign aid program, contributes to socioeconomic developments abroad. To educate American Catholics to this responsibility is a formidable task in itself. Dr. Shuster has suggested that the Catholic Association for International Peace might undertake such a program of education as one of its projects. He said further:

"The point of focus * * * is the secondary school, in which social studies ought to include not only what is relatively easy and even pleasant; namely, some course work in what are termed non-Western or world cultures, but a quite explicit and searching concern with the problems of economic and social development. If there were no other reason for advancing this suggestion, it would suffice to point out that sending heroic men and women to developing countries is sheer waste, in every sense other than bearing witness to the faith of the church, unless the tasks to which they are committed are understood. But there are other reasons in plenty. One of them is that the graduates of Catholic secondary schools—or Catholic youngsters in other schools—will be gravely disadvantaged in discussion unless they are adequately prepared."

Mention of foreign aid, of course, raises the question of public policy. Mr. William Moran, dean, School of Foreign Service, Georgetown University, presented an illuminating outline of the history of the U.S. Government's transition from a "that's-not-our-business" attitude to its more enlightened present policy. This current policy was clearly stated by Mr. Richard Gardner, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organization Affairs. Mr. Gardner cannot see anything in present U.S. policy which could prevent Catholics from supporting it in good conscience. He said the United States, through the United Nations, will make available information and technical assistance to those countries requesting it, but will not supply them with contraceptive devices.

Dr. Calvert Dedrick, Chief, International Statistical Programs Office, Bureau of the Census, said that in Latin America, one of the areas where the population pressure is most critical, there are strong, deeply rooted cultural forces which defeat efforts to limit fertility. He told us that most Latin Americans, particularly in the rural sections, want large families. The husbands regard many children as proof of their masculinity, and the wives are proud to have virile husbands. Eventually, it may be possible to change such cultural attitudes, but not easily or soon.

Meantime, the problem intensifies. Dr. Dedrick called attention to other factors in Latin America—early marriage; the large youthful population swelling the unskilled labor force; and "a taboo on the discussion of sex and procreation." If Dr. Dedrick's analysis of all of these factors is correct, the contraceptives being offered to Latin Americans will not be very effective because the people do not want them.

Even though it might distress some of my friends at this conference, I confess to being one of those who has hoped that the oral contraceptive, or the pill as it is generally described, would become a morally acceptable method of bringing population growth under reasonable control.

It is my belief that the immorality of most contraceptive devices lies in the fact that they prevent the sex act from proceeding to its normal culmination. The end of a thing being its nature, in the Aristotelian sense, such an intervention is therefore against the nature of the act itself. In my opinion, the pill does not intervene in the sex act; it merely fosters certain conditions permitting the act to proceed to its normal end, although conception—because of the absence of ova—will not ensue.

I am not a professional moralist, and the professional moralist probably would tear me to tatters. I have hoped the professional moralist eventually would come around to my viewpoint, agree with me upon the validity of the distinction I make, and thus morally justify the use of the pill.

However, after listening to the papers presented at this conference, I am better educated and I now realize that the pill alone will not solve the problem. In answer to a question from the floor, Dr. Berelson conceded that oral contraceptives have not proved to be entirely acceptable in the pilot projects to which he referred in his paper, but he was most hopeful about future results.

I, for one, cannot see why we, as members of a pluralistic society, cannot support this policy.

According to Dean Moran:

"We have twice as many people as we had a little over 60 years ago on this globe, but we have them on a smaller, more interdependent globe, where they are more aware and where what they do may threaten our peace and security * * * because we now have so many more people, we are going to have more—how many? No one can really tell but the base is bigger, and 2 times 4 is bigger than 2 times 2. Our capacity to control death has thus far been greater, cheaper, and easier than our capacity to increase the production of the wherewithal by which the people who did not die might live better."

Father Drinan summarized existing dilemmas in both U.S. domestic and U.S. foreign programs concerned with population control, as they relate to Catholics. In conclusion, he said:

"In thinking of the problems associated with an exploding world population it might be very helpful if Catholics would begin by considering both the principle that responsible parenthood is a moral imperative and the commitment which the church has made to respect and honor the religious liberty of all men. If Catholic thought on fertility control commenced with these two moral principles it might result in judgments substantially different than many of the conclusions enunciated by Catholics up to this point in the ongoing worldwide debate regarding what humanity should do to prevent its own suicide by overpopulation."

We convened to hear suggestions about avenues that should be explored in seeking solutions, and also to be forewarned about undesirable avenues which would lead only to moral, sociological, or psychological culde-sacs. I think we have achieved those objectives.

EXHIBIT 2

[From Commonweal, Jan. 22, 1965]

POPULATION PLANNING

In his state-of-the-Union message, President Johnson said that it would be the aim of his administration "to seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources." This passage in the message was short, but its implications are wide-ranging. President Eisenhower, one recalls, specifically rejected the idea of Federal funds being used to aid foreign countries in coping with population pressures. President Kennedy approached the matter somewhat less gingerly. In 1963, he lauded the fertility studies being conducted by the United Nations and the National Academy of Sciences, and, going one step further, approved a memorandum of Secretary of State Dean Rusk informing foreign aid missions that the United States would be receptive to requests for some forms of aid in population planning. Now it would appear that President Johnson is going to allow the Government to play an even more active role.

Why has the Government gradually shifted its position in the past few years and, specifically, why is President Johnson apparently confident that increased population planning aid will not set off a domestic political reaction? The most plausible answer is doubtless the great consensus throughout the world and in the United States that the economic and social well-being of the underdeveloped nations will depend, in great part, on their ability to slow down the population growth rate. But of equal significance, from a political point of view, is the fact that most Catholics are now inclined to agree with this consensus; thus a major source of opposition has lessened. Two signs of a change in Catholic attitude are suggestive: In Latin America, reportedly, the Catholic hierarchy has cooperated in population study projects underwritten by American foreign aid funds; at home, in a related issue, the use of Federal funds to establish a few birth control clinics in cooperation with municipal governments has not elicited strong Catholic opposition. Clearly Mr. Johnson has sniffed a change in the direction of the wind and plans to act accordingly.

To be sure, there has been some Catholic opposition to the President's intention as expressed in the state of the Union message. Msgr. John C. Knott, of the Family Life Bureau of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, felt compelled to deny that the church has changed its position on the immorality of artificial contraception and to recall the 1959 statement of the American bishops, which said that "Catholics will not support any public assistance, either at home or abroad, to promote artificial birth prevention." There is little reason to think that the bishops have changed their position on this point. But then neither can it be doubted that Catholics have become far less vocal in their opposition; not support, but tacit acceptance is probably now the prevailing mood. Monsignor Knott also derided the expression "population explosion" as unscientific. Many demographers would agree with him on this semantic point, but there are very few who would accept his judgment that any prediction beyond the next 10 years is pure speculation. And there are very few who feel that the present generation can afford to ignore the present projections, however subject they may be to unforeseeable changes.

There will be no short cuts to a decent standard of living for this generation and those to come. A reduction of population growth, no matter what means are employed, cannot be accomplished overnight. Nor would such a reduction, taken by itself, solve the vast economic and educational problems facing the underdeveloped nations. For all that, there is an urgent need for research and for the coordination of all those groups and nations concerned with population. The President proposes to throw more Federal resources behind these needs. It is hard to see how he can do otherwise; and it becomes increasingly hard to see on what grounds Catholics can oppose his decision.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alaska yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I yield with pleasure to my friend the Senator from Texas.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. I desire to commend the distinguished Senator from Alaska for the able speech he is making, for the information he is bringing to the Senate, and for the thoughts he is advancing.

Mr. President, I believe that the problem which the Senator from Alaska has touched on is at the bottom of the reason for so much poverty on this earth. Populations all over the world are outracing the growth of their industrial resources. In South America, I know that there are some populations which are increasing at the rate of 5 percent a year. As the population growth increases, the per capita average will be lower and lower and lower each year. Consequently, unless something is done about population growth through intelligent methods to solve the economic ills of the world, I can see nothing but trouble ahead for the human race.

The Senator from Alaska is making a most intelligent, perceptive, and enlightening speech, and I hope that it will be read all over America. I congratulate him for his leadership on this problem.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my name may be added as a cosponsor on the bill with the other Senators whose names the Senator from Alaska has read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank my friend, the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], for his valuable assistance, and for his not unexpected remarks, which are always in the public interest, as I have listened to them in the 6 years I have been fortunate enough to be in the Senate with him.

Mr. YARBOROUGH. The Senator is very kind and I thank him for his comment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GRUENING. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I commend the distinguished Senator from Alaska for his forthright statement and his courage in a field which has far too long been declared to be politically taboo; namely, the field of population control. I question what will happen to our way of life if we do not face realistically the problem of the population explosion. I invite the attention of every Senator to the problems we face with respect to crime and social unrest in our great urban areas, in particular the problem of juvenile delinquency.

Time and time again we have been faced with the situation of a young boy, technically a juvenile, that is, one under the age of 18, who becomes delinquent, and we seek to find the reason for his delinquency. When we look back in the record, we often find that the youngster has no recollection of having had a father, or that he grew up in surroundings in which he was not wanted, or in a family where he was one of many children who were not wanted.

To be specific, several weeks ago I was making a study tour through the District of Columbia Receiving Home for Children. I talked with some persons in the home about a young boy who was a truant. The boy had been absent from school a great many times. When he was in school, time after time his teacher would notice that the boy was sleeping in class.

A study of the case showed that the little boy was the eighth child in a family with no father. There was only one bed for all eight children. The boy, the youngest boy in the family, was forced to sleep on the edge of the bed, and every so often, all during the night, he would be bumped off onto the floor.

The problem of population control relates directly to the problems of our great cities, our slums, our rootlessness, our social disorganization, our juvenile delinquency.

Recently the New York City Youth Board decided to test the basic philosophy of the Glueck Social Prediction Table. They wished to test how closely related the juvenile delinquency rate was to the factor of a stable family life, whether a child enjoys the affection and supervision of a father and a mother, and particularly a father. They made an exhaustive comparative study of 500 delinquent and nondelinquent boys. It was an interesting study, conducted over a long period of time.

In one area, the Bronx, which is a constituency of the distinguished junior Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY], young boys were studied as they enter the first grade and they were studied all the way up to the time they reach the age of 18. Predictions were made as to what would happen to those young boys, in the area of delinquency or the commission of crime, based upon the social environment or the background of a boy as he entered the first grade. The results bear out the point which I believe the distinguished Senator from Alaska and many other Senators have tried to make, namely, that when there comes into the world a child who is not wanted and who is not planned for, serious trouble and social unrest are invited. One particular case which I should like to discuss involved a little boy who was called by the name of Dennis James—though, as with other case histories, the name is fictitious. Dennis was given no chance for survival based upon the social factors of his environment. The social factors basically were whether or not the boy had a stable family life, whether or not he had a mother and a father who loved him and gave him affection, and discipline, things which every child needs, and deserves.

I should like to read for the record a portion of that case study as it was reported in the New York Times magazine of January 31, 1965, in an article by Mr. Julius Horwitz, because I think the facts stated speak louder than words. We are referring now to the youngster whose name, for the sake of the article, is Dennis James. Mr. Horwitz stated:

> His first year of school started with a prophetic boom, for nothing in his existence had prepared him to accept school, to feel that school was important. This is his teacher's observation in the first grade: Dennis' behavior is impossible. He is a terrible fighter. He does not work. He can't sit with the rest of the class. He can't be put in line with another child. He seems to resent being told what to do. He just looks at his teacher with a blank stare.
>
> Why should a 6-year-old boy look at his teacher with a blank stare in the wonder world of polished desks, books, a green-tinted blackboard, chalk, crayons, a record player, the scrubbed faces of other children?
>
> This is what the caseworkers reported: Dennis never saw his father. He vanished before he was born. Dennis never asked about his father. He doesn't know what a father is. The mother works. Dennis is supervised by a 67-year-old woman in the south Bronx. The mother works in a bakery. Dennis is more affectionate toward his mother than she is to him. What is the cohesion in the home? There appears to be no yelling or screaming. What marks did Dennis get on the social prediction table? Supervision by mother, 57.5, discipline by mother, 82.9; cohesion of the family, 61.3; total, 201.7; or an 89.2 probability of becoming delinquent.
>
> Why is there no rating for the father?

In this instance, as in so many other instances, the father is only the impregnator. He vanishes. He wants no responsibility for his acts. He is never around to give his little boy a Bible, to buy him an ice cream cone, to take him to the zoo, to tell him what is right or wrong, or to give him any guidance, any love.

The differences in the accuracy of the predictions of nondelinquency, because of a stable family life as between the white and the colored children were most interesting. The predictions were 100 percent accurate with relation to the white children and only 93 percent accurate with relation to the Negroes. It was interesting to note that in relation to cases in which the predictions were not accurate with respect to the colored children, in three of those cases it was because a grandmother moved in and saved the child from the probable consequences of being rejected at an early age.

The problem of population control, family planning, and the giving of information and knowledge to people hits home in the United States. We do not have to go to Europe, to South America, or to Asia or Africa; we see it here in the heart of any of our great cities.

I commend the distinguished Senator from Alaska for his fights in this area. He is making great progress. I believe there are changes. I hope that before long we shall have a complete recognition of the responsibility to give out family planning information and to help particularly our own people who are ignorant, and who do not even realize in many areas and in many cases the facts of life insofar as the reproduction of the species is concerned. I am hopeful that before too many months go by we shall face up to the problem realistically and make some real progress in this area in our own great cities with respect to the problems of social unrest, slums, juvenile delinquency, and related areas.

Mr. GRUENING. I thank my friend the junior Senator from Maryland for his very valuable contribution to this discussion. He has introduced the human factor, the personal factor, the specific case, the individual tragedy, which is so closely related to the whole problem. I welcome his assistance in a good cause. He is a cosponsor of the bill. He was one of the first persons who came to me when I was discussing the subject and said he wanted to cosponsor the bill. He has given a great deal of thought to this field. His assistance is most valuable, and I am very grateful to him.

I am hopeful that we may hold hearings on the proposed legislation, and that we may get favorable action on it during the 89th Congress.

THE MESS IN VIETNAM—IX

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, the Saturday Evening Post is admittedly a magazine with conservative or perhaps middle-of-the-road leanings and reflects the moderate views of great numbers of our fellow Americans. All the more interesting then and significant that in its current issue—that of March 27—it carries a most revealing article on the mess in Vietnam entitled "Vietnam: Where Do We Go From Here?" by Stanley Karnow. Its subtitle says:

> More and more Americans are being killed, and almost every battle plan has been tried.

While this article is factual, it reveals most tellingly what confusion and folly are being compounded incidental to our military presence there.

The article concludes with the sentence:

> And a weary young American diplomat told me, "I'm all mixed up. We work a 12-hour day, go home to a couple of drinks and ask ourselves—what the hell are we doing here?"

That is perhaps as pertinent a question as is being asked today. Why are we there? We are there because of an unhappy folly bequeathed us beginning with John Foster Dulles, whose role as Secretary of State was in many respects disastrous, and because subsequently two Presidents, John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, have unfortunately taken the mistaken advice of Secretary McNamara and other war hawks and have gotten us into a tragic mess, the solution of which becomes daily more difficult.

We should never have gone into South Vietnam in the first place, after the French defeat with its 175,000 casualties. We should never have stayed in, and we should now, as I have urged, and as has the distinguished senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], for over a year, make every effort to wage peace as actively as we have waged war. We have violated section 33 of the United Nations Charter. We supported, in violation of the 1954 agreement, the refusal of the South Vietnam Government to hold the elections scheduled for 1956. We should withdraw on as honorable terms as possible, but withdraw we should, as far as our military activities are concerned. Our security is in nowise imperiled by what happens in Vietnam. Only if it were would our military involvement be justified.

The war in Vietnam will never be won by military means. It is a civil war in which we have, regrettably, taken the least popular side, have installed and supported puppet governments with little popular support, and, in consequence of the intensification and escalation of military action, have brought about the death of over 300 Americans and countless Vietnamese, including women and children. We have now made it our war, abandoning the earlier premise that we were there merely to help South Vietnam maintain its independence.

I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Saturday Evening Post, entitled "Vietnam: Where Do We Go From Here?" be printed at this point in my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. GRUENING. Mr. President, I likewise ask unanimous consent that an excellent article entitled "War With China: Why U.S. Policy in Asia Is Wrong," by Hans J. Morgenthau, the noted political scientist who is director of the Center for the Study of American Foreign and Military Policy at the University of Chicago, be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

VIETNAM: WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

MORE AND MORE AMERICANS ARE BEING KILLED, AND ALMOST EVERY BATTLE PLAN HAS BEEN TRIED. AT THE CENTER OF THE CHAOS STANDS AN EXTRAORDINARY U.S. AMBASSADOR

(By Stanley Karnow)

Some of the children wore jungle camouflage uniforms, and some held dolls, and all of them had name tags tied to their clothes. One boy, with shaggy hair and a rumpled sport shirt and a bewildered look in his eyes, carried a large Chinese junk under his arm. Shepherding them aboard the waiting aircraft at Saigon's Tan Son Nhut Airport were the mothers with hastily wrapped bundles and packs of spare diapers. These were the 1,819 dependents of American officials and soldiers, being evacuated from South Vietnam last month in an emergency airlift that President Johnson called "clearing the decks." One of them, 13-year-old Stephen Sutherland, was typically cool about the operation. "Life," he said as he boarded a plane for Hong Kong, "just isn't going to be adventurous any more."

The evacuation clearly marked the beginning of a new phase in the long and ugly war in Vietnam. For months, indeed years, the United States had been failing to win a war it had pledged to win. Despite about 25,000 American troops serving as advisers to the 200,000-man Vietnamese army, despite U.S. aid and supplies, despite unchallenged control of the sea and skies, increasingly large areas of Vietnam had fallen to the Communist Vietcong guerrillas. As a time of decision seemed to near, Russia's new Premier Aleksei Kosygin flew into the North Vietnamese capital of Hanoi—just as President Johnson's chief security aid, McGeorge Bundy, was visiting Saigon. But if there was any hope that these high-level visits heralded a negotiated settlement, those hopes ended in a crash of explosives—a Vietcong raid that killed eight Americans near Pleiku; American retaliation with a bombing strike in North Vietnam; another Vietcong attack that killed 20 GI's, and yet another American bombing.

The unexpected raids on North Vietnam easily achieved their military goals, but, as one U.S. general put it, "you cannot solve South Vietnam's problem outside its boundaries." And across the world the danger of a bigger war brought new appeals for a settlement. Pope Paul warned that "the hour is grave," and pleaded that "innocent populations be spared," while U.N. Secretary General U Thant appealed to both sides to move "from the field of battle to the conference table."

In this continuing dilemma of how to win or end the Vietnamese war, the American most intricately involved is a tall graying officer who combines the unique qualifications of combat hero, scholar, experienced negotiator, and former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Yet when he gave up the Nation's top military job to become U.S. ambassador to Saigon 9 months ago, Gen. Maxwell Davenport Taylor knew that the problem confronting him was nearly insoluble. He remarked rather wistfully, "I am expendable."

Taylor's appointment was almost preordained, for Taylor himself played a large part in planning the present American strategy in Vietnam. Originally he had been one of General Eisenhower's most daring combat commanders. He parachuted into Normandy at dawn on D-day, the first American general to fight in France. In Italy he slipped behind enemy lines on an intelligence mission to Rome—running risks that were, Eisenhower wrote afterward, "greater than I asked any other agent or emissary to undertake during the war." As U.S. Army Chief of Staff, however, Taylor fought President Eisenhower's plan to reduce Army strength and to rely primarily on nuclear weapons. Resigning in 1959, he wrote "The Uncertain Trumpet," outlining the strategy of "flexible response" as an alternative to "massive retaliation." His thesis attracted John F. Kennedy, as did Taylor's impressive scholarship. The Pentagon, after all, boasts precious few generals who subscribe to the Berlin "Tagesspiegel" and Paris' "Le Figaro," or read Greek tragedies in the original for relaxation.

Following Kennedy's election, Taylor became his special military adviser, and in late 1961 he went out to Vietnam to assess the growing Communist insurgency there. Taylor saw that routine police operations were doomed to fail. He recommended a broad military, economic, and political counterinsurgency drive, to be sustained by U.S. money and weapons, thousands of advisers and hundreds of American-piloted helicopters to make the Vietnamese Army mobile. And with this program—a winning program, official publicists called it—the United States made its large-scale plunge into Vietnam.

The U.S. mission in Vietnam today is the most formidable American "peacetime" establishment ever assembled abroad. As his deputy, Taylor has no less a figure than Deputy Under Secretary of State U. Alexis Johnson, an unruffled Far East veteran who ranks fourth in the State Department hierarchy. Taylor's military executive is a rugged, gung-ho combat officer, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, former superintendent of West Point and, at 50, the second youngest four-star general in the U.S. Army.

Taylor's operation covers an extraordinary range. There are Vietnamese-speaking analysts of Communist tactics, and experts in pig breeding, well digging, housing, and hygiene. There are surgeons and schoolteachers, accountants, mechanics and even disc jockeys, to keep up morale. Ordnance technicians are testing such esoteric weapons as high-velocity Armalite rifles, weird needle-bombs and infrared cameras that peer through camouflage. Undercover operatives staff a dozen secret networks with James Bond labels like Smiat, for special military intelligence, or the apparently innocuous central registry detachment, which supposedly spies on spies.

The United States pours almost $2 million a day into this effort. It takes the shape of aircraft, tanks, guns, and ammunition. It also finances imports of medicine, milk, gasoline and other products, sold locally to raise the cash that pays South Vietnamese officials and an armed force now expanding to 600,000 men. As one American economist puts it: "The war is Vietnam's biggest dollar-earner." Nor is there, on public record at least, any end to U.S. aid. When he arrived in Saigon in early July, Taylor told Vietnamese officials, "I'm here to assure you of our unstinting support. There is no time limit in that commitment."

But doses of American money, equipment, know-how, gallantry—and blood—have not arrested Vietnam's steady slide downward. On the contrary, Communist rebels are stronger, more pervasive than ever, while the country's leadership fragments in a despairing confusion of internecine rivalries. Factious politicians, army officers, students, Buddhists, Catholics and others, seemingly unconcerned with the Vietcong threat at their gates, whirl in a chaos of intrigue and violence.

If there was ever the chance for a fresh start in Vietnam, it was after the collapse of the regime of the dictatorial President Ngo Dinh Diem (the Post, Dec. 21–28, 1963). But the inexperienced military leaders who overthrew Diem had no positive plan for running the country or winning the war. And the United States, maintaining a hands-off policy toward Vietnam politics, made no strenuous attempt to manage or coach them. Ambassador Henry Cabot Lodge, for example, did little more than persuade Gen. Duong Van Minh, the reluctant chief of state, to deliver some public speeches.

Nor could American officials keep up with Vietnamese political maneuvers. Late in January 1964, when a goateed young field commander named Gen. Nguyen Khanh turned up in Saigon, rumors spread that he would stage another coup d'etat. But his American military adviser, a colonel, reassured the U.S. Embassy that Khanh was merely visiting his dentist.

A couple of nights later, however, Khanh telephoned Ambassador Lodge to announce that he was indeed staging a coup in 3 hours. "What could we do?" recalls a U.S. diplomat involved in that hectic night. "If we'd tried to stop him and then he succeeded, we'd have been in the doghouse. So we just went along with him."

Like Diem in previous years, Khanh became "our boy." Washington set out to bulwark him with more money, equipment, and manpower. Defense Secretary Robert McNamara took him on a barnstorming tour. Indeed, so much depended on him that McNamara said, "If Khanh goes, the United States will need a new Secretary of Defense."

It was largely to hearten Khanh, too, that President Johnson picked America's top general as ambassador when Lodge decided to join the presidential campaign at home. As originally conceived, Taylor's task was to "hold the fort" in Saigon until after the U.S. elections, then turn it over to Deputy Ambassador U. Alexis Johnson.

Taylor's relationship with General Khanh started coolly, however, and soon degenerated into undisguised hostility. Status and age divided them. Taylor was a general when Khanh was still in high school. Until a short while before, Taylor had managed the world's greatest arsenal. He wears 10 rows of ribbons, testimony to a brilliant war record. Khanh was a soldier in the French colonial army that lost a war fighting against Khanh's own people.

Their dissonant personalities aggravated the difficulty. Taylor, fashioned by 40 years of Army life, leans to formality; Khanh is gregarious, talkative, vain. Taylor's aloofness congealed Khanh as much as Khanh's swagger repelled Taylor. They settled into addressing each other as "your excellency," and Khanh once quipped, "Ambassador Taylor is so much older than I am that we can't twist together."

The relations between them were further frayed by apparent contradictions in U.S. aims. Taylor's first serious clash with Khanh, last July, arose over the issue of escalating the war into North Vietnam. For months Washington had repeatedly hinted at enlarging the conflict. President Johnson warned Hanoi against playing "a deeply dangerous game," and U.S. Air Force Chief of Staff Gen. Curtis LeMay declared that "we're swatting flies when we should go after the manure pile." When Khanh made similar statements to a Saigon crowd, however, Taylor clamped down on him in several terse talks. His honor bruised, Khanh retreated, muttering that Vietnam was "independent" and "free in its actions."

Somewhat later, when Khanh tried to create a dictatorship, Taylor assented, saying he favored moves "to strengthen the government. * * *" But after Khanh's attempt resulted in bloody riots, Taylor confided to Washington reporters that Khanh "is a very impetuous young man (who) frequently has overshot his capabilities * * * in the political field."

Khanh eventually yielded to a civilian government but kept control of the army. Yet his bitterness toward Taylor persisted. Predictably, the Khanh-Taylor tensions erupted again in a full-scale crisis in late December.

With surreptitious skill, Khanh had mobilized a group of young officers into dissolving the High National Council, a shaky pillar of the latest civilian regime. This time Taylor dropped all avuncular pretense and turned back into a four-star general. He summoned the young Vietnamese soldiers to his office and berated them. Then, in an angry conversation, he flatly told Khanh to leave the country.

Khanh riposted with equal fury. He accused Taylor of meddling in Vietnam's internal affairs, adding, "If he does not act more intelligently, the United States will lose southeast Asia and we will lose our freedom."

Eventually, Vietnamese and American officials patched up a compromise of sorts, but it brought no stable government to Saigon. At one point Khanh staged another coup (the fourth in the 15 months since Diem's downfall). But no sooner had Khanh installed a new cabinet of his own choice (the ninth post-Diem regime) than rival officers launched another coup against Khanh. The general beat off that threat—only to find himself voted out of office by the Armed Forces Council, which also demanded that Khanh leave the country.

If Taylor had political problems, his military situation was no better. It was not for lack of American talent. The U.S. military chief, General Westmoreland, is an eagle-faced ex-Eagle Scout with superb combat credentials—"one of the best soldiers in the business," as Taylor rates him. Severe, abstemious and energetic. Westy blends epic courage with perennial self-betterment. On a jungle strip in central Vietnam recently, he sat upright and unflinching as Vietcong gunfire ripped into his light aircraft. His comment later was typically terse: "I learned a lesson about airfield security."

But U.S. advisers are baffled by the behavior of their Vietnamese wards. When rebellious Vietnamese battalions rumbled into Saigon for a coup d'etat not long ago, four American advisers went along, totally unaware that they were headed for mutiny. At the same time, a U.S. Ranger captain on an operation nearby was suddenly abandoned as his Vietnamese unit rushed off to join the revolt.

Under the ground rules, the Vietnamese need not heed U.S. counsel—and they often exercise that prerogative. Sweeping an area 35 miles north of Saigon recently, a government battalion fell into a Vietcong ambush. Despite vigorous U.S. urging, the Vietnamese area commander declined to send help. The trapped unit fought its own way out, leaving 4 dead and 25 captured. "We argued all night, but it was like talking to a wall," an American officer recalled. "That colonel had the lines drawn on his map, and he wouldn't change them for anything."

In southern Chuong Thien Province soon after, a government infantry battalion walked into a similar Vietcong snare. Of its 300-odd men, 20 were killed and some 200 captured, an American sergeant among them. "Why were they caught?" growled a U.S. general. "Because they don't send out advance patrols or watch their rear and flanks. Of course we try to tell them. We beg, cajole, plead. We cry, we stomp, we even bring them ice cream. But we haven't succeeded."

A mood of distrust, mingled with frustration and bewilderment, gnaws at senior U.S. officials, Taylor among them. The indefinable feeling of doubt has, almost instinctively, impelled the U.S. mission to drift away from the Vietnamese, to adopt a vast, detached life of its own. For every American in the field, there are six or more in Saigon.

In part, the gigantic American headquarters was imposed by Washington, which seems to equate strength with size. But it also mirrors Taylor's own inclination for large staff setups.

Taylor observes a tight, busy schedule. He gets to his fifth-floor office at 8 a.m., lunches sparingly on a sandwich or Metrecal, and works until early evening. In contrast to Lodge's solitary, often secretive tactics, Taylor relies on his staff. He plays tennis once or twice a week with junior employees, carefully reads their memorandums, and frequently interrogates them on details.

With its accent on discipline, Taylor's Pentagon approach has also eliminated adventurous but valuable nonconformists. One tough ex-officer, who first parachuted into Vietnam during World War II, knew the Vietnamese leaders so intimately that one night last September he personally dissuaded a rebellious Vietnamese general from staging a private revolt. That initiative, along with other unconventional gestures, earned him a quick transfer to Africa. Said one of Taylor's deputies, "We don't want any Lawrences of Asia."

Like a chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Taylor presides over a weekly meeting of the U.S. political, military, aid, intelligence, and information chiefs. Drawing from an agenda, this "Mission Council" may discuss ideas for, say, a new currency exchange rate, or radios to reinforce psychological warfare.

"Staff it," says Taylor if the suggestion seems plausible, and it goes to a lower echelon committee composed of different U.S. agency delegates. A week or more later the committee returns to present a prepared project for the council's verdict—or what is called "concurrence or nonconcurrence."

American concurrence is not enough, however. A Vietnamese council must also agree, and in joint sessions with U.S. representatives, it almost always does. "After that," explains an American official, "we're in the mysterious Orient. The Vietnamese come back to tell us what we want to hear—that our 'psywar' radios are converting the peasants, or they're growing giant aspidistras with our fertilizer. We never really know, but we've deluded ourselves into believing that we've accomplished something."

Cumbersome and ambiguous as it is, the whole process is further marred by intramural U.S. bickering. "We criticize the Vietnamese for their rivalries," says a high-ranking U.S. officer, "but our own agencies are not setting an ideal example."

Indeed, each American agency is promoting itself. The CIA handles certain paramilitary groups that the U.S. military claims it can manage better. State Department officials question CIA intelligence evaluations, while CIA agents moan that their reports are ignored. Civilian AID operatives resent military intrusion into economic and social programs, and there is even squabbling within the military itself. American Air Force officers charge that armed U.S. Army helicopters are too fragile for attack operations. Statistics on damaged choppers, an Army colonel counters, are "deliberate lies put out by the Air Force." In chairmanlike fashion Taylor can arbitrate rivalries—until they break out again.

Back in 1961, when he first surveyed Vietnam, Taylor foresaw that his recommended counterinsurgency program "might not be sufficient." In that case, he envisaged some supplementary form of action against the Communists beyond South Vietnam's borders. But not until last fall, as Vietcong pressure mounted and the Vietnamese regime floundered, did he finally regard it as imperative to enlarge the war.

On a visit to Washington in late November, Taylor suggested two operations to President Johnson: (1) Retaliatory forays into North Vietnam for Vietcong terrorism against Americans or attacks against U.S. installations; (2) air strikes against supply lines and staging areas in Laos, possibly phasing into hits on such North Vietnamese targets as bridges and powerplants.

The President was cautious. He worried "about the consequences of getting American troops into a war with 700 million Chinese." "And when a brigadier general can walk down the street in Saigon and take over the government without firing a shot," he also said, "I don't know how much offensive we're prepared to launch."

After a full-dress review of the situation, however, President Johnson conceded in principle to limited escalation—on condition that the Vietnamese generals and politicians in Saigon stop wrangling. In his view, it made no sense to attack the north if the south wasn't stable.

Returning to Saigon, Taylor conveyed that message to the Vietnamese. The rival generals continued their intriguing. Buddhist leaders fasted to protest against what they called U.S. political interference, and students rioted, shouting, "Down with Taylor" and "Taylor go home." They rampaged through the streets of Saigon, encircling the U.S. Embassy and smashing the U.S. Information Agency's windows.

Taylor's anger at the mess was evident when a visitor asked him, "What do we do if some future Saigon government invites the United States to leave South Vietnam?" Without hesitation, Taylor answered, "We leave."

But the United States had no intention of being forced out of Saigon. And out of that determination evolved the feeling that whether or not the South Vietnamese government was stable, some kind of action would have to be taken against the north. Messages went back and forth between the U.S. Embassy in Saigon and the White House until President Johnson gradually came around and told Taylor the United States would attack the north "on the next appropriate occasion." As Taylor has since explained, "Once that decision was reached, all that was required was a circumstance that justified reprisal. The Vietcong handed us the chance at Pleiku and again at Quinhon, and every time it's handed to us again in the future we are going to hit back harder and harder and harder."

Taylor had not been given a blank check, however. His request for air strikes was significantly reinforced by the fact that McGeorge Bundy was on the scene and visited Pleiku after the attack. Caught up in the atmosphere of blood and tension, he supported Taylor's appeal to Washington. But it is clear that President Johnson very much wants to limit strikes on North Vietnam and avoid "a wider war."

Yet the quandary remains, a quandary for Johnson, for Taylor, and for America itself. Rarely in their history have habitually buoyant, self-confident Americans confessed to such perplexity, uncertainty and despondency. "I've found the situation here more complex than I ever visualized it would be," says General Westmoreland. "The political dimension and psychological flavor have been a revelation." And a weary young American diplomat told me, "I'm all mixed up. We work a 12-hour day, go home to a couple of drinks and ask ourselves—what the hell are we doing here?"

EXHIBIT 2

WAR WITH CHINA?—WHY U.S. POLICY IN ASIA IS WRONG

(By Hans J. Morgenthau)

It illuminates the many misunderstandings that beset our Vietnam policy that in order to criticize that policy in public one has first to justify one's right to do so. The

President himself has declared such criticism to be unhelpful and even damaging. A former President has supported him, and many eminent men interviewed on television and elsewhere have at least implied that to support these policies was the only decent thing to do under the circumstances. This position is incompatible both with the principles of democracy and the requirements of sound policy formation.

The Constitution assigns to Congress the right to declare war. How can Congress discharge this function if its Members and the citizens who have elected them are precluded from discussing the merits of the issues which might lead to war? The Constitution implies that Congress has a choice in the matter of war. How can it make that choice if neither it nor the people it represents have the right to debate the issues? To say that the most momentous issues a nation must face cannot be openly and critically discussed is really tantamount to saying that democratic debate and decision do not apply to the questions of life and death and that, as far as they are concerned, the people have given carte blanche to one man.

Not only is this position at odds with the principles of democracy, but it also removes a very important corrective for governemntal misjudgment. Would Great Britain have been better off if, in the months preceding and following the outbreak of the Second World War, Churchill had kept quiet and rallied behind Chamberlain, however disastrous he thought his policies to be? The Chamberlain government was driven out of office in the midst of war; was it the duty of the opposition to keep quiet and rally behind it? Should the German Reichstag have kept silent in 1917 instead of passing a resolution asking for a peace without annexations? The German Government of the day indeed thought so, but history showed that the parliamentary opposition had better judgment than the Government. In the years preceding Pearl Harbor, this country engaged in a great debate about the best foreign policy to follow. Did the country not benefit from this clarification of the issues and was its later unity not in good measure founded upon it?

Two main arguments are advanced in favor of the proposition that the people should rally behind the President and not criticize his Vietnamese policies. One is that only the President has all the facts and therefore only he has the right to judge. The truth is that nobody has all the facts and nobody needs them all. What both the President and his critics need and have are the relevant facts, and what they need more than anything else is sound judgment. No one man can have a monopoly of that judgment. More particularly, the President cannot have it under present conditions.

It must be obvious to anyone who is acquainted with the President's principal advisers that the most powerful advice he gets seeks the extension of the war, and that it is hardly anything more than his innate good sense that has thus far prevented these advisers from carrying the day completely. The President ought to welcome, rather than regret, those voices from Congress and the public at large which give arguments and support to his sound instinct. The President would no doubt have personally an easier time of it, but only in the short run, if his Vietnamese policies were not exposed to criticism. Yet what the President must seek is not the convenience of one day but the approbation of history for all time to come. President Johnson is as conscious of his historic mission and of his place in history as any of his predecessors. Why, then, does he in this instance not practice what he knows to be right?

The answer to this question is to be found in the other argument in favor of silently rallying behind the President. It is the conception of consensus. Certainly the political health of the Nation and the effectiveness of government are greatly enhanced when the policies of the Government are supported by the great mass of the people. But consensus is a means to an end, not an end in itself. Here is one of the differences between a totalitarian and a democratic society. In the former, dissent is a moral vice and a political crime by definition and, conversely, consensus is the ultimate good. In a democracy, the ultimate standard is the soundness of policy for the support of which popular consensus is sought.

The democratic statesman is faced with an inevitable dilemma if he cannot get popular support for the sound policies he would like to pursue. He will choose the easy disastrous way out if he sacrifices sound policies on the altar of a fleeting popularity. If he chooses to pursue the policies he deems to be right against the opposition of the popular consensus, he must seek to change the consensus in favor of his policies in order to be able to pursue them. Doing this, he risks domestic political failure, but if he succeeds domestically, he will gain the immortality of a great statesman.

George Washington knew how to resolve this dilemma of democratic statesmanship. He proclaimed the neutrality of the United States in the War of the First Coalition against revolutionary France in 1793, while the popular consensus fervently wanted him to join France in that war. For weeks, crowds roamed the streets of Philadelphia clamoring for Washington's head, and John Marshall reports in his biography of Washington that if a motion for Washington's impeachment had not been tabled in Congress, it would have passed with an overwhelming majority. Yet if Washington had made consensus the ultimate yardstick of his policy, he would have gone down in history as the wrecker, not the father, of his country.

TWO DIFFERENT ANSWERS

A critical assessment of our involvement in Vietnam must start with the question, Why are we involved in Vietnam? Spokesmen for our Government have given two different answers. One answer is implicit in the Secretary of State's often repeated statement that our military mission in Vietnam will end when North Vietnam leaves its neighbor alone. In other words, we are in Vietnam in order to protect the independence of a sovereign state. Once that sovereignty is assured we can go home. It follows from this position that we would not presume to control the way in which that sovereignty might be exercised. If, for instance, the Vietcong should take over the government in Saigon without support from the North or if a South Vietnamese government should come to an understanding with the North through which the country would be united under Ho Chi Minh, we would not intervene.

The other answer to our question has been most clearly formulated by the Secretary of Defense when he said on February 18 that "the choice is not simply whether to continue our efforts to keep South Vietnam free and independent but, rather, whether to continue our struggle to halt Communist expansion in Asia." It is the same answer Senator DODD has given at length in his Senate speech of February 23. This answer is tantamount to saying that we shall oppose communism in South Vietnam or wherever else we find it in Asia, by military means if necessary. In other words, we shall contain communism in Asia, as we have contained it in Europe. Other official spokesmen, such as Undersecretary of State Ball in his speech of March 16, have expressed the same thought less concisely by defining our mission in Asia as the defense of freedom; that is, of non-Communist governments, against communism.

It is obvious that these two positions are irreconcilable. For if one takes the Secretary of State at his word, then we are engaged in a limited undertaking which could be liquidated through a negotiated settlement without too much difficulty. If Hanoi made a gesture toward noninterference in the affairs of South Vietnam, we could find a formula which would allow us to disengage ourselves from South Vietnam. If, on the other hand, one takes the Secretary of Defense at his word, then we are engaged in a global crusade against communism which we must fight wherever we find it. Consequently, there is no possibility for a negotiated settlement, and we shall stay in South Vietnam as long as communism threatens to expand in Asia; that is, indefinitely.

There can be no doubt, on the basis of external and internal evidence, that the position of the Secretary of Defense is at present in the ascendancy in our Government. It is with that position, therefore, that I am here concerned. I am emphatically opposed to it on two grounds: because of the intellectual errors from which it derives, and because of its likely consequences.

The intellectual errors of that position are two: misunderstanding of the nature of contemporary communism; misunderstanding of the policy of containment.

We are in Asia in order to contain communism. But what do we mean by communism? To answer that question we must take a critical look at the two equations that provide the implicit foundation for our Asian policies. On the one hand, we have equated communism with the power of China; on the other hand, we have equated communism anywhere in Asia with Chinese communism. Yet what has been true of the Soviet Union in Europe has proved to be true also of China in Asia: that the basic direction of her policies is determined primarily by her traditional national interests, and that communism only adds a new dynamic dimension to the means by which those policies are to be achieved. In other words, the fundamental fact in Asia is not that China has a Communist government but that she has resumed her traditional role as the predominant power in Asia. That that power has been restored under Communist auspices is the only relevant fact for our anti-Communist crusaders. Yet it is but of secondary importance to the nations of Asia which, from Japan to Pakistan, behold with awe and admiration the new Chinese power and try to come to terms with it.

The identification of Asian with Chinese communism is similarly the result of the crusading opposition to communism as a political philosophy and a way of life. Such identification is justified in philosophy and ethics, but it has no place in foreign policy. For it is an obvious fact of experience that in the conduct of our foreign policy we are not faced with one monolithic communism, but with a number of different communisms whose character is determined by the character and the interests of the particular nation embracing it. Thus we find in Asia, as elsewhere, different kinds of communism whose relations to China and the Soviet Union range all the way from complete independence to complete subservience. To treat all these communisms alike on the assumption that they are all equally subservient to either China or the Soviet Union or to both is the height of doctrinaire folly. In its intellectual debility, it is no different from the doctrinaire excesses of a vulgar Marxism which sees the capitalistic world as a monolithic monster bent upon the destruction of communism.

Not only is such an attitude of indiscriminate hostility intellectually untenable, but it also precludes any possibility at diplomatic maneuver, subtle bargaining, and tolerable accommodation. In other words, it renders impossible the conduct of a foreign policy worthy of the name. One only needs to consider in the light of such opportunities for creative diplomacy the present relations among the United States, the Soviet Union, China, North and South Vietnam in order to see how self-defeating this doctrinaire crusading attitude toward communism is. Instead of bombing North Vietnam because we don't know what else to do, we would at least have a chance at bending the situation in southeast Asia to our rationally defined interests if the President were advised by a Richelieu, a Talleyrand, a Bismarck or—why go abroad?—a Hamilton.

FOREIGN POLICY CURSE

Alas, the President of the United States has no such advisers. Instead, he is advised "to continue our struggle to halt Communist expansion in Asia," regardless of its character, its aims, its relevance to the interests of the United States. For such simple-minded conception of the enemy, the complexities and subtleties of diplomatic manuever hold no promise. It needs an instrument as simple, indiscriminate, and crude as itself, and it has found such an instrument in the policy of the peripheral military containment of China. Here we are in the presence of the other intellectual error that dominates our Asian policy.

It seems to have been the curse of our foreign policy since the end of the Second World War that it has become the victim of its own success. The Marshall plan was eminently successful in Europe, and so we have fashioned a global policy of foreign aid on the assumptions of the Marshall plan. The policy of containment was eminently successful in Europe, and so we have extended it to the rest of the globe.

Yet the factors which made the policy of containment a success in Europe are present nowhere else and least of all in Asia. First, a line could be drawn across the European Continent which clearly delimits the western borders of the Soviet Empire. Second, two armies face each other across that line of demarcation, which is guaranteed symbolically by the presence of American troops and actually by the nuclear power of the United States to which the Soviet Union is vulnerable. Third, to the west of that boundary there lies an ancient civilization which was but temporarily in disarray and proved itself capable of containing Communist subversion. These factors add up to a threat which is primarily military in nature and to be countered primarily by military means. None of these factors are present in Asia.

The threat here is not primarily military but political in nature. Weak governments and societies are exposed to Communist subversion, which may or may not be an extension of Chinese power, as Chinese power may or may not be carried abroad by communism. Military containment has no bearing upon such a threat. Thus SEATO has been irrelevant to the expansion of Chinese influence into Indonesia and Pakistan. More particularly, China can, in the present state of her development, be hurt but not destroyed by nuclear weapons.

But even if the threat emanating from China were primarily military in nature, it could not be contained through the defense of accidentally selected local outposts at the periphery of China. For since the ascendancy of China in Asia is due primarily to its cultural and political predominance, it is futile to think that one can contain that predominance by militarily defending South Vietnam or Thailand. That Chinese predominance is as much a fact of life as is American predominance in the Western Hemisphere, and our attempts to contain Chinese predominance in Asia through local military operations is about as sensible as would be China's trying to contain the American predominance in the Western Hemisphere by committing her military forces in defense of one or the other of the Latin American countries.

Whoever wants to contain American predominance in the Western Hemisphere must strike at the very sources of American power; he must destroy that power itself. The same conclusion applies to the containment of China. Thus the policy of the peripheral military containment of China leads with logical necessity to war with China. Such a war cannot be fought with even a remote chance for success from the air and the sea; it must be fought and won where the sources of Chinese power lie, that is, on land. It must be fought as Japan tried to fight it, from 1932 to 1945, without ever coming close to winning it.

It is beside the point that all our leaders, past and present, even those who have deemed a war with China inevitable, have recoiled from the idea of sending millions of American soldiers to the mainland of Asia to fight. President Eisenhower said on February 10, 1954, that he "could conceive of no greater tragedy than for the United States to become involved in an all-out war in Indochina," and General MacArthur, in the congressional hearings concerning his dismissal and in personal conversation with President Kennedy, emphatically warned against sending American soldiers to the Asian mainland to fight China. We are here concerned not with the intentions of statesmen but with the inevitable consequences of their policies. None of the statesmen who made the fateful decisions in July and August 1914, could have looked back in November 1918, on the European scene and said, "I planned it that way." Yet what happened in Europe during the First World War was the inevitable result of what statesmen decided at its beginning, without wanting or even imagining the consequences. As Mephistopheles said to Faust: "At the first step you are free, at the second you are a slave."

In Vietnam today, we are in the process of taking that fateful first step. At the moment of this writing, at least, our policy is still ambiguous. On the one hand, it seeks to create a position of strength from which to negotiate. There is an ominous similarity between this attempt to fashion somehow out of the wreckage of a lost war a favorable negotiating position, and the French policies leading to the surrender at Dienbienphu. General Navarre's last offensive also sought to establish favorable conditions for a negotiated French withdrawal, and the concentration of the French forces in strong points like Dienbienphu was to serve the protection of those armed forces from uncontrollable guerrilla actions. Is Danang destined to become the American Dienbienphu? And if it is, shall we follow the French example and withdraw, or shall we go forward until we encounter China? It is here that the ambiguity of our present policy comes into play.

The extension of the war into North Vietnam can be interpreted as an attempt to create in Hanoi the psychological precondition for a negotiated settlement. But it can also be interpreted as an attempt to change the fortunes of war in South Vietnam by rupturing the assumed casual nexus between the policies of Hanoi and the victories of the Vietcong. This casual nexus is a delusion, which has been given the very flimsy appearance of fact through the white paper of February 28. A policy derived from such a delusion is bound to fail. Yet when it has failed and when failure approaches catastrophe, it would be consistent in terms of that delusionary logic to extend the war still further. Today, we are holding Hanoi responsible for the Vietcong; tomorrow we might hold Peiping responsible for Hanoi. "At the first step you are free, at the second you are a slave."

To call attention to these implications of our present policies has nothing to do with pacificism, isolationism, appeasement, and softness on communism. The difference between calling attention to these implications now, when we have still the freedom of choice, and of stumbling unawares deeper and deeper into a morass from which there is no retreat, is the difference between prudence and recklessness; between a rational, discriminating understanding of the hierarchy of national interests and the power available for their support, and a doctrinaire emotionalism which drowns all vital distinctions in the fervor of the anti-Communist crusade.

France owes more to Mendes-France who liquidated the Indochinese War, and to De Gaulle who stopped the fighting in Algeria, than to those who wanted to continue fighting without regard for the limits of their country's interests and power. Those few who warned Athens against the Sicilian expedition, which was to become the grave of Athens' greatness, were better patriots than its promoters. To point to the likely consequences of present policy is, then, not only a right, which ought not to require apologetic assertion, but it is also a duty, burdensome yet inescapable.

COOPERATION BETWEEN AGENCY FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND CREDIT UNION NATIONAL ASSOCIATION

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, January 1965 marked the beginning of the fourth year of cooperation between the Agency for International Development and CUNA International, the worldwide association of credit unions, formerly known as Credit Union National Association. Many of my colleagues in the Senate know of the accomplishments of credit unions in the United States. In my own State, there are well over 300 credit unions, with some 215,000 members, providing the traditional facilities of a safe place to save and a low-cost source of loans.

The rapid growth of credit unions in the United States is now being matched by equally as impressive growth in underdeveloped countries. In the last 27 months, 250,000 Latin Americans have become credit union members. Today there are more than 1,200 credit unions with 375,000 members in Latin America. Savings have increased more than threefold since September 1962, now totaling $14.7 million. This figure is all the more remarkable when it is recalled that the credit union members are the poor—those who had no savings at all before they joined a credit union.

These and other points were made by the Honorable Herbert J. Waters, Assistant Administrator for Material Resources, AID, in a speech delivered recently before the executive committee of CUNA, International, in Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the speech, entitled, "The Co-op Way to Economic Development," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CO-OP WAY TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

I appreciate—and welcome—this opportunity to speak to you today. Over the years—as an associate of our new Vice President, HUBERT H. HUMPHREY—and as Assistant Administrator for Material Resources in the Agency for International Development—I have had a long and close relationship to the cooperative movement in the United States. I have learned to appreciate the enormous contribution cooperatives had made to social, political and economic development here at home.

Is it not logical, then, to expect cooperatives and cooperative institutions, to make a significant contribution to the attainment of similar objectives in the developing countries?

No other American institution is more suited for export to other countries. No other American institution is better equipped to demonstrate how economic growth and political democracy can develop hand in hand.

To the farmer, to the worker in an underdeveloped land, a cooperative can offer the first exhilarating experience in self-determination. He can become an active participant—for the first time—in the shaping of his own destiny. By his own efforts—and in concert with his friends and neighbors—he can own a home—he can be master of his own acreage—he can learn the meaning of self-government. The cooperative can be—and is, in fact, proving to be—the community center of training and experience in social, political and economic democracy in the developing nations.

Based on his deep convictions—convictions reinforced by personal observations made in this country and abroad, the then Senator HUMPHREY sponsored an amendment to the Foreign Assistant Act—a history-making step forward in U.S. foreign policy. In 1961 he proposed, and the Congress enacted, an amendment that proclaimed it to be "* * * the policy of the United States to encourage the development and use of cooperatives, credit unions, and savings and loan associations."

That has been our mandate in the Agency for International Development—and we have welcomed it.

We have welcomed this opportunity to establish a partnership with the great American cooperative organizations. We hope our contribution will continue to assist you in the work so well begun in mid-1950 when CUNA—on its own—started large scale efforts to help the people of many countries to help themselves to achieve a better life—the co-op way—in dignity, democracy and freedom.

The late Winston Churchill once characterized foreign aid efforts of the United States as "* * * the most unsordid act in history." He could have just as correctly been describing your own unselfish efforts to encourage self-help measures among the people of the developing nations. And, self-help is the key to development—for we do not intend to extend aid to those who are unwilling to help themselves. We do not intend to provide an economic crutch to those who do not commit their own resources to their own development—through self-help measures.

India provides an excellent example of this principle.

The United States puts up about $400 million in aid to India. Other nations put up roughly $600 million—a total of $1 billion—a lot of money, making India the largest aid recipient in the world. But, a lesser known fact is that India herself is contributing 80 percent of the resources going into her own development—$4 billion. And she does this through savings and investment by her own people.

Since a nation is only a composite of each of its citizens, Indians throughout their country must practice thrift and effect savings.

And thrift means more than hiding savings under a mattress, or burying coins under a tree.

Thrift requires positive action if it is to be meaningful. It is an essential part of the process of generating capital—for wise use—for sound investment—for expanding productivity. But more, thrift exemplifies private ownership—it represents freedom of choice—it may even represent freedom itself.

This is where CUNA's activities make their greatest contribution. For credit unions not only mobilize the small savings of large masses of people—credit unions free their membership from the traditional and ubiquitous usurer—the enslaving loan shark who hasn't got a chance where credit is available at reasonable rates.

Still, this is but part of the message—this is but part of the contribution that credit unions are making in the developing nations—just as they have done since the days of Edward Filene in the United States and Alphonse Dejardins in Canada.

CUNA's contribution to development is much broader and has even greater impact. For the strength of a credit union is not measured only in terms of its monetary assets—important as they are. Its greatest value is its contribution to the growth and development of its members—its practical demonstration of democracy at work—its development of leaders from among its membership—its demonstration of private enterprise as a means of attaining social, economic, and political freedom.

And CUNA has played a dynamic role in these developments.

Last month marked the beginning of the fourth year of cooperation between AID and CUNA—an association that has resulted in the extension and acceleration of credit unions in the developing countries. Since our first agreement in 1962—the agreement to develop credit union systems in Latin America—we have broadened the scope of our partnership—in January 1963—to include all our regional areas.

This has been an association in which you may take justifiable pride.

As of last December, your activities have led to the organization of over 800 new credit unions in Latin America—with more than 600 awaiting charters. In this 27-month period, the ranks of individual credit union membership have been augmented by 250,000 more thrift-minded people. Today, there are more than 1,200 credit unions with 375,000 members in Latin America. From September 1962 to December 1964, savings held by Latin American credit unions have increased at a phenomenal rate—from $4.2 to $14.7 million—in excess of a threefold increase.

When you consider that the average annual income of the membership ranges between $80 and $100, I feel sure you will agree with the aptness of my use of the word "phenomenal" to describe this growth rate.

In the last 2¼ years, loans to members increased from $4 to $19 million.

The multiplier effect that credit unions have on the development of a community and its people becomes readily apparent when we consider the uses that are made of these credit union loans.

They have been used to start small businesses; to finance farm and home improvements; to provide seed capital for marketing cooperatives; and for family uses.

Each of these loans has a dramatic story all of its own to tell.

In Peru, the poor people in the isolated jungle town of Iquitos, not far from the headwaters of the Amazon River, have shown how a credit union can influence an entire community's growth and perspective. Organized in the poorest section of the town, the credit union is now the largest in Peru. It has more than 3,500 members, deposits approximate $1 million, and has started a building boom by financing low-cost housing projects among its members.

In a more personal vein, a peasant woman in Arequipa near the Chilean border, exercised her credit union membership rights by borrowing the equivalent of $22—not a significant sum—but nevertheless, an amount of money sufficient to enable her to buy three used beds for her nine children—the first time any member of the family had slept off the ground.

There are other examples of opportunities opened by credit unions—a loan permitting a young lawyer to pay for his license to practice—a newly licensed dentist to buy his equipment—a mechanic to open his own tire recapping shop.

Credit unions also expand people's knowledge. They act as training centers, teaching people with limited economic experience a basic understanding of economics, bookkeeping and perhaps even more importantly, the one man—one vote credit union rule teaches—for the first time, in many cases—the basic democratic principles of equality.

Credit unions are also bringing people and their communities out of isolation. They are being brought into the mainstream of their country's economic life, where their thrift is having a profound impact as they become an integral part of their country's development.

Part of your remarkable progress is directly attributable to these education and training programs you conduct—programs designed not only to instill technical competence—but also to develop local leadership.

I find it very impressive, indeed, to learn that you have provided some 220,000 man-hours of training to more than 4,000 volunteers in 121 seminars throughout Latin America.

We in AID have found that our investment in credit union proliferation has paid handsome dividends in Latin America. Reports indicate that for every dollar of technical assistance spent, $40 in new capital is being raised from people who seldom, if ever, used financial institutions of any kind. Our investment in this program is uncovering dormant capital and putting it to productive, nation-building use.

This, then, is where we are today.

I would now like to share with you our plans for working with you to help organize additional credit unions in other parts of the world as part of our overall aid efforts.

Feasibility surveys for credit union development or service programs were recently completed in Asia—India, Pakistan, and Iran being the most prominent. Proposals for Korea and the Philippines are now pending. In time, I would hope to see all our regions taking active part in the AID–CUNA partnership so that it will truly become a global program.

Toward this end, plans are also being developed to establish three credit union training centers in Africa—one in the eastern part of the continent, probably Tanzania—another in Nigeria to train West Africans—and another for French-speaking peoples, probably in Tunisia. We will be looking to CUNA to participate by providing its best technicians in a joint effort to help train local leadership in this noteworthy self-help development program.

The eastern regional training center and program is scheduled to start this spring, under the leadership of Mr. Jack Dubin who has already spent 2 years in the region on funds provided by the credit unions of Michigan and Saskatchewan.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without commending this fine gesture of service, friendship and goodwill manifested by the credit union members of Michigan and Saskatchewan. I understand that their contribution is representative of similar ones made by many States and provincial credit union leagues—and countless other credit union members who contribute to CUNA's world extension budget for carrying the program to more than 70 countries.

This certainly establishes CUNA as an international body. It gives meaning to the name, "CUNA International."

Our major thrust is directed toward finding ways to bring into even more active play the resources and experience of cooperative organizations in the United States, an attempt to bring into active participation these additional resources to help carry out our commitments in the developing countries.

Greater use is expected to be made of such nongovernmental organizations during the year ahead to advance this program of cooperative development abroad. Efforts are being made to further encourage "partnership" ties between cooperatives of other countries and those in the United States, ties of business and trade, as well as ties of friendship and assistance.

For, it is the policy of AID to seek first to achieve our objectives through the private enterprise system that has contributed to the unparalleled wealth and power of this country. To this end, we are encouraging even greater participation by the private sector in our development programs and cooperatives are an integral part of our great free enterprise system.

Under the guidance of a Cooperative Advisory Committee composed of distinguished American cooperative leaders, including, of course, your president, Ken Marin and his extremely able alternate, your own managing director, Orrin Shipe, we have moved rapidly ahead toward this end.

Organizations actively participating in AID programs include in addition to your own CUNA, International, National Farmers Union, Cooperative League of the USA, National League of Insured Savings Associations, Foundation for Cooperative Housing, and National Rural Electric Cooperative Association, as well as the International Cooperative Training Center of the University of Wisconsin.

Worldwide service contracts have been signed with these organizations during the past year, placing the experience and operating know-how of key cooperative leaders in the Unted States at the disposal of cooperative planning officials in the developing countries.

Let me use a few brief "success stories" to illustrate how effective other American cooperative organizations have been in their fields.

In Nigeria, the native fishermen of the Western Nigerian Cooperative Fishermen's Association are confidently expecting that their daily catch of fish will increase by 150 percent. Thirty-five fishing boats outfitted with outboard motors and modern fishing gear, will take them out to sea. The fishermen have expanded their cooperatives to include transportation, marketing, and a boat repair shop.

In Caracas, Venezuela, organizers, who started a cooperative bookstore to provide an outlet for books on democracy and cooperatives, have also helped a group of furniture workers build a successful cooperative out of the ruins of a bankrupt factory. Another cooperative has broken a monopoly that squeezed both the producers and consumers by stabilizing egg prices in the area. Here the success of these purely local organizations has stimulated new demands for cooperatives in a wide variety of fields, and increased requests for AID assistance in the form of technical aid and loans.

In each of the instances I mentioned, the people were helped to organize a cooperative because they were convinced that it was the most sensible way to put their unorganized group efforts on a paying, businesslike basis. While the local leaders may have had some familiarity with cooperatives and a fair smattering of experience, the members knew almost nothing about cooperatives. They joined, many of them, on faith, either an original faith in the leadership or in the promises they held out.

The role of AID in these joint endeavors with American cooperative organizations is to help these people—but not with huge grants—but with good, practical commonsense. The assistance is direct—and the results are translated into a better health, better education, greater productivity, and a more vital life.

In closing, I would like to quote from President Truman's inaugural address on January 20, 1949. He proclaimed it the aim of his administration "* * * to help free peoples of the world, through their own efforts, to produce more food, more clothing, more * * * housing, and more mechanical power to lighten their burdens." This is still our aim.

You, and the other great cooperative organizations of America, have joined in this vast undertaking. You have become a part of a process—along with your government and other sectors of American private enterprise—that is changing the outlook for hundreds of millions today—and the expectations of still unborn millions of many tomorrows.

The true perspective of history may yet rank what we do for human development through foreign aid today above the voyages of discovery by Columbus and Magellan in the 15th and 16th centuries.

If we are to succeed—and we cannot countenance failure—then we need your support. We need your best efforts—we need the skills of your best people—we need the cooperation and understanding of every American.

RESULTS OF AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to some of the results of research being carried on by the Department of Agriculture. My State has been one of the important beneficiaries of this research, because many of the new discoveries have served to increase the utilization of cotton fabrics. Of course, cotton is one of Alabama's most important farm products, and these new processes and products have significantly benefited income and employment in Alabama. Let me list a few of the new products that have been developed.

First. One of the most important developments, and probably the one most familiar to us, has been a class of finishing agents for imparting wrinkle-resistance and wash-and-wear properties to cotton fabrics. These agents produce a high-quality, durable finish to the fabric which enables cotton to compete successfully with the synthetic fibers. In 1962 alone, it is estimated that over 2 billion yards of cotton fabric were treated with these new finishing agents.

Second. Another development has been stretch fabrics which are opening new markets for cotton. The value of this development for 1963 was over $5 million at the manufacturer's level. Consumer demand for stretch textiles in both wearing apparel and industrial applications is increasing rapidly. By 1975 it is expected that more than 2¼ million bales of all textile fibers will be devoted to stretch fabrics. Greater elasticity makes cotton a strong competitor in these markets. Over 30 companies—both large and small—are engaged in the production of 100 percent cotton, woven stretch fabrics. Estimated production of 57 million yards for 1964 was more than three times the 1963 production of 17 million yards.

Connected with the development of stretch cotton is the development of a new type of cotton surgical bandage made of a fabric which shrinks in all directions, and has self-clinging and elastic properties which allow the bandage to conform to the natural contours of the body. The new bandage has proved especially useful in the treatment of burns, and its value in a nuclear war, where burns could be the major type of injury, would be very great. The introduction of this new bandage has reversed the trend toward use of noncotton materials.

Third. Another important development for the cotton industry has been that of durable, flame-resistant cotton fabrics, which are being produced by processes invented and developed in the laboratories of the Department of Agriculture.

There is a real need for fire-retardant cloth in many areas. Hospitals need bedsheets, pillowcases, pajamas, and other necessary linens. In industry, there is a large and growing need for fire-retardant treatment of work clothing. It is estimated that 3 to 5 million workers need this additional protection. The military departments alone are presently using some 5 million yards per year. It can also be expected that consumer items such as sheets, pillowcases, blankets, bedspreads, and drapery fabrics will soon be treated by these new processes.

Mr. President, I have described only a few of the many accomplishments in agricultural research. These new developments are already promoting wider use of cotton and this will be of continued significant benefit to my State and to other cotton-producing States. The Department of Agriculture is to be commended for these important contributions to our economy.

FLOOD DISASTER IN CALIFORNIA, OREGON, WASHINGTON, AND IDAHO

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] be added as a cosponsor of S. 327 at the next printing of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KENNEDY of New York in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, S. 327 deals with flood disaster in California, Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. The bill will soon be considered by the Committee on Public Works. I testified this morning in advance of the reference of the bill to the subcommittee, although it had been referred to the full committee.

I am pleased to have the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] join with us as a cosponsor of the bill. The senior

Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL] has been of great help to us, as have the Senators from Idaho [Mr. CHURCH and Mr. JORDAN] and the Senators from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. JACKSON].

The junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER] and I introduced the bill on January 6, 1965.

As I stated to the committee this morning, we are much disappointed that there has been so long a delay in getting the necessary reports from the executive departments to the Capitol. But I wish to say, in defense of the President of the United States, that that is not his fault. As I stated to the committee this morning, there have been some stories in the press of Oregon—the anti-Morse press—seeking to leave the implication that the disagreement of the senior Senator from Oregon with the administration on certain matters of foreign policy, including foreign aid—and I shall demonstrate that disagreement before I take my seat this afternoon—was having some effect on expediting consideration of the pending legislation for disaster relief.

As I said to the committee, I do not care what they say about me, but I do care what they say about my President. Not a scintilla of fact exists as a basis for that libel of the President.

The President, in cooperation with the two Senators from Oregon, has done everything that he possibly could to try to obtain consideration for this legislation. I have had the privilege of conferring with the President several times. He has given us complete cooperation. Only last week, the President made it clear again that so far as the executive branch of the Government is concerned, he wants the maximum of expedition in the handling of this legislation.

Having mentioned this much, I wish to state that it will be very interesting to watch and see how soon we get huge sums of money into Chile to help Chile again on the shocking earthquake disaster from which the poor people of Chile are suffering. I am for dispatch in this matter. Congress ought to take note of the different procedure that has to be followed when we have a domestic disaster that affects the lives and welfare of the American people.

I do not object. In fact, I would be one to insist that necessary checks be exercised by Congress in any authorization and appropriation process, even including disasters. I wish someone would try to answer my mail and the mail of the Senators from California, Washington, and Idaho from dissatisfied constituents on this matter. And they have a right to be dissatisfied, when they take note of the dispatch with which we pour millions of dollars into a foreign country for the aid of disaster relief, as we should. But they note the long delay in getting relief to the people of our own country when we have a disaster that goes back to last December, as my testimony of this morning discloses.

I ask unanimous consent that my testimony given before the Committee on Public Works this morning be printed at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, when there is a disaster in which the people of this area have suffered a loss of over $200 million, it takes some explaining to explain why we should wait from December until now—and we are still in the authorization process—to bring them some relief. Likewise, as I pointed out in my testimony this morning, there is the matter of the roads and bridges that have been washed out in the areas where the lumber mills exist. This presents a matter of employment or unemployment. Mills are closed because we cannot obtain the relief necessary to have timber roads opened up again so that the logs can be transported to the mills.

There seems to be no question, or, at least, I have found no one who raises any question as to the merits of the proposal of Senators and Representatives from the Pacific Northwest. But we are suffering not only the losses from flood, but also great economic losses, because our Government has not risen to its obvious moral and economic obligations, and clearly legislative obligations in regard to that disaster.

I do not like to have to speak this way, in criticism of what I consider to be too long a delay in coming to the disaster relief of the people of the Pacific Northwest.

I could cite many examples. The Bureau of Public Roads wants to help. But as I said in my testimony this morning, the Bureau of Public Roads, so far as available funds are concerned, can help only to the extent of 5 percent of the relief that it would furnish immediately if its funds were built up by the necessary authorizations and appropriations.

It is all right to say that the Bureau will receive the funds some time in the future, but where is the 95 percent going to come from? These people are broke. The public funds are nonexistent. I say most respectfully that Congress cannot justify further delay. The departments downtown that have not submitted their reports—as I stated to the President in a letter last week—cannot justify the dilly-dallying that describes their inaction.

At long last, we did get a report from the Bureau of the Budget this morning. We should have had the report 90 days ago. It does not take very long for people to decide whether there is a meritorious demand for disaster relief in our own country.

Contrast this situation with the procedures that will be made available to come to the relief of Chile or any other foreign area through the largess of the American people, because of the recognition of our great moral obligation to a great humanitarian cause created by disaster that has resulted in the suffering of human beings.

I hope it will not be necessary for me to remind Congress and the administration again of the deplorable situation that exists in the States of California, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho. But I shall do so if it becomes necessary.

EXHIBIT 1

STATEMENT OF SENATOR WAYNE MORSE BEFORE ROADS SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE ON S. 327, APRIL 1, 1965

Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, as a Senator from the flood-stricken State of Oregon, I am deeply appreciative of your courtesy in having scheduled this hearing. Although S. 327 is not officially before the subcommittee today, the general subject has been referred to the subcommittee. Therefore, I shall discuss the Disaster Relief bill which I introduced on January 7 with my colleague Senator NEUBERGER as cosponsor.

Our bill is designed to provide assistance for the reconstruction of areas damaged by the recent floods and high waters in the Pacific Northwest. I must admit, however, that my testimony may not be as complete as it should be. This is due to the difficulty I have encountered in securing factual information from the Bureau of the Budget and other agencies on the extent of the damage which resulted from the devastating floods of December 1964 and January 1965. It should be of interest to the committee that the two Senators from Oregon, and several Members of the House, were able to draft and introduce legislation within 2 weeks after the occurrence of the west coast flood disaster. It is not unusual for disasters to occur, although it is unusual to have one as large as the one we experienced on the west coast last December. Ample precedent for legislation of this type is provided in the Alaska earthquake legislation, and it is no secret that we relied heavily upon that legislation in preparing our bill.

Over 3 months have elapsed since the date of the flood. The Bureau of the Budget, as of last week, had not been able to submit its views on S. 327. In the meantime, the Federal agencies have been unable to make the necessary long-term plans to go ahead swiftly with work to alleviate the catastrophic damage that swept from the State of Washington well down into California.

A MAJOR FLOOD DISASTER

Before giving the subcommittee an analysis of our bill, I should indicate the nature and extent of this catastrophe. As I pointed out to the Senate on January 6, the floods resulted from unusual forces of nature which converged so as to create a condition that was almost unprecedented in the history of the West. First we had a long hard freeze, which is not at all common in our State. The Willamette Valley which normally has a relatively mild climate, had a deep hard freeze which extended from the valley far up into the Cascade Range to the east. After this freeze we had what is known as a Chinook wind which carried with it warm air and a heavy volume of water. The sudden rise in temperature brought not only the rain, but melted the heavy snow packs in the mountains. The water that was formed from the rain and melting snow did not absorb into the ground and flowed in enormous volumes through the watersheds and into the valleys of the Willamette and its tributaries. Similar developments occurred in eastern Oregon and the result was floods of enormous proportions in areas such as the John Day River Basin, the Grande Ronde River, and other major streams of eastern Oregon.

It is to the everlasting credit of the Congress, and particularly the Public Works Committees, that the flood control dams for which we obtained authorizations and appropriations, saved enormous flood losses. For example, the major multipurpose flood control dams in the Willamette River Basin cut 14 feet off the crest of the December flood waters at Eugene, Oreg., they reduced the crest at Portland by 7 feet. One major flood of this type can reflect, through flood damages prevented, the cost of an entire system of multpurpose river dams. Had this committee and the Congress not had the wisdom and foresight to provide the State of Oregon with these invaluable dams I would have replayed a much more somber story of flood damage this morning.

The damage occasioned by the December and January floods was enormous. Here are estimates of the damages suffered by the four western States of Oregon, Washington, California and Idaho, as supplied by the Office of Emergency Planning on March 29:

[In millions of dollars]

	Public	Private	Total
Oregon	95.0	147	242.0
Washington	9.0	3	12.0
California	140.0	60	200.0
Idaho	5.5	2	7.5

HIGHWAY REHABILITATION

Turning now to an analysis of S. 327, our bill proposes under section 2(a) that Federal share payable from the emergency fund in section 125 of the act shall be 100 percent of the cost of flood-damage restoration. As the committee knows, the present authority under the law does not permit emergency contributions to equal, in each instance, the original Federal share of road construction cost. For instance, the original cost of the Interstate Highway System in Oregon is federally financed to the extent of 92.25 percent. Forest highways are financed at a 100-percent Federal level. My position is that the committee could find it in the public interest to permit up to 100 percent of the cost of highway restoration to be borne by the Federal Government. In no event, however, should the Federal share be less than the original Federal contribution to the class of road being restored.

The present law relative to the Federal share payable from the emergency fund produces anomalies. For example, if a bridge on an interstate highway had been constructed in Oregon under the 92.25-percent Federal grant-in-aid and was substantially destroyed in the December flood, the Federal Government would pay only 63.45 percent of the cost of rebuilding the bridge. The State of Oregon, already staggering under the terrific burden of flood losses, would have to contribute a larger share to the restoration of the bridge than it did for the original cost of the bridge. Section 2(a) of our bill would correct this inequity.

The relief to be provided by section 2(a) is urgently needed, especially when we recall that roads and highways eligible for Federal rehabilitation aid for the States of Oregon, Washington, California, and Idaho, totaled an estimated $114,211,754 in the floods of December and January. As the law now stands, these States would be called upon to make the following payments toward repairs and reconstruction of these highways and roads: Oregon, $6,622,466; Washington, $709,903; California, $9,770,645; Idaho, $522,718; a total of $17,625,732. These States have suffered overwhelming losses in the floods. They should receive help of the type proposed in this bill.

TIMBER PURCHASER ROAD RECONSTRUCTION

Section 2(b) of our bill would permit the Secretary of Agriculture to assist timber purchasers, to the extent he deems appropriate, in the restoration of roads and trails being constructed under timber sales.

The committee should take several factors into account in arriving at the final language of this section. First, whatever authority is granted to the Secretary of Agriculture is also needed by the Secretary of the Interior. Both administer timber contracts. In the case of the Secretary of the Interior, I am advised that approximately 225 contracts are involved in flood damage to roads in the process of construction. The estimated damage to these timber-purchaser constructed roads is $1.25 million. This is primarily in western Oregon.

On the national forests, I have been told that there are approximately 334 contracts (225 involving more than $1,000 damage) where the total road damage is approximately $4 million. I emphasize that in these two situations the only roads involved are those in the process of construction by timber purchasers under timber contracts.

S. 327 does not set standards for the Secretary to use in determining the extent to which he will assist timber purchasers. It would be most agreeable to me to have such standards spelled out in the legislation so that a uniform and equitable treatment can be given to all. The system used by the Federal agencies in pricing their timber is to reduce the price for their timber by the estimated cost of constructing essential roads. This is called an allowance by the technical people. The contracts contain no disaster clause and thus, if a timber purchaser suffers a disaster such as this, he is obligated to restore the road out of his own pocket. Legally, I suppose the purchaser-road contractor would be bound by the strict terms of his contract. But the sponsors of S. 327 seek an equitable adjustment, not legal technicalities in these timber access roadbuilder cases.

In my discussions with Federal officials and with people in the industry, I find unanimous agreement that they have never before been confronted with a situation of this magnitude. In the past, there have been individual instances of slides or small washouts, but these have usually been quite minor when compared to the area-wide catastrophe produced by the winter floods of 1964 and 1965. Consequently, I think that there is a clear case for recognizing that the contracting parties simply never contemplated damage of this sweep and magnitude. In my opinion it would be fair and reasonable to provide substantial assistance to the timber purchaser-road contractors. These roads are, in effect, to be paid for out of Federal timber and are the property of the Federal Government; they will continue to be useful to the Federal Government in the management of its forests, in future sales of timber, and for protection and other uses of forest lands. The roads on these lands will continue to be used by the Federal Government in the years ahead. Thus, there is a direct Federal interest in these roads.

Where the timber purchaser has undertaken the construction of one of these roads as required by his contract, and all or a portion of the road under construction has been washed out, he has used up the allowance in the timber appraisal and should not be expected to shoulder the full burden of flood restoration. Thus, I believe that an excellent case can be made for substantial allowances to timber purchasers for rehabilitation of flood-damaged roads on Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management roads.

It was my intent that any damage restored by the timber purchaser prior to the enactment of this legislation would be as eligible for compensation as damage restored after the enactment of this bill. There is some question as to whether S. 327 makes that point clear. Therefore, I suggest that the committee adopt clarifying language. Failure to specify that rehabilitation work undertaken prior to the enactment of this law would be the subject of compensation to the timber purchaser-road contractor, could penalize the timber purchaser who restored the road promptly. This would be inequitable. Of course, the arrangements for compensation should require substantiated evidence upon which the Secretaries could reach their determinations of the estimated value of work claimed to have been performed.

I have been told that some Federal officials suggest a 50-percent compensation for damaged timber-purchaser roads and that the first $1,000 of the cost be absorbed by the timber purchaser. This appears to be rooted in part in a new section proposed for Forest Service contracts. I view both components of this suggestion as clear examples of parsimony and would urge that the committee carefully study their impact. It might be preferable to have the committee authorize and direct the Secretaries to pick up in full the first thousand dollars in damage. The requirement that purchasers absorb the first thousand dollars could work a hardship on small business.

As to the balance where the damage is great, the committee should weigh the impact that only a 50-percent reimbursement will have. Here, one test should be the measure of damage. To me, the salient point is that the road allowance has been used. Where this occurs, and if there is a subsequent Federal need for the road, the allowance should, in effect, be reinstated to a substantial degree.

It has been suggested by some that the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior have ample authority to make, through administrative determinations, equitable adjustments to timber operators who restore flood-damaged roads. If the committee should decide that this authority exists and that an amendment such as that suggested in section 2(b) is unnecessary, a statement to that effect in its report on this proposed legislation would be helpful.

At this point, Mr. Chairman, I submit, for inclusion in the record, materials which have been furnished to me by various associations, firms, and individuals in the timber industry. I believe the suggestions contained therein warrant careful study.

REPAIR OF COOPERATIVE TIMBER ROADS

Some of the materials I have submitted for the record suggest an amendment to our bill which would provide that where there are cooperative timber road agreements, the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior should shoulder 100 percent of the cost of restoration of such cooperative roads. I would point out to the committee that these roads are cooperatively constructed and used by the Federal agencies and private timber companies. The normal method of computing the share of costs on such roads is to relate it to the benefits each obtains from the agreement. The usual measure is the proportion of timber each party has. Thus, if a road serves an area where the Federal timber is 60 percent of the volume and the private timber 40 percent of the volume, costs and road maintenance are shared on this basis. Of course, there are many special provisions which occur when from time to time one party or the other makes heavy use of a road, then the maintenance cost is related to its use.

It is my position that the Federal Government has an obligation to share in the restoration of these cooperator roads but I believe that equity would be done if the Federal contribution were held to the terms of the original agreement. To do more, when unrelated to a directly measured Federal benefit, would be to award a subsidy to the private landowner. In an original agreement that involves 60 percent Federal and 40 percent private cost of the road, the rehabilitation costs should be borne on a 60–40 basis. The suggestion that the Federal Government assume 100 percent of the cost of repairing or reconstructing these cooperator roads, would only have my support as part of a general Federal policy which would give a 100 percent Federal grant to other segments of the private economy suffering from flood disasters such as storeowners, homeowners, and businesses, generally.

Section 2(c) of our bill would increase the emergency fund to $200 million for the period ending July 1, 1966. The Bureau of Public Roads has requested an increase in the limitation to provide for $80 million for fiscal year 1965 and $50 million annually thereafter. If the committee should determine that the Bureau's request is completely adequate to provide emergency funds sufficient to take care of the situation in the Pacific Northwest and other probable developments, I would support the recommendation by the Secretary of Commerce. However, the committee may wish to raise this limitation so as to cover fully all possible contingencies.

Section 2(d) of our bill would expand the types of roads upon which emergency funds can be expended.

In lieu of the language in S. 327, I would suggest that the committee consider the possibility of amending sections 120(f) and 125(c) of title 23, United States Code, by inserting after the words, "forest development roads and trails," the following: "highways, roads, and trails on lands administered by the Secretary of Interior".

This language would be in lieu of the phrase, "park roads and trails, and Indian reservation roads,". This would continue the use of these funds for these two classes of roads and would add the other roads on public lands, wildlife refuge, and other special classes of land administered by the Secretary of the Interior.

This seems to me to be a simpler and briefer way of stating the availability of the emergency fund since all of the roads represent Federal responsibility, being on Federal land.

OTHER PROVISIONS OF S. 327

The balance of S. 327 relates to programs coming within the jurisdiction of the Farmers Home Administration, the Rural Electrification Administration, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Small Business Administration.

It is my understanding that the Senate Public Works Committee prefers to have these special topics reviewed by the respective committees of the Senate having primary jurisdiction over the subjects of the remaining sections of our bill. Therefore, I have confined my statement to the portions of our bill which come clearly within the jurisdiction of this committee.

I appreciated the opportunity to have presented this statement on behalf of an extremely important segment of the flood-stricken State of Oregon and I know that the subcommittee and its very able chairman will give thorough and sympathetic consideration to the requests made herein.

SPEECH BY MR. CHESTER BOWLES, AMBASSADOR TO INDIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very able speech by the Ambassador to India, Mr. Chester Bowles, made on January 24, 1965, in which he discusses some of the problems of foreign aid to India.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BY THE HONORABLE CHESTER BOWLES, AMBASSADOR OF THE UNITED STATES TO INDIA, AT THE SHARAVATHY HYDEL INAUGURATION

The American people are proud and pleased to contribute capital and equipment for the building of this great hydroelectric plant. And I am personally grateful for the invitation of your Chief Minister to join with you in this impressive ceremony.

But precisely why should an American Ambassador be taking part in this dedication of an Indian dam, on an Indian river, running entirely through Indian soil, into the Arabian Sea?

I cannot add significantly to the praise which the Indian planners, engineers, and workers have earned by their great achievement. Nor can I say anything fresh or new about the momentous contribution the dam will make to the people of Mysore and south India—the thouands of newly lighted villages, the hundreds of new small industrial plants, and the scores of larger factories.

But what I can do is help answer a basic question on which there is much confusion both in your country and my own: Why have the American people who live on the other side of the world been loaning or giving India each year Rs.225 crores in dollars plus an equal sum in wheat, rice, and other commodities to speed India's ambitious development plans?

In our annual congressional and public debates over what we call foreign economic assistance a variety of claims are put forward to justify these expenditures to our American taxpayers.

Some advocates, for instance, argue that our contribution to oversea development will win us friends in India and elsewhere in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. I sincerely hope that this dam and the other assistance we are giving India will contribute to this end, and I can assure you that there is a deep and genuine spirit of friendship in the United States toward India, her leaders, and her people.

Yet if our friendship continues to grow I do not believe it will be the result of the capital loans, wheat, and rice which we send each year to India. In this context I am reminded of Mark Twain's remark to a contentious neighbor: "Why is it that you criticize me so? I cannot for the life of me remember ever having loaned you any money."

Indeed, our own American history should be enough to persuade us that recipient nations are not always grateful for foreign assistance. In the 19th century, for example, the United Kingdom invested literally billions of pounds in the building of American railroads and industry. Yet even today only a minority of Americans are conscious of the massive British contribution to our early economic development.

So, it would be a mistake for us Americans to have any illusions on this score. We earnestly seek the friendship of India, but we know that your friendship is no more for sale now than was our own in the critical early years of our development.

A second answer to the much discussed question of, Why American aid? is related to the first: By helping India's economic development it is suggested that we may bring you into closer agreement with America's approach to current international questions.

In my opinion this answer is no more valid than the first. Indeed, some nations which we have assisted seem to go out of their way to criticize various aspects of American foreign policy in order to demonstrate to their own people and the world that U.S. aid money had not undermined their independence. I confess that on more than one occasion in the last 10 years this thought has passed through my mind here in India.

We will, of course, continue to seek common ground with India on international questions. But we know that such agreement carries no price tag. So, again we shall have to seek an answer elsewhere.

A third response to the question, Why American aid? is that our American economic assistance program is a moral obligation which we, as the richest nation in history, are dutybound to assume. Four years ago, President Kennedy emphasized this point in his inaugural address:

"To those peoples," he said, "in the huts and villages of half the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period—not because the Communists may be doing it, not because we seek their votes, but because it is morally right."

Those of you who have visited my country will testify that America's sense of moral commitment runs deep. A recent dramatic demonstration of it is the Peace Corps under which some 75,000 dedicated young Americans apply each year for opportunities to work almost without pay in the urban slums and rural areas of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Twelve thousand are now abroad; several hundred of them are here in India with a contingent in Mysore State itself.

Yet the American tradition of oversea service provides only part of the answer to our question.

The rest of the answer grows out of a concept which a hundred years ago or even 30 years ago would have been hard for either you or us to understand, but which in our modern era is overriding.

After two world wars, most Americans have come to see that our own security and prosperity cannot be isolated from that of the rest of the globe.

Whether we all like it or not, whether we always agree with each other or not, we are all members of the human race. Consequently, our common future depends on our ability to live together rationally on our increasingly crowded and turbulent planet.

As our world grows smaller, each nation, large or small, has a growing stake in the behavior of everyone else.

In the postwar years, Stalin's intransigence concerned us all. More recently, when an irresponsible China threatened India with a conflict which might have extended throughout Asia, the security of every man, woman and child in America was involved in some degree.

Nor does our mutual interest in a more rational world stop with matters of aggression and military defense.

If we Americans should flounder and fall in our efforts to provide an increasing measure of prosperity, opportunity and dignity for all of our citizens under a free government, the impact would be ultimately felt in every Asian, African and Latin American village.

Similarly, unless the poverty, malnutrition and illiteracy of countries such as India are met and mastered there can be no hope for security and prosperity in the more privileged countries of the world.

Furthermore, because of new technologies the economic interdependence of all nations is rapidly increasing. In today's world the continuing dynamism and growth of the American economy would be impossible without expanding foreign trade. And for India and other developing countries increasing trade with the more highly developed nations is equally essential if an adequate rate of growth is to be achieved and maintained.

In this sense, every living American—indeed, everyone everywhere who believes in peace and human freedom—has a deep personal stake in the success of the unprecedented development effort which has been undertaken by free India.

The industrial revolution which in the 19th century laid the basis for the present prosperity of Western Europe and America involved a heavy cost in human suffering which was vividly described by Charles Dickens.

Under different circumstances and through different methods the Soviet Union under Stalin concentrated Russia's energies and resources on building industrial and military capacity regardless of the consequences to the Russian people.

Today, democratic India seeks what would have been beyond the reach of any developing country not so many years ago: a rapid rate of national economic growth side by side with increasing direct social and material benefits for the individual.

Your success or failure as a nation rests not only on your ability to construct great dams, new factories and more miles of railroad tracks. Equally important is your capacity to build a society which offers a steadily increasing measure of dignity, opportunity, and social justice to each individual.

This calls for higher real incomes and improved living conditions for your urban people, and the right to landownership and fair crop prices for your cultivators.

This twin objective requires bold pragmatic national planning, the wise use of all available domestic resources, a keen sensitivity to human suffering and enlightened political and economic leadership.

It also requires a substantial amount of capital and technical assistance from the more privileged nations so that the present generation need not be sacrificed for the sake of its grandchildren.

Not only the amount of foreign assistance which you receive but also its nature and the manner in which it is provided are of crucial significance.

In this regard, we Americans have come to see from hard experience that not all developing nations have the will or the ability to do what India is striving to do, and when these qualities are lacking, the effectiveness of our aid is blunted.

For these reasons, we are concentrating our assistance in those countries which are prepared to use their own resources to pursue realistic development practices and where there is a certain degree of mutual respect and understanding.

We consider Sharavathy a prime example of the proper and constructive use of American assistance. It is part of a carefully conceived and well-integrated program for the development of south India. Its planning and engineering were completely Indian.

Sharavathy will promote massive employment; it will encourage rural electrification; and it will permit the establishment of dynamic new industries which will earn foreign exchange to pay for similar projects in the future.

You could have built this great project without American assistance. But with such assistance you were able to build it sooner, and without sacrificing other important projects or unnecessarily suppressing the day-to-day needs of your people.

Thus, the primary purpose of American economic assistance may be summed up in the following terms: To enable competent, socially conscious nations such as India to respond quickly, constructively, and responsibly to the forces which are shaping tomorrow's world.

More specifically, it represents an effort by the American Government and citizens to help new nations which are prepared to help themselves to generate increasing national incomes and to insure political and social stability.

Only on such a foundation can any nation contribute effectively to our common objective which is a more peaceful and rational world.

If free India succeeds in reaching her democratic goals, the benefits will be felt in every community in my own country and, indeed, throughout the world. That in a nutshell is why I am here today.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I turn now to my statement on foreign aid, dealing with a major amendment that I intend to offer, both in committee and if necessary, on the floor of the Senate.

Before I turn to the manuscript, I wish to say that I am keenly disappointed with the Foreign Relations Committee because of the parliamentary situation into which the Foreign Relations Committee has put me all this week.

I speak in a kindly fashion; nevertheless, my colleagues in the Senate need to know the position I have been in all week, because it is bound to have an effect on the handling of the foreign aid bill, both in committee and subsequently on the floor of the Senate.

Last Monday the Foreign Relations Committee voted, by a vote of 9 to 4, to consider an omnibus foreign aid bill, which means a foreign aid bill, including both economic aid and military aid.

As Senators know, I have been a strong supporter of the combined bill. Show me where the military program of the United States in any underdeveloped country is in substantial amount, and I will determine thereby the foreign policy of the United States in that country.

If I have not learned that lesson in my many years of service on the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, I have not learned anything. When there is a substantial military aid program in an underdeveloped country, that aid program is turned over to the administration in the Pentagon, and, in effect, the Secretary of Defense is made the Secretary of State in that country.

I do not propose to turn the foreign policy of the United States over to the Secretary of Defense and his military war hawks for 1 minute in one place in the world.

In effect, the Secretary of Defense has already become the Secretary of State in Vietnam, with the ugly reality that American boys are dying, thousands of people are dying in South Vietnam and North Vietnam, and increasing hundreds of thousands are going to die if we do not stop the Secretary of Defense, Ambassador Taylor, the Bundys, and the rest of the war hawks in this country who, in my judgment, are leading this Republic into a massive and colossal war which will kill Americans by the hundreds of thousands.

I propose to fight to the limit any attempt to turn American foreign policy over to the American military, no matter how unpopular it may make me. God help us if we do not stop it.

I am at a loss to understand why the State Department and the Secretary of State have not been fighting against the proposal to turn military aid over to the Defense Department. They say we are neutral, that it is up to Congress to decide. What do they mean, it is up to Congress to decide? It is up to the administration to make its recommendation as to administrative policy. I know what it is up against. It was the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee in the Senate who wished to turn it over to the Pentagon, and has wished to do so for the past 2 years. The Chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House did not wish to do that. The American people have a right to know from the top man himself, the President of the United States, what the recommendation is, instead of a recommendation of neutrality.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. Thus, the administration gave us three bills. It gave us an economic aid bill, it gave us a military aid bill, and it gave us an omnibus bill. When it became perfectly clear that it was going to stand by and do nothing about it, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate introduced the economic bill. We proceeded on the assumption that it was going to be the only bill that the Foreign Relations Committee was going to consider. I stopped that strategy by offering the draft of an omnibus bill which the administration lawyers had prepared. I said that I introduced the draft for hearings, but opposed the bill and would vote against it in its present form. However, hearings were held on the omnibus bill in the Foreign Relations Committee. As a result of that, last Monday, a majority of the Foreign Relations Committee voted to proceed with an omnibus bill, which means a combination of military and economic aid.

I apologize to the Senator from Kentucky for not yielding to him at the moment he requested, but I wished to finish my thought. I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. I did not wish to interrupt the Senator's thoughts. I do wish to say, however, that I approve of the position the Senator is taking. There was a time when I believe that military aid should be separated from economic aid. I now believe the Senator's reasoning to be right, that our military aid—which means our military aid and force—is committed, the decisions which respect our foreign policy move more and more to the Department of Defense. We have learned that once engaged militarily, there is difficulty in ever disengaging. In past years the Senator has supported me on this issue. I am grateful that he has been able to have his influence felt in the Foreign Relations Committee against the proposal to separate military and economic aid.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. He knows the high regard in which I hold him. I said to him this morning, in a private conversation, when his name appeared so favorably in Walter Lippmann's column, how pleased I was that Walter Lippmann had come to recognize the position which the Senator from Kentucky had taken on another matter.

I engage in no flattery when I say that the statement he has just made, expressing his agreement with me on the need for continuing the consideration of foreign aid on an omnibus basis rather than separating economic from military aid, means a great deal to me. It is one of the finest compliments that could be paid to me.

Mr. President, after the Foreign Relations Committee took the action it did last Monday to combine military and economic aid, the committee, over my objection, proceeded to mark up the bill, which put me in an impossible legislative position. I am chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and I was under the urgings of the administration, including the President, to proceed with subcommittee action on the education bill, morning and afternoon, in an endeavor to have the bill marked up, and if possible reported to the full committee before the week was out.

Therefore, I could not be in the Foreign Relations Committee this week for a markup of the foreign aid bill. I explained it to the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I explained it to my colleagues on the Foreign Relations Committee. I explained it to the majority leader. I assume that, in view of the emergency nature of the education program and the fact that I was acting in direct response to the request of the majority leader, the request of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the request of the President himself, we would postpone for 1 week the markup of the foreign aid bill.

To my utter surprise, in my absence, it was decided to go ahead and mark up the bill.

Let me say, in complete fairness to the chairman of the committee, that he made the point and was so quoted in the press, that of course the decisions reached would be tentative. When I could get back to the committee, I could then offer my amendments, next week, or whenever they go ahead with the markup later, if they have not finished.

Every Senator knows that that may sound good and look good in the press, but everyone knows what the situation is when a committee has gone through a bill on a markup, and has taken votes on it section by section, and Senators have committed themselves. If a Senator who could not be present—for the reasons I could not be present—comes in next week and says, "Gentlemen, I want to go back to page 10 of the bill and offer an amendment in line 6," although specific action had already been taken on line 6. It is tentative, surely; but they have taken action and have come to the conclusion, without—at the time they came to that conclusion—hearing the opposite point of view. They have a right to do this, of course. I merely wish the Record to show that this is what they did.

Next week, if the committee holds further sessions on the foreign aid bill, I shall go back to the first page and proceed to offer my amendments. But, I do not have to be hit on the head with a baseball bat to know that I have received a bump. I have already received a good bump, so far as the procedure of the Foreign Relations Committee is concerned, because now I have an additional handicap to overcome. I must persuade members to change their minds. For example, consider what was done with respect to the contingency fund. It was increased from $50 to $100 million. It should not have been increased at all. I shall try to hold it where it was. It will be more difficult. Many of the positions already taken are contrary to some of the amendments which I intend to offer. I am sorry that the Foreign Relations Committee followed this procedure, because there was no rush.

We shall not get to the debate on the foreign aid bill on the floor of the Senate for at least 30 days; and that is a very optimistic statement of the procedure. The Foreign Relations Committee and its members knew it when they decided, in the absence of the senior Senator from Oregon, to proceed to mark up the bill under what they call a tentative markup.

Mr. President, we shall have before us in the Senate next week the education bill. I shall have something to say about that in a moment. Then we shall have before us the voting rights bill. Certainly then we shall have before us the disaster bill.

We shall not get to the foreign aid bill on the floor of the Senate for at least 30 days. There was no need, I say quite frankly, for the Foreign Relations Committee to mark up the bill this week.

I have made my record. Now let me show what the consequences will be.

I shall offer my amendments in committee. I have been placed under such a handicap, however, that the chances of my getting very many considered in the Foreign Relations Committee as thoroughly as they would have been considered if the members of the committee had not already crystalized their thoughts on various sections of the bill are quite dim.

However, there is one committee in which they will be given due consideration, and that is the Committee of the Whole, on the floor of the U.S. Senate.

I have been maneuvered into a parliamentary situation again this year, as I was last year, which I had hoped could be avoided by the Foreign Relations Committee membership. I serve notice now that I shall offer each of my amendments, in depth. That means that there will be no agreement of any kind entered into, for any unanimous consent, or for any waiver of any rights of the senior Senator from Oregon, in the handling of the foreign aid bill this year.

If the Foreign Relations Committee membership felt they were saving time, that they were short circuiting the senior Senator from Oregon by the procedure they followed last week, they could not have been more mistaken.

Let the members of the Foreign Relations Committee understand something else. I have more support this year than I had last year on the floor of the Senate. More Senators have been back to their constituencies since last year. We added some amendments to the foreign aid bill last year. My prediction is that we shall add more this year. That is so because at the grassroots of America there is a swelling tide of opposition to the waste and inefficiency of the foreign aid program, which has already added up to more than $110 billion of American taxpayer money since 1946. The American people are saying to more and more politicians, "When are you going to call a halt to this waste of our money?"

Of course I shall work through the Foreign Relations Committee, to do my best to have some of my amendments adopted in committee; however, I shall also, when I am turned down in committee—and I believe I shall be turned down, because of the procedure that has been followed in the Foreign Relations Committee in the past week—work through the Committee of the Whole, the entire Senate. I shall give each Senator an opportunity to decide for himself what he thinks he ought to do as a Member of the Committee of the Whole on foreign aid.

Mr. President, that causes me to present my first amendment this afternoon, which is probably my major amendment, for which I received substantial votes last year, and for which, in the last two or three reports of the committee, I also got the language. It is a case of giving me the language but not the votes. I got the commendatory language for this approach. I have a considerable amount of confidence, or a strong hope, that this year, in the Committee of the Whole, I will get the votes, too.

I believe that Senators, if they will check with their constituencies, will find that the overwhelming majority of the people of this Republic will support the major Morse amendment, which I shall discuss in a moment.

I said that I could not be at the Foreign Relations Committee meeting for the markup because I was presiding over the Subcommittee on Education of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I am very proud to report that, as a result of the wonderful work of the subcommittee—this is a committee job—we reported from the subcommittee this morning to the full committee, by unanimous vote, the House bill for aid to elementary and secondary schools.

Both sides of the membership around the table, Democratic and Republican, gave to me, all week long, the most magnificent cooperation that any chairman of any subcommittee could possibly hope for.

This was committee action. I am proud of it. Some votes were not unanimous on specific amendments, but in each instance proposals to amend the bill were defeated. When the final vote was taken on reporting the bill, the vote was unanimous.

Mr. President, we hope to have the bill before the full committee for action next Tuesday morning at 10:30. We hope to have it on the floor of the Senate on Tuesday afternoon, for possible beginning of action on it, subject to the wishes or pleasure of the majority leader, next Wednesday.

I am very happy to say, to show the kind of cooperation I received, that I received an understanding from the Democrats and Republicans on the subcommittee, that those who intend to file supplemental views or any individual views would have those views ready when the full committee meets next Tuesday morning, so that there will be no danger of further delay after the full committee votes on the bill next Tuesday.

Senators know that the common practice is to vote in committee to send the bill to the floor of the Senate, and then to have Senators ask for 2 or 3 or 4 days in which to prepare minority or supplemental views.

I am very proud to be able to tell the Senate that all members of the subcommittee entered into a gentleman's understanding with me that if they have any views to file they will be ready between now and Tuesday, so that when there is a final vote on the bill next Tuesday in committee the bill will come to the floor of the Senate; and all the material that is to be in the report will go to the Printing Office in time to be on the desks of Senators next Wednesday morning.

Mr. President, I wished to make these remarks because if I had not made them there would be those who, not understanding the parliamentary situation, might want to know why I was not present at the markup of the foreign aid bill this week.

FIRST MORSE AMENDMENT (NO. 61)

Mr. President, I wish to say a few words on the first amendment I intend to offer to the foreign-aid bill. I send it to the desk for appropriate reference, and I ask to have the amendment printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. MORSE. This amendment, if adopted, would terminate by June 30, 1967, all foreign economic and military assistance programs and the food-for-peace program as they are presently authorized and administered. It requires the President prior to that time and in consultation with the Congress to rethink, replan, and rejustify the bundle of foreign-aid programs which now spread round the world in some 90 countries.

After June 30, 1967, aid would be extended to not to exceed 50 countries, and even then it would be extended only to those countries which the administration has freshly justified to the Congress and which the Congress has approved.

I do not propose at this time to speak at length about the shortcomings of the present program. I have made my criticisms clear over the past 2 years. Debate this year, as in the past, will again develop the weaknesses of the programs as friends and critics alike speak to the obvious. No amount of systematic briefing of Senate aides by officials of the Agency for International Development, and no amount of slick footwork by a bloated AID congressional relations office can hide the transparent and obvious difficulties of the AID program.

Permit me to list a few facts about what we call foreign aid.

First, it is not a program at all. Foreign aid is a conglomeration of mixed-up half measures. The able Administrator of the Agency for International Development, Mr. Bell, is not in charge of the foreign-aid program. Approximately half of the $3 billion bundle in the annual AID bill is military assistance. It is only what is left that Mr. Bell has charge of—and even then he finds that goodly portions of his economic aid are dispersed not for the achievement of economic development purposes, but rather to serve the political aims of the Department of State.

Mr. President, in rebuttal it will be said that the Pentagon has to go through the Department of State and the AID office, and that there has been worked out a coordinating and consulting arrangement whereby there is constant conversation between the two Departments.

I listened. But I came to the conclusion that still the State Department and the AID people are not exercising the responsibilities in connection with the total program that they ought to assume. My amendment would do something about that. Of course, the law specifically provides—and I refer to the act of 1961, which is the governing law—that the Secretary of State shall be in command. That is why it was a little difficult for proponents of the separation really to justify their proposal without offering an amendment to the basic law; that put them in an indefensible position. It is pretty hard under this civilian form of government to go along with any proposal in which the Pentagon would have the final say. We are not ready yet—and I underline the word "yet"—to turn over under our constitutional system control to the military.

I warn the American people, "You had better be ever vigilant about it, because there are various ways, by indirection, of building up military control. The reason that you, the American people, know so little about your foreign policy is that you have already, by indirection, built up a topheavy Military Establishment in this country. Through that Military Establishment you have one document after another marked 'Secret' that never should have the label 'Secret' written on it."

Marking a document "Secret" does not mean that the label makes it justifiably secret material that should be kept from the American people. The Senator from Oregon has no intention of letting up or laying off in respect to the issue of trying to carry out what I used to teach, namely, that in a democracy the people are entitled to the facts if the people are to remain free.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Does the Senator from Oregon realize that a Senator is not always a good security risk? For example, this Senator recalls one time when a Member of this body was engaged in a television debate that had to do with nuclear energy. He said, "Now, I am going to tell you a secret." He then proceeded to say that we had invented a hydrogen bomb and were planning to explode it sometime soon.

That was something the Government did not want known. But the Senator was carried away with himself, and he told it before the viewers of television.

The Senator realizes that now and then it is not too good for all of us to know some Government secrets. The smaller the number of people who know them, the better the chance that we can keep those secrets closer to our chests.

Mr. MORSE. I have two comments in reply. That is a risk of democracy that WAYNE MORSE is willing to run. That is an element of the right of being free for which WAYNE MORSE is willing to stand up.

The Senator from Louisiana has suggested that a Senator sometimes is not a good security risk. I would rather take the security risk than to take the risk which the Senator from Louisiana is apparently willing to run, that is, the risk of having government by executive supremacy in a country that claims to be free, for we cannot have government by executive supremacy and remain free. That is an issue on which I am perfectly willing to meet any spokesman of this administration at any time and place.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I am delighted to yield.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Louisiana was a member of the team that invaded Sicily in World War II. We took the Germans by complete surprise. History will show that Adolf Hitler sent Rommel with an army down to Greece because we had deluded him into believing that we would land in Greece. Our secrecy was so good that they did not even tell those engaged in the action where we would land. As an amphibious officer, I was not told. They were going to tell us when we were at sea. We got into a big storm, and the cracker box which I was operating could not hold its course in the storm, with the result that we were lost and did not know where to go. But we surely fooled Rommel. A whole German army was waiting in Greece while our army landed on Sicily.

I wonder if we could have had that kind of success had we told everyone our plans.

When we invaded Salerno, our people did it the democratic way. Some trucks even had "Salerno" printed on them. They were headed for Salerno. When they arrived, they met a German panzer division at the landing place, and we lost many lives because the Germans knew where we were going to land.

Does the Senator feel that we should go all the way and tell everyone where we are going and what we have in mind before we make our move, or does he feel that under some circumstances secrecy might be justified?

Mr. MORSE. I say most respectfully that the point the Senator from Louisiana is raising is completely irrelevant; it has no connection whatsoever with the point the Senator from Oregon is making. I am not talking about what should be done at the time of a battle by way of keeping information from an enemy. I am merely saying that when we consider matters of major public policy, dealing with the overall foreign policy of this country, most of what is now concealed from the American people should be told them.

Eighty-five percent of the information that I have seen marked "Top Secret" should not have been marked "Top Secret" at all. That leaves 15 percent which, as we all know, we sometimes have to keep secret, but only for a period of time, if it is vital to the security of this country. Of course, legislators and the executive branch of the Government should keep it secret for the time being. But most of the material that is marked "Top Secret" we read about in Reuters, the London Times, the Paris newspapers, and the rest of the press abroad, while the American people are denied the information. That is what I mean when I talk about government by secrecy or government by concealment.

Let us consider the Comptroller General's reports, for example. The senior Senator from Oregon has been trying for years to have the Comptroller General's reports released from secrecy in regard to the Comptroller General's finding concerning foreign aid. I am satisfied that in this field, too, at least 85 percent—and I am sure I am engaging in understatement—of the material in the Comptroller General's reports ought to be made available to the American people, so that the people can better judge what changes ought to be made in foreign aid. So long as we keep this kind of information from the people, we build up the hush-hush policy of the administration in the field of foreign aid.

When I get back home, I hear comments to the effect, "WAYNE, if you only knew the facts"; or "I have a hunch"; or "Can you tell me something about these reports?" My answer is "No." So long as these lips are sealed by the secrecy label on the documents, I cannot tell what they contain. But I am satisfied, and it is my considered judgment—the Senator from Louisiana may reach a different judgment—that if I could only disseminate the facts, foreign aid would be drastically revised by amendment at this session, because the American people would demand such an amendment.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I believe our position is now clear. The Senator from Oregon agrees that under certain circumstances secrecy is necessary.

Mr. MORSE. I always have.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Oregon is complaining about the misuse of classified information; about classifying something which should properly be released to the public.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. As I recall, the Senator from Louisiana was in the committee room the other day when we heard confidential statements. I have to be very careful now, but I think I can get the point across and not be one of the Senators referred to a few moments ago by the Senator from Louisiana as poor security risks. As the Senator from Louisiana knows, I am a stanch supporter of the proposal to bring the CIA under congressional surveillance to a much greater degree than it now is. I believe that if we could only bring the CIA under congressional surveillance, the peace interests of the American people would be better protected. I cannot put it more bluntly. If we had only the problem of the CIA to deal with on the point the Senator from Oregon is raising, my bill for public disclosure would be supported. But there are many other areas in which the evidence is, I think, so overwhelming in support of my contention that I shall continue to do what I can to see if I cannot get this administration to open some of the doors of concealment with regard to the people's right to know.

The people have a right to know.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I am sure the Senator from Oregon recalls an occasion when there was a briefing, and the military experts showed us something of the situation with regard to the Chinese Communists. One of our fellow Senators—I feel certain he was acting in complete good faith—called this Senator from the floor of the Senate and said, "I explained this situation to the reporter, and I wanted you to verify just what it was."

I said "If you recall, the whole subject was designated 'Top Secret.' We were not supposed to tell a word of it."

The senior Senator from Oregon attended that briefing. He did not make that mistake; but a colleague did.

I said, "This whole subject is 'Top Secret.' What you have done is wrong. You should not have told it at all"; and I said to the reporter, "You should not print it."

The reporter replied, "I will do the best I can."

The Senator from Oregon may recall that there was a subsequent briefing; and on that occasion one of the top military officers of all American history told us he had some doubt whether he should ever again tell any Senator anything about military problems. The Senator from Oregon and I sat there and took that chastisement, knowing very well that we were not responsible but that a fellow Senator, carried away by enthusiasm, leaked the information, and it appeared in the newspapers.

Mr. MORSE. There is always that risk, but I am willing to run it. I have difficulty in reconciling such risks with the denial of information to Members of Congress, who form one of the three coordinate, coequal branches of our Government, and whose constitutional responsibility is to check the other two, as the other two check the Legislature. I have some difficulty understanding the denial to Congress of full access to information involving the interests of this country, but supplying it to some little official, at a rather low echelon so far as responsibilities are concerned, in the CIA, the General Accounting Office, the Pentagon, the State Department, or AID, although he has never had the responsibility, the opportunity, and the great honor of facing the ballot box.

We know, too, that all Members of Congress, the press, Governors, and mayors are being briefed on Asian affairs, which suggests that only the general public still has not heard much of this information.

I do not know of a man in uniform under our system of government who is entitled to information that a Member of Congress is not entitled to. Until that cord is broken, we run the danger of hanging the freedom of the American people in a noose of concealment. I want to cut that cord.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I suggest to the Senator from Oregon that perhaps the best answer would be that the committee itself should decide whether to release such information. I believe the point the Senator is dwelling on is that in many cases someone in the executive branch says something is secret or confidential, when there is really no good reason why the public should not be told. I have experienced that situation myself.

Mr. MORSE. I know the Senator has. He and I traveled through Europe in 1952. Our lips were sealed with regard to some of the information we obtained. When we returned, we submitted a highly confidential report to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as the Senator will recall, but we were allowed to make a report to the public that did not in any way violate the confidential material that he and I collected. I remember that he and I had quite a discussion about how much we should include in the confidential report; how much material really ought to be confidential and should not be disclosed to the American people.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator from Oregon may recall that in that particular instance the State Department, for diplomatic reasons, insisted that we should take out everything that was meaningful with regard to the horrible situation that existed in France.

That is where we are really getting our eyeballs stolen from us. They permitted us to save about 3 paragraphs out of the 6 or 8 pages. That being the case, we said we could not print anything.

Mr. MORSE. I shall never forget the Senator from Louisiana standing on the airbase in France which we had built at tremendous expense to the American taxpayers. The Senator kicked stone after stone out of the cement. The stones were half as big as an egg. Sometimes the stones were as big as an egg. When that occurred, we were surprised to learn from the Americans in charge that no American fighter plane had ever landed on that airbase. Landing an American fighter plane on that airbase would have wrecked the plane because the runway was so defective. So we were going to have to re-cover it at additional heavy expense. But the French would not do it. The French contractor did not live up to the specifications. He stole us blind, as they did in a good deal of the construction that American taxpayers paid for. We could not tell that story. That was top secret. The story got out, but not from us. That is why I am able to talk about it now.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. The Senator and I really have no basic disagreement. We are talking about a question of degree.

Mr. MORSE. Certainly, and the time element. From my observations, 15 percent, as a rough estimate—which I think is an understatement—can be justified as top secret at the time of the occurrence. But as soon as the time period passes, it is no longer unsafe to release it. I think it shoud be released then. But they do not do that. Once it is buried in the tombs of concealment, it is left there. They never do bring it out.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. As a new member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have been puzzled as to why it is that information as to the amount of aid we give on a country-by-country basis is classified and cannot be revealed. I have tried to find out. The best story I get is that if Ecuador were to know what Peru was getting, it would cause a rumble up and down the west coast of Latin America that might be embarrassing to some of our Ambassadors. I am only using Ecuador and Peru as examples. I could have taken many other countries to which we give foreign aid. If word reaches Lima that the country to the north or south is not getting "X" dollars at all, but just a total amount of foreign aid, military or economic, that includes tentative sums for each of the countries, subject to change without notice by the AID Administration if they find either country is not living up to its commitments or if they find that conditions in the country have changed. It is said that if that one small tentative figure were to be made available to the American people, it would cause such a disruption of our foreign affairs as to seriously set back our foreign policy in the United States. Does the Senator have any comment to make on that?

Mr. MORSE. I do have a comment. The ones they want to keep it from are Members of Congress, and not the foreign lobbyists from Peru and Ecuador.

I thought the Senator slew them the other day when he brought this point up in the Committee on Foreign Relations. I thought their answers were sophomoric. They gave the kind of answers to which the Senator from Pennsylvania is referring. They again demonstrated how entrenched is the idea of keeping the facts from the American people. If they had not kept the facts from the American people, they could not have gotten by with the program as long as they have.

My amendment, which I am about to explain, takes care of that.

Mr. CLARK. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. It has occurred to me, without impugning anybody's motivation, which I do not want to do——

Mr. MORSE. I do not like to, either, but sometimes the facts support it.

Mr. CLARK. Without impugning anyone's motivation, the inevitable result of not allowing those of us on the committee, or in the Senate, during the course of the argument on the foreign aid bill, to reveal how much of the various categories of aid is to go to each country—not only with respect to the categories of aid in the foreign aid bill, but also with respect to such matters as Public Law 480 and the international development aid given by banks and others—is to make it very difficult indeed to have an intelligent debate on the policy of the operations of our foreign relations program.

Mr. MORSE. There is a great handicap involved, as the Senator from Pennsylvania brought out in committee the other day. They bring up the secret workbooks that we are supposed to work from. We must work from the books in the committee room. If we take the books out of the committee room, we must have a surveillance officer from the committee staff go along with us.

Mr. CLARK. And if we should like to have some member of our staff look at the books, they say they cannot see the books because they have not had a security clearance.

Mr. MORSE. That is the point. We cannot have an administrative assistant sit down with us and work out an analysis of our position in regard to the recommendation of the State Department or the Pentagon Building or the AID people.

Does the Senator not see the effect of that procedure?

I shall not be unkind. But I shall not run away from a statement of my interpretation of motivation, either. They know full well that as long as they keep the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations at that kind of disadvantage, they can get by with many proposals in that foreign aid book that we ought to correct, if we had the assistance that we needed in order to do the analytical work. I do not know when we shall declare our independence in the Senate. One of the greatest declarations of independence needed in the country today is for the Senate to declare its independence from the executive branch of the Government and point out that we are going to carry out our duties and check on the executive branch of the Government.

Of course, we ought to see to it that we are given every fact that we ask for. We are willing to have our assistants undergo any security clearance it is desired to impose. There is no legislative assistant or administrative assistant that would not meet the test of any security investigation test to which the Government wanted to subject them.

We must stop having handcuffs put on us or having our arms tied behind our backs when we try to turn the pages of secret documents and analyze them. The Senator from Pennsylvania put them in an impossible position the other day when he said, "Why can I not take it to my office? Why can I not sit down with my aid and study this document?"

Is there anything about this army of liaison officers from the State Department, the Pentagon Building, and the AID people that would make them safer for the handling of the material in the workbooks than one of our assistants? Do only Secretary Rusk and David Bell see this material? Of course not. But, by reason of being tied down with this kind of hamstringing procedure, we cannot do our work. Let us face it. The Senator and I are not representing the people of our States the way we ought to be free to represent them. They do not give us the assistance and they do not give us the procedure by which to break through the secrecy with which they hamstring us.

Of course, one of the things an examination of the presentation books reveals is how much aid is for political purposes and not for either economic development or military defense. It is in the "buying friends" category and it is understandable that AID people do not want much known or said about it.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK. Is not the inevitable result of the present system that when we come to the floor to debate the foreign aid bill we find ourselves unable to enlighten the American people and the country by virtue of the distribution to various countries, with the result that the American public is rather in a state of confusion as to who is doing what and in what amount all over the world?

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is correct. The courageous Senator from Pennsylvania said this in the Foreign Relations Committee, but we did not get anywhere. We were told, "We are sorry, but those are the rules."

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his kind remarks. Personally, I do not feel the same kind of antagonism toward members of the executive branch which I know experience has brought the Senator from Oregon to feel. I would have some hope that, with the same type of kind persuasion the Senator from Oregon exercised in connection with the primary and secondary school education bill, with the use of a carrot as well as a little stick, those who feel as the Senator and I do, might, in due course, in a relatively short while, persuade them. Perhaps I am unduly optimistic because of my inexperience.

Mr. MORSE. The Senator is an optimist. They are going to eat the carrot and then beat us with the stick.

Mr. CLARK. I ask this question out of ignorance. What is the law, and what is the philosophical basis behind the law, under which subordinates in the executive branch of the Federal Government are able to tell elected Senators of the United States what they can and cannot reveal to their constituents?

Mr. MORSE. That is up to the Senate. Any time we want to take that discretionary power from them, the Senate can do it.

Mr. CLARK. Is there a law under which subordinate members of the executive branch can come before the Senate——

Mr. MORSE. Yes.

Mr. CLARK. Of course, some of them are top level, but every now and then they are not on the top level, and they will tell us, "We will tell you this, but this is top secret." How do they get that authority?

Mr. MORSE. The major premise is based on the doctrine of privilege that accrues to the President of the United States, which is in effect delegated to his representatives. Second, it is based on those officials using the doctrine of privilege by saying to us, in effect, "I will tell you only on this condition," and unless we grant that condition, we cannot force them, under the doctrine of privilege, to disclose anything the President of the United States tells them not to disclose.

Without going into any depth on this matter, that question arose in two great hearings in which I participated. It came up in connection with the MacArthur hearing, and it came up in connection with the Formosa resolution.

I defend the doctrine of privilege. I defend the right of the executive branch of the Government to be free from dictation from the legislative branch. There is no question about that. But the Senator talks about comity in this matter. I have always urged in these matters that we try to sit down and arrive at an understanding with the executive branch to get the material we really need, and try to get as much of it as possible.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield briefly—and I am almost through——

Mr. MORSE. The Senator can take his time.

Mr. CLARK. This has been a most enlightening discussion to me.

Again, in somewhat lighter vein, this thought occurs to me, on which I would like to have the Senator's comment. It is true, I take it, from what the Senator has said, that the executive branch has authority, which it can delegate pretty far down, to determine what information which is given to a legislative committee of the Senate is classified and what is not; but in the end we still have one thing left in the Congress, and that is the power of the purse.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct.

Mr. CLARK. When the executive branch comes to Congress, asking first for authorizations, and then for appropriations, we do not have to give it to them if we do not so desire.

Mr. MORSE. That is correct. We also have the power to make our own investigations, which we do not exercise nearly enough, especially in foreign affairs. We do not have to rely nearly as much as we do upon the good grace of a relatively low-grade official to tell us what is going on or to advise us on policy. But the power over the purse is still our greatest check and that has not been exercised nearly enough either.

Mr. CLARK. I am reminded of the old story about the Chinese laundry.

An individual had sent some laundry to the Chinaman to wash for him. When he came back, the Chinaman asked for the ticket he had given him. The individual had lost his ticket. The Chinaman said, "No tickee, no shirtee."

It occurs to me that perhaps the executive branch is not entirely without some power in this instance, which, of course, should be exercised responsibly; which, of course, should never be done with demagoguery or for improper purposes, but which does give a basis, it seems to me, for a far more satisfactory arrangement for classification than is now in effect.

Mr. MORSE. I completely agree.

Mr. CLARK. The Senator raised the vexing problem of the CIA. It has puzzled me ever since I came to the Senate. I remember that the late Senator McCarthy, from Wisconsin, raised a question about placing appropriate oversight over the CIA.

Mr. MORSE. So did the present majority leader, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD]. He proposed a Mansfield amendment.

Mr. CLARK. Yes; so did the majority leader. Then the matter was dissipated.

I recognize the need, in the most imperfect world in which we live, to have a high level, well staffed, and well financed intelligence agency, much of the work of which is necessarily secret. The Senator will recall that the classic intelligence function is to collect, evaluate, and disseminate information. It is not to engage in military or quasi-military operations.

I am wondering whether the Senator, with his long experience in this field, has thought of any policy, or perhaps even a program, as to how we could regulate and exercise authority over the intelligence functions better than we do.

Mr. MORSE. Yes. Without taking time to go into it at great length, as the Senator may know, I have introduced in the past several years, and will introduce again, the so-called congressional watchdog proposal, modeled after the Mansfield and McCarthy proposals. I think it would be very helpful. That would provide a congressional check.

The important thing is that if the agency knows that the check exists, it is checked from expanding its activities beyond the intelligence collecting job to which the Senator from Pennsylvania has so rightly referred. That is where I want to keep it.

Mr. CLARK. This is my last comment. It is my understanding that there is a certain check now from certain senior members of the Appropriations Committee, and possibly the Armed Services Subcommittee, where the request for appropriations by CIA which are, perhaps correctly, pretty well dispersed across the whole budget, are revealed. Possibly that is enough.

Mr. MORSE. No. That is not a legislative check. It is not enough. It is a voluntary agreement check. I want the law on the books. I want them to conform to the law on the books. That is the real check, so that no one can, by his exercise of discretion, waive a check in regard to a particular matter. The present voluntary arrangement I think is rather unsatisfactory.

Mr. CLARK. I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, another $2 billion is not even in the AID bill. It is the food-for-peace program which is now sending food abroad at a rate approximating $2 billion per year. Mr. Bell does not have control over other kinds of foreign aid such as the Peace Corps, the Inter-American Highway, migration and refugee assistance, as well as many international institutions to which the United States provides vast funds, including the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Bank, the International Development Association, the International Finance Corporation, and many others—all of which are in some respects distributing the largess of the American taxpayer.

What has happened is that the generosity of the American people has been utilized to create a multiplicity of national and international institutions spending and loaning our tax dollars to help everyone.

CONGRESS SHOULD REASSERT CONTROL

A second fact to note is that Congress has lost control of these programs because of their number and their dispersal.

I know that there are some who will say, "Fine, keep Congress out of foreign policy." But this is not the way the Constitution is written. And even to those Americans who may feel that congressional control should be loosened, I say that there is no one in the executive branch of this Government who is in control of foreign aid. No one on an overall basis knows who gets what and why. At least five national agencies—AID, State, Defense, Peace Corps, and Agriculture—plus three international banking institutions scrap, negotiate, convene committees, and conclude agreements among themselves in trying to divide foreign aid dollars in such a way as to serve the national interest and, of course, preserve their own bureaucratic jurisdiction.

Nor does Congress have any reason to be intimidated by the implications so often thrown out from downtown and which appear so often in the press that Congress is too ignorant and incompetent to exercise any appreciable direction over foreign aid.

It is a strange and miraculous phenomenon to hear the presentations of foreign aid which now point with pride to the many changes in the program over the years. Today, aid administrators recommended the program as one which has been drastically cut down since the high point of the Marshall plan, as banning aid to Communist countries, as banning aid to countries that seize the property of U.S. investors, as having virtually eliminated aid to Indonesia and to the United Arab Republic, as having cut down greatly on grant economic aid, as having increased the loan terms to more realistic interest rates.

Yet, nearly all these changes were made by Congress, not by the executive branch, and were made over the vigorous objections of administration officials who insisted that statutory provisions of this kind were unnecessary and undesirable.

I need do no more than point to our experience with Ceylon. In adopting the Hickenlooper amendment terminating aid to a country that seized the property of our investors, Congress left no loophole; it gave the President no waiver power or discretionary power in the matter at all. Naturally, the amendment was strongly opposed "downtown." But aid to Ceylon was terminated under the terms of the Hickenhooper amendment.

What was the result? Was the stupidity of Congress revealed by Ceylon falling into the Communist orbit?

Quite the contrary. If anything was revealed it was the wisdom of the congressional policy. I do not contend that Congress can take credit for the election results which drew Ceylon back from its Communist tendencies, but that election is being hailed as unique in its rejection of procommunism, incompetence, and mismanagement.

It is simply my contention that the continued policy of flattering and currying favor with the Sukarnos and Nassers of the world has only seen our relations with those countries worsen. A firm, uniform, and statutory policy as applied to Ceylon has produced much better results. I only wish now that Congress had been as firm in its amendments relating to Indonesia and the United Arab Republic and had permitted no waiver or discretion to be exercised.

Judging from the praise now bestowed on aid provisions that were condemned and ridiculed when Congress adopted them, I think Congress can take some pride in its handiwork. It should encourage us to conduct a really far-reaching overhaul of the entire program.

CHANGES SINCE 1961

A third fact to keep in mind is that there have been vast changes in the world since 1961 when the AID bill was enacted. New states have multiplied; the older European states have prospered; the American balance of payments is running adversely; we have a new administration; the Sino-Soviet split has deepened; large programs in Indonesia and the United Arab Republic that cost us in the neighborhood of three-fourths of a billion dollars each seem to have produced negative results; our AID program in Vietnam has helped to get us into a war without allies; and the United Nations is on the rocks, financially at least.

The significance of these and other changes is not lost on the American people. With reason they demand that foreign aid be subjected to minute scrutiny by the Congress.

A fourth fact to consider is the self-evident evidence that in country after country, American aid programs are inviting the people of proud new nations to kick us out. There is something deeply and fundamentally wrong when foreign nations that have been the recipients of vast assistance from the United States are delighted to ask us to leave, and when so many of the countries where we stay are under regimes that are oppressive and on their way out.

A final factor to which I invite attention is that the Committee on Foreign Relations for some years now has been calling for changes in these programs, insisting that the United States be more selective in providing assistance, less magnanimous toward dictators, and more parsimonious in manpower and missions.

The only trouble with the reports of the Foreign Relations Committee, as I have stated earlier, is that they point out all the defects. They give me all the language but never the votes. They tell me how good my proposals are, and they write them out in the reports which members of the Foreign Relations Committee never see until we pick them up on our desk in the Senate Chamber the day debate starts.

During the past 2 years, members on the Foreign Relations Committee—except the chairman and possibly one other member—never saw either report. They are not signed reports. We pick them up when debate starts.

All one has to do is to read the reports of the Foreign Relations Committee on the foreign aid vote in the past 2 years and find all the support for my amendment that is needed. The only thing wrong with reports is that they point out that the amendments were turned down, but they say to the administration, “You had better do something about these points before next year, or you will be in trouble. That is what the Foreign Relations Committee reports have stated, in effect, for 2 years.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield?

Mr. MORSE. But I hope they will be in real trouble this year. I have done my best to give them plenty of trouble in the past 2 years. I have not done badly. A few of my amendments have been adopted. I hope, this year, that we will have it out. I hope that this year the Senate will adopt amendments which really carry out the warnings of the Foreign Relations Committee for the past 2 years.

There has been a rising tide of opposition among Members of this body; former friends have turned into opponents; men like the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. COOPER], a former Ambassador to India, asks for country by country reappraisal of our programs; and indeed, the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee himself, reaching the end of the rope in managing the mixed bag of programs annually presented to the Congress, asks for relief.

Mr. President, I have acquired the reputation during the past 2 years of being the No. 1 enemy of foreign aid in the Senate. Nothing could be further from the truth. I am for a program that serves the national interest; I will support these programs if I believe they are conceived and administered in order to enlarge the area of individual initiative and freedom and the rule of law in this world by in fact bringing succor and development to the poor.

Unfortunately, the bills we have had before us the last few years have failed miserably to advance our national interest by helping underdeveloped nations move to improve their economic condition and to secure economic and political freedom for their people.

Mr. President, I propose a simple remedy in the short amendment which I have submitted today. I hope it will be read by every Senator.

In broad terms, this amendment is designed to help both the Congress and the President to get control of the sprawling octopus that has become foreign aid.

TERMS OF AMENDMENT

My amendment authorizes a planning committee, consisting of members of the House and Senate Foreign Affairs Committees, plus four public members to be appointed by the President. To them is assigned the task of assessing our foreign aid program to date and recommending a new one by July 1966. No aid under the current Foreign Assistance Act or title I of food for peace would be extended after July of 1967, giving Congress a year to consider the recommendation of the planning group before enacting a new program.

My amendment, however, is not a blank page for this planning group to fill in. It sets forth certain guidelines that I believe should be followed in recommending a new program. One is that not more than 50 countries shall receive aid at any one time. That device is one means of making it apparent that it is a privilege to receive aid, not a duty for the United States to extend aid to everyone. The limitation will also require a more stringent assessment of who is really deserving of our assistance.

The amendment also spells out that, except for humanitarian and strictly political types of aid, our programs are to be directed toward promoting development in countries which have some appreciation for the advantages of a free enterprise system and a rule of law. It limits aid to those countries that show a desire to develop in the direction of free institutions.

The committee is called upon to recommend a program that will more clearly define the purposes of aid. Humanitarian, relief aid, and that channeled through international bodies would be considered as one purpose. A second would be that for development, which, however, would be confined to project aid rather than general lending to the greatest extent possible.

A third purpose of aid would be military, with the stipulation that the only criterion for military aid henceforth shall be the military defense of the United States.

A fourth purpose of aid would be the political or contingency purposes, which I would expect to be financed out of a fairly modest contingency fund.

My amendment calls upon the planning group to unify the administration of all bilateral aid programs, including food for peace.

It further requires the unified aid program for each country to be approved by Congress after the end of fiscal year 1967. In my opinion, that is the only means whereby Congress can exercise that control over expenditures which is essential if our form of government is to be preserved and which is equally essential, if foreign aid is to achieve the vital elements of stability, continuity, and reasonable results.

Obviously, the committee would depart from the principles the amendment sets forth, but the burden of proof would fall on those seeking a departure.

After its report a year from now, Congress would have another year to consider the new program.

I should like to make perfectly clear that I am willing to consider any proposal from anyone who believes he can improve upon the amendment. I am perfectly willing to go along with any perfecting of it. But the objective is what I shall battle away for; namely, that we clear the slate by the end of the fiscal year 1967 and that we grant further aid by way of applications made by not more than 50 countries which demonstrate their willingness to comply with the criteria and the guidelines that would be set forth in the type of bill that I think would result from the planning study that the amendment seeks to bring about.

EXHIBIT 1

AMENDMENT 61

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MORSE to S. 1524, a bill to amend further the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes.

At the end of the bill add the following:

"PART IV—PROGRAMS FOR FISCAL YEARS BEGINNING AFTER JUNE 30, 1967

"SEC. 401. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new part IV to read as follows:

" 'PART IV—PROGRAMS FOR FISCAL YEARS BEGINNING AFTER JUNE 30, 1967

" 'SEC. 701. TERMINATION OF EXISTING PROGRAMS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no assistance shall be furnished pursuant to this Act or pursuant to title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, or any extension thereof, to any country or area (or enterprise therein) subsequent to June 30, 1967.

" 'SEC. 702. PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS.—The President is requested to submit to the Congress, on or before July 1, 1966, his recommendations, including legislative proposals designed to carry out such recommendations for such future foreign assistance programs as may be necessary and appropriate in the national interest and as may be consistent with the principles set forth in section 703.

" 'SEC. 703. PRINCIPLES TO BE EMBODIED IN PROPOSALS FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS.—(a) In the formulation and submission to the Congress of proposals for foreign assistance for fiscal years beginning on or after July 1, 1967, such proposals shall include and be divided into the following separate and distinct categories—

" '(1) Assistance intended primarily for humanitarian purposes, including grants, loans, contributions, or other aid to be made available for relief purposes through international organizations or relief agencies, famine relief and other assistance authorized by title II of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended, and similar relief programs, which should be administered without regard to political considerations and without regard to the social or economic organization of recipient states.

" '(2) Assistance for development purposes (A) to be extended only to countries in which the rule of law is respected, in which there is freedom of expression and of the press, and in which the governments recognize the importance, and encourage the exercise, of individual freedom and initiative, and (B) (except for technical assistance and assistance furnished through free world development institutions) to be extended only on a bilateral basis with not less than 75 per centum thereof being furnished for specific projects.

" '(3) Assistance for political or contingency purposes, to be extended on a bilateral basis to a limited number of countries or areas, primarily for purposes of advancing or protecting the political interests of the United States, such as programs relating to the creation of special relationships with recipient countries, reinforcement of alliance-type relationships, or other similar political or contingency purposes.

" '(4) Military assistance to be furnished only for purposes that serve the military defense of the United States as recommended by the Secretary of Defense, subject to approval by the Secretary of State.

" '(b) The proposals referred to in subsection (a) shall also provide that after June 30, 1967, the total number of countries receiving assistance referred to in paragraphs (2), (3), and (4), of subsection (a) shall not exceed a total of fifty, and that such assistance shall not be extended to any country not authorized by the Congress to receive such assistance.

" '(c) In order to provide for better coordination of all programs of United States assistance to foreign countries, and for more efficient, economical, and effective administration of such programs, the proposals referred to in subsection (a) shall also include provisions for unification, insofar as practicable, of the administration of such programs under a single officer or agency.

" 'SEC. 704. Temporary Planning Committee Established.—(a) There is hereby created a Foreign Aid Planning Committee (hereinafter referred to as the "Committee") which shall consist of twelve members to be selected as follows:

" '(1) Four members, not otherwise holding office under or employed by the United States, to be appointed by the President;

" '(2) Four members of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, to be designated by the Vice President;

" '(3) Four members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, to be designated by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

One of the members appointed under paragraph (1) shall be designated by the President as Chairman of the Committee.

" '(b) It shall be the duty of the Committee to advise and otherwise assist the President (or such officer or agency as the President may designate to formulate the program described in section 703) in the planning and formulation of such program.

" '(c) The Committee is authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such secretarial, clerical, and other staff assistants as may be necessary to enable it to perform its functions, including the procurement, without regard to the civil service laws and the Classification Act of 1949, as amended, of temporary and intermittent services to the same extent as is authorized for the departments by section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (60 Stat. 810; 5 U.S.C. 55a), but at rates not to exceed $75 per diem for individuals.

" '(d) Members of the Committee appointed under subsection (a)(1) shall be paid compensation at the rate of $100 per diem while engaged in the work of the Committee, and shall be reimbursed for travel and other necessary expenses incurred while so engaged, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 73b-2) for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

" '(e) Each department and agency of the Government is authorized to furnish to the Committee, upon request made by the Chairman, such information or other assistance as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions.

" '(f) The Committee shall from time to time transmit to the President, and to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, reports of its activities, including its recommendations, and shall file its final report on or before January 3, 1967. Upon the filing of its final report, the Committee shall cease to exist.

" '(g) There are authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed an aggregate of $400,000 as may be necessary to enable the Committee to carry out its functions.' "

VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I should like very quickly to refer to the speech on the issue of Vietnam which my great colleague, the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], made earlier today.

Once again I am proud to be associated with him in our objections to the war-making policies of the United States in Asia.

Earlier today, commenting on what he said, I said that I am satisfied that if those policies continue, the American people will be involved in a massive war in Asia in the not too distant future. The time has come when there is no longer any hope for bilateral negotiations between the United States and North Vietnam or between the United States on the one side and North Vietnam and Red China on the other. I believe we must get a third force in the picture now. We must get an intermediary. We must get a group of nonparticipants.

That is why we must bring in the membership of the United Nations not participating in this war to carry out their obligations under the United Nations Charter. I should like to say to the head of every government that is signatory to the United Nations, "You have a duty to back up your signature on that Charter by using the procedures of that Charter to bring the United States to an accounting and to bring to an accounting the Communist world that is threatening the peace of the world."

The United States is as guilty as any power in the world in threatening the peace of the world today, for we are conducting a unilateral United States military action—an American war—in Asia, and we do not have a scintilla of right under international law to conduct that war.

On the contrary, we stand in violation of our signature on the United Nations Treaty, and we stand in violation of our commitment to abide by the Geneva Accord of 1954. We have not done so. The International Control Commission has so found.

Yet the present administration, when it issued its propaganda paper called the white paper, conveniently avoided telling the world in that paper that we, too, had been found guilty of violating the Geneva Accord. We saw to it that we put in the paper the fact that North Vietnam had been found guilty. But so have we and so has South Vietnam. That is why I say, as a party litigant, so to speak, that we must have a judge now to adjudge the case. We can no longer be the judge.

That is why I am glad to support the Senator from Alaska, who time and time again has said that the first step must be a ceasefire. In my judgment, the United Nations is the body that should call for the ceasefire; and it should then move in and set up the negotiation table.

If 85 nations of the world said to the Communists and to the United States, "We think you owe it to mankind to stop the course of action that is endangering and inflaming the world in a nuclear war if it is not stopped," the Communist world as well as the United States would go to the conference table.

Mr. President, I am through with my speech on the Vietnam issue today, but to give support to the great Senator from Alaska and to back up the point of view that I have stood for and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] has stood for now for so long, I shall ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD material taken from the press of this country which, in varying degrees and with varying emphasis, and, in some instances, some differences in development of the theme, neverthless, taken as a whole, are encouraging support for the position of those of us who have refused to go along with this administration in its warmaking in Asia.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that an article from the March 30 issue of the Washington Post by Marquis Childs entitled "Will L.B.J. Fall Into a Goldwater Trap?" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILL L.B.J. FALL IN A GOLDWATER TRAP?

(By Marquis Childs)

For an impulsive man Barry Goldwater has been remarkably restrained since the debacle of last November. He might have been writing "I told you so" on every vacant space since the policy followed by the administration in Vietnam resembles in kind, if not yet degree, what Goldwater advocated in the campaign.

Yet to this point he has made only one public speech—to the Young Republicans 6 weeks ago—in which he demanded to know what was wrong with his campaign recommendations for bringing all possible force to bear against communism in southeast Asia. Within the administration there is acute sensitivity on this score.

The line as officially dispensed is that the choice last fall was not so much between policies as between the contrasting temperaments of the two candidates—one man "trigger happy," the phrase Democratic orators used; the other repeatedly declaring his willingness to go anywhere and talk to anyone in the search for peace. If one issue could be singled out as decisive, aside from the ineptitude and inefficiency of the Goldwater campaign, this was it.

A recent Gallup poll showed a marked drop in the percentage of voters who thought that the Democratic Party would be more likely to keep the country out of World War III. The increase in those saying "no difference" between the parties was 16 percent. This is reflected in mail to Senators critical of Vietnam policy saying that they had not voted for Lyndon Johnson so that he could carry out the policy of Barry Goldwater.

While early in the campaign Goldwater used such choice adjectives as "liar" and "faker" in attacking the President, a more prominent target as the contest heated up was Secretary of Defense McNamara. The Republican candidate called him Yo-yo McNamara in speech after speech. He accused him of putting out falsely optimistic statements about Vietnam following each trip to the scene of the conflict.

Having come directly from one of the most commanding positions in industry into Government, McNamara had never before experienced such a public broadside. True, he had undergone Senator JOHN MCCLELLAN'S attack in the TFX investigation. There, however, he could and did defend himself with his customary skill and resourcefulness.

Answering the political blast with statements from the Pentagon, he nevertheless had to endure a punishment that to him was cruel and unusual. Today, as the President's principal adviser on Vietnam, no one can accuse him of vacillation. Those questioning where the policy can end short of American commitment to all-out war in southeast Asia are asking whether he may not be overreacting to the unaccustomed abuse he was forced to endure.

In September of 1963 McNamara and Gen. Maxwell Taylor, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, paid a 5-day visit to Vietnam. On their return they reported to a National Security Council meeting and the White House issued a statement saying:

"Secretary McNamara and General Taylor reported their judgment that the major part of the military task can be completed by the end of 1965, although there may be a continuing requirement for a limited number of * * * training personnel. They reported that by the end of this year (1965) the U.S. program for training Vietnamese should have progressed to the point where 1,000 U.S. military personnel * * * can be withdrawn.

The statement went on to stress that the political situation was "deeply serious." But the difficulty from the beginning has been that the appraisals by McNamara and other high-ranking visitors fail to relate the political to the military. Almost entirely lacking in experience in either international or domestic politics, McNamara relied on the estimates of the top-ranking military. They, in turn, were anxious to put the best possible face on the war. Since the statement was issued more than 20,000 additional American advisers have been sent to Vietnam.

In his appearance before the Young Republicans in Washington, beginning with a 12-minute standing ovation, Goldwater retracted not one word of his campaign. While he approved the steps taken to carry the war to North Vietnam, he went on to say he had a terrible feeling that turning tail and coming home is what the Johnson administration has in mind. In short, he was identifying the political trap and if his opponent of last November should fall into it he will be heard from loud and long.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New York Times for April 1 entitled "New Phase in Vietnam" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW PHASE IN VIETNAM

The American predicament in Vietnam now is one for which the French have a word. It is "engrenage," which roughly translated means getting caught in a massive set of moving gears.

The limited air war against North Vietnam having thus far failed to persuade Hanoi to halt its aggression—as the attack on the American Embassy in Saigon confirms—President Johnson reportedly now faces a proposal to increase the pressure. And Ambassador Taylor evidently has returned from Saigon to help him decide how much to step up the raids.

The attacks theoretically can be escalated in various ways. They can be heightened in frequency or in intensity. They can be broadened in target choice, adding economic installations to the military ones struck so far. And they can be stepped up in geographical sensitivity, in proximity to North Nietnam's control center and capital, Hanoi.

To escalate the attacks in frequency or intensity or in choice of targets offers little, especially if they continue to be limited largely to the southern third of North Vietnam. Between the 17th and 19th parallels, there simply are not enough targets.

That was one reason it was suggested to the President last year that the operation begin with small-scale, semiclandestine attacks, as in Laos. That way it was thought there would be enough targets for a year and yet Moscow would not be put on the spot and Hanoi would not lose face in gradually making quiet peace overtures.

But the publicly announced mass raids decided on in February seem not only to have forced Soviet arms shipments and a stiffening of position in Hanoi, but to have assured that the target list would be exhausted in 2 or 3 months. That eventually is now on the horizon, although efforts are being made to postpone the inevitable by reducing the size of the attacks.

The fact is that escalation by going north of the 19th parallel is the only practicable way to increase the pressure. The first question that must be decided here is whether it is feasible to prevent installation of a Soviet air defense system of surface-air missiles and jets if, as reported, this equipment is on its way. The recent attacks on the radar links in North Vietnam's air warning and ground control system suggest that this may be the American intention. It could lead to a direct confrontation with Russia.

Attacks on military and industrial installations in the Hanoi-Haiphong area, moreover, would risk conflict with China—not only in the air but on the ground, which would mean another Korea. Even so doughty a government as the military regime in Thailand, which now is virtually a cobelligerent alongside the United States, has warned that the Red River Valley region surrounding Hanoi and Haiphong is the beginning of the highly sensitive Chinese periphery.

Even if these dangers do not eventuate, the number of significant military and industrial targets north of the 19th parallel is not extensive. North Vietnam is a primitive agricultural country with only about 150,000 industrial workers and miners in its 17 million population. The North Vietnamese Communists undoubtedly would not enjoy losing the few dozen small factories they have built or restored over the past decade. But they simply do not have much to lose.

It seems clear bombing will not bring about Hanoi's unconditional surrender. It may not even produce a negotiation, unless the United States makes persuasive peace proposals that both rally world opinion and offer Hanoi a more attractive route to viability than reunification of Vietnam by force.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New York Times of March 31 entitled "The Answer to Terror" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ANSWER TO TERROR

The sense of doom that seems to lie over the Vietnamese conflict was given a horrible symbol in the terrorist attack on the American Embassy in Saigon.

The war escalates, and it can do nothing but escalate since both sides continue on courses that must crash because they are opposing, adamant, and dependent on force. The fact that some form of escalation from the Communist side was just as predictable as the previous U.S. escalation is no comfort for yesterday's savage act of terrorism in Saigon and no reason to condone such a ruthless atrocity.

The temptation to strike back—and much harder—is clear, though in his temperate statement yesterday, President Johnson seems to be resisting it. The conflict has been moving not like a vicious circle but like a vicious ascending spiral ever since the reprisal policy began after the Vietcong attack on Pleiku last month. That policy has thus far failed of its purpose of forcing Hanoi to call off its campaign of subversion and aggression in South Vietnam.

The previous U.S. policy, tried for 4 years, of creating a stable, viable, independent South Vietnam had also failed. The subsequent extension of the war to North Vietnam was a tacit admission of the failure. There is no adequate reason to hope that a further escalation can succeed in anything but more death and destruction, and the grave danger of bringing in the Russians and/or Chinese, and also bringing them together.

The problem that Vietnam represents is not going to be solved by military means. The solution lies in the political, economic, and social fields. But the situation has now deteriorated to such a degree that the only instrument Washington has and uses is military force. There was a time, and not very long ago, when negotiation was a promising possibility. In present circumstances it seems that neither China nor Russia nor North Vietnam is interested. Yet, sooner or later, negotiation will again be feasible if the ground is prepared with some other seeds than bombs, and it should be prepared now.

The United States has the power to repay the Saigon atrocity with force a hundred or a thousand times over. This requires no thought, no skill, no diplomacy, no understanding—just power. It would not bring about Hanoi's unconditional surrender. A serious peace offensive might bring the desired results. Its preparation is urgent and essential and should take precedence over the planning, now evidently underway, for extension of the war.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article from the New York Times by Robert Kleiman entitled "Vietnam: The Inexplicable Strategy" be printed in the RECORD. Note the titles of the articles. We could not have had these articles a year ago. The exhibits that I am putting in the RECORD are eloquent proof that there is a great shift of viewpoint in this country; and I am satisfied that that shift will widen in the months ahead.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 29, 1965]

VIETNAM: THE INEXPLICABLE STRATEGY

(By Robert Kleiman)

PARIS.—Washington's policy of bombing North Vietnam while avoiding negotiations is sowing confusion among America's friends. To cross East Asia, India, and the Soviet Union to this NATO capital in Europe is to hear repeated questioning of the purposes and tactics of American policy.

There is worry about Soviet or Chinese intervention that would escalate the conflict into a major war. There is concern that the bombing will bring about a Sino-Soviet rapprochement. There is disquiet that Soviet-American and other East-West talks leading toward a detente are grinding to a halt. And there is skepticism everywhere that the bombing by itself will force Hanoi to halt its infiltration—the stated American objective—or persuade the Vietcong to give up their winning battle in South Vietnam.

OBSCURE U.S. GOALS

But what most disturbs the Allies and friendly neutrals—especially the British and Indians, who would like to mediate—is the lack of definition of American objectives. Even full explanations delivered privately by special envoys from Washington seem to leave American intentions so opaque that there is little of interest to communicate to Moscow, Peiping or Hanoi, where London and New Delhi both maintain diplomatic missions.

The lucid chairman of the State Department's Policy Planning Council, Walt Rostow, spent several days recently explaining Washington's thinking to high foreign office officials of a dozen NATO countries. These conversations, on the sidelines of the semiannual seminar of the Atlantic Policy Advisory Group in Reinhartshausen, West Germany, overshadowed the European issues on the regular agenda. But, when it was all over, the European policy planners felt little more enlightened than before. The consensus was that the United States urgently needed to clarify its purposes, both privately and publicly. Mr. Rostow was urged to carry this message back to Washington.

HARRIMAN IN INDIA

An even less successful encounter occurred earlier this month in New Delhi. Roving Ambassador Averell Harriman spent many hours skillfully explaining American policy on Vietnam. He received a sympathetic if noncommital hearing from Prime Minister Shastri. But he clashed with Foreign Minister Swaran Singh, who urged negotiations and a new Geneva conference, as did other high Indian officials.

The incident shows that even Washington's most prestigious Ambassador has difficulty obtaining support abroad for a policy that resists negotiations while bombing North Vietnam. The Indians are clear that their interests parallel those of the United States in trying to prevent domination of southeast Asia by Communist China, but they do not agree with all the tactics Washington is employing for this purpose.

The Indians were told that the United States would welcome their help in exploring Communist intentions and in explaining American views, particularly during Shastri's forthcoming visit to Moscow. The key point was to make it clear that the United States was not going to negotiate until Hanoi had stopped its aggression. The Indians were urged to stand with Washington in opposing the Franco-Soviet proposal for a conference without preconditions. The United States, Mr. Harriman emphasized, could not agree to a conference without adequate conditions.

What, asked the Indians, are the American conditions? At that point President Johnson's special envoy—his hands obviously tied by his White House instructions, or lack of them—had to reply that it was premature to explain this, but that Washington wanted India's support for the principle that there must be conditions.

The Indians said they had been informed of Soviet plans to provide North Vietnam with surface-to-air missiles, technicians and fighter aircraft manned by Soviet personnel. And they warned that Moscow would not pursue bilateral negotiations for a détente while American bombing continued.

The Indians believe there is a serious threat of war stemming from the possibility that Russia may take over the air defense of North Vietnam. In urging negotiations they argue that, once the conference date is set, a cease-fire effective before the talks begin will be more easily obtainable.

As the major power in Asia threatened by Communist Chinese aggression, the Indians believe that the United States should take the initiative in proposing a conference, stating its conditions and objectives clearly. Some suggest that Washington take the dramatic step of announcing that it would stop bombing North Vietnam for 2 or 3 weeks, pending a Communist reply and cessation of major Communist military operations. This would expose whether Hanoi and Moscow were serious in stating that the main obstacle to negotiation was the bombing of North Vietnam.

PEACE OFFENSIVE NEEDED

Undoubtedly, there are other ingenious formulas that would permit the United States to open a long-neglected peace offensive. Proposals for an honorable negotiation, now evoked by President Johnson as an objective, would help refute the image the United States has been acquiring in Asia as "the white aggressor on colored soil," in Europe, it would reply to such charges as that of the New Statesman that Washington "has now forfeited all right to British sympathy over Vietnam" because of a "savage intensification of the war * * * accompanied by an apparent refusal to contemplate negotiations in any form."

And it is even possible that persuasive proposals might find a response in the Communist world. Clearly, before any further step-up in the American air offensive in North Vietnam, the time has come to devise and set in motion a political stategy that, for the first time, will take priority over military tactics.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter which I received from Michael Rosen, along with an open letter to President Johnson on Vietnam, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROVIDENCE, R.I.,
March 23, 1965.

Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washintgon, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: The enclosed open letter to President Johnson appeared in the Sunday edition of the Providence Journal, March 21. I thought I would like to bring it to your attention.

I would also like to thank you for your courageous stand on the Vietnam issue. It is unfortunate that your sane, forthright defense of world law is in such marked contrast to the opinions of so many of your colleagues.

Thank you for your attention.

Sincerely yours,

MICHAEL ROSEN.

OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT JOHNSON ON VIETNAM

We, as members of the academic community of Rhode Island, are deeply concerned about our policies in southeast Asia. The United States has increased its involvement in Vietnam: The danger of a major war in Asia is increasing rapidly.

We are willing to accept risks and sacrifices on behalf of our country. However, as citizens of a democratic society, we have the responsibility to ask what sacrifices will be involved and for what purposes they will be made.

Why are we in Vietnam? You have stated that we are there to help the Vietnamese people defend their freedom. Mr. President, as coup follows coup in Saigon, how can we believe that the people of this strife-ridden country are free? Not one of these many governments has been elected and not one appears to have had any widespread support.

Are we on the side of a popular cause? There is much evidence that we are not. For example, after the recent attack on our base at Pleiku, an American officer was quoted as saying, "any of the people in the hamlet over there could have warned us that the Vietcong were around, but they did not warn us."

If aid from North Vietnam ceased, would the guerrilla activity cease? There is little reason to believe that it would. Most reports available to the public contend that the Vietcong weaponry consists largely of captured U.S. equipment. The guerrillas are fed and sheltered by the rural population of South Vietnam. In fact, the major proportion of the Vietcong forces seem to be recruited from the native peasantry.

How can we hope to end the war by extending it to North Vietnam when the main source of the difficulty appears to be the instability and unpopularity of the regime in Saigon? While Hanoi certainly aids the rebel activity, bombing the north cannot stop the Vietcong from obtaining supplies in the south. It is obvious that this could only be accomplished by winning the support of a majority of the Vietnamese people.

Is it possible to win a military victory in South Vietnam? The French suffered 172,000 casualties and they lost the war. A military expert estimated that we would have to commit up to 1 million American soldiers probably for many years. North Vietnam has an army of 250,000 men; China has an army of several million men. Mr. President, we could devastate Asia with nuclear weapons but can we win a land war against such forces?

The only real alternative to large-scale war is a negotiated settlement. The United States and China are the only two major countries who have refused to see the need for such negotiations. Our demand for complete Vietcong withdrawal is as unrealistic as China's demand for complete American withdrawal. In the past, in Algeria, Suez, Cyprus, and many other places, the United States has maintained that conflicts must be settled at the conference table. World opinion is virtually unanimous in agreeing that this conflict, too, should be settled by diplomats, not armies.

The dangers of further escalation are grave. At best, this would mean the abandonment of all the excellent plans for building the Great Society and the deaths of hundreds of thousands of Americans. At worst, it could mean a nuclear holocaust.

A recent Gallop poll has shown that 81 percent of the American people are in favor of an international conference including the leaders of southeast Asia and China. We urge you to follow this course. It is the only honorable, just, and humane way out of our present dilemma.

This advertisement has been paid for by the signers.

If you are in agreement with this statement we urge you to write to President Johnson and your Senators.

(NOTE.—The members of the academic community who have signed this letter have done so only as individual citizens. The institutional affiliations are included solely for the purpose of identification.)

Brown University: Charles Baldwin, Chaplain; Kenenth Barkin, History; Frederick W. Barnes, Jr., Division of Medical Science; Frederic E. Bisshopp, Applied Mathematics; Donald S. Blough, Psychology; Kees W. Bolle, Religious Studies; Elizabeth Brown Chase, Biology; Herman B. Chase, Biology; Leallyn B. Clapp, Chemistry; Allan H. Clark, Mathematics; William C. Crossgrove, German; Donald Fanger, Slavic Languages; Leo N. Flanagan, English; Wendell Fleming, Mathematics; Ted Frankel, Mathematics; Eugene A. Friedmann, Sociology and Anthropology; Stanton Garner, English; John K. Gilbert, French; Joseph Gurland, Engineering; Frederick W. Hegge, Psychology; Herbert Heidelberger, Philosophy; Michael Hinden, English; Werner Hoffmeister, German; Park Honan, English; Alan Howard, Mathematics; David Joravsky, History; Donald L. Kimmel, Jr., Division of Medical Science; Edward Koren, Art; Seymour Lederberg, Biology; Myrna Pike Lee, Mathematics; Barbara K. Lewalski, English; William G. McLoughlin, History; Nicolaus C. Mills, American Civilization; Gerald Needham, Art; Etta S. Onat, English; E. T. Onat, Engineering; Harold Organic, Sociology; Charles H. Philbric, English; Beverly S. Ridgely, French; Michael I. Rosen, Mathematics; Thomas G. Sanders, Religious Studies; Lawrence F. Schiff, Sociology; Richard Schmitt, Philosophy; William R. Schoedel, Religious Studies; D. W. Schumann, German; Steven S. Schwarzschild, Religious Studies; Julius S. Scott, Christian Association; Merwin Sibulkin, Engineering; Alene F. Silver, Biology; Carole Sirovich, Mathematics; David Stea, Psychology; Fred Stollnitz, Psychology; Vincent Tomas, Philosphy; Harold N. Ward, Mathematics; Karl S. Weimar, German; Leonard Weiss, Applied Mathematics; John Wermer, Mathematics; Margaret L. Wilbur, English.

Rhode Island College: Paul W. Anghinetti, English; Edith C. Becker, Art; Walter J. Blanchard, Social Studies; Elizabeth Cooling, Elementary Education; Doris Dashew, History; Spencer DeVault, Psychology; Thomas G. Devine, English; Ara Dostourian, History; Morton Felix, Psychology, D. G. Hartman, Biology; Raymond H. Holden, Psychology; Anthony H. Hull, History; Aileen S. Kraditor, History; Kenneth F. Lewalsky, History; Eugene H. Perry, Social Science; Donald C. Smith, Art; Nancy Sullivan, English; Herbert R. Winter, Political Science.

Rhode Island School of Design: Robert G. Hamilton, Painting; Baruch D. Kirchenbaum, History of Art; John W. Lincoln, Design; Bernard Sabaroff, Architecture; Judith Speyer, Associate Chaplain.

University of Rhode Island: M. Ezzedin Batroukha, Journalism; James D. Brash, Dean of Summer Session; Joel A. Dain, Chemistry; Joel B. Dirlam, Economics; Otto Dornberg, Languages; Herman Eschenbacher, Education; George Fitzelle, Child Development; Mark I. Goldman, English; Ethyl Grady, Home Management; William Haller, Jr., Economics; Niels Madsen, Chemical Engineering; Nelson Marshall, Oceanography; Richard T. Neuse, English; Elizabeth Page, Child Development; Elton Rayeck, Economics; Stanley Rubinsky, Industrial Engineering; Richard Sabatino, Economics; Milton Solomon, Agricultural Chemistry; Bernard Schurman, Economics; Robert F. Smith, History; Warren Smith, English; Grace Ellen Stiles, Education; A. Ralph Thompson, Chemical Engineering; Paschal Viglionese, Languages; Ferdinand Votta, Jr., Chemical Engineering; Frank G. Wiener, Marketing.

Mr. MORSE. Many in the academic communities who are signing these open letters are recognized scholars on Asia. They have signed advertisements protesting this administration's policies in Asia. Those men have forgotten more about Asia than Rusk, the Bundys, McNamara, Taylor, Alexis Johnson, and the reset of this administration's war hawks will ever know about Vietnam. These men have forgotten more about Asia than the President's advisers will ever know. That is why it saddens me to find my administration following such ill advice as it has been following, when it has available to it the knowledge of outstanding authorities who have had the courage to stand up.

Do Senators believe that it is easy for them to do so? They have had the courage to stand up in their academic communities.

Let us consider Hans Morgenthau of Chicago. Can Senators cite to me any man in this country, including anyone in the present administration, whose knowledge on Asia can even begin to compare with that of Hans Morgenthau?

The other day I lectured at the University of Chicago. I was honored by being invited to participate in a 30-minute radio broadcast with Hans Morgenthau.

Not only did he fill me with humility; he inspired me with a determination to continue to warn the American people about the holocaust they are being led into if the war in Vietnam is not stopped. What Hans Morgenthau said there and what he said in the article that the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] placed in the RECORD earlier this afternoon is irrefutable; and this administration cannot answer him. The same is true of the other scholars whose names will be found on these advertisements.

I am only pleading that my administration listen to the advice of those who know, rather than to the advice of those who have themselves so implicated and have now developed such a professional self-interest, because they do not want to be proved wrong, that the great danger is that they are going to be proved wrong. Too many people are going to sacrifice their lives before there is a final recognition that we cannot win the peace by making war.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "House Studies Charges U.S. Military Restricting Viet News," published in the Sunday Oregonian of March 21, 1965.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregonian, Mar. 21, 1965]

HOUSE STUDIES CHARGES U.S. MILITARY RESTRICTING VIET NEWS

WASHINGTON.—An information subcommittee of the House of Representatives is investigating complaints that U.S. military authorities are imposing severe restrictions on foreign correspondents in South Vietnam.

"We are very concerned that the American people get maximum information in Vietnam," the subcommittee chairman, Representative JOHN E. MOSS, Democrat, of California, said.

The Defense Department has promised to investigate the situation and will make a full report, a subcommittee aid reported.

Top U.S. Government information officers will discuss news coverage in Vietnam with U.S. press relations officials.

Marshall Wright, State Department press officer, said in Washington that the meeting would look into news coverage of American military and other activities in the war-torn country.

Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, in reply to a newsman's questions, acknowledged some changes in announcements of air strikes against Communist North Vietnam. But he said the Department's policy was one of "complete candor with newsmen."

VERSION VARIES

Dispatches from Saigon, however, painted a picture of restrictions which are making the war there more difficult to cover than at any time since major U.S. involvement began in 1961.

While there are 115 accredited correspondents in Vietnam, there are 60 American military and civilian officers assigned to keep tabs on the correspondents. At least as many Vietnamese press officers are similarly employed, creating a ratio of about one information officer per correspondent.

Newsmen in Saigon reported these recent developments:

1. Five newsmen were arrested inside the U.S. marine compound at Da Nang, the strategic airbase near the North Vietnam frontier. A spokesman said there had been a misunderstanding and the newsmen were released.

2. Six weeks after the Pentagon said it was working on a pool of correspondents to join the 7th Fleet and report first hand activities of American pilots, a group of correspondents was flown to the carrier *Ranger* for a brief 1-day visit. A staff of 23 carefully briefed escort officers stayed with the newsmen during the visit.

3. An escorting officer must accompany each correspondent admitted to Da Nang Airbase.

4. Interviews with fliers must be arranged on an individual basis with the escort officer present, a policy also in effect in the Pentagon.

5. Newsmen have been barred from U.S. military clubs and restaurants both at Da Nang Airbase and in the city of Da Nang.

6. Pilots flying outside Vietnam are instructed not to talk to anyone.

TWO DISPATCHED

Two U.S. information officers, one civilian and one military, were sent from Saigon to Da Nang Thursday to investigate the situation. Authorities in Saigon said there were plans to establish a press camp in Da Nang but they would not elaborate.

"This is the first war in American history," one newsman told an American military spokesman in Vietnam, "in which newsmen are being barred from the battle area—in this case airstrikes, airbases, and the fleet—to talk freely with the men involved."

Newsmen have expressed no objection to safeguards against disclosure of classified information. There is no censorship of correspondents' dispatches.

Their main handicap to free flow of news is caused by drying up of sources. Some newsmen hold that the presence of an escort officer at every interview frightens the man being interviewed so that natural answers are not obtainable.

Newsmen also fear that no distinction will be made between stories involving security and those involving subjects annoying or embarrassing to military policymakers.

During World War II, hundreds of correspondents reported military activities in every part of the world. A number were killed. Dispatches were subject to censorship.

Wes Gallagher, general manager of the Associated Press, said in a statement issued in New York:

"New restrictions imposed by the Pentagon raise serious questions as to whether the American people will be able to get a true picture of the war in Vietnam.

"Barring correspondents from free access to airbases and other military installations and providing an 'escort' for every correspondent is clearly aimed not at security matters but at controlling what American fighting men might say. Such controls exceed anything done in the darkest days of World War II.

"Correspondents have voluntarily acceded to military requests on security matters, such as not reporting raids until planes return. So far as the Associated Press is concerned, our correspondents would be prepared to submit airbase copy to formal censorship if the U.S. Army installs it.

"FREEDOM ASKED

"But correspondents should be free to see and cover all aspects of the war as was done in World War II.

"The spectacle of 23 Navy 'escort' officers greeting a small group of correspondents on a brief carrier visit, of scores of press relations officers being on U.S. payrolls but not available when a correspondent wants to get on an airbase would be ludicrous if the matter were not so serious."

During much of the past year, officially sanctioned press interviews with American servicemen have required the presence of a military information officer. In practice, however, correspondents traveling on their own had been able, until the last few days, to talk to servicemen privately.

Escort restrictions were imposed at Da Nang last week. Since the base has only two men available for escort duty and some 30 correspondents are covering Da Nang, the order makes coverage almost impossible.

A U.S. military spokesman said the restrictions were ordered by the Vietnamese air force. Brig. Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi denied knowledge of it.

Originally, the restrictions applied to the entire base, but U.S. officials said later their authority covered only U.S. facilities at the base.

An order imposed by the U.S. Air Force Tuesday, demanding escorts along the South Vietnamese-controlled road which is the sole access to U.S. Marines at Da Nang, was rescinded a few hours later.

A military spokesman in Saigon was asked whether he would cite any instance in recent weeks where military security had been violated. He replied:

"No, I cannot. But do you lock the door after the horse is gone?"

When requests were made in Washington for a pool of newsmen to join the 7th Fleet, Sylvester said the public did not care whether such coverage was available or not.

The tight military control at the source of information in South Vietnam is comparable to that imposed by Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, during the Cuban crisis and understood to be imposed by him this time.

REQUEST MADE

Newsmen asked the Pentagon in 1962 to permit on-the-spot coverage of the U.S. Navy base at Guantanamo and the U.S. blockade of Cuba. The Defense Department refused at first. Sometime later, a press pool was allowed to fly 1 day over the blockade area. Newsmen were not allowed aboard ships or on air bases.

Congressman Moss said later that he and his committee thought newsmen should have been permitted to go to Guantanamo and to be with the blockade fleet after President Kennedy announced a quarantine against offensive weapons.

During the Cuban crisis Sylvester said the Kennedy administration controlled news of Government actions as a weapon in the drive to force the dismantling of Russian bases in Cuba.

"News flowing from actions taken by the Government is part of the weaponry," Sylvester said.

In December 1962, Sylvester told Sigma Delta Chi, national journalistic society, in New York, that he had not changed his views but "even though I think what I said was accurate, I shouldn't have said it."

In that speech Sylvester also said: "It's inherent in a government's right, if necessary, to lie to save itself when it is going up into a nuclear war. This seems to me to be basic."

Sylvester, during the Cuban crisis ordered the Pentagon's military and civilian personnel to report to public information officials what they told newsmen in interviews. He said the purpose was to enable the Government to "speak with one voice."

In May 1964 Sylvester issued a new order calling for weekly reports to his office "on interviews granted by departmental personnel at the seat of Government," including the Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

PURPOSE GIVEN

The stated purpose of that order was "to keep the Secretary of Defense properly informed as to whether there is a broad and continuous flow of information from the Department of Defense to the public, particularly through media representatives."

Sylvester acknowledged that the order was intended to remind defense officials of the memorandum issued during the Cuban crisis.

The freedom of information committee of Sigma Delta Chi said in a report at its annual convention last November that the Defense Department's information policies "continue to cause more concern this year than those of any other area of Federal Government."

"There were hard-to-understand delays in getting newsmen to Guantanamo and the Gulf of Tonkin at critical times," the report said.

"Secretary Robert S. McNamara and Assistant Secretary Arthur Sylvester continue a trend toward centralizing information activities in Sylvester's office. This was done in the name of economy (and surely economies should and can be made), but the individual armed services continue to feel that the real purpose was to suppress expressions of diversities of opinion on military matters."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD an article entitled "Washington: Just a Little Old 'Benevolent Incapacitator,'" written by James Reston, and published in the New York Times of March 24, 1965.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON: JUST A LITTLE OLD BENEVOLENT INCAPACITATOR

(By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, March 23.—The Pentagon's main argument for using nauseous gas in Vietnam is that it is better in some cases to gas the Communists than to maim or kill them. The officers here even have a wonderful phrase to describe the new instruments of chemical warfare: "Benevolent Incapacitators."

This, of course, was the defense for using poison gas in the First World War. It wasn't very "benevolent" and it often incapacitated a man for life, and it sent such a shudder through the world that even in so savage a conflict as the Second World War it wasn't used.

Secretary McNamara was careful to explain that he was not supplying "poison" gas to the South Vietnamese Army. He almost sounded as if he was doing the Communists a favor by treating them like rowdy race rioters in Rochester, but the thing is not quite as innocent as he made it sound.

WHAT NEXT?

The trouble with reverting to the use of any kind of gas in war is that it opens up so many other possibilities of chemical warfare. The use of gas on the battlefield has almost stopped in the last two generations, but the art of chemical warfare has not.

There is now a whole new arsenal of gases that not only nauseate, but stun and paralyze the enemy. The military correspondent of The Evening Star in Washington, Richard Fryklund, for example, recently reported on "the latest and best"—a gas called BZ by the U.S. Army.

He tells of recent tests of BZ at the Army's Chemical Warfare Proving Grounds at Dugway, Utah. Volunteer soldiers were submitted to the effects of BZ while they were executing simple battlefield operations.

"In one case," he reports, "a soldier on guard duty was gassed. He was approached by a strange soldier who said he did not know the password. The guard tried to remember what to do about it, couldn't, got tired of the whole problem and sat down and went to sleep. * * *

Secretary McNamara emphasized that the only gas that was used in Vietnam was the same as the gas that can be purchased at a store. But the same argument made for nauseous gas could also be made for BZ or even for some of the paralyzing gases. After all, it is more "benevolent" to paralyze a man than to kill him with a machinegun.

Where do you draw the line on the McNamara argument? And even if you draw it at nauseous gas, how do you know what gas the enemy will use after you start this devilish business?

The national policy on the use of all chemical weapons has been that the United States would consider using them only if the enemy used them, but the Pentagon's reaction to the criticism of using nauseous gas was merely to express surprise that anybody would be disturbed.

Nobody concerned has even claimed that the use of the gas was effective. The military spokesman in Saigon said it proved of little value on the three occasions it was used. In two cases, according to United Press International in Saigon, it was discovered that no Reds were in the area. In a third, a few Communists may have been "demoralized," but "there was a fair wind that day and the people were not very ill."

The main effect was merely to nauseate a lot of people all over the world with the thought that gas could be used merely on the authority of the South Vietnamese soldiers concerned.

One unfortunate aspect of the incident was that it occurred precisely at the moment when the United States was beginning to gain a little more understanding in the world for its policy in Vietnam.

Ever since the United States started bombing North Vietnam and dropping napalm fire bombs on Communists targets, there has been a considerable outcry for negotiations to end the war. President Johnson has insisted from the start, as he told 42 State Governors at the White House this week, that he would go anywhere at any time if he thought he could serve the cause of peace, but that there was simply no evidence that the Communists were interested in negotiating a settlement in Vietnam.

This view is now being confirmed by the principal foreign offices of the world. The British Foreign Secretary underscored the point at the White House today. He told the President that the Soviet Foreign Minister, Andrei Gromyko, had said in London a few days ago that it was useless to talk about negotiations.

REBUFFED ON TALKS

The French, who have been the principal agitators for a negotiated settlement, now concede that their explorations in Peiping and Hanoi have been rebuffed, and the Canadians report that their official on the International Control Commission in Vietnam was not even given the opportunity to discuss negotiations with the North Vietnamese Communists.

Accordingly, the propaganda was over Vietnam was beginning to turn a little to the American side, when the gas incident was disclosed, incapacitating our own propagandists, and not very benevolently either.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, Mr. Reston's article deals with the gas issue. I thought, except for its tragedy, that one of the most ridiculous excuses I ever heard was the excuse given by the Secretary of State that gas is being used to protect women and children. Gas has been dropped in places where women and children have been gassed. But it is said, "Gas does not kill; bullets do."

Mr. President, how do you like that statement? Is it a complete non sequitur?

I understand that in the British House of Commons today one of the spokesman for the Prime Minister said that during some riots in a British colony this kind of gas had been used. What does that prove? Does that justify our action in a war? The use of nonlethal gas along with lethal gas gave rise to the protest, after World War I, that led to the convention of 1925. But not a single member of this administration will admit that the use of nonlethal gas violates the articles of fair war. I know it is almost ludicrous to talk about fair war; but it so happens that articles governing fair war exist, and civilized nations are supposed to follow them.

Because nonlethal gas has been used in some riots, somewhere, and in some police activities, somewhere, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense, believe it or not, believe that that justifies using it in war; whereas the convention prohibits poisonous "or other gases" in warfare. It does not say, "or other gases except nauseating gases, gases that so incapacitate a soldier that they are mere sitting ducks for the bullets." Whom do they think they are fooling? The gases are being used so that soldiers cannot fight back and then can be shot. If we do not watch out, we shall be getting excuses from our war hawks for the killing of captured prisoners.

No, Mr. President; the verbalism of this administration cannot change the fact that the use of nonlethal gases in the Vietnam war has shocked humanity around the world and is turning a bloody page in American history.

I am glad to place in the Record the article entitled "Washington: Just a Little Old 'Benevolent Incapacitors,'" written by James Reston.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "When a War Policy Fails," published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 21, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

When a War Policy Fails

The Post-Dispatch takes no pleasure in publishing Richard Dudman's series of dispatches from South Vietnam beginning in today's news columns.

It is always more agreeable to bear good tidings than ill. As Americans we wish we could report that the United States is winning the war in Vietnam.

But the facts as assayed by a skilled reporter with much experience in that land of conflict, are otherwise; and we believe the American people must have the facts, stripped of the distortions and half-truths of an increasingly controlled official information policy.

The bitter truth is that things are not going well in South Vietnam. Mr. Dudman reports that the United States faces imminent defeat. The massive air strikes against the North have brought no perceptible improvement even in the military situation; and the political situation, always the more important, is rapidly deteriorating.

Scores of "pacified" villages have been retaken by the Vietcong in recent weeks, the Communists have continued to increase their strength, American forces even dare not trust the South Vietnamese to protect our bases, but must mount guard duty themselves.

As Mr. Dudman sums it up, "our side" may still control the cities and the air; but "their side" controls the great majority of the countryside and commands the allegiance of the great majority of the people.

What to do?

There is no disguising the painfulness of the decisions confronting the United States, and this newspaper takes no comfort in having warned of precisely this result throughout the 10 long years of a disastrously wrong Vietnam policy.

Having got in so deep, it is difficult indeed to find any way out that will not cost our country respect and prestige. Some say that therefore we must dig in ever deeper, even to the point of war with China, even to the point of world nuclear war. But no great country can justify before history risking a world war solely to save face, a presumably Oriental compulsion. If the only choice left is one between unpalatable alternatives, let us have the courage to accept the least undesirable course instead of blundering into a major war for want of the fortitude to choose.

The present policy is to punish North Vietnam so severely, by air bombardment, that it will "halt its aggression" in South Vietnam. This policy plainly is not working and logically can never work.

It requires the United States to take over, more and more, a civil war which the Vietnamese people themselves are unwilling to fight.

It requires us to believe that, though we ourselves would not be bombed into unconditional surrender, the North Vietnamese backed by China will accept that fate.

It requires us to kill women and children in the course of attacking military installations which, in a guerrilla war, are inseparable from the civilian countryside. Every civilian slaughtered only stiffens the will to resist. Last week, villagers near the big airbase of Da Nang tried to use the bodies of 16 children, killed in a bombing raid, in an anti-American, antiwar demonstration. Vietnamese troops broke up the demonstration, but can anyone believe they drained the bitterness from those villagers' hearts?

What a policy to be conducted by Lyndon B. Johnson. How can a President who has displayed so much compassion and understanding in Alabama sanction so much brutality and irrationality in Asia?

At times the administration has indicated that its air-strike policy was intended to bring North Vietnam to the conference table for a negotiated settlement. If this ever was the purpose, it is obviously not being achieved. The Russians, who have every reason to favor negotiations, have now given up any effort to arrange them. U Thant's efforts in the name of the United Nations have come to nothing. French and British initiatives have died with a whimper. One by one, our friends leave us. And why should they not? How can we expect Hanoi to negotiate out of fear, when we would not?

There is only one thing to do about a policy that has failed, and that is to adopt another.

There is only one way to end a policy that leads to war, and that is to adopt a policy that leads to peace.

Once this basic decision were made, a multitude of diplomatic resources for attaining the new objective would present themselves. The world is full of leaders who would gladly strive to arrange a peace based on the still valid principles of the 1954 Geneva agreements, the honorable principles of self-determination, of military neutralization, of mutual nonintervention. To stand for these principles would not show weakness, but strength. The greatest military power on earth, master of the seas and the sky, able to obliterate any aggressor anywhere, would lose not an iota of strength by extricating itself from a profitless land war in Asia.

Late as it is, we believe President Johnson ought to devote every ounce of his great leadership talents to ending the war in Vietnam.

He ought to repudiate the misguided advisers who, in the name of a bankrupt philosophy of containment have led him, step by disastrous step, into an Asian morass.

Instead of the rigid adherence to a sterile policy which he again expressed in his televised news conference on Saturday, he should suggest constructive avenues toward peace.

What the United States cannot gain by war it cannot lose by an act of moral courage on behalf of peace.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, no matter how many times one compliments the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, that newspaper cannot be complimented enough. We should all be grateful that the segment of the press represented by the St. Louis Post-Dispatch and the New York Times, refuses to follow the propaganda line of this administration in its warmaking. It has stood up and is carrying out that precious guarantee of a free press. It has criticized this administration as it deserves to be criticized for its unilateral military action in South Vietnam. I am proud of the record made by these newspapers, and I am proud to place their articles and editorials on this subject in the Record.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record another editorial published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. It is entitled "Official Hypocrisy About Vietnam," and appears in the issue of March 10, 1965.

I ask unanimous consent also to have printed along with the editorial the letter I received with it from Mr. James S. Ayars, of Urbana, Ill., supporting my position on Vietnam.

There being no objection, the letter and editorial were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

URBANA, ILL.,
March 17, 1965.

DEAR SENATOR MORSE: As you can see from the attached copies of editorials, you are no longer alone. Many others are joining you in your stand on the Vietnam situation. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch has been on your side for some time.

I was surprised, on a recent trip to Kentucky, to pick up a copy of the Louisville Courier-Journal with an editorial condemning the President's course in Vietnam. I was told in Kentucky that the Courier-Journal has veered in your direction rather recently.

Doesn't it mean anything to the President that Senators and newspapers that supported him in the recent campaign have turned against him on his Vietnam policy? Does the President want the Republicans to rejoice that they can again point to the Democratic Party as the war party?

Gratefully yours,
JAMES S. AYARS.

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, Mar. 10, 1965]

Official Hypocrisy About Vietnam

One unpleasant side effect of the kind of policy our Government is pursuing in Vietnam is the moral deterioration that attends official efforts to justify it. Truth is an early victim in such circumstances, as U.N. Secretary General U Thant has observed. And the moral slippage is progressive. Little white lies have a way of rapidly giving way to whoppers, fraud and hypocrisy gain ascendancy over candor, doubletalk becomes habitual.

President Johnson and Secretary of State Rusk exhibit the classic symptoms of this ailment as they strenuously seek to convert Members of Congress, the diplomatic corps and the public to their point of view on Vietnam.

The President, for example, keeps telling his visitors that there has not been a single sign of any interest in negotiation from Hanoi, as if this were the major obstacle to diplomatic efforts to end the conflict. He has, however, demanded that North Vietnam "end its aggression" as a precondition of any negotiation. Would we negotiate if talks hinged on our first withdrawal from South Vietnam? Of course not. The obstacle to diplomacy, therefore, is quite as much the precondition set by President Johnson as it is unwillingness in Hanoi to talk. The United States should stand ready to negotiate whether Hanoi does or not.

Nowhere does truth take so much punishment as in Secretary Rusk's repeated description of the Vietnam conflict as a simple case of aggression across national frontiers—like Korea, like Hitler's invasions, and so on. If this were the simple truth, as the Goldwater extremists have always claimed, then our moral posture in Vietnam would be defensible. But the complex truth is that national aggression and support of a native revolution are not the same thing; that the great majority of Vietcong guerrillas are natives, not outside infiltrators; that the 1954 Geneva accords did not establish South Vietnam as a nation, but on the contrary clearly intended all of Vietnam to be unified under a government chosen in free elections; that our own Government supported South Vietnam in refusing to hold those elections, and has done as much as anybody to destroy the military neutrality that the 1954 accords sought to establish for the whole of Vietnam.

When Mr. Rusk says we are only repelling aggression, he is stating the proposition to be proved, without proving it. In all honesty, the United States cannot support the claim that our military aid is a noble defense of freedom while North Vietnam's is a reprehensible act of aggression. That may be why our Government has never presented the case to the United Nations, the proper and lawful body to decide when aggression has been committed and how it should be responded to. In candor, the United States shares responsibility for the conflict in South Vietnam and must end its own intervention as a part of any peace settlement.

The President and Mr. Rusk speak as if no peace settlement is needed, but only a withdrawal by North Vietnam. The fighting will not be ended by fiat, however. There will have to be a settlement in some form, and the best basis for it remains the principles of the 1954 Geneva accords, which the Johnson administration so righteously accuses Hanoi of violating.

Those principles were: an immediate ceasefire, an immediate freeze on the levels of foreign troops and military aid, followed by gradual withdrawal; no foreign military bases to be permitted anywhere in Vietnam; respect by all concerned for the "independence, unity, and territorial integrity" of Vietnam; unification to be achieved within 2 years under a government chosen in free elections, internationally supervised; protection for persons and property, and no reprisals for past activities in the civil war.

The main lines of these accords still hold good though, of course, they would have to be adapted to meet changed circumstances. Unification, for example, may now have to be delayed until passions of the civil war cool. But military neutralization of the whole of Indochina could be established, with more direct guarantees by all interested parties than in 1954. Under such terms American troops could be gradually withdrawn and the future of Vietnam left to the decision of the Vietnamese people.

The Johnson administration keeps contending these are its only aims—that the United States covets no territory, no military position, no bases, no political gains. The best, and the most honest, way to realize such aspirations—if indeed we entertain them—is through an honorably negotiated peace settlement.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "Do We Have Anything To Gain From More War in Vietnam?" published in the Louisville Courier Journal of Louisville, Ky.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Do We Have Anything To Gain From More War in Vietnam?

President Johnson's irritation with growing criticism of his Vietnam policies reflects, we fear, not only the annoyance of a leader accustomed to popular success but the uneasiness of a man who is himself uncertain of the soundness of those policies. Though he points to polls which apparently support our involvement in South Vietnam, the President, well knows that foreign policy must be formulated on the basis of Presidential judgment, not the finding of pollsters. He must also know that growing press criticism of our conduct in Vietnam stems at least in part from his failure to make clear what our policy is, if indeed we have a policy, and where it is leading us, if indeed we know.

All of the beliefs and assumptions on which our original intervention in Vietnam was based have been shaken lately: Many people no longer believe, as we have hitherto believed when resisting Communist aggression, that this is a good war. It is obvious that the Vietnamese on our side are not always the "good" ones.

MR. KENNEDY'S REMINDER

There is little substantial evidence that the people we are trying to save from the horrors of communism want to be saved. We have long since abandoned the hope and the pretense that we are in Vietnam to install democracy. In fact, it seems increasingly that we are there simply because we can't find a decent way out.

We could, of course, negotiate, as our allies are urging us to do. But again there is evidence that fear of political repercussions at home, fear of being labeled "soft on communism," is leading the administration to ignore President Kennedy's reminder that we "must never negotiate from fear, but we must never fear to negotiate." Instead, in order to gain a position from which we can "negotiate from strength," we are risking an expanded war in which negotiations will become increasingly difficult.

Admittedly, disentanglement from Vietnam is going to be difficult, if only because our pride, our dislike of Communist China and our belief in the moral correctness of resistance to communism are involved. Since invoking the Truman doctrine we have held it our right and duty to resist Communist aggression wherever it occurred, and it was for this purpose that we intervened in South Vietnam, first with economic aid, then with military advice, and now with open armed assistance. But where before we intervened with the support of allies or under the aegis of the United Nations, we are now acting unilaterally, without the blessings of the U.N., and against the stated wishes of our most dependable allies.

THOSE SHAKY GOVERNMENTS

And more and more ours seems to have become a pointless crusade. The successive governments on which we have lavished aid have failed to win enough popular support to survive, while the rag-tag Vietcong has gained territory, strength, and apparently popular support. We insist that the Vietcong exists only through aid from North Vietnam. But our military leaders admit that if all foreign elements were withdrawn, the civil war would continue, probably to the advantage of the Vietcong, which controls the countryside.

The more we become ensnarled in the Viet mess, the less we seem able to say who the enemy is, how we plan to deal with him, and what we hope to achieve by his defeat. We say we are raiding North Vietnam to force Hanoi to call off the Vietcong. But there is no proof that Hanoi could call off the Vietcong if it chose to do so. Nor is there reason to believe that the Vietcong would collapse should we blast North Vietnam from the face of the earth, a fact we implicitly admit when we display Chinese weapons captured from Vietcong troops.

RUSSIA AND CHINA SIT BACK

It is true that if we withdraw, the influence of China could well become dominant soon in southeast Asia, but it is doubtful if we will materially strengthen the cause of democracy by spreading the war there. We might, on the other hand, force North Vietnam, which has shown an increased desire for independence from China, into Peiping's grasp by continued war against Hanoi.

Those who oppose a withdrawal from Saigon insist that we must stay until Russia and China—the real well springs of Communist strength—are convinced that the possible gain in southeast Asia is not worth the risk of war with the United States. But we are doing nothing whatever to punish Russia or China, which can sit back, enjoy the propaganda victories and let North Vietnam and the Vietcong do their fighting for them.

For this reason it does little good to argue that we must force the Communists to back down, as we did in Cuba, by a threat of war. Whom would we threaten? The Chinese and North Vietnamese contend that they are not involved, and that it is the United States that is the aggressor. And we can hardly threaten nuclear showdown with the Vietcong, which is mainly South Vietnamese.

POSSIBLY CUBA IN REVERSE

Nor is Cuba an apt parallel. Russia, clearly the aggressor, found herself involved 90 miles from the United States and its awesome power. Vietnam could for us be a Cuba in reverse. It is we who have escalated the war, and who have carried it beyond its original boundaries. We could find ourselves forced to choose between backing down, facing a land war with China's massive armies, or initiating a possibly global nuclear war.

On the other hand, we can swallow our pride, admit to the unusual circumstances of Vietnam, and accept allied efforts to initiate negotiations. The very best we can hope from our current course of action is a continuation of the limited war. But we have probably gotten as much from this as can be had. We have shown the determination and ability to resist Communist designs regardless of cost, an attitude that should not weaken our hand at the negotiating table. But there is no reason to believe we can gain much beyond this, and there is no sound reason to hope that the little war can much longer be kept little. In fact, it is already growing. And the risk involved in the growth is terrible to contemplate.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record a column written by the editor of the Salem, Oreg., Statesman, Mr. Charles A. Sprague. Mr. Sprague is a former Governor of my State, and in the 1950's he was one of the members of the U.S. delegation to the United Nations. In his column, Mr. Sprague discusses his great concern about our military action in Vietnam.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

It Seems to Me

(By Charles A. Sprague)

Berkeley, Calif.—"Startling Charge by Senator Morse" was the headline in the San Francisco Chronicle on its report of a Morse speech at Stanford University on Wednesday. The lead paragraph ran:

"United States escalation of the war in South Vietnam, Senator Wayne Morse told the Chronicle yesterday, 'is preparatory to bombing nuclear test sites in Red China.'"

This was in an interview. He made only "indirect" reference to such a "dreary forecast" in his speech to students and faculty.

Also in the interview, Morse asserted that "they" (the President and his advisers) "intend to provoke her (Red China) until she makes a misstep. Then we'll hit the nuclear sites."

I doubt if the President and his close advisers have any such purpose. But the war escalator could easily carry that far. And some warhawks already have suggested the bombing of the nuclear sites in Red China. That would delay but not destroy China's nuclear capability. That resides in the brain of its scientists and the energies of its people.

What was the reaction to the Morse speech? Here is a sidelight: I had lunch with some friends in Richmond. One of them, a young bank executive, mentioned the speech, said it made sense to him—and it was about the only time he had been in agreement with Morse.

One of the most rational analyses of the situation I have read recently was an essay in the Wall Street Journal of March 3 by its editor, Vermont Royster, under the title of "The West and Asia." He reviewed the history of European efforts to gain control of Asian countries. All, save a few patches like Hong Kong and Macao, have been surrendered. American penetration even on plausible grounds is likely to succeed, especially if the Vietnamese grow weary of the war. He discounts the fear of Red China's predominance in southeast Asia because of the historic independence of the peoples of that region. Royster thinks we could continue to exert influence in Vietnam and elsewhere; and adds: "In all the offshore waters from Singapore to Tokyo we remain, as before, the dominant power, politically and militarily."

Several months ago I wrote a review of the book "Only You, Dick Daring," by Merle Miller and Evan Rhodes. Miller had been engaged to write a TV script on the life of a county agent, to be shown on CBS. The book is a satire on his experiences with the CBS hierarchy and its satellites. The man at the top (then) was James T. Aubrey, Jr.; and Miller flew out to Los Angeles with his notes for the production which were to be recited before Aubrey, who was, wrote Miller, "to play the double role of presiding judge and executioner."

They had the meeting: "At the end of page 13, Aubrey nodded, waited a moment, and then rose and without a word left the room."

Well, the county agent story was never presented on CBS; and now James T. Aubrey has been summarily replaced by CBS. Terence O'Flaherty, who writes an excellent column on the "electronic media" for the San Francisco Chronicle, offered this "autopsy" on Aubrey:

"The 46-year-old Princeton graduate wanted only to win and he was tolerated only as long as he did win. In 1959 he was hired away from ABC where he had specialized in dramas of violence and sex. He was respected as a businessman, and disliked as everything else.

"At CBS he made stars and broke them just as easily. His word was final. He was the network's tastemaker and is said to have approved of every program detail, every plot, every cowboy, every hill and every billie at CBS.

"As the president of a television network, Aubrey's stamp on public taste was a powerful one. Now that it has been removed, the impression it left is not one to brag about. I doubt that CBS will."

Now we are off to Arizona.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an article entitled "Young Democrats Put Beliefs on Line," published in my hometown newspaper, the Eugene Register-Guard, of February 17, 1965. In their convention, the Young Democrats gave support to the position that I have taken for well over a year in opposition to our warmaking in South Vietnam.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Young Democrats Put Beliefs on Line

The University of Oregon Young Democrats organization Tuesday night took stands on a variety of issues ranging from Vietnam to the Skinner Butte cross.

The organization approved a resolution calling for an end to the war in Vietnam, with negotiation of "a peaceful settlement" by the 14-nation Geneva Conference. The resolution also called for an end to bombing raids in North Vietnam and Laos; the "earliest possible withdrawal" of American troops; shipment of food, medical supplies, and other equipment to rebuild South Vietnam, and seeking of an international agreement "to insure that South Vietnam and the rest of Indochina will be freed from military intervention by the United States, China, the Soviet Union, or any other nation."

The YD's will cosponsor with the campus Students for Socialist Action organization a Western Union table in the student union building for students and faculty members to send telegrams to President Johnson, urging an end to the Vietnam conflict.

In other action, the Young Democrats voted to oppose a bill creating a State legislative interim committee to investigate subversive activities in Oregon; to support the U.S. Supreme Court's one-man, one-vote reapportionment decision, and to support the group seeking removal of the cross from Skinner Butte.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record an editorial entitled "Shall the United States Lose Face or More Lives?" published in the Lexington, Ky., Herald of January 2, 1965.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Shall the United States Lose Face or More Lives?

When the United Nations ran out of money for its peacekeeping operations in Vietnam, a shortage resulting largely from Russia's refusal to go along with the majority vote of that agency, the United States felt that the advance of communism might be halted if some great power would take up the fight. At that time and even up until recent months it appeared that our country had a commitment in that area and a responsibility to the free world that it could not shirk.

That time now seems to have passed. The United States must decide whether we shall "lose face" or lose thousands of American lives. It is a war which this country simply cannot win and the sooner we get out of Vietnam and many other countries where we have failed to accomplish the things we set out to do for the free world, the better it will be for our country. Voices that heretofore have backed the Government's program in the firm belief that this was the only alternative to the spread of communism and that such action aided in the defense of our own country, now are being raised against further insistence on a program that already has failed.

If the United Nations cannot look after the peace of the world then the United States certainly cannot undertake this task. Our forces are spread all over the globe and our resources are being depleted in behalf of peoples who couldn't care less about our efforts in their behalf. Leaders in countries that we have tried to help have turned on us, have burned our libraries, destroyed and damaged our embassies, desecrated our flag and shot our citizens while they were devoting their lives to helping the unfortunates under their rule. One unstable government after another is overthrown and Communist control and sympathy openly are admitted in many areas where hours before we may have thought we were making progress in the fight to restore or bring democracy to the people.

All our efforts to get other countries to support us in this effort to help the peoples of these countries have been rebuffed. Not only have some of these countries refused to help us but their leaders actually have given aid and comfort to those who were destroying our program and nullifying our efforts in behalf of the people.

It is true that we have made some progress in Europe and Latin America and we might find it wise to continue our efforts in these areas. If we "lose face"—to use one of the favorite expressions of the orientals—it is only for the moment. To lose the entire program, to become involved in a long drawn-out war that we simply cannot win, would be far worse than the temporary loss of face that might result from our withdrawal. Many Congressmen who have defended our program and have argued in behalf of our efforts in Vietnam, Korea, and the Congo, now appear to have had their fill of the whole affair. They are beginning to question how we got into this mess in the first place and why we still are so deeply involved.

The United States undoubtedly lost considerable standing in its run-in with Cuba. It also has had to give ground—or soon will—in its little controversy with Panama. But today few remember and fewer care. We realize now that the whole policy of trying to bring the world to our way of life is hopeless of achievement unless other countries, who should be fighting at our side right now, join us with money and men and not stand back and let us go it alone.

It is to be hoped that the prime objective of 1965 for our country will be the gradual, but ultimate, withdrawal of our troops from countries where we are not wanted, where the people openly oppose our presence, and where we just might become involved in an all-out war at any minute.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have an editorial published in the San Francisco Chronicle of March 3, 1965, entitled "Where the White Paper Is Silent." The article casts doubt on the propaganda features of the white paper. The white paper is nothing but a piece of war propaganda designed to fool the American people. It is a journalistic sleeping pill.

Mr. President, the students, authors, and editors who have taken the time to analyze this propaganda have gutted it. The white paper is a very unfortunate document to have ever been put out by our Government.

I ask unanimous consent that this editorial, published in the San Francisco Chronicle, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Where the White Paper Is Silent

The U.S. white paper on Vietnam solemnly observes in its introductory paragraphs that it is concerned with a new kind of war "as yet poorly understood in most parts of the world."

To that truism, it might well have tacked on the phrase "including the United States." For here at home, the events in Vietnam are swathed in inscrutable mystery, as evidenced by the confusing differences of opinion currently being expressed in the Halls of Congress, and even more markedly by the bewilderment of the American public.

This widespread puzzlement is in part the outcome of the persistent silence emanating from the White House. It has been dispelled but little if any by the white paper itself. That document labors hard to prove that the long and substantial U.S. commitment in South Vietnam is in simple opposition to flagrant aggression mounted and sustained by a Communist regime in the North against "an independent people who want to make their own way in peace and freedom."

It speaks in plaintive detail about infiltration by guerrilla fighters, technicians, propagandists, political organizers, and secret agents, lavishly armed and equipped. But it shies completely away from the circumstances that are confounding the speakers in Congress and the people at home.

How strongly, one would like to know, do the South Vietnamese in general actually yearn to make their own way in peace and freedom. For that matter, how independent are they? Are they, or are they not, being dragooned into an army and forced to fight a battle for which they have little heart and no stomach? Are they hopelessly split and divided along religious and political and social lines? Do they distrust and even despise the leaders who, by their incessant toppling and rebuilding of rickety governments, appear more concerned with self-aggrandizement than with national interest and democratic principles?

Also unanswered is the big question that leaps up with every new Vietcong success deep inside the territory of South Vietnam: Are the Vietnamese, by and large, too war-weary or too much intimidated to fight off the invaders, or, as a matter of distressing fact, are they actually in sympathy with the Communists?

Here are some of the matters on which the American people need and ardently desire full and reliable information. It is not to be found in the white paper. The dogged avoidance of these matters is indeed disquieting at a time when there are signs of greatly intensified American activity in Vietnam, both North and South.

Is not the hour at hand for an end to President Johnson's studied silence?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a letter to the editor, entitled "Playing Russian Roulette in Vietnam," which was published in the San Francisco Chronicle of March 3, 1965, written by Lewis Mumford.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Playing Russian Roulette in Vietnam

The following letter on America's role in Vietnam was written to President Johnson by critic Lewis Mumford—EDITOR.

"MR. PRESIDENT: The time has come for someone to speak out on behalf of the great body of your countrymen who regard with abhorrence the course to which you are committing the United States in Vietnam. As a holder of the Presidential Medal of Freedom, I have a duty to say plainly, and in public, what millions of patriotic fellow citizens are saying in the privacy of their homes. Namely, that the course you are now following affronts both our practical judgment and our moral sense.

"Neither your manners nor your methods give us any assurance that your policy will lead to a good end: on the contrary, your attempt to cure by military force a situation that has been brought about by our own arrogant, one-sided political assumptions cannot have any final destination short of an irremediable nuclear catastrophe. That would constitute the terminal illness of our whole civilization; and your own people, no less than the Vietnamese and the Communists, would be the helpless victims.

"In embarking on this program, you are gambling with your country's future, because you have not the courage to discard a losing hand and start a new deal, though this was the magnificent opportunity that your election presented to you. Your games theorists have persuaded you to play Russian roulette. But you cannot save the Government's face by blowing out our country's brains.

"From the beginning, the presence of American forces in Vietnam, without the authority of the United Nations, was in defiance of our own solemn commitment when we helped to form that body. Our steady involvement with the military dictators who are waging civil war in South Vietnam, with our extravagant financial support and underhanded military cooperation, is as indefensible as our Government's original refusal to permit a popular election to be held in Vietnam, lest communism should be installed by popular vote. Your attempt now to pin the whole blame on the government of North Vietnam deceives no one except those whose wishful thinking originally committed us to our highhanded intervention: the same set of agencies and intelligences that inveigled us into the Bay of Pigs disaster.

"Instead of using your well-known political adroitness to rescue our country from the military miscalculations and political blunders that created our impossible position in Vietnam, you now, casting all caution to the winds, propose to increase the area of senseless destruction and extermination, without having any other visible ends in view than to conceal our political impotence. In taking this unreasonable course, you not merely show a lack of decent respect for the opinions of mankind, but you likewise mock and betray all our country's humane traditions.

"This betrayal is all the more sinister because you are now, it is plain, obstinately committing us to the very military policy that your countrymen rejected when they so overwhelmingly defeated the Republican candidate.

"Before you go further, let us tell you clearly: your professed aims are emptied of meaning by your totalitarian tactics and your nihilistic strategy. We are shamed by your actions, and revolted by your dishonest excuses and pretexts. What is worse, we are horrified by the immediate prospect of having our country's fate in the hands of leaders who, time and again, have shown their inability to think straight, to correct their errors, or to get out of a bad situation without creating a worse one.

"The Government has forfeited our confidence; and we will oppose, with every means available within the law, the execution of this impractical, and above all, morally indefensible policy. There is only one way in which you can remove our opposition or regain our confidence; and that is to turn back from the course you have taken and to seek a human way out.

"LEWIS MUMFORD.

"AMENIA, N.Y."

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a series of articles written by Richard Dudman, of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch assigned to this brilliant journalist the task of going to Vietnam and preparing some articles on what is going on in South Vietnam.

The first article, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 20, 1965, is entitled "United States Facing Military Defeat in Vietnam as Communists Continue To Gain Territory. Correspondent Finds Political Situation Deteriorating. Vietcong Extending Control of Countryside." The article is very penetrating with respect to our unsound policy in Vietnam.

The second of a series of articles by Mr. Dudman, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 22, 1965, is entitled "Vietcong Winning Key Province in Drive To Cut Nation in Two. Militia Defections Help Reds Take Area District by District."

The third of a series of articles by Mr. Dudman, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on March 23, 1965, is entitled "Reds Winning Peasants Over in South Vietnam. Vietcong Work, Eat, Live With Those in Countryside."

The fourth of a series of articles by Mr. Dudman is entitled "Rivalries of Ambitious Generals Hinder Fight on Vietnam Reds. Religious Jealousies Between Buddhists and Catholics Add to Instability." This article was published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on March 24, 1965.

The fifth of a series of articles by Mr. Dudman, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 25, 1965, is entitled "Vast Military Data Output on Vietnam War. Press Given Run of Countryside—Aided by Big Information Staff."

The sixth of a series of articles by Mr. Dudman, published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of March 26, 1965, is entitled "Hanoi Theory: United States Knows It Has Lost War. Frantic Move for Negotiations Underway, Reds Think."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the series of articles by Richard Dudman to which I have just referred be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES FACING MILITARY DEFEAT IN VIETNAM AS COMMUNISTS CONTINUE TO GAIN TERRITORY—CORRESPONDENT FINDS POLITICAL SITUATION DETERIORATING—VIETCONG EXTENDING CONTROL OF COUNTRYSIDE

(By Richard Dudman)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, March 20.—The United States faces imminent defeat in Vietnam.

The defeat ahead is a military one. The cliche of this war is that the problem is more political than military; but the military situation has been deteriorating so fast that political efforts have all but collapsed.

"Pacification"—a term applied here after being discredited by French failures in Vietnam and Algeria—has been virtually abandoned in much of the country, although hopeful but limited efforts continue to be made in the immediate vicinity of Saigon.

An American aid official stationed within 50 miles of Saigon reported this month that the people of his province still preferred the Government of South Vietnam, but that the Communist Vietcong had already seized 27 hamlets and seriously threatened most of the 49 others.

"After you have won the hearts and minds of the people and the Vietcong continues to gain territory, then what?" he asked. "We have the people, but the land is fast disappearing."

Other Americans and Vietnamese here believe the Americans are losing the hearts and minds along with the land—by fighting the wrong kind of war.

American enlargement of the war, through bombing raids on Communist North Vietnam and the use of American jet bombers against reported Vietcong concentrations in South Vietnam, has all the earmarks to many officials here of a desperate last resort. The new measures have yet to prove that they can turn the fast-ebbing tide of the war.

American officers and enlisted men now are standing night guard duty in addition to doing their full-time day work because their commanders dare not rely on Vietnamese guards.

American Marine combat battalions are protecting the major American jet bomber base at Da Nang, but other American installations are still guarded by a makeshift improvement on the sentry arrangements that failed so miserably in the February attacks on American military quarters at Pleiku and Qui Nhon.

FATIGUE AND CARELESSNESS

Commanders already are noticing the fatigue and carelessness that results from the extra night watches. They expect errors in judgment and accidents.

In short, observers here believe that the Vietcong forces are rapidly proving that the "war of liberation" proclaimed by the Chinese Communists can defeat a backward Western-oriented country despite massive American military and economic assistance and increasing American participation in actual combat.

Vietcong successes are casting increasing doubt on the validity of the American theory of the war—the theory, adopted by President Dwight D. Eisenhower and accepted by Presidents John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, that American advisers and the limited use of American air and sea power could help the South Vietnamese save their country.

There is much skepticism whether the outcome would be any different if the United States expanded the size and mission of its ground combat forces here and tried to win back South Vietnam on the ground with American forces under American command.

SIX WEEKS ON SCENE

These are a reporter's overall observations after 6 weeks of talking with top American military and civilian officials in Saigon and traveling through much of the rest of the country for talks with scores of the Americans who have been trying to help South Vietnam save itself from absorption by the Communists.

These travels have been in the central and northern parts of South Vietnam, the regions where the Vietcong now is pressing its initiative and where the Vietnamese are rushing back troops that they had withdrawn last fall when the southern delta region was under attack.

Some observers here have a somewhat less pessimistic view of the situation, although few if any could be called optimistic. Those who see a brighter picture emphasize recent pacification achievements in the delta, where the Vietcong now is quiescent. They rely also on the hope that air raids against the North will persuade Hanoi to stop supporting the Vietcong and inspire the South Vietnamese to greater effort.

In the north and central parts, now the principal theater of the war, the accelerating trend of defeat is unmistakable. Scores of hamlets that had been classed as pacified have been lost to the Vietcong in the last few weeks. Officials of many district headquarters towns no longer dare spend the night there but retire to the relative safety of the provincial capitals.

CONCERN ABOUT CAPITALS

Rumors are sweeping several provinces that even the capitals will be overrun by Vietcong forces that now roam these provinces almost at will. Prime examples are Quang Tri, next to the 17th-parallel border with Communist North Vietnam; Quang Ngai, Binh Dinh and Phu Yen on the north-central coast; and Kontum and Pleiku in the central plateau.

Just outside Pleiku is a supposedly secure hamlet, carefully protected by its double fence, moat and sharpened stakes and within a mile of help from Vietnam's 2d Corps headquarters. The hamlet keeps its rice stored in sheds outside the fence.

American officers say that the reason is to permit the Vietcong to steal the rice quietly in the night without having to fight for it. A shopkeeper in the United States uses the same system when he leaves his safe open at night to keep thieves from cracking it.

Even where the Vietcong is relatively quiet, it is busy collecting taxes from the people, gathering intelligence and preparing new strikes.

Major highways that a few weeks ago were economic and military arteries now are cut down by blown bridges, crosswise ditches, or known ambush sites. Many routes that carried rice and other essential civilian goods, generally on payment of a tax at Vietcong checkpoints, now are blocked completely.

Military supplies, which also got through on land by paying the Vietcong tax, also are largely halted. Now they must go mainly by air, except when ships can be used to a few coastal points.

The United States ordered a fleet of cargo planes from Japan this month to set up an emergency airlift to carry 250 tons of rice to the plateau provinces of Pleiku and Kontum. Truck shipments, which used to go from Qui Nhon on the coast over Route 19 on payment of a $30 tax to the Vietcong, have been stopped altogether. The rice reserves in the two provinces were nearly gone.

Increasingly, the government forces are being driven back into the province capitals. The countryside is being left to the Vietcong, to collect taxes, dispense its brand of justice and actually set up a rival government.

INLAND CITIES CUT OFF

More and more inland cities are being cut off by land and must depend on air for travel and supplies.

This was the situation on the ground when President Johnson decided to bomb North Vietnam and send in Marine combat forces, both on a limited scale but with a clear indication that there was more to come.

It still is the situation. The new use of American armed strength has not yet had discernible effect.

In many respects, the American-assisted war against the Vietcong resembles the disastrous 7-year French war against the Vietminh. Small guerrilla bands gradually controlled the countryside as the French army withdrew into the principal cities, relying increasingly on artillery and air power against the tightening hold of the enemy.

As they gained ground, the Vietminh guerrillas formed into large units, following Mao-tse Tung's classic formula for conversion into mobile warfare while keeping up guerrilla harassment.

Similarly, the Vietcong now is operating in battalion strength, sometimes standing its ground several days at a time before fanning out into the jungle until time to regroup and strike again.

There are indications now that the Vietcong has established a regimental headquarters in northern Binh Dinh province and possibly another in Long An province, immediately south of Saigon.

"Is the army strong? One avoids him. Is he weak? One attacks him. To his modern armament one opposes a boundless heroism to vanquish either by harassing or by annihilating the enemy according to circumstances or by combining military operations with political and economic action; no fixed line of demarcation, the front being wherever the enemy is found."

He was writing about his war against the French. The same rules apply to the war that North Vietnam now is directing, supplying and assisting in South Vietnam.

Those rules defeated the French. The far greater American air power has not yet shown that it can supply the margin for victory that the French lacked. The U.S. side is still losing and losing fast.

VIETCONG WINNING KEY PROVINCE IN DRIVE TO CUT NATION IN TWO—MILITIA DEFECTIONS HELP REDS TAKE AREA DISTRICT BY DISTRICT

(By Richard Dudman)

QUI NHON, SOUTH VIETNAM, March 22.—Binh Dinh is a name to be remembered in the Vietnamese war.

It is a province on the coast halfway between Saigon and the 17th parallel boundary with Communist North Vietnam. It has been a Communist stronghold for 17 years.

The capital, Qui Nhon, is where the Vietcong blew up a U.S. enlisted men's barracks February 10. Crews spent a week digging dead Americans out of the wreckage. (The last body to be removed was just developing rigor mortis, indicating that the man had been alive most of that week.)

Now the Communist-led Vietcong have massed about 11 main force battalions (of 400 to 500 men each) in the area—enough units to stand and fight it out with Vietnamese forces for 3 or 4 days at a time. A Vietcong regimental headquarters is believed to have been established north of here.

The obvious goal, now virtually achieved, is to cut the country in two on both the north-south and east-west axes.

An additional prize is the richest rice crop in many years, ready for harvest in a few weeks.

Before the first of several Vietnamese marine battalions was flown to the area to try to save the province, the retreat had become a near rout.

American advisory teams have withdrawn from 4 of the 11 districts. Two of the districts have been abandoned by the Vietnamese, except for a toehold in one corner of each. In one of the abandoned headquarters, the Vietcong staged their own show last month to celebrate the victory.

Only 4 of the 11 district headquarters now can be reached by road.

An Nhon district, whose 93 hamlets were rated as "pacified" last December, had lost 33 to the Vietcong at last report. Binh Khe district has lost 20 of its 58 hamlets to the Vietcong in the last month.

BEING PUSHED BACK

"They're doing to us just what they did to the French," said an American officer who had reluctantly joined in the retreat. "They're pushing us into the district headquarters and then into the province capital, and we could soon lose even Qui Nhon."

Part of the trouble has been the so-called "popular forces," the Vietnamese local militia that is supposed to take over from the army and regional forces when a district is pacified.

In Binh Dinh, the popular forces proved disastrously unreliable. Five full platoons (25 men each) defected with their weapons last November in Hoai Nhon district on the coast. Three of them set up an ambush and tried to trap an American adviser and a group of Vietnamese regulars sent to investigate the trouble.

DEFECTIONS NUMBER 1,100

About 1,100 popular force troops have gone over to the Vietcong in that district in the last 6 months, three-fourths of them, with their weapons.

The reason's clear—the Vietcong blows up a few houses, in a village and kidnaps some women and children and the leverage can be enough to cause the local militia platoon to switch sides.

Some are known to work for the Government in the daytime and fight for the Vietcong at night.

The implications are ominous, Of Vietnam's total armed forces—561,000—the popular forces account for 170,000.

Another complication is a flood of Catholic refugees clogging the roads and burdening welfare agencies and the Provincial Government. These thousands are fleeing partly from the Vietcong but partly also from their Buddhist neighbors and a witch hunt for remnants of the Catholic-alined Ngo Dinh Diem dictatorship. Catholic leaders at first urged the exodus but now are trying to stem it.

CHRONIC CORRUPTION

Another problem is chronic corruption. High Vietnamese military officers have been trying (unsuccessfully in this province) to get American aid materials to build private homes for themselves. About $50,000 in aid funds is mysteriously missing from a 1963 family relocation program; an audit showed that provincial officials got the money, instead of the relocated families.

The New Rural Life office has 154 civic action workers on the payroll although its program of reestablishing strategic hamlets collapsed more than 6 months ago.

Cutting the country in two is the same strategy that the Communist Vietminh used successfully against the French.

North and south, the two main land routes that hold this banana-shaped country together have been cut for several months. Vietcong guerrillas blow up bridges, dig trenches across the pavement and ambush trains, trucks, and military convoys along the coastal railroad and Highway 1.

Commercial trucks used to get through on Route 1 by paying tolls to the Vietcong. Military travel long has been subject to ambush. Now the trenches and blown bridges block all travel on most stretches.

The Vietnamese fill the trenches and rebuild the bridges with American help. The U.S. Information Service puts up signs that say, "The Vietcong destroyed this bridge and deprived the people of its use; the government is rebuilding the bridge for the benefit of the people."

But the highway has had to be abandoned as a commercial and military route for most of its length. Ships can make a few ports, such as Qui Nhon and Da Nang. Air delivery must take over the rest of the load.

East to west, the vital link is Highway 19, from Qui Nhon to Pleiku. It was cut in most of February and the first half of March.

Finally, on March 15, it was reopened to the extent of sending an armed convoy along its 100-mile length. The convoy consisted of 168 vehicles carrying 300 tons of food, supplies, and military equipment accompanied by a company of Vietnamese regulars and air cover provided by 16 American armed helicopters and 4 Vietnamese Air Force Skyraiders. Not a shot was fired.

Although choosing not to tackle such a force, the Vietcong controls the mountainous jungle on both sides of the highway, and the narrow passes are historic ambush sites.

One of the proudest recent achievements of the war was a helicopter lift, supported by American jet bombers, to extract 220 Vietnamese soldiers from Route 19 last February 24. The operation went off like clockwork. The jets suppressed groundfire from guerrillas, the helicopters swooped down and picked up the soldiers with only one minor casualty.

But an American major who helped manage the operation said afterward: "We'd much rather have been putting them in than taking them out."

UNTRIED TROOPS

He was asked what would have happened if the force had been left to fight its way out. He explained that 175 of them were untried montagnard troops. They had been thrown into combat when their training camps were closed after a revolt by some of their fellow mountain tribesmen last fall.

"They probably would have been attacked that night," the officer said. "There is a question whether they would have stuck or run off. When we picked them up, some threw away their weapons before they crawled aboard the choppers. We shoved them off and made them load the weapons aboard before we would take the men on again."

The cutting of Route 19 tightens a noose around much of the central plateau, especially Kontum and Pleiku Provinces. A lesser route, Highway 14 from the south, is subject to ambush south of Pleiku. Despite the success in sending through the food and weapons convoy, the United States found it necessary to go through with plans for a special airlift to fly in 250 tons to meet urgent needs.

The Vietcong control large areas of both provinces and roams at will almost everywhere but the capitals. In their areas, the guerrillas are benefiting from a bumper rice crop. They give seed to the peasants and get 10 percent of the harvest in return. In emergencies, they take it all.

VIETNAM ON DEFENSIVE

Vietnamese forces have gone almost entirely on the defensive. They are hampered by troop shortages, units operating at 60 to 80 percent of normal strength and with no effective system of replacement for casualties and deserters. Such strikes as they do make must be short and quick to keep units ready to react to new Vietcong attacks.

With Route 19 cut or in constant jeopardy, Americans and Vietnamese at Pleiku and Kontum are under virtual siege. They know that the French had to give up the area in the face of similar strangulation tactics.

They know that airlift can supply them indefinitely. But they know also that their assignment is to hold on as best they can with the forces they have and avoid calling for reinforcements from places with higher priority.

REDS WINNING PEASANTS OVER IN SOUTH VIETNAM—VIETCONG WORK, EAT, LIVE WITH THOSE IN COUNTRYSIDE

(By Richard Dudman)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, March 23.—Two different wars are being fought in Vietnam. That is the big reason that the United States and its South Vietnamese proteges are losing.

The difference has nothing to do with cruelty, which exists on both sides. The

Vietcong practice assassination wholesale and sometimes kill a whole family or burn a whole village when it won't cooperate.

On the American side, Vietnamese soldiers still use water torture—pouring water down a prisoner's throat to the point of drowning—to get a confession or information about the enemy.

FEW PRISONERS

Vietnamese marines were taking few prisoners this month in northern Binh Dinh Province. American advisers saw them shooting a dozen suspects a day on the spot in an area heavily infested with Vietcong.

An American captain had this to say about the Vietnamese captain of their battalion:

"They caught a girl about 19 years old in a Vietcong village. She was suspected of being a Vietcong herself. My counterpart beat her up and kicked her in the stomach.

"I really told him off—especially because he did it in front of the whole village. But I can't blame him too much. The Vietcong had buried 20 of his men alive, with only their feet showing above ground, and had decapitated a dozen others so that the heads couldn't be matched with the bodies."

The difference between these two wars is not a matter of heroism. No one doubts the Vietcong dedication. The Americans here are brave, devoted, and superbly trained. The Vietnamese can be good soldiers and often exhibited bravery when aggressively led.

The difference has gradually less to do with firepower. The Vietcong used to fight mostly with homemade weapons or what it could steal from the other side. Now its main force has a complete line of Soviet-standardized weapons up to an antitank grenade that will pierce 7 inches of armorplate.

The real difference lies in the army's relation to the people and the countryside.

Everyone talks about this being a war for the hearts and minds of men, but the Vietcong is better at putting the theory into practice. Its slogan is "Tam Cung" meaning "the three togethers"—live together, eat together, work together with the peasants.

The Vietcong, like other Communist armies, call themselves a "peoples army" and devote much time and effort to indoctrinating their troops to make the concept an actuality.

Although indiscriminate terror sometimes breaks out, the Vietcong generally are becoming more sophisticated. They kill landlords and tax collectors and make a continual effort to take the side of the people.

The opposite side of this strategy is picturing the Americans as imperialist successors of French colonialism and the Vietnamese Government as a puppet of the United States.

In the Dalat area, in the central part of the country, the Vietcong grabbed the political initiative last month when the poor were losing heavily in high-stake gambling during the Vietnamese New Year celebration.

The Vietcong threatened to kill the provincial officials if they did not halt the gambling.

In areas that it controls, the Communist underground army has its own aid program that includes setting up clinics, supplying seed, helping with irrigation works and providing schools.

Part of the difference is that the Vietcong live among the country rice farmers by the nature of the war, dependent on the countryside for food, occasional shelter, security, and intelligence.

The Vietcong operation sometimes seems to be a 24-hour-a-day, 7-day-a-week war, but much of the effort goes into mere survival and much of the time is spent lying low and making careful plans for a new attack.

Americans who have studied the matter are amazed at the amount of detailed investigation and planning that goes into a Vietcong strike. After the attack on American billets at Pleiku, a ground plan of the compound was found where the raiders had dropped it.

CIVIC ACTION PROGRAMS

American and Vietnamese officers are trying to instill similar devotion to duty and respect for the importance of the people into the Vietnamese soldiers. Civic action programs tell them to drive carefully, help old people, pay for what they take and stay out of trouble with the civilian population.

The program has come a long way since an American colonel 3 years ago considered his Operation Candy a major civic action program. He obtained candy from American manufacturers and distributed it to American soldiers to give to hamlet children.

But Vietnamese generals are understandably impatient with civic action when they have a war to fight, to say nothing of their constant political maneuvering. And Vietnamese soldiers, like those in most Asian armies, tend to believe their uniform confers special privileges.

AMERICAN'S COMPLAINT

An American official in a sensitive northern province complained this month that Vietnamese soldiers were "losing the population by their increased rate of stealing, robbing, raping, obtaining free meals at local restaurants and damaging property in fist fights."

In the southern Delta area, Vietnamese troops have used precious village water supplies to wash their clothes, seized draft oxen and used them for food.

There are complaints that the troops attending movies go in at gunpoint without buying tickets or buy tickets and then push in ahead of those waiting in line.

The commonest complaint is about Vietnamese army driving, which is worse, if possible, than Vietnamese civilian driving. Soldiers often race their big American army trucks along provincial roads without regard for children, chickens or pigs.

EDITOR'S VIEW

A Saigon writer, writing about plans for a new civil administration corps in the army, asked: "How can a government administrative expert convert the peasants to the government side unless he first proves he is not alien to them, that he is not detached from them, that he does not loathe them?"

American advisers set a good example of hard work and devotion to duty. Many Americans work nights and weekends while their Vietnamese counterparts in battalions and districts go home for a 3-hour midday siesta, stop work promptly at 5 p.m. and observe every weekend and holiday.

American naval advisers, trying to make a successful patrol operation with a makeshift junk fleet, watch larger Vietnamese patrol boats take off for Saigon so that the officers can visit their families and be on hand for possible coups.

KEPT FROM COUNTRYSIDE

But the Americans, with their tanks and artillery and planes, have inevitably helped keep the Vietnamese soldiers away from the countryside and the people.

A modern army is trained to fight guerrillas by hunting them down on the ground, using small self-reliant units that patrol at night as well as in the daytime and go cross country instead of by road.

American advisers complain rather generally that Vietnamese officers try to avoid night patrols, keep their units too large, and when they make contact with the enemy, sit back and wait for an artillery barrage or an air strike before taking aggressive action themselves.

An American artillery officer displays the overlapping circles 11 and 15 miles in radius that show the coverage of government's howitzers. But he complains that there is no ground observation 90 percent of the time to tell whether the shells found their target.

AIRSTRIKES HINDERED

Airstrikes are hindered by slow intelligence, jungle growth, and cloud cover. In a typical airstrike, some intelligence source reports the map position of a Vietcong concentration, a spotter plane drops a smoke grenade on what he thinks is the right place, and the planes dump bombs and napalm on the spot.

Some targets are actually seen. Many are not seen at all.

War casualties, including bomb and shell fragment wounds and napalm burns, being treated at a civilian hospital in Qui Nhon include approximately equal numbers of men and women and the proportion of children that would be expected in any general hospital.

A constant source of concern among Americans is the danger that indiscriminate bombing and artillery fire is losing popular support as it damages the enemy.

RIVALRIES OF AMBITIOUS GENERALS HINDER FIGHT ON VIETNAM REDS—RELIGIOUS JEALOUSIES BETWEEN BUDDHISTS AND CATHOLICS ADD TO INSTABILITY

(By Richard Dudman)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, March 24.—It is said here that the American effort to help South Vietnam defend itself from Communist-led insurrection would be successful, given two conditions:

1. A loyal commander in chief of the armed forces able to stay in power.

2. A generally respected prime minister.

A further condition is that the two must have confidence in each other.

Even if everything else were going smoothly, the two conditions are far from satisfied.

The commander in chief, Maj. Gen. Tran Van Minh, known to Americans as "Little Minh," is regarded as a temporary choice pending emergence of a new strong man from among the young generals who forced out Lt. Gen. Nguyen Khanh.

Most powerful among the prospects to take over next as strong man of the country appear to be Brig. Gen. Nguyen Chanh Thi, commander of the First Corps, and Air Vice Marshal Nguyen Cao Ky, commander of the Air Force. Both are decisive, flamboyant, and ambitious.

Premier Phan Huy Quat, satisfactory to Buddhist leaders for a change, seems highly suspect to the militant right-wing Catholic minority. Some influential Buddhists think that the American embassy is cool toward Quat because he is too close to the Buddhists.

Political instability thus promises to characterize the future as it did the past.

American officials are still unhappy over Gen. Khanh's ouster of Premier Tran Van Huong last January 27. Most other observers considered Huong's overthrow inevitable and overdue. Partly through his own fault, partly through that of the Buddhists, he became involved in a bitter fight with them. It ended with his calling them "animals," a particularly unpleasant epithet in Vietnamese.

Buddhist leaders believe that they are seriously misunderstood in the United States. There have, indeed, been times when their statements were distorted. For example, when Thich Tam Chau recently called for the withdrawal of both American forces and North Vietnamese forces from South Vietnam, an American press service report gave prominence to the first point and minimized the second.

The Buddhists see themselves as the catalysts of a revolution that is needed in Vietnam, a revolution to rid the country of remaining elements of feudalism, French colonialism, and the dictatorship of the late President Ngo Dinh Diem.

Although they are generally considered neutralist by American officials, the Buddhist leaders appear at the same time quite wary of coming under Communist domination. Their primary goal appears to be peace rather than neutrality.

Buddhist leaders in the university community of Hue, in the far north of South Vietnam, are strongly in favor of the American and South Vietnamese air raids against North Vietnam, as long as they are intended to bring about peace negotiations. If the raids are aimed simply at winning total victory over North Vietnam, however, they are against them. The Buddhists say they are not sure which is the aim of President Lyndon B. Johnson.

POLITICAL POWER

The great majority of South Vietnamese is normally Buddhist and under the right circumstances, such as in the repressive final months of the Diem regime, can be rallied in a powerful political movement by the Buddhist leaders.

There is a strong feeling among these South Vietnamese Buddhists that they are bearing the brunt of the war. It seems to many of them that the casualties on both sides are mainly South Vietnamese, while the North Vietnamese main force in the Vietcong stays somewhat in the background and the North Vietnamese Catholics who fled here in 1954 live mainly in the cities and escape the worst of the war.

Part of the popular attitude is plain war weariness. Buddhist leaders generally have a stake in the status quo, but they must show some deference to the peace sentiment or lose most of their influence over their followers.

Aside from rivalries among the generals, political tension here is largely a matter of mutual suspicion between the Buddhists and Catholics.

Diem's flagrant favoritism toward the Catholics mobilized the Buddhists against him and led to his downfall. Since then, the Buddhists have been watchful lest Diem's followers gain a foothold in a new government.

DIEM FOLLOWERS

The last coup was primarily by members of a secret political society headed by Diem's brother, the late Ngo Dinh Nhu. It was essentially the same group that tried unsuccessfully to overthrow the Government last September 13.

A mark of that group's continuing strength seems to be that Lt. Gen. Tran Thien Khiem remains South Vietnam's Ambassador to Washington although he let his name be used by the coup leader as the man who would come flying in and take charge.

The chronic political instability is bound to affect the course of the military and "pacification" efforts.

Whenever there is a new surge of unrest, the generals converge on Saigon and key troop units are rushed here to provide leverage. General Ky takes his Air Force off other duties and sends bomb-laden planes over the capital and the airport as a threat to whoever he opposes.

The unrest is blamed mainly for the fact that Hop Tac, a special pacification effort centered on the capital and intended to spread to surrounding provinces, is lagging behind its timetable. When troops were withdrawn from areas being cleared and secured against the Vietcong, guerrilla agents moved back in with their threats and propaganda. The message was believed to be that they would return anytime the troops left.

Officials have been unable to get precise details. The villagers are afraid to tell.

VAST MILITARY DATA OUTPUT ON VIETNAM WAR—PRESS GIVEN RUN OF COUNTRY—AIDED BY BIG INFORMATION STAFF

(By Richard Dudman)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, March 25.—The war in Vietnam probably is the most fully reported war in American history. This is not to say that it is the best understood by the American people.

Reporters have come to Saigon from all over the world and they have the run of the country.

They are assisted by about 20 military officers and 38 enlisted men assigned full time to "public information" or public relations duties—answering questions, arranging interviews, and providing military transportation and accommodations almost anywhere in South Vietnam.

The output of information is prodigious.

DAILY BRIEFING

Every afternoon at 5 o'clock, a military briefing officer recounts the day's incidents before reporters at the U.S. Information Service, giving casualties on each side and such details as weapons losses and capture by Vietnamese forces.

A daily "mission breakdown" for the United States and Vietnamese air forces tells how many flights were devoted to such purposes as air cover, close air support, interdiction, escorting convoys, dropping night flares and airborne resupply. Total missions are about 400 a day.

A weekly summary of military activities says, for example, that there were 70 Vietnamese operations of battalion size or larger with 30 that made contact with the enemy, 16,250 small unit actions with 90 that made contact with the enemy, 535 incidents initiated by the Vietcong, and 3,060 junks searched, and 10,350 persons searched by navy and coastal forces with no junks and six persons detained.

KILL RATIO REPORTED

Personnel losses for the same week were 975 for the Government and 575 for the Vietcong. The numbers killed in action were 250 and 525, respectively, with the week's "kill ratio" 2.1 to 1 in favor of the Government.

When a reporter objected that the Vietcong incidents were broken down only in order of magnitude in four categories—terrorism, propaganda, sabotage, and attacks—the officer offered to give exact figures on a typical day. In addition, he agreed to consider listing incidents of harassment of Vietnamese troops and antiaircraft fire, neither now included.

Limited use of gas was classified secret until the Associated Press reported the story 3 months after the new technique had begun.

Then in a belated official disclosure, chemical warfare officers tried to describe the gas as merely tear gas. They minimized the inclusion of Adamsite, a gas that causes nausea. The temporarily disabling gas is far more humanitarian than bombs and artillery, especially when suspected Vietcong have taken hostages or mingled with civilians. It is less effective, however, except in special circumstances of no wind or in an inclosed space like a cave or building.

Official efforts at secrecy and minor deception helped blow up the gas story into a world controversy over the use of a nonlethal weapon in three isolated cases, two of them unsuccessful.

The Air Force makes no bones about using napalm, the exploding jellied gasoline, although it prefers the name "incendojel."

To test the availability of information on more sensitive subjects, the Post-Dispatch submitted a series of questions to military authorities. Results were moderately responsive.

One question was how many combat missions were flown in January and February by American pilots and how many by Vietnamese pilots. The answer bears on the truth of the American policy line that this is South Vietnam's war and that the United States is merely assisting.

Figures produced by the U.S. Air Division showed that American pilots flew fewer than half as many operational sorties as the Vietnamese in January. But the use of American jets starting February 19 shifted the February totals to make them nearly equal. American pilots flew 1,224 operational sorties, while the Vietnamese flew 1,331.

The officers produced information on Operation Ranch Hand, the use of chemical defoliation sprays by four special U.S. Air Force planes. American authorities have deemphasized this program because of world objection to destroying food, and because of Communist propaganda that the sprays harm human beings.

RANCH HAND MISSIONS

The reply was that there were 107 ranch hand missions flown in January and 58 in February. Officers said that they were unable to say how many were to destroy crops and how many were to kill jungle foliage at likely places of Vietcong concealment.

Crop destruction is understood to be the more important purpose, because food supplies are critically important to the guerrillas, but emphasis usually is given to the jungle defoliation in public mention of the program.

The military spokesmen were unable to give figures on how many of the Vietcong reported killed are counted by American or Vietnamese Government personnel and how many are counted by spies. Information coming from agents could be considered less reliable than direct military intelligence.

The spokesmen could not supply any figures on the proportion of men, women, and children among casualties from American and Vietnamese air operations. Only men are considered in totaling Vietcong casualties in the weekly reports, because the Vietcong is not known to use female troops.

BUILDUP IN THAILAND

The officers said they could give no information on a rapid buildup of American air strength understood to be underway in northern Thailand. They said that their responsibility was limited to information inside Vietnam.

Despite the massive flow of information, there are gaps.

Reporters have asked repeatedly for permission to accompany American air attacks on targets in North Vietnam and in South Vietnam, where more than 400 jet sorties were flown in the first month since February 19. The Air Force has shown little enthusiasm over the requests.

The U.S. Navy, which has been operating three carrier task forces off the Vietnamese coast, recently opened the door a bit to invite a group of reporters aboard the *Ranger* to spend a day watching the air operations. They were the first reporters to visit the fleet since the air raids against North Vietnam began February 7.

TELL OF RAID ON NORTH

Naval officers gave accounts of their participation in the latest strike, 180 miles north of the 17th parallel boundary and only 100 miles south of Hanoi. But they would give no details on their flights over Laos or whatever other missions they are flying.

In some contrast with the information policies of the Air Force and the Navy, the Army appears to make its officers freely available to reporters, the only restriction being closely defined military secrecy.

The frankness of these officers more than offsets some carryover of the deliberate "cautious optimism" still being voiced by some American authorities in Saigon about the course and prospects of the war.

American information policy has been undergoing much study in recent weeks. New restrictions appeared recently when officials said that they no longer could give the numbers of American planes supporting Vietnamese raids against the north. Nor could they continue to give total tonnage of bombs dropped or more than rough approximations of the numbers of American planes taking direct part in the strikes.

There seems to be a move also to shift more of the information task to the South Vietnamese Government, in order to strengthen the thesis that this is South Vietnam's war.

This could result only in a diminished flow of information about the war in a country that lacks a tradition of a public right to know, bans all books about Vietnam by Dr. Bernard Fall, and Ian Fleming's "From Russia With Love" (on the ground that the title sounds communistic), and sets a quota on the importation of mystery novels for fear they will put ideas of stealth and conspiracy into the minds of the people.

HANOI THEORY: UNITED STATES KNOWS IT HAS LOST WAR—FRANTIC MOVE FOR NEGOTIATIONS UNDERWAY, REDS THINK

(By Richard Dudman)

SAIGON, SOUTH VIETNAM, March 26.—The Communist regime in Hanoi believes that the United States knows that the war in Vietnam is already lost.

It believes that the United States is frantically seeking negotiations and has begun bombing North Vietnam as a last gasp in hopes of creating a bargaining position. It regards any negotiations now as a face-saving device for the United States and opposes them.

This is the best current estimate available here of how Hanoi views President Lyndon B. Johnson's new strategy of expanding the war with limited but accelerating attacks north of the 17th parallel.

If correct, this American appraisal means that the new effort to persuade Hanoi to close down the war in South Vietnam must cause a 180-degree reversal of North Vietnamese thinking.

That could take a considerable time. There is general insistence here that this supposed Hanoi view is all wrong. It is conceded that the war in the south has been going badly, but officials believe that the answer is simply not to accept loss of the war. They insist that the United States now sees the way to success and above all will not quit.

AMERICAN THINKING

What follows is an informed account of the thinking behind the new U.S. policy.

The underlying assumption is that North Vietnam is the moving force behind the Vietcong war in the south. The Hanoi regime felt cheated by the 1954 Geneva accords that were intended to neutralize former French Indochina. Soviet Foreign Minister V. M. Molotov persuaded Hanoi that it should accept temporary division at the 17th parallel on the theory that South Vietnam was weak and could be absorbed after elections scheduled for 1956.

But South Vietnam proved stronger than expected, largely through U.S. help, and South Vietnam, with American encouragement, refused to hold the elections.

Thus Hanoi is considered to be trying to achieve by force the victory it lost 11 years ago at the negotiating table. Hanoi, therefore, is the logical point of attack of the new policy rather than Peiping or Moscow.

Three main results are sought:

First, the United States hopes through gradually increasing military pressure to convince Hanoi that it will suffer more than it will gain by continuing the war. The problem is gaging the pressure to persuade Hanoi without bringing Peiping or Moscow to its aid.

Second, the United States hopes to improve morale in South Vietnam, to offset widespread war weariness "to give the people some light at the end of the tunnel at last."

Third and much less important, the military pressure is intended to make infiltration of men and arms from the north more difficult and expensive for Hanoi. Bombing may force some curtailment of infiltration and thus help achieve the first goal.

Use of U.S. Marine battalions at Da Nang and bombing raids by American jets inside South Vietnam are intended to serve the same purposes.

The question arises whether the United States is offering North Vietnam anything other than calling off the bombing if Hanoi calls off the guerrilla war.

Incentives most often mentioned are trade with South Vietnam and the West, diplomatic relations with the non-Communist world and economic assistance from the West or from international agencies.

These are ruled out here as meaningless because they have not the slightest appeal to the Hanoi regime. Hanoi is thought to be unwilling to tie its government or economy in any way to any country outside the Communist bloc.

At the same time North Vietnamese leaders generally are believed to want to avoid increased dependence on China. This is understood to apply to the so-called Soviet group in Hanoi as well as to the Chinese group there.

Only the Soviet Union, it is felt here, could hold out any meaningful positive incentive to the Hanoi regime that would point the way toward improved national stability and economic progress through peaceful means. And that is considered to be a long way down the road.

The one limited positive offer that the United States can make is an offer of peaceful coexistence. The United States withheld such an offer in 1945, when Ho Chi Minh sought American aid and in 1954 when the United States refused to sign the Geneva agreements.

It is insisted here that the United States now offers coexistence to the Hanoi regime. This has been implicit in statements by various officials including Ambassador Maxwell D. Taylor.

JOHNSON STATEMENT

President Johnson stated the point explicitly in a recent press conference. Speaking of the North Vietnamese leaders, he said, "No one threatens their regime. There is no intent or desire to conquer them or to occupy their land. What is wanted is simply that they carry out their agreements, that they end their aggression against their neighbors."

It is pointed out here that the 1954 agreements, which the United States refused to sign but would now like to go back to, offered guarantees to North as well as South Vietnam. A final point is that the United States will have to continue to provide military forces in Vietnam as the situation may require. But it needs no bases here as long as it has its present bases in Okinawa, the Philippines and Thailand. And it realizes the grave objections to keeping a large American force here indefinitely. It would be an easy target for political attack portraying it as a successor to the French colonial army.

This then is the shape of the new American policy in Vietnam. Will it work? The best answer available here is that the system we were using before wasn't working.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I thank my majority leader for his patience and courtesy. I particularly thank the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] for his waiting ability.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I take this means to assure the senior Senator from Oregon that when I listen to him I always learn something. I am therefore better off as a result.

I take this occasion to extend to the senior Senator from Oregon, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Education, and to his distinguished colleague the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK], who is also a member of that subcommittee, and all members of that committee, my appreciation for the fine work they have done in reporting a good educational bill for the benefit of the secondary and elementary schools.

I assure the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the senior Senator from Oregon, that, barring unforeseen events, his statement that we shall take the bill up Wednesday still holds.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the kind words of the majority leader. But here again, I shall never assume credit when credit is not due.

Not only is credit due to every member of my subcommittee, but also a great deal of credit is due to the majority leader himself. The majority leader has been my leader in this matter, too. During the early part of this week the majority leader held a conference in his office. Several of us who were working on this measure listened to the majority leader and received his courteously given advice and suggestion, and his explanation as to the wishes and desires of the administration with regard to the bill.

As the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLARK] knows, I so reported to the subcommittee and told them that the advice of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] constituted my marching orders, so to speak, and that I intended to do whatever I could to march in complete support of his command.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator has exceeded my fondest expectations.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I add my commendation to that of the majority leader for the skillful, good-natured, and very able way in which the senior Senator from Oregon guided the elementary and secondary education bill through the subcommittee in the course of the past few days, and, before that, for his attendance at very long and extensive hearings.

Mr. MORSE. I thank the Senator.

PROTECTION OF PATENT RIGHTS—AMENDMENTS

During the delivery of Mr. MORSE's speech,

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to submit two amendments to be appropriately referred. The two amendments I wish to offer are to protect the Government in its private patents on Government research.

The Senator from Oregon was very helpful in that field, and I hope we shall have more success in trying to protect the public interest in this situation. The Senator has made a courageous fight with regard to the patent rights on private research in connection with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. I recently saw a copy of the letter the Senator sent to James E. Webb, the Administrator. It was a very fine letter. In the letter the Senator drew a parallel between the giveaway of the Government's natural resources and the giveaway of the Government's information. I am trying to achieve what the Senator has worked for during the past several years.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am very appreciative of what the Senator has said. The amendments the Senator is submitting are amendments on which I have stood shoulder to shoulder with him. I do not deserve credit for that. We have worked as a team. Senators will remember that in 1954, when we started that filibuster—that naughty word, "filibuster"—against an attempt to give away $14 billion of the American taxpayers' investment in the atomic energy facilities of this country, the attempt was made to get it all done in that same afternoon, and to get unanimous consent to consider it immediately—unbelievable, but true—and to get unanimous consent to vote that very afternoon. We stopped that. A patent fight was involved. We debated it. We had no intention of preventing a vote, but we wanted a little time in which to educate the Senate and the country on the shocking proposal to sell out the public interest. A patent fight was connected with it. We added amendments to protect the people with regard to the patents that were involved.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I recall the occasion to which the Senator has referred. The Republican leader at that time was the majority leader of the Senate. That was the only time when that has happened since I came to the Senate. Every time the Senator from Oregon offered an amendment, the majority leader would move to table it.

When it appeared that we would finally get down to the merits of these issues, the Senator from Oregon offered his amendment, and the majority leader asked the Senator how long he would speak on the amendment, because the majority leader proposed to move to table it.

The Senator from Oregon said he would not speak at great length, but that he did not care to make any commitment. The majority leader then moved to table the amendment, and the motion prevailed.

The Senator from Oregon then took the floor to speak on the bill. He said to the Senators present, "You can all go home now and get a good night's sleep. Nothing will happen in the Senate."

I remember that I had one of my best nights of rest that I had had in a long time. I slept from 11 o'clock that evening until 11 o'clock the next day.

I called the Senate the next morning and asked what was happening. I thought I must have overslept. I was told, "Do not worry; the Senator from Oregon is still going strong."

I think on that occasion the Senator made his 24-hour speech.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it was not quite that long. I remember the occasion, though. We got the facts to the people and to the Senate. As a result of those 13 days and 6 long nights of debate we added a good many amendments to the bill.

I now yield to my lovely colleague from Oregon.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Does the Senator refer to the offshore oil-for-education bill?

Mr. MORSE. The one the Senator from Louisiana was discussing was the one that dealt with the atomic energy bill. The long speech was on the offshore oil bill. I may say to my colleague from Oregon that a good deal of pressure was put on us to vote to give away the tidelands of Oregon. There were even then some rumors that there might be oil under them. We are still hoping that that is true. A great deal of money is being expended for drilling.

My colleague will remember that I responded—and this is borne out by the record—by saying that the people of Oregon had not sent me to Washington to steal for them, the Supreme Court having held that the paramount interest in the tidelands belong to all the people of the country. That is the filibuster my colleague was thinking about. The other had to do with the atomic energy bill.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. President, previously section 305(f) only required that the Administrator determine that the interest of the United States will be served thereby with a written record and he could waive.

The amendment will not allow the Administrator to make advance waivers. It will not allow him to grant waiver in those fields of research where Congress has already indicated a policy position. Further, where he is allowed to waive, he must comply with much more definite guidelines. The other restrictions would also diminish any psychological desire to waive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 62) was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences.

The amendment (No. 63) was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

LIFE LINE LOSES TAX PRIVILEGES

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, on several occasions I have addressed the Senate on the subject of certain rightwing organizations who received tax-exempt privileges under the cloak of "education." In 1963, I requested the Internal Revenue Service to "exercise much closer surveillance of material distributed by all tax-exempt groups" and "to report on steps being taken to assure compliance with the law by organizations of this type."

Therefore, I was indeed pleased to learn that the Internal Revenue Service last week revoked its 1952 ruling on the tax-exempt status of Life Line Foundation, Inc., the Nation's top peddler of rightwing propaganda. The IRS stated that this action resulted from a 2-year investigation of the foundation's activities.

Revocation of Life Line's tax exemption privileges is a victory for the American public. For 13 years, H. L. Hunt, head of the foundation, has tried to convince his fellow citizens that the United States is thickly infiltrated with Communists, that Chief Justice Earl Warren should be impeached, and that any man or woman who supports medicare, aid to education, or any other social welfare measure is an enemy of freedom.

To get the message across, this Foundation has spent $4.9 million in administrative and operating expenses. Life Line is only one of many organizations under investigation who abuses the tax-exempt privilege by engaging in political and propaganda activities. But it illustrates the heavy price American people pay financing tax-free contributions used to sustain rightwing foundations.

Life Line Foundation received a ruling as a tax-exempt educational organization on July 30, 1952, under its original name, Facts Forum. In support of its application, the organization said its purpose was "to support an educational undertaking," and more specifically, to conduct "small discussion groups devoted to the study and consideration of the art of living, social advancement, the science of government and agriculture."

Its exemption was governed by section 501(c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code, which provides for the exemption of:

> Corporations, and any community chest, fund, or foundation, organized and operated exclusively for religious, charitable, scientific, testing for public safety, literary, or educational purposes, or for the prevention of cruelty to children or animals, no part of the net earnings of which inures to the benefit of any private shareholder of individual, no substantial part of the activities of which is carrying on propaganda, or otherwise attempting to influence legislation, and which does not participate in, or intervene in (including the publishing or distributing of statements) any poltical campaign on behalf of any candidate for public office.

The Income Tax Regulation defines "educational" as:

> (a) The instruction for training of the individual for the purpose of improving or developing his capabilities; or
>
> (b) The instruction of the public on subjects useful to the individual and beneficial to the community.

What sort of "educational undertaking" did Life Line make to the public? Here is a sample: "Support gained from church circles in the United States helps them—the Communists—to break down the moral antipathy of a community and gives the infiltrator this respectability which they desperately need."

I am appreciative of the fact that the IRS has given careful consideration of all the evidence—including briefs filed on behalf of Life Line—before revoking their earlier ruling. However, it is not difficult to see that Life Line broadcasts did not constitute "instruction of the public" within the contemplation of the regulations, and that they did not otherwise qualify as "educational" within the meaning of the law.

According to IRS:

> The content of Life Line's broadcasts, taken as a whole, is essentially political commentary consisting largely of unsupported opinion and conclusions. As such, it lacks sufficient factual or other development of the subject matter to qualify as being instructional in the sense that it may be reasonably expected to improve significantly the public's understanding of the subject.

Mr. President, the evidence revealed, in my estimation, clearly justifies retroactive revocation of tax-exempt contributions to Life Line Foundation. Presently, there are 24 tax-exempt organizations under investigation for abusing the law by engaging in political propaganda.

I hope the IRS will continue an intensive investigation of all organizations, regardless of ideological position, who participate in the indoctrination of certain political views under the guise of "education" for tax-exemption purposes.

I ask unanimous consent that a report by Group Research, Inc., on the background of Life Line Foundation, Inc., including information on finances and sponsorship of Life Line programs, be placed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIFE LINE FOUNDATION, INC., WASHINGTON, D.C.

Life Line Foundation, Inc., is the major propaganda operation of a Dallas, Tex., oil billionaire, Haroldson LaFayette Hunt, one of the richest men in America. It was created in September 1958 by amending the corporate character of H. L. Hunt's earlier front, Facts Forum, an elaborate package of radio and TV programs, a monthly magazine, pamphlets, and a free circulating library studded with the works of extreme rightist such as Joseph Kamp and the late Senator Joseph McCarthy. Facts Forum's No. 1 performer was an ex-FBI agent, Dan Smoot, who broke with Hunt and established his own superpatriotic venture. (See Smoot, sec. 2—IND.)

Although Facts Forum had been under widespread attack as a rightist propaganda front, and therefore not entitled to either tax exemption or free radio time as a "public service," when it was converted to Life Line the Internal Revenue Service did not even require a new application for tax exemption. Everything was changed—name, personnel, nature of the program—everything except (1) the man who actually controlled both organizations and (2) the privilege extended by IRS—freedom from paying taxes on funds used in spreading rightist political propaganda.

BACKGROUND ON HUNT

Billionaire Hunt was born in Illinois 74 years ago. He has been rated the second richest man in the United States (Eric Sevareid, "Thunder on the Right," CBS, Feb. 22, 1962). As long ago as 1957 his wealth was estimated as high as $3 billion with an annual income as high as $50 million (New York Times Magazine, Oct. 27, 1957).

Few details are available on Hunt's financial holdings. His proved oil reserves in the Dakotas-Montana area were estimated at a billion barrels (ibid.). One corporation, the Hunt Oil Co., is listed as a producer and refiner of oil and producer of natural gasoline with properties located in Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, Mississippi, and North Dakota. Hunt Oil owns an asphalt plant and straight-run gasoline refinery at Tuscaloosa, Ala., and a part interest in the Cotton Valley Operators Committee (pipeline company and natural gasoline manufacturers) which operate a plant in the Cotton Valley Field, Louisiana (International Petroleum Register, 1961).

The HLH Parade Co., the most frequently encountered sponsor of Life Line broadcasts, although it is a food canning and processing business, is a division of the Hunt Oil Co. (Directory of Texas Manufacturers, 1962, p. 261).

Hunt is a frank proponent of plutocracy; i.e., rule by the rich. In his own privately printed book, Alpaca (January 1960), he outlined his concept of a utopia and it was plutocracy all the way: "The more taxes you pay, the more votes you get. * * * If you accept State aid because you are poor or sick, you cannot vote at all, and you're denied an old-age pension." Hunt has apparently had no major afterthoughts, as Alpaca was still being pushed in 1962. For example, a Michigan college received a package containing 100 unsolicited copies.

Alpaca was described by Time magazine as "a weird pitch for utopian plutocracy authored and published by * * * the fearless big daddy to many a far-right crusade" (Feb. 29, 1960, p. 43).

Hunt's political viewpoint is illustrated by his support of Gen. Douglas MacArthur for President in 1952 (New York Times Magazine, Jan. 27, 1957, p. 1) and his assertion in 1962 that the last U.S. President he approved of was Calvin Coolidge (op. cit., CBS-TV, Feb. 22, 1962).

In April of 1961, in a speech at Houston, Tex., he warned against big foundations and intellectuals as "the great menace." The Houston Chronical of April 27, 1961 reported: "Without naming them, he said many great foundations have fallen under the influence of communistic idealism. He said Communists are dedicated but probably include not more than 2 percent of the total population in America, 'about the same percentage that seized the Kerensky government in Russia in 1917. Their sympathizers and dupes may build this up to 20 percent,' he said. 'This leaves 80 percent of our population as patriots, only about 2 percent of whom may be termed active.'"

In another outburst the same year, Hunt said, "It's just as well that the Cuban invasion failed, because it was 'just one Communist government trying to overthrow another'" (Time, May 5, 1961).

If Hunt's personal statements are combined with his Facts Forum and his current Life Line operation, he emerges as a prototype of American ultrarightism: billionaire who believes that communism is a great menace, here and abroad; that the U.S. Government is so infiltrated that it is practically Communist now; that the United States is at war, at home and abroad against the Communists. The "mistaken" are defined as all of the enemies of freedom, and, in the course of his propaganda, democratic Socialists (the few that are left), ordinary liberals, those who propose medicare, foreign aid, and virtually every other social welfare program are all carefully intertwined. Ultimately the word "mistaken" becomes as he boasts the nonlibelous smear word which damns communism utterly and is then used to smear socialism, welfare reforms, the U.N., and measures to fight communism abroad. On the side, through his publications and associations and the publications he has pushed for circulation, he promotes anti-Semitic, and anti-Catholic, anti-Protestant (e.g., the National Council of Churches) propaganda, and damns the Supreme Court as the violator of the Constitution.

LIFE LINE ACTIVITIES

The latest propaganda package—Life Line Foundation, Inc.—is Hunt's operating front, supported with tax-free money. (Gifts are deductible from personal and corporation incomes taxes.) Included are:

Life Line radio is a daily radio program.

Life Line TV is a 5-day-a-week TV program.

Life Lines (plural) is the name of the four-page political commentary published three times weekly.

Life Line Links is a type of book club which furnishes the membership with right-wing writings.

Life Line Essay Contest is a continuing solicitation of "patriotic" writings.

Life Line Seminars, Inc., announced in 1961 as a separate corporation, was to have conducted 3-day meetings in large cities to "Meet the public demand for accelerated enlightenment" on freedom, Communist subversion, and "shelter protection against fallout." Mr. Melvin T. Munn of Pampa, Tex., was hired as representative to organize the seminars and among the performers pushed as attractions were: Dr. Kenneth McFarland, Topeka, Kans.; Dr. Madden, president, Lubbock Christian College, Lubbock, Tex.; and Dr. George Benson, president of Harding College, Searcy, Ark. Life Line Seminars, Inc., folded, apparently without ever holding a seminar.

THE CONTENTS OF THE PACKAGE

Life Line radio is a 15-minute radio program broadcast 6 or 7 days a week. Life Line started in November 1958, with 35 stations. By October of 1961 it was carried on 200 stations; by February of 1962 it was being broadcast 343 times a day over 304 different stations in 279 towns, in 42 States and the District of Columbia. (Life Line program, Feb. 6, 1963.) A list of the stations appears below.

From 1959 until late 1962 the star performer was the Reverend Wayne Poucher. Since December 1962, he has had an assistant—James Dobbs, another former Church of Christ minister. Occasionally, guests are invited to tape programs. Life Line is self-described as a "patriotic, educational, and religious program * * * dedicated to a defense of our American system of constitutional government and persuasion toward the realization that only through faith in God can man be free. It is also dedicated to the foundational [sic] concept that freedom and self-government will continue in America in direct relationship to the loyalty of Americans to God and country" (news release, Life Line, October 1961).

Life Line Radio Broadcasts, February 1963, by State

Texas	68
California	23
Florida	19
Mississippi	18
Alabama	16
Oklahoma	14
Louisiana	13
Arizona	12
Arkansas	11
Illinois	11
Indiana	11
New Mexico	11
Georgia	8
Kansas	8
Montana	8
Iowa	7
North Carolina	7
Tennessee	6
Washington	6
Missouri	4
Nebraska	4
New York	4
Ohio	4
Oregon	4
Pennsylvania	4
South Carolina	4
Colorado	3
District of Columbia	3
Idaho	3
Michigan	3
North Dakota	3

Life Line Radio Broadcasts, February 1963, by State—Continued

Utah	3
Virginia	3
Wyoming	3
Connecticut	2
Kentucky	2
Maryland	2
West Virginia	2
Massachusetts	1
Minnesota	1
New Jersey	1
South Dakota	1
Wisconsin	1
Total	42

At least 17 stations were added to these in February and March 1963.

Life Line radio claims it is self-supporting, maintained by a charge of $1 per daily tape plus 20 percent of the radio station time charge paid by the sponsor. Beginning January 1, 1963, the tape charge was cut to 50 cents per day plus the same percentage of the radio station time charge. This is the cost of 6 days of the week because each station is offered a seventh tape each week free—a sermon by the Reverend Poucher which the station can either broadcast as a public service item or as an extra source of income if sponsors are at hand (Life Line, Jan. 4, 1962).

An additional source of income, and service to patrons, is the sale of Life Line radio transcripts.

Life Line TV: Beginning March 5, 1962, Life Line TV became available, with the Reverend Poucher playing the same role he has played so successfully on the radio. It is a 5-minute, 5-day-a-week program. By May 10, 1962, 30 stations carried Life Line TV. By January 21, 1963, it was being carried by 59 stations.

"Life Lines" is the name of the four-page commentary issued three times weekly, described by the author as a "newssheet," although it is almost entirely opinion. It is available for $5 per year with a claimed circulation of about 40,000. It claims that, with reprinting in other publications, it has a readership of 15 to 20 million.

Life Line Links is a kind of book club to which one can belong for $10 a year and receive a monthly mailing of "freedom" material of a value in excess of the dues paid.

A NEW APPROACH TO FINANCING PROPAGANDA

H. L. Hunt frequently urges his business friends to understand that the propaganda of "the mistaken" cannot be defeated with tax-exempt funds, that the only way to finance a winning program is through the use of all or part of the $11 billion which business spends on advertising each year (Life Line, vol. 3, No. 53, May 3, 1961).

In financing the old Facts Forum, Hunt had utilized large-scale gifts of money plus as much as $5 million a year in free public service time wangled from radio stations. Table 1 indicates that the income to Facts Forum—other than contributions—was quite inconsequential. Internal Revenue Service did not require reporting of contributions, but they can be derived by subtracting the limited income from the total expenses. They totaled about $3,500,000 in a little over 6 years.

Despite the fact that such gifts are deductible, Hunt decided to pay for propaganda—via commercial advertising, using the term in its tax-deductible sense, as will be indicated.

Life Line Radio and Life Line TV and Life Lines, the propaganda sheet, are all theoretically self-supporting; i.e., the commercial sponsors of the radio and TV programs and those who subscribe for either the radio transcripts or the thrice-weekly Life Lines. It is true that some tax-free cash contributions are made, but they are not a large percentage of the total income.

Table 1 indicated that the income exceeded a quarter of a million dollars in 1961. Table 2 shows that the overwhelming bulk of the income shown is from sale of radio and TV tapes and the propaganda organ, Life Lines.

There are no figures available on the membership of Life Line Links, but since the annual dues are $10, table 2 would indicate that there are few members.

TABLE 1.—*Financial facts on Life Line Foundation, Inc., and its predecessor, Facts Forum*

[Figures rounded to nearest dollar]

Year ending—	Gross income	Total expenses	Liquid assets [1]	Liabilities [1]	Reported net worth [1]
FACTS FORUM					
Sept. 30, 1951	([2])	$36,251	$2,500	None	
Sept. 30, 1952	$144	151,535	9,401	$631	
Sept. 30, 1953	599	270,335	36,191	725	
Sept. 30, 1954	545	767,076	16,542	1,405	
Sept. 30, 1955	278	1,491,598	14,044	1,682	
Sept. 30, 1956	294	668,467	67,440	117,965	
Sept. 30, 1957	[3] 21,630	127,212	40,924	80,475	
Total, Facts Forum	23,490	3,512,474			
LIFE LINE					
Sept. 30, 1958	180	170	[4] 250	None	$250
Sept. 30, 1959	[5] 168,670	184,370	564	None	564
Sept. 30, 1960	[6] 207,300	188,657	52,442	63,649	(11,206)
Sept. 30, 1961	262,979	225,163	69,002	61,665	7,336
Sept. 30, 1962	447,183	410,795	79,417	34,264	45,153
Total, Life Line	1,086,312	1,009,155	[7] 128,788	[7] 47,247	[7] 81,541
Grand total, Life Line and Facts Forum [8]	1,109,802	4,521,629			

[1] At the beginning of each fiscal year.

[2] Not available.

[3] $20,883.64 of this was sale of 654 shares of Welex Jet Services for capital gain of $17,532.

[4] Liquid assets at end of 1957 were $235.29; at the beginning of 1958 they were $250.

[5] Contributions totaled $6,463.52, of which only 1 was over $100—from Bright Star Foundation, Inc., for $4,250.

[6] Contributions totaled $22,898.24—$12,500 from Bright Star Foundation; $9,883.82 from Elred J. Robinson, Dallas Tex.

[7] As of Sept. 30, 1962.

[8] The discrepancy between income and expenditures is the result of the deliberate policy of the Internal Revenue Service of refusing to give the public access to either the amounts of contributions or their sources. As a result of revelations by Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, this policy is under partial reconsideration—as to amounts only.

Source: Form 990A—Returns to the Internal Revenue Service.

TABLE 2.—*Life Line Foundation, Inc., income for fiscal years ending Sept. 30, 1959, 1960, 1961, 1962* [1]

[Totals rounded to nearest dollar]

Source	1959	1960	1961	1962
Commissions	$4,605			
Contributions:				
Bright Star Foundation	4,250	$12,500		
Elred J. Robinson		9,834		
Sales:				
Radio tapes	104,387	126,914	$174,344	$242,882
Books	[2] 57,106	3,177	1,228	8,487
News sheet		52,691	71,448	118,072
Radio transcripts	713	1,599	15,086	38,136
TV receipts				34,377
Income from Life Line Links				2,951
Miscellaneous		21	874	1,877
Total	173,275	207,300	262,979	446,784
Less loss on assets	112	100		
Total, net income	173,163	207,199	262,979	446,784

[1] Income for fiscal 1958 was only $179.94. Facts Forum was being transformed into Life Line.

[2] Apparently included subscriptions to Life Lines.

Life Lines, the 4-page publication, sells for $5 a year and claims a circulation of around 40,000. If so, it certainly is not a paid circulation because the income statement would indicate only about 14,000 paid subscriptions. Nevertheless, beginning January 1, 1963, the size of the newsletter was increased and a more expensive format adopted. This is a particularly significant development in view of the recent withdrawal of part of the Federal subsidy from Life Lines, as explained hereafter.

HOW THE POST OFFICE SUBSIDIZED LIFE LINES

Life Lines, the propaganda letter, has been distributed under a second-class mailing permit because it was classified as an exempt organization; i.e., entitled to a postal subsidy on its mailing rates. The application for the permit was granted October 28, 1959, on the basis of an application filed a month earlier by Lee Goodman, Jr., executive director of Life Line Foundation, Inc. The application indicated that Life Lines was sponsored by the Metropolitan Baptist Church of Miami, Fla., and the Trout Methodist Church of Trout, La.

The Post Office Department apparently did not look behind the application, and during 1962 it vigorously resisted revealing any information regarding the Life Lines' permit. Only after congressional intervention did the Post Office admit that Life Lines enjoyed the subsidized rate reserved for religious, educational, and scientific publications and that the exemption had been granted, ostensibly, on the basis of the sponsorship by the two churches.

Subsequently it was revealed by private investigation that one of the churches apparently did not exist and the other failed to reply to letters regarding the "sponsorship." At this juncture the Post Office undertook an investigation of the matter, and the exemption privilege was revoked.

This second-class permit granted by the Post Office, under rates prevailing in 1962, was worth over $20,000 a year to Life Lines in subsidized postal rates over and above the regular, and also subsidized, second-class permit rate. (If circulation is 40,000 as claimed, the subsidy was $23,800 at the 1962 rates.)

WHO PAYS FOR LIFE LINE'S POLITICAL PROPAGANDA?

In view of the fact that Life Line Foundation produces political propaganda, spiced with religious evangelism, who pays for the product?

This question was raised privately with the Federal Communications Commission, but the agency denied that it had or could obtain such information or even ascertain whether the programs were paid for by commercial sponsors or were offered as free "public service programs." (FCC letter, Mar. 26, 1962.)

Life Line claims 317 different concerns "use Life Lines on the air" but this does not distinguish between Hunt companies and others (Life Lines, Mar. 8, 1963).

A private survey of Life Line radio and TV broadcasters in the summer of 1962 covered 27 radio and TV stations in 24 towns and 17 different States. The survey revealed that the overwhelming majority of such broadcasts are sponsored by Hunt-controlled companies, including Hunt Oil Co., its HLH Food Products "division," and the U.S. Coffee & Tea Co. Only 4 of the 27 stations carried no identifiable Hunt sponsors on the days of the survey. Eighteen of the 27 stations carried only Hunt sponsors, and the remaining 5 stations carried the program sponsored by known Hunt corporations plus other ostensibly non-Hunt sponsors.

In Dallas, Tex., in addition to HLH Parade Products, one sponsor was Dragert Paint Co., owned by the vice president of Life Line Foundation. Another Dallas sponsor was the First National Bank of Dallas, which is also a heavy lender to the tax-exempt Bright Star Foundation, whose contributions belie the Life Line claim that it is not subsidized by contributions. (See earlier financial report.)

Some of the (apparent) non-Hunt sponsors identified by the survey were:

Shreveport, La., Lone Star Steel, controlled by E. B. Germany.

Shreveport, La., Querbas & Bourquin Insurance.

Shreveport, La., First National Bank.

Shreveport, La., Chevyland—only Chevrolet dealer.

Shreveport, La., Louisiana Fire Insurance Co. (Same address as Q & B above).

Cody, Wyo., Intermountain Equipment Co., the Cody newspaper carries ads urging readers to listen to Life Line. Ads sponsored by Hoodoo Ranch, a Hunt holding.

Cody, Wyo., Webster Chevrolet.

Cody, Wyo., Cody Feed.

Williston, N. Dak., Farmers State Bank, Crosby, N. Dak., Citizens State Bank, Roy, N. Dak., First International Bank, Watford City, N. Dak., American State Bank, Williston, N. Dak.

Riverton, Wyo., OK Rubber Welders, Riverton; Hallam Motors, Landers; and KVOW itself.

Late in 1962, Life Line was broadcasting an invitation to listeners to write to "Life Line, Washington, D.C.," for copies of broadcasts and other information. Writers were furnished with a recent radio-TV schedule covering the whole country and an attractive 65-page pamphlet which contains everything from the name of HLH products to recipes, information on essay contests and reprints of prior broadcasts. Writers in the District of Columbia area were advised that HLH products were not available in any stores in the area, although HLH sponsors the Life Line broadcasts (HLH-American Heritage Recipes).

HLH products include a variety of canned foods, suntan lotion, and vitamins under the HLH brand. Other HLH brands include Saxet, Alma, Hallmark, Triumph, White Crest, Honest, Rel-e-Hot, Perfection (largely spices and flavoring), Tasty (largely spices and flavoring), and Butterfield products (Ibid.).

Life Line radio's economy rates: A check of Life Line figures on its radio broadcasts raises a question on the rates paid by Hunt for his propaganda. Taking May 1961, as the nearest midpoint of that fiscal year for which information is available, Life Line was broadcasting over 165 stations not counting double broadcasts each day. At a rate of 312 broadcasts a year this would have produced an annual income from tape sales ($1 each) of about $51,000. The total revenue from radio tape sales that year was reported as about $174,000. This figure, less $51,000 is $123,000, which is supposed to be 20 percent of the total time charge. Computed on this basis, the total cost of radio time purchased would be $616,500. This would indicate that Life Line sponsors were paying about $12 per 15 minute broadcast, whereas the standard rate tables indicates a general range of $25 to $63 for this amount of time. Since the $12 per quarter hour is considered an overestimate, it would appear that Life Line's sponsors have secured an unrealistically economic rate which might bear further investigation to see whether there are tie-in contracts with other advertising or some other element involved.

For fiscal 1961, Life Line reports expenditures of over a quarter of a million dollars ($263,000). To get anything approaching a realistic figure on total outlay that year, including sponsors' time costs, one would certainly have to add a million dollars, bringing the total to $1,263,000. The added million is based on an average charge of $25 per quarter hour for radio time.

LIFE LINE, THE SUBTLE SELL, VERSUS FACTS FORUM

Life Line touts itself as an effective program which has proven it is good, profitable business to extoll Americanism and promote Freedom, and they do not need to soothe Socialists, caress the Communists, nor try to assume the silly and impossible status of neutrals (Ibid., undated leaflet 1962).

With a wary eye to the past and Facts Forum, Life Line promotion claims that it never attacks nor discredits minorities and does not deal with racial issues, criticism of Jews or other minorities, criticism of the National Council of Churches of Christ of America, charges of communism in the educational field, criticism of labor unions or leaders (Ibid.).

"Mistaken" is the title which Life Line has fixed in the public mind as a specific but nonlibelous designation for all enemies of Freedom—Communists, fellow travelers, etc., leaving them to classify themselves (Ibid.).

Life Line's current careful reiteration that it does not deal with these issues or groups is in marked contrast to Mr. Hunt's earlier Facts Forum. In the May 1953 issue of Facts Forum News, there was a story headed "Counter Subversives." "Many are asking," it read, "how can I know about subversives?"

Facts Forum then listed names and addresses of some of the people who were said to have "devoted much of their lives in gaining an understanding of subversion and 'who keep files.'" Eight people were listed as experts on identifying subversives. The list includes:

Harry Jung, described by Fern Marja of the New York Post as "a man with good connections in native Fascist circles." Jung was a wholesale distributor of the fraudulent "Protocols of the Learned Elders of Zion," a part of Hitler's "Bible" of anti-Semitic documents; had formerly published "The American Gentile." A supergentile publication much esteemed by the Nazi "World Service" (Fern Marja, "Facts Forum and the Hate Mob," New York Post, Feb. 19, 1954).

Other subversive experts include: Carl McIntire of the American Council of Churches. (See sec. 2, IND, McIntire, Carl); Dr. J. B. Matthews, former counsel to the House Un-American Activities Committee, who once charged that "The largest single group supporting the Communist apparatus in the United States today is composed of Protestant clergymen" (Marja, New York Post, Feb. 19, 1954).

Walter S. Steel was another, of whom Marja wrote: "Steel's testimony before the Dies Committee filled 402 pages, a substantial proportion of which were devoted to proving that the entire American labor movement was under Communist domination" (Ibid.).

Robert Stripling, former chief investigator and counsel for the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Harper L. Knowles, chairman of the California American Legion's "radical research committee." (Ibid.)

The Life Line Propaganda Line: What is the propaganda line of Mr. Hunt's current lavishly financed operation? In 1960, Life Line was awarded the American Legion Mercury Award for Americanism. It stoutly maintains that it does not deal with (1) racial issues, (2) criticism of Jews or other minorities, (3) criticism of the National Council of Churches of Christ of America, (4) charges of communism in the educational field, or (5) criticism of labor unions or leaders.

Before turning to the general question of propaganda, what is the record on some of these points?

On racial issues: While Life Lines avoids dealing with "racial issues" as such, it is significant that it is critical of the Supreme Court since 1954, the year of the school desegregation decision (Life Lines, Apr. 28, 1962).

On communism in the churches: Similarly, while not mentioning the National Council of Churches or any other organization by name, Life Lines charges that "Support gained from church circles in the United States helps them [Communists] to break down the moral antipathy of a community and gives the infiltrators respectability which they desperately need" (June 30, 1961).

On communism in education: "Today it is not uncommon at all for a college student to challenge a professor to prove the smooth line of socialism he may be peddling behind the cloak of professional respectability and academic freedom" (Jan. 16, 1963). "Make it a crime to teach and advocate the violent overthrow of the U.S. Government regardless of whether the advocacy incites students to action" (Feb. 15, 1961).

Criticism of labor unions or labor leaders: Contrary to the rabid antilabor views expressed by Facts Forum (e.g. programs No. 103 and No. 115), Life Lines has been remarkably consistent in avoiding comments on labor other than to commend American labor on being anti-Communist. Thus subtlety, however, does not conceal the fact that the overwhelming impact of the whole Life Line propaganda is aimed at the social welfare programs championed by the labor movement. (Examples follow in the general analysis.) Moreover, there is an abundance of Freudian slips such as the lead article in one issue of Life Lines endorsing Senator MUNDT's proposal for reconstructing the electoral college to cut the voting power of the industrial States; i.e., the workers (Mar. 31, 1961).

The general propaganda line: The foundation of the Life Line propaganda line is anticommunism; i.e., the threat of international communism and stress upon the existence of an internal conspiracy which threatens our freedoms: "Mistaken is the title which Life Line has fixed in the public mind as a specific, but nonlibelous designation for all enemies of Freedom—Communists, Fellow Travelers, etc., leaving them to classify themselves" (Life Lines release, Apr. 19, 1962).

That socialism is equated with communism, in the standard rightwing manner, is clear from the cartoon strip (no printed in the RECORD) on the following page which is reproduced from the January 9, 1963, issue of Life Lines.

The emphasis on an alleged threat from internal subversion is reflected in the following quotations from various issues of Life Lines.

"[Communism is a conspiracy of] a relatively few fanatics who deny the existence of God and all moral values and who are bent on the enslavement of every man, woman, and child in the world * * * the communism operation on American soil now is more deadly and dangerous than ever before in the history of this Nation * * * there is an imminent danger from communism. There is also an imminent danger which comes from our indifference, our failure to grasp the fact that there is an imminent danger from communism" (quoted March 24, 1961, from Chairman Walter of the House Un-American Activities Committee).

An article titled "The Homegrown Conspirators" warns that the "dedication of the homegrown mistaken to the Marxist-Leninist ideology makes them potential recruits for Soviet espionage" and quotes J. Edgar Hoover on the "diabolical skill" of the Communists and seconds his contention that they are "an advance detachment within our borders" of a powerful foreign government (December 28, 1962). Another article charges that the "Supreme Court Does Not Protect the United States" and that "Everyone in the United States * * * except, apparently, the Supreme Court, knows that communism advocates the overthrow of this Government" (April 28, 1961).

"As anti-Communist sentiment grows stronger in the United States, the mistaken forces seeking to end freedom feel the damage to their cause. Word has gone out that anticommunism must be stopped * * *. Definite orders for the liquidation of anticommunism have been given in a party manifesto * * *. Since that manifesto, the drive against anticommunism has been growing steadily more intense * * *. Americans may take heart from this evidence that their patriotism is paying off" (January 7, 1963).

And a recent, cryptic warning that "When a government's economy sputters, coughs, and then runs out of gas, by the time everyone begins asking how it happened, some very sinister individuals may already be in the driver's seat" (January 4, 1963).

Foreign policy—Life Lines' conspiratorial view is evident also in its pronouncements on foreign policy:

(Under the heading "United States Betrayal in Cuba")—"If you were the head man of the mistaken forces that are working to end freedom, what orders could you have given that would have produced greater strategic victory than the communization of Cuba? Cuba is only one of the most recent examples of the way U.S. foreign policy has failed to hinder the spread of communism in many parts of the world" (March 31, 1961).

A December 3, 1962, Life Line guest said, speaking of the Cuban situation: "It looks like a victory but * * * it is a defeat." The missile bases were built by Russia to protect Cuba because the Russians have "created a blind, unwarranted, irrational terror of nuclear war * * * we are firmly convinced that Russia will not unleash a nuclear war * * * the only solution for the Cuban problem is the invasion of that island and the establishment of a democratic government * * * [with] the full backing of the United States."

On foreign aid: The frequent rightwing allegation that Stalin was the originator of foreign aid is repeated by Life Lines (May 15, 1961) and it is further contended that "In underdeveloped countries the usual effect is to help keep in power Socialist regimes which are retarding economic development. The United States is actually subsidizing socialism in many countries." (March 8, 1961.) Furthermore, "We have been guilty of treason because we have given military aircraft to Marshal Tito of Yugoslavia. We have also trained Yugoslav pilots" (Jan. 14, 1963, quoting Alfred Glen Mays, of Alexandria, Va.).

On the United Nations: An article titled "United Nations Charter versus United States Constitution" states that "the Second World War was but another step in the program of the mistaken to conquer the entire world" and that "long before 1945, Soviet planners blueprinted the machinery of the United Nations to suit their future plans * * *. As the true aims of the Soviets to use the United Nations as the instrument by which they intend to rule the world became evident, a corresponding propaganda campaign has been waged in America and elsewhere, to convince people that 'world peace' can be achieved only through 'one world government' " (Mar. 22, 1961).

On coexistence: "There can be no peace until the threat of communism has been overcome." ("Christmas Message" Dec. 24, 1962.) "Whenever daydreaming people talk of peaceful coexistence, remember * * * that peaceful coexistence is possible only when it acts to the advantage of the atheistic Communists and to the disadvantage of the free world" (Oct. 24, 1962).

On disarmament: "World disarmament conceals a mistaken trap. The U.N. is under the domination of the Soviet and pro-Soviet neutrals * * * the entire propaganda line of the mistaken, including doubletalk about disarmament, is designed to make it easier for them to carry out their plot for ending freedom" (radio transcript, August 1962).

Domestic affairs: The outline of Life Lines' policies for domestic action is clear in the following recommendations from an article titled "The Way Back to Fiscal Sanity":

"1. Stop deficit spending. (Urges that 'farm plans, aid to education, huge highway spending, urban renewal * * * and other services' either 'should be curtailed or discontinued.')

"2. Keep government out of business. (Alleges that 'hundreds of governmental operations' are competing with personal enterprise and that if they 'were sold to private owners, their return would go a long way toward paying off the national debt.')

"3. Curtail the foreign aid program. 'The United States has been pouring dollars down an economic rathole.'

"4. Establish efficiency in government (by returning 'to the State and local governments the responsibilities which have been taken over by the Federal Government') (Dec. 23, 1962)."

Other quotations on various domestic issues follow:

On the income tax: "The 16th amendment to the U.S. Constitution has done more to promote the growth and expansion of government than any other single factor * * * the income tax has drained from the American people the money necessary to finance governmental growth on a terrifying scale * * * a great many of the troubles the U.S. faces today are caused by big government. For it is big government that imperils our freedom by imposing controls that reach into the daily lives of all of us" (Feb. 15, 1961).

On medicare: In an August 1962 broadcast it was alleged that medical care via social security will cost $7.5 billion a year, reduce the quality of medical service, destroy the doctor-patient relationship, and bring the growth of private medical insurance to an end. "Most alarming of all, the introduction of a system of socialized medicine * * * would represent a fatal straying away from freedom of choice."

On Federal aid to education: "The present clamor for Federal aid to education is just another step toward socialist statism, to paternalism, and to the welfare state * * * Federal aid to education without Federal control is a hoax and a fable. We never have had one without the other" (Mar. 1, 1963).

On mental health: Refers to "teachers, psychologists, sociologists, psychiatrists, economists and politicians" as "practiced braintwisters [turned] loose on our defenseless children" (Mar. 8, 1961).

On the Federal farm program: In addition to urging that it be "curtailed or discontinued," Life Lines recommends William H. Peterson's "The Great Farm Problem," which constitutes a major attack on the program (May 15, 1961).

On welfare programs in general: "There are those in America who do not trust the goodness of humanity. These social planners are convinced that the hungry will not be fed, the naked clothed, or the aged cared for unless the power of the state intervened" (Jan. 2, 1963).

On the proposed Freedom Academy: Strongly supporting the proposal, Life Lines says that "graduates of this Freedom Academy would know how to expose the fraudulence of mistaken propaganda" and that we need "trained professionals to help break the power of the mistaken ones who hope to subvert America" (Mar. 20, 1961).

On people and publications: Among the patriots lauded by Life Lines have been Gen. Bonner Fellers ("A strong patriot" whose opposition to disarmament is quoted approvingly—Apr. 19, 1961) and Clarence Manion ("a dedicated patriot" whose attack on the U.N. is reprinted—Apr. 28, 1961). Publications urged "for consideration by patriots" have included the Fringe on Top by M. Stanton Evans, William Schulz (assistant to Fulton Lewis, Jr.), and Allan H. Ryskind (assistant editor of Human Events) and a report to the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee by Dr. Stephan T. Possony which is cited as authority for an attack on coexistence. (See Jan. 11, 1963, Jan. 21, 1963, and Feb. 8, 1963.)

Political values: Life Line's chosen political vehicles is the ACA Index published by Human Events, Inc. for Americans for Constitutional Action. This is the highly partisan voting record which was used in Germany by ex-General Walker who recommended it to his troops as a guide in voting. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Oct. 4, 1962, speech by Senator McGEE). It was circulated in 1962 as the semiofficial voting record of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and has been reprinted in part by the Farm Bureau, Dan Smoot and the Network of Patriotic Letter Writers, a California group interlocked with the John Birch Society (Ibid.).

ACA is operated by an outstanding collection of right wingers, including Adm. Ben Moreell; Gen. Bonner Fellers; Felix Morley; Charles Edison, who has served on the editorial advisory committee of the John Birch Society's American Opinion; and Allan Kline, former President of the American Farm Bureau Federation.

ACA is the offspring of a drive to recreate a GOP-Dixiecrat alinement in the Congress, and its voting record reflects an ultraconservative political viewpoint, including opposition to Federal farm programs, aid to depressed areas, extension of the wage and hour law, increase in the minimum wage, foreign aid, Federal aid to education, Federal housing and slum clearance, Federal power, health research, manpower training and disarmament—to mention a few. (See GRI Special Reports No. 8, Voting Records; No. 9, Americans for Constitutional Action; and No. 10, Human Events.)

LIFE LINE'S STAFF

Life Line's main office and a staff of about 12 occupies two floors of a building in Washington, D.C. Another office, in nearby McLean, Va., purportedly houses the printing plant and the operations of the "editor and commentator," Wayne Poucher and his new assistants, James Dobbs and Gene Scudder. The Washington office is under the immediate direction of Dan Patterson, director, aided by Norman Larsen, manager, and a recent recruit from a Dallas radio station, Keith Kathan. (Dallas Times-Herald, Oct. 14, 1962). The receptionist at Life Line, in August 1962, was a former employee of Liberty Lobby.

One floor of the space contains a well-equipped processing and mailing operation. In mid-1962, the staff reported a usual day's orders for literature at around 165—plus the mailing of 37,000 copies of Life Lines three times a week.

The origins of Life Line's maestro, the Reverend Wayne Poucher, are a bit vague. He was born in Florida and graduated from high school at Largo. He attended a couple of colleges in Tennessee and one in Florida. Subsequently, he worked with radio station WCOS, Columbia, S.C. "In 1956, convinced that the battle between freedom and tyranny would ultimately be won by the depth of man's religious convictions" he turned to the ministry. By November 1958, he had been ordained, had been minister to one small church for a short time, and was working for Hunt in his present job. (Life Lines Release, "Biographical Information.")

His official biography does not reveal that he was local campaign manager for STROM THURMOND, Democrat, of South Carolina, when the latter first won his Senate seat.

Poucher told a reporter for the Texas Observer he was ordained a minister in 1957, 1 year after he determined the need for religion in the fight against communism. He was minister of the Owen's Chapel Church, Franklin, Tenn., in 1957–58—his only church assignment as he went to work for Hunt in November 1958.

In his 1959 speech to a west Texas teachers' group, Poucher said there were two documents of supreme importance to Americans in deciding whether we will have freedom or enslavement; i.e., the Holy Bible and the Constitution.

He warned that freedom was disappearing day by day and "The time has come when Americans must pray and pass the ammunition."

"I have been sneeringly called reactionary, mossback, sometimes a fundamentalist, flagwaver, and other less complimentary names, because I believe in these documents," the reverend said. "But if to love my flag and my God is the offense, I take the epithets as the greatest compliments that can be bestowed upon me."

During Poucher's review of his concept of the disputes over interpretation of the Constitution, the teachers sat silent, not applauding, but they sat—under the eyes of the administrators who had assembled them.

Poucher said Alexander Hamilton had championed big government and that today the Federal Government is the largest electric power producer, insurer, lender, borrower, landlord, grain operator, shipowner, and truck fleet operator in the country.

"Even Alexander Hamilton would turn over in his grave * * *. The antifreedom, mistaken forces of Communism * * * will succeed in America in exactly the degree we permit Christianity to fail," he concluded. "We have surrendered to the governmental welfare state our sacred responsibility to love our neighbors as ourselves * * * we are a nation which worships at the shrine of sex, sadism, and brutality."

He urged teachers to investigate textbooks for propaganda * * * take nothing for granted. He said the U.S.S. *Nautilus* was sabotaged and the FBI was investigating, "yet some folks will say there is no Communist threat in this country."

Don H. Norris, president of Abilene Christian College, in introducing the Reverend Poucher, said: "He served as campaign manager for J. STROM THURMOND of South Carolina in his successful campaign for U.S. Senator on a write-in vote," (the Texas Observer, vol. 51, No. 39, Jan. 1, 1959).

Poucher's new broadcast assistant, James Dobbs, joined Life Line in December 1962, after he was defeated as the GOP candidate against Representative Homer Thornberry (Democrat of Texas). Dobbs' biography reveals he is a native Texan educated in advertising and art, and was variously employed as draftsman, Hollywood bit player, chamber of commerce editor, Church of Christ minister, and public relations consultant and lecturer for corporations.

Apparently without formal training he began to serve as minister in 1948 and continued through 1960, but his ministerial career shows a 3-year gap as far as his self-published record is concerned. By 1960, although still holding a ministerial position, he was assisting George Roberts in his Citizenship Training courses in Houston, courses originally designed to give certain views to corporation employees and then expanded at corporation expense to the community level. Among the sponsors: Mission Manufacturing Co., Humble Oil Co., Sheffield Steel Co., Cameron Iron Works, and Houston Shell and Concrete Co. (Houston Post, Apr. 14, 1961). Roberts has done graduate work at Harding College, Searcy, Ark., and has been a consultant for Dr. George Benson, its president, according to a Farm Bureau announcement of a speaking appearance. (Texas Agriculture, August 1960.)

During 1961–62, prior to running for Congress, Dobbs lectured for an organization first known as Texas Free Enterprise, Inc., then as Free Enterprise, Inc., which he refers to as a group of "conservative Houston businessmen" (biography).

Both his campaign literature and George Roberts' programs read like an extension course from George Benson's Harding College at Searcy, Ark. In the campaign he used the U.S. Chamber of Commerce reprint of the ACA voting index to damn his opponent's liberal record. He favored cutting foreign aid, local control of schools, free enterprise, a "liberated" farm program, local medical care, right-to-work laws, and the oil depletion allowance, a longtime Texas favorite. One ad: "If you want a socialist government—don't vote for Dobbs." Thornberry won handily.

Manager and apparently No. 4 man at Life Line is Norman Larsen, former student at Northwestern University. He was present at the Washington, D.C., meeting, March 22, 1962, called by Billy James Hargis which resulted in the formation of the Anti-Communist Liaison as a coordinating committee for rightwing activity.

LIFE LINE OFFICIALDOM

In 1960 and again in 1963 there was a reshuffling of the officers and directors of the corporation, and in 1960 the number of directors was increased from seven to nine.

Pre-1960 officers and directors: President, C. H. Dragert; vice president, John W. Mayo; secretary-treasurer, Edward R. Maher; directors:[1] C. H. Dragert, Edward R. Maher, Earle C. Bell, William F. Billings, Allen White, Dr. Ridings E. Lee, and John W. Mayo.

Officers and directors, 1960:[2] President, Henry Clay, vice president, C. H. Dragert, secretary-treasurer, Edward R. Maher; directors: C. H. Dragert, Edward R. Maher, H. L. Hunt, Henry Clay, Mrs. Dorothy Franey Langkop, Dr. Milford O. Rouse, Mrs. Robert Fitch, Allen White, and Dr. Ridings E. Lee.

Officers and directors, 1963:[3] President, Mrs. Dorothy Franey Langkop, vice president, C. H. Dragert, secretary-treasurer, Yale Griffiths; directors: C. H. Dragert, Edward R. Maher, James B. Kuykendall, Henry Clay, Mrs. Dorothy Franey Langkop, Dr. M. O. Rouse, Mrs. Robert Fitch, Yale Griffis, and Jerome K. Fullinwider.

Life Line advisory board: Chairman B. A. Hardey, a Shreveport, La., oil and lumberman, is chairman of the Life Line advisory committee and has been since its inception. In 1955 he held the same position with Facts Forum, but then as Major Hardey.

Gen. Robert E. Wood, retired, Chicago, Ill. Wood, formerly board chairman of Sears, Roebuck, was also a member of the advisory board of Facts Forum (Facts Forum news, May 1955, and Facts Forum letterhead Nov. 23, 1956); sponsored the 1944 luncheon which launched Human Events (HE, Apr. 21, 1961). In 1946 Wood wrote a letter requesting contributions for American Action, Inc., in the drive against liberal Congressmen. Fellow sponsors were Merwin K. Hart, the anti-Semite, and Robert M. Harris, a Coughlinite. "In 1952 the general was chairman of the Chicago dinner at which McCarthy tried to link Adlai Stevenson with communism." (New York Post, Feb. 16, 1954.) More currently, Wood is a member of the senior advisory board, American Security Council (Washington Report) and was a director of Americans for Constitutional Action. (Denver Post, Jan. 27, 1959.) Wood contributed $832 to ACA in 1962. (House Clerk Reports.) He is also a member of Citizens Foreign Aid Committee (letterhead Feb. 26, 1962), and National Advisory Board, Young Americans for Freedom (letterhead, Feb. 16, 1962).

Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer, retired, Washington, D.C. Former Chief of Staff to Chiang Kai-shek and proponent of "unrestricted attacks against Red China's mainland." (New York Post, Feb. 16, 1954.) Formerly advisory board member, Facts Forum. (Facts Forum news, May 1955.) Originally a member of the advisory committee, John Birch Society and contributing editor to American Opinion, the John Birch journal. (Time, Dec. 4, 1961.) Sponsor, the Congress of Freedom along with Westbrook Pegler, Myron Fagan, Merwin K. Hart, et al.; American Committee for Aid to Katanga Freedom Fighters; National Strategy Committee, American Security Council; advisory board, Young Americans for Freedom; National Policy Committee, for America; Committee of One Million; Citizens Foreign Aid Committee (letterhead, Feb. 26, 1962).

John Wayne, the Hollywood star, was formerly member, advisory board, Facts Forum (Facts Forum news, May 1955); "former president of the Motion Picture Alliance, who has stumped for McCarthy" (New York Post, Feb. 16, 1954); appeared as guest at Fred Schwarz's Christian Anti-Communism Crusade; given an award by Young Americans for Freedom, March 1962.

Gen. James A. Van Fleet. Recalled to active duty by President Kennedy as a specialist on guerrilla warfare; distinguished by his attack in the fall of 1961 on Adlai Stevenson, later smoothed over by an apology. (Van Fleet charged that Stevenson was responsible for blocking air support during the Bay of Pigs fiasco.) (Washington Daily News, Nov. 2, 1961.) Still on active duty with the Defense Department, late in 1962 "working primarily on plans to increase the readiness of Army units." (Secretary McNamara, Washington Post, Nov. 18, 1962.)

---

[1] Only seven directors until 1960.

[2] Minutes of Life Line Board, Feb. 28, 1960.

[3] Dallas Times-Herald, Jan. 25, 1963.

Dr. Batsell Barrett Baxter, David Lipcomb College, Nashville, Tenn. (Reverend Poucher's alma mater).

Louis C. Wyman, Concord, N.H., elected GOP Congressman, 1962; Attorney General of New Hampshire, 1953–61; General Counsel to U.S. Senate Investigating Committee, 1946; Secretary to Senator Bridges, 1947 (Who's Who, 1962–63).

Dr. W. R. White, Dallas, Tex. Formerly president, Baylor University, 1962 Awards jury chairman, Freedoms Foundation at Valley Forge (1962 award winner brochure).

C. C. Moseley, Beverly Hills, Calif. Charter subscriber to Human Events (1962 brochure); member, Executive Committee, National Committee for Economic Freedom; contributed $100 to Americans for Constitutional Action in September 1962 (Report to Clerk of House) and $500 to Senate campaign of Milward Simpson, Wyoming Republican (Wyoming Eagle, Nov. 6, 1962).

LIFE LINE TV

The following TV stations are airing Life Line 5-minute programs 5 days of the week. Complete information concerning sponsorship is available from Life Line, Washington, D.C.:

Abilene, Tex.: KPAR, channel 12, 12 noon.

Ada, Okla.: KTEN, channel 10, 5:45 p.m. and 10:25 p.m.

Albuquerque, N. Mex.: KOAT, channel 7, 12:55 p.m.

Alexandria, La.: KALB, channel 5, 12:30 p.m.

Amarillo, Tex.: KVII, channel 7, 10:55 p.m.

Big Spring, Tex.: KWAB, channel 4, 7 a.m., and 5:55 p.m.

Biloxi, Miss.: WLOX, channel 13, 10:25 p.m.

Columbus, Miss.: WCBI, channel 4, 5:55 p.m.

Clovis, N. Mex.: KICA, channel 12, 4:55 p.m.

Daytona Beach, Fla.: WESH, channel 2, 6 p.m.

Denver, Colo.: KTVR, channel 2, 5:55 p.m. and 9:25 p.m.

El Paso, Tex.: KELP, channel 13, 9:20 a.m. and 12:30 p.m.

Elk City, Okla.: KSWB, channel 8, 8:55 p.m.

Fort Smith, Ark.: KFSA, channel 5, 10:25 p.m.

Fort Worth-Dallas, Tex.: KTVT, channel 11, 12:25 p.m.

Garden City, Kans.: KOLD, channel 11, 8:25 a.m.

Goodland, Kans.: KLOE, channel 10, 6:25 p.m.

Great Bend, Kans.: KCKT, channel 2, 8:25 a.m.

Harlingen, Tex.: KGBT, channel 4, 12:25 p.m.

Hastings, Nebr.: KHAS, channel 5, 5:50 p.m.

Hays, Kans.: KAYS, channel 7, 6:25 p.m.

Hot Springs, Ark.: KFOY, channel 9, 5:55 p.m.

Indianapolis, Ind.: WTTV, channel 4, 10 p.m.

Jackson, Miss.: WLBT, channel 3, 6:50 a.m.

LaCrosse, Wis.: WKBT, channel 8, 11:25 a.m.

Lafayette, Ind.: WFAM, channel 18, 6:55 p.m.

Lafayette, La.: KLFY, channel 10, 10:55 a.m.

Lake Charles, La.: KPLC, channel 7, 8:25 a.m. and 12:30 p.m.

Laredo, Tex., KGNS, channel 8, 6:15 p.m.

Lawton, Okla., KSWO, channel 7, 1:55 p.m.

Little Rock, Ark., KTHV, channel [illegible], 7:55 a.m.

Los Angeles, Calif., KCOP, channel 13, 12:10 p.m.

Lubbock, Tex., KLBK, channel 13, 7 a.m. and 5:55 p.m.

Macon, Ga., WMAZ, channel 13, 11:30 p.m.

McCook, Nebr., KOMC, channel 8, 8:25 a.m.

Milwaukee, Wis., WXIX, channel 18, 8:25 p.m.

Mont Emery, Ala., WCOV, channel 20, 12:25 p.m.

Muncie, Ind., WLBC, channel 49, 6:30 p.m.

New Orleans, La., WWL, channel 4, 9:55 a.m.

Oak Hill, W. Va., WOAY, channel 4, 6:25 p.m.

Odessa, Tex., KOSA, channel 7, 5:40 p.m.

Parkersburg, W. Va., WTAP, channel 15, 6:10 p.m.

Roswell, N. Mex., KSWS, channel 8, 12:10 p.m.

St. Louis, Mo., KPLR, channel 11, 2:30 p.m.

Salina, Kans., KSLN, channel 34, 6:25 p.m.

San Antonio, Tex., KENS, channel 5, 11:55 p.m.

San Diego, Calif., XETV, channel 6, 12:55 p.m.

Sherman, Tex., KXII, channel 12, 12:55 p.m.

Shreveport-Texarkana, KTAL, channel 6, 5:40 p.m.

Sioux Falls, S. Dak., KSOO, channel 13, 5:55 p.m.

Tacoma-Seattle, Wash., KTVW, channel 13, 10:55 a.m. and 5:55 p.m.

Topeka, Kans., WIBW, channel 13, 10:30 p.m.

Tulsa, Okla., KTUL, channel 8, 12:10 p.m.

Tyler, Tex., KLTV, channel 7, 12 m.

Wichita, Kans., KARD, channel 3, 8:25 a.m.

Wichita Falls, Tex., KSYD, channel 6, 12:15 p.m.

Williston, N. Dak., KUMV, channel 8, 5:40 p.m.

Zanesville, Ohio, WHIZ, channel 18, 5:55 p.m.

Life Line Radio.

Active Patriots: Please phone three others before next broadcast and notify friends at a distance the time and dial for them.

Abilene, Tex., 1340, KWKC, 6:35 p.m.

Ada, Okla., 1230, KADA, 6:40 p.m.

Albuquerque, N. Mex., 1580, KRZY, 6 a.m.

Amarillo, Tex., 1010, KBUY.

Amory, Miss., 1580, WAMY, 3:35 p.m.

Anderson Ind., 1470 WHUT, 10:30 a.m.

Anderson, S.C., 1280, WANS, 6:45 a.m.

Atlanta, Ga., 1480, WYZE, 7 a.m.

Augusta, Ga., 1050, WAUG, 11:15 a.m.

Aurora, Ill., 1580, WKKD, 5:15 p.m.

Aurora, Ill., 95.9fm, WKKD, 5:15 p.m.

Austin, Tex., 1300, KVET, 11:15 a.m.

Austin, Tex., 1370, KOKE, 11:15 a.m.

Bakersfield, Calif., 1230, KGEE, 7:30 a.m.

Bakersfield, Calif., 1230, KGEE, 7:15 p.m.

Baltimore, Md., 1570, WAQE, 7:30 a.m.

Bartlesville, Okla., 1400, KWON, 6:15 p.m.

Bastrop, La., 730, KTRY, 11:30 a.m.

Baytown, Tex., 1360, KWBA, 6:15 a.m.

Bay Minette, Ala., 1150, WBCA, 12:45 p.m.

Beaumont, Tex., 95.1 fm, KHGM, 6:45 p.m.

Belgrade, Mont., 630, KGVW, 7:15 a.m.

Berryville, Ark., 1480, KTHS, 8:30 a.m.

Big Spring, Tex., 1400, KBYG, 12:45 p.m.

Billings, Mont., 730, KURL, 5:30 p.m.

Biloxi, Miss., 1490, WLOX, 7:45 a.m.

Birmingham, Ala., 1070, WAPI, 8:45 p.m.

Bisbee, Ariz., 1230, KSUN, 6:30 p.m.

Bismarck, N. Dak., 550, KFYR, 6:30 p.m.

Black Mountain, N.C., 1010, WFGW, 8:15 a.m.

Blaine, Wash., 550, KARI 6:45 a.m.

Blakely, Ga., 1260, WBBK, 1 p.m.

Blanding, Utah, 790, KUTA, 7 a.m.

Bloomsburg, Pa., 930, WCNR, 12:05 p.m.

Bonham, Tex., 1420, KFYN, 7:45 a.m.

Borger, Tex., 1600, KBBB, 5:15 p.m.

Bozeman, Mont., 1450, KXXL, 12:30 p.m.

Brookhaven, Miss., 1340, WJMB, 6:30 p.m.

Brownwood, Tex., 1240, KEAN, 5:45 p.m.

Bryan, Tex., 1150, WTAW, 12:30 p.m.

Burbank, Calif., 1490, KBLA, 12:15 p.m.

Burbank, Calif., 1490, KBLA, 9:30 p.m.

Butler, Ala., 1220, WPRN, 7 p.m.

Caldwell, Idaho, 910, KRGN, 12:15 p.m.

Canton, Miss., 1250, WDOB.

Carbondale, Pa., 1440, WCDL, 11:30 a.m.

Carrollton, Ala., 590, WRAG, 8:15 a.m.

Carrollton, Ga., 1100, WLBB, 8:15 a.m.

Casper, Wyo., 1470, KTWO, 6:45 p.m.

Charlotte, N.C., 1110, WBT, 9:15 p.m.

Chicago, Ill., 1450, WHFC, 11:00 a.m.

Chicago, Ill., 1450, WHFC, 12:00 m.

Cincinnati, Ohio, 700, WLW, 11:05 p.m.

Clarksdale, Miss., 1600, WKDL, 7:45 a.m.

Clarksville, Tex., 1350, KCAR, 9:45 a.m.

Cleveland, Ohio, 1220, WGAR, 9:05 p.m.

Cody, Wyo., 1400, KODI, 7:00 a.m.

Colorado Springs, Colo., 1240, KRDO, 6:30 p.m.

Columbia, Miss., 1450, WCJU, 5:05 p.m.

Columbia, S.C., 560, WIS, 7:15 p.m.

Columbus, Ga., 1420, WRBL, 6:15 p.m.

Columbus, Ohio, 1460, WBNS, 8:15 p.m.

Corpus Christi, Tex., 1030, KCTA, 8:30 a.m.

Corpus Christi, Tex., 1030, KCTA, 4:45 p.m.

Cumberland, Md., 1450, WTBO, 6:30 p.m.

Dade City, Fla., 1350, WDCF, 8:30 a.m.

Dallas, Tex., 1080, KRLD, 6:15 p.m.

Davenport, Iowa, 1580, KWNT, 8:00 a.m.

Davenport, Iowa, 1420, WOC, 6:45 p.m.

Dawson, Ga., 990, WDWD, 1:15 p.m.

Daytona Beach, Fla., 1340, WROD, 7:15 p.m.

De Funiak Springs, Fla., 1280, WDSP, 7:30 p.m.

De Funiak Springs, Fla., 1280, WDSP, 5:15 p.m.

Denton, Tex., 1440, KDNT, 6:45 a.m.

Denton, Tex., 1440, KDNT, 11:45 a.m.

Denver, Colo., 630, KHOW, 6:30 p.m.

DeRidder, La., 1010, KDIA, 12:15 p.m.

DeQueen, Ark., 1390, KDQN, 8:00 a.m.

Dowagiac, Mich., 1440, WDOW, 8:30 a.m.

Durant, Okla., 750, KSEO, 7:15 a.m.

Durham, N.C., 620, WDNC, 6:30 p.m.

El Paso, Tex., 690, KHEY, 6:30 p.m.

Eugene, Oreg., 1280, KERG, 6:15 p.m.

Eugene, Oreg., 1540, KWFS, 7:30 a.m.

Eureka, Calif., 1480, KRED, 6:35 p.m.

Evanston, Ill., 1330, WEAW, 8:30 a.m.

Evanston, Ill., 1330, WEAW, 12:30 p.m.

Evansville, Ind., 1280, WGBF, 12:45 p.m.

Fargo, N. Dak., 970, WDAY, 6:15 p.m.

Farmington. N. Mex., 1390, KENN, 6:15 p.m.

Farmington, N. Mex., 1280, KRZE, 6:30 a.m.

Fayetteville, Ark., 1250, KFAY, 7:15 a.m.

Flagstaff, Ariz., 600, KCLS, 8:45 p.m.

Foley, Ala., 1310, WHEP, 7:30 a.m.

Fort Smith, Ark., 950, KFSA, 6:45 a.m.

Fort Smith, Ark., 950, KFSA, 6:15 p.m.

Fort Wayne, Ind., 1450, WANE, 7:45 p.m.

Fort Worth, Tex., 1540, KCUL, 7:30 a.m.

Fresno, Calif., 900, KBIF, 12:15 p.m.

Gainesville, Fla., 850, WRUF, 6:30 a.m.

Garden Grove, Calif., 94.3 fm, KGGK, 8:05 a.m.

Garden Grove, Calif., 94.3 fm, KGGK, 6:00 p.m.

Gastonia, N.C., 1450, WGNC, 6:15 p.m.

Glendive, Mont., 590, KGLE, 12:35 p.m.

Globe-Miami, Ariz., 1340, KIKO, 9:45 p.m.

Graham, Tex., 1330, KSWA, 12 noon.

Grand Prairie, Tex., 730, KPCN, 11 a.m.

Grand Rapids, Mich., 1570, WFUR, 12:45 p.m.

Great Falls, Mont., 1400, KARR, 5:45 p.m.

Greenville, Miss., 1330, WJPR, 6:15 a.m.

Greenville, Miss., 1330, WJPR, 6:15 p.m.

Greenville, Tex., 1400, KGVL, 7:15 p.m.

Griffin, Ga., 1450, WKEU, 11:45 a.m.

Groton, Conn., 980, WSUB, 11:30 a.m.

Guthrie, Okla., 1490, KWRW, 12:45 p.m.

Haleyville, Ala., 1230, WJBB, 8 a.m.

Hampton, S.C., 1270, WBHC, 5:45 p.m.

Harlingen, Tex., 1530, KGBT, 12:45 p.m.

Hartford, Conn., 1080, WTIC, 11:45 p.m.

Hastings, Nebr., 1230, KHAS, 6 p.m.

Hastings, Nebr., 1230, KHAS, 6:00 p.m.

Hattiesburg, Miss., 1230, WHSY, 6:30 a.m.

Helena, Mont., 1340, KCAP, 7:15 a.m.

Henderson, Tex., 1000, KGRI, 1:45 p.m.

Hobbs, N. Mex., 1480, KWEW, 8:15 a.m.

Hobbs, N, Mex., 1480, KWEW, 7:35 p.m.

Holbrook, Ariz., 1270, KDJI, 12:30 p.m.

Houston, Tex., 98 fm, KFMK, 6:45 p.m.

Houston, Tex., 740, KTRH, 7:45 p.m.

Huntsville, Ala., 99.1 fm, WAHR, 1 p.m.

Jackson, Miss., 620, WJDX, 6:45 p.m.

Jackson, Tenn., 1390, WTJS, 5:15 p.m.
Jacksonville, Fla., 600, WPDQ, 7:05 p.m.
Jacksonville, Tex., 1400, KEBE, 7:45 a.m.
Jacksonville, Tex., 1400, KEBE, 6:30 p.m.
Jamestown, N.Y., 1240, WJTN, 8:00 p.m.
Jefferson City, Mo., 950, KLIK, 8:45 a.m.
Kalamazoo, Mich., 1420, WKPR, 7 a.m.
Kansas City, Mo., 810, KCMO, 7:30 p.m.
Kilgore, Tex., 1240, KOCA, 7:45 a.m.
Kilgore, Tex., 1240, KOCA, 10 p.m.
Killeen, Tex., 99.3 fm, KLEN, 12:45 p.m.
Kinston, N.C., 1230, WISP, 6:15 p.m.
Kirkland, Wash., 1050, KNBX, 11:15 a.m.
LaGrange, Ill., 1300 WTAQ, 10 p.m.
LaGrange, Ill., 1300, WTAQ, 10 p.m.
Lake Charles, La., 1470, KPLC, 6:45 p.m.
Lamesa, Tex., 690, KPET, 6:15 p.m.
LaPorte, Ind., 1540, WLOI, 12:45 p.m.
Laredo, Tex., 1490, KVOZ, 6:45 p.m.
Laredo, Tex., 1490, KVOZ, 5:45 p.m.
Laurel, Miss., 1260, WNSL, 12:45 p.m.
Lawrence, Kans., 1320, KLWN, 12:45 p.m.
LeMars, Iowa, 1410, KLEM, 9:45 a.m.
Lewistown, Mont., 1230, KXLO, 6:30 p.m.
Lexington, Ky., 1300, WBLG, 10 p.m.
Lexington, N.C., 1440, WBUY, 6:45 a.m.
Lexington, N.C., 1440, WBUY, 9:45 p.m.
Lexington, Va., 1450, WREL, 10 p.m.
Liberal, Kans., 1470, KLIB, 5:15 p.m.
Little Rock, Ark., 1090, KAAY, 7 p.m.
Littlefield, Tex., 1490, KZZN, 12:45 p.m.
Livingston, Tex., 1440, KETX, 5:15 p.m.
Long Beach, Calif., 1390, KGER, 2:45 p.m.
Longview, Tex., 1280, KLUE, 6:45 a.m.
Longview, Tex., 1370, KFRO, 8:15 a.m.
Longview, Tex, 1370, KFRO, 10:45 p.m.
Los Alamos, N. Mex., 1490, KRSN, 10:30 p.m.
Los Angeles, Calif., 107.5 fm, KBBI, 6 p.m.
Los Angeles, Calif., 640, KFI, 10:15 p.m.
Los Angeles, Calif., 99.5 fm, KHOF, 5:30 p.m.
Los Angeles, Calif., 1460, KTYM, 8 p.m.
Lovington, N.Mex., 630, KLEA, 7:40 a.m.
Lubbock, Tex., 790, KFYO, 6:30 p.m.
Lucedale, Miss., 1440, WHHT, 7:15 a.m.
Lufkin, Tex., 1420, KTRE, 11:45 a.m.
Manhattan, Kans., 1350, KMAN, 9:15 a.m.
Marianna, Fla., 980, WTOT, 12:15 p.m.
Marshall, Tex., 1410, KADO, 7:30 a.m.
Marshall, Tex., 1450 KMHT, 5:45 p.m.
Maryville, Tenn., 1400, WGAP, 6 p.m.
McComb, Miss., 1250, WHNY, 12:30 p.m.
Memphis, Tenn., 790 WMC, 6:30 p.m.
Meridian, Miss., 1330, WDAL, 8 a.m.
Meridian, Miss., 1330, WDAL, 12 noon.
Miami, Fla., 1140, WMIE, 10:15 a.m.
Miami, Okla., 910, KGLC, 7 a.m.
Miami Beach, Fla., 1360, WKAT, 6:15 a.m.
Midland, Tex., 550, KCRS, 9:45 p.m.
Miles City, Mont., 1340, KATL, 1 p.m.
Milwaukee, Wis., 1290, WMIL, 7:45 p.m.
Minden, La., 1240, KASO, 5:45 p.m.
Mobile, Ala., 710, WKRG, 10:10 p.m.
Monroe, La., 1440, KMLB, 6:45 p.m.
Monroeville, Ala., 1360, WMFC, 4 p.m.
Montgomery, Ala., 1600, WAPX, 12:15 p.m.
Montgomery, Ala., 1440, WHHY, 6:15 p.m.
Morton, Tex., 1280, KRAN, 12:30 p.m.
Mount Pleasant, Tex., 960, KIMP, 4:45 p.m.
Muleshoe, Tex., 1380, KMUL, 7:45 a.m.
Muncie, Ind., 1340, WLBC, 5:45 p.m.
Muskegon Heights, Mich., 1520, WKJR, 12:45 p.m.
Nacogdoches, Tex., 860, KSFA, 12:15 p.m.
Nampa, Idaho, 580, KFXD, 5:45 p.m.
Nampa, Idaho, 580, KFXD, 6:30 p.m.
Nashville, Tenn., 1510, WLAC, 2:45 a.m.
Nashville, Tenn., 1510, WLAC, 6:15 p.m.
Nashville, Ark., 1260, KBHC, 7:30 a.m.
Nashville, Tenn., 650, WSM, 4:45 a.m.
New Bedford, Mass., 1340, WNBH, 7:15 p.m.
New Orleans, La., 870, WWL, 5:45 a.m.
New Orleans, La., 870, WWL, 9:15 p.m.
New York, N.Y., 1330, WPOW, 7 p.m.
Newark, N.J., 620, WVNJ, 6:30 a.m.
Norfolk, Nebr., 780, WJAG, 3:15 p.m.
Norman, Okla., 1400, KNOR, 12:15 p.m.
Oklahoma City, Okla., 890, KBYE, 12 noon.
Oklahoma City, Okla., 890, KBYE, 4:15 p.m.
Omaha, Nebr., 590, WOW, 7:35 p.m.
Opelousas, La., 1230, KSLO, 6:30 p.m.
Orlando, Fla., 580, WDBO, 6:15 p.m.
Ottumwa, Iowa, 1480, KLEE, 6:30 p.m.
Oxford, Miss., 1420, WSUH, 8:15 a.m.
Palestine, Tex., 1450, KNET, 5:45 p.m.
Palm Springs, Calif., 920, KDES, 6:30 a.m.
Panama City, Fla., 1430, WPCF, 8:15 a.m.
Paris, Ill., 1440, WPRS, 12:15 p.m.
Paris, Tex., 1490, KPLT, 7:30 a.m.
Paris, Tex., 1490, KPLT, 5:30 p.m.
Pascagoula, Miss., 1580, WPMP, 7 a.m.
Pensacola, Fla., 1370, WCOA, 6:05 p.m.
Peoria, Ill., 1020, WPEO, 5:15 p.m.
Perryton, Tex., 1400, KEYE, 7:15 a.m.
Phoenix, Ariz., 550, KOY, 7:30 p.m.
Phoenix, Ariz., 620, KTAR, 7:45 p.m.
Picayune, Miss., 1320, WRJW, 7:45 a.m.
Pittsfield, Mass., 1420, WBEC, 7:15 p.m.
Pocahontas, Ark., 1420, KPOC, 7 a.m.
Port Arthur, Tex., 1250, KPAC, 6:15 p.m.
Portales, N. Mex., 1450, KENM, 1:30 p.m.
Portland, Oreg., 800, KPDQ, 9:45 a.m.
Portland, Oreg., 1290, KLIQ, 7:15 a.m.
Kratt, Kans., 1290, KWNS, 5:45 p.m.
Prescott, Ariz., 1340, KENT, 7:30 a.m.
Prescott, Ariz., 1490, KYCA, 7:45 a.m.
Prescott, Ark., 1370, KTPA.
Prichard, Ala., 1270, WSIM, 7:30 a.m.
Pueblo, Colo., 590, KCSJ, 6:15 p.m.
Puyallup, Wash., 1450, KAYE, 12:15 p.m.
Rayville, La., 990, KRIH, 7:15 a.m.
Red Lion, Pa., 1440, WGCB, 2 p.m.
Red Lion, Pa., 96.1 fm, WGCB, 11 p.m.
Redding, Calif., 1400, KQMS, 12:05 p.m.
Reno, Nev., 99.5 fm, KNEV.
Riverton, Wyo., 1450, KVOW, 1 p.m.
Roanoke, Va., 1550, WKBA, 12:45 p.m.
Rockford, Ill., 1150, WJRL, 11:45 a.m.
Roswell, N. Mex., 1230, KRSY, 6:30 p.m.
Ruidoso, N. Mex., 1340, KRRR, 7 a.m.
Rusk, Tex., 1580, KTLU, 7 a.m.
Rusk, Tex., 1580, KTLU, 12:15 p.m.
Ruston, La., 1490, KRUS, 8:15 a.m.
Rutland, Vt., 1380, WSYB, 11:40 a.m.
Safford, Ariz., 1230, KATO, 10:30 p.m.
St. Augustine, Fla., 1420, WETH, 12 noon.
St. Joseph, Mo., 680, KFEQ, 6:05 p.m.
St. Louis, Mo., 1010, KXEN, 8:30 a.m.
St. Paul, Minn., 1500, KSTP, 6:45 p.m.
Salt Lake City, Utah, 1160, KSL, 8:10 p.m.
San Antonio, Tex., 1150, KBER, 6 p.m.
San Antonio, Tex., 1200, WOAI, 10:45 p.m.
San Diego, Calif., 1090, XERB, 8:15 p.m.
San Diego, Calif., 860, XEMO, 12:15 p.m.
San Diego. Calif., 860, XEMO, 6:30 p.m.
San Francisco, Calif., 1100, KFAX, 5 p.m.
San Francisco, Calif., 1450, KSAN, 10:45 a.m.
San Jose, Calif., 1170, KLOK, 9 a.m.
Sanford, Fla., 1400, WTRR, 9:15 a.m.
Santa Barbara, Calif., 1290, KACL, 7:15 a.m.
Searcy, Ark., 1300, KWCB, 4:30 p.m.
Seattle, Wash., 1250 KTW, 8:30 a.m.
Sebring, Fla., 960, WJCM, 5:15 p.m.
Selma, Ala., 1340, WHBB, 6:45 p.m.
Seminole, Tex., 1250, KTFO, 12:15 p.m.
Sheffield, Ala., 1590, WVNA, 11:45 a.m.
Shenandoah, Iowa, 960, KMA, 6 p.m.
Sherman, Tex., 1500, KTXO, 8:30 a.m.
Shreveport, La., 1130, KWKH, 12:45 a.m.
Shreveport, La., 1130, KWKH, 6:30 p.m.
Snyder, Tex., 1450, KSNY, 5:38 p.m.
Spanish Fork, Utah, 1480, KONI, 4:30 p.m.
Spokane, Wash., 1510, KGA, 5:45 p.m.
Springdale, Ark., 1340, KBRS, 11:45 a.m.
Springdale, Ark., 1340, KBRS, 5:45 p.m.
Springhill, La., 1460, KBSF, 8 a.m.
Stephenville, Tex., 1510, KSTV, 7:45 a.m.
Stillwater, Okla., 780, KSPI, 12:30 p.m.
Storm Lake, Iowa, 990, KAYL, 5:30 p.m.
Sulphur Springs, Tex., 1230, KSST, 6:35 p.m.
Sweetwater, Tex., 1240, KXOX, 6 p.m.
Tacoma, Wash., 103.9 fm, KTWR, 6:30 p.m.
Tallahassee, Fla., 1450, WTNT, 6:30 p.m.
Tampa, Fla., 1300, WSOL, 8:15 a.m.
Tampa, Fla., 1300, WSOL, 5 p.m.
Terre Haute, Ind., 1230, WBOW, 7:45 p.m.
Terrell, Tex., 1570, KTER, 5:15 p.m.
Texarkana, Tex., 1230, KCMC, 6:45 a.m.
Texarkana, Tex., 1230, KCMC, 6 p.m.
Thomasville, Ga., 1240, WPAX, 6:30 p.m.
Toledo, Ohio, 730, WMGS, 4:45 p.m.
Topeka, Kans., 580, WIBW, 7:15 p.m.
Tucson, Ariz., 580, KTAN, 5:45 p.m.
Tucumcari, N. Mex., 1400, KTNM, 12:45 p.m.
Tulsa, Okla., 1050, KFMJ, 9:45 a.m.
Tulsa, Okla., 1170, KVOO, 4:45 p.m.
Tulsa, Okla., 1170., KVOO, 11:45 p.m.
Tuscaloosa, Ala., 1230, WTBC, 6:45 a.m.
Tuscumbia, Ala., 1410, WRCK, 2:45 p.m.
Tyler, Tex., 600, KTBB, 12:45 p.m.
Union, S.C., 1460, WBCU, 6:15 p.m.
Vanceburg, Ky., 1570, WKKS, 4:45 p.m.
Victoria, Tex., 1410, KNAL, 8:30 p.m.
Viscalia, Calif., 1400, KONG, 6:30 p.m.
Waco, Tex., 1460, WACO, 8 p.m.
Washington, D.C., 1220, WFAX, 7:30 p.m.
Washington, D.C., 1220, WFAX, 12:15 p.m.
Washington, D.C., 1260, WWDC, 9:15 p.m.
Waterloo, Iowa, 1540, KXEL, 10:15 p.m.
West Point, Miss., 1450, WROD, 1 p.m.
Wewoka, Okla., 1260, KWSH, 1 p.m.
Wheeling, W. Va., 1170, WWVA, 4:15 a.m.
Wheeling, W. Va., 1170, WWVA, 11:15 p.m.
White Plains, N.Y., 1230, WFAS, 6:15 a.m.
White Plains, N.Y., 1230, WFAS, 9 p.m.
Wichita, Kans., 1070, KFDI, 8:30 a.m.
Wichita, Kans., 1070, KFDI, 6:30 p.m.
Wichita, Kans., 1330, KFH, 10:15 p.m.
Williamsburg, Va., 740, WBCI, 9:05 a.m.
Williston, N. Dak., 1360, KEYZ, 6:15 p.m.
Yankton, S. Dak., 570, WNAX, 8:15 p.m.
Yuma, Ariz., 560, KYUM, 9:45 p.m.

DECREASE IN RATE OF UNEMPLOYMENT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I am happy indeed to note the announcement by the administration today that the unemployment rate for March has dropped to 4.7 percent of the labor force, from the earlier figure of 5 percent for February. The figure of 4.7 percent is the lowest rate of unemployment since 1957.

Those of us who have supported the Kennedy-Johnson administration are entitled to a feeling of intense gratification that the wise military, fiscal, and manpower policies which have been followed since the early days of 1961 have resulted in this significant reduction in the unemployment rate.

It is perfectly clear to me, however, that we are really only in the beginning of a long, hard fight to restore employment to that 3 percent of the labor force which most knowledgeable economists believe to be appropriate for an industrial society such as ours.

We still must face the inevitable fact that the processors of technology are destroying hundreds of thousands of jobs each year, and that the increase in the labor force which will confront us from individuals not yet alive will also make great demands for further employment. This will call for our unremitting efforts along the lines which I indicated in a rather extensive speech in the Senate only a few days ago. Nevertheless, I think we can all take heart because, for the time being, the unemployment rate is down to the lowest figure since 1957.

This should spur us to new efforts to bring it down even further, at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REREFERRAL OF S. 1387 TO COMMITTEE ON INTERIOR AND INSULAR AFFAIRS

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, I have consulted with Senator McCLELLAN, chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, and Senator JACKSON, chairman of the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, as well as the majority and minority leaders, and have obtained their consent and approval to have my bill, S. 1387, rereferred to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

S. 1387 was introduced by myself and cosponsored by Senators FANNIN, BENNETT, JORDAN of Idaho, YOUNG of North Dakota, ALLOTT, THURMOND, SCOTT, and DIRKSEN. The bill would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to make a payment to local governments in lieu of taxes and other revenues lost by such governments by reason of the conversion of revenue-producing lands to Federal recreational lands.

I am sure that the bill was referred to the Government Operations Committee because it deals with Federal payments to local governments. I think it would be more appropriate if the bill were rereferred to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee because the bigger issue involved is the treatment of local governments as they are affected by Federal activities in acquiring lands for recreational purposes.

Because of that, I now ask unanimous consent that the bill be rereferred to the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TUALATIN FEDERAL RECLAMATION PROJECT, OREGON

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 132, S. No. 254.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 254) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 2, line 11, after the word "law", to strike out "Construction costs allocated to irrigation beyond the ability of the irrigators to repay shall be returned to the Reclamation Fund from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration." and insert "Construction costs allocated to irrigation beyond the ability of the irrigators to repay shall be returned to the Reclamation Fund from revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration and attributable to the Bonneville project dam."; on page 5, after line 2, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 5. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water shall be delivered to any water user on the Tualatin Federal reclamation project for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

And, in line 16, after the word "such", to strike out "sums" and insert "sums, not to exceed $23,000,000,"; so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in order to supply irrigation water to lands in the Tualatin River Valley, Oregon, to develop municipal and industrial water supplies, to provide facilities for river regulation, water quality control, and control of floods, to enhance recreation opportunities, to provide for the conservation and development of fish and wildlife resources, and for other purposes, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws (Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 388), and Acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto). The principal features of the said project shall be a dam and reservoir on Scoggins Creek, canals, pumping plants, and water distribution facilities.

SEC. 2. Irrigation repayment contracts shall provide, with respect to any contract unit, for repayment of the irrigation construction costs assigned for repayment to the irrigators over a period of not more than fifty years exclusive of any development period authorized by law. Construction costs allocated to irrigation beyond the ability of the irrigators to repay shall be returned to the Reclamation Fund from revenues derived by the Secretary from the disposition of power marketed through the Bonneville Power Administration and attributable to the Bonneville project dam. Power and energy required for irrigation water pumping for the Tualatin project shall be made available by the Secretary from the Federal Columbia River power system at charges determined by him.

SEC. 3. (a) The Secretary is authorized to construct, operate, and maintain or otherwise provide for basic public outdoor recreation facilities, to acquire or otherwise to include within the project area such adjacent lands or interests therein as are necessary for present or future public recreation use, to allocate water and reservoir capacity to recreation, and to provide for the public use and enjoyment of project lands, facilities, and water areas in a manner coordinated with the other project functions. The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with Federal agencies or State or local public bodies for the operation, maintenance, or additional development of project lands or facilities, or to dispose of project lands or facilities to Federal agencies or State or local public bodies by lease, transfer, conveyance, or exchange upon such terms and conditions as will best promote the development and operation of such lands and facilities in the public interest for recreation purposes. The costs of the foregoing undertakings, and the costs of developments and operations for the enhancement of fish and wildlife resources, including an appropriate share of joint costs of the project, shall be nonreimbursable. Nothing herein shall limit the authority of the Secretary granted by existing provisions of law relating to recreation development of water resource projects or to disposition of public lands for recreation purposes.

(b) Costs of means and measures to prevent loss of and damage to fish and wildlife resources shall be considered as project costs and allocated as may be appropriate among other project functions.

SEC. 4. (a) Costs of the project allocated to municipal water supply shall be repayable, with interest, by the municipal water users over a period of not more than fifty years from the date that water is first delivered for that purpose, pursuant to contracts with municipal corporations or other organizations, as defined in section 2(g) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 1187). Contracts may be entered into with water users' organizations pursuant to the provisions of this Act without regard to the last sentence of subsection 9(c) of the Reclamation Project Act of 1939, supra.

(b) The interest rate used for computing interest during construction and interest on the unpaid balance of the costs of the project allocated to municipal water supply shall be determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, as of the beginning of the fiscal year in which construction is commenced, on the basis of the computed average interest rate payable by the Treasury upon its outstanding marketable public obligations which are neither due nor callable for redemption for fifteen years from date of issue, and by adjusting such interest rate to the nearest multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum if the computed average interest rate is not a multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum.

SEC. 5. For a period of ten years from the date of enactment of this Act, no water shall be delivered to any water user on the Tualatin Federal reclamation project for the production on newly irrigated lands of any basic agricultural commodity, as defined in the Agricultural Act of 1949, or any amendment thereof, if the total supply of such commodity for the marketing year in which the bulk of the crop would normally be marketed is in excess of the normal supply as defined in section 301(b)(10) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, unless the Secretary of Agriculture calls for an increase in production of such commodity in the interest of national security.

SEC. 6. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums, not to exceed $23,000,000, as may be required to carry out the purposes of this Act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the Tualatin reclamation project, authorized under the terms of S. 254, has widespread support in the State of Oregon. On February 16, 1965, the 53d Legislative Assembly of the State of Oregon approved a joint memorial, urging expeditious processing of the authorizing legislation.

The site of the Tualatin project is in a fertile river valley that was one of the earliest farming settlements in the State of Oregon. Pioneers called the area bordering the river the "Twality Plains." With the passage of years, this was changed so that the area is now known as "Tualatin."

The productivity of land in the Tualatin Valley has not declined since pioneer days, but the requirements of agriculture have changed. Through the Tualatin reclamation project we are seeking to change the vagaries of nature. The Tualatin Valley has an average annual rainfall of about 45 inches. One might assume that this would be sufficient to raise and harvest profitable crops. However, there is virtually no rain in the Tualatin Valley during the critical growing months of summer. In January, the Tualatin River is a raging torrent, frequently causing extensive flood damage. In August, the river is a mere trickle. This sharp decline in river flow comes at a time when the needs of agriculture and municipal and industrial users are at their peak.

The plan of development for the Tualatin project calls for a 61,000 acre-foot reservoir behind the proposed Scoggin Dam. This will store excess wintertime flows of the Tualatin River and release the water as needed for irrigation of 17,000 acres of land for municipal and industrial supplies, maintenance of fish life in the river, recreation, flood control, and water quality control. Economic studies show that annual benefits from the project would exceed costs by a ratio of about 2.3 to 1.

Mr. President, I wish to thank the majority leader, the chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee [Mr. ANDERSON], the chairman of the Senate Interior Committee [Mr. JACKSON] and all members of the Interior Committee for having taken expeditious action on S. 254, which made possible the passage of this bill in the Senate today.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleague [Mrs. NEUBERGER] in expressing deep thanks to the majority leader for bringing up our bill, S. 254 at this time. I also wish to state than I am indeed grateful to the chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee [Mr. ANDERSON] for having scheduled prompt hearings and early action on this very meritorious bill. My thanks also go to the chairman of the Senate Interior Committee and to each member of the committee for the support they rendered on S. 254.

The Tualatin project will store surplus waters of the project area for distribution in irrigating highly productive crops, supplying municipal water and enhancing conservation and recreation benefits.

In time of flood emergency it will contribute to the savings of flood damage and will lessen the possibilities of destructive floods such as those which occurred in the area this winter.

The people of Oregon join us in expressing thanks for the Senate passage of S. 254 this afternoon.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DOMINICK obtained the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senate, if the distinguished Senator from Colorado will yield for a moment——

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. S. 800, the military procurement bill, will be the pending business on Monday. It has been reported today.

Following that bill the Senate will take up H.R. 5721, the tobacco acreage bill; following that, amendments to the Foreign Registration Act, S. 693; and following that the aid to education bill, which was reported today by the subcommittee and will, I understand, be taken up by the full committee on Monday or Tuesday next.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 11 A.M. ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11 o'clock Monday morning next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Senator from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the distinguished majority leader for letting me know in advance when I could get a little time today for a few miscellaneous items.

THIS IS COLORADO—POEM BY MRS. JANE HARPER

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, all of us in the Colorado Republican Party are particularly proud of Mrs. Jane Harper, who is the editor and publisher of the Colorado Trumpet, the official newspaper for the Colorado Republican Party. The Trumpet, for the fourth consecutive time, has been awarded first place by the Colorado Press Women as the best weekly and best special edition.

Mrs. Harper, Janey as she is known to all of us, is also a very accomplished poet, and her poem, entitled "This is Colorado," has also been awarded first place in that category by the Colorado Press Women. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this poem may be inserted in the RECORD so that others may read and enjoy it.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS IS COLORADO

The mountains rise in variegated splendor
Conquered and crossed by man.
The plains lie flat, half scorched
Crisscrossed with well-planned ditches and cultivated hope.
The cities grow
Sprawling masses of steel and stone, glass, and wood,
Straining for air and schoolrooms and remembered space.
The small towns shrink
Become old, sometimes broken, sometimes so quiet a tumbleweed can roll free before the whistling, echoing wind which once danced through raucous, boiling life.

BUT NO MAN NOR GOVERNMENT ALONE CAN STOP GROWTH OR EMPTINESS OR DEATH

No man nor government, alone,
Can find the unalterable answer, grasp all the changing problems, build an indestructible future.
No man nor government can be measured alone
But only as a part of a great and moving whole,
Only in relation to the rest,
Only in response to the people.
No man nor government, alone,
Lives on forever, unchanged, undenied, unmoved.
The people, together, can find new life, new hope, new success.
Together, the people with their government
Will channel the rivers of humanity, resources and potential into a new era
Of progress—
Of planning, of building, of beauty,
As majestic as the mountains,
As challenging as the plains,
As endless as the cities,
As peaceful as the small town.

WHERE WAS THE BEGINNING?

With the cliff men at Mesa Verde?
With the Conquistadores searching for Cibola?
With Zeb Pike and his unscalable mountain?
With John Gregory striking gold?
With John Routt, Governor from territory through statehood?
There is always a beginning, always a new start toward greatness.
It began with all of these,
Each man giving something to tomorrow,
To the men and women who would follow tomorrow,
To Colorado—
From this a great State grew.
And the hands of many became calloused, brown and giving,
And the feet of many walked uncertain trails and certain streets,
And the minds of many planned and found the answers to the ever rising problems of an ever rising State.
There have been many great and wise men gathered in the marble halls under the gold dome,
And there will be many more in the 87 years still come—and the 87 years after that—and that—
There have been many good and devoted men and women who have served their State and its people.
They are there now, dedicated to a more independent and perfect government, to the establishment of justice, to promoting the general welfare to securing the blessing of our great resources,
Moving forward in the tradition of dignity, majesty and courage on which this State and this Nation were founded;
Building and creating from a solid foundation in order that tomorrow may be more than a promise and today is the reason why.
These are the men and women, past and present, who hold the public office as a public trust for
We, the people of Colorado.

—JANE HARPER, 1964.

THE DISPUTE OVER OIL SHALE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, recently, on an extremely important issue in Colorado; namely, the development of oil shale, the Special Oil Shale Advisory Board issued its report to Secretary Udall. This report was a split report, in which some of the members urged the Secretary to go forward with the development of public lands for oil shale development, and some said we should not do it, that it is not in the public interest. Those of us who were here at the time will remember the Senator from Illinois talking about the public interest in connection with the tariff on brooms last year.

There has been much comment, particularly on the views of Prof. John K. Galbraith, of Harvard University, who says that development of oil shale is not in the public interest. One of the most cogent and devastating replies came from Mr. James H. Smith, of Aspen, Colo., businessman and rancher, former Director of the International Cooperation Administration, and former Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air.

Mr. Smith's reply was reported in an article from the Denver Post. I ask unanimous consent that this article by Bert Hanna may be reprinted in the RECORD so that others may read it and have a better understanding of the real issues involved.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Post, Mar. 20, 1965]

THE DISPUTE OVER OIL SHALE

(By Bert Hanna)

An Aspen, Colo., businessman and rancher and nationally recognized leader in economic development fields has crossed swords with Economist John K. Galbraith, of Harvard University, former Ambassador to India, over issues in development of the oil shale industry in western Colorado.

The attack on Galbraith's negative position on oil shale, made by James H. Smith, of Aspen, former Director of the International Cooperation Administration and former Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Air, has stirred much interest in Washington, D.C.

Galbraith is a member of Interior Secretary Stewart L. Udall's Oil Shale Advisory Board. The Board after a lengthy study recently submitted a report to the Secretary revealing sharp disagreement over exploitation of Colorado's enormous shale deposits, the richest such natural resource in the world.

The Harvard professor was the leading dissenter on the Board to a leasing policy to permit private industry to develop commercial shale oil extraction plants on public lands at this time. His views were concurred in by another member, Benjamin V. Cohen, Washington attorney. The six-member Board was split on the economic questions involved.

Both Representative WAYNE N. ASPINALL, Democrat, of Colorado, chairman of the House Interior Committee, and Senator GORDON ALLOTT, Republican, of Colorado, have endorsed the views expressed by Smith as a devastating rebuttal to Galbraith's theories.

In a statement now rather widely circulated in Congress, Smith analyzed the core of the disagreement which split the Advisory Board as:

"A question whether the oil shale development should be the responsibility of the Federal Government or of private enterprise—a battle old as the hills and one not to be won or lost by recommendation of a temporary advisory board."

Smith referred at the outset to a statement by Galbraith in the report:

"There is a businesslike, certain, and straightforward course of action. It is for the Department of the Interior * * * to enter into contracts with interested firms to develop methods of mining and processing. * * *"

On this score, Smith observed, "I would like to predict from data in Professor Galbraith's own statement that the Government's role in the development of shale would have every chance of being unbusinesslike, uncertain, and straight backward.

"Galbraith opens with a statement that the publicly owned shale deposit embraces 5,118,000 acres and that there is several hundred years' supply of petroleum in these lands owned by the people of the United States (deposits in Utah and Wyoming as well as Colorado).

"This may be accurate but is misleading. Most of this acreage and much of the shale will never be touched.

"It must be understood—if one is to deal with this problem at all—that shale will have to fight its way into being as a profitable energy producer; will achieve such position only for a limited period and then will be driven out by another competitive source of energy," Smith continued.

"Shale's life as an income producer might end within 35 years—at least one should not rely on more than that. Consequently, a more enlightening statement would have been that the longer we delay the development, the greater the chances of leaving billions of barrels of reserve right where they are.

"Galbraith does not seem to realize that we are not static. The drive of private enterprise makes it impossible for one natural resource to remain dominant until it is exhausted. What might look like a reserve today is made obsolete tomorrow by the technological advances generated by the private enterprise system and the profit motive."

Smith ridicules a statement by Galbraith that: "Foresighted efforts in the past have kept these lands from those who under the sanction of private enterprise view public property only as an opportunity for personal profit."

"I would reply that as long as there is no profit potential in shale, there will be no shale industry," Smith said. "Also, that I would like to know what is meant by 'personal profit.'

"I do not know of any profit that is not immediately shared with the public through taxation and without which the Government would have to cease doing what it does.

"Galbraith goes on to state that there is no urgent economic need for oil from shale. This reminds us of remarks from Washington that we have no gold or silver problems.

"The Government seems to have adopted the position that if it squeaks through today, tomorrow will be okay. Somehow, the rest of us keep wondering about where we are going to be in 1975.

"There is no doubt in my mind that we will then need more petroleum products than we can produce conventionally in the United States and that we will either have to be more reliant on foreign sources or will have developed new ones such as shale or nuclear energy of our own. For either of these sources to become significant by 1975, action is required now."

Galbraith deprecated the contention that there are strategic needs for oil from shale.

Smith pointed out that the known petroleum reserves of this country started to decline last year for the first time "and I can think of nothing more fatal than to let this highly industrialized country become dependent on oil to be imported from countries with which we may or may not be on good terms.

"Nor can I imagine how an economist can overlook the possible effect of shale on the balance-of-payments problem, which certainly is a factor in determining our national strategy."

Galbraith evidenced distrust of some of the oil companies and said they were more interested in acquiring a land position than going into production. Smith noted that Galbraith ignored completely the fact that a plant is now almost completed in the Parachute Creek area of western Colorado (by the newly formed Colony Development Corp. on privately owned lands).

In this respect, Smith labeled Galbraith's reference to the old Teapot Dome and Elk Hills oil scandals as "pure demagoguery."

"If the Government is unable today to arrange contracts between itself and private enterprise dealing with public property without the risk of repeating Teapot Dome, then we do not have a competent Government," Smith went on.

"However, let's assume for the moment that the Government should run this development. First, remember that the Government acquired these deposits only by chance. The question is then, what has been done to enhance their value for the public benefit?

"Mere ownership of shale acreage does not come close to putting anyone in the shale business. A package of things is necessary.

"One must have technical know-how, rights-of-way to the property, transportation systems, space for waste disposal, gas and water for innumerable purposes, real estate for housing, etc.

"So far as production is concerned, the Government has done nothing about even preliminary plans for such things. The limited facilities it did have for research were locked up in a jurisdictional dispute between two agencies of government for years and were only unlocked by action of the legislative branch."

(This is reference to the Government's oil shale research plant at Anvil Points, near Rifle, Colo., which has been taken over for privately financed research under a contract with the Interior Department approved by Congress.)

"The Government has made no effort to acquire the many components essential to the development. Presumably this is because it has been our policy for private enterprise to undertake these things. The Government today does not have the capability of carrying out the program Galbraith is prescribing.

"On the other hand, there are many things directly and solely within the jurisdiction of the Government which remain undone. The Government alone can settle the oil depletion allowance question. It alone can settle the unpatented land problems, the availability of public land question, the water availability, the air and water pollution problems.

"That these things have not been done does not look businesslike, certain, and straightforward."

Moreover, Smith said, when Galbraith speaks of the public sector or the Government, he has referred only to that part which he considers competent and honest; he writes off the legislative branch because "it will succumb to pressures from some oil companies and expectant lease-holders to resist such course of action (Government-controlled contracts).

"This statement," Smith observes, "makes one wonder what chance we have of ever obtaining a definitive Government policy.

"We also must look with regret on what appears to be a very subjective and superficial evaluation of the motivation of Congress."

Looking back over the whole matter and particularly at the questions presented by Secretary Udall to the Oil Shale Advisory Board for evaluation, Smith concludes:

"One cannot help but believe the Board was drawn off its assigned task to argue a question which was beyond its terms of reference—public sector versus private.

"I believe this issue was settled prior to establishment of the Board and that a decision was for the private sector to handle the job as it does in other fields. Udall has stated that he wants private industry development of oil shale under proper safeguards for the public interest.

"The Board's responsibility then would have been to devise means whereby private industry could move ahead in a manner which would adequately protect the public interest."

The other members of the Advisory Board who combined in the controversial report to Udall were Dr. Orlo E. Childs, president of the Colorado School of Mines, H. Byron Mock of Salt Lake City, and Milo Perkins of Tucson, Ariz., all of whom argued for a Government leasing policy to open shale lands to private development, and Joseph L. Fisher, president of Resources for the Future, Inc.

Fisher, not as extreme as Galbraith or Cohen, would open limited areas of oil shale land to private industry research and experimentation, along with Government contracts for private industry research. He suggests that ultimately some leasing policies for commercial scale tracts could be developed, without jeopardizing the public interest. However, he cautions against haste, since supplies of oil from shale are not now urgently needed and competitive production has not been demonstrated.

ASPINALL told the Denver Post recently that he may hold hearings in Denver and Washington of his Interior Committee on the oil shale report and that the arguments raised by Smith may well form the basis of some searching questions to the Advisory Board members.

Senator ALLOTT said: "I agree wholeheartedly with the position of Jim Smith. The position of Galbraith is wholly untenable and his arguments are specious. I cannot go along with his theory that oil shale development is not needed for national security. We have a tremendous and valuable resource and the Government will not develop it.

"It is absolutely vital to this country to have an economic means of extraction and use of shale oil and we should get started on this development at once."

This is not the first time Smith and Galbraith have been at swords points on philosophy of private versus public enterprise.

"In my old job as Director of the International Corporation Administration," Smith said, "one of my main battles was over the question of doing the work through private enterprise or Government channels.

"Galbraith was the exponent of the Government public sector and I with many others, the private enterprise route. The battle, of course, still goes on and my hope is that the public will be aware that there is such a battle and one in which they should participate and not let it go by default to those who work in Government."

Smith, in his career in development fields, has been associated with some airlines in this country and abroad, has worked on enterprises in the Middle East, is currently a director of the Aspen Ski Corp., trustee of the Aspen Institute and a director of the South Texas Development Co.

He has been instrumental in developing a plan for a municipal and industrial complex which the oil shale industry would need in western Colorado.

SETTING ASIDE OF LAND WITHIN NATIONAL CAPITAL PARKS SYSTEM FOR CONSTRUCTION OF BUILDING BY BUREAU OF WATER RESOURCES OF THE NATIONAL RIVERS AND HARBORS CONGRESS

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, Senator ALLOTT, and Senator HOLLAND, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to set aside land within the National Capital parks system in Washington, D.C., for construction of a building by the Bureau of Water Resources of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

The building would be devoted entirely to the education of the public in the field of water resources. We in Colorado are particularly interested in this bill, since water is a very valuable commodity in the arid West, and it is imperative that the public of the entire country be educated generally in the field of water resources.

Perhaps the most favorable aspect of this legislation is that the building is to be constructed and equipped without cost to the United States by the Bureau of Water Resources of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and further that the building will be operated and maintained by the Bureau without cost to the United States on a nonprofit basis.

As we all know, most States in the West, including the State of Colorado, are now experiencing a time of great drought; and therefore, we in Colorado are enthusiastic in supporting legislation which would further public education and research in the field of water resource development.

Mr. President, I ask leave to have the bill remain at the desk for a week, because I think this is a subject of such interest that many other Senators will wish to cosponsor the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Colorado.

The bill (S. 1690) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to set aside certain land within the National Capital parks system in Washington, District of Columbia, for construction of a building by the Bureau of Water Resources of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. DOMINICK, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the executive calendar which was reported favorably by the appropriate committee this afternoon.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the nomination on the calendar.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Sam Zagoria, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask that the President be notified immediately of the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, before the Senate returns to the consideration of legislative business, let me say that it is a happy day when a man who has earned his spurs as an associate and assistant to a man like the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] is appointed to a high public office.

I compliment the President. I also congratulate Mr. Zagoria, who has earned this appointment by the skill of his mind, and by his character and that of his family.

I also congratulate the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE] on his perspicacity in picking such a fine assistant for so many years.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I should have objected to the confirmation, because it means that I am losing probably the most devoted, able assistant and associate any man could possibly have.

On the contrary, I am delighted. I rejoice with Mr. Zagoria and his family in this opportunity for what I know will be a rewarding service in a broad and important field.

On his behalf and on my own, I wish to express my appreciation to the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] for his gracious and kind remarks.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD three editorials commenting on the proposed appointment of Mr. Zagoria, as well as an excerpt from a newscast of March 25th by Joseph McCaffrey of the American Broadcasting Co., lauding Mr. Zagoria's qualifications.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Plainfield Courier-News Mar. 26, 1965]

SAM ZAGORIA'S APPOINTMENT

For the second time, the staff of Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE, Republican, of New Jersey, has been tapped for appointments to other responsible Government positions. This time it was Sam Zagoria, a Somerville native, who was selected by President Johnson for appointment to the National Labor Relations Board. The appointment recognizes the ability of Zagoria, and it also reflects credit on the type of men who form the staff of Senator Case.

In this appointment, we take particular interest because Zagoria is not only from the area but at one time was a sports correspondent for the Courier-News from Somerville. His parents still reside in Somerville.

We shall miss Zagoria on Senator Case's staff because he was always a good source of information, a friend to newspapermen, and ready to help in any way he could to clear up questions on pending legislation or controversial issues. We are pleased to see him picked for a larger job, and we wish him all success.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 24, 1965]

THE NEW REGULATORS

The most important of the new appointments announced by President Johnson is the retention of Charles R. Ross as a Federal Power Commissioner. Mr. Ross had provoked a gusher of criticism from the oil and gas industry because he had shown too keen a devotion to consumer interest on the FPC. Some 34 million American consumers of natural gas have looked to the FPC as a shield against arbitrary price increases. By siding with Chairman Swidler on key votes, Mr. Ross has contributed to a 3-2 majority that insists that natural gas prices be effectively regulated at the wellheads.

Mr. Johnson has balanced off the appointment of Mr. Ross by designating another Republican, Carl E. Bagge, to fill a vacancy on the FPC. A Chicago railroad lawyer, Mr. Bagge is not expected to startle the oil and gas interests by ardent espousal of the consumer cause. Yet Mr. Bagge has not made his record, and the important point is that the proconsumer balance has been preserved on the FPC.

The choice of Sam Zagoria as a new member of the National Labor Relations Board will be applauded. Mr. Zagoria, who has been administrative assistant to Senator Case, of New Jersey, is well known, liked and respected in Washington. He brings formidable experience in the ways of this city to an important job.

John Adams, another Republican, moves from the CAB's Bureau of Enforcement to the Civil Aeronautics Board itself. He is remembered for his important if not wholly glorious role in the Army-McCarthy dispute, but the then counselor of the Army was hardly alone in not knowing how to deal with Pic David Schine. His subsequent service in three major divisions of the CAB has earned him a promotion, and a reprieve from remembrances of things past.

Taken as a whole, these appointments suggest that the President is concerned with attracting competent officials to the pervasive regulatory agencies. They also indicate that Mr. Johnson is sensitive to charges of favoring the oil and gas interests. If he had passed over Mr. Ross, the President would have given his critics their most powerful argument.

[From the Newark Evening News, Mar. 26, 1965]

TO THE NLRB

Forty-sixth in size and eighth in population, New Jersey is honored by the presence of two of its sons in President Johnson's Cabinet. To this distinction is added the appointment of Sam Zagoria, native of Somerville, to the National Labor Relations Board.

A familiar figure in the public life of the State, Mr. Zagoria has for the last 10 years been chief administrative assistant to Senator Case. Naturally, this makes him a Republican, a fact carefully underscored by President Johnson as evidence of his partiality to talent above political affiliation.

In Senator Case's opinion, "the public service couldn't have an abler, a more dedicated addition" than Mr. Zagoria. The Senator ought to know.

JOSEPH MCCAFFREY, RADIO WMAL, MARCH 25, 1965

Good evening.

You probably don't know Sam Zagoria. Or, perhaps, you may know him.

Last Saturday he was a member of the supporting cast of a television program billed as Lyndon Johnson Talks. Mr. Zagoria was one of those who stood in the wings, and at the proper moment had the kleig lights focused on him as the President gave his name, rank, and serial number.

For Mr. Zagoria was among those named by the President to positions in the executive department.

Mr. Zagoria becomes a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

And I mention all of this, not because I know Sam Zagoria since he was a good reporter years ago with the Washington Post, but because Sam Zagoria is proving that reporters can, too, be good citizens.

Sam served with the Post with distinction—although the Post was probably glad to see him leave. After all, Sam handled the contract bargaining for the Guild—and he did, as some of the oldtimers recall, a good job of it.

But he finally left this business to become Senator Clifford Case's No. 1 man. And if there was a living example of how to keep your senatorial boss in the mainstream of political life, Sam Zagoria showed that example.

No aid on Capitol Hill did a better job than did Zagoria.

He was, as one Senator told me some years ago, the best in the business.

What was interesting, I thought at the time and still do, is that the Senator who said this wasn't exactly an admirer of the liberal Senator Case.

But, he said, that man Zagoria knows how to keep a Senator on his two feet—he knows how to take advantage of every break in the game for his man. He is like a young, political Casey Stengel.

Now Zagoria gives up all of this to enter the confused jungle of bureaucracy. What he will find there, no one knows.

But bureaucracy will never be the same again once Sam Zagoria starts to work his quiet, thoughtful, sincere magic on it.

Sam may never make labor relations as popular as some other kind of relations, but chances are he will do more for it than anyone else ever has.

All of which proves that reporters can make good citizens—but I can't help but wonder how much our business lost when it let a guy like Zagoria get away from us.

I'll have a final word or two after this for Security National Bank; having the Security National Bank as a sponsor gives me, I must say, a nice secure feeling. But the other day I received a letter from a listener whom I don't know asking me if I would arrange a loan for him at Security National. This, I thought, was carrying the sponsor relationship a little too far.

Take care. Good night.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On motion by Mr. Mansfield, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

BOMBING OF U.S. EMBASSY IN SAIGON

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, this is the first day following the explosion of the terrorist bomb at the U.S. Embassy in Saigon in which the Senate has been in session, making it possible to say anything on the floor about it.

The event itself was, of course, heartbreaking. I believe that I speak for every American in saying that our sorrow is deep for the many dead and wounded in this dreadful disaster. Our profound sympathy goes out to the families of the innocent victims, American and Vietnamese alike. This tragic experience shows that our Foreign Service and other personnel at the Embassy demonstrate constantly that theirs, too, is often a position of gravest danger and sacrifice in war, as well as in peace. They should receive the thanks of a grateful nation as much as those whom we honor so greatly who give their all in the defense of the Nation's security and freedom.

The blood which flowed in this terrible bombing manifests the danger and the insecurity which has come to exist even in the heart of Saigon, and confirms the judgment of the President in ordering U.S. dependents home after the Pleiku attack.

In the wake of this terrible event, it is deeply gratifying to be able to report that we kept our heads in this country and acted coolly. The bombing was a political act which may well have been designed to provoke us into retaliation against Hanoi or Haiphong, or other population centers in North Vietnam, in order to put pressure on Communist China and the Soviet Union to commit themselves more deeply and more concretely to support North Vietnamese policy and the Vietcong. That the attack may have been timed to influence our policy in some way is evident from the fact that Ambassador Taylor was at that very moment in Washington to engage in policy talks with the President and his chief advisers.

From the way in which we kept our heads in the situation, it is clear that we do not intend to fall into any Communist trap of this sort. We are engaged in a vast and complex political, as well as military, operation in South Vietnam. We cannot permit the bombing of the U.S. Embassy there—terrible, dreadful, and shocking as it is—to blind us, however temporarily, to our overall goals. No matter what rough justice it might feel like to Americans to retaliate massively and decisively against population centers, our strategy must not be sidetracked or upset by our fully justified anger over this terrible act of terrorism.

Last week, I stated on the floor of the Senate my concept of the principles upon which we should be willing to negotiate. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper] did the same thing. It is, therefore, with great gratification that I have noted the action of the President of the United States in declaring the economic opportunities which await a settlement of the terrible conflict, as well as the reaction to this dreadful Embassy bombing which shows the United States continuing its policies with purpose, without falling into any traps or being pushed into action specifically directed toward revenge for this particular act.

I am hopeful that our feet are gradually treading the right road. I hope very much that as these days continue, while continuing the vigorous and forceful policies we have pursued, the President will add to his statement concerning economic possibilities some concept of other political and diplomatic possibilities, the result of negotiations.

Finally, it is a delicate and serious moment for the American people and for the U.S. Government. But great nations cannot bluff, nor can they keep the peace free, without the expenditure of blood and treasure. While we pursue a course which all deeply feel must be prudent, it is a course which must also engender fortitude and which cannot run in the face of a situation like the terrible bombing of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon.

I believe that the temper and quality of our reaction to the bombing is very much along the line of the policy which I and others have been suggesting in our statements as the right policy to pursue in Vietnam.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two articles published in the New York Times today, one entitled "Reprisal Barred in Embassy Raid," written by Max Frankel, and the other entitled "Rusk To Get Peace Appeal."

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPRISAL BARRED IN EMBASSY RAID—TAYLOR MEETS JOHNSON AND SEES NO SPECIFIC REACTION

(By Max Frankel)

WASHINGTON, March 31.—Ambassador Maxwell D. Taylor held the first of several meetings with President Johnson today to present what he called some "more definitive proposals" for U.S. operations in Vietnam.

The Ambassador, here for consultations since Sunday, declined to "speculate" about the extent of future military actions against North Vietnam. He said there would be no specific "reprisal" for the terrorist bombing of the U.S. Embassy in Saigon yesterday but a determined effort to "carry out the programs we've laid out in front of us."

The ideas that he brought to Washington—which Mr. Johnson described as "the seeds he's been planting here"—were not further described by either the President or the Ambassador. But the Ambassador implied that they dealt with tactics already decided upon rather than with any major innovation.

At least one purpose of the 1-hour meeting at the White House this evening was to lay to rest recurrent reports that Ambassador Taylor was planning to resign.

"There's no truth in it," the Ambassador said. "I have no plans for resigning. I expect to be returning to Washington periodically—in about 2-month cycles."

President Johnson obliquely took note of the reports by calling reporters and photographers into his Oval Room office.

TALK CALLED PROFITABLE

The President said he and the Ambassador had had a very profitable hour, would dine together with other officials during the evening, would meet tomorrow in a larger group and possibly again on Friday.

Mr. Johnson also promised appearances by the Ambassador before the press and several congressional committees and said Mr. Taylor would immediately join newsmen in the White House lobby "if you will get your pencils sharpened and your notebooks out and your penknives back in your pockets."

In the lobby Mr. Taylor explained that he had been conferring "vigorously" at the State and Defense Departments on the proposals he hoped to have ready for the President tomorrow.

Asked whether he foresaw discussions with the Communists, he replied: "I have no yardstick to measure the distance from the conference table."

RUSK TO GET PEACE APPEAL

WASHINGTON, March 31.—Secretary of State Dean Rusk agreed today to receive 4 ambassadors who will speak for 16 nonalined governments tomorrow. The envoys will present an appeal for Vietnamese peace negotiations without any strings attached.

The appeal was drafted in Belgrade, Yugoslavia, at a 2-day conference in mid-March. It has since been signed by 16 heads of government or chiefs of state and is to be formally made public tomorrow.

Mr. Rusk will receive the Ambassadors of Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Ghana, and Yugoslavia. Similar groups of ambassadors are scheduled to present the same appeal tomorrow to the Governments of the Soviet Union, Communist China, Britain, France, North Vietnam, South Vietnam, Poland, and Canada.

Diplomats said the appeal also would be handed to the United Nations Secretary General, U Thant, and to representatives of the National Liberation Front of the Communist forces in South Vietnam.

MR. DIRKSEN'S STATEMENT ON WEST GERMAN-ISRAEL RELATIONS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to a fine statement made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on March 25, with respect to the relationship between the Federal Republic of West Germany and the Republic of Israel, including the issue of extension of the statute of limitations in the German Federal Republic with respect to Nazi war crimes, especially genocide.

The Bundestag has since acted, in order to extend the statute of limitations and to make it impossible for war criminals to escape justice for some years to come. The German Federal Republic is also showing every evidence of being true to its own view of what is moral and right in foreign policy in respect of its recognition of the State of Israel.

I express to the minority leader my appreciation for the enunciation of policy which he gave upon the occasion to which I refer. I also point out again how important it is for the United States Government to make the German Federal Government, Chancellor Erhard, and his colleagues feel that, in these difficult times and in this difficult situation, when they proceed along lines such as those to which I referred, they have the sympathy and support of the United States.

SECRETARY UDALL CONTINUES RESIDUAL OIL CONTROLS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Secretary Udall's decision yesterday to continue the existing controls on the importation of residual fuel oil with only minor modification in the allocation system is most regrettable, particularly since the Secretary himself admitted at his news conference that the program did not appear to be justified on national security grounds and that in his judgment, this decision could cost the consumers on the order of $40 million a year.

Over the past several years, I fought hard to lift controls on the importation of residual fuel oil, as have many of my colleagues from States on the eastern seaboard. The program is not justified as an aid to the domestic coal industry or on the grounds of national security. This has been made very clear by a February 1963 report of the Office of Emergency Planning to the President. It has also been clearly established that the existing method of allocation is creating anticompetitive conditions—over 50 percent of the total import allocation on the east coast today is in the hands of four oil marketers, the remainder being allocated among the 56 other eligible importers.

Despite the 75,000 barrels a day increase in permissible imports the situation now facing consumers in New York and elsewhere remains untenable. It is therefore essential that the administration once again review the soundness of the continuation of these controls both from an economic point of view and from the point of view of national security. I also urge Secretary Udall, particularly, to examine closely recommendations submitted to him by electric utilities of New York for a more equitable method of allocating residual fuel oil, as long as the present program remains in effect. I ask unanimous consent that the story appearing in the New York Times this morning as well as my own statement before Secretary Udall's hearings on the residual fuel oil program be included in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 1965]

WHITE HOUSE BARS UDALL'S OIL PLAN—MOVE TO END IMPORT CONTROLS FOR NEW ENGLAND STATES AND FLORIDA REJECTED—NEW REVIEW FORESEEN—SEVENTY-FIVE THOUSAND BARRELS A DAY ADDED TO RESIDUAL FUEL LEVEL FOR EAST COAST INSTEAD

WASHINGTON, March 31.—Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall today announced a 75,000-barrel-a-day increase in the import quota for residual fuel oil on the east coast.

The maximum import level for the year ended March 31, 1965, was 638,000 barrels a day.

Mr. Udall said the increase was the result of the reduction in residual oil production at home and also a normal rise in demand. Oil sources had predicted the increase.

He told a news conference official documents covering extension of the program for another year would probably be available tomorrow. These will give individual import allocations.

He said he had originally determined last week that the best solution to the residual fuel oil problem was to exempt all of New England and Florida from the import controls.

This decision had to be dropped, he said, when Government lawyers found it would not meet legal requirements.

SEVERAL LAWYERS INVOLVED

He said the lawyers who took part in the decision included some from the Departments of Interior and Justice, the Bureau of the Budget and counsel for the White House.

[Failure to remove the quotas was considered a victory for the coal-producing areas and a defeat for New England, which claims the quotas hamper competition and cause increased electricity prices, United Press International said.]

Asked who made the decision to scrap the program he had outlined, and whether it was the President, Mr. Udall replied:

"No. It was the lawyers' opinion that it was not a viable approach—an approach to administration of the program that was not legal."

"The program we are announcing is basically a continuation of the existing program with substantial increases in the imports that are allowable," he said.

NEW REVIEW EXPECTED

He added that "a question has arisen in my judgment whether the national security interest warrants continuance of this program."

The Secretary said primary responsibility for reviewing the situation seemed to be in the Office of Emergency planning and that a new review may soon be initiated, though he said he did not plan to request one.

He said he had determined in his original decision that it was logical to exclude New England and Florida because the national security interest would be less in those areas than in other Atlantic coast sections. He said there was very little competition between coal and residual fuel oil in the New England areas, generally, and in Florida.

The purpose of the program under the national security concept is to maintain a "viable petroleum industry in this country," Mr. Udall said.

The Secretary said he did not feel it would be necessary to maintain residual controls so long as there were controls on crude imports. But he said that determination would be up to the administration as a whole and would rely on a redrafting of the national security requirement.

Mr. Udall said the existing program, which he is continuing, admittedly has many defects, but no workable alternative has been developed.

"In our judgment, the program imposes a penalty on the consumer, probably on the order of $40 million a year, and this has to be balanced against the national security interest," he said.

Residual oil is used primarily in New England and New York by large manufacturers, hospitals and utilities to heat buildings. Thirty-three percent of the electrical generation in New England is fired up by residual oil. The cost of the oil bears a direct relationship to the cost of electricity to consumers.

An estimated 232 million barrels of residual oil is imported annually from Venezuela. New England alone uses 70 million barrels a year and the oil users claim that import restrictions hamper competition and cost an extra $25 million a year.

TESTIMONY OF SENATOR JACOB K. JAVITS BEFORE THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT HEARINGS ON RESIDUAL FUEL OIL IMPORT CONTROLS PROGRAM, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT AUDITORIUM, MARCH 11, 1965

I appreciate the opportunity to appear and testify on the residual fuel oil import controls program, particularly as they affect my own State.

Imported residual fuel oil is of vital concern to New York hospitals, public schools, electric utilities, and apartment buildings which depend on this fuel for the low-cost operation of powerplants and heating systems. According to a study by the Petroleum Industry Research Foundation, with which most industry observers agree, these import restrictions have caused the price of residual fuel oil to be nearly 20 cents per barrel higher than it would be in the absence of these restrictions. On the basis of these calculations, the restrictions have cost New York State consumers nearly $15 million in 1963. This has meant higher heating costs to schools, hospitals and apartment houses principally in the New York City metropolitan area. Similarly, in 1963, the Long Island Lighting Co., which consumed 6.3 million barrels and Consolidated Edison Co., which consumed 11.2 million barrels of fuel oil, together spent several million dollars more for power generation last year than they would have had to if imports had been freely available and this only adds costs ultimately paid by the people.

The downstate area of New York is a natural market for residual fuel oil because of its coastal location, while the upstate area is a natural market for coal. In the latter area, coal continues to be by far the principal industrial and utility fuel; in fact, all steam-electric utilities in New York State, outside New York City and Long Island are fueled by coal exclusively. If import restrictions were removed, coal's upstate markets—about 13 million tons of coal annually—would not be affected.

New York has a particular concern about these controls as it consumes more residual fuel oil than any other State in the Union. Exclusive of Navy and commercial ship bunker fuel, New York State consumed 73 million barrels of residual fuel oil in 1963. This was equivalent to 16.6 percent of total U.S. residual fuel oil consumption in that year.

The existing import controls program—the use of historic pattern as the principal basis of allocation—has resulted in the creation of fundamentally anticompetitive conditions with great injury to consumers—schools, hospitals, industrial plants, electric utilities, office and apartment buildings; it has inhibited the normal process of growth and change through competition, and has resulted in growing concentration and increasing domination of the industry by the principal historic importers. The major portion of the total imported residual fuel oil allocation on the east coast is in the hands of four oil marketers which between them have more than a 50-percent share of the total import allocation, the remainder being allocated among the 56 other eligible importers.

The demand for imported residual fuel oil has increased rapidly in the postwar years for several reasons, but primarily because of the increased energy needs of industrial consumers and utilities in the past couple of decades and air pollution which caused conversions in densely populated areas from coal to oil. Residual fuel oil is competitive with domestic gas. But it is competitive with domestic coal only in a narrow area. This latter competitive market amounts to approximately 6 million tons of coal which, matched against an annual production of 400 million tons, is a very insignificant amount.

In coastal States which are far removed from domestic sources of coal and gas, imported residual fuel oil is an essential source of energy. Domestic production of residual fuel oil has fallen each year since the war from over 20 percent per barrel of domestic crude oil to just over 5 percent today and is insufficient to supply domestic needs. High costs of the domestic raw material—crude oil—and better technological and engineering refinery processes, which produce a product with a higher value over each barrel of oil refined, will further diminish the availability of this fuel from domestic sources. Imported residual fuel oil thus has been and will increasingly become essential to fill the gap between domestic supply and demand.

The domestic coal industry has undertaken an energetic effort to protect its domestic markets by putting steady pressure on the White House, the Congress and the Interior Department to maintain or even restrict the existing import program. Americans are, of course, sympathetic to the problems of the domestic coal industry. I wish to point out, however, that the well-known memorandum of the Office of Emergency Planning to the President of February 13, 1963, stated that the difficulties confronting the domestic coal industry cannot be justifiably charged to residual fuel oil but instead to various patterns of change and fuel uses, for example, increased consumption of natural gas and diesel oil in place of coal by major users.

The maintenance of these controls cannot be justified in terms of our national security. This issue has been clearly disposed of by the Office of Emergency Planning report which I have already mentioned. The report concluded that "* * * a careful and meaningful relaxation of controls on imports of residual fuel oil would be consistent with the national security and the attainment of western hemispheric objectives which contribute to the national security."

Controls on residual fuel oil imports are also damaging to our relations with Latin America. Those who favor their continuation should consider the impact of such controls on Latin America and our aim to keep it free and economically viable through the Alliance for Progress. In this case we are doing something which has directly the opposite effect. By maintaining these controls we are acting against our own self-interest. The exportation to the United States of such products as residual fuel oil is vital to the economic expansion of several countries of Latin America. It makes little sense to pour billions of dollars into Latin America with one hand, while on the other hand to limit the importation of such products from Latin America as cotton, lead, and zinc, as well as crude and residual fuel oil. About 75 to 80 percent of the total residual fuel oil consumed in New York and New Jersey is imported from the Caribbean area. These controls are particularly damaging in this sensitive area of the hemisphere.

For all these reasons, I strongly urge that the controls on residual fuel oil imports be allowed to expire at the end of the present fuel oil quota year.

PRESIDENT'S VOLUNTARY BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS PROGRAM AND LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on March 25, 1965, I inserted in the RECORD an exchange of correspondence between myself and Secretary Dillon and Chairman Martin concerning the effects of the President's voluntary program to meet our balance-of-payments deficit problem on the flow of private U.S. capital to developing nations. This correspondence was prompted by the concern of some in the U.S. financial community that this program would result in a sharp curtailment of private investment in developing nations—a concern shown not to be warranted.

On March 9 I wrote a similar letter to Secretary of Commerce Connor whose responsibility it is to administer the program as far as the nonbanking business community is concerned.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter of March 9 along with Secretary Connor's reply of March 25 may be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARCH 9, 1965.

Hon. JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce, Department of Commerce, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am deeply disturbed by reports to the effect that the President's voluntary balance-of-payments program will be used to limit the flow of private U.S. capital to less developed countries. This would represent a reversal of the principle laid down in the interest equalization tax and other legislation, such as the proposed 30 percent investment tax credit, which would encourage private U.S. investment in less developed countries. A limitation on the flow of private U.S. investment to less developed countries could undermine our foreign aid program and be injurious to our desire to establish viable private sectors in less developed countries. There are also involved questions of net gain in any such policy.

I would appreciate it if you could furnish me with a report on this matter at your earliest convenience.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

Jacob K. Javits,
U.S. Senator.

The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C., March 25, 1965.

Hon. Jacob K. Javits,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Senator Javits: I believe that the President's voluntary balance-of-payments program has been formulated so as to overcome the concern which you express in your letter of March 9 about the possibility that the program might limit the flow of private U.S. capital to less developed countries. Our wish not to have the program affect capital flows to these areas is clearly stated in both of the President's messages, in the speeches and testimony of myself and other senior administration officials, and in the descriptive literature put out about the voluntary program. For example, my letters to the 600-odd business concerns seeking their cooperation in the program specifies "* * * we regard the national objective of increasing the contribution by private enterprise to growth in less developed countries of such importance that we do not wish this program to inhibit the flow of these investments."

Furthermore, the summary worksheet attached to my letter, which companies are requested to use in reviewing their balance-of-payments situation, calls for information as to earnings and capital transactions only as to developed countries. In other words, in both purpose and practice we are seeking to abide by the principle noted in your letter of achieving our balance-of-payments objectives without impeding private U.S. investment in the less developed countries.

Sincerely yours,

John T. Connor.

CHARGE THAT DRAFT OF PROPOSED VOTING RIGHTS LEGISLATION WAS SHOWN TO MEMBERS OF SUPREME COURT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, lest my silence be taken for assent, I should like to join the minority leader, the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen], and the Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach, in denying unequivocally and without question the allegation made by a Member of the House of Representatives that five members of the Supreme Court gave their approval to the voting rights bill which the minority leader and I drafted jointly in his office over the past several weeks.

According to the account, Mr. Katzenbach was engaged in putting the finishing touches on the voting rights bill draft when Senate leaders who were working with him raised questions about the constitutionality of the measure's more drastic provisions.

Allegedly, the Attorney General eased their concern by saying he had shown the bill to Chief Justice Earl Warren and four other Justices of the Supreme Court, and that it had met with their approval.

If I had had any idea that any Justice of the Supreme Court was being approached on a matter of this kind, I would have been the first to raise this question, if the minority leader had not preceded me.

There was absolutely no conversation of any kind with any Member of the Supreme Court. So far as the drafting of the bill itself is concerned, I believe the major credit should go to the distinguished minority leader and his staff. Whatever help was needed, I and the Democratic policy committee's staff did what we could to be helpful.

Again for the Record I wish to join the distinguished minority leader and the Attorney General of the United States in refuting unequivocally this allegation, which supposedly has been made by a Member of the other body.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I completely concur in what the distinguished majority leader has said. To make sure that there can be no doubt as to what was said, I sent for the transcript of the hearing before Subcommittee No. 5, when that subcommittee was taking testimony on H.R. 6400 and related bills. At page 852 I quote from the testimony of Hon. John Dowdy, a Representative in Congress from the State of Texas. It reads as follows:

> An incident was related to me, the source being one for which I have high regard, that further leads me to believe we are indulging in wasted effort when we present logic, reason, and constitutional questions.
>
> It is this: The Attorney General met with some of the leadership, both parties, of the other body, to discuss the proposed bill with them. When the constitutional questions were there raised, the Attorney General immediately laid them to rest, advising the Members of the other body there present that they would not have to worry about that; that he had shown the bill to Chief Justice Warren and four other members of the Supreme Court and talked to them about it, and that they "enthusiastically approved" of it.
>
> Without going into the ethics of a lawyer talking to the court about a case that might likely come before it, this matter has probably been prejudged. The report of this incident was hot from the meeting, almost within seconds, and was res ipsa loquitor—the act speaking.

Mr. President, this is one of the most shameless things that I have ever heard uttered in the Nation's Capital in my more than 32 years in public life. It is an affront to the High Tribunal of the country. It is an affront to the Senate. It is absolutely unworthy of any parliamentary body to reflect upon the Supreme Court and upon its companion body in the National Legislature.

The man responsible for it ought to apologize to the Senate and to Senate Members—and he never named one of them—and he ought to apologize to the U.S. Supreme Court for such an unwarranted statement. It invites a breakdown of confidence in the Supreme Court and in the Senate as well.

I must brand it as a monstrous lie.

Yesterday I said it was a fabrication almost as big as the State of Texas, from which this Representative comes. That statement stands. I expect to see an apology forthcoming, because we cannot take this sort of thing in stride and maintain free, impartial government.

I am delighted indeed that the distinguished majority leader brought this subject to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I should like to list the names of the Senators who were present at the meetings referred to in the drawing up of the voting rights bill. The distinguished minority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] was present at every meeting. The distinguished Senator from California [Mr. Kuchel] was present at most of the meetings. The distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Hruska] and the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] were present at several meetings.

The distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. Long] was present at one meeting. The senior Senator from Montana, now speaking, was present at all the joint meetings. That, I believe, covers the list. I could not imagine any one of those Senators making the kind of statement alleged to have been made about the hearings in which they all engaged, in whole or in part. To the best of my knowledge, these are the only Members of the Senate who did participate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, anyone who is familiar with the history of the High Tribunal knows how circumspect the members of that Court have been through the years in guarding their opinions and in avoiding any consultation on proposed legislation of any kind long before it is properly before the Court in a state of adjudication. I think what we have heard is an outrage. I have some deep feeling about it.

THE HINSDALE SANITARIUM AND HOSPITAL—THE RESULT OF UNSELFISH SERVICE TO OTHERS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, what makes our country great is that it was built upon the principle of the determination of the individual and his faith in God. Dr. David Paulson, as a teenager, saw his brother die of diphtheria, and while awaiting his own death from that disease, vowed to God that should his life be spared, it would be devoted to unselfish service to others. There was the seed planted that grew into the Hinsdale Sanitarium and Hospital, which is commemorating its 60 years of dedicated service, coinciding with National Hospital Day, Sunday, May 9.

In honor of these two significant occasions, I ask unanimous consent that this brief history of the Hinsdale Sanitarium and Hospital and its founders, Drs. David and Mary Paulson and their coworkers, be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the history was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HINSDALE SANITARIUM AND HOSPITAL: 60 YEARS OF DEDICATED SERVICE

To coincide with National Hospital Day, Sunday, May 9, 1965, the Hinsdale Sanitarium and Hospital will observe its 60th anniversary. The history of this medical and surgical institution is closely knit with the dedicated lives of its cofounders, Drs. David and Mary Paulson.

Dr. David Paulson was born October 27, 1868, in Raymond, Wis., but spent most of his early life in a sod house on the Dakota frontier. When a teenager, his brother succumbed to a diphtheria epidemic, and the family awaited David's imminent death so that both boys could be buried together. At this time he vowed to God that should his life be spared, it would be devoted to unselfish service to others. David Paulson entered Battle Creek College in 1888 and his medical career took him to the University of Michigan and Bellevue College in New York, where he was graduated in 1894. Dr. Paulson joined the medical staff at Battle Creek Sanitarium in Battle Creek, Mich., and 2 years later married Mary Wild, also a physician. In 1899 Dr. Paulson left his comfortable position in Battle Creek to pioneer medical missionary work among the indigent of Chicago, and shortly after the turn of the century began to consider the need for a hospital located in the country.

A Chicago businessman, Mr. C. B. Kimbell, whose home was in the village of Hinsdale, west of Chicago, became well acquainted with Dr. Paulson. Kimbell suggested that such an establishment be opened in Hinsdale and offered to make available an abandoned country estate at a low figure, with payments extending over a long period of time and without interest.

Lacking in funds, but not in faith, Drs. David and Mary Paulson moved onto the property and began to gather a staff. The first 8 months were spent in renovating existing buildings, and in October of that year the Hinsdale Sanitarium & Benevolent Association was organized and a board of trustees named. It was to be a Christian but nonsectarian, philanthropic, charitable, and benevolent association. It would also train students for medical work.

Even before the rooms were finished, the first patient arrived. The first guest, a young woman who had been an invalid for years, went home cured and later became a physical culture instructor. Shortly after the dedication all rooms were filled.

The year 1907 brought hard times to the Nation. When the board voted a salary of $75 a month for Dr. Mary Paulson, she refused to accept it stating that her former salary of $65 per month was entirely adequate. Dr. David Paulson was receiving $40 a week, and nurses were paid 15 cents and 17 cents per hour.

At the conclusion of the first 10 years of the sanitarium's operation, Dr. Paulson could with just pride point to outstanding achievements. In addition to the medical program, his genius and faithfulness to his childhood vow to God had established the nurses' training school, the Good Samaritan Inn for indigent patients, a home for unwed mothers, a gospel program for prisoners, a health education program, medical lecture tours, and continuing medical mission program to larger cities.

But the continual strain of leadership told on Dr. Paulson's health, and on October 14, 1916, he passed away at the age of 48. The local newspaper, the Hinsdale Doings, printed a three-column story on his life and achievements ending with this statement:

"He builded wisely and well, and the various institutions and interests of which he was the founder, and chief promoter, and for which he gave his life, will continue to bless humanity, and serve as a monument to his memory."

In 1930 the great depression struck. This was a genuine crisis, but as a result of some earnest belt tightening, which included reducing the working force and cutting back wages, the sanitarium family weathered the storm. During 1931 the institution even contributed $9,005 in charity to free services and donations. The medical staff was organized for the first time in 1933, the general pattern of which remains in use. Its first president was a surgeon, Dr. F. G. Dyas. At the end of World War II in 1945, the institution was faced with a major decision. The patientload was more than the antiquated original buildings could bear. The administration realized that reconstruction on a much larger scale would be necessary to care for the rapidly expanding area. Because such expensive expansion requirements were beyond the meager resources of the institution, the Lake Union Conference of Seventh-day Adventists was voted in as owner and supervisor of properties and equipment. Hinsdale applied for financial assistance for an ambitious rebuilding program.

While plans for building were still in the embryonic stage, a severe polio epidemic struck the community in 1949 spreading terror throughout Hinsdale and Du Page County as well as metropolitan Chicago. Scores of homes were hit by the crippling and sometimes killing disease. Mr. and Mrs. Eugene Kettering of Hinsdale helped provide for the hospital the latest equipment for combating the disease, and the workers labored around the clock until the crisis was past. During the last 5 months of 1949, 70 polio cases were admitted to the sanitarium, 60 of which were classified as acute. There were only three deaths. During mid-1949 the Hinsdale Sanitarium and Hospital became one of only four hospitals in the metropolitan area to be qualified to accept acute polio cases. The hospital's medical program had from its foundation featured physical therapy equipment and staff, and during the crisis the physical therapy department was constantly staffed by willing therapists, who, under the direction of Miss Stella Peterson, contributed thousands of hours for the polio victims.

This challenge, well met, engendered community interest in the hospital. A group of leading citizens met in the Kettering home to lay plans for organizing the community to help finance the construction of the new badly needed 200-bed hospital. On September 27, 1953, 8-year-old "Chucky" Richards, one of the 1949 polio victims, cut a ribbon to open the new institution. Two days later all patients were transferred to their new quarters, and the razing of the old buildings began.

Hardly had this new $4 million building begun to serve its purpose when a suburban population explosion made further enlargement mandatory. In March 1958, the hospital planning council of Metropolitan Chicago forecast an 8,000 hospital bed shortage by 1960. And even worse, Du Page County had the lowest average number of beds per 1,000 population. Spurred by this report, the hospital's civic advisory council recommended that the board undertake an exhaustive study of the hospital, and consultants were employed. Their study clearly established the acute bed shortage as well as the fact that the hospital's specialized services were severely handicapped in handling the patient load because of space limitations. Based on a further estimated population increase of 53 percent by 1970, the study recommended a long-range development plan which would mean virtually doubling the hospital's size.

The campaign to raise $4,240,000 was formally launched. A Federal grant provided $1,012,882 and $1 million each was given by the Seventh-day Adventist Church and an anonymous donor. The remaining amount was donated by local community contributors.

Formal groundbreaking ceremonies for the new addition were held August 31, 1961. Meanwhile departments were moved into their new hospital quarters as fast as they were ready. The first patient was moved into the new wing in November 1962. Finally the new pavilion was dedicated with a special open house celebration on Hospital Day, May 12, 1963.

Today the Hinsdale Sanitarium and Hospital stands as a modern 360-bed general hospital in which all the main branches of medicine and surgery are practiced. The following services are represented: medical, surgical, obstetrical, physical therapy, psychiatric, orthopedic and pediatric. The facilities in the departments include operating suites, an out-patient clinic, an emergency room which serves more than 1,000 patients a month, and electroencephalographic and cardiographic departments, radiology, physical therapy and occupational therapy.

The teamwork of the citizens of the area served by the Hinsdale Sanitarium and Hospital with its administrators and medical staff has tremendously benefited the development of the institution. Volunteers, workers in the institution, contribute more than 30,000 hours every year. More than 200 senior and 50 junior volunteers continue to serve in the institution, qualified through a 2-week intensive orientation course. These volunteers are a part of a larger volunteer organization known as the Women's Service Board. Other branches include the medical distaff (wives of the medical staff), volunteers of a community gift shop operated for the benefit of the institution, and the Hinsdale Assembly, which is a social organization formed to raise funds for the institution in an annual December social event.

In addition to its intern program, the hospital operates four schools on its campus: school of nursing, school of practical nursing, school of X-ray, and school of medical technology. The 170-member medical staff has more than 75 board certified physicians, 55 of whom are on the teaching staffs of medical colleges in the Chicago area. This multimillion-dollar modern medical center stands ready to meet the needs of the community it serves. It is the fruition of a dream of a young boy on America's primitive frontier. It is the lengthened shadow of a great and selfless man, Dr. David Paulson.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate at this time, I move, pursuant to the order previously entered, that the Senate adjourn until 11 o'clock a.m. Monday.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until Monday, April 5, 1965, at 11 o'clock a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate April 1, 1965:

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Alexander B. Trowbridge, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Henry H. Fowler, of Virginia, to be U.S. Governor of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 5 years; U.S. Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years; and a Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years and until his successor has been appointed, vice Douglas Dillon.

William B. Dale, of Maryland, to be U.S. Executive Director of the International Monetary Fund for a term of 2 years. (Reappointment.)

Representative to 20th Plenary Session of Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations

Walter M. Kotschnig, of Maryland, to be the Representative of the United States of America to the 20th Plenary Session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Representative to Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations

Morris B. Abram, of New York, to be the Representative of the United States of America on the Human Rights Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

U.S. Advisory Commission on Information

The following-named persons to be members of the U.S. Advisory Commission on Information for terms expiring January 27, 1968, and until their successors have been appointed and qualified.

Palmer Hoyt, of Colorado.

Morris S. Novik, of New York. (Reappointment.)

Coast and Geodetic Survey

Subject to qualifications provided by law, the following for permanent appointment to the grade indicated in the Coast and Geodetic Survey:

To be lieutenant

William R. Curtis.

Postmasters

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CALIFORNIA

Maurice E. Ball, Fillmore, Calif., in place of J. K. L. Schwartz, retired.

COLORADO

Hilma J. Madison, Cope, Colo., in place of L. E. Wrape, retired.

Frederick M. Struck, Fort Lupton, Colo., in place of A. S. Gustafson, retired.

James W. Casteel, Holly, Colo., in place of C. D. Shively, retired.

Goldie L. Simpson, Monument, Colo., in place of W. W. Carrothers, resigned.

Velda F. Tucker, Snowmass, Colo., in place of L. B. McFadden, retired.

FLORIDA

Donald P. Totman, Apalachicola, Fla., in place of J. O. Mahon, deceased.

GEORGIA

R. Lester Wall, Columbus, Ga., in place of D. J. Graves, retired.

Chester C. Alderman, Valdosta, Ga., in place of J. A. McLeod, retired.

ILLINOIS

Shirley J. Weaver, Carbon Cliff, Ill., in place of A. C. Pinner, resigned.

John D. Frye, Cissna Park, Ill., in place of R. R. Staubus, retired.

Donald W. Benbrook, Long Point, Ill., in place of J. O. Brown, retired.

INDIANA

M. Melberta Clerget, Chalmers, Ind., in place of A. L. Clerget, deceased.

Howard E. Schwartz, Craigville, Ind., in place of J. L. Wasson, retired.

Edith C. Gamber, Economy, Ind., in place of M. C. Sander, deceased.

Robert W. Rushton, Monrovia, Ind., in place of R. C. Bray, retired.

Virgil F. Morris, Jr., New Ross, Ind., in place of E. A. Snow, retired.

Herbert E. Raymond, West Newton, Ind., in place of M. R. Dorrell, retired.

IOWA

William E. Rhoten, Carlisle, Iowa, in place of D. W. McCauley, transferred.

Merton V. Johnson, Grinnell, Iowa, in place of L. W. Brock, retired.

Kenneth P. Reed, New Virginia, Iowa, in place of C. P. Shane, retired.

Howard J. Hughes, Norwalk, Iowa, in place of R. W. Nible, resigned.

Gladys E. Pomeroy, Pacific Junction, Iowa, in place of E. M. Olson, retired.

Oliver W. Goldsmith, Salem, Iowa, in place of M. L. Barton, deceased.

John H. Petersen, Wyoming, Iowa, in place of Ernest Reitz, retired.

KENTUCKY

Lawrence C. Hunter, Hartford, Ky., in place of F. P. Bell, retired.

James O. Clark, Newport, Ky., in place of C. G. Bonar, retired.

LOUISIANA

M. Mildred Thomas, Spearsville, La. Office established August 1, 1961.

MAINE

Colby A. Davis, Canton, Maine, in place of Lyman Ellis, retired.

MARYLAND

Ralph H. Barrett, Bladensburg, Md., in place of C. H. Brown, deceased.

Stanley C. Day, Jr., Randallstown, Md., in place of S. A. G. Phillips, retired.

Donald L. Derr, Walkersville, Md., in place of N. M. Jamison, retired.

MICHIGAN

Donald F. Seiser, Deerfield, Mich., in place of L. J. Diver, retired.

Nellis M. Canfield, Mulliken, Mich., in place of C. R. Ramsay, retired.

Helen H. DeVol, Old Mission, Mich., in place of G. H. Lardie, deceased.

Edward A. Chorman, Sparta, Mich., in place of G. Q. Brace, retired.

MINNESOTA

Edward E. Groff, Clarks Grove, Minn., in place of I. R. Johnson, retired.

Frank P. Blatnik, Duluth, Minn., in place of G. J. Merritt, retired.

Genevieve K. Billiet, Nassau, Minn., in place of W. F. Albrecht, transferred.

Daniel R. Culhane, Rushford, Minn., in place of M. A. Culhane, retired.

MISSISSIPPI

Walter F. Turcotte, Jr., Waveland, Miss., in place of T. Z. Landry, retired.

MISSOURI

Henry A. Tucker, Stockton, Mo., in place of G. L. Preston, retired.

W. Kent Weigman, Weston, Mo., in place of L. J. Peden, removed.

NEVADA

Lisa A. Butters, Tuscarora, Nev., in place of S. L. Woods, retired.

NEW JERSEY

William J. Nawrocki, Hackensack, N.J., in place of H. A. Grod, deceased.

Lemuel C. Earley, Lakehurst, N.J., in place of H. J. Fuccile, removed.

Theodore J. Hirst, Lincroft, N.J., in place of H. H. Seylaz, retired.

William L. Krieger, Maplewood, N.J., in place of O. V. McNany, resigned.

William L. Rose, Montclair, N.J., in place of R. F. McMahon, retired.

Robert W. Kidd, Jr., Penns Grove, N.J., in place of R. W. Kidd, retired.

NEW YORK

Rose M. Hogle, Clinton Corners, N.Y., in place of J. M. Bowman, retired.

Lynn A. Harris, Morris, N.Y., in place of S. E. Gage, retired.

Vincent J. Boccalini, Valley Cottage, N.Y., in place of Frank Piliere, deceased.

NORTH CAROLINA

E. June Martin, Jr., Mount Olive, N.C., in place of Jack Barfield, retired.

OHIO

Clarence S. Braun, Coldwater, Ohio, in place of A. T. Schoch, retired.

Ruth L. Hudson, Dunbridge, Ohio, in place of K. B. Hudson, deceased.

Eugene Bailey, Franklin Furnace, Ohio, in place of R. E. Bailey, retired.

Beverly J. Neighbor, Thurston, Ohio, in place of V. A. Hoover, retired.

OKLAHOMA

Winton L. Cox, Boise City, Okla., in place of D. W. Fowler, retired.

Geraldine L. Tuxhorn, Helena, Okla., in place of R. S. Howe, retired.

Herbert W. Laird, Olustee, Okla., in place of J. A. Drury, transferred.

William J. Hutcheson, Waurika, Okla., in place of E. N. Anderson, retired.

OREGON

Arnold W. Wheeler, Hood River, Oreg., in place of A. J. Hansen, retired.

PENNSYLVANIA

J. Leslie Marstellar, Fredonia, Pa., in place of J. M. Hays, retired.

George Mermon, Nesquehoning, Pa., in place of V. J. Koomar, deceased.

Allen Adam Kleintop, Saylorsburg, Pa., in place of T. C. Sharer, resigned.

PUERTO RICO

Helga Franco-Cabrero, San Sebastian, P.R., in place of T. S. Gutierrez, deceased.

RHODE ISLAND

Hector J. Fontaine, Jr., Woonsocket, R.I., in place of Antonia Prince, retired.

SAMOA

Jane T. Uhrle, Pago Pago, Samoa, in place of A. P. Lauvao, resigned.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Ray D. Martin, Pelion, S.C., in place of J. L. Williams, resigned.

SOUTH DAKOTA

John H. Schroeder, Plankinton, S. Dak., in place of M. M. Fitzgerald, retired.

TENNESSEE

Geraldine G. Carpenter, Corryton, Tenn., in place of D. L. Clapp, transferred.

Gerald M. Short, Hornbeak, Tenn., in place of R. G. Hornbeak, retired.

TEXAS

Gid R. Davidson, Brazoria, Tex., in place of C. B. Phillips, retired.

Crook T. Waller, Kermit, Tex., in place of H. L. Almond, transferred.

Gladys G. Trantham, Needville, Tex., in place of B. F. Goldsmith, retired.

Hubert J. Moseley, Rochelle, Tex., in place of L. H. Lee, transferred.

E. Nathan Eldridge, Wylie, Tex., in place of R. B. Richardson, transferred.

Paul B. Foster, Yantis, Tex., in place of J. F. Leigh, retired.

VIRGINIA

Elbert J. Johnson, Jr., Bristol, Va., in place of C. H. Drinkard, retired.

Thomas C. Emory, Chase City, Va., in place of F. T. Given, retired.

WASHINGTON

John C. Boid, Marysville, Wash., in place of L. L. Stock, retired.

WISCONSIN

Walter R. Schoenherr, Hamburg, Wis., in place of T. J. Helmke, retired.

In the Navy

Having designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, Rear Adm. Luther C. Heinz, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, I nominate him for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following persons for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be captain, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Hill, Vaughn E., 71975A.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Judge Advocate)

Murphy, Edward J., AO3121962.

To be captains, USAF (Dental)

Bourne, William F., O5312991.
Hoopes, Grover R., AO3125628.
Kramer, Robert A., AO3125193.
Rutledge, Edward J., AO3125602.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Dental)

Almon, John V.

To be first lieutenant, USAF (Medical)

Lathrop, George D., AO3142080.

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished military graduates, the following distinguished military students of the Air Force Reserve Officers' Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with the dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Abela, Alexander A.
Adams, Jack L.
Addison, William A. B., Jr.
Aitken, Douglas B.
Alber, Antone F.
Allaben, Lee D.
Allen, James D.
Allen, Roy M.
Amaditz, Carl W.
Ammon, Robert V.
Anderson, James C.
Anderson, Robert M.
Apolonio, Franklin J.
Arrington, Ronald L.
Atwell, Donald C.
Austin, Douglas G.
Bacha, George T., Jr.
Badgett, William R.
Baldwin, Ronald L.
Barrineau, Tim W.
Barron, George R.
Bash, James C.
Battista, Robert B.
Bauer, Raymond P.
Baum, Dwight J.
Bauman, Marion C.
Bauman, Robert B.
Bearden, James D.
Bender, William C.
Bexfield, James N.
Bisceglia, Joseph A.
Black, William S.
Blansett, Randy S.
Bok, Frederick C.
Bonnell, Roy O., Jr.
Bouch, Kevin S.
Bouma, Eugene F.
Bourn, Frank D.
Boyken, Jeffrey W.
Bradley, Gary M.
Brambilla, Walter J.
Brennan, Robert E.
Bretz, Ralph J., Jr.
Brown, Charles B.
Browning, Larry D.
Buck, Donald L.
Buckellew, William R.
Bull, David E.
Bumgarner, Charles R.
Bunce, Charles N.
Burns, James S.
Burns, Melvin W.
Burr, Hiram H., Jr.
Canavera, Stephen A.
Capriotti, Donald L.
Caracciolo, Raymond P.
Cardwell, Thomas A., III
Carpenter, Michael F.
Carroll, James G.
Carter, Charles E.
Castell, Harold L.
Catalano, Charles P.
Cates, Robert L.
Cauley, Robert F.
Chapman, George W., Jr.
Christian, James W.
Christy, Donald F.
Chronister, Richard D., Jr.
Church, David L.
Ciminelli, Lawrence W.
Clegg, Philip G.
Cleland, Thomas E., Jr.
Clem, Ralph S.
Cole, Dennis L.
Colvin, Murl W.
Cook, William S.
Conrad, Wilkinson G., IV
Cope, Robert S.
Corrallo, Carl A., Jr.
Coughenour, Richard W.
Crandall, Richard W.
Creasy, Eddie O.
Crick, Maxie E.
Crocker, Gordon B.
Cross, James E.
Crow, Thomas R.
Culver, John D.
Cunniff, Robert E.
Daniel, Harold L.
Dassler, William H.
Davis, Joe A.
Deinlein, Christopher J.
Dellermann, Frank J.
De Long, Leslie G., Jr.
Des Brisay, Thomas D.
Devolites, Philip J.
Dick, Steven C.
Dolim, Henry P., Jr.
Doubet, Frederick P.
Drummond, John R.
Drury, Richard S.
Duffy, Charles G., III
Dumville, James C.
Dunlap, Samuel C., IV
Durden, Robert R.
Eardley, Kenneth S.
Eastman, Bruce
Edgar, John D.
Ellard, Norman E.
Ennis, Carl A.
Featherston, Fielding W., III
Feher, Theodore M.
Ferriola, Constantino J., Jr.
Fichter, George M.
Finan, Edward J.
Ford, Bernard R.
Ford, Ronald H.
Forsyth, Stuart A.
Fowler, William H.
Franklin, David A.
Freeman, Charles H.
Friski, Michael P.
Gage, Harlan R.
Gallardo, Fernando L.
George, James H.
Gluntz, Thomas A.
Glenewinkel, Dennis R.
Goodson, Woodrow W., Jr.
Graham, Alan C., Jr.
Grawl, Franklin L.
Gray, Jerry W.
Gregory, Harry L., Jr.
Grosse, Vinson G.
Hall, Ronald K.
Hall, Timothy C.
Hand, Stanley I., Jr.
Hanson, Hans E.
Harborth, Nelson L.
Harriman, Roy E.
Harris, Robert D.
Harvey, Thomas E.
Havanac, Peter J.
Hawkins, Grady H.
Hawver, Ira D.
Hays, Herbert B., Jr.
Hayter, Richard B.
Held, David J.
Hewett, Gary W.
Heyns, Terry L.
Hill, David B., Jr.
Hindon, William K.
Hines, Benjamin C.
Hite, Gregory C.
Hodges, Thomas B.
Hogan, Danny A.
Holsman, Darol V.
Holycross, Thomas W., Jr.
Hooten, Joseph B.
Hoover, Ronald C.
Hopkins, Philip W.
Horning, Robert E.
Howe, David C.
Huffman, Arlie C., Jr.
Hunter, Welton B., Jr.
Hussey, Richard H., Jr.
Hyder, John H., Jr.
Imle, Robert M.
Ivey, David J.
Jacob, Kendall M.
Jaynes, Jay J.
Jefferies, Chris L.
Jenkins, William A., III
Johnson, Charles F.
Johnson, Gail R.
Johnson, Phillip A.
Jones, James M., Jr.
Jones, Johnny M.
Joyner, Donald R.
Karras, Thomas J.
Katsuki, Paul
Kearse, Robert F.
Keegan, John J., Jr.
Keele, Bernard B., Jr.
Keller, George F., II
Kemp, Roland C.
Kemp, William H.
Kennedy, Chandler J.
Kersey, Lesley, I.
Kiggans, Robert G.
Kilkullen, Thomas S.
Kimerling, Lionel C.
Kinton, David W.
Kirschbaum, Klaus K. R.
Klein, Bruce O.
Klusman, James E.
Koch, Edwin A.
Kohl, Carl C., III
Kollar, Stephen F.
Koon, James M., Jr.
Kozlowski, James B.
Krassy, Joseph G.
Krause, Kenneth L.
Kroncke, George T.
Krzynowek, Paul S.
Kyle, Arthur C.
Kyle, James D., Jr.
Lahendro, Albert L.
Laird, Edward P.
Land, Samuel B., Jr.
Lane, David G.
Lane, Dennis M.
Lange, James J.
Lanto, Reino C., Jr.
Larsen, Richard H.
Lebak, Michael O.
Lee, John C.
Lees, Lawrence E.
Lehman, Neal F.
Lennon, Thomas J.
Leonard, Terrence W.
Leonard, William J.
Lerda, John A.
Levernez, Lynne L.
Lewis, George T., Jr.
Lien, John D.
Linvill, Robert M.
Lodie, Robert C.
Lojacono, James F.
Loomis, James L.
Lowery, Robert G.
Machorek, William C., Jr.
MacQueen, Henry C., Jr.
Madison, Henry C. Jr.
Makal, Thomas J. Jr.
Maki, Richard L.
Mann, James L.
Martin, Berkeley T.
Martinez, Gerald E.
Mason, Richard P.
Matthews, Charles H.
Matuszewski, John P.
McArthur, Frank F.
McAulifee, Michael A.
McBrearty, Charles F. Jr.
McBride, William F.
McCafferty, Robert J.
McClenny, John W.
McComb, Craig E.
McCreary, Frank D. Jr.
McDuff, James R.
McGill, Emmett B.
McGlone, Vayland L.
McIver, Claud L., III
McKeever, Jeffrey D.
McLawhorn, David W.
McTighe, Donald A., Jr.
Meade, Roger E.
Meives, Lawrence T.
Meldrum, James R., Jr.
Michel, Marshall L., III
Miller, John E.
Miller, Roy L.
Mills, David P.
Mills, Harold W., Jr.
Mitchell, James U., Jr.
Moore, James B., Jr.
Moquin, Douglas L.
Moran, William E., III
Morgan, Roy J.
Moriarty, Thomas E.
Moscatelli, John J.
Mosley, Charles W.
Mottern, Michael M.
Mueller, William K.
Murchison, Alexander H., III
Murray, Douglas J.
Myhre, Jerry O.
Neal, William F.
Neale, James G., Jr.
Nelson, Willard J.
Newberry, Richard M.
Nicewarner, Enoch F.
Novak, Richard A.
Novakovich, Michael J.
Odom, William W., Jr.
Oliver, Carl E.
Ondrasek, Michael J.
Orton, Stephen A.
O'Such, Robert J.
Owen, Thomas G.
Palmer, John G.
Parker, Gerhard H.
Paschall, Richard C., Jr.
Pasquet, Henry L.
Pawlow, Thomas A.
Paxton, John R.
Peavey, William F.
Pedersen, David D.
Penndorf, Richard P.
Peter, William M.
Petersdorf, Paul K.
Phillips, Hance C., Jr.
Picarelli, John G.
Pierne, John P., Jr.
Pittman, Clyte D., Jr.
Pitzer, David M.
Podzimek, Robert G.
Poore, William B.
Porinchak, John M.
Porkorney, Edward E.
Porth, Andrew G.
Potterton, William H.
Pounds, Herbert E., Jr.
Powell, Byron R.
Press, Michael C.
Price, Don R.
Pruit, Carl G.
Purdy, Stephen G.
Putman, Richard B.
Putzke, David A.
Quilici, Ronald H.
Rader, William K.
Ralston, Joseph W.
Rash, Richard A., II
Rathwell, Peter J.
Raub, Eugene L.
Rauschenberger, Robert C.
Ray, William D.
Raz, Jerry E., Jr.
Reichart, John R.
Reitinger, John P.
Resio, Edward N.
Rhoden, Harold H.
Rhodes, Dougles C.
Rhodes, Herbert C.
Rice, Lee R.
Richards, Norman J.
Richardson, John E., II
Richmond, David W., Jr.
Rider, Kenneth J., II
Riedesiel, Lynn R.
Riek, Justus R., Jr.
Riske, Robert M.
Robertson, Thomas A., Jr.
Robinson, Ronald A.
Rockwood, Stephen D.
Rogers, Richard H.
Root, Barry D.
Rosenmeier, Harvey O.
Ross, Keith C.
Ross, Raymond M.
Rouse, George E.
Sadler, Mitchell O., Jr.
Sadowski, Alexander M.
Saffell, Bernard F., Jr.
Salmieri, Stephen A.
Sander, Raymond J.
Sanders, Edward C., III
Santacroce, Marc A.
Saunders, Carl J.
Scatterday, Robert W., Jr.
Schneider, James P.
Schneider, Kenneth F.
Schuster, Theodore J.
Scott, Byron W.
Scott, Clyde A., Jr.
Scott, Travis H., Jr.
Seefried, Kenneth J., Jr.
Seeger, Christopher C.
Seeler, Richard A.
Sewell, Richard E.
Sharp, William H.
Shaughnessy, William A.
Shell, William R.
Shickel, David O.
Silliman, Scott L.
Sipolski, James G.
Sloan, Ronald V.
Smith, Charles W., Jr.
Smith, Farrell M.
Smith, Nathan S.
Smith, Stanley J.
Snider, Donald F.
Snoy, Joseph A.
Snyder, Clarence E., Jr.
Somerlot, Douglas K.
Southerland, Grover R.
Steadman, Eugene, Jr.
Stephens, John D.
Stidsen, Carlton A.
Stiles, Shelley I., III
Stouffer, James A.
Stout, William A.
Struck, Theodore F., III
Suchy, Russell J.
Sullivan, John S.
Sweigart, Marlin L.
Swezey, Robert W.
Taylor, Frank J., Jr.
Thompson, Albert T.
Thompson, Robert H.
Thoreson, Allen D.
Thurman, John B., III
Tumlin, William N., III
Turner, Edward N., III
Usher, Troy C., Jr.
Van Deventer, Arthur D.
Van Gilder, Walter L.
Van Gorder, John F.
Van Syoc, Lynn L.
Velez, Randy A.
Viscegila, Frank T.
Vise, Carrell D.
Vogl, David J.

Vraa, Ronald D.
Walker, Billy D.
Walling, Bruce C.
Walsh, Henry J.
Ward, Hal M.
Ward, Wayne E.
Warren, Joe B., Jr.
Watts, Adrian L., Jr.
Waybright, James N.
Weaver, Paul R.
Weeldreyer, James A.
Welde, John L.
Westermeier, Franz E.
White, Lawrence L., Jr.
Whitesel, Stephen H.
Wier, Michael I.
Wilcox, Jerry D.
Wiles, John C., Jr.
Williams, Terrence T.
Williams, Thomas S.
Wimberly, David T.
Windel, Jerry L.
Wortham, George E.
Wortham, Murray L.
Wortmann, Jeffery W.
Wright, Richard L.
Yersak, Richard J.
Yuhas, Joseph R.
Zacharias, David L.
Zeck, Francis H., Jr.
Zeller, Karl F.
Zimmerman, Laurence J., Jr.
Zoeller, Michael A.

In the Navy

The following named (Naval Officers Training Corps candidates) to be permanent ensigns in the line or Staff Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefore as provided by law:

James T. Abbey
Jonathan R. Abbott
Thomas S. Abernathy, Jr.
Gary M. Abraham
Thomas J. Ackerson
Richard P. Adams
Alan R. Adaschik
Paul W. Adelgren
Charles M. Adkins III
Howard E. Adkins, Jr.
Craig P. Adryan
Vance E. Aeschleman, Jr.
Jerry R. Alexander
Samuel J. Alexander
Dennis A. Altergott
Lloyd P. Amborn
Arthur J. Anderson
David G. Anderson
Dennis D. Anderson
Lawrence R. Anderson
Terrance E. Anderson
William M. Anderson
John T. Antoun
Eric B. Ardell
Richard C. Asbell II
Elton T. Ashby, Jr.
Michael J. Assum
Joseph V. Attanasio, Jr.
Robert C. Auerbach
Robert J. Aurin
Julian L. Austin
Harry E. Bailey
Edward F. Baird
Fred T. Baker, Jr.
Paul L. Baker
William J. Baker
Robert C. Ballenger
Thomas F. Balogh
Stephen E. Barkas
Douglas W. Barnert
Burnice E. Barnett, Jr.
Dennis R. Barnhart
John W. Barr
Jarold M. Bartz
Ronald F. Bass
Daniel Bauch
Martin H. Baumberger
Michael A. Bauser
Garnet C. Beard, Jr.
David J. Beattie
Lawrence C. Bechtel
Barry A. Becker
Michael F. Beckmeyer
Roger G. Bekooy
Harry L. Belin
Ronald F. Belanger
James W. Bell
Robert S. Bell, Jr.
Thomas P. Bell, Jr.
Craig C. Bennett
Harvey E. Bennett
Robert B. Bennett
Francis T. Bergin, Jr.
James R. Berry
Robert C. Berry
Aivars T. Berzins
Lance J. Bibin
William G. Biddlecom
Richard A. Bienia
Christopher M. Bigelow
Larry J. Billa
Henry H. Bishop II
Craig B. Bittenbender
Patrick W. Bixby
James W. Blackburn
James O. Blackmon
William P. Bleakley
Larry D. Bliss
Billy C. Boatright
William R. Boehm, Jr.
William M. Bokesch
William N. Bolster
Hugh E. Bonnoitt, Jr.
Curtis G. Borchardt
Paul D. Borchardt
Robert B. Borsum
Terry L. Bowman
James D. Braden
Jeffrey G. Bradley
Martin H. Brennan
Robert A. Bried
Glenn B. Brindel
Jon A. Broadway
William M. Browder
Charles H. Brown, Jr.
David A. Brown
Harry J. Brown, Jr.
Jeffrey B. Brown
Roger H. Brown
Terry L. Brubaker
James W. Bruckner
Arne B. Bruflat
Norman D. Brunson
Louis E. Brus
Donald C. Bryant, Jr.
George J. Buckowski
Allen J. Budnick
Thomas A. Buffum, Jr.
John E. Bulkowski
Andrew L. Burgess, Jr.
Gary K. Burkle
Richard A. Burt
Francis M. Bushnell, Jr.
Robert D. Butterbrodt
William B. Byers
Shaun M. Byrnes
James R. Cain III
Arvid M. Calaway
John D. Caldwell
William H. Calhoon, Jr.
Dennis L. Calkins
James B. Cannon
Richard J. Carlson
David L. Carroll
Dennis R. Catania
Walter T. Cederholm
Richard T. Cederwall
Stephen E. Celec
Robert L. Chandler
John P. Chihorek
Gordon L. Chipman, Jr.
Randall B. Christison
Robert H. Christman
Roberto Cipriano
Robert C. Claar
John R. Clarey
David L. Clark
Herbert F. Clark
Jon B. Clarke
John S. Clasen
Peter G. Claymore
Robert L. Clifford
Spencer W. Closson
Howard C. Cohen
Bernard D. Cole
Mark C. Coleman
Gordon B. Coley
Stephen G. Colgan
James M. Collins
John E. Collins, Jr.
Michael J. Conerty
John M. Connelly
Terence J. Cooney
James B. Cooper
Glenn A. K. Copp III
Joseph L. K. Corcoran
Patrick M. Cosgrove
Dale M. Couch
Frank T. Coughlin
James H. Cowan, Jr.
Douglas B. Cox
Stephen E. Cox
Richard J. Cragg
John S. Craig
Harold J. Cramer
James C. Crawford
John G. Crawford, Jr.
Thomas M. Crimmins, Jr.
Douglas E. Criner
Philip C. Crosland
Peter J. Cross
James S. Csizmadia
Howard M. Cullum
Glenn K. Currie
Albert L. Curtis
Ronald M. Daddario
Paul B. Dahl
Claud A. Daigle, Jr.
Terrence N. Danner
George T. Daughtry
Joseph M. Davis
Lorenzo D. Davis IV
Teddy M. Davis
Joseph W. Davison
John B. deBrun, Jr.
Christian F. Decker III
Donald W. Decoursey
Leo S. Demski
Robert E. Denton
John C. Dewolfe III
Robert L. Dickey
Richard M. Dillow
William L. Docekal
James W. Dodson, Jr.
John Doering, Jr.
Cornelius A. Dolby
Raymond F. Dostal
David C. Downey
Matthew J. Doyle, Jr.
Joseph A. Drago
Dennis R. Drowty
George F. Druist
Robert R. Duncan
Hugh M. Durden
Floyd J. Dyches
Donald R. Eager
Joel D. Eaton
Roy W. Eaton, Jr.
Glenn H. Edwards
Fred C. Eichmann
William M. Eisenbach
Joel T. Eiserman
Thomas R. Eliassen
James E. Ellison
Bruce B. Emory
Michael T. English
Frank N. Eppinger
Christian D. Ericksen
Keith L. Erickson
Ronald J. Erion
Leroy E. Euvrard, Jr.
Charles H. Everill
Kent W. Ewing
Barent L. Fake
Theodore H. Faller
Edward C. Farrell
Stephen R. Farrow
James J. Feder
William R. Feldhaus
Wayne J. Fernandez
Charles D. Feustel
Kurt D. Findeisen
Ralph Fink III
Thomas M. Finn
James H. Fischley
Rex B. Fitch, Jr.
Dale H. Fitzsimmons
Michael Flannery
Edwin R. Fleuriet
Charles G. Flint
Frederick H. Flor, Jr.
Scott C. Follett
William T. Free, Jr.
Thomas L. French
Jon H. Friedman
Peter E. Frisbee
Robert P. Fritzsche, Jr.
John A. Fuller
Dale E. Gabrielson
Ernest F. Gale, Jr.
Albert F. Galietta
Carlos "E" Galindo
Jerry V. Gammill
Henry M. Gastrell III
Carl E. Gatto
Laurence P. Gebhardt
Richard W. Geer, Jr.
Jon R. Geiger
Jon C. Geisbush
Paul F. Gerroir
Philip S. Gidiere, Jr.
Richard E. Gilbertson
James M. Gill
Thomas E. Gilliam
Kenneth R. Girouard
John P. Giuliani
Wynn A. Goldsmith
Wayne K. Goodermote
Carl W. Gooding
Kenneth R. Goodsell
Jeffrey L. Gordon
Bruce A. Goreham
John J. Gottsman
Richard K. Gould
Peter F. Goyer, Jr.
Christopher C. H. Graber
James E. Graber
Stephen T. Grabowski
Michael S. Grady
Clifford M. Graf II
Robert B. Graham
Frank S. Grauch
Cameron R. Gray
George D. Green
David S. Greenberg
James E. Greene, Jr.
James V. Greene, Jr.
Jonathan M. Greene
Robert W. Greer, Jr.
Leonard R. Greger
Richard N. Griffin
John A. Griner
Edson Griswold
William E. Grizzle
John C. Groth
Dennis L. Groves
Christian L. Gruenther
Ernest J. Guay, Jr.
Edward H. Guilbert, Jr.
Norman G. Guimond
David L. Gunn
Lee F. Gunn
Carl E. Gustafson
Michael H. Guth
David P. Hall
David R. Hall
David W. Hall
Robert E. Hall III
Steven C. Hall
David R. Halperin
Richard D. Hamly
Kent A. Hampton
Frederic K. Hanaway
Robert R. Hanke
Frank C. Hankins
Robert S. Hann
Donald A. Hanson
John C. Harley, Jr.
Robert H. Harmon
Charles H. Harper IV
Henry A. Harper, Jr.
William H. Harrell
Gary M. Harris
Patrick R. Harrison
Peter G. Harrison
Alden G. Haskins II
Clarence J. Hatleberg
Howard W. Hay
Clyde C. Head, Jr.
Raymond A. Heald
John F. Healy, Jr.
George W. Heburn
Frederick W. Hedges
Joseph J. Hegenbart
Richard A. Hendry
David C. Henny
Joseph W. Henrick
Michael J. Henry
Peter B. Heroy
David W. Heyer
Gerald C. Hickman
Donald R. Hillier
William A. Hilley III
Charles E. Hilsinger
John W. Hitchcock
John P. Hite
Jan R. Hofland
Richard E. Holk
Robert W. Holloran, Jr.
Peter S. Houseknecht
Jacques R. Houyoux
Steven J. Hovany
Wayne L. Howlett
James D. Hubbard
Wendell H. Huff, Jr.
William D. Hunter
Samuel S. Hurd
James A. Hurley
Kenneth H. Hurrelbrink
Kenneth L. Hurst, Jr.
Eugene B. Hutchinson
George E. Huxhold
Francis Iafrate
Thomas H. Idema
Alfred C. Jackson III
Arthur R. Jacobstein
William B. James
John M. Jarratt
Bruce C. Jayne
Armour A. Jensen, Jr.
Richard A. Jensen
Alan K. Johnson
Donald E. Johnson
Gary L. Johnson
Kenneth E. Johnson
Larry E. Johnson
Norman M. Johnson
Robert C. Johnson
William R. Johnson III
David B. Johnston
Joseph B. Johnston
Alonzo L. Jones, Jr.
Charlie R. Jones, Jr.
David A. Jones
Edward M. Jones
Frank W. Jones
Donald J. Jonovic
Lloyd E. Jordon II
James A. Julian
Joseph L. Just, Jr.
Thomas J. Kane
John C. Kasdorf
Robert A. Kasnevich
Daniel C. Kasperski
Lee H. Keely
James C. Keenan
Gerald F. Keeney
Stuart J. Keiller
Edward L. Keiser
Ray R. Keiser, Jr.
Richard L. Kelbaugh
George J. Keller, Jr.
Bruce D. Kenyon
Malcolm H. Kenyon
Morton W. Kenyon
Harvey K. Kesler
Richard C. King
Stoddon G. N. King
Oliver D. Kingsley, Jr.
Geoffrey Kingston
Robert V. Kinsey
Kenneth E. Kinyon
Frederick N. Kleckley, Jr.
Stephen G. Kmetz
Frederic W. Knapp
Ronald C. Knecht
Rodney D. Knutson
Gary C. Koelbl
John T. Kohlmann
William F. Kopecky
Larry N. Koppenhaver
Robert A. Kosakoski
William A. Koski
Frederick R. Krafcik
Ben A. Krause
James H. Kreuzer
Kraigher Kristofferson
Paul G. Kruetzfeldt
Paul H. Kuhn, Jr.
Raymond F. Kulbitskas
Larry B. Laakso
Edward H. Ladd III
Raymond G. M. Lah
Ronald J. Lambe
Phillip B. Lamberson
Stephen D. Lambert
Edwin J. Lanfear, Jr.
Michael E. Langley
Allen P. Larson
Richard L. Lasky
Ronald J. Laspisa
James R. Latham II
Walter B. Lawrence
David A. Lawson III
Robert K. Lawton
Michael A. Leahy II
Herve J. Leboeuf III
John E. Leder
John D. Lee
Kenneth A. Lee
William J. Leebern
Lawrence M. Leise
John A. Leo III
William D. Leonard
Winsor Letton III
David F. Leverenz
Richard E. Lewis
Grey D. Libbey
Robert M. Lightstone
Thomas S. Lillig
Wendell R. Link
David D. Loehr
Henry W. Logan III
Klaus Londot
Thomas L. Loosbrock
Stephen M. Lovett
Gerald C. Lund
Walter W. Luther, Jr.
Gerald J. Lyall
Kyle T. Lynn
David G. McAlees
Arthur W. McAllister, Jr.
Joseph R. McAlpin III
James R. McBride
James E. McCormack
Norman K. McCoy, Jr.
Richard A. McCreary
Neil J. McElwee
Thomas P. McGinley
James E. McGlinn

Kenneth R. McGruther
Robert A. McKelvie
Nicholas V. McKenna
Harry A. McKinnon, Jr.
Lawrence L. McKnight
Arthur L. McLaughlin
Michael J. McLaughlin, Jr.
John A. McMahon
Robert T. McMahon
Theodore C. McMeekin
Frederick M. McNamee
William E. McNicholas
Robert D. McPheters
Arnold C. McQuaide, Jr.
Leo J. McStravick, Jr.
Braid C. MacDonald
James S. MacDonald
Donald A. MacAulay, Jr.
Myron D. MacEchko
William A. MacKay
William C. MacKey III
Stephen S. MacVean
Thomas H. Magee
Thomas R. Maher, Jr.
Lee S. Mairs
William E. Major II
George A. Malinasky
Robert J. Maloit, Jr.
Dexter I. Manlove
William W. Mann, Jr.
John T. Margeson
Sheldon L. Margolis
Earl M. Marks
Craig H. Martin
David L. Martin
Kenneth E. Martin
Royal S. Martin
Derek C. Marshall
John P. Marshall, Jr.
Paul T. Marston
Joseph R. Martelle, Jr.
Edward L. Marvin
Gerald E. Marx
Theodore W. Mason
Frederick T. Massey
John J. Matous
James P. Mauney
Neil M. Mazurek
James L. Merrick
Dennis O. Merrill
Fred L. Meyer
Robert E. Mier
Wayne E. Miers
Gary R. Millar
Charles R. Miller III
Dennis P. Miller
Donald C. Miller
Gary R. Miller
Kenneth M. Miller
Lawrence E. Miller, Jr.
Robert E. Miller, Jr.
Russell F. Miller
Jack R. Millikan
Sumner P. Mills III
Scott F. Milner
Alan L. Minard
John M. Mitchell
Thomas R. Mitchell III
Robert E. Mittelstaedt, Jr.
Richard W. Moise
James K. Moore
Michael K. Moore
Timothy D. Moore
William L. Moll
Stephen A. Morehouse
Edward L. Morgan
Franklin A. Morgan
William E. Moritz
Christopher J. Morren
Dean L. Muehler
Wayne T. Mulholland
Rand P. Mulford
Anthony R. Muller
Penn E. Mullowney, Jr.
Gregory L. Murrell
David M. Musolf
John M. Nagl
Carl F. Nagy
Edward L. Naro
Donald C. Nelson
Larry H. Nelson
Ronald C. Nelson
James A. Neubauer
Carl J. Newberg
Donald E. Newman
George E. Newton
Peter D. Nichols
Robert V. Nicoletti
William M. Oakley, Jr.
Jon H. Oberg
Denis E. O'Brien
Daniel P. O'Connell
Alexander J. Ogrinz III
Roman S. Ohnemus
Charles E. Olsen
Gaylord C. Olson, Jr.
Carl W. Orlob
Lawrence B. Orr
Wiley M. Osborn
John S. Oswald II
Roger J. Pachuta
Joseph S. Palermo, Jr.
Dennis J. Pallai
William C. Panagakos
Alan M. Parker
John J. Parker
John W. Paul, Jr.
Paul E. Paulsen
Richard W. Payne
Orin F. Pearson III
Bruce H. Peck
James L. Peddicord
Robert H. Peiffer
Paul J. Pekar
Ronald L. Pelton
Ralph B. Perkins
Kenneth E. Perry
William Elliott Perry
William Edward Perry
Dennis H. Peters
Thomas J. Peters
Arthur V. Peterson
Dennis A. Peterson
Michael C. Peterson
Erik G. Pettersen
Jary J. Phillip
Donald B. Phillips
Jackie L. Phillips
James A. Phillips, Jr.
Frank P. Piazza, Jr.
Quinten A. Pierce, Jr.
Donald W. Pine
John M. Pinney
Michael W. Pliska
Thomas W. Plosila
Louis R. Plotz
James E. Plowman
Joseph C. Pocken III
John C. Pollock III
Bradley C. Poole
Geoffrey W. Pope
John M. Pospisil
David G. Potter
John A. Potts
Robert L. Pou
Philip L. Poythress
Larry W. Presnell
Harry J. Price
Frederick F. Ptucha
Lanny J. Puckett
Nelson B. Pulliam
Nicholas J. Quinn
Harry S. Raleigh, Jr.
Robert P. Rambo
Steven U. Ramsdell
Stephen L. Rapp
John D. Raup
Joseph D. Reck
Norman D. Recknor
John C. Redcross
Roger W. Redenbaugh
Gordon T. Reed
Ronald A. Rehb
Thomas A. Remus
Richard L. Repasky
Frederick J. Rerko
Gary W. Reynolds
John P. Reynolds, Jr.
William M. Ribble
Frank W. Rice, Jr.
William C. Rinaman, Jr.
David G. Ritchey
David L. Roberts
Gary L. Roberts
Stephen S. Roberts
Leon E. Robins
Michael F. Robinson
Francis M. Roddy
Stephen T. Rogers
Dale A. Rorabaugh
Edward J. Rose
Max L. Rosenquist
Lawrence J. Rosintoski
Philip J. Roth
Richard E. Roth
Calvin T. Roush, Jr.
Richard E. Rowlands
Charles W. Rowley
Chester D. Rudolf III
Ralph H. Ruedy
Stephen K. Rush
John M. Rushing
Dan H. Ryder
Brian P. Sack
Barry E. Sammons
William J. Sandberg
Christopher F. Sapp
Merrill A. Sappington
William D. Sauerwein
Donald R. Schafer
Robert E. Schafer
John A. Schalde
George W. Schandel
John A. Schmahl
Robert W. Schmauder, Jr.
Todd W. Schmidt
Gary W. Schoen
Paul L. Schofield
Russell C. Scholl, Jr.
Robert A. Schooley
Francis E. Schrader II
Russell J. Schreier, Jr.
Michael S. Schroering
Michael F. Schuler
Thomas F. Schuster
Robert J. Schutte
Robert G. Schwartz, Jr.
Richard D. Scott
Thomas F. Scott, Jr.
Dean L. Sedgwick
David W. Seidel
Wayne A. Seim
Ronald L. Sellers
Frank L. Settle
Ormond G. Sexton
Jesse S. Shaffer
David C. Sheats
Noel Shipman
John F. Shipway
Dale G. Shuman
Paul B. Sigrest
Leigh D. Silliphant
Guy J. Simmons
Thomas E. Simons
Wayne F. Simpson
James A. Small
David H. Smith
William B. Smithson
John S. Smock
Warren T. Smyth
Albert L. Sneed, Jr.
William A. Snider
Paul J. Snyder
Dag Sohlberg
Walter C. Spalding, Jr.
David A. Spiegel
Robert H. Spies
Preston W. Staats, Jr.
Tellmon S. Stallings
William A. Stanford
William G. Stanley
Dennis W. Stansbury
Frederick L. Steenburgh
Jeffrey F. Stein
Paul P. Stein
Mark E. Stella
Lawrence F. Stevens
Michael E. Stewart
Robert G. Stewart
Van Nelson Stewart
Louis T. Steyaert
Clinton N. Stiger
Laurence L. Stone, Jr.
William C. Stone
Richard L. Stover
Beetem H. Strack, Jr.
John E. Straw
Thomas B. Stryer
Steven H. Stryker
James G. Stuckey
Phillip G. Stueck
John P. Sudigala
Timothy B. Sullivan
Harvey I. Susswein
Stephen E. Sweaney
Toney M. Sweeney
John M. L. Sweet
Merrill F. Swiney
Harley H. Swink
Robert F. Szymanski
Lawrence P. Tabaka
John C. Tanner
James L. Taylor, Jr.
Patrick E. Taylor
James S. Thiel
James E. Thomas
Jerry L. Thomas
William S. Thomas, Jr.
Fred C. Thompson, Jr.
Grove G. Thompson, Jr.
Melvin E. Thompson, Jr.
William E. Thompson, Jr.
William G. Thompson
Henry F. Thorne, Jr.
Roger N. Thornton
Thomas J. Thornton
Lee F. Thurner, Jr.
Paul D. Towner III
Jack A. Tozier
James E. Trawinski
John L. Troutman
Lynn D. Trowbridge
Edmond G. Tucker
Paul A. Tummonds
Howard S. Turner
William A. Turner
James Tyng
John T. Unipan
Paul J. Valovich, Jr.
Frank P. Vanderploeg
Peter D. Vanlobensels
Stuart M. Vantine
Raymond V. Van Wolkenten, Jr.
Keith M. VanVelkinburgh
William C. Vaughn III
George A. S. Veronda
William M. Vick
John E. Vomastic
Richard A. Vorce
Gary J. Vulgamore
Howard E. Waddell
David L. Wagner
Richard H. Wagner
Niles A. Walker
Donald A. Wallis
Henry S. Walsh
George R. Walters
Victor Y. Walters
William H. Walton, Jr.
Allen R. Warmington
Kenton D. Warner
Edward O. Warren
Ramon L. Warren
James T. Watts
Gary W. Weber
William C. Webster
Paul Weeks
Darrell E. Weidauer
Larry K. Weittenhiller
James H. Wendt
Richard D. West
Charles S. Westbrook
Jimmie D. Westmoreland
David L. Wetherell
Timothy G. Wettack
John D. Whelan
Allan S. White
Guy W. Wicks
Edwin G. Wiggins
Clarence D. Wiles
Glennon J. Wilhelm
Klaus P. Wilhelm
Robert B. Wilkes
Ronald G. Wilkins
Clyde R. Williams
Gary A. Williams
John G. Williams
Ralph V. Williams
Richard B. Wilmot II
Charles A. Wilson
George K. Wilson
Ronald K. Wise
Ronald L. Wise
Richard B. Withington
Douglas M. Witt
Dennis L. Witzenburg
Ronald D. Wolfe
Richard E. Wolff
David A. Wolovick
Douglas C. Woodard
George B. Woodring, Jr.
Kenneth M. Woodward
Robert U. Woodward
William B. Worthington, Jr.
Charles T. Wright
Donald A. Wright III
Harold E. Wright
Jay K. Wright
James F. Wyatt, Jr.
Christian Y. Wyser-Pratte
Sterling N. Yoder, Jr.
William C. Young
William W. Young, Jr.
John E. Ystrom
William F. Zabor
James S. Zayicek
Gilbreath B. Zealer
Charles E. Zettle
John T. Zick, Jr.
Lee A. Ziegler
Bruce A. Zimmerman
Dennis M. Zimmerman
Ronald W. Ziolkowski
Walter D. Zitzkak
Joseph A. Zocher
Vincent P. Zodiaco
Ralph E. Zunich

The following-named graduates from Navy enlisted scientific education program to be permanent ensigns in the line of the Navy subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Erich H. Ashburn
Darrell L. Ashe
Gregory E. Bajuk
Warren H. Bakken
Darrel L. Bartelheimer
Robert G. Belcher
Donald B. Bell
Richard M. Berg
Patric E. Bonds
Kenneth W. Boyer
Albin P. Bukowick
Robert A. Cattabriga
Robert W. Cherry
John C. Cogswell III
George R. Crosby
Donavon C. Current
Richard L. Cutchin
Melvin C. Dowden
James E. Edwards
Bobby L. Faust
Peter C. Finne
Luther L. Fletcher III
Margaret A. Frederick
David L. Freeman
Robert A. Ford
Robert A. Ham
James F. Hampton
Cecil A. Harrison
Gregory G. Hartenstein
Donald D. Hazen
Louis A. Hettel
Lowell Hibbard
Ross G. Hibler
Gary D. Hickox
Dale F. Hicks
David O. Hinton
William E. Hulse
Henry A. Jatzek, Jr.
Delbert R. Kidd
Amon W. Manning, Jr.
Edward T. Martinez
Norman C. Meck
William R. Mitchell
Randall J. Moore
Seley E. Moore
William H. Odell
Randall E. Offutt
Dennis R. Oldson
Gary L. Pace
Peter P. Pappas
Martin J. Polsenski, Jr.
Ronald L. Potts
Donald A. Quinn
Marshall D. Rester
Philip M. Sanborn
Victor L. Scherzinger
Harold C. Schleicher, Jr.
John D. Schroder
Clair J. Schrodt
William T. Shenton
James R. Simon
Elvin B. Standrich
Robert D. Stolt
John W. Strother
Richard F. Tackett
Benjamin E. Thurston
Charles F. Tibbetts
Peter A. Trump
John D. Turner
Michael T. Vanecek
Paul E. VanHouten
Joseph F. Vargo
Clifford I. Waggoner
Dennis L. Wagner
John K. Warner
Carl L. Whisman
Kenneth J. Wiltshire
Bobby G. Wise
Thomas R. Wortham, Jr.
Daniel L. Young

Russell H. Mitchell (Naval Reserve officer) to be a permanent lieutenant commander and a temporary commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following-named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants and temporary lieutenant commanders in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Allen C. Minser
Leslie Wiener

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Michael B. Hussey
Revis W. James, Jr.
Jay H. Miller, Jr.
John E. Williams
Raphael F. Smith

Dirk Frauenfelder (civilian college graduate) to be a permanent lieutenant (junior grade) and a temporary lieutenant in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Edward G. Briscoe
William H. Browning, 3d
Robert M. Gay
Raul A. Morales
Joseph W. Plautz

The following named (Naval Reserve officers) to be permanent lieutenants (junior grade) and temporary lieutenants in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Jim P. Back
Nelson T. Crowell
John A. Dertinger
George S. Foster
Paul F. Regan
Gary C. Robinson
Jon E. Schiff
Richard W. Wickord

The following-named U.S. Navy officers to be reverted to permanent chief warrant officers, W-4 in the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Francis X. Baglioni
Clarence A. Devine
George W. McMillin
Frank D. Wilson

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following named (Naval Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

William J. Caldwell
William A. Davidson III
Patrick J. Kahler
David M. Kowalski
Allen A. Lindeman
John S. Lowery
Thomas J. Marziaz
John R. Moore
Donald E. Pellecchia

The following named (Army Reserve Officer Training Corps) for permanent appointment to the grade of second lieutenant in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Richard E. Waters

BOARD OF GOVERNORS, FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

Sherman J. Maisel, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of 14 years from February 1, 1958.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 1, 1965:

APPALACHIAN REGIONAL COMMISSION

John L. Sweeney, of Michigan, to be Federal Cochairman of the Appalachian Regional Commission.

U.S. ARMY

The following officer presently on the temporary disability retired list for reappointment to the active list under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 1211, 3442, and 3447, as indicated:

Maj. Gen. Hobart Hewett, O12328, U.S. Army, to be major general in the Regular Army of the United States, and as temporary major general in the Army of the United States.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

Sam Zagoria, of Maryland, to be a member of the National Labor Relations Board for the term of 5 years expiring December 16, 1969.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, APRIL 1, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer: Isaiah 58: 11: *The Lord shall guide thee continually and satisfy thy soul.*

Eternal God, our Father, grant that our aims and aspirations, purified and purged of all self-seeking and selfishness, may be well pleasing unto Thee.

Inspire us with a willingness to be channels and co-workers with Thee for the fulfillment of and the accomplishment of Thy divine purposes.

Make us to see more clearly that we are joined to all mankind in the very depth of our nature and help us discover the glory and splendor of that life which binds us one to another.

May we understand more clearly that, if we had the love, the faith, and the hope to rise to those heights to which Thou art continually calling us, what wonder and blessedness might be wrought among us and all men everywhere.

Hear us for the sake of our blessed Lord in whose name we offer our prayers and dedicate our lives. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

HOUSING SUBCOMMITTEE OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency have permission to sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs have permission to sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SUCCESSION TO THE PRESIDENCY AND VICE-PRESIDENCY

Mr. COLMER (on behalf of Mr. YOUNG), from the Committee on Rules, reported the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 314, Rept. No. 217), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES. 314

Resolved, That, upon the adoption of this resolution, it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the resolution (H.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office. After general debate, which shall be confined to the resolution and shall continue not to exceed four hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the resolution shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the resolution or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. After the passage of H.J. Res. 1, the Committee on the Judiciary shall be discharged from further consideration of S.J. Res. 1 and it shall then be in order in the House to move to strike out all after the resolving clause of said Senate joint resolution and to insert the provisions of H.J. Res. 1 as passed by the House.

ADDITIONAL TRAVEL AUTHORITY TO THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. COLMER (on behalf of Mr. YOUNG), from the Committee on Rules, filed the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 273, Rept. No. 218), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

H. RES 273

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 141, Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on Public Works is hereby authorized to send five of its members and two staff assistants to Lima, Peru, to attend the South American Regional Meeting of the International Road Federation from May 14, 1965, to May 24, 1965, inclusive.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provisions of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the committee and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided,* (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies or appropriated funds for subsistence in an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for oversea travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 59]

Adair
Ashley
Baldwin
Bow
Brown, Calif.
Byrnes, Wis.
Conte
Conyers
Curtis
Diggs
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Foley
Fulton, Tenn.
Gettys
Hawkins
Herlong
Hosmer
Jones, Ala.
McClory
MacGregor
Mackay
Mathias
Michel
Morton
Passman
Patman
Pepper
Powell
Purcell
Roberts
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Sisk
Smith, Iowa
Steed
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Watkins
Yates

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 393 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MANPOWER ACT OF 1965

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 305 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 305

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4257) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed two hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority members of the Committee on Education and Labor, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Education and Labor now in the bill and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the five-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], and pending that I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 305 provides for consideration of H.R. 4257, a bill to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes. The resolution provides an open rule with 2 hours of general debate, making it in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment now in the bill.

H.R. 4257 further amends the Manpower Development and Training Act in order to improve and strengthen the Nation's active manpower policy. The bill would extend the terminal date until June 30, 1968, continue 100-percent Federal financing until June 30, 1966, continue 100-percent Federal financing until June 30, 1966, and change State matching requirements thereafter to 10 percent of the costs of institutional training, in cash or kind. It also directs the Secretary of Labor to stimulate and assist job development programs to fill unmet service needs; expands the Secretary's research authority under title I, authorizing the use of grants as well as contracts, and providing explicit direction to undertake experimental and demonstration manpower projects; extends and increases the authorization for labor mobility demonstration projects and establishes trainee bonding demonstration project authority; liberalizes training allowances with respect to amount, duration, and eligibility; permits payment of daily commuting costs of trainees; rationalizes the national manpower training program by bringing the training program for redevelopment areas, now provided in the Area Redevelopment Act, under the Manpower Development and Training Act; and replaces the existing title-by-title limitation on annual appropriations with an open end authorization for the entire act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 305.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi, my colleague on the Committee on Rules [Mr. COLMER], explained not only the rule but the contents of the bill the rule makes in order with 2 hours of general debate. This bill would extend the Manpower Development and Training Act with certain amendments. It is my understanding the Committee on Education and Labor reported this measure unanimously. I know the Committee on Rules approved the rule without difficulty or controversy. It is entirely possible, inasmuch as this measure does carry a number of amendments and changes in the present act, that there may be some additional amendments offered on the floor of the House after general debate has closed. I know of no general opposition either in the rule or in this legislation itself in its present form.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4257) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 4257, with Mrs. GRIFFITHS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. POWELL. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Madam Chairman, I speak to this House today on behalf of H.R. 4257, a bill entitled "The Manpower Act of 1965." This bill comes from the Committee on Education and Labor and amends the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended.

The manpower development and training program established by that act is one of the most valuable weapons we have in this Nation's continuing battle to prevent the waste of our human resources and to realize the full productive potential of the American people. The new amendments to the act, proposed in H.R. 4257, are designed to make certain we will be able to use this weapon vigorously and effectively in the years ahead—and in all 50 States of this country.

The bill makes necessary changes in the act's present provisions for non-Federal matching contributions to Manpower Development and Training Act training costs. It also expands the eligibility for receipt of weekly subsistence allowances by trainees enrolled in the manpower development and training program. In several other ways it reduces the financial hardships that have discouraged some workers from taking training under the act and which have virtually forced some to drop out of training before completion. The bill further broadens the program to provide more adequate training for those with especially deprived educational backgrounds and to those capable of being trained for some of the advanced occupational skills that the Manpower Development and Training Act program has heretofore not been able to reach effectively.

These and other provisions of the bill will be presented in more detail by my fellow member of the Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Madam Chairman, I think a tribute should be paid to two of our colleagues, in particular, as we consider this bill. One is the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Labor. He, more than any other Member of this House, has been closely identified with the Manpower Development and Training Act ever since the early days of the 87th Congress, 4 years ago, when he first began the extensive hearings on manpower and automation problems which led ultimately to the passage of the act. The gentleman from Pennsylvania can be justly proud of his legislative accomplishments in making the manpower development and training program a reality and in securing the passage of further legislation which he introduced in 1963 to amend the act in a number of valuable ways. It is his bill, introduced on behalf of the administration, which we consider today as we again seek to improve this act by new amendments.

The other Member to whom special mention should be accorded is the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], one of the most effective leaders in the effort that originally created the Manpower Development and Training Act. During February, in the unavoidable absence of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Michigan very ably chaired the select subcommittee through 2 weeks of hearings on the bill before us today. He has an exceptionally fine understanding of the manpower development and training program, and I know of no one better qualified to explain to this House the need for keeping this indispensable program alive and healthy.

As I stand here today, I cast my mind back 4 years to the month of March 1961, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania opened the first day of hearings of his ad hoc Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation—a subcommittee which I had established as one of my earliest acts after becoming chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. I spoke to the large audience present, before I turned the hearing over to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and told them that these "might well be the most important hearings in this Congress concerning domestic issues during this session."

As it turned out, those hearings paved the way for the Manpower Development and Training Act—one of the first and most creative items of major legislation that has come from the Committee on Education and Labor during my tenure as chairman. We reported the Manpower Act from the committee in August 1961, with unusually strong bipartisan support from our committee members. We were unable to get it to the floor of this House for final action until February 1962 but, when it at last came before this House, it was passed by a great bipartisan majority. I would like to congratulate those here today, on both sides of the aisle, who voted 3 years ago to establish the manpower development and training program. They showed, by their votes, their deep concern for our unemployed workers and by their faith that unemployed Americans would respond vigorously to an opportunity to gain new skills that would help restore them to jobs. I am happy to be able to say that their faith was not misplaced.

Four years ago, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania's subcommittee opened hearings on unemployment and the impact of automation, the Nation's unemployment rate was just a shade under 7 percent. One American worker out of fifteen was without a job and looking for work. Since then, we have made some progress, it is true. Today, the unemployment rate stands at approximately 5 percent. One out of every 20 workers in America, rather than 1 out of every 15, is now unemployed and seeking a job.

But let us not allow this gradual improvement—over a period of 4 years—to make us complacent, or to blur our perception of the great human waste still created by this Nation's stubborn unemployment problem. A 5-percent rate of unemployment is intolerably high and needlessly high. If we look across the Atlantic, we see that almost every one of the democratic nations of Western Europe has an unemployment rate below ours, and which has been below ours for years. And not just slightly below ours. Their rates of unemployment are typically one-half, or even less, the rate in the United States.

What the democracies of Western Europe have done, we can do. We also can push our unemployment rate down to an acceptably low level—if we are really determined to do so, and if we energetically carry out the policies which are necessary. One of these policies, and one of the most important, is the maintenance of an adequate manpower development and training program.

In this so-called affluent society of ours, let us not forget that last year, 1964, some 13 to 14 million Americans experienced involuntary unemployment at some time or another during the year. Let us also not forget that in February of this year, the latest month for which we have official figures, there were 4,200,000 unemployed workers in this country. Think of that for a moment: more than 4 million jobless Americans looking for work. Of these, more than 1 million had been vainly seeking jobs for 15 weeks or longer—1 million of our fellow citizens who had been suffering continuously from unemployment for more than 3 months. And, as of this February, over 400,000 of our workers had been without jobs for more than 6 months.

These 400,000 workers, incidentally, who had borne the crushing burden of unemployment for 6 straight months or more, constitute a much larger group than the total number of people we expect to train under the Manpower Development and Training Act in the coming year. I advise anyone who hears claims that the Manpower Development and Training Act program is unnecessarily large just to look at the number to whom Manpower Development and Training Act training can be given in any one year. Then compare that number to the massive ranks of the unemployed in this Nation.

There are other aspects of the unemployment problem that we should call to mind. In February of this year, more than 1 million workers who normally work full time were only able to get part-time employment. These workers were not counted as among our unemployed—but they certainly were not fully and productively employed. In addition, there were thousands of other Americans who were not actually counted as unemployed only because they had become too discouraged and demoralized to continue an apparently hopeless search for work. They thus dropped out of the Nation's labor force. We have now learned—as a result of the manpower research provided for under title I of the Manpower Development and Training Act—how frequently disadvantaged workers, those with little education or skill training, are found to have dropped entirely out of the labor force, and thus right out of our official unemployment statistics.

Finally, we should not forget that the unemployment rate for nonwhite workers continues—as it has for years—to be more than twice the rate for white workers. This great gap becomes even wider when we look just at those who are the victims of 6 months or more of long-term unemployment. Whatever the overall, average rate of unemployment may become in this country, we will never reach a truly acceptable situation until we have lifted the disproportionately heavy load of unemployment that has borne down so harshly, for so long, on the members of our society who are the victims of inadequate education and racial discrimination.

The Manpower Development and Training Act is not directed exclusively toward the unemployed worker since it establishes a broad and flexible program for raising the skill level of the American labor force. Employed workers as well as the unemployed can also be helped under the program to gain new skills. But the act gives top priority, in selection for training, to the unemployed. The act focused when it was first conceived, primarily upon the unemployed adult, with substantial previous work experience, particularly the unemployed worker with dependents. And this is still the act's central focus although the act was amended in 1963 to make Manpower Development and Training Act training accessible to a somewhat larger proportion of young workers without family responsibilities.

If we look in detail at the manpower development and training program, we find that almost 90 percent of the trainees who have been enrolled so far were totally unemployed at the time they were selected for training. Of these, about half had been vainly striving to find work for 3 months or more and almost one-third for 6 months or longer. These Manpower Development and Training Act trainees, in other words, have been drawn in large proportion from American workers who clearly faced very severe difficulties in finding jobs without training in new skills. This fact makes the rate of success in placing these trainees, once they have completed Manpower Development and Training Act training, even more impressive.

I shall point up very briefly a few more facts describing the workers we have been training under this program. More than 25 percent of them have been nonwhite—which is slightly higher than the proportion of nonwhite workers suffering from long-term unemployment in the United States. More than half of the trainees have been the heads of families, and about one-fourth have been workers with three or more dependents. Over two-thirds of the trainees have had 3 or more years of previous work experience. These are experienced workers whose jobs have disappeared and who now need to acquire new skills in order to get reestablished in secure and productive employment.

In conclusion, let me remind this House that the Manpower Development and Training Act was born, in part, out of the conviction that an unemployment compensation check or a relief check is just not enough. The unemployment insurance office or the public welfare board can hand out enough money to keep the unemployed worker and his family from actually starving or freezing to death, but we will never be able to estimate the extent to which millions of Americans have had their lives shortened from malnutrition and inability to get decent medical care, as a direct result from unemployment. Still a handout of money is no compensation for the unemployed worker's feeling that he is rejected, that he is useless, that there is no place for him in this great productive economy of ours. How does it feel to spend week after week asking for a job and be turned down time and time again? Thousands of the people who have been trained under the Manpower Developing and Training Act know exactly how it feels, because this was their painful experience before they entered training. What the Manpower Development Training Act program offered them was not just a weekly check, but something far more important—a chance to equip themselves with skills that would help them to escape from the demoralizing, spirit-corroding status of being unemployed.

Madam Chairman, I believe the Manpower Development and Training Act to be one of the great acts of social legislation in our Nation's history. I am confident that this House will further strengthen this act by passing the bill we have before us today, and that it will pass it by a massive bipartisan majority.

Madam Chairman, this bill has a peculiar personal interest for me. When I became chairman, even before the Congress met to formalize my chairmanship, the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland], telephoned me the day after election in November and said, "Let us do something about the problem of automation."

Beginning the second day after election in Washington we worked together on this bill during November and December. Mr. Holland is the father of this bill. This is the first definitive bill to tackle the problem of automation. It is a totally new idea and as all new ideas do, it eventually comes to the place where it needs to be examined and strengthened. This is what we are doing here today.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] has done yeoman service as the acting chairman of this subcommittee during the unfortunate illness of our beloved colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland.]

I would like to bring before the House a few pertinent facts about this new concept and point out that 6,700 projects for nearly 320,000 trainees were approved during the first 29 months of the operation of the Manpower Development and Training Act. Projects are still being processed. Through December of last year 91,000 enrollees have completed their course in both the institutional and on-the-job training programs.

The proof, even though this is a new idea—and it was a good one—is the fact that these people who were unemployable or unemployed were unemployable because they lacked skills or were unemployed because they had skills but did not have the opportunity to use them.

Madam Chairman, 75 percent of the trainees in these courses have now been placed in jobs. This one fact alone in terms of taking people off the public welfare roll, reducing social security welfare payments, and increasing income from State and Federal taxes has more than paid for the cost of this legislation so far.

Also, Madam Chairman, in the on-the-job training program, 90 percent of the men and women who receive training in the on-the-job training program have been placed and are employed.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLLAND. Madam Chairman, in the two previous sessions the Members of Congress have acted on manpower training legislation.

In the 87th Congress, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 was passed. For the benefit of our new Members this session, I would like to say this legislation resulted from a personal survey I conducted, immediately following President Kennedy's election, and public hearings of an ad hoc Subcommittee on Unemployment and the Impact of Automation which Chairman Powell created and to which he appointed me chairman, early in 1961. With unemployment and its ever-increasing rate of growth considered as a most important domestic problem—all avenues were explored in an effort to find a satisfactory solution.

The Manpower Development and Training Act program—with its provisions to retrain heads of families in the newer, needed skills—to replace those which automation had made obsolete—appeared to be the most logical approach to those of us who had seriously studied this problem. This act also provided funds for demonstration and experimental programs aimed at discovering the best methods for retraining our unemployed. The new Members might be surprised to know that this legislation was considered "revolutionary" by some for it had the Federal Government accept the responsibility of trying to rehabilitate our unemployed. However, when this act was finally passed in March 1962, it was hailed as the "first piece of constructive labor legislation passed by Congress since 1938."

Occupational training courses started officially in September 1962 as appropriations for the program were delayed that year. It did not take long for the administrators of the act to find out that we had overestimated the ability of our unemployed and underestimated the fundamental requirements necessary for retraining in the needed skills.

The 88th Congress was called upon—early in 1963—to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act program and provide, in addition to the 52 weeks of occupational training, 20 weeks of academic educational training, as only one out of seven applicants for training under the Manpower Development and Training Act could qualify. We were also requested to extend full Federal financing of this program for fiscal year 1964 as the States did not have sufficient time to provide appropriations to cover the required 50 percent of costs.

Extensive hearings were held by the Select Subcommittee on Labor and the Manpower Development and Training Act program was enlarged and extended with full Federal coverage of the costs for the period through June 30, 1965, with the States required to pay, after that date, one-third the cost of the program. The amendments were passed in December 1963.

Today, as chairman of the Select Subcommittee on Labor, I ask the Members of the 89th Congress to pass the amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act program—amendments which again broaden the coverage of the program, lengthen the training period, increase the subsistence allowance in specific cases, and make other provisions including the extension of full Federal financing for 1 more year—fiscal year 1966—with the States share, starting July 1, 1966, being reduced to only 10 percent in cash or kind.

The success of this program, in respect to reclaiming individuals and restoring their ability to become self-sufficient once more, is well known. The records show that between 70 and 80 percent of those, who have completed their training, are now employed. The fact that no opposition was raised in the Full Committee on Education and Labor, when this legislation was reported out, demonstrates not only bipartisan support but also the sincere recognition of the need for the continuation of this program.

It is no secret that our national economy has a growth rate of 5 percent—and conditions are considered very good—but it also is apparent that we are having quite a bit of trouble in our attempt to get our rate of unemployment under 5 percent and keep it going down.

We are witnessing a decided change in our economy—a change brought about by the new technological developments in the industrial segment of our society. According to a Brookings Institute study:

> Industry is getting more output for each dollar invested (from 1948 to 1962, a gain of 28 percent, and is spending proportionately less for new plant and equipment (from 10 percent of the GNP in 1956 to 8½ percent in 1963). As a result wholesale prices stay stable, capacity exceeds demand, output keeps growing but jobs stay scarce.

All of us realize that the use of computers is just beginning. Let me assure all concerned, no one advocates the elimination of them, for, without them our Nation would not remain a world leader nor could we hope to ever explore space. We do know, however, that computers will accelerate the use of automated equipment in many fields of employment and workers will be displaced. Right now the rate of displacement is said to be around 35,000 jobs a week, and, were it not for automation, thousands of others would have been hired. Time magazine reports:

> If U.S. industry were to automate its factories to the extent that is now possible—not to speak of the new possibilities opening up each year—millions of jobs would be eliminated.

In 1962—here in Congress—I stated that "automation is the problem of the present and the promise of the future." We cannot help but feel that automation is certain to liberate both manpower and brainpower to tackle tasks once considered impossible and meet human needs now felt impracticable. In the meantime, however, we feel just as strongly that those, hurt by this progress, must be helped—and those yet too young to realize the impact must be adequately educated and prepared to live and work in a highly technical world.

I shall not discuss the amendments in length; however, I firmly believe they are necessary if we hope to see our presently unemployed get back to work, as well as those who will be unemployed through no fault of their own, and permit these people to be active members of our Government. Frankly, I know very, very few who would rather receive from the Government in place of contributing towards its upkeep.

May I remind the Members, your vote today on this legislation before us will help determine the Nation's economy tomorrow.

Madam Chairman, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, the bill before us today, introduced and sponsored by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] is a further step in the effort to provide a chance for American workers who are without the skills necessary to secure and hold substantially gainful employment. It represents the latest chapter in a struggle begun many years ago by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] to rescue from the human scrap heap of prolonged joblessness millions of our fellow citizens who needed to work and wanted to work but could not find a market for their labor. I would like to begin my remarks by paying tribute to the fight made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania for these neglected members of our labor force. It was a continuing struggle that he sometimes carried on nearly alone in which he persevered despite all obstacles. Its fruit is the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, one of the most successful programs ever adopted by the Congress. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has now proposed amendments to strengthen and improve this program which are embodied in H.R. 4257, the bill before us today.

It is a bill which has received the endorsement of both the majority and minority members of the Committee on Education and Labor. It is also a bill whose prompt enactment by the Congress is essential in order to preserve the manpower development and training program. This program, in the 2½ years since it began in the fall of 1962, has made an impressive contribution in restoring thousands of Americans to productive employment. Those of us who have watched the Manpower Development and Training Act program since its inception can testify to the satisfaction we have felt as it has demonstrated its value to our society.

The manpower development and training program was initiated in 1962 with exceptional bipartisan support in both Houses of the Congress—as was shown by the large majorities that voted to pass the original act. Since 1962, the program has proven itself a success, and has developed an even broader base of bipartisan support. The act was amended in important respects in late 1963—again by very large majorities in both Houses—and the additional amendments proposed on behalf of the administration this year have received a strongly favorable response. Manpower development and training is not, therefore, a controversial program. It is now well established and almost universally recognized to be one of the indispensable elements in this Nation's determined attack upon the problems of unemployment and waste of our human resources.

The select subcommittee held 8 days of hearings in February on the bill. Without exception, the witnesses who came before us, and others who submitted written statements, expressed enthusiastic support for continuing and expanding the manpower program. No one requested time to testify against the bill, and no statements in opposition were received. The bill was reported favorably from the full Committee on Education and Labor on March 4, without a dissenting vote, and with several improving amendments, including amendments proposed by minority members of the committee. There was no minority report.

Madam Chairman, I shall discuss briefly what has been and is being accomplished under the Manpower Development and Training Act program. By the time all the regular title II training projects that so far have been approved and given commitments of funds are completed—in addition to those projects that have already been completed—this program will have successfully equipped well over 300,000 American workers with new and much-needed skills. About 90 percent of these trainees, we should note, were totally unemployed before they entered Manpower Development and Training Act training, and practically all of the remainder were part-time workers or underemployed in jobs that did not fully use their potential productive capacity. In addition to these trainees I have just described—those enrolled in the standard title II training projects—the Manpower Development and Training Act program will also have given counseling, basic education, training, placement, and other services to approximately 60,000 more persons in the special experimental, demonstration, and pilot projects that have been designed for workers in our society with especially severe employment problems. These experimental and demonstration projects have constituted an extremely valuable part of the Manpower Development and Training Act program, and have contributed to improving techniques for assisting such groups as older workers displaced by automation, workers handicapped by extremely limited educational backgrounds, nonwhite workers, and members of other racial minorities, members of low-income farm families who are struggling to make the transition to employment in urban areas, and young workers who dropped out of school because they were unable to adjust to formal academic education.

This, then, is the record of the Manpower Development and Training Act program. With the funds Congress has appropriated for its first 2½ years of operation, a total of almost 400,000 workers, by the end of this fiscal year, will have been involved in projects that are completed or under way.

Has the program been worthwhile? There is no question about it. The placement rate for those who have completed Manpower Development and Training Act institutional training projects has been approximately 73 percent. That is, almost three-fourths of these trainees are shown as having been placed in jobs within 90 days after completing a course of training. For the relatively smaller group of trainees who have completed Manpower Development and Training Act on-the-job training projects, the placement rate has been about 94 percent—this higher rate, of course, being a reflection of the fact that most on-the-job trainees begin their training in the establishment of employers who expect to keep them on as permanent employees after the training period, while trainees in the institutional projects must go into the labor market to seek jobs when their training is over.

We can say, therefore, that around three-fourths of those who complete their prescribed course of training are finding jobs within a relatively short time after completion. This is a very solid achievement—especially in view of the fact that 9 out of 10 Manpower Development and Training Act trainees have been drawn from the ranks of the unemployed, and that a high proportion had been without jobs for 3 months, 6 months, a year or even longer before they were selected for training. Indeed, this is an achievement substantially greater than had been anticipated by many who voted, 3 years ago, to pass the Manpower Development and Training Act. The Manpower Development and Training Act program has more than fulfilled the hopes of its original supporters. It is putting thousands of Americans back to work—including great numbers whose long, frustrating search for decent employment seemed almost hopeless before Manpower Development Training Act training provided them with new skills.

The cost of the program, when set alongside the results being achieved, is a modest one for a great nation like the United States to pay. Looking at the institutional training projects and the on-the-job training projects combined, we have found that the direct cost of training one worker—including the cost of weekly subsistence allowances to those eligible for them—has so far averaged around $1,200 or $1,300. And no consideration has been given, in estimating this average cost, to the fact that a significant part of the cost of the weekly allowances actually just takes the place of unemployment compensation benefits or welfare and relief payments that otherwise would have been paid to many Manpower Development Training Act trainees.

The cost of training can be fully and completely measured in terms of dollars and cents. The benefits, of course, cannot be. It is impossible to put a price tag on the value of a worker, and the members of his family, receive when he is reclaimed from the industrial scrap heap, when his self-confidence is restored through the acquisition of a new and marketable skill. These are benefits that can accumulate over the lifetime of the worker—and even over the lifetime of his children, whose own motivation and chances of becoming productive members of our society may be greatly damaged if their father falls into the discouraged condition of the chronically unemployed.

The desirability of manpower training hardly needs to be defended at all, if the alternative is stagnation and demoralization. I doubt that there is a Member of this House who would contend that it is preferable for an unemployed worker—whether from the standpoint of his own interest or the interest of our society—to spend weeks and months in self-destructive idleness, rather than be engaged in skill training which can offer him even a fair fighting chance of regaining a place in the world of work.

If we confine ourselves just to those benefits from training that can be roughly estimated in dollars and cents, however, the clear indication is that manpower training is a very worthwhile investment in human beings. The Manpower Development and Training Act training program is still so young relatively, that only very limited information is yet available on the incomes and earnings, over a period of time, of those who have completed training. But I would like to summarize very briefly one of the few studies so far published on this question—a study carried out, with a grant from the Ford Foundation, under the direction of one of the country's most distinguished labor economists, Gerald Somers at the University of Wisconsin. This study examined the post-training experience of approximately 500 previously unemployed workers who completed either ARA or State-sponsored training courses in West Virginia, and compared their experience with that of a control group of unemployed West Virginians, of comparable background. Observations over a period of several years clearly demonstrated that the first group—those who had completed training—enjoyed a very significant advantage over the control group with respect to stability of employment and with respect to the incomes they were able to earn. The conclusion of this University of Wisconsin study was that it had produced strong evidence that the benefits and potential benefits of manpower retraining substantially outweigh the costs.

In concluding my comments on the question of the cost of Manpower Development and Training Act training, I want to make two points, to help us see this program in perspective. First, the total amount paid out to unemployed American workers in weekly unemployment compensation benefits last year, 1964, was more than $2½ billion. By contrast, the amount of Manpower Development and Training Act funds committed for the payment of weekly training allowances during the year was not over 5 or 6 percent of this figure. For every dollar we committed to support a Manpower Development and Training Act trainee last year, while he undertook training, at least $15 to $20 was paid out in benefits to unemployed workers who were not being trained.

Secondly, the total number of workers whom the Department of Labor expects to be able to train under title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act program, during fiscal 1966—on the basis of the proposed administration budget—is approximately 275,000. This number is little more than one-third of 1 percent of the total number of people now in the American labor force. When we consider the high rate of productivity increase and of technological change in our economy, with its constant destruction of old jobs and creation of new job opportunities—and when we consider that the Manpower Development and Training Act program is now providing new skills to only about one-third of 1 percent of our labor force each year—then I think the proper question to be asked is not whether we are trying to do too much with Manpower Development and Training Act, but whether we are trying to do too little.

Madam Chairman, I will now discuss the main provisions of the bill we have before us, to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act.

This bill extends the life of the Manpower Development and Training Act program to June 30, 1968—that is, for 2 years beyond its presently scheduled expiration date of June 30, 1966. This extension for only 2 years does not indicate that members of the Committee on Education and Labor believe there is a possibility that we may not need a manpower development and training program after 1968. It simply reflects the view that the Manpower Development and Training Act program should be reexamined, within a reasonable period of time, by the committee, in order to develop any legislative action that the future may reveal is needed to improve the program.

The bill provides a 1-year extension, to June 30, 1966, of complete Federal financing of the Manpower Development and Training Act program. After fiscal 1966, a non-Federal contribution of 10 percent will be required for the costs—exclusive of the costs of training allowances—of institutional training under title II. This provision maintains the requirement of a non-Federal matching share, but it also sets that share at a level which will not threaten our ability to keep the Manpower Development and Training Act program going ahead in high gear. There is no doubt that this is a successful program, and that it is an essential program, for our unemployed workers and for the health of our economy. But there is also no doubt that most States—not all, but most—cannot take on a large share of the cost of the program. The provision we have in this bill, therefore, reflects the hard reality of the fiscal situation that faces practically all of our States.

The bill brings under Manpower Development and Training Act the separate training program which, since 1961, has been operated under authority of the Area Redevelopment Act. That act is scheduled to expire on July 1 of this year, but the administration is proposing to maintain the designation of redevelopment areas, which are to be eligible for special Federal assistance. Part of the Manpower Development and Training Act appropriation, from fiscal 1966 on, is expected to be specifically set aside for training in these redevelopment areas. The training projects in these areas will differ relatively little from other Manpower Development and Training Act projects. The chief points of difference are that the Secretary of Commerce will share responsibility with the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare for redevelopment area training, and that any unemployed or underemployed individual in these areas may be eligible to receive a regular weekly subsistance allowance when selected for training, whether or not he meets the usual manpower development and training act eligibility requirements with respect to previous work experience, age, and family status.

This bill consolidates all research, experimental, developmental, demonstration, and pilot projects under title I of the act, and explicitly directs the Secretary of Labor to carry out such projects. It also increases somewhat the total allowed spending for the special labor mobility demonstration projects that were authorized by our amendments to the act of 1963, and extends to June 30, 1967, the deadline for concluding these projects. Under title I, the bill also directs the Secretary of Labor to carry out two more specifically named types of projects: First, a job development program to explore means of creating new employment opportunities, primarily in the service trades; second, a trainee placement assistance project, which will be a 2-year experimental undertaking designed chiefly to assist the placement of trainees with police records who need to be bonded for many types of employment and who find it difficult or virtually impossible to be accepted for bonding by commercial surety companies.

Another provision of the bill extends the period for which a trainee may receive a training allowance to a maximum of 104 weeks. The act presently limits allowances to a maximum of 52 weeks, if the trainee is engaged in strictly occupational training, or to a maximum of 72 weeks, if he is in a course which includes training in basic education skills as well as occupational training. This provision of the bill, let me emphasize, is not intended to produce a large increase in the average planned length of the Manpower Development and Training Act training projects. But it will give flexibility to the program in two desirable respects—first, by allowing longer periods of remedial instruction in basic education skills for trainees with especially deprived educational backgrounds, and; secondly, by enabling the Manpower Development and Training Act training projects to be instituted for a variety of the more highly skilled and technical occupations which are presently beyond effective reach of the program, under a limit of 52 weeks for occupational training.

The bill contains a set of provisions designed to reduce the financial hardships that bear upon many Manpower Development and Training Act trainees, and thereby encourage more individuals to enter training and to remain in training until their prescribed courses are completed. These provisions make single people, living apart from their families, eligible for the first time for regular training allowances. Also, eligibility for allowances is now extended to more than one member of a family, provided that the family head is unemployed. The amount of the allowance that can be paid is increased for one category of trainees—those with more than two dependents. For each dependent beyond two, the allowance may be increased by $5. The maximum increase, however, is $20—which could be received by a trainee with six or more dependents. The final provision to be mentioned in this group is one which authorizes the payment of daily transportation costs for trainees, to and from the location of the training site. Since these costs can mount up to $3 to $5 a week in many cases, which is a much more than nominal proportion of the trainee's weekly allowance, the committee has endorsed the administration's proposal to begin defraying these costs.

The few remaining provisions of the bill are of a technical or minor nature, and I will only take time at this point to comment upon one of them. That is the provision which authorizes Federal payment of up to 100 percent of the cost of Manpower Development and Training Act projects assigned to private educational and training institutions, even after the 10-percent matching provision becomes effective at the end of fiscal 1966. This provision has been incorporated in the bill because the committee recognized that many States will be very reluctant to put up part of the costs of training projects outside the public vocational school facilities. Yet there are quite a few projects which can be most effectively and rapidly carried out in private institutions. The committee is convinced that it would be undesirable to reduce greatly the participation of well-qualified private institutions in the Manpower Development and Training Act program. For that reason, it has written into the bill this exception to the non-Federal 10-percent matching requirement.

Madam Chairman, I think this is an excellent bill and that its passage will mark an important step toward improving the manpower development and training program and solidly establishing it for the future on a sound, viable basis.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. The authority which was transferred from the ARA to Manpower Development here only has to do with training, does it not?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. WAGGONNER. No authority is intended to interfere in any way with future ARA project grants?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I want to assure the gentleman from Louisiana that that will be a separate matter which will be brought before the House at an appropriate time from a different committee. All we are attempting to do here is to increase administrative efficiency by including any training done in redevelopment areas under the provisions of this act.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Are there any other programs in addition to ARA that are brought under this Manpower Training Act?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. No. There are others that perhaps should be, but there are no others in this bill.

Mr. GROSS. I had hoped the gentleman could say that all of these training programs had been brought together under one tent.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I think the gentleman's suggestion is well taken. I hope we can discuss these further during the debate today.

Mr. AYRES. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Madam Chairman, this has been one of the most constructive pieces of legislation enacted in recent years to assist people in getting gainful employment. Fortunately, it has not been a partisan issue in any way. The subcommittee members and the committee members have worked diligently and have come here today with a bill that both sides agree should be passed. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], the ranking member of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. QUIE], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL] have done a superb job.

It will be recalled that several years ago when many amendments were offered and Mr. GOODELL was active in the legislation at that time it was predicted that this would be one of the most constructive laws in this field. That has proven to be the case.

Madam Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK], ranking minority member of the subcommittee, 3 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Madam Chairman, I rise not to point out any inadequacies in this bill, but to refer to the fact we have a continuing obligation to proceed in the direction this bill indicates. It is important that we continue to perfect this program.

One of the main objections I stressed when this bill originally passed was duplication and a certain amount of overlapping in existing programs. Some of the overlapping is not really significant. To some degree there is overlapping in the existing vocational training program, but this is not an important factor.

One of the areas of overlapping, which was very significant, has been handled by this bill, due to the consideration and study of the gentleman from Michigan, and other members of the committee. That of course is the Area Redevelopment Administration program, commonly called ARA.

I think this is basically a step forward to prevent duplication, to bring existing efforts under one general program. I would point out at the same time that we do have a continuing obligation to incorporate other similar programs into the Manpower Development and Training Act. Again, I know the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA] has recognized this and has been very diligent in this field. Even after the enactment of this bill, the improvement of this law, there will still be overlapping in several important areas.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I and all the members of the committee are aware of the gentleman's interest in making this more efficient. We share his belief that we ought to consider the entire field of training and we hope to do that in the very near future.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I particularly thank the gentleman from Michigan because this has been one of the most constructive subcommittees I have had the opportunity to serve on. Under the provisions of this bill, the ARA is brought into manpower development training. We do have existing programs which at the present time should be considered, although we are not going to offer amendments to this specific bill.

I read the following from page 127 of the President's manpower report transmitted to the Congress in March of 1965, to give you an idea of the further obligation of our committee in studying these programs:

> It is still too early to evaluate the Economic Opportunity Act programs.

That is the Economic Opportunity Act, the so-called poverty program.

> The law has been in effect only 6 months. By the end of the current fiscal year, these programs are expected to be providing work training for some 200,000 young people.

It can be seen that there is at the present time one basic program which is operating simultaneously with the manpower development and training program. There is also another program which I hope in the future we will consider incorporating in the provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act. You all recall when we passed the Trade Expansion Act there were provisions for basic training or retraining, as the case might be, where workers were harmed by the effect of imports. This program has not been very fully implemented yet but undoubtedly it will be in the future. It is important, I hope, that we as members of the committee in the further study of this bill will endeavor to incorporate into this act the provisions of the Trade Expansion Act which provide for training in the case of those employees who are hurt by the impact of imports.

I also hope the Economic Opportunity Act provisions providing for retraining can at least be coordinated with this program if they are not, indeed, placed under the efficient leadership that is offered by the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Mr. GROSS. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Ought not this bringing together of the training programs to have come in this bill? The Trade Expansion Act is embodied in the program, and the poverty program, too. How do you get them in?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I share the gentleman's concern, but I also feel the subcommittee has done a very admirable job of recognizing this problem and bringing the ARA into this bill. We are considering further the inclusion of other programs. There are also programs being advocated regarding those on the farm who may be moved off the farm, programs of that type, which we hope will be incorporated in this program. So we have made progress.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS].

Mr. DANIELS. Madam Chairman, I want to underscore my support for H.R. 4257 and also focus particular attention on some aspects of the task of manpower training which must be given increased emphasis. The Manpower Development and Training Act has been in operation for 2½ years, and the Nation and thousands of individuals have benefited from its provisions. Nevertheless, the size of the yet unaccomplished task is so great in dimension and in its variety of problems that new and imaginative techniques must be provided to meet the challenge. I call your attention, therefore, to the provision of the bill before us which directs the Manpower Development and Training Act administrators to maintain a much-needed program of research and of experimental and demonstration projects.

Research, experimentation, and demonstration are indispensable adjuncts to an effective Federal manpower training program. The resources of the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare must be combined with those of all community agencies that can contribute innovations to the total training effort on a broad and continuing basis. Much of the experimental and demonstration effort under the Manpower Act thus far has been conducted by the Department of Labor and has been concerned with finding special counseling, testing, and referral techniques. These are vital needs—and there is an equally important need for finding unique training methods that benefit all types of individuals, with diverse backgrounds, in a multitude of occupational areas.

There are groups of individuals who continue to have especially serious employment problems and for whom provisions of the Manpower Development and Training Act and H.R. 4257 are uniquely designed. Manpower Development and Training Act experience has shown that new approaches and methods are required to meet the needs of disadvantaged worker groups, such as the undereducated, the non-English speaking, the migrant workers, out-of-school and out-of-work youths, older workers, minority groups, the physically and mentally handicapped, and others. New approaches are needed to provide jobs and occupational training for the more than a million unemployed workers with less than 8 years of schooling, for older workers who comprise about 40 percent of the long-term unemployed, for the nonwhite workers who have double their proportionate burden of unemployment, for the unskilled and semiskilled workers who account for one-third of the unemployed, and other similarly disadvantaged worker groups.

Progress has been made in alleviating the burdens of unemployment among these severely disadvantaged workers. Up to this time, a limited experimental and demonstration program has been undertaken under title II of the Manpower Development and Training Act. The projects have tested and evaluated new or improved approaches and techniques for testing, counseling, motivating, finding jobs for and training groups of workers with especially difficult employment or training problems. They have arranged for critical supportive social services and supplemental financial assistance in order to prevent dropouts and to insure successful job placement. They have utilized a wide variety of community, educational, employment, labor, and local government organizations with special expertise in solving or investigating the problems of the target groups.

By January 1, 1965, over 110 projects, serving some 60,000 individuals had been authorized. The results of some of these projects have already been put to work in improving services to unemployed workers in regular Manpower Development and Training Act operations and in attacking complicated manpower problems.

Nevertheless, the remaining real challenge is that of marshaling additional know-how to cope with the problems of these severely disadvantaged workers. The amendments in H.R. 4257 are pointed toward expanding our tools and facilities for research and experimentation under title I of the act. These will be stepping stones in learning how to treat causes rather than symptoms of our still present manpower problems, and in opening up job opportunities which might otherwise be closed for reasons which may no longer apply.

In H.R. 4257, we now give the experimental and demonstration program the dignity of statutory language to acknowledge its rightful place in the total range of Manpower Development and Training Act activities. Such legislative authority will provide specific impetus for the Secretary of Labor to initiate a wide variety of imaginative and pioneering experimental and demonstration manpower projects to meet the needs and problems of workers, areas, industries, and occupations with severe or unique employment or training problems. This type of pioneering pays for itself many times over by improving regular training projects under the Manpower Development and Training Act and by guiding industries, communities, organizations, and the Nation to the solution of our manpower problems.

In concluding, I would like to call attention to the excellent cooperation of the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare—working closely with public authorities and private groups at the State and local level—in developing new techniques for reaching and training our disadvantaged workers. New methods of training have already been achieved as a result of the individual imagination and ingenuity of vocational educators, in cooperation with public institutions and private business. For example, here in the District of Columbia, private business is providing unique training methods to prepare persons for certain data processing jobs in a relatively short time. I have asked unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD, at the conclusion of my remarks, a brief description of this and certain other interesting projects that have been developed by vocational educators in cooperation with public employment service officials under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

But these efforts by educators so far are limited in scope. A massive change in training practices can come only through an extensive research, experimental, and demonstration program which includes participation by vocational educators who have the responsibility to provide institutional training as well as supplementary or related classroom instruction for on-the-job training.

The amendment to the act expanding the research, experimental, and demonstration program is designed to provide the Secretaries of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare with the tools they need to coadminister this important activity and learn more about how to develop and implement effective testing, guidance, counseling, referral, institutional training, on-the-job training, job development, and placement programs.

I am gratified to see this provision in the bill. It would not have been as good a bill without it.

Madam Chairman, I include the following:

SOME SPECIAL EXPERIMENTAL AND DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS DEVELOPED BY VOCATIONAL EDUCATORS IN COOPERATION WITH PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OFFICIALS UNDER PROVISIONS OF THE MANPOWER AND TRAINING ACT—ADDITIONAL INNOVATIONS IN MANPOWER TRAINING PROGRAMS

1. Basic communications skills were provided in manpower training programs in St. Louis, Philadelphia, and other cities for socioeconomic and educationally handicapped persons long before the first amendments to the act.

2. Project "Prepare" in the District of Columbia in which some persons with less than a high school education are receiving unique training by private business in data processing jobs by combining basic education, technical instruction, and machine practice at significantly reduced class hours of instruction.

3. High school graduation was tied into a telephone occupations training program in California to meet employer requirements.

4. The Forest Service has provided technical instruction in manpower training programs in Washington, Oregon, and other States.

5. A sewage and sanitation maintenance facility in Missouri serves much of western United States in this specialized occupational area.

6. We are providing training that reaches across traditional political subdivisions by serving persons with special needs in large regional areas. A manpower center in Iowa serves regional needs in data processing occupations. We are now working with the National Farmers Union for needed rural manpower training on a regional basis in the States of Kentucky, Virginia, and West Virginia; plans are being completed for health occupations training at the Appalachia Hospitals, Inc.

7. State and local vocational educators have reached far beyond the local high schools for training facilities. Hotels, restaurants, stores, machine shops, garages, and business offices are examples of the involvement of private business in providing manpower training facilities. In Oregon, a trade association provided rent-free facilities for a very successful formal waiter training program. In another State, a college fraternity house was used to help train persons with sight disabilities. We have heard of rooms being used in very unusual places such as outdoor theaters. Private schools, community agencies, and the Defense Establishment have been tapped to provide institutional training facilities.

8. Residential manpower training centers have been the forerunner of Job Corps sites such as those in Indiana and Ohio where disadvantaged youth from large metropolitan areas were brought into a highly desirable training environment.

Mr. MONAGAN. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DANIELS. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MONAGAN. I compliment the gentleman from New Jersey on the fine statement he is making. I agree with the points he is making.

Madam Chairman, I heartily approve of the objectives of H.R. 4257 and I strongly support this legislation.

Certainly one of the penalties which we pay for automation is the increased requirements for employment. The time has long past when the average unskilled laborer can walk into a factory and get a job based on the strength of his muscles. It behooves us, therefore, to assist in the upgrading of the working man to permit his gainful employment at a relatively skilled job. Not only does this assist the employee, but it also puts a potential welfare recipient in the ranks of the wage earners and taxpayers who are supporting our economy.

The Congress has set a goal of training 400,000 persons in the 3-year program and by the end of 1964 the Manpower Development and Training Act objective had nearly been reached. Training opportunities were brought not only to displaced older workers but to unskilled youth whose absorption into the labor force is increasingly difficult.

The present legislation will extend and modify the existing program to permit full Federal funding through June 30, 1966.

Already under the act it has been demonstrated that there exists in the country a vast, untapped potential for job development in a variety of service activities. These additional jobs would very likely remain unfilled without the activities that would be possible under this act.

This legislation will perform a necessary and unusual function in our complex industrial society and I am confident that its worth will be demonstrated increasingly as time goes by.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Madam Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL].

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, I do not intend to use the entire 10 minutes.

Having had an active role in the original development of the Manpower Development and Training Act, I take special pride that since its enactment we have had a bipartisan approach to changing the legislation and improving it. I believe it is one of the most effective pieces of legislation we have had to try to meet the problems of unemployment and the problems of poverty in this country.

I believe the bill as it is written takes the natural next step in extending the benefits of this program.

I also wish to express my satisfaction that this piece of legislation is beginning the process of bringing other training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

We wrote, with great care, a number of amendments into the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 to be sure that we would have a minimum danger of scandals, to be sure that these programs would be directly related to the needs in an area, that they would be related to the existing educational facilities and training facilities, and to be sure that education would be separated from labor in the administration, and that the program would take care of those in greatest need first—those who are heads of households, heads of families, the breadwinners, and out of work.

Madam Chairman, I support H.R. 4257 which extends and further amends the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. This act is one in which I take a measure of personal pride and satisfaction because it contains so many important contributions by Republican members of the Committee on Education and Labor. In 1962, the Republican substitute bill which I authored was presented to the House and adopted. A total of 29 major changes were made in the administration's original proposal in 1962 by the Republican substitute.

Almost all of the criticisms of Federal manpower training efforts, upon examination, are found to be directed at other programs, such as those under the Area Redevelopment Act and the so-called poverty program. These other programs go astray because they lack the carefully devised safeguards and criteria established for the Manpower Development and Training Act at the insistence of Republicans, and with the cooperation of Democrats in the House.

Madam Chairman, I do not say this out of any partisan malice, but to emphasize the advantages to the Nation of genuine bipartisan action on important legislation designed to meet vital national objectives. Unemployment and its associated ills and miseries are of concern to every thinking citizen in both political parties; measures designed to combat these conditions need the constructive efforts of each of us, if such measures are to succeed.

I cannot help but compare the action of this act, where bipartisan cooperation has produced tangible benefits for America's unemployed, with the steamroller tactics evidenced in last week's debate on the school bill and in last year's debate on the poverty bill. The lesson should be clear that when constructive suggestions from the minority are heeded the result is effective legislation.

The Manpower Development and Training Act, as noted by the President in this year's manpower report to the Congress, has become one of the pillars of the Nation's manpower policy. While we should continue to scrutinize results under the act in order to find ways to improve its effectiveness, we may all take much satisfaction in accomplishments thus far.

About 380,000 individuals have received training under this act, some 60,000 of whom were in programs especially designed for individuals who first needed to acquire basic skills in order to profit from a training program. The job placement rates have been high—72 percent for institutional trainees and 94 percent for on-the-job trainees. These bare statistics are gratifying, but no statistic can adequately express the hope and dignity which a new job and a new opportunity brings to a human being who has known the despair of unemployment or the indignity of welfare.

I view this act as an investment in people in which the incidental benefits to our economy—substantial as those benefits may be—are a secondary consideration.

In my judgment, and in all fairness, these achievements would not have been realized had it not been for Republican contributions to the basic act. These contributions tightened the act with respect to the length of the training programs and the quality of the training, and assured that training was related to the job market; they focused training upon the unemployed and related training allowances to unemployment compensation; they drew a necessary distinction between education and training and assured that the appropriate agencies would be responsible for each. These and other Republican-sponsored features of this act account in large measure for its success.

The bill before us represents a continuing and bipartisan effort to further strengthen the act. I am sure that additional changes will be made as experience with administration of the act may prove desirable. For example, Republicans from the outset believed that State participation, on a matching basis, would be necessary to assure that manpower retraining would become a permanent feature of cooperative State-Federal-private efforts to combat unemployment. I regret that the States thus far have not been more responsive to their responsibilities in this regard. This bill, however, preserves the principle of State matching. I think that is a vital principle and, in more favorable circumstances, I hope to see it made more operative.

Madam Chairman, let me digress somewhat at this point to observe that the surest safeguard of our Federal system—sometimes mistakenly labeled as "States' rights"—is responsible State government which is eager to seize upon opportunities to serve its citizens. That is the way toward full and equal partnership in a federal system, and that is the principle we are attempting to preserve in this act. Responsible and energetic State and local government serves the cause of democratic self government, and should be of equal concern to Democrat and Republican, conservative or liberal.

This bill, by incorporating ARA training programs under the Manpower Act, controlled by the provision of Manpower Development and Training Act, also takes an important step toward consolidating our national efforts in manpower training. We must somehow abandon the notion that a proliferation of overlapping Federal efforts in any field increases our capacity to deal with urgent national problems. A scattering of effort has just the opposite effect; it confuses and weakens our attempt to accomplish worthy objectives. I shall continue to resist the unfortunate tendency of the present national administration to use a shotgun where a rifle is required, and I sincerely hope that the consolidation of programs in this bill is an indication of a change in direction.

In conclusion, I support this bill wholeheartedly, although it represents a variety of compromises of the viewpoints of majority and minority members of our committee. I am proud of the constructive Republican contributions to the development of this act from its inception. These contributions, of course, were made possible by the cooperative attitude of majority members, and by the constructive position of the Department of Labor. This is the way legislation should always be developed, because it is the way which serves the best interests of the American people.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CEDERBERG. I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from New York.

This program is an excellent program and is working well. It is a fine example of cooperation between the Federal Government and the State and local governments, along with industry and labor, in training, to provide training of our young men and women and some older men and women, to provide the skills which are in short supply around the country.

About 2 weeks ago I attended the graduating exercise of a class under this program, in farm equipment mechanics. I believe it is about the first class in the country to graduate. There were approximately 30 graduates. One large equipment manufacturer offered employment to every graduate of this class. They will find employment as a result of this program.

In the area of education, I believe this can do the very best job, along with vocational education. I want the record to show that once again I support the extension of this program. I believe it is well worth the effort made, on behalf of the Federal Government.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman. I agree with him, and I appreciate his original support for the act when we passed it in 1962.

There are some things that need additional attention where we have some problems. I will not go into them in detail, but we still are not functioning effectively and properly with on-the-job training, meshing this into the normal employer operations of on-the-job training. We have corrected, I think, some of the inflexibilities of the original program as they developed from experience. I am hopeful that we can have a regular review of this program from year to year so that we may keep it attuned to the needs of our society.

I commend the members of this subcommittee for the hard work and the effective work that they have done.

One final point I feel should be made: We are moving away from the matching principle in this legislation. I personally want to express my strong feeling that eventually, as soon as it is practicable, we will have better administration and a more effective program by meshing the training under this act with State responsibility and State matching. In this bill we further postpone the matching and cut it down to 10 percent effective July 1, 1966. Hopefully in the future, as this program develops, we will be able to reintroduce in a more substantial way the matching principle.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I want to compliment this committee and particularly this subcommittee on this bill they have brought out. As a former teacher of vocational agriculture, I have, of course, a lot of faith in the necessary place that vocational training occupies in fitting into our educational system. Particularly I want to associate my remarks with those of the gentleman from New York concerning the matching principle and participation by the States. As one who taught under a program of that type, under the Smith-Hughes Act, where you have matching funds, you get a joint responsibility as between the Federal, State, and local authorities, which, in my opinion, makes for a better program and a more effective one.

Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. QUIE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. Madam Chairman, I want to take this time to commend the gentleman from New York for the work he has done on the Manpower Development and Training Act from its inception. I well remember the great work he did on the number of amendments which were added to the Manpower Development and Training Act making it a far superior piece of legislation than was first considered when the bill was sent up here by the administration. I understand that the administration was a little concerned as to what it might be able to pass up here. Neither did it have the kind of insight that the gentleman from New York had and which is really necessary for the retraining of individuals who have already gone into their careers but find that they have obsolete careers.

I think that our country will always be indebted to the great work which the gentleman from New York did in developing the Manpower Development and Training Act and the continued interest he has to make certain it does operate well and does provide the kind of training which is still needed as long as we have structured unemployment in this country.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman and I want to express my appreciation for his original support for the act, the work that he is doing and for the magnificent way he has carried out the tradition of bipartisanship in making a major Republican contribution to this legislation as an active member of the subcommittee this year.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I want to commend the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Minnesota, and all the other minority members of this subcommittee for the tremendously constructive contributions they have made to the creation of this program and to its improvement and strengthening since its creation. I can recall serving with the gentlemen on the subcommittee which was the precursor of the subcommittee which eventually acted on this program. I recall their constructive contributions then, and I want to say that I know of no committee in this Congress that has enjoyed more active bipartisan support than this one. I think the gentleman from New York, the gentleman from Minnesota, and the gentleman from Ohio and their colleagues are to be complimented for the work they have done on this bill.

Mr. GOODELL. I thank the gentleman and I want to say that bipartisan support can only be effective if it comes from both sides of the House and we have had some of the finest cooperation in reaching the agreement on the amendments that we have made to this legislation. I am sure the gentleman will agree with me that the experience in this program thus far amply justifies bipartisanship.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield further, I will say that I could not agree more.

Mr. PICKLE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PICKLE. Madam Chairman, I would like to say to the gentleman that I agree with the point he has been making on the matching principle. I recognize that the States are limited in their resources, perhaps, at this time, and that all we can do is to go to a 90-to-10 ratio in cash or kind. But I envision a better program when we can put this on a more solid matching basis so that the States, if they want the program—and apparently they do—will participate on a realistic level.

When I was in Texas before I came to the Congress I was a member of the Texas Unemployment Commission and I had the privilege of helping put into operation the Manpower Development and Training Act program on a State level. We brought together the factions in the State—business, education, labor, employment—and with our advisory committee we set down certain guidelines.

In the 3 years that this program has been in operation we have trained nearly 3,000 young trainees and over 2,000 of them have secured worthwhile jobs. This has been in over 50 occupations. So it has been a worthwhile performance. I have pushed it. I think it is a good program. I agree with the statements that have been made. The matching principle is sound—to have the States participate with the Federal Government. If we do not, we are saying that this is strictly a national problem, that there are no State lines and that there is no State basic responsibility in this training program. With that I do not agree. I think that along with the unemployment compensation program, and the employment commissions this ought to be kept as closely to a State program as we can make it.

If we say that the matching principle means only that it is strictly Federal then in effect we are saying that this problem is a national problem and that the State boundaries have no part in this discussion. With that I do not agree. I think our State program is stronger in the field of compensation and unemployment by keeping it controlled by the State and that in this Manpower Development and Training Act program the State should participate strongly. I hope we may look forward to that end.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, I think the gentleman has made an excellent statement and I thank him for that contribution. The matching principle is important because so many of the existing programs must be meshed and interwoven with this program. We must have a high degree of State involvement as far as the vocational education system is concerned. We wrote that in through the original Republican amendment insisting that the training should be, to the extent possible, in the institutions of the vocational education system. Certainly, as the gentleman has indicated, eventually we must have a better meshing of this program with the unemployment compensation program. This will come about, presumably, if we get more State matching and State participation in this program.

Mr. PICKLE. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further. Obviously they intended that this be kept along State lines because the amount of money was based on the average weekly pay received in that State. You have added to it by giving extra help for dependents, and so forth, but it certainly must be maintained on a State level.

Mr. GOODELL. I might say that we have had a bipartisan feeling on the committee and the subcommittee that the matching principle was important and I am sure, as much as we are able to in the future, we will reincorporate this to the greatest extent possible.

Mr. WYDLER. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Madam Chairman, I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] is much too modest in describing what he terms "Republican contributions" to the original Manpower Development and Training Act. The other day a very distinguished member of the majority, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Bolling], remarked in a Rules Committee hearing that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell] is the father of this act.

In fact, the 1962 act passed the House as H.R. 8399, but the complete text of the bill was that of H.R. 10363, introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell], who was a member of the subcommittee responsible for the legislation.

Madam Chairman, I call your attention to the Congressional Record, volume 108, part 3, page 3064. The Clerk was reading the substitute for H.R. 8399 offered in the Committee of the Whole House by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland]. The following colloquy is quoted from the Record:

> Mr. Powell (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute be considered as read, and be open to amendment at any point.
>
> Mr. Griffin. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I should like to inquire as to whether the substitute the gentleman from Pennsylvania now offers is the same as H.R. 10363, the bill which was introduced by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell]? Is it identical in all respects?
>
> Mr. Holland. It is identical.

The foregoing excerpt from the Record refers to the bill which became the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Madam Chairman, in all fairness, this act should be known as the Goodell Act, or as the Goodell-Holland Act. The gentleman from New York has never sought to have the Manpower Development and Training Act thus identified, but he deserves this recognition, as does also the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Whenever I hear the grossly false accusation that "Republicans are always opposed to things" I think particularly of the untiring, unselfish efforts of the gentleman from New York on behalf of the millions of our fellow citizens who are unemployed, or underemployed, due to their lack of training in marketable skills. There are many, many other examples of constructive efforts by many other Republican Members in many other vital fields, but the example given by Charlie Goodell always comes to my mind first.

What has been the constant intent of the gentleman from New York, as again exemplified here today? It has been to make this legislation effective. That is the role of constructive legislators, and it serves the American people, whatever their political persuasion.

Madam Chairman, the title of a bill does not indicate its merit. You can call sloppy and ill-conceived, or even unworkable legislation by any name, however high sounding—take, for example, the war on poverty—without changing its character. The Manpower Development and Training Act is effective legislation and is working well for our country, in very large measure, because the gentleman from New York determined that is should be so.

So we Republicans are proud of our colleague and of his fellow Republicans on the committee who aided him in this task. I think that our Democratic colleagues can share this pride, for efforts such as those of the gentleman from New York reflect credit to the great institution which is this House, and to the concepts of representative democracy.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BRADEMAS].

Mr. BRADEMAS. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4257, the Manpower Act of 1965. I would like to relate to this body what I have seen to be the human and economic significance of the manpower training program to our unemployed workers in South Bend, Ind. I would like to describe briefly what has come to be known as the South Bend story.

I might say that what would be even better—and I extend an open invitation to all of my distinguished colleagues—would be for you to come to South Bend and see for yourself the operations of our manpower training classes.

Last April, President and Mrs. Johnson visited our manpower classes. They were deeply impressed by what they saw, and the President was moved to say:

> We have gone through this school and have been stimulated and inspired by what we have seen—men and women who have lost their jobs but not their determination * * *. They are working and preparing themselves to do a better job today than they did yesterday * * *. When I get back to Washington, I am going to say to the leaders of that great capital that I wish they could come here to the heartland of America and see what the people are doing for themselves.

I would like to call attention to a key phrase in what the President said, "what the people are doing for themselves." It is, of course, true that the Manpower Act provides Federal assistance, but what is vital to the success of manpower training programs is the initiative and proper planning of local and State officials and the enthusiastic response and desire of the enrollees themselves.

Following enactment of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, a manpower retraining advisory committee was formed in South Bend composed of local representatives of industry, labor, the employment service, and education. This was a broadly based and very enthusiastic group.

Through the outstanding and speedy efforts of this committee, one of the first manpower development and training programs in the Nation was begun in South Bend on September 24, 1962. The program was, and is presently, administered jointly by the South Bend Community School Corp. and the local Indiana Employment Security Division office.

The program, begun on a small scale, provided our unemployed with new skills and new hopes for the future of themselves and their families. Remember, however, that this was a pioneer program in our country in those latter months of 1962, and administering officials were soon to find ways in which a good program could be made even better.

For instance, it was soon discovered that some individuals were unable to move immediately into training classes because they lacked sufficient basic education. For the older enrollees, only brush-up or review classes might be adequate. For the younger enrollee, remedial courses in reading, writing, and arithmetic would be necessary to correct the lack of educational attainment.

Accordingly, Franklin D. Shurz, chairman of both the Indiana State and St. Joseph County Manpower Advisory Commissions, testified before the House Education and Labor Committee in support of amending the Manpower Act to authorize literacy classes to prepare those insufficiently educated for occupational training. This important amendment was enacted in 1963.

Fortunately, by December 1963, South Bend's manpower training program had over a year of experience and improvement behind it. I say fortunately because that month the Studebaker Corp. closed its gates on more than 8,000 workers and moved to Canada. This meant that about 9 percent of the county's labor force was suddenly jobless. Greatly aggravating the tragic circumstances was the fact that the average age of these unemployed workers was 54. And contrary to what might be thought, because the workers were up in age, they averaged more than one child each under the age of 19. It was, indeed, a crisis situation.

President Johnson immediately issued directives to several members of the Cabinet and Federal help was quickly on the way. During the early months of 1964 the splendid cooperation of Federal, State, and local officials accomplished much in taking immediate first steps in ameliorating the problems of our unemployed.

One of these first steps was to accelerate and expand greatly the Manpower Development and Training Act program. Time was of the essence to prevent this temporary economic retardation from developing into a longrun unhealthy condition. One objective of the Manpower Development and Training program—"To occupationally train the individual to his potential pinnacle within the most effective period of time"—become strikingly meaningful and timely.

By March 1964 the Manpower Development and Training Act program was geared organizationally and equipped with facilities, equipment, and technical instructors to handle this acceleration. Within this period of 3 months following the Studebaker closing, courses were instituted to serve over 430 trainees. Today there are 31 manpower training courses in operation with a total enrollment of 600 trainees.

Madam Chairman, I would not even venture to guess how much more serious our unemployment situation in South Bend would have been without the tremendous assistance of the Manpower Development and Training Act program. During the time the program has been in operation, over 1,500 men and women have been enrolled in training projects. About 1,000 of these people were enrolled within the past year. Of those who have completed training, 70 percent have training-related jobs.

One hundred people were selected for the prevocational, or basic education, training course. Of these, 81 remained for the 36-week training period. All of these removed their functional illiteracy deficiencies and successfully passed appropriate pre-entrance examinations for vocational training. They were then enrolled in regular vocational courses to complete their training.

Because there is a substantial number of people with similar deficiencies that are currently unemployed and cannot successfully compete in the labor market nor enter regular vocational training projects, another prevocational project is being developed to serve 100 people.

Unemployment in St. Joseph County jumped to over 10 percent following the Studebaker closing. The February rate of unemployment in the county, the latest month for which figures are available, was 6.2 percent. This is still too high; but it is a great improvement, due in no small measure to the success of the Manpower Development and Training Act program.

What I hope that I have illustrated by relating to you the South Bend story is that the Manpower Development and Training Act program has rekindled hope for our unemployed workers, taught new skills to young and old, brought men and jobs together, and saved our community millions of relief dollars.

The valuable experience gained from the pioneer manpower training programs in South Bend has been extremely helpful in demonstrating where improvements could be made in the existing law. The amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act program proposed in the bill before us will make a good program even better and hopefully continue to help attack the problem of unemployment in South Bend and elsewhere in the Nation.

I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of an editorial from the March 22, 1965, South Bend Tribune concerning this legislation:

NOT A CURE-ALL

The U.S. Senate has passed a bill authorizing a 5-year continuance of the Manpower Development and Training Act program and providing continued Federal underwriting of most of the program's cost.

The House is expected to pass a similar bill shortly, and the manpower extension act could turn out to be the second big economic measure of 1965 to reach President Johnson's desk.

Rather than allow the Federal share of the costs of the Manpower Development and Training Act to fall to two-thirds this summer, the new legislation would continue to have Washington carry the full cost through mid-1966, when the Federal share would dip to 90 percent, the remainder to be furnished by the States. Other technical changes are included in the bills.

It is encouraging to see the 89th Congress, which is setting some kind of record for getting down to business, putting its stamp of approval on the Manpower Development and Training Act, which has proved to be one of the most worthwhile pieces of legislation to come out of Congress in the last half-dozen years. The Senate vote for the program was 78 to 8.

If there is a danger in all this, it is that too much might come to be expected of the Manpower Development and Training Act. It was never meant to be a cure-all, but some of its supporters and some of its critics are beginning to talk as if it was.

The Manpower Development and Training Act, which retrains unemployed persons in new skills to fit available job openings in their areas, cannot by any stretch of the imagination be considered the complete solution to the unemployment problem in this country. Yet in the Senate floor debate the other day, the program was attacked, on the one hand, for not eliminating unemployment. On the other hand, it was overenthusiastically defended by Senator Joseph S. Clark, Democrat, of Pennsylvania, as a program that will eventually cure the unemployment problem.

The causes of unemployment in this country are complex. No one program or approach will cure the problem.

It would be unfortunate if Americans came to expect more from the Manpower Development and Training Act than it is designed to deliver. It is not a cure-all. But it's a big help, and it will be a bigger help still as the years go by.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent].

Mr. DENT. Madam Chairman, I would like to say it would be remiss I believe if I did not at this time call to the attention of the Members of the House the fact that late in 1960, after the 1960 elections, my colleague of some 20 years in the State senate and house in Harrisburg, the gentleman from Pittsburgh, Pa., Mr. Elmer Holland, the sponsor of this act, came down to Washington and from November until January worked, after consulting with the then President, the late President John Kennedy, and after talking to the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell], he and his good wife came down to Washington and with his wife and his staff, they worked for a period of about 7 weeks in making the preliminary studies and in getting this legislation into a position where it could be introduced.

Madam Chairman, from that time to this the gentleman from Pennsylvania has lived with, he has fought for, and has devoted most of his time in this House of Representatives to this particular subject.

Madam Chairman, it is a tribute to this House of Representatives and to the people of this great Nation of ours that dedicated men like Mr. Holland will take their time and devote their efforts and energies to a field that up until that moment had been completely neglected.

Madam Chairman, I want to say while paying tribute to Mr. Holland that he had in these last months, since he has been ill, the great right hand of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] who has been stalwart in his support and in his efforts, and the great left hand, as it may be, of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell], who has also given of his own knowledge that this legislation could continue.

Madam Chairman, we really do not know, unless we live in a district where there has been longtime chronic unemployment and depression, what this particular bill means to the working people of this great Nation who find themselves, through no fault of their own, eliminated from the active work ranks due to their lack of ability to perform because of the lack of skills which they had no opportunity to learn.

Madam Chairman, I want to say that in my opinion this is a great moment in this House of Representatives, that we have again an opportunity to make the necessary amendments in order that this legislation may continue.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. DENT. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, I wish to join with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Dent] in paying tribute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland].

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland] has taken, from the very beginning with reference to this legislation, a completely nonpartisan view. This illustrates the remarkable stature of the man, that he was willing to accept suggestions and major changes from all sides in an effort to improve the legislation.

Madam Chairman, the history of the enactment of this law demonstrates that it is I believe a monument to every individual who had a part in it, and certainly the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland] himself can take special pride in this as the man who made a major contribution to the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. DENT. On behalf of the gentleman from Pittsburgh [Mr. Holland], I thank the gentleman from New York.

Madam Chairman, in our national effort towards solving the problems of unemployment and underemployment, the Manpower Development and Training Act has proved to be an effective and efficient piece of legislation. Of course, it is only part of the total picture which also includes such important pieces of legislation as the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the Area Redevelopment Act along with other constructive efforts, such as the poverty program.

According to a recent survey of some 500 economists by the Chase Manhattan Bank of New York, 37 percent of the professors said that unemployment is the main problem of our country. The Manpower Development and Training Act program has proved itself to be worthy of continuation as set out in the measure now before the House. The Manpower Development and Training Act program is, to my way of thinking, exactly like a sharpshooter's rifle. With it we can take an accurate sight on our targets of unemployment and underemployment and, working with the States, bring to bear our joint efforts to use all types of educational institutions, public and private, to train people for jobs.

The Manpower Development and Training Act program does not, in the long run, cost money. Actually, it represents an investment in the future productivity of our citizens. In this day of automation all workers must be prepared for continuing education. No worker can afford to stop learning. Hence, jobs, employment and education are inexorably linked.

According to a recent survey by the well-known pollster, Lou Harris, which appeared in the Washington Post, Thursday, March 25, 1965, financial worries are the toughest problem in securing sufficient education. Of the people polled, 48 percent stated that finances were the main problem.

Madam Chairman, with the help of these 1965 amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act we can continue to invest in the people of our Nation. An outstanding example of such investment was presented to the Holland subcommittee in the course of the hearings on this measure. At an investment of $474.19 per trainee a stenographer program was carried on under contract by the Detroit Institute of Commerce—a private business school. Out of 24 trainees, 20 were Negro and 4 were whites—18 trainees responded to a followup survey showing white-collar employment in such national corporations as: Jones & Laughlin Steel Co.; Prudential Insurance Co.; Vickers, Inc.; Sears, Roebuck & Co.; Ford Motor Co.; Chrysler Corp.; Burroughs Co.; General Motors.

The average earnings of the graduates of this program are $323.72 per month. On the basis of one deduction from a trainee's annual salary of $3,884.64 each of these Manpower Development and Training Act graduates will pay $456.80 in Federal income tax. In other words, the income tax paid in the first year after graduation just about equals the cost of our investment in human productivity and dignity.

Madam Chairman, if there is no objection I would like to have entered into the Record, the full report on this Manpower Development and Training Act project conducted at the Detroit Institute of Commerce which, I might add, is a wonderfully rewarding example of a forward looking, fully integrated private business school:

Manpower Development Training Class (MT-284) for Stenographers at Detroit Institute of Commerce, 1308 Broadway, Detroit, Mich.

(As reported to United Business Schools Association meeting in Detroit, Mich., November 6, 1964.)

We began the manpower development training program for stenographers (MT-284) on November 18, 1963.

The Michigan Employment Security Commission (MESC) had selected the students on the following basis:

Age: 17 through 21 years; sex: female preferred; education: graduation from high school with course in typing and shorthand; physical attributes: weight in proportion to height; ability to pass prescribed proficiency test in spelling, shorthand and typing and specific aptitude test battery for stenographer.

B-215 norms: G (intelligence), 95; P (form perception), 100; Q (clerical perception), 100; K (motor coordination), 100.

Class hours were from 8 a.m. to 3 p.m., 5 days a week for 24 weeks—or 720 clock hours.

These hours were divided as follows:

Stenographic and clerical skills, 375 hours.

English and communications, 125 hours.

Computational skills, 120 hours.

Clerical-secretarial procedures, 80 hours.

Transcribing and duplicating machines, 20 hours.

Subjects included in the program were typewriting Gregg shorthand, machines (comptometer, Burroughs calculator, ditto, mimeograph), English, word studies, mathematics, payroll, secretarial procedures, charm and personal improvement.

At the end of the 11th week, one girl dropped voluntarily. She was to be married. At the end of the 12th week, two were dropped for poor attendance which meant poor grades.

At this point, three more students were entered and they completed the remaining 12 weeks of training. One of these three was put into a clerk-typist program, two others were changed to clerk-typist because of slow progress in shorthand.

The program ended on May 8, with 24 of the 25 enrolled. Four of these girls were Caucasian, 20 Negro. The one girl dropped at the end of the 17th week because she found employment, a stenographic job.

The attendance and interest in study was excellent. There were absences only when necessary—five of the students had perfect attendance.

These students had looked for employment and found themselves unable to pass tests, therefore, they were "motivated" to get the most out of the program.

Statistics on the group are interesting:

The average age—18.8 years.

Twenty were graduates of local public high school.

Five were graduates of local parochial schools.

Two were from suburban schools (Ecorse and Hamtramck).

One graduated from a high school outside of metropolitan Detroit area.

Ten graduated from high school within the last year.

Eight graduated between 1 and 2 years earlier.

Ten had graduated over 2 years earlier.

Ten had office work experience (three full-time jobs, seven part-time).

Compensation ranged from $1 an hour to $45 a week. Others had little or no work experience, babysitting, store clerks, etc.

Before completing the program, we gave the students the Wonderlic and the general clerical (9 part) tests.

On the Wonderlic (with a highest possible score of 50) only 3 scored below 21, which is the average cutoff score used by most businessses. All of these scores are considered passing by most businesses utilizing Wonderlic for personnel selection. On the general clerical test they ranged from the 94th to 40th percentile group.

Interestingly enough, two persons who were below the 50th percentile on the general clerical had high scores on the Wonderlic test.

Typing skills ranged from 76 to 53 words on 5-minute tests. Everyone passed shorthand at 100 words per minute and 8 passed the 120 words per minute. Even though we had to score in terms of words per minute, these girls would also be rated very high in the neatness of their work, letter arrangement on 8½ by 11 or executive size paper, etc. A properly framed letter became a byword to them.

The class in charm and personal improvement made these students very conscious of their appearance and gave them a feeling of confidence, too.

EMPLOYMENT

Even though MESC was responsible for the placement of these students, the school assisted. When employment calls were received they were given an opportunity to apply. Placement assistance will continue with this group as with all other students.

A survey of these students was made as of November 1, 1964. Eighteen replies were received.

Employment listed was as follows: one at Jones & Laughlin Steel Co.; one at Ford Motor Co.; four at University of Michigan; one at Prudential Insurance Co.; two at Wayne State University; two at Chrysler Corp.; two at attorney offices; one at Wayne County Civil Service; one at Vickers, Inc.; one at Burroughs Co.; one at Sears, Roebuck & Co.; one at General Motors.

They are all doing stenographic work. The average earnings are $323.72 per month or $74.70 per week. If each girl has one deduction from her annual salary ($3,884.64) she will pay $456.80 income tax.

For this training program the school received 65.859 cents per hour of training or a total of $474.19 per student. This included all books and supplies. After all taxes are deducted there is left more than $3,000 from which they can save, and purchase durable and nondurable goods.

We feel that this was a wonderful project. We will like to do more of this type of training, since we have a physical setup that is adequate and an experienced staff. Most of all, we have a desire and a willingness to help students of this type who want to prepare themselves for a better job in business.

As we said earlier, the MESC selected the students after determining the employment need. The State department of public instruction selected the school. Both of these agencies were most cooperative and it was a pleasure to work with them.

Madam Chairman, according to the Department of Labor there are more than 10 million persons employed in clerical occupations and the number should increase by 1970 to nearly 13 million. The training available under the Manpower Development and Training Act covers both initial or entry training and refresher and upgrading. A most perceptive article on office education appeared in the March 1965 issue of the American Vocational Journal. In passing, I might add that the AVA has testified in support of this measure. It is on the subject of "Office Education, a Partner in Vocational Education" by Bernard Shilt, director of business education, Buffalo, N.Y., and a vice president of the American Vocational Association. Mr. Shilt points out that training for office careers covers a multitude of institutions all which can be used by reason of the language and amendments to this bill. They include our secondary schools, technical schools, private business schools, and junior and senior colleges.

Madam Chairman, if there is no objection, I would like to have entered into the RECORD the article on office education by Mr. Shilt:

OFFICE EDUCATION: A PARTNER IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION—A GROWING SEGMENT OF THE NATION'S WORK FORCE CLAIMS VOCATIONAL STATUS

(By Bernard A. Shilt, director of business education, Buffalo, N.Y.)

Many educators and most laymen think of vocational education as a program restricted to the preparation of persons for skilled or semiskilled trades, such as auto mechanics, printing, electronics, and the like. However, there is a type of vocational education which enrolls more high school students than all the other types of vocational education combined. It is office education, the preparation of persons for employment in the so-called clerical occupations.

Probably because most of this type of education is found in the academic or general high school, many people do not think of it as vocational education. Nevertheless, the preparation of persons to be stenographers, typists, and clerical workers is certainly vocational education.

SIZE OF CLERICAL WORK FORCE

The importance of office education in the total program of vocational education is easily seen when one takes a look at the number of persons employed in the field of office (clerical) work.

Information recently released by the U.S. Department of Labor indicates that there are approximately 10.3 million clerical and kindred workers. They represent about 15 percent of the total number of employed workers, the second largest employment group of the Nation. This figure (10.3 million) also represents an increase of 5 percent among clerical workers in a 2-year period.

The U.S. Department of Labor estimates that by 1970 there will be 12.8 million persons employed in this clerical occupational group. This estimate is based on the growing amount of paperwork required of businesses by the Government and the consequent need for increased clerical workers by Government at the local, State, and Federal levels.

Another factor points up the problem of our educational programs in meeting the future needs for clerical workers. Approximately 70 percent of the clerical workers are women. Surveys indicate that, on the average, a woman who enters office work for the first time remains 3.2 years before leaving for marriage, raising a family, etc. Thus there is an unusually heavy demand for replacements among women office workers, in contrast to men, who remain on the job considerably longer.

TYPES OF CLERICAL WORKERS

The "Dictionary of Occupational Titles" lists several hundred different job titles for clerical and kindred occupations (1–00.00 through 1–49.99). It defines this group as "including occupations concerned with the preparation, transcribing, transferring, systematizing, or preserving of written communications and records in offices, shops and other places of work where such functions are performed. Most of these occupations are performed by mental and manual processes but some include, in part or in whole, the operation of such machines as bookkeeping machines and calculating machines."

The jobs that provide employment to the largest number of persons are those of typists, stenographers, bookkeepers, file clerks, office machine operators, and general office clerks. Among these job categories, the most rapidly growing is that of the office machine operators.

OFFICE EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Occupational preparation for careers in business takes place on the high school level, in private business schools, in junior colleges, and in the 4-year colleges and universities.

The largest percentage of students preparing for officework is found in the high schools. Office training is extremely popular at this level. In high schools, especially in the larger cities, one usually finds that 25 to 30 percent of the students are enrolled in office education programs. The high schools of New York State, alone, currently enroll more than 400,000 students in business subjects.

Training at this level prepares students for such beginner's jobs as typists, stenographers, general office clerks, office machine operators, file clerks, and bookkeepers.

In most cases, the officeworker who received her basic office training in high school can advance to higher jobs after proving her abilities through a few years of experience and/or by taking advanced courses in business.

The early high schools in this country were concerned principally with academic education—preparation of youth for college. To fill the need for trained officeworkers, private business schools were organized. The first formal private business school seems to have been Foster's Commercial School, organized in Boston in 1827. The principal subjects taught during that century were bookkeeping, penmanship and business arithmetic; and nearly all of the students were men.

The typical private business school of today provides a wide variety of curriculums, such as accounting, business administration, secretarial (general, medical, legal, and technical), stenographic, data processing, and marketing. Generally, there are more women than men students. Nearly every school now requires high school graduation as an entrance requirement. The smaller schools usually provide only a 1 year intensive business training course, while the larger schools normally offer both a 1- and 2-year program.

In recent years there has been a rapid growth in the number of junior colleges offering 2 years of post-high school education. A large percentage of these institutions are public (largely supported by public taxes), but a considerable number are private. In most of these schools there are one or more business curriculums, the most common being the secretarial. Several junior colleges have established the business administration curriculum and the data processing curriculum. The satisfactory completion of a curriculum in such educational institutions usually earns an associate degree for the graduate.

Business training on the higher level is found in the universities and 4-year colleges. Schools of business administration in the universities usually provide for majors in such areas as accounting, economics, management, industrial relations, and marketing. Such programs are thought of as being professional and are designed primarily to prepare students for junior executive positions in business. Graduate programs in the field of business are offered in the larger universities.

OCCUPATIONAL MIX

Business and office education can make a contribution to other areas of vocational education. For example, in agricultural education there is need for some instruction in bookkeeping and business arithmetic. Even some exposure to business law is important to acquaint the farmer with the fundamentals of such topics as landlord and tenant relationships, employer and employee relationships, buying equipment on the installment plan, insurance contracts, and mortgages.

Similarly, business and office education can add strength to such other vocational education programs as auto mechanics, radio and television servicing, tailoring, service station operation, the distributive specialities, and home economics. Educators in the field of business and office education can be of aid in developing units of instruction in these areas of vocational education.

Madam Chairman, the Manpower Development and Training Act program can effectively contribute to the upgrading, with dignity, of all the people of our country. As the committee noted in its report on the measure, in quoting the testimony of the noted economist John Kenneth Galbraith before the Joint Economic Committee:

> The primary remedy for this unemployment * * * is better education, more job training, more deliberate job creation for youngsters, and an equal break in education and employment for Negroes.

I do not wish to emphasize office education at the expense of other areas of opportunity, but I would point out that according to the U.S. Office of Education 16 percent of the employed of our Nation's manpower are in clerical occupations. I would also point out that with examples such as the program at the Detroit Institute of Commerce, where 20 out of the 24 trainees were Negroes, the way is clear with the Manpower Development and Training Act to provide hope and dignity for our citizens by voting for a continuing investment in them through similar programs in other such institutions. Entry to white collar occupations can be provided through the Manpower Development and Training Act.

In summary, I would like to reaffirm my remarks to the House made on the 1963 amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act on December 12, 1963. In that bill and in this measure we have made it possible for the States to continue to use all educational institutions, public and private, to continue the success of the Manpower Development and Training Act program. This is particularly true concerning the use of private institutions under contract beginning July 1, 1966, when the 90-to-10 ratio goes into effect on payments for institutional training.

Let us keep open wide the door to full utilization of all educational institutions, both public and private, so that the Nation will have available the continued use of all valuable sources of training expertise and by the continued use of both public and private schools we will get more training for our investment of program dollars. I urge you to concur.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. PERKINS] such time as he may consume.

Mr. PERKINS. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation. I happen to represent a district where we have one of the highest unemployment rates in the whole Nation in the coalfields of Kentucky.

I have personally witnessed the great work that the employment opportunities have made available to the many unemployed of eastern Kentucky since the enactment of this legislation a few years ago.

Madam Chairman, I actively supported the passage of the Manpower Development and Training Act in the 87th Congress. For many, it represents a necessary second chance to prepare for job opportunity. For many others, it represents a first chance.

Before the advent of automation it was possible and highly acceptable for the breadwinner to enter a full lifetime occupation requiring little or no basic education or skill. Technology has changed all of that. Until the enactment of the Manpower Development and Training Act, many thousands of unemployed persons in many districts had no opportunity to support their families and at the same time pursue a course of training which would pave the way for them to secure a job.

To say that the Manpower Development and Training Act in its initial years of operation did not measure up to our full expectations is no condemnation of the act nor of its administration. The task ahead is monumental. Much has been accomplished. Much more remains to be done. At this point I would like to insert in the RECORD summary data relative to the program's operation in Kentucky as of the close of the fiscal year 1964:

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT, RETRAINING, AND RESEARCH ACTIVITIES IN KENTUCKY

Summary data cumulative through June 30, 1964—Program approvals to date

	Trainees and individuals served	Estimated cost	Number of projects
Retraining projects, total	6,048	$13,488,583	115
Manpower Development and Training Act:			
Institutional	6,015	13,476,765	108
On-the-job	33	11,818	7
Experimental and demonstration			
Manpower research projects			

Participation as a percent of U.S. retraining approvals:	
Trainees	2.4
Funds	5.5
State unemployment (1963) as a percent of U.S. total	1.4
State work force (1963) as a percent of U.S. total	1.5

Summary data for projects completed through Dec. 31, 1963

Enrolled in completed projects	488
Percent completed	78.5
Dropouts	105
Completed	383
Employed	83.0
Training-related jobs	68.1
Non-training-related jobs	7.8
Dropped out training related	7.0
Unemployed	13.3
Other (including awaiting referral)	3.7

Projects approved under Manpower Development and Training Act through June 30, 1964

Project No.	Labor market area or county	Occupational goal	Duration (weeks)	Trainees or persons serviced	Total funds
	INSTITUTIONAL				
3049.000	Ashland	Appliance serviceman	52	18	$34,345
3015.000		Automobile mechanic	52	15	28,309
4303.000		Clerk-stenographer	44	20	43,771
4249.000		Clerk-typist	44	20	46,222
	Total (4)			73	152,647
3016.000	Bowling Green	Automobile-body repairman	52	24	64,271
4245.000		do		18	47,269
4211.000		Cook (hotel and restaurant)	50	28	91,578
3060.000		Draftsman, mechanical	52	16	48,682
4217.000		Farmer, general (agriculture)	52	20	44.974
	Total (5)			106	296,774
3070.000	Bowling Green, Elizabethtown, Glasgow	Sewing machine repairman	32	24	52,511
4240.000	Cincinnati (Covington)	Clerk-stenographer	44	20	33,502
3004.000	Cincinnati (Kentucky portion)	Automobile mechanic	44	36	47,406
3003.000		Stenographer	26	36	29,609
	Total (2)			72	77,015
4265.000	Corbin	Clerk-stenographer	44	20	47,165
4266.000		do	44	20	40,788
4263.000		Machinist	52	18	52,282
4264.000		Welder, combination	44	18	58,476
	Total (4)			76	198,711
4231.000	Covington	Automobile mechanic		18	50,062
4237.000		Machinist		18	55,950
	Total (2)			36	106,012
4241.000	Eastern Kentucky (Appalachia)	Multioccupation		3,296	8,433,441
4295.000	Elizabethtown	Automobile-body repairman	52	18	60,836
4235.000	Frankfort	Clerk-stenographer	44		59,654
3024.000		Electrician	52	18	52,405
3023.000		Nurse aid	13	24	9,932
	Total (3)			42	121,991
4244.000	Glasgow	Automobile mechanic		16	48,372
3062.000		Clerk-stenographer	44	15	19,945
3052.000		Farmhand, general	20	20	15,139
	Total (3)			51	83,456
3035.000	Harlan	Automobile mechanic	52	18	47,991
3061.000		Automobile-body repairman	52	18	50,070
3069.000		Repairman, mine	52	30	81,770
	Total (3)			66	179,831
4298.000	Hazard	Automobile-body repairman	52	18	57,263
4222.000		Clerk-stenographer	44	20	56,594
4284.000		do	44	20	34,180
3034.000		Draftsman	52	18	40,361
4285.000		Draftsman, commercial	44	18	32,689
4286.000		Office-machine repairman	52	18	51,686
	Total (6)			112	272,773
3053.000	Hazard-Harlan-Corbin	Forester aid	36	40	89,277
3014.000	Henderson	Tool and die maker	50	18	97,527
3031.000	Hopkinsville	Automobile mechanic	52	18	42,632
3030.000		Refrigeration mechanic	52	18	38,657
	Total (2)			36	81,289
3027.000	Jackson	Automobile mechanic	52	15	43,031
3009.000	Lexington	do	52	15	33,718
4229.000		do	52	18	46,657
3006.000		Clerk-stenographer	44	40	71,884
4220.000		do	44	40	56,713
3025.000		Draftsman, mechanical	52	18	41,172
4246.000		do	52	2	16,176
4234.000		Machinist	52	18	53,868
4243.000		Salesperson, automobile parts		40	37,490
3043.000		TV service and repairman	52	18	45,123
	Total (9)			205	402,801
4209.000	Louisville	Auto-body repairman, metal	52	20	66,169
3037.000		Clerk-typist	18	120	44,604
4202.000		do	18	80	40,155
3056.000		Dental assistant (medical service)	36	20	42,259
4208.000		Janitor	6	40	9,319
3044.000		Motor analyst	16	72	32,575
3008.000		Nurse aid	13	24	8,908
3029.000		Nurse aid, geriatrics	6	75	8,231
4310.000		Nurse, practical, licensed	50	36	81,899
4297.000		Reproduction specialist	44	31	90,780
3038.000		Stenographer	18	120	32,549
4201.000		do	18	80	29,767
4210.000		Transmission repairman (automobile service)		36	55,550
4206.000		Waitress	4	50	7,220
	Total (14)			804	549,985

Projects approved under Manpower Development and Training Act through June 30, 1964—Continued

Project No.	Labor market area or county	Occupational goal	Duration (weeks)	Trainees or persons serviced	Total funds
4247.000	Madisonville	Automobile-body repairman	52	18	$56,863
3033.000		Nurse, practical, licensed	50	20	30,064
4315.000		do	50	20	55,720
	Total (3)			58	142,647
4204.000	Mayfield	Nurse, practical, licensed		20	44,946
3058.000	Maysville	Clerk, general office	44	20	35,187
3050.000		Farmhand	20	20	19,356
3040.000		Nurse aid, geriatrics	6	24	3,110
	Total (3)			64	57,653
3039.000	Maysville-Morehead	Automobile mechanic	52	30	87,956
4215.000		Farmhand, general	52	20	63,721
	Total (2)			50	151,677
3046.000	Middlesboro	Automobile mechanic	52	18	39,907
3005.000	Morehead	Cabinetmaker	52	35	133,068
3041.000		Clerk-stenographer	44	20	26,650
	Total (2)			55	159,718
3026.000	Owensboro	do	50	18	20,561
4230.000		do	44	18	40,102
3065.000		Electrical appliance serviceman	52	18	43,658
3013.000		Millman	52	18	39,677
3075.000		Office-machine serviceman	50	18	35,303
3076.000		Welder, combination	44	14	44,829
	Total (6)			104	224,130
3045.000	Paducah	Automobile mechanic	52	18	40,156
4258.000	Pikeville	Automobile service station mechanic	52		73,401
4259.000		do	52	18	58,765
4214.000		Clerk-stenographer	44	20	46,838
4260.000		Welder, combination	44	36	122,478
	Total (4)			74	301,482
3018.000	Prestonsburg	Automobile mechanic	52	30	67,454
4271.000		do	52	18	50,782
3022.000		Clerk-stenographer	52	30	68,494
3020.000		Electrical appliance repairman	52	14	28,863
3019.000		Refrigeration and air-conditioning mechanic	52	14	33,147
4274.000		Television repairman	52	18	53,361
3021.000		Welder, combination	52	14	50,043
4275.000		do	44	18	65,263
	Total (8)			156	417,407
4213.000	Somerset	Clerk-stenographer	44	20	40,769
4269.000		Maid, general	8	20	8,400
4218.000		Radio-TV announcer	34	18	53,901
3010.000		Woodworker, carpenter	52	16	38,729
	Total (4)			74	141,799
3032.000	Whitesburg	Automobile mechanic	52	30	74,672
3048.000	Winchester	Auto-body repairman	52	18	74,353
3028.000		Automobile mechanic	52	15	33,929
3057.000		do	52	18	60,393
3055.000		Electrical appliance serviceman	52	18	61,870
3011.000		Machine repairman	52	15	42,559
3017.000		Sewing machine operator	4	40	4,119
3051.000		do	4	20	2,108
3047.000		Stenographer	44	40	67,830
	Total (8)			184	347,161
	Total, institutional (108)			6,015	13,476,765
	ON THE JOB				
4207.000	Henderson	Tool and die maker	36	5	4,450
3006.000	Logan County	Finisher	12	1	205
3003.000		Molder operator	24	2	820
3005.000		Shaper operator	24	5	2,049
3004.000		Variety saw operator	12	5	1,025
	Total (4)			13	4,099
3001.000	Munfordville	Sewing machine operator	8	11	2,181
3002.000		Wrapping machine operator	8	4	1,088
	Total (2)			15	3,269
	Total, on job (7)			33	11,818

The proposed amendments will make the program more effective and in my judgment are essential to its continuation. I actively supported the committee amendment extending the terminal date until June 30, 1968, and to continue the 100-percent Federal financing until June 30, 1966.

In many States and areas where the program is most urgently needed, financial resources are not available to finance any part of the cost at this time. Also of great importance are provisions of the bill which call upon the Secretary of Labor to stimulate and assist job development programs to fill unmet service needs. Every effort should be extended to fully identify job opportunities in areas where there are large numbers of unemployed people.

The liberalization of training allowances under title II will provide the necessary flexibility to reach particularly needy cases. Provisions in the new legislation to permit payment of daily commuting costs will be extremely meaningful in the eastern Kentucky districts which it is my privilege to represent. In many instances, trainees have to travel great distances over bad roads in order

to obtain the benefits of the program. Under the most ideal circumstances their participation represents considerable hardship and sacrifice. This provision will open the door for many unemployed persons who cannot now find the means to enroll.

Particularly crucial to the ability of the Manpower Development and Training Act program in eliminating unemployment are the provisions of the original act as amended to reach the hard-core unemployed. A full opportunity must be afforded to provide basic educational skills in conjunction with vocational training. In this connection the amendment authorizing payment of allowances up to a maximum of 72 weeks for individuals taking advantage of this aspect of the program is extremely important.

I would strongly urge the passage of H.R. 4257 as amended by the committee so that the opportunities created by the original legislation may be expanded and the work started by the Manpower Development and Training Act can be completed.

It is my great pleasure to compliment my colleagues on the Committee on Education and Labor for bringing this important piece of legislation to the floor of the House. Particularly I wish to compliment the distinguished author of the bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND], and his and my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], who has rendered such great service and who has done such an outstanding job on this bill as has the gentleman from New York [Mr. GOODELL], who has supported the program beginning with its original introduction. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI], the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS], and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY], deserve high praise for their work on the subcommittee which handled the bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MADDEN].

Mr. MADDEN. Madam Chairman, I want to commend the Committee on Education and Labor for bringing this legislation to the floor of the House today. I supported this Manpower Development and Training Act in 1962, and also when it was expanded in 1963. The bill we are considering today, sponsored by our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] is a good bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] is to be commended, and also the other members of the Committee on Education and Labor are to be commended for this legislation which will further expand the good work that the bill has been doing for providing additional employment in the last few years.

In my industrial congressional district we have received great advantages by reason of the training provided for thousands of workers to enjoy employment and income.

I hope this legislation will be passed unanimously today.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SICKLES].

Mr. SICKLES. Madam Chairman, I would like to add my voice to those who have previously recognized the leadership provided by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. HOLLAND] in this important field of legislation.

A number of important and new provisions of H.R. 4257 have been commented on by my distinguished colleagues. I fully support passage of this bill, and, at this time, I would like to call your attention to one of its most interesting provisions—the job development program.

I believe the job development program holds great promise for eroding the mountain of human and economic waste created by the unmet demands for jobs and workers in the service industries. It seems to me a wise move to pinpoint this neglected but fertile area of our manpower utilization growth. It seems almost a certainty that the need to match jobs and the jobless in this area will be unfilled unless additional steps are taken to develop jobs in conjunction with the required training and stimulation of new enterprise.

H.R. 4257 contains a proposed amendment to title I of the Manpower Development and Training Act which would give the Secretary of Labor specific direction and authority to realize the possibilities in this area by using on-the-job training, and other suitable methods, in cooperation with both public and private interested agencies. I understand that exploratory work has already been undertaken, and that more substantive work will evolve as soon as the stimulus provided by this bill is available.

Another interesting provision of title I, to which I would now like to direct your attention, is the proposed section 105 concerning "Trainee Placement Assistance Demonstration Projects." It poses a novel but practical approach to an old problem which is: How does a person with a police record find an employer who will take a chance on hiring him? The proposed amendment gives the Secretary of Labor authority to establish a pilot program to assist in placement of qualified persons, but to whom employment is denied primarily because of difficulty in securing bonds for idemnifying their employers against loss from theft or embezzlement.

The impetus for this project stems from the Manpower Development and Training Act experience with youths who have juvenile records. Up to now, these workers were generally placed in jobs which do not require bonding, and the results of these efforts have been very encouraging. However, this placement policy necessarily excludes a whole range of job opportunities which, for instance, require handling money or licensing—and consequently bonding. Jobs in a variety of appropriate occupations, including various sales positions, are virtually closed to these workers.

This amendment would permit the Secretary of Labor to explore effectively ways to open these opportunities to youth who were once occupationally untrained juvenile offenders but who are now rehabilitated and trained members of the work force. The amendment does not suggest that the Secretary will go into the business of merely urging placement of delinquents. Rather, he will use this authority as another possible effort to salvage the talents of all manpower resources without regard to factors which may no longer bear substantially upon job performance.

The amendment would provide some bonding authority at the Federal level to supplement bonding by private carriers. As suggested by the relatively small authorization of $200,000 in fiscal year 1966 and $300,000 in fiscal year 1967, the size and scope of the experiment is modest, indeed. However, it will give us authority to gain demonstrable experience—be it good or bad—in placing persons with juvenile records for offenses against society. I believe it is a measure worth trying in matching available jobs with willing and eager workers.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GIBBONS].

Mr. GIBBONS. Madam Chairman, I would like to discuss one of the most important features of H.R. 4257: its provision with respect to non-Federal matching funds.

The bill before us today postpones any State matching requirement to June 30, 1966. After that date, Federal funds will continue to finance 100 percent of the cost of the weekly subsistence allowances paid trainees, but the Federal contribution will be reduced to 90 percent of the instructional and other costs of the institutional training projects under title I.

Let me make clear that this provision of the bill is not the provision that was reported by the Select Subcommittee on Labor to the full Committee after the Subcommittee's 8 days of hearings on H.R. 4257. During those hearings, I and the other members of the subcommittee received an impressive array of testimony from witnesses who strongly urged us to continue the Manpower Development and Training Act as a permanent, 100-percent federally financed program. The case in favor of completely eliminating any non-Federal matching requirement was a powerful one—and the subcommittee responded by reporting a bill that provided complete Federal financing, for all costs of the Manpower Development and Training Act program.

During our discussion of the bill in full committee, however, members of the minority proposed—and the committee accepted—an amendment which reestablished the principle of non-Federal matching. This amendment is incorporated in the bill now before the House. The matching provision in this bill, therefore, represents a reasonable compromise worked out in committee between those of us who would have preferred complete Federal financing and those who believed it necessary to preserve the requirement that a share of the cost be met by the individual State.

Madam Chairman, there can be no doubt that any matching conditions which called upon the States to bear a larger proportion of the costs than we have provided in this bill would inevitably force us to cut back—and cut back sharply—the level of our manpower training in many States. This is a fact that we must face squarely and frankly. It was quite clear to our committee that there were only two alternatives—either to develop a non-Federal matching provision that was within the financial capacity of our individual States to meet, or else allow a great deal of the manpower development and training program to go right down the drain.

Our subcommittee, during its hearings, received more than ample evidence on this point. Secretary of Labor Wirtz and representatives of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, submitted to us letter after letter they had received from State Governors and other responsible State officials, urgently requesting that the matching requirements for Manpower Development and Training Act either be done away with entirely or greatly reduced. These letters point out something of which everyone in this Chamber must be well aware—that the terrific financial pressures which bear down upon our State and local governments, as they struggle to meet the soaring costs of educating our young people, are simply making it impossible for the great majority of our States to consider taking on a large share of the costs of manpower training under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

I will not fill the record with facts and figures to demonstrate a point that is familiar to all of us. But let me remind the Members of this House that the bonded indebtedness and other debts of our States and local governments had reached a total figure of more than $92 billion at the end of the last fiscal year—and that this figure was three times the level of a dozen years earlier. In a period of only 12 years, that is, State and local debt approximately tripled. This is a rate of increase in debt which not only vastly exceeds the relatively gradual rate of increase in the Federal debt, but—and this is especially significant—greatly exceeds the rate at which the incomes of our citizens have been growing. When we measure it against the size of our income, State and local debt loom far larger today than it did a few years ago.

The fact is that our State, and local governments have had to do more and more, and at such a pace, that they are facing a really critical problem in finding adequate tax revenues. At the same time that we in this Congress were putting through a substantial cut in Federal corporate and personal income tax rates, last year, State and local property tax rates, income tax rates, and sales tax rates were continuing to be forced up. And they will continue to be forced up even further—not because the States are seeking to take on new programs and new responsibilities, but just to enable them to provide the services for which they are presently responsible.

To see the rate at which the pressures on State revenue sources are mounting, we can look at two recent years for which we now have final and complete data. From fiscal year 1962 to fiscal year 1963, the States managed to increase their general revenues by approximately 8.7 percent. This was an impressive achievement—and yet State general expenditure rose even more rapidly, by almost 10 percent. If we examine for these same 2 fiscal years, 1962 and 1963, the four functions which account for about 80 percent of State government expenditure, here is what we find: State spending for education rose more than 11 percent between these 2 years; spending for highways rose more than 11 percent; spending for public welfare rose by approximately 8 percent and for hospitals about 7 percent.

I need hardly add that these are very sharp rates of increase from one year to the next, and that our States are terribly hard-pressed for ways to squeeze out enough additional tax revenue to keep up the pace.

Allow me to illustrate this problem by a reference to my own State of Florida. In my State, it is estimated that State expenditures for education in the biennial period, 1963–65, will be about $487 million. For the coming biennial period, 1965–67, our State legislature, which meets this year, is being requested to provide $624 million for education. This budget request represents an increase of no less than 28 percent over the previous period.

Madam Chairman, the inability of most of our States to meet a large matching requirement for the manpower development and training program in no way reflects a lack of interest or concern for this program. On the contrary. As I stand here now, I could read to you letters and telegrams from Governors and leading officials of the great majority of our States, expressing their satisfaction with this program, telling us of what it has already accomplished in their States, and calling upon us to take the steps necessary to make certain that the Manpower Development and Training Act program is not allowed to shrink and wither away for lack of funds. The southern Governors' conference for example, at it annual meeting in October, passed a resolution—by the unanimous vote of the 17 Governors present—which cited the benefits that manpower development and training has brought to our Southern States, and petitioned the Congress and the President to continue 100-percent Federal financing of this program until much more progress has been made in reducing the great reservoir of uneducated and untrained persons that the South has inherited from past generations.

Before I conclude, let me discuss briefly several aspects of manpower development and training which make it particularly appropriate that the Federal Government bear the primary financial responsibility.

The causes of unemployment are not local in origin—but national. All of us realize that the amount of unemployment in a community or in a State is greatly influenced by forces that originate beyond the State or local boundaries. This has become increasingly the case as our economy has developed more and more into a nationally integrated economy, and as the continued employment of ever-greater numbers of our workers is subject to the decisions made in the headquarters of great national corporations and in the Department of Defense. Accordingly, it is only equitable that the lion's share of costs of training and retraining our unemployed workers be shouldered by the Nation as a whole, rather than by the individual State or community, whose level of unemployment is usually due to forces largely beyond its own control.

We should also remember that training under the Manpower Development and Training Act program has never been intended to be exclusively for job opportunities that are located in the State of the trainee's residence. The majority of the Manpower Development and Training Act training program graduates, it is true, will find jobs in their own States—but a significant minority will move elsewhere, once they are trained. And it is not difficult to understand that a State will be naturally reluctant to finance a large share of the training of workers whose new skills are going to be put to use only outside the State's borders.

Another feature of the Manpower Development and Training Act program that calls into question the practicality of a large State matching share is the fact that many training projects have been, and will be, established in metropolitan areas which are natural centers for drawing in groups of trainees from two or more different States. Examples come easily to mind—the New York-northeastern New Jersey area, the Chicago-northern Indiana area, St. Louis, the Philadelphia-Camden, N.J., area, or the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area. If the States are required to finance a large proportion of the Manpower Development and Training Act training, there is a very real danger that they will prove unable to cooperate effectively in working out arrangements for dividing fairly among themselves the costs of any training projects which take in residents of more than one State. The result, of course, may be a fragmentation of the program into smaller training projects which are confined exclusively to trainees living in a single State.

For all these reasons, I have no hesitation in supporting the matching provision which we have written into this bill. It maintains the requirement of a non-Federal contribution, but not at such a level as to endanger the vitality of the Manpower Development and Training Act program. I, for one, believe that it would be a tragic and indefensible policy to deny unemployed American workers the new hope and opportunity that the Manpower Development and Training Act program can hold out to them, simply because they happened to be residents of a State that was unable to bear a large share of the costs of the program. The matching provision that we have in this bill guarantees that the manpower development and training program will remain alive not just in some of our States—or in most of them—but in all 50 of them.

Mr. QUIE. Madam Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Madam Chairman, the economists have disagreed on the persistent cause of unemployment which has prevailed during the last few years. However, there has been very little disagreement among observers of our current market situation that a large number of the unemployed are inadequately prepared to enter the current labor market, particularly in the occupations which have been expanding most rapidly in recent years. Long-term unemployment, that is, continuous unemployment lasting 26 weeks or longer, has averaged half a million a year since 1958, and the number of those unemployed for 15 weeks or longer has been 11 million. Many of them have not been able to return to their industries and occupations. There exists, therefore, a stagnant pool of hundreds of thousands of persons who need new skills and retraining to help them participate in the American economy.

We have heard from the Department of Labor that there are more jobs going unfilled than there are unemployed in the country. We have also heard that when a person begins his occupation in a semiskilled job he can look forward to four or five occupational changes during his lifetime.

Mr. COLLIER. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COLLIER. Can the gentleman tell me to what extent a study has been made on the subject of chronic alcoholism as it affects this problem?

May I just add at this point, from the figures I have been able to secure from the departments that there are actually over a million-and-one-half men between the ages of 21 and 45 who, because of this disease of chronic alcoholism, would not be available to enter the labor market even if jobs were available for them. It seems to me, this is certainly a large enough number to make this a very important factor in this employment figure that we so often hear.

Mr. QUIE. I could not tell you what studies have been made at the national level. I am familiar with the studies we have made in Minnesota. But this is not the question the gentleman asked. If the gentleman has any information available that he can submit for the Record, I think it would be very helpful to us and helpful to the department as well. But if the Department of Labor has done anything on chronic alcoholism, as it affects unemployment, I am not aware of it.

Mr. COLLIER. I would only submit in the light of the growing problem and when you speak in terms of unemployment that certainly this must be a consideration and this must be a factor which has a very dominant effect on the unemployment figures. Yet, for some reason, I have sensed at least that there is little or no discussion of the effect of alcoholism in its relationship to the number of unemployed in the country when, in fact, it is a very important factor.

Mr. QUIE. I thank the gentleman for bringing this to our attention because there are other factors too that we have not been seriously considering. We have studied the Manpower Development and Training Act and its impact on unemployment. But I know of none on mental retardation and mental illness. Mental illness is a factor in unemployment, of course, that is very large in our country.

As we look at the problem, however, of the unemployed and the fact that there are some adults who can be retrained, there is a necessity to retrain people for employment not only in their own area but there are many individuals who no matter what their training could not find employment in their own area and there is a need for them to learn skills just to find employment elsewhere in the State. Or another factor that is important, they would be required to leave the State to find employment if they are properly skilled. Therefore, the Federal Government becomes involved in this being interested in unemployment and being involved in unemployment compensation.

In 1962 the Manpower Training and Development Act was adopted by the Federal Government to provide assistance and incentive to go into the retraining as we have seen now operating in a number of instances.

This was amended again in 1963 and I believe the work that was done by a number of men who have been mentioned so far today should be mentioned again—the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Holland], and the work he has done and his closest sidekick in this, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara]. As I mentioned earlier, I think on our side one who provided outstanding changes in the bill and gave great strength is the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell].

From this we now see a record in the Manpower Development and Training Act which I think is so good and so well developed that we ought to extend the act and make some changes in the act as we are providing in this legislation. Whatever its shortcomings, it emphatically is not merely another Federal welfare or handout program designed to relieve, without curing, some of the more unsightly and superficial aspects of poverty and despair resulting from being continuously out of work. Its purpose rather is to provide effective means for dealing successfully with, and eventually eliminating the basic causes of such unemployment.

It should not be forgotten that a concern by the Federal Government for improving the productive skills of our people did not originate in 1962 with the passage of the Manpower Development and Training Act. It has a much longer history.

The Federal Government manifested its concern almost 50 years ago by enacting the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act in 1917. This legislation provided for the Government to share part of the costs involved in meeting labor market demands for skills which were felt to be in short supply. During the following half-century, Federal aid for vocational education was expanded on several occasions in the George-Barden Act of 1946, title VIII of the National Defense Education Act, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Area Redevelopment Act, and the legislation which we are here proposing to amend.

In 1963, some 4 million youngsters and adults participated in the federally supported vocational education programs. However, this seemingly impressive total vastly exaggerates the real contributions of traditional vocational education to the acquisition of sorely needed skills. These federally supported programs of vocational education have tended to emphasize such activities as home economics and training for agricultural occupations. In fact, these two areas alone accounted for about two-thirds of all of the enrollees in the entire program.

The Manpower Development and Training Act constituted a new departure—an attempt to grapple with the unmet manpower needs of a highly complex and rapidly changing technical economy while simultaneously providing a hope of reabsorption into the productive life of the Nation for those whose skills had become obsolete or whose occupations had vanished.

The program has been in existence for less than 3 years. It is much too early to express any definitive conclusions about its effectiveness. But there is sufficient evidence to indicate that the prospects are hopeful and that many of those who are receiving training under the act are succeeding in finding jobs in which their newly acquired skills are being utilized. I regret that the committee report did not contain more information in the form of specific examples of what has been accomplished since the original enactment of the law in 1962.

However, shortly after the report was filed, an event occurred which not only constitutes a substantial contribution to the success of the program, but is a manifestation that important segments of American industry are eager to cooperate. I refer to the job-training contract entered into between the Government and Chrysler Corp. I would like to quote from the news story concerning this development which appeared in the Daily Labor Report published by the Bureau of National Affairs on March 18, 1965:

> The largest Federal on-the-job training program negotiated to date is announced by Labor Secretary Wirtz and Commerce Secretary Connor, recently directed by the President to administer the job development program in the service industries.
>
> The new program begins with a contract between the Government and Chrysler Corp. to train 1,000 previously unemployed workers as automobile mechanics and auto-body repairmen while they are on the job at Chrysler dealerships on a starting wage of about $1.50 an hour, the announcement states.
>
> The contract was signed by Chrysler President Lynn A. Townsend and the two Cabinet members in a ceremony in Wirtz' office.
>
> The initial contract is expected to continue at least 3 years and to include another 1,000 workers later. The cost of the first phase is $7,850,000, of which the company and its 6,300 dealers will contribute $6,463,000. The Government will contribute the remainder.

Wirtz terms this agreement, under the Manpower Development and Training Act, "one of the most significant developments to date in the growth of the job development program."

The program will begin among dealers in Chrysler's Detroit, Cleveland, Pittsburgh, and Cincinnati sales regions. It will be expanded later to include dealers in regions such as New York City, Philadelphia, Atlanta, Chicago, Kansas City, Los Angeles, and Portland, Oreg.

The trainees will be employees of franchised dealers. Any union relationship this may involve will be a local matter between the dealer and any local bargaining unit to which his employees may belong.

Three unions are said to have some dealers' mechanics organized in major cities: the Auto Workers, the Machinists, and the Teamsters.

The average hourly wage rate for journeymen mechanics with Chrysler dealers is about $3 in most areas, the Wirtz-Connor announcement states.

The length of the training courses will vary from place to place, as worked out with individual dealers, and may be as long as 3 years, according to a Labor Department spokesman.

Local offices of the Employment Service will screen and test the jobless workers applying for the training. The Wirtz-Connor announcement adds:

"Once selected by local Chrysler Motors dealers, individual workers will be employed on a full-time basis, but will also receive additional nighttime instruction in automotive repair at local vocational educational facilities. Needed equipment at such facilities will come directly from Chrysler, and from funds allocated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. That allocation will also include the cost of nighttime supplemental instruction to trainees."

Secretary Connor has these prepared comments about the new program:

"This administration is convinced that the best way to provide job training as a means of generating increased employment for young and old is through the normal channels of the private enterprise system. It is now possible, under the Manpower Development and Training Act, for private industry and the Federal Government to work together to provide training in a normal working environment and on a scale big enough to be meaningful.

"I want to express our appreciation to the Chrysler Corp. for responding so quickly and affirmatively to President Johnson's call for a job development program to enlarge economic opportunities for our citizens."

Secretary Wirtz adds:

"The purpose of that program is to enable unemployed and underemployed workers to capitalize upon the evident job opportunities in many service and service-related fields. We are now producing automobiles at a rate that taxes our ability to provide trained personnel to service them. Some suggestion of this demand is found in the fact that courses in auto repair have consistently outpaced those for any other occupation for male trainees under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

"The participation of the Chrysler Corp. in this project may be regarded as a sign of the increasing interest in expanding job opportunity in the service industry, and filling immediate unmet needs, by major American employers. As such, this contract is to be doubly welcomed."

Madam Chairman, I am particularly impressed by the overwhelmingly huge proportion of the cost of the project's first phase which the employer, Chrysler Corp., has agreed to assume. Its share will be more than 80 percent, that of the Federal Government less than 20 percent. And that division of responsibility, which I think a highly desirable one, calls attention to one aspect of the amendments made by the committee bill which troubles me a little.

The Manpower Development and Training Act as written when it first became law in 1962, provided that before the act expired, the States were to make substantial matching contributions as a condition to receiving Federal funds during the last years of the program. Unfortunately very few of the States acted to assume their proper responsibilities. As a result, the law was amended in 1963 and the practical effect of the 1963 amendments was to relieve the States of any obligation to make any financial contribution whatsoever for the life of the statute.

The committee bill, as originally introduced in the present Congress, realistically faced the problem created by the apparent apathy of the States, and in extending the program, among other things it substantially reduced the matching requirements for the States. The bill provided that the Federal Government was to bear 90 percent, the States only 10 percent, of the costs of the various training projects and programs set up under the act. However, during the hearings, most of the witnesses testified in favor of eliminating all matching requirements and having the Federal Government assume the financing of the entire cost of the program.

A small number of witnesses, among them Prof. Richard Lester, of Princeton University, recommended that the 10-percent matching requirement should be retained. Professor Lester felt that it was desirable to give the States a sense of concrete participation in the program which would carry with it a sense of responsibility on the part of the States for the success of the program. The subcommittee decided, however, to eliminate the matching requirements in toto. This troubled me, and for precisely the reasons described by Professor Lester.

As a result, I discussed the matter with the acting chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA], and it was agreed that in the full committee I would offer an amendment to retain some element of matching and that the acting subcommittee chairman would support the amendment.

My amendment provides for the retention of some element of financial participation by the States. It is a compromise between what the bill originally proposed and the subcommittee's decision to eliminate the matching requirements entirely. It requires the States to contribute 10 percent of the costs of training programs, but relieves them of any obligation to bear any of the costs of the living allowances paid to trainees. These are borne entirely by the Federal Government. The full committee accepted my amendment and it is included in the bill as reported.

I regret that the States have not shown the willingness of a large private enterprise like Chrysler Corp. to assume more of the financial burden of the program; and this despite the fact that the contributions originally asked of them were so much smaller in proportion. However, Chrysler's willingness to cooperate bodes well for the future of the program.

I think that the amendments made by the committee bill are justified despite the briefness of the experience we have had with the act. The general summary of the results of the program to date, set forth on page 3 of the report are most heartening. But I do wish to express the hope that after we have learned more about the results of the program as time goes by, we will give more thought to possible changes in the law to encourage an even greater degree of participation by private industry of which the Chrysler Corp. project is so striking an example.

After all, what we are trying to do is effectively to meet the manpower needs of our rapidly changing economy. The achievement of this goal is just as important to American enterprise as self-respect through productive employment is to our unemployed and to the health of American society as a whole. I can think of none who are better qualified to see, yes to foresee, the labor needs of our productive system. But even self-interest sometimes requires an additional stimulus, and often requires material help. I look forward to possible future amendments in the manpower program which will provide real incentive to private industry in the form, perhaps, of tax credits or deductions. The possibilities are many, and I sincerely hope that the Congress will give them its serious attention as the manpower program develops.

Some people have questioned the fact that the Department of Labor moved slow and did not try to make a great record fast and, therefore, make a number of mistakes.

Some people wonder why they took so long to get into operation. I would say this is a commendable thing that the Department of Labor did make sure of its ground as they did in the States before they got into operation. We now have a number of these programs in Minnesota.

I heard from Raymond V. Nord, director of vocational education, consultant in industrial education, Minneapolis public schools, the following:

> Currently, we have 160 students in training under the manpower development and training program. These students are recruited by the employment service from many parts of the State and are individuals who would not seek vocational education unless they were paid a subsistence through funds made available under the manpower development and training program. These programs are operated in the late afternoon and the evening. The Minneapolis public schools make the Central Vocational School, valued at between $6 and $8 million, available for the Manpower Development and Training Act classes. We have, at times during the past year, utilized certain training facilities in our vocational school for Manpower Development and Training Act classes 21 out of 24 hours, to accommodate the expanded program requested by the local employment service.

With the training program action just suggested, I find the vocational technical schools have been ready immediately to take action.

Mr. Thomas W. Raine, director of the Winona area vocational-technical school, says:

> Winona Technical School is at present offering 5 courses under the Manpower Development and Training Act in the area of auto-body repair, general office clerk, highway technician, stenography, and welding. We have been most successful, in cooperation with Winona Employment Service, in recruiting, training, and placing unemployed or underemployed men and women in employment in their areas of interest.

In Albert Lea, Minn., under Director Norman K. Bailey, they have some excellent courses which stand out. I notice that the Department of Labor has made special mention of these programs. One is an 8-hour-a-day course in stenography, which includes typing, shorthand, mathematics, English, and filing. A second is a course in drafting, using modern equipment. The teaching style is one of exposure rather than actual classroom teaching. It is exposure to the work they will be doing. This course takes care of 15 men.

Then they have an 8-week sales training course. Here the students are learning for themselves. The teacher uses textbooks, but spends a great deal of time letting the students "sell" things to each other. On the whole, the students have shown great maturity and responsibility. Attendance is good because the students choose to be there, not because they have to be. Most look at it as a job.

I believe that these programs have proven themselves well.

There are a number of other programs. There is one in Red Wing for boot stitchers, because we have a shoe company operating there.

Also in Red Wing, there is a woodworking machine operator program, a case coverer program, and a case framer program.

In the movement of technological type employment into my district, we are able to train many of the unemployed or the underemployed to find occupations in these expanding jobs. I believe this speaks well for the program.

Mr. HALL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. As one who voted against this program originally, I intend to support the bill today, for the reasons the gentleman had so well stated; second, because I have been in the field and have checked the progress of the very type of training programs mentioned, and their development; and third, I believe that the duplication and overlap of the original 11 agencies has been, as a result of the work of this committee, well straightened out.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. QUIE. I yield further to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. The gentleman from Illinois asked a question awhile ago about the effect of alcohol on the end result of this fine principle of a program of retraining and development to suit vocational needs. Having served as a consultant in this area for many years, I appreciate those principles.

I believe the question of relocation is probably much more vital than the question of disease, including alcoholism, in the effectiveness of the program. I know of many instances where people have been retrained at considerable expense to qualify for a needed occupational specialty but have not then seen fit to relocate where the demand was present and the jobs were available. Indeed, the gentleman in the well said awhile ago that there are more job descriptions open than there are people to fill them among the unemployed.

I wonder if this relocation is not a factor, and if it is to be incorporated in this or future studies?

Mr. QUIE. This relocation question is incorporated in this legislation in the studies. There will be some demonstration programs in relocation. From that we can gain experience on how best to enable these people to pull up roots from a community and make a fresh start in a different area. The experience developed from this legislation will enable us to make positive improvements in our whole employment picture.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman. Would the gentleman agree with me that regardless of the various programs we may have in certain given areas—if for no other reason than the leaching of the soil and nonrestoration—there always may be pockets where we will have to relocate people if we train them for the job vacancies of the Nation.

Mr. QUIE. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. PIRNIE. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. QUIE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PIRNIE. I should like to state that in our district, which was one of the earliest areas to implement the act, we had a very excellent result. We were able to place 496 people into new jobs within 1 year.

The programs have been well received in the community. All of the agencies have cooperated and new programs are being provided. So, therefore, I am very happy that this program is receiving consideration through the action which will be taken here today.

Mr. QUIE. Madam Chairman, I thank the gentleman from New York, and I would like to make a comment about one feature of this bill that I have talked about previously, and I know a number of my colleagues here have also; namely, bringing the retraining program of the ARA under Manpower Development and Training Act. We have too frequently fragmentized Federal programs in the past, and when we can bring two of them together and achieve the coordination and cooperation that we can through bringing these two together, then I think it will enable us to do a much better job.

The next step that I hope will be taken is to bring the retraining in the Trade Expansion Act, under the Manpower Development and Training Act so that it can be consolidated under one head and so that a much more efficient and effective job can be done.

I also point out in this bill we retain the principles of State sharing which will go into effect after June 30, 1966. On this occasion and on one other occasion we changed the matching formula in the bill. The original bill passed in 1962 provided 50 percent State matching would be in effect by now. The act we are operating under at the present time provides one-third State matching after June 1965. Because the States have been unwilling to assume their share of the Manpower Development and Training Act it is necessary for us to extend 100 percent Federal financing for another year. I hope that we will always at least maintain the principle of 10 percent of State matching on the training program. I say this because the States must assume a good portion of the responsibilities of this program if it is going to expand to the end that we can retrain most all of the people who need this because of unemployment or underemployment. With this expansion it would not make any sense for States to run a separate State program from the one the Federal Government is involved with. So, with the matching funds principle in mind, we can come back 2 or 3 years from now and take another look at the program and see if the States cannot share in a greater amount than 10 percent under this bill.

I wish to thank the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] for his assistance in my efforts to retain in this part of the bill the principle of State matching, because we do have a certain amount of autonomy and sovereignty among our States yet. When they continue to accept at least some portion of the responsibility, I think the programs function in a much better way.

Mr. SPRINGER. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Madam Chairman, we Republicans recognize unemployment as both a personal and a national tragedy. It is a personal tragedy for the jobless individual and his family. It is a national tragedy because of the loss of productivity and revenue and the waste of our greatest national resource, the skills of our people.

A few years ago the Republican policy committee sponsored a searching study, under the chairmanship of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] into the causes of unemployment in this country and the possible remedies. I served as chairman of one of the subcommittees for that study.

We learned that one out of every five unskilled workers was without a job, that the unemployment rate among untrained persons was three times higher than among the trained. We learned, at the same time, that jobs were going begging for lack of qualified applicants.

To a great extent, therefore, the unemployment problem did not result from the inability of our economy to create jobs, but because of our failure to train people to fill them.

Our Republican study group in 1961 endorsed the need for such legislation as the Manpower Development and Training Act, which was passed the following year. My colleagues will recall that on the House floor we substituted for the bill reported by the Committee on Education and Labor a bill embracing the Republican study group's recommendation and largely written by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell].

The role of the opposition party in our form of government is an important one. It has been correctly said that we should support the administration when it is right, criticize it when it is wrong, and be ready to offer constructive alternatives to bills we agree with in principle but disagree with in detail.

The constructive alternative offered by Republicans in 1962 resulted in the successful manpower development and training program. The bill before us would strengthen and extend this program and, therefore, has my wholehearted support.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Madam Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill].

Mr. CAHILL. Madam Chairman and Members of the Committee, as one who originally supported this legislation, I am happy again to pledge my support of the pending bill. I think generally this program has met with the approval of all segments of the population of our country. However, I wanted to bring to the attention of the House a complaint about this program which was made to me just about 2 or 3 weeks ago by a group of personnel managers from the State of New Jersey. Their objection was this: There is not sufficient liaison between the administrators of this program and the employers of the country. One of the men, for example, advised me that he had been seeking to employ some 40 people in a factory where all that was required was the basic skill of a machine operator. It was nothing that required any tremendous know-how, but it did require some weeks of training. Their objection seemed to be that, the Secretary, and those who are administering the program are not fully aware of the needs of the community on a continuing basis, because these needs change from time to time.

I note in reading the report that Secretary Wirtz is quoted as saying on page 9:

> This proposal will be carried out in closest cooperation, not only with all appropriate Federal agencies * * * but with management and labor and local community representatives.

So I have taken this time to address a question to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'Hara] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] in charge of the bill for the purpose of attempting to make some legislative history and for the purpose of giving to the Secretary a directive. Is it the policy of the committee and is it the directive of the committee that the Secretary should insist upon, through those who are administering the program, the closest type of liaison in a community so that in the first instance the needs of the community will be known and therefore the training program can be as closely as possible associated with the needs of the community?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to respond to that question. This matter has concerned us. In the amendments to the act in 1963 and in the committee report accompanying those amendments, we specifically referred to this problem. We also stated our conviction that advisory committees composed of representatives of labor, management, and the public should be involved in the conception and operation of these programs. Our objective was to obtain the fullest community participation possible in this program.

We amended the act to require the formation of certain advisory committees and encouraged their use to the fullest extent. We are going to involve the community more than ever under these amendments, and we think we have already done quite well.

Mr. CAHILL. It is the considered opinion of the committee that this should be utilized to the fullest possible extent?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Absolutely.

Mr. CAHILL. Madam Chairman, I would say in closing that one of the personnel managers also called my attention to the fact that he had been actively seeking help for his plant from the unemployment office in the community and that they readily admitted that they just could not supply him with men to do the work that he wanted. When he asked them the question, "Why don't you take this up with the manpower retraining administrators?" they more or less said that "that is something separate and apart from us; we really have nothing to do with that."

So I think it is very important that we do have this cooperation because at least in my State it has been my observation that there are jobs available but that special skills are required to fill them. These skills should be supplied as far as is possible by the retraining program.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CAHILL. I yield.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Madam Chairman, I am glad the gentleman brought up this point. On page 128 of the manpower report of the President it is clearly outlined that the Manpower Development and Training Act recognizes this as a problem and they are working on it but they readily admit that they have not accomplished the desired results. They say here:

> Despite characteristic difficulties in establishing new relationships at national, State, and local levels—with other Government agencies, employers, labor unions, and other organizations—and in developing new policies and practices—

They indicate that they recognize the problem but have not fully solved the problem.

I think the gentleman's contribution will help.

Mr. CAHILL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. Bell].

Mr. BELL. Madam Chairman, as one of those who supported the Manpower Development and Retraining Act from the very beginning, I wish to say that I support this bill now and the improvements contained herein as they relate to that program.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. Don H. Clausen].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Madam Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Manpower Development and Training Act extension before us today.

The committee is to be commended for some of the improving amendments and the obvious bipartisan support given this very important measure.

Many people will be helped to better prepare themselves to participate more productively in the social progress of our Nation. Without question, the Manpower Development and Training Act has done more to vocationally rehabilitate many of our most able workers in the country. I have discussed the successes of the various Government programs designed to provide vocational education assistance, with a good friend of mine, Mr. Alan Burch, an expert and training coordinator for many labor and operating engineer organizations affiliated with the AFL–CIO. He advises me that the Manpower Development and Training Act is the most favored and successful of all programs as he seeks means to improve the working capability of our Nation's labor force. I bring this to the attention of my colleagues as the finest example of testimony for support of this bill. I urge my colleagues to join in passage of the measure.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Madam Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois, a member of the committee [Mr. Findley].

Mr. FINDLEY. Madam Chairman, several speakers have mentioned the principle of State matching. It is a principle that was mentioned repeatedly during the initial debate authorizing this program back in 1962. It is a good principle. But I am afraid the facts show that it is just a principle for tomorrow—a tomorrow that never seems to come.

It is time for us to review a little history. Back in 1962 when the initial authorization was voted by this House, the bill provided 100 percent Federal payment the first 2 years and provided that the third year of the program would be carried out on a 50–50 State-Federal matching basis. So, that meant that the first year was financed 100 percent by the Federal Government.

The second year was financed 100 percent by the Federal Government.

And, just ahead of the time when this 50–50 matching provision would have gone into effect, an amendment to the Manpower Training Act was proposed and enacted.

It made several changes.

First of all, it provided that the third year of the Manpower Training Act, once more, would be financed 100 percent by the Federal Government. It provided that after the third year, the Federal Government would chip in only two-thirds of the cost and the States would pick up one-third. But remember, even the altered matching provision was to take effect later. The third year was to be paid 100 percent by the Federal Government.

Now, Madam Chairman, if we enact this legislation today, as I am sure we will, let us bear in mind that it will authorize one more year's delay in bringing about this matching principle. Because under this legislation the first full year of it will be financed completely by the Federal Government.

If this bill is enacted, the first 4 years of this program will be financed entirely by the Federal Government without one dime's participation by the States.

If we are to learn anything from past history, we can expect that before this 10-percent matching principle goes into effect, we will have a bill before the House to delay once more this noble matching principle.

So, Madam Chairman, we might just as well open our eyes to the plain fact that this is a Federal program, 100 percent.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. TALCOTT].

Mr. TALCOTT. Madam Chairman, I have asked for this time for the purpose of directing two questions to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. O'HARA].

I take it that one of the purposes of this bill—and I support the principle of the bill—is that we have some 4 million unemployed people in this country, and in other areas we have job opportunities that are not filled because people are not trained to perform them.

I happen to think that the farm labor situation is one of those areas. In my area we have a great demand for farm labor, particularly stoop labor, and yet there are no domestic workers who are willing or able to fulfill these jobs.

Will this Manpower Training Act supply training for this type worker?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield, agricultural workers have been trained under this program. There is nothing in these amendments that would reduce or prevent further training of agricultural workers under this program. However, we expect the Department to exercise judgment on these matters and train people for jobs that will provide them with a more or less steady source of income.

If any agricultural job meets that requirement we would expect the Department to train people, and we hope they will.

Mr. TALCOTT. I thank the gentleman.

I would like to ask another question. It has come to my attention that in the hiring of restaurant workers in the city of Washington they proselyte and import restaurant workers from Germany and other foreign countries. Some have been here 3 months or 3 weeks. Is there anything in this bill which would help to retrain some of our own unemployed in the slums of New York or in the coal mines of Kentucky and Tennessee, or in the cottonfields of Mississippi for positions in restaurants and hotels? Could these unemployed people be retrained for restaurant work in the city of New York or in the city of Washington where there is great demand, rather than importing workers from Europe? In Swiss papers they are advertising for restaurant workers in America. It seems to me that such a situation should not be allowed to continue while we have unemployed people here who want to work in hotels.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. If the gentleman will yield, we not only permit training for services, such as work in restaurants and food establishments, but an amendment in this bill specifically directs the Secretary to make an effort to develop job opportunities for people in service occupations.

Mr. TALCOTT. Would it not be proper to terminate the importation of foreign workers for restaurant work, as we did with farm labor, until this program can be put into effect?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I am sorry. I am not aware of the facts involved and I could not intelligently comment on that matter.

Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he might consume to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HATHAWAY].

Mr. HATHAWAY. Madam Chairman, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Departments of Labor, and Health, Education, and Welfare, for their administration of the Manpower Development and Training Act over the past 2½ years. Within the limits imposed by the legislation itself, they have provided training, and new hope to thousands of formerly unemployed Americans.

On the basis of working with the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Departments made recommendations to this Congress for amendments to strengthen the act. The Holland subcommittee, under the able leadership of the gentleman from Michigan, Acting Chairman O'HARA, carefully considered the Departments' recommendations, presented their suggestions to the full Education and Labor Committee, and the full committee now asks all Representatives to further their commitment to provide training to the unfortunate unemployed in our Nation.

One of the changes contained in this Manpower Act of 1965, the amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act, concerns the length of training.

Although there is, theoretically, no limit to the length of training courses, they are practically limited by the length of time a trainee may receive training allowances. For the training allowance often means the difference between being able to stay in the course or being forced to drop the course and accept any job, just for a little money.

The amendments we are considering here today include a provision to allow a trainee to receive allowances for 104 weeks, rather than the present 52- or 72-week limit. We are, in effect, asking for the right to conduct courses for up to 2 years under the Manpower Development and Training Act.

It should be made clear that a statutory increase to 104 weeks of training under the Manpower Development and Training Act would not mean that many courses would actually run that long; just as many courses do not now run the full 52 weeks, or 72 weeks with basic education. But it would allow the administrators enough flexibility to provide courses of the 104-week length where they are required; and they are required in some cases.

Essentially, there are two kinds of courses which require a longer training period.

The first involves those people who do not have enough basic education to enable them to absorb the occupational training itself, so that it is necessary to provide them with some basic education either before they begin job training or concurrently with it. Such additional basic education necessarily extends the total time necessary to prepare a trainee for employment.

This is particularly important for those Manpower Development and Training Act trainees—nearly half of all trainees—who come from the ranks of the hard-core unemployed. These disadvantaged people, many of whom are many years away from high school or any kind of school situation, need more time to absorb both the preoccupational and occupational training.

The second kind of course which requires more than the present 52 weeks of training involves certain more highly skilled jobs. Many technical jobs which are a product of our increasingly automated society cannot be learned in just 1 year.

In connection with this kind of training, it should be noted that graduates of these highly skilled training programs are usually more readily placed in jobs than those with semiskilled and minimum-skilled training.

I am asking that we give the administrators of this important training program, who have proved themselves in the past 2½ years, the flexibility to provide the most meaningful training in every situation. As they have not abused the present limitations, we can all be assured that they will not abuse the new limitation.

Our first commitment and thought must be to aiding as many unemployed persons as possible. The Manpower Development and Training Act is an important facet of our overall educational program. Its improvement deserves our support.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4257. I consider it a privilege to serve on the subcommittee that drafted this legislation and reported it to the full committee and to the House. It is gratifying to see support from both sides of the aisle for this important legislation, and the amendments that are proposed today. The Manpower Retraining Act will undoubtedly go down in history as one of the most important pieces of legislation ever approved by the Congress. I know of no greater waste of human resources in this country than an unemployed American. Unemployment erodes his self-respect; crushes his dignity. It costs the community vast sums of money which must be spent to provide assistance to him and to his family. And finally, Madam Chairman, prolonged unemployment tends to shatter the unfortunate worker's confidence in our economic system.

This bill is designed to help retrain those Americans who for various reasons are unemployed; people who had been dislocated by automation; people who had been layed off because their plant moved to another area of the country, and for various other reasons. This bill also is designed to help those young Americans who for various reasons, in many instances because they dropped out of school prematurely, are not qualified or prepared to gain employment.

On all fronts this legislation has indeed proved its merit and worth. It has worked extremely well in Chicago. If the people of this country could see how much money we actually are saving the taxpayers of America by retraining these unemployed Americans for employment, they would realize the full significance of this bill.

Madam Chairman, in rising in support of this legislation, I should like to recall one brief anecdote of an experience I had in Chicago. We had an American father of a family of five children, married, unemployed for several years, not that he wanted to be unemployed but he was unemployed because he could not find work because he was unqualified for any decent work. This family was costing the taxpayers of Chicago some $270 per month for welfare benefits. This had been going on for many months.

Finally this man enrolled in the manpower retraining program, and we took this fellow and trained him to be a chef. It took 8 months to complete the job. He did his studies well. He is now a good chef and is earning $350 a month. The taxpayers of Chicago are spared the expense of providing $270 a month in relief for himself and his family.

I recently had an opportunity to talk to him and he said, "Mister, you don't know how wonderful it feels to come home and be greeted by my children as a breadwinner instead of a reliefer."

This is one benefit that could not be defined in terms of dollars and cents, but this is one illustration of what is happening all over America.

The Secretary of Labor today announced that our unemployed have reached the lowest percentage in the past decade. Our ratio of unemployed today stands at 4.7 percent. This impressive reduction certainly reflects the people who are being retrained under the bill and put to work.

It is clear now that there will be full employment opportunity for every American citizen only if two policies are pursued:

First, the economic policy of promoting that degree of overall economic growth which will produce the demand for enough work to occupy the full work force;

Second, the manpower policy of matching people and jobs, of supplying the manpower needs that develop, of getting people into the jobs that exist—or can be developed.

The Manpower Development and Training Act has been carefully designed to enable us to carry out successfully the second of these policies that I have just described.

One of the unique and most important features of the Manpower Development and Training Act is its provision for income maintenance for unemployed individuals undertaking occupational training under title II. We can thank the 87th Congress for its foresight in introducing this provision into our body of Federal manpower legislation—a provision which permits literally thousands of individuals to take advantage of training which would otherwise be beyond their reach. The amount of the basic training allowance is small indeed. Nevertheless, it often spells the difference between having basic living support and no support—between training for a job and not training. Often, however, it has not been enough to permit an individual to enroll in a Manpower Development and Training Act training course—or to remain in training once begun.

In 1963, the Congress provided some extension of income maintenance benefits for the Manpower Development and Training Act trainees. Now, H.R. 4257 proposes other amendments to the allowance provisions to bring benefits more in line with the needs of the individuals for whom the act is intended. These amendments generally mean a broader scope of allowance payments available to more unemployed persons.

One step in this direction is the proposed amendment to allow more than one member of a family to receive a training allowance. Another is to provide increased allowances for workers with large families. Removal of the present provision that not more than one person in any one household may be receiving training allowances at any particular time permits training opportunities to be extended to several members of families living at very low income levels. Nine and one-half million families—one out of five in the United States—live in poverty. Of these, 6⅓ million have one or more wage earners, and over 2 million have two or more workers. For them, economic growth alone will provide relatively few escapes from poverty.

We must focus on the handicaps that deny these workers a fair access to the expanding income of a growing economy. The single greatest hope of escaping substandard living conditions for the adult workers in these families is attaining a vocational skill. Although we may not be able to provide training opportunities for every unemployed member in these families, we will be able to improve the situation in some of the more severely impoverished family units.

The proposed dependency allowances—increase of an additional $5 per week for each dependent over two up to a maximum of four additional dependents—are necessary because of the pressures of heavy family responsibilities of family heads. Over 25 percent of the Manpower Development and Training Act trainees have three or more dependents, and one in six have five or more dependents. The regular weekly training allowances now payable in the 50 States range from a low of $24 to a high of $44 per week, with some trainees drawing up to an additional $10 as provided by the 1963 Manpower Development and Training Act amendments. Much of the training is done in States paying the lower allowances, and it is obvious that a family of five or more persons cannot live on these low levels of income. Increased benefits in increments geared to family responsibilities is a must, in order to enable some individuals to enter training and to give them some of the wherewithal to remain in training until they are equipped with a skill for suitable full-time employment.

A further improvement contained in H.R. 4257 recognizes the financial needs of single adult trainees without dependents. Heretofore, one eligibility requirement for allowances has been that the trainee be either the head of a family or the head of a household. These definitions, however, excluded the single adult worker—the unmarried man or woman, the widow, and the widower who had no dependents. Nevertheless, their living expenses—rent, utilities, grocery bills, carfare, and the like—continued, and often have prevented them from accepting training opportunities for purely financial reasons. This inequity in the eligibility requirement for training allowances would be removed by the amendments in H.R. 4257.

The provision for payment of daily transportation allowances is recommended because of the financial hardships many trainees encounter in merely commuting between their home and the training facility. The cost of transportation is generally high in relation to the amount of the weekly training allowance, and can absorb a disproportionate amount of the trainee's weekly income for living expenses. The employed worker can afford to pay commuting costs because his salary is adequate to meet them. The average weekly wage in manufacturing is now over $100, but the average trainee receives an allowance much less than one-half of this amount. Obviously, it is only equitable to help those who are motivated enough to enter and persist in training by covering the transportation costs that training involves.

Madam Chairman, I have highlighted some of the more significant provisions in H.R. 4257, because of their importance in providing the type of income maintenance needed to assist individuals to participate in the benefits of the Manpower Development and Training Act. I hope that these improvements will reduce considerably the extent of dropouts because of financial burdens from family responsibilities, and allow individuals to train for full-time suitable employment. The Manpower Development and Training Act has passed through the initial testing stage of an infant program with so much distinction and accomplishment that I urge each Member of the House to give favorable consideration to the changes in allowance provisions and the many other improvements in the Manpower Act of 1965.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PICKLE].

Mr. PICKLE. Madam Chairman, I want to pursue the question raised by the gentleman from New Jersey a minute ago with regard to the service feature of this bill. Having been connected with an employment commission, I know that to set up a training program for automotive mechanics it was necessary for our commission to interview 100 men or more before we got the 20 that were called for in the request—educational requirements being what they were, a limited number have the ability by background to get into the classes. The big percentage does not have the background.

One of the crying needs we have in any State, or at least in my State of Texas, is emphasis on service training. On page 9 of the report it is indicated that this bill, in title I, directs the Secretary of Labor to develop and maintain a program of job development primarily in the service trades. You go further and refer to the demand for such services as home maintenance, child care, appliance repair, hospital service, home nursing, and many others.

My question is this. The Secretary is not given any additional money or authority to do this. Did you discuss in your committee what emphasis you are going to put on it; just how is the Secretary going to put forth this emphasis; because there is great need for this kind of training?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. The purpose is to work with trade associations training groups, welfare agencies, and similar groups, to establish job vacancies and to work out training programs where none have existed. We have to work out new programs. We cannot tell what they will be, but they will include home services and the other things the gentleman mentioned.

Mr. PICKLE. I hope the committee will direct the Secretary of Labor to put great emphasis on this. Admittedly, it is not particularly glamorous training to be a maid, a domestic cook, a handyman or a farmworker, as the gentleman from California mentioned, but at the same time there are many, many demands for this kind of work. People throughout the country call the employment office but that office cannot supply the jobs because nobody wants to take that kind of job, or they do not have the skills. We must push these services training classes.

We want to put all the emphasis on this that we can.

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Madam Chairman, I rise to express my support for H.R. 4257, which would liberalize and extend the Manpower and Training Act of 1962.

The bill would amend the act by raising the Federal Government's contributions to the cost, by lengthening the period of time that training programs may be conducted, and by increasing the weekly training allowances for trainees with several dependents.

It would also expand the research and pilot programs authorized by the act so that new ways may be found to restore workers to productive employment. And it would provide for regular training programs in depressed areas designated under the Area Redevelopment Act.

The Manpower Development and Training Act is without doubt the most ambitious national program of job training and manpower research ever undertaken. Its goal is to help each citizen find a useful and profitable place in our society.

The benefits of this program are already apparent. Training projects and services have been approved for nearly 400,000 men and women throughout the Nation. Workers who were unemployed because of automation, industrial shutdown, or lack of skills, today are working in new fields or building new careers.

Admendments to the act in 1963 made it possible to include greater numbers of young people, and more persons without fundamental skills in reading, writing, and counting.

The amendments we propose here today will permit us to move this wonderful program forward at an even faster pace. They will enable us to fully demonstrate to the world that anyone who can learn can find a place in our Great Society.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Madam Chairman, as chairman of the Republican policy committee I rise in support of H.R. 4257.

The concept of manpower development through retraining is a basic tenet of the Republican Party. The Manpower Development Act of 1962, was Republican drafted and Republican supported.

One of the Republican concepts included in the original bill was the requirement for a Federal-State partnership achieved through the medium of matching funds. Under the original act the States were required to provide matching funds in the amount of 50 percent. And this was reduced to 33⅓ percent in 1963.

This bill reduces this requirement still further to 10 percent and defers its effective date for another year, until July 1, 1966. However, it was only through the efforts of the Republican members of the Education and Labor Committee that even this small percentage of State participation remains.

While the Republican policy committee deplores this further erosion of the concept of Federal-State partnership through matching funds, we are relieved that at least the principle of matching funds is left intact.

We are pleased to note that the bill brings the training program for redevelopment areas now pending in the Area Redevelopment Act under the Manpower Development and Training Act. This as you know is a principle long advocated by Republicans.

The Republican policy committee has gone on record in support of the bill.

Mr. McCLORY. Madam Chairman, in supporting the Manpower Act of 1965—H.R. 4257—I want to indicate my belief that increased employment, and additional skills for Americans can be best developed by private concerns operating within the framework of our free enterprise system.

This Congress can assist employment efforts through research, vocational education, and other related programs which may be sponsored appropriately by governmental action. However, it is misleading to assume that the Federal Government can be a substitute for private business, or that Federal appropriations can replace private investment. The responsibility of the Federal Government should be to provide a climate in which free Americans may work and produce. The Manpower Act of 1965 can contribute to this end. However, the individual citizens from management and labor are the essential elements in the formula for economic success and increased employment.

Mr. GRAY. Madam Chairman, it is a privilege to support H.R. 4257. An expansion of the Manpower Development and Training Act is a forthright proposal and I know will have a great economic impact on the unemployed people of this country and will be a stimulus for business. I want to commend the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor and the members of his committee for submitting this bill. Coming from southern Illinois, I can assure all of my colleagues that the Manpower Development and Training Act has provided new hope for thousands of unemployed persons.

Mr. Chairman, over 75 percent of all those retrained in southern Illinois under Manpower Development and Training Act have found good jobs. Hundreds of others are now in training and I expect the percentage will go up as the new training classes are formed. In Franklin and Williamson Counties in Illinois we have seen unemployed coal miners and others, who have not seen steady work for years, find a paycheck in the mailbox every month instead of the relief check that has been so common over the years.

I want to particularly commend the committee for extending the period of training allowance assistance and the amount received by the trainee. This will give the slow learner a better opportunity to reach his skill and thereby find employment at the end of the training period.

Madam Chairman, in behalf of all of the unemployed people of southern Illinois and, particularly, those who are now in training, and will soon enroll, I want to again commend the Committee on Education and Labor, President Johnson, and our great Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, an Illinoisan, for their compassion, understanding, and support of this progressive program.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Madam Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 4257, the Manpower Act of 1965.

The Committee on Education and Labor is to be commended for having agreed to the provision in the bill to eliminate State matching fund requirements until June 30, 1966, and to reduce the present 33⅓-percent requirement to 10 percent thereafter.

This is a recognition of the growing financial difficulties which our State governments are encountering. The new demands for State government services which come as a result of our fast-growing population and economy have created a general condition of near instability in State finances throughout our Nation.

Because unemployment in any local area is frequently the result of causes rooted elsewhere in our interdependent national economy, unemployment has been recognized since the 1930's as being primarily a Federal responsibility. In time we ought to consider a complete elimination of the State matching fund requirement if we find that the reduced 10-percent matching will be so burdensome as to cause some States to be unable to participate, for then in such States our Federal responsibility would remain unfulfilled.

Statistics show that 3.7 million of our citizens want work but are unable to find it, and that 1.3 million more potential workers will enter the labor force within the next year. Moreover, 20 million of our labor force lack the minimum training needed for most jobs in our world of technological change, with its attendant changing requirements in skills.

The development of our human resources must keep pace both with the constantly increasing size of our labor force, and with the requirements for new skills and varied education. The inexorable tide of population growth can become a dead weight on our economic system if the unskilled cannot be successfully trained and profitably employed. If we successfully meet the challenge, our growth in population will mean an increase in our greatest national wealth—our human resource.

The potential for new employment through the implementation of this bill exists in every State in our Union. In my own State of Hawaii, I am informed that some industries have failed to establish plants because of the lack of qualified skilled personnel. This legislation will, therefore, be most important to Hawaii in attracting new industry to create new jobs for our growing population.

The training program for redevelopment areas will also have application in Hawaii. Even though Hawaii has a low total State unemployment rate in comparison with many of its sister States, we do have pockets of depressed areas where the rate of unemployment is relatively high.

Madam Chairman, H.R. 4257 is a forward-looking, yet down-to-earth bill which can do only good for our country's future. I strongly urge its passage.

Mrs. MINK. Madam Chairman, I am especially proud and happy to rise in support of H.R. 4257, the Manpower Act of 1965.

My own State of Hawaii has often been cited as one of the most imaginative and energetic users of the Manpower Development and Training Act since its passage in 1962. This bill would extend and expand that act in a comprehensive and greatly beneficial manner that can bring immense benefits to the Nation as a whole.

This act meets the growing needs of our unemployed citizens.

Swiftly paced technological innovations are developing new industrial situations almost daily and unprecedented numbers of youths are pouring into the labor market.

All this adds up to a nationwide problem which can be solved by this forward looking piece of legislation.

For some 30 years now, the Federal Government has been recognized as the agency with prime concern for combating unemployment. The Federal involvement in employment measures which started with the depression has been confirmed again and again.

One of the most gratifying successes arising from attempts to grant every wage earner a chance at a decent income has been the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Not only has the Manpower Development and Training Act program practically reached its goal of training 400,000 persons across the Nation, but it has had excellent success in placing these trainees in productive employment.

A total of 72 percent of those completing institutional training and 94 percent of those completing on-the-job training courses under the act have been placed in jobs. These jobs have covered many fields from the semiskilled to technical and whitecollar occupations. Many of those trained were long-term unemployed, whose lot would have been virtually hopeless without the aid of the Manpower Development and Training Act.

In short, the unemployment problem we face in the midst of unprecedented plenty would have been far worse without the Manpower Development and Training Act.

Now, this bill would strengthen the Manpower Development and Training Act program and make it more flexible and more responsive to the conditions which cause this unemployment.

First, it would continue full Federal funding of the Manpower Development and Training Act program through June 30, 1966. This is just, since the problem of unemployment is a national one and must be attacked on a national scale. The States, desirous as they are of continuing the program, lack the resources to carry it on because of the multitude of demands upon their revenues.

Second, the research and information programs initiated under the Manpower Development and Training Act would be expanded. Even with the modest start provided so far, these programs have proved useful. The act's activities have already discovered a vast possible reservoir of jobs in the service industries, which can be tapped if steps are taken to develop these jobs while the people who will fill them are being trained.

Another highly significant step taken by this bill would bring into the Manpower Development and Training Act program more of the disadvantaged youth and other unemployed single persons by providing a living allowance for them as well as those who have dependents while they are undergoing training.

By making more of our young single people eligible for training, and by providing them with training allowances and increasing the allowances available to those with large families, the bill opens the door to help the very people who need it most.

We have become increasingly aware in recent years that the vise of poverty grips strongest those who are uneducated and who come from a long background of poverty. The answer to this problem is better education and training, the very things this bill would provide. It recognizes the need for basic education as well as occupational training and extends the maximum period to 104 weeks that a trainee may be eligible for a training allowance.

We have seen in the last 2½ years the development of one of the most promising and heartening weapons against unemployment in our Nation's history. Virtually all informed opinion has been in favor of its continuation and expansion.

I am highly gratified at having helped in the development of this bill as a member of the Education and Labor Committee. More importantly, I am happy to have been able to contribute to the fullest possible utilization of this act by the citizens of my State of Hawaii by having successfully offered an amendment which would allow the Secretary to authorize our trainees full reimbursement of their travel costs from the neighbor islands if it should exceed the 10 cents per mile limit as provided in the original bill. My amendment also allows the Secretary to authorize extra living allowances to Hawaii trainees who come from the neighbor islands to Honolulu over and above the bill's limit of $5 per day, in recognition of the high cost of living in Hawaii.

It is especially gratifying that this amendment I offered was unanimously accepted by the whole House.

This bill as amended now paves the way for the fullest implementation in all States of this far-reaching program to utilize our human resources in our evergrowing industrial economy.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Madam Chairman, I rise in enthusiastic support of H.R. 4257, the Manpower Act of 1965. This bill will extend and improve the program established by the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. The program in its present form is largely the result of Republican initiative in the House. I am happy to report that it is working very well in my district because its approach is correct and the mechanisms for putting it into action are sound.

It is pleasing to see that the bill before us now, H.R. 4257, broadens the emphasis on improving techniques for helping the long-term unemployed, disadvantaged young people, displaced older workers, the handicapped, and other groups with special problems.

This program already is beginning to pay dividends in salvaged lives. Every life we enable to become useful and self-supporting not only relieves the burden on the tax rolls but becomes an active contributor to the economy. Our complex and growing society needs every talent available, trained to the greatest possible degree.

This bill will help achieve this goal.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ASHBROOK] desire to yield time?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Madam Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the Clerk will read the substitute amendment reported in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4257

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Manpower Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 102(5) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the "Act"), is amended by adding a comma after the word "arrange" and inserting "through grants or contracts," immediately following the comma.

(b) Section 102 of the Act is further amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (4), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu of such period "; and", and by adding at the end of such section the following new paragraph:

"(6) establish a program of experimental, developmental, demonstration, and pilot projects, through grants to or contracts with public or private nonprofit organizations, or through contracts with other private organizations, for the purpose of improving techniques and demonstrating the effectiveness of specialized methods in meeting the manpower, employment, and training problems of worker groups such as the long-term unemployed, disadvantaged youth, displaced older workers, the handicapped, members of minority groups, and other similar groups. In carrying out this subsection the Secretary of Labor shall, where appropriate, consult with the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Commerce, and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Where programs under this paragraph require institutional training, appropriate arrangements for such training shall be agreed to by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. He shall also seek the advice of consultants with respect to the standards governing the adequacy and design of proposals, the ability of applicants, and the priority of projects in meeting the objectives of this Act."

SEC. 3. (a) Title I of the Act is amended by renumbering sections 103 and 104 as sections 106 and 107, respectively, and by inserting immediately after section 102 the following new sections:

"JOB DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

"SEC. 103. The Secretary of Labor shall stimulate and assist, in cooperation with interested agencies both public and private, job development programs, through on-the-job training and other suitable methods, that will serve to expand employment by the filling of those service and related needs which are not now being met because of lack of trained workers or other reasons affecting employment or opportunities for employment.

"LABOR MOBILITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"SEC. 104. (a) During the period ending June 30, 1967, the Secretary of Labor shall develop and carry out, in a limited number of geographical areas, pilot projects designed to assess or demonstrate the effectiveness in reducing unemployment of programs to increase the mobility of unemployed workers by providing assistance to meet their relocation expenses. In carrying out such projects the Secretary may provide such assistance, in the form of grants or loans or both, only to involuntarily unemployed individuals who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment in the community in which they reside, have bona fide offers of employment (other than temporary or seasonal employment), and are deemed qualified to perform the work for which they are being employed.

"(b) Loans or grants provided under this section shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe, with loans subject to the following limitations:

"(1) there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;

"(2) the credit is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs;

"(3) the amount of the loan, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure achievement of the purposes for which the loan is made;

"(4) the loan bears interest at a rate not less than (A) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (B) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Secretary may determine to be consistent with its purposes; and

"(5) the loan is repayable within not more than ten years.

"(c) Of the funds appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this Act, not more than $5,000,000 may be used for the purposes of this section.

"TRAINEE PLACEMENT ASSISTANCE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"SEC. 105. During the period ending June 30, 1967, the Secretary of Labor shall develop and carry out experimental and demonstration projects to assist in the placement of persons seeking employment through a public employment office who have successfully completed or participated in a federally assisted or financed training, counseling, work training, or work experience program and who, after appropriate counseling, have been found by the Secretary to be qualified and suitable for the employment in question, but to whom employment is or may be denied for reasons other than ability to perform, including difficulty in securing bond for indemnifying their employers against loss from the infidelity, dishonesty, or default of such persons. In carrying out these projects the Secretary may make payments to or contracts with employers or institutions authorized to indemnify employers against such losses. Of the funds appropriated for fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967, not more than $200,000 and $300,000, respectively, may be used for the purpose of carrying out this section."

(b) Section 102(2) of the Act is amended by striking out "104" and inserting in lieu thereof "107".

SEC. 4. Section 202(i) of the Act is amended by striking out ", and such persons shall be eligible for training allowances for not to exceed an additional twenty weeks".

SEC. 5. (a) Section 203(a) of the Act is amended as follows:

(1) Amend the second sentence thereof to read as follows: "Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding one hundred and four weeks, and the basic amount of any such payment in any week for persons undergoing training, including uncompensated employer-provided training, shall not exceed $10 more than the amount of the average weekly gross unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent four-calendar-quarter period for which such data are available: *Provided,* That the basic amount of such payments may be increased by $5 a week for each dependent over two up to a maximum of four additional dependents: *Provided further,* That in any week an individual who, but for his training, would be entitled to unemployment compensation in excess of his total allowance, including payments for dependents, shall receive an allowance increased by the amount of such excess.";

(2) Amend the second paragraph thereof to read as follows:

"With respect to any week for which a person receives unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or any other Federal or State unemployment compensation law which is less than the total training allowance, including payments for dependents, provided for by the preceding paragraph, a supplemental training allowance may be paid to a person eligible for a training allowance under this Act. The supplemental training allowance shall not exceed the difference between his unemployment compensation and the training allowance provided by the preceding paragraph.";

(3) Insert the words "under the training program" after "compensated hours per week" in the third paragraph of such subsection;

(4) In lieu of the fourth paragraph of such subsection insert the following:

"The training allowance of a person engaged in training under section 204 or 231 shall not be reduced on account of employment (other than employment under an on-the-job training program under section 204) which does not exceed twenty hours per week, but shall be reduced in an amount equal to his full earnings for hours worked (other than in employment under such an on-the-job training program) in excess of twenty hours per week."

(b)(1) Section 203(b) of the Act is amended by striking out the matter following "to defray transportation" and preceding *"Provided"*, and by inserting in lieu of such matter the following: "expenses, and when such training is provided in facilities which are not within commuting distance of the trainee's regular place of residence, subsistence expenses for separate maintenance of the trainee:".

(2) Such subsection is further amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ", except in the case of local transportation where he may authorize reimbursement for the

trainee's travel by the most economical mode of public transportation".

(c) Section 203(c) of the Act is amended as follows:

(1) Strike the words "not less than" in the first sentence and insert "at least" in lieu thereof;

(2) Strike out everything in the first sentence after the words "gainful employment", and insert the following in lieu thereof: ": *Provided,* That they are not members of a family or a household in which the head of the family or the head of the household as defined in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is employed.";

(3) Amend the last sentence to read as follows: "The number of youths under the age of twenty-two who are receiving training allowances (or who would be entitled thereto but for the receipt of unemployment compensation) shall, except for such adjustments as may be necessary for effective management of programs under this section, not exceed 25 per centum of all persons receiving such allowances (or who would be entitled thereto but for the receipt of unemployment compensation)."

(d) Subsection (d) of section 203 of the Act is repealed and subsections (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) of such sections are redesignated as (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i), respectively.

(e) The first sentence of section 203(g)(2) of the Act (as redesignated by section 5(d) of this Act) is amended by striking out everything that follows "all of such benefits paid" and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

Sec. 6. Section 208 of the Act is repealed.

Sec. 7. Section 231 of the Act is amended by striking the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The State agency shall be paid not more than 90 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement, unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare determines that payments in excess of 90 per centum are necessary because such payments with respect to private institutions are required to give full effect to the purposes of the Act: *Provided,* That for the period ending June 30, 1966, the State agency shall be paid 100 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services."

Sec. 8. Title II of the Act is amended by adding part C to the end thereof to read as follows:

"PART C—REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

"Sec. 241. (a) The Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, in accordance with their respective responsibilities under parts A and B of this title, are authorized to provide a supplementary program of training and training allowances, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, for unemployed and underemployed persons residing in areas designated as redevelopment areas by the Secretary of Commerce under the Area Redevelopment Act or any subsequent Act authorizing such designation. Such program shall be carried out by the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare in accordance with the provisions otherwise applicable to programs under this Act and with their respective functions under those provisions, except that—

"(1) the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall determine the occupational training or retraining needs of unemployed or underemployed individuals residing in redevelopment areas;

"(2) all unemployed or underemployed individuals residing in redevelopment areas who can reasonably be expected to obtain employment as a result of such training may be referred and selected for training and shall be eligible for training allowances under this section: *Provided,* That the amount and duration of training allowances under this section shall in no event exceed the amount and duration of training allowances provided under section 203(a) of this Act;

"(3) the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, each with respect to his functions under this section, prescribe jointly with the Secretary of Commerce such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section; and

"(4) section 301 shall not apply with respect to funds available under this section.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such amounts as may be necessary to carry out this section."

(b) Sections 16 and 17 of the Area Redevelopment Act (42 U.S.C. 2513 and 2514) are repealed.

(c) This section and the amendments made by it shall take effect on July 1, 1965.

Sec. 9. Section 302 of the Act is amended by striking the word "and" following "the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act" inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and inserting "and the Vocational Education Act of 1963," following "the Vocational Education Act of 1946,".

Sec. 10. Section 304 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 304. For the purpose of carrying out this Act there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years such amounts as may be necessary."

Sec. 11. The following subsection is added to section 305 of the Act to read as follows:

"(e) The costs of all training programs approved in any fiscal year, including the total cost of training allowances for such programs, may be paid from funds appropriated for such purposes for that fiscal year; and the amount of the Federal payment shall be computed on the basis of the per centum requirement in effect at the time such programs are approved: *Provided,* That funds appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, may be expended for training programs approved under this Act prior to July 1, 1965, and expenditures for such purposes shall be subject to the matching requirements in effect at the time such programs were approved."

Sec. 12. Sections 309(a) and 309(b) of the Act are both amended by striking "Prior to March 1, 1963, and again prior to April 1, 1964, April 1, 1965, and April 1, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof: "Prior to April 1 in each year for which an appropriation is authorized by section 304".

Sec. 13. Section 310 of the Act is amended by striking out "1966" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1968".

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan (during the reading). Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MRS. MINK

Mrs. MINK. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. Mink: On page 19, line 24, after "transportation" insert the following: ", and except that in noncontiguous States and in areas outside the continental United States where the per diem allowance prescribed under section 836 of title 5, United States Code, exceeds the maximum per diem allowance prescribed under that section for contiguous States, the Secretary may provide for a reasonable increase in the transportation and subsistence expenses in such amounts as he may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and subject to such limitations as he may prescribe".

Mrs. MINK. Madam Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make explicitly clear in the bill what I believe to be the committee's intention, which is, to provide the fullest opportunities for all of our potential trainees to take advantage of this wonderful program in order that they may fill the employment markets in the respective States.

The bill has been amended by the committee, and as reported to the House, it provides for full reimbursement for travel costs of trainees while they are at the training center. The bill also provides for transportation costs of persons who must leave their community to attend various training centers which may be set up in the States. But, unfortunately, there is a limitation of 10 cents per mile in this transportation allowance.

Madam Chairman, the reason for this amendment is to make special provision in this regard for two States, Hawaii and Alaska. Therefore, the use of the word "noncontiguous" is to single out these two States where the travel conditions within the State are higly unusual.

In Hawaii, the State that I have particular knowledge of, we are totally dependent upon air transportation provided by two commercial airlines between our outlying islands and the principal island of Oahu. Now, a large number of beneficiaries under this bill are individuals who live on the smaller neighbor islands who must travel to these training centers on Oahu, where 80 percent of our population is located. The limitation of 10 cents per mile on travel expenditures for them would discourage many who otherwise would be interested in participating in this program.

The second feature of the amendment is the subsistence allowance which, at a $5 per day maximum, would also be very, very severely limiting on the number of people who would be able to subsist in the city of Honolulu if no special considerations were provided for them.

The Federal Government by statute in the United States Code recognizes the high cost of living and expenses generally in these two areas of Hawaii and Alaska by providing additional per diem allowances for the civil servants of the Federal Government in these areas.

So, Madam Chairman, this amendment provides that in the noncontiguous States where the per diem allowance is in excess of that allowed within the continental limits of the United States, the Secretary may provide for additional expenses for travel and subsistence over and beyond the limitations now provided by the bill.

Madam Chairman, at this time I yield to the gentleman from Alaska who will elaborate on his situation in that State.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Madam Chairman, Alaska and Hawaii have this proposed amendment in common. I want to compliment the gentlewoman from Hawaii for her initiative in introducing this amendment and for her grasp of the subject, and I rise in support of the amendment and of the bill.

The cost of transportation is very high as is the cost of subsistence in Alaska. Of course, as the gentlewoman has said, we want people in the noncontiguous States to have full advantage of this fine program.

The problem this amendment seeks to solve, Madam Chairman, is the problem of providing transportation and subsistence allowances under the Manpower Development and Training Act adequate to the needs of the participants in the program. The amendment would solve the problem by giving the Secretary of Labor the discretionary authority to adjust the allowances in noncontiguous States where the costs of transportation and subsistence are so high that present levels place a burden upon the trainees.

Alaska is such an area. Transportation costs are high, the cost of living is high. The present level of allowances under the Manpower Development and Training Act places a heavy financial burden upon Alaskan trainees, a burden most can ill afford to carry.

The burden upon trainees in Alaska is well demonstrated in the case of a trainee from Togiak, told me by Mr. Virgil N. DuPuis, the chairman of the Anchorage Manpower Advisory Committee. In a recent letter, Mr. DuPuis wrote:

> The man from Togiak who entered the truck-tractor training course traveled 440 miles by air at a cost of $67.50. The Manpower Development and Training Act will reimburse him $44. Since his annual income was less than $2,000 last year and in addition he had lost his job and home as a result of a tidal wave at Togiak that wiped out the cannery in which he had been a watchman, he felt it worth the gamble to borrow that extra $23.50 and come in for training in the hope that he could work on a construction job this summer in the Dillingham area after learning to operate a "Uke," or large dump truck. Each day that he is in training he will receive $5 per day to pay for his room and board. Since even the cheapest room will cost $2.50 to $3 per night, it is apparent that $5 is a very meager sum. Since he is a married man with children he will also receive $44 per week as a training allowance, of which he will probably send the greater amount home. If he had been single, the $5 would have been his entire allotment, and patently inadequate.

The problem of inadequate allowances for the Manpower Development and Training Act program in Alaska is not only that of causing a burden for those who do enter the program, but also one of discouraging entrance into the program by many of those most in need of it. This is, indeed, a cause of much regret.

That the cost of living in Alaska is higher than in mainland States is well established. Recent figures compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics—using Washington, D.C., as a base—show the cost of living to be 132.8 in Juneau, 143.2 in Anchorage, and 146.5 in Fairbanks.

In Nome, the site of one Manpower Development and Training Act center, prices for food are 62 percent more than they are in Seattle, Wash.

The difference in costs of transportation in Alaska and the allowances available under the present rates are substantial. These figures are based on travel to the Nome Manpower Development and Training Act center: a trainee from Mekyoruk would have to spend $77.20 in addition to his allowance for his round-trip ticket; a trainee from Quinhagak would have to spend $69.90 in addition to his allowance.

Others in the 70 villages that provide trainees to the Nome facility would also have substantial out-of-pocket costs in order to begin the training they so badly need.

Madam Chairman, I urge that this amendment be adopted so that trainees in Manpower Development and Training Act programs will not be penalized for living in areas where costs of subsistence and transportation are high. Adoption of the amendment will be only a modification of the act to take into account experiences gained in the first years of its operation; its adoption will not change the goals of the act, but only better enable the realization of those goals.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Madam Chairman, the three members of the subcommittee on the minority side not only have no objection to this provision offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii, but also support it.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I support the amendment also. I believe there are special circumstances in Hawaii and Alaska which justify this amendment. We do expect that the amendment will be made applicable only where it is necessary to meet unusual expenses caused by these circumstances.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

I take this time merely to ask the gentlewoman from Hawaii a question or two about the amendment. I do not oppose the amendment. It certainly carries a great deal of merit.

Since it is an open end amendment, perhaps we should have some sort of legislative intent as to what we mean by "reasonable."

Mrs. MINK. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK. I assume the intent of the amendments recommended by the committee is to fully reimburse the travel expenses of the trainees for local transportation while they are at the centers. By the same token, the intent of this amendment is to provide for reimbursement for the actual travel expenses found necessary for these trainees from the outlying areas in my State to the centers for training.

Mr. PUCINSKI. We agree that "reasonable" means the most economical form of transportation and not necessarily some luxurious travel, which obviously would be subject to great criticism.

Mrs. MINK. We have only one method of transportation in my State, actually, between islands, and that is by the two existing commercial airlines. If a time should come in my State, through the assistance of my colleagues in this illustrious Chamber, when we might be able to offer low-cost transportation, we would certainly accede to the wishes of this body in terms of lowering the cost and perhaps coming below the 10-cent limitation. That would be my fondest hope.

Mr. PUCINSKI. On the question of subsistence, when it exceeds $35 per week or $5 per day, can we also agree that it shall be within reasonable bounds, or the most economical type of living quarters consistent with good standard living conditions?

Mrs. MINK. Yes. I trust that the Secretary would be so guided.

Mr. ALBERT. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I congratulate the gentlewoman for offering this amendment. I believe it is meritorious. I certainly intend to support it.

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GOODELL. I should like to make the legislative history clear. I believe the gentleman said "not necessarily" luxurious transportation. I believe we wish to say "not ever" luxurious transportation or subsistence.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I agree.

I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise in support of the amendment. I wish to commend my colleague, a member of the Education and Labor Committee, for offering the amendment.

As those who have been to Hawaii know, we are faced with a peculiar situation of a State divided into islands in the middle of the Pacific Ocean. Our mode of personnel transportation is by air only at present. This does run into considerable sums of money, especially as it pertains to trainees who are even unable to provide for their daily living costs. The proposed amendment will provide a more workable program in our State. As the youngest State of the Union, Hawaii looks to her sister States as a little sister seeking to do her best to be on an even par in this great family of States. Because of certain conditions peculiar to our geographic makeup, we need your assistance, and we earnestly seek it.

I urge your support of the amendment.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I wish to commend the Representatives from Hawaii and Alaska for their diligence in this matter, and I ask approval of the amendment. I do not believe it is opposed by any member of the majority of the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Madam Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Madam Chairman, if there has been any discussion of the added cost of this expanded program, I have not heard it.

I wonder if someone could give the House some estimate as to what this expanded program is likely to cost.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I would like to advise the gentleman that we have no exact figures on this particular aspect of transportation.

Mr. GROSS. No. I am not speaking of the pending amendment. I am speaking now to the entire bill.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Well, the additional cost of the amendments, if the gentleman will yield, in rough estimate, are as follows: the cost of dependents allowances, $8 million; the cost of transportation allowance, $7 million; the cost of changes in eligibility allowance, $30 million. I believe this information is contained in the committee report if the gentleman wishes to look at it.

Mr. GROSS. Are these the figures for the expanded program, that is, the program you propose here today? I understand we are doubling the maximum time allowed for training from 52 weeks to 104 weeks. Your present costs, as I understand it—and this is purely hearsay—on the basis of 23 weeks of training, are $1,500. If this is anywhere near accurate, would you take it from there and give us some idea as to what the cost per individual would be, predicated on a possible 104 weeks of training?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. The gentleman will be advised that the full budget request for the next fiscal year, which is the year that the gentleman is discussing, is $452 million. The increase in the permitted number of weeks training will not result in a proportionate increase in the time the trainees actually spend in training. For instance, we have had up to 72 weeks authorized before but the actual training course has been running about 32 weeks. You cannot relate those two things to each other.

Mr. GROSS. I have the figure of 23 weeks as being the present average training period. When the gentleman speaks of the budget, is he not speaking of the budget based on the present program without the additions or expansions proposed in this bill?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. I am sure if this bill is enacted, there will be no additional requests for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. Projected into the future and on the basis of an increase to 104 weeks of training and increases for dependents, do you mean to say that funding for this purpose is going to be confined to the present rate of spending? Is that what the gentleman is saying?

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. What I am saying is that the request is as I stated to the gentleman. If this bill passes, there will be no request for additional funds in the next year.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think perhaps it may be a little easier for the gentleman to understand with respect to this question he is raising if I put it in this fashion. The gentleman himself said the average figures he has are for 23 weeks. The present law now permits 72 weeks. As the gentleman from Michigan tried to explain, even though we allow up to 104 weeks it does not necessarily mean that everyone participating in this program will take that length of time.

Mr. GROSS. I was trying to get at the increased cost, if any, predicated on the present estimated average cost per week.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. Of course.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I think the gentleman certainly raises a very valid question, but I wonder if the gentleman would agree that there is a corollary, an equally important question, which is, what is the alternative cost if we do not approve this program.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I will say to the gentleman that on one day we get a poverty bill in the House and the next day we get some other kind of a welfare bill. We are hearing today about all the unemployment in this country and the necessity for retraining the unemployed. One of these fine spring days the House will get the annual foreign handout bill calling for the spending of at least $3.3 billion abroad.

Next week we will probably hear from administration leaders that this Nation is wallowing in wealth and economic progress. Somehow or other I am not able to put these together and make them add up to any logic. Perhaps I do not have the intelligence, I do not know.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODELL

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Goodell: On page 23, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following new section and renumber the subsequent sections accordingly:

"Sec. 9. Section 301 of the Act is amended by striking the period at the end thereof, inserting a colon, and adding the following proviso:

"'*Provided*, That no funds apportioned with respect to a State in any fiscal year shall be reapportioned before the expiration of the sixth month of such fiscal year and only upon thirty days' prior notice to such State of the proposed reapportionment, except that the requirement for prior notice shall not apply with respect to any reapportionment made during the last quarter of the fiscal year.'"

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, I would like to advise the gentleman from New York that we have examined his amendment, we think it is a very useful amendment and would be inclined to accept it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell].

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODELL

Mr. GOODELL. Madam Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Goodell: On page 24, between lines 11 and 12, insert the following new section and renumber the subsequent sections accordingly:

"Sec. 12. Subsection (a) of section 306 of the Act is amended by inserting after the comma immediately following the word 'procedures' the following: 'subject to such policies, rules and regulations as they may prescribe, the approval of any program under section 202, the cost of which does not exceed $75,000,'."

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODELL. I yield.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Madam Chairman, this is another amendment which has been discussed with the Members on the majority side to which we have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. Goodell].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment as amended.

The committee amendment as amended was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. Aspinall] having assumed the chair, Mrs. Griffiths, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4257) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 305, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 395, nays 0, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—395

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert

Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, Glenn
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashbrook
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Boggs
Boland
Bolton
Bonner
Bow
Brademas
Bray
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Jennings
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Mailliard
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Resnick
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Springer
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Sweeney
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tunney
Tupper
Tuten
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—38

Ashley
Ashmore
Baldwin
Blatnik
Bolling
Brown, Calif.
Colmer
Curtis
Dawson
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Foley
Fulton, Tenn.
Gettys
Gray
Hébert
Herlong
Hosmer
Jones, Ala.
Lennon
McClory
MacGregor
Mackay
Mathias
Michel
Miller
Pepper
Purcell
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
Smith, Iowa
Stephens
Toll
Udall
Watkins
Yates

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Hosmer.
Mr. Evins of Tennessee with Mr. Curtis.
Mr. Herlong with Mr. Erlenborn.
Mr. Ashmore with Mr. Michel.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. Watkins.
Mr. Brown of California with Mr. McClory.
Mr. Toll with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Gray.
Mr. Colmer with Mr. Gettys.
Mr. Fulton of Tennessee with Mr. Miller.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Jones of Alabama.
Mr. Smith of Iowa with Mr. Stephens.
Mr. Blatnik with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Udall with Mr. Dawson.
Mr. Everett with Mr. Evans of Colorado.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 974) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

S. 974

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Manpower Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. Section 101 of the Manpower Development and Training Act, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the "Act") is amended by inserting before the last sentence thereof the following new sentence: "The Congress further finds that, because of reductions in, or changes in the nature, kind, or extent of, national defense and other industrial activities, many professional employees have become unemployed, and because of the specialized nature of their previous employment, are in need of refresher or reorientation educational courses in order to become qualified for other employment in their professions."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 102(5) of the Manpower Development and Training Act, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the "Act"), is amended by adding a comma after the word "arrange" and inserting "through grants or contracts," immediately following the comma.

(b) Section 102 of the Act is further amended by adding new paragraph (6) at the end thereof to read as follows:

"(6) establish a program of experimental, developmental, demonstration, and pilot projects, through grants with public or private nonprofit agencies or contracts with public or any appropriate private agency, for the purpose of improving techniques and demonstrating the effectiveness of specialized methods in meeting the manpower, employment, and training problems of worker groups such as the long-term unemployed, disadvantaged youth, displaced older workers, the handicapped, members of minority groups, and other similar groups. In carrying out this subsection the Secretary of Labor shall, where appropriate, consult with the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Commerce, and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Where programs under this section require institutional training, appropriate arrangements for such training shall be agreed to by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. He shall also seek the advice of consultants with respect to the standards governing the adequacy and design of proposals, the ability of applicants, and the priority of projects in meeting the objectives of the Act;

SEC. 4. Sections 103 and 104 are renumbered 106 and 107, and new sections 103, 104, and 105 are added, to read as follows:

"JOB DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

"SEC. 103. The Secretary of Labor shall stimulate and assist, in cooperation with interested agencies both public and private, job development programs, through on-the-job training and other suitable methods, that will serve to expand employment by the filling of those service and related needs which are not now being met because of lack of trained workers or other reasons affecting employment or opportunities for employment.

"LABOR MOBILITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"SEC. 104. (a) During the period ending June 30, 1967, the Secretary of Labor shall develop and carry out, in a limited number of geographical areas, pilot projects designed to assess or demonstrate the effectiveness in reducing unemployment of programs to increase the mobility of unemployed workers by providing assistance to meet their relocation expenses. In carrying out such projects the Secretary may provide such assistance, in the form of grants or loans, or both, only to involuntarily unemployed individuals who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment in the community in which they reside, have bona fide offers of employment (other than temporary or seasonal employment), and are deemed qualified to perform the work for which they are being employed.

"(b) Loans or grants provided under this section shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe, with loans subject to the following limitations:

"(1) there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;

"(2) the credit is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs;

"(3) the amount of the loan, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure achievement of the purposes for which the loan is made;

"(4) the loan bears interest at a rate not less than (A) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (B) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Secretary may determine to be consistent with its purposes; and

"(5) the loan is repayable within not more than ten years.

"(c) Of the funds appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this Act, not more than $5,000,000 may be used for the purposes of this section.

"TRAINEE PLACEMENT ASSISTANCE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"Sec. 105. During the period ending June 30, 1967, the Secretary shall develop and carry out experimental and demonstration projects to assist in the placement of persons seeking employment through a public employment office who have successfully completed or participated in a federally assisted or financed training, counseling, work training, or work experience program and who, after appropriate counseling, have been found by the Secretary to be qualified and suitable for the employment in question, but to whom employment is or may be denied for reasons other than ability to perform, including difficulty in security bonds for indemnifying their employers against loss from the infidelity, dishonesty, or default of such persons. In carrying out these projects the Secretary may make payments to or contracts with employers or institutions authorized to indemnify employers against such losses. Of the funds appropriated for fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967, not more than $200,000 and $300,000, respectively, may be used for the purpose of carrying out this section."

Sec. 5. Section 202(i) of the Act is amended by striking the words "and such persons shall be eligible for training allowances for not to exceed an additional twenty weeks.", and by changing the comma after the word "Act" to a period.

Sec. 6. (a) Section 203(a) of the Act is amended as follows:

(1) Amend the second sentence thereof to read as follows: "Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding one hundred and four weeks, and the basic amount of any such payment in any week for persons undergoing training, including uncompensated employer-provided training, shall not exceed $10 more than the amount of the average weekly gross unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent four-calendar-quarter period for which such data are available: *Provided,* That the basic amount of such payments may be increased by $5 a week for each dependent over two up to a maximum of four additional dependents: *Provided further,* That in any week an individual who, but for his training would be entitled to unemployment compensation in excess of his total allowance, including payments for dependents, shall receive an allowance increased by the amount of such excess.";

(2) Amend the second paragraph thereof to read as follows:

"With respect to any week for which a person receives unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or any other Federal or State unemployment compensation law which is less than the total training allowance, including payments for dependents, provided for by the preceding paragraph, a supplemental training allowance may be paid to a person eligible for a training allowance under this Act. The supplemental training allowance shall not exceed the difference between his unemployment compensation and the training allowance provided by the preceding paragraph.";

(3) Insert the words "under the training program" after "compensated hours per week" in the third paragraph of such subsection;

(4) In lieu of the fourth paragraph of such subsection insert the following:

"The trainnig allowance of a person engaged in training under section 204 or 231 shall not be reduced on account of employment (other than employment under an on-the-job training program under section 204) which does not exceed twenty hours per week, but shall be reduced in an amount equal to his full earnings for hours worked in excess of twenty hours per week.

(b) Section 203(b) of the Act is amended as follows:

(1) Insert a comma after the word "transportation" where it first occurs, strike out the language after that word and before the word *"Provided"* and insert the following in lieu thereof: "and when such training is provided in facilities which are not within commuting distance of the trainee's regular place of residence, subsistence expenses for separate maintenance of the trainee:";

(2) Change the period at the end of section 203(b) to a comma and insert the following immediately thereafter: "except that in noncontiguous States and in areas outside the continental United States where the per diem allowance prescribed under section 836 of title 5, United States Code, exceeds the maximum per diem allowance prescribed under that section for contiguous States, the Secretary may provide for a reasonable increase in the transportation and subsistence expenses in such amounts as he may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and subject to such limitations as he may prescribe."

(c) Section 203(c) of the Act is amended as follows:

(1) Strike the words "not less than" and insert "at least" in lieu thereof;

(2) Insert a colon after the words "gainful employment", strike everything in the first sentence after the words "gainful employment", and insert the following in lieu thereof: *"Provided,* That he shall not pay training allowances to members of a family or a household in which the head of the family or the head of the household as defined in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is employed, unless the Secretary determines that such payments are necessary in order for the trainees to undertake or to continue training: *Provided further,* That no allowances shall be paid to any member of a family or household if the Secretary of Labor determines that the head of such family or household has terminated his employment for the purpose of qualifying such member for training allowances under this section.";

(3) Amend the last sentence to read as follows: "The number of youths under the age of twenty-two who are receiving training allowances (or who would be entitled thereto but for the receipt of unemployment compensation) shall, except for such adjustments as may be necessary for effective management of programs under this section, not exceed 25 per centum of all persons receiving such allowance (or who would be entitled thereto but for the receipt of unemployment compensation). The Secretary of Labor may authorize continued payments of allowances to any youth who becomes twenty-two years of age during the course of his training, if he has completed a substantial part of such training."

(d) Section 203(d) of the Act is repealed, and sections 203(e), 203(f), 203(g), 203(h), 203(i), and 203(j) are relettered 203(d), 203(e), 203(f), 203(g), 203(h), and 203(i).

(e) The present section 203(h)(2) of the Act is amended by striking everything in the first sentence after the words "all of such benefits paid" and adding a period immediately thereafter.

Sec. 7. Section 208 is repealed.

Sec. 8. (a) Section 231 of the Act is amended by striking the second sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Such State agencies shall provide for such training through public educational agencies or institutions or through arrangements with private educational or training institutions where such private institutions can (1) provide substantially equivalent training with comparable Federal expenditures, or (2) provide equipment or services not available in public institutions, particularly for training in technical and subprofessional occupations, or (3) make possible an expanded use of the individual referral method, or (4) aid in reducing more quickly unemployment or current and prospective manpower shortages."

(b) Section 231 of the Act is amended by striking the third sentence and inserting the following in lieu thereof: "The State agency shall be paid 90 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement, unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare determines that payments in excess of 90 per centum are necessary because (1) a State is without authority on the date of the enactment of the "Manpower Act of 1965" to enact legislation providing contributions to noncollegiate, adult education or training conducted in public institutions, or (2) such payments with respect to private educational or training institutions are required to give full effect to the purposes of the Act: *Provided,* That for the period ending June 30, 1966, the State agency shall be paid 100 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services."

Sec. 9. Title II of the Act is amended by adding part C to the end thereof to read as follows:

"PART C—REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

"Sec. 251. (a) The Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, in accordance with their respective responsibilities and under parts A and B of this title, are authorized to provide a supplementary program of training and training allowances, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, for unemployed and underemployed persons residing in areas designated as redevelopment areas by the Secretary of Commerce under the Area Redevelopment Act or any subsequent Act authorizing such designation. Such program shall be carried out by the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare in accordance with the provisions otherwise applicable to programs under this Act and with their respective functions under those provisions, except that—

"(1) the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall determine the occupational training or retraining needs of unemployed or underemployed individuals residing in redevelopment areas;

"(2) all unemployed or underemployed individuals residing in redevelopment areas who can reasonably be expected to obtain employment as a result of such training may be referred and selected for training and shall be eligible for training allowances under this section: *Provided,* That the amount and duration of training allowances under this section shall in no event exceed the amount and duration of training allowances provided under section 203(a) of this Act;

"(3) the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, each with respect to his functions under this section, prescribe jointly with the Secretary of Commerce such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section; and

"(4) no funds available under this section shall be generally apportioned to any State pursuant to section 301 of this Act, nor shall any matching funds be required.

"(b) Sections 16 and 17 of the Area Redevelopment Act are hereby repealed. The repeal of these sections shall not affect the disbursement of funds under, or the carrying out of, any contract, commitment, or other obligation entered into pursuant to the Area Redevelopment Act prior to the date of repeal of such sections."

Sec. 10. Section 301 of the Act is amended by striking the period at the end thereof, inserting a colon in lieu of the period, and adding the following after the colon: "*Provided,* That no funds apportioned with respect to a State in any fiscal year shall be reapportioned before the expiration of the sixth month of such fiscal year and only upon thirty days prior notice to such State of the proposed reapportionment, except that the requirement for prior notice shall not apply with respect to any reapportionment made during the last quarter of the fiscal year."

Sec. 11. Section 302 of the Act is amended by striking the word "and" following "the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act" inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and inserting "and the Vocational Education Act of 1963" following "the Vocational Education Act of 1946,".

Sec. 12. Section 304 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 304. (a) For the purposes of carrying out title I, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of $46,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter such amounts as may be necessary.

"(b) For the purpose of carrying out parts A and B of title II, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of $385,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each fiscal year thereafter such amounts as may be necessary.

"(c) For the purpose of carrying out part C of title II, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of $22,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each year thereafter such amounts as may be necessary.

"(d) For the purpose of carrying out title III, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated not in excess of $1,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each year thereafter such amounts as may be necessary."

Sec. 13. The following subsection is added to section 305 of the Act to read as follows:

"(e) The costs of all training programs approved in any fiscal year, including the total cost of training allowances for such programs, may be paid from funds appropriated for such purposes for that fiscal year; and the amount of the Federal payment shall be computed on the basis of the per centum requirement in effect at the time such programs are approved: *Provided,* That funds appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, may be expended for training programs approved under this Act prior to July 1, 1965."

Sec. 14. Section 306(a) of the Act is amended by inserting after the word "procedures" the following: "including, subject to such policies, rules, and regulations as they may prescribe, the approval of any program under section 202, the cost of which does not exceed $75,000".

Sec. 15. Sections 309(a) and 309(b) are both amended by striking "Prior to March 1, 1963, and again prior to April 1, 1964, April 1, 1965, and April 1, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof: "Prior to April 1 in each year."

Sec. 16. Sections 310(a) and 310(b) are both amended by striking "1966" and inserting in lieu thereof: "1970".

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. O'HARA OF MICHIGAN

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. O'Hara of Michigan: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of H.R. 4257 as passed:

"That this Act may be cited as the "Manpower Act of 1965".

"Sec. 2. (a) Section 102(5) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the 'Act'), is amended by adding a comma after the word 'arrange' and inserting 'through grants or contracts,' immediately following the comma.

"(b) Section 102 of the Act is further amended by striking out 'and' at the end of the paragraph (4), by striking out the period at the end of the paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu of such period '; and', and by adding at the end of such section the following new paragraph:

" '(6) establish a program of experimental, developmental, demonstration, and pilot projects, through grants to or contracts with public or private nonprofit organizations, or through contracts with other private organizations, for the purpose of improving techniques and demonstrating the effectiveness of specialized methods in meeting the manpower, employment, and training problems of worker groups such as the long-term unemployed, disadvantaged youth, displaced older workers, the handicapped, members of minority groups, and other similar groups. In carrying out this subsection the Secretary of Labor shall, where appropriate, consult with the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Commerce, and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Where programs under this paragraph require institutional training, appropriate arrangements for such training shall be agreed to by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. He shall also seek the advice of consultants with respect to the standards governing the adequacy and design of proposals, the ability of applicants, and the priority of projects in meeting the objectives of this Act.'

"Sec. 3. (a) Title I of the Act is amended by renumbering sections 103 and 104 as sections 106 and 107, respectively, and by inserting immediately after section 102 the following new sections:

" 'JOB DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

" 'Sec. 103. The Secretary of Labor shall stimulate and assist, in cooperation with interested agencies both public and private, job development programs, through on-the-job training and other suitable methods, that will serve to expand employment by the filling of those service and related needs which are not now being met because of lack of trained workers or other reasons affecting employment or opportunities for employment.

" 'LABOR MOBILITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

" 'Sec. 104. (a) During the period ending June 30, 1967, the Secretary of Labor shall develop and carry out, in a limited number of geographical areas, pilot projects designed to assess or demonstrate the effectiveness in reducing unemployment of programs to increase the mobility of unemployed workers by providing assistance to meet their relocation expenses. In carrying out such projects the Secretary may provide such assistance, in the form of grants or loans, or both, only to involuntarily unemployed individuals who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment in the community in which they reside, have bona fide offers of employment (other than temporary or seasonal employment), and are deemed qualified to perform the work for which they are being employed.

" '(b) Loans or grants provided under this section shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe, with loans subject to the following limitations:

" '(1) there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;

" '(2) the credit is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs;

" '(3) the amount of the loan, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure achievement of the purposes for which the loan is made;

" '(4) the loan bears interest at a rate not less than (A) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (B) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Secretary may determine to be consistent with its purposes; and

" '(5) the loan is repayable within not more than ten years.

" '(c) Of the funds appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this Act, not more than $5,000,000 may be used for the purposes of this section.

" 'TRAINEE PLACEMENT ASSISTANCE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

" 'Sec. 105. During the period ending June 30, 1967, the Secretary of Labor shall develop and carry out experimental and demonstration projects to assist in the placement of persons seeking employment through a public employment office who have successfully completed or participated in a federally assisted or financed training, counseling, work training, or work experience program and who, after appropriate counseling, have been found by the Secretary to be qualified and suitable for the employment in question, but to whom employment is or may be denied for reasons other than ability to perform, including difficulty in securing bonds for indemnifying their employers against loss from the infidelity, dishonesty, or default of such persons. In carrying out these projects the Secretary may make payments to or contracts with employers or institutions authorized to indemnify employers against such losses. Of the funds appropriated for fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967, not more than $200,000 and $300,000, respectively, may be used for the purpose of carrying out this section.'

"(b) Section 102(2) of the Act is amended by striking out '104' and inserting in lieu thereof '107'.

"Sec. 4. Section 202(i) of the Act is amended by striking out ', and such persons shall be eligible for training allowances for not to exceed an additional twenty weeks'.

"Sec. 5. (a) Section 203(a) of the Act is amended as follows:

"(1) Amend the second sentence thereof to read as follows: 'Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding one hundred and four weeks, and the basic amount of any such payment in any week for persons undergoing training, including uncompensated employer-provided training, shall not exceed $10 more than the amount of the average weekly gross unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent four-calendar-quarter period for which such data are available: *Provided,* That the basic amount of such payments may be increased by $5 a week for each dependent over two up to a maximum of four additional dependents: *Pro-*

vided further, That in any week an individual who, but for his training, would be entitled to unemployment compensation in excess of his total allowance, including payments for dependents, shall receive an allowance increased by the amount of such excess.';

"(2) Amend the second paragraph thereof to read as follows:

"'With respect to any week for which a person receives unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or any other Federal or State unemployment compensation law which is less than the total training allowance, including payments for dependents, provided for by the preceding paragraph, a supplemental training allowance may be paid to a person eligible for a training allowance under this Act. The supplemental training allowance shall not exceed the difference between his unemployment compensation and the training allowance provided by the preceding paragraph.';

"(3) Insert the words 'under the training program' after 'compensated hours per week' in the third paragraph of such subsection:

"(4) In lieu of the fourth paragraph of such subsection insert the following:

"'The training allowance of a person engaged in training under section 204 or 231 shall not be reduced on account of employment (other than employment under an on-the-job training program under section 204) which does not exceed twenty hours per week, but shall be reduced in an amount equal to his full earnings for hours worked (other than in employment under such an on-the-job training program) in excess of twenty hours per week.'

"(b)(1) Section 203(b) of the Act is amended by striking out the matter following 'to defray transportation' and preceding '*Provided*', and by inserting in lieu of such matter the following: 'expenses, and when such training is provided in facilities which are not within commuting distance of the trainee's regular place of residence, subsistence expenses for separate maintenance of the trainee:'.

"(2) Such subsection is further amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following: ', except in the case of local transportation where he may authorize reimbursement for the trainee's travel by the most economical mode of public transportation, and except that in noncontiguous States and in areas outside the continental United States where the per diem allowance prescribed under section 836 of title 5, United States Code, exceeds the maximum per diem allowance prescribed under that section for contiguous States, the Secretary may provide for a reasonable increase in the transportation and subsistence expenses in such amounts as he may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and subject to such limitations as he may prescribe'.

"(c) Section 203(c) of the Act is amended as follows:

"(1) Strike the words 'not less than' in the first sentence and insert 'at least' in lieu thereof;

"(2) Strike out everything in the first sentence after the words 'gainful employment', and insert the following in lieu thereof: ': *Provided,* That they are not members of a family or a household in which the head of the family or the head of the household as defined in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is employed.';

"(3) Amend the last sentence to read as follows: 'The number of youths under the age of twenty-two who are receiving training allowances (or who would be entitled thereto but for the receipt of unemployment compensation) shall, except for such adjustments as may be necessary for effective management of programs under this section, not exceed 25 per centum of all persons receiving such allowances (or who would be entitled thereto but for the receipt of unemployment compensation).'

"(d) Subsection (d) of section 203 of the Act is repealed and subsections (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) of such section are redesignated as (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i), respectively.

"(e) The first sentence of section 203(g)(2) of the Act (as redesignated by section 5(d) of this Act) is amended by striking out everything that follows 'all of such benefits paid' and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

"SEC. 6. Section 208 of the Act is repealed.

"SEC. 7. Section 231 of the Act is amended by striking the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: 'The State agency shall be paid not more than 90 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement, unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare determines that payments in excess of 90 per centum are necessary because such payments with respect to private institutions are required to give full effect to the purposes of the Act: *Provided,* That for the period ending June 30, 1966, the State agency shall be paid 100 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services.'

"SEC. 8. Title II of the Act is amended by adding part C to the end thereof to read as follows:

"'PART C—REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

"'SEC. 241. (a) The Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, in accordance with their respective responsibilities under parts A and B of this title, are authorized to provide a supplementary program of training and training allowances, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, for unemployed and underemployed persons residing in areas designated as redevelopment areas by the Secretary of Commerce under the Area Redevelopment Act or any subsequent Act authorizing such designation. Such program shall be carried out by the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare in accordance with the provisions otherwise applicable to programs under this Act and with their respective functions under those provisions, except that—

"'(1) the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall determine the occupational training or retraining needs of unemployed or underemployed individuals residing in redevelopment areas;

"'(2) all unemployed or underemployed individuals residing in redevelopment areas who can reasonably be expected to obtain employment as a result of such training may be referred and selected for training and shall be eligible for training allowances under this section: *Provided,* That the amount and duration of training allowances under this section shall in no event exceed the amount and duration of training allowances provided under section 203(a) of this Act;

"'(3) the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, each with respect to his functions under this section, prescribe jointly with the Secretary of Commerce such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section; and

"'(4) section 301 shall not apply with respect to funds available under this section.

"'(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such amounts as may be necessary to carry out this section.'

"(b) Sections 16 and 17 of the Area Redevelopment Act (42 U.S.C. 2513 and 2514) are repealed.

"(c) This section and the amendments made by it shall take effect on July 1, 1965.

"'SEC. 9. Section 301 of the Act is amended by striking the period at the end thereof, inserting a colon, and adding the following proviso:

"'*Provided,* That no funds apportioned with respect to a State in any fiscal year shall be reapportioned before the expiration of the sixth month of such fiscal year and only upon thirty days' prior notice to such State of the proposed reapportionment, except that the requirement for prior notice shall not apply with respect to any reapportionment made during the last quarter of the fiscal year.'

"SEC. 10. Section 302 of the Act is amended by striking the word 'and' following 'the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act' inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and inserting 'and the Vocational Education Act of 1963,' following 'the Vocational Education Act of 1946,'.

"SEC. 11. Section 304 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"'SEC. 304. For the purpose of carrying out this Act there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years such amounts as may be necessary.'

"SEC. 12. The following subsection is added to section 305 of the Act to read as follows:

"'(e) The costs of all training programs approved in any fiscal year, including the total cost of training allowances for such programs, may be paid from funds appropriated for such purposes for that fiscal year; and the amount of the Federal payment shall be computed on the basis of the per centum requirement in effect at the time such programs are approved: *Provided,* That funds appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, may be expended for training programs approved under this Act prior to July 1, 1965, and expenditures for such purposes shall be subject to the matching requirements in effect at the time such programs were approved.'

"SEC. 12. Subsection (a) of section 306 of the Act is amended by inserting after the comma immediately following the word 'procedures' the following:

"'subject to such policies, rules and regulations as they may prescribe, the approval of any program under section 202, the cost of which does not exceed $75,000,'

"SEC. 13. Sections 309(a) and 309(b) of the Act are both amended by striking "Prior to March 1, 1963, and again prior to April 1, 1964, April 1, 1965, and April 1, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof: 'Prior to April 1 in each year for which an appropriation is authorized by section 304'.

"SEC. 14. Section 310 of the Act is amended by striking out '1966' wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof '1968'.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H.R. 4257) was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR WEEK OF APRIL 5

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the schedule for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the majority leader.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, we have finished the legislative business for this week, and it will be our purpose to ask to adjourn over after the announcement of the program The program for next week is as follows:

Monday is Consent Calendar day and there are five suspensions:

H.R. 3990, amendment of section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors;

H.R. 1763, amendment of section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code, to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28 for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis;

H.R. 5702, extension of National Commission on Food Marketing;

H.R. 4778, increasing the amounts authorized for Indian adult vocational education; and

H.R. 980, to provide for the return of obscene mail matter.

Also on Monday the 1966 appropriation act for the Treasury and Post Office Departments.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day. Also on Tuesday the Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1965, and House Resolution 273, to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on Public Works.

Wednesday and the balance of the week, H.R. 6675, the Social Security Amendments of 1965, which, of course, is the so-called medicare bill.

This announcement is made with the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and any additional program may be announced at a later time.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Would the distinguished majority leader give the Members of the House any guideline for the program prior to and subsequent to the Easter recess?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the gentleman has brought this subject up, because I think the Members of the House are entitled to know what the program is so that they can make their own arrangements accordingly.

I am able to announce now that it will be our purpose to have off Friday, the 16th of April, and Saturday, Sunday, Monday, and Tuesday. We will have important legislative business on Wednesday, April 21. We have 5 days during the Easter period and Members may govern themselves accordingly.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman give the Members information as to what legislation will be scheduled beginning on Wednesday the 21st?

Mr. ALBERT. On that, if the gentleman will permit, I should like to remain flexible. There is a very good chance that the first bill after coming back will be the authorization bill for the Department of Defense which, of course, is a very large authorization and a very important bill.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Is it the hope that we will finish perhaps not Thursday night the 15th, but possibly Wednesday night the 14th?

Mr. ALBERT. I would not like to make any commitment on that. We are not going out of our way to try to find extra business; but I must confine my remarks, as I have previously, to advising the House that our recess will begin on Thursday after the business of that day is finished.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I thank the majority leader.

ADJOURNMENT OVER UNTIL MONDAY, APRIL 5

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, am I to understand that we are going to have a 5-day Easter recess, or maybe a 4-day Easter recess—it depends on how you figure it, of course—but there is no assurance that we will be in recess until the Friday before Easter?

Mr. ALBERT. Thursday afternoon after the conclusion of the legislative business for that day. The gentlemen then may safely be away until the House convenes at noon on next Wednesday.

Mr. GROSS. On the following Wednesday?

Mr. ALBERT. That is correct; the gentleman is correct.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is not doing much of a favor for those of us who are a thousand miles or more away from home.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman does not live any farther away from Washington than I do. We are doing the best we can under the circumstances to accommodate as many Members as possible.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Iowa, more than any other Member that I know of, deplores the fact that the House sometimes does not meet regularly on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday. But we meet every Thursday, Friday, and Saturday when we have business. If we did not have business on Wednesday, after the Easter recess, we would adjourn over, but we do have business and will have to reconvene on that date.

Mr. GROSS. That was the point I was trying to make. The House does not meet on Friday, except on rare exceptions.

Mr. ALBERT. That is only when the House does not have business.

Mr. GROSS. But it seldom meets on Friday, and that apparently will be the case on tomorrow which is Friday.

Mr. ALBERT. It meets whenever it has business on Friday. May I ask the gentleman this? When the gentleman has done a week's work, does he not think he ought to be able to take off? When we finish our week's schedule, whether it is Thursday or Friday or Saturday, does he not think we ought to have the rest of the week off? Last Friday we were here until 10:30 p.m.

Mr. GROSS. All that the gentleman from Iowa is trying to do is to ask the gentleman, if out of his warm heart, he could not open up a little bit and make the recess 10 days instead of 3 or 4 days?

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman almost moves me to tears.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, when is the House going to observe Pan American Day? I believe it is the week just before Easter, is it not?

Mr. ALBERT. I think it is the 14th of April.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Why could we not go out just before the close of business on the 13th, the day before Pan American Day?

Mr. ALBERT. We would not be doing Pan American Day justice if we do not observe it here on the floor of the House.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Why could we not finish the business of the week, the legislative business, on the day before Pan American Day so that others who feel they could get away could leave and others could stay and observe Pan American Day?

Mr. ALBERT. We hope to finish the legislative business as fast as we can. That is our intention.

Mr. GROSS. What I am trying to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma is that I am perfectly willing to work Mondays through Fridays, 5 days, and at least 8 hours each day in order to expedite the business of the House and make it possible to spend a little time with those I am privileged to represent. I strenuously protest the failure to provide a reasonable Easter recess.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, if I am in order—and may I say I do not propose to object—I want to take this opportunity to point out that it is very difficult under the rules of this House for Members to vote sometimes.

On the bill that was just disposed of a moment ago I had handled the rule and had stated my position in favor of the bill. However, I had been called to my office to see some constituents and was detained down there—I left my office shortly after the first call but was detained in the elevator, a stuck elevator.

When I got into the Chamber, they had passed my name and had gotten into the D's. Therefore, I could not qualify to vote.

I just wanted to call this to the attention of the distinguished majority leader. That has happened to me before, but not exactly under those circumstances. I want to suggest that there is not, after all, any difference whether we vote under three bells or two bells, and under the automatic rollcall, you go down in the well of the House and you do not have to qualify.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the situation which the gentleman describes is most unfortunate, and I, for one, wish there was some way under the circumstances for the gentleman to have his vote recorded. There is no more conscientious Member of the House than the gentleman from Mississippi. I wish there was some way we could take care of this matter. The gentleman's complaint is certainly meritorious.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. COLMER. I am willing to surrender. I quit.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COOLEY. Is it in order for me to ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] be permitted to vote on the record vote just taken?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is not.

Mr. COOLEY. That is a clear-cut answer all right.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture may be permitted to sit during general debate on April 6.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on Calendar Wednesday of next week be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs may have until midnight Saturday night to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

SUPREME COURT DECISION STRIKING DOWN NEW YORK'S MOTION PICTURE CENSORSHIP PROCEDURE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the recent Supreme Court decision striking down New York's motion picture censorship procedure should be of grave concern to everyone interested in decency and the protection of the morals of our youth.

As one who is not a lawyer, I cannot quarrel with the findings of our learned Justices. But, as a former police official, I can say without fear of successful contradiction that indecent movies, obscene literature, and fifth in any form are the major contributing factors to the alarming increase in juvenile delinquency.

Since we have no appeal from rulings of the Supreme Court, I believe we have a responsibility as legislators to take some action to minimize the potential damaging effects of this decision.

If existing laws against transmission of smut through the mail or shipment in interstate commerce by common carrier are not adequate to halt this traffic, we should tighten them up and make them foolproof.

Producers of indecent movies will cease spending money producing them if their viewing audiences are limited to a single State and they cease to make a profit. The penalty for bootlegging them across State lines should be stiff enough to discourage such traffic.

WORLDWIDE POPULATION EXPLOSION

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. TODD. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today a bill which is similar to one introduced in the other body by Senator GRUENING.

The bill is designed to:

First. State recognition by the Congress of the urgency and importance of the problems associated with the worldwide population explosion.

Second. Establish Assistant Secretaries of the Departments of State and of Health, Education, and Welfare to coordinate information and activities of Federal agencies in fields pertaining to the population problem.

Third. Authorize President Johnson to call a White House Conference on Population Problems to assist in bringing public attention and informed discussion to bear on the matter.

We all realize this subject is one of the greatest personal delicacy and political sensitivity. Yet this does not mean that it should uncomfortably be pushed aside. For the population explosion and the problems it entails—both at home and abroad—are among the gravest issues of our times.

We must face the issue, and face it squarely.

For, in the long run, it is possibly the most important issue facing our future on this planet. As the New York Times said, reporting the increase of 63 million people in the world last year—

> This news is just as important as any this newspaper can print. * * * It means more in the long run than elections, economic trends, catastrophes and international crises. If the human race is to survive on anything higher than a slum basis, something will have to give—presumably the birth rate. Such is today's biggest news—and greatest problem.

The facts of the matter are clear and simple—and so vast they are almost meaningless to our imaginations:

By the time of Christ, the earth's population was one-quarter billion; by 1830 it had risen to 1 billion; by 1930—a short 100 years later—it was 2 billion; it has taken less than 35 years to pass the 3 billion mark.

At present growth rates, by A.D. 2000 our population will have doubled to 6.6 billion. In less than 70 years it will have quadrupled, to 12 billion.

Demographers project our growth to the astronomical figure of 150 billion people by A.D. 2150.

In America, the growth rates are nearly as high. By the year A.D. 2000 the U.S. population will have nearly doubled; an increase from the present 190 million to around 340 million.

Remember that population growth figures are strange; the growth rate may remain the same, but the more people there are, the greater is the absolute population growth.

What do these cold figures mean in human terms?

Here in the United States, we are all aware of parents who have families that are larger than they want and can raise properly. Children in such cases may grow up unwanted, or financially deprived, or educationally stunted. Parents may face a life of constant struggle, anxiety, and failure.

The cost to society of taking care of such families is second only to the personal anguish which is the lot of their members.

Such families often neither know about family planning information nor can they afford to put such information into practice. In many cases, it is precisely the families which most need to know about the option of family planning to which such information is not available.

Abroad, the human problem is equally harsh. In many nations, still struggling to bring their standard of living up from a bare subsistence level, any economic advances or increases in food production may be more than offset by population increases. A nation may strain to increase production by 12 percent over 5 years, only to find that population has grown by 15 percent, leaving its citizens worse off than before.

The population explosion threatens to ruin our efforts to bring political stability to many parts of the world. It threatens to produce an explosion compounded of misery, anger, and desperation that can do nothing but benefit the forces of totalitarianism and communism.

As Eugene R. Black, then President of the World Bank, said in 1961:

> Population growth threatens to nullify all our efforts to raise living standards in many of the poorer countries. We are coming to a situation in which the optimist will be the man who thinks that present living standards can be maintained

Mr. Speaker, in the light of these facts, I believe that something must be done, and done soon.

I further believe that responsible opinion in this country—regardless of political partisanship—is in substantial agreement with me.

President Kennedy said in 1963:

> We should know more and do more on the whole reproductive cycle, and this information should be available to the world.

President Eisenhower has pointed out:

> The time has come when we must take into account the effect of the population explosion on our mutual assistance system. Unless we do, it may smother the economic progress of many nations.

Former Vice President Nixon, after his Asian tour, recommended that the United States give assistance to nations requesting help on population problems.

And President Johnson, in his state of the Union address delivered to this Congress, said:

> I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population.

The President has spoken, before the Congress assembled. It is up to us to act, not only for us but also for the world.

In the face of this situation, what has the Government done? Something, but not much when compared with the dimensions of the problem.

The 1963 foreign aid bill authorized funds "to conduct research into the problems of population growth." But there was a $6 million ceiling placed on all types of research, and Senator GRUENING estimates that only $130,000 was spent on population problems. In broader terms, while the U.S. Government is spending around $15 billion a year on research, around $4 million is being spent on medical research in fertility and related fields.

There is some private research, but it, too, is limited in extent.

The fact is that many of the basic physiological problems have yet to be solved. This part of medical science and public health is still in its infancy. More work is badly needed, as is more coordination and dissemination of the results.

Some programs in this field have been started, particularly by the Office of Economic Opportunity and by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Yet any accurate summary of what the Government has done or is doing is unavailable because of poor coordination and reluctance to speak frankly.

Abroad, the State Department and the Agency for International Development have been providing assistance on population and demographic problems to those countries which formally ask for help. But here again, the impact of these programs is limited, partly because the data are lacking, partly because much research has yet to be done, and partly because information is not fully coordinated.

The Government's activities in this field, then, are uncoordinated and often insufficient to meet the pressing need.

All of us, Mr. Speaker, firmly believe that family size is a decision to be made solely and privately by husband and wife. But I also believe that husband and wife should have available full information to assist them in making an informed and responsible decision about their own families.

Within the last 2 years, much progress has been made. Science has developed means of family planning which are safe, reliable, and inexpensive enough to be used in underdeveloped countries abroad. Methods acceptable to various religious faiths appear to have been found. An informed, responsible dialog between all groups involved has slowly grown out from under the mask of embarrassment and suspicion.

This dialog is particularly apparent within the Catholic Church and between Catholics and others. Although the third session of the Vatican Council closed without taking a stand on the problem of population growth, Pope Paul VI directed a special papal commission to make a comprehensive study of the problem. A report is expected within the near future. Concern within the church has grown. Commonweal, in January 1965, suggested that most Catholics are now in agreement with the "great consensus through the world and in the United States that the economic and social well-being of the underdeveloped nations will depend, in great part, on their ability to slow down the population growth rate."

Mr. Speaker, I have discussed this legislation with many people: expert and lay, Catholic and Protestant. I have found substantial agreement with both my argument and with my proposals.

This legislation, if enacted, would authorize and direct responsible officials of our Government to coordinate and assist the health and research agencies around the world in grappling with the problem of population growth.

It would coordinate information and increase efficiency. It would encourage further research. It would, particularly through the White House conference on population problems, focus attention on the issue. It would further the dialog which is now emerging on the matter. It would open channels of communication between our Government and our friends abroad. It would bring understanding and hope.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more important problem facing this Nation and the world. Its scale is vast, but we cannot hesitate. Its extent is worldwide, but we must not draw back. Its implications are deep, but we must not shy away.

The issue must be faced and faced now if we are to avoid widespread misery and possible disaster.

The full text of my bill follows:

A bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

STATEMENT OF FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF POLICY

SECTION 1. (a) The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) the application of public health measures, and the introduction of modern medical life-saving and life-prolonging techniques have contributed to a doubling of the annual rate of world population growth within the past eighteen years, and may be expected to continue to increase rates of such growth in the future;

(2) population growth is a vital factor in determining the extent to which economic development and political stability will prevail in any country, especially in countries which are in the early stages of economic and political development;

(3) at present, because of the rapid and continued growth in population, hundreds of millions of parents are unable to provide adequately for themselves and their children;

(4) many nations in which population growth is most extreme and where the problems arising from such growth are most acute are, anxious because of economic, technical, and other considerations, to share our experience in dealing with such growth and the problems connected therewith;

(5) past and present efforts on the part of the United States in cooperating with and assisting nations desirous of dealing with urgent population problems with which they are confronted have not been sufficiently effective; and

(6) the President of the United States, in his 1965 state of the Union address, announced that the United States should expand and intensify its efforts to contribute to the solution of the problems connected with rapid world population growth.

(b) It is therefore the policy of the Congress that—

(1) there should be made within the departments, agencies and instrumentalities of the executive branch of the Government such organizational and other changes as may be necessary to enable the United States more effectively to deal with rapid population growth throughout the world and the problems arising from or connected with such growth; and,

(2) the United States, in dealing with such problems, should, to the maximum extent feasible, cooperate with and assist over nations, the United Nations and other international organizations, and private institutions, organizations, groups, and individuals in their efforts to cope with the problems arising out of rapid population growth.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE: DUTIES OF SECRETARY WITH RESPECT TO POPULATION AFFAIRS: CREATION OF AN OFFICE OF POPULATION AFFAIRS: CREATION OF OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR POPULATION AFFAIRS

SEC. 2. (a) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of State (hereinafter in this section called the Secretary) to:

(1) develop and coordinate the United States positions on the international aspects of population growth and the problems connected therewith;

(2) maintain liaison with scientific organizations, philanthropic foundations, and other bodies concerned with international population problems;

(3) make policy recommendations in the field of population growth to appropriate officials of the Government;

(4) organize and direct a program for the utilization of demographic attachés in embassies and other appropriate diplomatic establishments of the United States abroad;

(5) to cooperate with and utilize to the maximum extent feasible the services of the United States Information Service in carrying out his various duties with respect to population and demographic problems;

(6) coordinate and maintain current data on all foreign population programs whether or not instituted or assisted by the United States;

(7) transmit such information and other data to United States diplomatic personnel, as well as other interested officers and employees of the Government, as may be necessary to keep them advised of the policy and programs of the United States with respect to population problems and of their duties in implementing such policy and programs;

(8) devise and recommend to the Secretary of State areas wherein demographic research may more effectively be utilized in formulating and carrying out programs to cope with population problems;

(9) make available, in all countries, with which the United States maintains diplomatic relations information (through publications and other means) with respect to the grants, fellowships, scholarships, and other types of assistance available in the United States to foreign students desiring to carry on studies with respect to demographic and related matters;

(10) make available to recognized scientific and medical authorities in foreign countries, upon the request of the governments of such countries, information and assistance pertaining to medical and other aspects of population growth problems; and

(11) cooperate with, and seek the assistance of, interested public and private institutions, groups, organizations, and individuals in carrying out the policies and programs of the United States relating to international aspects of population growth and control.

(b) The Secretary shall submit annually to the President and to the Congress with respect to the preceding year a report—

(1) identifying and describing all programs which foreign governments have carried on in dealing with population and related matters;

(2) containing a complete summary of United States activity in the field of foreign population problems, including, with respect to such problems, reports on all programs instituted or participated in by the United States and on all conferences, symposiums, seminars, or other meetings in which the United States participated; and

(3) containing such other data as may be necessary fully to inform Congress of activities, needs, and developments in the area of population growth problems.

(c) There is hereby created in the Office of the Secretary an Office for Population Affairs to which the Secretary may delegate such of the duties and functions set forth in section (2)(a) of this bill as the Secretary may determine to be necessary and desirable. Under the direction of the Secretary, the Office for Population Affairs shall be under the supervision and control of an Assistant Secretary for Population Affairs, who shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and who shall be compensated at the same rate as are other Assistant Secretaries within the Department of State.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE: CREATION OF OFFICE FOR POPULATION AFFAIRS; CREATION OF OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR HEALTH, MEDICAL SERVICES, AND POPULATION AFFAIRS

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be the duty of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare (hereinafter in this section called the Secretary) to:

(1) review continually the health and medical programs of the Department insofar as they relate to the problems of population growth and health with a view to coordinating and improving such programs, as well as to determining the need for additional programs which relate to population growth and health;

(2) collect and disseminate such data and material, and to perform such functions as may be necessary most effectively to serve as a liaison with scientific organizations, philanthropic foundations, and other bodies concerned with domestic population problems;

(3) make policy determinations in the field of family planning and population growth to appropriate offices within the Department;

(4) coordinate and maintain current data on all domestic family planning and/or population programs instituted or assisted in the United States;

(5) keep the personnel of the Department, as well as other interested officers and employees of the Federal, State, and local governments, advised with respect to the domestic policies and programs of the Government with respect to population problems and with respect to their duties in implementing such policies and programs;

(6) publish and distribute to interested persons a list of grants, fellowships, scholarships, and other types of assistance available to students and others desiring to carry on studies with respect to demographic and related problems in the United States and abroad; and

(7) cooperate with, and seek the assistance of, interested public and private institutions, groups, organizations, and individuals in carrying out the policies and programs of the United States relating to problems of population growth.

(b) The Secretary shall submit annually to the President and to the Congress with respect to the preceding year a report—

(1) containing a list of all official indications to the Department of interest and requests for assistance from State and local governments in problems of population growth and family planning;

(2) containing a complete summary of United States activity in the field of domestic population growth and control programs; and

(3) containing such other data as may be necessary fully to inform the Congress of activities, needs and developments in the area of domestic population growth and for family planning programs.

(c) There is hereby created in the Office of the Secretary an Office for Population Affairs to which the Secretary may delegate such of the duties and functions set forth in section 3(a) of this bill as the Secretary may determine to be necessary and desirable. Under the direction of the Secretary, the Office for Population Affairs shall be under the supervision and control of an Assistant Secretary for Health, Medical Services and Population Problems who (i) shall be appointed by the President by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; (ii) shall be compensated at the same rate as are other assistant secretaries within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; and (iii) in addition to the duties set forth herein, shall assume the duties discharged by the Special Assistant to the Secretary (Health and Medical Affairs), which latter position is hereby abolished.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON POPULATION

SEC. 4. (a) A White House Conference on Population to be called by the President of the United States in January 1967 in order to develop recommendations for further research and action with respect to population problems shall be planned and conducted under the direction of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare who shall have the cooperation and assistance of such other Federal departments and agencies as may be appropriate.

(b) For the purpose of arriving at facts and recommendations concerning the needs for further research and action with respect to population and for family planning problems, the conference shall bring together professional and lay people working in the field, representatives of various religious groups and of the general public.

(c) A final report of the White House Conference on Population shall be submitted to the President not later than ninety days following the date on which the conference was called and the findings and recommendations included therein shall be immediately made available to the public.

Grants

(d)(i) There is hereby authorized to be paid to each State which shall submit an application for funds for the exclusive use in planning and conducting a State conference on population prior to and for the purpose of developing facts and recommendations and preparing a report of the findings for presentation to the White House Conference on Population, and in defraying costs incident to the State's delegates attending the White House Conference on Population a sum to be determined by the Secretary, but not less than $5,000 nor more than $15,000; such sums to be paid only from funds specifically appropriated for this purpose.

(ii) Payment shall be made by the Secretary to an officer designated by the Governor of the State to receive such payment and to assume responsibility for organizing and conducting the State conference.

Administration

(e) In administering this Act, the Secretary shall:

(1) Request the cooperation and assistance of such other Federal departments and agencies as may be appropriate in carrying out the provisions of the Act;

(2) Render all reasonable assistance to the States in enabling them to organize and conduct conferences on population prior to the White House Conference on Population.

(3) Prepare and make available background materials for the use of delegates to the White House Conference, as he may deem necessary and shall prepare and distribute such report or reports of the Conference as may be indicated; and

(4) In carrying out the provisions of this Act, engage such additional personnel as may be necessary (without reference to the provisions of the Civil Service Act) within the amount of the funds appropriated for this purpose.

Advisory-committees

(f) The Secretary is authorized and directed to establish an Advisory Committee to the White House Conference on Population composed of professional, religious, and public members, and, as necessary, to establish technical advisory committees to advise and assist in planning and conducting the Conference. Appointed members of such committees, while attending conferences or meetings of their committees or otherwise serving at the request of the Secretary, shall be entitled to receive compensation at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary but not exceeding $50 per diem, including travel time, and while away from their homes or regular places of business they may be allowed travel expenses, including per diem in lieu of subsistence, as authorized by law for persons in the Government service employed intermittently.

Authorization of appropriations

(g) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as Congress determines to be necessary for the administration of this section.

WISHES OF THE CONGRESS

SEC. 5 (a) In carrying out the provisions of this act, both Secretaries shall take such steps as may be necessary to require compliance with the following wishes of the Congress.

(1) Participation by individuals in any family planning component of any program shall be entirely voluntary. No coercion or compulsion shall be employed to induce persons to use any family planning services.

(2) Use of any family planning services shall not be a prerequisite to receipt of the benefits of or participation in any other unrelated program or activity.

(3) Any program carried out pursuant to the authority contained in this Act must provide and make known to each participant the availability of advice and assistance on a variety of family planning methods and techniques sufficient to ensure that persons may obtain benefits from the program which are consistent with their personal beliefs.

(4) Any such program must be under medical supervision sufficient to ensure that all practices conform to accepted medical standards.

(5) Informational materials used in connection with any such program shall not contain propaganda promoting any particular philosophy of family planning or technique or method of family planning.

(6) Federal funds shall not be used to announce or promote through mass media the availability of family planning programs under this Act.

(7) No Federal funds shall be used for any surgical procedures intended to result in sterilization or to cause abortions, except for medical reasons unrelated to family planning objectives.

(8) No program under this Act shall be established to provide contraceptives, contraceptive devices or drugs to unmarried women or married women not living with their husbands.

THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call attention of the membership of this House to an excellent editorial commentary in the Polk County Democrat, which is published at Bartow, Fla., in my district, on the subject of the administration's voting rights bill, which will be before us for decision in the near future.

In asking unanimous consent of the House that this editorial, entitled "Watch the Weather, Congressmen," be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to call attention to the fact that it not only is moderate in tone, but that it is based on facts all too often ignored in an atmosphere in which the entire South is accused of bigotry and intolerance and discrimination against the Negro voter.

The facts are that in my State of Florida, there is no effort, at any level, to deprive the Negro—or any other person, regardless of race, creed, color or national origin—of the right to register as a voter or of the right to cast his ballot.

These facts are plainly delineated in the editorial comment of Mr. Loyal Frisbie, editor of the Polk County Democrat, on this so-called voting rights bill which we soon will be asked to enact. Mr. Frisbie is known in the district which I represent in Congress, to be one of the newspaper editors who take the more "moderate" view on matters transpiring in our Government. I am, as all of you know, of the conservative stripe. It is therefore with particular pleasure that I commend to all of you Mr. Frisbie's well-thought-out, well-reasoned, and excellently stated opinion as to the merits—or lack of merits—of the bill which we are being pressured to enact.

WATCH THE WEATHER, CONGRESSMEN

An editorial in last Thursday's issue of the Democrat commented that, without waiting to see the bill itself, a number of Senators had announced they would (1) filibuster against President Johnson's voter registration law, or (2) seek to strengthen it. The editorial called on all Senators to wait until they knew the facts before starting to stir up the populace.

Now the facts are known, and it is time to do some stirring.

It is idle to oppose the bill on grounds that it violates the U.S. Constitution, for the Constitution is what the U.S. Supreme Court says it is—and in recent years, the Supreme Court has consistently held that Federal power is supreme, and State powers are virtually nonexistent.

The only chance that there may be of softening any portions of the bill is to point out, statistically, that it has a hidden stinger which could be as damaging to Michigan, Illinois and New York as to Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama.

With the professed purpose of the bill—to eliminate discrimination and intimidation of any person who wants to register and vote—there can be no argument. The right of the ballot is as basic an American principle as is freedom of religion.

It is good that literacy tests are to be forbidden as a prerequisite to voting. When a college graduate will vote against a candidate because "he's too homely" or "I don't like the sound of his voice" (and that too often happens), it is obvious that the ability to read and write is no guarantee of sound judgment.

As distasteful as is the thought of Federal examiners being sent into a State to accept voter registrations, the blame for this possibility lies squarely at the door of those who, for generations, have been denying Negroes their constitutional right to vote.

The provision that makes the proposed voting bill as tyrannical as any of the practices it seeks to abolish, is the one that makes the size of the vote on November 4, 1964, the yardstick for determining if racial discrimination existed in a given area. By this scale, Polk County is barely in the clear—and there is no discrimination in this county on registration and voting.

For may years under Hugh Carlton and, since his retirement under Blanche Work, registration has been made as easy as possible for all races. Every person who applies for registration is promptly waited on. When there is a rush of registrants, whites and black stand together in line, and are served in the order in which they arrived.

These are eyeball facts, not theory.

In addition, instructions in using voting machines has been a long-standing custom of the registrar's office—a service available equally to Caucasians and Negroes.

Nevertheless, here are the statistics. Polk's population at mid-1964 was estimated at 214,000. On the basis of the national average of population over the age of 21, Polk's 84,418 registered voters last November represented 66.6 percent of those eligible to register.

The total number of voters on November 4 was 66,159. This was 78.2 percent of the registration—an unusually high percentage. But this figure was only 52.2 percent of those eligible to register. Thus, Polk County escapes being branded a discriminatory area by a scant 2.3 percent. And the weather was perfect last November 4. If there had happened to be a heavy day-long rain to discourage voters, Polk would have been guilty—in Federal eyes—of racial oppression at the voting booth.

To remove the presumption of guilt, under the proposed law, a State or county would have to prove its innocence before a three-judge court in Washington. Federal court decisions, on an accelerating scale in the past decade, indicate that innocence—where the race question has been raised—will be almost impossible to prove.

While the theory of guilty-until-proved-innocent violates the most sacred principle of American law courts, neither the majority of Congress nor the U.S. Supreme Court can be expected to pay any attention to this fact. But when an honest State or county can be penalized for the vagaries of weather, there may be a chance for congressional second thoughts.

ALABAMA BOYCOTT IS NONSENSE

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, as one who strongly supports the proposed voting rights legislation, and as one who marched with Dr. Martin Luther King out of Selma, I feel that Dr. King is barking up the wrong tree in his latest proposal for an economic boycott and for withdrawal of Federal funds from Alabama. This latest proposal is sheer nonsense.

For example, such a move would cripple the Nation's space program, and result in the departure of many highly talented scientists, engineers, and technicians from Alabama. The Marshall Space Flight Center at Huntsville, Ala., where the Saturn 1-B and the Saturn V launch vehicles for the Apollo moon program are being developed, would have to be shut down.

There are 7,195 men and women currently employed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in Huntsville, Ala., plus an additional 6,088 employees of contractors at the Marshall Space Flight Center. The total annual NASA payroll at Huntsville is $82 million, and the total capital investment at the Marshall Center amounts to $223,843,000. Furthermore, the total dollar value of pending space contracts in the State of Alabama amounts to $441,984,000. Such a course as advocated by Dr. King would not only wreck this Nation's progress in space, but would not, I believe, accomplish the objective of extending equal rights.

Boycotts are helpful under some conditions. For example, the segregated bus boycotts which Dr. King and others organized were extremely helpful in improving intolerable conditions. The Selma-Montgomery march aroused the conscience of the Nation. But we are now at a stage when men of good will in Alabama are starting to achieve some reforms, and such a sweeping boycott and withdrawal of Federal funds would destroy much of the good work which these moderates are accomplishing.

I trust that civil rights demonstrations will remain peaceful, realistic, and pointed toward a logical and just objective.

SECOND DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS PARTICIPATES IN HISTORIC MARCH IN ALABAMA

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor and experienced the pride of mentioning on several occasions the participation in freedom's fight in Alabama of the good men and women of the Second Congressional District of Illinois.

I have mentioned the experience of Ralph Fertig, one of the pioneers from our district who some 2 years or so ago, was thrown into a jail in Alabama and frightfully beaten by his jailers, all in the cause of freedom.

It has been my privilege to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the graphic and moving narrative of her experience in Selma by Emily Taft Douglas, wife of the great senior Senator from Illinois and resident of, and voter in, the Second Congressional District. Dr. Walter Johnson has furnished me with the names of distinguished American historians recruited by him for the finishing lap of the historic march, all of which I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent graciously granted to me, I am now including in my remarks the complete text of the article in the April 1, 1965, issue of the Hyde Park Herald, by the Honorable Leon M. Despres, alderman of the fifth ward in the city of Chicago. At a future date I hope to put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the complete list of persons from the Second District who participated in the march in Alabama, a list which is now being prepared by Mrs. Walter Johnson and Alderman Despres.

Alderman Despres' article in the Hyde Park Herald follows:

OBSERVATIONS FROM THE CONFEDERACY

(By Leon M. Despres, fifth ward alderman)

Taking part in last Thursday's voting rights demonstration in Montgomery, Ala., was one of the great experiences of a lifetime. For all who went, it was an opportunity to participate in a historic event and give encouragement to actions which will immensely improve the entire United States. Our community has a vital, direct stake in the success of the Alabama vote drive.

Our planeload of 92, sponsored by Alderman Chew, arrived at Montgomery at 11:30 Thursday morning. The keynote for the day was struck immediately at the airport under an official city sign which read: "Welcome to Montgomery."

The Reverend Aron Gilmartin, a Unitarian pastor from California, addressed us and said: "As soon as the afternoon program is concluded, you are asked to proceed immediately to the area where the special buses will pick you up for the airport. It is absolutely essential that all demonstrators leave Montgomery immediately after the program, because we expect the troopers and the National Guard to be withdrawn this evening."

The remarks from Mr. Gilmartin showed at once how different this demonstration was from the 1963 march on Washington. The march on Washington was a dramatic, national, social, and religious affirmation of equality in the midst of hospitable national shrines in the Capital of our Nation.

The march on Montgomery was a tense drive for equality at an unhospitable shrine in the capital of the Confederacy.

The bus took us quickly on U.S. 80 to the campsite at the edge of the city, and we were able to join the end of the column of marchers a short distance away. The 4-mile march itself was sensational. The first part lay in an all-Negro section of Montgomery, and the second part in an all-white section and the central business district.

During the first part, crowds lined the streets, waved at us, spoke to us, smiled, wept, nodded, and expressed encouragement and exultation. They made a wonderful show of southern hospitality. One example that stands out was a man at one corner, all smiles, who graciously held out cold, opened bottles of Pepsi-Cola for thirsty marchers. Apparently he had been doing this during the entire 2½ hours of the march. People heard the loudspeakers' appeals to join the march and fell in. A few people were reserved, but not many.

The invisible line which divides Negro housing from white housing, as it does in Chicago, came next. There we saw a segregated white firehouse just like most fire houses in Chicago. There we saw stony-faced, silent white people crowding the porches as we marched by. I saw only one porch return our waves. Our lines fell silent too. The joy of the earlier part of the march transformed into quite different feelings. Earlier, when we passed a segregated Negro school, the pupils couldn't stop smiling and waving, no matter how often we photographed them. Later, students at the windows of a segregated private white school couldn't stop looking stern, and turned their backs when we photographed them.

More hostile people lined the streets in the business section. Their passions led them to line the streets even though Governor Wallace had asked all white people to stay away. Here we met the jeers which reporters have written about. Here the parade marshals began to look anxious, asked us to close ranks, urged us not to talk to the crowd, told us not to step out of line for photographs, and kept perfect order. The watchers' hostility had to be seen and heard to be believed. Southern hospitality stopped when the inhabitants changed color.

The military protection was overwhelming. Naturally there were soldiers along the line of march, but you could see how impressive the protection was when you looked a block away and saw that there were sentries at all streets, reserve companies of foot and motorized equipment, and soldiers on roof tops. In all directions, you saw soldiers with communications equipment held to their ears for continuous attention. There were FBI men in the unmistakable Brooks Bros. suits, and probably a great many other Federal representatives sprinkled throughout the crowd.

At the capitol, the area of the demonstration was clearly marked out by sawhorses, and we were the prisoners of our protectors, with ample latitude for the demonstration but no right to move outside the area. Stretched across the capitol steps, two rows of uniformed Alabama State officers barred our way. Behind them on the steps and at the windows of the capitol, white Alabama State personnel watched the demonstration with concern.

On top of the capitol flew the flag of Alabama, and under it, the flag of the Confederacy. There was no flag of the United States.

Everywhere among the demonstrators were priests, ministers, rabbis, and nuns. Their very number was awe-inspiring. Even they, perhaps especially they, were unwelcome to white Alabamians. At the airport, a young white man with a baby in his arms looked up at some priests and asked: "Are you Catholic fathers?" "Yes," answered one. "I am Catholic, too," said the young man, "and now that you have been here, I hope you will stay home. We don't need you here." That was all. However, other Alabamians need them desperately; and perhaps the young white man does too.

The program itself was deeply moving, especially Dr. King's talk. I felt that he summarized the situation well when he said: "Segregation is on its deathbed in Alabama, and the only question is how costly Governor Wallace and the segregationists are going to make the funeral."

I talked with as many Negro Alabamians as I could. I found them tremendously encouraged, courageous, and proud over what is taking place. Last Thursday, however, it was not possible for me to find white Alabamians to talk with.

I wish that every fifth ward resident could have been in Montgomery last Thursday.

One eight-year-old white boy I read about expressed the sentiments held by our community. When his father asked him if he understood what the President was talking about on TV, he said he thought the President meant, "the colored people should be free."

The march to Montgomery helped hasten that day of freedom. I think Alabama will never again be quite the same. I hope that soon, over the dome of that State capitol of Montgomery, where Jefferson Davis changed flags in 1861, there will once again fly not the Confederate flag of racial supremacy but the American flag of freedom and equality.

Mr. Speaker, here is a partial list of the men and women who marched in Montgomery with Alderman Despres and his daughter Linda:

Charles Henderson, 1451 East 55th Street.

Mrs. Elizabeth Elwin and her daughters, Susan and Katherine Elwin, Bernadette Vial, Victoria Pyle, 5603 South Dorchester.

Norman Adamson, 7004 South Merrill.

Henry Seele, 5459 South Blackstone Avenue.

Dr. Ruth Lerner, 1525 East 53d Street.

Mrs. Helen Ketterer, 5481 Ridgewood Court.

Dr. William Shoemaker and his son Robert, 4908 South Kimbark Avenue.

Mrs. Deborah Meier, 1343 East 50th Street.

Janet Linford, 5435 South Kenwood Avenue.

Dr. Edgar H. S. Chandler, 1366 East 58th Street.

Mr. Devereaux L. Bowley, Jr., 5558 South Kimbark Avenue.

Mrs. Betty Nance, 5122 South Woodlawn Avenue.

Mr. Elliott Knauer, 4919 South Dorchester Avenue.

Curtis Hayes, 6011 South Woodlawn Avenue.

Rev. Earl Neil, 6451 South Woodlawn Avenue.

Rev. Bellarmine Wilson, 6426 South Dante.

Prof. Jacob W. Getzels, 5704 South Dorchester Avenue.

Fabian Necheles.

Mr. and Mrs. Peter Bright and two children, 1336 Hyde Park Boulevard.

Eugene and Jeanette Dibble, 1227 East Madison Park.

Mr. John C. Godbie, 5432 South Woodlawn Avenue.

Dr. Quentin Young, 1512 East 55th Street.

Fredericka McDew, 1170 East 54th Street.

Sherwin Kaplan, 1601 East 55th Street.

FAIR WAGES FOR FARM LABOR

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, in a brief but pointed editorial the New York Times yesterday hit at the crux of the problem in securing farmworkers.

As the Times made very clear:

> No crops will spoil if the growers finally face up to the need for a substantial increase in the wages that have for so many years made migratory farm laborers the country's most exploited workers.

And as the Times so correctly went on to point out, even a substantial increase in farm wages would have little impact on the actual costs to consumers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to read this cogent analysis:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 31, 1965]

END OF CHEAP FARM LABOR

Secretary of Labor Wirtz sharply reflected the expressed intention of Congress when he told importunate corporate farmers that they could never again expect Government authorization for the mass import of cut-rate foreign labor to harvest American crops.

No crops will spoil if the growers finally face up to the need for a substantial increase in the wages that have for so many years made migratory farm laborers the country's most exploited workers. Their average earnings have never come to much more than $1,000 a year—a third of the level President Johnson has taken as the dividing line between poverty and decency.

Even a doubling of farm wages should mean little in costs to consumers. A recent survey by the Labor Department found that the field labor cost for picking oranges was 1 to 2 cents a dozen, as against a retail price of 50 to 72 cents at big city markets. For lettuce the picking cost was a little over 1 cent a head, the retail sales price 23 cents. The farm laborer can move far up the economic ladder without any profound impact on the pocketbook of this best fed of nations.

PROHIBITION OF COMMERCE WITH NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, men in their greed seldom consider the far-reaching consequences of their avaricious deeds. Time and again they see fit to profit through maritime trade in time of war. It happened during the world wars, it happened during the Cuban crisis, and such is also the case in North Vietnam. Many of our stanch allies are sending ships into North Vietnam while our forces are struggling to maintain a vestige of democracy in the south of that nation.

And not only are these foreign ships profiteering at the expense of our military effort and the American merchant marine, but they are doing so with American goods in some instances. I am today proposing legislation to amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1920 in order to prohibit transportation of articles by foreign vessels who engage in commerce with the Communist dominated nation of North Vietnam.

This law will not force the cessation of such base conduct on the part of our allies—that is beyond our legislative power—but at least it will focus attention upon this problem, this gross disloyalty to the cause of liberty permitted to private citizens by their governments. Even though this commerce may mean little at present to the economy of North Vietnam, the far-reaching consequences of greedy men may eventually contribute to the loss of liberty by entire nations.

RACIAL DEMONSTRATIONS IN ALABAMA COMMUNIST INSPIRED

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week I spoke in this Chamber on the recent Communist-inspired racial disturbances in my State. I mentioned that Martin Luther King has been and continues to be surrounded by Communists and Communist sympathizers.

In yesterday's Washington Daily News, on the same page on which there was an account of my remarks, Mr. Ted Knap, a Scripps-Howard staff writer, reported the following:

INVESTIGATORS SAY: REDS BORE INTO RIGHTS MOVEMENT

(By Ted Knap, Scripps-Howard staff writer)

Government investigators confirmed today that there is some Communist infiltration of the civil rights movement.

As to the extent of this infiltration, informed sources in the Justice Department, Senate and House agree:

It is more prevalent in the organizations of militant young Negroes than the larger, mature civil rights groups.

It is "substantial," though not to the extent of taking over the movement, or even coming close.

It is effective in inciting situations which hurt the United States when propagandized overseas, particularly in Africa.

CONGRESS

The question of Communist infiltration in the civil rights movement was raised yesterday in Congress. Chairman EDWIN E. WILLIS, Democrat, of Louisiana, of the House Un-American Activities Committee, in announcing an investigation of the Ku Klux Klan, said "Communist influence" is also involved.

The committee has traced Communist agitation among Negroes back to the late twenties, when Stalin decreed that the Communist Party, U.S.A., was to organize a Negro government in the South that would secede from the Nation.

In 1959, Khrushchev switched to a line of "full integration" for the Negro and Communists were urged to infiltrate Negro groups.

Here's how the Government sources described Communist penetration of the main civil rights organizations:

Urban League: "Always has been clean."

NAACP: "Kicked them out years ago."

Southern Christian Leadership Conference: "Martin Luther King discourages them; kicked out one Communist who had been an SCLC leader."

CORE: "Fairly clean. Jim Farmer won't tolerate them, but there are some Communists in lower echelons."

Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee: "Irresponsible * * * allows Communists."

Freedom Now Party: "Welcomes Communists."

Muslims and Black Nationalist: "Welcome Communists, particularly of the Chinese line. Small in number."

The Government officials expressed concern about fringe groups that latch onto the civil rights movement as an excuse to agitate.

They mentioned the Progressive Labor Movement, whose members regard Russian communism as bourgeois, and W. E. B. Dubois Clubs, Trotzkyite groups springing up on college campuses. PLM leaders were active in the Harlem riots last summer.

As the article states, sources within the U.S. Government describe the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee as "irresponsible * * * allows Communists."

Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, at the end of the march on Montgomery, the Reverend Ralph Abernathy, first lieutenant to Martin Luther King, stated on national television while appealing for additional funds to finance more demonstrations:

> Bring your contributions by the table up here before you leave or send them to the office of the SCLC (Southern Christian Leadership Conference) at 714 Auburn Avenue NE., Atlanta, Ga.; or send them to the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee in Atlanta. Either way, it will go to the movement.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one more admitted link between the racial troubles in Alabama, Martin Luther King, and the Communist Party. This proves beyond doubt that the money received goes to a common pot, and that there is really no difference in SNCC and "King" Martin Luther's Southern Christian Leadership Conference.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER RECREATIONAL AREA

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to an editorial written by Art Higgins, editor of the Quincy Herald-Whig, Quincy, Ill., on March 21, 1965. He urges completion of a Mississippi River Recreational Area plan originally introduced by my predecessor, the late Clarence Cannon. I think the points he makes, in favor of such an overall federally established park, are well taken; and under the leadership of our present great Secretary of the Interior, Stewart Udall, such a program would be of great benefit to our entire Nation.

> For 20 years, the 10 States bordering the Mississippi River have been actively seeking creation of a national parkway along the shores of the Nation's greatest river.
>
> Still, when the parks for America program was set up this year, the river playground was omitted.
>
> Other projects, numbering 12, are newer and each would serve fewer persons within 1 day's journey or less.
>
> The Mississippi plan was introduced in Congress by the late Representative Clarence Cannon two decades ago. A national parks study was ordered. Preliminary plans followed a report on the study. But the job of procuring land and building roads was left to the several States.
>
> Some progress has been made in some States, but there has been little coordination. With 10 States involved, it is clear only the Federal Government can accomplish the job within the span of the present generation.
>
> Further, if each State is to develop the parkway in its own way, there will be 10 different types of facilities. Yet the hope is to provide a playground from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico, along the great river and through some of the most scenic territory in the United States.
>
> The park expansion plan is worthy. It is long overdue. Not since the days of Gifford Pinchot has there been real enthusiasm in the Federal parks program. And since that time our national population has doubled.
>
> Vacation travel has grown much more rapidly than has the population. When Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt envisioned playgrounds in our vast public domain, only a few thousand persons annually traveled to the Nation's scenic sports on annual vacations. Now, almost everyone has a vacation, and many millions each year take trips of from 1 to 6 weeks or more and travel from a few hundreds to 20,000 miles or more. The number of visitors to the country's famous scenic areas doubles each 3 or 4 years.
>
> Of the 12 proposed new park areas 7 are in the West or Southwest, 3 are in the East and only 2 are in the Middle West. The greatest number of new parks thus will be in the least populous areas.
>
> Of the two projected midwestern parks, one is in Michigan and the other in northern Indiana, on the shore of Lake Michigan.
>
> Nothing is planned for the immediate Mississippi Valley, perhaps the most interesting part of Middle America.
>
> The great river road, the highway that will serve the parkway, has been marked through Illinois and some other States. But, with some exceptions, it leads to nothing. The heart of the program is the recreational development in a vast parkway system. There were to be access points to the river, beaches, boating facilities, picnicking and outdoor sports facilities.
>
> Few of these now are available. Only the Congress can bring order and action to the Mississippi River parkway plan.
>
> It is not too late to include it in the new program.

VICTIMS OF AUTO ACCIDENTS

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call the attention of the House to a matter of great concern to all Americans and particularly those who operate or ride in motor vehicles. The tragic victims of accidents on our highways are now suffering a flank attack. I respectfully call attention to two articles printed side by side on page A22 of the Washington Post, Sunday, February 28, 1965. One calls attention in headlines to the "Tragic Decline in Moral Values" and assails "A Rise in Fake Claims." The article continues:

> "Fraudulent and padded claims likewise increased in 1964," top Geico executives said. "The industry continues to be mulcted by the small but tremendously costly minority of policyholders, claimants, and garage owners who present exaggerated or fraudulent claims, in some cases with the aid of doctors and lawyers who sully the ethics of their honorable professions by abetting or even instigating these malpractices.
>
> "It is unfortunate that, despite the efforts of our industry and the educational articles printed by many great newspapers, the general public is still not aware of the fact that these unscrupulous practices penalize all persons who buy insurance by contributing to the need for higher insurance rates. It is the responsibility of all citizens, and particularly the ethical practice committees of the great professions, to help stamp out these evils."

It also assails "excessive jury awards in personal jury suits," although one would assume that any jury award which was truly excessive would be reversed by the appellate court. The broadside slant at the medical and legal professions is unencumbered by specific facts, names, and supporting evidence. The plethora of comparisons on increasing costs of claims contains no statement of the increases occurring in automobile prices, repair bills, living expenses, or doctor and hospital bills, in the same period of time covered by the report.

One can only be thankful that the Washington Post makeup man had a keen sense of humor and placed alongside the article another one on the same company complaining of a decrease in earnings because of poor underwriting results in the auto casualty insurance field.

Automobile accident victims are seeking and obtaining relief in such numbers that last year the Geico net earnings after taxes were a mere $6.2 million or $1.93 a share as compared to $6.6 million or $2.5 a share in the preceding year. The company's underwriting profit last year was $3.7 million as opposed to $6.1 million underwriting profits the preceding year. Total company assets increased 16 percent last year to $171.8 million. Net investment income before taxes increased 8.2 percent to $4.3 million.

In view of such profitable conditions, after taxes, and the tragic decline the company finds in our moral values and standards of ethical conduct, you might expect the annual report to indicate premium reductions to set the proper tone for leadership in ethical standards and/or a report of substantial contributions to research foundations, medical and legal professional groups to eradicate aberrant miscreants. Not so.

The 1965 outlook is highly favorable according to Geico's annual report. Its president says 1965 should bring further premium rate increases in numerous States which will improve underwriting profits. They predict that Geico premium income and the number of policyholders will set new records, that investment income will increase 25 percent.

The National Association of Claimants Compensation Attorneys, the Missouri Association of Claimants Compensation Attorneys, and such leaders of the bar as J. E. Clarke, attorney of Elsberry, Mo., a director of that association, will remind this body and the American public that not only are they the ones who must bear the costs of increased auto insurance premiums but on any given day they may find themselves the tragic victims of such an automobile accident and should recall that living expenses, doctor, hospital, and garage bills cannot be paid with homilies.

UDALL BILL TO PROVIDE FOR CERTAIN REORGANIZATIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to reorganize certain functions in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in order to bring about better coordination of activities concerned with population growth in this country and abroad.

The bill also provides for a January 1967 White House Conference on Population and assistance to States which want to hold conferences prior to the national gathering.

A similar bill is being introduced in the Senate, cosponsored by Senators Gruening, Bass, McGovern, Tydings, and others.

Earlier this year I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 56, requesting appointment of a Presidential Commission on Population. The resolution is patterned after the one introduced in the 88th Congress jointly by Senators Gruening and Clark, both of whom have given fearless and pioneering leadership in this field.

Today's bill is aimed at improving coordination of presently authorized population programs within the two Departments named and to encourage dialog on the issue.

In his state of the Union message, the President gave new and bold stimulation to the discussion of a problem which most everyone recognizes exists. This one sentence may have been one of the most significant statements issued by a President. He said:

> I will seek new ways to use our knowledge to help deal with the explosion in world population and the growing scarcity in world resources.

With these words the President has opened the way for free and open discussion about the problems brought on by the world's population growth. Almost overnight the climate for discourse has changed. As late as last summer I had serious qualms about public reaction to a Member of Congress expressing concern with the world's burgeoning population. It was, I thought, a dangerous political topic.

But on August 10 I sent out thousands of copies of a newsletter on the subject and the immediate mail response convinced me that on this issue our citizens are not only ready but anxious to hear debate in the American tradition. People are often ahead of their leaders and I am convinced this is the case with the population explosion problem.

Mr. Speaker, I request permission to have printed at this point my August 10, 1964 newsletter entitled, "A Time Bomb Called Population."

A Time Bomb Called Population

In this presidential election year heated debate will be waged on a multitude of current and pressing problems. But conspicuously absent from issues to be discussed is the one which may well be our most urgent problem—the time bomb called population.

As Mark Twain might have put it: Population is something everybody does something about but nobody talks about. I intend to talk about it.

During a recent press conference, in discussing sharply increased school district and local taxes, I cited some startling statistics and commented that a great many of our local, national and international problems originate in one way or another in the "population explosion." When I finished, a reporter asked, "Congressman Udall, what are you doing to help solve this problem?"

"Well," I replied, "as a father of six, I can't say that I've done very much."

But last week I did do something, little though it may be. I introduced in the House a concurrent resolution which, if passed, might be a step toward reorganizing and moving to meet the problem of tremendously rapid population growth.

THE STARTLING FACTS

But, it might be asked, isn't population growth good? Doesn't it mean more people to buy our products, more jobs, more growth for our State? Don't we in Arizona take pride in our growth statistics?

In answer to such questions one might observe that a good steady rain is beneficial but a flood wreaks havoc. And we are talking about a floodtide of human beings.

It took earth millions of years to acquire, by the time of Christ, a population of one-quarter of a billion. It took until 1830 for the world's population to reach 1 billion. But in only 100 years we passed the 2 billion mark. It has taken less than 35 years for the population to have reached 3 billion. And, incredibly, the fourth billion will be here in but 15 more years.

If present rates are unchecked, it will take only a 35-year span to add the next 3 billion to our present 3 billion. And it will take less than 35 years after that for the 6 billion to double to 12 billion.

Bear in mind that just an increase of 1 billion (due by 1980) is equal to the total present population of all of North and South America plus all 55 nations in Europe.

Each year the United States adds more than 3 million to its population, enough to fill six brandnew cities the size of Phoenix. Providing the additional schools, streets, sewers, post offices and all the other facilities needed by modern society is a heavy and expensive burden.

By the year 2000 the United States will likely increase its population from 190 million to 340 million. Of these, 100 million will be children who need schools, playgrounds, library facilities, etc. And 30 million will be "senior citizens" with medical care and other problems which become most acute as years advance.

Population growth, like compound interest, is self-accelerating; that is, the more people there are the greater the population growth, even though the rate of growth remains the same. When you are talking about billions of people the results of doubling are staggering.

Just when men and women everywhere are awakening to the possibilities of a decent life and are thus demanding improvement in their standard of living, the population explosion is wiping out most of the benefits of economic growth (and our foreign aid program) in the underdeveloped world. A key democratic nation in Asia, for example, attempting to rise by its bootstraps, recently completed a successful 5-year program by increasing its economic output 12-percent. Are its people better off? No, because in this time its population increased 15 percent and net living standards are worse than before.

WHY NOW?

How does it happen that in this century population figures have gone crazy? The answer is found in two words: medical science. Human beings aren't suddenly more fertile; our reproduction potential hasn't changed. In any given year the increase or decrease in population is simply the number of births minus the number of deaths.

In North America and Western Europe birth and death rates have declined more or less proportionately. But medical science has upset this pattern in the underdeveloped parts of the world. It has caused a precipitous decline in the death rates while birth rates have remained constant. The result is galloping population growth.

Never before in history has it been possible to introduce an extensive program of death control so quickly in any given area of the world. Armed with miracle drugs, insecticides, and extensive knowledge of sanitation and nutrition, scientists almost overnight can drastically curtail the rate of dying. Just since World War II, for example, death rates have been reduced more than one-third in such places as India and Malaya. In Ceylon the spraying of DDT reduced the death rate by 40 percent within a single year.

Birth rates are higher in the underdeveloped areas of Latin Amerca, Asia, and Africa—where two-thirds of all the world's people live. Where birth rates are high, there are high proportions of youth. As infant mortality has declined, family burdens have increased. And the children, when they become adults and parents, face the same prospect of endless toil just to acquire the barest of essentials.

A NONPARTISAN ISSUE

While the wonders of medical science have brought on this problem, the doctors are also concerned with its solution. We are now within sight of safe, reliable drugs and other medical means to make it possible for mankind, if it will, to regulate its growth. Whether these solutions will be used in a way to defuse the population bomb is a problem the doctors cannot solve. This is a matter for ordinary citizens, community leaders, and people acting through their governments all over the world.

Fortunately, the population problem is not a partisan political issue in this country, as evidenced by the following:

Shortly before his death, President Kennedy said, "We should know more and do more about the whole reproductive cycle, and this information should be available to the world."

Former President Eisenhower recently commented that "the time has come when we must take into account the effect of the population explosion on our mutual assistance system. Unless we do, it may smother the economic progress of many nations."

Richard Nixon, after his Asian tour, said he had observed poverty "worse than I have ever dreamed existed" and recommended that the United States give assistance to nations requesting help on population matters.

This is, in short, one of those rare subjects upon which a great many leaders with widely differing political views wholeheartedly agree.

THE RELIGIOUS QUESTION

Central to any consideration of the population problem is the religious question, and particularly the position of the Roman Catholic Church on birth control. It should be emphasized, however, that the church does not condemn birth control; it raises barriers only on the methods used.

Within the church right now there is a tremendous dialog taking place regarding the population explosion, a discussion spurred by the recent Ecumenical Council and by prominent church leaders.

The oral contraceptive pill, simple and nearly 100 percent effective, has opened up opportunity for change within the church. As Newsweek magazine recently pointed out, Catholic theologians are beginning to accept the position of the distinguished Roman Catholic gynecologist, Dr. John Rock, who argues that the new pills can be considered morally acceptable.

Look magazine, in a recent comprehensive report on Latin American Catholics and birth control, noted the open declaration of Jesuit priests in Santiago, Chile. It holds that the pills, which inhibit ovulation but do not destroy any egg, are permissible.

A recent national survey found that at least 30 percent of Catholic couples use birth control methods condemned by the church. And a heavy majority of those polled hoped their church would change its attitude toward birth control. It should be remembered that of the 11 countries in the world with the lowest birth rates five are predominately Catholic: Austria, Belgium, France, Italy, and Luxembourg.

Further evidence of the church's concern with the population problem is the important work being done at Catholic research centers such as the one here in Washington at Georgetown University.

WHAT THE UNITED STATES SHOULD DO FOR OTHER COUNTRIES

Eugene R. Black, then President of the World Bank, declared in 1961:

"Population growth threatens to nullify all our efforts to raise living standards in many of the poorer countries. We are coming to a situation in which the optimist will be the man who thinks that present living standards can be maintained."

That's a pretty bleak outlook when we realize that the average per capita income of the 2 billion people in Asia, Africa, and

Latin America is about $100 a year, compared to over $2,300 in the United States and $850 in Western Europe.

Thus the prospect is one of seething unrest, impatience with the existing order, and sympathy to the advocates of communism (who, ironically, generally assert that concern for population growth is merely a bourgeois excuse for the failure of capitalism).

Congress, in passing the foreign aid bill last year, specifically authorized the spending of money "to conduct research into the problems of population growth." However, there was a $6 million ceiling on research of all kinds, and Senator GRUENING, of Alaska, calculated that only $130,000 would go toward helping population problems. Nevertheless, the specific authorization was a big step forward. And the late President Kennedy stated that the results of research in this area should be made available to the people of the world.

We certainly ought not to hesitate to give our research findings to nations which request them. Perhaps we should also offer technical assistance in implementing programs of population control when such help is sought. As President Johnson has said: "The only way that we can hope to deal with the population explosion is with the knowledge explosion."

Other nations are beginning to look to the United States for leadership. For example, Pakistan's President Ayub Khan asserted: "We look to you, a country like yours, to apply your mind and your resources to be able to combat this problem." He bluntly stated the alternative:

"If we continue to increase at the present rate it will ultimately lead to a standard of living little better than that of animals."

It has been pointed out that in all of its many programs the U.S. Government is spending $15 billion a year on research. But less than $10 million is being spent on the basic problem of population.

THE CLARK-GRUENING-UDALL RESOLUTION

Senators CLARK of Pennsylvania and GRUENING of Alaska have introduced a resolution relative to population control. I am the only House sponsor. The resolution would have Congress:

Urge the President to hasten implementation of the policies of the United States regarding population growth by inaugurating substantially increased programs of research within the National Institutes of Health and to make results freely available to countries requesting such assistance.

Request the President to create a Presidential commission on population with the duty to inform, after investigation, the Government and the American people of the nature of population problems at home and abroad, with respect to the implications for all aspects of American life.

THE FUSE IS BURNING

This presidential year we shall debate medicare, civil rights, big Government, control of nuclear bombs and all the rest. But looking ahead three or four presidential elections, I venture to predict that the population bomb may soon overshadow all other issues.

When 6 or 8 billion people are shoved into the already overcrowded cities and slums of this planet, breathing polluted air and fighting for an insufficient supply of land, water and resources, then wars, revolutions and global strife are inevitable. And even if through science we manage to provide enough basic essentials for everyone we would likely do so only by sacrificing improvement of society's institutions for the sake of providing bare minimums.

I believe the problem of overpopulation on this planet can be solved. But the time to begin was yesterday.

LAKE ERIE—OHIO RIVER CANAL

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, today would be an appropriate time for sponsors of the proposed Lake Erie-Ohio River Canal to announce that they will abandon the project, that they were only fooling about wanting Uncle Sam to build the billion-dollar ha-ha. The idea of such an expensive ditch has for a long time been the subject of many an amusing editorial, but there has been entirely too big an investment in Federal funds for studies, hearings, and reports to consider it a laughing matter any longer.

Dropping the proposal at this time would be especially welcome to citizens still wondering how to meet the April 15 income tax deadline. Because the change in our income tax structure which took place last year did not in every case allow sufficient withholding rates to cover the total assessment, a good number of our wage earners were caught short and are in the position of having to find the means to square themselves with the Internal Revenue Service 2 weeks hence. It was for this reason that I introduced H.R. 4689, which would permit taxpayers in arrears because of this unfortunate situation to make up the difference by spreading payments over the next 12 months.

In this critical period taxpayers see nothing funny about the crazy canal. If the Federal Government were to collect $1,000 from every man, woman, and child in Pennsylvania's 22d Congressional District, as well as from everyone in the city of Pittsburgh, the accumulation would scarcely meet estimated original costs of the canal.

Besides imposing on the general taxpaying public, the canal would have a devastating effect upon the economy of the 22d District and on various other areas. Our steel production would suffer because of Government-sponsored competition through subsidization of shipping in the eastern Ohio area, with railroads and truckers undergoing incalculable harm. Though railroads have reduced delivered prices of coal substantially with introduction of the unit train, rates on the Federal waterway would negate the advantages made possible by this innovation, and more mines would close in central and western Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to take a good look at the complex of railroad lines and highways in eastern Ohio. No further evidence of the folly of the proposed canal is necessary to convince any objective person that every undertaking by the Army Engineers on this project has been designed to befool, and that continued support would be carrying an impractical joke entirely too far.

RESIDUAL OIL IMPORTS

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, admittedly the increase in residual oil import levels announced yesterday should not have come as a surprise. By now the American worker should be getting accustomed to the practice of having alien producers receive favored treatment in this country's markets regardless of the condition of the domestic economy. For almost two decades jobs of miners and railroaders in the Appalachian region have been sacrificed to the surging seas of foreign residual oil that capture coal's traditional east coast markets.

Yet somehow we felt that the voracious demands of international oil interests would for once be subordinated to requirements of the national welfare, that it is the domestic worker's turn to receive consideration in the import control program.

Once more this hope has been dashed through another in a long series of boosts in allocations. The jump in import levels permitted under the new quota figures will open America's fuel markets to another 27,375,000 barrels of foreign residual oil in the next 12 months. In energy equivalent, that volume represents 6,570,000 tons of bituminous coal that will not be mined in the year ahead. I remind my colleagues that to produce that coal would provide enough work to enable 2,190 miners to earn in excess of $5,000 each between now and next April 1. To move the coal to market would create employment for a thousand railroaders.

The prospect is not encouraging in an area where make-work programs must be carried on under Federal and State auspices to provide employment opportunities for the jobless until the normal economy is able to absorb them. Each increase in residual oil import levels seriously impedes the industrial progress that would come in the ordinary manner with growing population and consumer demand.

A reassessment of the Nation's foreign trade policy has long been in order. At present it is urgently needed not only because of the detrimental effect of present policy on American labor and industry, but also from the standpoint of national security and the balance-of-payments situation.

I remind my colleagues of the following recommendation contained in House Report 3567 issued in March 1963 by Subcommittee No. 4 of the House Select Committee on Small Business, as printed at the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT]:

> A suitable Government agency should immediately undertake a survey of essential plants and installations along the east coast. This agency should determine the true extent to which those plants have become dependent on this insecure source of fuel through abandonment of other types of burning and fuel handling.

If such a survey has been made the findings should be made known to the Congress. It is folly to chance development of an Achilles heel by failure to determine exactly where defense installations would obtain fuel in the event Atlantic shipping lanes were severed. If there has been no survey of this kind, a suitable agency of Government should undertake to initiate the study at once. If in the process it is determined that our domestic fuel industries should no longer be ignored, Pennsylvania and other coal States may at long last come in for reasonable treatment under the oil import control program.

VETERANS' BENEFITS

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIGAN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill to provide nearly the same range and kinds of benefits to the men and women who have served in the Armed Forces since January 31, 1955, as were made available to the veterans of World War II and the Korean conflict.

One simple but compelling consideration has prompted me to introduce this bill: it is only just and equitable to regard those who have defended this country in the last 10 years, a period as perilous as we have ever known, in the same way we sympathetically viewed the World War II and Korean veterans. The need for their services has been, and continues to be, at least as great and the dangers as incalculable. Over 360 lives have been given so far in defending the independence of South Vietnam. Who among us can know whether or not yet another South Vietnam may appear tomorrow or next year in another part of the world? Regardless of the amount of money we devote to arms, we still need men and women in uniform who are well trained and prepared at all times to go wherever needed.

There are presently in this country over 3 million unremembered veterans who have served our Nation well since the expiration of the Korean GI bill of rights in January 1955. As a direct result of their service they were unable to advance their careers and education during a most critical stage in their lives. It is not surprising, therefore, to find that most of them are unsuccessfully competing for jobs in today's increasingly demanding employment market. Two hundred and ten thousand of these veterans in 1963 received unemployment compensation in the amount of $96 million. This condition is not only disgraceful and degrading, but most of all it is unnecessary. We have at our disposal the means to rectify the imbalance against these veterans who after an average of 2½ years of service are returned to civilian life to find that those in their same age group who escaped the draft have moved far ahead and that they are left to catch up as best they can. By ignoring these veterans we are helping to create problems and are denying ourselves the contributions they otherwise could be making.

We all vividly recall that the World War II and Korean veterans who took advantage of the benefits offered them continue to contribute to our general well-being. Altogether 11 million of these veterans have acquired a considerably higher educational level than nonveterans of the same age group. These programs have helped to add 220,000 physicians, nurses, and others in related fields, 625,000 engineers, 165,000 physical and natural scientists, 375,000 teachers, as well as other urgently needed skilled workers to our fund of resources. These veterans are earning higher incomes and thus are paying higher income taxes, to the point where the Government has recovered many times over the cost of the programs. And this calculation obviously does not, as it cannot, take into account the many other significant contributions made these veterans.

Apart from the consideration of justice, it is from the standpoint of making a sound investment that we should act quickly on this bill. This in no way can be considered an exercise in charity or a gratuitous handout. The two GI bills have proved beyond any doubt their immense value in developing human resources, in their soundness as an investment, and in their justice.

SCIENCE EDUCATION

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, not long after the Subcommittee on Science, Research, and Development was formed in 1963, we determined through a series of hearings that one of the crucial areas of American endeavor—scientific and technological education—needed particular study.

There were two main reasons for this.

One was that the field of science education itself was in a general state of flux and deep introspection.

The other was that due to the rapid changes taking place both in education and in scientific development, most laymen have lost sight of the significance and the problems of science education in the United States.

Many of us who attended the first comprehensive hearings of the subcommittee were astounded to discover that not only had technology been revolutionized since our own school days, but so had many fundamental concepts of science itself. Moreover, the teaching of science and technology—in many instances—bore little resemblance to either prewar or postwar educational method. And we found that science teaching was itself as mercurial as the subject matter.

At the same time, it became clear that to a great extent the future welfare of the Nation depends on the excellence of our science education—and that such education is, indeed, faced with serious problems.

For these reasons I inaugurated a series of discussions with Dr. Leland Haworth, Director of the National Science Foundation, and with members of his staff to see how the Foundation, in conjunction with Congress, might further aid the science education process while sharpening public awareness of the needs and resources involved.

We determined, as an initial step, that it would be helpful if the Foundation undertook a series of studies which would describe to Congress and the public the overall background of science education in America, its current status, the problems it is facing and those which it may be expected to face in the foreseeable future.

Mr. Speaker, this in itself is a large order. It encompasses innumerable facets of both science and education. We have learned through long months of planning that these inquiries will take time, perceptive digging, and much thought.

However, the first of these studies has now been completed and I have forwarded it to the chairman of the Committee on Science and Astronautics for consideration by the full committee.

The study, which today I wish to call to the attention of the House, is entitled "Science Education in the Schools of the United States." It deals with science education exclusively at the elementary and secondary school levels. It is designed primarily for lay consumption, although I believe that members of the scientific and educational communities will find it useful and of much personal interest to them.

A second study dealing with science education at college and postgraduate academic levels is now in process and should be completed within a few months. After it, we hope to focus on sharp, specific areas of scientific and technological learning—and thus eventually complete a series of studies to form a permanent record of this most important phase of our national scientific endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, we do not anticipate that these studies will have spectacular results in the form of harsh criticisms, fixed conclusions, and stringent recommendations for change. The subject is far too fluid and the blacks and whites are penetrated by far too many tones of gray to permit this kind of thing. As with many other segments of the scientific world, this one is a highly complex topic.

But through these studies we do expect to make available a readable record which will be reasonably complete and which will duck no issues.

I think Members will agree that we have a good start in the current report, which unequivocally lays out the component parts of such issues as:

First. Competition for top students by the various academic fields.

Second. The teacher's need for scientific expertise versus the need for educational theory.

Third. How to train the young teacher.

Fourth. How to retrain the older teacher.

Fifth. The relative expenditure of funds for salaries vis-a-vis equipment.

Sixth. The why and how of curriculum revision.

Seventh. Academic loads and pressures on the young student; his learning rates and capabilities.

Eighth. Methods of eliminating preschool misconceptions of the physical world.

Ninth. The illusions of any "best way" to teach science and technology.

Tenth. Characteristics, technical and nontechnical, which tomorrow's scientist or engineer should have.

Eleventh. The proper role of Government in fostering science and the better teaching of it.

I commend this report to every Member of Congress. It is worthwhile reading.

UNEMPLOYMENT FOR MARCH OF THIS YEAR

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am highly pleased and gratified to learn of the Department of Labor's announcement this morning that unemployment during March in this country dropped to its lowest level in some 7½ years. The 4.7 percent unemployment rate is still far too high, but it suggests that we may be beginning to turn the corner on what has certainly been America's most vexing economic problem for far too long.

Particularly satisfying is the news that the jobless rates for adult men dropped down to 3.3 percent, and that the rate for married men declined to 2.5 percent. There has been no more important facet of the unemployment challenge than that represented by this problem. These individuals are, for the most part, the Nation's breadwinners. These are the people upon whom so many millions of Americans, the members of workers' families, must depend on a day-to-day basis for the very necessities of life.

On the basis of the March facts on the labor force, we may now have every hope that this intolerable problem may soon become met with solutions.

The solutions, of course, must come from as varied degree of sources as our free, modern economicc structure is itself varied. Expansion of present Federal training programs, a massive effort in the field of education, new and imaginative tax policies, sustained economic growth of a kind that results in a seeking after workers, and a full utilization of them.

We are, it seems, now, moving in that direction.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who desire to do so may have permission to extend their remarks following my remarks on the subject just discussed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, I am greatly pleased by the Department of Labor's announcement, this morning, that unemployment in the United States had declined in March to a 7½-year low. The rate stands at 4.7 percent, and it holds out every hope that we are at long last beginning to make the kind of progress we require if we are ever to fully honor the commitment made by the Congress, in 1946, to a full employment policy.

Three particular facts emerging from today's Labor Department report are worth particular attention. First and foremost, the unemployment rates for adult men and married men in the labor force went down to 3.3 percent and 2.5 percent, respectively. This means that a lot of children in a lot of families across the land are starting to get the kind of better economic break they deserve in a country as abundantly prosperous as ours.

Again, we saw a dramatic decline within the ranks of our long-term unemployed. These are the individuals in our labor force who have, for far too long, been bearing the brunt of our very serious jobless problem. Often, these have been the utterly despairing, the workers who have given up hope. Many of them have been out of work for periods ranging from 6 months to a year, and beyond that. But their numbers went down significantly during March, declining by some 300,000.

Finally, we find that in March, employment reached a figure of 70.2 million men and women. And that is an increase of fully 1,650,000 jobs in our Nation over this time last year.

We can take satisfaction with this record, but it must also serve as an inspiration to end this problem in America for good.

Mrs. MINK. Mr. Speaker, the Nation can take great satisfaction in the decline of the rate of unemployment to 4.7 percent in March. This is, of course, the lowest rate in over 7 years.

We would all like to see it pushed down to its absolute minimum. The central fact of the moment, however, is that the programs designed to reduce unemployment are paying off.

We can see now how close this country came to living with an increasingly higher level of unemployment. During the 1950's, the economy suffered three recessions—and after each one the level of unemployment remained on a higher level. That would have continued to build through the 1960's had not the American people elected to office a leadership that made unemployment the number one domestic priority, that rolled up its sleeves and went to work on the problem of idle youth, of wasted skills among our older workers, of job barriers raised by discrimination and prejudice.

This administration did not sit back and wait for something to happen through one recession after the other. It designed fiscal and monetary policies that stimulated the economy while stabilizing the cost of living. It came to Congress with a list of recommendations for tax cut, for manpower training, for trade expansion, for aid to business through greater depreciation allowances and for aid to the worker through skill development and job placement.

Today we have evidence that this is the right course—for American business and for the American worker. We are enjoying the longest and strongest period of expansion in modern economic history, and we are enjoying it not because the fates have been kind but because our leadership has been vigorous.

The major part of reducing unemployment to its minimum is in deciding to do it, having the vision to devise the means to do it, and having the will to execute those means. The Nation can be grateful that we have all three qualities.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the Nation can take great encouragement and satisfaction from today's monthly report on the labor force; which revealed that we are now at our lowest rate of unemployment in some 7½ years.

We have come to a point at which it is becoming increasingly clearer that solid and continuing economic expansion—such as we have been experiencing over the course of the past several years—holds the key to putting to work every American who wants a job. Such expansion has been the great characteristic of our economic life throughout the course of the administrations of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson. We have seen wise policies put into effect, have seen them diligently pursued, and now we are beginning to experience some of the fruits of such a course of action.

There has not been an economic downturn in this country since the days of 1960–61.

And the comparisons between those days and the present days of 1965 are indeed impressive. We have seen unemployment move down from 5.5 million men and women in the first quarter of 1961, saw it move downward to 4.0 million by the first quarter of 1964. And now we see it at 3,740,000 for the past month. That, of course, is still far too many, but it represents a distinct record of progress. The unemployment rate of early 1961 was fully 6.8 percent. Today, we are down to 4.7 percent. All in all, this has meant a difference of about 1.8 million new jobs.

It is a direction in which we must keep moving.

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, it is crystal clear, from the heartening announcement that our unemployment is down to 4.7 percent, that this country is continuing, at a very accelerated speed, moving to prosperity for all.

Since March 1963 when workers began to feel the effect of the tax cut, total employment jumped by 1.6 million. During that very same period unemployment tumbled by 550,000.

There is no more dramatic way to demonstrate the wisdom of the policies formulated and executed in this challenging period of the sixties.

This administration has not only achieved a record breaking upturn but has initiated programs so that the fruits of these gains will be shared by more and more of our people.

The significant gains we are making give every indication that each and every American will have the opportunity to fulfill his destiny in the Great Society.

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, in the past 4 years, America has been on the move socially and economically as never before in our history.

The announcement today that the Nation's unemployment rate is down to a 7½-year low of 4.7 percent is a major development.

When the Democratic administration took office in January 1961, America's unemployment rate stood at a deplorable 6.7 percent of the labor force.

Today, that rate is down by an amazing 30 percent. And it is down a full 6 percent over the jobless rate of 5 percent for the previous month.

This incredible reduction has come about through a solid series of programs this administration has initiated to drive the economy ahead to record heights.

Among the programs of the past 4 years designed to create new jobs and upgrade the skills of our citizens are: The Area Redevelopment Act of 1961, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, the Tax Revenue Act of 1962, the Accelerated Public Works Act of 1962, the Trade Expansion Act of 1962, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the Tax Revenue Act of 1964, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

There is no question but that these programs are enabling more Americans to lead more useful and rewarding lives.

But our task remains unfinished with millions of our fellow citizens victimized by racial discrimination and poverty.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, in his 1965 Manpower Report to the Congress, President Johnson labeled unemployment as America's No. 1 manpower problem.

In so doing, he urged an affirmative manpower policy to cut further into the joblessness that touches the lives of millions of our citizens, men, women, and children.

Today, with the unemployment rate—4.7 percent—registering its lowest point since the fall of 1957, there is heartening evidence we are at last meeting this problem effectively.

Here are some of the significant signs the March employment and unemployment figures show:

Joblessness among family breadwinners is down to an 8-year low at a rate of 2.5 percent; joblessness among adult women, at a rate of 4.6 percent dropped back to the 5-year low recorded in January; very long-term unemployment—6 months and longer—stands at 400,000, down nearly 200,000 from a year ago.

These encouraging developments did not just happen. They are the result of a series of stimulating programs that have revitalized the economy and helped tailor the skills of our citizens for the jobs available in our highly specialized economy.

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, it has been 7½ long years since a Member of this House could stand up to comment on an unemployment rate of 4.7 percent.

When the Democratic administration came into office in 1961, the rate had been pushed to 7 percent by a decade of alternate growth and stagnation. We inherited a worsening unemployment situation caused by a Government not equipped—and not willing to equip itself—with the programs necessary to provide for a rapidly increasing labor force, for the growing influence of technology, for the changes in world markets, and for changes in American jobs.

The legislative program that has been enacted since 1961—and especially those that have passed this Congress in the last year—have provided the necessary tools to meet these problems. They have been coupled with Federal executive policies and administrative leadership that has had the effect of bringing unemployment to its lowest point since 1957.

Between February and March, the number of jobless persons fell by nearly 500,000—twice the usual decline.

During the first quarter of 1965, the unemployment rate averaged 4.8 percent—the lowest quarterly average since the fourth quarter of 1957.

This improvement is vindication of the President's conviction that a tax cut, manpower programs, Government economy, and prudent investment in once wasted lives can together bring this Nation to full employment.

I have every confidence that we will continue to reduce unemployment. The evidence is found in the performance of the economy this year. We are on the way—and I think the President and his administration can take justified satisfaction in the results of his policy.

UNEMPLOYMENT FOR MARCH OF THIS YEAR

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the monthly report on the labor force, released today by the Department of Labor, contains some highly satisfactory and gratifying news. The Nation's unemployment rate dropped to 4.7 percent, the lowest it has been in 7½ years.

Most encouraging in this report was the fact our jobless totals went down in an across-the-board manner. The long-term unemployed, head of households, teenagers, women workers; these and other categories which have long represented the most difficult facets of the unemployment problem all were substantially improved during the month of March.

The long-term rate has perhaps been the most troublesome of these particular kinds of unemployment. These are the men and women of our labor force who have been out of work for periods ranging 15 weeks to 6 months, and often longer. For far too long, this particular problem has been the principal symptom of an economic weakness in our free enterprise system which simply has no place in a Nation vibrantly prosperous, in a Nation in which well over 70 million Americans are at work.

But over the course of the past year, the total number of our long-term unemployed dropped by 300,000; down to a total of around 1 million. This again represents the lowest March level since 1957. Fully half the decline was among those who had been out of work for more than a half year. There seems every indication that we have begun to make serious inroads into this particular problem. This is indeed welcome news.

But with 100,000 of our people still jobless over extended periods of time, we have only made a beginning. We must continue to apply our best efforts to reduce to the absolute minimum the economic and social waste associated with unemployment.

W. TRESPER CLARKE HIGH SCHOOL CODE OF ETHICS

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, this is an age of startling and disturbing statistics. Consider, for example, the fact that of the entire population of the earth, more than one-half is 25 years of age or under. This fact makes clear the importance of youth to the world's immediate future.

There are prophets of doom who see in today's American youth the seeds of our moral decay. They point to the rising crime rate among young people and shake their heads sadly and hopelessly. The facts are sad but not hopeless.

I am proud of the youth in our fabulous Fourth Congressional District. Proud because our youth today is paradoxically more mature than ever before.

Recently I talked before an assembly of the W. Tresper Clarke High School in East Meadow on the rights and responsibilities of citizenship.

I was informed that the teachers and superintendent had become disturbed about student behavior and the drift away from discipline. This is something plaguing our college campuses right now.

What was done? Instead of a call for experts and Government funds, an appeal to school and individual pride was made. The superintendent called for a meeting of student representatives and faculty advisers to discuss the problem and seek solutions.

It was decided that the students draw up their own code of ethics and behavior. It is an eye opener.

It immediately stresses that "student behavior is strongly influenced by dress and appearance of students" and calls for girls to refrain from wearing "shorts, divided skirts, slacks, beach sandals and sweatshirts." It calls for hair to "be neatly arranged" and describes as "not appropriate" excessive makeup and jewelry.

Boys are cautioned against wearing "dungarees, sweatshirts, shorts, boots and T-shirts." Hair is required to be worn at a reasonable length.

For the good of all, it calls for courtesy for all and smoking for none. It calls for an end to defacement of school property. It sets up an "honor system" for the elimination of cheating.

In short it is a system that could serve as a model for some parents. All parents would be proud of it and the students who wrote it.

This is an example of self-control that should be spread throughout the country. I intend to place the "Code of Ethics" of the W. Tresper Clarke Junior High School General Organization in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and make it available to all other schools in our Fourth Congressional District.

It is a good example of American self-reliance. It is something that money, even Federal tax dollars, cannot buy.

W. TRESPER CLARKE HIGH SCHOOL—JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL GENERAL ORGANIZATION, CODE OF ETHICS

STUDENT DRESS AND GROOMING

It is commonly understood that student behavior and the total school environment are strongly influenced by the dress and appearance of students. While we are establishing basic standards of behavior and dress, our goal is to encourage self-discipline. Obviously, we do not intend to prescribe standards that are set up by any one person or cause unnecessary expense. However, we do believe these recommendations will help in maintaining the proper academic atmosphere in our school. We offer, therefore, the following commonly acceptable modes of dress, with mention also of what is regarded as inappropriate.

GENERAL APPEARANCE

Junior high school students should maintain a clean and neat appearance. Appropriate school dress shall be consistent with the following description:

Girls: Apparel for girls shall consist of skirts, sweaters, blouses, jumpers, and dresses all worn at a reaonable length. Not appropriate for school wear are shorts of all kinds, divided skirts, slacks, beach sandals and sweatshirts. Hair should be neatly arranged. Excessive makeup and jewelry are not appropriate.

Boys: Apparel for boys shall consist of shirts that are tucked in when should be except at the collar, sweaters, and properly fitted slacks. Not appropriate for school wear are dungarees, sweatshirts, shorts of all kinds, boots, and T-shirts as an outer garment. Hair should be worn at a reasonable length. Shoes or sneakers are to be worn with socks.

All students: Any apparel or unusual accessory that detracts from school decorum will not be permitted. Taps on shoes are not allowed. Finally we submit that for students the school is the equivalent of their place of business. The work of the school comes first. We wish to maintain the general tone which makes this both completely possible and expected.

GENERAL BEHAVIOR AND COURTESY

Students should be respectful and courteous to each other at all times. We would also expect that students be polite and respectful to their teachers and to all adults entering the school. Such courtesy will do much to establish the school's reputation for good manners and training. Poor behavior such as pushing, fighting, or throwing of objects shows a lack of concern for the rights and safety of others. All students are entitled absolutely to the safety of their persons at school.

All students are required to leave the schoolbuilding and grounds each day no later than 2:50 p.m. except when they have special teacher's permission to remain. Once having left the building, please do not return.

STUDENT BEHAVIOR

No student is to be mistreated by act or threat by another student or students. Rude or insolent behavior will be dealt with immediately.

Cigarettes or other items to be smoked are not to be brought to school. A student smoking or under suspicion of smoking in the building or on the schoolgrounds is subject to suspension. Gum chewing is not permitted at any time.

RESPECT FOR PROPERTY

We encourage students to take pride in their classrooms and in the physical schoolplant as a matter of respect for the school. Writing on desks, walls, etc., in bathroom, classrooms, lunchrooms, gymnasiums, etc., is a severe example of disregard for property and respect for the school. If a student finds school materials or personal property belonging to someone else, it should be returned promptly to the junior high office. Students are responsible for damage done to school property and to books and other materials issued to them. Books are to be kept covered at all times. Respect for property also means not being careless about one's own school materials and personal belongings. School lockers are to be locked at all times.

Locker combinations should be kept secret and personal. Students may go to their lockers before and after school and before and after lunch only. Special permission may be granted in emergencies only, by individual teachers.

HONESTY AND INTEGRITY IN SCHOOL ACTIVITIES

Scholarship must be founded upon integrity. Students will be held responsible for honesty and integrity in their academic work and in their dealings with fellow students and their teachers. Students should understand why their own work in tests or themes, for example, must be unquestionably their own. Good sportsmanship should be shown at all times in all school activities.

ENFORCEMENT

Students and teachers are urged to report violators to the junior high office.

Punishment for violation of the above regulations shall consist of detention, the length of which will be determined by the principal.

This "code of ethics" was developed by a group of 45 junior high students and discussed and approved later by the general organization representatives.

UNFAIR TREATMENT OF CONGRESSIONAL WITNESSES

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the Special Subcommittee on the Federal-Aid Highway Program is presently holding public hearings on road building practices in the State of Louisiana. During these hearings we will call witnesses from the Louisiana Department of Highways, the Federal Bureau of Public Roads, the General Accounting Office, and others. It has been brought to my attention that some of these witnesses will appear at considerable personal financial sacrifice because of outmoded rules of the House of Representatives.

As we all know, traveling away from our homes is quite expensive, when we consider the cost of hotel rooms, meals, taxi fares, and other necessary expenses. The present standard travel per diem rate for employees of the executive branch and congressional personnel is $16 per day. Witnesses called to appear before Senate committees are paid $16 per day, and mileage is at the rate of 12 cents per mile. These rates are barely adequate—if that—to cover necessary expenses. But under the rules of the House of Representatives, witnesses are limited to per diem of $9 and mileage of 7 cents per mile.

These limitations were established in 1955—some 10 years ago—and I consider them completely unrealistic. Can any of us imagine trying to visit Washington—with its high hotel rates, meal charges and other expenses—on $9 per day?

Many of the witnesses who will appear before our subcommittee are extremely low-paid persons. As Chairman BLATNIK stated in his opening statement, at the beginning of our hearings, they "come to Washington, usually with some personal embarrassment, frequently with considerable courage." It is disgraceful that they should suffer financial loss as well. It is heartbreaking to hear witnesses, who are willing and anxious to appear before our subcommittee to give vital testimony, explain how they will try to save or borrow the money to finance their trip to Washington.

The time is long past when the House rules should be brought in line with the expense allowances of the Senate and the executive agencies. In the hearings before our subcommittee we now have the anomalous situation of underpaid privately or State employed witnesses being compensated at the rate of $9 per day—under the House rules—while comparatively high paid observers from the executive branch are attending at the rate of $16 per day.

This is not only an unwarranted financial burden on persons summoned to appear before congressional committees. It impedes the work of the committees because persons otherwise willing to appear may be reluctant to do so because of the personal financial sacrifice. The Federal expenditures involved are nominal to the Government, but desperately important to some of the prospective citizen witnesses.

I am making these statements because today I am introducing a House resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for payment of $16 per diem and 12 cents mileage to witnesses appearing before House committees, instead of the present $9 per diem and 7 cents mileage. This change will bring the House rules in line with the practices of the Senate and the executive agencies, and I have the deep hope that this amendment to the rules will be supported on a nonpartisan basis, and promptly passed by the House. It would be a practical help as well as a humanitarian gesture if this resolution could be passed before the next hearings of our subcommittee.

CONGRESSMAN CLEVELAND DEPLORES RESIDUAL OIL QUOTA DECISION

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's decision by the Secretary of the Interior to continue costly restrictions on the importation of residual oil is a serious blow to New England. The decision makes no sense. It is deplorable. It is indefensible. It is immoral.

As a result, people in New England must continue to pay tribute, in the form of needlessly costly fuel, to the big business, big labor, and big political interests of the big coal and big oil States. The decision obviously is a cold-blooded political one: there is no other reason for it. It represents another demonstration of the political approach of this administration under which the little man, the consumer, the smaller States, the ordinary, unorganized citizen is left out of the Great Society, except, of course, when it comes time to pay the bills. Otherwise, only the voice of the big special interests are heard.

The restrictions on imported residual oil are costing the people of New England an estimated $40 million a year. Even Secretary Udall admits the program penalizes consumers and is unfair, but he says his plan to remove the restrictions for New England was overruled by his lawyers. It is hard to imagine what legal reasoning could have led to this conclusion. But it is easy to trace the political reasoning. The decision is deplorable.

That the Secretary himself agrees is clear from the following extracts of his remarks yesterday to the press:

> With regard to the residual oil import program, we do not have a press release or documents before you and I will try and speak slowly and we are asking the reporters to take this down so that it will be available for you in case you want to get the precise details of it.
>
> We are working on the documents and probably sometime tomorrow we will have the details in them available for you, so that we will have a new program on the line as of tomorrow but I will announce the general outlines of it today and also disclose part of the decisionmaking process on this.
>
> I had determined last week that the best solution for the residual oil problem was, on the east coast, to create three subdistricts. One would be in the State of Florida; another, the five New England States: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island; and the third would be the remainder of the States in district I.
>
> We had contemplated what would have amounted to an open-end program in Florida and these five New England States with a continuation of the existing program, with some modifications in the remaining area.
>
> This represented my best judgment as a solution.
>
> Certain legal questions were raised by the legal staff with regard to this proposal, and the decision was finally reached within the last 48 hours that because of the national security basis of the program, that this was not a solution that was legally viable and, therefore, I had to abandon this as a plan, which we had all drafted and worked out.
>
> The program that I am announcing today, therefore, is basically a continuation of the existing program, with substantial increases in the imports that are allowable for both the normal increase in demand and the decrease in the domestic production of residual oil in this country, which probably two-thirds of the total can be something in the neighborhood of 45,000 to 50,000 barrels a day, and also for the growth factor increase that is normal. This will make an increase—I saw the UPI dispatch earlier; it is somewhat erroneous. I think the figure, as you will find out tomorrow, will probably be somewhere in the range of 75,000 barrels a day which is somewhat comparable to the increase of last year.
>
> There is in my judgment a very serious question whether the national security interest warrants the continuation of this program and this was reflected in the initial decision that I had made. However, a national security determination is not something that is within my power, acting alone, to make a decision on this; nor did I approach it in terms of making this type of basic decision. So that I think what we emerge with is a continuation of the existing program which admittedly has defects in it.
>
> We have not, despite many suggestions that have been made, come up with an alternative plan. No one ever suggested a workable plan. Nor have we ever been able to devise one whereby you would not have a quota-license system and this is the system which particularly in New England and Florida, I think, obviously increases the price to the consumer.
>
> It is our judgment that there is a penalty for the consumer as a result of this program—probably something on the order of $40 million a year—and I think that this is unfortunate and this has to be weighed in the balance when one looks at the national security aspect; but this is the result we have come out with, in this instance, and we will have the documents in your hands sometime tomorrow.
>
> Those are the two matters I wanted to discuss with you.
>
> Go right ahead.

AEC TO LAUNCH SPACE REACTOR FROM VANDENBERG AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, all Americans in recent days have taken great pride and have been thrilled by two highly successful U.S. space explorations—the two-man Gemini orbital flight and the newest Ranger closeup photographs of the moon.

Largely unheralded, however, is another forthcoming American experiment in space with highly exciting and fascinating prospects. This is to be a launching of a compact nuclear reactor power system into space, the first of its kind ever attempted anywhere, by the Atomic Energy Commission. The launch is scheduled to be made today, or within the near future, from Vandenberg Air Force Base, located in the California district which I have the honor to represent here.

This project is purely experimental and the outcome is uncertain. I know that all my colleagues will join me in prayers for its success.

A brief description of the reactor and its purpose is given in a press release issued by the Atomic Energy Commission, which I am inserting in the RECORD at this point:

> The 970-pound device, designated SNAP-10A, will be boosted into a 700-nautical-mile polar orbit by an Atlas-Agena vehicle.
>
> The objective of the flight test is to establish the feasibility of operating a nuclear reactor power system in space.
>
> The SNAP–10A system was developed under the AEC's SNAP (Systems for Nuclear Auxiliary Power) program. The purpose of the program is to develop reliable, long-lived sources of electrical power for satellites and space vehicles, and for other uses on land and in the sea.
>
> Atomics International, a division of North American Aviation, Inc., Canoga Park, Calif., is prime contractor to the AEC for the space power system.
>
> SNAP–10A includes a nuclear reactor and power conversion unit. Heat produced by nuclear fission in the reactor is converted directly into 500 watts of electricity by thermoelectric elements. The power will be used for the spacecraft's extensive test instrumentation and to test an ion propulsion engine developed by the Air Force.
>
> The reactor is cooled by a liquid metal alloy of sodium and potassium. The enriched uranium 235 fuel is combined with zirconium hydride.
>
> A radio command from the ground will initiate the startup of the nuclear power system after it is placed into orbit. The reactor will be controlled during startup by rotation of sections of a beryllium reflector surrounding the reactor core.
>
> The reactor will reach full power about 24 hours after launch and the reactor system will be in self-controlled operation about 48 hours later. Once the reactor is stabilized at a desired power level, the reactor system will use no moving part. The reactor system has been designed to operate for 1 year.
>
> If the orbit planned for the test is achieved, the reactor system would not be expected to reenter the atmosphere for 3,500 years. In any event, the reactor will not be started up until it has attained an orbit of sufficient duration to permit the radioactive material to decay to safe levels after shutdown of the reactor.
>
> Future space, lunar, and planetary missions will require power supplies up to many thousands of kilowatts, with lifetimes up to several years and with near-perfect reliability. The only practical device which can meet requirements for relatively large amounts of power in space exploration is a nuclear reactor. The SNAP–10A system technology can be applied in nuclear space power units that have no moving parts and are capable of producing up to tens of kilowatts of power.

RESIDUAL FUEL IMPORTS

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. Moore] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, the action today taken by the Department of the Interior in increasing the level of residual fuel oil imports is clearly against the best interest of the United States. Impact will be most strongly felt not only in my State of West Virginia but throughout the entire Appalachian region. Approximately 5,400 coal mining jobs will be eliminated by increasing residual fuel oil imports by 75,000 barrels a day.

Statistics are irrefutable. Under the present import quotas, the level of imports of fuel oil have increased constantly. Thus, in 1962, over 186 million barrels were imported into districts I and IV. This rose to almost 205 million barrels in 1963, and last year it reached the staggering total of over 230 million barrels, notwithstanding controls.

The recent action of the Indonesian Government in taking over the management of three oil companies, two American and one Dutch, should bring home the danger this Nation faces in possibly being deprived of both residual fuel oil and coal.

It is a well-known fact that, if once coal mines are shut down, it takes a considerable period of time to again reactivate them. It is also a fact that, if a coal mine is closed, it later becomes economically prohibitive to extract any coal from that mine.

As regards the recent hearings held by the Department of the Interior; some of the witnesses who appeared made the unwarranted statement that, because of controls, New England and the Northeast have been compelled to pay extra sums of money for such requisite fuel. This is not consonant with the facts. Declining coal prices have forced residual oil prices down, and the New England consumers actually saved $20 million in 1963 on residual purchases compared to what they would have had to pay for the same amount of oil at 1958 prices. I want to emphasize the fact that it is vital for American industry to keep competition alive and, because coal is competitive with residual fuel oil, prices for both of these commodities are substantially less. It does not make sense that the Congress enacted the Appalachian bill when now that region is dealt a body blow by permitting cheap, foreign residual oil to displace the main product of the Appalachian region coal.

The performance of the Secretary of the Interior yesterday and today was incredible even to those who agreed with him, as well as to those who disagreed with him. It represents a high water mark of displays by a Cabinet officer of a lack of knowledge of the law, the facts, or even what his own Department is doing. The Secretary of the Interior is charged by Presidential order with administering the oil import program, a program which the President and the Office of Emergency Planning previously had concluded was required by the national security. He also is charged, by nature of his duties as Secretary of the Interior, with promoting the domestic resources industries, including coal and oil, so far as consistent with national security.

Instead of doing either, the Secretary of the Interior first sought, in effect, to abandon the residual oil import program, by excluding New England and Florida from its coverage. He did this, among other stated reasons, on the ground that coal did not compete with oil in New England and Florida, which even the neophyte student of our energy market would know was totally incorrect. He did this on the further grounds that he did not believe national security required the residual oil import program and stated at the press conference that this did not enter into his considerations, while at the same time admitting that he did have the responsibility for a national security determination and, therefore, contradicting himself, he did not consider national security in his determination.

For reasons which no one could fathom, and although a lawyer himself, he waited until the last minute to obtain legal advice and then found that what he proposed was unlawful. That a decision which affects the livelihood of thousands of Americans should be made on such a last minute and uninformed basis is unbelievable, even to the most cynical Washington hand.

The Secretary of the Interior is even confused about the amount of the quota he announced. An early UP story stated that the increase was over 100,000 barrels a day. The Secretary stated that this was an error; it was only 75,000 barrels a day. At 75,000 barrels, this involves a great deal of hocus-pocus. What the Secretary apparently has done is to ignore the advances against current quotas which he authorized in March, thereby rendering what appears to be a firm decision to permit residual oil in only against the new quota year. Of course, in such a whirling dervish process one more change is not a surprise.

The problem is not just the inconsistencies in numbers and lack of information—it appears clear that the Secretary, learning that he could not decimate the residual oil import program as he proposed, has now sought to do it by the amount of quota increases—therefore rendering the quotas almost meaningless.

He has sought to accomplish by indirection what he was specifically told he could not do.

Perhaps worst of all is his endorsement of the hoax that the residual oil import program can be separated from the crude oil import program and a meaningful crude oil import program maintained. Those who know the oil industry recognize that a barrel of residual can be substituted for a barrel of crude and that if the residual oil program ends, effective controls on crude ends with it.

GUNS DO NOT COMMIT CRIME

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. Hansen] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the second amendment to the Constitution states in part, "the right of the people to keep and bear arms, shall not be infringed." In view of this I would seriously question the constitutionality of proposed legislation calling for registration and taxation of firearms. This sort of action would only harass the legitimate gun owner, and would not correct the critical crime problem existing in the United States today.

Guns do not commit crimes, Mr. Speaker; people carrying guns commit crimes. Instead of badgering the hunter, the gun collector, and other legitimate gun buffs, I believe a far better approach to the problem is the one proposed by Congressman Casey, of Texas.

The gentleman from Texas has introduced a bill, H.R. 5462, which provides for a mandatory Federal sentence of 25 years for anyone guilty of using or carrying, during the commission of a robbery, assault, murder, rape, burglary, or kidnaping, any firearm which has been transported across a State line.

Many feel that punishment for armed crime should rest with the State in which the crime was committed. However, some courts do not adequately come to grips with the problem by the leniency shown to the criminal in all too many cases. Thus, a mandatory Federal sentence would be an active deterrent to any criminally inclined person since he would know that, should he be caught using or carrying firearms during the commission of a crime, a 25-year sentence would be the minimum that he would receive.

And, Mr. Speaker, there is precedent for this Federal action in the existing mandatory Federal sentences for trafficking in narcotics.

Registration of firearms would affect only decent, law-abiding citizens, and would not even inconvenience criminals. After all, who would expect anyone to register a weapon with which he intended to commit a crime—particularly in view of the fact that any weapon being used by a hardened criminal was probably stolen in the first place?

Mr. Speaker, something must be done to curb our rapidly increasing crime rate; but legislation more oppressive to the decent citizen than to the criminal is not the way to achieve it.

THE PANAMA CANAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include certain documents, letters, and exhibits, and a copy of a bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be permitted to insert their remarks in the RECORD on this subject following my remarks today.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

INTEROCEANIC CANAL PROBLEM: INQUIRY OR COVERUP?

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, with the opening in 1914 of the Panama Canal, the world had two great interoceanic waterways: Suez and Panama. Shortening voyage routes and strengthening commercial ties among nations, these two arteries of marine transportation today form what may be called an around-the-world canal route. History shows that crises at one inevitably make their impacts on the other.

This interaction was dramatically illustrated following the Suez crisis of 1956, when radicals in the Republic of Panama, aided and abetted by sympathetic international socialist groups in the United States, set out to alter the diplomatic and juridical foundation of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal. As all Members of the Congress who have followed the canal question may recall, soon after the Suez crisis I undertook to present to the Nation and the world at large a comprehensive clarification of significant Isthmian Canal policy questions by means of an extended series of carefully documented addresses and statements in this body. These are listed in an extensive bibliography in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 2, 1964, under the title, "Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States—Documentation, 1955–64," prepared by my distinguished colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMPSON], a former chairman of a special Panama Canal Subcommittee and the principal author of the Panama Canal Reorganization Act of 1950.

This bibliography is an indispensable tool for those seeking full information on one of the most gravely important questions now before our country. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, it is commended for the widest possible use, especially among Members of the Congress and the staffs of committees with jurisdiction over key phases of the interoceanic canal problem; officials of the executive branch of our Government; editors and writers; commentators and journalists; educators and librarians.

A careful study of the works cited in this documentation will guard against being misled by self-serving propaganda and official doubletalk.

ISTHMIAN QUESTION ALWAYS DRAMATIZED BY CRISES

The history of the development of our isthmian canal policy is too long and complicated for recital here. Its main purposes have been securing the best type of canal at the best site at least cost for the benefit of all nations on terms of equality. Unfortunately, the consideration of the weighty problems involved has been lacking in continuity. The resulting gaps, at times, have caused perplexing confusions and uncertainties. Despite such lapses, fatal errors have, so far, been avoided and the main arguments have been clearly stated, and are better understood by those who have sought reliable information on the subject.

In fact, experience shows that serious attention to the canal questions has seldom been aroused except when some tragic crisis served to force action. The defeat of France in the Franco-Prussian War of 1870 inspired the great French effort at Panama, 1879–89, as a means of offsetting that defeat in war by a great project of peace. The dramatic rush of the U.S.S. *Oregon* around Cape Horn in 1898 to join our fleet off Santiago de Cuba aroused the entire Nation to the need for an interoceanic canal. The patriotic stand of American schoolchildren in defense of the American flag in front of an American high school on American property at Balboa in 1964, dramatized the long-neglected canal question to a greater degree than any single incident since the dash of the *Oregon;* and the issue is still with us.

Unfortunately, much of the propaganda that followed was ill advised and biased in the interest of groups originating it. Thus, inspired, it has served to mislead many of our people in mountainous waves of words. So like navigators who have passed through a storm with overcast skies, some have lost their true positions and it is up to us in the Congress who have deeply studied the subject to examine the past with the view of determining our future course.

KEY CANAL ISSUES

What are the key interoceanic canal issues that other Members of the Congress and myself have so steadily endeavored to elucidate over a period of years? Though previously stated many times, I shall repeat them primarily for the benefit of new Members:

First, the transcendent responsibility of safeguarding our treaty-based sovereign rights, power, and authority over the Canal Zone that are indispensable for the efficient maintenance, operation, sanitation and protection of the Panama Canal.

Second, the problem of the major increase of capacity and operational improvement of the existing Panama Canal through the modification of the third locks project (53 Stat. 1409) to provide a summit-level-lake anchorage in the Pacific end of the canal to match that at Gatun in the Atlantic sector, on which project some $75 million was expended before work was discontinued in May 1942.

Third, the matter of constructing a new Panama Canal of so-called sea-level design, or any variation thereof, to replace the existing canal.

Fourth, the subject of the construction and ownership by the United States of a second canal at another site than the Canal Zone.

As emphasized by many who have studied the canal question in its broadest aspects, the determination of basic canal policies is no mere routine task for routine administrative officials but a challenge to the Congress, requiring the services of the best qualified individuals that our country can muster.

To provide such body, Representatives BOW, HOSMER, THOMPSON of Texas, and I have introduced bills over a period of years to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission. Invariably, these measures were opposed by routine executive agencies who evidently do not wish any type of inquiry not dominated by themselves. It would seem, Mr. Speaker, that if they were confident of the correctness of their position they would welcome rather than seek to obstruct the type of inquiry that only a capably constituted, independent commission could make.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I would invite special attention of the Congress to a 1944 report by former Gov. Glen E. Edgerton to the Secretary of War on the "Elimination of Pedro Miguel Locks." In this the Governor stated that the "wisdom of the adoption of the high-level plan in the original construction of the canal is completely established" and recommended a "thorough investigation" of the proposal but warned the Secretary that advocates of a sea-level canal would "oppose unjustifiably" any major improvement of the existing canal. See statement of Senator Thomas E. Martin, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 102, part 8, page 10756.

Viewed in the light of recent developments, this 1944 warning by Governor Edgerton was, indeed, prophetic. What is urgently needed is a rigorous inquiry and not a studied coverup.

PATTERN OF ISTHMIAN CANAL DEBATES

What has been the pattern of Isthmian Canal debates during various canal crises? In 1879, at the Paris Congress called by Ferdinand de Lesseps, the great builder of the Suez Canal, there was a battle of the routes over the question of site and a battle of the levels as to type. From 1898 to 1903, there was a second battle of the routes, decided in 1902 by passage of the Spooner Act and sealed in 1903 by the Panama revolution, creation of the Republic of Panama and acquisition of the Canal Zone. Between 1904 and 1906 was a second battle of the levels decided by act of Congress, approved June 29, 1906, in favor of the high-level-lake and lock type, which was constructed and has been successfully operated for half a century.

Though these important decisions by our Government were made only after the fullest consideration by some of the ablest men that our country ever produced and full debates in the Congress, the issue of type of canal did not die but gradually and quietly revived. A few years after the Panama Canal was opened, Gov. Jay J. Morrow in a letter on May 31, 1924, to former Chief Engineer John F. Stevens, made this significant statement:

> The sea-level project is a hardy perennial, and apparently there will always be someone to argue for it, no matter how often the impossibility of realizing any such scheme within practicable limits of time and cost may be demonstrated.

Recent history certainly justifies this foretelling statement, for the "hardy perennial" is still with us.

The arguments always used for it are military. In 1904–06, it was the alleged "vulnerability" of the high-level type to naval gunfire; in 1939, it was the danger of enemy bombing attack that led to the separation of the proposed new parallel locks in the third locks project a short distance away from the existing locks and the inclusion of the undisclosed objective of a sea level canal in the third locks project, without specific authorization by the Congress; and in 1945–47, it was the alleged greater security of the sea-level type against destruction by nuclear attack. Because the A-bomb scare propaganda did not fool President Truman and the Congress in 1947, the protagonists of the sea-level idea changed tactics in 1964 and their spokesman alleged that even two sticks of dynamite could destroy the existing canal and at the same time were employing alien Panamanians in the Canal Zone Police Force.

These advocates never mention the obvious fact that nothing can be constructed of indestructible proportions, that the greatest dangers in any type of canal at Panama are massive slides into the channel where it crosses the Isthmian cordillera and that the true criterion for judgment as to type, as expressed by General Abbot in 1905, is still the ease and safety of transit.

In all the propaganda for a sea-level canal on the present site there are repeated references to the so-called vulnerability of existing locks but complete exclusion of the fact that Gaillard cut constitutes a much greater feature of vulnerability because, if closed by nuclear attack, it could take years under peace conditions to reopen. If deepened, as in the contemplated sea-level project, slides in massive proportions would undoubtedly occur, exceeding those during the construction era and some since 1914. Why are these facts ignored in all official representations on the subject?

Mr. Speaker, in these lights the time has certainly come to stop trying to humbug the Congress and the people of our country with specious arguments and deceptive slogans, and to adopt canal policies based not upon hypothetical assumptions but on realities and plain commonsense.

EVASION OFFERS NO SOLUTION

The initial reaction of the President to the violent Panamanian challenge of U.S. treaty rights and obligations, as represented by the Red-led January 1964 mob assaults on the Canal Zone, were in line with the highest American traditions and U.S. vital interests as has been set forth in many addresses by various Members of the Congress. Moreover, his statements were relied upon by patriots in the United States and other countries, who understand Isthmian problems and wish to see preserved the just and indispensable rights of the United States over the Panama Canal enterprise. Also, distinguished Members of the Congress warned responsible officials of the administration as to the type of advice they should follow to guard against making serious policy mistakes. I feel honored to have been among those singled out as qualified to advise the President on this crucial subject.

With subsidence of the crisis, the urgency of the situation decreased, culminating in two most significant, but unfortunate, official moves.

The first of these was the enactment of Public Law 88–609, approved September 22, 1964—78 Stat. 990. This law, in complete disregard of costs and other consequences, authorized a study of one predetermined solution of the interoceanic canal problem long advocated by a small professional group and certain industrial interests that would benefit from a vast sea-level undertaking; and this to the exclusion of the solution that experienced engineers and other canal experts consider to be the best when the problem is evaluated from all significant angles.

The so-called commission from civil life provided by the law to make the inquiry is not an independent body with members of special qualifications made secure by the advice and consent of the Senate for their appointments and provisions for salaries but merely a part-time consulting board subject to bureaucratic hiring and firing as was the Board of Engineering Consultants for the 1946–47 Isthmian Canal studies. Moreover, there is no doubt that the efforts of the recently created Board will be directed toward rescuing the discredited 1947 report recommending the construction of only a sea level project in the Canal Zone—a report that failed to secure Presidential approval and was ignored by the Congress because of the fallacious assumptions on which its recommendations were based.

As proof of my assertions as to endeavors of this so-called commission from civil life, it is to be noted that, under the recent directive of the President and in the failure to appoint the so-called commission provided by the recent enactment, Secretary of the Army Ailes and Assistant Secretary of State Mann with Ambassador Anderson have recently visited Central American countries concerning the building of a new canal. Thus, under the indicated statutes, the entire investigation and recommendations are in the hands of officials committed in advance to one type of canal and to the exclusion of even the slightest consideration of the proposal deemed best by many independent engineers and other canal experts as well as by various informed Members of this body.

Undoubtedly, in a matter of such grave consequence all realistic proposals should be considered and none excluded. The recently enacted law is restrictive and arbitrary in its purpose and effect and is unjust to the Congress and the people of our country and, by its own terms, prevents consideration of key canal issues that must be met. Accordingly, I voted against it.

The second move by our Government was the announcement by the President on December 18, 1964, of the decision to negotiate an entirely new treaty on the Panama Canal that should recognize the sovereignty of Panama—whatever that may mean. Thus, the extreme Panamanian demands, formulated by radicals and subversives in Panama were accepted with reliance on members of the administration for counsel and recommendations and are in absolute contravention of the President's initial position.

Mr. Speaker, these two policy moves together are diametrically opposed to the considered views of many Members of the Congress who, over the years, have expressed themselves, and counter to the conclusions of experienced engineers, nuclear experts and others who have studied the subject and cannot be dismissed as incompetent or uninformed.

With regard to the idea of a canal at sea level, the 1906 message of President Theodore Roosevelt to the Congress is still illuminating, for, with minor changes it is just as applicable today as it was when written. For this reason, I quote it at the end of this address and invite attention to the way President Theodore Roosevelt dismissed the contentions of sea level advocates which were just as lacking in candor then as they are today.

As to the matter of Panamanian demands for sovereignty, I would quote the 1923 statement of Secretary of State Hughes to the Panamanian Minister in Washington when faced with a similar crisis:

> It was an absolute futility for the Panamanian Government to expect any American administration, no matter what it was, any President or any Secretary of State, ever to surrender any part of these rights which the United States had acquired under the treaty of 1903. (Foreign Relations, 1923, vol. III, p. 684.)

In view of the critical situation now obtaining in the Caribbean, it is indeed strange that some high official of our Government has not taken an equally forthright stand. Certainly, evasion offers no safeguard against disaster.

The overall and established policies of the United States in these connections have been wise and just. The Panama Canal could not have been efficiently operated through all these years with any less authority than that which has been exercised by our Government and as accorded by the treaty of 1903. Nor can it continue to operate efficiently under two flags.

PANAMA CANAL STILL KEY TARGET FOR RED CONQUEST

More than a year ago, after the school flag incident in Balboa, Red-led Panamanian mobs, on January 9–12, 1964, attempted to invade the Canal Zone in what would undoubtedly have been a bath of destruction, murder, and rape had it not been for the courageous actions of our Armed Forces in defending the Canal Zone under the able leadership of Gen. Andrew P. O'Meara, commander in chief, Caribbean Command. It was the mass of factual information as listed in my colleague's documentation, previously mentioned, that supplied the cushion of knowledge that enabled our Government to withstand the shock of the Panamanian mob attack unflinchingly, despite much hostile propaganda against the United States carried over our own mass news media.

What our people were not told is that wresting control of the Panama Canal from the United States and its internationalization have been Red objectives since 1917; that Alger Hiss, when in the State Department, and against the express wishes of Assistant Secretary Spruille Braden, officially reported the Canal Zone as an "occupied" area; that there was heavy Red infiltration in the Panamanian Government; and that the Panama Canal is still the prime target in the program for Red conquest of the Caribbean and other strategic transportation lifelines of the world.

These facts, Mr. Speaker, must never be overlooked in appraising our situation at Panama for we do so at our peril. All of this and more, I have repeatedly emphasized in the last several years in this Chamber; and the most recent news from Moscow is that the Communist Party newspaper, Pravda, on January 14, 1965, "pledged Soviet support for anti-U.S. movements in Latin America today." The latest evaluation on "Soviet Military Strength in Cuba" is given in the March 1, 1965, Washington Report of the American Security Council. Could there be a more effective validation for what I have repeatedly warned? I would prefer to have children from our American high schools to formulate our canal policies rather than hidden appeasers and sappers in the executive departments.

VITAL INFORMATION DENIED THE CONGRESS

How did the unfortunate steps as just enumerated take place? I do not know the full story but do know part of it, which I shall relate.

On June 4, 1964, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries conducted public hearings on S. 2701, 88th Congress, the "administration" bill, undoubtedly drafted by advocates of a sea level project who well know the weakness of their position. After testimony by Secretary of the Army Ailes, Assistant Secretary of State Mann and Chairman Seaborg, of the Atomic Energy Commission, on invitation of the Chairman, I made an oral statement and submitted a written one in opposition. The impact of my testimony was obvious, with evidence of approval on the part of certain members of the committee and indications of great interest and even concern among members of the press and others who were present.

When the mass news media published the story of the hearing, the statements of the three administration witnesses were featured but, so far as I have been able to ascertain, not one word was published about my own. Later efforts by me to obtain copies of the hearings were not productive, and these hearings still have not been published.

Then followed a series of events which, whether by design or not, were astounding:

First. Attempt on August 12 by the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to suspend the rules of the House and secure immediate action on S. 2701, which move was temporarily blocked by an objection.

Second. Passage of the House on September 1, under the procedure—suspension of rules—of S. 2701, without the benefit of published hearings and without adequate debate, which passage was followed immediately by a flood of supporting propaganda supplied by administration sources in all major news media.

Third. Later publication, under the cognizance of the Canal Zone Government, of a voluminous bibliography on the Panama Canal for obvious major propaganda purposes for general consumption, including libraries, schools, and colleges. This impressive-looking publication, so far as I can see, lists only one 1956 address by me: "John F. Stevens: Basic Architect of the Panama Canal," which address was purely historical. As a consequence, I have addressed a letter to the Secretary of the Army inviting his attention to these omissions and requesting correction. The text of my letter will be found at the end of this address, together with the Secretary's reply thereto and my rejoinder.

At this point, Mr. Speaker, may I ask: Why is that investigational committees of the Congress have not delved into the conduct of our Panama Canal policies? If one would do so, it may make some startling discoveries affecting the security of the Western Hemisphere and thus be able to perform a much-needed service for the security of the Western Hemisphere.

INFORMED CONGRESSIONAL VIEWS IGNORED

When the many addresses and statements on interoceanic canal problems over the last decade by other Members of the Congress and myself are studied as to specific issues and compared with administrative actions or proposals, the record is truly shocking.

As to the crucial question of sovereignty over the Canal Zone, my colleagues and I have strongly urged the reaffirmation by the Congress of our undiluted and indispensable sovereign rights, powers, and authority and opposed the formal display of the Panama flag over the zone. President Eisenhower, apparently influenced by his brother Milton, in 1960, authorized such display in one spot as evidence of "titular sovereignty" of Panama in contempt of the overwhelming vote—381 to 12—of the House on this subject; and such display was later expanded by President Kennedy. Manifestly, there cannot be two sovereigns in one territory and, if the United States does not have sovereignty over the Canal Zone, then we are squatters and have no right there at all.

In regard to the confusing term of "titular sovereignty," we have repeatedly requested an official definition of what it is: a reversionary interest that can become vital only upon our abandonment of the canal. The Department of State has ignored these requests, leaving matters in confusion and thereby inviting mob violence, and the end does not seem in sight.

With respect to our responsibility for protecting the Panama Canal, we have protested the employment of aliens on the Canal Zone Police Force—recommended by the State Department—as being "tantamount to treason." The Canal Zone Government has now employed alien Panamanians as members of this protective body.

As to the Panama Railroad, we urged its continued operation and improvement as an important adjunct to the Canal, especially in times of disaster. One Governor of the Canal Zone attempted to liquidate it until blocked by an independent inquiry by the House.

In regard to major piers at Cristobal, we opposed their transfer to Panamanian jurisdiction. Elements in our Government endeavored, nevertheless, to make such transfer until blocked by law.

With respect to providing a much needed transit capacity, we urged the major increase of capacity and operational efficiency of the existing Panama Canal to supply the best canal for the transit of vessels, all at least cost and not involving a new treaty with Panama. Elements in our Government secured legislation authorizing an investigation only of their own predetermined objective and excluding what many independent authorities consider the best solution.

As to the diplomatic problems involved, we emphasized the diplomatic angles of the overall canal question as being of vital importance, if not paramount. Faceless planners have started a program that ignores the seriousness of the diplomatic problems involved and this program, unless counteracted, is certain to open a Pandora box of difficulties, the extent of which cannot be forecast.

In regard to news, we have endeavored over the years, by every means at our disposal, to supply the Nation with the fullest information on the entire subject in a forthright and objective manner. Under the prevailing system of managed news, the mass news media has ignored practically all that has thus been said, and published only matter supporting the objectives of certain interests. In fact, what has been disseminated as news has been nothing but inspired propaganda intended to mislead the people of our country.

In marshaling facts on these vital canal questions, we have made only documentable assertions and not one has ever been challenged in the Congress or elsewhere. Elements in our Government have treated our irrefutable statements with a studied silence, which has been reflected in our heedless press.

As to the crucial matter of securing the proper type of investigation, we have urged over a period of years the creation of an independent Interoceanic Canals Commission. Elements in our Government have steadily opposed this idea and brought about passage of a law authorizing the conduct of the needed inquiry by a part-time consulting board, erroneously called a commission, which they will control.

The pattern thus created is obvious:

First. Delay, confusion, or ignoring of crucial issues.

Second. Refusal to consider the canal question on the basis of merit.

Third. Circumvention of the Congress by irregular, if not illegal, procedures.

Fourth. Management of news with the evident purpose of preventing informed public consideration and discussion.

Fifth. Disregard of the principles of Public Law 841, 81st Congress, the purposes of which were to improve the management of the canal and to place it on a self-sustaining basis.

In the light of the above record, the marvel is that the Panama Canal has been able to survive at all.

Evidently, planners in the State Department have in mind the building of a misnamed sea level canal near the present site at vast cost to the American taxpayers and then to turn it over to an international body for operation and maintenance under terms and conditions acceptable to Panama. As to these, the Congress and the people of the country are entitled to have definite information in advance and not after a new canal is built.

CONGRESS MUST NOT ABDICATE ITS POWERS

The record of documentable developments at Panama over a long period of time has been one of piecemeal liquidation of U.S. authority, which has now reached dangerous proportions. In view of what has occurred prior and since June 4, 1964, it should not be overlooked that, as already stated, it was Alger Hiss himself who, in 1946, listed the Canal Zone possession of the United States as an "occupied area," which meant that our control over the Zone was only provisional or temporary. What has taken place in the years following the action of Hiss could not have been better calculated to bring about the eventual internationalization of the Panama Canal as urged by John Reed, the notorious American Communist in 1917 in Petrograd, and which has ever since been Soviet policy. Moreover, the passage of Public Law 88-609, 88th Congress, in 1964 has, by its terms, placed the stamp of congressional approval on the objective for ending U.S. jurisdiction over the Canal Zone territory in favor of some form of internationalization, all at the expense of the American taxpayer and the users who will have to pay tolls.

In these general connections, Mr. Speaker, I would invite special attention of the Congress to the obvious fact that most of the so-called alternate canal projects are not realistic proposals but merely "straw projects" in a fake "horse race" for propaganda purposes, and that in the end the site decided upon under the recent statute will be in the Canal Zone.

Why all this shadow boxing and hypocrisy? Whom are they trying to bamboozle or mislead? Certainly, the President of Nicaragua was not fooled thereby for he recently stated that Panama would get the new canal.

Consequently, even if the recommendation under the 1964 law is for a sea level project in the Canal Zone, such recommendation will not solve the issue but merely focus it on the old one of the major improvement of the existing canal or its replacement with a new tidal lock canal; and that the final decision will still require mature and experienced judgment by independent experts. The present study, by excluding consideration of economic, commonsense solutions, will inevitably serve to waste valuable time for a decision that ought to have been made years ago, as recommended by Secretary of the Navy Knox, supported by his successor, Secretary Forrestal, and approved by President Franklin D. Roosevelt as a postwar project.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I may add that the studies under the recent act have not, and will not, deceive alert leaders of Central America and Panama but only the people of the United States who have been denied the full story by the process of supression but are gradually getting wise to what is being attempted.

The claim has been made that changed conditions justify a new canal policy. Times, indeed, have changed, but certainly not for the better as shown by subversive infiltration in every government of the Western Hemisphere, including our own; and as also shown by the establishment and maintenance of the Red beachhead in Cuba. Most certainly, this is no time to surrender any of our authority over the Panama Canal enterprise, for the inevitable outcome would be Soviet control of the canal and the ultimate subversion of all Latin American governments, including that of Panama.

To say the least, our Government has been most unfortunate in some of its advisers, because, in realistic effect, what has been done constitutes a loss of the legitimate interests of the United States. Besides, it indicates a recent and ominous willingness by the Congress to abdicate its constitutional functions as the ultimate authority in the canal question in favor of the executive branch by actions which, if not corrected, will be a coverup instead of an inquiry and can only serve to cause further delay and ultimate surrender.

Mr. Speaker, whether or not the statements I have made will register with the Congress and the American people, I do not know. However, I do know that as a Member of this body and because of my special knowledge, I have a duty to perform—namely, to give to the Congress and the Nation at large—the information and judgment that I have on this subject; and this I do without evasion or mental reservation, let the consequences be what they may.

A partial documentation follows:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 15, 1965]

RUSSIA TO BACK ANTI-U.S. DRIVES

MOSCOW, January 14.—The Communist Party newspaper Pravda pledged Soviet support for anti-U.S. movements in Latin America today.

Pravda said that all the Latin American countries were united in "one historical goal—liberation from the oppression of the imperialists, above all the imperialists of the United States. * * *"

It said the "Soviet people consider, as they always did, that their sacred duty is to render support to the peoples defending their independence."

[From the Washington Report, Mar. 1, 1965]

SOVIET MILITARY STRENGTH IN CUBA

(By DeWitt Copp)

While global attention is focused on the Far East, critical problems closer to home are all but forgotten. One of these problems is Cuba, and the Soviet military presence there. What is happening in both Vietnam and Cuba emanates from the same source. The only real difference between the two is one of geographic proximity.

On September 4, 1962, a White House statement declared: "Should it ever be determined that there are Soviet troops in Cuba, the gravest consequences would arise." Today, 2½ years later, Soviet troops remain in Cuba and certainly the gravest consequences have resulted, although not in the context of the original statement.

In November 1964, KBG officers, working out of the Soviet Embassy in Havana, summoned Communist Party delegates from 22 Western Hemisphere countries to a secret conclave in Cuba. The decisions made at this conference were announced by Tass, the Soviet News Agency, on January 18, 1965. The communique detailed the Kremlin's peaceful coexistence plans for Latin America. Local Communist organizations and parties were to line up in a solidarity movement with Cuba in pushing for a number of goals, key of which "is the achievement of the Cuban revolution in all spheres." The six specific spheres listed for 1965 are Venezuela, Colombia, Paraguay, Guatemala, Honduras, and Haiti. There are presently Communist guerrillas operating in Venezuela, Colombia, and Guatemala.

Castro's official news agency, Revolucion, spelled out the ultimate goal by saying that "Venezuela and Colombia form the embryos of a vast Vietnam of Latin America." In Havana this concept is referred to as the "Cuban corollary."

THE SOVIET MILITARY BUILDUP

In evaluating the determination of the Communists to move aggressively for more takeovers in Latin America, it is helpful to know the Soviet military strength in Cuba. We asked Paul Bethel, executive secretary of the Citizens Committee for a Free Cuba for his appraisal of Soviet military strength in Cuba. His report follows:

"For the past 2 years, official Cuban statements and underground intelligence reports have recounted the story of constant military construction being carried out in Cuba by the Soviets. Those sources have been supplemented by literally hundreds of interviews with Cuban escapees from all walks of life—defectors from Castro's military and diplomatic services, farmers, laborers, fishermen, to name a few. What emerges from a sober evaluation of all types of intelligence is that, unchallenged since the 1962 missile crisis, the Soviets have converted Cuba into an immense military establishment which is directly under their control.

"The Soviets took over the operation of Cuba's major cement-producing plants in 1962 and have never relinquished control. It is estimated that 90 percent of all Cuba's cement and building materials has gone into military preparations.

"One result is that military installations literally crisscross the island. Many are underground so as to exploit Cuba's extensive cave complexes, some of which run 10 miles and more in length. It is our belief from knowledge available to us that medium-range ballistic missiles are presently housed in certain caves.

"Canadian Newspaperman Bruce Taylor, who journeyed 2,000 miles around the island in 1964, recapitulated the missile situation as follows in the Montreal Star:

"'The Russians say that they have removed their intercontinental atomic missiles from Cuba, but underground leaders there insist that some remain, that they have seen them, and that they are well hidden from the spying cameras of the U-2's.'

"An explosion at the La Guatana missile base in Pinar del Rio last year, turned up a significant bit of evidence. Two eye-witnesses to the blast, which killed and wounded over 100 Soviet soldiers, established that a strange gelatinous material was scattered over a wide area by the explosion. When lighted, the material burned profusely, a characteristic of solid-fuel propellant for ballistic missiles. Four other eyewitnesses saw the frantic removal of missiles described as between 120 and 160 feet in length to El Incino mililitary base.

"Virtually all of the important details related by eyewitnesses were corroborated independently by a carefully documented intelligence report from the Cuban underground. Such corroboration is needed in most instances, since many eyewitnesses lack sufficient knowledge to identify the variety of missile types now in Cuba.

"Other hard evidence of underground construction obtained from three refugees involves subterranean airplane hangars. One, Jose Dans Reyes, a mason's helper, escaped from virtual imprisonment a year ago and told of his work on an underground plane depot in Oriente Province, designed to hold about 'a dozen bombers.' He described the concrete top of the hangar as '80 inches thick, with reinforced steel rods 2 inches in diameter.' Since then, intelligence reports from inside Cuba claim to have located two other such hangars—one in the central Province of Camaguey, and another in the westernmost Province of Pinar del Rio. They report that today these hangars house bombers.

"Information varies regarding the numbers and organization of Soviet troops in Cuba. Some of it comes from Pentagon sources, some from underground sources, and some is evaluated from interrogating escapees. There is wide divergence as to the numbers, with the State Department claiming the extraordinarily low figure of 'about 2,000' and the Pentagon declining in general to enter the 'numbers game.'

"However, Pentagon spokesmen say that 24 ground-to-air missile installations have been identified in Cuba. Cuban underground intelligence sources agree, and maintain that they are manned by 6,000 Soviet soldiers and military technicians, with 2,000 of that number located on the Isle of Pines. The latter are also in command of land-to-sea cruiser missiles.

"There are four Soviet tank battalions in Cuba, and an unknown quantity of armored amphibious vehicles, with all-Soviet crews.

"Underground intelligence reports place the number of Soviet military technicians (i.e. soldiers) in command of radar and missile-detection system at around 4,000.

"The largest organized force of Soviet troops reported by the Cuban underground is a motorized infantry division consisting of what are described as between 16,000 and 18,000 'select Soviet troops.' The division reportedly is broken up into small, highly mobile units which maneuver almost exclusively at night, and have the capability of moving swiftly against landing parties. In addition they are considered to be a potent, and calculated, factor in internal intimidation, in itself a military consideration for the unpopular and heavy-handed Soviets.

"A maginot-type line, approximately 30 miles long has been constructed at a cost of between $15 and $20 million around our Guantanamo Naval Base. Its front line is manned by Cuban infantry, but dug into the hills behind are Soviet troops. Their strength is unknown, and can only be guessed at by the number of trucks carrying food to them. This presently ranges from a minimum of five truck loads of food per week at one point to a maximum of 30 at another.

"As to air power, the January 9, 1965, issue of Cuba's military magazine, Verde Olivo, published pictures of Mig 15's, 17's, 19's and late model Mig 21's. Pentagon and Cuban underground intelligence sources are in general agreement that there are about 150 of these planes in Cuba. Furthermore, Cuban sources insist these planes are piloted exclusively by Russians.

IS HISTORY REPEATING ITSELF?

"The body of evidence gathered over a 2-year period does not substantiate official Washington statements: (1) that the Soviets have retired most of their troops from Cuba with a diminished military interest in the island, or the concomitant proposition, (2) that the Soviets intend to drop their Caribbean satellite as an expensive and troublesome burden. The latter theory seems to have been demolished by the intent expressed in the Tass communique of January 18, 1965.

"Even taking into consideration a divergence in figures on Soviet troops in Cuba, Russian military activities display at the very least an extremely disturbing air of permanency, even to the point of confirmed information that young Soviet recruits are undergoing training in Torrens, near Havana. This attitude probably stems from a sense of security on the part of the Russians that the Soviet base is militarily protected by the latest in Soviet armaments, and that U.S. policy has come to accept that permanency.

"On two different occasions last fall, Fidel Castro bluntly refused to answer questions put to him regarding ballistic missiles by C. L. Sulzberger of the New York Times and Barnard Collier of the New York Herald Tribune as to whether they remained in Cuba (while at the same time official sources in Washington were insisting that they did not).

"Undermining still further the credibility of current public statements on Soviet military strength in Cuba, Castro then told Sulzberger that there are enough Russian troops in Cuba to form 'a solid combat force,' sneering quite openly at State Department estimates with the comment that the Soviets were not in Cuba as 'military tourists.'

"Meanwhile, two of the target countries in Latin America are giving new evidence that the Soviets, through their Cuban base, are on the move. Honduran Foreign Minister, Jorge Duron, announced on February 11 the capture of arms and subversive plans against Honduras, saying that 'there isn't the slightest doubt about Cuban interference * * * open and constant intervention * * *' for the overthrow of the Honduran Government. Colombia has come under increasing attack by guerrillas operating in its region of Marquetalia in operations which Pravda gratuitously labeled as 'very little difference from the dirty war being carried out in Vietnam * * *.'"

Mr. Bethel's foregoing report warrants serious attention: We have checked his evaluation and estimates with officers in the Department of State, the Department of Defense, the OAS, and other Cuban refugee groups. They have been rejected as far too high in some quarters, given qualified support in others, and accepted as valid in still others. A very knowledgeable, high ranking administration officer, when asked a few days ago about the number of Soviet troops in Cuba, replied cryptically: "there are a helluva lot of them, although I can't tell you the number."

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 4, 1965]

U.S. HINTS AT INTERNATIONALLY HELD CANAL

(By Dan Kurzman)

The United States has indicated to four Latin American countries, through any of which a sea-level canal might be built, that it tentatively favors international operation of such a waterway.

Three countries—Nicaragua, Costa Rica, and Colombia—appear to favor this view, but Panama is holding out for joint operation with the United States.

ENTHUSIASM NOTED

This reaction toward internationalization appeared to be the most significant result of talks held between officials of these countries and a U.S. mission that returned to Washington yesterday. The mission was led by Thomas C. Mann, Assistant Secretary for Inter-American Affairs, and Stephen Ailes, Under Secretary of the Army.

The American team, which toured the four countries to determine their attitudes, ascertained that all were "very interested" in the project. They said the United States could proceed with full-scale surveys of possible sites.

The talks are understood to have been uniformly friendly despite the difference in opinion between the United States and Panama.

According to informal sources, the U.S. representatives indicated a preference for an international operation involving representatives of the canal's users and financers in addition to the United States and the host country. Such an arrangement, presumably, would dilute any future charges of "Yankee imperialism."

Panamanian officals are said to have argued that internationalization would infringe on Panama's sovereignty.

PANAMA'S PLAN

It is speculated that Panama wants to take over full control of the new canal after construction costs are paid off in 40 or 50 years, a possibility that would be eliminated if many countries shared operational control.

Disclosure of the conflict in views coincided with reports from Panama quoting the Panamanian foreign minister, Fernando Eleta, as saying on Tuesday that his country may try to build a sea-level canal alone, with financial aid from institutions such as the World Bank.

Careful not to rule out the possibility of U.S. construction of a new canal, Eleta said that a "go it alone" decision might be possible if nuclear excavation methods, which would be cheaper than conventional methods, proved feasible.

INTERNATIONAL FINANCING

Consistent with its attitude toward internationalization, the U.S. mission indicated to officials of the four countries visited that Washington would welcome financial contributions from any source, public or private, administration sources said.

After reporting yesterday to President Johnson on his trip, Mann himself told reporters that the United States was urging two conditions for construction of a canal: reasonable tolls and unlimited access to the waterway, without discrimination, to all ships.

The U.S. team is also understood to have made clear to officials they met that this country does not wish to build a new canal unless the project, and the conditions under which it would be constructed and operated, had the support of public opinion in the host nation.

Stressing of this U.S. view was apparently intended to impress Panama with the possibility that, regardless of what the technical surveys may show, Washington might build a new canal through another country unless the threat of anti-American demonstrations and riots, which have periodically taken place in Panama, can be eliminated.

[From the Washington Star, Jan. 14, 1964]

UNITED STATES WON'T BACK DOWN ON CANAL—JOHNSON CITES OBLIGATION TO INSURE ORDER—WAY HELD OPEN FOR TALKS AFTER VIOLENCE ENDS

The White House said today that the United States has an obligation to operate the Panama Canal efficiently and securely and cannot allow the canal's security to be imperiled.

A statement issued earlier this morning after President Johnson conferred with members of a task force he had dispatched to Panama reasserted the American position that restoration of order is a necessary prelude to direct and candid discussions between the United States and Panamanian Governments.

The White House statement emphasized that the United States had no intention of backing down from its insistence on retaining full power over the canal.

RECOGNIZED OBLIGATION

"The United States cannot allow the security of the Panama Canal to be imperiled," the statement said. "We have a recognized obligation to operate the canal efficiently and securely, and we intend to honor that obligation in the interests of all who depend on it."

The statement concluded:

"The United States continues to believe that when order is fully restored, it should be possible to have direct and candid discussions between the two Governments."

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT ON THE PANAMA CANAL, DECEMBER 18, 1964

This Government has completed an intensive review of policy toward the present and the future of the Panama Canal. On the basis of this review I have reached two decisions.

First, I have decided that the United States should press forward with Panama and other interested governments, in plans and preparations for a sea-level canal in this area.

Second, I have decided to propose to the Government of Panama the negotiation of an entirely new treaty on the existing Panama Canal.

These decisions reflect the unanimous judgment of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They are based on the recommendations of Ambassador Robert Anderson, Secretary Stephen Ailes, Secretary Thomas Mann, and our Ambassador in Panama, Ambassador Jack Vaughn. They have the full support of Mr. Truman and General Eisenhower. They have been reported to, and in most instances sympathetically received by the leadership of the Congress.

These two steps I think are needed now—needed for the protection and the promotion of peaceful trade—for the welfare of the hemisphere—in the true interests of the United States—and in fairness and justice to all.

For 50 years the Panama Canal has carried ships of all nations in peaceful trade between the two great oceans—on terms of entire equality and at no profit to this country. The canal has also served the cause of peace and freedom in two World Wars. It has brought great economic contributions to Panama. For the rest of its life the canal will continue to serve trade, and peace, and the people of Panama.

But that life is now limited. The canal is growing old, and so are the treaties for its management, which go back to 1903.

The Panama Canal, with its limiting locks and channels, will soon be inadequate to the needs of our world commerce. Already more than 300 ships built or building are too big to go through with full loads. Many of them—like our own modern aircraft carriers—cannot even go through at all.

So I think it is time to plan in earnest for a sea-level canal. Such a canal will be more modern, more economical, and will be far easier to defend. It will be free of complex, costly, vulnerable locks and seaways. It will serve the future as the Panama Canal we know has served the past and the present.

The Congress has already authorized $17 million for studies of possible sites and of the other practical problems of a sea-level canal. There seem to be four possible routes—two in Panama, one in Colombia, and one which goes through Nicaragua and possibly Costa Rica as well.

I have asked the Secretary of State to begin discussions immediately with all the governments concerned with these possible new routes. In these discussions we will be prepared to work on the terms and the conditions of building and operating a new canal, and if preliminary arrangements can be reached, we will be ready to go ahead with selected site surveys.

Last January there was violence in Panama. As I said then, "Violence is never justified and is never a basis for talks."

But while the people of the United States have never made concessions to force, they have laways supported fairplay and full respect for the rights of others. So from the very first day, as your President, I made it clear that we were ready to sit down and to seek answers, to reason together and to try to find the answers that would be just, fair and right, without precondition or without precommitment on either side.

On that basis, relations between our two countries, negotiations were resumed in April, and on that basis I chose Mr. Robert Anderson, the distinguished former Secretary of the Treasury under President Eisenhower, to be my special Ambassador on this problem. Since then Ambassador Anderson has been working with the American Ambassador, Mr. Vaughn, with the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Ailes, and with Secretary Mann of the State Department. They have recommended that we should propose a new treaty for the existing canal. After careful review with my senior advisors, I have accepted this recommendation.

Today we have informed the Government of Panama that we are ready to negotiate a new treaty. In such a treaty, we must retain the rights which are necessary for the effective operation and the protection of the canal, and the administration of the areas that are necessary for these purposes. Such a treaty would replace the Treaty of 1903 and its amendments. It should recognize the sovereignty of Panama. It should provide for its own termination when a sea-level canal comes into operation. It should provide for effective discharge of our common responsibilities for hemispheric defense. Until a new agreement is reached, of course, the present treaties will remain in effect.

In these new proposals, we will take every possible step to deal fairly and helpfully with the citizens of both Panama and the United States who have served so faithfully through the years in operating and maintaining the canal.

These changes are necessary not because of failure but because of success; not because of backwardness but because of progress. The age before us is an age of larger, faster ships. It is an age of friendly partnership among the nations concerned with the traffic between the oceans. This new age requires new arrangements.

The strength of our American system is that we have always tried to understand and meet the needs of the future. We have been at our best when we have been both bold and prudent in moving forward. The planning of a new canal and the negotiation of a new treaty are just such bold and prudent steps. So let us today in friendship take them together.

JANUARY 25, 1965.

HON. STEPHEN AILES,
Secretary of the Army,
Department of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Since returning to Washington, I have examined the recently published "Subject Catalog of the Special Panama Collection of the Canal Zone Library-Museum." Its purpose, as expressed by the Governor of the Canal Zone in his approval dated January 30, 1964, is to let "scholars and researchers everywhere" know of its existence.

As a close student of interoceanic canal history and problems, I recognize the work involved in producing this voluminous compilation and the advantages of having such data easily available. Under normal circumstances, I would be happy to be the first to commend the compilers. However, certain of the catalog's features impel me, as a Member of the Congress who has special knowledge of the subject, and over a period of years has made many addresses on all key elements in the Panama Canal equation, as recorded in the attached documentation, to protest what has been done under the guise aiding scholarship.

First of all, it should be noted that the tabulation in subparagraph 3 on page vii and the inclusion of 41 cards on the so-called sea-level canal (pp. 46-48) clearly indicate that the main object of the publication is massive propaganda in support of a predetermined sea-level project in the Canal Zone—an undertaking long sought by dredging combines, manufacturers of heavy earthmoving machinery, and a limited number of professional engineers, but opposed by many experienced ship-canal engineers, nuclear warfare and other qualified experts.

Though the catalog very properly lists some important statements by other Members of the Congress, I can find only one instance (p. 313) in which an address by me is indexed: "John F. Stevens: Basic Architect of the Panama Canal." This 1956 paper of mine was merely historical and not related to current canal questions; whereas the many other addresses and statements made by me in the Congress on acute canal problems are absolutely ignored and excluded from the catalog.

As my contributions often made banner headlines in isthmian newspapers and are well known in both the Canal Zone and Republic of Panama, I must believe that such exclusion from the collection could not possibly have been an innocent oversight on the part of the compilers. Instead, it must have been a deliberately planned affront by high administrative officials not only to me personally but also to the House of Representatives, which, on occasion, has overwhelmingly approved my stand. Moreover, no process could be better calculated to nullify the published purpose of the catalog to supply citations of authoritative information to scholars and researchers everywhere, who undoubtedly wish to know the whole story of current problems and not just a part of it.

To provide perspective, attention is invited to the following facts:

(a) The mass news media of the United States has steadily ignored for years all objective and forthright addresses in the Congress on interoceanic canal problems and this has apparently been induced by the attitude of administrative officials.

(b) Most recent major canal publicity has been either that supporting the surrender of U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone and Panama Canal or for the construction of an alleged sea-level canal of vast proportions.

(c) The June 4, 1964, hearings before the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, when both you and I testified, were never published, although request therefor was duly made.

(d) The House of Representatives, under gag-rule procedure on September 1, 1964, passed S. 2701, 88th Congress, without the benefit of indispensable background information in published hearings.

(e) The subject catalog does not list any of my relevant addresses, particularly those dealing with the questions of sovereignty, security, and the major modernization of the existing canal.

Mr. Secretary, this sequence cannot be accidental but forms a sinister pattern of suppression comparable to that in a proletarian dictatorship rather than in a nation with a constitution guaranteeing legislative independence based on complete resource information. Moreover, it is a serious reflection on the character and patriotism of those with supervisory responsibility over its preparation, and no doubt will be so considered in the Congress when the facts are known.

In this general connection, the practice of concealing knowledge of vital facts from the public in representations concerning the so-called sea level project is strikingly illustrated by the data issued in support of the alleged vulnerability of the present high-level-lock canal with complete omission of the greater vulnerability, in effect, of the Gaillard Cut. Thus, erroneous assumption that only a canal at sea level would be "secure." This propaganda does not stress the fact that a "sea level" undertaking in the Canal Zone would require massive tidal locks and many miles of lateral dams and spillways on both sides of the main channel. Nor does it recognize that the major vulnerable feature of either the present canal or of any sea-level design at or near the present site, is to be found in the cut. The "sea level" design, in fact, by substantially deepening and lengthening the cut would greatly increase the vulnerability on this score.

As regards slides, although it is true that the 1957–60 Board of Consultants, in its final report, voiced the view that a sea level is probably the ultimate solution of the canal problem, it did express doubt of the ability to carry out "any reasonable plan" for a sea-level canal in the Canal Zone without serious dangers of prolonged interruption to traffic at the time of cutover (H. Rept. 1960, 86th Cong., p. 5), a highly qualifying objection that is utterly ignored in all propaganda in support of the sea level project involving the present site. Experienced ship canal engineers have corroborated this warning, which should not be, but is being, ignored. In view of what occurred in preparation of the catalog, it is possible that you have not been supplied such information.

In making this protest, Mr. Secretary, I wish to stress most earnestly that I do not blame any hard-working employees who may have carried out orders or may not have understood the significance involved. I do condemn higher administrative authority for what is, in its effect, a classic example of bibliographic sabotage.

Because of the transcendent importance of the canal question, I trust that you, as the Special Representative of the President charged with supervision over the Panama Canal enterprise, will assume charge of this matter in a way, I am sure, that Secretaries Taft, Root, or Hughes would have done and arrange either for the issue of a suitable supplement to the catalog for all purchasers or for its withdrawal from circulation and revision, so as to make available all pertinent information in the premises, including congressional addresses and discussions. It is fair to assume that the withholding of vital information from the Congress and the public by administrative authorities has also governed presentations made to the President on this subject.

In addition, I desire information on how the publication of the subject catalog was financed, what funds were used, by whose authority, and the amounts thereof.

An early reply is respectfully requested.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D.C., February 17, 1965.
Hon. DANIEL J. FLOOD,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. FLOOD: Reference is made to your letter of January 25, 1965, concerning the "Subject Catalog of the Special Panama Collection of the Canal Zone Library-Museum," published in 1964.

The circumstances surrounding the publication of this subject catalog have been thoroughly investigated and the following details are provided in response to your questions.

The subject catalog was published by G. K. Hall & Co. of Boston, Mass., at its own expense. The project resulted from a casual meeting between the librarian-curator of the Canal Zone Library-Museum and a representative of the G. K. Hall Co. during the course of an American Library Association Conference. The G. K. Hall Co. undertook publication of the subject catalog on its own initiative purely as a commercial venture, in view of the timeliness of the subject matter. Since information contained in a library catalog is public information available to anyone, there was no objection to such a venture.

With reference to the material contained in the subject catalog, it is significant to note that the catalog was not intended to be a bibliography but a working card file of materials acquired through purchase and donation for the Panama Collection from 1914 to January 30, 1964. Your addresses and statements concerning the Panama Canal that have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are part of the Canal Zone Library's collection of the RECORD and covered by the comprehensive index of the RECORD itself. As a matter of normal procedure, and in the interest of economy, items appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are not catalogued separately in the Special Panama Collection except in those cases in which the library receives separate reprints as donations from the authors. These separate reprints when received are entered in the Special Panama Collection card catalog and as a result appeared in the reproduction by G. K. Hall & Co.

In summary, the subject catalog was in no way intended to be an exhaustive bibliography. It merely represents a gradual accumulation over many years of books, clippings, pamphlets and other items not normally available through indexes and reference materials found in any library of comparable size. There was no cost to the Canal Zone Government or Panama Canal Co. for the publication of the subject catalog since it was entirely a private venture of the G. K. Hall & Co. In addition, no instructions of guidance were given to the librarian-curator of the Canal Zone Library Museum by her supervisor at any level concerning form or content of the catalog.

I regret that there has been a misunderstanding of the origin, nature, and purpose of this special catalog, and trust that the above information will assist in rectifying any erroneous impressions that may have been imparted.

Sincerely yours,

STEPHEN AILES,
Secretary of the Army.

MARCH 8, 1965.

Hon. STEPHEN AILES,
Secretary of the Army,
Department of the Army,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I have studied your letter of February 17, 1965, concerning my protests over the "Subject Catalog of the Special Panama Collection of the Canal Zone—Museum" published in 1964 by G. K. Hall Co. with the formal approval of the Governor of the Canal Zone.

As to your conclusion that there was a misunderstanding, I understood too well, and regret that I found your reply not only unresponsive but also evasive. Your statement that there were "no instructions or guidance" given the compiler "at any level" of the Canal Zone Government as to "form or content" in a work of this importance is, in effect, a disguised effort to pass to a subordinate the responsibility that must be borne by the Governor.

Accordingly, I reiterate my letter of January 25, 1965, on this matter.

Sincerely yours,

DANIEL J. FLOOD.

PRESIDENT THEODORE ROOSEVELT'S MESSAGE TO THE CONGRESS, FEBRUARY 19, 1906

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I submit herewith the letter of the Secretary of War transmitting the report of the Board of Consulting Engineers on the Panama Canal and the report of the Isthmian Canal Commission thereon, together with a letter written to the chairman of the Isthmian Canal Commission by Chief Engineer Stevens. Both the Board of Consulting Engineers and the Canal Commission divide in their report. The majority of the Board of Consulting Engineers, eight in number, including the five foreign engineers, favor a sea-level canal, and one member of the Canal Commission, Admiral Endicott, takes the same view. Five of the eight American members of the Board of Consulting Engineers and five members of the Isthmian Canal Commission favor the lock canal, and so does Chief Engineer Stevens. The Secretary of War recommends a lock canal pursuant to the recommendation of the minority of the Board of Consulting Engineers and of the majority of the Canal Commission. After careful study of the papers submitted and full and exhaustive consideration of the whole subject I concur in this recommendation.

It will be noticed that the American engineers on the Consulting Board and on the Commission by a more than two to one majority favor the lock canal, whereas the foreign engineers are a unit against it. I think this is partly to be explained by the fact that the great traffic canal of the Old World is the Suez Canal, a sea-level canal, whereas the great traffic canal of the New World is the Sault Ste. Marie Canal, a lock canal. Although the latter, the Soo, is closed to navigation during the winter months, it carries annually three times the traffic of the Suez Canal. In my judgment the very able argument of the majority of the Board of Consulting Engineers is vitiated by their failure to pay proper heed to the lessons taught by the construction and operation of the Soo Canal. It must be borne in mind, as the Commission points out, that there is no question of building what has been picturesquely termed "the Straits of Panama"; that is, a waterway through which the largest vessels could go with safety at uninterrupted high speed. Both the sea-level canal and the proposed lock canal would be too narrow and shallow to be called with any truthfulness a strait, or to have any of the properties of a wide, deep water strip. Both of them would be canals, pure and simple. Each type has certain disadvantages and certain advantages. But, in my judgment, the disadvantages are fewer and the advantages very much greater in the case of a lock canal substantially as proposed in the papers forwarded herewith; and I call especial attention to the fact that the chief engineer, who will be mainly responsible for the success of this mighty engineering feat, and who has therefore a peculiar personal interest in judging aright, is emphatically and earnestly in favor of the lock-canal project and against the sea-level project.

A careful study of the reports seems to establish a strong probability that the following are the facts: The sea-level canal would be slightly less exposed to damage in the event of war, the running expenses, apart from the heavy cost of interest on the amount employed to build it, would be less, and for small ships the time of transit would probably be less. On the other hand, the lock canal at a level of 80 feet or thereabouts would not cost much more than half as much to build and could be built in about half the time, while there would be very much less risk connected with building it, and for large ships the transit would be quicker; while, taking into account the interest on the amount saved in building, the actual cost of maintenance would be less. After being built it would be easier to enlarge the lock canal than the sea-level canal. Moreover, what has been actually demonstrated in making and operating the great lock canal, the Soo, a more important artery of traffic than the great sea-level canal, the Suez, goes to support the opinion of the minority of the Consulting Board of Engineers and of the majority of the Isthmian Canal Commission as to the superior safety, feasibility, and desirability of building a lock canal at Panama.

The law now on our statute books seems to contemplate a lock canal. In my judgment a lock canal, as herein recommended, is advisable. If the Congress directs that a sea-level canal be constructed its direction will, of course, be carried out. Otherwise the canal will be built on substantially the plan for a lock canal outlined by the accompanying papers, such changes being made, of course, as may be found actually necessary, including possibly the change recommended by the Secretary of War as to the site of the dam on the Pacific side.

THEODORE ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *February 19, 1906*.

[Public Law 88-609, 78 Stat. 990, 88th Cong., Sept. 22, 1964]

S. 2701

An act to provide for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a sea level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized to appoint a Commission to be composed of five men from private life, to make a full and complete investigation and study, including necessary on-site surveys, and considering national defense, foreign relations, intercoastal shipping, interoceanic shipping, and such other matters as they may determine to be important, for the purpose of determining the feasibility of, and the most suitable site for, the construction of a sea level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans; the best means of constructing such a canal, whether by conventional or nuclear excavation, and the estimated cost thereof. The President shall designate as Chairman one of the members of the Commission.

SEC. 2. The Commission is authorized to utilize the facilities of any department, agency, or instrumentality of the executive branch of the United States Government, and to obtain such services as it deems necessary in accordance with the provisions of section 15 of the Act of August 2, 1946 (5 U.S.C. 55a).

SEC. 3. The Commission shall report to the President for transmittal to Congress on July 31, 1965, with respect to its progress, and each year thereafter until the completion of its duties. The President shall submit such recommendations to the Congress as he deems advisable. The Commission shall continue until the President determines that its duties are completed, but not later than June 30, 1968.

SEC. 4. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act, not to exceed $17,500,000.

Approved September 22, 1964.

Legislative history:

House Report No. 1706 (Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries).

Senate Report No. 968 (Committee on Commerce).

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 110 (1964): March 30, considered and passed Senate; August 12, considered in House; September 1, considered and passed House, amended; September 8, Senate concurred in House amendments.

[89th Cong., 1st sess.]

H.R. 4871

(In the House of Representatives, February 15, 1965, Mr. FLOOD introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.)

A bill to create the Interoceanic Canals Commission, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Interoceanic Canals Commission Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. (a) A commission is hereby created, to be known as the "Interoceanic Canals Commission" (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission"), and to be composed of eleven members to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, as follows: One member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Army; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Navy; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the line (active or retired) of the United States Air Force; one member shall be a commissioned officer of the Corps of Engineers (retired) of the United States Army; and seven members from civil life, four of whom shall be persons learned and skilled in the science of engineering. The President shall designate one of the members from civil life as Chairman, and shall fill all vacancies on the Commission in the same manner as original appointments are made. The Commission shall cease to exist upon the completion of its work hereunder.

(b) The Chairman of the Commission shall receive compensation at the rate of $30,000 per annum, and the other members shall receive compensation at the rate of $28,500 per annum, each; but the members appointed from the Army, Navy, and Air Force shall receive only such compensation, in addition to their pay and allowances, as will make their total compensation from the United States $28,500 each.

SEC. 3. The Commission is authorized and directed to make and conduct a comprehensive investigation and study of all problems involved or arising in connection with plans or proposals for—

(1) an increase in the capacity and operational efficiency of the present Panama Canal through the adaptation of the third locks project (53 Stat. 1409) to provide a summit-level terminal lake anchorage in the Pacific end of the canal to correspond with that in the Atlantic end, or by other modification or design of the existing facilities;

(2) the construction of a new Panama Canal of sea-level design, or any modification thereof;

(3) the construction and ownership, by the United States, of another canal or canals connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans;

(4) the operation, maintenance, and protection of the Panama Canal, and of any other canal or canals which may be recommended by the Commission;

(5) treaty and territorial rights which may be deemed essential hereunder; and

(6) estimates of the respective costs of the undertakings herein enumerated.

SEC. 4. For the purpose of conducting all inquiries and investigations deemed necessary by the Commission in carrying out the provisions of this Act, the Commission is authorized to utilize any official reports, documents, data, and papers in the possession of the United States Government and its officials; and the Commission is given power to designate and authorize any member, or other officer, of the Commission, to administer oaths and affirmations, subpena witnesses, take evidence, procure information and data, and require the production of any books, papers, or other documents and records which the Commission may deem relevant or material for the purposes herein named. Such attendance of witnesses, and the production of documentary evidence, may be required from any place in the United States, or any territory, or any other area under the control or jurisdiction of the United States, including the Canal Zone.

SEC. 5. The Commission shall submit to the President and the Congress, not later than two years after the date of the enactment hereof, a final report containing the results and conclusions of its investigations and studies hereunder, with recommendations; and may, in its discretion, submit interim reports to the President and the Congress concerning the progress of its work. Such final report shall contain—

(1) the recommendations of the Commission with respect to the Panama Canal, and to any new interoceanic canal or canals which the Commission may consider feasible or desirable for the United States to construct, own, maintain, and operate;

(2) the estimates of the Commission as regards the approximate cost of carrying out its recommendations; and like estimates of cost as to the respective proposals and plans considered by the Commission and embraced in its final report; and

(3) such information as the Commission may have been able to obtain with respect to the necessity for the acquisition, by the United States, of new, or additional, rights, privileges, and concessions, by means of treaties or agreements with foreign nations, before there may be made the execution of any plans or projects recommended by the Commission.

SEC. 6. The Commission shall, without regard to the civil service laws, appoint a secretary and such other personnel as may be necessary to carry out its functions, who shall serve at the pleasure of the Commission and shall receive compensation fixed in accordance with the Classification Act of 1949, as amended.

SEC. 7. The Commission is hereby authorized to appoint and fix the compensation of such engineers, surveyors, experts, or advisers deemed by the Commission necessary hereunder, as limited by the provisions in title 5, United States Code, section 55a; and may make expenditures, in accordance with the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended, and the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, for travel and subsistence expenses of members of the Commission and its employees while away from their homes or regular places of business; for rent of quarters at the seat of government, or elsewhere; for personal services at the seat of government, or elsewhere; and for printing and binding necessary for the efficient and adequate functions of the Commission hereunder. All expenses of the Commission shall be allowed and paid upon the presentation of itemized vouchers therefor approved by the Chairman of the Commission, or such other official of the Commission as the Commission may designate.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this Act.

SEC. 9. The Act entitled "An Act to provide for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a sea-level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans" (Public Law 88-609, 78 Stat. 990), is hereby repealed.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT, SEPTEMBER 24, 1964

I have approved a bill to provide for an investigation and study to determine a site for the construction of a sea level canal connecting the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

The Panama Canal was a great engineering achievement. It has served world commerce for 50 years. It has been a major source of income for Panama's economic and social development. It has been a key link in our security arrangements. But if we are to meet the challenges of the future, we must begin now to think in terms of the long-range needs of the United States, Latin America and the rest of world for a sea level canal across the American Isthmus.

Construction of a sea level canal presents formidable obstacles even after a suitable site is selected. There are enormous technical problems and complex and inter-related political, military and economic considerations that must be weighed. Under this bill the task will be undertaken by a five-member commission, appointed by the President, with annual reports on the progress of the Commission's work submitted to the Congress through the President.

This authorization will permit the study to get underway. Equally important, however, is appropriation of necessary implementing funds. I urge that the Congress act promptly on the supplemental request of $5 million for this purpose for the fiscal year 1965.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MATSUNAGA). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BUCHANAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent the great State of Alabama and the fine city of Birmingham.

It is most regrettable that, through the press, the people of my State and of my city have, over a period of time, been painted in a far different light from that which I have known them to be as I have grown up in their midst.

The people of Birmingham and of Alabama are in overwhelming majority fine Americans. They are in majority Christian people. They are law-abiding citizens. They are fairminded citizens. They are among the finest people of this land.

But in my city, as in many major cities of the United States, there is a certain criminal element, a vicious element which constitutes the worst enemy to the South in the present context and in the present crisis—I speak of those who preach bigotry, who practice intolerance and violence and terrorism.

It is with a saddened heart that I recognize this minute minority has again perpetrated an act of terrorism and violence in my city this morning and last night.

I wish to reiterate that the bombs which were planted in Birmingham within the last 24 hours were either the work of a madman—and this is most likely—or the work of vicious criminals having nothing to do with that which is representative of the people of my city and of my State.

Like all Alabamians and all Americans, I am most anxious that those who are guilty of such crimes shall be brought to justice, shall be tried, shall be convicted and prosecuted to the full extent of the law. No Americans wish this more than the Americans who live in Alabama and in cities like my city, cities that have known great travail, that are going through a time of trouble but whose people are fully able and fully willing to work out their problems locally and with their leadership and who deplore the acts by criminals in their midst which serve to blacken the good name of our State and of our city.

Because we have this criminal minority in the Deep South, I as a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities from the very outset have supported an investigation of the Ku Klux Klan by that body.

Many Americans have believed through the years that the Klan was guilty of preaching bigotry and of perpetrating acts of violence and terrorism. If this organization is not guilty of these things, then it has nothing to fear from investigation by any congressional body. If the Klan is guilty, then the investigation is mandatory. I am very anxious to see this take place, because I am anxious to demonstrate, perhaps through this investigation and the things surrounding it, among other things, that the overwhelming majority of the people of my State stand out in bold relief to the criminal minority perpetrating such acts. This may also settle once and for all the extent of the Klan's involvement.

I note from my mail that there have been some who interpreted certain remarks I made to the press recently as indicating some support of this Klan organization. I did, Mr. Speaker, defend the right of four Americans accused of a crime—accused but not convicted and not tried by any jury in this land. I defended their right to be presumed innocent until declared guilty by a jury of their peers. I protested the action of the President of the United States in apparently pointing a finger of guilt at four Americans who had not been tried for any crime. I protested that this was a violation of their civil, of their human, and of their basic American rights, because perhaps the most basic right of all is the right to be tried by a jury. Every citizen of every race and of every religion has a right to be presumed innocent until convicted, and to be tried by a jury of his peers.

I did not defend in this statement, however, bigotry or violence or terrorism or murder, all of which I deplore.

The President in his statement surrounding this event had some things to say about the fact that he had always fought the Klan and that his father had always fought the Klan. It might be of interest to note that during the Klan outbreak after World War I my father, as a young pastor, opposed the Klan and refused to support their movement. He was threatened by certain individuals with being blackballed, and with never receiving another church. He told them to put his name at the top of the list and said that he was willing to stand up for his convictions at any price. They were, of course, unable to fulfill their threats. Again at the end of World War II when there were outbreaks of violence and terrorism which were believed to be sponsored by the Klan, my father led or was one of those who led the movement in my State for the organization of a citizens committee of 500 which worked to bring to Alabama and succeeded in getting passed through our legislature a measure which unmasked the Klan and all like organizations. Out of this period came certain measures concerning demonstrations and parades which were aimed not at Negro demonstrators but at the Klan, which are the same measures which have been violated by Negro demonstrators in recent days. I have before me and I will request permission to include in the body of the RECORD at this point an Associated Press dispatch of April 24, 1950, in which my father, then as pastor of the Southside Baptist Church in Birmingham, spoke out against terrorism and violence when a new series of such activities had broken out in my State.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include this dispatch at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The dispatch referred to is as follows:

[Associated Press Dispatch, Birmingham Ala., Apr. 24, 1950]

ALABAMA PASTOR DEMANDS HALT ON BOMBING OF NEGRO HOMES

An angry white pastor says Federal help should be requested, if necessary, to catch the criminals responsible for dynamite attacks on Birmingham Negro homes.

Dr. John Buchanan issued the statement yesterday while city and county officers staged an all-out investigation of the second dynamiting in 10 days. Four city detectives were assigned full time to the case.

Six bombings, most of them violent blasts that alarmed a wide area, have gone unsolved since the first occurred 13 months ago. Dr. Buchanan, a Baptist minister, said in part, "I think it's time for the right-thinking citizenship of Birmingham to begin to mobilize sentiment again behind the forces of decency and law and order, to bring justice to these irresponsible criminals. If the local police authority are not able to find the violator, they should call upon the State forces, and if necessary, the Federal forces, to apprehend these law violators."

Dr. Buchanan is pastor of the large Southside Baptist Church and an official of the

> citizens committee of 500. The committee was organized last year after an outbreak of floggings, and cross-burnings by hooded bands. It supported officers attempting to crush the outbreak of lawlessness.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, this has represented throughout the years the position of responsible people of the South and the overwhelming majority of the people of my State and region in deploring acts of terrorism and violence and standing up for the basic rights of all Americans and in standing up for law and order. The people of the South have, to a greater extent than anyone can imagine who has not lived there, lived in basic friendship and respect for one another. There has always existed in the Deep South a basic attitude of respect and friendship between people of the two major racial groups there. Problems between major racial groups living within the same area are not exclusive to the South. They are as old as time and as wide as the world and wherever a similar situation has existed, problems have developed. We have not found perfect solutions to these problems and we have not been guiltless in our human relationships in the Deep South, but I believe there has been and there is within States like Alabama, a basis, a rock of friendship and mutual respect on which we ourselves can build a better future for all of us.

Mr. Speaker, the danger and the difficulty lies not only in the activities of that vicious criminal minority within our State which disturbs the peace and commits acts of violence against citizens of our State and against other persons visiting our State—the difficulty is not restricted to this group but goes beyond the criminal minority in the South and stems from the greatest threat this country faces now or has ever faced; namely, the threat of world communism which is also involved in this difficult situation in the South. This has been a primary target of the Communist movement for a long time. J. Edgar Hoover so said, and there is much evidence that because of its unique value as propaganda the civil rights movement, with many absolutely honest people and people who are absolutely devoted to Negro rights, nevertheless, has been a prime target of Communist activity.

This is an area in which the Communists have had a field day in fomenting strife and aiding and abetting in the difficulties and the dangers of the situation in tense areas and in times of crisis in the Deep South.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I gladly yield to my distinguished colleague from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, we have been asked many times whether in fact Communists are involved in this movement. I suspect the only answer I have as far as documentation is concerned is this, that if I were a Communist I think the first place I would have gone to is right down there, to stir things up with all the other marchers and people who have been intruding down there, trying to separate our people, trying to create discord among the people of America, because I think that is the prime target of the Communists of this world and of this country. So if I had been a Communist I am sure I would have been right there trying to stir up strife as much as possible. I am sure the Communists have not passed up this opportunity to take a further poke at this fine country of ours.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. And may I add that there is ample evidence that those affiliated with Communist-front organizations and identified with the Communist Party have in fact been active in Alabama in recent days. This is not to say that all those who participated in demonstrations are Communists by any means, or Communist sympathizers. Some were there with the purest motives, I am sure, some who have a legitimate interest in Negro rights; indeed, many may be in this classification. But I do not think we should lose sight of the fact that world communism is out to destroy our whole society and to wage propaganda war against us at any point of vulnerability and is out to do anything in its power to make our country look wrong, look worse than it is, even in those areas of weakness, and that they have been active in this area in American life.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in announcing our decision to investigate the Klan, which decision I fully support and have supported, said this:

> There are other racial agitators at work in all parts of the country. The committee is aware that Communist influence is at work in this field. These Communists have no honest interest in civil rights. Their aim is to promote racial discord, to tear down and subvert.

I do not believe, therefore, that any person or organizations can be treated as sacrosanct and immune from a close look as to Communist influence and infiltration any more than I believe that certain persons can be declared immune to law. I am deeply disturbed, as I have said, to have heard a very outstanding leader of the civil rights movement state on national television that he will decide which laws he will obey or disobey depending on what he considers just or unjust.

Mr. Speaker, this is a most dangerous doctrine and it is one which we cannot permit to prevail in our land lest we lose liberty for all of our people and unless our whole system of law is undermined by this doctrine of civil disobedience. Nothing could enhance the Communist movement more than that we widely believe and practice civil disobedience. It could bring about the total breakdown of law and order in our society.

May I say in connection with this that I have absolute faith in the character and in the importance of our local law-enforcement officers. I am glad that my city of Birmingham has one of the finest police forces in this country. They are men of character and of restraint and men of whom I am deeply proud. I am glad that in this tense time we have such men protecting my family and protecting the families of my neighbors. I think that it is time that this country learn more respect for its police officers, its local law-enforcement officers. I think it is time that we recognize that it is the duty of each one of us, not only some of us, to obey the law, Federal, State, and local.

Mr. Speaker, I believe as a citizen of the Deep South and as a Representative of a district of the Deep South in absolute equality of opportunity for all people and in equal and exact justice under the law. I have taken an oath to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States, including the Bill of Rights, and I shall do so for every citizen of my district and for every citizen of America, regardless of race or the region in which he lives. I am deeply concerned that we are developing a double standard in our outlook toward people, toward States, and toward law.

Mr. Speaker, the problems of the South are caused by people within the South and by people who are out not to help but to hurt the basic cause of civil rights in this country, and I speak of the Communist involvement, but there are other people who also contribute to our travail. These are well-intentioned people who want to help and who in many cases have flooded into our State with a desire to help, but who have only complicated problems which they cannot solve and have hurt rather than helped the cause they seek to serve.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge that the citizens of our land understand the fact that the overwhelming majority of our people are law-abiding people, who want to do what is fair and who want to solve our problems locally with local leadership. We want the basic rights and privileges of all American citizens to be fully shared by people of every race, of every color, and of every creed. To give our citizens reasonable opportunity to work toward this end, I respectfully request that we have a moratorium on demonstrations in Alabama and relief from further invasions by citizens from other States, however well-intentioned, whose actions contribute greatly to the problem.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Negro citizens of Alabama to take a new look at their leadership. I do not know anyone in Alabama who goes into a church and in the pulpit of that church would stand to make obscene remarks and would advocate un-Christian actions. Yet this has happened quite recently in Alabama, and I read from the Birmingham News of March 28 the account of the incident when James Forman, secretary of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee did this. The article states that he has been one of those pressuring King to step more militantly in the integration movement, and I quote:

> And, as if to complement his own radical tact, he often slips off into crude profane language, even obscene.
>
> One speech Forman made at the Beulah Baptist Church in Montgomery is a good example. From the church pulpit, and with white and Negro women and ministers in

> the audience, Forman used a word straight from the back alleys.
>
> If the Negro isn't given his place at the table of democracy with the rest of the American people, Forman shouted, it's time "for us to knock the * * * legs off the table."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not the language of Christian people, it is not the language of the pulpit. This is the language of the gutter. This is not the language which can help our people, nor is this the language of nonviolence. It is not the language of civil rights.

Mr. Speaker, may I quote, if you please, appropriate language for the pulpit, and redemptive and constructive language to meet this problem of human relations in the Deep South:

> The fruit of the spirit is love, joy, peace, long suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance; against such there is no law.

I have found these qualities in the lives of many Negro citizens of Alabama, I have found these qualities in the lives of many Caucasian citizens in my State. I believe that the people of my State, manifesting the spirit that is here described, can work together toward the solution of our problems. But we cannot be aided by leaders who, under the cloak of nonviolence, bring vulgarity and obscenity of action and words into our State and our pulpits, and who would lead our people down the pathway of strife and of hatred.

May I point out that another very outstanding leader, Martin Luther King, has quite recently advocated the boycotting of the entire State of Alabama, the guilty with the innocent, the good with the bad, a boycott of all of our State and of all of our people because of the terrible actions of a vicious minority within our State. He has advocated all Federal aid be withdrawn, and that businesses suffer from a total economic boycott.

Let me point out something: If his desires are carried out by our Government or by business, the people who will suffer the most are the Negroes. We have in our State, for example, $120 million in the budget for the Alabama Department of Pension and Security.

We receive $90 million of Federal funds.

Nearly 49 percent of all persons receiving State welfare aid are Negroes—64 percent of all families receiving aid to dependent children are Negroes. Over 39 percent of the totally and permanently disabled are Negroes.

In Dallas County, for example, 85.2 percent of all persons receiving aid are Negro; 83.3 percent of old-age pensioners are Negroes, 97.4 percent of persons receiving aid to dependent children are Negroes.

There are other counties where this is equally true, and the figures equally high. If Federal funds are removed, this will again take money from the people who need it most. This is also true of employment.

The same leader advocates a business boycott in the steel industry, for instance, in Alabama. In my own district there are more than 5,000 persons of the Negro race employed in the steel industry, earning around $40 million per annum. A boycott against this industry would take the bread from the mouths of their children and would severely damage these people who do have rights, economic rights as well as any other.

When we come to the point of economic rights we have come to the crux of the problem. The South has been poor, relative to the rest of the Nation. The South has been poor, and for this reason the South has not built the schools we should have built for the children of either the Caucasian or Negro race. We have not been able to accomplish all we wanted to accomplish. This is, however, beginning to change. Alabama is undergoing and has undergone an agricultural revolution in which we have become a leading cattle State, in which we have become a leading poultry State, in which we have developed soybeans, peanuts, and other products to replace our corn and cotton economy of a generation ago.

Similarly, we have been going ahead with increased economic opportunities for all our people.

In spite of all the adverse publicity last year was our greatest year in industrial expansion. Much of this new income will go into the hands of Negroes, from which they can enjoy greater advantages and more opportunities. There are more tax funds to build schools, to provide health services for both races. This has been one of our most basic needs—the need for a stronger economy, for more jobs for more of our people, that our people might know a better life economically. On this increased tax base, we can provide better schools and better health facilities, and other government services for all our people.

In view of these things, this leader who would take from this economy would tear down and strike at the heart of that which means most to the progress and advancement of Alabama's Negro citizens.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. I was rather shocked to see in the newspaper the other day that Martin Luther King has determined he is going to descend on the city and county of Mobile, Ala. I understand leaflets urging a boycott and demonstrations are being sent to Mobile, the city in which I live, and which I have the honor to represent.

I want to point out here on the floor of the House how unjustified such acts are.

Mobile, Ala., has had colleges integrated for 15 years. Mobile, Ala., has had a police force integrated as long as I have lived there. Mobile, Ala., has had the buses integrated as long as I can recall. Busdrivers drive all over the town in all neighborhoods. Restroom signs and all these things that separate people have been torn down and moved away. Mobile Negroes have no trouble in voting. If they can walk into the registration office, they can register on the same basis as anyone else. This has been a fine example of what a southern town can do, yet we are told that this is not good enough.

I am happy to be able to say to this Congress today that Mobile, Ala., accomplished all this by communication between the races and without pressure from the outside. We can continue to progress if we are allowed to progress with normal communication between the races.

May I mention one James Hobbs, who happens to be the principal of Camden Academy in Wilcox County, which is also in my district. James Hobbs is the principal of a school containing 1,200 Negro students. His dedication in life is to see that those students are educated and raised to be fine Americans.

James Hobbs has been harassed by one Daniel Harrell, who is listed in the Washington Post this morning as a project director for Dr. Martin Luther King and his Southern Christian Leadership Conference. James Hobbs has been called an "Uncle Tom" because he would not turn his schoolchildren out into the streets during school hours. This did not please the outside agitators, so by putting up a smokescreen on one side of town, they sent others to the school and disrupted the school in trying to get people to come out into the sreets. This is what the colored people of the South have to put up with.

Daniel Harrell is the same person that several weeks ago James Hobbs had to order off the school grounds and call the police to come and get him because he was trying to sell pep pills to the children in the school.

I wrote the President a strong letter the other day and urged him to tell these people to stay out of our State. They have gotten all the headlines they should get. I urged him to tell them to stay out of our State while we try to pick up the pieces and rebuild our communities. I find completely inadequate the letter received from his office today. It indicates that he is not interested in trying to bring harmony back to this troubled land of ours.

I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I have here a communication from the Honorable August E. Johansen, a former Member of Congress, which I ask unanimous consent be included at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. AUGUST E. JOHANSEN, OF WINTER PARK, FLA., FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS (1955–65) FROM MICHIGAN, FORMER MEMBER, HOUSE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE, MARCH 29, 1965

How long will the U.S. mails be immune from the zealot vendettas of Martin Luther King's nonviolent good will?

It is risky to ask the question—lest it be accepted in some quarters as a welcome suggestion for a daring next pressure tactic.

But I take that risk in order to underscore the wicked audacity of King's proposal, yes-

> terday, to invoke economic lynch law against the people of an entire State.
>
> King's program calls for a union ban on transportation of all Alabama products, a nationwide consumers' strike against those products, withdrawal of all Federal funds on deposit in Alabama banks, and a cutoff of all Federal aid to the State and its citizens.
>
> This is a proposal for an unconstitutional, ruthless, indiscriminately disruptive, and punitive action against all of the people of the State, based on the totally un-American premise of mass guilt.
>
> If tolerated with respect to Alabama, it can be expected in every other State; if tolerated in the name of civil rights, it can be invoked in behalf of any other cause; if required of one agency or department of the Federal Government, none is exempt.
>
> If the Treasury Department knuckles under in the matter of Federal deposits in Alabama, why not, next, a demand—and compliance with the demand—that the Post Office Department suspend or curtail its service in Alabama, or elsewhere, until the requirements of King et al., have been completely satisfied?
>
> The powers King would invoke—or require that the Federal Government invoke—either have no beginning or they have no end.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, seldom in world history and never before in the history of this country has there been a precedent for what Alabama has endured in recent months. Many thousands of people have flooded into our State to try to set our house in order. They have broken our laws, defiled our churches, denounced our citizens, littered our streets with whisky bottles, and piously prayed. In all of this, they have apparently enjoyed the blessings and support of our Government. I think the people of Alabama have shown extraordinary strength in enduring this unique ordeal. I think, however, the need is great for us to be delivered from our deliverers. After all, in the last analysis we can only solve our problem by the action of local people. We need to solve our problems in accordance with the Constitution and with the constitutional rights of our State and all its citizens. We need to build on the friendship, the understanding, and the mutual respect between our people. This, I believe to be the only right pathway to peace and to genuine progress for all our citizens.

THE IMPORTANCE OF CLEAN AIR—PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CLEAN AIR ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today for appropriate reference, a bill to amend the Clean Air Act of 1963 which proposes certain measures designed to reduce and eliminate air pollution.

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the contamination of the air we breathe has assumed the proportions of a substantial and critical national problem. This condition is not localized in any one city or in any particular state. Polluted air does not confine its movement within geographic or political boundaries. Smog and other forms of air pollution are no longer indigenous to Los Angeles, or even to a handful of our largest cities. It has pervaded the air, in varying degrees, in nearly every large metropolitan area in our country, and in many of our smaller cities. The problem of air pollution is national in scope and its resolution calls for—indeed demands—a national remedy. There are common sources of air pollution throughout the land which may be controlled only by effective national legislation. Our fresh air supply is one of our most precious, and limited, natural resources. As such, it is deserving of our protection and conservation.

Although air pollution as a serious environmental hazard was unknown in this country prior to the early 1940's, when it began to occur with regularity in Los Angeles, there is reason to believe that men have been fouling the air they breathe for some time. As long ago as the first century, Seneca remarked on "the heavy air of Rome and the stench of its smoky chimneys, of which when stirred poured forth whatever pestilent vapours and soot they held enclosed." In the 14th century, the smoke from coal-burning fireplaces in London probably prompted Shakespeare to let Hamlet exclaim:

> This most excellent canopy, the air * * * appears no other thing to me than a foul and pestilent congregation of vapours.

To Shelley:

> Hell is a city much like London—A populace and smoky city.

Milton's "Paradise Lost" was a "populace city pent, where houses thick and sewers annoy the air."

In recent times in this country we have been so preoccupied with realizing an unprecedented rate of industrial growth that we have largely ignored and neglected the great residue of waste which has been strewn in the wake of industrial progress. Just as the advancement of science and technology has created an abundance of products to be consumed it has also left an abundance of byproducts to be disposed of. The air sheds of our urban industrial areas are in danger of becoming great wastelands. This need not be so. Waste and pollution are not necessary or inevitable prices to pay for the advance of industry. We now have the technological capacity to reduce or eliminate nearly all forms of air pollution. To do so will be a costly project. It will require a limited economic sacrifice on the part of certain industries and additional expenditures by State and municipal authorities throughout the country. And it will require the Federal Government to give meaningful financial and technological assistance to local governments and private industry.

Most of all, the elimination of air pollution will require an increased determination on the part of those citizens most directly affected to cooperate in the resolution of this problem. The inhabitants of our cities must be alerted to the hazards of air pollution and educated to the fact that pollution is not an inevitable part of the air around them. It is now more than a minor irritant and should no longer be tolerated. Those two familiar obstacles to civic improvement, indifference and self-interest, must be overcome. That familiar attitude of despair which finds expression with the question "What can you do?" must be answered "There is much we can do." The time has come to make positive plans and take positive steps to revitalize, to beautify, to humanize our cities. The pall of smoke, the curtain of smog, which hangs over many of our cities much of the time is a blight on their landscape which ought not to be suffered longer.

Continued exposure to the invidious fallout of air pollution may pose a grave risk to human health. Some of the waste substances found in the air of our cities may have lethal effect. It is well documented that only relatively short exposure to a heavy concentration of pollutants will result in a high incidence of illness and death. A 1948 episode of pollution in Donora, Pa., left 20 inhabitants dead and more than 4,000 acutely ill. In 1952, one of London's pea soup smogs accounted for more than 4,000 deaths in a single week. For a period of 1 week in 1953, New York City was enveloped by an inversion of air pollution which resulted in the death of more than 200 inhabitants. And it was not until 9 years later that a statistical study revealed this quiet tragedy.

Aside from the proven effects of an episodic dose of air pollutants, there is much, though not conclusive, evidence that even the concentration of pollution normally found in many of our cities has an adverse effect on health. The incidence of several varieties of upper respiratory and pulmonary disease, ranging from asthma and chronic bronchitis to emphysema and lung cancer, shows a measurable increase under normal pollution conditions.

However, existing research has yet to establish firm and irrefutable evidence of a direct causal relationship between disease and air pollution. Further and more intensified research is required. These efforts will be expensive, but failure to pay the price now may prove more costly later. In 1963, $157 million was appropriated by Congress for mental health research to care for approximately 20 million people. In the field of cancer research, a Federal appropriation of $75 million benefited approximately 1 million patients. Yet only $6 million was allotted to air pollution research to take care of two-thirds of our population—130 million citizens—whose health is endangered by industrial fallout.

It is well established that air pollution is injurious to certain forms of vegetation ranging from spinach to tobacco leaves. Substances such as sulfur dioxide, ozone, and fluorides have caused extensive damage to vegetation. Various sulfur gases react with moisture to form an acidic mist which corrodes metals, rubber, leather, and most other common materials. The estimated annual cost to the Nation of all property damage resulting from air pollution is over $11 billion.

As a result of our research efforts, we have identified most of the air-polluting agents and the sources from which they originate. The factors which contribute to air pollution, of course, vary from place to place. In some degree, however, the automobile is a contributing factor nearly everywhere. The hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, and nitrogen oxides which are emitted from its crankcase and exhaust systems react with sunlight and other chemicals to form the so-called photochemical smog which is so acute in Los Angeles. Sulfur oxides which emanate from the combustion of sulfur-containing fuels, such as coal and residual fuel oil, are major contributors to pollution in many communities. The disposal of solid wastes by burning is a common practice throughout the country.

II. PRIOR LEGISLATION

A. FEDERAL

The first identifiable Federal program in air pollution came with the enactment of the Air Pollution Control Act of 1955. That act authorized a program of research and technical assistance by the Federal Government to State and local air pollution control agencies, with modest provisions for Federal grants to assist them in formulating and conducting research programs. In this legislation, Congress expressed for the first time its basic policy which has thereafter guided the Federal-State relationship in the area of air pollution: The primary responsibility for regulatory control rests with the State and local governments, and the Federal role is to support them with financial and technical assistance and training.

Next came a 1960 amendment to the Air Pollution Control Act which directed the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service to study and report to Congress on the effect of motor vehicle exhaust on human health. The Surgeon General's report was published in June of 1962.

The currently effective legislation, the Clean Air Act, was enacted in December 1963, as an amendment to the 1955 act. Basically, it provides for grants to local and interstate air pollution control agencies in amounts up to two-thirds and three-fourths, respectively, of the costs of developing air pollution control programs, for the abatement of air pollution under certain circumstances, and for the encouragement of efforts to eliminate automobile exhaust emissions.

With the enactment of the 1955 act, the Public Health Service began its work in air pollution by establishing two programs. One was an engineering air pollution program which undertook research to inquire into the sources and control of air pollutants. Laboratory facilities for this work were established at the Robert A. Taft Sanitary Engineering Center in Cincinnati. The other program dealt with medical air pollution and was established for the purpose of evaluating the effect of air pollution on health. In 1960, the two programs were combined under the auspices of the new Division of Air Pollution in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

In carrying out its program, the Division of Air Pollution has been faithful to the legislative mandate that the primary responsibility for the regulation of air pollution rests with the State and local governments and that the Federal role should be a supporting one. In the area of research, the Public Health Service has studied the nature and control of automotive crankcase and exhaust emissions, the incineration of solid wastes, meteorological conditions affecting air pollution and biomedical studies of the effect of air pollution on health. A national air monitoring network consisting of approximately 250 stations has been established to provide data on air pollutants in both urban and nonurban areas in every State. A training program has been established at the Taft Laboratory to afford State and local air pollution control personnel the benefit of the Federal research findings.

B. STATE

State and local regulation of air pollution control, as might be expected, varies considerably. Thirty-three States and territories have enacted some type of air pollution control legislation, while 18 have not. Of those which have programs, 15 have some control authority, 12 operate under local option legislation, and 6 provide only research and technical assistance. Only a few of the States have adequately assumed their responsibility to control air pollution at its source.

Only about one-third of the States spends as much as $5,000 per year on air pollution programs. The California program alone accounts for more than one-half of the total State expenditures. The per capita expenditure in Los Angeles is about 57 cents, whereas less than 10 cents per capita is spent in New York City.

California, because of the acute smog problem in Los Angeles, has taken the lead in establishing an extensive program of regulation and control. Under California's program, the State authority has jurisdiction over motor vehicle emissions, and local air pollution control districts, covering regional air sheds, are authorized to deal with air pollution from all other sources. All new cars registered in California beginning with the 1966 models must be equipped with crankcase and exhaust control devices or otherwise meet California's automotive emission standards. And, beginning in January of this year, all used cars in California are required to be equipped with crankcase emission control devices. The Los Angeles district's control program features a permit system which requires the builder of any facility capable of emitting air contaminants to obtain a permit from the district's engineers prior to construction. Following construction, the builder must obtain another permit by showing that the operation of the facility will not violate the district's air pollution requirements. Another rule adopted in Los Angeles prohibits the use of sulfur-bearing fuel oils during a 7-month period of each year. For the remaining 5 months, fuel oil burning is permitted only on days when a supply of natural gas is unavailable.

New York State has legislation which required all new cars sold there beginning with the 1963 models to be equipped with crankcase emission control systems sufficient to meet certain prescribed standards. New York and New Jersey, having contiguous metropolitan and industrial areas, are now conducting an air pollution control program on an interstate basis. This is the only interstate air pollution control program currently in operation. This approach is commendable, since local governments having a common air shed can deal most effectively with the problem on a regional basis. Only by means of uniform regulation and enforcement can sources of air pollution be effectively controlled within an area encompassing the jurisdictions of several local governments. Under the Clean Air Act, the Federal Government has encouraged interstate compacts to deal with air pollution by providing an additional financial inducement for regional control programs.

III. PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The provisions of the Clean Air Act were predicated upon the assumption that there were no technological answers to many of the recognized air pollution problems. Thus, it treated the problems on a rather modest scale and provided for additional, more intensified research. Since that time, our research has shown that technological means are now available to control some of the most pernicious sources of air pollution and that failure to act quickly may pose a serious threat to human health. Therefore, it is clear to me that new legislation is required to supplement and extend the policy of the Clean Air Act.

Senator MUSKIE, whose Special Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution conducted extensive hearings throughout the country last year, apparently shares this view for he recently introduced a bill in the Senate to amend the Clean Air Act, and was joined by 19 of his colleagues. An identical bill was subsequently introduced in the House. I endorse the objectives of these measures. They supplement the existing legislation in a meaningful way. However, I feel certain aspects of air pollution control require different or more extensive treatment. The bill which I introduce here today incorporates most of the substantive provisions of Senator MUSKIE's proposed legislation. It would adopt a national standard for reducing or eliminating the emission of air pollutants from gasoline powered vehicles, it would authorize grants to municipalities and air pollution control agencies for the acquisition, construction, or installation of devices or facilities designed to reduce or eliminate air pollution resulting from the disposal of solid wastes, and it would provide for the accelerated research programs which Senator MUSKIE proposes. The bill would go beyond the Muskie bill by affording private industry a financial inducement to control the emission of air pollutants from solid waste disposal facilities by amending the Internal Revenue Code to permit expenditures to be deducted and an increased investment credit to be taken for the acquisition, construction, or installation of water and air pollution control devices. It would also direct the Surgeon General to study and report to Congress the effect of air pollution from all sources on human health, and in particular whether it has a causal relationship to lung cancer.

A. AUTOMOTIVE EMISSIONS

First. National standard for emissions: The most significant and far reaching proposal advanced by Senator MUSKIE's bill, with which I substantially agree, would prescribe a national standard for allowable emissions of pollutants from gasoline powered vehicles. The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would be directed to prescribe these standards adopted by California and publish them in the Federal Register. Thus, section 6—which relates to automotive vehicle and fuel pollution—of the Clean Air Act would be amended to provide that within 1 year after the enactment of the amendment crankcase emissions must be limited to 0.15 percent hydrocarbons by weight of the supplied fuel, and that after November 1, 1967 allowable exhaust emissions must be limited to 275 parts hydrocarbons per million and 1.5 percent carbon monoxide by volume, as measured by nondispersive infrared spectrometers.

Prescribing and enforcing a national standard for automotive pollutant emissions is to me the single most effective method of controlling air pollution on a national level. The automobile is truly a creature of interstate commerce and should be subjected to Federal regulation for the purpose of eliminating it as a source of air pollution. Even though many rural areas of our country do not require protection from automotive emissions, it is nonetheless appropriate to construct a national standard because of the great mobility of our population. Automobiles originally destined for rural areas may find their way into many urban areas during their useful lives.

The California standard is a particularly appropriate one for national adoption since the automobile industry is already required by the laws of that State to meet those specifications with respect to all new cars beginning with the 1966 models. It is apparent from the testimony of industry representatives before the Muskie subcommittee that the industry does not intend to equip cars for distribution on a nationwide basis which would meet the California specifications. The industry reasoned that it would impose an economic burden on the rest of the country to charge the consumer for the cost of equipping new cars with exhaust control components. However, since that time the industry has reportedly perfected engine modifications which would not require additional equipment for the control of exhaust emissions. The engine modification adopted by one manufacturer has already demonstrated its ability to comply with the California standards and has been approved for the installation on 1966 models manufactured for sale in California. It is entirely proper—and indeed imperative—that the rest of the country be given the benefit of a design improvement intended for California.

The State air pollution control authority of California recently revised the motor vehicle emission standards to reduce the allowable hydrocarbons to 180 parts per million by volume—compared with the current limit of 275 parts per million—and to reduce the allowable carbon monoxide to 1 percent by volume—compared to the current limit of 1.5 percent. These more restrictive standards are to become effective January 1, 1970. California also adopted more stringent standards, effective last October, for crankcase emissions: 0.1 percent hydrocarbons by weight of supplied fuel, as compared to the previous limit of 0.15 percent. Although the Muskie bill adopts the previous California standard for crankcase emissions, I have conformed my bill to meet California's current standard.

The domestic automobile industry voluntarily installed crankcase blowby devices beginning with the 1963 models. Since that time, some of the factory-installed devices have experienced operational difficulties. One of the domestic manufacturers ceased to install these devices on 1964 and 1965 models except for those manufactured for sale in the regulated States of California and New York. The unsatisfactory operation of some of these devices appears to stem largely from inadequate maintenance and servicing. The solution seems to be one of educating the car owner and service man as to the nature and requirements of these devices.

Adoption of a national standard should bring noticeable relief, though in varying degrees, to most of our country's metropolitan areas. It has been estimated that the automobile is responsible for approximately 75 percent of the air pollution in Los Angeles and approximately 40 percent in New York City. The primary ingredients of that phenomenon known as photochemical smog, which is so acute in Los Angeles, are traceable to automotive emissions. The hydrocarbons and oxides of nitrogen which are discharged from the crankcase and exhaust systems of automobiles react in the presence of sunshine to form that familiar, irritating haze. Due to the unique meteorological condition of Los Angeles—a basin surrounded by foothills where the prevailing winds are never strong—pollutants emitted from automobiles and other sources are trapped beneath a layer of warm air whenever a thermal inversion occurs. Thus, the term "smog" is very misleading since it cannot be explained as simply a combination of smoke and fog.

California's automotive emission standards are designed primarily to limit the discharge of hydocarbons and carbon monoxide. Neither these standards nor the engine modifications and control devices manufactured to comply with them are designed to reduce emissions of oxides of nitrogen. In fact, until recently, there has been little research with respect to nitrogen oxides. This raises the possibility that the anticipated large increases in vehicle population will correspondingly increase the hydrocarbons and nitrogen oxides emissions to a level incapable of being controlled by the existing devices unless steps are taken to reduce the emission of nitrogen oxides. Furthermore, some studies indicate that reducing the emissions of hydrocarbons will proportionately increase the emissions of nitrogen oxides.

Second. Research on nitrogen oxide emissions: With this in mind, the Muskie bill would amend section 3 of the Clean Air Act which relates to research, investigations, and training to direct the Secretary to conduct and accelerate research programs relating to the control of hydrocarbon emissions from the evaporation of gasoline in carburetors and fuel tanks, and the control of emissions of oxides of nitrogen and aldehydes from gasoline or diesel powered vehicles. I subscribe to this provision, while adding appropriate language to make it clear that the Secretary is empowered to initiate, as well as conduct, and accelerate, such research programs and that they should examine means of controlling nitrogen oxides and aldehydes emissions by modifying engine designs as well as by installing control devices.

Third. Diesel emissions: The Muskie bill would further amend section 6 by requiring the Secretary to establish criteria for allowable emissions from diesel powered vehicles manufactured or imported for distribution in interstate commerce. Once he establishes such criteria, the Secretary is required to make any necessary recommendations for additional legislation to regulate the discharge of pollutants from diesel powered vehicles. This provision also appears in the bill which I introduce. My bill, by an amendment to section 3, would better prepare the Secretary to establish criteria by instructing him to initiate, conduct, and accelerate research programs relating to diesel powered vehicles for the purpose of reducing or eliminating emissions of hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, oxides of nitrogen, aldehydes, and sulfur dioxide.

Comparatively little is known about the concentration or effect of emissions from diesel-powered vehicles. It has been generally assumed that because of their small number as compared to automobiles they are not a major contributor to air pollution. The latest surveys indicate that there is now only about 1 diesel vehicle for every 300 gasoline vehicles. However, large numbers of diesel vehicles are typically found in relatively small areas in our major cities. Thus, they may contribute quite heavily to the air pollution in certain localities. Moreover, we can probably expect an increasing number of diesel vehicles on the streets of our cities with the development of more efficient systems of mass transportation.

It is generally agreed that a well-designed diesel engine, in good repair, and using the proper fuel, will not emit visible smoke. However, most diesel vehicles are underpowered and do not have a chemically correct air-fuel ratio. The pollutants emitted from diesel exhaust consist primarily of carbon monoxide, hydrocarbons, aldehydes, oxides of nitrogen and sulfur dioxide. Of these, the aldehydes and sulfur dioxides are the major contributors to the noxious odor usually associated with diesel vehicles.

More research is required in this area. Recent studies have shown that the use of catalytic afterburners may control diesel smoke and odor to a certain extent. There has also been experimentation with fuel additives for the reduction of smoke.

Fourth. Exhaust devices for Federal vehicles: In a separate bill, Senator MUSKIE proposes an additional amendment to section 6 which would provide that no appropriation made in any act of Congress after July 1, 1965 shall be available for the purchase of any automotive vehicle by any of the Government departments unless the vehicle is equipped with an exhaust control device which meets the standards established by the Secretary. I have included the substance of this provision in the bill which I introduce, with changes in language to limit its provision to any new gasoline-powered vehicle. The Muskie bill provision conceivably could apply to any new or used gasoline- or diesel-powered vehicle. Since no criteria have been established to limit emissions from diesel vehicles, it would be inappropriate to require that diesel vehicles be equipped with exhaust devices beginning July 1, 1965. Government-owned diesel vehicles, however, should be required to be equipped with control devices as soon as emission standards have been adopted and devices approved.

Under California law, used cars manufactured from 1950 through 1960 which are registered in the 13 more populated counties were required to be equipped with crankcase control devices last year. This year, the remaining passenger vehicles must be so equipped. Since its program was initiated, California has experienced many difficulties with the operation of these devices. In some cases, they have not been correctly installed and in other cases they have been inadequately maintained. Inspection and enforcement have been real problems. For these reasons, I believe it desirable not to require nationwide installation of control devices on used cars at this time, even though an immediate application of the same standards to new and used cars would be the quickest and most effective way to eliminate air pollutants traceable to automobiles.

Fifth. Emission standards for imported vehicles: Both the Muskie bill and the one which I propose would direct the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of the Treasury to jointly promulgate rules and regulations to prohibit the importation of any gasoline-powered vehicle which fails to meet the standards applicable to domestically manufactured vehicles. It should be determined whether, as a general rule, imported vehicles emit pollutants to the same extent as domestic vehicles. If so, we should find out whether foreign manufacturers are actively engaged in developing devices or engine modifications which would control the emission of pollutants. If their control programs are at an early stage, we should perhaps give them a period of grace before requiring them to meet the standards applicable to domestic manufacturers, unless the Secretary determines that emissions from imported vehicles present an immediate and critical problem.

Sixth. Penalty for violation: Both the Muskie bill and my bill provide that the manufacture for distribution in commerce or the importation of any gasoline powered vehicle, after the effective date of standards prescribed by the Secretary, which does not meet those standards is unlawful. Senator MUSKIE's bill provides that whoever violates such standards or regulations prescribed thereunder shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned not more than 6 months, or both. As drafted, this provision could be read to subject an automobile manufacturer who violated the emission standards to only one fine of $1,000 regardless of how many substandard automobiles he distributed in interstate commerce. If this were so, a manufacturer might well elect to incur a $1,000 penalty rather than equip his automobiles as the act requires. To avoid such an interpretation, the bill which I introduce provides that each gasoline powered vehicle manufactured and distributed or imported in violation of the applicable emission standards shall constitute a separate offense.

Seventh. Inspection and maintenance of control devices: Another amendment to section 6 which is proposed by Senator MUSKIE's bill provides that it is the policy of the United States to insure the proper inspection and maintenance of the devices and other means required to meet the prescribed emission standards. To accomplish this purpose, the Muskie bill authorizes the Secretary to enter into agreements with, and to make grants to, appropriate State agencies designated by the respective Governors. An interstate air pollution control agency may qualify for a grant if one State having jurisdiction of such agency enters into an agreement with the Secretary. The sums appropriated for grants under this subsection are to be allotted by the Secretary to States entering into agreements in the proportion that the number of gasoline-powered vehicles registered in the year of appropriation in each State bears to the total number of such vehicles in all agreeing States for the year in question. By amending section 13 of the act—which relates to appropriations—the Muskie bill would authorize $25 million to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, for the establishment of inspection programs.

I am in general agreement that the Federal Government should assist the States in conducting inspection and maintenance programs for this purpose. I would also permit Federal funds to be granted to States to insure the proper measurement of automobile emissions. With the exception of California, the States are not equipped to inspect the installation and maintenance of control devices or engine modifications, and may not have available proper instruments for the measurement of auto emissions. My bill would also differ slightly from Senator MUSKIE's in that it would authorize $15 million to be appropriated for this purpose during both the 1966 and 1967 fiscal years.

B. SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

Another source of air pollution which is common to nearly every city in our country is the emissions from solid waste disposal facilities. Most municipalities, particularly the larger ones, dispose of refuse by burning it in large incinerators. Industrial plants, office buildings, and apartment houses also frequently incinerate their refuse themselves rather than have it collected by municipal authorities. Unfortunately, a good many of the local government and private waste disposal facilities pollute the air while disposing of the waste produced by our cities and industries.

Open burning of refuse is still permitted by many communities. Even where incinerators are required, few cities require the installation of air pollution control devices, and those which do often fail to regulate their operation and maintenance.

There are nearly 20,000 incinerators in New York City alone, most of which are found in apartment houses and office buildings, and which contribute daily to a heavy fallout of soot and fly ash. In addition to waste disposal facilities, many municipalities and public utilities operate heat and power generating plants which are a constant source of air pollution.

Our technology has progressed to the point where we have now developed devices and equipment capable of eliminating a very high percentage of the pollutants discharged from incinerators and powerplants. One of the most effective of these devices is the electrostatic precipitator. By means of an electrical discharge, these devices separate and collect suspended particles from combustion gases. A number of mechanical collectors and scrubbers have also been developed which separate particulates from gaseous matter. A variety of these devices is on the market. Unfortunately, their introduction has been greeted with a general lack of enthusiasm because of their high cost. The cost of an effective device to eliminate air pollutants from gas or smokestacks of steel mills, for instance, may range anywhere from $500,000 to $3 million per stack. Control devices for even small incinerators are very expensive. In fact, the cost of some of these devices may well exceed the value of the plants or buildings on which they would be installed. In view of the high costs involved, Federal assistance to local governments and private industry is clearly required.

First. Grants to municipalities: Senator MUSKIE's bill would provide Federal assistance to municipalities in this area by amending section 4 of the Clean Air Act—which relates to grants for support of air pollution control programs—to authorize the Secretary to grant to municipalities up to two-thirds of the cost of constructing facilities designed to eliminate air pollution resulting from the disposal of solid wastes. Under this provision, no grant would be made to any municipality which did not prohibit open burning of solid wastes. In addition, the applicant for a grant would have to satisfy the Secretary that the facility would be properly and efficiently operated and maintained after its construction. One hundred million dollars would be appropriated for the making of such grants during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and identical sums would be appropriated for the next 2 succeeding fiscal years. No grant could be made for any one project in an amount exceeding 5 percent of the total appropriation in any 1 fiscal year.

With certain refinements, I have included this provision in the bill which I introduced. As drafted by Senator MUSKIE and his colleagues, the grants to municipalities would cover only the construction of facilities designed to eliminate air pollution resulting from the disposal of solid wastes. The bill which I introduce would authorize the Secretary to make grants for the acquisition and installation, as well as the construction, of both facilities and devices designed to reduce or eliminate air pollution resulting from both the disposal of solid wastes and the generation of heat and power. In most cases, I would imagine that municipal governments would be in the position of purchasing and installing, rather than constructing, air pollution control equipment. This equipment might be in the form of a portable device or a more permanent fixture. As I noted earlier, heat and power plants operated by municipalities, as well as solid waste disposal facilities, frequently contribute to air pollution and should also be equipped with control devices with the aid of Federal grants.

Second. Tax incentives to private industry: Municipally owned solid waste disposal facilities and heat and power plants are not the only facilities and plants which contribute to air pollution and which should receive some form of Federal assistance for its control. Private industry and individuals are often financially unable to purchase the equipment necessary to reduce or eliminate air pollution emanating from their plants or buildings, although they would otherwise be willing to cooperate in a control program. The Federal Government should seek to provide an incentive to the private sector in the form of affording a substantial tax benefit to those who would acquire, construct, or install certified air pollution control devices. The same treatment should apply with respect to water pollution control devices. To accomplish this purpose, the bill which I introduce includes a provision amending the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 by adding a new section 183 relating to expenditures for the acquisition, construction, or installation of water and air pollution control devices.

Under this proposed amendment, the taxpayer could elect to treat expenditures paid or incurred by him during the taxable year in connection with his trade or business for the acquisition, construction, or installation of any certified air or water pollution control device as a deductible expense.

The taxpayer could elect to treat such expenditures as having been paid or incurred in any of the 3 taxable years preceding, or in any of the 5 taxable years following, the taxable year in which such expenses were paid or incurred. A deduction with respect to any air or water pollution control device would not be allowed unless the State or interstate air pollution control agency had certified to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare that such device had been acquired, constructed, or installed in conformity with State requirements. The Secretary would then be required to certify to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate that the device was beneficial to the control of air or water pollution and in furtherance of the general policy of the United States of cooperating with the States in the reduction and elimination of such pollution.

The amendment would further provide that if the taxpayer realizes any income from the operation of any certified air or water pollution control device, through the recovery and profitable utilization of wastes or otherwise, his allowable deduction would be reduced. This limitation is appropriate since some of the latest methods of eliminating sulfurous emissions from stack gases show promise of yielding an economic return in the form of the recovery of marketable sulfur and sulfuric acid. In addition, if the taxpayer had taken a depreciation deduction under section 167 with respect to air or water pollution control device expenses, the deduction available under the new section 183 would be likewise appropriately reduced.

As an additional tax incentive, my bill also includes an amendment to section 46 of the Internal Revenue Code which would increase the amount of investment credit available for devices and facilities to control water and air pollution from 7 percent to 14 percent. The increased investment credit would be available for any device, facility, machinery or equipment used to reduce or eliminate air pollution by removing, altering, or disposing of air pollutants resulting from or affecting the taxpayer's trade or business. Senator RIBICOFF, joined by 11 of his colleagues in the Senate, introduced a similar amendment to section 46 last year, as part of the Revenue Act of 1964, which was not enacted. His bill, however, differed from mine in that it confined the additional investment credit to facilities or equipment used to control air pollution resulting from any type of manufacturing or mining process. As such, it would not have covered investment in devices for the control of air pollution resulting from other kinds of businesses.

Third. Research of collection and disposal methods: There is a need not only for the control of pollutants discharged from the combustion of solid wastes, but for further research in the general area of methods of collecting and disposing of municipal solid wastes. Nearly 520 million pounds of refuse must be dispose of in our urban areas every day of the year. With a large increase in our population anticipated, greater attention must be given to developing efficient and low-cost techniques of collection and disposal.

Disposing of solid wastes in sanitary landfills, of course, does not create an air pollution problem from combustion. However, most of our large urban areas do not have contiguous land areas sufficient to accommodate the disposal of wastes by this method. Composting, central grinding, distillation, wet incineration, and oxidation are other methods which merit further investigation. Thought should also be given to the development of more efficient collection techniques. It may be desirable in some communities for the municipal authorities to assume the entire burden of waste collection, rather than relying on private on-site incineration.

With this in mind, I propose to amend section 3 of the Clean Air Act by directing the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to initiate, conduct, and accelerate research programs designed to develop efficient and low-cost methods of collecting and disposing of municipal solid wastes. To carry out this research program, the Secretary shall appoint a technical committee consisting of representatives from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Public Health Service, and municipal solid waste collection and disposal agencies. The committee would meet from time to time to evaluate progress in the development of new techniques of collection and disposal, to recommend programs which would utilize these techniques, to inform and advise municipal solid waste authorities of any such recommendations, and to suggest additional legislation, if necessary.

C. SULFUR-CONTAINING FUELS

Another source of air pollution which exists on the national scene is coal and sulfur-bearing fuel oil. These fuels are burned in industrial facilities, powerplants, and private homes throughout the country. The gaseous sulfur oxides which emanate from the combustion of these fuels contribute heavily to the air pollution in many communities. These gases have a demonstrable adverse effect on human health and many forms of plant life and react to corrode certain metals and other materials. High concentrations of sulfurous gases were responsible for the severe air pollution episodes which caused sickness and death in Donora, Pa., and London, England. Since the consumption of coal and residual fuel oil is expected to double during the next 15 years, there is an urgent need for prompt and effective action to reduce the emission of sulfur gases in every section of our country.

Basically, there are two ways of eliminating harmful sulfurous emissions: Desulfurizing the fuel before it is burned or removing the sulfur gases from gas stacks upon its combustion. In the long run, the more desirable method would seem to be to eliminate air pollution at its ultimate source by extracting the offending sulfur compounds from coal and fuel oil. Research conducted to date makes it clear that there are technically feasible methods of removing sulfur from fuel oil. However, the fuel industry has not adopted these methods because of their relatively high cost. Representatives of the industry have testified that the removal of sulfur would price their residual fuel oil out of the market, to the advantage of oil imported from Venezuela. Processing fuel oil to remove sulfur by use of the methods presently known would allegedly increase the cost per barrel more than it could be sold for in competition with imported oil.

The ultimate solution may be to require use of natural gas or nuclear energy instead of sulfur-bearing fuel. However, natural gas is in limited supply in many areas and the development of atomic powerplants is still years in the future. The best alternative would be to undertake a concerted effort for the development of a low-cost method of removing sulfur from coal and fuel oil. In the meantime, the Federal Government should encourage the installation of control devices on smoke and gas stacks by means of the grants to municipalities and tax incentives to private industry which my bill would provide.

The Muskie bill would amend section 3 of the Clean Air Act by requiring the Secretary to appoint a technical committee composed of representatives from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Bureau of Mines, the Federal Power Commission, and the coal, petroleum, and electric power industries for the purpose of encouraging the development of improved low-cost techniques of reducing emissions of sulfur oxides produced by the combustion of sulfur-containing fuels. The committee would report on the progress of research developments and make any necessary recommendations for legislation.

The corresponding provision of the bill I introduce would include representatives of the Atomic Energy Commission and the natural gas and atomic power industries on the technical committee. The purpose of the committee would include encouraging and accelerating the development of improved low-cost techniques designed to remove sulfur from sulfur-bearing fuels, as well as to reduce sulphur oxide emissions produced by the combustion of such fuels. I would also charge the committee with conducting research programs relating to the feasibility of increasing the use of natural gas, electric power, and atomic power as a source of fuel and energy.

D. JET AND MISSILE EMISSIONS, FEDERAL AIR POLLUTION CONTROL LABORATORY, AND POLICY PROMOTION

The bill which I introduce would amend section 3 by directing the Secretary to initiate, conduct, and accelerate research programs with a view toward reducing or eliminating pollutants emitted from jet aircraft and missiles and from fuels used to power them. To carry out this research, the Secretary would be directed to appoint a technical committee consisting of representatives from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Defense, the FAA, the NASA, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Department of Commerce, the jet aircraft and missile industries, and the affected fuel manufacturers.

Recent evidence indicates that emissions from jet aircraft and missiles contribute very little to the general pollution of the air. However, there is some indication that jet emissions do contribute significantly to pollution in the immediate vicinity of jet airports. A continued increase in the number of jet aircraft could result in a corresponding increase of air pollution. Moreover, the use and testing of missile fuels also represents a potential hazard to public health and welfare. Therefore, before these potential hazards become actual ones, studies should be made of ways and means of eliminating polluting emissions from jet aircraft and missiles and from the fuels which power them.

Both my bill and Senator **MUSKIE'S** provide for the establishment of a Federal Air Pollution Control Laboratory to conduct such phases of the national research and development program for the prevention and control of air pollution as the Secretary deems appropriate. At present, the Federal Government lacks adequate facilities to carry out the research and development programs required by the Clean Air Act. There is a pressing need for a fully equipped laboratory where a whole range of unanswered questions could be looked into and findings made available to both local government and private industry.

My bill would further amend section 3 by directing the Secretary to encourage and promote the policy and provisions of the Clean Air Act by initiating and carrying out a program designed to educate State and local government and the general public about the air pollution control policies of the Federal Government. This program would inform and advise eligible municipalities and air pollution control agencies of the availability of Federal grants, and would inform the business community of the income tax benefits which could be realized in connection with the acquisition, construction, or installation of air pollution control devices. The policies of the Federal Government in the area of air pollution control can be fully realized only when the potential recipients of Federal assistance, as well as the potential subjects of Federal enforcement, are made aware of those policies. Until the public interest can be stimulated and its opinion enlisted in support of air pollution control, our objectives, however else well conceived, will go unrealized.

E. STUDY AND REPORT OF SURGEON GENERAL

It is becoming increasingly evident that air pollution is a very real hazard to human health. This is the case not only when the concentration of air pollutants reaches an episodic level, but during periods when air contamination is no more than average. Many physicians are convinced that prolonged exposure to even a so-called normal amount of air pollution is sufficient to adversely affect the health of many of those exposed. The abnormally high incidence of certain types of disease which is typically found in areas of air pollution is difficult to attribute to any other cause.

There is strong evidence that air pollution is associated with a number of respiratory ailments including chronic bronchitis, bronchial asthma, emphysema, and lung cancer. The relationship between these diseases and air pollution has been studied in basically three ways. Experimental conditions have been established in which mice and other animals have been subjected to various air pollutants thought to cause disease. Much information has come from actual clinical experience involving the treatment of patients whose diseases are sensitive to air pollution. A third approach involves the study of statistical data to determine the correlation between physical disorders and atmospheric conditions. Mortality and morbidity surveys have been employed to determine the effect of air pollution on death and disease. The incidence of disease in highly polluted areas has been carefully studied.

Nearly 10 percent of all deaths in Great Britain are officially attributed to chronic bronchitis. Many studies there have shown positive connections between air pollution and the occurrence, severity, and aggravation of this disease. Chronic bronchitis is not a well recognized cause of death in the United States, probably because of differences in definitions and terminology. One investigation, using the British criteria, found chronic bronchitis in 21 percent of men in this country from 40 to 59 years of age.

Bronchial asthma is another condition which most physicians believe is definitely aggravated by air pollution. Sulfur dioxide has been found to stimulate asthmatic attacks. In New Orleans, asthma patients have suffered epidemic attacks on occasions when air pollution resulting from open burning in city dumps has been concentrated.

Pulmonary emphysema is a disease in which the fine air sacs of the lung become abnormally stretched, resulting in an impairment of lung function. Emphysema often results from chronic bronchitis and bronchial asthma. People suffering from advanced emphysema are extremely sensitive to smoking and air pollution, so that any additional obstruction in the respiratory mechanism can actually precipitate heart failure. In fact, many of the deaths officially attributed to heart failure are actually brought about by emphysema. In California, between 1950 and 1960, emphysema as a cause of death increased about 400 percent. A corresponding increase has been noted throughout the country. The Social Security Administration reports that for 1960 the second largest group of patients who were given total disability were people with emphysema. Between 1958 and 1960, the percentage of people receiving social security disability because of emphysema doubled. Various studies have concluded that emphysema is definitely aggravated by air pollution. A recent study showed a 26-percent reduction in the diffusing capacity of the lungs after a 2-hour exposure to an abnormally high concentration of ozone, an atmospheric agent activated by automotive emissions.

Perhaps the most ominous finding revealed by recent research efforts is a correlation between the incidence of lung cancer and air pollution. Statistical evidence shows that the lung cancer rate is appreciably higher in cities. This cannot be fully explained by other recognizable factors, such as smoking and occupation. A number of studies have shown that a change in air environment can affect one's chances of getting lung cancer. One recent experiment demonstrated that mice which had recovered from induced influenza developed lung cancer after inhaling ozonized gasoline, a substance quite similar to photochemical smog. Similar mice which did not inhale the ozonized gasoline did not develop cancer, nor did those which were exposed to ozonized gasoline but had not had influenza.

According to some estimate, the mortality rate from lung cancer has increased about 30 times since 1900. The death rate from lung cancer is consistently higher in urban areas than in rural areas. There is a high statistical association between lung cancer and both smoking habits and air pollution. Certain cancer-producing substances, such as benzpyrene, are common to both cigarette smoke and polluted air. It is generally agreed among those involved in this area of research that air pollution is probably a significant causal factor of lung cancer, but not as great a factor as smoking.

It must be conceded, however, that some research studies fail to find a definite causal relationship between air pollution and pulmonary disease, including lung cancer. Some of the findings are inconsistent. Most researchers would admit that more time and intensified effort is needed before firm evidence or definitive answers can be found.

In 1962, the Surgeon General reported on the results of a study which Congress directed him to conduct of the effect on human health of automotive emissions. His report was thorough and informative, but conceded that "the time available for actual studies related to the biological effects of contaminants has been limited, and at this moment only preliminary study results are in hand." However, on the basis of these preliminary results, the Surgeon General concluded:

> It is evident that components of automobile emissions produce biological effects. These include human eye irritations, changes in pulmonary function and reduction of spontaneous activity in animals, as well as damage to vegetation.
>
> In addition, available statistical evidence also suggests possible relationships between illness and photochemical smog * * *. Furthermore, the evidence with respect to the production of lung cancers is such as to require further study as expeditiously as feasible.

It is clear that a renewed and intensified research effort is called for. There have been many developments since the Surgeon General's report which may shed further light on the causal relationships between automotive emissions and various forms of disease. Moreover, the Surgeon General's study only covered polluting agents emitted from automobiles. There are several pollutants thought to adversely affect human health that originate from other sources. For instance, sulfur dioxide emitted from the combustion of coal and fuel oils is highly suspect as a factor in human illness. Persons already suffering from pulmonary afflictions are especially sensitive to sulfur dioxide and sulphuric acid mists. Atmospheric levels of these substances which produce no apparent change in normal persons are capable of producing a severe worsening of pulmonary disease in individuals whose lungs are already compromised. A definitive study of the adverse health effects of sulfur compounds is clearly required.

The Surgeon General, with the aid of a distinguished advisory committee, recently performed an invaluable public service by alerting the public of the effect which smoking has on human health, especially lung cancer. The Surgeon General can perform a service of similar magnitude by studying and reporting on the effect of all forms of air pollution on human health. The inhalation of polluted air may be as significant a factor in producing lung cancer as the inhalation of cigarette smoke. There is this difference, however: Those who smoke assume the risk of doing so; those who breathe polluted air have no choice.

With these considerations in mind, the bill which I introduce would amend the Clean Air Act by directing the Surgeon General to conduct a thorough study for the purpose of determining the effects of air pollutants from all sources on human health. His study would seek to determine, among other things, whether a causal relationship exists between air pollution and lung cancer. To assist him in conducting his study, the Surgeon General would be authorized to appoint an advisory committee composed of professional and technical members of proven ability. As soon as practicable, but not later than 2 years after the amendment is enacted, the Surgeon General is to report to Congress on the results of his study and to make any recommendations which he deems necessary to protect the public health.

It may be many years before firm and irrefutable evidence confirms the probability that air pollution is a serious threat to human health. We cannot afford to wait that long. The appropriate resources of the Federal Government must be enlisted in the fight to eradicate every source of air pollution. The future good health of our country may depend upon our swift and forceful action. I therefore urge the enactment of the bill which I introduce to amend the Clean Air Act.

INDEPENDENCE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BYRNE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in August of last year, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed Public Law 88-477 which authorized the acquisition and inclusion in the Independence National Historical Park, the site where Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence at Seventh and Market Streets, Philadelphia, Pa. The law allocated $200,000 for the purchase of the ground. I was privileged to have sponsored this bill and I am happy to make this progress report which indicates that the Spirit of '76 of "citizens' action" is as strong today as it was when this, "the greatest declaration of man," was written. A group of nationally distinguished citizens have formed the Declaration of Independence House & Library, Inc., to raise the funds necessary for the reproduction of the house and its contents.

The following individuals comprise its officers and board of directors:

OFFICERS

The Honorable Edwin O. Lewis, president.

The Honorable Albert M. Greenfield, chairman, Committee of '76.

Casimir A. Sienkiewicz, vice president.

Earl K. Mueller, treasurer.

Kenneth G. Smith, Sr., secretary.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Samuel J. Cohen, Thomas Graham, Edward Hopkinson, Jr., Esq., J. P. Hansen, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Edward T. Hughes, Charles E. Ingersoll, Thomas F. Joyce, Bernard Litvak, Mrs. Mary G. Roebling, Stuart T. Saunders, the Honorable Harold D. Saylor, Samuel B. Sturgis, M.D., Gen. Thomas R. White, Jr.

Ever since the nonprofit organization was officially chartered, progress has been its theme: President Lyndon B. Johnson and former Presidents Harry S. Truman and Dwight D. Eisenhower have agreed to serve as honorary chairmen. The Governors of the Thirteen Original States have accepted to serve as honorary associate chairmen, as well as Senators JOSEPH S. CLARK, HUGH D. SCOTT, James H. J. Tate, mayor of Philadelphia, and myself. The Honorable Secretary of the Interior, Stewart L. Udall, and other Members of the Congress, are being asked to serve in similar capacities.

Under the able leadership of the Honorable Albert M. Greenfield, a Committee of '76 was formed with the responsibility of raising the funds necessary to reproduce the house— and its contents— in which Thomas Jefferson wrote the Declaration of Independence. Mr. Greenfield is the chairman and the following members make up the committee:

Gustave A. Amsterdam, the Honorable Jacob M. Arvey, Gen. Milton G. Baker, Mrs. Elizabeth O. Benedict, Jack Beresin, David Berger, Esq., Robert M. Bernstein, Esq., David C. Bevan, Frank G. Binswanger, Alfred Blasband, Jacob Balustein, Joseph E. Boettinger, George H. Brown, Jr., Richard C. Bond, Edward G. Budd, Jr., John F. Connelly, Paul J. Cupp, William J. Curtis, Edward L. Cushman, S. A. Dalton, Samuel H. Daroff, John A. Diemand, the Honorable Richardson Dilworth, S. Harrison Dogole, Robert G. Dunlop, Edward J. Dwyer, the Honorable Myer Feldman, Benjamin Fox, Arthur A. Gallagher, Wilfred D. Gillen, William Goldman, H. J. Grinsfelder, Wallace D. Hall, Kenneth B. Hatch, Richard W. Havens, Brownlee W. Hayden, Richard B. Herman, Mrs. Thomas B. Hess, Mrs. J. Sydney Hoffman, Hubert J. Horan, Jr., James F. Hutten, Mrs. Henry Ittleson, Cecil D. Kaufmann, John B. Kelly, Jr., Philip Klein, the Honorable Philip M. Klutznick, the Honorable David L. Lawrence, the Honorable George M. Leader, Herman Lefco, the Honorable Thomas D. McBride, Frank C. P. McGlinn, Robert McLean, Wilmoth C. Mack, Harry K. Mayway, Sydney J. Markovitz, Charles E. Mather II, Robert R. Nathan, Esq., Albert J. Nesbitt, Howard C. Petersen, Theodore C. Phillips, Joseph L. Pollock, Frederic A. Potts, Elizabeth G. Ravdin, M.D., Walter P. Reuther, R. G. Rincliffe, Rolland A. Ritter, Morris J. Root, Sol Satinsky, Milton J. Shapp, Theodore H. Silbert, Bradford Smith, Jr., Charles Frederic Graff Smith, Esq., Howard K. Smith, L. M. C. Smith, Edward H. Smoker, G. Stockton Strawbridge, Benjamin A. Strouse, Harry S. Sylk, the Honorable STUART SYMINGTON, E. Richard Werner, the Honorable Nochem S. Winnet, Jerry Wolman, Sol Zallea.

Once the funds have been raised, the house will be transferred to the Department of the Interior to remain forever a part of the National Park Service. In this manner, not only the present generation but generations to come, will be able to walk in spirit with Washington, Franklin, and Jefferson from the site where the Declaration was drafted to the Liberty Bell where it was proclaimed.

The house and its contents will be reproduced exactly as it stood in the days when our forefathers were building our great democracy. However, it is also planned to enhance the meaning of the house with a living library where scholars, teachers, and students can study and learn in detail the background and full meaning of the Declaration and its influence of man's eternal struggle over tyranny against mind and spirit. The library will also house documents of freedom from other times and cultures, ranging from the first recorded thoughts of ancient civilization to the most modern manifestoes of today's emerging nations.

It is hoped, the library will transcend time and become a continued demonstration that the basic tenants of freedom, so perfectly embodied in the Declaration, are as vital to every citizen and nation today, as they ever have been in the history of man.

The impending anniversary of the Declaration, the restoration of the house in which it was written and the establishment of a living library of freedom will undoubtedly serve as catalysts for a vast effort to consummate the purpose behind these projects—to make every adult and child in the United States understand the true meaning of our country. Only if we know and live the letter and spirit of the Declaration of Independence, can we fulfill the destiny conceived for America by her founders.

VOTING RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARBSTEIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, those farsighted men whom we salute as the fathers of our country did more than institute a new way of government. They passed on to our hands the conduct of one of the noblest experiments on earth; one which would determine whether free men could decide of and by themselves the course of the government to which they owe allegiance. We meet here today to confront a challenge to that experiment—a challenge which has denied that right of choice to a large segment of our population—a challenge which must be met here and now with forceful legislative measures.

We have before us for consideration legislation that the President has proposed to meet this challenge. I feel this legislation is strong, but that it could be improved in certain respects. Toward this end, I am today introducing my own bill which incorporates those important improvements which I believe are necessary to achieve the voting equality which we seek.

First among these changes should be the complete abolition of literacy tests as a means of qualifying voters. Such tests have long been used as a pernicious means of discrimination at the polls—not only in the South where it has become so evident these past few weeks, but as far away as my own State of New York where countless Spanish-speaking citizens—who are perfectly literate in their own tongue, and who often have high school or college degrees—are denied this basic right because they are not literate in English.

The argument can be made that the sovereign States have the prerogative to set whatever qualifications they deem necessary, including literacy tests. This is true and none would deny it. But it is equally true that the 15th amendment empowers Congress to curtail any such State qualifications when they are used in a discriminatory manner. I feel that the literacy test has so long been used as such a means that we should act now to exercise our congressional obligation to strike it out.

This gives rise to the very serious question of whether or not our polls will be flooded by ignorant voters. I have given this careful consideration and can honestly say that it is my belief that with radio and TV news coverage at the advanced state it is today, the means of informing oneself of the issues at hand are just as adequate for a person who can neither read nor write as they are for a person who is literate.

The second change which I would seek would be an extension of the coverage of the bill to those counties where, although literacy tests are not given, less than 25 percent of the nonwhite population was registered in 1964. We would indeed be myopic if we thought that literacy tests were the only means of voter discrimination in the South or elsewhere. While the provision in the administration bill for the automatic appointment of registrars is good, it should be extended to those areas where literacy tests do not apply. For example, Arkansas has no literacy test, yet only 40.3 percent of the nonwhite eligible voting population was registered in 1964 as compared to 65.4 percent of the white population. The actual voting figures were much lower.

The third improvement I seek is the removal of the requirement that those who have been repeatedly harrassed by local officials must in some cases apply to the same officials before they can register with a Federal examiner. The provision for Federal registrars works on the well-grounded presumption that discrimination already exists. Why must Negroes or Spanish-speaking citizens and others risk serious reprisals—reprisals which have in the past, as in Selma, reached the point of murder—to prove again what we have already assumed?

My bill would eliminate the provision that before registration by a Federal examiner, applicants must try to register with State officials within 90 days.

Lastly, I feel that the poll tax should be eliminated completely as a requirement for voting in State and local elections, as it has been by constitutional amendment for Federal elections. The right to vote is essential and should not be compromised by a person's financial situation. Moreover, I feel such abolition is demanded by the equal protection clause of the first section of the 14th amendment.

These are the ways in which I feel the voter rights bill should be strengthened. They do not deny H.R. 6400; they will just make it a much better bill—a bill which will more clearly defend the basic voting rights of the nonwhites in America and a bill which will enable us to proceed with our experiment in democracy.

A NEW WEAPON FOR JUNGLE WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Assistant Secretary of Defense Arthur Sylvester has admitted that the United States has developed and is buying spray tanks for use by jet aircraft in chemical destruction of jungles and crops. The Pentagon was very careful to say that these tanks are not being developed for use at Vietnam.

At the conclusion of my remarks I shall include an article by Mr. Charles Nicodemus, of the Washington bureau, Chicago Daily News, who brought to light this interesting development in the Pentagon and who, in my judgment, has performed a great service by his exclusive disclosure that the U.S. Army is developing special tanks for chemical defoliants for use on jet aircraft for the spraying of these chemical defoliants in jungle areas. I think this is a most significant development, and one that we in Congress should hail with great enthusiasm.

There is no question that the United States will be involved in a series of problems in jungle areas throughout the world. Right now our biggest problem in Vietnam is uncovering the Communist guerrilla forces who find sanctuary in the jungle areas of both Vietnam and Laos. I might say my only disappointment is that there still remains some question whether this equipment will be used in Vietnam. My other disappointment is that this equipment will not be available until some time in December of this year, when the first tanks are to be developed.

I would think that the development of a tank for use by jet aircraft would be the one thing we need in Vietnam to bring the forces of subversion, of the guerrilla Communists, out into the open, and it would seem to me that the use of defoliants is a humane way of combating the situation. True, the Pentagon admits that if the defoliant touches humans it can produce many of the same disabling symptoms of sickness and nausea caused by the nonlethal gas already used by the United States in Vietnam.

I do not find cause for criticism in the use of these materials to bring hostilities to a quick end in Vietnam. It would seem to me that the problem we have had up to now is they have been using this by helicopters, which are slow and easy targets for Communist guerrillas hiding in the jungle. The use of these tanks by fast-moving jets would eliminate that problem, and would lay bare the whole terrain or area sprayed. This could be one of the most effective ways of stopping the Communists from coming into South Vietnam and carrying on their aggression.

So it would be my hope the Defense Department will accelerate the development of these tanks and will indeed use this equipment in Vietnam as a humane way of bringing this hostility to a head, and a successful conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I believe those who have been urging negotiations with the Communists ought to first familiarize themselves with our entire program. We have stated repeatedly we shall not negotiate until the Communists have ceased their aggression in South Vietnam.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, the proposal to use defoliants against jungles differs considerably from proposals made by Senator Goldwater in the 1964 campaign. Mr. Goldwater suggested using low yield nuclear warheads to destroy the foliage. President Johnson insisted the work can be done with nonlethal defoliants. Obviously the President was correct. It is regrettable that some critics of defoliants will insist we do not use them. They are badly wrong.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that there is an even more important element in the disclosure that the Army is developing methods of spraying defoliants on a larger scale.

There is a peaceful aspect to this development which should not be overlooked. Before those who look with horror on developments in the use of nonlethal gas or defoliant get too excited, I would submit that development of this equipment might open up entirely new vistas of opportunity in jungle countries throughout the world that now are landlocked, with heavy foliage, and inaccessible to normal development.

I think by mutual agreement with our neighbors to the south, vast areas of South America could be opened up for commerce, for development of roads, for development of communications, so that these great continents with their people can become a greater part of the world community.

It would seem to me that in Africa also there are similar problems.

Granted that the population would have to be temporarily removed from these areas and granted also that great care would have to be taken not to direct these defoliants upon human beings, I am sure this can be done where proper measures and proper safeguards are employed.

I view this development by the Defense Department as a very significant breakthrough in maintaining peace and opening up these vast areas of the world where we can bring in our equipment and methods and help these peoples become part of the world economic structure. It seems to me there is great help in what the Defense Department is doing. I, for one, would like to congratulate the Defense Department for these farsighted measures, which I do not view as entirely destructive but also as instruments to help America bring its way of life to other parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the excellent newspaper article to which I have referred is as follows. The Chicago Daily News can be justly proud of the job done by its Washington correspondent, Mr. Charles Nicodemus:

A NEW WEAPON FOR JUNGLE WAR

(By Charles Nicodemus, of our Washington Bureau)

WASHINGTON.—The U.S. Army has developed and is buying spray tanks for use by jet aircraft in chemical destruction of jungles and crops. Pentagon officials told the Daily News the equipment is not for use in Vietnam.

Procurement of the tanks came to light when nonclassified bid documents on the equipment were sent to 31 prospective manufacturers.

Chemical defoliants can kill vegetation in 24 hours. Defoliation of jungle areas of Vietnam in which Vietcong guerrillas hide immune from air attack has long been discussed in the Pentagon.

The North Vietnamese Government in Hanoi this week charged that defoliating liquids were dropped on guerrilla areas in recent weeks. The United States denied the charge.

Chemical spray tanks for jet aircraft to be purchased by the Army are designated the TMU-28(B). The Army Materiel Command will buy 1,074 of the units under a contract for which bids were opened at Edgewood (Md.) Arsenal on March 15. The contract has not yet been awarded.

First of the tanks are for delivery in December, the last in July 1966.

A spokesman for Fairchild-Hiller Corp., paid by the Army to develop the tanks, acknowledged that they were for spraying defoliants.

"But this project is so secret we probably shouldn't even mention it further over the telephone," he said.

Arthur Sylvester, Assistant Secretary of Defense, could not explain why equipment involved in a secret project is being purchased through a publicly advertised procurement.

Sylvester denied that the equipment was designed specifically for use in Vietnam. He said it was part of "a highly secret project designed for much broader contingency purposes," and no details could be disclosed on intended use of the tanks or the exact nature of the chemical they will carry.

"This equipment would have been developed even if there hadn't been a Vietnam," he said. But he acknowledged the tanks "conceivably could be" used there.

Sylvester at first denied that the tanks were intended to dispense defoliants, or that they were for use by jet aircraft. However, the public bid document clearly indicates this.

The tanks are specially designed, with a rare metal alloy, to carry a herbicide called Mixture Orange 198–2–47. The dictionary defines herbicide as a chemical agent to destroy or inhibit plant growth. Sylvester acknowledged that herbicide is the term generally used to describe defoliants.

The Daily News learned that the herbicide Mixture Orange was developed at Fort Detrick, Md., a research and development lab for the Army's biological warfare program.

An unofficial Pentagon source said the chemical apparently is a defoliant that begins killing vegetation immediately and, barring rain, turns an entire, lush green area into dead brown within a day.

If it touches humans it can produce many of the same disabling symptoms of sickness and nausea caused by the nonlethal gas already used by the United States in Vietnam.

Bid specifications further reveal that the spray tanks must pass tests to withstand vibration generated only by turbine (jet) aircraft.

Bidders were told by Army Materiel Command personnel that the tanks were for use with the Air Force F–105 jet fighters, built by Republic. The F–105 is used by American forces in Vietnam.

"I'm told these tanks probably can be used with F–105's" Sylvester said.

The Daily News learned that during development the tanks were tested only on the F–105. But personnel at Edgewood Arsenal said the tanks are for use with the entire Century series of jet fighters.

That would include the F–100, F–101, F–102, F–104, and the new TFX or F–111 fighter. Armament of the F–111 has not yet been disclosed.

In chemical warfare, jets have several advantages over helicopters. The slow-moving choppers are easier targets for ground fire, and their noise announced their arrival well in advance.

Jets can streak into a target area with little warning, giving enemy troops virtually no time to escape, fire back, take cover, put on gas masks, or take other preventive action. Jets are available in greater number and have a greater range.

Until now the chief advantage for helicopters in such missions was greater accuracy made possible by slower speed.

However, the new, 16-foot-long tanks for jets dispense their chemical through a "cat tail" that hangs down from the tank to give greater concentration and accuracy.

Each of the 1,074 units to be produced will include 2 tanks, 1 for under each wing. The tanks can be dropped when they have been emptied.

The Army bid document discloses that the completed spray tanks are to be shipped to Dana, Ind., railhead for the Army's nearby Newport ammunitions plant.

This is a top-secret installation, which the Army refuses to discuss beyond the acknowledgement that "Yes, this is a biological warfare center."

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

SHORT SHRIFT GIVEN GAO URBAN RENEWAL REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS DEMANDS THOROUGH CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the short shrift given GAO urban renewal reports, findings, and recommendations to date demands a thorough congressional investigation here and in the field, in order to achieve greater efficiency and economy in Government.

I have, within recent weeks, had the Library of Congress make a detailed review of 23 GAO reports on the Federal urban renewal program and a number of local urban renewal projects which the Comptroller General of the United States has made to the President and the Congress in recent years. Following the completion of the Library of Congress review, I made it available to the Comptroller General for his information and, at the same time, I made it available to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, Mr. Kermit Gordon, for his information and comment.

I suggested to the Director of the Budget Bureau that an effective means to correct the serious administrative and other deficiencies in the Federal urban renewal program, which were revealed by the GAO reports, is to be found in the directive set forth in Circular No. A-50 issued by the Bureau of the Budget on April 1, 1959, over the signature of the then Director Maurice H. Stans. Circular No. A-50 in paragraph 4 requires that:

> Within 60 calendar days after formal transmittal of a General Accounting Office report to the agency, the head of the agency will comment on it to the Bureau of the Budget whenever the report is addressed to the Congress, to a congressional committee, or to the agency head by the Comptroller General.

In my letter to Mr. Kermit Gordon I requested him to furnish me the following:

First. A copy of each comment forwarded to the Bureau of the Budget by the Federal URA on each of these 23 GAO reports.

Second. A copy of the report on each of the actions taken by the Federal URA on each of the 23 GAO reports.

Third. A copy of each action taken by the Budget Bureau in implementing each of these 23 GAO reports.

Mr. Gordon was most cooperative, of course, and he has furnished me, as well as the chairman of this subcommitte, and the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, a detailed summary of "HHFA actions taken in response to GAO recommendations" which undoubtedly should be made available to all members of the committee and to the public.

In his covering letter dated March 27, 1965, the Budget Bureau Director made these highly significant points:

First:

> Reviews of relocation problems in urban renewal areas by the Budget Bureau "indicated that a major need was more adequate staff in Urban Renewal Administration to assist and review local relocation activities. Over the past several fiscal years, we have supported increases in the HHFA budget to provide this additional staff. The President's 1966 budget recommends an increase of 51 people in relocation or relocation-related activities."

Second:

> The Budget Bureau has supported for several years, and continues to support, a GAO recommendation to limit local noncash grant-in-aid credits allowed for publicly-owned parking facilities which assist urban renewal projects. Legislation for this purpose has been developed by HHFA, and this recommendation has been spelled out in a section of the Republican Housing Bills.

Third:

> The Budget Bureau has also supported for several years, and continues to support, a GAO recommendation to limit noncash grant-in-aid credits received by the District of Columbia in the same manner as they are limited for other local communities. This would seem to me to be long-overdue, in view of the fact that the Federal Government has contributed more than $134 million in cash for urban renewal projects in the District of Columbia, while the District government has been content to contribute only $4,000 in cash, over the past 14 years as its share for these projects, and has made excessive and unreasonable use of noncash grant-in-aid credits for the remainder of the local contribution.

Fourth:

> Detailed investigation by the Bureau of the Budget of each GAO report would obviously have been impossible; over the 10-year period covered by the cited reports, we have been able to devote less than the full time of one examiner to the entire urban renewal program in all of its aspects.
>
> Under these circumstances, most of our efforts to secure adequate agency consideration of such reports are part of our day-to-day work with general problems affecting agency budgets, management problems, and legislative programs; we are not in a position to take formal action on each such report.

Mr. Gordon's reply clearly indicates that it is not Budget Bureau policy to make independent findings on GAO reports or to implement them. Under the circumstances I would hope that this committee would recommend that the Budget Bureau give more consideration to the GAO reports when judging the spending requests of HHFA, the Federal URA, and its other constituent agencies. These steps are vitally important, in view of the recommendation by President Johnson that "all reports made by the General Accounting Office be given prompt and thorough and careful attention."

In his 1964 Annual Report the Comptroller General of the United States included the following excerpt from the State Appropriations Committee Report No. 1095:

> The committee believes that there has been a lack of prompt and adequate attention given by the agencies to recommendations contained in reports of the General Accounting Office. Failure to immediately implement proposals of the General Accounting Office in many instances provides for the continued unnecessary expenditure of Government funds. The committee strongly urges the departments to give prompt and vigorous attention to deficiencies and recommendations contained in reports of the Comptroller General. The committee shares the views of the President of the United States in his remarks to the press, on May 2, 1964, following a Cabinet meeting in which he outlined a nine-point program to achieve greater efficiency and economy in Government operations. Included in the program was his request that "all reports be given prompt and thorough and careful attention."

The 23 GAO reports submitted to Congress and to the President by the Comptroller General, with their findings, suggestions, and recommendations, show that the major problem areas in the urban renewal program have been, or are:

First. Inadequate relocation assistance and displacement of families into substandard housing.

Second. Allowance of excessive noncash and grant-in-aid credits by URA.

Third. URA approval of large-scale demolition without adequately determining whether less costly renewal methods were warranted, that inspections as well as reports were inadequate to provide URA with a sound basis for authorizing large-scale demolition, and that there had been insufficient examination by HHFA of the buildings in the urban renewal areas.

Fourth. Use of different inspection standards resulted in housing classified as substandard for project eligibility purposes which formerly had been classified as suitable for relocation purposes.

Fifth. Contract approval without adequate information as to the feasibility of projects.

Sixth. Inadequate rehabilitation programs. The GAO report, issued September 23, 1964, was concerned with the ineffective administration contributing to unsatisfactory progress in rehabilitating the Hyde Park-Kenwood urban renewal area in Chicago, Ill. The report pointed out that the contract was approved without adequate information as to the feasibility of the project, and found that the loan and grant contract was executed even though "(1) the LPA did not have an adequate rehabilitation program and (2) prior studies of the feasibility of the project were inconclusive."

The problems brought to the attention of the Congress in this report with regard to rehabilitation in Chicago are not the only ones plaguing this aspect of urban renewal, as was shown by speakers at a conference of Action, Inc., in Washington on Tuesday, March 30, 1965. A report in the Evening Star newspaper of Washington, D.C., follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Mar. 31, 1965]

URBAN RENEWAL DEFENDED

(By Robert J. Lewis)

Earlier, two speakers said development of a means of rehabilitating dwellings has become urban renewal's most crucial unsolved problem.

Seth P. Taft, of Cleveland, Ohio, said he did not "know of any city in the country where you can say there has been a successful rehabilitation program." Taft, a nephew of the late Senator Robert A. Taft and chairman of Action's rehabilitation committee, reported on a study of 200 cities where urban renewal rehabilitation programs have been started. Under such programs, housing is supposed to be improved rather than torn down for redevelopment.

Seventh. Ineffective and inadequate administration by HHFA and URA.

Eighth. Recertification of workable programs although they did not make reasonable progress in correcting code deficiencies which HHFA considered essential.

It should be pointed out that these matters can be, and must be, corrected by legislation. The fact that a number of these problems have persisted throughout the 10-year period covered by the GAO reports shows that more is needed than a revision of the Federal Urban Renewal Manual and the regulations of the HHFA. These have been repeatedly revised, but the problems I have mentioned continue to recur.

It is in the belief that these problems will only be corrected by legislation that the Republican housing bills have devoted so much space to amendments which will make the intent of the Congress unmistakably clear.

Beyond this, however, is the bald fact that while the correction of these urban renewal deficiencies should be, and must be, the task of this special House Housing Subcommittee, no real hearings have ever been held on the urban renewal program, particularly in the field, yet every other committee of the Congress has, time and time again through the years, gone out into the field and held hearings throughout the Nation.

The Select Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition of the House Public Works Committee has held hearings throughout the Nation on the problems of providing just compensation for people displaced by the urban renewal program, but this committee has not even indicated that it is aware that there is a problem in this field.

I think, in all fairness to the people of this Nation, who are being displaced by this program in the hundreds of thousands, tens of thousands of whom are homeowners and businessmen, that they are entitled to more than a rubberstamping of the administration's housing and urban renewal program and its continuance without hearings in the field.

I include here the letter I have received from Mr. Kermit Gordon, the two letters I addressed to him, and the Library of Congress review of the GAO reports.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D.C., March 27, 1965.

Hon. WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WIDNALL: This is in reply to your two letters with regard to audit reports issued by the General Accounting Office on housing and urban renewal. As has been explained to Mr. Frain of your staff, our reply has been delayed by the pressures of the budget season in late December and January, and then by the necessity of making a fresh review of the matters covered by your request, which extend over a period of nearly 10 years.

In accordance with an alternative provided for in circular A–50, the Housing and Home Finance Agency in most of the cases under review reported to the Bureau by furnishing a copy of the response which it had given GAO earlier when the General Accounting Office had invited comments on the draft of the report prior to its issuance. The agency views thus expressed are often summarized or referred to in the audit reports themselves.

In order to place this matter in perspective, we asked the Administrator's office to prepare a summary of the criticisms and recommendations in all of the reports, HHFA's views and actions thereon, and the status of open items. There have been excluded from the summary those points included in the audit reports which had already been settled to GAO's satisfaction before the reports were issued. I am enclosing this up-to-date summary with the expectation that it may be more useful to you than the older, detailed statements on the various individual reports. This should cover the first and second points mentioned in your February 3 letter.

The third point in that letter relates to the actions of the Bureau of the Budget on these matters. I would like to make clear the nature of the Bureau's responsibilities with regard to audit reports. It is our responsibility:

(a) To assure that the head of each agency provides for systematic and prompt consideration of all GAO reports on the work of his agency.

(b) To assure that the possible need for remedial action is considered in the agency at a level of authority consistent with the nature of the audit findings and recommendations.

(c) To give adequate consideration to information, findings and recommendations contained in audit reports and information contained in agency responses thereto in the formulation of the administration's budget and legislative programs.

(d) To exercise initiative with regard to followup on matters of an interagency or Government-wide nature.

Circular A–50 does not contemplate that the Bureau of the Budget will make detailed, independent investigations of the merits of the findings and recommendations of the General Accounting Office. The thrust of the circular is toward insuring that those findings and recommendations receive proper consideration and action by those agency officials who have the direct authority and responsibility for the management of the agency.

In the case in question, detailed investigation by the Bureau of the Budget of each GAO report would obviously have been impossible; over the 10-year period covered by the cited reports, we have been able to devote less than the full time of one examiner to the entire urban renewal program in all of its aspects.

Under these circumstances, most of our efforts to secure adequate agency consideration of such reports are part of our day-to-day work with general problems affecting agency budgets, management problems, and legislative programs; we are not in a position to take formal action on each such report. We have, however, attempted to assure ourselves that the Agency does so. In this instance, it is the judgment of our staff members concerned with urban renewal and other activities of the Housing and Home Finance Agency—in which I concur—that the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency has provided for prompt and systematic review of these reports, and has given them his personal attention.

We have, nevertheless, questioned the HHFA with regard to most of the findings and recommendations appearing in the audit reports, and we have made it a particular point to take up with them from time to time the GAO findings that have shown a repetitive pattern—particularly those relating to the administrative review of relocation activities, the determination of credits for noncash grants-in-aid, and the procedures for review of alleged administrative deficiencies in the urban renewal program.

For example, our reviews indicated that a major need was more adequate staff in Urban Renewal Administration to assist and review local relocation activities. Over the past several fiscal years, we have supported increases in the HHFA budget to provide this additional staff. The President's 1966 budget recommends an increase of 51 people in relocation or relocation-related activities. In the central office, the budget recommends an additional relocation specialist. In the regional offices, the budget recommends five additional people (a 10-percent increase) in the Relocation Branch which provides advice and assistance concerning relocation activities. Other regional office staffs, which devote a major portion of their activity to relocation reviews and assistance, would be increased. Eighteen additional people (an 85-percent increase) are recommended in the Program Review and Evaluation Section which collects and evaluates data on local Agency operations, and 23 more in the project representative staff (a 9-percent increase) which maintains liaison with local programs and procedures.

We have also supported proposed legislation consistent with GAO recommendations. On January 4, 1962, in response to an informal request from the House Committee on the District of Columbia for our views on proposed legislation "to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945, as amended, and for other purposes," we supported an earlier recommendation of GAO to limit noncash grant-in-aid credits received by the District of Columbia in the same manner as they are limited for other local communities.

Again, on June 22 of the same year, we received a draft bill from HHFA "To limit local noncash grant-in-aid credits allowed for publicly owned parking facilities which assist urban renewal projects." The GAO, in a report on this subject on June 12, 1962, made this same recommendation to the Congress. We reviewed and cleared the draft bill on June 25, 1962, which HHFA later submitted to the House Banking and Currency Committee. The bill, however, was not introduced. In this instance, of course, the final result was not within the control of the executive branch.

I believe it is inevitable that there will be differences of opinion with regard to the merits of legislative proposals, budget requests, and management actions. I cannot promise that every recommendation of the General Accounting Office will be adopted. We try to assure, however, that every recommendation of the GAO will be carefully considered, and I believe that this has been done in the instant cases.

I hope that this information is responsive to your inquiry. I am sure that the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency would be happy, in testimony or otherwise, to provide such further information about the cases in question as the committee may desire.

I am sending a copy of this reply to the chairman of the subcommittee, and to the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, for their information.

Sincerely,

KERMIT GORDON, *Director.*

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Washington, D.C., December 17, 1964.

Hon. KERMIT GORDON,
Bureau of the Budget,
Executive Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GORDON: In his 1964 Annual Report the Comptroller General of the United States included the following excerpt from the Senate Appropriations Committee Report No. 1095:

"The committee believes that there has been a lack of prompt and adequate attention given by the agencies to recommendations contained in reports of the General Accounting Office. Failure to immediately implement proposals of the General Accounting Office in many instances provides for the continued unnecessary expenditure of Government funds. The committee strongly urges the departments to give prompt and vigorous attention to deficiencies and recommendations contained in reports of the Comptroller General. The committee shares the views of the President of the United States in his remarks to the press, on May 2, 1964, following a Cabinet meeting in which he outlined a nine-point program to achieve greater efficiency and economy in Government operations. Included in the program was his request that 'all reports made by the General Accounting Office and congressional committees be given prompt and thorough and careful attention'."

In view of the above, and the directive of the Bureau of the Budget requiring Federal departments and agencies to fully report on actions taken with regard to GAO recommendations, I believe it would be useful for the House Special Housing Subcommittee to hear from you as to steps which could be taken, including legislation, to assure that "all reports made by the General Accounting Office * * * be given prompt and thorough and careful attention." Would you be willing to testify before the Special Housing Subcommittee as to the problems faced by the Budget Bureau in trying to make certain that all reports made by the GAO on housing and urban renewal are given prompt and thorough and careful attention? If legislation is needed to correct the present situation where the GAO reports and recommendations on housing and urban renewal are concerned then this should be developed and presented to the Congress by the administration for action at the earliest opportunity.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., February 3, 1965.
Hon. KERMIT GORDON,
Director, Bureau of the Budget,
Executive Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GORDON: The Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress recently undertook, at my request, a detailed analysis and review of the findings, suggestions, and recommendations made by the General Accounting Office regarding the urban renewal program during the period 1955–64. This review, covering the 23 GAO reports to the Congress, took 7 weeks to complete. The relocation of families and individuals displaced from urban renewal project areas was considered in 9 reports; and noncash grants-in-aid credits were considered in 15 reports.

This completed review by the Library of Congress spotlights the fact that despite repeated findings, suggestions, and recommendations by the GAO over this 10-year period, "a significant number of the families displaced from urban renewal projects in St. Louis, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans., were relocated into substandard housing and that a substantial number of the families displaced in these cities and in Columbia, Mo., were not offered relocation assistance."

In September 1964, the GAO report to Congress on urban renewal relocation practices in the Nation's Capital disclosed that: "In its relocation operations, RLA (1) used standards for determining the acceptability of dwellings for relocating families displaced from urban renewal areas which were less stringent than the standards used for evaluating the physical condition of dwellings in determining the eligibility of an area for urban renewal, (2) made inadequate inspections of housing for displaced families, (3) prepared incomplete inspection reports, and (4) referred some displaced families to substandard or uninspected housing."

The Library of Congress points out that primary responsibility for the enforcement of the relocation provisions of the Housing Act of 1964 and the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, rests with the Federal Urban Renewal Administration, and concludes that (1) the deficiency of administrative review of relocation activities of LPA's was widespread, and (2) this widespread deficiency in proper administrative review persisted over the 10-year period, 1955–64, despite repeated GAO recommendations "for more control and guidance on the part of the URA regarding the plans and practices of the LPA's in their relocation activities.

In the 15 GAO reports dealing with noncash grants-in-aid over the 10-year period, the Library of Congress review shows that the GAO found that many of the facilities allowed by URA as noncash grants-in-aid were actually ineligible, or the amount of credit allowed, based on the benefit to the project, was excessive. Schools and streets and related facilities, parks, playgrounds, and sewer facilities and, in one case, a fire station, were declared to be either excessive in, or ineligible, for, the amount of noncash credit allowed by URA.

The Library of Congress study lists many examples of misuse of the noncash grants-in-aid provisions of the Housing Act, and then comments that: "as in the cases of inadequate relocation, the GAO indicated in their recommendations the need for a better review of this aspect of the urban renewal process on the part of HHFA and URA."

The GAO recommended that the Congress amend section 110(d) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to show the minimum percent that a supporting facility must benefit a project in order to be eligible as a noncash grant-in-aid. Despite agreement from the Federal Urban Renewal Administration "there appears to have been no legislative action on this GAO proposal," the Library of Congress commented. This recommendation was made in the 1958 GAO report on HHFA slum clearance and urban renewal.

The GAO recommended in a 1962 review of noncash grant-in-aid credits allowed for publicly owned parking facilities, HHFA, that legislation be enacted to amend the Housing Act of 1949 to exclude from noncash grants-in-aid all publicly owned facilities to the extent that the capital costs of such facilities are contemplated to be recovered out of revenues derived from their operations. An amendment to this effect has not been adopted by the Congress, even though the Federal Housing Administrator sent such a draft proposal to the Congress after clearance by the Bureau of the Budget.

The time surely has arrived, indeed, it is long overdue, for administrative reforms and housecleaning in the Federal Urban Renewal Administration in order to implement President Johnson's directive of May 2, 1964, in a nine-point program to be outlined at a Cabinet meeting to achieve greater efficiency and economy in Government operations, that "all reports made by the General Accounting Office and congressional committees be given prompt and thorough and careful attention." No one in or out of the Administration can afford to be satisfied with the lipservice given by Federal URA officials to the findings, suggestions, and recommendations by GAO regarding urban renewal.

I would like to suggest that an effective means to correct the serious administrative deficiencies in the Federal Urban Removal Administration is to be found in the directive set forth in Circular No. A–50 issued by the Bureau of the Budget on April 1, 1959, over the signature of the then Director Maurice H. Stans. In this connection I would appreciate your furnishing me with the following:

1. A copy of each comment forwarded to the Bureau of the Budget by the Federal URA on each of these 23 GAO reports as required by paragraph 4 of Budget Bureau Circular No. A–50.
2. A copy of the report on each of the actions taken by the Federal URA on each of the 23 GAO reports as required by paragraph 3 of Budget Bureau Circular No. A–50.
3. A copy of each action taken by the Budget Bureau in implementing each of these 23 GAO reports.

Your cooperation in furnishing this material to me at your earliest convenience will be deeply appreciated.

I am enclosing for your information and comment a copy of the Library of Congress analysis and review of the 23 GAO reports.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
Member of Congress.

GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE REPORTS ON URBAN RENEWAL, 1955–64—A SURVEY WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO RELOCATION OF INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESS AND TO NONCASH GRANTS-IN-AID

(By James R. King, economic analyst, Economics Division, Library of Congress, Jan. 25, 1965)

I. INTRODUCTION

During the period August 1955 to November 1964 the Comptroller General of the United States made 23 reports to the Congress based on General Accounting Office studies of the Federal urban renewal program authorized by the Housing Act of 1949.

One review, August 1955, covered the slum clearance activities of the local public agencies; another, December 1958, reviewed the entire urban renewal program; and two reports investigated specific practices under the program—controlling and sharing of costs, March 1962, and noncash grant-in-aid credits for publicly owned parking facilities, June 1962.

The remaining 19 reports may be divided into two categories—9 reports which deal with selected activities of 5 Housing and Home Finance Agency Regional Offices (Forth Worth, New York, Philadelphia, Atlanta, and San Francisco), 2 local redevelopment authorities (LPA's), District of Columbia and Harrisburg, Pa., and the territory of Puerto Rico; and 10 reports dealing with a specific practice in a specific locality, for example, excessive allocation of costs of certain facilities to the Mill Creek Valley urban renewal project, St. Louis, Mo.

Contained in all 23 reports are criticisms of various practices observed during the course of the GAO investigations and proposals for both administrative and legislative changes which, in the opinon of the GAO, would improve the implementation of the program.

It is the purpose of this report to bring together for analytical purposes in summary form the findings and recommendations of these reports with special emphasis on criticisms that are common to a significant number of the reports under consideration.

II. SURVEY OF REPORTS

As mentioned above, the GAO reports on urban renewal activities cover a period beginning August 1955 and ending November 1964. It is worth noting that the 1955 report represents the sole general review of local public agency activities and the 1958 report is the only comprehensive analysis of the entire urban renewal program.

Of the remaining 21 GAO investigations, two were conducted in 1959, two in 1960, one in 1961, five in 1962, two in 1963, and nine in 1964. All reports issued in 1963 and 1964, with the exception of one review of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land

Agency, were investigations of a specific practice in a specific locality as described previously. Conversely, the 10 reports issued between 1959 and 1963 surveys selected urban renewal activities by regional office, with the exception of two 1962 reports (March and June), dealing with a policy question in several localities.

The above chronology appears to indicate that the investigations conducted by the GAO has been shifting from an overall review of the urban renewal program, as such, to a greater concentration of attention on matters which, in the opinion of the GAO, indicate a possible abuse of congressional intent or inefficient administration of public responsibility. We now turn to the substantive findings of these 23 reports.

A number of general topics have been chosen by the GAO for consideration in their reports. Project eligibility, inflated prices for slum property, and unsatisfactory progress in rehabilitation of the project area have been the subject of one mention each; appraisal practices, collection of rents in project areas, delay in disposal of cleared land, and deficiencies in the workable program were each mentioned in two reports; and three reports gave attention to the demolition of sound structures.

Particular attention was given two other problems. Relocation of individuals and businesses from urban renewal project areas has been one of the subjects covered in 9 GAO reports, and noncash grants-in-aid has come in for GAO consideration in 15 of its investigations.

It is beyond the scope of this report to establish the relative seriousness of the deficiencies observed by the GAO in their investigations. For example, either dollarwise or in terms of the extent of variation from the intent of Congress, the three examples of demolition of sound structures (District of Columbia, May 1959; Cleveland, Ohio, June 1963; and Topeka, Kans., June 1964) may be of much greater importance and, therefore, in more imperative need of corrective action than the 13 instances where deficiencies in the noncash grants-in-aid were found. For that matter, the single 1960 example of inflated prices paid for slum property in the San Francisco area could be more important to the future of the program than all other discrepancies put together. With no complete review of the program since 1958, it is difficult to establish how widespread any of the above-mentioned practices might be. Therefore, the balance of this report will be directed toward relocation and noncash grants-in-aid—the only areas where it has been established that the problem is somewhat common to urban renewal projects in general—despite the fact that any of the above-mentioned subjects considered by the GAO could be equally fruitful as a topic for additional investigation and analysis.

III. RELOCATION

Proper relocation of residents to be displaced by an urban renewal project is provided for in section 105(c) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. Prior to the 1964 amendments, section 105(c) required that—

"There be a feasible method for the temporary relocation of families displaced from the urban renewal area, and that there are or are being provided, in the urban renewal area or in other areas not generally less desirable in regard to public utilities and public and commercial facilities and at rents or prices within the financial means of the families displaced from the urban renewal area, decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings equal in number to the number of and available to such displaced families and reasonably accessible to their places of employment."

In the Housing Act of 1964, this section was amended to (1) apply the above provisions to individuals as well as families displaced from an urban renewal area, and (2) require the administrator to issue rules and regulations providing for the establishment of a relocation assistance program for each urban renewal project to determine the needs of displacees, including businesses, for relocation assistance, provide information and assistance and minimize the hardships of displacement, and coordinate relocation activities with other project activities and related governmental activities. These changes apply to all projects authorized subsequent to the enactment of the 1964 law.

Primary responsibility for the enforcement of this provision, of course, rests with the Urban Renewal Administration, the constituent unit of the Housing and Home Finance Agency which is charged with the administration of the urban renewal program. But, as has been pointed out by the GAO:

"The prime responsibility for initiating and administering the urban renewal program at the local level is placed with the communities themselves. Each urban renewal project is carried out by a local public agency (LPA) which is defined by statute as any State, county, municipality, or other governmental entity or public body, or two or more such entities or bodies, authorized to undertake the project for which assistance is sought.

"To assist in the administration of the program, URA has issued an Urban Renewal Manual which contains the policies, procedures, and requirements to be adhered to by the LPA's in undertaking an urban renewal project pursuant to title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended. The HHFA regional offices are responsible for determining whether LPA's follow the requirements set forth in the manual, with respect to the submission of project proposals and subsequent execution of the project."[1]

Through the Urban Renewal Manual, URA provides the guidelines for carrying out the provisions of the urban renewal program. These rules, however, are subject to administrative change and may differ significantly from time to time. Nevertheless, the LPA's are now, and have always been, under an indirect statutory and an explicit administrative obligation to rehouse displacees from urban renewal projects in safe and sound housing.

In the first GAO report covered in this survey, deficiencies in the relocation activities of the LPA's were cited and extensively considered by the investigators.

In its August 1955 review of a number of LPA's, the GAO found evidence of deficiencies in local relocation plans, prolonged relocation periods, lack of inspection of relocation dwellings, insufficient use of public housing for relocation, and lack of followup on lost families.[2]

Specific comments were made by the GAO on each of these points. Particularly relevant was the statement of the GAO that, "One of the principal reasons for the existence or occurrence of these weaknesses and deficiencies appears to be that regional personnel have relied almost solely on URA project representatives and the HHFA internal audit staff to disclose and correct deficiencies in project operations." GAO recommended "closer contact with the LPA's" by URA technical staff personnel, and "tightening controls over the projects by the establishment of firm guidelines," as corrective measures.[3]

The GAO report of June 1959 on urban renewal in Puerto Rico disclosed that a significant number of families had been relocated in dwellings that had not been certified or inspected by the LPA, and that, in two cases, relocation payments were made to families relocating in substandard housing. The GAO recommended that URA exercise greater caution in future reviews regarding the availability of adequate relocation housing and amend its regulations "to provide that relocation payments will be made to only those families that relocate into standard housing."[4]

In the same year the GAO reviewed the activities of the Redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia. Under the heading, Control Over Relocation Operations Deficient, the GAO stated:

"We reviewed RLA's relocation operations in Project Area C and noted a lack of control over records, reports, and inspections pertaining to families self-relocated in private housing."[5]

After citing a number of specific discrepancies, GAO recommended corrective action including the belief that "URA should make periodic reviews of RLA's relocation records, reports, and inspections in order to determine whether adequate controls are maintained to avoid the recurrence of the above-cited deficiencies."[6] In addition, GAO asked that the LPA Manual be changed to require that observed code violations in relocation housing be reported to the proper local authorities.[7]

Relocation of families in substandard housing was also observed in the 1960 GAO Report on San Francisco. 'We found," the report says, "that a number of families displaced by the San Francisco western addition project had relocated into substandard housing although the LPA had reported that these families had self-located into standard housing."[8] In this case the GAO recommended "* * * that the Commissioner, Urban Renewal Administration, require the San Francisco HHFA Regional Administrator to more thoroughly review the relocation plans submitted by LPA's to determine that there is a feasible method for the relocation of families displaced from future projects so as to reduce the possibility of unsatisfactory relocations."[9]

In 1961, the GAO charged that the URA authorized a project in Chattanooga, Tenn., despite the fact that sufficient evidence as to the availability of relocation housing for nonwhite displacees was not available. The GAO suggested that no future projects be authorized by the URA Commissioner, "* * * unless URA has received adequate evidence from LPA's that sufficient standard housing will become available for relocating all project families."[10]

In its review of selected phases of the workable program as administered by the

---

[1] U.S. General Accounting Office. Inadequate relocation assistance to families displaced from certain urban renewal projects in Kansas and Missouri administered by Fort Worth Regional Office, June 1964.

[2] U.S. General Accounting Office. Report on review of slum clearance activities of local public agencies under title I of the Housing Act of 1949, August 1955, pp. 25–34.

[3] Ibid., pp. 3–4.

[4] U.S. General Acocunting Office. Review of slum clearance and urban renewal activities in Puerto Rico, June 1959, pp. 6–7.

[5] U.S. General Accounting Office. Audit of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, fiscal years 1957 and 1958. May 1959, p. 60.

[6] Ibid., p. 63.

[7] Ibid., p. 64.

[8] U.S. General Accounting Office. Review of slum clearance and urban renewal activities of the San Francisco Regional Office, HHFA. July 1960, p. 8.

[9] Ibid., p. 9.

[10] U.S. General Accounting Office. Review of slum clearance and urban renewal activities of the Atlanta Regional Office, HHFA. June 1961, pp. 6–7.

Fort Worth, Tex., regional office, the GAO reported in 1962 that:

"There is a need for improved administration of the relocation phase of the Workable Program to provide adequate assurance that displaced families can be relocated into decent, safe, and sanitary housing, as intended by the Congress. The present HHFA workable program requirements do not provide that cities present specific plans for relocating displaced families. We found that, in certain cities whose workable programs had been certified and recertified, families displaced by slum clearance projects were relocated permanently into substandard housing." [11]

GAO recommended that the Administrator not certify, or recertify workable programs in communities that have not demonstrated "that it has determined its need for and supply of decent, safe, and sanitary relocation housing for displaced families." [12]

Three reports issued in 1964 give attention to the problem of relocation. In the Comptroller General's letter of transmittal to the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate regarding the GAO review of relocation practices in Kansas and Missouri, Mr. Campbell remarked as follows:

"In our review of the relocation of families displaced from selected urban renewal projects administered by the Fort Worth regional office, Housing and Home Finance Agency, we noted that a significant number of the families displaced from urban renewal projects in St. Louis, Mo., and Kansas City, Kans., were relocated into substandard housing and that a substantial number of the families displaced in these cities and in Columbia, Mo., were not afforded relocation assistance. We believe that the regional office's supervision and review of relocation activities of local public agencies were not adequate to fulfill the intent of title I of the Housing Act of 1949, as amended, that displaced families be afforded an opportunity to relocate into decent, safe and sanitary housing.[13]

This finding was accompanied by a number of specific recommendations on the part of the GAO regarding better review of the relocation phase of urban renewal projects.[14]

The two other 1964 reports dealt with the District of Columbia. In September the GAO reported that:

"In its relocation operations, RLA (1) used standards for determining the acceptability of dwellings for relocating families displaced from urban renewal areas which were less stringent than the standards used for evaluating the physical condition of dwellings in determining the eligibility of an area for urban renewal, (2) made inadequate inspections of housing for displaced families, (3) prepared incomplete inspection reports, and (4) referred some displaced families to substandard or uninspected housing * * *." [15] In November of 1964, the GAO conducted a follow-up investigation of the status of recommendations made in the 1959 report on the District of Columbia. Better control over records was found along with reporting of code violations as recommended. Referral was made, however, to the deficiencies cited in the September 1964 report.[16]

The only recommendation, as far as relocation is concerned, made in these two reports asked for uniform standards and procedures in evaluating the physical condition of residential structures for relocation.[17]

The above review of GAO reports on deficiencies in the relocation phase of urban renewal activity appears to substantiate the proposition that deficiency of administrative review of LPA's in this regard was widespread.

Although the particular form that the deficiency took varied from report to report, one general recommendation that appeared throughout was for more control and guidance on the part of the URA regarding the plans and practices of the LPA's in their relocation activities.

IV. NONCASH GRANTS-IN-AID

Turning now to local noncash grants-in-aid we find that the review of the slum clearance and urban renewal program presented by the GAO in 1958 gives a prominent place to this subject. This, it should be recalled, is the only GAO review of the entire program to date.

The balance of the 15 reports which deal with noncash grants-in-aid range through all subsequent years and cover all categories described previously, including the two special policy investigations in 1962.

The urban renewal program is financed by Federal cash grants and local cash, or noncash, grants-in-aid. In general, the Federal Government provides two-thirds of the net project cost and the local community provides the remaining one-third.

Noncash grants-in-aid may consist of such things as donations of land, improvements in the urban renewal area (streets, sewers, etc.), and provision of public buildings, parks, playgrounds, schools, health centers, parking facilities, and other public facilities.[18] GAO has explained the process as follows:

"The community incurs the costs for the noncash grants-in-aid, and such costs are included in the overall project cost together with the slum clearance and urban renewal costs incurred by the LPA. The Federal Government thus, in effect, pays two-thirds of eligible costs incurred by the community and the LPA. If the community does not provide noncash grants-in-aid, the project cost will consist solely of costs incurred by the LPA and the community will be required to pay its one-third share of such costs in cash."

"To qualify as noncash local grants-in-aid (all items except land donations), must be necessary for carrying out the urban renewal objectives of the project. In order for the total cost of a public facility to qualify as a noncash local grant-in-aid, the facility must be of direct benefit to the project. If such facility is of some direct benefit to other areas, a part of the cost may be eligible as a noncash local grant-in-aid. URA has administratively determined that (1) if the benefit is more than 80 percent, the full cost is allowable as a noncash local grant-in-aid and (2) if the benefit to the project area is less than 10 percent, no part of the cost is allowable. If the project receives between 10 and 80 percent of the direct benefit provided by the facility, the amount of cost allowable as a noncash local grant-in-aid is determined by the Commissioner, URA, on the project." [19]

According to the GAO, many of the facilities tentatively allowed by URA as noncash grants-in-aid were actually ineligible, or the amount of credit allowed, based on the benefit to the project, has been excessive.

The initial, and only, GAO report on the entire urban renewal program found, for example, that "In two New York City projects, certain supporting facilities and site improvements, were tentatively approved by URA as noncash local grants-in-aid although the benefits to the projects claimed by the LPA were not adequately supported * * *"; that "URA tentatively allowed the cost of widening and straightening a street, although certain URA records show that the straightening was not essential to the redevelopment of the site * * *"; that "contrary to its established policy, URA approved a credit of $54,370 for a noncash local grant-in-aid that had a communitywide character." [20] These are but a few examples from the 1958 GAO report.

Based on the findings of this report, the GAO recommended to Congress a change in section 110(d) of the Housing Act of 1949 to clarify the minimum amount that a facility should benefit the project to be declared eligible as a noncash grant-in-aid. The report stated as follows:

"We believe that many of these situations can be corrected by a better administration of the law by URA, but we believe, also, that clarification of the law would assist URA in administering the program.

"We are recommending that the Congress amend section 110(d) of title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to show the minimum percent that a supporting facility must benefit a project in order to be eligible as a noncash grant-in-aid. The Urban Renewal Administration agrees with this recommendation." [21]

Despite agreement from URA, there appears to have been no legislative action on this GAO proposal.

GAO studies in subsequent years have disclosed a number of noncash grants-in-aid, which, in the opinion of the GAO, are excessive or ineligible.

Schools and streets and related facilities have come in for special attention. Other cases involved parks, playgrounds, and sewer facilities. One case involved a fire station. All were declared by GAO to be either excessive in, or ineligible for, the amount of noncash credit allowed by URA.

In its May 1959 report on the District of Columbia, the GAO found that, "For project areas B and C, Urban Renewal Administration (URA) tentatively allowed one-third of the estimated total cost of the Southwest Expressway as a part of gross project cost and as a noncash grant-in-aid even though the expressway is a communitywide benefit." [22] In a followup report in 1964, the GAO said, "our current review disclosed that URA had not changed its tentative allowance of one-third of the cost of the Southwest Expressway as noncash grants-in-aid for project areas B and C." [23]

---

[11] U.S. General Accounting Office. Review of selected phases of workable programs for community improvement under the administration of the Fort Worth Regional Office, HHFA. December 1962, p. 8.

[12] Ibid., p. 9.

[13] U.S. General Accounting Office. Inadequate relocation assistance to families displaced from certain urban renewal projects in Kansas and Missouri administered by Fort Worth Regional Office, HHFA. June 1964 (letter of transmittal).

[14] Ibid., pp. 5–13.

[15] U.S. General Accounting Office. Inadequate policies and practices relating to the relocation of families from urban renewal areas, District of Columbia Redevelopment land Agency, HHFA, September 1964, p. 6.

[16] U.S. General Accounting Office. Status of findings and recommendations included in prior report on audit of District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency. November 1964. P. 35.

[17] U.S. General Accounting Office. Inadequate policies and practices relating to the relocation of families from urban renewal areas. District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, HHFA. September 1964. P. 10.

[18] U.S. General Accounting Office. Excessive allocation of costs of certain streets and related facilities to the northside urban renewal project, Kansas City, Mo. September 1964. P. 3.

[19] Ibid. P. 3–4.

[20] U.S. General Accounting Office. Review of slum clearance and urban renewal program, HHFA. December 1958. Pp. 1–5.

[21] Ibid. Pp. 1–2.

[22] U.S. General Accounting Office. Audit of the District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency, fiscal years 1957 and 1958. May 1959. P. 2.

[23] U.S. General Accounting Office. Status of findings and recommendations included in prior report on audit of District of Columbia Redevelopment Land Agency. November 1964. P. 13.

Regarding San Francisco, the GAO reported in 1960 that, "URA has tentatively approved a $2,156,452 noncash grant-in-aid credit claimed by the San Francisco LPA for widening and converting that part of an existing street within the project into an expressway * * * we believe that the percent of the credit URA tentatively allowed was not properly determined." [24]

In 1963, the GAO found that, "URA tentatively approved a noncash grant-in-aid credit in the amount of $1,080,000 for replacing the existing Melan Bridge which spans the Kansas River at Topeka, Kans. In our opinion," said GAO, "the new bridge is ineligible for noncash grant-in-aid credit because it will not provide the flood control or traffic benefits upon which the credit was based." [25]

In Kansas City, Mo., "URA gave final approval to a noncash grant-in-aid credit of $54,152 for street lights and traffic signals. The credit is excessive because the available data show that the credit includes operating costs in addition to capital costs for the lights and traffic signals." [26]

The most recent GAO report, issued in November 1964, notes that in the St. Louis, Mo., project, "The URA allowed, without adequate basis, noncash grant-in-aid tentative credits for (1) $1,134,957 for 50 percent of the estimated cost of an underpass at Forest Park Street and Grand Avenue and of certain street improvements in connection with the underpass and (2) $462,500 for 50 percent of the estimated cost of that portion of the proposed Grand Avenue Viaduct which would serve as a project boundary." [27]

The above examples represent a small sample of the findings of the GAO regarding noncash grants-in-aid for streets and related facilities. We now turn to consideration of GAO findings on the subject of schools which have been tentatively allowed by URA as noncash grants-in-aid.

The 1960 report on San Francisco asked that the Commissioner of URA reduce the noncash grant-in-aid for a girl's school by approximately 20 percent because the percent of benefit allowed was "* * * not based on a proper estimate of the number of project students who will attend the school * * *." [28]

Another 1960 report, this one on Harrisburg, Pa., noted that "URA has tentatively allowed an $884,200 noncash grant-in-aid credit for the estimated cost of a public school, including an adjoining playground. We do not believe that this credit should be allowed because local school officials have not determined that the facility will be constructed or that the facility will be necessary to accommodate students from the slum clearance and urban renewal project." [29]

In 1961 the GAO reported on a tentative URA allowance for a noncash grant-in-aid for a school in the Chattanooga, Tenn., West Side urban renewal project, which, according to the GAO, was excessive by better than 50 percent,[30] and in 1962 several deficiencies were found in the Philadelphia region and the New York region.

In its April 1962 report, the GAO found a $423,093 final allowance as a noncash grant-in-aid in the form of a school in Perth Amboy, N.J., to be excessive by $239,470.[31] In Philadelphia, a tentative noncash grant-in-aid of $1,287,074 representing 35.7 percent of the estimated cost of a junior high school was questioned as ineligible on the grounds that, "* * * the project may receive less than the required minimum or 10 percent of the benefit from the school * * *." [32]

Finally, in Paterson and Jersey City, N.J., two schools estimated at a cost of $1,475,000 and $1,500,000 respectively, were considered by GAO to have received noncash credit in excess of the benefit to be derived by the project based on enrollment data.[33]

In October of 1962, the GAO published a report on programs administered by the New York regional office, stating that:

"URA tentatively allowed noncash grant-in-aid credits amounting to about $4,733,800 which represent part of the costs of five schools which have been or are to be provided in connection with slum clearance and urban renewal projects in New York City and New Haven, Conn. Four of the schools do not appear to be eligible for any grant-in-aid credit because, on the basis of information available, the urban renewal areas involved are not expected to receive the required minimum of 10-percent benefit from the schools. The amount of grant-in-aid credit allowed for the fifth school was excessive. We believe that grant-in-aid credits for the five schools should be reduced by an amount of $4,246,246." [34]

Last year, the GAO reported on urban renewal activities in the St. Louis area finding that:

"The URA allowed noncash grant-in-aid tentative credits of $1,373,586 for constructing a proposed elementary school and for expanding a playground in the Mill Creek Valley urban renewal project area, although there was no reasonable evidence that the facilities would be needed. Moreover it is apparent that neither facility will be provided, because the St. Louis school officials determined that an existing school would be able to accommodate all pupils from the project area and because the land which had been designated as the playground-expansion site was sold for redevelopment of the area for residential use." [35]

Again, as in the cases of inadequate relocation, the GAO indicated in their recommendations the need for a better review of this aspect of the urban renewal process on the part of HHFA and URA. In one report the GAO specifically commented that, "The New York HHFA regional office did not effectively review the data submitted by LPA's in support of the claims for most of the noncash grant-in-aid credits discussed in this report. The ineligible and excessive grant-in-aid credits cited in this report are, in our opinion, attributable in considerable part to lack of effective reviews by URA." [36]

In addition to the above-cited examples of problems arising over the noncash grant-in-aid aspect of the urban renewal program, one GAO report deals specifically with policies regarding noncash grants-in-aid for public parking facilities. In a 1962 report, GAO disclosed that:

"In connection with certain slum clearance and urban renewal projects, URA has tentatively allowed noncash grant-in-aid credits amounting to $9.3 million for certain land and construction costs applicable to six publicly owned parking facilities. The cities where the facilities are located plan to recover, out of revenues derived from the operations, the entire costs of the parking facilities. The effect of allowing these noncash grants-in-aid will be that the cities will be reimbursed in amounts in excess of the actual costs of the facilities. The entire costs, totaling about $12 million, will be recovered through user charges and, in addition, about $6 million will be contributed by the Federal Government as a result of the grants-in-aid being included in the project." [37]

Therefore, GAO suggested to Congress that it "* * * may wish to consider enacting legislation which would amend the Housing Act of 1949 to exclude from noncash grants-in-aid all publicly owned facilities to the extent that the capital costs of such facilities are contemplated to be recovered out of revenues derived from their operations." [38] An amendment to this effect has not been passed thus far.

Another 1962 report by GAO raised the question of how binding are the commitments of local municipalities to provide agreed upon noncash grants-in-aid. The GAO also raised the point that municipalities are not generally obligated to assume costs determined to be ineligible by HHFA. In this context, the GAO asked that the URA secure "legally binding commitments" on noncash grants-in-aid and "* * * reasonable assurance that municipalities will reimburse the Government for ineligible costs." [39]

Other examples of noncash grant-in-aid deficiencies were cited by the GAO. The preceding discussion of this aspect, as in GAO findings and recommendations, as in the case of relocation, was based on a fair sample of all reports. No particular weight or significance should be attached to the choice of examples to be presented beyond the previously stated criterion of repeated occurrence throughout the GAO reports on urban renewal activities.

V. SUMMARY

In summary, the GAO has issued 23 reports to Congress during the period 1955–64. A significant number of these were found to be, in part, concerned with two administrative problems—the relocation of persons displaced from urban renewal activities (considered in 9 reports); and noncash grant-in-aid credits (considered in 15 reports). It should be noted that the frequency with which these subjects are mentioned by the GAO in no way indicates that these are necessarily the most significant findings of the investigations surveyed. Absence of any overall GAO review of the urban renewal program since 1958 prevented detailed consideration of the extent to which other deficiencies apply to the program in general.

---

[24] U.S. General Accounting Office. Review of slum clearance and urban renewal activities of the San Francisco Regional Office, HHFA. July 1960. P. 6.

[25] U.S. General Accounting Office. Improper inclusion of Melan bridge costs in cost of Keyway slum clearance and urban renewal project, Topeka, Kans. October 1963. P. 8.

[26] U.S. General Accounting Office. Excessive allocation of costs of certain streets and related facilities to the northside urban renewal project, Kansas City, Mo., September 1964. P. 16.

[27] U.S. General Accounting Office. Excessive allocation of costs of certain facilities to the Mill Creek Valley urban renewal project, St. Louis, Mo. November 1964. P. 8.

[28] U.S. General Accounting Office. Review of slum clearance and urban renewal activities of the San Francisco Regional Office, HHFA. July 1960. P. 7.

[29] U.S. General Accounting Office. Report on examination of selected slum clearance and urban renewal activities of the Redevelopment Authority of the City of Harrisburg, Pa. October 1960. P. 6.

[30] U.S. General Accounting Office. Review of slum clearance and urban renewal activitives of the Atlanta Regional Office, HHFA. June 1961, p. 7.

[31] U.S. General Accounting Office. Review of selected slum clearance and urban renewal activities under the administration of the Philadelphia Regional Office, HHFA. April 1962, p. 6.

[32] Ibid., p. 8.

[33] Ibid., p. 9.

[34] U.S. General Accounting Office. Review of selected slum clearance and urban renewal activities under the administration of the New York Regional Office, HHFA. October 1962, p. 7.

[35] U.S. General Accounting Office. Excessive allocation of costs of certain facilities to the Mill Creek Valley urban renewal project, St. Louis, Mo., p. 6.

[36] U.S. General Accounting Office. Review of selected slum clearance and urban renewal activities under the administration of the New York Regional Office, HHFA. October 1962, p. 10.

[37] U.S. General Accounting Office. Review of noncash grant-in-aid credits allowed for publicly owned parking facilities, HHFA. June 1962, p. 4.

[38] U.S. General Accounting Office. Review of noncash grant-in-aid credits allowed for publicly owned parking facilities, HHFA. June 1962, p. 14.

[39] U.S. General Accounting Office. Review of policies and procedures for controlling and sharing the costs of slum clearance and urban renewal projects. March 1962, pp. 8–9.

In closing, we note that this report is limited to a survey of GAO reports and is not an investigation of the urban renewal program or its operation by HHFA and URA. For the purpose of this analysis the findings of the GAO have been taken at their face value, despite the fact that many of the reports contained rebuttals by HHFA and URA officials as to the correctness of the GAO findings.

It should also be noted that this analysis has given no consideration to any action taken, or not taken, by the LPA's, or URA, subsequent to the issuance of the report by the GAO. In many cases, where URA agreed with the GAO findings, proper action was promised. In other cases, URA promised to secure additional information. It was beyond the scope of this investigation to "follow up" these promises.

These exclusions, however, do not detract from the main objective of this paper; i.e., to bring together and focus attention on the principal findings of the 23 GAO reports dealing with problems in carrying out the intent of Congress regarding the urban renewal program.

THE NEW LATIN AMERICAN PARLIAMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, one important but little noted event in Latin American affairs last year was the convening of the first Latin American Parliament in Lima, Peru, in December.

I was honored to be accredited to the assembly as a U.S. observer. Thirteen nations sent 160 delegates to the initial meeting. The nations represented were Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay, and Venezuela.

In addition to the United States, observers included the Organization of American States, the Inter-American Development Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the Inter-American Committee of the Alliance for Progress. The presence of representatives of these groups gives us some idea of the significance that is attached to the meeting in Lima.

The meeting got off to an inspiring start with a notable address by the President of Peru, Fernando Belaunde Terry. His vision of the future of the hemisphere was tempered wisely with an appreciation of the enormous problems that the nations of Latin America face, individually and collectively, in all phases of their national lives.

In addition to President Belaunde, Felipe Herrera, Director of the International Development Bank, Carlos Sanz de Santamaria, Chairman of the Alliance CIAP committee and Jose Mora, Director General of the Organization of American States, all spoke to the delegates. Each stressed the importance of this first step toward greater political cooperation and communication in Latin America, not only for its own sake, but for the contributions that this development can make to the economic and social development and stability of the Western Hemisphere.

In talking with many of the delegates to the session, I was impressed and moved by the spirit of cooperation and mutual concern expressed by the Latin American legislators.

While the meeting in Lima was called originally to explore and discuss the possibility of further organization, the sentiment of the delegates for a permanent group led the Conference to declare the Lima meeting as the first session of the Latin American Parliament. It went on to establish the Parliament as a permanent body with an executive secretariat.

The Declaration of Lima adopted during the session, specifically affirmed the goal of Latin American integration as a necessary historic process and called upon the Parliaments of the member nations to marshal governmental and public support for political integration. This declaration also provided for and encouraged the inclusion of additional nations in the future.

It became evident when the parliamentarians got down to brass tacks on specific issues that there are innumerable areas of mutual concern in which each nation can profit from the experience of the others. In fact, I noted a genuine willingness to share ideas in the areas of agrarian reform, economic development, participation in international and regional institutions, and increasing exports.

To be sure, there were some criticisms of U.S. policy expressed during the course of the meetings, but for the most part they were reasoned statements of differences in judgment. In fact, I felt at the time that to channel and communicate grievances could prove to have a healthy impact on hemispheric relations.

I have taken this time today because I believe that the House should be aware of what our fellow legislators are doing in Latin America to widen their channels of communications with one another.

Just as the Alliance for Progress is working to build a foundation for greater economic and social cooperation, the regularization of political cooperation in the future. It is my belief that this meeting, called at the initiative of Latin American legislators who have turned to a democratically organized parliament for the discussion of problems of mutual concern in a significant development in Latin American affairs, and one of which every Member of the U.S. Congress should be aware.

AMENDMENTS TO SOCIAL SECURITY LAW

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BYRNES] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. I have today introduced a bill (H.R. 7057) to amend the social security laws. I offer this bill not only on my own behalf but also on behalf of many of my Republican colleagues. We offer this bill as a substitute for the bill (H.R. 6675) reported by the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7057 contains all of the amendments to the social security laws which are contained in the committee bill, except for parts 1 and 2 of title I of the committee bill—which contain the hospitalization program financed under social security and the program for voluntary supplemental medical insurance—and, of course, except for the additional payroll tax provided for in the committee bill to finance the hospital program. The bill I have introduced would substitute the comprehensive program of health insurance for the aged which I offered in an earlier bill (H.R. 4351) for parts 1 and 2 of title I of the committee bill. It is financed partly by premium contributions and partly by the general revenues.

We believe that the comprehensive health insurance program in this bill will offer better medical insurance to the aged, at a lower overall cost, than the combined package of benefits in parts 1 and 2 of title I of the committee bill (H.R. 6675). Bills to provide comprehensive insurance have been introduced by many Members, including Hon. JAMES B. UTT, of California, H.R. 4352; Hon. JACKSON E. BETTS, of Ohio, H.R. 4353; Hon. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI, of Pennsylvania, H.R. 4354; Hon. HAROLD R. COLLIER, of Illinois, H.R. 4355; Hon. MELVIN R. LAIRD, of Wisconsin, H.R. 4356; Hon. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON, of Alabama, H.R. 4357; Hon. BEN REIFEL, of South Dakota, H.R. 4358; Hon. ROBERT T. STAFFORD, of Vermont, H.R. 4519; Hon. JOHN B. ANDERSON, of Illinois, H.R. 5022; Hon. ROBERT F. ELLSWORTH, of Kansas, H.R. 5031; Hon. CHARLES A. MOSHER, of Ohio, H.R. 5582; and Hon. J. IRVING WHALLEY, of Pennsylvania, H.R. 6690.

While the bill which I introduced today contains all the other amendments to the social security laws that are in the committee bill, neither I nor my Republican colleagues intend to imply that we support each and every amendment adopted by the full committee. Our purpose in limiting the changes proposed in this bill to the medical care phase is to make doubly clear the absolute and complete unanimity of the Republicans in their opposition to the concept of financing of hospital benefits through the social security system.

In opposing this concept, the Republicans are not unmindful of the increased cost of health insurance for those over age 65. The individual rates which must be charged by private carriers of health insurance double between age of 25 and the age of 60. After the age of 60, this progression increases at a more accelerated pace. I do not claim to be able to draw the line among the 18 million persons over age 65, and to distinguish those who are able to finance adequate health insurance from those who cannot afford such insurance. I do know that there are many millions among them for whom the cost of adequate health insurance today is a real economic burden.

The eldercare bills introduced by some of my colleagues sought to meet this problem by expanding the State administered programs of medical care under the Kerr-Mills Act. There were many who felt that this would provide a proper solution. Eldercare bills have been introduced by Hon. A. S. Herlong, Jr., of Florida, H.R. 3727; Hon. Thomas B. Curtis, of Missouri, H.R. 3728; Hon. Durward G. Hall, of Missouri, H.R. 3800; Hon. Joel T. Broyhill, of Virginia, H.R. 3801; Hon. Tim Lee Carter, of Kentucky, H.R. 3802; Hon. Paul Findley, of Illinois, H.R. 3803; Hon. Walter S. Baring, of Nevada, H.R. 3917; Hon. Laurence J. Burton, of Utah, H.R. 3920; Hon. John N. Erlenborn, of Illinois, H.R. 3929; Hon. H. R. Gross, of Iowa, H.R. 4253; Hon. Dave Martin, of Nebraska, H.R. 4501; Hon. Charles M. Teague, of Texas, H.R. 4547; Hon. Frank Chelf, of Kentucky, H.R. 4866; Hon. Bob Wilson, of California H.R. 4981; Hon. John O. Marsh, Jr., of Virginia, H.R. 5045; Hon. James D. Martin, of Alabama, H.R. 5046; Hon. Ray Roberts, of Texas, H.R. 5049; Hon. W. J. Bryan Dorn, of South Carolina, H.R. 5284; Hon. Joe R. Pool, of Texas, H.R. 5307; Hon. Craig Hosmer, of California, H.R. 5488; Hon. E. C. Gathings, of Arkansas, H.R. 5573; Hon. James H. Quillen, of Wisconsin, H.R. 5773; Hon. John M. Ashbrook, of Ohio, H.R. 5786; Hon. John J. Duncan, of Tennessee, H.R. 5787; Hon. Prentiss Walker, of Mississippi, H.R. 5892; Hon. J. Irving Whalley, of Pennsylvania, H.R. 6263; Hon. Odin Langen, of Minnesota, H.R. 6397; and Hon. Ancher Nelsen, of Minnesota, H.R. 6405.

Much of the eldercare concept is embodied in the committee bill (H.R. 6675). The States are given more latitude to provide the aged with health insurance under the Kerr-Mills program. The States are permitted to require individuals to participate in the cost of such programs in a manner reasonably related to the individual's income and resources. The bill I have introduced makes even more specific the authority of the State to use the eldercare approach. The States are specifically authorized to set up private health insurance programs for the aged. However, we must recognize that there is no compulsion on the States—and there should be none.

I can readily understand the concern of the aged. They want to be assured in advance that their medical needs will be met. That is the purpose and advantage of health insurance. The program of comprehensive health insurance in my bill would extend that advantage to all of the aged—at a cost which they could afford.

Under the health insurance program in this bill, the aged will be given the same coverage and the same benefits that are provided for Federal employees under the high option—that is the maximum coverage—of the Government-wide indemnity plan. It is admittedly the best program available today. The insured will pay about one-third of the cost. The remaining cost will be financed out of general revenues. This program is predicated on a subsidy which would be equivalent to the savings in premium costs to the aged which would result if the aged were insured in a group which included the entire population over age 21. Since the problem arises because many of those aged 65 no longer have any insurable identity with a group under age 65, I would offer them the advantages of the group rate by means of a Government subsidy.

The bill offers the comprehensive program to the aged without the taint of welfare. All of the aged pay something toward the cost of the insurance. The amount which they pay is related to the funds most of them will have available under the bill as a result of the increase in social security cash benefits. It is reasonable and well within their means.

The bill also amends the Internal Revenue Code to provide for a special tax to recoup the Federal Government's part of the cost of the insurance from those participating who have incomes in excess of $5,000 for a single person and in excess of $10,000 for a married couple filing a joint return. In this manner, those over age 65, who are fully able to finance health insurance without Government aid, can participate in the program with the full knowledge that they are not passing on this cost to others.

I include a description of the bill at this point:

DESCRIPTION OF REPUBLICAN PLAN OF COMPREHENSIVE INSURANCE FOR THE AGED—H.R. 7057

GENERAL DESCRIPTION

This is a bill to provide for comprehensive health insurance for all persons aged 65 and over on a uniform basis throughout the United States. The cost of the insurance will be shared by the individual participants and the Federal Government. The insurance will be entirely voluntary.

SUMMARY OF BENEFITS

The bill provides for comprehensive health insurance equivalent to the medical services available to Government employees under the high option of the Government-wide indemnity plan, modified in order to meet the special needs of the aged.

The benefits under the plan will greatly exceed the benefits provided for in the committee bill (H.R. 6675).

The bill is comprehensive with respect to the scope and duration of benefits, subject only to a maximum of $40,000. No longer will the life savings of an elderly person be wiped out because of a major illness.

The bill provides for full coverage of the first $1,000 of hospital (or nursing home) room and board plus 80 percent of any balance. This is the equivalent to 50 days in the hospital or 100 days of a qualified nursing home without a deductible. In addition, the insurance program covers 80 percent of all other hospital, surgical, and medical expenses, after a deductible of $50, of which only $25 will apply to other hospital charges. This includes professional services of doctors, such as surgery, consultations, and home, office, and hospital calls; professional services of registered nurses; diagnostic services; rental of medical equipment; ambulance service; and prescribed drugs and medicines.

The insurance will pay the actual charges for the service, subject to the reasonable and customary test used by private insurers. This test avoids the determination of reasonable cost separately with respect to the aged for each service of each hospital. It will result in uniformity in charges for patients over age 65 and for patients under age 65. The medical costs of the former will not be shifted to the latter. It will provide better medical care for the aged.

Except for the liberalization of the coverage of hospital room and board to include nursing homes, the plan is in all respects identical to the high option of the Government-wide indemnity plan offered to Federal employees. This program has been described by the Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare as affording the most comprehensive coverage which could be offered at the present time.

METHOD OF FINANCING

The insurance would be financed by a graduated premium contribution by the individual participants based on ability to pay, supplemented by an annual appropriation from the general revenues.

By including a contribution or premium charge, the cost of the program is shared by those who receive the benefits and by the Government.

Unlike the committee bill (H.R. 6675), this bill does not rely upon a regressive payroll tax for financing. The Government's share of the cost will be paid from the general funds of the Government. The bill thus avoids the dangerous fiction inherent in the committee bill that, through the use of a payroll tax, today's workers and their employers are prepaying the cost of health protection for their later years.

ELIGIBILITY FOR COVERAGE

All persons upon attaining age 65 will be eligible for coverage on a voluntary basis. Following enactment of the program, there will be a 6-month enrollment period during which all persons 65 years of age and over will be eligible to elect to participate. Thereafter, there will be periodic enrollment periods. All persons reaching age 65 will have 7 months within which to elect to participate.

Under the committee bill, hospitalization benefits are automatically extended to all persons aged 65 and over (except certain Federal employees). This results in the inclusion of persons opposed to such coverage, as well as those already covered by group insurance programs. The voluntary concept avoids this excess coverage. Since there is a cost to the insured, those who already have adequate programs paid for by their former employers or through associations and the like, may decide not to participate in the Government-sponsored program. To the extent that these do not participate, the cost to the Government is reduced.

MANNER OF ELECTION

For those under social security (or railroad retirement), the election will be exercised by authorizing a "checkoff" or assignment of the prescribed premium contribution out of the individual's current monthly social security benefits. An election by those not under social security (or railroad retirement) will be evidenced by execution of an application for participation in the program and the payment of premium contributions.

BASIS FOR PREMIUM CONTRIBUTIONS

The premium contributions by the participants are graduated according to ability to pay as evidenced by their old age insurance benefit. The premium is an amount equal to 10 percent of the minimum cash benefit of a primary beneficiary (increased to $44 per month) plus 5 percent of the additional cash benefit payable to the primary beneficiary and his spouse (if over age 65). This will result in an average premium contribution of $6.50 per month per person.

If an individual otherwise entitled to receive cash benefits under social security is ineligible for such benefits (or such benefits are reduced) on account of the earnings test, this will not affect the individual's contribution. The amount of the individual's contribution will be paid by the Social Security Administrator to the insurance program irrespective of earnings.[1]

At the level of social security cash benefits provided for in the bill, the premium contributions required for select benefit levels would be as follows:

Monthly health contribution

Monthly benefit of aged family unit:	
$44 (single worker)	$4.40
$66 [1]	5.50
$81	6.30
$114	7.90
$150.90	9.80
$203.85 [2]	13.00

[1] Monthly minimum of $44 for worker and $22 for wife.

[2] Monthly maximum of $135.90 for worker and $67.93 for wife.

Railroad retirement contributions would be based upon the same formula as the social security contributions, up to the maximum payable by social security participants.

For a couple receiving the maximum social security benefit (increased to $203.85), the cost of the insurance will be $13 per month. A couple receiving the minimum social security benefit (increased to $66) will be able to buy the same health insurance at a cost of $5.50 per month. The amount of the Government subsidy thus varies with the economic status of the individual, as measured by social security benefits. The proposed increase of 7 percent in the social security cash benefits, with a minimum increase of $4 per month retroactive to January 1, 1965, will provide the social security beneficiaries with additional funds to participate in the insurance program.

Persons who are not under social security may participate by a premium contribution on an individual basis equal in amount to the maximum individual contribution of those eligible under social security. Where payment of the premium would represent an undue hardship, such as in the case of a person under old-age assistance, the individual could be included under the group buy-in option extended to the States.

The insurance concept is completely independent of the social security system. Social security benefits are used merely as a test of ability to pay in determining the amount of the individual contribution. The assignment of a predetermined percentage of these benefits to the health insurance fund is the only relationship of the program to the OASDI system.

PARTICIPATION BY STATE AGENCIES—GROUP BUY-IN OPTION

State agencies will have the option to purchase the plan benefits for their old age assistance (OAA) and medical assistance for the aged (MAA) recipients at a group rate equivalent to the weighted average rate applicable to the social security beneficiaries, which is presently about $6.50 per month.

The bill preserves fully the role of the States in providing for those who are in need. The State agency will have considerable flexibility in meeting the requirements of these groups. If the individual is a social security beneficiary, presumably the State would require the individual to elect the benefits through the assignment of social security benefits and increased the individual's old age assistance cash allowance to make up the difference. Other recipients of State aid could be blanketed in at the group rate.

Thus, while the individual contributions will vary, all persons over 65 will be eligible for the identical comprehensive protection. No distinction is made between the person covered on an individual basis, the recipient of OAA or the recipient of MAA.

ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM

The bill establishes a national health insurance fund. The fund will be administered by the Secretary of the Treasury. Premium contributions of the individual participants will be deposited directly to the credit of the fund. An appropriation will be made annually to provide for the additional amount required by the fund in order to finance benefits for the ensuing benefit period.

The general administration of the insurance program will be entrusted to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. That Department will be charged with the responsibility of making known the program to those presently over age 65; notifying those reaching age 65 in the future of their rights to participate; maintaining records; preparing actuarial studies; and presenting the appropriation requests for the program to the committees of the Congress, et cetera.

The Office of the Surgeon General will be charged with the administration of the benefit provisions of the insurance program. The Surgeon General will utilize established health insurance organizations to process the claims (bills) of the hospitals, physicians, and other organizations rendering the service. Payment for health service will be processed in the same manner as a charge presently covered by Blue Cross-Blue Shield or a private insurer. The hospital, physician, and the like will send their bills to the accredited health organization designated to process claims. After the customary verification, such organization will pay the charge. The paying organization will then be reimbursed by the Treasury for the charges paid together with an agreed upon fee or handling charge.

TAX RECOUPMENT FOR INCOMES OVER $5,000

A provision is added to the Internal Revenue Code to recoup a part of the cost of the insurance from those participating who have incomes in excess of $5,000 for a single person and in excess of $10,000 for a married couple filing a joint return. In this manner, those over age 65, who are fully able to finance health insurance without Government aid, can participate in the program with the full knowledge that they are not passing on this cost to others.

---

[1] To this extent, there is an automatic liberalization of the earnings test.

Comparison of programs of health insurance for the aged

	Committee bill (H R. 6675)		Republican substitute (H.R 7057)—Comprehensive insurance program
	Hospitalization program	Medical services program	
Eligibility	Persons over age 65 (excluding Federal employees retired after 1959) without regard to social security status, and persons reaching age 65 after the year 1967 with required social security coverage.	All persons over age 65 without regard to social security coverage.	All persons over age 65 without regard to social security coverage.
Enrollment	No enrollment required	Enrollment and payment of premium required. Premium may be paid by social security allotment.	Enrollment and payment of premium required. Premium may be paid by social security allotment.
Cost to the insured.	Benefits extended to eligible persons without cost to the insured.	Premium contribution of $3 per month required of the insured.	Premium contribution required of insured based on cash benefits under social security. Average premium about $6.50 per month.
Benefits	1. Hospital charges for up to 60 days of hospitalization, followed by 20 days of nursing home care subject to a $40 deductible. Hospital period may be exchanged for nursing home care on a 1 to 2 ratio up to a total of 100 days of nursing home care. Benefit limitations apply to a "spell of illness," which continues until lapse of 60 consecutive days during which no benefits are received. 2. Home health services up to 100 visits following a period of hospitalization. 3. Hospital outpatient diagnostic services subject to a $20 deductible for each 20 days.	Physicians' and doctors' services, home health services, limited psychiatric hospitalization, and miscellaneous medical services in and out of medical institutions, subject to a deductible of $50, with 20 percent of the charges to be paid by patient.	1. Hospital charges for room and board up to $1,000 without a deductible. 2. All additional hospital charges, including room and board subject to a deductible of $25 with 20 percent to be paid by patient. 3. Any and all other recognizable medical expense, in or out of the hospital, including physicians, surgeons, private nurses, and prescribed drugs. Subject to a deductible of $25 to $50 overall, with the patient paying 20 percent of the charges. 4. Benefits are subject to a lifetime maximum of $40,000, with restoration of maximum where annual benefits do not exceed $1,000.
Financing	Payroll tax beginning with a rate of 0.70 percent on $5,600 and increasing to a maximum of 1.60 percent on $6,600, applicable to employers, employees and self-employed alike.	Premium contributions by the insured (½) and general revenues (½).	Premium contributions by the insured (⅓) and general revenues (⅔).
Benefits financed by tax revenues, 1st full year.	$2,300,000,000 [1]	$560,000,000 based upon 80 percent participation.[1]	$2,000,000,000 based upon 90 percent participation.[1]

[1] Benefit cost will also be offset by savings in other Federal programs and by increased Federal tax revenues. Total offset under combined programs in committee bill and under Republican program would be approximately the same—about $300,000,000 to $500,000,000.

CIVIL DEFENSE

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, for many years, along with many of my colleagues, I have been very much interested in the problems of civil defense. Several years ago, I introduced legislation which would set up a system of stockpiling agricultural commodities to serve the civilian population in the event of a national emergency, and during the last session of Congress I introduced legislation to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, to provide for shelter in Federal structures and for other purposes.

I am very grateful to the Honorable F. EDWARD HÉBERT, who, as chairman of the appropriate subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, had extensive hearings last year on this important subject.

When I was in my district this past fall, many of my constituents expressed to me their concern that we are not making more efforts to provide shelter for our civilian population in the event of war. I do not think it is probable, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to have an atomic war in the near future, but I am concerned about nuclear blackmail. Based on the information that has been given to me, and which I believe is irrefutable, the Soviet Union has done much more in the area of civil defense than we in America have.

I am today introducing the same bill that my able colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BENNETT] has introduced, with the hope that during this session of Congress we can move more rapidly and more satisfactorily in the field of civil defense. With the permission of my colleague [Mr. BENNETT], I join ranks with him and many others of our colleagues who feel that in the area of civil defense we have been weighed in the balances and found wanting. We must take action in the very near future to solve this grievous problem.

A NATIONAL TECHNICAL INSTITUTE FOR THE DEAF

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. CAREY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, on April 8, 1864, Abraham Lincoln signed the charter for Gallaudet College here in the Nation's Capital. This was the first and still is the only institution providing postsecondary education for deaf young adults. Today 101 years later I bring to this, the 89th Congress, a piece of legislation for further assistance to the young deaf adults of our country. This bill would establish a National Technical Institute for the Deaf, the second postsecondary educational institution in our great country.

Deafness sets up a wall around the intellectual potential of our young deaf people which can be penetrated only by the use of every educational weapon and all the modern electronic technology available. Hearing impairment as a communicative disorder has an impact on a person's total development and adjustment. It is not only a physical, but an educational and social handicap affecting understanding, speaking, reading, and writing.

One of the most important needs in the education and training of the deaf is an institution which will offer deaf young adults at the post-high school level a varied choice of courses in technical fields which will result in employment at much higher levels of competence than is now the case for most of this age group. Such an institution should have as a major focus, not the segregation of the deaf in occupations considered suitable solely or even primarily for the deaf, but rather training tailored to help integrate the deaf into the working community as it now exists.

Ideally, the deaf should be trained and educated to the fullest extent possible in a hearing environment. Those additional aids made necessary by the students' deafness should be added to the educational structure. Until this is possible, however, the deaf should not be denied the opportunity to develop their talents to the fullest.

A technical institution, affiliated with a great university and able to take advantage of its many resources, preferably located in a busy and expanding industrial complex, would be a first step toward meeting a great need. A flexible curriculum, a top-flight faculty and thoroughly modern facilities and equipment would be essential. Beyond this, however, there will have to be special professional services built into the schedule and provided for all students in varying degrees, aimed at enlarging each student's ability to communicate—both as a necessity in the learning process and to improve personal and work relationships on the job and in community life—and broadening the student's concepts of himself and his role in the economic and social life of the community and the country.

Behind the entire institution should be a driving force and a basic philosophy of reaching out, not closing in.

ADMINISTRATION OF THE DAVIS-BACON ACT

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ROOSEVELT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, during the 87th and 88th Congresses subcommittees of the House Education and Labor Committee conducted studies into the administration of the Davis-Bacon Act, which act requires that contractors bidding on Government construction projects agree to pay their laborers and mechanics the wages found by the Secretary of Labor to be prevailing in the locality of the proposed construction project.

The committee published a committee print during the 1st session of the 88th Congress entitled "Administration of the Davis-Bacon Act." This report presented the conclusions of the committee subsequent to 21 days of hearings.

During this period the Department of Labor, admirably sensitive to constructive criticism, proposed revised regulations which were published in the Federal Register on November 3, 1962—27 F.R. 10760. These regulations were adopted and published—29 C.F.R. parts 1, 3, and 5; Secretary's Order No. 32–63.

At the time that these regulations were proposed, I promised the committee that after a reasonable period had passed I would request a report from the Department on its experience under the revised regulations. One year after the promulgation of the regulations I requested that the Department of Labor submit its analysis of the effectiveness of the administration of the act subsequent to the adoption of the revised regulations. I now have that report and I request that it be printed following my remarks.

I welcome any comments concerning this report of the Department of Labor, particularly comments of a constructive nature. I intend to submit copies of the report to several interested parties and, after a reasonable time for response, will call an executive session of the General Subcommittee on Labor to consider the advisability of legislative hearings.

FEBRUARY 1, 1965.

Hon. W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor,
U.S. Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: While the problems of administration of the Davis-Bacon Act were being studied by the General Subcommittee on Labor during the last Congress, the Labor Department published new regulations (29 CFR subtitle A, pts. 1, 3 and 5, effective Feb. 3, 1964; and notice, Department of Labor, Office of the Secretary, Secretary's Order No. 32–63, F.R. Doc. No. 64–64; Field, Jan. 3, 1964; 8:46 a.m.).

The subcommittee subsequently suspended its study for the purpose of allowing the Labor Department to gain some experience under the new regulations. At that time I announced that 1 year after the promulgation of the regulations I would request from the Department a complete statement evaluating the experience with the new procedures.

I do now request that the Department prepare and submit at the earliest possible date a complete report regarding its experience in administering the Davis-Bacon Act subsequent and relevant to these new regulations.

With best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Chairman.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, March 22, 1965.
Hon. JAMES ROOSEVELT,
Chairman, General Subcommittee on Labor, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with your request of February 1, 1965, there is attached a report of the Department's experience under the revised regulations under the Davis-Bacon Act and the Secretary's order establishing the Wage Appeals Board.

As you will note, there are several cases pending before the Board at the present time. The decision of the Board in these cases will be sent to you as soon as they are issued.

Sincerely,
W. WILLARD WIRTZ,
Secretary of Labor.

(Enclosure.)

REPORT ON EXPERIENCE UNDER THE REVISED REGULATIONS

(29 C.F.R. pts. 1, 3, and 5; Secretary's Order No. 32–63)

The information furnished follows the order used by Mr. Charles Donahue, solicitor of labor in explaining the revised regulations in his statement before the subcommittee on H.R. 7075.

1. Requiring contracting agencies to outline their construction programs (sec. 1.4). This provision of the regulations requires that the contracting agencies at the beginning of each year shall outline for us their construction programs so that we can anticipate their demands for wage determinations by securing in advance wage data from the areas where their construction is projected for the current year.

Comment: The full effect of this requirement will not be realized immediately. Since the regulations did not become effective until after the first of the year 1964 some of the agencies were not able to implement these regulations to their field offices until quite late in 1964. With these data in our hands we are able to determine where and when substantial projects will be built and in those areas where wage rates are not well established we are in a position to do some advance planning in our operations and obtain wage information in sufficient time to insure the correctness of our wage determinations prior to bid opening or award of contracts.

As an example of the effectiveness of this provision, we recently received data indicating that in the near future contracts for construction, requiring the determination of wage minimums, totaling nearly $60 million were to be awarded by several agencies in the Durham, N.C., area. The data in our files showed conflicts existing as to rates prevailing for construction in Durham. To resolve these conflicts and to obtain all the wage information available, we have conducted an on-the-spot survey. This information is presently being analyzed and when requests for the anticipated work in this area are received we will be in a position to immediately issue accurate wage determinations.

2. Disclosure of information (sec. 1.15).

Comment: We have had numerous requests, both from labor and management, to review our wage data files with respect to specific wage determinations. In each case we have assisted them in every way to assure that evidence upon which we based our decision was made available to them for inspection. We have had no complaints concerning the withholding of necessary information.

3. Change of effectiveness of wage determinations from 90 to 120 days (sec. 5.4(a)).

Comment: These changes were designed to lend stability to the procurement process with respect to wage determinations issued under the pertinent legislation, but still provide for the issuance of wage determinations with sufficient frequency to maintain current prevailing wage practices. Our experience under these changes has reached fully our expectations.

An indication of the effectiveness of this provision is the fact that we have had numerous verbal comments from representatives of contracting agencies stating that this has assisted them considerably in orderly procurement. That is, the extra 30 days gives them greater flexibility in establishing their advertising, bid opening, and award dates without interruption or readvertising. Previously, it was their experience that the 90 day limitation was inadequate and often caused them to readvertise because of the expiration of a wage determination. Furthermore, the extended life of the wage determinations mean that they do not have to be issued as often at military installations where contracts are continually being awarded for construction. This procedure has substantially reduced the number of reissues that were necessary due to the expiration of the wage determination prior to opening of bids. This has eliminated a lot of paperwork in this Office and in the requesting agencies.

4. General wage determinations (sec. 5.3 (b)).

Comment: This type of a determination is issued to all Federal agencies and State highway departments having work in a particular locality or area. Any number of contracts can be awarded during 120 days life period of the determination. Upon the expiration of a general wage determination, a new one is automatically issued by the Department. This results in only three wage determinations being issued in a year for a particular locality or area in place of the many determinations previously issued on a project-by-project basis for each agency. To date general wage determinations covering 192 areas have been issued.

It should be noted that as a result of area determinations and the 30-day extension of the effective date we reduced the number of wage determinations issued from approximately 46,000 in 1963 to 41,000 in 1964.

From September 1, 1964, through December 31, 1964, 5,409 requests were received as compared with 10,117 received during the same period in 1963. This is a reduction of 4,708. Although other factors may have contributed to this reduction, the issuance of general determinations is the primary cause for this reduction. It is obvious that the saving in time and effort to both this Department and the various requesting agencies is substantial. Of particular interest is the fact that this reduction was accomplished during a period of increased Federal participation in construction brought about by the passage of 11 new statutes by the 88th Congress requiring the inclusion of wage minimums.

5. Additional classifications (sec. 5.5(a) (1) (ii)).

Comment: Prior to the issuance of the new regulations, agencies administering federally assisted programs were required to submit a formal request to the Secretary of Labor for a supplemental wage determination when classifications needed in the performance of the work were not included in the original wage determination. This created a vast amount of paperwork for the agencies and the Department of Labor. Under the new regulations an authorized agency representative can approve the use of such classification and establish a rate therefor as long as it is in conformity with the wage determination in the contract. We do, however, require such action to be forwarded to the Department of Labor for post review and for decision in case of a dispute. As a result of the new regulation, agencies can establish immediately classifications needed to expedite the progress of the work.

6. Giving agencies an opportunity to furnish available wage information (sec. 5.3(a) (3)).

Comment: Under section 115 of the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1956 we consult with the highway department of the State in which a project in the Interstate System is to be undertaken. In making a wage determination due regard is given to the information obtained through this consultation. Because of this experience we are giving other Federal agencies an opportunity to participate in the wage determining process. Consequently we revised our regulations to require all Federal and State agencies requesting wage determinations to submit a full description of the work, their recommendation as to the type of construction involved (i.e., building, heavy, or highway), and available data reflecting the wage rates being paid on similar construction in that area. Apparently the agencies consider furnishing payment evidence too burdensome since they generally have not taken advantage of this opportunity.

7. Wage Appeals Board (Secretary's Order No. 32–63).

Comment: The new rules provide for review by a Wage Appeals Board of all important questions relating to the administration of the Davis-Bacon Act, including those involving wage determinations and interpretations. The procedural rules of the Board are set forth in 29 CFR, part 7 (29 F.R. 8004).

To date the Board has passed upon two cases. The Board's opinions are attached.

There are three cases presently pending before the Board. The cases and the issues presented are briefly described below:

1. Determination of prevailing wage rates applicable to construction of Mattapony Towers, a seven-story elevator apartment building in Bladensburg, Md.: The petition has been filed by the apartment builders. The essential question presented is whether the construction involved is similar (1) to garden, walk-up apartments, as alleged by the petitioner, or (2) to commercial construction, as found by the Department of Labor.

2. Appeal of Griffith Co. and Southern California Chapter, AGC, re an interpretation of the Davis-Bacon provisions of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1956: The petition is concerned with the coverage under this legislation of mechanics employed by lessors of power equipment who perform repairs of this equipment at the jobsite. The essential questions would appear to be: (1) whether such a lessor may be considered a "subcontractor" for purposes of this legislation, and (2) whether mechanics employed by them in the repair of this equipment may be said to be engaged in the "initial construction" of the Interstate System.

3. Joint Appeal of U.S. Atomic Energy Commission and Leland Stanford Junior University re coverage of certain work under the Davis-Bacon Act: The issue is whether the Solicitor of Labor's opinion that part of the assembly of 40′ modules is covered by the Davis-Bacon Act was in error.

8. Change in reporting requirements (sec. 5.7(a)).

Comment: Under our previous regulations, contracting agencies were required to submit reports to the Secretary of Labor when violations amounted to $200 or more, as well as when found to have been willful. The $200 standard has been changed to $500. While there appears to be no precise way of determining the number of nonwillful violations between $200 and $500, now unreported, there no doubt would be a substantial number of cases falling within this category. Accordingly, it would appear that this change in our regulations enables agencies to spend more time on preventive enforcement and on the more serious violation cases. It also reduced the number of full-scale investigations required, which are time consuming and costly; it likewise reduces the amount of time required to prepare full-scale investigation reports; and thus cuts down on the paperwork previously required both in the contracting agency and in the Department of Labor.

9. Semiannual reports (5.7(b)).

Comment: Since the regulations were not issued until February 1964, and since considerable time was needed by the agencies to implement these regulations by appropriate instructions to their field offices, it is difficult at this time to adequately evaluate the first set of reports received. However, we are convinced that this reporting procedure has given both the agency headquarters and the Department a better picture of general agency compliance, and of the effectiveness of the enforcement program, and there is ample reason to believe that a detailed analysis will enable us to detect the weak points in the overall compliance picture and make it possible to work with the agencies to achieve effective enforcement.

10. Simplification of Anti-Kickback Regulations under the Copeland Act (3.5).

Comment: Because, at the present time, there are many types of standard deductions customarily made by employers with the consent of the employee, we listed such in the regulations and provided that the contractor, instead of seeking permission in advance for these deductions, may do so without having to go through the previously required cumbersome, and actually unnecessary mechanics of obtaining prior formal approval. This new system has relieved the contractors, agencies, and this Department of a substantial burden of paperwork, as is graphically evidenced by the following statistics. By actual count, there were 682 requests from contractors in the last 4 months of 1963 which required action by this office, whereas during the last 4 months of 1964 we received only 29 requests.

11. The regulatory debarment period described in section 5.6 for serious violations of all pertinent legislation, except the Davis-Bacon Act itself, was revised to provide for debarment for a period up to 3 years in lieu of an inflexible period of 3 years.

Comment: The flexibility has received wide acceptance. It is fully consistent with the recommendations of the Administrative Conference of the United States concerning debarment practices. We note that in connection with H.R. 7075 the General Counsel of the General Accounting Office has urged the insertion of a similar provision in the Davis-Bacon Act.

RELOCATING FAMILIES DISPLACED BY URBAN RENEWAL AND HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Ronan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a series of articles appearing originally in the Chicago Tribune dealing extensively with how Chicago copes with the problems or relocating families displaced by urban renewal and highway construction.

The city of Chicago's Department of Urban Renewal, under the leadership of its chairman, Commissioner John G. Duba, has put Chicago in the forefront of the urban areas of our Nation in attacking the problems of urban blight and deterioration. In so doing, John Duba and his department have not lost sight of the human values involved in displacing individuals, families, and business establishments.

Because the critics of urban renewal frequently point to the problems and hardships of those who are uprooted as a major reason for their opposition to urban renewal projects, I feel this series is of more than ordinary interest to all concerned, and therefore, I highly commend it to my colleagues and the readership of the Congressional Record:

Relocation as a Means to the Realization of a Decent Home and a Suitable Living Environment for Every Chicago Family

(By Peter Negronida)

MOST RELOCATED PERSONS ARE SATISFIED

"Compared to the house I moved from, this is heavenly fine," wrote a near west side Italian woman of her new home. "I just know I'm going to love the neighborhood. My husband loves it, too, but he doesn't say too much about it.

"I have plenty of room, and it is all so nice for me. I just can't begin to tell you how much I love it. I thank you from the bottom of my heart for helping my family and me to find such a wonderful home."

Her reaction is more ecstatic than the typical responses to the questionnaires which relocated families fill out for the urban renewal department. Nevertheless, 9 out of 10 families polled were satisfied with every aspect of their relocation experience.

Wax eloquent

Some respondents wax eloquent about their relocation experiences. One man wrote, "Your cooperation in helping us to relocate to much improved living conditions has brought about a tremendous change, resulting in unforeseen happiness because of it. I wish to extend our deepest and sincerest appreciation for the noble work you all have personally undertaken in achieving your goal.

"I realize that those with whom you have had some friction, who lack initiative and understanding, will, in the end result, share my sentiments."

Others are brief and to the point. "The only comment I can think of is that I should have moved 20 years ago," a man said.

Also dissenters

But there have been dissenters as well. A disabled veteran was unsatisfied "because I wanted a first floor unit, and the elevators are out of fix too often. I had to take what I was offered."

"We did not receive any assist from your office—despite the fact that your office thinks otherwise," wrote a sharp-penned housewife. "This entire move was done solely, strictly, and entirely by us alone, and not your office."

Questionnaires are not used just to build up the urban renewal ego. All complaints are investigated by a special quality control unit within the relocation division.

Moves downstairs

In the case of the disabled veteran, for instance, a first floor unit was made available to him within a matter of weeks. The housewife who went it alone was visited to see if her new home was adequate.

Each and every relocated family, in fact, is visited by quality control personnel for just that purpose. "Our responsibility does not end until we have done everything we can for each family," said Sidney Turner, head of quality control.

Turner explained his function as being similar to that of an inspector general in the armed services.

Plenty of attention

"We see that each tenant is apprised of his rights to help and relocation payments, that each gets proper attention from the relocation representative (including an adequate number of referrals to new housing), and that each is satisfied, to the limit of our capability."

Relocation is big business: more than 7,500 families or individuals had been relocated through August. The average caseload at any one time is 2,500 to 3,000, necessitating a lot of paperwork to avoid mistakes and breakdowns.

Despite the need for records to keep things straight, Turner has a tenant-centered approach to his job.

"I don't mind if paperwork is not quite up to date in some cases," he maintained, "just so long as I can be sure each relocation representative is doing his best to help each tenant. After all, the records exist only to make it easier for us to help people."

GREEK TOWN FIGHTS BACK

Greek Town, that old ethnic landmark at Harrison and Halsted streets which died fighting when the area was razed for the new University of Illinois campus, may soon come to life again—a scant three blocks away.

The Greek language signs of many old Harrison-Halsted businesses already have regrouped in locations around the intersection of Halsted and Jackson Boulevard, in the very shadow of the university's rising skyscrapers.

The area is still mixed, containing cheap hotels as well as the Greek shops, but some of the more enterprising merchants plan to form a Greek Town association in hopes of giving the area an "authentic" look.

BUSINESSES NEED HELP

Such a project will, of course, require money. Ironically enough, many of the businessmen needing loans for property improvements will be turning for help to the same urban renewal department which took their longtime homes.

Laodarnas Deligiannis, a leader in the Greek Town association project, knows firsthand that urban renewal has a heart as well as a wrecking ball. He relocated his old Harrison-Halsted import business (food, gifts, liquor) to 766 Jackson Boulevard, with the help of a Small Business Administration relocation loan arranged by the department's relocation and property management division.

"I have no ill will toward anyone," he said. "I think relocated stores like mine are better and nicer than before. Sure, there will be a lot of headaches for a while, but relocation will be helpful in the long run because this is an up-and-coming area."

HAS GOOD FUTURE

Jerray Elsinger, the urban renewal commercial relocation officer who arranged Deligiannis' SBA loan, agrees that the Jackson-Halsted area has a good future. Further, he is sure he can help many of the businessmen in the proposed Greek Town association.

"We won't be able to use SBA relocation loans in this instance," Elsinger pointed out, "except possibly in converting a merchant's short-term, high-interest loan into a long-term obligation."

"There are other loan programs available, though. For instance, the SBA has a new program we should be able to use. It consists of loans of $15,000 or less which are based on projected earnings and the borrower's character rather than the conventional collateral requirement," he continued.

"Once the Greek Town Association gets underway, I expect quite a few of the merchants will be coming to us for these loans."

Plan organization

The association will get underway, according to Deligiannis, as soon as its members can meet to get organized. He outlined some of the things the association would try to accomplish.

"Most of the work would be in trying to create an 'Old Greek' atmosphere," he said. "We would have voluntary rules governing signs and decor, like they do in Old Town."

"And once we have the strength of numbers, we can go to city hall and ask for new street lights and other things, to get the kind of area we want."

Another aspect of the association's plans was discussed by John Damianos, operator of Greek Art Printing & Publishing Co., which he moved from Harrison-Halstead to 810 Jackson Boulevard in 1961.

Some don't fit

"We already have a Greek drugstore, a candle factory, restaurants, gift shops, coffee shops, night clubs, and offices of various Greek societies located around here," he said, "but there are also a number of establishments—some of them rundown—which don't fit in with the Greek Town concept we want."

"We plan to talk with the landlords or owners of these places and see if we can get them to at least fix their places up and make them presentable so they won't detract from our shops.

"Cooperation like that will be essential if this promising idea is to succeed."

(The Federal Government is interested in the unique commercial relocation activities of Chicago's Urban Renewal Department. Plans to acquaint other cities with the program will be described next Thursday.)

SMALL BUSINESSES SURVIVE RENEWAL

What does the little businessman do when he is displaced by an urban renewal project?

He could sell his inventory at a loss and retire, but he probably would rather stay in business. Or he could look through the want-ads for another location to buy or rent, but he probably could not afford to start over from scratch.

There is another way. He could join with other displaced businessmen in a corporation, and ask the urban renewal department for help in acquiring a new site and financing construction of a shopping center on it.

Form corporation

This was the method used by 14 wholesalers and retailers displaced from locations scattered throughout the West Side area cleared for the new University of Illinois campus. They formed the Jeffro Corp., and now do business in a modern shopping plaza at Jefferson Street and Roosevelt Road.

Although most occupants of the plaza have been in the center since May, formal dedication ceremonies were delayed. A ribbon-cutting ceremony is scheduled for 2 p.m. next Thursday, with officials of the city and the urban renewal department expected to participate.

Jeffro Plaza is on a 5½-acre site purchased from the department of urban renewal for $565,289. The masonry and concrete building housing all 14 merchants on one floor contains 103,000 square feet of floorspace, and is fully air conditioned. Parking for 350 cars is provided.

Saw alternatives

Father of the plaza idea was Joe Magit, a partner in the Turner and Magit clothing and fur companies, both wholesalers. "There are all these other modern shopping areas," he said, "and I knew we had to compete with them somehow. This was a necessity—either we go modern or we go out of business."

Magit and the other businessmen admit the help of the relocation workers from urban renewal was essential to the success of their project.

Staff members work with business firms in resolving their complex moving problems. One such commercial relocation specialist is Jerray A. Elsinger. There were financial troubles at first, but Elsinger helped secure acquisition and construction loans from Sharon Mortgage Co., and Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.

"Even after we got finances settled," Elsinger said, "we still had a big problem. Where were we going to put the businesses between the time they had to vacate their old locations and the completion of the new facilities?"

Leases vacant bank

Even that was within the resources of the department. A lease was arranged for temporary use of the vacant building which formerly housed the Central National Bank building, Roosevelt Road and Halsted Street, and which also had been acquired in the U. of I. project.

And how is business now? "Great," said Magit. "On the whole, businesses here in the plaza are doing 25 percent better than they did in their old locations."

Praises location

Marvin Paul, of Royal Mercantile, Inc., another wholesaler, ascribed part of the plaza's success to its location—right off the Dan Ryan Expressway—and the rest to the convenience of its facilities.

The other firms located in the plaza are Michaels, Bloom, Saxon & Co., Associated Meyerson Clothing Co., Midwest Mercantile Inc., Turner & Seifman, Turner & Co., Max Nathan Inc., Jewel Merchandising, Pritikin Furniture Co., Moderne Furniture Co., and Kite & Kite Textile Co., all wholesalers; and Conte-di-Savoia, the lone retailer.

Retailer lags

Conte-di-Savoia, a gourmet food store specializing in imports from Italy and other European countries, has not yet experienced the same good fortune in the plaza as the other occupants.

"We were closed for 8 months between the time we got kicked out of our old place and the time we moved in here," said Vito Cambio, the owner. "So many of the old customers don't know we're here yet, and business hasn't picked up as much as I had hoped."

HOSPITAL DEDICATION PLANNED

Results of the largest single loan ever granted by the Small Business Administration will be in evidence at 3:45 p.m. Monday when the new Fairview Hospital is dedicated at 4840 Marine Drive.

Among officials expected at the ceremony are Governor Kerner, Mayor Daley, John G. Duba, urban renewal commissioner, and Richard Lassar, regional administrator of the SBA, reception will follow the dedication.

Loan important

Fairview Hospital, a privately owned psychiatric institution specializing in diagnostic treatment of emotional and mental disorders, was relocated from its old south side home with the help of a $1,250,000 CBA loan arranged by Jerray Elsinger, the department of urban renewal's commercial relocation officer.

"You can't underestimate the importance of this loan to the success of the relocation project," said Elsinger. "It is next to impossible to get conventional financing for hospitals."

The magnitude of Elsinger's feat can be seen in the fact that the largest loan granted previously by the SBA was for $300,000.

Owners of the institution, Dr. and Mrs. C. Dennis Freund, are happy and grateful to urban renewal for its help.

Weren't happy

"I'll admit we weren't very happy 3 years ago when the land clearance commission (a predecessor agency of the department of urban renewal) notified us that our hospital at 2628 Prairie Avenue was to be taken," Mrs. Freund said.

"After all, we had been there since 1942, and we already had brought additional land to expand our facilities."

Relocation has made that expansion possible beyond the Freunds' wildest dreams. Their old south side mansion contained only 58 beds in 25,000 square feet, while the new facility has room for 150 beds in its 48,000 square feet.

Other problems too

Making that dream come true was not easy, according to Elsinger. There were other problems beside financing to be overcome.

"There was zoning, for one," he said. "The building the hospital is in already was under construction as a nursing home when the Freunds bought it. In view of popular misconceptions of mental illness, you can imagine how residents of the area reacted to our request for zoning variation when they heard a psychiatric hospital was going to be a neighbor.

Other problems were caused by the Freunds' new philosophy of treatment, the milieu concept, which allows patients freedom of movement under supervision.

No window bars

"Instead of bars on the windows, they wanted to use a special unbreakable glass," Elsinger recalled. "It took quite a while to get it in, because it could be installed only when the outside temperature was within a certain range."

Now completed and staffed by 50 consulting psychiatrists and a full complement of nurses and other personnel, the hospital is a $3 million project produced by conventional loans and the Freunds' savings as well as the SBA loan.

No expense has been spared to eradicate the "institutional" look in Fairview Hospital. Lounges and waiting rooms are tastefully furnished. Patients' rooms have pastel walls and cheerful curtains, and intimate dining facilities with elegant china are provided for each wing on each of the five floors.

Roof garden

Highlight of the building is the fifth floor roof garden, a sunny and airy retreat with an excellent view of North Lincoln Park and Lake Michigan.

"We feel this building enables us to give the best treatment possible," said Dr. Freund happily. "The surroundings are so homelike that patients hardly realize they are in a hospital."

STUDY CHICAGO RENEWAL

Chicago's urban renewal department has had great success with a novel approach to relocating displaced businessmen and institutions. The approach has been so successful, in fact, that it has resulted in issuance of more than $2.5 million in Small Business Administration (SBA) loans in Chicago alone.

The Federal Government is greatly impressed so officials of the SBA and the Urban Renewal Administration (URA) in Washington have arranged an informal meeting to spread Chicago's unique yet simple relocation methods throughout the 10-State Midwest region.

Meeting is today

This regional conference on service available to business displaced by urban renewal is scheduled for 9 a.m. today in the new Federal building. Urban renewal officials from five other Midwest cities will be in attendance.

Coming from Washington will be Daniel Carr, Assistant SBA Administrator; Clarence Cowles, head of the SBA office of financial services; and Clarence Hurt, relocation, Commissioner of the URA. Representing the local offices of the two agencies will be Richard Lassar, regional SBA administrator, and William Gist, deputy regional administrator of the URA.

Cities sending representatives are Cincinnati, Cleveland, Detroit, Milwaukee, and Minneapolis.

"We want these officials from other cities to hear the experiences of someone who has dealt with displaced businessmen," said Gist, "and to learn what programs the SBA has available to help these people."

Acts as coordinator

The man with experience he refers to is Jerray Elsinger, commercial relocation officer of Chicago's urban renewal department, who has served as liaison man between the SBA and countless small businessmen.

Both local and Federal officials are unanimous in praise of Elsinger's relocation work.

"We were one of the first urban renewal departments to hire someone for direct contact with business and the SBA," said Edward J. Lally, head of relocation and property management. "The results have been gratifying."

"They certainly have," agreed John G. Duba, urban renewal commissioner. "We have received letters from relocated businessmen thanking us for help. Virtually all of them say they are better off now than in their old locations."

Lassar, regional BSA administrator, said his statistics show Chicago has been a leader in relocation aid.

"Our midwest region has loaned more money for relocation than any other in the country," he said. "Chicago has accounted for $2.5 million out of our total $2.75 million.

Aids in workload

"Not only has the local liaison program enabled us to help more people than otherwise, but it has also made the work of my office much easier. When we get an application, we can be pretty sure it will hold up."

Dean Swartzel, regional URA administrator, stressed the importance of the liaison work to the nationwide urban renewal program.

"Whether it's Chicago or Cleveland," he said, "it is important for displaced businessmen to know what is available from the SBA, and other sources of financing.

"Basically, that is why we are holding this conference. We want to establish better communication between local urban renewal officials and SBA personnel so that existing and new legislation affecting loan programs can benefit citizens as soon as possible."

MEET A LANDLORD WITH A HEART

What happens to families and businessmen when the buildings they occupy are acquired for clearance by the urban renewal department?

They must be moved to new homes and shops eventually, of course, but until that happens the conditions under which they live and work must be improved—or at least made bearable. Repairs are made and services provided. Leases are redrawn for temporary occupancy, and rents lowered if they were too high.

The task of dealing with residential and commercial tenants in acquired buildings falls to the urban renewal department's property management staff, headed by Carl Christiansen. This "landlord with a heart" presently controls some 300 buildings on 400 acres throughout the city.

Job never ceases

Christiansen defined his staff's job as managing and keeping up all department-owned property from the time it is purchased until it is sold. "The department buys and sells property every week," he said, "so really, our job never ceases."

First thing his staff of management aids does when a building is acquired is inspect it to determine the need for repairs.

"We don't try to correct every building code violation," he pointed out, "because the building probably will be torn down in a matter of months. We limit our repairs to things which are really necessary to the health and safety of the occupants—like plumbing, electrical system, and anything in danger of imminent collapse."

He said he had seen some instances of buildings so close to falling apart that occupants were relocated on a crash basis so that the structures could be torn down before causing serious injuries.

"Not too many of them are that bad, though," Christiansen said, "but we do put in an average of about $100 in repairs on each building acquired."

Provide other service

Other things done to make buildings fit to live or do business include providing space heaters and appliances where needed.

These items come from a warehouse, stocked with serviceable equipment salvaged from previously demolished buildings.

In addition, property management provides janitors and guard service for all its buildings, and five snow removal vehicles to plow walks in winter.

In the meantime, management aids renegotiate all residential and commercial leases, putting them on a month-to-month basis pending relocation.

Commercial rents sometimes decrease further if clearance of the surrounding area has removed customers.

In a revelation significant for the "slum landlord" situation, Christiansen revealed that realistic rents do not pay the entire cost of repairs made and services provided.

Pioneer in field

Edward J. Lally, head of the relocation and property management division, has been a pioneer in the field under the urban renewal department and its predecessor agencies. He said there have been instances when tenants were reluctant to leave buildings scheduled for clearance.

"We go to extremes to avoid evicting people," Lally said, "but there are unusual circumstances when there is no other way.

"One of my first experiences along this line was with an Italian couple who told us they wouldn't leave their place unless we bought them airplane tickets to Rome. We had to take them to court for an order, but we found a new place for them, too."

Lally recounted a story that proved particularly troublesome. "This man was a character," he said. "Relocation people moved part of his equipment out to his new place of business, but he stalled for several months on the rest. We finally discovered he was running his business in both locations at the same time.

"And to top it off, he couldn't see what was wrong when we took him to court. He wound up writing letters to everyone from the President on down."

RELOCATION: PROS AND CONS

"I first encountered Mrs. S in February of 1964," began the report of a relocation representative from the urban renewal department, "when I visited her in the 3½-room apartment which had been her home for 10 years."

She lived alone on $77.50 a month from old-age assistance. She ate one meal a day, consisting of a pork chop, a slice of bread, and a cup of tea. She was very agile, despite her 86 years and poor eyesight.

Her moods varied, and at times it was difficult to make her understand the necessity of moving. At first she insisted she wanted to die in her old home."

Term case typical

The narrative of Mrs. S is typical of the cases encountered by relocation representatives. When a building is acquired by the urban renewal department for clearance, it makes no difference whether the occupants are old people, large families, or recent immigrants who do not speak English. There can be no exceptions.

"Many people are reluctant to move, of course," admitted Edward J. Lally, head of the department's relocation and property management division. "This is especially true if they have lived in the same place for 30 or 40 years."

"But there is no possible way we can let any of them stay in their old homes. They must move."

Lally pointed out that in virtually all cases, the persons relocated wind up living better than they had before. "That just stands to reason," he said, "for most of the units we acquire are at or near the bottom of the housing heap."

Staff has experience

"The department realizes that moving from a home of long standing can be difficult—even shattering—for some," he said. For that reason the department sends a staff of experienced relocation representatives into every urban renewal area to work with individual tenants and owners.

Whether a person owns or rents, he has three options available: Public housing, private standard rental housing, or home ownership. His preference is the most important consideration, but financial problems also must be taken into account.

For instance, if a family with an annual income of $4,000 wants to purchase a home, the relocation representative would try to dissuade them and suggest rental housing instead. Or if the income is even smaller, the family would be advised to consider public housing.

The actual work of relocation representatives begins even before buildings in an area are acquired according to Miss Frances Dixon, supervisor of the Noble division project on the near northwest side.

Cover entire project

"The relocation representative and I covered the entire project a couple of months before our site office opened," she said. "We talked to every tenant, found out what their problems and needs were, and even made suggestions for immediate action in some cases.

"When we actually acquired the buildings, we were able to set up priorities for the tenants needing special assistance and put them in touch with the special services the department offers. This kind of organization enables the representatives to do a thorough job."

Aside from special services, Miss Dixon went on, the most important—and difficult—job is to find new homes or apartments.

"We hear there is plenty of available housing," she said, "but we must find a standard (as opposed to substandard) apartment for the price the tenant is willing and able to pay.

"In the Noble division project many families are paying about $40 a month rent with gas space heat. The majority of tenants prefer private rental but, though they would be willing to pay a little more than they have paid, there is not much standard housing which can compare with public housing for the same money.

"For those who can afford private rental, it is a question of matching the available apartment with the prospective tenant."

RELOCATION AIDS FACED WITH COMPLEX PROBLEMS

Every family has its problems, but some of the problems are more complex than others. That is the experience of urban renewal department relocation experts who visit every household in areas acquired for clearance.

Relocation representatives can solve most of these problems easily by arranging relocation appropriate to the needs and resources of the individual family. But in many other cases—some of them unusual and shocking—the help of experts is required.

Never know

"When I knock on a door, I never know what I'm going to find on the other side," said Mrs. Flora Nelson, relocation representative specializing in problem families. "We see everything from old age to child neglect."

She told of Mr. J., a hermit discovered living in the basement of an acquired building. "He slept on newspapers near the furnace with a stray cat and dog, and without benefit of toilet facilities. He had neither bathed nor shaved in years," Mrs. Nelson related.

"He was literally doubled over with age and wanted to be left alone. He had no friends or relatives, and no place to go."

Sent to hospital

Arrangements were made to take him to Cook County Hospital, where he received a complete physical and mental examination. Mrs. Nelson said this was necessary to determine what type of relocation would be feasible for the old man, in his eighties.

"There was nothing wrong with him, except for natural deterioration," she said, "so we were able to get him into Oak Forest Sanitarium (a convalescent hospital)."

Mrs. Nelson explained that her role is that of a social service coordinator, referring people to the proper local agency for appropriate help.

Many connections

Liaison is maintained with the Cook County Department of Public Aid, United Charities, Family Court, the Juvenile Protective Association, the county physicians service, the Visiting Nurses Association, Catholic Charities, and many individual churches and hospitals.

"There is an almost limitless number of family problems which can complicate relocation," Mrs. Nelson said. "Among them are alcoholism, narcotics addiction, child neglect, and mental illness, to name a few of the more serious ones."

Once the problems are solved, the work of relocation can begin. Four of every five families relocated choose private rental housing (discussed last week), but the rest need the aid of other relocation experts.

Some want to buy

A few insist on purchasing homes, while the incomes of the rest are so low as to make public housing the advisable answer to their housing needs.

For those desiring to buy, insured mortgages are available through "221-D(2)" certificates issued on request to anyone displaced by any governmental action (including school and highway construction in addition to urban renewal).

Edward Bielicki serves as administrative assistant in cases. "Having one does not guarantee getting a mortgage," he pointed out, "it just establishes eligibility." He said the certificate will guarantee Federal Housing Administration insurance of a mortgage from a private lending institution at 5¾ percent interest up to 35 years, with a $15,000 maximum on a single family home.

Second way to finance

In the event minority group members are unable to get these mortgages, they may apply to the voluntary home mortgage credit program, which arranges mortgages through insurance companies.

Also handled by Bielicki is the "221-D (3)" program which provides certificates of eligibility for middle income housing like Englewood Manor, in which a family of five or six members can obtain a three-bedroom apartment for $140 a month if their income does not exceed $9,650 annually.

More prevalent, though, is aiding families to get into public housing, which accounts for 15 to 20 percent of all relocations. The supervisor for public housing is Mrs. Mellownee Washington, who coordinates with the Chicago Housing Authority.

Housing hurried

"When the initial survey is made," she said, "we find out who is interested in public housing, and whether they qualify. From then on, we try to move as fast as we can.

"Field representatives get registrations and have the people fill out applications. I look them over here in our downtown office, and then I take them over to CHA personally. If the forms are in order the family will go to the top of the waiting list."

She explained that displaced families are given priority and allowed higher income ceilings for qualification. They can specify the exact type of unit they want, and in which development.

Some hold out

"Some families will hold out for a long time to get just what they want," said Mrs. Washington. "For instance, the D family, consisting of 2 adults and 14 children, put in an application in April 1959 when they were displaced from their West Side home. They wanted a five-bedroom unit in the same area.

"A unit was offered them at Altgeld Gardens, but they did not want to move south, so they held out until August of 1961, when the kind of unit they wanted became available on the west side."

Mrs. Washington said she had helped some people obtain citizenship, aided others in proving their age to qualify them for social security, and arranged to have common law marriages legalized to establish CHA eligibility.

Track "lost" families

Alvin Hutcheson is the department's "lost" family specialist. He must trace every family who moves without the department's knowledge, to establish whether they are in standard housing. He is successful 9 times out of 10.

Hutcheson, who said he does not work with police, uses such means as new telephone listings, forwarding addresses, and transfers of school-age children to find his "lost" families.

"If they are in standard housing when I find them," he said, "we can close our books. But if their unit is substandard we are obligated to offer them help in finding a better place."

All must be OK

This help is the responsibility of a special substandard section under Mrs. Jean Shirley, which is concerned with every one of the department's relocated families who are found to have moved into substandard housing.

The section deals with some 300 families a year, of which half are relocated into standard housing. For the rest, the city building department is asked to see to it that the landlord makes all repairs necessary to bring the housing up to standard.

IMPROVED SERVICES FOR CHILDREN WITH PHYSICAL OR MENTAL IMPAIRMENTS

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MATTHEWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MATTHEWS. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing for appropriate reference a bill to amend part 2 of title V of the Social Security Act in order to expand and improve services for children with physical or mental impairments, and for other purposes.

This bill is designed to improve what is now called services for crippled children under title V of the Social Security Act in several important ways—by changing the name of the program to more accurately reflect the broad scope of services intended, by improving the Federal-State financing arrangement to permit comprehensive services to children with all types of seriously handicapping conditions, and by strengthening the State plan provisions to assure more adequate services.

My interest in the welfare of our handicapped fellow citizens is of long standing. Several years ago, I had the privilege of serving as the chairman of the Florida Council for the Blind, the State agency in my home State which provides comprehensive rehabilitation and medical social services to blind and severely visually handicapped persons. This agency is the one which administers the Federal-State vocational rehabilitation program for blind persons in Florida.

Recently, I learned from officials of the Florida council that there is a problem with regard to adequate provision of corrective services for visually impaired children, a group which is supposed to be treated under the present crippled children's program with the aid of Federal funds. The Florida Crippled Children's Commission—the official State agency receiving Federal funds for this program—tends to concentrate on orthopedic problems and is unable to serve the visually impaired or the hearing impaired. The Florida Council for the Blind is finding its resources for serving visually impaired children strained, and it is prevented by the present law from receiving Federal funds for this purpose.

I have also learned that children needing correction of eye conditions which will worsen into blindness if uncorrected, such as strabismus, are not being adequately taken care of nationally. According to the Children's Bureau, only 5.6 percent of the total treated under this program were treated for eye conditions. In 37 States, the programs do not include children with strabismus, usually a readily correctible condition resulting in loss of vision if not treated.

The bill I am introducing would correct situations like this. With more adequate Federal financial support, with authorization for a specialized State agency to serve the group it knows best, and with a proper system of priorities based on the handicapped effects of a condition, no child need be deprived of services which would assist him to lead a more normal life as a result of prevention or correction of a handicapping condition.

I should like to emphasize that this bill has the support of the major national organizations of and for the blind in the United States—the American Association of Instructors of the Blind, the American Association of Workers for the Blind, the American Council of the Blind, the American Foundation for the Blind, and the National Federation of the Blind.

Section 1 of the bill alters the name of the program under part 2 of title V of the Social Security Act from "Services for Crippled Children" to "Services for Children With Physical or Mental Impairments." Conforming amendments change "crippled children" wherever it appears in part 2 to "physically or mentally impaired children."

The purpose of these amendments is to clarify the intent and scope of the program in serving children with nonorthopedic disabilities as well as those with orthopedic disabilities. The term "crippled children" is generally accepted by both professional and lay persons to mean orthopedically disabled children. Although the intent of the program is to serve children with other types of disabilities as well, this broadening of the program from an orthopedic emphasis has evolved slowly, usually as a result of a concerted effort by the administration. The proposed change in name of the program should contribute much toward broadening the understanding throughout the country of the program's actual purposes.

Section 2 of the bill supplants existing section 511 of the act with a new section 511 authorizing Federal appropriations adequate to meet all matching funds the States are willing to devote to this program. Section 3 of the bill amends the act to supplant existing section 512 with a new section 512 concerning allotments to the States. The new section 512 also supplants existing section 514 of the act relating to the method of payments to the States.

The new sections 511 and 512, covering financing of the program, are similar to the Federal-State financing system used in titles I, IV, X, XIV, and XVI of the Social Security Act. The formula is based on per capita income of the States; and under the provisions of this bill, the poorer States would receive as high as 83 percent Federal matching for this worthwhile program, while the highest per capita income States would receive 50 percent Federal matching. In addition, all States would receive a Federal share of 75 percent for medical administrative and supportive services, 50 percent for general administrative services, and 75 percent for training of the highly specialized personnel needed in the program.

One of the factors which has kept this vital program from expanding as it should and serving children with all types of disabilities on a comprehensive basis has been the ceiling on appropriations. As a result of this restriction of funds, children with vision impairments, for example, have not been able to get the surgical treatment they needed to prevent the serious disability of blindness. As a consequence, they have had to be educated as blind persons, trained for a job as blind persons, helped to find employment as blind persons. In many instances, these individuals have become public assistance recipients. All of these programs and many ancillary ones designed to assist our country's blind people have, in fact, cost the taxpayers many times more than adequate preventive service would have cost in the first place. The improved Federal-State matching formula provided for in this bill should have been included in this program when the Social Security Act was first enacted in 1935, just as it was for the public assistance programs. I hope my colleagues in the House of Representatives will join with me in an effort to correct this longstanding oversight.

Section 4 of the bill amends section 513(a) to strengthen the State plan provision. Among the changes in the State plan requirements is that the program must be in effect in all political subdivisions of a State. Originally, the emphasis in this program was in rural areas. However, the changing population pattern requires that we serve more adequately children in urban areas, particularly those of low-income families where the prevalence of serious disability seems to be greater.

Another important change is the requirement that State plans establish a system of priorities for treatment so that conditions which may worsen into severely handicapping disability will be assured of early adequate treatment. The example I cited earlier about visual impairments which will worsen into blindness if untreated will illustrate the value of this provision. At present, impaired hearing and impaired vision are among the conditions which are not receiving adequate and early treatment as a general rule in this program.

Another change in the State plan provision would make it possible for the State agency serving blind persons and the State mental health agency to administer that part of the plan affecting children with vision problems or children with emotional or mental impairments. The existing provision is interpreted to require a single State agency to administer the program in the State. In some States, this is the State health agency, in some the welfare department, in others a separate crippled children's agency. Thus, the agency best equipped to handle some of the specific disabilities involved does not receive Federal funds for this purpose. This has resulted in either inadequate service for the visually impaired in some States or in no service at all in others.

The use of more than one State agency to administer part of a Federal-State cooperative program is not a new concept. It already exists in the public assistance program, with five State agencies for the blind administering aid to the blind under titles X and XVI. Similarly, 36 State agencies for the blind administer the part of the State plan affecting blind persons under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act. In both programs, this separate administration has worked efficiently and effectively. Needless to say, each State should have the privilege of designating the administrative structure which best suits its needs and circumstances in a Federal-State cooperative program without being restricted by the Federal law from doing so.

Section 6 of the bill merely adds a new section 515 for the purpose of defining how the Federal impaired children's percentage used in the fund distribution formula is derived.

I sincerely hope that this bill will receive the support of all of my colleagues in the House. The program it would expand and improve is one whose validity and significance has too long been undervalued from the standpoint of Federal financial assistance. What health program could be more important than one designed to prevent or correct physical or mental handicaps in children? Enactment of this bill into law will assure the children who need this service of a chance to minimize handicapping disability and lead more normal lives.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MOELLER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, the self-styled Nazi and professional hate merchant, George Lincoln Rockwell, is scheduled to speak at Ohio University in Athens, Ohio, on April 14. He was invited by a single student chapter, and its invitation was allowed to stand by university officials—although I am positive that they look upon Rockwell with utter distaste and abiding contempt.

For myself, I believe that the leadership of Ohio University is to be commended for its judicious dedication to the concept of freedom of speech, even when the provocation is so great to deny it to a renegade such as Rockwell.

Freedom of speech is not a luxury to be turned on and off according to our likes and dislikes. If an extremist on the far right or far left can be gagged today, then the weapon of arbitrary silence can be used tomorrow against anyone who expressed unpopular or radical ideas.

The power and glory of our system is that it protects the fundamental rights of the Rockwells as impartially as it protects the rights of decent, responsible citizens. This is a lesson on Americanism that I trust will not be lost on the students of Ohio University when this bogus Hitler launches into his usual tirade against our system of government.

Frankly, I do not quite understand why anyone would want to waste an evening listening to the gibberish parroted by George Lincoln Rockwell. He is nothing more than a pathetic and pitiful misfit—a chronic failure who long ago retreated from the world of reason and reality. The ragtag Nazi "army" that he is leading down the road to nowhere is not to be taken seriously; it has never managed to attract more than 40 or 50 delinquents and malcontents at any one time. If anything, it is a testament of the stark futility of its organizer.

Perhaps, Rockwell is being invited to speak as a curiosity piece, and he is indeed a curious specimen; perhaps, the students want to see for themselves what a real-life traitor to decency looks like; if this is so, Rockwell is their man. Or perhaps they invited him just for kicks.

Whatever the reason, I do hope that those who attend the Rockwell lecture will remember that he speaks for a twisted and corrupted philosophy that exalts hatred and intolerance, that denies the existence of God and the dignity of man, that, in short, runs counter to everything that America stands for.

Rockwell speaks for a philosophy that brought forth the most heinous war in the history of mankind.

Rockwell speaks for a philosophy that condemned nearly a quarter million American boys to death on the battlefields of Europe. Rockwell speaks for a philosophy that condemned 6 million Jews to mass extermination in the ovens and gas chambers of the Third Reich.

The degeneration of George Lincoln Rockwell is so complete that he now boasts that, had the choice been his, he would have taken up arms for Hitler and fought against the United States, his native land, in World War II.

These are some of the things about Rockwell that I hope that students of Ohio University will remember—and remember well—on April 14. I hope also that they will remember his right to speak is guaranteed and protected by the very Government that he so hates and despises, and that he would replace with the Nazi system of despotism and tyranny.

LABELING AND ADVERTISING OF CIGARETTES

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Rooney] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to regulate the labeling and advertising of cigarettes.

My distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Rogers] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Nelsen] have already introduced identical bills in this field. I have conferred with them and I agree that constructive and positive action should be taken to protect the welfare of the American people and, at the same time, to avoid the potentially disastrous economic effects which could accrue to the American tobacco industry through wholesale scare techniques and unintelligent labeling.

It should be possible for a nation as sophisticated and knowledgeable in the fields of public health as the United States of America has proved itself to be, to arrive at a sensible, humane, and informative solution to this problem without putting on a fright wig or sounding like a rerun of "The Munsters" or "The Addams Family."

The bill in question would require cigarette packages to carry a label cautioning the consumer that smoking its contents may be hazardous to his health. At the same time, the bill would prevent the Federal Trade Commission from forcing upon cigarette advertisers the inclusion of warnings as part of their overall advertising campaign.

The tobacco industry, aided immeasurably by a commission directed by the esteemed former Governor of the State of New Jersey, the Honorable Robert Meyner, has made significant and impressive strides on its own behalf toward the elimination or, at the very least, the reduction of highly emotional and misleading advertising which would attribute to cigarette smoking everything from excessive masculinity and athletic prowess to the heights of skill at romance.

I am sure the Members of the Congress will recall the first shock waves which followed the Surgeon General's report on smoking and health. It was not too long afterward that the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission was down here, storming the doors of Capitol Hill and the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee with dire threats of reprisal and recrimination against an industry which has long been one of our greatest revenue producers and employers.

Since those dark hours the Commission has subsided somewhat in its pursuit of what it considers absolute truth and rigidly enforced cautionary measures.

Despite the grade B melodramatics of some of the more fanatic opponents of cigarette smoking the public continues to consume them in ever-increasing number. Obviously, this is a time for reason and education; obviously, it is not a time for irrational propaganda techniques.

The bill to which I refer represents such a rational approach. It is my hope that my distinguished colleagues will hear the voices of reason as they are raised by Mr. Kornegay, Mr. Rogers, and Mr. Nelsen. I am privileged to associate myself with their effort today.

THE HONORABLE SANTIAGO POLANCO-ABREU

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. de la Garza] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. de la GARZA. Mr. Speaker, it is most gratifying to note the excellent educational job that is being done in the United States by Sr. Santiago Polanco-Abreu, who not long ago was elected Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico.

In a series of addresses before important groups Sr. Polanco-Abreu is bringing knowledge about the growth and economic development of Puerto Rico that cannot help but inspire those who hear him. He has addressed the Washington Chapter of the Society for International Development on "The Economic Development of Puerto Rico" and the officers and staff members of the Brookings Institute on "The Significance of Commonwealth Status for Puerto Rico."

More recently he spoke before a large audience in New York City on "Personality, Culture, and Living Together," which was a discussion of relations of the Puerto Ricans living in the cities and towns of the United States with their fellow U.S. citizens.

The occasion for this last address was the bestowal upon Sr. Polanco-Abreu of the Citizen of the Year Award by the Institute of Puerto Rico. This award was given for his distinguished contribution to the development and dissemination of Puerto Rican culture, which he has made as a legislator, a lawyer, a writer, and a speaker.

Puerto Rico has become of tremendous importance to the United States. Many natives of that island are now living among us. Many citizens of the United States visit Puerto Rico each year. This interchange is of mutual benefit, for Puerto Rico and the United States have much to offer each other and much to gain from a continuation and an intensification of this spirit of friendship, admiration, and respect.

EXPANSION OF THE WAR ON POVERTY

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Powell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include a bill and an analysis thereof.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill to expand the war on poverty. Due to the nature at this program and the interest expressed by the many Members of the House I include herein a text of the bill, and a section-by-section analysis:

H.R. 7048

A bill to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965.

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I—YOUTH PROGRAMS

Jobs Corps—Enrollee affidavits

Sec. 2. Section 104(d) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by (1) striking out everything through the clause designation "(2)", and (2) amending the remainder of such section to read as follows: "Each enrollee must take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the following form: 'I do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I bear true faith and allegiance to the United States of America and will support and defend the Constitution and laws of the United States against all its enemies foreign and domestic.'. The provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable to the oath or affirmation required under this subsection."

Job Corps—Application of Federal Employees' Compensation Act

SEC. 3. Section 106(c)(2)(A) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"(A) The term 'performance of duty' in the Federal Employees' Compensation Act shall not include any act of an enrollee while absent from his or her assigned post of duty, except while participating in an activity (including an activity while on pass or during travel to or from such post of duty) authorized by or under the direction and supervision of the Corps."

Job Corps—Enrollee work activities

SEC. 4. Section 110 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting the word "male" before the word "enrollees" in the first sentence.

Work training programs—Limitations on Federal assistance

SEC. 5. The first sentence of section 115 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows: "Federal assistance to any program pursuant to this part shall not exceed 90 per centum of the costs of such program, including costs of administration, unless the Director determines, pursuant to regulations, adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this part."

Work-study programs—Limitations on Federal assistance

SEC. 6. Section 124(f) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting a semicolon after the word "compensation" the second time it appears and striking the balance of such section.

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

General community action programs—Limitations on Federal assistance

SEC. 7. (a) The first sentence of section 208(a) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows: "Assistance pursuant to sections 204 and 205 shall not exceed 90 per centum of the costs referred to in those sections, respectively, unless the Director determines, pursuant to regulations, adopted and promulgated by him establishing objective criteria for such determinations, that assistance in excess of such percentage is required in furtherance of the purposes of this part."

(b) Section 208 of such Act is amended by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c) and inserting a new subsection (b) as follows:

"(b) The Director is authorized to prescribe regulations establishing objective criteria pursuant to which assistance may be reduced below 90 per centum for such community action programs or components as have received assistance under section 205 for a period prescribed in such regulations."

(c) Section 208(c) of such Act (as redesignated by subsection (b) of this section) is amended by adding at the end thereof a new sentence as follows: "The requirement imposed by the preceding sentence shall be subject to such regulations as the Director may adopt and promulgate establishing objective criteria for determinations covering situations where a literal application of such requirement would result in unnecessary hardship or otherwise be inconsistent with the purposes sought to be achieved."

Adult basic education programs—Payments; Federal share

SEC. 8. Section 216(b) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) For purposes of payments under this section, the Federal share of expenditures of each State under its State plan shall be 90 per centum."

Adult basic education programs—Teacher training

SEC. 9. Part B of title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended—

(1) by striking out "From the sums appropriated to carry out this title" in section 213(a) and inserting in lieu thereof "From so much of the sums appropriated or allocated to carry out this part as is not reserved pursuant to section 218"; and

(2) by redesignating section 218 as section 219 and inserting immediately after section 217 the following new section 218:

"TEACHER TRAINING PROJECTS

"SEC. 218. Not to exced 5 per centum of the sums appropriated or allocated to carry out this part for any fiscal year may be reserved and used by the Director to provide (directly or by contract), or to make grants to colleges and universities, State or local educational agencies, or other appropriate public or private nonprofit agencies or organizations to provide training to persons engaged or preparing to engage as instructors for individuals described in section 212, with such stipends and allowances, if any (including traveling and subsistence expenses), for persons undergoing such training and their dependents as the Director may by or pursuant to regulation determine."

Voluntary assistance program for needy children

SEC. 10. Title II of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out part C thereof.

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III—SPECIAL PROGRAMS TO COMBAT POVERTY IN RURAL AREAS

Cooperative associations—Prohibition of loans to assist manufacturing

SEC. 11. Section 305 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by inserting immediately before the period at the end thereof the following proviso: ": *Provided*, That packing, canning, cooking, freezing, or other processing used in preparing or marketing edible farm products, including dairy products, shall not be regarded as manufacturing merely by reason of the fact that it results in the creation of a new or different substance."

Assistance for migrant and seasonally employed agricultural employees

SEC. 12. Section 311 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows:

"MIGRANT AND SEASONALLY EMPLOYED AGRICULTURAL EMPLOYEES

"SEC. 311. The Director is authorized to develop and implement a program of loans, loan guarantees and grants to assist State and local agencies, private nonprofit institutions and cooperatives in establishing, administering, and operating programs which will meet, or substantially and primarily contribute to meeting the special needs of migratory workers and seasonal farm laborers and their families in the fields of housing, sanitation, education, and day care of children."

AMENDMENT TO TITLE V—WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAM

SEC. 13. The second sentence of section 502 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended to read as follows: "The costs, to the United States, or projects supported from funds transferred under the preceding sentence shall, notwithstanding the provisions of such Act, be not entirely from such funds."

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION

Vista volunteers—Assignment; application of other provisions and Federal laws

SEC. 14. (a) Subsection (a) of section 603 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out everything in paragraph (2) following the clause designation "(C)" and inserting in lieu thereof "in connection with programs or activities authorized, supported or of a character eligible for assistance under this Act."

(b) Subsection (d) of such section is amended to read as follows:

"(d)(1) Each volunteer shall take and subscribe to an oath or affirmation in the form prescribed by section 104(d) of this Act, and the provisions of section 1001 of title 18, United States Code, shall be applicable with respect to such oath or affirmation; but, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, volunteers shall not be deemed to be Federal employees and shall not be subject to the provisions of laws relating to Federal employment, including those relating to hours of work, rates of compensation, and Federal employee benefits.

"(2) All volunteers during training and such volunteers as are assigned pursuant to paragraph (2) of subsection (a) shall be deemed Federal employees to the same extent as enrollees of the Job Corps under section 106 (b), (c) and (d) of this Act, except that for purposes of the computation described in paragraph (2)(B) of section 106(c) the monthly pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be that received under the entrance salary for GS-7 under the Classification Act of 1949."

National Advisory Council

SEC. 15. Section 605 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking "fourteen" in the second sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "twenty".

Affidavits

SEC. 16. Title VI of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out section 616 thereof.

Authorization of appropriations

SEC. 17. (a) The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by redesignating title VII as title VIII and redesignating section 701 as 801, and by inserting after title VI a new title VII as follows:

"TITLE VII—AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 701. For the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this Act, there are hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $1,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966."

(b) Effective July 1, 1965, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 is amended by striking out the following parts and provisions:

(1) part D of title I;
(2) part D of title II;
(3) part C of title III;
(4) section 407;
(5) section 503; and
(6) section 615.

Amendment to National Defense Education Act—Moratorium on student loans to VISTA volunteers

SEC. 18. (a) Paragraph (2)(A) of section 205(b) of the National Defense Education Act of 1958 (20 U.S.C. 425(b)(2)(A)) is amended by striking out "or" before "(iii)" and by inserting before the proviso and after "Peace Corps Act" the following: ", or (iv) not in excess of three years during which the borrower is in service as a volunteer under section 603 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964."

(b) The amendments made by this section shall not apply to any loan outstanding on the effective date of this Act without the consent of the then obligee institution.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS OF THE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965

Section 1. Short title: Section 1 provides that the proposed act may be cited as the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1965.

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE I—YOUTH PROGRAMS

Section 2. Job Corps—Enrollee affidavits: This section amends section 104(d) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 (hereinafter referred to as the Act), which provides that Job Corps enrollees must execute disclaimer affidavits and subscribe to an oath of allegiance. It would eliminate the requirement for such affidavits and otherwise conform the provisions of section 104(d) to current requirements for certain oaths in the National Science Foundation Act and the National Defense Education Act.

Section 3. Job Corps—Application of Employees Compensation Act: This section amends provisions of section 106(c) of the Act to extend Federal Employees' Compensation Act coverage to certain activities of Job Corps enrollees while on pass and during travel to or from a Job Corps site.

Under specific language in paragraph (2) (A) (i) of section 106(c) payment of disability or death benefits is precluded in the case of any enrollee who is injured or killed while on authorized leave or pass. In addition, section 106(c) (A) (ii) provides that Federal Employees' Compensation Act coverage does not extend to injury or death of an enrollee while absent from his or her assigned post of duty, unless sustained while participating in an activity authorized by or under the supervision of the Corps. The amendment would modify and combine these provisions in such a way that an enrollee could be considered as engaged in an authorized or supervised activity, and thus covered, while on pass or traveling to or from a Job Corps site. This would not affect the regular exclusions established under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act for cases of willful misconduct.

Section 4. Job Corps—Enrollee work activities: This section amends section 110 of the Act to provide that 40 percent of male enrollees in the Job Corps must at any one time be assigned to camps where their work activity primarily involves public natural resources or public recreational areas.

Section 5. Work-training programs—Limitation on Federal assistance: This section extends the period during which Federal assistance for work-training programs authorized under title I–B of the Act may regularly cover 90 percent of the cost of these programs. Under existing provisions, this period ends on August 20, 1966. The bill would extend the authority for 90 percent Federal financing through the fiscal year 1967, the last year for which appropriations are authorized.

Section 6. Work-study program limitation on Federal assistance: This section amends the work-study program to extend the period during which the Federal share of student compensation may be up to 90 percent through the fiscal year 1967, the last year for which appropriations would be authorized under the bill.

A number of important amendments to the work-study program, including a program extension and transfer of authority to the Commissioner of Education, have been recommended by the President and are included in the proposed Higher Education Act of 1965. The amendment contained in this section is intended to be effective only pending enactment of these other amendments.

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE II—URBAN AND RURAL COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAMS

Section 7. General community action programs—Limitations on Federal assistance: Subsection (a) extends the period during which general community action programs may be regularly financed with 90 percent Federal assistance from August 20, 1966, through the fiscal year 1967, the last year for which appropriations would be authorized.

Subsection (b) adds a new subsection (b) to section 208 under which the Director would be specifically authorized to promulgate regulations relating to the reduction of assistance below 90 percent for community action programs or component programs which have been conducted with assistance under section 205 for more than a prescribed period. As with other determinations under section 208, reductions would be made pursuant to objective criteria established in such regulations.

Subsection (c) amends provisions of section 208 of the Act which require that the non-Federal share of a community action program be in addition to the aggregate of non-Federal expenditures or contributions made for similar purposes immediately prior to the extension of Federal assistance. Under the amendment, the Director would be authorized to promulgate rules and regulations establishing objective criteria pursuant to which modifications of this requirement could be permitted in situations where its literal application would result in unnecessary hardship (as in the case of a community with a sharply declining population) or would otherwise be inconsistent with the basic purpose to be served by the requirement.

Section 8. Adult basic education programs—Payments—Federal share: This section amends section 216(b) of the Act to extend the period during which the Federal share of the costs of State plans shall be 90 percent. Under the amendment, the 90 percent Federal share would be authorized through fiscal year 1967, the last year for which appropriations would be authorized.

Section 9. Adult basic education programs—Teacher training. This section authorizes use of up to 5 percent of the funds appropriated or allocated for the adult basic education program for the training of persons to act as adult basic education instructors.

Section 10. Voluntary assistance program for needy children. This section deletes part C of title II of the Act which authorizes establishment, on a nationwide basis of a program for voluntary financial assistance by individuals to needy children. Similar programs on a local level could, notwithstanding this amendment, be incorporated in community action programs if otherwise feasible and in accordance with applicable State and local law.

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III—SPECIAL PROGRAMS TO COMBAT POVERTY IN RURAL AREAS

Section 11. Cooperative associations—Prohibition of loans to assist manufacturing: This section amends section 305(f) of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to make clear that the prohibition against loans to cooperatives organized for manufacturing purposes does not prevent loans, if otherwise appropriate, to cooperatives processing dairy products or similar edible farm products for the benefit of low-income farmer members.

Section 12. Migrant and seasonally employed agricultural employees: This section amends part B of title III of the Act, requiring the Director to develop and implement a program to assist migrant workers and their families, so as to clarify the authority granted with respect to the types and scope of assistance and the institutions through which that assistance may be extended.

AMENDMENT TO TITLE V—WORK EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS

Section 13. Payments: This section extends through fiscal year 1967 the authority for meeting costs of work experience programs from funds appropriated under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

AMENDMENTS TO TITLE VI—ADMINISTRATION AND COORDINATION

Section 14. VISTA—Assignment; application of other provisions and Federal laws: Subsection (a) authorizes the assignment of VISTA volunteers under section 603(a) (2) of the Act to programs, which are authorized, supported, or of a character eligible for assistance under the Act. Under section 603(a) (2) of the Act, assignment of volunteers in connection with other programs under the Act is now limited to programs under titles I and II.

Subsection (b) makes specifically applicable to VISTA volunteers the same oath requirements as would apply to Job Corps enrollees under section 2 of this bill. In addition, it provides that for purposes of death or disability benefits under the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, the pay of a volunteer shall be deemed to be the entrance salary for GS–7 under the Classification Act of 1949 (in lieu of the entrance salary for GS–2, as now provided for both Job Corps enrollees and volunteers).

Section 15. National Advisory Council: This section expands from 14 to 20 the number of members (in addition to the Director) who may be appointed to service on the National Advisory Council established by section 605 of the Act.

Section 16. Affidavits: This section deletes section 616 of the Act, requiring a disclaimer affidavit applicable to VISTA volunteers and dairy farmers receiving indemnity benefits in view of the amendments made by section 15 to the VISTA program and the lapse of the indemnity payments program.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

Section 17. Authorization: This section authorizes the appropriation for fiscal year 1966 of $1,500,000,000, and such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 1967, in order to carry out the provisions of the Act.

Subsection (b) of this section consists of conforming amendments which would delete from the Act the separate duration and authorization provisions contained in its several titles.

AMENDMENT TO THE NATIONAL DEFENSE EDUCATION ACT

Section 18. Moratorium on student loans to VISTA volunteers: This section amends the National Defense Education Act to authorize a moratorium of up to 3 years on the repayment of student loans under that Act to individuals in the VISTA program authorized under section 603 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964.

HERMANN SONS' 75TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, April 3, 1965, will mark the 75th anniversary of a distinguished group, the Hermann Sons, as a statewide organization in Texas. In fact I am proud to be a member.

The Hermann Sons is an organization of German immigrants to our State and its founding began in my hometown of San Antonio on July 6, 1861. The San Antonio group remained the only lodge for 29 years until 1890 when 242 persons from eight cities gathered in San Antonio to form a statewide organization. Lodges of the Fraternal Order of the Sons of Hermann were established in Austin, Brenham, Taylor, LaGrange, Temple, Waco, and Houston, Tex.

There are now 165 lodges with a total membership of 61,000 in about 100 cities and towns in Texas. The entire year of 1965 is being celebrated as diamond jubilee year. Although Saturday marks the 75th year of the Sons of Hermann, the really big celebration will be later this month, April 25–28 when the State convention will be held in San Antonio.

Mr. Speaker, thousands of German immigrants came into my native State of Texas in the 1840's. Most of these were political fugitives—intellectuals, craftsmen, professionals—who sought the freedom of America to escape subjugation in the Fatherland. Many of these "19th century pilgrims" settled in San Antonio and a nearby area, usually referred to as the Hill country.

Their imagination and initiative did much to stimulate the growth of San Antonio. By 1870 they became the leading group in the community comprising 36 percent of the total population and dominated the social and business life of San Antonio.

The city embarked on a meteoric rise in the late 1800's; it became the greatest horse market in the world, and a huge center for wool and cotton. The first cement plant west of the Mississippi River was built there around that time. German immigrants and their families played a major role in this growth.

German cultural contributions in San Antonio are universally acknowledged. Nationally prominent musicians and singers appeared at the Casino Club and Beethoven Hall when San Antonio was an oasis of culture west of the Mississippi in the era of the "Wild West." Song festivals—Sangerfests—and get-togethers—Kommers—were held regularly in the area of San Antonio once called "Little Rhineland." A German-English school and a German language newspaper served the intellectual and cultural needs of the population.

In this age of manned space flights and moon rockets, it would serve us well to pause and reflect upon the contributions of the early pioneers and immigrants who explored and expanded the frontiers of America and allowed this great country to reach into the frontiers of space.

It is truly a privileged honor for me to salute the members of the Order of the Sons of Hermann on their diamond jubilee—America is indeed fortunate for the great German migration to Texas that this organization symbolizes. Their contributions are numberless and their achievements renowned.

CITY CLUB OF NEW YORK

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been placing in the RECORD the articles from the series on "New York City in Crisis," which has been appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

The City Club of New York has awarded the New York Herald Tribune its highest honor for this series. I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following article about the award which appeared in the Tribune on February 25, 1965:

CITY CLUB AWARDS TRIB HIGHEST HONOR

The City Club of New York, a nonpartisan civic organization founded in 1892, has voted to award its highest civic honor to the New York Herald Tribune for its coverage of city affairs through the years and, in particular, for its current investigative series, "New York City in Crisis."

The award—a certificate of merit called Ad Urbem Perfectiorum (Toward a Perfect City)—has been awarded fewer than a dozen times in the club's history.

According to the club president, who announced the award after a meeting of the club's board of trustees yesterday, the only previous winners still living are Thomas C. Desmond, former State senator; James Felt, former chairman of the city planning commission; William Reid, chairman of the housing authority, and George H. Hallett, Jr., executive secretary of the Citizens Union.

According to club records, the Herald Tribune is the only newspaper and organization of any kind to win this award.

"Be it known hereby whereas it is the objective of the City Club of New York to advance the science of government and to promote the better administration of civic affairs and to encourage devotion to those ideals among civil servants, students of government and the citizenry of the city at large and to recognize distinction and merit among them and whereas in the judgment of the City Club of New York the New York Herald Tribune has attained outstanding distinction and merit in the science of government within the cognizance of the club and has contributed to the success and advancement of the aforementioned ideals and has accordingly met the requirements for this distinction, now therefore in recognition and in honor thereof, the City Club of New York does award said designee this certificate of merit."

According to club President I. D. Robbins, "The trustees took into consideration the long history of the Herald Tribune in serving the city but the decision to make this award now came about because we sense the current series, 'New York City in Crisis,' is above and beyond the regular coverage of city affairs. One of our interests as a civic organization is to encourage newspapers to cover the city in depth, not merely to print handouts from municipal press agents. What we have here is a clear case of a newspaper accepting and fulfilling its obligation to bring the truth to the citizens of New York."

The award will be presented at the club's annual Bard Award luncheon (to honor excellence in city architecture) March 15 at the Americana Hotel.

This is the second award the Herald Tribune has won this week for its continuing investigative series. On Tuesday it was announced that the newspaper was chosen as the first recipient of an annual urban affairs award of the Brooklyn center of Long Island University.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XXXII

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following installment of "New York City in Crisis."

This article is the second concerning a $1 million fund for emergency repairs of substandard housing. It appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 20, 1965:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—$1 MILLION FUND FOR REPAIR OF HOUSING DOESN'T DO JOB

(By Alfonso Narvaez)

When Paul R. Screvane, chairman of the city's antipoverty operations board, announced the creation of a $1 million revolving fund to initiate emergency repairs on slum tenements, tens of thousands of slum dwellers breathed a sigh of relief.

For many, the sigh of relief has turned to one of despair.

Since February 4, when the emergency action committee (consisting of representatives of the departments of health, buildings, relocation and real estate) was formed, 116 buildings have been referred to it by community groups and various city departments.

Of these 116, the committee decided that 75 were not in need of emergency repairs and were turned over to various departments for action. Violations were placed on these buildings and would be handled through regular channels, which invariably means delays of weeks and even months.

Of the 41 others, the action committee says it made major repairs in 11 and minor repairs in 13. In four, it was found that there was no longer need for action when the committee investigated. Nine buildings were vacated and four others are still being studied.

"This is what we have done to date," said a spokesman for the housing and redevelopment board yesterday.

Ted Velez, executive director of the East Harlem Tenants Council, challenges the rosy picture of accomplishments painted by the city.

Of the 79 buildings the East Harlem Council referred to the city for repairs, 58 were, according to the emergency action committee, not in need of "emergency repairs."

Mr. Velez says, however, that all of these buildings were in "terrible condition" and the tenants were suffering needless hardships.

"None of our buildings has been fixed," he said. "They inspected 17 buildings on the list we gave them, but nothing was done. In nine buildings the heat was turned on, but within a day or two the houses were as cold as ever."

He said that the only lasting action taken by the city was to vacate three of the buildings on his list. He charged that the people were thrown out into the cold.

"In one case the people had only 12 hours' notice to get out of the building, and in the other two it was 24 hours," he said. "These people went to the city for help and instead they are turned out. This looks like another grandstand play by the city."

Action by the committee forced tenants in three of the East Harlem buildings to find quarters in other places. In some instances the department of relocation found them apartments, but in others, according to Mr. Velez, they were forced to find shelter with friends or in a public shelter.

None of the tenants forced to vacate by action of the committee could be located yesterday, but Seavon Brown, who had been forced to vacate under similar circumstances, gave his appraisal of how it works.

Mr. Brown said he, his wife and two children were forced to vacate 225 East 122d Street under orders of one of the city departments.

He said he and the other tenants in the building were given a 12-hour notice to get out, but instead, he said, they had to get out faster. A broken water pipe was the cause of the action taken by the city.

"It was a very rough experience at a time like that," he said. "It was 5 o'clock in the evening and we had no time to find a place. We couldn't even stay overnight. We had no place to go. I finally had to stay in a friend's house for a few days until I could find a place."

Late yesterday afternoon, two dozen East Harlem residents, who last week picketed outside Gracie Mansion demanding heat for their houses, moved their demonstration into the offices of housing and redevelopment board at 2 Lafayette Street.

Housing and Development Coordinator Milton Mollen told the sit-ins that he would send health inspectors up last night to inspect the four houses in question.

So far, the cost of major repairs ordered by the committee on 11 buildings has come to $15,500. A spokesman for the committee said that in many cases the repairs had to be supplemented by additional work once the original repairs had been taken care of.

The money for the repairs comes out of a $1 million revolving fund authorized by Mayor Wagner early this month.

The way the fund works is that after a complaint is received and investigated by a health department investigator a report is filed with the Emergency Action Committee. The department of real estate is then ordered to make the needed repairs or turn the job over to a contractor.

The cost will come out of the fund, but after the repairs are made the city will send the landlord a bill with the force of a lien against the property.

Meanwhile, the city's special housing complaint telephone number (WOrth 4–3000) continued to be swamped with calls. Of the 1,475 calls received yesterday, 58 were described as emergency calls and were referred to appropriate departments for immediate action. The other complaints were turned over for investigation to the city agency concerned.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XXXIII

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the financial crisis developing in New York City is reaching disastrous proportions.

The following article from the February 21, 1965, edition of the New York Herald Tribune discusses this problem:

New York City in Crisis—A Decade of Worsening Financial Crises

(New York is the world's financial and cultural center, the Nation's tastemaker and the home of the power elite, but to many of its 8 million citizens, it is no longer the greatest place in which to live. Discontent has always been a distinctive quality of the New Yorker—restlessly unwilling to accept the status quo—and in the past this discontent has been channeled into the tremendous creative civic energy which has given the city its dynamic character. But in the complex years since the end of World War II the creative channels have clogged up. The city's simple problems require complex answers. And the complex problems seem to have no solutions at all. With reasonable outlets denied, the citizen's discontent has turned inward: to bewilderment, frustration, rage, and finally fear or indifference. A special Herald Tribune team—headed by Barry Gottehrer and including Barrett McGurn, Marshall Peck, and Claude Lewis—has spent the last half year investigating the deeply disturbing characteristics of a city in crisis, and, in this series of articles, presents its findings.)

(By Barry Gottehrer)

The year is 1934 and New York, the greatest city in the world, is in the middle of a serious financial crisis.

Tax revenues continue to plunge just about as quickly as the number of unemployed continues to rise.

Staggering financial obligations mature and, when the city cannot meet them, the banks refuse to extend credit.

Salaries of teachers and other employees are slashed and payless days for city workers are not uncommon.

As difficult as it is to believe, the situation was so bad that New York City was on the verge of bankruptcy.

Now, some 31 years after Mayor Fiorello La Guardia forcefully averted complete fiscal disaster, New York, the greatest city in the world, is in the middle of another financial crisis.

Though there is no threat of bankruptcy (bankers insist that the city bonds continue to be a "fine investment") and no threat of across-the-board salary cuts, New York City today is indeed undergoing a financial crisis—one that has grown increasingly worse in the last decade.

In a city in which funds are desperately needed to help solve the critical problems of housing, education, job training, hospitals, and crime in the streets, there are not, at this time, sufficient funds to meet even the present needs on a pay-as-you-go basis.

In the last 12 years, during the three terms of Mayor Robert F. Wagner, the expense budget has more than doubled to a gigantic $3.355 billion (the 1934 budget was $518 million)—and today, in the United States, only the Federal Government has a larger budget.

It has now reached the point where 14 percent of each year's expense budget must go to pay debt service.

Even with the skyrocketing expense budget, the city is expected to find itself $100 million in the red when the current budget expires this June and $350 million more in the red by the end of the next fiscal year—unless new taxes and drastic economies are suddenly instituted.

Over the past 10 years, the number of city workers has risen more than 25 percent, despite the increasing signs of a serious fiscal crisis, while the expense budget has increased at the rate of $175 million a year. In the past 5 years alone, the rate of annual increase has been closer to $250 million.

Also, during this same decade, the price level has risen only slightly and the city's population even less. In 1954, the city's expense budget amounted to approximately $200 a resident. This year, it will amount to approximately $430.

This is basically the problem—where is the money going to come from? The State government, long looked to as a source of increased funds, has increasing fiscal problems of its own—with some $400 million needed in some forms of new revenue to finance an expected $3 billion-plus budget.

As for the city, the increased sales tax, boosted from 3 to 4 percent in 1963–64, has been a dismal failure, failing to approach predicted revenues. And the off-track betting proposal, even if it is approved by the Democratic-controlled State legislature this year, cannot be expected to provide substantial, or even adequate, revenue.

Though the complexities of finances tend to bore the average citizen and deficits in the millions tend to overwhelm him (particularly when most of the city's 8 million citizens measure their deficits in single dollars), the city's current fiscal crisis is too important to be ignored.

One man who cannot ignore the crisis is Mayor Robert Wagner, who, in face of the increasing gravity of the problems, has come up with what are by now typical solutions.

As he has often done when faced with critical problems, the mayor first has set up a special commission to make a study and then criticized someone else for not producing a solution.

As he has done almost from the day he took office, Mayor Wagner continues to fire away at the State government for not giving the city the money, he says, it rightfully deserves.

In what has become an annual December letter to the Governor, Mayor Wagner wrote last December 23 and called for a $340 million increase in State aid to the city, which is 23 percent higher than the $274 million in additional aid sought a year ago and more than eight times the $41 million increase the State finally authorized.

Though City Controller Abraham D. Beame boasts of the city's "skilled, modern and efficient fiscal management" and "the financial strength of the greatest city in the world" in his December message for investors, Mayor Wagner gives a more three-dimensional picture in his appeal to Governor Rockefeller.

The mayor's naming of a special commission so far has produced no more hope for immediate assistance. As he has done in the past, he has been able to convince several prominent bankers and businessmen to lend their names if not their undivided attention to the commission and has, as a rather neat means of practicing much-needed fiscal economy, appropriated $1 million for the study.

"It's all a game," says one of the mayor's aids who has been around city hall long before the mayor made his first appearance. "We know we have fiscal problems and we know what we have to do—raise existing taxes or put in some new ones. But, most of all, we know we need some more Federal and State help. But by setting up these commissions, the mayor gets the bankers and business leaders, many of them Republicans, involved. If they should come up with something new, then all the better. If they don't it's their failure, not the mayor's."

So far, after studying the problem since October of 1963, the temporary commission on city finances has, unfortunately, come up with little that was new. The first public announcement was to ask for an extension—from September 1965, to June 1966 (and some more money)—which the mayor forced through the city council despite some loud opposition.

The second announcement was the release of an interim report which the mayor quite candidly said offered "nothing that is new."

In effect, the report did offer a host of old solutions to old but worsening municipal fiscal problems. To obtain an additional $195 million in revenue, the report recommended an increased water and sewer tax ($35 million), an auto use tax ($40 million), a sales tax on beer ($10 million), a sales tax on personal services ($40 million), increased liquor taxes ($45 million) and a statewide sales tax ($25 million).

The off-track betting proposal was dismissed as offering "no solution to the immediate financial problems" and the city payroll and income taxes were still to be studied.

What the commission did point out—and what the mayor still hasn't commented on—was a possible saving of at least $8 million annually by merely eliminating municipal waste.

Though he continues to approve salary increases for his aids (he granted four raises totaling $10,500 last Thursday) Mayor Wagner has not been completely unconcerned about the financial problems that increasingly threaten the future of his city.

In fact, he even anticipated his special commission's call for economy in government by ordering early last December that lights be turned off in city buildings when they are not needed. By doing this, he feels $1 million could be saved in electric bills.

It's clearly a start in the right direction. If he is correct in his estimate and should he be reelected to an unprecedented fourth 4-year term this year, he will have to come up with only $349 million more to meet the $350 million deficit forecast for next year.

WHAT CITY'S LEADERS SAY ABOUT CITY'S FINANCES

(What can the city do about the crisis in municipal finances? Is there no way to keep the $3.355 billion expense budget from climbing steadily higher? Where is New York to get the money? Just how bad is the situation? The Herald Tribune put these questions to city officials, bankers, and experts on municipal finance. Here are their answers:)

Abraham D. Beame, comptroller of the city of New York:

"New York City must approach the day-to-day business of spending by keeping an eye on actual receipts rather than estimated revenues.

"We had a striking example of this need in the fiscal year of 1963–64. It was necessary to transfer $69,325,907 from the so-called "rainy day fund" to the general fund, because general fund receipts were less than estimated.

"To prevent a recurrence, there must be a continuing review of revenues and expenditures. We must make every effort to adhere to a program of prudent spending and avoid costs which cannot be financed within current revenues.

"However, the city cannot straitjacket itself within an inflexible budget framework. New needs of a real emergency nature crop up, and they must be met. Such urgencies must, except in rare instances, be financed within the budget by reappraising current needs, and deferring less vital expenditures.

"Previous comptrollers had invested large sums of pension money in New York City bonds, which are sound investments but offer low yields. * * * [Now] all new money has been invested in corporate securities and mortgages of rock-ribbed security.

"A major part of our annual operating expenses is debt service. * * * This makes debt management a vital part of any program of prudent spending.

"Since assuming office on January 1, 1962, I have issued bonds for shorter periods than had been the practice (and that) means less interest to pay. I estimate the taxpayers will save $95 million over the life of bonds issued in the past 3 years.

"I have also established the ultimate goal of building up our unencumbered debt margin until we reach the point where 1 year's redemption of bonds is greater than the same year's capital expenditures. This margin serves as a sort of cushion of unused ability to issue bonds. The larger the cushion the stronger our credit should be.

"The unencumbered margin was $51.2 million at the end of the fiscal year June 30, 1963. By November 30, 1964, the margin was increased to $114.5 million. I have recommended a program to increase the margin to $285 million by the end of the fiscal year 1970–71. When we reach that point I hope to see a leveling off and then a program which should result in a reduction of outstanding debt."

John M. Leavens, executive director of the Citizens Budget Commission:

"The financial troubles which recurrently beset the government of New York City can be traced to two root causes:

"1. Decisions that increase expenditures faster than the growing yield of the city's existing tax system, and

"2. The hit-or-miss fashion in which recurring revenue—expenditure gaps have been financed. * * *

"In making high policy decisions on financial matters the city has too often sought to have its cake and eat it too. Expenditures have been increased without eradicating built-in waste of long years' standing.

"New and expanded services have often been added in a helter-skelter fashion during the course of a fiscal year, thus hiding the true costs of the program until the next fiscal year. Then what appears as a relatively minor added expenditure toward the end of 1 fiscal year reappears as a gigantic 'inescapable mandatory expenditure' forever after.

"To make matters worse, prospective revenues have all too often been overestimated and deficits have been financed by cleaning out the city's reserve funds.

"Here is what must be done:

"1. The city charter must be amended to restore control over basic budget and tax decisions to the people and their elected representatives in the city council.

"2. The city administrator's office must be sufficiently revitalized to make it the focal point for long-range budgetary and fiscal planning.

"3. The city must realize that the best way to fight poverty is to prevent it. * * * What is needed is a truly workable economic redevelopment program. * * *

"4. The time is long overdue when economy in city government must become a reality."

William S. Renchard, president of the Chemical Bank New York Trust Co.:

"It has become increasingly evident * * * that the biggest growth industry in the United States is local government (mainly because) * * * a growing and shifting population is demanding more and more in the way of government services.

"The traditional answer has been to seek new sources of revenue in the form of increasing existing taxes and adding a variety of special taxes. * * *

"It would appear that little if any attention has been given to the possibility of affecting economies in the operation of local government through elimination or curtailment of services which have become obsolete and through streamlining the operations of departments performing essential services. This can be accomplished through more competent and efficient fiscal management and planning.

"In my judgment there is no reason why in this greatest city of the world the talent for this purpose should not be readily available.

"The city government might also take a leaf from the book of our Federal Government which recently has been offering encouragement to the expansion of business and industry through providing tax incentives for growth and a better all-around climate in which to operate.

"The fiscal problems of New York City are urgent. However, the fact that the securities of the city continue to be well regarded by investors indicates that these problems are not of unmanageable proportions."

Dick Netzer, professor of public finance at New York University's Graduate School of Public Administration:

"But this tends to encourage additional migration from the city.

"What is needed is fiscal balance.

"Ideally we might devise a metropolitan region tax district to finance truly metropolitan functions. For good reasons we are not likely to get this.

"Based on this point of view I would then make four proposals:

"1. The State and Federal Governments should finance a larger share of the public service which reflect mainly national and statewide influences.

"2. The city should revamp its tax structure so as to minimize business migration from the city. In other words, it should try to replace taxes which erode the tax base.

"3. The city should eliminate unwarranted subsidies to users of certain city services. Water users, for example, should pay fees appropriate to their water consumption.

"4. The city should adopt long range fiscal planning on a continuing basis. This would contribute to economy in Government and to an integration of expenditure programing, fiscal capacity and economic growth in our city."

George S. Moore, president of the First National City Bank and former chairman of the New York World's Fair's finance committee:

"If the people of New York City would take a livelier interest in good government, at least temporarily submerging special group interest, New York could command financial resources and management skills unmatched elsewhere for the difficult task of reshaping policies.

"New York's urgent needs for schooling, transportation, policing, social services and the other usual municipal functions have imposed staggering burdens of current taxation, outrunning even the tremendous leverage of rapid growth in taxable property valuations, a growth which has exceeded 25 percent during the last 5 years.

"It is now imperative that a halt be called on the imposition of further special tax levies creating competitive disadvantages for New York business. A high rate of local sales tax, a unique commercial rental tax, gross receipts taxes and other nuisance charges have unquestionably dimmed the great attractions of living and doing business in New York City.

"Capital debt also has been rising at a disquieting pace; but as bankers we are happy to testify that New York City today enjoys able and expert debt management. Nearly 50 percent of the city's debt is scheduled for retirement by 1970, and 70 percent by 1975, an extraordinary rapid rate of debt repayment for a major municipality.

CONYERS CALLS FOR STRENGTHENING VOTING RIGHTS BILL

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, this morning I had the great honor of testifying before the Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Judiciary Committee on the voting rights bills. I urged upon the subcommittee my feeling that we must not be satisfied with anything less than a bill that completely fulfills the promise of President Johnson's March 15 speech to once and for all guarantee that "every American must have an equal right to vote."

I want to state how much I appreciate the courtesy extended to me as a member of the full Judiciary Committee to join the subcommittee in listening to and questioning witnesses. The voting rights hearings, under the outstanding leadership of the gentleman from New York, the Honorable Emanuel Celler, have been very helpful and informative. I look forward to the passage of a fully effective voting rights bill.

Mr. Speaker, I include my statement to the Judiciary Subcommittee on the voting rights bills, with the accompanying press release, at this point in the Congressional Record. Also, Mr. Speaker, I include in the Record some of the telegrams I have received from various leaders of labor, civil rights, and religious groups urging strengthening amendments to the voting rights bill:

Conyers Calls for Strengthening Voting Rights Bill

Congressman John Conyers, Jr., Democrat, of Michigan, only Negro member of the House Judiciary Committee, today called for strengthening amendments to the administration's voting rights bill. Conyers emphasized the need for "more effective safeguards against the violence and intimidation, both legal and extralegal, that have so often accompanied the efforts of southern Negroes trying to gain their equal rights."

Conyers stated that he feared a recurrence of the terror, violence, and economic reprisals which were so effective in the South during Reconstruction as a means of subverting the legislation passed after the Civil War to protect the rights of Negroes.

"We cannot be satisfied with anything less than a bill that completely fulfills the promise of President Johnson's March 15 speech to once and for all guarantee that 'every American must have an equal right to vote.' All America awaits our translation of the President's eloquent words into the last voting rights bill we will ever need to pass."

Showing the committee a sheaf of telegrams urging improvements in the bill, Conyers stated, "These telegrams demonstrate the overwhelming support from all over the country for improvements in the bill by leaders of labor, civil rights, and religious groups."

Conyers called for safeguards of not only the vote but of the entire political process including participation in political parties and running for office. "Protecting the right to vote without assuring a place on the ballot for qualified Negroes would certainly be a mockery. If Alabama could keep President Johnson off the ballot, it would be no trick to prevent a Negro from filing for sheriff in Dallas County." Conyers also urged that the Federal voting examiners be provided the same protections under Federal law as those provided FBI agents and U.S. marshals.

Supporting the proposals of the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, whose representatives preceded him in testifying before the House Judiciary Subcommittee, Conyers urged the elimination of the poll tax in State and local elections, expansion of the bill to cover every area of the country where Negro Americans are denied the right to vote, and more effective safeguards against violence and intimidation of not only voters, but also of people informing and assisting people to register and vote.

Statement of Congressman John Conyers, Jr., First District, Michigan, on H.R. 6400, the Voting Rights Act of 1965, Before Subcommittee No. 5 of the House Judiciary Committee, Thursday Morning, April 1, 1965

INTRODUCTION

Chairman Celler and members of the subcommittee, I deeply appreciate the courtesy and consideration extended to me by this subcommittee and by our honored and distinguished chairman. I am doubly indebted, Mr. Chairman, for you have permitted me not only to question witnesses, but also to testify myself.

I feel that this is the most important bill I shall ever be privileged to work on. What we do in the Judiciary Committee could guarantee, for the first time in American history, the right of all Americans to fully and fairly participate in the political process, and give true meaning to the 15th amendment which was finally ratified exactly 95 years ago as of Tuesday.

I am very much aware that the members of this subcommittee have had more experience than I in the technical and difficult area of drafting good legislation that will avoid constitutional pitfalls. Therefore, I make my remarks this morning in a spirit of humility and cooperation and with the deep hope that I may help to further the "dignity of man and the destiny of democracy" of which President Johnson spoke so eloquently on March 15.

BILL MUST BE STRENGTHENED

I am very concerned that this bill must be strengthened if we are to meet our responsibility to deal with the moral and political crisis facing this country. Congress passed civil rights legislation in 1957, 1960, and 1964 designed to guarantee the right to vote. Yet, millions of Americans are still denied the right to vote by means both blatant and devious. Unless we pass a voting rights bill this year which will quickly and finally secure the vote to all Americans regardless of race, I fear the increased feelings of discontent may reach epidemic proportions.

I have heard and am aware of statements that have been made by some that they did not support the inclusion in this bill of further protections of the right to vote, because they feared this would "weigh down" the bill and result in its defeat. I must honestly admit to a very different concern. After three unsuccessful attempts, if our fourth try at drafting voting rights legislation is not successful, I fear that we risk creating a feeling of cynicism and frustration among many American citizens with regard to the effectiveness of justice in our democracy.

President Johnson's speech was the most explicit and the most far-reaching one ever made by an American President concerning the right to vote. The overwhelming national support given that speech demonstrated that it reflected the sentiments and mood of the great majority of the American people. We have seen thousands of American citizens from all walks of life and backgrounds journey to the South in the last few weeks to make personal witness of their determination to achieve equal rights for all Americans. In the last few days, I have been receiving telegrams and letters from all over the country on this subject, as I know my colleagues have, from not only leaders of labor unions, civil rights groups, and each of the major religious denominations in Michigan, but from prominent Americans all over this country, calling for speed and effective enforcement of the equal right of all Americans to vote. These telegrams demonstrate the overwhelming support from all over the country for improvements in the bill by leaders of labor, civil rights, and religious groups.

The great majority of our colleagues will approve the strongest bill necessary to finally guarantee the right to vote, because they know such a measure is vitally needed, long overdue, and has the complete support of the country. The American people have repeatedly shown that they fully support President Johnson's determination that we "must overcome the crippling legacy of bigotry and injustice. And we shall overcome."

Mr. Chairman, I would like to discuss the various amendments which I strongly support.

MORE EFFECTIVE SAFEGUARDS AGAINST VIOLENCE AND INTIMIDATION

Frankly my greatest concern about this bill is that it may result in a recurrence of the terror, violence, and economic reprisals which were so effective in the South during Reconstruction as a means of subverting the legislation passed after the Civil War to protect the rights of Negroes. The history of the South has repeatedly shown that legal techniques are used to maintain a racially discriminatory society, but that when that social order is significantly challenged extralegal techniques are used to protect the system against change. State and local governernments in the various areas where Negroes are disfranchised have shown that they are either unwilling or unable to guarantee law and order. We must have more effective Federal safeguards against violence and intimidation.

I fully support and applaud the President's plan to quickly submit legislation to this Congress which will combat the uses of violence and intimidation against Negroes and other groups by such organizations as the Ku Klux Klan. But certainly Congress cannot provide Negro Americans with expanded opportunities to gain their right to vote without, at the very same time, providing safeguards against the violence and intimidation which have usually accompanied the efforts of Southern Negroes to gain their equal rights.

I fully support the Leadership Conference on Civil Right's proposed amendments which would broaden the protections against violence and intimidation to cover all persons trying to vote, whether or not under the specific provisions of this act, and to increase the penalties for acts of intimidation and violence when a human life is placed in jeopardy. I also strongly support safeguards for people attempting to inform and assist people in the exercise of their rights to register and vote.

In order to provide full and effective enforcement of this act, we should authorize civil actions to be brought, both by the injured party and by the Attorney General on behalf of the injured party. In cases of suits for money damages against governmental officials, the political subdivision should be jointly liable, so that the suits are both economically meaningful and are brought against the responsible authorities.

We should authorize the Attorney General to assign FBI agents and U.S. marshals to observe the entire process: registration, voting, and counting of the ballots. When local officials refuse or are unable to enforce the laws, the only true and effective guarantee of any voting rights bill we pass is the presence of such Federal law enforcement officials.

We must protect not only the voter but also the Federal examiners and hearings officers. I propose that we include these new Federal officers under the provisions of 18 U.S.C. 1114 so that the same penalties for interference, intimidation, assault or murder should apply as is now the case with not only Federal judges, U.S. attorneys, FBI agents, and U.S. marshals, but also with the field officers of the National Park Service and the Bureau of Land Management.

It is because I feel that in many areas it will be a very difficult and dangerous thing to be a voting examiner, that I am so concerned that we not require that the examiner be a resident of the local area. In many places it may be extremely difficult to find a local person who will be willing to serve as an examiner. If there is such a person he would inevitably be subject to the most extreme forms of social and economic pressures against both himself and his family.

VOTING QUALIFICATIONS

I support the provisions of the Case-Douglas bill which specifically itemize the types of State voting qualification that will be administered by the Federal voting examiners. The bill we are now considering would suspend literacy tests and other devices, but what of the many other restrictions on the franchise which were designed and are being used to deny Negroes the right to vote. Let me cite some of the reasons people are denied the right to vote in some of our States: Louisiana—any person convicted of a second misdemeanor and sentenced to more than 3 months or any person when convicted of even his first misdemeanor if he is sentenced to more than 6 months. Alabama—vagrancy: None of these restrictions would seem to come under the definition of "tests and devices" which are suspended in those States under section 3(a) of H.R. 6400. Presumably mass arrests for vagrancy would result in the inability of even a Federal examiner to register such people.

RIGHT TO RUN FOR OFFICE

If we are to secure the right to vote which is defined in this act as "all action necessary to make a vote effective," then we must protect the validity and fairness of the entire political process, including participation in political parties and running for office. A vote is meaningless unless there are significant choices on the ballot. Protecting the right to vote without assuring that Negroes could run for office would certainly be a mockery. If Alabama could keep President Johnson off the ballot, it might be much easier to prevent a Negro candidate from filing for any office.

VOIDING OF ELECTIONS WHERE THE RIGHT TO VOTE IS STILL DENIED

Section 9(e) does not fully meet the problem with respect to any person voting or attempting to vote under authority of this act. As George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, pointed out, the Landrum-Griffin Act provides that union elections are declared void and new elections are held under the supervision of the Department of Labor if the courts find that there have been violations of Federal law which may have affected the outcome of the election. I support an amendment to section 9(e) which would also provide for the holding of new elections under the direct supervision of the Federal court where 50 or more persons were denied the right to vote. Such a provision is contained in the Lindsay bill, H.R. 4552.

EXTEND BILL TO COVER AREAS WHERE NEGROES ARE DENIED THE VOTE

I want to associate myself completely with the proposals that examiners will be appointed in any political subdivision where less than 25 percent of the Negro citizens are registered to vote or where on complaint of 20 individuals, the Department of Justice determines that a pattern exists of denying the right to vote on account of race. The Congress must not be put in the untenable position of providing safeguards against denials of the right to vote in only certain selected areas of the country. Racial discrimination is an evil which we must work to eliminate wherever it is found.

ELIMINATE REQUIREMENT OF APPLYING FIRST TO LOCAL VOTING REGISTRARS

This bill is aimed at the areas that the President described as having "systematic and ingenious discrimination." Under this bill determinations will first be made of those areas where the right to vote has continuously been denied because of race. Then the Attorney General must find that the appointment of examiners in those areas is necessary to enforce the guarantees of the 15th amendment. What is the sense of first determining that the local officials still refuse to conform with the intent of present Federal law and then requiring Negroes to apply for registration to those local officials and be refused before we provide the remedy of a Federal examiner? I strongly urge an amendment to section 5(a) which will allow a citizen to apply directly to a Federal voting examiner without any preliminary step.

ABOLISH THE POLL TAX

How ironic it would be for us to draft a new Federal law to assure that Negroes can be registered and then have them met by the Federal examiner with the request that they pay $1 or $2 or $3 for the right to vote under our provisions of new and effective guarantees of the right to vote. As stated in an official report of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1942 (77th Cong., 2d sess., S. Rept. No. 1662), "the object of these State constitutional conventions from which emanated mainly the poll tax laws, were moved entirely and exclusively by a desire to exclude the Negro from voting." As the report further states, the effect was also to restrict the rights of many whites to vote, but this was considered to be an unfortunate but necessary result of excluding Negroes from the franchise. Of course, the poll tax has been and is being applied discriminately to deprive Negroes of the right to vote. Even if the poll tax was applied in a nondiscriminatory manner, it would still violate the 15th amendment, since Negroes as a group are almost half as well off financially as are the rest of the population. A poll tax continues into the future the effects of past unconstitutional State action in discriminating against Negroes in educational and economic opportunities which has resulted in their current economic status.

CONCLUSION

We should be responsive to President Johnson's request for suggestions of "ways and means to strengthen this law and to make it effective." President Johnson has well described our very difficult job, but also our great responsibility, when he described the problems of guaranteeing the right to vote: "Every device of which human ingenuity is capable has been used to deny this right."

We cannot be satisfied with anything less than a bill that completely fulfills the promise of President Johnson's March 15 speech to once and for all guarantee that "Every American must have an equal right to vote. There is no reason which can excuse the denial of that right." All America awaits our translation of the President's eloquent words into the last voting rights bill we will ever need to pass. We must not default on that promise.

We are here today concerned with more than just a legal question; this is also a moral question that we have been called upon to resolve. The course of American history will be decided not just by what happens in the law libraries, but by what takes place in the hearts and minds of men and women in the Congress of the United States.

DETROIT, MICH.,
March 1, 1965.

Congressman JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

On behalf of the membership of the Wolverine Bar Association, may I respectfully urge that you impress upon your colleagues the compelling need for strengthening the voting rights bill if it is to lend credence to the American dream and live up to the promise of President Johnson's "emancipating proclamation" of March 15. I refer specifically to the complete elimination of poll taxes, effective protections against violence and intimidation, and extending coverage of the bill to operate wherever Negro Americans are denied the right to vote. It's fourth down and 1 yard to go for the touchdown Congressman—we pray to God that you and your colleagues don't fumble.

MYZELL SOWELL,
President, Wolverine Bar Association.

DETROIT, MICH.,
March 1, 1965.

Hon. JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.:

Our council respectfully urges you to press for a voting rights bill that is clear and meaningful in its intent and effect. We believe that the present proposal must be strengthened to meet the promise of the President's speech. Specifically we suggest the elimination of poll taxes and latitude for the law to operate wherever qualified citizens are denied the right to vote. The law must protect potential voters against intimidation and should take into account the ratio of nonwhite that are registered as compared with the total population of a given area. Further that provisions for voiding an election ought to be included when evidence that voting or registration is restricted.

JEWISH COMMUNITY COUNCIL
OF METROPOLITAN DETROIT,
WALTER KLEIN, *Director.*

DETROIT, MICH.,
April 1, 1965.

Congressman JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The archbishop's committee on human relations, archdiocese of Detroit, believes the voting rights bill must be strengthened if it is to live up to the promise of President Johnson's eloquent March 15 speech. We refer specifically to the complete elimination of poll taxes, effective protections against violence and intimidation and extending coverage of bill to operate wherever Negro Americans are denied the right to vote. There is a strong consensus throughout the Catholic population of Detroit for the strengthening of the voting rights bill.

Father CLEMENT KERN,
Most Holy Trinity Parish.

DETROIT, MICH.,
March 31, 1965.

Congressman JOHN CONYERS,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Detroit branch of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People would ask that you demand the voter registration bill now being considered be strengthened in the following areas:

1. Total elimination of the poll tax as a requirement for voting in State and local elections as well as in Federal elections.
2. Removal from the present bill the requirement that a prospective registrant apply to a State official before going to Federal registrar or examiner to register.
3. Bring the entire county under the coverage of the registrar or examiner provisions of the bill if persons have been wrongfully denied the right to vote.
4. Maximum Federal protection for registered voters and prospective registrants against economic and physical intimidation and coercion by making these acts a violation of Federal law.

Sincerely,
Rev. JAMES E. WADSWORTH, Jr.,
President.
ROBERT R. TINDAL,
Executive Secretary.

DETROIT, MICH.,
March 31, 1965.

Congressman JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We of the First Congressional District urge you to press now for full freedom to vote by

Negroes and all America. We want legislation to remove the poll tax blight and establish protective procedures to vote without intimidation and violence.

MARK STEPP,
Chairman, First Congressional District Democratic Party.

DETROIT, MICH.,
March 31, 1965.

Representative JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

There can be no doubt that many citizens of this country have been purposefully denied the right to register and vote. There should be no doubt that the only correction to this situation rests with the passage of strong Federal law to enable the Federal Government to intervene when citizens are denied the constitutional right to vote. As moderator of the Presbytery of Detroit, United Presbyterian Church, I urge you to do all within your power to see that such a strong Federal voting registration bill be passed quickly.

Rev. RAYMOND SWARTZBACK.

DETROIT, MICH.,
March 31, 1965.

JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Yesterday the remains of Viola Liuzzo were laid to rest in a Detroit cemetery. Although she is gone the vivid memory of her courageous struggle lives on in the minds of all decent minded citizens who believe that the time has come to establish full equality for all. The tremendous wave of support for the cause of freedom demonstrates that the majority of American sentiment is behind the President's proposed legislation to abolish poll taxes and provide effective protection against violence and intimidation. Negro Americans must be guaranteed the right to register and vote. Be assured that you will be speaking for the overwhelming majority of your constituency in supporting such legislation.

NELSON JACK EDWARDS,
Executive Board Member-at-Large, International Union, UAW.

JACKSON, MISS.,
March 31, 1965.

Congressman JOHN CONYERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

It has come to our attention that you are to testify before the House Judiciary Committee in support of the voting rights bill that is now before Congress. While this is a good bill, we would like to convey to you and ask you to convey to the committee, that in the opinion of Negro citizens of Mississippi this bill does not nearly go far enough. The bill must be strengthened in several areas.

(1) Elimination of poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in State and local elections is very necessary. The poll tax is a great deterrent to the ability of Negro citizens to vote. Poll tax is manipulated by State officials to continue to deny the right of thousands of Negro citizens.

(2) The bill must provide for the right to vote for all citizens, as long as one citizen of this great Nation of ours is denied the right to vote, America is not guaranteeing equal protection of the law to every citizen.

(3) If the bill is to be truly effective, there must be a provision to protect citizens who go down to register to vote, from police brutality, intimidations, and economic reprisals. The city, county, and State should be made financially liable for civil damages in the event violence or any form of intimidation is directed against prospective voters.

The 15th amendment to the Constitution of these United States of America guaranteeing the right to vote, is 95 years old this week, yet millions of Americans are denied this right. How much longer before this right becomes a reality?

MISSISSIPPI STATE CONFERENCE NAACP BRANCHES,
CHARLES EVERS, *Field Director,*
AARON E. HENRY, *President.*

DETROIT, MICH.,
March 31, 1965.

Representative JOHN CONYERS, Jr.,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Over 10,000 Detroiters gathered together on March 8 to voice their concern for adequate Federal voter registration law. Over 300 went to Washington on March 12 to tell their Representatives this concern. Our country needs such a law as now before Congress. Our country demands such a law to insure constitutional rights for all citizens. Please do all you can to speedily pass such a law.

ROBERT A. HOPPE,
Director, Commission on Race and Cultural Relations, Metropolitan Detroit Council of Churches.

GOVERNMENT PUBLICATIONS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. WOLFF] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which will provide, upon request from the duly authorized person or institution of higher education, one free copy of each publication that our Federal Government prints. At present there is no program by which our educational institutions and our State and local governments may have access to even one copy of Federal publications without cost.

This bill will enable our schools to participate in a more informed curriculum of governmental education in order that they may better comprehend their government's policies, laws, and programs. The Federal Government will be served by the wider dissemination of the published advice and policy of its agencies. State, county, and city governments and municipalities will be able to benefit from a better Federal-local governmental coordination through Federal information made available under this bill.

We presently have a governmental courtesy among governments whereby the elimination of fees provides a reciprocity of information, now let us have an educational and Federal-local courtesy between our Federal and local Governments and between our educational institutions and the Federal Government.

By making available one single free copy of Federal publications to each institute of higher education and each State, county, and municipal government, we will be implementing on our Federal aid to our schools and contributing an invaluable source of information to our schools and local governments to which they do not now have access. This bill will provide on the school and local government level a connecting link between Federal policy and its understanding, laws and their application, Federal programs and their utilization.

I urge that we grant these benefits to our schools and local governments by passing this bill.

VETERINARY MEDICAL EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES ACT OF 1965

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced H.R. 6999, a bill to provide Federal grants and loan funds to public and nonpublic schools of veterinary medicine.

H.R. 6999 would authorize $2 million per year in the next 3 fiscal years for replacement or rehabilitation of existing teaching facilities for the training of veterinary medical personnel. Further, it would authorize $15 million per year for the construction of new facilities in that same period.

Equally important, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6999 authorizes $2.56 million for student loan funds for fiscal years 1966 and 1967.

At first blush, it would seem unlikely that an urban Congressman would introduce a bill to assist the education of veterinarians. We tend to associate the work of the veterinarian with our rural farm communities.

The truth is that every American has a stake in the availability of well-trained veterinarians. Over 100 diseases, Mr. Speaker, are transmissible to men from animals, from both domestic pets and farm animals. However, instances of this transmission are rare only because the necessary precautions have been taken by private veterinarians and those employed with State and local public health agencies and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Veterinarians are needed for medical research, teaching, and even space exploration. Further, the safety of our drugs cannot be guaranteed without extensive preliminary testing on animals. Many people lead normal lives today, for example, because extensive research was done with animals to make insulin safe for human use.

On the other hand, over 100 people died when "elixir of sulfanilamide" was released in 1937 without proper preliminary animal testing.

Veterinarians are clearly essential to our country. Yet, a report published by the American Veterinary Medical Association estimates a shortage by 1980 of 7,000 to 10,000 trained veterinarians at the present rate of graduation. Right now the U.S. Public Health Service estimates that 525 veterinarians are needed at the State and local government level.

The 18 schools offering veterinary training in the United States are already overcrowded. We, are, therefore, faced with three choices—we may chose to lack sufficient veterinary personnel at our own peril; we may overcrowd present facilities and risk declining quality in education; or we may pass this bill to expand educational opportunities for young men and women in this field.

Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members of the House, and under unanimous consent, I include the text of H.R. 6999:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Veterinary Medical Educational Facilities Construction Act of 1965".

National Advisory Council

Sec. 2. Section 725 of the Public Health Service Act (relating to the National Advisory Council on Education for Health Professions) is amended as follows:

(a)(1) In the first sentence of subsection (a) of such section, strike out "sixteen" and insert in lieu thereof "seventeen";

(2) In the second sentence of such subsection (a), (A) strike out "eight" and insert in lieu thereof "nine", and (B) strike out "or the public health professions" and insert in lieu thereof "the public health professions, or veterinary medicine";

(3) In the third sentence of such subsection (a), strike out "or schools of public health" and insert in lieu thereof "schools of public health or schools of veterinary medicine";

(b) In subsection (b) of such section, insert "and part A of title IX" after "this part"; and

(c) In subsection (c) of such section, strike out "this part" (wherever it appears therein) and insert in lieu thereof "this part or part A of title IX".

Grants for Veterinary Medical Teaching Facilities

Sec 3. The Public Health Service Act is amended by adding after title VIII thereof (42 U.S.C., ch. 6A) the following new title:

"TITLE IX—TRAINING OF VETERINARY MEDICAL PERSONNEL

"Part A—Grants for construction of teaching facilities for veterinary medical personnel

"Declaration of Policy

"Sec. 901. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that (1) increased demand for veterinary services and research necessitates the expansion and improvement of existing educational facilities for the training of veterinary medical personnel, and (2) steadily increasing tuition fees and increasing contributions from private citizens, State appropriations and funds from the veterinary medical profession itself have proven insufficient to provide the necessary capital funds required for such expansion and improvement.

"(b) It is, therefore, the policy of the Congress to provide funds for construction of veterinary medical teaching facilities for our public and nonprofit veterinary medical schools, thus insuring the continued production of an adequate number of properly qualified and trained veterinarians.

"Authorization of Appropriations

"Sec. 902. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated over a period of three fiscal years, beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, not to exceed the following amounts—

"(1) $2,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, for grants to assist in the replacement or rehabilitation of existing teaching facilities for the training of veterinary medical personnel; and

"(2) $15,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1965, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years, for grants to assist in the construction of new or expanded teaching facilities for the training of veterinary medical personnel.

"(b) Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

"Approval of Applications

"Sec. 903. (a) No application for a grant under this part may be approved unless it is submitted to the Surgeon General prior to July 1, 1967.

"(b) To be eligible to apply for a grant to assist in the construction of any facility under this part, the applicant must be (A) a public or other nonprofit school of veterinary medicine, and (B) accredited by a recognized body or bodies approved for such purpose by the Commissioner of Education, except that a new school which (by reason of no, or insufficient, period of operation) is not, at the time of application for a grant to construct a facility under this part, eligible for accreditation by such a recognized body or bodies, shall be deemed accredited for purposes of this part if the Commissioner of Education finds, after consultation with the appropriate accreditation body or bodies, that there is reasonable assurance that the school will, upon completion of such facility, meet the accreditation standards of such body or bodies.

"(c) A grant under this part may be made only if the application therefore is approved by the Surgeon General upon his determination that—

"(1) the applicant meets the eligibility conditions set forth in subsection (b);

"(2) the application contains or is supported by reasonable assurances that (A) for not less than ten years after completion of construction, the facility will be used for the purposes of the teaching of veterinary medical personnel, (B) sufficient funds will be available to meet the non-Federal share of the cost of constructing the facility, (C) sufficient funds will be available when construction is completed, for effective use of the facility for the training for which it is constructed, and (D) in the case of an application for construction to expand the training capacity of an existing school of veterinary medicine, the first-year enrollment at such school during the first full school year after the completion of the construction and for each of the next nine school years thereafter will exceed the average first-year enrollment at such school for the five full school years preceding the year in which the application is made by at least 5 per centum of such highest first-year enrollment.

"(3)(A) in the case of an application for a grant from funds appropriated pursuant to clause (1) of section 902(a), such application is for aid in construction which will replace or rehabilitate facilities of, or used by, an existing school of veterinary medicine which are so obsolete as to require the school to curtail substantially either its enrollment or the quality of the training provided, or (B) in the case of an application for a grant from funds appropriated pursuant to clause (2) of section 902(a), such application is for aid in the construction of a new school of veterinary medicine, or construction which will expand the training capacity of an existing school of veterinary medicine;

"(4) the plans and specifications are in accordance with regulations relating to minimum standards of construction and equipment; and

"(5) the application contains or is supported by adequate assurance that any laborer or mechanic employed by a contractor or subcontractor in the performance of work on the construction of the facility will be paid wages at rates not less than those prevailing on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276a—276a–5); and the Secretary of Labor shall have, with respect to the labor standards specified in this clause, the authority and functions set forth in Reorganization Plan Numbered 14 of 1950 (15 F.R. 3176; 5 U.S.C. 133z–15), and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934, as amended (40 U.S.C. 276c).

Before approving or disapproving an application under this part, the Surgeon General shall secure the advice of the National Advisory Council on Education for Health Professions established by section 725 (hereinafter in this part referred to as the 'Advisory Council').

"(d) In considering applications for grants, the Advisory Council and the Surgeon General shall take into account—

"(1)(A) in the case of a project for replacement or rehabilitation of existing facilities of, or used by, a school, the relative need for such replacement or rehabilitation to prevent curtailment of the school's enrollment or deterioration of the quality of the training provided by the school, and the relative size of any such curtailment and its effect on the geographical distribution of opportunities for training (giving due consideration to population, available veterinarians, and available resources in various areas of the Nation for training veterinarians); or

"(B) in the case of a project for a new school or for expansion of the facilities of, or used by, an existing school, and relative effectiveness of the proposed facilities in expanding the capacity for the training of first-year students of veterinary medicine (or, in the case of a two-year school which is expanding to a four-year school, expanding the capacity for four-year training of students of veterinary medicine), and in promoting an equitable geographical distribution of opportunities for such training (giving consideration to the factors mentioned above in subparagraph (A)); and

"(2) in the case of an applicant in a State which has in existence a State planning agency, or which participates in a regional or other interstate planning agency, described in section 909, the relationship of the application to the construction or training program which is being developed by such agency with respect to such State and, if such agency has reviewed such application, any comment thereon submitted by such agency.

"Amount of Grant: Payments

"Sec. 904. (a)(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amount of any grant under this part shall be such amount as the Surgeon General determines to be appropriate after obtaining the advice of the Advisory Council; except that (A) in the case of a project for a new school, and in the case of a grant for new facilities for an existing school in cases where such facilities are of particular importance in providing a major expansion of training capacity, as determined in accordance with regulations, such amount may not exceed 66⅔ per centum of the necessary cost of construction, as determined by the Surgeon General, of such project; (B) in the case of any other grant, such amount may not exceed 50 per centum of the necessary cost of construction, as so determined, of the project with respect to which the grant is made.

"(2) Notwithstanding subsection (a), upon application of any veterinary medical school, a grant of not more than $25,000 may be made for the purpose of preparing initial plans with estimates for proposed new construction.

"(b) Upon approval of any application for a grant under this part, the Surgeon General shall reserve, from any appropriation available therefor, the amount of such grant as determined under subsection (a); the amount so reserved may be paid in advance or by way of reimbursement, and in such installments consistent with construction progress, as the Surgeon General may determine. The Surgeon General's reservation of any amount under this section may be amended by him, either upon approval of an amendment of the application or upon revision of the estimated cost of construction of the facility.

"(c) In determining the amount of any grant under this part, there shall be excluded from the cost of construction an amount equal to the sum of (1) the amount of any other Federal grant which the applicant has obtained, or is assured of obtaining, with respect to the construction which is to be financed in part by grants authorized under this part, and (2) the amount of any non-Federal funds required to be expended as a condition of such other Federal grant.

"Recapture of Payments

"SEC. 905. If, within ten years after completion of any construction for which funds have been paid under this part—

"(a) the applicant or other owner of the facility shall cease to be a public or nonprofit school,

"(b) the facility shall cease to be used for the teaching purposes for which it was constructed (unless the Surgeon General determines, in accordance with regulations, that there is good cause for releasing the applicant or other owner from the obligation to do so), or

"(c) the facility is used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship, the United States shall be entitled to recover from the applicant or other owner of the facility the amount bearing the same ratio to the then value (as determined by agreement of the parties or by action brought in the United States district court for the district in which such facility is situated) of the facility, as the amount of the Federal participation bore to the cost of construction of such facility.

"Definitions

"SEC. 906. As used in this part—

"(1) The term 'Advisory Council' means the National Advisory Council on Education for Health Professions established by section 725;

"(2) The terms 'construction' and 'cost of construction' include (A) the construction of new buildings, the expansion of existing buildings, and remodeling, replacement, renovation, major repair (to the extent permitted by regulations), or alteration of existing buildings, including architects' fees, but not including the cost of acquisition of land or offsite improvements, and (B) initial equipment of new buildings and of the expanded, remodeled, repaired, renovated, or altered part of existing buildings; but such terms shall not include the construction or cost of construction of so much of any facility as is used or is to be used for sectarian instruction or as a place for religious worship;

"(3) The term 'nonprofit school' means a school owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; and

"(4) The terms 'school of veterinary medicine' and 'veterinary medical school' mean a school or college providing training leading to the degree of doctor of veterinary medicine.

"Noninterference with Administration of Institutions

"SEC. 907. Nothing contained in this part shall be construed as authorizing any department, agency, officer, or employee of the United States to exercise any direction, supervision, or control over, or impose any requirement with respect to, the personnel, curriculum, methods of instruction, or administration of any institution.

"Regulations

"SEC. 908. (a) The Surgeon General, after consultation with the Advisory Council and with the approval of the Secretary, shall prescribe general regulations for this part covering the eligibility of institutions, the order of priority in approving applications, the terms and conditions for approving applications, determinations of the amounts of grants, and minimum standards of construction and equipment for various types of institutions.

"(b) The Surgeon General is authorized to make, with the approval of the Secretary, such other regulations as he finds necessary to carry out the provisions of this part.

"Technical Assistance

"SEC. 909. In carrying out the purposes of this part, and to further the development of State, or joint, or coordinated regional or other interstate planning of programs for relieving shortages of training capacity in the field of veterinary medicine through constructing teaching facilities, providing adequate financial support for schools, or otherwise, the Surgeon General is authorized to provide technical assistance and consultative services to State or interstate planning agencies established for such purpose.

"Part B—Student loans

"Loan Agreements

"SEC. 920. (a) The Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare is authorized to enter into an agreement for the establishment and operation of a student loan fund in accordance with this part with any public or other nonprofit school of veterinary medicine (as defined in section 906) which is located in a State and accredited as provided in section 903(b)(B).

"(b) Each agreement entered into under this section shall—

"(1) provide for establishment of a student loan fund by the school;

"(2) provide for deposit in the fund of (A) the amounts allocated under this part to the school by the Secretary, (B) an additional amount from other sources equal to not less than one-ninth of amounts deposited pursuant to clause (A), (C) collections of principal and interest on loans made from the fund, and (D) any other earnings of the fund;

"(3) provide that the fund shall be used only for loans to students of the school in accordance with the agreement and for costs of collection of such loans and interest thereon;

"(4) provide that loans may be made from such fund only to students pursuing a full-time course of study at the school leading to a degree of doctor of veterinary medicine, and that while the agreement remains in effect no such student who has attended such school before July 1, 1967, shall receive a loan from a loan fund established under section 204 of the National Defense Education Act of 1958; and

"(5) contain such other provisions as are necessary to protect the financial interests of the United States.

"Loan Provisions

"SEC. 921. (a) Loans from a loan fund established under this part may not exceed $2,000 for any student for any academic year or its equivalent. In the granting of such loans, a school shall give preference to persons who enter as first-year students after June 30, 1964.

"(b) Any such loans shall be made on such terms and conditions as the school may determine, but may be made only to a student in need of the amount thereof to pursue a full-time course of study at the school leading to a degree of doctor of veterinary medicine.

"(c) Such loans shall be repayable in equal or graduated periodic installments (with the right of the borrower to accelerate repayment) over the ten-year period which begins three years after the student ceases to pursue a full-time course of study at a school of veterinary medicine, excluding from such ten-year period all periods (up to three years) of (1) active duty performed by the borrower as a member of a uniformed service, or (2) service as a volunteer under the Peace Corps Act.

"(d) The liability to repay the unpaid balance of such loan and accrued interest thereon shall be canceled upon the death of the borrower, or if the Secretary determines that he has become permanently and totally disabled.

"(e) Such loans shall bear interest, on the unpaid balance of the loan, computed only for periods during which the loan is repayable, at the rate of 3 per centum per annum, or the going Federal rate at the time the loan is made, whichever rate is the greater. For purposes of this subsection, the term 'going Federal rate' means the rate of interest which the Secretary of the Treasury specifies during June of each year for purposes of loans made during the fiscal year beginning on the next July 1, determined by estimating the average yield to maturity, on the basis of daily closing market quotations or prices during the preceding May on all outstanding marketable obligations of the United States having a maturity date of fifteen or more years from the first day of such month of May, and by rounding off such estimated average annual yield to the next higher multiple of one-eighth of 1 per centum.

"(f) Loans shall be made under this part without security or endorsement, except that if the borrower is a minor and the note or other evidence of obligation executed by him would not, under the applicable law, create a binding obligation, either security or endorsement may be required.

"(g) No note or other evidence of a loan made under this part may be transferred or assigned by the school making the loan except that, if the borrower transfers to another school participating in the program under this part, such note or other evidence of a loan may be transferred to such other school.

"(h) Where all or any part of a loan, or interest, is canceled under this section, the Secretary shall pay to the school an amount equal to the school's proportionate share of the canceled portion, as determined by the Secretary.

"Authorization of Appropriations

"SEC. 922. (a) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to carry out this part $510,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, $1,020,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, $1,540,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1967, and such sums for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1968, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years as may be necessary to enable students who have received a loan for any academic year ending before July 1, 1967, to continue or complete their education. Sums appropriated pursuant to this subsection shall be allotted among loan funds at schools which have established loan funds under this part.

"(b)(1) The Secretary shall from time to time set dates by which schools with which he has in effect agreements under this part must file applications for allotments to their loan funds.

"(2) If the total of the amounts requested for any fiscal year in such applications exceeds the amounts appropriated under this part for that fiscal year, the allotment to the loan fund of each such school shall be reduced by whichever of the following is the smaller: (A) the amount requested in its application, or (B) an amount which bears the same ratio to the amounts appropriated as the number of students estimated by the Secretary to be enrolled in such school during such fiscal year bears to the estimated total number of students in all such schools during such year. Amounts remaining after allotment under the preceding sentence among schools whose applications requested more than the amounts so allotted to their loan funds, but with such adjustments as may be necessary to prevent the total allotted to any such school's loan fund from exceeding the total so requested by it.

"(3) Allotments to a loan fund of a school shall be paid to it from time to time in such installments as the Secretary determines will not result in unnecessary accumulations in the loan fund at such school.

"Distribution of Assets From Loan Funds

"SEC. 923. (a) After June 30, 1970, and not later than September 30, 1970, there shall be a capital distribution of the balance of the loan fund established under this part by each school as follows:

"(1) The Secretary shall first be paid an amount which bears the same ratio to the balance in such fund at the close of June 30, 1970, as the total amount of the allotments to such fund by the Secretary under this part bears to the total amounts in such fund derived from such allotments and from funds deposited therein pursuant to section 920 (b)(2)(B).

"(2) The remainder of such balance shall be paid to the school.

"(b) After September 30, 1970, each school with which the Secretary has made an agreement under this part shall pay to the Secretary, not less often than quarterly, the same proportionate share of amounts received by the school after June 30, 1970, in payment of principal or interest on loans made from the loan fund established pursuant to such agreement as was determined for the Secretary under subsection (a).

"Loans to Schools

"SEC. 924. Upon application by any school with which he has made an agreement under this part, the Secretary may make a loan to such school for the purpose of helping to finance deposits requird by section 920(b)(2)(B) in a loan fund established pursuant to such agreement. Such loan may be made only if the school shows it is unable to secure such funds upon reasonable terms and conditions from non-Federal sources. Loans made under this section shall bear interest at a rate sufficient to cover (1) the cost of the funds to the Treasury, (2) the cost of administering this section, and (3) probable losses.

"Administrative Provisions

"SEC. 925. The Secretary may agree to modifications of agreements or loans made under this part, and may compromise, waive, or release any right, title, claim, or demand of the United States arising or acquired under this part."

Technical Amendments

SEC. 4. Section 1 of the Public Health Service Act is amended to read as follows:

"Short Title

"SECTION 1. Titles I to IX, inclusive, of this Act may be cited as the 'Public Health Service Act'".

(b) The Act of July 1, 1944 (58 Stat. 682), as amended, is further amended by renumbering title IX (as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act) as title X, and by renumbering sections 901 through 914 (as in effect prior to the enactment of this Act), and references thereto, as sections 1001 through 1014, respectively.

WIFE OF MILLIONAIRE SPURS AID TO NEEDY STUDENTS

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, the March 27 edition of the Pittsburgh Courier contains an article entitled, "Wife of Millionaire Spurs Aid to Needy Students," which I should like to call to the attention of the House.

This article outlines the testimony of Mrs. A. G. Gaston—director of the Booker T. Washington Business College in Birmingham, Ala.—on H.R. 3220 before the Special Subcommittee on Education. Mrs. Gaston is also the wife of well-known Negro leader, A. G. Gaston.

Mr. Speaker, it is noteworthy that these are the same Gastons on whose property the Selma-to-Montgomery marchers camped one night, and in whose funeral home a bomb was planted and found just a week ago. Their courage in the area of civil rights is not limited to that alone, but extends to their entire way of life.

I am pleased to inform the House that Mrs. Gaston will again appear before an Education subcommittee next week. In this instance, however, she will testify before the Select Subcommittee on Education, of which I am chairman. The bill under consideration will be H.R. 6468—the National Vocational Student Loan Insurance Act of 1965.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, is in my opinion, one of the most urgently needed pieces of legislation before the Congress. It is intended to provide loan insurance for a group of students largely ignored and often underestimated. I am speaking, of course, about students attending post-secondary business, trade, and technical schools.

Recent emphasis has been directed toward the college student. The trend now is for everyone to aspire to a college degree. This is not only unrealistic, but it is absolute folly. To say that this great and prosperous Nation only has need for college graduates is to deny acknowledgement to the many tradesmen, technicians, and business aids—products of the schools in question—who have substantially contributed, and will continue to contribute, to our very greatness.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to not only consider the following article about Mrs. Gaston, but to consider the bill H.R. 6468. I am hopeful that it may come before the House in the near future.

The Courier article follows in full:

[From the Pittsburgh Courier, Mar. 27, 1965]

WIFE OF MILLIONAIRE SPURS AID TO NEEDY STUDENTS—MRS. A. G. GASTON ASKS CONGRESS TO PASS BILL—GRADS OF HER SCHOOL HAVE FOUND SUCCESS

WASHINGTON, D.C.—In seeking congressional support of a student loan bill that would aid those in business school, Mrs. A. G. Gaston disclosed that graduates of the Booker T. Washington Business College operated by her and her husband in Birmingham, Ala., are employed in five-sixths of the Negro businesses throughout the South.

In a forceful appearance before the Special Subcommittee on Education and Labor, of which Congressman ADAM POWELL is chairman, Mrs. Gaston, who is the wife of the well-known millionaire, pleaded for enactment of part B, title IV, of H.R. 3220. Other speakers from the United Business School Association appeared, also, and spoke of the need of Government-sponsored student loans which, presently, are restricted to those in 4-year colleges.

Tracing the development of the A. G. Gaston enterprise, Mrs. Gaston, who is director of the Washington school, said that it was born out of need to service her husband's insurance firm, in 1939, with white-collar workers. Since that time, she related, more than 8,000 students have been graduated, and the current enrollment is 360, with a well-trained faculty of 20.

"I wish to point out here," she declared, "that we have only scratched the surface of our potential. My husband and I have the facilities for training ambitious youths, but the amount we can do is limited. A financial boost to the ambitions of these people would be a credit to our society."

In her congressional statement, Mrs. Gaston pointed out that their school has been one of the few training Negro youths for white-collar employment as accountants, clerks, secretaries, general office workers and IBM machine operators in the South. When World War II started, she testified, 56 of their trained graduates were sent to Washington in answer to a distress call from Government officials.

Even now, she said, many of her present students found it a strain on their family's purses to enroll. Last year, one-third of 700 who made applications couldn't enter because they were unable to pay just the first quarter of tuition, while another one-third paid on the installment plan.

In closing, she pleaded with committee members who, later, said they were impressed with her presentation, that they give serious consideration to pass the bill before them. The student loan program for business college enrollees, she asserted, will be of immediate assistance for Negro youths in the South for years to come.

As Mrs. Gaston spoke and, later, was questioned by committee members, sitting in the front row of spectators was her husband, proudly beaming at his wife's first congressional appearance. He is rated one of the few Negro millionaires in the South, and has worked, unceasingly, for civil rights causes. The business couple, both, are active members of the UBSA leadership.

Both Congressmen JOHN BRADEMAS, of Indiana, and ROBERT GRIFFIN, of Michigan, told Mrs. Gaston they were "impressed" with the "human advances" achieved at her school. Mr. BRADEMAS said that he had been acquainted with Mr. Gaston's contributions in the insurance field.

Richard A. Fulton, general counsel and executive director of the UBSA, who accompanied her to the hearings, said that the organization is an integrated one, with a membership exceeding 500.

In a joint statement, Walter J. Tribbey, president of UBSA, and Prentiss Carnell, on an Albany, N.Y., business school, urged Federal aid for students who aren't college bound. They said the role of the business school fulfills the major requirements of colleges, by their high quality standards of specialized education.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. COHELAN, for 1 hour, on April 6; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HALL, for 60 minutes, on Tuesday, April 6, 1965.

Mr. LINDSAY, for 30 minutes, today.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FARBSTEIN (at the request of Mr. ALBERT), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 10 minutes, today.

Mr. WIDNALL (at the request of Mr. WYDLER), for 20 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. MORSE (at the request of Mr. WYDLER), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. HANNA (at the request of Mr. FARNSLEY), for 60 minutes, on Tuesday, April 6.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts.

Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. O'HARA of Michigan) in the Committee of the Whole and to include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WYDLER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. GUBSER.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. FARNSLEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. POWELL.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. TUCK.

Mr. IRWIN.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FARNSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 5, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

848. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended" (H. Doc. No. 133); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

849. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the request for appropriations set forth in the budget for fiscal year 1966 and a proposed provision for the Department of the Interior (H. Doc. No. 134); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

850. A letter from the president and national executive director, Girl Scouts of the United States of America, transmitting the 15th Annual Report of Girl Scouts of the United States of America, pursuant to section 7 of the act of March 16, 1950, as amended by Public Law 272 of August 14, 1953 (H. Doc. No. 135); to the Committee on the District of Columbia and ordered to be printed with illustrations.

851. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the scope of the 1964 conservation reserve program, pursuant to section 108c of the Agricultural Act of 1956 (7 USC 1832(c)); to the Committee on Agriculture.

852. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Installations and Logistics), transmitting the annual report on the National Industrial Reserve, pursuant to section 12 of the National Industrial Reserve Act of 1949, Public Law 883, 80th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

853. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting a report on the activities of the Small Business Administration in 1964, pursuant to the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

854. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize compensation for overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

855. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive costs incurred in the procurement of ball powder for .30 caliber blank ammunition from Olin Mathieson Chemical Corp., East Alton, Ill., Department of the Army; to the Committee on Government Operations.

856. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on excessive allocation of costs of streets and roads to the Queensgate I urban renewal project, Cincinnati, Ohio, Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

857. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report on an application to the department from the Phillips Petroleum Co., for refund of excess oil royalties (barging costs) paid on lease OCS–0474, pursuant to section 10(b) of 43 U.S.C. 1339(b); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

858. A letter from the president, National Safety Council, transmitting a report of the audit of the financial transactions of the council for calendar year 1964, pursuant to section 15 of Public Law 83–259; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

859. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize the acceptance of a settlement of certain indebtedness of Greece to the United States and to authorize the use of the payments resulting from the settlement for a cultural and educational exchange program"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 3413. A bill to amend section 106 of title 38 of the United States Code to provide that individuals who incur a disability in line of duty during certain service shall be entitled to certain veterans' benefits; without amendment (Rept. No. 216). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 314. Resolution for consideration of House Joint Resolution 1, joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency and to cases where the President is unable to discharge the powers and duties of his office; without amendment (Rept. No. 217). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. YOUNG: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 273. Resolution to grant additional travel authority to the Committee on Public Works; without amendment (Rept. No. 218). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 980. A bill to provide for the return of obscene mail matter; without amendment (Rept. No. 219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DULSKI: Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. H.R. 6622. A bill to exempt the postal field service from section 1310 of the Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1952; without amendment (Rept. No. 220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 221. Report on the disposition of certain papers of sundry executive departments. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. PATMAN: Committee on Banking and Currency. H.R. 6497. A bill to amend the Bretton Woods Agreements Act to authorize an increase in the International Monetary Fund quota of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STEED: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 7060. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 7028. A bill to provide compensation to the Crow Tribe of Indians, Montana, for certain lands embraced within the present boundaries of the Crow Indian Reservation, for the validation of titles, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7029. A bill to permit a State to increase the mileage of its Federal-aid primary system when provision is made for the completion and maintenance of 75 percent thereof; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7030. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a farmer a deduction from gross income for water assessments levied by irrigation ditch companies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 7031. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 7032. A bill to repeal the provisions of law relating to the fixing by the Postmaster General, with the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission, of rates of postage on fourth-class mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 7033. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that an individual's entitlement to child's insurance benefits shall continue, after he attains age 18, for so long as he is regularly attending school; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GILLIGAN:

H.R. 7034. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. GRIFFITHS:

H.R. 7035. A bill to amend title I of the Tariff Act of 1930 to provide for the continuation of the long-established duty-free reciprocity with Canada in the case of parts for farm equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALPERN:

H.R. 7036. A bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an extended program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HARVEY of Indiana:

H.R. 7037. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEE:

H.R. 7038. A bill to authorize two professional legislative assistants for each Member of the House of Representatives and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 7039. A bill authorizing construction of a dam and reservoir on Mill Creek in Grand County, Utah, in the interest of flood control and allied purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KREBS:

H.R. 7040. A bill to provide certain increases in annuities payable from the civil service retirement and disability fund, to improve the financing of the civil service retirement system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 7041. A bill to amend certain laws relating to housing in order to assist in the provision of decent, safe, and sanitary housing for low-income families in urban and rural areas, to provide standards for determining just compensation in eminent domain proceedings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 7042. A bill to amend section 402(d) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7043. A bill to amend the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act and the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939 in order to require that imported woven labels must have woven into them the name of the country where woven; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 7044. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Redevelopment Act of 1945; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OLSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 7045. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide, as an alternative method of computing benefits, for dropping out of an individual's wage record the 6 years 1951 through 1956 instead of dropping out his 5 years of lowest earnings; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7046. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that, for benefit computation purposes, a man's insured status and average monthly wage will be figured on the basis of an age-62 cutoff (the same as is presently done in the case of women); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POOL:

H.R. 7047. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 7048. A bill to expand the war on poverty and enhance the effectiveness of programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RANDALL:

H.R. 7049. A bill to allow an additional time for payment of 1964 income tax to the extent of underwithholding on wages paid to individuals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. REDLIN:

H.R. 7050. A bill to provide for the entry free of duty of articles donated by Canadian residents to the International Peace Garden, Dunseith, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7051. A bill to regulate the labeling and advertising of cigarettes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 7052. A bill to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SAYLOR:

H.R. 7053. A bill to amend the Helium Act Amendments of 1960; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. TUCK:

H.R. 7054. A bill to amend the criminal laws of the United States to prohibit any person from crossing State lines for the purpose of violating the laws of any State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H.R. 7055. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to allow gas tax refunds due for gasoline used by aerial applicators serving farmers to be refunded to the aerial applicators providing such service to farmers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WYATT:

H.R. 7056. A bill to authorize a study of methods of helping to provide financial assistance to victims of future natural disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 7057. A bill to establish a program of voluntary comprehensive insurance for all persons aged 65 or over and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BANDSTRA:

H.R. 7058. A bill to authorize loans for undergraduate study in public and other nonprofit institutions of higher education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BOW:

H.R. 7059. A bill to amend the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 724; 20 U.S.C. 79–79e), to authorize such appropriations to the Smithsonian Institution as are necessary in carrying out its functions under said act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STEED:

H.R. 7060. A bill making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 7061. A bill to establish the Point Reyes National Seashore in California and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7062. A bill to increase the limitation on emergency relief for the repair or reconstruction of highways under section 125 of title 23, United States Code; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 7063. A bill to protect the right of individuals to register and to vote in State and Federal elections without discrimination because of race or color; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS:

H.R. 7064. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 7065. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to require national standards for reducing or eliminating the emission of air pollutants from gasoline-powered vehicles, to authorize grants to municipalities and air-pollution-control agencies for the acquisition, construction, or installation of devices or facilities designed to reduce or eliminate air pollution resulting from the disposal of solid wastes, to direct the Surgeon General to conduct a study of and report to Congress on the effect of air pollution from all sources on human health (particularly lung cancer) and for other purposes; and to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit deduction of expenditures and increased investment credit for the acquisition, construction, or installation of water and air pollution control devices; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 7066. A bill to provide revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 7067. A bill to prescribe administrative procedures for the District of Columbia government; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7068. A bill to correct inequities with respect to the basic compensation of teachers and teaching positions under the Defense Department Overseas Teachers Pay and Personnel Practices Act; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATTHEWS:

H.R. 7069. A bill to further amend the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended, to provide for shelter in Federal structures, to authorize payment toward the construction or modification of approved public shelter space, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7070. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7071. A bill to amend part 2 of title V of the Social Security Act in order to expand and improve services for children with physical or mental impairments under State plans approved under such part, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TODD:

H.R. 7072. A bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. UDALL:

H.R. 7073. A bill to provide for certain reorganizations in the Department of State and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. WOLFF:

H.R. 7074. A bill to provide for the distribution on request and without charge of certain publications of the Federal Government to State and local officials and institutions of higher education; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 7075. A bill to establish a New England Regional Development Commission to formulate plans for the development of that region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BATES:

H.R. 7076. A bill to establish a New England Regional Development Commission to formulate plans for the development of that region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 7077. A bill to establish a New England Regional Development Commission to formulate plans for the development of that region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CONTE:

H.R. 7078. A bill to establish a New England Regional Development Commission to formulate plans for the development of that region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 7079. A bill to establish a New England Regional Development Commission to formulate plans for the development of that region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H.R. 7080. A bill to establish a New England Regional Development Commission to formulate plans for the development of that region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 7081. A bill to establish a New England Regional Development Commission to formulate plans for the development of that region; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.J. Res. 416. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the 7-day period beginning April 9 of each year as "National Family Health Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McFALL:

H.J. Res. 417. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit the apportionment of one house of a bicameral State legislature on factors other than population in certain circumstances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 381. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the efforts of APDANS toward the building of a national living memorial to the unknown creators of the American Negro spiritual; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H. Res. 315. Resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

160. By Mr. RYAN: Resolution No. 95 adopted by the New York State Senate and concurred in by the Assembly, memorializing the Congress of the United States to amend the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, increasing the minimum wage to $1.50 per hour; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

161. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to prohibit discrimination against electors in registration to vote; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

162. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation establishing Prospect Hill Park in the city of Somerville as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

163. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact legislation to provide for an increase in the emphasis on desalination research and to provide greater aid and expansion for metropolitan reservoirs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

164. Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to provide for enforcement of the guarantee of the 15th amendment of the U.S. Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 7082. A bill for the relief of Johnny U. Dulay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 7083. A bill for the relief of Jose Trono and Felipa L. Trono; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 7084. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elena Vassiliou; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 7085. A bill for the relief of Olga Mae Hicks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHEN:

H.R. 7086. A bill for the relief of Virgilio Acosta-Martinez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 7087. A bill for the relief of the heirs of Harmon Wallace Jones; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 7088. A bill for the relief of Wassify Michael Hanna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 7089. A bill for the relief of Nikolaos J. Soumilas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 7090. A bill for the relief of certain individuals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

149. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Phi Alpha Rho fraternity, Northwestern University, Boston, Mass., with reference to supporting passage of the Federal voting bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Hon. Bradford Morse Speaks on Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, at a memorial meeting on Boston Common for the Reverend James Reeb, of Boston, who was so cruelly slain in Selma, Ala., the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman F. BRADFORD MORSE, summed up in two short phrases the very heart of the civil rights struggle today.

In commenting on the need for Federal legislation and pledging his support for a bill that will guarantee, once and for all, that basic right of citizenship—the right to vote, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman MORSE, said:

> So long as there are second-class citizens, there can be no first-class citizenship.

This conviction that all Americans are involved in the current struggle for voting rights is also reflected in the Congressman's declaration that "those who march in Selma march for us." It seemed to me that these two phrases reflect the fundamental understanding that this is a truly national issue. Until it is resolved in favor of equality, our country will be infected with hatred and bigotry.

The brief remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, Congressman MORSE, spoke volumes about the century-old battle for equality.

His statement rang true for the thousands of people massed on Boston Common that Sunday and I wanted my colleagues to have the benefit of his thoughts by inserting this reference to the Congressman's address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Jewish Federation-Council of Los Angeles Honors Congressman Jim Corman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 1965, the Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles presented its coveted Hollzer Award to Congressman JAMES C. CORMAN. The award was in recognition of JIM CORMAN's outstanding service in fostering good will and understanding among religious and racial groups in the Los Angeles area.

The award was presented by Mr. Walter S. Hilborn, dean of the Jewish community of Los Angeles. Mr. Hilborn is a member of the board of directors of the Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles and a vice chairman of its community relations committee.

I know that my colleagues of both parties would like to join in this salute to JIM CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I place in the RECORD both Mr. Hilborn's introductory remarks and the acceptance speech of our distinguished colleague from California [Mr. CORMAN]:

PRESENTATION OF AWARD BY MR. WALTER S. HILBORN

Throughout the years we have worked diligently to strengthen civil rights guaranteed to all persons by the Constitution and to preserve the basic separation of church and state. Each year at our annual meeting we adopt resolutions which evidence our dedication to these ideals. Thus, we were vitally concerned with the ultimate enactment of the civil rights bill by the Congress last year.

Congressman JAMES CORMAN, our honoree, was a decisive factor in each field. His important role in the enactment of the civil rights bill was described by John Averill in the Los Angeles Times in the following eulogistic language:

"As one of the junior members of the House Judiciary Committee he demonstrated such immediate talent in piercing to the heart of complex legal questions and shattering arguments by the opposition, that he wound up as the leading utility man for the Northern Democratic forces, backing the bill." Averill quoted a southerner: "If we could have CORMAN on our side, we might have come out of this in better shape."

For his leadership in this historic fight we are deeply indebted to Congressman CORMAN. We are equally grateful to him for his fight against the Becker amendment, which—if it had passed—would have brought religion into our public schools. In this fight he showed himself to be a man of principle and of courage. His position on that issue almost cost him his seat in Congress, for his opponent and right wing radical extremists used this during the last campaign to smear and defeat him. Fortunately, they failed at it.

His battles fought were our battles. All we can do is honor him by presenting to him the highest and most coveted award of the organized Jewish community, named after our first president, the late Judge Harry Hollzer. The award, which bears his likeness, has the following inscription:

"TO CONGRESSMAN JAMES CORMAN

"For outstanding service in fostering good will and understanding among religious and racial groups in the Los Angeles area.

"Presented by the Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles at its annual meeting, January 31, 1965. "Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together."

Congressman CORMAN, it is a distinct honor and privilege to present this award to you in behalf of the Jewish Federation-Council of Greater Los Angeles. May this occasion always be one of the durable satisfactions of your life.

ACCEPTANCE OF AWARD BY CONGRESSMAN JAMES CORMAN

You all must know how truly honored and delighted I am to receive the Hollzer Memorial Award. This occasion reminds us of the impact for good that one man's life can have on the lives of so many. The 66 years that Harry Hollzer was on this earth and, more specifically, the 13 years he devoted to unifying the Jewish community of Los Angeles, have given to our city an organization with purpose, with direction, and with strength, an organization which has eased the burden of countless citizens and has enriched the total community.

The most debilitating question in this large, complex, and imperfect world of ours is always "But what can I—only one—do about it?" When we are tempted to answer that question with "Nothing," we would be well advised to review the life of a single man, Judge Harry Hollzer.

To share with you this observance of 500 combined years of service is a stellar occasion. That is a lot of years—more years than all the committee chairmen, put together, have served in the Congress. That 500 years of service has changed the lives of thousands of citizens of Los Angeles. It has given orphaned children homes and families. It has helped combat racial bigotry and anti-Semitism. It has made loans available to students and businessmen. Truly, it has reached almost every segment of community life.

The fact has not escaped my attention that last year you honored a prominent politician, the year before a famous Methodist lawyer. I cannot claim to be in their class, but at least I am in the category of both. You have generously mentioned two efforts in which it was my good fortune to be involved during the last Congress: Passage of the Civil Rights Act and defeat of the Becker amendment. It was a satisfying year for me, and a successful one for all who have some understanding of, and respect for, the constitutional rights of individual Americans.

FREEDOM OF RELIGION

In dealing with the Becker amendment, our greatest adversary was a broadcast misunderstanding of what religious freedom in America is all about. It is my observation that most people respect the right to religious freedom of each American. Though theologically we may suspect that all our Friday or Sunday morning seatmates are headed for Hell in a breadbasket, we're willing to go along with the system which gives them that choice. Yet, many have lost sight of the proper relationship between the church and the state. If we are to retain that freedom of choice, we must keep our religious activities above and beyond the control of Government. The Becker proposal, advocated as a step toward bringing God into our public life, would, in truth, have brought Government regulation into our individual religious convictions and practices.

This controversy is rooted in a nationalism that has more and more become defied. Patriotism for one's country is a laudable trait. But nationalism raised to the level of religious fervor is disastrous. History is replete with the tyrant's use of religious nationalism.

We have won the battle with Becker, thanks to the vigorous efforts of every major religious denomination in this country. His cause is pretty well laid to rest. But this was the battle, not the war. The ill-conceived union of the cross and the flag, as epitomized by Gerald L. K. Smith, is a trusted tool of the rightwing. We are far from delivered from that scourge.

CIVIL RIGHTS

A much more constructive endeavor of the 88th Congress was the passage of the Civil Rights Act. This legislation was a reflection of a new high in our national standards of morality. We abolished the legality of racial discrimination in important segments of American society. To all Americans, we said that race, color, or religion would no longer be used to deny equality at the ballot box, in the marketplace, or in the enjoyment of public facilities. The act was the accomplishment of two great Presidents and two great political parties each making substantial and constructive contributions. John F. Kennedy was the principal architect of the bill. Lyndon B. Johnson made it his first objective when history thrust the Presidency upon him. Congressmen CELLER and McCULLOCH in the House, and the then Senator HUMPHREY and Senator KUCHEL in the Senate, led a successful legislative battle which was beyond the most optimistic hopes of those of us who support strong civil rights legislation.

I think we would not do proper honor to the memory of Harry Hollzer if we took this occasion to congratulate ourselves for a job well done in the field of human relations and, more specifically, race relations. At best, we may say that we have a job well begun. We must recognize that the Negro would have considerably less than equality, and the Nation considerably less than harmony, if we must resort to legislative statute and court decree at every point in our interracial relations. We shall not have attained our ultimate goal until that day when a legislative committee could find no witnesses interested in civil rights legislation, and that day when a judge would be shocked that a citizen would have to come to his court to obtain equality with his fellow citizen of another color.

MORALITY AND THE LAW

Frequently, during the course of our hearings on the Civil Rights Act we were urged to do nothing because you cannot legislate morality. We rejected this premise, not because it was untrue, but because it was irrelevant. Just as all laws do, the 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibits certain kinds of conduct. It doesn't establish morality in the hearts of men.

This is the promising and exciting challenge which lies ahead for each of us and for our Nation. If one wonders how far we have to go, I would remind you that just last November an overwhelming majority of Californians decided that although we are delighted to have Negroes play baseball at Dodger Stadium, we don't want them playing on our neighborhood sandlots. But 20 short years ago we wouldn't even let them play in Dodger Stadium. Let's hope it doesn't take us 20 years to realize what we are doing to ourselves by the decision we made last November. We need to think a little less about how lucky Willie Mays is that he is allowed to play baseball and a little more about how fortunate we are to live in a day when we can watch him. I'd like to say, parenthetically, that this analogy would be a little more accurate, and our chances for winning the 1965 World Series would be a little better, if Willie Mays played more often in Dodger Stadium and less at Candlestick Park.

PROGRESS IN HUMAN RELATIONS

The discouraging part of our progress in race relations is that, although no one wants to go back from whence we came, few seem to want to go on from where we are. I suggest to you that in this endeavor each of us has a tremendous opportunity to prove the validity of racial equality by living it daily. For most of us it is going to involve change. From time to time it will be awkward and, from time to time, we may have to be unpleasant to those who resist change. But the objective is well worth the effort. If we can relieve our society of the artificial barriers which lock some people out and other people in, if we can remove fear and suspicion from our own hearts, then our few brief years on this planet will certainly have been worthwhile to us, to our neighbors, and to our Nation.

Independence of Senegal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADAM C. POWELL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, April 4, 1965, marks the fifth anniversary of the independence of the Republic of Senegal. On this memorable occasion, we wish to extend warm felicitations to His Excellency Leopold Sedar Senghor, President of the Republic of Senegal; and to His Excellency Ousmane Soce Diop, the Senegalese Ambassador to the United States.

This occasion provides us with the opportunity to commemorate the independence of one of the most stable and progressive states of the African Continent.

As early as the 17th century, at the behest of one of the most famous and talented of French politicians, Cardinal Richelieu, France established its first African settlements in what has become known as Senegal. It was here that the first real town, named after the French monarch, Louis XIV, was built—Fort St. Louis, which still stands. As the headquarters of the Government General of French West Africa until 1902, it became and has remained a thriving port for the produce and commerce of the Senegal River hinterland. Further south, however, another city was established. Built on a small islet called Goree, once used as a major base for the slave trade, and then moved to the mainland for the purpose of expansion, this little hamlet grew in size to become one of the most magnificent cities in all of Africa today, Dakar. It occupies very nearly the most westerly point in Africa with one of the best natural harbors on the continent. Its position astride the main trade routes between Europe, America, and Africa has made it the major port in west Africa as well as its most important air terminal.

The economy of Senegal is based upon agriculture, and primarily upon peanuts as a cash crop. The sandy soils in which the peanut thrives were first put to use by the French, who introduced it early in the 19th century. Fully aware of the problems associated with a single-crop economy, the Senegalese have undertaken and encouraged the development of other industries. Many plants are engaged in processing and distributing locally produced raw materials from textiles to sugar.

After an extended study of the economy of the country, the Senageles Government propounded a 4-year development plan, under the terms of which other sectors would be promoted and expanded. This included the phosphate industry, the fishing and fish-canning industries, and the diversification of the textile industry. In addition, new ones would be established: a fertilizer and chemical industry, a petroleum refinery, as well as smaller factories in rural areas in order that the population movement to the larger cities will be reduced.

This plan is an indication of the rational and farsighted means by which Senegal is going about solving its economic problems. Rather than resorting to unattainable projects in order to fill the mind, the government of Leopold Sedar Senghor has conscientiously outlined programs which will, when effected, provide tangible and meaningful results for the portions of the population which most need such assistance.

Under the leadership of their poet and scholar President, the Senegalese provide us with the hope that an African society will be able to peacefully synthesize the best elements of African and European cultures, and become a model for other African states in the future.

The Proposed Voting Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD J. IRWIN
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in Monday's Wall Street Journal, March 22, 1965, which has been printed elsewhere in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, unjustly criticizes the administration's proposed voting law. I have written the Journal commenting on the editorial.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., March 31, 1965.

EDITOR,
Wall Street Journal,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: Your editorial of March 22, labeling the administration's voting rights bill "an immoral law," seems to me to indicate a lack of understanding about the facts surrounding literacy tests and the proposed law.

The editorial apparently assumes that the literacy test has been applied fairly to white voters in the areas under question and unfairly only against Negroes. Thus, all we would need to do is eliminate the unfair requirements applied to Negroes. However, the Attorney General testified before the House Judiciary Committee that highly literate Negroes have been refused the right to vote by use of literacy tests, while totally illiterate whites have been allowed to vote.

Thus, in a very real sense, this bill would require the same standard for both Negro and white in the affected States; i.e., no literacy test. This seems reasonable since poorly qualified whites have been voting for years in State and Federal elections, and the States have raised no objections. To now insist on a "fairly administered test" contradicts their own practice over the years. It is true that many States have literacy tests. The number is 18, including my State of Connecticut as well as New York. It is also true that 32 States, almost twice the number, seem to function satisfactorily without such tests.

The editorial suggests that the law would abolish literacy tests in the affected States. It would not do so. First, no literacy test would be suspended unless (1) the Attorney General certifies that it is being used to deny the right to vote because of race, and (2) voter registration on November 1, 1964, or voting in the 1964 presidential election was below 50 percent. Following this determination, literacy tests would be suspended during registration by examiners. After 10 years free from racial discrimination, the suspension could be terminated upon petition to a Federal court in Washington, D.C.

The editorial also suggests that use of a concept of 50 percent of the voting-age population opens the whole matter to manipulation. This assumes that the 50-percent figure will be used for future elections. It will not. It will be used only in connection with registrations as of November 1, 1964, or voting in the presidential election. It will be rather difficult, even for ingenious men, to manipulate those figures.

One other factor apparently ignored is the voting rights sections of the Civil Rights Acts of 1957, 1960, and 1964. These laws permit the Government to bring suit in cases of discrimination no matter what the percentage of the vote or registration. No State or locality is free to deny the Negro the right to vote.

It is suggested that these States are being penalized unfairly, and some charge that this is ex post facto legislation. If this legislation does penalize the affected States, the penalty is not for violating a 1965 law in 1964, but for violating the law of the land for 95 years; ever since the ratification of the 15th amendment to the Constitution in 1870.

Sincerely,
DONALD J. IRWIN.

Honor Roll of the Gemini Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in any great American undertaking such as the Gemini manned space flight program, certain key leaders' names become household words and gain the admiration and respect of the American people. Names such as Chris Kraft, Chuck Mathews, Bill Schneider, Deke Slayton, General Davis, General Funk, and Mr. McDonnell are such leaders. Their names are known to all America as leaders in our Gemini program which has started our great new series of manned space flights as a forerunner to the Apollo program. Behind these leaders and the astronauts are the true heroes of the Gemini program. Their work represents days, months, and years of sacrifice and dedication to assure the success and safety of our astronauts in this effort. For the benefit of all people it is my privilege to list an honor roll of key personnel participating in the Gemini program. They represent personnel of NASA, industry, and of the military establishments, who have worked so successfully together to fulfill our national space program objectives:

Name	Organization	Area
R. McFarland	Martin Co.	Airframe/Structures.
T. Shiokari	Aerospace Corp.	Do.
J. MacDonald	Martin Co.	Vehicle propulsion.
R. G. Olander	Aerospace Corp.	Do.
L. D. Wilson	Aerojet	Engine.
G. M. Forslund	Aerospace Corp.	Do.
J. Llewelyn	Martin Co.	Flight controls.
E. Mitchell	do	Hydraulics.
L. Jackson	do	Flight termination.
R. E. Ringe	Aerospace Corp.	Do.
J. Folberth	Martin Co.	Electrical system.
R. C. Weaver	do	Malfunction detection system.
H. S. Siesel	Aerospace Corp.	Do.
J. Atkinson	Martin Co.	Instrumentation.
R. H. Dickinson	General Electric Co.	Ground guidance.
H. Nonken	Burroughs Corp.	Ground guidance computer system.
C. W. Pittman	Aerospace Corp.	Guidance equations.
A. Chambers	do	Do.
L. Bush	do	Performance status.
J. W. McCurry	do	GLV development status.
B. A. Hohmann	do	Design certification, GLV.
Col. R. C. Dineen	U.S. Air Force	Do.
KEY PERSONNEL, GEMINI PROGRAM OFFICE		
Eldon Hall	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Systems engineering.
D. Cain	do	Reliability and quality.
L. Day	do	Test.
J. Edwards	do	Mission operations.
J. P. Field	do	Program control.
D. R. Collins	do	Design criteria, environment and mission sequence.
W. J. Blatz	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Do.
W. F. Hoyler	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Spacecraft structure.
W. B. Engelbart	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Do.
R. L. Frost	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Environmental control system.
H. Imster	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Do.
R. R. Carley	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Guidance and control system.
L. M. Warren	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Do.
H. J. Overal	do	Propulsion and retrorocket system.
N. R. Schulze	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Do.
C. M. Jackson	do	Communications system for Spacecraft 3.
R. E. Perkins	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Do.
J. W. Good	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Instrumentation system.
L. R. Blanke	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Do.
P. S. Miglicco	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Electrical system for Spacecraft 3.
G. J. Weber	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Do.
K. F. Hecht	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Landing and escape system.
S. H. Simpkinson	do	Pyrotechnics.
KEY PERSONNEL, GEMINI PROGRAM OFFICE—continued		
F. J. Smith	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Pyrotechnics.
R. M. Machell	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Crew station.
A. J. Wiegand	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Do.
J. V. Correals	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Gemini pressure suit and GFAE.
L. T. MacMillan	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Spacecraft production test summary.
W. H. Douglas	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Reliability estimates for crew safety and mission success.
D. A. Defreece	McDonnell Aircraft Corp.	Do.
Walter F. Burke	do	Gemini spacecraft design certification.
Charles W. Mathews	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Do.
Howard W. Tindall	do	Mission planning.
Carl R. Huss	do	Do.
Vearl N. Huff	do	Trajectory design.
Louis D. Allen	do	Flight crew equipment.
Warren J. North	do	Do.
James W. Bilodeau	do	Do.
James J. Donnegan	do	Computer support.
R. D. McCafferty	do	Mission simulator.
Hal Parker	do	Do.
Jeremy B. Jones	do	Flight plan integration.
K. M. Nagler	Department of Commerce	Weather forecasting.
Lt. Col. John G. Albert.	U.S. Air Force	Launch director.
Charles Cicchetti	Martin Co.	Chief launch vehicle test conductor.
Frank X. Carey	do	Launch vehicle test conductor.
G. Merritt Preston	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Spacecraft test.
George F. Page	do	Spacecraft test conductor.
John D. Hodge	do	Flight control.
Eugene F. Kranz	do	Do.
Clifford E. Charlesworth.	do	Flight dynamics.
Charley B. Parker	do	Do.
Arnold D. Aldrich	do	Guidance and navigation.
Charles A. Berry, M.D.	do	Medical monitor.
Capt. Robert B. Sheridan.	U.S. Air Force	Chief network controller.
Maj. L. Gordon Cooper.	do	Cape capsule communicator.
Robert F. Thompson.	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Recovery support.
Col. J. E. Warren	U.S. Air Force	DOD support.
Donald E. Stullken	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Recovery support.
Rear Adm. D. W. Sarver.	U.S. Navy	Recovery.
Rear Adm. D. M. White.	do	Do.
John C. Stonesifer	National Aeronautics and Space Administration.	Carrier recovery team.
Col. T. P. Tatum	U.S. Air Force	Air rescue.
Capt. J. W. Guidry	U.S. Navy	Recovery control.

Boycott Is Un-American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES D. MARTIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, along with all the other illegal and unlawful acts, demonstrations, defiance of court orders which he engineered, Martin Luther King now demands that the State of Alabama be crippled by an economic boycott.

> Don't buy anything produced in Alabama—

King cries.

> Wreck their industries, throw their people out of work, create more poverty and it's too bad if the Negroes suffer, but it just has to be.

This is the callous, inhumane, un-American attitude of this so-called leader of the civil rights movement. Mr. Speaker, Martin Luther King is not interested in voting rights for the Negroes of Alabama; he is not interested in helping the Negroes of Alabama gain equal economic opportunity; he is not concerned with helping them to build a better life. He is interested only in the power he gains by using the Negroes of Alabama to his own selfish ends. If this is not his purpose, why would he demand a program that can only hurt most the very people about whom he expresses such concern?

The tragedy of this hour is that there are those who encourage and support the immoral and illegal acts of Martin Luther King. I refer to an article in this morning's edition of the Washington Post which states:

> The Childs Securities Corp., a firm that underwrites municipal bonds, said today that it plans to do no business with Alabama.

Mr. Speaker, I am amazed and shocked that a reputable business firm would be so unethical and so lacking in American principles as to participate in such an action. The support of an economic boycott against a whole State and its people is a well-organized Communist technique which has been used to topple every government which the Communists have taken over.

I would hope that the executive vice president of this company, a Donald E. Barnes, would reconsider his ill-advised letter to the Governor of Alabama, threatening to boycott our State on the demand of an agitator who has set himself above the law and above the traditions of the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud those writers and public officials as well as officials of private business who have condemned Martin Luther King's un-American tactic of calling for a boycott of Alabama. It will be my purpose to spread upon the RECORD, so that Members of

Congress and the American people may see, the names of those companies who aline themselves with those who are doing all possible to destroy America; those who are ready and eager to wreck private companies and local communities and the States of the Union; ready and eager to deprive thousands of American citizens of all races, colors, and creeds, of the means of making a livelihood.

So that I will not be accused of quoting out of context, I include as a part of these remarks the entire news story from the Washington Post of April 1, 1965, dealing with the Childs Securities Corp.:

> WILL BOYCOTT ALABAMA, SECURITIES FIRM SAYS
>
> NEW YORK, March 31.—The Childs Securities Corp., a firm that underwrites municipal bonds, said today that it plans to do no business with Alabama.
>
> Executive Vice President Donald E. Barnes, in a letter to Alabama Governor, George C. Wallace, said the firm would refrain from purchases and sales of all securities issued by the State, its cities, school districts, or other political subdivisions.
>
> Barnes' letter said the firm acted because of "credit considerations, arising from the failure of the Wallace administration to protect the citizens of Alabama in their exercise of constitutional rights."
>
> "The prospects for business and industrial growth in the State have thus been placed in doubt," it said.

The "Neighbors Abroad" Program in Palo Alto, Calif.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES S. GUBSER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Speaker, the people of Palo Alto, Calif., in my congressional district, are actively engaged in a program of international cooperation and understanding which is worthy of note and comment. Palo Alto, as we all know, is the home of one of our Nation's greatest centers of learning—Stanford University. This distinguished community has historically taken an active interest and role in international relations because of its association with the university which attracts scholars and visitors from throughout the world and which has sent its faculty, students, and graduates to every country.

With this background and rich tradition, the people of Palo Alto have undertaken a new program to help achieve better relations and understanding with their neighbors abroad. They have embarked upon a town affiliation program, which while still in its early stages, is already most successful. I wish to comment briefly upon some of the more significant accomplishments of this program in the hope that by so doing we may encourage more American communities to initiate affiliations with their counterparts in other countries.

Six years ago, in the spring of 1959, Palo Alto's civic leaders began to explore the possibility of establishing a sister city relationship with a foreign city. In the beginning, contacts were made with the American Municipal Association and the U.S. Information Agency in order to obtain advice and guidance regarding the town affiliation program. Several unsuccessful attempts were made to seek out a sister city, and it was not until July 10, 1962, that, quite unexpectedly, the Palo Alto City Council received a letter from Attorney Miguel V. Roca, the mayor of Palo, on the island of Leyte in the Philippine Republic, which contained the heartwarming invitation "to make our two cities twins." On July 23, the Palo Alto City Council voted unanimously to enter into a town affiliation with Palo, and Mayor David B. Haight called a meeting of citizen leaders to develop further plans.

Thirty-five persons, representing 19 Palo Alto organizations, responded to the mayor's call, and during the next 3 months devoted their time, their talents and their energy to planning and organizing an effective program. Representatives of this group visited other communities which had already established sister city affiliations; they discussed their plans with interested individuals and organizations; they began to study about Palo, its people, customs and institutions; they visited the Philippine consulate in San Francisco.

On October 7, 1962, the Municipal Council of the City of Palo unanimously adopted a resolution confirming the affiliation. Shortly thereafter the late General of the Army, Douglas MacArthur, in a letter expressing his pleasure in learning of the affiliation, extolled the bravery of the Palo citizenry in resisting and fighting against the enemy, and stated that "the people of Palo are, indeed, worthy of this honor."

On January 18, 1963, those who had been working to implement the affiliation program selected a name by which it might be symbolized. The name selected was "Neighbors Abroad," and it has proven to be an appropriate appellation for a distinguished and dynamic group of citizens working together to achieve friendship and amity between people.

Since formalization of the town affiliation program, Neighbors Abroad and its counterpart in Palo, the Giants Club—glory is achieved nobly through sacrifice—have accomplished much. While the two cities are separated by nearly 7,000 miles, they and their people are linked by the sister city movement, one facet of the people-to-people program endorsed by the Government of the United States.

A brief recapitulation of some of the accomplishments of the Palo and Palo Alto program may indicate the scope and beauty of the effort. It is obvious, of course, that many of the benefits of such an affiliation are subtle and intangible, but as such, they are perhaps the most meaningful.

An early accomplishment was the purchase and delivery of various pieces of sports equipment for the children of Palo. The funds for this gift were collected by junior high school children in Palo Alto who sponsored a "Philippine fiesta" at their school and by a local sports group, the Palo Club. The sports equipment was delivered personally to the people of Palo by Navy commander, Robert Bergner, a resident of Palo Alto.

One of the greatest health problems facing the citizens of Palo is the prevalence of parasitic diseases which cause great suffering, decrease average life expectancy to 42 years, and affect even those not afflicted because of their adverse effect on agricultural productivity. Schistosomiasis, or snail fever, is endemic to the Palo area. About 80 percent of the children over 10 years of age have this crippling disease. It was learned that the lack of shoes or other footwear was a contributing factor to the high incidence of the disabling, often fatal disease, and also to the prevalence of hookworm.

Palo Alto's most dramatic venture in cooperating in the fight against the parasitic disease, and one which highlights Palo Alto's desire to involve large numbers of the local community in the sister city program was the collection and shipment or more than 4 tons of shoes for the young people of Palo. These shoes were distributed in Palo by trained personnel who instructed the recipients in the prophylactic properties of the shoes—in many cases, the first to be worn by the children. Through the generosity and cooperation of Mayor Villegas, of Manila, also a participant in the sister city program, the shoes were freed from customs on the docks in Manila.

Neighbors Abroad has encouraged Palo Altans to visit Palo, and several have already done so. Three residents of Palo have visited Palo Alto and have met with the sister city committee. Continued efforts are being made to promote reciprocal visits, but the great geographic distance between the communities is a definite deterrent.

Many other commendable accomplishments have already been realized. A detailed listing is, however, impossible here, but it should be pointed out that the people of the two towns have developed and strengthened a great and lasting bond between themselves. The citizens, and particularly the students, are exchanging letters; Palo Altans assisted in the establishment of the first library for Palo; Palo Alto has participated annually in the Palo fiesta, and purchased the perpetual crown for the queen; direct communication between community leaders has been achieved through the amateur radio network; each city has given and each has received. The relationship between the two is excellent and mutually rewarding.

During the planning stages of Palo Alto's sister city program, it had seemed highly probable that a city in the Western Hemisphere would be the most logical affiliate for the community. Indeed, in the fall of 1961, the Palo Alto City Council had developed a series of criteria and characteristics for their sister city. Ideally, she was to be in Latin America—to compare with Palo Alto's Spanish and Mexican background and traditions. Preferably, she was to be a university city—again like Palo Alto—and should be relatively comparable in population.

A city which met all of these qualifications was Oaxaca, Mexico. The U.S. Department of State assisted in the preliminary explorations. Neighbors Abroad and the Palo Alto City Council sustained interest in developing an affiliation with Oaxaca, and such was accomplished during the early part of 1964. Relations between Oaxaca, and Palo Alto have proceeded rapidly and excellently. Only 2,000 miles separate the two communities, thus facilitating personal visits. Many Palo Alto residents have already visited the unique city of Oaxaca, rich in culture and tradition.

In May 1964, Oaxaca's distinguished young major, Dr. Horacio Tenorio Sandoval, and his charming and beautiful wife visited Palo Alto to participate in the community's colorful May Festival. Dr. Tenorio served as cogrand marshal of the festival. Later that same month, Palo Alto's major, Dean R. Cresap, city council member, Mrs, Frances Dias, and city manager, Jerome Keithley, visited Oaxaca.

This was only the beginning of what is already an outstanding sister city affiliation. Last December, for example, 10 young people from Oaxaca arrive to spend 1 month in Palo Alto's homes and schools. The competition to host the children was great, but 10 Palo Alto families are now richer for this unique experience.

Neighbors Abroad is now developing final plans to send Palo Alto youngsters to Oaxaca this coming summer. Again, the competition for this unique aspect of the sister city program was intense and generated even greater interest in Neighbors Abroad and the people-to-people program. The 10 high school students have now been selected and are now preparing for their trip to Oaxaca where they will live with individual Mexican families, attend public school and serve as able ambassadors of Neighbors Abroad and their country, thus completing a two-way exchange—the first of an annual program.

The people of Palo Alto, and particularly those who have worked to create and support the sister city program, are to be complimented for their outstanding work in promoting improved understanding and more cordial relations between the people of the world.

Law To Prevent Strife

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM M. TUCK

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. TUCK. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced in the House of Representatives a bill that I regard as an effective instrument with which to put an end to the racial troubles now shaking the entire Nation. This bill is identical to the one I introduced in 1963. Had it been reported out of committee and acted upon by the Congress, we would have been spared much of the strife which has ensued. Also, several lives would have been saved.

The proposed legislation would bar any person, irrespective of his race, creed, or color, from crossing a State line for the purpose of demonstrating in violation of law or otherwise fomenting lawlessness or inciting to riot.

The country vitally needs this legislation and the public generally approves it. I hope that my bill may be favorably considered in the Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member and to which committee I am sure it will be referred.

Although the President of the United States and his Attorney General may now be concerned over the current outbursts of law defiance and disorder in many places throughout the North and South, it seems to me that they display a strange blindness as to the essential causes of these riots and acts of law violation.

When I consider the disgraceful concerted defiance of law which has occurred in communities such as Danville, Va., which is in my own congressional district, and the disgraceful conduct of these invaders and agitators in Alabama and other places, it is perfectly obvious that the participants are responding to incitation from outsiders. These people have no interest in the welfare of the States they invade. Their main purpose is to foment strife and discord and to create a cleavage between the races. As most everyone should know by now, many of these agitators are believed to be Communists. Even the theme song they chant, "We Shall Overcome," was written by a person alleged to be a Communist. In this motley crew are such characters as Peter Seeger, Carl Braden, and Frank Wilkinson, who are incendiaries of the worst order and whose records are well known in the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, as well as in the courts of the country.

For various motives, these persons and organizations from afar have been stirring up the people to fever pitch and are working incalculable mischief. This situation is being reenacted in many places. In virtually every case the disobedience to law has been shown to have been methodically inculcated into what were ordinarily peaceful and peace-loving people. If we are to avoid a major tragedy on a national scale, these uprisings and organized floutings of law must stop.

The way to stop them is to prohibit outsiders from invading States where they have no business except to stir up disorder, or from conspiring to do so.

The law I have in mind would have equal application to everyone. It would apply to the Ku Klux Klan and any kindred organizations; it would apply to the NAACP, or to CORE and SNCC, as well as to the Communist Party. In short, it would apply to all persons who travel in interstate commerce for this sinister purpose. My bill is clearly within the purview and intent of the Constitution, and is something that is needed for the protection of the great bulk of our population, the law-abiding public that bears the responsibility of our industry, our government, and our religion.

There is nothing strange or novel about my bill when viewed against the background of existing law. Since 1910, when Congress adopted the Mann Act—18 U.S.C. 2421—this legislative body has enacted a substantial number of criminal laws to free interstate commerce of corruptive influence and to aid the States in law enforcement.

The Mann Act was aimed at the suppression of the white slave traffic. It prohibited the transportation of female persons across State lines for immoral purposes. Later, in 1919, Congress made it a Federal offense to transport stolen automobiles in interstate commerce—18 U.S.C. 2312—and this was later expanded to cover other kinds of stolen goods—18 U.S.C. 2314.

In 1934, Congress enacted the Fugitive Felon Act, prohibiting interstate travel to avoid prosecution for crime, and this enactment was expanded in 1960 and 1961—18 U.S.C. 1073, 1074. Clearly, if it is sensible to penalize interstate flight to avoid prosecution, it makes even better sense to prohibit interstate travel which is undertaken with the intent of violating the law. Such an enactment has the effect of deterring wrongdoing at its very inception.

Congress has seen the wisdom of this approach. In 1961 it enacted a law prohibiting travel in interstate commerce with the intent to carry on, or commit, any crime of violence to further any of a number of specified activities—18 U.S.C. 1952.

My bill merely carries this approach to its logical conclusion by penalizing travel across State lines with the intent to riot or violate State law.

The legislation I propose would have prevented some of the riots and community outbursts which have bothered the Nation at times for generations. Even the famous Hatfield-McCoy feud of the last century, with all its sadness and family suffering, might never have happened if such a law had been in existence.

Without exception, I feel that States are capable and desirous of enforcing the law on a local basis. This can be accomplished if they are protected from the vicious outside influence which snub our laws and ignore our community mores, resulting in the chaos prevalent among us today.

It is a sad day in America if our local and State officials are deprived of exercising their police power. This power historically rests with the localities and with the States.

I would beg the Department of Justice and others to keep their agents at home and leave the enforcement of law to local officials and not send these agents into the States and localities unless requested so to do by the governor or legislature of the State involved. Unfortunately, some of these agents appear to advise and consort with the lawbreakers and impede the local police in suppressing public mischief.

I believe the law I propose is one that the right-thinking people of this Nation deserve. It will protect the sound, taxpaying, law-abiding element from the lawlessness and threat of riot and violence brought in by outside agitators.

The language of my bill is as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) Congress finds that the recent and increasing practice of certain persons and organizations, with diverse ulterior motives, to enter States, Territories, Commonwealths, or possessions of the United States, of which they are not residents, for the purpose of fomenting disobedience to their laws has led and leads to violent disorders gravely disrupting the peace and threatening the welfare of the entire Nation.

(b) It is hereby declared to be the policy of this Act to promote the general welfare and assure peace and order by prohibiting in interstate commerce, or from conspiring to do so, where the purpose of such travel is to incite to riot or to engage in the violation of any law.

SEC. 2. (a) Title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding after Chapter 53 the following new chapter:

"CHAPTER 54—INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, TRAVEL IN FOR UNLAWFUL PURPOSES

"Whoever moves or travels in interstate commerce with the intent (1) to incite to riot or to commit any act or engage in any conduct which would tend to incite to riot, or (2) to violate any law of any State, Territory, Commonwealth, or possession of the United States shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(b) If two or more persons conspire to violate subsection (a) of this section and one or more such persons do any act to effect the object of the conspiracy, each of the parties to such conspiracy shall be punished as provided in said subsection (a).

"(c) Nothing in this section shall be construed in anywise to limit the exercise of jurisdiction by any such State, Territory, Commonwealth, or possession over any crime or offense committed therein or cognizable under the laws thereof."

Voting Rights Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK EDWARDS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 1, 1965

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege today of presenting to the House Judiciary Committee my testimony regarding a responsible approach to the complex and important matter of voting rights legislation. I asked first that we view recent events with reason and with full posession of significant facts. Second, I urged an unemotional and thorough consideration of the legislative proposal presented to us by the President. And third, I suggested that we proceed in a responsible manner to deal effectively with unequal application of any State's voting qualifications while acting in accord with the Constitution to provide that each State retain its rightful power to establish its own voter qualifications. Following is the testimony I presented:

A RESPONSIBLE APPROACH

(By Congressman JACK EDWARDS of Alabama)

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the committee for this opportunity to present my views with regard to H.R. 6400 and the general subject of voting rights legislation.

As we all know, the subject has been one of real concern to the Congress for several years, and justly so, since it involved one of the most fundamental concepts of our democratic system of government.

The 15th amendment to the Constitution guarantees to every American citizen the right to cast a ballot. This right is basic to representative government. I believe in this right of every qualified citizen to register and also to cast a vote on election day. Anything less than a full and equal opportunity to vote by all qualified citizens presents our country with a problem which must be corrected.

And I want to make it very clear, Mr. Chairman, that I join with other citizens from all parts of the country in regretting the violence which has broken out in recent weeks over this issue. It has been a tragic series of events, not only for Alabama, not only for the South, but for the United States. I know that we all concur in the need to bring an end to violence, and to bring men of good faith together in the interests of advancing harmony and progress.

We, in Alabama, also regret that the issue has been presented to the Nation in a vastly oversimplified manner based on incomplete information. We would ask that events in Alabama be judged on the basis of demonstrated facts, and according to the same standards used to judge events elsewhere. With this kind of approach, concerned persons everywhere will reach conclusions reflecting a realistic combination of understanding and indignation.

For example, if law-enforcement officers in Washington, D.C., or Rochester, N.Y., find it necessary to forcefully eject demonstrators from public buildings and streets in the interests of community order, then perhaps it is conceivable that law-enforcement officers in Southern States can act in similar ways to maintain law and order in their own communities without bringing down the wrath of the Nation. Alabama citizens are also concerned with order in their communities. And these are sentiments which I believe we hold in common with other respectable people throughout the Nation.

All of us will agree that the key to the American right of peaceful demonstration and protest is responsibility. Reasonable men assume that a demonstration by individuals acting responsibly is to be honored. But how easy it is to lose sight of the distinction between responsibility and irresponsibility when we are far from the scene. And how quickly the distinction becames clear when one's own freedom to move through a hallway or along Pennsylvania Avenue in Washington is affected.

And, if I may add, gentlemen, how easy it is for citizens around the country to divert their attention from unsavory social and economic and political conditions in their own cities and towns in order to join in what has evidently become the popular activity of pointing an indignant finger at an easy target.

Without question, many of the individuals engaging in demonstrations in Alabama have been motivated by a sincere desire to see voting rights extended to all citizens. Unfortunately, others have sought to becloud the facts so as to exploit the good intentions of many other Americans for their own purposes, to encourage the setting of a double standard of values, and to arouse emotion both in Alabama and elsewhere.

What are some of the facts which have been effectively submerged?

1. On February 4, 1965, in Mobile, Federal District Judge Daniel H. Thomas issued an order, acting under the civil rights laws of 1960 and 1964, requiring the board of registrars in Dallas County, Ala., where Selma is located, to receive and register all persons who submitted applications.

Further, he ordered that if the requested registrations could not be completed by July 1965, the Federal voting referee would receive and process applications.

I want to submit, Mr. Chairman, that the officials of Dallas County, though not pleased with the order, were going about the business of complying with it. Further, they were taking pains to let the country know of the actions they were taking and planned to take. But this real evidence of progress toward expansion of voting rights made no difference to the professional demonstrators. The agitation work was begun, and senseless violence erupted, even though the avowed goal of the demonstrators had already been achieved through the courts.

2. In Alabama, we do not have the oversimplified voting participation pattern that some would have the Nation believe. We have approximately 115,000 Negroes registered to vote in the State, more than 20 percent of the vote cast in the 1960 presidential election.

In other words, today's objective in Alabama is not a complete reversal of direction. Rather, we have made some good beginnings, and we have been moving ahead. The intrusion of demonstrations, carrying with them the heated emotions of both extremes, has served not to aid progress in Alabama, but to retard it.

3. Just 5 years ago, on March 18, 1960, there was a proposal made in the U.S. Senate to enact legislation establishing Federal voting registrars to serve as enrollment officers in cases where voting registration discrimination existed against a particular race or class. That proposal, offered as an amendment by Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois, was weaker than H.R. 6400 in that the machinery for Federal voting registration would be set in motion by the complaints of 50 persons instead of only 20 as in the current proposal.

The amendment was defeated on a vote of 53 to 24 when Senator DIRKSEN, of Illinois, and the then Senator Lyndon Johnson, of Texas, opposed it, along with others who raised constitutional questions. Among those voting against it were Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, and the present majority leader of the other body, Senator MANSFIELD, of Montana.

Surely the reasons which these distinguished gentlemen had for opposing a system of Federal registrars in 1960 cannot have changed so drastically that now in 1965 the same gentlemen and others will allow themselves to be swept along in the tide of emotional popular feeling created in part by demonstrators for a goal which has already been reached.

In 1960, the Congress acted in this matter as a coequal branch of Government, as it should. It felt itself capable of giving thoughtful consideration and intelligent evaluation to a serious legislative proposal.

In 1965, are we in the Congress to enthusiastically abrogate our responsibility as a coequal branch of Government? Are we prepared to cast away our legitimate function as an effectively independent national legislature as the result of widespread emotional turbulence? Have we relegated ourselves to the status of a rubberstamp?

Or do we feel that we are a responsible body capable of evaluating conditions and facts, and then taking deliberative action to provide sound legislation with a view to orderly progress? We are a coequal branch of Government made up of elected representatives of the people and charged with the lawmaking function. Perhaps the real question today is whether we understand that function and are willing to exhibit courage to fulfill it, or whether we have failed our responsibility.

Mr. Chairman, in order to fulfill our constitutional responsibility as the National Legislature, we should consider very carefully the bill that the President has recommended to us despite his urging that we enact it against an early deadline and with no compromise.

The bill would, in general, eliminate literacy tests in any State or country where less than 50 percent of those of voting age were registered or voting in the presidential election of 1964.

Let us consider for a moment the question of literacy tests. The Supreme Court has on several occasions defended the right of States to establish literacy tests as a voter qualification. As recently as 1959, in the Lassiter case from North Carolina, the Court said:

"The ability to read and write likewise has some relation to standards designed to promote intelligent use of the ballot. Literacy and illiteracy are neutral on race, creed, color, and sex, as reports around the world show."

The Attorney General has indicated that the President's proposal would not flatly abolish literacy tests. But it certainly would outlaw them for a period of 10 years in the few States and counties affected by the bill. We should consider whether or not the country is prepared to set aside constitutional provisions for a temporary period of whatever duration.

Literacy tests themselves are not evidence of discrimination. The application of them can be. And so corrective legislation should not be aimed at literacy tests unless we are ready to prohibit them everywhere in the country, and unless we disregard constitutional principles.

With regard to other deficiencies of the bill, the Honorable HOWARD H. CALLAWAY, of Georgia, presented testimony to this committee on March 29. I want to associate myself with his remarks. Mr. CALLAWAY ably demonstrated the problem which is presented in attempting to segregate States where the 1964 presidential vote or registration was more than 50 percent of the persons of voting age from those States where the vote or registration was less than 50 percent.

He pointed out the factors other than discrimination which may lead to a low voting percentage in a general election or to a low registration. He demonstrated that in States with a history of political domination by one party, the vote may be greater in primary elections than in general elections, or the registration may be low because of the lack of contested elections. And he showed that substantial numbers of persons of voting age may not register to vote for reasons having nothing to do with discrimination: transients, noncitizens, military personnel, or persons who simply want nothing to do with voting for personal reasons.

And he brought out the vast opportunity this bill would provide for a politically oriented Attorney General to apply provisions of the bill for partisan political gain.

The bill gives the Attorney General power to appoint Federal examiners simply on the basis of "his own judgment." And it prescribes no tests or rules for selection of the examiners and specifies no methods of operation. It gives the examiner power to register voters as he sees fit.

There is nothing in the bill to prevent an Attorney General from appointing a county political party chairman as voting registrar with power to register or refuse to register voters as he wishes. This would be an extraordinary authority.

How can we justify the feeling that punitive Federal action must be taken against States which record a voting registration or participation of less than 50 percent while we pay no heed to places where the percentage might be 51 or 60 percent. Surely in the light of cool analysis some months in the future this arbitrary proposal will appear to be artificial and contrived to many who may not see it now. How soon would the Congress again be called on to enact new voting legislation all over again?

And if this kind of action can be taken against a few selected States, then it appears that some other punitive action can be taken against some other group of States for some other apparently worthy objective. But we should consider that a central government with this kind of authority can proceed another time with less regard to the real or suggested merits of the objective, and with less regard to an informed popular will.

This is how the national Socialist movement of the Germany of the 1930's was brought to prominence: greater government authority on a wave of emotional fever followed by the loss of individual political expression. The stage preceding acquisition of absolute power by Adolf Hitler was the period during which the national legislature allowed itself to be intimidated by executive authority into putting its stamp of approval on measures eliminating the potence of representative government. Today's popular demand for centralization of power is tomorrow's dictatorship.

If we now are to approve voting rights legislation we should do so in the light of cool analysis and reason, not on the basis of emotion. We should not put the Federal Government in the position of dictating a State's voting laws on the basis of arbitrary percentages in an arbitrarily selected election.

What we should do is retain State authority to determine its voter qualifications in accord with the Constitution, but assure that each State's qualifications are applied without discrimination to all individuals regardless of race, color, religion, or national origin.

I wonder if many Members of Congress today do not fear within themselves that many persons feel so strongly in favor of a voting rights law that just any voting rights law will do without regard to its real merits. I have the distinct impression that it takes courage today in a Northern State to publicly declare oneself in favor of taking a close look at the President's bill or to suggest that there may be improvements that can be made. In that connection, I want to make note here of some of the comments we have seen recently in nationally respected newspapers.

1. Arthur Krock, in the New York Times, March 16, 1965:

"The administration's bill * * * would reverse precedents deeply embedded in the constitutional and political history of the United States. And care must be taken lest the backswing prove too wide for the conscience of the Supreme Court and the obligation of Members of Congress to the people of the several States."

2. Arthur Krock, in the New York Times, March 22, 1965:

"The more time that is allowed to point out the flagrant Constitutional and procedural flaws in the draft submitted by the administration, the more plainly these flaws will be exposed."

3. Richard Wilson, in the Washington Evening Star, March 24, 1965:

"The question that the advocates of the [President's] new voting rights bill have as yet failed to answer adequately is this: Why should literacy tests as a qualification for voting be perfectly all right in 45 of the 50 States, but invalid in the other 5? This is another example of the devious legislative tactics in the Johnson administration to achieve results by legal circumlocution. Literacy requirements have validity both in reason and in law. It makes sense that a voter should have at least an elementary ability to read and write the language of the country in which he resides. It hardly needs to be argued, also, that a Federal law should apply equally to the citizens of all States. The strange, awkward and unequal nature of this new legislation shows how wrong it is to try to legislate on such complicated matters in an atmosphere of violence-provoking public demonstrations. The Johnson administration was rushed into the presentation of a law that has so many obvious flaws that it can immediately be challenged in the courts."

4. John Chamberlain, in the Washington Post, March 25, 1965:

"The law should be limited to sending in registrars to provide even-handed justice in enforcing any given State's own election standards. The Federal Government has no right to substitute standards of its own. What impresses honest and decent southerners about all this is that it [the President's proposal] actually denies equal protection of the law under the pretense of providing this protection. It penalizes the just along with the unjust. So let's have a Federal law that will guarantee fair enforcement of local election laws without telling States what their own standards shall be."

5. James Kilpatrick, in the Washington Evening Star, March 25, 1965:

"This is a bad bill, bad in ways that need to be understood if something precious is to be preserved. This precious something is a system of government obedient to a written Constitution. If the Congress sacrifices this high principle to the pressures of a turbulent hour, the Congress may succeed in redressing some palpable wrongs, but a fearful price will be paid in the loss of ancient values. The bill undertakes to prohibit in these States the imposition of those very qualifications, when used without discrimination, that the Supreme Court repeatedly has approved."

6. David Lawrence, in the Washington Evening Star, March 25, 1965:

"The 15th amendment to the Constitution * * * now is being construed as giving to Congress the power to control the whole election process by passing a few laws. This could mean the removal of all qualifications for voting except those that happen to suit the party in power. Never in American history has so much power been concentrated in the Federal Government which is now virtually directed by the one man who occupies the highest office in the land."

Finally, Mr. Vermont Royster, in the Wall Street Journal for March 25, 1965, writes of the mood in Congress for hasty action on the bill—a mood set by ultimatums for this committee to complete its work by a certain date.

He writes:

"In such a mood, who but a brave man could stand up and say, 'Wait. Let us see what we are doing before we do it.' Who but a brave man could ask now about Constitutionality or propriety or the wisdom of the means to a wise end. What weighs heavily on the mind is that men in Congress should have doubts and fear to speak them."

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, Congress has the choice today of acting in a responsible fashion, or allowing itself to be propelled into an irresponsible act. I join with many others in hoping that our choice will be the former. Thank you, again, for permitting me to present my views.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, APRIL 5, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Malcolm W. Graham, Third Presbyterian Church, Petersburg, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, everlasting Father, whose command is over all and whose love never fails, whose wise and gracious providence watches over this and every human event, look upon us, Thy children here assembled in this House of Representatives, in answer to the call of the citizens of our several States.

May these, Thy servants, be aware that the shining glory of their lives is to give, not receive, to serve, not to be served, to sacrifice self, if need be, that men may live in truth.

Through the centuries Thou hast guided the growing of a democracy that cherished not only for herself, but for all men, liberty and freedom and hast also given her a vision of peace for all mankind in righteousness and justice. For the loyalty and the devotion, for the suffering and sacrifice that make this a nation under God in times past and now, we give Thee thanks.

May the deliberations of this day be guided by Thy wisdom, may the debates be tempered with love, and may the decisions be worthy of our calling. In Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 1, 1965, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on April 2, 1965, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1496. An act to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc, lead, and copper from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 254. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 307. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity.

The message also announced that the Presiding Officer of the Senate, pursuant to Public Law 115, 78th Congress, entitled "An act to provide for the disposal of certain records of the U.S. Government," appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members on the part of the Senate of the Joint Select Committee for the Disposition of Executive Papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 65-9.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday and Thursday next, April 7 and 8, the House Small Business Committee be permitted to sit during general debate in the afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE 13TH SEMIANNUAL REPORT OF OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 13th Semiannual Report of the Office of Minerals Exploration from the Secretary of the Interior as prescribed by section 5 of the act of August 21, 1958, entitled "To provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its territories and possessions, by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 5, 1965.*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency have permission to sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. It there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

WITNESS' FEES IN HABEAS CORPUS CASES

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1763) to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28 for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1763

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1825 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding after the first paragraph of the section the following paragraph:

"In all proceedings, in forma pauperis, for a writ of habeas corpus or in proceedings under section 2255 of this title, the United States marshal for the district shall pay all fees of witnesses for the party authorized to proceed in forma pauperis, on the certificate of the district judge."

And the last paragraph of section 1825 is amended to read as follows:

"Fees and mileage need not be tendered to the witness upon service of a subpena issued in behalf of the United States or an officer or agency thereof, or upon service of a subpena issued on behalf of a party, authorized to proceed in forma pauperis, where the payment thereof is to be made by the United States marshal as authorized in this section."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCREASE PER DIEM—GRAND AND PETIT JURORS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3990) to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

ALIBATES FLINT QUARRIES NATIONAL MONUMENT

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 881) to authorize the establishment of the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire what is the current appraised value of the land to be acquired?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the land that will make up this area is already owned by the Federal Government. It has an appraised value, I believe, of somewhere around $50 an acre. Any land that has to be acquired in addition will not be burdensome because there is a limitation in the bill that no more land may be acquired at a cost in excess of $5,000.

Mr. HALL. Does the gentleman know if there are improvements on the land to be acquired under the provisions of this bill?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. There are no improvements at all. It is grassland in the general area of what we call the breaks, in the Canadian River area.

Mr. HALL. I am familiar with the Canadian River area.

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HALL. And I do understand that. I appreciate the gentleman's response, but I simply want to get this on the record: Who now owns the land? Is it in private ownership and are they willing to sell and, if so, does the asking price come within this figure?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Most of the land that would be acquired under any situation is already owned by the Federal Government. It was acquired as a part of the Canadian River Reservoir.

The only additional land that would be needed would not be in excess of 90 acres, and a limitation has been placed in the bill that if an additional 90 acres or any part thereof is needed, the expenditure cannot be in excess of $5,000 for additional land. The land is owned by the Bivins estate, if my memory serves be correctly.

Mr. HALL. Well, that is the portion for the Alibates quarry and the Pueblo Culture National Monument, I presume?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes. It is all within the confines of the reservoir area that has already been acquired by the Canadian River Dam operations.

Mr. HALL. But it is not in the nature of an inholding?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. No, it is not. It is owned by the Federal Government. As a matter of fact the language as contained in this bill had to be changed because the title had passed to the Federal Government and the authority to acquire the land had to be changed. However, the land has already been acquired by the Federal Government and is owned by the Federal Government and no transfer is necessary.

Mr. HALL. Does the Federal Government own the oil, gas, and mineral exploration rights?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Provision has been made in that respect. There will be no difficulty about it. The oil and gas operations in that general area were moved in connection with the building of the reservoir under contract between the Federal Government and the people owning the oil and gas rights. There will be no servitude of the surface estate.

Mr. HALL. If the gentleman will refer to the bill, I believe it states therein that the United States has acquired most of the land?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HALL. It was acquired in connection with the Sanford Reservoir, a feature of the Canadian reclamation project. This we understand.

But, then, about 90 additional acres may be needed, but the exact acreage cannot be determined until further field studies are made.

Do I understand the gentleman to say that this is within the acquisition for the reclamation project?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes. Let me clear the matter up this way: The further excavation may create a situation where additional acres may be needed. But it is estimated that under no circumstances will more than 90 additional acres be needed for any purpose. But that 90 additional acres can be acquired under present law. There is a limitation placed in this bill that no more than $5,000 additional can be expended to acquire any additional land.

The 90 acres or, let me say, the potentially needed acreage that might be acquired—and I stress the word "might"—is outside of the present ownership in the reservoir area. But it can be acquired under present law. The value that was fixed on that land that might be needed for the future, that was placed on the land that has already been condemned and taken over for the reservoir area. So, there will not be any chance of additional money to be expended over and above the value of the land as it existed at the time the reservoir was acquired. If it is, they would have to come back to Congress for additional authority in order to obtain it.

Mr. HALL. I understand the savings clause as far as the Government is concerned.

Now, I revert to my other question: Does the gentleman know if the owners are willing to sell?

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Yes; they are willing to sell because this land generally is in range area, and since this reservoir area has already been acquired they have no objection to this because that entire area is interested in the development of this monument.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 881

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to accept from the Canadian River Municipal Water Authority, Borger, Texas, on behalf of the United States, title to those lands comprising the Alibates Flint Quarries and the Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture sites, together with any structures and improvements thereon, located in and around Potter County, Texas.

SEC. 2. (a) The property acquired under the provisions of the first section of this Act shall be set aside as a national monument for the benefit and enjoyment of the people of the United States and shall be designated as the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument. The National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall administer, protect, and develop such monument, subject to the provisions of the Act entitled "An Act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes", approved August 25, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and the Act entitled "An Act to provide for the preservation of historic American sites, buildings, objects, and antiquities of national significance, and for other purposes", approved August 21, 1935, as amended.

(b) In order to provide for the proper development and maintenance of such national monuments, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to construct and maintain therein such markers, buildings, and other improvements, and such facilities for the care and accommodation of visitors, as he may deem necessary.

SEC. 3. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, lines 3 through 9, strike out all of section 1 and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"That the Secretary of the Interior may designate, acquire and administer as a national monument lands and interests in the lands comprising the Alibates Flint Quarries and the Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture sites, together with any structures and improvements thereon, located in and around Potter County, Texas."

On page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike out "The National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior," and insert "The Secretary of the Interior".

On page 2, lines 21, 22, and 23, strike out all of section 3 and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sum not to exceed $5,000 for the acquisition of land and such other sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAKE MEREDITH, TEX.

The Clerk called House Joint Resolution 95, to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by Sanford Dam, Canadian River project, Texas, as "Lake Meredith".

There being no objection, the Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

H.J. RES. 95

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by Sanford Dam, Canadian River project, Texas, shall hereafter be known as "Lake Meredith" in honor of A. A. Meredith. Any law, regulation, document, or record of the United States in which such lake is designated or referred to shall be held to refer to such lake as "Lake Meredith".

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINERAL RESOURCES OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN NATIONAL FORESTS IN THE STATE OF COLORADO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 398) to permit the discovery, location, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of certain public lands in national forests in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to interrogate the gentleman from Colorado.

This is a relatively small portion of land you are seeking to grant mining rights to. What is the idea of picking out this 7,000 acres to grant locator rights to others?

Mr. ASPINALL. It is not a question of the amount of land; it is a question of the way the reservation is withdrawn on the part of the Federal Government. This land belongs to the people of the United States and is under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service. As long as it has been under the jurisdiction of the Forest Service it has been subject to use for mining and associated uses that have been permitted under the law of 1872 and similar acts. The lands were, in fact, withdrawn the second time for the purpose of recreational features and, having been withdrawn the second time for the purpose of recreation, this has in effect made impossible some of the uses that are permitted under the act creating the Forest Service areas.

So, what we are doing here is reestablishing by congressional statement our policy of multiple use of lands wherever possible. These lands would remain under the control of the Department of Agriculture. Under the proposed legislation they cannot be used for mining purposes unless the Secretary certifies that mining purposes are not adverse to the use for recreational purposes.

These are small areas of 40 to 160 and 320 acres scattered here and there throughout Colorado. This is a new attempt to continue the multiple-use theory that means so much to us, and which theory came into our recent policymaking authority in Congress under the advice and at the suggestion of the Department of Agriculture and the Forest Service.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Are these 7,000 acres a contiguous piece of property?

Mr. ASPINALL. Oh, no. These 7,178 acres are scattered areas throughout the forest areas of the State of Colorado, areas which have been withdrawn to take care of the recreational needs of the people; but they are scattered at places where there are some mineral values, and if mining activities do not interfere with the recreation uses the additional use will be permitted.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I take it from the bill the person who finds these minerals can retain them and keep them, and the Government will give them a fee simple title, but retains title to the surface?

Mr. ASPINALL. Yes. If there are any minerals, minerals that are of commercial value, and the values can be developed, then whatever rights the discoverer and the developer—the claimant—has will be only to the mineral deposits themselves, and not to the surface.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Will the U.S. Government receive any royalty from the finding of these minerals?

Mr. ASPINALL. No. None of the minerals that are developed under the law of 1872 bear royalties as do the minerals that are discovered and developed under the act of 1920, the Mineral Leasing Act. If there are any minerals, of course, the person who develops them will be subject to the income tax laws of the United States of America.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Do you have anybody in mind who will go in and make these explorations, or will it be on an advertising basis or a bid basis? What basis is used in choosing these people?

Mr. ASPINALL. After gold, silver, and other minerals were discovered all over the Western States they were developed by those pioneers and enterprises who made their discoveries, filed their claims and prosecuted the development of the same. Under provisions of the 1872 act they were allowed to go to patent. The authority permitted is a general authority to any citizen who seeks to give his time to this particular activity of securing needed minerals and metals.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of the right to object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 398

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the national forest lands in the Gunnison, Rio Grande, San Juan, and White River National Forests in the State of Colorado, aggregating seven thousand one hundred and seventy-eight acres, more or less, described in application for withdrawal, serial number Colorado 0123127, published in the Federal Register, July 21, 1964 (29 F.R. 9806), required for administrative and recreation sites, roadside zones, and experimental uses shall hereafter be subject to location and entry under the mining laws of the United States subject to the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 2. Mining locations hereafter made on the lands referred to in section 1 shall confer upon the locator the right to explore, develop, utilize, enter, and patent the mineral resources thereof. Any disturbance or use of the surface or surface resources thereon by or on behalf of the prospector or claimant shall be made only with the permission of the Secretary of Agriculture and subject to such terms and conditions as he may deem necessary for the adequate protection and utilization of the surface of the lands for the purposes for which such lands are withdrawn.

SEC. 3. Any patent issued under the United States mining laws to the lands subject to location and entry under the provisions of this Act shall convey title to the mineral deposits within the claim, but shall reserve to the United States all title in and to the surface of the lands and the surface resources. Any disturbance or use by or on behalf of the patentee, his successors or assigns, of the surface or surface resources thereof shall be made only with the permission of the Secretary of Agriculture and subject to such terms and conditions as he shall deem necessary for the adequate protection and utilization of the surface of the lands for the purposes for which such lands are withdrawn.

SEC. 4. Nothing in this Act shall be construed to limit or restrict rights of the owner or owners of any existing valid mining claim.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 17, after "claim" insert "to the extent provided by the United States mining laws".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INFORMATION RELATING TO SECOND-CLASS MAIL PUBLICATIONS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 459) to provide for more uniform application of section 4369 of title 39, United States Code, which pertains to filing of information relating to second-class mail publications.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 459

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4369(a) of title 39, United States Code, is amended by striking out ": *Provided, however,* That trade publications serving the performing arts need only to furnish such information to the Postmaster General".

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN PROPERTY TO THE COUNTY OF DARE, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2176) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property to the county of Dare, State of North Carolina, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object in order to ask one question of the gentleman from Colorado, the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Since this bill does provide for an exact description or what is known as a surveyor's description of the property to be acquired by the county, should the county be required to pay the cost of any such surveys made as well as the reasonable expense incurred therein?

Mr. ASPINALL. What is involved here is of such small value and the administrative expenses of making the transfer are so limited, I do not believe the bill should carry the clause which my friend and I would usually put into this kind of legislation. If this land is not used for the purpose for which it is transferred to the county, then title will revert to the United States. This area happens to be outside the national park area and is not needed for the purpose for which it was originally acquired by the National Park Service. It is a piece of land that has no particular value to the Park Service except for the value of the land itself, which land area, as I understand, was given to the United States in the beginning.

We are not entirely divesting ourselves of the title. We are keeping the title where it will come back to the United States if the area is not used for the purposes intended by the Legislature—and those purposes, of course, are making available health services, not only for the residents of the local community, but, the thousands of visitors to the national park facility.

Mr. HALL. I thank the chairman. I understand the reclaimer clause and what it will save for the Government on the original gift to the Government; but as it is now written, do I understand the Government will pay for the survey and not the county?

Mr. ASPINALL. I would think in this instance the Government will pay for the survey and take care of the administrative expenses. However, in my opinion, this is a rather small contribution by the Government when considered in the light of the health services to be provided by the hospital for those people visiting the Government's own facility. I think the equities are fair in this matter.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, in view of the chairman's explanation, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to convey the tract of land and improvements thereon situate in the village of Hatteras, Dare County, North Carolina, and administered as a part of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore, formerly bearing General Services Administration excess property control number C–NC–444, comprising one and five-tenths acres, the exact description for which shall be determined by the Secretary, to the Board of Commissioners of Dare County, for purposes of providing thereon a public health facilities: *Provided,* That title to the land and any improvements shall revert to the United States upon a finding and notification to the grantee by the Secretary that the property is used for purposes other than a public health facility. The conveyance herein authorized shall be without monetary consideration.

SEC. 2. Upon the transfer of title to the grantee, the property herein conveyed shall cease to be a part of the Cape Hatteras National Seashore.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FACILITATING THE WORK OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 5508) to facilitate the work of the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to interrogate the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], the chairman of the committee, or any other spokesman with respect to this bill.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like for the gentleman from Pennsylvania to yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. JONES] who conducted the hearings on this bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman. I will yield to the gentleman from Missouri. I want to ask a few questions about this bill. It is an omnibus bill and there are quite a number of features to it.

First, I want to ask the gentleman a question about extending the research in colleges and experimental stations, and so forth, by the Department of Agriculture.

In the extension of this research into applied research, who will receive the fruits from the research? Supposing some very fine discoveries are made—will they be the property of the U.S. Government or private enterprise or of the university doing the research? What protection will be given to the Government with respect to this extension of research activities?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. In the hearings that were conducted 2 years ago that question was brought up. We were assured that anything of value would be retained by the U.S. Government.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Was an agreement made by the Secretary of Agriculture or a provision made in the agreement for the protection of the Government in case of a discovery?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That was our assurance at the time the hearings were held.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I have another question with respect to the circumventing of the civil service when you want to hire employees of the Department who, let us say, return from abroad. Has this question of circumventing the civil service in this manner been referred to the House Committee on the Post Office and Civil Service?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No; I do not think it was. But that is in a very limited way. I do not know whether I understand which one of these things the gentleman is referring to. Is the gentleman talking about the agricultural attachés who return to this country and go to work for the Department of Agriculture? Of course, they are employed by the Department of Agriculture to start with and all we are trying to do here is to facilitate the work of the Department. As the gentleman may know, these agricultural attachés after 4 years of service abroad are usually brought back to the United States so that they may have the benefit of any developments here in this country and to work where they may do the most good and become more familiar with conditions here before they go back. At the time the bill first came up there was some question about this that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] had. At that time we worked with the gentleman from Iowa and accepted language which he had drafted. This is limited to 15 employees at any one time. I do not think the gentleman need to have any fears about that particular operation. We have tried to meet every criticism or suggestion that was made.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. But if this bill becomes law, the truth is that you will be able to hire these returning attachés without reference to the civil service?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No; that is not exactly correct. I think the gentleman has unintentionally, I am sure, exaggerated what would actually occur. These people are employees of the Department of Agriculture. They have been employed in the foreign agricultural service as attachés. They come back to this country and are assigned to other duties within the Department compatible with the training and education that they have.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. What this amounts to is authorization to rotate agricultural attachés back to this country and they can hold a job anywhere in the Department of Agriculture. They may be grade 15 and hold a grade 9 job. This for a period of 3 years. My quarrel with this at first was to the unlimited nature of the bill. The pending bill limits the number to 15 at any one time who can be rotated back and be placed in this status.

I say to my friend from Pennsylvania that these are not new employees. They are not being newly hired. They retain their status.

I regret that they are given a 3-year period, because I believe that if grade 16, a grade 15, or a grade 14 is rotated back from Foreign Service—and I believe that they should be brought back to rub elbows with the people in this country once in awhile—he could be located in a slot commensurate with his grade level and job description in much less time than 3 years.

I am not going to quarrel about this, but I believe proper assignments could be made in a year or less.

I do wonder what happened to the bill passed last year. Did the other body refuse to accept it?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. The gentleman will recall that the bill passed late last year, at the tail end of the session. I believe that was the only thing involved.

I wish to say to the gentleman, with regard to these people being sent back here, if there were not an opening in that particular grade, I believe we should encourage trying to utilize these people where they are needed, even if it is necessary to put them into jobs which ordinarily would be assigned to lower grades.

As a practical application, I believe these gentlemen who come back—I am fairly familiar with the duties performed—are given jobs which utilize to the fullest extent the experience they have gained in the other foreign countries. In all instances I know of they have. I have not seen any occasion of any abuse.

This was discussed quite at length in the hearings. I certainly wish to relieve the gentleman of any apprehension he might have that the Department would take advantage of such a provision.

Mr. GROSS. I would only say, in reply to the gentleman, that in the matter of rotation of military personnel we limited them much more severely in the Department of Defense than they are to be limited in the Department of Agriculture.

I join with the gentleman in the hope that there will not be serious abuse of the 3-year provision. I reiterate the belief that the proper assignments can be made in much less than 3 years, if Agriculture Department officials are disposed to do so.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield further, as a member of the Subcommittee on the Foreign Agricultural Service, I can say we will certainly keep that in mind and try to see that these people are utilized to the best advantage.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. If I may continue, I have one more series of questions.

I now turn to the phase of the bill which repeals a provision relating to shipment of grain from public grain warehouses to other warehouses without cancellation of warehouse receipts.

We realize, as Members of Congress, that the law on warehousing is a vast subject.

If we repeal this particular section of the Agricultural Adjustment Act will it make it easier in the future for another Billie Sol Estes scandal or another salad oil scandal, like we are experiencing in New York? Should we at this time be letting the bars down on the regulation of warehousing receipts, in view of the frightening scandals which have occurred in the past 3 or 4 years?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I can assure the gentleman that at the time the hearings were held we went into that thoroughly. The minority side was represented by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARVEY], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE], and at that time the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Beermann.

I know that the State laws do cover all those things. We feel there are sufficient safeguards and that those things would not happen.

The instances referred to were discussed. We were assured to our satisfaction that there was no danger of similar incidents as a result of this proposed legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. I should like to read two sentences from the report on the bill. It is stated, on page 10:

> The Department is also of the opinion that the most effective means of attaining additional protection lies in strengthening the warehousing statutes, regulations, and policing activities of the States, and the Federal Government where a need for additional protection is found.

Does the committee plan any additional warehousing tightening laws, in view of the scandals of the past 2 or 3 years, to prevent such an incident from occurring in the future?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. We have requested the Department to give us the benefit of any suggestions they would have on that. However, I do not think that they have come up with any definite suggestions at this time. I would anticipate, though, in the event of this bill being passed here today and its eventually becoming law, I believe that would be the appropriate time to make those changes in the law.

Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania. Then, you are assuring this House today that if this particular section doing away with the surrendering of the outstanding warehouse receipts is passed, it will not weaken our warehousing law if we repeal that particular section?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I do not think it would. I think it was the unanimous opinion of the subcommittee which held hearings on this that they felt there were sufficient safeguards in the State laws and other regulations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I have one or two questions I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri.

This bill authorizes the Department of Agriculture to purchase insurance coverage on its vehicles in foreign countries. Does the U.S. Government require foreign countries to carry insurance on their vehicles in this country?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I am sorry. I could not answer that question.

Mr. GROSS. It seems to me if foreign countries are going to require the U.S. Government or its employees to buy insurance in a foreign country in order to operate a U.S. vehicle, then we ought to require foreign governments to buy insurance on their vehicles in this country.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. If the gentleman will yield, my comment on this would be that the provisions of this bill are intended to try to relieve and protect American employees in other countries. We have had instances where the individual employee of this country serving in foreign countries has actually bought insurance and paid the premiums for it out of his own pocket. That is the purpose of this bill. I do not think this committee would have had the opportunity even to consider a bill requiring foreign countries to buy insurance here.

Mr. GROSS. No. But I thought perhaps you asked the question, when you had hearings on this bill, as to whether foreign governments are required on a reciprocal basis to buy insurance in this country.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I may say to the gentleman that may be a good idea, but I do not think it is anything our committee can do anything about.

Mr. GROSS. But we are going to buy insurance in foreign countries.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. We are buying that insurance for the protection of our own employees. That is what we are buying that protection for, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Of course. In the case cited in the report, in that foreign country, the U.S. Government could not operate a motor vehicle without insurance. Is that not true?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No. I think it is as it is in this country. We can probably operate it, but if we had an accident and did not have insurance, then, there would be a personal liability on the operator of that vehicle. He would be the person who would suffer as a result thereof. The intention of this committee, when we went into the hearings on this subject, was to try to protect our employees there. We do not feel they should be paying for it.

Mr. GROSS. No. The report says that the employee had to bear the insurance cost on two federally owned trucks.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Since the report says, the trucks were essential to our work and could not be operated without insurance.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. That is probably true. I think it is true. However, the employee had to buy the insurance because there was no authority for the Federal Government to buy that insurance.

Mr. GROSS. And because it was a requirement of the foreign government that the trucks be insured.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think that is right.

Mr. GROSS. All right. Then, let us have some reciprocity in this matter and at least in the foreign countries that operate motor vehicles in this country, let us require them to carry insurance. That is the point I am making.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think the gentleman will have to admit that we would have to go to some other committee for that legislation.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman. Let me ask the gentleman another question, and I shall be brief about this. There is authority in the bill to construct facilities and structures. What is meant by "structures"? Could that be a peanut research laboratory—what is covered by "structures"?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I think that would be limited by the appropriations, surely. In the hearings it was brought out that many of these buildings are the Butler type buildings, more or less temporary.

Mr. GROSS. Let me interrupt the gentleman. Section 1 apparently rules out CCC storage facilities, so I assume this blanket authority to the Department of Agriculture to erect structures would not apply to Butler grain bins?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I did not say Butler grain bins. There are other types of Butler buildings than grain bins, which may be used for small facilities, buildings that can be moved after the use of the particular facility is over.

Mr. GROSS. Since broad authority is delegated for the building of structures on Government-held land, the next question is, does the Department have to come back to Congress for authority to erect the structures or may they go ahead without further consultation with Congress and put up a research laboratory or any kind of a structure they want to put up—perhaps an apartment house, I do not know?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. No. This was brought out in the hearings that were held. During the hearings the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE] asked:

> Now, as to the buildings that are contemplated under this section, would those include such things as experiment stations—would that be within the purview of this section?
>
> Dr. IRVING. Experiment stations, in the sense that they would be research facilities for use by the Department of Agriculture; yes, sir. They would be laboratories, green-

houses, animal yards, storage facilities, et cetera.

Mr. DOLE. If you erect the building it could be used for any number of things, could it not?

Mr. GRANT. It could also be a building used in connection with the inspection and quarantine activities of the Agricultural Research Service.

But it is not contemplated—and I think if you read the hearings you will find that the type of the buildings would not be of what I would call a substantial nature or involving a substantial amount of money.

The chairman of the Committee on Agriculture advises me that if it were over $10,000 then they would have to come back to the Congress.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of existing law, except the Commodity Credit Corporation Charter Act and without regard to section 355, Revised Statutes, as amended (40 U.S.C. 255), but within the limitations of cost otherwise applicable, appropriations of the Department of Agriculture may be expended for the erection of buildings and other structures on land owned by States, counties, municipalities, or other political subdivisions, corporations, or individuals: *Provided,* That prior to such erection there is obtained the right to use the land for the estimated life of or need for the structure, including the right to remove any such structure within a reasonable time after the termination of the right to use the land: *Provided further,* That appropriations and funds available to the Department of Agriculture shall be available for expenses in connection with acquiring the right to use land for such purposes under long-term lease or other agreement.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make grants, for periods not to exceed five years' duration, to State agricultural experiment stations, colleges, universities, and other research institutions and organizations and to Federal and private organizations and individuals for research to further the programs of the Department of Agriculture. Each recipient of assistance under this section shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such grants, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such funds are given or used, and the amount of that portion of the costs of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit. The Secretary of Agriculture and the Comptroller General of the United States or any of their duly authorized representatives shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of the recipients that are pertinent to the grants received under this section.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to obtain insurance to cover the liability of any employee of the Department of Agriculture for damage to or loss of property or personal injury or death caused by the act or omission of any such employee while acting within the scope of his office or employment and while operating a motor vehicle belonging to the United States in a foreign country.

SEC. 4. Section 602 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 908) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(e) Any officer or employee appointed and assigned to a post abroad pursuant to this title may, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture, be assigned for duty in the continental United States, without regard to the civil service laws (and without reduction in grade if an appropriate position at the employee's grade is not available in any agency of the Department of Agriculture), for a period of not more than three years: *Provided,* That the total number of such employees assigned for duty in the continental United States under this provision shall not exceed fifteen at any one time: *Provided further,* That this Act shall not increase the number of persons employed at grade GS–16, GS–17, or GS–18."

SEC. 5. Section 104(a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, as amended (7 U.S.C. 1704), is further amended by inserting, after the word *"Provided,"*, the following: "That the Secretary of Agriculture may release such amounts of the foreign currencies so set aside as he determines not to be needed, within a reasonable period of time, for such purpose: *Provided further,*".

SEC. 6. Section 4 of the Act of August 2, 1956 (ch. 878, 70 Stat. 934; 7 U.S.C. 1884), is hereby amended—

(1) by striking the word "insurance" and substituting the word "benefits";

(2) by inserting after "Federal Employees' Group Life Insurance Act of 1954" the words "and the Federal Employees Health Benefits Act of 1959,"; and

(3) by inserting after "employees' life insurance fund" the words "or the employees' health benefits fund, as the case may be,".

SEC. 7. Section 1 of the Act of July 12, 1943 (5 U.S.C. 542–1), is hereby amended by striking out the word "reimbursed" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "credited with advances or reimbursements" and inserting after the word *"Provided"*, the following: "That such advances shall not be available for any period beyond that provided by the Act appropriating the funds: *Provided further,*".

SEC. 8. Subject to limitations applicable with respect to each appropriation concerned, each appropriation available to the Department of Agriculture may be charged, at any time during a fiscal year, for the benefit of any other appropriation available to the Department, for the purpose of financing the procurement of materials and services, or financing activities or other costs, for which funds are available both in the financing appropriation so charged and in the appropriation so benefited; except that such expenses so financed shall be charged on a final basis, as of a date not later than the close of such fiscal year, to the appropriations so benefited, with appropriate credit to the financing appropriation.

SEC. 9. Section 8f of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended (7 U.S.C. 608f), is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the eligible bills on the Consent Calendar.

INCREASE PER DIEM—GRAND AND PETIT JURORS

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3990) to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3990

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 1871. Fees.

"Grand and petit jurors in district courts or before United States commissioners shall receive the following fees, except as otherwise expressly provided by law:

"For actual attendance at the place of trial or hearing and for the time necessarily occupied in going to and from such place at the beginning and end of such service or at any time during the same, $10 per day, except that any juror required to attend more than thirty days in hearing one case may be paid in the discretion and upon the certification of the trial judge a per diem fee not exceeding $14 for each day in excess of thirty days he is required to hear such case.

"For the distance necessarily traveled to and from a juror's residence by the shortest practicable route in going to and returning from the place of service at the beginning and at the end of the term of service 10 cents per mile; and for additional necessary daily or other interim travel during the term of service the juror shall be allowed for such travel 10 cents per mile, but not to exceed the subsistence allowance which would have been paid him if he had remained at the place of holding court overnight or during temporary recess, and if daily travel appears impracticable, subsistence of $10 per day shall be allowed, including the time necessarily occupied in going to and returning from the place of attendance. Whenever in any case the jury is ordered to be kept together and not to separate, the cost of subsistence during such period shall be paid by the United States marshal upon the order of the court in lieu of the foregoing subsistence allowance.

"Jury fees and travel and subsistence allowances provided by this section shall be paid by the United States marshal on the certificate of the clerk of the court, and in the case of jury fees in excess of $10 per diem, when allowed as hereinabove provided, on the certificate of the trial judge."

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 61]

Andrews, Glenn
Arends
Ashley
Baldwin
Boggs
Bonner
Brademas
Bray
Byrnes, Wis.
Cabell
Callaway
Clark
Corbett
Diggs
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Dyal
Edwards, Ala.
Fino
Gibbons
Goodell
Grabowski
Grider
Hanna
Helstoski

Holland
Irwin
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
Keogh
Kluczynski
Leggett
MacGregor
Mackie
Mailliard
Mathias
Meeds
Moorhead
Nix
O'Hara, Mich.
Passman
Pepper
Pickle
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Roncalio
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
St Germain
Scheuer
Skubitz
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Staggers
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tunney
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
Whalley
Williams
Wilson,
  Charles H.

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 368 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed.

INCREASE PER DIEM—GRAND AND PETIT JURORS

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. ASHMORE] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ASHMORE. Mr. Speaker, I know of no questions. I yield back my time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina, that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 3990.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACADEMY OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Un-American Activities be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6071) to establish an Academy of Criminal Justice and to provide for the establishment of such other Academies of Criminal Justice as the Congress may hereafter authorize and that the bill be re-referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. This bill was inadvertently referred to the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

SAN GORGONIO WILDERNESS AREA, SAN BERNARDINO NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 6891 was referred to the House Committee on Agriculture. It occurs to me it should be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture be discharged from further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6891) to provide for family winter recreational use of a portion of the San Gorgonio Wilderness Area, San Bernardino National Forest, Calif., without reducing the area set aside for wilderness preservation within such forest, and for other purposes, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was objection.

EXTENSION OF NATIONAL COMMISSION ON FOOD MARKETING

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5702) to extend for 1 year the date on which the National Commission on Food Marketing shall make a final report to the President and to the Congress and to provide necessary authorization of appropriations for such commission.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 5702

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 4(b) of Public Law 88–354, approved July 3, 1964 (78 Stat. 270), is amended by striking out the figures "1965," and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "1966".

(b) Section 7 of such Act (78 Stat. 272) is amended by striking out the figures "$1,500,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$2,500,000".

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN].

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY], has already reported, this legislation is nonpartisan and, I am sure, noncontroversial. It merely extends for an additional year, until July 1, 1966, the period in which the National Commission on Food Marketing, created last year, must make its final report. It also increases, to $2,500,000, from the present ceiling of $1,500,000, the limit on appropriations authorized for the work of this Commission.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission on Food Marketing does not have, and has not spent, the $1,500,000 authorized last year. It has received only $700,000. That amount will carry it through the rest of this fiscal year. The remaining $800,000 of the original authorization, plus the $1 million more in appropriation authority sought in this bill today, would cover funds to be spent in the 1966 and 1967 fiscal years—nearly all of it in the coming fiscal year.

THE 1966 FISCAL YEAR BUDGET CALLS FOR $1,500,000

The $300,000 or so to be spent in the 1967 fiscal year—after the Commission will have made its final report—will be for such things as printing of the various reports and technical studies, and for final cleanup work. But the bulk of the Commission's investigative work and hearings and so on will take place in the coming fiscal year, when an amount of $1,500,000 will be required.

This was supposed to have been a 2-year, $2,500,000 study to begin with—the legislation which came to the House last year so provided. The House cut it back to a 1-year study, costing $1,500,000 with the understanding that we would review the matter again at this time to see if additional time and money are necessary. The facts are, Mr. Speaker, that the additional year is absolutely necessary—for reasons beyond anyone's control—because the work of the Commission could not really get started until January of this year. The appropriation of $700,000 was not provided until last October; a new Chairman had to be appointed by the President because the original Chairman, Judge Marvin Jones, an outstanding expert in agricultural matters, found it necessary to resign. The staff director, who is, of course, the key staff man, was not put on the payroll until mid-November and most of the other top staff people could not be hired until early February. The Commission is now going ahead full speed, having held its first hearings last week in Cheyenne, Wyo., with another set of hearings scheduled later this month in Fort Worth, Tex.; and with subsequent hearings scheduled so far in Omaha, Nebr.; Atlanta, Ga.; and Washington, D.C.

THE 15-MEMBER BIPARTISAN COMMISSION

Mr. Speaker, as the ranking House Member on this 15-member bipartisan Commission, I can assure you and the Members of the House that we are anxious to do a full and thorough and complete job of analyzing the spread between farm prices and consumer prices and make detailed recommendations to the Congress on what, if anything, should be done to assure fairness and efficiency and competition in food marketing.

The Commission consists of the following five House Members: Representatives SULLIVAN, PURCELL, ROSENTHAL, CUNNINGHAM, and MAY; the following five Senators: MAGNUSON, MCGEE, HART, MORTON, and HRUSKA; and the following five private citizens appointed by President Johnson: former California Supreme Court Chief Justice Phil S. Gibson, Chairman; former Congressman Fred Marshall; New Mexico Republican National Committeeman Albert K. Mitchell; J. C. Penney Co. Board Chairman William M. Batten; Missouri University Agriculture Dean Elmer R. Kiehl.

We met in Washington in September, right before the adjournment of Congress and our reelection campaigns; we authorized the Chairman to interview candidates for the position of staff director, and he did so, reporting to us by mail and telephone. The staff director we agreed upon took office in November. When we returned to Washington for the new Congress, we met again on January 7, and ratified other top staff appointments, then met in February to set up our agenda of early hearings, establish rules, and give other directions to the staff. So we have not been neglecting our responsibilities. Quite the contrary.

SCOPE OF COMMISSION'S ASSIGNMENT

Now what is it that the Congress has asked us to do? Essentially—and I am quoting now an informal statement made by the staff director, Dr. George E. Brandow, of Pennsylvania State University, which says it very clearly without all of the legalistic whereases of the law—Congress said this:

> All kinds of changes have been taking place in the way in which the food industry is organized and how it operates. See if you can give us some perspective on the extent to which firms are becoming larger, fewer, and more vertically integrated. Try to find out why these changes are taking place. Give us your best judgment as to how they are affecting the efficiency of the food industry, the bargaining power of different groups within it, and the maintenance of fair and effective competition. Advise us on the ways in which the regulatory activities of Government are outmoded, ineffective, or otherwise in need of revision. In short, how can we maintain the efficient, competitive kind of industry that is in the best tradition of American private enterprise.

FOOD MARKETING FROM FARM TO CONSUMER

Mr. Speaker, that is the gist of our assignment. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL], who is very interested in the spread between livestock and retail beef prices, was the only House Member to attend the opening hearings in Wyoming last week, and he can report on the vigorous protests the Commission heard there from western livestock interests on their price problems. But we are not investigating only livestock prices, or meat prices, or any other single segment of the $77 billion food industry. We are going to look into the whole industry, from top to bottom, from farm to consumer. It is a big job. It cannot be completed by this coming July 1. It would be futile even to try.

From the controversy we had here last year over beef imports, and the general unanimity of feeling in the House in support of this kind of study, I know of no reason why those who supported the original resolution would hesitate now to approve of this absolutely necessary extension of the time for the Commission's report.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Yes. I am glad to yield to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture who is the author of H.R. 5702.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask this question: This resolution conforms with the original purpose of the resolution we introduced last year. Is that right? It extends this Commission for 2 years and puts the appropriation back where we had it originally?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. That is correct, Mr. Speaker. This would restore it to the original concept for such a study as proposed in the resolution as it was first introduced last year.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as one of the House members on the National Commission on Food Marketing, I rise in support of H.R. 5702, extension of National Commission on Food Marketing. My esteemed colleague from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] has made an excellent presentation of the urgent need for the extension of time if the Commission is to do a thorough, meaningful, and effective study of our Nation's food industry. As has been pointed out, since the Commission was created by law last year, we have had to spend many months in careful preparation in the areas of obtaining competent staff, working out a detailed program where facts and figures must be gathered and how best to correlate and amass the necessary data for reaching objective and valid conclusions which, in turn, hopefully, will provide meaningful answers to many questions which have puzzled not only Members of Congress but our farmers, our consumers, and the various segments of the food industry itself.

As Dr. Brandow, Executive Director of the Commission, said, in a recent speech:

> I am sure that the Food Commission will not arrive at final solutions to all major problems in the food industry. I am optimistic, however, that it will bring them into sharper focus and will have significant recommendations to make about several of them. The Commission itself can take no action, but its findings can provide a basis for both private decisions and public policy.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to say that I feel that the makeup of the Commission as to individuals is excellent in its balance of background knowledge as well as keen interest in the field of study that we are conducting. We are fortunate to have a man of the stature of Justice Phil Sheridan Gibson as our Chairman and I feel, in turn, that he has shown a tremendous grasp of the magnitude of this study. In this respect, I would like to congratulate Justice Gibson for finding a man of the ability of Dr. George E. Brandow as the Executive Director of the Commission. Justice Gibson and Dr. Brandow together, with the advice and consent of the Commission members, have put together, painstakingly, a staff of men and women who are unusually competent to work in the fields for which they have been chosen. This was the first important step, no matter what the time involved, before we could, as a Commission, go ahead and discharge the responsibilities Congress placed upon us in the creation of the Commission itself.

As you have heard, we have now had the first hearing in a series of those set up this year and next, and we are now off to a good start. But it certainly would be shortsighted on the part of this body if we did not now provide an adequate amount of time to do the job that we were set up to do, now that these early months of experience have shown we must cover a wide field of study in depth in key areas that have been selected. We have a firm foundation now. We must have time to build on it. We must also have the necessary funds to keep a competent staff together, and we feel that the Commission staff, working with the Bureau of the Budget, has projected as well as is possible figures that place a practical ceiling on what I am confident will be needed between now and the time this Commission finishes its work and makes its report and disbands.

I urge your support of this legislation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman from Washington yield to me at this point?

Mrs. MAY. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska, a member of the Commission.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I want to concur in the remarks of the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. SULLIVAN] and the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY] and say that this is a most important study that is being conducted. This is in line with the request of President Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, I believe every Member of this body should be interested in the reasons why there is such a spread between what the producer receives and what the consumer pays.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to be a member of the Commission and I am very much impressed with the staff that has been assembled. It was late in getting started because of the health of the original Chairman. However, this represents a tremendous study that is being undertaken and I certainly join in urging the adoption of this legislation.

Mrs. MAY. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. DOLE].

Mr. DOLE. As I understand it, there are five Members of the other body and five Members of this body as well as five public members?

Mrs. MAY. This is correct.

Mr. DOLE. And, if the gentlewoman will yield further, I am wondering if the public members are so located as they will be able to attend most every session, particularly the Chairman, Justice Gibson?

Mrs. MAY. To date the majority of the public members have attended those meetings held in Washington, D.C. However, I would have to defer to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PURCELL] as to how many were at the Cheyenne hearing, the first of our hearings.

Justice Gibson, our Chairman, has been back on several occasions and I do feel that Justice Gibson has had a lot of preliminary work to take care of before he could leave his home in California to spend more time in Washington, D.C. But we are certainly hopeful, and we know it is in his planning, that he can spend a great deal of his time back here working with the Executive Director of the Commission and the staff.

We realize that this is very important in order that this job can be carried on.

Mr. DOLE. I endorse the Commission and certainly commend the gentlewoman from Washington and the other Members for the fine work they have done. But as a member of the Committee on Agriculture this was one question we had because many times it is impossible for Members of the House or Members of the other body to attend meetings. We want to make certain, of course, that whenever possible the public members are in attendance.

Mrs. MAY. We are certainly anticipating that this is to be done. We have had word that Justice Gibson expressed his intention to spend a great deal more time in Washington, D.C., working with the Executive Director.

Mr. DOLE. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Washington on the statement that she is making. Certainly I concur with her remarks with reference to this Commission.

Mr. Speaker, never in the history of this country has agriculture received less return for its production in comparison with the cost of producing the food and fiber than it does today.

There is a great disparity between the price the producer receives and the price the processed product brings in the marketplace. Unless this gap is closed so the farmer receives a better price for his product the 2.4 million small farmers the President referred to in his budget message as indispensable will certainly be forced off the farms.

Mr. Speaker, the welfare of this Nation is dependent upon a healthy agriculture and a healthy agriculture is dependent upon reasonable prices; reasonable prices are dependent upon less slippage between the producer and the consumer.

I have supported this kind of legislation for a number of years and support this legislation which provides for a thorough study of this problem through this Commission.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MAY. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand that $1.5 million was appropriated for this purpose last year?

Mrs. MAY. No; $1.5 million was authorized, but only $700,000 was actually appropriated.

Mr. GROSS. Then was this fund carried over, the unused portion of the $1.5 million carried over?

Mrs. MAY. Only the actual $700,000 that was appropriated.

Mr. GROSS. It was not turned in to the Treasury?

Mrs. MAY. We have the figures on that. I believe the gentlewoman from Missouri [Mrs. Sullivan] has those figures and I would be glad to yield to my colleague from Missouri in order to answer the gentleman's question.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Last October the Appropriations Committee appropriated only $700,000. So, this coming year we need the additional $800,000 previously authorized but never appropriated, plus the additional $1 million we are asking for in order to make the total of $2.5 million. That was the original figure recommended when the Commission was first proposed—$2½ million to be authorized over a 2-year period.

Mr. GROSS. So, the full amount is necessary, the gentlewoman from Missouri is saying, because of the fact that it has been extended for a period of another year?

Mrs. SULLIVAN. We will need another year in order to obtain the full facts that we are seeking. We must have a 2-year period for this study, as well as the full appropriation necessary to support it.

Mr. GROSS. I could not conceive, in light of the late start last year of the Commission, that it had spent any part of the appropriation which was made last year.

Mrs. SULLIVAN. If the gentlewoman from Washington will yield further, they have not spent all of the $700,000 appropriation, but they are in the process of obligating it for various studies by other Government agencies as well as for staff salaries, hearing expenses, and so on.

The Commission has 45 people on the staff who are on the Federal payroll. The Commission had its first hearing last week in Cheyenne. We will use the $700,000 by the end of this present fiscal year—July. We will need in 1966 fiscal year the other $800,000 already authorized plus about $700,000 more. Then in the 1967 fiscal year, about $300,000 will be needed for printing and cleanup work. But most of the money this bill would authorize will be spent next year if the Commission's life is extended by passage of this legislation.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Purcell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support H.R. 5702, a bill to extend the life of the National Commission on Food Marketing.

This extension is necessary if the Commission is to accomplish the task assigned it by such an overwhelming majority of the 88th Congress. After going through a change in the chairmanship at a crucial time; waiting out the 1964 election campaign; and starting the difficult job of building a competent staff, the Commission is now well organized and hard at work.

This past weekend the Commission held its first hearings at Cheyenne, Wyo. Ample evidence was given at this one set of meetings alone to justify the need for the Commission and the study expected of it. Considerable evidence was given which pointed out the striking changes that have taken place in our food industry. The Commission found that these new and more complex problems have reached staggering proportions in certain segments of the industry. Further, these problems are not generally susceptible to solution by the individual farmer, processor, or retailer; most certainly not unless there is a better understanding of the entire food marketing process and the pressures which influence it.

At the hearings the Commission found continued support for the belief that the greatest asset in our Nation is the food industry. It has continued to supply the American people with a flow of food abundance unparalleled anyplace in the world. Yet, within that industry, testimony was given which pointed out the difficulties that it faces now and the dangers which exist in the future.

Additional hearings will be held in Fort Worth, Tex., April 22–24, on buying and selling practices in markets for cattle and lambs and feedlot operations of the packers; in Atlanta, Ga., May 13–15, on integration in the broiler and egg industries; and in Omaha, Nebr., June 3–5, on buying and selling practices in markets for cattle and hogs and feedlot operations of packers.

These, and other hearings, and the other studies of the Commission, are essential to the Congress in its efforts to make it possible for the food industry to continue to grow and prosper along with the rest of the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to support passage of H.R. 5702.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Albert). The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

INCREASING AMOUNTS AUTHORIZED FOR INDIAN ADULT VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4778) to increase the amounts authorized for Indian adult vocational education.

The Clerk read as follows:

> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That section 2 of this Act entitled "An Act relative to employment for certain adult Indians on or near Indian reservations", approved August 3, 1956 (25 U.S.C. 309a), is amended by striking out "$12,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$15,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. Aspinall].

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse H.R. 4778 and hope it can be enacted in its reported form. We have had similar legislation before us several times since 1956 when the original bill was passed.

In 1956, Congress established the Indian vocational training program for Indians living on or near reservations. From modest beginnings, the program has grown to its present proportions. Over 10,000 Indians between the ages of 18 and 35 have been enrolled in various schools that have been designated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as institutions for vocational training. Considerably more than half of the enrollees have completed their courses and are employed in gainful employment—as automotive mechanics, carpenters, plumbers, electricians, barbers, nurses, hairdressers, stenographers, etc. Except for nurses training, the courses are limited to 24 months. Nurses are permitted an extra year of training. Following a very careful screening process by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the students are selected and assigned to their choice of vocational schools. Each of the States with sizable Indian populations have one or more approved vocational schools. Arrangements are made to permit the wife and children to accompany the husband and father to the city where he is in training so that the family may be kept intact. Experience has proven that this precaution is essential. The funds provided the students are in the form of scholarships and need not be repaid.

Nearly 5,000 heads of families and single individuals have been accepted for training and are presently awaiting assignment. The $3 million increase provided in H.R. 4778 will clear up most of that backlog. Our colleagues need not fear that the Bureau of Indian Affairs will build up a huge administrative staff to handle this program. A limit of $1½ million is permitted for such purposes.

When the Indian vocational training program was established in the 84th Congress the sum of $3½ million per year was allocated to it. An increase to $7 million was made in the 87th Congress and to $12 million in the 88th Congress. Mr. Speaker, I know of no part of the Bureau of Indian Affairs operations that has borne more fruit than has this vocational training program. I strongly support the provisions of H.R. 4778.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may desire.

Mr. Speaker, the first bill I introduced when I came to Congress 15 years ago was a bill to provide a trades training and on-the-job training program for Indians, similar to the GI trades training and on-the-job training program that had been so successful in assisting the GI's to get started after their interruption in trades, professions, business and industry during the war.

Each session I reintroduced this bill. I made speeches. I met with the Commissioner of Indian Affairs and members of his staff trying to sell the idea to them. Finally in 1956 the Indian Department agreed to go along with the trades training bill and H.R. 9904, introduced by the gentleman from Oklahoma, Representative ED EDMONDSON, was passed by the House August 3, after an identical bill, S. 3416 had passed the Senate July 23, 1956.

Originally it authorized $3.5 million to carry on this program but, because the Department did not think they could spend that much, only part of this fund was appropriated. Finally, when the program got started and the Department found out that the Indians wanted to get ahead, wanted to learn a trade, wanted to learn how to live like non-Indians, wanted to learn how to earn and send their children to nonsegregated schools, wanted to build their own homes and provide for themselves, instead of having a Government bureau tell them how they could live, what they could do, how they could spend their money, and so forth, the Department came to Congress and asked for an authorization of $7 million in the 87th Congress.

Still more Indians wanted to learn trades and provide for themselves, and their families, and in the 88th Congress the Department asked for $12 million. To the law the Congress added my amendment which increased from 2 to 3 years the length of time girls who were taking nurses training could be covered by the law in order that these girls could come out with degrees as registered nurses.

The program is simply this: An Indian living on, or near an Indian reservation, who is between the ages of 18 and 36, whether single or the head of a family, makes application for trades training. After he is classified he is granted a scholarship, so to speak, a grant which need not be repaid. He goes to a trade school approved by the Department. If he is married, his family goes with him, and while he is learning his trade the family is learning to live with non-Indian people off the reservation. The wife learns that when she wants water she turns a tap instead of going to the well; when she wants lights, or heat, she turns a button instead of lighting a lamp or cutting wood. By the end of 2 years the husband is ready to take over a job in industry and the family is ready to live in a nonsegregated community.

The other half of the law, the on-the-job training program, is similar to the GI program where the Government pays part of the individual's salary until he has learned enough about the work that he can earn the salary he is being paid. Then the employee takes over full payment of the salary.

I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that each Member read the report of the committee which accompanies this bill. It is a success story if ever one has been written.

It points out that since the inception of the law, until December 31, 1964, there had been 10,040 persons entered into institutional vocational training and that of this number 1,677 were still in training and 5,576 had completed their training. It points out that 3,243 Indians had been placed in on-the-job training, learning a trade, or job, while they work.

At the present time there is a backlog of applicants for this service, of approximately 4,872 heads of families and single persons. This figure includes the number of applicants on registers at training locations who have been scheduled for training, 384; the number at training locations who are not yet scheduled for training, 846; those who have applied, but not yet processed, 969; and the number estimated to be eligible who will apply almost immediately when funds are available, 2,673.

More and more of the Indian youth are completing high school and will become available for this training in the near future and a further backlog of applicants will develop.

Mr. Speaker, this is a success story. This is a program that has proven its worth. Now, Mr. Speaker, if this Congress would only pass a law providing a tax benefit to any industry that will move to an Indian reservation and provide jobs and opportunities on the spot to these people—that program, coupled with this program would, within a very few years, put the Government out of the Indian business and solve what has been referred to down through the years as the so-called Indian problems.

Mr. Speaker, we grant tax concessions to American industrial firms that will go abroad and establish industrial plants in underdeveloped areas abroad; but—the Treasury says—we cannot afford to do the same thing to the underdeveloped peoples on Indian reservations in America. We can afford it—and we will afford it—but it will not be done until the Congress rises up and determines that the individual rights of the Indian are just as precious as the individual rights of other minority groups.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may revise and extend their remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALBERT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4778. I favor increasing the annual authorization for vocational training of Indian adults from the present $12 million to $15 million, for this program is a very effective means of opening new doors for Indian men and women by increasing their employability. It is, at the same time, an extremely popular program among the people who are eligible to participate.

Since 1958, when the program for adult vocational education was initiated, nearly 10,000 men and women have been placed in technical and skilled jobs. More than 2,000 others are now undergoing training at more than 100 private and public vocational education institutions throughout the Nation.

I have said the program is effective in achieving its goals, and popular among the people affected. Because of this, and because there is an increasing number of eligible applicants, there is a large and ever-growing backlog of applicants. Reduction of that backlog of applicants—increasing the number of persons participating in this beneficial program—can be realized through approval of the $3 million annual authorization increase proposed in H.R. 4778.

Owing to lack of funds, and to high interest in this program, there is in Alaska a backlog of applicants for adult vocational training at all times. According to Alaska's Area Director for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Mr. Robert L. Bennett, there are now 225 persons awaiting authorization of funds that would permit their entrance into this program of vocational training. I want to see their wait come to an end, and their opportunities through vocational education begin.

The importance of this program for Alaska natives has been substantial. Just as they have been eager to seek to acquire new skills, so they have been successful in acquiring them. A total of 830 persons have received training and placement in the fields of electronics, nursing, office work, drafting, auto mechanics, and more than a dozen other fields.

Thus, this program has proved to be successful and should be expanded as provided for in H.R. 4778 to more fully meet the need.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4778, a bill to increase the amounts authorized for Indian adult education under the act of August 3, 1956, as amended.

While this program has been in effect for just a short period of time at the Fort Hall Reservation in my congressional district, it has already had considerable impact. Since fiscal year 1961 through February of this year, 89 Indians from the Fort Hall Reservation have been trained for employment off the reservation, and an additional 18 will start new work lives within the next week or two.

This has been an unusually effective program, Mr. Speaker, and should not only be continued, but should be expanded.

As a member of the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I urge passage of the bill.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BERRY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to join in the support of H.R. 4778. I happen to be the sponsor of H.R. 5518, a measure similar to the one sponsored by my good friends, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HALEY] and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON].

H.R. 4778 will increase to $15 million annually the authorized ceiling for the Indian adult vocational education program.

Mr. Speaker, here is one Government effort on behalf of the Indian-Americans which has proved extremely popular not only with those who participate but also in the eyes of the general public. It has become, since its inception in 1956 as Public Law 959, a highly successful means of leading these underprivileged, untrained and unemployed people down the road to self-sufficiency.

At the present time there is a backlog of applicants numbering over 4,000, and some 846 are completely cleared for training but cannot begin because of inadequate funds. In addition, it is estimated that nearly 2,700 Indian adults would apply for training if funds were available.

Eighty-six of the persons who have completed training, which averages 11.4 months per applicant, are now in business for themselves. Eighty-three percent of those who have participated in the training program have been placed in employment, about half of them in off-reservation jobs.

The $3 million increase in authority called for in this bill will enable the Bureau of Indian Affairs to step up the program by about 20 to 25 percent. It will give more of our Indian-Americans the actual tools with which to carve out livelihoods in the outside world and it will instill in them the confidence to compete with Indian and non-Indian alike for lucrative jobs in our expanding economy.

Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better investment for the American taxpayer. The success of this program speaks for itself.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. EDMONDSON] such time as he may require.

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman of the Indian Affairs Subcommittee for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of thousands of Indians in the State of Oklahoma, I want to express appreciation to the gentleman from Florida for the leadership he has given to this most worthwhile program.

The gentleman from Florida has looked at a number of programs in the field of Indian legislation and I think he has reached the wise conclusion in which he is fully supported by the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs that this is one of the most effective programs to do what the President calls—making taxpayers out of taxeaters—that we have going in the Nation today.

I would like to call your attention to just a few facts with regard to the record of this program and to one school in the State of Oklahoma, the Oklahoma State Technical School at Okmulgee, Okla., where during the year 1963, under this program, 81 people received training as a part of this adult Indian vocational program. It is very interesting to observe just what happened to these people after they had the chance to get some vocational skills.

In a report which was submitted to my office on March 10, 1965, by the area director for the Muskogee Bureau of Indian Affairs office, it was pointed out that 29 of the Indians who received training during that year were family heads—males—who had in only one instance some permanent job prior to entrance into this training. Twenty-eight of these twenty-nine family heads were either casual laborers or farm laborers and most of them were potential welfare recipients due to their lack of skill and industrial acclimation. What happened to them once they got in and got the training is the meat of the coconut insofar as this legislation is concerned. Because 26 of the 29 completed their training and today they have steady employment as the result of acquiring vocational skills. Their starting wages when they went to work at the finish of this program ranged from $1.50 to $2.20 an hour.

Eighty-six people were included in the families of these twenty-six who were able to obtain steady employment after getting training. Today, as reported by the area office, all of these families are living in urban areas where the children have adequate education and social opportunities and take pride in seeing their fathers as wage earners. Potential welfare recipients have changed into self-sufficient individuals with a skill, who are not afraid to compete in a non-Indian society.

This happened not only with reference to family heads who were males. It happened also with respect to single men and single women who took the training.

Seven of the women who took the training were mothers who were receiving aid for dependent children, totally dependent upon society. Of these seven, five today are completely self-sufficient, requiring no payment of any kind from public funds.

The savings which have been made in aid for dependent children payments to those five mothers have more than paid the cost of the Government's investment in the training of the women who were receiving aid for dependent children.

These are only a few of the instances which show why it is very good business for us to increase the amount of allowable appropriations for this program, to make it possible for some of the approximately 5,000 Indians who today are on waiting lists waiting for an opportunity to participate in this program, unable to do so because the program funds are exhausted and the authorizations have already been equalled within the individual area offices. I know the area office in my district has a waiting list now of 125 Indians who have been waiting to get into this training for quite some time and have been unable to do so because the funds were all committed. There is no appropriation to take care of their educational needs.

I strongly support this legislation. I commend the gentleman from Florida for sponsoring it. I commend the able chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ASPINALL], for his recognition of the need for the legislation and the priority which he has given to it in the business of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, as previous speakers have said, this has been a successful program. It is a program, as the gentleman from Oklahoma describes it, which makes tax earners instead of tax eaters. I believe the program has been extremely successful.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to endorse H.R. 4778 which will increase the amount available for the Indian Vocational Training Act of 1956 from $12 to $15 million per year.

I have personally seen this program in action and am convinced that if given time and encouragement it will go a long way toward relieving the sad economic conditions on most of our Indian reservations. In Los Angeles a few years ago I saw Indian lads working side by side with their non-Indian counterparts in airplane factories and in automobile assembly plants. In Chicago, I saw them welding, operating precision equipment, and handling complicated printing machinery with all the ease and confidence that comes with skill and experience.

Our Indians with the training and on-the-job experience that can be obtained under this bill can be prepared for skilled or semiskilled tasks as well as non-Indians. Over 10,000 Indians have completed training—12-18-24 months depending on the type of job—under the 1956 act. A great many of them are now gainfully employed and are adding to the skilled labor pool. Unfortunately, Indians who are partially trained or who are newly employed are often the first to be laid off and the last to be rehired.

The training program not only prepares the breadwinner for modern employment but his wife as well. She is given assistance in adjusting herself to city living, rather than the reservation environment in which she was reared.

I am always impressed with the feeling of well-being that our trainees exhibit when they complete their programs and the pride they take in their jobs and homes.

Of course, I would not like to insinuate that there are no failures, dropouts or misfits. We have them in every society. By and large, the Indian mechanics, the plumbers, the practical nurses, and the hairdressers can compete adequately with non-Indians of similar training and experience.

I am anxious for this bill to be passed and to see the program extended to the some 5,000 applicants who have been processed and are ready for enrollment under the Indian Vocational Training Act as soon as funds are made available.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Florida that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 4778.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETURN OF OBSCENE MAIL

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 980) to provide for the return of obscene mail matter.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 980

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 51 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end of such chapter the following new section:

"§ 4009. Return of obscene mail matter

"(a) Any person may return to the Postmaster General mail matter which, in the opinion of such person, is obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile and which is addressed to and received by him or any child of his. On making such return such person may request the Postmaster General to notify the sender not to send additional such mail to him or any child of his, except mail which he has solicited. The request shall be signed by the person making it, and shall contain a statement that in his opinion the mail is obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile; also the name and date of birth of each child to whom the request pertains; and the person's residence and/or business address to which further such mail should not be sent. The Postmaster General shall promptly notify the sender of such request and the information contained therein, and direct that, effective on the thirtieth day after the date of the notice, then sender, or anyone acting on his behalf with knowledge of such notice, shall not send mail in violation of its terms. The Postmaster General's notice shall apply to a sender under any name or designation.

"(b) Whenever the Postmaster General believes that the sender or anyone acting on his behalf has violated or is violating the notice given under subsection (a) of this section, he shall serve upon the sender by registered or certified mail a complaint stating the reasons for his belief and request that any response thereto be filed in writing with the Postmaster General within fifteen days after the date of such service. If the Postmaster General, after appropriate hearing if requested by the sender, and without a hearing if such a hearing is not requested, thereafter determines that the notice given under subsection (a) has been or is being violated, he is authorized to request the Attorney General to make application, and the Attorney General is authorized to make application, to a district court of the United States for an order directing compliance with such notice.

"(c) Any district court of the United States within the jurisdiction of which any mail matter shall have been sent or received in violation of the notice provided for by subsection (a) of this section shall have jurisdiction, upon application by the Attorney General, to issue an order commanding compliance with such notice. Failure to observe such order may be punished by the court as contempt thereof.

"(d) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) Mail addressed to a specific address without designation of a specific addressee shall be considered as addressed to the head of the household at that address.

"(2) The term 'child' means an unmarried child who has not attained his nineteenth birthday, including (A) a stepchild, (B) an adopted child, and (C) a child who is the ward of, or in the custody of, the person concerned, or who is living with such person in a regular parent-child relationship.

"(e) Receipt of mail matter thirty days or more after the effective date of a notice or of a court order provided for by this section shall create a rebuttable presumption that such mail was sent after such effective date.

"(f) The Administrative Procedure Act (5 U.S.C. 1001–1011) shall not apply to any provision of this section."

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 51 of title 39, United States Code, is amended by adding

"4009. Return of obscene mail matter."

immediately below

"4008. Communist political propaganda."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Postal Operations considered a similar bill—H.R. 319—in the last Congress. The full committee voted unanimously to report H.R. 319 and the bill passed the House by a vote of 321 to 19.

In this Congress, this year, the subcommittee considered the bill again. It made some changes which I think are excellent improvements, and the bill was passed unanimously to the full committee. The full committee took it up and passed it unanimously. I certainly favor this legislation and believe it should be enacted.

Mr. Speaker, I had some opportunity to read the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations for the Post Office Department, and now I have had an opportunity to look at the report. The request of the Post Office Department for funds to be used in the Bureau of Operations was cut $278,900,000. I do not believe that the Operations Bureau can stand that cut.

In reading the testimony of the Post Office Department officials before the subcommittee, I detected a good deal of Pollyanna in their statements. I thought the testimony was nonrealistic in appraising the postal service today, and was based upon a good deal of wishful thinking of what can be accomplished in the future. It is high time for action, the hour is late, and the time is here for postal improvement.

The Appropriations Committee in its report stated that the committee feels that the solution to this problem is not to be found in additional personnel and appropriations alone, but in improved methods, equipment, and management techniques as well.

Last year, the Post Office Department cut the delivery of parcel post from 6 days to 5 days a week. At the time the cut was made, the Department was not delivering parcel post promptly and, if they could not do that in 6 days, they certainly cannot do it in 5. I have the covers from three parcels which were mailed from New York City with a destination of Elmhurst, N.Y. One of these parcels took 7 days to be delivered, one 10 days, and the third one took 13 days. You can travel from Elmhurst, N.Y., to New York City in somewhat less than one-half hour, and certainly the delivery of these parcels leaves a great deal to be desired.

I also have a piece of first-class mail which was posted in Washington, D.C., to a Des Moines, Iowa, address. It took 12 days to reach its destination.

All of the various programs that we hear of in the Post Office Department have done little or nothing to improve service. It is possible that the zip code might eventually bring about an improvement in service but presently it is costing more money than it is saving. A great deal of money is being spent in setting up the program and the zip code is not used in sorting mail, except for parcel post.

In my opinion, the Post Office Department officials should admit that the service is poor and the reason that it is poor is that there is a lack of manpower. They have hired something like 57,000 temporary employees, but they are not appointing regular employees because of appropriations and various ceilings that are imposed upon the Post Office Department.

We have a rapidly growing population in this Nation—it is anticipated that we will have a population of 200 million people in 1970. It is not necessary to tell the Members of this body that suburban areas around every large city in the Nation are growing rapidly, and that manpower is required to give proper mail service to these people.

All of the programs that are presently being talked about, including the optical scanner and other developments, are in the future. The optical scanner has not been perfected as yet and, when it is perfected, it will have limited application.

We, as members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, are aware of what is necessary to restore good postal service, and the first thing that is necessary is the appointment of sufficient regular employees to do the necessary functions of the Post Office Department—that is, preparing mail for dispatch and delivery; and collecting and delivering the mail. More manpower is sorely needed in this area, and I hope that the money for this additional personnel will be restored to the Post Office Department appropriations for the Bureau of Operations, before it is finally approved.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski].

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to serve as chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations which considered H.R. 980. The bill was reported by unanimous vote of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

A similar bill, H.R. 319, was reported unanimously by our committee last year and passed the House of Representatives by a vote of 325 to 19.

There are two significant differences between H.R. 980 and H.R. 319. The first defines the type of mail matter to be covered as "obscence, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile" in lieu of mail matter which is "morally offensive." The second difference provides greater protection of the due process for the mailer by affording him a hearing before the Postmaster General after being cited for violation of the Postmaster General's order.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to establish the principle that a parent, a patron of the postal service, has the right to be protected from receiving through the U.S. mails unsolicited mail matter which, in his opinion, is obscene.

The Post Office Department and the Department of Justice both are in full accord with and support this objective, but both have stated they cannot recommend enactment of H.R. 980.

Their position is based on their contention that the legislation is unnecessary since there is a statutory prohibition—18 U.S.C. 1461—which makes the mailing of obscene material a crime, and a statutory provision—section 307, Public Law 87–793—which affords the mail patron an opportunity to keep any particular matter out of his home when he does not desire to receive it. Also, doubts are raised on the constitutional questions in the area of freedom of speech. These doubts arise from the procedure which permits the determination of what mail is obscene to be based solely on the opinion of a private citizen without review under constitutional standards.

These are the same reasons that the Departments advanced last year. Our Committee unanimously disagreed with those positions last year. The House, by a vote of 325 to 19, disagreed with them last year. Our committee unanimously disagrees with them again this year. I hope the Members will vote for H.R. 980 today and disagree with them again.

I am not an attorney so I will leave the constitutional questions to my attorney colleagues. However, I do know that neither the constitutionally protected standards as defined under the criminal law nor the opportunities afforded a parent under section 307, Public Law 87–793, have had much effect on the curtailment of the delivery of mail matter to households, which parents, and you and I, believe constitutes obscene material.

I believe that neither the right to privacy of the home, particularly the right to keep unsolicited mail out of our mailbox, nor the right of the mailer to disseminate unsolicited and undesirable information, is absolute. I also am told that the constitutionality of legislation affecting these rights will depend on a balancing of the conflicting interests of the mailer and of the mail patron in the particular circumstances. These matters must be determined by the courts. Our decision here today should not be deterred by the inability of the Post Office Department or the Department of Justice to recommend favorably for the enactment of H.R. 980.

This legislation will insure protection for patrons of the postal service from unsolicited obscene mail matters. The standard of what is obscene is to be determined by the mail patron. This procedure will avoid the difficulties arising under existing statutes in classifying objectionable material as obscene.

It will give a person receiving mail, addressed to him or his children, which, in his opinion, is obscene, the right to return such mail to the Postmaster General and request him to notify the sender not to send additional such mail to him or to his child except mail which he has solicited. The Postmaster General shall give the sender notice of this request and inform him that after 30 days from the receipt of the notice he should not send any mail to the recipient unless it is solicited. The notice is to apply to the sender under any name or designation.

The procedure provides for a second notice with opportunity to reply within 15 days. Then if the sender continues mailing morally offensive matter to the patron, the Postmaster General after a hearing, if requested, can request the Attorney General to apply to a Federal district court for an order directing the sender to comply with the Postmaster General's directive. Failure to obey the court order could lead to punishment in the form of contempt of court.

The Post Office Department could not give the committee any estimate of the cost of administering this program. Even if it were to result in the need of additional funds for the Post Office Department, it is surely worth the extra cost in view of the substantial amount of good it will accomplish.

Mr. Speaker, there are compelling reasons why the Congress should protect American families from the forced intrusion of morally objectionable materials into their homes. I urge each and every Member of the House to join with me in supporting the principle of the sanctity of the home and in voting for H.R. 980.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, as has been stated, this legislation passed the House of Representatives overwhelmingly last year, with only 19 votes against it. I was on the Postal Operations Committee for years with the distinguished and beloved gentlewoman from Pennsylvania, Mrs. Granahan, and now under the distinguished leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski]. We have worked long and hard on this problem of obscenity. We have worked long and hard on this particular piece of legislation. There are literally millions of American mothers and fathers who are concerned about the receipt of such mail, mostly by their teenage youngsters, which is unsolicited by them.

There are many organizations throughout the country who are carrying on active campaigns against smut sent through the mails such as the Citizens for Decent Literature, which has chapters in almost every city throughout the United States.

There is a very effective organization called Operation Yorkville, in the Yorkville section of New York City. This is an interfaith group, headed by a Jesuit priest, a Rabbi Neumann of the Jewish congregation, and a Protestant minister. Just recently Cardinal Spellman, of New York City, donated $5,000 to the work of that tremendous organization.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, most of the mail we are after in this legislation goes to teenagers. This is in line with President Johnson's message to us on crime and juvenile delinquency, because we have had testimony from people throughout the United States—doctors, psychiatrists, and others—that proves that juvenile delinquency and crime are definitely linked with this type of material.

The purpose of this legislation is to say to a person who sends it into my home, to me or my minor child, "We don't want any of this smut sent into our home." This is based on old English common law that a man's home is his castle and therefore it is my parental right not to have my privacy invaded. It is just the same as though my 14-year-old daughter were watching a horror movie on television; I have the right, as her parent, to ask her to turn to another channel because it is not good for her 14-year-old mind to watch that type of program.

We are only saying we do not want our home and our privacy invaded by this type of smut that is flowing through the mails uninvited.

This racket is a tremendous operation. This is a couple of billion dollars business. There are millions and millions of pieces of this mail that are going to our younger people and also to adults.

Mr. Speaker, the Post Office Department's legal staff and the Department of Justice legal staff recognize the need for this legislation. They have some questions as to due process and so forth; but we have worked with the Department of Justice attorneys and others, as well as a firm of constitutional lawyers, and every protection is built into this piece of legislation.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we feel that we have a much needed piece of legislation that is designed to protect the privacy of our home and it would do this in this manner: If we receive or our minor children receive a piece of this foul material—and I have a whole packet here which represents just samples and if any Member wants to see it I shall be glad for you to see it, but I would not dare put it in the Record—but if this comes into your home for you or for your minor child and is unsolicited, you have a right to say to the Postmaster General, "I want my name or the name of my child taken off that mailing list." If the mailer continues to send it, eventually he can be held in contempt of court.

Mr. Speaker, this racket represents a tremendous business which is referred to as the "list broker business." I have gone around the country as a member of the committee and have urged fathers and mothers not to allow their children to send in for anything because once they send in for a legitimate article, that company to whom they sent for this legitimate article, in order to pick up some pocket change, will sell the list of such names to a list broker who, in turn, will sell or rent it for profit to a list broker.

Mr. Speaker, these people go around the country to high schools and colleges and, yes, even to grade schools and obtain lists of these young people. This is where they get many of the names of these youngsters. This is where they secure their mailing lists, and the names on these lists run up into the millions.

Mr. Speaker, there are statutes on the books as to nonmailable matter. This piece of legislation comes under the category of nonmailable matter. For example, you cannot send heroin through the mail. Heroin or any type or form of narcotics of that nature destroys the body. This type of material about which we are talking today is the type of material that destroys the mind.

So, Mr. Speaker, the form of this legislation is nothing new. We have precedents where much of this material is categorized as nonmailable.

The Members will notice on page 9 of the committee report various types of mail that is considered nonmailable.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, that our beloved and highly respected Speaker of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCormack], is very much interested in this legislation. In a letter to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski], chairman of the subcommittee, under date of March 22, he asked that this legislation come before us today for a favorable vote.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to congratulate him as a Christian man. He believes in the sanctity of the home and he does not want the privacy of the American home invaded. He is deeply interested in the young people of America.

So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that we will pass this legislation overwhelmingly, because the courts cannot agree among themselves as to the definition of "obscenity." Therefore, we have to take another approach and decide for ourselves.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation would allow me or you as a father to determine in our own minds whether or not this obscene, lascivious, lewd material, if it comes into your home or mine, constitutes an invasion of our privacy and I and you have a right to determine whether we want it dumped into our homes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I certainly compliment the gentleman from Nebraska on his statement and for all of the evangelical work which he has done on this subject. The gentleman was instrumental in preventing the spread of Communist information through the mail.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman has said here and particularly his statement that groups are meeting to work with the chairman of the committee and the subcommittee and the speaker now in the well of the House about this matter.

I know the gentleman will recall that a former Member of this body who now and did at that time reside in my hometown, of Springfield, Mo., the Honorable—and former Congressman—O. K. Armstrong, has just in the last 2 weeks presided at a meeting dealing with this subject and their findings have been printed in the Record on this side and the other body dealing with their reports, resolutions, and other related matters.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly associate myself with this and intend again, as I did in the last session of the last Congress, to support this bill and I hope it will pass overwhelmingly through the House of Representatives.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri. The meeting to which he referred was held last week on the Senate side. There were 300 people in attendance representing 300 organizations that are in favor of strong legislation to combat the cesspool racket.

I might say to those who might think otherwise that this is absolutely, positively, noncensorship and does not constitute any violation of freedom of speech. When I tell my little daughter to turn from channel X because there is a horror movie on there, that is my parental responsibility. Surely that is not censorship but it is the duty of a father or mother on behalf of their children's well-being.

This has absolutely nothing to do with freedom of speech because we do not try to tell our neighbor whether he should receive this or not. We only determine that we, you and I, do not want it in our homes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. I used to have a good deal to do with these matters. May I ask the gentleman whether he knows if these magazines, pamphlets, and so forth, are using young people, as they used to do, to write the stories, get their imaginations going in very wild directions?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. In answer to the gentlewoman from Ohio, I would say definitely "Yes."

Mrs. BOLTON. I think it is one of the most shocking situations that exists. We have been having it, to my knowledge, for over 30 years. Why cannot groups like our own stop these things?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. That is a long story, and my time would not permit an answer, but I should like to discuss it with the gentlewoman at any time.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to rise in support of this legislation, and to indicate my gratitude and compliment the gentleman from Nebraska, and the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Dulski, and all of the members of that committee, for bringing before us a bill that hopefully will meet the objections that have been made in the past, because in this body we do not have any more consistent objections from our constituents than on this matter. It has been a long, hard fight. All of the members of the committee will agree we should get together on legislation that is needed. We know that the parents throughout this country have been trying to put forth the effort that is needed to close the legal loopholes in an effort to answer those who have been asking for help, the mothers and fathers of this Nation.

I congratulate the gentleman for bringing this bill to the floor for consideration today.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman and the members of the committee on this legislation. I had an opportunity to participate in this conference last week of the National Evangelical Association. We know this is an important step in support of and on behalf of the young people and the homes and families of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, the opportunities for this Congress to do something constructive in behalf of the moral growth and development of our young people are necessarily limited. The basic job of building character and good habits in the boys and girls of America must occur in the homes, schools, and churches of the 50 States.

However, this measure (H.R. 980) enables families to protect themselves from immoral and indecent influences arising outside their homes, but which invade their homes through the mails.

The establishment and operation of the U.S. Post Office Department are the particular prerogatives of the Federal Government. Accordingly, it is highly appropriate that this Congress should declare what procedures the Post Office should follow with respect to obscene, lewd, and indecent mail matter as provided in this bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his dedicated work in this matter over a long period of time, also the gentleman from New York, Mr. DULSKI, and the members of the subcommittee. I wholeheartedly support this legislation. All who are concerned with the moral welfare of our country owe a debt of gratitude to this committee for devising a method whereby Americans can protect themselves against the unwanted invasion of the privacy of their homes by obscene literature.

This is a bill which recognizes rather than limits the rights of American citizens, it supports the right of parents to protect their children against an immoral and reprehensible influence. It shows recognition of the sanctity of the home. It underlies an individual citizen's right to privacy, and protects him against invasions of his private property in the form of illicit and immoral mail.

All thoughtful Americans are concerned about the signs of moral decay in our country—about the rising crime rate and increasing juvenile delinquency. We must, therefore, address ourselves to the contributing influences to such moral decline. Obscene literature sent through the mails is certainly one such influence. I congratulate Mr. CUNNINGHAM and the committee for framing legislation which should serve to effectively combat a singularly insidious and evil force in our society.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to add my congratulations to all members of the subcommittee for the leadership they have shown in this area, particularly the efforts made by our colleague, the gentleman from Nebraska. I commend him, and I want to associate myself with the remarks he has made.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 980. This bill, as reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, is similar to legislation I have introduced, H.R. 4943, and closely parallels legislation which the House passed by a 325 to 19 vote last year. In addition, it gives an opportunity for senders of mail deemed "obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy or vile" to have an appropriate hearing before subsequent mailings to the objecting recipient are halted by the Postmaster General.

As I told the committee during its recent hearings on this legislation, I feel that a problem exists here which must be solved if the public is to be protected from the use of the U.S. mails to bombard American homes and youth with obscene mail. In addition, I feel that this bill meets the problem by allowing the individual the right to determine what is morally offensive mail and what, by his own standards, constitutes damaging moral influence over his children and his household.

This legislation accomplishes this by a very simple procedure—if any person finds that he or his children are receiving mail which in his opinion is obscene or vile, he merely asks the Postmaster General to notify the sender, "I don't want any more of this trash sent to me by this firm." Once this notice is passed on to the company or individual sending this mail, he must not send any more mailings to this individual or family, beginning 30 days after the receipt of the notice. If necessary, a hearing would be held. In any event, this procedure seems the most appropriate method to stop offensive mailings to Americans without violating the rights of any individual or group of individuals.

I commend the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for reporting this legislation favorably, and I urge its passage by the House of Representatives in order to give every recipient of the U.S. mails the right to protect his privacy and that of his children against mail which in his opinion is obscene.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I might say that this legislation is the product of all of the members of the subcommittee and the full committee of the House of Representatives.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. REINECKE. Mr. Speaker, we are told by the administration's representatives that there are adequate existing laws to protect a man and his children against this vile, obscene matter. If this is true, then why is the obscene mail traffic at an all time high? Why not allow the head of his family decide for his own family that which is offensive to him? This bill does not violate the freedom of speech or press—it violates no right of anyone else—it simply allows a man to refuse his family to be exposed to a moral level which he deems inadvisable. I ask my colleagues to vote for this legislation to help stop a flagrant example of moral decay.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. MOELLER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to rise in support of the legislation and commend the subcommittee for its activities in this direction.

I would like to ask the gentleman from Nebraska just what has happened to legislation enacted by this body in the past with respect to use of our mail for these obscene pieces of literature, and so forth. Can we not write some kind of legislation to break this up?

Why does one have to send this back when it should not have come to us in the first place?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I will tell the gentleman what the trouble is: The courts have not been able to decide among themselves what is obscene and what is not. It is the adult mind that makes that decision, and that is the reason we have to get around it and let the parents make the decision.

Mr. MOELLER. This bill will provide that opportunity?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. It will.

Mr. MOELLER. I think every right-thinking citizen should support this legislation.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DANIELS], who sponsored the bill H.R. 4241, a bill identical to H.R. 980, be permitted to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DANIELS. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in supporting H.R. 980. I sponsored an identical bill, H.R. 4241. This legislation is the fifth in a series of legislative improvements in the postal and criminal statutes developed by the Postal Operations Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service to aid in keeping obscenity and other unfit matter out of the U.S. mails.

The earlier measures encountered substantially the same degree of opposition that has occurred during the consideration of H.R. 980. They have long since proved their value to the postal service and to the public. You may be interested to read the discussion concerning these measures as summarized in House Report No. 219 accompanying H.R. 980.

The need for this legislation is obvious. Recognized authorities presented overwhelming evidence to our subcommittee that a multimillion-dollar traffic in obscene and immoral products is still growing with much of it directed to the debasement of the morals of the very young and impressionable. This undesirable traffic continues to increase in spite of the increased and successful efforts of the Post Office Department and the Department of Justice in prosecuting the purveyors of this undesirable material under the postal and penal laws.

The efforts under the existing laws are limited to the small area of material that comes within the legal definition of obscenity. That definition is—whether to the average person, applying contemporary community standards, the dominant theme of the material taken as a whole appeals to prurient interests. Of equal or greater damage, particularly to children, is the immoral and suggestive matter which under court decisions does not stand the test of that standard.

This legislation proposes a workable solution to stop obscene material from being delivered to any person's mailbox. It will allow any person to return to the Postmaster General mail which, in his opinion, is obscene and which is addressed to and received by him or his child. The Postmaster General will be required to notify the distributor to discontinue sending mail to him unless it is solicited. The legislation also prescribes a method of having the notice from the Postmaster General enforced by a court order if necessary.

The opponents of this legislation claim that it makes everybody a censor, that it tends to infringe on the constitutionally protected right of freedom of speech, and that it infringes on the constitutional right of due process.

There certainly can be no legitimate basis for the cry of censorship. The restriction under this legislation resulting from a request of a postal patron, at most, would apply to one addressee or to one family. There is no restriction whatever on the right of the public to have access to the material involved. The right of the public to receive the material remains inviolate. Under these circumstances there is no justification for contending that there would be censorship under this legislation.

The constitutional rights of freedom of the press and due process of law are always cited in opposition to proposed controls over offensive matter in the U.S. mails. These rights have not been overlooked. On the contrary, the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and our subcommittee which considered this legislation have thoroughly scrutinized all aspects of the rights and liberties involved. We have analyzed the merits of each right in relation to the others with the greatest of care.

It is hard to believe that a prohibition to send mail matter to one person or one family, such as contemplated by this legislation, will violate the constitutionally guaranteed freedom of speech. Even if there is some degree of restriction, we are faced with a question whether the right of privacy of an addressee would balance the right of the distributor of freedom of speech or the right to distribute the mail matter to that particular addressee.

The constitutional right of due process is intended to be protected by the hearing before the Postmaster General if requested and the requirement for action by the Court in contempt proceedings before the mailer is subject to any penalty.

Mr. Speaker, any questions on these matters are for the courts to decide. The need for a more effective tool to protect the right of a person to keep morally offensive material out of his mailbox far outweighs any assumption or threat of the proposal being unconstitutional.

This legislation in my opinion should have the highest priority. I earnestly hope it will have your approval.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. UDALL].

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I congratulate the authors of the bill and the committee which reported it. They have come up with legislation which promises to curtail the distribution of obscene literature without threat of thought control.

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. KING of Utah. I, too, express my strong support of the anti-pornography measure now before the House. I know, during my practice of the law, the feeling of outrage and frustration I have felt when pornographic literature would come into my office unsolicited, presumably because my name was found on some professional list. I have felt for many years that something should be, and must be, done to guard against this outrageous infringement upon the right of privacy. I commend the gentleman for what he has done.

The muck merchants are doing a billion dollar a year business in this country.

Some of their trash has come to my own mailbox at home. Perhaps some of you have received the same.

I do not like it. In fact, I am enraged. The thought of such filth falling into young hands, to prey upon immature minds, fills me with revulsion.

The muck is the product of warped, diseased minds. Were it not for the abundant evidence of their work, it would be hard to believe that such minds existed—depraved, sinister creatures, consumed in the hellish game of concocting obscenity and pornography, to prey upon young minds and emotions for a fast buck.

The real price of their racket can hardly be measured in dollars. Tens of thousands of young minds are, in fact, polluted by their trash every year. The injury they are inflicting upon the moral stamina of our people is beyond calculation.

As I voice my support of this legislation, H.R. 980, I recognize that there are potential dangers in it.

But the dangers which the muck merchants pose to our way of life are, in my judgment, infinitely more grave.

The damages they are raining upon our society have been clearly documented. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, has repeatedly declared that the traffic in obscenity and pornography is a key factor in the alarming rise of delinquency throughout the Nation.

Many experts have confirmed his judgment.

The dangers which critics see in this legislation can be remedied, if in fact the dangers materialize at all.

What is significant is that the bill offers a remedy to the larger and very real dangers of obscenity and pornography.

This bill gives the private citizen a very specific remedy when the muck merchants attempt to invade his home through the mailbox.

He would no longer have to stand by and wring his hands, wondering how he might combat such an invasion. Under this bill he can easily take steps to rid himself of the unwanted literature: he can ask the post office to return the muck to its sender; and he can also ask the post office to send a notice to the sender insisting that his name be removed from the mailing list so that he will not receive like materials again.

I am very pleased to see the Congress take this action to reaffirm the fundamental right of the citizen to privacy and refuge within his home. A man's home is his castle.

To give him the right to reject and return obscene materials aimed at corrupting his family is a step in the right direction.

I praise the Postal Operations Subcommittee for its work on this bill. I appreciate the determination and the courage it has shown in attempting to strengthen the private citizen's defenses against a grave and insidious menace.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. WAGGONNER. I want to commend the gentleman from Arizona as well as the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI], the chairman of the subcommittee, and the other members of the subcommittee and the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for bringing to this House this much needed legislation, which will remove from the mail all obscene literature. It is the responsibility of Congress. We are happy to support the committee in their efforts to protect the children of our country from this type of literature.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. I congratulate the gentleman for bringing this matter to the House.

An effective ban against obscene mail is something all Americans desire and deserve. This legislation will provide the necessary remedy to insure that patrons who receive obscene mail will not continue to receive the same mail even after refusing acceptance. The provisions of the bill allow a person who has received such obscene correspondence to ask the Postmaster General to notify the sender to send no more mail to the patron or a child of the patron. If this request is not carried out the Postmaster General may go as far as securing appropriate court relief to insure that his request is complied with.

This is a necessary provision for any effective legislation on this subject, for the type of individual who engages in these activities will not respond to idle threats. He must be aware of an effective prohibition which could result in legal action against him. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this legislation.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FISHER. I share the support expressed here for this much needed legislation, and also commend the committee for supporting it and giving us another chance to vote on it.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to give every person a means to prevent the forced entry into his home, or into the hands of his children, of mail matter which in his opinion is obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile.

While this will serve an urgent purpose, more needs to be done in the area of lascivious literature. This Congress has enacted laws several times, designed to close the loopholes that protect those who traffic in such filth. But the courts have made it difficult to obtain proper enforcement, making it necessary that the Congress do more.

I recently introduced H.R. 2968 which would impose heavy penalties on those who would send such matter through the mails or through express services or other common carrier. While we already have laws against this traffic, my proposal is intended to strengthen existing laws and improve their enforcement.

In addition, there would seem to be a need for stronger State laws against intrastate traffic and sales of obsence matter that cannot be reached by the Congress which is limited to the mails or interstate traffic. There is an urgent need for a nationwide drive against this practice. Newsstands are filled with the type of literature I am referring to. Every possible step must be taken to control the publication, movement, and sale of this degrading material.

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I want to address my remarks to some of my friends, particularly on the Democratic side, who have fought with me past battles for civil liberties. I have worked on this and similar bills over the last few years, and I rise in support of it. This is a reasonable, moderate bill, one that anybody can support who believes in civil liberties.

In the past the statutes the Congress has enacted have nearly all given to some public official, the postmasters, the Custom Service, or someone in Government, the task of determining what is or is not obscene. These statutes have brought about long battles in the courts; and administration of any such law has been hampered by legal confusion with one court saying this book is and another court saying this book is not obscene.

We have attempted in this legislation to make an end run around all of these controversies, by enabling the individual citizen who is concerned about pornography to do something about it himself, and to censor his own mail without giving anyone else the right to censor his mail or giving him the right to censor your mail or anyone else's mail.

This is the way this bill would work and this is why we think it is reasonable. Suppose you receive some mail or a minor child of yours receives some mail which is an advertisement for pornographic materials or something that you consider offensive. You write to the Postmaster General on a form and you say that you have received some lewd, vile, and obscene mail from a particular source and you ask that your name be taken off that mailing list. If your name is taken off the list that is all there is is to it. The mailer is required to do this. If you are not taken off the list and subsequently receive from the same mailer another item of the same character, you can complain to the Postmaster General and he will then hold a hearing to determine whether or not the mail was sent the second time in violation of your request to get off the mailing list. Following this, if it appears that the mailer is not removing people from his mailing list when they want to get off, then the Postmaster General requests the Attorney General of the United States to file an action against the offending mailer. The Attorney General—and he has the discretion—he can avoid situations where some crank might consider something pornographic or offensive that you and I and most people would not consider to be offensive—he can then file if he sees fit an application for an injunction. The final and ultimate weapon here is not prosecution or criminal sanctions or trial by jury and so on—things that we have tried in the past with all of the difficulties that those procedures entail. The final and ultimate weapon here is a court order and an injunction to take people off the mailing list who want to get off the mailing list. So I say this is a reasonable bill and a moderate bill. It is a bill that can command widespread support and should have widespread support here in the House.

Mr. LANDRUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LANDRUM. I have a question with regard to minors receiving such mail, their names being on lists from which these minors might want their names removed. Is it necessary for the parent of the minor to request removal or could the minor himself or herself request the removal of his or her name and have the same protection?

Mr. UDALL. It is my understanding that under the bill this minor child himself can do so and in addition to that the parent can and we give the parent the right to protect the minor child by requesting that the minor's name be taken off the list.

Mr. LANDRUM. And following this request by the parent or the minor child, the procedures would be in effect that the gentleman just described?

Mr. UDALL. Precisely, that is my understanding.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POOL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to associate myself with the efforts of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] and my other colleagues who wish to eliminate pornography from the U.S. mails. The measure sponsored by Mr. CUNNINGAM, H.R. 980, attacks the problem of obscenity in the mails in a responsible and direct manner. This measure would allow the recipient of such mail to inform the Postmaster General that he has received an "obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile" piece of mail and request that his name be removed from the sender's mailing list. If the sender fails to honor this request, the recipient may then file a statement with the Postmaster General noting this fact.

Further steps may be taken in the form of a hearing for the offender before the Postmaster General and if he determines that the mailed material comes within the terms of this legislation, the case would be referred to the Attorney General for further action.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain that all legitimate businessmen who are engaged in the sales of goods and services through the medium of direct mail recognize the moral danger involved in the distribution of unsolicited pornographic material. I have received the further assurance of the author of this measure that it poses no threat to the legitimate mailer.

I do not propose that, through the enactment of this measure, we as parents and community leaders abandon our responsibility to the moral strengthening of our young people. Rather we may use this measure as one more tool to combat the wave of obscene and lascivious matter that threatens our Nation and which rightly alarms church and educational leaders.

My support of this measure, Mr. Speaker, is based on the appeal of Americans who seek some method of keeping their mailboxes free of unsolicited obscenity. I believe we must take steps to halt the nefarious circulation of such material and take these steps in such a way that legitimate interests are not endangered. Mr. Cunningham's bill, I believe, affords us this opportunity. Certainly no legitimate mailer wishes to have his business fraternity blackened by the actions of smut peddlers and the measure which Mr. CUNNINGHAM has proposed goes directly to the heart of the problem. The record on this measure has made it clear that its purpose is not to encourage mischievous harassment, and I want it made perfectly clear also that proper salesmanship has my defense at all times.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 980 provides us a method to deal with an increasingly dangerous nationwide problem through responsible and direct methods, and I urge the support of all my colleagues.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. GATHINGS. I am grateful to the gentleman for his fine presentation as well as the presentation of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] who spoke just a few minutes ago. I like this approach very much. I have had this objectionable material come to my home and I have turned it over to the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. I was chairman of a Select Committee on Current Pornographic Materials in 1952. We held extensive hearings on this subject. Since that time quite a lot of work has been done by the gentlemen's committee in drafting and presenting remedial legislation. I approve wholeheartedly of this legislation and again want to thank the gentleman for his very fine presentation.

As a matter of fact, this is big business, the mailing out and sale of this material to these young people. What is behind this distribution of filth is a desire to make money irrespective of the effect such materials may have upon the youth in the formative years of their lives.

Mr. UDALL. And I might add it is a very profitable business.

Mr. GATHINGS. It is gigantic operations in this country and it amounts to a demoralization of our people for profit.

Mr. UDALL. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY].

Mr. LINDSAY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I dislike being the one voice so far raising some questions about this bill, but I believe it must be done for the sake of proper debate, honesty, and completeness.

First, it should be noted for this record, which it has not been so far, that the Attorney General has stated about this bill, as he did with respect to its predecessor, that it raises grave constitutional questions. Second, the Postmaster General stated that the procedures and requirements of this bill are "incapable of handling."

As the Attorney General pointed out, this bill would give the recipient of mail the right to trigger off a Justice Department action against a sender of mail. Once having done that, there would be a blanket prohibition against the sender. As the Attorney General points out, the language "additional such mail" would in effect mean a blanket prohibition. The subsequent mailing, just as the original, will be judged solely by the recipient, even though the sender acted in good faith.

Under this bill, works by Chaucer or Hawthorne or a Congressman's newsletters could be judged "indecent" by the recipient and that would decide it once and for all. Neither the Attorney General, nor the Postmaster General, nor a court would have the right to question this simple subjective judgment.

All a receiver will have to do is to say that a piece of mail he has been sent is indecent. That is a subjective test, not challenged by anyone—not by the Post Office, not by the Attorney General, not by the sender, not by anyone else.

This will give the recipient the power to trigger off an action by the Attorney General against the most innocent sender.

I should like to point out to Members that under existing law all a recipient has to do is to put "refused" on an envelope, and back it will go.

If a receiver or a recipient does that, then he is doing, in effect, the same thing as the bill would provide, but not getting into this tricky, difficult, dangerous area of prior censorship.

I remind Members that their newsletters could be subject to this bill.

Mailers of every kind of legitimate material could be subject to this bill.

I do believe, in view of the constitutional questions raised by the Attorney General, we should think twice before throwing out the baby along with the dirty bath water.

Heaven knows that I believe in whatever measures are necessary to see to it that the minds of the young, of our children, are not corrupted. But I believe also we must be sensible and must understand that we should not take steps which will set up machinery completely unworkable, as the Postmaster General says, or which cannot stand constitutional tests, as the Attorney General says.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINDSAY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman made two statements which I respectfully suggest are in error.

This has nothing to do with a newsletter. I do not believe any Member of this House would send out an obscene or lascivious newsletter.

Mr. LINDSAY. No; but the gentleman understands that all the recipient of the mail has to do is to say that it is obscene or indecent.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Oh, no. The gentleman has not studied the report.

Mr. LINDSAY. I have studied the bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman should read the report.

Mr. LINDSAY. I have read the report.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. There is chance for a "crank" to make such a complaint, but there would be a hearing before the Postmaster General before he would proceed and he could determine the complaint to be from a "crank."

I say further that the present procedure in the Post Office Department is a farce.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, I respectfully decline to yield further, because I have only 1 minute remaining.

It has been carefully pointed out in the letters of the Attorney General and of the Postmaster General that the hearing before the Postmaster General can prove nothing, because the subject of obscenity cannot be tested. The Postmaster General must accept the receiver's definition of what is indecent, and he is stuck with that definition.

Let the record be clear.

I believe the gentleman has worked hard and diligently, but we at least must know what we are doing before we vote on a bill of this importance and sensitivity.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. Zablocki].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as one who for many years has been searching for a way to cope with the rising tide of mail-order pornography, I wish to state my position on the legislation before us today, H.R. 980.

I commend the chairman of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Dulski], and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham], the author of H.R. 980 for their sincerity in attempting to prevent the forced and unwanted obscene, indecent, and filthy materials from entry into our homes and into the hands of children.

As you know, I too have introduced a bill designed to assist in the elimination of obscene and pornographic materials from the mails. My proposal, H.R. 3027, the result of some 18 months study of the problem, would require persons who buy or sell mailing lists in the course of their business to register certain information on their operations at least once a year with the Postmaster General. Mailing lists buyers, sellers and users also would be required to keep records of their transaction which postal authorities could see upon request.

Although the bill had been prepared for introduction late in the 88th Congress, I deliberately withheld it pending the result of congressional action on a measure identical to the one which we consider today. The bill in the 88th Congress, H.R. 319, like the one before us today, was sponsored by the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham]. It passed the House but was never acted upon by the Senate and died at the end of the 88th Congress.

The proposal embodied in H.R. 319 and H.R. 980, would allow a postal patron to return to the Post Office Department any unsolicited mailings which he found morally offensive. Whereupon the Post Office would notify the sender that no further mail should go to that postal patron or his children under pain of court action.

It is my belief that this measure needs drastic revision if it is to accomplish the purpose for which it is intended. There is no doubt that only the highest of motives and the best of intentions have occasioned the introduction of the bill, and its approval by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

Nevertheless, I have some substantial doubts about the administrative feasibility of the bill and its potential effectiveness in solving a grave and disturbing problem.

Unfortunately the bill comes to us today under procedures which make it impossible to amend it on the floor of the House. Thus, the possibility of strengthening its provisions is precluded.

It would, of course, be possible to submit a motion to recommit the bill to committee with instructions. To do so would, I fear, be misinterpreted as an attempt to kill the bill, since recommital is often used for just such a purpose.

For these reasons I sincerely regret that this bill did not come to us under a rule. In that way it could have been debated at greater length and improved by amendments.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly support the Cunningham proposal. The problem of mail-order pornography is of such magnitude that some action by Congress is necessary—even if that action is less than satisfactory.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize to my colleagues that if this bill, H.R. 980, is buried in the other body, a new approach must be devised in the next Congress. We must not repeat a similar exercise. The problem is too pressing to allow further delays.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I would like to advise my colleague that the Committee on Education and Labor has under consideration now a proposal which I introduced to set up a commission which would go into all of the aspects of this problem. There are deep constitutional problems involved, and we are working on them and hope to bring this legislation before the House.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that the other body did not bury this bill. I had a conference with Senator Monroney who was very sympathetic to this legislation, but our bill did not get over there until last July and they did not have the time to consider the legislation.

I might say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Pucinski] that for 4 years I and other Members of this body have had before his Committee on Education and Labor a bill to set up a commission to study this overall problem. I hope this will eventually come about, but this is a two-headed problem. We are talking now only about what goes through the mail. There is another tremendous problem with regard to what does not go through the mail. I think the President is giving this serious consideration and has held out hope for such legislation, which is in both the House and Senate committees.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. Don H. Clausen].

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 980 by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham]. The problem of lewd and obscene literature being distributed through the mails continues to chip away at the moral fiber of this Nation. I am pleased to hear the Speaker has added his endorsement to the bill and I sincerely compliment him for this attitude.

Recently the committee of which I am a member, Public Works, unanimously passed a water pollution bill designed to provide incentives to improve the water quality in the various States of the Nation. In effect, we are attempting to motivate people to clean up the streams of the Nation to protect the beauty and health of our people.

I think we have a similar opportunity in this bill to clean up the mails being distributed to many of our young people. Without question, this will not resolve the problem but it is at least a step in the right direction and I commend the committee for its action. I hope the bill passes overwhelming. In this way we can demonstrate by deed that the Members of Congress representing the American people are firmly committed to oppose the peddlers of pornography.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Cahill].

Mr. CAHILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 980. American homes have been flooded for many years with unwanted and harmful mail matter which, in my judgment, fits the most liberal definitions of "obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, and vile."

I have been seeking in the 7 years that I have served in the House of Representatives to find some legislative method of preventing this unwanted filth from being delivered to the homes of Americans and being exposed to the eyes and imaginations of the youth of our country. My own home has been no exception from this deluge of filth. I have written the Postmaster on many occasions complaining. The only answer I ever get is "We can't do anything about it."

While I do not agree with the Supreme Court decision, I know that it is the law of the land and that it is, therefore, difficult for our postal authorities to enforce any code of morality in making a determination as to who shall use the mails. I recognize that we as a legislative body must provide the postal authorities with the legal authority to prevent this type of pornographic reading material from being delivered to the homes of our citizens. While the bill under discussion has certain weaknesses and while it does not get the job done that all of us would like to see accomplished, it is, nevertheless, a step in the right direction. It is an aid to the parents of this country. It can help the children of this country.

This bill at least gives the parents of America the right to stop a mailer from delivering unwanted reading material to their home. It gives the parents and the children some remedy to prevent this continuing abuse. I find it difficult to understand how anyone, for the purpose of making money can cater to the baser instincts existing in all of us, particularly, when the person involved must know that the material comes into the hands of youngsters and that it must have as its effect, a corruption of these youthful minds. It is for this reason that I believe that bill should pass the House, the Senate, and be signed by the President. While it may be difficult to implement and while it leaves more to be desired, it is not, in my judgment, violative of any constitutional right, it does not provide for any censorship except that which properly belongs to a mother and father and it is an indication of the deep concern that all of us in the House have concerning the increasing deluge of this type of material that is being delivered through the postal service of this country to the homes of our citizens.

I hope the committee will continue its efforts to find way and means to improve this legislation to the end that the day will come when all of this indecent, obscene, and lewd reading material will be removed from the mails and from the homes of Americans.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to my dear friend from Illinois [Mr. O'Hara].

Mr. O.HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the measure authored by the distinguished and able gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. Cunningham]. I regard it as the most meritorious legislation that has been proposed at this session of Congress in an area that should be sacred to our interest, the protection of the loved ones in our homes from the unwanted and uninvited burglars of indecency and dispoilers of chastity that sneak into the intimacy of our family circles under cover of the mails.

Mr. Speaker, I have built during a long lifetime a reputation as a liberal. As a liberal, I am banking that reputation on my support of this bill. There is not one iota of censorship. If there were anything in this bill authorizing the Government or indeed anyone to pass upon what other people should or should not read or write or circulate there might be some basis for the questioning by liberal sources. But what is proposed here is an entirely different approach in the fight against indecency and the infiltration into our homes of printed matter so dirty and so vile that it cannot be read aloud in this Chamber. All that this bill does is to give the heads of American homes the means of saying what shall not be sneaked in the mails into the hands and before the eyes of the members of their own families, including the children. It does not give any person the right or the means of telling another what shall be excluded from his home. As I have said, and as the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. Udall] has so clearly and convincingly explained, there is not an iota of censorship.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. Lindsay] has suggested that this measure, if enacted into law, could interfere with the communication of Congressmen with their constitutents. I think this is a bit farfetched, but if a constituent does not wish to receive mail from his Congressman whether it is pure as the driven snow or offensive to the recipient for political, moral, or any other reason, I see no reason why he should be forced to receive it.

I commend the chairman and the members of the subcommittee for a good job well and skillfully done in a delicate and difficult field. It is based upon the long established and recognized right of the American to protect his own home. This right it extends to cover intruders upon the peace and security of his home who come by mail, as well as those who uninvited, crowd through the window.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. Edwards].

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill. In the first place I object to a bill of this significance being brought before the House under the procedure of the suspension of the rules that provides for only 30 minutes of debate. A bill involving freedom of speech and the censorship of the mails should first go to the Rules Committee and arrangements provided for a full-scale debate.

I point out that the Post Office and Civil Service Committee asked for opinions on this bill from both the Justice Department and the Post Office Department. The Justice Department opposes the legislation on constitutional grounds as contrary to the freedom of speech guarantee of the first amendment and the right to due process.

The Post Office Department opposes the bill on the grounds "of grave constitutional questions in the area of freedom of speech," and also because there are existing laws that protect homeowners from obscene mail.

This is Public Law 87–793, No. 307, approved October 11, 1963, as follows:

> Any person may file a written request with his local post office to detain obscene, lewd, lascivious or indecent matter addressed to him and the Postmaster General shall detain and dispose of such matter for such period as the request is in effect.

As Mr. Lawrence Speiser, director, Washington chapter, American Civil Liberties Union, pointed out in his letter of March 31, 1965, to the chairman of the subcommittee:

> It could have a paralyzing effect on the public dialog on the most important issues of our day. To a segregationist, literature of the NAACP or of CORE might, indeed, be obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy or vile, and such a person could effectively demand the stoppage of mailings to him by such organizations of materials which are clearly protected by the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, for myself and for every throughtful parent in the district I am privileged to represent, I commend the Post Office and Civil Service Committee, and in particular the gentleman from Nebraska, for bringing this meaningful measure to the floor for our consideration today.

As the author of other legislation to control the mailing of obscene matter, I am pleased to see this further step to protect our citizens and their children from the unsolicited receipt of objectionable material through the mails. Under the terms of this bill, the citizen's right to protect himself and his children from moral debasement is spelled out. No constitutional rights are abridged for the right of the individual to mail an item to another individual is legally and morally balanced by the right of the intended recipient to forbid entry into the privacy of his home of any unsolicited matter which he considers degrading, lewd, or lascivious. With this bill, we have the ounce of prevention to stop the commerce in obscenity before it blights impressionable young minds.

Our dedicated postal workers find themselves involuntarily involved in this reprehensible traffic in pornography and it was a disappointment to me that the chief administrative officer of that executive agency has chosen to oppose this legislation.

I intend to vote for H.R. 980 under the conviction that it is necessary, fair, constitutionally sound, obviously workable, and morally essential.

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the House has an opportunity today to take a constitutional and necessary step to stanch the flow of pornography through the mails. There is nothing in this bill that offends the guarantee of freedom of speech and publication of the first amendment. I believe that I can hold my own with most civil libertarians, and I find nothing in H.R. 980 that offends me. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that this bill will stop much that does offend me.

Many of us, I am sure, have been the recipients of some of the filth that comes uninvited through the mails into our homes. Freedom of speech involves the right to speak one's thoughts and to publish them. Nothing in this legislation prevents speech or publication.

Each of us also possesses a right to privacy. A right to exclude from our homes materials which offends us. It is this right that H.R. 980 seeks to protect. I intend to support this bill and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, permit me to congratulate our colleague from Nebraska for his untiring efforts to have enacted legislation which would put a crimp in the operations of those who are selling pornography through the U.S. mails. With the help of Speaker McCORMACK, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], and the House Post Office Committee have been able to expedite hearings on H.R. 980 and to bring before this body today a piece of legislation which will provide penalties for those who continue to send unsolicited pornographic literature to mail patrons. H.R. 980 has my wholehearted support.

I should like to say also that the legitimate direct mail industry is composed of dedicated men and women who will have no contact with the peddlers of smut. They need have no fear that H.R. 980 can be used as a weapon against the legitimate user of the mails. The homeowner should have the right at all times to cut off the supply of any salacious or indecent literature reaching his mailbox.

GLENN CUNNINGHAM's bill provides the mechanism whereby the mail patron can get his name off the pornographer's mailing lists. H.R. 980 is not a cure-all. State and Federal officials must continue to track down the purveyors of hardcore filth and to book them for their nefarious offenses. Churches and civic groups can work in their own communities to eliminate the seemingly endless supply of salacious literature which is available to our children. This bill has the support of these groups. I recommend its enactment into law.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have listened carefully to the debate on H.R. 980, "a bill to provide for the return of obscene mail matter," and I have studied the unanimous report of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, recommending the passage of the bill.

As stated in the committee report, the purpose of this legislation is to give any person, particularly a parent, served by the U.S. mail an effective and urgently needed means to prevent the forced entry into his home, or into the hands of his children, of mail matter which in his opinion is obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile.

The bill is substantially similar to one passed by the House last year by a vote of 325 to 19, but it makes certain changes, described in the committee report as follows:

> The differences are that H.R. 980 characterizes the mail matter as "obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile" rather than "morally offensive." Second, H.R. 980 makes provision for barring subsequent mailings of "additional such mail" to the objecting recipient rather than barring all mail. Third, H.R. 980 affords an opportunity to a sender to have an "appropriate hearing" before request is made of the Attorney General to apply for a court order directing compliance with the Postmaster General's notice directing the sender to refrain from sending mail to the complainant.

I have decided to vote in favor of H.R. 980. I do so because I believe it strengthens the right of a head of a household to prevent obscene matter from coming into his house by mail.

Some of my colleagues, whose views I greatly respect, are opposed to this bill. They have grave doubts as to its constitutionality. I do not share these doubts. It is clear that the head of a household now has the right to refuse to accept mail delivered to his house, whether he has a good reason to do so or not. As I see it, what the present bill does is to extend his right to prevent the delivery of mail to his house by providing that he can effectively tell the source of such mail to stop sending it.

It is true that, as pointed out by the American Civil Liberties Union in its statement in opposition to the bill, the recipient of mail can stop further receipt of it on the basis of standards of obscenity which might not be upheld in the courts. To my mind, however, the right of an individual to refuse to accept mail to which he objects is complete, and I see no vice in giving him a means to prevent the delivery of such mail to his house. Thus, in either case, the standard of obscenity which he applies is not relevant from the constitutional point of view.

It is also argued that the bill is unnecessary in that a recipient can already refuse to accept mail, it is already unlawful to send obscene matter through the mails, and in that Public Law 87-793, section 307, gives to a recipient of mail the following right:

> Any person may file a written request with his local post office to detain obscene, lewd, lascivious, or incedent matter addressed to him and the Postmaster General shall detain and dispose of such matter for such period as the request is in effect.

These various provisions, however, have apparently not been successful in stopping the flow of unwanted obscene mail. Under the last quoted section it is not clear how the Post Office can identify the objectionable mail without opening it.

The right to refuse mail at delivery may not be effective since the head of the household may not be present to register such objection when the mail is delivered and to prevent the mail from reaching minor children in the household, especially if it is addressed to them.

I have some sympathy for the objections to the bill on the grounds of administrative practicability raised by the Postmaster General and the Attorney General. However, I feel that any difficulties which arise in this regard can be corrected in the future as experience in the administration of this legislation is acquired.

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 980, a bill to provide for the return to the sender of obscene mail matter.

As a father I am greatly concerned with what my five children read and see in the home. This bill, in addition to giving me—and parents all across the land—some opportunity to reject undesirable material sent to us through the mail, also calls attention to this most serious problem facing our youth today.

That such a problem does exist will be denied, I believe, by no one except the purveyors of the filth itself. The problem is recognized by children in my congressional district—and I am very proud of these youngsters—over eleven hundred of whom in the cities of Boise and Rupert alone have signed petitions protesting the current adult indifference toward moral issues and the example these degrading patterns are setting for the rising generation.

These young people, Mr. Speaker, are to be commended for the stand they have taken. I am sure that literally millions of our children would sign similar petitions were they given such an opportunity.

I commend the following petition to the attention of my colleagues, and I urge passage of the bill:

> As a group, we desire to publicly protest some of the influences which we encounter daily. We are all students, going to school in Boise.
>
> We protest the great majority of movies we have to choose from, for entertainment. We can seldom find a movie to attend which does not flaunt immoral sex. The movie that won the academy award last year was about a young man who committed adultery with several women. The movie was classed as a comedy. We wonder if we are to accept adultery as such.
>
> We protest the filth we find on the newsstands. Over 50 percent of the covers of magazines on the average newsstand present pictures and titles that openly degrade any human who sees and reads.
>
> The articles in the magazines, and the pictures, fairly scream to us that chastity and virtue are a joke; sex is a joke; Christian principles are a joke. We are prone to think that the requirement for a best seller is that it must be based on the theme of sexual immorality. The best seller list for the past several years indicates this.
>
> We protest the sale of tobacco, beer, or liquor, to any teenaged person, by anyone. We ask nothing more than that the law of the State be observed.
>
> We protest any and all styles of dress that tend to detract from the dignity of the human body, by destroying modesty. We observe daily that designers are attempting to eliminate modesty, and make a mockery of us all.
>
> We further pose the following questions, and challenge all parents and businessmen in this area to spend 10 minutes reading and thinking:
>
> 1. Who brings immoral movies into our town, youth or parents and businessmen? Who made them immoral? Who brings the literary sewage onto our newsstands, youth or parents and businessmen?
>
> 2. Are the morals, and minds and standards of the youth really for sale, for the profits the businessmen will derive from handling the filth that will ruin the youth?
>
> 3. Who makes and sells the liquor and tobacco to youth?
>
> 4. Who determines standards of dress, youth or businessmen? What is the exact price of modesty?—or is it out of vogue now?
>
> By and large we want to be good citizens, but we find ourselves in a paradox. We want to follow the lead of our parents, and the community, but which one? The one we are told, or the one we observe? Do we listen to what you say to us, or submit to the influences you allow us to grow up in?
>
> Is there something you can do to help? If you cannot help, please tell us who can.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 980 is similar to legislation which I voted for in the last Congress and I am delighted to see it before the House today with the unanimous endorsement of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

With this legislation it will be possible to stop the flow of obscene literature at the source. It will guarantee to each citizen the right of privacy in his home and enforce his right to be protected from the unwanted incursions of objectionable mail.

I agree with the committee, which found that "the right of an individual to protect his home and his children from damaging moral influences must prevail both in reason and in law over the right of another to send morally offensive mail into that home to those children."

The postal service was not meant to be a conduit of offensive material into the homes of America, although it has become so. The bill before us today will give to every American a way to stop objectionable mail right at the place where it originates.

The need is apparent. The Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has reported officially that the commerce in filth sent through the mails is a major factor in the alarming growth in the rate of juvenile delinquency.

Existing laws on postal obscenity have been proven to be inadequate. The dealers in filth have been able to circumvent them in a variety of ways. I receive frequent complaints, with enclosures, from constituents who have received obscene material unasked for in the mail.

This bill will put some teeth into the law. When H.R. 480 is enacted, any person will be able to ask the Post Office Department to notify the sender to send no more mail to him or to any child of his that he himself has not solicited. It is past time that the public had this protection and I urge its speedy approval.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, as I did last year in connection with H.R. 319, I very strongly support the pending legislation, H.R. 980, which provides a simple, potentially effective means by which parents and other persons can protect themselves and their families from indecent or obscene mail.

As I read the bill, the means of protection is not only simple and effective, but it is also constitutionally sound. It would not be punitive; it would not interfere with the rights or the judgment of others; it would not be censorship.

By characterizing the mail matter in question in more specific terms, by authorizing the recipient to prohibit subsequent mailings to him of the same kind of mail, rather than of all mail, and by providing a hearing for mailers of objectionable materials, the present bill improves on last year's version. For reasons which I detailed during last year's debate, I can find no substance to the objections which have been raised against the bill. The present bill reinforces my judgment that this is a needed, carefully drawn, responsible, and effective piece of legislation.

Under leave to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I include the text of my remarks in the House last year on H.R. 319:

> **Mrs. Dwyer.** Mr. Speaker, I have studied the pending bill, H.R. 319, and the committee report very carefully, and in my judgment it would do no more or no less than what is claimed for it; that is, provide a simple and effective means for people to protect themselves against the intrusion of mail matter which they consider to be morally offensive.
>
> I have also carefully considered the few objections which I have seen raised against the bill, and I do not believe—in spite of the obvious sincerity of the objectors—that they are soundly grounded. There is nothing in this legislation that smacks of censorship. There is nothing that would inhibit or interfere with the free circulation of ideas or of published material. There is nothing, so far as I can see, that would jeopardize the constitutional protection of free speech or freedom of the press. There is nothing here that would contradict established principles of constitutional law as enunciated by the Supreme Court. Nor is there anything in the pending bill which would impose unreasonable burdens or restraints upon those who use the mails for commercial, political, or other purposes.
>
> The basic premise of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is unobjectionable. It implies that people have a right to refuse certain mail, just as they have a right to turn off their television or radio sets, or refuse to patronize theaters, bookstores, or other establishments, or refrain from reading certain newspapers or magazines, because of whatever they may find there that is morally objectionable to them. These are personal judgments which people have a right and a responsibility to make for themselves. They also have a right to act on those judgments, so long as they do not interfere with the equal rights of others in doing so. This bill would implement that right with regard to matter received in the mail, and thus it would protect our right to privacy and our freedom of choice.
>
> Without this bill, Mr. Speaker, the U.S. mails would remain the principal medium of communication from which individual persons are unable to protect themselves against the intrusion of morally objectionable matter. As I have suggested, if a person finds that a particular radio or television station, theater, newsstand, magazine, or other purveyor of information or ideas has offended his sense of moral probity, he can simply stay away from the offending medium. He cannot do so, at present, in the case of mail. Since a great deal of the most offensive mail arrives in plain envelopes or other unmarked covers, thereby effectively obscuring the origin of the mail, the recipient cannot even identify it as offensive until he opens it and is exposed to its offensive character. No one is forced to attend a movie, read a magazine, or watch a television program until the offending material actually reaches his eyes; no one should be forced to accept offending material through the mails.
>
> I must respectfully disagree, Mr. Speaker, with those who characterize such an exercise of judgment or choice as "prior restraint" or "precensorship" or the "antithesis of free speech." I believe as deeply as anyone in permitting maximum exposure to all ideas and materials so that the truth may emerge from the resulting competition. But I insist there is a distinction between permitting or encouraging or making available such ideas and materials, on the one hand, and forcing or imposing those ideas and materials on people who have found them objectionable and freely chosen to reject them. I shall defend the former even while I oppose the latter.
>
> The bill before us respects this distinction. It would do nothing to impede, restrain, discourage or otherwise hamper the availability or circulation of constitutionally protected ideas and materials. Under this bill, one man's exercise of his right to refuse objec-

tionable mailings would have no adverse effect on his neighbor's equal right to receive anything and everything addressed to him through the mail. One man's private judgment that certain material is morally objectionable would remain just that—a private judgment having no force or effect upon anyone else. Neither the Government nor the publisher or the mailer of the objectionable material would be required to accept this judgment as of general validity; they would be required only to respect the complainant's freedom of choice and his right to privacy.

If this is censorship, Mr. Speaker, it is a pretty harmless variety. "Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary," second edition, 1956, defines censorship as "One. The office or power of a censor. Second. The action of a censor." And censor is defined as:

"1. Antiq. One of two magistrates of Rome who took the census and became overseers of morals and conduct. 2. One who acts as an overseer of morals and conduct; esp: (a) An official empowered to examine written or printed matter, motion pictures, etc., in order to forbid publication if objectionable. (b) An official or a military officer charged in time of war with examining letters, printed matter, etc., in order to delete or suppress anything that might aid the enemy, injure discipline or morale, etc. 3. A faultfinder; adverse critic."

It should be clear that this bill establishes no offices of a censor, empowers no official or private person to act as an overseer of morals and conduct other than for himself, nor authorizes anyone to examine written or printed matter, motion pictures, etc., in order to forbid publication if objectionable. At worst, the person who refuses to accept offensive mail could be termed a censor only in the sense of faultfinder or adverse critic, and who would deny anyone's right to be a critic.

As this bill is written, Mr. Speaker, the absence of standards by which to determine what is "morally offensive" is a strength rather than a weakness. So long as the judgment is a purely private one and has no direct or indirect bearing on the judgment or standards or values of another, then the standard should remain personal and private. Indeed, if the bill in fact established standards of decency or morality, Congress would be in the questionable position of imposing common standards on all our people without regard to differences in education, background, taste, and values. In such an event, Congress would be establishing itself as the Nation's censor, or delegating such authority to the Post Office Department or to the Attorney General. I much prefer the arrangement proposed by the bill where, if each man is his own censor, he cannot impose censorship on others.

Two other points should be mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the effect of the bill on mailers and the enforcement authority given to Government agencies and the courts. So far as I can determine, the only burden mailers would face as a result of this bill would be the need to keep their mailing lists in reasonably up-to-date condition, at least to the extent of removing the names of those who have objected to continued mailings. This may be a nuisance and perhaps something of an added expense in certain cases, but it seems to me a reasonable burden.

The use of the mails for mass distribution of material to the general public should certainly involve some responsibility. In the past, Congress has decided that such mailings must be directed to a particular address and has specifically prohibited the use of unaddressed "junk" mail. This decision may have been a costly one to some mailers but it was a reasonable one. So, I believe, is the provision in the bill requiring mailers to stop sending mail to recipients who object and who follow the procedures outlined in the bill. Many of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, maintain mailing lists of varying sizes and I suspect that those of us who receive requests from constituents to remove their names comply rather expeditiously—simply as a matter of good public relations. I do not believe, therefore, that the burden is an intolerable one.

In this connection, it is worth observing that the bill grants discretion to the Postmaster General and to the Attorney General in carrying out their repsonsibilities. While the Postmaster General must notify the sender to stop sending unsolicited mail to an addressee who makes such a request, he is authorized rather than directed to pursue violations of the notification. The Attorney General is provided similar authority. In both cases, therefore, enforcement would not be blind and automatic, but would undoubtedly be tempered by recognition of the realities of particular situations. Those who violate the law intentionally could be treated differently than those who did so by mistake.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, this bill attacks a serious problem—the matter of the multimillion-dollar traffic in obscene materials through the mails—in a way that effectively harmonizes the rights of the individual with those of society in general. I hope the bill will be approved.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Louisiana that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 980.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that two-thirds had voted in favor of the passage of the bill.

Mr. MORRISON. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Louisiana makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. Evidently a quorum is not present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 360, nays 21, not voting 52, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—360

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Edmondson
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Price
Pucinski
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Roudebush
Roush
Rumsfeld
Satterfield
St. Onge
Saylor
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
Weltner
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—21

Brown, Calif.
Burton, Calif.
Cameron
Conyers
Edwards, Calif.
Farbstein
Fraser
Gilbert
Hawkins
Holifield
Lindsay
Matsunaga
Mink
Multer
Powell
Reid, N.Y.
Rosenthal
Roybal
Ryan
Scheuer
Sickles

NOT VOTING—52

Andrews, Glenn
Arends
Ashley
Baldwin
Boggs
Bonner
Brademas
Bray
Byrnes, Wis.
Callaway
Celler
Cohelan
Diggs
Dow
Dyal
Edwards, Ala.
Fino
Gibbons
Grabowski
Helstoski
Irwin
Jennings
Jones, Ala.

Keogh
Kluczynski
MacGregor
Mailliard
Mathias
Moorhead
Nix
Passman
Pickle
Purcell
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
St Germain
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Staggers
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tunney
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
Whalley
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Glenn Andrews.
Mr. Wolff with Mr. Mathias.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Whalley.
Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Bray.
Mr. Boggs with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.
Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. MacGregor.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Smith of New York.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Roosevelt.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Dyal.
Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Gibbons.
Mr. Vivian with Mr. Tunney.
Mr. Passman with Mr. Irwin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 980.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

SAIGON CHANCERY

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 7064) to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 7064

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 4 of the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended (22 U.S.C. 295), is further amended by adding the following new subsection:

"(e) For the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this Act in South Vietnam, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, in addition to amounts previously authorized prior to the enactment of this amendment, $1,000,000, to remain available until expended."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a second demanded?

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill to authorize $1 million to build a chancery building for our Embassy staff in Saigon. As the membership is aware, the building occupied there was bombed a few days ago. Several people were killed and many were injured.

The present quarters in Saigon are in two buildings which are leased, comprising a total area of about 25,000 square feet. The main building is on a busy intersection. The way the place was blown up the other day was that a car drove up, full of explosives, parked outside the building, and they touched off the bomb.

We own a piece of ground of a little more than 3 acres in Saigon, on which we can build a building with a wall around it, and we can set it back from the street so that this kind of bombing cannot take place again.

The White House has told me that the President would order, and I believe has ordered, the Army to cooperate in every way.

The State Department people have plans for a building and can use these plans for a stripped-down version. They tell me they can have a building in operation within 6 months.

I believe it important that we grant this authorization not only to get a building but also as a symbol of our determination to stay in South Vietnam until this matter is brought to a reasonable and satisfactory conclusion.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge unanimous and immdeiate adoption of this bill. It was reported unanimously by the subcommittee which heard testimony and studied it. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The evidence is overwhelming for its speedy enactment.

It seems to me there are two issues here.

First. The matter of providing necessary, adequate, and secure work space for our staff in Saigon.

Second. The matter of letting it be known to the people not only of Vietnam, not only of southeast Asia, but of the world, that we are in South Vietnam and we intend to stay there until a satisfactory conclusion of the tragic situation in that country is reached.

Upon the first point the gentleman from Ohio has pointed out that plans now in being will permit an increased amount of space available for office use by our people in Saigon. This is necessary and desirable. In the light of our increased staff there, we do need more space. Many Members of this House who have had occasion to visit Saigon are aware that our staff there is badly crowded and cramped for space. It is worthwhile to point out that on the 3-acre site where the new building is to be built it will be possible to institute greater security measures.

It is not likely that we shall see a repetition of the kind of bombing of a few days ago, because there is enough ground space so that the actual structure can be recessed from the street. Thus a truck of explosives could not be driven close enough to it to cause damage of any great consequence. The site is in a much less congested district in Saigon. That is one reason that I urge the adoption of this bill.

There is a second point. We must make it unmistakably clear to the peoples of the world that we are going to remain in Vietnam until the Communist enemy has been conquered there. We cannot permit the feeling to be abroad that the Vietcong or any other Communist influences are going to drive the United States out of that war-torn country until peace has been restored, until the Vietnamese people can live in dignity under a government of their own choosing. If for no other reason, Mr. Speaker, than to establish this psychological factor, I would urge the adoption of this bill. I think it is highly desirable that this vote be made unanimous and that by this showing of unanimity we demonstrate again, if that be necessary, the absolute certainty that our presence in Vietnam will continue so long as it may be necessary.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ADAIR. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. The question arises as to what is going to happen to these premises that we have been using and were damaged. Are they going to be repaired and are we going to use them in the meantime? Of course, I strongly favor the building of the new building as well.

Mr. ADAIR. The gentleman has asked a question the answer to which depends to a large degree on the attitude of the lessor. These are leased premises. We were informed in the committee that our employees in Saigon have taken some necessary preliminary steps to clear the area and to make it somewhat useful. Since the premises are leased, the rehabilitation would be a matter up to the lessor of the premises. I understand that the premises are owned by a citizen of Vietnam and it will be up to that person to make the corrections or improvements.

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. If the gentleman will yield further, my other point is what will the U.S. personnel and the chancery functions do? Where will they be in the meantime until this new building is constructed in 6 months? How do we carry on from here permanently in Saigon? Before the gentleman answers my question, I want to state that I approve wholeheartedly his expression of our determination that we cannot and will not leave Vietnam despite this tragic occurrence. To do so will only confirm the impression that we are a "paper tiger." This characterization I cannot and will not accept for my country.

Mr. ADAIR. The answer to the gentleman's question is that our staff in Saigon will have to make do with what they have for the time being. My understanding is that the upper floors of these two buildings were not damaged to the point where they could not be used. They will be used. It will not be convenient and it will not be a satisfactory arrangement, but the two buildings there, of course, can be used until a new building is constructed.

In that connection I would underscore what the gentleman from Ohio said; namely, that it is proposed to use plans which were drawn up several years ago to construct a building on a site which we already own.

If the Congress acts expeditiously, this whole matter can move forward very promptly and very smoothly and we will be in the new building in the shortest possible time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with everything that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] has said. We went into this matter very thoroughly. Incidentally, I have always felt that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] was a most excellent chairman. He gives everyone a chance to speak his mind and ask all the questions he desires. It has been a very satisfactory experience to find ourselves ready to take immediate action. I think the strength of this whole matter is in immediate action so that we may tell the world that we are there and we are not getting out at the moment.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI].

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I wish to join the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] in urging support of this measure. Even though there is a limitation on the construction of the new chancery, for practical purposes it gives the House an opportunity to dramatize our determination to support the President in Vietnam, especially at a time when the President is receiving much unsolicited advice to compromise and retreat. The House has a chance to declare in a very affirmative and effective fashion support of the President.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ZABLOCKI].

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, as the Chairman of a Study Commission that has visited Saigon on several occasions, the most recent in 1963, I can attest that a new chancery building is long overdue. I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this chancery building, which will be built about a mile away from the present building which has been destroyed will not only have a good psychological effect on those who are trying to destroy the United States image in that area and in the world, but will also have a salutary effect on the morale of our U.S. Embassy personnel.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the chairman of the subcommittee who so expeditiously brought this legislation providing for a new chancery building to the House for its consideration. I, too, hope that the legislation will be passed by a unanimous vote.

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I want to say in conclusion that it is a matter of some pride to the Committee on Foreign Affairs that this matter has been handled so expeditiously. The message came up after noon on last Thursday. The committee met Thursday afternoon, had a hearing and reported it out. The full committee reported it out on Friday and it is before the House on Monday. I think this is another example of our determination to act and act expeditiously, to show the world that we will not be pushed out of Vietnam.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 7064?

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 378, nays 0, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

YEAS—378

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Bingham
Blatnik
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chamberlain
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Cleveland
Clevenger
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Curtis
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Derwinski
Devine
Dickinson
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Findley
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Gross
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Hall
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Holland
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
King, Calif.
King, N.Y.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Landrum
Langen
Latta
Leggett
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCulloch
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Morrison
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Roncalio
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif
Smith, Iowa
Smith, Va.
Stafford
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—55

Andrews, Glenn
Arends
Ashley
Baldwin
Betts
Boggs
Boland
Bonner
Brademas
Bray
Byrnes, Wis.
Callaway
Celler
Clawson, Del
Cohelan
Daddario
Diggs
Dow
Edwards, Ala.
Fino
Gibbons
Grabowski
Helstoski
Irwin
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
Keogh
Kluczynski
Kornegay
MacGregor
Mackie
Mailliard
Mathias
Moorhead
Nix
Passman
Pickle
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
St Germain
Smith, N.Y.
Springer
Staggers
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tunney
Vivian
Walker, Miss.
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Arends.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Betts.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Del Clawson.

Mr. Wolff with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Mathias.

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Daddario with Mr. Smith of New York.

Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Callaway.
Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Glenn Andrews of Alabama.
Mr. Charles H. Wilson with Mr. Walker of Mississippi.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.
Mr. Brademas with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Grabowski.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Nix.
Mr. Irwin with Mr. Diggs.
Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Dow.
Mr. Toll with Mr. Tunney.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Vivian.
Mr. St Germain with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Pickle with Mr. Boland.
Mr. Cohelan with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Mackie.
Mr. Kornegay with Mr. Passman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, when the roll was called on H.R. 7064, I was on my way from the office, having been unavoidably detained.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, on rollcalls 62 and 63 I was necessarily detained on business in the Senate. If I had been present, I would have voted "no" on H.R. 980, a bill to provide for the return of obscene mail, and "yes" on H.R. 7064, a bill to amend the Foreign Service Building Act.

Mr. Speaker, I would particularly like to explain my position on H.R. 980.

I agree that a man should be able to protect his family from "morally offensive" mail matter; from mail that is "obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile."

But I disagree and disagree strongly with the bill which was before us today; just as I disagreed with its predecessor in the previous Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the plain and admitted purpose of this bill is prior censorship. As such it poses serious constitutional doubts, for prior restraint on publications has always been condemned by the courts.

The Supreme Court, as a matter of fact, in several decisions, including *Roth* v. *United States*, 364 U.S. 476, and *Jacobellis* v. *Ohio*, 378 U.S. 184, has ruled that material which is not obscene enjoys the freedom of the press. But the committee itself has stated that the legislation is intended to suppress material which under court decisions is not per se obscene.

In addition to jeopardizing materials which enjoy constitutional protection of freedom of the press, this bill could seriously restrict the flow of otherwise legitimate information.

To a segregationist, literature of the NAACP or of CORE might indeed be considered "obscene" or "lewd" or "lascivious" or "indecent" or "filthy" or "vile." As such, he could effectively demand the Post Office to stop its delivery, even though it is clearly protected by the 1st amendment to the Constitution.

Conversely, the same constitutional denial would exist if those who favor full civil rights for all Americans were to judge, as they might very likely, material from the Klu Klux Klan or the White Citizens Councils as "obscene" and demand its censorship.

These and other points have been carefully considered by the Department of Justice and the Post Office Department. Both have strongly recommended against the passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, considering these reservations and the constitutional denials contained in this bill, and considering the limiting conditions which suspension of the rules imposes, I believe that this bill should not have been passed today. I am very hopeful that the other body will give it the same consideration they gave it a year ago, which was to very wisely let this unconstitutional, unwise, and unnecessary bill die a natural death.

TREASURY, POST OFFICE, AND EXECUTIVE OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1966

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7060) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue not to exceed 3 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 7060, with Mr. Blatnik in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous consent agreement, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed] will be recognized for 1½ hours, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] will be recognized for 1½ hours.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I come here today in charge of this bill for the first time, having been chosen to succeed the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Gary, who so ably produced and presented this bill each year for such a long time. I realize I have a very heavy responsibility and a very large pair of shoes to fill. In addition to the fact that I am new as chairman of this subcommittee, we also have a new ranking minority member and four new members of the subcommittee. Because of the newness of so many of us to these new responsibilities, I would ask the House to indulge me for just a moment while I express my personal appreciation to the members of my subcommittee for the wonderful cooperation and assistance they have given me in this heavy job of preparing this bill and bringing it here today. They have worked hard and shown interest beyond the call of duty and have given me such fine cooperation and help that I feel I should publicly express my appreciation to them.

Mr. Chairman, the bill which we bring here today is characterized by two major factors. It represents an increase over the appropriation for the same departments of the Government for last year of $366,061,000. We have, of course, allowed the $255 million that was added to the cost of these departments by the pay raise voted by the Congress last year. This is an automatic cost. Then, in addition to that, we have allowed $111,061,000, which is our best estimate of the normal workload increases that these departments are mandated to carry out. Most of the agencies financed in this bill are susceptible to workload increases beyond their control. However, since most of them are old and experienced agencies of the Government, it is not too difficult to measure the additional cost factors that these workload increases impose upon them.

In total, in the bill this year, we recommend $6,604,404,000. That compares with appropriations for the same agencies, to date, of $6,238,343,000. We considered a budget estimate this year totaling $6,708,510,000, an increase of $470 million over the current year. We reduced this request by $104,106,000. Reduced to percentages, this means that we have actually reduced the request by 1.55 percent, which, on its face, is a very modest reduction. However, we call the attention of the House to the fact that these agencies traditionally bring in tight budgets, and it is not easy to make substantial cuts. Because they are old and experienced agencies, their functions are well spelled out and, with due deference and credit to those who are in charge of these agencies, they are very careful in the requests they make of the Congress for funds. We are very proud to have the opportunity to work with these people and to observe firsthand the wonderful job which we feel they are doing and the candor and manner in which they have presented their requests.

We have allowed an increase over the current year for the two major reasons I cited, which amounts to a net growth of 5.87 percent in the next fiscal year over the current fiscal year.

Allowing for the pay increase costs, I think you will find that the rest of this increase is well accounted for in the natural growth factors that these agencies experience. For instance, in the Post Office Department, they are having almost a 4-percent increase in mail volume at this time over last year. They estimate that there will be a continuing increase during the next fiscal year of some 3 percent. In the case of the Post Office Department their cost accounting system tells them that when there is a 1-percent increase in mail volume it will add between $12 and $13 million to the cost of operating the Department.

There are two other major items of increase. In the section dealing with the Treasury Department we have increased the acquisition, construction, and improvements fund for the Coast Guard by $16 million over the previous year. The House, of course, is aware that the Coast Guard has a very serious replacement problem in capital ships, aircraft, and shore installations. This fund will gradually increase for the next several years; it must increase if they are ever to get the kind of replacement they must have to carry on the farflung functions of this great and important agency.

In addition, we have added $28 million to the Internal Revenue Service. We hope that will pretty well finish the task of equipping this great agency with the automatic data processing equipment they need to automate their activities in order to cope with the very substantial increase in workload.

Most of this increased workload is the result that a growing nation and a growing economy automatically create and I think they are a good, healthy sign.

In summary, in the Treasury Department, there is a total increase over the current fiscal year of $52,852,000. Of this amount $30 million is allowed for pay increases. The other $22,852,000 is for increased workload.

For the entire bill there was a request for a total of 25,578 additional jobs. We allowed 9,413 or 37 percent of the request. We disallowed some 16,000 job requests.

In the case of the Treasury Department, they requested 5,025 jobs. We allowed them 2,762 or 55 percent.

In the case of the Post Office Department, where most of the additional job requests are contained, they asked for a total of 20,520 jobs and we have allowed 6,625.

Mr. Chairman, I want to take just a minute to make a comment about this item. Of this request for 20,520 jobs by the Post Office Department, some 5,000 are needed for the natural increase in mail volume, which the committee has approved. The remainder were asked for in order to convert temporary positions to permanent positions. We know that the overtime and the temporary employee problem of the Post Office Department has been growing for years.

Mr. Chairman, we have encouraged the Department to try to do something about this. This year they wanted to convert 15,000 temporary jobs into permanent jobs. However, after going into the matter with them, the committee felt they had not developed the program far enough for us to grant that entire request this year. We have provided funds to convert 1,300 of these temporary positions to permanent status in order to give them an opportunity to take care of the most urgent overtime and temporary employment problems. In addition, of course, we have allowed funds to continue the employment of the remaining temporary employees.

Mr. Chairman, at our request, the Department has developed a considerable amount of statistical information with reference to this job situation since the hearings. However, I feel that considerably more study is going to have to be done before the problem can be fully resolved. There will always be need for overtime and temporary employment in the Post Office Department.

It costs about $790 a year to convert a temporary employee to permanent status. When you are dealing with 15,000 jobs at a cost of $790 each, it runs into millions of dollars. Because it does represent a substantial amount of money we feel, after working with the Department on this subject, they do need to firm up their program better than it was at the time we heard their testimony on this request.

Mr. Chairman, we have tried to help get the solution to this problem started by allowing 1,300 jobs this year, hoping that with this amount they can get the program moving and come back next year with a more specific and a well-spelled-out program which will enable us to bring you something that will once and for all get rid of this problem of overtime and temporary employment in the Department.

I would like to say that people who are engaged in the operations of this Department do not have an easy task. We have had a 2- to 4-percent increase in mail volume every year for more than 20 years. At the same time that this enormous increase in the amount of mail to be handled has been going on, there has been an unprecedented change in the transportation facilities of this country to move this mail. We have gone from 10,000 mail trains in 1948, down to a little over 900 mail trains at this time. As the volume grows, the facilities to move it have been diminishing. The Department has crisis after crisis and they are still a long way from being out of the woods on this problem.

Mr. Chairman, the Department is now working on some very far-reaching plans which I believe will make it possible for the Department in the next 2 or 3 years to offer this country a program that will almost guarantee overnight mail service throughout the Nation. That program is well on its way now and we hope that it will be accelerated. We offer the highest praise to those in the Department who are working on this problem. We feel that they will quite soon come up with a better answer.

Mr. Chairman, mechanization is moving along and we are making progress in the zip code program. With the new approach to the transportation problem, I believe we can see some daylight in the not too distant future in this enormous problem of rapid mail delivery that has been on our backs for so long.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Before the gentleman leaves the matter of personnel, is it not true that the pay increase costs were budgeted last year and, therefore, does it not follow that the reduction in this bill was not attributable to the cutting of the budget from the standpoint of pay increases?

Mr. STEED. No. The additional $255 million in the bill is the annual recurring cost of the pay increase bill enacted by the Congress last year.

Mr. GROSS. It was budgeted last year?

Mr. STEED. Not the pay increases for fiscal year 1966. The additional costs for fiscal year 1965 will be taken care of in the supplemental appropriation bill, which, I understand, will be considered by the House tomorrow.

Mr. GROSS. Let me ask this question: Was the 10 percent, as it was understood it would be, absorbed by the departments and agencies incorporated in this bill?

Mr. STEED. As I understand it, and as was represented to the committee, the 10 percent absorption was to be accomplished Government-wide. The Bureau of the Budget then made a determination as to how much each agency would be required to absorb. In the case of the Post Office Department, it only absorbed about 8 percent. In the case of many agencies they absorbed 100 percent. You will find from agency to agency there is a variation, but in total throughout the Government the 10 percent was absorbed according to the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. GROSS. Earlier in the gentleman's remarks he spoke about the economic progress in the country, yet I note on page 3 of the report that there is an increase this year of $300 million in interest payments on the debt. If there was economic progress in the country why is it not reflected in some retirement of the Federal debt?

Mr. STEED. The gentleman can provide his own answer to that.

The items we are discussing, as the gentleman knows, are the trust funds and permanent appropriations. The payment of interest on the public debt is a permanent appropriation and requires no action by the Congress. We include these items in the report tables for the information of the Members.

Mr. GROSS. How are we going to reduce the interest? It is now up to $11 billion, or $11.5 billion. That is the annual interest payment on the Federal debt. How is it ever going to be reduced if in time of economic progress we do not pay off something on the Federal debt?

Mr. STEED. Some of the members of the committee had similar questions. When the Secretary of the Treasury and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget were before the committee they were asked and did comment on this phase in some detail in the hearings. The gentleman might be able to find some answers to the questions by reading the hearings.

Mr. GROSS. I do not think I can get much consolation out of that.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I would like to ask the gentleman if the Customs Bureau received all the employees it asked for?

Mr. STEED. They asked for 272. We allowed 200, which increases their employment to about 8,300. Most of the additional employees they need is in the area of the collection of customs duties and the handling of claims. We believe this 200 increase for the coming fiscal year will enable them to get current on most of their work.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I have drawn to the Commissioner's attention this matter, and I hope he will give some consideration to the fact that Detroit is the second largest port of entry in the United States; it is second in rescue and second in the number of people and goods that enter there.

I want to point out to the gentleman that the largest traffic between Canada and the United States is over Ambassador Bridge in Detroit. On that bridge they have a customs agent between the hours of 8:30 and 5:30, which forces all the truck interests to use that impacted area of time. There are people bringing goods to this country from as far north as Ottawa, so I do think that we should have an increase in the hours, particularly in that area.

As to more appraisers, we are certainly entitled to this. The customs brokers have told me that it is as much as 2 years at times before they can have an appraisal. So I hope that in dealing with the Bureau of Customs, you consider the city of Detroit and the State of Michigan, through which a tremendous trade with Canada passes into the United States.

I might also point out the fact that we want to keep the regional office under the new customs plan.

I thank the committee for the very fine interest they have shown.

Mr. STEED. I thank the gentlewoman for her fine statement. The additional personnel we have allowed should help overcome the problems the gentlewoman has mentioned.

The President's reorganization plan that has recently been submitted to Congress, which we hope will be approved, dealing with the reorganization of the field structure is estimated to save about $9 million annually. So there will be more resources available to the Customs Bureau to help with the problems the gentlewoman has mentioned. We want to get them on a current basis.

The problem of an agency like this is largely one that is beyond their control. They have to handle whatever workload is placed upon them. I think they do a wonderful job in view of the resources they have.

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. I agree that the Bureau has probably done all it can. We have been reluctant to complain, but we are complaining now. There are several airports where people fly home between the United States and Canada. I think it would be very nice if each one of those airports was open with a customs man in charge.

Mr. STEED. I am sure that the gentlewoman will find the Customs Bureau to be most cooperative. We think they do a fine job.

There is another matter that I think the House would like to know about. The Internal Revenue Service asked for 3,681 additional personnel. We allowed 1,200. We think we have given them as many workers as they need to meet their normal workload. They are now in the process of converting their operations to automatic data processing, and very good reports have come out of the first fully automated regional office at Atlanta.

We have allowed them a substantial number of additional employees each year for several years. We think the new Commissioner is on the right track. He has not been there too long yet, but so far we are very pleased with his attitude concerning these problems and the progress he has made and steps he has taken. I think by this time next year you are going to find a very fine improvement in the manpower utilization program of the Internal Revenue Service. We believe that the 1,200 new employees we have allowed will be sufficient to meet their requirements. We believe that we are now on the threshold not only of saving a lot of the cost of manpower but in improving the efficiency of the Internal Revenue Service. We have great hopes for this automatic data processing program and we think the new Commissioner is going to be very effective in getting the maximum benefit from this very heavy investment in ADP equipment we have been making during the last several years.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. With reference to the subject of internal revenue agents, will the gentleman state whether he knows into how many foreign countries we have sent internal revenue agents to teach those countries how to collect taxes and whether the Treasury Department is being reimbursed for the services of these revenue agents or whether this is another one of our giveaways.

Mr. STEED. We have a few internal revenue agents in several foreign countries who handle the tax returns of Americans employed in those countries.

Mr. GROSS. No, I am speaking of internal revenue agents who have been shipped abroad to teach foreign countries how to collect their taxes, apparently.

I do not know what their business is in those countries, but they are going over to foreign countries in increasing numbers and into an increasing number of countries besides.

Mr. STEED. The salaries and expenses of those employees are financed by the AID program and the Treasury Department is reimbursed for their services.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, we believe we have brought in a good bill. I hope the House will agree with us and will support us in its passage.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman explain this new Stover Commission report that puts the port of Philadelphia and New York in with Boston as a regional office? Taking into consideration the fact that the port of Philadelphia ranks third in receipts and is the first in tonnage, what do they intend to accomplish by doing this?

Mr. STEED. The only way I can answer the gentleman's question would be to say that the committee considers this matter to be a prerogative of the executive branch and suggest that the gentleman consult with the proper officials in the executive branch.

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. LENNON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEED. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LENNON. I want to commend the gentleman and his committee for this piece of legislation. Would the gentleman comment with respect to the cut that is involved in the acquisition and construction of certain planes and ships and onshore and offshore installations of the Coast Guard service. Those of us on the legislative committee are greatly concerned because we have in this bill a cut of approximately $8,200,000 in our capital improvements. We would like to know, Mr. Chairman, what the feeling of this committee is with respect to the reason for this cut.

Mr. STEED. I assure the gentleman that the committee has been concerned with the problem of the Coast Guard for many years. I do not believe anyone in the Congress is more interested in having their problems solved than we are. We know that the amount of money this year is only partially what they need to complete their capital ship replacement program as well as their aircraft and shore installation programs.

The thing which concerned the committee is, despite the urgency of getting the replacement program rolling in fiscal year 1964, they estimated an unobligated balance of $3.1 million but which turned out to be $21.3 million. This year they estimate $3.8 million, but of course the actual figure is not yet known. For fiscal year 1966 they anticipate a $10 million carryover. These large carryovers worry us.

We hope that the Coast Guard will step up its activities. If it will, and if it will use the funds in the fiscal years in which we know they should be used to keep the replacement program on schedule, the gentleman can rest assured that the committee will be quite happy and will be more than willing to go along with their program.

Mr. LENNON. I thank the gentleman for his assurance. It is our understanding that these carryover funds for fiscal year 1965 will be committed before July of this year.

Mr. STEED. I hope so. If they are and if the Coast Guard can make that showing to the other body, the other body will be as willing as we, I feel certain, to have this money restored. We are trying to get them to move, not trying to hold them back.

Mr. LENNON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, to begin my remarks on behalf of the recommendations for funds in fiscal 1966 for the Treasury and Post Office, I want to say that I consider the appropriation measure now before us a tight, clean bill—free of as much fat as we could fairly cut out of it, and beefed up where we felt more beef was justified. I feel it will adequately meet the requirements of these two fine agencies in fulfilling their responsibilities to the public. We on the committee, have made every effort to keep the public interest foremost in our deliberations. I am sure you will agree, on this balance, that the increases and the cuts which we recommend here are fully and fairly justified.

I would like to add at this point that one of the chief reasons we on the committee have been able, over the years, to arrive at accurate, honest judgments on behalf of this appropriation bill, is the dedicated service of Mr. C. Douglas Dillon, who just the other day stepped down as Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Dillon's budgets have always been a pleasure to work with. His requests have been grounded in genuine concern for the mission of his Department to serve the public. He has cooperated to the fullest with the committee in providing facts and figures, and in supplying just and sagacious support for his requests. He has, when necessary, yielded to the committee's judgment without rancor or ill will. He has always retained a clear view of the constitutional balance of powers which makes all of us responsive ultimately to the will of the people. His wisdom and dedication have always been both an inspiration and a source of deep satisfaction to me. It is a pleasure and a privilege to work with such a man.

He has served under three Presidents and both political parties. Whatever his personal political conviction, he has never allowed it to interfere with his duty to all of the people. He has presented us with one of the best examples this country has ever known of the kind of devoted bipartisan—or I should say nonpartisan—service which is the hallmark of true statesmanship.

I look forward, of course, to working with his successor, Mr. Henry Fowler, who I know is no less dedicated or highly motivated. In saying goodby to Doug Dillon, I say hello to Henry Fowler. To both of them I extend my personal wish for the best of fortune.

This, of course, was the last budget prepared under the direction of Mr. Dillon and, as usual, it has been one which the committee could find little fault with.

As I stated earlier, we have tried as always, to keep the public interest uppermost in our deliberations. These Departments are somewhat unique in that they are the Government's revenue producers as well as its servants. The activities of these two agencies touch directly on the lives of virtually every citizen.

The agency which produces the bulk of the revenue needed to run the Government is the Internal Revenue Service of the Treasury Department. The Service is presently in the throes of the biggest streamlining operation in its history. The results will greatly expedite the processing of returns, spot more cases of fraud, and speed payment of refunds. The financial commitment, as we have seen in the past couple of years, is high. But I am convinced the results will warrant the investment.

The Post Office, a revenue producer as well as one of our oldest and most universal service agencies, is also streamlining things. New post offices with much electronic and automated equipment are being built and more are needed in order to improve the service and cut the unfortunate deficit which this agency has been saddled with in recent years.

Among the other agencies with which this bill deals are the Customs Bureau—which serves the public through control of imports and exports, immigration, and collection of duties and imposts—and the Secret Service. The Secret Service, of course, has the job of protecting our President, Vice President, and the First Family. The Service is also a key bulwark in our monetary system, charged with keeping counterfeit money out of circulation.

Some of the biggest increases sought by the Treasury Department in fiscal 1966 are designed to beef up the Secret Service. The glaring inadequacies of the Service—which in no way can be laid to its dedicated personnel—were brought tragically home on November 22, 1963. The increases sought this year will add desperately needed personnel and equipment to this vital activity.

The committee recommends some cuts in the budget for the Coast Guard, but I must emphasize that these cuts are limited to areas where the committee feels there is no risk whatsoever to the invaluable service provided by this fine organization.

We are all aware and tremendously impressed with the increased burden of responsibility thrust upon the Coast Guard by a developing economy, increased international trade, and the tremendous boom in recreational boating in recent years. The service has experienced an expansion since World War II, in keeping with the expanded waterborne commerce and recreation of this country, virtually unmatched in our history.

I point out the fact that the budget for operations of the Coast Guard has very nearly doubled in less than 10 years—from an appropriation of $161 million in fiscal 1956 to a request for $285 million in fiscal 1966. The Congress appropriated $6 million in 1956 for acquisition, construction, and improvement of Coast Guard equipment. This includes ships, aircraft, and shore installations. The request in this category for fiscal 1966 has skyrocketed to $109 million—from $6 million in 1956 to over $100 million in 1966.

I have no doubt that the Coast Guard can find a place for ever nickel of this request. But the cuts that have been made and are here recommended are based on the simple fact that they cannot get it all spent in a single fiscal year.

During hearings before the subcommittee, Adm. E. J. Roland, Commandant of the Coast Guard, told us that of the approximately $85 million which we appropriated for acquisition, construction, and improvements for the current fiscal year, about $53 million was still unobligated in January. This means that at the midway point in the fiscal year, the Coast Guard had still not spent anywhere near half of the money we had given them in this category. Admiral Roland further admitted that the amount of unobligated funds might be as high as $6 million by the end of the fiscal year. The committee felt a decrease could safely be made in the Coast Guard's request for $109,250,000 for acquisition, construction, and improvement, and therefore suggests a cut of about $8,250,000 on this figure.

The Post Office, as you already know, is seeking one of the largest budgets in its history this year—$5,383 million. The committee feels an increase of $311,400,000 will adequately meet the Department's expanded needs. This will be a little less than $70 million below what the department has requested.

The committee believes that the savings which the Post Office can realize under the fine leadership of Postmaster General Gronouski are just now being felt. Improved mail handling methods and elimination of what I consider projects of questionable merit, such as studies to determine the usefulness of mudflaps on mailtrucks, should more than compensate for the cuts we have made.

Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, I will conclude here and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point in the Record to include detailed statements on each of the agencies and bureaus affected by this appropriation bill.

I might make one further point, Mr. Chairman, with respect to the overall bill. I expect there will be a lot said here today about the cuts we have made—and about the cuts we have not made. Some will say we have cut too deeply, some will say not deeply enough. In anticipation of these debates, I should like to point out one statement which appears on page 3 of the committee report on this bill:

> The committee is quite sensitive to the growing Federal employment and has carefully considered the request of each agency for increased personnel. Where additional personnel are allowed, the committee requests that these allowances, together with personnel previously authorized, be considered as ceilings and directs that additional personnel above this number not be employed by eliminating or deferring other activities in circumvention of the allowances provided by the committee. The committee also requests that all agencies be prepared during next year's budget hearings not only to justify the request for additional personnel but to provide justification and detailed information concerning personnel already authorized and on the rolls as well as for vacancies which may exist in the agencies.

The point is, Mr. Chairman, that so many of these requests for increases involve automatic and electronic data processing equipment which is supposed to cut down the need for added people on the one hand, and on the other, these same agencies are asking for more people. There is an obvious contradiction which the committee is taking steps to eliminate.

NARCOTICS

The increase in the budget estimate for fiscal year 1966 reflected in this bill for the Bureau of Narcotics is necessary and warranted by the continuing problem of narcotic sales in this country. Approximately one-half of the increase in the budget request for the Bureau is the result of factors over which the Bureau has no control. An amount of $107,000 is needed to defray the expense of the increased pay costs resulting from the Federal Employees Salary Act. The $100,000 is needed to reimburse the General Services Administration for leased office space being used by their headquarters operation. Of the remainder, $114,000 has been requested for 23 additional personnel, and $20,000 for operating support funds for these new employees. Also $24,000 has been requested to furnish minimal operating support for additional agents to be redeployed overseas.

I believe that anyone familiar with the work of this Bureau and the problem of narcotic sales by merchants of misery who prey on the weak and sick, and in increasing numbers, on the youth of this country, will agree with me and the committee that this modest increase is more than justified.

The narcotics picture is not all bad. There has been and continues to be substantial progress in reducing the traffic in narcotics. Vigorous enforcement of the Federal narcotic laws, with the support of the States and local authorities in those areas where heavy penalties are meted out to the human vermin in our society, the dope peddlers, have virtually eliminated the traffic in many sections of the country.

However, I believe it is depressing to note that the major concentration of the total of 55,899 known addicts in this country is in 10 or less cities in the United States.

Reports indicate that heroin continues to be the drug of choice, and its traffic is still a serious problem in New York City, Chicago, Los Angeles, and Detroit. Only vigorous law enforcement and prompt, effective prosecution with long mandatory terms of imprisonment for the seller will stop this blight. However, treatment of the addict, with adequate controls for rehabilitation after hospitalization, is essential in reducing the market at the same time pressure is exerted on the suppliers.

Reports reaching me establish that addiction is a great factor in the general crime area. Five surveys in the United States and one in Canada indicate that over 75 percent of the addicts were engaged in some form of criminal activity before they became addicted. This is particularly disturbing when statistics show that 3.6 percent of the total number of addicts are under 21 years of age.

We should be extremely concerned at the climate of public opinion in some areas which no doubt has contributed to the abuse of drugs by youths in many sections of the country. They have been involved in not only the use of amphetamines, barbiturates, and glue sniffing, but also heroin and marihuana.

Marihuana is not physically addicting but the results after usage are unpredictable. Some people derive a sense of well-being, a lessening of tensions, vague recognitions of time or space, while others become excited, suffer hallucinations, uncontrollable irritability, and commit irresponsible and violent acts. In all, the inhibitions are released. Medical authorities long ago determined that in view of its unpredictability, marihuana, or cannabis as it is botanically known, has no use in practice.

Experts and researchers in medicine and in narcotic and marihuana law enforcement universally report that most heroin addicts allege an earlier usage of marihuana. No doubt, under the influence of marihuana, the self-imposed behavior restrictions are relaxed and in group association where the marihuana was available, antisocial, including criminal acts, are more readily committed.

Because of these unquestionable facts, I view with deep concern the advocacy by some to remove the controls on marihuana. These proponents have been given widespread publicity in national magazines. In fact, one such group, Lemar, Inc., has picketed extensively on the west coast, but more recently before network television in New York City. These charlatans not only want to legalize marihuana but also misinform the public nationwide that marihuana is harmless. In view of the heroin addiction already in New York and recent press reports indicating marihuana usage on college campuses, particularly in that area, public officials and citizens should demand more responsible and factual reporting.

Other misinformation on narcotic law enforcement has been highly publicized recently and coincidentally with the incorrect information on marihuana. In two separate reports and a magazine article given widespread circulation, a small and vociferous group continues to malign the Bureau of Narcotics and narcotic law enforcement. In short, this group charges: The mandatory sentences are improper; law enforcement agencies are prosecuting addicts and are not bringing to justice high-echelon traffickers; physicians should be given freedom in dispensing narcotic drugs to addicts; and the Bureau of Narcotics has refused to follow the mandate handed down by the Supreme Court in 1925 in the Linder case, but has continued to harass physicians until the medical profession has relinquished treating the problem of addiction as a medical matter.

I believe, and I am sure you will agree, the interpretation and application of the Federal Narcotic Law by the Bureau of Narcotics is based clearly upon decisions of the U.S. Circuit Courts of Appeals and the Supreme Court.

Without attempting to relate all of the legal ramifications of the Linder case, it should be pointed out that many lawyers have reviewed the case, prepared extensive briefs covering subsequent interpretations of the decision by various U.S. courts of appeals, and have concluded there is no basis for holding that the Supreme Court would countenance dispensing of narcotics by physicians to addicts solely to maintain addiction. Responsible medical bodies believe a physician should cure addiction, not sustain it.

The Bureau of Narcotics is not a court but a law enforcement agency which relies on decisions of the courts for guidance. In all prosecutions of physicians, of which there have been few compared to the nonphysician violators prosecuted, expert medical testimony by physicians as to what constituted "good faith" and "in the course of professional practice" within the standards established by the American Medical Association was introduced. In at least 10 cases decided by 5 different U.S. Courts of Appeals throughout the years since the Linder decision, the courts have affirmed judgments of convictions for making unlawful sales of narcotics by physicians where the indictments, unlike those used in the Linder case duly negated "good faith" and "in the course of professional practice." In two of the cases affirmed since the Linder case ruling of 40 years ago, the defendants sought review by the Supreme Court but each was denied. To assert that the Bureau of Narcotics is responsible for erroneously causing doctors to be prosecuted is tantamount to saying that the Bureau has been capable of dictating policy and law to each of the individual agencies and legal bodies involved in the judicial processes. Such an achievement is utterly impossible under the system of due process in the United States.

In the enforcement of the Federal narcotic law, the Bureau of Narcotics has followed a policy which is sufficiently flexible to prevent unwarranted suffering by addicts. Bureau enforcement functions are adjusted to avoid interference with, or harassment of, any reputable physician who dispenses or prescribes narcotics: First, to a person who requires legitimate relief of acute pain; second, to an aged or infirm person with drug addiction of long standing whose collapse or death might result from withdrawal of the narcotic; or third, to a patient in the course of bona fide treatment of addiction.

While prescribing and dispensing by a physician must be "in the course of professional practice only," the standards followed by the Bureau of Narcotics are those established by responsible medical bodies. The American Medical Association has had committees on the subject and has issued statements as to what constitutes legitimate medical treatment of a narcotic addict. The joint statement of the American Medical Association—AMA—and the National Research Council—NRC—issued in June 1963, is, I believe, representative of medical and scientific opinion on the ethical use of narcotic drugs and the management of addicts.

To summarize, I understand the Bureau follows the program established by the Federal Government even before the creation of the Bureau of Narcotics in the Treasury Department in 1930.

This program was:

First. A strong vigorous law enforcement policy aimed at exacting stringent punishment for illicit traffickers in narcotics;

Second. Proper treatment and effective rehabilitation of addicts with a view of curing addiction; and

Third. International and national cooperation with enforcement agencies to help eliminate the local violators and foreign sources of supply.

In carrying out its responsibilities, U.S. narcotic agents work abroad with foreign authorities seeking to eliminate sources of supply. In November 1962, the Secretary of the Treasury extended foreign responsibilities of the Bureau which had been limited to Europe and the Near East, to include all foreign areas. Bureau personnel are now assigned in Rome, Italy; Paris and Marseille, France; Beirut, Lebanon; Istanbul, Turkey; Mexico City and Monterrey, Mexico; Bangkok, Thailand; Hong Kong and Singapore.

During 1964, I know that Bureau agents overseas assisting law enforcement officers of foreign countries established an impressive record of arrests and seizures. In such joint investigations, 284 defendants were arrested, 5 clandestine heroin laboratories were seized, and the following drugs were seized: 1,722 kilograms of raw opium, 99 kilograms of prepared opium, 341 kilograms of morphine base, 233 kilograms of heroin, 3 kilograms of cocaine, and 2,605 kilograms of marihuana.

The Bureau of Narcotics has been in the forefront of investigations involving organized crime at the national and international level as evidenced by the arrest of diplomat Salvador Pardo-Bolland, and others, in New York City in February 1964, following the seizure of 60 kilograms of heroin. Over the years, it amassed considerable intelligence on many top members of organized crime. Since 1956 the agency has developed over 20 major conspiracy cases involving and convicting 206 important racketeers of narcotic law violations. Among those were such notorious violators as Vito Genovese, Big John Ormento, Carmine Galante, Natale Evola, and Joseph Valachi. Genovese, Ormento, Galante, and Evola, you will recall, were delegates to the infamous Apalachin "conference."

Long mandatory sentences imposed on all sellers of narcotic drugs have had a salutary effect on the hierarchy of organized crime in general, and, on the drug traffic, for you will recall that Joseph Valachi was, and is, serving concurrent 15- and 20-year prison terms for violation of the Federal narcotic laws. This incarceration played a major part in his decision to cooperate with law enforcement and to publicly disclose at hearings before the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations last year the existence of, and his and others' membership in, the Cosa Nostra. Valachi described its organized crime tentacles both inside and outside of prisons and throughout the country.

But to continue to do its job, the Bureau must have the funds with which to operate. The recommendation of the committee, with which I am in complete agreement, is that these funds be provided.

Mr. Chairman, there recently appeared in two issues of Life magazine two articles on the problem of narcotic use and its sale. I believe that not only are these articles an outstanding example of responsible journalism, but also give a clear picture of this vicious traffic and the misery it leaves in its wake. The merit of these articles is such that they deserve to be made a part of this debate and the permanent RECORD of this assembly, and I include them herewith:

"WE ARE ANIMALS IN A WORLD NO ONE KNOWS"—JOHN AND KAREN, TWO LIVES LOST TO HEROIN

Four times a day, this is John and Karen, holed up with heroin. Faces desperate and intent, teeth pulling tight the tourniquet, grimy fingers squeezing fluid into the bloodstream, and then—peace. This is everything they live for—this is what heroin is all about. With this shot their problems vanish, and the world they cannot handle fades to leave them in solitary bliss.

No "square"—the addict's word for anyone who does not use drugs—can imagine the strength of heroin's hold. The addict will beg for it, walk miles for it, wait hours for it, con for it, stay up days and nights on end to pursue it, steal from those he has loved for it, risk death for it. Heroin, more than any other drug, leads the greatest number of addicts to squalor and desperation.

The frightening power heroin holds over John and Karen is the subject of this essay and the article that follows. To outsiders, they sometimes seem to stroll but always they are driven by the drug—he to thievery, she to prostitution, and both to "pushing" heroin to pay for their own supply. The drug urges them, as the story shows, to murky streets and ill-lit corners, through shabby rooms and in and out of hospitals and jails. It is their jealous lover, and their wrathful god.

Every day heroin wins a few new converts to its ranks, and now there are more addicts in America than authorities can successfully count. The Federal Narcotics Bureau estimates that the United States has 60,000 heroin addicts, but other less official counts climb into the hundreds of thousands. Half of the country's addicts live in New York City, and almost all the others are in the slums of Detroit, Chicago, and Los Angeles. Half are Negro. Only 20 percent are women. They commit an enormous number of crimes—more than 15 percent of New York City's burglaries (but less than 2 percent of its felonious assaults). Few are violent. Contrary to popular belief, it is not heroin that may lead to violence, but the excessive use of other drugs: amphetamines, barbiturates, cocaine, Doriden, marihuana.

The heroin addict is a very busy man. For those who would separate him from his heroin he has no use and no time. When he awakes in the morning he reaches instantly for his "works"—eyedropper, needle ("spike," he calls it), and bottle top ("cooker"). He dissolves heroin in water in the cooker and injects the mixture. This is his "wakeup," a morning shot to hold off the anxiety and sickness of withdrawal and get him "straight" enough to start the day. If his habit is costing him $20 a day, and that is not a large habit by any means, he must now start out to steal at least $100 worth of goods, knowing that a fence will give him only one-fifth the true value of his loot. When he has stolen something, he must haggle with his fence over the price. The argument seems interminable to him, for it has now been hours since his wakeup and he is getting nervous again, his eyes are watering and he is beginning to feel like a man coming down with a bad case of flu.

Finally he gets the money and begins his search for a "connection"—someone with heroin for sale. Not just any connection, but a connection who deals good quality stuff—"dynamite," not "garbage." Once the addict has bought his fix (has "copped" or "scored") he is faced with the risky business of getting it to his cooker and into his arm without getting caught and "busted" (arrested). When he has finally injected the heroin—he calls it "shooting up," "taking off," "getting off"—he may or may not go on a "nod"—his eyelids heavy, his mind wandering pleasantly—depending on how much heroin his body has become accustomed to and how much actual heroin was in the powder he injected.

He hopes that the shot will be at least strong enough to make him straight for a few hours. He can judge immediately the quality of the shot. If it is strong enough, he calms down, the flu feeling leaves, and he instantly begins looking for money for the next shot.

What haunts the addict are anxieties, which only heroin can relieve. In the shaky families and oppressive environment of big-city slums, anxieties pile up fast—and it is in the teeming slums that heroin is handy. From friend to friend the drug spreads inexorably among the emotionally weak and unstable.

John and Karen have much in common with other big-city junkies. Karen is 26, John 24. Both had broken the law before they started on heroin—she as a prostitute in the Midwest, he as a thief in New York. Karen is the first in her family to use illegal drugs; but John has two addicted brothers, and a third died of an overdose.

Both John and Karen have used many drugs, but they prefer heroin to all the rest just as a gourmet prefers wine to beer. Both have been to jail (he 10 times, she twice) and to hospitals (he 4 times, she twice)—and have emerged each time to start their habits fresh.

John and Karen have been together—sleeping wherever they can find a place to lie down—for three years. They use the same last name, but never got around to formal marriage. ("We did get a blood test once," says Karen.) Karen's earnings as a prostitute also support John's habit, and he occasionally contributes a little money by breaking into parked cabs, in which drivers may have left coin changers.

Both John and Karen are at times all but overcome by revulsion for their habit and for the horrifying, unseen world it forces them into. "We are animals," says Karen. "We are all animals in a world no one knows."

THE WORLD OF NEEDLE PARK

(By James Mills)

From legal poppy fields in Turkey, by camel across the sands of Syria to the not-so-legal laboratories in Lebanon, then by ship to southern France for final refining, back to Italy and, courtesy of the Mafia, to New York's docks and airports—heroin comes to Harlem. And from Harlem the drug moves swiftly through the city of New York, as efficiently and regularly as milk from New Jersey or fish from Fulton Street. As it moves, the illicit stream swells into pools from which addicts in various parts of the city draw their daily needs. Addicts—and the police—are as aware of the selling locations as the housewife is of her neighborhood shopping center.

In the rush and confusion at 96th Street and Broadway, addicts gather on the corner to meet the pushers and buy their drugs—ignored by crowds of New Yorkers on their way to work. On the southwest corner of

82d Street and Columbus Avenue, two blocks from Manhattan's Museum of Natural History and the expensive Central Park West apartments nearby, addicts spend thousands of dollars a day for heroin. In front of a drugstore at 47th Street and Broadway, within the chaotic glow of Times Square, unknowing tourists brush shoulder to shoulder with barbituate addicts waiting stiff and zombielike for their connections. It's the same just two blocks south, among the honky-tonk bars and nightclubs, or down in Greenwich Village, where heroin and marihuana pass from hand to hand on the benches of Washington Square.

Of these hundreds of locations outside Harlem, one of the most typical is located at the corner of 71st Street where Broadway pushes through Amsterdam Avenue on its diagonal slice across Manhattan. To subway riders who use the stop there, the intersection is Sherman Square. To the drug addicts it is "Needle Park."

Needle Park, like the rest of the world of the big-city narcotics addict, is peopled by a conglomeration of individuals who come from different backgrounds, have different ways of getting the money they need, and who prefer different combinations of drugs. Simply by hanging around Needle Park for a while with John and Karen and John's older brother "Bro," you can meet a whole spectrum of addiction: Irene, a slight, wispy lesbian addicted to "goofballs," barbiturates. Goofballs usually produce a quiet drowsiness, but also at times a tense aggressiveness that can be frighteningly unpredictable. Irene's behavior when she is high on GB's, which is most of the time, has created such havoc in the neighborhood restaurants that they no longer let her in. So sometimes she stands outside on the sidewalk and tries to shout at her friends through the window. After a while, she laughs uproariously and goes running on down the street with another girl.

There is Billy, who never stays around for long because he is trying desperately to stay clean. He just finished 3 years in Leavenworth for smuggling drugs from Mexico. Now he has had enough and wants to be square. He is trying to get a job, "but how can you explain 3 years out of your life? And no one in his right mind is going to hire a junkie."

Hank is a regular habitue. He is on bombitas—Spanish for "little bombs." In Harlem they cost a dollar; in Needle Park the price is $1.50 or $2. Hank has the customary symptoms of a bombista user. Because they are amphetamines, stimulants, he talks constantly, cannot sit still, and his arms and face are covered with sores where he has picked at the skin, sometimes with the illusion that bugs are crawling underneath.

And always, lurking in the shadows, haunting Needle Park, stands Mike, a tall, trench-coated Negro. Mike is a "takeoff artist," and a man to keep away from. He supports his habit by taking off (robbing) connections, and almost anyone else in the junkie world who appears to have money.

When junkies meet, they talk incessantly about drugs. Which is better, heroin mixed with a bombita or with cocaine? Both cocaine and bombitas are stimulants, and either one combined with heroin, which is a depressant, produces a more pleasurable high than heroin alone. The mixture is called a "speedball." But cocaine is very expensive, so addicts agree that for the money, a bombita-and-heroin cannot be topped.

During one of these interminable conversations, someone said he had a friend who liked to shoot model airplane glue. No one else had heard of that. Sniffing glue, yes; but not shooting it. They had heard of people doing something to paregoric and shoe polish and then shooting it, but the high was reported to be no good. Heroin, of course, was the best. Heroin and a bombita. It gave the best high, completely relaxed, not a problem in the world.

But that's not really the best high, one addict said. Do you know that the best high really is? The voice was serious. Everyone turned and stayed very quiet to hear, maybe, of a new kind of high that was better than heroin, better than anything else. The best high—the voice was low and somber—is death. Silence. Man, that's outta sight, that's somethin' else. Yeah, no feelin' at all. Everyone agreed. The best high of all was death.

Junkies hang around Needle Park because it is surrounded by cheap hotels, needed by addict prostitutes; because three blocks away, a short walk for a sick junkie, are respectable neighborhoods which are good for burglary and "cracking shorts"—breaking into cars; and because, probably, a long time ago someone started selling dope there and the area just got to be known as a good place to make a connection—to "score."

Today much of the heroin in Needle Park comes from a man who lives in a very nice apartment on a pleasant East Side street. He buys heroin in "pieces" (ounces), cuts it and bags it, and hands it over on consignment to a handful of pushers—junkies themselves—who sell it for him. The pushers do not really have to push. It is a seller's market with heroin, and the junkies fight their way to any connection who has good stuff. The image of the sly pusher enticing nonusers into trying a free bag of heroin is pure myth.

The amount of payment the junkie pusher gets is the same anywhere in the city. Fifteen $3 bags are wrapped together with a rubberband (the package is called a half load). The pusher buys the package for $25, sells enough bags to recoup his investment, and uses the rest himself. Often the junkie pusher will deal "nickel bags" at $5 each, as well as $3 "treys." These come in "bundles" similar to half loads, except that the package costs $75 and consists of 25 $5 bags. Sometimes a junkie pusher can get half loads or bundles on consignment. But if he decides to shoot up all the bags himself and beat the supplier for the money, his friends will soon be remarking that they haven't seen him around for a while. He usually keeps pushing until he is "busted" (arrested) or until he gets scared and decides to stop pressing his luck with the police, and return to less serious crimes to finance his habit.

JUNKIES TURN A HOTEL ROOM INTO A "SHOOTING GALLERY"

From time to time the addict may voluntarily interrupt his life on the street to enter a hospital. (Several New York hospitals reserve beds for addicts.) His body has achieved such a high tolerance to heroin that he must shoot a huge number of bags—not just to get high, but to keep from getting sick. In the case of a prostitute, she may be getting so thin and sick looking—so "strung out"—that she has been forced to reduce her price. In both cases the addict goes into a hospital to withdraw from the drug and get back to the point where just a bag or two will make him high.

The male junkie, when he isn't pushing, almost invariably turns to theft and burglary to support his habit. One of the most expert burglars among Needle Park junkies is "John's brother, Bro. Bro is 28, with thick black hair and an intent, quiet face. He was first arrested—for purse snatching—when he was 9 years old. He mainlined his first heroin shot when he was 13 and has now done 20 "bits" in jail for a total of nine years, plus two years in the Federal narcotics hospital at Lexington, Ky.

"I'm the best burglar on the West Side," he told me proudly one night. I believe him. Once I was standing with him outside the door of a hotel room I had rented near Needle Park, fumbling in my pocket for the key. "Man, you don't need that," he said, and quickly slipped a celluloid card into the doorjamb. In an instant the door was open and Bro was in the room.

He has skill and daring—what junkies call "heart." "Burglary is my job," he explains soberly. "It's what I'm good at." In addition, he has an indispensable talent for talking his way out of tight spots. "You see," he said, "when I go into an apartment I jam the lock—stick some toothpicks in the keyhole and break them off—so if the people come back I can hear them trying to get their key in and I can make it out the fire escape. But once in a while I get careless and don't jam the lock and then—well, like once this guy come back and got in the apartment and saw me.

"It was real tight, man. He was standing there with his wife and his little kid, and I grabbed the kid and said, 'Man, I don't want to do nothing' to the kid, but I'm a dope fiend and I'm real sick and I got to get out of here.' And I guess the guy thought I was really gonna hurt the kid or something—I mean, you couldn't blame him—and he let me go."

Bro is married, but his wife does not use drugs and so he spends as little time with her as he can get away with, preferring to stick with John and Karen and the other junkies. Often none of them has a hotel room and then they lounge around on the benches in Needle Park or in a nearby luncheonette, or just walk the streets. When Karen is working—and by that she means hustling, on the telephone with old customers when possible, on the street if necessary—she may end up with a room for the night and a little sleep.

That doesn't happen to Johnny. If he cannot find a friend with a room, he walks around all night looking for cars to break into or for a place to lie down. Often he finds a public bathroom in one of the hotels around the park and sleeps there. Bro jokes about the time Johnny actually moved into a fourth-floor bathroom in a hotel on Sherman Square. "I went looking for him there," Bro said, "and he even had laundry strung up in the place. A couple of more nights and the hotel would have put in a phone."

At one point John and Karen had a room in a tiny, seedy hotel sandwiched between more respectable hotels on West 72d Street across from a row of high-rent apartment houses. The hotel does a fast business with prostitutes and junkies, possibly because it has a night deskman who will send heroin to the room faster than you could get a ham on rye from room service at the Hilton. When a junkie has a hotel room, the word spreads fast. All his friends and their friends stream in and the place turns into a "shooting gallery."

I knocked on the door one night and Johnny let me in. It was in the midst of a panic—a citywide drug shortage—and the desk man was out of stuff. Drugs were so scarce addicts were kicking their habits in the street, and many had been forced to switch to barbiturates. The room was littered with the debris of addiction—bits of toilet paper and clothing that had been used to wipe blood from arms; glasses half filled with water tinged red from the cleaning of many needles; scraps of electric light cord chopped up and separated into thin strands with which to unclog needles; charred metal bottle tops used for cookers. Everywhere on the floor—strewn so thick you could not see the carpet—were clothing, old comic books, and cigarette butts. Sheets and blankets, cigarette holes burned in them by nodding addicts, had fallen from the bed and lay kicked into corners. Stuffing oozed from a waffle-sized burn in the mattress. The smell was of sweat and smoke and heroin.

Karen looked worse than I had ever seen her. Her eyes were widely dilated, partly from heroin withdrawal, partly from enormous doses of barbiturates. She had a $50 date with a "John" in New Jersey and Johnny and his friends were trying desperately to get her into shape for the trip. She was nearly unconscious. Two men held her up, and another whose name was Ronnie brushed her hair for her. Her face looked as if makeup had been laid on with a trowel. "Come on, Karen," Ronnie pleaded, "you got to make that train. You got to get out there, baby. You can't miss this trick, Karen, you got to make it." She mumbled and slouched in her supporters' arms, and Ronnie kept brushing.

Johnny walked over to a corner of the room that was stacked high with cases of coffee and cellophane packages of women's hair curlers. He and a friend had spotted a truck unloading supplies onto a sidewalk in front of a grocery store. They had grabbed everything they could carry and ran with it in their arms to the hotel. Now they were going to try to sell the haul.

The men who had been holding up Karen sat her down on the bed. She fell back, anesthesized by the barbiturates. Someone knocked on the door and Johnny yelled at the men "There's too much noise in here. Can't you guys shut up? That's probably the cops now. You make so much racket they could hear you inside the station house." He walked to the door and whispered, "Who is it?"

"It's the FBI." It was Bro's voice. Johnny opened the door. "Funny," he said as Bro slipped past him and sat down on the edge of the bed. He glanced at Karen and shook his head in mock distaste. He had a bag of heroin and dumped the powder into a bottle top. "Where'd you get that?" Johnny demanded.

Bro gave the name of a connection. "It's probably garbage." He produced a bombita, broke off the glass top and poured the fluid in with the heroin. Bro held a match under the cooker until the white powder dissolved. Then he put the tip of the needle—the same one Ronnie and Karen and the other men had used—into a pea-sized wad of cotton (used to filter out large impurities that might clog the needle) and drew up the liquid from the bottom of the cooker. Borrowing Ronnie's belt, he wrapped it around his arm, held the end in his teeth, stuck the needle into a vein and waited for the blood to start backing up into the eyedropper. Instead of shooting the fluid in immediately he squeezed in a few drops, let it back up into the eyedropper again, squeezed in a little more, let it back up, squeezed in more, and continued the in-and-out process until the fluid in the dropper was dark red with blood.

The technique, known as "booting," is believed to prolong the drug's initial effect. He continued booting until there was so much blood in the dropper he was afraid it would coagulate and clog the needle. Then he shot it all in and withdrew the needle. Had the needle clogged, he would have dumped the mixture of blood and drugs back into the cooker, heated it until the blood dissolved, and started over. Addicts call this "shooting gravy": "Because that's what it is—right? Cooked blood?"

"IT'S GARBAGE," BRO SAID, "ALL I FEEL'S THE BOMBITA"

Bro put the dropper and needle into a glass of water. "How's it?" one of the men asked. "Garbage," Bro said. "All I feel's the bombita."

Ronnie had Karen sitting up on the edge of the bed and was brushing her hair again and begging her to stay awake, but it was hopeless. She was too far gone to make her New Jersey date until the next afternoon. The phone rang and Johnny talked on it for a minute and then announced he was leaving to sell some of the stolen coffee to a grocer. Around Needle Park it is not uncommon for addicts to steal from one grocer and sell to another, or to steal meat from a supermarket and sell it to a restaurant. "At one point," Johnny once told me, "Karen and I were robbing every candy store in the area, mostly for cigarettes. We told one candy store guy that if he bought all our cigarettes, we'd leave him alone. We did quite a business for a while."

Johnny loaded three coffee cases into the elevator and I rode down with him. He put them out next to the desk in the lobby and we sat and talked while he waited for someone to pick them up.

Stringent search and seizure laws make it tough for detectives to produce much unshakable evidence against addicts and addict pushers. Merely being an addict is not a crime in New York; he must have drugs or a hypodermic needle in his possession. Many addicts—especially pushers—wear a rubber band on their wrists (a "dealer's band," some call it) which, if hooked properly around a deck of heroin, will send it flying if an approaching detective is spotted.

But when police are in a drug neighborhood they have no difficulty spotting addicts on the street. An experienced narcotics cop, or a longtime addict, can with surprising reliability spot a user in a group of 20 people, state with authority what kind of drug he is on, approximately how long it has been since his last fix, and whether or not he is at that moment "dirty," carrying drugs. Because heroin subdues appetite, the addict is almost always thin. He has a craving for sweets, and often carries a bottle of soda pop (although he may know that, to a detective, it is a badge of addiction). The backs of his hands are chronically puffed and swollen, from shooting in the veins there.

The addict is habitually dirty, his clothes filthy, and he stands slackly as if his body were without muscles. Waiting for a connection, he is nervous and intent, staring for minutes at a time in the direction from which he expects the pusher to come. Detectives know that when a group of addicts is standing around, talking, waiting, none of them is carrying heroin. But if you watch the group long enough suddenly it explodes, all the addicts walking off in different directions. The pusher has appeared and soon, one by one, they will make their roundabout way to him to "cop."

Once the addict has drugs on him, he keeps moving. He is about to achieve the one thing for which he lives, and he is not slow about it. His shoulders are hunched, his head is down, and he strikes out with what some detectives call a "leaving-the-set walk," as if he had just learned where a million dollars was hidden. When the heroin addict is high, his pupils are "pinned," constricted, and if the shot was sufficiently powerful he goes on a "nod"—his head drooping, eyelids heavy.

But though he appears terribly sleepy, he speaks coherently. His mind wanders, he daydreams, and everything he does, he does with maddening slowness. He can take 30 minutes to tie his shoelaces. But he always resists admitting that he is on a nod. He is very sleepy, he says, and if he stops talking in midsentence, he argues that he is not nodding, only trying to phrase the sentence properly. Once the addict has had his shot and is "straight," he may become admirably, though briefly, industrious, suddenly deciding to shine his shoes, brush his coat, comb his hair—all the while scolding himself bitterly for having slipped so far.

Even the seasons conspire to identify addicts. In winter, waiting to cop, they alone stand around in the snow and slush, apparently aimlessly. In summer, they alone wear long sleeves (to cover their "tracks"—needle marks). Because heroin users almost always feel cold, they wear piles of sweaters, even in hot weather.

When male and female addicts gather together, in a hotel room or public bathroom, the narcotics detective knows better than to suspect sexual activity. Heroin depresses sexual desire—men may become impotent, women often do not menstruate. (If a woman gives birth while she is addicted to heroin the infant also will be physically addicted and must live his first 3 days withdrawing from the drug). For most heroin addicts a sex crime would be impossible, and they are all contemptuous of stories about the "raging, dope-fiend, sex maniac."

Almost all heroin addicts are childishly immature; full of demands, empty of offerings. When they want something, they want it yesterday and they want it effortlessly. Nothing is their fault—their addition, their degradation, their desperation. All are insecure, most dislike people, and—though the mechanics of obtaining and injecting drugs forces them into relationships with other people—most would prefer to be alone.

None can tolerate "changes." If the junkie goes looking for a connection and does not find him on the right corner at the right time, he grumbles about all the changes. Almost everything he is forced to do involves too many changes. He must go through changes to steal, to find a fence, to get a shot, to avoid the police, but the addict is rarely violent. He wants heroin to get his fix with as few complications, as few changes, as possible, and be left in peace to shoot it. He prefers simple, nonviolent crimes—theft, burglary, prostitution.

When they are off heroin, addicts tend to be morose and restless. On heroin, when they are straight, they are pleasant, gentle, likable. Psychiatrists who have studied them over long periods know that most of them are extremely narcissistic, that their intense preoccupation with heroin is a surface manifestation of a more profound emotional preoccupation with themselves.

In pursuit of the drug they can bring to bear extraordinary cunning, nerve, and acting ability. But once they have the fix in hand and the problem shifts from how to get drugs to how to avoid arrest, these qualities vanish. An addict who is arrested because a detective discovered heroin hidden in his pants cuff may, once he is released, immediately buy a deck of heroin and hide it in his pants cuff.

Perhaps the dominant emotional characteristic of the addict is his enormous compulsion to abdicate all responsibility for his own life. He craves to be told what to do. If he is encouraged to go to a hospital by someone he trusts, he will go; but soon, when he finds the hospital not to his liking, he will leave, and then blame the failure not on himself but on the person who urged him to go. An addict will walk along a street openly displaying a container of drugs, all but asking to be arrested. If a detective does spot the drug and arrests him, the addict will blame it on bad luck. He thus purges himself of the responsibility of choosing between jail and abstinence, or continued addiction on the street. He feels he has left the choice to fate.

Female addict prostitutes may, for the same reason, solicit men who are almost certainly detectives. One psychiatrist reported that when one of his addict patients saw another patient in an artificial lung, she became enraged and demanded the lung for herself, unconsciously demonstrating her wish to relinquish to the lung her ultimate responsibility—breathing.

After I had known John and Karen for a couple of months, I sat down with them individually and we talked of familiar events and ideas, and about some subjects that had never before been mentioned. Because most drug addicts, particularly those in big cities, live similar lives and display common symptoms, these tape-recorded conversations reveal much about the lives and personalities not only of John and Karen, but of the many thousands of other young people who suffer from drug addiction. They should be read with the thought in mind that just as the paralytic's every step is twisted by his affliction, so every word an addict speaks is colored by the symptoms of his disease—self-deception, immaturity, insecurity, guilt.

The morning the conversation with Karen occurred, she was lying on a dirty, bare hotel mattress, relaxing under the effects of a shot taken 30 minutes earlier. She had just discovered lice crawling on her and had placed one of them on a table by the bed. She stared at it while I connected the recorder.

KAREN EXPLAINS IT: "I LIKE FEELING OF NOT FEELING"

"I can't stand these terrible things," she almost shouted. "The filthy little things. Johnny must have brought them home from jail. I put it on the table there so I can see how tiny it is and then it doesn't scare me so much."

"Karen, when did you first use illegal drugs?"

"I got this awful toothache and Johnny gave me a shot, and it took the pain away, and it also took my fear of drugs away. So I started doing it myself, while Johnny'd be in the bedroom sleeping. I was scared to death of Johnny catching me. And I had a habit before I knew it. We were living right in the same house and for a long time he didn't know I was using it. I liked it. It made me very relaxed, very high. I grooved with it. I dig junk. I won't kid anybody. I dig the high, the whole bit. I like the feeling. I like the feeling of not feeling.

"What is it the Spanish say? No siento nada—I feel nothing. That's just the way you get to feel—nothing. Nothing fazes you. You could hear about your mother dying an excruciating death and you wouldn't even shed a tear. And I was still hooking then—$100 dates, making maybe $2,200 a week. Meanwhile Johnny was just sitting home doing nothing. Shooting up, sleeping, watching TV, reading comic books, having his buddies over, turning them on. He had a real ball."

"What do you think of other junkies, junkies, in general?"

"They're pigs. I can't stand them."

"Why not?"

"I'm probably looking in a mirror and I can't stand it. They're animals. We're all animals. We'll step on one another for a shot if there's no dope. I've seen it. I can't even trust Johnny. I had my wake-up shot 3 days ago right here on the table. When I got up, it was gone and Johnny was the only one that was straight that morning. Everyone was sick but Johnny. And I know Johnny didn't have a wake-up of his own.

"And I'm just as bad. I don't live from day to day or paycheck to paycheck. I live from fix to fix. Yesterday morning, as sick as I was, Johnny insisted that I go with this John. Johnny brought him up here and I turned the trick. I gave the money to Johnny, but I never saw any junk for it.

"I'm no different from any of the others. I'll beat somebody for their money just as fast as look at them. That's why I say we're animals. One time when I was sick myself, a girl came up here and she had $30. She said, 'Karen, can you cop?' I said 'Yes.' I took the money and I never came back. I didn't intend to come back from the very beginning. She waited 10 hours for me, and I never came back."

"Karen, have you ever used a knife on anybody?"

"No. But I could, and I know how. I'm capable. And I'll cut anybody who threatens me. Like I said, that's what I mean about being an animal. Three years ago I couldn't have hurt a fly. But when you don't care about your own life—that much—then you know what you care about someone else's life. And when someone threatens the little bit of care that you do have for your own life, then you know what you're going to do to them. If they're gonna hurt me, I could kill somebody and it wouldn't faze me. Just like Freddy—you know Freddy—said he ripped somebody's stomach wide open and when he found out his guts weren't falling out, he put his hand in and pulled them out. He made sure that guy died. And I could do the same thing."

"Has Johnny ever cut you?"

"Yes. He went crazy behind bombita. He didn't cut me badly. I broke the blade of the knife off. But when you can't get stuff and you get sick, you get desperate. Like, let me tell you what you go through sometimes just trying to cop. When you cop, you don't know whether you're going to get caught with that bag on you or whether you're going to get it home. Let me tell you what goes on in your mind.

"All right, let's say it costs me $10 to get a fix—two nickel bags. OK. Well, I have my $10. Now, if I can't locate a connection around Needle Park, what I have to do is go uptown. Last night I went up to 112th Street in Harlem, where the better junk is. Once I'm there, I walk with a knife opened, like this. That's the way you have to walk up there. They see a white in Harlem and they're ready to jump all over you. So you walk up there with a knife out—or like Julio did the other day. He carries a .45 right out in the open. OK. I have my $10. I want to get two $5 bags. So I go and ask someone, 'Who's got the best stuff around here?' 'Chico has.' OK. Chico has. Then someone says, 'Emanuel has.' So I have to find out who's who and who has the better stuff, Emanuel or Chico.

"Meanwhile you're walking on this street, you know darn well The Man [any cop] is watching you. You know it. You feel it. But you don't care because you're sick. So you're going to take that chance anyway. Now, you don't want to jeopardize the connection either. So all right, you're gonna cop off Chico. You walk by Chico and say, 'I want two,' and keep walking. Then you turn around and you come back and you give him the money and at the same time you say you want two. Then you come back and he gives you the two.

"Now if Chico decides to beat you, Chico's just gonna turn around and walk away. And you're dead. Your $10 is gone with the wind. Or maybe you're gonna get the stuff home and find it's baking soda. The fellow you met steered you wrong because he's getting a piece of it. This doesn't often happen when it's not panic time.

"Now, after you cop, most of the time you have to walk home because you don't have that much money for a cab. Buses take too long, and you're standing on that corner with stuff on you. So all the time you're walking, you're praying too. You're saying to yourself, 'Is there a narco [narcotics detective] around that knows my face and is going to call me over just for the hell of it?' Which they do. Meanwhile, you've got stuff on you, and you're sick. You never know—you're never relaxed until you feel the stuff in you, and even then you know that within 4 hours you've got to get some more money, and get more stuff again. This is gonna go on and on. And you know that before you go to bed that night you not only have to have your bedtime fix but you have to have your wake-up. So that's $20 right there that you must have, you absolutely must have. And you have to cop before you go to bed because when you wake up you might be too sick to be able to go out and cop."

"I IMAGINE I'VE BEEN SORRY EVERY DAY I'VE HAD THE HABIT"

"Karen, I know you can think up a very glib story and with your acting ability deliver it to a doctor and get a prescription. Can you do this with other people as well?"

"I can do this with anyone. Anybody I want to do something for me. I can make them do it. Just by talking. I've been able to do that since I was a little girl, since I first told a lie to my father. My father was very strict. I had to think up reasons to get out of the house to do the things I wanted to do. So that was what I did. I started on my father. It worked on him, it worked on my mother, it worked on my teachers, and it worked on everybody else. The only thing you really need is a sincere approach. If someone thinks you're sincere, they'll do anything in the world for you.

"If ever I was going to get a licking—not a licking, but a punishment, rather—that I didn't want. I used to cry and say, 'Gee, I'm sorry.' They felt so bad about my feeling sorry that they wouldn't do anything. I was a cute little girl—until they started telling me what to do and my father started to be a tyrant. My father started to use military tactics on me. Never hit me. But he messed my mind up. I had to sit on a straight-backed chair for 3 and 4 hours at a time with my hands folded without talking. Three years old. Or he made me stand at attention 3 and 4 hours till my back felt like it was breaking. I never cried to my father, or to my mother—she was an angel—but I cried to my aunts and uncles. I got what I wanted."

"Karen, have you ever been sorry that you went on the stuff 3 years ago?"

"I imagine that I've been sorry every day that I've had a habit."

"Why don't you kick and get clean and be square?"

"That's probably what will happen eventually."

"Why don't you do it now? Why didn't you do it a year ago?"

"Johnny didn't want to do it then."

"All right then, why don't you do it now?"

"I might. I just might do that. I don't want to start right into a job. I want to go on a vacation first somewhere. I want to go to Puerto Rico."

"How long ago did you have your last shot?"

"Half hour ago."

"Do you ever look at a square girl on the street * * *?"

"And envy her? Yes. Every day. Because she doesn't know what I know. I could never be a square like that. I was once, but once I took that first shot, that shattered the whole bit—because then I knew. I knew what it was to be high. I knew what it was to groove with junk. Even the first habit that I kicked, which was the worst that I ever kicked, I kicked cold turkey of my own volition—and I still went back to junk. Right in this very hotel. I bought my first fix right here. Why? Oh, I don't know. I found some excuse or another to do it. I'll tell you right now. I wouldn't care if I died. I just hope it isn't painful, that's all."

"What do you think is going to become of you eventually, Karen?"

"I don't know. I'll probably die—early. It won't be from junk, but it'll be from something connected with junk. Hepatitis or something. I don't care anymore. I really don't. Because there's nothing for me. I don't have any reason to quit using."

"Isn't it enough of a reason that you wouldn't be living the kind of life you live now?"

"That means nothing to me. I don't give a good damn."

The conversation with John was recorded in the same hotel room his brother Bro had entered so effortlessly with a celluloid card. John had just injected a bombita, and began to talk long and easily about his addiction, his career as a pusher and his relationship with Karen.

"Johnny, how old were you the first time you used any drugs?"

"About 13. I smoked some pot (marihuana). And I've seen drugs practically all my life. My brother was already hooked, not just starting but already hooked, at 13 when he was still going to school. I was going with this girl, and like I used to walk the straight and narrow line. And then I think I had an argument with her, and instead of going drinking to get drunk, I went and bought a stick of pot. I was started. Ever since then, boy, I've been going real strong."

"How did you meet Karen?"

"My brother and his girl were living in Karen's apartment. And one day I went to visit them and my brother brought me into the bedroom and says, 'Karen, this is Johnny, the brother I was telling you about.' And like the first words out of her mouth made me turn like blood red. She said, 'Oh, yeah, but he's cuter than what you said he was.'

"Now I wasn't used to talk like that, because I'd been away at jail for 3 years and hadn't so much as kissed a girl. And I've always been kind of shy of girls when I first meet them. Usually when I first meet people I'm quiet. I sit and find out what kind of people they are before I even commit myself. So like right away when I blushed she thought it was cute. She started teasing me. So we got along right away

"I wanted to get high. So I told my brother, I says, 'I want to get high.' So he says no. Now, Karen's listening to this—like she was death on drugs. She was death. Karen says, 'No, don't give him any.' So I said, 'The hell with you. I got money, I know where to score. I'll see you later.' So I started going out the door and my brother said, 'Look, Karen, one of my other brothers went with somebody else to get high and they left him, and he died. I don't want it to happen to Johnny.' So after she thought about it, she said, 'All right.'

"So I got high. I got high and then I left and when I was leaving I turned around to Karen and I told her, 'Karen, I like you. You're real people.' Because, like, every hooker I've ever met * * * I'd never made it with a hooker before. Like, when you walk into the house and they first meet you, they start talking hundred-dollar bills, five-hundred-dollar bills. I don't know, they're phonies. And she was regular people—like, for real.

"And the second day I come downtown from the Bronx and I walk into this restaurant and they were sitting in the back. She had black slacks on and a black jacket and a black scarf. And I hadn't seen here before with any makeup on. It was raining out and I had an umbrella in my hand and I looked at my brother and I says, 'You told me she was pretty.' And like I could see that she was starting to get insulted, probably thinking like I was going to say she was ugly. But then I said, 'She's not pretty, she's beautiful.' And she didn't know how to act behind that.

"And neither did I after I said it. I was hung up for words. I started to turn red again. We went out and started running through the rain. We wound up in a drugstore and there was an iron Karen liked, a clothes iron, and they wanted $7 for it. So my brother said, 'Karen, for a couple more dollars you could get a big steam iron.' She says, 'Yeah, but it's nice, I want it.' And like, I like that, too. She says, 'This is nice. I like it. I want it. I'm going to get it.' So, I like that. I went for the way she came on with it. So it stuck in my mind. I like people that if they want something, they'll get it. I'm like that myself. If I can't buy it, I'll steal it. If I can't steal it, I'll get it some way. Anyway, she bought the iron.

"So the next night I went over and my brother and his girl left and now my hand accidentally bumped against Karen's arm and her skin was so smooth, like I was fascinated by it. It was like silk. And then all these other people came over and Karen says, 'Everybody has to go, I'm going to sleep.' So I started to put my coat on. I figured she meant me too, and I was on parole anyway. I had to be home at certain times. And my brother says, "Take your coat off. Karen says she wants you to stay.' And I says to my brother, 'I'm on parole. And if the parole officer comes over to the house, it's going to be all over.' So anyway, all he had to do was say it one more time. 'Karen wants you to stay.' That was it. I took my coat off. Ever since then, we've been together."

"SHE USED TO HAVE MY FIX READY, LIKE BREAKFAST IN BED"

"She wasn't using drugs then?"

"No. And she was some beautiful girl. We used to go out for a walk and people used to look at her—twice. Boy, she was a doll. And then once we were in the bedroom, and we were lying down talking. And out of nowhere she says, 'Johnny, I'm on stuff.' I looked at her and says, 'What do you mean, you're on stuff?' She says, 'I've been using behind your back the past 6 months.' I don't know how I felt. But I felt so empty. Like, I wanted to get up and bash her brains against the wall. And then I felt sorry for her.

"She's been using stuff ever since then. But even before she was using, she had this problem with her own mind—not sure whether she wanted to go with girls or with boys. So, like she was very unsure of herself, very insecure. And I started going with her and eventually, as the time went on, she found out, like, she wasn't gay. And like she was always afraid, and then, I don't know, as time went on, she realized like she loved me. Like it was me and only me—first, last, and always. Since then like everything was like real sweet.

"So anyway, she was hooking when I met her. So I didn't go for that at all, because I had never made it with a hooker before. So one night she had a date and she told me to come back later, in an hour or something like that. I came back later, I rang the bell and walked through the front door and was going to the apartment, and the door opened and she had the chain on it and she stuck her hand out. And I stopped dead right in the hallway. I don't know if I wanted to cry, run, kick the door in. I didn't know what to do, I was so hurt.

"Ever since that time, every time she'd go out with a trick, I'd get an attitude. Or, if the trick would come over, I'd just be sulky, nasty with the trick. Even today I don't like her hustling. I'd rather have her stay home and I got to go out and steal. I don't think you or anybody else can understand the way I felt standing in the hallway—like, the only person I really loved in there with someone else. And, like stopping me from coming in. Even today when we get to talking, like, that always comes up. I never liked her to hook. Like a lot of times I tell her, 'Don't go out. Stop hooking, get a job.'

"She's very timid in a lot of ways. She has to have me to lean on. With little problems she'd come to me. She'd cry in her sleep. She'd wake up crying. If somebody would wake her up too hard, she'd cry. It's hard to explain. I just never liked her to hook. She used to make like at least $1,500 a week, maybe more. Even with that money coming in—and most of it going on clothes and me, nothing but the best she used to get me—and even with that, I would have rather give that up than have her go out with other guys. Even today, like she's got two habits to support.

"I don't do anything. I don't contribute anything. Except another problem, another habit to support. And my love for her, that's all."

"Johnny, do you and Karen ever fight?"

"Do we fight? Boy. Like yesterday she woke up real sick. She had given somebody $25. She wanted to surprise me by coming home with the stuff instead of coming home and giving me the money and having me go out and get it. She wanted to surprise me by waking me up and saying, 'Here, Johnny,' and I could just get off in bed. That's what she used to do—wake me up and have my fix ready, like breakfast in bed.

"Well, she gave the guy $25. He went uptown. This was 9 o'clock in the morning. At 9 at night we finally find out where he lives and we go up there and he says, 'Look, I don't know how to tell you, but I got beat.' Now that's 12 hours we're waiting for him. He could have called and we could have went out and got some money. We didn't get straight until about 3 o'clock this morning. And my last shot before that was close to maybe 18, 20 hours, something like that. It was a long time.

"When she woke up, she was very sick. She had a bombita and a $3 bag. And she started putting it on the cooker. I told her, 'Leave half of it in the cooker for me.' Now, we'd be lucky if two $3 bags would straighten either one of us out—the way stuff is out there now—never mind one, never mind half of one. She looked at me like I was crazy.

"She said, 'Johnny, it's only a $3 bag.' I says, 'I know what it is, leave half of it for me.' She says, 'Johnny,'—she started crying—'Johnny, I'm sick. Please let me do it and I'll go out and get some money, fast. I'll turn a trick or something. I can get money faster if I'm straight,' which is true. I would probably have got straight in an hour.

"But I was like cold-blooded. I told her, 'I don't want to hear no stories. Leave half in the cooker, or I'm going to take it all.'

"It's not like me to do something like that. That's just vengeance, some kind of vengeance. I'm very spiteful. Like if I have an argument with somebody and they bite me on my big toe, you know eventually I'm going to get to their big toe and bite it back. I don't like myself like that. It scares me. Maybe it wouldn't even bother me with someone else. But with her, who's supposed to mean so much to me, that I could do something like that and threaten to take the whole thing, knowing that neither one of us are going to get straight, maybe just get the edges taken off. * * * If I'm going to keep that up, she can get somebody a whole lot better than me.

"Last night we had an argument and she got scared and started running up these stairs. And her being afraid of me like that, that got me mad. She ran up to the sixth floor—as sick as she was—and ran into a bathroom and locked the door and tried to hide from me. You do something like that with an animal. You hide from an animal. She wouldn't open the door, I threatened to kick the panel out and she finally opened it. And she was in the shower stall, crouched down like a real refugee. You see them picture posters of refugees crouched down, and the fear that she had on her face, and the shaking. She was actually, really shaking. Afterwards, she couldn't hold the cooker steady. I tell you, I'll leave her for good before I keep putting her through that. I don't want her to be afraid.

"When you were pushing, Johnny, what's the largest amount you ever bought—to put into bags and resell?

"Three pieces, three ounces.

"How many bags will that make?

"That depends how many times you cut it. Some connections used to cut it 4 to 1, maybe 5 to 1. But I only cut mine 3½ times. That way it would be very strong. And I put the rest of the connections in my neighborhood out of business.

"I used to get very good stuff. I went up to this guy's house and he cut it for me. You stretch a nylon stocking over a wire hanger, put the stuff on it and run over it with a spoon. And it flows through the nylon and gets fluffed up. And after that you cut it with quinine and milk sugar. And after it's mixed you have these stamp-collectors' bags, little glassine envelopes, and you have these baby measuring spoons, like a mother uses with her kids. You put the stuff in one of the small spoons and run a razor over the top to flatten it out. Then you put it into the bag, wrap it up, put tape on it and you've got yourself a bag. And then you go out and sell it."

"How much does your habit cost you a day?"

"I'll tell you, when people tell you, like they're using $50 a day, they can't tell you that. They don't really know how much heroin they're using. Like I might find old Joe Schmo today and buy three bags from him and find that one bag straightens me out. Now, OK, so I'll time my shots and get away with $15 today. Tomorrow I can't find Joe Schmo so I go find Larry the Jerk, and I buy three off him and one don't straighten me out, and maybe three won't straighten me out. So, actually how much you use depends on the quality of the stuff.

"Like right now the stuff is so weak that to find somebody on the streets that you can really say has a real bad habit would be doing something. I mean, it's not like it used to be. I've seen guys come into jail and, like the expression goes, they kicked their habit on the elevator. In 2 or 3 days they're eating, sleeping, doing pushups.

"So it depends on the quality. I can't say I use this much or that much. I used to use a lot. Even today, if I have 10 bags in the morning, I won't have anything left that night, or maybe not even that afternoon. I just can't hold on to stuff without shooting it. I won't actually get greedy and shoot it all at once but like, whenever it enters my mind to get off, I just get off. I can't hold on to it."

"Johnny, when you go to a hospital or to jail and you get clean, why do you always go back on drugs?"

"Well, the longest I ever stayed clean on the street on my own was when one of my older brothers died of an overdose. I didn't want to use drugs. I think it was like 2 weeks, 3 weeks. I thought I would really do it—stay clean—because of my brother. And then, one day I was with one of my other brothers and I saw this kid I knew standing on the corner. He was sick. I was doing good, staying dressed nice, leading a good life. I was happy. He was sick. So I said to him, 'What are you shooting, what's your fix?' And he says, 'Two bags.' So I gave him $6. And I know where he's going and what he's going to do, and I know the feeling he's going to get.

"It must have hit my mind all the way in the back. I looked at my brother. He knew what was on my mind and he like shrugged his shoulders, like to say, 'I don't care.' So I said to the kid, 'Look, here's another $6. Get two more.' So we got up to the bathroom in some hotel and the kid got off first because he was sick, and my brother got off, and then I drew up the stuff and I just kept sitting around with it in my hand. And I kept thinking about my dead brother. And I didn't want to use, because of what happened to him. Then I says to myself, only it was like to him, 'I hope you'll understand. You know what it's like.' And I got off. After almost squirting it on the floor for maybe four or five times. But finally I shot it. And ever since then * * *."

"What do you think of junkies in general, Johnny?"

"Well, I wouldn't put my money in another junkie's hand unless I really, really trusted him. I've been beat by my own brother, and if my brother's going to run around and beat me, who can I trust? I can't trust nobody out there. Even Karen has gotten off behind my back. Like all the times I've stayed 16, 17, 18 hours without a fix and she disappeared someplace, and I know she's not going to go that long without a fix. She can tell me anything she wants, but I know Karen. And she'll come back and tell me she hasn't gotten off, but she's high. A couple of times she's been gone all day and all night and I didn't see her until the next day and, if I didn't do anything, I'd be sick when she came back. But when she came back, she'd have a bag of stuff to get me straight and I'd get off first before I even started arguing with her. And then I'd be happy I was straight and I'd only give her like half an argument.

"You can't trust junkies. But after using drugs for so long, they're, like, my people. That's what I call them, my people. I can't get along with square people. If I'm walking in the streets, anywhere, I walk pretty fast and, if somebody's in front of me, I get very, very aggravated with them. I'll shoot around them and I might say something under my breath or I might say, 'Move it the hell out of the way.' I don't like people. Maybe if I got back off drugs and got a job, I might try to force it from myself. Maybe in a week or two it'll just come back."

"What do you think is going to become of you, Johnny?"

"I don't know what's going to happen. But I've had it with drugs. I'm going to stop. I've had enough of it. If I want to go back to it 10 years from now, it will still be out there. I can always get it. And if I can't make the square life, if I find it too rough—which I doubt—the stuff will always be on the corners, the connections will always be there. It's been there for hundreds of years, and it'll be there for another hundred years."

"Well, Johnny, what is it that keeps you around Needle Park?"

"Nothing, I just don't have any place else to go. That's the whole thing in a nutshell. I could go to my parents upstate. Like, Monday I'm going home. I want to clean up. I want to get a job. I want to be square again. I'm tired of this life. I've had it. I'm ready to stop. And I'm ready to take on responsibilities of all kinds that I should be able to—as a man. Instead of using escapes, all kinds of escapes."

"How long has it been, Johnny, since you've had a fix?"

"Two or three hours."

"How long do you think it will be before you get off again?"

"Maybe right after I leave here."

"Well, then, why do you say that you've had it with drugs?"

"Well, after Monday, anyway."

I Told Them Not To Go Home

The world's largest, oldest, most prestigious center for treating drug addicts sits atop a hill near Lexington on a thousand acres of Kentucky's bluegrass meadowland. It opened 30 years ago as the U.S. Narcotics Farm, but when addicts started writing in to order narcotics, the name was hastily changed to the U.S. Public Health Service Hospital. It has been an off-and-on home for countless addicts, who refer to it simply as "K.Y." Until recently, when a few big cities started putting aside hospital beds for addicts, Lexington and a smaller Public Health Service hospital in Fort Worth, Tex., were just about the only spots in the United States where a junkie could hole up, get off heroin, catch his breath and have a crack at permanently overcoming his addiction.

The scores of addict treatment centers that spread across the country—there are 40 in New York City alone—range from the well-known, multichaptered Synamon (Life, Mar. 9, 1962) to the offices of a few individual physicians with an honest sympathy for addicts. But Lexington still bears the brunt of addiction treatment, taking in 1,900 voluntary patients and 432 Federal prisoners last year (at any one time, prisoners, who stay longer, outnumber voluntaries).

Anyone who has never been a voluntary patient before and uses any drug included in a long—but outdated—list set by Federal law may get in simply by showing up at the main gate. Former voluntary patients who seek readmittance must file an application. Unfortunately, some of the more hazardous addicting drugs, like barbiturates and amphetamines, are excluded from the list, and users of them are admitted only if they also use a listed drug. While a once-in-a-while marihuana smoker can get it, a dangerously addicted barbiturate user is turned away.

Checking into Lexington, an addict finds himself swept up by a system designed to take him off drugs and keep him off. Getting him off is not much of a problem. Because of the high price of heroin on the street, few addicts today can afford enough to give them a severe habit. When they kick the habit, even without assisting medication, they ordinarily experience intense nervousness, runny nose, goose flesh, diarrhea, mild stomach cramps—symptoms familiar to anyone who has fought off a bad case of flu. To relieve discomfort during the first few days of withdrawal, heroin addicts get a periodic swallow of methadone, a synthetic narcotic. Barbiturate addicts get pentobarbital. After a few days, the addict's body has lost its dependence on heroin and needs not drugs but rest and food.

The real battle at K.Y. is not with the addict's body but with his mind. He must be weaned from his emotional craving for drugs. Once off drugs, he is moved to "orientation," where for 3 weeks he is tested and talked to by psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, and job trainers. Finally, assigned a room in "population," he finds himself with a 30-hour-a-week job or a school program teaching him to be almost anything from a printer or pants presser to a dental assistant.

From here on in, Lexington stops looking like a hospital. The staple medicine is other people. The addict is forced to cope with the staff and other patients, and now he has no drugs to help him escape—as he always has before—the problem of dealing with other people and with himself. Group therapy sessions help him along and, if he needs it, he may get individual therapy from one of the hospital's 14 staff psychiatrists.

Treatment does not always go so smoothly. Most patients are big-city heroin addicts who, though they come voluntarily to the hospital, may not be really sure they want to make the break. Sometimes they try to smuggle drugs in with them. They show a resourcefulness and ingenuity picked up in years of street living. Addicts have hidden heroin under their toenails, taped to the bottom of their feet, stuffed behind dental plates, sprinkled through their hair. To inject drugs smuggled into the hospital, patients have fashioned syringes from plastic bottles and needles from ballpoint pens. Some years ago, the entire hospital system appeared outsmarted when patients suddenly started showing up high on heroin. Security men sitting in the admitting rooms could not detect the flaw, and the heroin kept coming in. Finally a helpful addict sent a hospital official a copy of a leaflet he had bought on a Harlem street corner for $1. It was titled "How To Smuggle Drugs into Lexington": simply, go in with a couple of bags of heroin in your hand, ask for a paper towel to wipe your nose, crumple the bags into the towel and hold on to it—nobody will suspect the towel because a hospital official gave it to you in the first place. And it worked.

Dr. Frederick B. Glaser, the psychiatrist who appears on the preceding pages, considered the two young sisters to be among his most hopeful patients. "You talk to those girls," he said, before they had returned to New York, "and your heart goes out to them. They're ingenuous, not at all hardened. Both girls break a lot of rules, but you hate to punish them because they're so childish and they break them so innocently. One day they don't go to work and you tell them they have to, and they ask innocently, 'Why?' They're so childish that someone suggested that when they do something wrong, we ought to just spank them. If I were in New York and could see these girls as outpatients I think I could help them."

When they did get back to New York, the younger sister moved in with her mother and the older one went back with a 60-year-old bookie who had kept her before she went to Lexington. They live only a few blocks from a corner—96th Street and Broadway—popular with junkies and pushers. "I try to stay out of the neighborhood," the older sister said, looking up toward the drug-infested corner, "but it's tough. The other junkies ride you when you're off stuff. I guess they want to get you back on so they won't feel put down by you. I really want to stop drugs. At K.Y. I saw these junkies with scars and abscesses and all that. That's not for me. I want to stop." But a week after leaving Lexington, she was back on drugs—and so was her sister.

Doctors at Lexington, though disappointed, were hardly surprised. Very few Lexington patients—probably less than 10 percent—stay off drugs when they get home. Dr. Glaser and the other doctors would seem to have ample reason for feeling that they are fighting a losing battle. But they do not. They are bolstered by one intriguing and extraordinary fact: nearly half the country's addicts are in their twenties, and only 11 percent are over 40. What happens to an addict when he begins to age? Evidently, as he grows older, he also grows up. He matures. His compulsion to avoid the desperate, degraded life of addiction overpowers his compulsion to use drugs.

Many psychiatrists believe that the maturing process can be hastened by hospital therapy, that as the addict experiences drug-free life in a hospital—or perhaps even in a jail—a layer of maturity is laid down within him. Each time his addiction is arrested for a few more weeks or months, the layer thickens. Finally, he outgrows his infantile need for the solace of drugs and gives them up. This theory, combined with the obvious humanitarian necessity of providing some kind of hospital treatment to addicts, is what refutes Lexington's high relapse rate —and keeps its doctors plugging.

REALITIES WE MUST FACE—BUT WON'T

(By James Mills)

If you smoke a pack a day, drink too much, weigh more than you should, or have a bad cold—your system is taking a bigger beating than it would from heroin. Even a long-time, hard-core heroin addict, if he stops using the drug (either voluntarily or because he is in a jail or hospital), loses all physical need for it within 3 to 5 days—less time than it takes to shake off a common cold. After that time, his body is clinically unaware that it has ever had a shot. Though the addict may be in miserable condition—emaciated, covered with abscesses, weak with hepatitis—his afflictions are not caused by heroin itself but by unsterile needles, by impurities in the heroin he has used, and by general neglect of his health. If he remains in the hospital for months of treatment and general drug-free routine he emerges strong and healthy, completely cured of his physical addiction.

Why then is there so much concern over addiction? Obviously, because it destroys the life of anyone who becomes ensnared by drugs, and turns each day's struggle to maintain his habit into a degrading hell. Furthermore, drug addiction is an emotional problem, and no matter how often or how painstakingly the addict is physically rehabilitated, his emotional problems have not necessarily been touched. As soon as he is on his own he will almost certainly go looking for another shot. Within a few weeks he will be physically addicted again, sick again, desperate again.

Why does the cycle begin? The addict, as a result of his own deep-seated insecurities, feels that he has been thrown into life's conflicts without armor and weapons everybody else has. Heroin allows him to escape this uneven battle. It deadens his desire for wealth, strength, success, sex—even for food. With heroin, he needs nothing more. The satisfactions sought so relentlessly by the rest of the world, the addict can have—temporarily—with a $5 deck of heroin. So he takes a shot.

But in exchange for these brief periods of artificial bliss, he suffers everything else. Whenever the addict comes out of a high—and he cannot stay euphoric indefinitely—he faces the agonizing truth that family, home, friends, and job are gone, his clothes are dirty, his neglected body is filthy and sick. Shame overwelms him—and at that moment he wants desperately to stay off drugs. But heroin can handle shame, too. So he takes another shot.

THE REASONS FOR NOT LEGALIZING DRUGS FOR ADDICTS

Many who argue that the addict's problems are created not by drugs, but by the attempts to deprive him of them, go on to claim that if every addict could get drugs without resorting to crime, he might straighten up, take the time to sterilize needles, eat occasionally, maybe even work.

The best answer to this argument is to take a backward look; until 50 years ago, narcotics were completely legal in the United States. Opium in its various derivatives—today they include heroin, morphine, Dilaudid, and codeine—were basic ingredients in countless patent medicines. Many doctors and pharmacists handled narcotic drugs with the cure-all enthusiasm of an Army corpsman passing out aspirin. At the turn of this century one in every 400 Americans was addicted to opium in one form or another. Many of them were unwittingly hooked on such accepted household nostrums as Mrs. Winslow's Soothing Syrup and Dr. Cole's Catarrh Cure.

Then, in 1914, Congress passed the Harrison Narcotics Act, forbidding anyone but licensed doctors to prescribe cocaine or opiates and then only "in the course of his professional practice." Five years later the Supreme Court ruled that professional practice did not include handing out narcotics for the sole purpose of satisfying addiction. All over the country, doctors cut off the flow of drugs, and addicts by the tens of thousands showed up at local boards of health for help. Government narcotics agents suggested drug-dispensing clinics as an answer, and some 44 were set up by local authorities.

On the whole, the clinics appeared to have had no other purpose than to save addicts from exploitation by pushers. But there was a fatal flaw in this seemingly enlightened program. Given an unlimited supply of heroin, few—if any—addicts level off at a stable dose; an addict receiving a prescribed amount from a clinic or doctor soon demands more. To get it, he returns to the illegal pusher—and he is back where he started.

After 3 years of experiment the clinics closed down, largely on the advice of the medical profession. And the AMA today sticks by its opinion, first expressed in clinic days: "Any method of treatment for narcotic drug addiction, whether private, institutional, official or governmental, which premits the addicted person to dose himself with the habit-forming narcotic drugs placed in his hands for self-administration is an unsatisfactory treatment of addiction, begets deception, extends the abuse of habit-forming narcotic drugs, and causes an increase in crime."

But why limit the addict's dose at all? Why not give him all he wants? First, it is not done because society—especially the medical profession—feels a responsibility to cure the sick, not just to abandon them to their sickness. And second, it is not done because if narcotics were legally available to everyone without prescription, addiction would spread. A psychiatrist who has worked closely with addicts for years points out that addiction is "pathological behavior which can be viewed as infectious. The individual who is susceptible to this particular disorder most often decides to try drugs after his curiosity has been stimulated by the presence of an addict in the neighborhood."

A study by doctors at the Federal narcotics hospital at Lexington, Ky. indicates that in his lifetime the average addict introduces four nonusers to heroin. If addicts could get drugs legally, cheaply and in unlimited quantity, they would hardly be less inclined to share them with nonusers than they are today. People who accepted heroin as a means of escaping their emotional problems would become addicted. The number of these addiction-prone individuals is enormous—perhaps a majority of the millions of people who are emotionally unequipped to tolerate discomfort, or who are directed toward pleasure more than responsibility.

Federal narcotics laws have been refined and tightened—often at the urging of the medical profession—since the Harrison Act, but they still permit much more freedom than most doctors realize, or are willing to exercise. "It is clear," says the Medical Society of the County of New York, "that the majority of physicians do not understand what kind of therapy they can undertake."

The laws do not, for example, forbid that a physician treat an addict or give him narcotics. They state only that he must do so in an effort to cure the addict, not simply to maintain his addiction, and that the doctor must not trust the addict to administer the drugs to himself. The laws require that treatment of an addict, during which drugs are given to reduce withdrawal discomfort, must—except in certain extreme circumstances—be restricted to a hospital. The doctor is permitted to dispense narcotics continuously to patients with painful chronic diseases and also to the "aged and infirm," whose collapse and death might result from withdrawal of the drug. When an addict is awaiting admittance for hospital treatment, a doctor may, for as long as 2 weeks, give him daily doses of a narcotic to hold off withdrawal. Also, restrictions on the use of narcotics may be modified for the benefit of research into addiction. In rare instances, it is even possible to secure government permission to maintain a young, otherwise healthy addict on drugs.

One reputable east coast doctor, an exception in that he has treated many addicts, encountered a patient he thought could benefit from a steady, easily obtained supply of narcotics. The doctor had good reasons for his belief. Though numerous attempts to cure the patient had failed, he did have—and this was the crucial factor—an understanding and sympathetic family, eager to help him control his habit as much as possible. The doctor called the Federal Narcotics Bureau to explain the situation, and the Bureau agreed. The doctor then informed a pharmacy of the dosage the addict was authorized to receive. The pharmacist confirmed the legality of the procedure with his own call to the Bureau. The patient got his drugs. (The doctor took the precaution of warning the addict that if any of his addict friends showed up at the office, the whole arrangement was off.)

But most doctors, although they publicly may advocate less stringent narcotics laws, privately want nothing to do with treating addicts, even within the framework of existing laws. Addicts make very bad patients. They often steal, lie, refuse to cooperate, and, when it comes to paying for anything except drugs, they're always broke. They can be withdrawn from drugs temporarily, but they almost always relapse. Give drugs to one and he returns the next day at the head of a long line of other hopeful addicts.

Some unscrupulous doctors take advantage of this very weakness. Without checking with the Federal Narcotics Bureau, or with other doctors, or with anyone, they deal with addicts strictly for the money they can make by writing illegal prescriptions. Addicts call such doctors croakers. One New York doctor freely hands out small amounts of cocaine and six Dilaudid tablets (which cost him less than $2) and charges $13. Another—and there are many like him—sells Dilaudid prescriptions (not the drugs, just the prescription) for $10 each. The ease with which croakers do this sooner or later trips up most of them: detectives, who must go through elaborate search-and-seizure procedures to get evidence against pushers, can pinpoint an unscrupulous doctor simply by tracing his blizzard of prescription slips back to the source. On this evidence, a croaker can lose his license to practice and be jailed for up to 5 years.

Doctors—respectable and otherwise—will themselves sometimes turn to drugs. Exhausted by long hours, upset by personal problems, a doctor may be tempted to seek relief with a handy dose of morphine, Demerol or Dilaudid. He unwisely assumes that he is not addiction prone and that one shot will not necessarily lead to another. But doctors are not that different from other people—some of them do have an emotional susceptibility to addiction, and some of them do become addicted. One study indicated that the proportion of addicted doctors in the Nation's total number of addicts was eight times the proportion of doctors in the general population—a concrete and disturbing example of what can happen when drugs are easily available.

Other examples of the dangers of an unlimited supply of drugs are evident abroad. Israel for 4 years operated drug clinics, but closed them when they failed to control the spread of addiction. The people of Denmark, where drugs are legal, consume 60 percent more drugs per capita than any other country in the world, and that government is now tightening controls.

THE MYTH OF THE BRITISH SYSTEM OF DRUG CONTROL

But what of England? Almost everyone has heard of the "British system" of dispensing drugs to addicts. Over a period of years ill-informed commentators have created the impression that in Britain the addict invariably is treated as a sick person, in America as a criminal; that in Britain laws radically different from our own require the official registration of addicts, who may obtain their needed drugs simply by visiting a pharmacy and displaying their registration card. This "system," some observers have argued, has reduced the British narcotics problem to practically nothing.

British doctors and government officials are the first to deny that they have a system at all. Addicts there are not required to register, do not have registration cards and cannot get drugs from a pharmacy without a doctor's prescription—though prescriptions are more easily obtained than in this country.

England has never had a severe narcotics problem; its procedure for handling addicts appears to be the result of the problem's small size, not the cause of it. The New York County Medical Society supports this conclusion. "There is no evidence," it says, "that the permissive approach in England is responsible for their low addiction rate. Other countries, such as Norway, with a similar approach, have very high addiction rates."

The British narcotics laws differ from our own in only one significant respect. A British doctor is allowed to dispense drugs to an addict if "it has been demonstrated that the patient, while capable of leading a useful and normal life when a certain dose is regularly administered, becomes incapable of this when the drug is entirely discontinued."

An infinitesimal number of addicts falls into this category. British journalists and researchers report that the problem there is far more acute than official statistics indicate, that there are perhaps four times as many addicts as the government admits—almost none of whom fulfill the "useful and normal life" requirement. Many of these addicts get their drugs from illegal pushers, from unscrupulous doctors who make a living writing "scripts" for addicts, or from other addicts who con more drugs from legitimate doctors than they really need.

A British doctor who studied 30 addicts seeking hospital treatment in 1962 reported that the going black-market price for heroin was 30 shillings ($4.20) per grain, about four times what a New York addict pays for it—an indication that British addicts sometimes find it tougher than Americans to get drugs. Like U.S. addicts, most of the 30 were thin, poorly dressed, dirty, and unemployed. On the whole their lives—and the lives of other British addicts investigated more recently—appeared hardly less distressing than the life of the typical American big-city junkie.

Even if the British did have a system that could reduce their drug problem, would it be equally effective everywhere else? Since addiction is an emotional problem, an anti-addiction program that worked well in the British environment might not work so well on a people with a different emotional and cultural makeup. In support of this view, authorities point to the drug problem in Hong Kong. Although it is a British colony, enjoying the benefits of the "British system," Hong Kong, with one-third the population of New York City, has more addicts (approximately 150,000—or one for every 10 adult males) than the entire United States. It is, in fact, the only city in the world with more heroin addicts than New York.

Even as practiced in England, the "British system" contains curious inconsistencies. Doctors there often accommodate heroin addicts by prescribing cocaine with their heroin—not because the addict needs cocaine, but only because the two drugs mixed together provide a more pleasurable high than heroin alone. But, because cocaine is a far more dangerous drug than heroin—it may destroy brain cells and body tissues, induce paranoia and sometimes lead to violence—addicts would be better off without it. Marihuana, on the other hand, though far less dangerous, is totally illegal and strictly controlled in England.

Britain is not the only country where these two drugs are misunderstood. Some Americans—mostly members of beatnik groups—have protested that marihuana should be legalized, since it is not addicting. They are correct that it is not addicting (though it is strongly habituating), but they are wrong in assuming that this fact alone makes it safe. Many drugs which are not addicting are nevertheless dangerous, and quite properly controlled by law. (Cocaine, for example, is not physically addicting, but it is extremely dangerous.) Marihuana, in its action on the central nervous system, may produce dangerous and unpredictable effects ranging from distortion of time and space to hyperexhilaration and acute depression. Though many marihuana smokers never progress to heroin, a significant number of them do. Rarely is a heroin user found who did not come to the drug by way of marihuana.

Public confusion concerning which drugs are dangerous and which are not extends beyond the better known narcotics like heroin. Newspaper stories of crimes committed by "drug addicts" rarely mention the specific drug. Because to most laymen "drug addict" means heroin addict, the implication is that the crime was committed by someone on heroin. In the case of assaults or sex crimes this is rarely true, unless the assailant was unusually desperate or had been using the drug in small doses or for a short time. The drugs that are more likely to produce violence are cocaine; amphetamines like Dexedrine, Benzedrine, Desoxyn; barbiturates like Tuinal, Seconal, Nembutal, when taken to great excess; and Doriden (thought to be responsible for much addict violence, it is often taken by heroin addicts when they ter off than he is on heroin.

If opening the narcotics gate completely is not the answer to the problem, what about really locking it shut? Presumably, you cannot have drug addicts if you do not have drugs. The addict, deprived permanently of his supply, would not, according to most doctors, be likely to slip into some worse antisocial pursuit. He would perhaps have more than ordinary trouble keeping up on his rent payments, getting along with coworkers, coping with his family, handling routinely difficult problems of everyday life—the same symptoms displayed by nonaddicts with a personality disorder. But most authorities concede he would be decidedly better off than he is on heroin.

Any disease—including drug addiction—depends for its spread on three necessities: a susceptible individual, an infecting substance and an environment where the two can meet. Removing the environment—big-city slums—is itself a problem broader and thornier than drug addiction. But what about the other two corners of the triangle—the individual and the infecting substance, the drug? A psychiatrist at the Lexington hospital put it this way: "To have a drug addict, you must first have an unstable personality and a drug. It is the scientist's responsibility to reduce the supply of unstable personalities, and the Government's responsibility to reduce the supply of drugs."

HOW THE COURTS IMPEDE NARCOTICS LAW ENFORCEMENT

Is the Government doing its part? On the whole, police work aimed at the nonusing pusher—the pusher who is in business only for the high profit—is efficient and productive. But getting a pusher into court is not getting him into jail. If a man walks up to you on the street and hits you in the mouth, you call a policeman, sign a complaint and agree to appear in court to testify against the attacker. You are the complaining witness, not the police. But the drug pusher's victim, the addict, would usually not think of bringing charges against the pusher. The pusher is his savior, the supplier of his fix. So it falls to the police to take the pusher to court. To have a case against a pusher, the police must have evidence; but the laws dictating how evidence may be seized are a basic constitutional protection, framed with great care. In recent years the U.S. Supreme Court has broadened its interpretation of these laws with such zeal that at times seizure has seemed all but impossible to frustrated law enforcement officers.

Every day New York's Police Narcotics Bureau receives letters from slum tenants reporting the names, nicknames, descriptions, and addresses of drug pushers. Obviously, the letter writers assume that such information should be sufficient to produce the pusher's arrest. Actually, narcotics detectives often can do little more than make routine checks of this information. They already may know more pushers than the average addict. Their need is not for information, but for evidence. And to get evidence admissible in court often takes weeks or months of intense investigation, endless patience, and a deep awareness of the subtleties of seizure.

For example: A detective staking out the home of a suspected heroin wholesaler sees him emerge with an attaché case. On the sidewalk, he meets another man, known to be a pusher. They enter a parked car, sit for a moment and, as the detective approaches, he sees the pusher hand the suspected wholesaler a fat manila envelope. The detective opens the car door, flips open the attaché case and finds it filled with a kilogram of pure heroin—worth at the addict level a quarter of a million dollars. The envelope is filled with cash. He arrests both men. Later, in court, both men are freed. Recent Supreme Court decisions, rules the judge, indicate that the detective's knowledge of the suspects' background and method of operation did not legally justify his opening the attaché case.

Another example: Some time ago police raided a New York apartment and seized 6 kilograms (13.2 pounds) of heroin—enough, after repeated cuttings, to make 270,000 $5 bags. The haul indicated a well-financed, highly organized operation. Sophisticated laboratory equipment was seized with the heroin. A man in the apartment was arrested. In court, police produced the warrant on which the raid had been made. But, argued the defense, had the warrant been legally issued? It had been issued on the strength of information from an informant, the police replied. But was the informant known to be reliable? After all, you can't go barging into an apartment because just anyone says it's loaded with heroin. (The fact that the apartment did indeed prove to contain heroin was not considered sufficient indication of the informant's reliability.) Had the informant ever before provided information producing a conviction? Yes, he had—twice.

But had those convictions been handed down at the time the warrant was issued? In other words, was he at that moment known to be reliable? No, at that time the particular cases on which his reliability was based were still in court. In that event, the judge ruled, the warrant had been obtained on information from an informant not—at the time the warrant was issued—known to be reliable. The warrant was therefore ruled illegal. Since the warrant was illegal, the raid was illegal and the evidence illegally seized. Case dismissed.

All this occurred, not during a trial, but at a hearing requested by the defense to suppress the evidence. Had the suppression been denied, the case would have gone to trial. "These people get two cracks at us," says Inspector Ira Bluth, head of the New York Police Narcotics Bureau. "If the pusher loses out at the suppression hearing, he of course gets another chance to beat the case at the trial—and it's easier for him there because at the hearing he got a good look at the kind of case we have against him."

Often a pusher arrested for selling drugs never even approaches a suppression hearing, much less a trial. New York's courts overflow with unsettled cases, and judges and DA's frequently agree to reduce felony charges to misdemeanors to help clear the calendars. Pushers may end up happily pleading guilty to minor charges like mere possession and drawing a 6-month sentence—sometime less than their addicted customers receive for getting caught with a hypodermic needle.

In New York City, which is to the Nation's heroin supply what Chicago is to beef, a pusher can stand an excellent chance of amassing a considerable fortune without ever seeing the inside of a jail. He buys an ounce of heroin for $750, then cuts it and bags it into more than 500 $5 decks. Even as a fledgling street-corner pusher, he can make up to $1,000 a day. If he is cautious and smart, he can keep at it for years without an arrest. When he is caught—say, after 3 years—he knows that the incredibly flexible legal technicalities involving seizure of evidence give him a good chance of beating the case. If he is unlucky and does not beat the case, he may, if it is his first offense, get away with about 3 years in jail. (Legally he could receive a maximum of 15 years, but usually does not if he pleads guilty.)

During the 3 years he was pushing, he could have cleared close to a million dollars. Spread out over 6 years, to include his 3 years in jail, his earnings averaged out to something over $150,000 a year (untaxed)—a tempting income for a man brought up in the oppressive climate of asylum. The pusher ends up earning more money for his crime than most bank robbers, counterfeiters, or kidnapers, whose sentences customarily range from 20 years to the electric chair. Such staggering profits, coupled with the relatively low risk of prison, are a constant frustration to police. "It's not always new laws we need," a Federal Narcotics Bureau official observed recently. "Often we'd just settle for a realistic administration of the laws we've got."

The results of stricter penalties against pushers can be seen in Ohio. In 1955 the percentage of drug addicts in Ohio's big cities was almost as high as New York's. Then the State imposed a mandatory 20- to 40-year sentence for a first offense of selling drugs, and the courts backed the prosecutors with strict interpretation of the law's intent. The number of important violations plummeted 80 percent in 8 years. Evidently the pushers were scared out of business, or at least into setting up shop in more lenient States. The decline was so sharp that the Federal Narcotics Bureau reduced its agents in Ohio from 20 to 3. Unfortunately, Ohio and many other States did not stop with severe penalties for selling drugs. They also passed laws punishing mere users with unfairly harsh sentences ranging from 2 years to life, often with no chance of parole.

Assuming that 50,000 addicts live in New York City (estimates range from a low of 23,000 to a high of 100,000) and each spends about $20 a day for drugs (a very conservative figure), then $1 million in drug money changes hands illegally in New York City every day—not counting money paid for drugs eventually shipped westward across the country. Considering that New York City's political machinery periodically shows itself to be mildly clogged by corruption, it is possible to believe that some of this $1 million a day in untaxed cash must find its way in bribes to city officials. Some Government officials in New York and Washington argue that such must be the case, although they concede that both the local and Federal narcotics police are completely untainted. One official, who perhaps knows more about the existence of corruption than most other sources, admitted: "Unquestionably there is (corruption) among politicians. But often the politicians don't know that narcotics are mixed into the total package gangsters pay them for. They may think it's only bookmaking or loan sharking. If they knew narcotics were involved, they would not touch it." Another source thought for a moment, leaned back in his chair and said, "Well, you do see certain jail sentences that surprise you. I can't say there is no corruption." Another just said simply: "* * * I can't prove it."

A MAJOR STEP: CUTTING OFF THE SOURCE OF SUPPLY

If—because of legal technicalities, impossible court conditions, corruption—the torrent of heroin into New York and, through it, to the rest of the country cannot now be dammed why not attack the source of the flood? During World War II, when war conditions made smuggling difficult, drug addiction in the United States dropped to an all-time low—less than half of its present level. Heroin's high value and easy concealment makes its movement virtually impossible to control. But what about the poppyfields where the original opium—from which heroin is refined—is grown? Poppyfields are not easy to hide.

Actually, there is no need to hide them. More than 80 percent of the heroin reaching New York City comes from opium grown legally in Turkey. Turkish peasants are allowed to grow it as long as they sell all of it to the government, which then sells it to legal pharmaceutical factories. A Turkish farmer must tell the government how much land he is using for opium production, and must estimate the amount of opium he expects his land to yield. But Turkish police guess that half of their country's 200,000 opium farmers manage quite easily to underestimate their crops and sell the few extra pounds to black marketeers—for about $32 a pound, or double what the government pays. If the farmer is caught, the penalty is usually no more than a fine.

The U.S. Federal Narcotics Bureau reports that "Turk peasant producers, and even the wholesalers who buy up quantities from groups of producers, are often dealt with leniently when they are apprehended," often receiving in cases of serious violations "minor prison sentences of up to 6 months." The Bureau says that 6 to 8 percent of Turkey's 340-ton yearly opium output enters illegal channels, most of it ending up in the veins of U.S. heroin addicts.

Black marketeers who collect opium from the Turkish farmers move it to Syria in armed caravans of camels, mules or—less frequently—trucks. As many as 30 gunmen, armed with rifles or machineguns, guard these convoys, often fighting pitched battles with Turkish and Syrian patrols. U.S. narcotics agents, in Turkey to help halt the American-bound flow of drugs, join in the fights. Turkish authorities have resorted to planting land mines along frequently used routes, but smuggler armies overcome this tactic by driving sheep ahead of them. Turkish authorities say an average of 11 police and smugglers are killed each month in skirmishes along the Syrian border.

Once it has passed through Syria and into Lebanon, the smuggled opium is easily converted to less bulky morphine base and shipped through France (where clandestine laboratories convert it to heroin) to the United States.

In recent years the Turks have tried to improve control of opium production in their country. Our Federal narcotics agents, working with police in Turkey, Syria, Lebanon, France, Italy, and in U.S. cities, have assisted in seizures of enormous quantities of opiates. But the seizures hardly dent the total traffic. Stopping the flow at the source remains, in the words of the U.S. Public Health Service, "the most readily available means of preventing narcotic drug addiction." But our own State Department argues that encouraging producing countries to stop the flow is not its job. "The State Department is not the proper agency to push controls," says a spokesman. "The problem is being handled in the U.N. and is their baby at the moment. If the public puts up enough of a clamor, changes will be made."

What about the U.N.? "The remedy," says the U.N., "lies in strengthening the system of control." But the U.N. has no means of enforcing control. It admits that worldwide illicit opium traffic is "appallingly high," as much as 25 percent of the world's total legal crop—or up to 200 tons a year. Turkey is not the only source. Southeast Asian countries contribute to the illicit traffic, but the heaviest opium source in that part of the world is Red China. Chinese opium pours into Hong Kong. From there heroin moves on to Japan—the principal victim country—and then, in limited amounts, to Mexico and California.

"Clandestine manufacturers," says the U.N., "still have access to ample supplies of opium for the production of morphine and heroin, and this has been the most serious aspect of the opium problem throughout the last three decades."

What does the U.N. think can reduce the drug traffic? It echoes the State Department: "Public opinion."

All right. Opium production is not sufficiently controlled. Heroin pushers operate under the umbrella of the courts. Legalizing drugs won't help matters. Then what is being done to cope with the victims of these shortcomings and impossibilities—the addicts themselves?

In New York City, home of half the Nation's heroin users, an addict arrested on almost any charge can usually elect to swap a trial and possible jail sentence for treatment in a hospital. If he has committed only a misdemeanor and takes advantage of this option, he spends about 3 months in a hospital, followed by 9 months of regular visits with a social worker or psychiatrist at an after-care center. If the charge against him is a felony, the total length of treatment and follow-up care may extend to 3 years. If the addict does not respond to treatment—if he fails to show up at the center or repeatedly goes back on drugs—he may be returned to the court for trial on the original charge.

THE CHANGES THAT MUST BE MADE—STARTING NOW

Most drug users when arrested never take advantage of this opportunity for treatment. Most do not want to. An addict brought into court on a misdemeanor charge—possessing drugs, petty larceny—reasons: "Why serve 3 months in a hospital and then endure 9 more months of staying off drugs during follow-up care when I can get a 6-month sentence—maybe less—on the charge, serve only 4 (2 months off for good behavior) and come out totally free to take all the drugs I want?" "Also," he reasons, knowing that the option cannot be invoked repeatedly, "why waste this privilege on a mere misdemeanor? I'd better wait till I get hit with a felony and need the treatment option to avoid a really long jail term."

If an addict in court elects to go to jail briefly rather than to a hospital, society is, of course, better off than if he remained on the street. In jail the addict is not stealing, a saving to society of perhaps $1,000 a week, the value of property that must be stolen and fenced to support a $20–$30 a day habit. The addict himself also may be better off. He is at least eating, exercising, regaining strength and—perhaps to his emotional advantage—rediscovering what it takes to face social situations without the aid of drugs. And he is not introducing young nonusers to drugs.

Most authorities agree that, if the drug addict is to be successfully treated, long-term care must be forced on him. They argue that a typhoid fever victim who does not want to go to a hospital is required to go—for his own sake and for the sake of the community. Why not the addict? Dr. Warren Jurgensen, a top psychiatrist at the Lexington hospital and one of the leading authorities in the field, has written that drug addiction "is an illness of comfort. In other diseases, the discomfort of the patient provides real motivation to seek help. The addict, however, knows that successful treatment means loss of a source of great comfort: the drug."

The addict who sincerely wants to kick needs more than hospital treatment. He needs close, intensive assistance when he gets out. Few, if any, knowledgeable authorities in the area of drug addiction suggest that after-care as it exists today is anything but inadequate. The addict emerging from a hospital or jail still carries with him his basically infantile personality—and his child's need for training, support and encouragement. Unassisted, he is no more capable than a 3-year-old of finding a place to live, respectable friends, a means of support.

For 10 years, Dr. Jurgensen has watched many Lexington patients stay off drugs for very long periods while hospitalized only to return to them within hours after they hit the street. He puts it this way: "Posthospital treatment and supervision have, to say the least, been meager. Probation and parole officers have been the most active group providing the followup supervision. We find ourselves professionally frustrated when our discharged patients have so few resources for help. There cannot be good treatment without good followup care in the community. In the treatment of addiction, followup care after discharge is perhaps the greatest unmet need."

The problem of addiction abounds with unmet needs. The public, the Government, and the medical profession—with shamefully few exceptions—have not begun to grasp the broad realities of drug addiction—let alone tackle them. Ill-informed observers have obscured the truth, while authorities in the know—doctors and officials experienced in treatment and control—have remained silent or unheard.

What strong, specific steps could be taken to control addiction? Our State Department, without passing the buck to the United Nations, could pressure Turkey to police its peasant farmers closely and force them to stop diverting opium to black marketeers. In New York, the principal port of entry and principal victim city, the courts could stop bending over backward to protect the legal rights of drug traffickers, and act on the realization that the addict needs protection too—that only stiff jail sentences will force drug dealers to abandon their lucrative crime. Legislators could face up to the need for new laws that will force addicts to undergo treatment. The Government could set up adequate aftercare facilities to help addicts stay off drugs when they emerge from jails or hospitals. Research into addiction—into both its social and organic aspects—could be increased and accelerated. And doctors could accept their responsibility to treat the addict instead of using the law as an excuse to ignore him.

All these things could be done. But they are not.

SILVER

One of the most important items contained in the Treasury-Post Office Departments and Executive Office appropriations for 1966 has to do with coinage. Before I go into this subject in some detail, I should like to discuss the question of the minting of silver dollars.

Last year's appropriation bill provided funds for the minting of 45 million new silver dollars. I strongly opposed this appropriation, and I am gratified to note in this year's hearings that my reasoning was in accord with Secretary Dillon's subsequent decision. He testified at the hearings on this year's bill that these silver dollars were not minted on account of the Treasury's crash program which was necessary to meet the demands for other coins. The Secretary also stated that we cannot mint these dollars now without reducing the production of other denominations. He stated that great pressure was put on the Treasury to mint these silver dollars, but that in their view, it was not proper to undertake this minting until such time as they were in better shape with coin production in the smaller denominations. The Secretary informed us that both Senators from Montana talked very vigorously about a need for these coins. However, he stated that the Treasury had received a report from the suboffice of the Federal Reserve in Helena, Mont., saying that silver dollars had, for all intents and purposes, disappeared as a circulating medium in Montana. Consequently, if new coins were issued they would go into the hands of the speculators and coin collectors immediately, and would not be in circulation more than 20 minutes. The latest circulation statements show 482 million silver dollars outstanding, very few of which are ever seen. There are approximately 3 million silver dollars remaining in the Treasury.

The Director of the Mint, Miss Eva Adams, informed us that the dollars were needed, particularly in Western States where these coins have been used traditionally as a medium of exchange. Miss Adams told us that she was brought up near a mining camp, so her sympathy for the western producers is quite understandable. However, she did confirm the fact that production of silver dollars has been temporarily deferred. She also furnished us with some very pertinent and interesting information on the availability of silver dollars. She stated that the dollar machines in Las Vegas are a great source of revenue to the Federal Government, so she was anxious that a way be found to keep them running. She remarked that the machine operators have been very adroit. They will give you silver dollars to play the machines, but if you win the jackpot, or receive even a small winning, a security officer will take you to the cashier, and you must change the silver dollars back into bills. If silver dollars are really necessary as a medium of exchange in the Western States, would it not be more desirable to eliminate these machines and distribute the dollars where they might be needed? I think we could lose just as much money on the 50-cent machine, although it might take twice as long.

Possibly the day will come when we can once again afford to permit those who hit the jackpot to take their silver dollars away with them. Until that time, there are far better uses for our coin presses and for our silver supply. I am in favor of retaining this coin in our monetary system with its present silver content. It has remained unchanged since the beginning of our coinage system in 1792. But I strongly oppose the minting of additional silver dollars at this time. They are in effect a collector's item.

A great deal has been said and written about our coin shortage. It has been with us a long time—in fact too long. Funds are being requested to increase coinage production from 8 billion coins in fiscal year 1965 to 9.3 billion in fiscal year 1966. Although there are indications that the shortage is not as bad as it was, this is not reassuring and certainly is no cause for optimism.

Secretary Dillon has stated that the Federal Reserve feels they are pretty well on top of the penny shortage, but that there is still no inventory in the mints, or adequate inventories in the Reserve banks. He stated that nickel inventories are still much too low, but they are putting great effort there and it is hoped that the situation will improve in the next few months. Although the Treasury has made great efforts, there has been no improvement in silver coins. Inventories in both the mint and the Federal Reserve are depleted, and therefore, the Treasury will have to continue full steam ahead with the crash program. Assistant Secretary Wallace stated that between 1959 and 1964 the mint very nearly tripled the production of coins from 1½ to 4⅓ billion. He stated that by June 30, 1965, they will have produced 8 billion coins during the present fiscal year and their machines will be going at the annual rate of 9 billion. Concurring with Secretary Dillon he stated that the entire coin situation has improved but the demand still exceeds the supply in the case of coins other than pennies and that the situation remains somewhat tight.

Miss Adams stated that she believed the proper answer is for the mint to manufacture all coins necessary to satisfy the demand for coins for all purposes, including the speculators. You might well ask the question, How high is up? Where does it all end?

The coin shortage has created a silver shortage. In a moment I will discuss the silver situation. At this time I am interested in finding out more about what caused the coin shortage, why it continues, and when it will finally be ended. Most important of all is to insure that this situation will not occur again.

The mint certainly deserves great credit for its crash program which has resulted in the production in 1 year of an amount equal to 15 percent of all the coins minted in 172 years. But why has this been necessary?

The shortage appears to have begun in late 1961, almost immediately following a change in the mint administration. This is not to say that there were no spot shortages of coins prior to this time. However, the record shows that the proper use of mint facilities and proper planning took care of such shortages as they arose. Such was not the case at the end of 1961.

The first serious shortage developed in the latter part of that year with regard to the 1-cent and 5-cent pieces. The shortage was well publicized through utterances by public officials. More than that, the mint implied that if the Congress had provided funds in a supplemental appropriation bill a substantial portion of the coins required would be coming out of the mint. Despite this development of a shortage in pennies, production of these coins in 1962 was cut back, while the production of half dollars was substantially increased from 31 to 48 million. This was a production increase of 55 percent in a coin which was not in short supply, and which used up a large amount of silver. The production of other silver coins was also substantially increased. This obviously poor planning was not the fault of the Congress.

In July 1963 the Director of the Mint publicly stated that there was no sign that the coin situation would improve in the months ahead. She said in an interview:

> It is going to be awful. We are already scraping the bottom of the barrel.

This statement was not conducive to quieting the fears of those who were concerned about a coin shortage.

In 1963, with a shortage more and more critical in 1-, 5-, and 10-cent pieces, the production of pennies was about equal to that of 1961, but the production of half dollars took another phenomenal jump from 48 to 92 million—an increase of almost 100 percent, again with no shortage of this coin. In the period 1961–63, with an acute shortage of 5-cent pieces, the production of these coins was increased by only 49 percent, while the production of 25-cent pieces was increased by over 70 percent. The mint was manufacturing silver coins and using up silver obviously at the expense of lesser coins which were in short supply.

In summary, in the period 1961–63 the production of 1 cent pieces which were in critically short supply was increased only three-fourths of 1 percent. Five cent pieces were increased 49 percent, 25 cent pieces were increased by over 70 percent, and half dollars by 197 percent.

The New York Times on March 10, 1964, carried an article entitled "New Silver Dollars Are Held Unlikely." The article went on to say that the silver dollar may be on its way out and that this bit of news was announced by the Director of the Mint. It was also stated that she offered "8 to 5 odds" that a congressional committee, considering further manufacture of the cartwheels, would not approve further minting of them. Immediately following this statement there was a run on the Treasury stock of silver dollars. On March 10 there were 22.6 million silver dollars in the Treasury. Two weeks later the Treasury cut off sales of silver dollars with only 3 million left. They had become a collector's item. Over 18 million silver dollars had been withdrawn from the Treasury during this 2-week period.

During the past 30 years an annual average of less than 19 million silver dollars were withdrawn. However, 36 million silver dollars were withdrawn in 1962 and 66 million silver dollars were withdrawn in 1963.

In 1964 the San Francisco Examiner stated that local observers trace the well-publicized shortage back to the speech made by the Director of the Mint warning of a shortage of silver dollars.

Senator Bible stated before a Senate Appropriations Committee on May 27, 1964:

> Silver dollars have not been minted since 1935—for almost 30 years. Yet we have not had a shortage, and Nevada and other Western States had used this honorable medium of exchange. I say with all candor that we would still have sufficient silver dollars had not our Treasury Department officials issued too many press releases pointing to a shortage of dollars as well as subsidiary coins. We all know such public statements are taken as gospel, and it is only natural for our citizenry to hoard coins if they truly believe a shortage exists and is real.
>
> Let me appeal to reason. How can any nation not mint silver dollars for 29 years and, out of a blue sky, in less than 1 year, see our Treasury raided until it is barren with the exception of a few rare silver dollars which it dare not release?

The Director of the Mint, in a prepared statement before the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Committee on Government Operations on February 17 this year, stated that she did not in any way criticize the Congress for lack of attention to the coinage problem. But she then stated:

> What I do think calls for examination, however, is the period of many, many months through which there is a constant hassle over funds to produce coins. Oftentimes, it is during these periods when coin crises develop.

I think the record will show that the Congress has done its best to provide the funds required to produce enough coins for our monetary system. As pointed out by Assistant Secretary Wallace, between 1959 and 1964 the mint very nearly tripled the production from 1½ to 4⅓ billion coins annually, in fiscal year 1965 they will produce 8 billion coins and they are now producing at the rate of 9 billion a year. As I have pointed out, this is about 15 percent of the total number of coins minted since 1792 and four and a half times the maximum number of coins minted in any year prior to 1959. Considering all of the circumstances the responsibility for the coin shortage cannot be laid at the door of the Congress.

In trying to explain away the coin shortage the blame was variously placed on increase in population, increase in gross national product, and increase in coin-operated machines. However, it was stated by the Director of the Mint that while they were making 174 percent more coins than in 1959, the gross national product increased only 28 percent and the vending machine sales only 47 percent. During this period the population increased only 8 percent. This phenomenal increase in coins is far out of proportion to the above increases in gross national product, population, coin-operated machines or any other criteria.

The Arthur D. Little Co., of Cambridge, after conducting an exhaustive survey of mint facilities in a report dated February 11, 1963, concluded that the marked increase in the use of vending machines between 1946 and 1961 had no discernible increase on the demand for fractional coinage.

Attempts have also been made to blame the coin shortage on the shutting down of the San Francisco Mint. Mints in other locations have been shut down when the need for them no longer existed. Requirements for coins have varied with the growth of the Nation. Various factors enter into the picture such as the cost of production, proximity of supplies, and areas to be served. After due consideration by the administration and the Congress, the San Francisco Mint was shut down in 1955. Its machinery was transferred to Denver—the net result was an increase in production. An editorial note in the Washington Evening Star of June 5, 1964, reads as follows:

> The San Francisco Mint is now a Government assay office. Its equipment was transferred to the Denver Mint, which operates at less cost because it is a more central source of coin distribution for the West. The new Philadelphia Mint is contemplated because 70 percent of the Nation's coins are used east of the Mississippi.

That the Congress has done its duty in appropriating money is evidenced by the fact that funds provided have resulted in substantial yearly increases in the number of coins produced from 1.5 billion in 1958 to 3.8 billion in 1963. This number of coins should have been sufficient under normal circumstances to have fulfilled the Nation's requirements for coins. It has not been necessary to conduct a propaganda campaign to obtain funds for the mint. This repeated crying to the public about shortages created shortages. As a Federal Reserve official stated, "The shortage has become self-perpetuating."

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the RECORD, first, a summary of the number of coins minted in the various denominations for the years 1948 to date, as well as, second, a summary of coinage production and indicators of coin demand from 1959 to 1964:

Annual coinage of the United States, 1948–65

[Number of pieces]

Calendar year—	1 cent	5 cents	10 cents	Quarters	Halves	Total pieces
1948	571, 942, 500	145, 382, 500	163, 311, 000	67, 922, 800	7, 095, 429	955, 653, 729
1949	435, 197, 500	106, 866, 000	70, 484, 000	19, 380, 400	13, 514, 612	645, 442, 512
1950	726, 141, 386	12, 477, 416	117, 424, 500	56, 331, 116	16, 361, 208	928, 735, 626
1951	1, 045, 998, 500	56, 845, 500	191, 096, 602	87, 908, 402	40, 694, 918	1, 422, 543, 922
1952	1, 070, 786, 984	115, 279, 980	265, 641, 573	102, 365, 073	54, 217, 977	1, 608, 291, 587
1953	1, 139, 233, 800	125, 862, 300	229, 231, 920	88, 793, 320	27, 969, 346	1, 611, 090, 686
1954	419, 615, 850	194, 437, 910	243, 500, 503	108, 785, 725	44, 006, 519	1, 010, 346, 507
1955	938, 825, 700	82, 730, 300	45, 297, 381	21, 740, 781	2, 876, 381	1, 091, 470, 543
1956	1, 519, 615, 484	103, 108, 324	217, 324, 484	77, 147, 884	4, 701, 384	1, 921, 897, 560
1957	1, 335, 129, 952	176, 484, 852	274, 762, 282	125, 704, 112	26, 328, 802	1, 938, 410, 000
1958	1, 054, 353, 952	186, 212, 772	169, 350, 252	85, 360, 552	28, 880, 064	1, 524, 157, 592
1959	1, 890, 624, 291	189, 135, 531	251, 849, 081	87, 587, 523	20, 403, 041	2, 439, 599, 467
1960	2, 168, 980, 602	249, 689, 782	272, 242, 002	93, 855, 926	25, 931, 414	2, 810, 699, 726
1961	2, 509, 639, 944	306, 011, 004	305, 904, 794	123, 721, 172	31, 594, 686	3, 276, 871, 600
1962	2, 402, 411, 419	380, 797, 739	410, 616, 399	166, 928, 775	48, 405, 300	3, 409, 159, 632
1963	2, 531, 206, 045	455, 681, 105	548, 202, 175	212, 679, 829	92, 308, 937	3, 840, 078, 091
1964	3, 388, 081, 319	800, 538, 759	814, 677, 349	385, 686, 227	205, 612, 531	5, 594, 596, 185
1965 [1]	(521, 237, 843)	(326, 873, 843)	(188, 057, 843)	(122, 813, 843)	(35, 731, 843)	(1, 194, 715, 215)

[1] 1st 2 months of 1965.

Sources: U.S. Director of the Mint annual reports, 1948–62. U.S. Bureau of the Mint annual domestic coinage reports, 1963–64. U.S. Bureau of the Mint monthly domestic coinage reports for January and February 1965.

Coinage production and indicators of coin demand

Fiscal year—	Coinage production		Population [1]		Gross national product [2]		Vending machine sales [1]	
	Pieces	Increase	Number	Increase	Amount	Increase	Amount	Increase
	Millions	*Percent*	*Thousands*	*Percent*	*Billions*	*Percent*	*Millions*	*Percent*
1959	1, 571		177, 830		$483		$2, 380	
1960	2, 567	63. 4	180, 684	1. 6	503	4. 1	2, 590	8.8
1961	3, 059	19. 2	183, 756	1. 7	519	3. 2	2, 740	5.8
1962	3, 461	13. 1	186, 656	1. 6	556	7. 1	2, 960	8.0
1963	3, 627	4. 8	189, 375	1. 5	584	5. 0	3, 220	8.8
1964	4, 307	18. 7	192, 072	1. 4	619	6. 0	3, 500	8.7
1965 (6 months)	3, 431		193, 500		(4)	(4)	(4)	(4)
1959–64	2, 737	174. 2	14, 242	8. 0	136	28. 2	1, 120	47.1

[1] Source: Bureau of the Census, Commerce Department, fiscal years 1959–64, June 30, 1965, Dec. 31, 1964.

[2] Source: Office of Business Economics, Commerce Department (calendar year basis).

[3] Source: Vending trade publication (calendar year basis).

[4] Not available.

There is little point in delving further into the coin shortage, but it is necessary to find out what keeps it going, what can be done to end it, and most important, what can be done to keep it from reoccurring in the future. Obviously the number of coins being produced should be far more than enough to take care of our requirements. The problem is to find out what happens to them after they are put into circulation.

The Director of the Mint has stated that "our primary responsibility is to produce domestic coins for commerce." This is the key to the solution of our coinage problem. Domestic coins for various reasons are being used for purposes other than for commerce. The most important characteristic of a coin used as a medium of exchange is that it must not have other values which will detract from its use as a medium of exchange.

As a result of the coin shortage we have many factors which affect the circulation of coins. In addition to the numismatists, there has been a great increase in collecting, hoarding, and speculating in coins. Those who need large numbers of coins in the conduct of business are holding on to them rather than turning them into the banks for redistribution. This holding of coins is one of the most important factors in the coin shortage. It has disrupted the normal pattern of circulation. This will continue until those who need coins are assured that there will be a plentiful supply through the normal channels.

Possibly the root of the coinage problem lies in the fact that the coins we are producing have a greater value or potential value for purposes other than commerce. As an example, the Kennedy half dollar has become a commemorative coin. Over 200 million have been minted and yet they do not appear in circulation. This is nearly four times as many half dollars as were minted in any year prior to 1963. This coin obviously is valued more for reasons other than its 50-cent face value. The distribution of this coin was started in March 1964, a most unfortunate time as it coincided with the run on the Treasury to obtain silver dollars.

In addition to the numismatists who deal generally in rare and scarce coins, a considerable interest has developed in coins which may have a collector value greater than their face value. A case in point is the last issue of pennies made by the San Francisco Mint, dated 1955. I understand that 45 million of these coins were minted, and yet they were bought and sold in large quantities for more than 1 cent apiece. This collecting craze increased to the point where it became big business to buy and sell coins for a premium.

Overnight millions of Americans became interested in coins and in monetary matters generally. Many coins go into piggy banks. At night pockets were emptied of coins which were tossed into a box. In self-defense, those who need coins in their businesses have been holding coins for their own needs instead of turning the excess of their normal requirements into banks. Arrangements were made outside of banks for distribution of coins. Even the newsboy on the corner was solicited for his change. In such a haphazard arrangement, someone is bound to be short of coins.

Finally a new factor has come into the picture. Treasury stocks are being used up at a fantastic rate. At this point, I would like to insert in the RECORD a summary illustrating the increase in coinage and subsequent increase in silver consumption during the period 1954 to date.

Silver consumed in U.S. coinage, 1954–65

[In millions]

Calendar year	Dimes		Quarters		Halves		Total	
	Pieces	Ounces	Pieces	Ounces	Pieces	Ounces	Pieces	Ounces
1954	243	17.6	108.7	19.7	44.0	15.9	395.7	53.2
1955	45	3.3	21.7	3.9	2.8	1.0	69.5	8.2
1956	217	15.7	77.1	14.0	4.7	1.7	298.8	31.4
1957	274	19.9	125.7	22.5	26.3	9.6	426.0	52.0
1958	169	12.3	85.3	15.4	28.8	10.5	283.1	38.2
1959	251	18.2	87.5	15.8	20.4	7.4	358.9	41.4
1960	272.0	19.6	93.8	17.0	25.9	9.4	391.7	46.0
1961	305.0	22.1	123.7	22.4	31.5	11.4	460.2	55.9
1962	410.6	29.7	166.9	30.2	48.5	17.5	626.0	77.4
1963	548.2	39.7	213.0	38.5	92.3	33.3	853.5	111.5
1964	815.0	59.0	386.0	69.8	206.0	74.5	1,407.0	203.3
1965[1]	(188.0)	(13.6)	(122.8)	(22.2)	(36.0)	(13.0)	(346.8)	(48.8)

[1] 1st 2 months of 1965.

Sources: U.S. Director of the Mint annual reports, 1954–62. U.S. Bureau of the Mint annual domestic coinage reports, 1963–64. U.S. Bureau of the Mint monthly domestic coinage reports for January and February 1965.

In other words, the coin shortage has focused attention on the current deficit between silver supplies and demand. Talk of a change in the silver content of our coins has created speculative interests in higher prices which could result from a change in the silver content of our coins. Legislation has been proposed which would reduce the silver content to 30 percent as compared with the present 90 percent. This would permit the market price to rise to $4 an ounce. Even the serious consideration of legislation to reduce the silver content could result in increased disappearance of subsidiary coins, awaiting the day when such coins would be worth more for their silver content than their face value.

As I stated earlier in my remarks, I will discuss the silver situation shortly. It is now my understanding that legislation will be submitted by the administration dealing with the question of silver in coinage. Any such legislation will affect industrial users and producers of silver, as well as users of coins.

There has been talk of prohibiting melting down of coins, hoarding and ending the activities of speculators who sell circulating coins at a premium. There has also been talk of stopping or curtailing the redemption of silver certificates, placing an embargo on the export of silver bullion as well as silver coins, and reestablishing the Government control of silver through end-use certificates. I submit that the Congress should take a very long look at these proposals before taking any action, and I suggest that the Treasury do the same.

Coins placed in circulation are purchased by the people. The mutilation of coins is already prohibited by law, which is a proper and necessary prohibition. Apart from this, the people should be entitled to use their coins as they see fit. If they wish to melt them down for the metal content, they should be permitted to do so. In fact, this actually would result in a profit to the Government as the Government would not have to redeem them with paper money. It would be impossible to enforce such a law prohibiting the melting down of coins.

Should laws be passed to prohibit hoarding? How does one draw the line between hoarding and saving, if there is any? Are we to deprive the citizens of this country of the opportunity to save coins? Are we to stop our children from putting coins in piggy banks? Attempts to enforce such a law would make the attempt to enforce prohibition look comparatively easy.

It would be equally difficult to enforce an embargo on the export of silver coins. An embargo on the export of silver bullion could boomerang. Normally this country is a net importer of silver. Are we to destroy our trade relations with other countries and jeopardize our future relations through an embargo which should not be necessary?

I submit that before we turn this country into a police state, we eliminate the speculative interest in silver which is the root of the problem. If we can eliminate this factor, the interest in hoarding, holding, and speculating in coins and in bullion will be eliminated. Let us give our coins a chance to circulate in a normal manner. This can be done very simply. All we have to do is to provide for new coins which contain no silver.

PUBLIC DEBT

The Bureau of Public Debt, in its budget estimate for fiscal year 1966 has requested an increase of $760,000 out of a total budget having direct obligations estimated to be $50,330,000. Salary adjustments resulting from the provisions of the Government Employees Salary Reform Act of 1964 account for $717,000, which, with increases of $622,000 for items other than personal compensation are offset by decreases in nonrecurring items from fiscal year 1965. These items, listed in the published hearings, amount to $579,000.

The major cause for the increase in the budget requirements of the Bureau of Public Debt are substantially attributable to the increased activity in the sale and redemption of series E savings bonds. These activities have increased steadily since December 1962, I am happy to note, to the point where the 1966 volume of sales is expected to exceed revised estimates for 1965 by almost 2 million additional pieces, or bonds; an expected total of $100,300,000. Additional cost items necessary to these sales and which cannot be absorbed by them, include $121,000 for savings bond stock to meet the increased volume of sales as well as to restore stock inventories to normal levels; $325,000 for reimbursements to paying agents for the increased number of series E savings bonds redeemed from purchasers unable to hold them until maturity.

In the other activities of the Bureau, those which entail the issuance, servicing, and retirement of other Treasury securities, and the maintenance and audit of public debt accounts, the workload and costs, are expected to remain at a level commensurate with this fiscal year.

I should also like to call the attention of this Congress to the fact that the year 1966 will mark the 25th anniversary of the sale of series E savings bonds. A promotional program will be started, but the cost of this promotion will nevertheless be the same as the amount budgeted for this fiscal year.

OFFICE OF THE TREASURER

The increase in the budget estimate for fiscal year 1966 for the Office of the Treasurer of $350,000 is justified by the record of that office. The Treasurer's Office, facing the increased demands of a heavier workload, has undertaken the fulfillment of its obligations with the recognition of the need for prudent expenditure of the funds appropriated.

Of the additional funds granted, $250,000 are needed to meet the cost of the Federal Employee Salary Act of 1964; $15,000 to provide for employee health programs of emergency treatment in the work building, formerly financed by the Office of the Secretary. An additional $60,000 will be used for the purchase and maintenance of new equipment which will replace certain electric accounting machines now being rented. The committee and I have continually urged that ADP equipment be purchased rather than rented whenever it is possible because of the long-term savings to the taxpayer resulting from these purchases. I am pleased to note that more and more such equipment is being purchased by the Government, although there is added cost at the outset. $103,000 are required to restore supply inventories to adequate levels and for machine replacement where the present machines have become so worn and inefficient that operations of the Treasurer's Office have been hampered.

The issue of Federal Reserve notes in the $1 denomination was begun in November 1963, and they are gradually replacing the $1 silver certificates in circulation. As a result, there will be a decline in silver certificates destroyed as unfit for circulation by the Federal Reserve banks in 1966. This will result in a reduction in the costs of the Treasurer's Office of $78,000 and this reduced operating expense is reflected in these appropriations. The Treasurer's Office is to be commended for the percent absorption of the pay increase it was able to effect, an amount not achieved by the majority of the other agencies.

TREASURY GUARD FORCE

Direct obligations for the Treasury Guard Force for fiscal year 1966 are estimated to be $434,000 representing an increase over fiscal 1965 of $14,000. The entire increase is required to cover the cost of the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1964. There is no request for additional personnel and the other operating costs of the force have maintained without increase. These funds are considered to be essential to maintain the necessary post coverage required to assure proper security.

WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

The appropriations for the White House Office for fiscal year 1965 was $2.73 million and with proposed transfer into this account of $125,000, the total available for fiscal 1965 and that estimated for fiscal 1966 are identical amounts. The $125,000 transfer item continued into this year's budget estimate is to cover salary increases which were instituted to maintain the salaries in the White House Office at their relative level when compared to the salaries of Federal Government workers increased by the Federal Employee Salary Act of 1964. No further salary increase is planned nor are any additional personnel positions sought, thus continuing the Office at the 255 number to which it was reduced for fiscal 1965.

WHITE HOUSE POLICE

The appropriations requested for the White House Police represents an increase of $136,000 over funds appropriated for fiscal year 1965. Of this amount, $129,000 will be spent to cover the cost added to the police operations by the Police and Firemen's Act of 1964 and $12,000 will be provided for stepup and longevity promotions to maintain current staff levels.

The budget estimate has been reduced by $16,000 due to nonrecurring costs and $9,000 of that amount was absorbed for the $138,000 cost of the Police and Fireman's Act.

The services performed by the White House Police are exemplary. There has been no request for additional personnel even though the number of annual visitors to the White House is presently at an alltime high and continues to increase. I feel that this budget increase, almost exclusively required by mandatory cost items, is justifiably warranted.

EXECUTIVE MANSION

The estimate of $694,000 for the Executive Mansion and Grounds for fiscal year 1966 represents a reduction of $2,000 under the amount appropriated for fiscal year 1965. Included in the estimate is a decrease of $25,000 which was the cost of painting the exterior of the mansion and increases of $12,750 for increased pay costs and $10,250 for increased overtime and temporary employment costs.

The wage increases are to pay prevailing wage rates for employees paid at hourly rates and to grant increases comparable to those in the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964 for employees paid at annual rates.

The increases due to overtime and temporary employment result principally from increased visitation. This increased use of the White House by more and more visitors is requiring more and more personal service costs to maintain the public rooms during and after the periods when it is open to the public.

The regular maintenance and operating functions will be carried on at the same levels as the current year.

COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS

The Council of Economic Advisers requested an appropriation of $723,000 for fiscal year 1966 which represents a $78,000 increase over fiscal year 1965. The full-year effect of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964 accounts for $56,000 of this increase. Another $6,000 is estimated as required for overtime, intermittent employment, personnel benefits and other services owing, in part, to the effect of the salary act. The balance of the increase in the budget, $16,000, will allow the Council to increase the size of its staff by two in the average annual number of people on the job. This staff increase, the first requested in 4 years, comes after a number of specific new duties have been assigned to the Council.

The amount requested represents the best judgment of the Council in estimating its activities for fiscal year 1966 and is urged as the reasonable minimum appropriation if the Council is to carry out the responsibilities and functions with which it has been charged by the Employment Act of 1946 and by the President, that is, to formulate and recommend national economic policy to promote employment, production, and purchasing power under free competitive enterprise.

NATIONAL SECURITY COUNCIL

The appropriation for the National Security Council for fiscal year 1965 was $575,000 and of that amount the Council accepted a reduction of $11,000 in keeping with the President's directive to reduce expenditures and lower personnel ceilings. The enactment of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964 required a supplemental appropriation of $66,000 to meet the increased pay costs and this amount is continued in the budget estimates as part of the $96,000 increase for fiscal year 1966.

The remaining increases for fiscal year 1966 cover two new operations. In September 1964, the President named a panel of distinguished private citizens to advise him and the National Security Council. This bipartisan group of 14 consultants will be asked for advice under flexible and informal arrangements suited to specific needs. The 1966 fiscal year budget includes $20,000 for payment of compensation fees, transportation, and related travel costs in support of the Panel.

An additional 4,000 has been included in the 1966 budget to provide support to operations of the White House situation room which is now under the jurisdiction of the Council. Essentially, this facility is a communications and intelligence center to meet the needs of the President for immediate information and to get back to the agencies his questions and requests for additional information.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

The special projects appropriation has been provided for the last several years in the amount of $1.5 million. This same amount has been requested for fiscal year 1966. This appropriation enables the President to bring into his staff individuals for special studies, special assignments, or to provide studies which he could not otherwise provide for within the White House Office.

TAX COURT

In its budget estimate for fiscal year 1966, the Tax Court requests an increase in appropriations of $230,000. The court estimates that 5,800 new cases will be received by it during 1966, substantially the same workload estimate as for 1965, but the fact that the workload of the court is not self-generated precludes accurate predictions on the number of cases the court will receive in any given year. Of the increase requested, $223,000 is required to meet the effects of the Federal Employees Salary Act of 1964 increase in salary costs. The additional $7,000 to defray the increased costs of the stenographic reporting services utilized by the court at all trial sessions is a cost item over which the court has exercised the maximum control at its disposal in the use of the competitive bidding process in contracting for these services. The low bid submitted for the current year established a cost 35.4 percent above the rate of the previous year. The court depends upon these reporting services to provide accurate transcripts of all case trials.

The policy of this court to operate at a minimum cost level consistent with the efficient adjudication of the cases before it is reflected in the appropriation request now before you, which is $2.2 million, and, after the pay increase costs have been accounted for, requests only an increase of $7,000.

ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

The appropriation request of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations for the fiscal year 1966 is $410,000, an increase of $15,000 over the amount originally appropriated for the current fiscal year and this entire increase is necessitated by the increase in salary expenses effected by the Federal

Employee Salary Reform Act of 1964. It was indicated to the subcommittee that the Commission has stabilized its operations in budgetary terms and has actually reduced its permanent staff from a maximum of 27 in the fiscal year 1962 to the present 23 in order to accommodate within its budget a considerable part of the salary increases. This $15,000 increase is to be used to cover that part of the salary increases that the Commission was unable to accommodate in its budget and not to increase its staff back to its former size.

ADMINISTRATIVE CONFERENCE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Administrative Conference of the United States was established on a permanent basis late in 1964 to provide for continuous study and improvement of the administrative procedure of Federal agencies. The costs experienced by the conference in its previous operations on a temporary basis, concluded in December 1962, have been used as guidelines in estimating this request. In the fiscal year 1962, the last Conference operated under an appropriation of $150,000 and the Department of Justice furnished staff services amounting to approximately $50,000. The budget requests an additional $50,000, or a total of $250,000 to provide for the requirements of a full-time chairman, a full-time staff, and the costs of a full-time operation, necessarily a more expensive operation than previously experienced.

COAST GUARD

Mr. Chairman, one of the quiet, but most effective services in our country is provided by the U.S. Coast Guard. It, without fanfare and without publicity, enforces the maritime law, provides security for our ports and waterfront facilities, saves life and property, provides navigational aid to maritime commerce in navigable waters and promotes the safety of the American merchant marine. It does its job quietly, as I have said, and effectively. Much of its duty is undertaken during periods of extreme danger such as during storms at sea or on burning vessels.

While a superficial review of the amounts of money recommended by the committee would give the impression that the committee has shown a certain amount of leniency toward the Coast Guard's requests for fiscal year 1966, nothing could be further from the truth. Each of us on the subcommittee examined the requests made by the Coast Guard with severity.

However, there are certain paramount facts which must be borne in mind when examining the amounts which we, on the subcommittee, and with which the full committee agreed, believe to be necessary to the proper functioning of this valuable service.

The first is that the cost of running the Coast Guard, as has the cost of living, has risen.

The second is that much of the work that the Coast Guard does is beyond the control of that service. I believe that the Members of this House need only examine the sporting pages of their own newspapers to realize the tremendous increase in pleasure boating in this country—some 8 million. Another example which I might cite is the increasing number of general patrols which have been required of them to protect our citizens and enforce our laws. The Cuban surveillance patrols are one concrete example of this increased general activity.

One of the reductions which the committee made was in the request of the Coast Guard for acquisition, construction, and improvements. The Coast Guard came to us with a request for $109,250,000. The committee recommends that $101 million be allocated to them for these purposes: this sum being some $16 million more than was appropriated last year.

Taking merely the need for improvements, it is amazing to learn of the number of manned Coast Guard stations with major structures that are over 50 years of age. In Alabama, there is 1, Alaska has 7, California has 19, Connecticut has 4, in Delaware there are 2. Florida has 4, Georgia has 1, Hawaii has 2, Illinois has 1, Indiana has 1, Louisiana has 2, in Maine there are 35, Maryland has 4, Massachusetts has 16, Michigan has 21, Minnesota has 4, New Hampshire has 3, New Jersey has 6, New York has 19, Ohio has 4, Rhode Island 6, Washington has 3, Wisconsin has 12, Puerto Rico has 1, and the Virgin Islands has 1.

I need not tell my colleagues who are houseowners that the cost of maintaining a house increases with the age of that house. I think that our practical experience should be carried over to our examination of the needs of the Coast Guard.

Funds under this item have been provided for the replacement of three high-endurance cutters which, I believe, the Coast Guard needs if it is to continue to do its job properly. It now has three high-endurance cutters which are between 25 and 30 years of age.

I am aware that the Comptroller General has been critical of the long-range plans of the Coast Guard in regard to the procurement of high-endurance cutters, but I would like to point out to the Members that it was at the prompting—I might even go so far as to say prodding—of your committee that the Coast Guard developed its long-range vessel procurement program and it is one which we have followed up very closely. The details of this plan are readily available in the hearings or from the Coast Guard. I am also aware of the fact that the criticism that is made in the Comptroller General's evaluation of aspects of this plan is that it is a long-range projection of the needs of the Coast Guard, and that such plans are subject to change. I agree that long-range plans are subject to change, but I would also like to call to your attention the fact—which you, who are also familiar with the year-to-year requests of the various departments—that with the existence of a long-range plan, the moneys which the committee appropriates can be better utilized. You do away with the necessity of having to hear about a large increase one year which could have been foreseen had there been such a long-range plan. Such a long-range plan which the committee has long favored provides for the orderly replacement of wornout vessels which results in savings for the taxpayer, although, as I have said, these plans must be examined each year not only by the legislative, our committee, but also by the Coast Guard.

As stated in the report of the committee the funds appropriated under this heading "Acquisition, construction, and improvement"—remain available until expended. Therefore, the committee has, as in past years, considered the long-range program, rather than annual increments separately, and has provided funds necessary to continue a reasonable and level program for modernizing the Coast Guard. The unobligated balances carried over in this account in recent years have been significantly larger than estimated by the Department.

The sum unobligated as of January 31, 1965, was $53 million, while it is estimated that the unobligated balance at the end of this fiscal year will be $5 million.

I am of the opinion that we should not give the Coast Guard more than they are able to use in a year, as I am of the opinion that we should not give them less than they need. But in light of the unobligated balance that they have as of January 31, 1965, I, as is the committee, am of the belief that the funds which we have recommended are ample to meet the needs of the Coast Guard with proper utilization of those funds. To appropriate more would be to generate waste and larger unobligated balances.

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, these men and women have, and have for a long time, done an outstanding job protecting our interests and our lives. To continue doing so they must have the proper funds. We of the committee believe, after close scrutiny of their requests, that the amounts contained in this bill will enable them to go on doing the valuable work that they have done in the past and impress upon them the necessity of good management and economy.

Coast Guard: acquisition, construction, and improvements

1960 (Public Law 86–39)	$23,250,000
1961 (Public Law 86–561)	30,000,000
1962 (Public Law 87–159)	39,000,000
1963 (Public Law 87–575)	33,300,000
1964 (Public Law 88–39)	51,000,000
1965 (Public Law 88–392)	85,000,000
Total	261,550,000
Budget estimate (1966)	109,250,000
Committee recommendation (1966)	101,000,000
Total	−8,250,000
Appropriated fiscal year 1956	6,132,000
Unobligated balance:	
As of Jan. 31, 1965	53,000,000
As of June 30, 1965	5,000,000

Operation of new ships provided in Coast Guard appropriations, 1961–65

Type	1961	1962	1963	1964	1965
Medium-endurance cutters	------	------	2	1	[1] 2
Inland tenders	------	------	9	2	2
Missouri River tenders	------	------	------	------	2
Coastal tenders	------	------	------	1	1
Harbor tugs	------	------	10	2	------
Small patrol craft	------	30	7	7	------
Total	------	30	28	13	7

[1] ¼ year.

Coast Guard—Reserve training

1960	$15,500,000
1961	16,000,000
1962	16,000,000
1963	16,500,000
1964	18,800,000
1965	20,700,000
Total	103,500,000
Budget estimates (1966)	$23,750,000
Committee recommendations (1966)	22,500,000
Total	−1,250,000
Appropriated 1965	4,271,000
Unobligated balance:	
As of Jan. 31, 1965	7,926,516
As of June 30, 1965	50,000

	Drill-pay status	Non-drill-pay status	Active duty [1]	Total
June 30—				
1960	12,711	15,518	1,822	30,051
1961	15,515	14,757	777	31,049
1962	15,102	12,418	688	28,208
1963	16,277	9,973	600	26,850
1964	16,807	9,343	600	26,750
1965 [2]	16,807	10,428	650	27,885
1966 [2]	17,010	13,510	1,690	32,210

[1] Reservists on extended active duty are part of Ready Reserve strength but are not available to meet callup requirements.

[2] Estimated.

Coast Guard—Operating expense

1960	$189,000,000
1961	205,000,000
1962	212,000,000
1963	220,000,000
1964	249,000,000
1965	271,100,000
Total	1,346,100,000
Budget estimate (1966)	285,200,000
Committee recommendation (1966)	284,000,000
Total	−1,200,000
Appropriated 1956	161,139,000
Unobligated balance:	
As of Jan. 31, 1965	107,500,084
As of June 30, 1965	100,000

Coast Guard—Retired pay

1960	$29,500,000
1961	30,000,000
1962	31,350,000
1963	32,350,000
1964	33,600,000
1965	37,500,000
Total	194,300,000
Budget estimate (1966)	40,300,000
Committee recommendation (1966)	40,000,000
Total	−300,000
Appropriated 1956	21,300,000
Unobligated balance:	
As of Jan. 31, 1965	15,637,230
As of June 30, 1965	0

Retired pay, U.S. Coast Guard, number on rolls, Feb. 28, 1965

Regular military	10,374
Former lighthouse and lifesaving services personnel	561
Reserve (Public Law 810)	121

SECRET SERVICE

Mr. Chairman, when Secretary Dillon came before the committee he stated that he would take up a matter which in his mind overshadowed in its importance every other item in the Treasury's budget request. He was referring to the question of the resources and personnel necessary to provide effective protection for the President of the United States.

The Warren Commission, after studying the operations of the Secret Service concluded that the complexities of the job that the President must do has increased so rapidly in recent years that the Service has not been able to develop or to secure adequate resources of personnel and facilities to fulfill its important mission.

After the publication of the Warren Commission report, President Johnson appointed a Committee composed of the then Acting Attorney General, Mr. Katzenbach, the Director of Central Intelligence, Mr. McCone, his Assistant on National Security Affairs, Mr. Bundy, and the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Dillon to advise him on the recommendations of the Commission report.

The recommendation of the President's Committee was that a policy of strengthening the Secret Service be commenced immediately. As a result of this report, Secretary Dillon came before the committee with an additional request for $3,877,000. The committee has recommended that this additional sum be appropriated. The President did not pass on this request as he felt that as the appropriation in excess of that requested in the budget was so intimately connected with him and his family, that he should not personally pass upon them.

Mr. Chairman, we of the committee have heard the request of the Secretary of the Treasury, and we have passed favorably on that request.

POST OFFICE—GENERAL

As stated earlier, the Post Office Department came to us this year with one of the largest estimates that it has ever presented to the committee for consideration. The Department requested that $5,383 million be made available to it for the next fiscal year. I, and the Committee, believe that an increase of $311,400,000 over last year's appropriation is sufficient to meet the needs of the Department if careful utilization of the funds be made. This is true notwithstanding the anticipated increase in mail volume. I do not consider studies undertaken to determine the value of mudflaps to be such "careful utilization" of these funds.

Moreover, I believe that under the careful guidance of the Postmaster General, Mr. Gronouski, and the improved efficiency of operations, the savings which can be realized in postal operations are just now being felt by the Department. Mr. Gronouski himself stated that "as a result of pay reformation and more more-modern employment practices generally, the Department's operations benefit from the assist that high morale gives."

Savings which would more than absorb the recommended cuts and which result from new and improved methods of handling the mails are just beginning to be realized. Last year the Post Office continued to install the improved Mark II facer-canceler. Contracts have been awarded for improved lettersorters and the Post Office Department's Advisory Board will continue to focus its attention on new areas as problems are solved in the old.

The recommended cut can therefore be absorbed by the Post Office without a curtailment of service or adversely affecting its operations. Cost-avoidance measures instituted by the Post Office Department over the past few years are already saving the Post Office in excess of $133 million annually.

Yet, as I stated earlier, we are just beginning to fully realize the potential saving resulting from the increased morale and efficiency of the dedicated postal workers. It is estimated that the productivity of clerk and mail handlers in 1965 will be 1.4 percent.

The installation of 26 additional multiposition letter sorting machines in 13 of our largest post offices will result, I believe, in definite savings. I might point out that something like 70 percent of all the mail sent in the United States is handled by something like 68 of our 34,000 post offices. I believe that greater utilization of our post offices and possible realinement would result in greater savings for the Post Office.

We, I think, all experienced the greater efficiency of postal operations during the Christmas season last year. Yet there were 4.4 percent more first-class pieces handled than the previous Christmas and only 2.2 percent increase in man-hours. Overtime was reduced by 1.2 percent or 125,570 hours over the same period last year.

The budget estimate of the Department included a request for 15,000 new positions for conversion of excess overtime to permanent employment. This conversion would have cost the Post Office Department $11.8 million, to say nothing of the cost for salaries, and so forth. This is a brandnew program which has been initiated by the Post Office Department, based on the excessive overtime which is taxing the personnel of this Department. The funds which the committee has recommended includes sufficient funds for 1,300 of these positions. The committee, as I do, feels that we should go slow in initiating this program with its new employees so as to be better able to determine its effects on the operations of the Post Office Department.

I strongly concur with the committee's statement contained in the report on this bill that the solution to the problem of excess overtime is not to be found in additional personnel and appropriations alone, but in improved methods, equipment, and management techniques. It is through better ways and means of handling the mail, and not through increased personnel that true savings and greater efficiency are to be realized. In fact, one might almost go on to say that a large increase in personnel would act to decrease the stimulus for finding new and better ways of handling the mails while adding a great recurring expense to the Post Office budget.

There is one area in the Post Office estimates which the committee believed should not be decreased. This is the "Building occupancy and post supplies" request.

Increased mail volume, shifting population, new business enterprise, and obsolete offices now occupied all have combined to create a need for an additional 6 million square feet of new space for post office facilities. These requirements, taken with recurring rent and related fuel and utility costs are things which the department can control, or if there is an element of control it is a very minor factor. The $15.7 million increase in the budget estimate for building occupancy is therefore a necessary expense. Of this, $12.3 million is already contracted for in the form of rent resulting from leases previously awarded for buildings to be occupied in fiscal year 1966, or which must be contracted for. Of the increase in rent, approximately two-thirds is for increased space and one-third is for increased cost of space. The increase in rent is not unique to the Post Office Department and reflects the increased cost of living.

The Post Office Department has a blue-ribbon committee studying the question of the why and wherefores of the lease programs, vis-a-vis Federal ownership programs. This committee may recommend that it is more economical for the Post Office Department to construct its own large buildings and have a lease-purchase agreement in the smaller post offices.

I have long felt this way and have so recommended it to the Post Office Department from time to time. I believe that in certain cases it is to the advantage of the Post Office Department to own its own buildings rather than get into long term, expensive leases. A case in point is the project turnkey, which our subcommittee has dubbed as project turkey.

This is an excellent example of waste of the taxpayers money resulting from ill-advised leasing of buildings. Another case in point is the proposed FDR Post Office in New York, which is to be a lease-purchase building. I have strongly felt that if the Post Office Department had the authorization, it would have saved the taxpayers a great deal of money by building a federally owned post office rather than a lease-purchase one.

For building and postal supplies and services there is an overall increase of $2.5 million. In part this increase is directly due to the increase in the size of the postal operations and the increase in the volume of mail being sent by the American public.

The increases are due, therefore, to factors over which the Department has little or no control.

The Postmaster General is aware of our concern over the increase in rental costs and has assured us that he will attempt to find a solution which will be of advantage to the Post Office Department. I might suggest to him that we have no more project turnkey, as a start.

To deny the increase due to increased rental costs would not solve the problem.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, having been a member of the Legislative Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for going on 9 years, I have been concerned, as I know other members of the committee have, about these cuts made in the budget of the Post Office Department, the results of which have made necessary the reduction of many of their services. I am wondering if the gentleman can assure us that with the cuts that have been made this years we are not going to suffer any further cuts in service.

Mr. CONTE. I do not foresee any cuts in services. One of the largest cuts that was made here was on a request for 15,000 additional personnel to take care of overtime in the Post Office Department. We allowed them 1,300. Certainly it will not cut any services. And mind you, the committee felt, and I believe I speak for the committee when I say that we strongly feel, that the Post Office Department should do everything it can to cut out overtime.

But we do not feel we can start this new program with 15,000 additional personnel. We did give them the entire request for additional mail volume personnel. We gave them, I believe, 5,500 additional employees for additional mail volume.

So, I do not anticipate any cuts in services as a result of the reductions which we have made here today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, I appreciate the gentlemans' reassurance. However, we have had many of our long-time services cut out because of reductions in the budget. I have always been of the opinion that the Post Office Department is a service organization and that it can never be expected to pay its own way, just as a fire department is a service organization and could not be expected to pay its own way by just charging for the fires it fights. The same would be true of a police department with reference to paying its own way, based upon only the number of crimes of burglaries or related violations of the law to which they respond.

So, I wanted to put in my 2 cents worth to the effect that this is a service organization and our mail volume is growing.

I hope that the Committee is satisfied with the amount of funds which it has provided.

Mr. CONTE. I certainly appreciate the concern of the gentleman from Nebraska and I certainly can vouch for his continued interest in the Post Office Department over the many years that I have been in the Congress. I know it is a real genuine sincere interest. I feel that these cuts which we have made would not injure the service of the Post Office Department.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. We have heard a lot of talk about doing away with the 12-cent-per-mile allowance for our rural mail carriers who use their own vehicles. The people who have proposed the GSA leased auto plan do not understand the problems of rural America and certainly have not traveled some of our roads.

I want to emphasize that this bill, an appropriation bill, will allow to be continued for fiscal year 1966 the same program of compensating the carriers for using their vehicles that has worked so well in the past.

In view of this the Appropriations Committee has allowed for full continuance of this rural carrier allowance of 12 cents a mile for those who use their own vehicles.

Mr. CONTE. Let me assure the gentleman from North Dakota that the Post Office Department made a presentation before our committte in respect to leased vehicles for rural mail carriers rather than paying the allowance of 12 cents per mile, with brand new vehicles from the automobile industry. Questions were propounded to the representatives of the Post Office Department at that time and they assured us that legislation is required in order to do this. In other words, they would need authorization by the Congress.

So, in regard to your question, definitely, money is in this bill for the payment of rural mail carriers on the same basis as in the past.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. That is right. This reassures the rural mail carriers of America that, in effect, the Committee on Appropriations is today allowing for a full continuance of this program.

Mr. CONTE. Yes, any change would have to be made by the legislative committee after hearings upon a bill providing for this changeover. The gentleman is exactly right. Such measure would have to be passed by both branches of Congress and signed by the President.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONTE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. Would the gentleman comment on the cutback by the committee of the request by the Post Office Department for the budget to include an additional 20,520 positions, of which some 15,000 were for excess overtime to permanent employment in connection with the labor management program?

I notice that the committee has only allowed some 6,600 positions. Would the gentleman comment on that and state whether or not it is the feeling of the committee that this will be adequate for the purposes intended?

Mr. CONTE. The committee, as I understand it, allowed all of the personnel for additional mail volume. Then, on this 15,000 figure which the Post Office Department requested for overtime work, the committee allowed about 1,300 additional employees for this new program.

I do not want it to be interpreted that it is the sense of the committee that we do not believe in this program. We do believe in the program. We felt we would like to get the program started and see how it works and then have the representatives of the Post Office Department come before our committee again next year so we may continue to discuss the program. We want to try to get some norm established here so that we can apply it to the entire program.

Mr. HORTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the committee for bringing before the House an appropriations bill that reflects a dedicated desire to curb excessive executive spending. The soundness of this measure testifies to the hard work and long hours which many of our colleagues devoted to analyzing each and every item in the portion of the fiscal year 1966 budget pertaining to the subject of H.R. 7060.

However, I do feel compelled to raise a question regarding Post Office Department operations. Where the administration asked appropriations allowing an additional 20,520 positions, including 15,000 for conversion of excess overtime to permanent employment, the committee's recommendation will permit position increases of only some 6,600.

Frankly, Mr. Chairman, I fear this insufficient. And, while I quite agree with the committee's conclusion at the bottom of page 14 in House Report No. 223, in reference to reducing the excess overtime worked by postal employees:

> The committee feels that the solution to this problem is not to be found in additional personnel and appropriations alone, but in improved methods, equipment, and management techniques as well.

This is a long-range proposition which does not come to grips with the present problem, namely, that excessive overtime now being required of our Nation's postal clerks is detrimental to economy and efficiency in Government.

It has been encouraging to note the increasing awareness of this excessive overtime problem in the postal service. Therefore, I regret this appropriations bill does not take greater cognizance of the situation and provide the full funds needed to alleviate what has been termed by many—and properly so—"a disgraceful situation."

So that the House can be apprised of one specific example of how this overtime problem presents itself in the post office of a metropolitan community, I shall quote one paragraph from a letter I have received from my constituent, Joseph Lauricella, president of Local 215 of the United Federation of Postal Clerks in Rochester, N.Y.:

> Regarding this request for employees, Rochester Post Office substitute employees are averaging 60 hours a week, and at this present time overtime is being used for regular employees. Our production is up, and volumes have increased by at least 10 percent in the past year. On top of this, we have had our regular compliment of employees reduced from 641 regular clerks, and 139 substitute clerks, to 612 regular clerks and 131 substitutes, since November 1962. We feel a great need for additional regular clerks in the Rochester Post Office.

Mr. Chairman, I believe Mr. Lauricella's letter is important and instructive. I believe it points out in terms of one office what is a problem faced by tens of thousands of honest, hard-working postal clerks the country over.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ADDABBO].

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to say that I was pleased to be assigned to the Subcommittee on Treasury-Post Office at the beginning of this Congress. It has been a pleasure to work under the very able chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], and with my other friends and colleagues on the subcommittee from both sides of the aisle. I have been impressed with their devotion to duty and the conscientious manner in which the hearings on this bill have been handled.

Most of our citizens have very little day-to-day contact with their Government, but should he never have occasion to contact a Government official, every American citizen has one contact and that is through his postman. Almost every citizen has some contact with the Treasury Department and most citizens are very much aware of that at this particular time of the year. I take this opportunity to congratulate the dedicated men and women of the Federal service and compliment them on their dedication to duty and the Government and people they serve.

In this bill before us we are appropriating for both the Post Office and Treasury Departments, plus the Executive Office of the President.

H.R. 7060 recommends a cut of $104,106,000 below the budget estimates for fiscal year 1966. In some areas increases have been made over the budget estimates, the most notable being for the Secret Service. I am sure that no one will argue against the necessity for taking every precaution possible to protect our Chief Executive and his family.

As a member from the State of New York, I have been greatly concerned by many proposals and plans of action which will take Government facilities from the State of New York, particularly the New York City area, and the impact these moves have upon the economy of the State and the individual employees. It is gratifying to me personally that the committee has approved the full budget estimate for "Construction of mint facilities" in order to permit the mint to acquire property in New York City for the use of the New York Assay Office. Also, I am pleased that there has been placed in this bill additional funds for the Coast Guard and that the Coast Guard will be acquiring and occupying Fort Jay, N.Y.

The entire Nation is greatly concerned over the increase in the illicit trade in narcotics. Every effort must be made to stem this tide, therefore, the committee has recommended the appropriation of the full amount requested for the Bureau of Narcotics. The Bureau has been quite successful recently with its program to suppress illicit narcotics at the source and this program is to be strengthened.

As a stanch supporter of all beneficial legislation for our postal employees, I believe that there is nothing contained in this bill which will in any way adversely affect them and everything possible for their benefit has been included. The reduction in requested personnel only affects the proposed changeover by the Department from the use of substitutes and temporary help to the use of new "regular" employees to eliminate excess overtime. There has been included additional personnel so that this program might be put into effect on a limited experimental basis to determine which is the better procedure for the more efficient operation of our postal system and the benefit of its employees.

We know that there are areas in which individuals and groups of individuals will disagree with the action your committee has taken, but I believe, by and large, we have a good bill and one that will accomplish the aims of the administration and serve the interests of the Congress and the entire Nation.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROBISON].

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, many of you have heard remarks like these from other Members who, like myself, are completing their first assignment on a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations.

I should first like to express my appreciation at the opportunity which has become mine to participate in the extremely important and, as I know now, difficult work of this committee. Of course, I also want to tender my thanks to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED], under whom it had been my privilege to serve in prior years on another committee. There are three freshmen members on our committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN], and myself. We, of course, have had a great deal to learn, not only about the work of this subcommittee but also about the entire appropriations process. There was not a great deal of time to do our homework so the only way we could learn was by asking a lot of questions, and ask them we did, as a result of which the printed hearings are longer than usual this year, and maybe longer than they should be, but we hope you will find them useful, particularly the newer Members of the House.

Throughout all this that might be called a process of education for the new members, TOM STEED never wavered from his position of patience and fairness to all of us, and I am sure we are most grateful to him.

As our chairman has already explained to you, this bill calls for a total approation of $6,604,404,000, a reduction of a little over $104 million from the budget estimates, but an amount some $366 million more than has been appropriated for the same purposes in the current fiscal year, to date.

I say "to date," because as you all know, this gap will be reduced considerably after Congress has completed its work on the pending supplemental request for the various departments and agencies covered by this bill, and the second supplemental bill for 1965 is scheduled for House consideration tomorrow.

Let me return to a matter that the gentleman from Iowa mentioned earlier. As you will note on page 3 of our report, the budget estimates from the departments and agencies provided for here, today, also include certain permanent appropriations and expenditures from trust funds that do not require congressional action. The largest of these is for interest on the public debt, or the national debt, as it is often called.

Since this is the only time you will see this item mentioned in any appropriation bill, you might as well take a good look at it now.

For fiscal 1966, the interest on the national debt is estimated at $11.5 billion, up $300 million over 1965. This suggests two things, first of all a continuing high interest rate and, secondly, the fact that our national debt has risen $26.2 billion during the last 4 years as a result of the deficit spending policies we are pursuing and evidently intend to continue.

Obviously, there is less public interest in this than there used to be. But I surely think we, as Congressmen, ought to occasionally at least ask ourselves if this is sound policy for any society of people to follow, year in and year out, in good years and bad, no matter how "great" that society might be.

Something can undoubtedly be said for the theory of what is called compensatory spending, under which, as I understand it, the emphasis is on balancing the economy rather than on balancing the budget.

And I think we would have to say we have had some degree of surface success with this rather sophisticated approach to the question of how much Federal spending—sophisticated as compared to our former attitude to this question.

I doubt if anybody, anymore, thinks the Federal budget ought to be balanced every year. Perhaps a few people do, but more and more of us are beginning to appreciate the usefulness of Federal spending to compensate for any falloff in private spending and investment.

However, the trouble with this theory of "compensatory spending," as it is now being applied is that it is used practically all the time to justify an increase in Federal expenditures, some of which may be and can properly be called investments, but it is seldom if ever used to justify the curtailing of Federal expenditures.

The result is—in good times as well as in bad times—the balance wheel here only works in one direction. And so we find ourselves in a situation today where, in the midst of rather general prosperity for the vast majority of our people, we still have to take from them about 12 cents out of every dollar of net Federal receipts that they put into the Treasury—to pay interest on the national debt, a ratio that was only exceeded as long ago as 1950.

That interest runs at the rate of $22,000 a minute, 60 minutes an hour, 24 hours a day. How long our economy can continue to support this burden without eventually running into serious trouble abroad, at least, if not here at home, remains to be seen.

Well, enough of this, except to remind you once again that you might well consider this bill as carrying a price tag of not just $6.6 billion, but of close to $18 billion, when the item for debt interest is added in.

With respect to the $6.6 billion, as the report shows you, the major components of the separate increases over the current fiscal year are the mandatory military and civilian pay increases enacted by Congress last year. The balance of the various items also increased pertain to allowed capital expenditures for the Coast Guard—over which there may be some argument but which I feel is sufficient—as well as capital expenditures for the acquisition of additional ADP equipment for several agencies; finally, they also cover workload-volume increases over which there can be little administrative or congressional control.

The constantly increasing workload problem is especially acute for the Post Office Department and for such Treasury agencies as the Internal Revenue Service.

I must admit that, as one citizen who, like millions of other mail users, had been somewhat skeptical about the so-called ZIP code program, I am something of a convert to it after having participated in these hearings. If anything is going to be able to bring order out of what too often seems like chaos in our postal operation, this may be it.

Once this program has been fully implemented, and when it has been fully accepted by the mail users, I think it can prove to be of considerable value in slowing the ever-increasing budget requirements of the Post Office Department—which, as you have noted, total $5,313,400,000 as allowed in this bill.

It had been my impression, from discussions with postal workers, that there was a considerable opposition to the implementation of the ZIP program on the part of the postal workers, apparently on the theory that it would eventually automate some of them out of their jobs. I asked Mr. Gronouski about this during the hearings, and was glad to hear him reply that, while there had previously been some such unhappiness with the program, most postal workers and the organizations to which they belong were now supporting the program and endeavoring to make it work. The Postmaster General also told me that, while the program as implemented may require a substantial amount of shifting among job categories, the combination of anticipated increases in mail volume and of normal retirement of workers will not cause the loss of any present postal jobs.

However, our subcommittee was less concerned at the moment with the elimination of jobs than it was with holding the Postmaster General's request for additional positions at a reasonable, yet adequate figure under existing circumstances. The subcommittee's decision as to the number of new positions allowed does represent a compromise—as it always must—and while the cut may be a little on the generous side it has my support, and the number we have allowed should be of benefit in reducing the unusually high excess overtime hours now being worked by far too many postal employees. According to the Postmaster General, this effort to reduce overtime has the support of the great majority of the postal workers, themselves.

I also had a colloquy with the Postmaster General about equal employment opportunities in his department, and he subsequently furnished the subcommittee with some statistical information concerning what has been accomplished in this field. In case you are interested, this appears at page 74 of the hearings.

There was also a discussion during the hearings about the future of the Postal Savings System—which has been in effect since 1911, but seems to be of doubtful value to continue as a public service any longer. I think it would be appropriate for the Congress to give serious consideration to its gradual elimination.

Finally—and, from my constituent mail, all too often—there is the unanswered question concerning the efficiency, or lack thereof, with which the Post Office Department carries out its operation. I am as aware as all of you of the rather constant criticism coming in from mail users—and much of it seems justified. This is criticism which the postal workers, themselves, not only accept, but in which they occasionally join. Undoubtedly, some portion of the problem, here, originates in the changing pattern of mail transportation. As some evidence of what can happen, an editor of one of my daily newspapers—the Sun-Bulletin in Binghamton, N.Y.—recently mailed himself three letters from New York City, one an air mail special delivery, the second regular airmail and the third by plain first class, dropping all three in the same box at the same time. The air mail special delivery letter reached him at Binghamton in 22 hours and 15 minutes, the regular airmail letter in 23 hours and 45 minutes, and it was delivered in the same delivery as the third- or plain first-class letter; this despite the fact that the first cost him 38 cents in postage, the second 8 cents, and the third, of course, 5 cents.

Although the result varies, naturally, according to the distance any letter must travel, this sort of thing points up the fact that we are not always giving the mail user the service he thinks he is buying. On this point, and its relationship to transportation problems, Ralph W. Nicholson, Assistant Postmaster General, suggested in answer to my question about all this that there should be a reconsideration of postal-rate structures so as to permit of "first-class transportation, whether it is on wheels or whether it is in the air."

I regret that our subcommittee did not have time, or did not take time to go into all of this more thoroughly, but I am hopeful that the appropriate legislative committees of one or the other body of Congress will do so.

The subcommittee's recommendation for the Treasury is $1,272,252,000, a reduction of $34,453,000 in the estimate, but, again, an increase of $52,582,000 over the amount appropriated for this Department, to date, in this fiscal year. Again, the gap here will narrow after action on the pending supplemental.

As for new positions, the subcommittee has been hard pressed to hold the line but we have held it to 500 such positions in the Revenue Accounting and Processing Division and to 650 in the Compliance Division of the Internal Revenue Service—in both of which divisions there is an ever-increasing volume of work, although you can see from the report that the subcommittee strongly feels that IRS has not taken fully into account the effect on additional employees that conservation of ADP systems should begin to have.

The record of the hearings also contains a fairly extensive exploration into the continuing investigation of charges of corruption involving IRS employees and others in the Manhattan office of the Service, in New York City. It is to be hoped that this matter can be cleared up as soon as possible, and the necessary corrective administrative action taken to prevent this sort of thing happening again for, although it is necessary to keep this unfortunate matter in proper perspective, there is nothing more discouraging to an honest taxpayer than to discover any lack of integrity on the part of those who collect his taxes.

Again, the record is also quite complete with respect to the unsolved coin shortage problem, and the increasingly urgent need to come to some decision with respect to silver coins. I do not think this is a decision that can be further postponed.

I was especially impressed with the account of the work of the Bureau of Narcotics. This is an increasingly serious problem in my State of New York, which now has some 52 percent of all the reported narcotic addicts in the Nation. The fact that the vast majority of these are in New York City rather than in upstate areas is of no comfort to me, particularly in view of the growing numbers of youthful addicts, and the reported incidents of marihuana and drugs on more and more college campuses. I think those of you who are seeking more information on this subject, in an effort to determine what should be done, will find our hearings most helpful in this respect, for they are very full and complete.

One final comment, and this with respect to the Coast Guard's plan to take over Fort Jay, on Governor's Island in New York Harbor, from the Army. This plan has my full support, and I am sure it will be of great benefit to the Coast Guard in our area and that it will also, as well, eventually produce some cost savings.

In summary, I have had a most interesting and challenging introduction to the overall problems faced by Congress in attempting to carry out its portion of the appropriation process in an efficient and responsible manner.

I have discovered that this is a difficult assignment, as any of my senior colleagues could tell you, and I remain convinced in my mind that we, in Congress, must find ways and means to do a still better job. Too often, it seems to me now, we on this committee find ourselves in a position where what might be called the burden of proof has subtly shifted.

In prior years, it was the proponents of Federal spending who were required to justify their programs. Now, increasingly it seems to me, it is the opponents of such spending or those who seek reasonable cuts or reductions therein who must justify their opposition or the cuts they attempt to make.

During the hearings, I asked Mr. Kermit Gordon, Director of the Bureau of the Budget, if he had any comment to make, critical or otherwise, about congressional budgetary procedures and practices. I did not really expect any real answer, but I asked the question in good faith because I, like a good many of you, have felt for a long time that budgetary control has been slipping away from the Congress, and I have sought to determine what we could do about recapturing it.

Mr. Gordon was kind enough to answer—although off the record for some reasons that, from his standpoint, were understandable—and his answers and the discussion that we thereafter had were, I felt, most useful and interesting to the members of the subcommittee.

Surely, this is a field to which a great deal of attention needs to be given—and I continue to hope that it will be.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Cohelan].

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to thank my distinguished subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed], for a very interesting and valuable experience. I warmly share in the sentiments which have already been expressed by my able colleagues on the subcommittee.

Like the gentleman from New York [Mr. Robison] and others, this is the first time I have had the benefit and the privilege of serving on this committee. I have found it to be a great challenge and a great opportunity for congressional service.

I may say that along with Mr. Robison, Mr. Addabbo, Mr. Yates, and others on the committee, this has been an enormous exercise in trying to learn about the details and the activities that take place in these various agencies. Of course, it has been necessary that we do our homework in order to keep up with the thorough review made by our subcommittee chairman. It has been a most useful and enlightening first year and I am sure that we will be helped greatly because of it in future hearings.

In respect to the bill, I have nothing special to add, except to raise a couple of questions and to make some comments about them.

First, I speak in connection with the overtime work. Like many Members of Congress, I was not too familiar with the postal operations until the postmasters in my district invited me to review some of the difficulties they were having.

I have been, as we all are, very proud of the leadership and dedication of postal service employees. I found, in the Seventh California District—in Oakland and Berkeley—that we are in a state of transition, and there were and are now very severe difficulties because of limitations that were then existing in respect to overtime and postal employment ceilings.

It is on this subject that I want to comment. We discussed this in our committee at great length, and some of us were quite concerned about it. I hope those of you who are interested in it will take the time to review the hearings, which are very complete. As new members of the committee, we were curious, and all of us asked many questions. We all expressed concern about the overtime problem. As you know, the Postmaster General came in and asked for 15,000 new positions. This is all shown in your committee's report on pages 12 and 13 as well as elsewhere throughout the report. Out of that 15,000 new positions asked for the committee allowed the addition of approximately 6,600 positions, which would increase post office employment to about 600,000 total, including temporary and hourly rated employees.

I want to add to what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. Conte] and others have mentioned. We vigorously discussed the overtime problems in our subcommittee. Some of us had some reservations about it, because the Postmaster General had been exceedingly strong on the point. He feels in order to do the kind of labor-management, and operational job he is required to do, he will have to have an increase in positions. He feels that the number he had in mind was the appropriate number to do the job. As a matter of fact, he informed many of us that he had a great deal of difficulty in getting it through the Bureau of the Budget, but he did, in fact, get his estimates approved by Bureau of the Budget.

I merely mention this because as a new member of the committee I have been following the arguments and relying on the experience of my distinguished subcommittee chairman and others who are more familiar with the ramifications and the details of the appropriations process than I am. I have confidence in their judgment, and I am going along with it on this basis in the hope, as indicated in the report, that should an emergency situation develop, our very able subcommittee chairman and our staff will consider any of the manpower requirements which might appear necessary.

Meanwhile I want also to lay special stress on one part of the report which I think is terribly important; namely, how are we going to use these additional employees. The committee gives this admonition in its report, which I think should be underscored. On page 14 this appears:

> The committee considers the amount recommended to be adequate to provide for mandatory increases, such as pay costs and other items over which the Department has limited control, as well as the estimated 3 percent volume increase. Of the 20,204 positions requested, including 15,000 for conversion of excess overtime to permanent employment in the labor-management program, the amount recommended will allow not to exceed 6,500 positions, which would be in line with the increase experienced last year. This would raise employment in the Bureau of Operations from 583,599 to approximately 590,000 positions, including hourly rate employees.
>
> The committee points out that the 6,500 positions allowed will provide the additional manpower needed for the estimated mail volume increase, and will allow about 1,300 positions to be used as an experimental program to reduce the excess overtime worked by postal employees.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Gonzalez). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. COHELAN. In the committee report on this very point it states:

> The committee feels that the solution to this problem is not to be found in additional personnel and appropriations alone, but in improved methods, equipment, and management techniques as well.

I merely want to say that I feel this emphasis is very important, and if it is carried out, I feel we have taken the correct position. We have made the point also that these employees should be put where they are most needed, which, of course, means in those operations where we have more complicated and larger volumes of mail business.

The committee points out that the 6,500 positions allowed will provide the additional manpower needed for the estimated mail volume increase, and will allow about 1,300 positions to be used as an experimental program to reduce the excess overtime worked by postal employees. It is requested that this allowance be used in the most critical locations, under careful controls, and the results reported to the committee next year. The committee feels that the solution to this problem is not to be found in additional personnel and appropriations alone, but in improved methods, equipment, and management techniques as well.

One final word in the brief time I have remaining. On the question of research and development, I refer you to the committee hearings where almost every member of the committee expressed some concern about the fact that all of the research and development funds that had been appropriated last year were not used. As I understand the feeling of the committee—and it is certainly this member's feeling—research and development in the Post Office is something that should be an ongoing project and should be done intensively.

Again I want to take this opportunity to thank my subcommittee chairman for his patience and thoughtful considerations at all times during our hearings. It is indeed an honor to serve with him in this important work.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, we can slice the discussion of economy in connection with this bill with a sharp or a dull knife and it will not make much difference. It still calls for more than $6,604 million to be spent in the coming fiscal year and that is $366,061,000 above the spending for the same agencies last year. I am waiting, still waiting and hoping for the day when somebody will bring in a bill from the Committee on Appropriations with a cut in it, with a cut below the spending for last year, and I mean a good, substantial cut. How else do you expect to do anything about the increase of $300 million or more a year for interest on the Federal debt unless you are prepared to cut this bill and all of the appropriation bills?

How else do you expect to cut this fixed interest charge of $11,500 million a year unless you reduce the debt? Talk about economic progress in this country. We are told we are wallowing in wealth one day. The next day we are told we are wallowing in poverty, and the next day we get a bill to spend more than $6 billion and increase the interest payment on the Federal debt by another $300 million. What is wrong? When are we going to give some attention to the staggering Federal debt that we have and to cutting the interest charge? I believe the annual interest charge is still the second largest appropriation that the Congress makes each year, second only to the spending on the Department of Defense. Then I believe in third place will come this bill with $6,600 million-odd. It makes me pretty sick to watch the wheels go around with apparently only a few interested as testified to by the scant attendance this afternoon.

There has to be a day of reckoning in this country. I do not know when it is going to come, but it will come and it is going to be a sad and sorry day in the life of this Nation when we have to face up to the financial facts of life.

You approved a bill the other day to liberate $5 billion in gold to play around with rather than balance the budget and get our house in order. There is another $10 billion that can be liberated, but some day you are going to have to face up to the financial facts of life in this country.

This bill provides for several thousand more employees for the Federal Government, despite the fact that millions are being spent for computers, data processing machines, and that sort of thing. They were supposed to reduce the number of personnel, supposed to provide more efficiency in Government, but more employees are added to the payroll.

I note in this bill—and I am sorry to see it—two provisions for the transferability of funds. I wonder how you can justify giving the Treasury Department the authority to transfer 2½ percent of its funds in this bill? I would like to see the Appropriations Committee appropriate for projects, services, and programs, and so forth, and so on, and say, "That is it." But this is not what you are doing in this bill with the Treasury and Post Office Departments. You are saying that they can take funds, if they have not spent them, and spend them somewhere else. I do not believe that this represents good fiscal management.

Mr. Chairman, I do not like to criticize any member of the committee. I would like to think that all the members of this committee are my friends, and I do not mean to single out anyone for particular mention. But I do not know how you can justify—perhaps you can and if you care to do so I shall be glad to yield to anyone who can tell me why you put transferability provisions in two places in this bill?

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my friend from Oklahoma.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. STEED. First, let me call the gentleman's attention to the fact that there is quite a bit of discussion on the need for this particular proviso in the printed hearings. The Secretary of the Treasury and his staff put the utmost emphasis on leaving this authority in the bill. One of the major justifications they used is that most of these estimates for appropriations are made up many, many months in advance and much of the activity of the Treasury Department is susceptible to workload factors beyond their control. By having this transfer authority, it will give them a little bit more leeway to meet some of the unexpected developments during the course of the fiscal year. It avoids the necessity of coming back to Congress for supplementals and in many cases, if you will read the comment of the Secretary of the Treasury, you will see where he points out, that in many cases with this authority they can save considerable money and also add to the efficiency of the operations of the Department.

Now, the committee has been very, very reluctant on this point. However, before any transfers are permitted they are submitted to the Bureau of the Budget for approval and the Committees on Appropriations of the House and Senate for further review. We have been assured that any time we did not agree with the proposed transfer, it would not be made. At the personal urging of the Secretary of the Treasury we finally, with some reluctance, agreed.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Oklahoma would not want to assure me here today that with this provision left in the bill they will not be back for a supplemental appropriation later on this year or early next year?

The gentleman knows that on tomorrow we are supposed to get a supplemental bill to make up the deficiency in appropriations for the remainder of this fiscal year.

The gentleman would not go so far as to guarantee the Members of the House that they would not be confronted with a deficiency appropriation if we leave the transferability provision in the bill?

Mr. STEED. If the gentleman will yield further, no, it cannot give the assurance that it will eliminate the necessity for supplemental requests. For instance, in the bill which will be considered tomorrow there is a transfer provided of some $539,000 from a fund that is not going to need the money into another fund for the purpose of paying for the additional Secret Service agents. To the extent that already appropriated money can be used to absorb additional requirements, we are insisting that they do it. It does require a transfer to bring that about.

Mr. GROSS. But you say that the money here appropriated is sufficient for the various items contained in the bill. Yet you put a provision in the bill providing that they can transfer money around, wheel and deal as they want to.

We ordinary, common garden variety of Members, who are not members of the Committee on Appropriations are not going to be let in on all the secrets as to how this money is used for one purpose or another?

We would like to know—at least I would—when you bring a bill to the floor that it has all of the specific meaning that the Committee on Appropriations handling the bill can give it. I am afraid that is not the case when you put in transferability provisions.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. May I say to the gentleman from Iowa that members of the Appropriations Committee are quite as interested as is the gentleman from Iowa in effecting reductions where they think such reductions are justified.

If I may supplement what the chairman of the subcommittee said a few moments ago respecting the advisability of the transfer provision, I do not believe any of us really want that provision, but it does have one advantage.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has again expired.

Mr. CONTE. I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I say to the gentleman in respect to his question I believe that this provision will lessen the possibility of the agency returning in some cases at least for a supplemental request.

As the chairman pointed out, the agency will have the opportunity of using to the extent of the transferability some part of the Department's activity which would otherwise require them to come up for a supplemental appropriation.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. I should like to make one observation. I opposed this transferability item in committee, but getting back to the amount of the bill, I think this committee did a very honorable job. Two hundred and fifty-five million dollars was for the pay increase, something we could not do anything about, $50 million of which was for increased services. That is over $300 million. We quizzed the Budget Director and Secretary Dillon at great length in regard to the interest on the national debt of $11.5 billion. One of the ways we tried to get that down was cutting this budget to the bone, or $104 million. So I think we have made some progress.

Mr. GROSS. I wish I could agree with the gentleman.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, it is a pleasure to return to the Appropriations Committee and to have the privilege of serving with one of the most able and hard-working chairman of the House Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. STEED]. I want to commend the distinguished chairman for the diligent and thorough manner in which he conducted the hearings on the appropriation bill before us today, and I want to express my appreciation to the other members of the subcommittee—on both sides of the aisle—for the exceptionally able and effective contribution they made.

As a participant in the hearings, I was impressed with the solid justifications presented for these funds. I believe it is no exaggeration to say that the agencies which come before this subcommittee are among the most efficient and tightly managed in the Government today. The Treasury Department, for instance, feels it must set an example in economy for the rest of the Government and as a result, has pared its request to the bone—almost to the detriment of many of its most important programs.

In discussing this bill today, I would like to briefly describe the operations of one of the most dedicated and vital agencies of the Government—and that is the Bureau of Narcotics. Your committee has recommended that the Bureau's entire request for $5,970,000 be approved and I think with good reason. I do not know of another area where the American taxpayer gets a better return on his dollar. In its efforts to stop the illicit traffic in narcotics, the Bureau is up against a worldwide organized conspiracy. This staggering job is carried on with 295 agents, 159 support personnel, and a budget under $6 million.

The main sources of the illicit narcotics trade have their origin in Turkey and mainland China. Opium is grown in Turkey and smuggled into Syria or Lebanon where it is generally converted into morphine and moved into France. There it is converted into heroin for shipment to market—to the United States, frequently by way of Canada or Mexico. In the Far East, a similar chain exists from the mainland of China through Thailand and Laos, on into Singapore and Hong Kong, and ultimately to the United States.

As a result of this international traffic, the Bureau has been making increasing effort to stop the movement of narcotics at its source or on route before it reaches U.S. distribution channels. In October of 1962 the Secretary of the Treasury assigned the Bureau enforcement responsibilties on a worldwide basis. Previously, agents were deployed in Europe and the Middle East with offices at Rome, Paris, Marseille, Beirut, and Istanbul. New offices have now been opened up at Bangkok, Singapore, Hong Kong, Mexico City, and Monterrey. Fourteen agents are presently assigned in foreign lands and the budget request now before the House would assign five more at Bangkok, Lima, Damascus, Mexico City, and Seoul.

What has all this accomplished? More than 700 pounds of pure heroin and morphine and 2½ tons of opium were seized in foreign lands since January 1, 1964, as a result of our agents working in cooperation with foreign authorities. Perhaps the most notable of recent cases was the arrest of an international narcotics ring in New York, including the then Mexican Ambassador to Bolivia, Salvador Pardo-Bolland. Over 130 pounds of heroin were confiscated. Pardo and others were convicted and are now serving long prison terms.

Despite this brilliant record, we have not been able to stop all narcotics from entering the country and drug addiction still remains a serious problem. For example, when we first started keeping statistics on drug addiction in 1953, there were an estimated 60,000 drug addicts in the country compared to a present day total of 56,000. Addiction, therefore, has not been appreciably reduced, but these figures do not tell the entire story.

In the first place, our total population has grown by about 20 percent since 1953, whereas the number of reported addicts has declined by 7 percent.

Secondly, we have substantially improved our reporting techniques since 1953 so that more addicts are now being reported who had previously gone undetected.

And, thirdly, the success of the Bureau in cracking down on the narcotics trade has dried up the source. As a result, there has been a progressive dilution of each dose and by the time it reaches the user, the heroin content is frequently as low as 1 or 2 percent. There might be a psychological addiction to such low-level dosages, but the physical addiction is minimal.

Doctors have reported, for example, an almost complete absence of severe withdrawal symptoms among recent patients being treated for drug addiction. Whereas previous addicts suffered from aches, pains, nausea, fever, chills, and tremors, as frequently portrayed in Hollywood movies, the symptoms shown by the more recent addicts are no more serious than a case of the flu.

And so, Mr. Chairman, we have made some progress, but much too little. We still have such a long way to go. We need to do more in the field of treatment and rehabilitation. We are far behind in this respect. We should do everything we can to achieve a breakthrough here to find the means of bringing back to society the unfortunate people who are trapped by drug addiction.

The Bureau of Narcotics has been doing its part in an outstanding manner, and I think it is typical of the many agencies contained within this appropriation bill. No Member of the House need hesitate in voting for the sums recommended by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YATES. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I think that the best reply I could make insofar as beefing up the Bureau of the Budget is concerned is to say perhaps we ought to beef up the Appropriations Committee, this and other appropriation subcommittees, because we find this committee cut the budget request by $104 million, which does not speak very well for the Budget Department and its professed interest in economy. And the bill as it stands calls for spending $360 million more than last year on the same agencies.

Mr. YATES. I do not think the gentleman's figure is right with respect to appropriations for the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. GROSS. No, no. I am not talking about that. I am talking about the total bill. You cut this bill $104 million below the budget request yet it is still higher than for fiscal 1965.

Mr. YATES. I do not think that follows from the comment I made. The point I make in respect to the Bureau of the Budget is that it reviews the request for appropriations of all the Government agencies in the first instance. In the second stage, the Appropriations Committee considers it, and in this case, as it always does, the Appropriations Committee reduced it. In its judgment it found that the Bureau of the Budget did permit the allowance of more funds than it thought justified. I do not see that is a reflection on the Bureau of the Budget necessarily.

As a matter of fact the Bureau of the Budget may have sought less funds had it had more personnel to review the justifications. That was the point I made to Mr. Gordon when he appeared before our committee.

Mr. GROSS. I am afraid too many people lie awake nights dreaming up ways to spend money down in the Budget Bureau.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman is entitled to his opinion and I am sure he will give me the right to have my opinion, too.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I wish to commend this committee on a good job. I note this committee has the most difficult circumstances experienced by any committee on the floor of the House. This committee has to pick and choose by the best information at hand, and then come to the floor and defend its action between those who would want more appropriated to a given agency and those who want less appropriated.

I note that some people are waiting for a curtailment in government in the United States, and I would take from that that they look for a reduction in population, that they look for a reduction in employment, that they look for a reduction in business, because it could only come from a reduction in employment and business and a reduction in population that we could get curtailment in the appropriations for these agencies, and particularly the Post Office Department. The Post Office Department and its services are extended and the amount needed to extend those services is a result entirely of an increase in population, an increase in business, and an increase in employment. Indeed, I think the Post Office Department is an index to business in America. The only time we know in this century when the Post Office volume decreased was in depression times, when business greatly decreased and employment greatly decreased. So we should rejoice when the postal operations increase, when postal employment as a result increases, because that means business has increased, it means employment in America has increased, it means the productivity of the country has increased.

I am one who is on the side of criticizing the committee for not having appropriated enough. I think they should have restored some of the services the Post Office has heretofore curtailed. I think if the Post Office had increased in the field of parcel post and the volume of parcel post could increase, then the unit cost of it could decrease, and as a net result we could have an increase in revenue from parcel post instead of the decrease that has been experienced in the last few years.

I would recommend, too, that we eliminate the part-time employees status, and that we eliminate overtime. I know this would result in some increase but I think it would increase the service to the American people and would increase the efficiency of the employees, who would move the volume of mail faster.

I think we should emphasize the increase of service for the ordinary postal patron. Deliveries per day to the ordinary postal patron should be emphasized as well as the number of deliveries per day in the business world.

Finally, I think the Post Office Department has invested entirely too little in research and development. I realize this committee noted that they did not spend what was appropriated to them heretofore. On our legislative committee, we are going to talk to them about this proposition of not thinking big enough and not thinking far enough into the future on research and development and anticipating the kind of development they must have in the Post Office Department to cope with the great increased volume of mail that they are going to have to cope with in the coming years.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. I could not agree with the gentleman more in what he has just said. The committee is interested in a good research and development program for the Post Office Department. It was my impression during the hearings that the research bureau of the Post Office was not paying enough attention to basic research. It was more interested in engineering problems. I think there is great opportunity for development of research that will ease its work in the future.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COHELAN. I want to compliment the gentleman on his observation and join in the remarks made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] on this same subject. I would commend to the gentlemen the discussion of this very problem in the hearings of the Subcommittee on Appropriations. I think he may find them to be useful in his legislative committee hearings on authorizations. I might say to the gentleman that in coming to the Subcommittee on Appropriations, I came from the Committee on Armed Services where I served on the Subcommittee on Research and Development. It will be my intention to urge the Post Office Department to attend to the question of research with the same intensity that we do with reference to matters concerning the armed services.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I thank the gentleman from California, and also the gentleman from Illinois for their observations. I know from your hearings and from your report that you would desire that research and development funds be not spent on engineering for buildings, for instance, but that they be spent on basic research. I think this is where the Post Office Department has neglected its job.

Finally, I want to say for those who are concerned about how we finance this Government, that I for one think we must finance, of course, out of reasonable taxation but also by means of reasonable credit. I want to commend this committee for the fact that they have paid attention to the fact that we must have reasonableness in credit as well as taxation. All of the load of this Government cannot be maintained out of taxes each year. I have high hopes for the Post Office Department and I am appreciative of the fact that this committee has great hopes and great ambitions for the Post Office Department in the future.

I would hope again in the near future that we would look at this proposition of eliminating overtime and eliminating part-time and eliminating temporary employees and having full-time employee status for this overtime and for these temporaries.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. I want to say to the gentleman, the committee is, of course, extremely concerned and this concern that you are expressing was expressed in the hearings. I want to reiterate that the allowances that have been made for additional employees are designed to accomplish that goal.

On page 14 of the report, it says it is requested that this allowance be used in the most critical locations under careful control and the results reported to the committee next year.

I hope that by that it means that we are going to follow this very closely, and I would expect if it proves to be inadequate at some future date we will make appropriate adjustments.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I would hope so because I know some employees who have been temporary employees for 7 or 8 years, and I think that that situation ought to be remedied.

I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, I rise for the reason of my consistency in proclaiming the ever-present need of a better postal service. I am very much concerned that again this year the representatives of the Post

Office Department have failed to include in their requests for appropriations, any provisions to restore services to the American people. Despite continuing complaints from the citizenry, there appears to be no concern on the part of the Post Office Department to put back into effect more than one delivery in the residential area nor 6-day delivery of parcel post.

The Post Office Department representatives have again come before Congress to attempt to justify their cost of inaugurating new programs such as the ABCD, NIMS, VIM, and programs which include automation. Mr. Chairman, I reiterate what I have said so many times in the past—the only way that the people are going to benefit from innovations in the postal service is to provide more service. Automation merely moves the mail inside the post office. We need more open-window hours to service the needs of the patrons. We need more collections of mail. We need more personnel to deliver the mail; and we need more deliveries to truly fulfill the Nation's needs. To just merely ask for sufficient funds to cope with the increased mail volume is an inadequate request for a service agency such as the Post Office Department to make. Departmental representatives should face up to their problems of deteriorating mail service, and tell the Congress the truth concerning the thousands and thousands of complaints which they are receiving in post offices throughout the country concerning delayed and dilapidated conditions of the mail. Congress has a right to know whether the policies that they have approved are being placed to full advantage. They have a right to know if the patron is dissatisfied with the new programs, and would prefer to have more deliveries and more convenient collection receptacles than to know that in isolated instances there will be special treatment given to tenants in large buildings.

The average postal patron is more concerned about how far they must travel to a collection box than how many times patrons in business areas may expect to have their mail picked up during the day. Residential patrons are more concerned over what services are available for the purchases of stamps and money orders, and for the mailing of parcels than they are concerned over whether the ZIP code on their mail will make it easier for postal personnel to handle that mail.

Mr. Chairman, I detect that the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, after thorough and exhaustive hearings and studies, has determined that the Postmaster General has supplied them with insufficient information to prove the necessity of increasing the number of postal employees to offset the thousands of hours overtime that are being worked by substitute postal workers. It is noted with keen disappointment that only 10 percent of the 13,000 additional employees needed to reduce long hours of employment, have been provided for in the new proposed appropriations.

The Post Office Department declared that the only additional cost to augmenting the service force would be for fringe benefits. But, I am wondering if enough emphasis was placed on the fact that when employees worked long hours postal patrons must suffer the effect through tardy mail service, and through tired and exhausted employees. Of course, Mr. Chairman, the sad note concerning overtime for these workers is the fact that substitute employees of the Post Office Department are not paid premium pay for overtime services; and I have received many complaints as a member of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee from employees throughout the country, who are asked to work 12 and 14 hours daily, 6 and 7 days weekly, in order to maintain services at their offices. They are suffering hardship and the postal patron is likewise suffering.

It is commendable that there are departmental officials who are eager to seek new methods of handling the mail; and if there has been improvement in some areas, I hasten to commend those responsible. However, I reiterate my previous thoughts that the taxpayer—the postal patron—is interested in how fast his mail can be collected and delivered. And he is likewise interested in how fast letters addressed to him can be received. He is not concerned over how fast his mail travels between the walls of a post office; and I strongly urge that consideration be given to providing funds necessary to permit the very best of postal services to the people of our great country.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, I want to assure the members of the Appropriations Committee who worked on the Treasury appropriation bill, and also the Members of the House, that the crisis in our silver supply situation will be considered promptly by the committee having jurisdiction over the content of our coins.

The heavy industrial needs for silver, coupled with the tremendous demands upon the Bureau of the Mint for more and more coins to meet the needs of our expanding economy, were factors which the Committee on Banking and Currency took into consideration in the last Congress in authorizing the replacement of outstanding $1 silver certificates with Federal Reserve notes. Since that legislation was enacted in 1963, hundreds of millions of ounces of silver previously immobilized in the Treasury as backing for silver certificates have been made available—through retirement of silver certificates and their replacement by Federal Reserve notes—for coinage and for industrial uses. About one-third of all outstanding silver certificates were retired last year, according to Secretary Dillon, and a similar number should be replaced by Federal Reserve notes this year.

The 1,089 million troy ounces of silver we still have on hand will not permit the continued prodigious use of silver in future years for coins and essential civilian and defense needs. We produce less than 40 million ounces of silver in this country a year—about 37 million ounces altogether—and we are using about 7 times that much silver a year just for coinage—252 million ounces in the coming fiscal year, according to the Director of the Mint. Then, industrial uses in this country account for another 110 million ounces or more. The photographic industry alone uses almost as much silver as we produce a year. The total free world production of silver would be unable to meet free world requirements for silver even if we were to stop using the metal entirely for coins. Our coinage use represents the largest single use of silver in the free world.

We are waiting for the Department of the Treasury to make its report to us on what changes it feels can properly be made in the content of silver coins to accomplish these purposes: First, assuring the continued production of sufficient coins to meet today's tremendous needs for coin; second, preventing shortages in silver supply from raising silver prices to a level at which existing supplies of silver coins would be in jeopardy of melting for their silver content; third, assuring a smooth transition to coins of a different content and/or appearance, with a minimum of disruption for the vending machine industry and other industries dependent upon an adequate supply of coins; and fourth, conserving silver for essential military and civilian uses for which there is no adequate substitute.

Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Banking and Currency has always been cognizant of its responsibilities to the Congress and to the American people to initiate or expedite necessary legislation within its jurisdiction. We responded promptly last year to the plea of the President to retain the 1964 date on coins as a means of curbing the speculative hoarding of new coins for future numismatic value. The legislation we successfully proposed to the House on this subject last year has been of inestimable help to the Treasury in reducing the diversion of rolls and bags and tons of new coins into storerooms and warehouses for future sale to coin collectors. A coin dated 1964 would hardly command any numismatic premium for many, many years to come, if ever, considering the billions of such coins which will be in existence carrying the 1964 inscription.

We do not presume to guess what recommendations the new Secretary of the Treasury will make to us on changes in the content of our silver coins, but I am sure some changes will be requested, based on the comprehensive study and mint tests now going forward. When those recommendations are submitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency, we will promptly review them, Mr. Chairman, and inform the House whether we believe legislation is necessary and justified and—if so—the form which we believe it should take.

In the meantime, I would urge the American public—in addition to the age-old admonition "Don't take any wooden nickels"—to retain their good, solid horsesense on this question of coin content and not be stampeded or steamrollered into hoarding coins against a possible increase in their value as silver. Those who have invested heavily in silver coins in the expectation of big profits are immobilizing their capital in a foolish display of economic sterility. Investments in Government bonds would bring far more return on capital.

Any legislation to alter the silver content of our coins would be geared to the requirement of maintaining the domestic price of silver at or about its present level for some years to come, so that there would be no profit in melting existing coins for their silver content, at least until they can all be replaced by new coins. Coin hoarding will thus turn out to be a waste of time, effort, and money, and a disservice to one's country.

Mr. DUNCAN of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted that the committee has at least made a start at eliminating the tremendous number of temporary employees in the Post Office Department by adding authority for 1,300 new permanent positions and directing a further study of the whole problem.

In my opinion, it is not good management to use temporary employees for permanent work. The U.S. Government may save on overtime pay and fringe benefits by such techniques but it is indefensible for the Government to so operate for such purposes. It is likewise unwise and inefficient to continue training temporary employees for permanent jobs when the reappointments are limited in such a manner as to require a constant turnover of personnel.

I hope the situation may be speedily corrected and congratulate the committee for its alertness to this problem.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Chairman, when this legislation was in committee the request of the Post Office Department for additional permanent employees was reduced from 20,520 to 6,625. While I realize the committee has provided for temporary employees which they feel are sufficient in number to maintain current services, the failure of the committee to provide for the necessary permanent employees will be a distinct disservice to our many areas of rapid economic expansion.

The Department's original request was the minimum request and was kept at that minimum figure in order to help with the President's economy in Government program. That 20,000 figure was the minimum figure necessary to maintain the current efficiency of the Post Office Department. If the Department were to eliminate all of the overtime now necessary, it would take twice the request they made in order to maintain adequate service to its 45 million family and 4.1 million business patrons.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite familiar with the problems that the Department faces in areas of rapid economic expansion. In my own district we have had 36 new post offices constructed in the last 11 years. Some of these have been in communities which as short a time ago as 1957 did not even exist. These post offices are making use of the latest equipment and systems for processing the mail but they also need employees.

If the Post Office Department is going to continue to meet the needs of areas of rapid economic expansion, they must have the manpower to do so. The committee action cripples the request for that manpower and the Department has attempted to be reasonable in their request.

Several of the communities in my district are so understaffed that substitute carriers and clerks have been working as much as 60 hours per week. On top of this the regular employees have been working overtime as well. The normal morning deliveries are arriving at residential homes as late as 5 p.m., and the continued growth in my area will mean added problems to the post offices in meeting the demands for adequate service.

Mr. Chairman, it would seem that if the fine record of our Post Office Department has made in the past is to be continued, additional permanent postal employees will be needed.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill.

Mr. CONTE (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any points of order?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 9, lines 8 through 16, as being legislation on an appropriation bill and calling for authority not previously granted by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, obviously the language is subject to a point of order, if the gentleman insists on his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph does contain legislation, as maintained by the gentleman from Iowa; and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 12, line 2, beginning with the word "*Provided*" and running to line 9 ending with the word "transfers", as being legislation on an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, this language has been in the bill for many years. I believe the gentleman will find that the transfer authority within this Department is considerably different from the point he raised in the case of the Treasury, where there was transferability between agencies.

The language probably is subject to a point of order, but it can take from the Department the only device it has to cope with unexpected and unforeseen changes in mail flow volume which can and frequently do occur. That makes transferability almost vital to the efficient functioning of the Department.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa insist on his point of order?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph does contain legislative matter, and the point of order is sustained.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. HALL

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. HALL: On page 8, immediately before the period in line 11, insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no appropriation made by any provision of this Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, may be used for the seizure of mail without a search warrant authorized by law in carrying out the activities of the United States in connection with the seizure of property for collection of taxes due to the United States".

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Oklahoma reserves a point of order.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman—

> The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects, against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated, and no warrants shall issue, but upon probable cause, supported by oath or affirmation, and particularly describing the place to be searched, and the persons or things to be seized.

I have just quoted the fourth amendment to the Constitution of the United States.

As long ago as in 1782, the Continental Congress passed a historic law guaranteeing the privacy of the mail and prohibiting its search and seizure.

Mr. Chairman, on March 25, after learning from the district I represent of collusion between the Postmaster General and the Director of Internal Revenue and the Secretary of the Treasury on search and seizure of first-class undelivered mail, I queried the Postmaster General and, on April 1, had a reply from the general counsel thereof—these dates will indicate clearly my lack of appearance or lack of time therefor before this distinguished subcommittee—confirming that there have been 14 such seizures since September 1962, the last on October 14 of 1964. I have copies of this reply, and they are available for anyone to consider. This amendment simply limits the use of search and seizure of first-class mail without due process without the necessity of going to the Attorney General or some other attorney and getting a search warrant, because as late as the April report of the Postal Worker, the chief inspector of the Postmaster General's department testified before the committee in the other body stating that mail is neither delayed nor opened and the contents of first-class mail are not examined in connection with the mail cover. We have literally caught those in collusion with their fingers in the cooky jar. This amendment simply limits funds appropriated herein and prevents their use for further search and seizure until such time as there may be (a) substantive limiting legislation or (b) the committee we created last week for post office and civil service investigation can complete its work. I certainly hope that the amendment will be accepted and strongly recommend it be adopted.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HALL. Yes. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. The gentleman's amendment, as I heard the Clerk read it, referred to the section on compliance of the Internal Revenue Service.

Mr. HALL. That is correct.

Mr. YATES. Should not the gentleman's amendment more properly be made a part of the appropriation for the postal service?

Mr. HALL. No. Because if we had the time to develop it, you would find that the Secretary of the Treasury is the one who has the authority. By a process of exclusion, in two different United States Codes which are already in existence, by not saying that they might search the mail, this leads to a double negative, which is a positive, and therefore they do search the mail on the word of the Secretary of the Treasury. Therefore, I want the limitation applied to the Director of Internal Revenue or his superior. At one time the decision was delegated to regional authorities which subsequently has been recalled and granted only to the Secretary of the Treasury—I want it to be so limited in this appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, this appropriation bill obviously lasts only from year to year, but pending such time as substantive legislation could be enacted, I think this is the best approach.

I thank the gentleman for his question. It is a valid point.

I include at this point a press release from my office, dated today, April 5, and the letter from the General Counsel of the Post Office Department:

[Press release from the office of Representative DURWARD G. HALL]

REPRESENTATIVE HALL, REPUBLICAN, OF MISSOURI, DISCLOSES POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT AND IRS "AGREEMENT" PERMITTING MAIL SEIZURES

Information has been brought to my attention, which discloses a clear-cut case of violation by two agencies of the Federal Government of the sacred seal of a piece of first class mail. On 14 occasions, since December of 1962, there have been admitted instances of actual seizure of first class mail addressed to taxpayers. The most recent occuring on October 27, 1964. This seizure has been carried out by the Post Office Department upon request from the Internal Revenue Service. The seizures took place without the issuance of any search warrant or other due process, in the cases of delinquent taxpayers, and is in direct violation of section 4057, of title 39, United States Code, providing that, "only a person holding a search warrant or an employee of the dead letter office may open first class mail, which is in the custody of the Post Office Department."

The alleged authority for the Internal Revenue Service-Post Office Department agreed action and seizures is so vague as to defy description. I am advised by the General Counsel of the Post Office Department that their actions are based on certain sections of the Internal Revenue Code, which spell out property not subject to levy. Nowhere in any of the three sections cited is there any mention of mail, as being exempt from seizure. Therefore, the Post Office Department concludes that, since mail is not specifically excluded, and since mail, in their opinion, becomes the recipient's property once it is dropped in the mail box, it becomes subject to seizure. Furthermore, these seizures have taken place in every instance without the issuance of a search warrant. All this in spite of the fact that the Postal Code specifically prohibits such actions.

On February 23, 1965, Chief Postal Inspector Henry B. Montague, testifying before the Senate Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure, made the following statement:

"The seal on a first-class piece of mail is sacred. When a person puts first-class postage on a piece of mail and seals it, he can be sure that the contents of that piece of mail are secure against all illegal search and seizure. The only time first-class mail may be opened in the postal service is when it can neither be delivered as addressed nor returned to the sender."

This is American tradition, concept, and belief.

The 14 instances cited clearly belie that assurance. I am advised that neither has a search warrant been secured by the Post Office Department in seizing such mail, nor has a search warrant been sought by the Internal Revenue Service, in opening mail obtained by it under this method. It goes without question that, in opening mail addressed to a citizen, the Internal Revenue Service must also open private mail having no bearing to a tax lien, in order to establish what is and what is not pertinent. Are there no longer freedoms? Is nothing (including the written word and seal), inviolate in the United States of America?

Less than 2 months ago, extensive hearings were held in the Senate on the question of mail cover. I believe the admitted practice of seizing first-class mail is far more invidious than merely recording who sent it and from where.

Certainly, I hope the House Post Office Committee will investigate the matter under the legislative authority approved early last week. It may be possible to restrain the Post Office Department from such action when the House acts on the Treasury and Post Office Departments appropriation today. I will submit such an amendment if it is in order. A third alternative, of course, would be the submission of legislation amending the statutes cited by the IRS to specifically exclude mail from seizure, although the fact that such prohibitions are already written into the Postal Code makes one wonder how many laws have to be passed before the executive branch of Government gets the message.

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL,
Washington, D.C., April 1, 1965.

Hon. DURWARD G. HALL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in further reference to your letter concerning levies on delinquent taxpayers' mail by the Internal Revenue Service. You requested this Department's comments. You also asked on how many occasions such seizures may have been made within the past 2 years.

As long ago as May 27, 1942, this Department has taken the position that mail was not exempt from the Internal Revenue Collector's authority to seize and sell property to satisfy delinquent taxes. (See 9 Ops. Sol. POD No. 191.) Congress has given the Secretary of the Treasury extremely broad authority to satisfy a tax levy. It has carefully spelled out the property not subject to levy. (See secs. 6331, 6332, and 6334(c) of title 26 of the United States Code.) Basically, the final decision as to the scope of the authority under the Internal Revenue Code is for decision by the Secretary.

Section 4057 of title 39, United States Code (formerly sec. 1717(c) of title 18, United States Code) provides that only a person holding a search warrant or an employee of the dead letter office may open first-class mail which is in the custody of this Department. The Internal Revenue Code and section 4057 of title 39 were both passed by the Congress. Legally, neither is superior to the other. In case of any inconsistency, the one latest in time takes priority. We do not believe that there is any basic inconsistency between section 4057 and the Internal Revenue Code seizure provisions. These sections apply to different situations, and the provisions of both titles of the United States Code can be given effect. This Department must comply with the legal obligations placed upon it by Congress in other titles of the United States Code.

As alluded to above, the Secretary is not legally compelled to levy upon the mail. He may, as a matter of policy, not levy on the mail. This Department has conferred with the Treasury Department concerning this matter. Both the Postmaster General and the Secretary of the Treasury were and are concerned with the practice of the Internal Revenue Service in levying on the mail. It was concluded that the authority which had been delegated to the field offices of the Internal Revenue Service would be and has been withdrawn. In other words, the field offices are no longer authorized to levy upon a delinquent taxpayer's mail. It was also agreed that in those extreme rare instances where all normal means of collecting delinquent taxes had failed, the cognizant field official would notify the Commissioner of the Internal Revenue Service. Then a levy would be made only if the Commissioner himself so determined after consultation with the appropriate official of this Department.

In summary, this Department recognizes and agrees that the Internal Revenue Service does have authority to levy on mail addressed to delinquent taxpayers. During the period of December 1962 to the date of this letter, the records of this Office reflect that there have been 14 levies made by the Internal Revenue Service, the last of which was made on October 27, 1964. I might add that while we believe these figures to be substantially correct, it is possible that there may have been one or more levies of which we have no record.

If I can be of further assistance, please advise.

Sincerely yours,
HARVEY H. HANNAH,
Acting General Counsel.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order against the amendment because it is not a limitation on appropriations. It requires actions by the Bureau of Internal Revenue, which can be authorized only by legislation.

The CHAIRMAN. The language is a limitation here. The Chair overrules the point of order. The point of order is not sustained.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

It is not a matter of our disagreeing with what the gentleman has said about stopping a practice he finds obnoxious. It is a fact that this involves something that the Committee knows nothing about, never heard of it before, except what we have heard today. That is the only information we have whether such a practice as this is going on. We have had no opportunity to take this matter up with the agency, and therefore, in fairness to all concerned I should hope that the House would defeat this amendment.

It would seem to me that if the facts are as has been stated here, this would certainly be a matter of very pertinent concern to the legislative committee. It is a matter, I would say, as chairman of the subcommittee, that had we had knowledge of it previously we would have gone into it and developed what information we could. I think if such a practice has been going on certainly redress can be had short of adopting this amendment today. It is inconceivable to me that an agency knowingly, especially after exposure such as we have had here today, would continue to insist on such a practice or a violation of law, whether we adopted the amendment or not. But because we are in no position to know what the background of the whole story is, I would have to ask the Committee to reject this amendment at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that there is not any question about the fact that mail seizures have been made.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, there may not be any question about it so far as the gentleman is concerned, but this Committee has had no information other than what has been said here today that such a situation existed at all.

Mr. GROSS. What I am trying to say to the gentleman is that I have in my hand a letter, and the gentleman from Missouri, the author of the amendment, also has such a letter, in which it is admitted that they have seized first-class letter mail.

Mr. STEED. Nobody called this to the attention of the committee until the gentleman appeared on the floor today. We have had no opportunity to go into the matter, to find out anything about it. It does not seem to me fair to ask us to approve an amendment here today when we are in no position to check any information on the background of this letter.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to make such a statement, but in view of the date of the letter which is April 1, 1965, that is tantamount, I think the chairman of the subcommittee will agree with me, to saying that we should continue appropriations even in the fact of admitted misuse of funds. I am thoroughly in agreement with the gentleman that it would have been nice if we had had the time to go into these disclosures and to look into this admission of malfeasance, if you please. It would have been nice to have had the time to bring it to the legislative committee and then the Subcommittee on Appropriations. But under these circumstances, the date of the letter being April 1, 1965, and today being the 5th day of April, there was no chance to do that. I submit again that we should not, as an appropriating body of the Congress of the United States, continue to appropriate funds to be used for this purpose.

This amendment simply limits the funds that they will have to use for such activity in the subsequent year.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to ask a question? Is this letter signed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue?

Mr. GROSS. This is a letter signed by Mr. Harvey H. Hannah, Acting General Counsel of the Post Office Department.

Mr. STEED. If the gentleman will yield, does the letter make any statement as to whether this practice has been stopped or will be continued or what does it say?

Mr. GROSS. The letter states that the authority for the Internal Revenue Service to seize mail for the purpose of income tax investigation has been withdrawn—has been withdrawn—but there is nothing in the letter to say that it could not be renewed tonight or tomorrow morning.

Mr. STEED. I believe the gentleman from Iowa has helped me to prove to the House that this is something that should be gone into, but not at the 11th hour such as has been suggested.

The committee does not like to be in the position of trying to block something that perhaps should be done. But in my opinion this is not a good way to proceed on these matters.

Mr. GROSS. All the gentleman is asking for is that due process of law be used in this matter, and that is all.

Mr. STEED. Due process of this Committee?

Mr. GROSS. Is there anything wrong with that?

Mr. STEED. The due process of this Committee is to have an opportunity to know what it is doing before it goes along with approving such an amendment.

Mr. GROSS. This will not deprive the Treasury Department of a dime of money or the Post Office Department. It is designed to put a stop to this violation of the mails.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Hall]?

Mr. GROSS. Of course.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I believe it might be better to have this question directed to the gentleman from Missouri. Is the contention here that a mail cover is to be equated with search and seizure? Is this the contention of the gentleman, or is he contending that mail has been seized and opened? Is that what the gentleman says? He is not speaking of a mail cover?

Mr. HALL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. I am not speaking of mail cover. I am not speaking of any of these other devices which the other body has been recently investigating. I am speaking of the 14 admitted cases in the last 2 years where the acting general counsel of the Post Office Department has admitted search and seizure in the tax delinquent cases.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I thank the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Hall) there were—ayes 13, noes 27.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. If there are no further amendments, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. Steed].

Mr. STEED. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Blatnik, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7060) making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the yeas had it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 347, nays 7, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

YEAS—347

Abbitt
Abernethy
Adair
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Arends
Ashmore
Ayres
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Berry
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boland
Bolling
Bolton
Bow
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Broyhill, Va.
Buchanan
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Chamberlain

Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Collier
Colmer
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Cramer
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Dague
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
Davis, Wis.
Dawson
Delaney
Denton
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Erlenborn
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gathings
Gettys
Giaimo
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffiths
Grover
Gubser
Gurney
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Haley
Halleck
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hanna
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Ind.
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hechler
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Hutchinson
Ichord
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Jonas
Karsten
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Laird
Langen
Latta
Lennon
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, La.
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McClory
McCullcoh
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McVicker
Macdonald
Machen
Mackay
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Ala.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Michel
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Minshall
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Morton
Mosher
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neal, Ga.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Pepper
Perkins
Philbin
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, Ill.
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Roudebush
Roush
Roybal
Rumsfeld
Ryan
Satterfield
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Skubitz
Slack
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Iowa
Smith, N.Y.
Stafford
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wis.
Todd
Trimble
Tuck
Tupper
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Watts
Weltner
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Williams
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wright
Wyatt
Wydler
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki

NAYS—7

Ashbrook
Curtis
Devine
Dickinson
Gross
Hall
O'Konski

NOT VOTING—79

Andrews, Glenn
Ashley
Aspinall
Baldwin
Boggs
Bonner
Brademas
Bray
Byrnes, Wis.
Cahill
Casey
Cederberg
Celler
Craley
de la Garza
Dent
Derwinski
Diggs
Dorn
Dow
Edwards, Ala.
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Farnsley
Findley
Fino
Fraser
Fulton, Pa.
Gibbons
Grabowski
Griffin
Hébert
Helstoski
Holland
Irwin
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
Jones, Mo.
Karth
Kelly
Keogh
King, N.Y.
Kluczynski
Landrum
Leggett
McMillan
MacGregor
Mackie
Mailliard
Martin, Mass.
Moorhead
Morrison
Murray
Nix
Passman
Pickle
Price
Resnick
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Roncalio
Roosevelt
Rostenkowski
St Germain
Scott
Smith, Va.
Springer
Staggers
Stephens
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Tenzer
Thompson, N.J.
Toll
Tunney
Tuten
Vivian
Whalley
Wolff

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Byrnes of Wisconsin.

Mr. Rivers of South Carolina with Mr. Glenn Andrews.

Mr. Toll with Mr. Fulton of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Jennings with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Tenzer with Mr. Fino.

Mr. Helstoski with Mr. Whalley.

Mr. Staggers with Mr. MacGregor.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Mailliard.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Bray.

Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Springer.

Mr. Gibbons with Mr. Cahill.

Mr. Thompson of New Jersey with Mr. Cederberg.

Mr. Boggs with Mr. Ellsworth.

Mr. Celler with Mr. King of New York.

Mr. St Germain with Mr. Derwinski.

Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Findley.

Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Edwards of Alabama.

Mr. Moorhead with Mr. Griffin.

Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Grabowski.

Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Landrum.

Mr. Nix with Mr. de la Garza.

Mr. Brademas with Mrs. Kelly.

Mr. Roncalio with Mr. Leggett.

Mr. Casey with Mr. Ashley.

Mr. Dent with Mr. Diggs.

Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Resnick.

Mr. Stephens with Mr. Tunney.

Mr. Vivian with Mr. Tuten.

Mr. Aspinall with Mr. Holland.

Mr. Scott with Mr. Irwin.

Mr. Dorn with Mr. Edwards of California.

Mr. Roberts with Mr. Karth.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Passman.

Mr. Dow with Mr. Farnsley.

Mr. Price with Mr. Fraser.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Mackie.

Mr. Pickle with Mr. Murray.

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 974) entitled "An act to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. CLARK, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. MURPHY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962, AS AMENDED

Mr. O'HARA of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 974) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. POWELL, O'HARA of Michigan, DANIELS, PUCINSKI, GIBBONS, HATHAWAY, AYRES, ASHBROOK, and QUIE.

DISCUSSION OF FARM LABOR SITUATION

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise our colleagues that tomorrow, after the completion of legislative business, I have taken a special order of 1 hour to discuss the current, objective situation in farm labor.

There has been much discussion of this subject, but most of it, unfortunately, has elicited more heat than light.

I am encouraging all Members who are concerned with attracting and holding an adequate and stable supply of farm labor to be present for the discussion which several of our colleagues will join me in making.

NO GROWTH IN SUPPLY OF MONEY THREATENS PROSPERITY; CO-OPS CALL FOR MONETARY REFORM, VIEWS OF OUR FORMER COLLEAGUE, HON. JERRY VOORHIS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the disturbing news that the Nation's money supply—demand deposits plus currency—is no longer growing has just been made public by the Federal Reserve System.

Demand deposits, or "checkbook money," are created as a result of bank loans to businessmen, consumers, and other borrowers. No nation's economy can grow without a corresponding growth in its medium of exchange—money.

Since last November, our supply of money has risen at a 0.7-percent annual rate. In contrast, our money rose at a 4.2-percent average annual rate from September 1962 to November 1964. A money growth rate of 0.7 percent is clearly inadequate. For example, the growth in the money supply between December 1956 and June 1960 was at the same rate, 0.7 percent. Members will recall that the economy suffered two serious recessions during that period, with millions unemployed and the gross national product growth down sharply.

A recent report by the Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis quite clearly underscores the absolute need for a growing money supply, in stating:

> There is a consistent empirical relationship between changes in the growth rates of either money or money plus time deposits and the turning points of business cycles.

In plainer words, no money growth, no prosperity. It is as simple as that.

Following is an article by former Congressman Jerry Voorhis, now executive director of the Cooperative League of America, on this very same issue. This article appeared in the March 29 issue of Co-op News, going out to over 11,000 families in the Waukegan, Ill., area:

PUBLIC AUTHORITY VERSUS PRIVATE BANKS: WHO SHOULD CONTROL NATION'S MONEY SUPPLY?

(By Jerry Voorhis, executive director, Cooperative League of America)

If we want growth in our American economy, there must also be growth in our supply of money. Otherwise both money and credit become scarce, interest rates rise, prices collapse, and economic growth slows down.

A few people like such a situation. They are the people who have money to loan—naturally. But even for them an economic depression is a disaster.

And it is not to the interest of anybody else—not farmers, consumers, manufacturers, retailers, anyone—for money to be scarce.

Most important of all, it is not to the interest of our country as a whole to have a scarcity of money and credit. We have enlisted in a crusade to end poverty in our own country. And for the sake of human brotherhood, our national security, and the turning back of communism, we must do all one nation can do to end hunger in the world. This is also very much a part of any decent solution to our problem of so-called agricultural surpluses. But we can neither end poverty at home nor combat hunger abroad unless the flow of money supply is ample.

So it is difficult indeed to argue against a monetary policy which provides enough money and credit to keep pace with our potential economic growth.

The only other major point is that when the whole Nation needs more money in circulation, and when the growth of production, exchange, and economic activity generally can absorb, without price increases or inflation, an additional volume of money, we should have sense enough to put it into circulation without increasing the public debt.

In other words, such money—just enough to accommodate the expansion of production—should be directly created by a public authority, not borrowed at interest from private banks which themselves create the money to lend.

This is not a radical idea. It is not inflation. It is just commonsense. At least half of our present national debt is caused directly because we do not use such commonsense.

This is what Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives, has been saying for many years. For saying it, he has been criticized and attacked by those who profit from scarce money and high interest.

He has been right. He still is right. He has conducted extensive hearings into the operations of the Federal Reserve System. As a result of those hearings he has advanced certain proposals.

First. That the term of the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board be coterminous with that of the President of the United States.

Second. That the number of Governors of the Federal Reserve Board be reduced to five.

Third. That we reduce the terms of office to 5 years and allow for reappointments.

Fourth. That instead of continuing the appointment of bankers, the requirements would state only that the Governors be "men of integrity, devoted to the public interest".

Fifth. That a public audit be made by the Comptroller General of all expenditures of the Federal Reserve Board and the Reserve banks—no Government or independent audit has ever been made of the 12 Federal Reserve banks.

Sixth. That the Federal Reserve stock be retired—member banks own the stock but this is unnecessary any longer since the Fed is, and has been since 1935, the central banking system of the United States of America. The stock does not carry a proprietary interest, and, therefore, it is not stock in the real sense of the word.

Seventh. That all capital gains and interest received by the Federal Reserve from U.S. Government securities be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts and that all capital losses be covered by the Treasury.

Eighth. That the President be required to set forth in his periodic Economic Reports recommendations concerning monetary policy, domestic and foreign, including the growth of the money supply necessary to attain the goals of maximum employment and production and purchasing power.

Ninth. That we express the sense of the Congress that the Federal Reserve Board operate in the open market so as to facilitate the achievement of the President's monetary policy; provided that if the Fed's monetary views and actions diverge from those of the President, it shall file with the President and the Congress a statement of reasons for its divergence.

Tenth. That we permit the Federal Reserve to concentrate on monetary policy by transferring its present bank supervisory functions to the Comptroller of the Currency, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, or to a newly created Federal banking authority.

What Mr. PATMAN is saying is (1) that the Federal Reserve claims to be a central bank for the United States—(2) that it is so in many respects—(3) but that it is not really guided in its decisions by public policy or by officials responsible to the people of the United States—(4) that the Federal Reserve Banks are still privately owned—and (5) that he wants to change these features and make the Federal Reserve what it purports to be—namely, a true central bank of issue for the United States.

Should Congressman PATMAN prevail in what he is attempting to do, we would not—as some suggest—have inflation or "soft money."

Such a policy will recommend itself to reasonable people. It is long, long overdue. The remarkable postwar prosperity of Western Europe and its very level of employment have been in large part due to a policy very much like that which Mr. PATMAN advocates. It's time we listened to him.

BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it would be inappropriate to recognize the 100th anniversary of the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives without recognizing the men who served as chairmen of that committee. Since the committee was organized in 1865, 24 men have served as its chairman. I have been privileged to be on the committee under three chairmen, Henry B. Steagall, of Alabama, who served from the 72d Congress into the 78th Congress; Brent Spence, of Kentucky, who took over as the chairman in the 78th and served during the 79th Congress and again in the 81st, 82d, 85th, 86th, and 87th Congresses; and Jesse P. Wolcott, of Michigan, who was the chairman during the 80th and the 83d Congresses.

Mr. Speaker, I first became a member of the House Banking and Currency Committee when the gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Steagall, was in the chair. It was during Mr. Steagall's term as chairman that the Home Owners Loan Act was passed which set up the savings and loan industry. Mr. Steagall was followed to the chair of the Banking and Currency Committee by the gentleman from Kentucky, Mr. Spence, a gentleman of extremely high culture, experience, and education. It was a great personal inspiration for me to have served under Mr. Spence. It was during his tenure as chairman that the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956 was passed.

It was also a privilege for me to have served on the committee during the period when Mr. Wolcott was its chairman. This capable gentleman was later to serve with distinction as a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, in order that we may honor all of the gentlemen who have served as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, I am including for the RECORD a list of the 24 chairmen who have served the committee from its beginning in the 39th Congress through my own chairmanship beginning in the 88th Congress.

Chairmen of House Banking and Currency Committee From 1865 to Present Time With Party Affiliation

The 39th Congress, 1865–66, Theodore M. Pomeroy of New York (Republican).

The 40th Congress, 1867–68, Theodore M. Pomeroy of New York (Republican).

The 41st Congress, 1869–70, James A Garfield of Ohio (Republican).

The 42d Congress, 1871–72, Samuel Hooper of Massachusetts (Republican).

The 43d Congress, 1873–74, Horace Maynard of Tennessee (Republican).

The 44th Congress, 1875–76, Samuel S. Cox of New York (Democrat).

The 45th Congress, 1877–78, Aylett H. Buckner of Missouri (Democrat).

The 46th Congress, 1879–80, Aylett H. Buckner of Missouri (Democrat).

The 47th Congress, 1881–82, William W. Crapo of Massachusetts (Republican).

The 48th Congress, 1883–84, Aylett H. Buckner of Missouri (Democrat).

The 49th Congress, 1885–86, James F. Miller of Texas (Democrat).

The 50th Congress, 1887–88, Beriah Wilkins of Ohio (Democrat).

The 51st Congress, 1889–90, George W. E. Dorsey of Nebraska (Republican).

The 52d Congress, 1891–92, Henry Bacon of New York (Democrat).

The 53d Congress, 1893–94, William M. Springer of Illinois (Democrat).

The 54th Congress, 1895–96, James H. Walker of Massachusetts (Republican).

The 55th Congress, 1897–98, James H. Walker of Massachusetts (Republican).

The 56th Congress, 1899–1900, Marriott Brosius of Pennsylvania (Republican).

The 57th Congress, 1901–02, Charles N. Fowler of New Jersey (Republican).

The 58th Congress, 1903–04, Charles N. Fowler of New Jersey (Republican).

The 59th Congress, 1905–06, Charles N. Fowler of New Jersey (Republican).

The 60th Congress, 1907–08, Charles N. Fowler of New Jersey (Republican).

The 61st Congress, 1909–10, Edward B. Vreeland of New York (Republican).

The 62d Congress, 1911–12, Arsene P. Pujo of Louisiana (Democrat).

The 63d Congress, 1913–14, Carter Glass of Virginia (Democrat).

The 64th Congress, 1915–16, Carter Glass of Virginia (Democrat).

The 65th Congress, 1917–18, Carter Glass of Virginia (Democrat).

The 66th Congress, 1919–, Edmund Platt of New York (Republican).

The 66th Congress, –1920, Louis T. McFadden of Pennsylvania (Republican).

The 67th Congress, 1921–22, Louis T. McFadden of Pennsylvania (Republican).

The 68th Congress, 1923–24, Louis T. McFadden of Pennsylvania (Republican).

The 69th Congress, 1925–26, Louis T. McFadden of Pennsylvania (Republican).

The 70th Congress, 1927–28, Louis T. McFadden of Pennsylvania (Republican).

The 71st Congress, 1929–30, Louis T. McFadden of Pennsylvania (Republican).

The 72d Congress, 1931–32, Henry B. Steagall of Alabama (Democrat).

The 73d Congress, 1933–34, Henry B. Steagall of Alabama (Democrat).

The 74th Congress, 1935–36, Henry B. Steagall of Alabama (Democrat).

The 75th Congress, 1937–38, Henry B. Steagall of Alabama (Democrat).

The 76th Congress, 1939–40, Henry B. Steagall of Alabama (Democrat).

The 77th Congress, 1941–42, Henry B. Steagall of Alabama (Democrat).

The 78th Congress, 1943–, Henry B. Steagall of Alabama (Democrat).

The 78th Congress, –1944, Brent Spence of Kentucky (Democrat).

The 79th Congress, 1945–46, Brent Spence of Kentucky (Democrat).

The 80th Congress, 1947–48, Jesse P. Wolcott of Michigan (Republican).

The 81st Congress, 1949–50, Brent Spence of Kentucky (Democrat).

The 82d Congress, 1951–52, Brent Spence of Kentucky (Democrat).

The 83d Congress, 1953–54, Jesse P. Wolcott of Michigan (Republican).

The 84th Congress, 1955–56, Brent Spence of Kentucky (Democrat).

The 85th Congress, 1957–58, Brent Spence of Kentucky (Democrat).

The 86th Congress, 1959–60, Brent Spence of Kentucky (Democrat).

The 87th Congress, 1961–62, Brent Spence of Kentucky (Democrat).

The 88th Congress, 1963–64, WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas (Democrat).

The 89th Congress, 1965–66, WRIGHT PATMAN of Texas (Democrat).

PRESIDENT JOHNSON SUPPORTS REPEAL OF CONSUMER EXCISE TAX; EARLY ENACTMENT OF H.R. 7 IS NECESSARY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is very important that the present 10-percent Federal excise tax on toilet articles, cosmetics, jewelry, furs, luggage and handbags be repealed at the earliest possible moment.

The so-called luxury tax on these consumer items, which more often than not are actual necessities rather than luxuries, is a remnant of World War II emergency revenue-raising and anti-inflationary measures. The conditions which prompted the passage of this tax, which was a 20-percent tax until reduced to 10 percent in 1954, no longer exist. Since the end of World War II and the dissipation of wartime purchasing power, deflation, and not inflation, has been the economic curse regularly visited upon America. Furthermore, the Federal Reserve Board's more restrictive credit policy just adopted within the past several weeks can be expected to greatly reduce economic activity if not reversed in time.

Early enactment of my bill, H.R. 7, would inject an additional $550 million in spending power into what otherwise may be a faltering economy. While I generally prefer sound monetary policies to insure orderly economic growth, the Federal excise tax on these several items is both outdated and discriminatory. Repeal is necessary in order to give all possible protection against a slowdown or recession.

Following is a statement by President Johnson and Secretary Dillon strongly supporting the provisions in H.R. 7, as reported in the New York Times of November 12, 1964:

About $550 Million Cut in Excises Is Due: Dillon and Johnson Set Figure as a Minimum

(By Charles Mohr)

AUSTIN, TEX., November 11.—President Johnson and Secretary of the Treasury Douglas Dillon agreed today to recommend a cut in excise taxes of at least $550 million.

The President also made known his desire for present members of his Cabinet to retain their posts.

The tax action has long been a goal of the administration, but had not been definitely scheduled until today.

Mr. Johnson met with Mr. Dillon at the L.B.J. ranch today. Later, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges arrived at the ranch to discuss efforts to increase American exports and other subjects.

At a news conference at Austin, Mr. Dillon said the President's legislative program for the next Congress would definitely include "repeal of the consumer excises as well as action on a number, a good number, of other excise taxes."

He said that the recommendation would be to eliminate the four basic excise taxes which are levied as retail taxes.

These are the taxes on toilet articles and cosmetics, on jewelry, on furs, and on luggage and handbags. He said these taxes produced about $550 million a year in revenue.

OTHER CUTS WEIGHED

Mr. Dillon made it clear that the administration would also recommend the elimination or reduction of a number of other taxes levied at the manufacturing level.

Informed observers believe that the total excise tax reduction recommended will be in the neighborhood of $2 billion.

This was the third day of conferences at the ranch for the President. Monday he met with Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara and yesterday he talked with both Mr. McNamara and Secretary of State Dean Rusk.

Mr. Dillon said that the excise bill would not take final shape until December and that it would be governed by such considerations as the size of the new Federal budget and estimated revenues.

Later this afternoon, Mr. and Mrs. Johnson flew by helicopter from the ranch to Austin to attend a reception for the White House press corps given by the Texas Democratic Committee.

Mr. Johnson stayed for more than an hour, chatting about his victory and other subjects on an off-the-record basis. He was in the best of humor, and Mrs. Johnson had to tug at his arm to persuade him to leave.

Mr. Dillon said that two other legislative recommendations had been discussed with the President.

FOUNDATION ABUSES

One was recommendations for a law to eliminate abuses of tax-exempt foundations. The other was action to improve the climate for foreign investment in American securities by altering the tax treatment of foreign investors.

Mr. Dillon said he would be "fully engaged" in work for the next 2 or 3 months and that after that time he would discuss with the President the question of how long he might stay in the Cabinet.

Mr. Johnson is known to hope that Mr. Dillon will stay for the foreseeable future.

The President's desire to retain his present Cabinet was made known by the associate White House press secretary, Malcolm Kilduff.

This, however, left open the question of the Attorney Generalship, since Nicholas de B. Katzenbach is the Acting Attorney General and has not been nominated to replace the departed ROBERT F. KENNEDY.

There was a report tonight that Clark Clifford, a Washington lawyer who was visiting the President, was to be nominated the Attorney General.

Mr. Kilduff said in answer to questions about this matter that "the President is extremely pleased with the Cabinet as a whole at the present time, and is extremely pleased with Acting Attorney General Nick Katzenbach."

Mr. Kilduff added that "the President says that if he planned any changes he'd let you know."

INTENTIONS UNKNOWN

White House sources said that a report that Mr. Clifford was to be nominated was incorrect and that this was not the President's intention.

However, these sources were unable to say that the President definitely planned to nominate Mr. Katzenbach as Attorney General.

Mr. Dillon said he also discussed with Mr. Johnson the problem of filling several major vacancies at the Treasury.

These are the offices of Under Secretary and Assistant Secretary for International Affairs, now vacant, and the Under Secretary for Monetary Affairs. Robert V. Roosa has announced his intention to retire from that post.

Mr. Dillon said that excise taxes, which produce a total of $4 billion in revenue, had been under consideration for elimination or reduction, but that "undoubtedly" the recommended cuts would not go that high.

At another point he indicated that major consideration was going to some 65 or 70 different excises which produce "something under" $2 billion a year.

These added to the $550 million of the four retail taxes definitely scheduled for elimination tended to confirm the speculation.

COMPUTERS FOR TAXPAYERS

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, now as we approach the Federal tithes of April, it occurs to me, as it must have occurred to others, that something must be done to alleviate taxpayer burdens in addition to reductions in the tax rate.

In this computer-science age, it seems to me that a tax computer could have been developed for taxpayer use at our local Internal Revenue Offices which would receive the essential data from the taxpayer and immediately process a computer-correct return. Most taxpayer errors are errors of computation. If the installation of such equipment would make the taxpayer's unpleasant burdens more tolerable, I think we ought to give it a try.

TRUTH IN LENDING

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, the gentlewoman from Missouri [LEONOR K. SULLIVAN], has introduced a bill, H.R. 155, to promote truth in lending, so those who must borrow—and the papers advise us even the President borrows to pay his income tax—may be completely and accurately advised of the amount of interest and carrying charges they must pay. I rise in support of this measure and believe the predicament of the borrower has never been more aptly put than in the words of a song frequently sung in the depression era on the WLS Barn Dance by the Arkansas Woodchopper.

A friend of mine bought a radio,
For a dollar down and a dollar a week.
He said it's the easiest trap I know.
A dollar down and a dollar a week.

So he bought a rug and a fountain pen,
A runabout car out here and then,
A set of the lives of the famous men,
For a dollar down and a dollar a week.

He bought a hat and coat and shoes,
For a dollar down and a dollar a week.
He joined the lodge and paid his dues,
A dollar down and a dollar a week.

He bought a ring that was fair to see,
For the lovely hand of his bride to be,
And when he got married the minister's fee,
Was a dollar down and a dollar a week.

When the baby came the doctor got,
A dollar down and a dollar a week.
They fed and clothed that little tot,
On a dollar down and a dollar a week.

His wife said, "Man, I must be free,
These weekly payments are a-killin' me."
So she got a divorce and the alimony,
Was a dollar down and a dollar a week.

I urge prompt and favorable consideration of this measure.

TRIBUTE TO SAM SNEAD

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, I think it is noteworthy to call to the attention of the House an achievement in the world of sports of one of America's great golfers, Sam Snead, of Hot Springs, Bath County, Virginia, in winning the Greater Greensboro Open. As news accounts have pointed out, this great athlete, a trim, youthful 52, was the oldest individual to ever win a PGA Tournament. At a time when so much emphasis is being placed on physical fitness for Americans, this great victory by Mr. Snead is deserving of public attention.

The runner-up I understand, was not born until 6 months after Sam Snead won this tournament for the first time, 25 years ago.

The President's Council on Physical Fitness seeks to encourage Americans to achieve physical excellence, and I feel that this accomplishment points out that properties of physical skill and stamina are not exclusively those of youth.

I might add, although West Virginia frequently claims Sam Snead, he nevertheless is a distinguished son of the Commonwealth of Virginia and makes his home in Bath County in the Seventh Congressional District of Virginia. I have the high honor to represent this area and this outstanding American athlete.

CLOSING OF FEDERAL FACILITIES

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, many of us here in the House who have been fighting the battle with the Veterans' Administration since January 13 were pleased to learn that the President in his press conference of April 1 stated that after reading testimony presented to the House Veterans' Affairs Committee he had ordered the VA Administrator personally to make another review of each of the 11 hospitals.

The President is certainly to be commended for his admission that the testimony has raised doubts in his mind that must be allayed. He deserves applause for naming a Special Advisory Committee composed of Members of Congress, a former VA Administrator, outstanding medical men, and chaired by a most able retired court of appeals judge.

Yet many of us will wonder whether the President has gone far enough. A lot of Members of the House recall so painfully that the January announcement included not only 11 hospitals, but included also 4 domiciliaries and 17 regional offices. The injustices caused by these closing are also great. In light of these injustices, I have today forwarded a letter to the President requesting a reappraisal and reassessment of the order affecting these regional offices, in addition to hospital reevaluation. The text reads as follows:

APRIL 5, 1965.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I was delighted to note that in your press conference of April 1 you had ordered a restudy of the closing of the 11 VA hospitals. Your action in requesting the Administrator to visit personally each of the hospitals and to reevaluate the evidence in each instance to search for possible error in judgment is laudable, as was your appointment of a panel of experts to help the Administrator in his task.

May I remind you that the 32 proposed VA closings also included 17 regional offices. Please let me point out the arguments offered against these latter decisions are just as compelling as those offered in opposition to the hospital closings. Handling VA problems by mail can never substitute for face-to-face counseling. The individual veterans will suffer a marked reduction in VA services and a sharp increase in personal expense. The arbitrary standards used in determining which offices are to be closed disregarded the quality of past performances by these offices. The savings are by no means as great as the Administrator claims. Indeed, inaccessibility of personal counsel to veterans may ultimately lead to an unnecessarily increased pressure on bed space in VA hospitals.

I respectfully urge that Mr. Driver and the panel be instructed to reevaluate the closings of the 17 regional offices and, in particular, to reassess the adverse effect of closing the Kansas City regional office upon the veterans of all western Missouri and eastern Kansas.

Respectfully yours,
WILLIAM J. RANDALL,
Member of Congress.

As I pointed out at the hearings, in countless instances face-to-face conferences have resulted in saving space in VA hospitals. If the regional offices are kept open and made available for personal conferences they will earn their cost many times over through reduced use of hospital facilities.

Mr. Speaker, the action of the President on April 1 and his subsequent action on April 4 to name the Special Advisory Committee gives new hope to millions of veterans who would have been adversely affected by the closings. It also gives a new opportunity to those Members of Congress whose districts have been adversely affected through the closing of regional VA offices.

All of us representing veterans who have been downgraded by the closing of these 17 regional offices should urge the President forthwith that the new study include these regional offices, as I have done today.

All of us affected should immediately submit to the Chairman of the Advisory Committee a summary of our testimony before the Veterans' Affairs Committee, accompanied by any new or additional arguments and statistics useful to the Committee in make its recommendation to the President.

Opportunity knocks. Let us not pass by this chance to fight yet another round for the deserving veteran populations in our districts.

COINAGE PROBLEMS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I have taken a special order tomorrow afternoon of 1 hour to discuss the problems that are apparently upon us with respect to the coinage problems of the United States. I think that all of us are aware we are going to have to have some coinage change. I believe there are some things that should be brought to the attention of the House which have transpired since the last time I addressed the House on this subject and also some of the controls which will be necessary during the transition period. Therefore, I would like to ask the Members of this House, if they are interested in this problem—and I think they should be—to pay particular attention to what is said tomorrow afternoon.

Thank you.

ON BOYCOTTING ALABAMA

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I was amazed to read in yesterday's Washington Sunday Star that Members of Congress, as officers of the Americans for Democratic Action, approved a resolution of that organization supporting the economic boycott of Alabama advocated by Martin Luther King. The same news story states that the Vice President spoke to the convention of the ADA by telephone and the President sent a telegram praising the actions of the organization in the field of civil rights and economic opportunity.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, we have not come to the point in this country where the President and the Vice President are giving approval to economic retaliation against one of the sovereign States of this Union.

As for me, and I know I speak for the people of Alabama, I am still for the right of every citizen to vote; I am still for the right of every citizen to any job he is capable of getting and holding through ability, training and his own initiative; I am still for due process of law for all the people. And I will continue to battle for those things as will the people of Alabama.

We have been persecuted and we have lived through it. Our people have been villified from one end of the Nation to the other and we have not lost our patience or our determination to do what is right. We can live through a boycott and we will do it without resorting in kind. Thousands of Alabama Negroes depend upon the white people for jobs and I have urged Alabamians not to retaliate against them. I have urged Alabamians not to boycott those firms who join this unholy alliance against us. History will be with us and not with those who are supporting a movement aimed at destroying one of the States of the Union.

The Washington Sunday Star story of April 4, 1965, follows:

Social Causes Gaining, Humphrey Tells ADA

Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY said Saturday that with many social causes won and others well on the way, "our job now is to get to work and enact the President's voting rights bill and enact it soon."

HUMPHREY spoke by telephone from his weekend retreat in North Carolina to the annual convention of Americans for Democratic Action.

More accomplishment is on the way, he predicted: "We are going to enact medicare in this Congress and we are going to enact the first really adequate program of Federal aid to education. We are well underway with our campaign to banish poverty."

PRESIDENTIAL MESSAGE

President Johnson sent a message to the convention lauding ADA for its dedication "to alleviating and conquering the injustices which exist both in the civil rights and equal opportunities of our citizens."

ADA elected as its chairman Representative DON EDWARDS, Democrat, of California. He succeeds John P. Roche, professor of political science at Brandeis University.

A convention resolution opposed the announced investigation of the Klux Klan by the House Committee on the Un-American Activities. The ADA said necessary investigations should be conducted by regular legislative committees of Congress.

BOYCOTT BACKED

Another adopted resolution supported the three-stage selective boycott in Alabama announced by Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., as "a reasonable and moderate proposal."

Other officers elected included Edward Rovner, executive assistant to Representative JONATHAN BINGHAM, Democrat, of New York, chairman of the National Executive Committee.

Elected new members of the national board were Prof. John Kenneth Galbraith and Paul Warburg of Harvard University and Anna Roosevelt Halstead of Washington, D.C.

THE VOTING RIGHTS LEGISLATION

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I agree with the ultraliberal policies of the Washington Post. When I have disagreed, I have said so without hesitation and without reservation.

In the Friday, April 2 issue, the Post published an editorial, "Hole in the Bill" which points out the discrimination contained in the voting rights proposal. Inasmuch as this position is an echo of my testimony on April 1 before the Committee on the Judiciary, I agree with rightness of their views.

I commend the Post for their editorial on this inequitable, punitive and unconstitutional proposal we are being eulogized to pass into law. I hope that their attitude of fairness displayed in this editorial will continue and that they will come to understand that there are those of us who speak out against the hasty, ill-advised and discriminatory civil rights proposals who do so out of love for the Constitution and for equal justice for every man and not out of hatred for the Negro.

Legislation dealing with the civil rights of our people does not have a sacred mandate as the Administration seems to think it has. It is subject to the same ill-conceived faults that any legislation is on any subject. But, so much has been written in the press and preached from the pulpits to the effect that all legislation must pass regardless of its content or its constitutionality, that many Members and many citizens are afraid to oppose any bill on this subject for fear of being branded a racist and a bigot. The Post has taken a giant step forward toward reasonableness in adopting this new attitude and I commend them for their position. At the same time, I urge them to continue. This Nation needs more voices of reason and the Washington Post is in an enviable position to be one of those voices.

With unanimous consent, I insert that editorial for the consideration of all:

Hole in the Bill

Southern critics of the administration's voting rights bill have properly drawn attention to a significant gap in the legislation. As Senator ROBERTSON put it in a letter to a New York paper, "New York requires voters to be able to comprehend English, which disqualifies thousands of Puerto Ricans who are not helped by the pending legislation." His point is a good one.

There are some 730,000 Puerto Ricans in New York City. According to one estimate, only 150,000 out of 480,000 potential Puerto Rican voters are registered. Thus around 330,000 Puerto Ricans are eligible but not registered. A major reason for this is a New York law requiring literacy in English as a prerequisite for the vote.

Herman Badillo of the Legion of Voters presented these figures in testimony before the House Judiciary Committee last week. He pointed out that Puerto Ricans have been American citizens for a half century, that most Puerto Ricans are literate in Spanish, and that even under existing laws qualified Puerto Ricans find discriminatory barriers to voting. There is no literacy test whatever on the island of Puerto Rico, where the illiteracy rate is now about 15 percent.

In our view, it would be highly unfair to impose one set of voting standards on Southern States while permitting another in the North. Admittedly, the problem is different. Negroes in the South are denied voting rights not by law but by arbitrary and discriminatory enforcement of the law. Though there may be occasional abuses in New York, qualified Puerto Ricans find it far easier to register than do qualified Negroes in Alabama.

The ideal remedy would be State action in New York. But the English literacy requirement is embedded in the State constitution, and the amendment process is complex. Mr. Badillo proposes that the voting rights bill could be broadened to provide relief for Puerto Ricans. He suggests that if the law were to apply to political subdivisions such as an assembly or election district, the 50-percent-registration requirements could protect the voting rights of Puerto Rican citizens.

There are other formulas possible. The point is that consistency, fairness and commonsense indicate that a uniform voting standard should prevail in every region, North as well as South. President Johnson called on local governments to "open your polling places to all people, allow men and women to register and vote whatever the color of their skin. Extend the rights of citizenship to every citizen in this land." Surely Puerto Ricans have a right to take the President at his word.

COMMUNIST PROPAGANDA TECHNIQUES

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, on last Wednesday, the House of Representatives was treated to one of the most remarkable discussions of the devious methods of Communist propaganda techniques that it has been my experience to hear. Surprisingly enough, this erudite and thought-provoking speech was made by a freshman Congressman, Representative JED JOHNSON, JR., of Oklahoma.

All I can say is that he has shown the way to a lot of us who have been here a lot longer. I predict a great future for him and I know his district is fortunate to have a man not only of his youth, who will be able to serve them for a long time, but one who is wise far beyond his years. I wish that it were possible for every college student throughout the United States to read his remarks and to heed his admonitions about getting involved in such things as the World Festival of Youth and Students for Solidarity, Peace, and Friendship.

Typically, this sinister, albeit subtle plan of the Communists to poison the thinking of the youth of the world bears a title that expresses intentions no one can disagree with, but behind this front Congressman JOHNSON calls to our attention, is the continued drive of the Communists to spread their philosophy and their control throughout the world.

Doubtless, some of our youth, sincere but misguided, will participate in this festival but at least they have had an opportunity by reason of Mr. JOHNSON's exposure of their method of operation, to go into such a meeting with their eyes open and knowing that they are only there for the purpose of being used—and used against the interests of America and the free world.

Congressman JOHNSON has, in his maiden speech to the House of Representatives, made a most constructive contribution to the Congress and to this Nation. I express my personal appreciation to him and salute him.

TACTICS IN VIETNAM

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, has been telling us all along that his computers and robots in the Department of Defense are giving us the best fighting machine we have had in the history of the country at the least cost. One never knows how good all these prognostications and statistics are until put to the test and I must say that after reading the morning news dispatches with respect to some of our latest bombing forays in North Vietnam that we have been caught short.

I hope that it is merely a matter of tactics and not the kind of equipment and caliber of the weapons being employed. At any rate, it is still pretty hard to understand why a mission of 40 of our first-rate attack bombers cannot knock out a suspension bridge, and from all the news releases read this morning, one of the targets was a suspension bridge which was declared still usable after the attack.

What kind of bombs or explosives are we using? Apparently they're nonlethal just as the gas was a few weeks ago.

Maybe as a former infantryman I am somewhat prejudiced, but I am sure the dropping of a two-man demolition squad could be just as effective in this kind of operation as a sortie of some 40 of our first-line fighter bombers.

Come on, Mr. McNamara, let us show them what we can really do.

THE PRINTING INDUSTRY

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to revise and extend my remarks to point out that the Federal Government is seriously infringing upon one of America's greatest industries, the printing industry.

Actually the printing industry is so closely allied to all other activities that Americans engage in—be they industrial, mechanical, artistic, cultural, or whatever—it is hard to imagine where our country would be without it. Indeed, on a broader scale, printing is so essential to so many facets of life throughout the world that we could not not exist without it. And yet, the Federal Government is constantly increasing its competition with that great industry.

As an indication of the growth of the printing industry there were in 1939 24,878 separate plants. In 1947, there were 28,986, and in 1958, there were 35,350. The industry pays an average hourly wage of $2.85 which is 46 cents an hour above the average for all other manufacturing. It has a total payroll of $5,412,955,000, and the value added to production by such industry is $9,995,964,000.

The printing industry is 3d in the number of establishments, 4th in average hourly earnings, 7th in total dollar payroll, 8th in value added by manufacturing, 8th in number of employees and 11th in dollars reinvested in capital expenditures.

Despite its high ranking among manufacturing industries, printing is still primarily a craft industry composed of thousands of small establishments giving employment to skilled workers all over the United States. To illustrate: About 90 percent—nearly 32,000 plants—have fewer than 100 employees. About three-quarters of the U.S. plants have fewer than 50 employees. About half have fewer than 20 employees, and about one-quarter of the plants in the United States have fewer than 10 employees.

Despite all of these facts and despite the fact that Government has no business competing with an industry of this size and proportion which could do all of Government's printing on a contractual basis, a report by the Bureau of the Budget before the Subcommittee on Fiscal Policy dated November 27, 1957, showed that there are 68 printing and publishing units in operation by the Federal Government. The report also showed that there 16 units owned by the Government, but contractor operated.

These printing operations have a total capital outlay of $3,939,678 and employ 1,042 people of whom 978 are civilians.

The information in detail, assembled by Miss McBrien of the Legislative Reference Service, reveals the following agencies are involved in printing and publishing operations.

	Number of installations	Capital assets	Employees	
			Civilian	Other
I. GOVERNMENT OPERATED				
Book printing: National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	3	$309,000	54	
Miscellaneous publishing:				
Department of Agriculture: Forest Service	1	10,000	30	
Department of Commerce: Coast and Geodetic Survey	1	85,283	18	
Commercial printing:				
Department of Defense: Corps of Engineers	23	292,000	70	
Department of Health, Education, and Welfare: Public Health Service	1	34,959	17	
Department of the Interior:				
Bureau of Indian Affairs	5	310,200	14	
Bureau of Mines	1	7,090	1	
Department of Justice: Prison Industries	3	343,100	9	64
Post Office Department: Operations	8	29,000	16	
General Services Administration	1	41,327	27	
Atomic Energy Commission	1	154,000	59	
Federal Civil Defense Administration	1	10,286	6	
Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation	1	21,212	7	
Federal Trade Commission	1	53,395	6	
Lithographing:				
Department of Agriculture: Soil Conservation Service	7	179,000	31	
Department of Commerce:				
Publications	2	193,026	68	
Coast and Geodetic	3	561,065	113	
Weather Bureau	1	119,027	27	
Department of the Interior: Reclamation	2	47,671	21	
Typesetting:				
Department of Commerce: Coast and Geodetic Survey	1	61,947	17	
Photoengraving:				
Department of Commerce: Coast and Geodetic Survey	1	13,089	76	
Total, printing, publishing and allied industries	68	2,875,678	687	64
II. GOVERNMENT OWNED-CONTRACTOR OPERATED				
Commercial printing: Atomic Energy Commission	16	1,064,000	291	
Grant total, all printing, publishing, etc	84	3,939,678	978	64

AN ELOQUENT NEWSPAPERMAN—C. W. (BILL) DRESSLER

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, last week marked the retirement of one of the Nation's outstanding editorial writers. C. W. (Bill) Dressler, whose newspaper career began in Pittsburgh in 1920, retired April 1, as associate editor and chief editorial writer of the Johnstown, Pa., Tribune-Democrat.

A keen observer of world, National, State, and local events, Mr. Dressler wrote brilliantly on any and every subject. His dedication to better government was a hallmark of his essays, and his works were quoted widely in and out of the State of Pennsylvania. Many of the editorials which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the enlightenment of my colleagues were products of the Dressler typewriter.

A man of great knowledge, clarity of expression, and unquestioned integrity is in position to contribute generously in the public interest when he shares his thoughts through the medium of newspaper columns and editorials. Mr. Dressler fulfilled this responsibility purposefully and unselfishly to the continuing benefit of community, State, and country. His service will always be appreciated, and his works will be remembered and cherished long after he is gone and we are gone.

In retirement, Mr. Dressler can look back to his many accomplishments in an illustrious career with deep satisfaction. And those of us who read, enjoyed, and were inspired by his writings will always have a special sense of gratitude that he chose our area as his base of operations.

FARM LEGISLATION PROPOSED BY THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the long-awaited administration farm bill has arrived. I had a look at the language this morning.

The bill would give the Secretary of Agriculture a tremendous range of new authority over American farmers. The Secretary could easily get soybeans into the same surplus trouble which has beset corn, wheat, and other major crops for years.

The Secretary could make incentives for soybean planting so attractive that production would zoom, prizes would drop sharply, and soybeans would soon be overflowing in Government bins.

Under the new administration proposal, farmers could substitute soybeans for feed grains and still get the price support payment-in-kind now authorized under the feed grains program. This year this bonus payment amounts to 20 cents a bushel.

Thus, the Secretary could allow a farmer to plant his feed grains base to soybeans, get the full market price for soybeans and still collect 20 cents a bushel bonus for the corn he could have—but did not—grow on those acres.

The Secretary could also permit soybean planting on acres diverted under the feed grains program and still make substantial diversion payments.

These two features would be powerful lures the Secretary could use to bring millions of additional acres into soybean production.

Up to now, soybeans have been the wonder crop, making money for farmers and winning expanding markets without cost to taxpayers. In my opinion, this legislation is intended to get soybeans into Government bins so bureaucrats can manipulate prices and supplies, and use the commodity more freely in our fast-growing worldwide feeding program.

For the first time in history, the right to grow corn could be bought and sold just like corn itself. The right to grow would be a valuable franchise granted by the Federal Government and therefore controlled by the Federal Government.

The right to grow corn could be separated completely from the land.

To me, this is one of the most dangerous and unwise feed grains proposals ever presented to Congress.

SOIL, SPACE, AND THE SOVIETS

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DERWINSKI] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with news media concentrating on rapid developments in Vietnam and debate in the Congress centering on that area, the much broader, long-term questions of administration policy or lack of it in relationship to worldwide problems of communism has been largely ignored.

Last Tuesday, March 30, the Washington Star carried a practical commentary on the agricultural defects within the Soviet Union, which I include as part of my remarks:

SOIL, SPACE, AND THE SOVIETS

The Soviet Union unquestionably is a formidable military power endowed with great scientific and technological capabilities, as repeatedly demonstrated in such fields as space. In terms of its civilian economy, however, in terms of its agricultural production and its output of consumer goods, it still is a woefully backward land by Western standards.

This is what accounts for the country's many economic reorganizations, the number of which is almost beyond count. The latest has been announced over the weekend, with characteristic obscurity, by Tass, the official news agency. According to the announcement, the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party has staged a 3-day plenary meeting resulting in a big bureaucratic shakeup at the highest levels. The result? More than a few of Nikita Khrushchev's old friends and sycophants have been either demoted or cast into the outer ideological darkness.

Still, the more things change in Russia, the more they seem the same. As reported by Tass, Leonid Brezhnev, Khrushchev's successor as party boss, has addressed the Central Committee in language not much different from Nikita's. He wants the light factories and consumer-goods industries to do a better job than the miserable one they're now doing. Above all, because it is more

> important for the Soviet people than the output of TV sets, electric toasters or motor scooters, he has put special emphasis on the "urgent tasks" involved in the effort to increase the output of grains, meat and other agricultural products.
>
> Indeed, to that end, Brezhnev has proposed—with the approval of the Central Committee—that the Soviet Union invest over $78 billion in the next 5 years to put an end to its crisis in agriculture. In urging that this be done, he has reminded his countrymen—whose population is increasing at a rapid rate—that farm output in the U.S.S.R. has increased only 10 percent over the last 6 years, whereas it was supposed to have increased 70 percent. Khrushchev, of course, is now being blamed for having failed to reach this goal, but the fault is the system's rather than his.
>
> This is what explains why Brezhnev, even with greater vigor than Khrushchev, has called for "wider use of economic and moral incentives" to encourage individual initiative on collective and state farms. Without that, the Soviet agricultural situation may drift not only from bad to worse, but to catastrophe. How strange that a nation so great in space is so weak on its own soil.

Mr. Speaker, the Soviet failure in agriculture dramatizes the thorough weakness of the Communist system. When we note that Red China and Eastern European satellite countries have encountered similar agricultural defects, the Communist weakness is irrefutable.

Mr. Speaker, the present administration policy of subsidizing Communist governments under the label of coexistence is shortsighted and extremely naive.

Last weekend a conference was held in Chicago on the subject of "Western Policy and Eastern Europe." This conference received considerable attention from the Chicago metropolitan press. I include at this point an editorial which appeared in the Chicago Tribune, Thursday, April 1, emphasizing a need for reality in dealing with Communists:

REALITY VERSUS THE SOFT LINE ON COMMUNISM

> An international conference on "Western Policy and Eastern Europe," which brought about 100 American and European foreign policy specialists to Chicago over the weekend, was remarkable for its measure of agreement and realism concerning the Communist challenge and our response to it. As noted with satisfaction by Eliseo Vivas, professor of philosophy at Northwestern and Duke Universities, the hardliners greatly outnumbered the softliners.
>
> The Europeans, among them German, Polish, and Czechoslovak professors now teaching in American universities, were especially scornful of the soft line. According to this line, now advocated obsessively in most academic and some governmental circles, communism is going through a process of democratic evolution, not only in the satellite countries but in the Soviet Union itself, and we should stimulate this development by expanding cultural exchanges and offering economic aid.
>
> We are told that nationalism is dying out and being replaced by a new spirit of brotherhood that transcends both national boundaries and ideological differences. Thus Prof. Robert F. Byrnes, of Indiana University, speaking at the Chicago conference, advocated more cultural exchange to promote a "new concept" of Europe that would tie it into an Atlantic community extending from San Francisco to Vladivostok. Prof. Wladyslaw Kulski, of Duke University, said such flights of the imagination simply evade reality.
>
> The most penetrating interpretation of the Kremlin's peaceful coexistence propaganda and Moscow's violent quarrel with Peiping was given by Prof. Boris Meissner, of Cologne University, who is widely regarded as Europe's foremost academic authority on communism. Professor Meissner recalled that the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in a declaration expounded by Nikita Khrushchev in 1961, explicitly condemned revisionism or reform communism and pledged continued support of "liberation" (revolutionary) wars in spite of peaceful coexistence.
>
> "By pledging their unqualified support to the party program, the new leaders of the Kremlin have made Khrushchev's objectives their own," Professor Meissner said.
>
> Although he described the Moscow-Peiping split as beyond repair, he warned that Moscow's foreign policy is no less aggressive than Peiping's.
>
> Other speakers, notably Baron von Guttenberg, a leader of the majority Christian Democratic Party in West Germany's parliament, agreed with Professor Meisner's contention that the Kremlin rulers need a breathing spell because of their difficulties on two fronts—Red China to the south and the satellites to the west—as well as at home. Khrushchev, said Baron von Guttenberg, "sowed in Kazakhstan and reaped in Canada."
>
> It was the consensus of the conference that we should not rush into the arms of Red Bear to save him from Red Dragon, or guarantee the safety of his rear (by accepting the status quo of a divided Europe) while he deals with the Dragon. There was agreement instead that the free world should confront the Soviet empire with greater unity and strength and economic pressure until it is so weakened that the enslaved peoples behind the Iron Curtain can throw off their yoke and rid the world of communism. That, substantially, was what Senator Barry Goldwater advocated with so little success in the presidential campaign.

Mr. Speaker, I feel it is most urgent that not only Members of Congress but the general public carefully scrutinize the slowly deteriorating foreign policy position in which a basic defect is the premise that we can coexist with communism.

THE LATE FRANK GOLDMAN

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, the city of Lowell, Mass., was deeply saddened on March 16 by the passing of one of its most distinguished citizens. The death of Attorney Frank Goldman at the age of 74 was not only a loss for his home city of Lowell, but a loss to our country as well. For Frank Goldman was one of those rare men who found time to raise an outstanding family, to conduct an energetic practice of the law and to give of his time, effort and means to innumerable charitable organizations.

At the time of his death, Frank Goldman was honorary international president of B'nai B'rith, an organization in which he was active from 1920 until 1965.

A summa cum laude graduate of Boston University in 1910, Goldman was admitted to the Massachusetts bar at the age of 21. He maintained a law office in Lowell for more than 50 years where he was the founder and partner in the firm of Goldman, Goldman & Curtis.

Goldman began his community work early. In 1926 he was the founder of the Lowell Hebrew Community Center and served as its president for 3 years.

His work for the B'nai B'rith led to his election to the national executive committee in 1941. From 1941 until 1947 he was national vice president, from 1947 to 1953 he was national president, and he later became international president as well.

Mr. Goldman's other affiliations included, among many others, the National Council, Boy Scouts of America, the American Committee for Weismann Institute, the board of governors, Hebrew University—Jerusalem—the National Organization for the United Nations, the National Council of American Friends of Hebrew University, and the board of overseers of the Jewish Theological Seminary.

Somehow Frank Goldman found time to do all of these jobs—and do them well. We will miss Frank Goldman in Lowell, in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and indeed in the United States. He leaves his lovely wife, the former Rose Sydeman and three fine sons, Attorney Robert H. Goldman, of Lowell; Frederic G. Goldman, of New York City; and Edward S. Goldman, of Denver. I know that they will carry on his outstanding tradition of service.

THE CONTRAST BETWEEN THE ADMINISTRATION AND REPUBLICAN HOUSING BILLS

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WIDNALL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIDNALL. Mr. Speaker, the Special Housing Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee is in the process of holding hearings on housing legislation, including the administration bill, H.R. 5840, and the Republican bill, H.R. 9501, and companion measures introduced by my colleagues on the minority side of the aisle. Discussion has proceeded far enough, I believe, that some sort of comparison is inevitable, and useful as well. As the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, and the sponsor of H.R. 9501, I offer the following analysis.

Title I of the Republican bill calls for a new approach to federally assisted low-income housing. By making use of existing private rental housing on a voluntary basis, through what we call a rent certificate approach geared to the income levels of those now qualifying for conventional public housing, we believe that we can reduce the present long-waiting lists and the present high costs associated with the public housing program as we know it today. At the same time, by limiting the number of units in any one building that can be used for low-income housing, we break up what have become known as vertical slums and economic ghettos. And as a definite side benefit, we encourage the private housing market, the meeting of housing code standards, and we retain property on the local tax rolls. Our program calls for a total of 60,000 units over a 2-year period, at which point we can reconsider the value of the program as a whole.

The administration bill makes a token effort to meet the housing needs of the low-income citizen by providing, over the next 2 years, 15,000 units of leased housing, and 25,000 units of purchased and rehabilitated housing. The total together amounts only to two-thirds the Republican amount. Although the administration bill calls for 35,000 units of conventional housing a year, we know from past experience that less than 30,000 can be made available to the low-income citizen per year, and that there is already a backlog of authorized units sufficient to keep the Public Housing Administration busy for the next 5 years. It should be noted, also, that even rehabilitation will take considerable time.

What is important, therefore, to the low-income citizen who finds himself on a waiting list for conventional public housing, is the availability of decent, safe, and sanitary housing now. We believe that the Federal Government has a particular responsibility to provide a means for supplying that need as quickly as possible since it is more than likely that the family needing aid is the displaced victim of some other governmental program such as urban renewal or highway construction. In this regard, then, the Republican proposal supplies four times as much housing over the next 2 years as the administration program.

TITLE II. URBAN RENEWAL AND REDEVELOPMENT

The Republican bill offers 15 sections dealing with urban renewal. Last year, four proposals originating with the minority were accepted into the Housing Act of 1964. These proposals placed a priority on rehabilitation over clearance supplied the tenant, homeowner, and small businessman with the tools to do rehabilitation through a new $50 million low-interest, 20-year loan program, placed the small businessman within the relocation process, and stressed the need for more rigorous local action in the code enforcement field.

This year's message by the President gave great promise that the administration was finally aware of the need to meet problems in the urban renewal area. I said at the time that his message read in part like the housing program of the minority delivered prior to any administration message, both last year and this year. Unfortunately, the administration bill does not live up to that promise. Only four sections deal with urban renewal, and one of these concerns the District of Columbia. After all the fine words, I cannot imagine a more gratuitous slap in the face to the elderly homeowner, the minority group, the small businessman, and all those faced with increased difficulties as a result of the present administration of a program originally designed to assist them.

The Republican bill begins by suggesting a study of housing and building codes, zoning, tax policies, and development standards, to be done by the HHFA, with a report directly to Congress. A similar study was suggested by Republicans last year, and I note that the President's message contains a reference to a proposed temporary commission to study these problems. The contrast between the two is the fact that the President's study group would report to him, and, as was the case with a task force report last year on urban problems, the report might remain buried forever. The same fate occurred to the celebrated Heller report on revenue sharing with the States.

We repeat our suggestion of last year that there be a priority for residential over commercial development by requiring a city to show that it has at least planned to meet its known housing needs before commercial redevelopment in urban renewal areas can begin. I would note at this point that although the President dropped his request of last year for an increase in the amount of funds that could be spent for commercial renewal, only last week in the Godkin lectures at Harvard, the Housing and Home Finance Administrator, Dr. Robert C. Weaver, suggested as a first priority for urban renewal, commercial, downtown redevelopment. The Republican approach in favor of meeting residential needs first stands then in direct contrast to the official administration position.

In addition, we call for the placing of assistance to commercial, nonresidential projects on a loan basis, but with a built-in loan forgiveness if no increase in local property tax returns should occur as a result of the project. Since one of the main reasons for these types of projects, it is said, is the alleged increase in tax returns, we believe that it is not a hardship to require that 20 percent of the increased return be repaid each year to cover the Federal cost. This is particularly true since we require much more stringent terms for the low- and moderate-income citizen and small businessman on their Federal loans. We doubt that very many cities will be inconvenienced, however, since we have as yet to see any actual figures to prove out the rosy estimates made by urban renewal officials regarding increased taxes. And residential projects, containing as much as 49-percent commercial renewal, will still be eligible for grants. No similar approach is contained in the administration bill.

The Republican bill also establishes a priority for low- and moderate-income residential renewal in an urban renewal project, requiring that 50 percent or more be set aside for that purpose. There is nothing in the administration bill to prevent a continued emphasis on luxury housing, while relocating people into other housing approaching slum conditions. Relocation efforts are also stepped up by requiring relocation housing to be certified as in accordance with local code standards, and providing additional emphasis on the needs of small business. There is not a word about these relocation needs in the administration bill.

The administration has made an attempt to give the appearance of increasing the effectiveness of the urban renewal rehabilitation procedure by calling for a stress on this aspect, a stress included by Republicans in last year's bill, and by calling for an appropriation to meet the authorization of last year for the Republican rehabilitation loan fund. There is also a rehabilitation grant of up to $1,000 to those owning homes and earning less than $2,000 a year. Since last year's loan fund has yet to be activated, we have no real idea if this grant is needed, or in what amount, or at what income level.

In contrast, sufficient testimony has been received by the Housing Subcommittee to indicate a need for an additional $250 million rehabilitation loan authorization, as the Republicans recommend. Adding further to our efforts to substitute action for words and promises, we would require that 30 percent of the funds made available for urban renewal be used for rehabilitation and code enforcement. And we would encourage the integration into projects of those property owners willing to rehabilitate on their own in accordance with the plan.

The Republican bill would also increase local responsibility in this field, by tightening up noncash credits allowed localities toward the local share of the cost, and by requiring that the local redevelopment agency be made directly responsible to the local elected officials. Although several of our suggestions are based on reports by the General Accounting Office, and agreed to by the HHFA, no similar provisions are contained in the administration bill.

With respect to title III, we would begin a new FHA mortgage financing program for veterans. The administration has made no move to replace the VA-administered program now being phased out, leaving our oversea military personnel without any assurance that their sacrifices, even in undeclared wars, will be recognized. We encourage mortgage insurance for rural housing, and for low- and moderate-income families, without the use of the unwarranted rent subsidy for middle-income housing suggested by the administration. Finally, we free FHA from the role of hostage to other more controversial, less desirable programs by providing it with indefinite authority to continue at its present level of operations, in contrast to the 4-year extension proposed by the administration.

In title IV, we correct the present interest rate for both college and elderly housing loans to allow it to reflect the lower level envisioned by Congress when the program was enacted. Despite pleas from educational and church groups, the administration has made no such move in its own bill. Furthermore, the continuation of these loan programs will also mean that direct grants for college housing will be reduced, and the proposed administration rent supplement program for the elderly will not subject them to an odious means test.

Title V is the first comprehensive plan, for fully compensating those who lose property as a result of urban renewal and other housing programs, ever offered in bill form. It is an extension of last year's Republican proposal. Despite actions by the House Special Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition in studying this problem, and a promise in the report from the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on last year's housing legislation that this problem would be reviewed, the administration has chosen to ignore this area of great concern and importance entirely. The Republican proposal makes use of procedural suggestions and the definition of fair value as contained in the staff report for the House Special Subcommittee on Real Property Acquisition. It goes further to provide an alternative standard for compensation of replacement costs, including such items as legal and real estate fees, temporary loss of profits and rents as a result of the move, installation of fixtures and equipment, and all moving expenses. We believe that the time has long since passed when it was appropriate to study the problem. It is now time to study positive proposals of this nature in order to cure the problem we know exists.

Title VI is "Miscellaneous" in name only. It provides changes in the administrative functions of those agencies now under the Housing and Home Finance Administration. First, we propose an independent Federal Housing Administration, out from under HHFA, to emphasize its primary concern for the private capital market in the housing field. In contrast, proposals by the administration would tend to drag FHA deeper into welfare fields whose costs should be paid, if at all, from general revenue funds, not the insurance premiums of millions of American homeowners.

Second, we propose to eliminate the duplication of effort and expense involved in maintaining both the Urban Renewal and Public Housing Agencies as separate agencies by combining the two into the Housing and Renewal Agency. We are unable to see why anyone would want to establish, as the administration does, a whole new bureaucracy under a new Cabinet department when the present one leaves so much to be desired.

We are not unaware, however, of the need to consider our urban needs and problems at a high level of coordination and information. For that reason, we propose the establishment of the Office of Urban Affairs at the White House level, providing an easy access point for State and local officials desiring to find ways of solving urban problems.

Finally, we suggest the use of insured loans for small businesses in downtown commercial areas, as an aid to relocated firms and small businesses in general. The expected demise of some 35 percent of all small businesses displaced by urban renewal alone, amounting to close to 40,000 over the next 10 years, is of particular importance in judging our efforts, versus the administration, in this field.

Of course, there are other proposals offered by the administration which cannot be found in the Republican bill. But they do not change the nature of the administration request which is to continue at high rates of spending programs that need to be revised, and to suggest new programs that would replace proven programs at greater costs, or begin additional Federal involvement where it may well be unnecessary. I have dwelt on the Republican proposals, however, to emphasize this contrast.

RETURN TO SENDER OF OBSCENE MAIL

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, it is good to note that the Postal Operations Subcommittee and the full Committee on Post Office and Civil Service have favorably reported H.R. 980 to us today. This bill, aimed at effectively stopping the flow of unsolicited obscenity through the mails, is sorely needed and has been an item of concern to me throughout my years as a Member of this body.

I have introduced legislation on a number of occasions to create a commission to study this growing problem of controlling the filth that enters our homes unsolicited. That is why I am most pleased to support the bill before us today as another step toward what we hope is the eventual elimination of such material.

We have too long heard the cries of anguish from these filth peddlers who scream that their constitutional rights are being abridged by legislation that prohibits them from sending whatever they like into our homes. Well, the homeowner and parent has constitutional rights, too, and this bill will assist in clarifying them. One of the features of this bill concerns the constitutional rights question, and actually protects both the sender and the receiver of mailed literature. There is nothing here that says an individual or a firm cannot mail whatever they please, but this bill does enable the receiver to stop such mail entering his own home if he feels the mail matter is obscene, lewd, lascivious, indecent, filthy, or vile.

There is no question of a man's right to prevent unauthorized persons from entering his home or molesting his children. There should be no question, either, of his right to keep unauthorized mailings from entering his home or molesting his children.

The committee report of this bill indicates that the traffic in obscene materials is increasing and is a multimillion-dollar business, aimed directly at the very young and impressionable. The Director of the FBI officially reported that such traffic is a major factor in the frightening growth of juvenile delinquency.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also would be welcomed by our mail carriers who are unwitting and unwilling carriers of this morally offensive matter through the mails. Our loyal postal employees consider it an insult to have to deliver such smut and we should remove this embarrassment from their shoulders at the earliest moment.

It is hoped that every Member of this body will support H.R. 980. To do otherwise is to cheat our children of the protection they need during these important, formative years.

OLIVER COUNTY GENERATING PLANT BETTER THAN ANTIPOVERTY SETUP

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. ANDREWS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The **SPEAKER.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in view of the announcement of 182 counties in this Nation that are to receive 100-percent participation funds in the war on poverty, I wanted to call to the attention of my colleagues the unique opportunity afforded one of these counties to be lifted out of this category by the construction of a generating plant described in the enclosed editorial from the Fargo Forum.

It is my hope and the hope of the people in my State that the Rural Electrification Administration will take rapid action on the approval of this loan, which will mean not only low-cost power to the consumers of North Dakota and Minnesota, but also a unique opportunity to better the economic situation in one of the 182 counties set forth by the administration as most needing help.

[From the Fargo (N. Dak.) Forum and Moorhead News, Apr. 3, 1965]

OLIVER COUNTY GENERATING PLANT BETTER THAN ANTIPOVERTY SETUP

Because of outdated statistics on population and personal income, the Federal Government has declared Oliver County in North Dakota so poverty stricken that the Federal Government will underwrite all costs of its antipoverty program in that county.

Of course the county has no antipoverty program in operation and had planned none until notified of the Federal Government's willingness to shell out money there.

We do not know just what kind of program will be developed for the county, but we suspect the Federal Government will want to hire a couple of county supervisors at fantastic salaries who will then look around for work that might be done. We would not be surprised if such work involved sending gangs of teenagers out to pick up beer cans from the highway ditches or to rebuild fences around the fields that are not being used for pastures.

Actually, there is one antipoverty program which will do more for the county and the surrounding area than anything the Federal Government will come up with on its own. This is the proposal by Minnkota Power Cooperative to build a $40 million electric generating plant near Center, the county seat of Oliver, which would burn lignite mined in Oliver County.

Of course, Minnkota must first get a $40-million loan from the Rural Electric Administration, but this loan is repayable to the Federal Government and would provide lasting benefits far beyond any antipoverty program that can be dreamed up on the spur of the moment.

This $40 million loan would put 500 people to work in the construction of the plant and the associated dam which would create a 1,000-acre lake. Once the plant is completed it will employ 50 people. Associated with the powerplant will be a coal mine of the Bankol-Noonan Coal Co., which would give employment to another 35 people. These 85 people will in turn require services which would provide jobs for another 300 people in the community.

If Minnkota is successful in getting an REA loan and builds this plant, the value of taxable property in Oliver County will double and it is estimated that the present per capita income will also double, according to Andrew L. Freeman, manager of Minnkota.

Other side benefits will include the fact that royalty payments on coal mined will bring $100,000 into the county annually, along with another $20,000 in the form of land-lease rentals each year.

The $40 million required to bring all this about is not a Federal handout. It is a sound business proposition. It is the reimbursable loan which would provide only the initial start to power development in Oliver County. Other powerplants follow along, with a possible industrial development resulting from the low cost power which will be produced from the rich low-cost fuel deposits within the county.

A sideline benefit of lesser magnitude, but yet important, is the element of recreation that will come from the lake which will be used for cooling the water used in the powerplant. The lake would provide a shore development, fishing, boating, and related operations and would bring the county new adventures in living that could probably come in no other way.

Mr. Freeman says: "To us we have a power supply problem. It must be solved. It cannot be ignored. We have selected Oliver County as a place to solve it. Engineering studies and coal prices indicate that Oliver County offers us the best possible solution. If we do build there, our consumers located in eastern North Dakota and northwestern Minnesota will be channeling more than $2 million a year in this county to pay for fuel and labor and will have a longtime commitment to do so.

"All in all it looks to us like Minnkota's plan to build a 200,000-kilowatt unit in Oliver County is the answer to this county's problems and the REA should be urged to move promptly to employ the opportunity which has been placed before them."

Never before has the timing for such a project been so appropriate. Federal support of the power project will do a lot more for the county, the area, and the State than anything any antipoverty program director could dream up.

There is so much common sense to the Minnkota proposal that we are fearful it will be ignored by the antipoverty masterminds.

ATLANTIC UNION TO SAVE THE DOLLAR?

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, columnist John Chamberlain, in Sunday's Washington Post, took note of recent warning by Clarence K. Streit that worldwide monetary collapse is just as much a possibility today as it was back in the 1930's. Streit's remedy is a Federal union of the NATO nations, in which a common currency would be established.

Backed by all gold reserves of NATO nations, this unified currency would, Streit believes, be almost invulnerable.

Chamberlain's column follows:

THESE DAYS—UNION OF WEST TO SAVE DOLLAR?

(By John Chamberlain)

If there is a more dedicated man in the world than Clarence Streit, who has been laboring since the 1930's to promote a true Federal union of the Western democracies, this column would like to know his name. Day in and day out, Streit has been telling the West that it must unite or perish. But the general verdict has been that "union now" of the democracies must wait the coming of the millennium, which means "never."

Now however, Streit seems at last to be striking some pay dirt. He couldn't get anywhere when it was a mere matter of fending off the threat of Communist invasion. But the weakness of the U.S. dollar is at last giving Streit a telling talking point. Oddly enough, people worry more about their pocketbooks than about their lives.

A double irony attends this: Streit has not only found money a better lever than military security to compel consideration of his concept of Federal union, he has also managed to evoke commendation of his ideas from both Nelson Rockefeller of New York and Barry Goldwater of Arizona.

The reason for the sudden spurt of interest in Streit's "federate or die" proposition is that the U.S. dollar, despite the parlous state of its gold backing, has become the working capital of the West. All the big Western monetary powers need dollars as well as gold if they are to have new factories, new oil exploitation money, and new trading capital. There are numerous good, selfish reasons why West Germany, Britain, Italy, Holland, Belgium, and even France should wish to keep the dollar from collapsing.

Clarence Streit's proposition is that the dollar versus gold dilemma would disappear if the Western democracies merged their monetary systems into a uniform system under a single Federal Government charged with sovereignty over three things: foreign policy, military policy and the issue and protection of money. Streit recalls that the Thirteen Original States of the United States were close to collapse in 1787 simply because they had 13 separate money systems. Their troubles ceased to be critical once the dollar was made supreme from Massachusetts to Georgia.

Streit's argument is so impressive that it has brought publishers such as Eugene Pulliam, of Phoenix, Ariz., and Indianapolis, Ind., to his side. This is remarkable, for Pulliam's newspapers have been in the conservative camp. And conservatives, by and large, have tended to look upon Streit's ideas about Western federation as no better than the ideas of those who argue for world government.

I have always been beguiled by Streit's logic simply because it would result in a stronger East-West confrontation. But the logic that calls for Western federation has weaknesses. A merging of the various democratic systems would certainly call for uniform central banking and uniform budgetary philosophy. How else would Streit accommodate the different welfare state ideas of Britain, France, Italy, West Germany, Canada, and the United States without civil war?

What the various "federal" states of a Western union chose to do about taxing and spending for their respective Appalachias, or school aid, or for meeting problems of socialized medicine, could not be left to six or seven separate authorities. Inflation can come from domestic drains as well as from an international raid on a nation's gold supply.

But regardless of objections to Western federation ideas, the ball is now in Streit's court. It will be interesting to see how he can deploy Nelson Rockefeller and Barry Goldwater as members of his team.

Chamberlain's fear that the new Federal union might branch into its own "Appalachia," medicare and other welfare activities deserves attention. To the best of my knowledge, Streit has never suggested that the authority of the new central government extend that far. Quite the contrary, he has always urged that its authority be carefully limited to these fields: currency, postal system, trade, foreign policy, military affairs.

Here is the text of the article to which Chamberlain referred, as it appeared in the March issue of Freedom and Union, a monthly edited by Streit:

THE MONETARY MENACE—AND OPPORTUNITY: WHY THIS DANGER IS COMMUNISM'S BEST HOPE—YET OPENS BEST ROAD TO ATLANTIC UNION

1. COMMUNISM'S WAY TO WIN WITHOUT WAR

With Vietnam knocking on the front door with hand grenades, and President de Gaulle rapping on the back door with gold knuckles, the American citizen is now facing double danger. One danger is that to which confusion over what to do, and what to do first, always exposes one. The other is the danger which necessarily follows a basic blunder on priorities, a fundamental mistake in values.

The first step toward clarity is to see that freedom may fall, and communism conquer, in two quite different ways—not one alone, as is generally assumed. The latter hardy fallacy results from various factors. They include the high interest rating which people give to all forms of violence, and the assumption that foreign tyranny can destroy our freedom only by war. The latter belief is bolstered by two World Wars; obviously the systems personified by the Kaiser and the Fuehrer could win by war alone.

Communism, however, presents a twofold threat. We can lose our freedom to this tyranny by monetary as well as military disaster. The former is far more probable than the latter for many reasons. Here are some of them:

1. The monetary danger is the neglected one, and people are more easily lulled into a false sense of security about it. It seems less dramatic, and most of the politicians, press, and people understand it much less than the war danger. Therefore they play up the latter and leave the former largely to financial specialists. These usually have little understanding of the nonmonetary factors that play an important role in this danger. They are as inclined to be cautious and reassuring as the war specialists tend to be alarming. In these conditions, the much greater sense of front-page urgency given the war danger in distant Vietnam than the monetary menace within Atlantica itself is all too likely to continue to prepare a disastrous surprise.

2. Communism can advance through an Atlantic monetary crash with no risk whatever to Russia and China, whereas the way

of war involves enormous danger for them. The danger, indeed, is so immense for all concerned that many Americans and Europeans bank on the resulting balance of terror to keep another world war from starting. Yet they do little or nothing to protect freedom from the monetary danger, although the cost of continuing this balance of terror and the cold war contributes to it directly, and with cumulative power.

3. The current Washington policy of seeking to reduce the war danger and the cost of the arms race by giving priority to direct talks and accords with Russia, rather than to efforts to unite Atlantica behind a common, mutually agreed policy has already contributed heavily to the monetary danger by arousing the distrust of President de Gaulle in particular, and also of many Germans and other Europeans. Continuance of this policy is certain to worsen the monetary threat, for reasons I gave in "The Danger to the Dollar—and How to End It" in our November 1963 issue.

4. Communism's history and theory lead the Russians and Chinese to rely for the expansion of their rule primarily on subversion and civil wars instead of on using their own armed forces directly—the instrument of national policy on which Prussia traditionally depended. The Communists are schooled in conspiracy, subversion, guerrilla and civil warfare. They came to power by these means; the Prussians rose through foreign war. Communism feeds on economic misery and social injustice. These are the prerequisites of successful Communist advance through subversion and civil war.

5. Communism's only hope of thus advancing in affluent Atlantica lies in another great depression. Such a disaster would have this added advantage for communism: It would necessarily hit first and hardest the host of weak underdeveloped nations which are already communism's easiest victims.

6. A major international monetary crash would cause a great depression. The depression set off by Wall Street in 1929 became a great depression only after the crash of the world monetary system in 1931—as the steeply plunging lines thereafter of all curves in that period attest.

7. Such an international currency crash need not start in a major financial power; the fall of the gold exchange standard in 1931 began with a run on the Austrian schilling in May, jumped in June to a run on Germany, then in September to a run that put the pound off gold, and in October to one on the dollar. Such worldwide depression immediately followed that by early 1933 all U.S. banks were closed and the dollar left gold.

8. A run on the pound could end by bringing down the dollar—and the latter now has even more key importance in the world monetary picture than the pound had before its fall in 1931. The dollar is now an important part of the monetary reserves of nearly all other nations.

The pound remains very vulnerable, despite the frantic international measures to rescue it in November; these were stopgaps, not remedies. The pressure on the pound could be eased by British national measures to improve its balance of payments, but such action is not likely, for political reasons, to be strong enough. Moreover, the stronger such action, the worse the upsetting effects on the trade and currency of other countries would be. The basic problem requires an Atlantic rather than a purely British action.

Meanwhile the increasing vulnerability of the pound is reflected by this little noted fact: in 1958 the ratio of the gold Britain had with which to meet its short-term liabilities to the world was roughly $1 of gold to $3 of debt; now, only 6 years later, this ratio is $1 to $6. Meanwhile, too, the monetary position of various countries of the sterling area has deteriorated; the currency of India, for example, seems more exposed now than Austria's in 1931.

9. It is highly imprudent to believe that the danger of a world monetary crash through a run on the dollar can be removed by U.S. national action alone, as President Johnson's balance-of-payments message and the measures he recommends to end the U.S. deficit lead many to assume. The situation, as in Britain, can be eased by these measures, and by the action by Congress to remove the 25-percent gold backing from Federal Reserve bank deposits—which frees about $5 billion of Washington's steadily shrinking gold reserves for use in meeting its foreign short-term liabilities.

These national measures are time gainers, however, as in Britain, rather than remedies. Moreover, the measures recommended to reduce the U.S. balance-of-payments deficits have three other basic faults. First, instead of knitting together the Atlantic community by encouraging American travel, loans, and investment in the rest of this community they discourage them. Second, and worse, they have an upsetting effect on the balance of payments and monetary situation of other Atlantic nations, and the rest of the world. Third, for domestic political reasons, as in Britain, they are not likely to be drastic enough—and if they were, the bad effects noted in points 1 and 2 would be correspondingly worsened. Again as in Britain, the dollar danger requires Atlantic much more than national action, if it is really to be ended. Meanwhile, the gains made by all these stopgaps can be quickly outbalanced by escalation of the war in Vietnam.

10. To seek to reassure people that there is no serious danger to the dollar by pointing to the immense resources of the United States as proof that the dollar will remain "as good as gold"—if not better, as opponents of the gold or gold exchange standards argue—is to lull the public to sleep with plausible delusions and waste the time gained by current stopgap measures.

True, as President Johnson said in his balance-of-payments message: "The strength of the dollar is backed by the world's most productive and efficient economy * * * the world's largest supply of gold * * * the world's strongest creditor position * * * the world's most favorable trade position." But it is also true, as Columnist J. A. Livingston pointed out in the Washington Post on February 14, that "whereas only 13 percent of American assets abroad are short term, 50 percent of America's liabilities are short term."

There lies the rub. Britain, too, had great foreign investments and other long-term assets abroad in 1931. But it couldn't turn them into cash when its short-term creditors panicked after finding or fearing that its gold and short-term assets were far below the total of its short-term debts.

11. The dollar rates "as good as gold," only while (as the President's present efforts prove) the United States convinces other nations that it will, and can, continue to make good its guarantee to convert their short-term dollar credits into gold on demand. The reverse is not true; no one asks it to guarantee to convert their gold into dollars, should a crisis come. Gold clearly continues to outrank by far the paper dollar in the judgment of the world at the showdown, whether one denounces or upholds the gold standard. The cold fact is that the United States does not have half enough gold left to carry out its guarantee to deliver gold on demand for all the dollar claims the world now has.

This would remain true, even if all of its reserve were made available for this purpose by repealing the law that requires 25-percent gold coverage for the domestic currency. Of course, the U.S. situation in this respect is like that of any bank; no bank keeps enough cash on hand to satisfy all the claims against it. Every bank counts, as the United States does with the dollar, on the probability that more claims than it can meet will not be presented at any one time. Nearly always, this calculation proves sound—but every so often the confidence on which the whole banking and monetary system rests caves in, and there is a run on the bank, on the schilling, mark, pound, dollar.

The decisive factor is not the confidence which the banker has in this banking system, his bank and his depositors; what matters is the confidence that the depositors have in him. Similarly, the confidence which the President and Americans have in the dollar, is not what counts; it is the confidence which the outside world has in the dollar remaining convertible into gold. Clearly this is not entirely under U.S. national control. Least of all is it when there begins the kind of run the communists are hoping for.

One thing more: the danger to the dollar lies only partly in financial and economic factors. It lies even more in the political factor of national sovereignty, which divides the Atlantic Community. The currency of each nation is, like its military force and trade barriers, an arm of national sovereignty, a major means by which each government seeks to serve its national interest. It was this factor of national sovereignty among the democracies of Atlantica that precipitated the 1931 monetary crash. In our October and November issues of 1963 we told the complex story of how it did this then, and why communism can hope that this factor will bring another such disaster, notably through the growing Franco-American divergence of interests all along the line—military, economic, and monetary.

This important subject is too big for our present space, and so we refer those interested to the reprints of these articles.

2. WHY ATLANTIC UNION CAN END DOLLAR DANGER

Perhaps the most forgotten fact about the two ways by which freedom can lose to communism is the trump that freedom holds. Freedom's trump is that the peoples of Atlantica have completely—100 percent—in their own power the means to end, for good and all, the monetary menace to liberty.

At the start of the atomic age, they were in the same favorable position, though to a less complete degree, to end the military menace too. They no longer are. Communism now has under its direct control the means with which to launch atomic war, and to influence world affairs meanwhile by its possession of this power. But communism does not have in its hands the material means to bring about a world economic crash—least of all by causing an international monetary crash.

Only the governments and peoples of Atlantica have the means of causing a monetary disaster. This power is, for all practical purposes, completely in their hands—and, it cannot be said too often, this is the only road by which communism can take over the free world intact, without risk to Russia or China.

True, the military and moral power of Atlantica, if united by federation, would be so immense as to remove, practically speaking, the danger of communism launching an atomic war. It must be conceded, however, that the possibility would remain that communism might thus attack an Atlantic union; so, too, would remain the possibility that a nation as weak as Vietnam might, like Serbia in 1914 and Poland in 1939, independently start a chain of events that resulted in world war.

Once the NATO nations established an Atlantic currency by federal union, however, no country, Communist or non-Communist, huge or small, could conceivably cause a world monetary crash. This is a strong statement, but its truth is easily demonstrable. The danger of a world monetary crash lies in the fact that the pound sterling and, especially, the dollar are used by many nations as part of their monetary reserves, and the short-term foreign liabilities of Britain and the United States now far exceed their gold reserves. The grand totals of these claims, for the latest month for which official figures are available, were $12,219 million for Britain last September, and $28,921 million for the United States in November—together a total of $41,140 million. The British and American gold reserves for the same months were $2,302 million for Britain and $15,566 million for the United States, a total of $17,868—or less than half the short-term liabilities.

This weakness is accentuated by the fact that the two countries are not united; each is separately exposed to a run.

The pound is most vulnerable; its foreign short-term liabilities were nearly six times its gold reserve in September, before the run on the pound began in November. The short-term claims in dollars were a bit less than twice as great as U.S. gold reserves. The dollar is particularly exposed, however, because the United States guarantees to convert all foreign dollar claims into gold—and the credibility of this guaranty is a keystone in the world monetary structure. Britain is committed to nothing more than to seek seriously to pay foreign claims on the pound with dollars and gold.

The practical result is that the United States must meet much of these British liabilities in last analysis, as well as its own, or risk a worse run on the dollar. It led in taking the heroic measures by which the November run on the pound was halted. If the United States fails to stop such a run, the resulting crash of sterling would almost inevitably lead to a run on the dollar—much as the run on the German mark in June 1931 led that September to a run on the pound, and the crash of the world monetary system of that period when Britain devalued and left gold.

An Atlantic Union would reverse this situation of dangerous weakness into one of immense and growing strength. The Union's currency would have behind it the combined gold reserves of the NATO nations—$32.5 billion— or three-fourths of the total gold reserves of the non-Communist world.

Russia and China keep their gold reserves secret, but by the highest estimate neither is more than a small fraction of the $15 billion U.S. reserve today—to say nothing of the $32 billion gold reserve of an Atlantic Union. Their currencies could not possibly rival that of the Union; they cannot compete on the world market with even the pound today.

If the Union followed the present policy of the United States, Britain and all the major financial powers, as it undoubtedly would, it would guarantee only to pay in gold the demands of its foreign creditors—not the domestic holders of its currency. This means that it would not have to pay in gold the present claims of any NATO nation on the dollar, or pound, assuming they all joined the Union. Their present claims, which total $12,442 million, would be converted into domestic liabilities. Subtract these from the present world total of foreign short-term dollar and pound liabilities, and it falls from $41,140 to $28,698 million.

The total foreign short-term liabilities of the pound held by other NATO nations is relatively small. It would seem safe to estimate that they hold or control enough of this $12,442 million total, or at least $5 billion, to reduce the total for foreign short-term claims on the Atlantic Union's $41 billion gold reserve to about $27 billion—a ratio of about 11 to 9, instead of the present one of roughly 3 to 7.

TABLE 1.—*Gold reserves*

[In millions of dollars]

Non-Communist World, November 1964:	
Total gold reserves	$43,020
Total NATO gold reserves	32,546
United States	15,566
German Federal Republic	4,149
France	3,632
United Kingdom	2,302
Italy	2,104
Netherlands	1,621
Belgium	1,434
Canada	1,007
Total, above 8 NATO nations	31,815

Source: January Federal Reserve Bulletin.

The dollar and pound are the only two currencies used in substantial amounts by other countries as monetary reserves, or in international trade. The Union would assume, of course, every member nation's current short-term assets and liabilities, as regards the outside world. Figures for these are not available, but it is not believed that the net figure would increase the foreign claims against the Union's gold reserves enough to alter seriously the above 11 to 9 ratio.

The Union's currency would undoubtedly be the one foreign currency used by other nations in forming their monetary reserves and financing their international transactions. Just as the dollar, by serving in these ways, has added liquidity to expanding world trade, the Union's money would meet this need; indeed, the Union could allow the total short-term liabilities to the outside world which it would assume at the start—about $27 billion—to increase by $30 billion more, and still have a currency much more solid than the dollar is today.

What of communism? We have noted that its money cannot compete even with the pound as a world currency. Nor do the Communist nations have the means to threaten the dollar. Of the $28,698 million foreign short-term claims against the dollar now, only $3 million are held by Moscow and only $21 million by its European satellites. Even Red China has a larger claim against the dollar; but it totals only $35 million; all told, communism—so strong in the arms of war—has but bow and arrow against the dollar. The only countries with enough claims against the dollar to start a run and bring on a world monetary crash are the other major NATO nations, plus Switzerland and Japan. The latter two could not possibly start a run on the Atlantic Union currency, even should they want to, which is inconceivable.

The conclusion is inescapable: communism lacks the financial power to bring down the dollar; freedom can lose through a monetary crash only by the free continuing to allow the dogma of absolute national sovereignty to divide the Atlantic community, even as regards the medium for international trade.

All that communism can do is to use its diplomacy to play on their differences and keep them divided. Its best card is to follow Moscow's present policy of reducing the fear of war in Europe and encouraging America to hope for atomic accommodation with it. The practical result of this policy, as the past 2 years have shown, is to increase division among the Western European nations, and between the United States and them—especially Gaullist France.

This situation also helps keep the United States saddled with not only the moral onus and the loss of life but the huge financial burden involved in keeping communism from winning by war, whether by conventional weapons in such strategic places as Vietnam or by nuclear arms and guided missiles at a major showdown.

TABLE 2.—*U.S. short-term liabilities—November 1964*

[In millions]

1. Total	$28,921
2. Foreign	23,871
3. To NATO nations:	
Canada	3,458
Belgium	474
Denmark	280
France	1,599
Germany	2,152
Greece	172
Italy	1,431
Netherlands	446
Norway	182
Portugal	224
Turkey	27
United Kingdom	1,997
Total	12,442
4. To U.S.S.R.	3
European satellites	21
Red China	35

Nor is this all the price in monetary danger which the United States pays for insisting on keeping in the driver's seat in the Atlantic Alliance, instead of offering these allies, through federation, a democratic share both in the financial, moral, and human cost of thus upholding freedom's interests in the world, and in the determination of Atlantic policy in these affairs. The lack of any such fair and effective voice has led first the British and then the French to overstrain themselves financially—to communism's benefit only—in order to have atomic weapons of their own, and the stronger diplomatic voice such possession brings. This strain has already hurt the pound badly. If continued, let alone sharply increased by full-scale war with Red China, it is bound in the end to break the dollar and plunge the non-Communist world into another great depression.

When all credit is given to Moscow's diplomacy, the fact remains that the source of the monetary danger in all its forms lies not with communism but with the major Atlantic allies. Communism cannot keep the Atlantic allies from removing the danger by uniting their gold reserves behind the common currency of an Atlantic Federal Union. If communism succeeds in its hope of winning without war through the crash of the dollar, we shall have only ourselves to blame.

3. WHY MONETARY APPROACH TO UNION IS BEST

Thus far the monetary motive for Atlantic unification has had scant attention. The primary incentive has been the military one—the need for defense. It was fear of armed Communist aggression which produced the Atlantic Alliance, NATO, and SHAPE. This fear has remained the alliance's main cement, albeit Moscow has succeeded in softening the cement increasingly in recent years.

The secondary motive power has been economic. With NATO tackling the military need, European unification turned to the economic approach and produced the Common Market. Its success led to the Kennedy plan for achieving an Atlantic partnership through the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 and the pressure to get Britain into the Common Market. This approach has been marking time, as regards both Europe and Atlantica, since President de Gaulle vetoed British entry into the market, after having been irked by the Anglo-American nuclear deal in Nassau.

The United States then fell back on the military approach and pushed its projected multilateral force (MLF). This proved to divide rather than unite,[1] and the Johnson administration has now apparently put this project on the shelf where its economic approach is gathering dust. In these circumstances it would seem timely for those who see the need for Atlantic union to examine the monetary approach to it.

---

[1] See the February Freedom & Union for a full report on the sharp debate on MLF at the November meeting of the NATO Parliamentarians Conference.

The astonishing thing that results from such a study is that this neglected entering wedge has great advantages over those that have been tried. It is perhaps the easiest approach to Atlantic union available—certainly now.

To use defense as the major motive has seemed the natural thing to do. To defend themselves, the Thirteen Colonies first formed their "grand alliance." Military danger led the British, French, and Americans to accept Marshal Foch as supreme commander in World War I, and still closer unity during and after World War II.

Often I have been told—by State Department and other advocates of "gradualism"—that it would take "another war" (and nothing less) to bring about an Atlantic Union—as World War II brought the United States into the United Nations. My aim has always been to prevent catastrophe by union of the free, rather than stand idly waiting for holocaust to weld the survivors together. I have remained dubious of thus seeking Heaven via Hell, although I have tried to make the most of the advantages of union from the standpoint of defense and war prevention.

To concentrate on this approach, however, has great disadvantages. The defense motive rouses opposition both inside Atlantica and outside, for various reasons. There is the fear, which Moscow makes much of, that Atlantic military unification is aimed at attacking Russia, or giving Germans control of atomic arms. The overwhelming armed power Atlantica would gain by federation would virtually assure it against attack—but even this rouses opposition. It makes a certain school in the United States and Britain fear that Moscow would launch a preventive war to prevent the formation of a Union that would so decisively outbalance it.

Then there are those in the new nations who fear that this unified Atlantic force would either lead to atomic war, in which they too would be destroyed, or would be used imperialistically against them. And there are the softheaded people in Atlantica who fear that the new nations would thus react. At the other extreme comes the opposition from nationalists within the Atlantic nations who equate patriotism with national power. They fear that Atlantic union means that they would be sacrificing their sovereignty, or that their country would be dominated by some other nation or group of nations, or—in the United States—that it would lose its position of "leadership," which President de Gaulle resents as "domination."

Untenable as these latter positions are, and unfounded or excessive as are the other fears mentioned, there is no denying that they do cause opposition to union, when the primary motive for it appears to be a military one. The result is to slow down unification dangerously, especially when people see no imminent threat of attack in the West.

To shift the primary motive for Atlantic unification to the economic side—the reduction of trade barriers and the creation of a common market—arouses other sets of fears, and deep-seated complex conflicts of interest. There then troop forward fears of lowering one's standard of living, or of losing a protected market or job. One is caught in conflicts between powerful vested private economic powers or politically important blocs, like the French and German farmers in the European Common Market.

Again, these fears are unfounded or excessive, but they delay union effectively, nonetheless.

Nor are these groundless or extravagant fears the only sources of opposition to Atlantic union when approached primarily from the military or economic side. Opposition rises too from the real technical difficulties facing military and economic union. To overcome them requires a considerable transition period, even after the decision to unite has been taken. Many of these difficulties are so obvious that any layman can see them; for example, the problems involved in composing a crew or a regiment of men of many languages, different eating habits, and so on. All these problems can be solved. The worst difficulty is that they loom so large in the eyes of laymen and specialists alike, and their solution seems to require so much time—much more than it really does. Result: They make an Atlantic Union seem remote, and discourage many from tackling the job.

Turn now to the idea of approaching Atlantic Union initially from the monetary side—accenting not the danger of war but the danger of depression through the dollar crashing, the need of preventing this through the creation of a stable common Atlantic Union currency, and the advantages in this. Seen from this angle, the picture at once grows much brighter, and the more one looks into it, the more attractive it becomes.

The monetary approach is capable of arousing everywhere in the non-Communist world much more self-interested support than the other two approaches, while reducing fear and opposition to a minimum, even in the Communist governments.

True, people in every nation have a sentimental and habitual attachment to their national currency—but it is not to be compared with their attachment to their flag, which is so tightly tied to their armed force. Whatever their feeling for their dollar, pound, franc, mark or lira, they all have a stronger attachment to the real value of the property they possess. They have a still stronger self-interest in having the stable possible monetary measure of the value of their possessions, and avoiding personal loss from monetary devaluation and depreciation.

In the multitude of currencies in Atlantica at present, they see no advantage to themselves, or anyone—only vexation, bewilderment, loss and a feeling that their ignorance of other currencies is being exploited when they travel abroad. So strong is the self-interest in having a simple, common means of measurement that nearly all the civilized nations have abandoned their national measures of length, capacity, and weight and adopted the metric system, which the French established less than 175 years ago. The only important upholders of archaic measures in these fields are the Americans and British. Since both nations cling to the same cumbersome, irrational, unrelated yards, gallons and pounds, their retardation must be attributed to parochialism and inertia, rather than nationalism.

The nations of Latin America, Africa and Asia have nothing to fear from the establishment, by Atlantic Union, of a far stabler currency for world trade than the pound and dollar. They have much to gain from this, perhaps more than anyone else. They all depend on the dollar and pound now as part of their national monetary reserves, and as the medium through which they sell and buy in the world market. They live on a narrow margin, and the gap between their resources and their needs and dreams is far greater than in most of the Atlantic nations. They have good cause to fear an international monetary crash abruptly weakening their already weak position. A stable Atlantic currency, invulnerable to the dangers of runs and devaluation to which the pound and dollar are now so exposed, would obviously bring nothing but immense advantage to them all.

The Communists, of course, would have good reason to fear that the creation of an Atlantic Federal Union currency would end their dream of winning the world intact through a monetary crash. But this fear would be even less likely than their fear of Atlantic military union to lead them to launch a preventive war. As for those in Atlantica who, from fear of Russians fears, shy away from Union when approached from the angle of defense, few among them would see danger of war in the creation of a stable Atlantic Union currency. At least part of the Communists—those who really believe that communism can win peacefully by surpassing free enterprise in benefits to people—would find the stability of an Atlantic currency useful in developing their own economies through world trade.

There are, of course, technical difficulties in creating an Atlantic Union currency, but they are trifling compared to those involved in military and economic union. They could be solved in relatively little time, once the NATO nations decided to federate for this purpose. Indeed, some international monetary authorities most conversant with the technical side of the question tell me that "there are no real technical difficulties—the only difficulty is the political decision."

Whatever technical problems there may be, they are evident only to monetary experts. The latter would have difficulty convincing the general public that there are serious obstacles to be overcome; whereas the difficulties in forming a Union defense force or common market, as we have noted, are obvious to everyone, and laymen tend to overrate rather than underestimate them.

Moreover, the creation of an Atlantic federation would in itself solve the immense and practically insoluble difficulties involved in maintaining a fairly stable international currency under present conditions. These difficulties would also face any other non-Federal alternative—whether a return to the old gold standard as the French urge, or the abandonment of even the present gold exchange standard, as some Americans propose at the other extreme, or the projects for a so-called "international currency" based on nations that remain sovereign in this regard.

The fact is that these difficulties result from national sovereignty; there can be no ending of them without replacing it with the federal principle.

Take the problem of assuring liquidity among the Atlantic nations. No such problem bedevils the people or governments of the States in the United States, or in any Federal Union. Yet, had the Southern Confederacy won the Civil War, this problem would exist for both the North and South.

The same is true of the balance-of-payment problem which figures so prominently in present efforts to end the danger to the pound and dollar. No such problem exists for any of the States of the United States or of any other federation, in their interstate relations. But let the smallest colony in Africa become a sovereign nation, and, as its flag goes up at the U.N., it acquires a balance-of-payments problem.

Granted, the United States and all other Federal Unions have not merely a common currency but a common defense force, a common market, a common foreign policy, and a common Federal Government for their common affairs.

Granted, too, these monetary, military, economic, and political factors are tightly interrelated. I have therefore always urged that Atlantica should tackle them as a whole, as did the Founding Fathers, and not separately, as has been done thus far in the Atlantic Community. I still maintain this—but one must have some entering wedge, some primary motive or incentive to get a convention officially authorized to tackle them as a whole or seriatim.

The question now is which is the best approach to this problem. Which approach—the military, the economic or the monetary—offers the most hope at present of getting the Federal answer explored by a convention in the least time and most auspicious atmosphere?

As a matter of fact, the currency danger which the 13 States faced under the Articles of Confederation provided the political motive power which produced the convention that worked out the first Federal Union—and ended by federating the 13 in the military, economic and political as well as monetary fields.

All told, it would seem that the approach today to Atlantic federation which would arouse the least fear and opposition, the most widespread support and involve the least technical difficulty, is the monetary one. And certainly the monetary danger is the most urgent of the many motives which the people of Atlantica have to federate now.

—Clarence Streit.

VOTING DISCRIMINATION

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. Younger] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Star of yesterday, April 4, there were two items of special interest to all of us today. First was the editorial entitled "Voting Discrimination" which follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Sunday Star, Apr. 4, 1965]

Voting Discrimination

Our basic objections to the administration's voting rights bill have already been stated. We think there is need for a reasonable literacy test, provided there is no discrimination in its application to would-be voters. The administration's bill, in one aspect, outlaws any and all literacy tests, and is designed to permit total illiterates to vote. The educational voting level is low enough now without enacting a Federal law to push it down even farther.

The second important aspect of this bill imposes its harsh and punitive provisions on any State which has a literacy test, and in which fewer than 50 percent of the residents over 21 are registered or actually voted in the 1964 election.

This bill contains other provisions which are reminiscent of the Reconstruction era following the Civil War. But the two which we have mentioned, taken together, offend one's sense of fairness. If enacted, in its present form, this bill would result in a legislative discrimination as bad or worse than the evil the bill is supposed to remedy.

Let's take the case of Virginia, which is brought under this bill because it requires a literacy test and, though more than 50 percent of its eligibles are registered, fewer than 50 percent voted in 1964.

What is Virginia's literacy test? As spelled out by Senator Harry Byrd in his recent statement, any person desiring to register must be able, without assistance, to give in writing the following information: His name. The date and place of his birth. His current residence. His occupation. And, if he has voted before, the county and precinct in which he voted. That is all.

Is this a test which opens the door to such obviously discriminatory requirements as being able to interpret to the satisfaction of some ignorant registrar sections of a State constitution? Is it a test which asks too much of a person who wants to vote on the important and complicated issues which face us today? We do not think so. Furthermore, the administration concedes that this is not an unreasonable literacy test, and that there is no evidence that it has been used is Virginia to discriminate against Negroes.

If this is so, why does the bill link a reasonable and nondiscriminatory literacy test to an arbitrary formula with respect to voting or registration percentages?

One explanation is that the statistics on registration are unreliable. But this is said to be true in West Virginia, which is not affected by the bill because it has no literacy test. What nonsense!

In addition to Virginia, the States covered by the bill are Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Alaska. We are puzzled by the inclusion of Alaska, in which Negroes certainly are not discriminated against. There are few if any there. As to the others, we haven't enough information to pass judgment.

But it is our firm belief that this is a discriminatory bill. If its purpose is to protect Negro voting rights, it discriminates in favor of New York, which requires a rather strict literacy test but which has met the voting percentage standards. It also discriminates in the case of Texas, which did not meet the percentage-of-voting standard in 1964, but which does require a literacy test, although it is verbal in character and is called by some other name.

There have been reports that the administration's bill will be changed or modified in some unrevealed aspects. We hope this is true. We also hope that the bill, if modified, will be made applicable to Virginia (in which we have a special interest) on the basis of facts rather than fiction. And certainly not on the basis of some arbitrary formula dreamed up by someone who hasn't the faintest idea what the facts are. Or, if he knows, doesn't care.

Coupled with this was an article from the files of the Star of 100 years ago, referring to General Lee's surrender at Appomattox, which ocurred on April 9, 1865, setting forth the very generous terms which Grant gave to Lee and the Confederate soldiers. It seems to me that this action on the part of General Grant following a 4-year Civil War should be a lesson to us today that even though we are all desirous of passing legislation granting to every qualified citizen the right to register and vote, we do not want to pass legislation which is revengeful in the least, nor do we want to set up a system of two classes of States in this Union. I am sure this registration and voting legislation can be enacted without any lasting punitive features to any of the States.

The article from the files of the Star of a hundred years ago follows:

Grant and Lee at Appomattox—100 Years Ago

For Robert E. Lee and his Army of Northern Virginia, the Civil War ended a century ago this week. His retreat cut off and his men—fewer than 30,000—without provisions, Lee sent a flag of truce to Grant on Palm Sunday, April 9, 1865, requesting a meeting. They met at Appomattox Courthouse at 11 a.m. Grant looked more like the loser in mud-spattered uniform that bore no marks of distinction other than shoulder strap. Lee was immaculate in his best grays. Grant's terms were generous. All of Lee's men who claimed to own horses or mules could take them home to "work their little farms." Union rations were distributed among the gaunt Confederates. Lee was not asked for his sword. The Star of Monday, April 10, 1965, printed an exchange of notes that preceded the surrender: "Gen. R. E. Lee, Commanding C.S.A.: * * * I propose the surrender of the Army of Northern Virginia on the following terms, to wit: Rolls of all the officers and men. * * * The officers to give their individual paroles not to take arms against the Government of the United States until properly exchanged, and each company or regimental commander sign a like parole for men of their commands. The arms, artillery, and public property to be packed and stacked, and turned over to the officers appointed by me to receive them. This will not embrace the sidearms of the officers, nor their private horses or baggage. This done, each officer and man will be allowed to return to their homes not to be disturbed by U.S. authority so long as they observe their parole and the laws in force where they may reside. Very respectfully, U. S. Grant, Lieutenant General." "Lieut. Gen. U. S. Grant, Commanding United States Armies. General: I have received your letter containing the terms of surrender of the Army of Northern Virginia, as proposed by you. * * * They are accepted. I will proceed to designate the proper officers to carry the stipulation into effect. Very respectfully your obedient servant, R. E. Lee, General." The meeting between Lee and Grant at the McLean farmhouse was marked by strained politeness. The two generals talked about their service in Mexico. They signed the necessary papers and shook hands. Lee bowed to the other officers and left. His horse, Traveller, trappings polished to a high shine, was brought by an aide. As Lee mounted, Grant stepped off the porch and walked toward him, raising his hat in salute. Lee replied in kind, then trotted off slowly. In the valley, his men crowded around him. Some cried "Uncle Robert"; some prayed "God help you, General." Lee said: "Men, we have fought through this war together. I have done the best I could for you. My heart is too full to say any more." The war went on elsewhere, but this paper commented: "When Lee, the wisest and bravest of the Confederate leaders, sees no ray of hope for the Confederate cause, and voluntarily lays down his arms to prevent the further and futile effusion of blood, the most credulous optimist amongst his followers must accept his judgment as decisive."

URBAN RENEWAL IN ELIZABETH, N.J.

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. Dwyer] may extend her remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency this morning heard some very important testimony on the actual operation of the urban renewal program as it has been experienced in Elizabeth, N.J.—the community in which I reside and which I am privileged to represent in the Congress.

Mayor Thomas G. Dunn outlined for the subcommittee the whole incredible story of more than 12 years of bungling, redtape, duplication, and administrative inefficiency which has left the city with an empty wasteland in the heart of its central business district at a cost to the city and Federal Governments of hundreds of thousands of dollars in lost taxes and misspent subsidies.

Under leave to extend, I include Mayor Dunn's statement following my own remarks. Mayor Dunn's testimony, Mr. Speaker, was especially significant both because it focused attention on Elizabeth's particular urban renewal problems and because it provided additional information for those who are seriously concerned about reforming the urban renewal program and making it serve the laudable purposes for which the program was intended.

I am pleased to report that the subcommittee was very much impressed with Mayor Dunn's testimony. The chairman of the subcommittee, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Barrett], is requesting Commissioner Slayton of the Urban Renewal Administration to look into the Elizabeth situation and report to the subcommittee. I am confident the subcommittee intends to do everything possible to help straighten out the present mess.

Beyond the individual situation in Elizabeth, however, I believe the facts presented by Mayor Dunn should alert the subcommittee and the Congress generally to the need of making substantial revisions in the urban renewal program.

Both this year and last year, Mr. Speaker, the Republican members of the Housing Subcommittee introduced legislation which, among other things, would go far to put the program back on the right track. The problems in Elizabeth were very much in our minds when we framed our recommendations. Nevertheless, while urban renewal in Elizabeth has been notably unfortunate, it is not uniquely so.

The program nationally has been characterized by excessive delays in individual projects, a net decline in available residential housing, serious problems of human dislocation and reinforced racial discrimination, a substantial increase in the rents low-income persons must pay for housing, the needless destruction of properties and neighborhoods which should have been preserved, and unnecessary subsidies for luxury apartments and high-cost commercial development.

Our minority proposals, Mr. Speaker, would not repeal or destroy the urban renewal program. They would help to save it. In an excellent article in the April issue of Commentary magazine, Herbert J. Gans, associate professor of sociology at Columbia University, points out that while past criticism of urban renewal has been spotty and sporadic, the program as a whole "is now beginning to be seriously and tellingly evaluated." I recommend this article, entitled "The Failure of Urban Renewal: A Critique and Some Proposals," to our colleagues.

The Republican proposals would deal directly with the criticisms Mr. Gans has summarized and the problems Mayor Dunn has identified. Among other things, we would emphasize the rehabilitation of houses worth saving rather than the usual wasteful bulldozing of complete areas. We would require that priority be given to residential rather than commercial projects and that a majority of residential units be constructed for low- and middle-income use. We would make use of available private housing for low-income families under a rent certificate plan. We would increase relocation assistance for residents and small business owners being displaced by projects. We would emphasize strengthening and enforcing building codes to prevent slums. We would strengthen local responsibility for urban renewal projects, make local redevelopment authorities more responsible to elected city governments, and give the people a voice in connection with large-scale demolition projects.

Our recommendations would help reduce waste in the program, shorten the time between beginning and completing a project, and eliminate many of the inadequacies and inequities which today seriously threaten the survival of the urban renewal program.

My introduction of Mayor Dunn and the mayor's statement follow:

Statement of Representative Dwyer Introducing Mayor Dunn of Elizabeth, April 5, 1965, Housing Subcommittee, House Banking and Currency Committee

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to present Mayor Thomas G. Dunn, of Elizabeth, to this subcommittee.

Though Mayor Dunn and I are of opposite political parties, we have both watched for the past 12 years—in common with other citizens of Elizabeth—the almost incredible shambles which urban renewal in our city has become.

Who is to blame is perhaps less important than what is to blame. Those of us who sponsored the alternative Republican housing bill this year and last had the Elizabeth situation in mind when we included certain of our recommendations for reform of the urban renewal program. We believe you will find, as you listen to Mayor Dunn describe the Elizabeth experience, that those recommended provisions are indeed pertinent.

Mayor Dunn, who took office in Elizabeth on January 1, is nevertheless very familiar with urban renewal in Elizabeth. Several weeks ago, in anticipation of the subcommittee's hearings on the administration and alternative housing bills, I suggested that he could make a contribution to our deliberations by telling us how urban renewal in one middle-size American city was working out.

I am indebted to Mayor Dunn for accepting the invitation and for coming here today.

Testimony of Mayor Thomas G. Dunn, Elizabeth, N.J., Before the Subcommittee on Housing of the House Banking and Currency Committee, April 5, 1965

Honorable members of the committee, I would like to start off my presentation this morning by thanking you for the high honor and privilege of appearing before you. I especially wish to thank, on behalf of the people of the city of Elizabeth, the Honorable Florence P. Dwyer, from the Sixth Congressional District in New Jersey, for making arrangements for my appearance.

"Urban renewal" is the term used to describe the official program of a community to improve itself through the elimination of slums and blight and the removal of the causes of slum and blighted areas, thereby preventing their recurrence.

Urban renewal is a locally planned and executed communitywide improvement program, using public and private resources. Through it a city seeks to refashion and rebuild its physical plant along modern lines, so that it can cope more successfully with the many problems of this industrial age: poor housing, traffic congestion, inadequate sites for commercial and industrial growth, decay of downtown areas, and neighborhood deterioration.

Urban renewal also produces very tangible dollars-and-cents benefits to local communities. New structures in renewal areas ordinarily result in a substantial increase in tax revenues to the city. At the same time, the value of properties adjacent to the renewal area tends to increase as the blighting influence is removed, and investment in rehabilitation and in new buildings begins to take place.

Equally important, slums have typically required a very high level of fire, health, police, and welfare services, compared with better neighborhoods. With the elimination of slums, the cost of providing these services ordinarily goes down very sharply.

Areas and cities benefit from better design. Obsolete land uses are replaced with more efficient, more pleasant patterns of development. There are also less direct benefits. For example, urban renewal will enhance the economic base of the entire community as a result of construction activity, new business coming into formerly deteriorated areas, and the consequent increase in employment, payrolls, and tax revenues.

The healthy picture portrayed with these words can be found in a brochure entitled, "Twenty Questions and Answers on Urban Renewal," published by the Urban Renewal Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency.

It clearly projects a dream had by the governing body of Elizabeth, N.J., back in 1950 when it founded the redevelopment agency to take advantage of the promise of urban renewal.

Now, 14 years and 3 months later the dream of urban renewal in the city of Elizabeth can best be characterized as a "nightmare." A nightmare of broken promises, delays, political maneuvering, red tape, ineptness, staggering loss of ratables and other questionable things that call out for public inquiry by someone or some agency in high authority.

In 14 years and 3 months, urban renewal in Elizabeth, N.J., has meant "that big hole on Washington Avenue"—and an ugly hole at that.

I would like to have the record show that as a new mayor of but 3 months tenure, I lay no claim to being an expert on urban renewal, nor on those intangibles that spell the difference between success and failure for an urban renewal project. My role at this hearing is little more than that of a narrator who hopes to dramatize to your honorable committee, through presentation of documentation and photographs, just one urban renewal failure, officially described as U.R. N.J. 14-1, and one unfortunately that finds its geographic location in the city of Elizabeth, N.J.

To save time in the reading of this presentation, I have taken the liberty of setting up a chronology entitled "Washington Avenue Project, U.R. N.J. 14-1: A History of Urban Renewal Frustration." You will find it attached to your copy of the statement from which I read.

I respectfully urge that you acquaint yourselves with the history of Project U.R. N.J. 14-1, tracing it from the optimistic days of 1953 through the most recent event of but a week ago which, I am afraid, once again thrusts redevelopment in the city of Elizabeth into another dark abyss. I refer to a hometown newspaper article captioned "New Doubts on Washington Avenue—New York Injunction Against Developer."

This article announces that Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz, of New York, obtained an injunction against Muhs Servicing Inc., of Queens, N.Y., and individuals who are principals of Mutual Development Urban

Renewal Corp., the developer for Elizabeth's Washington Avenue "big hole."

According to the newspaper article, the corporation involved in the New York action, and individuals, "delivered to the FHA a fraudulent list of persons who reputedly indicated an intention to purchase cooperative apartments" in the Brooklyn project.

Mr. Lefkowitz also charged, according to the newspaper, that illegal use was made of funds which the law requires to be held in trust, false statements were made in the sale of apartments and deposits of investors in the cooperative venture were "placed in jeopardy."

This New York action certainly gives justification for my personal thoughts and I trust the thoughts of all people of the city of Elizabeth, that our redevelopment agency is not doing business with people of integrity.

What appeared at long last to be the possible start of construction at Project U.R. N.J. 14–1 now appears to be the entry into another prolonged delay involving litigation, new planning, new developers, new frustrations.

At this point I would like to show photographs to you of Project U.R. N.J. 14–1, which is a site of approximately 11 acres in the heart of our central business district, across the street from our county court house, adjacent to our main free public library, across the street from a Protestant church, and an arm's length from a Catholic hospital, which incidentally, during the past 10 years, has successfully concluded a $9,062,000 building program that is but one step of a projected medical complex involving a hospital, nurse training school, research laboratories and a nursing home—a great thing for our city. I might remark here that if good Sister Ellen Patricia, who is in charge of hospital construction, were in complete charge of urban renewal in Elizabeth, Project U.R. N.J. 14–1 would today be a thing of beauty—a thing of pride—an accomplished feat.

Before demolition of private homes, retail stores, and industrial plants back in 1958 at the site in question, the city of Elizabeth was realizing approximately $32,000 in tax revenues each year from this area. Without allowing for normal increases in tax ratables, it can safely be assumed that aside from other investments in the project the city of Elizabeth has lost more than $200,000 in taxes. Two hundred thousand that we cannot afford—$200,000 that had to be absorbed by other taxpayers.

While this revenue loss is serious, the human element involved was tremendous. Good citizens were uprooted from our midst to be chased elsewhere—heaven only knows where. Many were a minority race and were forced into accommodations less than they enjoyed originally. Well established retail shops, operated for years by citizens of honesty and integrity, were forced out of business. And perhaps most important of all, the physical and mental health of the people involved was impaired in many cases. And what was the price paid for these disturbances? Disappointment, despair, and waste.

As the attached chronology vividly illustrates, it has been difficult for the people of Elizabeth, N.J., to pinpoint responsibility for failure of urban renewal.

Local authorities entrusted with the responsibility for revitalizing a city blame Federal Government procedures and personnel, all wrapped up in the package labeled "Redtape." Federal authorities oftentimes have placed the blame on local people. Developers blame both local authorities and Federal authorities. Federal authorities and local authorities blame the developer.

It is my aim, as mayor, appearing before you today, not to put in bad public light any individual or groups of individuals who have been derelict in the fulfillment of their duties and responsibilities. If such condemnation is to be made, I feel that it should be made by local or Federal grand juries.

One year ago today as a private citizen and as a candidate for mayor, I brought to the attention of the President of the United States, the Attorney General of the United States, U.S. Senators HARRISON A. WILLIAMS and CLIFFORD CASE, the Honorable Representative FLORENCE P. DWYER, the Honorable Representative JOHN DOWDY, the Governor of the State of New Jersey, our State senator and our county prosecutor, provisions of the contract existing between the developer and the city of Elizabeth which I termed a "sweetheart contract" due to the great number of concessions that favored the developer over the city.

Up until this time, the only official to show any interest in my report was the Honorable FLORENCE P. DWYER. Mrs. DWYER mailed to me a comprehensive analysis of my charges written by Commissioner William L. Slayton. In a word, Commissioner Slayton belittled my allegations in the letter to Mrs. DWYER. It is my hope that Mrs. DWYER can furnish members of your committee with copies of Commissioner Slayton's letter, which only 1 year ago, still portrayed a picture of "rosy progress through urban renewal in our city."

With the latest publicity given to Mr. Lefkowitz's injunction against the developer involved in the city of Elizabeth, I make note of the fact that interest is being shown by many public officials who heretofore showed none.

In preparing myself for my presentation today, I had hoped to be able to furnish each and every member of this committee with the contract that exists between the city and the developer and other material from the official files of the FHA. I was notified on March 30, 1965, by Mr. Peter J. Longarzo, director of the FHA Division in Newark, N.J., that "regulations of this administration forbid the furnishing of this information."

However, for your perusal I am submitting one copy of the existing contract obtained from the local redevelopment agency and I am submitting also for your perusal, an interpretation of the contract written for me by two young attorneys. Their interpretation, I feel, warranted my characterization of the document as being a "sweetheart contract." I hope you will agree with me on this. Commissioner Slayton does not.

I am confident that should this committee review the contract between the developer and the city of Elizabeth, you will agree with me that the contract reveals a clear pattern threatening the two most important advantages of the redevelopment plan; namely, the social objectives of the plan and the increased tax revenue for the city.

I do not want to give the impression that the contract alone is responsible for the failure of urban renewal in the city of Elizabeth, but it does point out, in my opinion, that the local redevelopment agency was so pressed for action by the citizenry that it entered into a contract with a developer that puts the city in one position of disadvantage after another. The developer has the city of Elizabeth over a barrel. Whether we like it or not, we must do business now with individuals whose honesty and integrity has been seriously questioned by the Attorney General of the State of New York, unless law allows us to step in and cancel out the relationship, as did happen once before with a previous developer (Lipkin-Kahn). The city of Elizabeth with a population of about 115,000 people and ideally located in the New York metropolitan area frankly needs a "shot in the arm" to start off its fourth century as a city. Your honorable committee can furnish the impetus. Urban renewal should succeed sometime. I hope the start begins here today.

Urban renewal has not kept pace with private construction in Elizabeth. Since 1959 permits have been issued for construction of 6,000 dwelling units, a total of $40 million in new construction. These cover the gamut of housing from single family structures to large 150–250 unit high-rise apartments. One 250-unit public housing project for the aged is included in the total and, I might say, it has proven to be of tremendous success, and a credit to the public housing authority, which has plans for two more similar projects well underway.

The bulk of this construction is in the nature of urban redevelopment, involving the purchase and demolition of existing structures, and building of apartments. Rentals range from about $95 per month for efficiency units in walkup apartments to luxury type, three-bedroom units renting for $280 per month or more in high-rise structures. The major part of this has been conventionally financed. By contrast, the Washington Avenue redevelopment project looks sad, indeed.

To summarize the chronology before you, the redevelopment agency was founded in 1950; the survey and plan contract was made in February 1952. In 1961, a developer was secured for the project. Two years later we started with a second developer, the first having been rejected by the Urban Renewal Administration, and just 5 days ago, the second developer found himself in the position of enjoying no confidence by the mayor of the city of Elizabeth, its governing body and its citizens.

There is something basically wrong here. Private enterprise has been able to take advantage of opportunities and build an unprecedented amount of new housing in our city in an extremely short period of time. Surveys indicate that the demand for these new units is still very high. Many 40- and 50-unit apartments are fully rented 3 months after completion.

At the same time, private enterprise has been unable to get off the ground in our city on redevelopment sites. It cannot be because the market for housing is poor.

With all the inducements available—assembled land ready for construction, a write-down on the land, special mortgage provisions available, and State legislation to provide added tax limitation inducements—we would expect that there would be tremendous competition for these projects. Instead, we have found that the developers who do get involved often wind up in trouble of one sort or another.

I have reason to suspect (and I do not mean to impugn the reputation of developers who have successfully completed urban renewal projects) that perhaps most projects attract that type of developer who is looking for a deal that assures him a good profit with minimum investment and risk and minimum qualifications as to previous experience or fiscal responsibility. This, I believe, should be an area of great concern to your honorable body.

Highly reputable developers show some interest when projects are first announced, but for reasons best known to themselves, dwindle in number as contract-signing draws near. I suspect that specifications to qualify are extremely stringent in the beginning, thus causing reputable developers to drop out, two by two, until but one or two remain, and these might best be described as real "operators." By this time, local authorities are so anxious to sign up a developer that a contract liberally drawn in favor of the developer is agreed upon. Whereas, if the specifications had been amended at an earlier stage, more reputable people would stay around to negotiate for the project.

Two years after our most recent contract-signing in Elizabeth, 2 years of waiting, prodding, threatening, and arguing and after receipt of an FHA commitment in the amount of more than $4½ million for the developer, we find another cloudy situation. We find ourselves doing business with a corporation of individuals whom the State of New York has found wanting—wanting of honesty and integrity. Will these people change character by crossing State lines? I believe not.

Another point. A private developer planning an apartment can, I am informed by local bankers, usually complete all his arrangements and start construction in about 6 months when he finances through the FHA.

Why is this not true of urban renewal projects? It is because of the number of agencies involved to get an urban renewal project off the drawing boards and completely constructed that causes the frustrations? Is it the need for involvement by specialists in the fields of financing, planning, etc. that cause the delays?

These things alone, I feel, discourage many developers who have the capacity and know-how from bidding on projects. If they have the resources and ability they can find plenty of opportunities for construction where the risks for delays of redevelopment do not exist. It is in these areas that I feel Federal authorities should interest themselves, as well as my request as mayor that you inquire into the unique, peculiar situation in the city of Elizabeth, N.J.

It is my job today to officially inform you that the integrity of urban renewal, as we in Elizabeth know it, is questioned. Aside from causing tremendous hardship, loss of money, aggravation, disenchantment, what has the liberal philosophy of urban renewal meant to us? Absolutely zero.

Ladies and gentlemen, we want to have faith in a program the Congress devised for community betterment. We want to progress as a city with a great past, but an even greater future. We want to be part of the Great Society.

We can take our rightful place in making the State of New Jersey a better State in which to live, and our great country a greater place to live, but a vital instrument to attain all this has broken down.

Urban renewal in Elizabeth has been a scandal of waste, misdirection, political opportunism, and illusion. I call upon you to consider using your investigative powers to expose the record of redevelopment in our city to the light of day, so that the people can see what has happened to its public trust and public funds.

I respectively call upon you to employ these powers to the end that you submit your determination as to whether or not this scandal of urban renewal in Elizabeth is traceable to malfeasance, misfeasance, nonfeasance, or perhaps just a rare case of urban renewal failure. I tell you today of our symptoms. We invite you to diagnose our ills. We trust you will find the remedy.

To the best of my ability, I will answer any and all questions you might have.

I thank you again for the honor and privilege of testifying before you.

THOMAS G. DUNN.

EXHIBIT B

CHRONOLOGY, 1953–65: A HISTORY OF URBAN RENEWAL FRUSTRATION, ELIZABETH, N.J.

May 29, 1953, "Slum Boards OK's Washington Avenue": A Washington Avenue area was adopted by the Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency last night as the project site for its first program of slum clearance and urban renewal.

August 27, 1953, "Huge Task Ahead To Transform Blight Spot to Bright Spot—Redevelopment Agency Faces Problem of Relocating 145 Families in Washington Avenue": Many wrinkles will have to be ironed out before the Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency can transform its Washington Avenue project site into a bright spot on the city's landscape, and one of these is the problem of relocating 145 families.

January 15, 1954, "Slum Body Spurs Project Plans": Action to prepare final plans for the proposed Washington Avenue slum clearance and redevelopment project was initiated last night by the Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency.

April 8, 1955, "328-Unit Apartments Slated for Blight Area": Three 10-story apartment buildings for 328 families are planned by the Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency to replace a blighted collection of 145 dwelling units in the Washington Avenue project area.

December 30, 1955, "Redtape Continues To Slow City Redevelopment Project": Many formalities must be attended to before the Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency can start its first slum clearance and urban redevelopment project. Most of them apply to Federal requirements. All of them add up to a continuation of the red tape that has slowed the agency in the 2 years since it designated a Washington Avenue site for its initial effort.

February 13, 1956, "Redtape Brakes Redevelopment Progress": Federal redtape continues to tie up the Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency.

March 1, 1956, "Slum Project Redtape Loosened, CASE Says": U.S. Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE today expressed hope that Washington finally is unraveling the redtape that has tied up Elizabeth's proposed slum clearance and redevelopment project.

May 5, 1956, "Federal Action Believed Near Redevelopment Plan": Elizabeth's redevelopment plan, which has been at a Philadelphia regional office of the Housing and Home Finance Agency for about 5 months, is expected to reach Washington for final Federal approval in 2 weeks.

September 15, 1956, "Slum Agency Given Federal Clearance—Redevelopment Board Can Take Final Steps Toward Washington Avenue Project": Long-awaited clearance from the Urban Renewal Administration today enabled the Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency to proceed with final steps for its proposed Washington Avenue slum elimination project.

December 6, 1956, "Blight Cleanup Project Gets Council OK": City council last night approved the Washington Avenue redevelopment project plan and authorized the Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency to apply for Federal financial assistance.

May 23, 1957, "Washington Avenue Project Gets $1,906,000 From United States—Final OK Received by City": The Urban Renewal Administration today granted long awaited final approval of the Washington Avenue redevelopment project, making available to the city an aggregate of $1,906,002.

January 30, 1958, "Redevelopment Agency Buys Pearl Street Tract, Its First": The Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency yesterday closed title to the first parcel of property for its multimillion-dollar Washington Avenue blight elimination project.

May 22, 1958, "Test of New Jersey Slum Law May Stall City Project": An undecided court suit challenging the State Redevelopment Act has held up delivery of the city's share of money to finance the Washington Avenue slum clearance project and threatens to delay the reconstruction effort.

August 22, 1958, "Washington Avenue Demolition Slated To Start in October": The Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency last night authorized preparation to demolish the first buildings on its Washington Avenue slum clearance site in October.

January 14, 1959, "21 Houses Razed on Project Site": 21 of 62 buildings on the site of the Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency's Washington Avenue slum clearance project have been demolished.

April 11, 1959, "Webb & Knapp Wants Washington Avenue Site": Webb & Knapp, New York City real estate firm, has offered to purchase the entire Washington Avenue slum-clearance area for redevelopment, it was disclosed today.

July 22, 1959, "10 Washington Avenue Units Still To Be Razed—Condemnation Snarls, Relocation Problems Slow Project": About 10 structures remain to be leveled on the site of the Washington Avenue redevelopment project. * * * Daniel J. Tracey, Jr., executive director of the Redevelopment Agency, said today it is difficult to predict when actual work will start at the 14½ acre site, bounded by Rahway Avenue, South Broad Street, Pearl Street and the Pennsylvania Railroad.

December 11, 1959, "Redevelopers Plan To Ask Sealed Bids": The Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency last night decided to call for sealed bids by developers seeking to purchase the Washington Avenue urban renewal site.

November 11, 1960, "$725,000 Minimum Price Set for Redevelopment Site—Action Clears Way for Sale of Washington Avenue Project Property to Private Investors": The Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency last night hung a minimum price tag of $725,000 on its 10 acre Washington Avenue urban renewal site. Its action cleared one of the last hurdles on the road to public sale of the land to a private developer.

February 3, 1961, "Urban Renewal Speedup Pressed by Bercik": Mayor Steven J. Bercik today called a meeting of city council and the Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency for Monday night to explore means of expediting Elizabeth's redevelopment program. The move constituted a prompt reaction to yesterday's request by President John F. Kennedy that municipalities seek ways of hastening their urban renewal projects.

May 10, 1961, "$6 Million Building Bid OK'd": The Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency last night voted to qualify only one of two bidders for its Washington Avenue urban renewal project, assuring the construction of twin 16-story apartment houses costing $6,464,770. The agency ratified a proposal submitted by the Lipkin-Kahn Co. of Long Island City, N.Y., disdaining one filed by the First National Redevelopment Corp. of Wood-Ridge.

May 23, 1961, "Agency Given Renewal Bid": A $675,000 bid to purchase the Washington Avenue urban renewal site for redevelopment was received yesterday by the Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency from the Lipkin-Kahn Co. of Long Island City, N.Y.

December 1, 1961, "Trek to Capital Due Monday to Speed Redevelopment": Elizabeth's official trek to the Nation's Capital to try to pry loose the stalled Washington Avenue redevelopment project will take place Monday.

December 6, 1961, "Action Vowed on Elizabeth Redevelopment": Urban Renewal Commissioner William L. Slayton promised yesterday that a logjam on the Washington Avenue redevelopment project in Elizabeth will be broken in from 4 to 6 weeks.

December 13, 1961, "Year's Delay Hinted on Redevelopment": The entire process of selling the Washington Avenue urban renewal site to a developer may have to be repeated with as much as a year's delay, the Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency was warned last night.

January 11, 1962, "Redevelopers for Elizabeth Under Attack in Trenton": The New York City firm which has been selected for multimillion-dollar redevelopment projects in Elizabeth and Trenton faced a threat today of losing its agreement with Trenton.

January 29, 1962, "Lipkin-Kahn Denies Charges at Stormy Trenton Session": Officials of the Lipkin-Kahn Co., which has a contract with Elizabeth for the Washington Avenue redevelopment project, stalked out of a city commission hearing in Trenton Saturday after branding as "lies" allegations that they have a record of poor performances in housing developments.

February 5, 1962, "Bercik Trip Aims at Renewal OK": Mayor Steven J. Bercik said today that he will go to Washington Wednesday or Thursday in an attempt to cut redtape which is delaying the start of the Washington Avenue redevelopment project.

February 7, 1962, "City Moves to Reject Lipkin-Kahn's Offer on Renewal Project": Elizabeth's Redevelopment Agency last night approved a resolution proposing the rejection of a successful bid by the Lipkin-Kahn Co. for the purchase of the Washington Avenue site. The resolution also called for readvertising for bids for the 10-acre tract to "avoid further delay" on the project.

February 8, 1962, "Speedy Decision Seen From URA": Carmine S. Bellino, a special assistant to President John F. Kennedy, yesterday told Mayor Steven J. Bercik that a decision will be made "shortly" on the Washington Avenue redevelopment project contract.

February 10, 1962, "Mrs. Gillen Raps Project Delay": Councilwoman Mary D. Gillen said today that she will not vote for further city redevelopment programs until the Washington Avenue project site "is converted from a dust bowl to a tax ratable."

March 7, 1962, "Bercik To Appeal to Weaver on Redevelopment Delay": Mayor Steven J. Bercik was to fly to Washington today for a conference with Dr. Robert C. Weaver, head of the Housing and Home Finance Agency, in an effort to break the Elizabeth redevelopment bottleneck.

March 8, 1962, "Project Tieup To End Soon, Bercik Told": Mayor Steven J. Bercik said today that the Deputy Chief of the U.S. Housing and Home Finance Agency has promised to break the deadlock over the stalled Washington Avenue redevelopment project in a week.

March 13, 1962, "United States Refuses To OK Lipkin-Kahn's Pact on Renewal Project": The Urban Renewal Administration has informed Elizabeth's Redevelopment Agency that it "cannot at this time" approve a contract with the Lipkin-Kahn Co. of New York for the purchase of the Washington Avenue redevolpment project site.

March 28, 1962, "New Bids Due on Project": The Urban Renewal Administration today gave Elizabeth a green light to readvertise for bids for the sale of the Washington Avenue redevelopment site.

April 11, 1962, "Drop Lipkin-Kahn Contract, Renewal Agency Advised": Elizabeth's Redevelopment Agency was advised by its attorney last night it can disregard a contract agreement with a New York City firm for sale of the Washington Avenue redevelopment site.

May 9, 1962, "Lipkin-Kahn Sees Clearance by United States": An official of the Lipkin-Kahn Co. of New York City told Elizabeth's Redevelopment Agency last night that he expects the Federal Government to reverse a decision which ruled out the firm as redeveloper of the Washington Avenue project.

July 26, 1962, "Three Months' Paperwork Before New Developer Named"; Daniel J. Tracey, Jr., executive director of the Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency said today it would take at least 3 months to submit a name of a new developer for Federal approval because of various paperwork involved. Two reuse appraisals required by the URA are currently being made "because we have to know the sales price," Tracey said. The First National City Bank of New York was the lowest of six bidders this week to furnish the agency with $850,000 for 6 months at an interest rate of 1.73 percent—the eighth consecutive semiannual contract.

July 28, 1962, "Slayton to Tracey: 'Expedite the Program,": U.S. Senator CLIFFORD P. CASE met in Washington yesterday with Commissioner William L. Slayton to protest the long delay on the Washington Avenue project. Slayton told the Senator he wrote a letter last March 26 to Executive Director Daniel Tracey, Jr. telling him to take steps to expedite the program.

November 14, 1962, "38 Redevelopers Interested": Thirty-eight companies from six States and the District of Columbia are interested in undertaking the long-delayed Washington Avenue project and December 5 will be the cutoff date, according to Hyman E. Cohen, redevelopment agency chairman.

December 12, 1962, "41 to 23 to 6 or 8": The Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency last night announced 18 firms which displayed interest in developing the Washington Avenue project site have been dropped from consideration. This leaves 23 firms still on the list of possible developers. Daniel J. Tracey, Jr., executive director of the city agency, said an attempt will be made to narrow the number of prospective developers to six or eight by mid-January.

January 9, 1963, "More Money Needed for Overhead": Firms still interested in developing the Washington Avenue urban renewal site have until January 23 to submit financial statements, the Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency announced last night. Daniel J. Tracey, Jr., executive director, said the agency hopes to choose a firm by mid-February provided no snares develop. By resolution the agency requested the Federal Government to amend the project loan and grant contract to increase the temporary loan to $1,465,887 and the capital grant to $723,716, hikes of $26,583. Tracey said the increases are needed to meet administrative overhead, legal services for bonding counsel, and interest on bonds.

January 25, 1963, "Appraisals at Least $200,000 Apart": The Washington Avenue urban renewal program faces another snarl because of three differing appraisals on lot 1 of the project site. The Federal Housing Administration has reportedly appraised the property at a figure in the neighborhood of $400,000. Two separate appraisals by the city agency reportedly are in the neighborhood of $600,000 to $700,000. The city cannot sell the land below its minimum appraisal figure. The FHA appraisal will control the amount of the mortgage loan the Federal agency will insure.

February 14, 1963, "* * * And Then There Were Three": Elizabeth's Redevelopment Agency announced last night that its list of prospective developers for the Washington Avenue urban renewal site has been whittled to three.

February 19, 1963, "Developer Chosen: $789,000 Price of Land": The Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency last night unanimously selected Mutual Housing Sponsors, Inc., of Forest Hills, Long Island, to undertake the Washington Avenue urban renewal project. The selection was made over two other prospective developers at a special dinner meeting at the Elizabeth Carteret Hotel. Mutual Housing plans to erect a complex of apartment houses to provide a total of 308 dwelling units ranging from 3½ to 7 rooms. Rents in one of the 16-story buildings and the 5- and 2-story structures would range from $89 to $159 a month. The other 16-story building would contain apartments renting from $129 to $251 a month. Also proposed for the project are a triangular-shaped office building with parking on the ground level and one level below the ground. A one-story shopping center with some 29,500 square feet of space will be built on South Broad Street.

February 20, 1963, "Costs Estimated": Mutual Housing Sponsors, Inc., estimates the total construction costs of the Washington Avenue project will be $7,262,000. Gross costs, which also include site improvements and financing, boost the overall total to $9,210,000. Principals of the Forest Hills firm which will handle the Washington Avenue project include Muhs Servicing, Inc., of Forest Hills, Benjamin L. Aaronson, of Brooklyn.

May 1, 1963, "Claims Better Plans": Officials of Construction Enterprises Inc., of 57 Union Place, Summit, which was one of three firms finally considered for the Washington Avenue project, have written to city council president, Mary D. Gillen, claiming that the project plans by Mutual Housing Sponsors, Inc., would not meet with FHA approval as readily as theirs. Construction Enterprises, Inc., has asked to meet with city officials to discuss the project. Hyman Cohen, chairman of the redevelopment agency said he did not think anything worthwhile would be accomplished by such a meeting.

June 14, 1963, "Personnel Turnover in Federal Agencies": Representatives of Mutual Housing Sponsors, Inc., and Construction Enterprises, Inc., met with city council last night to discuss problems that delay urban renewal. One of the basic problems is the constant turnover of personnel in the Federal agencies, according to both developers. The developers are in a position of having to reeducate and resell programs to newcomers, council was told.

July 11, 1963, "Contract to Philadelphia": The redevelopment agency announced a contract for redevelopment of the Washington Avenue site will be presented this week to officials of the Philadelphia office of the Housing and Home Finance Agency. John T. Glennon, agency counsel, stated that he sent a copy of the 42-page contract to Federal officials in Philadelphia for interpretation of a section about reimbursement of funds on certain project work.

September 19, 1963, "Minor Delays": Thomas Gallagher, a field representative of the Federal Housing and Home Finance Agency, told city council that the Philadelphia office of the agency was studying the redeveloper's contract and that minor contract items have to be ironed out and the matter should be resolved soon.

November 7, 1963, "Contract Approved": The Philadelphia office of the Urban Renewal Administration notified Elizabeth's Redevelopment Agency today that the Federal Government has approved the development contract for the Washington Avenue project.

November 27, 1963, "Contract Signed": The development contract for the Washington Avenue project was signed last night. The redeveloper said ground could be broken in 6 months.

February 12, 1964, "Developer Changes Plans": A reduction in the height of one 16-story apartment house and the addition of another 5-story unit were listed in revised Washington Avenue urban renewal plans received by the Elizabeth Redevelopment Agency from the redeveloper. It was stated that the changes were made to comply with various controls regarding density and space.

March 16, 1964, "Marketability Questioned": The redeveloper, through Bernard G. Walpin, stated it is expected that ground will be broken at the 12-acre Washington Avenue renewal site in August. The newest delay has been projected by Washington's concern about marketability of apartments to be constructed on the project site.

March 19, 1964, "Flying Trip to Slash Tape": Mayor Steven J. Bercik flew to Washington today in an effort to "slash redtape" hindering the Washington Avenue redevelopment project. The Mayor contended that complicated Federal regulations have resulted in time-consuming administrative blocks in redevelopment projects all over the Nation.

March 20, 1964, "Clears Major Hurdle": Mayor Steven J. Bercik declared today that the major hurdle in Federal financing of the Washington Avenue urban renewal program was cleared yesterday following his conference with officials in Washington. He said $4,277,000 allocation has been approved for four apartment houses and this sets the funds aside for a green light for an FHA mortgage commitment.

April 20, 1964, "Designer Named": The redeveloper announced today M. Milton Glass of New York, an architect and city planner, is the designer for Elizabeth's Washington Avenue redevelopment project.

May 23, 1964, "Business at the Trailer": Walter S. Clapp, project expediter, for the redeveloper said more than 100 persons have inquired about rental units at the trailer set up on the project site. Nine have said they will take apartments and two have placed deposits.

June 2, 1964, "$170,000 Annually in Taxes"; Bernard G. Walpin, an officer of the redeveloper, told Mayor Bercik, city council and the redevelopment agency last night that there will be an annual tax return of $170,000 from the project.

June 10, 1964, "Executive Director Resigns": Daniel J. Tracey, Jr., executive director of Elizabeth's Redevelopment Agency, submitted his resignation last night from the $12,000-a-year post, citing "personal reasons."

June 27, 1964, "Required for Traffic Pattern": Elizabeth police officials told Mayor Steven J. Bercik yesterday that Burnet Street, sought by the Washington Avenue redeveloper, is needed for the city's traffic pattern.

September 23, 1964, "Request Approved"; Elizabeth's City Council last night approved the Washington Avenue redeveloper's request to use the Fox-Lance-Crane law. Council action may pave the way for a start on construction by the end of the year according to Bernard G. Walpin.

November 20, 1964, "A Month or Two": John Graichen, executive director of Elizabeth's Redevelopment Agency, predicted today that an FHA mortgage commitment will be issued to the redeveloper on the Washington Avenue project "within a month or two."

January 7, 1965, "Mayor Warns of Abolition": Efforts to abolish Elizabeth's Redevelopment Agency will be initiated by Mayor Thomas G. Dunn if construction does not begin at the Washington Avenue renewal site by February 1.

January 27, 1965, "Contract May Be Voided": Elizabeth Council warned the Washington Avenue redeveloper last night that it will consider efforts to void the redevelopment contract if construction does not start by February 15.

February 10, 1965, "Another Delay": Elizabeth's Redevelopment Agency last night gave the Washington Avenue developer a month-long extension, until March 15, as the deadline for acquiring title to lot 1 in the project.

March 5, 1965, "But Another Delay": Mayor Thomas G. Dunn last night advised city council that an FHA official has told a title insurance company that processing of a mortgage commitment for the project developer cannot continue until a current financial statement is submitted.

March 10, 1965, "Charges Dragging Feet": John Graichen, executive director of Elizabeth's Redevelopment Agency, today charged the FHA with dragging its feet on the Washington Avenue project. He said FHA called him last week and asked for information he supplied in letter form in January.

March 20, 1965: "Grand Jury Probe Demanded": Mayor Thomas G. Dunn called last night for a Federal grand jury probe of the Washington Avenue urban renewal program. His action was endorsed informally by city council at an executive session.

March 12, 1965, "FHA Commitment Issued": A $4,595,000 FHA mortgage commitment for Elizabeth's Washington Avenue redevelopment project was issued today to Mutual Development Urban Renewal Corporation.

March 31, 1965, "New York Injunction Against Developer": New York Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz charged today that the Washington Avenue redeveloper was involved in an alleged $2,140,000 fraud in the financing of a Brooklyn cooperative apartment project. Mr. Lefkowitz said yesterday he obtained an injunction against Muhs Servicing Inc., of Queens, Bernard G. Walpin, vice president, and Benjamin Aaronson, secretary-treasurer, barring them from engaging in the securities business in that State. Mr. Walpin also is president of the Washington Avenue redeveloper. The corporation and the two individuals consented to the restraining order issued by New York Supreme Court Justice William C. Hecht, Jr. Mr. Lefkowitz charged that the promoters delivered to the FHA a fraudulent list of persons who reputedly indicated an intention to purchase cooperative apartments in the Brooklyn project. He also charged that illegal use was made of funds which the law requires to be held in trust, false statements were made in the sale of apartments and deposits of investors in the cooperative venture were placed in jeopardy.

April 5, 1965, and where do we go from here?

THOMAS G. DUNN,
Mayor, Elizabeth, N.J.

NOTE.—Most of the above captions were taken from headlines of Elizabeth's local newspaper, the Daily Journal.

HOUSE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, today the Honorable WILLIAM MCCULLOCH of Ohio and I introduced a House voting rights bill. I want to commend BILL MCCULLOCH, the Republican member of the Judiciary Committee and the Republican Voting Rights Task Force for the magnificent job they have done in cooperation with the Republican leadership.

Mr. Speaker, this proposal is offered to dramatize the serious deficiencies in the original administration voting rights bill. The Republican bill will correct voting discrimination wherever it occurs throughout the length and breadth of this great land. It respects the traditional and constitutional rights of the States to set reasonable and nondiscriminatory standards for voting. Our bill is comprehensive, expeditious and fair. We urge the House Judiciary Committee to adopt our approach to solving this crucial problem. We will cooperate in every way to see to it that effective and fair legislation is enacted promptly so that every qualified citizen will be able to vote in this country by 1966.

Under unanimous consent I place the joint statement made by Congressman MCCULLOCH and me this morning at this point in the RECORD, along with the text of the Ford-McCulloch voting rights bill.

JOINT STATEMENT BY HON. GERALD R. FORD AND HON. WILLIAM M. MCCULLOCH

Later today we shall introduce a voting rights bill which is the product of the effort of many Republicans in the House of Representatives.

This bill offers a comprehensive and effective remedy for the evil of disfranchisement of citizens because of race.

The voting rights bill which is written into law this year should:

1. effectively and speedily end the unconstitutional denial of the right to vote anywhere in the United States;
2. terminate unreasonable standards for registration and voting without interfering with the reasonable requirements established by the States;
3. terminate any discriminatory application of requirements for registration and voting; and
4. avoid penalizing areas which are not guilty of discrimination.

Our bill accomplishes these objectives. The administration bill does not.

We are taking this step because of the serious deficiencies of the administration bill on this subject. The defects of the administration bill were obvious from the beginning and they were pointed out by Republicans as soon as the President made it available to the Congress. Testimony by virtually every witness who has appeared before the Judiciary Committees of the House and Senate has brought to light a long list of shortcomings in the administration proposal.

This Republican bill applies wherever discrimination exists. The administration's bill applies only to a limited number of States which employ literacy and other tests. The absolute exclusion of Texas from the coverage of this bill has been widely noted.

The Republican bill does not penalize the innocent—the States and localities where discrimination does not exist. The administration's bill imposes undue burdens on areas such as Alaska and parts of Maine where discrimination is known not to exist.

The Republican bill is not limited by the straitjacket of an arbitrary percentage formula. The administration bill reaches only those States and their subdivisions having literacy tests where less than 50 percent of its people registered or voted in the 1964 general election. States or local communities coming within this arbitrary formula may or may not be practicing discrimination. Low registration or voting may be equally credited to voter apathy—especially in areas where one political party predominates—or to misleading census figures which include persons who are nonresidents (such as military personnel and college students).

The Republican bill is comprehensive in scope and speedy in action. A Federal examiner is appointed by the Civil Service Commission when the Attorney General receives 25 or more complaints from residents of a county alleging denial of the right to vote on account of race or color. The examiner immediately determines whether these persons are qualified to vote. Challenges by the State may be made to a Federal hearing officer, appointed by the Civil Service Commission, within 10 days, and the hearing officer must render his decision 7 days thereafter.

Determination by the hearing officer that 25 or more persons are denied suffrage because of race or color establishes a pattern or practice of discrimination. Immediately thereafter, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint such additional Federal examiners and hearing officers as necessary to register all other persons within the county who may be subject to discrimination.

Our bill provides for an appeal of the hearing officer's decision to the local Federal Court of Appeals if made within 15 days. All persons found qualified to vote by the examiners shall be entitled to vote. Those who are challenged shall vote provisionally until the appeal is decided by the hearing officer and the court. Provisional voting will encourage a prompt determination of the appeal. The administration's bill provides exactly the same appeal procedure, except that there is no authority for provisional voting.

Our bill provides that examiners shall disregard literacy test requirements for persons who possess a 6th grade education. But, Federal examiners under this bill will apply to all other persons a State's literacy test, provided it is fair and nondiscriminatory. The administration's bill requires the complete elimination of literacy tests in a few States or their subdivisions, caught in its net, no matter how reasonable the tests or how fairly applied. At the same time, the administration's bill permits other States to enact literacy tests in the future.

Our bill deals with the problem of physical and economic coercion and intimidation. It permits registrants in a county in which a pattern of discrimination has been established to bypass local registrars, if they have reason to believe that they will be subjected to coercion and intimidation. In addition, our bill provides for civil and criminal penaltes against those officials who engage in such coercion and intimidation. The administration's bill contains similar provisons except that the Attorney General must take affirmatve action to waive the requirement that a person first appear before a local registrar.

Our bill does not overturn constitutional principles by requiring States to establish their innocence. The administration's bill does do this by presuming a State or a political subdivision, covered by the bill, guilty of discrimination until it receives from a Federal court in the District of Columbia a declaratory judgment that it has not violated the 15th amendment in even one instance in the past 10 years.

Our bill does not invalidate laws or ordinances of State and local governments in contraventions of established constitutional principles. The administration's bill would require States and their political subdivisions covered by the bill, to come to a Federal court for validation of their future laws and ordinances relating to voting requirements. Such is required by the administration's bill even though the laws and ordinances of the State or local community have never been found to be discriminatory.

The Republican bill offers a constitutional, comprehensive, effective, speedy remedy for the evil of disenfranchisement of any citizen because of race or color. The Republican bill would eliminate voter discrimination quickly and wherever it may exist.

H.R. 7125

A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the fifteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "Voting Rights Act of 1965."

SEC. 2. (a) The phrase "literacy test" shall mean any requirement that a person as a prerequisite for voting or registration for voting (1) demonstrate the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter, or (2) demonstrate an educational achievement or knowledge of any particular subject.

(b) A person is "denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote" if he is (1) not provided by persons acting under color of law with an opportunity to register to vote or to qualify to vote within two weekdays after making a good faith attempt to do so, (2) found not qualified to vote by any person acting under color of law, or (3) not notified by any person acting under color of law of the results of his application within seven days after making application therefor.

(c) The term "election" shall mean any general, special, or primary election held in any voting district solely or in part for the purpose of electing or selecting any candidate to public office or of deciding a proposition or issue of public law.

(d) The term "voting district" shall mean any county, parish, or similar political subdivision of a State in which persons, acting under color of law, administer the registration and voting laws of the State.

(e) The term "vote" shall have the same meaning as in section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971(e)).

SEC. 3. (a) Congress hereby finds that large numbers of United States citizens have been and are being denied the right to register or to vote in various States on account of race or color in violation of the Fifteenth Amendment.

(b) Congress further finds that literacy tests have been and are being used in various States and political subdivisions as a means of discrimination on account of race or color. Congress further finds that persons with a sixth grade education possess reasonable literacy, comprehension and intelligence and that, in fact, persons possessing such educational achievement have been and are being denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote for failure to satisfy literacy test requirements solely or primarily because of discrimination on account of race or color.

(c) Congress further finds that the requirements that persons as a prerequisite for voting or registration for voting (1) possess good moral character unrelated to the commission of a felony, or (2) prove their qualifications by the voucher of registered voters or members of any other class, have been and are being used as a means of discrimination on account of race or color.

(d) Congress further finds that where in any voting district twenty-five or more persons have been denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote, as determined in section 6, there is established a pattern or practice of denial of the right to register or to vote on account of race or color.

SEC. 4. (a) Whenever the Attorney General certifies to the Civil Service Commission (1) that he has received complaints in writing from twenty-five or more residents of a voting district each alleging that (i) the complainant satisfies the voting qualifications of the voting district, and (ii) the complainant has been denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote on account of race or color within ninety days, and (2) that the Attorney General believes such complaints to be meritorious, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint an examiner for such voting district.

(b) A certification by the Attorney General shall be final and effective upon publication in the Federal Register.

(c) The examiner shall examine those persons who have filed complaints certified by the Attorney General to determine (1) whether they were denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote within ninety days, and (2) whether they are qualified to vote under State law. A person's statement under oath shall be prima facie evidence as to his age, residence and his prior efforts to register or otherwise qualify to vote. The examiner shall, in determining whether a person is qualified to vote under State law, disregard (1) any literacy test if such person has not been adjudged an incompetent and has completed the sixth grade of education in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, any State or Territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or (2) any requirement that such person, as a prerequisite for voting or registration for voting (i) possess good moral character unrelated to the commission of a felony, or (ii) prove his qualifications by the voucher of registered voters or members of any other class.

(d) If the examiner finds that twenty-five or more of those persons within the voting district, who have filed complaints certified by the Attorney General, have been denied the right to register or to vote and are qualified to vote under State law, he shall promptly place them on a list of eligible voters, and shall certify and transmit such list to the offices of the appropriate election officials, the Attorney General, and the attorney general of the State, together with a report of his findings as to those persons whom he has found qualified to vote. For those persons, possessing less than a sixth grade education, the examiner shall administer a literacy test only in writing and the answers to such test shall be included in the examiner's report. The examiner shall issue to each person appearing on such a list a certificate evidencing his eligibility to vote.

(e) A finding by the examiner that twenty-five or more of those persons within a voting district, who have filed complaints certified by the Attorney General, have been denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote and that they are qualified to vote shall create a presumption of a pattern or practice of denial of the right to register or to vote on account of race or color.

(f) Unless challenged, according to the provisions of section 5, any person who has been placed on a list of eligible voters shall be entitled and allowed to vote in any election held within the voting district unless and until the appropriate election officials shall have been notified that such person has been removed from such list in accordance with section 10. If challenged, such person shall be entitled and allowed to vote provisionally with appropriate provision being made for the impounding of their ballots, pending final determination by the hearing officer and by the court.

(g) No person shall be entitled to vote in any election by virtue of the provisions of this Act unless his name shall have been certified and transmitted on such list to the offices of the appropriate election officials at least forty-five days prior to such election.

SEC. 5. (a) A challenge to the factual findings of the examiner, contained in the examiner's report, may be filed by the attorney general of the State or by any other person who has received from the examiner a certified list and report of persons found qualified to vote, as provided in section 4(d). A challenge shall be heard and determined by a hearing officer appointed by and responsible to the Civil Service Commission. Such challenge shall be entertained only if made within ten days after the challenged person is listed, and if supported by the affidavit of at least two persons having personal knowledge of the facts constituting grounds for the challenge, and such challenge shall be determined within seven days after it has been made. A person's fulfillment of literacy test requirements, if not disregarded by the examiner as provided for in section 4(c), shall be determined solely on the basis of answers included in the examiner's report.

(b) A petition for review of the decision of the hearing officer may be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the person challenged resides within fifteen days after service of such decision by mail on the moving party, but no decision of a hearing officer shall be overturned unless clearly erroneous. A challenge to a listing made in accordance with this section shall not be the basis for a prosecution under any provisions of this Act.

SEC. 6. Upon determination by the hearing officer that twenty-five or more of those persons within the voting district, who have been placed on the list of eligible voters by the examiners, have been denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote and are qualified to vote, such determination shall establish a pattern or practice of denial of the right to register or to vote on account of race or color. The establishment of a pattern or practice by the hearing officer shall not be stayed pending final determination by the court.

Sec. 7. (a) Upon establishment of a pattern or practice by the hearing officer, as provided in section 6, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint additional examiners within the voting district as may be necessary who shall determine whether persons within the voting district are qualified to register and to vote. In determining whether such persons are so qualified the examiners shall apply the same procedures and be subject to the same conditions imposed upon the initial examiner under section 4(c), except that a person appearing before such examiner need not have first attempted to apply to a State or local registration official if he states, under oath, that in his belief to have done so would have been futile or would have jeopardized the personal safety, employment, or economic standing of himself, his family, or his property. Such examiner shall in the same manner as provided in section 4(d), certify and transmit lists of persons and any supplements as appropriate, at the end of each month, to the office of the appropriate election officials, the Attorney General, and the attorney general of the State, together with reports of their findings as to those persons found qualified to vote.

(b) Persons placed on lists of eligible voters by examiners shall have the right to vote in accordance with the provisions of sections 4(f) and 4(g).

(c) Challenges to the findings of the examiners shall be made in the same manner and under the same conditions as are provided in section 5.

(d) The Civil Service Commission shall appoint and make available additional hearing officers within the voting district as may be necessary to hear and determine the challenges under this section.

Sec. 8. (a) Whenever a person alleges to an examiner within twenty-four hours after the closing of the polls that notwithstanding his listing under the provisions of this Act he has not been permitted to vote or that his vote was not properly counted (or not counted subject to the impounding provision, as provided in this Act), the examiner shall notify the United States Attorney for the judicial district if such allegation, in his opinion, appears to be well founded. Upon receipt of such notification, the United States Attorney may forthwith apply to the district court for an order of contempt. Whoever, acting under color of law, fails or refuses to permit a person to vote, notwithstanding his listing under this subsection, or fails or refuses to properly count such person's vote, or intimidates, threatens, or coerces, or attempts to intimidate, threaten, or coerce such person for the purpose of preventing such person from voting under the authority of this Act shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever, acting under color of law, within a year following an election in a voting district in which an examiner has been appointed (1) destroys, defaces, mutilates, or otherwise alters the marking of a paper ballot cast in such election, or (2) alters any record of voting in such election made by a voting machine or otherwise, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(c) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether an applicant for listing under this Act shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.

Sec. 9. Consistent with State law and the provisions of this Act, persons appearing before an examiner, shall make application in such form as the Civil Service Commission may require. Also consistant with State law and the provisions of this Act, the times, places, and procedures for application and listing pursuant to this Act and removals from eligibility lists shall be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Civil Service Commission. The Commission shall, after consultation with the Attorney General, instruct examiners concerning the qualifications required for listing.

(b) Notwithstanding time limitations as may be established under State or local law, examiners shall make themselves available every weekday in order to determine whether persons are qualified to vote.

Sec. 10. Any person whose name appears on a list, as provided in this Act, shall be entitled and allowed to vote in the election district of his residence unless and until the appropriate election officials shall have been notified that such person has been removed from such list. A person whose name appears on such a list shall be removed therefrom by an examiner if (1) he has been successfully challenged in accordance with the procedure prescribed in sections 5 and 7, or (2) he has been determined by an examiner (a) not to have voted or attempted to vote at least once during four consecutive years while listed or during such longer period as is allowed by State law without requiring reregistration, or (b) to have otherwise lost his eligibility to vote: *Provided, however,* That, in a State which requires reregistration within a period of time shorter than four years, the person shall be required to reregister with an examiner who shall apply the reregistration methods and procedures of State law which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 11. Examiners, appointed by the Civil Service Commission, shall be existing Federal officers and employees who are residents of the State in which the Attorney General has issued his certification. Examiners shall subscribe to the oath of office required by section 16 of title 5, United States Code. Examiners will serve without compensation in addition to that received for such other service, but while engaged in the work as examiners shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses when away from their usual place of residence, in accordance with the provisions of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended. Examiners shall have the power to administer oaths.

Sec. 12. The provisions of this Act shall be applied in a voting district until, within any twelve-month period, less than twenty-five persons within the voting district have been placed on lists of eligible voters by examiners.

Sec. 13. (a) All cases of civil and criminal contempt arising under the provisions of this Act shall be governed by section 151 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1995).

(b) Any statement made to an examiner may be the basis for a prosecution under section 1001 of title 18, United States Code.

Sec. 14. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 15. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of the provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

RESOLUTION PROTESTING CLOSING OF 31 VA FACILITIES

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Skubitz] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include in the body of the Congressional Record the following resolution passed unanimously by the American Legion Tom Schwinn Post No. 90 at Wellington, Kans., and forwarded to the President of the United States on April 2, 1965.

Resolution of Tom Schwinn Post No. 90, the American Legion, Wellington, Kans., Protesting Proposed Closing of 31 VA Facilities

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has issued an order, dated January 13, 1965, calling for the closing of 16 regional offices, 4 domiciliaries, and 11 hospitals; and

Whereas if the order is effected, the VA would have five less regional offices than it had in 1930 and, for the first time since that date, eight States would have no regional office even though workloads have increased and VA forecasts very substantial further increases in the 30 years ahead; and

Whereas the 11 hospitals being closed have 2,909 beds and, in fiscal year 1964, treated 20,814 patients; and

Whereas the remaining hospitals to which VA intends to transfer patient demand currently have a combined waiting list of 2,457, part of a national waiting list of 13,000; and

Whereas the 4 domiciliaries being closed have 3,220 beds and treated 7,072 in fiscal year 1964; and

Whereas the VA has announced plans to relocate only 2,273 domiciliary members; and

Whereas even that reduced number of members cannot be "relocated" because in most cases the remaining domiciliaries have very substantial waiting lists; and

Whereas the reasons advanced by VA for eliminating regional offices conflict with prior policy expressions by the agency itself and conflict with the judgment and experience of the American Legion on how to render service to veterans; and

Whereas the reasons advanced by VA for closing hospitals have been disproved factually; and

Whereas no reasons have been advanced for the elimination of domiciliaries other than that the members can be taken care of by social security or other general welfare programs; and

Whereas it would appear that this is a move dictated by the U.S. Budget Bureau ignoring all the congressional actions which have created the Veterans' Administration as an independent agency dealing with the problems of the Nation's 22 million war veterans and their dependents; and

Whereas the manner in which the action was reported to the public creates the feeling that this is but one decision of many others to come, which will eventually subordinate the Veterans' Administration medical program to Social Security Administration; and

Whereas it would appear that the regional office closings are but a prelude to the destruction of the VA benefits program as now operated, and the eventual return to a compensation and pension bureau, similar to that in operation at the time the original Veterans' Bureau was created; and

Whereas all of the foregoing and other actions not fully disclosed by the Budget Bureau forecast a frightening future for the manner in which the Nation will consider the problems of the war veteran: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Tom Schwinn Post No. 90, the American Legion, Wellington, Kans., *at this duly convened regular meeting, held on this 1st day of April 1965, in Wellington, Kans.,* That it protests the arbitrary and abrupt decision to close 16 regional offices, 11 hospitals, and 4 domiciliaries, condemns the manner in which the order was arrived at and implemented, and vigorously disagrees with the reasons advanced; and be it further

Resolved, That Tom Schwinn Post No. 90, the American Legion, calls upon all war veterans to protest the action announced January 13, and that such protests include letters to the President of the United States, asking that the order be modified and that the Veterans' Administration be maintained as an independent agency dealing solely with veterans affairs; and be it further

Resolved, That every veteran be asked to write his Congressman and his Senators asking their help in securing a reversal of the closing order and urging that they support a course which will keep the Veterans' Administration as an agency solely devoted to the affairs of veterans; and be it further

Resolved, That the full force and influence of the American Legion be organized to seek appropriate legislation to insure that needed regional offices, hospitals, and domiciliaries will be maintained and to guarantee the integrity and independence of the Veterans' Administration as the central agency for the administration of the Federal veterans benefits and services program.

S. E. SAUNDERS,
Commander.
ELMER D. HEADLEY,
Adjutant.

STUDENT LOAN RECORD STEADY AT KSU

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MIZE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, the National Defense Education Act loan program for college students has recently been under attack for the high national rate of nonrepayment, which is currently 16.4 percent. However, at Kansas State University, located at Manhattan, Kans., in the Second Congressional District, the situation is somewhat better. At KSU, the nonrepayment rate is only 2.6 percent. The following is an article that appeared in the Manhattan Mercury of Friday, April 2, 1965, entitled "Student Loan Record Steady at KSU":

STUDENT LOAN RECORD STEADY AT KSU

There has been increasing national concern over loans to university students which become delinquent. This is particularly true of National Defense Education Act loans, where the Federal Government puts up nine-tenths of the total funds.

But if the situation at Kansas State University is typical of Kansas colleges and universities, the problem is a relatively minor one in this State.

According to comptroller Ralph Perry, the man responsible for collecting on National Defense Education Act loans from Kansas State students, the KSU repayment record not only is better than average, but a surprising number of students—nearly a third of those with accounts in collection stages—are paying off their loans ahead of time.

To put the delinquency situation in perspective, at the national level for every 1,000 students with loans in the collection stage, 166 are delinquent in their payments and 64 of the 166 have been delinquent for more than a year.

In contrast, at Kansas State University, only 26 individuals would be delinquent, and only 3 would have been delinquent more than a year.

Borrowing to pay for a college education is a relatively new phenomena. Ten years ago student loan funds at Kansas State University were standing idle, virtually untouched. But college on credit has become a way of life. Through the National Defense Education Act program, in particular, it is possible for the student to borrow up to $5,000 at low interest rates to finance his college education. Rising tuition and living costs, coupled with a strong demand for college graduates, brought a swift increase in use of credit to pay college expenses—so that today many have borrowed and, at Kansas State at least, all loan funds are committed to capacity.

For the current school year, Kansas State students have borrowed upward of a million dollars through university and university-administered funds to assist them in meeting educational expenses. One of every seven or eight students has borrowed a major sum through one of these funds. The bulk of the loans—more than two-thirds of the total—have been made through the National Defense Education Act program.

"One of the principal purposes of the National Defense Education Act program is to encourage top quality students to go on to college," explains Harold Kennedy, director of the office of aids and awards at Kansas State University. The National Defense Education Act program is making it possible for many more capable young people to get a college education. "It is the only loan program we have from which we can make loans to entering students."

But unique features of the National Dedense Education Act loan program create collection problems not present in conventional loans. For instance, the loans do not begin to earn interest (at 3 percent) until the student has been out of school a full year. And his initial payment, of approximately a tenth of the sum borrowed, is not due until 2 years after he has left school. If, in the meantime, the borrower resumes his schooling or enters the armed services, his obligation is deferred further. And if he teaches, his yearly repayments may be forgiven, up to 5 years.

In selecting National Defense Education Act loan applicants, Kennedy says such factors as financial need, character, scholastic records and scores on entrance tests are considered carefully. Cosigners are required for minors.

Relatively elaborate procedures have been worked out at Kansas State to apprise each out-going student of his obligations concerning National Defense Education Act and other loans, and a series of written notifications and reminders follow as payment on the loan become due or past due. If the student becomes delinquent, and he makes no effort to pay or arrange a satisfactory schedule for payments, his account is turned over to the State attorney general's office for collection. So far records of seven Kansas State National Defense Education Act borrowers have been turned over to the attorney general and three have been collected.

CONGRESSIONAL REFORM AND THE MINORITY NO. 2

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Republican Task Force on Congressional Reform and Minority Staffing, I shall be introducing material into the RECORD from time to time illustrating the need for the task force and presenting the work we are doing. I am now offering No. 2 in this series, the first having appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 30, page 6337.

The power of a majority, especially when it is also in control of the White House, is well nigh irresistible, unless the minority party enjoys certain protections which it does not now have. The following column by Charles Bartlett, which appeared in the April 1 edition of the Washington Evening Star, discusses one aspect of the problem.

The destruction of the Republican Party, as discussed by Mr. Bartlett, could mean the destruction of minority rights in this country and representative government as we have known it.

As a Republican, I naturally regard the portents of the Bartlett column with greater foreboding, perhaps, than the majority side of this House. It is fair to suggest however that the destruction of the Republican Party, which Mr. Bartlett reports to be the goal of the President, could well mean the destruction of effective minority protection in the United States.

The article follows:

JOHNSON AIMS AT EXTINCTION OF GOP

(By Charles Bartlett)

While Lyndon B. Johnson works as President to bury partisanship in a spirit of consensus, he is working as a Democrat toward the extinction of the Republican Party in the congressional elections of 1966.

The crucial aspect of these contests to the GOP is marked by a spreading reference to them as the last stand. Key Republican stratigists recognize that the party's failure to demonstrate a residual vigor in 1966 will be a long step toward oblivion.

The President's interest in these contests goes beyond an anxiety to protect his margins in Congress. He instinctively eyes the record set in 1934 when Franklin Roosevelt bucked precedent to augment his party's congressional majorities. No President, before or since, has matched this feat in an off-year election. Even Roosevelt went on, after his great personal victory in 1936, to lose 71 House seats in 1938.

The Democrats' retention of their 295 seats in 1966 would be a striking tour de force. About 19 of these seats were won by less than 5,000 votes in the anti-Goldwater sweep and more than 20 of them had previously gone to the Republicans by over 55 percent of the vote. The Republicans now say they cannot claim victory in 1966 unless they recapture at least 40 districts.

Johnson is meeting this challenge with a resourceful effort to help the 68 freshman Democrats sew themselves into their seats. The talents of the Democratic National Committee are being mobilized to work with these freshmen to win popular recognition at home. If these new Members wish to make a radio broadcast, mail a newsletter or deliver a speech, they can summon public relations specialists from the national committee. They can even seek funds to soften the expense of visits home.

This is estimable assistance to the funeral director from Syracuse, the accountant from

Erie, the machinist from Oshkosh, and the others who rode into office on the Johnson wave. Their surprise compounded by their confusion at being in Washington normally would delay a swift start at the big task of getting reelected. Now they can lean on experts as they wrap themselves in the cloak of the Great Society.

The Democrats have other factors working for them in the 1966 elections. A new Republican splinter group, the American Conservative Union, already has opened offices in Washington with the aim of fielding congressional candidates in 1966. The strenuous exertions by Republican leaders to fabricate issues against the Johnson program are somewhat muffled by the Republican Senate leader EVERETT DIRKSEN, who occasionally seems to prize his standing with the White House more than the chance to make party points.

One overlooked factor is that the 1964 election left only three States (Idaho, Kansas, and South Dakota) in which the Governor and both branches of the State legislature are Republican. Under the congressional reapportioning proposal now before Congress, about 130 districts would become subject to alteration by State action. Since changes in the boundaries of these districts will affect contiguous districts, the predominantly Democratic States governments may draw new lines for more than 150 congressional districts.

The Republicans are undertaking to meet the challenge of 1966 by raising $2 million that will be spent in 100 critical districts. They are seeking this money in special meetings of large contributors around the country and in mail appeals that ask, "Is this the beginning of the end of our two-party government?"

The response to this special drive has not yet revealed any fervent determination to save the GOP in the 1966 elections. About 60 rich St. Louis Republicans, all past donors of $1,000 or more to party campaigns, gathered at one of these special meetings last week and pledged $12,000, or slightly less than $200 each.

The Republican field men do find promising signs that impressive candidates will be avialable, especially in the districts that were stanchly Republican before Goldwater. To the extent that his defeat cleaned out weak incumbents in 1964 and created openings for abler Republicans in 1966, Goldwater may yet be counted a blessing by his party.

The potential of the South, where 41 districts were uncontested by Republicans in 1964, is obscured by the racial smoke. Some insight into the party's 1966 outlook in that region will be gained from the June 15 by-election in South Carolina. The Republicans have noted that the new Democratic House Members from the South frequently oppose the administration in their votes.

But the Northern Democratic freshmen are playing it extremely close of Johnson and his program. Their political careers and the President's chance of matching Roosevelt's feat will hang heavily upon the luster in November 1966 of the national administration.

WAR TURNING OUR WAY: BEECH

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday in the Chicago Daily News, Keyes Beech of the Daily News Foreign Service wrote a very important report from Saigon—actually, the dateline is Hong Kong—for the Chicago Daily News headlined, "War Turning Our Way: Beech."

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Keyes Beech is one of the most highly respected foreign journalists in this world, respected not only in all quarters of America but in international circles.

Mr. Speaker, it is more than significant in my judgment that this report should come at this time. It is particularly significant that so highly respected, reputable and competent international observer should note that the war is turning our way.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Keyes Beech says in his report as follows:

WAR TURNING OUR WAY: BEECH

(By Keyes Beech)

HONG KONG.—The war for South Vietnam which was going so nicely for the Communists only a few months ago, has gone sour and nobody in the enemy camp seems to know what to do about it.

Of the three parties most vitally concerned—Hanoi, Peiping, and Moscow—Hanoi is most unhappy of all. North Vietnam's big brothers, Red China and the Soviet Union, are locked in a bitter quarrel over how and what to do about rescuing their little brother from continuing U.S. air attacks.

Both, despite a great deal of tough talk, have been careful to hedge their commitments. Talk about Russian "volunteers" fighting side by side with their Vietcong brothers in the jungles of Southeast Asia draws nothing more than derisive hoots of laughter from Hong Kong-based experts.

China has threatened to send "selected individuals" and keep up the flow of arms and ammunition. This sounds like more of the same. And it's a far cry from the Korea-type war Peiping was threatening a few months ago.

Meanwhile, it's North Vietnam that's being bombed almost daily with increasing intensity. Its coastal shipping is screened by U.S. 7th Fleet vessels for southbound arms shipments. Its ports are under constant scrutiny and subject to attack any time. And the signs are multiplying that the long war in the South has become a real drain on the limited resources of the Hanoi regime.

Watchers here find it hard to believe reports from Moscow that Peiping has barred overland passage of Soviet military supplies to Hanoi. Yet they concede the Chinese are quite capable of doing just that.

After all, the Chinese are the people who a few years ago tossed bales of anti-Soviet propaganda off Russian trains at every station—until Moscow put a stop to it.

The Chinese Embassy in Kabul, Afghanistan, denied Thursday that Peiping is obstructing Soviet efforts to send aid to North Vietnam overland through China, the Associated Press reported.

Red China's hatred of Moscow almost matches its hatred of the United States. In some respects it's more virulent because Peiping considers the Soviet leaders traitors to the Communist cause.

The reason is not hard to find. With Soviet air power and nuclear weapons, Peiping could deal with the American imperialist aggressors on more than equal terms. Without them the Chinese Communist leaders are reduced to raging impotence.

Quite possibly the Chinese are blocking Soviet supplies from reaching Hanoi in a desperate bid to force Moscow into a united front against the United States.

There's good reason to believe the Chinese Reds are confused and uncertain as a result of U.S. determination to carry the war to North Vietnam. The U.S. bombings introduced a totally new and upsetting element into the war.

According to Mao Tse-tung's reckoning, the United States was really a paper tiger because when the crunch came the Americans would never use the power at their disposal.

Ironically the Chinese leaders were counting on world opinion, for which they personally have complete contempt, to stay the American hand.

But Americans seized upon the Communist attack on Pleiku February 7 as a reason to go ahead and do what they thought best. More and more Pleiku looks like the turning point of the war.

Peiping and Hanoi apparently are still betting they can force a political decision in South Vietnam by military means before North Vietnam is seriously hurt by American air raids.

A Communist military offensive in South Vietnam may be in the offing. If so, it doubtless will be accompanied by a political offensive to take the war to the conference table.

Mr. Speaker, it would be my hope that those who have been trying to force President Johnson into negotiations at this time when we are making progress in Vietnam, will take a look and carefully read Mr. Beech's very timely report.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question in my mind but what President Johnson's decision to strike back at the Communists in Vietnam will go down in history as a monument to his good judgment and indeed is going to secure that land for the freedom and democracy that the people of South Vietnam so urgently want.

FIRST NUCLEAR REACTOR IN SPACE

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, within the past 48 hours our Nation accomplished another first in its competition with the Soviet Union for the exploration and conquest of space. On Saturday, April 3, from Vandenberg Air Base, the United States launched the first nuclear power reactor for space application—the SNAP-10A 500-watt nuclear reactor. On April 3, at approximately 8:06 p.m., eastern standard time, after it successfully had been placed in orbit, a signal was transmitted to the nuclear powerplant approximately 700 miles out in space to bring the reactor into operation—the first time a nuclear reactor has been operated in space.

As chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I want to congratulate all the personnel of Atomics International, the Lockheed Corp., the Air Force, and the Atomic Energy Commission, who worked on this project and who successfully brought it to fruition. They have justified the faith the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Congress placed in them.

Lest it be forgotten, this project would have been canceled and the flight test would not have taken place had it not been for the actions of the Joint Committee and the Congress. One year ago at this time the executive branch of the Government, because it did not have an immediate requirement for the SNAP-10A project, had canceled its planned flight. The joint committee successfully convinced the executive branch to reinstate the flight test by authorizing the cost to be funded by the AEC in lieu of the Air Force. Subsequently, in September of last year we, for the first time, ascertained that the U.S.S.R. was working on an almost identical project, the Romashka.

Had it not been for the actions of the legislative branch, the United States would have been deprived of another first in its competition with the Soviets but, more important, we would not be able to obtain needed factual data on the actual operation of atomic reactors in space.

Any nation that seriously intends to be a leader in the conquest of space must ultimately depend upon atomic energy. We have taken the initial step in the attainment of this leadership.

To my colleagues in the Congress I cite the SNAP-10A as one more project to be added to that list of nuclear developments which would have been delayed or doomed to cancellation had it not been for the active influence and prodding by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. These former projects included:

First. The nuclear submarine program;

Second. The hydrogen bomb;

Third. The food irradiation program; and

Fourth. In 1961, the first launch of a nuclear isotope powered navigation satellite. This satellite isotopic power device is still operating and producing electricity today.

There are those who decry what they believe to be an inability of the legislative branch to effectively and positively influence policy decisions in this country. The decision to flight-test the SNAP-10A nuclear powerplant was made and directed through the influence of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and the Congress. It is not the first time we have been responsible for a major policy decision, nor will it be the last.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Record at this point in my remarks the following materials:

First. Excerpts from Senate Report No. 987 and House Report No. 1332, submitted by Senator John O. Pastore and myself from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, April 1964, in which the joint committee recommended to the Congress that it override the executive branch decision to cancel SNAP-10A and to authorize its flight test during the coming year.

Second. Background information and description of the SNAP-10A project.

Third. Congratulatory telegrams to Dr. Chauncey Starr, of Atomics International, and Mr. Reginald Kearton, of the Lockheed Corp., from Congressman Chet Holifield, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and Senator John O. Pastore, vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Fourth. SNAP-10A launch and test statistics prepared by the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Excerpts from Senate Report No. 987 and House Report No. 1332, submitted by Senator John O. Pastore and myself from the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, April 1964, in which the joint committee recommended to the Congress that it override the executive branch decision to cancel SNAP-10A and to authorize its flight test during the coming year:

(9) SATELLITE AND SMALL POWER SOURCES

A. AEC request

The Atomic Energy Commission requested $73 million for the satellite and small power sources (SNAP) program for fiscal year 1965. This amount is $4.5 million less than the level of funding for fiscal year 1964.

The SNAP program involves the development and testing of long-lived, lightweight, compact nuclear-electric power sources for space vehicles and other specialized applications.

The SNAP program has three major subdivisions: (1) The development of lower power electrical generators utilizing isotopes as the source of energy ($8 million requested by AEC for fiscal year 1965); (2) the development of medium-power electric generators utilizing a compact reactor as the source of heat energy ($48 million requested by AEC for fiscal year 1965); and (3) the advanced space power systems directed at the development of high power for use in large space systems ($17 million requested by AEC for fiscal year 1965).

B. Committee action

The committee has recommended an authorization of $77,600,000 for the SNAP program in fiscal year 1965, or $4.6 million more than the amount requested by the Atomic Energy Commission.

Specifically, the committee's authorization is intended to provide for a flight test of the SNAP-10A reactor in the spring of 1965 at an estimated cost in fiscal year 1965 of $14.6 million. Although the AEC requested funds for such a flight test in its submission to the Bureau of the Budget for fiscal year 1965, funds for this purpose were not included in the Commission's final submittal to the Congress.

As a matter of background, it may be well to review the history of the SNAP-10A project. SNAP-10A is a compact reactor designed to provide approximately 500 watts of auxiliary electric power for space applications. It has been under development for a period of over 7 years at a cost of approximately $100 million.

Early in fiscal year 1964, the Department of Defense placed the SNAP-10A development flight test in a lower priority category on the basis that no immediate and urgent requirement existed for SNAP power units. As a result of this decision, the flight-test portion of the program was canceled despite the fact that the project stood on the threshold of its "payoff."

In the course of its hearings, the committee was given firm assurance by the principal contractors in the SNAP-10A program and the responsible Government agencies, that SNAP-10A could be ready for a flight test in the early spring of 1965.

The committee believes that flight test of SNAP-10A should be conducted for a number of important reasons. It is necessary to the future of the SNAP program that certain questions associated with the operation of nuclear reactors in a space environment be resolved. But, more importantly, the flight test of SNAP-10A will be invaluable in demonstrating to potential users the reality of nuclear reactor systems for space applications. A successful demonstration flight will permit potential users to factor nuclear power into their future plans. Finally, the flight will be another "first in space" for the United States—a demonstration of the practical use of nuclear reactor systems for power in outer space.

The committee's decision to authorize appropriations for a SNAP-10A flight test is based upon a careful evaluation of the technical progress of the program and the potential of nuclear reactors in space. The committee's decision has come after extensive discussions with representatives of the executive branch, including the strongest possible representations by the committee at the highest levels of Government.

In a larger sense, a fundamental principle is involved in flight-testing SNAP-10A. This reactor system is but one example of several atomic energy projects which have been stopped just short of their "payoff" demonstration, despite the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars in research and development. It has become all too common at the critical point of demonstration for the user agency to declare that "no requirement" exists for the product of the research and development program. Whether the word "requirement" is used or some other reason is given, the fact is that important research and development programs are being terminated just short of their goals.

It is the committee's experience that first-of-a-kind devices are not utilized until they are first demonstrated in their intended environments. As an example, the committee recalls the 2-year delay involved in obtaining a flight test of the first isotopic power supply in space. It was only after the intervention of the committee that a flight test occurred and thereafter that requirements for these isotopic power devices evolved. Today, isotopic nuclear power supplies perform a number of important missions in the national space program. It is the committee's view that if we are to realize the maximum advantage from our investment in SNAP-10A development, a flight test must take place.

Finally, the committee wishes again to express its grave concern over the developing trend toward cancellation of successful development projects immediately prior to their actual demonstration. If this trend continues, it is the committee's view that research and development programs will be increasingly called into question by the Congress and the public with unfortunate consequences for the Nation's scientific and technological development.

In order to partially offset the additional funds required for the SNAP-10A test, the committee believes that certain other SNAP work should be deferred as a matter of priority. Accordingly, the committee recommends a reduction of $10 million in SNAP system improvement work, such as the Mercury-Rankine cycle development. It is the committee's judgment that this work, even if it proves successful, will not be incorporated in practical devices unless there is a path-breaking test of the SNAP-10A reactor. It is, therefore, in the overall long-range interests of the SNAP program to defer a portion of the system improvement work.

Finally, the committee wishes to express a word of caution concerning the advanced space power systems program (SNAP 50). The committee understands that this program may ultimately cost in excess of $1 billion. First, the committee questions whether a level of funding such as that proposed for fiscal year 1965 ($17 million) is adequate to permit significant progress in view of the overall task envisioned in SNAP 50 development. Second, the committee believes it is essential that in a program in this magnitude, clear benchmarks be established in order to have a basis for evaluating the periodic progress and technical feasibility of SNAP 50. The committee intends to follow this program very closely with these factors in mind.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION AND DESCRIPTION OF SNAP-10A

SNAP-10A FACT SHEET

Thermoelectric conversion—the conversion of heat into electricity through the use of thermocouples—requires no moving parts and thus is suitable for use in space power systems, where high reliability is required.

The Atomic Energy Commission became interested in 1958 in applications of the thermoelectric technique to space power systems. In December 1960, the Commission established the SNAP-10A program. Under contract to the AEC, Atomics International began development at Santa Susana, Calif., of a SNAP-10A power system employing a nuclear reactor and a thermoelectric converter.

The prime purpose of the SNAP-10A program is to develop a nuclear reactor power unit capable of producing a minimum of 500 watts of electricity for 1 year in space. Collateral aims are to demonstrate the usefulness of nuclear power in space, verify that nuclear power can be used safely in space, and provide data that will lead to development of larger and more advanced systems.

SNAP-10A has evolved through its development cycle to flight readiness. Under the encouragement of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of the Congress, funds were authorized for a flight test in 1965. SNAP-10A is the first reactor to be tested in space. As the Joint Committee noted, it will be another "first in space" for the United States—a demonstration of the practical use of nuclear power reactor systems in outer space.

SNAP-10A REACTOR

The SNAP-10A reactor weighs only 250 pounds. At its heart is the core vessel, a steel tank 9 inches in diameter and 15½ inches high. Each element consists of a rod of fuel-moderator material, a homogeneous mixture of zirconium hydride—the moderator—and uranium 235—the fuel. The uranium 235 fuel accounts for 10 percent of the weight of the mixture.

Thirty-seven cylindrical fuel-moderator elements are packed vertically into the core vessel. The fuel-moderator rod is clad with Hastelloy, a high temperature nickel-based metal alloy.

The reactor coolant is a liquid alloy of sodium and potassium metals (NaK). The NaK coolant is pumped upward into the core vessel, passing through the spaces between the fuel elements and becoming heated from 872° F. to 990° F. It passes out of the core tank into tubing which leads to the thermoelectric converter. The NaK pump, mounted on top of the reactor, has no moving parts. It is powered by a thermoelectric generator. A cross-shaped radiator rejects excess heat from the pump to space.

SNAP-10A REFLECTOR

A beryllium metal reflector about 2½ inches thick surrounds the reactor core vessel. In addition to reflecting neutrons back into the core vessel, the reflector provides for reactor control. Four semicylindrical sections (drums) of the reflector can be rotated to vary the rate of neutron leakage, and thus to control the chain reaction.

Once a SNAP-10A reactor has reached orbit, the release of pins, acting as mechanical stops, permits the reflector control drums to be rotated inward to start the nuclear chain reaction in the core. Two drums are driven in immediately by springs. The other two are rotated very slowly by means of electric motors. Once the reactor is stabilized at a desired power level, the SNAP-10A system will use no moving parts.

The reflector is split into two halves. They are held together around the reactor core by metal bands which can be broken to release the reflector either by ground command or by reentry heating. Without the reflector, the reactor cannot operate.

SNAP-10A CONVERTER

Thomas Seebeck discovered in 1821 that when heat is applied to the junction of two dissimilar conductors, a voltage can be measured across the cold terminals of the two materials. The Seebeck effect, or thermoelectricity, did not find practical application until the advent of semiconductor materials in the 1950's led to creation of more efficient thermoelectric materials. Because thermoelectric direct conversion involves no moving parts, it has obvious reliability benefits which are particularly valuable for space application.

The SNAP-10A thermoelectric converter is mounted around the surface of a cone-shaped corrugated titanium support structure. The NaK coolant flowing out of the reactor enters 40 parallel tubes arranged around the conical surface of the support structure. Seventy-two pellets of two types of germanium-silicon thermoelectric material are mounted along each NaK tube. (Twenty-four pellets form one module.) Each pellet is electrically insulated from the NaK tube by an insulating disk at the base of the pellet. A copper strap joins the hot ends of each pair of pellets. An aluminum radiator plate joins the cold ends of each pair of pellets and provides a means of rejecting excess heat to space. The radiator plates are wired so as to provide a series of parallel circuits. Thus, if part of the converter becomes inoperative, the rest will continue to operate. The entire converter produces at least 500 watts at 28.5 volts.

The converter has been subjected to exhaustive tests. Some thermoelectric modules have been tested for more than 12,000 hours. Total test time for all modules is more than one-half million hours.

SNAP-10A SYSTEM

The SNAP-10A reactor is mounted on top of a conical support structure. Suspended below the reactor inside the support structure is a shield of lithium hydride encased in steel. The shield protects the space vehicle payload from neutron radiation.

Most of the electronics for SNAP-10A are mounted at the base of the support structure. Instrumentation includes an automatic startup controller and about 75 pounds of equipment to monitor the operation of the reactor and converter.

The SNAP-10A system is 12 feet high with a base diameter of 5 feet. It weighs 970 pounds.

DEVELOPMENT AND TESTING

After withstanding the rocket launching, SNAP-10A is expected to operate reliably despite the heat and radiation it creates and the effects of vacuum and possible meteoroid attack.

Great obstacles had to be overcome simply to find the materials, structures and overall design that would meet the size, weight, power, and lifetime requirements for a space reactor powerplant. In addition, years of development and testing were required to assure that materials, subassemblies, and the complete system would operate despite shock, vibration, heat, radiation, and the peculiar effects of the absolute vacuum of space.

The conditions of launch and space operation have been duplicated to the extent possible in ground tests. The final preflight system qualification testing included operation of three complete SNAP-10A systems—two of them with electrically heated NaK and the third with the reactor and converter in flight configuration inside a vacuum chamber.

FACTORY-TO-FLIGHT SEQUENCE

After assembly of the system, the fuel was loaded into the core and the reactor was brought to criticality without coolant. The reactor was operated at very low power to avoid a buildup of fission products. Necessary adjustments in the fuel loading were then made. The top of the core vessel and NaK pump were welded in place and the system was loaded with NaK coolant. Electrical heaters brought the NaK to operating temperature and the reactor was again operated at low power. Final adjustments in the reflector thickness were made to assure the reactor will operate at design temperature and power.

The system was shut down and the reflectors were removed and replaced by a safety sleeve to prevent accidental operation. The SNAP-10A unit and its reflector subassembly were shipped separately to the launch site. At the site the reactor and its reflector were reunited but with various constraints to prevent operation. The system was then mated to an Atlas-Agena vehicle and final checkout activities were conducted. The ground safety contraints were then removed and the launch vehicle was fueled.

When a proper orbit is attained, a radio command to the spacecraft will initiate startup of the power system. When the system heats up to a few hundred degrees, a heat shield which has covered the radiator-converter to prevent the NaK from freezing will be ejected. The reactor will reach full power about 24 hours after launch and will be in self-controlled power operation about 72 hours after launch.

SAFETY

Safety has been a prime consideration throughout the design, development, fabrication, and testing of SNAP-10A. The reactor has been designed so that a chain reaction can be started only under controlled conditions. Assembly and prelaunch operations have been planned to permit unrestricted access to the system anytime up to the launch without radiological hazard to personnel.

Safety during prelaunch, launch, and possible abort situations is enhanced by the fact that the reactor will not be operated until the system is in a proper orbit. When the system was first assembled, it was operated at very low power to ascertain the necessity for adjustments in the fuel load. The low level of power prevented a buildup of fission products.

The system will be placed in an orbit of sufficient duration to permit decay of radioactive material before reentry. In addition, it has been designed to facilitate breakup, burnup and dispersal at a high altitude during reentry.

Upon completion of its mission, the power system will be shut down by ground command.

Under the AEC's aerospace safety program, extensive tests have been conducted to confirm the safety characteristics of SNAP-10A. SNAP-10A mockups have been subjected to various possible launch abort conditions including violent impact, propellant fire and explosion.

A reactor core was tested to destruction in a tank of water at the AEC's National Reactor Testing Station to ascertain the maximum energy released under the abnormal condition of water immersion. In the test the reactor destroyed itself by undergoing a nuclear excursion.

Reentry disassembly conditions were confirmed by a suborbital reentry flight test conducted at the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Wallops Island, Va., station. (See attached SNAP program fact sheet for further details of the safety program.)

FUTURE DEVELOPMENT

The primary purpose of SNAP-10A is to prove the feasibility of nuclear power in space. For certain missions requiring long duration, operation regardless of sunshade orientation and 500 watts of electrical power, SNAP–10A can qualify as an operational power source. More importantly, however, the SNAP–10A program has provided a foundation for nuclear space power. Technology developed under the program is already far enough advanced to permit development of systems producing up to tens of kilowatts of power. Thus SNAP–10A is the stepping stone to the large nuclear systems which must precede large-scale exploration of space and the planets.

FUNDING

The cost of the SNAP–10A program from July 1959, through June 1965, will be about $111,800,000 of which $83,400,000 is funded by the AEC and $28,400,000 by the Air Force. Of the total figure, $65,600,000 is for the development and testing of the nuclear space power system (including the flight systems) and $46,200,000 is for the development and testing of space vehicle equipment, booster and space vehicles and associated launch and satellite tracking services.

Dr. CHAUNCEY STARR,
Los Angeles, Calif.:

On behalf of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I want to congratulate you, Herman Diekamp and all the people at Atomics International who worked on the SNAP–10A project. You and your associates can take justifiable pride in giving our country a recommendable first in the field of space exploration. You have justified the faith that the Joint Committee exhibited in reinstating this project.

CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Dr. CHAUNCEY STARR,
Los Angeles, Calif.:

Congratulations to you, Herman Diekamp, and all the personnel at Atomics International who made the SNAP–10A a complete success. You and your associates have added to the prestige of our country through the successful design and operation of the first nuclear power reactor to be operated in space.

Senator JOHN O. PASTORE,
Vice Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. REGINALD KEARTON,
Atherton, Calif.:

On behalf of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, I want to congratulate you, Bill Wright, Robert Johnson and all the people at Lockheed who worked on the SNAP–10A project. The United States has become the first nation to operate a nuclear power reactor in space through the capable efforts of you and your associates. You fully met your commitments and justified the faith that the Joint Committee had in you and exhibited in reinstating the flight test.

CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

Mr. REGINALD KEARTON,
Atherton, Calif.:

You said you could do it and you did it. Your personal efforts have made it possible for the United States to be the first country to operate a nuclear reactor in space. Congratulations to you, Bill Wright, Bob Johnson and all your associates at Lockheed who made the SNAP–10A project a success.

Senator JOHN O. PASTORE,
Vice Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.

SNAP–10A LAUNCH AND TEST STATISTICS PREPARED BY THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON ATOMIC ENERGY

Launch: 4:25 p.m. e.s.t., April 3, 1965.

Orbit attained: Perigee—689 nautical miles, apogee—718 nautical miles.

Reactor startup signal transmitted to SNAP–10A reactor at 8:06 p.m. e.s.t., April 3, 1965. Full power attained at 5:00 a.m. e.s.t., April 4, 1965.

Electrical output: Approximately 600 watts.

Launching engines: First stage—Atlas; second stage—Agena.

Test Objectives:

Primary objective is to determine reactor powerplant operating characteristics in the space environment.

Secondary objectives include:

(a) The test of an ion space propulsion engine for the U.S. Air Force;

(b) Obtaining mapping and surface triangulation data for the U.S. Army;

(c) Obtaining micrometeorite and atmospheric density data; and

(d) The conduct of other space experiments.

REACTOR IN ORBIT

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. HOSMER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, April 3, 1965, the first reactor was launched into space from Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif. Upon achieving the planned 700-nautical-mile orbit around the earth, the reactor was started and is now operating at its full designed power.

The SNAP–10A reactor—powered conversion system generates more than 500 watts of useful electrical power for space power applications.

In the fall of 1963 the Defense Department failed to approve Air Force funding for a SNAP–10A flight test program. The AEC requested the necessary funds for a flight test program but these were disallowed by the Bureau of the Budget.

Last year the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, in its review of the AEC's authorizing legislation, recognized the importance of conducting a flight test program.

It felt that it is not enough just to develop a system of this sort and put it on the shelf. It is important that the developed system be tested in the environment for which it was intended to be used. NASA, DOD and commercial communication companies are unwilling to use a product that has not been completely tested and rightly so.

The joint committee, sensing the importance of a flight test, recommended to the Congress in April of last year that funds be authorized and appropriated for a flight test to be conducted in the spring of 1965.

As in most large undertakings of this nature, the success of this project was the result of a coordinated effort among a large number of people in several major organizations. The reactor was designed and constructed by Atomics International under contract to the Atomic Energy Commission; the Atlas booster was provided by General Dynamics Corp.; and the Agena second stage was produced and modified by Lockheed Missiles & Space Center—both under contract to the Air Force. Space Systems Division is also responsible for tracking and data acquisition during the SNAP–10A test program. The launch was conducted at Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif., by the Air Force Systems Command's Space Systems Division.

All of the participants deserve credit for a job well done. It has resulted in another first in space for the United States—the first nuclear reactor to be operated in orbit.

It must be noted, however, that congratulations to these participants would not now be in order except for the fact that the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy hauled the flight test program back off the shelf last year, insisted that it be carried forward, and successfully recommended to the Congress that the necessary funds be provided for doing so.

Moreover, to give credit where credit is really due, it is both fair and honorable to relate that the Joint Committee's motivation was inspired almost singlehandedly by one man, it's present chairman, the gentleman from California, Mr. HOLIFIELD. America would have no reactor in space except for CHET HOLIFIELD's vision, insistence, and persuasion. America deserves to be proud of her accomplishments. America also deserves to take pride in a son like this whose actions have spurred them.

DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the challenges of mid-20th-century America is the survival of our cities. We are an urban nation, and today's frontier is not on the farm—but in the city. President Johnson recognized this challenge in his excellent message on the cities and in his advocacy of a new Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Today I have introduced the administration's bill to create a Cabinet-level Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Our increasing urbanization presents two faces: On the one hand a unique opportunity for an unprecedentedly varied and fulfilling life; on the other hand: congestion, squalor, slums, and racial ghettos.

A Department of Housing and Urban Development would deal with the tremendous opportunities and problems of urbanization. This proposal has been discussed, deliberated, and debated in Congress for the past 12 years. I have testified in support of it before House and Senate committees in both the 87th and 88th Congresses and introduced legislation to accomplish this purpose. I have spoken on the floor of the House in favor of such legislation on a number of occasions. I have spoken in favor of President Kennedy's reorganization plan when it was on the floor.

While Congress has debated this issue for 12 years, the urban centers of this

Nation have increased in population by more than 30 million people. The problems have mounted. Children born 12 years ago have now completed six grades in overcrowded and inadequate schools. Slums have spread; housing has deteriorated; traffic has choked our cities. Polluted air and water continue to choke the inhabitants of our cities. The problems of urbanization have been recognized in no less than six Presidential messages since President Kennedy's state of the Union message January 30, 1961. He said then:

> A new housing program under a new Housing and Urban Affairs Department will be needed this year.

Later in the same year, President Kennedy again called for such a department in his housing message of March 9, 1961:

> Urban and suburban areas now contain the overwhelming majority of our population, and a preponderance of our industrial, commercial and educational resources. The programs outlined above, as well as existing housing and community development programs, deserve the best possible administrative efficiency, stature and role in the councils of the Federal Government. An awareness of these problems and programs should be constantly brought to the Cabinet table, and coordinated leadership provided for functions related to urban affairs but appropriately performed by a variety of departments and agencies.
>
> I therefore recommend—and shall shortly offer a suggested proposal for—the establishment in the executive branch of a new, Cabinet-rank Department of Housing and Urban Affairs.

Four years later, on March 2, 1965, President Johnson delivered his message on the cities which calls attention, once again, to the great needs of urban society.

President Johnson said:

> We want to build not just housing units, but neighborhoods; not just to construct schools, but to educate children; not just to raise income, but to create beauty and end the poisoning of our environment.

I said on the floor of the House 2 years ago:

> I believe that the development of truly effective solutions to the problems of urbanization will require a coordination of effort not only among levels of government but within the Federal Government as well. A piecemeal approach to the problems of our urban regions is a luxury we can no longer afford.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot stress too strongly the need for prompt action. This issue has had ample consideration. Over the past 12 years hearings have been held eight times—four times in the House and four times in the Senate—in 1955, 1959, 1961, and 1962. Favorable reports have been rendered four times on proposals to create a Cabinet-level department to deal with urbanization.

I need not reiterate the problems of the city. The President summed up some of the difficulties facing metropolitan regions in his message on the cities:

> Between 1954 and 1963 per capita municipal tax revenues increased by 43 percent, and local government indebtedness increased by 119 percent. City officials with inadequate resources, limited authority, too few trained people, and often with too little public support, have, in many cases, waged a heroic battle to improve the life of the people they serve.

Mr. Speaker, the creation of a Department of Housing and Urban Development has been urged on many grounds. There is a need for the people of the cities to have a voice in the President's Cabinet. The new Department is needed to study the problems of urbanization and offer technical advice and assistance to local public officials. It has also been pointed out that a Department of Housing and Urban Development could provide the coordination of Federal grants-in-aid that is so necessary to orderly growth and development in our local communities. The need for coordination of Federal programs aiding urban areas is well documented. The Federal Government is now administering over 40 separate programs of financial aid for urban development, involving some 13 departments and agencies. A recent study states:

> No evidence was found to indicate the existence of a unified Federal policy or organizational machinery for coordinating aid programs in the field of urban development (U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Government Operations, "Impact of Federal Urban Development Programs on Local Government Organization and Planning," 88th Cong., 2d sess., May 30, 1964, p. 22).

The need for Government research into urban problems prompted Senator MUSKIE to write in the foreword to another report:

> The implications of the report are disquieting. First, despite the importance of better understanding the problems of urban growth and social and economic well-being, urban research, however defined, appears to constitute only a very small fraction of all research carried on under Federal sponsorship. The survey findings clearly indicate that urban problems are not yet considered a subject to be studied and researched on the same basis as such well-supported Federal research areas as agriculture, water, oceanography, and meteorology. (U.S. Congress, Senate Committee on Government Operations, "Urban Research under Federal Auspices," 88th Cong., 2d sess., Apr. 15, 1964, p. v.)

Senator MUSKIE also noted that there is "a significant absence of a focal point within the Federal Government for consideration of the problems of urban life and development and of research directed to these problems."

Under the administration's proposal the present programs of the Housing and Home Finance Agency would provide the nucleus of the new Department which would "be primarily responsible for Federal participation in metropolitan area thinking and planning."

Two years ago I pointed out on the floor with the House that the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which deals with many of the problems of urbanization, was then responsible for expenditures exceeding those of 4 out of the 10 Cabinet departments.

The HHFA has jurisdiction over programs other than housing. The Community Facilities Administration, a constituent unit of HHFA, is responsible for the public works aspects of the Area Redevelopment Administration and the accelerated public works programs. The Urban Renewal Administration, another constituent unit of HHFA, is responsible for not only the urban renewal program but also the 701 planning grant program. Over 4,000 local communities and metropolitan regions are presently preparing plans under this program. The Office of Transportation in the HHFA has responsibility for the mass transit program.

The coordination of programs affecting urban areas will be facilitated by enacting the legislation which I have introduced today. I urged similar action in the 87th and 88th Congresses. It is past time for Congress to make the Department of Housing and Urban Development a reality.

Mr. Speaker, our cities are indeed in a state of crisis. If we are to confront the problems of urban America on today's frontier of our society, we must mobilize the vast potential resources of America. To fully achieve our potential, we need the tools and an organization. At the Federal Government level a department is needed which will be able to deal across the board with the wide range of problems and possibilities which confront us.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RYAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. I want to compliment the gentleman upon his statement. He has certainly made out an excellent case for the establishment of a new department. I desire to associate myself with his remarks.

Mr. RYAN. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I know he also is anxious that the House face this question and move forward with the program of the President in this area.

THE DEATH OF THE 37TH "BUCKEYE" DIVISION IN THE PROPOSED REORGANIZATION OF U.S. ARMY RESERVE COMPONENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RYAN). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, although I believe that Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara's plan for realinement of the U.S. Army Reserve and the National Guard into a single Reserve force is worthy of study, I question its merit at this particular time. The Communist enemy is on the move throughout the world engaging our forces in open hostilities, yet we hear talk of cutting back our vital civilian Reserve forces. I have studied this situation and my understanding is that the Secretary of Defense has proposed this reorganization and merger for the sake of efficiency and economy. I am not convinced of either.

The proposed reorganization of the U.S. Army Reserve and the National Guard gives rise to a number of questions. For example, are world conditions such that we can safely reduce our Armed Forces? To what extent, in the face of present world conditions, can we cut back on our traditional concepts of the citizen soldier trained through the National Guard and who is thus prepared to serve better our country in the event of emergency? To what extent are the hopes for universal disarmament motivating this reorganization plan? There is no evidence that Soviet Russia is seriously concerned with or disposed toward disarmament. To the contrary, there is an abundance of evidence that Soviet Russia and at least one of her satellite regimes are heating up the armaments race in the Middle East, southeast Asia, and Africa.

I view with serious concern the plan to abolish the fine Ohio 83d Division and the reduction of the 37th National Guard Division to a brigade. My immediate concern is the plan to eliminate the 37th or famed "Buckeye" Division from the active ranks of the National Guard divisions.

The proposed reorganization calls for reduction of the 37th Division to the 37th Ohio Brigade. The brigade will be realined with the 42d New York and the 77th New York Brigades, with the division base in New York.

The brigades, under the 42d Infantry Division of New York, will be split between New York and Ohio. In the opinion of informed observers such an organization plan would lack cohesiveness and unit integrity. Approximately 3 years ago, the Secretary of Defense eliminated four Guard and four Reserve combat divisions, contending that it was unsatisfactory to have divisions split between several States and that such divisions were not as effective as the divisions located entirely within one State. Now it appears the same logic is not being applied to the State of Ohio. Moreover, this proposal would seriously detract from the ability of the State of Ohio to preserve law and order in the event of domestic emergency or disaster.

The molding of separate brigades into effective combat divisions has in the past proven extremely difficult. What will be the proposed command relationship between the brigades, the division and the Adjutant Generals of the separate States? Where a brigade is split from its division base and assigned to another State, who will establish policies for this brigade? Will the division headquarters located in a different State where it is subordinate to the Adjutant General of that State determine standard operating procedures or will the Adjutant General of the State where the brigade is located provide the procedures?

I have expressed my views to the Secretary of the Army, Hon. Stephen Ailes, and the Secretary of Defense, Hon. Robert S. McNamara. The thinking behind the linking of the 37th Division with New York's 42d Infantry Division was to place these high-priority brigades into other States in order to give a greater spread of military equipment into these States which will lose their divisions. Therefore, it is claimed high-priority brigades will be authorized a greater density of equipment.

I have appealed to the Secretary of Defense and to the Governor of the State of Ohio, that the 37th Division which is so deeply meshed with the tradition and heritage of the great State of Ohio, be kept on the active list. The proud "Buckeye" Division which is slated to die, this year, has a record of gallantry and bravery in combat unmatched by any other national guard division.

Mr. Speaker, the distinguished military editor for the Cleveland Press, Robert C. Stafford, recently wrote a series of six articles, outlining the history and exploits of the 37th Division. He has traced the remarkable exploits of the citizen soldiers of Ohio, whom he aptly calls the weekend warriors, through World War I, World War II, and the Korean war. Blazed upon that record of more than 4 decades are the names of Ohio heroes and many inspiring military feats of the famed "Buckeye" Division. This series of articles is a warm tribute to the role of the citizen soldier in the defense of our country and serves as a reminder that care must be exercised in preserving the spirit and traditions which have carried us safely through the crises of war.

By unanimous consent, I include the six articles so ably written by Robert C. Stafford, military editor of the Cleveland Press:

THIRTY-SEVENTH DIVISION: 1917-65—WEEKEND WARRIORS EARNED RESPECT OF PROFESSIONALS

(By Robert C. Stafford)

(First of a series)

The 37th Infantry Division, 1917-65.

Rest in peace.

If the proud Buckeye Division with the fried egg shoulder patch dies late this year, as the Defense Department indicates, it will deserve its peace.

For it has a record of gallantry and bravery in combat unmatched by any other National Guard division, of conduct above and beyond the call of duty in three wars and of patriotic response to any call to service in peace as well as war.

The 37th's achievements are all the more remarkable because they were accomplished by weekend warriors—citizen-soldiers who were more citizen than soldier when called to war duty. They became professionals on the fighting fronts where they earned the respect and fear of the Germans in World War I and the Japanese in World War II.

The division's role in the Korean war was less dramatic, although useful. Called to Federal duty, the division sent most of its personnel to Korea as replacements to other units while the remainder served as a cadre to train recruits.

The proud Buckeyes protested in vain at the breakup of their division as a fighting force.

In both the World Wars, the 37th suffered more than its share of casualties: In World War I, 970 dead or missing and 7,186 wounded, gassed, or injured during its comparatively short time in combat; and in World War II, 1,852 killed or missing and 8,218 wounded in action.

The division earned more than its share of decorations: in World War I, 1 Medal of Honor, 2 Distinguished Service Medals, 27 Distinguished Service Crosses, and 21 citations for gallantry in action; in World War II, 7 Medals of Honor, 109 Distinguished Service Crosses, 4 Distinguished Service Medals, 939 Silver Star Medals, 61 Legion of Merit Medals, 94 Soldier's Medals, and 6,366 Bronze Star Medals.

It captured more than its share of prisoners: in World War I, 26 officers and 1,496 enlisted men; in World War II, 2,180 Japanese.

It certainly spent more than its share of time in the front lines in World War II: an amazing total of 592 days in combat, during which time it accounted for 33,500 Japanese deaths.

The division had another distinction in World War II—its top officer, Maj. Gen. Robert S. Beightler, was the only National Guard division commander who retained his command throughout the war. He had the pleasure of accepting the surrender of the "Butcher of Bataan," Gen. Tomoyuki Yamashita, ending the war in the Philippines.

The divisions heroes are too numerous to record. First there was Lieut. Albert E. Baesel, of Berea, who died winning the Medal of Honor, the Nation's highest award, near Ivoiry, France, September 27, 1918, in the 148th Infantry Regiment.

He was killed trying to rescue a wounded comrade under heavy enemy fire. He had just placed the man on his shoulders when both were slain.

Two of the Medal of Honor winners in World War II are of special interest here. Pfc. Frank J. Petrarca, of Cleveland, a medical aid man in the 145th Infantry, and Pvt. Rodger Young, of Tiffin, rifleman in the 148th Infantry, both of whom died in their gallant acts on the same day, July 31, 1943, on New Georgia in the Solomon Islands.

The famous war song, "The Ballad of Rodger Young," was inspired by the hero, who continued to creep toward a Japanese machinegun nest although the rest of his squad had withdrawn. He was wounded three times, the last fatally, as he tossed grenades into the emplacement.

A unique hero who is alive today is a Cleveland investment man—Cecil B. Whitcomb. He is the only man alive who won a Distinguished Service Cross in both World Wars. He also won Purple Hearts for wounds in both wars.

Now the Pentagon's orders seem to mean the end of the 37th Division as it has been known. It is expected to be reduced to a brigade, 5,000 to 6,000 men in size, as well as absorb part of the Ohio 83d Infantry Division of the Army Reserve.

It may still retain the "37" in its name, but it won't be the same.

A division—about 20,000 men in World War I and 14,000 men in World War II—has an identity and a meaning that other units do not. It is organized to be completely self-sufficient, actually an Army in itself, with all elements to supply all its needs under a single commanding general, capable of operating independently or in concert with other fighting units.

A National Guard division, while financed and equipped with Federal funds, is under control of the State until it is called to national duty. Then it comes under Regular Army command.

THIRTY-SEVENTH DIVISION 1917-65—BUCKEYE UNITS REFUSED TO SPLIT UP

(By Robert C. Stafford)

(Second in a series)

The birth of the 37th Division was neither ordinary nor easy. It was, in fact, in violation of direct orders which later were changed when it became clear the Buckeye patriots meant to fight in World War I as a division.

The Ohio National Guard in those days consisted of large numbers of separate, independent units—infantry, cavalry, field artillery, engineers, etc.

All but two regiments and one battalion of the Ohio guard had been mustered into Federal duty in June of 1916 for Mexican border service. These units spent 9 long, hot, tedious months in that area and were en route home for discharge to civilian life when the United States was forced into the war that had been raging in Europe since July 1914.

All the Mexican border troops except two regiments and one battalion of field artillery had been mustered out when the United States declared war April 6, 1917.

Those two infantry regiments remained on Federal duty. The field artillery battalion was at Fort Sheridan, Ill., in the final stages of processing for discharge. Only a day or so from discharge, processing stopped and this unit also stayed on Federal duty.

(Fort Sheridan, Ill., a permanent Army base near Chicago, should not be confused with Camp Sheridan, Ala., where the 37th Division later trained.)

In March, some Ohio Guard units were called up as war hysteria mounted. They were placed on guard duty around the State.

Formation of a division in Ohio long had been a cherished objective. But 2 days after war was declared, the Militia Bureau in Washington, which directed all National Guard operations, ordered that no more Guard units be organized.

The State adjutant general appealed to Secretary of War Newton D. Baker, of Cleveland, who passed the decision on to the judge advocate general, the Army's chief legal officer.

The latter decided, on technical grounds, that Ohio could recruit to the maximum allowed under the National Defense Act. That was 19,200 men, by coincidence almost exactly the strength of a World War I infantry division.

Then it became known that cavalry would not be sent to Europe and at the same time the order went out that 12 batteries of artillery would be needed to complete the division. The Ohio National Guard had 12 troops of cavalry, but not enough artillery.

So, overnight, the 12 troops of cavalry became 12 batteries of field artillery.

One of the cavalry units was the famous First City Troop of Cleveland, formed in 1877. It later became Troop A of the Ohio National Guard, famous as the Black Horse Troop that escorted Presidents at Washington inaugurals.

Another branch of the First City Troop was the lineal antecedent of the present 107th Cavalry Regiment, of Cleveland, a separate unit not part of the division.

The division's 135th Artillery had an even longer history. It dates to 1839 when it was organized as the Clevland Light Artillery, part of the famous old Cleveland Grays. It was the first Cleveland unit in combat in the Civil War.

In June 1917, more obstacles apepared. The Militia Bureau ordered three infantry regiments from the Ohio Guard to join a Mississippi-Louisiana-Arkansas division. The State adjutant general simply ignored the order.

A second telegram repeated the order and it, too, was ignored. At last Gov. James M. Cox wired President Wilson and this brought, within 48 hours, permission to complete the division if it could be done by July 15, only 2 weeks away.

By superhuman effort, the men were recruited and on July 15, 1917, the 37th Division came into formal existence. Under Maj. Gen. Charles G. Treat, a Regular Army man from Maine, the division was ordered to create a new camp for itself on the outskirts of Montgomery, Ala.

This it did, starting absolutely from nothing but pine woods and cotton patches. This became Camp Sheridan, where the Buckeye division trained and hardened itself for combat.

First infantry troops arrived on August 25. By October 24, there were 22,900 enlisted men and 1,009 officers in camp.

Lean and hard in their campaign hats, breeches and puttees, the men of the 37th completed training in May 1918, and the first unit began the oversea movement on May 26.

The Ohio Buckeye division was en route to the trenches of France.

THIRTY-SEVENTH DIVISION: 1917–65—BUCKEYES WON SPURS IN WORLD WAR I ACTION

(By Robert C. Stafford)

(Third of a series)

World War I was the war of the trenches. It was a war of slow, ponderous movement of large masses of troops.

It was a war of weary months of stalemate in France, where Germans and the Allies burrowed themselves into the ground in long muddy trenches and deep, muddy dugouts.

World War I was the one in which poison gas was first used, in which aviation became important, in which heavy armored tanks were developed, superseding horse cavalry.

The 37th Division landed at Brest, on the westerly tip of France. Some units were transported on the *Leviathan*, the huge German liner called the *Vaterland* by the Germans that had been seized in New York when war was declared.

From Brest the Buckeyes rode French trains across the country to the area around Bourmont, in the northeast part of the country.

After 3 weeks of shakedown there, the division on July 23, 1918, moved into the trenches and shed its first blood. It relieved the New York 77th Division on the Baccarat front, near the Swiss frontier west of Strasbourg.

The Baccarat front was called "quiet." But this was only relative. It meant only that neither army had tried a major offensive for some 4 years, during which they occupied zigzag trenches and sniped, patrolled, lobbed mortar shells, and loosed artillery barrages.

Here the Buckeyes suffered their first casualties. First to die were men of the 112th Engineers of Cleveland, killed by an artillery burst back of the lines.

The first man to die at the front was Sgt. Frank L. Knack of Cleveland's 145th Infantry Regiment, killed by machinegun fire August 6.

Here the division captured its first prisoners. Disappointingly, they were deserters. Here, too, the division experienced its first gas attack. Trained and equipped with gas masks, the men were ready and escaped without harm.

The division spent 6 weeks here and then got orders to move on September 12. This time it was to a sector that was not "quiet." It was into the frightful Meuse-Argonne offensive. The division moved into position near Recicourt the night of September 24. It had been raining for days and the earth was saturated.

Just before midnight the next night a rolling barrage opened and at dawn, September 26, the forward elements went "over the top" and fought and slashed their way forward in a pitched battle that lasted all that day, and the next, and the next—and the next.

In the Meuse-Argonne offensive, the 37th Division lost 16 officers killed, 113 wounded and two missing; 352 enlisted men killed, 2,287 wounded and 690 missing. By October 18, however, 128 of missing had been located. The division captured 1,120 of the enemy in 4 days of battle.

The Buckeyes, exhausted and bloodied, were relieved September 30 by the 32d Division and went into rest at Ivoiry, and then returned to Recicourt.

Only a few days later, the battered Ohioans moved to another position, the Pannes-Flirey-Limey sector. This location, part of the famous St. Mihiel front, cost 27 dead or missing and 882 wounded or sick. The division moved again October 15 and 16, this time into Belgium and the fields of Flanders.

In limited combat in a dozen locations, with no heavy battles, from October 22 to November 4, the division lost 374 killed or missing and 1,284 wounded, gassed, or sick. It was a period of almost continuous advance, often bitterly opposed.

When the Armistice came November 11, the 37th Division was alined on the banks of the Escaut River in Belgium and had started to make an assault crossing.

German officers, who had felt the brunt of the 37th's attacks, after the war rated the Buckeye Division as one of the top seven in the American Army.

Sailing from Brest, still under command of Maj. Gen. Charles S. Farnsworth, the division came home in March and April 1919 to tumultuous welcomes, parades and ceremonies in all the cities of Ohio.

Its losses, according to its own records: 655 killed in action; 150 dead of wounds, 1 dead from gas, 56 dead of disease and other causes, 108 missing, a total of 970 dead or missing; 2,775 wounded in action, 98 wounded accidentally, 1,041 gassed, 259 injured, 3,013 sick, a total of 7,186.

THIRTY-SEVENTH DIVISION: 1917–65—NEVER AGAIN—THEN MORE SERVICE

(By Robert S. Stafford)

(Fourth of a series)

The war-weary veterans of the 37th Division, home from France, vowed never again to be caught in a military uniform.

But they didn't mean it. In 1920, the division began rebuilding and many veterans returned to their old units.

Drills and summer camps—duty in the June 1924, Lorain tornado—duty in the 1937 steel strike in Warren—duty in natural disasters, such as floods and blizzards—this was the role of the Ohio National Guard in the peacetime years.

Summer camps were at Ohio's own Camp Perry, with some units going to Camp Knox, Ky. (It is now called Fort Knox, a permanent Army installation and center of armored force training.)

As Hitler and the Nazi legions began to overrun Europe and the Japanese slashed southward along the edge of Asia, war fever and the fear of attack spread over the United States.

Ohio's 37th Division was a crack outfit. It had shown up well at inspections and camps. It had 9,560 men on its rosters when the order came, September 26, 1940, to mobilize for Federal service on October 15—for only a year of duty.

Only a year? The division did not return to home stations until December 1945, with one of the most distinguished records of combat of any division in World War II.

To original roster of Ohioans, Selective Service added 10,200 from this State in the first stages of training. So the division had more than 18,000 Ohioans during the long process of preparation.

The percentage of Ohioans fell, however, as portions of the division were cut away and sent elsewhere and new draftees from all parts of the Nation were added to its ranks.

When the 37th Division first went overseas, about 45 percent of its personnel was from Ohio and by the end of the war the division probably counted no more Ohioans than any other organization in our Armed Forces. But it carried the spirit and identity of Ohio throughout.

The division trained at Camp Shelby, Miss., near Hattiesburg, a city of 20,000. The main force left Ohio for Shelby October 18, 1940, and the tedious hardships began under command of Maj. Gen. Robert S. Beightler.

Then came orders for an additional 18 months of Federal duty and on December 7, 1941, when the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor and war was declared, the length of service no longer mattered.

On the last day of the year, the Cleveland-based 112th Engineers suddenly got orders that whisked it away to Europe. The 34th Division, headed for Europe, needed trained engineers and the 112th was chosen. They never saw their old division again until the war was over.

Then the division itself got orders to move to Indiantown Gap, Pa., to prepare for European duty, and left Shelby in February 1942.

What happened next differs in the official and unofficial versions. Rumor had it the bulk of the division was to sail on the French liner *Normandie*, which burned at the pier in New York causing a change of orders sending the 37th to the Pacific.

Officially, the word was that two trained divisions were needed in the Pacific and the only two ready at the time were the 37th and the 32d. So the 37th turned around and shipped for San Francisco in April and May, picking up the 117th Engineers to replace the missing 112th.

On May 26, the division sailed from San Francisco on six big liners. The Cleveland-based 145th Infantry was on the U.S.S. *Uruguay* which took it to New Zealand. The larger part of the division, however, went to the Fiji Islands, where the 145th later joined them.

The first man of the 145th to step ashore in New Zealand was Sgt. Nathan E. Cook. He had been selected because his name resembled that of Capt. James Cook, British explorer who discovered much of the South Pacific.

The division manned the defenses of the Fijis until April 1943, meanwhile sharpening its combat readiness. On April 6, large elements of the 37th debarked on Guadalcanal, in the Solomon Islands, scene of heavier early fighting and still under frequent raids.

Probably the first man to die from enemy action, even though indirect, was Pvt. Thomas Varney, of the Second Battalion, 145th Infantry, killed when a Japanese dud shell exploded.

The division did not have much longer to wait. In June came orders to move to New Georgia, strongly held by the Japanese.

THIRTY-SEVENTH DIVISION: 1917–65—A JUNGLE HILL CALLED "700" MADE HISTORY

(By Robert C. Stafford)

(Fifth of a series)

Some of the bloodiest, most vicious fighting of the Pacific theater involved the Buckeyes of the 37th Division on New Georgia, Solomon Islands.

That two Buckeyes won posthumously the Nation's highest award, the Medal of Honor, is clue enough.

The Cleveland area's 145th Infantry Regiment and the 148th Infantry Regiment from the western part of the State bore heaviest fighting and heaviest losses.

Main objective was the Munda Airstrip, heavily defended by the Japanese deep in the humid, insect-infested jungle. On July 5, 1943, one battalion of the 145th, one battalion of the 148th and a marine raider battalion landed on New Guinea and began fighting to cut a main supply road.

In the next few days a major part of the division was engaged in inch-by-inch, yard-by-yard, hand-to-hand combat.

It was battle under the most horrible of circumstances, in the steaming jungles where the enemy was only yards away. It was fighting with flamethrowers, grenades, rifles, mortars, and bayonets. The Buckeyes were in combat until August 5 when the Munda airfield fell.

Names still famous came to the fore—Horseshoe Hill, drenched with the blood of both Japanese and Americans; Bibolo Hill, with its pillboxes and trenches; the Japanese machinegun nest where Pvt. Rodger Young, of the 148th Infantry, died winning his Medal of Honor on July 31.

Cleveland's Medal of Honor winner, Pvt. Frank Petrarca, of the 145th Medical Detachment, died the same day, climaxing 3 days of unbelievable heroism.

The brutal fighting concluded with victory, the 37th Division returned, August 15, to Guadalcanal for a rest.

The cost had been high for the division: 19 officers and 217 enlisted men killed and 34 officers and 979 enlisted men wounded or injured. Meantime, the division was credited with killing 1,426 Japanese and taking 20 prisoners.

Again the rest was short lived. On November 8, 1943, the first echelons landed at Empress Augusta Bay on the island of Bougainville.

It was nearly a repeat of New Georgia, hot jungles filled with Japanese and malarial mosquitoes, and of slow, slogging progress forward.

The Americans had a relatively small perimeter around the bay and the Japanese held most of the 125-mile-long island. Sporadic fighting continued until March 1944, when it became clear a major battle was in the making.

This was the Battle of Hill 700, Cleveland's Hill of Heroes, where the defending 145th Infantry threw back wave after wave of suicidal Japanese in a clash of arms that must stand as the high point of the 37th Division's gallant record.

How can such terrible carnage be described? The Japanese sacrificed two divisions in attacks up the steep sides of the hill, strategic key to the Empress Augusta Bay area.

Beginning March 8, for 4 days and nights the battle raged with heavy pounding by the Cleveland 135th Artillery, fanatical charges in which Japanese climbed over piles of their own bodies. After one Banzai charge more than 185 bodies were counted in front of one of our machineguns.

Japanese losses only could be estimated. A conservative figure of 4,957 dead on the hill and 1,395 killed by shelling the assembly areas—a total of 6,354 dead, a ratio of 40 to 1 in favor of the 37th Division.

Major hostilities on Bougainville ended in April, but the division remained, mopping up and garrisoning the island until December 15, 1944, when it boarded transports and steamed away for a landing on Luzon, Philippine Islands, and the drive toward Manila.

The 37th, with other divisions, went ashore at Lingayen Gulf, Luzon, January 9, 1945, in the largest single amphibious operation of the Pacific war. It was an unopposed landing and the division moved rapidly inland.

The 145th had a sharp battle for Clark Field outside Fort Stotsenburg at the end of January, and then 145th Infantry and the 148th Infantry slashed their way into Manila in a battle that started February 4. They released 1,275 internees from old Bilibid Prison. In the house-to-house fighting, the Japanese blew up and set fire to much of the city.

The fanatical Japanese fought savagely to hold Manila in a battle that lasted almost a month without letup, each building, each street a separate engagement in itself. Resistance finally ended March 4.

The Japanese lost 16,665 killed in Manila. The 37th Division was credited with 13,006 of them. The Buckeyes lost 461 dead of their own.

The division still was not through with war. On March 29, its 129th Infantry set off for heavy fighting around Baguio, the Philippines summer capital, and the 148th Infantry joined it there until relieved on May 4. The 148th then battled its way along the Balete Pass until May 25.

The 145th, meantime, had one more major conflict—at Mount Pacawagan, a battle that has been overshadowed by earlier clashes. It began April 21 and lasted for 25 days of some of the hardest fighting in the Philippines. The Cleveland regiment lost 100 killed and 476 wounded there.

The last combat for the division occurred August 12 after a tedious push through the Cagayan Valley. It was over then, and by September 10, 1945, the Buckeye Division was headed home at last.

THIRTY-SEVENTH DIVISION: 1917–65—BUCKEYE UNITS FOUGHT ON BATAAN AND IN THE INVASION OF NORMANDY

(By Robert C. Stafford)

(Last of a series)

Several units of the 37th Division were detached from the parent body in World War II and created gallant records of their own.

The first was the 37th Tank Company, of Port Clinton, which was mobilized for Federal service November 25, 1940, and trained for a year at Fort Knox, Ky., and Camp Polk, La. Redesignated Company C, 192d Tank Battalion, it reached Fort Stotsenburg, Luzon, in the Philippines a week before Pearl Harbor.

The Ohioans in this company participated in the first engagement involving U.S. troops in World War II, and also were the first in the American Army to fight tank against tank.

The company moved with the tattered American forces to Bataan and was captured there. The entire company, except one man killed earlier, was in the infamous Bataan death march.

All four of the unit's officers died in enemy prisons. Of the 33 of the company who went overseas, only 10 returned alive, the rest having died in imprisonment or on prison ships.

The 112th Combat Engineer Regiment, headquartered in Cleveland, was called up with the remainder of the division. Its 1st Battalion, a Cleveland outfit, was detached and went to England in January 1942, as part of the 34th Division, retaining the name 112th Engineers throughout the war.

It landed on Omaha Beach, Normandy, on D-Day and won the Distinguished Unit Award for bravery. It was in the St. Lo breakthrough, then drove toward Paris. It entered Belgium on September 8, 1944, and Germany on December 9.

The unit missed the Battle of the Bulge and was in Pilsen, Czechoslovakia, when the war ended. After the war it again became port of the 37th Division.

The 147th Infantry Regiment, one of the original elements of the division, was separated from the main body at Indiantown Gap, Pa., and went to the Pacific via New York and the Panama Canal.

It reappeared alongside the 37th Division on Guadalcanal in November 1942, and fought with the division but not as part of it. In May 1943, it left Guadalcanal under British command. It served in Iwo Jima and then in Okinawa before returning to the United States. It is now part of the 37th Division.

Home again after the war, the Buckeye Division reverted to National Guard status and the calm days of weekly drills and summer camps, rebuilding its strength with new men and a succession of commanding generals.

Before the start of the Korean conflict, the 37th Division was rated one of the best in the country. This, perhaps, led in part to the orders that sent the division once again into Federal service on January 15, 1952, with every prospect of going to Korea.

It went to Korea, sure enough, but not as a division. The bulk of its manpower went as individual replacements to other Army units fighting in Korea.

The division itself—mostly in name only—remained at Camp Polk, La. (now Fort Polk), serving as a training unit through which funneled draftees for final shaping up before shipment to Korea.

It was a disappointing experience and many were angered at what they believed was a broken promise that the Buckeyes would stay together and serve together.

Maj. Gen. Leo M. Kreber, veteran of the division's combat in World War II, was in command as the outfit went to Polk and he remained in command after the return to National Guard status.

When the division went to camp it had 8,500 officers and men. Eighteen months later only 200 officers and 400 enlisted men of the original outfit were in the 37th.

Two years to the day after it entered Korean war service, the division reorganized itself as a National Guard unit of January 15, 1954, with skeleton strength in some 50 units throughout the State.

Now, as it approaches the end of a long and honorable career as a division, the 37th is nearly at authorized strength, some 9,500 men and officers in 97 units in 53 Ohio communities.

Commanded by Maj. Gen. Loren Windom, a decorated veteran who fought with it in World War II, the division will go to what is probably its last summer training, August 14–28, at Camp Grayling, Mich.

Though erased as a division, the exploits of the 37th are indelibly written in the pages of history where they will live forever.

HEARINGS FOR TRAIN DISCONTINUANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. McDOWELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting today a bill to amend section 13(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to impose certain additional and fair conditions on the discontinuance of passenger train operations.

The bill would require that discontinuance of a passenger train may be authorized only after full hearings and upon findings by the Interstate Commerce Commission that:

First, the present or future public convenience and necessity require discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, of the operation of service of such passenger train.

Second, the continued operation of service of such passenger train without discontinuance or change will constitute an unjust and undue burden upon the interstate operations of such carrier or upon interstate commerce.

Third, my bill would require the Interstate Commerce Commission to notify the Governor of the affected State or States in which the train operated 30 days in advance of the hearing.

My bill is similar in these respects to a bill introduced in the Senate by the distinguished senior Senator from Indiana, Mr. HARTKE, and it is backed by railway labor organizations.

Mr. Speaker, I am moved to this action by the fact that discontinuance of Pennsylvania Railroad trains 454 and 455 between Philadelphia, Pa., Wilmington, Del., and Delmar, Del., may be an accomplished fact by April 18.

The discontinuance of the train service between Wilmington and Delmar will leave Delaware without any train service except at Wilmington on the through trains from New York to Washington, D.C.

The withdrawal of passenger trains 454 and 455 will impede the economic growth of Delaware, which is in the midst of tremendous expansion of population and industry.

These are the only passenger trains providing service on the Delmarva Peninsula.

The discontinuance of this service will work a special hardship on the Air Force personnel at the Dover Air Force Base who depend on these trains.

Especially saddening is the fact that the Dover Air Force Base depends on these two trains for the transportation of the bodies of deceased members of the Armed Forces, since DAFB is the center for their arrival from overseas.

It is especially significant, that the Pennsylvania Railroad has previously applied to the Delaware Public Service Commission for the discontinuance of trains 454 and 455, and this application was denied because it was shown that there was, indeed, a public requirement for this service, and that it should be rescheduled to provide daylight service in order that more people could use it.

Since the passage of the present section 13a of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act, hundreds of trains in all parts of the country have been discontinued. There is no evidence that this sweeping result was the intent of the Congress in adopting that section. The provisions of section 13a were enacted to provide a means by which railroads could secure discontinuance of trains for which there was no longer a need, but wholesale discontinuance of trains was certainly not envisioned.

The railroads have been permitted, under the present act, to discontinue trains without public hearings.

When and if hearings were held, the burden of proof has fallen upon the ill-prepared and protesting public to prove that continuance will not be an unfair burden.

It is this burden of proof, and the additional fact that under the present law the railroads may appeal to the courts, and the public cannot, which makes it necessary to change the law without delay.

My proposed bill will place the burden of proof upon the railroads where it belongs. My bill will protect and serve the public interest, which the present law definitely does not.

Unless legislation such as my bill is adopted, we may wake up one of these days to find that all we have is freight service, and that passenger service is a thing of the past.

If this happens, the only thing that can be shipped by train may be livestock.

I believe we need both passenger service and freight service, and that railroads must be required to provide both.

Our Nation cannot afford to lose one passenger train after another.

In a national emergency, such as a war, a civil disturbance, or even in bad weather, in which planes and cars are tied up, how are we going to move the troops necessary to our defense?

If we are going to avoid nationalization of our railroads, then we must see to it that they stay in business. I want the railroads to stay in business and I want them to be prosperous. As a cosponsor of the Mass Transportation Act of 1964, I fully support every effort to improve railroad passenger service in Delaware and throughout the country.

The rail consolidation movement between the Pennsylvania Railroad and the New York Central railroads, now underway, has been presented by its proponents as a plan which would provide badly needed financial help to these two railroads.

However, if the Pennsylvania Railroad is now going to press for the discontinuance of trains 454 and 455, and perhaps other trains as well, what justification is there for merger? I should think very little justification, if indeed, any at all.

I include as part of my remarks the text of my bill, for the information of my colleagues who may be facing a similar problem in their congressional districts, and may, therefore, wish to cosponsor it:

H.R. 7102

A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to impose certain additional conditions on the discontinuance of passenger train operations

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 13a of part I of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 1) is amended to read as follows:

"DISCONTINUANCE OR CHANGE OF CERTAIN OPERATIONS OR SERVICES

"SEC. 13a. (1) Any carrier or carriers subject to this part proposing to discontinue or change, in whole or in part, the operation of service of any passenger train or ferry operating from a point in a State to a point in any other State or in the District of Columbia or from the District of Columbia to a point in any other State shall file with the Commission an application for a certificate authorizing such discontinuance or change. The Commission may issue such certificate only after full hearing and upon findings by it that (1) the present or future public convenience and necessity require discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, of the operation of service of such passenger train or ferry, and (2) the continued operation of service of such passenger train or ferry without discontinuance or change, in whole or in part, will constitute an unjust and undue burden upon the interstate operations of such carrier or carriers or upon interstate commerce. Upon receipt of an application filed pursuant to this paragraph, the Commission shall notify the Governor of the States in which such passenger train or ferry is operated at least thirty days in advance of the hearing provided for in this paragraph. The Commission is authorized to avail itself of the cooperation, services, record, and facilities of the authority in such States in the performance of its functions under this paragraph.

"(2) In passing upon any proposed discontinuance or change under the provisions of paragraph (1) of this section, the Commission shall have power to issue such certificate as prayed for, or to refuse to issue it, and may attach to the issuance of the certificate such terms and conditions as in its judgment the public convenience and necessity may require, including terms and conditions for the protection of the interests of employees adversely affected by the issuance of said certificate. From and after the issuance of such certificate, and not before, the carrier or carriers may, without securing approval other than such certificate, comply with the terms and conditions contained in or attached to the issuance of such certificate and proceed with the discontinuance or change concerned thereby. Any discontinuance or change contrary to the provisions of this paragraph or of paragraph (1) of this section, may be enjoined by any court of competent jurisdiction at the suit of the United States, the Commission, any commission or regulatory body of the State or States affected, or any party in interest; and any carrier which, or any director, officer, receiver, operating trustee, lessee, agent, or person, acting for or employed by such carrier, who knowingly authorizes, consents to, or permits any violation of the provisions of this paragraph or of paragraph (1) of this section, shall upon conviction thereof be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than three years, or both."

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to present the following statement in support of the President's voting rights proposal and my bill, H.R. 1568, to the distinguished chairman of the House Judiciary Committee on April 2, 1965:

STATEMENT OF HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5 OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ON THE VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to have the privilege to state my views to the Committee on the Judiciary in support of the Voting Rights Act of 1965, which President Johnson submitted to the House on March 17, and in support of H.R. 1568, a bill which I introduced on January 5 to protect further the right to vote.

I should like to speak first about the meaning and necessity of the President's bill, and specifically about sections 3(a) and 4(a). Section 3(a) which would abolish literacy and other mental tests, examinations of personal character, and voucher requirements as conditions of voter registration for Federal, State, and local elections in any State or political subdivision of a State as to which the U.S. Attorney General certifies that it maintained any of these tests or devices on November 1, 1964, and in which the Director of the Census finds either that less than 50 percent of the persons of voting age were registered to vote on November 1, 1964, or that less than 50 percent of such persons actually voted in the 1964 presidential election. Section 4(a) provides that the Attorney General, whenever he has received 20 or more allegations of denial of the right to vote under color of law because of race or color in any political subdivision in which registration tests and devices have been abolished under section 3(a), may have the Civil Service Commission appoint Federal examiners to register voters in that political subdivision.

Under our constitutional separation of powers, it is up to the courts to provide the remedy against abuse of executive authority as well as against improper exercise of legislative power.

Denial to any citizen of the right to vote, not because that person is found unqualified by reasonable and uniform standards, but because of that person's race or color is an abuse of the authority to administer the registration process. Hence, it is proper that Congress should attempt to protect the right to vote against widespread denial because of race or color by authorizing recourse to the courts.

By the Civil Rights Act of 1957, Congress authorized the Attorney General to initiate civil actions for injunctive relief of denial of the right to vote. By the Civil Rights Act of 1960, Congress enhanced the powers of the Federal courts to prevent discriminatory denial of the right to vote. It did so by authorizing them to appoint temporary voting referees to assist in issuing orders for the registration of persons rejected by local registrars on account of race after the courts had found a pattern or practice of such discrimination. It did so by providing that States as such may be joined as party defendants in voting rights cases.

But the efficacy of our system of divided authority is conditional upon the good-faith compliance of executive officials with court orders enjoining acts which constitute abuse of their authority. We must be able to expect general compliance and cooperation. Whereas, under the Civil Rights Act of 1964, private hotel and restaurant proprietors and private employers are accorded the right to trial by jury for criminal contempt of court in regard to proceedings instituted under titles II and VII, registration officials, who are State officials, may be punished summarily by the courts for criminal contempt up to penalties of $300 fine or 45 days in jail for criminal contempt of court in regard to proceedings instituted under the 1957 Civil Rights Act or under title I of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The difference in jury trial provisions signifies what we have a right to expect of executive officials.

When executive officials as a whole refuse to comply with the courts, when they set themselves in concerted opposition to the courts, the courts are in no position to engage them in a power struggle in order to preserve threatened civil rights. The courts could not engage in such a power struggle with executive officials without attempting to take over the duties of public administration themselves. This the courts are in no position to do.

Continuing oversight of executive administration belongs in the first instance to heads of the executive branch itself, who have the responsibility to see that the laws are faithfully executed. It belongs in the second instance to the legislative branch. In order to protect the right to vote, we have attempted to transfer the duty of oversight or actual execution of the laws to the courts. Let me cite two examples.

The 1960 Civil Rights Act authorized the courts to appoint voting referees whenever they find that a denial of the right to vote is pursuant to a pattern or practice of discrimination. These referees are to receive applications from other persons who claim to have been denied the right to vote because of race or color, to take evidence, and to report their findings to the courts which would then issue orders declaring such applicants as are found qualified, to be so. This procedure means that the courts themselves actually undertake the duties of registration officials.

The Civil Rights Commission has found that litigation by the Attorney General to protect voting rights can be successful only if the court requires voting registrars to submit regular reports to the court stating the outcome of every application for registration and the reasons for every rejection. "The only way," the Commission said, "to eliminate the practices by litigation is to win comprehensive decrees with intensive reporting requirements so that literally every act of every registrar is known to the court" (1963 report, p. 24). A Federal district court has ordered such reports month by month from registration officials in Macon, Montgomery, and Bullock Counties, Ala. This reporting system means that a court itself undertakes continuing oversight of executive administration.

To attempt to transfer to the courts duties which do not belong to the judicial process must end in futility.

Civil actions are instituted so that the court may determine the existence of a right, and may determine whether what is due a citizen has been withheld or denied. It requires time for the court to find through due process of law whether injustice has been done or not.

To attempt to convert this judicial process into a process of executive administration is anomalous, and must result in interruption in the execution of the laws and in delay which has the effect of denying any right, such as the right to vote, which must be exercised at a certain time or not at all.

The Voting Rights Act of 1965 would relieve the courts of the duties of oversight and administration and would restore these duties to executive officials to whom they belong.

Title I of the 1964 Civil Rights Act established certain criteria for the application of registration requirements in order to facilitate adjudication of voting rights cases by the courts. Section 3(a) of the 1965 Voting Rights Act abolishes such requirements altogether wherever they have been used to deny voting rights because of race or color.

The 1960 Civil Rights Act provides for appointment of voting referees as officers of the courts. The 1965 Voting Rights Act provides for appointment of Federal examiners who would assume the duty of actually registering voters without reference to the courts.

Article I, section 2 of the Constitution and the 17th amendment state that electors for U.S. Representatives and Senators respectively shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the legislature in each of their States. Pursuant to these provisions of the Constitution, establishment of voter qualifications and registration of voters are functions which have been exercised by the States.

It cannot be argued in opposition to the Voting Rights Act of 1965 that abolition of literacy and other tests and devices used by certain States as conditions of registration and that appointment of Federal examiners to register voters constitutes illicit transposition of authority from the States to the Federal Government.

The President and the Congress intend by this bill to protect the federally guaranteed right to vote of U.S. citizens within each of the several States which have denied that right. Every American citizen is at once a citizen of the United States and the State in which he resides. As such, he is the subject both of rights under the Constitution and laws of the United States and of rights under his State constitution and laws. He carries with himself into his State guarantees of certain rights by the Federal Government.

The right to vote is that fundamental political and civil right which constitutes representative democracy.

The 15th amendment declares that "The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude."

Our Constitution does not establish any right without at the same time giving the Federal Government authority for its implementation. Section 2 of the amendment provides that "The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

I urge that the Voting Rights Act of 1965 is both necessary and appropriate to defend the most essential right of citizens of the United States.

I should like to turn Mr. Chairman, to my bill, H.R. 1568. This bill would ban all literacy and other performance tests as conditions for voter registration. I believe that the enactment of H.R. 1568 is demanded by the fact that there are 20 States of the Union which impose literacy tests of one kind or another. The Voting Rights Act of 1965 which you are considering would eliminate literacy tests, but only in those States where 50 percent of the voting age population failed to register or failed to vote in 1964.

The 20 States imposing a literacy test are Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Georgia, Hawaii, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, New Hampshire, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, Virginia, Washington, and Wyoming. Some of the above-mentioned States will be covered by the Voting Rights Act of 1965; most of them will not.

As for my own State of New York, I wish to point out that if the provisions of H.R. 1568 were to be included in the Voting Rights Act of 1965, or enacted as a separate law, it would have the effect of enfranchising approximately 200,000 Puerto Ricans who are U.S. citizens and who are presently denied the right to vote by English-language literacy tests imposed by the State of New York for registration.

Hundreds of thousands of Puerto Rican citizens are quite literate in Spanish but not in English. This should not be regarded as a disability with respect to the exercising of the duties and rights of citizenship. Practically every newstand in New York City carries daily newspapers printed in Spanish which give news and commentary on the affairs of government at every level; there are radio stations in New York that broadcast primarily in Spanish. In short, Mr. Chairman, there is no reason to assume that our Spanish speaking fellow citizens are not just as well informed as anybody else.

The amendment to the New York State Constitution requiring English-language literacy tests was adopted in 1921. It was an unhappy piece of business and I don't think anybody today is proud of the reasons for it.

Language, Mr. Chairman, is considered an attribute of race. The New York law does not test literacy as such as a reasonable test of mental qualification to vote. It tests rather proficiency in the English language and thereby discriminates against U.S. citizens on an attributable racial basis.

The Treaty of Paris in 1898 by which Puerto Rico was ceded to the United States provided that the Puerto Ricans themselves could adopt either Spanish or English as their official language. They chose Spanish. Since the Treaty of Paris is the law of the land, the right to conduct their public affairs in Spanish is a right of Puerto Ricans under U.S. law. I suggest, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that to deny Puerto Rican citizens who are literate in Spanish the right to vote is a denial of the equal protection of the laws.

The abolition of literacy tests and other discriminatory means of denying the right to vote will enfranchise the Negro citizen in Selma and elsewhere and the Puerto Rican citizen in New York and elsewhere. It will, thereby, immeasurably enhance representative democracy.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XXXIV

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following installment of "New York City in Crisis," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 22, 1965:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: MAYOR'S MULTITUDINOUS COMMITTEES

(By Barry Gottehrer and Tim Hutchens, of the Herald Tribune staff)

Mayor Wagner, who repeatedly has said that he is willing to listen to anyone, obviously likes to keep well advised. Yet even he has no idea of exactly how well advised he really is.

For that matter, at the present time, no one else does either.

In a city that long has had a tradition of setting up special committees, turning study funds over to them, and then ignoring them and their reports. Mayor Wagner has, according to most city hall observers, broken all records.

Right now, it is the job of Eugene J. Bockman, head of the municipal library, to determine exactly how many special commissions and committees have been created and which are still in existence.

This would seem to be a routine matter. It hasn't been. Mr. Bockman says he has intermittently spent 2 years trying to complete it.

In 1961 the State commission on governmental operations in New York City reported "some 140" special or temporary committees or commissions * * * "presumably acting, although many quietly went out of business while others never got started." Over the last 4 years, however, as the mayor apparently has found himself increasingly in need of advice, this estimate has become ridiculously obsolete.

"We have compiled and are in the process of compiling a list," said Mr. Bockman last week. "It's going to take us another 6 months to check on it. A lot of people are interested in getting this list. I will not give it to anyone, however, until it is completed and all checked out".

WHAT WILL REPORT INDICATE?

Will the final report indicate how much money has been spent on these committees and commissions and how much has been accomplished?

"That's not what we have been looking for," he said. "As for the appropriation, you have to catch it at the time the committee was formed. The city has an overall record of this somewhere, but it is difficult to find out exactly where."

If this record does exist, at present, the mayor's aids do not know where it is. "One of the problems is that we never hear anything about their dispersing," one aid said. "The whole thing is a game. The mayor brings in businessmen and bankers of all persuasion and gets them involved in his problems. They rarely come up with anything anyway. And, if they do, who says the mayor has to listen to them?"

The mayor's most expensive use of citizen participation last year centered around the temporary commission on city finances, a group of leading citizens and bankers who were given the job of trying to figure out what the city must do about an expected budget deficit of $350 million in 1966.

To get the commission started right—in pursuit of fiscal austerity—the mayor and the board of estimate immediately appropriated $1 million for the study.

Not suprisingly, the commission has already asked for an extension (after filing a preliminary report which, according to the mayor, offers nothing new), and, with the mayor's support, has received it.

ASKS ADDITIONAL FUNDS

And, not surprisingly, the commission has already asked for additional funds—$558,000—to complete the study.

For the city taxpayer's sake, other advice, as far as can be determined until the municipal library presents its findings, it would seem less expensive.

But even these committees generally cost taxpayers money.

Despite assurances that most of the smaller committees include only volunteer members and receive no public funds, many of them require certain city services or money—such as a city stenographer to record minutes—printing services for their final report, which invariably will gather dust in dozens of city offices.

Yet what frustrates many people—including those who seem so willing to serve—is not so much the waste of taxpayers' money as it is the waste of the efforts and studies that this money buys. While the mayor is always eager that they serve, he seems far less eager to act on the conclusions that they present.

It is now nearly a year that he has been considering specific proposals from two special commissions relating to the end of discrimination in certain unions doing business with the city. The mayor has still reached no decision on this matter.

A former member of the now disbanded mayor's committee on professional, technical, and managerial manpower complains that recommendations from a report which cost the city $120,000 and was received by the mayor several years ago still has not been acted upon.

This report, compiled and issued by the prestigious Brookings Institute, remains, however, the most popular report judged on the basis of the vast number of city offices in which it is now gathering dust.

TEN MILLION DOLLAR SAVING

In all, the report made more than two dozen recommendations for improving the city's method of filling jobs, which if followed according to the experts would save the city an estimated $10 million.

To date, however, no funds have gone to implement these recommendations, Dr. Theodore G. Lang, the city's personnel director, says he asked for $570,000 last year to put parts of this report to work. The budget bureau turned him down, he said, but he plans to ask for the same amount again this year.

There are few people who believe he will have much success.

To find out exactly how many advisory committees continue, one Herald Tribune reporter spent 3 weeks delving in city records.

At the bureau of the budget, which surveys those departments that are supposed to maintain contact with the special commissions, a public relations spokesman, paid for by city taxpayers, said last week that his office is far too busy these days to come up with a list of these special committees and how much of the taxpayers' money they are consuming.

Finally, someone in the mayor's office located a dated—but obviously outdated—list of committees. The list included dozens of interdepartmental committees—ranging from the mayor's advisory committee on markets (the office of the commissioner of markets, who is its chairman, doesn't know when the advisory committee was founded) to the new special commission on light preservation.

Following is an abbreviated list of some data on some special citizens' commissions that are spending their time and some city money in an attempt to keep the mayor informed:

The city advisory committee, office of cultural affairs: Includes 89 members prominent in the performing arts; appointed by Mr. Wagner in October 1963; chairman is August Heckscher, director of the 20th Century Fund and former White House consultant on the arts for President Kennedy; members with mutual interests such as theater and music form separate panels and meet irregularly with Robert W. Dowling, the city's cultural executive; members advise on programs for the city's cultural centers; committee receives no city appropriation although Mr. Dowling's office prepares minutes and notices of meetings:

Citizens' antipornography commission: Announced in August 1964, to try to put a stop to the flood of pornography now coming into the city; headed by the Corporation Counsel Leo Larkin and includes 23 citizens; meets irregularly and reports to the mayor's office; it's last task; in December, was "Candy"; generally receives no city appropriation although a committee spokesman said last week that the city will pay for a pending report on the committees' position; how much the report will cost and what it will contain are uncertain.

Business advisory committee: Established in 1963 to assist the department of purchase in alerting vendors to bid for New York City business; meets on an average of 4 times a year and consists of 10 members who represent each of the citys' major chambers of commerce; chairman is Edward F. Hanzlik, operating superintendent of Sears, Roebuck & Co. and representative of the West Side Association of Commerce; receives no city appropriation or services; cosponsored a How To Do Business With the City of New York Conference in 1963 at which major chamber and union members were invited.

Labor advisory committee: Established in 1963 to assist the department of purchase in labor matters; meets quarterly and includes 10 members from major unions; chairman is Harry Avrutin, secretary-treasurer of the Union Label & Service Trades Department; receives no city appropriation or services: cosponsored how to do business conference with business advisory committee.

Selection committee for the mayor's medal for outstanding city employees: Established October 1961 and includes five members, some from the city personnel department; meets once a year to consider nominations.

Suggestion awards board: Includes four city officials and one citizen who consider awards for suggestions on how to improve the city administration.

New York City Public Service Awards for Professional Achievement Selection Committee: A citizen and several city officials meet annually to consider six awards, including a $500 bond and a scroll for outstanding public service in the city.

Memorial Day fund committee: Established in 1939 and composed of representatives from veterans organizations in the city's five boroughs; receives an annual allocation of $25,000 from the city; meets periodically to arrange Memorial Day ceremonies; coordinator is James P. Farrell, a city employee, who volunteers his services.

Graves registration committee: Included in the $25,000 allocation; also includes various veteran organizations, coordinated by Mr. Farrell; arranges to place flags on veterans' graves.

Staten Island community: Includes 22 citizens who meet when needed and report to the president of the college; receives no city appropriation, only secretarial help.

Mayor's committee on job advancement: Announced in August 1964, as a group to encourage job openings for minority groups; consists of 14 members, headed by Theodore W. Kheel; in February 1964, issued a report: "The Racial Revolution in Advertising," calling upon advertisers and media to integrate ads; reports annually to the mayor; meets irregularly; receives no city appropriation.

New York Council on Port Development and Promotion: Established in 1954 to promote the citys' port; meets monthly; includes 16 members; executive director is Bernard Handwerker, who receives an annual salary, $13,000; no other direct city appropriation.

Health department advisory committees: The scientific committees, one of which is the measles—scientific advisory committee consisting of a group of doctors; meet irregularly to study medical programs and report findings to the department. Similar groups include the committee on amputees and the pediatric advisory committee of the department of health.

Mayor's committee on living music: Includes three citizens, and heads of city agencies which have particular interest in live music, such as the department of parks and the board of education; chairman is Seymour N. Siegel, director of the Municipal Broadcasting System (WNYC); receives an appropriation of $75,000 a year to match private funds for concerts in parks, schools, and other public facilities; committee meets irregularly.

Citizens advisory committee to the housing and redevelopment board: Established in May 1961; includes 21 members who review and try to enlist community support for urban renewal and middle-income housing projects; advises board on reaction to such projects; receives no allocation of city funds; city staff members serve as required; deputy chief of the board's bureau of community affairs acts as the committee's secretary.

Citizens advisory committee of the rent and rehabilitation administration: Established by law in 1962 and includes 15 members who meet monthly; members include representatives of tenant and landlord organizations, architects and unions; reports directly to the administration; members serve voluntarily; no city appropriation.

Landmarks preservation commission: Established in 1962 to examine buildings that it believed the city should save for historic value; includes 12 members and a small staff consisting of an executive director and seven others; receives $62,000 annually in city funds for its work; chairman is Goeffrey Platt; is proposing legislation that would empower the city to preserve buildings.

Mayor's committee for pedestrian safety: Established in 1957 to lower the number of jaywalking deaths; includes 25 businessmen, led by Jack Straus, chairman of the board of R. H. Macy Co.; arranges for advertising space where the city can put up safety posters; department of traffic reports that jaywalking deaths have decreased 14 percent since the committee started its campaign; receives no city appropriation.

Mayor's committee on the judiciary: Group of attorneys established to recommend appointments of judgeships; meets monthly; currently receives an annual appropriation of $32,800.

According to many of the city's top attorneys, this special committee has unfortunately failed to remove judicial appointments from the political patronage arena.

Mayor's committee on scholastic achievement: Established in 1955; 10th anniversary dinner scheduled for April 6 at the annual Senator Wagner memorial dinner at the Waldorf-Astoria; Thomas J. Deegan, Jr., to be chairman; committee reports it raised $140,000 at last year's dinner for scholarships to college students; city appropriates $50,000 a year for fellowships for science and mathematics teachers; committee cooperates with colleges and universities in the metropolitan area.

Mayor's committee for free Shakespeare: Reports annually on plans for the New York Shakespeare Festival.

Department of hospitals: Four hospitals have citizens' advisory committees.

Mayor's chaplaincy board: Consists of three committees representing the three major faiths and recommends chaplains for such institutions as hospitals and jails. The city has about 200 chaplains.

Welfare department: Several committees are listed, including the dental advisory board, the pharmaceutical advisory committee, the medical advisory board, the subcommittee on orthopedics and the citizens' advisory council to the children's center of the department of welfare, and a special committee to devise a way to cut red tape in the welfare department.

Mayor's committee on off-track betting: Established to determine whether legalized bookmaking would work in the city; Robert W. Dowling, the city's cultural executive, was named chairman, and five other committee members; Mayor Wagner later stated that "the findings of our fact-finding team which surveyed off-track betting practices in four countries convince me that legalized and controlled off-track betting would be of great benefit"; committee agrees and in January 1964, proposes legislation that would permit bookie parlors; proposals are still in Albany.

Mayor's council on poverty: Named 12 representatives of voluntary social agencies and neighborhood action groups last month: also includes the mayor, City Council President Paul R. Screvane and heads of major city agencies dealing with poverty and discrimination.

Committee on planning and coordination: Announced in January to assist the council "with particular reference to federally financed programs"; to include eight city officials and eight representatives of citizen groups.

A list of the mayor's special advisory committees could run on nearly forever. This does not surprise many people.

What does surprise them is that Mayor Wagner still has not gotten around to setting up a special temporary advisory commission to assist the municipal library in cataloging the city's special temporary advisory commissions.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XXXV

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the following installment of "New York City in Crisis."

This article concerns a study of redevelopment projects in New York City, it appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 23, 1965.

The article follows:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: THE UMPTEENTH STUDY, THIS ONE COSTING $197,000

(By Barry Gottehrer, of the Herald Tribune staff)

For more than a decade, lower Manhattan has been a battlefield.

Business and banking interests, the construction unions, and Robert Moses, the city's master builder, have pressed for a series of multimillion-dollar redevelopment projects and an expressway to relieve downtown crosstown traffic congestion and blight.

In each instance—the Civil Center, the World Trade Center, Washington Street, the waterfront, a new Stock Exchange building, urban renewal projects, and the Lower Manhattan Expressway—proponents have spewed forth studies—all time consuming, all expensive, all profusely documented, and all seemingly beyond criticism.

Area residents and businessmen, architects, civil rights spokesmen, and citizens' groups have joined to oppose many of these projects—particularly the controversial Lower Manhattan Expressway, which has been on the city's map of arterial highways since 1941 but remains a phantom road.

In many instances, opponents of these projects have spewed out studies of their own—all time consuming, all expensive, all profusely documented and all seemingly beyond criticism.

In the middle of these two warring groups, both powerful and vocal enough to create extreme pressure, is one man—Mayor Robert F. Wagner, who has given much consideration and time to these studies.

Yesterday, while city workers took a holiday, the mayor took this action—another study. This one will cost taxpayers $197,000, and will not be finished for a year, some 3 months after Mayor Wagner is expected to run for an unprecedented fourth term.

According to a statement issued by the mayor's office, the study (to be done by transportation consultants Alan M. Vorhees & Associates, Inc., and urban planning consultants Wallace-McHarg & Whittlesey-Conklin) will be used in developing a short-range and long-range plan for traffic and pedestrian circulation as well as future land use and design considerations for an area bounded generally by Canal Street, the Battery, the Hudson and East Rivers.

"With so many large and important public and private projects planned for lower Manhattan it is necessary that we move swiftly to relate these individual improvements to overall street and traffic patterns to best serve lower Manhattan and to develop a broad overview for its future development," said the mayor, who was unavailable for comment other than what appeared in the statement.

"I am confident that through sound planning we cannot only insure the continued preeminence of this area as a world center of finance, commerce, and governmental affairs, but create a handsome and appealing urban environment here as well."

These are clearly words to study and plan by.

It's what the mayor didn't mention that is sure to shock almost everyone connected with these projects. Nowhere in the announcement is there a single mention of the Lower Manhattan Expressway, which proponents have maintained is vitally necessary to relieve the congestion in lower Manhattan.

"The thought that the city is studying lower Manhattan and its traffic problems without studying the proposed expressway is ludicrous," says Paul Douglas, a New York businessman and spokesman for a citizens group opposing the expressway. "To me, this is just further proof of the shocking lack of planning and coordination on the part of this administration."

Though the Canal Street south demarcation for the latest city study includes a segment of the proposed expressway (which would run from the Williamsburg and Manhattan Bridges across Broome Street to the Holland Tunnel and West Side Highway), a spokesman for the mayor said yesterday, "The expressway is definitely not to be included in this study."

WILL NOT BE STALLED

Mayor Wagner, who voted for the expressway in 1960 and against it in 1962, has been considering the phantom road since it was revived at a board of estimate hearing since last December 22. At that time, he said, "the matter will not be stalled along."

In mid-January, one of the mayor's aids said a decision on the expressway would be forthcoming by the end of the month "at the latest." On January 31, the mayor said, "a decision would be made soon." And yesterday, as this one area of lower Manhattan continued the decline started not too long after the road was first placed on the master plan of arterial highways 24 years ago, his aid would only say, "the mayor has not made a decision as yet."

The few officials who could be reached on the holiday couldn't seem to agree on how the area could be studied without first arriving at—or permanently deferring—a decision on the expressway and the other projects in the area.

Traffic Commissioner Henry A. Barnes said, "This plan is long overdue. I'm glad to see that something is finally being done. The projects already planned will not affect the study. The expressway will not affect the study one way or another either. A study can still be made without this decision."

A spokesman for Planning Commissioner William F. R. Ballard disagreed. "Whether we have an expressway or not will most certainly have a bearing on this study," he said. "Obviously if the expressway does not go through, there will be a much different traffic pattern in lower Manhattan. As a matter of fact, when we started preparing for this study about 3 months ago, it was assumed that the administration would have reached a decision on the expressway by now. This study will not, however, defer action on the other projects already under way."

To those outside the administration, even those who have long favored a comprehensive study of the traffic needs of all of lower Manhattan (and not excluding the Broome Street area), the thought of this study, taking place while action on the other projects continues, is beyond comprehension.

"What good is a study if the city doesn't halt all those projects in the meantime?" asks Nathan Ginsburg, vice president of the Architects Council of New York and chairman of its Civic Center committee. "It's a phony. The study will be a complete waste unless they stop all work in the meantime. What's the good of it? Just to pacify those who are complaining and prevent discussion in actual hazards of what is being done.

ONLY TO LULL THE PEOPLE

"They're going to be studying while all the projects will be moving forward," he added. "Then suppose they find out that the city has gone ahead with something that it should not have? It's ludicrous. This is only to lull people into thinking it is being handled by the proper authorities. What it will really mean is further delay and waste."

To this implication of playing politics with taxpayers' money and the future development of the city, the mayor's aid said, "That is absolutely untrue."

To others, less attached to the present administration and particularly those involved in the problems of lower Manhattan, the mayor's call for a new study—which does not include the expressway and does not defer action on projects set for the area being studied—is open to many interpretations.

It is not that the area hasn't been studied—on a piecemeal basis both by private and city agencies. For example, the department of marine and aviation turned in a study of waterfront development 2 years ago and the planning commission turned in another last year. Though both call for future development of the port (and are in almost total disagreement as to how to go about it), both received praise from the mayor and both now gather dust in city hall closets.

The Downtown-Lower Manhattan Association, a business group headed by David Rockefeller, has also financed and completed studies relating to various downtown projects. These studies, according to the mayor's statement, will be drawn upon during the current study, which "will be developed in close cooperation with various public agencies, the local planning board and civic and business groups."

According to Commissioner Ballard's statement, the study will consider the street system (including possible closings and widenings), automobile circulation requirements, pedestrian movement, and circulation, expansion of the financial district, waterfront reuse, and preservation of historical buildings and landmarks.

"If this broad development ($422 million in building completed since 1950 and a potential of some $900 million more) is left to haphazard and unrelated planning "the city might face problems which would stultify the great renaissance we are experiencing in lower Manhattan."

It was made by Mayor Wagner himself yesterday, talking about his latest study.

This statement was not made by a critic of the Mayor's latest example of questionable planning and indecisive leadership.

These are the major projects now planned for the lower Manhattan area:

Civic center: First proposed in December 1962, as site for new municipal building, city hall annex, and mall. Funds provided on budget, going into land acquisition stage soon.

Brooklyn Bridge, southwest: Designated by planning commission for urban renewal and now in hands of housing and redevelopment board, $80 million project envisages 1,600 middle income dwellings, as well as expansion of Pace College and Beekman-Downtown Hospital.

World Trade Center: Port authority has proposed a $350 million twin-towered, 110-story office building. Well along in planning, but being contested in courts by firms in area. Some parts would require city approval.

Washington Street redevelopment: Designated by planning commission for mostly commercial development. In hands of housing and redevelopment board.

Hudson River landfill project: Proposed by department of marine and aviation, where piers are no longer being heavily used for cargo, as site for piers and housing. In exploratory stage.

Brooklyn Bridge, southeast: No formal plans for this area, which includes the Fulton Fish Market. It has been proposed for future redevelopment under urban renewal.

Brooklyn Bridge, north: Designated as new site for police headquarters and other public facilities. Architectural planning underway.

Heliport: Proposed heliport expansion. New York Airways now operates port authority heliport landing on pier 6 between Wall and Broad Streets.

New York Stock Exchange: Present plans call for the stock exchange to buy half of former Battery Park urban renewal site and for the remainder to be developed by private capital.

Lower Manhattan Expressway: First proposed in 1941. The $100 million on again-off again cross-Manhattan road is still up in the air. Mayor Wagner has not yet made a final decision on the project.

SISTER MARY JOSEPH

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MURPHY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, on April 5, 1915, Sister Mary Joseph, of the Sisters of Mercy, made her first religious profession, and today she is celebrating her golden jubilee in the service of God and neighbor.

Sister Mary Joseph has spent much of her life in various teaching assignments and she is presently in charge of personnel at St. Michael's Home on Staten Island, N.Y. A mass is being celebrated at St. Michael's Chapel at which time Msgr. James Kenny, celebrant, will read the Papal blessing bestowed upon Sister Mary Joseph, as well as a congratulatory message from Cardinal Spellman.

It is my great privilege and honor to join with the 280 youngsters at St. Michael's Home in extending congratulations and best wishes to Sister on the occasion of this great anniversary.

A FIERY CROSS BURNS IN DETROIT

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KREBS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KREBS. Mr. Speaker, on April 3, a cross was burned in Detroit. The purveyors of hatred have struck at the Luizzo family again. Not satisfied with brutally shooting down this wife and mother, in cold blood, in the dark of night, on a lonely Alabama highway, the Ku Klux Klan has exported their bigotry and hatred to Detroit so her family will know firsthand of their evil ways.

The burning of a cross in the yard of the Liuzzo home is one more testimonial to the lack of all decency and honor of these cowardly night riders.

As the President so accurately stated, when describing the first attack against the Liuzzo family, "they struck by night as they usually do, because their purposes cannot stand the light of day." So they struck by night again, while Mrs. Luizzo's family slept inside, thinking themselves safe from the terror perpetrated wholesale by these hooded bigots.

What manner of men are these who can take the symbol of Christianity and turn it from its meaning of brotherhood into a flaming brand that instills fear and speaks not of love of man but of impending violence.

The Ku Klux Klan say they are the protectors of civilization, the defenders of Christianity, and the saviors of the American way of life. These men are not civilized, these men are not Christian, these men do not know the meaning of the American way of life.

If their deeds cannot stand the light of day, if they are so ashamed of their purposes and acts that they must meet in the dark of night protected from each other by dressing in ghostly robes, their faces hidden, their identities kept secret even from those of their own kind, then it is time we brought them to light, disrobed them, and make them stand responsible to their neighbors and society for their acts of violence and intimidation.

We cannot long allow an organized group to visit terror upon all who act in disagreement with their desires, who would see the brotherhood of man a reality, who would not deny the rights of citizenship and equality to those of another religion, national origin, or color of skin.

It is evident the organized bigotry and intimidation of the Klan spans State lines. It is, therefore, not just a local problem or a sectional problem. It is a problem for all America and all Americans; it must be dealt with by all America and all Americans.

THE NEED TO IMPROVE WORKING CONDITIONS FOR FARM LABORERS

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, any reasonable and literate person ought to be able at this late date to read the congressional handwriting on the wall. The 88th Congress, in its wisdom, decided that time had run out on the "temporary" bracero program, and that it should expire at the end of 1964. The President, in his wisdom, signed into law that decision and thereby obligated himself and his administration to carry it out. The 89th Congress, in its wisdom, is not going to buckle under the pressures that have been generated to revive the discredited bracero program. The President is not going to buckle under those pressures, and the Secretary of Labor is not going to buckle under those pressures.

The bracero program is as dead as the dodo bird. It is time for the leadership in the farm industry to stop looking for cheap, captive sources of labor. It is time for the leadership in the farm industry to exert itself in a positive and constructive and progressive manner in order to help solve the farm labor problem. It is time to look forward to the day when the farmworker can share in the fruits of his labors. Today, for the sweat off his brow that he leaves in the rich and abundant fields and orchards which he harvests he receives for his part a pittance, a pat on the back, and a passport to nowhere. Justice, decency, and humanity demand that progress not pass him over for yet another generation.

Farmworkers under State and Federal labor laws are relegated to a second-class citizenship. Millions of Americans are protected by minimum wage, maximum hours, and child-labor laws. Millions of Americans are protected by workmen's compensation and unemployment compensation. Millions of Americans are assured decent housing for their families, good schools for their children, health and medical facilities. Not so the farmworker.

Historically, labor laws were designed to regulate and set a floor under the working conditions of employees in industry and trade. At first these laws were limited to specific types or places of employment or to certain industries. Some of these laws have been extended to cover employment generally, but usually agricultural employment is expressly excluded. Even where no specific exclusion exists and the laws could cover farmworkers, they often are not applied.

For example, in only eight States and Puerto Rico are there laws or regulations which specifically regulate farm labor contractors and crew leaders. Only a few States, California, Colorado, Connecticut, New York, North Carolina, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia, have laws setting safety standards for vehicles used in the transportation of farmworkers, and for the operation of such vehicles. Farm labor camps are regulated as to housing, location, and construction of the camp in 30 States. But in 20 States there is no such regulation. And even in the States where there are laws on this subject, the standards are very limited in most.

Only 11 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia provide a minimum age for employment of children on farms. This age is 14 in Connecticut, Alaska, Hawaii, Missouri, Texas, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. In four States the minimum age is 12. In one State, Utah, the minimum age is 10. Compulsory school attendance requires children to attend school, usually to age 16, in most States. But in many States the laws permit children under 16 or even under 14 to be excused from school in order to work on farms.

In only four States and Puerto Rico do workmen's compensation laws cover all farm employment. Only 17 States have any specific coverage for farmworkers at all. Only Hawaii and Puerto Rico provide any minimum wage coverage for all farmworkers. Hawaii requires a minimum of $1.25 an hour. Six States have wage payment laws and wage collections laws for farmworkers. Only Hawaii and Puerto Rico specifically cover farmworkers in their unemployment insurance laws. In one State, California, farmworkers are covered by a temporary disability law.

Federal laws supplement these deficiencies somewhat. The 88th Congress enacted more laws for the protection of farmworkers than perhaps any other Congress. The Economic Opportunity Act contains provisions for the assistance of migrant farmworkers and for low-income rural families. The Housing Act of 1964 provides for grants to States or its political subdivisions, or private nonprofit organizations, to assist in providing housing and related facilities for domestic farm labor.

Have these laws been utilized for the benefit of farmworkers? What are we doing now to implement them and to pass additional legislation in the area of minimum wages and workmen's compensation? There are the fruitful areas of work and inquiry where the time and energy of the people and the Congress could be well spent.

The farmworker is the forgotten man in the industrial revolution that has benefited almost every other class of worker. Part of the evil inherent in the bracero program was that it served to keep the farm industry in a constant state of depression, as far as the workers were concerned. Braceros were a cheap source and a captive source of labor. They stifled competition and formed a crutch on which farmers and growers became accustomed to lean. That crutch is gone. It is now time for the farmer and the grower to walk without it, to seek his labor needs in the competitive market, and to give decent wages and working conditions to their employees.

This afternoon, in the Washington Daily News, John Herling ably reviews some recent events in the struggle to upgrade conditions in the farm industry. With unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD this incisive and enlightening column by John Herling:

W.W.W.'S CRUSADE

(By John Herling)

Perhaps it is inaccurate to describe the efforts of Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz in the farm labor sector as a crusade. He himself would prefer to say that he sticks to his responsibility under the law and that he is doing only what Congress plainly intended him to do and what President Johnson would want him to do.

Maybe so. But in the administration of any law or policy, the character of the administrator—made up of gutpower plus brainpan—is often decisive, whether his regulatory function is direct or indirect.

Secretary Wirtz, accompanied by Labor Under Secretary John F. Henning, spent an intensive 4 days last week in California on the problems connected with the use of braceros—imported Mexican workers—in American agriculture. While California occupies the central place in the farm labor arch, more than 20 other States also have habituated their farm economies, to a considerable extent, to the use of imported workers from Mexico and the British West Indies.

But as of December 31, 1964, the law which permitted the importation of Mexican workers—Public Law 78—expired. To the shock of many of their employers—the growers—Mr. Wirtz had made it clear that he was not going to shut his eyes to the intent of Congress and permit the growers to keep on bringing in low-paid Mexican workers.

While field trips by Government officials are often a dime a dozen, there was a special quality about this one: Mr. Wirtz flew into the eye of the hurricane—the high-pressure center of the growers' indignant demand for cheap imported labor. His trip appears to have accomplished two things: One, the growers came to know Mr. Wirtz, and while they huffed and puffed, they did not succeed in blowing his house in. And second, within the space of 1 week the growers who were red-eyed ripe for conflict have now apparently come around to the point where, in effect, they adopt the attitude of Isaiah and L.B.J. and say, "Let us reason together."

In short, their attitude has changed because the Labor Secretary made it clear that when he said that Public Law 414 (the existing immigration law) was not going to be used as a subterfuge to do by other means what had been outlawed as of December 31, 1964, he meant it positively.

Boiled down, here is the way Secretary Wirtz finds the situation: "Much clearer now than it was at the start of this trip is that here is a basic, profound movement ahead as far as the agricultural economy of this State and some of the social implications of that change are concerned. The discussion a year ago—even 2 or 3 months ago—was in terms of superficial aspects of this situation. There was the suggestion that U.S. workers won't do stoop labor, and there were other catch phrases of one kind or another that were bandied around. What is now clear as you travel the State, talk to the growers and to the workers and to their representatives, to people of very strong conscience who are leaders in the attempt to meet this problem, to clergymen, to public officials, there is a much more basic development taking place.

"Three aspects of this development stand out: First and fundamental is the fact that Congress, by terminating Public Law 78, changed a situation in which there had previously been a fully assured, guaranteed labor supply for California agriculture. That no longer will be the case. The second change involves the fact that this previously guaranteed and assured labor supply had been provided under terms which included no competitive or bargaining power as between the employer and employees. Employment was solely on terms and conditions which could be dictated, subject only to the application of laws by the employers. From here on there will be a competitive factor in the labor situation which there has not been before. The third element, hardly appreciated or recognized in the public discussion of this matter, is that Public Law 78 had the effect of putting at least a fifth of California agriculture on the basis of its being performed by single individuals, men who lived apart from their families, and who came here alone as individuals, from Mexico.

"In the future, if the families move with the men who do California's agriculture work, there will be problems of schools, housing, churches, and of facilities of one kind or another to be met. With all of these factors taken into account, the changeover will be fundamental."

RETIREMENT OF MAJ. GEN. JAMES L. SNYDER

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, on March 31, 1965, Maj. Gen. James L. Snyder, the commanding general of Brooke Army Medical Center, retired from the U.S. Army after more than 32 years of service. At a retirement ceremony culminating his brilliant career, General Snyder was honored as more than 2,000 troops from units of the medical center and Fort Sam Houston passed in review.

Born at Medora, N. Dak., General Snyder was graduated from high school at Ashton, Idaho. He attended the University of Washington and received his B.S. and M.S. degrees from the University of Washington. He received his medical degree at the George Washington University School of Medicine in Washington, D.C., in 1933, and entered the Army upon completion of his internship a year later.

While previously stationed at the Army Medical Service School, Fort Sam Houston, Tex., where most Army Medical Service personnel train at some time in their careers, General Snyder served as training officer, school secretary, director of the department of tactics, techniques, and logistics, and assistant commandant. He assumed the position of commandant of the Army Medical Service School on October 1, 1959, and in December of 1961 General Snyder became the commanding general of Brooke Army Medical Center.

One of the Army Medical Service's foremost authorities in field medicine and training, General Snyder, while commanding the medical center, directed a vast and complex program which covers nearly every phase of medical education, training, patient care, and research.

General Snyder started the first Army Medical Service officer candidate school in July 1941, and subsequently assisted in the rapid expansion of schools of the technical services and the officer candidate school system of the Army service forces in 1942.

While serving with the 1st U.S. Army in England preparing for the invasion of Europe, he set up demonstrations to prove the value of his theories on the simultaneous discharge of troops and the loading of casualties into landing vessels. He landed on D-day with the 1st Army and supervised the establishment of medical units and the evacuation of the wounded through the bitter fighting of France, Belgium, and Germany.

General Snyder has taken part in special studies of problems encountered by the Army Medical Service in both arctic and tropical regions. While in Europe from 1956 to 1959, he formulated the first area medical service concept which has proven to be so effective for the U.S. Army. He has been a leading proponent of preparedness for medical care in a disaster. This includes not only disaster training within the medical service, but he has also emphasized the urgent need for this type of training in medical schools through the medical education for national defense program and through his cooperation with local civil defense organizations.

Among his many decorations for valor and distinguished service are the Legion of Merit, the Bronze Star Medal and the Croix de Guerre from France.

During his outstanding career, General Snyder has compiled a record of many achievements in the field of Army medicine and practice, for which we of this Nation are deeply grateful. General Snyder's retirement is the Army's loss, but I am proud to say that it is San Antonio's gain as General and Mrs. Snyder will continue to reside there.

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF MAJOR PROVISIONS OF H.R. 6675

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. FULTON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, later this week the House will consider H.R. 6675, the social security amendments of 1965, including two important new programs to improve the health, hospitalization, and medical care of our senior citizens.

I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the RECORD a brief summary of the major provisions of H.R. 6675, consisting of three tables and containing pertinent information on each major part of this important bill.

The analysis is as follows:

SUMMARY ANALYSIS OF MAJOR PROVISIONS—H.R. 6675—MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1965 (HOUSE VERSION, APRIL 1965)

This analysis of the medicare and social security amendments of 1965 (H.R. 6675), as acted on by the House is in the three tables—(1) a description of the basic hospitalization program; (2) a description of the optional supplementary medical program; and (3) a description of amendments to the Social Security Act, the Kerr-Mills law, and other miscellaneous provisions.

TABLE 1—BASIC HOSPITALIZATION PROGRAM (UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY SYSTEM)

Eligibility: All persons aged 65 years or over who are now, or will in the future, be entitled to monthly social security or railroad retirement benefits (except Federal employees who retired after 1959).

All persons aged 65 years or over, or who will reach age 65 before 1968, who are not eligible for monthly social security or railroad retirement benefits. This part of the program to be paid for from general revenues of the Federal Government, not paid for out of Social Security trust funds.

Effective date: July 1, 1966, except for services in extended care facilities, which will be effective January 1, 1967.

Enrollment: No enrollment necessary. Coverage is automatic to those eligible.

Cost to the individual: Benefits extended to eligible persons without cost as a matter of right; no "needs test" required.

Benefits:

1. Inpatient hospital charges for up to 60 days of hospitalization in each spell of illness, subject to a $40 deductible amount.
2. Twenty days of nursing home care in each spell of illness, after transfer from hospital; 2 additional days of nursing home care (if needed) can be added for each day that the patient's hospital stay was less than 60 days, to a maximum total of 100 days.
3. Outpatient hospital diagnostic services, subject to a $20 deductible amount for such services furnished by the same hospital during a 20-day period.
4. Posthospital home health services for up to 100 visits after discharge from hospital or nursing home (when patient is under care of physician).

Financing: Through the social security system—payroll taxes from employee, employer, and by self-employed persons. Taxes paid into separate hospital insurance trust fund to assure that actuarial soundness of trust funds and the entire social security system is safeguarded. Tax rates for employee (matched by employer) will be: 1966, 0.35 percent; 1967–72, 0.50 percent; 1973–75, 0.55 percent; 1976–79, 0.60 percent; 1980–86, 0.70 percent; 1987 on, 0.80 percent.

These amounts would be automatically deducted from payroll check (as at present) on first $5,600 earnings a year during 1966–70 period. Thereafter, they would be based on first $6,600 of annual earnings. Program will cost each employee, employer only 38 cents a week, rising to about 54 cents a week for each during 1967–72 period.

TABLE 2—OPTIONAL SUPPLEMENTARY MEDICAL PROGRAM (UNDER PRIVATE INSURANCE CARRIERS)

Eligibility: All persons age 65 or over, on an optional, voluntary basis, regardless of whether or not they are eligible for social security, railroad retirement, or other benefits.

Effective date: July 1, 1966.

Enrollment: Enrollment for persons age 65 years or over before January 1, 1966, will begin 2 months after enactment of bill and continue to March 31, 1966. Regular enrolling periods thereafter.

Cost to the individual: If person chooses to participate in this program, it will cost him $3 per month. Amount would be automatically deducted from monthly benefit check of those persons receiving social security or railroad retirement benefits. Others would pay their contribution into special trust fund directly.

Benefits: In addition to the benefits listed in table 1, those choosing to participate in the supplementary medical program would be entitled to:

1. Physicians' and surgical services furnished in a hospital, clinic, office, or in the home.
2. Hospital care for 60 days in a spell of illness in a mental hospital (180-day lifetime maximum).
3. Home health services (without regard to hospitalization) for up to 100 visits during each calendar year.
4. Additional medical and health services, provided in or out of a medical institution, including diagnostic X-ray and laboratory tests, electrocardiograms, basal metabolism readings, and other diagnostic tests; X-ray, radium, and radioactive isotype therapy; ambulance services (under limited conditions); surgical dressings, splints, casts, iron lungs, oxygen tents, artificial limbs, eyes, etc.

Benefits under this program are subject to an annual deductible amount of $50. Then the program will pay 80 percent of the patient's bills (above the $50 deductible).

Financing: Persons participating in this program will pay $3 a month ($36 a year). An additional $3 per person, per month will be paid into fund by Federal Government out of general revenues.

TABLE 3—OTHER PROVISIONS

Social security benefits: Increases by 7 percent (with a minimum increase of $4 a month) all old-age, survivors, and disability insurance benefits. Increases would be retroactive to January 1, 1965. New minimum benefit raised from $40 to $44 a month. Will benefit an estimated 20,000 persons.

Child's insurance benefits: A child's insurance benefits would continue to be paid until the person reaches age 22 (instead of age 18) if child is attending accredited school or college as a full-time student after he reaches age 18. Will be effective as of January 1, 1965, and benefit estimated 295,000 young people.

Optional benefits for widows at age 60: Widows may have option of receiving social security benefits at age 60, with actuarial reduction of benefits they would otherwise receive at age 62. Effective for second month after enactment of bill, benefitting estimated 185,000 widows.

Disability insurance amendments: Liberalizes eligibility requirements and waiting period for persons covered by disability insurance provisions of Social Security Act. Will benefit estimated 155,000 disabled workers.

Benefits to persons at age 72 or over: Liberalizes eligibility requirements by providing a basic benefit of $35 a month at age 72 or over to certain persons with a minimum of 3 quarters of coverage under the Social Security Act, acquired at any time since the beginning of the program in 1937. Will benefit an estimated 355,000 persons.

Retirement test: Liberalizes the social security earned income limitation. Beginning in the 1966 tax year, a person receiving benefits will be able to earn $1,200 a year without having his benefits reduced; earnings between $1,200 and $2,400 a year would be subject to a $1 reduction in benefits for each $2 of earnings up to $2,400; a $1 reduction in benefits for each $1 of earnings above $2,400 would take place. Existing law limits this provision to $1,700 instead of $2,400.

Miscellaneous amendments: Other amendments to the Social Security Act authorize benefits to certain divorced women, coverage of self-employed physicians and interns, amendments affecting annual gross earnings of farmers, coverage of cash tips received by an employee after 1965, and an exemption from social security taxes of self-employed persons of the Amish and other religious sects.

Improvement of Kerr-Mills program: Extends the provisions of expanded State Medical Assistance programs not only to the indigent aged, but also to needy persons who are part of the dependent children, blind, and permanently and totally disabled programs. Establishes a single and separate medical care program to replace the differing provisions for the needy in other parts of the Social Security Act. Provides a level of medical services States must offer to receive Federal payments. Requires States to provide a flexible income test for eligibility.

Other provisions

Public assistance amendments: Increases the Federal share of payments under all State public assistance programs, effective January 1, 1966. Contains other amendments providing Federal incentive to States to benefit aged persons in tubercular and mental institutions.

Child health program amendments: Increases Federal authorization for maternal and child health services and for crippled children services. Authorizes grants to higher education institutions to train professional personnel for health and related care of crippled children, particularly mentally retarded children with multiple handicaps. Authorizes a new 5-year program of special project grants to provide health care and services for children from needy areas. Authorizes grants to help States to implement mental retardation plans.

Financing improved social security benefits: Improvements in the regular social security program and increased benefits provided in the bill would be financed through a revised payroll tax schedule. Taxes on employees, employers, and self-employed persons are paid into social security trust fund as in the past 30 years. Rates of tax are designed to guarantee the actuarial soundness of the social security system.

The revised tax schedule and the rates under existing law are:

[In percent]

Years	Employee and employer tax rate (each)		Self-employed tax rate	
	Existing law	Proposed in bill	Existing law	Proposed in bill
1965	3.625	3.625	5.4	5.4
1966–67	4.125	4.0	6.2	6.0
1968	4.625	4.0	6.9	6.0
1969–72	4.625	4.4	6.9	6.6
1973 on	4.625	4.8	6.9	7.0

As in the past, these amounts would be automatically deducted from payroll check. Tax would be paid on first $5,600 (instead of present $4,800) during the 1966–70 period. Thereafter, they would be paid on first $6,600 of annual earnings.

OPPOSITION TO VOTING RIGHTS PROPOSAL

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WAGGONNER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Louisiana, the Honorable SPEEDY O. LONG appeared before the House Committee on the Judiciary on April 1, in opposition to the voting rights proposal. I was present at that meeting of the committee to present my own opposition and I remained to hear my colleague's argument.

It is a sound position, one that has not been explored to the extent that it should and I commend him for presenting this view to the members of that committee.

I know that there is not an opportunity for every Member to attend every committee meeting and many Members did not hear my colleague when he spoke. With unanimous consent, I would like to insert his testimony here in the RECORD for the convenience of all. It is worthy of everyone's consideration and I urge you to study it before we are called upon to vote on this vindicative, ill-advised and unconstitutional proposal.

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIVE SPEEDY O. LONG, BEFORE THE HOUSE JUDICIARY SUBCOMMITTEE NO. 5

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am not here this morning to delve into the merits of H.R. 6400, but will address my remarks to whether or not Congress has the authority to enact such legislation. From the outset I wish to make it crystal clear that I do not oppose qualified persons from being eligible to vote, but that is not the issue. The issue, as I stated before, is simply whether or not Congress has the authority to enact this proposed legislation.

The situation regarding this matter is analogous to that in 1920 when amendment No. 19 of the Constitution of the United States was adopted which prohibited States from denying women the right to vote. I realize the composition of the court and the legislature as well as the executive branch of the U.S. Government has changed since that time, but gentlemen, I submit that the Constitution of the United States has not changed and I firmly believe that Congress must follow the same procedure in this instance that was followed in granting women the right to vote. The 15th amendment to the Constitution is the vehicle which is being used to implement the request for this legislation. The 15th amendment to the Constitution contains but few words. It is a very simple amendment phrased in very simple language, the interpretation of which neither demands nor requires deep and profound thought. The 15th amendment contains only two sections—Section 1 of the 15th ameudment prohibits the U.S. Government and any State government of the United States from denying a citizen of the United States the right to vote because of his race, his color, or his previous condition of servitude. The latter condition being of no import today.

Therefore, we address ourselves to the first two conditions—race and color. The authority of Congress to legislate under the 15th amendment is merely remedial and not definitive. Congress may have the authority to provide remedies against discrimination on the basis of race and color, but I submit that Congress is not vested with the authority to prescribe qualifications prerequisite to voting. I submit Congress has provided the appropriate remedy through our judicial system.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we should address ourselves to section 2 of amendment No. 15, since this section evidently is the section which some would have us believe that, gives Congress the authority to enact into law the bill which is under consideration here today. Section 2 of amendment 15 states, and I quote: "The Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

To me this section states or merely grants the Congress the authority to enact legislation which would prohibit the United States or a State of these United States from denying a person the right to vote because of his race, his color, or his previous condition of servitude. But by no means, and by no stretch of the imagination whatsoever, can we read into section 2 the authority or power of this Congress to enact legislation which would prescribe uniform voter qualifications throughout these United States, imposing a system of Federal registrars and a penalty upon those charged with administrations of State law, and more specifically, to look back 10 years to ascertain whether there had been discriminatory statutes or laws enacted by a State.

Amendment No. 10 to the Constitution of the United States specifically reserves to the States such power and authority. Amendment No. 10 is very clear, its intent is very clear, its meaning is very clear, its language is very simple. It is couched in simple language so there could be no misinterpretation of its meaning, its intent, and its purpose when it states that "the powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution not prohibited to it by the States, are reserved to the States respectfully or to the people" means just what it says—that the Congress has only the authority which it is granted by the Constitution of the United States, and nowhere, Mr. Chairman, and I repeat, and nowhere in the entire Constitution is the Congress given the authority to prescribe voter qualifications, nor did the respective States divest themselves of this authority, but on the other hand, reserved this same unto themselves.

If it is the desire of this Congress to establish voter qualifications via the Congress, we have one avenue open to us and one avenue only. We have one recourse and one recourse only, and that is by amending the Constitution of the United States.

Again I submit that the same procedure must be followed in this instance that was followed in granting women the right to vote, which as you all know, was by amending the Constitution of the United States.

The Congress, the judiciary, and the executive realized and understood that an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was necessary to insure the right to vote. In 1920, all three branches of our National Government realized that the 10th amendment prohibited Congress to legislate or confer this voting rights upon American women. But furthermore, and foremost, all three branches of our National Government agreed that this right has been reserved to the States in the 10th amendment, and today, Mr. Chairman, the 10th amendment reserves to the States the right to prescribe voter qualifications.

In the final analysis, Congress is being asked to usurp the right and the duty of the States by enacting a Federal voting rights law. It is another example of how the Federal Government has seized upon the historical, traditional and reserved rights of the States. It further indicates attempted removal of the Government from the people who created it.

Legislation such as the Federal voting rights bill brings us closer to a Federal police state. Support of this bill would be to tell your State legislature that it cannot pass a law of any kind with respect to voter qualifications.

OUR FOREIGN SERVICE OFFICERS

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROONEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it was my great pleasure last Thursday afternoon to attend the swearing-in ceremony for 28 new foreign service officers at the Department of State.

Along with many of my colleagues, I have, on occasion felt inclined to be critical of some of the actions of our State Department. Being the instrumentality of human beings it is, consequently, subject to human error. We lose sight of that, sometimes, and we often expect from a diplomat a degree of infallibility we would not attempt to exact from a lesser mortal.

I want you to know, however, that I was deeply impressed by last week's ceremony. Aside from the excellent atmosphere of the occasion, for which Mr. Herbert E. Leggett served as host officer and Mr. Joseph Palmer, Director General of Foreign Service, was the main speaker, the occasion afforded an inspiring glimpse of a kind of devotion and dedication often found but seldom noted in the ranks of the Department's personnel.

As I looked at these young people embarking upon a career in their chosen field of Government, I could not escape a feeling of intense respect and admiration.

These were men who could, very likely, have chosen to enter private enterprise at much more comfortable salaries in far more comfortable surroundings.

They chose, instead, to answer a call to duty, to serve their country and its people in the way they felt they would be best qualified.

The ceremony was all the more impressive because of its timing.

Less than a week before, the newspapers of the world were crowded with the shocking news of the bombing of our Embassy in Saigon.

Who could possibly forget the photographs of women lying dead in the streets before that Embassy? Who could erase from his mind's eye the violent destruction brought down upon well-meaning Americans whose sole concern in southeast Asia is, as it has always been, the preservation of the small hope freedom has.

Yet these young men have decided that the Foreign Service can offer them, and their country, the kind of dedicated, unselfish representation abroad which, in the last analysis, may mean the difference between global peace and universal conflict.

I want to take this opportunity to commend the staff of the Foreign Service Institute and the many unsung, quietly heroic individuals who attend to the painstaking, seldom glamorous or rewarding task of diplomacy.

A BILL TO REPEAL THE EXCISE TAX ON COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. McVicker] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to repeal the excise tax on communications.

The time for repealing this tax is long overdue, since this tax was initially a wartime measure intended to discourage use of the telephone. Yet today this tax survives along with numerous luxury excise taxes. Telephone service is not a luxury—it is a business and household necessity. It should be regarded on an equal basis with other utilities such as electricity, gas, and water—all of which enjoy exemption from the excise tax.

For many people, telephone service is the only means of contact with law enforcement officials, with the fire department, doctors, and hospitals. Yet the excise tax on telephone service is a discriminatory measure, since it is levied on all income groups equally, and it places the heaviest burden on the lower-paid groups. I urge my colleagues to enact legislation containing the measures provided for in my bill.

AGRICULTURAL LEGISLATION

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Purcell] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend President Johnson and Secretary of Agriculture Freeman for the proposed farm legislation which was presented to the Congress today. Title I of this legislation would extend the voluntary certificate program for wheat which was enacted by the Congress last year. This step, accompanied by the proposed increase in certificates to provide for 100 percent of parity on wheat consumed domestically, will move us a long way toward providing for our wheat farmers a fair share in the economic abundance of our Nation.

The voluntary certificate program for wheat has been very favorably accepted by the farmers. It has accomplished the goals which were intended. The cost of the program has been reduced. Our surplus stocks of wheat have been reduced. The income of wheat farmers has been maintained at a fair level. Food costs are low. And our market prices are competitive with world prices.

Mr. Speaker, a price for wheat of about $2.50 per bushel for that amount of wheat which is consumed as food in this country is only fair and just. This is 100 percent of parity, and it is the price which will allow the wheat producer to receive a fair return for his labor and investment.

For too long the wheat producer has been subsidizing the American consumer. In the past 20 years, he has not received an increase in price for the wheat required to make a loaf of bread. In the meantime, the price of that loaf of bread has increased considerably, the income of the consumer has increased considerably, and the farmer remains the only link in this food chain who has not benefited from the economic growth of our Nation.

What we too often forget is that the farmer's skill and ingenuity is, to a great degree, responsible for the economic expansion which our Nation has experienced. He has provided us with food in abundance for a smaller part of our consumer dollar than is the case in any other major nation in the world. Today we spend only about 19 cents of our consumer dollar for food. The Soviet citizens spends about half of his dollar for food, and in Europe the percentages are considerably higher than in the United States.

The proposal presented to us today, to provide the wheat farmer with 100 percent of parity, would justify only a 1-cent per loaf increase in the cost of bread. It would cost the consumer about $1.35 per year per capita. This is a small price to pay to protect the economic health of the most vital of our basic industries.

An increase in farmer income from wheat is vital to our rural areas and essential for our Nation's continued economic growth. If we are going to continue to enjoy the fruits of abundance of American agriculture, we are going to have to pay an American price for the wheat we eat. We can no longer afford to shortchange our efficient farm producers in our market places, and we can no longer expect the wheat growers to be able to afford to subsidize consumers to the extent they have in the past.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Congress to get right to work on this agricultural legislation proposed by the administration today.

And, once again, I want to offer, on behalf of the American farmer, thanks and appreciation to the administration for the proposals they have sent to us today.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Glenn Andrews (at the request of Mr. Gerald R. Ford), indefinitely, on account of official business with the House Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. Dyal (at the request of Mr. Albert), for today, on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Ryan, for 15 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Feighan, for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Reid of New York) to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Dickinson, for 60 minutes, on April 9; and for 60 minutes, on April 12.

Mr. Buchanan, for 60 minutes, on April 8.

Mr. McDowell (at the request of Mr. Farnum), for 10 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Rosenthal (at the request of Mr. Farnum), for 60 minutes on Wednesday, April 7; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Martin of Massachusetts and to include a statement.

Mr. Hall his remarks in Committee of the Whole on H.R. 7060, and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. Conte his remarks in Committee of the Whole, and to include extraneous matter and tables.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Reid of New York) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Laird.

Mr. Talcott.

Mr. MacGregor.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Farnum) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Cohelan.

Mr. Gathings.

Mr. St. Onge.

Mr. Cooley in two instances.

Mr. Scheuer.

Mr. King of Utah.

Mr. Pucinski.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 254. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Tualatin Federal reclamation project, Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 307. An act granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. FARNUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 6, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

860. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes" (H. Doc. No. 137); to the Committee on Agriculture; and ordered to be printed.

861. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations for the payment of rewards to facilitate the capture of fugitives from District of Columbia institutions and conditional release and parole violators"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

862. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend the act of July 11, 1947, to include members of the District of Columbia Fire Department, in the Metropolitan Police Department band, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

863. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill relating to compensation of summer school personnel of the public schools of the District of Columbia"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

864. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to authorize appropriations for the acquisition of land for the Washington Aqueduct by the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

865. A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a report listing department and independent agencies exercising the authority providing for information on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work or for the manufacturing or furnishing of property for such work for period July 1 through December 31, 1964, pursuant to section 302 of 5 U.S.C. 630; to the Committee on Government Operations.

866. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of lack of information on construction costs incurred by sponsor-controlled subcontractors may unduly increase insured mortgages on multifamily housing projects, Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency; to the Committee on Government Operations.

867. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the indirect procurement of selected subsystems and accessories for the P-3 aircraft, Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

868. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on unncessary costs incurred because of acceptance of physically unqualified enlisted members in the Armed Forces, Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government operations.

869. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on potential savings through use of Government-owned housing to meet military requirements in the Orlando, Fla., area, Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and Department of Defense; to the Committee on Government Operations.

870. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, General Services Administration, transmitting a report of records proposed for disposal pursuant to 63 Stat. 377; to the Committee on House Administration.

871. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report relative to deferment of charges for the period 1963 through 1972 payable by the Casper-Alcova Irrigation District, Kendrick project, Wyoming, to permit the continuation of a seepage control program, pursuant to Public Law 86-308; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

872. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of contract proposed with the Kansas-Bostwick Irrigation District No. 2, Missouri River Basin project, Kansas, for minor construction work, pursuant to 70 Stat. 274; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

873. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency, transmitting the sixth annual report of the Agency for fiscal year 1964, pursuant to section 313(e) of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

874. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to provide penalties for certain offenses committed in connection with highway construction"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

875. A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, transmitting a report for calendar year 1964 with respect to tort claims paid within the Agency, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2672 and 2673; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

876. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Nationality Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting an order suspending deportation in the case of Benjamin Pollock, A-8862836, pursuant to section 244(a)(2) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by Public Law 87-885; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

877. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders entered in cases of certain aliens found admissible to the United States, pursuant to section 212(a)(28)(I)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

878. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Nationality Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders suspending deportation in certain cases, and lists of persons involved, pursuant to section 244(a)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, as amended by Public Law 87-885; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

879. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting copies of orders exercised in behalf of certain aliens and entered in cases in which the authority is contained in section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, pursuant to section 212(d)(6) of the act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

880. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting an amendment reducing the request for appropriations transmitted in the budget for 1966 for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (H. Doc. No. 138); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 31, 1965, the following bill was reported on April 2, 1965:

Mr. MAHON: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 7091. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 31, 1965, the following bill was reported on April 3, 1965:

Mr. HAYS: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H.R. 7064. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended, without amendment (Rept. No. 225). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, pursuant to the order of the House of March 31, 1965, the following bill was introduced on April 2, 1965:

By Mr. MAHON:

H.R. 7091. A bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes.

[*Introduced and referred April 5, 1965*]

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASPINALL:

H.R. 7092. A bill to expand, extend, and accelerate the saline water conversion program conducted by the Secretary of the Interior, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOLAND:

H.R. 7093. A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 7094. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMERON:

H.R. 7095. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H.R. 7096. A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. COOLEY:

H.R. 7097. A bill to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DENT:

H.R. 7098. A bill to amend section 302(c) of the Labor-Management Relations Act, 1947, to permit the participation of retired employees of employers, employees of certain labor organizations and employees of certain trust funds as well as certain self-employed persons to participate as beneficiaries of welfare and pension trust funds; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 7099. A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.R. 7100. A bill to provide for the establishment and operation of a National Technical Institute for the Deaf; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. JOELSON:

H.R. 7101. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional income tax exemption for a taxpayer supporting a dependent who is mentally retarded; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.R. 7102. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act to impose certain additional conditions on the discontinuance of passenger train operations; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORRIS:

H.R. 7103. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contract with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District of New Mexico for the payment of operation and maintenance charges on certain Pueblo Indian lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOSS:

H.R. 7104. A bill to require the payment of interest for delinquent mineral leasing obligations; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 7105. A bill to provide for continuation of authority for regulation of exports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RONCALIO:

H.R. 7106. A bill to repeal section 14(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, and section 705(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 and to amend the first provision of section 8(a)(3) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7107. A bill to amend title 37, United States Code, to increase the rates of basic pay for members of the uniformed services; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 7108. A bill to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SLACK:

H.R. 7109. A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TUNNEY:

H.R. 7110. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of Utah:

H.R. 7111. A bill to amend the Federal Coal Mine Safety Act so as to provide further for the prevention of accidents in coal mines; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McCULLOCH:

H.R. 7112. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H.R. 7113. A bill to provide for the utilization of professional services of qualified consulting engineers in private industry in connection with public works and other projects undertaken by the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7114. A bill to repeal the provisions of law relating to the fixing by the Postmaster General, with the consent of the Interstate Commerce Commission, of rates of postage on fourth-class mail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 7115. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to promote the welfare of the Indian tribes by making available to them surplus personal property; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 7116. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to permit the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to correct certain physical defects of veterans during the course of their hospitalization in a Veterans' Administration facility; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7117. A bill to provide a realistic cost-of-living increase in rates of subsistence allowances paid to disabled veterans pursuing vocational rehabilitation training and to the sons and daughters of deceased or permanently and totally disabled veterans pursuing a program of education under the war orphans' educational assistance program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7118. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to make the children of certain veterans having a service-connected disability rated at not less than 50 percent eligible for benefits under the war orphans' educational assistance program; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7119. A bill to amend title 38 of the United States Code to provide increases in the rates of disability compensation to reflect the increase in the cost of living from the year 1933; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H.R. 7120. A bill to amend chapter 31 of title 38, United States Code, to extend to all totally disabled veterans the same liberalization of time limits for pursuing vocational rehabilitation training as was authorized for blinded veterans by Public Law 87–591, and to clarify the language of the law relating to the limiting of periods for pursuing such training; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BURKE:

H.R. 7121. A bill to provide grants for public works and development facilities, other financial assistance, and the planning and coordination needed to alleviate conditions of substantial and persistent unemployment and underemployment in economically distressed areas and regions; to the Committee on Public Works.

H.R. 7122. A bill to amend section 5051(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to aid small business and discourage continued concentration in the brewing industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CARTER:

H.R. 7123. A bill to amend section 1498 of title 28, United States Code, to authorize the use or manufacture, in certain cases, by or for the United States of any invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN:

H.R. 7124. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to exchange land with the county of Del Norte, Calif., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GERALD R. FORD:

H.R. 7125. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H.R. 7126. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H.R. 7127. A bill to repeal the excise tax on amounts paid for communication services or facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7128. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PHILBIN:

H.R. 7129. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H.R. 7130. A bill to amend the Assignment of Claims Act of 1940, as amended, with respect to priority of assignments; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7131. A bill to amend section 217 of the Social Security Act to provide that certain military or naval service not now creditable toward benefits under title II of such act may be counted toward such benefits if such service is not used in determining entitlement to, or the amount of, military retired pay; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.R. 7132. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to increase the amount of outside earnings permitted each year without any deductions from benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORHEAD (by request):

H.R. 7133. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act, the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and section 5155 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SENNER:

H.R. 7134. A bill to authorize Federal assistance for the construction by public school districts of classroom facilities needed for the education of Indian children who reside outside the boundaries of the district;

to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 7135. A bill to authorize assumption by the various States of civil or criminal jurisdiction over cases arising on Indian reservations with the consent of the tribe involved; to permit gradual transfer of such jurisdiction to the States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. McCARTHY:

H.R. 7136. A bill to provide for the establishment of the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities to promote progress and scholarship in the humanities and the arts in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. McDOWELL:

H.J. Res. 418. Joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the Government of Egypt be denied aid under the terms of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.J. Res. 419. Joint resolution to create a joint congressional committee to study and report on problems relating to industrywide collective bargaining and industrywide strikes and lockouts; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.J. Res. 420. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives shall be 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By BOB WILSON:

H.J. Res. 421. Joint resolution providing for appropriate ceremonies in connection with the raising and lowering of the flags of the United States surrounding the Washington Monument; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.J. Res. 422. Joint resolution to authorize the President to proclaim the fourth week of September of each year as National Square Dance Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

H.J. Res. 423. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that the term of office of Members of the U.S. House of Representatives shall be 4 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H. Con. Res. 382. Concurrent resolution condemning persecution by the Soviet Union of persons because of their religion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H. Res. 316. Resolution to increase the amount payable to witnesses before congressional committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. Res. 317. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 318. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct studies and investigations relating to certain matters within its jurisdiction; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. OLSEN of Montana:

H. Res. 319. Resolution to increase the amount payable to witnesses before congressional committees; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SHIPLEY:

H. Res. 320. Resolution to express the sense of the House of Representatives on certain changes in operating frequency in standard broadcast band; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

165. By Mr. BARING: Senate Joint Resolution No. 8 of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, finding that the Carson City, Nev., Post Office Building could best be used as an annex to the Nevada State Museum and memorializing the Congress and the General Services Administration to act in light of such finding; to the Committee on Public Works.

166. Also, Assembly Joint Resolution No. 2 of the Legislature of the State of Nevada, requesting and memorializing the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting one house of a bicameral legislature to be apportioned other than according to population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

167. By Mr. CONTE: Memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress to enact legislation to provide for an increase in the emphasis on desalination research and to provide greater aid and expansion for metropolitan reservoirs; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

168. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation establishing Prospect Hill Park in the city of Somerville as a national historic site; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

169. Also, memorial of the General Court of Massachusetts, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact the civil rights legislation of President Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

170. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the NATO Parliamentarians' Conference, Paris, France, transmitting to the Congress of the United States a copy of reports and recommendations adopted by the 10th Annual Conference of the NATO Parliamentarians, held in Paris, November 16–21, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

171. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to approving pending legislation providing low-interest, long-term loans to small businesses; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

172. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alaska, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to urging the enactment of a Federal reinsurance program for natural disasters; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

173. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relating to increasing psychiatric services available through the U.S. Veterans' Administration to veterans who reside in California; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

174. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to take all actions necessary to expedite the undertaking of a flood control study of the windward side of the island of Oahu, State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Public Works.

175. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to retain a silver coinage of reduced silver content and to undertake a comprehensive study of the growing strategic importance of silver in defense and aerospace applications and determine an adequate strategic stockpile objective which can be set aside from existing Treasury stocks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

176. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Massachusetts, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact the civil rights legislation of President Johnson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

177. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to urge the Parliament and Government of the German Federal Republic to rescind its decision to institute a statute of limitations on prosecution of Nazi war criminals; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

178. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States expressing opposition to legislation to charge cooperators of soil and water conservation districts for technical assistance by the Federal Soil Conservation Service; to the Committee on Agriculture.

179. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Washington, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to devise and approve legislation for the extension of the Alaska Marine Highway as a part of the U.S. Interstate Highway System to a southern terminus connecting with U.S. Interstate Highway No. 5, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Public Works.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 7137. A bill for the relief of Maj. Leonard H. Potterbaum, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7138. A bill for the relief of Maj. Donald B. Powers, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BARING:

H.R. 7139. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands in Clark County, Nev., to Francis W. Thorne; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 7140. A bill for the relief of Joe D. Armendariz; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 7141. A bill for the relief of Ronald Whelan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FARBSTEIN:

H.R. 7142. A bill for the relief of Henrique Orange Fernandes Gomes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLYNT:

H.R. 7143. A bill for the relief of Birdsey Flour Mills, trading as Birdsey Flour & Feed Mills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HORTON:

H.R. 7144. A bill for the relief of Angela Yuen Chee Hsiao; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7145. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Reyhan Yalim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORRISON:

H.R. 7146. A bill for the relief of Mary Louise Swasey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MULTER:

H.R. 7147. A bill for the relief of Moise Hazan and his wife, Bahie Hazan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'KONSKI:

H.R. 7148. A bill for the relief of Josef Enzinger; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TEAGUE of California:

H.R. 7149. A bill for the relief of Manuel J. Vicent; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALBERT:

H.R. 7150. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lesline Gilbert Bryant; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

150. By Mr. CORMAN: Petition of John R. Brusati and the Patriots for Voluntary Enlistment urging immediate termination of compulsory military service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

151. By Mr. KING of Utah: Petition of the Central Utah Water Conservancy District in support of appropriation of funds by the 89th Congress, 1st session, for construction of the Bonneville unit of the Central Utah project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

152. By Mr. PHILBIN: Petition of the City Council of the City of Fitchburg, Mass., against the closing of the Rutland Heights, Mass., Veterans' Administration Hospital; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

153. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the City Council, Gary, Ind., with reference to the restoration of full freedom of collective bargaining throughout the United States by repealing existing sanctions of State "right-to-work" laws; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

154. Also, petition of the City Council, Boston, Mass., with reference to requesting that the Government delay the sale of certain surplus lands; to the Committee on Government Operations.

155. Also, petition of Henry Stoner, Avon Park, Fla., with reference to urging Congress to use its powers under article I, section 8, clause 18, of the U.S. Constitution to define the term "proper standing," in a Federal or U.S. court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

156. Also, petition of the Pointe Coupee Parish School Board, New Roads, La., with reference to requesting the continuance and expansion of the Nation's soil and water conservation programs; to the Committee on Agriculture.

SENATE

MONDAY, APRIL 5, 1965

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, Thou art the shining presence at the high altar of our hearts, where blaze the candles of faith and hope and love.

Closing the doors of a noisy world, with all its terror and alarm, we would bow with contrite hearts at this shrine of quietness and peace, in communion with Thee, who hast made us for Thyself.

As before Thee we search our own hearts, we are shamed by what we are, yet lifted up by what is still within us to become. We confess the fickleness and folly which so often have disappointed us and Thee. Forgive us for smug satisfaction with ourselves and for cynical contempt of others. Purge our minds of the prejudices which separate us from others; cleanse our hearts of the uncleanness which blinds our eyes to Thee and to the godlike everywhere. Amidst all the busy shuttles of legislation, as here is woven the fabric of law and order shielding the life of our democracy, save us from being so enmeshed in the immediate mechanics of our tasks as to lose sight of the radiant pattern shown in the mount of vision.

In the dear Redeemer's name we ask it. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, April 1, 1965, was dispensed with.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of April 1, 1965, the following reports of committees were submitted on April 2, 1965:

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

S. 800. A bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 144).

By Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

H.R. 5721. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; individual views filed (Rept. No. 145).

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Jones, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on April 2, 1965, the President had approved and signed the act (H.R. 1496) to authorize the release of certain quantities of zinc, lead, and copper from either the national stockpile or the supplemental stockpile, or both.

REPORT OF OFFICE OF MINERALS EXPLORATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 13th Semiannual Report of the Office of Minerals Exploration from the Secretary of the Interior as prescribed by section 5 of the act of August 21, 1958, entitled "To provide a program for the discovery of the mineral reserves of the United States, its territories and possessions, by encouraging exploration for minerals, and for other purposes."

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 5, 1965.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 21. An act to provide for the optimum development of the Nation's natural resources through the coordinated planning of water and related land resources, through the establishment of a water resources council and river basin commissions, and by providing financial assistance to the States in order to increase State participation in such planning; and

S. 974. An act to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE LEGISLATIVE CALENDAR UNDER RULE VIII

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the call of the Legislative Calendar under rule VIII was dispensed with.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Subcommittee on Indian Affairs of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency was authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for members of the Federal Farm Credit Board.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Stanley R. Resor, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. NAVY

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

On request of Mr. Mansfield, and by unanimous consent, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS AND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I have not requested a morning hour because it was my understanding that certain Senators were to be present to discuss the migrant labor problem. I ask unanimous consent that until those Senators arrive, there be a morning hour, which very likely will be continued after they have finished, and that statements during the transaction of the routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

Proposed Legislation Relating to District of Columbia

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the payment of rewards to facilitate the capture of fugitives from District of Columbia institutions and conditional release and parole violators (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation relating to compensation of summer school personnel of the public schools of the District of Columbia (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the acquisition of land for the Washington Aqueduct by the Chief of Engineers, Corps of Engineers, U.S. Army (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of July 11, 1947, to include members of the District of Columbia Fire Department, in the Metropolitan Police Department band, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Acceptance of Settlement of Certain Indebtedness of Greece to the United States

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the acceptance of a settlement of certain indebtedness of Greece to the United States and to authorize the use of the payments resulting from the settlement for a cultural and educational exchange program (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Penalties for Certain Offenses Committed in Connection With Highway Construction

A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide penalties for certain offenses committed in connection with highway construction (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Audit Report of National Safety Council

A letter from the president, National Safety Council, Chicago, Ill., transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report of the financial transactions of that council, for the year 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"HOUSE MEMORIAL 6 OF THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

"Memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to enable a Federal survey of land grant areas in New Mexico

"Whereas land grant rights were recognized and given status, by the treaty entered at Ciudad Guadalupe Hidalgo on February 2, 1848, between the United States and the United Mexican States, which was ratified at Queretaro on May 30, 1848; and

"Whereas land grant rights were recognized and protected by the Organic Act establishing the Territory of New Mexico and later by U.S. Courts of Land Claims; and

"Whereas land grants were purportedly the subject of a U.S. engineering-geographical survey, while actually land grants, particularly in Mora County, N. Mex., have never been surveyed; and

"Whereas grant lands, particularly in Mora County, without the benefit of a certain and accurate method of property description cannot be conveyed from primary holdings to smaller parcels or otherwise subdivided; and

"Whereas because of foreign and vague land descriptions, grant lands do not enjoy accurate and uniform property description based on Federal survey as do the lands of other former territories, and which is needed to confirm and protect real property titles and to facilitate economic development; and

"Whereas economic considerations preclude the possibility of grant land owners undertaking to conform grant land survey in New Mexico into the uniform Federal survey now extant: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States is asked to enable a Federal engineering-geographic survey of the grant lands in New Mexico, particularly those grant lands of Mora County; and be it further

"*Resolved,* That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Congress, to the leadership in the Congress and to the New Mexico delegation to the Congress.

"BRUCE KING,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"ALBERT ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Arkansas; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1

"Joint resolution applying to Congress to call a convention for the purpose of proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States

"Be it resolved by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Arkansas (*the House of Representatives concurring therein*), That this legislature respectfully applies to the Congress of the United States to call a convention for the purpose of proposing the following article as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

"ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

" 'SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within 7 years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.'

"Be it further resolved, That if Congress shall have proposed an amendment to the Constitution identical with that contained in this resolution prior to June 1, 1965, this application for a convention shall no longer be of any force or effect; be it further

"Resolved, That a duly attested copy of this resolution be immediately transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"ROBERT HARVEY."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nevada; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"JOINT RESOLUTION OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

"Resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the Constitution of the United States permitting one house of a bicameral legislature to be apportioned other than according to population

"Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States has ruled that membership in both houses of a bicameral State legislature must be apportioned according to population and has thus asserted Federal judicial authority over the basic structure of government in the various States; and

"Whereas this rule denies to the people of the respective States the right to establish their legislatures upon the same pattern of representation deemed advantageous for the Congress of the United States and provided by the Federal Constitution; and

"Whereas this action of the Supreme Court goes so far as to restrict the ability of the citizens of the respective States to designate the manner in which they shall be represented in their respective legislatures thereby depriving the people of their right to determine how they shall be governed; and

"Whereas the implications of this action by the Supreme Court has raised serious doubts as to the legality of the present form of the governing bodies of many subordinate units of government within the States: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the assembly and senate of the State of Nevada (jointly), That this legislature respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to propose an amendment to the U.S. Constitution which would provide:

" 'ARTICLE —

" 'SECTION 1. Nothing in this Constitution shall prohibit any State which shall have a bicameral legislature from apportioning the membership of one house of such legislature on factors other than population, provided that the plan of such apportionment shall have been submitted to and approved by a vote of the electorate of that State.

" 'SEC. 2. Nothing in this Constitution shall restrict or limit a State in its determination of how membership of governing bodies of its subordinate units shall be apportioned.

" 'SEC. 3. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the several States within seven years from the date of its submission to the States by the Congress.'

"And be it further resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be immediately transmitted by the Secretary of State to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States and to each Member of the Congress from this State.

"PAUL LAXALT,
"President of the Senate.
"LEOLA H. ARMSTRONG,
"Secretary of the Senate.
"WM D. SWACKHAMER,
"Speaker of the Assembly.
"NATHAN T. HURST,
"Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
"GRANT SAWYER,
"Governor of the State of Nevada."

A resolution adopted by the Tidewater Crime Clinic, of the State of Virginia, Norfolk, Va., expressing opposition to the proposal to transfer any of the functions of the Narcotics Bureau to other branches of the Federal Government; to the Committee on Finance.

RESOLUTIONS OF MASSACHUSETTS GENERAL COURT

Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] and myself, I present a certified copy of a resolution entitled "Resolutions Memorializing the Congress of the United States To Enact the Civil Rights Legislation of President Johnson," adopted by the house of representatives of the general court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts on March 19, 1965.

I ask that this resolution be appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES TO ENACT THE CIVIL RIGHTS LEGISLATION OF PRESIDENT JOHNSON

Whereas today, in many States of our Union there exists a denial to many of our citizens the right to vote; and

Whereas President Johnson in an attempt to right this injustice and insure equal rights to all citizens, has submitted civil rights legislation to Congress; and

Whereas because of tense feeling presently existing in our country because of this denial of equal rights, dividing neighbor against neighbor and State against State, it is expedient that this civil rights legislation be given top priority and support: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take immediate action and support President Johnson's civil rights legislation; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted by the Secretary of the Commonwealth to the presiding officers of each branch of Congress, and to each Senator and Representative from Massachusetts in the Congress of the United States.

House of Representatives, adopted, March 19, 1965.

WILLIAM C. MAIERS,
Clerk.

Attest:

KEVIN H. WHITE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

SILVER—JOINT RESOLUTION OF IDAHO LEGISLATURE

Mr. JORDAN of Idaho. Mr. President, the increasing imbalance between the consumption and the production of silver is of particular interest and importance to the people of Idaho. As the No. 1 State in silver production we believe we should encourage the maximum production of this metal which has played such a significant part in the development of our civilization.

Since earliest recorded history silver and gold have been the measure of a nation's wealth and prestige. Silver has been an integral part in the coinage system of the United States since 1837. Now that our silver bullion reserve is being reduced at a rapid rate there is good reason to reduce but not eliminate entirely, the content of silver in our auxiliary coins. I am a cosponser of S. 1297 to accomplish this objective.

Mr. President, the Idaho Legislature memorialized Congress by House Joint Memorial 9 urging that the Federal Government retain silver coinage of reduced silver content in order to preserve the international prestige of our money and public confidence therein.

I ask unanimous consent that this memorial be placed in the RECORD at this point, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 9 OF THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress Assembled and to the Honorable Secretary of the Treasury of the United States:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, respectfully represent that:

Whereas free world consumption of silver is continuing to exceed free world production by a steadily widening margin; and

Whereas U.S. Treasury stocks of silver are being depleted at an accelerated rate to make up a major portion of the deficit; and

Whereas these stocks may be completely dissipated in less than 3 years if the current rate of depletion continues; and

Whereas this situation poses a serious threat to the Nation's silver coinage system which is now under critical review by the U.S. Treasury Department; and

Whereas some segments of our national economy, in particular the silver-consuming industry, are exerting heavy pressure for the complete elimination of silver from our subsidiary coinage; and

Whereas this proposed adoption of a completely base-metal coinage would not only damage the international prestige and dignity of our money, but would also involve a high risk of psychological rejection of such coins in the domestic economy; and

Whereas a completely base-metal coinage system would also involve:

1. A grave danger that existing silver coinage with intrinsic value would be driven into hoards, thus aggravating the current coin shortage problem.

2. A serious disruption to the multi-billion-dollar vending machine industry and other industries utilizing coin machines which rely upon the peculiar characteristics of silver for operation of their rejection devices.

3. Greatly increased prospects for counterfeiting; and

Whereas the current balance of U.S. Treasury stocks, together with the extensive silver supply now circulating as silver coins and the excellent prospects for increased silver production in the immediate years ahead, provides persuasive assurance that this critical problem could readily be resolved through the less drastic alternative of retaining a silver coinage with reduced silver content, and

Whereas such a solution would not only preserve our Nation's long tradition of a coinage with intrinsic value, but would also sustain a more favorable economic climate for one of the major segments of Idaho's economy—the mining industry: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho, now in session, (the Senate and the House of Representatives concurring), That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States and the executive department of the Federal Government to retain a silver coinage of reduced silver content in order to preserve the international prestige of our money, and public confidence therein.

We further respectfully urge the Congress of the United States and the executive department of the Federal Government to undertake a comprehensive study of the growing strategic importance of silver in defense and aerospace applications and determine an adequate strategic stockpile objective which can be set aside from existing Treasury stocks before they are completely dissipated; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

PETE T. CENARRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
W. E. DREVLOW,
President of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1695. A bill to repeal certain acts relating to exportation of tobacco plants and seed, naval stores, and wool, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. BAYH:

S. 1696. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Philip J. Fichman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1697. A bill to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, in order to make the widows of certain peacetime veterans eligible for loans under such chapter; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. BAYH when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S. 1698. A bill to amend the Bank Merger Act so as to provide that bank mergers, whether accomplished by the acquisition of stock or assets or in any other way, are subject exclusively to the provisions of the Bank Merger Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. ROBERTSON when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK:

S. 1699. A bill for the relief of Esen Ortac Traub; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LONG of Missouri:

S. 1700. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Usha Hasmukh Mehta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SYMINGTON:

S. 1701. A bill to provide relief for Dr. Jose M. Quintero; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S. 1702. A bill to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See the remarks of Mr. ELLENDER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1703. A bill for the relief of Hyder M. Carim, Mahera Carim, and Altaf Carim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 1704. A bill for the relief of certain members of the American Hull Insurance Syndicate; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. DIRKSEN when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

CERTAIN LOANS TO WIDOWS OF MILITARY PERSONNEL KILLED IN LINE OF DUTY

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make the widows of military personnel killed in the line of duty eligible for certain loans which are now available to the widows of World War II and Korean conflict veterans. This bill, which is similar to S. 3092 which I introduced late in the 88th Congress, would rectify what appears to me to be an injustice in the operation of our present laws.

The need for this legislation was dramatically called to my attention by the death of Donald McCord, from Crawfordsville, Ind., who lost his life while serving on the ill-fated nuclear submarine *Thresher*.

Because Donald McCord was a post-Korean member of the Armed Forces, his widow—and three children—were unable to obtain a VA home loan. Widows of veterans who served in World War II and in the Korean conflict have benefited greatly from the direct, guaranteed, or insured loan provisions which Congress authorized by prior enactment.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the widows of all military men whose death resulted from a service-connected disability arising out of active military, naval, or air service should be entitled to these loan benefits. Those brave men who today are making the supreme sacrifice in the service of their country, whether it be as the result of a downed helicopter, a sniper's bullet, a sneak bombing, a damaged or faulty airplane, or a naval accident, should be entitled to benefits for their loved ones equivalent to those who lost their lives in earlier military activities.

My bill would not require additional appropriations nor increase the budget. The net effect would be simply to entitle widows of post-Korean military veterans, whose death can be attributed to active service factors, to the small downpayment and low interest features for home and business loans insured by the Veterans' Administration. The bill would limit benefits to a period of 10 years after the date of the veteran's death, except that no entitlement would expire prior to 10 years after the bill were enacted.

Mr. President, the financial and human success of the VA loan program is well known. At very little cost it has enabled the widows of thousands of veterans to obtain needed housing or to establish small businesses. With the risk of loss almost negligible, I urge the adoption of this bill in order to treat equitably and justly the dependents of those who suffer service-connected deaths from causes incurred on active duty.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McGOVERN in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1697) to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, in order to make the widows of certain peacetime veterans eligible for loans under such chapter, introduced by Mr. BAYH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

BANK MERGERS

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to eliminate the misunderstanding, confusion, and controversy which we now find in the bank merger field. My bill would exempt bank mergers approved under the Bank Merger Act from the restrictions of the Sherman Antitrust Act and section 7 of the Clayton Act. This would place bank mergers in the same category as mergers in other regulated industries approved under other statutes which delegate to specialized agencies the responsibility for carrying out our antitrust policies. This is the case with railroad mergers. I am sure no one here would want to turn over the problems involved in the New York Central-Pennsylvania Railroad merger to the Antitrust Division and the district court under the antitrust laws.

At the time the Bank Merger Act of 1960 was adopted it was generally agreed—in fact I think it was fair to say that it was universally agreed—that the restrictions of section 7 of the Clayton Act did not apply to bank mergers, and I think it was universally recognized that the decision of the Congress was against making section 7 of the Clayton Act applicable to bank mergers. The long background of the Bank Merger Act including specifically the overwhelming vote by which the O'Mahoney amendment was rejected—55 nays to 25 yeas—make this clear. In 1960 it was also generally recognized that the Sherman Act—if it applied to banking and bank mergers at all—had not proved effective to prevent bank mergers and was no protection to the current wave of bank mergers.

I think all will agree that the Bank Merger Act was intended to be the antitrust law applicable to the field of bank mergers, providing for a balanced judgment including due consideration of banking factors, public convenience and necessity, and competitive factors including tendencies toward monopoly.

The Supreme Court in the Philadelphia and Lexington cases has rewritten the antitrust laws and has nullified the intention of the Congress in passing the Bank Merger Act.

My bill will reinstate the original purpose and intent of Congress when it passed the Bank Merger Act. Since, in my judgment, the Supreme Court has erroneously interpreted antitrust laws and the Bank Merger Act, my bill is drafted so as to be applicable not only to future mergers but to all mergers heretofore consummated pursuant to appropriate regulatory approval including mergers now under attack by the Department of Justice under the antitrust laws.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred, and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1698) to amend the Bank Merger Act so as to provide that bank mergers, whether accomplished by the acquisition of stock or assets or in any other way, are subject exclusively to the provisions of the Bank Merger Act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Robertson, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

S. 1698

A bill to amend the Bank Merger Act so as to provide that bank mergers, whether accomplished by the acquisition of stock or assets or in any other way, are subject exclusively to the provisions of the Bank Merger Act, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (c) of section 18 of the Federal Deposit Insurance Act is amended by adding immediately before the last sentence of that subsection the following sentence:

"The authority to approve mergers, consolidations, and acquisitions of stock or assets and assumptions of liabilities, herein conferred on the Comptroller of the Currency, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and the Corporation shall be exclusive and plenary, and any banks participating in a transaction approved or authorized under the provisions of this section shall be and they are relieved from the operation of the antitrust laws, including the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Clayton Act, with respect to such transaction, whether accomplished by the acquisition of stock or the acquisition of assets, or in any other way, and whether such transaction has been or is hereafter consummated."

Sec. 2. No proceedings shall hereafter be instituted or prosecuted under the antitrust laws, including the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Clayton Act, against any bank insured under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act by reason of or with respect to any merger, consolidation, or acquisition of stock or assets and assumption of liabilities consummated before May 13, 1960, pursuant to approval of the appropriate State or Federal bank supervisory authority.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN HULL INSURANCE SYNDICATE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill for the relief of certain members of the American Hull Insurance Syndicate.

This bill was introduced by me on March 29, 1965. I presume, through my own inadvertence, a sentence was deleted or omitted from the bill. This is a replacement of the bill, S. 1600, that was introduced at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1704) for the relief of certain members of the American Hull Insurance Syndicate, introduced by Mr. Dirksen, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

VOTING RIGHTS BILL—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 64)

Mr. KENNEDY of New York. I submit, for appropriate reference, an amendment to S. 1564, the administration's bill to end voter discrimination. My amendment would extend that bill to make sure that no citizen who was educated in an American-flag school in which the classroom language was other than English is denied the right to vote for failure to pass an English-language literacy test. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the Record at the close of my remarks.

I think everyone associated with S. 1564 hopes that it will be passed in the strongest possible form, the form which goes as far as law can go in stopping discrimination in the registration and voting processes. It would be a great shame if next year we found that we had not gone far enough with this year's effort and that we had to act again. That being so, I rise today to ask that S. 1564 be amended so as to reach a form of discrimination which persists under the law of New York State.

There are between 450,000 and 480,000 Puerto Rican citizens of voting age in New York City. Depending on which estimate is correct, the number of these citizens who are not registered to vote is anywhere from 225,000 to 330,000. Many of those who are not registered have been refused because they cannot pass New York State's English language literacy test, even though they are literate in Spanish, having been educated in that language in schools under the American flag in Puerto Rico.

In my judgment Congress can and should find that the operation of New York's literacy test to deprive literate Puerto Ricans of the right to vote is State action arbitrarily denying the franchise to a class of citizens. These Puerto Ricans have not only been educated under the American flag in Puerto Rico, but are well informed about public issues through a great variety of Spanish-language newspapers and periodicals, and radio and television programs. They should no longer be deprived of their right to vote because they cannot pass an English language literacy test. Their educational achievement in their native Puerto Rico should no longer go unrecognized.

This amendment is constitutional. It is firmly grounded in the language of the 14th amendment, since it seeks to repair a discrimination against the educational achievement of a class of people. To any who argue that it should not be added to S. 1564 because that is captioned as a 15th amendment piece of legislation, I think it suffices to say that we must be prepared to legislate against discrimination in the registration and voting processes wherever it appears, and that there is no constitutional barrier to adding an amendment premised upon a different constitutional dictate. There is no reason of ritual or rote which requires a separate bill merely because the form of the discrimination is different from that reached by the rest of the bill.

The amendment is neutrally worded. It does not single out New York in so many words. It applies to any State in which an English language literacy test discriminates against persons educated in American-flag schools in which the main classroom language was other than English. If, for instance, Hawaii's literacy test were not available in both English and Hawaiian, as it so wisely is, the amendment might well have had some application in that State. Because the amendment is neutral in its wording, it was necessary to find a level of educational achievement which correlates generally with the existence of literacy. Administration bills in recent years relating to proof of literacy have, supported by various studies, used the 6th grade as the benchmark, and I have therefore used that standard in my amendment.

I am convinced that Congress should act to right the discrimination created by the law of New York State. I do, of course, hope that the State will end the discrimination of its own accord in the present legislative session by making its literacy test available on a bilingual basis as Hawaii does, or by some other approach, but even if it does act, it will take some time before the action can be effective. The literacy test provision is in the State constitution, and changes in that document must pass two successive sessions of the State legislatures and then be submitted to the people as well. Therefore, even if it were certain that New York State will change its literacy test this year, there would still be ample reason for the Congress to act now to get immediate relief for the thousands of disenfranchised Puerto Ricans in New York. I hope the Judiciary Committee will adopt my amendment and incorporate it in S. 1564.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the Record.

The amendment (No. 64) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

On page 3, between lines 23 and 24, insert the following new subsection:

"(d) No person shall be denied the right to vote in any Federal, State, or local election because of his inability to speak or understand the English language, or to read or write matter in the English language, if he demonstrates that he has successfully completed the sixth primary grade in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, any State or territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico in which the predominant classroom language was other than English."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to add the name of Senator Bible to the cosponsors of S. 1297, my bill to lower the percentage of silver in our coins.

I also ask unanimous consent to add the names of Senators Tydings, Byrd of West Virginia, and Williams of New Jersey to S. 1446, the bill creating a National Wild Rivers System.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the next printing of Senate Joint Resolution 35, permitting citizens of the United States who have reached the age of 18 to vote in Federal elections, the name of the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. Hart] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Kennedy] I ask unanimous consent that his name be added as a cosponsor of Senate Joint Resolution 65.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Under authority of the orders of the Senate, as indicated below, the following names have been added as additional cosponsors for the following bills:

Authority of March 22, 1965:

S. 1584. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the General Services to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies: Mr. Proxmire.

By authority of March 25, 1965:

S. 1605. A bill authorizing additional appropriations for prosecution of projects in certain comprehensive river basin plans for flood control, navigation, and other purposes: Mr. Dirksen, Mr. Fulbright, Mr. Holland, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Long of Missouri, Mr. Magnuson, Mr. McClellan, Mr. McGovern, Mr. Metcalf, Mr. Murphy, Mrs. Neuberger, and Mr. Young of North Dakota.

S. 1633. A bill to amend title 23 of the United States Code, relating to highways, in order to authorize a program to improve safety on the Federal aid primary, secondary, and urban systems of highways: Mr. Long of Missouri.

S. 1634. A bill to prohibit the introduction into interstate commerce of any shipping container manufactured in the United States from imported steel unless the container is marked so as to indicate the country of origin of the steel: Mr. Bennett.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 307) granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity, and it was signed by the Vice President.

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, April 5, 1965, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 307) granting the consent of Congress to a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

By Mr. COOPER:

An address by Senator John Sherman Cooper on August 30, 1957, entitled "The Tobacco Program: Why It is Needed; How It Is Working."

FOREIGN CREDITORS SHOULD REPAY THEIR NATIONAL DEBT TO THE UNITED STATES BEFORE DEMANDING OUR PAYMENT IN GOLD

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, in the face of our rapidly vanishing gold reserves, I have received a number of letters suggesting that we call upon our debtors of World War I to honor their debt obligations to the United States and to desist from asking the United States to pay its current short-term obligations in gold instead of our paper dollars. I agree with the arguments made by these Ohio citizens that our short-term foreign creditors first pay up their national debt to the United States incurred in World War I before demanding that we pay their present short-term credits in gold.

On March 9, when Secretary of State Dean Rusk appeared before the Foreign Relations Committee, he answered certain questions which I put to him pertaining to this problem. Since that time, the Secretary has submitted to the committee a tabulation of the debtor nations and the amounts which they owe us.

President de Gaulle has been unjustifiably drawing on our gold, creating great difficulty for us in our balance-of-payments problems.

He obviously forgets or is unwilling to consider that the United States has been fair and mindful of the past interdependency of the United States and France. France owes the United States $6,600,759,301 due from World War I. The people of the United States know that this debt arose out of the war in which we fought a common foe.

We have not demanded the payment of this French indebtedness. The United States is prepared to pay in dollars the short-term obligations we owe to France but President de Gaulle insists that the payments be made in gold.

We were considerate of the problem of the French people, but President de Gaulle is not equally considerate of our present problem. Our country on the basis of reciprocity and justice is entitled to better treatment than that which it has been accorded by President De Gaulle.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the dialog which I had with Secretary Rusk be printed in the Record:

There being no objection, the dialog was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Senator Long. No thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. The Senator from Ohio.

TOTAL FOREIGN INDEBTEDNESS TO THE UNITED STATES

Senator Lausche. I would like to ask a few questions. Mr. Rusk, some mention has been made of the debts owing to us by different nations, as a consequence, one, of World War I, and then, of World War II. Do you have available in round numbers the aggregate indebtedness that exists now, including the interest accumulation on the still existent debts of World War I?

Secretary Rusk. I don't have that with me this morning, Senator. I did mention the figure of just over $6 billion as it relates to France, but I don't have the others. I will be very glad to furnish those for the record.

Senator Lausche. Do I understand you to say that the debt of France alone is $6 billion, or is that the aggregate of all the nations?

Secretary Rusk. No, that is the World War I debt, accumulated principal and interest over time, in the absence of a final settlement or elimination of the problem.

Senator Lausche. Relating to France alone?

Secretary Rusk. Yes, sir, according to the information——

The Chairman. If the Senator will yield, I put that in the record last year in a speech. I got the figure from the Treasury, and it is over $6 billion. Part of that is not yet due under the arrangements made after the war. The due date hasn't arrived, but that is the total up to now including what——

Secretary Rusk. As far as the debts that arose out of World War II are concerned, France is current in its payments of those debts.

Senator Lausche. May I ask the chairman did his tabulation also cover the aggregate debts that are owing to us out of World War II?

The Chairman. No, it did not, because they were current with those debts. There were the ones growing up subsequent to World War I. Most of them were set forth in settlements made about the time of the Young agreement made in the twenties.

Secretary Rusk. That is correct, sir.

Senator Lausche. I would like to have supplied for the record a tabulation of the identity of the debtors, the principal amounts still due, and the accumulated interest on World War I debts and a similar tabulation relating to World War II.

(The information referred to follows:)

Indebtedness of foreign governments to the United States arising from World War I, as of June 30, 1964

	Original Indebtedness	Interest through June 30, 1964	Total	Cumulative payments		Amount due June 30, 1964		
				Principal	Interest	Total	Unreturned principal	Principal and interest due and unpaid
Armenia	$11,959,917.49	$26,793,083.37	$38,753,000.86	--------	--------	$38,753,000.86	--------	$38,753,000.86
Austria [1]	26,843,148.66	44,058.93	26,887,207.59	$682,688.00	--------	26,025,539.59	$3,530,505.24	22,494,034.35
Belgium	419,837,630.37	293,936,720.47	713,774,350.84	19,157,630.37	$33,033,642.87	661,583,077.60	219,980,000.00	441,603,077.60
Cuba	10,000,000.00	2,286,751.58	12,286,751.68	10,000,000.00	2,286,751.58	--------	--------	--------
Czechoslovakia	185,071,023.07	97,297,635.61	282,368,658.78	19,829,914.17	304,178.09	262,234,566.52	91,875,000.00	170,359,566.52
Estonia	16,466,012.87	20,152,190.71	16,618,202.88	--------	1,248,432.07	35,369,720.81	10,036,000.00	25,333,770.81
Finland	8,999,999.97	10,953,718.46	19,953,718.43	[2] 3,751,300.98	[2] 10,937,285.27	5,285,132.18	5,243,698.99	[3] 16,433.19
France	4,089,689,523.18	2,552,119,487.14	6,944,809,075.32	226,639,588.18	70,036,302.82	6,455,733,184.32	1,958,692,869.71	4,497,000,314.61
Great Britain	4,802,181,641.56	6,524,431,953.11	11,326,613,599.67	134,481,641.56	1,590,672,656.18	9,301,759,391.93	2,701,000,000.00	6,600,759,301.93
Greece [4]	32,499,922.67	16,781,628.44	49,281,531.11	983,922.67	3,143,133.34	45,154,495.10	9,100,000.00	36,054,495.10
Hungary [5]	1,982,555.50	2,576,335.31	4,553,890.61	73,995.50	182,924.26	4,001,971.05	1,212,085.00	2,789,886.05
Italy	2,042,364,319.28	295,203,720.22	2,337,368,039.50	37,464,319.28	63,365,560.88	2,236,538,199.34	1,262,900,000.00	953,638,159.34
Latvia	6,888,634.20	8,533,006.20	15,421,671.11	9,200.00	752,349.07	14,660,122.04	4,230,300.00	10,129,822.04
Liberia	26,000.00	10,471.52	36,471.55	26,000.00	10,471.56	--------	--------	--------
Lithuania	6,432,465.00	7,965,412.34	14,397,877.14	234,783.00	1,003,173.58	13,159,920.56	3,859,007.00	9,300,913.56
Nicaragua [6]	141,950.36	26,625.48	168,575.84	112,950.36	26,625.48	--------	--------	--------
Poland	207,344,297.37	257,946,604.38	465,290,901.75	[7] 1,287,299.37	21,359,000.18	442,644,684.20	128,375,000.00	314,269,604.20
Rumania	68,359,192.45	45,816,305.84	114,175,498.89	[8] 4,498,632.02	[8] 292,375.20	109,384,491.07	35,084,000.00	74,300,491.07
Russia	192,601,297.57	447,199,484.93	639,800,782.30	--------	[9] 8,750,311.88	631,050,470.42	--------	631,050,470.42
Yugoslavia	63,577,712.55	19,354,652.92	82,932,365.47	1,952,712.55	636,059.14	80,343,591.73	38,895,000.00	41,448,593.73
Total	12,193,267,338.92	10,929,229,851.91	23,122,497,190.83	766,495,556.01	1,998,341,233.45	20,363,660,401.37	6,494,018,465.94	13,869,641,935.43

---

[1] The Federal Republic of Germany has recognized liability for securites falling due between Mar. 12, 1938 and May 8, 1945.

[2] $5,905,605.58 has been made available for educational exchange programs with Finland pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 282–224.

[3] Represents deferred interest due Dec. 15, 1964.

[4] Includes $11,336,000 of this debt which has been refunded by the agreement of May 28, 1964. The agreement has not been ratified by Congress.

[5] Interest payments from Dec. 15, 1932, to June 15, 1937, were paid in pengo equivalent.

[6] The indebtedness of Nicaragua was canceled pursuant to the agreement of Apr. 14, 1938.

[7] Excludes claim allowance of $1,813,428.69 dated Dec. 15, 1929.

[8] Excludes payment of $100,000 on June 14, 1940, as a token of good faith.

[9] Principally proceeds from liquidation of Russian assets in the United States.

INDEBTEDNESS OF FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS TO THE UNITED STATES ARISING FROM WORLD WAR II

The executive branch is currently preparing definitive data on the status of World War II debts owed to the United States, but this information is not presently available.

Secretary Rusk. Very well, sir.

Senator Lausche. With regard to the outstanding debts as a consequence of World War I, has there in every instance been an agreement made where the disputes about the amount of the debt have been settled?

Secretary Rusk. I don't think this matter has been completely closed off by agreement. I would have to review the history on that. I have asked my colleagues in the last few days to prepare that for me. I just don't have it at my fingertips this morning, sir.

Senator Lausche. My recollection is that at least with regard to Russia there has not been any agreement.

Secretary Rusk. Oh, that is quite true as far as the Soviet Union is concerned.

DISCUSSIONS ON AMERICAN TOURISM

Senator Lausche. Is the Department at all discussing with foreign nations their concern about our Government advocating a policy of inducing American tourists to visit the United States, and thus help our balance-of-payments problem?

Secretary Rusk. We have had some exchanges on that, but our principal effort thus far has been to indicate to our Americans that if they are making on-balance judgments about what their own tourist plans are, that they might want to consider visiting parts of the country that they have not seen.

The net deficit in our tourist account is about $1.7 billion as I understand it. There has been an increase of about $400 million in the past 4 years. We don't want to discourage tourism as such.

We would like, however, during this period, when we are working on the gold balance, to encourage Americans to have a good look at their own country, and if they are making on-balance judgments, to perhaps do some traveling here first. You see, the number of passports, for example——

Senator Lausche. The amount has increased in the last 4 years. It is now up to $1.7 billion, did you say?

Secretary Rusk. I believe the net has gone up about $400 million a year compared to say 4 or 5 years ago, and similarly with passports. We are issuing now about 75 percent more passports than we did in 1961.

In other words, there has been a very substantial increase. Now fortunately there has also been a very substantial increase in tourism coming the other way, but not quite enough to take up the energetic desire of the American people to travel abroad.

Senator Lausche. If the imbalance resulting solely from tourism is growing worse, why are you hesitant about exercising greater efforts to discourage tourism abroad?

Secretary Rusk. Well, we hope that we can use it just as in the case of capital investment, we can try the process of persuasion, rather than going to compulsory measures that interfere very greatly with private decisions and judgments on the matter.

Tourism itself is a very important element of our relations with other countries in both directions. We would not wish to move drastically on it if it were possible to have it make some contribution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Ohio has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to speak for another 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The total indebtedness due us from our foreign creditors growing out of World War I, which includes interest and principal payment, is in excess of $23 billion. It is interesting to note that Russia is indebted to us on the amount of $639 million. However, I believe that amount is the consequence of some adjustments that were made and which brought the larger figure down to this sum of $639 million.

To summarize, it would seem to me that the closeness of ties which in the past has existed between the French Government and the French people and the U.S. Government and the U.S. people ought to be remembered by De Gaulle. We have fought common foes. We have acted as interdependents, believing that the life of France was vital to the security of the life of the United States. I supposed the French people believed that the continued life of the United States was related to the continued life of France. But for unknown reasons, in these years of 1964 and 1965, De Gaulle has forgotten all of that sympathetic relationship. I wish to say to him that when he is injuring us, he is injuring France also.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this past week the Senate passed numerous bills including the following: authorized the Secretary of Interior to transfer title to movable property to municipalities which assume operation and maintenance responsibilities for project works (S. 1000); added volunteer fire companies to the group of qualified nonprofit organizations entitled to use preferential second- and third-class postage rates for bulk mailings (S. 390); extended to 1975 the authority of the Secretary of Interior to enter into contracts with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, New Mexico, for payment of operation and maintenance charges involved in the irrigation of Pueblo Indian lands (S. 1462); and authorized up to $23 million for Federal construction of the multipurpose Tualatin reclamation project in Washington County, Oreg. (S. 254).

The week of April 5-10, the Senate will act on the military procurement bill (S. 800); the tobacco acreage bill (H.R. 5721); amendments to the Foreign Agents Registration Act (S. 693); and the elementary and secondary education bill (H.R. 2362); to be followed by the voting rights bill (S. 1564) which is to be reported to the Senate April 9.

In addition to the above, the Senate may act on the following measures to be reported by the Senate Commerce Committee on April 6: To exempt oceanographic research vessels from the application of certain vessel inspection laws (S. 627); the Coast Guard authorization (H.R. 4527); a 1-year extension of the National Commisson on Food Marketing (S. 1555); an amendment to the Wool Products Labeling Act (S. 836); authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to employ aliens in a scientific or technical capacity (S. 905); authorizing the Secretary of Commerce to adopt improved accounting procedures (S. 908); a bill authorizing vessel documentation (S. 1275); an amendment to the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act (S. 1129); and a pesticides measure affecting fish and wildlife (S. 1623).

COMMITTEE ACTIVITY DURING THE WEEK OF APRIL 5-10

Appropriations: Hearings will continue on Agriculture, Defense, Labor-HEW, Public Works, and the second supplemental.

Banking: Housing subcommittee will continue on S. 1354, the omnibus housing bill.

Commerce: Full committee executive on April 6, to be followed by hearings on Rupert Murphy and John Bush to be members of ICC. Subcommittee hearings April 7 and 8 on S. 179 and S. 1098, freight car shortage.

District of Columbia: Subcommittee hearings April 6 in connection with adjustment of traffic tickets in the District of Columbia. Subcommittee hearings April 8 on S. 1316, authorizing the District of Columbia Commissioners to enter into joint contracts for supplies and services; and S. 1314, authorizing District of Columbia Commissioners to close streets in connection with redevelopment or urban renewal projects.

Foreign Relations: Continues markup on foreign aid authorization bill.

Interior and Insular Affairs: Subcommittee hearings April 5 on S. 1413, Colville Indian termination bill. Subcommittee hearings April 6 on S. 339, to establish Agate Fossil Beds National Monument, Nebr. Subcommittee hearings April 7 on S. 1088, authorizing construction of Touchet Division, Walla Walla project, Oregon and Washington.

Judiciary: Hearings will continue April 5 on voting rights bill (S. 1564), to be followed by markup sessions and reporting on April 9.

Labor and Public Welfare: Full committee executive April 6 on H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Subcommittee hearings April 7 and 8 on S. 1566, to extend the Juvenile and Youth Offenses Control Act.

Public Works: Subcommittee hearings April 6, 8, and 9 on S. 306, to provide research programs relative to controlling air pollution resulting from gasoline and diesel engine fumes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a résumé of Senate legislative activity through April 1 be included in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the rèsumè was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY THROUGH APRIL 1, 1965

The tally sheet so far—

Senate activity:

Days in session	23
Hours in session	176: 30
Total measures passed	149
Confirmations	23, 262
Public Laws	6

PRESIDENTIAL RECOMMENDATIONS

APPROPRIATIONS

Agricultural Supplemental: Appropriated $1.6 billion for Commodity Credit Corporation, allowed the President final discretion in shipping surplus food to Egypt, and suspended until May 1 the planned closing of 11 VA hospitals, 4 domiciliaries and the merger of 17 regional offices. Public Law 89-2 (PR)

CONGRESS

Joint Committee on the Budget: Established a 14-member Joint Committee on the Budget composed of 7 members from each Appropriations Committee, 4-to-3 ratio. The purpose of the Joint Committee is to serve the Appropriations Committee year-round with the same expertise as the Bureau of Budget for the executive. S. 2 passed Senate January 27.

Joint Committee on Organization of Congress: Established a 12-member bipartisan Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress to make a full and complete study of the organization and operation of Congress and to recommend improvements. Rules changes are eliminated from the study. Authorizes $150,000 through January 31, 1966, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate. First report to be submitted 120 days following effective date of the resolution. Senate Concurrent Resolution 2 passed Senate March 9, 1965; Passed House March 3, 1965.

DEFENSE

Zinc, lead and copper: Authorized the disposal of 200,000 tons each of zinc and lead and the sale of 100,000 short tons of copper to producers and processors. H.R. 1496 Public Law 89–

Stockpile Act: Provides more statutory guidance on the purpose for which materials would be stockpiled; provides for disclosure to Congress and the public, pertinent information on the management; permits disposals of surplus material without requiring congressional action on each while retaining in Congress the power to disapprove proposed disposals; and makes contracts for furnishing materials to the stockpile subject to the Renegotiation Act. S. 28 passed Senate February 9.

ECONOMY

Aid to Appalachia: Authorized $1.1 billion in aid to the 11-State Appalachian region and established the Appalachia Regional Commission; $840 million of this amount will be in the form of Federal grants for a 5-year highway construction program and a 2-year authorization of $252.4 million for a variety of economic development projects. Public Law 89-4 (PR).

Disaster victims: Directs the Housing and Home Finance Administrator to make an immediate study of alternative programs which could be established to help provide financial assistance to those suffering property losses in flood, earthquake, and other natural disasters, including alternative methods of Federal insurance as well as the existing flood insurance program. S. 408 passed Senate January 28.

Gold cover: Repeals the requirement of 25 percent gold backing of commercial bank deposits held by the Federal Reserve banks, but retains the 25-percent requirement against Federal Reserve notes in actual circulation. Public Law 89-3 (PR).

Manpower Act of 1965: Extends the Manpower Development and Training Act to June 30, 1970, authorizes $454 million for fiscal 1966, and provides up to 2 years' training in classrooms or on the job for persons unemployed because they lack education or skills. S. 974. In conference (PR).

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

Goddard Day: Designates March 16, 1965, as Goddard Day in honor of Dr. Robert Hutchings Goddard, the father of modern-day rocketry. Public Law 89-5.

Water pollution control: Vests authority to establish purity standards for interstate water and authorizes $80 million in new grants to help States and localities develop new methods of separating combined storm-water and sewage-carrying sewer systems; increase the dollar ceiling limitations on individual grants for construction of waste treatment works from $600,000 to $1 million for a single project and from $2,400,000 to $4 million for a joint project involving two or more communities. S. 4 passed Senate January 28. H. Cal. (PR.)

Water pollution control—Federal installations: Provides for improved cooperation by Federal agencies to control water and air pollution from Federal installations and facilities and to control automotive vehicle air pollution. S. 560 passed Senate March 25.

HOUSING

Distressed homeowners: Authorizes the Veterans' Administration to extend aid to distressed homeowners who, after relying on VA or FHA construction standards and inspections, find structural or other major defects in their properties purchased with GI mortgage loans which affect the livability of the property. S. 507 passed Senate January 27. (PR.)

INDIANS

Pueblo Indian irrigation charges: Extends to 1975 the authority initially granted the Secretary of Interior by the act of August 27, 1935, to enter into contracts with the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, New Mexico, for payment of operation and maintenance charges involved in the irrigation of some 11,000 acres of Pueblo Indian lands within the district. S. 1462 passed Senate March 29.

Movable Property Act: Authorizes the Secretary of Interior to transfer title to movable property to municipalities which assume operation and maintenance responsibilities for project works serving municipal and industrial functions under the same conditions and on the same terms as title may be transferred to an irrigation district or water users' organization which assumes operation and maintenance responsibilities for project works serving an irrigation function. S. 1000 passed Senate March 29.

Postal rates for volunteer fire companies: Adds volunteer fire companies to the group of qualified nonprofit organizations entitled to use preferential second- and third-class postage rates for bulk mailings. S. 390 passed Senate March 29.

HEALTH

Community health services extension: Extends for 5 fiscal years, 1966–70, authority for grants to States and communities for mass immunization programs against polio, diphtheria, whooping cough, tetanus, and adds measles. Extends for 1 year general and special health services, including those for migratory workers, chronically ill and aged, and grants for research to improve such services. S. 510 passed Senate March 11 (PR).

Loan cancellation: Permits cancellation of a portion of the unpaid balance of a student loan awarded to a physician or dentist who practices in a shortage area. S. 576 passed Senate January 28.

INTERNATIONAL

Coffee implementation: This bill implements the International Coffee Agreement ratified in 1963, and authorizes the President to require all coffee entering U.S. markets and all exports of coffee to be accompanied by a certificate of origin or a certificate of reexport. Limits imports of coffee from countries which have not joined in the agreement; and requires certain recordkeeping. S. 701 passed Senate February 2 (PR).

Disarmament act amendments: Authorizes an appropriation of $20 million for fiscal years 1966 and 1967 for the Disarmament Agency, thus continuing the authorization on the same basis as fiscal years 1964 and 1965. H.R. 2998, in conference (PR).

Inter-American Development Bank: Provides for a $750 million increase in the U.S. contribution to the Fund for Special Operations of the Inter-American Development Bank—over a 3-year period at the rate of $250 million a year. This represents the U.S. share of a planned $900 million increase in the fund which will serve to strengthen multinational aid and the Alliance for Progress. Public Law 89-6 (PR).

JUDICIAL

Illicit traffic in child adoption: Imposes Federal criminal sanctions on persons engaged in interstate or foreign commerce in the illicit traffic of placing children for adoption or permanent free care. S. 624 passed Senate March 22.

PRESIDENCY

Presidential succession: Proposed an amendment to the Constitution that will totally replace article II, section I, clause 5, relating to succession to the Presidency and Vice-Presidency. Senate Joint Resolution 1 passed Senate February 19. House Calendar (PR).

RESOURCE AND RECREATION BUILDUP

Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area: Authorizes $355,000 for the establishment of the Bighorn Canyon National Recreation Area in the States of Montana and Wyoming to provide for public outdoor recreation use and enjoyment of the proposed Yellowtail Reservoir, and for the preservation of the scenic, scientific, and historic features of the area. S. 491 passed Senate February 10 (PR).

Kaniksu National Forest: Authorizes up to $500,000 from the land and water conservation fund to extend the boundaries of the Kaniksu National Forest to include lands necessary for the protection and conservation of the scenic values and natural environment of Upper Priest Lake in Idaho. S. 435 passed Senate March 4.

Manson irrigation unit, Washington: Authorizes $12.3 million for the construction and operation of the Manson unit of the Chief Joseph Dam project. The Manson unit has an irrigation potential of 5,770 acres of land, with half of the costs reimbursable. S. 490 passed Senate February 10.

Nez Perce National Historical Park, Idaho: Authorizes $630,000 for the purchase of 1,500 acres of land to establish the Nez Perce National Historical Park to commemorate, preserve, and interpret the historic values in the early Nez Perce Indian culture, the tribe's war of 1877 with U.S. cavalry troops, the Lewis and Clark Expedition through the area early in the 19th century, subsequent fur trading, gold mining, logging, and missionary activity. S. 60 passed Senate February 10.

River basin planning: Authorizes Federal grants of $5 million a year in matching funds to States for State project planning over a 10-year period; sets up a Cabinet-level water resources council to coordinate river basin planning; and authorizes creation of river basin commissions for regional planning. S. 21 in conference (PR).

Tualatin project, Oregon: Authorizes up to $23 million for the Federal construction of the multipurpose Tualatin reclamation project in Washington County, Oreg. S. 254 passed Senate April 1.

Water Resources Research Act: Amends the 1964 Water Resources Research Act to authorize grant, matching, and contract funds for assistance to educational institutions in addition to State land-grant colleges, to competent private organizations and individuals, and to local, State, and Federal agencies in undertaking special research in water resource problems. Authorizes $5 million for fiscal 1966 and increases the authorization by $1 million annually until the level of $10 million is reached. The ceiling of $10 million will remain thereafter. S. 22 passed Senate March 25 (PR).

Yakima project, Washington: Authorizes $5.1 million for the extension, construction, and operation of the Kennewick division of the Yakima project with an irrigation potential of 7,000 additional acres (present irrigated acreage is 19,000). All but approximately $135,000 is reimbursable. S. 794 passed Senate February 10.

TAXES

Motor fuels taxation compact: Grants the consent of Congress to any of the several States and the District of Columbia to enter into a compact relating to taxation of motor fuels consumed by interstate buses and to an agreement relating to bus taxation proration and reciprocity. S. 307, Public Law 89–11.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TIME FOR A THINK-IN

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, there comes a time in the course of political and social change when moderation becomes a vital ingredient. The American process of nonrevolutionary change requires both the catalyst and the tranquilizer. The recent events in Alabama are beginning to demonstrate the need for a "think-in"—a period of cooling-off by those pressing for expanded voting rights for all Americans.

It is tragic and regrettable that the Alabama confrontation has caused the deaths of the Reverend James Reeb, Viola Gregg Liuzzo, or Jimmy Lee Jackson. I know my colleagues from the great State of Alabama and the overwhelming majority of Alabamians regret and deplore the taking of human life.

Mr. President, I am confident the courts of Alabama and the citizens of that State will face their responsibilities in dealing with the crime of murder.

I have been a frequent critic of the Supreme Court and some of its recent decisions, but I think Chief Justice Warren commented succinctly on the role of the courts in dealing with barbarous acts of society:

> "When society acts to deprive one of its members of his life, liberty, or property, it takes its most awesome steps," Mr. Justice Warren wrote in *Coppedge* v. *United States*. "No general respect for, nor adherence to, the law as a whole can well be expected without judicial recognition of the paramount need for prompt, eminently fair, and sober criminal law procedures. The methods we employ in the enforcement of our criminal law have aptly been called the measure by which the quality of our civilization may be judged."

All decent Americans want to see the covert assailants, the attackers-by-night, brought before the bar of justice.

But there is abroad now a movement to indict the entire State of Alabama—and indeed much of the South—for the acts of a handful of terrorists, men outside the law wherever they may be found.

There can be no defense for terrorism. But at the same time, the aftermath of tragedy should not be the building of new tensions and new animosities which can only serve to harden attitudes and light those torches which draw the assassins from dark corners.

I refer, Mr. President, to such manifestations as a call for an economic boycott of the State of Alabama—tantamount to a plea for genocide.

This plea comes at a moment in history when the President of the United States, in the strongest possible terms, has already endorsed the drive for equal opportunity and particularly for voting rights for all Americans.

The President of the United States, it may be pointed out, made clear his position long before Selma. One needs only to read his state of the Union message to discover this.

There will shortly come before the Senate, legislation dealing with voting rights. The Senate will discharge its responsibilities on this legislation in its best judgment—not under pressure or under threat.

I need not dwell here on the merits of this legislation. Even when I opposed the civil rights bills of 1957, 1960, and 1964, I emphasized that I did not oppose giving every American the right to register and vote.

I am still committed to that principle and if the forthcoming legislation confers this right without imposing a civil wrong, then I shall support it.

Mr. President, this legislative body will be hampered and the people of Alabama, white and Negro, will be badly served if the spirit of Thaddeus Stevens is reincarnated.

One of the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to which I was opposed was the so-called genocide title—title VI—which provided for cutting off Federal funds to the States under certain conditions.

I am still opposed to placing on the Federal statutes any fiat which arrays the Federal Government against a region or a class of people.

I am similarly opposed to invoking economic sanctions against the State of Alabama at this time. There is no need to inflame and incite at a period when the best of men's thoughts must be rallied.

The New York Times of April 1 also reports that the Childs Securities Corp. has written Gov. George Wallace and notified him it would no longer buy or sell bonds issued by the State or any of its political subdivisions. While this is only one firm, similar actions by other bond houses could have a profound effect on the State's economy.

Whose purpose would it serve to have a mouthful of civil rights and no bread?

The path to equal opportunity, Mr. President, means not only voting rights, but education and jobs.

We are not dealing here with a foreign power intent on overthrowing democracy. Alabama is not Cuba. We are talking of Americans who have a wide range of beliefs, living in one of our 50 States.

It would be a misguided and ill-timed decision indeed to seek genocide penalties against the State of Alabama at this time.

Dr. Martin Luther King, who proposes the boycott, says he has been accused before of taking actions at untimely moments. But, Mr. President, Dr. King will merit that criticism in this instance if he persists in urging economic reprisals.

Similarly, he errs when he counsels a moral obligation to obey "just laws" but not "unjust laws." The civil rights movement cannot be immune to court orders any more than the body of society.

Respect for the law is a cornerstone of the Judeo-Christian ethic. The Apostle Paul, counseled respect for authority even under Roman tyranny.

Mr. President, conciliation is a spirit that undergirds civilization. We need that spirit of conciliation now—not bombs on the doorsteps of public officials or cries for vengeance.

I think it was an act of wisdom when Congress wrote into the civil rights bill the establishment of a Federal Conciliation Service for civil rights.

My colleague, Senator HOLLAND, and I supported the President's nominee for Director of that organization, a former Governor of our State, LeRoy Collins.

It is significant that Governor Collins has also urged a slowdown of demonstrations and a lessening of pressures in Alabama. He has been on the scene and knows to what degree tempers can be frayed in tense situations such as these.

Mr. President, I believe in the right of peaceful assembly and the right to petition for redress of grievances. But this must be consistent with public order.

I believe that civil rights marchers had the right to proceed from Selma to Montgomery in an orderly fashion, without obstructing traffic. I believe they were entitled to protection in that course.

It was tragic that, in the final hours of that peaceful demonstration, self-appointed vigilantes chose to strike down Mrs. Liuzzo in the most cowardly manner.

But cries for vengeance cannot restore Mrs. Liuzzo to life. Alabama needs no more martyrs. The point is made, the issue dramatized. This is not the time for retaliation or for pitting race against race, or Federal Government against State.

Let Alabama be given time to breathe; let the Congress have the opportunity to proceed in an orderly fashion; let the civil rights movement demonstrate its bond with the Constitution.

For civil rights—or any right—is not the special charge of any single agency or Government. I believe with James Madison that "the ultimate authority resides with the people alone and it will not depend on the comparative ambition of the different governments, whether either, or which of them, will be able to enlarge its sphere of jurisdiction at the expense of the other."

In sum, Mr. President, let us proceed to resolve this issue of voting rights in an atmosphere which permits thought and reflection which allows us, as legislators, to move in a manner that does not rip the fabric of Federal-State responsibility.

My own State of Florida has long been proud of a record of peaceful race relations. The State legislature eliminated the poll tax more than 25 years ago. There are no literacy tests or other artificial barriers to voting. I am confident that this record of achievement will continue.

But the pace of progress will be impeded by extremism on either side. The civil rights movement will make a serious mistake if it concludes that more and more demonstrations are necessary and that it must shift from Selma to Tallahassee or anywhere else.

Demonstrations are not an end in themselves. And even Mahatma Gandhi, whose concept of nonviolent demonstration is embraced by Dr. King and the rights movement, also knew the use of restraint.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a column by William S. White, dealing with this subject, which appeared in the Washington Post of March 31, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KING'S BOYCOTT: A SHOCKING DEMAND

(By William S. White)

An odor of totalitarianism is rising from the supposedly nonviolent leadership in the Negro civil rights movement of the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

Just as it had seemed that the men of reason and restraint, North and South, were at last to be able to raise their heads in this tragic business, Dr. King's call for an economic boycott of the entire State of Alabama has shocked the sensible North, repelled and sickened the moderate South, and maddened and rearmed those irreconcilable southerners who resist any and all concessions to the Negro.

It is an act hardly less damaging to the cause of true civil rights than the acts on the other, far end of the stick of such men as Gov. George C. Wallace, of Alabama, and former Gov. Ross R. Barnett, of Mississippi.

For what Dr. King proposes is tactically indefensible and morally intolerable. It is nothing less than the application of the principle of total warfare—against the just as well as the unjust, against Alabama Negro as well as Alabama white. A man who appeals so often to the higher moral law now urges what is in principle the economic bombing of defenseless cities.

Its timing is, moreover, provocative and mischiefmaking beyond ready belief. For Dr. King summons up the forces of unreason and the technique of the general strike at the very moment when the entire Johnson administration and a great majority of Congress are engaged upon a historic program to secure Negro voting rights beyond doubt or question. And it is this man, this holder of the Nobel Prize for peace, who has so long been presented as the chief voice of responsibility and reason within the Negro movement.

If his demands were not already being met as fast as elementary orderliness and a decent regard for the minimum rights of dissenters in a free society could possibly meet them, his position might to some extent be understandable, even though it would still be wrong.

In all the existing circumstances his attitude surely cannot be adopted even by the most advanced civil rights advocates unless they believe that a single, unelected person, granting him, if one wishes, the highest motives, is entitled to pronounce a judgment of economic strangulation upon a part of the American Union.

It is not pleasant to be in the middle of an issue such as this. Americans are not even remotely aware of the depth of bitterness being fomented in this Nation by the George Wallaces—and also, let Northern people recognize by the Martin Luther Kings.

All the same, the middle way is the only way if justice and national union and national order are to be preserved; for justice never lies with the men of passion and violent tongue.

That part of the South which will not submit to fair play for the Negro is demonstrably being forced to its knees by lawful process lawfully employed. Is it not now time, in all conscience, for an end to, or at least a suspension of, the long pillorying of one tortured region of this country? Is it not now time to put a period to marches and demonstrations, and now to an outright effort to destroy the economy of a whole State, at least until Congress has had some kind of chance to work its will?

ESTONIA, LATVIA, AND LITHUANIA: ONCE PROUD REPUBLICS, NOW GRIM REMINDERS OF SOVIET COLONIALISM

Mr. **KUCHEL**. Mr. President, since the Second World War, the Western nations have been repeatedly condemned as imperialist or colonialist. Yet these countries, including France, Belgium, Britain, and the United States, have enabled countless African, Asian, and Asian Pacific nations to establish independent governments. Mr. President, should not the Soviet brand of imperialism be exposed for the brutal thing that it is? Should not the nations of the world, assembled as the United Nations, be confronted with the plight of citizens of the captive states of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania and the other nations of Eastern Europe?

As the American people have recently paid honor to our first President, the people of a small nation celebrated the 47th anniversary of their independence. Last February 24, the people of Estonia recalled the creation of their free independent nation. Americans that week celebrated the birthday of George Washington with a confidence that freedom, preserved for over a century and a half, will continue. But for Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, freedom was short lived, and today these people are prevented from exercising their will. They are stifled by an outside force whose actions betray a total absence of respect for the individual.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to give thoughtful consideration to Senator DIRKSEN's resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, of which I am very glad to be a coauthor. The distinguished minority leader's proposal requests that the President of the United States bring before the United Nations for its consideration the question of the forceful incorporation into the Soviet Union of the many captive nations and peoples now behind the Iron Curtain which stretches from the Baltic to the Black Sea.

The Baltic nations to which I refer, the nations of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, are neither new nor insignificant. The search for free institutions is both the common thread which unites the history of the Baltic peoples and the common experience which draws Americans and free men everywhere to their cause. Today Communist exploitation and suppression continue to sicken us, in Asia and in Europe; in Cuba as in some of the evolving nations of Africa. It plagues the consciences of men who are at liberty to determine their own government and who value the concept of civil liberties so central to the success of a democratic form of government.

The Lithuanian kingdom, founded over 700 years ago, in 1253, lapsed into confusion when the first and only Lithuanian King, Mindaugas, was assassinated 10 years after he was crowned. It was not until the 15th century that the Lithuanian people united with the Poles, as both nations sought to rid their lands of German Teutonic hegemony. Estonia was subjugated to Swedish, then Russian rule. Latvia witnessed similar strife during the centuries which preceded the French Revolution. Yet, with the upheaval of the French Revolution, new intensified pressure focused on eastern Europe and the Baltic.

The French Revolution marked the beginning of modern political Europe. The economic, social, and military turmoil of that Revolution and the Napoleonic Wars scarred the map of the Continent. The Congress of Vienna, in 1815, froze many of the changes which came about, as delegates to the meetings attempted to stifle the nationalistic sentiments sweeping the Continent. The Baltic peoples' modern difficulties began with the upheaval of the French Revolution. As a result of the 1815 Congress, the Russian czar became both the King of Poland and the Grand Duke of Lithuania. Throughout the 19th century the Baltic lands were eyed by the Prussians, the Austrians, and the Russians. Late in the century, as tension in eastern Europe and the Middle East increased, and as the Continent and the world moved inexorably toward the First World War, Russian rule tightened in Lithuania and other Baltic States. Civil liberties were suppressed in an attempt to lessen Lithuanian, Estonian, and Latvian nationalism. The Russians unsuccessfully attempted to impose their values and standards on the Baltic peoples. They continue that attempt today. Freemen believe this imposition of a totalitarian system should cease.

The Bolshevik Revolution in 1917 afforded Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia the chance to proclaim their independence. The Lithuanian people declared their independence on February 16, 1918, the Estonians on February 24, 1918, and the Latvians on November 18, 1918, but hope for free institutions was cruelly snuffed out by the German occupation. After the war, despite the fact that the Baltic States were caught between Russia and Germany, independent governments and free institutions were created. The Soviet Union repeatedly acknowledged the independent status of the Baltic States.

In 1921, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania joined the League of Nations. Remarkable social and economic improvements were made in the 1920's and 1930's despite postwar and depression conditions. The late, great Herbert Hoover returned to Latvia and Estonia in 1938, having previously seen conditions in the Baltic at close range when he supervised wartime and postwar relief and rehabilitation operations. Mr. Hoover compared conditions in the Baltic with those in Russia for a special committee of the House of Representatives:

> The Baltic States, in contrast, had a free economy. Their currency was stable, their currencies were convertible into gold, they were accepted all over the world. Their fiscal policies were completely successful; their budgets were all balanced, their industries were thriving; their agriculture was making an astonishing progress.
>
> "The result was that the standard of living in the Baltic States was about as high as any standard of living in Europe, possibly outside of Switzerland and Norway.
>
> "The contrast with Russia was so great that it became one of the menaces of the Baltic States. The Russian people were constantly attempting to escape from Russia into the Baltic States. The Russians had established a barbed-wire fence over some portion of that border—I don't know how many miles—but in any event, they maintained a rigid picket line in order to repel their own people from escaping into the more prosperous Baltic States to live." (P. 217, hearings of House Select Committee To Investigate the Incorporation of the Baltic States into the U.S.S.R.—83d Cong., 1st sess., held under authority of H. Res. 346.)

Despite the remarkable economic successes and democratic achievements of the interwar period, the onslaught of the Second World War doomed all Europe to oppression and chaos. Lithuania provides an illustration. For that nation a brief, challenging period of political and economic freedom came to an abrupt end in June 1940, in the form of a Soviet ultimatum to form a friendly government. Immediate Soviet occupation of this small nation decided the issue and within a month the pattern was complete. Deportation to Siberia, on-the-spot execution of potentially dangerous patriots and well-educated citizens, and phony single slate elections with handpicked candidates on the ballot were all part of the story. Lithuanians, once again caught between Germany and Russia, found their nation the scene of German invasion as Germany attacked Russia.

The Nazis occupied the area from 1941 to 1944. Following the German retreat the second wave of Soviet troops poured in. The following 4 years saw the forced collectivization of Lithuanian agriculture and deportation on a scale so massive it is difficult for us to fathom. In this time, roughly 10 percent of the population, or 300,000 people were uprooted.

As Americans, our position is clear; for we believe that men should be able to determine their own destinies. From all reliable sources we understand that the Soviet Union has attempted to impose an order, an economy, and a value system, all of which are contrary to the history, but most important to the aspirations of the Baltic peoples.

The Soviet Union shall not succeed. As the human race careens into the second half of the 20th century, evidence increases that the Soviet hold on her satellites is slipping. The Communist bloc has become the antithesis of a monolithic structure. Is this not the time for the Congress and the American people to repledge its support for the aspirations of men and women who hope to create an open, free, and individualistic society?

While our continued policy on nonrecognition of the present puppet regimes in Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia has been made clear, representatives of the Department of State have argued that the United Nations is not the place for a discussion of this question. If the U.N. is not the place for discussion of tyranny in the Baltic, as well as colonialism and racism in South Africa, or civil war in the Congo, then no forum for discussion exists.

I want to make one thing absolutely clear. I do not think for a moment that the passage of Senate Concurrent Resolution 10 will influence Russian policy or that it will bring about free elections under United Nations auspices. The passage of this resolution may serve, however, to give an important fact a wider hearing. The Russian Communists claim they advocate self-determinism in Africa. Yet they have carried out a severe imposition of their will upon men who live in the Baltic and Eastern European States. Americans find the U.S.S.R.'s policy in direct opposition to the principles of self-determination. We find that policy of suppression—no matter where it occurs—reprehensible. This resolution would hopefully serve as an added source of strength to the people who are forced to live behind the Iron Curtain.

MEDICARE SUPPLEMENTAL HEALTH BENEFITS AND SOCIAL SECURITY PACKAGE

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, is the Senate operating under a time limitation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is proceeding on routine business under the 3-minute rule.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 7 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to speak on the so-called medicare proposal and the social security package, H.R. 6675.

H.R. 6675 which is a social security bill calling for the enactment of medicare and an additional program referred to as a supplementary health benefits program should not be enacted. This bill has just recently come into print. It consists of 296 pages. Much of the language is technical.

The people of the United States have not had an opportunity to study this bill. They have had no opportunity to contemplate its cost either immediately or in 10, 25, or 50 years from now. The extent to which this bill will change our private enterprise economy cannot be comprehended without sufficient time for study and discussion.

In the short while that this bill has been available I have attempted to familiarize myself with its provisions. I am of the opinion it neither properly defines the need of our elderly in regard to medical care nor does it properly meet their need. The enactment of this bill will plunge our country into a permanent program having many bad features from which there will be no retreat.

A social security bill is in a category by itself. The Congress can enact a public works program or a tax program or some other program, and, if it is not satisfactory after 2 years, for example, bring it to an end. We cannot add new benefits to our social security law and say there is a termination date. How could we enact the provisions of this bill and say that they shall end in 5 years, or 10 years, or 2 years after we have tried it? Any decision the Congress makes now is a permanent decision. It will run in perpetuity, or the social security system will collapse.

I do not want the system to collapse. I want every commitment made to every citizen paid, and paid in full, and paid in dollars that are of value.

This proposal should be held in abeyance until the next session of Congress. The interests of our elderly people and the interests of those people who will bear the cost of whatever program is adopted should be paramount. Is there any reason why the Congress should not submit this bill to public consideration for a period of months before it is acted upon?

I wish to make the following observations about this proposal:

First. If this bill is enacted, the social security tax for an employee earning the full amount of the covered wage will increase from $198 to $243.60 in 1966 and to $353.10 by 1973. The self-employed person, if this bill is passed, and if he earns the full amount of income covered, will have the present tax of $297.60 per year increased to $355.60 in 1966, and by 1973 it will be $498.30.

Second. By 1967, in addition to the increased social security tax, $875 million will be required out of the general fund of the U.S. Treasury to pay the costs of H.R. 6675. These costs will increase.

Third. The social security tax including these new added burdens will fall heaviest upon the poor people, the working people, the people who are raising families, the physically handicapped and the blind. This is true because there is no personal exemption for the taxpayer and his dependents as there is in the income tax. Neither are any deductions allowed. The individual supporting a large family and earning $5,600 next year will pay as much into the social security fund as the person whose income is $56,000 or $560,000. In fact, if the person with the high income receives all of his income from investments, he will pay nothing into the social security fund.

Mr. President, why should Congress be stampeded into increasing the tax upon the poor, the working people, the physically handicapped, and the blind, in order to pay the hospital bill of someone well able to pay it himself, including the very wealthy?

Fourth. Under this bill, if it is enacted, hospital and medical benefits will be provided free of charge for those who can well afford to pay their own medical bills, or to buy adequate private insurance. This includes the well-to-do, the wealthy and the very wealthy.

Fifth. This proposal, if enacted, will do very little for the individual or the family that suffers from a catastrophic illness. If an individual is hospitalized continuously for 1 year or 2 years, 5 years or 10 years, the medicare provisions will provide him with 60 days hospitalization only, less the $40 deductible.

If anyone should have the consideration of Congress, if anyone should have public funds to assist him, is it not the individual who has a catastrophic illness which goes on and on and on?

Sixth. The supplemental health benefits provisions of H.R. 6675 put the U.S. Government directly into the insurance business. The Government will be the insurer. The Government will take the risk. It is a plan whereby individuals over 65 may participate, if they choose, by paying a premium of $3 a month to the Federal Government and the Federal Government will also pay $3 a month into the fund. The U.S. Government, as the insurer, guarantees that the $3 rate to be paid by the individual will not be raised for a year and a half.

Seventh. If the supplemental health and medicare portions of H.R. 6675 are enacted, it will be the beginning of the end of private hospital and medical insurance for individuals over 65. Great progress has been made by private companies in providing insurance for those over 65. All of these benefits will come to an end if the Federal Government invades the field and acts as insurer and pays one-half of the monthly cost.

Eighth. The $3 per month Government subsidy for the supplemental health benefits provided for under the Government insurance portion of the bill will be paid for on all over 65 who wish to participate, including those well able to pay for their own insurance and regardless of their property or income.

Ninth. While the Government is the insurer and takes the risk for the supplemental health benefits, the administration of the program will be handled by outside carriers, supposedly such organizations as Blue Cross or insurance companies. Those outside carriers will be selected by the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. The Secretary, in determining what companies he shall employ as outside carriers, will be able to oversee the work of such carriers and their contracts with doctors. Ultimately, all will toe the mark.

Tenth. The supplemental health benefit provisions of H.R. 6675 fail to provide for the individual who requires long and continued hospital or home nursing care. The individual hospitalized for 10 years will still get only 60 days free hospitalization less the $40 deductible.

Eleventh. This gigantic program, which will so burden people of the United States and change the economy, will not provide drugs or medical prescriptions for any aged person outside of the hospital.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 1 additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska is recognized for 1 additional minute.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, twelfth, the individual over 65 who continues to work and who avails himself of coverage under the supplemental health benefits will carry an enormous social security burden. If such an employee earns up to the maximum amount of covered wages or income, his social security burden will go from the present $198 to $279.60 in 1966, and to $389.10 by 1973. In the case of the self-employed person over 65, his social security burden—if H.R. 6675 is enacted and he continues to earn the maximum—will increase from the present $297.60 to $391.60 in 1966 and to $534.30 by 1973.

Mr. President, we should enact that portion of the bill which increases benefits under the present program. Many low-income people in this country need the increase. That increase should be enacted now. The new bill—which the whole country has not seen until the last few days—should be held in abeyance, so that it can be submitted for public study and discussion.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

VOTING RIGHTS ACT OF 1965—ANALYSIS BY SENATOR BYRD OF VIRGINIA

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on April 2, the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia, Hon. HARRY F. BYRD, released to the press a statement indicating his unalterable opposition to the administration's new voting proposal labeled "Voting Rights Act of 1965."

In pointing out how the bill is aimed specifically at Virginia and five other Southern States, he charged that at other times and for other purposes it could be used to destroy the constitutional rights of any State. Senator BYRD said:

> I have analyzed all provisions of the bill. They are iniquitous in effect and contemptible in design.

He also characterized the bill as being vicious, harsh, hypocritical, and discriminatory. He said:

> The Attorney General tortures legal reasoning in the scheme he contrived to include and exclude States from the vengeful clutches of his bill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the full text of Senator Byrd's analysis of Senate bill 1564.

There being no objection, the analysis was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement by Senator Harry F. Byrd, of Virginia, in Re the Administration's So-Called Voting Rights Act of 1965

To the People of Virginia:

This is a statement about the administration's so-called Voting Rights Act of 1965. I am making it as a Member of the U.S. Senate representing Virginia under oath to uphold the Federal Constitution.

I am intensely aware of the democratic liberties to be achieved through our form of government, and to be guarded by it.

I am also dedicated to preservation of the principles and requirements of our State-local-Federal system and the checks and balances necessary to protect it.

The Federal Government of this country has worked itself into fiscal, monetary and military difficulties which are exceedingly serious.

Now the Federal administration is allowing itself to be influenced beyond reason by the emotion of domestic hysteria; and by its own actions it is inflaming so-called civil rights issues.

The so-called voting rights bill now before Congress is an act of the present administration. It admittedly was drafted by the Federal Attorney General.

It is a vicious bill. It clearly bears the unreasonable stamp of hysteria. Even Chairman Emanuel Celler, the New York chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, has called it harsh.

The administration has pushed its consideration ahead of everything else. Committee hearings have been arbitrarily limited. Efforts to amend it are discouraged.

There is a terrific administration pressure to pass the bill before Easter. But this statement is not made with such intemperate haste. Instead, it is made with all deliberate speed.

I have analyzed all provisions of the bill. They are iniquitous in effect and contemptible in design. The administration has been advised of the odium in which I hold its proposal.

I have also studied the Federal Attorney General's testimony. He admits drafting the bill. Neither the bill nor the testimony is worthy of men entrusted with high office in the National Government of this country.

The proposal is made in the name of voting justice. It would be less hypocritical and more accurate to describe it as Federal law designed for vindictive use against six States selected in advance.

It is a proposal grossly to offend Virginia; and not only this. It is subversive of the Constitution of the United States and the whole system under which we are governed.

The Attorney General has documented his own cynicism. He has proclaimed his impatience with judicial process, and his lack of faith in it.

I quote directly from the prepared testimony of the Federal Attorney General before the Senate Judiciary Committee on March 23, 1965. He said: "* * * the judicial process, upon which all existing remedies depend, is institutionally inadequate to deal with practices so deeply rooted in the social and political structure."

I never expected to hear a responsible member of the legal profession or an Attorney General of the United States take such an attitude or make such a public statement about the judicial process.

Based on this rejection of government by law and not men, this Federal Attorney General seeks in a voting rights bill to arrogate judicial power to himself in areas of his own choosing.

A written Constitution protects us from despotic rule. For this protection against oppressive government we rely on the checks and balances of division of power and separation of powers.

The power of government is divided between State and Federal Government. And in both State and Federal Government, legislative, judicial, and executive powers are separated.

The Federal Attorney General, speaking for the administration, is demanding that the legislative branch of the Federal Government empower him—a political appointee in the executive branch—to preempt the judicial branch in areas he has chosen to punish.

That is not all. He is demanding power by Federal legislation to usurp the constitutional power of States he has already chosen to be his victims.

There is more. He is demanding this power under general Federal law which by his own design is limited to enforcement in only a handful of States.

He decries racial discrimination in voting practices, but he deliberately wrote this bill to exempt all voting discrimination in a four-fifths majority of the 50 States from its application.

The Federal Attorney General tortures legal reasoning in the scheme he contrived to include and exclude States from the vengeful clutches of his bill.

The States he wants to incriminate are caught by his own dictates combined with a devious statistical formula. Under terms of the bill—

The Federal Attorney General—by asserting that the voting requirements in a target area are racially discriminatory--may indict a whole State or any subdivision as violating the Constitution of the United States and Federal law; and

If 50 percent of the voting-age people in the area were not registered to vote on November 1, 1964, or if 50 percent did not choose to vote in the 1964 presidential election, the State or locality—with never a day in court—is automatically guilty of the Federal Attorney General's indictment.

When a State or locality is convicted by this kangeroo procedure, the Federal Attorney General orders invasion of the State or subdivision by an unspecified number of Federal registrars.

Occupation of the State or subdivision by the Federal registrars will continue for an unspecified and indefinite period of time.

The purpose of the Federal registrars is to impose and enforce the will of the Federal Attorney General with respect to voting laws, ordinances and practices in the State or locality.

The practices, operations and locations, etc., of the Federal registrars are limited only by the whim of the Federal Attorney General, but they will include registration of persons to vote when they claim they have been disqualified under State or local requirements. And the Federal registrars will collect annual poll taxes in States where they are imposed.

(And the Federal Attorney General says he will extend his authority to all elections—Federal and State, general and primary, and local and district, including those for bond issues and the like.)

The State or locality has no rights to any sort of judicial appeal until it is actually incriminated by the Federal Attorney General's drumhead court. Then it may enter an appeal from the position of a culprit already convicted and sentenced.

The appeal in that position cannot be to test the validity of the Federal Attorney General's action. It is in the nature of an appeal for a pardon which is necessary before the State or locality can be released from the clutches of the Federal Attorney General and his Federal registrars.

But like the State or locality, the pardon appeal is virtually prejudged by the terms of the bill.

The appeal can be made only in a remote specially selected three-judge Federal court in Washington, D.C. (The Federal Attorney General says this is desirable for uniformity of decision.)

The State or locality is convicted by the Federal Attorney General of racial discrimination in voting practices, but much more than this is involved in getting a pardon from the Federal Attorney General's special court at the doorstep of the Federal Justice Department in Washington, which is headed by the Federal Attorney General.

This court is allowed to grant a pardon to a State or locality only when it is able to prove to the court's satisfaction that for 10 past years not only the State or locality, but also everybody in it, "acting under color" of its laws or ordinances, has been totally innocent, not only of racial discrimination in voting practices, but also totally innocent of all discrimination suggestive of voting discrimination.

(The Federal Attorney General says complying with the equal but separate education doctrine of the Federal Supreme Court which stood as the law of the land for a half century would be an example of a practice suggestive of voting discrimination.)

Until a State or locality convicted by the Federal Attorney General is given such a pardon, under such conditions, by such a court, it is not allowed to enforce any change in any of its election laws or ordinances without permission from a district Federal court in Washington.

The extremes to which the administration and its Attorney General have gone to exempt the majority of States and convict a minority are beyond the realm of reason.

They demonstrate the bias and prejudice under which the bill was conceived and with which it will be enforced. The bill itself is literally based on discrimination as between States.

There is nothing in the Virginia constitution or statutes which can be honestly interpreted as discriminatory with respect to voting rights or registration.

I doubt that the Federal Attorney General can find a State where it is simpler or easier for anyone to register than it is in Virginia, or where election practices are cleaner.

If in truth, or consequence, there is any evidence of discriminatory voting practice or procedure in Virginia I am unaware of it.

If there is any evidence of racial discrimination in the registration laws or voting practices in Virginia, the Federal Attorney General has not given it the usual Federal fanfare.

Even the Federal Civil Rights Commission—with all of its bias and prejudice and snooping—has found that in Virginia there appears to be no racial discrimination with respect to voter registration and that Negroes "appear to encounter no significant racially motivated impediments in voting."

Despite all the activity of his own agents combined with that of the Civil Rights Commission agents, the Federal Attorney General says there is no widespread voting discrimination in Virginia.

But the Federal Attorney General persists in misrepresenting Virginia as a State with discriminatory registration laws or engaging in discriminatory voting practices.

He admits that this bill which he has drafted for the administration is fixed so that he can incriminate Virginia.

He admits also that he has designed this administration bill so that he can exempt Texas from its application.

In advance he has said that he will incriminate Virginia and exempt Texas.

He says Virginia is caught in his numbers game because 41 percent (not 50 percent) of its voting-age people voted in the presidential election of November 1964.

But he says Texas, where 44 percent (not 50 percent) of its voting-age people voted in the presidential election of November 1964, is not to be subjected to the application of his numbers racket.

When the Federal Attorney General was asked why Texas was to be exempt, he said: "Texas is out for the reason that it does not have a literacy test. The literacy tests are the devices that have been primarily used in order to prevent Negroes from registering."

For those who may be misled by the Federal Attorney General into believing that Virginia has a literacy test, I shall compare the so-called voting tests and other requirements for voting in Virginia and Texas.

Both States voted less than 50 percent in the presidential election of November 1964.

Both States have a relatively high percentage of nonwhite population.

Both States in November 1964 required the payment of poll taxes as a prerequisite for voting in all but Federal elections.

The voting lists for the 1964 presidential election in Texas were composed of the names of persons certified by the poll tax collectors as having either paid their $1.75 poll tax, or as having formally applied for and received a certificate of exemption from payment for voting in the Federal election.

Like Texas, Virginia voters were exempt from payment of their $1.50 poll tax as a requirement for voting in the 1964 Federal election. The voting lists in Virginia were composed of the names of persons who had been registered under the Virginia voting registration laws.

In Texas, the so-called test is applied to prospective voters by the tax collector when they undertake to pay their poll tax; or when they formally apply for a certificate of exemption.

In Virginia the prospective voter is billed for his poll tax along with other taxes. He is asked simple questions of identification when he registers to vote at the office of a registrar.

In Texas the prospective voter must be able to understand the questions asked by the tax collector, and give the answers. In certain cases a husband can apply in behalf of his wife, and a wife can apply in behalf of her husband.

In Texas, article 5.14 of the election code requires the following questions to be answered:

Name?

Age?

Sex?

Race? (This is presumed to have been outlawed by a recent Federal court decision.)

Occupation?

Length of residence in the State of Texas?

U.S. citizenship?

Native-born or naturalized citizen?

State or country of birth?

Length of residence in county?

Texas post office address (if residence is in an incorporated city or town give the ward, street, and number of residence in lieu of post office address, and length of residence in such city or town)?

Political party affiliation?

In Virginia, title 24, section 68, of the code requires the following questions to be answered in writing by the person registering, without assistance:

Name?

Age?

Date and place of birth?

Residence?

Occupation?

Have you ever voted before?

State, county, and precinct where you last voted?

(Members of armed services are required to give their service, serial number and discharge date where pertinent.)

(Naturalized citizens are required to give date, court and State where they received their naturalization papers, along with their petition and certificate numbers.)

All persons registering are required to sign the following oath:

"I ——— do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I am entitled to register under the constitution and laws of this State, and that I am not disqualified from exercising the right of suffrage by the constitution of Virginia."

But the Federal Attorney General, while admitting that both States are ensnared in his voting numbers trap, reveals that he has written this bill for the administration so that he can exempt Texas by simply asserting that Texas has no literacy test. But he can incriminate Virginia by inferring that Virginia has some kind of a voting test that will not get his approval.

The fact is that in State and local elections on questions of bond issues, debt, and other matters of public finance, Texas voters must own taxable property.

There is no such requirement in Virginia.

For State and local elections Texas requires payment of poll taxes for 1 year; Virginia requires their payment for 3 years, but the 3-year requirement does not apply to new voters coming of age or moving into the State.

What does the Federal Attorney General do about poll taxes? He exempts Texas from application of his bill. But his bill provides that his Federal registrars sent to poll tax States will collect the taxes for 1 year—as in Texas—from persons they qualify to vote.

Beyond this, he has testified that neither he nor his Federal registrars will recognize the 3-year poll tax requirement—as in Virginia.

But while the Federal Attorney General refuses to recognize the requirement to pay poll taxes for 3 years as a requirement to vote, he provides in his bill that he and his Federal registrars can disenfranchise persons they have qualified to vote contrary to State laws if they do not vote "at least once during 3 consecutive years while listed."

The people of Virginia, and the Nation, are justified in the condemnation of legislation such as the Federal administration and its Attorney General propose in the so-called Voting Rights Act of 1965.

They would pin a rose on Texas, but incriminate Virginia.

And when they incriminate Virginia, they deny it the judicial process accorded a murderer.

They would convict Virginia of voting discrimination, but deny it a pardon until it has proved its innocence of something else for 10 years.

They admit there is already ample law under which allegations of discrimination can be tested in the judicial process, but they want this special law to bypass judicial process for the punishment of the States of their choice.

For purposes of this law, the Federal administration and its Attorney General condone an eighth grade education voting test in New York, but they want the power to qualify a moron to vote in Alabama.

They decry discrimination devices, but they have proposed a law which, in itself, is a discrimination device.

The Federal Attorney General has no patience with the judicial process for the victims of this bill. He wants the power to deal with them himself.

The Federal administration and its Attorney General propose to incriminate certain States by means of dictator-type decree and a statistical formula.

They demand for themselves the right, under certain conditions which they name, to disenfranchise people they themselves qualified to vote.

The Federal administration and its Attorney General propose by a single Federal statute to take away the constitutional rights of States and substitute Federal Executive decree.

If this can be done for this administration, for the purposes of this bill, to punish the States it has chosen, it can be done at other times for other purposes to detroy the constitutional rights of others, the Constitution not withstanding.

It is significant that this bill would extend Federal control over all elections—Federal, State, local, and party primaries.

Federal agents are not to confine their control only to elections for political office. They extend it to State and local elections with respect to public finance—bond issues, credit, expenditures, etc.

Simply by changing the statistical formula the Federal administration and its Attorney General can be empowered to extend their control over any and all States they wish to give this treatment.

What would remain of our form and system of government if all elections in all States and localities were controlled by the Central Government?

Only last month 99.9 percent of the people in Moscow voted in an election of candidates who had no opposition. And when Mr. Khrushchev voted, he was not required even to produce identification.

VOTING TESTS AND THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL—CLARIFICATION OF THE PICTURE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, in recent weeks there has been an abundance of speculation about voting tests in the Nation and the degree to which they prohibit qualified individuals from voting. Incongruities in the Voting Rights Act of 1965 have also been cited.

I ask unanimous consent that certain articles and editorials indicative of this situation be printed at this point in the RECORD. They include those entitled "Vote Test Here Simple, and Same for Everyone," from the Fayetteville Observer of March 23, 1965; "Question Lingers on Voting Bill," from the Washington Star of March 24, 1965; "Incongruities in the Drama," from the Wall Street Journal of March 25, 1965; and "Special Laws and Blanket Indictments," from the Greensboro Daily News of March 23, 1965.

There being no objection, the articles and the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Fayetteville (N.C.) Observer, Mar. 23, 1965]

VOTE TEST HERE SIMPLE, AND SAME FOR EVERYONE

(By Bill Wright)

No, Mr. Katzenbach, there was no snowstorm.

There might be one, though, in July, before enough Cumberland County folks vote so as to exempt the county from provisions of the proposed voting rights law.

Fact is, far less than one-third, much less one-half, the qualified voters within the bounds of Cumberland County voted in last November's general election.

The reason is another matter.

A close look strongly indicates that Attorney General Katzenbach did Cumberland County an injustice when he "indiscriminately" lumped 34 eastern North Carolina counties with Mississippi in a statement on registration procedures, and said "snow did not keep them away from the polls."

The implication was there that is racial discrimination.

The study shows there is none.

Unless the discrimination is much subtler than a cynical reporter can detect, none exists in the Cumberland County elections office against Negroes registering to vote.

From what can be learned, registrars go further than they might to help a Negro get registered, becoming at times almost paternal.

The figures support the conclusion.

And so do Negroes themselves.

REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS

A Negro, when he goes to register, must prove only that he can read and write, as must everyone.

It is widely known that the test for proving that can be so manipulated as to bar almost anyone from registering. That is the problem in Alabama and Mississippi. There, the charge is, Negroes are given a much harder reading and writing test than whites.

Negroes and whites in Cumberland County have to do only two things, and all have to do it, regardless of race. They are required to read aloud the elections oath, and sign their names.

Whoever can do that can register and vote.

Further proof of the county's position on registration is the fact that Fayetteville's only precinct which is made up predominantly of Negro voters has a prominent Negro man as registrar.

He has the full backing of Elections Board Chairman G. E. Edgerton to register whomever he finds to have met qualifications.

He is Dr. Henry M. Eldridge, professor at Fayetteville State College, prominent member of the community and registrar in the 13th precinct.

Asked if he knew of any racial discrimination, direct or implied, in Cumberland's registration policies, Eldridge said he did not.

"I have found that anyone who wanted to register had an opportunity to do so," he told the Observer.

He confirmed the fact that the same simple test for registration is given Negroes and whites.

The length to which registrars sometimes go to help a Negro get on the registration rolls was shown recently when a man came to the elections office and asked to be registered.

The registrar filled out his form, and asked that he read the oath.

She learned by questioning him that he was going to night school. But his reading was quite elementary.

The registrar coaxed, helping him get through the oath. Finally, it appeared he could not do it.

She offered to give him another chance when his reading proficiency improved through his night study.

Another man came recently to Eldridge. He could read, but could not see well enough to read the oath. Eldridge went to great lengths, even trying to obtain the oath in braille, to determine that he could read. He was eventually registered.

REGISTRATION BREAKDOWN

Cumberland County at the moment has 31,176 voters registered. Of the total, 24,595 are white, 6,581 Negro.

Chairman Edgerton said that, although he did not have exact figures, within the past year his office registered a larger percentage of Negroes than whites. (Percentage based on the number registered to population.)

A year ago, the total registrations were 31,638. That total was cut by a recent purge of the books, cutting the total back to its present level.

The purge cut white registrants from 25,798 then to 24,595 now. Despite the purge, the Negro registration total has increased—from 5,840 a year ago to 6,581.

The fact remains that Cumberland is among 34 North Carolina counties that would qualify for Federal registrars under the voting rights bill. The bill would allow Federal registrars to go into a county in which less than 50 percent of the population over 21 years of age in the 1960 census voted in the last general election.

About 23,000 persons voted in Cumberland County in last November's election. There are about 86,000 people in the county over 21. That means less than one-third of the eligible people voted.

FORT BRAGG PERSONNEL

Why is this true?

The biggest reason, most observers believe, is the presence of Fort Bragg. Thousands of military personnel choose not to declare North Carolina their home State, and therefore vote elsewhere by absentee.

That creates a big population total and depresses the percentage of people voting. It creates the illusion of discrimination, or some other artificial voting controls.

Discrimination, of course, is the assumption in the voting rights bill in picking counties with less than 50 percent voting.

The Government might send Federal registrars here, but chances are they will be an inactive group.

[From the Washington Star, Mar. 24, 1965]

QUESTION LINGERS ON VOTING BILL

(By Richard Wilson)

The question that the advocates of the new voting rights bill have as yet failed to answer adequately is this: Why should literacy test as a qualification for voting be perfectly all right in 45 of the 50 States but invalid in the other 5?

If a voter in Alabama who cannot read or write is qualified to vote in a Federal or any other election, why should not an illiterate New Yorker have the same right? The right to vote certainly has no connection with the number of people who vote, and it is manifestly unjust to bar an illiterate from voting in a State where less than 50 percent of the qualified voters cast their ballot, but to permit him to vote in a State where more than 50 percent of the voters go to the polls.

This, nevertheless, would be the effect, in 606 counties in 10 States, of the passage of the voter rights bill sent to Congress by President Johnson.

The only justification offered for this anomaly is that it is the only way to force election officials in those 10 States to register Negroes to vote. Otherwise, they will enforce prohibitive regulations that prevent Negroes from voting, but not enforce the same regulations on whites who could not meet the qualifications.

This is another example of the devious legislative tactics in the Johnson administration to achieve results by legal circumlocution. Another outstanding example is the aid to education bill that attempts to get around the church-state issue.

From the President's recent statements it can be concluded that what he really desires is the removal of virtually all restrictions on voting for persons 18 years old, and over, if they are sane, and in spite of the fact that the Supreme Court would have to reverse itself in finding that the imposition of reasonable qualifications is valid.

It must be admitted that literacy tests as a qualification for voting are honored in the breach in the North. Thirty States have no such requirements. States that do have literacy requirements often do not enforce them, or the enforcement is so cursory as to be meaningless.

New York requires proof of an eighth-grade education or demonstration of the ability to read as a requirement for voters. This excludes a great many people, including recently arrived Puerto Ricans, from voting and is being challenged in the courts. Previous Federal legislation proposals would have required a sixth-grade education as proof of literacy.

Residency requirements are universal. In short, people are not born in this country with an inherent right to vote at any time or any place. This is a right for which they must qualify by tests that vary from State to State, and which was affirmed by a 1959 Supreme Court decision. The layman would think that the Constitution is quite clear on this point in its 1st article and in the 17th amendment, to say nothing of the 1959 decision of the Supreme Court.

Furthermore, the Johnson voting rights bill recognizes this principle by providing that a voter shall be stricken from the rolls if he fails to vote at least once in 3 consecutive years. Thus the Federal law would impose restrictions Congress regards as reasonable while outlawing other restrictions imposed by the States.

Why is not the issue confronted squarely? Why is Congress not asked to abolish literacy requirements in all States altogether?

The answer to that is clear. It is because literacy requirements have validity both in reason and in law. It makes sense that a voter should have at least an elementary ability to read and write the language of the country in which he resides. It makes sense that States should have the power to set reasonable minimum standards for voters, and the proposed law recognizes that by itself setting some standards. It hardly needs to be argued, also, that a Federal law should apply equally to the citizens of all States.

The strange, awkward, and unequal nature of this new legislation shows how wrong it is to try to legislate on such complicated matters in an atmosphere of violence—provoking public demonstrations.

The Johnson administration was rushed into the presentation of a law that has so many obvious flaws that it can immediately be challenged in the courts. Elaborate and tricky formulas provide no answer for a more basic question: Why in a nation with compulsory, universal public education are so many people, Negro and white, illiterate? And why should there be a premium on illiteracy in some States and not in others?

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 25, 1965]

INCONGRUITIES IN THE DRAMA

The civil rights struggle, focusing this week on the march to Montgomery, is customarily described in terms of high drama, and certainly there has been no lack of violent incidents. Yet great drama, whether in real life or reflected on the stage, must have the ring of truth, and it seems to us that too often, on all sides, this one does not have that ring.

To say that is not to disparage the justice of the voter registration drive, condone the extreme southern segregationists or question the depth of concern in the White House. On the contrary, the sympathy of the majority of Americans is for the Negro cause, especially in so fundamental a field as voting, and not for a bullying sheriff or a recalcitrant Governor.

It is, rather, to say that all the protagonists are pursuing particular, highly political, interests which do not always add up to the Nation's best interest but which do produce incongruities and rob the drama of some of its reality.

Consider the frequently made comparison between the American demonstrations and the Indian resistance movement of Mahatma Gandhi. It is a little incongruous, to begin with, to equate the well equipped Montgomery marchers, moving under the full panoply of U.S. Government military protection, with the Indian leader's wretched hordes.

Therein lies the major weakness of the analogy: Gandhi was protesting the foreign rule of his entire nation, not some local abuse. In the United States today the whole Federal Establishment, as well as most public opinion, is arrayed on the side of the Negro. We may be thankful it is so, but the present point is that against that awesome power the intransigent local politician can prevail only for a time. Ultimately the contest is unequal.

Such confrontations intensify the politics and the bitterness. Not only is it right that the Negro should have access to the polls equally with other citizens in his State; the extent of his success in reinforcing the right can also powerfully affect local politics. On a national scale, long before the present efforts, the Negro vote was showing its considerable influence in elections.

While there can be no quarrel with this development as such, it helps explain the bitter-end opposition of some of the southern politicians in municipal, county, or State office. In the Deep South especially they can play on, as well as mirror, white fears that some local political structures may eventually be taken over by Negroes through sheer force of numbers. It is remarkable that in all the long period of strife few outside the South appear to have recognized that this potential revolution actually is a problem requiring consideration and accommodation.

At the same time the high political content of the issue is causing the national administration, for its part, to stray from the paths of reality and constitutionality. The Government's attempts to redress wrongs also have obvious political advantages. It can hope to cement, for the time being anyway, the Negro vote without alienating the majority of the electorate. Last November demonstrated how feebly resentment, either South or North, could affect the outcome.

So it is that less than a year after passage of the Civil Rights Act, a couple of whose sections are open to constitutional question, we have a proposed voting law which is inherently inconsistent and seems flatly to contravene the Constitution. It is expected in Washington that the momentum of the administration's efforts to reassure the civil rights leaders will accelerate.

Beyond any proposed legislation, reality also tends to be submerged in some general attitudes. If the diehard segregationists err in supposing they can reverse the movement, so do the civil rights leaders and supporters err in thinking that endless disruption of the civil order spells the automatic fulfillment of their aspirations; it may delay them through exasperating the patience of the public.

Specific goals may indeed be won; more important is what is done with equal treatment or full citizenship. Too little attention has been paid to the Negro's own responsibility in the development of the society. The reality is that the society, with the best will in the world, cannot do everything for him or any other citizen.

That the various political interests play a large part in the issue is inevitable, since practically all national decisions are reached through the interaction of political interests. But those who lead groups or nations must, like other mortals, find time for cooling off and reflection lest they propel the drama to lengths that are not only incongruous but injurious.

[From the Greensboro (N.C.) Daily News, Mar. 23, 1965]

SPECIAL LAWS AND BLANKET INDICTMENTS

In the present tense situation in Alabama Federal officials—and indeed everyone connected with the civil rights controversy—should check carefully on facts and figures before sounding off in public.

Attorney General Nicholas Katzenbach failed to do this in remarks made before a House committee last Friday. The substance of his testimony was sound—much of the civil rights story in the South had been one of "intimidation, discouragement, and delay" in the struggle to win full citizenship rights for Negroes.

But the Attorney General barked up the wrong tree when he dragged 34 eastern North Carolina counties into the picture and linked them with Alabama. The reference was to the projected abolition of literacy tests in counties where less than 50 percent of eligible citizens turned out to vote—and they included Aroostook County in Maine as well as most of the 4 Southern States, parts of Alaska, and Arizona, and 34 counties in North Carolina.

"They may have had a snowstorm in Aroostook County," the Attorney General told the committee, "but they didn't have a snowstorm in 34 counties of North Carolina, and they didn't have a snowstorm in Mississippi."

No, there was no snowstorm down here last November. But as far as North Carolina is concerned neither was there specific "intimidation, discouragement, or delay" in registration or voting for Negro citizens. The only protests about registration delays in North Carolina in recent years have been confined to one county, Halifax—and that situation has now been cleared.

Let it be understood by Mr. Katzenbach and others, including President Johnson and Rev. Martin Luther King, that North Carolina cannot be tarred with the brush of Alabama or Mississippi. Negro citizens have had the right to register to vote here just as other citizens have. They have been subjected to the same kind of literacy tests which apply for all other would-be voters—except in several very rare situations in Halifax County.

To equate conditions in North Carolina with those in Dallas County simply because less than 50 percent of the eligible voters went to the polls last November is presumptuous and inaccurate. It indicts the thinking behind the President's new Federal voting legislation.

There are far, far more reasons than racial discrimination behind some of the voting apathy in North Carolina, Mississippi, or New York. As we noted the other day, the Guilford County Elections Board has tried to cooperate in getting more registrants on the books; a study of its recent efforts reveals that even voters signed up by an intensive campaign have stayed away from the general election in droves.

It is grossly unfair to infer that simply because 50 percent of the eligible voters failed to go to the polls, racial discrimination is the reason.

The more we study the President's Federal voting legislation, the more we are convinced that the 50-percent figure is ill advised. Indeed, the whole idea of setting up special laws to cover certain statistical situations may not work fairly. The Federal Government's duty is to see that all citizens are allowed to register and vote if they desire to do so. It is not to create special rules for some citizens which do not apply to all citizens. And that quite clearly would be done if literacy tests and other voter qualifications are abolished in certain areas but allowed to flourish in others.

Basic constitutional principles are involved on both sides of this controversy over suffrage rights. One principle ought not to receive higher priority than another, closer home, and the Attorney General should watch the blanket indictments based on fuzzy statistics.

USE IN VIETNAM OF U.S. AIR POWER

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, The Reporter magazine, in its issue dated March 25, presents us with a lucid report, from Saigon, by Denis Warner.

The article recounts the military situation which has led to the utilization of American air power against North Vietnam and in support of government troops in South Vietnam. It makes the point that Ho Chi Minh and his followers remain unwilling to negotiate the Vietnamese situation on any terms less than a U.S. capitulation, and remain convinced that they can win that nasty war. But consistent, effective use of American air power can be used, Mr. Warner points out, to disabuse the Hanoi regime and its allies in Peiping of this notion.

I ask unanimous consent that the Reporter article on Vietnam be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Reporter, Mar. 25, 1965]

VIETNAM

(By Denis Warner)

SAIGON.—By the beginning of February the restricted war in South Vietnam, with its inhibitions on the use of American power and its privileged sanctuaries for the Communist Vietcong, was all but lost. Lost not merely in the sense that a weak government in Saigon would one day want to negotiate a fictitious neutrality, but in the total sense of the word. Instead of the diplomatic niceties and face-saving protocol of the conference table conjured up by some Congressmen and editorial writers on the basis of unrealistic and ill-informed accounts of the situation, what lay ahead for South Vietnam—and the United States—was bitter and disastrous defeat.

"The National Liberation Front counts on clear-cut victory over whatever United States-Saigon régime is in power at the time," wrote the Australian Communist journalist Wilfred Burchett from the National Liberation Front's headquarters in the jungle north and west of Saigon. "Pax Americana is unacceptable to the Vietcong."

Hanoi confirmed this hard line. In conversations with International Control Commission officials, the North Vietnamese leaders expressed no interest in the resumption of the Geneva Conference, or in any negotiations that did not include the prior exclusion of all American military advisers and equipment from South Vietnam.

Opinions differed in Saigon on how long final disaster might be averted. Some qualified observers spoke of a couple of months. The resilience of the Vietnamese people and the country's capacity to muddle along without effective government, or any government at all, convinced the more optimistic that things might just go on getting worse for a much longer time. But few, if any, doubted the inevitability of defeat if the war continued to be fought by Vietcong ground rules. Not all of the troubles were due to the Vietcong, of course. The generals had abandoned the battlefield for politics. In the interplay between military and government, the South Vietnamese administration, never very strong, simply withered away.

On the military front, there were, as always, some gains with the losses. In the southern regions of the populous Mekong Delta, along the region most heavily infested by the Vietcong, the government reported successes. Villages once securely in Vietcong control had passed more or less into government hands. But even here there was scarcely reason for jubilation. Of the 6 million inhabitants of the 15 provinces in the southern corner of Vietnam, not more than a million could be regarded as on our side, and only 1,700 of the 4,000 hamlets were anything like secure. Meanwhile in central Vietnam, which had been drained of its government forces to reinforce the delta, the deterioration had been shattering.

In February 1964 the hard core of the Vietcong forces numbered, by official American estimate, about 22,000 men. Despite heavy combat losses, by the beginning of February of this year their regular forces had grown to an estimated 35,000. These men are organized under 5 regimental headquarters (3 others are in the process of formation), and are deployed in some 50 battalions, 139 independent companies, and 29 independent platoons.

With the active military assistance of perhaps a hundred thousand part-time guerrillas and regional forces and the cooperation of some half a million members or supporters of the National Liberation Front, the Vietcong now had a substantially larger mobile attacking force than the 600,000 military and paramilitary troops of the Government. With their responsibility for keeping roads, railways, rivers, and canals open, and for insuring that crops reached the markets, by far the larger portion of the Government's forces were tied down.

Tactically, helicopters had added a new element of mobility and surprise to the Government's family of weapons. With this new strength, however, there were also weaknesses. While the helicopters often contributed to the success of Government sorties against the Vietcong, they also tended to give them the character of hunting parties, thus helping the Communists to identify themselves more closely with the peasants. The lesson has been slowly and painfully learned that there is no substitute for effective administration on the ground.

THE MEANING OF PLEIKU

By December some inkling of the grave new turn in the war had become apparent when substantial Vietcong forces grouped to seize An Lao in central Vietnam. In itself, the fall of An Lao was of little consequence. What did matter, however, was the capability implicit in the Vietcong action. Under the patient leadership of Maj. Gen. Nguyen Don, who established his headquarters in the mountains of Kontum Province 5 years ago, the Vietcong had accumulated sufficient forces to attempt what the American Military Assistance Command had once believed impossible: to cut South Vietnam in two.

The attacks against the American installations at Pleiku and Qui Nhon, which led to the retaliatory raids north of the 17th parallel, were part of this plan. For weeks the Vietcong rehearsed the Pleiku attack. Few armies have ever given such attention to the planning of the most minute detail of comparatively small actions. From sand tables the Vietcong moved to full-scale mockups, leaving little to chance or luck—although by miscalculation or inexperience, many of their rounds of mortar fire at Pleiku fell short. But for this, the U.S. casualties would have been much heavier.

The real significance of the Pleiku and Qui Nhon actions was less the calculated selection of American targets than the fait accompli of partition. As Government forces quickly discovered, the Vietcong had seized control of the Qui Nhon-Pleiku road, the strategic highway supplying the Second Corps headquarters and all of the northern part of the high plateau. Under the rules by which the war had been fought, Pleiku, Kontum, Dak To, and other Government positions in this part of the high plateau were now untenable. It was a defeat as potentially disastrous for Saigon as the loss of the Thai country of Tonkin had been for the French 11 years before. The war, it was clear, was entering its final phase.

The days when the Vietcong depended on slingshots, homemade rifles, and even captured American equipment had long since passed. Hard-core units were receiving their own new Communist-bloc equipment. And tucked away in the middle of a long war communique was the news that the Vietcong had used artillery for the first time.

It was this change, and not just the question of retaliation against North Vietnam, that was the real challenge President Johnson faced on February 7. If ever there was to be a last chance to amend the rules of the war so as to fight back to a position where peace might one day be won at the conference table, this was it.

Ambassador Maxwell D. Taylor brought with him to Vietnam the realization inspired by the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 that if only the United States could convince Hanoi and Peiping that it was in deadly earnest, that southeast Asia was really worth the risk of a major war, then a way could be found to terminate North Vietnamese aid and to bring the Vietcong insurgency to an end. For the plan to work, there could not be an ounce of bluff.

Until February, however, the one deadly aspect of the whole scheme was Washington's indecision. The Tonkin Gulf affair last summer appears in retrospect as anything but a bold warning of the shape of things to come. Instead of drawing in its horns, Hanoi responded with a vastly increased volume of materiel and other aid to the Vietcong. Yet attempts by planes of the 7th Fleet to close off the Ho Chi Minh Trail in the general region of Tchepone in Laos were low-key, irresolute, and unsuccessful. To the Vietcong, they were more of an irritant, and perhaps even a stimulant, than a hazard. As Hanoi and Peiping evaluated the situation, the United States had bluffed in the Gulf of Tonkin, and its bluff had been effectively called. Nor were the Communists alone in this estimate. In other parts of southeast Asia, friends, foes, and neutrals alike wondered whether Washington really meant business.

Here in Saigon, Washington's resolution is no longer seriously questioned. Whatever doubts remained were quickly taken care of by the introduction of American jet fighters in direct support of Vietnamese ground forces. The sensation of each new development now is truly that of being carried upwards on a rapidly moving escalator.

The message does not yet appear to have reached North Vietnam, however. As one senior U.S. official commented: "The great debate in the United States about whether we should cut and run, and the generals' three-ring political circus in Saigon, haven't helped to get the message across. Hanoi still thinks it's got it made down here." This opinion is confirmed by International Control Commission reports from Hanoi. The Commission's observers have found nothing to indicate a willingness on the part of Ho Chi Minh and his followers to negotiate on terms that would require anything less than a U.S. capitulation.

UPPING THE ANTE

American officials advance three reasons for the bombing attacks on the North: to persuade Hanoi to stop interfering in the South; to inspire some feeling among the South Vietnamese that there is real hope of winning the war; and, though graded a long way below the other reasons, to interrupt the southward flow of men and materials.

If the impact is not ultimately to be negative, bombing above the 17th parallel, and also direct American jet support in the South, must be continuous and effective. As part of a cautious phased program designed to test world reaction rather than to hurt North Vietnam, the first attacks against Dong Hoi and Vinh Linh no doubt served their purpose: but the destruction of 30 barracks and the sprinkling of some fields with a particularly nasty antipersonnel bomb known as the Lazy Dog, which showers razor-sharp pieces of steel in its target area, were not enough to promote radical changes in Hanoi. Elsewhere, the raids provoked predictable expressions of hostility and some reassuring support, not all of it expected. But they lacked the conviction of deadly earnestness that the United States must communicate if the new exercise is not to prove a failure.

North Vietnam has reconstructed its railway lines to China, and built its steel center at Thai Nguyen, and cement mill at Haiphong, only by great economic sacrifices at a time when it has the lowest living standards in southeast Asia. It must be made to understand that the price for continuing the war in the South will be the destruction not merely of barracks and bridges but what it has labored to achieve industrially.

In terms of the Peiping-Hanoi concept of wars of national liberation and their impact on the United States, the stakes are so high that Ho Chi Minh may elect to suffer even this sort of disaster while he still has hopes of victory in South Vietnam. Those who know him best believe that he will want to avoid at all costs a situation in which Chinese Communist forces (as distinct from specialists) may come to his aid. But the doubt persists, and will continue to persist, unless and until it can also be shown that direct American air support in South Vietnam and any other measures the United States may decide on are successful. Failure will breed failure, and this is true on all the complex political, diplomatic, and military fronts that are involved in this crisis.

For this reason, the battle slowly unfolding in central Vietnam for the Qui Nhon-Pleiku road is without doubt the most important of the war. This is the proving ground for American air support of South Vietnamese forces pitted against a mobile Vietcong force that not only controls the jungle, and therefore has the initiative, but may well also prove to be numerically superior. Early combined actions along the highway, the scene of the bloodiest Vietminh ambush of the entire Indochina war, proved highly successful, as jet fighters drove off entrenched ambush forces. A government prisoner who escaped from the Vietcong during the bombing reported that he saw a hundred dead being carted off. It would be excessively optimistic, however, to expect this sort of casualty rate to continue. Targets will be more difficult to locate as the Vietcong becomes aware of the even greater need for camouflage and concealment, and experienced air officers are reluctant to predict the outcome.

What is at stake here is not merely a highway, or the security of the Second Corps Headquarters at Pleiku, or even the control of the High Plateau, damaging though its loss would be: what is of absolutely critical importance is that the Vietcong be denied the opportunity to move into the Maoist phase of mobile warfare. If by the use of American air power they can be forced back to a lower level of guerrilla activity—which, though dangerous enough, lacks the means of delivering the massive blows on which their hopes for a purely military victory depend—then Hanoi may realize the futility of continuing an interminable war in which the rewards for continued struggle are the ashes of its own destruction.

MORE OF LIPPMANN ON VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, in a foreign-policy debate which has been characterized by rigidity, the voice of

Walter Lippmann has added a much-needed creativity. In two recent articles, Mr. Lippmann has exposed some of the fallacies which seem to underline much of the current thinking on the subject of Vietnam.

In his article which appeared in the April 1 issue of the Washington Post, Mr. Lippmann agrees with the tenets of Senator Cooper's closely reasoned March 25 speech on Vietnam. Both Senator Cooper and Mr. Lippmann warn of the danger of prescribing conditions to negotiations which are clearly unacceptable. I ask unanimous consent that two of Mr. Lippmann's recent articles—entitled "On the Way to the Brink" and "The Basis of Negotiation"—be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Today and Tomorrow—On the Way to the Brink

(By Walter Lippmann)

The war in Vietnam has reached the point where the President is wrestling with momentous and fateful decisions. For what has happened is that the official theory of the war, as propounded by Gen. Maxwell Taylor to President Kennedy and by Secretary McNamara to President Johnson, has proved to be unworkable. The government in Saigon has not been able to pacify South Vietnam even with the help of American munitions, money, and 25,000 military advisers. The crucial fact today is that for all practical purposes the Saigon government has lost control of the countryside, and its followers are increasingly holed up in the cities.

The roads and the railroads connecting the cities have been cut by the Vietcong. The cities now have to be supplied in great measure by air and by sea. This condition of affairs has been well reported by Mr. Richard Dudman in a series of reports to the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, and his findings are confirmed in all essentials, though not yet publicly, in the well-informed quarters in Washington.

The surest evidence that Mr. Dudman's reports are substantially correct is that in the Pentagon and the State Department there is mounting pressure for the commitment to southeast Asia of American infantry. The current estimate is that the President should be prepared to send 350,000 American soldiers, even though this would compel him to order a mobilization of reservists and draftees.

This call for American ground forces is the logical and inevitable consequence of the virtual collapse of the Saigon government in the villages. Having lost the countryside Saigon has lost the sources of military manpower. This deprives it of the means for winning the war. The official estimates today are that the Saigon government commands forces superior to the Vietcong by a ratio of not quite 5 to 1. Experience shows that no guerrilla war has ever been subdued with such a low ratio of superiority. It is estimated that in Malaya, the British and the Malayans, who were fighting the indigenous Chinese guerrillas reached a superiority of 50 to 1. In Cyprus, which they gave up, the British had overwhelming force. In Algeria, though the French Army had unmistakable superiority, the country became untenable. It is the deficiency in South Vietnamese military manpower which explains why the pressure is now on to put in Americans to fill it.

After 2 months of bombing North Vietnam, it has become manifest also that the bombing has not changed the course of the war. As a result of this disappointment, the President is now under pressure to extend the bombing to the populated centers around Hanoi and Haiphong.

There is no doubt that American airpower can devastate North Vietnam and, if China intervened, could do great damage in China. But if we had an American army of 350,000 men in South Vietnam, and extended the war in the air, we would have on our hands an interminable war without the prospect of a solution. To talk about freedom and national independence amidst such violence and chaos would be to talk nonsense

In order to rationalize, that is to sell, the wider war, we are being told by Secretary McNamara and others that this war is a decisive test for the future. It will decide the future of "wars of liberation." This is a profoundly and dangerously false notion, and it shows a lamentable lack of knowledge and understanding of the revolutionary upheavels of the epoch in which we live. It assumes that revolutionary uprisings against established authority are manufactured in Peiping or in Moscow, and that they would not happen if they were not instigated, supported, and directed from one of the capitals of communism. If this were true, the revolutionary movements could be suppressed once and for all by knocking out Peiping or Moscow. They little know the hydra who think that the hydra has only one head and that it can be cut off.

Experience shows that there is no single central source of the revolutionary upheavels of our epoch. What is there that is common to the Irish rebellion, to the Jewish uprising in Palestine, to the civil war in Cuba, to the Arab rebellion in Algeria, to the Huk revolt in the Philippines? What is common to them all is violent discontent with the established order and a willingness of a minority of the discontented to die in the attempt to overthrow it.

What has confused many well-meaning Americans is that in some of these rebellions, though not by any means in all of them, Communists have become the leaders of the rebellion. But that does not mean that they owned the rebellion. The resistance to the Nazis in France and Italy contained a high proportion of Communists among the active partisans. But 20 years later it is General de Gaulle who presides over France.

It would be well to abandon the half-baked notion that the war in southeast Asia will be decisive for the future of revolutionary upheavels in the world. Revolution is a home-grown product, and it could not be stamped out decisively once and for all—supposing we had such delusions of grandeur—by stamping out Red China. In southeast Asia we have entangled ourselves in one of the many upheavels against the old regime, and we shall not make things any better by thrashing around with ascending violence.

Today and Tomorrow—The Basis of Negotiation

(By Walter Lippmann)

The cardinal defect of the administration's conduct of the war in Indochina has been pointed out by a Republican Senator, John Sherman Cooper, of Kentucky. In a statement last week (March 25), Senator Cooper said that the U.S. Government, like its adversaries in Peiping and Hanoi, is "prescribing conditions as a prerequisite to negotiations which will not be accepted." The Communists are making it a condition of a negotiation that the United States must withdraw from Vietnam; we are making it a condition of a negotiation that North Vietnam must withdraw from South Vietnam. This is, said Senator Cooper, "a kind of demand from both sides for unconditional surrender."

It is, therefore, highly important that the administration put itself in a position where negotiation is possible, granting that even if it did so, Hanoi and Peiping may gamble on winning the war in order to overrun South Vietnam and inflict a smashing defeat on the United States. But regardless of what they do, we must come into court with clean hands. The administration needs to clarify its own position—in order to set in motion a movement for negotiation and, failing that, to put the onus of prolonging and widening the war unmistakably on our adversaries.

There is a mistaken impression in this country that we are ready and willing to negotiate but that the other side is imposing intolerable conditions; namely, that we should withdraw our forces before the negotiation begins. Senator Cooper rejects the Communist condition, as do all of us who have been actively interested in this question. We cannot withdraw our forces until there has been a political settlement in Indochina, a settlement which promises to last because it serves the primary interests of all concerned.

But what, as a matter of fact, is our position? It is that before negotiations can take place, the North must demonstrate its readiness "to leave its neighbors alone." Secretary Rusk has avoided a precise definition of that phrase. We know that "illegal infiltration of military personnel and arms" is considered to violate that condition. That "leaving your neighbors alone" means also withdrawal of infiltrators who are already there has at times been suggested but never formally stated.

Senator Cooper says of this position: "I think it unlikely that the Communists will agree to this condition for negotiations, as we will not agree to their condition that the United States withdraw."

What Senator Cooper is asking the administration to do is what was done in the Korean war: "No such conditions were imposed by either side prior to negotiations, but a cease-fire was sought." Until the administration comes around to this position, its diplomacy will be confused.

Last week (March 25) the President issued a statement that "we have said many times—to all who are interested in our principles for honorable negotiation—That we seek no more than a return to the essentials of the agreements of 1954—a reliable arrangement to guarantee the independence and security of all in southeast Asia."

This is rather puzzling. The agreements of 1954 were reached at Geneva in a conference in which there participated not only the Indochinese states but also Russia, Red China, Britain, France, and the United States. The agreements ended the fighting between the French Union forces and the Vietminh in Laos, Cambodia, and Vietnam. These states were to become independent countries, with Vietnam partitioned at the 17th parallel into two zones pending general free elections to be held by January 20, 1956.

The cease-fire agreement was signed by the military commanders. But in addition, the Geneva Conference issued a final declaration, dated July 21. This declaration contained the following principles of settlement. One of the principles was that the cease-fire prohibited the "introduction into Vietnam of foreign troops and military personnel as well as of all kinds of arms and munitions." The Geneva Declaration went on to say that "the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary." Furthermore, the declaration said that "general elections shall be held in July 1956 under the supervision of an international commission * * *."

The United States did not sign the final declaration. But the Under Secretary of State, Gen. Bedell Smith, made a unilateral declaration which said that the United

States supported the agreements and that "in connection with the statement in the declaration concerning free elections in Vietnam, my Government wishes to make clear its position which it has expressed in a declaration made in Washington on June 29, 1954, as follows: 'in the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections supervised by the United Nations to insure that they are conducted fairly.'"

The United States encouraged the Diem government in Saigon to refuse to hold the elections of 1956, almost certainly for the quite practical reason that they would have been won by the Communists.

Considering the essentials of the 1954 agreements, it is not easy to understand what it means to say now that "we seek no more than a return to the essentials of the agreements of 1954." I am afraid it means that in the diplomatic conduct of the war in Vietnam, the diplomatists have not been doing their homework.

ON BREAKING THE DIPLOMATIC DEADLINE IN VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, on Sunday, March 28, the New York Times published an excellent editorial on the dilemma which confronts us in Vietnam. The editorial is entitled "Something More Than Bombs." As this editorial cogently emphasized:

> Military pressure alone—which implies a demand for unconditional surrender—is unlikely to swing the balance in the Hanoi leadership toward a negotiated settlement. Positive American proposals, which suggest a viable future for North Vietnam are the essential complement.

In an article which was published in the New York Times on March 29, Robert Kleiman, a member of the editorial board of the Times, who has just returned from an extensive tour of the Far East, pointed out:

> And it is even possible that persuasive proposals might find a response in the Communist world. Clearly, before any further stepup in the American air offensive in North Vietnam, the time has come to devise and set in motion a political strategy that, for the first time will take priority over military tactics.

I ask unanimous consent that these two excellent excerpts from the New York Times be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and the article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 28, 1965]

SOMETHING MORE THAN BOMBS

The limited American air war against North Vietnam is now entering its eighth week. It is not too soon to ask what it has accomplished—and why it has not accomplished more.

The aim of the continuing air offensive, accompained by threats of further escalation, was to persuade the North Vietnamese Communists to halt their armed infiltration into South Vietnam. When it was undertaken, one of President Johnson's highest advisers predicted that the Communists' will to fight would be weakened in two months. So far, there is no indication that he was right; on the contrary, there clearly has been a stiffening of Communist positions as Secretary Rusk has admitted.

The Soviet Union has announced that arms aid is on its way to North Vietnam. More important, a direct Soviet-American confrontation in southeast Asia through the use of Soviet "volunteers" in North Vietnam has been publicly threatened by the top Soviet leader, Communist Party First Secretary Brezhnev.

The Vietnamese and Chinese Communists have stiffened their positions even more. Hanoi, which a few weeks ago privately indicated agreement to French and United Nations proposals of negotiations—while refusing a cease-fire—now rejects such proposals. Backed by Moscow, the North Vietnamese insist that there can be no talks while American bombing continues. Peiping has taken the most extreme position of all. It insists there can be no negotiations before the "complete, unconditional" withdrawal of American troops from South Vietnam. The Vietcong, which shows some signs of independence from Hanoi, has enthusiastically adopted the Peiping line.

Meanwhile, the American bombing—not to mention use of nonlethal gas—has significantly alienated world opinion. Concern about the danger of a major war is widespread. Equally important, there is profound puzzlement about Washington's objectives and tactics.

The trouble is that President Johnson, a master of domestic politics, had until last week seemed to forget that war is politics too, even if pursued by "other means." He launched a military offensive, but neglected his diplomatic offensive.

Now the President has promised American aid for "wider and bolder programs" of regional economic development benefiting all of southeast Asia, including North Vietnam. Despite its vague terms, this promise indicates that Washington is beginning to face up to the need to offer its opponents in southeast Asia a diplomatic, political, and economic exit from the military cul-de-sac in which we as well as they are now entrapped.

Persuasive peace proposals can be a political weapon not only toward world opinion, at a time when Americans are bombing Asians, but in presenting moderate Communists with an alternative they can support within the Communist camp. That camp is divided, not only along national lines but within each national capital. And nowhere are the divisions more critical than in Hanoi.

Neither the Vietcong nor the Chinese Communists can be swayed by the bombing of North Vietnam, which causes them no direct pain. They are pressing to intensify the war. The Vietcong, particularly, has made major military gains in recent months and sees every successive Saigon coup as another nail in the coffin of its enemies. It will not be easy for Hanoi, in these circumstances, to shift course and seek a negotiated settlement, even with Soviet backing.

Military pressure alone—which implies a demand for unconditional surrender—is unlikely to swing the balance in the Hanoi leadership toward a negotiated settlement. Positive American proposals, which suggest a way out and a viable future for North Vietnam, are the essential complement.

President Johnson's statement last week could be the precursor of proposals offering Hanoi, once peace is restored, access to the rice of South Vietnam, trade with the West, an end of the embargo and diplomatic boycott that Washington and Saigon have imposed since 1954, and entry to international development assistance. Area-development schemes covering the entire Mekong Valley could be pushed. These, linked with concrete proposals for negotiations and firm offers of a phrased American withdrawal from South Vietnam in accordance with the Geneva agreements, could not fail to influence events.

An immediate Communist response might not be forthcoming. But the words would be heard both within the Communist regimes and outside. World opinion would be rallied. That support will be needed, especially if the war in Vietnam is about to enter a new and more virulent phase.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 29, 1965]

VIETNAM: THE INEXPLICABLE STRATEGY

(By Robert Kleiman)

PARIS.—Washington's policy of bombing North Vietnam while avoiding negotiations is sowing confusion among America's friends. To cross east Asia, India and the Soviet Union to this NATO capital in Europe is to hear repeated questioning of the purposes and tactics of American policy.

There is worry about Soviet or Chinese intervention that would escalate the conflict into a major war. There is concern that the bombing will bring about a Sino-Soviet rapprochement. There is disquiet that Soviet-American and other East-West talks leading toward a détente are grinding to a halt. And there is skepticism everywhere that the bombing by itself will force Hanoi to halt its infiltration—the stated American objective—or persuade the Vietcong to give up their winning battle in South Vietnam.

OBSCURE U.S. GOALS

But what most disturbs the Allies and friendly neutrals—especially the British and Indians, who would like to mediate—is the lack of definition of American objectives. Even full explanations delivered privately by special envoys from Washington seem to leave American intentions so opaque that there is little of interest to communicate to Moscow, Peiping or Hanoi, where London and New Delhi both maintain diplomatic missions.

The lucid chairman of the State Department's Policy Planning Council, Walt Rostow, spent several days recently explaining Washington's thinking to high foreign office officials of a dozen NATO countries. These conversations, on the sidelines of the semiannual seminar of the Atlantic Policy Advisory Group in Reinhartshausen, West Germany, overshadowed the European issues on the regular agenda. But, when it was all over, the European policy planners felt little more enlightened than before. The consensus was that the United States urgently needed to clarify its purposes, both privately and publicly. Mr. Rostow was urged to carry this message back to Washington.

HARRIMAN IN INDIA

An even less successful encounter occurred earlier this month in New Delhi. Roving Ambasador Averell Harriman spent many hours skillfully explaining American policy on Vietnam. He received a sympathetic if noncommittal hearing from Prime Minister Shastri. But he clashed with Foreign Minister Swaran Singh, who urged negotiations and a new Geneva Conference, as did other high Indian officials.

The incident shows that even Washington's most prestigious Ambassador has difficulty obtaining support abroad for a policy that resists negotiations while bombing North Vietnam. The Indians are clear that their interests parallel those of the United States in trying to prevent domination of southeast Asia by Communist China, but they do not agree with all the tactics Washington is employing for this purpose.

The Indians were told that the United States would welcome their help in exploring Communist intentions and in explaining American views, particularly during Shastri's forthcoming visit to Moscow. The key point was to make it clear that the United States was not going to negotiate until Hanoi had stopped its aggression. The Indians were urged to stand with Washington in opposing the Franco-Soviet proposal for a conference without preconditions. The United States, Mr. Harriman emphasized, could not agree to a conference without adequate conditions.

What, asked the Indians, are the American conditions? At that point President Johnson's special envoy—his hands obviously tied by his White House instructions, or lack of them—had to reply that it was premature to explain this, but that Washington wanted India's support for the principle that there must be conditions.

The Indians said they had been informed of Soviet plans to provide North Vietnam with surface-to-air missiles, technicians, and fighter aircraft manned by Soviet personnel. And they warned that Moscow would not pursue bilateral negotiations for a detente while American bombing continued.

The Indians believe there is a serious threat of war stemming from the possibility that Russia may take over the air defense of North Vietnam. In using negotiations they argue that, once the conference date is set, a cease-fire effective before the talks begin will be more easily obtainable.

As the major power in Asia threatened by Communist Chinese aggression, the Indians believe that the United States should take the initiative in proposing a conference, stating its conditions and objectives clearly. Some suggest that Washington take the dramatic step of announcing that it would stop bombing North Vietnam for 2 or 3 weeks pending a Communist reply and cessation of major Communist military operations. This would expose whether Hanoi and Moscow were serious in stating that the main obstacle to negotiation was the bombing of North Vietnam.

PEACE OFFENSIVE NEEDED

Undoubtedly, there are other ingenious formulas that would permit the United States to open a long-neglected peace offensive. Proposals for an "honorable negotiation," now evoked by President Johnson as an objective, would help refute the image the United States has been acquiring in Asia as "the white aggressor on colored soil." In Europe, it would reply to such charges as that of the New Statesman that Washington "has now forfeited all right to British sympathy over Vietnam" because of a "savage intensification of the war * * * accompanied by an apparent refusal to contemplate negotiations in any form."

And it is even possible that persuasive proposals might find a response in the Communist world. Clearly, before any further step-up in the American air offensive in North Vietnam, the time has come to devise and set in motion a political strategy that, for the first time, will take priority over military tactics.

THE THREAT TO AMERICA'S SOIL CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a statement which he has prepared on the subject "The Threat to America's Soil Conservation Programs."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR NELSON—THE THREAT TO AMERICA'S SOIL CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

I am deeply concerned over the Budget Bureau's proposals to sharply reduce Federal support for soil and water conservation practices in rural areas. This is shortsighted budgetmaking.

It would result in a serious cutback in the important work of the 3,000 soil and water conservation districts in this country. And it would reduce support for individual farmers participating in cost-sharing soil and water saving practices.

Ironically the proposed reduction comes at a time when the President is eloquently pleading for the preservation of America's natural resources—its water, soil, forests, open spaces, wilderness, and scenic beauty.

No other program in American history has made such an important contribution to the husbanding of the land. No other program strikes more directly to the heart of resource management. We ought now to be expanding the program, not contracting it.

The soil and water conservation districts, which all are locally managed, have provided outstanding leadership for soil and water conservation in rural America since the 1930's. They are the stewards of soil and water resources on the 70 percent of our Nation's land that is privately owned.

The conservation record of the soil and water conservation districts in my State is among the finest in the Nation. We in Wisconsin were particularly gratified a few weeks ago when Secretary Freeman signed an agreement with a new district encompassing Menominee County. That agreement for technical, credit, cost-sharing, research, and educational assistance brought the last of Wisconsin's 36,150,000 acres into a soil and water conservation district.

I have been disturbed in recent months by the suggestions of some of our budgetmakers that conservation is responsible for some of the overflowing granaries that result from the high productivity of our land. Good conservation practices do make land more productive. But that is hardly a valid criticism. Efficient crop production is only one of the soil and water conservation objectives stated by the 1964 Yearbook of Agriculture:

"To control soil erosion at all times and prevent soil damage in the future.

"To use the better soils, wherever crops can be grown efficiently, for greater net gain per acre. The aim is to help the farmer reach a level of income and standard of living closer to that of managers in industrial enterprises.

"To convert land least suitable for cultivation to pastures, forestry, recreation, and wildlife and other uses in which the soil is not disturbed.

"To protect and hold in reserve soils not needed but potentially suited to cultivation until there is a demand for farm commodities from them or until they may be needed for the balancing of efficient farm units."

This same publication shows that the acreage converted by soil conservation district cooperators to less intensive long-term uses exceeded 21,500,000 acres in this country in the 10-year period ending in 1961. The cost to the taxpayers has been extremely small in contrast to the sums required to retire or divert land under other programs.

I am concerned, too, by the proposal to cut conservation cost-sharing funds by $100 million at a time when we should be accelerating conservation and resource development program on privately owned land. This cost-sharing helps pay for terraces, surface waterways, stripcropping, and other soil- and water-saving practices.

This cut is in appropriations recommended for the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service for cost-sharing, under the agricultural conservation program. This cost sharing, also a locally administered program, gives farmers the added incentive needed to push ahead with the work of conserving our natural resources.

But it is the proposal to cut by $20 million the Federal funds available to the Soil Conservation Service, and to have this agency raise this same amount by charges to farmers, that I find most objectionable. This proposal to charge for this technical assistance and put the proceeds into a revolving fund would be a serious blow to a very valuable conservation program. The Government should not charge farmers for help in designing, laying out, and adopting soil and water conservation practices on the land. This is an investment in preserving one of this Nation's most valuable capital assets, its soil.

Since this revolving fund idea was proposed I have received reports from every one of the 72 soil and water conservation districts in my State. I have received petitions from a large number of county boards. And I have had a flood of letters from private citizens, both rural and urban.

All of these reports, petitions, and letters oppose the revolving fund proposal. They reflect a feeling of concern that the Federal Government's commitment to this longtime conservation activity is being downgraded. They express fear that a longtime conservation policy is being reversed.

Under present law the Soil Conservation Service provides technical assistance to these districts through a memorandum of understanding with the Secretary of Agriculture. This technical assistance is provided without cost to eligible farmers and landowners, who are called "cooperators." Except for these services, the districts obtain their support from State, local, or private sources.

Approval of the revolving fund idea would cut the Federal Government's contribution to soil and water conservation in Wisconsin by $314,249 in the coming fiscal year. It would eliminate Federal support for 44 of the 88 Soil Conservation Service technicians now available to advise and assist the 72 districts in my State.

I submit at this point the breakdown in terms of both man-years and dollars that this proposed cutback would mean for the next fiscal year in Wisconsin's 72 soil and water conservation districts:

County	Man-years	Dollars
1st District:		
Kenosha	0.5	3,574
Racine	.4	2,536
Rock	.5	3,738
Walworth	.6	4,454
2d District:		
Columbia	.8	5,484
Dane	1.1	7,674
Dodge	.7	5,081
Green	1.0	7,538
Jefferson	1.0	6,889
3d District:		
Buffalo	1.1	8,214
Crawford	.8	5,776
Grant	1.2	8,363
Iowa	1.1	8,204
Jackson	.8	5,407
Juneau	.7	4,730
La Crosse	.6	4,412
Lafayette	.9	6,652
Monroe	.9	6,540
Pepin	.7	4,666
Pierce	1.1	8,271
Richland	.7	4,956
Sauk	1.0	6,904
Trempealeau	.7	4,803
Vernon	1.2	8,468
6th District:		
Calumet	.6	4,171
Fond du Lac	.8	5,688
Green Lake	.2	1,675
Ozaukee	.3	2,140
Sheboygan	.4	2,704
Washington	.6	4,051
Winnebago	.6	4,309
7th District:		
Adams	0.3	2,334
Clark	.9	6,790
Florence	.1	476
Forest	.1	456
Langlade	.5	3,266
Lincoln	.4	2,931
Marathon	1.6	11,784
Marquette	.5	3,280
Portage	.3	2,269
Shawano	.6	4,520
Taylor	.8	5,847
Waupaca	1.1	7,660
Waushara	.6	4,230
Wood	.9	6,585
Menominee	0	------------

County	Man-years	Dollars
8th District:		
Brown	0.8	5,419
Door	.2	1,775
Kewaunee	.7	5,169
Manitowoc	.9	6,628
Marinette	.2	1,579
Oconto	.6	4,023
Outagamie	1.0	7,172
9th District:		
Milwaukee	0	------------
Waukesha	.6	4,066
10th District:		
Ashland	.2	1,481
Barron	.7	5,106
Bayfield	.2	1,384
Burnett	.3	1,789
Chippewa	.7	5,017
Douglas	.3	2,111
Dunn	.6	3,963
Eau Claire	.5	3,669
Iron	.1	482
Oneida	.1	587
Polk	.6	4,272
Price	.4	2,922
Rusk	.4	3,063
St. Croix	1.0	7,487
Sawyer	.3	2,314
Vilas	.1	685
Washburn	.2	1,586
Total	44.0	314,249

I am told by W. W. Russell, Wisconsin's State conservationist, that the workload of our 72 soil and water conservation districts grows each year. Districts receive more and more requests for soil surveys and other measures of the value of land. Many of these requests now come from land appraisers, planning commissions, credit agencies, and Government.

The districts have increasing responsibilities because of new State and Federal authorizations that provide new opportunities for conservation. They work together, for instance, under the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act (Public Law 566). This law permits local watershed groups to obtain Federal funds for flood prevention and for such conservation activities as improvement of fish and wildlife habitat and development of recreation resources.

River basin planning activities also are becoming more prevalent. Local soil and water conservation districts participate in this important phase of resource development.

The new Resource Conservation and Development (R.C. & D.) program requires assistance from soil conservation districts in working for resource development, cropland conversion, recreation development, and new economic opportunities. One of the first 10 R.C. & D. projects approved as pilot programs is in Wisconsin. The project includes all of Price, Rusk, and Taylor Counties. Technical assistance in planning this regional project was provided by the soil and water conservation specialists working in these three counties.

These greater demands for soil and water conservation assistance at the local level signal the need for more Federal assistance, not less. The soil and water conservation districts and their cooperating farmers need and deserve the full and determined support of both the Congress and the administration.

The supervisors of Wisconsin's 72 districts recently met in Eau Claire to discuss the proposed cuts in support for soil and water conservation. One of the major points made was that the State's work in this field is hardly one-third complete.

I also submit the resolution adopted by the Wisconsin Association of Soil and Water Conservation District Supervisors:

"RESOLUTION OF WISCONSIN ASSOCIATION OF SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT SUPERVISORS, EAU CLAIRE, WIS., MARCH 10, 1965

"All the people of Wisconsin, as well as throughout the Nation, are dependent upon soil and water. We do not have an abundant supply of these natural resources. They can be wasted and lost if not given careful and proper care.

"Seventy-two soil and water conservation districts cover the entire State of Wisconsin. These soil and water conservation districts organized under State enabling legislation provide for the conservation of the soil and soil resources of this State, for the control and prevention of soil erosion, prevention of floodwater and sediment damage, preserve wildlife, protect the tax base, protect public lands and protect and promote the health, safety, and general welfare of the people of our State.

"Each of these 72 soil and water conservation districts have a memorandum of understanding with the Soil Conservation Service to help carry out the technical phases essential to our program.

"The soil and water conservation work in Wisconsin has made a good start but the job is hardly one-third complete. Pressures are increasing upon our land and water resources: Therefore be it

"*Resolved,* That the Wisconsin State Association of Soil and Water Conservation District supervisors oppose the President's revolving fund proposal for the Soil Conservation Service; be it further

"*Resolved,* That the Wisconsin State Association of Soil and Water Conservation District supervisors urge the continuation of the program as it is now being carried out, and we urge the adoption of the Soil Conservation Service budget for 1966 as recommended by the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts."

I suggest that there is nothing in 1965 that makes soil and water conservation less essential than it was in the 1930's. In many ways, as we attempt to shift our less productive farmland into recreational uses, it is more important. This less productive land often is hilly, subject to erosion, and difficult to establish a cover crop on.

I have found from my experiences in Wisconsin that district supervisors and cooperating farmers have a strong feeling of stewardship regarding the land. I think that over the past 25 years there has developed a growing feeling of responsibility toward the soil and the beauty of the countryside.

I also submit a letter that is typical of many that I have received in the past few weeks. This one is from a district supervisor who also is an educator in Buffalo County. It is from O. J. Sohrweide, superintendent of schools at Alma, Wis., and secretary of the Buffalo County Soil and Water Conservation District:

FEBRUARY 18, 1965.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: According to information received from several sources, it appears as though the work being carried on throughout the country by our soil and water conservation districts is due for a drastic setback.

For the past 24 years Buffalo County has had a soil and water conservation district. In fact our district was started in 1939 and 1940.

During the past 25 years we in Buffalo County have been able to get approximately two-thirds of the farmers in the county to become cooperators in our soil and water conservation program. This progress was made only because of the active interest shown by our Federal Government by providing trained personnel with which to do the job, as well as Federal funds under ACP.

If the Federal budget cutback is allowed to take place we are confident that there will be a slowing up of our program. In other words, it has taken 25 years to get two-thirds of the job done and it might take another 25 years to get the remainder of our country's land and water under a planned and controlled program. We feel that these natural resources do not belong to the farmer alone, but all people in all walks of life are being affected now and will be affected more so in the future. With our population increase we feel that every acre of our precious topsoil, every drop of our available water supply will be necessary for the growth and development of our Nation.

Those of us who are close to the soil and water problems of our county and State will appreciate anything you can do to help provide the Federal funds necessary for the continuation of local, State, and Federal soil and water conservation district programs.

Sincerely yours,

O. J. SOHRWEIDE.

If this proposal is approved by the Congress, I think it is probable that county boards will be asked to make up Wisconsin's $314,249 share of the contribution to the revolving fund for this technical assistance. The only other alternative would seem to be to have the districts seek contributions from the farmer to make up this lost Federal support.

This does not seem to be a fair choice. Local and State government in Wisconsin and elsewhere already make a sizable contribution to the support of the work of these soil and water conservation districts.

Several counties furnish secretarial assistance to the districts. The supervisors, who throughout Wisconsin are members of the agriculture committee of each county board, serve the districts without pay. Many counties furnish office space, the use of office equipment, and other services to the Soil Conservation Service.

The reason the funds probably would have to be raised by the county boards is that charging farmers and landowners for a share of these technical services is administratively unworkable. Who is going to set the charge for these services? What do we want the Government to charge a farmer when a soil technician stops in his farmyard to give him some advice on planting some shrubs to improve wildlife habitat or on stopping erosion in a troublesome gully? Will this new ratemaking job fall to the unpaid soil and water conservation district supervisors? I'm sure they hope not.

Who will do the bookkeeping and fill out the forms for the Department of Agriculture and collect for these services? Will this new responsibility fall on the volunteer officeworker furnished by the county board?

Suppose the county boards decide they are too hard pressed for funds after paying for this technical assistance and decide to charge the Department of Agriculture for the use of courthouse space? Will Congress be asked to appropriate some funds for this?

I think it is clear that this proposed cutback is shortsighted and in fact militates against the very conservation program the President has undertaken with such vigor. Furthermore, it will undermine one of the finest and most successful examples of partnership between the Federal Government and the local people.

It also will mean that these technical services will no longer be available to the farmers who can't afford to pay for them. And it is likely that even the well-off farmers will be willing to pay only for assistance that means something in terms of a dollars-and-cents return. The bill for services will force most to pass up those practices that create wildlife habitat or otherwise conserve and beautify the countryside.

This budget cut would be a long step backward in our much talked about conservation program.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION AND INABILITY

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I received from Mr. C. W. Ufford, director of industrial relations, of the Warner & Swasey Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, an interesting and thought-provoking letter regarding the proposed constitutional amendment on presidential succession and inability.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Ufford's letter be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WARNER & SWASEY CO.,
Cleveland, Ohio, March 16, 1965.

The Honorable FRANK J. LAUSCHE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR LAUSCHE: The Senate's action in approving a proposed constitutional amendment on presidential succession and inability is to be warmly commended. The proposed amendment would be an important improvement over the present situation. However, I am concerned about two aspects of the proposal and I am sure many people would be if they probed into it.

The first is the provision for handling the resumption of office by the President. As now drafted, this would make it possible, for a period of time, for two people to attempt to exercise the powers and duties of the Presidency. This seems possible under the provision that the Vice President, with the concurrence of a majority of the Cabinet (or such other body as Congress may establish) will have 7 days in which to declare in writing that the President is unable to resume his office. The Congress would then proceed to decide the issue, a two-thirds vote being required in each House to sustain the Vice President and Cabinet in their finding of inability. The delay while Congress probed and debated the issue through its normal procedures in both Houses could make the determination of this difficult decision, especially in a time of crisis, a matter of critical importance.

My second concern is that this provision could, in effect, place in the hands of a hostile Congress actual impeachment power without the safeguard of proper impeachment, procedure.

In view of these possibly serious flaws, may I commend to you an alternate provision recommended by the Committee for Economic Development which proposes that the ending of presidential inability be determined by a majority vote of the Cabinet, the President concurring. Discussions leading to such vote might be initiated by the President or any member of the Cabinet. The Cabinet is close to the President and his condition. It could act with a minimum of delay, publicity, and possible loss of public confidence.

I can think of no more compelling reason for this CED proposal, with which I presume you are already familiar, than that "there must always be a President, but there must never be two."

Again may I commend the Senate for moving ahead on this vital issue. Best personal regards.

Sincerely,

C. W. UFFORD,
Director of Industrial Relations.

THE SCHOOL LUNCH PROGRAM AND HAWAII'S CONTRIBUTION

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on behalf of my colleague, Hawaii's senior Senator, HIRAM L. FONG, and for myself, I am happy to take this opportunity again to invite all Senators to the special type A, pineapple lunch which Senator FONG and I are hosting in the Senate Conference Room, at 12:30 p.m., on Friday, April 9.

This lunch has a twofold purpose. The first is to remind each of us of the purpose, progress, and future importance of the national school lunch program. The second is to invite attention to the economic, as well as nutritional, contribution of Hawaii and our pineapple industry to the success of this program.

In 1946, Congress passed the National School Lunch Act. I believe that the high purpose of this landmark legislation is best described in the act itself. I quote:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress, as a measure of national security, to safeguard the health and well-being of the Nation's children and to encourage the domestic consumption of nutritious agricultural commodities and other food, by assisting the States, through grants-in-aid and other means, in providing an adequate supply of foods and other facilities for the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of nonprofit school lunch programs.

This policy statement is a very persuasive argument for the national school lunch program. Even more convincing, however, is the simple premise and slogan of the program itself: "You cannot teach a hungry child."

A child may hunger for knowledge; but if his very being hungers for food, learning is impeded—if not impossible. Clearly, a nutritious meal enhances a child's ability to learn; and a healthy, well-educated child enhances our Nation's future.

To me, the national school lunch program is a landmark of enlightened, yet self-serving, legislation. It has already given America a generation of healthier, better educated citizens; and it promises to enrich our Nation even more in the years ahead, for this program is growing—growing in size, growing in importance to the health of our economy, as well as our children.

Widely accepted today, the national school lunch program has not always enjoyed the approval and support of parents, educators, and legislators. In fact, it was only a few years ago that a prominent educator was able to say:

> As an uninvited guest at the educational banquet, school food service has successfully run the gamut of neglect, of scorn, of fear, of anger, and has now entered the approved portals which entitle it to a chair at the educational board.

In 1964, the national school lunch program occupied a dominant chair, indeed, at the educational board. During the 12 months which ended last June 30, for example, approximately 17 million schoolchildren—one-third of our precollege school population—participated in the program daily. These children were served nearly 3 billion meals during the school year.

Not included in these figures as participants in the national school lunch program are an estimated 13 million children who also benefited from nutritious lunches served through other school lunch programs.

The national school lunch program itself was actively supported by 68,500 schools in every State, plus the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and American Samoa, in 1964. Both the number of children and the number of schools participating in the program are expected to increase this year.

Under the National School Lunch Act of 1946, all public and nonprofit private schools of high school grade or under are eligible to participate in the school lunch program. The fact that so many schools have elected to do so is due in large measure, I believe, to three regulations contained in the act.

First. The lunch program in each school must be operated on a nonprofit basis.

Second. Children unable to pay the full price of the lunch must be served free or at a reduced price.

Third. Lunches must meet nutritional standards established by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. These standards are embodied in the lunch pattern known as the type A lunch—the type of lunch, incidentally, which will be served on Friday, April 9.

How does the national school lunch program actually work?

The program is administered by the Consumer and Marketing Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in cooperation with the education departments of the various States. These departments enter into agreements with local boards of education. The local school authorities or other interested groups actually operate the school lunchrooms. Department of Agriculture specialists provide administrative and technical assistance to State personnel, who, in turn, make this assistance available to individual school managers.

Many States do not permit the educational agencies to administer the national school lunch program in nonprofit private schools. In these States, the schools may enter into agreements directly with the Department of Agriculture.

In the fiscal year 1964 the national school lunch program cost approximately $1½ billion. Of this amount the school children themselves contributed approximately one-half—more than $741 million, or an average of 25 to 30 cents for each lunch. Federal funds to reimburse the schools for part of the cost of each lunch served totaled about $130 million, for a national average of 4½ cents per lunch. In addition, the Department of Agriculture also contributes food to the program. It is estimated that in the current fiscal year, Federal food donations will amount to $254 million. The schools themselves use the normal channels of trade to buy in the local food markets, and this year will purchase about 74 percent of the total food used in the program.

Just as the children in each of our States benefit from the national school lunch program, so the economy of each of our States is buttressed by this program. I am sure each Senator knows in detail the extent to which his State and its citizens both contribute to and benefit from the national school lunch program. I know, too, that other Senators are as proud of this contribution and this participation as Senator Fong and I are of Hawaii's role in the national school lunch program.

I began these remarks by noting that one of the purposes of the pineapple school lunch on April 9 is to invite attention to the role of Hawaii and the pineapple industry in this program. A few statistics will make this point clear.

It is a well-known fact that Hawaii ranks first in the world in pineapple production. This production in 1964 was valued at $120 million, and represented approximately 29 million cases of pineapple fruit and juice.

For most of the world, Hawaiian pineapples are a nutritious, taste delight. To Hawaii, they are a cornerstone of its economy. They provide year-round employment for nearly 7,000 of our citizens, and seasonal employment for an additional 15,000 Hawaiians. In 1964 alone, the employment payroll of the pineapple industry totaled nearly $42 million. Last year, the industry spent more than $37 million for goods and services in Hawaii. It paid more than $6 million in taxes, not including Federal corporate and income taxes.

No review of the pineapple industry, however brief, can be complete without pointing out that the industry is not a nameless giant. It is the California Packing Corp.; the Dole Co.; Libby, McNeill & Libby; Maui Pineapple Co.; Hawaiian Fruit Packers; and the Haserot Pineapple Co.

Above all, and most appropriately, the pineapple industry and all of Hawaii are enthusiastic, essential partners in the national school lunch program.

So far as participation in the national school lunch program is concerned, the Department of Agriculture readily acknowledges that Hawaii is one of the States of which it is particularly proud—and rightly so, I may add.

Hawaii has participated in the program since its inception in 1946. Last year, the program operated or was available in 198 out of the State's 204 public schools. In these 198 schools, the average daily participation in the national school lunch program was 124,576 children—or 84.5 percent of the average daily attendance. This is a remarkable record.

The program in Hawaii last year was a $10 million operation: $6,108,000 from income received in the school cafeterias; $721,000 cash reimbursement from the Department of Agriculture; $1,572,000 as a food-commodity donation from the Department of Agriculture; and $1,875,000 from the general tax fund.

In 1962, the Department of Agriculture made its first purchase of canned pineapple for the national school lunch program. It purchased approximately 133,000 cases of pineapple tidbits and cubes, or enough for one and one-third servings for each child. Last year, the Department purchased some 309,000 cases, or enough for 2.7 servings per child. In addition, it is estimated that local purchases of pineapple for the national school lunch program totaled 500,000 cases last year.

Clearly, pineapples are becoming a nutritional taste delight to those who must plan school lunches and to the children privileged to enjoy them.

Mr. President, I greatly appreciate the consideration of the Senate in permitting me to review some of the highlights of the national school lunch program, especially as it relates to Hawaii and our pineapple industry. For myself and for Senator Fong, I again extend to each Senator a cordial invitation to enjoy a typical type A pineapple school lunch in the Senate conference room—S-207—at 12:30 p.m., on Friday, April 9.

NAVY HEROES COMMENDED

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, it has now been a year since the great and terrible Alaska earthquake, fire, and wave. The heroism displayed by the many, many people who came to Alaska's aid can never be fully recognized or adequately acknowledged.

Recently, the Secretary of the Navy officially commended the Navy units of Alaska "for extremely meritorious service" during and after the Alaska disaster. He commended them, not only for "restoring military facilities and utilities," but also for "providing invaluable assistance to their civilian neighbors." Alaskans are, indeed, grateful for their assistance, and are pleased that these units have now been awarded the Navy Unit Commendation Ribbon.

I ask unanimous consent that the list of units and their citation be made a part of the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy,
Washington, D.C.

The Secretary of the Navy takes pleasure in commending the following units: Staff COMALSEAFRON 17; U.S. Naval Station, Kodiak; U.S. Naval Communication Station, Kodiak; U.S.S. *Kodiak* (LSM-161); U.S.S. *Salisbury Sound* (AV-13; Fleet Weather Central, Kodiak; U.S. Navy Commissary Store, Kodiak; U.S. Marine Barracks, Kodiak; U.S. Mobile Construction Battalion 9 for service as set forth in the following citation:

"For extremely meritorious service during the period March 27 through May 10, 1964, in connection with the disastrous earthquake and tidal waves which struck the island of Kodiak, Alaska. Immediately following the earthquake, which occurred on Good Friday, March 27, 1964, and which seismologists claim to be the most devastating on record in North America, the above-listed units mustered their full strength and went into action to alleviate the widespread suffering and destruction resulting from this catastrophe. In addition to restoring military facilities and utilities, these units simultaneously played a significant role in Operations Helping Hand by providing invaluable assistance to their civilian neighbors in effecting the recovery of Alaskan communities. The fortitude, initiative, cooperation, and devotion to duty of the individual members of all units in the face of disastrous circumstances were in keeping with the highest traditions of the U.S. naval service."

All personnel attached to and serving on board any of the designated units during the above period, or any part thereof, are hereby authorized to wear the Navy Unit Commendation Ribbon.

Paul H. Nitze,
Secretary of the Navy.

LOCAL-SERVICE AIRLINES SUCCEED

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, the March 8 issue of the Aviation Daily contained a concise summary of the latest report on the local-service airline industry, prepared for the Association of Local Transport Airlines by the Systems Analysis and Research Corp. This report, published every 2 years, gives all interested persons a description of the status of local-service airlines and the progress they have made.

This latest study contains valuable information which should be brought to the attention of every Member of Congress. Congress appropriates many millions of dollars each year for subsidy to these carriers, and should keep itself informed on the results of its investment.

I congratulate the Association of Local Transport Airlines for again publishing a helpful and useful report. I also commend the association and each individual local-service carrier for the strides they have made in improving short-haul air transportation and for their cooperation with the Government in reducing the levels of the subsidy.

I ask unanimous consent that the Aviation Daily article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Locals Show Heavy Traffic-Revenue Gains With Declining Subsidy Ratio

Local service airlines' ton-miles increased 18 percent and commercial revenues 16 percent in the past year with no increase in subsidy, according to a new report on the industry prepared for the Association of Local Transport Airlines by Systems Analysis & Research Corp.

"Local traffic and commercial revenues have doubled since 1960, while public service payments have grown only one-third," the report said. "In other words, each public service payment dollar buys in 1964 three times the public benefits it bought 4 years ago." The $69 million subsidy paid in fiscal 1964 was described as being only one-half of 1 percent of total Federal payments for aid and special services. Before World War II, 12 smaller trunks received $10.10 subsidy for each passenger carried, or over 40 percent more than the $7.11 received by today's 13 locals; for each $1 of commercial revenue earned these trunks received 65 cents subsidy—almost 60 percent more than the 41 cents received by the locals, according to SARC. The report also said:

Cities served by locals increased from 315 in 1950 to 589 at the end of 1964. Cities served exclusively jumped from 177 to 402, and have increased by more than one-third in the past 5 years.

Route miles are up 85 percent since 1952. During this period, trunk route miles have increased only 20 percent and the number of points served exclusively by the trunks decreased 70 percent. Passenger train miles dropped 45 percent. In the past 4 years, more than 9,700 local route miles have been added, 1,400 of them in the past year.

Of 97 cities where trunk service was superseded by that of a single local in the past 14 years, that carrier substantially improved passenger development above former levels at 70 cities. In 52 cities, the local generated passenger volumes more than 20 percent larger than had formerly been generated, while in 23 cities passengers were up 100 percent.

Average revenue per passenger has increased to $16.07 as a result of fare increases and increases in trip length. However, fares cannot be raised much above their present level "without the danger of pricing the service out of the market." Operating expenses per available seat-mile are 7 percent below those of 1959.

Stockholders of the carriers have received negligible benefits. The industry's retained earnings on June 30, 1964, after more than 14 years of operation, totaled $17,925,000. "On gross revenues over the period of $1.5 billion, this is equivalent to a profit margin of only 1.2 percent."

Employment totaled 16,000 persons with 1964 payroll of more than $105,500,000.

Taxes paid to and collected for Federal and State Governments include $3 million on fuel and oil, $7,750,000 transportation tax, and $5.5 million in property, income, and other levies.

Results thus far indicate that the class mail rate has been a "real success," the report said. "The subsidy needs of the industry have declined and the financial position of the carriers has improved. The subsidy rate level has declined 26 percent from the first-class rate (in 1961) into the current rate—from 1.98 cents per available seat-mile to 1.46 cents. However, it must be noted that continued reductions will depend, in large measure, upon continued improvements in route structure and operating flexibility. There is tremendous potential available to local carriers in better density short-haul markets which the locals are not permitted to realize under current restrictions. Such potential includes 102 short-haul markets, access to which would double presently available commercial revenue. Access to such markets for the locals could not jeopardize the trunklines."

RAILROAD SAFETY

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, railroad safety and traincrew working conditions should concern all of us, since at one time or another nearly everyone places his trust in the ability of the men of the railroad to take him safely from place to place. The safety regulations prescribed in title 45 of the United States Code now permit railroad men to work up to 16 consecutive hours, whereas 12 hours would seem to be a safer and fairer maximum. The Idaho State Senate has adopted a memorial to the U.S. Senate, setting out the need for change in work rules, and has made specific suggestions which should be of interest to the Members of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that the memorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE JOINT MEMORIAL 6 OF THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, in Congress Assembled:

We, your memorialists, the Legislature of the State of Idaho, assembled in the 38th session thereof, respectfully represent that:

Whereas Federal law, title 45, sections 61 to 64, inclusive, now allows a railroad to require its employees to work as long as 16 consecutive hours without rest; and

Whereas the Federal law was enacted March 4, 1907, for the purpose of safeguarding the health and safety of employees; and

Whereas such law has never been amended; and

Whereas the high speed operations of modern railroads impose an undue strain upon employees required to work the long hours now allowed, thus endangering the health and safety of the employees: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the 38th session of the Legislature of the State of Idaho (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That we most respectfully urge the Congress of the United States of America to proceed at the earliest possible date to pass legislation amending title 45, sections 61 to 64, inclusive, and more particularly amending section 62, to read as follows:

"It shall be unlawful for any common carrier, its officers, or agents, subject to sections 61 to 64, inclusive, of title 45 to require or permit any employees subject to said sections to be or remain on duty for a longer period than twelve consecutive hours, and whenever any such employee of such common carrier shall have been continuously on duty for twelve consecutive hours he shall be relieved and not required or permitted again to go on duty until he has had at least ten consecutive hours off duty; and no such employee who has been on duty twelve hours in the aggregate in any twenty-four-hour period shall be required or permitted to continue or again go on duty without having had at least eight consecutive hours off duty: *Provided*, that no operator, train dispatcher, or other employee who by the use of the telegraph, telephone or radio dispatches, reports, transmits, receives, or delivers orders pertaining to or affecting train movements shall be required or permitted to be or remain on duty for a longer period than nine hours in any twenty-four-hour period in all towers, offices, places, and stations continuously operated night and day, nor for a longer period than twelve hours in all towers, offices, places, and stations operated only during the daytime, except in case of emergency, when the employees named in this proviso may be permitted to be and remain on duty for four additional hours in a twenty-four-hour period on not exceeding three days in any week: *Provided further*, that no locomotive engineer working without the assistance of another qualified engineman, operating locomotives or trains, receiving, interpreting, or carrying out telegraph or telephone dispatches, radio messages, or written orders pertaining to or affecting train movements shall be required or permitted to be or remain on duty for a longer period than nine consecutive hours and shall not be required or permitted to continue or again to go on duty until he has had at least eight consecutive hours off duty: *Provided further*, The Interstate Commerce Commission may after full hearing in a particular case and for good cause shown extend the period within which a common carrier shall comply with the provisions of this proviso as to such case."

Now, therefore, be it resolved, That the secretary of state of the State of Idaho be, and hereby is authorized and directed to forward certified copies of this memorial to the President and Vice President of the United States, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress, and to the Senators and Representatives representing this State in the Congress of the United States.

W. E. DREVLOW,
President of the Senate.
PETE F. CENARRUSA,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Attest:

ARTHUR WILSON,
Secretary of the Senate.

URBAN RENEWAL IN THE BUSH

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, in the 88th Congress I spoke to the Senate about the village of Holikachuk, Alaska, and the desire of the villagers to move to a new and more desirable location along the Yukon River. When I spoke, the move was still a dream, for the work had just begun.

Many people said the villagers of Holikachuk would never get beyond the dreaming or planning stage. They said the move would never come about.

There were many obstacles facing the village. There were logs to be cut, houses to be built, a school to be constructed, and careful and extensive planning to be done.

To a less enterprising and ambitious group than the villagers of Holikachuk, these obstacles might well have proved insurmountable. But, Mr. President, all of these obstacles were overcome. In the first year of the move, 1963, seven homes were completed and the school was constructed.

The work continued in 1964, and 20 more homes have been completed.

In establishing the new village of Grayling, there was assistance, first, from the Housing and Home Finance Agency, in making available for the experiment funds from the Alaska State Housing Authority, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and other governmental and private agencies. The people of Holikachuk intended to move, either with or without assistance; but with such help, the move and the building of the community were accomplished in an orderly fashion. The homes constructed are better built and planned, and will be far better places in which to live. The new village of Grayling is a tribute to the hard work of the villagers and to the creative assistance the Federal and State Governments offered.

Mr. President, recently I received in the mail, from the community of Grayling, a newsletter which reports on the accomplishment of the community, and gives thanks to all those who assisted the villagers in the move. I ask unanimous consent that the newsletter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the newsletter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GRAYLING NEWSLETTER

(By Walter Maillelle)

I don't really know how to start this news of our new village of Grayling—but I will give it a try. The people of Holikachuk had been talking about moving out to the Yukon for many years. This move is something we did dream about last night and it come true today. This move had been talked about for as long as I know myself. In 1962 the people in Holikachuk started talking more about moving. The council held lots of meetings with each other and with the whole village. About 90 percent of the people in the village of Holikachuk decided to move to the Yukon area. A committee, chosen by the council, came over to the Yukon area and decided that the Grayling area was the place for us.

Holikachuk was a clean village but we wanted it better even to keep clean in Grayling. We decided the way to do this was to see that each family had a lot large enough to take care of his family. Also we wanted space for roads in our village. The council decided that each family would have a lot 200 feet long by 125 feet wide, and each family would be responsible for keeping his own lot clean. We cleared space for roads—the roads are 30 feet wide.

We talked to lots of people about our move. So finally we had visit from BIA Juneau. I'm pretty sure many people know Neal Jenson who is with BIA Housing, he helped us and many others I could not name at this time. We asked them for help to move so it would not be so hard for many of our people. BIA brought in chain sawmill and Alaska Housing brought in tools. In January 1963 the men of the Holikachuk Village went out to the Yukon, 24 miles by winter trail, to cut logs, before everybody go out beaver trapping. After the men come back from trapping during the month of April 1963, we cut more logs. By the end of April 1963 we had 1,650 logs cut and hauled to the Yukon River bank ready to be floated down the Yukon to our new village site of Grayling. Right after breakup our village men brought the logs down to Grayling to be sawed into lumber for our new homes. Four of our families took down their homes in Holikachuck and by barge did bring them over to Grayling and rebuilt them here. Henry Deacon brought his sawmill in June 1963 by barge and set it up in Grayling. Four of our men left at this time to work for the cannery in the Bristol Bay area.

On July 13, 1963, the BIA foreman come into Grayling to start construction on the new Grayling BIA School. They got 25 men to work on the new school. In late August 1963, Alaska State Housing started to help us with plans for building our new homes here. The people were working at the school and also trying as well to build their homes in the new village. By the time the river freeze up in 1963, Alaska Housing had helped us plan and build seven new homes. Some of our people at this time built a cache for a temporary home.

The new BIA School was completed in December 1963. We are very proud of our new school.

I myself was appointed acting postmaster for the Grayling Village on November 23, 1963. I never will forget that day because it was the day after our dear President Kennedy was killed—it was such a shock to our people and everyone was very sad in Grayling that day.

We have had one family move to Grayling from Anvik. We also have had two marriages here in the past year.

During the month of April 1964 our people went up the Yukon River 20 miles to cut more logs. At this time 1,300 more logs were cut. In the first part of June 1964, Chuck Blomfield, from Alaska State Housing, and three other guys came into Grayling to start to help us plan to build more homes here.

In the month of November 1964, I see nearly all homes were up, only about four more homes now will have to be built this summer then Grayling homes will be complete.

I feel pretty sure that a lot of people don't know where Grayling is; as Grayling, of course, is not on the map yet. We hope Grayling is soon put on map. Just in case you don't know where Grayling is, it is about 20 miles upriver from Anvik and west from Holikachuk.

I would say we are about 80-percent better in our living conditions at this time in Grayling than we were at our old village of Holikachuk.

We used to have to go through a slough about 40 miles to get to our fish camp from Holikachuk. Now, today, living in Grayling we need to go only 3, 7, or 20 miles to get to our fish camps. In the spring and fall the Yutana Barge discharges freight in front of our village and before our freight used to have to go by way of Holy Cross before it finally got to Holikachuk.

The population of the village of Grayling is 142 persons (which is a lot different than some people are saying that we are nearly all back in Holikachuk). Out of this number we have 14 children away in high school and 37 children attending the new BIA School in Grayling. We have two churches here and one store called Grayling Native Store. Population of the village of Holikachuk at this time is three persons (belonging to the same family).

On Thanksgiving Day 1964, the new BIA School was dedicated and everyone in the village had a real good day. Besides the dedication we had a big feed and a movie in the school. Everyone had a good Christmas also.

Two weeks ago we had some native dances here in Grayling and everyone enjoyed them.

I would also like to mention that we hear rumors are around that some of our people have moved back to Holikachuk. These rumors are wrong. The same people said we never would move in the first place to Grayling—but we did move. We will be very happy to welcome anyone to visit our new village—we are proud of Grayling and someday we hope it will grow into a big place.

I hope this is only the start as I would like to see more things here for our people and hope we can get working on them soon. We would like to see a well in each home and village power so each of our people could enjoy electricity.

When all homes are completed we hope then to build a new village hall. These are plans of the future. We hope arctic health research can work with us on projects.

We hope soon that Governor Egan can help to see we get the airstrip we so badly need for this village because we must go (round trip) 40 miles to Anvik by boat to get mail in the summer.

I wish also to say thanks for your trust to the people who believed us when we said we would move, and thanks also to those who helped us.

MR. ANSETT MIGRATES TO AUSTRALIA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, every now and then our great newspapers take editorial note of a small matter that has large impact. Such is the case of Mr. Robert Ansett, whose chronicle is observed in the Idaho States Journal, of Pocatello, on March 7. Mr. Ansett made a great to-do about the terrible state of American affairs; and he vowed that if Barry Goldwater—who apparently epitomized Mr. Ansett's ideal in government—were defeated last November, he, Mr. Ansett, would pack up family and fortune and would go to Australia, where a man could hack out a free existence by the sweat of his brow. Mr. Goldwater was defeated; and Mr. Ansett was as good as his word: He quit his $175-a-week bakery job—incidentally a salary, somewhat better than most—and departed for the land down under. But the editorial writer has made a great discovery: Awaiting Mr. Ansett in Australia was not only new opportunity, but also a multimillionaire father.

Mr. President, I submit that both Mr. Ansett and Mr. Goldwater played true to their beliefs. Rugged individualism and the will to make it on one's own regard to the needs of his neighbor, are made much easier when a man is backed by a million-dollar bank account.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Pocatello (Idaho) State Journal, Mar. 7, 1965]

MR. ANSETT'S OPPORTUNITY

It was with great relief—but with some disappointment—that we read of the good things awaiting Robert Ansett when he reaches Australia. There we were, visualizing Mr. Ansett and his family hacking out a meager existence for a while, then laboriously achieving a measure of well-being in true pioneer style. Just as it was when this country was young, you might say.

But alas, it probably won't be that way at all, and it's a bit disillusioning.

In case you missed the stories, we refer to the Robert Ansett who sailed this past week from California to Australia to begin a new life. It was reported that his decision to leave this country was hastened by Barry Goldwater's defeat last November. He told his boss that if Senator Goldwater lost, he'd depart. He was quoted as saying that his bet "just brought the situation to a head faster than it would have been. We'd have left sooner or later anyway, with things here the way they are."

A $175-a-week bakery route salesman, Ansett declared that "Australia is presently more socialistic than the United States but the trend there is toward conservatism. It's just the opposite here."

Ansett specifically objected to the tax structure, social security, Government controls on commerce and "taking the initiative from the individual. There just isn't the opportunity now that there was when the country was young," he said.

Noting that there were "a lot of jobs available in Australia," he said he'd "just have to take whatever comes along at first and plan from there."

Well, it developed after Mr. Ansett left that life in Australia isn't likely to be so challenging after all. It turns out that his father lives in Australia, and he is described as one of that country's richest men. His wealth is in airlines, buses and trucks, television stations and hotels and motels, and is estimated at more than $85 million.

So it appears that Mr. Ansett will not be entirely destitute, and he probably won't find it difficult to make his way down under. If he finds some leisure time, we hope he'll reflect upon his comments about the country he left. Not that this Nation can't stand criticism; we merely question the validity of what he said.

All of us complain about taxes, of course, but at least some of his former countrymen look upon them as the price we pay for living in a vibrant, growing nation. Social security may be unpalatable to Mr. Ansett, but it is not so to many who find it their only hope for a decent existence in their late years.

As for Government controls on commerce, Mr. Ansett had only to read the reports of countless corporations in the past few months. Almost without exception, they have told of record sales and profits, obviously despite "Government controls" and possibly because of some Government policies, such as tax cuts.

Of course there "isn't the opportunity now that there was when the country was young." The country is no longer young in the sense that there is a continent to be subdued, but that doesn't mean there's no future here. Opportunities are being made and grasped every day in business, in science, in education, in the arts.

It is hoped Mr. Ansett has a pleasant voyage to Australia and that he finds the freedom and opportunity there that he couldn't find here. With a father worth $85 million, he should not find it much of a chore—L. E.

RESEARCH ON CHILDHOOD ASTHMA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, a distinguished Washington physician known to many of us has stressed the need to broaden the base for the fight against a most crippling affliction, childhood asthma.

This is the season when asthmatic problems are particularly noted; and in Denver, Colo., last Saturday, Dr. Frederic G. Burke made well the point that research in the asthma-emphysema syndrome is deserving of increasing economic support from industry, private resources, and particularly, from the Federal Government.

Mr. President, Dr. Burke's paper, presented at the seminar of the Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital and the Jewish Home for Asthmatic Children, at Denver, is deserving of attention, because of the light it throws on this medical problem and because of the hope it holds out for the many air-hungry children stricken by this vicious disease. I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Burke's paper, entitled "The National and International Significance of Research in Childhood Asthma," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL SIGNIFICANCE OF RESEARCH IN CHILDHOOD ASTHMA

Significant and dramatic advances in medical research are stimulated only by catastrophic forces of considerable magnitude. Static inertia holds tantalizing breakthroughs firmly imbedded in ignorance until counterbalancing leverage of greater power is applied to advance our medical knowledge and relieve human suffering.

Among such forces are wars and the interests of the executive branch of the U.S. Government. History is full of examples of this relationship and while not an exclusive association, because there are numerous examples of the dramatic impact of occasional scientific geniuses working along in their laboratories initiating medical discoveries, in recent years, war and Presidential interests have been important and effective.

Possibly the most important positive dividend from World War II was the discovery and application of penicillin. Certainly the affliction of President Franklin Roosevelt played no small part in the dramatic and successful fight against poliomyelitis. Certainly the dedicated interest of our late President John F. Kennedy in spotlighting mental retardation has led to more knowledge and interest about this cacophonic illness in the past 5 years than had been known in all previous recorded time.

Under President Truman, the hospital construction acts and NIH programs were built and tremendously expanded to provide the base for future medical discoveries. The intimate contacts of Presidents Eisenhower and Johnson with cardiovascular illness have surged forward research in these areas with the imminent promise of additional investments of large national resources into cancer, heart disease, and strokes.

For those of us interested and indeed charged by our consciences with relieving the breathing diseases of chicken, one can only wistfully wish that in terms of time and history, President Theodore Roosevelt would be our next President. The travails of this man with asthma, of course, are well known to all.

Now, of course, no one would say that money alone is the lever that moves mountains of medical ignorance, but like that little boy who was asked by his mother from a distant part of the house, "Johnny, are you spitting in the goldfish bowl?" replies, "No, Ma, but I's coming close." Money helps—it helps by status and seduction, by producing good facilities to work in, biologic and behavioral manpower are attracted to apply their know-how to medical problems not before looked by them at in depth.

Historically the greatest patrons of the arts and sciences have shifted from Mother Church and from the Medici type families of the Middle Ages, from industry, corporations and the private great fortunes of more recent times. The principal patron of scientific research today is the Federal Government.

The Nation's expenditures for the conduct of medical and health related research is approximately $1.5 billion with the Federal Government providing about 63 percent of the total funds.

Continued growth of funds for health-related research has continued from all sources in the postwar period—a rise in the Federal contributions from a $27 million program in 1947 to a $1.2 billion a year program in 1964. Contributions by non-Federal sectors of the country have also grown considerably, but not at the same acceleration and this is due at least in part to the initiating and watching programs of Uncle Sam stimulating the total research capability of the entire scientific community both in the United States and throughout the world. This represents about a 20–25 percent increase per year in the budget since the end of the war. However, the total amount of $5 billion in the aggregate, spent in health-related research between 1947 and 1964 is less than the $5.6 billion spent in the space exploration program in the year 1964 alone.

Although contemporary medical and health related research draws upon all fields of science, so far as Federal Government expenditures are concerned, 90 percent is concentrated in the many disciplines of biology and medicine, 10 percent is spent broadly among related fields in the physical, social and behavioral sciences. Federal funds supporting scientific investigators working in the research environment of nonprofit institutions, however, have become increasingly significant and last year two-thirds of these funds were spent by these researchers in their locations.

Relating these escalating economic forces to the problem of the childhood asthma-emphysema syndrome provides something of a relative disappointment when one considers the increasing magnitude and importance of this crippling chronic disease in our pediatric population.

The relative decrease in deaths due to infectious diseases has thrown into bas-relief the importance of asthma as a deadly disease and even in the 1953 vital statistics when there were 7,640 homicide deaths, at least 6,737 died of asthma. Severe asthma can be considered a potentially preventable disease and when we compare these deaths with those resulting from those diseases on which we have made dedicated drives to prevent and treat (more than all the diseases which we currently now control by immunization) we see the ever-growing importance of asthma as a medical challenge.

Despite the impressiveness of the incidence of deaths due to this disease, the estimates of the crippling effects in adult life of childhood asthma can only be estimated since morbidity statistics are frequently hard to obtain. In the 1963 national health survey of children in the United States the data showed more than one-third of all chronic illness reported for children under 17 years was caused by hay fever, asthma, eczema, orsinusitis. Nearly one-fourth of all the days reported lost from school because of chronic conditions are due to severe asthma. These figures are considered conservative and are probably higher. The crippling psychologic, pulmonary, and economic effects of childhood initiated asthma in adult life can only be guessed at, but they are high.

The saddened plight of the air-hungry child stimulates patient and family panic and is breathtaking, not only to the child but also to his family. Many family units have been uprooted and broken by the frightening visitation of this vicious disease complex.

While the role of the genetic endowment and biologic and psychologic factors are undoubtedly important components in the causation of asthma, another, and most important is the physical environment of the child. The urgency of investigating the role of air pollution and environmental contamination in the production and/or aggravation of these diseases cannot be overstated. Medical annals are filled with volumes dealing with the effects of climate on human disease, but there is a signal lack of controlled scientific observation on the human effects of polluted air. We are accustomed to thinking that a diseased state is brought on by a single cause, a classic view that is no longer tenable for many disease states. While there is frequently a simple association of an infectious agent producing an acute disease state, this concept simply does not answer many chronic diseases which are on the rise today. Chronic bronchitis in Great Britain, once thought to be a specific disease entity, similar to chronic asthma, develops over a long period of time and can become crippling through a combination of factors.

It seems apparent that there is probably no single cause of chronic asthma but air pollution certainly is part of the etiologic complex and one that has not been extensively evaluated.

Indeed, with due consideration of the full magnitude of this problem, there needs to be a greater and more concerted research effort made into all of the several etiologic avenues of approach. In turn, research in the asthma-emphysema syndrome is deserving of increasing economic support from industry, private resources, and particularly from the Federal patron.

The outstanding leadership of the board and medical staff of the Children's Asthma Research Institute and Hospital in bringing our present levels of understanding about asthma to the present position is, of course, recognized both here and abroad. Imaginative research, quality training of personnel, and patient care have set high standards for others to follow. As a real pioneer in plotting the research trails into asthma, this institute has assumed the robes of leadership, and it has worn them well. Grateful acknowledgment of their efforts is accorded by the medical profession and imitative efforts to simulate this demonstration model in part or in whole must be stimulated in a widening geographic circle of distant communities.

Thus we look for a broadening of the base on which to expand our fight against childhood asthma. We need to expand our recourses in service, in training and in mobilizing research potentials nationally and indeed internationally because this medical enemy has passports to all areas of the world.

Increasing manpower and economic investments are currently being mobilized for this research siege, and are coming from private as well as Federal sources. The Allergy Foundation of America now starting its second decade has stimulated general public awareness by public information campaigns and is supporting significant research and training programs in a number of medical institutions. The American Academy of

Allergy and the American College of Allergists, Inc., by their insistance of high professional standards of excellence in practice and research, have recruited scientists and others to meet this multifaceted problem. The Research Council of the American Academy of Allergy, particularly, has been most effective in stimulating interest in asthma research.

From the immense resources of the Federal budget, opportunities for support of quality training and research in the asthma-emphysema complex are many and deep. They are national and international in scope and are mandated by the specific missions of the several granting agencies.

These include the National Science Foundation; the Chronic Disease sections of the State Services Division of the USPHS; the Children's Bureau; the Environmental Division of the USPHS, and others—in addition to all eight of the National Institutes of Health.

In 1964 alone there were 30 research grants in childhood asthma that were supported by the NIH for a total amount of $961,000. Eight of these projects were supported by the Institute of Child Health and Human Development, in its first operational year, for a sum of $300,000.

The expanded fiscal year 1965–66 budget of the Institutes of Health recently approved by Congress for both domestic and foreign health-related research gives ample evidence of the level of consciousness of our Federal leadership to their responsibilities to improve the health of the Nation.

At all levels of research action, with all available resources at our disposal, a concerted and determined effort must be structured to bring relief and open the windows of ignorance to let in the air of enlightenment for our breathless asthmatic children.

LAND SUITS—APPEAL LAW UPHELD

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, an opinion of great interest to all Senators from public land States, and, indeed, to all from States in which publicly owned lands are situated, was handed down, earlier this month, by the U.S. District Court for Nevada.

The case was that of *Stewart* v. *Penny, et al.*, civil No. 1619, decided by Judge Bruce Thompson, involving a homestead entry. Among the issues was the 1960 amendment to the venue provisions of the Judicial Code by which a private citizen may bring suit against Federal officers in a land matter in the district court for the district in which the lands that are the subject of the action are located. Formerly, actions against Interior Department officials involving publicly owned lands could be brought only in the District of Columbia; and, thus, a great many private citizens were in fact denied the remedy of judicial review of administrative action, because of the expense and time required for suit against the Secretary of the Interior in Washington, D.C.

In the 87th Congress, I sponsored, in the Senate, the bill, S. 717, on which this amendment to the judicial code is based; and, hence, I am particularly interested in its interpretation by Judge Thompson, in affirming the intent of my bill.

Also at issue was the scope of judicial review of administrative action. The Government took the position that a finding by the Secretary of the Interior of noncompliance with statutory requirements for homestead entry was conclusive, and was not subject to review. Judge Thompson disposed of that argument with the following observations:

> We cannot, however, accept without limitation a contention that a high administrative official in Washington, D.C., is better qualified than others to analyze and draw conclusive fact inferences from a cold record produced at an evidentiary hearing 3,000 miles away and relating to physical conditions with which he has questionable familiarity.
>
> * * * * *
>
> The omnipotence of the Department of the Interior as guardian of the public domain is exhibited when the Department acts affirmatively and grants patents under the public land laws. The converse is not true. An entry or application for patent which is contested or rejected by the Secretary presents issues regarding the legal rights of the entryman under the public land laws. These are rights established by Congress which the Secretary of the Interior may not arbitrarily or capriciously ignore and which must be determined within the due process safeguards of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Mr. President, in view of the significance and interest of Judge Thompson's opinion to citizens in all of the public land States, and as chairman of the Public Lands Subcommittee of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the opinion be printed in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEVADA—CHARLES H. STEWART, PLAINTIFF, *v.* GORDON PENNY, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS MANAGER OF THE RENO, NEV., LAND OFFICE, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, AND DANTE SOLARI, INDIVIDUALLY AND AS DISTRICT MANAGER, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, DEFENDANTS—CIVIL NO. 1619

OPINION AND DECISION

The inadequacy of our public land laws to afford reasonably workable methods, under present conditions, for the acquisition of public lands by private citizens is a matter of growing national concern. It is of particular concern to the State of Nevada inasmuch as approximately 85 percent of the area of this State (the seventh largest) is still in the public domain. Much of it has a valuable potential for private use. Yet the archaic Federal land laws, enacted in an era of an agrarian economy, are ill-suited to an orderly disposition of the lands into private ownership.

The laws were enacted with the laudable motive of enabling the penniless pioneer to acquire a home for himself and family primarily through toil and with little capital expenditure. That purpose was long ago achieved and most of the lands of the Western States which had a valuable agricultural potential even if only marginally so, have been patented to individuals under the beneficent laws to the exclusion of the wealthy who, under a different policy, might have acquired large blocks of public lands by purchase. The inapplicability of this policy to modern conditions has, during the past quarter century, accomplished a virtual deep-freeze of public lands in Federal ownership. True, some small progress has been made under the Small Tract Act, laudable for its effort to dispose of public lands, but questionable insofar as it has clung to the concept of "proving up" the entry by requiring construction of minimum improvements, a policy which has resulted in shanty-town-like development of many areas opened to small tract entry.

The inertia of Congress in modernizing the public land laws has been a disservice not only to the public but also to the officials of the Bureau of Land Management who have been faced with the problem of applying archaic laws to present-day problems of public land disposition. This is such a case.

On November 23, 1953, Charles H. Stewart, of Gardnerville, Nev., filed an application for homestead entry upon the E½ W½, sec. 18, T. 19 N., R. 20 E. (160 acres) with the Reno Land Office of the Bureau of Land Management. A land status investigation determined that the SE¼SW¼ had theretofore been withdrawn as a highway material deposit site, and this portion, by amendment, was excepted from the application, reducing it to 120 acres. The remainder was included in a Taylor Grazing District, so the Land Office, acting pursuant to part 296 of the Code of Federal Regulations, undertook to determine whether the land could properly be reclassified for homestead entry. On March 14, 1955, the Land Office made its decision, allowing the entry, and finding: "A field examination has been made and it has been determined that the land is more valuable and suitable for homestead entry than for the protection [sic] of native grasses and forage plants and accordingly the land is opened to entry." A specific condition of the entry was "Submission to the Manager, Land Office, Reno, Nev., within 30 days of receipt of this notice, evidence of filing of a water permit application with the state engineer, Carson City, Nev., for the lands allowed. Failure to submit such evidence will subject this allowance to cancellation." Stewart complied with the condition.

Stewart thereupon took possession of the 120 acres, built a house, dug a well, developed the spring, built a small reservoir, cleared and cultivated land and made other improvements. On January 14, 1959, Stewart filed his "Homestead Entry Final Proof" alleging that he had cleared and cultivated 15 acres in 1956–57 and 5 acres more (20 acres total) in 1958, on which he had raised potatoes, sweet potatoes, onions, and peanuts, and that he had constructed improvements at a cost of $3,970. Land examiners of the Bureau of Land Management examined the land and made an adverse recommendation which resulted in the initiation of a Government contest to the application for patents (43 CFR, Part 222). The contest complaint alleged:

"That the cited regulations require that 'during the second year not less than one-sixteenth of the area entered must be actually cultivated, and during the third year and until final proof, cultivation of not less than one-eighth must be had'; and that for homestead entries on lands which are desert in character, there must be an available developed water supply sufficient to irrigate the acreage required to meet the cultivation requirement of the homestead laws.

"That the designated contestee has not cultivated the required one-eighth of his entry, nor has he developed sufficient water to irrigate the required acreage of his homestead entry, Nevada 016595."

Stewart denied the charges and an administrative hearing was held April 5, 1960, before Hearing Examiner John R. Rampton, Jr.

At the outset of the hearing, Stewart moved that all charges relative to the insufficiency of water be dismissed upon the ground that the general Homestead Act, under which the entry was made, as distinguished from the Desert Land Act, required no proof of water, an issue which had been determined by the classification order of March 14, 1955. Decision on the motion was reserved and the hearing proceeded.

The decision of the examiner was filed August 11, 1960, and the adverse proceedings were dismissed. The examiner held (1) under 43 U.S.C. 164, and 43 CFR, part 166, governing homestead entries, no proof of water is required and this issue was foreclosed under the classification order of March 14, 1955, although the order may have been improvidently entered; and (2) the Government had the burden of proof and it had not proved its charge that less than one-eighth of the entry (15 acres) had been cultivated by Stewart as required by the homestead laws and regulations. The Government appealed the decision of the hearing examiner to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management. CFR 222.13, 222.47, et seq.

On April 11, 1961, the Director reversed the decision of the examiner.[1]

Now it was Stewart's turn to appeal, and he did so to the Secretary of the Interior. CFR 221.73, et seq. On September 25, 1962, the Assistant Solicitor, acting for the Secretary, affirmed the Director's decision upon different grounds.[2]

The Secretary's decision is based upon an extensive analysis of the testimony and exhibits concerning the area cultivated by Stewart from 1956 to 1959.

Thereafter, Stewart filed this action for review of the administrative proceedings and final agency action (5 U.S.C. 1009).

PARTIES

This action seeks review of a final decision by the Secretary of the Interior and prays for a reversal of his decision dated September 25, 1962, and of the Director's decision dated April 11, 1961. It also seeks to enjoin the named defendants from carrying out a threatened eviction of Stewart from the premises embraced within the homestead entry upon the grounds that the decision of the Secretary is against the law and the evidence. The only named defendants are Gordon Penny, described as manager of the Reno, Nev., land office, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior, and Dante Solari, described as district manager, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Department of the Interior.

In their answer, the defendants alleged that the Secretary of the Interior is an indispensable party defendant. This is theoretically true, inasmuch as it is his final action which is being reviewed. The Court, nevertheless, clearly has jurisdiction to restrain threatened illegal action by subordinate officials of the Bureau of Land Management, the propriety of which rests upon the Secretary's decision. *Adams* v. *Witmer* (9 CCA 1958), 271 F. 2d 29.

Under 28 U.S.C. 1391(e), the Secretary might have been named a defendant in this action. In their pretrial memorandums, neither party referred to a defect of parties as an issue of law remaining in the case. Defendants have been represented throughout this case by the special attorneys in the Lands Division of the Department of Justice in the same manner as if the Secretary of the Interior had been a named defendant. The briefs to this Court have not mentioned a defect of parties. We conclude that any defense of defect of parties has been waived and this Court has jurisdiction to review the administrative proceedings and final agency action. To hold otherwise would be to substitute form for substance.

SCOPE OF REVIEW

The Government has filed an excellent brief in which it argues, in part, that the decision of the Secretary finding noncompliance with the statutory requirements for valid homestead entry is conclusive and binding upon the courts,[3] citing *Boesche* v. *Udall*, 1963, 373 U.S. 472; *Best* v. *Humboldt Mining Co.*, 1963, 371 U.S. 334; *Cameron* v. *United States*, 252 U.S. 450. We recognize the peculiar and specialized knowledge of the officials of the Department of the Interior respecting the interpretation of the multifarious laws and regulations relating to public lands, and that Congress has entrusted the guardianship of the public domain to the Department of the Interior. We have relied upon that knowledge and expertise in reaching our conclusions. We cannot, however, accept without limitation a contention that a high administrative official in Washington, D.C., is better qualified than others to analyze and draw conclusive fact inferences from a cold record produced at an evidentiary hearing 3,000 miles away and relating to physical conditions with which he has questionable familiarity, conditions normally deemed to be within the realm of judicial notice. We deem the correct rule of judicial review to be that enounced in *Foster* v. *Seaton*, 1959 App. D.C., 271 F. 2d 836: "Thus the case really comes down to a question whether the Secretary's finding was supported by substantial evidence on the record as a whole." This is the only rule of judicial review which will breathe vitality into the mandate of Congress (Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 1009(e)) that the reviewing court shall "hold unlawful and set aside agency action, findings and conclusions found to be (1) arbitrary, capricious, an abuse of discretion, or otherwise not in accordance with law; (4) without observance of procedure required by law; (5) unsupported by substantial evidence in any case subject to the requirements of sections 1006 and 1007 of this title or otherwise reviewed on the record of an agency hearing provided by statute."

---

[1] Director's decision, Apr. 11, 1961:

"The evidence was conflicting as to whether the entryman had cultivated one-eighth of the land embraced in his entry as required by the Homestead Act, 43 U.S.C. 164. It is clear that because of lack of water, rodents and general poor husbandry the entryman has been plagued by crop failures and has not been successful in raising crops to fruition. The evidence is clear that the water now available to the homestead is but sufficient to irrigate about one-half acre thereof.

"The gravamen of this appeal is that the requirement of the cited regulation, 43 CFR 296.4, is a continuing one and since the entryman has insufficient water for the irrigation of 15 acres that his final proof is not satisfactory and that the entry must be canceled.

"At the outset we must note that the allowance of this entry in 1955 without requiring the entryman to show a water right sufficient to cultivate at least one-eighth of the land in the entry, or 15 acres, was erroneous. However, the fact remains that the entry was allowed under the general homestead laws. Thereafter, in order to establish his right to patent, the entryman is required to show compliance only with the pertinent provisions thereof, 43 U.S.C. 164 and the applicable regulations, 43 CFR, part 166.

"Nowhere in the statute or regulations is an entryman required to show that he has successfully raised a commercial crop; he is required to show an 'actual breaking of the soil, followed by planting, sowing of seed, and tillage for a crop other than native grasses.' 43 CFR 166.23. However, improvements on the entry 'should be of such character and amount as are sufficient to show good faith.' 43 CFR 166.24. Evidence of good faith is a prerequisite to the earning of patent to a homestead. See *United States* v. *Cooke*, 59 I.D. 489, 504–505.

"The charge as made, although not in any wording of the statutory provisions, is sufficient to put in issue the good faith of the entryman.

"The testimony of the Government land examiners was to the effect that some acreage had been cleared. This was found by the hearing examiner to be in excess of 15 acres. The Government witnesses stated that they found only 1½ to 2½ acres cultivated as compared to that which was cleared. The entryman's evidence was to the effect that he had cultivated more than the minimum 15 acres but because of lack of water, rodents and general poor husbandry his attempts at successfully raising a crop over the 15 acres were dismal failures.

"Surely, after once attempting to raise a crop the entryman was fully aware that further plantings, without the benefit of irrigation, would be abject failures. Even at the very moment of entry, he knew that any attempt at cultivation would be a failure unless he was able to and prepared to irrigate. Yet notwithstanding this knowledge he set about to create but an illusion of compliance with the positive mandates of the homestead law in regard to cultivation—knowing full well that such attempts at husbandry were foredoomed to disaster. And knowing that water was necessary for a successful operation it is indicated that no attempt was made to make water available to the homestead. This leads but to the conclusion that the entry including the maintenance thereof, although in ostensible compliance with the mandates of the homestead laws, lacks the good faith which is the primary ingredient for compliance therewith. Clearly, the character and amount of cultivation notwithstanding the amount of the cleared acreage wholly fails to satisfy the requirement of good faith on the part of the entryman. When viewed in this light, the evidence falls far short of demonstrating that the entryman complied with the cultivation requirements of the homestead law.

"Accordingly, the hearing examiner's decision is reversed and the entry is canceled."

[2] Secretary's decision, September 25, 1962:

"The ultimate question to be decided on this appeal is whether the homestead entry was properly canceled. Whether the land is, in fact, desert in character and whether the Secretary may allow a homestead entry on desertland are not in issue at this time. If the entryman had fully complied with the requirements of the homestead law, the cancellation was improper. If he had not complied, it was proper. He was charged with failing to cultivate one-eighth of the entry. The appeals officer did not decide whether the clearing, working of the soil and planting, which the entryman claimed to have done, extended to the required 15 acres of the entry but pointed out that, if so, the entryman failed to meet the cultivation requirement of the homestead law because he did not have a supply of irrigation water sufficient to support an inference that his efforts were calculated to produce profitable results considering the physical environment in which they were made and thus were not made in good faith.

"I think it is clear that a homestead entryman may not prove compliance with the cultivation requirement of the homestead law merely by showing that he broke the soil and planted something. If this were sufficient, homestead patents would be issued to entrymen who had gone through these motions on land suitable for the opening of a gravel pit and perhaps sought for that purpose. The different processes which comprise cultivation of the soil must include such acts and be done in such manner as to be reasonably calculated to produce profitable results. Charles Edmund Bemis, 48 L.D. 605 (1922). Therefore, if the land is arid or semiarid, cultivation which will meet the cultivation requirement of the homestead law must, of necessity, include the application of such amounts of water as may reasonably be required to produce a crop.

"In this case, the finding of the appeals officer that Stewart did not meet the cultivation requirement of the homestead law because of his failure to develop an adequate water supply rests upon an implied finding that irrigation is an indispensable element of the cultivation of the land in the entry. The fact that it seems to have been regarded as desertland when the entry was allowed is some evidence of the necessity of irrigation. The entryman's efforts to bring spring water to his garden and his application of it to the garden and, to some extent apparently, to sowings of rye outside the garden area constitutes some additional evidence. But the record suggests that some of the land may have needed only supplemental water, in addition to subsurface percolation from the spring or fault area to which Stewart's supply pipe extended, to permit successful cropping. Certainly it is doubtful that there was an adequate water supply for even a limited need for water, on one-eighth of the homestead entry. But I do not find that any of the crops planted died for lack of water. Hence, I am unable to find, on the basis of the evidence adduced at the hearing, that there was a total want of the type of cultivation reasonably calculated to produce profitable results. If this were the only pertinent factor in the case, it would be necessary to remand the case for the taking of further evidence. However, I believe that this is unnecessary since, after a careful examination of the evidence, I am obliged to conclude that the entryman did not apply the processes of cultivation which he employed to the required one-eighth of the acreage of the entry so that he failed to meet the cultivation requirements of the homestead law for this reason."

The omnipotence of the Department of the Interior as guardian of the public domain is exhibited when the Department acts affirmatively and grants patents under the public land laws. The converse is not true. An entry or application for patent which is contested or rejected by the Secretary presents issues regarding the legal rights of the entryman under the public land laws. These are rights established by Congress which the Secretary of the Interior may not arbitrarily or capriciously ignore and which must be determined within the due process safeguards of the Administrative Procedure Act.

Subordinately, the Government argues that the hearing held on Stewart's application was not a hearing required by statute within the meaning of the Administrative Procedure Act and that the act, therefore, does not apply. This we cannot accept. The Administrative Procedure Act applies to "each authority of the Government of the United States," not expressly excepted (5 U.S.C. 1001). *Adams* v. *Witmer* (9 CCA 1958), 271 F. 2d 29, is direct authority for its applicability to the Secretary of the Interior.

QUESTION OF ADEQUATE WATER

Stewart's final proof was contested upon the ground that "he had not developed sufficient water to irrigate the required acreage." No such requirement is found in the Homestead Act (43 U.S.C. 162–4), or regulations (43 CFR pt. 166). Stewart's initial application was properly treated as a petition for reclassification of the lands described and the Land Office acted within the regulations in classifying the lands, which were desert in character, for entry under the general homestead laws (43 CFR pt. 296).[4]

In a well-reasoned discussion, the hearing examiner concluded that "once an applicant for a homestead entry has made a showing of a water right sufficient to justify a classification that the land is suitable for such entry and his entry is allowed, then the requirements of the homestead laws as set forth in 43 C.F.R. 166 govern and the Bureau of Land Management is precluded from again questioning the sufficiency of water." This conclusion was affirmed in the decision of the Director of the Bureau of Land Management who said:

"At the outset we must note that the allowance of this entry in 1955 without requiring the entryman to show a water right sufficient to cultivate at least one-eighth of the land in the entry, or 15 acres, was erroneous. However, the fact remains that the entry was allowed under the general homestead laws. Thereafter, in order to establish his right to patent, the entryman is required to show compliance only with the pertinent provisions thereof, 43 USC 164 and the applicable regulations, 43 CFR, part 166."

The Secretary impliedly agreed, holding: "Whether the land is, in fact, desert in character and whether the Secretary may allow a homestead entry on desertland are not in issue at this time. If the entryman had fully complied with the requirements of the homestead law, the cancellation was improper. If he had not complied, the cancellation was proper."

We not only accept the administrative expertise in the interpretation and application of the Secretary's own regulations, but we believe the record cries for affirmance of these conclusions. Any other holding would be a fraud on the entryman, to whom it had been represented by knowledgeable local officials of the Bureau of Land Management after investigation and classification that the 120 acres were suitable for entry under the homestead laws. Such a finding represented final agency action unless appealed. 43 CFR 296.9. This interpretation of the intent of the regulations applicable to this entry is confirmed by the more explicit regulations since promulgated (43 CFR pts. 2410, 2411, secs. 2411.2, 2411.4, Apr. 1, 1964, supplement). The administrative file in evidence shows that on April 9, 1955, Stewart wrote a letter to the Reno office of the Bureau stating that he had filed for a water right as required by the classification order of March 14, 1955, and requesting:

"Will you please send me complete literature on the rules and regulation governing the proving up of homesteads." The pencil note on the letter is, "file ltr in case—send: Hd Circ." From this we infer the request was answered by sending the homestead circular, that is a reprint of parts 166–169 of the regulations then in effect; i.e., the regulations governing homestead entries. As noted, these regulations contain no specific requirement with respect to water. We have considered *Boesche* v. *Udall*, 1962, 373 U.S. 472, in which the Supreme Court sustains the right of the Secretary to reconsider and cancel an entry illegally allowed in the first instance. We believe it inapplicable to these facts. There the issue arose because of conflicting applications for the same land, and the administrative remedies were timely invoked by the rejected applicants. Thus the issue of the legality of the contested oil lease was presented on direct review in a private contest. In our case, no Taylor Grazing permittee or other person having a right to use or enter upon the lands embraced in the homestead application contested the classification order of March 14, 1955, or appealed therefrom, and the order and finding that the land was suitable for entry under the general homestead laws attained the status of final agency action. The Secretary correctly concluded as a matter of law that the adequacy of water is not an issue in this case.

GOOD FAITH

The Director of the Bureau placed his decision of April 11, 1961, upon the ground that the applicant had not shown good faith (footnote 1). This was not an issue presented by the contest complaint. The Secretary discarded the issue of good faith, saying:

"Hence, I am unable to find, on the basis of the evidence adduced at the hearing, that there was a total want of the type of cultivation reasonably calculated to produce profitable results. If this were the only pertinent factor in the case, it would be necessary to remand the case for the taking of further evidence. However, I believe that this is unnecessary since, after a careful examination of the evidence, I am obliged to conclude that the entryman did not apply the processes of cultivation which he employed to the required ⅛ of the acreage of the entry so that he failed to meet the cultivation requirement of the homestead law for this reason."

The good faith requirement stems from 43 U.S.C. 162 requiring the applicant to make oath "that such application is honestly and in good faith made for the purpose of actual settlement and cultivation, and not for the benefit of any other person, persons or corporation, and that he or she will faithfully and honestly endeavor to comply with all the requirements of law as to settlement, residence and cultivation necessary to acquire title to the land applied for." These basic requirements, with some elaboration, are restated in the regulations (43 C.F.R. 166.18). An appropriate statement of the meaning of good faith in this context is found in *Carr v. Fife* (CC Wash. 1891), 44 F. 713:

---

[3] Quotation from Government's brief:

"In providing for disposition of the public domain under the generous provisions of the Homestead Act, the Congress made a number of specific requirements. One of these, the sole point involved here, is the requirement that a homestead entryman 'cultivate not less than one-sixteenth of the area of his entry, beginning with the second year of the entry, and not less than one-eighth, beginning with the third year of the entry and until final proof.' 43 U.S.C. 164. Thus, the final proof that an entryman files, as the basis for an application for patent, must establish that the requisite cultivation has been effected. Whether this is true or not, i.e., whether the proper areas were cultivated, is a pure question of fact. If the Secretary accepts the proof, a patent will issue. However, the Secretary is the guardian of the public domain and the administrative officer who must, by law, determine whether the congressional directives have been complied with. If, as in this case, he concludes in the first instance that the issue is questionable, he will proceed under the contest provisions of 43 CFR 1852.2–1 (formerly 43 CFR 221.67). The sole point of such a proceeding is to give the entryman an opportunity to establish that he has complied with the requirements of the law. If he has not, the Secretary is not authorized to issue a patent. More importantly, however, the finding of fact on this point is one within the exclusive authority of the Secretary. This is not open to question."

[4] "§ 296.4. **Classifications of irrigable land for homestead entry.** Public lands which are desert in character within the meaning of sections 2 and 3 of the desertland law (act of March 3, 1877, 19 Stat. 377, 43 U.S.C. 322) and are subject to classification under section 7 of the Taylor Grazing Act may, on the filing of an application under the general homestead laws, be classified for entry under these laws, provided the applicant makes a satisfactory showing that the land is susceptible of successful cultivation by irrigation and that the cultivation requirements of the homestead laws will be met. The applicant in such a case will be required to furnish satisfactory evidence of a water right and plans of irrigation. The available water supply, and the plan of irrigation, however, need be sufficient only to enable the applicant to meet the cultivation requirements of the homestead laws."

"* * * whether he (the applicant) had actually, within the time limited by law, established his residence upon the land, with the intention of acquiring it for a home; whether he had continued to actually reside upon the land; whether he was really engaged in improving the land, or in good faith intending to do so; or whether he was only making a colorable pretense of residing upon and improving the land for the purpose of stripping it of its valuable timber, and acquiring it for speculative purposes, without complying with the terms of the homestead law."

The words "colorable pretense" and "speculative purposes" are operative and characterize the meaning of good faith in fulfilling the specific requirements of residence and cultivation under the homestead law. They refer to the intent and motive of the applicant.

In the light of what Stewart did on the land, it is inconceivable to this Court that there could be found the slightest semblance of an issue of good faith. He moved onto the entry with his wife and son, constructed a homesteader's house of three rooms, and lived there continuously to filling of final proof. He cleared over 15 acres, cultivated the land, developed a spring, constructed a small reservoir, conducted the water from the reservoir to the cleared land by installing approximately 2,200 feet of metal pipeline, and purchased and used three pressure pumps and some 1,800 feet of plastic hose pipe to irrigate the land by use of sprinklers. He dug a well near his residence, constructed other outbuildings, brought electric power to the property, and had a new home under construction at the time of final proof. He was 78 years old when final proof was filed, about 4 years after homestead entry was approved. There is not the least intimation that the land is valuable for anything other than grazing and agriculture, so there is no basis for speculating about "speculative purposes."

In *United States* v. *Cooke*, 59 I.D. 489, cited by the Director, the Secretary, in an exhaustive opinion dealing primarily with the good faith of a questionable residence, reversed the Commissioner and sustained the homestead entry on the premise that all that the entryman did "indicated purpose, determination, industry and good faith." This is true of Stewart. In *Helen E. Dement*, 8 L.D. 639, the Secretary again sustained a homestead entrywoman, stating: "It is right and proper to take into consideration the degree and condition in life of the entryman in determining whether the improvements show good faith." Citing the Dement case, the Department, in *Kendrick* v. *Doyle*, 12 L.D. 67, held:

"In the former contest it does not appear that there was any question about the house being on the land. This entryman is 66 years old and in infirm health and poor. He has made his living by raising goats and chickens on the land; he keeps from 25 to 50 goats on the tract. His improvements cost him about $100.

"In the case of *Mary A. Taylor* (7 L.D. 200), the proof showed no breaking of the land, but some cutting of grass for hay, and that the land was principally used for pasturage and that the entryman did not take the land for the purpose of tillage. It was said:

"'It [the proof] further shows that said tract is illy adapted for tillage and the raising of grain or other agricultural crops requiring the breaking and cultivation of the soil. But raising stock and grass is an agricultural pursuit, etc.'

"The entry was passed to patent.

"In *Helen E. Dement* (8 L.D. 639), it was said:

"'It is right and proper to take into consideration the degree and condition in life of the entryman in determining whether the improvements show good faith.'

"If it should be admitted that all the contestant claims is true, it would show the entryman, acting in good faith, built his house a little outside of the lines of his land, by a mistake that anyone might have made; that he has maintained continuous residence and done the best he could, under the oppression and trespassing of the contestant and those acting in harmony with him, to make a living on the land and maintain his home there, and taking the case as it stands, I cannot concur in your findings and judgment.

"Your decision is therefore reversed, and the contest dismissed."

That the homestead laws should be liberally applied in favor of the entryman is established by law and is not a matter of the whim or predisposition of the particular Secretary of the Interior who graces the office. The Supreme Court of the United States has established the principle. *Ard* v. *Brandon*, 1895, 156 U.S. 524:

"The law deals tenderly with one who, in good faith, goes upon the public lands, with a view of making a home thereon. If he does all that the statute prescribes as the condition of acquiring rights, the law protects him in those rights, and does not make their continued existence depend alone upon the question whether or no he takes an appeal from an adverse decision of the officers charged with the duty of acting upon his application."

In *Clements* v. *Warner*, 1861, 24 How. 394, the Court said:

"The policy of the Federal Government in favor of settlers upon public lands has been liberal. It recognizes their superior equity, to become the purchasers of a limited extent of land comprehending their improvements, over that of any other person."

We cannot find in this record a scintilla of evidence pointing to lack of good faith.

ACREAGE CULTIVATED

On the issue of the acreage cultivated, the hearing examiner stated that he could not find that 20 acres were cultivated, as alleged by contestee Stewart, but that "neither can I find that less than one-eighth of the entry (15 acres) was cultivated as alleged by contestant." The examiner then volunteered the opinion that the burden of proof was on the Government. We do not agree. The Administrative Procedure Act imposes the burden of proof on "the proponent of a rule or order" (5 U.S.C. 1006(c)). In our case, Stewart's Homestead Entry Final Proof, filed January 14, 1959, was an application for patent. Procedurally, the contest complaint filed by the Department was, in effect, an answer to the final proof affirmatively specifying the alleged deficiencies. Procedure by way of a contest complaint is justified because the final proof is not in the form of a pleading and does not lend itself readily to a definition of issues by answer thereto. The procedural regulations then in effect (43 CFR 221.73, 1961 Regulations) provided that on a hearing of a Government contest, the contestant would first present his case. It does not follow therefrom that the burden of proof is on the Government. The correct rule is stated in *Foster* v. *Seaton*, 1959, 271 F. 2d 836, involving a mining claimant. The reasoning there expressed is equally applicable to a homestead entryman. The true proponent of the rule or order is the applicant for patent or other right to public lands claiming compliance with the public land laws. The Government "bears only the burden of going forward with sufficient evidence to establish a prima facie case, and the burden then shifts to the claimant to show by a preponderance of the evidence that his claim is valid."

The Director, in his decision, interpreted the examiner's finding with respect to acreage cultivated as a finding that in excess of 15 acres had been "cleared." This Court considers it a finding, negatively expressed, that 15 acres had been cultivated.

The Secretary deliberately restricted his reasons for affirming the cancellation of the entry to the finding: "The entryman did not apply the processes of cultivation which he employed to the required one-eighth of the acreage of the entry." This is the finding of the final agency authority which is subject to judicial review. If arbitrary and unsupported by substantial evidence and not in accordance with law, the decision based on the finding should be reversed.

The finding is based upon a very thorough and careful analysis of the testimony and surely is not arbitrary in the sense of being capriciously made without due consideration of the evidence. The finding, nevertheless, in our opinion, is unsupported by the evidence and was made without regard for the governing principal that the homestead laws should be liberally interpreted in favor of the entryman.

Most of the State of Nevada is rough, hard, dry country. Water is in short supply. The reclamation of this land for agricultural use is not easy, and the area here in question is of the kind described. The "processes of cultivation" which this entryman employed were suitable to the homestead. He intensively cultivated from one to two acres near his house, growing corn, potatoes, strawberries, sweet potatoes, peanuts, and onions. He brought water to the area by pipeline and plastic hose for the irrigation of the produce. He cleared an additional 13 to 14 acres adjoining the garden plot and from 1 to 3 acres near the north boundary of the homestead. These areas he plowed, seeded to rye, harrowed, and irrigated, by hose and sprinkler, to the extent of his capacity and the resources available. On a portion of the land, he left windrows of sagebrush to stay erosion by prevailing winds, which were subsequently removed by bulldozer in 1958 and 1959.

The adequacy of the acreage involved in this activity is not open to substantial doubt. It was surveyed by a licensed civil engineer, a witness for Stewart, who surveyed 15.2 acres of cleared land in the larger parcel and 3.1 acres in the smaller. A registered surveyor for the Bureau of Land Management surveyed and located the boundaries of the 120-acre homestead entry and prepared a map (exhibit R) on which he accurately located the reservoir, road, pipeline, well, houses, and other improvements on the property, and the elevations and contour lines. The Government surveyor did not testify. The map he prepared did not show the boundaries of the cleared area. These boundaries were superimposed thereon in pencil by a Government land examiner who had used the "pacing" method of estimating boundaries and distances and estimated 12.5 acres in the larger cleared area and 1 acre in the smaller. The actual survey by a registered civil engineer must be given credence over an estimate of acreage based on pacing distances and boundaries.

Stewart testified by reference to an aerial photograph of the farm. It is true, as suggested by the Secretary, that there is some distortion of distances because of the perspective. Nevertheless, the cleared areas are obvious on the photograph, and are, by comparison, the same cleared acres surveyed by Stewart's surveyor. Stewart, by reference to the photograph, showed that he had cultivated and planted rye on over half the cleared area in 1956 and planted rye on the whole cleared area in 1957 and 1958. Mrs. Stewart testified that all the cleared area was in rye for the last 3 years. This testimony clearly supports a finding that the entryman did apply the processes of cultivation which he employed to the required one-eighth (15 acres) of the acreage of the entry.

The Secretary relied heavily upon the failure of other witnesses to testify positively to cultivation of the entire cleared acreage. In our view, their testimony strongly corroborates that of Mr. and Mrs. Stewart with respect to the employment of processes of cultivation on the homestead entry. It should not be expected that they could testify to a specific number of acres, or that they saw a crop growing on the entire area. Their testimony is not inconsistent with Stewart's claim of having plowed, seeded and harrowed the whole field. On the contrary, the testimony corroborates his claim to the extent that the witnesses did see, observe, and remember. The presence of brush windrows on a portion of the land, later removed, does not detract from the cultivated area. Such windrows may be considered an aid to cultivation and were one of the processes of cultivation employed by the entryman. The careful analysis of the testimony made by the Secretary demonstrates that there is no substantial evidence to support a finding that the entryman did not apply the processes of cultivation which he employed to one-eighth of the entry.

The fact that Stewart's rye crop failed because of freezing, depredations by mice, rabbits, and other rodents, and invasions of ranging livestock (the entry was unfenced) are irrelevant to this inquiry, except insofar as they account for the inability of some of the witnesses to see evidence of a rye crop at different periods of observation.

Conclusion

We have related the administrative history of this case at some length. The varying approaches to decision adopted in the administrative heirarchy seem to us to stem from a basic feeling that the area was not properly classified for homestead entry. This may or may not be so. Perhaps it would have been more prudent to classify less than the entire 120 acres covered by the amended application as suitable for homestead entry. Once the entry was allowed, however, all the entryman had to do was comply with the statutory requirements to be entitled to patent. The photographs, maps, and testimony prove that he did so, taking into consideration "the degree and condition in life" of the entryman and the obstacles of nature and environment with which he contended.

The foregoing opinion dispenses with the need for separate findings and conclusions (F.R.C.P. 52). Plaintiff will prepare and submit an appropriate form of decree within 10 days.

Dated: February 26, 1965.

BRUCE R. THOMPSON,
U.S. District Judge.

PHYSICAL FITNESS—ROPE EXERCISE

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the medical profession has long realized that man be treated as a whole animal; that it does little good to apply specific remedies for his diseases and malfunctions if the entire body is not in a general state of good health. And those who study the means of establishing and maintaining good health have become convinced that for the normal human being, exercise is essential. It has become painfully evident that in our motor-driven, electrically controlled society a great many citizens do not get enough exercise to maintain good health.

Indeed, Mr. President, the situation became so alarming that the late President Kennedy established the President's Council on Physical Fitness, to survey the situation and to recommend the steps necessary to reestablish exercise as a part of the American way of life. The preliminary investigations by the Council brought to light some rather saddening statistics, for it was discovered that not only are a great many adults overweight and underexercised, but a great many of our children cannot pass simple tests of physical fitness. So now we find ourselves in the sad situation, not of losing the physical conditioning of our youth, but of never having attained that condition in the first place. The effect this state of affairs has had upon our youth is a source of great concern to those in our Armed Forces and to those who are trying to promote the general physical health of the Nation. It has become obvious, beyond doubt, that the American public must be lured away from the television set long enough to keep itself in good physical shape.

The real problem is finding a means, acceptable to the majority of the public, for obtaining the necessary exercise for physical fitness. For a small percentage of the population—those engaged in active sports or physically strenuous occupations, nothing is needed. But most of us are hard pressed to find the time for a physical fitness program, or are not attracted to the traditional mass exercises, which our British cousins quite aptly call "physical jerks." Not many of us can find the willpower, much less the time, to don a sweat suit and to do a few laps around the block and 30 minutes of vigorous exercise. There is no doubt that this can be done. There is even a small minority of the Members of this body who pursue a vigorous physical-fitness program; but my point is that they are a small minority. What is needed is something that almost everyone, regardless of age, sex, shape, or inclination, can and will use.

So, Mr. President, I was delighted to be informed, recently, that in my hometown of Laramie, Wyo., a progressive and aggressive firm is now engaged in the distribution of a physical exercise system that I believe can be of great benefit in developing physical fitness. This system is suitable for all ages and both sexes. It requires no elaborate equipment or special clothing. It is portable, and is simple to use. In fact, the only piece of equipment involved is an 8-foot nonstretchable rope with flexible plastic handles. This system is called isometric rope exercise. It is based upon the fact that contractions of a muscle can produce an improved condition in that muscle, without the violent and vigorous movement usually associated with exercise. I may add that these isometric rope exercises not only greatly improve strength and muscle tone, but also very often bring about a sizable weight loss.

These exercises are not mentioned here in the hope that the Congress of the United States will undergo a radical transformation by eliminating all the 97-pound weaklings in our midst, for ardous physical chores are not associated with our jobs; but I am suggesting that in view of the pace we are now setting in space-age America, the job of keeping up with our responsibilities does not allow us the luxury of soft bodies that break down under the stress and strain to which we are subject.

Mr. President, through the generosity of the distributor, Ideas, Inc., of Laramie, Wyo., the Wyoming congressional delegation is pleased to distribute to each Member of Congress an isometric rope exercise kit. This kit consists of the rope exerciser, a manual explaining how it is to be used, and a wall chart to demonstrate some of the basic exercises.

Both my colleague, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] and I have been much impressed with the potential for good health that exists in this simple system, which can benefit every member of the American family. I hope that it will be used by the Members of this body in good health.

Mr. President, this system was developed by a well known authority in physical education, Don W. "Tuffy" Mullison, assistant professor of physical education at Colorado State University. Professor Mullison has written an article in which he describes how he developed this system and gives the scientific details on how it works. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHYSIOLOGICAL REASONS FOR ISOMETRIC ROPE CONTRACTION

INTEREST

I became interested in isometric contraction after being introduced to it primarily through reading information sent out by Bob Hoffman of Health and Strength magazine concerning football isometric training and accomplishments of certain weight lifters and track and field performers in increasing their performances in individual events. I have always attributed some of my own personal strength to a concentrated effort in a form of static contraction while attending high school; consequently, I became interested in learning more about this form of training called isometric contraction.

While supervising a gym class at Colorado State University this spring, I picked up a piece of twine about 6 feet long tied together and with it I began trying a few isometric contractions. I began to wonder why this form of exercise could not be beneficial to almost everyone. This piece of twine led to a rope and eventually the rope I am now calling the isometric rope and a group of contractions called the isometric rope exercises. This is a group of exercises performed with a rope designed to contract basically all of the muscles used in moving the levers of the body. Much time and effort went into these exercises as I became convinced this system had a tremendous potential for physical fitness. I personally, in working isometric contractions with this piece of rope, had tightened flabby muscles, gained amazing strength, and lost some aches and pains I had been living with for some time. I also noticed some weight loss as I experimented with these exercises. As this happened I began to ask myself questions concerning why these contractions affect a person as they do.

In reading, I found that Perry Radar, the editor of Iron Man magazine, reported that weight lifters using isometric contraction remarked that their old aches and pains seemed to be leaving them and that they felt like a million dollars, with a new spring in their step and a zest for living. One thing that everyone seems to notice is how alert, alive, and good they feel after a workout. Bob Hoffman of Health and Strength magazine, advocates an isometric power rack for offices and feels that 1 minute a day on isometric power rack contractions can build strength, slenderize individuals, improve posture, aline and strengthen the back, and make everyone look like an athlete. The only trouble is that isometric racks require space, are bulky, cost money, and are pretty stationary. The isometric rope is probably an answer to this problem as it is cheap, portable, and can be used anywhere.

THE MEANING OF ISOMETRIC CONTRACTION

What does isometric contraction mean? the prefix "iso" means the same; "metric" refers to length. The word in total means no change or equal. In an isometric contraction a muscle acts upon a lever to move an overload. "Nothing moves, yet a great amount of energy is expended. In this type of contraction there is no change in the length of the muscle but there is a sharp augmentation of tension."[1]

PHYSIOLOGY OF ISOMETRIC CONTRACTION

In an isometric contraction the maximal contraction of the muscle is achieved when the strength of the stimulus is enough to stimulate the least irritable muscular units, thereby involving the entire muscle in the response. "Muscle fibers respond in an all-or-nothing response. In other words, a single muscle fiber responds maximally or it does not respond at all. Different fibers possess different thresholds, thus, if a weak stimulus is applied to a muscle, only those with very low thresholds will be activated. Obviously, the more fibers that are active, the greater will be the force of contraction of the whole muscle."[2] It appears that isometric contraction aids in lowering the threshold of muscle fibers and through continued stimulus effort the individual brings a maximum amount of muscle fibers into use. Actually to lift a piece of chalk will require the maximum contraction of a few units of muscle, to lift a 100-pound weight will require the maximum contraction of many units of muscle, to exert an isometric contraction against an immovable overload all of the muscle fibers that the individual can stimulate come into maximum contraction. "Isometric contractions are rarely undertaken voluntarily since no mechanical work is achieved. Although the muscle does no work it liberates energy in the form of heat. This heat causes a rise in body temperature which increases capillary volume and pressure."[3] This liberation of heat also seems to have an effect on reducing excess body weight. Observation of persons performing isometric exercise indicates that the whole body is involved in the effort. "Palpation and electromyographic exploration of the activity of readily accessible muscles during the effort confirm the visual observations that there is a general increase in tone of most of the skeletal muscles of the entire body. Fatigue of this effort appears early, and a definite period of rest is required before an equal contraction can be performed again."[4]

"Oxygen debt is about 40 percent greater in isometric exercise and the oxygen income is around 20 percent less during isometric exercise; and the debt-income ratio is much larger for isometric exercise; especially for the greater loads."[5] Respiration rate increases after exercise to recover the oxygen debt. "The high carbon dioxide acts directly upon the inspiratory center, spurring it to greater activity and thus augmenting ventilation."[6]

In trying to answer some of my own questions concerning this system of exercise, blood circulation came into the study. "The number of capillaries in a muscle actually can increase by 50 percent as the result of exercise. It was found that in guinea pigs that there was actually a multiplication of the number of capillaries to roughly 50 percent of what was present before."[7] Also these would disappear within 90 days if the exercise was discontinued. "In contraction the contracting muscles increase the blood flow by a pumping action. The compression empties the veins which soon fill as the pressure on them is released. Because of the one-way action of valves, the blood cannot flow in a direction away from the heart; it flows only toward the heart."[8] This contraction also keeps the arterial blood from coming into the muscle, consequently there is no immediate circulatory strain placed on the heart. "However, when the muscles become active their blood supply is increased, often 4 or 5 times that of the resting supply. Muscular activity itself stimulates different nerves, which stimulate the vasodilator center, thereby increasing the local blood supply."[9] It also increases adrenaline into the blood stream which stimulates heart action and increases vasoconstriction in the skin."[10] I noticed that the heart rate increases very little immediately after rapid isometric contractions of a violent effort. In explaining this, the constriction of the muscles cutting down the arterial supply plus the emptying of the veins causes little strain on the heart. "Heart rate and blood pressure increase but to a much lesser extent than in isotonic work of similar degrees of exertion."[11] Through the exertion of contraction carbon dioxide is formed. "Carbon dioxide increases and acts directly upon the heart. It tends to slow the heart but at the same time increases the extensibility of the cardiac muscle. It helps to make the heart more efficient by increasing its vigor and therefore its stroke volume, at the same time as it acts as a brake on the heart. Thus the cardiac output remains high with possibly a slightly lower beat. At the same time, all the arterioles in the contracting muscle are wide open because of the local action of the carbon dioxide."[12] Isometric exercise appears to benefit the heart. "Extensive statistical surveys seem to provide strong support for the assumption of an earlier and greater cardiovascular morbidity and mortality among nonexercising individuals, as compared with those in physically strenuous occupations or sports activities continued into their later ages."[13]

Isometric exercise provides a type of exertion which does not cause a rapid increase in heart rate during contractions but speeds up the heart action after the individual is more in a state of inactivity. In fact, tests indicate that three-quarters effort in contractions appear to increase the heart rate more at the time of exercise than complete violent contractions. "In exertion the adrenaline gland secretes epinephrine which tends to increase the vigor of cardiac contraction, dilate the coronary vessels, to encourage peripheral vasoconstriction, and generally to exaggerate the effects of the sympathetic nervous system."[14] After isometric exercise, the increase in circulation to the tissues supplies the tissues with additional fuel and oxygen, disposes of the wastes and restores equilibrium which has a healthful effect on all of the body organs as well as the muscle structure. "The psychological factors and tension of daily living frequently outweigh physical stress in alteration of heart rate, blood pressure, clotting time, and plasma lipids. Physical work protects rather than damages the coronary arteries. With reduction in work and greater leisure time there is appearing an increase in tension and neurotic states."[15] "Emotionally unstable individuals have heightened levels of physiological activity and inferior physical fitness. By stimulating the adrenal glands through exertion the body is more able to combat stress."[16] "Exercise fundamentally throws one into relatively greater sympatheticotonia, out of which a person may not come completely for several hours or even days. In other words, persistent physical training negates some of the poorly rated parasympathetic nervous tendencies, and if not carried too far into over-training develops positive dynamic qualities of psychological value."[17] There seems to be little doubt that the liberation of sympathin produced at the sympathetic nerve endings when exertion takes place aids in reducing certain neurotic tendencies.

STRENGTH GAIN

In reading about isometric contraction a great strength gain seemed to be acquired through this type of exercise. Sports Illustrated reported that Dr. W. T. Liberson in a controlled study at a veterans' hospital in Rocky Hill, Conn., reported strength increases of up to 300 percent on convalescing patients. "Strength output may be doubled in 3 weeks. A few moments of heavy resistance exercise twice a week produces significant gains in strength.[18] It is generally agreed that strength increases when repetitive exercise is performed against heavy resistance and that the slope gradient of the training curve varies with the magnitude of the stress imposed, the frequency of the practice sessions and the duration of the overload effect.

"In one experiment subjects gained up to 161 percent in strength working only 5 minutes a day for 10 days using a heavy load. When the workload was reduced 75 percent and repetitions were quadrupled, no perspective gain in strength was achieved.[19] Another experiment reported a 5-percent strength increase for 10 weeks with a daily 6-second isometric contraction at two-thirds strength. Still another experiment found that the overload principle implies that the limits of performance must be persistently extended to improve muscle strength; and the rate of improvement depends to a degree to which a person is willing to overload." [20]

---

[1] L. L. Langley and E. Cheraskin, "The Physiology of Man," McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1958, pp. 43–44.

[2] Ibid., p. 45.

[3] S. R. Reidman, "Physiology of Work and Play," Henry Holt and Co., Inc., 1950, pp. 104–105.

[4] L. E. Morehouse, "Physiological Basis of Strength Development," Exercise and Fitness, Library of Congress.

[5] L. L. Langley and E. Cheraskin, op. cit., p. 413.

[6] H. H. Clarke, "Development of Volition Muscle Strength as Related to Fitness," Exercise and Fitness, Athletic Institute, Library of Congress, p. 207.

[7] A. H. Steinhaus, "Lessons from Physiology for Coaches and Athletes," 55th Annual Convention for American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, Washington, D.C., p. 116.

[8] S. R. Riedman, op. cit., p. 237.

[9] S. R. Riedman, "Physiology of Work and Play," Henry Holt and Co., Inc., 1950, p. 244.

[10] Ibid., p. 248.

[11] L. E. Morehouse, "Physiological Basis of Strength Development," Exercise and Fitness, Library of Congress, 1950, p. 193.

[12] L. L. Langley and E. Cheraskin, "The Physiology of Man," McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1958, p. 353.

[13] W. Raab, "Degenerative Heart Disease from Lack of Exercise," Exercise and Fitness, Library of Congress, Washington, D.C., 1960, p. 10.

[14] L. L. Langley, and E. Cheraskin, op. cit., p. 354.

[15] E. L. Bortz, "Exercise, Fitness and Aging," ibid., p. 9.

[16] Ibid., p. 8.

[17] T. K. Cureton, "Anatomical, Physiological, and Psychological Changes Induced by Exercise Programs in Adults." Exercise and Fitness, Library of Congress, 1960, p. 177.

[18] L. E. Morehouse, "Physiological Basis of Strength Development," op. cit., p. 195.

[19] L. L. Morehouse and Philip J. Rasch, "Scientific Basis of Training," W. B. Saunders Co., 1958, p. 110.

It also seems that the strength increase is not in the amount of repetitions done in training. "A thousand contractions a day can have no effect upon strengths." [21] One contraction per day seems to be a satisfactory stimulus upon the muscle fiber.

"Also the peak of muscular strength is generally attained between the ages of 20 to 30 years of age. However, if training is continued past this age, strength can be maintained at a high level until old age." [22]

WHY STRENGTH?

John Bunn in Scientific Principles of Coaching says, "The importance of strength is so vital in athletics and actually so neglected. Athletes in order to have reserve to meet emergencies should acquire strength in excess of that required for the desired activity." The U.S. Air Force reports that 50 percent of our young men lack the strength and agility to pass a physical fitness test for pilot training. "J. Roswell Gallagher has stressed that the evaluation of strength, the determination of the disproportion between strength and probably stress, and the increase of strength through exercise at times constitute better medical practice than a regime which focuses upon the ailment, emphasizes rest and ignores the facts regarding strength development through exercise.[23] Harold E. Jones found that boys high in strength tend to have good physiques, to be physically fit and to enjoy favored social status in adolescence, and the boys who are low in strength show a tendency toward asthenic physiques, poor health, social difficulties, and lack of status, feelings of inferiority, and personal maladjustments in other ways." [24]

Kay H. Petersen concluded that strength was a consistent differentiator of ability to make and to achieve success on interschool athletic teams.[25] H. D. Whittle reported that strong physical programs in public schools result in higher levels of muscular strength among the participants.[26]

Strengthening activities to maintain fitness levels may well be considered desirable for all people as a way of life. In fact, Jean Mayer in an article "Exercise and Weight Control," says that a reorganization of one's life to include regular exercise adapted to one's physical potentialities is a justified return to the wisdom of the ages.

BENEFITS OF ROPE EXERCISE

After careful study, we feel that isometric rope exercise has a very scientific place in the development and maintenance of strength and the general physical fitness of the Nation as a whole. It can be the answer to development of strength in the junior high school and high school gym classes. Because of the small amount of time involved in isometric rope exercise, functional exercise, and development of skills can still be the main physical education program. Strength development has long been a neglected phase of our physical education programs. Weight programs are too time consuming, space consuming, and expensive to have evolved as an integral part of these fitness programs. This system without a doubt can be reasonable, inexpensive, effective, and simply administered. The results will show in regard to fitness tests in the future wherever it is adopted.

This rope system also has tremendous potential as a benefactor to any person who will take the time and effort to apply this program to his daily life. The rewards of a few minutes a day could well mean years to his lifespan. Women as well as men can use this exercise system because of its nature and simplicity. In fact, the potential for removing flabby muscles and excess weight in women is no farther away than the use of the rope.

The Armed Forces may well find that this system can do much for their daily routine. Athletic teams already are using it as a supplement for their extensive training programs.

"In conclusion, strength exercise is needed for the maintenance of a fit body and should be presented as a way of life." [27]

THE WILD RIVERS BILL

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the initial reaction to establishment of a national wild rivers system has been more than gratifying. While one would anticipate the generous support of most conservation and wildlife groups, support of the measure has been coming from all sources.

Of particular satisfaction has been the editorial comment in my own State. This editorial approval was most aptly set forth in the Idaho Daily Statesman on March 22; and it pays homage, not only to the intent of the wild rivers proposal, but also to President Johnson, for including it in his message to Congress on natural beauty.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Record.

There being no objection the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Boise (Idaho) Daily Statesman, Mar. 22, 1965]

The Wild Rivers

Congress has received from Secretary of Interior Udall a bill to establish a national wild rivers system to preserve conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values.

It is one of the bills singled out by President Johnson in his February 8 message to Congress on natural beauty.

The legislation proposes immediate wild river status for all or part of six rivers. Two are located in Idaho, the Salmon River from the town of North Fork downstream to the town of Riggins, and the entire Salmon Middle Fork; and the Middle Fork of the Clearwater River from the town of Kooskia upstream to the town of Lowell, the fork also embracing the Lochsa River from its junction with the Selway at Lowell forming the Middle Fork, upstream to the Powell U.S. Forest Ranger Station, and the Selway River from Lowell upstream to Thompson Flat.

Segments of the Rogue River in Oregon, the Rio Grande in New Mexico, the Green in Wyoming, and the Suwanee in Georgia and Florida including the Okefenokee Swamp are proposed for classification under the wild rivers bill.

In Idaho, the Bureau of Outdoor Recreation spent considerable research in studying the Salmon and the Clearwater Middle Fork. Private consulting firms were employed by the BOR in compiling the definitive studies. The Statesman has not received reports of the research on the Idaho rivers involved, but a preliminary review of Secretary Udall's proposals and acquaintance with the beauty of the Salmon and Clearwater suggest the bill should be adopted.

There certainly will be no hesitancy in outdoor groups and wildlife organizations giving their approval to the wild rivers system measure. The views of local interests directly affected by the bill should be forthcoming.

The beauty of the treacherous River of No Return between North Fork and Riggins is known universally by outdoor enthusiasts. The Salmon River is incomparable and exciting and as much of its pristine character must be conserved as possible. The Middle Fork of the Clearwater and its companion Lochsa and Selway streams reach into a million-acre wilderness area of the Selway-Bitterroot administered by the U.S. Forest Service as directed under appropriate laws of Congress and regulations of the Department of Agriculture.

Historically speaking, the rivers have provided colorful pioneer legends. Much of the Clearwater system has traveled by the Lewis-Clark Expedition.

Idaho now gains by national recognition of these magnificent rivers. Congress will study the Udall proposals. The passage of the Wild Rivers System Act appears inevitable.

"COAL IN YOUR FUTURE"

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, coal represents the greatest mineral resource of the Appalachian region of this country, and its production is still the basic foundation of the economy in Appalachia.

George Fumich, Jr., Director of the U.S. Office of Coal Research, recently reviewed the progress made by his Office to develop new uses for coal. Great strides have been made in this field; and the results of this research are easily seen in the production of coal, which has shown an increase for the first time in many years.

Mr. Fumich's talk, entitled "There is Coal in Your Future," is certainly worthy of study by every Senator. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

There Is Coal in Your Future

The industrial market is a very important one for coal and one which the industry has in the past done perhaps too little to promote and expand. Despite this, it has remained over the past decade and a half the second or third largest single coal market, varying in ranking with steel in individual years. For 1963, it comprised a market of 83 millions of tons, excluding cement, which utilized another 8 million tons.

It is encouraging that in recent years the industrial market, declining slowly but steadily through 1959 when 74 million tons were consumed, has reversed that trend and climbed annually since that year to the present size of 83 million tons. An important job for the coal industry is to see that what needs to be done to insure the continuance of the present short range trend is done.

A frank review of the possible causes of the decline prior to 1959 is perhaps in order.

Coal-fired equipment was traditionally larger—heavier—more expensive than similar equipment employing competitive fuels. Coal had to be handled, stored—ashes disposed of. Coal-fired plants required labor over above those of the other fuels, and labor costs were trending steadily upward. There was some doubt in the consumer's mind as to whether the delivered costs of coal would not increase similarly.

---

[20] L. E. Morehouse, op. cit., p. 203.

[21] Ibid., p. 195.

[22] L. L. Morehouse and Philip J. Rasch, op. cit., p. 110.

[23] W. H. Clarke, "Development of Volitional Muscle Strength as Related to Fitness," Exercise and Fitness, Library of Congress, p. 203.

[24] Ibid., p. 201.

[25] Ibid., p. 201.

[26] Ibid., p. 202.

[27] Ibid., p. 203.

In all too many cases these problems and doubts, coupled with the factor that cost of the steam or heating plant operation was in frequent cases an almost inconsequential factor in the final cost of the consumer's product, led to the displacement of coal in the industrial market. That the decline of coal in this market was not greater is in part due to the equipment manufacturers. Even after well above a normal lifetime of operation, coal-fired equipment was simply too good to throw away.

In my mind, at least, this reputation of coal-burning equipment as being high priced and nonautomated, based on experience with frequently obsolescent equipment, was a mixed blessing. I believe that it set the plant owner and operator thinking, "If coal-fired equipment was only cheaper, cleaner, and easier to operate, I'd never switch. The equipment lasts almost forever, and coal is still the cheapest fuel."

To me, then, these are the ground rules if this vitally important market for coal is to be expanded. Equipment for the handling and burning of coal must be developed that is competitive over a reasonable depreciation period, if not in initial cost, with other fuels.

The knowledge that coal can be a clean fuel, clean in handling and burning, must be expanded. Possibly most important, the fact that a coal-fired plant can be as highly automated as any other must be stressed. Where local ordinances discriminate against the automated coal plant, the proper officials need to be shown and convinced so that the local laws may be changed. And the coal consumer needs to be continually reassured of the coal industry's interest in his needs and problems, that coal in desired quantities and consistent qualities will be available for his requirements, and that the price of coal, including its delivery to his plant, will insure its position as the lowest cost fuel.

As papers presented at this meeting have amply demonstrated, the coal and equipment suppliers have risen to the bait. They have shown their willingness and capability to contribute to the growth of this market. I shall mention just a few of their recent contributions.

Industry-financed Bituminous Coal Research, Inc., has erected and is operating a modern basic and applied research laboratory at Monroeville, Pa., where all facets of coal handling, combustion, air pollution, and ash handling and disposal are being investigated. The pioneering efforts of this laboratory led to the development of the first "packaged" coal-fired boiler units in capacities of less than 20,000 pounds of steam per hour. Industry interest, as evidenced by the BCR work, led to worthwhile activity on the part of at least four manufacturers.

One development was the packaged unit built to basic designs developed by BCR. Two of these units are installed, and utilized for both heating and air conditioning, in the Coal Building, headquarters of the National Coal Association, in Washington, D.C. Your inspection of these units is invited by their owners should you visit the Capital City. While the initial cost of these packaged units is higher than for gas or oil, they have in many instances been economically competitive with other fuels.

Another manufacturer has developed a somewhat similar unit, again higher in initial cost than for similar equipment fired by other fuels. Nevertheless, it is another satisfactory and desirable addition to the range of automatic coal-burning equipment.

A Virginia company acquired the manufacturing rights to a stoker design originally developed in Canada. Initially it employed an air-cooled grate which was found inadequate for many industrial applications. An improved grate assembly has been developed which has the advantages of lower cost and adaptability to conventional-type boilers.

One well-known equipment supplier has been working on a similar grate assembly for several years, and the unit will soon be ready for field testing. The manufacturer has expressed enthusiasm over its possibilities.

These equipment units have capacities of from 75 to 300 boiler horsepower and above.

Still another is considering the manufacture of a coal-fired boiler of English design which may offer some cost advantages and would perhaps be available in capacities of up to 500 boiler horsepower. Undergoing evaluation at this time is the design of an automatic ash removal system for this unit.

Various manufacturers of coal-handling equipment, combustion controls, and air pollution prevention devices are also known to be working on methods of making coal-fired equipment cleaner, cheaper, and more highly automated.

Other public and private researchers are working on improved combustion systems utilizing coal, including improved burner designs, the establishment of stoichometric combustion conditions, the recirculation of furnace gases, development of pressurized furnaces, and the adaptation of slagging furnaces to smaller industrial capacity ranges. Certainly some of this effort can be expected to bear commercial fruition within the foreseeable future.

The Office of Coal Research of the Department of the Interior is intensely interested in contributing to the health and growth of the industrial coal market. In fact, the goal of the Office, as specified upon its creation by the Congress in 1960, is to encourage and develop through a contract research program, new and expanded markets for coal.

Today's program has been mentally a stimulating and gratifying one, so although I could speak enthusiastically at great length concerning the work of the Office of Coal Research, this is not the time for such a talk. Allow me please, however, a few moments to discuss that part of our present and planned program which is of most interest to you.

I have mentioned the vitally important developments by BCR and manufacturers of the packaged coal-fired boilers up to 15,000 pounds of hourly capacity. However, competitive fuels were able to produce packaged units of 100,000 pounds of hourly capacity—and just recently this range has been extended to 200,000 pounds.

Because of the past history of declining markets, and other reasons too well known to you to warrant discussion, equipment manufacturers were not able to justify as an extensive research and development program as was being utilized for competitive fuels. It was in an attempt to equalize the situation that the first OCR contract was signed with Pope, Evans & Robbins, of New York, for the development of a higher capacity, more competitive coal-fired packaged boiler.

The contract has been completed, and the designs and specifications of the complete plants, including coal and ash handling facilities, and the combustion unit and controls are available to the public. The designs for the packaged boiler-stoker unit are available in capacities of 20,000, 30,000, 40,000, and 50,000 pounds of hourly steam capacity.

These new plants should materially assist the coal industry in gaining a share in the expanding industrial heating market. We believe that they will find wide application in factories, hospitals, and other large buildings.

Completely "live" storage of coal is a feature of all plants, together with the ability to burn almost any American coal, including anthracite, with minor modification of the combustion changer.

The new plants can be erected at costs considerably below present coal-fired units in this capacity range and will require no more attendance than oil- and gas-fired plants.

The designs and specifications are of such detail and quality that, except for normal site engineering, any designer or manufacturer of coal-burning systems would be able to build a plant from them.

The design employs an "A" type boiler considerably smaller than previous boilers of this capacity coupled with a new-type oscillating-grate stoker. The overall as-shipped height of the boiler-stoker package permits it to be shop constructed and shipped by rail to almost any erection site in the United States. The major difference between the two basic plant designs available is that one provides coal storage in a below-ground level "tank," while the other employs a surface-storage silo.

Boiler-stoker specifications provide heat release rates on the grate of 750,000 British thermal units per hour maximum, 650,000 minimum. This service is made possible by heavy alloy castings with high-velocity tuyeres; the arrangement permits an excellent turndown ratio. The furnace heat release limit is 54,000 British thermal units per cubic foot per hour, maximum, considerably greater than employed in other types of coal-fired units due to furnace configuration. This is accomplished by an extremely turbulent furnace condition with high-velocity tuyeres, 16 overfire air nozzles, full boiler length travel, and a high heating surface-volume ratio. Despite these increased heat release rates, exit furnace gas temperature will not exceed 1,900° F.

Several of these boiler-stoker units are presently in industrial operation, and you have heard a complete report and description of their operation this afternoon, so I shall not bore you with repetition.

As a result of what we believe to have been a major contribution under this contract to the needs of the industrial fuel market, a second contract in the amount of $531,000 was awarded to Pope, Evans & Robbins on February 20 of this year. Under terms of the new contract, we hope that the contractor will be able to develop boiler units (probably not stoker fired) in the capacity range of up to 100,000 pounds of hourly steam capacity. We even hope to reach the 200,000-pound goal that has recently been achieved by competitive fuels.

Such units, requiring minimum attendance, minimum space, maximum efficiency, and with an initial cost and operating cost considerably more favorable than existing coal-fired equipment should provide a substantially increased market for coal within a relatively short period of time.

Under terms of the research contract, numerous new concepts for coal handling, combustion, ash and fly-ash collection will be developed and evaluated. Prototype components of the package unit will be constructed and tested prior to the development of the complete final design of the overall system. All elements of the system will be so integrated and refined as to produce a compact, safe, automated, and efficient installation designed to prove economically attractive to the owners of industrial establishments.

Total time for the performance of work under the contract is 30 months. Full interest and title to any discovery or inventions developed in the course of the contract will vest in the Government.

Concurrently, we are proceeding with contract research efforts designed to assist the coal operator in reducing his production costs and to assist the coal consumer in finding uses for the present waste ash and fly-ash resulting from coal combustion. The end result of each of these areas of effort is to make coal cheaper in final cost to the coal consumer.

Our mining cost reduction work is being performed by Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Under a $147,000 contract just completed, four computer programs were developed for evaluating those factors which contribute to the cost of mining in the immediate production area. The programs can be used to evaluate numerous production problems found in the diverse variety of continuous and conventional mining systems which prevail throughout the coal industry. The programs vary in scope and have been tested and proven applicable in a broad range of mining systems. Fieldwork has indicated that application of the program to specific mining problems may reduce coal production costs by up to 40 cents per ton.

The computer programs are available to the coal industry, at cost, and the technical staff and computer facilities are available at VPI to mining companies who wish to employ these programs in their operations but do not have computer facilities. Thus coal operators, large and small alike, can apply these newly developed techniques in reducing the cost of mining.

Since the VPI report was released to the public in October 1964, OCR has learned that the computer programs are in actual use at three major companies whose underground output was 20.4 million tons in 1963, or 6.9 percent of total underground bituminous and lignite production for that year. Five producers accounting for 36.1 million tons annually of underground production are planning to utilize the programs.

During the month of February 1965, five mining companies and two manufacturers of mining equipment made applied "runs" of the VPI–OCR computer programs and expressed satisfaction with the results. Runs for four additional companies were scheduled for the month of March.

A followup contract with VPI to find additional methods of reducing the cost of mining coal in the amount of $286,500 was signed on June 9, 1964, and will run for a period of three years.

The last contract I shall mention is that for determining uses for the solid wastes of coal combustion.

In a $139,140 contract with West Virginia University for determining potential markets for coal-associated rocks and minerals, a method has been developed for making high-strength bricks and other construction material from fly ash and bottom ash. The Government has filed a patent application for the process.

By using a mix of ash, sand, and sodium silicate in combination with modest forming pressures and firing temperatures, it is possible to produce lightweight, durable, and attractive building material. Tests indicate that the bricks produced can withstand severe environmental conditions and have compressive breaking strengths which range from 5,000 to 9,000 pounds per square inch. The material weighs from 95 to 100 pounds per cubic foot against 140 to 150 pounds per cubic foot for common clay brick.

The new process produces a building material that is stronger and lighter than the clay brick. This may mean a saving of up to 30 percent in transportation costs. Sample bricks have been tested in accordance with the American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM). In every instance, the bricks met or surpassed standards established for clay bricks.

Tests of the new type brick are continuing. But, from all indications, the use of coal-ash for the manufacture of building brick is economically feasible, technically possible, and highly desirable. However, work to date has been on a bench and batch scale only. Additional work is required to develop a continuous production process.

OCR hopes in the future to undertake other research projects designed to further decrease the cost of mining coal, improve its quality, reduce its transportation costs, reduce the problems of boiler-tube corrosion, and in other ways increase the desirability of coal as an industrial fuel.

We are constantly looking for additional new ideas that will help coal in the competitive energy market. Many of you have wide experience in the field of combustion. If any of you have ideas for research in this area, OCR will be happy to discuss them with you, either personally or by informal letter. We solicit knowledge and experience in developing a research program useful to you and to the coal industry.

The coal industry is convinced that their expanded efforts will, in coming months and years, make it impossible for you, the industrial consumer, to ever forget that, "There is coal in your future."

KENNEDY CLIMBS HIGH

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, because of his courage, diligence, and intelligence, ROBERT KENNEDY has won the respect of the Nation. Now the junior Senator from New York has added yet another triumph to his already long list, by climbing Mount Kennedy, the highest unclimbed peak in North America. This act of brotherly tribute to the memory of our slain President is greatly admired and appreciated by all Americans.

An editorial praising ROBERT KENNEDY's achievement was published in the Washington Evening Star on Friday, March 26. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOBBY TO THE SUMMIT

It is unlikely that anyone else can really understand what brought Senator ROBERT KENNEDY from the whispers of spring in Washington to the permanent snow and ice of Mount Kennedy, in Canada, the highest previously unclimbed peak in North America. The Senator had had no previous climbing experience and could hardly have been much help to the team he joined 2,400 feet below the 13,850-foot summit.

But, at the top, he drove in a stake with a black-bordered flag of the Kennedy coat of arms. Clearly for the Senator himself, there was a sense of doing something the hard way for the memory of his brother.

It is a fitting act, not only because of the unusually close relationship between the slain President and his brother, but also because of the interest in athletic endeavor that characterized the Kennedy family as led by the President.

We salute this expression of brotherly love and memory and congratulate the climber on having conquered such a peak his first time out.

LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE ITALIAN-AMERICAN WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I urge legislation to incorporate the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States.

Few groups in our free society have so consistently contributed, in peace and in war, to America's physical, cultural, and spiritual growth, and the strengthening of its free institutions, as our citizens of Italian origin.

All of us honor America's discoverer, the great Italian explorer, Christopher Columbus. Many of us here in the Senate have been working to make Columbus Day a national holiday, and I hope that we will succeed in the near future.

Millions of Americans of Italian origin and ancestry are making contributions to every walk of American life today.

And when our freedom has had to be defended on battlefields around the world, Americans of Italian origin have always been in the forefront of our forces.

That is why I have joined with the distinguished minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN, in introducing a bill to incorporate the Italian-American War Veterans of the United States.

I am urging prompt consideration of this legislation.

TRIBUTE TO THE 100TH INFANTRY BATTALION

Mr. FONG. Mr. President, in the annals of American military history, the 100th Infantry Battalion has earned a special place of honor. Organized as an all-Nisei Army unit from Japanese American members of the Hawaii National Guard a few months after Pearl Harbor, the 100th Battalion went into action in Italy in September 1943. It fought with great distinction and bravery, and became known as the "Purple Heart Battalion" because of its heavy combat casualties.

Recently, in Honolulu, Gen. John K. Waters, Commander in Chief, U.S. Army Pacific, recalled the gallant record of this fighting unit in a speech before Club 100, composed of 100th Battalion veterans.

In his remarks he referred to "courage that saw the battalion receive three Presidential Unit Citations; one member of the 100th win the Congressional Medal of Honor; 24 others, the Distinguished Service Cross; 147, the Silver Star; 238, the Bronze Star for valor; and 1,703, the Purple Heart—mark you, all from one battalion."

General Waters commends the 100th Battalion men not only as courageous wartime soldiers but also as peacetime veterans devoted to continuing community service.

In his address the General voiced his hope that the 100th Infantry Battalion will have its unit designation retained in the merger of the Army Reserve with the Army National Guard. I was pleased to learn since then, that the Department of the Army has every confidence that the 100th Battalion designation will be retained in the proposed reorganization.

I ask unanimous consent that General Waters' address delivered before Club 100 in Honolulu on February 13, 1965, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF GEN. JOHN K. WATERS, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, U.S. ARMY, PACIFIC, BEFORE CLUB 100, HONOLULU, HAWAII, FEBRUARY 13, 1965

Mr. President, members and guests of Club 100, it is indeed an honor for me to be with you this evening. It is not often that one has the opportunity to spend an evening with such a distinguished group of people who represent a famous chapter of our American history and heritage.

During my 34 years of service as a member of our Armed Forces, it has been my privilege to meet with many groups. When I received your invitation to join you tonight, I was very happy to accept. If I remember correctly, I first heard and admired the wartime exploits of your members while I was a POW in Germany and you were making U.S. history in 1943–44 on the Italian Peninsula as members of Mark Clark's 5th Army. I think it was in April 1944 that a West Point cadet roommate of mine, Gordon Singles, first joined your unit. He has spoken often with great pride and devotion of you.

I feel privileged to be with you here tonight and would like to take this opportunity to pay public recognition to your distinguished organization. As you sit here, you can proudly reach out and touch not only one stalwart soldier, but many. There are few organizations in our country which can claim such a thing. Frankly, I'm humbly proud to be with you. I am grateful for the opportunity to pay my sincere respects to fighting men. This country has needed them and will need them again.

Club 100 and you men of the 100th Battalion who comprise its membership deserve a renewed share of public recognition for the contributions you have made, and are continuing to make, to our country, our State, and our community. What your club represents to this community cannot be measured by any known device. It may never be appreciated fully until your sons and grandsons are called to react to any challenge to our country. This may not even be a physical challenge. In fact, some people believe the greatest threat to our people today is that Communist target—our minds. But what I mean about the failure to appreciate fully your vital work is that your practicing patriotism, your reputation for courage, your place in the community and what you stand for—these things, will help build our youth to the point where they will resist the encroachment on their minds. It is as important that their heritage be such that their minds are trained to recognize the dangers. They will be blessed with the courage of their fathers and grandfathers—you men here tonight. Courage that saw the battalion receive three Presidential Unit Citations; one member of the 100th win the Congressional Medal of Honor; 24 others, the Distinguished Service Cross; 147, the Silver Star; 238, the Bronze Star for valor; and 1703, the Purple Heart—mark you, all from one battalion.

Sometimes it is hard for us to realize that a whole new generation has grown up since the 100th Battalion was organized. In a few years you will be observing your 25th anniversary—a quarter of a century of service that has seen the world change in so many ways—changes, too, right here in our own country, in which many of you have played such important roles within our own state. It is a happy thought that your sons and daughters will never have to sacrifice and suffer as you did for the principles for which you stood and the right to become full-fledged Americans. I think I could put it more correctly if I said "effort to be recognized as the full-fledged Americans that you have always been." History knows that no other group of Americans ever went so far above and beyond the call of duty for their country and their own people than did the Americans of Japanese ancestry in Hawaii during World War II. Many of our minority groups in America have displayed their loyalty in many ways since 1776, but the Americans of Japanese ancestry proved their loyalty and trust at great personal sacrifice and loss of life on the field of battle. A new and fortunate generation of Americans are enjoying the rewards of your efforts. Here in Hawaii this is particularly true where men and women, young and old, of many ethnic backgrounds, work, live and play together in a harmonious atmosphere of public understanding and cooperation. It has helped to make this Nation of ours great and a leader in the free world.

You of Club 100 and the 100th Battalion must be very proud of the continuing success of your members and the work that your organization is doing in this community. There is hardly any field in our daily life in Hawaii in which you cannot find some former members of the 100th in it or associated with it in some manner. This is particularly true in public life where the 100th Battalion is represented in the U.S. Congress; others serve in the State legislature, and still others hold offices in the State Government or are leaders in business, industry and professional trades. We in the military are particularly proud that one of your former members, Francis Takemoto, has climbed through the military ranks to the grade of brigadier general in the Army Reserve while still serving his community as a leader in the field of education. Time does not allow me to go on to review with you the many contributions each of you and your organization are making to help this country be a better place in which to live for our families, our friends, and our neighbors.

It is most fitting that Club 100 was organized to serve in promoting the unity and welfare of all the people of Hawaii. I understand that your slogan is "for continuing service." If Club 100 continues to serve this community as it has the past 23 years, it will compile a record of public service second to none of any such organization in the Nation. The attitude of the members of the 100th Battalion and Club 100 toward community service individually and collectively following the war has proven to be a great asset to this community. Many of you can recall that some of our veterans, fresh from war duty, felt, upon their return, that the country owed them their livelihood. Not so for you. To you men and your ogranization the termination of the war offered an opportunity to serve our people at home in pursuit of peaceful activities for the welfare of the community with the same vigor that carried you through your various campaigns so successfully. I am sure that the accomplishments of Club 100 have enriched your lives over the years. Honolulu and the State of Hawaii have indeed been fortunate. I know from experience that this organization of yours and its members have helped to foster the fine and strong relationship that exists between the military establishments here and the civilian community. We are grateful for this and are confident it will continue in the future. Mutual understanding is at the bottom of it—a deep understanding that has increased with the years.

Just 10 days ago I returned from a trip through the Far East. There I observed our young men and women in the service and saw first hand the wonderful job they are doing in carrying out our country's responsibilities to help defend our liberty and freedom and that of our allies in this hemisphere. I can assure you that they are doing an outstanding job. Many of these men are from families in Hawaii. They represent many ethnic groups of the islands. Some of these men are dying in battle in Vietnam where there is not even a known battlefield but where the fight to preserve liberty and freedom goes on in the bitterest sort of way.

It is Americans like those of you here tonight who will answer the challenge and will see to it that the United States will continue to maintain its leadership in the free world in pursuit of liberty and freedom. You have not and will not shirk your duty to defend against aggression should the necessity arise. The examples you have set and the principles for which you stand will enable your sons and daughters and those of Americans elsewhere to carry on in the same proud manner as you have—if and when the time comes. Your contributions to our American heritage are a distinguished chapter in the history of our country.

I have one more subject to mention, which is of interest to all of us here tonight. As you know, the Army Reserve is being merged with the Army National Guard and there has been some question as to the retention of unit designations in the reorganization. The Department of the Army will make final decisions as to designation of surviving units. The 100th Infantry Battalion because of its seniority and history deserves to be retained and transferred to the Hawaii Army National Guard in order to continue its tradition of distinguished service to the Nation. I had hoped to be able to announce the decision—however, it has not been made as yet. My hopes are high.

And now, I congratulate the new officers of Club 100.

I commend those who are retiring for their outstanding contributions "for continuing service."

CIVIL RIGHTS DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I want to commend the Concerned White Citizens of Alabama for their support of the Selma-to-Montgomery freedom marchers and for their efforts to interpret the civil rights movement, not alone as a Negro struggle, but as an American struggle for the basic freedoms of all men.

Concerned White Citizens raised about $1,000 for food for the Selma-to-Montgomery freedom marchers, and 20 of its members participated in the last leg of the march to the State Capitol on Thursday, March 25. A group of 100 Concerned White Citizens has attracted about 200 more persons since it marched in Selma 3 weeks ago to support the Negro drive there.

Rev. Joseph Ellwanger, a Birmingham, Ala., Lutheran minister who is the leader of the month-old group, is to be commended for his efforts to organize the Concerned White Citizens group.

The Concerned White Citizens group of Alabama should serve as an example for all communities in our country who must demonstrate a responsible and thoughtful response to Negro ambitions for basic rights.

Local communities should help to solve community problems. Every American is implicated in the struggle to secure basic freedoms for all citizens.

Bitterness and frustration must be cast aside in favor of a positive, constructive approach to solving the problem of racial discrimination.

IOU 32: PREPACKAGED PUBLIC OPINION

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, the lid has been lifted off one of the most insidious propaganda operations in the United States. It is time to open the lid all the way. The public has the right to know which industries and which companies are paying for the editorials which are represented to be—in the words of the American Medical Association—"the viewpoint of a majority of the American people."

We can all be grateful to the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA] for his analysis of editorials presented to members of Congress by the American Medical Association. It is indeed remarkable when editors in widely separated sections of the country simultaneously arrive at identical conclusions against adequate health care for the aged, and express their sentiments in identical words.

As the junior Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] and newsmen have observed, some of the editorials sent to us by the AMA, and represented to be the independent expression of editors, came from a single source, the Industrial News Review, of Portland, Oreg.

Industrial News Review has been prepackaging public opinion since 1906. It sends packets of 12 or 13 editorials weekly, free of charge, to some 11,000 editors. Some editors throw the editorials away. But many use them, and the unsuspecting reader thinks they are written by the local editor.

A journalism school survey of use of Industrial News Review editorials in one State—Colorado—published in Nieman Reports revealed that about one-third of the editors used the prepackaged Industrial News Review editorials. Some used as many as 100 or 200 of the editorials a year. Of course, if only 1 percent of the editors publish a prepackaged Industrial News Review editorial it will appear in more than 100 papers. The industry whose objectives are lauded in the editorial can then point with pride to the seeming ground swell of support for its cause.

Industrial News Review was mentioned in the press as the source of at least one of the editorials reprinted by the American Medical Association in its 171-page booklet which claimed editorial support for AMA legislative objectives. I have now verified that at least 44 of the 221 editorials in the AMA booklet came from Industrial News Review, whose Lawrence Hofer has admitted that his organization receives a fee from the AMA.

Those 44 reprints were of 6 different INR editorials of which 1 was used by 11 different newspapers and 1 by 10 different papers. Another was used by nine and another by eight. In addition, five of the editorials in the AMA booklet are so similar to INR editorials as to indicate a rewriting of the INR release. Several others indicate the inspiration, at least, came from INR materials.

The word-for-word reprints were used by weekly and daily papers serving such widely scattered areas as Dickinson, N. Dak.; Baltimore, Md.; Rock Island, Ill.; Mesa, Ariz.; and Miami Beach. Most of those listed are dailies.

In addition, an editorial from Washington Exclusive was used by seven newspapers including papers at Modesto, Calif.; Roanoke, Va.; Dickinson, N. Dak., and North Canaan, Conn. Washington Exclusive is the product of U.S. Press Association of McLean, Va., which "for $175 will send your message to 1,199 weeklies and 150 daily newspapers." U.S. Press Association has listed such clients as American Bankers Association, National Association of Manufacturers, National Right-to-Work Committee, Electric Industries PIP, General Electric Corp., National Association of Electric Companies.

In the AMA booklet there were at least three other of the editorials which were used word for word by two or more newspapers, often in widely separated areas, indicating they also may have been furnished by a service.

But AMA is a minor client for Industrial News Review. INR distributes four editorials glorifying the IOU's—investor owned utilities—for every one editorial praising the AMA.

Industrial News Review has a simple formula. My analysis is based on the 12 or 13 editorials furnished free each week to approximately 11,000 editors during 1964.

Here is how it works. Every other week with regularity one editorial praised Pan American Airways, the New York Stock Exchange, REA Express, the American Meat Institute, the American Medical Association, the Committee of American Steamship Lines, chainstores, and the timber industry.

Every week one editorial glorified the drug industry, the oil industry, the railroad industry, and the chamber of commerce taxpayer groups.

And every week, week in and week out, 2 of the 12 or 13 editorials sang the praises of the IOU's.

Mr. President, the last investigation of propaganda activities of power companies, more than a generation ago, showed that they were contributing $84,000 a year to Industrial News Review. Some companies now contribute more than $1,000 each annually to Industrial News Review. And some companies include these subscriptions to a prepackaged propaganda machine as operating expenses, paid for in full by the customers through higher utility rates.

Industrial News Review is a small part of the vast propaganda operations of the power companies. I believe that regulatory commissions should interest themselves in this matter. Newsmen would also find the field fascinating and quite unlike its presentation by Industrial News Review which says "a power company lives in a gigantic goldfish bowl" with "its every act subject to public observation and local, State, and Federal regulation."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the body of the RECORD, immediately following my remarks, my article, "Unlabeled Packages," dealing with Industrial News Review and other power company propaganda, which appeared in the September 1964, issue of Public Power; "Prefabricated Public Opinion—The Industrial News Review in Colorado," by Denny Lowery, which appeared in the July 1955, issue of Nieman Reports, and "Behold the Grass-Roots Press, Alas," by Ben H. Bagdikian, which appeared in the December 1964, issue of Harper's.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Public Power, Sept. 1964]

UNLABELED PACKAGES: THE IOU'S—INVESTOR OWNED UTILITIES—PART 2

(By Hon. LEE METCALF, U.S. Senator from Montana)

Power company propaganda is well packaged, but it frequently carries no return address. Whenever possible, the companies find a "patsy" to play postman and make deliveries to the unsuspecting consumer and his children.

The patient who browses through Public Service magazine in his physician's office sees no hint that it is, as correctly labeled in Ayer's Directory, a utility publication. On the contrary, he is told that the magazine has "no affiliation or connection with any other business, groups, organizations, or associations."

The college student who suddenly finds that he is on the mailing list for the "Freeman" magazine isn't told that the IOU's (investor-owned utilities) have long been among its regular financial supporters.

Neither high school and elementary students nor their parents know that distribution of "economic education" kits and films which saturate some areas of the country involves the manpower and money of more than 50 power companies.

In one instance, the letterhead of a press release was that of Columbia University. But the words were those of the IOU's complaining about competition, Government regulation and "harrassment to the management of the privately owned, business managed utility company" (Public Power, September 1962, p. 24). (The university said that the release was produced without the knowledge of the university news office.)

FILM "OPENS MINDS" FOR IOU'S

During the past year the electric light and power industry has been busy arranging for others to show the IOU's current propaganda movie, "The Power Within," which is described by the industry distributor as "an inspiring technicolor sound movies which tells the complete story of Government encroachment * * * opens minds which have been long closed to the problems of the investor-owned electric utility industry—prepares a path for further education or action, as your company directs."

The film tells how private power "companies were swallowed up by TVA—a backdoor Federal takeover of the investor-owned companies." (When I checked recently, I found that private power companies in the TVA area were not only alive and kicking, but that their common stock earnings have increased more than twice as fast as the national average, thanks in good measure to increased sales after they lowered rates to meet TVA yardstick competition.) Half-truths and distortion throughout the film culminate in an emotional scene, with the cameras on a statute of Abraham Lincoln, as a voice intones Lincoln "quotations" which were long ago branded as fictitious.

The film was produced by Varicom International of Boulder, Colo., and is distributed to companies as part of a "project action" package which includes a 119-page manual crammed with techniques of audience manipulation, and a selection of anti-REA and anti-TVA brochures. The film has already been shown in most States and at least one foreign country.

"COMMUMITY LEADERS" INTRODUCE FILM

Last fall the "Project Action Newsletter" reported with unconcealed delight that "Community Public Service of Fort Worth * * * has been successful in obtaining community leaders who are not associated with the company to introduce the film at club and civic organization meetings." The First National Bank of Englewood, Colo., and the Englewood Chamber of Commerce had "promoted the program through the local paper, the Englewood Herald." Public Service Co. of Colorado had obtained 15 copies of the film and set out to arrange showings to "public, private and parochial schools" and scheduled meetings, built around the film, with various organizations in the Denver area.

"The information department of Public Service of Colorado," reported the newsletter, "will be meeting with a number of outside organizations, including junior chamber of commerce, Colorado Farm Bureau, Manufacturers Association, and others, in an attempt to get one or more of these groups to undertake project action as one of their specific programs."

The director of communications of Public Service Co. of New Mexico arranged for the film to be shown to a Lions Club luncheon and some visiting Shriners, then returned to his office to write with elation that the film tied in with the chamber of commerce "Action Course in Practical Politics" and that a precinct chairman (the political party was not mentioned) had told him "we finally have a vehicle for presenting these facts to the average person."

The technique for dissemination of the film is as simple as the old chain letter. Normally one showing "triggers many other meetings," wrote Hager Patton of "Project Action" a few months ago. The audience is asked to furnish the names of school, church and civic groups which should see the film.

"Members of church and PTA groups," said Mr. Patton, "generally want to make the message available to others."

The aim of the film is to get letters and telegrams which reflect the power industry's viewpoint to members of Congress. Every effort is made to hide the power companies' role in this campaign to pressure Congress. Extremism in the pursuit of secrecy is no vice by the standards of the IOU's. Their manual states that: "sample letters should be on various colored and sized stationery and handwritten. This will give members of your audience an 'authentic' guide, yet, because it looks as though it is an actual letter someone has written, avoids the chance of copying and standardized letters coming from your audience to any one Congressman. This will allow the action obtained to appear spontaneous to the recipient and not as though it were a planned, concerted effort by any one interested group."

Again the IOU's stress that the real return address on the letters to members of Congress should be obliterated. The patsy who shows the film is cautioned, in the manual, that envelopes should "carry individual stamps not metered postage which will betray the source of the letters to the recipient."

In at least one instance this year a sponsor of the film decided to discontinue use of the film. Sears, Roebuck & Co. showed the film to its employees in Owensboro, Ky. Rural electric cooperative members protested the unfair attacks on them and, after some delay, a vice president of Sears announced that "I do not believe that such a showing will be repeated elsewhere." Occasionally a company will sponsor the film, as Gulf States Utilities did, twice, on Baton Rouge's WAFB–TV.

Similarly, a company will sometimes directly plant a newspaper editorial. But the direct approach (ads and news stories for the press, regular contributions for service clubs) is invariably supplemented by the indirect approach, in which the role of the company is hidden. The power companies help finance newsletters and editorial writing services. A busy editor, trying to fill a hole on the editorial page and without time or inclination to write his own comments, publishes some of the convenient canned editorials. He has noted that the editorials may be used "with or without credit" and frequently runs the editorial as his very own. Even if he does credit the editorial to, for example, the Industrial News Review, most of his readers do not know that this Hofer family enterprise of Portland, Oreg., is a favorite charity of the IOU's.

I doubt too that some of the Northwest editors who use INR editorials reflecting local utilities' opposition to Federal dams are aware that Pacific Power & Light, and Portland General Electric each gave $1,300 annually to INR, and that Union Electric (of St. Louis) gave $1,100. And in those too few instances when a utility is required to itémize its contributions, thus permitting the public to know who the power company "postmen" are the electric consumer is in for more surprises. This summer the Federal Power Commission prevailed upon Texas Power & Light to itemize several hundred thousands of dollars casually listed as "other miscellaneous general expenses." Lo and behold, part of the cost of providing power in Texas, charged to the consumer, are $600 per year contributions to Industrial News Review.

EDITORS USE FREE EDITORIALS

The free editorials distributed each week by Industrial News Review constitute a catalog of power company propaganda and catchwords. The IOU's are painted red, white and blue, their competitors pink. And in the IOU's semantics used by Industrial News Review, "municipal," "cooperative," "TVA," "BPA," and "Federal" are all synonymous with "socialistic." To quote from some Industrial News Review editorials distributed in 1 month this year: "The plain factual record (of the electric power industry) makes a mockery of the tax-subsidized, socialized power movement" (January 6): "There is no rational excuse for continuing REA subsidies" (January 13); "We have Federal and State officials promoting an unnecessary nationwide, Government-owned, tax-exempt power system" (from another January 13 editorial); "The electric power business is the prime example (of) the drive to socialize" (January 20); "The socialized power systems are purely commercial" (January 27); "Socialization of any phase of the electric service business is totally unnecessary" (from another January 27 editorial).

The INR material goes to about 11,000 editors. A journalism school survey in one State—Colorado—showed that about one-third of the editors use the Hofers' INR material, some as many as 200 items per year. Thus it is not surprising that, in one instance, at least 59 editors arrived at identical and simultaneous conclusions.

The electric light and power industry reportedly has doubled last year's budget for national advertising. Many individual companies are now spending more than 75 cents per customer per year on direct advertising. But indirectly, through grants-in-aid to pliant purveyors of power propaganda, through exploitation of company connections with community organizations, the industry pumps out that propaganda which it does not choose to label. The IOU's search is unceasing for those who will tell their club, their church or their readers how the Nation's largest, most preeminent growth industry, with virtually unlimited prospects for future growth and continually increasing profits, has been hobbled and gobbled by Federal, State, and municipal governments—even by those townspeople and farmers who have elected to provide themselves with electricity at cost, through their own local organizations and their own initiative and effort.

[From the Nieman Reports, July 1955]

PREFABRICATED PUBLIC OPINION: THE INDUSTRIAL NEWS REVIEW IN COLORADO

(By Denny Lowery)

The Industrial News Review, published each week in Portland, Oreg., reaches 179 Colorado newspapers, according to the Review's own figures.

Almost 70 of the editors of those papers, in answering a recent quetsionnaire, stated very definite ideas about this free editorial service. When all of the opinions were in, the editors against INR seemed to have four bones to pick with the service, while those favoring the publication had four points to praise.

Maurice Leckenby, editor of the Steamboat Pilot, led off the long parade of those against INR. He stated, "I consider the Industrial News Review to be dynamite and propaganda that is not in the public good." However, Lyle Lindsmith's Englewood Press came back with "We are glad to know there are those who care about the free enterprise, capitalistic system. We need more of its kind."

Otis Bourn's Routt County Republican expressed disfavor concerning E. Hofer & Sons' publication by saying, "You will find a favorite expression of small newspapermen to be that such junk mail is filed in the wastebasket and replies sent to the effect that since no advertising was forthcoming, they should 'Board where they room.'"

However, the Aspen Times, edited by V. E. Ringle, noted: "The Industrial News Review is good. While it is pointed toward business, it gives lots of facts about problems most people never know."

Jack Wellenkotter, editor of the Alamosa Courier made still another charge against INR. He said, "The Industrial News Review is very carefully and very thoroughly Republican in everything it contains. The Review openly calls Democrats power-hungry bureaucrats. And I am a Democrat."

But still on the political standpoint, James Dement of the Antonito Ledger-News said, "Another 20 years of Roosevelt and Truman and we might as well join with the Reds and scrap our Constitution and Declaration of Independence," and in addition, he stated, "I like INR's treatment of the Socialistic trend and the warning of approaching communism if we don't get back to a sound philosophy of government."

The Walsenburg World-Independent felt that INR is too biased to be of any value in conscientious public service, while the Buena Vista Republican said INR is "Good with relation to domineering, selfish labor activities."

The total result of the opinions went against INR. Fifty-two percent of the answering editors felt the copy of INR had no value in the column of a newspaper. They cited various reasons including "harmful propaganda" and "unpaid advertising."

Naturally, not all of the 48 percent who wrote in favor of INR (or at least did not denounce it) actually use its copy.

Marge Mundell Hale, assistant editor of the Denver Record Stockman, for instance, stated, "The Industrial News Review might be quite valuable editorial material," but "it does not apply as such for the Record Stockman for our newspaper is devoted entirely to the livestock industry and what affects it."

And Roscoe Bullard's Wray Gazette noted "Most of the time, [INR] isn't localized enough to be of special interest to a farming community such as we operate in."

Although Dale Cooley of the Limon Leader didn't favor the Industrial News Review, he did state very clearly one of the causes many editors cited for not using such copy. He said, "There is a long chance that in not regularly pursuing this release, we are sometimes overlooking something which would be of actual news value, but the search for the wheat among the chaff requires so much time that the average country editor simply has more important things to do."

Fred Pottorf of the Holly Chieftain seconded this by saying, "I (as a one-man force) don't have the time to ferret out such copy."

Some of the other reasons given for not using the copy were lack of space in the paper, and lack of interest in such material among the subscribers.

Out of the 96 editors who returned the questionnaires, 32 said they did use INR copy, at least occasionally, and several stated they use 100 to 200 items a year.

Fifteen of the editors said they wrote many of their own editorials on ideas received from the Review's copy. Wallace Foster, of the Gunnison News-Champion said he merely lifted out INR figures which he could fit into his own editorials.

Several papers, such as Mary Morgan's Georgetown Courier, said they used the copy only for filler material.

Although less than one-third of the papers actually reprint the material regularly, over 60 percent of the editors stated they did read the weekly releases.

According to the results of the questionnaire, most editors preferred to change the material before reprinting it. For every one editor who printed the copy just as he received it, four either rewrote it, changed the heading or made some other change.

If the percentage of the 32 papers using INR copy applied to all Colorado weekly papers, the Review's reprinted editorials would reach almost 100,000 Colorado subscribers a week.

In an attempt to get more material on INR's use in Colorado papers, the November 1954 issues of 87 Colorado papers were surveyed.

Out of the 87, only 9 were found to use INR copy during that month. Only one daily paper was among the nine.

Most of the nine papers used the copy sparingly. Only one used it almost exclusively.

The presentation in the nine papers was slightly different from that of the original copy. The most frequent change was in the headings. None of the papers gave credit to INR for the material.

The Industrial News Review was established in 1913 in Portland, Oreg., by its present publishers, E. Hofer & Sons. At that time the Hofers were the publishers of the Portland Daily Capitol Journal, and INR was an outgrowth of the paper's editorial policy.

The service began slowly, being sent to a few weekly papers in the Portland area. Then local industry began to support it financially. The service was gradually enlarged throughout the Western States as more financial support from industry was secured. Finally in 1923, the service became national in scope. It is now sent to approximately 11,300 newspapers across the country.

The service consists of a monthly magazine and a five-page weekly selection of editorials and other features. It is sent to almost every type of newspaper published with the exception of metropolitan papers.

The weekly releases are made up of about 15 editorials and a section called "Grass Roots Opinions," which includes four or five short editorial excerpts from small daily and weekly papers around the country.

An editor may use as much of the copy as he wishes. He can change the copy in any way and is not required to give credit for it in his publication.

The purpose of the service is stated in the "To the Editor" section of each week's release as follows:

"The aim of the Industrial News Review is to advocate and encourage policies which it believes essential to the well-being of our country, the development of industry, the sound investment of savings, and the steady employment of American workers. Its editors express their personal convictions in discussing industrial and economic questions that affect business stability and social progress. * * *"

Also in the same section of the releases, the Hofers state their financial sources: "INR's weekly distribution," they say, "is supported financially by industry, business and professions, including public utilities, retailers, railroads, mines, manufacturers, food processors, petroleum, financial institutions, and others who believe that community prosperity and growth, sound government and reasonable taxation, must accompany individual and corporate prosperity."

Subjects for the INR editorials vary from dams to double taxation and from roosters to railroads. But the main emphasis of the INR writers is placed on utilities, stockownership, retail distribution, socialism, communism, and the major industries such as oil, meatpacking, steel and coal.

The editorials run from about 100 words up to 500. They quote recognized sources, deal with problems often uppermost in the American mind, and naturally, they present the side of the subject-situation which favors industry.

Although the editorials range among a great many subjects, the writing style of the material is about the same in all. The INR writers appear to use a timeworn but successful gimmick—that of the "question" or "thought provoking" lead, with fact and figures sandwiched in the middle of the editorial and the necessary conclusions to close it up.

The wording of the editorials, however, is very well done. The adjectives, verbs, and adverbs are the words that appear to carry the weight of the writer's thoughts. These words are strong and forceful—often so strong as to cause the reader to wonder at their use in the editorial.

For instance, INR stated the following about socialism:

"Human beings are not like ants, they are individualistic in nature, and must have freedom to do their best. That is why socialism and ant-like regimentation are not the answer to man's problem. To progress and gain contentment and profit from his work and at the same time preserve his individualism, is all important to him. He can't do this under antlike socialism."

And then, in another release, "socialism depletes everybody's pockets, just as it undermines everybody's freedom and opportunity."

Words such as "antlike" and "undermines" might derive no special notice when their source is known, but when reprinted in the Nation's weekly press, their meanings and significance are greatly magnified.

INR advocates private, rather than Government ownership of electric power systems. This subject is dwelt upon more than any other single aspect of industry by INR. Almost anything concerning the subject makes its way into the lines of INR copy, and the latest issue, and one of the most loudly proclaimed in the Nation, is the Dixon-Yates contract.

The Industrial News Review has not commented on the contract any more vehemently than many newspapers around the country. But the wording of some of the INR editorials has no doubt carried great weight among many of their readers.

"In short," INR says, "the Democratic attack on the contract has been an ideological one, made by those who want socialized government power monopolies."

Jack Wellenkotter, the Democrat, quickly picked on that statement with the sarcastic phrase "As if the Dixon-Yates affair could ever be described 'in short.'"

Concerning taxes in one recent release, INR gave detailed statistics on individual tax costs now over individual taxes 20 years ago, but it failed to mention one word about the rise in government costs in those 20 years.

And commenting on labor, INR quoted a passage from the Versailles, Ky., Woodford Sun: "As we read on and on about union demands for 'fringe benefits,' paid vacations, shorter workweeks, guaranteed annual wages—in short, more and more for less and less—it is downright refreshing to be reassured now and then that the rank and file of American workers are truly interested in their jobs."

Several things came to mind concerning that passage. First, is not almost every rank-and-file American worker interested in fringe benefits, paid vacations, shorter workweeks, and annual wages? And secondly, just who are the unions? Are they not made up of the "rank and file" of American workers.

The critics of INR range from the "lukewarm" editors who feel the service is a bit too one-sided to be editorially fair, to the "hot" editors who attack INR on the basis of "outright propaganda."

Louis M. Lyons, editor of Nieman Reports, explored the use of INR releases in the July 1948 issue of Nieman Reports, in an article entitled, "Editorial Writing Made Easy." He asked the question, "What would be the reader's judgment of an editor who farmed out his editorials to someone else without letting them know? Suppose this someone else was an anonymous person not resident in their community or within a thousand miles of it—someone not working for the interest of their community or even the interest of their newspaper, but working for some special interest with an ax to grind of which the readers are not told."

Lyons went on to berate newspapers using INR and similar copy without identifying its source, then named 59 newspapers which had used a certain Hofer editorial concerning a speech by the president of Harvard University.

In concluding his article, Lyons stated "The medical profession has a procedure for malpractice. So do the lawyers. There is an American Newspaper Publishers Association and an American Society of Newspaper Editors, and there are ethical codes for journalism sponsored by these and by State press associations. This exhibit (the article) is offered to any who accept any responsibility in these matters."

Another critic of the Review, with a slightly different slant, is the editor of the Pleasant Hill (Mo.) Times. In an editorial reprinted in the January 8, 1955, St. Louis Post-Dispatch, he said "Since 1913, the Hofers have been blanketing the rural press with essays on behalf of 'the essential well being of our country,' as they demurely phrase it." Then "It just happens that the essential well-being of our country always coincides with the special interests of those industries—notably oil, power, railroads, shipping, and stock exchanges—which pay the tab for the Hofers."

And commenting on who receives the most benefits from INR he stated, "It is not the ink-stained chump who permits someone else to sell and collect for the space in his newspaper; not Uncle Sam, who must rule this a legitimate, tax-deductible business expense; not even the clients, who really ought to know the influence brought from a newspaper that would go for canned editorials isn't worth postage. The winner, by a technical knockout of everybody in the ring, is E. Hofer & Sons."

But, although INR seems to be attacked from every angle, it evidently has many, many editors who think highly of it and use its copy. The Review claims a reproduction of 1,894,318 inches of its copy in 1953, and of that total, 14,332 inches reprinted in Colorado. These figures suggest that not all editors follow the policy in regard to INR suggested by a Colorado editor who neglected to sign his name or indicate his paper: "An editor must think for himself."

Mr. Gayle Waldrop,
Director, College of Journalism, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colo.

Dear Mr. Waldrop: Thanks for sending us Denny Lowery's report in reply to our request. We have made two copies of it for our files, and are returning it to you.

We had expected the report to be of a more academic nature based on the actual facts as supplied by the newspapers and by us. Any judgment, whether favorable or unfavorable, as to the merit of the work should have been stated clearly after a full presentation of the subject. As so many of us do, I'm afraid Mr. Lowery allowed his prejudices to greatly influence the factual content of the report.

We deal with economics, one of the social sciences, which branch of learning is unfortunately neither fish nor fowl. I took economics as my major in college and everywhere found an attempt being made to lend the subject an exactitude possible only with the physical sciences. This cannot be done because, after all, any social science deals with the interrelationship between people, who are influenced not so much by exact mathematics, as they are by feelings, customs, and personal judgments.

Mr. Lowery fell into the trap of allowing his personal economic convictions, based on a nebulous mistrust of private business and our free enterprise system, slop over to an alarming degree into what should have been a factual study of the Industrial News Review. I don't want to get into an ideological discussion. We are convinced that we can have political freedom and a representative form of government only by keeping the economic activity of the country in the hands of private citizens rather than government bodies. This has been proven often by the experiences of countless civilized societies through thousands of years of recorded history.

We feel strongly the importance of getting this idea before people generally in every part of the country. That's the only reason we're in this business. Any one of us could make as much or more money running a feed and seed store, or a grocery store, or selling automobiles, or any of a number of things that are purely commercial. I believe some of the economics books call it "psychic income." A person likes to be connected with an activity which he feels has some meaning or importance. That's probably why you are in the field of education.

There is one thing that we would like Mr. Lowery to understand, and that is that the material which we sent him, and which he should have made some effort to understand, gave as true a statement of our intentions and picture of our business as it was possible to give. Our editorial policy is not decided by the size of anybody's check. We discuss subjects which we believe are of importance to the country, and our editorial support cannot be bought like a half page advertisement any more than can editorial space in the newspapers with which we work. We turn down a great many subjects which simply do not fit our policy. Industries provide the support for our work, but industry does not tell us what to write. You or Mr. Lowery, or any editor in the country are more than welcome to come into our office any time and learn about any aspect of our publication in which you are interested. We have no secrets.

We do not like to have the integrity of the Industrial News Review questioned even by an uninformed person, but we never quarrel with anyone for disagreeing with our views. A divergence of opinion is a good thing. After all, a good rousing disagreement is what got this country started in the first place. I would suggest to Mr. Lowery, however, that he give the benefit of the doubt to any person whose intentions and basic integrity he sets out to judge. If he ever runs a newspaper he will soon find there would be no free press without private enterprise to support it—government in business furnishes no business for newspapers.

We have removed your name from our mailing list as requested.

Very truly yours,

L. V. Hofer.

May 16, 1955.

Mr. L. V. Hofer,
Industrial News Review,
Portland, Oreg.:

This morning, with great interest, I read your letter to Mr. A. Gayle Waldrop concerning my report on the Industrial News Review in Colorado.

To begin with, I agree with you on one point. The report was not as good as it should have been. When I first began the study, I pictured the end result as being a polished, smartly written piece reflecting tremendous effort and a great amount of cautious analyzing, balancing, and the presentation of the facts. Although quite a bit of effort did actually go into the report, the facts would not allow themselves to be balanced, and the report came out saying two things: (1) A majority of Colorado editors do not appreciate the Industrial News Review, and (2) through careful study of your releases, neither do I.

Now, on to the next point. One of the basic elements of any new concept or undertaking is constructive criticism. I appreciated your criticism of the report, although I did not consider it to be too constructive. Now, in the same vein, I would like to criticize your criticism.

1. In your letter, you stated the report was influenced by my "personal convictions, based on a nebulous mistrust of private business and our free enterprise system." Am I to assume then, that I am a misty, but budding Socialist?

My only answer to this point is that I have a faith in private business, and an admiration for free enterprise just as strong as you, or any other person in these United States.

If my report was prejudiced, or influenced to any degree, it probably stemmed from the reading of your releases, the research I did into your service, and the replies from the editors of Colorado newspapers—a very sincere and sensible lot, for the most part.

2. As to the factual content of the paper, you will find it quite valid. If there is any prejudice in the report, it is in the 38 lines (of a 10-page report) where I commented on the wording and structure of your editorials.

3. In your paragraph concerning your editorial policy and finances, I might point to one sentence which was a very nice understatement. Industry might not tell you what to write, Mr. Hofer, but I'm sure you won't, and never have, "bitten the hand that feeds you" by criticizing some phase of industry. And I'm sure that you, as an economics major, will admit there are many phases of industry that need criticism.

4. This fourth point is not a criticism, but a question: When the study was first proposed, just what did you expect the results to be?

I hope this letter will clear up a few misconceptions you have evidently drawn from the report. I will readily admit that I greatly lack experience in the field of gathering and preparing such reports, but as you say, Mr. Hofer, I expect the benefit of the doubt when my intentions and basic integrity are judged.

Denny Lowery.

Grand Junction, Colo.

BEHOLD THE GRASSROOTS PRESS, ALAS

(By Ben H. Bagdikian)

(Note.—For a modest fee, you can put your message on the editorial page of hundreds of newspapers—because smalltown publishers are surprisingly willing to turn their editorial columns over to the press agents.)

The unperishing myth of American journalism is the ideal of the smalltown newspaper as the grassroots opinionmaker of the Nation, the last bastion of personal journalism, the final arena where a single human being can mold a community with his convictions and fearless iconoclasm.

Needless to say, there are some small papers like this and they are marvels to behold. But the fact is that most small dailies and weeklies are the backyard of the trade, repositories for any piece of journalistic junk tossed over the fence, run as often by printshop proprietors as by editors. Mostly they serve as useful bulletin boards of births, deaths, and marriages (providing this news comes in by its own initiative); only in exceptional cases do they raise and resolve important local issues. When it comes to transmitting signals from the outside world, a remarkable number of these papers convey pure—that is, unadulterated—press agentry. Its subject matter, which is printed both as news and as editorial comment, ranges from mouthwash to politics—usually rightwing.

Few readers realize that the publicity pipelines supplying the small papers are numerous, gushing, and free. A dozen large syndicates provide such material without charge to local papers, sometimes in printed or mimeographed form but more often in mats, the pressed cardboard molds into which hot type metal is poured to reproduce pictures and texts cheaply. These syndicates make their money by charging a fee to the propagandists who have something to sell. Some businesses and other organizations bypass the syndicates and send out their own canned goods to be reproduced as local products.

For the past 3 years the National Association of Manufacturers has sent out editorials which have been picked up, usually verbatim, by 600 daily newspapers, most often without attribution to the NAM as source. The AFL–CIO sends out its material, too, but with far less success. In 1962 medicare was the subject of a syndicated and boilerplate battle, with a volunteer promedicare group sending out through a commercial syndicate (at a cost of about $15,000) canned material, some of it from officials of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. In response, the American Medical Association used the usual syndicate channels, plus three articles that it sent to local medical affiliates, which presented them personally to their local papers. The fight still goes on. Within the last few months, antimedicare editorials have appeared with miraculous similarity in widely separated places. Last May and June, for example, newspapers in South Carolina, Montana, and Michigan all ran editorials beginning, "Remember the medicare proposal of the Kennedy administration? It got nowhere."

But there is nothing like a political balance in the battle of boilerplate. In 1962 the American Press, a trade magazine for small dailies and weeklies, polled a cross section of such papers and found that 84 percent opposed any Government-sponsored medical or hospital aid to the aged, were strongly opposed to Federal aid to education, and were generally found in the rightwing Republican camp. The vast body of opinion picked up word-for-word by small papers is either strictly commercial or ultraconservative.

The reader, of course, is almost never told that he is seeing something other than the considered product of his local editor.

Look at the vision of the hard-fighting small-town editor, working late at night, his green eyeshade low, his fingers spasmodically attacking the typewriter, his mind anticipating the angry reaction to his words by people he will have to face in the street, but deciding it is his moral duty to speak his mind. But behold what happens more often. The man is at his desk, all right, but if it is a very small paper, the editor is also the owner, ad salesman, and mailer. And he is not processing issues and words through his mind. He has before him a dummy of page 2—the girdle ad on the right, the tractor ad on the left, the annual American Legion carnival stepped between them, and 9 inches of remaining space reserved for news. It is not his mind that is creating and discriminating for this space. It is more likely his right hand, fishing through the purple mats and yellow mimeographed canned editorials in his lower drawer, feeling for one exactly 9 column-inches long. Depending on the fortuitous length and the luck of his fingers, what will triumph on page 2 the next day may be an article proclaiming the virtues of prune juice for regularity (compliments of the prune industry) or an editorial condemning labor unions (compliments of a conservative lobby). This is not to say that the local editor disagrees with the prune juice or the social doctrine; one must assume that he does not. But the thrifty transmitter of the precast words of a public-relations man in Chicago who happened to plug his product in exactly 9 inches somehow seems disappointing as the hero figure of American journalism.

A FRIENDLY FAMILY BUSINESS

One of the commercial conduits for the canned editorial, but not the largest, is the U.S. Press Association, Inc., which has a cosmic sound enhanced by the parenthetical note next to its address: 12 miles from the White House. But it is a friendly family business run by a pleasant couple in McLean, Va. Mr. and Mrs. Robert Nelson Taylor will take your words and ideas, if they approve of them, and $175 of your money, and send your editorial message, free of charge, to 1,199 weeklies and 150 dailies. The Taylors don't hide from the local editor that he is getting conservative editorials that someone else has paid for. A standing box on top of the weekly batch of editorials says:

"This regular, comprehensive service is made possible by responsible American business institutions who pay an established fee to present timely business stories of free enterprise to grassroots Americans, 'the most influential people in the world.' Clients do not dictate policy * * *. Our opinions remain our own. (The Taylors' devotion to old-fashioned capitalism includes unashamed deployment of capital letters.)"

In a brochure inviting clients to buy its service, U.S. Press offers them a measure of freedom of opinion: "Easy to use * * *. Just give us your story, in conference or by mail or phone. We do the work: We write your editorial unless you want to. If we write it, or edit your copy, you have final OK."

Among customers listed by the Taylors as having bought or written editorials distributed by U.S. Press since June 1, 1951, are some of the leading corporations in the country, plus such lobbying or special-interest groups as the American Bankers Association, American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, American Legion, American Petroleum Institute, Bookmailer, Bourbon Institute, National Association of Manufacturers, and the Right To Work Committee.

Messages paid for or written by such groups go out under the masthead of U.S. Press Association, Inc., and typically are picked up by about 200 papers, each one run as the local paper's own opinion, usually on its editorial page. Mr. Taylor says he never tells the newspaper who paid for the editorial and this makes for an interesting guessing game. One mailing by U.S. Press last year, for example, included an editorial vigorously backing the railroad position in favor of enforced arbitration of its dispute with railroad unions. It called on Congress to make "arbitration compulsory." U.S. Press lists the Association of American Railroads as a paying client.

Other editorials in the same mailing:

1. Urged readers to watch a particular TV comedy program, noting that the hero gets the hilarious point of the plot "as will every viewer who has ever heard of a Purolator filter." (U.S. Press lists Purolator as a client.)

2. Praised the steel industry and said it was incorrect to assume that the price of steel is rising. (Among clients listed by U.S. Press are American Iron and Steel Institute, and United States Steel.)

3. Plugged Barry Goldwater and Brig. Gen. Bonner Fellers, head of the isolationist right-wing for America group.

Much of U.S. Press has been so fervently pro-Goldwater for so long that it was natural for it to print zealous pieces for their man before the Republican Convention, though it is not evident who paid for them. Taylor says he takes no money from political parties. In the usual accompanying editorial note to the July 14 mailing just before the Republican Convention, U.S. Press Editor Taylor quotes a favorite source, Adm. Ben Moreell, chairman of the ultraconservative Americans for Constitutional Action, denouncing Gov. William Scranton, of Pennsylvania, as "this brash young man." This was lavish praise compared to the quoted descriptions of the Johnson administration: " 'umbrella-squad' of native appeasers, peace-at-any-price champions (and) 'better Red than dead' zealots." The paid-for editorials have regularly boosted Goldwater and attacked his opponents. On July 7 an editorial said the anti-Goldwater forces in the GOP were trying to nominate a "moderate (the new word for left wing)." It ascribed this conspiracy to "Governor Scranton, backed up by his mysterious and affluent backer-uppers." In the same mailing there was another pro-Goldwater editorial entitled, "The Scranton 'Image.' " (Mr. Taylor likes interior quotes as well as capital letters.) Leaden with heavy sarcasm, it described Scranton as "a Governor of some eastern State, Pennsylvania, we believe * * * the man whom Dr. Milton Eisenhower (that's the general's eastern brother) will be explaining to the convention." (Mr. Taylor, who seems to dislike things eastern, lives and works in McLean, Va., a suburb of Washington, D.C., "out where the West begins.")

Some of U.S. Press editorials written by or for foreign clients came to the attention of Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT when he investigated the action of foreign agents last year. U.S. Press, for example, carried fervent pro-Trujillo articles paid for with Dominican money while Rafael Trujillo was dictator. One such editorial was called "Trujillo's First 'Era,' " and it said, "Today the Dominican Republic * * * is a bulwark of strength against communism and has been widely cited as one of the cleanest, healthiest, happiest countries on the globe. Guiding spirit of this fabulous transformation is Generalissimo Trujillo who worked tirelessly."

HOW NAIVE IS THE EDITOR?

Another editorial paid for by Dominican money urged readers to buy a book written by Dona Maria Martinez Trujillo, wife of the fabulous four-time President of the Dominican Republic. This U.S. Press editorial was picked up by papers in Zanesville, Ohio; Montpelier, Vt.; Beaver Falls, Pa.; Germantown, Ohio; Middletown, Del.; Calais, Maine; and Deming, N. Mex., among others.

In 1961, U.S. Press Association received $175 from the American public-relations firm, Selvage & Lee, which, acting for Portuguese principals to defend Portuguese colonial policy in Africa, hired U.S. Press to send out an editorial called "How To Woo the Communists." When Mr. Taylor was told by Senator FULBRIGHT that Selvage & Lee had received—for expenses and fees—in excess of $250,000 for its Portuguese propagandizing, the elderly man looked shocked. "I think our fees are too low," he said.

Mr. Taylor told Senator FULBRIGHT he was paid by the Netherlands Government to run an editorial praising the character of a visiting Dutch princess. "I did not meet her, unfortunately," Mr. Taylor said, "but I believe I was telling the truth." Mr. Taylor looked relieved when a Senator said he had met the Princess and she seemed to be a nice girl. Later, the editor of U.S. Press told me, "I never send out anything I do not think is good for the United States or that I think is not so." Senator FULBRIGHT obviously took a dim view of U.S. Press' editorial activities on behalf of unnamed clients. (Possibly the Senator was stung by Taylor's casual disclosure that the FULBRIGHT's own family paper in Fayetteville, Ark., had used U.S. Press editorials.) How, the Senator asked, could a local editor know that a paid propagandist, Selvage & Lee, had written the pro-Portuguese editorial?

"I think you are disparaging the judgment and keenness of the great American newspaper editor," Mr. Taylor said.

"I just want to say I don't see how you can possibly expect them to know that this editorial was written by Selvage & Lee," the Senator insisted.

"I don't intend for them to know that, frankly," Taylor replied.

Samuel Bledsoe, a Selvage & Lee official, sounded more realistic when he said, "I think it is pretty well known to anybody who is not naive that some interest is paying for it. The people who print it. They know that they are getting it free. They are not so naive."

Naive or not, the newspaper editor who receives such free editorials would have to be extraordinarily dense not to know that it was paid-for ax grinding. When U.S. Press, for example, distributed an editorial, as it did, urging the use of reflectorized tape on automobile bumpers as a safety measure, the editor does not have to know that one of U.S. Press' clients is Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing, makers of reflectorized tape, to suspect that someone is making a commercial pitch. While it is not unknown for a newspaper editor to be extraordinarily dense, it is more likely that he recognizes the press agentry but doesn't care because it is a cheap and agreeable way to fill space.

WHAT IT COSTS THE READER

The result is that almost any private citizen or special group can buy his way into the editorial columns of smaller papers with relative ease and low cost. In the process the reader loses his major protection against manipulated news—the professional journalist.

If you were a reader of the Uniontown, Pa., Independent for April 18, 1963, a weekly of about 2,000 circulation, you would have seen a column called "About Your Health." It seemed to be a syndicated news feature with a standing logotype of a silhouetted microscope. The author was Dr. R. I. Schattner, whose picture appeared in the text. The subject for the day was "Vacant Smiles," in which Dr. Schattner wrote that 22 million Americans are "without a single natural tooth" and that the major cause of this toothlessness is gum disease and the major cause of that is tartar. "However," the good doctor wrote, "tartar can be coped with * * *. During treatment, Chloraseptic Mouthwash is an excellent topical anesthetic for controlling soreness in these tender gum conditions. This nonprescriptive medication also may be used as an antiseptic to maintain good oral hygiene."

It is no derogation of Chloraseptic Mouthwash (which has received admiring clinical reports) to report that at that time it was owned by Dr. Schattner who had invented, promoted, and was selling it. He is an intelligent, ambitious, and engaging man, a resident of Washington, D.C., who sees the public relations-news syndrome in American newspapering far more clearly than do many practitioners and professors of journalism. His column on "Vacant Smiles" appeared in about 200 papers, thanks to a strictly cash arrangement. Dr. Schattner told me:

"I paid a commercial artist about $25 to draw that microscope logotype and then I paid Derus Media Service in Chicago a little under $300 to distribute the whole thing in mat form to 1,800 weeklies and dailies. We checked placement by using a clipping service: 200 papers picked it up, so it cost me $300. If I had run it as an ad in the same papers I figure it would have cost at least 10 times as much. But as a health column or as news, it isn't advertising which would offend some professional codes, and it's much more effective."

Early this year the Wall Street Journal reported that Dr. Schattner sold Chloraseptic Mouthwash to Norwich Pharmacal Co. for more than $4 million.

Large newspapers are not safe from this flood of unfiltered propaganda. Their own processing of news and editorials is usually more professional, and while the public-relations syndicates get through with successful penetrations from time to time, the mechanical use of canned material tends to be limited in the metropolitan press to special pages like women, finance, travel, and real estate. The great, gorgeous photographs of cottage-cheese delight or tunafish pizza that are the standardized centerpieces for household pages are provided free by the companies selling the goods in the picture. If it is a color photograph, it is almost a certainty that the food company provided the expensive color separations. The glowing travel articles in some of the greatest papers show up word for word—all taken from a publicity release—in still other, otherwise great papers. In such papers, the chief difference from small papers—other than the concentration in special sections—is that the photos and text are engraved and typeset by the local newspaper, rather than being reproduced from mats. Big papers usually have unions which reject the use of mats.

For the earnest, openhearted believer in the editor as the unsleeping guardian of every inch of news and editorial space, it is a shock to look at the scrapbooks of clippings compiled by the public-relations firms. The scrapbooks are important to the process. Some cynics insist that the canned editorials and commercial pluggery have little effect on sales or persuasion and that their chief function is to fill the scrapbooks which the public-relations operators then show the clients as proof that the clients ought to continue.

This explains why most of this press agentry is plainly marked for those who know what to look for. In many photographs and cartoon features there is a symbol printed in a corner. "K," for example, means Central Feature News, which distributes free cartoons and food pictures; it also uses a small "f" for its printed features. "MS" appears on material from Master Syndicate, which has distributed, noncommittally, medicare, AFL–CIO, and pro-Nixon copy. "Z" is for Editors Syndicate, "G" for Precis, "FM" for Fred Morris Associates, and so forth. The symbol serves as a signal to the commercial clipping services which daily scan every paper in the country and compile the clippings for scrapbooks by which the syndicates and PR men keep score. There are times when an ideological point would be stronger if the lobbying group kept its name out of the canned editorial, but it is often put in nonetheless so that the clipping-service reader can pick up the key words when the time comes to see how well the distribution worked.

It may be that commercial pluggery is relatively ineffective except for convincing the propagandists themselves. But it is hard to dismiss it all. Even if the charge were true, it would put the newspapers in the position of giving away what they ought to sell, advertising space. More important, such irresponsible editing helps destroy in the minds both of the advertisers and the readers the crucial distinction by which the American press lives—the difference between news and advertising.

A PERVERSE RULE

The political effect of canned rightwing messages is not easily measured. For one thing, they appear mostly in rural areas, which tend to be conservative anyway. And, undoubtedly, most editors who put such material in their papers agree with it; perhaps, left to their own devices, they would write the same kind of pieces. But there is a profound difference between the identical NAM editorial appearing in 600 newspapers and 600 local editors thinking and writing about what the NAM has to say. The effect of the canned editorial is to make more rigid what is already a limited political and intellectual environment and to inhibit the individualistic responses which defenders of the rural life say they value.

Because rural papers have a disproportionate political impact and because they happen to be the major carriers of canned opinion, we are confronted with a perverse rule: The smaller the newspaper, the greater its relative influence in national politics.

There are 435 congressional districts in the country, and in this year's 88th Congress, 203 of these, 46 percent, were rural districts. Our population is at least 70 percent urban. In many of these rural congressional districts the leading paper is a small one, in 106 of them the leading paper has less than 10,000 circulation. In 12 of them the only paper is a weekly. To imply that a small circulation automatically means surrender to boilerplate is unfair to a number of small dailies and weeklies which, whatever their politics, are plainly the product of diligent personal editorship, and precisely in those places where this takes courage because the editor does literally have to face his readers on the street. But no one can look at the common run of small papers—and at the collected rightwing opinion which they mechanically reproduce—without being appalled at the standardized puffery that floods the countryside.

The Member of Congress almost never ignores what the small papers in his district say. For one thing, he may be interested in what the editor thinks is important. For another, he wants to know what is going into his constituents' heads. It is irrelevant to the Congressman that the editorial may be a canned one written by a paid propagandist in New York or Chicago or Indianapolis. He knows that, whoever paid for it or wrote it, when it appears in a leading paper in his district it has helped establish the political norm among his constituents.

So behold the small-town editor. He may be a conscientious journalist and community leader who thinks out issues for himself and writes what he thinks. Let the record show, futilely, no doubt, that this writer knows such men exist; some of his best friends are creative and courageous small-town editors. But beware that the grassroots winnower of great issues may not be the thinking editorial mind, but the circling editorial hand, feeling in the lower drawer for the bit of prefabricated politics and pluggery that happens to fit, in inches and ideology, that sacred interstice for which all newspaperdom is supposed to exist: the space between the ads.

RELATION BETWEEN WEST GERMANY AND ISRAEL

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, I read with great interest the remarks of the distinguished minority leader, Senator DIRKSEN, relative to the relationships between the Federal Republic of West Germany and the Republic of Israel which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 25—pages 5863 to 5868. I would like to associate myself with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and especially the minority leader, in paying tribute to Chancellor Erhard of the Federal Republic of Germany and Prime Minister Eshkol of Israel for their high statesmanship and firm policy in defying the tactics of Nasser and finally establishing diplomatic relations between their two free nations, both loyal and trusted allies of the United States.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert after my remarks the following articles relating to this matter: the New York Times, March 31, article entitled, "Germans and Nazi Trials," the Herald Tribune, March 31, article "Erhard Vows Drive Against Nazis," and the Washington Post, March 29, editorial, "Paying a War Debt."

The 8th of May will be the 20th anniversary of the enslavement of 17 million Germans who live behind the Berlin wall. The Atlantic Charter guarantees all people self-determination. We have sacrificed our men on the battlefield to help to bring freedom to this world, and I recall with deep emotions the speech delivered by the late President Kennedy in front of the Berlin wall, and statements by President Johnson, assuring the German people that we will not rest until the Berlin wall is broken down and until the German people are reunited as a free democratic nation. We have witnessed in Korea and South Vietnam what it means to fight for freedom. We will never have to witness such a tragedy between the two parts of Germany, as the Germans behind the wall are praying daily to be reunited with their own countrymen, as they have experienced communism firsthand, and are longing for the day when the commitment will be carried out that they are free again and part of their own country. Just think of it, Mr. President, it is already 20 years, and a new generation has come into being in the Federal Republic completely democratically inclined—a country that was built from ashes with our help and the help of our allies under the brilliant leadership of former Chancellor Adenauer and his distinguished successor, Chancellor Erhard, with the help of all our allies and the help of all the German political parties.

I think it is important for us to recognize who the man is that Moscow has imposed on the German people behind the Berlin wall as their boss and dictator. He is an old Stalinist, Walter Ulbricht, and I believe it important that we and all the free world keep in mind that 17 million people who want to be free still live under the yoke of the old Stalin creation. I pray that it will not be long and that this matter can be settled peacefully and through negotiations. The Soviet Union was a party to the four power agreement, and must be reminded to carry out its bargain. Without the help of the United States, the blood we shed and the equipment we provided during World War II, the Soviet Union, too, could well have been enslaved completely under Hitler.

The President of the United States has repeatedly pleaded for peace. He, like all of us, abhors war, and warlike action. Therefore, the United States must be strong, remain strong, in order to keep peace. While our present attention is with the situation in the Far East and South Vietnam, let us not overlook our commitment to our loyal allies. The Federal Republic has carried out its commitment now to Israel and has also extended the statute of limitations against Nazi murderers in order to find all the criminals who were tools, executioners and terrorists of Hitler and brought so much tragedy to the free world.

I, too, want to join the minority leader in paying tribute to American Jewry, which played a historical part in its restraint on this problem. I know when the day comes that the German Ambassador reports to the President of Israel to present his credentials, and the Israeli Ambassador arrives in Bonn to present his credentials to the President of the Federal Republic, it will be a day in which not only all free nations will rejoice, but especially our countrymen of German ancestry and Jewish faith.

I am glad that the minority leader has made available to us his documentation and analysis of this great historical event. In the days ahead I hope that many Members of Congress will take the floor to remind the free world that the fight is not over until every man is free and the people behind the wall have again become citizens of their own country, the Federal Republic of Germany.

Last week distinguished professors from American and European universities and renowned statesmen and members of the European parliaments had a 3-day conference in Chicago, sponsored by the Foundation for Foreign Affairs, Inc. At this conference Dr. Axel Seeberg, editor in chief of the Soontagsblatt, Hamburg, who ranks as one of the world's great foreign affairs editors, delivered several lectures to this distinguished audience on the reunification of Germany. I ask unanimous consent that a summary of his lectures be inserted here in the RECORD so we all have the benefit of his penetrating analysis of the situation.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Mar. 29, 1965]

PAYING A WAR DEBT

The crimes committed by the Nazi regime continue to haunt the politics of West Germany. By extending the period for 5 years in which war crimes can be prosecuted, the Bundestag has shown a decent respect for world opinion even though the decision will be unpopular with many Germans. Under existing laws, no new prosecutions for war crimes are possible after May 6—the 20th anniversary of the German surrender. The bill which the Government is expected to approve changes the base year for the 20-year statute of limitations to 1949, when the Allied occupation regime formally came to an end.

Chancellor Erhard's decision to favor extension is causing him political problems. A dissenting Minister of Justice, Ewald Bucher, is resigning. Mr. Bucher is a Free Democrat, and the Chancellor needs his party's votes to command a majority in Parliament. It is considered unlikely that any other Free Democrat would agree to serve as Minister of Justice and sign a bill that is opposed by his party.

Yet Mr. Erhard can have the satisfaction of being on the right side of the controversy. The Nazi crimes were unique in their horror and unparalleled in magnitude during this century. To argue that extension of the statute of limitations is somewhat comparable with Hitler's own infringements on basic laws is to contend that the excesses of Nazism provide an argument for allowing Nazi murderers to escape punishment. It would be highly disquieting if misplaced devotion to the letter of the law led Germany to exempt from prosecution those involved in systematic extermination of millions of people.

Five years is a minimum period of extension, and the problem will arise again in the future. But for the moment Chancellor Erhard and his supporters in the Bundestag have made an important payment on Germany's enduring war debt.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 31, 1965]

GERMANS AND NAZI TRIALS: PEOPLE BELIEVE THAT THE NEW GERMANY IS BEING MADE TO PAY FOR SINS OF OLD

(By Arthur J. Olsen)

BONN, March 30.—Shortly after the West German Parliament approved extension of the statutory deadline for the prosecution of Nazi criminals, a television commentator sarcastically suggested the unpopularity of the move.

"I should like to express the thanks of the German people to the members of Parliament for the high level of the debate, and to the people of Tel Aviv and New York who made it possible," he said.

The commentator pointed up the feeling that the extension bill was enacted under heavy pressure from abroad.

In one opinion poll 73 percent of the women and 65 percent of the men approached replied "yes" to the question: "Do you think prosecutions of Nazi criminals should be brought to an end?"

The small Free Democratic Party, whose strategists have decided to seek electoral fortune this year in an appeal to the nationalists' vote, took this and similar opinion studies at face value.

This was the basis of the Free Democrats' decision to oppose dramatically any extension of the hunt for Nazi criminals.

BONN NOT ENTHUSIASTIC

It is by no means certain that the small party's position will assist its struggle for survival. It is clear that the West German Government took one of the major moral decisions of its brief history without enthusiasm.

Did this action mask a lingering sympathy for the gray-haired men and women who are marching to the dock in courtrooms all over the Republic? Do West Germans today privately repudiate their formal repudiation of Germany's Nazi heritage?

Barring the insignificant right radical fringe—1 or 2 adult citizens out of 100—this is patently not so. Rarely is a voice raised in defense of the accused—even of the group of elderly nurses who explained to a Munich court that they had given lethal injections to mental patients because Herr Doktor had assured them that it was not only legal but merciful to do so.

West Germans recoil from the repetitive trials today because they feel that the new Germany is being made to pay for the sins of the old.

For the ordinary citizen, who does not identify with the ex-Nazi defendants, these trials mean first of all a raking over of the vanished past to the injury of the painstakingly built reputation of post-Nazi Germany.

West German Army conscripts, not yet born in the Hitler era, were met on a NATO exercise in Denmark this month with protest demonstrations and cries of "Nazi!" Reading about it back home, their fathers think it would not have happened if the trials had not freshened old memories.

OTHER EFFECTS OF TRIALS

The trials also tend to exacerbate a problem of generations ("What did you do during the war, father?") And they offer the country's extreme right an opportunity to hitch its kite to a potentially broad-based resentment.

Many a citizen, holding no brief whatever for the man in the dock, honestly believes it is healthier for the new Germany to "close the books." Most of all, he believes it is time for the world to let the German people off probation.

"When you consider Germany's history as a whole, we as a nation have nothing to be ashamed of," said Chancellor Erhard in a recent speech in Berlin.

"The German people have again become somebody," he told a Christian Democratic Party rally Sunday.

But Dr. Eugen Gerstenmaier, the President of the Bundestag, said the next day that this was not yet quite so.

"German policy in the West must take into account a continuing reserve and inner aloofness, even if it be politely veiled," he said.

Not a few West Germans, as judged from letters to the editor and afterhours discussions in bars, react to their continuing "probationary" status with a sense of injustice.

Germans were the victims as well as the perpetrators in the savagery surrounding World War II, they say. Who is wringing his hands over the unpunished murderers in Eastern Europe, for example? they ask.

Despite the side effects of the trials of Nazis and the wish that it all could be consigned to history, West Germany has decided to go forward with the Nazi hunt and the prosecutions for at least almost 5 years more.

This was the achievement of a group of West Germans that is very probably a numerical minority—older persons of conscience and a younger generation that insists on "mastering the past."

A little-noticed fact of perhaps equal significance is that only a much smaller minority found a voice to raise in protest.

[From the New York Herald Tribune, Mar. 31, 1965]

ERHARD VOWS DRIVE AGAINST NAZIS

DUESSELDORF, GERMANY.—Chancellor Ludwig Erhard yesterday assured an American Jewish leader that there will be no letup in West Germany's effort to bring to justice Nazis guilty of crimes against the Jews.

Mr. Erhard made the pledge to Rabbi Joachim Prinz, president of the American Jewish Congress and chairman of the conference of presidents of major American Jewish organizations.

Rabbi Prinz told newsmen later that he had "full confidence" in Mr. Erhard's assurances.

A Bonn spokesman said Mr. Erhard stressed to Rabbi Prinz that West Germany will "firmly and conscientiously continue its efforts to investigate the crimes against the

Jews during the Nazi dictatorial era and bring the guilty to justice."

He said Parliament's recent vote to extend the statute of limitations on Nazi murders from this May 8 to January 1, 1970 was discussed "within the framework of general problems of common interest" by Mr. Erhard and Rabbi Prinz in talks at a Duesseldorf hotel.

Rabbi Prinz came here from West Berlin where he was the guest or Mayor Willy Brandt and the city government.

Rabbi Prinz told a news conference that Mr. Erhard "impresses me as a man of deepest convictions who stands by his word and belief. One can trust him."

Rabbi Prinz said he "regretted to have to report my impression that too few Germans take an interest in politics * * * West Germans strike me as generally too well-fed and complacent."

But he said students he talked to at West Berlin's Free University "show there are still young people who express themselves freshly and critically." He said he received many "sympathetic and interesting" letters from all parts of the country during his visit. One, Rabbi Prinz told newsmen, was "anti-Semitic in content." It was unsigned.

The Hopes and Fears of German Reunification

(By Dr. Axel Seeberg, Sonntagsblatt, Hamburg)

SUMMARY

(The following summary contains an abridgement of parts 1, 2, and 3 of Dr. Seeberg's lecture. Part 4, concerned with the division of Germany as an aspect of German politics, is given in full. Part 5, dealing with the Soviet attitude toward the German question, is again abridged, while the concluding section on possible solutions of the German question is again given in full.)

The remarks to follow constitute the personal observations and opinions of the speaker. As a German, he cannot avoid a feeling of involvement in many respects; an involvement that cannot be suppressed in describing or judging specific problems. There are a number of moral approaches to the German problem. One such approach that has been relatively little discussed lies in the attempt by the rulers of the Soviet zone to bring about a systematic transformation of human consciousness, against the will of the individuals concerned. It is the speaker's conviction that such attempts to manipulate human personality belong among the gravest crimes against humanity, and are little better than the physical destruction of human beings. This judgment is based on the fact that the distinguishing feature of human personality is spiritual existence.

The second part of the presentation deals with the division of Germany and with efforts to reunite that country, with special reference to factors that endanger world peace. The speaker considers the division of Germany dangerous because it is based on a vacuum in the center of Europe. So long as this vacuum is not filled by a relatively powerful state, the continued presence of Soviet troops in the eastern part of Germany and Western troops in West Germany will be inevitable, the function of each force being to prevent the other from occupying the rest of Germany. This situation results in the immediate confrontation of Western and Soviet troops, so that every incident involves the danger of an immediate warlike encounter of Western and Eastern troops. It is an illusion to believe that relaxation alone, without German reunification, can effectively change this situation. The objection sometimes raised in Eastern quarters, that efforts to achieve reunification disturb the laboriously maintained world balance of power and thus endanger peace, has no basis in fact. It is clearly far less dangerous to seek a controlled reunification through a common policy of the four responsible world powers than it is to leave things to the spontaneous turbulent course of history.

The foreign policy of the German Federal Republic seeks the following objectives: Security for the Federal Republic; maintenance of world peace; European unification; and German reunification.

Because of moral considerations, because of popular desire for a policy of peace, and because it recognizes the limitations of the German power potential, the Government of the Federal Republic has renounced any aspirations toward world power. In this respect, it has set its goals lower than those of the Kaiser's Germany or National Socialist Germany. This fact is reflected in the German renunciation of atomic weapons. The German abandonment of claims to world power has its effects, both in shaping the specific goals of reunification, and in the choice of means to achieve them.

During the first 10 years of its existence, the Federal Republic accorded security a certain priority over the other goals. After a degree of military balance and the resulting security had been achieved through NATO, the European and German goals assumed a more prominent position. The overtly nationalist policy of President De Gaulle in Common Market negotiations has resulted in the strengthening of public support for national political goals within the Federal Republic. Reunification, however, never has been and is not now the only foreign-policy goal of the Federal Republic. The goal of reunification and the other goals of German foreign policy exert significant mutual influences on each other.

The following arguments are advanced in Germany to support efforts toward reunification:

The sundering of human ties is unbearable; the unity of Germany corresponds to the general national structure of States throughout the world, especially in Europe, and most particularly in Eastern Europe. The will for reunification therefore a natural, spontaneous, and elementary phenomenon; denial of German unity violates the principle of democratic self-determination;

Only German reunification can lead to genuine relaxation and thus to permanent peace;

Reunification will reduce the danger of a bolshevisation of Europe;

The reunification policy of the German Federal Government is expressly recognized by the Western Powers in the general agreement of 1954, and accepted as a goal of Western policy.

Various arguments against German reunification are advanced by the governments, Communist parties, and certain sectors of the population in Eastern bloc States. Analogous arguments are heard in the West from certain sectors of public opinion.

One line of argument commonly heard in the East admits the possibility of German reunification in principle, but attempts to eliminate it as a subject of quadripartite negotiation and thus to hamper reunification altogether by focusing attention on the establishment of two German partial states, which are supposed to negotiate with each other. Another argument is that reunification is impossible in any case because of the different political structure of the "two German states." It is sometimes contended that reunification can take place only when the "socialist achievements" of the German Democratic Republic (Soviet Zone) are extended to all Germany. Every now and then a limited demilitarization of Germany is mentioned as a prerequisite for reunification. One argument that is not encountered is that a new popular consciousness, that is to say a new nation, has arisen in the Soviet Zone.

Among the arguments against German reunification heard in the West is the contention that it cannot be realized because of Russian objection. In the interest of general relaxation of tensions, therefore, the demand must be set aside. It is also argued that the German people does not strongly desire reunification, and that a new national consciousness is emerging in the Soviet Zone. Still another argument is that a reunited Germany could not be integrated into the Western military system and would therefore destroy Western security. Some argue that considerations of security would lead a reunited Germany to follow a policy of military strength that would involve it once more in the quest for world power. Finally, it is argued, that a reunited Germany would, through its size and strength, exercise a natural hegemony within the European Economic Community. Such a development would either make European unification impossible, or lead to its abuse by Germany.

So far as the attitude of the German people and the alleged new national consciousness in the Soviet Zone are concerned, these objections are without any foundation. In assessing popular movements, it is never to be expected that they will involve all people to the same degree. The test is rather that of mass resonance to goals actively promoted by relatively small elites. Resonance to the movement for German unification is clear and generally positive in both parts of Germany. Only the small minority of convinced Communists rejects unification, and they are by no means unanimous about it.

There is no difference in the opinions of political parties, religions, or sociological groups in West Germany concerning the desirability of German reunification. In the Soviet Zone, it is theoretically possible that a new national consciousness might some day emerge. Such processes tend, however, to last several generations, especially when they have to overcome traditional forms of political awareness. Because the Soviet Zone is closely linked to current happenings in West Germany through the television, radio, and other media, the process of separatist political development would probably take longer than would have been the case in earlier centuries. At the present time the vast majority of the population in East Germany regard the Communists as tools of Soviet imperialism. A certain identification with the misery of the Soviet Zone may also be observed, but does not change this fundamental attitude.

Concerning the division of Germany as an aspect of Soviet foreign policy, the speaker points to two different sets of motives that guide the Kremlin in its foreign affairs. One set reflects traditional Russian imperialism within regional limits, and the other is an expression of Communist world-revolutionary politics. The two patterns are mutually interlocking. The importance of Russian national politics for the Communist Party derives from the fact that—in Europe at least—Russian imperialism has proved to be the single available means for spreading communism. In Moscow's East European vassal states, communism rests on the points of Soviet bayonets.

Since 1945, Soviet policy concerning Germany has manifested two different tendencies. At times, the Kremlin has sought to restore an all-German state. Its motive in doing so was the desire to head off the possible exploitation of the West German potential by the Western Powers. Since 1955 the Soviet Union, having recognized the failure of a policy based on reunification, has adopted the opposite policy. From then until the present time it has adhered to a policy of preventing reunification.

From the contemporary Soviet point of view, the following reasons militate against a reunification of Germany:

1. The possible deterioration of Russia's strategic position in Europe;

2. The danger that reunification would raise for communism in East-Central Europe;

3. Fear that a reunification would be regarded as a defeat for the Soviet Union and for communism in Europe; and

4. The pressure of world-revolutionary agitation by China.

A factor which might lead Soviet policy to look more kindly on the prospect of German reunification is the realization that neither the German people nor the Western Powers are prepared to abandon reunification as a long-range objective. Because of this, the Russian position in Eastern Germany is bound to collapse whenever Russia is shaken by a serious crisis. The Soviets might also consider that, because of the importance of the German Federal Republic with its 12 divisions for Western strategy, any attempt to achieve relaxation of world tensions through a Russian-Western arrangement without a solution of the German problem is certain to founder on the rock of German resistance. The Soviet Union could, on the other hand, achieve a far more rapid development of its economy by the reallocation of wasteful armament expenditures for productive purposes—a reallocation which a genuine solution of the German problem would make possible.

There is no doubt that contemporary Soviet foreign policy is dominated by negative considerations. The Soviets hope to overcome the Western Powers, the Federal Republic, and the resistance in the Soviet Zone through a policy of attrition. In concluding this section, the speaker warns against the false hope that the so-called liberalization in the Soviet Union will have any significant influence on the European policy of that state. Talks on relaxation of tensions are designed to achieve a consolidation of the position of the Soviet Union in central Europe combined with a reduction in armaments. They do not contemplate the liquidation of Soviet imperialism in that area.

In considering, finally, the possibilities of finding a solution to the German question, it is hardly necessary to observe that neither war nor the threat of war are acceptable means. Both are excluded by the realities of atomic warfare and the atomic pact. For this reason the strategy once contemplated by John Foster Dulles is no longer available. Aside from the possible exploitation of unpredictable events, such as a serious weakening of the Soviet Union, the only way to achieve reunification is through agreement of the four powers, who both formally and in fact are responsible for the German question. The Western Powers are definitely determined to achieve the goal of reunification. The Soviet Union has attempted since the mid-1950's to secure the abandonment of this goal. A change in the Soviet attitude is only conceivable if the interest of the Soviet Union in solving the problem can be aroused.

A Soviet interest in solving the German problem might emerge as a consequence of the Soviet desire for disarmament or arms limitation—a desire that is a matter of controversy in Soviet internal politics. It might conceivably be an attractive prospect for the Soviet Union to be able to employ its own economic potential for general development of the country—especially for internal consumption and as a tool of foreign policy to gain influence in Asia and Africa—rather than expending it on the armament of military divisions. With this thought in mind, the Kremlin might be led to accept the idea that disarmament must be accompanied by appropriate solutions of political problems, without which it remains impossible. Considerations of this kind formed the basis for the Herter plan, which contemplated the combination of gradual disarmament and a gradual solution of the German question. Pursuance of the plan was blocked by the Soviet hope to achieve disarmament or arms limitation without concessions on political matters, as well as by the change of Government in the United States.

SENATOR ANDERSON HONORED—BACKS RESOURCES COUNCIL PROPOSAL

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, on Friday evening, at its eighth biennial wilderness conference, the Sierra Club made the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] an honorary lifetime member—a recognition he very richly deserved. I take special pride in the brilliant career of the Senator from New Mexico, because he is a distinguished native son of South Dakota, and a graduate of my alma mater, Dakota Wesleyan University.

Among the numerous conservation measures which Senator ANDERSON has successfully sponsored in the past few years is the Wilderness Preservation Act. That act, which I was privileged to author as a Member of the House in 1957, is a historymaking document. It is the first time in world history that a nation has established a system of undisturbed, natural areas, to be preserved in their natural condition, for recreation, scientific, and cultural values.

The Senator from New Mexico was also the author of the bill, in 1958, which set up the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. It has led to the creation of a Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, establishment of a land and water conservation fund, and a major national movement to provide adequate recreational facilities for our citizens.

He is the author of a Water Resources Research Act, now in operation, which the Senate has voted to expand. He is the author of the river basin planning bill, S. 21, which the House of Representatives last week passed by a vote of 383 to 0, thus duplicating the Senate's unanimous approval. It will undoubtedly become law in a matter of weeks, for the differences between the House version and the Senate version are not of great consequence.

The Senator from New Mexico has sponsored saline-water conversion legislation. He is the author of a weather modification bill now before the Commerce Committee. It was Senator ANDERSON's suggestion that atomic-power production and saline-water conversion be combined in a single operation, which now promises to cut water-conversion costs to practicable levels.

All of us have taken a great deal of pride in the conservation record of the 88th Congress. A very great deal of the credit for it goes to Senator ANDERSON. He fathered much of the legislation on which the record of Congress was based. He has provided resources and conservation leadership for all of us.

Because of Senator ANDERSON's wide grasp and significant record in the resources and conservation field, it was a matter of great satisfaction to me that in his address to the Sierra Club conference, he strongly recommended the establishment of a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers, as proposed in Senate bill 938, introduced earlier this year by myself and 13 cosponsors. It is a proposal endorsed in 1960 by the Democratic platform and the Democratic presidential candidate John F. Kennedy; and I hope we shall finally get it enacted into law in the present Congress.

Senator ANDERSON's address, dealing very broadly with resources and conservation problems, is well worth study by every Member of the Congress and others who follow the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS OF SENATOR CLINTON P. ANDERSON, AT NINTH BIENNIAL WILDERNESS CONFERENCE, SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., APRIL 2, 1965

This is my second appearance at a Sierra Club event within 5 months. In November, I had the pleasure of addressing the Rio Grande chapter at Santa Fe. Tonight—as then—I feel at home among old friends, among comrades in arms in the long struggle to save wilderness America.

Those who roam the wilderness years from now will marvel at its quiet and its charm. But they may neither remember nor appreciate what organizations like the Sierra Club and the Wilderness Society did to preserve it. Those of us who do, however, will remain forever grateful.

Together with its allies in the conservation movement, the Sierra Club came to Congress again and again and again to plead the cause of wilderness preservation. National attention was centered on the need to endow future generations with an inheritance of the land—land with a wild beauty as yet unscarred by man; land remote in mood and location but accessible to those who want to experience the wilderness.

After 8 years of hearings, reports, debates and off-stage conversations, we have at last created a system to preserve wilderness areas. No one man, no single group was responsible for that historic achievement. But Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY blazed the trail in Congress by introducing the original wilderness bill—and in the highest administrative circles will be our ally. The roll of honor includes the late Senator James Murray of Montana; his successor, LEE METCALF; Senators FRANK CHURCH and TOM KUCHEL, and Congressmen WAYNE ASPINALL and JOHN SAYLOR, to name but a few. It also includes Aldo Leopold and Howard Zahniser, who are no longer with us, and Dave Brower.

There will be other heroes. For the long struggle to save something of America's wilderness for our children did not end with the passage of a law. The next few years will be crucial. They will tell how well we succeed in creating a wilderness system under an act we finally accepted, though it is considerably less than we would have liked.

The Interior Department is reviewing all roadless areas of 5,000 acres or more in the national park system and similar areas regardless of size in the wildlife preserves and game ranges. The Department of Agriculture is reviewing some 5½ million acres of primitive areas in the national forests. These surveys, over a 10-year period, are in accord with the Wilderness Act's provision for the submission to Congress of proposed new areas for inclusion in the wilderness system.

We need, however, to look beyond the areas specified for potential preservation in the Wilderness Act. It is here that the struggle will go on. Those who forced us to compromise did not intend to make it easy to save additional land for future generations. We are going to have to justify each additional wilderness area, beyond the 9.1 million acres of the original Wilderness Act.

One of the most promising attempts to supplement the Wilderness Act—an effort that deserves the warm support of conservationists everywhere—is the Wild Rivers Act, introduced in Congress last month by Senators JACKSON and CHURCH.

This act "finds that some of the free-flowing rivers of the United States possess unique water conservation, scenic, fish, wildlife, and outdoor recreation values of present and potential benefit to the American people."

Congress would be given the power to designate such unspoiled river sections—in sparsely populated areas, near the sources of the rivers, and above any damsites—as wild river areas, to be administered for present and future generations by the Departments of Interior and Agriculture. Six river segments are so named in the act, and nine others are listed for study in the act.

Some critics of the Wild Rivers Act wonder what effect it will have on flood control. If dam construction is prohibited in wild river areas as a hindrance to the free flowing of the river segment, won't these segments be susceptible to damaging floods?

One of the best answers to this question was given in a letter written me 2 weeks ago by the Sierra Club's vice president, Dr. Edgar Wayburn.

He pointed out that damming is only one way—and a comparatively expensive way—to cut down flood damage. It is, of course, the only way in the more heavily developed, populated areas.

But, as Dr. Wayburn points out, there may be another way to minimize flood damage in wild river areas. That way is to protect the river from wastes and debris caused by industry, logging, or mining. This is one of the things that the Wild Rivers Act will accomplish.

Dr. Wayburn claims—and I think he is correct—that much of the damage caused by the flood disasters out here last December came because of silt and logging debris that hindered the water from returning quickly to its natural level.

The Wild Rivers Act will cut down flood damage. It will not interfere with dam building in populated areas where such work is appropriate, and it would prohibit the clogging of rivers with junk in sparsely populated areas where it is not economically feasible to prevent floods by building dams.

The Wild Rivers Act is at once a conservation bill, a recreation bill, and a flood control bill. It deserves to be passed, and my hope is that everyone within the sound of my voice will support it.

This has been a profitable period for those who love good books on the out of doors, and I am collecting a 5-foot shelf of conservation classics. On the shelf sits Rachel Carson's "Silent Spring," Stewart Udall's "The Quiet Crisis," "Resources in America's Future" by Landsberg, Fischman, and Fisher, "Whose Woods These Are" by Michael Frome, "The Last Redwoods" by Hyde and Leydet, "Tomorrow's Wilderness" by Leydet, and finally, a lovely volume, "In Wildness Is the Preservation of the World."

Last year onto the shelf went Harold Barnett and Chandler Morse's new look at the prospects for natural resources. They found that, except for timber products, technology has made possible the production of commodities of every sort more cheaply and with less effort than in the past. Technology has also made it possible to discover more mineral deposits, to utilize lower grade ores and create substitutes, such as plastics.

I fully expect that we will again be charged with locking up minerals and undoubtedly there are some materials of value in some wilderness areas. However, the Barnett-Morse study makes it clear that there is no presently foreseeable need to exploit such resources.

There is not a great deal of timber in prospective wilderness areas. During consideration of the wilderness bill, it was determined that there are only 4.7 million acres of commercial forest land in the 14 million acres of wilderness-type areas in the national forests. And this ignores the fact that much of the 4.7 million acres is inaccessible at high altitudes and is of low productivity.

Local pressure for economic development may prove to be the gravest threat to the preservation of unspoiled areas in the years just ahead. It always will be difficult to persuade a community that a nearby resource should be left undeveloped or held in reserve because there is abundance elsewhere.

Consequently, it seems to me that it is especially important that conservationists seek enlightened solutions to conflicts over land use and encourage application of the most improved technology to resource problems.

Some 52 million acres of accessible forest lands in the Nation are now idle. Planted to trees, this acreage could produce at least 12 times as much timber as the inaccessible wilderness areas. But insects, fire, disease, and other hazards cost the commercial timberlands 4 billion board feet annually—80 times the growth capacity of the wilderness forests and nearly the equivalent of our present annual timber cut.

There would be far less pressure on timber in wilderness if that potential production were realized. It would be farsighted for those who want to preserve an adequate amount of wilderness and scenic beauty to put full timber production potential on their agenda.

I know that you want that timber production to be conducted without disruption of watersheds. Dr. Wayburn made that dramatically clear in his letter. He showed how large logging operations and shortsighted land practices contributed to the flood devastation.

While the road ahead is difficult, I believe a good beginning has been made because there is wider acceptance that—in the words of Mr. Justice Douglas—"The esthetic values of the wilderness are as much our inheritance as the veins of copper and gold in our hills and the forests in our mountains."

Most people who use the wilderness live in cities. And while it is true that most of these areas are far from the heavy concentration of population in the East, it is also true that 16 wilderness and primitive areas are within a few hours' drive of large urban centers in California.

The conservation movement is moving to town—and it is high time.

I was born in South Dakota before the turn of the century and in that day 7 of 10 Americans lived in rural areas. Now 70 percent of us live in areas having an urban density of 1,500 persons a square mile. A generation from now 3 of every 4 Americans will be city dwellers.

For these, it is not enough to have magnificent national parks and forests in the Far West. There is a growing nationwide demand for natural areas of rest and recreation. Recognition of this is apparent in the President's proposal for six new parks, lakeshores, recreation areas, and seashores east of the Mississippi River.

We must never forget that the fight to preserve beauty and cut down on pollution is national, not regional. We shall always cherish the memory of those great inspirers of conservation movements from the East: Theodore Roosevelt, of New York; Gifford Pinchot, of Pennsylvania; and John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts—tall men who stood tall.

President Johnson has declared his intention to use revenue from the Land and Water Conservation Fund to acquire lands needed to bring the proposed eastern parklands into being.

Much of the value of the Land and Water Conservation Fund—which became law last fall—will stem from its application to metropolitan areas. "Give priority attention," the President instructed the Secretary of the Interior, "to serving the needs of our growing urban population." Conservation Fund dollars will be used to acquire desperately needed recreation areas for urban and suburban residents.

It should not be necessary for families in cities to have to embark on an expedition to see a stand of trees or a grassy field.

There is a tendency, however, to regard the fund as primarily for a massive park program. Those who do should recall that the Federal portion of the fund shall be used to obtain inholdings with wilderness areas of the national forest system and to acquire areas for the preservation of species of fish or wildlife threatened with extinction. The State portions will be used to obtain State parklands and the urban and suburban recreation areas.

Money is already accumulating to get the conservation fund on its way. One source of revenue is the sale of recreation conservation automobile stickers. It is estimated that these stickers will net the fund $35 million this year. I have one on my bumper—No. 13 for good luck. And I wish the sticker sale good luck too; because if sales fall short of expectations, the idea of the recreationist paying for a substantial part of the benefits he receives will go down the drain.

In this conservation fund, we have brought together a variety of needs—those of the wilderness people, the wildlife enthusiasts and the fellow who simply wants a refreshing place to sit or hike or bike right around home. It is meaningful that visitors to the great parks, sweeping oceanside areas, and lonely game preserves will—through their entrance fees—help provide themselves and neighbors in town with outdoor recreation sites.

A national policy has been laid down to acquire recreation lands. The conservation fund gives us the means for financing this ambitious program. But we need to move quickly, to act at the floodtide of public support.

Just 3 decades ago the National Park Service surveyed the Atlantic and gulf coasts for undeveloped seaside areas desirable for public recreation. The Service recommended that 12 major shorelines—437 miles of beach—be preserved as national areas. Cost of these unspoiled stretches was $12 million. Regrettably only one area was acquired—the rest went to private and commercial developers.

Some seashores still remain—by good fortune—for potential inclusion in the national park system: Assateague in Maryland and Virginia, Oregon Dunes and Cape Lookout in North Carolina. And on the Great Lakes, there is the promise of public ownership for Sleeping Bear and Indiana Dunes.

Crowded recreation facilities and advancing bulldozers and developers have frightened the people and made it possible to win support in recent years for new recreation and wilderness facilities. We are at the peak of an interest cycle. Let us make sure that we do not get a wilderness system started, the outdoor recreation job partly done, and then find that this interest has subsided.

We have—as a nation—paid attention to resource problems on a crisis basis. We are alerted to the water crisis, the timber crisis, the pesticide crisis, the strip mine crisis. I have no question that it is the squeaking crisis which gets the oil. But is it the wisest way for a nation to develop and manage its resources for 190 million today and 330 million by the year 2000? I think not.

A Council of Resource and Conservation Advisers might help to avoid the potential wastefulness of reaction only in the face of crisis. It might enable decisionmakers to take more initiative in advance of a severe resource problem rather than after it has ballooned to massive proportions.

The Council would be an arm of the executive branch, but it would serve all of Government in much the same fashion as the Council of Economic Advisers. The Council of Economic Advisers does not create national economic policy, but it gathers the information and does the advance thinking essential to the shaping of enlightened policy. It is still up to political leaders to create and implement tax and fiscal policy. By the same token, Members of Congress and Cabinet officers would still be left with the responsibility to make sound conservation policy.

But the Council of Resource and Conservation Advisers would help chart the way toward appropriate conservation measures. It would let us know where we stand and where we should be heading.

The need for such a continuing high-level examination of natural resource matters was in the mind of the National Academy of Sciences when it recently said:

"It is evident that optimization of natural resources for human use and welfare cannot be achieved by fragmentary and sporadic attention given to isolated parts of the problem, but that the issues involved must be made the subject of a permanent, systematic process of investigation, recording and evaluation, carried on continuously in reference to the total perspective."

This kind of evaluation should be applied to all decisions affecting natural resources—particularly when they are irretrievably lost, once used or altered by man. The proposed high dams on the Lower Colorado River are a case in point. Before more dams are authorized, some of us want to know if the power to be produced is really economic and necessary or whether it is included as a way which has worked elsewhere and may now be the only way to finance the central Arizona project.

The most desperately needed resource in the Colorado River basin is water itself. Some experts are advising storage in aquifers in that area to avoid losses to wind and sun.

The economics of further storage of surface water for power—even in relatively narrow reservoirs—is open to serious question, even without a charge for evaporation and recognizing that water has certain peaking capacity values over other sources of power.

The closest kind of study should be devoted to a detailed comparison of alternative energy sources for generating electricty. The Four Corners region of New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado and Utah is underlaid with large deposits of coal. Some of that mineral abundance is now being used to generate electricty at quite favorable costs. There are other proposals in the talking stage for additional coal-fired plants at the mineheads of the Southwest.

While conservationists may look upon coal as a bulwark against encroachment on the Grand Canyon, they rebel against its use to produce kilowatts at certain other places. The banks of the St. Croix River are echoing to the sounds of battle between those who want the economic advantages of a large coal-burning electric plant and those who fear the blighting of our loveliest spring-fed rivers.

Jobs and a bigger tax base are tangible—a community can measure and feel that income. But what of the so-called intangibles—a clear stream for fishing or boating or just for looking at. They become less intangible when measured against the cost of restoration—if restoration is even possible. And, of course, recreation makes jobs and produces taxes.

If coal barges, slag piles and warm water from the plant will despoil the river, is there an alternative that will give the area electricity and payrolls without scenic and recreation damage? An atomic reactor offers a possible answer. It would avoid ugly slag heaps, high stacks and barge traffic. It would not pollute the atmosphere and it might be possible to avoid heating the river water. I think you are going to find that atoms for conservation make sense in many situations.

I was interested to read in the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists the account of the fight over the Bodega Head power reactor. Your club had something to do with the withdrawal of the reactor project. Unequipped with all the details of that dispute, I would not attempt to plead the case for either side.

But I would counsel you not to reject nuclear reactors in all cases out of a fear that these powerplants can behave like bombs or that they will spew radioactive wastes into the atmosphere. Rather I would hope that the Sierra Club and other conservation groups will view the atom as an ally in the cause of intelligent resource development.

"Not blind opposition to progress but opposition to blind progress" is a principle that may serve us well in this matter.

While I have been close to the conservation movement for many years, I have long had a continuing involvement with atomic energy. I am optimistic about the alliance of the atom and conservation. Linked with desalinization plants, atomic energy will help provide additional water. In some areas, atomic power may lessen the need to lay bare hillsides to get at coal seams. Reactors will firm up hydropower so that large volumes of water do not waste into the sea without being productive. Atomic fuel will lessen airpolluting smog. And atomic energy can extend the fossil-fuel resources of the country.

Albert Schweitzer has said, "Man can hardly even recognize the devils of his own creation." But I believe that we are coming to recognize the problems posed by rapidly advancing technology. Like the genie in the lamp, technology can be used to enhance the quality of life or leave it barren. We will seek its blessings.

I foresee an intensification of the conflicts between what some label progress with a capital P and others call progress with a question mark. We are going to hear more and more "payrolls or picnickers." In the cities and suburbs the roadbuilders who want to pave over woodlands and level neighborhoods are racing with those who ask: "Is there a better way to move people in metropoles?"

As I suggested in Santa Fe last fall, "All the angels are not on the side of the conservationists." But these problems demand our concern; how they are resolved will determine to a large extent the character and atmosphere of American life for generations.

Although the battle must be waged wilderness by wilderness, river by river, park by park, we must see conservation in its total dimensions. We must master technology for the broadest common good. We must improve the system of decisionmaking as regards resources.

"Those who will not remember the past," said Santayana, "are condemned to relive it."

But we do remember; how one landscape has been torn and defaced in the name of industry while another has been preserved for posterity almost as the Lord left it ages ago. We remember the struggles to bring beauty to our cities, to save beauty along our shores, and to find beauty in the depths of a quiet forest where no tree has fallen save as the Master has decreed. Surely in this conference we can agree that no great problem is settled until it is settled right, and holding that belief, can dedicate ourselves "To the cause that needs assistance and the good that we can do."

WALTER LIPPMANN CONTINUES TO SPEAK CLEARLY ON VIETNAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, the clearest and most persistent commentator on the deepening Vietnamese crisis is Walter Lippmann. He has clearly exposed the fallacies of our Vietnam policy and the dangers in our present course.

The current issue of Newsweek magazine includes another of Mr. Lippmann's lucid analyses, entitled "Nearing the Brink in Vietnam." I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD; and I trust that Members of Congress and others will carefully read and ponder the article.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From Newsweek magazine, Apr. 12, 1965]

NEARING THE BRINK IN VIETNAM

(By Walter Lippmann)

While the American press is free to report and comment on Vietnam, our people are receiving very little official guidance and help in understanding the portentous events which are happening. Officially, we are being told that we are now involved in a war between two separate nations, North Vietnam and South Vietnam, and that our task is to put enough pressure on the North Vietnamese to make them cease and desist from taking part in the war at the other end of the country of Vietnam.

The official interpretation is one of those half-truths which can be grossly misleading. The half of the truth which we are being told is that North Vietnam is sending some men and officers, is helping to supply, and is probably directing the strategy of the civil war in South Vietnam. The half of the truth which is being neglected is that in a very large part of South Vietnam the resistance to the Vietcong has collapsed.

Yet, it is the state of the war in South Vietnam which is of critical importance to the United States. It is on that above all that we need to fix our attention. For it is in South Vietnam that disaster impends, and it is the effort to forestall the disaster that brings us very near to becoming involved in a land war of great proportions. It is there that we are being pressed to engage several hundred thousand American troops and to face the prospect of at least a partial mobilization in this country to support and sustain those troops.

OFFICIAL THEORY VERSUS ACTUAL EVENTS

The argument for making South Vietnam a second Korea is growing louder in the lobbies and corridors of Washington. The argument is being made because the official theory of the problem in South Vietnam has been confounded by events. The theory, which was propounded by Gen. Maxwell Taylor when he persuaded President Kennedy to enlarge our intervention, was that with enough arms, more money, and some American military advisers, the South Vietnamese could create an army able to subdue the Vietcong rebellion. Until a year ago, more or less, this was the theory on which our excellent Secretary of Defense rested his hopes and his plans, and staked his reputation as a political prophet.

The theory has not worked. Our side has been losing steadily the control of the countryside. It has failed to win the allegiance of the peasants, who are not only the majority of the nation, but are the one and only source of military manpower. Today, the principal highways north and south, east and west, have been cut by the Vietcong, and the cities where our clients are holed up are being supplied by air and by sea. The South Vietnamese Army has not surrendered, but it has so little will to fight and has such a high rate of desertion that we can no longer count on South Vietnamese soldiers even to supply sentries for American airbases and installations.

The basic character of the war has changed radically since President Johnson inherited it from President Kennedy. It used to be a war of the South Vietnamese assisted by the Americans; it is now becoming an American war very inefficiently assisted by the South Vietnamese. In fact, it would not be much of an exaggeration to say that the South Vietnamese, who have good reason to be war weary, are tending to sit on the sidelines while we, who have promised to "win" the war, are allowed to show how we can win it.

NUMBERS NOT ENOUGH

For a time the warhawks in this country argued that a certain amount of bombing—a "clean" war in the air rather than a "dirty" war on the ground—would do the trick. But it has not done the trick. All wars, and particularly civil wars, are won or lost on the ground.

It is evident enough now that the South Vietnamese ground forces are unable and unwilling to fight the war effectively. They may have a superiority in numbers over the Vietcong of 5 to 1. That is not nearly enough in guerrilla wars where a ratio of 20 or 50 to 1 is not always enough. And so we are being confronted with two dismal prospects. The first is the landing of American soldiers for an interminable war on the ground against the inexhaustible masses on the Asian continent. The second prospect is the bombing of the populated cities in North Vietnam. This would bring down on us the opprobrium of almost all the world and also the risk that we would compel Russia and China to join in opposing us.

Having staked our prestige on the outcome of the civil war which is being lost in South Vietnam, we may find ourselves with a choice between the devil of defeat in South Vietnam and the deep blue sea of a much wider war in eastern Asia. That choice could perhaps be avoided if we remember in time that when there is no military solution to a conflict, there must be negotiation to end it. In such a situation, only fools will go to the brink and over it.

EFFECT OF NATIONALISTIC POLICIES ON EUROPEAN UNITY AND RELATIONS OF THE WESTERN WORLD

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, in recent statements I have expressed my concern about the effects nationalistic policies were having on European unity and the relations of the Western World.

A firsthand report from the European capitals brings disturbing fresh evidence that this spirit of nationalism, damaging to the paramount hope for world peace, is nevertheless permeating the countries of the Atlantic alliance.

For 2½ months, Mr. Thomas W. Ottenad, of the St. Louis Post Dispatch, surveyed the political attitudes of Western European countries.

In Paris, London, Rome, Bonn, Geneva, and Brussels, Mr. Ottenad talked with more than 150 diplomats, government officials and military leaders, European and American, to assess the major difficulties of the Western alliance.

I believe that every thinking American should be concerned about the drift and division in the policies of the West.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Ottenad's seven articles appearing in the St. Louis Post Dispatch commencing the week of March 21 be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Mar. 21,1965]

Crisis of Change in Europe: Divisive Influences Threaten Atlantic Alliance—Hopes for Western European Political Unity and for Closer Relations With United States Fade as Nationalistic Rivalries and Balance-of-Power Politics Increase

(By Thomas W. Ottenad)

Paris, March 20.—The divisive crisis of change has spread a pall of uncertainty over the Western alliance. On both sides of the Atlantic powerful forces are at work, tugging at the United States and Europe, threatening to wrench them apart and raising fears for the future.

At stake are such vital issues as the existence of the Atlantic community, the stability of Europe, the control of nuclear weapons and the precariously peaceful balance of terror that now exists between the West and the Soviet Union.

Torn by what may well be its most severe strain since World War II, the Western alliance faces a disturbing challenge: Can America and Europe maintain some kind of effective relationship for their mutual good or are they going to drift apart into increasingly independent courses regardless of the consequences?

For the past 9 weeks the Post-Dispatch has been discussing this and related questions with government officials, diplomats, military leaders, businessmen, academicians and others throughout Western Europe. The picture that emerges from these conversations, most of them off the record, is not an encouraging one.

It is plain that hopes for unifying Western Europe politically and allying it more closely with the United States have been weakened in the past few years. Europe appears to be turning once again in the direction of nationalistic rivalries and balance-of-power politics, which have proved to be disastrous in the past.

Best guesses are that the Western alliance will not collapse. In time, however, it could become badly fragmented. Its defense mechanism, too, may be seriously weakened, especially if the threat of French withdrawal from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization materializes.

Conversations with officials in Paris, London, Rome, Bonn, Geneva and Brussels lead to some rather unflattering observations about current European attitudes. For example, there is a preoccupation among some statesmen with scoring personal triumphs rather than with solving world problems.

Repeatedly one hears, "If such-and-such a policy prevails, it will be a victory for Prime Minister X, but if so-and-so happens, it will be a triumph for Prime Minister Y." Which course is the better one seems of less interest.

All too often there appears little understanding of the maturity and restraints required of those who would be world leaders. Remarked an exasperated diplomat at the Kennedy round tariff negotiations in Geneva, "Everyone wants power but few want responsibility." Policies frequently seem based on narrow self-interest rather than broad common interest.

Europe clings to patterns of the past despite their failures and despite the needs of a new age. The only break with tradition has been the successful Common Market. It has brought an important measure of integration to European economic life. Its promise of political unity, however, appears to have been stifled, at least for many years.

One of the most deadly dangers facing the western alliance is the appearance of a neo-nationalism in Europe and a neo-isolationism in America.

Officials in Europe agree almost unanimously that a tendency toward nationalistic rivalries has stirred to life again after having laid dormant for many years. The principal blame is placed on French President Charles de Gaulle. His rejection of Great Britain's application for membership in the Eureopean Economic Community in January 1963 badly damaged the fragile spirit of cooperation that was beginning to develop. His action has led to nationalistic retaliation by others.

The apparent awakening of a new isolationist sentiment in the United States is equally worrisome. Mounting frustration over heavy responsibilities abroad could lead to demands that America sever its ties with Europe. Some experienced observers believe that De Gaulle's repeated attacks on the United States are deliberately designed to fan this flame.

Differences over Vietnam and America's financial problem are causing serious friction in the Western camp.

America's escalation of the war in Vietnam has been received cooly in Europe. The United States is charged with failing to consult its allies about its action. At the same time, Europe has shown little interest in providing greater assistance to the United States in South Vietnam.

In the financial field, concern over America's balance-of-payments deficit and gold outflow has been aggravated by French actions that could affect the dollar. France has begun to convert an increasing percentage of its foreign currency reserves, together with all new dollar earnings, into gold. While there is little shortrun danger, the action comes at an awkward time. The U.S. stockpile of gold has dropped below $15 billion, and any large-scale demand for gold could be embarrassing.

A related source of disagreement is increased investment in Europe by American business firms. Some European businessmen and others, fearful of American competition, want the practice curbed.

The Europe that is taking shape today is a curious blend of the old and the new.

The pattern of the past shows most clearly in the political sphere. Throughout Western Europe there is general agreement that any hope for forming a United States of Europe has been put off, perhaps indefinitely, by De Gaulle's hostility. The French leader opposes political integration and clings to Europe's tradition of independent states linked loosely by treaties providing only for consultation and coordination. This opposition has brought a sharp change in European attitudes.

A few years ago many thought Europe might at last be ready for political federation. Now the prevailing belief, even among the most deeply committed federalists, is that if there is to be any movement it must be first in the direction advocated by De Gaulle.

In the field of defense policy, there is the same argument for a return to the past. De Gaulle opposes integration of military forces. He wants to revise and loosen the NATO alliance. Instead of a unified allied defense, he favors individual military forces under national control. His argument is this sphere has not been as widely accepted as his view on political unity.

Agricultural policy is another major area in which Europe appears to be following the path of yesterday. The Common Market is erecting high, protective tariff walls around its farming community.

In contrast to these hangovers from the past, the most dynamic thrust toward the future is provided by the Common Market itself. Except in agricultural matters, the six-nation European Economic Community has followed progressive, forward-looking economic and trade policies. Since its establishment in 1958 it has become the most powerful force working toward economic and eventually political integration in Europe.

The treaty of cooperation adopted by France and Germany in January 1963 represents a break with the past in one sense, but also constitutes a potential hazard. Many officials believe that Europe and the world will benefit if these two ancient enemies can end their hostilities.

On the other hand, if the agreement leads to a combined Franco-German effort to dominate the Common Market, the EEC's goal of a broader, integrated community may be jeopardized. So far, the treaty, which calls for efforts to reach common agreement on foreign and defense policies and other matters, has produced a few tangible results.

Twenty years after World War II, Europe remains a continent in transition. Its final destination is far from clear. Some experienced diplomats fear that if it reverts to the pattern of loose national alliances it will never reach the goal of political union. Others, however, are confident that it will move on eventually.

One who remains optimistic about the ultimate outcome is Dr. Walter Hallstein, the respected president of the commission or executive agency of the Common Market. In his office in Brussels, the cheerful Hallstein sounded like the university professor he once was as he told the Post-Dispatch:

"We need patience, determination and the willingness to advance in small steps. We integrationists always have felt that a small step, even a very small one, is better than none."

He raised a warning finger and his face became grave. "There is only one thing that is out of the question," he said emphatically. "That is that we should fail to reach decisions and take action of some kind."

It is this pragmatic approach that is being followed by those who hope to see Europe move ahead. Under consideration by the Common Market are separate but similar plans by Germany, Italy, and Belgium. All call for expanded consultation among the six EEC members and for the drafting of plans for increased political union. The proposals are expected to be discussed later this year. Any action, however, is likely to be extremely limited.

Perhaps the most explosive of all the immediate issues facing the free world is a bitter controversy over how to handle its nuclear defenses. The dispute has far-reaching ramifications, for it threatens not only to split the Atlantic alliance but also to endanger relations between the West and the Soviet Union.

At the core of the argument is the multilateral nuclear force proposed by the United States. The plan contemplates creation of an allied fleet of up to 25 surface ships armed with Polaris nuclear missiles and manned by mixed crews from participating nations. It has been cooly received. Principal supporters are Germany and Italy. Principal opponents are France and Great Britain.

Underlying the dispute is a serious dilemma that the West has not yet solved. On the one side, some experts believe that Germany and other non-nuclear members of the alliance may be tempted to break away and seek atomic weapons of their own if they are not given a larger voice in nuclear affairs. On the other, creation of the MLF or something like it may well antagonize the Soviet Union, intensify the cold war and jeopardize hope for reaching agreements on disarmament and the control of nuclear weapons.

The problem is aggravated by the highly independent course followed by France, which is developing its own nuclear striking force. Critics assail the French policy as both cynical and dangerous.

They point out that the principal purpose of the small French force de frappe or striking force is to trigger American nuclear power if the United States appears hesitant to act. In conversation with the Post-Dispatch a French official conceded that this was the purpose of the French force. He thought it unlikely, however, that the actual firing stage would ever be reached.

Those who fear the dangers of nuclear proliferation are horrified by the French attitude on this question. France argues that, except for Germany, any nation that wants nuclear weapons and can produce them should have them. In a bland dissent from most opinion, a French official said his government saw little danger in expanding the "nuclear club." He predicted that Japan, India, Italy, and perhaps two or three other nations would eventually develop nuclear weapons.

EUROPE'S BIGGEST PROBLEMS

The difficulties confronting the United States and Western Europe cover a wide range. The major issues, their causes and possible solutions will be discussed in subsequent articles in this series. In summary, the principal problems are:

Atlantic Alliance: Jeopardized by serious disagreements, many of them stemming from the intransigent attitudes of French President Charles de Gaulle.

Political union: Western Europe may never achieve it; if it does, it may not be for 25 to 50 years.

Nuclear defense: No decision is likely this year on the controversial multilateral nuclear force (MLF) proposed by the United States.

Future of NATO: Serious trouble if France withdraws, as expected, some time after 1969.

French policies: De Gaulle's concept of loose national alliance appears to be politically unstable and militarily dangerous.

Britain's role: No interest in uniting with the continent despite continuing economic difficulties.

Germany: Many fear it may again become a threat to peace if it is not kept tightly tied within the Western alliance.

Agriculture: The Common Market's highly protectionist policy promises difficulty for the United States and others.

Kennedy Round Table negotiations: Moving slowly; sizable reductions are likely in industrial tariffs, but agricultural levies are a stumbling block.

The divisive tendencies in the Western alliance make little sense to those who favor continued close relations between the United States and Europe. Viewed objectively, they say, a separation would mean more losses than gains for both partners.

For Europe it would mean the loss of American military power, on which it relies for its ultimate security. The extent of Europe's dependence was underscored by an allied military leader who told the Post-Dispatch:

"There is no group of nations in Europe that can provide adequate nuclear protection for themselves without American participation and resources. Even if Britain is included, there is no combination that can mount the deterrent needed to hold the Soviet Union in check."

For America the hazard of separation lies in the possibility that an estranged Europe might seek to play the United States against the Soviet Union. Those who believe such a development is possible point to De Gaulle's long-standing determination to make Europe a "third force" in world affairs. Shortly before he returned to power in 1958, the French leader wrote that his objective was:

"To bring together the states along the Rhine, the Alps and the Pyrenees into a political, economic and strategic group—to make of this organization one of the three world powers and if necessary one day the arbiter between the Soviet and Anglo-Saxon camps."

In fairness to De Gaulle, it should be said that even his critics believe he would not desert the rest of the free world if a major crisis developed between East and West.

The air of unease that envelops the Western alliance is the outgrowth of a variety of changes in world affairs in recent years. The nations of Western Europe, nearly prostrate after World War II, have regained economic and military strength. Understandably, they want a greater voice in international councils. They seek to end their dependence on the United States.

At the same time, tensions between the East and West have relaxed. The turning point may well have been the Cuban missile crisis in October 1962. Since then the Communist offensive against the West has eased appreciably. The Soviet Union has been preoccupied with problems of its own—at home, among the Communist satellites in Eastern Europe and with Red China.

The military picture has changed drastically, too. Russia's formation of a powerful nuclear force ended America's monopoly. The development of long-range missiles has made it possible for both the United States and the Soviet Union to strike directly at each other, reducing the value of bases in Europe.

The prospect of devastating retaliation, however, has created a balance of terror. The result is that fear of nuclear war has subsided. Repeatedly a visitor in Western Europe hears this confident appraisal, "No one is going to start a nuclear war unless it is through accident or miscalculation."

These changes have thrown the Western alliance, completely unprepared for it, into a new era. Differences that were temporarily submerged in the face of common danger and common need have come to the surface again. Maneuvering for individual advantage has resumed.

Since the end of World War II America has sought to build a united and prosperous Europe and to link it closely with the United States to form a powerful combination in world affairs. Now with Europe in transition this basic policy is being tested.

Questioning voices are being raised, suggesting that Europe need not unite. The need for close relations with the United States also is being reexamined. In some quarters the concept is under sharp attack.

There are two major factors that may tend to push Europe in the direction of greater internal unity and continued cooperation with the United States. One is the unifying force of the Common Market. Its integrated economic policies are exerting a powerful, although indirect, influence toward eventual political union.

The other factor is America's nuclear power. Europe's clear realization that its safety depends on U.S. military strength is a strong deterrent to severing its ties with America.

American and European diplomats with whom the Post-Dispatch talked agree that the current, trying period calls for patience and persistent effort if the Western alliance is to be preserved. It also calls for exceptional American delicacy. For while American leadership is resented in many quarters of Europe, informed officials say it is badly needed. Without it, they warn, Europe still seems incapable of making important decisions.

In their search for the future, the Western allies are enjoying the luxury of dissent. Divergent views, conflicting interests, rival schemes create a babel.

The mood recalls the theme of the final volume of Sir Winston Churchill's history of the Second World War: "How the great democracies triumphed and so were able to resume the follies which had so nearly cost them their life."

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Mar. 22, 1965]

VISION OF UNITED EUROPE DIMS—DE GAULLE THINKS CHANGE WILL TAKE AT LEAST 50 YEARS—MANY EXPERTS BELIEVED PRESENT SETUP IS UNSTABLE, MILITARILY DANGEROUS—CALL IT THREAT TO PEACE

(By Thomas W. Ottenad)

PARIS, March 22.—Europe has turned its face against the future.

The vision that has gleamed fitfully since the end of the war, of a United States of Europe, is growing dimmer. In its place there shines again the old image of a Europe that is a loosely knit alliance of independent and jealous nations.

This is regarded by some European leaders as an extremely disquieting development, fraught with grave risks. It may endanger world peace, for many experts believe that the kind of Europe which appears to be emerging will be politically unstable and militarily dangerous. Compounding the hazard is the prospect that it may take half a century before Europe can move on to a more stable and rational order.

The fundamental question of how Europe is to organize itself is one in a series of troublesome issues facing the Western alliance. Others include:

Difficulties in relations between the United States and Europe; a revival of the spirit of nationalism; the divisive effect of France's independent actions; sharp differences over nuclear defense policy, and a threat by France to withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

Taken together, these problems constitute one of the most severe internal strains the Western allies have experienced. Some diplomats in Europe think it is even worse than the Suez crisis in 1956 when Britain and France split openly with the United States. Said one gloomily:

"The issues are more fundamental this time. There are basic disagreements over how the Western alliance should be organized and how it should function. If the nations of Europe fail to integrate their political and defense policies, the alliance may begin to break up. Europe may be split from the United States and from the rest of the world."

At the heart of the current controversy is the question of whether the countries of Europe, after centuries of bickering and fighting, are at last ready to move toward a political union in which individual differences are subordinated to the common good. Or are they going to continue the traditional practices of patchwork alliances and power politics?

In American terms the choice lies between the federalists and the States righters. In European terms it is between the Eurocrats, who have been working energetically for a United States of Europe, and the Gaullists, or followers of Gen. Charles de Gaulle. The French President is the chief exponent of a policy of loose alliances.

The fight between these forces has swung in favor of the Gaullists. A visitor who travels through Western Europe talking to diplomats, politicians, and others repeatedly hears:

"Any hope for unifying Europe politically has been put off for many years. If we are to progress at all, the first step will have to be nothing more than an alliance between existing states. A true federation, if it ever comes, can only develop later."

This attitude has been created chiefly by De Gaulle. His uncompromising opposition to unification in either the political or military field has convinced even the Eurocrats that federation is out of the question at present.

This represents a fundamental change in mood. After World War II there were many who believed that a new and unified Europe not only must, but could be created. One of the first was the late Sir Winston Churchill. In 1946 in a famous speech in Zurich he said "we must build a kind of united states of Europe."

Under the leadership of Churchill, Robert Schuman, Jean Monnet, and others, a number of moves were made toward unifying Europe. In 1952 the European Coal and Steel Community was established, creating a common market for coal, iron ore, and scrap among France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxembourg.

In 1958 the same six nations joined in forming the European Economic Community and the European Atomic Energy Community. These three organizations provided a measure of supranational integration, chiefly in the economic field. In the defense field, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, set up in 1949, provided limited unification in military policies and operations.

The Eurocrats had won the first round in the fight for Europe's future. There were many who thought that Europe might soon be able to move directly into political federation.

De Gaulle smashed that hope in January 1963 when he vetoed Britain's application for membership in the Common Market. Since then he has shown that he is willing to go to almost any length to block the formation of a political union.

"The second round in the battle has been won by the Gaullists," a French official remarked accurately.

There is general agreement now that prospects for achieving political unity in Western Europe have been postponed for many years. One of the best-informed sources in Europe, a man who has been in the center of the movement for unity since its start but who asked that his name not be used, gave this view:

"Back at the very beginning some of us made a private prediction. We thought it would take about 40 years to complete the drive for unification, to produce a true United States of Europe with a federated government and a popularly elected European Parliament.

"That was 15 years ago. So we have 25 years to go." He paused reflectively for a moment. "Yes," he said decisively, "I still think we can do it in another 25 years."

Other forecasts are less optimistic. De Gaulle reportedly believes that it will be 50 years before Europe can begin even to consider a federal union. He thinks it will take that long to develop a feeling of "Europeanis" which he regards as a prerequisite to close political cooperation.

Despite this discouraging outlook, those who believe that Europe should unite are trying to keep the spark alive. Plans aimed at achieving a greater measure of political integration have been put forward by Germany, Italy, and Belgium. In essence, they call for the six members of the Common Market to consult regularly on foreign policy and other problems and to try to develop a plan for some kind of political union.

These are timid schemes. No one expects them to lead to political federation. They are, in fact, not much more than warmed-over versions of the old Fouchet plan. This proposal, which was advanced by De Gaulle and was considered in 1961, was dropped after other members of the Common Market objected that it did not go far enough toward political union.

The argument over European political organization is important to the Atlantic Alliance because, in the judgment of some competent students, it involves Western security. They believe that the Gaullist approach has such serious shortcomings that it is extremely hazardous.

"National alliance and balance of power politics failed to preserve the peace in the past," remarked one worried official. "In a nuclear age they are even more hazardous."

Another critic warned that the De Gaulle concept might encourage a revival of German militarism. "The French approach," he said, "is almost sure to weaken NATO or even dissolve it. If that happens the German Army, which is the most powerful in Western Europe, might be set free from direct Western control. The consequences of such an event could be extremely dangerous for world peace."

Of all the strains facing the Western alliance, one of the most severe stems from the increasingly difficult problem of maintaining close relations between the United States and Europe. Differences have developed over a variety of issues.

The United States, for example, has sought to have the prospering countries of Western Europe take on a larger share of the burden of foreign aid. It would welcome greater European help, too, in critical trouble spots like Vietnam. Although there has been some response from Europe, it has fallen far short of American hopes.

For their part, many Europeans want a larger voice in Western defense councils. They think that the Atlantic alliance needs revision. They feel also that the United States is losing interest in Europe.

Other disagreements have arisen over tariffs in negotiations at the Kennedy round in Geneva and over the agricultural policy of the Common Market.

These and other developments have raised serious doubt as to whether the long-sought objective of closer transatlantic ties is any longer a realistic goal. Some officials in Europe believe that a contemplated partnership between the United States on the one side and a cohesive Europe on the other cannot be expected for many years. Even more remote, in their view, is a tighter, integrated Atlantic union of the kind advocated by the United States from time to time.

A well-informed American official in Paris said, "I don't think we can expect to achieve any partnership arrangement while De Gaulle is in power. There has to be more European unity before we can move in this direction. Yet France blocks nuclear integration and political union, the two developments that would help to make a partnership possible."

Even Great Britain appears to have reservations about an intimate Atlantic union, despite its longstanding "special relationship" with the United States. In London a high-ranking foreign official made it plain that this country regards as impractical and unwise the kind of Atlantic "interdependence" that the late President John F. Kennedy advocated in a speech on July 4, 1962.

Furthermore, there is a widespread belief among Europeans that the United States is not ready for a truly integrated Atlantic union. "The day for an Atlantic community has not come," observed a French diplomat. "The United States in particular is not ready to accept a system in which it would have to relinquish some of its sovereignty."

Germany and Italy, the major proponents of European political union, also are the strongest advocates of closer ties between Europe and the United States.

A potentially grave problem for the Western alliance lies in the apparent reemergence of a spirit of nationalism among European nations. Government officials and others agree that this feeling, which created tension in the 19th and early 20th centuries, is on the rise again.

Of particular significance, sources in Bonn concede that nationalistic sentiment in Germany has increased in the last few years. They offer some reassurance, however, to those who wonder if this powerful, energetic nation may again endanger world peace. They say the sentiment has not taken the aggressive form of the earlier German nationalism that played an important part in bringing on World Wars I and II.

Informed officials differ as to the importance of the nationalistic feeling they see in Europe. "I think it has become quite serious," remarked one student of European affairs. "It has become increasingly evident in fields like defense and foreign policy. De Gaulle's constant harping on France's national prerogatives has led others to demand equal national rights."

A French official offered a contradictory view. He said, "The feeling of national existence and national awareness has increased in recent years. But there hasn't been any growth of the dangerous kind of nationalism that all of us worry about." He disputed the general view that De Gaulle's veto of Britain's application for membership in the Common Market caused the revival of national feeling.

Perhaps the best appraisal was given by an expert in Brussels. "It really is too early to tell how deeply this feeling runs," he observed. "We don't know yet whether it is just a passing phase or the beginning of a new nationalistic era in Europe."

The strains that afflict the Western alliance have been sharply intensified by the highly independent course pursued by France.

The overall effect of these policies, say De Gaulle's critics, has been highly divisive. He has encouraged disunity among the Western allies. His repeated attempts to reduce American influence in Europe jeopardize the basic concept of Atlantic cooperation. His only concern, say his detractors, is to increase France's power and prestige regardless of the cost to the alliance.

In the final analysis, the varied problems pressing on the Western allies pose the serious question of whether they can find an effective way to provide for the security of the world and the well-being of their peoples.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post Dispatch, Mar. 23, 1965]

ATLANTIC ALLIES STAY ON SIDELINES DESPITE THREAT TO NATO POSED BY DE GAULLE'S INTRANSIGENCE—SENSE OF URGENCY FOUND LACKING—NUCLEAR FORCE DISPUTE PERSISTS AS STRONG U.S. LEADERSHIP IS AWAITED

(By Thomas W. Ottenad)

PARIS, March 23.—In Bonn a German official seemed remarkably unconcerned about the danger that France might withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

"We should not worry too soon about that," he remarked, with a wave of the hand. "It's probably just a threat. Besides, nothing is likely to happen for several years."

In Rome an Italian diplomat was equally casual about the deep split in the Western alliance over nuclear defenses. "It's up to Britain and the United States to solve the problem," he said.

But neither Britain nor the United States is moving forcefully.

In London a British official observed, "We might be just as happy if nothing at all were done about nuclear defenses." And in Paris an American representative at NATO headquarters said, "We're maintaining our interest, but the next move is up to our allies."

A visitor who travels through Western Europe talking with government leaders, military officials, and others comes away with a clear impression that the Western alliance appears to be drifting idly while major defense problems pile up.

Although both the alliance itself and the balance in East-West relations may be affected, there is no discernible sense of urgency in either the United States or Western Europe about common military difficulties. On both sides of the Atlantic it is almost as if everyone was waiting for someone else to make the first move.

There is disagreement as to whether this lack of action is wise. Some informed officials think a cooling-off period is needed because of sharp differences of view. Others fear that the pause will provide an opening for France to push forward with its anti-American, anti-NATO campaign.

The military issues facing the Western Allies are difficult ones: a controversy over the organization of nuclear armaments; the danger that France may get out of NATO; demands for an overhaul of the NATO structure; the need for nuclear missiles to replace manned bombers that are becoming obsolete, and friction between Greece and Turkey, the guardians of NATO's southeastern flank.

By far the most troublesome are the French attack on NATO and the nuclear dispute. Each has caused heavy strain. Unless skillfully dealt with, either could wreck the Western alliance.

European officials agree that no decisive action is likely soon on either issue. There is a belief that the problem of organizing the West's nuclear defenses will not be taken up again in any serious fashion before the end of 1965 or early in 1966. As for the NATO question, no steps are likely until France actually moves to leave the alliance, a development that may come 4 years from now.

The French threat to withdraw is the climax of a continuing attack on NATO that goes back at least to 1958. Gen. Charles de Gaulle, who was then premier, resented not being consulted when Britain and the United States dispatched troops to Jordan and Lebanon. In September of that year he proposed a drastic reorganization of NATO.

His plan called for additional French representation in the NATO command structure. It contemplated also a three-power directorate composed of France, Britain, and the United States to consider far-reaching political questions. When his scheme failed to make any headway, he announced that France would oppose the system of NATO financing under which each country makes contributions to the Organization in proportion to its wealth.

Since then, De Gaulle's record of anti-NATO actions has grown rapidly. He refused to allow American missile bases and stockpiles of U.S. nuclear weapons for NATO forces to be placed in France. He declined to put the French Mediterranean fleet under NATO control. In 1963 he withdrew from NATO 19 French vessels assigned to defend the English Channel. Today France has only two army divisions in NATO, the smallest active contribution of any major member of the alliance.

The French attack now includes a demand for reorganization of NATO, together with a veiled but not very subtle threat to withdraw from the military organization. The general belief among European experts is that if France does decide to get out, the move will come in 1969, when the NATO treaty becomes open to renunciation.

Although De Gaulle has not specified how he wants NATO reorganized, the outlines of the French position are clear. A knowledgeable French diplomat told the Post-Dispatch:

"Basically, we object to the military integration that NATO provides. We think the system should be revised so that each nation is responsible for its own defense. Of course, there would be consultation and coordination, perhaps even a commander in chief and a skeleton staff for emergencies."

This official insisted that France would maintain a defense alliance with the West even if France withdrew from the operating structure of NATO. Many military experts believe, however, that the loose military arrangement advocated by the French is inadequate for the needs of a nuclear age.

The nuclear controversy confronting the Western alliance centers largely on the multinational force proposed by the United States. This plan, which calls for a new allied fleet of 25 nuclear-armed surface ships manned by mixed crews from participating nations, has not been received enthusiastically.

Its principal supporters are Germany and Italy. France opposes it. Britain has proposed an alternative Atlantic Nuclear Force. Broader in scope, the British plan would include manned bombers and land-based missiles and would eliminate or downgrade the multinational concept.

The nuclear issue appears stalled at present. The principal reason is that the Germans are reluctant to act until after their national elections next September.

Other major factors in the delay are coolness in Britain, together with the possibility of an election there this year, and a sharp switch in the American attitude. The United States, which last year was pushing strongly for early approval of the multinational force, is following a new tack. It started last December when President Johnson ordered an end to American pressure, in effect putting the next step up to Britain and Germany.

Conversations with European representatives indicate that they are reluctant to move without strong American leadership. The views of many Europeans were expressed by a German official who told the Post-Dispatch:

"It is absolutely essential that the United States enter the process more actively very soon. It is impossible for Europe to make a decision by itself when this is such an American project and the United States plays such an important role in it."

Mr. Johnson has not indicated whether he intends to reassert American leadership. There are hints, however, from American officials in Europe that the United States is maintaining a discreet but active interest in the project.

They deny emphatically that America has abandoned the multinational concept. Although there is a widespread belief in Europe that "MLF is dead," many well-informed sources are convinced that a compromise will be reached eventually.

They think a solution can be found by adopting a modification of the broader British scheme and including in it the multinational surface fleet advocated by the United States.

"I know the British say they will not participate in the MLF," observed a diplomat with long experience in European affairs. "But I think they would join if they were offered the opportunity to get in without any cost other than contributing, say, 500 sailors to the multinational crews."

There are strong indications that an arrangement of this type might be acceptable to Germany. Officials in Bonn said repeatedly that they see "room for a compromise" in the British position.

The basic U.S. objective of integrating its military forces with those of Europe for the common defense of the West is under question today.

With De Gaulle as the leading spokesman, a divisive doctrine is being pushed. It would rely on America for ultimate support but would place immediate responsibility for European security in European hands.

De Gaulle would like to see Western Europe organize its defenses around the French nuclear deterrent, the force de frappe. So far, however his neighbors have shown little interest in this idea.

"Why should we?" asked one German official rather caustically. "De Gaulle intends to retain full control of his force without giving anyone else a voice in it. We would be completely dependent on him."

Some skeptics question whether the other nations of Western Europe could rely on France to come to their defense in all circumstances. They point out that De Gaulle's record is one of intransigent independence that shows little concern for others. "What assurance is there that he would use his nuclear weapons to defend the rest of us?" asked one European critic.

The puny size of the French force, compared with American might, makes the idea even more unattractive to many Europeans. Informed sources say the force de frappe now consists of fewer than 20 bombers, each carrying a relatively small 60-kiloton bomb. Later, it is expected to reach a total of 50 planes or more. American experts say that most of the French fleet could be destroyed before reaching its targets by the Soviet SAM-3 missile, designed especially to bring down low-flying planes.

In time the French bombers are to be replaced with missiles and nuclear-armed submarines. The French hope to have by 1970 a nuclear arsenal equaling 2,000 times the power of the first atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima. But this total amounts to no more than 40 percent of the nuclear stockpile the United States has in Germany alone. To practical Europeans, the American figures are impressive.

European officials repeatedly indicated that they preferred to rely on the United States for their ultimate defense. Many would like a stronger voice in joint defense matters, leading eventually perhaps to a veto over the use of American nuclear weapons. An arrangement of this type has been suggested by some American officials as a desirable goal. Generally, however, they have recommended that a greater degree of European political unity must be achieved first.

Germany occupies a key position as the West wrestles with military problems. Under the Paris agreements of 1954 making it a member of NATO, Germany renounced the right to manufacture nuclear weapons although not the right to employ them.

German officials as well as other competent observers in Bonn say the nation has no interest in obtaining control of nuclear weapons. They warn, however, that this sentiment, could change. The best way to forestall such a possibility, in their judgment, is to give Germany a larger voice in nuclear affairs in the Western alliance. This is the principal purpose of the proposed multinational force.

France is exerting heavy pressure in an effort to kill German support for the multinational force. It has warned that participation in the multinational fleet would jeopardize chances for German reunification. The French have also threatened that any hope of European political unification, which Germany strongly supports, would be weakened if the multinational force is set up.

These are potent threats, but the Germans say they will not be frightened off. "We will not change our position despite France's opposition," an official in Bonn said firmly. "We have a right to demand a voice in nuclear affairs.

"We believe in an integrated, supranational defense organization. And we are ready to fight for our beliefs."

Like the Germans, officials in Italy indicated that they, too, will remain firm in demanding that the multinational force be included in any nuclear defense scheme that may be worked out by the allies.

Under the pressure of conflicting military policies, the NATO organization today faces one of the gravest tests it has endured since the North Atlantic Treaty was signed in Washington April 4, 1949. Unless the differences are resolved, the alliance could be fragmented, perhaps even broken up.

The results would be both serious and far-reaching. Warned one high-ranking allied military officer, "If NATO collapses, there will be a mad scramble by many nations to establish their own independent nuclear forces. The nuclear race will be on in deadly earnest."

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Mar. 24, 1965]

De Gaulle Tries To Make France Leader of Europe by Creating False Image of It as Great Power—He Antagonizes Friends as Well as Enemies, Causes Serious Dissension in Western Alliance

(By Thomas W. Ottenad)

PARIS, FRANCE.—Gen. Charles de Gaulle is the powerful magnifying glass through which France sees itself and its role in world affairs.

The image that the imperious French leader holds up is one in which France glitters grandly as a mighty world power, but the reality behind the reflection is far less impressive.

On any scale of power, France is not all that De Gaulle would make it seem to be. Big by European standards, it is nonetheless smaller than Texas. Its nuclear arsenal—sarcastically dubbed the farce de frappe by its critics—is small and of doubtful effectiveness. There is no longer an oversea empire. Both the economy and army are small. And there are big domestic needs such as substandard schools and housing.

Yet none of these shortcomings prevents De Gaulle from acting as if France were the equal of the Soviet Union and the United States. A master of the iron-nerved bluff, he has used his considerable intelligence, experience and Gallic shrewdness to try to push his nation into a dominant position in world affairs.

Apparently as heedless of friends as of enemies, he has followed an increasingly independent, intransigent and sometimes capricious course. French policies frequently have been tangential, or even in direct opposition, to those of other Western nations.

The 74-year-old French leader has clashed sharply with the United States, antagonized other friendly countries and caused serious dissension in the Western alliance. His actions have blocked hopes for political union in Western Europe and, say some critics, may even jeopardize world peace.

His objective is clear. It is to make France the leader of Western Europe and to make Europe a "third force" between the United States and the Soviet Union.

To do so he seeks, first of all, to reduce American influence in Europe. Thus he wants U.S. troops and weapons removed. He opposes the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and the Multilateral Nuclear Force proposed by the United States. He is hostile to American investment in Europe. He has adopted financial policies that might seriously affect the dollar.

The second hallmark of French policy is insistence on the sovereignty and primacy of the individual European state. France favors a scheme of loose political alliances, providing for consultation and co-ordination, but leaving each nation free to do as it pleases. It opposes any effort at present toward political federation in Europe.

Although De Gaulle frequently is given credit for special preworld affairs, critics believe that his philosophy of national alliances is anachronistic and dangerous. They are convinced that it is not the best way to protect peace. They see it as nothing more than a revival of the 19th century pattern of unstable power pacts.

"We mistook this approach for statesmanship once before," remarked one skeptic. "All it proved to be was a path to near-suicide."

Critics see much to worry about in actions taken by De Gaulle in the 6 years he has been in power. Their dossier begins with his veto in January 1963 of Great Britain's application for membership in the Common Market. This action, many Europeans agree, has had incalculable effects in slowing a movement toward political union and in reviving a dangerous spirit of nationalism.

France frequently has exerted a divisive influence by following policies contrary to those of its allies. Thus it is the only major nation besides Communist China that refused to sign the limited nuclear test ban treaty in 1963. In addition to Red China, it is the only principal country not participating in disarmament negotiations in Geneva. Like Russia, it has refused to pay its share of the cost of United Nations peacekeeping operations in the Congo.

France is the only Western nation to extend diplomatic recognition to Red China since the Korean war. It has made the American position in the Far East more difficult by opposing the war in Vietnam. Like Russia, France has proposed neutralization of Southeast Asia.

The French have shown marked cordiality to the Communist bloc. A 5-year trade agreement recently concluded with the Soviet Union will provide long-term credits for the Russians. Similar agreements have been made or are in the offing with other Soviet satellites. France has a trade pact with North Vietnam also.

De Gaulle's insistence that France and Europe must be completely independent of the United States has a rather hollow ring in military terms, for it is clear that he is relying on United States power to protect France.

This was made plain in a debate in the French National Assembly last December. Arguing the need for France's independent nuclear deterrent, Prime Minister Georges Pompidou nonetheless conceded the limitations of the small force de frappe. It would be "quite insufficient for achieving ultimate victory," he remarked, and therefore "the alliance remains a necessity." In blunter language, this means that from a military standpoint French independence is a myth.

Relations between France and the United States are, in the view of many experts interviewed by a Post-Dispatch reporter in a 9-week trip through western Europe, at one of their lowest points. There are wide differences on fundamental issues ranging from Vietnam and the Congo to defense policy and the future of Europe and the Western alliance.

A French official conceded that there was a deep cleavage between France and America, but suggested that perhaps the low point had been passed. Other observers are encouraged by a sharp decline in anti-American sentiment among the French public.

If France has its way, Europe's relations with the United States will be made as distant as possible short of an actual break. One of the clearest expositions of De Gaulle's views came in a television address to the nation last New Year's eve.

Pronouncing a "declaration of independence" from the United States, he asserted that "we intend to be our own masters." France, he said, would reject any supranational, multilateral or Atlantic system. He has argued repeatedly that anything but the most distant relationship will inevitably bring Europe under domination by the United States.

"The most disturbing factor about De Gaulle's attitude," remarked one American diplomat, "is that he misinterprets our policies. This is particularly true when he argues that the United States seeks to dominate Europe and when he questions the integrity of our promises to defend the nations of Europe."

Another American official questioned the sincerity of De Gaulle's argument that America might fail to respond to a threat to Europe. "This is just a rationalization to support his claim that France must have its own independent nuclear force," this source remarked.

In its relations with its neighbors, France is out of step on the question of European political union. Of the six members of the Common Market, experts say, only France opposes political federation. De Gaulle refuses to accept any movement toward political integration through the Common Market. He insists that its method of integrating national policies into a larger, common framework works only in the economic field.

As a pattern for the looser arrangements they favor in the political field, the French point to the treaty of cooperation they negotiated with Germany in January 1963. Significantly, even French officials concede that the pact has not worked well. Yet they argue that the same consultative approach could be used successfully on a broader, more difficult scale involving much of western Europe.

France's relations with Germany have cooled noticeably in the year and a half since Konrad Adenaur, De Gaulle's close friend, bowed out as Chancellor. The two countries have been at odds over the proposed MLF, the level of grain prices in the Common Market and tariff policy.

The atmosphere improved somewhat last December when Germany agreed to a schedule of grain prices for the Common Market. A month later De Gaulle and Chancellor Ludwig Erhard held an amiable meeting. De Gaulle agreed to Erhard's request for new discussions concerning German reunification and European political union. So far as could be learned, however, the agreement did not involve the substance of either difficult issue; it was only a decision for further discussions.

Among the few who have the opportunity to talk to De Gaulle, there is general agreement as to how he views East-West relations. These sources say the French leader believes that both the Eastern and Western blocs have lost some of their cohesiveness with the easing of world tensions in recent years. As the troubled waters recede, De Gaulle is casting about with every device, including bluffs and threats, in an effort to enhance France's position.

He is convinced that the Communist bloc is slowly changing, moving gradually toward a more peaceful posture externally and toward greater freedom internally. Through this kind of development, he is said to believe, an overall European settlement may eventually be achieved. The reunification of Germany in turn depends on a solution to broader European problems. In the Gaullist view, neither will be attained for many years to come.

The French people pride themselves on their realism and logic, yet to American ears some of their arguments on international issues have an incredible ring.

One of the most illogical sounding is their thesis that America seeks to dominate Europe. If the United States wanted to subjugate Europe, it could easily have done so after World War II, when Europe was nearly prostrate, say critics of the French view.

Equally difficult to follow is their rationale on the dangers of nuclear proliferation. They profess to see little hazard in the development of additional nuclear forces. But at the same time they complain that the proposed MLF would involve dissemination of nuclear weapons and is therefore dangerous.

Most astonishing of all was the argument against NATO advanced by one highly intelligent French diplomat. He said that French officers lose their sense of national identity when thrown into NATO's integrated command structure. Yet, he said, the same thing does not seem to happen to American or British military men.

Difficult ally though he is, De Gaulle has made immense contributions to his country's well-being. In the 1940's as leader of the Free French forces he helped his people regain their self-respect after their country had been overrun and occupied by Germany. In the 1950's he brought the bloody and disastrous Algerian war to a close.

Since his election as President in 1958, France has enjoyed a period of political stability far different from the governmental chaos that had prevailed for so long. A nation that seemed on the verge of civil war only a few years ago now appears remarkably tranquil. France has also enjoyed rising prosperity marred only by inflation.

De Gaulle is expected to seek his second consecutive term as President in elections late this year, probably in December. Political observers agree that he is almost certain to be elected, for there is no effective political opposition. The outcome of the election could be influenced by a recession that appears to be developing.

Most experts in Paris doubt that De Gaulle will serve out another full 7-year term. They believe that he will resign, perhaps after calling for a constitutional amendment to create the new position of Vice President. Prime Minister Pompidou is regarded as the most likely heir-apparent.

De Gaulle underwent a prostate operation last spring. Since then he has shown little difficulty in carrying the burdens of his office despite his advanced age. Last September he made a 20,000-mile trip through Latin America, visiting 10 countries and making about 50 speeches.

Even if De Gaulle should die in office, most experts doubt that there will be a political upheaval of the type that might have occurred a few years ago. They regard as entirely unlikely any move by the military to seize power, or development of a dictatorship of either the right or left. The selection of a successor will be made in orderly fashion, they say. They warn, however, that this rosy outlook could change if a severe economic collapse should occur.

Qualified observers here are convinced that De Gaulle's international policies have broad support, or at least, acceptance, among the French people. They doubt that there will be any sudden or dramatic change in French programs after he leaves the presidency. The tone may become more moderate, but the basic philosophy is likely to remain much the same, said one expert.

"De Gaulle has more political stature than any French leader since Napoleon. The legacy of his political thinking is likely to remain for a long time," he said.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Mar. 25, 1965]

Agricultural Tariffs Posing Principal Stumbling Block in Trade Talks at Geneva—Europeans Hope Major Cuts in Industrial Duties Will Offset Lack of Progress on Farm Goods

(By Thomas W. Ottenad)

Paris, March 25.—In an 18th century Swiss villa looking out on the snow-covered Alps a European trade expert leaned forward in his chair.

"Progress in the Kennedy round is slow," he remarked. "The big stumbling block is agricultural tariffs. They probably will not be cut by very much. Industrial duties, however, are likely to be reduced substantially."

This hopeful but cautious view of the complicated trade negotiations underway in Geneva is widely shared in Europe. As the Kennedy round moves into a critical stage, two other basic facts also have become clear:

The United States apparently has written off most hope of winning major concessions on agricultural trade from the European Economic Community, or Common Market. Its hopes now rest with other nations.

A highly protective trade policy that is developing in the Common Market will enable it virtually to exclude foreign farm goods at will.

The discussions at Geneva, the largest, most ambitious trade negotiations ever undertaken, are named for the late President John F. Kennedy. Mr. Kennedy sponsored the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 that made the Kennedy round possible.

More than 40 countries are participating in the negotiations that seek to liberalize and expand trade among the 64 nations that are members of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Negotiators are trying to make reciprocal cuts of up to 50 percent in tariffs and to lower other barriers to world trade. Thousands of industrial and agricultural products are involved.

The Kennedy round has been underway since May 1963. So far, no final, major results have been achieved. Most of the time has been spent in discussing how to negotiate, rather than in actual bargaining. Prospects are that it will be at least another year before the job is completed.

The present atmosphere in Geneva is disturbed and uneasy. European nations are unhappy about a number of American policies, including a 100-percent increase in tariffs on glass and carpets.

The United States is worried about European barriers to agricultural trade. Great Britain's 15-percent surcharge on most imports caused widespread ill will, although this condition should be remedied somewhat later this month when the levy is to drop by one-third. Uncertainty over political relations between the United States and Europe also affects the negotiations.

Despite hazards, knowledgeable officials such as W. Michael Blumenthal believe the Kennedy round can be carried through to a successful conclusion. The 39-year-old economist who heads the American negotiators at Geneva, told the Post-Dispatch:

"We already have offers of industrial tariff cuts that are better than anything ever achieved before." While Blumenthal gave no figures, most experts expect the Kennedy round to produce reductions in industrial tariffs averaging 30 to 35 percent.

This would be far short of the original goal of a 50-percent cut across the board. Nonetheless, it would undoubtedly be the most important international tariff reduction ever made. By way of comparison, the "Dillon round" completed in 1962 produced a cut variously estimated at 4 to 8 percent in American tariffs and covered only one-fifth of the Nation's trade.

The agricultural half of the Geneva negotiations is far less promising.

"It is the toughest part of the negotiations," remarked Blumenthal. "We will just have to wait and see what the EEC offers."

Any cuts that may be achieved are likely to be smaller than those on industrial goods. Some experts fear that the agricultural controversy might even wreck the conference. The more general belief, however, is that a solution will be found that will avoid a breakup.

Although the Kennedy round is concerned immediately with commercial trade policy, it has other far-reaching implications. It is a challenge with important potential benefits. It is, in essence, a test of the ability of Western Europe and the United States to cooperate. If they can succeed at Geneva, they may have a better chance for reaching common decisions on broader and more difficult questions like trade with the Communist bloc and relations with the less developed nations of the world.

Failure would be another serious blow to the concept of transatlantic partnership, already undergoing severe buffeting in the fields of defense policy and political relations. It might also put in jeopardy the continued existence of GATT, the major international organization dealing with tariffs and trade problems.

The final outcome of the Kennedy round will turn largely on whether a solution can be found in the next few critical months to the serious agricultural problem now facing negotiators at Geneva.

The task is a difficult one, compounded by domestic political and sociological considerations which are involved in the farm problem on both sides of the Atlantic. There are deep and fundamental differences between the United States and the Common Market, the largest traders in the negotiations.

As the world's leading exporter of agricultural products, the United States wants freer access to the markets of the EEC and other big importers of farm goods. It wants protective trade barriers lowered and would even like a guaranteed share of foreign markets.

In contrast, the EEC has an extremely backward and inefficient farm industry. Although it has only 46 million acres of land under cultivation, or one-tenth the American total, it has twice as many farmworkers. Leaders of the EEC believe protection is needed to encourage modernization of agricultural methods and to cope with political pressure exerted by the European farm bloc.

These considerations underlie a controversial agricultural trade formula which the Common Market has advanced at Geneva. Known as the "Montant de Soutien," (MDS) or "amount of support," the proposal is highly technical. In simplest terms its essence is this:

The margin of support provided for farm products by each country would be computed and then frozen at its present level. This amount, plus a variable surcharge when necessary, would be added to the price of cheaper farm imports. In the case of commodities entering the EEC from the United States, this would increase the lower import prices at least to the level of the Common Market's relatively high-priced domestic farm products or perhaps a little higher.

American criticism of the MDS was summed up succinctly by one negotiator in Geneva, who said, "It is highly protective. It creates an autarchical system. It aims at producing as much as possible inside the EEC under a system of complete price protection."

"It prohibits price competition because no matter how cheaply an importer can produce, the import levy would make it impossible for him to underbid European producers."

American negotiators are disturbed particularly by the possibility that the MDS concept might replace more favorable tariff arrangements now in effect. At present GATT guarantees enable a number of American agricultural commodities to enter the Common Market either duty free or subject to fixed tariffs ranging up to 28 percent. Under fixed rates, low-cost foreign producers can compete with domestic goods, a possibility that would be virtually foreclosed under a system of variable duties.

At present, fixed tariffs or duty-free guarantees cover about 45 percent of all American farm exports to the EEC. In the year ended June 30, 1962, U.S. sales under these provisions amounted to $470 million.

The EEC plan calls also for world commodity agreements to stabilize prices on grains, beef, and some other products. The United States is amenable to this idea. It has, in fact, proposed a world grains agreement, but wants it to include guarantees for sharing markets.

In defense of the MDS officials of the Common Market say that a new concept is needed in dealing with agricultural trade. They say subsidies and other elements of support must be considered, as well as tariffs. They believe that binding all these components under a GATT agreement would be a progressive step because it would prohibit any country from making unilateral changes in its support levels. They argue also that freezing farm supports at their present rates would, in effect, amount to a reduction because it would halt the increases that have occurred in recent years.

Under questioning, however, EEC spokesmen concede that the MDS and a related variable levy system already being used on some farm imports into the Common Market will not improve access to EEC markets for other nations. They acknowledge also that their plans will make price competition difficult for outsiders, will boost farm production within the Common Market, and may reduce their purchases of American commodities.

Although the United States so far has refused to accept the MDS, some officials in Geneva think its position is softening. Informed sources suggest that America may eventually agree to a variation of the MDS as the basis for an accord on grains and related products.

Those in a position to know believe that the United States is ready to give up its original hopes of gaining a larger portion of the EEC farm market through the Geneva negotiations. Instead, its principal objective now is said to be to hold its present share, amounting to annual sales of about $1.1 billion.

This development would force the United States to look elsewhere for increased farm sales to meet its often-stated objective of achieving improvement in both agricultural and industrial trade in the Kennedy round. It appears likely that this will be the strategy of American negotiators at Geneva.

It has been learned that in their efforts to boost U.S. farm trade, American negotiators are counting on gaining tariff concessions from such countries as Japan, Canada, and the United Kingdom. These three nations are important markets for American farm commodities. In 1963 they purchased $1.7 billion worth of agricultural products from the United States, or about half a billion more than was bought by the Common Market.

The Post-Dispatch learned that at least one of the three, the United Kingdom, expects to offer substantial concessions on agricultural trade to the United States at Geneva.

Although industrial negotiations in the Kennedy round have moved far more rapidly than those affecting agriculture, they, too, remain far from completion. Negotiators now are at work on the crucial job of reducing the size of so-called exceptions lists presented last November 16 by the United States, the EEC, Japan, and members of the Eurogean Free Trade Association. The lists consist of items that would be excluded wholly or in part from the general, 50 percent tariff cut that forms the working hypothesis for the Geneva negotiations.

Of all major trading nations, the United Kingdom presented the shortest list of exceptions—amounting to about 5 percent of its dutiable industrial imports. The United States estimates its proposed exceptions at 8 percent of dutiable industrial imports, with an additional 11 percent excluded from the current negotiations. The EEC puts its total at 19 percent.

Negotiation on the exceptions list will involve tough bargaining. Final agreement, which will, in effect, determine the size of the average reduction in industrial tariffs, is not expected for some time.

A long list of other problems remains to be dealt with in the negotiations, but none is regarded as insuperable. The most important include:

Providing tariff concessions to less-developed countries without demanding full reciprocity; handling "disparities," or cases in which there are wide differences between tariffs levied by two countries on the same product; reducing nontariff barriers to trade, and dealing with an effort by some Western European nations to have duties on steel and iron exempted from the general 50-percent cut.

Heartening progress has been made within the last week on several issues. An agreement has been worked out to admit two Soviet satellites, Poland and Czechoslovakia, to the Geneva negotiations. A plan has also been developed under which poorer nations of the world will be asked merely to offer some "contribution to the objectives of the trade negotiations" in exchange for tariff concessions from wealthier countries.

And on the difficult agricultural issue, agreement has been reached for submitting initial offers affecting farm trade by April 26. The first proposals are to deal with grains. At the request of the EEC, plans affecting other agricultural products will not be outlined until next fall.

The next few months will be crucial in determining whether the Kennedy round can move on to a successful conclusion. There may be trouble if the Common Market's farm offers, expected to be based on MDS, do not contain some liberalizing element.

The United States appears firm in insisting that any agricultural plan must meet the basic objective agreed to by all participants in the Kennedy round last May. This calls for providing "acceptable conditions of access to world markets for agricultural products in furtherance of a significant development and expansion of world trade." American negotiators have said that the original MDS plan did not meet this goal.

The agricultural problem is one of two major hazards that could cause the Kennedy round to fail.

The other is the possibility that French President Charles de Gaulle might blow up the negotiations. Many observers doubt that France wants a major success at Geneva. They believe that De Gaulle might try to torpedo the conference if he thinks that such a move would aid his campaign to increase French influence in world affairs.

"I don't really think he will do it," said one informed expert who reflected the views of many. "But nobody except De Gaulle ever knows what he may do."

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post-Dispatch, Mar. 26, 1965]

Labor's Program for Britain Is Hobbled by Tenuous Hold in Parliament and Tradition—Drastic Modernization Said To Be Needed if Country Is To Maintain Status in Nuclear Age

(By Thomas W. Ottenad)

Paris, March 26.—In London's Trafalgar Square an astute student of British affairs glanced at the statute of Lord Nelson, hero of the Battle of Trafalgar in 1805 and a symbol of the lost age when Great Britain dominated much of the world.

"The British," he said, "still claim the privileges of the mighty, but they are no longer mighty. They have lost much of their power, and I doubt they will ever regain it.

"This country's problem comes down to habits and traditions. In many ways it is an uncompetitive culture. In many ways it isn't interested in progress. It hasn't moved fast enough to keep up with the modern world."

This unhappy judgment is shared by many, including friends, enemies, and even some British.

Britain, they say, is no longer a first-rate world power. Indeed, they believe it may not be able to maintain a second-class position unless it is willing to modernize its economy, its society, and its entire structure.

There is a new battle of Britain to be fought and a new government to lead it. How is the Labor government elected last

October 15, and headed by Prime Minister Harold Wilson, likely to go about it?

Clearly the Laborites hope to turn the country in a number of new directions. Informed sources both in London and on the Continent believe the party's program will follow these major guidelines:

On foreign affairs—continued intimate relations with the United States; new efforts to relax East-West tensions; little interest in any form of European unity or Atlantic partnership that would submerge British identity; no new attempt to join the Common Market.

On Western nuclear defenses—would not really mind if no new steps were taken for quite a while.

On economic matters—Labor is determined to put more growth, technology, and government—into the British economy.

On social welfare—wants broad reforms in education, housing, and other fields, coupled with greater social security benefits, but on the whole no revolutionary change.

It is extremely doubtful whether the Labor government can act effectively on any meaningful program. With its precarious majority in Parliament whittled to three seats, it dares little more than caretaker functions.

The problem facing the British is compounded by the continuing difficulties of the pound sterling. Although not so dramatic as last year's spectacular run on the pound, pressure continues, raising the possibility that additional financial measures may be required.

Sharpest differences between the Laborites and the Conservatives who had ruled Britain for 13 years are expected in the role of the Government and in the Laborites' attitude on social and economic questions.

Wilson and his colleagues intend to play an active, influential role in many areas of society. In matters ranging from land speculation to the price of butter and the nation's whole economic future, the Government plans to take a forceful part, leading, cajoling, pushing, and persuading although probably not directly compelling.

To achieve social change the Laborites are ready to use powerful economic tools. This attitude shows plainly in revisions being made in tax policy. At one end of the ladder, a new capital gains tax is intended to redistribute part of the nation's wealth.

Many think this move is long overdue, for the gap is still enormously wide between the privileged few and the working classes. Nearly three-fourths of all personal wealth is owned by 7 percent of the population; half the amount is concentrated in the hands of less than 2 percent of the people.

At the lower end of the scale, new tax increases are designed to pay for what the Laborites call the largest expansion of social security benefits since the system began in 1948. Old-age pensions will rise by about 18 percent this year, giving typical elderly married couples payments of about $18 a week.

Changes by the Laborites probably will not revolutionize society overnight. This is precluded by a broad national consensus in Britain on many basic goals. There are large areas of practical agreement between the Tories and the Laborites.

Most experts doubt that there will be any really radical changes in fundamental British purpose. Thus the Labor Party is not going to try to get rid of private business any more than the Conservatives tried to get rid of socialized medicine.

Similarity between the two parties shows up most strongly in foreign policy. Basic ideas are much the same, although Labor is regarded generally as more anti-European. This may be true, but it also is true that the Conservatives were highly ambivalent on the question of Britain's relation to the rest of Europe.

Conversations with high Government officials as well as with experts outside the Labor Party indicate clearly that the Laborites have no enthusiasm for the idea of a federated Europe. "Why should we want to join Europe?" a Cabinet member asked in surprise. "We're not Europeans."

Some leaders of the party would find much more acceptable French President Charles de Gaulle's idea of a loose alliance of national European states, each still clutching tightly its cherished, if antiquated, national sovereignty.

Similarly the Laborites favor a three-cornered Atlantic partnership among the United States, Europe, and Britain. They have no liking for a two-way partnership between the United States an an integrated Europe that would include Britain.

In both these areas the Labor Party is at odds with the United States. America has favored true integration for Europe over De Gaulle's looser concept, and it has looked toward a two-member Atlantic partnership.

A third area of disagreement concerns Western nuclear defense policy. The Labor government has firmly opposed the American proposal for a multilateral nuclear force (MLF) for the Western alliance. Although Wilson has suggested as a substitute a broader Atlantic nuclear force (ANF), informed sources believe he really would not mind if his plan died just as, in the British view, the MLF already has.

Differences between the United States and Britain have been sharpened by mounting British concern over American policies in southeast Asia. The leftwing of the Labor Party has become increasingly restive at the U.S. expansion of the war in Vietnam. Disclosure this week that various forms of nonlethal gas have been used in South Vietnam has generated new controversy in Britain. There are increasing demands that Britain disassociate itself from American policy in Vietnam.

Britain's concern over Vietnam is intensified by its own problems in the Far East. It is heavily committed to support Malaysia in its struggle against guerrilla attacks by Indonesia. Producing about one-third of the world's rubber and tin, Malaysia is an important economic prize where there are heavy British investments.

Labor Party foreign policy places heavy emphasis on efforts toward disarmament and against the spread of nuclear weapons. Unlike the Conservatives, the Laborites are ready to give up Britain's own independent nuclear deterrent and depend on American military power. Their effort is complicated, however, by the MLF–ANF controversy.

Diplomats who have watched Wilson closely say he has two major objectives in foreign policy: one is to seek new ways of reducing East-West tensions; the other is to direct Western attention increasingly to the Middle and Far East, where he believes the problems are more pressing than they are in Europe.

By all odds the most imperative challenge facing the Labor Party is the herculean task of revitalizing and modernizing Britain's antiquated and sluggish economy.

One of Wilson's first moves in this area has been to try to cut Government spending on defense. This is mirrored in his effort to avoid the expensive MLF and to junk new, high-priced weapons such as the TSR–2 bomber.

This could be extremely significant if he is willing and able to go far enough. If he could shift the country's concentration of money, scientists, and technologists away from defense and into badly needed civilian export industries, the effects would be far reaching. But the job is both difficult and politically dangerous.

To deal with immediate crises in the balance of payments and pound sterling, the Government has been forced into a variety of short-term measures. These have included unprecedented international borrowing of $3 billion, a temporary 15 percent surcharge on most imports, and a hike in the basic bank rate from 5 to 7 percent.

The basic need is to increase exports and boost the rate of economic growth. Labor has pinned its hopes chiefly on Government-led efforts to plan the national economy, check the rising spiral of prices and wages, and prod both business and unions into better performance.

In the field of economic planning, top British officials talk privately of a scheme similar to the one used successfully in France since 1946. Such a program would set targets for economic growth, together with production goals for major industries. It would not be compulsory, but might offer financial incentives to encourage cooperation. This concept is considerably more ambitious than the limited approach to planning that was made by the Tories.

A new Ministry of Technology has been established to encourage industrial modernization. A new Ministry of Economic Affairs is to do long-range planning and find ways of strengthening industries that are most inefficient. A new agency to review price and wage increases may be given some indirect regulatory authority in an effort to hold the inflation line. And a variety of incentives are being considered to stimulate exports.

These are difficult measures to carry out. More important, there is a serious question as to whether they are adequate for the size and complexity of Britain's staggering economic ailment.

A few figures tell the story. There have been recurrent financial crises—three in 7 years; repeated balance-of-payments deficits—seven in the past 12 years—with one of the worst last year; persistent trade deficits—six in 7 years.

Economic growth has been slow and uncertain. The Labor Party estimates that if British growth had just kept pace with that of the rest of Europe since 1951, national income last year would have been a third higher, an extra $2.2 billion.

Exports are vitally needed, but in 1963 only 29 percent of British manufactured goods were sent abroad, the lowest level in 10 years. Britain's share of total world exports of manufactures has dropped steadily since 1953.

The causes for this economic malaise have their roots deep in a maze of sociological and economic factors that are not easy to change. One astute observer expressed the views of many when he remarked:

"The British are slow to change, probably too slow. Many of their methods are not modern. They are hampered by restrictive labor practices and inefficient management. Some factories, schools, and public facilities are hopelessly out of date.

"Furthermore, the economy rests on a precariously narrow base. There are few raw materials aside from minerals. Britain must import, manufacture, and export in order to live. To do so profitably, it must compete. But it has lost markets and become less competitive."

What is needed, say many, is nothing less than a national will to make drastic, fundamental changes. What is needed, as Prime Minister Wilson said recently, is "the spirit of Dunkirk."

No doubt there will always be an England. The question is—what kind.

[From the St. Louis (Mo.) Post Dispatch, Mar. 28, 1965]

Common Market Held Best Hope of Ending Europe's Nationalism—Economic Community, Now 7 Years Old and Apparently in Sound Condition, Exerts Indirect Political Force That May Effect Great Changes

(By Thomas W. Ottenad)

Paris, March 27.—The European Common Market is becoming an increasingly powerful force in world affairs. Through its concept of integrating national policies into a broader, supranational framework, it is exerting a significant influence on both economic and political life in Europe and the world.

It already has pulled the economies of its six-member nations into a close and cohesive relationship. In time they may merge into one economic entity in which a common European policy will replace individual, national goals.

The power of the European Economic Community is making itself felt far beyond its boundaries. It is exerting heavy influence on world trade, international monetary policy, tariffs, economic relations and agricultural and industrial life.

It also has become a major although indirect political force that may greatly affect the future shape of Western Europe. The "Eurocrats" at the head of the Common Market are among the strongest advocates of European unity and close partnership with the United States. Although both of these undertakings appear to be stalled, leaders of the EEC are fighting to keep them alive and to protect the limited progress that has been made.

They are working for the day when the Common Market can be expanded into a true political federation, leading the way toward a United States of Europe. Until that distant dawn, they are pushing ahead, confident that through greater economic integration they also are slowly but surely tying the knot of political union.

In this effort is the bright promise of the EEC. By all odds the most imaginative, forward-looking political development in Europe since World War II, it offers the best hopes for some day ending the national rivalries of this ancient continent and moving to a more rational and stable pattern of cooperation and unity.

After 7 years of troubled existence, the EEC appears today to be in sound condition. It seems to have recovered from the shock and paralysis that griped it 2 years ago after France vetoed Britain's application to join the Common Market.

At EEC headquarters in Brussels there is an air of confidence and assurance that was lacking after the French action. Top officials believe there is no longer any danger that the organization can be destroyed.

The Common Market now is moving toward its goals of creating first a customs union, then a full economic union and eventually a political union of its six members—France, Germany, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg.

Outstripping its original timetable in a number of fields, it is far ahead of schedule in its drive toward formation of a customs union. The job is nearly three-quarters complete. It looks as though it will be finished by July 1, 1967.

By that time, 2½ years ahead of schedule, there is a good chance that the Common Market will have achieved the two traditional hallmarks of a customs union—free internal movement of trade and a common tariff policy in dealing with the rest of the world.

Progress toward both these objectives has been impressive. All quota restrictions on industrial goods moving from country to country inside the EEC have been eliminated. Original internal tariffs prevailing when the Common Market came into existence in 1958 have been cut by 70 percent. This means that articles traveling between any two countries within the Common Market now are subject only to 30 percent of the national duties in force before the EEC was formed. The task of eliminating internal tariffs is now 40 percent ahead of the schedule outlined in the Treaty of Rome, which created the Common Market.

This freer climate has contributed to a phenomenal increase in business among the six members of the EEC. Intramarket trade leaped by nearly 130 percent between 1958 and 1963, climbing to $15.7 billion. Of course, not all of this gain is due merely to reduction of trade barriers. Much of it is the result of rising prosperity and the emergence of a mass consumer's market, which Europe previously lacked.

The task of creating a single schedule of external tariffs is moving forward rapidly. Each nation in the Common Market has its own duties, but they are being moved gradually toward a common set of levies that will apply to all. The job is now 60 percent complete.

For most goods the common external tariffs will be based on the arithmetical average of the national duties that were in force one year before the EEC came into being. The change will result in lower trade barriers in France and Italy, both high-tariff countries. It will mean higher walls in Germany and the Benelux nations, traditional free traders.

The movement toward a common external tariff has been accompanied by substantial increases in trade with the rest of the world. Between 1958 and 1963, imports by Common Market countries from the rest of the world rose by 53 percent, reaching a total of $24.6 billion. By comparison American imports in 1963 amounted to $17 billion. The EEC is the world's biggest customer.

By mid-1967 it is possible that the Common Market will have completed measures allowing the free movement of labor, capital, and business within the EEC. A common agricultural policy, which already covers 86 percent of the community's farm output, may be fully operative by that time, too.

Beyond the stage of a customs union lies the broader, more difficult goal of unifying the entire economies of the members of the Common Market. This will require a variety of actions, including steps to prevent price-fixing or other restrictive business practices and to harmonize manufacturers' taxes.

Also needed are common policies to replace national programs in transportation and foreign trade, together with coordination in labor matters and financial affiairs.

Initial steps have been taken in many of these areas. Experts in Brussels attach special importance to progress that is being made toward dealing with economic and financial matters on a communitywide basis. Last April in what constituted the first act of community economic policy, the six nations agreed on a common approach in combating inflation. They also made a start on economic planning and on strengthening the structure of their financial and monetary cooperation.

Some European officials think the eventual result may be the formation of an EEC monetary union. A powerful but indirect impetus in this direction stems from the common grains price set last December by the community. The fixed price makes it extremely difficult for individual members of the community to revalue their currencies unilaterally.

If a monetary union should evolve, making it possible for the EEC to act as a single powerful unit, it would have far-reaching significance in international financial matters. What form the union might take is open to speculation. It might set fixed rates of exchange among the six, provide for pooling of national monetary reserves and take other steps.

It might, say some enthusiasts, even lead to creation of a common EEC currency to replace the present national systems. Remarked one EEC official, "A few years ago it would have been impossible to talk of a common currency. Now no one even seems upset when the idea is mentioned."

Beyond the economic sphere there gleams dimly the greatest of all the promises offered by the EEC: the prospect of political union for Western Europe. Only limited progress has been made in this field. Further advances may be stymied for many years because of French President Charles de Gaulle's opposition to political integration.

Even though direct political action may be impossible, leaders of the EEC believe that progress in the economic field is serving to push Europe toward greater unity. They insist that important economic decisions are, by their very nature, political.

Emphasizing this theory, Dr. Walter Hallstein, president of the Common Market, told the Post-Dispatch, "The community is half political. We are not in business. We are in politics.

"We are pooling national policies concerning the economic field. We are already an economic and social policy union. What is in the air now is the second half of the work of the big book of European unification in this century—the union of foreign and defense policies."

There is a dispute over whether direct political activity is a legitimate function of the Common Market. The French are inclined to argue that it is not. They point out that the Treaty of Rome makes no specific provision for political integration.

While this is true, it is also true that there has been one underlying objective ever since the current movement to unify Europe began in 1950 with the "Schuman declaration" that led to establishment of the European Coal and Steel Community. The continuing goal of leaders of this effort has been eventual political federation. At times even the French have appeared to accept this premise.

Perhaps the greatest political value of the EEC lies in the strength and dedication of its leaders. They are determined to prevent the permanent creation of the kind of Europe that many of De Gaulle's critics believe he favors: a limited alliance cut off from intimate connections with the United States.

"We may have to move in the direction of De Gaulle's concept of loose alliances," said one high-ranking official of the EEC. "But if we do, the move will be temporary in nature and it will not be anti-American in character." He paused a moment, then added forcefully:

"There is no chance that the other five members of the EEC would join a Europe that is closed, inward-looking and anti-American. The choice that must be made is between a new Europe—one that is united but open, outward-looking and intimately associated with the United States—and the old Europe—one that continues to be divided and disunited."

A number of recent actions have contributed to the new strength of the Common Market. Chief among them was establishment of a common grains price last December. The decision ended a dangerous internal battle between France and Germany. It also opened the way for broader economic and political cooperation.

Earlier this month initial agreement was reached on a plan for merging the EEC and its two sister organizations, the European Coal and Steel Community and the European Atomic Energy Community. The first step, due at the beginning of 1966, will be the formation of a single executive branch. This is to be followed evenually by complete merger.

Another step forward is expected next January 1 when the present right of veto will expire on most major questions except treaty revisions and admission of new members. A new system of voting by qualified, weighed majorities will come into effect.

Under the new procedure, it will be possible for any one of the three large members of the EEC to be outvoted. As a result, France's ability to block action desired by the other five members of the community will be sharply reduced. Those who favor greater political integration hope that the change will make faster action possible.

There appears little likelihood that the question of British membership in the EEC will be taken up again in the near future. Government leaders in London made it plain that the Labor Party has no intention of renewing the nation's application for membership.

Relations between the Common Market and the United States have been marred by a fight over agricultural policy. American officials believe the EEC approach is a highly protective one that threatens to eliminate outside competition. The pessimistic fear that eventually the Common Market will be able to cut off imports of many items almost at will.

American interests aside, some informed sources question the effectiveness of the EEC's approach. They believe it may stimulate production, creating troublesome surpluses. They note that the European plan provides no direct physical controls to curb production.

There has been concern in some business circles in the United States that formation of the Common Market may damage American exports of manufactured goods. With internal levies removed but with external tariffs remaining around the EEC, there is fear that American firms will be placed at a disadvantage. The desire to get inside the EEC tariff wall explains in part the increasing tendency of American firms to establish European subsidiaries.

EEC officials believe American fears are groundless. They assert that the EEC's position on industrial trade has been generally liberal. It has cut industrial tariffs and can show that its average levy is lower than those of either the United States or the United Kingdom. Trading experience so far has been highly favorable to the United States.

The EEC is compiling an impressive record in many fields of economic and social policy. Among major actions, it has:

Established the principle of equal pay for men and women; created a social fund to finance the retraining of displaced workers; established antitrust laws; moved toward free movement for capital, labor, and business within the EEC; taken steps to assure equal rights for migrant workers; made loans to underdeveloped areas of the Common Market; laid the groundwork for a regional development policy; given financial aid to nations, largely in Africa, that are associated with the EEC; banned national discrimination in the transportation of goods and started work on a common energy policy.

Economic progress has been impressive, whether the EEC is cause or corollary. Wages and salaries of individual workers rose by 56 percent in 5 years after establishment of the EEC in 1958. Consumer prices in the same period rose only 16 percent. The community has become the fastest growing major economic area in the Western World. Between 1958 and 1963 its growth in both industrial production and gross national product outstripped that of the United States.

The linkage of six nations has created a powerful economic base. The EEC's population of 179 million is only slightly less than that of the United States. Its working population of 72 million is actually somewhat higher than that of America. Gross national product in 1963 was $249 billion, nearly half that of the United States. It is the world's largest trader, standing first in imports and second in exports.

A controversy is expected later this year within the EEC over a proposal to change the method of financing the community's agricultural support system. There are disagreements over the size of export subsidies, which principally benefit France, and over the distribution of revenues from import levies.

The outlook for the Common Market for the future appears to be for further advances toward economic unification but continued controversy and perhaps stalemate in the field of political union.

A top official of the EEC told the Post-Dispatch, "I think the situation that has prevailed for the past 2 years will continue for some time. On one side, the six nations are working together in the field of economic integration, making good progress.

"On the other, they are quarreling over political union, nuclear defense, foreign policy, enlarging the EEC, and over relations with the United States. We believe Europe must unite and be independent, but that its independence must be built in conjunction with, not against, the United States.

"We could move a lot faster if there were not so much anti-American feeling at the top in France."

ADDRESS BY WADE B. FLEETWOOD TO MINNESOTA STATE JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I have been informed that the Minnesota State Junior Chamber of Commerce convention held in Moorhead, Minn., on February 12 and 13, 1965, was a productive and well-attended one.

One of the highlights of the work of the convention was the presentation of the Partners of the Alliance program as a statewide project. This project was initiated by the Minneapolis Jaycees, and was unanimously adopted by the board of directors; a partners resolution was adopted during a business session attended by 500 delegates; and the program was detailed at a luncheon meeting, and was discussed further at a forum.

The luncheon speaker was Wade B. Fleetwood, special assistant in the Partners of the Alliance programs, Agency for International Development, Washington, D.C. Nearly 650 junior chamber members attended the luncheon, and heard how they can lead Minnesota in the organization of a statewide program in partnership with Uruguay.

The President of the United States mentioned the Partners of the Alliance programs as one of the accomplishments of the Alliance for Progress in his foreign aid message of January 14, 1965; and I ask unanimous consent that the address by Mr. Fleetwood be printed in the Record, so that Minnesotans and others throughout the country will have a better understanding of the partners programs.

I also ask that a report from the February 19 issue of Time magazine be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the address and the article were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address by Wade B. Fleetwood, Special Assistant, Partners of the Alliance Programs, Alliance for Progress, on the Occasion of the Minnesota State Junior Chamber of Commerce Luncheon Meeting, Held in the Civic Auditorium, Fargo, N. Dak., February 13, 1965

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, Jaycees of Minnesota, ladies and gentlemen, your international director of the Minnesota Jaycees, Mr. John Kotula, reminded me last night that Abraham Lincoln once noted that it was possible for him to prepare a 1-hour speech in 5 minutes, but that to prepare a 5-minute speech it took him 1 hour. As to my talk today, I will speak a little more than 5 minutes and a lot less than 1 hour. As most of you know, it will be my pleasure to participate in a special forum later in the afternoon at which time I will put myself in the bull's eye and do my best to answer your questions in detail in regard to the Partners of the Alliance program.

I feel that I would be remiss in my duty as a guest in your State if I did not pause to salute an outstanding Minnesotan and American, a great Senator and Vice President, your own Hubert H. Humphrey. It is my understanding that the Vice President and the mayor of Minneapolis, Honorable Arthur Naftalin, participated in a TV show in St. Paul last week in which both indicated their interest and strong support of the partners program. It is certainly a pleasure to welcome the support of the mayor and the Vice President of the United States.

I am also advised that Gov. Karl F. Rolvaag has expressed in a like manner his interest and support of this newly developing program under the Alliance for Progress. Yesterday, at the airport in Minneapolis, where I participated in a press conference upon my arrival from Washington, D.C., I had an opportunity to meet with Mr. Robert Goff, an administrative assistant to the Governor. He reaffirmed the Governor's intention to follow the program closely and lend the support of his office to enhance its development in Minnesota.

Also, your Minnesota congressional delegation is taking a leading role in making the partners program known among the citizens of this State. We are indebted for the assistance given by Senator Eugene McCarthy, whose initial letters regarding the partners program directed to certain of your State leaders, started the chain of events culminating in the presentation of the program today at this convention. Just this week, I had a visit with Senator Mondale who was very enthusiastic about the prospect of Minnesota participating in the "grass roots" program. Further, I had a meeting in the office of Congressman Alec Olson prior to coming to Minnesota. The Congressman has a deep interest in the on-going program between Montevideo, Minnesota, and Montevideo, Uruguay, and welcomes the complement to this program that a statewide Minnesota Partners of the Alliance Program would offer to the rural areas of Uruguay. Congressman Clark MacGregor of the 3d District and I traveled on the same plane yesterday from Minneapolis to Fargo and earlier, had a brief discussion of the partners program. Others of the congressional delegation are also looking forward to the report regarding the partners program and its presentation at this convention.

It is a pleasure to say a special word on behalf of the Minneapolis Junior Chamber of Commerce for the initiative and action-mindedness of their leadership that have brought the partners program as a project for the consideration of this convention. These young men have done much groundwork prior to the submission of their report to the International Relations Committee.

Another word of special thanks should be extended to the Moorhead Jaycees for staging this great Jaycee convention. They are to be commended for the outstanding arrangements they have attended to in making the delegates welcome and comfortable. Let's hear it for the Moorhead Jaycees. I feel right at home among Jaycees. Last May I flew directly to Moscow, Idaho, from Ecuador. There I joined your last year's national Jaycee president, Mr. Richard Headlee on the program at the Idaho State Convention of the Junior Chamber of Commerce. He, too, reflecting the drive and vigor of all Jaycees, was very much interested in the new Partners of the Alliance program and my first hand report from Latin America.

I feel that I must warn you that I became rather used to an old tradition in the Senate during my days on Capitol Hill. It was my pleasure to have served as executive secretary to Senator FRANK CHURCH for 7 years. Since coming to AID, and especially since working with this partners program, I find that I tend to filibuster. Please forgive me. Senator CHURCH and I grew up in the same block in Boise, Idaho. We enjoyed a friendship stretching back over 30 years. When we first came to Washington, D.C., an acquaintance of mine said, "Is it true that you and Senator CHURCH grew up in the same block?" I said that it was. "And is it true that you went all through school together?" I affirmed this. "Then why is it," he said, "that he looks so young and you look so darn old?"

Another young man, John Kennedy, of whose words we were reminded last November 22, said, "To other peoples in the huts and villages across the globe struggling to break the bonds of mass misery, we pledge our best efforts to help them help themselves, for whatever period is required * * * because it is right."

President Johnson, in his state of the Union address on January 4, 1965, twice referred to the Alliance for Progress, noting that we had "joined in an Alliance for Progress toward economic growth and political democracy," and, he affirmed, "I will steadily enlarge our commitment to the Alliance for Progress as the instrument of our war against poverty and injustice in the hemisphere."

In looking at our hemisphere, many have said that we face with the Alliance for Progress an even greater task than was undertaken by the Marshall plan in Europe. There, we sought to repair the ravages of 5 years of war while here we face the problems of five centuries. The Alliance for Progress has been the catalyst to commence the needed changes that will help build the economic institutions demanded for the growth and full development of the great potential of this hemisphere. The problems requiring attention are many and include land and tax reform and pressing problems regarding education, health and agriculture.

Last year a valuable conference was held in Washington, D.C., for the purpose of discerning the progress of the Alliance program. Mr. Bill Rogers, the Deputy Coordinator of the Alliance for Progress, chaired the conference. All of the U.S. AID mission directors in Latin America participated and sat side by side around the conference table, affording them an opportunity to come together and compare notes as to the workings of the economic programs underway in a great common effort in all of Latin America. The concensus was that much progress has been made toward attaining the goals of the Alliance for Progress.

By the end of fiscal year 1965, under the Alliance, U.S. AID will have helped provide over 36,000 classrooms; over 11 million textbooks; will have constructed over 2,100 water systems benefiting 24 million people; will have built 735 hospitals and health centers extending medical service to nearly 9 million people; will be feeding over 22 million people under Public Law 480; will have built 3,000 miles of road and trained nearly 75,000 teachers. This is achievement. Our share in this undertaking is $1 billion a year. Though this amount is very great, it is less by one-third than the $1½ billion we spend on our lawns and crab grass; it represents one-third of 100th of our income; it contrasts with the yearly increase in our wealth which is 15 times what we invest in Latin America. The countries of Latin America are heavily committed to the financial support of the Alliance also and, in fact, put in a great deal more than do we.

Under the Alliance for Progress, the government to government programs that have been launched are designed to help the countries of Latin America build their own institutional capabilities and to resolve their own problems. But it takes time to build institutions. Look at our own history. It takes time to develop an agricultural extension service. It takes time to build a savings and loan system. It takes time to establish cooperatives. It takes time to build a solid educational base and to train technicians. It takes time to build institutions to the point where they have impact on the people. In this institute-building process, the skeleton is the Alliance for Progress. It is people like you who contribute the flesh and blood to make the Alliance a living reality. We are reminded that in the charter of Punta del Este, it says "it is the purpose of the Alliance for Progress to enlist the full energies of the peoples and governments of the American Republics."

Last May 6, 1964, President Johnson, in a White House news conference said, "While the efforts of governments are vitally important in the struggle for hemispheric progress, the efforts of private persons and groups can also have great impact." He was speaking of the Partners of the Alliance program.

This, then, is in answer to the question, why was this program begun? The partners program is an effort to get the needed items right into the hands of the people in the slum and rural areas of Latin America who are trying to help themselves. The program dates from the assignment of my colleague and director of the Partners of the Alliance programs, James H. Boren, as the deputy mission director in Peru. Among other duties, Mr. Boren was the leg man for the mission and traveled throughout the country to meet the people and see what they were doing to help themselves. He found that they were engaged in many small projects in the villages and communities throughout Peru to better their lives. They often approached him with requests for mission assistance to implement the projects in which they were engaged. But funds could not be dissipated from the institution-building efforts underway in the country. In an attempt to get to those people with the small amount of financial assistance needed to make the difference between a project completed or abandoned, Mr. Boren saw the need to join the private sector forces in the United States with these efforts taken by small groups in Peru. He sought to bring together the needs he saw with the resources of United States organizations and groups that were willing and anxious to lend a hand. This was the formation of an alliance of peoples in a meaningful partnership for progress. Here was an attempt to buy a little time until the institution-building efforts made themselves felt on the people in the countryside.

The help that Mr. Boren was able to get to implement the numerous small projects was not in the form of gifts, but rather tools to finish a job. To us, in this program, a project is a blackboard for a school, a pump to lift water from a well, a generator to provide a little light, some toolkits with which to learn a trade. These are the items that help give a vital sense of movement to the Alliance for Progress in the rural areas of Latin America where the help is needed most. It is a program that complements the Alliance for Progress, seeking as it does to meet immediate needs of people.

Last May I had the opportunity to go to Colombia and Ecuador and meet with mission officials looking toward further implementation of the partners program in those countries. I was interested in seeing the people and learning of their problems so that I would have a first-hand grasp of the battle being waged against those forces that would keep men in poverty and want. I saw a town that had been rebuilt. Pelileo was destroyed in a great earthquake in 1949 and 7,000 of her citizens lost their lives. As the Ecuadorans said, not a stone was left on a stone. But those people have rebuilt their town a couple of miles away from the old site. I saw their wide streets and neat buildings and the pride on their faces. I visited the small hospital with its one doctor. The operating table is what you and I would call an examination table and the light for that room was a goosenecked lamp. There were no anesthetics. Since that visit, Idaho has become the partner of Ecuador and has assisted the people of Pelileo in their efforts.

Senator CHURCH recently told me that as he walks down the streets of Boise or Pocatello, people stop him and say, "Sure Senator, I know what the Alliance for Progress is and what its principles are. But what can I do to help the Alliance?" Senator CHURCH tells them now that they can help through their Lions, Kiwanis, Business and Professional Womens' clubs, Rotary groups, Junior Chamber of Commerce chapters, League of Women Voters and other local civic organizations through the Idaho Partners of the Alliance.

This partner program is a real challenge, a real test for the private sector. The opportunities to directly participate are unlimited. There is enough for all. And Minnesota has a target. Your partner is Uruguay.

Uruguay is south of Brazil and east of Argentina. Small in comparison with its neighbors, it is larger than Belgium, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Switzerland combined. Nearly 82 percent of its land area is devoted to livestock raising, while 10 percent is utilized with the raising of crops. Over one-half of its boundary is water—the ocean, rivers or lakes. The beautiful coastal city of Punta del Este gave its name to the charter that established the Alliance for Progress. Uruguay is a social democracy and does not contain the extremes of wealth and poverty common to the majority of Latin America.

The partners program offers the opportunity for Minnesota to develop a substantive program involving all the citizens of your State with the rural areas of Uruguay. It could be a meaningful augmentation to your on-going Montevideo program with the capital city of Uruguay. But to be really effective, it is imperative that you reach the people in this State—every group and organization within your borders can participate in the Minnesota Partners of the Alliance program. It is a channel through which civic clubs, unions, business, and professional groups, schools and even private individuals can work directly with the people of Uruguay.

What are the steps that can be taken in Minnesota to effect a statewide program and what can the Jaycee's do to spearhead the effort in this State?

First. The Jaycee's can be the leaders to help direct the selection of a statewide representative committee. All spectrums of life in Minnesota should be represented in that body.

Second. It would be the responsibility of the State committee to select a strong State chairman and executive committee.

Third. A nominating committee drawn from the parent committee would have the responsibility of selecting a program development team whose membership should encompass the fields of education, health, labor, business and civic organizations.

Fourth. Our mission in Uruguay will issue invitational travel orders for your Minnesota team to go to Uruguay and see the people. They would first meet with U.S. AID officials for briefings on the economic programs developing within that country as well as political briefings by our Embassy. The team would experience no junket, nor pink tea visit, but rather would ride in jeep or boat or plane to get out into the countryside, and would wade in the backwash of the rivers and eat the dust of the open road. Our teams return from Latin America complaining that they have no time to buy souvenirs. Their schedule each day is an arduous one.

Fifth. Your Minnesota team would then report their findings back to the State committee and discuss the self-help projects they had witnessed. It would be their task to help formulate the program by which the material and human resources of Minnesota could be marshaled and brought to bear upon the need they found.

Sixth. Finally, every Jaycee chapter in the State would be called upon to seek the groups and organizations within their communities to implement small impact-type projects that mean so much to the people who, by their own hands, are attempting to make for themselves and their children a better life. It is a fact that there is widespread self-help in Latin America and it is one of the reasons why the American people and the Congress are responding to the partners program. Our partners office acts as a catalyst to bring the private sector here and in Latin America together and 25 of our States are now engaged in the program. In his foreign aid message of January 14, 1965, the President of the United States saw fit to mention the partners program as one of the accomplishments of the Alliance for Progress. It is your program. The Government stands in the wings to serve as your resource, to speed communications and transportation between you and your partner.

In such a program, a program in which the efforts of all your citizens are important, each Jaycee chapter throughout Minnesota can function to develop this statewide program by taking the lead in your communities. I know of no more action-minded group to show the way. I urge you to lead. Your counterparts in Idaho, Colorado, and Alabama have launched the program. I predict that Minnesota can soon lead the Nation in a mighty response of the people here to lend a hand to those already helping themselves. I know that Minnesota will meet their extended hand not with charity but with friendship.

America is responding through her citizens in meeting the challenge. They seek to lift the eyes of despair to hope, to join hands with friendship.

America is responding through her citizens in meeting the challenge. They seek to lift the eyes of despair to hope, to join hands with those who seek to improve their lot, and thus, together, attain a vast improvement in the lives and spirits of men throughout the Americas.

I have come here today to seek your help, looking toward the prospect of Minnesota, with its industrious people and its bountiful resources, joining in a meaningful partnership with Uruguay. I am confident that Minnesota will respond.

[From Time magazine, Feb. 19, 1965]

THE ALIANZA—STATES-TO-PEOPLE AID

The biggest share of Alliance for Progress aid goes into long-term development programs, and it often takes a desperately long time to filter through Government bureaucracies. To give ordinary Latin Americans a sense of progress now, the United States is backing a new program called Partners of the Alliance. The idea is to match a U.S. State with a country, region, or large state in Latin America that shares some common characteristics and let the partners take it from there.

Since the program started 17 months ago, 22 U.S. States have joined, and 13 more are expected to sign up by the end of this year. Alianza officials in Washington establish the first contacts between the State governments and their Latin American opposite numbers. Utah is paired with Bolivia because both have a mountainous, mining economy; Illinois is matched with the big Brazilian state of São Paulo, whose booming highly industrialized capital city is Latin America's closest facsimile of Chicago. Most of the U.S. States then send a delegation down south to see how they can be useful; then get in touch with local organizations at home to get the plans going.

A shipment of 21 tons of electrical equipment from rural electrical cooperatives in Kentucky is helping an Ecuadoran cooperative double its output; Wisconsin plans to send a similar shipment to Nicaragua. Idaho has sent sewing machines to an Ecuadoran orphanage where the girls learn to become seamstresses. The junior chamber of commerce in Mobile, Ala., has sent to Guatemala a bookmobile and funds to build a rural school, while Santa Barbara, Calif., has provided $100,000 worth of medical equipment and pharmaceuticals for Bogotá.

Last week a Texas delegation headed by Edward Marcus, of Dallas' Neiman-Marcus department store, returned from Lima, where the Texans investigated joint-venture possibilities with Peruvian businessmen. And a group of New Jersey civic leaders is just back from a visit to Brazil's underdeveloped northeast state of Alagoas, looking for ways to help Brazilians help themselves. In one village the North Americans promised assistance for 10 self-help projects, starting with a powerful pump for an irrigation well. Arthur Byrnes, assistant Alianza director for Brazil, explains: "This program is small in terms of dollars. But it is reaching the people directly, bringing about immediate results, and that makes a great difference."

THE NEW FARM BILL

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, my attention has been called to the fact that the press-association articles on the farm bill sent to Congress today feature the statement that it will increase a little the consumer cost of bread.

Personally, I think the big news in the farm-bill story is that the income of farmers, who have been hard pressed for a decade now, is going to be improved a little, the rate of disappearance of farming units will slow down some, and the national economy will be stronger, as a result of the proposals the administration has made.

It is an interesting fact that strenuous efforts are always made to arouse consumers about farm bills, but the protests are almost always synthetic; they are not bona fide consumer protests.

The editor of the editorial pages of the Des Moines Register and Tribune made a speech at the fifth annual Farm Policy Review Conference here in Washington, in January; and he pointed out that the "bread-tax" cry was raised by a certain farm organization and agriculture-related industries, and that it did not originate with consumer or labor groups.

The editor, Lauren Soth, had the assistance of Dr. Don Hadwigger, of Iowa State University, in going over labor and consumer publications for 10 years.

Mr. Soth said, in his talk at the conference:

> There has been a great deal of talk in farming circles in recent years about "poor public relations," "bad press for agriculture," and the like. But I have found little evidence of this. In preparation for this paper, a search of recent (last 10 years) published materials of labor unions, consumer groups, and urban groups failed to produce significant examples of protest against farmers because of high food costs.
>
> As a matter of fact, the AFL–CIO usually has backed farm income support legislation in Congress. Consumer and urban groups, to the extent that they have taken an interest in agriculture at all, have been more concerned with the problem of poverty in agriculture, migratory farm labor, the absence of welfare legislation for farm workers, and that sort of thing, than in food prices. The National Consumers League, for example, testifying in Congress on farm labor and rural poverty in 1964, argued that the consumer could well afford the slight increase in cost of food that might accrue through providing a minimum wage and better living conditions for farm laborers.
>
> The truth is that practically all the objection to farm production controls comes from certain farm organizations and agriculture-related industries, which have a stake in large volume farm production, and from theorists who see such regulations as beyond the pale of prescribed doctrine of free enterprise. Farm organizations in some cases have argued that consumer antagonism required a reduction in farm controls. There has been talk of farm price support legislation being a "bread tax" on consumers. So far as I have been able to find, this protest does not come from consumers.

I sincerely hope the press will be fair to farmers, and will report the plight of farm operators.

For example, since 1959, prices received by farmers have dropped 6 percent, but prices paid by farmers are up 9 percent. The parity ratio, reflecting the relationship between prices received and prices paid, stood at 85 in 1958, and was down 10 points to 75 last year.

Giving the farmers 100 percent of parity for domestic food wheat is not going to cost American citizens as much as $3 per capita per year, based on average consumption of wheat products.

Food will still cost American citizens a smaller proportion of their income than food costs in any other nation in the world. Food will still be a bargain; and the American economy will be healthier—to the benefit of everyone in the Nation—if the Secretary's recommendation on food wheat is carried out.

My objection to the new farm bill, which I have examined only hurriedly, is that half the increase in return from domestic food wheat is to be recaptured by the Treasury by discontinuing export certificates—$125 million out of a prospective $250 million gain in farm income—at a time when saving farmers is more important than cutting the farm budget.

The liquidation of farmers hurts cities as much as it hurts rural areas. Half of the unemployment in our cities today is a result of displacement of farmers, who have been forced to move into cities and to search for jobs that are not available.

The modest increase in consumer costs proposed in the administration farm bill is probably a great deal less than city consumer costs will be to pay relief and unemployment costs, if farm income is not brought up to considerably improved and more equitable levels.

TERMINATION OF MEXICAN FARM LABOR PROGRAM

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, in 1963, Congress voted to terminate the

Mexican farm labor program. It did so because of the evidence that the annual importation of some 200,000 or more Mexican workers resulted in severe adverse effects on the job opportunities, wages, and working and living conditions of domestic migratory farm workers.

Congress gave the employers sufficient notice, of nearly a year and one-half, that they would have to make adjustments and develop new methods of recruiting workers.

It certainly was not the intention of Congress that the purpose of terminating Public Law 78 was to be offset by a great increase in the number of foreign workers recruited under another program permitted by the immigration laws.

I believe that Secretary of Labor Wirtz deserves commendation for his conscientious efforts to deal with this problem and to keep the number of foreign workers at a minimum.

Recently, representatives of the eastern and southeastern councils of churches met in Washington. This region includes 22 States, from the eastern seaboard through Minnesota. They issued a thoughtful statement regarding the migratory farm labor problem and the work of Secretary Wirtz; and I ask unanimous consent that their statement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Eastern and Southern Councils of Churches Concerning Migratory Farm Labor

Washington, D.C.—Representatives of 22 eastern and southeastern State councils of churches meeting in Washington sent a message today to Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz and congressional leaders supporting Mr. Wirtz in his firm stand against continued importation of foreign farm labor unless the grower can prove in good faith that he cannot recruit an adequate supply of domestic labor.

The statement said:

"The migrant ministry of the churches working together through the Councils of Churches has always conceived of its mission to include a ministry to both farm laborers and growers. In the interest of both, we recommend continued opposition in principle to the importation of foreign labor because of its detrimental effect on the domestic labor market and the agricultural economy of the Nation, and because it is believed there is sufficient domestic labor to meet the growers' needs if they are properly recruited, trained, and paid.

"It is recognized, however, that during the period of transition from the use of foreign to domestic labor many growers and those who must supply farm labor are faced with complex problems, but it is believed that the present regulations set by the Secretary of Labor are adequate.

"These regulations sharply restrict the use of foreign labor, but do permit their importation for emergency needs where the grower has demonstrated his inability to employ domestic labor.

"We firmly oppose any legislation that would open the door to the importation of foreign labor and express confidence in the Secretary of Labor to administer these regulations. It is strongly recommended that he not certify the importation of foreign labor until it has been demonstrated to him beyond reasonable doubt that the growers, in good faith, have exhausted every means possible of securing domestic labor without success.

"We also recognize that some growers face legitimate problems during the first year of transition from foreign to domestic labor and will need the Secretary of Labor's help in securing the labor they need.

"We are pleased to hear of and commend those growers who have by their own efforts and initiative raised farm labor standards and wages and have attracted sufficient domestic labor to meet their needs.

"The Secretary of Labor is also urged to intensify the efforts of Government to help provide an adequate supply of better trained domestic farm labor for the growers, and to raise labor standards so that no grower will need foreign labor in the future.

"We urge continued support for further migrant labor legislation to provide for (1) extension of the Migrant Health Act; (2) an agricultural minimum wage; (3) collective bargaining rights for farm workers; (4) prohibition of harmful child labor on the farm; (5) better recruitment, transportation, and placement procedures for migratory farm workers, and (6) the establishment of a National Advisory Committee on Farm Labor."

Executive secretaries and directors of migrant ministry from 22 eastern and southeastern State councils of churches have been attending their eastern regional conference on the migrant ministry this week at the National 4-H Center in Washington.

EQUITY FOR AGRICULTURE

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, Anson Horning, of the National Association of Wheat Growers, has just released a statement supporting the President's proposals today in the wheat section of the new farm bill.

Mr. Horning directs attention to the fact that wheat price has little to do with bread cost; that in 1947, when wheat was $2.80 a bushel—more than the President proposes for farmers at full parity, the price of a 1-pound loaf of bread was only 14 cents.

If the full cost of giving farmers a 100-percent return on domestic food wheat is passed on to consumers, he estimates that it will cost the average family about 2 cents a day, or only $1.60 a person, annually.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Horning's statement be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement of Anson Horning, President of National Association of Wheat Growers, Larned, Kans., Supporting Presidential Farm Bill Wheat Proposals

Anson Horning, president of the National Association of Wheat Growers, said the release of the administration wheat bill with provisions to improve wheat producers income was welcome news to wheatgrowers throughout the United States. "With income down the past few years and operating costs continuing to climb, many growers have been hard-pressed just to meet operating cost," Horning said. He stressed that 100 percent of parity on domestic consumption would improve income to growers without additional costs to the Treasury.

He pointed out the average American consumer today is spending only 18.5 percent of his income for food, and this is a smaller percentage than the consumers of any nation in the world spend for food.

Horning admitted that when the certificate price is increased to reflect full parity, the price of a one pound loaf of bread could increase by about seven-tenths of a cent. He further pointed out, "In 1947 the price of a one pound loaf of bread was about 14 cents and wheat was selling for $2.80 per bushel; now, today, wheat is selling for $2.00 per bushel for domestic consumption, and that same one pound loaf of bread costing consumers 21 cents—an increase of 50 percent to consumers while farm prices were declining almost 30 percent." He continued, "If the wheat farmer had received an 81 percent increase in the price of wheat from 1947 to 1963—the same as marketing spreads had increased—he would now be getting almost $4.00 per bushel for his wheat, and a loaf of bread would be costing consumers more than 24 cents."

"The added income for growers provided in the wheat bill will cost the average family in the United States only about 2 cents per day, or about $1.60 per year for each person. We believe that labor, industry, and the consumers of this Nation want to see Agriculture prosper, and will support this small increase in the price of bread in order to insure a healthy and prosperous wheat industry," Horning concluded.

ADDRESS BY ROGER SAVARY TO ANNUAL CONVENTION OF NATIONAL FARMERS UNION

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, one of the principal addresses at the 63d annual convention of the National Farmers Union, held recently in Chicago, was delivered by Roger Savary, secretary general of the International Federation of Agricultural Producers.

In his address, Mr. Savary reviewed briefly the history and activities of the international federation, and discussed the problems facing farm families in countries where a free economy exists—in particular, that of maintaining the individual owner-operator system of farming. He also dealt with the question of competition between farmers of each nation, as well as their areas of agreement.

I believe that his address will be of interest to all who are concerned with farm problems; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Address By Mr. Roger Savary, Secretary General, International Federation of Agricultural Producers at the 63d Annual Convention of the National Farmers Union, Chicago, Ill., March 1965

The International Federation of Agricultural Producers had its beginnings some 20 years ago when the decision was taken to broaden the original British concept of a federation of the farmers' unions in commonwealth countries and to set up instead, a world body including at the start the national organizations of farmers in European and North American countries.

There were two major reasons why the response to the call to establish a world farmers' union was received with such favor: The first one was that the experience of the thirties had clearly demonstrated that laissez-faire could no longer be expected to restore even a semblance of balance on agricultural markets but also that no strictly national policy was likely to achieve an acceptable farm situation in a world where recourse to export and import control and to widespread governmental subsidies had become almost universal; the second reason was that the establishment of the Food and

Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) had raised great expectations in two directions. It was widely anticipated that governments through FAO would promptly evolve a network of international agreements designed to achieve an orderly marketing of the major agricultural commodities on a world basis; and it was equally hoped that a successful attack would be made on the problem of undernourishment and malnutrition in underprivileged areas of the world.

IFAP was an immediate success. The most striking feature of its first conferences was a realization of the extent to which farm leaders the world over agreed on a few fundamental principles and were willing to try to reconcile their differences in the mutual interest of their members.

In the early years of the federation the major problems of world agriculture were, of course, to reconstitute the production potential of farms in all the areas which had suffered directly or indirectly from war operations. These were the years of the Marshall plan and the European recovery program; the years when European farmers were catching up on technical developments which had taken place while they were starved for information and requisites. The concept of productivity became better understood and great strides made everywhere. At the same time world farm leaders realized clearly that agriculture was the most vitally interested economic sector in a rapid growth of the world economy.

In the long run, expanding markets for food would emerge primarily in those areas where people's diets are grossly inadequate and the only way to transform their existing needs into effective demand was a stepped-up rate of their economic expansion. IFAP was, I believe, the first international nongovernmental organization strongly to endorse the United Nations programs of technical assistance and economic cooperation. It was also instrumental in convincing governments to conclude major commodity agreements under which, in particular, an expanding wheat trade at stable prices became possible.

In the early fifties, however, structural surpluses of a few commodities began to hang over world markets and the problem of their utilization became topical. While controversies among exporting countries were taking an unpleasant turn, farmers' organizations in IFAP unanimously recommended and promoted the adoption of international principles of surplus disposal and the establishment under FAO auspices of the Washington Consultative Subcommittee which is still being used as a clearinghouse and as a watchdog body. Simultaneously, IFAP was active in promoting multilateral schemes for the utilization of surplus skim milk powder to improve the milk supply of large Asian cities.

Meanwhile, the extraordinary advances made in this country's agriculture combined with the unprecedented generosity of the American people to launch the gigantic food aid programs of the Eisenhower and Kennedy administrations. But, IFAP remained convinced that a multilateral approach involving all nations would be preferable and worked assiduously to propagate that idea. After many disappointing attempts, the United Nations in 1961 approved the world food program through which food supplies are used, under international management and supervision, to accelerate the economic development of the less developed countries. This program was an experimental one and it is due for renewal and expansion at end of 1965. IFAP has combined its influence with that of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) and the International Cooperative Alliance (ICA) to put pressure to bear on governments and insure its continuation as a major tool in the global war against underdevelopment.

The world farming community, which IFAP was established to represent, consists primarily of producers who do not enjoy the benefits of advanced technology and do not as a rule harvest embarrassingly large crops. Although the stage of development reached by many countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America is not yet such that active and representative organizations of farmers have emerged, many such organizations have joined IFAP during the last few years. They have IFAP's active support in their endeavors to secure a more satisfactory standing for agriculture in national development plans and technical assistance programs, more substantial incentives to increased production, and more acceptable conditions for the agricultural producers. FAO's Freedom from Hunger Campaign, now in its fifth year, was launched to dramatize the magnitude of this problem and it is significant that the first campaign coordinator was the Secretary General of IFAP who has the honor of addressing you this evening.

I could, as you may well imagine, elaborate at length on these activities of IFAP as well as on many others which have left their mark in the contemporary world: the extraordinarily successful record of our European Regional Committee where the very first proposal for a common agricultural policy originated and where in spite of political developments beyond their control—producers' representatives of all European countries continue to collaborate in harmony; the similar meetings held, on this side, among Canadian, United States and Mexican member organizations; the activities of our Standing Committee on Agricultural Cooperation; those of our newly established commodity committees, and many others. But, I would now like to turn to another aspect of farmers' organizations work through IFAP, which can be described as a continuing search for a better understanding of their mutual interests and common problems.

That phase of IFAP's activities concerns the complex issue of how best to achieve and insure a reasonable level of prosperity for viable family farms in the context of a rapidly industrializing economy.

One of the common beliefs held by farmers' organizations the world over is a conviction that there can be no substitute for the unique contribution made to civilization, democracy, and a balanced society by the individual farm operator. And their common experience is that that irreplaceable form of free human enterprise is gravely threatened today.

Leaving aside the predicaments of agricultural producers in those countries whose governments have adopted totalitarian systems which are seldom concerned with the welfare of the rural populations, we can see clearly that farmers today are often confronted with the alternative menaces of ruthless liquidation and economic colonization. But, we can also see that they need to watch carefully many other aspects of the present evolution.

To cure all the difficulties confronting agriculture in a rapidly expanding industrial economy (the least of which is not the tendency of nonfarm prices to increase year after year under the combined influence of cost inflation and demand inflation with the nonfarm sector, notwithstanding the latter's loud claims of ever-improving productivity), many economists in this, as well as in other, countries have a panacea to offer: drastically reduce the agricultural population.

Everybody is naturally agreed that there is an unavoidable relationship between the progress of productivity per man inherent on the implementation of new techniques and a decline in agriculture's manpower requirements. But, there can be no such agreement on three crucial points: the pace which is socially desirable and economically profitable for such transformation; the extent to which they should be allowed to proceed—in other words, the minimum acceptable size of the farm population in a given country; and the policies best suited to insure a smooth transition from the ways of farming of yesteryear to those of decades to come.

This is not the time to discuss these issues in depth. But, it is perhaps relevant to note that those who advocate the urgent and radical transformation of farming patterns seem to be less concerned with the extent to which, and the ways in which, this could be achieved without unacceptable hardships for millions of farm families and, indeed, for the local and national communities as a whole, than with the solution of fiscal and political problems. Problems which the increasing prosperity of the Western economies would seem to have reduced to quite manageable proportions.

The threat of liquidation concerns farmers in practically every country and the formulation of positive instead of negative policies to size up rationally and to cope constructively with adjustment in agricultural population numbers is a challenge of our time.

But, the need will remain as these policies are being evolved and implemented—and long after they have alleviated current difficulties—to maintain the safeguard of farm supports. This is precisely what the proponents of a drastic rationalization of farming patterns prefer to ignore. On this vital issue, virtually every farm organization has adopted similar policies and this creates across boundaries one of the strongest links among them.

Adjustment problems in agriculture have, during the last few years, taken a new dimension with the spread of "contract farming." Because centralized management of the various phases of the food productive processes—all the way from the industrial supply of agricultural requisites to the retailing of precooked meals—makes for greater efficiency and higher profitability, hundreds of thousands of farmers in Europe as well as North America have become involved in gigantic economic operations over which they so far exert little or no control.

At the same time, the trend toward larger production units has introduced within the agricultural sector competitors which have little hesitation to jeopardize traditional farmers' markets and to manipulate them to their immediate advantage even at the risk of compounding an already precarious supply-demand position.

Concentration in the supply, processing, and marketing sectors, vertical integration and contract farming are progressing everywhere by leaps and bounds. The farmer when he does not realize in time the dangers of these transformations and does not work almost frantically to establish and strengthen producer-controlled cooperatives or bargaining organizations before nonfarm interests secure an entire control of this sector of activity is bound to become a helpless cog in the new agri-business complex. These spectacular developments have originated in this, the most advanced and capitalized economy in the world. But, they have become a major subject of preoccupation of farm organizations everywhere. Active consultations among them is an important current task in IFAP.

Even where the farmer succeeds—as a majority of them fortunately do—to safeguard his existence, freedom, and independence to become a member of a fair cooperative undertaking or to be associated in dignity with a contractual complex, present trends in agriculture demand a careful reconsideration of a number of traditional concepts.

The field where the farm operator is in a position to exert fully his initiative and freedom of choice tends to narrow year after year. The management adviser and his linear programing virtually select his lines of production for him, the soil specialist tells him how to work and fertilize his land, the crop and livestock specialist tells him how to produce to best advantage, and the manager of the marketing cooperative finds an outlet for his products.

In these new circumstances the farmer can only remain an imaginative and intellectually active entrepreneur when he broadens his horizon and takes an active part in the formulation and implementation of farm organizations policies. This vital function of farmers associations is increasingly recognized and a subject of fruitful consultation among them.

Farmers have to struggle harder than ever to maintain a degree of influence in the management of public affairs. With the reduced influence which is the consequence of their declining numbers, they must learn to live in a society where major politico-economic decisions affecting their well-being will increasingly be taken by representatives of the urban people. Their organizations, therefore, have no more pressing task than that of projecting a true image of today's farmer.

It is not true that public opinion is spontaneously inimical to farmers' interests. On the contrary, there remains a fundamental appreciation in every urban dweller's conscience of the role of the food producer. But, that reserve of good will is being whittled away by unfair descriptions of the true conditions. Farmers are being denounced as responsible for rising costs of living even though their share of the consumer's dollars spent on food is steadily declining and the residual share in the overall expenditure for total private consumption has become almost negligible. They are being accused of pilfering the State treasury through subsidies and grants when these expenditures are only a fraction of huge State budgets and an inadequate redress for the way in which economic factors are stacked against the little man in a system largely controlled by large concentration of interests.

I understand that a congressional inquiry is underway which should throw light on these corners of the food economy where the real profits are made and I trust that it will be of as much interest to all farmers' organizations as was a few years ago the report issued by the Royal Canadian Commission investigating the same subject.

Many people are asking me whether the notion of an international brotherhood of agriculturalists is not deceptive. Are not farmers of the various countries primarily competitors? Conflicts of interests between them would seem to rule out a community of interests.

The little I have been able to say of the major facets of IFAP's work already indicate that there is a substantial community of interests among farmers in a number of the major fields of contemporary economic policy.

But farm leaders in IFAP do not shy away from a frank confrontation of those issues which may tend to divide them. It must be realized in the first place that individual farmers within a nation, still more than farmers of different countries, are competitors. This is the very foundation of a free economy. It has never precluded the successful and beneficial operation of farmers' unions. International competition per se is not therefore a factor which should rule out the possibility of active international cooperation.

International competition, to be sure, differs greatly from competition on a national market. The main difference consists in the fact that producers in different countries are included in very dissimilar economic environments and operating under completely distinct laws and policies. A situation which calls for a substantial degree of government control. But, we have seen that the operation of market forces at national level is universally government-controlled in the agricultural sectors. Similarly, there is an almost unanimous recognition nowadays of the need for a policy of orderly marketing at the international level. To that extent, national and international problems are not, therefore, different in nature and there is room for an international agricultural policy.

What, exactly, such a policy should be remains, of course, a matter of continuing debate. The important underlying prinicple, from farmers' standpoint, is that that debate must take fully into account all the factors which are recognized as relevant in the national context. It would obviously be inconsistent to apply a double standard to national and international policies. If a degree of price stability, acceptable farm incomes, smooth adjustment to changes, protection of the farmer against abuses of superior bargaining power by its economic partners, the imperatives of a rational town and country planning, and many other factors are relevant to the formulation of a national farm policy, these same factors cannot be deliberately ignored in evolving an international policy.

This is the crucial point on which all farmers' organizations are agreed. The following excerpt from the policy report of the last IFAP Conference puts it in a minimum number of words:

"It would be wrong to pass judgment on the merits of national farming policies by reference to an oversimplified concept of an international division of labor. But, a constructive approach demands that the validity of the principles on which each country bases its policy decisions must be constantly reassessed. Internationally, it is clear that regular examinations among countries of their national agricultural policies is necessary."

Farmers' organizations in IFAP are earnestly working in that direction. Assiduous and painstaking efforts are made by all to study and to understand the problems of the other national farming communities. As a result of these activities, I can confidently say that there is today a much greater degree of mutual understanding and good will among farm leaders the world over than in any period of history.

During recent months, however, we have witnessed a disquieting tendency, on the part of governments engaged in difficult and protracted trade negotiations, to enlist the support and to appeal to the loyalty and alleged self-interest of farmers' organizations who are pressed to give uncritical endorsement to rigid negotiating positions which often fail to recognize, as does IFAP policy, "the primary aim to seek, nationally and internationally, an improvement on the levels of income for agriculture so that they compare more favourably with those in other economic sectors." I do not believe that such tactics enhance the chances of a successful outcome of trade negotiations which are already reduced by the unfortunate tendency of press reports to describe the progress of these negotiations in terms which would be more appropriate for a world boxing championship.

In order to whittle away the efficiency of and, if possible, to destroy national farm policies, it is a time-honored practice for those interests which are not particularly amicable toward the farming industry to play upon the differing outlook of small and commercial farmers; of crop and livestock producers; of farmers in various States and areas. The same tactics may prove equally detrimental to the future of the world farming community as a whole.

In these circumstances it is all the more encouraging to see that U.S. farmers remain strongly united under the enlightened leadership of such international figures as your universally respected president, James G. Patton, and his successor to the presidency of IFAP, the Grange's national master, Herschel D. Newsom. One of the purposes of my visit to this convention was to bring you the message of good will of the farmers of the world who have learned so much from the pioneering developments achieved by U.S. farmers and who look forward to further progress in the direction of an even closer partnership among all of those who will remain engaged in the most noble calling on earth.

VIETNAM

Mr. MORSE. In today's issue of Newsweek, dated April 12, 1965, the incomparable Walter Lippmann really made my speech for today in opposition to the shocking American war and its continuation in Asia. He says in his article, entitled "Nearing the Brink in Vietnam":

> While the American press is free to report and comment on Vietnam, our people are receiving very little official guidance and help in understanding the portentous events which are happening. Officially, we are being told that we are now involved in a war between two separate nations, North Vietnam and South Vietnam, and that our task is to put enough pressure on the North Vietnamese to make them cease and desist from taking part in the war at the other end of the country of Vietnam.
>
> The official interpretation is one of those half-truths which can be grossly misleading. The half of the truth which we are being told is that North Vietnam is sending some men and officers, is helping to supply, and is probably directing the strategy of the civil war in South Vietnam. The half of the truth which is being neglected is that in a very large part of South Vietnam the resistance to the Viet Cong has collapsed.
>
> Yet, it is the state of the war in South Vietnam which is of critical importance to the United States. It is on that above all that we need to fix our attention. For it is in South Vietnam that disaster impends, and it is the effort to forestall the disaster that brings us very near to becoming involved in a land war of great proportions. It is there that we are being pressed to engage several hundred thousand American troops and to face the prospect of at least a partial mobilization in this country to support and sustain those troops.

Under the heading, "Official Theory Versus Actual Events," Walter Lippmann continues:

> The argument for making South Vietnam a second Korea is growing louder in the lobbies and corridors of Washington. The argument is being made because the official theory of the problem in South Vietnam has been confounded by events. The theory, which was propounded by Gen. Maxwell Taylor when he persuaded President Kennedy to enlarge our intervention, was that with enough arms, more money, and some American military advisers, the South Vietnamese could create an army able to subdue the Viet Cong rebellion. Until a year ago, more or less, this was the theory on which our excellent Secretary of Defense rested his hopes and his plans, and staked his reputation as a political prophet.
>
> The theory has not worked. Our side has been losing steadily the control of the countryside. It has failed to win the allegiance of the peasants, who are not only the majority of the nation, but are the one and only source of military manpower. Today, the principal highways north and south, east and west, have been cut by the Viet

Cong, and the cities where our clients are holed up are being supplied by air and by sea. The South Vietnamese Army has not surrendered, but it has so little will to fight and has such a high rate of desertion that we can no longer count on South Vietnamese soldiers even to supply sentries for American air bases and installations.

The basic character of the war has changed radically since President Johnson inherited it from President Kennedy. It used to be a war of the South Vietnamese assisted by the Americans; it is now becoming an American war very inefficiently assisted by the South Vietnamese. In fact, it would not be much of an exaggeration to say that the South Vietnamese, who have good reason to be war-weary, are tending to sit on the sidelines while we, who have promised to "win" the war, are allowed to show how we can win it.

Under the heading "Numbers Not Enough," Lippmann continues:

For a time the warhawks in this country argued that a certain amount of bombing—a "clean" war in the air rather than a "dirty" war on the ground—would do the trick. But it has not done the trick. All wars, and particularly civil wars, are won or lost on the ground.

It is evident enough now that the South Vietnamese ground forces are unable and unwilling to fight the war effectively. They may have a superiority in numbers over the Vietcong of 5 to 1. That is not nearly enough in guerrilla wars where a ratio of 20 or 50 to 1 is not always enough. And so we are being confronted with two dismal prospects. The first is the landing of American soldiers for an interminable war on the ground against the inexhaustible masses on the Asian continent. The second prospect is the bombing of the populated cities in North Vietnam. This would bring down on us the opprobrium of almost all the world and also the risk that we would compel Russia and China to join in opposing us.

Having staked our prestige on the outcome of the civil war which is being lost in South Vietnam, we may find ourselves with a choice between the devil of defeat in South Vietnam and the deep blue sea of a much wider war in Eastern Asia. That choice could perhaps be avoided if we remember in time that when there is no military solution to a conflict, there must be negotiation to end it. In such a situation, only fools—

I repeat, only fools—

will go to the brink and over it.

ANTI-U.S. CHILL PERVADES RUSSIA

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article by Drew Pearson which appeared in today's Washington Post, entitled "Anti-U.S. Chill Pervades Russia," be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 5, 1965]

ANTI-U.S. CHILL PERVADES RUSSIA

(By Drew Pearson)

MOSCOW.—A week in Moscow gives you the definite impression that the United States and the Soviet Union may be on a collision course.

In terms of climate the snow is melting, the sun is out, the huge snow plows are being laid up for the winter, the more daring daffodils are poking their noses out from under the slush.

But politically the climate is the opposite. The freeze is on toward the United States and daily it is getting more frigid. With each bombing of North Vietnam, each statement justifying the use of gas, each photo of Vietnamese children burned by napalm, the situation gets worse.

This is my third trip to the Soviet Union in 4 years, and never before have I found criticism toward the United States so intense.

The first visit was in the summer of 1961 when the Berlin wall had just been built, Russian and American tanks were rumbling on both sides of the wall, President Kennedy had sent 50,000 extra troops to West Germany and Khrushchev had sent about twice this many to East Germany. A false step could have started war.

But the attitude of Soviet officials toward the United States was not as harshly critical as it is now.

SOVIET-UNITED STATES FRIENDSHIP

My second visit was in the summer of 1963 for a second interview with Khrushchev, this time shortly after the signing of the nuclear test ban treaty. The Russian people were then glowing with praise of the United States.

After that interview I took a sheaf of press cables to the Soviet telegraph office in Socchi to wire collect to New York. I expected a long wrestle with the cable officials—almost inevitable in an Eastern country when you haven't cleared your collect press privileges with the foreign office.

The lady in charge read the first cable regarding better relations between the United States of America and the U.S.S.R. and remarked: "Anything we can do to help peace I am for." She sent the cables collect, thereby trusting a strange capitalist newsman for about $300.

When I went to the only radio station in Socchi—Government owned—to make a transcription for use in the United States, the manager was glad to accommodate me. I asked the charge. "Nothing," he replied, "if you will make a broadcast about your visit to Socchi."

Today this would not and did not happen. Much of the good will built up by the test ban treaty, the friendship so carefully cultivated by exchanges of professors, students, scientists, and officials during the past 10 years, is out the window.

There are several reasons for this resumption of the cold war. The most overriding and important is the fact that the United States has embarrassed the Soviet with the Chinese over North Vietnamese bombing and coexistence.

For approximately 5 years the Chinese have been telling the Russians that coexistence would not work.

Today as a result of our bombing of North Vietnam, the Chinese have been really rubbing it in. With almost every bombing raid, they have been saying, "We told you so."

IS UNITED STATES A PAPER TIGER?

Before I left Washington, officials were arguing that the United States was doing the Russians a big favor by bombing North Vietnam, a policy that demonstrated we were not a paper tiger, that we were a force the Communist world had to reckon with.

It hasn't worked this way at all. There was never any thought in the Russian mind that the United States was a paper tiger. The entire Soviet structure knew—especially after the Cuban missile crisis—that we could not be pushed around when our own defenses were threatened.

But bombing a small country on the opposite side of the globe where American security is not involved, in defense of a nation that in the last year has had an average of one change of government per month, doesn't help the Russians demonstrate to the Chinese that we are no paper tiger.

It helps the Chinese demonstrate that we are aggressive bullies. As one Russian put it: "It's like a big boy at school smashing a small boy in the face. All the sympathy is for the small boy."

In the Kremlin there are powerful forces that never liked Khrushchev's pro-American policy now exerting their influence against the United States. It is this that makes the situation in Moscow so dangerous and could lead to a collision course with the United States.

Mr. MORSE. Drew Pearson has just come back from Russia. He gives an account in this article of the chill that pervades the Soviet Union vis-a-vis the war being conducted by the United States in South Vietnam.

Members of the Senate have heard me say for many months that we are headed for a massive war in Asia. I make the statement that we are galloping toward that massive war in Asia and that thousands upon thousands of American boys are going to be involved in the next 12 months if the course of action of this administration is not changed.

CANADA AND THE ASIAN CRISIS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the press reports of Prime Minister Pearson's visit with the President recently left the impression that Mr. Pearson sought to express concern about events in Asia without actually doing anything about them. I regret that Canada has not seen fit to act under the United Nations Charter to bring about an end to the fighting in Vietnam, by bringing the matter to the attention of the Security Council of the General Assembly. Canada signed the charter. But Canada has no boys in South Vietnam. It is one thing for the Prime Minister of Canada to come to the United States and make certain suggestions to the President, but I most respectfully say to him that I believe that Canada has a clear obligation, as a signatory to the United Nations, to lay before the United Nations an official request that the United Nations take jurisdiction over this threat to the peace in Asia. Mr. Pearson's suggestion for a temporary pause in the air raids in the north seemed to be intended more for Canadian home consumption than for serious consideration in Washington. Nor does he seem to have pressed it seriously. Mr. Pearson has long been closely associated with the United Nations and is known as one of its greatest friends. It is that knowledge which he could now bring to bear on the Vietnamese problem, and I hope that he will find ways to do so.

There is nothing to prevent the Prime Minister of Canada from making a formal request for United Nations intervention in behalf of peace in the Asian crisis. It should be obvious to all that there is not the slightest chance of bilateral negotiations between the United States and North Vietnam.

We have reached the point where a third party force must be brought in to conduct the negotiations. Let me say to the Prime Minister of Canada that we are going to have to count upon others in the world now—not partisans and the parties to the war—to use their good offices to bring to bear upon this crisis the existing procedures of international law for bringing about a conference table meeting whereby, with the nonparticipants sitting at the head of the table, and the partisans on both sides, an attempt will be made to save mankind from a holocaust which can develop quickly into a third world war.

Many people do not realize—although it was brought out by implication in Drew Pearson's column today—that what the United States is doing in North Vietnam is shooting fish in a barrel, killing people in a country which has no air defense and is almost helpless against air attack.

Is it not interesting that we cannot get out of the Pentagon, at the very moment I speak, any statistics on the number of civilians in North Vietnam who have been killed? Is it not interesting that we do not get into the United States the pictures of the killing by American planes in North Vietnam, but we can see them in foreign newspapers.

Of course, the fact is, we are not telling the American people the truth. There is no attempt to give the American people the full story of what is being done in North Vietnam by the United States.

Therefore, Mr. President, once again on the floor of the Senate I plead—as I shall continue to plead, as I pleaded last Friday night at the coliseum in Portland, Oreg., before over 5,000 fellow Americans, and I shall plead next week in a series of speeches across this land—that the American people recognize that only they can change the warmaking policies of this Government.

I say to the American people that they must rise up peacefully, through public opinion, to save the thousands and thousands of Americans who will otherwise die in an unjustifiable and unnecessary war. The American people must stop the administration from its substitution of jungle law and military might, this time practiced not by Russia but by the United States, instead of keeping faith with our ideals of substituting the procedures of international law at the conference table in an attempt to prevent the ever-increasing danger of a third world war starting in Asia.

ADDRESS BY JAMES G. PATTON AT PRESENTATION TO VICE PRESIDENT HUMPHREY OF AWARD FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO AGRICULTURE

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, not long ago James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, made an excellent speech in which he presented to the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States, the 1965 award for outstanding service to agriculture. It is with pardonable pride that the State of Minnesota claims HUBERT H. HUMPHREY as its own; and, for this reason, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Patton's speech be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY AND FOOD FOR PEACE—THE EMERGENCE OF A MAN AND AN IDEA

(Statement by James G. Patton, president of National Farmers Union, in making 1965 Award for Outstanding Service to Agriculture to the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States, Mar. 15, 1964)

The Biblical admonition to "feed the hungry" is as old as Christianity itself—it has stirred the hearts of countless men and women down through the centuries—among them the tillers of the soil and the keepers of the flock.

Food for peace is one of the great advances of human history, not because this generation of Americans created a new idea, but because this was the first generation which had the capacity as well as the desire to abolish want and hunger.

Tonight, we are honoring a man who has helped the Nation and the world understand its unique opportunity.

Year by year and session by session since he first came to the Senate, this man has pleaded with the Nation to understand how it could use food to help establish the climate for peace.

He has expounded—he has proposed—he has needled our conscience—he has chided us for our lack of Christian perception—but ever and always, he has pleaded with a complacent America to open up its heart.

We are sure that there are a hundred reasons why National Farmers Union should wish to honor Vice President HUBERT H. HUMPHREY.

American farmers will remember many things about HUBERT HUMPHREY.

They know him as a great friend and exponent of the family farm system.

They know him as an apostle of cooperation; as a defender of the farmer committee system; as a tower of strength for the REA program; as the originator and sponsor of scores and scores of significant farm bills in his 16 years in the Senate; as a foremost strategist and floor leader in the fight for many farm bills; as a tireless and persistent worker for better public understanding of agriculture.

Yes, farmers know very well how HUBERT HUMPHREY has responded to the needs of agriculture.

We hold him close to our hearts in Farmers Union—because of what he has done and what he has stood for.

Today, because National Farmers Union has always been motivated by the quest for peace and justice in the world—not only during and after World War I—not only during and after World War II—but during all the tense years of hot and cold wars since that time—we wish to honor him for his leadership in the evolution of the food-for-peace program.

"Without food and nourishment for the children of Asia, there can be no real peace in the world," HUBERT HUMPHREY said early in 1949.

In the great drama of world history, China had slipped into the Communist orbit. A new young Senator from Minnesota steps onto the stage, and within a few weeks of having arrived in Washington, is warning that India needs food.

India was in fact desperately seeking food. It was seeking to barter mica, manganese and other raw materials for a million tons of wheat. The negotiations broke down.

The leaders of India proposed the purchase of wheat on long-term credits. Again no agreement was reached.

Early in 1950, Senator HUMPHREY appealed on the Senate floor: "What is the most important problem of the Government of India today? It is food. Who has the food? We ought to get down on our hands and knees and pray to God to forgive us our sins—for here on the eastern coast of our land are Liberty ships—10,000-ton freighters loaded with wheat which the Commodity Credit Corporation has purchased.

"The wheat is stored up while over there you have people who are dying of hunger, with the Communists on top of them, with their government almost tottering. What are we doing? We are sitting around saying we cannot get along with Pakistan, or with this country or with some other country."

By August 1950, conditions had grown worse in India and HUMPHREY proposed an immediate opening of negotiations to make 60 million bushels of wheat available for famine relief.

"Here would be a grand gesture of goodwill and basic humanitarianism, a firm cementing tie between our nations, and one of the most significant steps we could take for the preservation of world peace and democracy," HUMPHREY said. He conferred with the Secretary of State and his staff to try to pave the way for an agreement.

"This would be good foreign policy, it would be a good neighbor policy, it would be sound and prudent policy to make available to this great country some of the foodstuffs which we have in our warehouses at the present moment."

Later in the same year, Senator HUMPHREY sought to rally support for the Javits resolution to extend food assistance to India. But, the effort was destined to continue well into 1951 and reach a conclusion only after Soviet Russia had delivered 50,000 tons of wheat to India and China had offered rice.

Senator Smith of New Jersey sponsored an emergency food aid bill for India, and in speaking for the bill, Senator HUMPHREY said:

"I am appealing today that the great American Nation answer those basic needs before it is too late. What India is asking is not 300 tanks. She is not asking for arms aid. She is not asking for money to develop atomic energy plants. What she is asking for is something we have in abundance. We do not have to recruit a whole new group of laborers to produce what India needs. We have millions of bushels of wheat that India needs. We have it in storage.

"This is only to remind ourselves again that food is a weapon in the arsenal of democracy and that particularly it is an effective weapon where people are hungry. We have an arsenal of democracy filled with food."

The Smith bill was approved and became Public Law 48 of the 82d Congress.

Early in 1953, Senator HUMPHREY and Senator Murray joined with others in a resolution to create an international food reserve.

At about the same time a new crisis was arising in Pakistan where the Government had collapsed largely because it was unable to cope with the famine. Senator HUMPHREY conferred with the Secretaries of State and Agriculture and the Mutual Security Administrator about using our food surpluses to help the new Government meet the food crisis.

Senator HUMPHREY introduced a wheat for Pakistan bill in April 1953, and shortly thereafter an administration bill was introduced and quickly approved to send a million tons of wheat to Pakistan.

The need to legislate in each crisis—and to risk serious delays—led Senator HUMPHREY to seek legislation which would permit the Government to move more swiftly in using surplus foods in famine relief.

Senator HUMPHREY sought an amendment in July 1953, to the mutual security bill broadening the power of the Administrator to use surplus foods in foreign aid programs.

He urged that the President be given legislative authority to donate commodities, to sell at world prices, to sell at concessional prices, to sell on long-term credits, to sell for soft currencies, and to trade for strategic materials.

Senator HUMPHREY considered this amendment a stopgap measure and began looking beyond it immediately to special legislation to make more effective use of the abundance farmers are capable of producing.

Speaking in December 1953, he said: "We need policies which will enable the farmer to see his food used wisely, rather than wasted, to see the output of his land, his toil make its utmost contribution to stamping out hunger and deprivation at home and abroad, and serving as the humanitarian arm of the Nation's foreign policy, in our efforts to create a better and more peaceful world."

Several bills were introduced in 1954 and an administration bill was adopted and became Public Law 480.

It was a 1-year program, considerably narrower in scope than the Humphrey bill and slanted more toward surplus disposal than to foreign economic development assistance.

But, it was a start and it was subsequently extended for 2 years.

In 1957, HUMPHREY sought a 2-year extension with a total of $3 billion in authorizations.

"By sharing our blessing of food abundance with the people who seek to break away from tyranny, we can make American food the 'yeast of freedom' which can expand and strengthen the movement to freedom and independence. We take a calculated risk, but all we have to lose is the food itself," he said.

In early 1957, as our delegate to the United Nations General Assembly, HUMPHREY proposed a plan for international cooperation toward the establishment of a world food reserve.

"It would seem only logical if some of the world's surplus holdings were used to bolster stocks in areas where people live on the brink of disaster from one harvest to another," he told the U.N.

In August 1957, Senator HUMPHREY noted that "in time of war, we recognized the importance of food and fiber. We created a War Food Administrator to mobilize our food resources for victory. Today, in the time of a shaky and uncertain peace in the world, it is time to think about a similar role for a special Peace Food Administrator to guide more effective use of our food resources for another victory. It is even more important to use our food abundance as a constructive force for peace."

HUMPHREY envisioned that the Peace Food Administrator would coordinate the various functions relating to food distribution scattered among agencies in the Departments of State, Commerce, Agriculture, Defense, the Bureau of the Budget, the ICA, and the ODM.

"I would like to see America have a policy of setting aside a food reserve for humanity, as an arsenal for peace—to set aside, let us say, a billion bushels of wheat, and to announce to the world that never again will famine destroy peoples and nations. Why not? This country will never go bankrupt by sharing. One year's defense budget would pay for 10 years of this food-for-peace activity. Our task is to wage peace."

Speaking to our National Farmers Union convention in nearby Springfield, Ill., in March 1959, Senator HUMPHREY outlined the terms of the comprehensive, 5-year International Food for Peace Act, which he was to introduce 3 months later.

He told us at Springfield that the challenge of world conditions, "can best be met by proving that we really care about people, at home or abroad, and care about progress—and most of all about peace with justice. We must seek constantly to express the American dedication to people, peace, and progress throughout the world—not only in words of peace, but in works of peace.

"A breakthrough in the conquest of hunger could be more significant in the cold war than the conquest of outer space. Thanks to you farm people, and others like you, the United States is today in a far better position than Russia to lead the world toward the conquest of hunger and want."

In 1961 President John F. Kennedy, as one of his first acts in office, established the office of the Food for Peace Director in the White House and instructed his appointee to exercise affirmative leadership in the program.

In 1961 Senator HUMPHREY's amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act declared it to be the policy of the U.S. Government to encourage and assist in the development of cooperatives.

HUMPHREY was a cosponsor of a resolution for a World Food Congress, and when it was held in Washington in 1963, he viewed it as a new advance—a beginning of a worldwide effort in the war against hunger. Fifty nations pledged $100 million to the first phase of the world food program. HUMPHREY noted that from the Hot Springs conference in 1943, "it took 10 years for action to be initiated and it took nearly 20 years for this philosophy to become the consensus of world opinion."

Only a month ago, Vice President HUMPHREY said that food for peace and the Peace Corps, side by side are a powerful team in our foreign policy. But he insisted, food for peace must be strengthened.

"Food for peace is more than a farm program—it is a foreign policy program. It is one of the most imaginative things ever created. Through food for peace we are reaching 100 million persons, but we have only scratched the surface."

Again in a recent address, he declared: "In a real sense, what we need to understand is that agriculture is in the forefront of the struggle for a better world. It is not a laggard; it is not a burden; it is not what is holding America back. It is what's putting America ahead."

This is the measure of the man whom we honor today—a great friend of agriculture—one of the great statesmen of the world today—and a beloved coworker in the race for peace.

I am pleased on behalf of the membership of the National Farmers Union to confer our 1965 Award for Outstanding Service to Agriculture to the Honorable HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Vice President of the United States.

Our congratulations, Mr. Vice President, God bless you in the days ahead.

THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am most honored to be listed as a cosponsor of S. 1564, the Voting Rights Act of 1965. I believe that it is absolutely necessary that this Congress act promptly and decisively to guarantee to all Americans the true enjoyment of their God-given, human, and constitutional rights. I am supported in this position by an overwhelming majority of the citizens of the State of Minnesota. As but one indication of their support for my position and the position of President Lyndon B. Johnson, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Minneapolis Spokesman of March 18, 1965, be reprinted at this point in the RECORD. Cecil E. Newman, editor of the Minneapolis Spokesman, wrote the editorial; and I think he is to be commended for that and for his lifelong dedication to the cause of equal rights for all. I am proud to have this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Congress of the United States his dedication and the dedication of all our Minnesotans to these principles.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PRESIDENT'S FINEST HOUR

Monday night the President of the United States, Lyndon Baines Johnson of Texas, made perhaps the greatest speech a Chief Executive of this great Nation ever made, on the unresolved right of the Negro to full voting rights in this country—rights which are guaranteed by the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

No other President speaking to Congress and the American people has ever before so honestly, unequivocally, and courageously laid the issue so squarely and fully on the line—for all to see and heed.

Pulling no punches, Mr. Johnson placed the violation of the rights of the Negro to the ballot, the accepted practice in a number of States, right out where the whole world could see it. And in doing so, he arrayed himself and the power of his office definitely on the side of the Negroes who have been denied the right to vote by intimidation, murder, beatings, economic reprisals, and trick tests set up and designed by State legislatures and vote registrars for the sole purpose of keeping the Negro disfranchised.

There was no compromise in the southern accent and voice of a southern born President who, although admittedly proud of the region of his birth, recognizing its strengths and weaknesses, was prepared to disregard all except the rights which he said all Americans must enjoy equally, if this Nation was to live up to its great promise and national law.

In President Johnson's message there was not a word of comfort to the Wallaces, the Eastlands, the Ervins, the Ellenders, the Stennises, the Smathers of his own party or the Strom Thurmonds of the Republican Party. Most of this crowd sat on its collective hands as other Members of the Congress, the judiciary, the Cabinet, and the gallery arose spontaneously to its feet to applaud when President Johnson praised the Negro for his struggle to get the United States in line with the aims and promises of its Constitution.

In commenting on the long struggle for human rights in this Nation he told the people of the Nation that, "The real hero of this struggle is the American Negro." As true as this statement is, no President before Johnson had ever so frankly and forcibly reminded the country of the Negro's magnificient courage under extreme adversity, and those auditors who were touched by the magnificance truth, and courage of his statement could not help but stand and applaud.

We doubt that in the years ahead Lyndon Baines Johnson will ever have a finer hour than he had Monday night. His "we shall overcome," was also a tribute to those brave Negroes and whites who have led and marched in behalf of freedom and justice, now. He accepted the genuine applause with a sober dignity that reminded one of the long hard road still ahead.

We felt rather proud of being an American Monday night despite our obvious continued concern against the injustice which is practiced against our Negro people, as President Johnson pointed out in all 50 of our States. Our pride was based on what we believe is the ability of this Nation and its people "when the chips are down" to make a final determination based on truth and justice. This has happened all through the history of this Nation and the time has come for it to happen in the instance of the American Negro—for no force as President Johnson said, "can keep back the tide of freedom and justice."

He asked the Congress to pass as soon as possible a voting rights bill which would insure the right to vote of every American citizen who can write his name, in all elections; local, State, and National. If such legislation is passed, and it must be enacted, the final barriers to full citizenship will have been pushed aside to allow every qualified American man and woman of voting age to participate in the selection of public officials. This will greatly affect the peace, harmony, and unity of the country which has long been divided by the denial of constitutional rights, to part of the country's citizenry.

The Nation owes a debt of gratitude to President Johnson and the aroused public opinion which convinced him that he had to take a strong position and promised him the support which made his Monday night speech such a great document of true statesmanship.—CECIL NEWMAN.

VOTER COMPLAINTS ABOUT MISLEADING PACKAGING

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am a cosponsor of S. 985, the truth-in-packaging bill. I have received many letters supporting this proposed legislation. Typical of all that I have received is a series of correspondence relating to the deceptive use of "cents-off" allowances. I ask unanimous consent that these letters be printed at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; and, in particular, I call attention to the letter from a leading food retailer in St. Paul, Minn., in which it is stated that many of the coffee companies come out with deal packs on coffee anywhere from 8 cents to 10 cents to 15 cents to 17 cents a can off. These do not reflect any difference in the cost. This is done by regulating the promotional allowance to the retailer, so that the cost of the 8-cent-off pack comes to the same price as the 17 cents one. This is a source of much concern to all ethical and honest retailers and businessmen; and I call it to the attention of the Congress of the United States.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
March 4, 1965.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: Thank you for your prompt reply to my letter of February 22.

I certainly have no objection to your reprinting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the entire file I sent you, and can only hope it will focus the attention of others on the deceitful practices you are trying to combat.

Further, I enclose a reply I received from the Folger Coffee Co. In his third paragraph, Mr. Paulsen does not mention the regulating of promotional allowances which Mr. Sidney Applebaum calls attention to, and which naturally affects the dealer's price.

I realize the pressure on today's manufacturer to increase his business, but certainly there are other avenues than shady and misleading promotions such as we seem to have here.

My best wishes, Senator, for your success.

Sincerely,

MARY L. URBAN
Mrs. Mary L. Urban.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
February 22, 1965.

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MONDALE: I heartily endorse your action in cosponsoring the truth-in-packaging bill, described in the February 11, 1965, issue of the Minnesota Union Advocate, copy herewith.

As you can see by the enclosed file, I have done some investigating myself. It appears that the manufacturer is using misleading merchandising to encourage the purchase of his coffee, and if one is not alert at the checkout counter, she may not realize she is not getting the cents off.

I've noticed many other such practices of late, and feel if manufacturers won't be honest and factual about package contents and labeling, then legislation is definitely needed.

Senator, I congratulate you on your forceful beginning in the Senate, and I consider us fortunate to have you represent our views in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

MRS. MARY L. URBAN.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Union Advocate, Feb. 11, 1965]

TRUTH-IN-PACKAGING BILL: MONDALE PROPOSAL STRIKES BLOW AGAINST SALES DEFICIT

Senator WALTER F. MONDALE this week cosponsored a truth-in-packaging bill aimed at eliminating practices which confuse and deceive consumers.

The Minnesota Senator joined Senator PHILIP HART, of Michigan, in supporting legislation which would direct the Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission to promulgate regulations that will require packages accurately and clearly to give essential product information and fairly represent the contents.

Both MONDALE and HART have established national reputations for their efforts in behalf of consumer protection.

"Today's housewife," MONDALE noted, "is confronted with some 7,000 to 8,000 different items in the average supermarket and must choose between them on the basis of the packages they are in.

"Too often, these packages and the messages on them are either confusing or downright deceiving; thus there is a real need for laws which will require that packages contain sufficient meaningful information to allow the buyer to make a rational choice between competing products."

Among the devices the bill would prohibit would be phony "cents-off" deals. For example, a package which says "8 cents off," but doesn't say off what.

The bill also would prohibit deceptive illustrations on packages. For example, a picture of a pie full of ripe, red cherries when in fact there isn't a single cherry in the pie inside.

Also prohibited would be packages designed to deceive the consumer as to quantity. For example, the use of a 6-inch piece of cardboard in a package containing a 4-inch candy bar.

The bill also would authorize the standardization of weights and measures under certain conditions so that the housewife would not have to take a calculating machine shopping with her in order to determine whether the best buy is 17 ounces for 30 cents, 22 ounces for 35 cents, or 27 ounces for 40 cents.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
February 3, 1965.

BETTER BUSINESS BUREAU OF ST. PAUL, INC.,
Garrick Building,
St. Paul, Minn.

GENTLEMEN: Several weeks ago I called your office to report what I feel is an irregular procedure in the grocery department of Target Stores, Inc., 1515 West County Road B. At that time I was told to file a letter of complaint if the incident was repeated.

That week I had purchased a 3-pound can of Folger's regular grind coffee, on which the manufacturer had printed, "15 cents off the regular price." However, the price stamped on the bottom of the can was $2.29, which is the regular price without discount. The cashier would not allow the 15-cent discount, so I asked for the manager, who said, "We don't take it off."

Again last week I purchased a 3-pound can of Folger's with the same imprint, with approximately the same sequence of events, except that another cashier testily assured me that "Folger's is a more expensive coffee," and the manager stated that $2.29 marked included the discount.

I bought the coffee, but sent my husband back to the coffee shelf, where other cans of Folger's without the "15-cent off" label were marked $2.29. I could have pursued this further with the manager and undoubtedly obtained the 15-cent discount. However, I believe a shady practice such as this should be stopped, and the manufacturer made aware that this merchandising is being used for the benefit of the store, not of the buying public.

On both occasions mentioned, I purchased other items with cents off imprints, and in all these cases, the store-stamped amount was legitimately priced. In other words, I believe some coffee is being sold at an excessive profit while cheaper brands are used as leaders.

If you need further details, you may reach me at work during the day at 733–0149, or at home evenings, MI 5–4037.

Thank you for your anticipated cooperation.

Yours very truly,

MRS. RAY URBAN.

ST. PAUL, MINN.,
February 12, 1965.

MERCHANDISING MANAGER,
FOLGER COFFEE CO.,
San Francisco, Calif.

SIR: Recently I have been in disagreement with the manager of a local discount supermarket over his refusal to allow the discount of "15 cents off" banded on a 3-pound can of Folger's coffee, which has been selling regularly for $2.29 at his store. The price is the same, with or without the band. After two attempts to obtain the 15 cents off, I wrote a letter to our local Better Business Bureau, complaining of his procedure.

Better Business sent a copy of the letter to the headquarters of the discount store, and a gentleman called me to explain why the discount is not allowed. He claimed they pay the same case price for the banded coffee as the other, and that a complicated distributor pricing schedule makes it difficult for them to know exactly what to charge for each new order of coffee they receive.

At another supermarket this week, I checked Folger coffee prices. Their 3-pound can price with "15 cents off" band (also not allowed) was $2.39, or almost 80 cents per pound. However, the 2-pound can without the band was $1.39, or only 70 cents per pound. It would appear that the "15 cents off" is a signal for increasing rather than decreasing the price, and that on a descending scale we could buy a quarter-pound for a few pennies.

I have also obtained coffee-pricing figures from an independent grocer in this area.

I realize that you do not directly set retail coffee prices, but indirectly you do, by creating confusion and indignation on the part of retailers and consumers with your misleading merchandising and vacillating wholesale prices.

I take issue with this kind of merchandising, which does not benefit the consumer, but is completely false. It is practices such as this which undoubtedly has caused the U.S. Government to begin taking a hard look at labeling of products.

Your comments on the preceding facts will be greatly appreciated.

Yours very truly,

MRS. MARY L. URBAN.

APPLEBAUM'S FOOD MARKETS, INC.,
St. Paul, Minn., February 17, 1965.

BETTER BUSINESS BUREAU OF ST. PAUL, INC.,
Garrick Building, Sixth and St. Peter Streets,
Saint Paul, Minn.

DEAR SIR: In response to your letter of February 3, I am in receipt of the letter that Mrs. Ray Urban sent you and I have taken the liberty of calling her and explaining to her our position on this matter. I will admit that it is confusing and we, as retailers, have been trying to eliminate this problem for some time. This is not only a problem with our stores, but with the entire grocery industry.

In short, many of the coffee companies come out with deal packs on coffee anywhere from 8 cents to 10 cents to 15 cents to 17 cents a can off. Now it is hard to believe that each of these cost the same. They do this by regulating the promotional allowances so that the cost of the 8 cents off one comes to the same price as the 17 cent one. I tried to explain to Mrs. Urban the problem and I believe she understands it and she also fully appreciates the problem, but admits that it is still confusing.

I do hope that no further occurrence like this happens again and I would like you to know that we have been in business a long time and feel we have not built our reputation by trying to take advantage of any of our customers.

Very truly yours,

APPLEBAUM'S FOOD MARKETS, INC.,
SIDNEY APPLEBAUM.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT TO FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 133, Senate bill 693, to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, and that it be made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 693) to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments on page 2, line 16, after the word "employee", to strike out "servant or" and insert "or servant, or any person who acts"; in line 18, after the word "or", to strike out "control" of and insert "control, of"; in line 20, after the word "controlled", to strike out "financed or" and insert "financed, or"; on page 4, line 6, after the word "activities", to strike out "includes" and insert "means"; in line 10, after the word "any", where it appears the second time, to strike out "other person" and insert "agency or official of the Government of the United States"; in line 13, after the word "to", to insert "formulating, adopting, or changing the domestic or foreign policies of the United States or with reference to"; in line 16, after the word "foreign", to strike out "country, or" and insert "country or"; in line 17, after the word "party", to strike out "or with reference to the domestic or foreign policies of the United States"; in line 19, after the word "any", to strike out "person, including, without limitation, and economic, legal or other consultant," and insert "person"; in line 22, after the word "any", to insert "other"; in the same line, after the word "to", to insert "the domestic or foreign policies of the United States or"; in line 24, after the word "interests", to strike out "policies or" and insert "policies, or"; on page 5, line 1, after the word "party", to strike out "or with reference to the domestic or foreign policies of the United States"; in line 17, after the word "by", to insert "striking out the comma following the word 'each' where it first appears, and the following: 'unless, and to the extent, this requirement is waived in writing by the Attorney General'; and by"; in line 21, after the word "end", to strike out "thereof" and insert "of the subsection"; on page 7, after line 21, to strike out:

(f) The Attorney General may, by regulation, provide for the exemption from registration, or from the requirement of furnishing any of the information required by this section, of any person who is listed as a partner, officer, director, or employee in the registration statement filed by an agent of a foreign principal under this Act, where by reason of the nature of the functions or activities of such person the Attorney General having due regard for the national security and the public interest determines that such registration, or the furnishing of such information, is not necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

(f) The Attorney General may, by regulation, provide for the exemption—

(1) from registration, or from the requirement of furnishing any of the information required by this section, of any person who is listed as a partner, officer, director, or employee in the registration statement filed by an agent of a foreign principal under this Act, and

(2) from the requirement of furnishing any of the information required by this section of any agent of a foreign principal,

where by reason of the nature of the functions or activities of such person the Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, determines that such registration, or the furnishing of such information, as the case may be, is not necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act.

At the top of page 9, to strike out:

SEC. 3. Section 3(d) of such Act is amended by striking out the words "financial or mercantile" and by inserting after the words "foreign principal" the words "or other activities not serving predominantly a foreign interest".

And, in lieu thereof, to insert:

SEC. 3. (a) Section 3(d) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only (1) in private and nonpolitical activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal; or (2) in other activities not serving predominantly a foreign interest; or (3) in the soliciting or collecting of funds and contributions within the United States to be used only for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, if such solicitation or collection of funds and contributions is in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the Act of November 4, 1939, as amended (54 Stat. 4), and such rules and regulations as may be prescribed thereunder;".

(b) Section 3 of such Act is further amended by substituting a semicolon for the period at the end of subsection (f) and adding a new subsection as follows:

"(g) Any attorney whose activities are confined to openly representing, as an attorney of record, the interests of a disclosed foreign principal before any court or administrative agency of the United States, or of any State or political subdivision thereof.

And, on page 10, at the beginning of line 13, to strike out words "send to the Librarian of Congress two copies thereof" and insert words "for or in the interests of such foreign principal".

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may speak out of order for 2 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE "NEW DIPLOMACY"

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the four R's of international relations, reason, respect, reciprocity, and regard have frequently, in the past, been the missing factors in our relations with our neighbors. Squabbling among nations with common borders is nothing new in history. The fact is that amiability and good feelings between closely neighboring nations is somewhat of a rarity—but it is a rarity that has been more and more characteristic of Mexican-United States relations. The underlying causes are that reason, respect, reciprocity, and regard have prevailed for many years on both sides of the border, and among the leadership of both countries.

Problems between our two countries still exist, but none is so important or so immediate as to threaten deterioration. Last week's announcement of a mutually satisfactory settlement of the Colorado River salinity problems followed by only a year or so the El Chamizal Treaty which transferred 437 disputed acres in El Paso, Tex., to Mexico. Such an agreement was not feasible only a few short years ago. This is truly a new diplomacy—a new diplomacy which, if applied among relations of nations in other parts of the world, would aid immeasurably in bringing about a new era of reason in international affairs. Such a goal may challenge our patience and our ingenuity, but the results make any effort worthwhile, no matter how demanding, as is evident from the present state of Mexican-American relations.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an editorial which was published in the New York Times on April 3, 1965, entitled "The New Diplomacy."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The New Diplomacy

The happy relations between the United States and Mexico have been strengthened by a triumph of what Mexicans hail as the "new diplomacy."

The "new diplomacy" was initiated by the settlement last year of the century-old Chamizal dispute, which former President López Mateos characterized as the most important achievement of his administration. Now his successor, President Díaz Ordaz, starts his administration under equally auspicious circumstances with an agreement with the United States to control the salinity of the Colorado River water that has been damaging Mexican crops.

Both agreements were made possible by American concessions. Under the Chamizal agreement the United States turned over to Mexico 437 disputed acres in El Paso, Tex. Under the new agreement the United States undertakes to build a $5 million extension of an existing drainage canal to divert the salt-polluted water from the Arizona irrigation district in order to avert further corrosion of the land and crops of the Mexicali Valley.

Mexico is one of the most stable and fastest growing of the Latin-American countries. Its greatest problem, politically, economically and socially, is agriculture. The Colorado River agreement should contribute toward a solution of at least part of that problem.

RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY CONCERN OVER THE WELFARE CRISIS IN WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on Monday evening of last week, March 29, 500 persons attended a meeting in the new Senate Office Building auditorium.

They came to register their strong conviction on the aid to dependent children program in the District of Columbia. The meeting was sponsored by the religious community of Washington. This size turnout simply to hear an expression of conscience is a remarkable testament to the depth of feeling in Washington on aid to dependent children.

I have a statement, which expresses the concern at that meeting of the religious community of Washington, D.C., over the welfare crisis in the Nation's Capital. Although it deals explicitly with the need for aid to dependent children, it deals also with other welfare programs. I ask unanimous consent that the statement be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Concern of the Religious Community of Washington, D.C., Over the Welfare Crisis in Our Nation's Capital

1. In the Book of Deuteronomy, it is written "you shall not harden your heart or shut your hand against your poor brother, but you shall open your hand to him, and lend him sufficient for his need, whatever it may be." In the Gospel according to Matthew, Jesus challenged his disciples to feed the hungry, give drink to the thirsty, clothe the naked, visit the sick and imprisoned, and to show friendliness to the stranger. On the foundation of these teachings, we express concern for those in need of public assistance in Washington, D.C.

2. Our primary purpose is to encourage the eradication of poverty and the social, economic, and political conditions out of which it arises. At the same time, however, we are concerned about those in our community who are now caught up in poverty. It is our contention that our public welfare programs should enhance a sense of dignity and self-respect among the needy, thereby motivating and assisting them in their efforts to achieve independent status.

3. Our investigation of factual data concerning public assistance in the District of Columbia suggests that, in many cases, the opposite result is being obtained. For example, the failure to make available to our people the benefits of the Federal program of Aid to Dependent Children of Unemployed Parents is resulting in the breakup of many families and in the placement of the children involved in institutions, with a resultant increase in costs to the community.

Furthermore, inadequate food benefits, based on 1957 Department of Agriculture estimates of food costs, and insufficient shelter allowances, based on rental costs in 1953, make both individual and family survival on public assistance in 1965 most difficult. The high cost of housing compels many clients to use for rent some of the money allowed for food. Thus, instead of opening the door of opportunity and hope for the needy, the impact of our present public assistance program in many cases is to decrease their capacity to care for themselves at a time when they need help the most.

In addition, inadequate board rates to foster parents have resulted in an undersupply of foster homes at the very time we have an oversupply of children eligible for foster care.

4. As religiously committed people we are concerned with the false economy which tends to govern our public welfare program in the District of Columbia. For example, the cost of keeping a child in Junior Village approximates $250 per month. On the other hand, the average expenditure for foster care per child approximates $70. For the care of a child in his own home, the monthly allotment approximates $33.

We are also distressed by the fact that our present allowances, instead of increasing self-sufficiency, tend to increase dependency among the needy. In the midst of a national war on poverty, our public assistance program tends to create poverty.

Furthermore, we question the validity of adding personnel to the Investigation and Collections Unit in view of the greater need for additional social workers to assist in the rehabilitation of the clients.

5. With these facts and situations before us, we reaffirm our desire that our public welfare program be redesigned so as to provide more adequately for the food, shelter, and other basic requirements of the needy. We challenge all those involved in the establishment and maintenance of our public welfare program to provide those resources required to restore the needy, the handicapped, and the sick to dignified, healthy, and independent living.

To this end, we call upon the Congress of the United States, and its appropriate committees and subcommittees to take action that will make available to residents of the District of Columbia who have need thereof—

1. The provisions of the federally supported program of aid to dependent children of unemployed parents.

2. An increase in living allowances (food, shelter, etc.) so as to reflect the 1965 costs thereof;

3. An increase in foster care allotments so as to increase the number of foster homes, and the establishment of a Foster Home Care Unit to assist the foster child, his parents, and the foster parents in their relationships with each other to the end that the child might return as soon as possible to the home of his parents;

4. A comprehensive and adequate day care program for public assistance and other low income families;

5. An additional intake service unit to provide immediate assistance in locating housing, medical care, and other resources;

6. Additional counselors at the Receiving Home, Cedar Knoll, and Maple Glen;

7. Additional special staff and administrative staff for the mentally retarded at the Children's Center; and

8. Emergency aid to provide assistance for persons who have special needs during their certification period.

In conclusion, we call attention to the fact that the highest form of assistance is that which makes it possible for the needy to achieve independence. A welfare program which handicaps or thwarts such efforts is not adequate. We find this to be the case with the public assistance program of the District of Columbia. We urge all citizens to join us in the effort to provide a welfare system which does not rob a client of his dignity, but which assures him of our concern for his well-being.

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, at that meeting the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. Yarborough] made a very cogent, compassionate, and persuasive address, concerning the importance of giving the most earnest consideration to the subject of providing a program of aid to dependent children this year.

I ask unanimous consent that the Senator's brief speech on this subject be printed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Members of the District of Columbia Council of Churches, and distinguished guests, before directing our attention to the problem of giving aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, I think it only proper to explore briefly the framework in which welfare is operating today.

Anytime a welfare or assistance program is being contemplated, it is obvious that there is a serious problem in our society which we are trying to overcome. Hence, when we think in terms of welfare, whether it be aid to dependent children or unemployment compensation, we are actually talking about a defeat, or a chink in the wall of the Great Society.

When we deal with these problems, two alternatives face us: The first approach, and by far the most undesirable, is a temporary stop-gap program which might be effective in a crisis, but rarely alleviates any deep-seated problem.

Through many years of experience in this area, our Nation has found that some alternative must be found to merely temporarily assisting those who need welfare programs. Hence, we evolve from a system of unemployment compensation to a program of retraining, Job Corps, and educational opportunities—all of these are programs which are designed to strike at the roots of unemployment, and not just temporarily offset the problems of a man who cannot find a job.

So, we come to the second approach of welfare, the remedial approach, which seeks to avoid the constantly growing problems which face our Nation. I think that there is no doubt that the latter approach to welfare is the preferable one by far, when it can be applied.

So, now we come to the problem of a family which has an employable parent, in fact, yet when the realities are presented he is unable to secure a job so that he can support his children. When Congress passed legislation in 1962 to extend the welfare program to children whose parents are unemployed, we were not merely providing a method whereby a family could continue to exist even though they could not find supporting employment, but rather it did have a very definite element of prevention, of remedying this difficult situation.

To assist a family in times of difficulty is not to place them on welfare payments for the remainder of the life of the family unit. Rather, in keeping the family together we avoid the probability that the dependent child will later on swell the already bursting seams of Junior Village, or we give him the chance in life to escape the perils of becoming a juvenile delinquent—and the public expense required later on to rehabilitate or even more unpleasant, incarcerate him.

By keeping the family unit together, we avert the inevitable consequences of a school-dropout which may have the effect of carrying the problems we are now facing into another generation when his children again become dependent upon an unemployed father.

When we consider the problems of aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, we are not only talking about the temporary difficulties of their existence, but we are speaking about avoiding the millions of pitfalls which may be passed on for generations to come—for one thing that poverty teaches us is that if it continues to exist, it nurtures the succeeding generation to be doomed to a life of poverty.

And, the second fact that experience is good at driving home—and I hope that it will not be too late in this case—is that scrimping on giving unfortunate families a break in life now means resultant increases in costs to the community later. Payments under this program even now are a fraction of the cost which it will take to care for a child in Junior Village, or later in a more confining institution.

It is essential that the District of Columbia be allowed the chance to share in a program that Congress has endorsed for all the Nation. Indeed, it doesn't taken an extremely sophisticated analysis to conclude that it is inconsistent to tell all the Nation that the Federal Government will be most happy to provide matching grants of aid to dependent children of unemployed parents, provided there is a local program, and then turn to the District of Columbia and say "of course, we haven't provided you with a local program yet."

To me, it is somewhat like endorsing a political candidate who has just lost in a primary race—if you are for something, logic demands that you be for it across the board, and before it is too late.

Perhaps this single neglect of the problems of the District of Columbia contains the entire weight of justification for "home rule" for the District—where in the primary over 90 percent of the voters endorsed this aid for dependent children of unemployed parents.

AMENDMENT OF FOREIGN AGENTS REGISTRATION ACT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 693) to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I shall take very little of the Senate's time in explaining the bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act.

The subject matter of the bill has been studied thoroughly by the committee over the last 4 years and this is the same bill, with a few minor changes, that the Senate passed without opposition last year. The committee approved the bill without opposition this year.

The basic purpose of the bill is to update the Foreign Agents Registration Act to reflect the changes in the nature of the U.S. role in world affairs today. A quarter of a century ago, the original targets of this act were the subversive agent and propagandist. But as our interests throughout the world have multiplied, the efforts of foreign interests to influence American foreign and domestic policies have become correspondingly greater and more subtle. The place of the old foreign agent has been taken by the professional lobbyists and public opinion manipulators whose object is not subvert the Government but to influence its policies to the satisfaction of his client. The trench coat has been replaced by the gray flannel suit.

For a number of years the Committee on Foreign Relations has been concerned about the growing use—in both the legislative and the executive branches—of nondiplomatic means to influence Government policies. The economic impact of U.S. policies on the rest of the world in the postwar years has created a situation which nurtured the rise of the new foreign agent. Sugar quotas, foreign aid loans and grants, sale of surplus agricultural commodities—these and many more Government programs have afforded the foreign agent fertile soil in which to operate. And the Congress growing participation in specific foreign policy matters in recent years has made the legislative branch a prime target for the representative of the foreign interests. Sugar quota legislation alone provides sustenance to many.

After a number of incidents involving agents' attempts to influence policy had been brought to the attention of the committee, a decision was made in 1962 to conduct a full investigation to determine what legislative changes might be needed to adapt the Registration Act to fit present-day circumstances. The committee conducted a full investigation of the activities of selected foreign agents during 1962 and through most of 1963. This bill is the basic product of that study.

The major provisions of the bill as reported by the committee are:

First. Revised definitions of the terms "foreign principal" and "agent of a foreign principal" and addition of two new terms, "political activities" and "political consultant." These revisions are designed to aim the act more directly at persons performing political activities.

Second. An injunctive remedy is authorized where compliance with the act or the regulations is considered inadequate.

Third. Stricter requirements for disclosing political activities and expenditures are imposed on agents.

Fourth. Campaign contributions by foreign principals are prohibited.

Fifth. Contingent fee contracts based on the success of the agent's political activities are outlawed.

Sixth. Registered foreign agents appearing before congressional committees must file, as part of their testimony, their latest registration statement. Agents contacting Government officials, including Members of Congress, on policy matters must disclose their status as agents and identify their principal.

Seventh. Attorneys of record appearing before courts and administrative agencies on behalf of a disclosed foreign principal are exempted from registration.

Eighth. Authority is given the Attorney General to exempt agents and subagents from filing information which does not serve a useful public purpose.

The committee held a hearing on this bill on February 16 at which witnesses made a number of suggestions for amendments, most of them relating to professional services for foreign clients. Last year, after the committee had reported its earlier bill, the Supreme Court in the decision of Rabinowitz against Kennedy took a rather narrow view of the commercial exemption provision of the act. Our bill of last year recognized that the exemption was too narrow and expanded it considerably. But the House did not have an opportunity to consider that bill, so the problems created by the decision remain to be solved. This bill will accomplish that.

The Rabinowitz decision has been of particular concern to attorneys and the provisions in this bill will assure the legal profession that the normal services of attorneys to foreign clients will be exempt. Professional services by attorneys, architects, or engineers will not require registration unless the efforts for the foreign client constitute political activities. A specific exemption for attorneys representing foreign clients before courts and administrative agencies, where the attorney's status is a matter of record with the court or agency, has been included in the bill. The exemption is not intended to apply to agency contacts generally but only to those where proceedings are formalized and disclosure is assured due to the nature of the decisionmaking process. It is not intended to cover policy matters of interest to agents coming before the regular agencies and departments, such as sugar import questions handled in the Department of Agriculture.

The committee has also revised the definition of "political activities" in an attempt to make its meaning, and the committee's intent, more precise and eliminate any possible ambiguities.

Last year representatives of several large U.S. corporations with foreign subsidiaries and foreign concerns with U.S. subsidiaries expressed concern for fear that registration might be required because of their contacts with Government agencies and officials involving matters where the interests of the parent and subsidiary were mingled. I believe that the committee's intent as to coverage of activities of this nature was covered satisfactorily in the debate last year and is reemphasized in the report on this bill. The bill expands, not contracts, the commercial exemption. And it is not designed or intended to impair the normal contacts of company officials with Government agencies and the Congress, even if the contacts would constitute "political activities" as defined in the bill, unless the principal beneficiary of the activities is the foreign subsidiary or parent.

In summary, the bill is designed to do a face-lifting job on a statute that has served the Nation well but which has not been revised to keep it abreast of the times. Foreign and domestic affairs are so inter-related today that the political and propaganda efforts of foreign agents ultimately affect every American. Both Government officials and the public need to—and have a right to—know more about the objectives, tactics, finances, and general mode of operations of those who seek to influence Government policies for foreign interests. With adequate disclosure both the public and officials will be better equipped to protect the integrity of the decision-making process of our Government.

Modernization of the act is long overdue and I hope that the Senate will pass the bill without opposition.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the committee amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I send to the desk some technical amendments, and ask that they be considered and agreed to en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The Legislative Clerk. On page 4, line 17, strike out the word "poltical" and insert "political".

On page 10, line 2, insert quotation marks at the end of the sentence.

On page 15, line 24 and continuing on to page 16, line 1, strike out "servant, or" and insert "or servant, or any person who acts".

On page 16, line 2, insert a comma following the word "control".

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state the amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with. I shall explain it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following:

"Sec. 10. (a) An individual who has a 1964 wage withholding deficiency may elect to pay the amount of such deficiency as provided in subsection (b).

"(b) if an individual makes an election under this section the amount of his 1964 wage withholding deficiency shall be paid—

"(1) if such amount does not exceed $100, not later than three months after the last day prescribed by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for payment of such individual's income tax for his taxable year beginning in 1964,

"(2) if such amount exceeds $100 but does not exceed $500, in two equal installments payable not later than three months and six months, respectively, after such last day, and

"(3) if such amount exceeds $500, in four equal installments payable not later than three months, six months, nine months, and twelve months, respectively, after such last day.

"Any installment payable under paragraph (2) or (3) may be paid in advance.

"(c) Any payment in accordance with the provisions of subsection (b) of a 1964 wage withholding deficiency by an individual who has made an election under this section shall, for all purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, be treated as a payment of the income tax of such individual for his taxable year beginning in 1964 and shall be treated as made on the last day prescribed by such Code for payment of such tax.

"(d) An election under this section shall be made within such time and in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate may prescribe by regulations.

"(e) For purposes of this section, the term '1964 wage withholding deficiency' means, with respect to any individual, whichever of the following amounts is the smaller:

"(1) the amount by which—

"(A) the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on the taxable income of such individual for his taxable year beginning in 1964, computed by disregarding all items of income other than wages and all deductions allowable solely because attributable to income other than wages, exceeds

"(B) the credit allowable to such individual under section 31(a) of such Code for tax deducted and withheld under section 3402 of such Code on the wages of such individual during 1964; or

"(2) the amount by which—

"(A) the tax imposed by chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 on the taxable income of such individual for his taxable year beginning in 1964, exceeds

"(B) the sum of (i) the credits allowable to such individual for such taxable year under part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code, and (ii) the estimated tax paid by such individual under section 6015 of such Code for such year.

"The Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate may by regulations prescribe conditions under which all items of income may be treated as wages for purposes of paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection.

"(f) Terms used in this section shall have the meanings assigned to them by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954.

"(g) The Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate shall prescribe such regulations as he deems necessary for the application of the provisions of this section in the case of a joint return of a husband and wife and may prescribe such other regulations as he deems necessary to carry out the provisions of this section."

On page 17, line 11, strike out "This" and insert "The preceding sections of this".

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, and for other purposes."

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I am pleased to note that the President and the Internal Revenue Service have at long last taken cognizance of the problem facing many Americans because of underwithholding on 1964 income taxes.

However, I was most disappointed to find that the Internal Revenue Service does not plan to do anything substantial about this problem. Instead, according to the IRS Director's weekend comments, the Service will render only its normal, routine assistance to those taxpayers who can prove that hardship prevents them from making full tax payments by the 15th of this month.

Many of us have recognized this problem for a full year now. We have presented legislative solutions to this governmental-inspired situation. But, we in the Congress were constantly assured that there really was no problem and that, if there was, the IRS would work it out.

Well, try and tell the American taxpayer that there is no problem.

Eventually, that reality even filtered through to IRS. Then for many more long weeks they promised relief. But, the relief when it belatedly came was too little and too late.

IRS' "solution" to make the taxpayer prove an elusive thing called hardship. Even then it plans to charge him interest on his hardship.

There is a much better way.

On January 26 of this year, I introduced S. 733, which would grant up to 1 year additional time for the payment of income taxes caused by underwithholding resulting from the 1964 income tax law revision. The schedule of payments under my proposal would be as follows:

First. If such amount does not exceed $100, not later than 3 months after the last day prescribed by the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 for payment of such individual's income tax for his taxable year beginning in 1964;

Second. If such amount exceeds $100, but does not exceed $500, in two equal installments payment not later than 3 months and 6 months respectively, after such last day; and

Third. If such amount exceeds $500, in four equal installments payable not later than 3 months, 6 months, 9 months, and 12 months, respectively, after such last day.

I regret, Mr. President, that no action was taken on my proposal. The Administration and the IRS have known of the problem for a long time.

Briefly, the story is this. An 18-percent withholding rate continued in effect until March 1964. The 1964 tax bill which passed at that time provided for an immediate transition to a 14-percent rate, not 15 percent as had been earlier proposed. Thus, many have had an insufficient amount held out of their paycheck.

In simpler terms, this administration gave "attention extraordinary" to the much heralded tax cut. The pay envelope was a much fatter one. What was not pointed out was the fact that some of the extra money—all of which was thought of by the taxpayer to be a result of the tax cut—was not the taxpayer's money at all, but actually belonged to the Federal Government, and would have to be repaid come April 15, 1965.

Subsequent to passage of the 1964 Revenue Act, Treasury began, ever so gently, advising the taxpayer to beware that he might have to pay a little extra tax. This slight admonition certainly got nowhere the publicity that the tax cut received. The result was that many, many taxpayers never had any idea at all that a good portion of their increased pay was not theirs at all.

The Treasury Department advised my office on March 8 of this year that the estimated increase was not really very much, that it would only amount to an increase in final tax payments of some $500 million. Now, in the billions that Treasury deals with, I realize that $500 million is small, but in terms of individual hardship, $50, $100, or $500 can seem awfully big.

I hope, of course, that Treasury's estimate is correct and their statements, that the lower income wage earner will not have to pay an additional amount in excess of that already withheld, are true. But numerous letters I have received, similar to the following, make me wonder if Treasury estimates are entirely accurate. I quote:

Dear Sir: Having just figured my income tax for the year and finding that I will have to pay $44.80 additional income tax on a yearly salary of $3,725, I thought I would write and express my views.

I was under the impression that the Government was going to reduce the income tax but it certainly has not turned out that way. Possibly the cut that was supposed to have been made benefited the higher salaried people who do not need it nearly as much as people like myself.

I am well aware of the fact that you alone cannot get this done, but that it will take the cooperation of all the Senators and Representatives together. I would certainly appreciate your efforts in getting something done toward cutting down on the withholding tax, especially for the small salaried people.

Yours very truly,

——— ———.

The name I withhold.

Mr. President, it is unjust to blame the taxpayer for this plight. The Treasury Department should have done something about it, but all they could figure out to do was to charge 6-percent "interest for hardship." The Internal Revenue Service will decide what constitutes "hardship." The Government-imposed "inconvenience" will not count. The Senate should assume the leadership in remedying this sneak attack on the taxpayers of our Nation.

Therefore, I have sent to the desk an amendment to the pending bill.

I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment; therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Montoya in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to the amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Texas. I believe he has offered a very constructive and useful amendment, and one which, under the unusual circumstances which now confront many taxpayers, deserves the support of the Senate.

At this time this strange new decreased withholding concept was initiated, when the Senate considered the tax reduction bill, I raised the question as to the perils of undercollecting from taxpayers. I felt it was one of my obligations as a Member of the Senate to alert the taxpayers of South Dakota who might be affected at least to what they might confront.

In the weekly newsletter which I have sent to the people of South Dakota each week since I was first elected to the House of Representatives quite some time ago, I have tried to portend events of this type. I feel that one of the purposes of the newsletter is to display such caution flags and to flash the bronze lights when they become necessary.

Three times last year in my newsletter I predicted precisely the type of predicament which was going to confront the taxpayers of South Dakota in particular and of the United States generally. First, on March 17, 1964, in my newsletter volume XXVI, No. 3, under the heading "Tax Reduction Can Cost," I said, in part:

Taxpayers now receiving more money in their regular paychecks through a reduction in the Federal withholding rates should keep in mind that "today's benefits might be tomorrow's expense. The withholding tax rate now in effect may not be sufficient to provide for the average taxes to be collected from the vast majority of the wage-earning taxpayers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the complete statement I made in my newsletter of March 17, 1964, on the subject "Tax Reduction Can Cost."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TAX REDUCTION CAN COST

Taxpayers now receiving more money in their regular paychecks through a reduction in the Federal withholding rates should keep in mind that today's benefits might be tomorrow's expense. The withholding tax rate now in effect may not be sufficient to provide for the average taxes to be collected from the vast majority of the wage earning taxpayers. Here's why: The new law provides for a tax reduction in two installments. The first reduction is for the 1964 tax year. The remainder of the reduction is applicable for the 1965 tax year. However, the entire withholding rate reduction from 18 percent to 14 percent took effect immediately (on March 5). This means the taxes withheld may not match the rates for the year and the average salaried taxpayer could find that he owes additional taxes when he prepares his return next year. The taxpayer has the alternative of asking his employer to withhold more than the 14 percent by claiming fewer exemptions than he is entitled to or be prepared to pay an additional amount when he files his 1964 return because not enough was deducted in withholding.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I explained the dilemma. I pointed out the reason for this situation and suggested steps which taxpayers might take at that time to protect themselves. Considerable interest developed as a result of this particular newsletter's warning, so I discussed the subject in greater detail a few months later in Newsletter, volume XXVI, No. 16, dated September 15, 1964, again under the heading "Tax Reduction Can Cost." I alluded to the previous newsletter and pointed out:

The result is that most taxpayers are being underwithheld in 1964 and must face unusually large tax payments next spring. Many taxpayers will unhappily discover that much of the tax cut they thought they were receiving this year will have to be paid back to the Government next April when 1964 income tax payments fall due.

It seemed to me at the time that the Federal Government had an obligation to tell taxpayers generally what, in my limited manner, I was trying to point out to the taxpayers of South Dakota. It was quite obvious that many taxpayers thought that reduced withholding taxes meant for them a reduction in the amount of taxes they would have to pay all the way along the line, and did not have the vaguest idea that they were going to get a big tax bill for underpaid taxes which they would have to finance in April 1965.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the Record the entire portion of my Newsletter, volume XXVI, No. 16, of September 15, 1964, under the heading "Tax Reduction Can Cost."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

TAX REDUCTION CAN COST

Readers of "Your Washington and You" will recall that last March I warned that the new tax law which provided for a tax reduction in two installments might cause problems and today's benefits might be tomorrow's expenses. The first installment of the tax reduction was for the 1964 tax year and the remainder of the reduction is applicable for the 1965 tax year. This, I indicated, could mean that many taxpayers would find that they owe additional taxes when they prepared their next return.

My prediction of the predicament the average taxpayer might find himself in was borne out by Congressman Thomas Curtis, of Missouri, a ranking member of the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee who discussed the "phantom" tax cut on the House floor. He explains the tax cut in these words:

"In effect, the Revenue Act of 1964 provided for what might be termed a two-sided tax reduction. On the one hand, the income tax rate structure was reduced, which cut the taxpayers' actual tax liability to the Federal Government. On the other hand, the withholding rate was cut from 18 to 14 percent in one stroke—rather than in two stages as originally provided in the House bill—so that wage and salary earners would have less taxes withheld from their wages and thus receive larger paychecks than previously. The cut in the withholding rate might be called the apparent tax reduction.

"The withholding rate was cut to 14 percent immediately, only on the urgent recommendation of the Johnson administration. However, the reduction in tax liabilities was scheduled to take place in two installments, the second of which will not become effective until next January. The result is that most taxpayers are being underwithheld in 1964 and must face unusually large tax payments next spring. Many taxpayers will unhappily discover that much of the tax cut they thought they were receiving this year will have to be paid back to the Government next April when 1964 income tax payments fall due."

Congressman CURTIS concludes with the unhappy news that next April when they pay their 1964 taxes, the average married couple with two children will owe anywhere from $10 to $1,135 in addition to what has been withheld from their salary throughout the year, dependent on income level.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, a considerable amount of correspondence developed as a result of that newsletter, so in my newsletter volume XXVI, No. 17, dated September 29, 1964, I devoted the entire back page of my weekly report, which I call "Your Washington and You," to the same subject, under the heading "A Cold Spring, Taxwise." Mr. President, that "Cold Spring" is now with us, taxwise, and from all over the country we are receiving many letters, some expressing mild criticism, some almost expressing consternation, about the impact of the increased amount of taxes in 1965 on the household budget of many an American family.

In that newsletter, I included a tax table, pointing out precisely what would occur as a consequence. I am happy to report that a number of South Dakota taxpayers, at least, made necessary readjustments in order to be ready for this contingency, but not all of them. A great many Americans are ill prepared, however, to pay Uncle Sam's tax collectors an increase in taxes in 1965 when they had been led to believe by Federal publicity that the taxes, in their instance, were being reduced.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Dakota yield for a question?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. First, I thank the Senator for his eloquent and timely support, and also for the fact that he is one of those who sounded the alarm early on this subject.

Is it not true that one of the original purposes of the passage of the tax bill of last year was to put more money into the economy, and will we not be thwarting that purpose if we do not enact some sort of legislation of this kind?

Mr. MUNDT. The Senator from Texas is correct. I congratulate him on having proposed a perfectly fair, equitable, and plausible solution to the problem. I believe the Federal Government was seriously at fault in not providing for the taxpayers generally the kind of information which I tried, in my way, to provide for the people of South Dakota. The least the Federal Government could have done was to point out that the economies of a synthetic nature that they were enjoying in 1964 would become tax penalties in 1965, and that they should fortify themselves against the payment date and take the steps which were available to them not to enjoy the temporary withholding tax windfall, because "payday" was just around the corner, and they could have been ready for the situation.

But not having been adequately forewarned, not having been told generally by the tax administration that they would face this kind of serious problem in April 1965, the Government generally, Congress included, has an obligation now to act along the lines of the Tower amendment, which would enable the people at least to stagger the payments of this increased tax burden which American taxpayers who have a withholding schedule are confronting in their salaries and wages in 1965.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks the entire paragraph of my newsletter, volume XXVI, No. 17, for September 29, 1964, entitled "A Cold Spring, Taxwise."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A COLD SPRING, TAXWISE

In my September 15 report I discussed the 1964 tax bill and the reduction in withholding rates which will result in taxpayers having to pay an additional amount next spring because not enough is being withheld now. Representative THOMAS CURTIS, of Missouri, a ranking member of the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee, in discussing the "phantom tax cut" said: "The plan will prove a cruel and costly hoax to many working men and women. While their pay envelopes are fattened by a large 'apparent' tax reduction, they are being exhorted by President Johnson to spend the increase in aftertax incomes in order to give the economy a 'shot in the arm.' When April rolls around, many taxpayers will find that they have to repay the Government as much as $1 of every $3 of their 'apparent' tax reduction." Mr. CURTIS also included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (vol. 110, pt. 17, pp. 22336–22338) tables showing how much extra money the taxpayer will have to pay next spring. One example follows, with the third column from the left showing what a married couple with no dependents will have to pay:

Tax liability, tax withheld, and tax refund or tax due under Revenue Act of 1964 and under previous law (calendar year 1964)—Married couple with no dependents with standard deduction

Annual income all from wage or salary	Under Revenue Act of 1964			Under previous law			Revenue Act of 1964 over previous law		
	Tax liability	Tax withheld	Tax due or refund (−) in spring of 1965	Tax liability	Tax withheld	Tax due or refund (−) in spring of 1965	Decrease in withholding ("apparent" tax cut)	Increase or decrease (−) in tax due in spring of 1965	Increase or decrease (−) in tax due in spring of 1965 as percentage of decrease in withholding
$3,000	$230	$244.80	−$14.80	$305	$296.40	$8.60	$51.60	−$23.40	−45.3
$4,000	399	392.40	6.60	485	478.40	6.60	86.00	0	0
$5,000	554	545.20	8.80	660	665.60	−5.60	120.40	14.40	12.0
$6,000	720	703.20	16.80	844	858.00	−14.00	154.80	30.80	19.9
$7,000	900	817.80	82.20	1,042	998.40	43.60	180.60	38.60	21.4
$8,000	1,080	988.00	92.00	1,240	1,211.60	28.40	223.60	63.60	28.4
$9,000	1,260	1,140.80	119.20	1,438	1,398.80	39.20	258.00	80.00	31.0
$10,000	1,440	1,293.60	146.40	1,636	1,586.00	50.00	292.40	96.40	33.0
$11,000	1,668	1,420.18	247.82	1,888	1,740.96	147.04	320.78	100.78	31.4
$12,000	1,903	1,566.99	336.01	2,148	1,920.88	227.12	353.89	108.89	30.8
$13,000	2,138	1,713.80	424.20	2,408	2,100.80	307.20	387.00	117.00	30.2
$14,000	2,373	1,860.61	512.39	2,668	2,280.72	387.28	420.11	125.11	29.8
$15,000	2,636	2,007.42	628.58	2,960	2,460.64	449.36	453.22	129.22	28.5
$16,000	2,906	2,154.66	751.34	3,260	2,640.56	619.44	485.90	131.90	27.1
$17,000	3,176	2,301.56	874.44	3,560	2,821.00	739.00	519.44	135.44	26.1
$18,000	3,446	2,448.37	997.63	3,860	3,000.91	859.08	552.55	138.55	25.1
$19,000	3,744	2,595.18	1,148.82	4,192	3,180.84	1,011.16	585.66	137.66	23.5
$20,000	4,049	2,742.42	1,306.58	4,532	3,360.76	1,171.24	618.34	135.34	21.9

If you desire to have the entire text of Mr. CURTIS' speech, which includes in addition to the above table three others, I will be happy to send it to you.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I urge Senators to take this necessary emergency step to meet a problem confronting our taxpayers, a problem that was made in Washington. It is not a problem that was created in the homes or in the offices or at the desks of taxpayers. This is a problem that was created in Washington for the taxpayers, and it can be solved satisfactorily only by action from Washington. I think the Tower amendment would do the job. I hope it will be adopted by the Senate.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas because it would help to alleviate a situation in which many taxpayers find themselves through no fault of their own.

First, I wish to express appreciation to the Internal Revenue Service for the consideration which they have given to this subject thus far on a voluntary basis. Over the weekend the Commission of Internal Revenue announced his recognition of the problem which confronts many taxpayers and said he was instructing the District Directors to give consideration to those taxpayers who file returns but do not have the money. To the extent that their deficiency can be accounted for by underwithholding they are to be given some additional time in which to pay.

The only difference between the Treasury directive and the Tower amendment is that the Tower amendment spells out the amount of time that the taxpayers should receive so that they may know as a matter of law that they will have 3 months, 6 months, or whatever amount of time is provided to make their monthly payments and that there will be no penalty. I think it would be much better to have this point cleared up so that taxpayers who file their returns will know exactly where they stand without having to appeal to some bureaucrat for the extra time. If the amount a taxpayer owes is, say, $300 he will know that he will have 3 months in which to pay in three installments.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Is it not true that it is not only much better for every taxpayer to know in advance the schedule to which he is entitled, but that it is also much better, generally speaking, to have this understanding in the form of a Federal statute, rather than to leave the handling of the matter to the discretion of an individual who, being human, might move in one direction or another, if he has to make a decision in each individual case, but who obviously is looking for some opportunity to be helpful? The Tower amendment would spell out the understanding so that every taxpayer would be entitled to the same kind of treatment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is true. There is another point: If we do not spell out a specific time it will mean that the various district directors will have to handle each case individually, and the extra paper work of necessity could cost an exceedingly large amount of money.

This amendment would reduce the work on the Bureau itself. If this provision were spelled out it would be much simpler than if the Internal Revenue Service had the burden of examining each of these returns to determine the financial status of the individuals involved. I can see that the cost of administering that procedure would be far in excess of the cost that would be required under this amendment.

Mr. MUNDT. It would not only be simpler, but much more economical all the way through.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is the point I am making. I do not think we want to lose sight of the fact that this formula will not be known by all taxpayers. The taxpayers were given a tax reduction last year. As the bill was first sent down to the Committee on Ways and Means by President Kennedy it was recommended that the withholding rate be fixed at somewhere between 15 and 16 percent.

As I recall it, the actual figure given to the committee was 15.67 percent withholding. To round it out, they would have had to use 16 percent.

The Committee on Ways and Means used 15 percent instead. This figure reduced the withholding somewhat below the actual withholding needs. However, when the measure came to the Senate Committee on Finance—and I am speaking as a member of the committee—the bill was the recipient of this so-called Texas twist. The rate was fixed at 14 percent so that the people would think they were getting a larger tax reduction than they actually received. Word came from the White House very early in 1964 to forget all about the 15 percent recommendation and to make it 14 percent. That is what we referred to in the committee as the Texas twist.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I say that this is a reverse Texas twist that will be put on it.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. We are trying to correct the impact of the "Texas twist." I compliment the junior Senator from Texas for trying to correct the misleading Texas twist that was given to the 1964 tax reduction in order to fool American taxpayers. On orders of the administration the withholding was reduced to 14 percent.

While it is true that the Internal Revenue Service did a marvelous job throughout the country in instructing taxpayers that it would represent an underwithholding, the administration was discrediting this warning and playing it down. They were boasting about what a tax cut they had given to the American people. The administration not only insisted that the withholding be reduced to 14 percent, which would be two points below the necessary withholding rate, but also asked that all of the employers of the country have their forms ready prior to the enactment of the bill, with instructions that the reduced 14 percent rate should be made retroactive. They wanted to get the extra money into the hands of the people. The administration urged the people to spend it with the thought of stimulating the economy so that it might have the benefit of the election results.

Taxpayers are now paying the fiddler. There was approximately $500 million in underwithholding as a result of this so-called Texas twist. I think it is only proper that Congress now try to remedy this deliberate action. Let us hope that in the future we can get this Texas twist out of bills as they come up. We should recognize that, as a Congress, we represent all 50 States of the Union, working together for the good of the taxpayers.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I point out that what the Senator has said has a good deal of validity. I should hope that whatever happens to the amendment of the distinguished junior Senator from Texas, and I hope it will be agreed to, the taxpayers who read this RECORD and the taxpayers who write these ballooned checks for tax costs this month will realize that after every party there is a payday, and that this is simply illustrative and symbolic of what will happen in other tax bills in succeeding years as we start to pay for the cost of the Great Society.

It is all very easy to pass authorizing bills and put the camel's nose under the tent and say that the measure will not cost very much for the remainder of the year, or for the first few months of the following year. However, when we start on hundred-million-dollar programs and multibillion-dollar programs, there will be a payday after every party. The taxpayers who now face the payday for the party of tax forgiveness that was carried out in 1964 should know that there will be paydays for the other great costly experiments under the Great Society.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I agree fully with that statement. It is most unfortunate that the American taxpayers were given the impression that they were getting a greater tax reduction than was actually voted and approved by the administration. What makes it worse is the fact that this misleading information was distributed deliberately and admittedly for political reasons. Because it was an election year—they wanted the taxpayers to go into the voting booths thinking they had received a great tax reduction. The administration knew that the payday would come after the election, when it was too late for the taxpayers to change their ballots.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I concur in the Senator's comments relating to the Internal Revenue Service. I thank the Senator from Delaware for his able support of this measure. The Senator is a well-known expert in fiscal matters.

I further point out that the difference between the action we would take here, providing my amendment were adopted, and the action that the Internal Revenue Service might take on its own initiative, is that this measure would eliminate any hardship, and waive any interest.

I think it is incumbent upon us to do so. We created the problem in the first place by enacting the bill. Since we created the problem, I do not think we should punish the taxpayers for a mistake that we made.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I thoroughly agree with the statement of the Senator from Texas. I shall support this measure.

I think the junior Senator from Texas will agree that the Commissioner himself has gone as far as he can under existing law to minimize the adverse effects imposed on the taxpayers as a result of the Texas twist that was placed on the 1964 tax bill by the administration.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I think the Commissioner has gone as far as he can go. I think we would help him if we were to agree with my amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I agree.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I do not believe that my good friend, the senior Senator from Delaware, is alleging that there was no tax cut.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Oh, no. There was a tax cut, but the tax cut was not as great as the American people were led to think when the administration reduced the withholding rate to 14 percent. We were first advised that it would require approximately 16 percent—to be exact, I think that was 15.67 percent to keep withholding on a par with previous years.

The House provided for a 15-percent withholding rate. By orders of the White House in early 1964 a majority of the Senate Committee on Finance made it 14 percent. That was done knowing that it was too low.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, did the Senator vote for the 14-percent provision?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I did not vote for the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did not vote for that provision either.

I read in the newspaper, either today or yesterday, that the Internal Revenue Service would administratively correct the evils that may have occurred as a result of this "Texas twist" to which the Senator has referred.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. That is true to a great extent. I compliment the Internal Revenue Service for the action that it has taken thus far.

Mr. ELLENDER. If this can be accomplished administratively, why should we agree to this amendment?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. The Internal Revenue Service has stated that it will take care of such cases on an individual hardship case basis.

As I understand, under the administrative procedure that is all it can do. That means that each individual taxpayer must file his return and then apply for an extension of time on the basis of hardship.

The cost of examining all the applications will be terrific. What the amendment of the junior Senator from Texas seeks to do is to spell out under a fixed formula that the taxpayer would have 3 months or 6 months extra time to pay his tax. Then the taxpayer could pay his shortage in three or six installments. The taxpayer would know what he was doing without filing an application. The Internal Revenue Service would know what to expect.

It is my understanding that the Internal Revenue Service cannot establish a deadline such as is proposed in the amendment. However, the Internal Revenue Service can extend it by 3 months or 6 months, as they see fit, on an individual basis, but it would cost a great deal more money to process each separate application.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not had the time to read the amendment. Would the amendment provide that the extension would be given to all those taxpayers whose tax is not over $100?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. No.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, may I point out to the senior Senator from Louisiana that the Internal Revenue Service has done probably as much as it can under certain circumstances. My proposed amendment would give to taxpayers who have had their tax underwithheld, not in excess of $100, 3 months within which to pay this amount.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean the additional amount?

Mr. TOWER. Only the amount of the deficiency that was the result of the underwithholding.

Mr. ELLENDER. Will they have to pay the interest?

Mr. TOWER. They will not have to pay the interest. This amendment would allow them to forget the interest.

Mr. ELLENDER. That applies only to the increase between what was withheld and what they have to pay?

Mr. TOWER. It applies only to the withholding deficiency; nothing more than that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I shall support the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER]. I think it is not only timeful, but helpful in the collection of taxes. Millions of citizens will know when and how to pay the tax they owe, rather than have it be a matter of administrative decision.

I concur in what the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS] has said about the Internal Revenue Service. He held many conferences with the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and others in the agency, urging them to do something about it, which I think resulted in the cooperative response of the agency. Therefore, I believe the Senator from Delaware deserves a great deal of commendation for starting this move to take corrective action.

Secondly, there were members of the Finance Committee, including the Senator from Delaware and myself, who realized, when 18 percent of salaries had been withheld, that a cut to 14 percent was much greater than it should have been.

There is no doubt that a reduction was made in order to get an added amount of money in to the spending stream before the election. There is no question about it. That aspect was fully discussed, but the proposal was adopted. I hope the Senate will adopt the Tower amendment today.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. I thank the Senator for his comments. In line with what he has said with respect to my conferences with the Department, I wish to express my appreciation to Commissioner Cohen and those in his Department who worked on this matter. They recognize the problem, and to the extent that they are able to do something administratively, they are. The Senator from Texas proposes to do away with the interest requirement and sets a specific time for payment. This needs legislation. The adoption of the amendment would go far toward correcting hardship cases involving many taxpayers who in the years heretofore have prided themselves on being timely taxpayers but who through no fault of their own are now placed in an embarrassing situation as a result of the "Texas twist."

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, at the appropriate time I expect to make a motion to table. I would like sufficient time for Senators who favor the amendment and who wish to make speeches to do so. I shall withhold making the motion until all Senators sponsoring the amendment or in favor of it will have an opportunity to speak.

The Senator from Texas is ringing a bell, but in all candor, he has been ringing a bell at the wrong door. There is no purpose to be gained by adding this amendment to the pending bill. The pending bill is the Foreign Agents Registration measure. If the Senator is looking for speed, he will not get it by putting this amendment in the bill, because if we add that amendment to this bill, it will then have to go to the House of Representatives, where it has not yet been considered. I presume it will have to go to the House Foreign Affairs Committee for hearings. That, I presume, will take a little time. It will then have to go to the House Rules Committee, where it will take some additional time. Then it has to be adopted in the House. All of this takes time.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. If the Senator from Florida can suggest a more speedy vehicle on which I can hang this measure, I shall be glad to do it.

Mr. SMATHERS. This procedure has been referred to as the "Texas twist." This is simply talk by the Seantor from Texas for the benefit of some people who have a feeling about this matter, for whom there was underwithholding in 1964. We shall have to ask certain people in certain categories to pay additional taxes over that which the law specifically provides, because of the fact that taxes were underwithheld in 1964. But in 1966 and in every year thereafter, the total amount of the tax cut, as we discussed it, was to have a beneficial effect in the Nation. I believe 70 percent of the Members of the Senate voted for that measure.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. From the discussion I have heard thus far I have been under the impression that this amendment was being added to a tax bill. Am I to understand that it is proposed to be added to a Senate bill unrelated to taxation?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. How would that meet the rules of the House? We do not have a tax bill before us, and this amendment affects taxation?

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct. Constitutionally, this proposal is not correct, but I thought it would be simpler, rather than make such a point, to let the able Senator from Texas make his offer and let him and all the other Senators who have certain feelings about this "Texas tornado" talk, and then make a motion to table. It would be simpler to do that than talk about constitutionality.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I said a while ago, I am in sympathy with the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. SMATHERS. And so am I sympathetic to the amendment of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I have spent less time talking about this matter than any other Senator, including the Senator from Florida. This proposal has been before us since January. Nothing has been done. We are getting down to the deadline. I said last week that I would try to pick some sort of vehicle to which to attach this proposal, because something must be done. I think the modification of the tax was good. I did not vote for it, for which I received a great deal of criticism from people in Texas. I did not do so because I think we should keep our expenditures within our receipts. But the taxpayer was given the impression that he was going to get more money back than he actually was entitled to, and now he finds he has to borrow money to pay his taxes. That is going to take money out of the economy so that the taxpayers can pay their taxes. The proposal has gone through the Senate quickly. I do not think it will be in the House very long.

Mr. SMATHERS. It has not gone through the Senate. The Senator has just now offered his amendment. It has not gone through the Senate.

Mr. TOWER. I am talking about S. 693. That has been approved. We are talking about the vehicle to which to attach this measure.

As to the constitutional point, that is not involved. The Constitution provides that bills raising revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives. I have some legal information to the effect that this is a legitimate procedure and measure. Therefore it is not something within the constitutional ban.

Mr. SMATHERS. I do not agree with the junior Senator from Texas on this particular point of constitutionality. For years in the Senate, the Senate Finance Committee has been trying to put itself in the position where it could change, somehow, tax rates, rates of payment, even proposals with respect to social security matters, and every other kind of matter; and we always have had to wait, constitutionally, until the House acted, because such matters have to do with revenue. Whether the proposal is to raise or lower, or whatever the proposal on taxes is, it originates in the House of Representatives. That has been, unfortunately, the rule, but it is the rule.

We do not expect to be able to talk about sugar legislation because a lower tax is placed on sugar from time to time; but, unfortunately, we are bringing it up because it has been construed all over again, and unquestionably there are precedents concerning it. We have to see that it is taken up in the House of Representatives because it has something to do with either bringing more money in on a tax on sugar, or less money, and frequently we are trying to lower it.

Therefore, I disagree with the Senator on that point, but that is not the point I make. The point I wish to make is that the Senator brings up a question which is serious and occupies the minds of many taxpayers. The Internal Revenue Service is the agency which should do something about it immediately.

Last Saturday the Internal Revenue Service had something to say on the subject. It should be printed in the RECORD, and I shall therefore read it. It is published on the front page of the New York Times Sunday edition for April 4:

PAYMENTS EASED FOR 1964 TAX BILLS: GRACE PERIOD IS PERMITTED BUT HARDSHIP MUST RESULT FROM UNDERWITHHOLDING

WASHINGTON, April 3.—The Government left the door ajar tonight for those who face hardship in paying their income tax in full on April 15. But the burden of proof rests on the taxpayer.

Further, he must convince the Internal Revenue Service that hardship results from underwithholding from his paycheck.

What the Senator is suggesting raises another complication. Are we talking about taxpayers who are having to pay a great deal of tax because of underwithholding, or those who do not wish to pay a tax? To determine this would require the investigation of approximately 77 million tax returns, which the Internal Revenue is not in a position to do.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield at that point?

Mr. SMATHERS. I should like to finish reading the article, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

The article continues:

The policy of permitting people to file a return without paying the whole bill right away is not new. The Service has never tried to put people in jail for failure to pay on time.

But the Service issued a special statement making these points:

It warned all taxpayers that their returns must be submitted by the April 15 deadline to avoid severe penalties under the law.

It urged taxpayers to pay the full amount due at that time if it were at all possible.

It recommended payment of as much as possible if full payment "would result in undue hardship, as distinguished from mere inconvenience."

It said those who did not pay in full would receive a bill for the unpaid balance.

It instructed those receiving such balance-due bills to "promptly write or visit the nearest Internal Revenue Service office to arrange payment" in what it described as "a reasonable period of time."

A reasonable period of time. I add those words.

I added the second "reasonable period of time." It is stated specifically in the article that it will work out payments within a reasonable period of time.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. Will the Senator clarify that last statement? There is only one reference to "a reasonable period of time."

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct. There is only one reasonable period of time. For emphasis I merely read it again.

The article continues:

It added that full payment should be made "as quickly as possible."

It noted that interest at 6 percent would be charged on unpaid balances.

Many taxpayers face problems in paying their 1964 income tax because insufficient money has been withheld from their wages or salaries.

When the two-stage tax reduction bill was passed last year, the new withholding scale was put into effect at once on the basis of the full reduction. But this does not become effective until the tax bills for 1965. This was done primarily to inject more spendable income into the economy in 1964.

There was considerable publicity about this and many persons arranged to have employers increase sums withheld.

I should like to emphasize that to all Senators—

And the service sent a notice to all employers pointing out the consequences of underwithholding and asking them to suggest that employees request adjustments in withholding.

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Sheldon S. Cohen, noted:

"There are a number of taxpayers who in good faith did not make such adjustment. These taxpayers may not have understood the need to do so in their particular case or they may have been unable to make such an adjustment as a result of circumstances beyond their control."

He then concluded:

"In such cases, if the taxpayer can demonstrate that the unpaid portion of his tax is due to underwithholding and that the immediate payment of the entire balance would result in undue hardship, as distinguished from mere inconvenience, the Internal Revenue Service will attempt to work out arrangements for payment of the balance over a reasonable period of time."

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. TOWER. All that information has been brought out in discussion in the Chamber. The Internal Revenue Service has been commended for its efforts to try to inform the people as to the facts on underwithholding. The fact remains that what is proposed is a hardship test. The interest still applies. What we are trying to do is to set up a time schedule to avoid the hardship test and forgive the interest, because many taxpayers were not properly informed regarding underwithholding.

To me, this is eminently reasonable. From the administrative standpoint, it would relieve the Internal Revenue Service of a great deal of work in having to go into all the tax returns individually in order, to determine existing hardships.

Mr. SMATHERS. If the Senator from Texas will yield at that point, the Senator is concerned about giving the taxpayer relief, and he makes some point about the 6 percent interest. Why did the Senator not vote a year ago for the $11½ billion tax cut? He now proposes to give the taxpayers the benefit of elimination of the 6 percent interest, which is approximately one-half percent a month. It will be of considerably less benefit to them than if he had voted—as most Senators did last year—for the $11½ billion tax cut a year ago.

Mr. TOWER. I shall be delighted to answer that question if the Senator from Florida will yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I voted against the bill last year because I believed that our expenditures should not exceed our receipts. If we were to bring up a tax cut bill today and appeared to be undetermined in disciplining ourselves to cut taxes, I would vote against it again. But the reason I wish to give relief is that the taxpayers are victims of a mistake which we have made. I do not see the point of putting money into the economy and then taking it out of circulation by a punitive situation which arises from underwithholding.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the colloquy which is taking place, has there been any indication made of the estimated number of taxpayers who now find themselves in distress financially because of the $11.5 billion tax cut.

Mr. TOWER. If I may answer the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Texas for that purpose.

Mr. TOWER. I believe that the Internal Revenue Service would be hard put to determine the number. It is an intangible number, it is difficult to determine.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me answer the question by asserting that the distinguished counsel of the committee who sits beside me now, tells me that there is no way in which the Internal Revenue Service can know that number, which is exactly what the Senator from Texas has just said.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I read in the newspapers that small loan companies are offering to distressed taxpayers who are supposed to be benefited by the $11.5 billion tax cut loans with which to pay their income taxes. I suppose these loans will be made on the usual usurious basis upon which small loan companies operate. Will one or the other of the two Senators from Florida and Texas answer that question for me as to taxpayers now being driven to the small loan companies who charge 2 percent or 3 percent a month to borrow from them.

Mr. SMATHERS. I can answer the Senator's question for him by saying of course that is not quite the case because small loan companies, as the able Senator knows, charge 12 percent interest—sometimes it goes as high as 42 percent. Actually, according to the statement issued by the Internal Revenue Commissioner, taxpayers will be given a reasonable period of time in which to work out the payment of their income taxes. They will be charged 6 percent interest a year, which is one-half of 1 percent per month.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Is it or is it not a fact instead of bringing good, the $11½ billion tax return to a large number of people has brought distress, because they cannot now pay the taxes which are due as a result of not withholding adequate amounts from their salaries?

Mr. SMATHERS. The reductions which they received during the year are already greater than any additional tax which they will have to pay. I could not agree with the Senator from Ohio at all. On the contrary—this is not an allied point, and I do not want to become involved in it—I believe that the $11.5 billion tax cut has been a great boon not only to the general economy, but also to the individuals who make up the economy.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I believe the tax cut has been a boon. It has brought about expanded business. However, the time has not yet come when the accounting must be made. That time is partly here for many who cannot pay the taxes that are due. It strikes me that this is the first evidence of what we can expect at a later date, when eventually there will be the second prejudicial consequence of the $11.5 billion tax cut.

I voted against the tax reduction. I voted against it because I believed it was a political sop. I believed that eventually there would be a day of accounting. We shall find that we cannot keep cutting taxes and at the same time spend more and more money and be faced with a $300 billion debt and a deficit each year of $8 billion and $10 billion.

The people were told: "Go out and spend all the taxes we have relieved you of paying. It will stimulate the economy."

That is what, in effect, they were told. These people did it. Now they are begging for help from the Government.

Unless there is evidence that the Internal Revenue Service contemplates dealing fairly and reasonably with distressed taxpayers, the Tower amendment ought to be adopted.

I should like again to hear from the Senator from Florida what the Government intends to do for those citizens.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Internal Revenue Service asks the people to come to talk with them. It says that if there has been a misunderstanding, it will help. First, I believe we should understand that the tax cut came in two steps, one in 1964 and the other in 1965. The Government underwithheld in 1964. At that time, the tax people warned employers to be on notice that this situation was likely to result.

Many of the employers corrected the situation, and withheld the proper amount. We have no problem there at all. The Internal Revenue Service now says to those people that if they did not understand the situation they should come in to discuss the problem, and see if there is some solution. They say, "Come in and see us, and we will give you a reasonable time in which you can make up your tax payment. We will charge you the regular rate of one-half of 1 percent a month." That is less than the average taxpayer would have to pay to get the money anywhere else.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMATHERS. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Florida whether it is not true that inasmuch as the pending bill, S. 693, is a Foreign Agents Registration Act, and not a revenue act, and has been reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, the bill has absolutely nothing to do with the tax situation. If the Tower amendment is added to the bill, the House, under its customary procedure, on constitutional grounds, will absolutely refuse to receive the bill, and the bill will be returned to the Senate or thrown in the wastebasket; therefore, this is a completely wrong way to go about achieving the purpose under discussion. Is that not correct?

Mr. SMATHERS. I completely agree with the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. To propose it to this kind of bill is wholly inappropriate and is not the proper way to achieve the purpose, assuming the purpose is a good one.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why are we wasting time on it? Why does not the Senator from Florida move to table the amendment? There is no purpose to be served by proceeding with it. The bill under consideration was passed by the Senate last year. It is a noncontroversial bill. The House will not accept the bill if we add the Tower amendment to it. Under its normal procedure, the House will reject it. I believe their principle is that they will not even receive such a bill. I wonder why the Senator does not move to table the amendment.

Mr. SMATHERS. I had said earlier that I would make a motion to table at the most propitious time and after the proponents and the opponents of the amendment had had an opportunity to make their statements.

I believe that moment has arrived. Therefore, I move to table the Tower amendment.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for a quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. I ask for the yeas and nays on the motion to table.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, will the Chair state the question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] to table the amendment offered by the Senator from Texas [Mr. TOWER].

The yeas and nays having been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the distinguished Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I would vote "yea." I withhold my vote.

The rollcall was concluded.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MOSS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. HART], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. McINTYRE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] are detained on official business.

The pair of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. FANNIN] has been previously announced.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Dalaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. SIMPSON] would each vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 29, as follows:

[No. 41 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Church
Clark
Fulbright
Harris
Hayden
Holland
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McGovern
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Muskie
Neuberger
Pell
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Smathers
Stennis
Talmadge
Young, Ohio

NAYS—29

Aiken
Allott
Carlson
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Ellender
Fong
Hickenlooper
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Kuchel
Lausche
Miller
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Murphy
Prouty
Randolph
Scott
Smith
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—34

Bennett
Boggs
Burdick
Byrd, Va.
Case
Dodd
Eastland
Ervin
Fannin
Gore
Gruening
Hart
Hartke
Hill
Javits
Johnston
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McIntyre
Moss
Nelson
Pastore
Pearson
Robertson
Russell
Saltonstall
Simpson
Sparkman
Symington
Tvdings
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

So Mr. SMATHERS' motion to table the amendment of Mr. TOWER was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

The bill (S. 693) was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 1 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The term 'foreign principal' includes—

"(1) a government of a foreign country and a foreign political party;

"(2) a person outside of the United States, unless it is established that such person is an individual and a citizen of and domiciled within the United States, or that such person is not an individual and is organized under or created by the laws of the United States or of any State or other place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States and has it principal place of business within the United States; and

"(3) a partnership, association, corporation, organization, or other combination of persons organized under the laws of or having its principal place of business in a foreign country."

(2) Subsection (c) is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Except as provided in subsection (d) hereof, the term 'agent of a foreign principal' means—

"(1) any person who acts as an agent, representative, employee, or servant, or any person who acts in any other capacity at the order, request, or under the direction or control, of a foreign principal or of a person any of whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, controlled, financed, or subsidized in whole or in major part by a foreign principal, and who directly or through any other person—

"(i) engages within the United States in political activities for or in the interests of such foreign principal;

"(ii) acts within the United States as a public relations counsel, publicity agent, information-service employee or political consultant for or in the interests of such foreign principal;

"(iii) within the United States solicits, collects, disburses, or dispenses contributions, loans, money, or other things of value for or in the interest of such foreign principal; or

"(iv) within the United States represents the interests of such foreign principal before any agency or official of the Government of the United States; and

"(2) any person who agrees, consents, assumes or purports to act as, or who is or holds himself out to be, whether or not pursuant to contractual relationship, an agent of a foreign principal as defined in clause (1) of this subsection."

(3) Subsection (d) is amended by striking out "clause (1), (2), or (4) of".

(4) Subsection (g) is amended by inserting before the words "matter pertaining to" the words "public relations" and before the semicolon at the end thereof the words "of such principal".

(5) Such section is further amended by substituting a semicolon for the period at the end of subsection (n) and adding the following new subsections:

"(o) The term 'political activities' means the dissemination of political propaganda and any other activity which the person engaging therein believes will, or which he intends to, prevail upon, indoctrinate, convert, induce, persuade, or in any other way influence any agency or official of the Government of the United States or any section of the public within the United States with reference to formulating, adopting, or changing the domestic or foreign policies of the United States or with reference to the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a government of a foreign country or a foreign political party;

"(p) The term 'political consultant' means any person who engages in informing or advising any other person with reference to the domestic or foreign policies of the United States or the political or public interests, policies, or relations of a foreign country or of a foreign political party."

SEC. 2. Section 2 of such Act is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by striking out the second, third, and fourth sentences and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "Except as hereinafter provided, every person who becomes an agent of a foreign principal shall, within ten days thereafter, file with the Attorney General, in duplicate, a registration statement, under oath on a form prescribed by the Attorney General. The obligation of an agent of a foreign principal to file a registration statement shall, after the tenth day of his becoming such agent, continue from day to day, and termination of such status shall not relieve such agent from his obligation to file a registration statement for the period during which he was an agent of a foreign principal."

(2) Subsection (a)(3) is amended by striking out the comma following the word "each" where it first appears, and the following: "unless, and to the extent, this requirement is waived in writing by the Attorney General"; and by inserting before the semicolon at the end of the subsection a comma and the following: "or by any other foreign principal".

(3) Subsection (a)(4) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "including a detailed statement of any such activity which is a political activity".

(4) Subsection (a)(6) is amended by inserting before the semicolon at the end thereof a comma and the following: "including a detailed statement of any such activity which is a political activity".

(5) Subsection (a)(7) is amended to read as follows:

"(7) The name, business, and residence addresses, and if an individual, the nationality, of any person other than a foreign principal for whom the registrant is acting, assuming or purporting to act or has agreed to act under such circumstances as require his registration hereunder; the extent to which each such person is supervised, directed, owned, controlled, financed, or subsidized, in whole or in part, by any government of a foreign country or foreign political party or by any other foreign principal; and the nature and amount of contributions, income, money, or thing of value, if any, that the registrant has received during the preceding sixty days from each such person in connection with any of the activities referred to in clause (6) of this subsection, either as compensation or for disbursement or otherwise, and the form and time of each such payment and from whom received;".

(6) Subsection (a)(8) is amended to read as follows:

"(8) A detailed statement of the money and other things of value spent or disposed of by the registrant during the preceding sixty days in furtherance of or in connection with activities which require his registration hereunder and which have been undertaken by him either as an agent of a foreign principal or for himself or any other person or in connection with any activities relating to his becoming an agent of such principal, and a detailed statement of any contributions of money or other things of value made by him during the preceding sixty days (other than contributions the making of which is prohibited under the terms of section 613 of title 18, United States Code) in connection with an election to any political office or in connection with any primary election, convention, or caucus held to select candidates for any political office;".

(7) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection as follows:

"(f) The Attorney General may, by regulation, provide for the exemption—

"(1) from registration, or from the requirement of furnishing any of the information required by this section, of any person who is listed as a partner, officer, director, or employee in the registration statement filed by an agent of a foreign principal under this Act, and

"(2) from the requirement of furnishing any of the information required by this section of any agent of a foreign principal,

where by reason of the nature of the functions or activities of such person the Attorney General, having due regard for the national security and the public interest, determines that such registration, or the furnishing of such information, as the case may be, is not necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act."

Sec. 3. (a) Section 3(d) of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Any person engaging or agreeing to engage only (1) in private and nonpolitical activities in furtherance of the bona fide trade or commerce of such foreign principal; or (2) in other activities not serving predominantly a foreign interest; or (3) in the soliciting or collecting of funds and contributions within the United States to be used only for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering if such solicitation or collection of funds and contributions is in accordance with and subject to the provisions of the Act of November 4, 1939, as amended (54 Stat. 4), and such rules and regulations as may be prescribed thereunder;".

(b) Section 3 of such Act is further amended by substituting a semicolon for the period at the end of subsection (f) and adding a new subsection as follows:

(g) Any attorney whose activities are confined to openly representing, as an attorney of record, the interests of a disclosed foreign principal before any court or administrative agency of the United States, or of any State or political subdivision thereof."

Sec. 4. Section 4 of such Act is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by inserting after the words "political propaganda" the words "for or in the interests of such foreign principal"; and by striking out the words "sent to the Librarian of Congress two copies thereof and file with the Attorney General one copy thereof" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "file with the Attorney General two copies thereof".

(2) Subsection (b) is amended by inserting after the words "political propaganda" where they first appear the words "for or in the interests of such foreign principal"; by inserting after the words "setting forth" the words "the relationship or connection between the person transmitting the political propaganda or causing it to be transmitted and such propaganda;"; and by striking out the words "each of his foreign principals" and inserting in lieu thereof "such foreign principal".

(3) Subsection (c) is amended by striking out the words "sent to the Librarian of Congress" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "filed with the Attorney General".

(4) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(e) It shall be unlawful for any person within the United States who is an agent of a foreign principal required to register under the provisions of this Act to transmit, convey, or otherwise furnish to any agency or official of the Government (including a Member or committee of either House of Congress) for or in the interests of such foreign principal any political propaganda or to request from any such agency or official for or in the interests of such foreign principal any information or advice with respect to any matter pertaining to the political or public interests, policies or relations of a foreign country or of a political party or pertaining to the foreign or domestic policies of the United States unless the propaganda or the request is prefaced or accompanied by a true and accurate statement to the effect that such person is registered as an agent of such foreign principal under this Act.

"(f) Whenever any agent of a foreign principal required to register under this Act appears before any committee of Congress to testify for or in the interests of such foreign principal, he shall, at the time of such appearance, furnish the committee with a copy of his most recent registration statement filed with the Department of Justice as an agent of such foreign principal for inclusion in the records of the committee as part of his testimony."

Sec. 5. Section 5 of such Act is amended by inserting after "the provisions of this Act," where they first appear the words "in accordance with such business and accounting practices,".

Sec. 6. Section 6 of such Act is amended by inserting the letter "(a)" after the section number and by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(b) The Attorney General shall, promptly upon receipt, transmit one copy of every registration statement filed hereunder and one copy of every amendment or supplement thereto, and one copy of every item of political propaganda filed hereunder, to the Secretary of State for such comment and use as the Secretary of State may determine to be appropriate from the point of view of the foreign relations of the United States. Failure of the Attorney General so to transmit such copy shall not be a bar to prosecution under this Act.

"(c) The Attorney General is authorized to furnish to departments and agencies in the executive branch and committees of the Congress such information obtained by him in the administration of this Act, including the names of registrants under this Act, copies of registration statements, or parts thereof, copies of political propaganda, or other documents or information filed under this Act, as may be appropriate in the light of the purposes of this Act."

Sec. 7. Section 8 of such Act is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended by adding before the period at the end of paragraph (2) a comma and the following: "except that in the case of a violation of subsection (b), (e), or (f) of section 4 or of subsection (g) or (h) of this section the punishment shall be a fine of not more than $5,000 or imprisonment for not more than six months, or both".

(2) Such section is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(f) Whenever in the judgment of the Attorney General any person is engaged in or about to engage in any acts which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of this Act, or regulations issued thereunder, or whenever any agent of a foreign principal fails to comply with any of the provisions of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder, or otherwise is in violation of the Act, the Attorney General may make application to the appropriate United States district court for an order enjoining such acts or enjoining such person from continuing to act as an agent of such foreign principal, or for an order requiring compliance with any appropriate provision of the Act or regulation thereunder. The district court shall have jurisdiction and authority to issue a temporary or permanent injunction, restraining order or such other order which it may deem proper. The proceedings shall be made a preferred cause and shall be expedited in every way.

"(g) If the Attorney General determines that a registration statement does not comply with the requirements of this Act or the regulations issued thereunder, he shall so notify the registrant in writing, specifying in what respects the statement is deficient. It shall be unlawful for any person to act as an agent of a foreign principal at any time ten days or more after receipt of such notification without filing an amended registration statement in full compliance with the requirements of this Act and the regulations issued thereunder.

"(h) It shall be unlawful for any agent of a foreign principal required to register under this Act to be a party to any contract, agreement, or understanding, either express or implied, with such foreign principal pursuant to which the amount or payment of the compensation, fee, or other remuneration of such agent is contingent in whole or in part upon the success of any political activities carried on by such agent."

Sec. 8. (a) Chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 613. Contributions by agents of foreign principals

"Whoever, being an agent of a foreign principal, directly or through any other person, either for or on behalf of such foreign principal or otherwise in his capacity as agent of such foreign principal, knowingly makes any contribution of money or other thing of value, or promises expressly or impliedly to make such contribution, in connection with an election to any political office or in connection with any primary election, convention, or caucus held to select candidates for any political office; or

"Whoever knowingly solicits, accepts, or receives any such contribution from any such agent of a foreign principal or from such foreign principal—

"Shall be fined not more than $5,000 or imprisoned not more than five years or both.

"As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'foreign principal' has the same meaning as when used in the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, except that such term does not include any person who is a citizen of the United States.

"(2) The term 'agent of a foreign principal' means any person who acts as an agent, representative, employee, or servant, or any person who acts in any other capacity at the order, request, or under the direction or control, of a foreign principal or of a person any substantial portion of whose activities are directly or indirectly supervised, directed, or controlled by a foreign principal."

(b) Chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section as follows:

"§ 219. Officers and employees acting as agents of foreign principals

"Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States in the executive, legislative, or judicial branch of the Government or in any agency of the United States, including the District of Columbia, is or acts as an agent of a foreign principal required to register under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

"Nothing in this section shall apply to the employment of any agent of a foreign principal as a special Government employee in any case in which the head of the employing agency certifies that such employment is required in the national interest. A copy of any certification under this paragraph shall be forwarded by the head of such agency to the Attorney General who shall cause the same to be filed with the registration statement and other documents filed by such agent, and made available for public inspection in accordance with section 6 of the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended."

(c) (1) The sectional analysis at the beginning of chapter 29 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"613. Contributions by agents of foreign principals."

(2) The sectional analysis at the beginning of chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new item:

"219. Officers and employees acting as agents of foreign principals."

SEC. 9. This Act shall take effect ninety days after the date of its enactment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. SMATHERS. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ACT OF 1965

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agricultural commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ACREAGE-POUNDAGE MARKETING QUOTAS FOR TOBACCO

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 5721, Calendar No. 135, the tobacco acreage-poundage bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 5721) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments on page 2, line 8, after the word "of", to strike out "excessive supplies in order to achieve the policy of the Act" and insert "supplies to the reserve supply level. Any such downward adjustment shall not exceed 10 per centum of such estimated utilization and exports"; on page 3, line 10, after the word "reserve.", to insert "In determining farm acreage allotments for Flue-cured tobacco for 1965, the 1965 farm allotment determined under section 313 shall be adjusted in lieu of the acreage allotment for the immediately preceding year."; on page 4, line 2, after the word "in", to strike out "like manner, except that the five most recent crop years for which data are available shall be used instead of the period 1959 to 1963" and insert "the same manner"; in line 11, after the word "be", to strike out "the sum of 75 per centum of the average of the three highest years and 25 per centum of the national average yield goal but not less than"; on page 5, line 9, after "(6)", to strike out "except that in lieu of the five consecutive crop years beginning with 1959 the five most recent crop years for which data are available for the kind of tobacco shall be used"; on page 8, line 25, after the word "within", to strike out "thirty" and insert "forty-five"; on page 9, line 19, after the word "period.", to insert "If marketing quotas on an acreage-poundage basis are not approved by more than 66⅔ per centum of the farmers voting in such referendum, the marketing quotas on an acreage basis shall continue in effect as theretofore proclaimed under section 312(a)."; on page 11, line 2, after the word "under", to strike out "subsections (b) or (c) or a referendum on acreage poundage quotas under this subsection" and insert "subsection (b) or a referendum on acreage-poundage quotas under this subsection, and at least 15 days prior to the holding of any special referendum under subsection (c)." "; on page 12, at the beginning of line 18, to insert "and shall not exceed the community average yield"; on page 13, line 15, after the word "may", to insert "(except in the case of Burley tobacco, or other kinds of tobacco not subject to section 316)"; in line 23, after the word "transferred.", to insert "Transfers of acreage allotments for 1965 under section 316 on the basis of leases executed prior to the effective date of a program for the 1965 crop of Flue-cured tobacco under this section may be approved or ratified by the county committee for the purposes of this section, but the amount of allotment transferred shall be increased or decreased in the same proportion that the allotment of the farm from which it is transferred is increased or decreased under this section."; on page 14, line 12, after the word "per centum", to insert "(120 per centum in the case of Burley tobacco)"; on page 16, line 2, after the word "be", to strike out "applicable," " and insert "applicable."; after line 2, to insert:

(h) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, for any year subsequent to the first year for which marketing quotas are made effective under this section for Burley tobacco—

(1) the farm acreage allotment for Burley tobacco under this section shall not be less than the smallest of (A) the acreage allotment established for the farm for such first year, (B) the acreage allotment established for such first year for a farm which had an acreage allotment of five-tenths of an acre for the year preceding such first year, or (C) 10 per centum of the cropland; and

(2) the farm marketing quota for Burley tobacco under this section shall not be less than the minimum allotment provided by clause (1) multiplied by the farm yield established for such first year for such farm.

Farm acreage allotments and marketing quotas to which the provisions of (1) and (2) are applicable shall be subject to adjustment for overmarketing or undermarketing or reductions required by subsection (f). The additional acreage and quotas required under this subsection shall be in addition to the national acreage allotment and national marketing quota.

(i) If an acreage-poundage program for Flue-cured tobacco is approved by growers voting in the special referendum under subsection (b), the Secretary shall not later than January 1, 1966—

(1) Consult with representatives of all segments of the tobacco industry, including growers, State farm organizations, and cooperative associations, in meetings held for each kind of tobacco, to receive their recommendations and to determine the need for a similar or modified program for that kind of tobacco.

(2) Conduct a study and report to the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on experience with and operation of the program, and make recommendations for any modifications needed to improve the program, including alternatives adapted to the different needs of other kinds of tobacco.

And, on page 18, at the beginning of line 4, to insert "(120 per centum in the case of Burley tobacco)".

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, the tobacco program has often been referred to as the most successful farm program we have. For many years the present acreage allotment program for tobacco worked reasonably well in maintaining supplies in line with demand. Prices received by tobacco growers have been favorable. Costs to the Government for price supports on tobacco have been held to a minimum. In fact, for many years, price supports on tobacco operated with no costs at all to the Government. For a number of years, the steadily increasing demand for tobacco used in the manufacture of cigarettes tended to offset increased per acre yields. Also, prices trended upward, enabling the producer associations operating the support program to dispose of their holdings at prices which would enable them to repay their loans from CCC.

As a matter of fact, since 1933 the price support program costs to the Government amount to only $39 million. On the other hand, since 1950 alone the taxes collected by Federal, State, and local governments amount to over $39 billion.

In recent years, however, excessive supplies of tobacco have accumulated because of accelerated increases in per acre yields on some kinds of tobacco, especially for Flue-cured and burley—which account for about nine-tenths of our total tobacco production. During the 5 years, 1954–58, Flue-cured tobacco yields average 1,509 pounds per acre. In 1964, Flue-cured yields are estimated to have averaged 2,203 pounds per acre, an increase of 46 percent. Similarly, the 1964 crop of Flue-cured tobacco was 5 percent larger than the 1954 crop, notwithstanding the fact that the acreage grown in 1964 was 40 percent less than the 1954 acreage.

The burley story is quite similar. Burley yields averaged 1,579 pounds per acre in 1954–58, but increased to an all-time high of 2,231 pounds per acre in 1963. Unfavorable weather conditions prevailed in parts of the burley-producing area in 1964 but yields still averaged over 2,000 pounds per acre—second only to the 1963 record.

It is clear that we have by no means reached the limit in yields per acre. Research conducted by both the Department and by the land-grant colleges clearly shows that further increases in per-acre yields are readily obtainable. The records of individual farm marketings which are maintained in the county ASCS offices disclose numerous instances of yields as high as 3,500 pounds per acre, with some running even higher.

With increased yields per acre, the quality of U.S. grown tobacco has deteriorated and we have lost more of the export market for our tobacco. All tobacco offered for sale on auction markets is graded by trained Federal graders. During the 5 years, 1946–50, 31.1 percent of Flue-cured tobacco marketed in the United States was placed in first, second, and third qualities by USDA inspectors. During the 5 years, 1956–60, only 14.4 percent was placed in the first three qualities. For the 1962 crop, only 10.3 percent, or about one-third as much as in 1946–50, was graded into the first, second, and third qualities. Since Government grade standards for Flue-cured tobacco were substantially revised in 1963, comparable data for the 1963 and 1964 crops are not available.

Tobacco grown in the United States over the years has been noted for its superior quality. It has been the hallmark of quality in world tobacco trade. Historically, there has been a strong consumer preference for tobacco products made from U.S. leaf. High-quality cigarettes in most countries of the world have been made solely from U.S. leaf or blends of U.S. leaf with domestic or other imported leaf.

The United States has the soil, climate, research program, and know-how to produce tobacco far superior in quality to that produced in any other area of the world. U.S. leaf has excelled in nearly all phases of smoking and manufacturing qualities, including flavor and aroma.

Flue-cured tobacco has become of increasing importance in world tobacco trade since the end of World War II, and now accounts for around 50 percent of all free world tobacco exports of leaf tobacco. In spite of increased demand for Flue-cured from world markets, the U.S. export level has remained relatively constant at about 450 million pounds annually. During this period, our competitors have been moving larger and larger quantities into world trade.

In 1950–54, an average of about 670 million pounds of Flue-cured tobacco moved from free-world countries. Of this total, the U.S. share was about 66 percent. During 1955–59, when an average of nearly 780 million pounds were being exported by free-world countries, the U.S. share was 60 percent—a drop of 6 percent in that short period of time.

For 1960–64, the U.S. share was only a little over 50 percent, and based on preliminary data, the U.S. share in 1964 was only 45 percent.

Recognizing that unless some remedial action were taken, the National Tobacco Industry Advisory Committee, which, incidentally, is a 44-member group, representing all types of tobacco and all segments of the industry, formed specifically to advise the Secretary of Agriculture on tobacco matters, at its meeting during the period November 18 and 19, 1964, set up a task force to study the problem. Members of the task force were chosen from the Advisory Committee, land-grant colleges, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

A report was prepared and on January 15, 1965, the National Advisory Committee met to consider it.

The report of the task force dealt primarily with a proposal to stabilize production of tobacco by means of an acreage-poundage program. An acreage-poundage program would continue acreage allotments, and in addition apportion poundage quotas among growers. This would provide more effective adjustment of supplies in line with demand, and would provide greater incentive for quality improvement—an essential prerequisite if exports are to be expanded. The Advisory Committee thoroughly discussed the principal features of the proposed acreage-poundage program and unanimously recommended that the Department of Agriculture adopt this approach to the problem of stabilizing tobacco production. It was recognized that legislative authority was necessary before further steps could be taken.

The President, in part of his agricultural message to Congress on February 4, 1965, stated:

> The tobacco program must also be reappraised this year. Yield increases, higher Government costs, deterioration in quality, and loss of foreign markets have weakened what has been a highly successful program.
>
> Legislation is needed to authorize production and marketing limits on an acreage-poundage basis. Consideration should also be given to revisions in our programs which will make American tobacco more competitive in world markets.

Mr. President, I refer to the President's message to Congress on agriculture. Legislation authorizing the establishment of an acreage-poundage program for tobacco was introduced in both the Senate and House of Representatives. Hearings on this legislation have been held in Washington, and also in the Flue-cured tobacco producing areas—Flue-cured tobacco is the only kind of tobacco that would be affected in the 1965 crop year if the proposed legislation becomes law. The Under Secretary of Agriculture testified in favor of the proposed legislation authorizing an acreage-poundage program for tobacco at hearings held by the Senate and the House Agriculture Committee on February 9 and 11, respectively.

On March 23, 1965, H.R. 5721, a bill to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, and for other purposes, was passed by the House of Representatives and the bill in an amended form is now before the Senate.

The computation of acreage-poundage quotas is as follows:

Whenever acreage-poundage quotas are proclaimed, the Secretary would announce a national marketing quota equal to the amount to be utilized in the United States and exported during the marketing year, adjusted up or down as needed to maintain an adequate supply or to reduce supplies to the reserve supply level. The downward adjustment could not exceed 10 percent of such utilization and exports. The national quota would be apportioned in the following manner:

First. The national quota would be converted to a national acreage allotment on the basis of a "national average yield goal"—a yield which on a national average basis will improve or insure the usability of the tobacco and increase the net return per pound.

That means that the tobacco they would grow would be of better quality and bring a better price in the market.

Second. Farm acreage allotments would be established by adjusting the farm acreage allotments for the preceding year uniformly so that the total of the new allotments equals the new national acreage allotment—less a reserve of not to exceed 1 percent, which would be used to provide allotments for new farms and to correct errors and inequities.

Mr. President, in working with any of these formulas, there is always some error made in computation of inequities. Some new farms come into existence. The 1 percent was included here to take care of that problem.

I should also like to add at this particular point that a situation has been called to my attention by one or two farmers and there are probably several others—who this year bought new farms that they had never farmed before. However, the farms had tobacco allotments on them. Sometimes the farmer who had owned the farm was not a very good farmer, or for some reason or other, did not fertilize properly or do a great many of the things that should have been done to insure an average yield that would be in line with the yield of his neighbors for the same quality of land.

I envision that this 1 percent could be used in terms of raising the allotment already made for the acreage, or perhaps a little extra acreage may be granted so that the production of the land would be in accordance with the average yield.

I hope the 1 percent will be used to work out the problem. There would be an inequity in the case of a farmer who had acquired a piece of land which he had not farmed himself, but which land did have an allotment on it.

Third. Actual adjusted yield figures would be determined for each farm and adjusted proportionately so that the final adjusted yield figures for old farms multiplied by their acreage allotments would equal the national marketing quota.

These yield figures are prepared as follows:

First. A "preliminary farm yield" is determined. This is the average yield for the farm for the 3 highest years of the 5 years 1959–63—which is fair for the farmer—but not more than 120 percent of the community average yield or less than 80 percent of the community average yield.

Mr. President, that is an important phase of this particular piece of legislation. A farmer who did a good, high-grade, efficient job of farming could produce up to 120 percent of the yield average without being penalized. He could sell the crop, and an adjustment would be made in the following years. He would not be penalized in any way in the first year under this provision. If a farmer in that area were to produce less than 80 percent of his average yield, his allotment could be raised so that it could be equitable to that of like farms in the surrounding territory.

The bill was originally proposed on a county basis. We realized after hearings that a county basis was not entirely fair. We found some counties that had very fine soil in one end of the county and at the other end of the county they would possibly not have as good soil. There would be a vast difference in the poundage ratio in the acreage from one end of the county to the other.

Some counties are from 30 to 40 miles long. There could be a vast difference in the amount of rainfall. It was determined that this bill should be based on a smaller area, which would certainly be more fair to all the farmers in that area.

The community average yield is an average of the community yields for the 3 highest years of the 5 years 1959–63, but if the yield for any of the 3 highest years is less than 80 percent of the 3-year average, that year or years is eliminated from the computation of the average.

The reason that provision was placed in the bill is that there have been a great many cases in which an area was declared to be a disaster area. This has occurred in the case of any crop produced, regardless of whether it is tobacco or some other crop. Sometimes there is a severe drought, a hurricane that destroys the crop, or there is exceptionally wet weather. Many things could happen. This provision would allow the farmers to figure their yield on a 3-year average. This would be equitable and fair to the producer, which is what the bill is designed to do all the way through.

Special provisions are made for counties with less than 500 acres of tobacco and farms with inadequate history. A county that has less than 500 acres of tobacco would be treated separately. That would be a very small acreage for that territory.

Second. The preliminary farm yield for each farm is multiplied by its allotment, and the products thus obtained for all old farms are totaled and divided by the national acreage allotment to obtain a weighted national average yield.

Third. The national average yield goal is divided by the weighted national average yield to obtain a national yield factor.

Fourth. The preliminary farm yield is multiplied by the national yield factor to determine the farm yield.

Finally, the farm yield thus obtained is multiplied by the acreage allotment to determine the farm marketing quota. If marketing quotas on an acreage-poundage basis were in effect for the preceding crop and the full quota for the preceding crop was not marketed, the current quota would be increased by the amount of the preceding quota which was not marketed, such increase not to exceed 100 percent.

I wish to elaborate on the particular phase of the problem to which I have just referred. As I said a while ago, there are cases—not numerous, I am glad to say, but there are cases—in which a disaster hits a particular farm. Perhaps the farmer's total crop is destroyed. That has happened. If that were the case, he could pick up all of that loss of yield and market it the next year without any penalties. In other words, if he suffered a penalty through an act of nature or something over which he had no control whatsoever, he would be protected. If he lost half of his crop, he could market 50 percent of it the next year, but in no case over 100 percent. He could not market 250 percent if he lost 100 percent.

If the preceding quota was exceeded, the current quota would be reduced by the amount of the excess, and if such excess exceeded the current quota, the balance of such excess would be deducted from the quota for the succeeding marketing year or years. In the case of Maryland tobacco and any other kind of tobacco for which the Secretary determines it impractical to make the adjustments for overmarketing and undermarketing in the year following such overmarketing or undermarketing, the adjustments would be made in the second succeeding year.

Under the existing law the entire production of the acreage allotment can be marketed without penalty. Under the bill the farm quota will be something less than what can be produced on the acreage allotment. Since the farmer will not be able to produce the exact amount of the farm quota and no more, the bill permits him to market 110 percent of his quota—120 percent in the case of burley—without penalty or loss of price support. The excess will, however, be deducted from his farm quota for the following year.

It has been said, and it will be argued here this afternoon, that the referendum is coming very close to the planting season. That is quite true. It is said that some of the farmers may produce the exact quantity allotted to them, or perhaps 105 percent or 110 percent. If a farmer does, he will be able to market it without penalty, but that amount will be deducted from next year's marketing. It will be 120 percent on burley, because there will be no vote on burley until next year, to determine whether it is needed. It will be up to the Secretary to determine whether it is needed.

Mr. President, we have reached the point where remedial action must be taken in the tobacco production program. If action—and effective action—is not taken, then we are going to see the complete destruction of the program.

What has happened in the past 4 years is a dramatic illustration of how tobacco surplus stocks have already increased to proportions all out of reason. On January 1, 1962, the Flue-cured Tobacco Stabilization Corporation held 449 million pounds of tobacco.

I hope my colleagues will listen to this particular figure, because it is very revealing. I repeat: On January 1, 1962, the Flue-cured Tobacco Stabilization Corp. held 449 million pounds of tobacco.

In 1963, the figure jumped to 583 million pounds. In 1964, it increased to 699 million pounds, and on January 1 of this year, the figure had soared to 970 million pounds.

That is only a little short of 1 billion pounds of tobacco in excess of what we need.

In the short period of just 4 years, surplus stocks more than doubled. All of this is true in spite of the fact we have taken acreage reductions in the meantime.

We cannot allow this trend to continue if we expect to provide farmers with price supports for tobacco.

Mr. President, if price supports are taken away from tobacco, it will destroy the tobacco farmer and the economies of the regions where tobacco is grown.

Unless we establish an effective system of production controls, we can expect surplus stocks to increase in the future.

The bill we are now considering, H.R. 5721, will bring about effective controls and allow us to begin working off the surplus stocks in an orderly fashion.

The pending bill is designed to hold our production in line with what we consume at home and sell abroad, and, in addition, to try to work the 1-billion-pound surplus down, on the basis of about a 10-year program. That is approximately the aim of the pending bill. It is designed not to wreck the economies of the tobacco-growing areas of this country. It would not result in dumping a tremendous amount of tobacco on the market and thus destroy the price. Yet, at the same time, it is designed to reduce the surplus year by year.

Mr. President, the President of the United States, the Secretary of Agriculture, the National Advisory Committee, the House of Representatives, and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry all feel that the proposed bill will meet the challenge which now faces the entire tobacco industry. It is our hope and belief that the proposed program will work, and work well, to the benefit of tobacco producers. Their markets, both domestic and foreign, will be preserved—and more importantly, the price support benefits of the program will continue.

Following my remarks, Mr. President, I would like to insert in the RECORD the amendments adopted by the Senate committee and a section-by-section analysis of the bill.

Before doing so, however, I call attention to one amendment adopted by the committee. In all, we adopted 14 amendments to the House bill, most of which are technical in nature and deal largely with procedural problems.

The amendment to which I would like to call attention deals with the manner in which each individual farm allotment would be computed. Under the bill as approved by the House, individual farm quotas could exceed the average township or community yield by more than 120 percent. Under the formula in the House version, very little cutback in production would be required of those farmers who have engaged in excessively heavy production.

The Senate committee amendment would put an upward ceiling on all producers, and would limit their poundage quotas, based on past production, to 120 percent of the township or community yield. In other words, Mr. President, all farmers would be treated exactly alike on the formula, in excess of the quota or average yield which they have had in the past.

At this point, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a description of the committee amendments and a section-by-section analysis of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The description and analysis are as follows:

COMMITTEE AMENDMENTS

The amendments recommended by the committee, which are generally of a technical nature, would—

1. Prevent downward adjustment of the national marketing quota under section 317(a) either (i) by more than 10 percent of estimated domestic consumption and exports, or (ii) so as to reduce supplies below the reserve supply level.

2. Provide for use of the 1965 (instead of 1964) farm acreage allotment in computing the 1965 Flue-cured farm acreage allotment for the purpose of the acreage-poundage quotas.

3. Provide that the "community average yield" shall be determined in the same manner and using the same base period for all kinds of tobacco.

4. Make 120 percent of the community average yield the upper limit on preliminary farm yields, striking out the alternative upper limit based on 75 percent of the farm yield and 25 percent of the national yield goal.

5. Provide for use of the same base period 1959–63 in determining preliminary farm yields for all kinds of tobacco.

6. Permit the Secretary to conduct the first referendum on acreage-poundage quotas for any kind of tobacco (except Flue-cured in 1965) as long as 45 days after proclamation of the quota.

7. Make it clear that quotas on an acreage continue in effect if quota on an acreage-poundage basis are disapproved under section 317(c).

8. Provide that insofar as practicable notices of farm marketing quotas shall be mailed at least 15 days prior to the first referendum on acreage-poundage quotas for any kind of tobacco (except Flue-cured in 1965).

9. Limit the farm yield for new tobacco farms to not more than the community average yield.

10. Make it clear that the bill does not grant authority for leasing allotments for burley or other tobacco not now covered by section 316.

11. Provide for increasing acreage allotments transferred prior to the date the acreage-poundage quotas become effective for 1965 in the same proportion that acreage allotments are increased for 1965 under the acreage-poundage provisions.

12. Provide that in the case of burley tobacco, the amount which may be marketed without penalty and be accorded price support shall be 120 (instead of 110) percent of the farm marketing quota.

13. Preserve the minimum allotments now provided for burley tobacco. Farms, at the present minimum when acreage-poundage quotas become effective could not have their allotments or quotas subsequently reduced below the allotments and quotas first established for them under the acreage-poundage system. Farms with allotments above the minimum when acreage-poundage quotas first become effective could not be reduced below farms which were then at the minimum.

14. Provides that if acreage-poundage quotas are approved for the 1965 Flue-cured crop, the Secretary will consult with representatives of the tobacco industry concerning each kind of tobacco, conduct a study, and report to the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, recommending any modifications needed to improve the program and adopt it to other kinds of tobacco.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

Section 1: Section 1 adds a new section 317 to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended. An analysis of section 317 follows:

Subsection (a) contains the definitions of "national marketing quota," "national average yield goal," "national acreage allotment," "farm acreage allotment," "community average yield," "preliminary farm yield," "farm yield," and "farm marketing quota." These definitions are necessary because some of the terms have not been heretofore used in the act and other terms have a different meaning under the program provided for in section 317 than they have under the tobacco programs now provided for in the act.

The committee has recommended several amendments to this section.

The definition of "national marketing quota" differs from the definition in the House bill in that the Secretary would not have authority to fix the quota below the amount needed to maintain supplies at the reserve supply level nor to determine the quota in an amount which represents more than a 10-percent reduction in the estimated domestic consumption and exports. The definition of "community average yield" provides for the use of the base period 1959–63 for all kinds of tobacco rather than for Flue-cured tobacco only as provided in the House bill. The definition of "preliminary farm yield" provides for reducing the average yield for the 3 highest years of the base period to 120 percent of the community average yield if the 3-year average is in excess of 120 percent of the community average yield. Under the House bill the reduction would be to a yield determined by adding 75 percent of the 3-year average to 25 percent of the national average yield goal but not below 120 percent of the community average yield. The base period of 1959–63 would be used in determining preliminary farm yields for all kinds of tobacco. In the House bill this base period is required to be used only for Flue-cured tobacco. In determining farm acreage allotments for Flue-cured tobacco for 1965, since allotments under the present program have been issued for 1965 those allotments would be adjusted instead of the allotments for the preceding year as will be the case for years after 1965.

Subsection (b) is designed to give Flue-cured tobacco growers an opportunity to vote on acreage-poundage quotas for 3 years beginning with the 1965 crop. The Secretary would be required within 30 days after the enactment of the bill into law to determine and announce the amount of the national marketing quota for Flue-cured tobacco for the marketing year beginning July 1, 1965, and the national acreage allotment and national average yield goal for the 1965 crop of Flue-cured tobacco in accordance with the provisions of this section. Within 30 days after the announcement of the national marketing quota the Secretary would be required to conduct a special referendum of farmers engaged in the production of Flue-cured tobacco of the 1964 crop to determine whether they favor or oppose the establishment of marketing quotas on an acreage-poundage basis as provided in section 317 for the marketing years beginning July 1, 1965, July 1, 1966, and July 1, 1967. If the Secretary determines that more than 66⅔ percent of the farmers voting in the special referendum approve marketing quotas on acreage-poundage basis then marketing quotas on an acreage-poundage basis would be in effect for the 3 marketing years and the marketing quotas for Flue-cured tobacco which are now in effect on an acreage basis would cease to be in effect beginning on July 1, 1965. If the Secretary determines that marketing quotas on an acreage-poundage basis were not approved by more than 66⅔ percent of the farmers voting in the special referendum, then no quotas on an acreage-poundage basis would be in effect and the marketing quotas on an acreage basis which have been previously proclaimed and received producer approval would remain in effect.

Subsection (c) contains the provisions for making effective marketing quotas for 3 marketing years on an acreage-poundage basis for any kind of tobacco, including Flue-cured tobacco. The Secretary can only proceed under the provisions of subsection (c) during the first or second marketing year of the 3-year period for which marketing quotas on an acreage basis are in effect for the kind of tobacco under consideration. It is the purpose of this provision to not leave the tobacco grower without a program if acreage-poundage quotas are not approved. If the Secretary, in his discretion, determines that acreage-poundage quotas under section 317 would result in a more effective marketing quota program for the kind of tobacco under consideration, he shall, at the time of the next announcement of the amount of the national marketing quota under section 312(b) of the act, also determine and announce the amount of the national quota for the kind of tobacco under the provisions of section 317 and at the same time announce the national acreage allotment and national average yield goal. Within 45 days thereafter he would conduct a special referendum of farmers engaged in the production of the kind of tobacco of the most recent crop, in order to determine whether they favor the establishment of marketing quotas on an acreage-poundage basis for the next 3 marketing years. If the Secretary determines that more than 66⅔ percent of the farmers voting in the special referendum approve marketing quotas on an acreage-poundage basis, quotas on that basis will be in effect for the next 3 marketing years and marketing quotas on a acreage basis shall cease to be in effect at the beginning of the first marketing year of the 3-year period. However, if he determines that the required number of farmers do not favor quotas on an acreage-poundage basis the marketing quotas on an acreage basis which have been proclaimed and received, the requisite farmer approval will not be affected.

Subsection (d) provides for the procedure to be followed if marketing quotas have been made effective for a kind of tobacco on an acreage-poundage basis. In the last year of the 3-year period the Secretary would proclaim a marketing quota for the next 3 succeeding marketing years and, in his discretion, would proclaim it either on an acreage-poundage basis or an acreage-allotment basis, whichever he determines would result in a more effective marketing quota for that kind of tobacco. A referendum would then be conducted under the provisions of section 312(c) of the act and if the Secretary determined that more than one-third of the farmers voting opposed national marketing quotas, the national marketing quota so proclaimed would not be in effect. No marketing quotas of any kind would be in effect for the ensuing marketing year. However, marketing quotas on an acreage basis could be proclaimed in the ensuing marketing year for the 3 marketing years following the ensuing marketing year under the provisions of section 312(a)(4).

In a referendum held pursuant to subsection (c) insofar as practicable notice of the farm marketing quota for the first year affected by the referendum would be required to be mailed to the farm operator at least 15 days prior to the date of the referendum. In other cases the notices would be mailed insofar as practicable prior to the referendum but the target of 15 days' notice would not be applicable.

Subsection (e) provides that no farm acreage allotment or farm yield shall be established for a farm on which no tobacco was produced or considered produced under applicable provisions of law for the immediately preceding 5 years. However, provision is made for a reserve of 1 percent or less of the national acreage allotment to be available for making corrections of errors in farm acreage, adjusting inequities, and for establishing acreage allotments for new farms which are farms on which tobacco was not produced or considered produced during the immediately preceding 5 years.

The farm yield for a new farm would be determined on the basis of available productivity data for the land involved and the farm yield for similar farms but could not exceed the community average yield.

Subsection (f) provides that only the last two sentences of subsection (g) of section 313 of the act will apply to acreage-poundage programs. These two sentences contain provisions relating to false identification in the marketing of tobacco, the filing of false acreage reports, and the double cropping of tobacco. The provision with respect to filing false acreage reports is made applicable to the filing of false production or marketing reports. The subsection also provides that in transferring allotments under the eminent domain provisions of section 378 of the act increases or decreases in acreage allotments and farm yields on account of marketings below or in excess of the farm marketing quota for the farm acquired by the eminent domain agency will be taken into account. The leasing provisions of section 316 of the act are made applicable to the acreage-poundage program except that adjustments will be based on farm yields rather than normal yields and credit for undermarketing or charges for overmarketing shall be attributed to the farm to which the allotment is transferred under the leasing arrangement.

If an acreage-poundage program becomes effective for 1965 for Flue-cured tobacco, transfers based on leases executed prior to the effective date of the program would be recognized. However, the acreage transferred would be increased or decreased in the same proportion that the allotment for the farm from which the transfer is made is increased or decreased. This could result in a transfer for 1965 which would exceed the 5-acre or 50-percent-of-cropland limitation contained in section 316. The leasing provisions would not be extended to burley or any other kind of tobacco to which section 316 does not apply.

Subsection (g) provides that the penalty provisions of section 314 of the act shall apply to the acreage-poundage program, except that no penalty will be due or collected until 110 percent of the farm marketing quota has been marketed in the case of all kinds of tobacco except burley and 120 percent has been marketed in the case of burley, but thereafter each pound marketed in excess of the applicable percentage will be subject to the full penalty rate. Marketings in excess of 100 percent of the farm marketing quota will require a reduction in subsequent farm marketing quotas in accordance with paragraph (a)(8) of section 317. The Secretary is given discretionary authority to provide that grade N_2 tobacco or any grade of tobacco not eligible for price support may be marketed without penalty or deduction from subsequent quotas to the extent of 5 percent of the farm marketing quota for the farm on which the tobacco was produced. If under the acreage-poundage program any producer falsely identifies or fails to account for the disposition of any tobacco, the Secretary may elect to assess a penalty computed by multiplying the full penalty rate by an amount of tobacco equal to 25 percent of the farm marketing quota plus the farm yield of the number of acres harvested in excess of the farm acreage allotment. The penalty would be paid and remitted by the producer and would be in lieu of penalties based on actual marketings of excess tobacco. For the first year that a marketing quota program on an acreage-poundage basis is in effect the carryover provisions appearing in the fourth sentence of subsection (a) of section 314 would be amended by substituting "farm yield" for normal production. The carryover provisions of section 314 would not be applicable after the first year because of the provisions of subsection (a)(8) of section 317 which provides for an adjustment in the quota for overmarketings or undermarketings.

Subsection (h) provides for minimum farm acreage allotments and marketing quotas for old burley tobacco farms. Since the effects of the minimum provisions of the present law would be reflected in the farm acreage allotments established for the first year of an acreage-poundage program, allotments for the first year for burley tobacco would be determined under the procedure applicable to other kinds of tobacco. However, for years subsequent to the first year this subsection would require a determination of the acreage allotment, without adjustment from the reserve, established for the first year for a farm with an allotment of five-tenths of an acre for the year immediately preceding the first year. This would constitute a standard, to replace the present five-tenths of an acre standard. The minimum allotment for any farm after the first year would then be the smallest of that amount, the acreage allotment established for such farm the first year, or 10 percent of the cropland. The farm would also receive a minimum marketing quota in years subsequent to the first year equal to the product of the farm yield for the first year and the minimum allotment. The minimum allotments and marketing quotas would be subject to adjustments for overmarketing or undermarketing and to reductions for violations.

Subsection (i) would be operative only if an acreage-poundage program becomes effective on Flue-cured tobacco in 1965. In that event the Secretary would be required to hold meetings prior to January 1, 1966, with the tobacco industry with respect to each kind of tobacco to receive recommendations and to determine the need for similar or modified programs for such kinds of tobacco. He would also be required to conduct a study and report to the House Committee on Agriculture and the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on experience with and operation of the Flue-cured program and to make recommendations with respect thereto for Flue-cured tobacco and for programs for other kinds of tobacco. The report would have to be filed prior to January 1, 1966.

Section 2: Section 313(j) of the act, as added by Public Law 361, 84th Congress, approved August 11, 1955, provides that the production of tobacco on a farm in 1955 or any subsequent year for which no farm acreage allotment was established shall not make the farm eligible as an old farm but that such production would not make the farm ineligible for a new farm allotment. Section 2 amends this subsection to make it apply to the acreage-poundage program under section 317.

Section 3: Section 3 amends section 106 of the Agricultural Act of 1949 which contains price-support provisions for tobacco. A new subsection (c) is added which provides that price support shall not be made available on tobacco marketed in excess of 110 percent (120 percent in the case of burley) of the marketing quota for the farm when acreage-poundage quotas are in effect. It also provides that for the purpose of price support, eligible tobacco carried over from one marketing year to another to avoid marketings in excess of the farm marketing quota on an acreage-poundage basis shall, when marketed, be considered tobacco of the then current crop. The overall provision—that tobacco grown on a farm on which the acreage allotment is knowingly exceeded would not be eligible for mandatory price support—would apply to the acreage-poundage program.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, there are three typographical errors in punctuation in the committee amendments as set out in the report of the bill. In order to correct them on behalf of the committee, I move to modify the committee amendments as follows:

On page 5, line 9, after the word "specifically" insert a period.

On page 11, line 6, strike out the quotation marks.

On page 16, line 24, strike out the quotation marks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendments will be modified accordingly.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc and that the bill, as amended, be considered original text for the purpose of amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none; and, without objection, the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] may yield to me for an observation and a statement, with the understanding that he shall not lose his right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] yield to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]?

Mr. JORDAN. I am delighted to yield to my colleague.

Mr. ERVIN. I congratulate and commend my colleague upon his clear analysis and explanation of the bill, and associate myself with his remarks. I also wish to congratulate and commend him on the fine work he has done in connection with the proposed legislation.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 60

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I call up my amendment No. 60 and ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with, but that it be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the amendment will be printed in the Record at this point.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended by inserting after section 313 the following:

"APPORTIONMENT OF NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTA FOR FLUE-CURED TOBACCO WHEN MARKETING QUOTAS HAVE BEEN EFFECTIVE FOR THE PRECEDING MARKETING YEAR

"'Sec. 313A. (a) Notwithstanding the provisions of section 313 (except subsections (d) and (i)), if marketing quotas were effective for Flue-cured tobacco for the preceding marketing year, the national marketing quota established pursuant to the provisions of section 312 for any marketing year for Flue-cured tobacco, less the amount to be allotted under subsection (b), shall be apportioned by the Secretary among farms on the basis of their farm bases. The base for each farm shall be computed by subtracting one-fifth of the amount of tobacco produced on such farm and sold, pledged, or mortgaged to the Commodity Credit Corporation under the price-support program for the most recent marketing year for which such information is available as to all farms from—

"'(i) the product of the farm's acreage allotment for such preceding marketing year multiplied by the normal yield for the farm, if acreage allotments were established for such preceding marketing year, or

"'(ii) the farm's marketing quota for such preceding marketing year, if acreage allotments were not established for such preceding marketing year.

"'(b) The Secretary shall provide, through local committees, for the allotment of not in excess of 5 per centum of the national marketing quota (1) to farms not receiving marketing quotas under subsection (a), and (2) to increase allotments to small farms on the basis of the following: Land, labor, and equipment available for the production of tobacco; crop-rotation practices; and the soil and other physical factors affecting the production of tobacco: *Provided*, That farm marketing quotas established pursuant to clause (1) of this subsection shall not exceed 75 per centum of the farm marketing quotas established pursuant to subsection (a) of this section for farms which are similar with respect to the following: Land, labor, and equipment available for the production of tobacco, crop-rotation practices, and the soil and other physical factors affecting the production of tobacco.

"'(c) The farm marketing quota established under the foregoing provisions of this section for any farm for any marketing year shall be increased for undermarketing or decreased for overmarketing by the number of pounds by which marketings of tobacco from the farm during the immediately preceding marketing year is less than or exceeds the farm marketing quota for such preceding year: *Provided*, That the farm marketing quota for any marketing year shall not be increased for undermarketing by an amount in excess of the farm marketing quota for such year established without regard to the provisions of this subsection. If on account of excess marketings in the preceding marketing year the farm marketing quota for any marketing year is reduced to zero pounds without reflecting the entire reduction required, the additional reduction required shall be made for the subsequent marketing year or years. The farm marketing quota shall be increased or decreased for the second succeeding marketing year in the case of Maryland tobacco, and for any other kind of tobacco for which the Secretary determines it is impracticable because of the lack of adequate marketing data, to make the increases or decreases applicable to the immediately succeeding marketing year. Increases or decreases in farm marketing quotas or farm acreage allotments resulting from the application of this subsection shall not be taken into account in computing farm bases for succeeding marketing years.

"'(d) The Secretary may, on the basis of the normal yield for the farm convert each farm marketing quota determined under this section in to a farm acreage allotment. In such case the actual production of such acreage allotment (in lieu of the farm marketing quota determined under subsection (a), (b), or (c)) shall be the farm marketing quota.

"'(e) If any amout of tobacco shall be marketed as having been produced on any farm which in fact was produced on a different farm, the acreage allotments next established (or marketing quotas if acreage allotments are not established) for both such farms shall be reduced by that percentage which such amount was of the respective farm marketing quota, except that such reduction for any such farm shall not be made if the Secretary through the local committees finds that no person connected with such farm caused, aided, or acquiesced in such marketing; and if proof of the disposition of any amount of tobacco is not furnished as required by the Secretary or if any producer on the farm files, or aids or acquiesces in the filing of, any false report with respect to the acreage or production of tobacco grown on the farm required by regulations issued pursuant to this Act, the acreage allotment next established (or marketing quota if acreage allotments are not established) for the farm on which such tobacco is produced shall be reduced by a percentage similarly computed. If in any calendar year for which acreage allotments are established more than one crop of tobacco is grown from (1) the same tobacco plants or (2) different tobacco plants, and is harvested for marketing from the same acreage on a farm, the acreage allotment next established (or marketing quota if acreage allotments are not established) for such farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco has been grown and harvested (or equivalent to the amount by which the production of such acreage exceeded its normal production).'"

Sec. 2. The heading of section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"APPORTIONMENT OF NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTA WHEN SECTION 313A IS NOT APPLICABLE"

Sec. 3. This Act shall be effective beginning with the 1966 crop.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. Holland] be listed as a cosponsor on this substitute amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the tobacco program, under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, for many years served its purpose well. However, in the past few years, it has become increasingly apparent that the program was not serving the purpose of reducing the supply of tobacco on hand and keeping the supply of tobacco in line with demand. The factors which have caused the supply of tobacco to exceed demand are many. In the tobacco industry itself, there is wide disagreement as to what factors are primarily responsible for the crisis with which we are now faced in the tobacco program.

Over the past several years, several cuts in quotas have been put into effect in an effort to bring supply in line with demand. However, it is conceded by all concerned that the cuts in quotas have not been effective. The history of the program shows that as the United States cut the quotas on tobacco production the production cuts were more than offset by foreign production. In the period of 1950 through 1954, the total U.S. production was 1,332 million pounds, and the total foreign production was 1,210 million pounds. Thus, the United States was outproducing the combined foreign production by some 122 million pounds. By 1962, the picture had changed drastically, with the total U.S. production being 1,400 million pounds, and the combined total foreign production had increased to 2,098 million pounds, thus making the total foreign production exceed the U.S. production by 698 million pounds. Approximately 40 percent of the Flue-cured tobacco is grown for the export markets. If the present program is continued, it is an undisputable fact that the American tobacco farmers will lose all of the export market, necessitating further cuts of such drastic proportions as to wipe out the small tobacco farmer and create havoc throughout the tobacco industry.

It has long been contended by segments of the tobacco farmers that the current tobacco program was not administered on an equitable basis and that the administration of the program encouraged the production of tobacco which was not desired by the tobacco companies and which the tobacco companies refused to buy to such an extent that today the Commodity Credit Corporation holds approximately 961 million pounds of Flue-cured tobacco for which no market can be found. In passing, I might point out that of this 961 million pounds of Flue-cured tobacco held by the Commodity Credit Corporation, only some 17 million pounds is type 14 Flue-cured tobacco. The statistics of the U.S. Department of Agriculture show that for some time there has been a wide variation amongst the types of Flue-cured tobacco as to those types which find ready buyers on the open market and those types which the buyers on the open market refuse to purchase and which must be placed in the surplus held by the Commodity Credit Corporation. As examples, during the 17-year period from 1946 through 1963 a total of 163 million pounds of type 14 tobacco was placed under the Government loan, while in the year 1963 alone 129.1 million pounds of type 11–a Flue-cured tobacco was placed under the loan. As of January 1, 1957, 104.3 million pounds of type 11–a tobacco was held in Stabilization Corporation and this increased to 271.9 million pounds as of January 1, 1964. On the other hand, as of January 1, 1957, there were

33.2 million pounds of type 14 Flue-cured tobacco on hand, but by January 1, 1964, this had decreased to 16.8 million pounds. Further, during the 1963 tobacco marketing year only 2.8 percent of the tobacco marketed as type 14 Flue-cured tobacco was placed under the Government loan while at the same time 12.2 percent of type 13, 14.2 percent of type 12, 21.7 percent of type 11-b, and 43.6 percent of type 11-a Flue-cured tobacco were placed under the Government loan. The statistics of the U.S. Department of Agriculture make it abundantly clear that something is drastically wrong with the present tobacco control program and that emergency action by Congress is demanded.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table prepared by the Department of Agriculture for the years 1946 through 1963 and published in the Flue-Cured Tobacco Auction Market & Producing Areas.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The percent of Flue-cured tobacco placed under Government loan, from 1946 to 1963—Based on producer sales

Marketing season	Georgia-Florida, type 14	South Carolina border, type 13	Eastern Belt, North Carolina, type 12	Middle Belt, North Carolina, type 11B	Old Belt, North Carolina and Virginia, type 11A
1946		2.2	0.7	3.9	16.7
1947	16.1	15.6	10.2	17.2	34.6
1948	3.9	7.5	6.0	11.2	20.0
1949	14.2	10.4	4.7	6.8	14.0
1950	4.0	2.5	4.4	7.8	12.3
1951	9.7	11.1	5.9	9.3	15.7
1952	4.0	7.8	12.5	12.0	20.3
1953	3.2	3.5	3.6	18.4	41.0
1954	5.0	9.9	8.2	11.1	15.5
1955	16.1	26.0	25.1	14.6	10.7
1956	8.1	20.8	26.8	30.4	21.1
1957	1.0	4.0	6.7	16.4	27.1
1958	2.0	15.1	13.5	12.6	18.1
1959	1.2	4.5	2.3	5.8	12.1
1960	1.4	3.2	4.6	3.4	6.8
1961	4.1	2.8	8.1	4.2	7.1
1962	2.6	10.8	16.5	20.4	32.2
1963 [1]	2.8	12.2	14.2	21.7	43.6
Average	[2] 5.8	[3] 9.4	[3] 9.7	[3] 12.6	[3] 20.5

[1] Based on gross sales.

[2] 17-year average.

[3] 18-year average.

Source of information: March 1963 issue Tobacco Market Review, p. 38, USDA-AMS Tobacco Division. Data for 1963 from Tobacco News Letter, USDA-AMS, Tobacco Division.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the farmers throughout the Flue-cured tobacco belt are duly alarmed over the present crisis and are looking to the leadership of Congress to provide a speedy and equitable solution to the complex tobacco problem. The problem is so acute that tobacco farmers in Georgia and Florida have already gone into Federal court seeking relief from the inequities in the administration of the present tobacco program. These farmers have been successful with their litigation in the U.S. district court, as well as the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD at this point the decision of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals of the U.S. Court of Appeals in the case of Orville Freeman, Secretary of Agriculture, versus Darius N. Brown, et al. It is dated February 26, 1965.

There being no objection, the decision was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FIFTH CIRCUIT—ORVILLE FREEMAN, SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, APPELLANT, *v.* DARIUS N. BROWN, ET AL., APPELLEES—No. 21588

(Appeal from the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Georgia, before Brown and Bell, circuit judges, and Spears, district judge, Feb. 26, 1965)

Circuit Judge BELL. This is an appeal by the Secretary of Agriculture from an order of the district court permanently enjoining him from enforcing a cut in acreage allotments on type 14 Flue-cured tobacco for the 1964–65 tobacco marketing year below allotments for the 1963–64 marketing year. Plaintiffs, appellees here, are tobacco farmers and producers of type 14 Flue-cured tobacco. The basis of their class action against the Secretary was that he had failed and refused to treat type 14 as a separate kind of tobacco in arriving at the marketing quotas on which the acreage allotments were based, but had grouped it with all other types of Flue-cured tobacco. The complaint consisted of two counts; the first in the nature of a petition for mandamus, and the other for declaratory judgment. The district court followed generally the prayers of the count for declaratory judgment in granting the injunction. The prayer of the mandamus count was for an order compelling the Secretary to discharge his statutory and regulatory duties with regard to setting marketing quotas and acreage allotments on the type of tobacco in question. It was claimed that he failed to use the latest available statistics in making the determination in issue.

The Secretary moved to dismiss the complaint, or in the alternative for summary judgment. Appellees also moved for summary judgment. Each motion for summary judgment was supported by affidavits, and appellees offered the testimony of a marketing inspector for the Georgia Department of Agriculture. The motions of the Secretary to dismiss and for summary judgment were overruled. The motion of appellees was granted and the injunction which forms the subject matter of this appeal was entered.

THE ISSUES PRESENTED

There are three issues for consideration. First, it is urged that the district court did not have jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action. Second, the Secretary says, even assuming jurisdiction, he would be entitled to judgment as a matter of law because the Agriculture Adjustment Act does not permit the Secretary to constitute a type of tobacco as a separate kind of tobacco for a single year of the 3-year period for which marketing quotas and acreage allotments based thereon have been set. The relief sought was for the last year of such a 3-year period. Lastly, assuming both jurisdiction and requisite authority, it is contended that the determination by the Secretary not to treat type 14 Flue-cured tobacco as a separate kind of tobacco for the year in question was regularly made and supported by substantial evidence.

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

The duty of the Secretary to set marketing quotas, and from these to set tobacco acreage allotments arises under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, 7 U.S.C.A., section 1282 et seq. This act, 7 U.S.C.A., section 1301(b)(15) provides as follows:

"'Tobacco' means each one of the kinds of tobacco listed below comprising the types specified as classified in Service and Regulatory Announcement Numbered 118 of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department:

"Flue-cured tobacco, comprising types 11, 12, 13, and 14;

"The provisions of this subchapter shall apply to each of such kinds of tobacco severally: *Provided*, That any one or more of the types comprising any such kind of tobacco shall be treated as a 'kind of tobacco' for the purposes of this chapter * * * if the Secretary finds there is a difference in supply and demand conditions as among such types of tobacco which results in a difference in the adjustments needed in the marketing thereof in order to maintain supplies in line with demand: * * *"

It also provides, 7 U.S.C.A., section 1301(c), that:

"The latest available statistics of the Federal Government shall be used by the Secretary in making the determination required to be made by the Secretary under this chapter."

The determinations to be made are set out in 7 U.S.C.A., section 1312(a)(1)(2):

"(a) The Secretary shall, not later than December 1 of any marketing year with respect to Flue-cured tobacco, * * * proclaim a national marketing quota for any kind of tobacco for each of the next three succeeding marketing years whenever he determines with respect to such kind of tobacco—

"(1) that a national marketing quota has not previously been proclaimed and the total supply as of the beginning of such marketing year exceeds the reserve supply level therefor;

"(2) that such marketing year is the last year of 3 consecutive years for which marketing quotas previously proclaimed will be in effect; * * *"

The Secretary is directed to issue what is called a national marketing quota for a 3-year period. Within 30 days after the Secretary has issued that quota he is required to conduct a referendum of the affected farmers to determine whether they favor such quota for the 3-year period. 7 U.S.C.A., 1312(c). After the setting of the quota, i.e., the 3-year quota, and prior to the referendum, the Secretary must announce the part of the 3-year marketing quota to be in effect for the next year. 7 U.S.C.A., 1312(b). The quotas for each of the next 2 years are set at the end, respectively, of the first and second marketing year. And apparently the 3-year quota is an estimate, the whole of which may or may not be allowed by the Secretary over the course of the 3 years, depending upon supply and demand.

The Tobacco Stocks and Standards Act of 1929, as amended, 7 U.S.C.A., 501, authorizes and directs the Secretary to collect and publish statistics relating to the quantities of leaf tobacco in all forms and types owned by or in the possession of persons other than the original growers of tobacco. The statistics are to be summarized quarterly with an annual report to be issued. This act also makes it mandatory upon the Secretary to establish standards for the classification of leaf tobacco by types. 7 U.S.C.A., 502. These standards were established in 1929 in Service and Regulatory Announcement No. 118, 7 CFR 30.1 et seq. This announcement provides in pertinent part as follows:

Section 30.5. "Class—One of the major divisions of leaf tobacco based on the distinct characteristics of the tobacco caused by differences in varieties, soil, and climate conditions, and the methods of cultivation, harvesting, and curing."

Section 30.6. "Type—A subdivision of a class of leaf tobacco, having certain common characteristics which permit of its being divided into a number of related grades. Any tobacco that has the same characteristics and corresponding qualities, colors, and lengths, shall be treated as one type, regardless of any factors of historical or geographical nature which cannot be determined by an examination of the tobacco."

Section 30.31. "Classification of leaf tobacco. For the purposes of this classification, leaf tobacco shall be divided into the following classes: Class 1. Flue-cured types * * *. For the purposes of this classification the classes shall be divided into the following types and groups set forth in sections 30.36–30.44."

Section 30.36. "Class 1. Flue-cured types and groups—(a) Type 11. That type of Flue-cured tobacco commonly known as Old Belt Flue-cured, Western District Bright, Middle Belt Flue-cured, or Semi-Old Belt Flue-cured; and produced principally in the Piedmont sections of Virginia and North Carolina.

"(b) Type 12.—That type of Flue-cured tobacco commonly known as Eastern Flue-cured, New Belt of North Carolina Flue-cured, Eastern District Bright, or Eastern Carolina Bright; and produced principally in the coastal plains section of North Carolina, north of the South River.

"(c) Type 13. That type of Flue-cured tobacco commonly known as Southeastern Flue-cured, Southeastern Bright, South Carolina Flue-cured, or New Belt of South Carolina and Southeastern North Carolina; and produced principally in the coastal plains section of South Carolina and the southeastern counties of North Carolina south of the South River.

"(d) Type 14.—That type of Flue-cured tobacco commonly known as Southern Flue-cured, Southern Bright, Southern District Bright, New Belt of Georgia and Florida, Florida Bright, Alabama Bright, or Georgia Flue-cured; and produced principally in the southern sections of Georgia and to some extent in Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi."

This classification by types was adopted in the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, 7 U.S.C.A. 1301(15), supra. The Tobacco Inspection Act, as amended 7 U.S.C.A, 511 et seq (1935), in section 511b authorized the Secretary to establish standards for tobacco by which its type, grade, size, condition or other characteristics might be determined, and these standards were to be the official standards of the United States The Secretary, pursuant to this authority, issued regulations having to do with inspection certificates which were to include, together with other information, the type and grade of tobacco, and it was mandatory that such inspection certificate be placed on each lot of tobacco inspected at the time of sale in an auction warehouse. 7 CFR 29.66(b), 29.71. Tobacco auction markets were also to be established under this act. 7 CFR 29.73. No tobacco can be sold in the United States except at such designated markets, and unless the tobacco has been sampled and inspected by an official inspector of the Secretary to determine and certify the type, grade, size, form, condition or other tobacco characteristics of the lot of tobacco. 7 CFR 20.109.

The position of the appellees is that the Secretary failed to keep proper statistics and to use the latest available statistics to determine the suply of Flue-cured tobacco on hand by types, and whether type 14 should be treated as a separate kind of Flue-cured tobacco before he set the marketing quota for the marketing year 1964–65. The fact is that the Secretary treated all types of Flue-cured tobacco as one kind in arriving at the 3-year quota, and declined to treat type 14 separately for 1964–65. The 3-year quota then in effect had been apportioned among the Flue-cured tobacco production areas as follows:

State:	*Acreage allotment*
Alabama	500.00
Florida	13,586.02
Georgia	64,912.49
North Carolina	421,092.74
South Carolina	74,128.45
Virginia	64,041.95
Reserve	1,599.54

It was these acreages which were reduced by 10 percent for 1964–65.

THE EVIDENCE

In support of his motion for summary judgment, the Secretary filed several affidavits including his own. He stated that he was requested, on March 7, 1964, to establish type 14 as a separate kind of Flue-cured tobacco under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.[1] He was told at the time by counsel for appellees that his failure to so establish type 14 would render the 10-percent cut in acreage allotments for 1964, heretofore made by the Under Secretary as Acting Secretary, unlawful as applied to growers of type 14 tobacco. The Secretary stated that he investigated the facts and determined that type 14 tobacco should not be constituted as a separate kind of Flue-cured tobacco, and that the determination of the national marketing quota for the marketing year beginning July 1964 on which the cut in acreage allotments had been made was in conformity with law. The Secretary gave three reasons for his conclusion. He stated that the Act did not contemplate establishing a new kind of tobacco during the 3-year period of a national marketing quota on which quotas had been approved by referendum for the kind of tobacco sought to be changed. He stated that there was not such a difference in supply and demand conditions as among the types of Flue-cured tobacco as would result in a difference in the adjustments needed in the marketings thereof in order to maintain supplies in line with demand. See title 7, section 1301(b)(15), supra. He gave as his reason for so finding that Flue-cured tobacco is used almost entirely in the manufacture of cigarettes, that there is a high degree of homogeneity among the several types and interchangeability in their use; that there has been a close price relationship among the types over the years, and that types 11, 12, and 13 are readily marketable in the type 14 production area and such tobacco when so marketed is classified as type 14. His view was that type 14 has the same characteristics including quality, colors and lengths as types 11, 12, and 13, and that factors of historical or geographical nature could not be determined by an examination of the tobacco. His affidavit then contained the following statement which is of much importance in this case:

"That I did not have available statistics upon which to determine a quota for type 14 as a separate kind of tobacco in conformity with the act because the Department's statistics with respect to the production of Flue-cured tobacco by types are based on the area in which the tobacco is grown while the statistics with respect to the types of Flue-cured tobacco on hand are based principally on the location of the warehouse at which the tobacco was marketed, and the Department of Commerce which collects the records of the exports of Flue-cured tobacco does not report exports of Flue-cured tobacco by type."

The Under Secretary stated in his affidavit that at the time he set the annual quota under the 3-year national marketing quota, he was advised that some tobacco growers in Georgia and Florida were protesting any reduction in acreage allotment for Flue-cured tobacco in those States on the ground that a smaller proportion of tobacco from those States had been going under Government loan as compared to tobacco from other States producing Flue-cured tobacco. He stated that because of this he gave consideration to whether type 14 should be constituted as a separate kind of Flue-cured tobacco. He determined that he could not take such action unless he found that there was a difference in supply and demand conditions as among the various types of Flue-cured tobacco which resulted in a difference in the adjustments needed in the marketings thereof in order to maintain supplies in line with demand. This reasoning was based on section 1301(b)(15), supra. He then stated that he could find no statutory provision for making adjustments between types because of the amount of tobacco moving under loan. He also found that one type of Flue-cured tobacco is readily substituted for another, and that large quantities of tobacco produced in an area associated with one type is marketed at warehouses located in areas associated with other types, and there classified as being the type corresponding to the type produced in the areas in which the warehouse is located. He also found that the reports of exports compiled by the Department of Commerce do not break exports of Flue-cured tobacco into types.

The affidavit of a tobacco economist in the U.S. Department of Agriculture was submitted. He was of the view that Flue-cured tobacco, regardless of where produced or type, is a substantially homogeneous commodity. He did not believe that Flue-cured tobacco could be fragmented into types and hence all statistical data in the Department of Agriculture went to the whole rather than the separate types. He stated the data was lacking with respect to inventories representing tobacco grown only in the areas designated as producing type 14, or as to any of the other separate types, or as to exports of the various types of Flue-cured tobacco.

The Director, Tobacco Policy Staff, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, stated that the records showing the estimated production of Flue-cured tobacco compiled and issued by the Statistical Reporting Service of the Department show production estimates of Flue-cured tobacco by types and by States, but that these estimates were based on areas of production without regard to the areas in which the tobacco is marketed. He stated that the Tobacco Stocks Reports are based on the areas in which the tobacco is marketed without regard to the areas in which the tobacco was produced, and that all tobacco marketed in the Georgia tobacco markets was classified as type 14 without regard to the area in which it was produced.

---

[1] The kinds of tobacco as now classified are set out in 7 U.S.C.A., 1301(b)(15). The kinds listed are Flue-cured, Fire-cured, Dark Air-cured, Virginia Sun-cured, burley, Maryland, cigar-filler Cigar-binder, and Cigar-filler type 41. Appellees seek to divide the Flue-cured kind by having Flue-cured type 14 classified as an additional kind.

Stocks reports by types and marketings by types were not compatible with Flue-cured tobacco production estimates by types since substantial quantities are produced in one State or area and marketed in another.

The Director of the Tobacco Division of the Agricultural Marketing Service of the Department of Agriculture stated that he administered regulations issued pursuant to the Tobacco Statistics and Standards Act, supra, and the Tobacco Inspection Act, supra. He explained that records as to types are based on the place of marketing rather than the place of production, and contended that this was recognized from the beginning of the classification system due to the similarity of the various types of Flue-cured tobacco. He pointed to a contemporary explanation of the proviso in Announcement No. 118, supra, 7 GFR, section 30.6, defining the types:

"* * * Any tobacco that has the same characteristics and corresponding qualities, colors and lengths, shall be treated as one type, regardless of any factors of historical or geographical nature, which cannot be determined by an examination of the tobacco."

The contemporaneous explanation alluded to gives Flue-cured tobacco as an example, and pointed out that the type 11 area would produce tobacco of very nearly the same character as that produced in the type 12 area, and that type 11 could be sold as type 12 without being detected. It was said that the Department did not wish to require the segregation of such tobacco unless the difference could be clearly determined by an examination of the tobacco itself.

Appellees, in support of their motion for summary judgment, submitted several affidavits including those of two tobacco growers. One stated that Flue-cured tobacco grown in North Carolina and Virginia is distinguishable from Flue-cured tobacco grown in Georgia in color, texture, and leaf size. He stated that he had observed baskets of North Carolina and Virginia tobacco being sold at warehouses in Georgia. His statement was based on experience gained in growing Flue-cured tobacco for 46 years, and from observing auction sales of tobacco in Georgia, North Carolina, and Virginia. The other affiant stated that from a visual examination he could see a difference in the color, body, length, and size of tobacco leaves as between tobacco grown in Georgia and tobacco grown in the other Flue-cured tobacco belts. He attributed this to difference in soil and climate conditions, and to the fact that tobacco in Georgia is more generally irrigated which gives it a more uniform appearance than is true of nonirrigated tobacco grown in the belts.

The testimony of a marketing inspector for the Georgia Department of Agriculture was offered by appellees. He presented charts, based on data obtained from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, which demonstrated that in the 17-year period from 1946 through 1963, a total of 163 million pounds of type 14 tobacco was placed under Government loan while in the year 1963 alone 129.1 million pounds of type 11-A tobacco was placed under loan.[2] Another chart demonstrated that as of January 1, 1957, 104.3 million pounds of type 11-A tobacco was held in the Stabilization Corporation and 271.9 million pounds as of January 1, 1964. On January 1, 1957, 33.2 million pounds of type 14 was on hand but by January 1, 1964, this total had decreased to 16.8 million pounds. Another chart showed that in 1963 only 2.8 percent of tobacco marketed as type 14 was placed in Government loan, and it was conceded that some of this was not type 14. His testimony was that more than 13 million pounds of other types of Flue-cured tobacco had been brought into Georgia and was sold as type 14 in 1963. As to the remaining types, 12.2 percent of type 13 was placed under Government loan in 1963, 14.2 percent of type 12, 21.7 percent of type 11-B, and 43.6 percent of type 11-A.

JURISDICTION

Appellees invoked the jurisdiction of the court below under the judicial review provision of the Administrative Procedure Act. 5 U.S.C.A. 1009. The Secretary contends that judicial review, and thus jurisdiction, is precluded under the provision of that section which excepts agency action from judicial review where a statute precludes judicial review, or where agency action is by law committed to agency discretion. Section 1009(a).

It is settled that a statute must clearly demonstrate the intention of Congress to preclude judicial review in order for review to be denied by this exception. Cf. *Shaughnessy* v. *Pedreiro*, 1955, 349 U.S. 48, 75 S. Ct. 591, 99 L. Ed. 868; and *Fulford* v. *Forman*, 5 Cir., 1957, 245 F. 2d 145, footnote 23. The Secretary points to 7 U.S.C.A. 1363-67, the review provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and says that the review there provided is exclusive. These sections permit review by a local review committee in the event a farmer is dissatisfied with his farm marketing quota, and the determination by that committee may be judicially reviewed. *United States* v. *Sykes*, 5 Cir., 1962, 310 F. 2d 417, 420. But it is clear that this review provision does not permit review of the apportionment of a State allotment among counties. *Fulford* v. *Forman, supra.*

The Secretary contends that the intention of Congress was to preclude a challenge to the manner in which a national crop quota was fixed, or the manner in which a national quota was allocated or apportioned to States and counties. We conclude that there is no basis in the Agricultural Adjustment Act for attributing such an intention to Congress where, if such be the case and that is the allegation, the Secretary has failed to comply with statutory mandates relating to the gathering and using of statistics, the consideration of which is a condition precedent to determining whether types of tobacco should be treated as separate kinds in establishing marketing quotas.

It is urged that even assuming arguendo this to be the case, judicial review under the Administrative Procedure Act is nevertheless unavailable to appellees because the action of the Secretary was by law committed to his discretion. It is said that the determination that supply and demand factors did not warrant treating type 14 as a separate kind of tobacco constituted an exercise of discretion and nothing more. Such discretion is vested in the Secretary by the statute (7 U.S.C.A. 1301(b)(15)). This discretion, however, was not unfettered but was subject to the requirement that the Secretary use the latest statistics in making the determination. Section 1301(c), supra. And another statute required that these statistics be compiled (7 U.S.C.A. 501).

The crux of the complaint is that the Secretary failed to keep and consider the latest statistics in making the determination as to treating type 14 as a separate kind of tobacco, and therefore departed from the statutory base on which his discretion was to be exercised. This was a sufficient jurisdictional allegation. In sum, we conclude that judicial review of the Secretary's determination not to treat type 14 as a separate kind of tobacco is not precluded by statute, nor is the determination committed by law to the Secretary's unfettered discretion. Furthermore, the decision of the Secretary constituted final agency action for which there is no other adequate remedy in any court. See 5 U.S.C.A. 1009(c). We therefore hold that the district court had jurisdiction to review the action of the Secretary under the Administrative Procedure Act.[3]

THE MERITS

As is indicated by the statement of the evidence adduced on the motions, the Secretary does not contend that he exercised his discretion as to whether to treat type 14 as a separate kind of tobacco on full facts. The statistics available to him with respect to acreage planted in Flue-cured tobacco were based on areas of production and hence types. The statistics reflecting stocks on hand or supplies were based on the location of the warehouse at which the tobacco was marketed. These statistics did not reflect types as all types were treated as that of the producing area in which the warehouse was located. This, of course, amounted to no statistics by types, and was in contravention of the duty to keep statistics by types, 7 U.S.C.A. 501, supra, unless there was no practical difference in the types. He also stated that records of exports were not kept by types, but these were records kept by the Commerce Department and may or may not have been relevant. Neither the Secretary nor those of his staff whose affidavits on the subject were submitted in the district court deem it necessary to keep statistics based on types. They seem to be of the opinion that the high degree of homogeneity among the types was such as to render it conclusive that all of the types should be treated as one for purposes of establishing marketing quotas. This conclusion is buttressed only by other conclusions such as high degree of interchangeability, similarity in prices, and the like, but none of these underlying conclusions were supported by facts.

On the other hand, appellees submitted the affidavits of two witnesses who testified, based on experience and observation, that there is a difference in color, texture, and size of type 14 as distinguished from the other types. One of these affiants stated that this was due to the high degree of irrigation used in the type 14 belt. The testimony of the Georgia marketing inspector was based on statistical information sent him by the U.S. Department of Agriculture. It showed that a much less proportion of the type 14 crop was placed under the Government loan program. Only 2.8 percent of type 14 went under loan, while the other types varied from 12.2 percent of type 13 up to 43.6 percent of type 11-A for the year 1963. These figures also showed that over a period of 17 years ending in 1963 only 163 million pounds of type 14 tobacco was placed under loan while 129.10 million pounds of type 11-A went under loan in 1963 alone. These facts strongly support an inference that a substantially greater proportion of type 14 was selling above the support level than was true of the other types. Moreover, his testimony demonstrated that at least some statistics were available in the Department of Agriculture to separate true type 14 tobacco from tobacco produced in other areas and sold at markets in the type 14 area, inasmuch as he testified that "a fraction more than 13 million pounds" was brought into Georgia and sold as type 14 in 1963. In short, he had statistics separating type 14 from the other types both by sales and under the loan program.

---

[2] Apparently type 11 has been, since Announcement No. 118, supra, divided into types 11-A and 11-B. This does not appear of record.

[3] The legislative history of the Administrative Procedure Act as it pertains to the exceptions to review based on statutory preclusion of review, or matters committed to agency discretion is set out in *Amarillo-Borger Express* v. *United States*, N.D. Tex., 1956, 138 F. Supp. 411, 418 footnote 13. This history fully supports the conclusion we have reached.

This testimony is not conclusive on the question of whether the Secretary abused his discretion in not treating type 14 as a separate kind of tobacco, but it does show that statistics were available to the Secretary which were not considered by him in making the determination, and that there was a practical difference in characteristics as between type 14 and some of the other types such as would warrant a consideration of comparative statistics.[4] All in all, and as a matter of proof since the hearing went beyond a motion for summary judgment to the point where both sides were satisfied with the proof and to submit the case for final judgment, the evidence was sufficient to show that the Secretary departed from what is required of him by statute: to keep statistics and consider the latest available statistics in making the determination as to kind when arriving at marketing quotas.

This made out a case for appellees to the extent of the Secretary having failed in this duty, and the difficult question presented to the district court and to this court is what relief should have been accorded. It would have been improper for the district court to have taken up the question of whether the Secretary abused his discretion in holding that type 14 was not to be treated as a separate kind of tobacco as a matter of fact. The evidence adduced was insufficient to demonstrate this. In fact, the proof was not directed to this question. Facts as to prices, demand in the market by types, and the reason for differences in demand, if any, would, together with differences in characteristics, all be material, indeed a sine qua non to a judgment on an abuse of discretion question.

RELIEF TO BE ACCORDED

We hold that the order of the court now under consideration cannot be sustained in its entirety. It goes beyond what is warranted by the evidence and in fact amount to the setting of a marketing quota by the court. This follows from the fact that the court, without conclusive evidence as to whether type 14 should be treated as a separate kind of tobacco, in effect increased the acreage allotment by adding 10 percent to the type 14 acreage allotment. This relief was unwarranted in fact and in law. The proper approach would have been to deny the injunctive relief sought under the declaratory judgment count of the complaint, and to grant relief to the extent necessary and warranted under the first count of the complaint which was aimed toward requiring the Secretary to perform his statutory duties.

This means that the court in exercise of its equitable discretion once it found, as it did and as we affirm, that the Secretary had failed to use the latest statistics in treating with the contention that type 14 should be a separate kind of tobacco, should have directed the Secretary to reconsider his decision in the light of what the statutes required of him.

This was indicated by the fact that the marketing quota and acreage allotments had been set 2 years before appellees registered their complaint as to the treatment being given to type 14. All Flue-cured tobacco farmers had approved the marketing quotas and all that was left for the Secretary was to establish the annual quota for each of the last 2 marketing years of the period. The Secretary was entitled to a reasonable time to consider the contentions of the appellees, but they are entitled to have him follow the statutes and otherwise consider facts relevant to their contentions that type 14 should be treated as a kind of tobacco separate from the other types of Flue-cured tobacco.

This determination by the Secretary is apart from the question as to when he may change the marketing quotas and acreage allotments if he should conclude to treat type 14 as a separate kind. That is another question and one not ripe for decision at this time. Whether such separate treatment may be commenced prior to the setting of any annual marketing quota, simply by reapportioning the acreage among the several States or otherwise, or whether it may only be done prior to the setting of the 3-year marketing quota is a question that first should be considered by the Secretary, and will only arise in the event he determines to treat type 14 as a separate kind of tobacco. We add that, contrary to the contention of the Secretary, when such acreage relief, if any, as appellees may be entitled to will be accorded them in no way bars their right to a proper and present consideration of their claim.

It is thus apparent from what we have said that the judgment must be reversed because of its breadth, but in reversing we hold that the district court should enter an order directing the secretary to reconsider within a reasonable time the question of treating type 14 as a separate kind of Flue-cured tobacco in the light of all available and material facts, including such statistics as he may have or which may be reasonably derived from presently available facts or statistics, to the end of making a considered and fair judgment, in the exercise of his discretion, as to the question presented. Whether there is a high degree of homogeneity on the types, or interchangeability in their use are questions of fact. Evidence should be available as to whether there are material differences in the characteristics of the types, and in demand and prices. In any event, the Secretary shall make his decision on statistics which are presently available or which may be compiled from other statistics, documents, and other evidence presently available. This evidence may be obtained from the Department or elsewhere, such as from records that may be maintained by purchasers of tobacco from producers. The Secretary must make a decision and his decision, if reviewed after he follows the statutory mandates, will be on the basis of whether he has abused his discretion in the decision.

The determination of the Secretary may be made on the basis that any change in marketing quotas and acreage allotments based on his decisions, if it should be to treat type 14 as a separate kind of tobacco, shall be prospective in application. As stated, we do not reach the question of whether such relief may be applied prospectively to the next annual quota or whether it must await the first year of a 3-year marketing quota.

Reversed and remanded for further proceedings not inconsistent herewith.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, in this particular case the farmers who filed suit won in the District Court for the Southern District of Georgia. The defendant appealed the decision. The appellees also won in the Circuit Court of Appeals. I presume that the defendant now will seek to appeal that decision to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The tobacco farmers in our area of the country believe that this is one of the reasons why there has been such great haste in this matter and why the pending bill is sought to be passed with such great speed, to the exclusion of permitting the tobacco farmers themselves in their own areas to come before a committee of the Senate to argue the merits of their case.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am delighted to yield to the able and distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I wonder if the Senator from Georgia sees any equity in making the provisions of the pending bill apply to Flue-cured tobacco this year but not to burley tobacco until next year, in spite of the fact that all the Flue-cured tobacco producers in my State have already planted, and many of the farmers in the Senator's State have already planted, our two States being the principal ones which produce the type of tobacco under discussion, type 14, which is not in surplus and which has not contributed to building up the present problem.

Mr. TALMADGE. The distinguished Senator from Florida is eminently correct. The bill is utterly and entirely discriminatory, because the farmers who have not contributed to the surplus would be the ones who would be penalized. As my friend from Florida knows, in his State the farmers have already transplanted their tobacco plants to the field and the plants are now growing. In my State the same thing would have happened except for the unfavorable weather we have been experiencing in the way of abnormal rainfall. Although some of the farmers in our State have transplanted their tobacco, a great many have not. However, they have produced the plant, they have prepared the ground, they have laid off the rows, they have bought the insecticides, they have purchased the fertilizer, and they have made every plan and every preparation to plant. Last fall they voted overwhelmingly for one system, proposed by the Department of Agriculture. Now Congress says, "We are not going to keep faith with you. We will change the system, even though your tobacco may be in the ground, and even though you have bought your fertilizer, and even though you have planted your seed." In spite of all that, the Government is now willing to say, "We will change all this. You cannot rely on what we told you last fall." This proposition is absolutely and completely inequitable.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am glad to yield further to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that in the case of burley tobacco, Senators representing those areas were much wiser in insisting that the bill should not be made applicable to their product until next year, to give the producers an opportunity to adjust themselves to the situation?

---

[4] The objection of type 14 producers to the sale of other types in their area has been the subject matter of previous litigation, *Campbell* v. *Hussey*, 1961, 368 U.S. 297, 82 S. Ct. 327, 7 L. Ed. 299, affirming the district court's holding that a Georgia statute requiring different color tags to be placed on the different types was unconstitutional. In footnote 3 of the Supreme Court decision it was said:

"Both the purpose and effect of the Georgia enactment were to make a distinction at the markets, by the color tags, between tobacco grown in Georgia and that grown elsewhere. The effect was to create a wide disparity of price between the two groups of tobacco, the Carolina growers receiving a much lower amount. This resulted in losses of business to the plaintiff warehousemen" (189 F. Supp. 54, 59).

Mr. TALMADGE. Yes; to achieve a period of adjustment for themselves and to see how it would affect them.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that burley tobacco is planted even later, and would not be in the same inequitable situation, so far as having already been planted is concerned, in which the producers in my State and in the State so ably represented by the Senators from Georgia would find themselves if the bill were enacted?

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is entirely correct. I do not believe that any burley tobacco plants are in the ground. On the other hand, at least two States, and probably three States, have made substantial plantings of Flue-cured tobacco.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that even if the bill were passed and approved by the President in the minimum time, say, the last part of this week or some time next week, there would still be required time for the holding of a referendum to displace and supplant the referendum of last December, in which the Flue-cured tobacco producers voted by a two-thirds majority to cut their acreage by 19½ percent rather than continue to produce the surplus?

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is entirely correct. No matter how speedily the bill is enacted into law, and no matter how speedily the Department of Agriculture may order a further referendum on the subject, by that time at least two-thirds or perhaps even three-fourths of all the Flue-cured tobacco in the entire United States will have been planted.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. TALMADGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator think this is an equitable way to approach such a revolutionary change in a long-established quota system like this?

Mr. TALMADGE. There is no semblance of equity about it. The Senator well knows that after the crops are in the ground it is not possible to change the system.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I have not seen this kind of inequitable approach made on the floor or in committee in this whole field of agricultural production in the 15 or so years that I have served on the committee. I regret that this approach is being made in connection with the pending bill.

Mr. TALMADGE. I agree with the Senator. I compliment him for his valuable contribution.

The farm leadership in Georgia and Florida is wholeheartedly supporting the pending litigation. I know these men to be levelheaded, foresighted people who favor the tobacco support program so long as it is fairly administered and serves the purpose intended by Congress. However, at the same time, they are not men who will lie down and accept the current program which can only lead to economic disaster and ruin for the Flue-cured tobacco producing areas. The bill which I have introduced to provide for the apportionment of tobacco marketing quotas to those farmers who produce marketable Flue-cured tobacco would correct the flaws and defects in the old Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 and provide a solution to the complex tobacco problem.

The bill provides for apportionment of the national marketing quota for Flue-cured tobacco in a manner designed to increase allotments of farms producing tobacco for the market and decrease allotments of farms producing tobacco for the price support program.

Under the bill each Flue-cured tobacco farm would start with a base consisting of the product of its previous year's acreage allotment and its normal yield—or its marketing quota, if acreage allotments had not been established. This base would be reduced by one-fifth of the quantity of tobacco put under price support from the farm. The national marketing quota—less the reserve for new farms and small farms—would then be apportioned among farms in accordance with their bases, so that farms whose bases had been reduced would receive less, and farms whose bases had not been reduced would receive more.

Farm allotments might be made on either a poundage or acreage basis. If on a poundage basis, the amount apportioned to the farm as just described would constitute the farm marketing quota. If on an acreage basis, the poundage apportionment just described would be converted to an acreage allotment by multiplying it by the normal yield for the farm. The farm marketing quota would then be the actual yield of the acreage allotment.

Section 1 of the bill adds a new section 313A to the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

Subsection (a) of new section 313A provides for use of the method of apportionment just described for Flue-cured tobacco, if marketing quotas have been in effect for the preceding year. In such case it would supersede the apportionment method now prescribed by section 313 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; except that section 313(d), which permits the transfer of marketing quotas in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe, and section 313(i), which permits increases in allotments or quotas when necessary to meet demands for particular types, would continue to be applicable. Section 313 would continue to be effective for Flue-cured tobacco whenever marketing quotas had not been in effect for the previous year.

The computation of each farm base would begin with its acreage allotment—or marketing quota if acreage allotments were not in effect—for the marketing year preceding the marketing year for which the apportionment is to be made. Thus, for example, the 1965 acreage allotment would be used in computing the farm base for apportionment of the marketing quota for the 1966 crop. Where an acreage allotment is used in computation of the base, it is converted to pounds by multiplying it by the normal yield. "Normal yield" is a term now used in sections 314 and 316 of the law, but it is not defined, being left to the Secretary to determine.

The next step in the computation of the farm base is to subtract the amount of tobacco from the farm which was put under price support during the most recent marketing year for which such information is available for all farms. Such information is not now available and probably could not be made available for crops prior to the 1965 crop. The Secretary would have to keep adequate records for the 1965 crop, but it appears probable that these records would not be available in time to be taken into account in apportioning quotas for the 1966 crop. The 1966 marketing quota for Flue-cured tobacco must be proclaimed not later than December 1, 1965, and the referendum must be held within 30 days thereafter; but 1965 crop Flue-cured tobacco may still be going under price support during December. It is probable therefore that the farm bases used in making the apportionment for 1966 under the bill would not be reduced by reason of tobacco being put under price support in 1965; but the bases used in apportioning the 1967 quota would be so reduced.

There would be no State marketing quotas or allotments. The national marketing quota, less the reserve, would be apportioned directly to farms on the basis of farm bases.

Subsection (b) of new section 313A provides for a reserve similar to that provided by section 313(c) for the present method of apportionment. Up to 5 percent of the national quota could be apportioned to small farms and farms having no farm bases on the basis of the factors now set out in section 313(c). The amount apportioned to a farm having no base could not exceed 75 percent of the amount apportioned under subsection (a) for farms which are similar with respect to the allotment factors.

Subsection (c) of new section 313A provides that if a farm markets less than its full marketing quota, its marketing quota for the next marketing year, computed as provided in subsections (a) and (b) would be increased by the amount of the deficiency—but the increase could not exceed 100 percent of the quota as computed under subsections (a) and (b). This would give a farmer who had a crop failure in one year the chance to make it up the next year. If a farm exceeded its quota, its marketing quotas for succeeding years would be reduced until the total reductions equaled the excess. This penalty would be in addition to the marketing penalty imposed on the marketing of the excess.

The increases or decreases in marketing quotas or acreage allotments resulting from the application of subsection (c) would not be taken into account in computing farm bases for subsequent years. Thus if a farm marketing quota of 5,000 pounds computed under subsection (a) was increased to 7,500 pounds, the farm base for the next year would be computed as though the farm marketing quota had been 5,000 pounds—and, if acreage allotments had been established, as though the farm acreage allotment had been 5,000 pounds divided by the normal yield for the farm.

Subsection (d) of new section 313A authorized the Secretary to convert farm marketing quotas to acreage allotments on the basis of farm normal yields. At present the Secretary has somewhat similar authority under section 313(g) to provide for acreage allotments by converting State marketing quotas to State acreage allotments and apportioning them to farms. As in section 313(g), when acreage allotments are used, the actual production of the farm acreage allotment constitutes the farm marketing quota.

Subsection (e) of new section 313A applies provisions of section 313(g), modified as necessary, to the new apportionment method. These provide for reductions in farm acreage allotments (farm marketing quotas in certain cases) for falsely identifying tobacco, failing to furnish proof of disposition, participating in false reports, or producing two crops on the same acreage.

Section 2 amends the heading of section 313 to indicate that it is not applicable when marketing quotas are apportioned in the manner provided by the bill.

Section 3 provides that the bill shall become effective beginning with the 1966 crop. As indicated above, it would probably not be fully effective until the 1967 crop, since the price support data to be used in reducing farm bases would probably not be available in time to be applied to the 1966 crop apportionment.

Mr. President, the substitute which I have proposed for myself and the distinguished Senator from Florida would not penalize the producers of Flue-cured tobacco who are producing a high quality tobacco that finds a ready, willing, and available buyer in the marketplace. It would, however, reduce the production of the tobacco for farmers who produce an inferior quality tobacco that has been going into the commodity stabilization program in recent years in enormous quantities.

In order to enlighten my colleagues and reveal the true nature of the situation, I hold in my hand some diagrams. The small amount shown in the left-hand column of the diagram is type 14 tobacco and verifies the fact that only a slight percentage of its production receives support. The other types of Flue-cured tobacco are indicated by the tall columns, representing a much higher percentage of price-supported production.

The same situation has been true, without exception, for 17 years.

It is unfair and discriminatory to penalize the producers of tobacco who have sold their tobacco merely because others have produced an inferior quality of tobacco that has not found a marketplace.

The bill, if enacted, would reverse a lawsuit that has been won by the farmers of Georgia and South Carolina. The law applicable to the lawsuit is found on page 192 of the hearings, which each Senator will find on his desk.

Section 301(b) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 provides—

> DEFINITIONS APPLICABLE TO ONE OR MORE COMMODITIES
>
> For the purpose of this title, "tobacco" means one of the kinds of tobacco listed below comprising the type specified as classified in Service and Regulatory Announcements Numbered 118 of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department.
>
> Flue-cured tobacco, comprising types 11, 12, 13, and 14.

A portion of that act reads as follows:

> *Provided,* That any one or more of the types comprising any such kind of tobacco shall be treated as a "kind of tobacco" for the purposes of this Act if the Secretary finds there is a difference in supply and demand conditions as among such types of tobacco which results in a difference in the adjustments needed in the marketings thereof in order to maintain supplies in line with demand.

That is the law that the farmers of Georgia and South Carolina tested in Federal court and won. That is the decision that Congress is now being asked to overrule. If it is overruled, the farmers who have been producing tobacco for the marketplace, and not for a Government warehouse, will be penalized. The tobacco farmers in that region have an average allotment of about 2 acres. In many instances, that allotment provides their sole monetary income for an entire year. If those people are penalized, those who are among the lowest income group in the United States will be penalized.

We are being asked to pass poverty programs, and we have passed several of them. I certainly favor eliminating poverty wherever that can conceivably be done. But in this area, the tobacco farmers are working. They are trying to earn a living by the sweat of their brows on their own farms, their own small, humble plots of ground. In the bill, we are asked, at one fell swoop, to put them into a more poverty-stricken class for the benefit of the great many farmers who produce large volumes of tobacco of an inferior quality.

I asked one witness who appeared before our committee what his tobacco allotment was. His answer was, "I don't know; several hundred acres."

I said, "Do you mean to tell me that you do not know what your tobacco allotment is? Every farmer in my State knows within a fraction of an acre what his allotment is."

It developed upon further inquiry that the particular so-called farmer had a tobacco allotment of 2,200 acres. That is the type of people who are requesting that Congress impose further restrictions on the humble small farmers who have already planted their crops, who have already nurtured them in the ground, who have been into the courts of the United States—the district courts and the circuit courts of appeals—and have won their lawsuit. Now we are asked to reverse the result of that lawsuit by an act of Congress. We are asked to penalize further those humble small farmers for the benefit of the man who had a 2,200 allotment but did not even know what size allotment he had. "Several hundred acres," was his evasive answer.

I hope the Senate will do no such injustice or inequity. I hope the Senate will approve the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I have offered in my behalf and in behalf of the distinguished senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I compliment and congratulate the distinguished Senator from Georgia on his fine presentation of a case that has real equity and yet is being presented to the Senate with only seven Senators in the Chamber, including the Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. KENNEDY]. It is a pity that when a matter which strikes at the money income of a great many thousand small people is being considered by the Senate, we find ourselves unable to reach the ears of Senators who, I know, want to do the equitable thing. There is only one equitable thing that could be done in this case.

My own State of Florida is a very small producer of Flue-cured tobacco. According to the testimony in the hearing record, some 5,200 Florida farmers produce Flue-cured tobacco on a total of about 12,000 acres. That is a little more than 2 acres per farmer, on the average. Many farmers have less than 2 acres.

Flue-cured tobacco is the principal money crop of a great many of our people who live in that part of Florida which does not have the advantage of a thriving tourist industry, which does not have the advantage of a tremendous vegetable and fruit production, but which is largely dependent upon the production of staple crops. Flue-cured tobacco is the principal money crop, as I have already stated, for some thousands of mighty good Americans who happen to be producers of that kind of tobacco in Florida.

A somewhat comparable situation exists in Georgia, except that Georgia has approximately five times as great a production of Flue-cured tobacco, and something like five times as many families are directly affected by this problem, as compared with the situation in my own State of Florida.

In South Carolina, we cannot break down the number of producers of Flue-cured tobacco of type 14, the kind which is produced in Georgia and Florida, as compared with those who produce other types of tobacco, but several thousand producers in South Carolina produce Flue-cured tobacco of type 14, which I shall speak about in a moment, and which has been so ably discussed by the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], who certainly knows this industry from top to bottom, and has shown that knowledge as Governor of his State—and he was a great Governor. He has shown it for years in the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, where he has been the principal spokesman for the Flue-cured tobacco producers.

This trouble was caused not by the producers of type 14 tobacco, but by the producers of other types of Flue-cured tobacco. In order that the RECORD may clearly show that what I am about to say is correct, I shall ask for the inclusion in the RECORD as a part of my remarks of two or three of the portions of compilations appearing in the record of committee hearings.

On page 173 of the hearings, the third of the tables that are included shows the following:

> Proportion of production by type going into stabilization corporation storage (percent).

This covers the years beginning with 1961 and continuing through 1964, with the understanding that as to 1964 the figures are estimates all the way through. But I believe they are substantially correct, because that has been the case every year that we have obtained these data from the well-operated tobacco division of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

It appears that in 1961 the percentage of tobaccos of the five types which comprise Flue-cured tobacco, which went to the Stabilization Corporation—that is, into Government warehouses—was not greatly variant. It ran all the way from 2.8 to 8.1 percent, but nothing like the variance that has occurred since that time.

Beginning with 1962, Senators will note that as to type 14 tobacco, every year, only a minor percentage of the percentage of the production has gone into Government warehouses. For instance, in 1962, 2.6 percent of type 14 tobacco went to the Government; in 1963, 3 percent; in 1964, 1.7 percent; or a total average of about 2.9 percent.

I state again that the figure for 1964 is an estimate. Therefore, that makes the average somewhat of an estimate, although it must be almost correct.

If we consider each of the other types of tobacco not produced in Florida, not produced in Georgia, and not produced in the southern part of South Carolina, we shall see an entirely different picture.

As to type 13, in 1962, 10.8 percent of that type went to the Government warehouses. In 1963, it was 13.2 percent. In 1964, it was 13.8 percent. That is an average of 12.6 percent.

As to type 12, it was 16.5 percent in 1962, 14.9 percent for 1963, and 28.6 percent for 1964. That is an average of 20.0 percent for the 3 years.

If we go to type 11B, it was 20.4 percent for 1962, 23.3 percent for 1963, and 20.6 percent for 1964. That is an average of 21.4 percent.

As to type 11A, which has been the biggest offender of all, 32.2 percent in 1962 went to the Government; 45.8 percent went to the Government warehouses in 1963, and 21.3 percent in 1964. That is an average of 33.1 percent in those particular years.

I call attention to this fact because if one wishes to turn now to the next exhibit, found on pages 105 and 106 of the printed record, he will find the reason why the other types of tobacco have been building up heavy surpluses in the Government warehouses. They are the types which ought to contribute out of proportion to the solving of this catastrophe which they have brought on the Flue-cured tobacco industry. For instance, the compilation on page 105 shows the figure with reference to Florida type 14. It shows that, whereas in 1961 we produced in our State an average of 1,850 pounds per acre, we were still at about that figure in 1964. We were producing 1,765 pounds per acre. As to the total production, we had brought it down from a total of 25,900,000 pounds to a total of 22,239,000 pounds.

That shows rather clearly that we had not only not heavily built up our production per acre, but that we had also not built up the total produced. That was one of the reasons why our tobacco was still a superior type, 1's and 2's, and was taken by the buyers on the tobacco market.

Let us look at the figures for Georgia. For 1961, it will be noted that the farmers in Georgia produced 1,930 pounds per acre, as against 1,930 pounds, or that same average, for 1964.

If we look across the table to see the volume produced in that great State, the total volume went from 136 million pounds in 1961 down to 122.5 million in 1964. In other words, in the States of Florida and Georgia, where type 14 tobacco was being produced, and where the tobacco found a ready market, sold for a good price, and did not have to encumber Government warehouses, there was not an effort to step up heavily the production per acre, which we find in the great State so ably represented by my distinguished friend, the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN].

If we look at the North Carolina figures, we find a very different situation. In 1961, in North Carolina, the average production of type 11 per acre was 1,670 pounds per acre. If we look at the year 1964, we find that the average production per acre had been forced up to 2,150 pounds per acre, or an increase of nearly 500 pounds per acre in those 3 years.

If we look at the total production, we see what happened. From a production of 303,940,000 pounds of type 11 tobacco in 1961, the North Carolina Flue-cured tobacco farmers had increased their production to a total of 352,600,000 pounds, or a total of nearly 50 million pounds increase in production in those 3 years.

If we look at the next tabulation, we find that in North Carolina for type 12 production, the farmers producing that type in 1961 produced an average of 1,875 pounds per acre, whereas, in 1964, they had forced the average production up to 2,375 pounds per acre, or an average of 500 pounds per acre increase in the production of type 12.

If we look across the table to see the total volume of type 12 tobacco produced in that great State, the Tarheel State, we find that the farmers in North Carolina produced 421 million pounds plus of type 12 tobacco in 1961, whereas, in 1964, they produced 479 million pounds plus, or an increase of 58 million pounds in that particular type alone in 3 years.

I do not like to burden the RECORD with these facts, but they are facts. They ought to appear in the RECORD. They show clearly who has trespassed, and who has abused the protective cloak which Congress has tried to give the producers of Flue-cured tobacco to put around their shoulders. It shows who should receive a penalty, rather than placing the penalty upon those who do not deserve it.

If we look at page 106, we find what happened in the great State of North Carolina in the production of type 13 tobacco in those same years. In 1961, the average type 13 tobacco produced in North Carolina was 1,900 pounds, as against 2,350 pounds per acre in 1964. The total volume of production of that kind of tobacco had gone up in those 3 years from 106,400,000 pounds to 117,500,000 pounds.

Figures of this kind do not lie; they tell the facts. They reveal that the producers of Flue-cured tobacco in North Carolina, notwithstanding the fact that I am sure they met the acreage quotas by having to cut down their acreage as the acreage allotments were given, nevertheless did two things. They not only piled on the fertilizer and planted the tobacco closer together, but they also utilized—and this is the pitiful point—a new planting of tobacco turned out by a couple of nurseries, which planting was designed to greatly outproduce in poundage per acre that which had been produced before.

The record shows these things. I am only asking whether it is fair or equitable to put this particular hardship upon those who have not produced this catastrophe of tremendous warehouse supplies and oversurplus production. Why is it fair to place the penalty upon those who have not contributed to it, those who have been able to sell their crop for money on the barrelhead in their markets to the degree shown by the figures which I quoted?

In case I have not asked to do so, I ask unanimous consent that the table shown at page 173 of the hearings, part of which I quoted—the third compilation on page 173—be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 5.—*Production and accumulations of Stabilization Corporation stocks of Flue-cured tobacco, by types, 1961–64* [1]

	1961	1962	1963	1964	Total
Proportion of production by type going into Stabilization Corp. storage (percent):					
Type 14	4.1	2.6	3.0	[2]1.7	[2]2.9
Type 13	2.8	10.8	13.2	[2]13.8	[2]10.5
Type 12	8.1	16.5	14.9	[2]28.6	[2]17.6
Type 11b	4.2	20.4	23.3	[2]20.6	[2]18.0
Type 11a	7.1	32.2	45.8	[2]21.3	[2]27.5
Total	5.6	16.9	20.3	[2]19.3	[2]16.1

[1] Sources: "Flue-Cured Tobacco Market Review," TOB–FL–7, AMS, USDA, Washington, DC., March 1964; "Flue-Cured Tobacco Market Review," TOB–FL–6, AMS, USDA, Washington, D.C., March 1963; "Tobacco Situation," TS–110, ERS, USDA, Washington, D.C., December 1964; and "News Letter," Flue-Cured Tobacco Stabilization Corp., Raleigh, N.C., Jan. 4, 1965.

[2] Preliminary.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that the various tables from which I quoted on pages 105 and 106 be placed in the RECORD; namely, the one covering Florida, type 14, and showing Georgia, type 14, and the three covering North Carolina, type 11, type 12, and type 13.

There being no objections, the tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. Flue-cured tobacco: Average, yield per acre, production, price per pound, and crop value by types within States, 1956–64

FLORIDA, TYPE 14

Year	Acreage	Yield per acre	Production	Price per pound	Crop value	Year	Acreage	Yield per acre	Production	Price per pound	Crop value
	Acres	*Pounds*	*1,000 pounds*	*Cents*	*1 000 dollars*		*Acres*	*Pounds*	*1,000 pounds*	*Cents*	*1,000 dollars*
1956	17,700	1,225	21,682	48.5	10,516	1961	14,000	1,850	25,900	60.6	15,695
1957	11,400	1,350	15,390	56.7	8,726	1962	14,800	1,960	29,008	56.3	16,332
1958	11,100	1,485	16,484	57.3	9,445	1963[1]	14,000	1,845	25,830	57.0	14,723
1959	13,900	1,395	19,390	59.8	11,595	1964[1]	12,600	1,765	22,239		
1960	13,800	1,595	22,011	57.2	12,590						

GEORGIA, TYPE 14

Year	Acreage	Yield per acre	Production	Price per pound	Crop value	Year	Acreage	Yield per acre	Production	Price per pound	Crop value
1956	88,000	1,455	128,040	48.5	62,099	1961	70,500	1,930	136,065	59.0	80,278
1957	63,000	1,290	81,270	56.1	45,592	1962	74,000	1,975	146,150	57.0	83,306
1958	58,000	1,545	89,610	57.5	51,526	1963[1]	70,500	2,025	142,762	58.0	82,802
1959	69,000	1,520	104,880	58.1	60,935	1964[1]	63,500	1,930	122,500		
1960	70,000	1,845	129,150	56.8	73,357						

NORTH CAROLINA, TYPE 11

Year	Acreage	Yield per acre	Production	Price per pound	Crop value	Year	Acreage	Yield per acre	Production	Price per pound	Crop value
1956	227,000	1,525	346,175	50.2	173,780	1961	182,000	1,670	303,940	64.2	195,129
1957	170,000	1,355	230,350	53.8	123,928	1962	191,000	1,860	355,260	60.3	214,222
1958	163,000	1,570	255,910	57.6	147,404	1963[1]	182,000	1,790	325,780	56.9	185,369
1959	180,000	1,450	261,000	55.2	144,072	1964[1]	164,000	2,150	352,600		
1960	179,000	1,630	291,770	60.4	176,229						

NORTH CAROLINA, TYPE 12

Year	Acreage	Yield per acre	Production	Price per pound	Crop value	Year	Acreage	Yield per acre	Production	Price per pound	Crop value
1956	282,000	1,760	496,320	51.8	257,094	1961	225,000	1,875	421,875	65.5	276,328
1957	218,000	1,535	334,630	54.8	183,377	1962	234,000	1,825	427,050	59.8	255,376
1958	213,000	1,825	388,725	57.7	224,294	1963[1]	223,000	2,140	477,220	58.7	280,128
1959	223,000	1,550	345,650	58.7	202,897	1964[1]	202,000	2,375	479,750		
1960	223,000	1,980	441,540	61.2	270,222						

NORTH CAROLINA, TYPE 13

Year	Acreage	Yield per acre	Production	Price per pound	Crop value	Year	Acreage	Yield per acre	Production	Price per pound	Crop value
1956	70,000	1,700	119,000	55.0	65,450	1961	56,000	1,900	106,400	65.8	70,011
1957	55,000	1,560	85,800	59.6	51,137	1962	58,000	2,250	130,500	61.3	79,996
1958	53,000	1,740	92,220	60.3	55,609	1963[1]	55,500	2,120	117,660	59.6	70,125
1959	55,500	1,735	96,292	62.4	60,086	1964[1]	50,000	2,350	117,500		
1960	55,500	1,920	106,560	62.2	66,280						

[1] Preliminary.

Source: Compiled from reports of the Agricultural Estimates Division, SRS.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it is also a lamentable fact that growers right across North Carolina, in Virginia, did the same thing. If Senators will look at the last part of that page, on page 106 of the hearing record, they will find the compilation covering Virginia, type 11. They will find that the per acre production went from 1,580 in 1961 to 2,100 in 1964, and that total production went from 111 million pounds in 1961 to 132 million pounds in 1964.

I ask unanimous consent that that particular tabulation, covering Virginia type 11, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

U.S. Flue-cured tobacco: Average yield per acre, production, price per pound, and crop value by types within States, 1956–64

VIRGINIA, TYPE 11

Year	Acreage	Yield per acre	Production	Price per pound	Crop value	Year	Acreage	Yield per acre	Production	Price per pound	Crop value
	Acres	*Pounds*	*1,000 pounds*	*Cents*	*1,000 dollars*		*Acres*	*Pounds*	*1,000 pounds*	*Cents*	*1,000 dollars*
1956	88,000	1,560	137,280	52.8	72,484	1961	70,500	1,580	111,390	63.5	70,733
1957	67,000	1,470	98,490	51.2	50,427	1962	73,500	1,760	129,360	62.0	80,203
1958	65,000	1,640	106,600	57,9	61,721	1963	69,000	1,725	119,025	54.0	64,274
1959	70,500	1,560	109,980	54.4	59.829	1964	63,000	2,100	132,300		
1960	70,000	1,590	111,300	59.4	66,112						

Mr. HOLLAND. Anyone with an objective mind, trying to do the right thing, is of good character, and is trying to do the best to do a good job—could not look at the record without coming necessarily to the conclusion that there is only one reason why the surplus has been built too high. It is because those who have produced Flue-cured tobacco other than type 14 produced so much that there has been no ready market for it, and a great quantity of it has had to go into Government warehouses. I do not need to expand on that fact. The figures speak for themselves. There is no doubt that that is the case.

It is because that is the case that I feel, in the first instance, that the proposed law would be unfortunate and unfair.

The second reason why I feel it would be unfair has to do with the fact that, no matter how speedily the Congress enacts the bill under pressure from the administration, and under the pressure of the Department handling the matter, the Department of Agriculture, we must all remember that the Under Secretary is a North Carolinian. He appeared at our committee hearings. The head of the CCC organization which buys in this product and has it under his jurisdiction is another North Carolinian. I would not charge them with having said anything falsely before our committee. They know the situation in their State and realize what it is. They are bound to be most sympathetic to the situation there. They have shown that sympathy by bringing in this kind of legislation at this time.

The same group of officials last fall proposed an entirely different sort of procedure. They suggested that the acreage be cut by 19½ percent. They submitted a referendum to the producers of Flue-cured tobacco. Senators know that such a referendum has to be approved by some two-thirds of the growers before it can be put into effect. It was so approved. It has been followed by those who have planted, including many in my own State, including many in the adjoining State of Georgia. It will have covered everyone. It has to be approved by Congress. A large number of amendments have to be considered by the other body. Then it has to go to the President and be signed. It then becomes the subject of a referendum. This is not a first impression referendum. It is a referendum to set aside the 19½-percent acreage cut which has been already voted, and would supplant that with one which would combine the acreage and tonnage features.

If any Senator wishes to correct me if I am not accurate in my statement, I will yield for him to do so; but, as I recall it, they expected to submit the proposal of a cut of 10 percent in acreage, rather than 19½ percent, and with a poundage control such as is embraced in this measure.

So it is proposed, with all the haste that can be generated in such a bill, as a bill hereafter to be effective, when much of the acreage has been planted, to race that onto the floor of the House and to race it to a referendum, and then ask the tobacco growers to vote on it, knowing full well that the votes of those in North Carolina and southern Virginia are enough to adopt this particular measure.

Everybody knows that. We know what we are confronted with.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What is the difference between the substitute amendment which has been offered and the bill as reported by the committee?

Mr. HOLLAND. I would be glad to answer that, but I yield to the Senator from Georgia [Mr. Talmadge], who is more familiar with it. I would be glad to try to answer, but I am afraid I would leave out something important.

Mr. TALMADGE. The bill as reported by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and as submitted by the House would require every farmer to have a poundage quota as well as an acreage allotment, whereas the substitute that has been proposed by the Senator from Florida and myself would direct the Secretary of Agriculture to reduce the quota, either by acreage or poundage, of the farmer who produces a surplus that goes into the Government warehouse. The penalty would properly be paid on farmers who produce an inferior tobacco, and not on farmers who produce a tobacco finding a ready, willing, and able buyer on the marketplace.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What effect, if any, would the bill as reported by the committee have upon the farmers in Florida and Georgia?

Mr. TALMADGE. It would have a very substantial effect. First, it would nullify a lawsuit those farmers have won in the U.S. district court and again in the circuit court of appeals. That lawsuit was won by those farmers in a unanimous decision.

Second, it would change the method of allocating acreage and poundage even after those farmers had planted a crop already growing in the field. It would be an inconceivable proposal to require different acreage and poundage requirements after the farmers were authorized last December to do what they have now done.

Mr. LAUSCHE. In the event the amendment offered by the Senators from Georgia and Florida is adopted, will there be any restrictions either by acreage or poundage on the growers of Flue-cured tobacco?

Mr. TALMADGE. Yes. The Secretary of Agriculture would be authorized and directed to reduce the marketing quota of the individual farmer in direct ratio to the amount of tobacco he contributed to the surplus that went into commodity stabilization.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Do I correctly understand that the purpose of the substitute is to impose a penalty upon those who, by increased production, create the surplus, but that the same penalty would also be imposed upon the Georgia and Florida growers, except that it would be less in degree, being proportionate to the increase which contributed to the surplus?

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is correct. It would impose a penalty on every farmer, on every type of tobacco, in every area, if his tobacco went into surplus in a Government warehouse instead of into a market sale. In other words, it would encourage farmers to produce for the marketplace and not the Government warehouse.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield, so that I may elaborate on this subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Kennedy of New York in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. HOLLAND. I am glad to yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. As to the question asked by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. Lausche], the Secretary of Agriculture has already ordered a 19½ percent reduction in acreage for this year. The bill—regardless of whether it passes or not—will involve a 19½-percent reduction if it passes. If it does not pass, it will be the same thing. The 19½ percent reduction in acreage will stand, regardless of whether the bill fails or passes.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. My understanding is that one of the amendments offered by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. Cooper], which was agreed to by the committee, would place a ceiling of 10 percent on the reduction of any tobacco; therefore, his statement is not quite correct. I believe that the last amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky would limit reduction to 10 percent instead of 19½ percent.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. If the Senator will look it up, he will find that the 10 percent was a reduction on the displacement of the amount of tobacco in storage at the present time. In other words, the farmer could not dump his acreage in any one year, because it would completely ruin him. But we considered that the bill would treat the farmer better on an acreage-poundage bill than it would under the 19½ percent cut, because this would restore 12 percent of the acreage taken away from the farmer under the 19½ percent which he would get under the Secretary's order at the present time.

It would put 12 percent of that acreage back which the farmer can plant this year. He will not have to plant his tobacco so close together, fertilize it so heavily, irrigate it, harvest it, or market it. This will save him a great deal of money and will result in a much better grade of tobacco, because he will not be forced to grow his tobacco so close together, use high-priced fertilizer, irrigate it, and do other things which run up production costs on tobacco.

But, regardless of the type of tobacco which is grown, there is approximately a billion pounds too much tobacco in this country. We must reduce our stocks of tobacco over a period of years, or the whole tobacco program will fold up and cause serious trouble.

I thoroughly agree with the Senator about the position of the tobacco farmer today. There are 120,000 allotments in North Carolina. That is a large number of tobacco farms. That is farm allotments, not growers—approximately 120,000 tobacco farms in North Carolina.

The land on a tobacco farm averages 4 acres, and the tobacco farms stretch all along the entire State of North Carolina. I suppose this is also the case in Georgia and Florida.

Mr. TALMADGE. About half that.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The tobacco farms in the State of Georgia average 2 acres, I believe.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. This bill, as I see it—and I believe I am absolutely correct—is designed to save the small farmer, not the big farmer, who can be hurt badly by the acerage-poundage bill. Consider a farmer with 4 acres planted in tobacco this year, which is cut 19.5 percent—which is nearly 20 percent. He winds up with a little over 3 acres. He is taking a great cut. If it is cut further next year, he will have something left; but pretty soon nothing will be left.

There are thousands of farms in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia which consist of less than 1 acre. Take 20 percent from that 1 acre and there is not much left to fill a barn to cure any tobacco. The bill would keep the acreage almost intact. The farmer would be working on a formula.

Let me mention one further point. Figures have been quoted from the 1964 crop. The 1964 crop was an abnormally high crop. It was not considered in drafting this bill. The committee took the 3 highest years of the preceding 5 years, leaving out the 1964 crop, which was an abnormally high yield crop and should not have been taken into consideration. I believe that answers the question.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Will the Senator from Florida yield for the purpose of a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] stated that whether the bill is or is not passed, by order of the Secretary of Agriculture there will be a reduction in acreage of 19½ percent; is that correct?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. No; that is not exactly correct. I may have misstated myself.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Perhaps I misunderstood.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. If the bill does not pass, there will be a 19½ percent acreage reduction. If it does pass and is approved by a two-thirds vote of all the farmers—because, remember, the farmers themselves must vote on the bill or else it will not become effective anyway—if they do vote in the referendum to accept the bill, as reported by the Senate committee, 12 percent of the 19½ percent acres will be restored to them, in order that they might not grow inferior tobacco on the small acres and spread it over more acres, using less fertilizer, and not till the land intensively, as they are doing at the present time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What will be the percentage of reduction in acreage in the event the committee's bill is passed and approved? I understand the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN] to have stated that if it is not passed, the reduction will be 19½ percent.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LAUSCHE. But if it is passed, there will be an advantage provided to the farmer in a quantity—did he say 7½ percent?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Approximately 12 percent.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Approximately 12 percent.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Instead of being cut 19½ percent, it would be cut 6 or 6½ percent.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, this bears out the statement I was making that it is designed by the bill to enlarge the acreage permitted to be used for production in 1965.

There is a statement in the House report which I believe makes clear what was expected to be done under the bill as it was then. It has been slightly changed by Senate committee action.

The House report states that the national acreage factor will be determined by dividing the new 1965 national acreage allotment by the national acreage allotment currently in effect for the 1965 crop, which goes into tobacco; namely, 514,265 acres. This factor would be approximately 1.180, and would restore the 1965 farm acreage allotment to approximately 95 percent of the 1964 acreage allotment, so it would cut out the 19½ percent acreage allotment already voted by the growers by more than two-thirds last December, in order to put in this new formula which according to the statement in the House report would bring up acreage allotments to approximately 95 percent of 1964.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Am I correct in understanding that under the order of the Secretary of Agriculture, the cut will be 19½ percent, and under the bill it would be approximately 5 to 6 percent?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator is substantially correct, except that this was not accomplished by order of the Secretary of Agriculture, but was accomplished by an offer of his made to the farmers by a referendum, which they approved by more than a two-thirds vote. Under approval of that offer the acreage for 1965 was to be reduced by 19½ percent from the 1964 acreage as to those already planted whose crops are already grown, of course. That allotment, we believe, has been followed. Whether everyone has followed it, I do not know, but any prudent man would have followed that new allotment.

Mr. LAUSCHE. What was at issue in the lawsuit that was discussed?

Mr. HOLLAND. The issue in the lawsuit discussed had to do with the failure of the Department of Agriculture or the Secretary of Agriculture to differentiate between type 14 tobacco and the other types of Flue-cured tobacco under the provisions of the law.

I am quoting now from the law, section 301 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended:

> SEC. 301. (a) * * *.
>
> (b) DEFINITIONS APPLICABLE TO ONE OR MORE COMMODITIES.—For the purpose of this title—
>
> * * * * *
>
> (15) "Tobacco" means each one of the kinds of tobacco listed below comprising the types specified as classified in Service and Regulatory Announcement Numbered 118 of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department:
>
> Flue-cured tobacco, comprising types 11, 12, 13, and 14—

Then omitting all the other part of this section, which deals with other types of tobacco and with other commodities:

> The provisions of this title shall apply to each of such kinds of tobacco severally: *Provided*, That any one or more of the types comprising any such kind of tobacco shall be treated as a "kind of tobacco" for the purposes of this Act if the Secretary finds there is a difference in supply and demand conditions as among such types of tobacco which results in a difference in the adjustments needed in the marketing thereof in order to maintain supplies in line with demand.

Mr. President, it was the contention of those producers of type 14 tobacco, who went first to the district court and won their suit there, that the Secretary, looking at the figures that have been placed in the RECORD by the able Senator from Georgia and also by myself, in a somewhat different form, will see clearly who are the ones who have abused this program and who are the ones who have built up the tremendous surplus. They show clearly and exactly what is required by law, and the Secretary of Agriculture could have, and in this suit these growers claim should have, found that "there is a difference in supply and demand conditions as among such types of tobacco which results in a difference in the adjustment needed in the marketings thereof."

Judge Scarlett, one of our able district court judges—I believe he sits in Savannah—ruled with the growers. An appeal was taken to the circuit court of appeals, at New Orleans. Although the decision on the appeal stated that some other things had to be done, it made it very clear that the Secretary was advised to look at the law and at the figures, to see if something should not be done in connection with the law.

The case has not come to final hearing. The able attorney for the tobacco section was before our committee. He was asked the question, as I recall, by the distinguished Senator from Georgia, "Why has not that case been appealed?" As I recall, his answer—Senators will have to go to the record to find the exact answer—was substantially that the Secretary had not decided whether he wished to appeal or, instead, depend upon the passage of the proposed legislation, which is now before us, which would allow him to ignore that suit—one thing or the other, and not the two together.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Has any thought been given to the insertion of a saving clause, so as to protect the rights of the litigants in the action that is pending?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. I have not given such thought. I am not a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Georgia. I am sure he can give the exact answer.

Mr. TALMADGE. It would change the entire method and manner of allocating and apportioning tobacco. The pending bill would provide an acreage-poundage basis, whereas the existing law authorized the Secretary to separate tobacco by classes, depending upon the production. If the Senator from Florida will yield for the purpose, I ask unanimous consent that the statement of Mr. Homer S. Durden, Jr., attorney for the Georgia Commodity Commission for Tobacco, of Swainsboro, Ga., at pages 191 to 195 of the hearings, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. HOLLAND. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF HOMER S. DURDEN, JR., ATTORNEY FOR THE GEORGIA COMMODITY COMMISSION FOR TOBACCO, SWAINSBORO, GA.

Mr. DURDEN. My name is Homer S. Durden, Jr., of Swainsboro, Ga. I am the attorney for the Georgia Commodity Commission for Tobacco and I am speaking for Mr. Otis G. Turner, chairman, who is unable to attend this meeting because of illness.

The Georgia Commodity Commission for Tobacco is opposed to this proposed legislation on the grounds that first, the law already provides for quotas on tobacco on the basis of poundage in that the national marketing quota is determined by the Secretary of Agriculture and he proclaims the number of pounds of tobacco for the succeeding year on the basis of poundage which, under current law, he may convert to acreage basis when making the allocation of tobacco to the various States. This conversion from poundage as based on the national marketing quota to acreage to the individual State quotas is permissive and is not mandatory and it is our contention and belief that no additional legislation is necessary to establish a poundage quota basis.

Further, we oppose the proposed legislation in that no consideration is given to the farmers whose crops do not go into Stabilization. In the type 14 belt, less than 2 percent of the Flue-cured tobacco goes into Stabilization. In other belts as much as 43.6 percent goes into Stabilization. It is the tobacco held in Stabilization that primarily constitutes the surplus faced by the tobacco industry today. Of the 961 million pounds of tobacco held in Stabilization, approximately 17 million pounds represents type 14 Flue-cured tobacco. We strongly urge and believe that the quota should be adjusted taking into consideration the amount a farmer places in Stabilization from his production and sale of tobacco, and that it is not equitable to cut the quota of farmers who are not contributing to surplus in the same percentage and amount as for the farmer who is contributing to the surplus.

Rather than new legislation, we feel that a proper administration of the current law is in order. We are familiar with the statement presented by Mr. William L. Lanier, president of the Georgia Farm Bureau Federation, and adopt his presentation as ours.

I will be glad to answer any questions. I realize you are working against a time deadline.

Senator JORDAN. We are glad to have you, sir. Mr. Lanier made a fine statement yesterday. Senator TALMADGE?

Senator TALMADGE. Yes. Mr. Durden, did I understand your testimony to be that the Secretary of Agriculture now has the authority under the present law to set acreage quotas in accordance with types?

Mr. DURDEN. Yes, sir.

Senator TALMADGE. Do you have a copy of that act with you?

Mr. DURDEN. In my code. I don't have it with me.

Senator TALMADGE. Will you provide it for insertion in the record?

Mr. DURDEN. I can give you the code section, Senator.

Senator JORDAN. We have the code right here. What is the section number?

Mr. DURDEN. 7 U.S.C. 1331 I believe, or 1313.

Mr. HARKER T. STANTON (committee counsel). Section 301(b)(15) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 provides that any one or more types of tobacco shall be treated as a "kind of tobacco" for purposes of the act if the Secretary finds there is a difference in supply and demand conditions which requires different marketing adjustments. Section 313(1) provides for increasing quotas and allotments for farms producing particular types of tobacco where necessary to make available adequate supplies of those types.

The Secretary also has authority to apportion quotas on a poundage basis.

Sections 313 (a) and (b) provide for the proclamation of national marketing quotas their apportionment to States and farms on a poundage basis.

Subsection (g), which was added to section 313 in 1939, authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to convert State marketing quotas into State acreage allotments, and allot them to farms on a basis similar to that provided for the apportionment of poundage quotas.

Mr. DURDEN. That is permissive.

Mr. STANTON. Yes. The Secretary has the authority to make farm allotments on either an acreage basis or a poundage basis.

Senator TALMADGE. I would like to incorporate that in the record, if it is your contention.

Mr. DURDEN. Yes, sir.

(The information submitted by Mr. Stanton is as follows:)

"THE AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938

"SEC. 301. (a) * * *

"(b) Definitions Applicable to One or More Commodities.—For the purpose of this title—

* * * * *

"(15) 'Tobacco' means each one of the kinds of tobacco listed below comprising the types specified as classified in Service and Regulatory Announcement Numbered 118 of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department:

"Flue-cured tobacco, comprising types 11, 12, 13, and 14;

"Fire-cured tobacco, comprising types 21, 22, 23, and 24;

"Dark air-cured tobacco, comprising types 35 and 36;

"Virginia sun-cured tobacco, comprising type 37;

"Burley tobacco, comprising type 31;

"Maryland tobacco, comprising type 32;

"Cigar-filler and cigar-binder tobacco, comprising types 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 51, 52, 53, 54, and 55;

"Cigar-filler tobacco, comprising type 41.

"The provisions of this title shall apply to each of such kinds of tobacco severally: *Provided*, That any one or more of the types comprising any such kind of tobacco shall be treated as a 'kind of tobacco' for the purposes of this Act if the Secretary finds there is a difference in supply and demand conditions as among such types of tobacco which results in a difference in the adjustments needed in the marketings thereof in order to maintain supplies in line with demand: *Provided further*, That with respect to the 1958 and subsequent crops, type 21 (Virginia) Fire-cured tobacco shall be treated as a 'kind of tobacco' for the purposes of all of the provisions of this title, except that for the purposes of section 312(c) of this title, types 21, 22, and 23, Fire-cured tobacco shall be treated as one 'kind of tobacco'.

* * * * *

"APPORTIONMENT OF NATIONAL MARKETING QUOTA

"SEC. 313. (a) The national marketing quota for tobacco established pursuant to the provisions of section 312, less the amount to be allotted under subsection (c) of this section, shall be apportioned by the Secretary among the several States on the basis of the total production of tobacco in each State during the five calendar years immediately preceding the calendar year in which the quota is proclaimed (plus in applicable years, the normal production on the acreage diverted under previous agricultural adjustment and conservation programs), with such adjustments as are determined to be necessary to make correction for abnormal conditions of production, for small farms, and for trends in production, giving due consideration to seed bed and other plant diseases during such five-year period. * * *

"(b) The Secretary shall provide, through the local committees, for the allotment of the marketing quotas for any State among the farms on which tobacco is produced, on the basis of the following: Past marketing of tobacco, making due allowance for drought, flood, hail, other abnormal weather conditions, plant bed, and other diseases; land, labor, and equipment available for the production of tobacco; crop-rotation practices; and the soil and other physical factors affecting the production of tobacco: *Provided*, That, except for farms on which for the first time in five years tobacco is produced to be marketed in the marketing year for which the quota is effective, the marketing quota for any farm shall not be used less than the smaller of either (1) three thousand two hundred pounds, in the case of Flue-cured tobacco, and two thousand four hundred pounds, in the case of other kinds of tobacco, or (2) the average tobacco production for the farm during the preceding three years, plus the average normal production of any tobacco acreage diverted under agricultural adjustment and conservation programs during such preceding three years.

* * * * *

"(g) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the Secretary on the basis of average yield per acre of tobacco for the State during the five years last preceding the year in which the national marketing quota is proclaimed, adjusted for abnormal conditions of production, may convert the State marketing quota into a State acreage allotment, and allot the same through the local committees among farms on the basis of the factors set forth in subsection (b), using past acreage (harvested and diverted) in lieu of the past marketing of tobacco; and the Secretary on the basis of the national average yield during the same period, similarly adjusted, may also convert into an acreage allotment the amount reserved from the national quota pursuant to the provisions of subsection (c), and on the basis of the factors set forth in subsection (c) and the past tobacco experience of the farm operator, allot the same through the local committees among farms on which no tobacco was produced during the last five years. Any acreage of tobacco harvested in excess of the farm acreage allotment for the year 1955, or any subsequent crop shall not be taken into account in establishing State and farm acreage allotments. Except for farms last mentioned or a farm operated, controlled, or directed by a person who also operates, controls, or directs another farm on which tobacco is produced, the farm-acreage allotment shall be increased by the smaller of (1) 20 per centum of such allotment or (2) the percentage by which the normal yield of such allotments (as determined through the local committees in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary) is less than three thousand two hundred pounds, in the case of Flue-cured tobacco, and two thousand four hundred pounds in the case of other kinds of tobacco: *Provided*, That the normal yield of the estimated number of acres so added to farm acreage allotments in any State shall be considered as a part of the State marketing quota in applying the proviso in subsection (a). The actual production of the acreage allotment established for a farm pursuant to this subsection shall be the amount of the farm marketing quota. If any amount of tobacco shall be marketed as having been produced on the acreage allotment for any farm which in fact was produced on a different farm, the acreage allotments next established for both such farms shall be reduced by that percentage which such amount was of the respective farm marketing quota, except that such reduction for any such farm shall not be made if the Secretary through the local committees finds that no person connected with such farm caused, aided, or acquiesced in such marketing; and if proof of the disposition of any amount of tobacco is not furnished as required by the Secretary or if any producer on the farm files, or aids or acquiesces in the filing of, any false report with respect to the acreage of tobacco grown on the farm required by regulations issued pursuant to this Act, the acreage allotment next established for the farm on which such tobacco is produced shall be reduced by a percentage similarly computed. If in any calendar year more than one crop of tobacco is grown from (1) the same tobacco plants or (2) different tobacco plants, and is harvested for marketing from the same acreage of a farm, the acreage allotment next established for such farm shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the acreage from which more than one crop of tobacco has been so grown and harvested.

* * * * *

"(i) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, whenever after investigation the Secretary determines with respect to any kind of tobacco that a substantial difference exists in the usage or market outlets for any one or more of the types comprising such kind of tobacco and that the quantity of tobacco of such type or types to be produced under the marketing quotas and acreage allotments established pursuant to this section would not be sufficient to provide an adequate supply for estimated market demands and carryover requirements for such type or types of tobacco, the Secretary shall increase the marketing quotas and acreage allotments for farms producing such type or types of tobacco in the preceding year to the extent necessary to make available a supply of such type or types of tobacco adequate to meet such demands and carryover requirements. The increase in farm marketing quotas and acreage allotments shall be made on the basis of the production of such type or types of tobacco during the period of years considered in establishing farm marketing quotas and acreage allotments for such kind of tobacco. The additional production authorized by this subsection shall be in addition to the national marketing quota established for such kind of tobacco pursuant to section 312 of this Act. The increase in acreage under this subsection shall not be considered in establishing future State or farm acreage allotments."

Senator TALMADGE. Is it true you are representing the Georgia Tobacco Commodity Commission, which has filed a lawsuit against the Secretary?

Mr. DURDEN. Yes, sir.

Senator TALMADGE. Is it in the nature of a mandamus?

Mr. DURDEN. Yes, sir.

Senator TALMADGE. Mandamusing him to take action in accordance with that law?

Mr. DURDEN. Not that particular section of the law, Senator TALMADGE. The lawsuit is based on the legal theory that under the law where there is a difference in supply-and-demand conditions amongst the types of Flue-cured tobacco of such a degree as to warrant a difference needed in the adjustment for supply, to bring it in line with demand, the Secretary treat that type or types of Flue-cured tobacco as a separate kind of tobacco.

We contend, using Government figures, that in 1963 Georgia had 2.8 percent type 14 Flue-cured tobacco to go into stabilization, where some of the other belts put in as much as 46 percent, and that there is such a difference in the supply-and-demand conditions that we should treat type 14 as a separate kind of tobacco.

Senator TALMADGE. In other words, your contention is they ought to reduce where the surplus tobacco lies?

Mr. DURDEN. Correct.

Senator TALMADGE. And not where there is no surplus tobacco.

Mr. DURDEN. That is correct.

Senator TALMADGE. What has happened to your lawsuit?

Mr. DURDEN. The oral arguments were held before the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in Atlanta on October 5.

Senator TALMADGE. What happened in the lower court?

Mr. DURDEN. The lower court ruled with the plaintiff and joined with the Secretary.

Senator TALMADGE. You prevailed in the Federal district court?

Mr. DURDEN. We did, sir.

Senator TALMADGE. And the Department of Agriculture appealed?

Mr. DURDEN. Yes, sir.

Senator TALMADGE. And that appeal is now pending in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals?

Mr. DURDEN. Correct, sir.

Senator TALMADGE. That is the status of it now?

Mr. DURDEN. Yes, sir.

Senator TALMADGE. So if this bill is passed, what would that do to your lawsuit?

Mr. DURDEN. I think it would legislate it out of court, sir.

Senator TALMADGE. You, of course, recognize that the tobacco industry is in a serious condition by oversupply?

Mr. DURDEN. Yes, sir. I am fully aware of that. I might say that my family, we have been growing tobacco since 1928. My father used to be a director of the Tobacco Division for the Department of Agriculture, and I reckon I have slept on about as many piles of tobacco waiting for it to be sold as anybody in this room, and I am fully aware of the situation, what we are faced with.

However, I say, that we did not create it in the type-14 area. It was created elsewhere, and we should not be punished by taking these cuts, which is through no fault of our own.

Senator TALMADGE. You say that the present law authorizes a present remedy to reduce quotas of tobacco which is now in surplus?

Mr. DURDEN. Yes, sir.

Senator TALMADGE. And that you have filed suit under that theory of present law, and prevailed in the district Federal court, and the Department has appealed it to the fifth circuit?

Mr. DURDEN. Yes, sir.

Senator TALMADGE. And you think if the Secretary took action in accordance with your theory of the law, that the supply of tobacco wherein the surplus lies would be reduced and therein the taxpayers would fail to lose money on it, and the farmers that produce quality tobacco could continue to do so.

Mr. DURDEN. Yes, sir.

Senator TALMADGE. That is your argument?

Mr. DURDEN. That is my argument.

Senator TALMADGE. That was the substantial argument I believe of Mr. Lanier representing the Georgia Farm Bureau Federation yesterday.

Mr. DURDEN. Yes, sir.

Senator TALMADGE. Also, substantially the argument, though it didn't go into the legal details, of the group who appeared for the South Carolina Farm Bureau this morning.

Mr. DURDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I promised first to yield to the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I should like to answer one question with respect to the provision in the bill calling for an acreage-poundage basis. Th acreage would be increased by the bill, but the poundage would be reduced. A farmer could grow only so many pounds.

Going back to the attorney of the Department of Agriculture, and what he said in committee—I was present and heard all the discussions—I do not believe that the attorney said this provision would change the law. It would not change the law at all. This would give the farmer an opportunity to vote on whether he wished to go on a poundage-acreage basis or to stick to the old law.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator means acreage-poundage basis, does he not?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Yes. It does not affect the present law at all. He would still have the right to sue if he wished to sue under the old law.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I refer to page 195 of the hearings. Mr. Durden testified before the committee as follows:

> Senator TALMADGE. You prevailed in the Federal district court?
>
> Mr. DURDEN. We did, sir.
>
> Senator TALMADGE. And the Department of Agriculture appealed?
>
> Mr. DURDEN. Yes, sir.
>
> Senator TALMADGE. And that appeal is now pending in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals?
>
> Mr. DURDEN. Correct, sir.
>
> Senator TALMADGE. That is the status of it now?
>
> Mr. DURDEN. Yes, sir.

Since then the court has handed down its opinion. The farmers won.

> Senator TALMADGE. So if this bill is passed, what would that do to your lawsuit?
>
> Mr. DURDEN. I think it would legislate it out of court, sir.

Counsel for the farmers believes that if the bill is passed it will legislate them out of court. He was a good enough lawyer to win the case over the Department of Agriculture in the District Court for the Southern District of Georgia, and also was able to obtain a unanimous decision in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. His decision is in complete variance with the opinion of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I agree with what the Senator has said. I am not quoting Mr. Durden. He is the lawyer for the Georgia Tobacco Growers. I am talking about the lawyers from the Department of Agriculture. My understanding is that the bill would not repeal the present law. I am sure it would not. Conditions would still remain as they are, whether the bill is passed or not. So far as the farmers being able to sue is concerned, they would still be able to sue.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, my comment was not with respect to the hearings or the statement of the lawyers at the hearings. It was with reference to the statement of the chief counsel at our executive meeting when we were marking up the bill. The Senator remembers this, I am sure. He was there.

The question was whether the Secretary of Agriculture had appealed the case. The lawyer said he had not. The next question was, "Why not?"

The answer was that he had not decided whether to appeal it or wait to see whether the pending bill would be enacted. The Senator from North Carolina was present. If he knows of any different construction that can be placed on what the attorney said, I shall yield to him to state it. However, I was sitting as close to the attorney as I am to the able senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN]. I am always close to the senior Senator from North Carolina except that in this instance I am sorry that he has gone astray in connection with this case. I know perfectly well what the attorney said at that time.

I now yield to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina to state whether he has a different recollection of what was said.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. My recollection is he said that the problem would remain regardless of whether the bill was passed or not. He said the Secretary had not decided whether he would appeal the case to the Supreme Court. The decision had been handed down only a short time before.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator's recollection is substantially the same as mine. He said that the Secretary had not made up his mind as to whether he would appeal. He also said that he would wait to see whether the proposed legislation was passed.

I am now glad to yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will permit me to state one factor relative to our present tobacco situation, which I do not believe has been referred to so far in the debate. It goes back 5 years, when the United States put restrictions on the importation of oil from other countries. I was in Venezuela shortly thereafter. Some of the officials there were not happy over our putting restrictions on their selling oil to the United States. They said the only thing for them to do, in order to keep their trade in balance, would be to buy less from the United States. I asked one of these officials what those articles would be. It developed that they would try to produce more tobacco and buy less tobacco from us, also less rice and less dairy products.

As a result, the record of the last full year will show that their purchases of tobacco from the United States fell off 80 percent. Purchases of rice fell off about the same percentage. Purchases of dairy products fell off enough so that their purchases of tobacco, rice, and other farm commodities from the United States were cut $13 million worth.

When we consider that $13 million and add to it the $40 million which the people of Florida and the five New England States have to pay extra for domestically produced oil which comes over devious transportation routes, we find that we are paying a pretty high price for that little contribution to a few of our oil companies, including the loss of our tobacco market in countries which formerly bought nearly all their tobacco from the United States. That is one reason why our tobacco supply is going up and why the cost of petroleum products has gone up in certain States.

I thought this should be pointed out. The loss of our tobacco markets is not due entirely to the quality of the tobacco.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield. First, I should like to thank the distinguished Senator from the maple country and the country of McIntosh apples for the contribution which he has made. It shows that we are all one big country, and artificial action often works hardship on some of our own people and at the same time hardship on some people offshore. Unexpected results often follow.

I am talking today not because I am happy to break up the unity that has customarily prevailed among the tobacco producers, but because I think a great hardship would be imposed on a certain group of tobacco farmers who have not contributed to the present terrible situation and who ought not to be punished in the way proposed.

Mr. President, not claiming any particular magnanimity for myself, I merely wish to remind my distinguished friends from North Carolina that when they had a somewhat similar situation in which it was shown that the so-called baseball ground peanuts were selling to better advantage than the smaller or oil peanuts, I was glad to join in voting out of the committee and in approving on the floor of the Senate, with a short statement, the act which gave the Secretary specific directions to differentiate, because of the market, between those two different products.

There had been shown a great difference between the acceptability of the large peanuts and the smaller oil-filled peanuts.

Only last year my distinguished friends were laboring in the vineyard for their constituents. I never blame them for doing so. I remember having carried their battle not only in the committee, but on the floor of the Senate in behalf of greater experimentation in the field of tobacco. My recollection is—and I see my distinguished friend from Kentucky is present—that we provided an amount of over $2 million in the appropriation bill which I had the honor to handle both in committee and on the floor in order to step up experimentation for a great commodity which was in bad shape. My recollection is that the amount appropriated, which was something over $2 million, went to the two great States of North Carolina and Kentucky. I was glad to help get it there, because they are the centers of tobacco production, both Flue-cured and burley tobacco. I shall not hesitate to do so again.

I am sorry we are having this argument because I think anything that breaks down harmony in an industry of this kind is unfortunate. But I cannot sit idly by and see the producers of my State, who have not contributed to this surplus, who have already planted, and who, including the producers in Georgia and South Carolina, have won their case so far in the district court and in the Circuit Court of Appeals, in effect legislated partially out of existence for the benefit of other portions of the industry which have brought about this surplus production—and there is no doubt of it. The facts that I have read into the RECORD show that, and no one can dispute it. They have created this surplus, and we should not be punished for their dereliction in this matter.

Mr. President, because I did not wish to have a breakdown of harmony in committee, I made a proposal which I thought was fair to the distinguished junior Senator from North Carolina. I asked him for a year's extension for Flue-cured tobacco of the type that the able and distinguished Senators from Tennessee and Kentucky had already obtained for burley tobacco, which has not yet been planted and will not be planted for some time to come—they had insisted that it be applicable to burley tobacco only and the bill should not be made effective in 1965 for burley tobacco but only, for the first time, for 1966, I said that I would not fight the bill on the floor if this was done. I probably would have to vote against it. But it certainly would give my people, along with others, an opportunity to study the situation and to vote as they saw fit on the subject of a referendum next year.

But after a referendum had been voted and approved by more than two-thirds of those participating and that referendum was upon a basis proposed by no one else but the Secretary of Agriculture and his people as the remedy that was needed to meet the situation and was voted in December, then to come along after we have planted—and we are the only part of the industry which has planted—and put this hardship upon us is not fair. That is not equity, and no one can stand on the floor of the Senate and say that it is equity.

Mr. President, I am glad to yield to my good friend from North Carolina if he wishes me to yield.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I appreciate all the things which the distinguished Senator from Florida has had to say about the bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator remembers my proposal made to him, does he not?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I do. The Department of Agriculture did not think it was a good thing to put it off for the reason which I shall state.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is the Department of Agriculture deciding this question, or is the Senate deciding it now?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported the bill.

The Department had suggested that the bill should be passed in the way it is reported this year because we all know that when there is a prospect of a reduction based upon poundage, acreage, or some other basis, the farmer is as smart as any other businessman in the United States, and he is smarter than a great many of them. Therefore, this year he would produce every pound of tobacco he could produce on the acreage allotted to him.

A great many records and tests show that farmers can increase their poundage to over 4,000 pounds per acre—not on sorry land—but they can do it; it has been done. Last year 2,200 pounds an acre were produced.

They honestly believe that if that situation should prevail another year, a large surplus will be put in stock this year, and the program will come into further jeopardy.

That is the reason for the desire to have the referendum.

The Senator will remember that in 1955 the farmers, under a 3-year acreage program which they voted upon at that time, came back and voted again, under circumstances similar to those that now exist, further to reduce their acreage because of the great surplus that they had built up at that particular time as a result of the 1954–55 crop, I believe. It was an inferior grade of tobacco, which was later dumped on the market at a very cheap price.

They did the same thing again.

The proposed legislation would not do anything to the farmer. The farmer has a right to decide whether he wants the program or whether he does not want it. I have not talked with a single farmer—and I have spoken with a great many of them—who wants to see this tobacco program with support prices get away from him because if it does, he knows that he will never get it back, and tobacco will be in a serious situation. In North Carolina we have earnings of $1.2 billion in agricultural products each year.

A little more than half of that is tobacco income. Georgia produces much of that income. Much of that is their income.

The Senator from Georgia has pointed out that South Carolina does the same thing. It means a great deal to the economy of the sections that raise tobacco. The bill would stop the continual cutting of acreage of farmers, particularly tobacco farmers, who have a half-acre minimum, below which it is not feasible to cut.

If the Flue-cured tobacco producers had such protection, they would not be worried about what is happening now. But if we continue to cut their acreage, pretty soon the Flue-cured tobacco producers will not have any acreage left, when we consider the small acreage that they have.

I observe that my distinguished colleague from North Carolina wishes to make a statement. I should like to yield to him, if I have the floor.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I should like to ask my colleague from North Carolina to turn to page 105 of the hearings, to see if my understanding is correct that the Flue-cured production of North Carolina has been cut, while that of Florida has been increasing.

On page 105, with respect to U.S. Flue-cured tobacco, does not the record show that in 1956 Florida produced 21,682,000 pounds?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the table show that in 1964 Florida produced 22,239,000 pounds?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Is not that an increase of 557,000 pounds?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Going to the table for North Carolina, type 11 tobacco, does not the table show that in 1956 North Carolina produced 346,175,000 pounds?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. In 1964, did not North Carolina produce 352,600,000 pounds?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. That was an increase of 16,425 pounds, was it not?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. As to type 12 tobacco, does not the table show that North Carolina in 1956 produced 496,320,000 pounds?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the table show that in 1964 North Carolina produced 479,750,000 pounds of type 12 tobacco?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Is not that a decrease of 16,570 pounds?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Going to the following page, page 106, does not the table show that North Carolina, in 1956, produced 119 million pounds of type 13 tobacco?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the table show that in 1964 North Carolina produced 117,500,000 pounds of type 13 tobacco?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Is not that a decrease of 1,500 pounds of type 13 tobacco?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It is a very small decrease, but it is a decrease, nevertheless.

Mr. ERVIN. If we add 16,570,000 pounds to 1,500,000 pounds, what is the total?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It is 18,070,000 pounds.

Mr. ERVIN. And what is the difference between that total and the total of type 11 tobacco which showed an increase of 16,425,000 pounds?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. It is a little over a thousand pounds.

Mr. ERVIN. In other words, the calculation shows that North Carolina, instead of having a large increase between 1956 and 1964, sustained a decrease in production 1,645,000 pounds, whereas Florida's production increased by about 557,000 pounds.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. That is what the figures appear to show.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the figures produced by my dear friend the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], are interesting, but they simply do not apply to this situation at all. This trouble has arisen in the past 4 years.

If Senators will look again at the same tables from which the senior Senator from North Carolina quoted only the figures for 1956 and 1964, 9 years later, they will see that in the case of each of the types of tobacco produced in North Carolina, the production has gone away up in that period of time. They will find also that production per acre has gone away up. That appears in the table just before the one the senior Senator from North Carolina was quoting from.

For instance, as to type 11, the table shows production going away up from 1,670 pounds per acre in 1961 to 2,150 pounds per acre in 1964.

With respect to type 12 tobacco, the increase was from 1,875 pounds per acre in 1961 to 2,375 pounds per acre in 1964.

As to type 13, the increase was from 1,900 pounds per acre in 1961 to 2,350 pounds per acre in 1964.

Another thing as to which the Senator from North Carolina has probably not been advised is that the total acreage has been greatly reduced from the year at which he began, 1956, through 1964. The plain facts—I have already placed them in the RECORD in some detail—are that in the 4 years in which these tremendous surpluses have been amassed, the areas amassing them have been North Carolina and Virginia, as will be seen by looking at the tables of the four types of tobacco produced in that particular part of the Flue-cured tobacco area. The figures themselves will explain the truth of that statement, whereas in the case of both Georgia and Florida, if the Senator wishes to go over those tables again, he will see that the total production has diminished.

He will see also that the amount going to Government warehouses is still very small. In 1964, it was only 1.7 percent for all the type 14 tobacco as against an average of 19.3 for all types of tobacco, including the 1.7 percent.

There is no question that it is the great producing areas in North Carolina and Virginia that have created the surplus that has brought about a crisis. The legislation now proposed is drafted in such a way as to bear down the hardest upon the small, indefensible areas which have not created the surplus; whose product has been sold to the extent that only 1.7 percent of it went to Government warehouses last year; and whose crops have already been planted and who are, therefore, to be subjected to particular hardships.

There is no question about what has happened. I regret that it has happened. I have been trying to move in a way that would help in this situation. The whole industry seemed to be moving in that direction by cutting acreage about 19.5 percent in the referendum held in December. But now a large part of the industry does not want to accept that decision. It wants to have a smaller acreage reduction and wants to have, instead, a poundage figure established not in accord with what it has been producing, but in accord with what Florida and Georgia have been producing per acre.

It is too bad to see this kind of punitive treatment applied to people who have won their case in court, who have proceeded according to the referendum already adopted, but which they did not like, a referendum which cut their acreage by 19.5 percent; and who will be forced, if the cut is passed and if the referendum is approved, let us say, a month from now, to go under that new system after every acre that is producing type 14 tobacco will have been planted. Everybody knows that is the case.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I rise in opposition to the substitute.

Before I discuss it generally, I point out that what we sell is pounds, not acres. Between 1956 and 1964, the tobacco growers of Florida increased to a slight degree the poundage of tobacco which they were producing, whereas the tobacco growers in North Carolina decreased to a slight degree the tobacco which they were producing.

Now, the figures indicate that the production of the Florida type 14 kept increasing constantly, or virtually so, from 1956 to 1964, whereas North Carolina decreased its production of this crop for the few years following 1956. Thereafter, North Carolinians evidently learned something from our smart friends in Florida, and stepped up their production. But they never did reach the point where they exceeded their relative production as compared with Florida in 1956.

I deeply regret that my good friends from Florida and Georgia are on the other side of this question. As the Senator from Florida pointed out—they have usually stood shoulder to shoulder with us. What we are trying to do in this bill is to end the increase in production and bring about a decrease.

I think all of us agree that tobacco growing is in a serious state. While acreage has been cut—several times in Georgia, Florida, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and everywhere that Flue-cured tobacco is grown—those farmers who were financially able to do so, and had a sufficient acreage allotment, fertilized their tobacco, and, in many cases, irrigated their tobacco. Those farmers would be placed by this bill under more stringent requirements than the smaller growers in Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, and elsewhere.

This is a bill to save a program upon which 750,000 American farm families depend for their livelihood in whole or in part. The ones who have contributed most to the increase in the tobacco production, regardless of whether they live in Florida, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, Virginia, or elsewhere, have been those with the largest acreage allotments. They have been financially able to employ fertilizer and irrigation to a high degree and, thus multiply their production above that of others.

The bill would make more drastic cuts in the amount of tobacco which they could produce for the market. By so doing, it would contribute to the salvation of a farm program which is essential to the prosperity of the South Atlantic States.

My friends charge North Carolina and Virginia with being responsible for more tobacco going into stabilization. Tobacco buying is a peculiar profession. The work of a tobacco buyer is seasonal in nature. No tobacco company engaged in the manufacturing of tobacco is going to buy tobacco after it has bought its supply for the year to put in storage for aging.

I could use a very simple illustration on this point. When a man sits down to the table to eat, he quits eating when his appetite is satisfied. This simple statement illustrates why tobacco buyers and tobacco companies quit buying tobacco when their annual quotas are purchased, and why this bill ought to pass to curtail the production of tobacco above that required for domestic use and export.

Each tobacco company has a quota of tobacco which it is to buy during a given market year. When the tobacco company reaches its quota, it will stop buying. When the tobacco buyer buys his quota for his company, he will stop buying tobacco and his holiday will start so far as tobacco buying is concerned.

What happens? The markets open earlier in Florida and Georgia than they do in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia. The natural thing for the tobacco buyer to do, if he finds tobaco that is suitable for him, is to fill his quota as early as possible. That is human nature. When he reaches the quota assigned to him by his company, his tobacco-buying days are over for that season.

Good Flue-cured tobacco is grown in Florida, Georgia, Alabama, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia. The overwhelming amount of tobacco grown in all of those States is good tobacco.

We have type 14 tobacco merely because Flue-cured tobacco grown in Alabama, Florida, and Georgia is so designated. Every year, North Carolina tobacco growers take parts of their crops, which have matured early down to the Georgia market and sell it as type 14. There is very little, if any, difference between the types. One type can be passed off on the market as type 14, or some other type, because the tobacco is similar and the definition of type 14 is artificial.

While I am on that subject, I wish to say that I agree with my colleague in that I do not see how the lawsuit would be affected substantially by the bill. The lawsuit is based on the proposition that in determining whether there is an oversupply of Flue-cured tobacco, the Department of Agriculture, should treat each type of Flue-cured tobacco separately and make separate determinations to each of them and make separate allotments on that basis rather than upon all Flue-cured tobacco, as it has done in the past.

The decision of the district court was that in determining whether there is an oversupply of tobacco and whether there should be a reduction in the production of tobacco, the Department of Agriculture should appraise each type of tobacco seperately and make allotments on that basis—despite its contrary practice in the past and despite the fact that all types are used to manufacture the same cigarettes.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. TALMADGE. I drafted a salvation or preservation clause that would protect the rights of the litigants in this matter. If it has the approval of the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina and the distinguished Senator in charge of the bill, the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], I would like to offer it at this time with the consent of the Senator from North Carolina, and have it adopted. It reads as follows:

> SEC. 4. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the authority or the responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture under Section 301(b)(15) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to providing that different types of tobacco shall be treated as different kinds of tobacco or with respect to increasing allotments or quotas for farms producing certain types of tobacco.

Will the Senator agree to that, or will the Senator in charge of the bill agree to it?

Mr. ERVIN. I did not understand the last part.

Mr. TALMADGE. I show the draft to the distinguished Senator. It was prepared by counsel for the Committee on Agriculture, Mr. Harker Stanton, with the understanding that it would protect the rights of the litigants in my State in the case that was pending, or has recently been pending, in the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mr. ERVIN. I am not in charge of the bill, but if I were, I would not accept the amendment. In the first place, it has not been before the committee——

Mr. TALMADGE. I understood the Senator to say that the rights of the litigants would be protected.

Mr. ERVIN. There is language in the draft with respect to increases "in allotments or quotas for farms producing certain types of tobacco."

Mr. TALMADGE. That is the language of the 1938 Agricultural Adjustment Act. I thought the Senator was arguing eloquently and earnestly, as he does in any cause he espouses, that it would not affect any of the litigants.

Mr. ERVIN. If I were in charge of the bill, I would not agree to any language that would be subject to the interpretation that it would not authorize any change in the allotment of farms.

Mr. TALMADGE. That is the language of the Agricultural Adjustment Act. That is what the lawsuit is all about.

Mr. ERVIN. That would defeat the purpose of the bill, which is to change quotas.

Mr. TALMADGE. The Senator admits that the purpose of the bill is to kill my farmers' lawsuit.

Mr. ERVIN. No, I do not.

Mr. TALMADGE. I was hoping the Senator would have convinced himself of his argument.

Mr. ERVIN. I have, but I would not be agreeable, if I were floor manager of the bill, to accepting language that would be susceptible to an interpretation that quotas could not be changed. That question would still be open to the determination of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I understand that the Senator has taken the position that there is no substantial difference between types except as to where they are produced. I notice that the series of compilations from which he is quoting, on pages 105 and 106 of the printed hearing record, shows three different types with reference to North Carolina—North Carolina type 11; North Carolina, type 12; North Carolina, type 13.

Is the Senator contending that there is no difference between types 11, 12, and 13, all of which are shown as being produced in that same State?

Mr. ERVIN. I am contending that tobacco classified as type 11 can qualify in most instances as type 14, so far as chemical and natural composition of the leaves are concerned. Type 14 is an artificial name given to Flue-cured tobacco grown in Alabama, Georgia, and Florida. I also contend that some North Carolina tobacco growers who grow types of tobacco bearing other designations take it down to Georgia, where it is accepted as type 14 on the Georgia market.

There is no discrimination here as between Flue-cured tobacco and burley, because burley has not reached a stage of over-production comparable to that of Flue-cured tobacco. That statement is made manifest by the fact that there are approximately 252.3 million pounds of burley in Government stocks, whereas there are 961.1 million pounds of Flue-cured tobacco in Government stocks. The situation in burley is not nearly as desperate as in the Flue-cured field.

There is one other thing to be said. As I pointed out, tobacco buyers start buying on the Florida and Georgia markets. As soon as they get their quotas, they stop buying. As soon as tobacco companies get their quota, they stop buying.

As a result of overproduction in all States which grow Flue-cured tobacco, we have over 900 million pounds of such tobacco on hand.

There is another reason why Florida and Georgia tobacco is bought first. North Carolina markets handle so much tobacco that there is a rule under which Federal authorities will not inspect and grade North Carolina tobacco after the first 3 or 4 days unless that tobacco is tied. Flue-cured tobacco is sold untied in Florida, and it is sold untied in Georgia. It is sold tied in North Carolina because of this practice of the Federal inspectors.

It costs $6 a hundredweight, in labor, to tie the tobacco. Consequently, the tobacco on the North Carolina market costs about $6 a hundredweight more than does the untied tobacco in Florida and Georgia. Tobacco companies naturally prefer to buy tobacco which is low in cost in filling their quotas.

The bill before the Senate would prevent the continual and piling up of tobacco surpluses because of the ability of those having large acreage allotments to use fertilizer and irrigation and thus increase their production at the expense of small tobacco growers.

The bill should be passed as soon as possible in order to give the growers of Flue-cured tobacco an opportunity to say whether they prefer this type of bill, which will make controls work where they have not worked in the acreage allotment field.

Passage of the bill would promote the welfare of the average tobacco grower, and especially that of the small grower, not only in North Carolina, not only in Virginia, not only in South Carolina, but in Georgia and Florida also, and would contribute to the saving of one of the best and most essential agricultural programs that we have.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator think it is equitable, under this bill, to have growers who produce Flue-cured tobacco able to market, with price support, only 10 percent of overproduction of their tonnage or poundage quota without penalty, whereas the producers of burley tobacco are allowed to market 20 percent overproduction of the poundage that is allotted to them without penalty? What is the equity between the two different products with respect to marketing above the total poundage allotted?

Mr. ERVIN. I believe that the equity arises out of the fact that we have so much more Flue-cured tobacco in Government stocks than burley. We can talk about type 14, type 11, and all these other types of tobacco. The fact is that all of them are used to manufacture the same cigarettes which are smoked by the same individuals. There are no great difference between these different types of tobacco. This is a bill to save the tobacco program for all who grow Flue-cured tobacco.

ALLEGED DIVERSION OF U.S. AID FUNDS INTENDED FOR IRAN

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina yield?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in May of 1963, a man representing himself to be the Khaibar Khan contacted some other Members of the Senate and reported a large diversion of U.S. aid funds intended for Iran. He was referred to the Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations. At his request, the subcommittee gave him the opportunity to testify under oath in executive session. This man, who is also known as Khaibar Khan Goodarzian, represented himself to be the leader of a large group of Iranian tribesmen. In all, three executive sessions of the subcommittee were held to accommodate him. Each session was at his own request.

Khaibar Khan and his secretary and associate, Miss Mariam Kushan, presented the subcommittee with documents which, if genuine, would have indicated large-scale diversion of the aid funds provided by our Government for the assistance of Iran. The documents had allegedly been secured surreptitiously. These documents, almost all dated in 1962, included photocopies of 137 purported checks—face side only—ranging in amount from $100,000 to $2 million, in the total amount of $102 million for that year. They are purportedly drawn on the Swiss bank account of the Pahlavi Foundation of Iran—a country development program of the Shah of Iran—and payable to numerous prominent Americans, Iranians, and others.

The documents also included a photocopy of a purported bank statement of the Pahlavi Foundation account in the Union Bank of Switzerland, the entries on which corresponded with the checks. Notwithstanding the fantastic nature of these allegations, and the testimony of Khaibar Khan and Miss Kushan under oath, the subcommittee felt an obligation to examine into the facts and seek to establish the truth.

Every effort was made to substantiate any part of the documentation but those efforts proved fruitless. In response to the subcommittee inquiry, Dr. A. Schaefer and Dr. A. Hartman, officials of the Union Bank of Switzerland, wrote saying: First, the Pahlavi Foundation had never had an account at its head office, its Geneva branch or at any other branch of its bank; second, the alleged bank statement was type whereas the bank uses only bookkeeping machines; and third, the number of the account did not conform to the type of numbering system used by the bank.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a copy of the letter to which I have just referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNION BANK OF SWITZERLAND,
Zurich, February 14, 1964.

Subject: The Pahlavi Foundation of Iran.

Hon. JOHN L. MCCLELLAN,
Chairman, Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MCCLELLAN: We thank you for your letter of January 31, 1964, containing inquiries regarding the authenticity of copies of bank statements allegedly drawn up by our Geneva branch for the Pahlavi Foundation of Iran. With the specific desire of assisting in the dissipation of false accusations against the Government of Iran, we requested the authorization of the Director of the Pahlavi Foundation to permit us to speak in its behalf and we are prepared in this highly unusual instance to answer your questions to the fullest of our knowledge.

The type face appearing on the documents which you submitted to us for inspection does not correspond to that used in the preparation of such statements for our customers. Actually, they are printed on a bookkeeping machine and they are not, as in the case of the photostats in question, written by ordinary typewriter. In addition, neither our head office, our Geneva branch, nor any other branch of this bank has at this time, nor at any time in the past, ever had an account in the name of the Pahlavi Foundation of Iran. Further, the account number listed on the sheets does not conform in any measure to the numerical system employed by us. For these very convincing reasons we are certain that the evidence which you have forwarded to us for examination is forged.

Should it prove essential to your inquiry, we would be willing to swear to the truth of the contents of this letter.

We trust that the foregoing information will be of assistance to you in your further investigations.

Yours very truly,
DR. A. SCHAEFER,
Chief General Manager.
DR. A. HARTMANN,
Manager.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, in addition, an audit was made by the subcommittee staff of aid funds in the U.S. banks and the same type audit was made in Iran at our request by the Inspector General's office of the Department of State. The audits covered approximately 67 percent of U.S. aid funds to Iran for the period March 1959 to June 1963, approximately $169 million. There was no indication whatever of any diversion of aid funds to the Pahlavi Foundation.

A representative number of the alleged recipients of these checks were contacted, and all those so contacted filed affidavits with the subcommittee denying any knowledge of the checks or the funds they purported to represent. The personal finances of some of these persons were audited and the audits supported their affidavits. Others have indicated a willingess to file similar affidavits. In addition, an analysis of the purported bank statement shows that the bulk of the checks were drawn on one of five different days and, with only one exception, the alleged checks were presented to the bank for payment in the exact numerical sequence in which they were issued. The mathematical odds against such an occurrence are astronomical and prohibitive. The analysis also revealed a $4½ million error in subtraction on July 27, 1962, which remained undetected and uncorrected at the end of that year. A normal banking practice is to reach a balance each day.

The subcommittee heard testimony showing that apparently on November 5, 1962, imposters had established bank accounts in the City National Bank of Beverly Hills, Calif., in the names of members of the royal family of Iran. Accounts were set up in the name of Prince Mahmoud Reza Pahlavi and Princess Fatemeh Pahlavi by two persons, a man and a woman, who claimed to be the Prince and the Princess, respectively, at a time when, to the best of our ability to determine—which immigration records substantiate—neither the Prince nor the Princess was in the United States. The Prince and Princess are close relatives of the Shah.

The bank employee who received the account from the woman representing herself as the Princess positively identified Miss Mariam Kushan as the person who opened the account and signed the bank signature card which was filed as an exhibit along with the signature of Miss Kushan which was written in the presence of the subcommittee.

By way of interpolation, I believe that anyone who examines the two signatures, one filed with the bank at the time the account was established, and the other given to the committee in executive session recently when she testified, will agree that the signatures have a most striking similarity and I believe sufficient to establish that the same person wrote both signatures.

The subcommittee in good faith has given Khaibar Khan Goodarzian and Miss Mariam Kushan every opportunity to submit any additional proof they could to substantiate their statements. Our subcommittee itself made an exhaustive inquiry into these allegations. We have been unable to establish the truthfulness of the charges made. On the contrary, a great preponderance of the evidence, the apparently unimpeachable facts, and all attending circumstances point, we believe unerringly, to their deceptiveness and falsity.

By direction of the subcommittee, a complete transcript of these hearings is being transmitted to the Department of Justice for its careful examination and study, and for its determination as to whether there has been any violation of Federal law, including criminal libel and perjury, and for appropriate action thereon.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MUNDT. As the ranking Republican member on this investigating subcommittee, I endorse the statement which has just been made by our distinguished chairman, the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McClellan].

It seems to me that Khaibar Khan recital is a stranger and more fantastic story than anything I have ever read in the whole book of Arabian Nights fables.

What we have before us now is either the greatest swindle by representatives of a friendly foreign government on the taxpayers of the United States, or it is the most audacious and arrogant operation ever undertaken in the history of Congress to impose upon our legislative body and our investigating subcommittee.

If the facts are borne out ultimately by the Department of Justice, that what we have here is a planned case of perjury on the part of Khaibar Khan, he will go down in the history books as the man who made Ananias look as though his name actually was Diogenes.

I must admit that some strange things have happened in the field of foreign aid. Although I think it is inconceivable and totally incredible that the type of activities described by Khaibar Khan are factual in nature, I do not wish to rule out entirely the possibility that some grave and almost impossible abuses of the foreign aid program, either in Iran or elsewhere, have been committed. One thing is very definitely certain from looking at the transcript of the testimony, namely, that perjury has been committed by someone. The record is clear that some willful perjury has been committed by someone under oath before a constituent body of Congress, the Investigating Subcommittee charged with dealing with this subject, in connection with testimony that is entirely pertinent to the inquiry.

Thus, the basic elements of perjury are clearly written into this Record. I stand with the chairman in his assertion that the transcript should be, and now is, forwarded to the Department of Justice for its review and determination as to possible criminal action. It is obvious that criminal action against someone must be forthcoming by the Department of Justice after the Department has had an opportunity to analyze this amazing piece of testimony.

In conclusion, I wish to repeat that I do not foreclose the possibility of our committee taking a subsequent look at the Iranian foreign aid program or, for that matter, at the foreign aid program in any other areas of the world where it seems that mischief might have taken place.

I wish to emphasize, however, that the subcommittee and its staff have done very commendable work and have exercised great diligence over a period of many months in trying to sift fiction from fact and fact from fiction in this case. It is obviously difficult enough for our subcommittee to transact its duties in trying to inquire into the operations of the executive branch of the Government, but when we are confronted with diversions such as we have encountered in this case, it makes our task impossibly much more prodigious, and results in our legislative role being sidetracked and our investigation of other important matters delayed.

In repeating my endorsement of what the chairman has said, and in referring this matter to the Department of Justice, I believe that the revelation of such performances should serve a useful purpose. I hope this will prohibit ever again the kind of occurrence which is indicated by the testimony to which our committee has been subjected. If there are any irregularities in the foreign aid program which come to our attention, I know the chairman of the subcommittee will take appropriate action. I hope, however, that it will be initiated by proof of some demonstrable nature and something less suspicious of being perjurious than in connection with the instant case.

Mr. McCLELLAN. These charges, if true, reflect upon the integrity and honor of some very fine Americans. They sounded fantastic when they came to us. We felt they ought to be inquired into. It is not a matter of defending the foreign aid program. I have no defense to make of the overall program, because I voted against it. I am not saying that there may not be irregularities in the administration of the program. I do not know. I am convinced beyond any doubt that the charges that precipitated the investigation are false. Otherwise I do not believe the bank would have written this letter. One of these gentlemen is the general manager and the other is the manager of the bank in Switzerland. I do not believe they would have written, as they do here:

> Should it prove essential to your inquiry, we would be willing to swear to the truth of the contents of this letter.

If the contents of that letter are true, every allegation that we proceeded upon in the initial instance, when we started the investigation, is false. Therefore, we have been patient and have given everyone every opportunity to produce evidence to substantiate the charge. If the contents of the letter are true, the committee and the Senate have been imposed upon. Therefore we feel that we ought to make this statement and in due time make a full report.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield.

Mr. JACKSON. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the able chairman of the committee and the remarks of the distinguished Senator from South Dakota [Mr. Mundt]. The record, which dates back, I believe, to May of 1963, when the committee had this subject called to its attention, clearly indicates that the committee has been imposed upon by this gentleman and his associates. I believe one other point has not been mentioned.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, at that point I should like to say that if the record shows that the subcommittee has been imposed upon in other areas, they are not necessarily matters within the responsibility of the subcommittee. This seems to be a common practice or the usual way of life.

Mr. JACKSON. This gentleman has a genius for imposing upon people. I must say that he went beyond the point of making allegations against prominent Americans. The information we have in committee to date indicates that he has attempted to use the committee to his own advantage. I should say, too, that there appears to be evidence that he may have been engaged in an international confidence game. We have reason to believe that he has "taken" some prominent Americans for large sums of money, involving hundreds of thousands of dollars, as a result of his skillful and devious operations in the United States during the past several years.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Some of them would be embarrassed to testify.

Mr. JACKSON. Yes. This gentleman has operated as all confidence operators operate. He gets his intended victims in a larcenous situation in which it would appear that the victim was a joint venturer in the violation of State or Federal laws. This is the way all confidence men operate. If we look at the arrests and convictions of confidence men, we find time and time again a long series of arrests and no convictions: "Case dismissed." That is so because the prosecuting witness does not wish to come in and testify lest he or she appear to be engaged in the perpetration of a crime.

I must say it would appear as of now—and we have not completed the record—that this gentleman and others associated with him were engaged in a gigantic scheme of international proportions to malign the good names of prominent Americans and to utilize the subcommittee for his own larcenous ends in order to continue his confidence game.

I must say that the chairman of our subcommittee and the able staff, because of the serious initial allegation, went into great detail to get the facts and to get at the truth.

As of now the truth clearly would indicate that those who should face more serious criminal charges are the individuals who came to the committee to make these charges. At the present time, I commend the chairman for the action that he has taken.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. HARRIS. As the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee has made clear, the narrow and precise question which was presented to the subcommittee was the truth or the falsity of the grave charges which had been made by the so-called Khaibar Khan. Our able chairman, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, has carried on a careful, meticulous, and detailed examination and inquiry into these serious charges. The statements which he has made today present the inescapable conclusions of the subcommittee which can be drawn and must be drawn from the inquiry. There can be no question from an examination of the facts that at best the so-called Khaibar Khan has wholly, shockingly and reprehensibly failed to substantiate the charges which he has made; at worst, he and his associates are guilty of the grossest kind of fabrication and fraud. I personally am inclined to the latter opinion. I concur in the statement of our distinguished chairman that the question should be turned over to the Department of Justice for appropriate action. I commend our distinguished chairman for his handling of this inquiry, and I associate myself with his statement here today.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I yield to the distinguished Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. As members of the committee, I believe we all recognize that we are delegating to the Department of Justice a rather prodigious job as they look over the mishmash of confusing testimony which has come to us. But I believe there is at least the possibility that the Department of Justice may get a real assist from another source in trying to find out the facts in this case and in building the proper background of evidence with which to make a charge of perjury.

It has come to my attention indirectly that a prominent American magazine is planning to publish an article on the activities of Khaibar Khan. I believe the magazine should be forewarned that it will not be able to enjoy any element of congressional immunity for anything appearing in the article, because our hearings have not been published. They have been taken in executive session. There will be no privileged material in the magazine article insofar as basing it on congressional testimony is concerned.

If the article carries out the purport of the Khaibar Khan story, and if the facts are as we believe them to be, it will be essentially and notoriously libelous—libelous of some very important Americans, libelous of a great many people whose good reputation will be at stake and who will necessarily desire to carry Khaibar Khan and company into the civil courts in a case of civil libel.

In my experience, I have found that it has sometimes been easier to establish facts in a civil suit for libel than it has been to ask the Department of Justice to screen conflicting testimony.

I recall the fact that Alger Hiss escaped any kind of punishment from the law in this country until he trapped himself into instigating a libel suit against one Whittaker Chambers. When a civil suit for money is brought in an American court, the kind of evidence which often crops up is amazing. If this magazine carries the proposed article, if it contains the story in detail that Khaibar Khan imposed upon us, and if the facts are what the committee believes them to be, I can well imagine that there will be some rather substantial libel suits filed against that magazine. In that case it will be a question of "fish or cut bait." At that instance either the whole Khaibar Khan fabrication will fall down like a house of cards, or he will be compelled to produce evidence which he did not make available to our committee with which to substantiate his charges.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, since the distinguished Senator from South Dakota has referred to a magazine article that might appear, I believe the RECORD should be made clear that the action taken here today had been authorized and directed before any member of the committee, so far as I know, ever heard of an impending magazine article.

Mr. MUNDT. That is certainly correct so far as the Senator from South Dakota is concerned. We took our action some time last week, and I did not hear about the story until the past weekend.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The first I knew about a purported magazine article was about 9 o'clock on Friday night. I took some papers home to read, and I found among them an advance copy of the article. That had nothing to do with the action of the committee. The action to make this statement and to refer the question to the Department of Justice was taken by the committee before the committee ever heard of a purported magazine article.

Mr. MUNDT. As contained in the printed record of our last session, the chairman made the announcement one day last week. That statement appears in the official notes of the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I think the record will be clear. I thank the Senator.

I now yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I concur in what my chairman, the distinguished senior Senator from Arkansas, has said about the Khaibar Khan investigation.

I was present in executive session when Khaibar Khan and Miss Marian Kushan appeared in the first instance and presented their allegations. The allegations were such that they called for a painstaking investigation and inquiry into many things and many approaches to the problem. As usual, the committee, under the leadership of Chairman McCLELLAN, conducted a thorough investigation. There rests upon the committee an obligation to the taxpayers, to the Government of the United States as an entity, and, of course, to every individual whose name was mentioned in the allegations.

The distinguished chairman stated that there were three executive sessions. The subject was discussed many times in addition to the discussions at the specific meetings called for this purpose. Inquiries were made from time to time with members of the staff concerning their progress. A thorough investigation of the subject was made. The allegations were not found to be true, as was stated by the chairman. I think that should be said, and it should be said by all of us who participated.

I take this occasion to say to the Senate and to the country at large that Chairman McClellan has conducted a careful, painstaking, thorough investigation. His conclusions are correct, they are accurate, and they are in the public interest. I commend him for it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska. Of course, we do not accomplish anything except as a team. We all work together. I am indebted to my colleagues on the committee and to the able staff for these good results—I hope they are good results—that we have been able to accomplish in the inquiry.

I yield the floor.

INVESTIGATION OF BANKS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several weeks ago I introduced a bill to conduct a study of the manner and the method in which the fiscal position of banks would be investigated. It has been my belief that the liquidity of the banks is growing worse as time goes on. I am also of the conviction that loose practices have developed in the making of loans. I have noted that the newspapers, in relation to the investigation which the Committee on Government Operations is conducting, have touched upon the subject lightly.

I ask the Senator from Arkansas whether in his committee he contemplates exploring the noncoordination that exists between different Federal officials who are in charge of inspecting banks, ascertaining their liquidity, and determining the type of their management.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The first three or four witnesses to appear before the committee were the heads of the four agencies of the Federal Government that have some responsibility in connection with the banking and the building and loan system in our country. In the course of their testimony, it developed that apparently there had not been the kind of coordination and cooperation that some of us think should prevail.

Subsequent testimony has also revealed some other information that would tend to substantiate the charge that there has not been the liaison and cooperation between agencies that there should be. We are already into it.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I have observed that some measures have already been adopted as a consequence of the investigation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Some action has already been taken. Some practices have been discontinued, and therefore, I think that there is better liaison and better cooperation than there was when the hearings began.

Mr. LAUSCHE. My own opinion is that the isolated revelations that have thus far come to the surface are characteristic of what were to be found, in many instances, in the type of credit that is accepted and in the looseness of accredited practices.

I stated 3 or 4 weeks ago that 10 years back the Government bonds and cash held by banks constituted about 66 percent of the assets. Thirty-four percent of the assets were in the form of other types of nonliquid assets.

In the 10-year period, the very opposite has developed. Thirty-four percent of the assets are in Government bonds and cash, and the remainder is in nonliquid assets.

I am further of the belief that that condition is growing worse. It is my sincere hope that this problem will not only be attended to so far as the revelations that have thus far occurred are concerned, but that the matter will be checked into deeply, to learn whether or not new laws are needed and whether the present supervisory powers that are exercised by the Government are adequate to protect depositors in the banks.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The committee has already found some practices that, in my judgment, might well be termed reprehensible; but these practices, so far as I know now, were confined to the banks that we have been investigating. It may well be that the same situation exists in other banks. However, I believe that the practice that we have so far found is not too widespread; but where such practices exist, they ought to be exposed. If they exist at all, they should not exist.

The committee will pursue the matter. It will take some time. We cannot do this work in a day. We have a formidable task to do when we go into all the ramifications. We can expose a little at a time, and that is what we shall have to do. I thank the the distinguished Senator from Ohio.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S 1965 FARM PROPOSALS

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I introduce for appropriate reference the administration's 1965 farm proposals. I expect soon to introduce proposed legislation of my own covering some of the commodities included in the administration's bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Tydings in the chair). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1702) to maintain farm income, to stabilize prices and assure adequate supplies of agriculture commodities, to reduce surpluses, lower Government costs and promote foreign trade, to afford greater economic opportunity in rural areas, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Ellender, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I have not as yet had time to study the bill in detail, but from a cursory examination, I find that it contains six titles, which deal with all major farm crops, excepting cotton, peanuts, and tobacco.

Title I would extend the voluntary wheat certificate program for 2 years with a few changes from the present law. One of the most important, it seems to me, is that for the first time in many years an administration has asked that farmers receive the full parity price for that part of wheat production used domestically.

Mr. President, it is stated that our country is the most prosperous in the world. The gross national product in the last quarter of 1964 reached a high of almost $631 billion. Total national income in 1964 reached a new high of $510 billion. Business and professional income was at $39.3 billion, the highest ever; rental income at $12.4 billion, was also the highest ever; net interest income was at a new high of $27.8 billion; corporate profits reached $57.3 billion, the highest ever. But, what happened to farm income? Well at $12.7 billion, farm income was $300 million less than in 1963, and $5.1 billion less than the 1948 high of $17.8 billion.

Under these circumstances, where there is so much prosperity, and where all incomes are up, except in agriculture, I do not feel that it is asking too much when only parity is asked for wheatgrowers on that portion of wheat produced for domestic consumption.

We have minimum wage and other labor laws to help labor, we have tariff laws and special tax laws to help business; therefore, why not special programs to help agriculture?

Title II of the bill would also extend the voluntary feed grain diversion program for 2 years with certain changes. One of the principal changes as I see it, would permit the diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of soybeans, as well as guar and other nonsupported crops that are not in surplus.

Title III contains a 2-year certificate program for rice which has deep implications, and which will require much study so that rice farmers can obtain a fair share of income.

Title IV would extend the Wool Act for 2 years with some minor changes.

Title V provides for a cropland adjustment program under which land would be taken out of production under long-term agreements with producers. That title will require close study, as we have had in the past much experience on a similar program.

And finally title VI provides for transfer by sale, lease, or other means of acreage allotments, base acres, and sugar proportionate shares. This is another title which will require close attention as it represents quite a departure from our current method of handling acreage allotments.

As I said, Mr. President, I have not had time to study the full implications of the provisions of this bill. I am introducing it so that all interested parties can study and appraise the advantages and disadvantages inherent in such legislation. It is my hope that the Senate committee can begin to hold hearings within, say, 3 or 4 weeks. This will give every interested party plenty of time to prepare.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed, following my remarks, an explanation of the bill.

There being no objection, the explanation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Summary of Principal Provisions of Proposed Bill

TITLE I—WHEAT

Title I would extend the voluntary wheat marketing certificate program for 2 years—

1966 and 1967—with certain changes in the program features.

1. Wheat marketing quotas would be suspended during the operation of the voluntary program.

2. Acreage allotments would be continued for purposes of determining eligibility for price support, marketing certificates and diversion payments, but certain changes would be made to simplify the method for determining allotments. Under the new method, State, county and farm allotments will simply be computed on the basis of the preceding year's allotment.

3. The marketing certificate program would be similar to that in effect for 1964 and 1965 with the following changes:

(a) The number of certificates received by each farm would be based on the projected farm yield rather than the normal yield.

(b) The bill would authorize the Secretary to provide for distributing the certificates among the producers on the farm on a fair and equitable basis instead of requiring them to be distributed on the basis of the respective shares of the producers in the wheat crop.

(c) The Secretary would be authorized to adjust the amount of certificates issued with respect to any farm for failure of a producer to comply fully.

(d) "Food products" for which marketing certificates are required to be purchased by processors are redefined to mean those products composed wholly or partly of wheat to be used for human consumption, including beverage, as determined by the Secretary.

(e) The Secretary would be authorized to exempt processors from the requirement to purchase certificates for wheat produced by a State and processed for use by the State, wheat processed for donation and wheat processed for other noncommercial uses.

4. The diversion program for wheat would be extended for two years—1966 and 1967—with the following changes:

(a) The limitation of 50 per centum of the price support rate on diversion payments would be removed.

(b) The limitation on the number of acres of additional voluntary diversion would be raised from 20 per centum of the farm allotment to 50 per centum of the allotment.

(c) The Secretary may permit the diverted acreage to be devoted to guar, sesame, safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, soybeans and flax, if he determines that such production of the commodity is needed, is not likely to increase the cost of the price support program, and will not adversely affect farm income.

5. Price support—

(i) for wheat with domestic certificates would be between 65 and 100 per centum of parity. Price support for wheat with export certificates would be at such level, not more than parity, as the Secretary determines;

(ii) for non-certificate wheat would be on the basis of competitive world prices of wheat and the feeding value of wheat in relation to feed grains.

6. Minimum price for sales of wheat from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks would be 105 per centum of loan rate, plus reasonable carrying charges, as under the program in effect for 1964 and 1965.

7. The existing provisions of law permitting substitution of wheat and feed grains would be left in effect.

8. After 1967, the existing provisions of law for marketing quotas, marketing certificates, and price support would again become effective.

Title I of the bill would also amend section 377 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to preserve the acreage allotment for the farm for any commodity in any case in which the acreage planted to the commodity is less than the allotment.

Title I would also change the marketing quota provisions on rice and wheat to provide that in computing marketing penalties, the excess production on which the penalty will be assessed will be determined on the basis of the projected farm yield instead of the normal yield. "Projected farm yield" is defined as the yield per harvested acre of such crop on the farm during each of the 3 calendar years immediately preceding the year in which such crop is produced, adjusted for abnormal weather conditions affecting such yield, for trends in yields, and for any significant changes in production practices.

TITLE II—FEED GRAINS

Title II would extend the feed grain program for 2 years—1966 and 1967—with certain changes in the program features.

1. Price support—

(a) If a feed grain diversion program is in effect, producers would be required, as a condition of eligibility for price support, to participate in the diversion program to the extent prescribed by the Secretary.

(i) Existing law, which would remain in effect, provides that if an acreage diversion program is in effect for feed grains, price support corn shall be at 65 to 90 percent of parity and at comparable levels for grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye.

(ii) A payment-in-kind, in addition to price support provided through loans and purchases, would be authorized to be made available to producers participating in the acreage diversion program. In determining the amount or amounts of the payment-in-kind, the Secretary would be authorized to take into account the extent of participation by the producer. The payment-in-kind would be made on such part of the feed grain acreage as the Secretary determines desirable to effectuate the purposes of the program. The Secretary could permit producers to have acreage devoted to soybeans considered as devoted to feed grains for purposes of payments-in-kind. The bill would authorize the Secretary to provide for distributing the payment-in-kind certificates on a fair and equitable basis instead of requiring them to be distributed on the basis of the respective shares of the producers in the feed grain crop. The Secretary would be authorized to adjust the payments-in-kind for failure to comply fully with the program.

(b) If an acreage diversion program is not in effect, existing law, which would remain in effect, provides that price support for corn shall not be not less than 50 or more than 90 percent of parity as will not result in increasing Commodity Credit Corporation stocks and at comparable levels for grain sorghums, barley, oats, and rye.

2. The feed grain acreage diversion program would be similar to that in effect for 1964 and 1965 with the following changes:

(a) The limitation on payments of 50 percent of the price support rate would be removed.

(b) The Secretary may permit the diverted acreage to be devoted to the production of guar, soybeans, sesame, safflower, sunflower, castor beans, mustard seed, and flax, if he determines that such production of the commodity is needed, is not likely to increase the cost of the price support program, and will not adversely affect farm income.

(c) The program would be limited to corn, grain sorghums, and, if designated by the Secretary, barley.

(d) The payment limitation of 20 percent of the fair market value with respect to acreage involved in the program would be removed.

(e) The malting barley exemption would be removed.

3. The existing provisions of law permitting substitution of wheat and feed grains would be left in effect.

TITLE III—RICE

Title III of the bill would authorize a marketing certificate program for rice for 2 years—1966 and 1967—similar to the marketing certificate program for wheat. Marketing quotas would remain in effect.

1. The Secretary would proclaim a national acreage allotment equal to the number of acres which the Secretary determines will, on the basis of the projected national yield and expected underplantings of farm acreage allotments, produce an amount of rice which, together with the estimated carryover, would be adequate to make available a supply equal to estimated domestic consumption, exports, and an adequate carryover. The minimum national acreage allotment would be one which would produce not less than 60 million hundredweights of rice instead of the 1,652,596 acres specified under existing law.

2. Producers would receive a rice marketing allocation on which marketing certificates would be issued equal to the number of hundredweights obtained by multiplying the estimated production on the allotted acres by the percentage estimated by the Secretary to be the percentage of the rice crop which will be used in the United States during the marketing year except for seed. Provision is made for issuing additional certificates to be financed by Commodity Credit Corporation on the first 1,500 hundredweight of each farmer's production. Thus, small producers would receive relatively the highest returns from marketing certificates.

3. The marketing certificates would have a value per hundredweight equal to the difference between the price support on certificate rice and noncertificate rice.

4. Marketing certificates would be required to cover all rice processed in the United States and all processed rice imported into the United States, but the value of the certificates would be refunded on all processed rice exported from the United States. The Secretary would be authorized to exempt processors from the requirement to purchase certificates from (i) rice processed for donation, (ii) rice processed for use on the farm where grown, (iii) rice produced by a State or agency thereof and processed for use by the State or agency thereof, and (iv) rice processed for uses determined by the Secretary to be noncommercial.

5. Commodity Credit Corporation would be authorized to buy and sell marketing certificates.

6. The Secretary would be authorized to take such action as he determines would be necessary to facilitate the transition from the program currently in effect to the marketing certificate program.

7. Price support—

(i) for rice with marketing certificates would be between 65 and 100 percent of parity;

(ii) for noncertificate rice would be at such level, not in excess of parity, as the Secretary determines will provide orderly marketing of rice and retain an adequate share of the world market, taking into consideration the price of rice in world markets and other factors.

8. The minimum price for sales of rice from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks would be 105 percent of loan rate, plus reasonable carrying charges.

9. After 1967, the existing provisions of law for acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and price support will again become effective.

Title III would also provide authority to reduce the rice acreage allotment for any farm if the farmowner or landlord evicts or otherwise mistreats a rice tenant or sharecropper on the farm.

TITLE IV—WOOL

Title IV would amend the National Wool Act to extend the period during which price support may be made thereunder beyond its present termination date of March 31, 1966, to December 31, 1967. The bill would further amend that act by deleting the presently stated policy of encouraging domestic production of 300 million pounds of shorn wool, and the requirement that the support level be such as will result in a production of 360 million pounds if such support level would not exceed 90 percent of parity, and providing in lieu thereof a new policy of supporting wool at such level as will encourage domestic production of as much of the Nation's requirements of wool as possible at prices fair to both producers and consumers, minimize the adverse effect upon foreign trade, and not result in such an increase in lamb production as will depress lamb prices and reduce the total returns to producers from sheep production. Provision is made for three graduated levels of price support based upon each producer's marketings during the marketing year. Thus, small producers would receive relatively the highest returns from price support.

TITLE V—CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT

Title V would extend the Soil Bank Act to authorize a long-term cropland adjustment program under which the Secretary would be authorized to enter into long-term agreements with producers to assist them in diverting their cropland to vegetative cover, water storage facilities, or other soil-, water-, wildlife-, or forest-conserving uses, or practices or uses for the establishment, protection, and conservation of open spaces, natural beauty, wildlife, and recreational resources, and for the prevention of air and water pollution.

The Secretary would be authorized to enter into contracts with producers during the period 1965 through 1970 to be carried out during the period ending not later than December 31, 1979. The period covered by any contract would be not less than 5 years nor more than 10 years.

Grazing would be prohibited except in the case of severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster.

In return for the producer's diverting his cropland to approved uses, the Secretary would share the cost of establishing such uses and make an annual payment to the producer for the period covered by the contract. Authority would be given to the Secretary to make the annual payments for all years of the contract upon approval of the contract or in installments.

The total acreage placed under contract in any county would be limited to a percentage of the total eligible acreage in such county as the Secretary determines would not adversely affect the economy of the county.

For the purpose of obtaining an increase in the permanent retirement of cropland to noncrop uses, the Secretary would be authorized to transfer funds appropriated for carrying out the program to any other Federal agency or to States or local governmental agencies for use in acquiring cropland for the preservation of open spaces and natural beauty, the development of wildlife and recreational facilities, and the prevention of air and water pollution.

The Secretary would also be authorized to share the cost with State and local governmental agencies in the establishment of practices and uses which will establish, protect, and conserve open spaces, natural beauty, wildlife, and recreational resources and prevent air and water pollution.

Title V would also provide authority under which the Secretary would be authorized to prescribe a uniform rule for the preservation of cropland, crop acreage, and allotment history with respect to acreage which is devoted to vegetative cover and other approved uses.

TITLE VI—TRANFER OF ALLOTMENTS

Title VI would authorize the Secretary to permit the transfer by sale, lease, or other means of acreage allotments, base acreages, and sugar proportionate shares which have been established under Federal law, including the transfer from one farm owned by a person to another farm owned by him. The Secretary could not authorize the transfer of allotments, base acreages, and proportionate shares unless he determined that the effective operation of the program involved would not be impaired.

No transfer would be permitted outside the State, from a farm subject to a mortgage or other lien unless agreed to by the lienholder, or until a copy of the transfer had been filed with the county committee of the county to which transferred and it was determined by the committee that it complied with the provisions of the statute.

The transfer of an allotment, base acreage, or proportionate share also would include the acreage history and marketing quota attributable thereto.

The Secretary would be required to prescribe regulations governing transfers including provisions for adjusting the size of the allotment transferred if the farm to which the allotment is transferred has a substantially higher yield, and for putting reasonable limits on the size of the resulting allotments.

If the farm from which the transfer was made was covered by a conservation reserve contract, cropland conversion agreement, or other similar land utilization agreement, the rates of payment in the contract or agreement would be appropriately adjusted, but no similar adjustment would be made for the farm to which the transfer is made.

Provisions of existing law authorizing leases of tobacco allotments and transfer of producer rice allotments would be repealed.

ACREAGE-POUNDAGE MARKETING QUOTAS FOR TOBACCO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5721) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, a little more than 28 years ago, I introduced that title of the law which now covers tobacco. During the entire time the tobacco law has been on the statute books, somehow, in some way, tobacco growers when they wanted to amend the law, got together and agreed to present a united front with respect to any changes to be made.

I point out that since 1956 the acreage in tobacco has decreased from 875,200 acres to 626,000 acres. All of that reduction was agreed to by the tobacco growers. I regret that today there is some difference of opinion among the tobacco growers.

I attended the hearings and was present when all parties testified on the proposal now before the Senate. Except for some of the witnesses from Georgia and Florida and a few others who testified against the bill, the rest of the tobacco growers of the country seem to be in accord.

I believe the record will show that the tobacco growers of Georgia and Florida produce from 10 to 13 percent of the Flue-cured tobacco that we are discussing. The rest of the crop is produced in North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, and some in Kentucky.

I gave consideration to the fact that there was testimony in the hearings tending to show that under the law last year the Secretary of Agriculture presented a proposal to the tobacco growers whereby they were further to reduce their acreage by 19.5 percent. That proposal was submitted to the farmers. It carried by over two-thirds of those voting. That concerned me. However, I learned later that a precedent had been established in 1955. The farmers had previously approved marketing quotas for the 1953, 1954, and 1955 crops of burley tobacco. The Secretary established quotas for 1955 which required a 10 percent reduction in allotments. This was not a large enough reduction, and legislation was passed providing for a further 15-percent reduction, if approved by farmers in a referendum. I believe that action constitutes a valid precedent for the present bill. It is up to Congress to make this change if it sees fit. If the present bill is enacted, it would mean that the tobacco growers would be given another opportunity to vote on a proposal which will reflect the new provisions of the pending bill.

There is no doubt that something must and should be done with respect to tobacco. I understand that the administration is in favor of the bill as presented with the possible exception of one amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Kentucky. But, I do not believe there is much opposition to that amendment.

If the tobacco price support program is to continue, be of value and not hurt the farmers in the future, it seems to me that something must be done to curtail the enormous surplus now in the warehouses.

As my good friend from North Carolina pointed out, because Florida and Georgia markets for tobacco open a little earlier than the tobacco markets in Virginia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Kentucky, they have an advantage in being able to sell their crops at an earlier date. I understand that was the reason given by witnesses as to why there is less tobacco placed under loan from Florida and Georgia.

The fact remains that about 88 percent of the tobacco that we are talking about now—a tremendous percentage—is grown in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Virginia in particular. It would seem to me that unless something is done to alleviate this surplus we will be in serious trouble. This bill, if enacted, will correct the problem by putting the production of tobacco on an acreage-poundage basis rather than just acreage. Because of this there will likely be a reduction in production this year.

There is no doubt in my mind that reductions in tobacco acreage have stimulated intensive cultivation and growth of much tobacco that is now not of high quality. As the acreages of the farmers decrease they pour a little more fertilizer on the crop, they plant the tobacco stalks a little closer and the rows a little closer, resulting in more production.

As a result, as I recall, the production of tobacco has increased from about 600 to 800 pounds per acre, when the bill was first put on the statute books, to about 2,200 pounds now. All of that has come about, in my opinion, because the acreage in tobacco has been smaller and smaller. Of course, the farmers tried to grow more and more tobacco on the decreased acreage.

The pending bill, as I understand, contemplates putting tobacco allocations on an acreage-poundage basis, which would mean that a farmer would be allocated so many pounds as a marketing quota. In that way he would probably be able to plant a little larger acreage, and not use so much fertilizer, and perhaps produce a better quality of tobacco that will be readily sold on the market.

Because of the fact that there is such a large quantity of surplus tobacco on hand, it is my belief we ought to give the bill a trial, at any rate. I am hopeful the Senate will look with favor on the bill.

As I have said, the administration is for the bill. In the new farm bill, which I just sent to the desk for reference, tobacco is not included. As I understand, this will be the only bill introduced this year affecting tobacco.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. So far as I know, that is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. I ask that the bill be enacted.

AMENDMENT OF MANPOWER DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING ACT OF 1962

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 974) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes, which was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Manpower Act of 1965".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 102(5) of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended (hereinafter referred to as the "Act"), is amended by adding a comma after the word "arrange" and inserting "through grants or contracts," immediately following the comma.

(b) Section 102 of the Act is further amended by striking out "and" at the end of paragraph (4), by striking out the period at the end of paragraph (5) and inserting in lieu of such period "; and", and by adding at the end of such section the following new paragraph:

"(6) establish a program of experimental, developmental, demonstration, and pilot projects, through grants to or contracts with public or private nonprofit organizations, or through contracts with other private organizations, for the purpose of improving techniques and demonstrating the effectiveness of specialized methods in meeting the manpower, employment, and training problems of worker groups such as the long-term unemployed, disadvantaged youth, displaced older workers, the handicapped, members of minority groups, and other similar groups. In carrying out this subsection the Secretary of Labor shall, where appropriate, consult with the Secretaries of Health, Education, and Welfare, and Commerce, and the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Where programs under this paragraph require institutional training, appropriate arrangements for such training shall be agreed to by the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare. He shall also seek the advice of consultants with respect to the standards governing the adequacy and design of proposals, the ability of applicants and the priority of projects in meeting the objectives of this Act."

SEC. 3. (a) Title I of the Act is amended by renumbering sections 103 and 104 as sections 106 and 107, respectively, and by inserting immediately after section 102 the following new sections:

"JOB DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

"SEC. 103. The Secretary of Labor shall stimulate and assist, in cooperation with interested agencies both public and private, job development programs, through on-the-job training and other suitable methods, that will serve to expand employment by the filling of those service and related needs which are not now being met because of lack of trained workers or other reasons affecting employment or opportunities for employment.

"LABOR MOBILITY DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"SEC. 104. (a) During the period ending June 30, 1967, the Secretary of Labor shall develop and carry out, in a limited number of geographical areas, pilot projects designed to assess or demonstrate the effectiveness in reducing unemployment of programs to increase the mobility of unemployed workers by providing assistance to meet their relocation expenses. In carrying out such projects the Secretary may provide such assistance, in the form of grants or loans, or both, only to involuntarily unemployed individuals who cannot reasonably be expected to secure full-time employment in the community in which they reside, have bona fide offers of employment (other than temporary or seasonal employment), and are deemed qualified to perform the work for which they are being employed.

"(b) Loans or grants provided under this section shall be subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary shall prescribe, with loans subject to the following limitations:

"(1) there is reasonable assurance of repayment of the loan;

"(2) the credit is not otherwise available on reasonable terms from private sources or other Federal, State, or local programs;

"(3) the amount of the loan, together with other funds available, is adequate to assure achievement of the purposes for which the loan is made;

"(4) the loan bears interest at a rate not less than (A) a rate determined by the Secretary of the Treasury, taking into consideration the average market yield on outstanding Treasury obligations of comparable maturity, plus (B) such additional charge, if any, toward covering other costs of the program as the Secretary may determine to be consistent with its purposes; and

"(5) the loan is repayable within not more than ten years.

"(c) Of the funds appropriated for a fiscal year to carry out this Act, not more than $5,000,000 may be used for the purposes of this section.

"TRAINEE PLACEMENT ASSISTANCE DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

"SEC. 105. During the period ending June 30, 1967, the Secretary of Labor shall develop and carry out experimental and demonstration projects to assist in the placement of persons seeking employment through a public employment office who have successfully completed or participated in a federally assisted or financed training, counseling, work training, or work experience program and who, after appropriate counseling, have been found by the Secretary to be qualified and suitable for the employment in question, but to whom employment is or may be denied for reasons other than ability to perform, including difficulty in securing bonds for indemnifying their employers against loss from the infidelity, dishonesty, or default of such persons. In carrying out these projects the Secretary may make payments to or contracts with employers or institutions authorized to indemnify employers against such losses. Of the funds appropriated for fiscal years ending June 30, 1966, and June 30, 1967, not more than $200,000 and $300,000, respectively, may be used for the purpose of carrying out this section."

(b) Section 102(2) of the Act is amended by striking out "104" and inserting in lieu thereof "107".

SEC. 4. Section 202(1) of the Act is amended by striking out ", and such persons shall be eligible for training allowances for not to exceed an additional twenty weeks".

SEC. 5. (a) Section 203(a) of the Act is amended as follows:

(1) Amend the second sentence thereof to read as follows: "Such payments shall be made for a period not exceeding one hundred and four weeks, and the basic amount of any such payment in any week for persons undergoing training, including uncompensated employer-provided training, shall not exceed $10 more than the amount of the average weekly gross unemployment compensation payment (including allowances for dependents) for a week of total unemployment in the State making such payments during the most recent four-calendar-quarter period for which such data are available: *Provided*, That the basic amount of such payments may be increased by $5 a week for each dependent over two up to a maximum of four additional dependents: *Provided further*, That in any week an individual who, but for his training, would be entitled to unemployment compensation in excess of his total allowance, including payments for dependents, shall receive an allowance increased by the amount of such excess.";

(2) Amend the second paragraph thereof to read as follows:

"With respect to any week for which a person receives unemployment compensation under title XV of the Social Security Act or any other Federal or State unemployment compensation law which is less than the total training allowance, including payments for dependents, provided for by the preceding paragraph, a supplemental training allowance may be paid to a person eligible for a training allowance under this Act. The supplemental training allowance shall not exceed the difference between his unemployment compensation and the training allowance provided by the preceding paragraph.";

(3) Insert the words "under the training program" after "compensated hours per week" in the third paragraph of such subsection;

(4) In lieu of the fourth paragraph of such subsection insert the following:

"The training allowance of a person engaged in training under section 204 or 231 shall not be reduced on account of employment (other than employment under an on-the-job training program under section 204) which does not exceed twenty hours per week, but shall be reduced in an amount equal to his full earnings for hours worked (other than in employment under such an on-the-job training program) in excess of twenty hours per week."

(b)(1) Section 203(b) of the Act is amended by striking out the matter following "to defray transportation" and preceding "Provided", and by inserting in lieu of such matter the following: "expenses, and when such training is provided in facilities which are not within commuting distance of the trainee's regular place of residence, subsistence expenses for separate maintenance of the trainee:".

(2) Such subsection is further amended by inserting immediately before the period

at the end thereof the following: ", except in the case of local transportation where he may authorize reimbursement for the trainee's travel by the most economical mode of public transportation, and except that in noncontiguous States and in areas outside the continental United States where the per diem allowance prescribed under section 836 of title 5, United States Code, exceeds the maximum per diem allowance prescribed under that section for contiguous States, the Secretary may provide for a reasonable increase in the transportation and subsistence expenses in such amounts as he may deem necessary to carry out the purposes of this Act, and subject to such limitations as he may prescribe".

(c) Section 203(c) of the Act is amended as follows:

(1) Strike the words "not less than" in the first sentence and insert "at least" in lieu thereof;

(2) Strike out everything in the first sentence after the words "gainful employment", and insert the following in lieu thereof: ": *Provided*, That they are not members of a family or a household in which the head of the family or the head of the household as defined in the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 is employed.";

(3) Amend the last sentence to read as follows: "The number of youths under the age of twenty-two who are receiving training allowances (or who would be entitled thereto but for the receipt of unemployment compensation) shall, except for such adjustments as may be necessary for effective management of programs under this section, not exceed 25 per centum of all persons receiving such allowances (or who would be entitled thereto but for the receipt of unemployment compensation)."

(d) Subsection (d) of section 203 of the Act is repealed and subsections (e), (f), (g), (h), (i), and (j) of such sections are designated as (d), (e), (f), (g), (h), and (i), respectively.

(e) The first sentence of section 203(g)(2) of the Act (as redesignated by section 5(d) of this Act) is amended by striking out everything that follows "all of such benefits paid" and inserting in lieu thereof a period.

SEC. 6. Section 208 of the Act is repealed.

SEC. 7. Section 231 of the Act is amended by striking the third sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The State agency shall be paid not more than 90 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement, unless the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare determines that payments in excess of 90 per centum are necessary because such payments with respect to private institutions are required to give full effect to the purposes of the Act: *Provided*, That for the period ending June 30, 1966, the State agency shall be paid 100 per centum of the cost to the State of carrying out the agreement. Non-Federal contributions may be in cash or kind, fairly evaluated, including but not limited to plant, equipment, and services."

SEC. 8. Title II of the Act is amended by adding part C to the end thereof to read as follows:

"PART C—REDEVELOPMENT AREAS

"SEC. 241. (a) The Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare, in accordance with their respective responsibilities under parts A and B of this title, are authorized to provide a supplementary program of training and training allowances, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, for unemployed and underemployed persons residing in areas designated as redevelopment areas by the Secretary of Commerce under the Area Redevelopment Act or any subsequent Act authorizing such designation. Such program shall be carried out by the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare in accordance with the provisions otherwise applicable to programs under this Act and with their respective functions under those provisions, except that—

"(1) the Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, shall determine the occupational training or retraining needs of unemployed or underemployed individuals residing in redevelopment areas;

"(2) all unemployed or underemployed individuals residing in redevelopment areas who can reasonably be expected to obtain employment as a result of such training may be referred and selected for training and shall be eligible for training allowances under this section: *Provided*, That the amount and duration of training allowances under this section shall in no event exceed the amount and duration of training allowances provided under section 203(a) of this Act;

"(3) the Secretaries of Labor and of Health, Education, and Welfare shall, each with respect to his functions under this section, prescribe jointly with the Secretary of Commerce such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this section; and

"(4) section 301 shall not apply with respect to funds available under this section.

"(b) There are hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year such amounts as may be necessary to carry out this section."

(b) Sections 16 and 17 of the Area Redevelopment Act (42 U.S.C. 2513 and 2514) are repealed.

(c) This section and the amendments made by it shall take effect on July 1, 1965.

SEC. 9. Section 301 of the Act is amended by striking the period at the end thereof, inserting a colon, and adding the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That no funds apportioned with respect to a State in any fiscal year shall be reapportioned before the expiration of the 6th month of such fiscal year and only upon 30 days' prior notice to such State of the proposed reapportionment, except that the requirement for prior notice shall not apply with respect to any reapportionment made during the last quarter of the fiscal year."

SEC. 10. Section 302 of the Act is amended by striking the word "and" following "the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act" inserting a comma in lieu thereof, and inserting "and the Vocational Education Act of 1963," following "the Vocational Education Act of 1946,".

SEC. 11. Section 304 of the Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 304. For the purpose of carrying out this Act there are hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for each of the two succeeding fiscal years such amounts as may be necessary."

SEC. 12. The following subsection is added to section 305 of the Act to read as follows:

"(e) The costs of all training programs approved in any fiscal year, including the total cost of training allowances for such programs, may be paid from funds appropriated for such purposes for that fiscal year; and the amount of the Federal payment shall be computed on the basis of the per centum requirement in effect at the time such programs are approved: *Provided*, That funds appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, may be expended for training programs approved under this Act prior to July 1, 1965, and expenditures for such purposes shall be subject to the matching requirements in effect at the time such programs were approved."

SEC. 13. Subsection (a) of section 306 of the Act is amended by inserting after the comma immediately following the word "procedures" the following: "subject to such policies, rules and regulations as they may prescribe, the approval of any program under section 202, the cost of which does not exceed $75,000,"

SEC. 14. Sections 309(a) and 309(b) of the Act are both amended by striking "Prior to March 1, 1963, and again prior to April 1, 1964, April 1, 1965, and April 1, 1966" and inserting in lieu thereof: "Prior to April 1 in each year for which an appropriation is authorized by section 304".

SEC. 15. Section 310 of the Act is amended by striking out "1966" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "1968".

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 974), which presently lies at the desk. This bill provided for some 20 amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act. The House did not agree with the Senate version.

I move that the Senate ask for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. CLARK, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MCNAMARA, Mr. PELL, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. NELSON, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. MURPHY conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ACREAGE-POUNDAGE MARKETING QUOTAS FOR TOBACCO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5721) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be ordered on the second amendment to be offered by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Florida.

Mr. TALMADGE. I have no objection to voting immediately on our substitute amendment. On the next amendment to be offered I desire to have a yea-and-nay vote. Am I to understand the Senator to ask unanimous consent that the yeas and nays be ordered on the next amendment to be offered?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Yes.

Mr. TALMADGE. I have no objection.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I would have to object to unanimous consent being given for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask that the yeas and nays be ordered on the next amendment that will be offered by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator must first ask unanimous consent that it be in order to order the yeas and nays on the next amendment.

Mr. TALMADGE. I ask unanimous consent that it be in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. Is the request for the yeas and nays sufficiently seconded? It is sufficiently seconded, and the yeas and nays are ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. As I understand, the vote will now be taken on the substitute amendment of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Florida.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. TALMADGE. On the next amendment to be offered, we shall have the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

The question now is on agreeing to the pending amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Florida. [Putting the question.]

The nays appear to have it.

Mr. TALMADGE. I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment offered on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND]. I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. At the end of the bill add the following new section:

> SEC. 4. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the authority or responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture under section 301(b)(15) or section 313(1) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to providing that different types of tobacco shall be treated as different kinds of tobacco, or with respect to increasing allotments or quotas for farms producing certain types of tobacco.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the amendment was drafted by the attorney for the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. It would not change the existing law in any way whatever. It does make clear, however, that the lawsuit which was filed on behalf of the farmers of Georgia and Florida, and won by those plaintiffs in the District Court for the Southern District of Georgia, which obtained a unanimous opinion in the fifth circuit court of appeals upholding the lower court decision shall prevail and that that decision be preserved.

The Senator in charge of the bill and the distinguished senior Senator from North Carolina say they have no desire to change that situation. However, the language of the bill would change the existing law, which provides:

> Any one or more of the types comprising any such kind of tobacco shall be treated as a "kind of tobacco" for the purposes of this Act if the Secretary finds there is a difference in supply and demand conditions as among such types of tobacco which results in a difference in the adjustments needed in the marketings thereof in order to maintain supplies in line with demand.

Let us turn to the provisions of the bill. What do we find?

On page 2 of the bill, lines 16 to 18, read:

> In making this determination the Secretary shall give consideration to such Federal-State production research data as he deems relevant.

He could get a letter from someone in Hong Kong and deem that relevant and throw out the lawsuit which our farmers have won.

I ask the Senate to deal equitably with those who have gone to court to sustain their convictions and have won a judgment. If the Senate wishes to be fair and honorable, it will sustain the amendment.

I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BASS. Mr. President, for the past 10 years that I have served in Congress I have had the opportunity of working for and voting for every tobacco program that has been passed by Congress. I realize now that the Flue-cured tobacco growers have a problem and that there is a surplus of tobacco; therefore, something must be done to relieve the situation. For that reason I shall support the pending legislation.

However, I believe that in all honesty and fairness the amendment of the Senator from Georgia should be adopted, because there is litigation now pending in the court. Suit has been filed, and the lower court has held that the petitioners in the tobacco areas of Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina were correct.

I believe that Congress should not legislate these people out of court.

I believe that they were right before the passage of the legislation, and that if their case was just and fair then, their case would be just and fair next year.

Therefore, although the proposed legislation is intended to improve the tobacco situation in the Flue-cured tobacco area, I am supporting the amendment for that reason. My colleagues in the Senate would be ill advised if they did not support the amendment of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Florida, because although it has been said by some that the proposed legislation would not throw these people out of court, still, if there is any possibility that they would be thrown out of court, the amendment is some insurance to those who are in court at this time. I believe the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the able Senator from Ohio.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, several minutes ago I asked why a saving clause amendment to protect the lawsuit that was pending and decided in the courts of Georgia was not advisable. Now I understand an amendment has been offered to provide a saving clause for that lawsuit. In my opinion, nothing is more reprehensible in the conduct of legislative bodies than to try by legislation to reverse decisions of our duly constituted courts.

The court has spoken. There is an appeal pending to the U.S. Supreme Court.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator has expired.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I ask for 1 additional minute.

Mr. TALMADGE. I yield 1 additional minute.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I say in complete charity, an effort is being made to subvert the decision of the court. It is wrong. This honorable body should not approve of it.

Mr. President, I support completely the amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the cosponsor of the amendment, the able and distinguished senior Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, it seems to me that the question we are asked to determine is this: Are we to stand by our oft spoken pledge to have and to insist upon a government of laws and not a government of men?

If anyone wishes to read, even in a cursory fashion, lines 16 to 18 on page 2 of the bill, he will see that the purpose is to give complete discretion to the Secretary to follow any rule that he believes to be relevant in determining what shall be done under the law. I shall read those words again:

> In making this determination the Secretary shall give consideration to such Federal-State production research data as he deems relevant.

Mr. President, I do not believe that the Senate wishes to put itself on record as favoring the imposition of the judgment of any one man, no matter how dedicated he may be, in this important and controversial matter which is for the judgment of the courts. It is a case in which there has already been entered a decree of the District Court of the United States and a decree of the Circuit Court of Appeals of the United States, but in that litigation the final word has not been spoken, because the appeal can go to the U.S. Supreme Court.

I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I believe it is important to make legislative history on the amendment. It has been said on the floor of the Senate by several Senators that they do not believe the amendment is necessary, because the existing section of the law would be maintained.

I should like to ask the following question of the distinguished author of the amendment: In the event that the amendment should be adopted—and if it is correct, as I believe it to be, that the existing section of law would stand, whether the amendment is adopted or not—would the author say that the language of the amendment would create some kind of presumption which would then become an element for consideration by the court? Would it add anything? Would the amendment add any factor which the courts could then take into consideration?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I do not believe the amendment would add any additional factor. That is not the intent of Senators who have offered the amendment. We merely wish to be very sure that there is preserved the right of those who have gone to court to have a final court adjudication of the important question which they have raised under existing law, which applies not merely to tobacco, and not merely to type 14 tobacco, but to many other commodities as well. We think that that point should be decided by the courts. It is for that reason that we have offered the amendment.

Mr. COOPER. Then the Senator would agree—and I assume the Senator from Georgia would agree also—that the purpose of the amendment is to do nothing more than to preserve the existing law, and that it would in no way create a presumption upon which the court could fasten and say, "We have been directed by the Congress to act in a specific way"?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia to answer that question. I have already said that we are acting merely to preserve a lawsuit so that it may go to the Supreme Court for adjudication.

Mr. TALMADGE. It is the purpose and intent of the authors of the amendment to preserve the rights of the litigants under present law as they exist at the present time, without adding any additional rights to or taking any rights away from them. In other words, we wish to preserve the status quo as it is at the present time.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. LAUSCHE. It is my judgment that if the amendment is adopted, nothing will be added or detracted from what will be offered to support the action pending in the courts.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is my understanding of the situation. It has been well stated by the Senator.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I yield to my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, it would be unsafe to adopt the amendment. The amendment provides:

> Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the authority or responsibility of the Secretary of Agriculture under section 301(b)(15) or section 313(i) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to providing different types of tobaccos shall be treated as different kinds of tobacco or with respect to increasing allotments or quotas for farmers producing certain types of tobacco.

All farmers producing tobacco produce certain types of tobacco. The language of the amendment in stating, in effect, that the act shall not affect the authority of the Secretary to increase the allotments of farmers to produce certain types of tobacco would throw the validity of the whole bill in doubt. For that reason the amendment ought to be voted down.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to make a short statement and then I shall be ready to vote. There is no language in the bill which would in any way affect any authority or responsibility that the Secretary of Agriculture may have under section 301(b)(15) or section 313(i) of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. Therefore there is no need for the amendment, and we do not know what its possible effect might be. If the bill passes in its present form, sections 301(b)(15) and 313(i) will remain fully effective. But if we were to adopt the amendment, we would be suggesting that there is something in the bill that would, but for the amendment, affect the Secretary's authorities and responsibilities under section 301(b)(15).

In view of the statements that have been made with respect to the pending lawsuit, it is certain that the adoption of the amendment would be argued as showing that we adopted the contention of one side or the other in this lawsuit. Therefore, I must oppose the amendment. I am ready to vote.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate only briefly.

The able and distinguished Senator from North Carolina objected to the language in the last three lines of the amendment. I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that all that language does is to restate existing law. If Senators will turn to the hearings on the bill, page 193, they will see section 313(a), section 313(g), and section 313(j). Section 313(i) reads as follows:

> (i) Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, whenever after investigation the Secretary determines with respect to any kind of tobacco that a substantial difference exists in the usage or market outlets for any one or more of the types comprising such kind of tobacco and that the quantity of tobacco of such type or types to be produced under the marketing quotas and acreage allotments established pursuant to this section would not be sufficient to provide an adequate supply for estimated market demands and carryover requirements for such type or types of tobacco, the Secretary shall increase the marketing quotas and acreage allotments for farms producing such type or types of tobacco—

And so forth. Mr. President, that is existing law, and only existing law. The amendment would not change it one bit. What it would do would be to provide:

> The Secretary shall give such consideration to such Federal-State production research data as he deems relevant.

Mr. President, I do not wish the Secretary of Agriculture to look into the wastebasket and find a letter written by one in an insane asylum and say, "That is relevant." I think the Senate, if it wanted to be fair, would determine the same thing. I am ready to vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BASS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Georgia. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MCINTYRE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 23, as follows:

[No. 42 Leg.]

YEAS—47

Aiken
Allott
Bartlett
Bass
Bible
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Ellender
Fannin
Harris
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
McClellan
Miller
Morse
Morton
Mundt
Muskie
Pell
Prouty
Randolph
Ribicoff
Scott
Simpson
Smith
Symington
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Williams, Del.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—23

Anderson
Bayh
Brewster
Cannon
Ervin
Fong
Hart
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Montoya
Moss
Neuberger
Proxmire
Robertson
Tydings
Young, N. Dak.

NOT VOTING—30

Bennett
Boggs
Burdick
Dodd
Eastland
Fulbright
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Hickenlooper
Hill
Javits
Johnston
Long, La.
Magnuson
McGovern
McIntyre
Monroney
Murphy
Nelson

Pastore
Pearson
Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

So the amendment offered by Mr. TALMADGE, for himself and Mr. HOLLAND, was agreed to.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, while the Senators are in the Chamber and the majority leader is present, I should like to have some indication of the order of business for tomorrow and the remainder of the week.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, at the conclusion of business this afternoon, it is the intention of the leadership to adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow, at which time it will take up calendar order No. 134, S. 800, a bill to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes. Following the disposition of that bill, and others which may be on the calendar tomorrow, it is our intention then to go over to Wednesday. We hope that at that time we shall be able to take up the education bill.

ACREAGE-POUNDAGE MARKETING QUOTAS FOR TOBACCO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5721) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on the pending amendment the time be limited to 20 minutes; 10 minutes to the side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, are other amendments pending this evening, or is there a likelihood of a record vote on the amendment?

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, we have agreed on a unanimous-consent agreement for 20 minutes; 10 minutes to a side. I shall not ask for a yea-and-nay vote. So far as I am concerned, I shall be prepared to vote for passage after this amendment is disposed of. I have no objection to a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment on behalf of myself and the senior Senator from Florida. I ask that the amendment not be read, but printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 5721

Intended to be proposed by Mr. TALMADGE and Mr. HOLLAND to H.R. 5721, an Act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes, viz:

On page 3, line 3, strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)".

On page 3, line 5, strike out "(e)" and insert "(d)".

On page 3, line 9, strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)".

On page 3, beginning in line 9 with the word "In" strike out through line 14.

On page 6, line 11, strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)".

Beginning on page 7 with line 15, strike out all through line 12 on page 8.

On page 8, line 13, strike out "(c)" and insert "(b)".

On page 10, line 2, strike out "subsections (b) or (c)" and insert "subsection (b)".

On page 9, line 24, strike out "(d)" and insert "(c)".

On page 11, strike out lines 2 through 6 and insert "referendum on acreage-poundage quotas under this subsection, and at least 15 days prior to the holding of any special referendum under subsection (b)".

On page 11, line 21, strike out "(e)" and insert "(d)".

On page 12, line 19, strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)".

Beginning on page 13 with the word "Transfers" in line 23, strike out all through line 6 on page 14.

On page 14, line 7, strike out "(g)" and insert "(f)".

On page 16, line 3, strike out "(h)" and insert "(g)".

On page 16, line 21, strike out "(f)" and insert "(e)".

Beginning on page 16 with line 25, strike out all through line 15 on page 17.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, this amendment would do one thing, and one thing only. It would postpone for 1 year, until 1966, the acreage-poundage provision with reference to tobacco.

Burley is not included. It would place Flue-cured tobacco on the same basis as burley tobacco. There will be no acreage-poundage law relating to burley in the bill next year.

Last November, the Flue-cured tobacco farmer, in a referendum, voted overwhelmingly, some 90-odd percent, to accept an acreage reduction of 19.5 percent on tobacco acreage. They have acted in good faith on the proposal offered by the Government to reduce acreage 19.5 percent down in Florida.

In Florida virtually all of the Flue-cured tobacco people have already planted their tobacco. In my own State of Georgia virtually all of them would have completed their tobacco planting except that there has been a good deal of wet weather. That has impeded the planting of tobacco, but they have bought the seed and fertilizer, and under normal conditions would have planted 100 percent.

If this measure is approved by the Senate, the Secretary of Agriculture must call another referendum and say we did not mean what we said last November. We are changing the rules in the middle of the game, even though we have agreed to go ahead with this program. That is unfair and inequitable, particularly when the bill distinguishes between the burley producer and the Flue-cured tobacco producer. This measure would authorize poundage-acreage next year, but not in the year 1965.

I yield now to the able and distinguished senior Senator from Florida, who cosponsored the amendment.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Georgia. I shall have very little to say.

The real reason for this amendment is very obvious. All of the tobacco acreage in my State, which is not heavy, but belongs to some 5,200 growers, most of them small people, has been planted. There is no doubt about it. We know that is the case.

The Senator from Georgia referred to a similar situation in his State, just a little back of us.

If the bill is passed—which I asume it will be—and signed by the President, a referendum will be had. There will be a 30-day delay. Before that time not only will every single grower of type 14 tobacco already have planted but the planting will have been far advanced, and others up the seaboard will have planted.

It is not right to change the law applicable to these people, when so much investment has been made. when the industry is already in trouble, where there is a breach of feeling as between important segments in the industry, and when the law makes an invidious distinction between producers of Flue-cured tobacco and the equally fine people who produce burley tobacco.

I commend the Senators from Tennessee and Kentucky for recommending to the committee that the producers of burley should not be affected until next year, which means November or December of this year. It seems to me to make that distinction, particularly in view of the fact that the tobacco will have been planted for some weeks ahead, and some of it for 2 or 3 months, is just as wrong as can be.

We therefore urge that the two great branches of the tobacco producing industry be placed on an equal footing and be treated alike, as they would be with the proposed change. I do not care what the growers decide to do if they have a fair chance to get to that question and have a fair chance to decide it, but I object to their having to decide it when there is such a great difference between this 12 percent—and it will be much greater—and the rest. I do object to their being affected in an invidious way, being called on to make expenditures when the floor may be pulled out from under them.

I see no reason for making this kind of distinction between the growers of Flue-cured and burley tobacco. If they want to approve it by a two-thirds or more vote in November or December, I am willing to have them do it. I think it would be unwise to do it, but it is up to the growers. However, to force the change at this time is manifestly inequitable. I hope the Senate will do what it did a few minutes ago to avoid another manifest inequity when it voted that the litigation already pending would be saved from this bill.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to my colleague from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, if the Congress passes this bill, it will not be forcing the tobacco growers to do anything. It will merely give them a chance to determine whether they prefer the provisions of this bill over the old acreage allotments. We are in trouble today because the acreage procedures did not work. When acreage allotments are cut, the big growers merely put more fertilizer on the ground to grow more tobacco. The little growers cannot do it. The big one are the ones responsible for the overproduction, not the little growers.

The pending bill would put stringent controls under the poundage system rather than the acreage system. We are giving the growers the right to say whether they prefer the change. If they do not, they will vote it down.

There cannot be any comparison made as between the burley and Flue-cured tobacco because burley is not in great oversupply. That is not true of Flue-cured tobacco. The two cannot be compared for that reason.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ERVIN. I yield.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Burley is grown mostly in Kentucky. Most of the Flue-cured tobacco is grown in Florida, Georgia, the Carolinas, and Virginia. We have about 7 percent of it. There is an oversupply of it. Another bumper crop and we shall be ruined.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I yield myself 2 minutes. Flue-cured tobacco is included in this bill, but burley is not to be voted on this year, for the reason that burley is not in the trouble that Flue-cured tobacco is. There is no reason to have a referendum on burley this year. It authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture next year, if it is necessary—it may not be necessary—to call a referendum, after he has held hearings in the burley districts, which include Tennessee, Kentucky, and North Carolina, mostly. This is the reason burley is not included for this year.

Last year we sold on the domestic market and exported 1,100 million pounds of tobacco, but we produced 1,200 million to 1,250 million pounds. We put about 151 million more pounds in stock, which is that which we did not use or sell.

Last year there was a 10-percent cut in acreage. On top of the 10-percent cut in acreage, we also produced about 11 percent more tobacco than we did before.

The acreage system under which we are operating now is making a mockery of a balance between production and consumption. Technological processes give growers better ways for fertilizing, and better ways of tilling the soil, and other ways to get more tobacco out of a given piece of acreage. We have to do something to bring the production down. People do not smoke acres; they smoke pounds of tobacco.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator allotted to himself has expired.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. I yield the remaining time to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, how much time is left?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Six minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, while I have been in the Senate Chamber during the debate, much of which concerned Flue-cured tobacco, until now I have not participated except to ask some questions about the last amendment for the purpose of securing an interpretation of that amendment. I have not participated in the debate principally because the bill, as has been said, does not apply to burley tobacco this year.

However, the bill does authorize acreage-poundage programs for burley and dark leaf tobacco, which are produced in Kentucky, next year or later. If the Secretary desires to do so next year, he can ask for a referendum of burley growers, to choose between acreage-poundage and the present program. If two-thirds of the farmers voting should then approve, the acreage-poundage system of production controls would supersede and take the place of the present acreage allotment system of controls for the tobacco price support program.

I do not know what will happen during the coming crop year with respect to burley tobacco and Dark Fired and Dark Air-cured tobacco.

I supported the bill because, unless either the growers keep yields and their production per acre down, or there is a very large increase in demand, it appears to me that our burley tobacco program will be getting into trouble. It may not be in serious trouble yet, but it could be. So I voted in committee for the bill in order to give our growers the opportunity a year from now, if the Secretary asks for a referendum, to decide which of these programs would be best for burley growers and for the producers of Dark Fired and Dark Air-cured tobacco.

I believe that the entire tobacco program is in considerable difficulty. As I sat on the subcommittee which held hearings on this bill under the direction of its chairman, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. JORDAN], and with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE], I do have a duty to report my conclusions and my judgment as a result of those hearings.

There is a difference in the supply situation of Flue-cured tobacco and burley tobacco. For example, in the case of burley tobacco, Government loan stocks on February 28, 1965, amounted to 341 million pounds. In the case of Flue-cured tobacco, Government loan stocks amounted to 938 million pounds valued at more than $600 million.

As I interpret the testimony we heard, it was to the effect that if this year there is a good crop of Flue-cured tobacco—and the same would apply to burley tobacco—we could have a surplus in 1965 equal to that of 1964, and there could again be some 285 million pounds of Flue-cured tobacco placed under Government loan from that crop, which even allowing for some sales would mean over a billion pounds of Flue-cured tobacco held by the Government at the close of this marketing year.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. COOPER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Does the Senator believe that the Flue-cured tobacco industry will produce that great a surplus, when it will have to operate with 19½ percent less acreage that it did last year, by its own vote?

Mr. COOPER. No, it may not produce that much. I do point out, though, that last year we had a cut in burley acreage of 10 percent, and we had a drought. Yet even with the drought and the 10 percent cut, 50 million more pounds were produced than used, so that the total supply reached an all-time high.

Consequently, I believe that if our growers, both Flue-cured and burley, begin to believe that we are moving toward a stronger program, we shall find this year that they will put on more fertilizer, irrigate the land, and make every effort to get the utmost out of their production. The end result will be that the excess production will go into Government stocks.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ERVIN. We did have the 10-percent cut in Flue-cured tobacco last year and it did not accomplish very much, did it?

Mr. COOPER. The Senator is correct; about 1 percent more was produced, I understand. Unless our growers of tobacco use restraint and reduce their yields—and being good farmers and good businessmen, I do not believe they are going to do that—we are going to have increased production per acre every year. Even with additional cuts in acreage, farmers will work hard to realize just as much. If acreage cuts are continually offset by higher yields, in the end the price support program will just collapse.

I remember in 1948, when I first came to the Senate, I had the opportunity to introduce, with Senator Barkley, the amendment which today gives tobacco growers the 90 percent of parity support price. The distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who is the sponsor of the amendment now before the Senate, voted for that amendment and supported the 1948 bill. We carried it by one vote. That price support program has given our tobacco growers $1 billion more in the last 16 years than they would have received otherwise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time of the Senator from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Kentucky may speak for 2 additional minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senator from Kentucky is recognized for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I felt that I should make these comments, because I have served on the price support and production adjustment subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture Committee and have heard all the testimony. I supported the amendment just offered by the distinguished Senators, from Florida and Georgia, who are also members of the committee, because their growers have had this case in the district court and the circuit court of appeals, and their claim has been sustained.

The tobacco raised in the States of Georgia and Florida is designated as a particular type of tobacco. Consequently, I do not believe that anything should be placed in the bill which would deny their producers the right to have their final hearing in court. If the courts should decide as the lower courts have decided, their case is protected anyway. I believe there is unanimous agreement on that point. But based upon all the testimony which I heard, I must say that I have come to the conclusion, particularly in the case of Flue-cured tobacco, and probably in the case of burley, that unless we mend our ways, the tobacco program could collapse and we could lose our price support program. Every tobacco grower who grows any kind of tobacco would then find himself in the worst possible shape. In the 1930's and early 1940's, we remember, tobacco was selling at 15 cents, 18 cents, and 20 cents a pound.

Let me conclude by saying that this bill would give farmers an opportunity to vote. And two-thirds of them must vote to approve the acreage-poundage program before it can become their program. Therefore, I must oppose the amendment, but have taken this opportunity to state my position in support of the bill, and I hope that it will be enacted.

Mr. President, one of my amendments contained in the committee bill is designed to protect the position of small burley growers, who have allotments of one-half acre or less, and who are now protected under the acreage program. Senator Jennings Randolph has spoken to me about the many small growers in his State of West Virginia. He strongly supports the amendment, and asked me to express in the Senate his view that it is very important, and that it must be retained in the final bill enacted by the Congress. I am glad to do so, for I have also kept in close touch with the Senators from Tennessee and Members of the House of Representatives who wish to insist upon the provision.

Mr. President, I am glad that the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry adopted my amendments, which are now part of the bill the Senate will pass today. I ask unanimous consent that my views contained in the committee report, which describes these amendments, be printed at this point in the Record. Also, I have requested the latest figures on tobacco from the Department of Agriculture, and so that the record will be complete ask that this information, together with a brief statement, be included also.

There being no objection, the individual views, tables, and statements were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Individual Views of Senator Cooper

The tobacco program has been a good farm program. It has been good for farmers—for whom it has secured fair prices. And it has operated without substantial cost to taxpayers or loss to the Government. It has done so because tobacco growers have demonstrated their willingness and ability to maintain supplies in line with demand by accepting effective production controls.

But, in recent years, yields have increased rapidly—as much as 35 percent between 1960 and 1963, or 600 pounds more burley grown per acre—requiring repeated cuts in farm acreage allotments. And during the hearings of our committee on this bill, Under Secretary of Agriculture Murphy testified that the present program would require continuing cuts as production per acre continues to climb.

This bill would give farmers a choice between the present system of acreage controls and the acreage-poundage plan developed and recommended by the Department of Agriculture. As one of my amendments makes clear, unless two-thirds of the growers of a kind of tobacco vote in a special referendum for acreage-poundage, the existing acreage allotment and price-support program will remain in full effect.

Tobacco is the chief cash farm crop of Kentucky. The State ranks second in tobacco production only to North Carolina. It is the principal source of burley tobacco, which together with Dark Air-cured and Dark Fired, accounts for some $300 million of Kentucky's annual farm income. More than 300,000 farm families—140,000 of them in Kentucky—depend for their livelihood largely or in part upon their burley tobacco allotments. While this bill would apply immediately to Flue-cured tobacco, it also authorizes an acreage-poundage referendum next year or later for burley and other types of tobacco.

My purpose is to insure that any program presented to tobacco farmers protects the existing price-support program, and that full information will be provided to burley and dark leaf tobacco growers before an acreage-poundage referendum is held. For this reason I offered several amendments to the House bill. All were adopted by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, and I trust will be maintained in whatever acreage-poundage plan may be enacted by the Congress.

The committee amendments are described briefly in the Senate report. They are the amendments which I offered in committee, with the exception of the technical amendments for Flue-cured, 2 and 11, and amendment No. 4, which applies to all kinds of tobacco. I concurred in this amendment, offered by Senator Jordan. It is a very important amendment because it provides a more equitable method of allotting the national poundage quota among growers than does the House bill.

I am also glad that the House adopted the amendment of Congressman Stubblefield, of Kentucky, requiring field hearings by the Department of Agriculture to secure the views of growers before holding a referendum on acreage-poundage for any type of tobacco except Flue-cured.

Amendment No. 1 applies to all types of tobacco. Its purpose is to maintain the reserve supply level established in present law, which assures adequate stocks of tobacco—2.8 years' use in the case of burley. The amendment is also designed to prevent too drastic cuts in growers' poundage quotas, for the purpose of working off existing Government-loan stocks.

Amendment No. 12 permits burley growers to market up to 20 percent over their poundage quota—if they wish to do so by taking a corresponding reduction in their next year's acreage allotment and poundage quota. Unlike Flue-cured tobacco which is "primed" by pulling leaves from the stalk as they ripen in the field over a period of several weeks, the entire stalk of burley is cut, hung in the barn, cured, and then stripped and taken to market. Some years, depending on weather, it would be difficult for burley growers to hit their poundage goal precisely. There is a market, and an export market, for a wide variety of burley grades from the entire stalk. If good tobacco, ready for market, is not to be needlessly destroyed, this degree of flexibility is needed in burley—and in any event, it is a decision properly left to the farmer.

Amendment No. 13 applies to farms now having burley allotments of one-half acre or less. Under present law these small allotments are protected from cuts, but the administration bill made no provision for them under acreage-poundage. Under my amendment, the initial poundage quotas for small farms would be set on the same basis as all other farms. But after this initial adjustment, the quotas for these farms could not in future years be reduced below that figure. In this connection, I point out the testimony of the Department before our committee that while 33,000 Kentucky farms have burley allotments of one-half acre or less, this 23 percent of the allotments represents only 6 percent of the tobacco acreage. Yet these are often the allotments supporting families who have a real struggle for existence.

Amendment No. 14 requires the Department of Agriculture to consult with growers, State farm organizations, and tobacco cooperatives in determining the need for and details of an acreage-poundage plan for types other than Flue-cured tobacco. Amendments 6 and 8 assure ample notice of an acreage-poundage referendum, and require that each tobacco farmer be notified of his poundage quota and acreage allotment at least 15 days before the referendum. My other amendments are technical or similar in purpose.

I will vote for the bill, which has been recommended by the President and submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture. It gives tobacco growers a choice between the present and proposed methods of controlling production under the tobacco price support program. In making this choice, my amendments are intended to inform our farmers as fully as possible about the tobacco supply situation, its effect upon the tobacco price support program, and the details of the acreage-poundage proposal.

The tobacco price support program must not be allowed to collapse under the weight of an unmanageable surplus. Deeper cuts in acreage allotments year after year would be intolerable, and are not a fair solution to the problem of increasing farm yields.

I believe that all of us—tobacco growers, Members of Congress from the tobacco-growing States, and all those who work with tobacco—must join together to secure the best means to protect and continue the price support program, without which the tobacco grower would suffer great loss. We have worked hard throughout the years to protect our tobacco program and make it successful. We must continue to do so.

John Sherman Cooper.

TABLE I

	1962	1963	1964
	Production, value, and number of allotments (by crop years) for U.S. tobacco production		
U.S. tobacco production (pounds)	2,314,751,000	2,343,230,000	2,229,972,000
Value received by farmers	$1,363,808,000	$1,351,842,000	$1,306,764,000
Number of allotments	572,462	570,156	565,692
	Production, value, and number of allotments for U.S. burley tobacco production		
U.S. burley production (pounds)	674,854,000	755,146,000	631,462,000
Value received by farmers	$395,448,000	$446,706,000	$380,772,000
Number of allotments	301,142	299,843	298,633
	Production, value, and number of allotments for Kentucky tobacco production		
Kentucky tobacco production (pounds)	493,515,000	563,384,000	463,772,000
Value received by farmers	$278,310,000	$326,540,000	$272,052,000
Number of allotments	173,457	172,327	171,453

TABLE II.—*Tobacco: Acreage, yield, production, disappearance, price and crop value, United States, for specified years (farm-sales weight)*

Crop year	Acreage	Yield	Production	Disappearance [1]			Average price per pound	Value of crop
				Total	Domestic	Exports		
	Thousand acres	*Pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Million pounds*	*Cents*	*Million dollars*
Average:								
1925–29	1,756	773	1,356	1,387	787	600	18.7	253
1935–39	1,647	883	1,460	1,358	900	458	19.5	278
1945	1,821	1,094	1,991	1,928	1,334	594	42.6	848
1946	1,961	1,181	2,315	2,012	1,355	657	45.1	1,044
1947	1,852	1,138	2,107	1,850	1,413	437	43.6	918
1948	1,554	1,274	1,980	1,922	1,417	505	48.2	955
1949	1,623	1,213	1,969	1,951	1,420	531	45.9	905
1950	1,599	1,269	2,030	1,975	1,452	523	51.7	1,049
1951	1,780	1,310	2,332	2,072	1,488	584	51.1	1,191
1952	1,772	1,273	2,256	2,055	1,557	498	49.9	1,125
1953	1,633	1,261	2,059	1,995	1,480	515	52.3	1,076
1954	1,668	1,346	2,243	1,935	1,419	516	51.1	1,147
1955	1,495	1,466	2,193	2,058	1,410	648	53.2	1,166
1956	1,364	1,596	2,176	1,929	1,373	556	53.7	1,169
1957	1,122	1,486	1,668	1,921	1,393	528	56.1	936
1958	1,078	1,611	1,737	1,923	1,388	535	59.9	1,040
1959	1,153	1,558	1,796	1,928	1,425	503	58.3	1,048
1960	1,142	1,703	1,944	2,030	1,463	567	60.9	1,186
1961	1,174	1,755	2,061	2,051	1,461	590	63.8	1,315
1962	1,224	1,891	2,315	2,002	1,472	530	58.9	1,364
1963 [2]	1,175	1,993	2,343	2,056	1,447	609	57.7	1,352
1964 [2]	1,080	2,066	2,230	------	------	------	58.6	1,307

[1] For Flue-cured and Cigar-wrapper, year beginning July 1; for other types, Oct. 1.

[2] Preliminary.

Source: Tobacco Situations, December 1963 and December 1964, ERS, USDA.

TABLE III.—*Quantity and amount of investment in outstanding loans on tobacco by Commodity Credit Corporation on Jan. 31, 1965*

Kinds of tobacco	Quantity, redried and packed weight [1]	Amount of investment [2]	Kinds of tobacco	Quantity, redried and packed weight [1]	Amount of investment [2]
	Million pounds	*Million dollars*		*Million pounds*	*Million dollars*
Flue-cured	819	606	Other kinds [3]	27	14
Burley	306	214			
Kentucky-Tennessee Fire-cured	38	20	Total tobacco [4]	1,210	864
Kentucky-Tennessee Dark air-cured	20	10			

[1] The farm-sales weight equivalents of the tobacco under loan on Jan. 31, 1965, are estimated in million pounds as follows: Flue-cured, 952; burley, 344; Kentucky-Tennessee Fire-cured, 42; Kentucky-Tennessee Dark air-cured, 23; other kinds, 29; and total tobacco 1,390.

[2] The amount of investment shown in CCC accounts represents the unpaid principal balance of the loans to cooperative associations to implement price-support operations at the grower level. The actual value of the tobacco pledged as collateral for these loans based on the prices at which it is available to the trade exceeds the CCC investment by a sizable margin.

[3] Includes Virginia Fire-cured, Connecticut-Massachusetts Cigar-binder, Wisconsin-Ohio Cigar-binder and Cigar-filler, and Maryland tobaccos.

[4] Total differs slightly from summation of kinds due to rounding.

TABLE IV.—*Value of tobacco exports (sales for dollars and for local currencies, by years)*

Calendar year	Value of all tobacco exports	Value of tobacco exports, title I, Public Law 480	Title I sales as percent of total exports	Calendar year	Value of all tobacco exports	Value of tobacco exports, title I, Public Law 480	Title I sales as percent of total exports
	Millions	*Millions*	*Percent*		*Millions*	*Millions*	*Percent*
1955	$418.8	$31.3	7.5	1960	476.8	22.0	4.6
1956	399.3	48.5	12.1	1961	499.0	20.4	4.1
1957	432.7	26.6	6.1	1962	491.0	22.2	4.5
1958	439.5	28.3	6.4	1963	522.4	25.1	4.8
1959	440.5	41.6	9.4	1964	544.5	22.9	4.2

Principal markets for tobacco: United Kingdom, West Germany, Japan, Netherlands, Belgium, Sweden, Switzerland, Denmark, Ireland, Australia.

Principal markets for Public Law 480 commodities: Developing countries.

TABLE V.—*Price support and related program costs, basic*[1] *and selected commodities, Oct. 17, 1933, through June 30, 1964*

Commodity	Price support	Title I, Public Law 480	Tota
Feed grains	$3,990,790,783	$785,762,898	[3] $5,292,163,840
Corn and products	(2,865,711,758)	(435,961,353)	(3,622,686,201)
Wheat and products	2,089,714,316	7,399,536,695	[4] [5] 12,571,816,232
Rice	228,129,085	818,308,104	1,245,520,628
Tobacco	43,655,959	281,951,387	329,132,552
Cotton, upland	1,273,391,336	1,609,769,839	[6] 3,786,367,178
Dairy products	3,362,560,982	126,731,645	4,198,028,330
Oils and oilseeds	589,085,430	793,478,380	1,432,472,169
Peanuts	(266,410,022)	0	(266,410,022)
Total	12,658,994,789	14,728,570,734	31,871,171,416

[1] Basic commodities: Corn, wheat, rice, tobacco, cotton, peanuts.

[2] In addition to price support losses and title I, Public Law 480, costs shown, includes realized losses from price-support related programs, and cost of other programs operated under specific statutory authority for separate reimbursement.

[3] Does not include 1963 crops price-support payments, $382,409,240, and acreage diversion payments, $2,459,529,993.

[4] Includes $1,433,029,637 under International Wheat Agreement.

[5] Does not include 1963 crops price-support payments, $79,169,092, and acreage diversion payments, $448,379,518.

[6] Does not include cotton equalization program payments, $62,609,966.

Source: Commodity Credit Corporation report of financial condition and operations, June 30, 1964.

TABLE VI

Excise taxes on tobacco products, fiscal year ending June 30, 1964:

[In thousands]

Federal excise tax on tobacco products (96.3 percent from cigarettes)	$2,052,545
Total State excise tax on tobacco products (98.2 percent from cigarettes)	1,279,620
Local excise tax on tobacco products (99.2 percent from cigarettes)	58,704
Total, all tobacco products (97.1 percent from cigarettes)	3,390,869

The tobacco growers receive an average of slightly more than 3 cents for the tobacco contained in a package of cigarettes. The Federal, State, and local governments together impose cigarette taxes the weighted average of which 13.3 cents per package, or more than four times as much as the growers receive.

TABLE VII.—*1964 tobacco allotments, by States, burley, Flue, Fire, Air, Sun, Maryland, Cigar-binder, and Cigar-filler and Cigar-binder*

FLUE-CURED[1]

State	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
Alabama	253	501.80
Florida	6,922	13,599.77
Georgia	25,889	64,930.15
North Carolina	117,102	421,045.49
South Carolina	25,252	74,132.48
Virginia	22,657	64,030.94
Total	198,075	638,240.63

BURLEY[2]

State	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
Alabama	41	30.42
Arkansas	79	54.13
Georgia	216	91.16
Illinois	12	5.23
Indiana	9,683	7,906.30
Kansas	53	85.08
Kentucky	142,855	204,256.46
Missouri	1,651	3,192.96
North Carolina	18,156	10,585.67
Ohio	10,798	10,110.37
Pennsylvania	2	1.63
South Carolina	9	4.39
Tennessee	93,081	65,062.83
Texas	2	.46
Virginia	17,381	11,369.91
West Virginia	4,614	2,941.37
Total	298,633	315,698.37

FIRE-CURED (TYPES 22, 23, AND 24)[3]

State	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
Illinois	1	0.04
Kentucky	9,107	13,877.27
Tennessee	8,795	15,616.84
Total	17,903	29,494.15

TABLE VII.—*1964 tobacco allotments, by States, burley, Flue, Fire, Air, Sun, Maryland, Cigar-binder, and Cigar-filler and Cigar-binder*—Continued

FIRE-CURED (TYPE 21)[4]

State	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
Virginia	7,281	9,144.95

DARK AIR-CURED[5]

State	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
Indiana	116	34.89
Kentucky	19,491	12,057.39
Tennessee	4,818	2,040.06
Total	24,425	14,132.34

SUN-CURED[6]

State	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
Virginia	2,282	3,471.64

CIGAR-FILLER AND CIGAR-BINDER[7]

State	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
Illinois	3	4.25
Indiana	2	1.27
Iowa	1	7.24
Minnesota	121	168.70
New York	71	35.06
Ohio	1,586	4,584.95
Pennsylvania	122	176.04
Wisconsin	6,185	15,346.68
Total	8,091	20,324.19

CIGAR-BINDER[8]

State	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
Connecticut	1,294	4,492.32
Massachusetts	946	2,188.76
New York	1	.04
Vermont	1	3.35
Total	2,242	6,684.47

MARYLAND[9]

State	Number of allotments	Acreage allotted
Delaware	1	0.13
Maryland	6,667	47,275.98
Virginia	92	22.13
Total	6,760	47,298.24
Grand total	565,692	1,084,488.98

[1] Average Flue-cured allotment, 3.22 acres.

[2] Average burley allotment, 1.06 acres.

[3] Average Fire-cured allotment (types 22, 23, and 24), 1.65 acres.

[4] Average Fire-cured allotment (type 21), 1.26 acres.

[5] Average Dark Air-cured allotment, 0.58 acre.

[6] Average Sun-cured allotment, 1.52 acres.

[7] Average Cigar-filler and Cigar-binder allotment, 2.51 acres.

[8] Average Cigar-binder allotment, 2.98 acres.

[9] Average Maryland allotment, 7 acres.

NOTE.—Average size, all tobacco allotments, 1.92 acres.

DESCRIPTION OF COOPER AMENDMENTS NOT DISCUSSED IN INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Amendments Nos. 3 and 5 provide the same 5-year base period—1959 through 1963—for other kinds of tobacco as the House bill provides for Flue-cured. It must be made clear that 1965 production will not count as history for building the poundage quota which will determine the farm income for every future year. To do so would be to require farmers to compete to produce this year the highest possible poundage. While this would stimulate surplus production, only those who managed to increase yields even more than the average would benefit, as under the formula all yields would be uniformly factored back.

Nineteen hundred and sixty-four was a drought year in much of Kentucky and other tobacco States. If this year were included, those farmers not hit by drought could use 1964 record yields. But those suffering a crop failure would have to pick up 1961 as their third best year—when yields were much lower. This would create an inequity, discriminating against those hit by drought.

Amendment No. 9 limits the farm yield for new tobacco farms to not more than the community average yield. County ASCS Committees have discretion now in determining the size of a new grower allotment, according to similar farms in the same area. The amendment would set a standard on the yields to be assigned to new farms.

Amendment No. 10 makes it clear that the bill does not grant authority for leasing burley allotments, prohibited by the Cooper Amendment now contained in section 316 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1948, as amended in 1961.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Before this bill is passed, I think mention should be made of Mr. Frank R. Ellis, for a number of years Chief of the Price Support Branch of the Tobacco Division of the Department of Agriculture, and later executive secretary to Congressman FRANK STUBBLEFIELD, of Kentucky. Mr. Ellis is a native of Murray, Ky., and the brother of Mr. Holmes Ellis, general manager of the Western Dark Fired Tobacco Growers Association. He is now engaged in very important work as Director of the Food for Peace program in the Agency for International Development.

Ten years ago Frank Ellis worked out the essentials of the acreage-poundage plan, and represented the Department of Agriculture in the field hearings that were held on the 1957 bill. I think all who know tobacco acknowledge his foresight and leadership, and credit is due him for laying the ground work for the program the Congress is today authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to present to tobacco growers for their decision.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. TALMADGE] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND].

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I call for a division.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, can we not have a yea-and-nay vote on this amendment?

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois will state it.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What is the issue now before the Senate? Is it passage of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments en bloc of the Senators from Georgia and Florida.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Can the yeas and nays be ordered?

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. On passage only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division is called for.

On a division, the amendments were rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I ask for a third reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time. The bill was read the third time.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware is recognized.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, the Surgeon General recently issued a report, warning the American people about the use of tobacco as being injurious to the health of the American citizen.

Another committee is currently considering a bill under which it is proposed to label cigarettes as dangerous and to emphasize to the American people that the use of tobacco is injurious to health.

The Senate here today has before it a bill which would further subsidize the production of tobacco while this other agency of Government asserts tobacco to be injurious to the health.

During the past few years, we have spent over $39 million in subsidizing the production of tobacco. The time has come when we should stop these contradictory programs. We should defeat this bill, then repeal the entire program, and stop the use of the taxpayers' money to subsidize a product which every agency of the Government states is injurious to the American citizen.

I hope that the bill will be defeated. This contradiction just does not make sense.

CLOSING OF VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITALS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, over the weekend, the President announced the appointment of a blue ribbon committee, of which the Chairman is Barrett Prettyman, and the members are Representative OLIN TEAGUE, Representative Ross ADAIR, Gen. Alfred Gruenther, Dr. Dudley White, James Gleason, and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG].

This committee will report on the veterans hospital situation by June 1.

In the meantime, Mr. Earl Cooper, with the assistance of two persons from the General Accounting Office, have investigated many of the hospitals which are to be closed, and have accumulated a fine report containing an analysis and reasons for the closings.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that the report of the so-called blue ribbon committee is not due until June 1, whereas under the terms of present law, the hospitals will be closed on May 1.

It is time for the Senate to face this dilemma and solve it. I have an idea that the Senate will do so in the next few days. In the meantime, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, GRAND JUNCTION, COLO.

REASONS FOR CLOSING	ANALYSIS OF REASONS FOR CLOSING
	Size
The Grand Junction VA Hospital is a small high-cost hospital.	**This hospital is the fifth smallest hospital in the VA system and has a capacity of 152 beds.**
	Cost of operation
	As to per diem costs (costs per patient per day) Grand Junction costs for fiscal year 1964 were $34.07 per patient per day. This is $5.69 higher than the national average of $28.38. Thirteen of the 129 G.M. & S. hospitals show higher per diem costs. The nearest hospitals (which are designated to absorb the Grand Junction patient load) show costs as follows: Denver $31.80, with 528 beds, Salt Lake City $30.25, with 532 beds.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, GRAND JUNCTION, COLO.—Continued

REASONS FOR CLOSING

This hospital does not meet VA's needs for future care of veterans.

This hospital is isolated from the standpoint of veteran population.

This hospital is isolated from the standpoint of scientific stimuli.

Its 9 physicians, 1 dentist, and 24 nurses (out of a total employment of about 170) have been operating a hospital at less than optimum capacity.

Its 9 physicians, 1 dentist, and 24 nurses have been unable to develop the type of medical atmosphere which the VA should have.

Although this hospital has a nominal affiliation it currently has no residents and no training programs.

This percentage is rated to the number of "operating beds" which is a budgetary quanity and is not necessarily related to the capacity. For example, at Grand Junction for fiscal year 1965 the actual capacity is 152 beds but the "operating bed" level for computing bed occupancy rates is 136 beds.

This hospital cannot justify the expenditures of research funds.

The occupancy rate is low. The cumulative rate for fiscal year 1964 was 76 percent but for some parts of the year it was as low as 58 percent. The VA cannot justify continuance of this type of high-cost operation.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL, GRAND JUNCTION, COLO.—Continued

REASONS FOR CLOSING	ANALYSIS OF REASONS FOR CLOSING
	Cost of operation The cost per patient treated at Grand Junction for fiscal year 1964 was $850. Of the 129 G.M. & S. hospitals in the VA system 70 had higher costs per patient treated. The average cost per patient treated was $925 for all VA G.M. & S. hospitals. This hospital is not located adjacent to a medical school and thus is unable, according to VA, to offer the broad spectrum of medical specialties that could be offered at a hospital affiliated with and adjacent to a medical school. This broad spectrum of medical specialties seem to be the VA goal for the future, according to Dr. Joseph H. McNinch, Chief, VA Medical Director. The attached brochure prepared by the Veterans of Foreign Wars shows how isolated this hospital is from the veteran population and some of the travel hardships involved. (See p. 119.) This hospital is located 258 miles from Denver and 290 miles from Salt Lake City where the closest medical schools are located According to Dr. L. A. Zink, Associate Deputy Chief Medical Director of VA, the proper scientific stimuli can only be found in a close affiliation with a medical school at a hospital located adjacent to the school. The hospital has been operating at less than what VA considers to be the optimum. VA considers that a bed occupancy rate of 85 to 92 percent provides the best possible patient care. Grand Junction has had the following occupancy rates. Fiscal year 1960, 78.9 percent; 1961, 77.6 percent; 1962, 75 percent; 1963, 63.8 percent; 1964, 75.9 percent; and the first half of fiscal year 1965, 75 percent. The ambiguity of the term "medical atmosphere" makes analysis of this justification difficult, if not impossible. Apparently VA is referring to the location of the hospital, some distance from a medical school, because without a close affiliation program. VA contends a topflight medical atmosphere does not exist. At present there are two physicians in the "preceptorship" or "advanced residency program" at the hospital. This program has been operated with two residents on duty for several years. At the end of the 2-year program the "preceptors" have sufficient experience and enough cases to meet the requirements of the American Board of Surgery. The Deans Committee of the University of Colorado Medical School supervises the program. This affiliation has provided staff doctors without hardly any recruiting effort and has on occasion resulted in a waiting list for the positions which will become open. In fiscal year 1964, the Grand Junction hospital had two research projects with a total cost allowance of $3,020; a study of erythropoiesis in emphysema; and the relationship of high altitude to hiatus hernia. According to the director of the Grand Junction hospital, research funds were turned down last year because the staff was unable to undertake additional research. He explained that the staff workload was too high and the interest could not be generated. It is true that the average daily patient bed occupancy rate for fiscal year 1964 was 75.9 percent. The average daily patient load occupying beds at the hospital for the past few years has somewhat declined as follows: 1960, 120; 1961, 118; 1962, 114; 1963, 97; 1964, 110; and the first half of fiscal year 1965, 102. During the peak month each year the average daily patient load was as follows: 1960, February, 138; 1961, February, 138; 1962, January, 135; 1963, January, 118; 1964, February, 123. The actual capacity of the hospital is 152 beds but because of the decrease in patient demand the number of beds kept in operation was reduced in fiscal year 1964 to 145 and in fiscal year 1965 to 136 beds. The number of patients treated at the hospital each fiscal year has somewhat declined as follows: 1960, 1,870 patients treated; 1961, 1,706; 1962, 1,532; 1963, 1,554; 1964, 1,615; and for the first half of fiscal year 1965, 811. The hospital anticipated that for fiscal year 1965 they would have treated 1,682 patients if the operations would have continued normally.
The service area for Grand Junction is spread over a large portion of western Colorado and eastern Utah.	This statement is true and is a good reason to keep the hospital open rather than being a reason to close the hospital. Because of the large area served the veterans travel is burdensome (as is explained in another portion of this analysis) and to close the hospital and require the veterans to travel further, to Denver and Salt Lake City, would be more burdensome.
The Grand Junction patient load can be handled at Salt Lake and Denver. Currently Salt Lake City is operating below capacity.	An analysis of patient demand at the Grand Junction, Salt Lake City, and Denver VA Hospitals for the "peak" months, January, February, and March of 1964 shows that, with Salt Lake City operating at capacity (628 beds), the patient load at Grand Junction could have been absorbed by the two "receiving hospitals" on 90 of 91 days.
The hospital was selected for closing because it is located between two professionally comprehensive and well-staffed VA medical programs located in Denver and Salt Lake City.	The Grand Junction hospital is located 258 miles from Denver and 290 miles from Salt Lake City. VA hospitals located in those cities are affiliated and offer the "broad spectrum" of care which VA contends is necessary to provide the best medical care to veterans.
Transporting emergency cases by the use of ambulance plane makes these two broadly based programs accessible to the veterans who now reside in the Grand Junction service area. According to representatives of veterans' organizations in Colorado, the ambulance plane, which must fly at a high altitude over the range of mountains between Grand Junction and Denver, is not pressurized. Such a plane might cause considerable discomfort to the emergency cases being transported and under certain circumstances patients may not be allowed to travel in a nonpressurized plane over the mountain ranges.	Although this hospital is of post-World War II construction, it is small and has insufficient veteran population density to support the specialized skills that are found in its neighboring hospitals. The hospital was opened in May 1949. With 136 beds it serves an area with a 1963 veteran population of 27,010 or 5.04 beds per thousand veterans compared wtih a national average of 2.9 G.M. & S. beds per 1,000 veterans and Denver's 2.3 G.M. & S. beds per 1,000 veterans. During the years from fiscal year 1960 to 1964 the occupancy of the hospital ranged from a low of 63.8 percent in 1963 to a high of 78.9 percent in 1960 compared with VA's optimum desired occupancy rate of 85 to 92 percent.
The waiting list has been consistently below the national average.	While the Grand Junction waiting list was below the national average, it was higher than the "receiving" hospitals at Denver and Salt Lake City: Waiting list per 100 operating beds: National average ____ 11.3 Grand Junction ____ 6.9 Salt Lake City ____ 6.2 Denver ____ 2.6 Thus the low waiting list appears to prevail in the entire area, rather than applying to Grand Junction alone.
It is the VA's judgment that the VA hospitals at Denver and Salt Lake City offer higher caliber services covering the major specialties and have sufficient capacity to provide these services to veterans now residing in the Grand Junction area.	An analysis of patient loads at the three hospitals (Grand Junction, Denver, and Salt Lake City) shows that the "receiving hospitals" could have easily absorbed the Grand Junction patient load during the peak months of 1964, provided unused beds are activated at Salt Lake City. At hospitals such as Salt Lake City and Denver, having close affiliation with medical schools, the VA believes it can offer a "broad spectrum" of medical specialties, thereby providing better care to the veterans treated than is possible in isolated hospitals such as Grand Junction.

Physical condition of buildings and equipment, as of Feb. 23, 1965

PER INSPECTION BY CHIEF ENGINEER

Building or equipment	Condition	Recommendations
Building No. 1:		
Roofs	Good	Requires pointing of riglets and flashings annually, good physical inspection.
Exterior	do	Window sash and screens could stand painting or placing in A-1 condition.
Interior walls and partitions	do	Washing, cleaning, and painting; doors need refinishing.
Floors	do	None.
Floor covering	Fair	Many areas showing wear, replacements will be needed within 2d or 3d years.
Substructures	Good	Sump pump in service room should be kept in operation to avoid water seepage into room which would be approximately 2 or 3 feet deep in short period of time.
Building service equipment:		
Ventilating systems: Includes exhaust systems, kitchen hoods, dishwater, etc.	do	Cleaned, fiscal year 1965.
Air conditioner-humidifier, surgery	Fair	Mechanical parts all good, except spray pump needs replacing. Refrigerating units, coils and fan replaced, fiscal year 1964.
Communication system:		
Nurses call system	Good	Was planned to replace with audiovisual, fiscal year 1965.
Radio system	Fair	Console needs new tuners and turntables, entire system needs rewiring.
Electric wiring and fixtures	Good	No recommendations.
Elevators	do	Commutators of MG sets should be turned down; this was planned for fiscal year 1965, 3d quarter (canceled).
Dumbwaiters	do	No recommendations.
Fire alarm system	do	Batteries should be replaced for standby power to alarm circuit.
Gas distribution	do	Covers only laboratory, pharmacy and dental clinic, butane system only.
Heating system	do	All controls should be checked by Johnson representative next year; all traps should be checked yearly.
Plumbing system	do	No recommendations.
Refrigeration system	Fair	Ammonia system should be planned for replacement with freon.
Fire sprinkler system	Good	No recommendations.
Air compressors	do	Do.
Vacuum pump	Fair	Do.
Water coolers	Good	Water cooled by ammonia system should be changed to freon.
Portable air conditioners	do	No recommendations.
Emergency generators	do	Do.
100 kilowatt	do	Do.
10 kilowatt	do	Do.
Hot water storage tanks	do	Do.
Controls and coils	Fair	Coils and controls should be planned for replacement.
Sump pump	do	It is important that this pump be operative at all times to remove seepage water from service room.
Sidewalk heating unit	Good	Needs regular checking during operating season, and proper care when shutting down in summer season.
Steam distribution system	do	Steam reducing stations need annual check. New PRV valve for main station available. Not installed.
Building No. 2:		
Directors quarters	do	Building repainted completely, interior 1964. Basement should be watched for seepage water. Exterior should be painted.
Building service equipment	do	
Building No. 3: 4-unit apartment	do	All apartments need repainting. Apartments B, C, and D need garbage disposals replaced. Sump pump needs to be in operation to keep seepage water out. Exterior should be painted.
Building No. 4: 5-car personnel garage	do	Overhead doors and tracks need adjusting for better operation.
Building No. 5: Nonhousekeeping quarters	do	Rooms need painting, sump pit needs concrete lining, sump pit and pump should operate continuously to keep seepage water out. Also necessary to keep opening clear under footer.
Building No. 6: Nonhousekeeping quarters—closed, used for storage	Fair	Needs cleaning and painting, some plastering, basement needs repairing, loose tile—shower and toilet room. Drain needs to be kept open under footer to relieve seepage water pressure.
Building No. 7: Warehouse	Good	None.
Building No. 8: Garage and shop	do	Cleaning and painting interior.
Building No. 9:		
Boiler plant	do	Painting interior and exterior.
Boilerhouse equipment:		
Boiler	Fair	Arches need replacement; sidewall of fireboxes replaced, 1964.
Stokers	Good	Need yearly maintenance to keep in A 1 condition.
Coal conveyor	Fair	Augers should be planned for replacement.
Blowoff system	Good	None.
Forced draft blowers	do	None, routine maintenance.
Water control valve	do	Do.
Water columns	do	Do.
Soot blowers	do	Do.
Automatic damper control	do	Do.
Main header valves	do	Need refacing on yearly basis.
Mechanical fly ash removal system	do	(1) Another I.D. fan should be installed as standby as no steam can be produced if present fan is out of service. (2) Conversion of coal-fired system to natural gas would eliminate possible trouble from fly ash system and ash disposal.
Feed water pump, vacuum pumps, and condensate pumps	do	Should remain in good condition with required maintenance.
Deaerator feed water	Fair	Coils need checking and cleaning.
Booster pumps for elevated water tank	Good	None.
Coal silo and elevator	do	Drain at floor level or sump pump needed in elevator pit.
Steam reducing valves	Fair	2 have been replaced, remainder working satisfactorily at present, should be checked for replacement planning.
50-kilowatt emergency generator	do	None.
Structure No. 10: Chimney	Good	Continued inspection by Custodious Co.; surface needs painting for looks only.
Structure No. 11: Elevated water tower	do	Painting of interior should be planned for fiscal year 1967.
Building No. 12: Utility shops	do	None.
Building No. 13: Laundry	do	Sump pump needs to continue operation for removal of seepage water.
Building No. 14: Incinerator	do	Incinerator needs relining.
Structure No. 15: Flagpole	do	Should be painted yearly.
Structure No. 16: Coal silo—covered with building No. 9.		
Building No. 17: Storage shed	Fair	Built for lumber storage.
Building No. 18: Carport	Good	Should have steel beams to eliminate center posts supporting center beam.
Building No. 19: Butler Bldg. housing 100-kilowatt emergency generator.	do	None.
T1A-1B: Duplex, housekeeping quarters	Fair	These quarters require more maintenance due to type of construction. All units should have water heaters replaced.
T2A-2B: Duplex, housekeeping quarters	do	Do.
T3A-3B: Duplex, housekeeping quarters	do	Do.
Roads	Good	Should be checked and cracks sealed.
Parking areas	Fair	Should be resealed, and utility area needs 1-inch mat laid on top of present surface.
Walks	Good	None.
Curbs	Fair	Few areas need to be raised.
Grounds: Lawns, trees, shrubbery	Good	Remain in good condition with proper fertilizing, pruning, trimming, watering, etc.
Fences	Fair	Areas enclosed with chain link fence good; pole fence in front of station should be planned for replacement. Approximately 300 feet of chain link fence needed to complete fencing of south boundary.
Water distribution: Main system	Good	None.
Lawn sprinkling	Poor	System has been added to with pipe available for use; an entire new system should be planned; a system with automatic heads to eliminate the use of hoses should be planned.

Physical condition of buildings and equipment, as of Feb. 28, 1965—Continued

PER INSPECTION BY CHIEF ENGINEER—Continued

Building or equipment	Condition	Recommendations
Fire hydrants	Good	None.
Sanitary sewers	do	Do.
Storm sewers	do	Catch basins and lines should be flushed regularly.
Steam distribution	do	None.
Electric distribution	do	Do.

ACREAGE-POUNDAGE MARKETING QUOTAS FOR TOBACCO

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5721) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price-support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I announce that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG], the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. YARBOROUGH], are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McGOVERN], the Senator from New Hampshire, [Mr. McINTYRE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. NELSON], the Senator from Oregon [Mrs. NEUBERGER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. BURDICK], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS] would each vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS].

If present and voting, the Senator from Louisiana would vote "yea" and the Senator from Florida would vote "nay."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS], the Senator from New York [Mr. JAVITS] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is absent on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] are detained on official business.

If present and voting, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] would vote "yea."

On this vote, the Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] is paired with the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT]. If present and voting, the Senator from California would vote "yea" and the Senator from Utah would vote "nay."

On this vote, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PEARSON] is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. BOGGS]. If present and voting, the Senator from Kansas would vote "yea" and the Senator from Delaware would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 54, nays 16, as follows:

[No. 43 Leg.]

YEAS—54

Aiken
Anderson
Bartlett
Bass
Bayh
Bible
Brewster
Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Dirksen
Douglas
Ervin
Fannin
Fulbright
Harris
Hart
Hayden
Inouye
Jackson
Jordan, N.C.
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Long, Mc.
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McGee
McNamara
Metcalf
Mondale
Monroney
Montoya
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Muskie
Prouty
Proxmire
Randolph
Robertson
Scott
Smith
Symington
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—16

Allott
Cotton
Curtis
Dominick
Fong
Holland
Hruska
Jordan, Idaho
Lausche
Miller
Morse
Pell
Ribicoff
Simpson
Talmadge
Williams, Del.

NOT VOTING—30

Bennett
Boggs
Burdick
Carlson
Dodd
Eastland
Ellender
Gore
Gruening
Hartke
Hickenlooper
Hill
Javits
Johnston
Long, La.
Magnuson
McGovern
McIntyre
Murphy
Nelson
Neuberger
Pastore
Pearson
Russell
Saltonstall
Smathers
Sparkman
Stennis
Williams, N.J.
Yarborough

So the bill (H.R. 5721) was passed.

Mr. JORDAN of North Carolina. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar 134, Senate bill 800, and that it be laid down and made the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 800) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1966 for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, tests, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Montana.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE OTEPKA CASE AND ITS SEQUEL

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, in the April 4 issue of the Des Moines Register appears an article by Clark Mollenhoff, highly regarded reporter of the Register's Washington Bureau, relating a most unfortunate development in the State Department's bizarre handling of the case of Otto Otepka.

It will be recalled that Mr. Otepka headed the evaluators in the Security Division of the State Department at one time and was the recipient of awards for outstanding service to the Government. When he was called to testify before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee regarding lax practices which had come to light in the Department's security clearance program, he offered evidence which made it clear that false testimony had been given the committee by certain high State Department officials. Notwithstanding this false testimony, one of the three officials concerned is still on the payroll at the State Department; the other two were permitted to resign, thus protecting all of their retirement rights, and one of these has since been added to the legal staff of the Federal Communications Commission. On page 96, volume 110, part 1, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will be found excerpts from the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee's previously classified hearing reports on this matter which I included in my remarks before the Senate.

Charges were made against Mr. Otepka by one of these officials. Even though his false testimony before the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has been made clear, these charges have not been withdrawn. Mr. Otepka's reward for long and faithful service to the Government and for integrity before the Congress has been reassignment to paper-shuffling duties in the Department while a case for discharging him from the Department has dragged on.

Last October 31, the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee wrote a letter to the Secretary of State, expressing its confidence in Mr. Otepka's "integrity, capability, and professional skill," asserting the right of a committee of the Senate to have testimony of any official or employee of the Government respecting any question of security or possible wrongdoing in any department or agency, if the subject matter of the committee's inquiry falls within its jurisdiction, declaring that a Government employee who comes before a Senate committee and testifies truthfully should not thereafter be penalized or disciplined in any way for doing so, and pointing out that Mr. Otepka's testimony has been "a valuable contribution to the Internal Security Subcommittee's current investigation of security in the State Department."

The subcommittee renewed its expression of confidence in Mr. Otepka on March 11 of this year. Still the charges against Mr. Otepka have not been dropped.

Now it is revealed in the Des Moines Register article that retaliation is being taken against some of Mr. Otepka's associates in the security division. In March 1964 six of his associates were transferred out of the security division into the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs for work which they were told was on a supersecret project. At the time, these men did not wish to be transferred and they contended that the transfer was a disciplinary move to get them out of the security business because they had agreed to give testimony in behalf of Mr. Otepka. It now appears that the supersecret work to be done in the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs was not very important at all, and two of these men are being transferred out of there to positions in El Paso and Denver where they may find their jobs eventually abolished with no protection to their rights as security investigators. They regard these moves as demotions, and they have taken action to appeal the transfers through civil service procedure. As of last Friday their salaries were cut off in a move to force them, through economic necessity, to accept these transfers.

One of these men, John R. Norpel, served in the Federal Bureau of Investigation in highly sensitive positions for 10 years before going to work for the State Department. Howard Shea, the other security officer, also has a fine record of service. Their only offense, it seems, is that they have had the courage to stand by Otto Otepka, because they know of Mr. Otepka's faithfulness to our country's security and they also know of the lax practices which occurred in the State Department clearance procedures.

Here is an instance of a "public be damned" attitude on the part of those in control of the State Department. It makes no difference how loyal these employees have been. It makes no difference that they have been right and some of the higher-ups who tried to get Otto Otepka were proved to be perjurers. It makes no difference that lax practices in security were found out and that the Congress was given truthful testimony about such practices. All that seems to matter is that Otto Otepka and his loyal associates shall be made to pay the price for stepping on sensitive toes of certain officials in the State Department who had no business having sensitive toes.

I hope the Civil Service Commission will look into these cases, and I hope the appropriate committees of the House and Senate will make sure that the civil service rights of these loyal employees are protected.

It is no doubt true that certain people in the State Department should be transferred out of Washington, but the one's who have made these unfortunate decisions are the ones who should be transferred—not those they have selected for punishment to satisfy their false sense of departmental authority.

I ask unanimous consent that the article appearing in the Des Moines Register of April 4, to which I have referred, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CUT OFF PAY OF TWO OTEPKA FRIENDS

(By Clark Mollenhoff)

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The State Department has cut off the salaries of two security officers who supported chief security evaluator, Otto F. Otepka, and opposed what they call "disciplinary transfers" out of the Washington area.

John R. Norpel, 39-year-old former FBI agent, said Saturday that the State Department is engaging in "economic retaliation" because of his efforts to fight a transfer that can "destroy" his civil service job rights.

NEW POSTS

Norpel and Howard Shea, also a security officer who agreed to testify for Otepka, were notified in February that they were being assigned to posts in El Paso, Tex., and Denver, Colo.

Both filed objections on grounds that the new jobs represented demotions, and also because it appeared that the new posts might be discontinued at any time.

Neither Norpel nor Shea has been able to obtain any more than curt replies from the State Department personnel office or from William J. Crockett, the Deputy Under Secretary of State who is in charge of administration. Crockett has been a key figure in efforts to oust Otepka.

Otepka gave testimony before a Senate committee that was critical of his superiors, then produced three documents to prove he had told the truth and his superiors had not, on a security matter.

Norpel and Shea wanted specific assurance that the new jobs would not be abolished within a few months after they had been assigned to them. They also wanted to know why they were being removed from positions in the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs, to which they were assigned only a year ago with assurances that this assignment required their expertise as investigators and security evaluators.

SIX-WEEK EFFORT

For 6 weeks, they have tried unsuccessfully to obtain written explanations of the reasons for the transfers, which were to be effective April 1. Instead of explanations, they have received notes indicating they have received all the information they will receive, and that the transfer decisions would not be changed.

Norpel wrote to Secretary of State Dean Rusk last week to appeal to him to examine the transfer decisions, but no reply had been received from Rusk when Norpel and Shea were informed they have been cut from the State Department payroll and must not visit the offices they occupied in the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs.

The notice, from G. Marvin Gentile, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Security, stated that Norpel and Shea are to be considered absent without leave from their Government jobs until they report to the posts in El Paso and Denver.

Norpel, who has a GS–13 civil service rating, received a salary of $13,750 a year. Shea, with a GS–12 rating, received a salary of $13,000 a year.

The letter of explanation from Crockett to Norpel stated that the assignment was made because of "the critical need for trained investigators in our field offices at this time."

GOOD OF SERVICE

"Your previous background as an investigator, and your present availability for reassignment had led to my decision that your reassignment to El Paso is for the good of the service."

Crockett stated that the position to which Norpel is being assigned "is a bona fide one."

Norpel in his correspondence has pointed out that only a year ago Crockett shifted him and five other men who supported Otepka from the security division, and at that time assured them that it was because of the great need for their services in a special secret project in the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs.

Norpel said Saturday that the assignment to the Bureau of Inter-American Affairs was "a farce," and that it appears that the assignment to El Paso is "merely to get me out of the way."

There have been assurances that Norpel will be permitted to return to Washington to testify on behalf of Otepka when his ouster hearing comes up in May. However, the transfer of Norpel and Shea would remove them from daily contact with Otepka.

SPECIAL PROJECTS

When he transferred to the State Department security division in 1961, Norpel started working on a special project that involved restudy of a number of security cases of some high-level State Department career officers.

The work of Otepka, Norpel, and others on these special projects resulted in spotlighting laxity in the security procedures at the State Department followed by the highly critical investigation of State by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn, under the previous order, until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned, under the order previously entered, until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 6, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

The executive nominations received by the Senate April 5, 1965:

COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE CORP.

Frederic G. Donner, of New York, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Communications Satellite Corp. until the date of the annual meeting of the corporation in 1968. (Reappointment.)

THE JUDICIARY

Don J. Young, of Ohio, to be U.S. district judge for the northern district of Ohio, vice Frank L. Kloeb, retired.

Newell A. George, of Kansas, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Kansas for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires March 28, 1965.

Ernest W. Rivers, of Kentucky, to be U.S. attorney for the western district of Kentucky for the term of 4 years, vice William E. Scent, resigned.

Joseph P. Hoey, of New York, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of New York for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires April 13, 1965.

W. Arthur Garrity, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be U.S. attorney for the district of Massachusetts, for the term of 4 years. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expires April 12, 1965.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate April 5, 1965:

FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

R. Watkins Greene, of Louisiana, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring March 31, 1971.

Ralph K. Cooper, of Arizona, to be a member of the Federal Farm Credit Board, Farm Credit Administration, for a term expiring March 31, 1971.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

Stanley R. Resor, of Connecticut, to be Under Secretary of the Army.

U.S. ARMY

The following-named officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3442 and 3447:

To be major generals

Brig. Gen. Robert Rigby Glass, O19765, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Henry Kreitzer Benson, Jr., O20331, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward Chrysostom David Scherrer, O20690, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Roland Bennett Anderson, O21108, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Andrew Enemark, O20879, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Allen Beall, Jr., O19907, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Jarvis Tolson III, O20826, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Edward Clare Dunn, O20245, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Clarence Carl Haug, O19736, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Ben Sternberg, O21286, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Frank Alexander Osmanski, O19745, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Michael Shannon Davison, O22051, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Allen Thomas Stanwix-Hay, O51759, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Melville Brown Coburn, O19973, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Kelsie Loomis Reaves, O20777, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Thomas Jay Hayes III, O20134, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Arthur Goshorn, O31465, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Charles Fremont Tillson, III, O21196, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Stuart O'Malley, Jr., O20682, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Lawrence Edward Schlanser, O19886, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Benjamin Otto Turnage, Jr., O20360, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Donald Vivian Bennett O23001, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Milton Finn, O21252, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Charles Peter Stone, O21376, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

To be brigadier generals

Col. William Arthur McKee, O31867, U.S. Army.

Col. William Herbert Price, Jr., O21903, U.S. Army.

Col. Lloyd Hilary Gomes, O21353, U.S. Army.

Col. Omer Sigmund Dews, O40079, U.S. Army.

Col. Samuel McClure Goodwin, O23177, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. William Emmett Ekman, O21190, U.S. Army.

Col. Wilson Maxwell Hawkins, O22737, U.S. Army.

Col. Michael Jesse Reichel, O40087, U.S. Army.

Col. James Lawton Collins, Jr., O21788, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Charles Forbes, O24511, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Charles McNeal Mount, Jr., O21849, U.S. Army.

Col. Robert Riis Ploger, O21760, U.S. Army.

Col. Charles Martin Gettys, O44181, U.S. Army.

Col. Edward Harleston DeSaussure, Jr., O23790, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Frank Dickson Miller, O21270, U.S. Army.

Col. Clarence Clinton Harvey, Jr., O21076, U.S. Army.

Col. John Scarborough Hughes, O34271, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Eugene Kelsey, O21061, U.S. Army.

Col. Michael Paulick, O23060, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Marion Seignious, II, O47226, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. George Philip Seneff, Jr., O23738, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Thurston Tyler Paul, Jr., O32243, U.S. Army.

Col. John Frederick Freund, O23334, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Roland Merrill Gleszer, O23278, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Thomas Henderson Scott, Jr., O23030, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. John Russell Deane, Jr., O24835, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Jerry Spears Addington, O23041, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edward Alfred Bailey, O21083, U.S. Army.

Col. David Stuart Parker, O22907, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Samuel William Koster, O24873, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Walter MacRae Vann, O21812, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Alvin Ethelbert Cowan, O24171, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Jack Emerson Babcock, O21413, U.S. Army.

Col. Donald Harry Cowles, O35735, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Robert Campbell Cassibry, O23058, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Edwin Fahey Black, O23012, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Andrew Peach Rollins, Jr., O24237, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

Col. Frank Meszar, O23211, Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

The Army National Guard of the United States officer named herein for appointment as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Maurice Lynn Watts, O392863, Adjutant General's Corps.

The Army National Guard of the United States officer named herein for promotion as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be brigadier general

Col. William Fahy Sheehan, O1285126, Armor.

The following-named officers to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3962:

To be lieutenant generals

Lt. Gen. Verdi Beethoven Barnes, O17198, Army of the United States (major general U.S. Army).

Lt. Gen. Russell Lewell Vittrup, O17681, Army of the United States (major general, U.S. Army).

The following-named officer, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the

President under subsection (a) of section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Vernon Price Mock, O19906, U.S. Army.

U.S. NAVY

To be admiral

Vice Adm. Alfred G. Ward, U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving.

Rear Adm. Edward E. Grimm, U.S. Navy, to be Director of Budget and Reports in the Department of the Navy for a term of 3 years.

To be vice admiral

Rear Adm. Bernard F. Roeder, U.S. Navy, having been designated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps, when retired, to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5233:

To be lieutenant generals

Charles H. Hayes.
James P. Berkeley.

The following-named officers having been designated, in accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade indicated while so serving:

To be lieutenant generals

Richard C. Mangrum
Alpha L. Bowser

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Residual Oil: April Fool Joke

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Last Friday I issued a press release on the residual oil problem, and I am happy to note that on Saturday the Secretary of the Interior agreed with me. We both feel that there is no national security basis for this program.

The Secretary has referred the question to the Director of the Office of Emergency Planning to make "a searching new study." I hope this does not result in the interment of the question in this quiet burial ground.

The matter has been studied to death. We need no new studies. We request a prompt finding by the Director that there is at this time no national security basis for the controls.

Then, I trust the President will have the courage to issue a proclamation bringing this injustice to an end.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., ISSUED ON FRIDAY, APRIL 2, 1965

New England is once again to be victimized by the imposition of quotas for residual oil imports.

We had hoped and expected that we had convinced the Secretary of the Interior that his controls were on a very shaky legal foundation, there being no national security basis for his program.

We had thought that he was aware of the harm being done to New England, already suffering acutely from economic benefits given to other sections of the country to its disadvantage.

We had believed that his April 1 pronouncement would be: "No more controls for New England."

Imagine our consternation when we are told on March 31 that everything would be all right for New England, only to find out on April 1 that some last minute influence caused the Secretary to do a complete aboutface. What happened? If there was no national security reason to impose controls on us on March 31, what intervened to create a national security basis for this hardship on April 1?

At his press conference on March 31, the Secretary of the Interior said: "We had contemplated what would have amounted to an open end program in Florida and the five New England States, with a continuation of the existing program in the other east coast States. This represented my best judgment as a solution."

But this was not the April 1 decision of the Secretary. His best judgment was not allowed to prevail. Who intervened? Whose judgment is being substituted for that of the Federal official duly charged with this great responsibility by the laws of the land? Who played this April Fool's joke on New England?

The Secretary says that he does not have the power, "acting alone, to make a decision" on the national security question. Why not? The President of the United States delegated to him all the vast powers of the Presidency in respect to oil matters. What more powers does the Secretary need?

Who says that New England must continue to suffer this burden, when the Secretary of the Interior has concluded publicly that in his best judgment these unfair controls are not needed?

The Secretary admits honestly that consumers are paying a penalty of about $40 million a year as the result of this program, and a large percentage of that penalty is inflicted upon New England.

The Secretary admits honestly that he doesn't like and cannot justify the present plan, and he begs for an "alternative, workable plan." There isn't any such plan.

The only alternative to the present outrage is no controls. The alternative is for the Federal Government to admit the truth; there is no national security reason to justify this program. Once that admission is made, this jerry-rigged scheme to sabotage New England can be ended, and free enterprise can begin to make sense out of this expensive boondoggle promoted and maintained by the Department of the Interior.

Voting Rights Act of 1965 Is Bad Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, eligible Americans should have the right to vote, but it should not be done at the expense of tearing down the structure of State government. There are three provisions of the Constitution that affect the matter of voting. The first is article I, section 2, which reads as follows:

> The House of Representatives shall be composed of Members chosen every second Year by the People of the several States, and the Electors in each State shall have the Qualifications requisite for Electors of the most numerous Branch of the State Legislature.

The next one is amendment 15, which has this to say:

> SECTION 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude.

Subsequently amendment 17 was placed in the Constitution which has to do with the direct election of Senators and says this:

> The Senate of the United States shall be composed of two Senators from each State, elected by the people thereof, for six years; and each Senator shall have one vote. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislatures.

The two constitutional provisions, one of which was amendment 17, which came after the adoption of amendment 15, lodged the authority in the States to set qualifications with respect to voting. Hysteria, propaganda, and hasty appeals for action do not change the effectiveness of the State authority with respect to voting unless the qualifications set out by the State would discriminate against segments of the population or are themselves unreasonable. Then such State provisions would be subject to being reviewed as to their constitutionality.

I cannot agree with the doctrine enunciated by President Lyndon B. Johnson in his recent message to a joint session of Congress which was based on amendment 15, and this alone.

The Congress is working under a high top priority rating on what is known as the Voting Rights Act of 1965. The bill brings under Federal jurisdiction for the first time State and county elections. As it is worded, it applies to six States which are Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Virginia. These States are covered because less than 50 percent of their people who are 21 years of age or over cast a vote in

1964, which was set up as a guideline in the legislation. The effect of the bill would be to deny those six States the right to invoke literacy tests such as knowledge, intelligence, education, or morality on any of the citizens of such States who may wish to vote. The result of directing legislation at six States and six States only is quite unusual and highly discriminatory in that a person can vote in those States even though he cannot read and write, whereas in New York State and many others in the Nation, he will be deprived of the right of franchise.

It is reasonable and most desirable that a voting citizen should have at least a little bit of sense and a person who has not been convicted of a felony. There are two main considerations when you speak of providing rights of all of our citizens to vote. They should be given the right to vote, yes, under reasonable standards, but such a system should adhere to the law of the land—the Constitution of the United States.

This bill which is now being studied in both Houses of Congress would lodge discretionary power in the U.S. Attorney General to step in and by the use of his appointment of voter registrars deprive the local citizens of the right to qualify voters within those six States. There can be little doubt that such authority in the Attorney General to supervise the registration of voting in this manner is not only irregular but runs counter to the expressed provisions of the Constitution which gives the States the full and complete authority to set reasonable voter qualifications.

This bill will be approved by a fairly good majority in both the House and the Senate it appears without doubt. When this happens it would ride herd over the privileges that States have always enjoyed in this country. That is bad—very bad legislation.

The Tobacco Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN SHERMAN COOPER

OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, several years ago, when the successful operation of the tobacco program was questioned, I gave a talk describing the operation of the program, why it is needed, and the distinctions which not only require but also make workable a separate farm program for tobacco. While I said at that time that "increasing yields per acre may make production adjustment through acreage control more difficult as new varieties and cultural methods are adopted," that is not my chief reason for recalling the speech. I do think many parts of that review remain pertinent, and because it may be of interest at this time I ask unanimous consent that my remarks of August 30, 1957, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TOBACCO PROGRAM: WHY IT IS NEEDED—HOW IT IS WORKING

(By Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER, of Kentucky)

The welfare of my State, which is an agricultural State, rests very largely on the productivity and economic well-being of her farmers. Most of these farmers raise tobacco—for Kentucky is one of the great tobacco States, and supplies high quality burley, as well as Dark-Fired and Dark Air-cured tobaccos, to the entire world. The price of tobacco is a matter of vital concern to some 200,000 rural Kentucky families, because it directly affects their income, their standard of living, and their future opportunities.

That price is determined, not alone by the well-established demand for quality cigarette tobaccos, but also by the effective operation of the production control, or marketing quota, program for tobacco—through which growers cooperate with their Department of Agriculture to maintain a balanced supply in line with that demand. The necessity of keeping supply and demand in balance, in order to avoid ruinous price fluctuations, is generally recognized—as is the function of Government in providing for farmers the legislative and administrative means to do this job.

In maintaining stable supplies through production control—when this course is chosen by two-thirds of the farmers—our tobacco program also appropriately provides for price supports in order to safeguard individual farmers against unnecessary loss. This is not a subsidy. I want to make that clear from the outset. It is not a special benefit or a giveaway. Price support is simply a tool—in the case of tobacco, it is a loan which is repaid—in our production-control kit. In this tobacco production-adjustment program, price support does two things: First, it makes possible the adjustments in the total supply, which are achieved over several crop years, by stabilizing prices during the period in which these adjustments are being made. Second, it extends equal price protection to all farmers contributing to the production-control effort.

While the tobacco price-support and production-control program is in several respects similar to our programs for the other basic commodities, it is in many respects unique—in its design, operation, and results. And although the tobacco program has been an outstanding success among all our farm programs, I believe it is neither well understood nor as widely appreciated, at least in areas of the United States which do not produce tobacco, as it deserves to be.

For example, it has been said on the floor of the Senate that under this program the growing of tobacco is subsidized by the Government, and by taxpayers. A number of people may be under that mistaken impression, for I have also seen it expressed in newspapers and magazines. On the other hand, I understand that officials of the Department of Agriculture have sometimes been criticized because their other price-support or production-control efforts are not as successful as the tobacco program. That may not be entirely fair either, because each commodity is different and has its own special problems; what works for one may not work at all for another. Even in the Department of Agriculture, however, the merits of the tobacco program occasionally seem to be overlooked, or may not always be fully appreciated.

I hope we can bring about a better understanding of this program, and obtain for it the broader appreciation it deserves—not only among tobaccomen, but among all who are interested in farm problems, programs, and policies. I hope that I can contribute something to that understanding by describing today some of the basic reasons why a separate and distinct program is required for tobacco, and by showing how our present program makes good use of those characteristics which set tobacco apart in a class by itself.

Although I will discuss the program in the light of the most recent proposal to eliminate fixed 90-percent support for tobacco, the facts I expect to point out may apply with equal force to questions which may arise in the future, as they have in the past.

DISCRETIONARY PRICE SUPPORT HAS BEEN PROPOSED FOR TOBACCO

The Secretary of Agriculture recently recommended to the Congress a new approach to the farm problem. He said that production control is impractical, and that present laws governing acreage allotments and price supports are obsolete. He asked for major changes in the different price-support programs for the six basic farm commodities—corn, wheat, cotton, tobacco, peanuts, and rice.

These programs, of course, play a central role in our efforts to protect, stabilize, and increase farm income so that farmers may share more fully in, and contribute more effectively to, the general prosperity and economic welfare of our country. They deal, however, with a wide variety of complex problems, many of which have proved difficult to solve, and which, therefore, are the subject of continuing attention and effort by the Congress, the executive branch, and by those most concerned—the farmers themselves.

After appearing before both the Senate and the House Committees on Agriculture, Secretary Benson laid his specific legislative recommendation on this subject before the chairman of the House committee on May 28. I am expressing my views at this time on this matter, as it affects tobacco growers, because I am convinced that that proposal would, if adopted, seriously threaten or destroy our tobacco program.

The official departmental proposal is primarily a request for much greater, and discretionary, flexibility—from 0 to 90 percent, or as a second choice from 60 to 90 percent of parity—in the price-support levels of the basic crops already under flexible support formulas. Now, I have the highest respect for the Secretary of Agriculture, and for his integrity in seeking overall solutions which will be fair and helpful to farmers, and which will benefit the country as a whole. I realize that he is faced with serious problems of continuing surplus production in some of the commodities for which strict production controls may not be desirable or practical—a responsibility which Congress, and agriculture itself, shares.

Included also in the Department's request, however, was tobacco—which has a distinct program of its own, for reasons I believe I can show are sound, and which is not a flexible support crop. As far as tobacco farmers are concerned, the idea of abandoning 90 percent support is a drastic proposal which is not justified by today's needs or by the record of performance made by that program.

I see no reason to compound our farm problems by opening the door to controversy over abandoning a program which has proved workable, effective, popular, economical, and fair to all segments of the industry and to the Nation as a whole.

TOBACCO PROGRAM—AND TOBACCO ITSELF—IS IN A CLASS BY ITSELF

In supporting this view, I will not take time to review the history and development of the tobacco program, although that history is most enlightening and offers us many lessons which we can study with profit today. It is enough to say that our present program rests squarely on that long history—which goes back 50 years to the days of the night riders in Kentucky, and over 300 years to the first crop control measures in the New World, taken at a time when severe depression in the tobacco areas already walked hand in hand with overproduction. (In 1639 the Province of Virginia enacted a tobacco production adjustment law.)

The tobacco program is distinctive not only in its historical origins, which proved in violence the need for production and marketing controls long before such measures were adopted generally. It is also distinctive in the justifiable confidence which growers have placed in their program, and in the diligence they have exercised to keep that program sound. It is distinctive today as the one program with fixed supports, at 90 percent of parity, and established by law, and which, through effective production controls has made that support level work—to the advantage of growers, the Federal Government, and the taxpayer.

This is not to imply that tobacco has won a favored position to which it is not fully entitled, or at the expense of other commodities. That is not true. On the contrary, while billions have been spent in honest efforts to solve the problems of other commodities, and those of a lagging farm economy in general, the tobacco farmer has held the line and stuck to his program of balancing supply with demand.

Neither is it to imply that this program is necessary suited to other commodities. They have their own characteristics and particular problems. The only question involved here is whether or not a large group of over three-quarters of a million farmers, working together, is entitled to the help and assistance of their Government in carrying out and administering the program of their choice so long as they keep that program on a reasonably sound and equitable basis. My answer to this question is that their performance in good faith entitles tobacco growers to the continuation of their present program.

We have this distinct tobacco program today simply because the production, marketing and consumption of tobacco itself is in many ways unique. It therefore requires a different price support and production control program.

I would like to discuss now those characteristics which make tobacco different—which both require a separate program for it, and make that program workable. This fact has received too little attention: that the unique nature of tobacco not only creates special problems, but has also given us the solution to those problems. This coin has two sides. When we turn over the challenge we find opportunity—an opportunity which tobacco growers seized years ago, and which must not arbitrarily be taken from them.

I. PRODUCTION DIFFERENCES

First, as to its production, tobacco is a high-labor crop. It requires some 410 man-hours of labor to raise an acre of burley. That compares to approximately 81 man-hours for an acre of cotton, 11 man-hours for corn, and 4 for wheat—where, of course, a man may produce on 100 times as many acres.

Most of these long hours of labor represent hard, backbreaking toil. It takes a full year to produce an acre of burley tobacco. In fact, because seedbeds are often burned, steamed or chemically treated in the fall, before the crop is sold, the tobacco farmer's year may be 13 months long.

The seedbed is ordinarily sown in January or February. The young plants are carefully nurtured under canvas, and are transplanted when the ground warms up and the weather is right. In the summer months, the tobacco is cultivated a number of times, wormed by hand or sprayed, topped, suckered, and perhaps primed. Then it is cut, hung in the barn, cured, stripped, sorted into grades and tied in hands—and finally sold just in time to prepare the seedbed for the next crop. Each of these operations, and the many others involved, are done by hand. Each requires careful management and attention. Successful tobacco culture is an acquired art—as well as a skill based on years of experience.

At every step of the way, the tobacco grower is beset by disease, pests, and capricious weather. Having finally learned to control to some extent the additional vagaries of his markets, the tobacco farmer feels that a reasonably stable price structure is indispensable to his efforts, and is his just due.

In terms of his special need for effective price supports, this high-labor requirement means that when the four or five baskets of burley produced on an acre of our tobacco land are set out for sale on the warehouse floor, a year of the farmer's toil, hope and fears is sold at auction. Typically, tobacco is this farmer's major cash crop—his primary source of income. Our growers must depend, then, to an unusual degree on their price-support program.

This mutual dependence of growers on their program has, however, served to encourage and develop that spirit of coöperation and sense of responsibility which contribute so much to the success of the tobacco program. In the practical operation of that program, tobacco growers, and representatives of the trade as well, join together to resolve their problems in a way that is fair to all, and that is in the best interests of their industry and its individual members.

Second, tobacco production is not mechanized. For example, no machine has been developed to harvest the delicate tobacco leaves—which are as perishable as green garden vegetables until they are cured.

Because tobacco culture is unsuited to mechanization, and production has not been mechanized, we know that the second acre of tobacco costs the farmer as much to raise as the first. For many crops, it may be true that production per farmworker has doubled in the last 15 years—thus creating a "new dimension in farm policy" in these areas. Contrary to the general trend, however, and because of increased quality requirements, raising an acre of tobacco requires more labor today than it did 15 years ago (table I).

The belief that the "technological revolution" in agriculture as a whole makes possible, through increased mechanization, sufficiently lower costs on added units of production to more than offset the lower average price received does not apply in the case of tobacco. Nearly every grower would like to increase his tobacco acreage, of course—but not when he knows that the price he receives would drop, while his hours of labor and cost per unit of production would remain about the same.

This basic difference in production methods, which sets tobacco apart from the trend in much of agriculture, does, however, simplify the issue as to what is a proper level of price support for this crop. There is little question about the level of prices required to assure tobacco farmers a fair return for their labor. Tobacco farmers, large and small, are generally agreed that 90 percent of parity provides them a decent minimum wage floor (although less than hourly rates for common labor), and that a lower price would not be accompanied by a compensating increase in sales and decrease in labor requirements.

Third, tobacco is an intensive crop. For this reason, it is well suited to our small family farms, in hilly country, and on soils where other crops may not do so well, as well as on superlative soil such as we have in the Kentucky bluegrass.

The average size burley allotment in my State last year was 1.37 acres. However, that acre and a third produced over a ton of high-quality cigarette tobacco—worth $1,400 to the Kentucky farmer who sold it on last December's market. That typical Kentucky patch of tobacco, in fact, produced burley for 2 million cigarettes, or 10,000 cartons.

Only 2 percent of all burley allotments are larger than 5 acres; 90 percent are smaller than 2 acres; and one-fourth are half an acre or less (table II).

Because high value of production is associated with these small plots, however, and because our present program works, hundreds of thousands of modest family-type farms are able to depend on their tobacco allotment as a major source of income. For example, 300,939 farmers have burley allotments this year, of which 146,611 are in Kentucky. Including Dark-fired and Dark Air-cured as well as burley, there are 174,579 tobacco allotments in Kentucky.

The continued progress and growth of Kentucky agriculture rests, then, to a large degree, on our tobacco price support program. Most of the rural families in my State live on small farms, and have few alternative sources of income. These farms, cultivated intensively rather than extensively, do not have the broad fields of level, tillable acreage suited to large-scale crop production with heavy equipment and self-propelled machinery. Tobacco is and must be their main cash crop. In fact, at least 3 out of 4 farms in my State raise tobacco, and some 200,000 rural Kentucky families depend on tobacco for a substantial or major portion of their income.

These are the men who know tobacco best—and who produce the world's finest tobacco. I do not believe they will agree that it is worth less than parity, or that their years of experience and months of toil should be sold cheaper.

In terms of workable production controls, however, this intensive land use means that tobacco can well afford the strict measurement and compliance checking we now have, the cost of which is less than one-fourth of 1 percent of the crops' value. Small allotments having a high dollar value of production make accurate measurement practical and economical. So again we find reasons in the nature of tobacco culture itself which justify a distinctive production control and price support program.

Fourth, tobacco is a highly specialized regional crop. Burley and Flue-cured tobacco—the major cigarette types—accounted for 90 percent of last year's billion-dollar tobacco crop. Kentucky produced two-thirds (66.2 percent) of the burley, North Carolina two-thirds (67.6 percent) of the Flue-cured tobacco.

In my own State, tobacco is a quarter-billion-dollar crop, and produces 43 percent of Kentucky's cash income from farm products sold. In the great Bright leaf State of North Carolina, over half the farm income comes from tobacco. Nine States raise most of our tobacco, and within those States there are highly concentrated areas specializing in the various qualities of tobacco, of which there are 26 distinct domestic types and 1,466 grades (table III).

This concentration is a natural historical consequence of tobacco's peculiar dependence on soils and climate. Identical seed planted in adjoining counties may produce two different types of tobacco. Each year's weather may turn out a markedly different tobacco crop in the same area. Under identical weather conditions, variations in soil from farm to neighbor's farm result in noticeably different qualities. Moreover, each stalk of burley tobacco produces several grades from tips (until recently worth least) to trash (customarily worth much more)—and I have not mentioned differences resulting from cultural and curing practices.

This complex array of qualities, which depends on such a variety of closely related factors, is highly important to our tobacco trade and to our modern tobacco industry. It marks a difference in product which makes clear, I believe, tobacco's need for a special program of its own. It is local specialization which makes possible this broad spectrum of products—from heavy, smoke "black" tobaccos to the mild, bright, golden leaf.

This local specialization, moreover, contributes greatly to the effectiveness of our tobacco program. Perhaps in no other crop would rigid allotments based on historical production be more justifiable, nor could historical production patterns be continued more equitably.

I do not say that our tobacco program allows complete freedom of enterprise, but the equity of historically based production patterns is well established and widely accepted. Tobacco producers do feel that this program, in which they join together in a cooperative effort to comply with the law of supply and demand, provides them essential freedom in the marketplace to sell their product for what it is worth.

II. MARKETING DIFFERENCES

Marketing differences which require a separate and distinct price-support and production control program for tobacco, and which also make the present program workable, are perhaps even more significant than the production differences.

My fifth point, therefore, is that all our farmers' tobacco is channeled exclusively through central markets. None is kept on farms. Each selling season farmers must take the entire crop of cigarette tobacco to the auction warehouses—scene of the familiar "tobacco chant."

Our system of cooperative marketings for tobacco was developed after years of trial and error and travail. It works well. It seeks to provide uniform sales conditions, to insure that buyers are available for all the tobacco offered, and that farmers are protected from sharp seasonal fluctuations in price through the option which each may exercise of selling at the price bid or else having his baskets of tobacco delivered to the "pool" under the price-support program.

This auction warehouse system, operating in conjunction with the pools, is the central mechanism around which our successful tobacco program is organized. It offers distinct advantages in the price support operations of that program. For example, it makes possible a definite floor, not only for the tobacco crop as a whole, but for each farmer's individual lots of tobacco.

Under this plan, it has not been necessary for the Government to purchase large surpluses, as with some other crops. The plan is also fair to the farmer, in that he is the direct beneficiary of the price-support effort—receiving immediately 90 percent of parity in cash, and a dividend on any amount over that for which the tobacco is later sold. This whole operation is so sensible, in fact, that it is handled without loss by the farmers' marketing cooperatives under contract with the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Our central marketing system also makes practical and workable the realistic production controls required for no-loss operation of 90-percent supports, because it permits accurate identification of the source of all tobacco sold. In addition, it makes conveniently available the data for accurate market reports on the amounts and prices of the various graders sold.

The sixth difference which sets tobacco apart, and requires a separate program for it, is the limited field of buyers for this crop. As I pointed out when I sponsored the amendment first establishing in law 90 percent of parity as a separate provision for tobacco, the major buyers competing for the tobacco offered by three-quarters of a million farmers can be counted on the fingers of both hands. Six companies produce 99 percent of the cigarettes, and three of these account for 73 percent (table IV).

This is a situation unique in agricultural marketing as far as I know. Usually less than half a dozen major buyers are represented on any auction floor. These buyers can scarcely fail to be familiar with each other's needs and practices. A farmer who trucked his crop of tobacco 50 miles to the warehouse was at the mercy of buyers before the protection offered by this fixed support floor was inaugurated.

I consider my speech on this subject, made in the Senate on June 17, 1948, still to be a correct statement. That was during the debate on the long-range agricultural program, which required a change from fixed 90-percent supports to flexible supports down to 60 percent of parity on all basic commodities, including tobacco. At that time the Senate adopted my amendment preserving 90-percent support for tobacco, it was written into the law, and this separate provision for tobacco has been retained through every change made in our farm programs since that time. I quote from that speech:

"It is my contention, and one which I believe is supported by the facts, that the unusual conditions under which tobacco is produced and marketed, when coupled with the usually limited field of buyers, operate to give a dominant bargaining position to the buyers and to deprive the producer of tobacco of a free market, in the sense that a market is enjoyed by the producers of other agricultural commodities. In this limited market, the buyer pays a price which is not necessarily or always related to the law of supply and demand, but is fixed by the maximum amount the buyers must pay to get the tobacco, which in reality is the support price. For this reason the support price should remain fixed at 90 percent of parity."

As I pointed out 9 years ago, and I quote: "The tobacco farmer must take his crop to the place where the representative of the great tobacco manufacturers will come to buy his crop. Unless the representatives are there, the tobacco farmer cannot sell his tobacco. The farmer who has spent a year in backbreaking toil to produce a crop of tobacco, which is his cash crop and his principal source of income, knows that he must sell his tobacco to one of the few buyers, or else lose his year's labor. Can it be doubted that the buyers know that the farmer must sell or lose the work of a year?"

At that time, I offered the opinion, "which is one shared by my constituents, who know every phase of tobacco growing, buying, and selling, that the Federal Government offers through its parity and support-price program the only substantial assurance the tobacco growers have that they will receive a reasonable price for their product."

A seventh distinction, which operates to make our tobacco loan program among the most effective of farm price-support efforts, relates to the excellent storage qualities of tobacco. Cured tobacco, redried and compressed into 1,000-pound hogsheads, is virtually nonperishable, thus reducing the risk of holding loan stocks several years for improved markets. In fact, tobacco increases in value as it is aged. This enhanced value in itself often covers storage and interest charges on loan stocks held for up to 2 to 4 years.

Without a fixed level of support, on the other hand, this very storability would operate to the farmers' disadvantage—as it did for the hundred years when 1 year of good prices was followed by 2 or 3 years of starvation prices. In the absence of a strong support program, tobacco farmers are placed in double jeopardy; first, from lower prices caused by a year of unexpected abundance, and second, from reduced production or lower prices in later years as these hogsheads are moved from storage into trade. Producers of perishable crops, at least, are exposed to economic loss only once, and need make but a single adjustment.

It may be argued that flexible supports are desirable for semiperishable commodities, where old stocks must be moved or spoil, or where adjustments must reflect current consumption at all times. But, in tobacco, the very possibility of lowering supports could tend to depress prices. Progressively lowered support prices would, of course, soon destroy the tobacco program, and would result in huge losses in the process.

III. CONSUMPTION DIFFERENCES

An eighth and very important consideration is that there are no alternative uses for our tobacco. Most farm products have a number of uses, and can compete in a wide variety of markets at different price levels; many in fact must take into account these changing relationships. Again it may be argued in the case of some other crops that flexible supports will enable these commodities to seek out alternative uses and markets, or will encourage industrial utilization of farm products. Tobacco has no such opportunity.

This lack of alternative uses for tobacco clearly shows the need for controlling production and supplies in line with the demand for cigarette tobaccos. Burley and Flue-cured growers know that they are completely dependent on this single-use market, that at best they can profitably sell only as much tobacco as we smoke.

On the other hand, the limited use for tobacco provides a much clearer picture of the demand-supply situation than most commodities enjoy. The question of how much tobacco is needed is argued within relatively close limits, and is understood by farmers. They can then support, and do support, a program which meets these realities, and which gives each of them a fair share of the market at a fair price. So once more a special problem in tobacco contributes to the practical workability of our present program.

My ninth point concerns the relatively inelastic consumer demand for tobacco. Agricultural economists have shown, and it is historically true, that the price farmers receive for their leaf bears little or no relation to that consumer demand. The supply of tobacco, of course, almost wholly determines prices farmers receive, and realistic recognition of this fact has led growers to acceptance of progressively more effective production controls.

Burley consumption, in turn, may depend on a number of factors, but the price paid to the farmer is not a major one—because his percentage of the retail sales price is so small. These two facts taken together—that consumer demand plays a minor role in determining the farmer's price, and that his price scarcely affects consumption of tobacco—make an effective, stable price-support program essential if tobacco growers are to share equitably in the fruit of their labor. In addition, they remove from economic controversy the desirability of 90-percent support for this commodity.

I would like to point out here why the price farmers get for their tobacco has little or no effect on domestic sales of cigarettes. In a pound of manufactured tobacco, worth $3.45 at retail last year, Federal and State excise taxes account for $1.37, or 40 percent; manufacturing and distribution margins are $1.53 or 44 percent, and the farmers' end is 55 cents or 16 percent. For the tobacco in a 25-cent pack of cigarettes, the farmer receives about 3½ cents. Therefore, a 10-percent drop in farmers' prices would save only 3 mills on the cost of a pack of cigarettes.

I believe American consumers are willing and able to pay the farmer this very reasonable price for his tobacco. I might add that whereas farmers generally receive 40 percent of the consumer dollar—and we are concerned about such a low share—tobacco farmers receive less than half that.

As I understand the reasoning behind the Secretary's present proposals for all the basic crops, a lower support price is supposed to stimulate increased consumption and sales so that the price drop will be offset, or more than offset, by an increase in farmers' sales, and therefore an increase in their gross income or net income. This may be true in the case of other farm commodities, and I know that in manufacturing, for example, the greatly increased sales volume which may result from small reductions in price has played a very important part in our economic development.

However, because the consumer demand for tobacco is relatively inelastic in the first place, and because prices paid farmers are scarcely reflected in the retail price of cigarettes in the second place, I do not believe that the Secretary's argument would apply in the case of tobacco.

It is true that "production times price equals income," but the experience of tobacco growers is that small increases in production can cause sharp decreases in price, and in their income—and that prices continue to fall far faster than any increase in poundage sold can possibly make up.

IV. HOW THE TOBACCO PROGRAM HAS WORKED FOR THE GOVERNMENT

A 10th difference is that, alone among our different price-support operations for nonperishable commodities, the tobacco program does not result in burdensome Government-owned stocks. As a matter of fact, the Commodity Credit Corporation does not now own a pound of tobacco—and has not had a pound of cigarette tobacco in its inventory since World War II, when it help supply our Allies. CCC neither has to buy tobacco in the open market, nor under purchase agreements—nor has it been necessary for CCC to take title to any loan tobacco in recent years. In other words, tobacco is not subsidized. The tobacco price support program has, in fact, made several million dollars in interest profits on CCC loans.

This remarkable record must be credited to the farmers who have made the sacrifices necessary to keep their part of the bargain in this program. The Government can do no less than to keep its part of the bargain and maintain 90 percent support prices so long as growers continue to demonstrate their willingness to keep this program sound.

The distinctive machinery for this efficient and economical program is to be found in the operations and responsibilities of the tobacco pools, or grower cooperatives, which undertake to sell loan stocks of tobacco at a profit to the farmer over the 90-percent rate, and which over the long run have succeeded in doing so. These pools may not be wholly perfect, but they are a very important part of a system which has dealt with difficult problems with outstanding success. Several of them predate our Government programs by a number of years, and their experience and influence are generally recognized.

Our tobacco loan program actually operates just as the name implies it should. It is expected that the tobacco held as the security for those loans will be advantageously merchandised at private sale, and that the money advanced will then be repaid to the Government in full. It has worked this way with conspicuous success. In the 11 years since the war, for example, CCC has loaned $1½ billion to the tobacco pools to cover the amounts advanced to farmers. Nearly a billion dollars of that has been repaid by these pools, with interest, and the remainder is secured by current stocks of tobacco. I submit that this is an outstanding record for any Government loan program particularly on a farm commodity (table V).

I will not take time to mention here a number of less striking differences in the operation of our tobacco program and the legislation which governs it, except to say that tobacco farmers, their leaders and their representatives in Congress, have generally resisted a number of special or fringe benefits enjoyed by other commodities. They have done so for the sole reason that they did not want in any way to jeopardize their right and claim to fixed 90-percent supports.

A final difference between tobacco and other farm commodities is that it is the only one on which excise taxes are imposed.

While the operation of our price support program for tobacco has not cost the Government anything, tobacco has brought immense revenues to local, State, and Federal Governments. This fact alone merits the continuation of a tobacco program which insures stable prices and balance supplies.

Each year Federal and State excise tax receipts from tobacco far exceed farmers' cash receipts for tobacco, as the chart from the cover of the March Tobacco Situation shows. The Federal excise tax on tobacco returned $1,639 million to the Government last year. States received $513 million from their own excise taxes. Municipalities benefited by substantial sums. In addition, import duties on tobacco amounted to $19 million last year. While not levied with a view toward aiding farmers, these considerations ought to at least obtain for tobacco farmers a sympathetic attitude toward their problems and needs.

These annual receipts of over $2 billion in Federal and State revenues from the growers' efforts are about double the return to the growers themselves. That relationship is well illustrated by the blue stamp of a rather glum DeWitt Clinton which seals every pack of cigarettes. The stamp is worth 8 cents to Uncle Sam. The grower gets 3½ cents for the tobacco within.

This high-revenue-producing capacity and special contribution sets tobacco apart, in a separate class by itself. As my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Florida, stated on this floor 2 years ago: "It is a highly important matter to the Federal Government, therefore, that tobacco growers shall prosper, and that there shall be a sustained abundant level of tobacco production as free as possible from either overproduction or underproduction."

It may be pertinent to point out here that the Federal tax alone produced by tobacco since 1932 ($25 billion) would pay twice over for the entire cost to the United States of the farm price-support and farm-income stabilization programs, broadly interpreted, for all commodities, basic and nonbasic, in the last 25 years. This includes CCC nonrecourse loan, purchase, and payment programs; the National Wool Act; the International Wheat Agreement; donations of commodities to other nations; Public Law 480 sales for foreign currencies; school lunch and other welfare distribution; the Sugar Act; Federal crop insurance; acreage allotment payments under the ACP program from 1937 to 1944; parity payments under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; and the programs under the triple A of 1933.

V. HOW THE TOBACCO PROGRAM HAS WORKED FOR TAXPAYERS

In commenting for a moment on how the present tobacco program has worked for taxpayers and consumers, I would like to refer to the figures accompanying the Secretary's well-known letter of May 2 to Senator ELLENDER, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture. It was the substance of this letter which Secretary Benson shortly thereafter embodied in his legislative proposals for tobacco as well as the other basic crops, and which he sent to the House Committee on Agriculture on May 28.

These figures indicate that in the last 25 years, through June 30, 1956, the "net realized cost of programs primarily for the stabilization of farm prices and farm income" was $11.8 billion. Tobacco's share of that amount was $105.3 million, according to the table on page 7—or less than 1 percent of the total, charged to the Nation's fourth largest field crop produced by 11 percent of her farms. It is a modest figure when compared to the others on that page, and in saying this I do not imply that the other commodities and other farmers do not fully deserve the help we have tried to give them.

I would like to point out, moreover, that the great bulk of this money was spent for soil conserving activities in the 1930's. Only the figure "3" to the right of the decimal in this $105.3 million amount reflects CCC losses on tobacco price-support operations. That was the cumulative figure, over all the years of the tobacco programs, through June 1956. Since that time the loss has been reduced as of May 31 of this year to only $10,924—or eliminated for all practical purposes. Furthermore, interest income on CCC loans is not shown in this table—possibly because tobacco is the only commodity which produces an interest profit. Since 1948 and before, therefore, the entire tobacco price-support program has operated without loss—winning for it an especially unique place in our farm price support operations.

I believe this analysis shows how well the tobacco program has served taxpayers as well as farmers, and will continue to serve them in the future. All our people, in cities and towns as well as on farms, may well consider it the most successful of all our farm programs—in their own and their neighbor's interest.

One other point in the Department's May 2 statement calls for comment. That is, that "about two-thirds of all producers are at the minimum (allotment for burley) and thus sealed off from any visible relationship between the level of their price support and the size of their allotment." That is not true. As I have shown, in table II, only one-fourth of the burley allotments are at the minimum of five-tenths of 1 acre or under.

Finally, I would like to review what our tobacco program has meant to farmers.

VI. HOW THE TOBACCO PROGRAM HAS WORKED FOR FARMERS

Perhaps the most eloquent testimony on what farmers think of their tobacco program is found in the referendum votes. In the elections held since 1948, burley and Flue-cured growers have consistently cast ballots approving marketing quotas by between 95 and 98 percent. Their interest in these elections is real, because the tobacco program is vital to their welfare.

In April 1955, for example, 74 percent of the eligible burley voters came out to vote. That was the year our growers were faced with the hard decision to cut their allotments by 25 percent, reduce minimum allotments from seven-tenths to five-tenths acre, increase the penalty on excess or "red card" tobacco from 50 to 75 percent, and close the door to establishing allotment history by growing penalty tobacco. The vote was in favor of the program—by 96 percent. That is quite a plurality and quite a turnout at the polls for any election. In all the history of our farm programs, I can think of no more dramatic demonstration than this of the willingness of a group of farmers to make the sacrifices which are sometimes necessary to keep their program sound.

A brief glance at the dollar-and-cent figures on farm prices and income over the years will show what this program has meant to tobacco farmers in pocketbook terms. At the turn of the century Kentucky farmers could sell their tobacco for only 4 cents a pound. Farmers were desperate—literally up in arms—but began then to organize for the long search for a solution to their problems. In 1910–14, a stable period for agriculture generally, burley was worth 9 cents, and the crop brought farmers barely $20 million.

Conditions had not improved a great deal by 1930–34, when representatives of growers began working with the Department of Agriculture on what was to evolve into our present tobacco program. Fifteen years later, 1945–49, burley prices were 3½ times higher—and the crop was worth six times as much to farmers—a quarter of a billion dollars instead of $40 million. Even in terms of "real" dollars, burley prices had nearly doubled, and larger but controlled crops tripled farmers' purchasing power from their burley.

These gains have been maintained and improved under peacetime operation of our postwar program. Last year the burley crop sold for the highest prices on record—averaging 63.5 cents a pound for a crop which returned $322 million to farmers.

Farmers are selling their 1957 Flue-cured crops in the Carolinas today, and marketing has been finished in the Georgia-Florida belt. This crop, too, is bringing record prices—a dramatic change from the situation last year when Flue-cured supplies threatened to get out of hand, and which must be credited to a realistic cut in allotments, prompt measures to eliminate less desirable varieties, and participation in the soil bank. Burley growers, who cure their crop more slowly by natural air drying and market it later in the year, are looking forward to another favorable selling season on their 1957 crop, now being housed in their tobacco barns.

I think this record of increased crop values and better tobacco prices clearly shows what our tobacco program, using the tools of 90 percent support and production control to match, has meant, and can continue to mean, to farmers (table VI).

CONCLUSION

I do not say tobacco farmers have no problems today. We do have some problems in tobacco—as in all other phases of agriculture with which I am familiar. We need to maintain and increase our export sales—which account for 6 percent of the burley market and a larger portion of the market for other tobaccos. Increasing yields per acre may make production adjustment through acreage control more difficult as new varieties and cultural methods are adopted. The shift to filter cigarettes is changing consumption patterns, and new manufacturing methods are beginning to be used.

But these are all problems which can be handled, and should be handled, within the framework of our present program—using the successful techniques already developed where these are applicable, and taking full advantage of the hard lessons of the past. In the past we have been able to meet problems at least as serious as these—within this framework. There is no need now to tear down the house built so painstakingly over many years.

I do not say that the tobacco program is perfect. Minor modifications in it have been made from time to time—without disturbing the foundation of 90 percent support on which it is erected—and may need to be made in the future. I do not say that it operates without a certain pulling and hauling at times. This is inevitable where a variety of interests are involved, and wherever earnest efforts are made to realistically limit production so that farmers may obtain fair prices without subsidies. My colleagues and my friends know that I have helped work out these problems on many occasions.

I do say that tobacco farmers have learned how to work with and through the elemental forces of supply and demand, instead of being crushed by these forces. They have shown that by controlling production to match the demand they can achieve stabilized prices at an acceptable level without Government subsidy. They have made 90 percent-of-parity supports work—without loss to either growers or taxpayers.

In view of the latest proposal to Congress to abandon 90-percent support for tobacco, it seemed to me appropriate and timely to lay the facts in this matter before the Senate. It may well be that the Department of Agriculture, in drawing up a general, or blanket recommendation for all the basic commodities, simply failed to take into account the special nature and particular needs of tobacco—or the specific advantages offered by the present tobacco program. If that is the case, as I believe it to be, I trust the Department will not press its recommendation as applied to tobacco. In any event, I have no fear that the Congress would adopt such a proposal—which would threaten the livelihood of three-quarters of a million farm families.

I oppose lowering supports for tobacco. I am confident that my colleagues from the tobacco States take the same position, and will join me in opposing any move to destroy the present tobacco program. Furthermore, I believe it is plain to anyone who understands the problem that our tobacco program needs to be continued.

My purpose here today was to analyze this problem, to set out the basic reasons which require a distinct and separate price support and production control program for tobacco, and to show how the unique character of tobacco production, marketing, and consumption also contributes to making our present program effective and workable. It seemed to me worthwhile to enumerate those characteristics which make tobacco different, and the consequences which must follow from them, and I hope this appraisal will prove helpful.

Thanks to the joint efforts over many years of a great many conscientious and devoted people, and to the active cooperation of tobacco farmers everywhere, the tobacco program has been conspicuously successful. I believe it is a basically sound, helpful and essential part of our total farm program today. I believe it can continue to serve faithfully and well the burley growers of my State, the rural economy of the South, and hence the general welfare of our country—and do so without placing an undue burden on the Federal Government or the taxpayer.

In closing, I feel I can do no better than to quote the President's agricultural message to the Congress of January 11, 1954. President Eisenhower said at that time that "each farm crop has its own problems, and these problems require specific treatment." And in regard to tobacco, the President stated: "Tobacco farmers have demonstrated their ability to hold production in line with demand at the supported price without loss to the Government. The relatively small acreage of tobacco and the limited areas to which it is adopted have made production control easier than for other crops. The level of support to cooperators is 90 percent of the parity price in any year in which marketing quotas are in effect. It is recommended that the tobacco program be continued in its present form."

I believe those conclusions are still valid, and that that recommendation is as sound today as it was 3½ years ago.

Table I.—*Labor used in production of field crops*

	1940-44 (hours)	1955 (hours)	Percentage more (+) or less (−)
Tobacco:			
Man-hours per acre	436	494	13
Man-hours per 100 pounds	42	34	19
Cotton:			
Man-hours per acre	99	81	18
Man-hours per bale	182	93	49
Wheat:			
Man-hours per acre	7.4	4.3	42
Man-hours per 100 bushels	43	22	49
Corn:			
Man-hours per acre	25.6	11.4	55
Man-hours per 100 bushels	80	28	65

Source: Agricultural Research Service, USDA, June 1957.

Table II.—*1957 burley tobacco allotments—Distribution by size; cumulative percentages*

	Kentucky	United States
0.3 acre and under percent	9.3	12.8
0.5 acre and under do	19.6	26.8
0.7 acre and under do	49.6	63.6
1 acre and under do	60.7	73.6
2 acres and under do	82.6	90.0
5 acres and under do	96.7	98.2
Average allotment acres	1.37	1.03

Source: Tobacco Division CSS, USDA, April 1957.

Table III.—*Farmers' cash receipts from tobacco—Latest 5-year average; percentage of total for 9 leading States; percentage tobacco contributes to State's cash receipts from sales of farm products*

	Tobacco receipts (million)	Percentage of United States	Percentage of all farm products sold
North Carolina	$491	42.8	52.7
Kentucky	230	20.1	42.4
South Carolina	92	8.0	26.1
Virginia	83	7.2	18.0
Tennessee	73	6.4	15.4
Georgia	66	5.8	10.3
Connecticut	23	2.0	13.4
Maryland	19	1.7	7.6
Florida	22	1.9	3.8
Other tobacco States	48	4.1	1.2
United States	1,147	100.0	3.7

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA, June 1957.

Table IV.—*Cigarette output by companies, 1956*

	Billions of cigarettes	Percent of total
American Tobacco	128.9	30.1
R. J. Reynolds	113.5	26.5
Liggett & Myers	68.4	16.0
Brown & Williamson	50.0	11.7
Phillip Morris	39.7	9.3
P. Lorillard	22.8	5.3
All others	5.1	1.1
Estimated output	428.4	100.0

Source: Harry M. Wooten report, Printers' Ink, Dec. 28, 1956.

Table V.—*CCC postwar commodity loans—Net cash outlay to farmers under price support program fiscal years 1947 through 1957*

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	Amount loaned	Amount repaid	Percentage repaid to date	Purchases
All commodities	$19,718.1	$6,065.8	30.8	$6,179.3
Wheat	5,940.4	1,387.8	23.4	442.4
Cotton	5,410.3	1,802.3	33.3	67.7
Corn	3,644.5	653.1	17.9	534.1
Tobacco	1,526.9	945.3	61.9	1.6

Source: Commodity Credit Corporation, USDA.

Table VI.—*Burley tobacco prices and crop values, U.S. season average price and value of production, 5-year averages from 1910*

	Price per pound (cents)		Crop value (millions)	
	Actual	Purchasing power	Actual	Purchasing power
1910–14	9.7	24.4	$20.2	$60.5
1915–19	23.5	38.1	65.7	113.4
1920–24	20.4	31.7	55.7	85.8
1925–29	21.9	33.9	57.8	89.4
1930–34	12.8	25.9	41.5	83.4
1935–39	22.2	44.3	67.0	133.3
1940–44	35.4	56.7	148.3	232.4
1945–49	43.8	47.9	247.3	271.5
1950–54	50.6	45.7	303.4	273.2
1955	58.6	52.3	275.2	245.7
1956	63.5	55.7	321.8	282.3

Source: Agricultural Marketing Service, USDA, June 1957. Cols. 3 and 5 adjusted to "real" prices and values by using 1947–49 index of prices paid by farmers for commodities, services, interest, taxes, and wage rates equals 100.

The Farm Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. COOLEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, agriculture is the Nation's greatest industry. It is the most important industry to the well-being of our people. The President sent to the Congress today proposals for legislation of great significance and meaning to our farm people and to the Nation. I have introduced this legislation as H.R. 7097 and, because of the broad interest, I am placing in the Record a statement I made to the press on this bill.

The statement follows:

The Farm Bill

> I have today introduced the administration's omnibus farm bill, and our Committee on Agriculture will consider the proposed legislation carefully, thoroughly, and expeditiously.
>
> The administration is to be commended for the great amount of work it has done in an effort to develop policies and to improve programs with the overall objective of stabilizing farm income, revitalizing rural America, assuring abundant food and fiber for consumers, and bolstering the national economy.
>
> However, I am certain the legislation contains many controversial provisions, and I regret that the administration is so late in presenting its farm recommendations to the Congress.
>
> Moreover, I had hoped that the administration would by this time have submitted recommendations concerning cotton and the problems which will face our textile industry if the one-price cotton program is not continued. I have been assured that we will receive recommendations from the administration at an early date.
>
> Our committee will do everything in its power to make up the lost time, to compose all differences, improve and refine the legislation wherever possible, and to bring about the enactment of a bill that will be fair to our farmers and to all Americans.
>
> The President through this new farm bill proposes, among other program changes, to place greater reliance on the market price for wheat and rice. For years, the American farmer as a result of his greater efficiency has not received a fair price for his products. Prices farmers receive are substantially below such farm prices 15 years ago.
>
> Actually, a very good case can be made on the proposition that farmers now are subsidizing the consumers of the Nation by billions of dollars a year, because their income from their investment, management, and labor is much smaller and therefore they must accept lower standards of living than their customers who are engaged in the undertakings of other segments of the economy.
>
> The bill submitted by the President attempts to deal with this inequity. As I understand it, by getting more of the farmers' income from the marketplaces rather than from subsidy at taxpayers' expense, as proposed in the new legislation, a slight increase in the price of bread will mean only $1.60 per person a year, and in the case of rice, only 30 cents per person per year.
>
> Surely, this is a small price to pay for a healthy and prosperous agriculture.
>
> I personally am determined to improve farm income, and to protect our family system of agriculture.
>
> We shall have the Secretary of Agriculture before our committee tomorrow to discuss the details of the legislation, and then the various divisions of the bill—such as wheat, feed grains, rice and wool—will be referred to subcommittees for separate hearings.
>
> I am not certain at this time whether we shall take an omnibus bill to the House for action, or present separate bills as we make our determinations on the best policies and programs for the various commodities.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK MacGREGOR
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention today to the efforts of private business in this country toward providing a proper kind of encouragement and assistance for the quality education we all want for America's young people.

Too often we hear the statement that local government and private sources are not capable of providing for our educational needs. Too often, in our eagerness to improve educational standards, we tend to overlook what progress is being made by non-Government sources, and too quickly come to believe that the Federal Government must step in as the only source of competence.

It has recently come to my attention that the Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. of St. Paul, Minn., has announced its second $1.5 million grant to assist in the training of future teachers. This unique plan involves the distribution of individual grants of $2,000 in teaching tools and reference materials to each of the approximately 700 accredited teacher training colleges in the United States.

Mr. R. H. Herzog, Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. vice president, in announcing the program, said that the assistance grant program will enable teacher's colleges to expose future teachers to modern teaching techniques that will help them cover more material more effectively in the classroom.

The 1965 grant matches a similar program in 1963 that awarded $1.5 million in equipment to 500 public, private, and parochial schools across the country.

"The first AGE program clearly demonstrated the interest of teachers in improving their methods of presentation," Herzog said. "More than 1 out of every 10 eligible schools in the United States submitted proposals," he said.

Each $2,000 grant will consist of a complete teacher training unit in visual classroom communications. Included will be a unit of instruction in the use of visual aids, reference books, sets of transparency originals of illustrative material in 70 different subjects, transparency making equipment, and classroom and portable overhead projectors and supplies.

The new Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. grant will be made available to any college offering accredited teacher training courses leading to certification and graduating more than 12 students a year. Minnesota Mining & Manufacturing Co. said it will use Circular 719, "Earned Degrees Conferred 1961–62," published by the U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, as the source for eligibility and only schools listed therein will be awarded grants upon application. The circular is the most recent report issued by the Government.

Any such college will receive the $2,000 grant simply by applying before May 31, 1965. Distribution of the awards will be made at that time.

I can most heartily agree with Mr. Herzog's feeling that private industry has a responsibility to support our education system. This grant program is a prime example of industry meeting that responsibility. Mr. Herzog also said:

> By improving our education system at its roots—where teachers themselves are trained—we would hope to ultimately help improve the students. Thus, all American free enterprise profits from these same people, who though their education and motivation will move our great corporate enterprises forward in the future. We must recognize our stake in education.
>
> The knowledge explosion is one of the salient characteristics of our age.
>
> With more and more knowledge available, it becomes imperative for the teacher not only to cover an abundance of material but that she cover it interestingly and effectively. She must make learning important to her

students and must motivate them to continue to learn so that they will make a meaningful contribution to our national life rather than become a drain upon it.

Today's complex society puts a great premium on brainpower. The challenge of today's and tomorrow's teachers is greater than at any time during the Nation's history. It is generally recognized that the country's growth and prosperity—indeed its very survival—is largely dependent upon the ability of our schools to turn out thinkers, doers, innovators, and leaders.

We hope that our new program will encourage our teachers in that essential mission.

Armenian Martyrs Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, this year marks a half century since that infamous day in 1915 when the mass slaughter and deportation of some 2 million Armenians began in Turkey. Since then, April 24 of each year is observed as Armenian martyrs day in commemoration of this great tragedy which almost saw the annihilation of a whole people.

In the long and turbulent history of the Armenian people, the year 1915 undoubtedly stands out as the darkest year. By the end of that year only a handful of Armenians were left, spared miraculously from the scourge that swept over Turkey and destroyed nearly every Armenian community in that country. Clergymen, intellectuals, businessmen, artisans, old and young, men, women, and children—no one was spared, all were slaughtered in cold blood, save for the very few fortunate survivors who lived to tell the world of the massacre of an innocent people.

The noted British historian Arnold J. Toynbee in his book "The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire, 1915–16," describes the gruesome events in these words:

> Early in February "a decree went forth that all Armenians should be disarmed. The Armenians in the army were drafted out of the fighting ranks, re-formed into special labour battalions, and set to work at throwing up fortifications and constructing roads. The disarming of the civil population was left to the local authorities, and in every administrative centre a reign of terror began. On a certain date, in whatever town or village it might be, the public crier went through the streets announcing that every male Armenian must present himself forthwith at the government building. In some cases the warning was given by the soldiery or gendarmerie slaughtering every male Armenian they encountered in the streets. The men presented themselves in their working clothes. When they arrived, they were thrown without explanation into prison, kept there a day or two, and then marched out of the town in batches, roped man to man, along some southerly or southeasterly road. They were starting, they were told, on a long journey—Mosul or perhaps to Baghdad. But they had not long to ponder over their plight, for they were halted and massacred at the first lonely place on the road. There was complete coordination between Talaat Bey's Ministry of the Interior and Enver Pasha's Ministry of War, for simultaneously the Armenian Labour Battalions, working behind the front, were surrounded by detachments of their combatant Moslem fellow-soldiers and butchered in cold blood."
>
> (Arnold J. Toynbee, in "The Treatment of Armenians in the Ottoman Empire 1915–16," pp. 638–640.)

It is hardly necessary to add much to this description of what was probably the first genocidal act in modern days, except for the fact that the women and children were either slaughtered, sold into slavery, or retained as servants in Turkish and Arab households.

To this day the people of Armenian descent have never forgotten the tragic events of 1915, nor can they ever forget them. On April 24 of each year they remember the martyrs who were struck down so savagely at the hands of a cruel regime. In this country, where several hundred thousand Americans of Armenian origin live in peace with their neighbors, this sad day of tribute is observed in many communities. Special memorial services are held in the churches and public meetings are dedicated to pay homage to the martyrs of 1915.

On this day, peace-loving Americans of all faiths and national origins join in this observance with bowed heads and heavy hearts laden with sadness at the inhumanities of man. We express our profound sympathy to a dauntless and heroic people, to Armenians in the United States and in other countries, who have risen from the ashes of annihilation to rebuild their culture and heritage. Let us hope and pray that never again will humanity be afflicted with such a tragedy as befell the Armenian people just a half century ago.

Goodby to Braceros

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, a big city newspaper editor can be more provincial than a barefoot country boy when he writes about something he does not understand. An editorial in the Sunday Star of April 4, 1965, entitled "Goodby to Braceros" demonstrates this. A short editorial can include so many inconsistent and misleading statements that it is impossible to answer.

A very few of the misleading statements are mentioned in the following letter which I wrote to the editor of the Evening Star.

This is a most serious and difficult problem that cannot be twitted and passed over with a flippant "goodby."

I ask Congress and the Secretary why Public Law 414 is available to hotel operators, but not to farmers? Unemployed are more willing to learn the service trades than "stoop" labor.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., April 5, 1965.

MR. NEWBOLD NOYES,
Editor, the Evening Star,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. NOYES: Your editorial "Goodby to Braceros" displays a provincial ignorance of vegetable agriculture and an utter disdain for the real problem of the migrant family.

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is replete with testimony that termination of the temporary Public Law 78 was not intended as a termination of the permanent Public Law 414. Growers are not asking Secretary Wirtz to enforce Public Law 78; they, and numerous workers in industries allied with or dependent upon agriculture, are urging the Secretary to legally utilize Public Law 414 to prevent wholesale crop spoilage and unemployment of local domestic workers. You must try to understand the difference.

The problem is appreciated by everyone who lives and works in a vegetable producing area—and not understood by eastern big city dwellers who have never been on a farm and have no idea how artichokes or asparagus grow.

Like you, our Department of Labor is not oriented to the farms or agriculture. City-dwellers enjoy the "chow lines" and banquets, but ignore or neglect the problems of planting, cultivation, harvesting, processing, and distribution of vegetables.

If you had to live only a week with a nomadic farm family (especially observing the sensations and feelings of the innocent children), you might know somewhat of the cruelties you want to perpetuate with the "migrant system." Next to communism and war, the migrant life is the cruelest existence to which we can subject children—truly un-American. The braceros did not "roam"; only the American domestic workers roam. This is a pathetic tragedy which should be discouraged—not encouraged.

For your information and consideration, unskilled farm workers earn more than they can earn at any other job anywhere. Is not the farmer just as entitled to competent, reliable labor as the manufacturer? Should the farmer alone be required to accept the rejects and unemployables from other industries?

Is the California farmer the one to carry the burden of solving the social and environmental problems of Harlem and the big city slums, the economic and planning problems of the West Virginia and Kentucky coal fields, and the educational and social problems of the South?

Admittedly, farm wages, working and living conditions should be improved; but it should also be remembered that the men living in California "farm labor camps" enjoy a better, cleaner bed; more ample and nutritious food; and better washing and laundry facilities than they have at home.

Automation and mechanization of agriculture is speeding ahead—eliminating first the jobs of those who need them most—the low-skilled, local domestic worker.

In your noble humanitarian mission against the farmer why do you ignore the principal "mass exception to the law"—the wholesale importation of foreign workers to Washington, D.C., for work in restaurants and hotels? Is none of the 4 million unemployed Americans able to do this work? Why do you not advocate that Secretary Wirtz deny Public Law 414 to the hotels? Should not the big city hotel and restaurant operators be required to hire those drawing unemployment checks here in Washington every week—before importing foreign workers? Should not the wages of the hotel worker be increased to entice the unemployed in the

Washington, Baltimore, and New York areas to come to work? Why such a different attitude toward farmers than hotel operators? Because the hotels are here and the farms are far away in California?

Sincerely,

BURT L. TALCOTT,
U. S. Congressman.

Ambassador Stevenson To Receive Eleanor Roosevelt Political and Public Service Memorial Award

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, Adlai E. Stevenson, our distinguished Ambassador to the United Nations, has been selected to receive the Eleanor Roosevelt Political and Public Service Memorial Award for 1965. The Ambassador has received many well-deserved honors during his years of outstanding public service. This particular honor, though, carries with it a special significance. It is given annually in memory of Eleanor Roosevelt to that person who best exemplifies her spirit.

The Eleanor Roosevelt Political and Public Service Memorial Award was conceived by a group of her friends as a fitting and lasting memorial shortly after her death in 1962. They formed an independent award committee consisting of the following distinguished citizens: John J. B. Shea, Francis W. H. Adams, Richard A. Brown, Eugene Callender, Stephen R. Currier, Irving M. Engel, Arnold L. Fein, Abraham Feinberg, Thomas K. Finletter, Eleanor Clark French, Lloyd K. Garrison, Mrs. Louis A. Gimbel, Jr., Milton A. Gordon, Mrs. Dorothy Hirshon, Thomas R. Jones, Mrs. Robert Kintner, Arthur B. Krim, Orin Lehman, Mrs. Dorothy Norman, Frederick W. Richmond, Curtis Roosevelt, WILLIAM F. RYAN, Dore Schary, JAMES H. SCHEUER, Henry D. Sedgwick, R. Peter Straus, Telford Taylor, Robert Wechsler. In 1963, the award committee made its first presentation to Lloyd K. Garrison, and in 1964 selected Anna Rosenberg Hoffman as the award recipient.

This year, the award committee unanimously chose Adlai Stevenson to receive the Eleanor Roosevelt Political and Public Service Memorial Award. The following essay, written by Dore Schary, beautifully expresses the intent of the committee in choosing an annual recipient for this unique award.

MRS. R.: POLITICIAN

All of us who loved Eleanor Roosevelt have spoken and written at length about her devotion to causes of good and welfare. Her labors on behalf of the conquering of diseases; her fight for better educational opportunity; her steadfastness in the field of civil liberties; her intolerance toward inadequate housing, bigotry, industrial discrimination; and her allegiance to the humanities, are documented for all to see.

Too little is said of her tough capabilities as a politician. In this area she was always surprising the opposition who were constantly misinterpreting her massive benevolence as a sign of political naivete or ignorance.

Her performance as a delegate to the United Nations and her contribution to the bill of human rights proved her competence in international politics. Her willingness to defy the less astute members of her own party is on the record. She has opposed private interests or Presidents if need be, if principle was being sacrificed for expediency.

She was unremitting in pursuing principle, and in world affairs or national problems or State and city politics, she was willing to pick up the lance and give battle. There are a number of unhorsed opponents who bear witness to her skill and tenacity as a combatant in the political tournaments.

Eleanor Roosevelt's favority political theme was the responsibility of each citizen to participate in the affairs of his government at local, State, and National levels. It was her contention that our elected officials reflected the interest and devotion of the electorate; that, in effect, we got what we deserved or earned.

It is a credo that all members of every reform movement should repeat each day as a remainder of their basic obligation.

There was with the sweet smile and the soft voice of Mrs. Roosevelt an iron will and steely convictions that not only benefited the Democratic Party but could remain a shining inheritance to all of us who occasionally forget that principle must be pursued without considering the consequence.

The hand-illuminated parchment plaque being presented to Ambassador Stevenson contains the last photograph taken of Mrs. Roosevelt in her lifetime and reads:

> Adlai E. Stevenson, whose devotion to and efforts for the cause of good government splendidly reflect those ideals and principles which dominated the mind and heart of Eleanor Roosevelt.

The award will be presented to the Ambassador at a dinner on April 12 at the Hotel Pierre in New York, sponsored by the New York Committee for Democratic Voters, the citywide reform Democratic movement, Mrs. Roosevelt's major political interest in the last years of her life.

Fair Employment for All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JEFFERY COHELAN
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, this last week I had expected to address the closing session of a very interesting Industrial Relations Institute at the Alameda Naval Air Station, which adjoins my congressional district in California.

Unfortunately, our consideration of the education bill precluded my attendance, but the address was made in my absence by my sister, Mrs. Charlotte Danforth.

My remarks were directed at the critical problem of providing and promoting fair and equal consideration in employment, a consideration which is all-too-frequently denied today. I believe that our colleagues and all who are concerned with this important question may find these remarks of interest.

ADDRESS OF CONGRESSMAN JEFFERY COHELAN, BEFORE THE INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS INSTITUTE, ALAMEDA NAVAL AIR STATION, MARCH 27, 1965

I would like to speak to you today not strictly about the problems of industrial relations or personal management, for this has been your program for almost a week. Rather, I would like to talk about a related but much broader problem with which we all need to be concerned—the problem of more effectively utilizing our human resources; of seeing to it that every American is allowed to work to the fullest of his abilities.

In Selma, Ala., and in the Congress of the United States, a vigorous movement is underway to insure that Negroes and all other minority group members are no longer denied the right to vote in any election; that they are no longer prevented from fully exercising this fundamental right which is so clearly guaranteed by our Constitution.

But guaranteeing the right to vote—a right which has been most frequently and flagrantly abused in the South—is only one important step that must be taken. We must also move, and move forcefully, to insure fair and equal consideration in employment—whether it be government or private—and this is not only a southern problem, it is a national problem.

When we talk of the free enterprise system, we think in terms of a free market in which goods, talent, and ideas move freely without artificial restrictions.

This system has served us well and during the last 5 years, with the help of new depreciation schedules and a significant tax cut, we have achieved a record of prosperity unparalleled in our history. Yet this system has shown some serious imperfections which contradict its goals and have caused this Nation to fall short of its potential.

We know, for example, that we enjoy a standard of living unmatched anywhere in the world. But we also know that 35 million Americans fall below the line of poverty with family incomes of less than $3,000 a year.

We know that the American factory worker earns more than $100 a week. But we also know that millions of Americans are growing up in families where the father, if there is one at all, has never been able to work, or who has worked at common labor all his life because he has never had the chance to do anything else.

We know that our colleges are graduating more students than ever before. But we also know that each year more than 100,000 young people with leadership potential do not go on because they lack the economic means.

We know that nearly 1 million teenagers are looking for work, and when the additional ingredient of skin color is added, the figure becomes a national disgrace.

Last year fully 23 percent of all nonwhite teenage boys and 31 percent of all nonwhite teenage girls were unemployed and seeking work.

In the adult labor force, the unemployment rate for nonwhites was twice as great as for whites, and the preparation of persons regularly on part time because of the inability to find full-time work was five times as high.

The great tragedy of these shameful inconsistencies and inequities is that they are caused largely by artificial barriers—by inadequate education, by a cycle of poverty which viciously perpetuates itself, by poor health, and most important, by discrimination based on race, religion, and national heritage.

The loss that has resulted from this discrimination in employment has not only been deep in human suffering, it has been deep in lost potential as well. As a matter of fact, the Department of Commerce calculated recently that in failing to utilize Negroes and other minority group members at their present levels of training and education, the Nation was wasting a substantial portion of their productivity and contribution to the national economy. The loss figure set for 1963 was a staggering $11.1 billion.

The report also stated that if Negroes and other nonwhites were permitted to achieve the same educational levels as their white neighbors, and if discrimination did not hamper their full participation in the economy, that the gross national product in 1964 could have been expanded by nearly $22 billion.

And let us not think that this underemployment and unemployment—this waste of human resources and potential—will be relieved by sheer economic expansion alone.

Last year our economy grew by $38 billion. But in his Economic Report to Congress in January of this year, President Johnson pointed out that another similar gain would do little more than enable us to hold our own.

These huge losses because of what might be called economic obtuseness or social blindness are not unique to history. For hundreds of years, the economic and social systems of countries have been hampered by class distinctions. At one time, unless you were born into the aristocracy, you had little hope of attaining a position of authority or responsibility. Yet this form of foolish snobbery and wastefulness passed and today the sons and grandsons of farmers, laborers, and poor immigrants are the managers of great enterprises.

Hopefully, we are at long last beginning a period that will see the just end to discrimination based on the irrelevancy of race.

We have the moral impetus, spurred on by the fight to secure full voting rights.

We have the economic motivation made clear in lost purchasing power and human potential.

We have the executive mandate, which all of you are familiar with, banning discrimination in Federal employment and by those doing business with the Federal Government.

And we have the congressional commands of the landmark Civil Rights Act of 1964 making unlawful discrimination based on race, or religion, or national origin by any employer, by any union, or by any employment agency.

All this is essential, but more still is required.

This country's great productive capability is based essentially on four factors: on capital investment, intelligent management, the advanced state of our technology, and the skills of our labor force.

These factors must work together, they must grow almost abreast, but the contribution of the labor force has been lagging through insufficient preparation and use of our manpower. There has been a steady shift toward demand for higher skill levels, but our educational and training systems and our social customs have not provided them.

And it is significant to note, I think, that while every estimate of future manpower needs indicates that professional and technical jobs requiring high degrees of education and skills are increasing most rapidly, that nearly two-thirds of all nonwhites are working in unskilled jobs. Is it really any wonder then that our newspaper want ads are filled with thousands of open jobs while our unemployment remains consistently around 5 percent? And that is 5 percent of a labor force that has grown by 4¾ million jobs in the last 4 years.

There is no possible way that discrimination can be fully ended or the efficient matching of workers and job opportunities completely accomplished by the Federal Government alone.

We can follow the kind of fiscal and monetary policies that will help sustain growth, and we have done this through the tax cut, the revised depreciation schedules, and our protection of the dollar's stability.

We can develop programs aimed at freeing business and government from the social customs that have restricted the choice of workers, and we have done this through the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Executive orders on employment, and the President's Committee on Equal Employment Opportunity.

We can make Federal resources available to help upgrade the labor force and we have done so through the Manpower Development and Training Act, the poverty program, and the Vocational Education Act.

All this and more we can begin, develop, and make available. But in a free nation such as ours, these efforts will all be for naught unless the programs are seized upon and used by the people.

In the long run it will be the leaders of our communities, it will be you who are participating in this institute and who are leaders in your own fields, who will create the climate, who will make the decisions, and who will take the steps necessary to rid our land of the dread disease of discrimination and move our country forward to fulfill its rich potential.

But let me offer a few suggestions, which hopefully may encourage and stimulate further discussion, for the responsibility must be taken and the problem must be met. The future of our free and democratic society demands it.

First, we can work in the business community to expand and further programs of equal opportunity in hiring and retention; to encourage them in the areas where they already exist and to develop them where they do not. Here in the bay area, leadership has been taken by some companies, and good records have been established by others, but certainly much more can be done.

Second, we can make an all-out effort, in government as well as in business, to let every manager, every foreman, every personnel man, and every worker know that we mean business when we say that skin color, and national origin, and religion are not to be part of our selection and our promotion system.

Third, we can be sure that we live up to the intent as well as the letter of Executive Orders No. 10925 and No. 11114 which ban discrimination because of race, creed, color or national origin in employment by the Federal Government, by those who do business with the Government, and on all federally assisted contract work. Let us be sure that our own actions and our own attitudes are as highly motivated as the law.

Fourth, we can give consideration to compensatory efforts and compensatory opportunities. Equality in hiring should mean that every worker is considered on an equal basis, but such often cannot be the case today. For many, many years some Americans, and the Negro in particular, have been systematically denied and deprived of the conditions—the education, the training, and the experience—that would make this equality possible.

Is it not equally possible then that we could compensate in some fair manner for these past denials; that extra consideration could be given in placement, in on-the-job training, and in other areas, without infringing on the equally legitimate rights of other workers? Proper application may not be easy but certainly the problem warrants our efforts.

Fifth, and finally, we can let everyone around us know—relatives, friends, employees, and associates—that by denying equal opportunities to our fellow citizens because of the color of their skin, or the country of their birth, of the place where they may worship, that we make hypocrisy of our democracy. We not only betray ourselves, but we compromise our history and we weaken our resolve before the world.

We Americans of this decade are offered a rare opportunity. For a hundred years and more, the promise of our law has been equality but our precepts have not been equaled by our deeds.

Now, however, we can make the dreams and the promises a reality. We can wipe out the last roadblocks to full equality in voting and we can break down the last stubborn barriers to full participation in employment.

The task is already begun. With your help, and your neighbors, and your neighbors' neighbors, we can succeed and America can truly be the land of the free.

A Woman Legislator's View on Consumer Protection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Washington, Catherine May, recently delivered a notable address to the 38th annual convention of the Soap & Detergent Association. The speech, entitled "A Woman Legislator's View on Consumer Protection," is a forthright expression by an eminently forthright person and contains all of the elements that make the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. May] an effective and articulate legislator—humor, candid analysis, and good commonsense.

I commend the address by the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. May], delivered on January 28, 1965, to the attention of all my colleagues and under unanimous consent include it in the Record at this point.

The speech referred to follows:

A Woman Legislator's View on Consumer Protection

(By Hon. Catherine May)

I have been asked to speak to you today as a congressional housewife on the subject of the consumer versus Congress. I do so in the full realization that the main problem on your mind today concerning the American housewife is how in the dickens to keep her from wondering where the suds went. But that's your problem and Madison Avenue's.

I feel I have a few problems of my own in speaking to this group today. I have come here with a mild suspicion that you good people may have asked me to speak in the belief that my views on public affairs correspond in some degree with your own. My speech will concern itself with a theme that I have been reiterating over and over this past year before groups similar to your own and I suspect some of you in the audience have already suffered through one or two versions of it. In any case, I am assuming that most of you have divined my political and economic orientation from those speeches of the past year.

But I must remind you that, since I last spoke in your interest area, a rather violent political upheaval has shaken our country from coast to coast. As a result of that political upheaval I stand before you today as a member of the "Whooping Crane Society," i.e., a survivor Republican. And, as such, I feel compelled to admit honestly that there are growing indications that the Republican Party may not be as dominant today in the Nation's affairs as it was in the heyday of Lincoln, Teddy Roosevelt, and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

This last year we made a major blunder. We transgressed a political axiom: Never ask a question in public unless you know in advance what the answer will be.

We Republicans asked our countrymen, "Why not victory?"

The answer came roaring back, "You're short 16 million votes, that's why not victory."

Maybe we should have stood in bed.

So, let there be no mistake about it—I stand before you today minus a union card in the Great Society. In addition, I humbly confess I may never qualify for membership because I am having so much difficulty understanding some of the messages that are being sent up to us on Capitol Hill by major spokesmen for the Great Society. As I am sure you know, they are telling us that America is a paradise lost, to be federally regained. Within the context of one public statement we are told that American people are poverty ridden, ignorant, pressed into slums, our water poisoned, our air polluted, our food contaminated, and our cosmetics defiled. But, at the same time, thank goodness, in only 4 enlightened years we have become the richest, strongest, best educated, and healthiest people in all the world. Obviously, this means we must embark upon a realistic and businesslike program—in short, frugally extravagant and cautiously bold—for only through liberal conservatism can we ever achieve chronic deficits that are fiscally sound.

In addition to being very busy trying to understand the "blueprint for the grand design," I have, since the calamitous day of November 3, also been much involved with the "sage of good fellowship" that has been going on in the Republican Party as we immediately began, in traditional Republican style, to close our ranks and build party unity. You know, those fellows who say the Republican Party is dead and gone just haven't been reading the newspapers. We Republicans haven't had such fun since the cadets at The Citadel, in Charleston, lofted the first shells into Fort Sumter 103 years ago.

The sport we have been having among ourselves makes the uncertain probings of Secretary McNamara in Vietnam look like a friendly, dynastic game of touch football.

Never before has so small a party so greatly bled.

Clearly we Republicans are vital and strong—so much so, to paraphrase Thomas Jefferson, we are drenching the tree of liberty with the blood of our own patriots.

Considering all this, if I seem a bit edgy on your platform today, put yourself in my position: A fellow Republican might be in the hall.

And now, quickly before you think I am trying to make a partisan speech here today, I am going to bring in mention of the Democrats. Maybe we Republicans do have a little family spat now and then. Maybe we do dote on party slack fill and on fractional political weight. But, really, this is as nothing as compared to our political competitors who wear the brand L.B.J. The Democratic Party is having great troubles with truth in packaging. And, furthermore, the Democrats are detecting a little fraticide in their own party. With Lyndon to the right of them, HUBERT to the left of them, into the valley of 68 will charge BOBBY and TEDDY.

As I said when I began my remarks, a significant political upheaval has occurred since I began stressing the theme and philosophy that I have been asked to repeat here today. I feel, therefore, that in order to preclude any possibility of misunderstanding, I owe it to you to make this very clear:

If you think I shall go on resisting Federal intrusion into areas constitutionally and traditionally reserved to the States, the communities and individual citizens; if you have asked me here on the supposition that I shall continue to oppose Federal harassment of private enterprise; if you count me among those pledged to fight the cult of consumeritis and politics in the pantry—and determined also to defend the intelligence of American housewives and uphold their freedom of choice; if you expect me, in these remarks today, to decry paternalistic government and the baleful doctrine of bureaucratic infallibility—then, my friends, I must in all candor tell you this: Relax, your expectations, will be relaxed.

And, in this context I will now make some comments as a Member of Congress concerning the shape of things in your industry's areas of immediate concern.

To begin with (though, admittedly, my congressional crystal ball is often clouded) I think you are home free on water pollution. Though, naturally, Congress will want representatives of your industry to retestify on the progress you have made.

This victory you have fashioned yourselves, by your own aggressive and foresighted effort, through the creation of the new biodegradable detergents. I warmly congratulate you of the soap and detergent industry on this achievement valuable to our Nation and important to yourselves. The best way anyone has ever devised to forfend Federal intervention is to remove the excuse by forehanded action.

And, this brings me to the heart of my speech (no pun intended). Or, rather, the speech I have been giving so often about the virulent outbreak of consumeritis in Congress over the past few years. To recap I shall quote myself in placing before you some of the viewpoints I have been stressing.

I have been saying that I am opposed to further extension of Federal regulation into the marketplace. I have been expressing my alarm that since coming to Congress I have noted that the voices of the self-appointed champions of the consumer have become ever more vocal and militant in their demands for investigations and hearings and new Government authority to set up rules and regulations in the field of the free market. These apostles of regimentation of the marketplace have been out in full cry for 3 years. In spite of the overwhelmingly ample Government safeguards that already exist, certain people in Government, aided by specially set up organizations, keep insisting that Mrs. American housewife and her consumer husband are wandering, baffled, uncomprehending, and empty headed through dangerous clip joints, i.e., better known as supermarkets, being constantly robbed by Simon Legree, the storekeeper. Bills have been introduced in Congress that cannot help but imply that manufacturers of food and fiber products are taking every possible advantage of the consumer through deception in sizes and weights of packages and with misleading label information printed on them. Another Government agency, charged with consumer protection, has been urging housewives, through many means of communications plus public meetings, to submit their complaints to the Government concerning things that displease them at the buying counter.

A National Commission on Food Marketing was created in the last Congress. I am a member of this Commission. I am proud to have been appointed to it. But, I have not been proud of some of the irresponsible statements that have been made concerning its purposes. This Commission is barely beginning its study in the very important field of learning more about how our modern marketing system works to get food from farm to table. Yet, these statements imply that conclusions have already been reached and these conclusions, of course, assume that there will be a scandalous exposé of dishonest practices by the manufacturers and the middleman. This Commission could provide our country with one of the most important and helpful studies ever made by a congressional commission. But, only if it is allowed to work in an atmosphere of openminded and honest inquiry without prejudgment.

This type of governmental and political activity, over such a long period, has resulted in creating many misleading impressions and it is no wonder that a lot of good people are being fooled into joining the hue and cry for legislative action in Congress. Because of my concern, about a year ago, I set myself the task of trying to do what I could to balance propaganda with perspective. To try and get through to the American public, particularly women, with the warning that they should always take a good look at what the Government may be doing to them while it says it is doing something for them.

I have been using the famous truth-in-packaging bill as introduced in the Senate last year as one example. This bill, as you know, would give the Federal Government the right to dictate weights and other standards for product containers. Here is a bill that has been recommended by the President's Consumer Advisory Council and one which is being supported by the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Mrs. Esther Peterson, in her position as Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs. And, don't ever mistake it, at first glance it has tremendous appeal for any American shopper. Why shouldn't a woman be entitled to adequate information printed on the label which would help her decide on one can of beans over another can of beans, or one package of detergent over another package of detergent? She should have good labeling but I just happen to think that the company that produces that product should provide the labeling information for his package, and I also think that the American housewife is entitled to something more flexible and something more informative than a Federal yardstick used in Washington, D.C. Just as I think that the product manufacturer should have the flexibility to package his own product in the way that will make it most competitive in the market place when Mrs. Housewife comes in to select. Of course, this gives him the freedom to mislead his prospective customer if he wishes to do so. But, heaven help him if he does. To quote myself again:

All the Government officials and all the government laws in the world are as nothing compared to the impact Mrs. America has on Mr. Manufacturer and on Mr. Storekeeper when she makes up her mind to buy one brand over another. And when she makes that decision, no power on earth can save the businessman or the producer of the product who made the mistake of displeasing her. She has done and is doing a wonderful job in needling, inspiring and in regulating American business enterprise.

And, to reward her, I want to protect her. Not with more government regulations and laws—I want to protect her freedom of choice.

Now I know that you in this group today are on my side in this battle. The big question is how are we doing as we face the 89th Congress in the year 1965? It ain't good.

Our legislative difficulty is not concerned with the truth or the cogency of our shared views. Frankly, I think the American people, once they had the facts, would be with us in overwhelming majority. But, we are hampered by the disproportionate publicity of the opposing views—and, if I weren't trying to be a diplomatic lady, I would say at this point, "where were some of you guys these last 3 years?"—combined with the disproportionate political division in Congress. In both Houses of Congress every Republican is now flanked by two Democrats. Each one of the 20 House committees and nearly all Senate committees are 2-to-1 Democrat. Add this to these facts: The Democratic platform promised enactment of the packaging and labeling bill—last year the President demanded its enactment—labor has made this item a legislative "must"—four Members of the House have already reintroduced last year's Senate bill—and the report from the Senate side is that this year Senator HART will try to have his bill sent to the Senate Commerce Committee where it is presumed that it has a greater chance for favorable action.

It would seem indeed that the consumeritis virus has a very fertile congressional field in which to work these days.

So, where do we go from here? Well, I would like to end this message today by sharing a few thoughts on this and with your permission, offer some advice.

First, I repeat that the best defense against Federal skullduggery is for you yourselves to clean up any known trouble areas which can be seized upon to justify the use of the Federal shillelagh.

Deceit of any kind in the marketplace, even in isolated instances, is indefensible. I know you have patiently stated time and time again that you feel exactly the same way. I know we are agreed also that marketplace chicanery is not the rule but the exception. But where you can—wherever you can—if you of industry will yourselves root out these problems, correct them and prevent their recurrence, you will have done the best possible thing to keep your enterprises free of public criticism and restraint.

Second, you cannot imagine how disheartening and confusing it is to your friends in public life when industry, with its cherished anarchy, comes to us with a label of conflicting voices. Believe me, labor unions march up Capitol Hill lockstep and in unbreachable phalanx on every issue of real importance. As one who in private life has known the problems of business firsthand, I understand how difficult it is to achieve harmony on any issue that cuts across the great complex of individual companies—but again, where and when you can, you should strive for unity on the overriding issues. For only then can your views become clearly comprehended by people in Government; only then can your combined power and influence be brought fully to bear; only then can you develop an effective counterpoise to the relentless forward march of the disciplined collectivistic forces arrayed against you.

As for specific legislation—such as the Hart bill—I have never seen a legislative fight lost until the vote has been counted. In other words, if you will move tirelessly and vigorously and in concert with industries allied with you on this issue, you have no reason to be defeatist about it. Here, I must, of course, enter this reservation: all bets are off if the President, who is virtually enthroned politically, moves this legislation front and center. He has, with this Congress, a whim of steel.

Third, you of industry should unify your position on this legislation to the maximum possible degree and then advance that position in the proper places with all the persistence and energy you can command.

Fourth, you should move in many media, and continuously, to bring the pitfalls of this legislation home to the American people and thereby counteract the claims of its proponents.

Finally, I very earnestly repeat this suggestion: Do your best—your very, very best—all of the time, to pinpoint the areas that invite criticism, and then move with the kind of boldness and decisiveness you have so commendably demonstrated in the pollution area to purge yourselves of error.

It would overtax your patience if I attempted now to cover the many other areas that give you concern—antitrust probabilities for example, and taxation, restraints on advertising, and enlarged regulatory powers for such agencies as the FTC and FDA.

But all of it can be lumped into this one generalization: In Congress, due to the 1964 election, all systems are "go." Restraint in the National Government at this point is the restraint the President is disposed to exercise. Our system of checks and balances has become a blank check with an unlimited balance. That part of business leadership which in the last campaign helped to saddle America with unbridled executive power might well burn a few candles before the altar of making L.B.J. stand for "let's be judicious." I wish them luck.

And, my friends, for all of you I wish much more than luck. I wish you continuing prosperity in an environment of freedom kept hospitable to vigorous and healthy competion. Those of us in public life who have pledged ourselves to the preservation of a system of free enterprise will, I assure you, stand firm in the frontline of the battle to save our system. May it be your disposition, now and in the future to do no less. May S O S become your battle cry as well as our own.

Now I must ask you, please, to excuse me. I just glimpsed a Republican. If I don't stop right now, he may get away.

Thank you for your courteous attention.

America's Stake in the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I should like to include in the RECORD today my statement which was presented to a conference on water and peace sponsored by the Zionist Organization of America in Chicago on April 4.

I believe that this is a subject which deserves the widest discussion and it is my hope that our own Government will take a more active role in helping find a solution to this very serious problem.

I believe the Zionist Organization of America deserves great credit for leading the way in an orderly discussion of this very important subject.

Mr. Speaker, my statement, which was read in Chicago by Mr. Milton J. Silberman, follows:

AMERICA'S STAKE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Ladies and gentlemen, I am honored that I have been asked to speak to you on two of the most important issues facing not only the United States, but also the countries of the Middle East—peace and water.

One might wonder, at first blush, how peace and water can be so thoroughly related in the Middle East. I am very happy that the Zionist Organization of America has arranged this discussion today so that we may be able to put this entire subject in its proper perspective.

We, of course, have been seeking many ways to maintain peace in the Middle East. But I think we can all agree the task is becoming increasingly more difficult with the obvious lack of cooperation from Nasser and the Arab States.

While it is wise for us to discuss today the basic factors which we hope could lead to peace in the Middle East, it would be a great tragedy if we were to be blinded to the immediate problems at hand. This is one reason why the House of Representatives quite properly placed a ban on any further foreign aid to Nasser until he ceases his aggressive moves against Israel. I regret that the Senate found it necessary to somewhat temper the House action, but even with the Senate amendment it is significant that the House has demonstrated its patience is wearing thin with the arrogance of Nasser.

I believe the Congress must also recognize the realities of life in the Middle East by approving, as quickly as possible, legislation barring Nasser and the Arab States from boycotting American industry which does business with Israel. This attitude by the Arab States is contemptible, and one has a right to ask how much longer will the U.S. Government continue to tolerate such impudence.

We are aware that Israel has never been, in my judgment, in greater danger, and it would be my hope that the U.S. Government will again reaffirm its unequivocal determination that any act of aggression by the Arab States against Israel is an act of aggression against the United States and the Western democracies. We cannot permit an act of miscalculation by the Arab States to plunge the Middle East into open warfare. Nasser has been riding high, and it is my hope that the United States will make it crystal clear exactly what our position is.

This Nation is now historically committed to the proposition that Israel's independence must be maintained at all costs.

It is within this framework that we today undertake a discussion of water and peace in the Middle East.

President Kennedy enjoyed recalling the old Chinese proverb that even a journey of 1,000 miles requires a first step.

I would suggest that resolving the water problem in the Middle East might indeed provide the first step in the long and arduous road toward finding a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

The problem of maintaining the present shaky peace in the Middle East is, as I am sure you are all aware, one of the most delicate issues facing the American policymaker. We as Americans are concerned with a great number of related objectives—all of which have some bearing on whether or not this most important goal is achieved. For example, we want to maintain access to the essential transportation routes which traverse this area; we want to limit the influence of the Soviet Union; we want to make sure that the oil of this region continues to flow to Europe, for the latter's economic strength depends upon it; we want to help in creating political stability in the individual countries; we want to see an accommodation between Israel and its Arab neighbors, and, perhaps most important is that it can materially assist in achieving many of the above, we want to see the economic development of this area proceed as rapidly and as intelligently as possible.

Now, an indispensable element of the future development of this region, as well as of many others, is a sufficient supply of fresh water. However, Israel is perhaps more than others aware of this necessity. With a growing population, little naturally arable land, and an announced policy of industrialization, the problem of water is of the utmost importance. Large quantities of water are needed; for irrigation of land presently uncultivated because natural rainfall is insufficient, for large and complex industrial enterprises, for consumption by the population, and, for purposes of recreation and a great variety of other uses.

There are at present only two possible sources of additional water for Israel as well as the other Arab States of the area, because they too lack sufficient quantities of this necessary resource. The first consists of a more rational utilization of presently available sources, as for example, the Jordan River. The second consists of artificially increasing the supply, as for example, through extensive desalinization projects.

The Jordan River is the major river in the area of the Middle East where Israel is located. It has its origins in Lebanon, Syria, Israel, and Jordan. After meandering through the Sea of Galilee and an age-old trough, it finally makes its way into the lowest spot on earth—the Dead Sea. By the time it has arrived at its destination, the Jordan River has become more a river of minerals and salts than one of water. Both Israel and Jordan are "mining" the Dead Sea for this extensive mineral content. But what of its waters farther upstream? Here they are fresh, and could provide all of the riparian countries with sufficient water to irrigate many thousands of additional acres. Israel as well as the Arab States are aware of this, and have at various times proposed plans for the utilization of these precious waters before they are lost to the Dead Sea. So far, however, extremely complex psychological and political fears and disagreements have prevented the creation of any overall regional approach to the apportionment of the Jordan River waters. Consequently, both Israel and the Arabs have gone about the construction of their own diversion projects.

I think it is extremely important to note at this point that construction of diversion projects by the Israel Government along the Jordan River is in line with the broad plan included in the Johnston proposal. It was Eric Johnston who in 1953 proposed the Jordan Valley plan for water power and irrigation projects to benefit the Arab States as well as Israel. We are well aware of the wrecking tactics used by Nasser to upset the carefully worked our Johnston proposal. But I think that this conference should not lose sight of the fact that President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and today, President Johnson are formally committed to the Johnston proposal for distribution of water resources in the Middle East.

I know of nothing which has occurred since Eric Johnston first proposed this plan which has either changed the American position or would justify any change in American position. What is needed today is a bold reaffirmation by the United States of the Johnston proposal and then, if necessary, a complete assurance of assistance by the United States if Israel decides to unilaterally complete this proposal.

We are well aware of the tension that such action will produce in the Middle East, but I am quite certain that development of this program would help lead toward a partial solution of the water problem. Firmness on our part at this time in supporting Israel, in my judgment, will bring the Arab States into line even though we know the extent of mischief and actual brutality that they are capable of generating in their protest.

But the free world has tried to work both sides of the street on this very difficult problem too long. It is my hope that we will take a decisive position in supporting Israel on this matter at this time.

So much for the waters from the Jordan. The United States has also embarked upon the second of the possible means of increasing the available water supply of the Middle East; namely, desalinization schemes. Because the issue of the insufficient water looms so large as a source of both present and possible future friction between Israel and the Arabs, we have undertaken discussions with Israel for mutual programs to discover an economical way to desalt sea water.

The first step was taken last June when Prime Minister Levi Eshkol and President Johnson established a joint survey team to conduct technical surveys in order to define the scope and requirements of the program. On the basis of the economic and engineering studies which were carried out, the Chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, the Acting Secretary of the Interior, the Israel Ambassador, and the Coordinator of Israel's water desalting project signed a principles of understanding agreement in October. Both Governments have issued invitations to American engineering and consulting firms to participate in the second step: a detailed engineering study for a large desalting project in order to meet Israel's pressing demands for more fresh water.

This international effort to develop an inexpensive and feasible method of desalinization of sea water may one day prove to be one of the greatest technical feats of human engineering. Huge tracts of the earth's surface could be made productive if only sufficient supplies of fresh water could be brought to them. In this way, one may hope that not only will the problem of insufficient food for much of the world's population be alleviated, but also that disagreements over a limited supply of water will loom less large in an overall settlement for areas such as the Middle East.

American policy has in recent years shown a greater awareness of the aspirations of the peoples of the Middle East, as well as a willingness to assist those who desire our help in building for the future. It is our hope that by continuing to maintain a balanced and constructive relationship with the whole area, and by cooperating in mutual development schemes such as I have outlined, both the problem of water and that most precious of all goals—peace—may eventually be solved in at least this corner of our globe.

But ours is not an easy road to travel in the Middle East. Nor is it easy for our ally Israel to continually turn the other cheek when the Arab States repeatedly renege on their agreements—agreements executed in good faith by both Israel, the United Nations, and the United States.

It is my belief that peace can be brought a little closer to reality when the water problem is resolved in the Middle East. It would be my hope the United States will stand firm in supporting the moderate proposals of Israel in bringing about such a solution. It is only a firm position that the Arab States understand. I am sure in our firm and resolute support of Israel lies the only road to peace in the Middle East.

Urban Renewal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DAVID S. KING

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 5, 1965

Mr. KING of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report that Utah has now become one of the 46 States whose laws make possible the community sponsorship of federally assisted urban renewal projects. This fact results from the recent action taken by the Utah Legislature and concurred in by Utah's new and energetic Governor, Calvin L. Rampton. Prior to that, Utah was one of only five States in the Union having no enabling legislation to allow local participation in this program. I am proud to have been able to do my part to promote urban renewal legislation.

Let me point out some of the program's meritorious features. It can result in the elimination or arresting of municipal blight; it can rebuild rundown areas and develop new uses for them. Urban renewal can help reduce expenditures in police, fire, welfare, and other relatively fixed municipal costs. It can draw new investment into the community for the construction of housing and business and industrial buildings. It can create new jobs. The partnership which it creates between local government, private enterprise, and the Federal Government accomplishes many otherwise impossible things.

The Federal contribution to the cost of the program is an important consideration: it makes possible loans and grants for carrying out many of its features. Special FHA financial aids and public housing assistance help to provide low-rent or moderate-rent housing for families displaced by urban renewal. Relocation grants are made to reimburse displaced families and businesses for their moving expenses and for direct losses of property. Urban renewal, then, is designed to help compensate local citizens, businesses, and communities for out-of-pocket losses incurred when renewal programs are introduced. More important, however, the program is designed to stimulate local communities to initiate needed projects. It is a program to help people help themselves.

In his recent message to Congress on cities, President Johnson stated:

> Our cities are making a valiant effort to combat the mounting dangers to the good life. Between 1954 and 1963 per capita municipal tax revenues increased by 43 percent, and local government indebtedness increased by 119 percent. City officials with inadequate resources, limited authority, too few trained people, and often with too little public support, have, in many cases, waged a heroic battle to improve the life of the people they serve. But we must do far more as a nation if we are to deal effectively with one of the most critical problems of the United States.

In my opinion, the federally assisted urban renewal program seems to be one answer to the problems of our cities. I have supported this program; I plan to continue to do so.

I feel this way even though most of the cities in my State are small; and only one city in Utah has over 100,000 in population. However, the urban renewal program can be helpful to smaller cities. As a matter of fact, nationwide, more than 70 percent of all the cities in the program are under 50,000 in size. Also, Congress has made special provision for these smaller cities by fixing the Federal share of the costs to communities under 50,000 population at 75 percent, instead of the 66⅔ percent allowable to the larger cities.

There is still widespread misunderstanding about urban renewal, however. I recently received a publication that helps to clear up some of its misconceptions. It is the annual report issue of Business Review, published by the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia. The Review carried a most interesting and enlightening article entitled "The Toil and Turmoil of Urban Renewal." Because I think this article makes significant reading for all American communities, I would like to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE TOIL AND TURMOIL OF URBAN RENEWAL

(In ancient days, said China's Lao-tze in the sixth century B.C., men lived in peaceful rural simplicity. Then men attained knowledge, wrote books, complicated life with inventions, and moved from the fields into cities. Hence all the misery of men.)

Like the elephant which six blind men of Indostan went to "see," urban renewal casts many different images. One person sees it as metropolitan rejuvenation to make cities more livable. Another is impressed by its displacement of people. Still others are struck by its slow progress, its diverse objectives, its high cost. Differences of opinion are inevitable in an undertaking with the dimensions and complexities of urban renewal.

A city is a mass of humanity cooped up in a mass of masonry. The city is where the tumult is—a clatter and a chatter of multitudes on the sidewalks, a screech of rubber on asphalt, the shriek of a fire engine, the rumble of a subway, a Fourth of July parade, a 5 o'clock stampede to the suburbs, a shooting in a side-street saloon, and the honking of impatient motorists. The city is also where one goes to enjoy Van Cliburn at the piano, Ormandy on the podium, Fonteyn in the ballet, or Willie Mays in center field. In addition to the performing arts a city offers a cultural smorgasbord of art galleries, libraries, museums, and a variety of educational, scientific, and philosophic organizations affording fruitful opportunities to enrich hours of leisure.

For millions of citizens, the city is home in the fullest sense of the term—a place to live, to work, to play, to go to school. Many city dwellers are transfers from farms or villages; more and more, however, are city born and city bred. They love the city where there is always something going on; they loathe the countryside, dull and dead. Nocturnal orchestration of crickets and peepers would annoy urban sleepers, but not motor trucks thundering through the streets.

Urbanization is a product of our business civilization, our commercial and industrial economy. Seventy percent of the country's population occupy 1 percent of the land area. The heaviest concentration is in 219 metropolitan areas, each of which has as its nucleus a city of 50,000 population or more.

Urban concentration has its disadvantages but it also has its vexations. Familiar to everyone are: The traffic congestion in city center brought on by the widespread preference for personalized transportation, the shortage of downtown parking space, the decline of mass transit, the smog, the strain on water supply, the pollution of streams and the expense of sewage disposal, the exodus of urban population into ticky-tacky towns, the influx of minority groups and their socioeconomic segregation in residential ghettos, the deterioration of certain commercial, industrial, and residential areas of the city, the decay of downtown buisness districts, shrinkage of the tax base, skimpage of municipal services, unwillingness of suburbs to merge with the city—in short, metropolitan muddles, 219 of them.

HOW URBAN RENEWAL GOT STARTED

Urban renewal had its legal origin in the enactment of State enabling laws, some of which date back to 1944. Almost every city has its areas of rundown residential properties that have degenerated into unsightly and unsanitary shanty towns unfit for human habitation. Once a neighborhood reaches that stage of degeneration and decay, the contagion may spread further. Blight often begets more blight, and private enterprise may be powerless to rebuild.

Obstacles to restoration by private enterprise are basically twofold. First is the difficulty of assembling the parcels of multiple ownership into a sufficiently large tract to justify a restoration project. Almost always such plans are thwarted by a "holdout" or two. A second obstacle is the discouragingly high cost. Efforts to assemble land for a renewal project are likely to touch off speculative inflation of land values; and old buildings, howsoever dilapidated, have some value which becomes a significant item in the cost of new construction.

Remedies for these two basic obstacles to private restoration of slums were sought, therefore, in State enabling legislation and the Federal Housing Act of 1949 under which a community acquires and assembles properties in slums, using the power of eminent domain where necessary. Local and Federal Governments pay the net cost of renewal, which is the difference between the cost of acquiring and clearing slum properties and the income received when the land is sold or leased for public or private redevelopment. The so-called writedown is not intended to be a subsidy to the private redeveloper, who must pay a fair value for the cleared land, but is a cost of slum clearance. In some States such as Pennsylvania, there is a modest contribution to the net cost of renewal.

Subsequent amendments to the act raised the sights and broadened the horizon. In addition to slum clearance, provision was made for conservation and rehabilitation of areas that do not require demolition. Furthermore, provision was made for assistance to hospitals and urban colleges and universities to achieve needed expansion and to cope with blight encroaching on their doorsteps. Above all was the realization of the need for Federal aid to revitalize the economic base and taxable resources of cities. Slums are not confined to residential areas of cities. There are also commercial, industrial, educational, and recreational slums. Thus the concept of slum clearance was broadened to make Federal aid available to cities in need of comprehensive urban renewal.

HOW URBAN RENEWAL WORKS

Urban renewal works best when there is competent leadership at the local level, and the wider the degree of local participation the greater the success. The Federal role is largely one of financial and technical assistance.

To qualify for Federal aid, a locality must establish a so-called workable program for community improvement. Such a program must have the following basic elements:

1. Codes and ordinances establishing adequate building standards of health and safety.
2. Detailed neighborhood analysis to identify the nature and extent of the area in need of restoration.
3. Formulation of a comprehensive plan for the community's future development.
4. Administrative organization with authority and responsibility for coordinating and carrying out a community program.
5. Evidence of adequate financial resources to support the local share of an urban renewal program.
6. Provision of housing to meet the needs of families displaced by the renewal project.
7. Assurance that the entire community is fully informed and is given an opportunity to participate in the development and execution of the program.

Depending upon State-enabling statutes, the local public agency may be a department of the city government or a special agency appointed by the mayor with, or, as in Philadelphia, without the approval of city council. After the local public agency's plans are completed and approved by the Urban Renewal Administration, Federal assistance is made available in a loan and grant contract in which the local agency bears one-third of the net project cost and the Urban Renewal Administration, two-thirds. For cities of 50,000 population or less, the cost sharing is one-fourth local and three-fourths Federal. Larger cities may also qualify for three-fourths Federal matching funds if they absorb certain planning costs.

The Housing Act of 1961 permits the Federal Housing Administration and the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) to join in a program of mortgage insurance and purchase to make more moderate rentals possible. Long-term loans below market interest rates can be made to nonprofit organizations and cooperatives, limited dividend corporations, and certain public agencies to build housing for people of moderate incomes. To facilitate the most reasonable rents or carrying charges, FHA waives its usual one-half of 1 percent insurance premiums and insures loans for as long as 40 years.

Actual operations usually begin with acquisition of properties. In most instances, titles to the parcels are obtained by negotiation with the owners, and court condemnation proceedings are used only as a last resort. In all cases, local agencies are expected to assist displaced people and businesses to find suitable relocations. The relocation, of course, is seldom satisfactory in all respects to the family or business relocated.

Removal of structures and clearing the land is generally done under contract with a private contractor who, in some instances, may lay out the streets and other improvements. Meanwhile the city installs the necessary public facilities. When the land is ready for development it is publicly advertised and new construction takes place in accordance with the established plan.

WHERE URBAN RENEWAL WORKS

The Federal urban renewal program is nationwide. An indication of its scope is the growing number of communities participating. From 31 communities with renewal projects at the end of the Urban Renewal Administration's first fiscal year in 1950, the number has grown to 743 as of 1964 at midyear. The 743 localities participating are distributed among 42 of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Moreover, five of the eight States without localities participating in urban renewal have enabling legislation, as shown in the map.

Pennsylvania, with renewal projects in 85 localities, and New York in 66, are in the forefront of urban renewal. Other States with relatively large numbers of communities engaged in renewal are New Jersey, Michigan, Georgia, and California. In some communities the need for renewal may arise from the nature of its industries; in others it may be overcrowding or obsolescence and overage of private and public facilities.

Urban renewal is taking place not only in most parts of the country but also in all kinds of communities. Large cities were among the first to take advantage of Federal assistance to replace their blight-stricken residential and industrial areas with modernized construction. Subsequently, communities of medium and small size followed, as shown in the chart. By 1964, over half of the localities participating in urban renewal were in communities of less than 25,000 population. Of course, well over half of the country's communities under 25,000 population are still untouched by urban renewal, though many of them have blighted areas.

HOW URBAN RENEWAL HAS GROWN

Over 1,300 urban renewal projects had been started as of mid-1963.

In 1958, for the first time, the number of projects under sledge hammer and trowel exceeded those in the paperwork and blueprint stage. Now project completions are mounting. By the end of fiscal 1963, over 100 projects had been completed, and numerous others were nearing that stage.

With many renewal projects in many communities still in various stages of advancement, it is difficult to comprehend the overall accomplishments of the urban renewal program, but it may be helpful to cite some benchmarks of progress. Through June 1963, most of the congressional authorization of $4 billion for urban renewal grants had been utilized, almost 30,000 acres of land had been slated for acquisition and redevelopment, approximately 129,000 structures had been demolished, and 157,000 families had been relocated from blighted areas undergoing renovation. Of the families relocated, 46 percent, according to reports of participating agencies, went into standard private rental housing, about 21 percent into standard sales housing, and about 25 percent into public housing. The remainder—approximately 8 percent—relocated themselves into quarters that did not conform with minimum standards of safety and sanitation. The latter did not avail themselves of the relocation services offered by the local agencies established for that purpose.

Substantial progress has also been made in the expanding conservation program focusing on rehabilitation of urban properties capable of restoration without demolition. Most cities have some forlorn-looking properties, unhinged, unpointed, unpainted, and covered with the silt of time. Such buildings, too desolate for habitation but too good for condemnation, can be prime material for urban renewal's salvage program. Over 45,000 structures and 107,000 dwelling units have been selected for restoration and by June 1963, work had been completed on more than 17,000 structures, including more than 25,000 dwellings.

URBAN RENEWAL'S SIDEWALK SUPERINTENDENTS

Urban renewal has recently encountered a spate of criticism from sidewalk superintendents—professional and amateur. Urban renewal is criticized for its architecture, its overemphasis upon bricks and mortar, its failure to eliminate slums, its bulldozer tactics and displacement of people, its snail-paced progress and alleged lack of clearly defined objectives.

It is asserted that urban renewal legislation is ill conceived, that the central administration is too paper bound, that local agencies formulate their petitions to Washington more in terms of money than ideas, that city planners are "blue sky," that slum dwellers get pushed around, and that blight grows faster than its eradication. The severest critics maintain that urban renewal is a failure and should close shop.

Probably the most serious of these indictments is the removal of people and businesses preparatory to slum clearance by exercise of the power of eminent domain. Though upheld by the courts, the process is criticized as an arbitrary infringement upon the rights of the dispossessed families. In answer to the charge, the Urban Renewal Administration points out that as a prerequisite for Federal assistance a local agency must provide decent, safe, and sanitary housing for dispossessed families, and provision is made for followup of all those required to move. Of families being moved currently in Philadelphia, for example, 96 percent are successfully relocated to safe and sanitary housing. Some inevitably relocate without seeking assistance of the relocation office. A prominent builder operating in a number of urban areas points out that virtually the only direction that slum evacuees can move is up.

Slum clearance is the most vulnerable spot of urban renewal and there is where the sharpest shafts are hurled. The reason for the disappointing progress in slum clearance is the inability of the private housing industry to build houses that low-income families can afford. The Housing Act offers financial aid in making up part of the difference between the cost and reuse value of sites, commonly called the land writedown. But the value of land is only a small fraction of the monthly rent or purchase price. Newly built housing, therefore, is seldom within the means of the lowest income groups.

Some progress toward a solution of this basic difficulty has been made under the Mitchell-Lama program in New York City. The essence of that program is a 50-year municipal loan up to 90 percent of development costs at low rate of interest plus a 50-percent tax abatement for a fixed number of years. Under such a plan it is possible to replace slums with satisfactory housing for low-income families.

An entirely different program inaugurated by the Ford Foundation concentrates on renewal of urban people—the families who live in the "gray areas" of cities. Grants have been made to 41 slum schools as focal points for projects designed to improve the educational and employment opportunities of disadvantaged groups. The underlying basis of the experiment is the conviction that social planning must accompany physical planning.

The problems of substandard housing, health, and sanitation, school dropouts, unemployment and crime are all so closely related to each other and of such tremendous magnitude that now, for the first time, a Federal antipoverty program has been devised to deal with them in a comprehensive manner.

URBAN RENEWAL'S ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Urban renewal has instilled new life in American cities from coast to coast. In the heart of Boston, which was as bad as if not worse off than Philadelphia, a multimillion-dollar Government center of Federal, State, and private office buildings is replacing a 60-acre slumdom.

An insurance building resembling a tall boat in drydock is the eyecatcher of Hartford's Constitution Plaza built on reclaimed land alongside the Connecticut River.

One of the most amazing transformations is Pittsburgh's Golden Triangle—a family of sleek skyscrapers occupying what formerly looked like the junkyard of a steel mill at the source of the Ohio River.

Cleveland's Erieview Plaza Building is the showpiece of a quarter-billion-dollar renewal complex capitalizing on the city's vast lakescape.

In like manner, St. Louis is making the best of its Mississippi River waterfront formerly dominated by weatherbeaten warehouses. A 630-foot Gateway Arch, symbolic of westward expansion also symbolizes the city's urban modernization.

San Francisco's Golden Gateway apartment-townhouse project and the half-billion-dollar Century City in Los Angeles are among the outstanding renewal developments on the west coast.

In all of these cities as well as in Baltimore, Norfolk, Nashville, Minneapolis, and many others the stamp of urban renewal is the vastly improved appearance of their downtown business districts. Gone are the solid rows of ancient buildings with dirty faces. The new center-city look sports more open space, more glass, more class.

One of the best ways to strengthen the economic base of a city is to spruce it up with modern architecture, utilizing new building materials and new ideas as reflected in the handiwork of numerous urban renewal re-creations. This stimulates new private investment, attracts new industries, keeps some of the older ones that are flirting with the idea of moving elsewhere. An old-line Philadelphia firm of considerable size and prestige that had been "looking around" joined the renaissance with a magnificent structure of its own. Urban renewal has far-reaching generative effects.

In reply to a critic bemoaning urban renewal's burden on the city treasury, William Rafsky, a leader in the Philadelphia program, points out that "civic improvement programs have resulted in an increase in assessments, reversing a trend of declining real estate values" and that "they have made possible civic services with no recent tax increase."

Urban renewal adds immeasurably to the amenities of urban living in such developments as Lincoln Center, the Golden Triangle, and the Golden Gate. With the continuing concentration of population in metropolitan areas there is a growing need for more cultural facilities. Moreover, the variety and quality of such facilities play an important role in attracting industries with large complements of scientific and research personnel.

In former generations, cities took great pride in citing their rates of population growth from one census enumeration to another. They seemed to be oblivious to the accumulation of problems generated by the very process of growth until conditions became intolerably acute. Some of the worst aspects of urban living are now being remedied with federally aided renewal efforts planned and executed by local agencies. Much of the criticism of urban renewal is based upon mistakes made in the early years of the program, and urban renewal frequently gets blamed for things outside its jurisdiction—such as property condemnation for construction of highways and other improvements. This is not to say that urban renewal has achieved perfection, but the program is making a commendable contribution toward better urban living. "In our urban areas," said President Johnson, "the central problem today is to protect and restore man's satisfaction in belonging to a community where he can find security and significance."

SENATE

TUESDAY, APRIL 6, 1965

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

Rev. William J. Peckham, of the general board of evangelism of the Methodist Church, Nashville, Tenn., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, we have great need of Thy help. In the midst of all the confusing and conflicting voices which clamor for our attention and support, we turn to Thee in this moment for guidance. We are aware that our vision and understanding are always limited. We sense our personal inadequacy to carry the many burdens of power and responsibility which have been given to us.

As we begin this new day of deliberation and decision, grant that we may act wisely and with compassion. Guard us from the compromise of principle which costs us our integrity.

We also pray for the many men and women of our land who are sacrificially serving throughout the world in the Peace Corps, in our Armed Forces, and in the halls of diplomacy. May they—and may each of us—be empowered by Thee that Thy will will be done, and Thy kingdom will come, in us and on earth as it is in heaven. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request by Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, April 5, 1965, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

AMENDMENTS TO CHARTER OF UNITED NATIONS — MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the President of the United States on amendments to the Charter of the United Nations. Without objection, the message will be printed in the RECORD, without being read, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The President's message is a follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

I request the advice and consent of the Senate to ratification of two amendments to the Charter of the United Nations which are transmitted herewith along with a report to me from the Secretary of State. They are the first amendments adopted by the General Assembly since the founding of the United Nations.

These amendments will strengthen the ability of the United Nations to act as a force for peace and the progress of mankind.

They enlarge the membership of both the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council to bring those bodies into balance with the enlarged membership of the United Nations itself.

HISTORY OF THE AMENDMENTS

Amendments to the Charter of the United Nations must first be adopted by a two-thirds vote of the General Assembly, and then ratified by two-thirds of the member states, including all the permanent members, according to their constitutional procedure.

In late 1963, the General Assembly considered resolutions proposing the two amendments in question. These resolutions focused on three points:

First. That the text of the United Nations Charter be changed to increase the size of the Security Council from 11 to 15, to increase the voting majority of the Security Council from 7 to 9, and to increase the size of the Economic and Social Council from 18 to 27. In the Security Council, neither the seats nor the right of veto of the permanent members would be affected.

Second. The resolutions provided that members of the two Councils be elected on the basis of geographic distribution.

In the Security Council, the 10 nonpermanent members would include 5 from Africa and Asia, 1 from Eastern Europe, 2 from Latin America, and 2 from Western Europe and other areas; the 5 permanent members would remain the same. The present nonpermanent membership of the Security Council includes two members from Africa and Asia, two from Latin America, one from Western Europe, and one seat split between Asia and Eastern Europe.

In the Economic and Social Council, there would be the United States, 12 African and Asian States, 5 Latin American States, 3 Eastern European states—including the Soviet Union—and 6 states from Western Europe and other areas. The present composition of the Economic and Social Council, in addition to the United States, is five African and Asian States, four Latin American States, three Eastern European states—including the Soviet Union—and five states from Western Europe and other areas.

Third. The resolutions proposed that member states ratify the amendments by September 1, 1965.

On December 17, 1963, the resolutions were adopted by the General Assembly. On the enlargement of the Security Council, the vote was 97 to 11, with 4 abstentions; on the enlargement of the Economic and Social Council, it was 96 to 11, with 5 abstentions.

In those votes, the United States abstained, not because it doubted the principle of enlargement, but to maintain complete freedom of action while giving deliberate study to the effects of the specific proposals. The Soviet Union and France voted negatively. China voted for enlargement of the Security Council but abstained on enlargement of the Economic and Social Council. The United Kingdom abstained on both resolutions.

Since that time, 63 nations out of the required 76 have ratified the amendments. Other governments are now considering them. Of the permanent members of the Security Council, the Soviet Union has been the first to approve the amendments.

REASONS FOR RATIFICATION

The United States should now move to ratify the charter amendments to enlarge the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council.

First. The amendments are realistic.

The membership of the United Nations has grown from 51 in 1945 to 114 in 1965. Almost all of the newer members are nations which have gained their independence from the peaceful dismantling of empires—a process which brought nationhood to one-third of all the peoples of the world and which is here to stay.

We welcome this growth.

The peoples of the world are more directly represented in the General Assembly of the United Nations today than they were 20 years ago.

We want to work together and cooperate with these new countries, within the United Nations.

If there are differences among us, we want them to be aired and examined within the United Nations.

This is the way to a peaceful and cooperative world.

But just as we welcome the growth of the United Nations, we must also recognize that the present Security Council and the present Economic and Social Council do not now realistically reflect it.

An increase in the representation on both Councils is now clearly necessary to restore the balance which existed between the Councils and the General Assembly when the charter came into force. An expansion of 50 percent in the case of the Economic and Social Council and less in the Security Council is a reasonable way to adjust to a membership which has more than doubled. At the same time, the expansion is not such as to make the Councils unwieldy.

Second. The amendments are equitable.

When the charter was signed in 1945, the member states from Africa and Asia numbered 13 out of a total of 51—less than a third. Today, the member states from these great continents number 61 out of a total of 114—more than a half. The General Assembly resolutions, necessarily and rightly, take this new arithmetic into account.

Moreover, the explicit allocation of the new seats to geographic areas, as provided by Assembly resolution, is wise. It is designed to eliminate the contentious problem of sharing an inadequate number of seats—which has led to pressures against existing seats, to disputes over the definition of geographic areas, and to split terms on the Security Council to meet competing claims for representation.

Third. The amendments fully protect the basic interests of the permanent members. While we have seen that the work of the Security Council can be hampered seriously by the abuse of the veto provision, it nevertheless remains a wise and realistic feature of the United Nations Charter. The veto provision is maintained.

Fourth. Because the amendments are at once realistic and equitable, they will strengthen the United Nations.

They will increase the vitality of these Councils and of the United Nations itself by permitting more of the newer members to take part in the consideration of major world problems.

The amendments which will insure that the councils represent the whole organization they are intended to serve, will thereby also insure that the councils continue to earn the confidence and support of the membership at large. Without this confidence and support, the councils cannot be fully effective.

The organization as a whole will benefit from fuller participation in the work of the councils by the new members who have much to contribute—as they will benefit from the exercise of shared responsibility.

Fifth and finally, the amendments are a reflection and a demonstration of both the stability and the adaptability of the United Nations Charter.

We Americans have always had a healthy respect for the stability of our institutions and a wariness of change for the sake of change. Our American Constitution, which has been amended only 14 times since the Bill of Rights of 1791, has clearly met the test of stability. The fact that the United Nations Charter has remained as it was written 20 years ago is ample evidence of its stability.

At the same time, we Americans have always recognized the forces of change, and have always known instinctively that the ability of an institution to adapt to changed conditions is a reliable measure of its capacity for survival and growth. Our American Constitution, as evidenced by its amendments, has clearly met this test of adaptability.

Now, with its 20th birthday approaching, the United Nations is seeking the first two amendments to its basic charter. And this is welcome evidence of the inherent flexibility of another great institution.

THE STATE OF THE UNITED NATIONS

As we consider these first amendments to the United Nations Charter, it is fitting to review briefly the state of the United Nations itself.

The limitations of the United Nations are apparent. It has not been able to prevent aggression in southeast Asia; it has not been able to rid the world of poverty.

Nor has the United Nations been able to solve all of its internal problems. At the present time a serious financial problem threatens the capacity of the General Assembly to perform its share of peacekeeping.

And if the limitations are clear, the basic reason is plain. The United Nations is not a world government; it is an organization of governments participating by consent. It can move only in the direction and at the pace that its members want it to move.

And yet the United Nations has served well the cause of world peace and progress—and, therefore, the national interest and the personal interest of every American.

KEEPING THE PEACE

Through the United Nations, the members have acted to avert wars on at least a dozen occasions—local wars which could have spread.

In Kashmir, the United Nations obtained and still polices a cease-fire line running through a bitterly contested area.

In Suez, the United Nations deployed an emergency force which enabled the respective national military forces to withdraw.

In the Congo, the United Nations provided 20,000 troops, assisted a new nation to survive its birth, and forestalled an East-West confrontation in the heart of Africa.

In Cyprus, the United Nations has stationed a force of 6,000 to strengthen that nation's security.

The office of the Secretary General has evolved into a sensitive listening post—an ever-ready channel of communication—a potential conciliation service open at all times to the international community of states.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

At the same time, the day-to-day work of the United Nations is directed overwhelmingly toward building conditions which make the peace worth keeping.

United Nations experts are now at work in 130 countries or territories—bringing modern knowledge and technology to bear on the universal struggle to liberate man from the slavery of poverty.

The United Nations is in partnership with 89 nations and territories in cooperative preinvestment projects—surveying resources or training men and women in modern skills.

The development lending institutions affiliated with the United Nations have been investing some $1 billion annually in world development.

All in all, the level of development assistance flowing through the United Nations system of agencies now has reached some $1.3 billion a year.

TECHNOLOGICAL COOPERATION

Meanwhile, United Nations agencies are performing the vital task of establishing cooperative ground rules which are required in the age of rapid international transport and instant international communication.

Agencies affiliated with the United Nations have developed standards for international air traffic—and for the safety of life at sea.

They have arranged for orderly use of the airways by allocating available radio frequencies among nations and users.

They have promoted international weather forecasting and are pioneering in the development of a world weather watch of incalculable benefit to peoples of all nations.

They have developed and maintained uniform international quarantine regulations against the spread of communicable diseases—and liberated 800 million people from the threat of the greatest killer of all time: malaria.

In these and other ways—through peacekeeping, through nation building, and through international technical services—the United Nations serves its members. In doing so, the Organization serves the national interest of the United States. It helps us do things we could not do so well alone and encourages other nations to share the burdens.

CONCLUSION

In one sense, the smallest members are in greatest need of the United Nations.

In another sense, the United Nations is of greatest service to the largest nations—for without the United Nations, the nations with the greatest resources would have to shoulder most of these tasks alone.

And in a combined sense, the United Nations serves simultaneously the large and the small, the rich and the poor—for the peace of one area is but part of world peace, and the prosperity of one country is but an element of the world's well-being.

This is why consistent and effective support for the United Nations has been near the heart of the U.S. foreign policy for two decades.

This is why the Congress and the public, regardless of politics or party, have been ready to stick with the United Nations through thick and thin.

The organization has reached a point where the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council need to be enlarged to take account of the great growth of the organization in recent years.

The proposed amendments offer responsible and equitable plans for meeting this problem.

Because the United Nations will continue to be deeply needed by nations which seek peace—by all nations which seek to raise the levels of human welfare—by all nations which seek to cooperate in putting the achievements of modern technology to work for all mankind—it is in the national interest of the United States to ratify these steps toward making more effective the principal councils of the organization.

I therefore request the consent of the Senate to ratification by the United States of these amendments to the Charter of the United Nations.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *April 6, 1965*.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 974) to amend the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, as amended, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. POWELL, Mr. O'HARA of Michigan, Mr. DANIELS, Mr. PUCINSKI, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. AYRES, Mr. ASHBROOK, and Mr. QUIE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 398. An act to permit the discovery, location, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of certain public lands in national forests in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes;

H.R. 459. An act to provide for more uniform application of section 4369 of title 39, United States Code, which pertains to filing of information relating to second-class mail publications;

H.R. 881. An act to authorize the establishment of the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument;

H.R. 980. An act to provide for the return of obscene mail matter;

H.R. 1763. An act to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28 for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis;

H.R. 3990. An act to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors;

H.R. 4778. An act to increase the amounts authorized for Indian adult vocational education;

H.R. 5702. An act to extend for 1 year the date on which the National Commission on Food Marketing shall make a final report to the President and to the Congress and to provide necessary authorization of appropriations for such Commission;

H.R. 7060. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain Independent Agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes;

H.R. 7064. An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended; and

H.J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by Sanford Dam, Canadian River project, Texas, as "Lake Meredith."

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H.R. 398. An act to permit the discovery, location, development, and utilization of the mineral resources of certain public lands in national forests in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes;

H.R. 881. An act to authorize the establishment of the Alibates Flint Quarries and Texas Panhandle Pueblo Culture National Monument;

H.R. 4778. An act to increase the amounts authorized for Indian adult vocational education; and

H.J. Res. 95. Joint resolution to designate the lake to be formed by the waters impounded by Sanford Dam, Canadian River project, Texas, as "Lake Meredith"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 459. An act to provide for more uniform application of section 4369 of title 39, United States Code, which pertains to filing of information relating to second-class mail publications; and

H.R. 980. An act to provide for the return of obscene mail matter; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 1763. An act to amend section 1825 of title 28 of the United States Code to authorize the payment of witness' fees in habeas corpus cases and in proceedings to vacate sentence under section 2255 of title 28 for persons who are authorized to proceed in forma pauperis; and

H.R. 3990. An act to amend section 1871 of title 28, United States Code, to increase the per diem and subsistence, and limit mileage allowances of grand and petit jurors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 5702. An act to extend for 1 year the date on which the National Commission on Food Marketing shall make a final report to the President and to the Congress and to provide necessary authorization of appropriations for such Commission; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H.R. 7060. An act making appropriations for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, the Executive Office of the President, and certain independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H.R. 7064. An act to amend the Foreign Service Buildings Act of 1926, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

LIMITATION OF STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, statements during the transaction of routine morning business were ordered limited to 3 minutes.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

On request of Mr. MANSFIELD, and by unanimous consent, the Subcommittee on Public Health of the Committee on the District of Columbia, the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution of the Committee on Public Works, and the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare were authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

APPOINTMENTS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces the appointment of Senators TALMADGE, ROBERTSON, YARBOROUGH, HICKENLOOPER, and SCOTT to be members of the Interparliamentary Union Conference, to be held in Dublin, Ireland, on April 18–25, 1965.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

NOTICE RELATING TO TERMINATION OF DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN COUNTRIES AS LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES FOR PURPOSES OF THE INTEREST EQUALIZATION TAX

A communication from the President of the United States, notifying the Senate, pursuant to law, relating to the termination of the designation of certain countries as less developed countries for purposes of the interest equalization tax; to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on potential savings through use of Government-owned housing to meet military requirements in the Orlando, Fla., area, Federal Housing Administration, Housing and Home Finance Agency, and Department of Defense, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on unnecessary costs incurred in the indirect procurement of selected subsystems and accessories for the P–3 aircraft, Department of the Navy, dated March 1965 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON CONTRACTS NEGOTIATED FOR EXPERIMENTAL, DEVELOPMENTAL, OR RESEARCH WORK

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, Washington, D.C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on contracts negotiated for experimental, developmental, or research work, for the 6-month period ended December 31, 1964 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON DETERMINATIONS RELATING TO DEFERMENT OF CERTAIN CHARGES PAYABLE BY THE CASPER-ALCOVA IRRIGATION DISTRICT, KENDRICK PROJECT, WYOMING

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, on determinations relating to deferment of the charges for the period 1963 through 1972 payable by the Casper-Alcova Irrigation District, Kendrick project, Wyoming; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED CONTRACT WITH THE KANSAS-BOSTWICK IRRIGATION DISTRICT NO. 2, MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PROJECT, KANSAS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed contract with the Kansas-Bostwick Irrigation District No. 2, Missouri River Basin project, Kansas (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT ON TORT CLAIMS PAID BY HOUSING AND HOME FINANCE AGENCY

A letter from the Administrator, Housing and Home Finance Agency, Washington, D.C., reporting, pursuant to law, on tort claims paid by that Agency, for the calendar year 1964; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation of certain aliens, together with a statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law pertaining to each alien, and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN DEFECTOR ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting admission into the United States of certain defector aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

TEMPORARY ADMISSION INTO THE UNITED STATES OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders entered granting temporary admission into the United States of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of several departments and agencies of the Government which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. CARLSON members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NEW YORK LEGISLATURE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I present, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York, seeking to increase the minimum wage to $1.50 per hour. I ask unanimous consent that the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION 95 OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress to amend the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, increasing the minimum wage thereunder to $1.50 per hour

Whereas it is the sense of the people of the State of New York, as manifested by the considered judgment of their duly elected representatives in the State legislature, that the welfare of the people is involved in the soundness of this State's economic condition, as well as that of other States, and depends on the establishment and enforcement of national standards designed to protect, preserve and promote the soundness of the economy of the entire Nation; and

Whereas employers in this State are placed in an unfavorable competitive position by reason of lower wages paid in States which are subject only to the Federal minimum wage of $1.25 per hour, a rate considerably below that which generally prevails in the industries of this State; and

Whereas it is believed by the executive and legislative branches of the government of the State of New York that an immediate increase in the Federal minimum wage to $1.50 per hour is necessary to eliminate such substandard wages as now prevail in many States of the Nation and to protect the employers of this State and other States with high labor standards against unfair competition: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That the President and the Congress of the United States be and they are hereby respectfully memorialized to establish with all convenient speed a nationwide minimum wage of $1.50 per hour, in order to avoid an increase in unemployment in States with high labor standards, prevent unfair competition from industries in States having low labor standards and wages to preserve, protect and permit the soundness of the Nation's economy; and be it further

Resolved (if the assembly concur), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Congress of the United States by forwarding one copy thereof to the Secretary of the Senate of the United States, one copy to the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and one copy to each Member of the Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New York, and that the latter be urged to devote themselves to the task of accomplishing the purpose of this resolution.

By order of the Senate.

GEORGE H. VAN LENGEN,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

S. Con. Res. 30. Concurrent resolution to honor the victory over poliomyelitis (Rept. No. 147).

By Mr. BARTLETT, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

H.R. 4527. An act to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard (Rept. No. 148).

APPROPRIATIONS FOR COAST GUARD PROCUREMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of H.R. 4527, reported today by the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT] from the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONTOYA in the chair). The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 4527) to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, H.R. 4527 authorizes a sum of $114,250,000 to be appropriated to the U.S. Coast Guard for the fiscal year 1966 to procure vessels and aircraft and construct shore and offshore establishments. The authorization includes provisions for vessels, aircraft, and establishments.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a brief of authorization be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the brief of authorization was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRIEF OF AUTHORIZATION

Total authorization granted, fiscal year 1966

Vessels:	
(A) Procurement:	
3 high-endurance cutters	$45,000,000
5 medium-endurance cutters	18,750,000
2 inland tenders	1,400,000
1 river tender	687,000
3 small patrol cutters	1,105,000
(B) Extension of service life:	
Improve icebreakers	1,125,000
Enlarge operations center on 4 255-foot, high-endurance cutters	400,000
Rehabilitate 183-foot Reserve training vessel	150,000
(C) Increasing capability:	
Install oceanographic equipment on 9 high-endurance cutters	720,000
Install secure communications on 7 high-endurance cutters	1,739,000
Install bow thrusters on 2 seagoing tenders	200,000
Convert 1 barge for operation with river tender	
Total	71,316,000
Aircraft:	
13 medium-range helicopters	7,873,000
4 long-range helicopters	6,010,000
1 long-range aircraft	2,615,000
Total	16,498,000
Construction:	
Atlantic coast: Offshore light platform at New York Harbor entrance	2,100,000
New Orleans, La.: Air Station, hangar construction	1,071,000
Annette Island, Alaska: Fire protection at air station and landing pads for helicopters	402,000
Saugerties, N.Y.: Operations, administrative and maintenance facilities, light attendant station	260,000
Boothbay Harbor, Maine: Station, operational, administrative, and maintenance facilities and family quarters	419,000
Ocean City, Md.: Station, moorings	166,000
Rio Vista, Calif.: Station, operational, administrative, and maintenance facilities	525,000
Wildwood, N.J.: Electronics engineering station, administration-laboratory building and supply building	257,000
Southern California: Communications facilities	500,000
Galveston, Tex.: Base, pier for medium-endurance cutter	480,000
South Portland, Maine: Base, operational, and administrative facilities	$453,000
Grand Isle, La.: Loran-A station	781,000
New Castle, N.H.: Operational, administrative, and maintenance facilities and family quarters	325,000
Ilwaco, Wash.: Station, operational, administrative, and maintenance facilities, public family quarters	965,000
Avon, N.J.: Station, barracks building, public family quarters	553,000
Florence, Nebr.: Moorings for river tender	19,000
New Orleans, La.: Base, barracks, and administrative and operations facility on leased premises with long-term lease	1,320,000
Elizabeth City, N.C.: Air station, barracks building, sewage disposal	2,860,000
Barbers Point, Hawaii: Air station, barracks building	529,000
Curtis Bay, Md.: Yard, replace crane	320,000
Corpus Christi, Tex.: Station, wharf extension for medium endurance cutters	274,000
Cape May, N.J.: Recruit training center, barracks building	950,000
Alameda, Calif.: Recruit training center, galley and messhall building	971,000
New London, Conn.: Academy, develop waterfront and other improvements	1,700,000
Various locations:	
Aids to navigation projects	2,036,000
Advance planning, construction design, architectural services, and acquisition of sites in connection with public works projects not otherwise authorized by law	1,200,000
Governor's Island, N.Y.: Acquisition for integration of activities in New York area	5,000,000
Total	26,436,000
Grand total	114,250,000

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a description of the legislative background for this bill and an analysis of the legislation is summarized in the following report.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This bill represents the second legislative proposal submitted by the U.S. Coast Guard to obtain authorization for appropriations pursuant to Public Law 88-45. That act, passed and approved by the President in June 1963, provides that no funds may be appropriated to the Coast Guard for the procurement of vessels or aircraft or the construction of shore or offshore establishments unless the appropriation of such funds has been authorized by law.

Last year the committee amended the bill as introduced at the request of the Secretary of the Treasury to add specific dollar figures for items authorized and to prohibit the

Coast Guard from carrying forward authorizations without fiscal year limitation. The committee report expressed the hope that Coast Guard authorization legislation introduced in the future would follow more closely the practices developed under the authorization bills for the Armed Forces. The committee was pleased this year to note that the recommendation was accepted and that the present bill places a specific dollar figure on the items authorized and the authorization is only for fiscal year 1966.

The committee conducted a public hearing on the measure.

The Coast Guard authorizations included in this bill are based on comprehensive program plans documented in the committee hearings and in Coast Guard reports relating to the replacement and augmentation of vessels, aircraft, and shore establishments.

VESSELS

The vessel program provides for a construction schedule which will make available to the Coast Guard a fleet of modern ships by 1975. The plan covers a 10-year time span closing in 1974. To accomplish the plan, an annual average funding level of $105 million for vessels is required. The 1966 program is an important step in the overall effort since it provides for the construction of three high-endurance cutters, five medium-endurance cutters, two inland tenders, one river tender, and three small patrol cutters. In addition, the authorization permits the extension of the service life of certain vessels and increases the capabilities of others. The three high-endurance cutters to be replaced were constructed in 1944 for use as seaplane tenders engaged in activities in coastal waters. The Coast Guard has been required to use these war-built vessels on the high seas for search and rescue. The Coast Guard has determined that these 20-year-old vessels should be replaced before the replacement of several 30-year-old vessels constructed in the mid-1930's, which are more serviceable although older.

The vessel program also calls for the replacement of four medium-endurance cutters and the construction of one new cutter for operation in the North Pacific. The fleet of medium-endurance cutters presently in operation consists of 30 vessels. The four replacements being authorized by this bill will permit two vessels constructed in 1926 and two vessels constructed in 1927 to be retired from service. The new vessel is required to enforce the treaty obligations of the United States under the several international agreements relating to the fisheries between the United States, Canada, Japan, and Russia in the North Pacific.

The bill also authorizes the construction of two inland tenders to replace two others which are 30 years of age, three small patrol craft for search and rescue and law enforcement, and one small tender for the Missouri River.

AIRCRAFT

The aviation plan involved a construction program for the years 1961 through 1966. This, the last year of the program, will require the authorization of 17 helicopters. The 13 medium-range helicopters will serve as replacements for overage aircraft and as support helicopters at existing stations. The four long-range helicopters will supplant fixed-wing aircraft presently in use at some stations.

The one long-range aircraft is programed to replace an overage survey plane presently used to maintain the accuracy of electronic navigation aids.

CONSTRUCTION OF ESTABLISHMENTS

The bill would authorize the Coast Guard to proceed with the construction of 21 shore and offshore establishments. This includes construction work on the air station in New Orleans, La., and Annette Island, Alaska; the improvement of facilities at Booth Bay Harbor, Maine; Saugerties, N.Y.; Rio Vista, Calif.; Ocean City, Md.; Southport, Maine; Newcastle, N.H.; Ilwaco, Wash.; Avon, N.J.; Elizabeth City, N.C.; Barbers Point, Hawaii; Cape May, N.J.; Alameda, Calif.; Corpus Christi and Galveston, Tex.; and New Orleans, La. Improvements in the communication facilities and electronic equipment will be made at Wildwood, N.J., and Point Vicente, Calif. In addition, a continuation of the improvement of facilities at the Coast Guard Academy at New London, Conn., is included.

The committee reviewed closely the proposed addition of $5 million for integration of activities in the New York area made possible by the Department of the Army accelerating its departure from Fort Jay on Governors Island, N.Y. The acquisition of these facilities will represent an important advance in meeting the needs of the Coast Guard in the New York area and represents a long-term reduction in the cost of the Coast Guard.

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, today, the Committee on Commerce has reported H.R. 4527 which authorizes appropriations for construction of vessels, aircraft, and shore stations for the Coast Guard.

This is the second year that we have used this approach which is a procedure adpoted from the military construction bill for the armed services. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee, which handles this legislation, is now in a much better position to determine the requirements of the Coast Guard, and to make recommendations with respect to them.

The bill, as it has now been reported by the Commerce Committee, includes specific authorizations for specific capital items for the operations of the Coast Guard. The authorization is also only for fiscal 1966.

A quick glance at the committee report accompanying H.R. 4527, will show the exact amounts authorized for new and replacement items for the Coast Guard. The committee has found these items necessary for fiscal 1966, to keep pace with the 10-year modernization program which ends in 1974.

The administration request for the Coast Guard authorization amounted to $109,250,000.

The House Appropriations Committee has recommended a total of only $101 million for the Coast Guard, for fiscal 1966.

The Commerce Committee even in the face of the smaller amount of the recommended appropriation, has nevertheless, found it desirable to agree with a $5 million increase in authorization for this year. This extra $5 million will be used to convert Fort Jay, New York City, from its use by the Army, to facilities usable by the Coast Guard. This is actually an economy move because it will bring all of the Coast Guard facilities in that area, together in one place.

As ranking minority member on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee, I concur with the full authorization recommended by our committee for H.R. 4527.

Mr. President, the hearings on this bill and the Senate companion, S. 1053, demonstrated quite well the many advantages of this new approach to Coast Guard authorizations. The testimony of Admiral Roland, Commandant of the Coast Guard, convinced our subcommittee of the necessity for each of the items contained in this bill. Although the House recommends an appropriation of some $13 million less than we are authorizing here, I feel that it is incumbent upon us to approve an authorization which our hearings have demonstrated to be necessary.

Mr. President, I recommend that the Senate adopt H.R. 4527 as it has been reported by the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce:

William R. Curtis, for permanent appointment to the grade of lieutenant in the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

John O. Phillips, Robert C. Darling, and Miller J. Tonkel, for permanent appointment in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, in the grade of captain;

Rupert L. Murphy, of Georgia, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner; and

John W. Bush, of Ohio, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

By Mr. McNAMARA, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Jack T. Conway, of Michigan, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity;

Glenn W. Ferguson, of Maryland, Otis A. Singletary, of North Carolina, and Theodore M. Berry, of Ohio, to be Assistant Directors of the Office of Economy Opportunity.

By Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Robert B. Green, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. attorney for the eastern district of Oklahoma.

By Mr. DIRKSEN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John Doar, of Wisconsin, to be an Assistant Attorney General.

By Mr. JAVITS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Harold Leventhal, of the District of Columbia, to be U.S. circuit judge for the District of Columbia circuit.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965—AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE TO REPORT—MINORITY, SUPPLEMENTAL, AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am pleased and proud to report a bill from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, H.R. 2362, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

I ask unanimous consent to file minority, supplemental, and individual views with that report. I also ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file the committee report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am pleased to report to the Senate that the bill was ordered reported to the Senate by a unanimous vote of 16 to 0. Some amendments were offered in the committee. The amendments were defeated. Individual members of the committee reserved the right, as we always have that right, to offer or support amendments on the floor of the Senate. They also asked permission, even though they voted for the bill, in some instances to file minority or individual views.

No one could have a feeling of deeper gratitude than I have as chairman of the Education Subcommittee for the wonderful cooperation I received from all members of the subcommittee and of the full committee, Democrats and Republicans, for there is a recognition on the part of each one of us, even though there are differences of point of view in regard to some sections of the bill, that this Congress has an obligation and opportunity to pass for the first time a major aid to education bill for the elementary and secondary schools of the country.

I close my remarks, because I think Senators will be hearing much from me on this subject before the week is over, by saying on this occasion that in my judgment the educational crisis in this country is the No. 1 domestic issue that faces the Republic. It is my prayerful hope that the Senate will pass the bill without amendment this week.

Subsequently, Mr. Morse, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, reported, without amendment, the bill (H.R. 2362) to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools, and submitted a report (No. 146) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HRUSKA (for himself, Mrs. Smith, Mr. Curtis, and Mrs. Neuberger):

S. 1705. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the General Federation of Women's Clubs; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. Hruska when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SALTONSTALL:

S. 1706. A bill for the relief of Natalia Kushnariov De Afanasiev; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBERTSON (by request):

S. 1707. A bill to amend section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Robertson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARTHY:

S. 1708. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to reduce the highway use tax in the case of certain motor vehicles used primarily to haul carnival, circus, and allied outdoor show business equipment, materials, and personnel; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. McCARTHY (for himself and Mr. Mondale):

S. 1709. A bill to amend title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, to provide for additional measures and types of assistance for carrying out plans for land conservation and land utilization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

S. 1710. A bill for the relief of Dr. Dimitri George Polydefkis, Mrs. Lela Polydefkis, and Rosemarie and Christina Polydefkis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1711. A bill for the relief of George A. O'Connell, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YOUNG of Ohio:

S. 1712. A bill to provide for the appointment of congressional pages or messengers from among young men and women between the ages of 17 and 22 who are attending college; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

(See the remarks of Mr. Young of Ohio when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BIBLE (by request):

S. 1713. A bill to strengthen the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia;

S. 1714. A bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia to provide for the financial protection of certain persons suffering injury as a result of the operation of a motor vehicle by uninsured motorists;

S. 1715. A bill to extend the penalty for assault on a police officer in the District of Columbia to assaults on employees of penal and correctional institutions and places of confinement of juveniles of the District of Columbia;

S. 1716. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, as amended;

S. 1717. A bill to provide for the registration of names assumed for the purposes of trade or business in the District of Columbia;

S. 1718. A bill to provide for the compensation of overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force, and for other purposes; and

S. 1719. A bill to authorize compensation for overtime work performed by officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, the U.S. Park Police force, and the White House Police force, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 1720. A bill to assist in the provision of housing for moderate-income families and elderly persons by providing Federal guarantees for certain obligations issued by local housing agencies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. Javits when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota:

S. 1721. A bill to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959 to require separate contracts to be entered into for the performance of mechanical specialty work required in certain construction and alteration of public buildings; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 1722. A bill for the relief of Pak Tao Yeung; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey:

S. 1723. A bill for the relief of Nicolo Picinich;

S. 1724. A bill for the relief of Michael J. Venezia; and

S. 1725. A bill for the relief of Adelina Marcelo Miranda Gapac; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 1726. A bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself, Mr. Cotton, Mr. Monroney, Mr. Hartke, Mr. Scott, Mr. Randolph, and Mr. Bartlett):

S. 1727. A bill to provide for strengthening and improving the national transportation system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (by request):

S. 1728. A bill to amend section 222(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the service of process in enforcement proceedings, and for other purposes;

S. 1729. A bill to amend section 203(b)(5) of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for the issuance of certificates of exemption upon application and proof of eligibility, and for other purposes;

S. 1730. A bill to amend section 402(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for the issuance of certificates of exemption upon application and proof of eligibility, and for other purposes;

S. 1731. A bill to amend section 212(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 1732. A bill to amend sections 204a and 406a of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders; and

S. 1733. A bill to make the civil forfeiture provisions of section 222(h) of the Interstate Commerce Act applicable to unlawful operations and safety violations by motor carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bills, which appear under separate headings.)

By Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. Bartlett):

S. 1734. A bill to conserve and protect Pacific salmon of North American origin; to the Committee on Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. Magnuson when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

POSTAGE STAMPS TO COMMEMORATE 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, it is my privilege to introduce legislation which is cosponsored by my colleague, the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. Curtis] the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. Smith], and the junior Senator from Oregon [Mrs. Neuberger]. It would authorize the Postmaster General to issue a series of stamps to commemorate and honor the 75th anniversary of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

The current president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs is Mrs. William H. Hasebroock. As she is a fellow Nebraskan, I am aware of her continuing efforts to promote responsible civic improvements both in Nebraska and the Nation. We are proud of her accomplishments and of the organization she represents.

The purposes and accomplishments of the General Federation of Women's Clubs are the best endorsement which can be found for the issuance of this stamp.

The object of the federation is to bring into communication and to unite the women's clubs and like organizations throughout the world for the purpose of mutual benefit, and for the promotion of their common interest in education, industrial, philanthropic, literary, artistic, and scientific culture.

Founded in 1890, the General Federation of Women's Clubs is an international organization with membership in 55 countries and the United States. This membership figure includes 800,000 members in 15,500 clubs in the United States.

Membership in the general federation offers countless opportunities for rewarding results. It provides friendships with women whose interests extend beyond local horizons, it stimulates civic consciousness, it trains for leadership, it is effective, through united effort, in influencing national legislation, and it opens the way for constructive public service in the community, the State, the Nation, and the world.

About 100,000 of the members of the General Federation are young women under the age of 35. Their energetic support of local, State, and National projects makes them a vital force in carrying on the General Federation's worthwhile programs.

This outstanding organization carries on projects of both national importance and some which are international in scope. By their nature these projects are varied, some are educational, others are charitable and some promote international understanding and good will within the scope of the objectives and purposes of the federation.

Those of us who serve in the Congress are well aware of the federation's activities as they affect national legislation. Their members have done much fine work in the fields of aiding the handicapped, community improvement, conservation, and various educational activities.

Mr. President, our country can be proud of this fine group of women who do so much good to aid in national and international understanding in many complex fields.

As a sponsor of the bill, I believe it is fitting that we pay honor to the General Federation of Women's Clubs on the occasion of their diamond jubilee, by proposing the issuance of such commemorative stamps as the Postmaster General deems appropriate in 1966.

Mr. President, I send to the desk the text of the bill and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1705) to provide for the issuance of a special series of postage stamps in commemoration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, introduced by Mr. Hruska (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Postmaster General is authorized and directed to issue, during the calendar year 1966, a special series of postage stamps, of such appropriate design and denomination as he shall prescribe, in commemoration of the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of the General Federation of Women's Clubs.

INCREASE IN FEES FOR FILING OF REGISTRATION STATEMENTS WITH THE SEC

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I am introducing at the request of the Securities and Exchange Commission a bill to increase the fees to be paid in connection with filing registration statements under the Securities Act of 1933.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the letter from the Securities and Exchange Commission recommending this proposal and the accompanying enclosures be printed in the Record at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the letter and enclosures will be printed in the Record.

The bill (S. 1707) to amend section 6 (b) of the Securities Act of 1933, introduced by Mr. Robertson, by request, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The letter and enclosures presented by Mr. Robertson are as follows:

Securities and Exchange Commission,
Washington, D.C., March 26, 1965.
Re fee legislation.
Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President: I have the honor to transmit legislative proposals of the Securities and Exchange Commission with respect to fees charged for the filing of registration statements under the Securities Act of 1933.

In his budget message last month President Johnson stated: "Fairness to all taxpayers demands that those who enjoy special benefits should bear a greater share of the costs." This Commission has given considerable thought to the application of this principle with respect to the laws it administers and has concluded that it would be appropriate to amend section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 by increasing the fee paid in connection with registration statements for securities from one one-hundredth of 1 percent of the maximum aggregate offering price and increasing the minimum fee from $25 to $100. A proposed bill that would effectuate these changes is attached.

In addition to the provision for fees for securities registrations, which in fiscal 1964 totaled $1,780,697, there are statutory provisions for an annual registration fee for national securities exchanges and for filing fees for applications for qualifications of trust indentures relating to securities not required to be registered under the Securities Act of 1933. These are the only statutory provisions whereunder fees are collected in connection with the Federal securities laws, except for provisions permitting the Commission to make reasonable charges for copies of information filed with it. The registration fee for national securities exchanges is provided for by section 31 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and amounts to one five-hundredths of 1 percent of the aggregate dollar amount (2 cents per $1,000) of sales of securities on such exchanges in the preceding year. In fiscal 1964 these fees totaled $1,323,150. The filing fee with respect to trust indentures is provided in section 307(b) of the Trust Indenture Act of 1939 and the amount collected pursuant thereto in fiscal 1964 was $1,500. All fees collected pursuant to these sections are deposited into the general fund of the Treasury.

At the time of the passage of the first two securities acts there were indications that the registration fees provided therein were intended to cover the anticipated costs of administration. In fact, the amounts collected have fallen far short of this. There have been no amendments of the securities acts with respect to fees, except for the 1964 amendment to section 15(b)(8) of the Securities Exchange Act relating to fees to defray the cost of examinations and other expenses in regulating broker-dealers who are not members of a registered securities association.

Over the years there have been numerous suggestions or proposals for increased or additional fees. In 1951 title V of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1952, 5 U.S.C. 140, authorized agencies to adopt fees to cover the cost of agency activities where fees were not fixed by statute. Pursuant thereto in 1952 the Commission submitted for comment proposed rules which sought to impose substantial fees on various segments of the securities industry. These proposals resulted in considerable controversy and a subcommittee of the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which was studying the activities of this Commission, reported its view that any fees in this area should be "spelled out in specific legislation which has been submitted to and passed by the Congress, rather than through any delegation of authority to any agency to pass upon the need for or amount thereof."[1] Thereafter the Commission abandoned its proposal and has never since proposed fixing fees by rule.

In subsequent years the Commission has expressed the view that any fair fee proposal should include an increase in at least one of the existing fees. Thus in 1957 we submitted to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce a legislative proposal that would have increased the stock exchange registration fee from 2 cents per $1,000 of the aggregate dollar amount of each transaction to 5 cents per $1,000 and would have imposed a similar fee upon broker-dealers effecting transactions otherwise than on a national securities exchange. This proposal resulted in the introduction of bills in both the House and Senate[2] but, although the Senate passed its bill, no action was taken in the House. Substantially similar bills were reintroduced but not passed in 1959 and 1961.[3] In 1962 a bill increasing the stock exchange registration fee to 5 cents per $1,000, but containing no provision for over-the-counter transactions was introduced but not passed.[4]

---

[1] Report of Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on Securities and Exchange Commission, H. Rept. No. 2508, 82d Cong., 2d sess. (1952), p. 138.

[2] S. 2520, 85th Cong., 1st sess.; H.R. 7778, 85th Cong., 1st sess.

[3] S. 737, 86th Cong., 1st sess.; S. 755, 87th Cong., 1st sess.

While we have again considered the possibility of amendments such as those referred to above, we feel that the proposal to increase the Securities Act registration fee at this time would be more suitable. To increase the cost of the stock exchange fees alone without assessing a similar fee with respect to over-the-counter transactions might be considered unfair, particularly in the light of the growth of the "third market" for listed securities. On the other hand, it appears to be most untimely to assess fees on over-the-counter transactions now, when the NASD has recently increased its fee assessment on over-the-counter dealers to defray costs of the additional self-regulation imposed following the Commission's Special Study of the Securities Markets.

The Securities Act registration fee is necessarily passed on to investors. Since the increase would result indirectly in investors paying a larger proportion of the overall cost of this Commission, which operates to protect investors, it appears to us to be fair and in accordance with the principle stated by the President that "those who enjoy * * * benefits should bear a greater share of the costs." In this connection, the larger the public offering, and hence the fee, the larger normally would be the segment of the investing public purchasing the registered securities.

During the last fiscal year, had the proposed fee been in effect, the Commission would have collected approximately $3,561,400 under the Securities Act. This, together with the amounts collected under the stock exchange registration fee and trust indenture fee would have totaled $4,886,050. While this is slightly more than the total costs of the Commission's Divisions of Corporation Finance and Trading and Markets,[5] which processed the registrations involved, a substantial portion of the work of other divisions, particularly the Office of Records and Service and the Office of the Chief Accountant, was also spent in connection with the filings.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that the draft bill submitted herewith would be consistent with the administration's objectives.

By direction of the Commission.

MANUEL F. COHEN,
Chairman.

Attachments.

Securities and Exchange Commission statement of cost by organization, fiscal year 1964

Office:	
Executive offices	$341,793
Office of program planning	179,337
Office of the secretary	73,178
Office of hearing examiners	173,006
Office of opinions and review	166,942
Office of the general counsel	347,185
Office of the chief accountant	147,095
Division of corporation finance	2,942,084
Division of trading and markets	1,738,224
Division of corporate regulation	1,083,682
Office of the comptroller	143,914
Office of personnel	130,083
Office of records and service	739,271
Subtotal, departmental	8,205,794
Regional offices	5,728,154
Grand total	13,933,948

A bill to amend section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 is amended to read as follows:

"(b) At the time of filing a registration statement the applicant shall pay to the Commission a fee of one-fiftieth of 1 per centum of the maximum aggregate price at which such securities are proposed to be offered, but in no case shall such fee be less than $100."

SEC. 2. The effective date of section 6(b) of the Securities Act of 1933, as amended by this Act, shall be July 1, 1965.

PROPOSAL FOR REEXAMINATION OF CONGRESSIONAL PAGE SYSTEM

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, the boys who serve as pages in the Senate and in the House of Representatives are fine boys indeed. However, the time has come when the Congress should reexamine the method by which we select pages and the qualifications established for those positions, and another and better system should be adopted.

Historically, the custom of hiring pages goes back to the first Congress. In those days Members of Congress who knew of young orphan boys in destitute circumstances had their sympathies aroused and they were successful in having officers of the House of Representatives employ a few boys as runners. Originally, in 1789, a few runners were employed. The earliest records show that in the 20th Congress, which sat from 1827 to 1829, three boys were employed as runners. In succeeding Congresses, the number changed, but the custom continued.

In the 27th Congress, which sat from 1841 to 1843, a select committee was appointed to look into the number of persons employed by the House of Representatives to ascertain whether there were "more than the public good required"; and also to determine whether their pay should be adjusted. One result of the inquiry was that the number of pages was reduced from 12 to 8 and their compensation was increased from $1.50 to $2 a day. All extra compensation for overtime work was discontinued. According to the select committee, it seems to have been the practice to grant an extra allowance of $250 to the pages at the close of each session of the Congress.

Today pages may be employed in the House of Representatives at the age of 14 and continue until they are 18. In the Senate pages start at 14 and some remain in this employment until they are too large to serve inconspicuously—a rather nebulous standard for terminating employment.

In my judgment consideration should be given at this time to the advisability of employing college students, young men and women, from the ages of 17 to 22 to serve as pages in both Houses of Congress. This would give youngsters who are college students the valuable opportunity to view the work of Congress firsthand, help them to pay their way through college, and relieve Members of Congress of the responsibility of looking after the welfare of very young boys, many of whom are on their own for the first time, far from their parents and homes.

Today, most Capitol policemen, elevator operators, Post Office employees, and other patronage jobs on Capitol Hill are filled by young men attending colleges and universities in the Washington area. This has provided a wonderful opportunity for them, and I am sure has helped many a young man to graduate who otherwise might not financially have been able to make his way through college.

The present method of hiring young boys to perform these duties is archaic and troublesome. Because of the fact that so many of them have had improper supervision while living on their own in Washington, it is now proposed that $1 million of taxpayers' money be appropriated for a dormitory for them. To do this would merely be to compound an already unwieldy situation. Why spend taxpayers' money to perpetuate an outmoded, unnecessary, and unjustified system? I propose the employment of young women and young men of college age—17 to 22—to serve as messengers or pages in both branches of Congress.

The pages are fine boys. However, at present their salaries amount to approximately $5,000 or more a year. This is rather handsome remuneration for young boys from 14 to 17 years of age. Frankly, Mr. President, when I was a young married lawyer, a year or so out of college, I would have been glad to take a job that paid such a munificent salary.

I realize that whenever a long-established tradition or custom is set aside, very careful consideration should be given to the reasons for doing so. I am convinced that in this fast-moving space age of change and challenge, the present method of selecting pages for Congress is outmoded and really serves no useful purpose. Therefore, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to provide for the appointment of congressional pages or messengers from young men and women between the ages of 17 and 22 who are attending college. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1712) to provide for the appointment of congressional pages or messengers from among young men and women between the ages of 17 and 22 who are attending college, introduced by Mr. YOUNG of Ohio, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person shall serve as a page of the Senate or House of Representatives—

(1) before he or she has attained the age of seventeen years, or during any session of the Congress which begins after he or she has attained the age of twenty-three years; or

---

[4] H.R. 10167, 87th Cong., 2d sess.

[5] See "Statement of cost by organization, fiscal year 1964," attached hereto.

(2) during any period when he or she is not regularly pursuing a full-time course of study in a recognized college or university, if such period exceeds (i) thirty days, or (ii) four months if the period is between school years and such person has a bona fide intention to pursue a full-time course of study in a recognized college or university during the semester (or other period into which the school year is divided) immediately following such period.

Sec. 2. (a) Section 243 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 (2 U.S.C. 88a), and the proviso in the paragraph under the heading "Education of Senate and House Pages" in title I of the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1947 (2 U.S.C. 88b), are hereby repealed.

Sec. 3. This Act shall become effective at the beginning of the second session of the Eighty-ninth Congress.

NEW MODERATE-INCOME HOUSING PROGRAM

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, the Moderate Income Housing Act of 1965, to assist in the provision of urgently needed housing for moderate-income families and elderly persons. This legislation would establish a new program of middle-income housing through the use of Federal guarantees of bonds issued by local housing agencies and would authorize the local agencies to extend low-cost, long-term mortgage loans to nonprofit and limited profit corporations to construct moderate-income housing and housing for the elderly. The program would make available on a national scale Federal support for a program similar to the effective New York moderate-income program. The mortgage loans would be made for a period of 50 years at interest rates equivalent to the rates at which tax-exempt Treasury bonds could be sold, not exceeding 4 percent. These loans would be made for 90 percent of the development cost of a project. An additional servicing fee of less than one-half of 1 percent would be charged. A limitation of 6 percent would be placed on dividends payable by the borrower. Rents and carrying charges would be regulated as a condition for a mortgage loan in order to insure the retention of a middle-income level of rent for a project.

One of the greatest deficiencies in our existing Federal housing program is the lack of an effective program to stimulate the construction of new housing by private enterprise to meet the tremendous demands of moderate-income citizens residing in urban centers. The existing moderate-income program has not met these needs. The infection of slums spreading like epidemics through the older parts of our cities, the meteoric rise in our population since World War II and the rising costs of land, building, financing, and operating require new approaches to satisfy the exploding needs for improved housing. The strengthening and improving of both middle-income and low-rent housing is absolutely essential.

Through purchases of bonds issued by the State-created Housing Finance Agency, private investors in New York have purchased $479,239,000 in long-term obligations, permitting the financing of privately-owned housing at rentals low enough to make modern housing available to a vast segment of the population that previously could not afford new housing. Under the Javits bill, bonds issued by the local authorities would be guaranteed by the Federal Government in the event of default. The Federal guarantee would be expected to provide an incentive to the sale of housing bonds at even a lower interest rate than the New York Housing Finance Agency issues it bonds under the New York program and would provide a basis for lower rentals in New York and wherever such a program would be implemented.

This would create a parallel on the Federal level of the successful New York State Mitchell-Lama program, which has been in effect since 1956, and as expanded under Governor Rockefeller's administration to a requested total authorization of $1,150 million, and through the New York State Housing Finance Agency, has completed or has underway some 70 projects consisting of over 34,000 apartments.

The middle income housing plan which the Congress adopted in 1961 has so far been little used in New York and in other States, but the need for housing for this income bracket in the urban centers has become increasingly desperate. Our urban centers are tending to become the homes of only the extremes of wealth and poverty, and the suburban commuter is forced to use transportation facilities that are becoming more and more impossible. What the Congress has done in the past and what it is now being asked to do, has not and will not reverse this process or even slow it down significantly.

Mr. President, New York's successful Mitchell-Lama program, along which this measure was patterned, has, as of December 31, 1964, had the following results:

	Projects	Units
Completed	43	15,784
Under construction	17	12,221
In planning	9	6,381
Total	69	34,386

New York City Mitchell-Lama program

	Projects	Units
Completed	[1] 37	[1] 16,305
Under construction	9	2,855
In planning	15	4,858
Total	[1] 61	[1] 24,018

[1] Includes 7 low-rent projects and 6,170 units which are conversions to co-ops.

Total Mitchell-Lama program in New York State

	Projects	Units
Completed	[1] 80	[1] 32,089
Under construction	26	15,076
In planning	24	11,239
Grand total	[1] 130	[1] 58,404

[1] Includes 7 low-rent projects and 6,170 units which are conversions to co-ops.

The use of low-cost, long-term financing with Federal guarantees, together with limited profit ownership, Government supervision of construction and encouragement of local tax abatement would provide a new arsenal of weapons to meet the urgent needs of moderate-income housing and would allow the gap to be filled between low-cost public housing and the higher rentals resulting from conventional financing.

I believe that the private enterprise system can and should be stimulated to fill this need to a far greater extent than has been the case up to now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1720) to assist in the provision of housing for moderate-income families and elderly persons by providing Federal guarantees for certain obligations issued by local housing agencies, introduced by Mr. Javits, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 22 OF THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference, at the request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, a bill to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act. I ask unanimous consent that this bill lie on the table for 7 days in order that other Senators who wish to do so may join as cosponsors.

In the last Congress, the Committee on Commerce held hearings on S. 2075, which would have amended section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to assure that rates, fares, and charges established under that section for the U.S. Government are free from undue prejudice and preference.

Although the committee has considered many bills over the last 20 years to amend or repeal section 22, the only major change which has been made is the enactment in 1957 of a law requiring carriers to file certain rates with the Commission.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is of the view that, except during time of war or national emergency, the Government should pay full tariff rates and charges for its transportation, the same as any other shipper. A large percentage of Government traffic now moves at reduced rates under section 22, which rates are not available to commercial shippers. According to the Commission, this preferential treatment has a strong tendency to increase the cost of regulated transportation services to other shippers. These other shippers as a result, when their rates become too high, may resort to private carriage. This diversion of traffic the Commission considers to be detrimental to the maintenance of a sound common carrier system, and inconsistent with the national transportation policy.

This bill would not completely eliminate Government reduced rate privileges. In the interest of national defense, governmental bodies would retain section 22 privileges during time of war or national emergency. In addition, reduced rate privileges would be retained under section 22 in situations involving the transportation of bulk or agricultural commodities for governmental bodies. The Commission believes that this latter provision is necessary in order not to aggravate existing competitive inequalities between carriers of different modes arising from the exemptions in sections 203(b)(6) and 303 of the Interstate Commerce Act.

This latter proposal may offer a solution to the impasse that has heretofore developed. In the coming weeks, I would hope that representatives of the Government and the several States, shippers, consumers, and the industry will give the committee their comments on this recommendation of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

I ask unanimous consent that the Interstate Commerce Commission's justification of the need for the proposed legislation be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the justification will be printed in the RECORD, and the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

The bill (S. 1726) to amend section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The justification presented by Mr. MAGNUSON is as follows:

JUSTIFICATION

Section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act now permits, among other things, "the carriage, storage, and handling of property free or at reduced rates for the United States, State, or municipal governments" and "the transportation of persons for the U.S. Government at free or reduced rates." These provisions which apply to railroads and other common carriers subject to part I of the act, are also made applicable to motor common carriers by section 217(b), to water common carriers by section 306(c), and to freight forwarders as to transportation or service in the case of property by section 405(c).

Except for the enactment in 1957 of subsection (2) which requires carriers to file certain rates with the Commission, the provisions of section 22 relating to Government traffic have remained essentially the same since passage of the original act to regulate commerce in 1887. At that time the Government was a comparatively small user of freight or passenger services of the carriers. Today, however, it is the largest single purchaser of transportation services. According to a study prepared by the General Accounting Office dated August 15, 1961, during fiscal year 1959 the Government paid line-haul transportation charges totaling $184 million for shipments of 8 million tons of freight at reduced rates under section 22. This is indicative of the volume of freight moving under section 22 quotations and tenders.

The Commission has for many years been of the view that, except during time of war or national emergency, the Government should pay full tariff rates and charges for transportation services performed on its behalf, the same as any other shipper or user of common carrier services. A large percentage of Government traffic now moves at reduced rates under section 22 which, of course, are not available to the commercial shipper. This preferential treatment has a strong tendency to increase the cost of regulated transportation services to commercial users who, when their rates become too high, resort to private carriage. Such diversions of traffic are clearly detrimental to the maintenance of a sound common carrier system. Moreover, the preferential treatment accorded the various levels of Government is, in our view, inconsistent with the national transportation policy which has among its objectives "to foster sound economic conditions in transportation" and "to encourage the establishment and maintenance of reasonable charges for transportation services without unjust discriminations, undue preferences or advantages, or unfair or destructive competitive practices."

The draft bill would not, however, completely eliminate Government reduced rate privileges under section 22. During time of war or national emergency, these privileges would still apply. In such times, it is required that commodities be moved, often secretly, over routes and between points as to which the applicable tariff rates may be considered to be unreasonable under the circumstances, or with respect to which there are no existing published rates, there being little likelihood in many instances of any commercial demand developing for the use of such routes or for other services. Accordingly, we feel that, in the interest of national defense, governmental bodies should retain section 22 privileges during time of war or national emergency.

In addition, the draft bill contains a specific provision retaining reduced rate privileges in situations involving the transportation of bulk or agricultural commodities for governmental bodies. This provision is necessary in order not to aggravate existing competitive inequalities between carriers of different modes arising from the exemptions in sections 203(b)(6) and 303 of the act. However, we recognize that any change in the law respecting these inequalities may require a corresponding change in the proposed amendment to section 22.

STRENGTHENING AND IMPROVEMENT OF NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to curb illegal carriage and to require motor carriers and freight forwarders to pay reparations. I am pleased that Senator COTTON, ranking minority member of the committee, has joined in cosponsoring this bill. I ask unanimous consent that this bill lie on the table for 10 days in order that other Senators who wish to do so may join as cosponsors.

I point out that it is similar to S. 2796, which was introduced on January 2, 1964, and cosponsored by several Members of the Senate. The bill itself is now cosponsored by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. COTTON], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Alaska [Mr. BARTLETT].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie at the desk as requested.

The bill (S. 1727) to provide for strengthening and improving the national transportation system, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. President, in addition, I am introducing, for appropriate reference, at the request of the Interstate Commerce Commission, a number of bills recommended by the Commission to help combat illegal carriage, and to provide for motor carrier and freight forwarder reparations.

Illegal transportation is a major problem requiring action by this Congress. The Interstate Commerce Commission, on the basis of road checks in 42 States, has estimated that it involves a minimum of $500 million a year. Other experts believe the cost of illegal transportation to be even higher, amounting to between $1 and $5 billion a year.

The presence of these highway poachers penalizes the shipper, the community, and the public. The illegal operator often evades the tax laws as well as the transportation laws, and the law abiding must pay the difference. The public also pays more for goods because freight moved illegally takes revenues from the lawful carriers, causing their rates to be raised to pay fixed operating costs such as labor, maintenance, and equipment. Furthermore, the evidence to date indicates that illegal truckers are far more prone to highway accidents than are the lawful operators, whether they be common, contract, or private carriers.

Combating illegal carriage is not an easy task, and even with new enforcement tools, will not be ended overnight. Illegal operators have become sophisticated and are masking their operations under various disguises and facades.

In three recent, fine articles in Transport Topics, Associate Editor Harry D. Wohl describes some of the devices used by illegal carriers and the efforts of one State body, the Florida Public Utilities Commission, to war on these illegal carriers. They are too long to include in the RECORD, but I commend them to my colleagues' attention. They are being held in the files of the committee.

The bill which I am introducing today is premised on the position that the States, industry, and the general public must share with the Federal Government an equal interest in fighting illegal carriage.

In other words, if these highway poachers are to be curbed, primary emphasis must be placed on a cooperative, coordinated effort of the Commission, private industry, and the States.

The bill which I am sponsoring is intended to put muscle in the enforcement efforts of both the Federal Government and the States. Its provisions are summarized as follows:

Section 1 authorizes the Interstate Commerce Commission to enter into cooperative agreements with the several States to enforce State and Federal economic and safety laws relating to highway transportation.

Section 2 provides for uniform State registration of Interstate Commerce Commission motor carrier certificates.

Section 3 increases civil penalties for failure to comply with certain ICC regulations, and extends civil forfeiture provisions to unlawful operations by motor carriers and certain violations of the Commission's motor carrier regulations.

Section 4 permits the ICC, in enforcement proceedings, to obtain service of process and to join any other party or parties necessary to the proceedings. This section would also permit any injured person to apply to the courts for restraints against illegal carriers operating in clear and patent violation of an Interstate Commerce certificate or permit or law, rules, and regulations.

Sections 5 and 6 permit shippers to recover reparations from motor carriers and freight forwarders.

The provisions of this bill were for the most part the subject of extensive hearings in the 87th Congress. As a result of these hearings, the Senate approved S. 2560 in the 87th Congress, but action was not taken by the House.

On May 2, 1964, I introduced S. 2796 to fight illegal carriage. Joining me in cosponsoring that bill were Senators COTTON, SMATHERS, BARTLETT, Beall, HARTKE, McGEE, MONRONEY, RANDOLPH, and SCOTT. In introducing S. 2796, I stated:

> While House action on measures to deregulate the transportation of certain commodities has stalled in growing controversy, there would appear to be general agreement that legislation to combat illegal carriage and require reparations should be enacted now.
>
> The House Committee has done an excellent job in perfecting these so-called enforcement provisions and they should now be considered independently because of the contribution they will make to improving our national transportation system. These vitally needed measures should not await what appears to be the long-term resolution of controversial issues.

The bill which I am introducing today is similar to S. 2796. The present bill, like H.R. 5401, which was recently introduced by Chairman HARRIS, of the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, contains changes which were worked out by the Transportation Association of America since the close of the last Congress. I am advised that these changes will aid in eliminating opposition and increasing support for these measures to fight illegal carriage.

One change in the new bill would provide for relief by injunction against all carriers found to be violating the Interstate Commerce Act. In S. 2796, motor carriers "holding a certificate, permit or grant of temporary authority issued by the Commission" were exempted. This change is in section 4 of the bill introduced today.

A second change would add to section 2, providing for increased civil penalties, a proviso that nothing in that section would deprive the Commission of its primary jurisdiction to determine the validity of an operation in dispute under the primary business test.

A third change would add to paragraph (2) of section 4, providing for private injunction suits, a similar proviso stating that nothing in that section should be construed to deprive the Commission of its jurisdiction to interpret or construe its certificates and permits or rules and regulations; or validity of an operation in dispute under the primary business test.

Senator COTTON and I are not committed to any specific language. We firmly believe in the general principle that measures providing for a coordinated, cooperative effort should be enacted in the near future as part of an all-out drive against illegal carriage.

This same statement applies to the language of section 3, increased civil penalties. The proposed extension of civil penalties to motor carrier safety violations in S. 2796 was objected to by some groups. My hope is that the hearings will result in the industry, the State commissions, and the ICC reaching a consensus on this question.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the chairman of the Committee on Commerce traditionally introduces bills on behalf of the chairmen of various and numerous agencies within the jurisdiction of the committee, so that we might consider them and consider the views of those agencies, and in particular suggest amendments which would expedite work.

Mr. President, I am also introducing, by request, six bills recommended by the Interstate Commerce Commission to combat illegal carriage and provide for motor carrier and freight forwarder reparations. I ask unanimous consent that the bills along with the ICC's statement of justification be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The Commission indicates that these bills would greatly assist it in efforts to combat the threat to the preservation of a sound common carrier system posed by unlawful carriage.

The Commerce Committee will carefully and thoroughly evaluate the measures introduced today. In endeavoring to forge these improved enforcement tools, the committee will give careful consideration to the view of private industry and the States on this major problem confronting our national transportation system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills and justifications will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, by request, were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1732. A bill to amend sections 204a and 406a of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide civil liability for violations of such act by common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 204a of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended to read as follows:

"REPARATION AWARDS; LIMITATION OF ACTIONS

"SEC. 204a. (a) In case any common carrier by motor vehicle subject to the provisions of this part shall do, cause to be done, or permit to be done any act, matter, or thing in this part prohibited or declared to be unlawful, or shall omit to do any act, matter, or thing in this part required to be done, such carrier shall be liable to the person or persons injured thereby for the full amount of damages sustained in consequence of any such violation, together with a reasonable counsel's or attorney's fee, to be fixed by the court in every case of recovery, which attorney's fee shall be taxed and collected as part of the costs in the case.

"(b) Any person, organization, or body politic claiming to be damaged by any such carrier may either make complaint to the Commission or may bring suit in his or their own behalf for the recovery of the damages for which such carrier may be liable under the provisions of subsection (a), in any district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction; but such person, organization, or body politic shall not have the right to pursue both of said remedies.

"(c) When a complaint as authorized in paragraph (b) of this section is filed with the Commission, a statement of such complaint shall be forwarded by the Commission to the carrier or carriers named in such complaint, who shall be called upon to satisfy the complaint, or to answer the same in writing, within a reasonable time, to be specified by the Commission. If such carrier or carriers within the time specified shall make reparation for the injury alleged to have been done, such carrier or carriers shall be relieved of liability to the complainant only for the particular violation of law set forth in the complaint. If such carried or carriers shall not satisfy the complaint within the time specified, or there shall appear to be any reasonable ground for investigating the said complaint, it shall be the duty of the Commission to investigate the matters complained of in such manner and by such means as it shall deem proper.

"(d) If, after hearing on a complaint, the Commission shall determine that any party complainant is entitled to an award of damages under the provisions of this part for a violation thereof by any carrier, the Commission shall make an order directing the carrier to pay to the complainant the sum to which he is entitled on or before a day named.

"(e) If such carrier does not comply with an order for the payment of money within the time limit in such order, the complainant, or any person for whose benefit such order was made, may file with the district court of the United States for the district in which he or it resides, or in which is located the principal operating office of such carrier, or in which such carrier operates, or in any State court of general jurisdiction having jurisdiction of the parties, a complaint setting forth briefly the causes for which he claims damages, and in the order of the Commission in the premises. Such suit in the district court of the United States shall proceed in all respects like other civil suits for damages, except that on the trial of such suit the findings and order of the Commission shall be prima facie evidence of the facts therein stated, and except that the plaintiff shall not be liable for costs in the district court nor for costs at any subsequent stage of the proceedings unless they accrue upon his appeal. If the plaintiff shall finally prevail he shall be allowed a reasonable attorney's fee, to be taxed and collected as a part of the costs of the suit.

"(f) (1) (A) All actions at law by common carriers by motor vehicle subject to the provisions of this part for the recovery of their charges, or any part thereof, shall be begun within three years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after.

"(B) All complaints against such carriers for the recovery of damages not based on overcharges shall be filed with the Commission within two years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to subparagraph (D).

"(C) For the recovery of overcharges, action at law shall be begun or complaint filed with the Commission against such carriers within three years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to subparagraph (D), except that if claim for the overcharge has been presented in writing to the carrier within the three-year period of limitation said period shall be extended to include six months from the time notice in writing is given by the carrier to the claimant of disallowance of the claim, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the notice.

"(D) If on or before expiration of the two-year period of limitation in subparagraph (B) or the three-year period of limitation in subparagraph (C) a common carrier by motor vehicle subject to the provisions of this part begins action under subparagraph (A) for recovery of charges in respect of the same transportation service, or, without beginning action, collects charges in respect of that service, said period of limitation shall be extended to include ninety days from the time such action is begun or charges are collected by the carrier.

"(2) The cause of action in respect of a shipment of property shall, for the purposes of this section, be deemed to accrue upon delivery or tender of delivery thereof by the carrier and not after.

"(3) A complaint for the enforcement of an order of the Commission for the payment of money shall be filed in the district court or the State court within one year from the date of the order, and not after.

"(4) The term 'overcharges' as used in this section means charges for transportation services in excess of those applicable thereto under the tariffs lawfully on file with the Commission.

"(5) The provisions of this section 204a shall extend to and embrace all transportation of property or passengers for or on behalf of the United States in connection with any action brought before the Commission or any court by or against carriers subject to this part: *Provided, however,* That with respect to such transportation of property or passengers for or on behalf of the United States, the periods of limitation herein provided shall be extended to include three years from the date of (A) payment of charges for the transportation involved, or (B) subsequent refund for overpayment of such charges, or (C) deduction made under section 322 of the Transportation Act of 1940 (49 U.S.C. 66), whichever is later.

"(g) In suits brought to enforce an order of the Commission for the payment of money all parties in whose favor the Commission may have made an award of damages by a single order may be joined as plaintiffs, and all of the carriers parties to such order awarding such damages may be joined as defendants, and such suit may be maintained by such joint plaintiffs and against such joint defendants in any district where any one of such joint plaintiffs could maintain such suit against any one of such joint defendants; and service of process against any one of such defendants as may not be found in the district where the suit is brought may be made in any district where such defendant has his or its principal operating office. In case of such joint suit the recovery, if any, may be by judgment in favor of any one of such plaintiffs, against the defendant found to be liable to such plaintiff."

SEC. 2. Section 406a of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended to read as follows:

"REPARATION AWARDS; LIMITATION OF ACTIONS

"SEC. 406a. (a) In case any freight forwarder subject to the provisions of this part shall do, cause to be done, or permit to be done any act, matter, or thing in this part prohibited or declared to be unlawful, or shall omit to do any act, matter, or thing in this part required to be done, such freight forwarded shall be liable to the person or persons injured thereby for the full amount of damages sustained in consequence of any such violation, together with a reasonable counsel's or attorney's fee, to be fixed by the court in every case of recovery, which attorney's fees shall be taxed and collected as part of the costs in the case.

"(b) Any person, organization, or body politic claiming to be damaged by any such freight forwarder may either make complaint to the Commission or may bring suit in his or their own behalf for the recovery of the damages for which such freight forwarder may be liable under the provisions of paragraph (a) of this section, in any district court of the United States of competent jurisdiction; but such person, organization, or body politic shall not have the right to pursue both of said remedies.

"(c) When a complaint as authorized in paragraph (b) of this section is filed with the Commission, a statement of such complaint shall be forwarded by the Commission to the freight forwarder or forwarders named in such complaint, who shall be called upon to satisfy the complaint, or to answer the same in writing, within a reasonable time, to be specified by the Commission. If such freight forwarder or forwarders within the time specified shall make reparation for the injury alleged to have been done, such freight forwarder or forwarders shall be relieved of liability to the complainant only for the particular violation of law set forth in the complaint. If such freight forwarder or forwarders shall not satisfy the complaint within the time specified, or there shall appear to be any reasonable ground for investigating the said complaint, it shall be the duty of the Commission to investigate the matters complained of in such manner and by such means as it shall deem proper.

"(d) If, after hearing on a complaint, the Commission shall determine that any party complainant is entitled to an award of damages under the provisions of this part for a violation thereof by any freight forwarder, the Commission shall make an order directing the freight forwarder to pay to the complainant the sum to which he is entitled on or before a day named.

"(e) If such freight forwarder does not comply with an order for the payment of money within the time limit in such order, the complainant, or any person for whose benefit such order was made, may file with the district court of the United States for the district in which he or it resides, or in which is located the principal operating office of such freight forwarder, or in which such freight forwarder operates, or in any State court of general jurisdiction having jurisdiction of the parties, a complaint setting forth briefly the causes for which he claims damages and the order of the Commission in the premises. Such suit in the district court of the United States shall proceed in all respects like other civil suits for damages, except that on the trial of such suit the findings and order of the Commission shall be prima facie evidence of the facts therein stated, and except that the plaintiff shall not be liable for costs in the district court nor for costs at any subsequent stage of the proceedings unless they accrue upon his appeal. If the plaintiff shall finally prevail, he shall be allowed a reasonable attorney's fee, to be taxed and collected as a part of the costs of the suit.

"(f)(1)(A) All actions at law by freight forwarders subject to the provisions of this part for the recovery of their charges, or any part thereof, shall be begun within three years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after.

"(B) All complaints against such freight forwarders for the recovery of damages not based on overcharges shall be filed with the Commission within two years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to subparagraph (D).

"(C) For the recovery of overcharges action at law shall be begun or complaint filed with the Commission against such freight forwarders within three years from the time the cause of action accrues, and not after, subject to subparagraph (D), except that if claim for the overcharge has been presented in writing to the freight forwarder within the three-year period of limitation said period shall be extended to include six months from the time notice in writing is given by the freight forwarder to the claimant of disallowance of the claim, or any part or parts thereof, specified in the notice.

"(D) If on or before expiration of the two-year period of limitation in subparagraph (B) or the three-year period of limitation in subparagraph (C) a freight forwarder subject to the provisions of this part begins action under subparagraph (A) for recovery of charges in respect of the same service, or, without beginning action, collects charges in respect of that service, said period of limitation shall be extended to include ninety days from the time such action is begun or such charges are collected by the freight forwarder.

"(2) The cause of action in respect of a shipment of property shall, for the purposes of this section, be deemed to accrue upon delivery or tender of delivery thereof by the freight forwarder, and not after.

"(3) A complaint for the enforcement of an order of the Commission for the payment of money shall be filed in the district court or the State court within one year from the date of the order, and not after.

"(4) The term 'overcharges' as used in this section means charges for services in excess of those applicable thereto under the tariffs lawfully on file with the Commission.

"(5) The provisions of this section 406a shall extend to and embrace all transportation of property for or on behalf of the United States in connection with any action brought before the Commission or any court by or against freight forwarders subject to this part: *Provided,* however, That with respect to such transportation of property for or on behalf of the United States, the periods of limitation herein provided shall be extended to include three years from the date of (A) payment of charges for the transportation involved, or (B) subsequent refund for overpayment of such charges, or (C) deduction made under section 322 of the Transportation Act of 1940 (49 U.S.C. 66), whichever is later.

"(g) In suits brought to enforce an order of the Commission for payment of money all parties in whose favor the Commission may have made an award of damages by a single order may be joined as plaintiffs, and all of the freight forwarders parties to such order awarding such damages may be joined as defendants, and such suit may be maintained by such joint plaintiffs and against such joint defendants in any district where any one of such joint plaintiffs could maintain such suit against any one of such joint defendants; and service of process against any one of such defendants as may not be found in the district where the suit is brought may be made in any district where such defendant has his or its principal operating office. In case of such joint suit the recovery, if any, may be by judgment in favor of any one of such plaintiffs, against the defendant found to be liable to such plaintiff."

SEC. 3. Section 401 of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by striking out "SEC. 406a. Actions for recovery of charges; limitation of actions." and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 406a. Reparation awards; limitation of actions."

SEC. 4. The amendments made by this Act shall be applicable only with respect to cases in which the cause of action accrues after the effective date of the Act.

The recommendation and justification accompanying Senate bill 1732 are as follows:

RECOMMENDATION No. 15

This proposed bill would give effect to legislative recommendation No. 15 of the Interstate Commerce Commission as set forth on page 70 of its 78th annual report as follows:

"We recommend that sections 204a and 406a be amended to make common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders, respectively, liable for the payment of damages in reparation awards to persons injured by them through violations of the act."

JUSTIFICATION

The attached draft bill would amend sections 204a and 406a of the Interstate Commerce Act, which relate to actions at law for the recovery of charges by or against common carriers by motor vehicle and freight forwarders, so as to make such carriers liable for the payment of damages to persons, including the United States as a shipper, injured by them as a result of unreasonable charges on past shipments. It would give to an injured party the choice of pursuing his remedy either before the Commission or in any court of competent jurisdiction. Appropriate periods of limitation are provided with respect to the commencement of such actions or proceedings.

At present, liability for an unreasonable rate exists, and a remedy is provided, only with respect to violations by railroads and other carriers subject to part I and by water carriers subject to part III of the act. Prior to the decision of the Supreme Court in *T.I.M.E. Inc.* v. *United States*, 359 U.S. 464, May 18, 1959, the Commission, upon petition, made determinations of the reasonableness of past motor carrier rates on the assumption that the petitioner was entitled to maintain an action in court for reparations based upon the unreasonableness of such rates. However, in that case, the Court ruled that a shipper by a motor common carrier subject to part II cannot challenge in post-shipment litigation the reasonableness of the carrier's past charges made in accordance with applicable tariffs filed with the Commission. A shipper, therefore, is without remedy for injury arising from the application of an unreasonable rate. Since the pertinent provisions of part IV are similar to those under part II, a shipper by freight forwarder subject to part IV appears to be in the same plight.

The motor carrier industry has attained stature and stability as one of the chief agencies of public transportation, handling a substantial volume of the Nation's traffic. It seems appropriate, therefore, that shippers should have the same rights of recovery against motor carriers as they have against rail and water carriers for violations of the act.

The need for the relief proposed is evidenced by the number of proceedings instituted by shippers for redress against motor common carriers prior to the decision in the T.I.M.E. case. During the years ended June 30, 1958, and 1959, for example, 20 and 14 formal complaints or petitions, respectively, were filed to secure the Commission's determination of the reasonableness of established motor carrier rates ancillary to court actions for the recovery of reparations.

During the calendar year 1958, a total of 101 informal complaints were filed against motor carriers claiming damages for unreasonable rates and practices. In 1950 only 10 such complaints were handled by the Commission, but by 1954 the number had risen to 110. Prior to the decision in the T.I.M.E. case, adjustments of such complaints were negotiated, in appropriate cases, by an informal and inexpensive procedure involving informal conferences and correspondence with the parties. Many informal complaints, however, were found not to be susceptible of adjustment by such means. If the Commission had then been vested with the requisite authority, the filing of formal complaints seeking awards of reparations probably would have followed, as is now the practice under parts I and III of the act. In this connection it should be noted that reparation procedures before the Commission are more simple and less expensive than actions in court to attain the same end. It may be anticipated, therefore, that although both the courts and the Commission would be authorized under the proposed amendments to award reparations, shippers would prefer resort to the Commission since the reasonableness of the rates involved would, under the provisions of the act, have to be determined by it upon referral of the question by the court.

Although the need for a provision authorizing awards of reparations against freight forwarders is not as pressing as in the case of motor carriers, it is equitable logical, and desirable that all four parts of the act be uniform and that shippers by different modes be treated in similar fashion. Appropriate amendments to section 406a are therefore included in the draft bill.

For the reasons set forth above, the Commission recommends early consideration and enactment by the Congress of this proposed measure.

S. 1728. A bill to amend section 222(b) of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to the service of process in enforcement proceedings, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (b) of section 222 of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 822(b)), is amended to read as follows:

"(b) If any motor carrier or broker operates in violation of any provision of this part (except as to the reasonableness of rates, fares, or charges and the discriminatory character thereof), or any lawful rule, regulation, requirement, or order promulgated by the Commission, or of any term or condition of any certificate or permit, the Commission or its duly authorized agent may apply for the enforcement thereof to the district court of the United States for any district where such motor carrier or broker operates. In any proceeding instituted under the provisions of this section any person, or persons, acting in concert or participation with such carrier or broker in the commission of such violation may, without regard to his or their residence, be included, in addition to the motor carrier or broker, as a party, or parties, to the proceeding. The court shall have jurisdiction to enforce obedience to any such provision of this part, or of such rule, regulation, requirement, order, term, or condition by a writ of injunction or by other process, mandatory or otherwise, restraining such carrier or broker, his or its officers, agents, employees, and representatives, and such other person, or persons, acting in concert or participation with such carrier or broker, from further violation of such provision of this part, or of such rule, regulation, requirement, order, term, or condition and enjoining upon it or them obedience thereto. Process in such proceedings may be served upon such motor carrier, or broker, or upon such person, or persons, acting in concert or participation therewith in the commission of such violation, without regard to the territorial limits of the district or of the State in which the proceeding is instituted."

The recommendation and justification accompanying Senate bill 1728 are as follows:

RECOMMENDATION No. 21

This proposed bill would give effect to legislative recommendation No. 21 of the Interstate Commerce Commission as set forth on page 74 of its 78th annual report as follows:

"We recommend that section 222(b) be amended to enable the Commission in enforcement proceedings to obtain service of process upon motor carriers and to permit the joining of any other necessary party without regard to where the carrier or other party may be served."

JUSTIFICATION

The attached draft bill would provide the Interstate Commerce Commission with a more effective means of enforcing the motor carrier provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Under section 222(b) of the act the Commission is authorized to institute proceedings to enjoin unlawful motor carrier or broker operations or practices in the United States district court of any district in which the carrier or broker operates. Rule 4(f) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, however, limits the service of process in such proceedings to the territorial limits of the State in which the court sits.

In many instances the carriers against whom it is necessary to seek injunctions do not hold operating authority from the Commission and they have not, of course, designated an agent for the service of process as provided in section 221(c) of the act. The operations of such carriers are frequently widespread and it is often desirable to institute the court action in the State where most of their services are performed. This is usually the most convenient place for the majority of persons involved, including necessary witnesses. The illegal operator, himself, however, may avoid service of process by remaining outside of the State and by not stationing within its borders anyone qualified to receive service on his behalf.

Coping with the problem of unlawful operations is further complicated when a large shipper is involved. An injunction against one or several relatively small carriers without the shipper being named permits the shipper to continue his unlawful activities by using individual truckers or small carriers against whom no previous action has been taken. It is therefore frequently desirable and often critically important, that such shipper, as well as the carriers, be enjoined from participating in further violation of the law or the Commission's rules and regulations thereunder. In some instances, however, the Commission has been unable to obtain service of process upon both the carriers and the shipper because they were not located within the territorial limits of the same State.

The decision of the court in *Interstate Commerce Commission* v. *Blue Diamond Products Company*, 192 F. 2d 43, precludes the Commission from proceeding against a shipper without proceeding against the carrier. The Commission does not disagree with the principle of that case. However, it is of the view, and the draft bill would so provide, that it should be able to institute a civil action against a carrier in any State in which the carrier operates and to join in such action any shipper, or any other person participating in the violation, without regard to where the carrier or the shipper or such other person may be served.

The problem presented has been particularly troublesome in the efforts of the Commission to control so-called pseudo private carriage, i.e., for-hire carriers claiming, without basis, to be engaged in private transportation for the purpose of evading the economic regulation to which common and contract carriers are subject. The seriousness of these unlawful operations was recognized by the Congress when, as a part of the Transportation Act of 1958, it amended section 203(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act so as to more clearly define what constitutes bona fide private carriage. However, because of the inability of the Commission, under present law, to get both the responsible shipper and the carrier before the court, its efforts at effective enforcement is, in many cases, thwarted.

The proposed amendment would make more effective the original intent of the Congress in enacting section 222(b) and would aid the Commission substantially in its efforts to administer and enforce the act.

In order to make the provisions of section 222(b) harmonize with changes recommended by the Commission in section 212(a) of the act (see legislative recommendation No. 25, 78th annual report), the draft bill further provides that section 222(b) shall apply to any lawful rule, regulation, requirement, or order promulgated by the Commission. At present, the pertinent provision of section 222(b) refers only to rules, regulations, requirements, or orders promulgated under part II of the act.

S. 1729. A bill to amend section 203(b)(5) of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for the issuance of certificates of exemption upon application and proof of eligibility, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 203(b)(5) of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by changing the semicolon to a colon and by adding immediately before "or" at the end thereof the following: "*Provided,* That, except as otherwise provided in section 204(a)(4b) of this part, such cooperative association or federation has obtained and holds a certificate of exemption issued by the Commission pursuant to the provisions of that section.".

SEC. 2. Section 204(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by inserting after subparagraph (4a) thereof the following new subparagraph:

"(4b) To determine, upon its own motion, or upon application by any person or persons claiming to be engaged in transportation under the partial exemption provided in section 203(b)(5) of this part, whether such person or persons constitute, in fact, a cooperative association (as defined in the Agricultural Marketing Act, approved June 15, 1929, as amended), or a federation of such cooperative associations as described therein, and whether the transportation activities engaged in by such person or persons are within the meaning and scope of section 203(b)(5). Upon so finding, the Commission shall issue a certificate of exemption to the cooperative association or federation of associations, and such cooperative association or federation shall be entitled to operate under the partial exemption contained in section 203(b)(5) as long as such certificate remains in effect and unrevoked. At any time after the issuance of a certificate of exemption under the provisions hereof the Commission may by order revoke such certificate if it finds that the holder thereof is no longer a cooperative association or a federation of such associations, or that the transportation activities engaged in by such association or federation are no longer within the meaning and scope of the partial exemption provided by section 203(b)(5). Any cooperative association or federation of cooperative associations controlling or operating motor vehicles under the partial exemption provided in section 203(b)(5) on the date of enactment of this subparagraph, or during the year 1964, may continue to engage in transportation activities under such partial exemption for a period of one hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment without a certificate of exemption, and, if application for such certificate is made to the Commission within such period, may continue to engage in such transportation activities pending a determination of such application unless otherwise ordered by the Commission in that or any other proceeding. Applications for certificates of exemption under this subparagraph shall be made in writing to the Commission, and shall be in such form and contain such information and be accompanied by proof of service upon such interested persons as the Commission shall, by regulation, require. No certificate of exemption shall be denied and no order of revocation shall be issued, under this subparagraph, except after reasonable opportunity for hearing.".

SEC. 3. Section 220(d) of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by changing the third sentence thereof to read as follows: "The Commission or its duly authorized special agents, accountants, or examiners shall at all times have access to and authority, under its order, to inspect and examine any and all lands, buildings, or equipment of motor carriers, brokers, and lessors; and shall have authority to inspect and copy any and all accounts, books, records, memoranda, correspondence, and other documents of such carriers, brokers, lessors, associations (as defined in this section), and cooperative associations or federations of cooperative associations holding a certificate of exemption issued pursuant to section 204(a)(4b) of this part, and such accounts, books, records, memoranda, correspondence, and other documents, of any person controlling, controlled by, or under common control with any such carrier, as the Commission deems relevant to such person's relation to or transactions with such carrier."

The recommendation and justification accompanying Senate bill 1729 are as follows:

RECOMMENDATION NO. 23

This proposed bill would give effect to legislative recommendation No. 23 of the Interstate Commerce Commission as set forth on page 76 of its 78th annual report as follows:

"We recommend (a) that section 203(b)(5) be amended to provide that agricultural cooperatives shall be entitled to exempt status thereunder only upon application and proof of eligibility, and (b) that section 220 be amended to permit the Commission or its duly authorized agents to inspect the books, records, and other documents kept or maintained by such cooperatives."

JUSTIFICATION

The purpose of the attached draft bill is to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to cope more effectively with the unlawful activities of various groups and organizations which are syphoning off substantial amounts of traffic from authorized carriers by performing general transportation services under the guise of exempt agricultural cooperatives. This would be accomplished by the establishment of a procedure whereby agricultural cooperatives would be required to show, in the first instance, that they are entitled to exempt status under section 203(b)(5) of the act and by granting the Commission specific authority to examine the books and records of such cooperatives and associations.

For some time the Interstate Commerce Commission has been concerned with the relative decline of the Nation's common carrier industry. Several traffic studies clearly reveal that common carriers have lost considerable traffic which they formerly handled and, at the same time, have been unable to share proportionately in the additional traffic generated by the Nation's expanding economy. One such study, for example, showed a decline in the common carrier's share of total intercity ton-miles from 75.4 percent which they enjoyed in 1939 to only 67.5 percent in 1959. Projecting this trend to 1970, a further decline to between 60.8 and 63.8 percent was forecast.

This decline is essentially a result of the growth of unregulated private and exempt carriage. It is also attributable, however, to the growth of unauthorized and illegal carriage inimical to the public interest. The Commission has recommended in its annual reports to the Congress and in testimony before a subcommittee of the Senate several courses of action, including the instant proposal, designed to halt this steady rise in the volume of traffic handled by illegitimate private and exempt carriers to the detriment of the authorized carriers.

Under section 203(b)(5) of the act, motor vehicles controlled and operated by agricultural cooperatives, or by a federation of such cooperatives, are exempt from the Commission's economic regulation provided the cooperatives meet certain qualifying criteria as defined in the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929 (12 U.S.C. 1141). This exemption is, in our judgment, a breeding ground for multifarious schemes to avoid the obligations which must be assumed by for-hire carriers subject to the Commission's economic regulation.

While the number of groups and organizations claiming exemption as agricultural cooperatives has grown considerably in the last 10–15 years, the Commission is not presently equipped with authority effective enough to weed out those which are not entitled to the exemption or to prevent other such persons from commencing operations. It is only after such operations have been initiated that the Commission, on its own motion or upon complaint, may now institute an investigation to determine whether the operations are, in fact, lawful. In such an investigation, the Commission has the duty and responsibility of assembling and analyzing all facts pertaining to the respondent's operations. Although the information necessary to discharge this responsibility is often available only from the respondent's records, the Commission has no specific authority to inspect them. Thus, if the Commission is unable to gain access to the records, the investigation becomes futile, unless, through indirect and cumbersome means, scraps of information relating to the respondent's operations can be uncovered elsewhere.

It should be noted also that in some cases operators, upon being investigated and pressed as to their status under the exemptions, have merely suspended the questionable operation and resumed service under a somewhat changed modus operandi and usually a different name. The same result frequently occurs after the Commission has issued a cease and desist order.

These factors have made it extremely difficult for the Commission to police effectively operations commenced under the agricultural cooperative exemption.

Under the proposed legislation the applicant would have the burden of showing his eligibility for exemption. This, it is felt, would serve as a deterrent to the institution of operations by unqualified organizations. The certificate issued to a qualified agricultural cooperative would be revocable if the holder thereof ceased to be a cooperative association as defined in the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929 or the transportation activities in which it engaged were no longer within the meaning and scope of section 203(b)(5). Any organization operating under this exemption on the date of enactment of the proposal, or during the year 1964, would be permitted to continue its operations thereunder without a certificate for 120 days after the date of enactment, and, if application for a certificate is made within such period, it could continue to operate pending a determination of the application unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

It is not the purpose of the proposed measure to interfere in any way with the legitimate operations of bona fide agricultural cooperatives under the exemption provided in the Interstate Commerce Act. It is, however, designed to enable the Commission to cope more effectively with groups and organizations using this exemption as a device to engage in unlawful transportation activities.

It is therefore recommended that this proposal be given early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

S. 1730. A bill to amend section 402(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act to provide for the issuance of certificates of exemption upon application and proof of eligibility, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 402(c)(1) of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by inserting a colon in lieu of ", or" at the end thereof and by adding the following: "*Provided,* That, except as otherwise provided in section 403(g) of this part, no such group or association of shippers shall engage in consolidating or distributing freight for themselves or for the members thereof unless it has obtained and holds a certificate of exemption issued by the Commission pursuant to the provisions of that section, or".

SEC. 2. Section 403 of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection (g):

"(g) The Commission shall have the power to determine, upon its own motion, or upon application of any person or persons claiming to be engaged in operations as a group or association of shippers under the exemption provided in section 402(c)(1) of this part, whether such operations are, in fact, those of a bona fide group or association of shippers within the meaning of section 402(c)(1). Upon so finding, the Commission shall issue a certificate of exemption to the group or association of shippers, and such group or association shall be entitled to operate under the exemption contained in section 402(c)(1) as long as such certificate remains in effect and unrevoked. At any time after the issuance of a certificate of exemption under the provisions hereof the Commission may by order revoke such certificate if it finds that the operations of the holder thereof are no longer those of a group or association of shippers within the meaning of the exemption provided by section 402(c)(1). Any group or association of shippers operating under the exemption provided in section 402(c)(1) on the date of enactment of this subsection or during the year 1964 may continue to operate under such exemption for a period of one hundred and twenty days after the date of enactment without a certificate of exemption, and, if application for such certificate is made to the Commission within such period, may continue its operations pending a determination of such application unless otherwise ordered by the Commission in that or any other proceeding. Applications for certificates of exemption under this subsection shall be made in writing to the Commission, and shall be in such form and contain such information and be accompanied by proof of service upon such interested persons as the Commission shall, by regulation, require. No certificate of exemption shall be denied and no order of revocation shall be issued, under this subsection, except after reasonable opportunity for hearing.".

SEC. 3. Section 403(f) of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by changing the first sentence thereof to read as follows: "The Commission may investigate, either upon complaint or upon its own initiative, whether any freight forwarder or group or association of shippers specified in section 402(c)(1) has failed to comply with any provision of this part or with any order, rule, regulation, or requirement issued or established pursuant thereto, and, after notice and hearing, to take appropriate action to compel compliance therewith.".

SEC. 4. Section 412(d) of the Interstate Commerce Act is amended by changing the first sentence thereof to read as follows: "The Commission or its duly authorized special agents, accountants, or examiners shall at all times have access to and authority, under its order, to inspect and examine any and all lands, buildings, or equipment of freight forwarders; and shall have authority to inspect and copy any and all accounts, books, records, memorandums, correspondence, and other documents of freight forwarders, associations (as defined in this section), and of groups or associations of shippers holding a certificate of exemption issued pursuant to section 403(g) of this part, and such accounts, books, records, memorandums, correspondence, and other documents of any person controlling, controlled by, or under common control with any freight forwarder, as the Commission deems relevant to such person's relation to or transactions with such freight forwarder.".

The recommendation and justification accompanying Senate bill 1730 are as follows:

RECOMMENDATION NO. 24

This proposed bill would give effect to legislative recommendation No. 24 of the Interstate Commerce Commission as set forth on page 76 of its 78th annual report as follows:

"We recommend (a) that section 402(c) be amended to provide that shipper associations shall be entitled to exempt status thereunder only upon application and proof of eligibility, and (b) that section 412 be amended to permit the Commission or its duly authorized agents to inspect the books, records, and other documents kept or maintained by such associations."

JUSTIFICATION

The purpose of the attached draft bill is to enable the Interstate Commerce Commission to cope more effectively with the unlawful activities of various groups and organizations which are syphoning off substantial amounts of traffic from authorized carriers by performing general transportation services under the guise of exempt shipper associations. This would be accomplished by the establishment of a procedure whereby shippers' associations would be required to show, in the first instance, that they are entitled to exempt status under section 402 (c) of the act and by granting the Commission specific authority to examine their books and records.

For some time the Interstate Commerce Commission has been concerned with the relative decline of the Nation's common carrier industry. Several traffic studies clearly reveal that common carriers have lost considerable traffic which they formerly handled and, at the same time, have been unable to share proportionately in the additional traffic generated by the Nation's expanding economy. One such study, for example, showed a decline in the common carrier's share of total intercity ton-miles from 75.4 percent which they enjoyed in 1939 to only 67.5 percent in 1959. Projecting this trend to 1970, a further decline to between 60.8 and 63.8 percent was forecast.

This decline is essentially a result of the growth of unregulated private and exempt carriage. It is also attributable, however, to the growth of unauthorized and illegal carriage inimical to the public interest. The Commission has recommended in its annual reports to the Congress and in testimony before a subcommittee of the Senate several courses of action, including the instant proposal, designed to halt this steady rise in the volume of traffic handled by illegitimate private and exempt carriers to the detriment of the authorized carriers.

Section 402(c) of the act exempts from regulation under part IV, applicable to freight forwarders, the activities of shippers' associations which consolidate or distribute freight for their members on a nonprofit basis to secure the benefits of volume rates. This exemption is, in our judgment, a breeding ground for multifarious schemes to avoid the obligations which must be assumed by for-hire carriers subject to the Commission's economic regulation.

While the number of groups and organizations claiming exemption as shippers' associations has grown considerably in the last 10 to 15 years, the Commission is not presently equipped with authority effective enough to weed out those which are not entitled to the exemption or to prevent other such persons from commencing operations. It is only after such operations have been initiated that the Commission, on its own motion or upon complaint, may now institute an investigation to determine whether the operations are, in fact, lawful. In such an investigation, the Commission has the duty and responsibility of assembling and analyzing all facts pertaining to the respondent's operations. Although the information necessary to discharge this responsibility is often available only from the respondent's records, the Commission has no specific authority to inspect them. Thus, if the Commission is unable to gain access to the records, the investigation becomes futile, unless, through indirect and cumbersome means, scraps of information relating to the respondent's operations can be uncovered elsewhere.

It should be noted also that in some cases operators, upon being investigated and pressed as to their status under the exemptions, have merely suspended the questionable operation and resumed service under a somewhat changed modus operandi and usually a different name. The same result frequently occurs after the Commission has issued a cease and desist order.

These factors have made it extremely difficult for the Commission to police effectively operations commenced under the shippers' association exemption.

Under the proposed legislation the applicant would have the burden of showing his eligibility for exemption. This, it is felt, would serve as a deterrent to the institution of operations by unqualified organizations. The certificate issued to a shippers' association would be revocable if the operations of the holder thereof ceased to be that of a group or association of shippers within the meaning of the exemption provided by section 402(c)(1). Any organization operating under this exemption on the date of enactment of the proposal, or during the year 1964, would be permitted to continue its operations thereunder without a certificate for 120 days after the date of enactment, and, if application for a certificate is made within such period, it could continue to operate pending a determination of the application unless otherwise ordered by the Commission.

In addition, the recommended legislation would specifically empower the Commission, under section 403(f), to investigate the operations of shippers' associations to determine their compliance with the provisions of part IV or with any requirement established pursuant thereto. The Commission's authority under this section to investigate the operations of a freight forwarder has been construed to exclude shippers' associations.

It is not the purpose of the proposed measure to interfere in any way with the legitimate operations of bona fide shippers' associations under the exemption provided in the Interstate Commerce Act. It is, however, designed to enable the Commission to cope more effectively with groups and organizations using this exemption as a device to engage in unlawful transportation activities.

It is therefore recommended that this proposal be given early and favorable consideration by the Congress.

S. 1731. A bill to amend section 212(a) of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (a) of section 212 of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C., sec. 312(a)), is amended as follows:

(1) The second sentence is amended by striking out "of the Commission promulgated thereunder" and by inserting in lieu thereof "promulgated by the Commission".

(2) The first proviso is amended—

(A) by striking out "willfully", and

(B) by striking out "or to the rule or regulation of the Commission thereunder" and by inserting in lieu thereof "or to any lawful order, rule, or regulation promulgated by the Commission".

(3) The second proviso is amended by inserting "215", immediately after "211(c),".

SEC. 2. Subsection (c) of section 204 of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C., sec. 304 (c)), is amended as follows:

(1) The first sentence is amended by inserting, immediately after "thereto" and before the period the following: ", or with any lawful order, rule, or regulation promulgated by the Commission".

(2) The second sentence is amended by striking out "Provision or requirement" and by inserting in lieu thereof "provision, requirement, order, rule, or regulation".

The recommendation and justification accompanying Senate bill 1731 are as follows:

RECOMMENDATION NO. 25

This proposed bill would give effect to legislative recommendation No. 25 of the Interstate Commerce Commission as set forth on page 77 of its 78th annual report to Congress as follows:

"We recommend that section 212(a) be amended in the following respects: (1) To make motor carrier operating authorities subject to suspension, change, or revocation for willful failure to comply with any rule or regulation lawfully promulgated by the Commission; (2) to make the revocation procedure therein prescribed conform to the procedure provided in section 410(f) of the act by eliminating the term 'willfully' in the first proviso; and (3) to provide that the Commission may, upon reasonable notice, suspend motor carrier operating authorities for failure to comply with insurance regulations issued by it pursuant to section 215 thereof."

JUSTIFICATION

The purpose of the attached draft bill is to subject motor carrier operating authorities to suspension, change, or revocation for willful failure to comply with any rule or regulation lawfully prescribed by the Commission and to provide uniformity between parts II and IV of the Interstate Commerce Act with respect to revocation procedure. It is also designed to permit suspension of motor carrier operating rights, upon notice, for failure to comply with the Commission's insurance regulations.

As section 212(a) of the act now reads, the Commission cannot suspend or revoke a certificate except for failure to comply with the provisions of part II "or with any * * * regulation of the Commission promulgated thereunder * * *". The Commission has found this language to be unduly restrictive upon its enforcement powers. For example, regulations prescribed under the Transportation of Explosives Act do not come within the category of regulations promulgated under any provision of part II of the Interstate Commerce Act. The Commission is therefore powerless to suspend or revoke the certificate of any carrier for violations of the Explosives Act of any regulations prescribed thereunder, irrespective of how willful such violations may have been. However, by simply changing the words "of the Commission promulgated thereunder" to "promulgated by the Commission," as proposed in the attached draft bill, the Commission would be able to revoke or suspend certificates for willful or continued noncompliance with any of its lawful rules and regulations. Enactment of this recommended amendment would thus enable the Commission to cope more effectively, in the public interest, with serious violations of any of its applicable rules or regulations and not only those promulgated under part II of the Interstate Commerce Act.

Under the first proviso of section 410(f) of the act, a freight forwarder's permit may be revoked if the holder thereof fails to comply with an order of the Commission commanding compliance with the provisions of part IV, a rule or regulation issued by the Commission thereunder, or the terms, conditions, or limitations of the permit. Under the corresponding provisions in section 212(a), however, the failure of a motor carrier to obey a similar compliance must be shown to have been willful before the carrier's certificate or permit may be revoked. Once disobedience of a compliance order is established, an additional showing of willfulness should not be required. Proof of disobedience should be sufficient. The proposed change in the quantum of proof would make motor carrier operating rights revocable in the same manner as freight forwarder operating rights under section 410(f).

The second proviso in section 212(a) provides for the suspension, upon notice, but without hearing, of motor carriers' and brokers' operating authorities for failure to comply with brokerage bond regulations and tariff publishing rules. It does not, however, provide for suspension on short notice for failure to maintain proof of cargo, public liability, and property-damage insurance under section 215. As previously indicated, section 410(f) is a counterpart of section 212(a) and contains a provision similar to the second proviso of section 212(a). The second proviso in section 410(f), however, provides for suspension on short notice of freight forwarder permits for failure to comply with the cargo insurance provisions under section 403(c) and the public-liability and property-damage insurance provisions under section 403(d). The draft bill would bring section 212(a) into further conformity with section 410(f) by removing this distinction.

From the standpoint of the traveling and shipping public there is as much reason to require motor carriers to keep their cargo and public-liability and property-damage insurance in force as there is to require freight forwarders to keep their insurance in effect. It is therefore desirable in the public interest that the Commission have the authority to suspend motor carrier rights, on short notice, when insurance lapses, or is canceled without replacement, until compliance is effected. The prospect of such action by the Commission should act as a deterrent to violations of this nature. An investigation under section 204(c) is not a satisfactory answer to the problem since such a proceeding may be somewhat lengthy and the public may be adversely affected should losses occur while it is pending.

The proposed change in section 204(c), which relates to investigations and the issuance of compliance orders, would bring that section into conformity with the suggested amendment to section 212(a) by similarly removing the restrictive nature of the present wording.

The amendments proposed in this draft bill would enable the Commission to administer the enforcement provisions of part II of the act more effectively.

S. 1733. A bill to make the civil forfeiture provisions of section 222(h) of the Interstate Commerce Act applicable to unlawful operations and safety violations by motor carriers, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That subsection (h) of section 222 of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended (49 U.S.C. 322 (h)), is amended to read as follows:

"Any motor carrier, broker, or lessor, or other person, or any officer, agent, employee, or representative thereof, who shall fail or refuse to keep, preserve, or forward any account, record, or memorandum in the substance, form, or manner prescribed in this part or in any rule, order, or regulation prescribed under this part; or who shall fail or refuse to comply with any requirement of this part with respect to the filing with the Commission or with any agency, office, or representative of the Commission, as prescribed by the Commission, any annual, periodical, or special report, or other report, tariff, schedule, contract, document, or data or with any rule, order, or regulation prescribed with respect to such filing; or who shall fail or refuse to make full, true, or correct answer to any question required by the Commission to be made under the provisions of this part; or who shall fail or refuse to comply with the provisions of section 203(c) or section 206(a)(1) or section 209(a)(1); or who shall fail or refuse to comply with any rule, regulation, requirement, or order promulgated by the Commission pursuant to the provisions of sections 204(a)(1), 204(a)(2), 204(a)(3), or 204(a)(3a), shall forfeit to the United States, the sum of $200 for each such offense, and, in case of a continuing violation not to exceed $100 for each additional day during which such failure or refusal shall continue. All forfeitures provided for in this paragraph shall be payable into the Treasury of the United States and shall be recoverable in a civil suit by the Commission or its duly authorized agent, brought in the district where the motor carrier or broker has its principal office, or in any district in which such motor carrier or broker was, at the time of the offense, authorized by the Commission, or by this part, to engage in operation as such motor carrier or broker, or in the district where such forfeiture may accrue; or in any district where the offender is found. All process in any such case may be served in the judicial district whereof such offender is an inhabitant or wherever he may be found."

The recommendation and justification accompanying Senate bill 1733 are as follows:

RECOMMENDATION NO. 22

This proposed bill would give effect to legislative recommendation No. 22 of the Interstate Commerce Commission as set forth on page 75 of its 78th annual report as follows:

"We recommend that section 222(h) be amended so as to (a) extend the civil forfeiture provisions therein to unlawful operations and safety violations by motor carriers, (b) permit the Commission to institute forfeiture actions directly in the courts, and (c) increase substantially the amount of the forfeitures prescribed."

JUSTIFICATION

The purpose of the attached draft bill is to provide the Interstate Commerce Commission with a more effective means of coping with the spread of illegal and so-called "gray area" motor carrier operations which are undermining the strength of the Nation's regulated common carrier system. It is also designed to buttress the Commission's intensified motor carrier safety enforcement program.

Under existing law, procedures for dealing with certain motor carrier violations are often slow and cumbersome, and frequently ineffective. Criminal prosecutions, for example, must be brought in the district in which the violations occurred. Thus, in the case of multiple violations by a carrier with extensive territorial operations it may be necessary to institute separate actions in several district courts if all of the violations are to be covered. Civil forfeiture proceedings, on the other hand, may be instituted in the district in which the carrier maintains its principal office, where it is authorized to operate, or where it can be found. Moreover, less time is needed for investigating violations because of the difference in quantum of proof required in such proceedings.

Under the proposed amendment a civil forfeiture action could be brought against a for-hire motor carrier for transporting property without a required certificate or permit. Such action would be available whether or not the carrier had taken steps to give the operation an appearance of legality, but the principal enforcement advantage that would accrue would be when the operator, by means of an alleged vehicle lease or an alleged purchase of the commodity hauled, has attempted to give the operation an appearance of private carriage. More specifically, an owner of a vehicle may enter into a vehicle lease arrangement with a manufacturer under which the manufacturer allegedly uses the vehicle in private carrier operations. Such arrangements range all the way from a bona fide lease of a vehicle, at one extreme, to an obvious sham at the other. No enforcement action is, of course, involved in the case of a bona fide lease. The obvious shams, however, are the subject of criminal prosecution.

While there are a number of vehicle arrangements which the Commission believes to be illegal for-hire carriage by the vehicle owner, it is doubtful that a criminal conviction could be secured because of the necessity of showing knowledge and willfulness and proving guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. In addition, in a criminal proceeding there can be no appeal from an acquittal. Such cases are now handled in the civil courts, but an injunction against such operations in the future is all that can be secured. The possibility of a civil injunction action, where there is no pecuniary penalty or criminal stigma involved, has very little effect as a deterrent to would-be violators. A civil forfeiture action, such as that proposed, carrying with it substantial monetary penalties should, on the other hand, have a strong deterrent effect against questionable leasing arrangements.

Operations sometimes referred to as "buy and sell" operations are very similar in effect. By allegedly purchasing merchandise the transporter represents the operation to be private carriage. As in the case of leasing arrangements these operations have many variations, some of which present close questions as to whether the operation constitutes for-hire carriage. Some are obviously illegal for-hire operations and are handled as criminal cases. Others, however, are not so clearly unlawful as to warrant criminal action for the reasons stated above in connection with questionable leasing arrangements, but which, in the Commission's views, are nevertheless unlawful. Such operations may be continued for substantial periods during the pendency of a civil injunction proceeding and before a cease and desist order is issued by the court. If the proposed amendment were enacted a number of these cases could be made the subject of a civil forfeiture action in which, if successful, the operator would suffer a money judgment or forfeiture.

Enactment of the proposed legislation would also greatly facilitate the Commission's enforcement activities in the important area of motor carrier safety. Although a very high percentage of cases involving violations of the Commission's safety regulations are disposed of by pleas of guilty or nolo contendere, investigations looking toward such prosecutions are nevertheless extremely time consuming because of the necessity of proving to the court every element of the alleged criminal offense. Since the quantum of proof required in a civil forfeiture proceeding is not as great as that required in a criminal action, a substantial amount of the time that must now be spent in preparing for criminal prosecutions in such cases could be devoted to handling a larger number of civil forfeiture proceedings.

The Commission's efforts at more effective and expeditious enforcement would also be greatly enhanced if it were authorized to institute forfeiture proceedings directly in the courts instead of proceeding through the Department of Justice as it is now required to do. Delays would be avoided not only by eliminating the mechanics involved in taking the extra step, but also by the elimination of such delays as may be caused by the time consumed in convincing the U.S. attorney that an action should be filed.

These proposed amendments, coupled with a substantial increase in the amount of the forfeitures prescribed, would strengthen the Commission's hand considerably in dealing with some of the principal factors contributing to the decline of regulated common carriers.

AMENDMENTS TO THE ADMINISTRATION'S HOUSING MEASURE, S. 1354 (AMENDMENTS NOS. 65, 66, AND 67)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk, for printing and appropriate reference, three amendments to S. 1354, the administration's housing bill. The amendments would—

Permit the Housing and Home Finance Agency Administrator to waive the present 15-percent limitation on allocation of public housing funds for use by any one State, upon a finding that imposition of the limitation would cause hardship to a large number of low-income families in that State. The result of the present limitation is that fewer dwelling units are built in States with higher construction costs. Waiver of the limitation would provide authority for the allocation of more low-rental housing in New York as well as other States with large urban centers. The continuing 15-percent dollar limitation for any one State is unrealistic as well as unfair. It ignores the need for larger amounts of low-income housing in the high-cost, densely populated urban areas; it does not recognize the fact that metropolitan areas ignore State boundaries; it inhibits the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency from allocating public housing on an areawide and regional basis; and it is out of step with the growing emphasis on area development that has been recognized in other sections of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1965. It is a relic of the past; it should be discarded, now.

Increase the Federal cost limitation on construction of rooms for low-rental housing by $1,000 per room from the existing limitation of $2,750 per room in New York and $3,750 per room for housing for the elderly existing in areas of acute need and high cost such as New York. Increasing the per room construction cost limitation would permit more desirable and livable low-rent housing.

Expand relocation assistance for small businesses displaced by urban renewal projects to include payments of up to $10,000 upon relocation. The present limitation on relocation compensation is $1,500, but this figure was found to be totally inadequate by the Select Committee on Real Property Acquisition of the House Committee on Public Works. This additional payment is designed to aid small businesses which are less able to adjust to a new environment than the larger and more flexible business enterprises.

Strengthen the existing National Housing Act middle-income program by providing for a program of Federal matching grants for State and local contributions to such housing projects. The amendment would permit the Federal Government to make matching grants equal to one-half the value of State and local contributions to the Federal program and thus permit substantial reductions for existing middle-income programs. Contributions could take the form of local tax abatement or donation of land prior to construction of a project or local rent subsidy. Where the State or local contribution was made in the form of tax abatement or rent subsidy on an annual basis, the Federal contribution could be made yearly up to 25 percent of the development cost of the housing project. In New York City, for example, where real estate taxes on a $12,500 unit amount to approximately $490 per unit, a matching grant of full value equal to the dollar amount of a tax abatement of 50 percent would result in a reduction of $41.50 per month for a rental of a single unit.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendments (Nos. 65, 66, and 67), were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

VOTING RIGHTS—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 68)

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I submit an amendment to S. 1564, the voting rights bill of 1965. In the amendment there are incorporated several recommended revisions.

This amendment is intended, first to clarify and improve the language used in the original bill. Secondly, each of the substantive changes is designed to make the bill a clear implement of congressional authority under the 15th amendment; and finally, the amendment is intended to broaden and to strengthen the assurance to every American citizen that his rights under the 15th amendment shall be held inviolate. No one who has taken an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States can disagree with that objective.

Mr. President, many times in the past I have joined with my southern colleagues in opposing so-called civil rights legislation. I have willingly participated in full and extended debate over these issues.

I felt then, as I feel today, that most of those measures granted rights to one person at the expense of another. I have fought such provisions as first, the Fair Employment Practices Commission, because it tells an employer who he must hire in his own private business; second, the Public Accommodations law, because under this law the Federal Government brings its awesome power to bear against private businessmen, dictating whom they must admit, and whom they must serve in their place of business, or go to jail; and third, the so-called genocide provision, because it permits the Federal Government to hang like a dagger above the heads of a sovereign State the threat that all Federal funds will be cut off, unless such State bows to the mandate of so-called civil rights.

And, Mr. President, I have fought such legislation for many other reasons—but never because it sought to protect the right of all American citizens to register and to vote.

On the contrary, in each instance that I have opposed these measures, I have always made it expressly and abundantly clear that I was not thereby opposing the right to vote. It is my belief that every American citizen, in every State, regardless of his race or his color, should not only be allowed to exercise his franchise; he should be encouraged to do so. In my judgment, franchise and freedom are inseparable in America.

In the State of Florida, Mr. President, we have no literacy laws. We outlawed the poll tax 25 years ago. We go out into the highways and the byways and actively seek the vote of every citizen. The overwhelming majority of the citizens of Florida are in full and complete accord with the 15th amendment and all that it stands for.

Less than 24 hours after the President announced his plan to ask for voting rights legislation, I told the people of my State by newspaper, radio, and television, that I hoped to be able to support such legislation.

However, I have now had an opportunity to study carefully each of the provisions of the bill that was sent to Congress. We should not let such a bill become our final choice.

It is not only unclear in its language, unfair in its application, and unsafe in its total effect upon our system—it is patently unconstitutional in more than one respect.

In our concern for the rights of citizens under the 15th amendment, we should not let haste and anxiety dictate a remedy worse than the disease.

We should not discriminate against one section of the Nation on the grounds of discrimination. Pure hearts and motives know no State or regional boundaries.

We should not assign to the Attorney General, whose function is to enforce the law, the dual capacity of passing judgment upon the offender. That principle is repulsive to our system of government and inconsistent with elementary criminal jurisprudence.

We should not cite judicial delays as a basis for abandoning the judicial system, or else we may establish a precedent that the next generation may find expedient to follow—and the next—and the next—until the erosion process is complete.

We should be guided by the 15th amendment, which Congress has explicit authority to implement. The measure we pass, unlike the original bill, should guarantee to every citizen in every State the right to vote regardless of race or color—and we should protect that right in every State.

It is to meet these objections, Mr. President, that I have drafted my revisions to S. 1564. The amendment I offer today would achieve the following results:

First. At the very outset, it acknowledges that every State has the constitutional right to impose voter qualifications and procedures, so long as they do not conflict with the 15th amendment and other provisions of the Constitution.

Second. Under the original bill, the Attorney General is empowered to trigger the appointment of examiners, without court action, whenever (a) he receives 20 or more written complaints from citizens of a State or political subdivision alleging their voting rights are being violated; or (b) he determines, in his own discretion, that such examiners should be appointed.

The amendment provides that the Attorney General may not act on his own discretion, but must first receive 20 or more such complaints. At that point, the Attorney General may apply to the appropriate court of appeals for preventive relief.

Third. If the court issues an injunction, the order may provide that, during the term of the injunction, any tests or devices as a condition to voting shall be suspended in such State or political subdivision. The court is required to convey notice of such order to the Civil Service Commission, which then must appoint examiners to function as prescribed in the original bill.

Fourth. To obviate complaints against judicial delays, it is provided that (a) the court must render a decision within 30 days after the action is filed; and (b) the act goes into effect immediately upon issuance of an injunction by the court, irrespective of any appeal that may be taken from that decision, subject, of course, to the denial of certiorari or upholding of the decision by the Supreme Court.

Fifth. (a) If a person listed by an examiner as qualified to vote alleges to an examiner, within 24 hours after closing of the polls, that he was not permitted to vote or that his vote was not counted, the amendment requires—rather than permits—the U.S. attorney, upon request by the examiner, to ask the court of appeals—rather than the district court—for an order restraining certification of the election results; and (b) additionally, the amendment extends that right to every citizen in every State, regardless of whether examiners have been appointed in such State. Where no examiners exist, a citizen applies directly to the U.S. attorney.

Sixth. The amendment deletes that provision of the original bill under which listed persons would lose their right of franchise merely because they failed to exercise it. Such a provision imposes stricter standards upon those citizens than upon the general population.

Seventh. The original bill failed to state by whom challenges to a listing by an examiner could be brought. Our amendment provides that such challenges must be brought by appropriate election officials.

Eighth. In the original bill, the provision with respect to poll taxes was written in such terms that the voter was required only to tender payment for the current year, irrespective of liabilities for previous years, and irrespective of whether the amount tendered was timely or adequate under State law. Furthermore, the examiner was authorized but not required to accept the tendered amount. From a careful reading of this section, it appears that, in fact, no payment would be required. In effect, the right of the individual States to impose a poll tax in State or local elections would be abrogated.

Recently the Congress deemed it necessary to resort to a constitutional amendment in order to prohibit poll taxes in Federal elections. Clearly, Congress lacks the statutory power to prohibit such taxes in State or local elections.

The amendment deletes this provision because it is unconstitutional.

Ninth. With one exception, the original bill provided that the District Court for the District of Columbia should have jurisdiction under the act. The amendment transfers all judicial authority to the appropriate court of appeals.

Mr. President, I trust that the Judiciary Committee and the Senate will carefully consider each of these revisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 68) was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT OF 1965—AMENDMENT (AMENDMENT NO. 69)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk for printing, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. CASE], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. DOMINICK], an amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, H.R. 2362. This bill has just been reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. My amendment seeks to amend the so-called poverty definition, fixing the level at $3,000 instead of $2,000 for the last 2 years of the bill, and provides for matching funds in the bracket between $2,000 and $3,000. This would increase by 60 percent the number of children who would be affected and realistically reassess what represents poverty in the United States, especially in the big cities.

The lowering of the boom on any amendments in the committee makes it absolutely essential for Senators to realize that when the bill comes up on the floor, amendments which were not acted on in committee—because of some ukase that went out, I believe, from the President of the United States that no amendments were to be accepted, but were to be voted down by the majority—must be subject to the independent judgment of the majority of the Senate.

The principal title of this bill directs more than $1 billion in aid toward poverty-related children who are defined as those coming from families with less than $2,000 annual income and those from families whose income from aid to families with dependent children—AFDC—is more than $2,000. This $2,000 annual income poverty level stands in contrast with the $3,000 poverty level employed by the Office of Economic Opportunity in connection with its programs for preschool children—such as Project Head Start—and the administration's higher education bill (S. 600), which also stipulates a $3,000 annual income poverty level in setting forth the requirements for a student to receive a scholarship incentive.

Thus, we are faced with the anamoly of a youngster being at the poverty level during his preschool and college years if he comes from a $3,000 annual income family, but during his school years being considered at the poverty level only where his family earns $2,000 or less.

This amendment is designed to meet two principal objections to the present bill which had been pointed up by witnesses during the recent hearings: First, there is no matching provision; and, second, under the inadequate poverty yardstick of $2,000 annual family income, only about 11 percent of all school-age children are reached.

Under the amendment we are submitting today, the formula for the first year would stand as presently written, with each State receiving a Federal grant equal to 50 percent of the current average annual per pupil expenditure, multiplied by the number of children from families of under $2,000 annual income and those from AFDC families above $2,000. This formula would continue to apply for the second and third years for the under $2,000 and AFDC children. However, during the second and third years, children from families in the $2,000 to $3,000 annual income category would be brought in under a matching formula providing for a Federal contribution of 25 percent of the average annual per pupil expenditure, where this is matched by an equal amount from State and/or local funds.

Under our amendment, therefore, the number of children directly affected would be increased by about 60 percent—from some 5 million to some 8 million children—with a great improvement in educational opportunity, while Federal cost for title I would be raised only about one-third. In this way the bill could much more effectively serve its purpose of fighting poverty by aiding a substantial added number of the school population from such families who need it badly.

To illustrate how our amendment would work, consider a State with an average annual per pupil expenditure of $450. For each of the 3 years authorized for H.R. 2362, that State would receive a Federal grant of $225 for every child between 5 and 17 from a family with an income of $2,000 or less and those from AFDC families above $2,000. In addition, for each of the second and third years of the operation of the education bill the State would receive a Federal grant of $112.50 for each child from a family with an income of from $2,000 to $3,000—not counting AFDC children previously covered—provided that that amount is matched from State and/or local funds. Thus, an additional $225 a year would be directed to the child from the $2,000 to $3,000 income family, as well as to the child from under $2,000 income family.

In addition, the State could elect to receive either the additional funds for the $2,000 to $3,000 annual income children or the funds available under the special incentive grant provided by section 204.

I ask that there be appended to my remarks at this point a chart prepared by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare giving the number and percentage of school-age children in each State coming from families with incomes of less than $3,000 annually, a Library of Congress study, "Federal Laws Relating to Education Which Have Provisions Requiring Matching by the Recipient," a HEW survey as to the amounts to be received by each State under this amendment, and the amendment itself.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received, printed, and appropriately referred.

The amendment (No. 69) was ordered to lie on the table.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Total, age 5 to 17 population in families less than $3,000	Percent of total age 5 to 17 population
United States and outlying areas	8, 808, 863	19. 7
50 States and District of Columbia	8, 211, 720	18. 7
Alabama	343, 201	38. 0
Alaska	8, 102	15. 0
Arizona	65, 701	19. 0
Arkansas	214, 900	45. 0
California	396, 207	11. 0
Colorado	63, 100	14. 0
Connecticut	39, 902	7. 0
Delaware	13, 799	13. 0
Florida	265, 891	23. 0
Georgia	373, 102	35. 0
Hawaii	18, 259	11. 0
Idaho	27, 000	15. 0
Illinois	269, 794	12. 0
Indiana	140, 803	12. 0
Iowa	126, 789	19. 0
Kansas	79, 102	15. 0
Kentucky	279, 697	35. 0
Louisiana	304, 694	34. 0
Maine	41, 999	17. 0
Maryland	102, 302	13. 0
Massachusetts	96, 402	8. 0
Michigan	223, 193	11. 0
Minnesota	133, 793	15. 0
Mississippi	321, 205	51. 0
Missouri	209, 006	21. 0
Montana	26, 600	15. 0
Nebraska	68, 593	20. 0
Nevada	5, 998	9. 0
New Hampshire	13, 697	9. 0
New Jersey	112, 998	8. 0
New Mexico	63, 400	23. 0
New York	402, 401	11. 0
North Carolina	474, 008	38. 0
North Dakota	41, 704	24. 0
Ohio	271, 407	11. 0
Oklahoma	145, 404	25. 0
Oregon	45, 597	10. 0
Pennsylvania	342, 197	13. 0
Rhode Island	23, 799	12. 0
South Carolina	286, 799	41. 0
South Dakota	49, 801	28. 0
Tennessee	334, 893	36. 0
Texas	652, 698	26. 0
Utah	23. 397	9. 0
Vermont	16, 698	17. 0
Virginia	275, 490	27. 0
Washington	70, 702	10. 0
West Virginia	154, 895	31. 0
Wisconsin	111, 001	11. 0
Wyoming	10, 900	13. 0
District of Columbia	27, 700	20. 0
American Samoa	6, 592	85. 0
Canal Zone		
Guam	3, 279	17. 0
Puerto Rico	583, 172	22. 0
Virgin Islands	4, 100	42. 0

Source: Summary of IBM listing by counties.

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., February 25, 1965.

FEDERAL LAWS RELATING TO EDUCATION WHICH HAVE PROVISIONS REQUIRING MATCHING BY THE RECIPIENT

I. Grants for educational television broadcasting facilities, Public Law 87-447: Section 392(e) provides for matching formula for the method of aid. The Federal share may not exceed 75 percent.

II. National Defense Education Act of 1958, as amended, Public Laws 85-864, 88-665:

Section 204 provides that the institution of higher education is to provide an amount equal to not less than one-ninth of Federal contributions for loans under title II.

Section 304(b) of title III provides for a dollar-for-dollar matching formula for grants to acquire equipment.

Section 504(a) of title V provides that Federal payments shall equal the amount expended by the State during the first year of the program and one-half such amount thereafter in carrying out the State plan.

Section 504(b) provides for a dollar-for-dollar payment for testing students.

III. National School Lunch Act, as amended, Public Law 396 (1946), Public Law 518 (1952), Public Law 87-823: Title 42, United States Code, section 1756 provides matching grants for assistance in the payment of food costs. For each dollar of Federal funds paid, the State must pay $3 into the program.

IV. Smith-Hughes Act, as amended: Title 20, United States Code, section 19 provides that grants of the Federal Government are subject to a requirement for an equal expenditure of State funds.

V. George-Barden Act, as amended: Title 20, United States Code, section 15(k) provides for a dollar-for-dollar matching requirement by the States.

VI. Title VIII of the National Defense Education Act of 1958: Title 20, United States

Code, section 15ccc(a)(1) requires that for each dollar of Federal funds expended, an equal amount must be spent by the States.

VII. Vocational Education Act of 1963, Public Law 88–210, part A: Section 6 provides that the State share shall equal the Federal payments.

VIII. Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, Public Law 88–204:

Section 107 of title I provides that the Federal share for a project for an institution of higher education other than a public community college or public technical institute shall in no event exceed 33⅓ percent; and in the case of a project for a public community college or technical institute, the Federal share shall be 40 percent of its development costs.

Section 202 of title II provides that the Federal share of a grant for construction of graduate academic facilities may not exceed 33⅓ percent of the development cost of any such construction project.

Section 303(a) of title III provides that loans for construction of academic facilities shall not exceed 75 percent.

IX. Library Services Act, as amended, Public Law 597 (1956), Public Law 86–679, Public Law 88–269: Title 20, United States Code, section 353(c) provides that the Federal share shall be no greater than 66 percent nor less than 33 percent.

Estimated distribution of funds under proposed Javits amendment to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (H.R. 2362)

	Estimated basic amounts as bill now written [1] (A)	Estimated additional amounts under Javits amendment [2] (B)	Estimated total amounts (col. (A) plus col. (B)) (C)
50 States and District of Columbia	$1,106,631,732	$328,573,951	$1,435,205,683
Alabama	31,397,950	8,067,694	39,465,644
Alaska	1,809,608	478,612	2,288,220
Arizona	10,250,710	2,725,914	12,976,624
Arkansas	22,142,767	5,959,442	28,102,209
California	77,996,272	16,966,102	94,962,374
Colorado	8,879,240	2,974,630	11,853,870
Connecticut	7,799,100	2,085,750	9,884,850
Delaware	2,128,780	795,025	2,923,805
Florida	29,621,770	12,575,888	42,197,658
Georgia	37,240,335	12,160,748	49,401,083
Hawaii	2,212,265	801,933	3,014,198
Idaho	2,580,688	1,011,406	3,592,094
Illinois	49,878,448	12,224,899	62,103,347
Indiana	19,697,510	7,399,612	27,097,122
Iowa	17,629,216	5,892,916	23,522,132
Kansas	10,850,360	4,205,488	15,055,848
Kentucky	30,472,362	7,419,276	37,891,638
Louisiana	39,709,164	11,985,941	51,695,105
Maine	3,834,842	1,977,986	5,812,828
Maryland	14,767,074	5,480,940	20,248,014
Massachusetts	15,565,176	4,942,476	20,507,652
Michigan	36,951,540	9,981,338	46,932,878
Minnesota	21,918,564	6,902,084	28,820,648
Mississippi	31,750,310	6,047,086	37,797,396
Missouri	$28,790,329	$9,065,759	$37,856,088
Montana	4,550,595	1,515,202	6,065,797
Nebraska	7,344,926	3,306,875	10,651,801
Nevada	926,901	350,778	1,277,679
New Hampshire	1,658,800	677,270	2,336,070
New Jersey	21,582,796	6,356,049	27,938,845
New Mexico	9,650,575	2,703,462	12,354,037
New York	103,001,780	27,973,308	130,975,088
North Carolina	48,859,475	13,727,906	62,587,381
North Dakota	5,156,476	1,842,386	6,998,862
Ohio	38,272,522	12,414,802	50,687,324
Oklahoma	16,280,778	5,164,077	21,444,855
Oregon	8,304,555	2,476,146	10,780,701
Pennsylvania	48,926,736	16,514,722	65,441,458
Rhode Island	3,851,402	1,132,470	4,983,872
South Carolina	27,348,774	6,688,342	34,037,116
South Dakota	6,933,504	2,061,159	8,994,663
Tennessee	32,054,100	9,089,925	41,144,025
Texas	76,546,602	26,343,801	102,890,403
Utah	2,846,762	957,264	3,804,026
Vermont	2,099,223	1,129,478	3,228,701
Virginia	31,974,150	10,184,475	42,158,625
Washington	11,800,065	3,538,684	15,338,749
West Virginia	17,158,180	4,083,576	21,241,756
Wisconsin	17,553,290	6,291,741	23,845,031
Wyoming	1,611,309	703,996	2,315,305
District of Columbia	4,463,076	1,217,112	5,680,188

---

[1] Distribution estimated on the basis of the age 5 to 17 population in families with incomes of less than $2,000 per annum (1959) and in families receiving more than $2,000 from AFDC payments (1959), times 50 percent of the estimated 1964–65 current expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance.

[2] Estimated on the basis of the age 5 to 17 population in families with incomes of $2,000 to $2,999 (1959) less the age 5 to 17 population in families receiving more than $2,000 from AFDC payments (1959) under sec. 203(a)(2)(B), title I, H.R. 2362, and 25 percent of the estimated State current expenditure per pupil in average daily attendance (1964–65).

H.R. 2362

Amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. CASE and Mr. DOMINICK) to H.R. 2362, a bill to strengthen and improve educational quality and educational opportunities in the Nation's elementary and secondary schools:

On page 8, beginning with line 3, strike out all through line 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"(c) For the purpose of this section—

"(1) for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1966, and each of the two succeeding fiscal years, the 'Federal percentage' and the 'low-income factor' shall be 50 per centum and $2,000, respectively, and

"(2) for each of such two succeeding fiscal years, an additional amount shall be determined using a 'Federal percentage' of 25 per centum and a 'low-income factor' of $3,000 but more than $2,000 (excluding children counted under section 203(a)(2)(B)), and added to the basic grant, if (A) such amount is matched by State or local funds, or both, to be used for the same purpose as such basic grant and (B) at the option of the State educational agency of each State, such agency elects to receive for such year the amount determined under this clause (2) in lieu of a special incentive grant pursuant to section 204.

Any amount contributed by a State for the purpose of clause (2) shall be in addition to regular payments of State aid made by such State, and any amount made available by a local educational agency for the purpose of such clause with respect to any fiscal year shall represent an increase in such year in current expenditures of local funds for elementary and secondary school education by such agency over the amount of such expenditures in the previous fiscal year."

On page 9, line 16, after "shall" insert ", if no election has been made to receive the amount determined pursuant to section 203 (c)(2) in lieu thereof,".

On page 10, line 2, after "shall" insert ", if no election has been made to receive the amount determined pursuant to section 203 (c)(2) in lieu thereof,".

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on March 8, 1965, I introduced a bill (S. 1412) for the relief of military and civilian personnel for losses sustained to property by fire on August 17, 1963, while stored in commercial warehouses in Alexandria, Va.

At the next printing of this bill, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] be added as a cosponsor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, at its next printing, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. WILLIAMS], the name of the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], and the name of the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be added as cosponsors of S. 1588 to authorize the Secretary of Commerce to undertake research and development in high-speed ground transportation, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Bartlett, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 5721) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price-support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. COOLEY, Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. ABBITT, Mr. STUBBLEFIELD, Mr. DAGUE, and Mr. LATTA were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ADMINISTRATION SHOULD SPELL OUT PREREQUISITES FOR AN ACCEPTABLE POLITICAL SETTLEMENT IN VIETNAM

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President. I have prepared, for delivery this week, an extended address on the subject of Vietnam. In this address, I intend to reiterate the plea I made in the Senate on February 17 for a negotiated settlement of the war in southeast Asia. I also intend to emphasize my belief that if our carrot-and-stick strategy is to succeed in bringing Hanoi to the conference table on acceptable terms, it is not enough to brandish the stick only. It is equally important to show the carrot.

Finally, I intend to emphasize the necessity for breaking the diplomatic deadlock—first you withdraw, then we will talk—that finds both sides, in effect, demanding the surrender of the other as the price for negotiations.

The President has just disclosed that he will make a major speech on Vietnam in Baltimore tomorrow evening. This will be a policy statement of great importance. Accordingly, I shall defer any statement of my own until Thursday, following the President's address to the Nation.

However, in the meantime, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the exceptionally fine Walter Lippmann column, published in the Washington Post this morning. In it, Lippmann asks for an explanation of why the administration has thus far neglected to adequately spell out the prerequisites for an acceptable political settlement in Vietnam. He writes:

> We have never had, at least so far as I know, any straightforward explanation of why the administration persists in keeping its war aims uncertain. The crucial uncertainty is whether or not the administration intends to impose as yet undefined conditions which must be met before it will agree to a cease-fire and the beginning of negotiations for an armistice.
>
> This uncertainty has seemed to many who are much concerned a deliberate tactic, designed to make the Hanoi government sue for peace before it learns the terms of the peace.

Lippmann points out that it would be easy to put an end to the uncertainty. I agree. I believe, moreover, that this is the missing ingredient which must be supplied if we are to have any prospect of soon reaching the conference table.

I strongly commend the column to my colleagues, and ask unanimous consent that it may appear at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Is Uncertainty Necessary?

(By Walter Lippmann)

We have never had, at least so far as I know, any straightforward explanation of why the administration persists in keeping its war aims uncertain. The crucial uncertainty is whether or not the administration intends to impose as yet undefined conditions which must be met before it will agree to a cease-fire and the beginning of negotiations for an armistice.

This uncertainty has seemed to many who are much concerned a deliberate tactic, designed to make the Hanoi government sue for peace before it learns the terms of the peace. That this is the tactic of the administration is the opinion, for example, of Senator John Sherman Cooper, a lawyer and judge whose opinion in a matter of this kind carries weight. This is also the opinion of 17 nonalined governments which have just addressed an appeal to the principal powers. It is, as a matter of fact, the very general opinion throughout the world, and it is a principal reason why, even among our closest allies, there are deep misgivings about us.

Yet it would be easy to put an end to the uncertainty. The administration's stock formula is that Hanoi must show a willingness to "leave its neighbors alone." This is a quite ambiguous formula. It seems to say that there can be no cease-fire, no end, that is to say, to the Vietcong terrorism in South Vietnam and to the American bombing in North Vietnam, until Hanoi does—does what? Nobody knows what. Secretary Rusk never says what. And supposing that Hanoi did show a willingness to "leave its neighbors alone," how would the administration know whether to believe Hanoi, or how long to believe it?

This fundamental vagueness and imprecision is a wholly different thing from an unconditional cease-fire. There are indications that the administration may be thinking of clarifying its position. But the indications are ambiguous. On Sunday evening on "Meet the Press," Mr. McGeorge Bundy allowed that, "I didn't say anything about specific preconditions." It is not clear to me from studying the text whether there are no preconditions or whether Mr. Bundy, like Mr. Rusk, would not spell out the preconditions.

We are told that there are no signs from Hanoi that it wants a cease-fire followed by talks. To insist on this is to labor the obvious and it is beside the point. Considering the military situation in South Vietnam, it would be surprising indeed if Hanoi did not think or at least say, that it was in sight of a smashing victory. There can be no guarantee that if we decided to call for an unconditional cease-fire, that there would then be one.

The consequences of a misconceived and mismanaged war cannot be erased easily or cheaply. But it is more important that we save what can be saved and strengthen our position for the future which is complicated and entangled. The essential diplomatic material must be provided without which our allies cannot proceed to play their part in saving the peace. Nor can the Soviet Union, nor the nonalined nations, nor the Holy See, nor the Secretary General of the United Nations.

If the administration clarifies its position on a cease-fire, it will be taking the first indispensable step toward emerging from our present near isolation in southeast Asia into what could become membership in a great diplomatic coalition for peace and order.

In addition to this specific and indispensable correction of our diplomatic stance, we can improve our position in the war by spelling out—in general terms publicly, more specifically through private diplomatic channels—the nature of the overall settlement in southeast Asia which we would support. These are the "carrots" of a peace offensive, and in his statement of March 25 the President made a sketchy beginning along this line.

A diplomatic action on a sufficient scale to produce some results will have to include indications—through private channels, say of the Soviet Union and of France—of what kind of government might be set up in Saigon, and of the possible relations between North and South Vietnam which, according to the Geneva agreements of 1954, are not two sovereign nations but two zones of one sovereign nation.

Almost certainly some such political understandings as these are indispensable to the liquidation of the war. The juicier carrots of a large south Asian economic development are most desirable and talking about them will do good. But we must remember that on both sides men are dying for what they regard as inalienable political rights, and it is to that that our diplomatists must first address their minds.

THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION CUTS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, this week the Senate Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee begins its annual review of the justifications submitted by the Department of Agriculture for the coming fiscal year. They contain many important items, but much attention will be centered around a proposed cut of $100 million in the agricultural conservation program and a $20 million cut for the Soil Conservation Service.

The agricultural conservation program cut is a direct budget slash while the Soil Conservation Service cutback will be through the "back door" in that the administration proposes to establish a new technical assistance "revolving fund." The new fund, if set up, will shift up to 50 percent of the cost of the services of Federal soil technicians and engineers to the already hard-pressed farmer. In effect, it will amount to at least a $20 million cut.

The so-called revolving fund is additionally noxious since it fails to recognize the contributions already being made by farmers and county and State governments to these programs. In Nebraska alone it could mean increased costs to the farmers of approximately $500,000. This would be on top of the $1.5 million in conservation cost sharing already being spent by our farmers, as my colleague from Nebraska, Senator Curtis, has previously stated on the Senate floor. These are additional costs to be heaped on the hard-pressed farmer who has been caught in the cost-price squeeze as never before.

These two programs have been on the books for 30 years. During that time they have been widely accepted by farmers and have advanced the objectives of conserving our natural resources as well as making a substantial and continuing contribution to our farm economy.

In my State of Nebraska, the agricultural conservation program and SCS programs have achieved great success. In fact, the State ranks second in total participation in the programs. However, the work has just really begun. A high official of the Department of Agriculture recently estimated that in Nebraska only about 13 percent of the job has been done to date. This estimate is founded on necessary and practical conservation objectives. These objectives are long range, as should be the planning for all sound conservation programs. It is a kind of effort that is not suited for crash projects or quick starts or stops. It needs a steady, deliberate pace of operations so that the landowners and operators, the local, State, and Federal Government officials concerned with the programs can proceed in an orderly fashion with their planning and activities to achieve those goals.

Now the Johnson administration comes forth and suggests a 40-percent cut in the SCS budget for a single year. Such a slash is irresponsible at the very least and certainly not keeping good faith with the farmers and State and local governments who have invested substantial amounts of time, effort, and money in this important task.

There are many of us, on both sides of the aisle who will oppose these reckless cuts. There are many of us who are wondering if this is what the so-called Great Society has in store for our farmers.

My information is that the cuts were imposed by the Bureau of the Budget below the level of the original requests submitted by the Department of Agriculture. This is another example of budgeteers making farm policy, a duty which should be enjoined upon the Department of Agriculture rather than upon those who would seek to do things solely from the standpoint of reducing appropriations in an area where the uses have been demonstrated and where they are sound, in order to make them available for new and larger areas. Perhaps this proposal is a logical extension of the kind of thinking that led Kermit Gordon, the Director of the Bureau, to the conclusion in his January article in Saturday Review that there is no future on the farm for 2½ million of our 3½ million farmers.

This Senator rejects the spurious thinking that led to the proposed cuts. I shall do all that I can to see that the funds are restored.

Mr. President, Mr. Gene Kemper, editor of the Alliance Daily Times-Herald, of Alliance, Nebr., has editorialized on the proposed cuts very clearly and forcefully in the March 30 edition of his newspaper. I ask unanimous consent that the article be placed in the Record at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Cutting ACP and SCS Now Would Be Ag Folly

One only has to watch the Times-Herald's farm page each Saturday to realize how many rural people hereabouts are taking advantage of conservation services and practices offered by governmental agencies.

Farmers and ranchers have taken advantage of the agriculture conservation program to build terraces, ponds, windbreaks, and otherwise prevent a return of the "dirty thirties." The Government pays half and the landowner half. An additional Government service here is technical advice provided free by the Soil Conservation Service (SCS). Surveys and other help from this source have encouraged many a landowner to improve his acreage and increase its productiveness.

Now comes the Federal Government, which is doing these things on the cuff in other parts of the world, wanting to cut down on the conservation program at home. The Johnson administration is recommending to Congress a $100 million cut in the agriculture conservation program budget and a $20 million cut in the SCS technical assistance program. The suggestion is made that landowners pay the Government for this SCS help.

The entire recommendation is inconsistent at this time when efforts started in the 1930's are starting to really pay off. And at the very moment when new programs are being started to preserve natural resources and beautify the Nation.

SCS was born in 1935. It has been a most important long-range soil resource program. The form of assistance provided is technical to make soil surveys and investigations, to plan balanced use and conservation measures designed to meet the need and land capabilities of individual farms and areas, and to draft designs and specifications and to furnish supervision when conservation plans for a farm or area are being carried out.

The agriculture conservation program was also established in 1935, and under it the Government pays farmers about 50 percent of the costs of carrying out soil conserving practices. Through it serious soil depletion and erosion problems have been corrected.

These programs have been supplemented over the years by watershed protection and flood prevention programs, by a soil bank program, by the Great Plains Conservation Act of 1956 under which a necessary effort to fight erosion was mounted.

The 88th Congress, which President Johnson has called "the greatest conservation Congress in our entire history," passed more than 30 conservation measures including the providing of a land and water conservation fund.

Naturally none of these programs have been perfect. But the SCS and agriculture conservation programs have in effect been basic to the effort of conserving soil and water resources. They have worked hand in hand.

They perhaps could stand revision and expansion. The proposed cuts, however, would do little else but harm soil conservation goals.

Support for the cuts come primarily from the Budget Bureau and from administration statements dealing with economy. We realize that claims on the budget are mounting, but we realize also that some of these claims could just as easily be dumped or cut.

The effort to protect and assure better use of present land resources, and to expand land resources is no less important today than it was back in the 1930's. It is more important.

The proposed cuts represent an overdose of emphasis on budget dollars, and not enough emphasis on the importance of soil conservation and the dollars it will eventually produce.

The proposed cuts are inconsistent with the long-range program still unfinished. Congress should put the administration back on this one farm track that has traveled in the right direction.

TAX CREDITS AND TAX DEDUCTIONS FOR COLLEGE STUDENTS—RESOLUTION OF STUDENT CONGRESS OF UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS, CHICAGO UNDERGRADUATE DIVISION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, on December 10, 1964, the Student Congress of the University of Illinois, Chicago Undergraduate Division, unanimously adopted a resolution relating to tax credits and tax deductions for college students. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Whereas President Johnson in his state of the Union message of January 4, 1965, recognized the great necessity for our Nation's future leaders to be college graduates; and

Whereas the Student Congress of the University of Illinois, Chicago Undergraduate Division also takes cognizance of the unalterable significance which a college diploma for each citizen means for the furtherance of our Nation as a world leader socially, culturally, and economically; and

Whereas the cost of obtaining a college education in an American university requires many thousands of dollars and places great stress upon a family's budget in innumerable cases; and

Whereas the 88th Congress, through its consideration of the 1964 tax bill and specifically the Prouty and Ribicoff amendments which would have provided tax credits on college expenses, also recognized the enormous encumbrances which university tuitions place upon the finances of a family or self-sustaining student; and

Whereas President Johnson's plans for the Great Society seem to indicate that the present time is most propitious for Executive and congressional action which would mitigate the economic burden of tens of thousands of college students and their families and those unmanifested financial burdens of generations of students to come in the following years: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Student Congress of the University of Illinois, Chicago Undergraduate Division, implore President Johnson and each and every Member of the Congress of the United States of America to provide relief to the overburdened American university student and his family; Be it further

Resolved, That such relief be preferably in the form of a tax credit, which would permit either student or parent, whichever one pays the cost of tuition and textbooks, to deduct the full cost of same from his gross taxable income.

Proposed by Elliot S. Bacall.

Adopted unanimously on December 10, 1964.

ORGANIZATION OF U.N. TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT BOARD

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I call attention to the organization of the 55-member U.N. Trade and Development Board which had its first meeting yesterday and elected as President-Chairman the Honorable Syed Amjad Ali, Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the U.N.

The establishment of this Board on a permanent basis, following the U.N. Trade and Development Conference in Geneva last year, now provides a continuing body to emphasize and consider in a broad context the economic problems of the developing nations and their relations with the industrialized countries.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Pakistani Named to New U.N. Unit," by Kathleen McLaughlin, which appeared in today's New York Times, and an article by the Honorable Syed Amjad Ali, entitled "Trade Status Outweighs Development Assistance," which appeared in the February 26, 1965, issue of International Banker and outlines Pakistan's economic progress and discusses the work of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 6, 1965]

PAKISTANI NAMED TO NEW U.N. UNIT

ALI IS UNANIMOUSLY CHOSEN DEVELOPMENT AGENCY HEAD—OTHER ELECTIONS DUE; NEW YORK SITE IS UNCERTAIN; 55-NATION BOARD WILL WORK TO REDUCE WORLD POVERTY AND SPEED UP GROWTH

(By Kathleen McLaughlin)

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y.—Hailed as "the most representative forum in the history of international economic cooperation," the United Nations Trade and Development Board began organizing itself here today on a permanent basis.

Syed Amjad Ali, of Pakistan, who thus characterized the newest unit of the world organization, was unanimously elected president-chairman of the 55-nation Board, which will now function on a year-round basis.

The election of other officials is awaited tomorrow. Geographical representation will be important in their selection.

Secretary General U Thant, in a brief address of welcome, commented that the task of maintaining peace is "no longer viewed solely in terms of political events, but is indivisibly linked to the achievements of better standards of living in all parts of our shrinking globe."

"Governments and people expect this new machinery to make definite progress in achieving these aims," he added.

STANDING ROOM ONLY

An unexpectedly heavy influx of government delegations left standing room only for latecomers, especially among observer groups. The latter included representatives of intergovernmental organizations, primarily regional trade associations not previously active in New York.

They included the Soviet trade bloc known as Comecon (Council for Mutual Economic Assistance), the European Common Market, the European Free Trade Association, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the Latin American Free Trade Association, the Central American Economic Integration Organization, and the Arab League.

As in the Geneva conference last year, the Organization of African Unity and the Organization of American States also took part, attesting to their interest in trade problems.

NEW PATTERNS SOUGHT

The board, president Ali said, would work toward reduction of "the deep cleavage existing in the world today," not on political or ideological bases nor on color and race, but "primarily on the basis of plenty and poverty."

More directly, he stated it as the introduction of a new pattern of international trade that will favor and accelerate the economic growth of the developing countries.

The developing countries hold 31 seats on the board, although the chair of Indonesia, elected with the others at the Geneva conference, remained vacant. Since no official word has been received of Indonesia's resignation, the matter of a replacement will not come up for discussion at this time.

[From the International Banker, Feb. 26, 1965]

TRADE STATUS OUTWEIGHS DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE

(By Syed Amjad Ali, permanent representative of Pakistan to the United Nations)

The urge to develop is present whether a country is small or large, whether it has recently become independent, or whether it has been free for centuries. Among the developing nations, the drive for economic progress is particularly marked due to what Adlai Stevenson has called the "revolution of rising expectations."

The populations of the world are aware of the economic benefits made possible by 20th century technology, and have become impatient with a primitive standard of living.

Pakistan's drive for economic development began in 1950 with its first 5-year plan.

Completed in 1955, this program was not a glowing success. The quantum of foreign assistance did not match requirements, while exports earnings fell off due to the decline of international commodity prices.

The second 5-year plan, however, to be completed this June, has achieved outstanding results. GNP has increased by 24 percent and will rise an additional 30 percent during the third 5-year plan.

Industrial production has scored impressive gains; the increase for 1963 came to 14 percent, and final figures for 1964 will, it is hoped, be comparable.

Export earnings have also shown marked improvement, growing 5 percent in 1963 to $417 million.

Pakistan's economic progress is attributable to the political stability it has enjoyed over the last 6½ years, to its sense of financial discipline, and to effective utilization of its material and human resources.

The flexibility of Pakistan's economic policies also contribute importantly to the nation's growth—particularly in the sphere of industrial development.

Pakistan's economic philosophy allows its people full latitude to develop their initiative. In industrial development, the Government only enters a field where private enterprise is hesitant, or where private interests require financial and/or managerial help.

Such Government participations are channeled through the Pakistan Industrial Development Corporation (PIDC). A large number of enterprises have been aided by PIDC, but management is generally left in the hands of the private investors—even though as much as 50 percent of a firm's capital is provide by the Government through the PIDC.

Private enterprise has also been strengthened by two investment institutions:

The first is the Pakistan Industrial Credit and Investment Corp., launched in 1957 with the help of the World Bank. To my mind, it has proved the most effective investment venture among all the similar institutions established in the developing nations.

A second Pakistani institution is the Pakistan Industrial Development Bank, which helps small investors to enter industrial production.

Both the Pakistan Industrial Development Bank and the Pakistan Industrial Credit and Investment Corp. provide loans in foreign exchange and in Pakistani rupees.

Pakistan has not only helped its own private investors, but has also created the necessary climate for foreign private investment. The Pakistan Investment Promotion Bureau was set up for this purpose, and I had the honor of being its first chairman.

This Government institution deals with all foreign private investment proposals. All plans and applications are, I believe, handled in a genuinely expeditious manner.

To date, Pakistan has had its share of private foreign investment, but hopes that the flow will significantly increase in the years ahead. Meantime, friendly governments have provided an important amount of foreign aid assistance.

However, foreign aid clearly cannot be an instrument of development for all time to come. In order to finance the imports so desperately needed for industrialization, Pakistan and all other developing nations must improve their positions in international trade.

At present, the developing nations are extremely vulnerable in terms of world trade. Projects indicate that if they achieve the 5-percent minimum annual growth rate recommended for the United Nations "development decade," their collective trade deficit on imported capital equipment and other manufactures will rise to $20 billion by 1970. Such a deficit would considerably exceed the aid now forthcoming from the developed nations and the East bloc.

Solutions to both the immediate and long-range problems demand improvement of the new nations' trading position.

Pakistan has, of course, been concerned by the unsatisfactory state of international trade for many years. In the interests both of our own national progress and of a more equitable world order, we have sought to do something about it.

As long ago as 1952, I urged the United Nations Secretary-General—then Trygve Lie of Norway—to call an international trade conference.

Later, the trade position of the developing nations was seriously weakened with the post-Korea slump in commodity prices. Between 1953 and 1961, commodity export prices fell 8 percent. Manufactures at the same time became more expensive.

The United Nations reports that, over this period, "the terms of trade of primary commodities fell by 26 percent in relation to those of manufactures. * * *"

In Pakistan's case, the terms of trade by the end of 1962 stood at 60.1, relative to 1949.

Positive action in organizing an international trade conference was at last taken in 1962 and 1963.

The United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) met in Geneva from March through mid-June of last year attended by representatives of 122 nations.

As vice chairman of the Conference, as a member of the Special Committee on Conciliation, and as deputy leader of the Pakistan delegation, I was honored by a number of responsibilities. Perhaps most important, I was elected chairman of the group of 75 developing countries, and presented its joint declaration to the Conference.

UNCTAD's conclusions were provocative:

Exports of the developing countries should no longer be discriminated against (by quotas, etc.) by the industrial nations.

To prevent further deterioration or sharp fluctuation of commodity prices, international commodity agreements should be negotiated or, where they presently exist, strengthened.

Nonreciprocal concessions should be given industrial exports of the developing nations so as to promote their industrialization.

The first point seems incontestable to me, and certainly accords with the often proclaimed—but unpracticed—trade beliefs of the industrial nations.

There is also growing acceptance of commodity agreements. Such arrangements should be mutually beneficial, saving the industrial nations from the high prices of scarcity periods, as well as protecting commodity producers from times of glut.

Nonreciprocal concessions, at first blush, seem at sharp variance with the standards of the industrial nations established in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT).

But the facts are that the Commonwealth has long since afforded nonreciprocal concessions to its members, and the European Common Market extends similar benefits to some of the new African nations.

If it is recognized that the developing countries cannot achieve their economic takeoff without strengthening their positions in world trade, the industrial nations can certainly generalize and expand presently existing nonreciprocal concessions.

These improvements, I appreciate, can at best come gradually; the immediate benefit of the UNCTAD is the fact of its being. UNCTAD provided a forum for the developing nations to define their trade needs and problems.

The new institution, which next meets in 1966, began what will be a continuing dialog between the developing and industrial nations. This April, the 55-nation Trade and Development Board established by UNCTAD will hold its first session.

UNCTAD's paramount value is the spirit it generated among the developing nations. As I stated, in the closing declaration of the Group of 75:

"The developing countries regard their own unity, the unity of the 75, as the outstanding feature of this conference.

"This unity has sprung out of the fact that, facing the basic problems of development, they have a common interest in a new policy for international trade and development * * * [and] a strong conviction that there is a vital need to maintain and further strengthen this unity in the years ahead."

Ten months after the event, I am even more convinced that the unity of the developing countries forged at Geneva will profoundly affect the design of international trade relations in the years to come.

DOUGLAS DILLON

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, a few days ago the Washington Post published an excellent editorial about former Secretary Dillon. I wish to endorse the sentiments therein expressed, and to add that I believe that as time passes, we shall recognize even more than we do now the fact that Secretary Dillon has been a great public servant. His broad experience in business, in our foreign service, in the Department of State, and, most recently, as Secretary of the Treasury, gave him an unusual capacity for sound judgment in regard to matters of the highest national importance.

Our country is fortunate to have had such a capable man in a position of influence; and I hope that it will not be too long before he will find it possible to return to the public service.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial published in the Washington Post be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Truly Notable

There was a time, and not very long ago, when it was customary to praise a Secretary of the Treasury by declaring him to be the greatest since Alexander Hamilton or—at the very least—the greatest since Albert Gallatin. In accepting Douglas Dillon's resignation, President Johnson happily avoided comparisons that are historically irrelevant or inherently invidious. He described Mr. Dillon as "a truly notable Secretary of the Treasury," a characterization which does justice both to the man and the English language.

In his farewell press conference Mr. Dillon was asked whether he had not grown more "liberal" during his 4 years with the Kennedy and Johnson administrations. He replied with characteristic candor that as a liberal Republican, a friend and admirer of Senator Clifford Case, his fundamental views are unchanged. But then he added that he had learned a great deal. Indeed, it was the ability to learn and learn quickly that made Dillon an outstanding Treasury Secretary.

What distinguishes Douglas Dillon from his immediate predecessors was not only an active record of positive accomplishment, the reform of the depreciation guidelines and the comprehensive assault on the balance-of-payments problem, but an important change in style. In the past the most that one could hope for from an enlightened Secretary of the Treasury was that he would heed the advice of his economic advisers on questions of fiscal policy while continuing in public utterances to employ the conservative rhetoric that still passes for wisdom in some business circles.

Douglas Dillon changed all that, hopefully in a permanent fashion. He made it abundantly clear that a balanced budget is desirable, but only when the economy is operating at a much higher level of employment that has been attained in recent years. And it was equally refreshing for a Secretary of the Treasury to tell an assembly of international bankers that interest rates in Europe are far too high, and that a healthy readjustment requires the reduction of rates in Western Europe rather than the increase of those in the United States.

After 12 years of unbroken service, Douglas Dillon has more than earned a vacation from the tribulations of public life. But President Johnson has expressed a desire to call on him again, and one can only hope that Washington will not for long be deprived of his extraordinary talents.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE FOR THE DEAF

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, at its recent 75th anniversary dinner, presented honor citations and awards to two persons and two broadcasting associations for their outstanding contributions in work for and with the deaf.

Mrs. Harold Hitz Burton, widow of the late Justice H. H. Burton, who was a member of the Alexander Graham Bell board until his death, presented the two honor citations to Mrs. Hobart C. Ramsey, president of the Deafness Research Foundation, and to Mr. Robert H. Cole, the first president of its international parents' organization.

I was given the honor of presenting the awards to the Canadian Broadcasting Corp., for its film, "The Silence Barrier"; and to the American Broadcasting Co., for its television program, "A Woods Full of Question Marks." Both films treated the problems of deafness with sympathetic understanding and absorbing interest.

Probably no chronic physical impairment is as prevalent in the United States today as ear disorders. It is estimated that 18 million people, including 3 million children, suffer from some degree of hearing loss. This means that many children do not get a normal education, and many adults cannot make full use of their capabilities in a career, not to mention the silent suffering.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record the citations presented to Mrs. Ramsey, Mr. Cole, the Canadian Broadcasting Corp., and the American Broadcasting Co., because of their deep interest and fine accomplishments and contributions in the field of educating and teaching the deaf and the impact of responsible television programing in support of educational programs for deaf children.

There being no objection, the citations were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

The Alexander Graham Bell Honors Citation for Distinguished Service for the Deaf, Presented to Mrs. Hobart C. Ramsey

The Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, in its 75th anniversary year, is honored to present to Mrs. Hobart C. Ramsey, president of the Deafness Research Foundation, the 1965 Alexander Graham Bell Honors Citation.

Mrs. Ramsey has a deep personal interest in the problems of deafness since she herself had a severe hearing impairment for a number of years, until her hearing was restored to a serviceable level through surgery. This experience gave her the impetus for organizing in 1958 the Deafness Research Foundation. The foundation is the first national voluntary lay organization devoted primarily to furthering research into the cause, prevention and cure of disorders of the ear. Its aims and purposes have been officially endorsed by the appropriate medical societies and associations.

Many people do not suspect a hearing loss until they have lost a significant amount of their hearing. The average person is inclined to mask or deny, even to himself, that a loss exists. The Deafness Research Foundation urges all, especially children, to have regular complete hearing evaluations. It seeks to stimulate financial support for research, and to encourage those who have ear disorders to assist science on behalf of future generations.

In 1960 the Deafness Research Foundation and the American Academy of Ophthalmology and Otolaryngology sponsored the temporal bone banks program for ear research. This was the first nationwide effort to provide the inner ear structures essential to ear research. It has been hailed by authorities as one of the most progressive steps taken in the development of research in deafness in this country.

In recognition of the outstanding contribution which Mrs. Hobart C. Ramsey has made and is making in furthering research into the causes and prevention of deafness, this association presents to her the 1965 Alexander Graham Bell Honors Citation.

As authorized by the membership and the board of directors.

George T. Pratt,
President.
June Miller,
Secretary.

Washington, D.C., *March 8, 1965.*

The Alexander Graham Bell Honors Citation for Distinguished Service for the Deaf Presented to Mr. Robert H. Cole

The Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, in its 75th anniversary year, is honored to present to Mr. Robert H. Cole, the first president of its International Parents' Organization, the 1965 Alexander Graham Bell Honors Citation.

Across the face of the earth, on farms and in cities, surrounded by wealth or poverty, are to be found children born deaf. This has been so since the beginning of the history of man, and is still the case. Deafness does not respect race, religion, geography, social status, economic condition, or educational background.

Deaf children have in common frustrated parents, posing unanswered questions, seeking some light, searching for guidance and constructive assistance. They speak all languages. Most have never before seen a deaf child. Some find themselves in sparsely settled areas, miles from another deaf child.

The Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, at its meeting in Los Angeles, Calif., in 1956, considered the possibility of organizing the parents of deaf children. At Pittsburgh, in 1958, a small group of parents established the parents' section, and elected Mr. Robert H. Cole its first president. There were 18 affiliated groups of parents.

For the next 6 years, Mr. Cole, on his own time and at his own expense, tirelessly traveled the length and breadth of the country, meeting with and speaking to groups of parents of deaf children. No group was too small, or too inconveniently located, for him to visit. At the time of his resignation as president in June 1964, the section had been renamed the International Parents' Organization and there were 129 affiliated groups representing 4,100 families in the United States and abroad.

In recognition of the outstanding contribution which Robert H. Cole has made to deaf children everywhere, to their parents and to our profession, this association presents to him the 1965 Alexander Graham Bell Honors Citation.

As authorized by the membership and the board of directors.

George T. Pratt,
President.
June Miller,
Secretary.

Washington, D.C., *March 8, 1965.*

The Alexander Graham Bell Award for Distinguished Service for the Deaf Presented to Canadian Broadcasting Corp.

The Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, in its 75th anniversary year, is honored to present to the Canadian Broadcasting Corp. the 1965 Alexander Graham Bell Award for distinguished service for the deaf.

Because deafness is invisible and not a fatal disease, the deaf seldom enjoy the sympathetic understanding and concern, nor the assistance of the general public, accorded others with handicapping conditions. It seems that few take the time to comprehend that the sense of normal hearing is directly related to the acquisition of speech and language by children, and that language is the avenue to education and human fellowships. Because their speech is different, and communication is more difficult, the deaf often find themselves misunderstood and sometimes avoided. A large-scale program of public information is needed if the deaf are to participate fully in a world of predominantly hearing people.

The Canadian Broadcasting Corp., on October 19 and October 26, 1964, presented over its nationwide television network two half-hour programs entitled "The Silence Barrier." The real stars of the production were deaf children from Canada and the United States who demonstrated that oral education for them is both possible and worth the necessary effort. The programs reached into thousands of homes, and did much to promote public interest and knowledge of the capabilities of children who do not hear.

In recognition of the excellence of the contribution of the Canadian Broadcasting Corp. television network toward a better understanding of the problems relating to deafness, and in highlighting the challenges facing educators and the public, this Association confers upon it the 1965 Alexander Graham Bell Award for distinguished service for the deaf.

As authorized by the membership and the board of directors.

George T. Pratt,
President.
June Miller,
Secretary.

Washington, D. C., *March 8, 1965.*

The Alexander Graham Bell Award for Distinguished Service for the Deaf Presented to American Broadcasting Co.

The Alexander Graham Bell Association for the Deaf, in its 75th anniversary year, is honored to present to the American Broadcasting Co. the 1965 Alexander Graham Bell Award for distinguished service for the deaf.

Because deafness is invisible and not a fatal disease, the deaf seldom enjoy the sympathetic understanding and concern, nor the assistance of the general public, accorded others with handicapping conditions. It seems that few take the time to comprehend that the sense of normal hearing is directly related to the acquisition of speech and language by children, and that language is the avenue to education and human fellowship. Because their speech is different, and communication is more difficult, the deaf often find themselves misunderstood and sometimes avoided. A large-scale program of public information is needed if the deaf are to participate fully in a world of predominantly hearing people.

The American Broadcasting Co., on October 26, 1964, presented over its nationwide television network the Ben Casey show entitled "A Woods Full of Question Marks," a production of Bing Crosby Productions. This sensitive and dramatic program reached into thousands of homes to brilliantly demonstrate the way in which physicians, educators and parents can cooperate to help deaf children. All who contributed to this successful performance—writer, director, producer, and actors—can be justly proud as it represented a major stride forward in promoting public interest and knowledge of the capabilities of children who are deaf. The deaf children who acted themselves were the real stars.

In recognition of the excellence of the contribution of the American Broadcasting Co. television network toward a better understanding of the deaf and problems related to deafness, this association confers upon it the 1965 Alexander Graham Bell Award for distinguished service for the deaf.

As authorized by the membership and the board of directors.

George T. Pratt,
President.
June Miller,
Secretary.

Washington, D.C., *March 8, 1965.*

THE JOB CORPS OFFERS HOPE FOR MANY YOUNG AMERICANS

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, there recently came to my attention an article, written by Mark R. Arnold, and published in the March 29, 1965, edition of the National Observer, which I believe will be of interest to Members of Congress and other readers of the Record. Mr. Arnold has done an excellent job of capturing the spirit and purpose of the Job Corps camp recently established in the Ouachita National Forest, in Garland County, Ark. Often those of us who are "snowed under" by the countless issues which come before Congress forget the effect our actions have on individual American citizens. Mr. Arnold's article, entitled "That Abraham Lincoln—He's Dead, Isn't He?" is a thoughtful description of the hope the Job Corps offers for many young Americans; and I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the National Observer, Mar. 29, 1965]

That Abraham Lincoln—He's Dead, Isn't He?—A Reporter Lays Topsoil With the 100-Percent Losers in a Job Corps Camp

(By Mark R. Arnold)

Royal, Ark.—Carl Ward, 16, a clean-cut, blond, high school dropout from Poplar Bluff, Mo., laid down his shovel, pushed his green army surplus cap over his forehead to shield his eyes from the sun, and reflected a moment before answering my question about why he had joined one of the new Federal Job Corps camps. When he spoke, his voice was soft, his words accented with a country twang.

"I never did much after I left school. Wasn't much to do. I helped out this old woman who lives across from us to earn a little money. Once in a while I'd work in the grocery store or at the filling station. The principal at school—he knows us real well—he come out and told us about the Job Corps. Said I could learn to drive a cat (Catepillar tractor) or something like that. I don't know what I want exactly. Maybe go back and drive a truck like my daddy. Lessen they learn me something better here."

Carl Ward is one of 70 boys enrolled in the Ouachita Job Corps Conservation camp outside Hot Springs, Ark. He is one of 100,000 boys and girls who will be mustered into new Federal training centers that will be established over the next 18 months to give a new lease on life to out-of-school, out-of-work youth.

A SEARCH FOR THE EFFECTS

I spent 4 days at the Ouachita (pronounced Wash-a-tah) camp recently, living and working alongside the corpsmen. I wanted to find out whether such surroundings can indeed instill new values and new hope in boys who, for want of motivation and skills, might otherwise become tomorrow's welfare recipients.

What is life like in the Job Corps? What kind of boys are signing up? What are they learning. Can the new Federal camps, part of the antipoverty effort turn them into productive citizens? These are some of the questions I asked myself as I nosed my rented car into the Ouachita National Forest in which my camp is located.

I had chosen to live in a rural Job Corps camp, rather than in one of the larger urban centers also established by the poverty program, because I wanted to try to get to know the neediest youngsters. The urban centers are for more advanced youths, who will learn such specific skills as auto mechanics, data processing, and cabinet making. The rural centers, like the one at Ouachita, are for youths who lack the fundamental social and education skills needed to get or keep a job. "Most of these boys," a camp official told me upon my arrival, "are 100-percent losers. They've been kicked around all their lives. We've got a lot of unlearning to do before they can start learning a trade."

I had anticipated some resistance to the presence of a newsman among the boys, but my misgivings were short lived. After I had moved into a barracks, exchanged my business suit for some old Army fatigues, and joined a game of basketball, I found the youngsters friendly and eager to talk. I got to know about two dozen corpsmen by name, and interviewed a like number. My first impression, subsequently confirmed by daily contact, was that these boys had not been handpicked to give the Job Corps program a good name. They were right off the streets.

Beyond that, it is hard to generalize about them. One is a high school graduate, who officials say is trying to find himself. Six are total illiterates. The average youth has completed 8 years of schooling but is reading on a fifth- or sixth-grade level. Some have criminal records. They come from as far away as Connecticut and as near as Little Rock, 80 miles to the north. Some are products of big-city slums; others were recruited from declining rural communities. Half are white and half are Negroes and nonwhite Spanish-Americans. Many come from broken homes. Most come from large families. Almost all have backgrounds of poverty.

Most of them heard of the Job Corps from a friend, a clergyman, a welfare worker, or a school principal. They joined because "My mom thought I could learn something here," or "I couldn't find a job." or "I was just hanging around the house." "Just hanging around," is a phrase that turned up repeatedly in my interviews with them.

"HE'S DEAD, ISN'T HE?"

Their world, in most cases, is confined to their immediate surroundings. During a bull session I started one night about civil rights, someone mentioned that Abraham Lincoln had freed the slaves. "That Abraham Lincoln," said one of the boys, puzzled. "He's dead, isn't he?" A Negro youth who wants to learn to run a bulldozer said he hopes to become "an international" and work in Africa. "What part of Africa?" I asked. He answered: "Siberia." I was repeatedly besieged with questions about Vietnam: Where is it? Why is the United States involved there? And about more mundane subjects: How big is the earth? How far is it from New York to California? How high do jets fly? Is it true President Kennedy's assassin was a Communist? What's a Communist?

Teaching basic social and work skills to boys like these is no mean task. "Most of these boys are here," Camp Director Ralph Cunz told me, "because no one has ever been able to help them before. The problem isn't that they can't learn. It's that they haven't wanted to. Our job is to make them want to, to motivate them to make something of themselves. We've got one thing going for us. The fact that they joined up shows they want to be helped."

The basic facilities of the camp are designed to provide some of the amenities the boys missed at home. The youths are housed four to a room in attractive new prefabricated trailer units with pine-paneled walls. The barracks line one side of an open athletic field complete with basketball and volleyball courts and a baseball diamond. A fifth building, like the barracks composed of prefabricated trailer units, serves as an education center. It has a library, some musical instruments (two guitars, harmonicas, a set of drums), art supplies, and a record collection. The messhall doubles as a meetinghall and lounge. There are plans to build a gymnasium for wrestling, boxing, weight-lifting, and other sports. There will be shops for wood and metalworking.

TIME FOR STUDY AND WORK

The camp day begins at 6 a.m. and ends with lights out at 10:30 p.m. Three days a week are devoted to work training. The other 2½ days (the boys work a 5½-day week) they receive basic education. While I was there, most of the work involved beautifying the camp. Youngsters were busy building stairs for the barracks, planting shubbery, and painting some older buildings built while the camp was a recreation center for the World War II Army-Navy Hospital in Hot Springs. The work crew that I joined was given the job of laying topsoil outside the camp dispensary, and making a gravel sidewalk from building to building.

When the basic work on the campsite is completed, the youths will move into the forests. They will bulldoze new trails, remove dead trees, build public recreation areas, pave roads, plant seedlings, and do other conservation work. Those who want to will learn to run bulldozers, and how to repair them. Some of the youths are already being trained as cook's helpers in the camp kitchen, filing clerks for the 23-man staff, and aids in the corps dispensary.

The boys can remain in the camp for up to 2 years, but the plan is to move them into urban centers or other work training programs as soon as they have acquired the basic skills needed for specialized job training.

While at camp, a youngster receives $30 a month spending money. In addition, the Government puts $50 a month aside during his stay in the center, which is paid to him in one lump sum when he leaves. If he prefers, he can have $25 a month of this terminal allowance sent to his family, and the corps matches the amount. Almost all the boys at Ouachita are sending this money home to help their parents.

Talk to some of the boys and you learn about a slice of American life that eludes the public-opinion pollers. Few of the boys I interviewed could tell me how big their hometowns were. Several had never been more than 50 miles from home before.

Willie Lee Thomas, Jr., 20, has been out of work for most of the 3 years since he quit school in the 10th grade in Temple, Tex. He's a wiry, alert Negro youth who left the Job Corps soon after his arrival ("I didn't see what good it was gonna do me"), then returned.

"I couldn't get along with the teachers at school," he relates. "They were always blaming me for things I didn't do. So I quit and got a job in a restaurant for a year. But I couldn't take much more of that. Oh, I've worked at odd jobs, but mostly been hanging around the employment office, but they weren't doing much hiring. Most of the reason I come back, nothing had changed at home. Jobs still hard to get. So I figured, just like they say, you need some kind of education, and if you don't have it, then things are gonna be pretty rough on you."

SOME HAVE HIGH HOPES

In many of the boys, the visitor finds a striking disparity between ambition and expectation. Asked what he would like to be doing in 10 years, 19-year-old Gary Taylor said: "I'd like to do office-type work, maybe work my way up to be president of a company." Asked what he expects to be doing in 10 years, he responded: "Probably running heavy equipment, because it takes a lot of education to do anything else, and it takes a lot of pushing to get an education."

Many of the youths are self-conscious about their lack of achievement. When a work supervisor showed a group of boys the blueprint of a speaker's platform they were to build for the camp's dedication last week, one commented: "Ain't nobody here with sense enough to read a plan like that."

Even the simplest tasks can prove burdensome. Like writing a letter home. Said 17-year-old James Grice of Atlanta: "I try to write twice a week, but it takes so much time to look up the words I don't know in the dictionary."

A TYPICAL DAY

On a typical workday, I accompanied the boys to the work-assignment area at 8 a.m. That's the time work is supposed to begin, but boys were straggling in up to 8:20. A camp official explained to me that the boys are not used to working on a schedule. There was a lot of horseplay while we were waiting for the stragglers. The talk was of prowess with girls and of souped-up cars. Glen Kile, the deputy camp director for work, assigned all the boys to crews under the supervision of seven work supervisors, most of them career forestry officials. (The camp is run by the U.S. Forest Service.)

My crew was given the job of spreading gravel to make sidewalks along the side of the dirt road in front of the barracks. After a 10:30 break for coffee, three of the eight members of the group disappeared. "How come they can goof off and we have to still work?" one boy wanted to know. The work supervisor, Cliff Tackett, a former Boy Scout leader, replied: "They may goof off now, but when they need a recommendation to get a job, they won't get it. They're only hurting themselves."

We broke for lunch, then returned to work until 4 p.m. An hour's recreation period followed, then supper and a movie. Movies are shown 3 nights a week. On Saturday nights the boys are free to go into Hot Springs. A bus picks them up for the return to camp at 11 p.m.

Discipline frequently proves a problem to Camp Director Ralph Cunz. "We try to be as unmilitaristic as possible," he told me as he made an inspection of the barracks one afternoon. "We try to give them incentives to do what they should be doing." Sometimes this approach is successful. All of the barracks were kept cleaner after it was announced the boys in the two cleanest barracks would have an extra night in Hot Springs. Frequently, however, the boys are torn by the examples of the camp leaders and those of their friends. "When D. (one of the bigger corpsmen) says it's time to knock off work," a Negro youth said as he dug a shovel into a pile of gravel, "we knock off, even them that doesn't want to."

But there are rewards for those who apply themselves to work and study, and the rewards are enticing some of the youths who pride themselves on putting out as little as possible. The camp's two VISTA volunteers (Domestic Peace Corps men) have set up a camp newspaper. Some of the hardest to reach youngsters signed up for job interviews to work on it. Others are anxious to serve on the committee that runs the camp canteen. They've been told their conduct must improve if they hope to qualify.

TEACH BY TESTING

Teaching the three R's to some of the youths is a problem too. Job Corps educators in Washington have designed a teach by testing method that permits each youngster to proceed at his own pace. Each corpsman takes a reading test and a 16-problem arithmetic test upon arrival at the camp. A teacher goes over his mistakes with him. When the youth feels he understands his mistakes, the teacher consults a master test chart and moves him automatically to another examination specifically geared to test for the same kind of mistakes. If he achieves a passing score on it, he moves on to more advanced work. If not, he takes another test geared to his specific problem.

The system has not erased all resistance to learning. But it has revolutionized, in the minds of the job corpsmen, the pupil-teacher relationship. At lunch one day I asked a group of boys if the instruction was different from what they received in public schools. Pedro Cantu, a Spanish-American from San Antonio, was the first to speak. "In school if I was stumped," he said, "I wouldn't raise my hand. I'd just keep right on going. Here, the teachers are, well, a friend. You got a question, you ask. They're helpful, like."

THE PRACTICAL APPLICATION

To encourage the boys to sharpen up their reading skills, camp instructors stress the link between what they're being taught and the jobs they hope to obtain eventually. "I had a boy in here the other day," said Teacher Charles Porter, the only Negro on the camp staff. "He wants to be a cook. I asked him who was going to hire him if he couldn't follow a recipe or make up a menu? Haven't had a bit of trouble from him since."

This approach seems to be working with many of the boys. "I'm going to be reading books on heavy equipment for the next 2 weeks," boasted blond Eddie Turley, who quit school in Little Rock in the eighth grade. But for those whose deficiencies are more basic—to whom learning to read means filling in the missing letter on a page that says C—T alongside a picture of a cat—learning can still be deadly dull.

Some old habits are persistent. After every payday, some of the boys gather to shoot craps, as, no doubt, they did in their hometowns. Fights are not uncommon. I broke up one argument between a Negro and a white boy who were on the point of coming to blows. The Negro claimed the white boy had stuck out his tongue at him.

But the values camp leaders are trying to instill in the boys seem to be taking hold. None of the boys whose confidence I gained knew of anyone who had brought liquor into camp, though it would have been an easy matter to smuggle it back from Hot Springs. Explained Warren Richardson, a bright 19-year-old from Clarksburg, W. Va.: "We know they're depending on us. We're on our honor." On one of the work crews, I listened while a boy boasted of his criminal record (stolen hub caps, truancy, housebreaking). After a while he stopped. No one was interested.

A STATUS SYMBOL

To deal with disciplinary problems, the camp has set up a discipline board, composed of three corpsmen and three staffers. Membership on the board, like membership on the canteen committee and the newspaper, has become a status symbol, and a reward for good performance.

Camp officials do not expect to be able to rehabilitate all the corpsmen. Already, 10 have left for various reasons—homesickness, inability to get along with others, or a distaste for the training. The 70 who have remained can leave anytime they want to. The attractive living quarters, the recreation, the committees, the newspaper, the movies, the individualized education—all are designed to make them want to stay, and learn. And, as such, they seem to be working.

"This is the last chance for most of these kids, and they know it," says Dr. Howard Brighton, a University of Oklahoma educator who is Ouachita's deputy director for instruction. "We've got some who are along just for the ride, and they'll get discouraged and drop out, or else shape up. What we're trying to do is to kindle a spark in these kids, and I think we're succeeding in most cases. Once we've got them hooked, they'll work themselves to keep it alive."

IMPORTANCE OF THE SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE BUDGET

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, one of the most urgent challenges facing our Nation is to protect and improve our soil and water resources on the privately owned and operated lands of America.

Thirty years ago, in the wake of floods, land damages, erosion, and a series of frightening dust storms, a Federal, State, and local partnership was formed to conserve our invaluable soil and water resources. This partnership blossomed in the form of the Soil Conservation Service, which has made available, without charge, technical conservation assistance to private landowners.

The 30-year history of the Soil Conservation Service is a study in accomplishment. It is a program that has enjoyed virtually unparalleled support and cooperation at every level. It is a program designed to yield benefits to generations yet unborn, by safeguarding our most precious natural resources.

Through its programs, the Service assists Soil and Water Conservation Districts and other cooperators, watershed groups, and Federal and State agencies having related responsibilities in bringing about physical adjustments in land use that will conserve soil and water resources, provide for agricultural production on a sustained basis, and reduce damage by floods and sedimentation.

We have made great progress in the field of soil and water conservation; but the demands of the future illustrate that much remains to be done.

Because of the great work remaining before us, Mr. President, I was most disappointed to note that the Bureau of the Budget has proposed that soil conservation districts, farmers and ranchers, and other landowners make $20 million in payments to the Federal Government during the next fiscal year, for vital technical assistance provided by the Soil Conservation Service.

If adopted, the proposal would have the effect of reducing the Federal Government's contribution for technical services—and, in effect, its contribution toward our Nation's future—by $20 million.

I feel that this proposal represents an unwarranted reversal of national policy of the conservation and development of privately owned land and related resources. It is a reversal of national policy of aiding the family farm and farmers least able to pay for essential conservation work.

The decline of farm income is no secret, nor are we unaware of the financial plight of many ranchers who have been so hard hit in recent years by declining livestock prices and increased livestock imports.

In my State, many of those who are most knowledgeable about the effect of the proposal to establish a revolving fund declare flatly that few landowners could pay up to 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance furnished to help install planned conservation practices on their land.

I fear, Mr. President, that the proposed reduction, in the long run, may prove to be many times more costly and harmful to our natural resources than the $20 million that will be saved this year.

I will oppose the reduction in the Soil Conservation Service budget for assistance to landowners cooperating in the effort to conserve our soil and water resources; and it is my hope that the proposal will be firmly rejected by Congress.

The prudent use of our land and water resources benefits not only farmers, ranchers, and sportsmen. The real benefit will be derived by all who follow us. The Soil Conservation Service must be provided the funds necessary to enable it to continue its work on flood prevention, soil surveys, watersheds, and the other programs which are so vital to the future of our Nation.

AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION STRONGLY URGES REINSTATEMENT OF SERVICES OF MEDICAL SPECIALISTS AS REIMBURSABLE COSTS UNDER AGED HEALTH CARE BASIC PLAN

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on March 29 I urged, in a Senate speech, that the Senate restore to the House committee approved plan for expanded medical and hospital care for the aged reimbursement under the basic plan of the in-hospital services of medical specialists. While I dislike the barbaric English usage of some of the titles, the official designations of these specialties are radiology, pathology, anesthesiology, and physiatry.

After making this speech, I sent a telegram to Dr. Edwin N. Crosby, executive vice president of the American Hospital Association, asking the position of the association on this matter. The telegraphed reply of Dr. Crosby on behalf of the association speaks for itself, but I point out in summary his evaluation that the exclusion of these services: First, would seriously retard the continued development of the modern hospital as the central institution in our health service system; second, not only will confuse the public through a multiple-billing approach and cost them more, but could endanger the quality of patient service; third, interferes with existing relationships between hospitals and physicians and tends to dictate a nationwide pattern prescribed by the Federal Government; fourth, is certain to face aged beneficiaries with a substantial reduction in the benefits they will receive; fifth, will imperil the longstanding arrangements developed by many Blue Cross plans; sixth, will make the administration of the overall program enormously more complicated; and seventh, will require nationwide renegotiation of contracts between hospitals and specialists and between hospitals and third party agencies.

I earnestly hope the Senate will act to correct this exclusion, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of Dr. Crosby's telegram be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

APRIL 5, 1965.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

In reply to your wire the American Hospital Association takes the position that radiology, pathology, anesthesiology, and physiatry services in hospitals are essential to the provision of high quality patient care in the hospital and thus are basic hospital services. Exclusion of these services would seriously retard the continued development, so striking in the past few decades, of the modern hospital as the central institution in our health service system. The association's historic policy position that radiology, pathology, anesthesiology, and physiatry are hospital services was clearly enunciated on February 7, 1957, by our board of trustees when it acted to include these benefits as benefits of prepaid hospitalization benefit plans.

Fragmentation of the components of hospital service not only will confuse the public through a multiple billing approach and cost them more, but more importantly could endanger the quality of patient service in the hospital by diminishing the administrative controls necessary for the optimum delivery of these services coordination of which is so essential to high quality hospital care. The association maintains the position that these services including the professional activity of the specialist are a proper part of hospital reimbursable costs.

In testimony before the House Ways and Means Committee in its hearing on similar legislation in July 1961 we urged that these medical specialists' services be included in the hospital benefits proposed and we argued strongly against the deletion of such specialists' services from the bill. More recently we expressed our support of the provision of such services as it was incorporated in H.R. 1. We opposed interference by the Congress in the local arrangements developed through the Nation by the individual specialists and the hospitals concerned. We were distressed that the services of these specialists were removed from the definition of hospital services in H.R. 6675. We believe that this interferes with existing relationships between hospitals and physicians and tends to dictate a nationwide pattern prescribed by the Federal Government. The present provisions of H.R. 6675 in respect to these specialists will, we believe, seriously disturb the existing relationship throughout the Nation and may as above noted threaten in certain instances continued efforts to improve the quality of patient care. It is certain to face aged beneficiaries with substantial reduction in the benefits they will receive under the legislation. The longstanding arrangements developed by many Blue Cross plans will be imperiled. The administration of the overall program will become enormously more complicated. The required total separation of the particular physician's services involved from the departmental costs of hospitals will require nationwide renegotiation of contracts between hospitals and specialists and between hospitals and third party agencies. The effects will most likely be extended overall to hospital patients.

We strongly urge the reinstatement of the services of these specialists as a part of hospital services in the legislation you finally pass.

EDWIN L. CROSBY, M.D.,
Executive Vice President,
American Hospital Association.

DR. PAUL A. MILLER, PRESIDENT, WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY, ADDRESSES AMERICAN HOME ECONOMICS ASSOCIATION ON "POVERTY AMIDST AFFLUENCE"

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, the American Home Economics Association, whose headquarters are in Washington, D.C., sponsored a national workshop on working with low-income families at the University of Chicago, Ill., Center for Continuing Education, March 15–19, 1965. The association represents 23,500 members of the home economics profession, working in education, business, research, extension service, and health and welfare.

The workshop subject has been a part of the basic philosophy of the American Home Economics Association since its inception in 1909. Nationally recognized authorities on the problems of low-income families addressed 200 leading home economists. The purpose was to examine contributions the home economics profession can make in breaking the poverty cycle.

Dr. Paul A. Miller, dynamic president of West Virginia University, Morgantown, was the keynote speaker. Other participants included Dr. Allison Davis, professor of education, University of Chicago; Dr. Oscar Ornati, professor of economics, the graduate faculty of political and social science, New School of Social Research, New York City; Mrs. Esther Peterson, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs and Assistant Secretary of Labor, and Dr. Frank Riessman, associate professor, department of psychiatry, Albert Einstein College of Medicine, New York City.

Mr. President, Dr. Miller's address, entitled "Poverty Amidst Affluence," contains important statistics and information about the one-fifth of this Nation's population living in substandard conditions and his recommendations concerning the elimination of impoverishment will be of interest to all individuals who share the administration's concern for a workable solution to this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POVERTY AMIDST AFFLUENCE: AN OVERALL VIEW OF POVERTY IN CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN SOCIETY

(By Paul A. Miller, president, West Virginia University)

In a time of ever-narrowing specialization, it is important to consider whether the generalist or the specialist should make decisions on broad policy matters that cut across the dividing lines of specialties. The specialist, himself respectful of specialized knowledge, is often reticent to claim such global wisdom for himself. The generalist, if he is reticent at all, is by definition not in full possession of the facts; that, or he is respectfully deferential to the specialists. Fortunately, social progress does not necessarily become stymied in the untangling of this paradox; people are just too complex in their responses for that. Fortunately, too, the politics of these matters is responsive to the constant sifting and winnowing of fact and opinion, of countervailing powers, and wide perspective in decisionmaking. Then, somebody somewhere must take a great gulp of air and set out across the uncharted seas of specialized knowledge making observations built on facts and a grasp of wholeness. He knows that the eventual political decision will be a compromise; he hopes that it will be broad enough to accommodate contingencies, narrow enough to be practicable, the result of a pooling of facts from many specialties with public ramifications that are unspecialized. The point, then, is to form a coherent picture from a mass of detail. And so it is with one who speaks upon the very broad subject of poverty in contemporary American society.

The romantic rediscovery of poverty in the United States, a portion of the domestic inquiry that is a timely and necessary diversion from the more frustrating complications of promoting international development, has brought with its sentiment and oratory a searchlight on accumulating mountains of research data. The work of hundreds of social scientists on the causes and spread of poverty has suddenly become valuable as the grist for local and Federal programs collectively and sensationally described as a "war." The call to arms, sounded by John Kenneth Galbraith, Michael Harrington, and others, moved John F. Kennedy to initiate a broadly based Federal program aimed at the annihilation of poverty in the United States. The program continues with a new vigor in the Johnson administration. Through the causation, one fact is clear: none of this would be possible were it not that the American public is in a mood of receptivity to government programs attacking the causes of poverty. The iron is hot. The danger is that we may be tempted to strike too quickly, that we create false expectations, that insufficient years and resources will be allocated to the task, and that we shall seek a cure by treating symptoms. By pointing to the evident pitfalls of a crash program against poverty, I am attempting to define it as a phenomenon occurring amidst affluence.

The poor are always with us, the Victorian said with a shrug, and that was that. The outlook was characteristically Victorian until the 1930's. The coming of the depression with its one-third of a nation without sufficient soil to till or machines to tend brought to a stop the entire economy; our smugness about massive unemployment crashed with it. A prewar, war, and postwar economy absorbed the slack, and the nation yet was free to debate seriously the classical economic theory of "free" enterprise. But the technological and organizational revolution beginning in the late 1940's brought an end to that. Then we developed a new vocabulary for poverty: instead of temporary unemployment, we had structural unemployment, underemployment, the obsolescence of men and resources, an underclass, insular poverty and, finally, the other America.

As Christopher Jencks has pointed out, up to 1963, Americans spoke of the underprivileged, the deprived, the disadvantaged, the discriminated against, and about all those with low incomes in depressed areas. Poverty was euphemized, its misery softened. But early in this decade, poverty became recognized as a culture; today, its continued widespread existence in the midst of affluence threatens anew the growth of the Nation's economy.

At the same time, the limits of technology are nowhere in sight, and cybernation is both a promise and a threat. There is a frightening spector of larger pools of permanently unemployable people, a stagnating economy, urban blight, and rural decay, increasing juvenile delinquency, and the gradual shift from a military-oriented economy to a consumer-oriented economy, with all its discontinuities in the world of employment. The American body politic is rightfully alarmed and prepared for decision and action. This conference and similar ones across the Nation testify to this fact.

The statistics are well enough publicized. One-fifth of this Nation, the richest in history, lives in poverty. An arbitrary figure, yet, but a conservative one. Twenty-two percent of the poor are nonwhite, and nearly one-half of all nonwhites live in poverty. The heads of over 60 percent of all poor families have only a grade school education. One-third of all poor families are headed by a person over 65, and almost one-half of families headed by such a person are poor. Of the poor, 54 percent live in cities, 16 percent on farms, while 30 percent are rural nonfarm residents. Over 40 percent of all farm families are poor, and more than 80 percent of nonwhite farmers are poor. Less than half of the poor are in the South; yet a southerner's chance of being poor is roughly twice that of a person living in the rest of the country. One-quarter of poor families are headed by a woman; but nearly one-half of all families headed by a woman are poor. There are more than 9 million families in the United States whose family incomes are below $3,000 per year. Over 11 million of these family members were children, one-sixth of our youth. Moreover, 5.4 million families, containing more than 17 million persons, have total incomes below $2,000.

Paradoxically, a majority of the poor are employed: infrequently, to be sure, and in the most menial of tasks, but nonetheless they do not appear in the statistics on unemployment, nor are they widely eligible for welfare benefits. On the other hand, about half of the 4 million workers who are unemployed at any given moment are members of families with total incomes of $4,000 or more. The unemployed, as one writer describes them, are the elite of the poor. They are persons who have skills, but may have been displaced by new technology. They have known better times, and they are eligible for the retraining programs that occur most frequently in the cities, where most of them live. However, among both unemployed and underemployed are those who either have given up looking for work or have given up looking for something better. There is no accurate way of determining the extent of resignation to poverty by these persons, but its significance is quite obvious.

What is poverty? Michael Harrington remarks that "A definition of poverty is * * * a historically conditioned matter. It would be possible to prove that there are no poor people in the United States, or at least only a few whose plight is as desperate as that of masses in Hong Kong." But his point is simply stated: "In a nation with a technology that would provide every citizen with a decent life, it is an outrage and a scandal that there should be such social misery."

Poverty is now recognized as a national problem, and national means are being used to attack it. The most auspicious antipoverty plan is the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, the basic purpose of which is to create new jobs and to train people to fill them. The Job Corps, work-training and work-study programs, urban and rural community action programs, employment and investment incentives, all are part of the administration's war on poverty.

The economic theory underlying these programs seems to be based on the assumption that a national economy expanding fast enough, faster than our present annual growth rate, will absorb unemployed workers and upgrade the jobs of those who are underemployed.

However, there is a lively debate about whether this assumption is correct. Some economists build a quite persuasive case for increased welfare programs on the counterassumption that any economic expansion will absorb no more workers than new technology will displace. Chief among them is Robert Theobald, the prophet of the age of cybernation. He proposes nothing less than a radical change in the national outlook toward work. Looking into the future, he sees the time when man will no longer be required to live by the sweat of his own brow. He estimates that roughly 10 percent of the work force may become capable of producing all the goods and services needed by the entire population. His proposal is for a guaranteed annual income to every citizen, based on need rather than on one's marketable skills.

Needless to say, such proposals are controversial, and will be for a long time to come. They ask nothing less than a radical redefinition of the ethic of work. It is questionable, therefore, whether such proposals can be more than visionary at this time. The close relationship between individual dignity and an honest job is deeply imbedded in the American way. Whether it is so deeply imbedded that it cannot be changed remains to be seen, and the inquiries of people like Theobald deserve widespread discussion and debate.

Until such time as there is a radical change in the national outlook in these matters, the only road open to political relevance is one of basic conservatism—the gradual and persistent grinding away at poverty through accepted means. This means that ways must be found to stimulate the general economy, and that people must be taught to meet the world of work with skills. These hopes are reflected in the Annual Report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers in 1964. As strategy, the Council advocates moving into the broad front of fighting discrimination, improving regional economies, rehabilitating urban and rural communities, improving labor markets, expanding educational opportunities, enlarging job opportunities for youth, improving the Nation's health, and promoting adult education and training.

Some of these notions are incorporated into the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964. While the greatest promise of the act is that it emphasizes education as a weapon against poverty, its major observable accomplishment has been the awakening an affluent Nation to the seriousness of its poverty problem.

Curiously, John Kenneth Galbraith has been criticized for isolating poverty into two camps: insular and case poverty. Although these terms are not comprehensive, as Gunnar Myrdal and Harrington have shown, they throw light on discussions about Appalachia, the deep South, the northern border regions, and rural and urban pockets everywhere. But regardless of any shortcoming, Galbraith's "Affluent Society," by being a best-seller, helped to create a climate that has made possible the Area Redevelopment Act, the Economic Opportunity Act, and the Appalachian Development Act.

However, it remains to be seen whether the administration's poverty package will effectively engage the misery of the poor. The present commitment is clearly too shallow in outlay, but it would be senseless to discard it for what it lacks. As President Johnson frequently says, "Half a loaf is better than none; in fact, a slice is better than none."

A crash program cannot accomplish everything, but it is a good beginning. The roots of poverty run deep; but unlike a tree, poverty cannot be killed by sawing it off at the ground.

Long ago, Gunnar Myrdal spoke of the vicious circle of poverty, a theory of circular causation. Stated simply, poverty breeds poverty. Its symptoms are a lack of aspirations, illiteracy, indifference to self-betterment, cynicism about economic alternatives, and occasional hostility to change. The poor, like the rich, band together for support. Unlike the rich, once in the ghetto the poor are immobile. They find no ways in their own lives to break out of the vicious circle, and society offers little help to them apart from frequent appeals to conscience, morality, and ambition, which are assumed to be a sort of involuntary reflex.

What is poverty? Neither statistics nor definitions can tell the story. You have to see it. You have to look into the eyes of a raggedy child to see the harshness already growing deeply inside. You have to see the fear under the resolute setting of the lips. You have to feel something inside yourself. You have to see yourself as having sprung from the same soil as this child. You have to smell the stink of poverty, know its brutality, and the brutes it makes of those who live in it. But even though you hate the stink and you fear the brutality, you can't really understand what poverty and its handmaidens of illiteracy and mental retardation really are. Some have done so and have expressed it well. Foremost among them is James Agee, who produced a book with Walker Evans, the photographer, called "Let Us Now Praise Famous Men." To read it is a terrifying experience because it is an utterly new and unimaginable world that exists within its pages. Although the book was written in 1936, and its subject is three tenant families in Alabama, it is neither ancient nor regional history. The masks may be different today, and the poor harder to idealize now than they were in 1936, but the poverty of the mind and spirit is unchanged:

"These children, still in the tenderness of their lives, who will draw their future remembrance, and their future sorrow, from this place: and the strangers, animals: for work, for death, for food: and the scant crops: doing their duty the best they can, like temperless and feeble-minded children: rest now, between the wrenchings of the sun.

"O, we become old; it has been a long, long climb; there will not be much more of this; then we will rest; sorrow nor sweating nor aching back, sickness, nor pity, hope gone, heaven's deafness; nothing shall take or touch us more: not thunder nor the rustling worms nor scalding kettle nor weeping child shall rouse us where we rest: these things shall be the business of others: these things shall be the business of our children, and their children; we will rest."

That is the vicious circle.

Liberals may be high minded about poverty, or conservatives high handed about it. It is possible for one to love or to hate the poor, but it is utterly impossible for one not to love their children. To use a word of political currency, this is where we find "consensus" about attacking poverty. It means that present efforts may relieve the misery of the poor, but their greater effect is to eliminate the chance that the children of today's poor will grow up to be poor themselves. The vicious circle of poverty must be broken at the point where the most victimization occurs: in children.

Poverty is not a matter which most individuals are capable of solving by themselves. It is a public problem requiring public solutions. But to be effective, the public policy must stir the minds and feelings of the electorate to the extent that programs will be given adequate support from the public treasury, at Federal, State, and local levels. There are fundamental issues of communication involved, because there would surely be more evidence of action, particularly at State and local levels, if the public were better informed of the facts.

Historically it is true that when this Nation is alarmed, it is capable of accomplishing virtually anything. As a people, we support to the limit any and all demands upon national security. We finance the landing of rockets on the moon, and hang the expense. When hundreds of laboratories carry on fantastically costly research into subjects about which the taxpayer understands nothing, there is no complaint. In fact, the public clamors for more; in the name of science and national image, nothing is too expensive.

We are notably lavish with pets, automobiles, and organized sports, but we seem incapable of transferring this largesse to unfortunate people. A case in point is our historical indifference to the plight of the American Indian—this despite several decades of public study and discussion. Even more deplorable, and despite more than a half century of public guilt, it takes the threat of revolution by the American Negro to make the Nation act.

It leads one to wonder whether the current national commitment to the poor will amount to more than a romance. As Allan Nevins remarked, "The United States throughout its history has carried a grinning ape on its shoulders—the ape of complacency." Let us hope that this time it shall be different.

What, then, does the critic offer as a program?

First, if our commitment to the elimination of poverty is to mean anything, it must be accompanied by massive support in dollars, ideas, and energy, with an objective of actual solution. What we have seen thus far is almost negligible in proportion to the problem. Public policy, when it is timidly financed, always is piecemeal. No one knows how much the entire war will cost in money, brains, or activity, but we can ill afford not to invest to our limit—which is nowhere in sight.

However, once substantial and continuing support is assured, there is a very real danger of waste. For instance, the recent poverty legislation will allocate funds to the States and through them to the local communities. This may please the hearts of those who fear Federal control, but the point is that the communities most in need of outside support are least capable of using it wisely. They lack the organizing skills and technical knowledge necessary for comprehensive planning and action programs. The absence of such leadership and competence at the local level makes it questionable that imaginative plans will be forthcoming from those requesting support. There is a wide gulf between the public planning expertise of the Federal Government and the States. Accordingly, new ways must be explored whereby poor communities and poor States may obtain the services of experts in many fields as a prelude to public spending. Part of the answer may lie in the establishment of regional systems of cooperative activity whereby experts may be shared among several States to formulate statewide development strategy.

Second, ways must be found to put this support behind the building of institutions: schools, universities, libraries, and adequate health, welfare, and counseling services in every community where they do not now exist. It is necessary that support be generous for community physical improvements—sewage disposal systems, roadbuilding, urban and rural community building renewal—but a greater emphasis should be placed on the development of institutions. If we have learned anything about economic and social development, it is that investment in human institutions is more important than investments in hardware. This is yet another call for a massive assault—a comprehensive and organized program that will improve existing institutions while creating new ones. The keystone is the educational system.

The classic studies of Theodore Schultz and others, as well as years of experience at home and abroad, leave little doubt about the preeminence of education within the entire development enterprise. We know that poor schools tend to follow poor people. And although they cannot do the task in a vacuum, schools are the very heart of the model community. I speak of new kinds of schools, to be sure: schools offering limitless variety without meaningless activity; schools recognizing that each child is entitled to be educated to the limit of his abilities whether they be in carpentry, housewifery, or neurosurgery. I speak of school-related institutes whose chief obligation is that of preparing young people in technical skills, in the crafts, and in the practice of effective community citizenship.

One of the curious aspects of underdeveloped communities, in this country and abroad, is that they tend to deemphasize educational attainment at the intermediate levels. One reason is that Western culture tends to be success-oriented. Students who are highly capable of learning according to prescribed patterns glide along a smooth track with rewards at each stop along the way. But what of those who are not so intellectually gifted? Large gaps exist in the structure of education in which there are few turning-off points for students of varying motivations, aptitudes, and financial means. At its core, the American educational system harbors some peculiarly undemocratic notions of class and caste. Indeed, the best minds must be nurtured and guided to the heights of the educational process, but my point is that our responsibility is just as great for accommodating all the rest. Once we remove from our schools the notion that the unsuccessful, unskilled, and unprepared may be dumped into the community, we will have found the basis for a truly American school system.

As with adequately financed development activity of all kinds, the temptations are strong to pump money into existing organizations in hopes of a miracle. But it just won't happen. Instead, what we need is some intensive national planning on how to send a barrage of fresh ideas and teaching competence into every underdeveloped community and region in the Nation.

The triumphal success of the program in Prince Edward County, Va., is sufficient basis for optimism. You will recall that in 1959 Prince Edward County closed its public schools. A private academy for whites was opened and financed by the State. The Negro children were offered no schooling until 1963, when several private foundations granted enough money to operate semiprivate schools for 1 year.

A daring, imaginative administrator was hired, and he put together a staff of teachers firmly committed to the task. The children were offered free clothing, meals, and medical attention. Then, into the schools was brought a variety of old and new devices: ungraded classrooms, team teaching, books by the hundreds, emphasis on reading skills, unfixed goals, skepticism of standardized testing, variable class sizes, avoidance of rote assignments and yes-and-no questions, extensive use of audiovisual techniques and educational television. The school day and week lengthened, and the children were exposed to the arts in music, plays, films, and brief trips to urban centers. In short, they received a year's glimpse of the outside world.

In just 1 year, the results were far beyond expectations. Many students achieved 4 years' learning in 1; in fact, some were able to enter college.

If such a program were instituted on a permanent basis, with supporting community services for work training, health and welfare, there is no limit to what might be accomplished. Although a number of pilot programs would be necessary, at a later stage the program would be extended and enlarged to include regions. New devices of consolidation would be established, and school administration would be assisted from the shackles of underfinancing and established rigidity.

I envision no new bureaucracies, either at Federal or local levels. The public support should follow new ideas and the newer concepts of educational experimentation, with the Government role being much like that of a private foundation.

Third, emerging facts of family life need to be incorporated into community and State services. Solon T. Kimball speaks of the nuclear family vis-a-vis the corporate community, and analyzes the lack of institutional flexibility between them. While the schools and many community service agencies continue to idealize the family unit, as though the family were the focus of all American life, quite the opposite approach would come closer to the realities of contemporary society. If Kimball is correct, the community is becoming the dominant arbiter of values and ambitions. It is in the community that the family acquires its aspirations, not the other way around. These notions suggest to me a need for fewer fixed assumptions about the autonomous pervasiveness of family life.

Anachronistic too is our division of vocations by sex, according to a fixed assumption of appropriateness. Hospitals go begging for nurses, yet few men respond to this calling for which they are admirably well suited. There is a national shortage of professional domestic help—another vocation which men are certainly as well qualified to enter as women. Another paradox is that while the public schools cry out for competent teachers, untold thousands of college-educated American housewives spend their days scrubbing floors and diapering children. In recent years we have seen a breaking up of the ancient proposition that a mother must devote all her time to her household, but the news has not permeated the public school systems, most of which dislike to employ part-time teachers. Meanwhile, the mothers and the schools suffer, not very silently.

Other ancient assumptions deserve reexamination. To facilitate the inevitable transition of youth from the home into the community, new devices should be attempted, including community nursery schools for the children of working mothers and public boarding schools for children from slum areas. It is reasonable to expect that the community of the future will assume many of the roles traditionally assigned to the family. In fact, to advocate otherwise is to speak for an agrarian ideal that is utterly untenable in a corporate, interdependent society.

Fourth, we should saturate poor localities with an endless variety of cultural impressions. We need more libraries circulating more books, statewide educational television networks, and greatly magnified participation of local people in the creative and performing arts. Books, magazines, and newspapers must be gotten into every home. In short, youth and adults should be barraged with facts about the world apart from the home and the ghetto. Show them the richness of occupational alternatives—these become the avenues of escape.

A new intelligence about mobility is indicated. It seems almost heretical to say it, but one of the most predictable characteristics of an underdeveloped community is a strong kinship system. Frequently, however, social mobility is regarded, even by professional people, with the disdain for a social evil, making all the more difficult the up-rooting of rural people from uneconomical family-size farms, and minority groups from urban ghettos. People are taught to endure poverty for love of one's own soil—provincialism, to be sure, with a certain Faulknerian hopelessness. Tenacity is an admirable quality, indeed, but pathetic when there is so little about a place worth loving. The most wretched poverty seems to associate with the strongest ties to place.

Accordingly, a strategy against poverty will include the encouragement of mobility, with social agencies bearing more of the responsibility for counseling before moves and paying the relocation costs. The advantages and disadvantages need to be pointed out, and the people prepared for the consequences of either moving or remaining. It should be made clear that, for most, remaining will be axiomatic with a minimum standard of living, few opportunities, and the danger of the unbroken cycle for one's children.

Fifth, I propose that the Nation set out to actually eliminate poverty in a definable geographic area or within a single culture group. The best example of the former is Appalachia, of the latter, the American Indian. What a testing ground both would be for ideas and men! But apart from the dramatic aspects of such programs, this approach would challenge to the core that inscrutable maze of halfway objectives and less than halfway solutions of the corporate society.

No one inside or outside this creature of American organizing genius is quite certain who has responsibility for results. Evaluation is impossible, pragmatism reduced. Put in a billion dollars and a few million trickle down, here, there, and everywhere, so diluted and dispersed as to be almost imperceptible. But confine the goals within certain limits of activity, expect results within a given time—which is to say, fix responsibility—and the possibilities for success are far greater than they would be in the typically far-flung administrative program.

Something of this nature will be attempted under the Appalachian Development Act, with its program for building roads. Limited through the program is, 10 years from now there will be something to show for the investment, and it is a necessary requirement for development in a region relatively isolated from surrounding territory. We in Appalachia are hopeful that this strategy will eventually be applied to the building of institutions, thereby making development likely in fact as well as in name.

In the second example, the American Indian provides what is perhaps the most wretched case of American forgetfulness and complacency. Culturally deprived, isolated, politically expendable, the Indian is an uncomplicated and dramatic example of poverty amidst affluence. We have studied him and his culture exhaustively, publicly suffered guilt over his ravishment, pitied his tragic loneliness, and then done almost nothing to help him. Nearly invisible within his vast forsaken reservation, the Indian is now viewed with clinical detachment. Indeed, Americans can be brutal in their neglect of speechless minorities. If we are truly serious beneath all our talk, there could be no better place to begin, no better place to focus all we know about eliminating poverty and then to carry it through to completion. It is not necessary to say that the methodology gained here would be of inestimable value to poverty programs everywhere.

Finally, all the discussions and planning about effective ways for eliminating poverty will not matter much if the people most deeply involved are unable to persuade a majority of the American people that it is unnecessary for poverty to persist amidst affluence; that it can be eliminated; that we have the resources for the task; and that it is a moral commitment.

I close with a passage from John W. Gardner: "The renewal of societies and organizations can go forward only if someone cares. Apathy and lowered motivation are the most widely noted characteristics of a civilization on the downward path. Apathetic men accomplish nothing. Men who believe in nothing change nothing for the better. They renew nothing and heal no one, least of all themselves. Anyone who understands our situation at all knows that we are in little danger of failing through lack of material strength. If we falter, it will be a failure of heart and spirit."

SHORTAGE OF SEASONAL FARM LABOR

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I know of the desperate need in Virginia for temporary workers to harvest our apple crop, a need which has been met in the past only through the use of imported workers.

Virginia and other States are threatened with the loss of this type of assistance at harvest time by an arbitrary decision of the Secretary of Labor that he can persuade unemployed domestic workers, most of whom know nothing about farmwork, to take to the fields and orchards across the country and harvest a variety of crops as they mature.

As I say, I know what we face in Virginia, but I wanted to find out what the situation would be in the State of Washington. I sent a telegram of inquiry to Mr. J. W. Bloxom, manager of the Washington Fruit & Produce Co., Yakima, Wash., asking whether there would be enough domestic workers to harvest the apple crop in his State. Let me read from his reply:

> In answer to your telegram, I can assure you this State did not have enough domestic workers this past season to harvest a small apple crop in a timely manner * * *.
>
> To forecast what is going to happen next fall calls for an expression of opinion rather than stating facts on the last season's harvest. The same group of men from the Washington State Employment Security Department, at Olympia, referred to in the first paragraph of my letter to you of March 29, told me in that same conversation they felt we would be even shorter of domestic apple harvest help this coming fall than we were last fall if we have a normal crop. In fact, they forecast a progressively more difficult time in the coming years securing domestic workers for our apple harvest.
>
> I could not assure you of their willingness to state these opinions to you in writing, but I am asking them at this time for that. As you know, their salaries are paid by the U.S. Department of Labor, although they are employees of the State of Washington, and I would doubt their willingness to publicly take a stand contrary to that of the U.S. Department of Labor.

Now, we have abundant evidence of the power of a Cabinet officer to force all who depend on him for their jobs to support his point of view, regardless of the facts and the evidence. But no Secretary can successfully command the apples to stay on the trees, or the row crops to remain in suspended animation in the fields until he has completed his experiment of trying to persuade inexperienced, unemployed city people to go into the countryside and bring in the harvest.

Secretary Wirtz is gambling with crops that are not his, with farm income that does not belong to him, and with perishable produce prices that he seems determined to force upward, to the distress of all consumers.

Bureaucratic managers in Communist countries have made themselves the laughing stock of the free world by imposing arbitrary controls and theoretical policies on agriculture, then rushing cadres of ill-trained and poorly prepared city dwellers into the fields in a desperate effort to retrieve their errors of judgment. To see such a sorry spectacle repeated in this country is an appalling prospect, but that is what we face if Secretary Wirtz persists in telling experienced growers across the country that he can run their fields and orchards better than they can.

A COSTLY REVERSAL IN POLICY

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, in the opinion of a good many experts—and I have been hearing from them in my mail—administration proposals to readjust the formula for cost-sharing assistance in soil conservation work stand as a threat to many of the accomplishments achieved during the past quarter of a century.

The effort to shift 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance from Federal financing to local or landowner financing, if approved by Congress, could well mark the beginning of the end for a program that is one of the most worthy ever to be adopted in this country.

Immediately, it would mark a massive reduction in the work now being undertaken to conserve our valuable soil and water resources. In the distant future it could mean a return to those dreaded and dreary days of the past when the black clouds of dirt swirled over what was called the Dust Bowl.

Mr. President, I would hope that all Members of the Senate make it a point to familiarize themselves with the attempt underway to cutback activities of the Soil Conservation Service. For I am convinced that if this mandate to reduce SCS activities and virtually shortchange the technical assistance program is successful now, it will mean the erosion of this important program will have set in, and the effort to end erosion of our valuable resources will be going out.

Mr. President, the March 20 issue of the Farmer magazine and the March 19 issue of the Drovers Journal contain editorials on this important subject. They are worthy of the attention of the Senate, and I request permission to include them in the RECORD, followed by a statement which I issued on March 23 in my newsletter report.

In addition, Mr. President, I ask that following my newsletter report there be printed two excellent editorials from South Dakota newspapers on this important subject. The first is entitled, "Soil, Water, Saving Need Still Urgent" and was published in the Aberdeen American-News of Aberdeen, S. Dak., of which Henry J. Schmitt is editor and publisher, and E. J. Karrigan, associate editor. The second is entitled "Mother Nature Emphasizes Need for More Soil Conservation," and it appeared in the Daily Plainsman published in Huron, S. Dak., by Mrs. Robert D. Lusk.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Farmer magazine, Mar. 20, 1965]

WILL FARMERS HAVE TO PAY FOR SCS HELP?

Proposed in the President's budget is that farmers share the cost of technical assistance they get from Soil Conservation Service personnel in mapping terraces and contours, and in planning pond dams and other soil and water savings structures. It is estimated the farmers' share of such services will total $20 million.

The proposal is made as soil and water conservation district leaders are calling for increased support for projects designed to conserve soil and water. Also it is made at a time when the President himself is urging development of rural recreation facilities so that in the Great Society all Americans may enjoy outdoor recreation.

The President's penuriousness on the one hand doesn't jibe with his largess on the other.

If streams and lakes are to be suitable for recreation, they must not be depositories of silt from unprotected land. And the land to be protected is privately, not publicly owned land. "The simple arithmetic of land ownership in the United States," according to the National Association of Soil and Water Conservation Districts, "dictates that the lion's share of the conservation job ahead will be on privately owned lands" because more than 70 percent of the Nation's land is in private ownership.

What it appears is overlooked in the budget message is that soil and water conservation measures are not designed by SCS personnel simply to make farming more profitable for the individual landowner at the expense of the public. The service is publicly sponsored to conserve soil and water so the

American public is assured a continuing and abundant food supply at reasonable prices. That is soil conservation's chief function. Its other function is to prevent floods and the fouling of lakes and streams.

If flooding along the Nation's great rivers is to be prevented or reduced, efforts at prevention must start in the far back reaches of the watersheds that feed the rivers. Contour planted crops, terraces, grassed waterways, structures across gullies, and other devices must be used to hold water where it falls or prevent its rapid runoff. And although the individual landowner does profit from such devices, it should not be overlooked that the resident far downstream also profits.

If the Congress does OK the President's cost-sharing proposal, it is likely that the best land will get the best treatment, and the poor land will be ignored. This is to be expected because the farmer whose hilly land is extremely low in organic matter and therefore most subject to erosion is least likely to employ the services of SCS technicians. And yet it is his unprotected land that makes most trouble for downstream dwellers and is most responsible for the silting of lakes and streams.

[From the Drovers Journal, Mar. 19, 1965]

MUST WE CUT SOIL WORK?

While we are strong for economy and the elimination of needless spending in the operation of the Federal Government, the proposal by the Johnson administration of a sharp cutback in funds expended for soil and water conservation and the small watershed program leaves us cold.

The possibility that Congress will be asked to approve such a cut arose when the Bureau of the Budget suggested recently that a $20 million reduction be made in the Soil Conservation Service budget allocated to technical help in the conservation districts. Under the plan, landowners and operators in SCS districts would be required to pay up to 50 percent of the cost of any technical assistance in applying soil and water conservation practices on their lands. The money so paid in would go into a "revolving fund" for technical services.

We don't like the idea because we believe this abrupt shift in what has been established soil conservation policy for 30 years would seriously reduce the soil and water conservation work on privately owned farms all over the Nation. That, in our view, would be a serious mistake. If anything, the intensifying cultivation practices of modern farming call for increased soil conservation work, not less, if we are to leave a legacy of good topsoil to future generations.

Soil conservation officials over the Nation—who serve out of a sense of duty, not for salary—estimate that if the combined revolving fund and $20 million budget cut proposal goes through, soil work might be cut as much as 50 percent from present activity. This is only a guess, of course, but we would agree that under present circumstances, farm and ranch income simply could not absorb an additional load for technical soil assistance. The net of it in most cases would be that the project would be given up, or at least postponed indefinitely.

Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, told the Senate recently that "the administration's shortsighted proposal, calling as it does for payment for technical assistance, would discourage many farmers and ranchers from establishing enduring conservation systems on their land, because they simply cannot afford this additional expense."

In addition, the Senator said, such retrenchment in the Soil Conservation Service program probably would have a snowballing effect. "Abandonment of the Federal Government's traditional policy of providing technical assistance would be taken as a cue by others," he said. "It no doubt would be followed by decreased State and local appropriations and contributions to this work, which, including contributions of private groups and individuals, now amounts to approximately $44 million a year."

Senator QUENTIN BURDICK, of North Dakota, took a similar stand on the Senate floor, saying he believes such action "would strike a very serious blow to conservation work just at a time when this administration has rededicated itself to a new and vigorous policy of conservation and the beautification of our country." He quoted C. R. Guthermuth, vice president of the Wildlife Management Institute, to the effect that "slashing appropriations in the face of expanding population and accelerating needs is false economy. It will result in deterioration of valuable soil and water resources, increased rural poverty and the weakening of an otherwise strong nation."

Congress is under pressure from the administration to find places for trimming the big Department of Agriculture budget. We are certain there must be more appropriate places than in basic soil work, which is truly our "bread and butter" for the years to come.

A COSTLY REVERSAL IN POLICY

Out of the devastation that was the Dust Bowl of the 1930's came a pledge, "to never let it happen again," and action, through soil and water conservation work, to make sure those dirt-ridden bone-dry days remain a thing of the past. Soil conservation districts were formed and a most successful partnership of Federal-State-local cooperation was brought into play to conserve and protect our precious soil and water resources. Congress, through the Soil Conservation Service, has provided funds for skilled professional assistance—out on the land where it is needed. The States have provided the legal mechanism, and funds for other phases of the work. The local people have provided the organization, the leadership and the coordination. Individual participants have provided most of the fnuds required to carry out conservation programs on their land. Nothing approaching this cooperative effort at all three major levels of our Government has been accomplished before in the United States or anywhere in the world. As to the Federal Government's role—it has been a proper one. It has helped the local people carry out their own program. It has provided only the assistance that the local people cannot provide for themselves.

That worthy program to end the waste and preserve our land and water resources—of which two-thirds of the conservation job remains to be done—is in grave danger today. The administration now wants to shift 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance from Federal financing to local or landowner financing. This proposal is also tied up with a proposed reduction of $20 million in the SCS budget allocated for technical help to soil conservation districts. The recommendation comes at a time when the current workload requires more than 1,500 additional man-years of technical assistance. What happens if the plan goes through?

Officials of the Nation's nearly 3,000 soil conservation districts—people who serve out of civic duty, not for salary—believe soil and water conservation work now being accomplished would be reduced by as much as 50 percent. The proposed cut and change represents about one-third of the present technical help of the SCS in districts. If the administration action—which would also reverse congressional policy of more than 25 years—is successful, it will mark a step backward that could come back to haunt future generations because this generation failed to measure up to its proper stewardship of our soil and water resources.

[From the Aberdeen (S. Dak.) American-News, Mar. 27, 1965]

SOIL, WATER SAVING NEED STILL URGENT

Farmers in North and South Dakota and elsewhere during the past third of a century have become accustomed to Uncle Sam as an influential partner in their agricultural operations. The Government programs which included Federal controls of individual farm management have been variously interpreted as being good, tolerable or bad.

Regardless of how farmers and others view the results, Government programs have been and must continue for some time to be vital factors in agricultural operations. The change in programs that made farmers dependent upon the Government must be gradual to permit adjustment without financial penalty to the agricultural regions.

One suggested change, that is almost unanimously opposed in areas where its benefits have been universally praised, concerns the Soil Conservation Service.

South Dakota was one of the first States to know its advantages and one of Brown County's conservation districts—still operating effectively—was one of the first in the Nation.

Some of the pioneers in making that partnership program, between Federal and State Government and the landowner, work so successly are still active, still pointing to the necessity of continuing the conservation of water and soil for the benefits of future generations.

Some who faithfully devoted years of their lives to voluntary service in the interests of water and soil conservation died in the belief they had helped prove a program that would never die, but would become increasingly important as the world produced more mouths to feed.

As the Soil Conservation Service program was set up during the years of the drought, duststorms and depression, the Federal Government provided technical services; the States the authorizing legislation for the creation of conservation districts plus some administrative funds; and the landowners paid most of the funds needed to carry out the conservation work on their farms.

During the 30 years the program has been in operation it has helped minimize the damage of drought and erosion. The program has been one of the stabilizing influences in agriculture.

The current proposal that alarms farmers and farm area residents comes from President Johnson's Director of the Budget. It is that 50 percent of the cost of technical assistance be shifted from the Federal Government to the landowners and that the SCS budget for technical assistance be reduced by $20 million.

Some critics of this proposal, including Senator KARL MUNDT, Republican, of South Dakota, say it would place the Soil Conservation Service program in grave danger at a time when two-thirds of the job remains to be done. He said the administration program would have a snowballing effect. Abandonment of the Federal policy of providing technical assistance would be taken as a cue by State and local participants.

Dakotans certainly will support—and the Department of Agriculture should heed—Senator MUNDT's contention that "although we have harnessed the atom and are conquering outer space * * * our way of life, our American dream, and our future prosperity and welfare as a nation still rest upon an agricultural resource base."

"No legislation, no budget cuts," Senator MUNDT argues, "can change the fact that under all is the land, and that how we manage that land and its resources of soil, water, timber, and wildlife will largely determine what tomorrow will be for all of us."

What is done about soil conservation makes the big difference in America's challenge to feed and clothe a rapidly expanding population. There is still need for instruction and encouragement in crop rotation (to prevent soil depletion), contour plowing (for sloping land), drainage and other tested techniques.

The soil conservation program is needed today as much as it was 30 years ago. It must not be discouraged.

[From the Huron (S. Dak.) Daily Plainsman, Mar. 3, 1965]

MOTHER NATURE EMPHASIZES NEED FOR MORE SOIL CONSERVATION

Mother Nature, this past winter, emphasized the folly of the administration proposal to cut back America's soil and water conservation programs.

This emphasis came in the form of sweeping winds which caused a 50-percent increase in soil erosion in the November 1–March 1 winter season. This sharp increase was reported on the heels of the administration's planned cuts in soil conservation funds which could precipitate a 50-percent reduction in the present soil-saving programs.

The Department of Agriculture estimates 3,142,000 acres suffered extensive wind erosion, compared with damage to 2,087,000 acres the previous winter.

South Dakota's wind damage was placed at 35,221 acres, almost a seven-fold increase, and North Dakota's at 18,730 acres, about twice the loss of the previous year.

But hardest hit by the winds sweeping over the plains was Texas where 1.8 million acres were damaged by winter winds.

The toll of lost crops has not yet been computed in dollars and cents, nor has any estimate been made of permanent loss of crop production from these eroded acres.

That more than 3 million acres were damaged by wind in one winter points out the necessity for more conservation, not less, and supports the estimate that two-thirds of the Nation's cropland—888 million acres—needs conservation treatment.

Senator KARL MUNDT, a long and consistent supporter of soil and water conservation, termed the administration proposal a break of faith with the "dust bowl" era pledge "never to let it happen again."

Calling the budget cut a backward step, Senator MUNDT declared the protection of our soil and water resources to be more imperative now than ever. The current workload alone requires 1,500 additional man-years of technical assistance to farmers and ranchers willing to invest in conservation.

If Congress permits the administration's $20 million cut in the Soil Conservation Service budget to stand, it will signal the abandonment of a 25-year-old policy of fostering conservation. Soil conservation programs, since their start, have cost the Nation's taxpayers $10 billion. But the efficiency of production fostered by this investment has saved the same taxpayer many times this amount of money in the cost of food that he must buy.

To abandon the war against soil erosion in a shortsighted effort to provide money for a questionable attack upon poverty, will in the long run work a financial hardship not only upon farmers but upon every American consumer, who eventually will be forced to spend an increased portion of his income for food.

CONGRESSMEN NARRATE PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE ON CONTRIBUTIONS OF GI BILLS

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, as time progresses, this Nation becomes more and more aware of the contributions which the World War II and the Korean GI bills have made to our country. Although 11 million individuals and our entire Nation have been benefited by these two bills, we are now faced with a situation where hundreds of thousands of able men and women who have sacrificed from 2 to 4 years of their lives in the protection of this great country, are left with minds unchallenged and talents ignored. These are the cold war veterans.

Many of these people are merely numbers in the columns of unemployment statistics, when they could be economically valuable individuals in the broadening stream of intellectual and technical progress. We who are in a large measure responsible for the future of America cannot continue to allow this inexcusable waste of democracy's most precious resource—the unfettered mind. The cold war GI bill (S. 9) will allow us to tap this vital intellectual resource and to move forward, just as did the GI bills of World War II and the Korean conflict. Why should we who have reaped direct rewards from these prior investments now refuse to provide for the advancement of the cold war GI? There is no just reason.

Mr. President, responses to a questionnaire which I sent to the freshmen Members of the House of Representatives indicate that 61 percent of the new Congressmen who replied to the inquiry have received educational benefits from one of the two previous GI bills. To emphasize the contributions to their careers which these bills have made, I ask unanimous consent that some of their remarks be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the remarks were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Congressman JOHN J. GILLIGAN, of Ohio: "I taught literature for 5 years in a university after the war and three-fourths of all my students were beneficiaries of the GI bill. It is my conviction that the money expended by the Federal Government in the contributions made to our society in government, business, and education by young men who are able to develop more fully their skills and talents through the educational provisions of this magnificent legislation. It would be hard to calculate just how much of our recent economic boom has been due to the superior skills of these well educated young men, millions of them, but the GI bill must surely be reckoned to be one of the most productive investments of the taxpayers money in the history of this Nation."

Congressman ELIGIO DE LA GARZA, of Texas: "I think the money spent by the Government on the GI bill has been returned 10,000-fold."

Congressman BARBER B. CONABLE, JR., of New York: "I went to law school not only under the GI bill but also under a full expense scholarship."

Congressman GALE SCHISLER, of Illinois: "Tremendous benefit because of my age and the fact that I was married and had one child before my graduation from college."

Congressman JOHN R. SCHMIDHAUSER, of Iowa: "The GI bill was a great contribution to our entire society."

Congressman JOSEPH P. VIGORITO, of Pennsylvania: "Probably I would not have received my master's degree without the GI bill."

Congressman DONALD J. IRWIN, of Connecticut: "Not only was it [the GI bill] helpful to me, but it allowed me to get an education with many fine men who would not have gone to college at all if not for the bill. I also instructed many men as an instructor of Spanish at Yale. I was a 20-year-old sophomore teaching men in their thirties who had won battlefield commissions."

Congressman ED REINECKE, of California: "As a disabled vet [10 percent] I had additional benefits—feel a responsibility to return the favor or part of the cost."

Congressman JAMES H. SCHEUER, of New York: "While I personally would have been able to continue my education uninterrupted even had there been no GI bill of rights, I am sure that for the vast majority of veterans, the GI bill either made possible or certainly accelerated, the education of many veterans who have since made outstanding careers for themselves in public life."

Congressman LLOYD MEEDS, of Washington: "I feel the GI bill [particularly the educational benefits] was the most significant legislation imaginable."

NEW YORK TIMES SUPPORTS CREATION OF GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS NATIONAL PARK

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the New York Times, probably the Nation's leading newspaper, has recently published a very fine article outlining the many reasons why it is important for the people of the Nation that the Guadalupe Mountains in Texas be preserved as a national park. The Guadalupe Mountains comprise one of two areas proposed for national park status by President Johnson; the justification is well stated by the author of the New York Times article, Charles Layng, when he refers to the "often fantastic beauty of timbered slope and canyon" found there.

To better acquaint the Congress and the public with the nature of this unique area, I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD the article entitled "Potential National Park for Texas," by Charles Layng, from the New York Times of March 28, 1965.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 28, 1965]

POTENTIAL NATIONAL PARK FOR TEXAS

(By Charles Layng)

EL PASO, TEX.—With dramatic effectiveness, the massive dome of El Capitan, in the Guadalupe Mountains of west Texas, looms over a sweeping, four-lane highway. It can be seen for 75 miles on a clear day, and, out in this arid country, one can rely on clear days almost all of the time.

El Capitan is the southernmost peak of the Guadalupes. It is backed by Guadalupe Peak, which at 8,751 feet, rates as the highest point in Texas.

This is one of the 12 areas, involving 750,000 acres in various sections of the country, that President Johnson would like to see become national parks. The Guadalupes lie 115 miles east of El Paso, and just over 500 miles west of Dallas, but the building of U.S. 62–180 has made them comparatively accessible.

The ride along the road skirting the eastern and southern rim of the mountains is awe inspiring. It also is a trifle forbidding, because the surrounding land is so arid. But the real spirit and the beauty of the Guadalupes lie in their vast interior reaches, where the majestic, dour splendor gives way to a more intimate and often fantastic beauty of timbered slope and canyon.

MASSIVE WALLS

From the desert below, one can have no idea of the huge and lovely forest of Ponderosa pine and Douglas-fir situated in the "bowl" above. That comparatively flat area of several thousand acres stands at an elevation of about 7,500 feet, and is surrounded by massive walls and high peaks.

The mountains are laced and interlaced with canyons of all descriptions. The most spectacular of all are North and South McKittrick Canyons, which come together, rather like a grand finale, to form McKittrick Canyon itself.

A geologist, Wallace Pratt, has already donated 6,000 acres of the main canyon country to the National Park Service, and it is presently being administered as a part of Carlsbad Caverns National Park. The rest of the Guadalupe Mountain area in Texas belongs to J. C. Hunter, Jr., of Abilene.

FOSSIL REEFS

Mr. Hunter, and his father before him, went to great pains to keep this unusual wilderness area in its original state. The mountains are composed of Permian marine limestone, and contain what geologists have called one of the most extensive and significant fossil reefs in the world.

There are few trees in the desert area, but the mountain slopes are covered in many places with Texas walnut, Texas madrone, hackberry, gray oak, juniper, limber pine and big tooth maple, as well as a bewildering variety of cacti. Occasionally, too, there is a clump or two of quaking aspen and Gambel oak.

Largely through the efforts of the elder Mr. Hunter, there is teeming animal life in these mountains. In 1926, he imported 44 Rocky Mountain elk, and now there are nearly 400 of them.

Although it was thought that big-horn sheep, once common on the Guadalupe peaks, had been completely exterminated, a herd of them was spotted last summer high on the slopes of El Capitan. There is also a herd of about 2,500 mule deer; they are scattered through the high-land canyons and the rolling country at the base of the range.

Of the smaller animals, bobcats, racoons, skunks, squirrels, coyotes, gray fox and porcupines are quite common. An occasional bear and a few mountain lions are also found. However, they are probably on their way somewhere else, since they are not thought to be natives of this area.

WILD TURKEYS

Bird life is abundant, and wild turkeys, which were "planted" 10 years ago, have now become well established.

Although the Guadalupes were frequented by the Spanish in the 16th century, it was not until 1849, when routes to California's goldfields were being sought, that American citizens became seriously interested in the area.

In 1858–59, despite the dangers from the Mescalero Apaches, the Butterfield-Overland Mail Line was established. It carried passengers between St. Louis and San Francisco.

An overnight stop called Pinery Station was set up, and later became a military subpost to protect travelers. The station was abandoned in 1881, but it is still standing. In fact, it is the only remaining station of the old Butterfield stageline that is situated on a transcontinental highway, in this case U.S. 62–180.

LEFT NO REMAINS

Since the Mescalero Apaches did not construct anything, and depended entirely upon game and wild plants for their livelihood, they left no archeological remains. In the last few years, however, evidence has turned up indicating the presence of a pre-Indian civilization in these mountains at least 6,000 years ago.

This vast area is still, to a great extent, unknown. Prospectors have wandered through, but they have been surprisingly few in number in view of the many rumors of Spanish treasure and gold mines hidden away in the box canyons.

CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES POSED BY S. 1564, THE VOTING RIGHTS BILL

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, this is the first of a series of statements I shall make on S. 1564, the administration's voting rights bill, which I believe constitutes an unprecedented and clearly unconstitutional encroachment on the right of the States to fix voter qualifications.

Let me make clear at the outset that my opposition to S. 1564 is based solely on constitutional grounds. I believe, as I think all Americans of good will believe, that all qualified citizens of all races should be permitted to register and to vote, and that any person who interferes with another's right to vote, on account of race or color, should be prosecuted to the full extent of the law. I have repeatedly admonished the Justice Department for its failure to vigorously enforce existing Federal voting laws, which, I believe, are adequate to secure to every qualified citizen of any race the right to vote in any Federal election.

I may point out, Mr. President, that there are already more Federal laws protecting an individual's right to vote than there are to protect any other right. Remedies available under these laws include the following:

First. Any citizen may bring a suit for damages against any election official who denies him the right to vote—42 U.S.C. 1983.

Second. Any citizen who alleges he is wrongfully denied the right to vote may sue in Federal court, without a jury, to prevent the denial of that right—42 U.S.C. 1971.

Third. Any election official, anywhere in the United States, who denies any qualified voter his right to register and to vote is punishable by fine and imprisonment—18 U.S.C. 242.

Fourth. Any election official who conspires with another to deny any citizen the right to vote is subject to a fine of $5,000, or imprisonment for 10 years, or both—18 U.S.C. 241.

Fifth. The Attorney General may sue in the Federal courts for an injunction at any time any person is engaged, or there are reasonable grounds to believe he is about to engage, in any act designed to deprive a person of his right to vote—42 U.S.C. 1993.

Sixth. If a Federal judge finds a pattern of discrimination pursuant to the 1960 Civil Rights Act, he may appoint Federal voting referees to replace local officials—42 U.S.C. 1971.

Seventh. The 1964 Civil Rights Act provides that all voting cases be expedited, and that everyone with a sixth-grade education shall be presumed to be literate—42 U.S.C. 1971.

It is my belief that discrimination in voting could be eliminated in a relatively short time through forceful prosecution of existing laws, and that, therefore, no additional legislation is necessary. If, however, it is felt that additional legislation is needed to implement fully the 15th amendment, I am impelled by my oath as a Senator to uphold the Constitution to do my utmost to assure that such legislation not dilute the authority of the Constitution.

I would support any proposed legislation which was consistent with the 15th amendment itself and with the other provisions of the Constitution, and which operates fairly against all States alike. But S. 1564 is not such legislation. It is patently unconstitutional in its utter disregard of the fundamental principle that the States have the sole right to prescribe voter qualifications. Moreover, it is a harsh, highly discriminatory bill, designed to punish certain Southern States and to exclude other States, thereby constituting regional legislation, rather than the general, national legislation which it should be if it is necessary at all. In short, the bill constitutes a discriminatory Act of Congress designed to end discriminatory acts of others.

I feel that it is most unfortunate, Mr. President, that the administration has undertaken to pressure Congress into taking precipitous action on this ill-advised bill. Furthermore, it is ironic that only 15 days have been allowed for consideration of it in committee, whereas, according to the Attorney General, the administration had been working on the bill since December, and obviously had not completed it at the time of the President's special message to Congress. The fact that S. 1564 was drafted in haste and passion is borne out by the technical inconsistencies within it, as well as by the injudiciousness and arbitrariness of the formula proposed to establish the presumption that the 15th amendment has been violated by some States.

There can be no doubt that the Constitution vests the power to establish the qualifications for voting in both Federal and State elections solely in the States. Section 2 of article I provides that the voters in each State for members of the national House of Representatives shall have the same qualifications as those prescribed by the State for voters for the members of the most numerous branch of that State's legislature. Similar provisions are made in section 1 of article II and in the 17th amendment with respect to voters for the President and for U.S. Senators. Every Supreme Court decision on the subject has held that these provisions prohibit the National Congress from affirmatively prescribing voter qualifications; and I challenge the Attorney General or anyone else to point to one decision to the contrary.

The fact that Congress has been felt to have no such power is evident from the fact that, since the ratification of the Constitution, all attempts by the Federal Government to change voter qualifications have been made by constitutional amendment. The 15th amendment expanded the franchise to include persons who had previously been denied the right to vote because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude; and the 19th amendment extended the franchise to women. In fact, the 1959 report of the Civil Rights Commission recommended that if State literacy tests were to be abolished, that should be done by constitutional amendment. Not until 1961 did the Commission execute its remarkable turnabout and recommend legislation, instead of a constitutional amendment; and it did this in the face of an unbroken line of Supreme Court decisions holding that Congress may not by legislation bar or limit the right of the States to make literacy a qualification for voting.

In *Lassiter* v. *Northampton County Election Board*, 360 U.S. 45 (1959), the U.S. Supreme Court unanimously held that my own State's literacy test, which is simple and objective in nature, and applicable to all races alike, does not violate any provision of the Constitution of the United States. In short, the Supreme Court held that, as part of its policy, a State is entitled to require of the electorate some minimum standard of education and may, therefore, prescribe a literacy test as a prerequisite to the exercise of the franchise.

The constitutional power of the States to establish literacy tests and other qualifications for voting in both Federal and State elections is admittedly subject to the limitation, prescribed in the 15th amendment, that no State may deny or abridge the right of a citizen to vote on account of race or color. Section 2 of the 15th amendment provides that Congress may enforce the prohibition by appropriate legislation.

The proponents of S. 1564 argue that it is constitutional on the ground that it is intended merely to prevent violations of the 15th amendment, not affirmatively to legislate voter qualifications. However, section 3(a), the provision which determines which States and counties are to be affected by the bill, contains no reference whatever to any denial or abridgement of the right to vote on account of race or color, which is the foundation of the 15th amendment. Instead, section 3(a) merely sets forth the arbitrary and indefensible criteria that only those States and counties shall be affected which had literacy tests in November 1964, and in which less than 50 percent of the adult population voted in the 1964 presidential election. There would be no necessity that any actual violations of the 15th amendment had been shown to have occurred. Moreover, no provision anywhere else in the bill would limit the operation of section 3(a) to enforcement of the 15th amendment.

The Attorney General, in his testimony before the Judiciary Committee, stated that the basic premise behind section 3(a) is that the use by a State of a literacy test and low voter participation in that State necessarily indicate that there has been discrimination in the administration of the literacy test, in violation of the 15th amendment. The absurdity of that premise is easily demonstrated by reference to my own State.

Almost 52 percent of all North Carolinians of voting age voted in the last presidential election. However, 34 North Carolina counties which voted less than 50 percent would be presumed to have violated the 15th amendment, merely because North Carolina has a literacy test. Bear in mind, moreover, that North Carolina's literacy test is a simple test of reading and writing, and was held to be constitutional in the case of Lassiter against Northampton County Election Board. In contrast, New York County, N.Y., which also has a literacy test, voted only 51.3 percent in the last election. Yet it is untouched by this bill, whereas Hyde County, N.C., which voted 49.7 percent, would be presumed to have violated the 15th amendment. How can it seriously be asserted that a presumption of voter discrimination can depend upon a failure by three-tenths of 1 percent to achieve 50 percent voter participation?

The absurdity of the presumption is further illustrated by comparing North Carolina with Texas, which has no literacy test. One hundred and thirty-seven counties in Texas voted less than 50 percent in 1964; but these counties are not covered by the bill. Only 44 percent of the eligible voters of Texas voted in 1964; yet the entire State would be deemed innocent of discrimination, simply because it had no literacy test. It is particularly interesting to note, in this regard, that 19 of the 34 North Carolina counties condemned by the bill had a higher voter participation than did the State of Texas. It is also noteworthy that the report of the North Carolina Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, for the period 1959–62, entitled "Equal Protection of the Laws in North Carolina," suggested—at page 38—that—

> the disproportionately low registration and low voting of Negroes in North Carolina is due more to apathy or * * * to poor schooling and poor school attendance than to election officials' arbitrary denial of the right to register on account of race.

These comparisons, as well as many more of a similar nature which I could outline if time permitted, demonstrate clearly that the formula in the bill for determining what areas are to be affected by it is illogical, discriminatory, and has no reference to violations of the 15th amendment upon which the bill is supposedly based.

The arbitrariness of the formula is further demonstrated by the fact that it relates only to the 1964 presidential election. On the basis of low voter participation in that election alone, the bill would condemn the States which had literacy tests, and would leave all other States forever presumed innocent and unaffected. Surely if the bill purports to enforce the 15th amendment, it should be flexible enough to combat discrimination wherever and whenever it appears. Under the present bill, a State such as Texas, which is not covered by the bill, because it had no literacy test on November 1, 1964, would never be affected by the provisions requiring the appointment of Federal registrars, even if it subsequently enacted a literacy test. Such a State would also not be required by section 8 of the bill to seek a declaratory judgment approving any new voting laws, as would the States affected by the bill.

Apart from exceeding the authority of Congress under the 15th amendment, S. 1564 also contains provisions which are contrary to some of the most basic principles of our Constitution. Section 3(c) provides that any State or county caught by the formula in section 3(a) may escape the Federal-examiner procedure only by obtaining, from a three-judge district court convened in the District of Columbia, a declaratory judgment to the effect that neither the State or county nor any person acting under color of law has, during the preceding 10 years, denied or abridged anyone's right to vote for reasons of race or color. By condemning an entire State for a single act of discrimination occurring as long as 10 years ago, the bill violates the spirit of the constitutional prohibition against ex post facto laws.

In addition, Mr. President, section 3(c) would slam shut the doors of every court in the United States to States covered by section 3(a), except the District Court of the District of Columbia. It does not seem to me that a bill which would compel a State to travel hundreds, or even thousands of miles at great expense to gain access to a court of justice would be a fair system of justice. Indeed, one of the reasons stated in the Declaration of Independence as justification for breaking the ties of the Colonies with Great Britain was "For transporting us beyond Seas to be tried for pretended offenses." I submit that there is very little difference in principle between that and requiring States to travel to the District of Columbia to assume the impossible burden of proving 10 years' innocence of voting discrimination. If such a suit must be entertained at all, I fail to see why a three-judge court sitting in Richmond, Va., or Charlotte, N.C., or Charleston, S.C., could not try the case with the same intelligence and integrity and the same dispatch as could the already overburdened District Court in the District of Columbia.

Rather than trespass further upon the time of Senators, I shall discuss other aspects of the bill in subsequent statements. I do, however, wish to state my conviction that this bill has many grave defects, and needs careful scrutiny. I have devoted a very great deal of my time to the bill since its introduction, and I still find new defects in it almost daily. I sincerely hope each Senator will carefully consider my remarks before making a final judgment on this bill.

OPPOSITION TO MEDICARE—RESOLUTION OF SIOUX CITY JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution in opposition to the medicare bill, adopted by the board of directors of the Sioux City, Iowa, Junior Chamber of Commerce and by a three-fourths majority vote of the general members in attendance at their regular meeting of March 30, 1965.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SIOUX CITY JAYCEES,
Sioux City, Iowa.

HON. JACK MILLER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The enclosed copy of a resolution duly approved by our organization is being forwarded to you, at the members' request, for your consideration.

Sincerely yours,

ELWOOD L. THOMAS,
President.

I do hereby certify that the following is a true and correct record of a resolution approved by the board of directors and general members of the Sioux City, Iowa, Junior Chamber of Commerce.

"*Be it resolved*, That by a vote of a majority of the board of directors of the Sioux City, Iowa, Junior Chamber of Commerce and a three-fourths majority vote of the general members in attendance at the regular meeting of March 30, 1965, the Sioux City, Iowa, Junior Chamber of Commerce is opposed to the present bill before the Congress of the United States known as medicare, and that we are opposed to Government intervention in any form of insurance program for the elderly."

ELWOOD L. THOMAS,
President.

Attest:

P. ERICKSON,
Secretary.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE EDWIN BORDEN BROADHURST, LIEUTENANT GENERAL, U.S. AIR FORCE

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, my colleague, the Senator from North Carolina, Senator JORDAN, joins me in a statement which I shall make at this time:

Yesterday, the Nation was saddened to learn of the untimely death of one of our most valiant and able military officers, Lt. Gen. Edwin Borden Broadhurst.

General Broadhurst was the distinguished son of one of North Carolina's most illustrious families. A man of great capacity and outstanding accomplishments, he was born on August 16, 1915, in Smithfield, N.C., where he attended public schools. Later, he attended The Citadel, in Charleston, S.C., and was graduated from the U.S. Military Academy in June 1937.

The death of General Broadhurst not only saddens those of us who knew him, but his loss will be greatly felt by the Air Force, where he had been Chief of Staff for the United Nations Command, and the U.S. forces in Korea.

General Broadhurst's reputation as an outstanding officer and able citizen is well known. His military career included assignments in the Philippines, Java, Australia, and New Guinea. He flew 20 combat missions against the Japanese in the early 1940's. He had been decorated with the Silver Star, Legion of Merit, Distinguished Flying Cross, Air Medal, and Purple Heart.

His postwar duties included service with the General Staff, in Washington, D.C.; Chief of the U.S. Military Mission in Chile; Chief of Plans, Strategic Air Command; Commander of the 5th Strategic Reconnaissance Wing; Commander of the 57th Air Division; Inspector General, Strategic Air Command; Commander of the 7th Air Division; and his most recent assignment as Chief of Staff, United Nations Command, United States forces in Korea.

General Broadhurst's career is one of the most outstanding in the history of the U.S. Air Force. Beginning as a second lieutenant in 1937, he moved quickly up the ranks. By 1963, he became the youngest lieutenant general in the Air Force; and he was the highest ranking officer from North Carolina on active duty. General Broadhurst was a modest and unassuming man of superior intellect and capacity. His accomplishments were many, and belied his years. This son of North Carolina was a worldly and sophisticated man; but he always remained a man of great humility and kindness, and one who never lost the common touch.

General Broadhurst is survived by his wife, the former Viola Suebert, of Cottonwood, Idaho; his three children, Edwin, Jr., age 20; Mary Ann, age 18; and Barbara Ellen, age 15; his sister, Mrs. Marvin Taylor; and his mother, Mrs. Mabel Borden Broadhurst, one of our State's most vibrant and attractive citizens, who at age 89, last year, was awarded the Smithfield, N.C., Citizen of the Year Award.

General Broadhurst is known to a number of Members of Congress; and I am certain that each of them who knew him personally and by reputation joins Senator JORDAN and me in expressing to his family and to those who have known and worked with him throughout the world, the sympathy and appreciation of a nation grateful for his services.

AID BY RUTHERFORD, N.J., TO HAZARD, KY.

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. Mr. President, last week, I witnessed a heartwarming example of personal involvement in a national problem—a fundraising affair which was unique, original, and noteworthy for its purpose and results.

Over 20 tons of clothing, food items, and medical supplies were corralled in Rutherford, N.J., with the help of the citizens of Rutherford, and, in particular, the Girl Scouts from Bergen and Passaic Counties, to complete the VFW Post No. 227's "Operation Hazard."

"Operation Hazard" is a relief project, undertaken by the VFW Post No. 227, to bring purpose and hope to the meaningless lives of some 6,000 residents of an impoverished environment camouflaged in the poverty of southeastern Kentucky. The target of this miniature "war on poverty," Hazard, Ky., seems ironically named, when we consider the $800 per capita family income, and the firsthand account of Edwin Smith, post commander, Ted Galka, and Robert Brentlinger, who reported children in a family alternating days going to school because of the lack of shoes for everyone in the family.

I ask unanimous consent that my remarks at the VFW fundraising dance be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILLIAMS OF NEW JERSEY BEFORE VFW POST NO. 277, RUTHERFORD, N.J., MARCH 27, 1965

Having been a member of the VFW post in Plainfield, let me say that I have never been prouder to be a member of this great organization than I am tonight. The great effort you have made on your own initiative which is in accordance with the President's program on antipoverty deserves the highest praise. I have been to Hazard, Ky., and smelled the stench of slums and farms. I have seen children who have never had shoes to wear. I have seen their homes with little shelter and less food.

For 5 years I have been working on the problems of the most impoverished people in the Nation. Last week, Sargent Shriver announced an $8-million program to aid the migratory workers in sanitation, housing, and education. This has all emerged from the committee work that I have been doing.

To Commander Ed Smith, chairman of "Operation Hazard," Bob Brentlinger, Vincent McGrath, Ted Galka, and Bill Walsh, and all of you—my congratulations.

OPPOSITION TO REORGANIZATION OF THE ARMY AND AIR FORCE RESERVE—RESOLUTION OF RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution, adopted by the Reserve Officers Association, in opposition to the reorganization of the Army and Air Force Reserve.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESERVE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
DEPARTMENT OF IOWA,
Iowa City, Iowa, March 31, 1965.

Senator JACK MILLER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: The department executive council of the Reserve Officers Association of the State of Iowa, representing approximately 800 members, passed the following resolution unanimously at a recent meeting:

"The Department of Iowa Reserve Officers Association fully supports the national headquarters of the Reserve Officers Association in their past, present, and future efforts in opposing the reorganization of the Army and Air Force Reserve and that the appropriate congressional committees be kept informed of these efforts."

Sincerely,

R. H. DENNING,
Commander, U.S. Naval Reserve.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I move that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate and made the pending business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 800) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

SUMMARY STATEMENT ON CIGARETTE HEARINGS

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, the hearings just concluded before the Commerce Committee on S. 547 and S. 559 have been concerned with two basic questions: First, is cigarette smoking a definite health hazard; second, if so, is Federal remedial action required and what should it be? I would like to summarize some of the material presented during these 2-week hearings and to make a few observations.

THE HEALTH ISSUE, IS IT REAL?

No useful purpose would be served by my itemizing the testimony of each medical witness appearing at the hearings. No member of the Commerce Committee is a doctor, medical researcher, or statistician. For us to try to distinguish fine points of argument between witnesses would be an exercise of limited value, for we lack their expertise. But we can evaluate the social consequences of their conclusions.

The most authoritative statement on cigarettes and disease is the report of the Surgeon General's Advisory Committee on Smoking and Health, which concluded that "cigarette smoking is a health hazard of sufficient importance in the United States to warrant appropriate remedial action." Buttressing this conclusion, the witness for the American Public Health Association testified that in the last 11 years 65 professional health organizations, medical societies, governmental health agencies and research organizations have reviewed the evidence regarding the relationship between smoking and disease. Every one of these groups has voiced agreement with the Advisory Committee. Among those associated with this hazardous health link are: the American Medical Association, the American Cancer Society, the American Heart Association, the American Thoracic Society, the Canadian Medical Society, the British Royal College of Physicians, the President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke, and State medical associations, including many of special interest to the members of the Commerce Committee; that is, the medical associations or societies or boards of health from Alaska, Kansas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Ohio, Vermont, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Washington, Nevada, and Oregon. The collective support which these bodies have given to the smoking and disease thesis is awesome, to say the least.

I have already included in the committee record copies of surveys taken nationally in Britain and the United States and within my own State of Oregon on the smoking habits and beliefs of doctors, demonstrating a dramatic decline in their cigarette smoking. I would now like to add two more State surveys, from Rhode Island and Florida. The Rhode Island survey was taken even before the Surgeon General's report was published and yet it still shows that only one out of three physicians smoked cigarettes. Of those who did not smoke, over half had been cigarette smokers but had stopped. Three out of four of these did so because of scientific evidence or occurrence of adverse symptoms. The Florida survey was taken last year and showed that 97 percent of the physicians believed smoking of cigarettes to be a health hazard. Only 30 peercent still smoked cigarettes and 45 percent had given them up.

Lung cancer received a good deal of attention in the hearings. This is natural, for the direct tie between smoking and this disease has been suspected for a long time and the causal relationship is so well documented. For example, Dr. Diehl, of the Interagency Council, testified that at least 80 percent of lung cancer deaths are attributable to smoking. Dr. Aurbach made a powerful impression on several members of the committee as he described his research and results.

But testimony by the specialist medical organizations endorsed the even broader health problems raised by cigarette smoking. A spokesman for the Public Health Service listed several diseases as responsible for unnecessary and premature deaths attributable to smoking: coronary, lung cancer, bronchitis, emphysema, and cancers of the oral cavity, esophagus, larynx, and bladder. These deaths are increasing.

Questions were raised about the role that air pollution rather than cigarettes might be playing in the incidence of cancer. The remarks from the representative of the American Cancer Society are instructive here:

> Environmental exposure being a factor in increased incidence in cancer is something that has been known for a long period of time. We do not deny this. We do not say that this is not significant and hopefully should be corrected. The cigarette is one of the principal causes of lung cancer, but not the whole cause.

And after all, as one of the witnesses unsympathetic to the two bills pointed out, if air pollution is shown to be a definite cancer cause, cigarettes certainly must be as well.

Those who would seek comfort in the language of the Surgeon General's report that the Advisory Committee was unable to come to any firm conclusions about the causative role of cigarette smoking and cardiovascular disease will not find relief in the results of the Albany and Framingham studies subsequent to the report. So convincing is the evidence now available to heart specialists that they instructed the American Heart Association to present a direct relationship statement to the Committee.

The Surgeon General's report concluded that "cigarette smoking is the most important of the causes of chronic bronchitis in the United States and increases the risk of dying from chronic bronchitis and emphysema." The American Thoracic Society spokesman announced at the hearings that "an exhaustive study" had been concluded recently by the society which further confirmed the findings of the report.

In summary, what has the overwhelming bulk and authority of the medical community said about smoking and disease? They have testified that evidence has been accumulating for several decades on cigarette smoking and its effects on the human body. In every field of medicine where the evidence has indicated a relationship between smoking and disease, a witness from the national organization of specialists in that field has come before the Commerce Committee to declare that cigarette smoking is a serious health hazard and to recommend that Congress take remedial action.

I find these declarations convincing. I am impressed by the number and language of resolutions filed from international, national, State, and local medical associations expressing similar views. It seems significant to me that when the doctors of this Nation were polled, over 90 percent of them agreed that cigarette smoking is a health hazard, and that so high a percentage of them have discontinued smoking cigarettes.

I realize that, even after all the evidence which I find so conclusive is before us, not everyone will agree. The testimony and questions heard these last 2 weeks illustrate this. I would like to express my appreciation to Drs. Clerf, Greet, and Burford, as the elder statesmen, for their opinions, which do not happen to be shared by any of the blue-ribbon juries of scientists mentioned at the hearings. Unfortunately, neither they nor the other medical spokesmen opposed to the Senate bills have had any original data contrary to the findings listed above. These doctors do not seem to have put forward any studies with controls, or any objections of opinion that have not been stated again and again, and found wanting by their own peers. Nevertheless, the long years of devotion by those same doctors to so many thousands of patients deserve from us honor and respect.

One of the most perceptive comments on why people hesitate to accept the unpleasant facts about smoking came from Dr. Hundley of the U.S. Public Health Service. He noted that if you drink poison, you know about it right away. If you ram your automobile into a telephone pole the results are obvious immediately. But the cause and effect of cigarette smoking are so far separated in time. If you smoke cigarettes, it may be 30 years before you find out that you have lung cancer or emphysema caused by your smoking.

There seems no doubt whatsoever, that cigarette smoking is at the very least suspected strongly enough of being a health hazard that countermeasures ought to be taken against it. In dealing with human life, it seems more prudent to assume that the established association between cigarette smoking and disease has causative meaning, than to suspend judgment until no uncertainty remains in the minds of anyone. If we procrastinate, if we try to buy time in the hope that some miracle will occur and the whole problem will disappear like a bad dream, the odds are overwhelming that the people of this Nation—and let us be frank about it, our own families and colleagues right here in the Senate who smoke—will have to pay a heavy price for our timidity.

WHAT REMEDIAL ACTION IS REQUIRED?

Very little need be said about the justification for congressional consideration of this health problem. Tobacco is one of the basic support crops. Over the years the Federal Government has contributed millions of dollars to price supports, to tobacco research for improved quality and yield, and through the conservation and extension services to tobacco farmers. Having promoted and sustained the development of the industry for so long, it does not seem illogical that the Government should now consider assuming some responsibility for alerting the Nation to the dangers of the habit the Government has and continues to promote.

Federal action being appropriate, what direction should it take? The Public Health Service is continuing research into human behavior concerning smoking, as an aid to determining how their smoking and health educational program should be conducted. The President's Commission on Heart Disease, Cancer, and Stroke recommended that "the sum of $10 million be appropriated to the Public Health Service over a 3-year period for a comprehensive national program of education and public information regarding the hazards of cigarette smoking. The program should be aimed at the education of children, adults, physicians, and educators with the assistance of State and local community agencies. A network of smoking control clinics should be provided to assist those who desire to give up smoking. New and more effective educational material should be developed."

Dr. Terry testified that the PHS is spending $3.2 million on research which has any relationship or any application to the question of smoking and health. Compared to the over $100 million the PHS is spending on all cancer research, this is not much, but it is better than nothing. The new budget requests include $1.9 million for a smoking and health education program and public information clearinghouse within the PHS.

The PHS in cooperation with the Department of Agriculture is conducting research into the technology of safer tobacco. Attempts are being made to isolate the incriminating agents in tobacco, with the hope that they might be removed. The combustion level of tobacco may be related to its danger and this is also under investigation, with the hope that it might be possible to raise or lower it within cigarettes to reduce the hazards. This research will take many years and unfortunately guarantees no happy solution.

I have been joined by Senator MAGNUSON in introducing bills which we believe are remedial and complementary to the educational and research programs just described. The two measures are very similar in intent. They would require a health warning statement on cigarette packages, provide for the quantitative identification on the cigarette package of incriminating agents in the tobacco, and either specifically or implicitly put Congress on record as acknowledging the conclusion of the Surgeon General's report that cigarette smoking is a health hazard meriting public attention and remedial action. S. 547 directs the Federal Trade Commission to establish standards and requirements for warning statements in cigarette advertising, whereas S. 559 makes no mention of advertising other than Federal preemption.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare is the major Federal agency charged with the protection of the public health. In its administration of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, the Federal Hazardous Substances Labeling Act, and other consumer protection legislation, it has interpreted its responsibility in labeling and advertising to mean that they should, in the interest of honesty and fair dealing, neither mislead nor fail to give the consumer the information concerning the product that he needs in order to make an informed decision. This is especially so where the product has a potential for harm.

The Federal Trade Commission is also charged with responsibilities in this field. Their regulations include a provision concerning the misleading and unfair aspects of labeling and advertising. Following the issuance of the Surgeon General's report the Commission applied their regulations to cigarettes and found that the methods by which cigarettes have been and are being sold to the consuming public—by means of labeling and advertising, which fails to disclose the health hazards—are deceptive and unfair to consumers under settled legal principles governing truth and fairness in advertising.

The Commerce Committee heard from the tobacco industry that such health hazard statements are punitive and unfair against a single industry. By any criteria of the public interest, such claims are patently fallacious. Cigarette smoking is a health hazard of such magnitude that it is actually punitive to fail to provide the public with warning statements. The tobacco industry may lose dollars, but the public is losing lives.

No member of the committee who spoke on the issue during the hearings nor any witness before the committee, appeared to believe that the inclusion of a hazardous warning statement on cigarette packaging would have either any or more than minimal effect on cigarette consumption. Perhaps the best justification for the labeling requirement came in an exchange between Senator BASS and Dr. Horn:

> Senator BASS. And you think that to put a label on the cigarette, more people would think cigarettes a major cause of lung cancer?
>
> Dr. HORN. I don't think that it is so much a placing of a label on the cigarette as the meaning of not having a label on the cigarette. The fact that no label exists on the cigarette today is interpreted by many people to mean that this is a perfectly safe and reasonably harmless product.

But as Senator COTTON noted, the effect of package labeling might soon wear off and he suggested that it was fully as important to do something about advertising as it was to label the package from the standpoint of trying to stem or control the habit. This goes right to the center of the problem. If the committee assumes that cigarette smoking is hazardous, then it is certainly logical that Congress give serious thought to endorsing action commensurate with our belief in individual liberties, which would have the ultimate effect of reducing cigarette consumption. As Senator HART remarked during these hearings:

> The only reason it would make sense to put in a warning, would be that the warning would deter.

The tobacco industry has indicated that they will be reluctantly willing to accept the package labeling, but this is presumably based on the assumption shared by everyone on the committee that such labeling will have minimal effect on consumption.

Yet reduction of consumption is of tremendous medical importance. Numerous studies have shown that persons who stop smoking cigarettes experience, within 5 years, a reduction of over 50 percent in the risk of developing lung cancer. Doyle and his associates show that whereas moderate to heavy cigarette smokers observed over an 8- to 10-year period experience three times as many attacks of coronary artery disease, persons who had stopped smoking had no greater incidence of heart attacks than did nonsmokers, indicating that there is a definite preventive effect in stopping smoking which is quite marked in this one disease.

It has been suggested that a warning statement in advertising is unnecessary in that other dangerous products, such as disinfectants which do carry a warning statement on the label, are allowed to be advertised without any reference to their danger being required. Two points can be made here concerning this very natural reaction. First, there is nothing harmful about the use of these other products when the directions on the package are followed. The labeling requirements are usually on how not to use the product, such as consuming it, or consuming more than the recommended dosage, or bringing it near to heat or flame. The evidence on cigarettes is different in one vital respect: even the most moderate smoking is considered hazardous to health. It is not a matter of improper use, it is a pure and simple matter of any use, and certainly to the level of consumption which is considered normal by the average cigarette smoker today.

The second point is that we have no desire to lessen the sale of disinfectants, only the improper use of them. Therefore, hazardous warnings in advertising would serve no useful public purpose. But when we accept the contention that cigarette smoking is hazardous to health, then it is in the public interest that the people be informed of that fact before they have the cigarettes in hand, so that they will hopefully respond by cutting down their smoking or eliminating it. There is still individual choice, but the social consequences of cigarette smoking and disease justify a warning statement on advertising.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two medical surveys referred to in the text of my remarks, an editorial from the New York Times of April 5, and a news item from the same newspaper of April 2 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the surveys, editorial, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Current Status of Cigarette Smoking Among Rhode Island Physcians

(By Thomas H. Murphy, M.D., and John T. Tierney, M.S.)

(NOTE.—The authors, Thomas H. Murphy, M.D., medical director, Division of Chronic Diseases, Rhode Island Department of Health, John T. Tierney, M.S., program and planning specialist, Rhode Island Department of Health.)

The physician, more than anyone else, is bombarded with articles in the medical literature on the relationship between cigarette smoking and cardiopulmonary disorders in general and cancer of the lung in particular. Furthermore, he is continuously exposed to the numerous resolutions published by scientific and professional societies condemning the use of cigarettes. The question naturally arises as to the impact of scientific evidence and thought on the cigarette-smoking habits of physicians themselves.

Previous studies conducted in Massachusetts by Snegireff and Lombard [1,2] and in England by Doll and Hill [3] have provided some information on cigarette-smoking habits of physicians.

In September 1963, the Rhode Island Department of Health, in cooperation with the Rhode Island Medical Society, conducted a mail survey on the current status of cigarette smoking among members of the society. The design of this survey was intentionally kept simple to encourage maximum participation of the society's membership. No attempt was made to collect data on the infinite combinations of variables, nor to meet exacting standards of statistical excellence. The survey was intended to answer easily and quickly the following questions:

1. How many Rhode Island physicians smoke cigarettes?

2. Of those who previously smoked cigarettes, how long ago did they stop, and why did they stop?

3. Is there any relationship between the age, medical specialty, or both, of smoking and nonsmoking physicians?

Of the 1,074 questionnaires mailed to members of the Rhode Island Medical Society, 752, or 70 percent, were returned. All returned questionnaires were suitable for inclusion in the study.

Table I indicates the responses by medical specialty to the question, "Do you smoke cigarettes?" Thirty-three percent of Rhode Island physicians who replied smoke cigarettes. This compares with 58.5 percent [4] of the adult male population. The degree of cigarette smoking within the medical specialties ranges from 10 percent among the dermatologists to 58.3 percent among a miscellaneous category consisting of public health, hospital administration, and industrial and physical medicine. The next highest percentage of cigarette smokers was among urologists at 53.8 percent, followed by obstetricians and gynecologists at 45.6 percent, neurosurgeons at 42.9 percent, and orthopedists at 40.7 percent.

Among all physicians, the breakdown shows that 33 percent smoke cigarettes, 35.8 percent stopped smoking cigarettes, and 31.2 percent never smoked cigarettes.

TABLE I.—*Cigarette smoking among Rhode Island physicians, by medical specialty, 1963*

Medical specialty	Total replies	Smokers		Nonsmokers	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
General practice	171	59	34.5	112	65.5
Internal medicine	113	31	27.4	82	72.6
Surgery	100	32	32.0	68	68.0
Pediatrics	60	14	23.3	46	76.7
Obstetrics and Gynecology	57	26	45.6	31	54.4
Neurology and psychology	56	20	35.7	36	64.3
Anesthesiology	31	11	35.5	20	64.5
Orthopedics	27	11	40.7	16	59.3
Otolaryngology	24	6	25.0	18	75.0
Radiology	18	4	22.2	14	77.8
Ophthalmology	14	4	28.6	10	71.4
Urology	13	7	53.8	6	46.2
Dermatology	10	1	10.0	9	90.0
Pathology	8	2	25.0	6	75.0
Neurosurgery	7	3	42.9	4	57.1
Miscellaneous [1]	12	7	58.3	5	41.7
Unspecified	31	10	32.3	21	67.7
Total	752	248	33.0	504	67.0

[1] Includes hospital administration, public health, industrial, and physical medicine.

Table II represents a tabulation of the cigarette-smoking status of physicians, related to their present ages. The general trend is for cigarette smoking among physicians to decrease with age.

A review of reports of studies of physicians' smoking habits conducted over the past 12 years indicates that cigarette smoking is on the decrease. This conclusion is further supported by data collected in relation to the number of years since physicians stopped smoking cigarettes. Physicians who have stopped smoking cigarettes 4 or more years previously represented 39.0 percent; 5 to 9 years, 21.9 percent; 10 to 14 years, 13.8 percent; and 15 or more years, 25.3 percent. In the last 12 years, 193 physicians, or 71.7 percent, stopped smoking cigarettes.

To the question, "Why did you stop smoking cigarettes?" most physicians gave multiple reasons. Table IV represents all reasons provided.

The most frequent reason given by the physicians responding can be categorized as scientific evidence and represented 42.5 percent of all reasons. This group gave reasons which acknowledge the deleterious effect of cigarette smoking on health. Many physicians indicated they were influenced by what they read in the medical literature and by what they observed in their own practices. Typical of physicians' comments under this grouping were: "overwhelming evidence," "wasn't worth the risk," "scared," "findings at various necropsies," "impressed by carcinogenic association," "convinced," "health reasons," "unhealthy habit," "preventive medicine," "physician's advice," "as an example to my patients," "following an illness." Most physicians' concern was not limited to cancer, but included a wide range of cardiopulmonary diseases.

Next in importance was the occurrence of symptoms, which accounted for 30.9 percent of all reasons provided. A complete listing of these symptoms and their order of frequency can be found in table V.

TABLE II.—*Cigarette smoking among Rhode Island physicians, by age, 1963*

Age	Total	Smokers		Nonsmokers	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Under 40	163	60	36.8	103	63.2
40 to 49	209	79	37.8	130	62.2
50 to 59	205	69	33.7	136	66.3
60 to 69	102	29	28.4	73	71.6
70 and over	65	9	13.8	56	86.2
Unspecified	8	2	25.0	6	75.0
Total	752	248	33.0	504	67.0

TABLE III.—*Summary of findings reported on cigarette-smoking habits of physicians, 1963*

Study reported by—	Year	Place	Percent smokers	Percent nonsmokers
Doll and Hill [1]	1951	England	87.3	12.7
Snegireff and Lombard.	1954	Massachusetts.	51.8	48.2
Do	1959	do	38.5	61.5
Murphy and Tierney.	1963	Rhode Island.	33.0	67.0

[1] Limited to physicians over 35 years of age and includes all forms of smoking.

TABLE IV.—*Reasons given by 269 physicians as to why they stopped smoking cigarettes, Rhode Island, 1963*

Reason [1]	Number	Percent
Scientific evidence	160	42.5
Occurrence of symptoms	116	30.9
Nonhealth related	45	12.0
Lack of satisfaction	35	9.3
Self-discipline	20	5.3
Total	376	100.0

[1] Many physicians gave multiple reasons.

TABLE V.—*Symptoms [1] which caused physicians to stop smoking cigarettes*

Symptom	Number	Percent
A. Respiratory	71	61.3
Chronic cough	51	----------
Dyspnea	9	----------
Chronic irritation of throat	6	----------
Postnasal catarrh	2	----------
Rhinitis	2	----------
Paroxysmal sneezing	1	----------
B. Neurological and sensory	16	13.8
Impairment of taste and smell	9	----------
Headache	3	----------
Slight tremor	2	----------
Tinnitus	1	----------
Nervousness	1	----------
C. Cardiovascular	15	12.9
Angina pectoris	6	----------
Tachycardia	5	----------
Extra systoles	1	----------
Hypertension	1	----------
Intermittent claudication	1	----------
Auricular fibrillation	1	----------
D. Gastrointestinal	7	6.0
Hyperacidity	6	----------
Abdominal cramps	1	----------
E. General malaise	7	6.0
Total	116	100.0

[1] Some physicians listed multiple symptoms.

Most physicians indicating they stopped smoking cigarettes because of the occurrence of symptoms jubilantly reported that, upon the withdrawal from cigarettes, the symptoms disappeared. Such comments as "feel fine now," "have been like a new man since," "I feel so good I'll never smoke again," were common.

---

[1] Snegireff, L. S., and Lombard, O. M.: "Survey of Smoking Habits of Massachusetts Physicians," New England J. Med. 250: 1042, June 17, 1954.

[2] Snegireff, L. S. and Lombard, O. M.: "Smoking Habits of Massachusetts Physicians; 5-Year Followup Study (1954–59)." New England J. Med. 261: 603, Sept. 17, 1959.

[3] Doll, R., and Hill, A. B.: Mortality of Doctors in Relation to Their Smoking Habits; a Preliminary Report." Brit. M. J. 1: 1451, June 26, 1954.

[4] "Teen-agers and Cigarettes." Changing Times, March 1962.

Non-health-related reasons accounted for 12 percent. Such comments as "to get my wife to stop," "burned holes in my clothes," "changed to cigars," "liked my pipe better," "wasn't ladylike," "as a routine, every 3 or 4 years," "on a bet," "because of religion," "husband couldn't stand smoking," "a stupid habit," "just stopped—no reason," "expense involved," "increases in taxes" were included in this category of responses.

Another significant category was lack of satisfaction and accounted for 9.3 percent of the reasons. Such comments as "never really enjoyed it," "always hated it," "no more pleasure in it," "got disgusted with it," "didn't care for it any more" were listed.

The last significant group of reasons listed was self-discipline and accounted for 5.3 percent of the reasons. Such comments as "unable to control the habit," "to prove that I could," "didn't want to be dependent on them," "wanted to see if I could stop," "smoking too much," and "rebellion to being a slave" were representative of responses in this category.

TABLE VI.—*Primary reason [1] given by 269 physicians for having stopped smoking cigarettes, by age at which they stopped, Rhode Island, 1963*

Age	Scientific evidence	Occurrence of symptoms	Self-discipline	No satisfaction	Other non-health	Total	Percent of all age groups
Under 40	36	26	4	21	19	106	39.4
40 to 49	29	28	4	6	10	77	28.6
50 to 59	16	25	1	2	9	53	19.7
60 and over	9	11	1	3	2	26	9.7
Total	[2] 92	[2] 92	10	[2] 33	[2] 42	[2] 269	[2] 100.0
Percent of all reasons	34.2	34.2	3.7	12.3	15.6	100.0	----------

[1] When multiple reasons were provided, first reason was used.
[2] Totals include responses for which age was not specified.

It was considered of value to relate the ages at which physicians stopped smoking cigarettes to the reasons why they stopped. One might expect the younger physicians to be more influenced by scientific evidence and the older physicians by the occurrence of symptoms. Table VI shows this tabulation.

SUMMARY

In the fall of 1963, a survey was conducted to determine the current status of cigarette smoking among Rhode Island physicians. The results of this survey indicate that 33 percent of the physicians smoke cigarettes. Of the 67 percent who do not smoke cigarettes, 35.8 percent smoked and stopped, and 31.2 percent never smoked.

Scientific evidence and occurrence of symptoms are the most frequent reasons given by physicians for giving up cigarettes.

This study and a review of previous studies indicate that cigarette smoking among physicians is on the decrease. To further support this conclusion, it might be well to conduct a similar survey in the fall of 1968.

SEVENTY PERCENT OF FLORIDA PHYSICIANS ARE NONSMOKERS

The Florida Committee on Smoking and Health requested the Florida State Board of Health to plan and conduct a survey to determine the smoking habits of Florida physicians. The Florida committee is composed of the following agencies: the Florida Medical Association, the Florida State Board of Health, the State Department of Education, the American Cancer Society, Florida division, the Florida Heart Association, and the Florida Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association.

Accordingly, a letter explaining the survey and enclosing a postal card questionnaire was mailed on April 22, 1964, to 5,864 Florida physicians. Response from the physicians was excellent and prompt. Thirty-four hundred and sixty-seven or 60 percent of the physicians returned the questionnaire. Not included in the tabulations are 166 additional responses received after the cutoff date when the data study was completed. Perusal of these late replies indicates that they do not differ from those tabulated.

The questionnaire postal card was simply designed to encourage maximum participation and to supply the following information: Specialty, age, county, smoking habits, average daily consumption of cigarettes by the smokers, if stopped how long and why, opinion as to health hazard of smoking, the effects of the Public Health Service report on smoking and what advice the doctor gives to patients about the smoking of cigarettes.

Careful study of the various specialty groups by age and percent distribution indicates that the distribution of the respondents was not significantly different from the physician population of the State by age and specialty.

No attempt has been made to study the nonrespondents, as the physicians were not asked to sign the cards. Nor was there any attempt made to apply intricate statistical methods to the data.

STATUS OF CIGARETTE SMOKING

Among the 3,467 physicians who responded to the questionnaire 25 percent never smoked, 45 percent smoked but have now quit smoking, and 30 percent are now smoking. In table 1 physicians are distributed according to specific practice. It is noted that the pathologists have the lowest (18.5) percent of smokers in contrast to the urologists who report that 40 percent still smoke cigarettes. The nonsmokers for the total group, those who have quit and those who have never smoked, are 70 percent.

CIGARETTE SMOKING A HEALTH HAZARD

Ninety-seven percent of the physicians reported that they believed smoking to be a health hazard. Three percent stated that they did not believe smoking to be a health hazard. One of the respondents, while not answering the specific question, "Do you believe smoking to be a health hazard?", did comment as follows, "Certainly much less than drinking. Depends on the amount smoked. Dieting, auto speeding, flying, etc., etc., are health hazards. You've got to die of something."

CONSUMPTION OF CIGARETTES AMONG PHYSICIAN SMOKERS

The data indicate that 25 percent smoked less than 1 pack a day, 35 percent 1 pack or more and 40 percent 2 packs or more per day.

HOW LONG STOPPED

Of the 1,485 physicians who have stopped smoking, 17.2 percent have quit for less than a year, 27.3 percent have quit for from 1 to 5 years and 55.3 percent have quit for more than 6 years.

TABLE 1.—*Current status of cigarette smoking among physicians, by medical specialty, Florida, 1964*

Medical specialty	Replies received	Now smoking	Percentage quit smoking	Never smoked
Total, all	3,467	29.9	45.1	25.0
General practice	851	37.0	39.0	24.0
Internal medicine	594	26.5	50.9	22.6
Surgery	469	25.1	48.2	26.7
Obstetrics-gynecology	255	37.0	36.6	26.4
Pediatrics	213	25.0	43.4	31.6
Eye, ear, nose, throat	206	27.1	45.1	27.8
Psychiatry-neurology	160	37.0	44.1	18.9
Radiology	124	21.1	54.9	24.0
Orthopedics	115	29.1	50.1	20.8
Urology	86	40.0	37.4	22.6
Anesthesiology	84	27.0	47.6	25.4
Pathology	84	18.5	45.8	35.7
Dermatology	60	19.6	56.8	23.6
Miscellaneous [1]	166	23.0	53.9	23.1

[1] Miscellaneous includes industrial medicine, physical medicine, public health, and unspecified.

REASONS FOR QUITTING SMOKING

The reasons for quitting smoking were classified into several groups: (1) Health reasons, (2) scientific evidence, (3) lack of satisfaction, (4) self-discipline, (5) whim, and (6) other forty-three percent gave their reason for stopping smoking as health reasons—cough, throat trouble, bronchitis, angina, bronchiectasis, and others.

The next largest group (27.9 percent) was that involving scientific evidence that cigarette smoking was harmful to health. The most common answer given was "fear of lung cancer." One physician answered the question as to "Why did you quit?" with the reply, "Just for the hell of it."

EFFECT OF THE U.S. PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE REPORT

Eighty-six percent of the respondents reported that the Surgeon General's report on smoking and health had not affected their smoking habits. Of this number, however, a large percent of the respondents had quit smoking or had never smoked. Fourteen percent said that the report had an effect.

ADVISING THE PATIENT ON SMOKING

It was a surprise to learn that 50 percent of the physicians advised all patients to stop smoking, that 45 percent advised those patients with specific conditions to stop, and that almost 5 percent never advised anyone to stop. Among the internists, less than 1 percent of the group never advised their patients to stop smoking, while about 22 percent of the psychiatrists and neurologists never advised patients to stop smoking.

A study of physicians by age revealed there was no significant difference as to what they advised patients about the question of smoking cigarettes.

SUMMARY

This is a report of the results of a survey of the smoking habits of 60 percent of the Florida physicians. Ninety-seven percent of the Florida physicians responding to the survey believe the smoking of cigarettes to be a health hazard. They advise no smoking to all or patients with specific conditions 95 percent of the time.

In conclusion, it is evident from this study that the physicians of Florida are assuming personal responsibility for public education about tobacco and health by instruction and example.

We wish to acknowledge the assistance of the Florida State Board of Health and the Florida Tuberculosis and Respiratory Disease Association in making this survey possible. Especially do we wish to express our appreciation to Mr. Albert J. Klimaszewski, Florida State Board of Health, for his valuable help.

> "Stopping smoking is
> The easiest thing in the world—
> I've done it hundreds of times."
> —MARK TWAIN.

CHARLES I. TATE, M.D.,
Associate Professor of Medicine, University of Miami School of Medicine, and Chairman, Florida Committee on Smoking and Health.

J. E. FULGHUM, M.D.,
Director, Division of Chronic Diseases, Florida State Board of Health, and Secretary, Florida Committee on Smoking and Health.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 2, 1965]

PEDIATRICS ARE URGED TO DISCOURAGE SMOKING

(Special to the New York Times)

EVANSTON, ILL., April 1.—The American Academy of Pediatrics issued a statement today opposing cigarette smoking. It urged its 8,500 members to join "in every effort to discourage acquisition of the habit of cigarette smoking during childhood and adolescence."

Members of the academy are physicians certified in the care of infants, children and adolescents.

The statement prepared by the section committee on diseases of the chest and approved by the executive board, appears in the organization's March-April newsletter.

It said:

"Because of the strong bond of friendship usually present between the pediatrician and the parents and children in the families he serves, his counsel and advice might be far more readily accepted than that of any other individual."

Pediatricians were also urged to take leadership in school and community programs to discourage cigarette smoking.

[From the New York (N.Y.) Times, Apr. 5, 1965]

WARNING ON CIGARETTES

The tobacco industry continues its bitter and exaggerated resistance to the proposed legislation that would require health warnings on all cigarette packages. Its spokesmen have not gone to the extent of claiming that cigarette smoking is healthful. But they are less than frank in disputing statistical evidence linking smoking with the big increase in the incidence of lung cancer and other chronic diseases. They also maintain that passage of the warning requirement might lead to an elimination of advertising and a sharp decline in overall employment among tobacco growers, cigarette makers and other sectors of the industry.

It is perfectly true, as the industry states, that the majority of cigarette smokers do not get lung cancer. But neither the report of the Surgeon General's advisory committee nor other studies made here and abroad have said they do. What these investigations have revealed is evidence of a definite correlation between cigarette smoking and cancer. This evidence amply justifies the mild device of a warning to alert consumers to the danger they may face. If the evidence showed more than that, there might be a good case for banning cigarette sales altogether.

If the cigarette companies can fend off warning labels, their propaganda offensive will doubtless be geared to attract new smokers among the growing number of teenagers. It probably will anyway. The fact is that the labeling requirement should be only a first step in a broad attack. There is need for a Government program that will keep the public continually informed about the dangers in smoking, and there is need for further efforts to help those who want to get rid of the cigarette habit.

Mrs. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** Without objection, it is so ordered.

MILITARY PROCUREMENT AUTHORIZATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 800) to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

The **PRESIDING OFFICER.** S. 800.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, the bill before the Senate now is S. 800, to authorize appropriations during fiscal year 1966 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

In 1960, Congress enacted a requirement for new authorization of appropriations for procurement of what could be briefly called military hardware; that is, aircraft, missiles, naval vessels; later this requirement was extended to funds for research and development. Until that time, only naval vessels were subject to annual authorization bills. Consequently, no complete review of the military program was brought before the two Houses until the appropriation bills came in. After the new authorization requirement was approved, hearings by the Armed Services Committee became much more comprehensive and a major part of the military program for the coming fiscal year was presented to the House and Senate.

The new authorization requirement was imposed by what is known as the Russell amendment, which has proved to be very satisfactory indeed, not only for the membership of the committee but also for the Senate. I think it is of great help, also, to the Appropriations Committee. This is the authorization bill which is before the Senate today. It brings in review a major part of our military program, although it does not deal with personnel, operations and maintenance, and other procurement.

Mr. President, the bill before the Senate would provide $15,283,800,000 in authorization of appropriations for the procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, and for research, development, test, and evaluation conducted by or for the Armed Forces. Of this total, $8,687,000,000 is for the procurement part of the bill, and $6,596,800,000 is for research, development, test, and evaluation.

Last year, the Department of Defense sought $17,185,300,000 for the same purposes. The procurement authorization request last year was $10,613,300,000 and this year it was $8,738,400,000—a reduction of $1,874,900,000. Last year the research, development, test, and evaluation request was $6,572,000,000 and this year it was $6,558,800,000—a reduction of $13,200,000.

From these figures, it will be seen that the total authorization requested this year is lower than last year's request by $1,888,100,000. The total approved by the committee is $1,692,820,000 less than the amount authorized for the same purposes last year.

There are several reasons for the reduced authorization request in fiscal year 1966. Not the least of these is the extraordinary ability and energy of the Secretary of Defense and the civilian and military assistants he has selected to help him administer the immense and diverse effort carried on by the Department of Defense. Later in my remarks, I expect to say more about the accomplishments of the Secretary and the strikingly successful cost reduction program he initiated and is continuing within the Department.

Mr. President, these figures are so large, when we think in terms of more than $48 billion in one 12-month period for the Department of Defense alone, that it is almost impossible to contemplate such an amount of mony.

I illustrate by saying that the General Motors Corp. is the largest corporation in history. Its total volume of business last year, I believe, was close to $16 billion, while the Air Force alone, which is only one of the military departments in the Department of Defense, has a budget, I recall, of more than $19 billion. In other words, the Air Force spends more money in one 12-month period than all the volume of business obtained by General Motors in a similar 12-month period.

Another reason that this year's authorization requirement is lower than last year's is that some of the more expensive weapons systems with which our forces are equipped have been substantially paid for in earlier years. The emphasis now is on qualitative improvements, rather than on the initiation of new and costly procurement programs.

For example, most of the cost of developing and procuring the Polaris and Minuteman missile systems has been funded in earlier years. There is no procurement money now needed for the large B-52 bombers, and the other older missile systems require no new authorization in substantial amounts.

Still a third reason for the lower level of authorization this year is that a series of reprograming actions in the middle of this fiscal year that involved stretchouts, cancellations, and changes in accounting or funding practices made substantial amounts of funds appropriated for 1965 and earlier years available to finance the 1966 program.

The Department of Defense appropriations bill for fiscal year 1965 amounted to $46,752 million. The amount requested for 1966 is $45,153 million, of which roughly one-third requires authorization of the type provided by this bill. I do not propose to dwell on the appropriations figure, because this will be before the Senate later when the appropriations bill is here, but I mention the appropriations amount merely to show the relevance of the authorization bill now before the Senate. Incidentally, I should point out that the appropriations figures I gave are exclusive of military construction, family housing, civil defense, and military assistance, all of which are Department of Defense programs that are funded in other appropriations bills. When these programs are added to the amount in the Department of Defense appropriations bill, the grand total of new obligational authority sought by the Department of Defense becomes $48,565 million.

This total does not include certain items that come through the Atomic Energy Commission for the military program. This is a considerable amount of money in itself.

The Secretary of Defense testified that the military departments and other defense agencies had requested new obligational authority in the amount of $56.5 billion and that he had reduced these requests by almost $8 billion. When one remembers that there are certain built-in inflationary factors in defense costs, such as rising prices for material and labor and military pay increases, it is a significant achievement for the defense budget request to be lower than the one for the current fiscal year, especially if our military strength is being maintained and even increased, which I believe to be true.

Before the committee considered the requests of the Department of Defense for the authorization contained in this bill, the committee had the benefit of a presentation by the Director of Central Intelligence on the threat posed to our national security by the military forces and power possessed by our potential enemies. The chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General Wheeler, also presented to the committee information about the capability of nations that have been antagonistic to our Nation and its Government. As an understanding of the strength and capabilities and potential enemies is a major determinant of the size and kind of military strength we need, these intelligence estimates were extremely helpful to the committee. Obviously, the information given in these briefings cannot be fully discussed in public, but I assure the Senate that these estimates have entered largely into the committee's deliberations.

The committee report contains at least a brief description of each type of aircraft, missile, and ship that would be procured by the Armed Forces with appropriations based on the authorization this bill provides. Similarly, the research and development authorization in this bill is described for each military department in the committee report. Consequently, in my remarks at this time I do not propose to mention each weapon or weapons system covered by this authorization bill. Instead, I should like to summarize the forces we will have in 1966 and the major changes to these forces that this bill portends. In making this summary I shall follow the functional breakdown initiated in 1961 under which the forces are grouped not by military department, but by the kind of function they are intended to discharge, such as, first, strategic offensive and defensive forces, second, general purpose forces, third, airlift and sealift, and fourth, research and development.

I shall not try to cover the elaborate analysis and rationale by which the programed forces were determined in the Department of Defense. This discussion is available in the committee hearings. Instead, I shall only summarize the decisions that resulted from such an analysis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments to the bill be agreed to en bloc, and that the bill, as amended, be considered as original text for purposes of further amendment.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER**. Is there objection? The chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The amendments agreed to en bloc, are as follows:

On page 2, line 5, after the words "Marine Corps", to strike out "$1,915,800,000" and insert "$1,816,000,000"; in line 12, after the word "Navy", to strike out "$1,501,100,000" and insert "$1,549,500,000, of which amount $133,600,000 is authorized only for construction of two nuclear-powered submarines"; in line 21, after the word "Army", to strike out "$1,438,000,000" and insert "$1,429,500,000"; at the beginning of line 23, to strike out "$1,472,600,000" and insert "$1,462,600,000"; in line 24, after the words "Air Force", to strike out "$3,147,800,000" and insert "$3,221,300,000, of which amount $82,000,000 is authorized only for the development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft"; and on page 3, line 4, after the word "agencies", to strike out "$500,400,000" and insert "$483,400,000"; so as to make the bill read:

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

"TITLE I—PROCUREMENT

"SEC. 101. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1966 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for procurement of aircraft, missiles, and naval vessels, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

"Aircraft

"For aircraft: For the Army, $344,500,000; for the Navy and the Marine Corps, $1,816,000,000; for the Air Force, $3,550,200,000.

"Missiles

"For missiles: For the Army, $253,700,000; for the Navy, $364,000,000; for the Marine Corps, $13,000,000; for the Air Force, $796,100,000.

"Naval Vessels

"For naval vessels: For the Navy, $1,549,500,000, of which amount $133,600,000 is authorized only for construction of two nuclear-powered submarines.

"TITLE II—RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST, AND EVALUATIONS

"SEC. 201. Funds are hereby authorized to be appropriated during fiscal year 1966 for the use of the Armed Forces of the United States for research, development, test, and evaluation, as authorized by law, in amounts as follows:

"For the Army, $1,429,500,000;

"For the Navy (including the Marine Corps), $1,462,600,000;

"For the Air Force, $3,221,300,000, of which amount $82,000,000 is authorized only for the development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft;

"For Defense agencies, $483,400,000."

Mr. **STENNIS**. Mr. President, I continue with my prepared statement.

STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE AND DEFENSIVE FORCES

First. The force of Minuteman II missiles which had previously been scheduled to increase by 100 a year in both 1966 and 1967 to a total of 1,200 will be kept at 1,000.

Second. Under the plans of the Department of Defense, work on a new manned bomber will be limited to developmental effort on a new design, advanced avionics, and an advanced propulsion system, expenditures for which will total $39 million in fiscal year 1966. In addition, development work on a new short-range attack missile that could be used on such an aircraft will be begun. The committee has provided an additional $82 million in an attempt to encourage entrance upon the project definition phase of this development in fiscal year 1966, as unanimously recommended by the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Third. There is no decision to produce and deploy a new and improved manned interceptor, although developmental work on the YF–12A will be continued.

Fourth. A decision on the question of producing and deploying the Nike X ballistic missile defense system has been deferred until 1967, but approximately $400 million is included in the bill for continued development of the components of this system.

Fifth. The Department of Defense believes that if additional money were to be obligated for continental defense, first priority for the application of such additional money should be given to civil defense.

As the emphasis in the foregoing summary could be considered as being on the negative nature of key choices for improving our security, I should quickly point out that the forces planned and funded have a striking power that should be dreadful for an enemy to contemplate. By June 30 of this year, we will have 800 Minuteman missiles and 464 Polaris missiles in our operational forces.

Added to this strategic offensive power is that provided by 600 B–52's and 80 B–58's. The estimate is that our authorized missile forces, after absorbing a first strike, could cause 100 million fatalities and destroy 80 percent of the industrial capacity of the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, after hearing all the evidence on the bill, as well as further reviewing our military situation, independently, I believe there is no doubt that we are powerfully armed, that we have the forces and the power on the ground, in the air, on the sea, and under the sea, that are far superior to anything known in history, and that are far superior to anything that a potential enemy or any allied enemies could possibly throw against us.

We have a balanced force, as I have said, on the sea, under the sea, in the air, and on the ground. We have it in the way of a conventional force and we have it in the form of a nuclear force which, if necessary—and God forbid that it will ever be necessary to use it—could be devastating to even a greater extent than I have already indicated in my prepared statement.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to supplement what the Senator has said. It is my feeling what we have at the present time is a very fine inventory of materiel. What we have done in drawing the bill is to add to the present inventory of materiel a better quality of weapons and a sufficient number of weapons, together with the development of new weapons, to continue to make our force the biggest, best, and most destructive force, if we must use it, that any nation has.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator. His estimate of the situation is very valuable. He has rendered extremely valuable service in the Armed Services Committee for many years. He is certainly not inclined to make extravagant statements.

Mr. President, if we are to avoid a larger war or an extended war in Vietnam, it will be because of our unquestioned military superiority.

This fact looms large in the background of all this trouble. I believe it is likely to be the deciding factor if we avoid a large-scale extension or expansion of the war.

GENERAL PURPOSE FORCES

The general purpose forces include most of the Army's combat and combat-support units, almost all Navy units, all Marine Corps units, and the tactical units of the Air Force. These are the forces that are planned for use in limited war and in counterinsurgency operations.

That is the general, old-style war that we are talking about.

The Army general purpose forces proposed for the next fiscal year are substantially the same as those that exist this year, with continued improvement in weapons and equipment. An exception is that the temporary authorization of 15,000 men added to the Army's strength for the testing of the new air mobility and assault concepts will be eliminated, as the tests for which these men were provided have been completed and the results are being evaluated.

That reduction is really not a lowering of the fighting strength of the Army in any way. The additional men were brought in as a temporary need to test out certain Army air mobility concepts. It was a temporary testing program, and that program is completed. Therefore, the additional authorization will not be needed longer.

Additional Pershing missiles and launchers are being provided to increase the quick reaction capability of this weapon. Because of disappointments in the development of the Mauler systems, the Army is pursuing an interim program for providing forward area air defense. This interim program involves the use of Sidewinder missiles mounted on vehicles, 20-millimeter guns mounted on self-propelled vehicles, and a self-propelled version of the Hawk missiles.

The Shillelagh missile is being procured for use on the General Sherman armored reconnaissance-assault vehicle, and the Redeye missile will be procured to provide protection for frontline troops against low-flying aircraft.

The rate of Army aircraft procurement is being decreased, pending evaluation of the air mobility tests and the evaluation of some research and development projects that could substantially affect the future nature of Army aviation. The 1966 program involves procurement of Iroquois, Chinook, and light observation helicopters, but at a rate somewhat below that predicted last year.

A formidable problem for the Navy's general purpose forces is air defense for the fleet. To correct this deficiency the Navy has been vigorously pursuing an improvement program for the Tartar, Terrier, and Talos ship-to-air missile systems, it is developing a new standardized missile to replace Tartar and Terrier, and it is studying a completely new ship-to-air missile system for the 1970s. The number of attack carriers in the force will remain 15, but while the *Midway* is undergoing modernization, an older Essex-class carrier, the *Hancock*, will be retained in the force. The Navy will continue to procure F–4 fighter aircraft for carriers and it will begin the procurement of the F–111B, better known as Navy version of the TFX. The A–6A which is used for low-level bombing at night and in bad weather, and the A–7A, the general purpose attack aircraft, will be procured to provide additional punch for the carriers.

The planned construction of 16 destroyer escorts for the antisubmarine forces has been cut back to 10 new ships of this type. Although the program presented to the committee last year contemplated the construction of six nuclear-powered attack submarines this year and for several years into the future, the authorization request was for only four submarines of this type. The Joint Chiefs of Staff had unanimously recommended that this construction be at the rate of six. The committee agreed with this view and added the necessary $133.6 million to permit the construction of two more nuclear-powered attack submarines.

To modernize the antisubmarine warfare aircraft forces and to offset partially the reduction in the construction of destroyer escorts, the planned procurement of the P–3A Orion will be increased.

The Navy will have 263 ships that have a dual capability for antisubmarine warfare and fleet air defense. Many of these are equipped with guided missiles.

Fifteen new amphibious assault ships are planned for construction in 1966 to increase the Navy's ability to transport the amphibious forces of the Marine Corps.

Five logistical and operational support ships will be procured to add to the 160 of these types that are now in the force.

The Marine Corps will continue to maintain 3 combat divisions and 3 aircraft wings and its active duty personnel strength will be increased by 3,000. The Marine air wings will reserve new F–4, A–6A, and A–7A aircraft. The vertical envelopment capability of the Marine Corps will be enhanced by further procurement of medium helicopters and all-weather cargo and troop transport helicopters. The Marine Corps is also procuring the Redeye missile for use by its field forces against low-flying aircraft.

The procurement authorizations for the general purpose forces of the Air Force would be used to buy additional quantities of the F–4 tactical fighter and the first production quantity of the F–111. The program objective for Air Force tactical fighters remains at 24 wings, but the rate of modernization will be somewhat slower than was planned last year.

AIRLIFT AND SEALIFT FORCES

There are two new developments that will affect our capabilities to transport combat forces by air and sea.

Developmental work has started on a new, very large capacity airlift aircraft to be designated the C–5A. This aircraft will be in the 725,000-pound class with rapid loading and unloading features and the ability to operate from low-strength airfields. As a result of the decision to develop and to procure the C–5A the planned procurement of the C–141 jet transport will be reduced by about one-third. In the force that will combine these two types, the C–141 would carry cargo of great density, thereby using its heavy payload potential, and the C–5A would transport bulky, less dense cargo.

The second new start in this area is the planned procurement of fast deployment logistics ships. These ships would be designed for the efficient transport of wheeled and tracked vehicles at high speed. The committee was informed that the plan is to use these ships as forward mobile depots stationed close to potential trouble areas and not for carrying peacetime cargo.

The committee has reduced the authorization request for this class of ship from four to two. We now have three of those ships; the committee decided to authorize at this time only two more of the new ones that were requested.

The design characteristics have not yet been fully developed and the ultimate requirement has not been estimated. There is also some doubt whether ships specifically designed with roll-on, roll-off features for the efficient transport of wheeled and tracked vehicles should be limited to the pre-position role.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. We cut the building of roll-on, roll-off ships from four to two, because, as the Senator has said, there are three in existence. We believe that the two additional ships would be helpful this year. But the design and the purpose of the deployment of these ships were changing. The question as to whether they should be used to carry passengers, freight, and materiel, or whether they should be used for other purposes and stationed in far-off places on the sea, was not fully determined. Therefore, we wish to go more slowly than what the original program called for.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his comments. He correctly outlined the thinking of the committee on that question.

I should like to add another point with which I am sure the Senator agrees. The idea of building a ship for use possibly only once—loading it and carrying it out into the Pacific somewhere and keeping it there until something might happen so that the materiel onboard would be necessary or it would become so old that it would have to be replaced—is one which requires careful consideration. A great deal of money would be spent for a ship for that purpose. We did not want to go too fast on that course.

The Senator from Mississippi would much more favor the use of such ships if there were a more definite indication that such use would permit the return to this country of some of our military personnel and their dependents. The use of such ships and airlift is better than keeping large numbers of our personnel in foreign countries at an added expense.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Until fairly recently—within a year or so—there was a considerable difference of opinion between commercial interests and the Navy people as to the theory on which these ships are built and the best design for them. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. Until that is worked out, we have withheld approval of those two, anyway.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

The number of dollars allocated to research and development is leveling off after some substantial increases in the last 10 years. Many expensive developments relating to missile systems have been completed and, as I indicated at the outset, the emphasis now seems to be on qualitative improvements, efforts to make our weapons invulnerable, and to improve their accuracy and effectiveness.

It is difficult to summarize the research and development effort because of the number and complexity of the various projects, and the extensive nature of the work. The research and development program can be classified by first, requirements—the needs of the user; second, the so-called DOD categories that represent an evolutionary sequencing of progress from ideas to hardware; or, third, by budget activities—which are arranged in accordance with the subject of the military end product or weapon.

The committee report contains a summary of the amounts planned for application to research and development by budget activity. I shall confine my floor remarks to a few general observations.

An examination of the obligation for research, development, test, and evaluation over the last 4 years shows that the proportion of the amounts applied for research in the military sciences to the total research and development program has increased. A large part of the work in military sciences is very basic research, or study, or analysis. The committee has made its research reductions in the military science activity because of an opinion that the practice of contracting for study and analysis by nongovernmental agencies is perhaps being overdone, and also because of a doubt whether much of the work in this activity really produces results beneficial to the national security. There is no failure to recognize that much of the basic research is nonproductive by its very nature, or that it is difficult to judge performance or success in this kind of work. The reductions applied by the committee are relatively modest—5 percent—and there is confidence that these reductions will not be harmful. This confidence is reenforced by the knowledge that the Secretary of Defense can apply funds appropriated for emergencies, or that he can transfer funds from other accounts to research, if there is a demonstrable need to do so.

Some of the larger research and development efforts that would be funded by this authorization are the work on nuclear test detection, counterinsurgency warfare, ballistic missile defense—including both Project Defender and the Army's work on Nike-X—Minuteman II, Polaris, and the new Poseidon, Sram, and Phoenix missile systems, the F-111—TFX—aircraft, design of new ships, shipboard equipment and weapons for antisubmarine warfare, and new tanks and antitank weapons.

In the space field $150 million is budgeted for the manned orbital laboratory—MOL. The Department is continuing to study, in cooperation with the Space Agency, the best way to proceed with this program. The $150 million is intended for continuing design work through the project definition phase and for beginning full-scale development after choice of a single contractor. The committee was informed that these funds will not be obligated until the Department is sure that a sound approach is being made and that the results that can be expected from the program are worth the cost.

Another space project of substantial size is the Titan III space booster, a standardized launch vehicle that may be used for a variety of manned and unmanned missions, including the MOL, and the military communications satellite. The Titan III program has been stretched out from June of 1966 to June of 1967 because the user programs for this booster will not require it until 1967.

The committee added $82 million to the Air Force research and development authorization in the aircraft and related equipment activity. This additional $82 million is intended to fund the project definition phase of work on an advanced manned strategic aircraft in fiscal year 1966. The Joint Chiefs of Staff unanimously recommended that work on this aircraft should proceed to the project definition phase in 1966, and the committee agreed. This committee action is consistent with its frequently expressed opinion that it is important to expedite work on a new manned bomber to replace the aging B-52's.

There is a difference of opinion on how long the older models of the B-52's will last for effective use. The committee is inclined to believe that the estimates of the Department of Defense are too optimistic on this point and that it is a matter of urgency to hasten the development of a new manned aircraft meeting the optimum performance characteristics that the Air Force requires today.

Earlier in my remarks I referred to the Department of Defense cost reduction program.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I am sure the Senator from Mississippi had in mind, when he spoke about research, that we reduced the amount for research for the military sciences by about 5 percent. We included the full recommendation of the Department of Defense for the rest of the research. We did not include in the cut any of the money that would go into research concerning the nuclear test ban treaty. So actually the 5-percent cut did not apply to the nuclear test ban treaty program but it did apply to all the rest, which I believe was about $340 million.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator's figures are correct. There is a substantial program underway for checking upon and keeping up with the nuclear test ban treaty—keeping alert with respect to it—and also being ready, should anything occur that would cause us to desire to resume testing ourselves.

The program is complete and fairly definitely established now as to cost. So we left all those funds intact. The only reduction we made in research, as the Senator said, was a modest 5-percent reduction in the other part of military sciences.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa, who is a valued member of our committee.

Mr. MILLER. I thank the Senator from Mississippi. I believe it would be well to point out, in connection with what the Senator from Mississippi has just said about research and development, and in connection, further, with the committee's action in increasing the amount of funds for research and development by $82 million, that one of the points which troubled the committee considerably related to the follow-on bomber. We went into that subject at great depth in analyzing not only the status of the B-52, but also the need for a follow-on bomber and the time phase in connection therewith.

We received assurance from the knowledgeable people in the Department of the Air Force that if the money were made available, they would be prepared within a few weeks or a few months to go forward with the program definition phase for the follow-on bomber. I think it well to point out that this is not a simple problem. It sometimes takes years to define military requirements and come to a conclusion which will permit a program definition phase to be executed. We have assurance that in the near future the Department will be ready to do this if it has the money. If money were authorized and appropriated, but the Department was not ready to proceed, our action would be a gesture in futility. But the Department gave us assurance that it is ready, so I believe the action of restoring the money is well taken.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Iowa for his remarks. I agree wholeheartedly with what he has said with reference to proceeding, when at all possible, with the new concept of a bomber. As I recall, the testimony was that the Department would be ready this year—that would mean this fiscal year—if money were appropriated. So we have made an amount available, so far as authorization is concerned.

Mr. MILLER. It was my understanding that within a matter of weeks or a few months after the beginning of the fiscal year to which the bill applies the Department would be ready.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER. It was not a case of being ready at the end of the fiscal year; it was a case of being ready early in the fiscal year. I believe that if the money is made available, it will be spent promptly and wisely.

Mr. STENNIS. I believe the Senator is correct. As I recall, the proposal would be ready soon after the middle of this calendar year.

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada, who has made a valuable contribution to the bill, and who is a valued member of our committee.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, Senators will note that the Committee on Armed Services has amended S. 800 on page 2, line 24, by increasing the authorization for research, development, test, and evaluation in the Air Force to $3,221,300,000 and specifying that $82 million of that amount is authorized only for the development of an advanced manned strategic aircraft.

Mr. President, my colleagues and I on the Armed Services Committee have long been concerned with the delay in reaching a decision to develop a manned bomber system to replace our aging B-52 fleet. Since 1961, this matter has been under review and this body has seen fit to authorize additional funds to proceed with the development of such a bomber, but the matter has been constantly put off by the Department of Defense. As of this moment, it is no longer possible to produce such an aircraft in time to replace our oldest B-52's. The Chief of Staff or the Air Force testified before the Armed Services Committee and the Appropriations Committee that these older B-52's will have to be retired by the end of fiscal year 1966. I need not remind Senators that the authorization bill we are now discussing is for that same year, fiscal year 1966.

There is a school of thought on this matter which holds that we should wait to develop an advanced manned strategic aircraft until the scientists have had more time to perfect the propulsion and avionics systems for such an aircraft. It is argued that this would reduce the overall cost of the program. That may be so, but what are we to do in the meantime if we delay a decision for that period of time?

The defense of this country is far too important to allow a bomber gap to occur for the sake of a few million dollars. The simple fact is that the older B-52's will be taken out of service next year because of old age and we will not have any suitable operational aircraft to replace them. The longer we wait, the more B-52's will have to be retired before an acceptable replacement is available.

The Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General McConnell, testified before your committees that the decision to proceed on this matter cannot be put off beyond fiscal year 1967. The Air Force is ready and willing to proceed now.

The report discloses that the original request was in the amount of the additional $82 million that we authorized, and that this amount could be used efficiently in the research and development program. So I urge Senators to approve the additional sum recommended by the committee to enable the Air Force to begin work on this project immediately and bring about the production of advanced manned strategic aircraft a full year sooner than would be possible if we waited until fiscal year 1967 to authorize the funds for it.

I fully support the distinguished acting chairman of the committee in that position, and I urge the passage of S. 800 as reported by the committee on Armed Services and as amended.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Nevada for his fine remarks. He is unusually well qualified to speak on this particular subject. He has made a distinct contribution over the years.

Mr. President, for years the legislative branch of our Government has been pushing, pressing, and urging the more rapid development of a new bomber.

A subcommittee of the Armed Services Committee went to see the late President Kennedy and Secretary McNamara about that. We urged this procedure again last year. We urged it this year. The Joint Chiefs of Staff all agree on the need for pushing it forward.

I have no doubt, great as our missile system is, that we should continue to have a mixed force of bombers and missiles. We may not have it indefinitely in the future, unless we push this new advanced development forward.

I thank the Senators for their fine contributions to the discussion of this subject.

Mr. President, earlier I referred to the Department of Defense cost production program.

A brief statement of the objective of this program is that it attempts to save money by, first, buying only what is needed, through refining of requirements, using excess stocks, and eliminating unnecessary frills in weapons and equipment; second, buying at the lowest sound price through more competitive procurement, and by changing from contract types under which the contractor has no incentive to keep costs low; and third, reducing operating costs through terminating unnecessary operations, consolidation and standardization, and by increasing the efficiency of operations.

The Secretary of Defense estimates that if the objectives of this program had not been pursued so successfully, the cost of defense in 1966 would have been over $4 billion more.

Secretary McNamara generously credited the entire Defense Establishment with accomplishing significant savings. We should recognize, though, Mr. President, that the initiative for this efficiency came from Mr. McNamara and that he deserves the highest praise for what he has accomplished. One does not have to be an auditor or an accountant, and one does not have to accept every dollar of the estimate of these savings to perceive that tangible improvements have been made in the management of the Department of Defense.

The rewards of public service in the Department of Defense may often seem disproportionate to the criticism, frustrations, and misunderstandings to which officials there are subjected. I hope there is some satisfaction to Secretary McNamara and the talented military and civilian assistants he has selected to realize that their contributions are recognized and appreciated. Competence of the type he and they have applied is inspiring to all of us.

I say that of my own volition. I know these gentlemen, one might say, only officially. We are not associated socially to any great extent.

But I have been here long enough to compare their activities in holding down the cost of the new and modern weapons, research and development, and all the related subjects with similar efforts in the past and they deserve much credit.

Mr. President, I wish to make a few brief remarks on something that has come up lately with reference to the inroads that can be made into our regular military program, which further increases the cost of the military support of activities in Vietnam.

Over and above the provisions of this bill, there is a matter of great importance in connection with Department of the Army procurement and funding which demands and is receiving special study and consideration. The requirements for our operations and activities in Vietnam are not separately or specifically programed for and funded. The result is that our requirements there must be met by the withdrawal of funds, equipment, personnel, and other assets from the Regular Army inventory.

These requirements are considerable. As Secretary McNamara has said:

> Our people in Vietnam have first claim on every dollar and every man in the entire establishment. They have an absolute blank check to draw against and they exercise this power freely and fully without any restrictions whatever.

The impact which this has had and will have upon the Army as a whole is of major concern. For this reason, the staff of the Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee is currently engaged in making a thorough and complete study of the combat and materiel readiness posture of the Army combat divisions. An important part of this study is the impact which the demands and requirements of the Vietnam operations have had and will have upon other Army units and activities. As soon as this study has been completed an appropriate report will be made to the Senate.

That does not suggest anything wrong. It merely means that there is a constantly increasing withdrawal of items that are needed over there from the Regular Forces of the Army. Something special must be done at this session of Congress, even if the situation does not become worse over there. Something must be done to be certain that the withdrawals will not deplete the supplies of ammunition, equipment, and everything that is needed for the rest of the Army.

We must get something definite concerning that into law, perhaps, through the appropriation bills. We need further facts to guide us.

Mr President, the comments that follow are not a part of my remarks on this bill. However, I cannot see any basis whatsoever for the talk—certainly there is no evidence for it now—to the effect that the draft can be discontinued, or that Congress should fail to extend or continue the present Selective Service Act.

Speculation about what could be done or whether it will be continued is harmful to our ability to secure the proper flow of manpower into the services. It encourages postponement. Moreover, it creates uncertainty in the minds of the people, the young men, and their families, in making their plans for the future, and planning their education.

Even though the present law has 2 additional years to run, I think we ought to be emphatic about it now to eliminate uncertainty and get more stability as a basis for planning by persons who have a military obligation to discharge.

Mr. President, this is the bill that is ordinarily managed by that esteemed and beloved Member of the Senate, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is chairman of the Armed Services Committee. The Senator from Georgia had already scheduled these hearings. They were carried out by following his pattern as much as we could.

I commend and thank each member of the Senate Armed Services Committee and each member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is chairman of both. I thank them for their very fine cooperation and the careful attention they gave these hearings. The committees sat jointly. There was a splendid spirit of cooperation. A great many of the members of the committee substantially contributed to the hearings and the writing of the bill and examination of the witnesses.

The subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee and the Armed Services Committee came away with a very fine impression of our program and great confidence in it. We, of course, missed the chairman greatly. We are glad to know that he continues steadily to improve and is regaining his full strength and in time will be back to his usual active place here in the Senate. He tells me that he is feeling good now, and that he will be back in full harness when he returns. I am sure every Member of the Senate rejoices in that news.

Mr. President, the pending bill is an important one that I think will contribute substantially to a further strengthening of our ability to defend ourselves and our interests if hostilities should be forced on us. Characteristically, it does not contain everything that every person with responsibility for defense would like, but it does provide the foundation for an enhanced national defense.

I urge approval of the bill as presented by the committee.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts, who, as I have already said, contributed to the consideration of the bill in the hearings so greatly.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I appreciate what the Senator has said. I, with him, deplore the absence of our chairman who, for a good many years, always took care of this bill in the Appropriations Subcommittee and the Armed Forces Committee. I hope he will be with us shortly. We shall rejoice when that day comes. But may I say to the Senator from Mississippi that he has ably supplanted temporarily the regular chairman, and I am sure the Senator from Georgia will approve of the work of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator, but I am but a mild substitute.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I support what the acting chairman has said. I support him in full. The committee has submitted the request for new spending authority by the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1966. As submitted to the Congress, S. 800 requested $8.7 billion for procurement and $6.6 billion for research, development, test, and evaluation. The committee reduced the amount requested for procurement by $51.4 million and added a net amount of $38 million for research, development, test, and evaluation, for an overall net reduction in the bill of $13.4 million.

I supported the acting chairman in the addition of $82 million for further development of the manned bomber. I also supported the addition of two nuclear attack submarines, raising the total from four to six. We added these two amounts to the bill because they were supported by the unanimous opinion of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Where there is a difference of opinion between the top civilians and the unanimous vote of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and where there is doubt in the committee as to who is right, it is my opinion that we should add the additional amount. The Department of Defense need not spend that money under the authority of the President, unless it wishes to do so. But it is our duty to appropriate what is needed. This money may be needed and may be used, so we added $82 million for the manned bomber development, and increased the number of submarines authorized from four to six. I believe this was wise. As the Senator pointed out in the colloquy, we also reduced some research funds for military science, but not for the nuclear test ban treaty.

I have a very brief statement I wish to add to the statement of the Senator from Mississippi. I believe that this bill is a good one and has been carefully developed with a great effort by members of the committee, who have been extremely conscientious in their attendance at the hearings, as the Senator from Mississippi has well said. It covers the procurement of material and provides funds for research and development. The committee was most careful to make cuts where it felt that the program could be stretched out and the delay would have no marked effect on our defense effort.

I refer particularly to the elimination of funds for the procurement of 10 E-2A Hawkeye aircraft. As is stated in the committee report, at the bottom of page 5, the committee understands that the procurement will keep the production line in operation through the early part of calendar year 1967. The committee felt that procurement of this type of aircraft before there was evidence that it could fully perform its mission was unwise. Therefore, it decided to delay further procurement until such time as the technical defects were remedied.

I invite the attention of Senators to what the Senator from Mississippi and I know, namely, that there is a considable amount of reprograming. About 20 percent of the procurement of the Armed Forces is reprogramed.

In addition, there is an emergency funds of $150 million than can be used for additional research and development.

Also, there is $150 million that the Secretary of Defense has authority to transfer from any or all military functions appropriations available to the Department of Defense, but no one source can be reduced by more than 70 percent.

In addition to the $300 million I have just mentioned, there is $200 million for research and development available to the Department of Defense in the same manner and with the same limitations as contained in the "emergency fund."

Therefore, if it becomes absolutely necessary, there is $500 million the Secretary of Defense can use in research and development or for additional procurement, if the Hawkeye or any other materiel becomes important.

I agree with the committee that the Department of Defense should reduce from four to two the request for fast deployment logistic ships, and that it should reduce the request from 10 to 5 for motor gunboats.

I supported what the committee has done with respect to the request for research and development.

I shall not repeat what I said about research under the nuclear test ban treaty. I urge the Senate to approve the bill as reported by the committee. If there are any differences between the House and Senate in connection with any materiel procurements, that can be straightened out in conference.

I support the Senator from Mississippi. I hope the Senate will pass the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator again.

The only thing I have to add at this time is to read into the RECORD at this point the committee action with reference to a particular procurement program for aircraft for the Navy:

> The committee deleted an item of $99.8 million for the procurement of 10 E-2A Hawkeye aircraft.
>
> The E-2A Hawkeye is a carrier-based early warning aircraft that is important to fleet air defense. This program was initiated in 1957 and a substantial number of this type aircraft has been funded. Because of technical deficiencies, the 1965 procurement was canceled by the Department of Defense and the procurement authorized in earlier years was stretched over a longer period. The committee understands that the stretched procurement will keep the production line in operation through the early part of calendar year 1967.
>
> The procurement of a significant number of this type aircraft before there was evidence that it would perform as intended appears to be an instance of a commitment to production before this action was warranted.
>
> The committee appreciates the importance of the E-2A aircraft to fleet air defense.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] might well be interested in this:

> If the technical problems can be solved, the committee will be sympathetic toward authorizing additional procurement, but the committee desires to review the progress made on solving these problems before approving additional procurement at this time. If the deficiencies are overcome before another authorization request is considered, additional funds could be applied to this program after approval by the Congress of a reprograming action.

I point out that the production line will not be stopped because we took out these airplanes. Continuing production can be forthcoming well over into the early part of the calendar year 1967 and, by then, the program can have been back before us and we can consider whether to authorize the application of additional funds to this procurement, by reprograming or otherwise.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I agree with what the Senator has said. We were careful to point out in our report that when the "bugs" were removed, or on their way to being removed, we were interested in the aircraft.

This year's request was for 10 more. So all we have done is to cut out the additional 10 planes until we can be convinced, through proper evidence, that the "bugs" have been taken out.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for his comments.

Mr. President, unless there are more questions, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. INOUYE in the chair). The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending legislation and ask that it be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 5, it is proposed to insert the following:

> SEC. 202. (a) Section 271 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by inserting "(a)" immediately in front of "Under" and adding at the end of such section a new subsection as follows:
>
> "(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, a member of the Ready Reserve may be transferred to the Standby Reserve, Retired Reserve, or to an inactive status only at his request to be so transferred, or—
>
> "(1) if he fails to comply with the standards and qualifications prescribed pursuant to this title for all members of the Ready Reserve of the service of which he is a member; or
>
> "(2) pursuant to the provisions of chapter 363, 571, or 863."
>
> (b) The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be effective in the case of any member of the Ready Reserve on or after December 1, 1964; and any person who, on or after such date and prior to the date of enactment of this Act, was a member of the Ready Reserve and was transferred to the Standby Reserve, Retired Reserve, or to an inactive status without his consent shall be restored to his prior status in the Ready Reserve within thirty days after the date of enactment of this Act unless he requests in writing to remain in his current status.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, the Department of Defense on January 16, 1965, issued directive 1200.7 ordering all Members of the legislative branch and the judicial branch of the Federal Government, as well as key employees of the executive branch, out of the Active Reserve and into either the Standby Reserve of the Retired Reserve, depending upon their length of service.

Although the detailed procedures were not spelled out in the directive, recent amplifications have indicated that the Department will consider all executive department employees of grade 15 or above to be key employees and to be thus subject to the screening process from the Ready Reserve absent special circumstances.

I have very recently been informed that some Departments of the executive branch have considered personnel of the grade of GS-4 and above to be key employees under that provision.

The propriety and legality of the actions of the Defense Department in this regard are highly questionable for several reasons. First among them is the fact that participants in the Ready Reserve program are required to sign a Ready Reserve agreement, a contract which binds them to a term of service in the Active Reserve from 1 to 5 years. The individual is clearly bound by such contracts in a legal sense and the right of the Department of Defense to unilaterally abrogate such agreements is in doubt. The issuance of this directive marks the first such attempt in the more than 50 years of the Reserve system as we know it.

With reference to Members of the legislative branch who also may be members or former members of the Ready Reserve, their requirements for military service should be the subject of a Presidential determination, as they were in World War II. The premise underlying the Defense Department order is in error; namely, that a Member of the Senate or the House of Representatives, or the other persons to whom I have referred, is unfit not only to serve in the Ready Reserve, but also to decide for himself whether he can best serve his country at a time of national crisis as a legislator or as a member of the Armed Forces on active duty. President Johnson himself went on active duty in the Navy during World War II and served for 7 months until recalled by President Roosevelt. Twenty other Members of Congress, including Senators now present on the floor, did the same thing before the President determined by Executive order that they should be recalled. Subsequent to the recall order, 12 of that 20 later resigned or did not seek reelection in order to remain on duty in the Armed Forces, many for the duration of the war. This leads to another aspect of the DOD directive; its penal nature.

If a Member of Congress or of the executive branch should decide to resign his position in order to serve in the armed services during a national emergency, he will have been denied the opportunity to prepare himself for such duty as a member of a Reserve branch of the armed services for as long as he has held that position. Additionally, the directive harshly discriminates among Reserve officers who have less than 18 years of service and more than 20 years of service. This is so because those who have more than 18 years' service, but less than 20, will be permitted to remain in the Ready Reserve for the purpose of accumulating 20 years for retirement purposes. Thus, those with less than 18 years of service are summarily prevented from further participation in the Reserve program in order to qualify for retirement, and those with over 20 years are forced to retire prematurely or enter the limbo of the Inactive Reserve where they are unable to accumulate credit for retirement or promotion or to maintain a readiness for service in the event of an emergency.

Further, the failure of incumbent Members of Congress to win reelection is not an unknown phenomenon. In the 1964 elections, 10 Members of Congress who are also ready reservists were defeated, leaving 70 remaining Members as active reservists. If those 10 had not been eligible to participate in the Ready Reserve during their congressional service, and thus qualify for promotion and retirement points, their reentry now into the Ready Reserve would leave them behind their contemporaries in promotion and current readiness—a severe penalty for serving in the Congress. It is unfair to deny the right to accumulate promotion and retirement credit to a reservist simply because he is also serving his country in an elective or appointive office.

Mr. President, my amendment to the military authorization bill provides that any person transferred to the Standby Reserve or the Retired Reserve as a result of DOD Directive 1200.7 shall be restored to his prior status in the Ready Reserve within 30 days. The amendment makes clear that the Secretary of Defense lacks authority to make such blanket determinations in the future. It does not interfere in any way with the existing regulations for the management of the Reserve. In my view, this amendment is necessary because of the present disposition of the Department of Defense to take upon itself authority to issue orders contrary to the spirit, if not the letter, of congressional policy as set down in the statutes of the United States.

No order such as this has ever before been issued in the history of this Republic. In the 59 years since the passage of the Dick Act, there has been no precedent for this action. It represents an attempt on the part of the Department of Defense to create legal authority where none has previously existed. The very attempt illustrates the urgency for statutory clarification of the situation so that the intent of Congress, the country's only constitutional lawmaking branch of Government, may be made crystal clear.

The question of the legality of Members of Congress holding Reserve commissions has been the subject of discussion on the Senate floor several times. However, the colloquy between the distinguished senior Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND] and former Senator Goldwater on June 4, 1963, made clear beyond doubt that there was no constitutional violation when a Member of Congress also serves in a branch of the Reserve. A provision of the United States Code describes the status of a Reserve officer not on active duty. Title 5, section 30r(d), United States Code says:

> When he is not on active duty, or when he is on active duty for training, a Reserve is not considered to be an officer or employee of the United States or a person holding an office of trust or profit or discharging any official function under, or in connection with, the United States because of his appointment, oath, or status, or any duties or functions performed or pay or allowances received in that capacity.

Mr. President, for all the foregoing reasons I feel my amendment must be adopted. I urge my distinguished colleagues to consider the importance of this matter with great care and to vote in favor of my amendment.

Mr. President, the question has been posed whether my amendment would apply to the so-called congressional Reserve units which were in existence some time ago. I wish to state for the RECORD that my amendment would have no effect on the status of the congressional Reserve units, all of which were disestablished by the service Secretaries. The conduct of such units is clearly a matter within the discretion of the military departments. My amendment goes only to the eligibility of individuals to participate in the Ready Reserve; it does not purport to direct the reestablishment of defunct Reserve units or otherwise affect the management of the Reserve program.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum without my losing the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I do not desire to delay—and I am sure no other Senator wishes to do so—consideration of the bill. But for the first time there has now been proposed an amendment to the bill which was not presented to the committee. No hearings have been held on the amendment. I do not believe any Senator can state exactly what the impact of the amendment would be on our highly important Reserve system. Under those conditions, as well as for other reasons, I would feel compelled to continue consideration of the amendment until an opportunity has been afforded to inform Senators as to what it means and what it would do.

The amendment would in effect overrule to a large extent the order of the Secretary of Defense as delegated by the President of the United States. Although in some respects it is a different order from several preceding orders, nevertheless it was issued in the process of carrying out what has been the policy for several years under a law that was enacted for the purpose of trying to build up the Reserves.

As I said, there is no report on the amendment. There is no way for Senators to be informed, except through debate on the amendment. There is no way to get all the facts before the Senate. As active chairman of the committee, I feel compelled to take that position.

I should like briefly to point out the history of this subject. In 1955 the Congress enacted a law which was intended to be used really to strengthen the Army Reserve forces by authorizing a statutory screening process. I believe that until 1955 there was no statutory authority for screening the Reserves and as long as a member of the Reserves carried out his orders and met the minimum requirements, there was no way to screen out the Reserves.

Under that law, President Eisenhower issued an Executive order transferring that authority, as he was authorized to do, to the Secretary of Defense. In turn, the late President Kennedy exercised the power through Executive order, turning it over to the Secretary of Defense. In turn, President Johnson issued a continuation of the Executive order turning that power over to the Secretary of Defense.

Under that law and the power thereby delegated by the President last January, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, issued amended regulations for screening the Ready Reserves.

It contains some new disposition that I understand from the Senator from Nevada is the main basis of his complaint. It contains new items which I shall read in a moment. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada would amend the entire law that Congress enacted in the 1950's and would withdraw from the President the certain power to issue regulations for screening personnel in the Ready Reserve, thereby keeping it up to date as a going, quick, ready, hard-hitting organization, composed of men who are ready to go and are not needed more for other uses. The amendment would reduce the authority of that law.

The main discussion has been with reference to the part of the Department of Defense directive that provides as follows:

> The following members of the Ready Reserve who have fulfilled their Ready Reserve obligations will be transferred to the Standby Reserve.

That provision transfers them from the Ready Reserve—"ready to go" better describes them than any other words—to the Standby Reserve.

The Vice President of the United States, the members of the Cabinet, and other Presidential appointees requiring Senate confirmation were transferred under this order. Then:

> (B) Members of the legislative branch of the United States.
>
> (C) Members of the judicial branch of the United States.

In other words, those of Cabinet rank are included, and there are others. But generally the others follow what has been the order of screening heretofore.

This amendment does not pertain only to the three groups I have read, beginning with the Vice President and continuing through the legislative branch and judicial branch. It would amend the law that permits the President to screen the Ready Reserve, and would again make it the law of the land, even though we are trying to emphasize Reserves more, that the President would have reduced power to screen these men. Those of them who have a mind to do so would not have to do anything except to fulfill the minimum requirements, and could "sit it out." That would not include others, of course. But the Cannon amendment would revert to the old rule that does not give the emphasis to the screening that Reserve system deserves, in saying that so long as a man meets the minimum statutory requirements of the Reserve, he will continue to draw his pay and be in the Ready Reserve; and I suppose all the promotions would come in due course.

In other words, the order merely draws the hand back and says, in effect, "These men are not touchable."

I submit that regardless of the individuals involved or regardless of hardship that might accrue to individual Members of Congress, we should not enact general legislation that would put all the members of the Ready Reserve beyond the reach of even the Commander in Chief. That would not be consistent with the needs of national security.

I have been urging for years the appropriation of more money for more equipment, more supplies, more readiness, more pay, more functions, more buildings, more guns, and more of everything else for the Reserves, both the Army Reserves and the National Guard, which is a part of the Reserves. So this is not a new question to me. With all deference to everyone concerned, this proposal would definitely be a step backward in the Ready Reserve program. The principal differences between this Department of Defense order and the others that have been issued are those that I have mentioned.

In the first place, we are considering purely a hardware bill. The bill has to do with ships and aircraft of all kinds, materiel, research, and development. It concerns the actual hardware for all of our vast worldwide military program. The amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada has no business being tied to this bill, whatever the merits of the amendment. I am in sympathy with the motives of the individuals who have talked with me about the subject, but the amendment does not belong in the bill. It would literally cut the insides out of one of the major operations of our Reserve system.

Let us consider this subject only after there has been a hearing on a bill to amend the present law; after we have had an opportunity to get facts and to hear both sides; and after we have had an opportunity to evaluate the proposal and get the recommendations of the committee. Then let such a bill be placed on the calendar, and I shall help to move it along so that it can be debated on its merits and we can decide whether we wish to change the policy or not.

By all means, let us approach the subject under the conditions we are faced with now in a systematic, orderly, and logical way. The amendment is a shotgun proposal to amend a major law at the last moment. The committee has had no opportunity to study the proposal.

I speak with great deference to the Senator from Nevada. He is a valued Reserve officer and has an outstanding record. I do not detract from him or his excellent record. But I am compelled to tell Senators that, to a degree, these are matters of personnel. If the problem can be settled in a logical, systematic way, I shall be up front, fighting to do justice to the men concerned.

I have never had a more pleasant conversation and have never been more impressed with a man than I was with the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. Miller] who spoke with me about this subject. He has had many years of fine service in the Reserve and is a man who is willing to serve. I would not, of course, do anything that would hurt him. But we are not dealing with individuals in this matter. We are dealing for keeps in the matter of preparedness, especially in view of the reliance and dependence that we have come to place on our great Reserve system. I use the word "great" advisedly, because I know something about the contribution that many of the Reserve units and many of the National Guard units have made. I am up front in wanting to support them.

The Senator from Nevada mentioned this subject to me the latter part of last week, after the committee had passed on the bill; but when I received a copy of his amendment, I turned it over to a member of the staff of the committee who knows more about personnel than anyone else. I asked him to get some figures concerning the number of men the amendment would affect. In one short sentence, his memorandum states:

> Unfortunately, the Department of Defense does not have the statistics which indicate the reasons for the transfers from the Ready to the Standby Reserve.

In other words, 520,000 men, during fiscal 1964, were screened out of the Ready Reserve for all reasons. There were about 60,000 officers and 460,000 enlisted men.

A larger number of those transfers were due to transfers of those who completed obligated service. That is not this kind of screening before us now.

So I asked: "How many men can I tell the Senate this proposal would directly affect?" We cannot get those figures. But it will be in the thousands—not merely the small number we have been discussing. We do not know and therefore cannot tell the Senate what the impact of the amendment would be.

I have hurriedly prepared some remarks that are partly a repetition of what I have said; but I plead with Senators under their responsibilities as Members of this body, to go slow before they vote for the amendment. If it were to become law, it would literally cut the heart and soul out of the method of making our Reserve system effective and keeping it screened, so as to keep in it men who are ready to go and trained to go. These men are not screened out now because of any deficiencies of their own. I wish to emphasize that. They are removed, under this order, because they are already serving the Government in capacities that are deemed to be more important than would be their services as members of the Ready Reserve. As a part of making our Ready Reserve more and more ready, a number of persons were screened out because it was felt that they were more important in the positions they now hold. Of course, I had nothing to do with that. I knew nothing about it.

We have now in the Preparedness and Investigating Subcommittee a matter that I did not want to handle. However, the Senator from Georgia said, "Your subcommittee will handle it." I refer to hearings on the realinement program of the National Guard and Reserve. The amendment does not go to the abolition of the Army Reserve. That is another matter. The amendment relates to it in some way. However, if we want to preserve the Army Reserve, we cannot do it by voting for this amendment. This amendment goes to the assessing of the personnel and the screening of this Ready Reserve, which ought to be done every 12 months.

We are conducting hearings at the present time. We have not finished the hearings by any means. Certainly a special study should be included in those hearings.

The effect and the substance of this amendment is to reduce the ability of the President to screen the Ready Reserve of our Armed Forces.

As we know, the entire purpose of the screening is to insure that our Ready Reserves will be at their peak of readiness whenever they are mobilized, giving recognition at the same time to the needs of our civilian Government and economy.

The provisions of the proposed amendment, in effect, would provide that if a member of the Ready Reserve meets the prescribed qualifications and is not past the legal limit pertaining to age and length of service, he may not be relieved or removed from the Ready Reserve without his consent.

The amendment would have a retroactive date of December 1, 1964. That does not mean the members of our group in the Senate or House, or judges who were affected, or a few members of the President's Cabinet, or others under the confirmation process.

That means that no one in the Ready Reserve could be screened out so long as he was within the age and service limits and met the other requirements.

This proposal would give freedom of choice to the individuals on this question, rather than leaving this matter to the President, or to the Department of Defense, to whom this authority is delegated.

I would look with some favor on an amendment that pertained to a group, or provided that a Member of Congress should not be screened out. That would be wholly different, though. This proposal would prohibit the President of the United States from screening anybody out of the Ready Reserves, if he meets these minimum requirements.

I submit that if we are to have effective management of our Ready Reserves and meet the needs of national security, there must be a limitation on the freedom of choice on the part of the individual. In other words, there must be a single authority, as the existing law provides, with respect to making decisions on the screening of our Reserves.

The law now contained in section 271, of title 10, United States Code, provides the President with very broad authority for screening the Ready Reserves in order to accomplish five stated objectives.

The first objective is to prevent the attrition of units and members during mobilization, thereby insuring their availability when the proper time arrives.

We are talking about an effort to have a Reserve force that is ready to go. We are trying to get Reserves that are composed of men who are trained and ready to go. Under the proposed amendment, we would stay the hand of the man to whom we have heretofore given the responsibility of the screening out process.

The other objectives aimed at are as follows:

The second objective is a retention of a proper balance of military skills;

The third objective is to insure that critical civilian skills are not retained beyond the needs of the Reserves, thereby giving recognition to the needs of the civilian economy during the war effort;

The fourth objective is recognition of previous combatant action with respect to retention in the Ready Reserves; and

The fifth objective is to insure that extreme personal or community hardship will not occur as a result of retention in the Ready Reserves.

One could say, "The President could decide that after war was declared." I do not think that we shall declare war any more before we get in it. We did not do it in the case of Korea. The idea is to have men at the key place, trained and ready to go. Others are already screened out, so that when the order comes for them to move, they move forward as a unit, without anyone stopping and having to decide whether he was more valuable in that slot or in Congress.

We want the system as it is now, in which system it is provided that some responsible person has already said where he would be the most valuable.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator has read the five provisions. The important thing, in my opinion, in section 271 is that under the regulations to be prescribed by the President, each armed force shall provide a system of continuous screening of units and members of the Ready Reserve. Those are regulations prescribed by the President. It gives the authority subject to the order of the Commander in Chief, the President of the United States. It says, "shall." It does not say, "may," or any other equivocation. It says, "shall provide." This amendment would take away the regulation that the President is authorized to exercise under this statute.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. That is the law that was enacted in 1955. I would dislike to lose a single one of these men. The law was passed to authorize the Reserves. The law was used by President Eisenhower, President Kennedy, and now President Johnson.

We would weaken the Reserves by agreeing to this amendment. It is not necessary. It would be a step backward. It would weaken our whole system. If we were to repeal that section, we might as well stop talking about trying to build up the Reserves, put more money in it, or anything of that kind. In view of the fact that the proposed amendment would require an individual's consent for his removal from the Ready Reserves, I submit that the present authority would be diluted. No recognition could be given to the proper balance of skills if the individual might choose to remain in the Ready Reserves. No recognition could be given to the need for critical skills in the civilian economy. No recognition could be given to community hardship situations where the individual might be otherwise qualified and choose to remain in the Ready Reserves. In effect, the amendment would not permit a freedom of choice by all individuals.

When we are dealing with our Armed Forces, if we are to have an effective screening process, there must be a central authority with a single set of ground rules. That is what we did when we enacted the law.

Prior to 1955, there was no specific statutory provision for screening the Ready Reserves. The Korean experience, due to the many inequities and mixups during mobilization, magnified the need for a statutory system in order to attempt to achieve equity among the individuals involved and at the same time provide a continuous system of screening to make certain, so far as possible, that units and individuals would be trained, ready, and available when called.

Friends have called me and said that Members of the Senate, fine as they are, have a right to continue this service. Personally, I wish they could. But matters cannot be decided on a personal basis or on the basis of what is ordinarily an individual's right, when we are dealing with this subject matter.

The Presidential authority under section 271 for a number of years has been delegated to the Secretary of Defense and certain Department of Defense directives have been in effect for a substantial period of time. It is evident, however, that in the opinion of the Department of Defense, the screening process by the military departments has left something to be desired. As an example, the military departments were advised by the Assistant Secretary of Defense on November 1, 1962, that "the previous callup of the Ready Reserves in late 1961—the Berlin callup—reveals certain problem areas resulting from incomplete or inadequate screening of ready reservists."

That is what we said based on our Berlin callup experience. Even with this law, nevertheless, in practice, there are certain problems that result from incomplete or inadequate screening. The purpose of the amendment is to repeal the law for all screening. It does not make sense. Since the recent directive by the Department of Defense on January 16, the screening process has been intensified. It requires removal from the Ready Reserve of Members of Congress and Presidential appointees, members of the judiciary, and all key employees of all three branches of the Government. It is not directed exclusively against Members of this body. It is directed to key employees of all three branches of Government.

This action has been taken to insure what the Secretary of Defense considers the best uses of these individuals during periods of mobilization. In effect, it has been determined that, for the officials involved, their talents are more vital to the effective functioning of the Government during an emergency in their civilian capacities than in uniform.

Here again, in certain cases, these decisions may be debatable as to certain individuals, but we do not want to repeal a law and withdraw those persons from certain agencies in which President Eisenhower, and Presidents following him, have screened the Ready Reserves, so that they are ready to go and can move.

I have already urged on the Senate in every way I know the reasons why the amendment should be rejected.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Would the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, acting chairman of the committee, consider the possibility of holding hearings in his committee on this subject so that it can be considered on its basis, and not in relation to the present procurement measure now before the Senate?

Mr. STENNIS. Out of a sense of duty, I would do so if requested; and, as an individual, I think it is humane that we do so.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I would say to the Senator from Montana that, at the request of the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], who is absent, the Subcommittee on Preparedness, headed by the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS] is already holding hearings on this subject.

Under the rules of the committee, we shall have to make a report to the full committee when the hearings have been completed. When that report comes before the full committee, we shall have an opportunity to hold whatever other hearings are necessary, or submit a resolution to take care of the subject. That should be done, rather than tie the amendment to this particular bill, which is a procurement bill. We want to get the authorization through, so the materiel of our Armed Forces can be built up. I say that as a member of the Armed Services Committee and a member of the subcommittee on which the Senator from Mississippi serves.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator, and add this statement to his with respect to what he said about holding the hearings. There is an exception. We have not gone into the particular phase covered by the amendment, but it is related, and the subcommittee could go into that phase, or another subcommittee could be appointed to go into it.

The question ought to be looked into. It involves many fine people. I have never been more impressed with a case than that presented by the Senator from Iowa. But I will object from now until the sun goes down and insist that this amendment should not be added to this bill, for the reason that we do not know anything about it——

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I will say to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] that there are other ways in which we can do it. There were no resolutions on the matter until we saw the amendment on the subject. There are two ways to accomplish the desired objective. The subcommittee has to make a report. We can draw up a resolution. Or, if the Senator from Nevada, the Senator from Iowa, or other Senators who are interested or are members of the committee, can bring up a resolution, it can be placed before the full committee, and then there can be a hearing on the resolution. Thus we can bring into focus the Department of Defense to make recommendations on that resolution, and we shall have the question before us.

Mr. STENNIS. The question of realinement is so conflicting, involving the Reserves and the National Guard, that I would not want to promise, on such quick notice, to blend all those hearings into one. This question involves Members of the Senate, who are fine and honorable men. The subject should be considered impartially. I think it should be considered whether or not another group or committee should consider the question. But I promise to hold a hearing and try to work on it.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. What I had in mind was not a resolution on the part of our subcommittee, but a resolution being presented to the subcommittee, and having the subcommittee act on it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield to me so I may direct a query to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In view of the statements made by the acting chairman of the full committee and the ranking minority member of the committee, will the Senator from Nevada consider acceding to their suggestions with respect to this amendment?

Mr. CANNON. Am I to understand that I am being given assurance that if the amendment is not pressed at this time, the Preparedness Subcommittee or an appropriate committee will proceed to hold hearings and proceed to report it expeditiously?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I join the Senator.

Mr. CANNON. I am satisfied with that statement. I would like to make one statement to correct a statement made that the amendment would repeal the authority of the President or the Secretary of Defense to screen the Ready Reserves. Such is not the case. I did not want the RECORD to stand uncorrected. This language comes at the end of section 271 as an additional subsection, and does not prohibit the right of the President or Secretary of Defense—and particularly the Secretary—to screen on military matters. I did not want that misunderstanding in the RECORD.

With the assurance I have been given, I am willing to withdraw the amendment.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CANNON. I do not have the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. I shall be glad to yield. May I first say one word, in view of what the Senator from Nevada has said. I read a part of his amendment:

> Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, a member of the Ready Reserve may be transferred to the Standby Reserve, Retired Reserve, or to an inactive status only at his request to be so transferred * * *

So if he does not consent to it, that power is cut off, provided he meets the minimum requirements.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MILLER. I wish to reaffirm what the Senator from Nevada had to say, and request the Senator to continue reading, because there is a provision thereafter which in effect would leave the screening provision intact.

I would not have even considered supporting the amendment of the Senator from Nevada if its language had stopped at the end of the words the Senator from Mississippi just quoted; but with the additional words which are in the amendment, I thought it was a thorough amendment.

If the Senator from Nevada will permit, I should like to ask for an understanding on this point, because as I understand from his asking that hearings be held on this matter, he then said something about reporting it to the Senate for consideration. Have I understood the Senator from Nevada correctly on that point?

Mr. CANNON. I said that it would be reported expeditiously.

Mr. MILLER. The Senator means reported to the Senate as a bill?

Mr. CANNON. If the subcommittee holds hearings on it, it will make an expeditious report to the full committee, and then the full committee may decide against reporting it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But at least there would be a hearing.

Mr. CANNON. But I am talking about an expeditious report after the hearing.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I am not going to stand here and try to pledge any subcommittee or committee as to what it will do or not do when it reports, or anything else, if it involves something we have not had an opportunity to study.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Mississippi yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada a question, so that there will be no misunderstanding.

My question is: Under our general rules, I understand that the subcommittee has to make a report to the full committee. The full committee then has the opportunity to discuss the entire subject. If it votes favorably, of course the measure will be reported to the Senate, but if it votes negatively at that time, it will not be reported to the Senate.

Mr. CANNON. I understand that.

Mr. President, I withdraw my amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, before I yield the floor——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Nevada is withdrawn.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have not yet yielded the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi still has the floor.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I wish to add the rest of the amendment at that point, which I did not have an opportunity to see until debate started today. The remainder of the amendment reads:

> If he fails to comply with the standards and qualifications prescribed pursuant to this title for all members of the Ready Reserve of the service of which he is a member—

And so forth.

I have said all the time that if he did not meet the minimum requirements, he could be screened out, of course. That goes without saying; but if the interpretation I have placed on the amendment is not substantially what I said, why offer the amendment? If it were not necessary to change present law, the amendment would not be offered.

Mr. MILLER and Mr. BARTLETT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. MILLER. Let me say to the Senator from Mississippi that I appreciate very much his attitude of fairness on this issue.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MILLER. I regret that perhaps I did not understand the amendment the same way he did; but I wish to make clear that there was no intention on the part of the drafters of the amendment—and I participated in its drafting—to do anything to pull the hand of either the Secretary of Defense or the President so far as screening is concerned, except on one point: Because we happen to be Members of Congress, or someone happens to be a member of the judiciary, or someone happens to be a member of the executive branch, that mere fact by itself is not sufficient to screen us into the Inactive Reserve. We will take our chances with everyone else, and if we do not measure up to it, very well. I believe that this is the thrust of the amendment. I am sure that will be the basis for its advocacy before the subcommittee during any hearings which will be held.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Nevada withdrew his amendment, did he not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER The amendment has been withdrawn.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. JAVITS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York is recognized.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the distinguished Senator from Mississippi, the Senator in charge of the bill.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, does the Senator from New York have the floor?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. I do.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on passage of the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I thank the Chair and also the Senator from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Mississippi a few questions on this matter of the Hawkeye aircraft which has been deleted from the bill as introduced. I suggested to the Senator's assistant on the floor that I would ask these questions.

We sent a series of questions to the Navy, which has specifically answered them. The information elicited would seem to indicate two aspects of the matter which have a tendency to dictate, perhaps, some change in the committee's action. Knowing that this is an issue which will come before the committee in conference, I pose these questions for the Senator:

In essence, what we glean from the Navy's answers is that if we did what the committee suggests, namely, to stretch out the present procurement in order to see what progress is being made in getting out more of the "bugs" in the Hawkeye aircraft, we would encounter two difficulties. One would be that we could not sustain the approved force levels for this type of aircraft without new procurement, leaving a period of at least 6 months during which force levels would drop or the E-1B interim aircraft would be pushed beyond the period of carrier service recommended for it.

The second point is that there would be a gap in production which would be quite expensive. It would add $8 million to the cost of the program to break production and then restore the production at a later date.

I should deeply appreciate the Senator's commenting on these two difficulties, and also on the fact that an exercise—which followed the testimony of Secretary McNamara on this subject—elicited the comment from the carrier task force commander that the performance of the E-2A Hawkeye aircraft was "outstanding."

Taking all these points together, will the Senator from Mississippi be kind enough to give the Senate his views as to the program, and the disposition of the committee toward it?

Mr. STENNIS. Let me say to the Senator from New York that the main point here is the problem of eliminating the "bugs"—if I may use that word—which are not fatal, but when they are eliminated, we will wish to give a full green light to go ahead, so far as our consideration is concerned. We feel that the facts are such that that will happen. If this difficulty should be cleared up early, new funds could be applied by reprograming. That is one point. The other point is that we understand that the continuity on this matter is not going to be interrupted, that the production line will continue into the early 1967 calendar year, that this subject will be up again before Congress before that time. Therefore, I believe that this problem can be worked out to avoid closing the production line if the technical difficulties are overcome.

Mr. JAVITS. That is why I raised the point. Apparently, if the committee's deletion stood, continuity of the production line, to the extent that it would be undertaken, would still leave the Navy with a period of at least 6 months in which it would either have to drop its force levels—that is, the number of aircraft available—or push the aircraft which it already has beyond what is considered to be the proper period of service.

Moreover, there is the additional cost factor. I should like to ask the Senator to look into this matter before the conference takes place. If the conferees were satisfied that what has happened since this subject was considered justified, some other decision, it is conceivable, is it not, that this could be reflected, in whole or in part, in conference?

Mr. STENNIS. That is always true. The fact that we did not approve it does not mean that we have closed our minds to it. New facts may emerge or new slants may develop on existing facts. This subject will be in conference. Without any intimation of what our conclusion would be, that matter would certainly be considered.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator. The second point that I should like to ask him about is this: When the report of the Senator spoke of reprograming action, am I correct in saying that such action does not involve any new authorization, but involves only Appropriations Committee action?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes, Appropriations and Armed Services Committees.

Mr. JAVITS. Then both committees are in fact involved in such a reprograming action?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. No additional legislation would be necessary for reprograming action to occur.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator for this assurance.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I send two amendments to the desk and ask that they be read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read the amendments.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendments be dispensed with, and ask that they be printed in the Record.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendments, ordered to be printed in the Record, are as follows:

At the end of the bill insert the following:

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"Sec. 301. (a) Section 2201 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to members of the Armed Forces dying during an induction period) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'For purposes of this section, the area comprising (A) Vietnam, and (B) the waters and land areas adjacent to Vietnam as designated by the President by Executive order for purposes of this section, shall be considered to be a combat zone during the period commencing on January 1, 1961, and ending on the date designated by the President by Executive order as the date of termination of combatant activities in such area.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to estates of decedents dying on or after January 1, 1961.

"Sec. 302. (a) Section 692 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to income taxes of members of the Armed Forces on death) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'For purposes of this section, the area comprising (A) Vietnam, and (B) the waters and land areas adjacent to Vietnam as designated by the President by Executive order for purposes of this section, shall be considered to be a combat zone during the period commencing on January 1, 1961, and ending on the date designated by the President by Executive order as the date of termination of combatant activities in such area.'

"(b) The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply with respect to individuals dying on or after January 1, 1961."

At the end of the bill insert the following:

"TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

"Sec. 301. (a) Section 112(c)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to definition of combat zone) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'The term "combat zone" also means the area comprising (A) Vietnam, and (B) the waters and land areas adjacent to Vietnam as designated by the President by Executive order for purposes of this section.'

(b) Section 112(c)(3) of such Code (relating to service performed in a combat zone) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: 'Service is performed in the combat zone of Vietnam if performed on or after January 1, 1961, and on or before the date designated by the President by Executive order as the date of the termination of combatant activities in such zone.'

Sec. 302. The amendments made by section 301 shall apply to taxable year 1961 and all subsequent years, including the full year during which the President proclaims termination of combatant activities as prescribed in section 301(b) of this Act.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendments be considered en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, throughout our Nation's modern history the American citizenry has extended special benefits to those servicemen who are called to duty and who face combat conditions. This is a time-honored tradition and one Americans have proudly respected.

It seems to me only right and appropriate that this tradition be extended to encompass the present conflict in Vietnam. There can be little doubt that

Americans in southeast Asia are facing combat conditions.

Members of all the armed services, both officer and enlisted, have told me and written to me that they regard their service in Vietnam to be under combat conditions equal to those of Korea and World War II. In addition, officials of the State Department have informed me that they regard Americans in southeast Asia to be facing combat.

As everyone in this Chamber knows there are some 28,000 U.S. personnel committed to the Vietnam war. More than 300 of these have been killed. We are losing boys and equipment there almost every day in this fight against communism.

I am sorry that there has not been a greater dialog in the Nation about the present legal situation confronting servicemen in the Vietnam war. The situation is this: Current provisions of the Internal Revenue Code provide tax benefits for service in combat zones. All that is required is Presidential designation of an area as a combat zone.

Although the major American buildup in Vietnam dates from 1961, we never have proclaimed that area a combat zone for Internal Revenue Code purposes.

I am aware of the sensitive foreign policy questions raised when the President publicly designates an area a combat zone. Therefore, I propose that the Congress take that action now. Such congressional action need not be interpreted by anyone or by any nation as any sort of warlike action. Rather, congressional action can be interpreted only as a domestic matter concerning clarification of tax laws.

I hasten to add that I, for one, would welcome Presidential declaration of Vietnam as a combat zone. I think no one in the world any longer has any doubt about the situation there.

However, even if the President feels foreign policy requirements forestall his action in this area, it would seem to me that Congress has a fundamental obligation to treat our servicemen in Vietnam with as much fairness as that extended to the men who served our Nation and all freemen in Korea.

I urge this Senate to take the leading step in granting to American soldiers, sailors, and airmen in southeast Asia the recognition, opportunities, and benefits which this Nation has afforded for service in the far-too-frequent combat zones of the past.

The first amendment I propose would designate the southeast Asian area as a combat zone for the purpose of extending income tax relief to the personnel there. It would make operative existing provisions of the law that allow enlisted men total income tax exemption and all officers a $200 monthly tax exemption.

The second amendment is a companion measure designating southeast Asia a combat zone for the purpose of extending estate tax relief to the survivors of men killed there. It also would forgive unpaid income tax owed by those estates. It would benefit the widows and children of Vietnam dead, again utilizing existing provisions of the law.

These two amendments are so written as to be retroactive to January 1, 1961. That date marks the real beginning of the American buildup for the defense of both South Vietnam and of American interests there.

The period 1954 to 1959 was a quiet period in southeast Asia with the United States conducting a low-key military program of some 700 advisers. Communist terror and subversion were at a low level. Then, in 1960 the North Vietnamese Communists initiated a turning point with their decision to take over full direction of efforts to seize South Vietnam.

The American buildup in response to obvious Communist designs began in 1961 when we increased the number of advisers to some 2,000 in the face of Red infiltration. By 1962, we were up to 11,000 men; by 1963—15,500; by 1964—23,000; and today—nearly 28,000.

Americans fighting in southeast Asia today, and those who risked their lives in earlier years, are entitled to be regarded as combat veterans for these income tax purposes.

My amendments are so drawn as to apply not only to the men on the ground in Vietnam, but also—subject to Presidential delimitation of the zone of operations—to men in Laos and to those sailors and naval officers at sea in waters adjacent to the troubled area.

I have asked the Internal Revenue Service to estimate the funds involved in granting these time-honored benefits to servicemen. The Service advised me that estimation is very difficult because of the varying levels of American personnel commitment in the area, and that public discussion of an estimate is somewhat restricted by security considerations.

However, in a very general way, IRS has estimated that servicemen would receive, from these existing parts of the law, tax benefits in the neighborhood of $4 million. That is something like eight one-thousanths of 1 percent of the national defense budget. It is about four-tenths of 1 percent of the antipoverty program. It would buy less than one-half of one B-58 bomber. It is roughly the cost of the two F-105's we lost 2 days ago.

It is a very small price tag to place on a very big obligation owed by all Americans to those who fight for us in Asia. I urge the Senate to extend these tax benefits to our servicemen, by implementing existing law.

Mr. STENNIS. Quite briefly, Mr. President, I should like to reply to the Senator from Texas. I commend the Senator for his fine motives and his objectives in getting consideration of this matter. I do not believe the Senate, at this point, can really pass on the merits of the amendments. Certainly it is clear that they should not be attached to the pending bill.

I understand that the amendments have been presented earlier in the form of bills which are now pending before the Committee on Finance. Furthermore, the very subject matter of the bills themselves, although laudable, is one that is covered by the Constitution. It constitutes a revenue bill, affecting revenue. For that reason I believe a point of order would have to be raised, although the Senator certainly should have his "day in court" at another time in connection with his thoughts on this matter.

If the Senator does not see fit to withdraw his amendments, under these circumstances, and wait for a better day, under the rule I shall have to raise a point of order.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I respect the desire of the distinguished acting chairman of the committee to keep the bill a clean bill, so to speak, since it is a military hardware bill. I am very much inclined to defer to his wishes.

I believe that the constitutional objection is met, in that the bill is not a revenue bill as such. It is not a tax measure. It would merely establish a declaration which would enable present law to be implemented. It would not raise revenue. It would not raise or lower taxes or provide for additional rates. It would merely be a declaration of South Vietnam as a combat zone so that the provisions of existing law could be implemented.

I know that the distinguished Senator from Mississippi has worked long and hard to keep the bill purely a procurement bill, dealing only with military hardware. I am inclined to defer to the judgment and wishes of the Senator.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain comments by the distinguished junior Senator from California [Mr. MURPHY] in support of my amendment.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MURPHY

I join my distinguished colleague from Texas in urging the adoption of these amendments designed to give those Americans who daily place their lives on the firing line in Vietnam a tax consideration—a tax break that we have traditionally extended to servicemen in combat areas.

Although there may be policy reasons why the President is reluctant to designate this area of Vietnam a combat zone, fairplay and logic demands that Congress recognize the sacrifices our men are making to preserve our way of life.

Make no mistake about it. The results of that conflict may in no small way determine the shape of tomorrow's world. That conflict, depending upon the outcome, will either discourage or encourage the Communist aim of world domination. If we fail, the appetite of the aggressor will be increased; the Communists will look for other fertile areas into which to sink their ugly aggressive teeth.

With the stakes so high to the free world and with the risks so great to the American soldier, I believe the Congress by passing these amendments will be saying to the GI: "We recognize the sacrifice you are making in preserving freedom and we in a small way are granting you a taxing benefit in appreciation and recognition of your courageous fight against Communist aggression and for the preservation of freedom."

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Texas yield?

Mr. TOWER. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, I support these amendments by the distinguished Senator from Texas.

Surely there can be no doubt remaining in any American's mind that we are engaged in a war in Vietnam. To call it anything else is ridiculous.

We have long since passed the point where the death of a few military advisers or helicopter pilots could be shrugged off as unfortunate accidents.

The world knows of our buildup of military strength in Vietnam and the strikes against North Vietnamese targets by our planes. The world also knows that Communist aggression and terror, including the bombing of civilians, is on the increase.

To recognize Vietnam as a combat theater of operations simply amounts to facing the facts. I urge the support of my colleagues for these amendments because they are right and long overdue.

Mr. TOWER. I thank the Senator from Arizona, Mr. President, in deference to the distinguished acting chairman, I withdraw my amendments. I should like to have an opportunity at a later time to offer them to a more appropriate vehicle. It is my fervent hope that the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] might consider the amendments in his committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendments are withdrawn.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator from Texas for his very fine attitude and his presentation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have one question on another subject which I should like to address to the Senator from Mississippi. We have a rather burning interest in New York in the New York Naval Shipyard. There are provisions in the House military procurement authorization bill, H.R. 6500, recently ordered reported by the House committee to be found on page 3, lines 4 to 20, inclusive, in two sections which deal with that subject. Section 302 repeats, for practical purposes, the Vinson-Trammell Act of 1934 with respect to allocation of new ship construction. I can understand why the Senate committee felt that the act provided what it did; and that is sufficient. But I notice that section 303 of the House bill would abolish the so-called 65–35 ratio for ship conversion, alteration, and repair. I understand that that is the desire of the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara. The Secretary testified at page 192 of his statement before the committee that removal of the 65–35 formula would raise from 65 to 80 percent the quantity of work in the public yards on conversion, alteration, and repair. Section 303 of the House bill provides—

> The assignment of naval ship conversion, alteration, and repair projects shall be made on the basis of economic and military considerations and shall not be restricted by requirements that certain portions of such naval shipwork be assigned to particular types of shipyards or to particular geographical areas or by similar requirements.

This was a notable point in the House bill and the Senate report does not go into the subject. I suggest that perhaps the Senator would want to give the Senate a word of explanation as to its omission from the Senate bill.

Mr. STENNIS. In the first place, in relation to the legislative situation, the committee considered its own bill. The House bill has not yet passed in the House of Representatives. The Senate has before it the Senate version of the bill. The House committee action was brought to our attention after our hearings had closed, and we did not pass on it one way or the other. So, if the House should pass the House version of the bill with the provision to which the Senator has referred, the item would be in conference and would be given consideration.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, the subcommittee and the full committee have not made any specific decision on the question. It would be a matter of first impression.

Mr. STENNIS. That is correct. Of course, we have our own background, knowledge, and so forth, but no decision has been made on that point.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I call the attention of the Senator to page 2 of our report and the tabulation which appears in the fifth column. The Senator will notice that in section 412 there is shown the authorization required. The only thing we have to do is to cover the provisions of section 412 for the authorization of missiles, Navy ships, and so on. The question which the Senator from New York has raised did not arise within the province of the bill at all, but it comes within the jurisdiction of appropriations.

Mr. JAVITS. As I understand, if the House passes the House version of the bill—and I hope very much that it will—the committee will then be in a position to deal with it as a question of first impression.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. The Senator is correct.

Mr. JAVITS. So far as the bill and its consideration is concerned.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I assume that it would be in conference.

Mr. JAVITS. So far as the Senate is concerned, it would be necessary—and I hope very much that this would be borne in mind—at some stage to get the view of the Senate upon that particular provision which has been included in the past three defense appropriation bills. It might easily be one of the provisions which would be in disagreement of such a character that it would call for an expression of view by the Senate.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I believe that we have had the Senate's view on that subject for the past 3 or 4 years. I am confident that we shall have it again this year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, throughout the long hearings during the consideration of the bill and the preparation of the report, even down to the present time, the full Committee on Armed Services and the Subcommittee on Appropriations were very ably assisted by Mr. William H. Darden, Mr. William W. Woodruff, Mr. Francis S. Hewitt, and Mr. Joseph L. Borda. On behalf of all members of the committee I wish to thank the members of the staff of the Armed Services and the Appropriations Committees. In connection with the amendments I wish to thank Mr. Edward Braswell, of the Senate Committee on Armed Services, for giving his usual fine assistance. I wish to thank him, too, for the committee.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, as a member of the committee, I should like to commend our acting chairman. He took over under difficult circumstances upon the necessary temporary departure of our good friend the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. The Senator from Mississippi conducted the hearings with great fairness to every member of the committee, regardless of his party or political disposition. He deserves the commendation of the Senate for the fine way in which he has handled the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HARTKE], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MCGOVERN], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] are absent on official business.

I also announce that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. BASS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DODD], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. MCGEE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] would each vote "yea."

Mr. KUCHEL. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is necessarily absent and, if present and voting, would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 44 Leg.]

YEAS—85

Aiken
Allott
Anderson
Bartlett
Bayh
Bible
Boggs
Brewster
Burdick

Byrd, Va.
Byrd, W. Va.
Cannon
Carlson
Case
Church
Clark
Cooper
Cotton
Curtis
Dirksen
Dominick
Douglas
Eastland
Ellender
Ervin
Fannin
Fong
Fulbright
Gore
Harris
Hart
Hickenlooper
Hill
Holland
Hruska
Inouye
Jackson
Javits
Jordan, N.C.
Jordan, Idaho
Kennedy, Mass.
Kennedy, N.Y.
Kuchel
Lausche
Long, Mo.
Long, La.
Magnuson
Mansfield
McCarthy
McClellan
McIntyre
McNamara
Metcalf
Miller
Mondale
Montoya
Morse
Morton
Moss
Mundt
Murphy
Muskie
Nelson
Neuberger
Pearson
Pell
Prouty
Proxmire
Ribicoff
Robertson
Saltonstall
Scott
Simpson
Smathers
Smith
Stennis
Talmadge
Thurmond
Tower
Tydings
Williams, N.J.
Williams, Del.
Yarborough
Young, N. Dak.
Young, Ohio

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—15

Bass
Bennett
Dodd
Gruening
Hartke
Hayden
Johnston
McGee
McGovern
Monroney
Pastore
Randolph
Russell
Sparkman
Symington

So the bill (S. 800) was passed.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate turn to the consideration of H.R. 2362, reported today by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], that it be laid down and made the pending business. There will be no action on the bill tonight.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 2362) to provide for elementary and secondary education.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. For the information of the Senate, there will be no further voting tonight.

OCEANOGRAPHIC COUNCIL—RESOLUTION BY STATE OF ALASKA

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, Hon. Hugh J. Wade, secretary of state for the State of Alaska, has transmitted to me a resolution adopted by the legislature of that State, strongly urging congressional enactment of S. 944, to expand marine research and establish a National Oceanographic Council.

S. 944, cosponsored by Senators of both parties from many States, would provide a legislative base for the national oceanographic program, State program objectives, and create an independent Cabinet-level Council similar to that of the National Security Council, Federal Radiation Council, National Aeronautics and Space Council, and the proposed Federal Water Resources Council. Legislation to establish the latter, as all of us know, has already passed the Senate, and has been reported favorably to the House of Representatives.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 23 of the State of Alaska, calling for enactment of S. 944, and stating reasons therefor, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 23 OF THE STATE OF ALASKA

Resolution relating to the creation of a National Oceanographic Council

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Whereas the economy of Alaska is in great measure dependent upon the natural resources of the ocean; and

Whereas seafood is an important food source for Alaskans; and

Whereas Alaska commerce is vitally dependent upon maritime transportation; and

Whereas the importance of the oceans to the welfare of all citizens of the United States, as well as of Alaskans, was emphasized by the introduction, by Senator MAGNUSON of Washington, of S. 944 which provides for the coordination of all Federal activities regarding oceanography by a proposed National Oceanographic Council; and

Whereas expanded and efficiently coordinated national programs as envisioned by S. 944 would be of particular benefit to the people of Alaska: Be it

Resolved, That the enactment of S. 944 by the Congress is respectfully urged by the Fourth State Legislature of Alaska; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Honorable Lyndon B. Johnson, President of the United States; the Honorable CARL HAYDEN, President pro tempore of the Senate; the Honorable JOHN C. MCCORMACK, Speaker of the House of Representatives; the Honorable WARREN G. MAGNUSON, chairman, Senate Commerce Committee; the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, chairman, House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee; and the Honorable E. L. BARTLETT and the Honorable ERNEST GRUENING, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable RALPH J. RIVERS, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

Passed by the house February 19, 1965.

NICHE GRAVEL,
Speaker of the House.

Passed by the senate March 12, 1965.

——— ———,
President of the Senate.
WILLIAM A. EGAN,
Governor of Alaska.

VOICE OF BUSINESS AND U.S. POLICY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the March 13 issue of Business Week, which carries Secretary Connor's picture on its cover, tells of his aims as the Department's top executive in a lead article titled "Voice of Business in U.S. Policy." I have found this article highly interesting and informative and ask unanimous consent that the article from Business Week, titled "Voice for Business in U.S. Policy" be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOICE FOR BUSINESS IN U.S. POLICY—THAT'S WHAT JOHN T. CONNOR AIMS TO BE AS COMMERCE SECRETARY, AND HE'S LIKELY TO MAKE A BIGGER MARK THAN ANY RECENT HOLDER OF THE JOB; BALANCE-OF-PAYMENTS DRIVE IS HIS FIRST TEST

John T. Connor is not only the youngest man to be named Secretary of Commerce in a quarter century, but he promises also to stake out a new role for the holder of this usually lackluster Cabinet post.

Unlike the corporate executive who traditionally accepts a top Government position as the capstone of a career nearing its end, Connor—now 50—is still a "comer." He sees a new career ahead of him, believes this administration gives him new horizons.

President Johnson, he believes, wants advice from businessmen before policies are fixed, not just assent or opposition after they are adopted. So he conceives his role as that of businessman's representative in the Johnson administration.

MUTUAL

One reason he was eager to take on the job, Connor says, was because Johnson understands business and businessmen "better than any President since God knows when."

"I was attracted to this job by the President's frequent statement of his philosophy—which is just what I've been saying," he adds.

Johnson, obviously, was attracted to Connor because of what Connor is and represents: an executive who worked his way to the presidency of Merck & Co., Inc., by the time he was 40, and from this base became one of the authentic members of the U.S. business establishment.

WIDER SWATH

As a firm believer in the importance of business to the Nation's welfare, Connor feels that the management viewpoint should be brought to bear in the early stages of administration policymaking.

As a prime example, he mentions tax policy, and cites the provisions in this year's medicare bill levying half the increased tax (like other social security taxes) on employers. This will cost business a lot of money, but "as far as I know," he notes, the Commerce Department wasn't consulted on it.

One thing is evident in all this: Connor will have more opportunity to cut a wide swath in Washington than any Commerce Secretary since Herbert Hoover. And there are signs that the President is willing to let Connor earn himself a place in the ring of close-in Johnson advisers.

I. JUMPING RIGHT IN

Johnson assigned Connor to two tough problems before the new Secretary really knew his way around the long suite of offices on the fifth floor of the massive, block-size Commerce Building—just a hop-skip-and-jump from the back door to the White House.

He was placed on the President's three-man Panel created to settle the nagging dock strike, alongside Labor Secretary W. Willard Wirtz and Senator WAYNE MORSE, Democrat, of Oregon.

More important, he is in full charge of whipping up compliance of 500 of the country's largest companies with Johnson's unprecedented voluntary program to curb the critical balance-of-payments deficit that has been draining the United States of its gold and complicating our position in the world.

Welcome

Connor welcomed the assignment to the Dock Strike Panel, and thinks Johnson's appointment of him is a significant pointer. Many businessmen have long felt, as he puts it, that "settlements resulting from Government intervention haven't always reflected management's point of view." But he figures that his experience as an enlightened management man, who has long dealt with labor matters and union officials, indicates he won't deal with labor or strike problems "in a narrow or partisan way."

Both Secretary Wirtz and he, Connor says, see a need for a unified and common approach to problems in the labor-management field. While he doesn't say so, he obviously expects his access to the White House on such matters will be as easy as that of Wirtz, on whom Johnson relies heavily.

Favorable

Labor views Connor favorably. O. A. Knight, president of the Oil, Chemical & Atomic Workers, negotiated one contract directly with Connor. "They were stymied on a new contract at Merck when Connor and I took over, and we got a settlement," Knight recalls. "He's a fair man to deal with but he doesn't give away anything. You can do business with him."

Knight notes it's unusual for a company president to handle negotiations himself—and unusual to find one with whom you can reach an understanding.

A National Maritime Union official, who is usually blasting the Commerce Department for its maritime policy, commends Connor for setting up a tripartite subcommittee to study and report on the state of the maritime industry—"something we wanted for a long time but could never get. This fellow is going at it the right way."

An AFL-CIO maritime expert who sat in on the one tripartite meeting so far says of Connor: "I was very favorably impressed. He seemed to know what it was all about. He does his homework."

No special pleader

Connor doesn't consider himself a special pleader, by any means. He sees himself as representative of a new generation of business leaders whose views diverge widely from those of many older executives now retiring or past retirement age.

II. "I'M A NEW DEALER"

The President is a New Dealer, says Connor, and "so am I." He doesn't share the feeling of those businessmen of the time who couldn't bear even to hear Franklin D. Roosevelt's name. Connor's own generation can't forget the experience of getting an education or a job in the depression, or the experiences of the war and postwar years. "It's part of our fiber," he says.

The Commerce Secretary, whose gray hair, ruddy complexion, and reserved manner give him the air of the trust manager of a large bank, says this with great conviction.

Whatever his New Deal views, he believes the business community occupies a key position in the governmental, social, and economic structure of the country; so it is perfectly natural for Government policies to "encourage and nourish the growth and success of private business."

No stranger

This isn't Connor's first Government experience; his wartime Government career, in fact, provided his springboard to Merck.

A graduate of Syracuse (magna cum laude, 1936) and Harvard Law School (1939), he first served in a New York law firm, then as general counsel of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, whose chief was Dr. Vannevar Bush. After 2 years with the Marine Corps, he became, at war's end, a special assistant to Navy Secretary James Forrestal.

Connor agrees that Dr. Bush was "very instrumental" in sending him to Merck in 1947. He became vice president 3 years later and in another 5 years president.

III. CURING THE DEFICIT

In pushing the balance-of-payments program, Connor brings to bear experience in the inner circle of the top business organizations—the Business Council, Committee for Economic Development, American Management Association, and National Industrial Conference Board. There's no doubt, either, of his own firsthand knowledge of international trade. He led Merck's big expansion drive into markets in 21 countries.

Connor's advisory committee, picked to help put across the voluntary program, is blue chip all the way. Chairman A. L. Nicholson, of Socony Mobil Oil Co., is its chairman; Carter L. Burgess, of American Machine & Foundry, is vice chairman. Members are President Fred J. Borch, of General Electric; Chairman Carl J. Gilbert, of Gillette Co.; Chairman Elisha Gray II, of Whirlpool Corp.; President J. Ward Keener, of B. F. Goodrich; President George S. Moore, of First National City Bank of New York; Chairman Stuart T. Saunders, of the Pennsylvania RR., and Sidney J. Weinberg, general partner, Goldman, Sachs & Co.

Convinced

Connor is convinced the voluntary program will work; and the seven members at the first advisory committee meeting a week ago told newsmen they agreed.

"We think that we will begin to get results in the second quarter of the year," Connor said, "and by the end of the third quarter we should have a pretty good indication of just how successful it is."

The first wave of criticism of the program, Connor thinks, came from businessmen who weren't at the President's White House meeting and didn't understand what it was all about. He implies that once word gets around, the critics will subside.

He is relying on the chief executives of the 500 top companies in the program. They know, he says, the program has to be a success "because the consequences of failure are too dreadful to contemplate." Connor is ramming this home hard: The "or else" is direct exchange controls.

Doubtful, skepticism

Connor admits that "down the line" in many companies there is doubt and skepticism. That's why he is making sure that the top executive of each company is held responsible for its performance. Before his advisory committee convened, he met with the chief financial officers of its members' companies to make sure the top executives were well briefed.

Connor concedes there is resistance to the proposal for formal quarterly reports from each company on its own "balance-of-payments ledger," and says the quarterly proposal "isn't definite." "The idea of divulging this information is new to some companies," he explains.

No company is being asked to turn back its oversea investment program. Connor tells them: "If you keep your direct investment program unimpaired, then help us in other ways. Pick your own weapons."

Two years

What Connor wants mainly is for companies to borrow funds abroad (even though it's more costly), repatriate as much money as possible.

Connor is also relying on these companies to push exports higher. He thinks the big international companies can do a lot in the next year or two to expand exports by shipping more finished products, or more parts and supplies, overseas. Much can be done about some exports, he feels—"coal, for example"—through deals with European countries.

Hotspot

The balance-of-payments program has Connor on the hotspot. Federal Reserve Chairman William McC. Martin, Jr., has only about nine large banks to deal with on his end of the program. Connor has an auditorium full of businessmen to cajole; his 500 companies are much more diverse than the bankers.

A top Government expert, perennially pessimistic on balance-of-payments remedies, now thinks Connor's approach will work. "He knows these industry people and he knows all about the progam," says this expert. "They won't be able to fool him."

IV. DESKFUL OF PROBLEMS

Connor's long association with the chemical industry has earned him the suspicions of those dedicated to lowering tariffs. He told the Senate Commerce Committee he regards himself "neither as a protectionist nor as a free-trader," and shows a tinge of irritation when the subject crops up.

Criticism is usually tied to his dissent from a Committee for Economic Development recommendation for across-the-board tariff cuts. His statement was: "I must disagree with the basic recommendation in the CED statement that in the pending trade negotiations the United States should seek tariff reductions of 50 percent by the industrialized nations of the free world on an across-the-board basis."

Connor says he holds the same view still, and adds that it is consistent with the administration view and the bargaining position of U.S. negotiators at Geneva. He refers to the "exception list" on which the United States won't negotiate tariff cuts, and other products on which cuts will be less than 50 percent.

On East-West trade, Connor takes a show me sort of attitude; he sees no special reason for a company to sell know-how to the Russians that it wouldn't sell to domestic competitors. But he thinks firsthand discussions by U.S. industrialists with the Russians are all to the good.

Wide range

As Commerce Secretary, of course, Connor faces decisions on a wide range of problems—the lagging railroads and Johnson's proposed super-passenger speed service; a supersonic air transport; ship subsidies; highway user taxes; Patent Office automation. He will have a key role in administering the Appalachia program, too, and in any broader regional development program for the rest of the United States.

He is cagey about how he will shake up the Commerce Department, but points out that he is a "student of management" and says: "I'm going to simplify." He is aghast at the number of end runs that are possible; but he prefers to get rid of individuals who block organization channels, rather than change the organization to wire it around them.

DEVELOPMENTS IN COLOR TELEVISION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, a great deal has been written concerning the development of color television.

My committee has held extensive hearings on this subject. In recent months the activities with reference to color television have been moving at a rapid pace, therefore, I ask unanimous consent to make part of the RECORD at this point a copy of an article written by Mr. Jack Gould, the radio and television writer of the New York Times.

This article appeared in the March 1965 issue.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1965]

TV: Sarnoff Triumphant—CBS Will Offer Color on Two Major Shows

(By Jack Gould)

Fifteen years ago a grim-lipped Brig. Gen. David Sarnoff stormed down to the laboratories of the Radio Corp. of America in Princeton, N.J., and read the riot act to his scientists.

"Get something going," he demanded. "Get it off the breadboard. I'll be back tomorrow."

The general was talking about color television. He was an industrial tycoon whose pride had been wounded. The Columbia Broadcasting System, with no record of achievement at that time in television set manufacture, had challenged him on his own ground. It had dared to come up with a color TV set. Not only that, but it was a color set with a revolving wheel. To an electronics visionary, that was like replacing the telephone with smoke signals.

General Sarnoff won his battle of Princeton. "The thing the scientists came up with weighed a ton but it proved a principle in a demonstration," he remembers. "There was only one little trouble. The bananas in the picture were green and the monkeys were purple."

The peppery board chairman of RCA, who celebrated his 74th birthday last month, recalled with a laugh yesterday the occasion of his bravura Napoleonic performance on the Jersey meadow. Just minutes earlier he had received word that his old adversary, CBS, had awarded him the final and ultimate fruits of victory in a one-man struggle with few parallels in industry.

Starting next fall, CBS will become the last of the three networks to do regular programing in color. The Danny Kaye and Red Skelton shows will be done in natural hues and the new Thursday night feature movie will be presented in color. Some local CBS programing also will be switched to color.

CBS had been the lone important holdout against regular color and the general received its capitulation with a wry smile as he sat behind a desk that seemed big enough for doubles in table tennis.

"Of course, it might have come a little sooner," he quipped.

The general, nattily attired in a pin-striped suit and with a characteristically yeasty mode of expression that long has been the despair of his contingents of lawyers and publicity men, had reason to savor the quiet afternoon in his office in the RCA Building at 30 Rockefeller Plaza.

Before his company earned a nickel from color TV the general had sunk $130 million into the research and development of a color system that had no flywheels or motors and could be compatibly introduced without disturbing black-and-white TV service.

"I guess this may have been the toughest fight of my life," he said. "We only spent $50 million before getting a return on black-and-white TV."

At one time not a single TV manufacturer supported General Sarnoff's struggle, and both the American Broadcasting Co. and Columbia Broadcasting System initially adopted a philosophy of letting RCA and its subsidiary, the National Broadcasting Co., go it alone.

General Sarnoff yesterday could contemplate a new billion dollar color TV industry, a consumer demand that is exceeding the supply of picture tubes, and steadily lowering costs.

"It's really been remarkable," the general said. "Everybody laughed at our picture tube and some said it would never work. But we've never changed the principle of the thing since we started."

Color sets are now selling for about $380 and up. A few are priced as low as $300 as sales attraction. More than 400 stations are now equipped to transmit color.

The general estimated that 3 million sets were in use and that within a year the figure would rise to 5 million. Color TV is now RCA's leading consumer product in sales volume and the company is reaping the rewards of its pioneering.

The general diplomatically hinted that color might provide a new cycle of excitement that TV programing could always use but he was wary about predicting when the crucial bottleneck in color picture tubes might be broken.

"You never know about the American manufacturer when there is a buck around the corner," he said.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, incidentally, a great deal of the development is due to the fact that the Committee on Commerce had long urged that the makers of television sets embark upon this program, and they did embark upon it with great success.

POSTURE'S PLACE IN OUR HEALTH

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the President of the United States has done much to make the American people aware of the importance of physical fitness. President Kennedy, before him, created an intense interest in physical fitness in his youth fitness programs. Federal programs of this kind require the understanding and support of all citizens of the Nation to be effective and to produce a healthier, more robust population.

For many years, the chiropractic profession has sponsored National Correct Posture Week, May 1–7. This observance has helped to cite the importance of correct posture in total health. Throughout this Nation this week will be observed by chiropractic associations and community groups. Governors and mayors will focus the public attention on correct posture by proclaiming correct posture week. Public and private schools will be encouraged to promote correct posture, with particular emphasis on spinal health and of a sound body through development of a balanced, healthy spine.

The chiropractic profession's desire to augment the fine purposes of the President's Council on Physical Fitness deserves commendation. I ask permission to have the following statement by Dr. A. M. Schierholz, executive director of the American Chiropractic Association, printed in the Record, for the information and benefit of the American people.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Statement By Dr. A. M. Schierholz

The American Chiropractic Association realizes the responsibility shared by all members of the healing arts for maintenance of the public health. This responsibility may be divided into two primary obligations: First, we must care for the sick and injured. Second, we must create programs and take steps to prevent illness and degeneration of the public health through programs designed to improve the general stamina of our citizens.

National Correct Posture Week, May 1 through 7, is promoted by the chiropractic profession to help achieve this second objective. This week closely ties in with the President's Council on Youth Fitness and we praise the Chief Executive for his wise development of the national youth fitness program.

Correct posture contributes to inner health and attractive appearance. The ambition of every normal youngster is to grow up into a popular, well-coordinated specimen of adulthood. These hopes will never be realized by the child whose posture and spinal health are deficient.

So correct posture assures more than health. It helps to develop that radiance and poise which is so vital to general appearance and a person's sense of well-being.

The chiropractic profession has researched and studied the spine for nearly 70 years. Chiropractors are specialists in knowledge of the spine and its effects on general body health. To improve spinal balance and function, the chiropractic profession has propounded a simple and easily remembered rule of health:

"Stand Tall—Walk Tall—Sit Tall." These are the basic steps to improve one's posture. During National Correct Posture Week we make special emphasis of these ways in which all citizens can improve their posture.

Stand straight, with head held level and balanced over the body's center of gravity. Shoulders should be relaxed and even. The chest should be held high with abdomen flat. The spine from neck to posterior should describe a gentle "S" curve. Knees should be slightly flexed and the weight of the body resting squarely on both feet.

Walking tall describes an attitude of vigor and health. The gait is even, arms swing freely, and the head is held high. Walking in this proud and youthful manner contributes to better breathing and the traditional posture of one who faces the world squarely with the twinkle of health in his eye.

Sitting tall opposes the tendency to slump in one's chair. Proper sitting increases working efficiency and contributes to better, clearer thinking. The American Chiropractic Association reminds executives that as their chairs become comfortable and regal they very likely encourage poor sitting posture. Chairs for the home and office should be selected with posture as a prime consideration.

The American Chiropractic Association appreciates the wholehearted cooperation it received from the American people in the observance of Correct Posture Week. Likewise, our organization has been gratified to have the assistance of governors, mayors, church and school leaders, and civic and community groups in the promotion of National Correct Posture Week.

Working together we can all share the rewards that better posture provides. Posture consciousness and spirited national participation in the President's youth fitness program make a substantial contribution to better public health.

CONSERVATION AND PROTECTION OF PACIFIC SALMON OF NORTH AMERICAN ORIGIN

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for myself, and the senior Senator from Alaska [Mr. Bartlett], a bill to conserve and protect Pacific salmon of North American origin. This legislation would assist the United States in its continuing effort to conserve and protect the salmon resources of the North Pacific by permitting the use of economic sanctions when this becomes necessary to assure that State conservation programs for salmon are not being thwarted by abusive and reckless fishing practices followed by other nations.

This bill follows very closely the precedent that has been established of protecting U.S. fishing interests on the high seas through the use of economic sanctions found both in the Tuna Convention Act of 1950 and the amendment on conservation of fishery resources added to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

The Tuna Convention Act of 1950, as amended in October of 1962, places an embargo on the importation into the United States of certain fishery products when the exporting nation is conducting fishing operations in a manner which tends to diminish the effectiveness of the tuna conservation program. The amendment to the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 permits the President to increase the duty on any fish in any form which is the product of a country which fails to meet or negotiate a fishery agreement on the conservation or use of fishery resources.

Both of these measures have been approved by the administration and have, in the case of the tuna convention, been enacted at the suggestion of the Department of State. I, therefore, expect and hope for speedy and prompt action on this legislative proposal which is so vital to the protection of our North Pacific salmon resources.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1734) to conserve and protect Pacific salmon of North American origin, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON (for himself and Mr. BARTLETT), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this time a table of imports of fishery products from Japan by commodity description, 1962. It is a long list, which includes the tariff of July 1, 1934, and showing by unit the quantity and value of Japanese fishery imports, and the 1963 tariff.

There being no objection, the tabulation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Imports of fishery products from Japan by commodity description, 1962

Item	Unit	Quantity	Value [1]	Tariff July 1, 1934 [2]	1963 tariff
EDIBLE PRODUCTS					
Frog legs, fresh, chilled or frozen		1,322,863	$1,354,647	10 percent ad valorem	5 percent.
Frog legs, prepared or preserved		5,738	7,638	20 percent ad valorem	12 percent.
Fresh water trout, not elsewhere included, fresh and frozen		1,845,919	747,447	1 cent per pound	0.5 cent per pound.
Fresh water n.e.s. and blue pike, fresh or frozen		300	131	do	Do.
Eels, fresh or frozen		800	812	do	Do.
Salmon, fresh or frozen		165,753	113,860	2 cents per pound	Do.
Cod, haddock, hake, pollock, and cusk, fresh or frozen		318,500	51,385	1 cent per pound	Do.
Halibut, fresh or frozen [2]		394,164	107,260	2 cents per pound	Do.
Mackerel, frozen		447,695	73,390	do	0.75 cent per pound.
Sturgeon, fresh or frozen		130,620	47,399	1 cent per pound	0.5 cent per pound.
Swordish, frozen		59,316	21,729	2 cents per pound	0.75 cent per pound.
Shad, fresh or frozen		200	290	1 cent per pound	0.5 cent per pound.
Fish, n.e.s., fresh or frozen		1,761,804	338,476	do	1 cent per pound.
Smelts, fresh or frozen		390,886	74,348	Free	Free.
Albacore, whole, fresh or frozen, not cooked		52,074,117	9,346,616	do	Do.
Albacore, n.e.s., fresh or frozen, not cooked		2,464,777	412,254	do	Do.
Yellowfin, etc., whole, fresh or frozen, not cooked		4,057,936	622,757	do	Do.
Yellowfin, etc., gilled and gutted, fresh or frozen, not cooked		66,863,020	11,392,298	do	Do.
Yellowfin, etc., filleted, fresh or frozen, not cooked		10,732,820	1,897,632	do	Do.
Yellowfin, etc., gilled and gutted, heads, tails removed		10,772,880	1,658,272	do	Do.
Yellowfin, etc., n.e.s., fresh or frozen, not cooked		963,656	101,857	do	Do.
Skipjack tuna, fresh or frozen, not cooked		1,291,618	141,455	do	Do.
Tuna, not elsewhere specified, fresh or frozen, not cooked		1,508,740	211,371	do	Do.
Cod, filleted, fresh or frozen		21,630	4,047	2½ cents per pound	1.875 cents per pound and 2½ cents per pound [1]
Swordfish, filleted, fresh or frozen		18,425,981	6,232,416	do	1.5 cents per pound.[3]
Halibut and salmon, filleted, fresh or frozen		4,335,213	1,722,799	do	Do.
Yellow pike filleted, fresh or frozen		25,000	4,023	do	Do.
Fresh water fish except yellow pike, filleted, fresh or frozen		10,000	3,230	do	Do.
Flounders, filleted, fresh or frozen		23,148	10,338	do	Do.
Wolf fish, filleted, fresh or frozen		8,700	2,697	do	1 cent per pound.
Fish, filleted, boned, etc., fresh or frozen		3,903,804	1,161,359	do	1.5 cents per pound.
Cod, haddock, etc., dried and unsalted		2,045	750	do	0.2 cent per pound.
Shark fins, dried and unsalted		56,611	64,794	1¼ cents per pound	0.53 cent per pound.
Fish, n.e.s., dried and unsalted		115,796	82,970	do	0.3125 cent per pound.
Sardines in oil, not skinned or boned—over 18, not over 23 cents per pound.		487	108	30 percent	20 percent.
Sardines in oil, not skinned or boned—over 23, not over 30 cents per pound.		5,934	2,220	do	15 percent.
Sardines in oil, not skinned or boned—over 30 cents per pound, smoked.		4,960	2,188	do	12.5 percent.
Sardines in oil, not skinned or boned—over 30 cents per pound		3,774	990	do	15 percent.
Sardines in oil, skinned or boned—over 30 cents per pound		2,100	1,300	30 percent	24 percent.
Anchovies in oil, valued over 9 cents per pound		397	163	do	12 percent.
White meat tunafish in oil, canned		206,118	91,113	45 percent	35 percent.
Other tunafish in oil, canned		32,053	13,335	do	Do.
Bonito and yellowtail in oil, valued over 9 cents per pound		36,731	12,522	30 percent	15 percent.
Smoked pollock in oil, valued at over 9 cents per pound		12,039	6,653	do	Do.
Fish in oil, n.e.s., over 9 cents per pound		390,223	181,415	do	25.5 percent.
Salmon, not in oil, in airtight containers		4,422,325	2,237,655	25 percent	15 percent ad valorem.
Canned albacore in brine		26,081,906	12,053,459	do	12.5 percent.[3]
Canned tuna in brine, n.e.s		21,032,909	7,912,761	do	Do.[3]
Fish cakes, balls, and puddings, not in oil, airtight		358,516	125,955	do	3 percent.
Herring, smoked or kippered or in tomato sauce		998,010	180,483	do	6.25 percent.[3]
Bonito in brine, in airtight containers		63,499	24,119	do	12.5 percent.[3]
Fish, n.e.s., in airtight containers		158,708	113,164	do	Do.[3]
Salmon, pickled or salted		3,185	3,014	25 percent ad valorem	8.5 percent.
Cod, haddock, etc., pickled, salted, skinned or boned		7,825	1,594	2 cents per pound	0.75 cent per pound.
Herring, pickled or salted, in containers, not over 10 pounds, net		30	118	1 cent per pound	0.14 cent per pound.[3]
Herring, pickled or salted, in containers, over 10 pounds net		250	213	do	0.1 cent per pound.[3]
Mackerel, pickled or salted, bulk or containers, over 15 pounds		6,500	989	do	0.2 cent per pound.
Fish, pickled, salted, n.s.p.f., bulk or containers, over 15 pounds		118,759	54,547	1¼ cents per pound	1¼ cents per pound.
Fish, pickled, salted, n.s.p.f., in containers, not over 15 pounds		1,500	801	25 percent ad valorem	25 percent.
Salmon, smoked or kippered, n.e.s		122	420	do	10 percent.
Cod, etc., filleted, smoked or kippered		288	110	3 cents per pound	0.5 cent per pound.
Fish, smoked or kippered, n.s.p.f		600	200	25 percent ad valorem	6.25 percent.
Fish, n.e.s., in containers, not over 15 pounds		26,596	23,995	do	12.5 percent.[3]
Albacore, loins and disks, prepared, n.e.s., bulk or containers, not over 15 pounds.		1,630,638	669,423	1¼ cents per pound	1 cent per pound.
Tuna, loins and disks, n.e.s., prepared, bulk or containers, not over 15 pounds.		8,566,867	3,117,844	do	Do.
Frozen blocks or slabs, uncooked fish bits, etc		34,800	5,740	do	Do.
Other prepared or preserved fish		277,862	152,272	do	Do.
Fish paste and fish sauce		22,223	14,510	30 percent	8 percent.
Fish roe, n.s.p.f., not boiled		25,517	56,089	20 cents per pound	4 cents per pound.

See footnotes at end of table.

Imports of fishery products from Japan by commodity description, 1962—Continued

Item	Unit	Quantity	Value [1]	Tariff July 1, 1934 [2]	1963 tariff
EDIBLE PRODUCTS—continued					
Fish roe, n.e.s., for food, boiled, in airtight containers		2,883	$4,108	30 percent	5.5 percent.
Crabmeat, etc., fresh or frozen		206,300	188,634	15 percent	15 percent.
Crabmeat, etc., prepared in airtight containers		3,441,854	4,635,347	do	22.5 percent.
Oysters, etc., in airtight containers		2,777,969	916,272	8 cents per pound	6 cents per pound.
Oysters, smoked, in airtight containers		1,402,155	669,265	do	4.5 cents per pound.
Other oysters, etc., in airtight containers		3,109,862	825,326	do	6 cents per pound.
Razor clams, canned		1,428	631	23 percent	7.5 percent.
Clams, n.e.s		1,354,180	809,241	Free	Free.
Clam chowder and clam juice and combinations		5,441	5,009	35 percent [4]	17.5 percent.[4]
Roch lobster tails		299,647	338,160	Free	Free.
Other fresh or frozen lobsters		47,144	48,939	do	Do.
Lobsters, canned		914	1,562	do	Do.
Turtles		20	330	do	Do.
Clams, quahogs, not in airtight containers		358,083	76,136	do	Do.
Shrimps and prawns		1,468,230	875,366	do	Do.
Headless shrimp, fresh or frozen		91,369	63,938	do	Do.
Peeled and deveined shrimp, frozen		1,281,491	848,229	do	Do.
Shrimp and prawns, n.e.s		1,080,953	951,313	do	Do.
Scallops, fresh, frozen, and prepared		82,576	96,353	do	Do.
Oysters, fresh or frozen, not in airtight containers		94,228	53,175	do	Do.
Oysters, n.e.s., not in airtight containers		1,542,801	162,477	do	Do.
Abalone		105,313	171,897	do	Do.
Shellfish, n.s.p.f		2,669,865	695,434	do	Do.
Shellfish pastes and sauces, n.s.p.f		638	528	do	Do.
Total, edible		270,461,675	77,512,899		
NONEDIBLE PRODUCTS					
Whale oil, sperm, refined or processed	Gallon	5,638	4,605	1.87 cents per pound	0.47 cent per pound.
Cod liver oil	do	355,555	33,049	Free	Free.
Kelp	Pound	131,870	85,358	do	Do.
Coral, marine, uncut and unmanufactured	do	2,385	19,280	do	Do.
Fish scrap except fertilizer	Short ton	15	4,800	do	Do.
Whale, bone, unmanufactured			318	do	5 percent.
Goldfish and other aquarian fish, n.e.s			17,002	do	Free.
Fish, inedible, n.e.s			2,843,549	do	Do.
Shells, mother-of-pearl and trocus, unmanufactured	Pound	299,406	164,184	do	Do.
Shells, n.s.p.f., unmanufactured	do	181,618	20,419	do	Do.
Fish solubles	Short ton	338	11,578	do	Do.
Halibut liver oil, advanced	Pound	3,947	5,950	10 percent plus 3 cents per pound.	5 percent.
Fish oils and fish liver oils, n.e.s., advanced	do	232,897	914,193	do	Do.
Agar-Agar	do	140,860	244,944	25 percent	15 percent.
Spermaceti wax	do	29,880	4,747	3.5 cents per pound	2.5 cents per pound.
Pearl essence	do	38,099	241,072	25 percent	9 percent.
Buttons, fresh water, pearl or shell	Gross lines	1,536,723		1.75 cents plus 25 percent	1.75 cents plus 25 percent.
Buttons, ocean pearl shell	do	3,434,053		do	Do.
Natural pearls and parts			363,619	10 percent	3 percent.
Cultured pearls and parts			17,934,159	do	5 percent.
Reptile and sharkskin, leather, n.e.s			17,781	25 percent	10 percent.
Luggage, leather, fitted with travel sets, etc			59,960	35 percent	Do.
Luggage, reptile, not fitted			7,685	do	17.5 percent.
Purses, billfolds, etc., leather, reptile			1,522	do	14 percent.
Leather manufactures, n.e.s., reptile			7,154	do	Do.
Shells, etc., cut, engraved, ornamented or otherwise manufactured			25,427	do	17.5 percent.
Manufactures of shell and mother-of-pearl			173,805	do	Do.
Moss, sea grass, etc., dyed, manufactured, n.s.p.f			228,778	10 percent	22 percent.
Whale oil, sperm, crude	Gallon	5,206,777	3,563,470	0.67 cent per pound	0.065 cent per pound.
Total, nonedible			27,397,771		
Grand total			104,910,670		

[1] The dollar value is defined generally as the market value in the foreign country, excluding U.S. import duties, ocean freight, and marine insurance. Figures not checked by Tariff Commission. The above figures do not include 66,082,000 pounds of tuna received from the Canal Zone, Trinidad, Sierra Leone, Senegal, Ghana, Canary Islands, Ivory Coast, and the Fiji Islands. It is understood that these imports consist entirely or almost entirely of tuna landed in these countries by Japanese fishing vessels for shipment to the United States.

[2] Cuban rate not shown.

[3] In act correspondence with tariff schedule.

[4] On American selling price.

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census.

Prepared by Branch of Statistics, Bureau of Commercial Fisheries, Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Aug. 20, 1963.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I also ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD at this point an excellent editorial from Fishermen's News of March 1965, second issue. The editorial is entitled, "We Have Only Begun To Fight." It deals with the problem of the Bristol Bay salmon fisheries on the high seas. Of course, directly involved are the Japanese.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE HAVE ONLY BEGUN TO FIGHT

There are perhaps some in high places who are paying little attention to the campaign begun last issue in the Fishermen's News to arouse reaction against the Japanese piracy of the 1965 Bristol Bay salmon run. These are the Government officials who will regard this seemingly token effort as nothing more than the complaint of a few fishermen who are unable to recognize the broader relationships between the United States and Japan. These are men who feel that the entire fishing industry is expendable and such a minute issue as the relative ownership of a single river system's salmon run on the high seas is hardly worth passing consideration.

May we say to these leaders and officials of Government, "We have only begun to fight."

If they feel that the present campaign against Japan's taking of this run of salmon born and nurtured in American streams, will end with the mere submitting of petitions of protest, we may advise that they have underestimated the latent feelings of the American citizenry. They are not giving quite enough credit to the basic intelligence of the average citizen of this country, and they are surely underestimating the long-proven American ability to fight for that which they believe is their property.

In this era of big government, which is not in itself bad, there is a growing tendency to regard the citizenry as a great mass of unintelligent statistics, not in possession of the facts of the situation and totally incapable of creating action even if the truth were made known.

May we suggest, however, that the power of our Government still rests with the people, and when Government chooses to ignore the cry of injustice, no matter how small the issue or consequence, the will of the people will make itself known, not only from that tiny affected area, but from the length and breadth of America.

The office of Senator MAGNUSON is at this moment very likely receiving the beginning of the largest single reaction ever put forth in behalf of the fishing industry. Thousands of signatures are now on his desk protesting the 1965 Japanese piracy of the Bristol Bay run, thousands more are en route. We are sending out blanks by request in every mail, and filled petitions are heading for Washing, D.C., just as rapidly. These are not protests at the work of Senator MAGNUSON, for his dedication and interest in the fisheries is well known. There are tools for him to work with. Proof that America does care for its fisheries, concrete evidence that the citizenry is tired of tightening its belt to the point of disaster to insure escapement of salmon to our spawning grounds, only to supply the greedy export needs of the Japanese.

We said that we had only begun to fight.

If Japan is not told by our Government that we deem the taking of the 1965 run as an "unfriendly act"; if the U.S. Government refuses to stand up for the preservation and conservation of its own resources and in defense of its citizens, then those same citizens will begin a wave of reaction unheard of in the annals of fishery history.

This is not a case for fisheries and fishermen alone. We have spoken at gatherings where not a single fisherman was present, and yet the support to the cause was unanimous. They have been Democrats, Republicans, sportsmen, legislators, all manner of people. They have come from fishing villages, from the coastal cities, and the farms, to the hinterland. And in every case, without a single deviation, there was the question asked, "What can we do to help?"

Thus far we've merely asked them to sign petitions, to write letters merely to advise their feelings so that there can be no misunderstanding as to the value which the people place on the fishery resource. Then the burden for action is placed at the feet of our Government.

And if action doesn't come then? We, as citizens, will speak the only language the Japanese understand. We'll talk economics. Japan doesn't need this salmon to feed their hungry. This fish is for export, to make money, to satisfy a greed for red salmon profits, unavailable in 1965 from Asiatic stocks for the simple reason that Japan has desecrated the Soviet salmon runs by her unrestricted high seas fishing.

We will be forced to a course of action which is distasteful in its very nature. We shall begin to examine those products from Japan which we use in our work and in our homes, and we shall turn to the longshoremen and ask that they treat the imports from Japan even as they treated the Russian cod at Boston the other day.

And we shall examine more carefully those people whom we send to Washington, D.C., to represent our interests. And we shall select only those who place the American resource and the American people above the selfish interests of Japan.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, with the breakup of winter imminent, fishermen in the Pacific Northwest are actively engaged in preparing their equipment for a new season. Two very important segments of the industry, the salmon and halibut fisheries, will begin operations in a few short weeks. I wish I could say that the hardy men dependent upon salmon and halibut for a livelihood were eagerly and optimistically looking forward to a profitable season. Unfortunately, they have reason to be pessimistic about the coming season. The reason is the fishery policies of Japan.

Last year, our halibut fishermen believed that they would have a highly successful season. Some of these fishermen traveled from Seattle to the Bering Sea in small boats, nearly 2,000 miles, early in the spring when hazardous weather conditions prevail. These men took great risks in the hope of catching an early load of halibut and thereby giving themselves some assurance of a profitable season. Everyone familiar with the disastrous 1964 halibut fishery in the Bering Sea knows that those industrious men gained nothing but financial indebtedness.

The economic losses suffered by our halibut fleet are directly attributable to the fishery policies of Japan. In 1963, the Japanese refused to accept a reasonable catch quota for halibut in the Bering Sea and, as a result, the resource has been badly overfished. Indeed, this fishery has been eliminated as a factor in the financial stability of the North American halibut fleet.

Mr. President, the halibut resources of the Eastern North Pacific have been brought to high levels of productivity and maintained there by the joint effort of the United States and Canadian Governments and by the sacrifices of United States and Canadian fishermen, beginning in the 1920's. Now, in a few short years, the intemperate acts of Japan have canceled out a substantial part of the results of those efforts and those sacrifices.

Our salmon fishermen and salmon packers have had financial difficulties in recent years, especially those members of the industry trying to earn a living from the salmon resource of Bristol Bay in Alaska.

Fishermen from the Pacific Northwest have a financial interest in the red salmon runs in Bristol Bay. Some fishermen from the State of Washington travel to Bristol Bay to take part in the short fishing season. These men are taking a great financial risk by going to Alaska. For the past 3 years, these men have been unable to earn a living from that fishery.

The great salmon packing companies of the Pacific Northwest are the major investors in processing equipment and plants used in Bristol Bay. These companies have sustained three consecutive years of financial losses from operations in that area, because of small runs. These businessmen cannot afford to continue unprofitable operations in Bristol Bay. If the processors do not open their plants and hire local labor, the entire economy of the area will be disrupted.

The members of the salmon industry in the State of Washington have been looking forward to a highly successful Bristol Bay fishing season because of the prediction, by U.S. scientists, of a red salmon run of approximately 27 million fish. Such a run would bring about profitable fishing and processing operations, and permit the recouping of financial losses incurred during the last 3 years. But these people are hardly filled with optimism, because they have seen the fishing patterns of the Japanese high seas salmon fleets in the past, and they do not know what to expect in 1965. They fear the worst.

During the past 10 years, the Japanese have taken 30 percent of the total catch of Bristol Bay red salmon. The Japanese catches during the past 3 years have had a particularly harsh impact on the U.S. industry because the runs have been very small. Every fish was needed for our fishermen or for escapement to the spawning grounds.

Normally, the Japanese salmon fleets begin fishing in early May. Some of the fleets operate between 175° east longitude and 175° west longitude, the area occupied by Bristol Bay red salmon. In most years, the Bristol Bay salmon leave the Central Pacific and migrate toward their home streams in June. As a result, the Japanese move further west and catch salmon of Asian origin, following those fish all the way to the Asian coast. In 1964, however, the Japanese fleets were unable to obtain their quotas from Asian salmon and they returned to the east where immature Bristol Bay salmon were present. The Japanese caught over a million immature red salmon that would have spawned in Bristol Bay streams in 1965.

While a catch of 1 million salmon from a run of 27 million fish may not seem important, it must be remembered that some 12 million red salmon are needed for escapement. Add to this the million plus that the Japanese have already caught, plus the catch they can make in 1965—probably over 5 million fish—and it is clear that the U.S. fishermen will be fortunate to catch enough salmon in Bristol Bay to tide them over the winter, much less earn enough to pay off debts accumulated in the past 3 years.

The uncertainty of the Japanese salmon fishery actions during the coming season is disrupting the investment plans of the U.S. industry. A foreknowledge of Japanese plans would give our industry an opportunity to gear its operations to the size of the run expected in 1965. Without such knowledge, the risks involved in planning are increased well beyond the normally high risks common to the fishing industry. The segment of the U.S. salmon industry operating in Bristol Bay has never had the benefit of prior knowledge concerning Japanese fishing activities. This lack of information has been costly. The Japanese catches of Bristol Bay salmon have had a serious economic impact on our fishing industry.

The Japanese high seas salmon fishery has disrupted our conservation programs. The Japanese fleets take large numbers of immature salmon, a wasteful procedure, because the fish have not reached the stage in their life cycle where the period of most rapid growth occurs. In addition, our scientists can make reasonable estimates of the number of salmon expected to return to Bristol Bay. Regulations are established in a manner that will insure adequate escapement to the spawning grounds. The unknown effects of the Japanese high seas fishery make it impossible to regulate the U.S. fishery to insure proper levels of escapement.

The treaty establishing the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission prohibited Japanese salmon fishing east of 175° west longitude in the North Pacific Ocean. The negotiators of this treaty clearly understood that the intent of the agreement was to protect from exploitation by the Japanese any salmon of North American origin. Research by the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission has proved beyond doubt—and Japanese scientists do not dispute it—that the Japanese high seas fishery does exploit North American salmon, especially red salmon originating in the Bristol Bay area. The U.S. representatives to the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission have not been successful in changing this situation. As a result, as I have explained, the Japanese have taken nearly one-third of the catch of Bristol Bay red salmon during the last 10 years.

Obviously, there are defects in the treaty. The United States, Canada, and Japan have been conducting talks during the past year and a half aimed at revising the treaty to make it more acceptable to all. Hopefully, revision will correct the defects which work such hardships on U.S. fishermen. But, from what I can learn, Mr. President, negotiations are not going well for the U.S. fishermen.

Japan is a great fishing nation with fleets operating in all areas of the world and exploiting nearly every species of fish that has any commercial value. Unfortunately, the Japanese have not made any effort to conserve the natural resources of the seas. For example, Japan disregarded the scientific evidence presented at the 1964 annual meeting of the International Whaling Commission and would not agree to a quota based on sound conservation principles. Earlier, I mentioned the Japanese disregard for the conservation of halibut in the Bering Sea, which is another example of her ruthless exploitation of fishery stocks for the purpose of obtaining short-term economic benefits. The Japanese high seas salmon fishery for Bristol Bay red salmon represents the same type of disregard for proved conservation programs.

The Japanese do not need Bristol Bay red salmon to operate their fleets at a profit. Each year their fishery has a quota that is established through negotiations with the Soviet Union. The Japanese know the amount of investment that will be necessary to equip their vessels with sufficient gear to catch the quota. They know the areas where the Asian stocks of salmon are present, and they are capable of catching those stocks. Yet, the Japanese insist upon harvesting salmon of North American origin.

In 1963, a year of economic disaster in the Bristol Bay area, the Japanese mothership fleets caught over 23 million salmon. Included in this catch were 1.3 million Bristol Bay red salmon. If the Japanese had used the time spent fishing for North American salmon in fishing for Asian salmon, they probably would have caught a greater number of fish. Certainly, the 1.3 million Bristol Bay salmon were not necessary for a profitable Japanese fishery, but these same fish could have prevented the Bristol Bay area from becoming a disaster area in 1963.

The Japanese fishing companies do not need a few million Bristol Bay salmon to operate at a profit. These Japanese companies are highly diversified, with fleets operating in many other fisheries and they are obtaining substantial profits. The salmon canners of the State of Washington and residents of Bristol Bay do not have other fisheries from which they can earn enough money to buy the necessities of life. The people of Bristol Bay are dependent upon one source of income: the annual run of red salmon.

This year the problem is especially critical. The recent history of the Japanese high seas salmon fishery indicates that the United States must take positive action to protect legitimate U.S. interests in the salmon fisheries. The future of an important U.S. industry is at stake. The livelihoods of a large number of people in Alaska and the Pacific Northwest are in jeopardy. The course of patient negotiation pursued by the administration seems unlikely to ease the situation. I suggest that the Senate give serious consideration to legislation that will protect our people.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. BARTLETT. In my judgment, the bill which the Senator from Washington has just introduced on behalf of himself and me is vitally necessary.

It may be construed as a threat against a nation which we now consider friendly. That it is. I hope that soon it will become more than a threat. It hope that it will become an actuality.

I am sure that I speak for the Senator from Washington, as well as myself and all other Senators interested in the fisheries industry, in saying that unless something is done and done speedily, a priceless resource will have been lost to the American people.

Mr. President, a decade ago the United States, Canada, and Japan entered into a voluntary agreement—voluntary in every way on the part of each nation—dealing with certain fisheries resources, including salmon of the North Pacific Ocean.

Some Japanese like to say now that the treaty was imposed upon them as a consequence of their limited powers following the war. The record proves conclusively that this is not the case. There is abundant evidence to support my statement.

A provisional extension of the line was set forth in the treaty at 175° west longitude. It was provided in the treaty that the Japanese would not fish for salmon of North American origin west of that line.

So far as I know the Japanese have never violated that provision of the treaty—the line is shown in the newspaper to which the Senator from Washington referred a few moments ago, the Fishermen's News, in the form of a map which discloses from whence the fish come, and the Japanese methods and places of taking the fish.

In 1953, biologists were as sure as they could be—given the imperfect scientific knowledge of those days—that salmon of North American origin did not migrate in any considerable number, and perhaps not at all, west of 175° west longitude.

In this assumption, the biologists proved to be in total error, because it was subsequently discovered that great stocks of salmon are found west of that line.

These salmon come from the lakes and rivers of the Bristol Bay watershed in Alaska. This is the greatest red salmon fishery in the world. Most of the red salmon canned for human consumption comes from Bristol Bay stocks.

The treaty to which I previously referred contained adequate language so that it should have been simple, indeed, to revise it when it was discovered that migrating fish went west of the line, 175° west longitude. The treaty so provided. But the Japanese have uniformly refused to make any changes whatsoever.

Mr. President, what have been the consequences? They have been many and disastrous for the United States, particularly for Alaska.

One consequence has been that for each of the last 9 years the Japanese have taken an average of 30 percent of all the salmon originating from the Bristol Bay watershed.

Another consequence has been that the Japanese uniformly, without regard to any conservation principles whatsoever, have taken immature as well as mature fish.

Another consequence has been that three times since the treaty came into force—I repeat, three times—Bristol Bay has been declared a disaster area by the President of the United States. The American taxpayers in general, in one degree or another, have been required to furnish help and sustenance to fishermen and their families who—if the Japanese were not taking the salmon—would have received ample income from their labors.

The situation has grown to the point where not only fishermen are denied the living that should be theirs, but also the packing companies—many of them coming from the city of Seattle in the State of Washington—have been losing money year after year because they cannot pack enough fish to break even.

The U.S. Government and the State of Alaska have spent millions of dollars to try to conserve this great resource. The Japanese have not spent a single penny. These millions of dollars, to a large extent, have been wasted because of the depredations of Japanese fishermen, who fish immediately west of the line, as they did last year, with the full consent of their Government.

Mr. President, last year, for the first time, the Japanese came up against that line and took over 2 million red salmon, a good proportion of which, I am informed, were immature—far too small to be economically caught and put up in cans.

I salute the chairman of the Commerce Committee, the Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who has been such a great and effective friend and supporter of the fishermen of the Pacific coast and elsewhere—for having introduced this bill.

Contrary to the opinions of some, we have good, hard, tough negotiators working for us in seeking to bring about satisfactory solutions to this vexing problem.

Only a few weeks ago, these men, representing the State Department and the Interior Department—the Governor of Alaska, Mr. Egan, was a member of the party—went to Tokyo in the hope and belief that an arrangement could be made for this year whereby the Japanese would abstain from taking salmon right up against the line.

The Japanese refused any serious discussion on this subject. They turned us down. Our people had to come home without having won what was a vital point—a vital point not only for the

1965 salmon pack, but also for the future of the red salmon fisheries industry of Bristol Bay and the entire North Pacific, insofar as the United States is concerned.

The Japanese are unwilling to practice conservation methods which are commonly recognized by Americans, by Canadians, and by so many other nations of the world as being desirable and necessary. I for one regret the necessity, as I am sure the Senator from Washington does, of introducing a bill which might seem to some to be punitive. However, we must do it. We must do everything possible to have it enacted into law. As I said, there is a precedent for it. This is not an attempt to do something for the first time. It has been done before with the full knowledge and acquiescence of even the leadership in the executive department of the Government.

The livelihood and the fate of thousands of fishermen in my State and a great commercial enterprise depend to a very considerable extent on the rapidity with which we move and the momentum that we attain and maintain and the vigor of our Government's response to what is really an intolerable situation presented to us by the Japanese in the excessive taking, against all conservation principles, of almost a third of the salmon from Bristol Bay. It is estimated that this year the Japanese may take more than 5 million fish immediately west of the line. We need about 12 million fish to return to the lakes and streams for spawning purposes. If the Japanese "take" is on the order suggested, I doubt very much whether 12 million or any comparable number will return to the streams and lakes so that the future of the fishery may be assured.

This is a very momentous problem—momentous insofar as Alaska is concerned, so far as Washington is concerned, and the entire country is concerned.

Mr. President, on March 27, 1964, the State of Alaska suffered a severe natural disaster that severely disrupted the economy of the State. Extensive financial assistance to the State has been provided by the Federal Government and, to a great extent the economy of Alaska has recovered from the unprecedented calamity of the Good Friday earthquake.

The fishing industry of Alaska sustained severe damage from the earthquake, however, this same industry made a remarkable recovery in 1964 and played a major role in the rehabilitation of the State. The importance of the fishing industry to Alaska has been known for some time, but I feel that the importance was reemphasized during the past year.

Unfortunately, not all of the fishing areas of Alaska are prosperous or, for that matter, even able to maintain a decent standard of living. This is especially true of such communities as Naknek, Dillingham, and others in the Bristol Bay area where, even though unaffected by the earthquake, the fishing industry is in a life or death struggle for survival. This section of Alaska is almost entirely dependent upon the fisheries for its economic well being, and the fisheries of the area are dependent upon one species of fish: the red salmon.

Fishermen have long accepted the risk inherent in their chosen field of endeavor. The size of any fish stock will vary from year to year and the availability of the fish will vary. In the Bristol Bay red salmon fishery, however, an additional element of risk has been added in the form of a Japanese high seas fishery for salmon originating in and returning to the fresh water streams entering Bristol Bay. In the view of United States scientists the high seas fishery is wasteful and contrary to the proper conservation of the resource. For the communities dependent upon the Bristol Bay run of red salmon the Japanese high seas fishery threatens economic strangulation.

For the past 3 years salmon packing companies have suffered substantial losses in their Bristol Bay operations. The fishermen have been unable to accumulate earnings sufficient to meet their debts. Since the initiation of high seas fishing by the Japanese after World War II the Bristol Bay area has been declared a disaster area three times. The basis for these declarations was the failure of the salmon runs. In other years the Federal and State governments have found it necessary to distribute surplus foods to prevent the starvation of residents in the Bristol Bay area. When it is known that the salmon fishery of the area is capable of supporting the economy, providing the fish are available, it does not seem reasonable that extensive Federal and State aid should be necessary at the expense of all taxpayers. A more reasonable and acceptable method of support would be the assurance that the salmon runs will be protected until available to our fishermen.

I repeat, in the past 9 years the Japanese high seas fishery has accounted for 30 percent of the Bristol Bay red salmon catch. Over 27 percent of the Japanese high seas catch of red salmon comes from Bristol Bay stocks. These levels of exploitation have a major effect on the economy of the Bristol Bay area and have been a significant factor in the economic retardation of the area.

The lack of controls on the Japanese high seas salmon fishery has made the management of the Bristol Bay salmon runs an almost impossible task. The indiscriminate catch of salmon on the high seas results in the taking of salmon destined for streams that do not have a sufficient number of spawners as well as fish going to streams where there is a surplus of spawners. In addition, many immature salmon are taken on the high seas before they have reached the period of rapid growth. Such wasteful fishing practices should not be tolerated.

The U.S. scientists are not alone in condemning high seas salmon fishing. Canadian and Soviet scientists agree with our findings. The Japanese take a substantial part of the Asian salmon runs and these runs have been declining in recent years. Soviet scientists have stated that the principal reason for the decline is the Japanese high seas fishery. Certainly all of these scientists cannot be wrong in their assessment of the effects of high seas salmon fishing.

It has been brought to my attention that in 1965, the Bristol Bay red salmon run should consist of about 27 million fish. This will be the largest run since 1960, the year the parent stock spawned. From this run it is hoped that there will be an escapement of over 12 million fish for spawning. This leaves approximately 15 million salmon to be taken by the fishery. Such a catch would assure the packers and fishermen of the United States a profitable year and allow them to repay the debts incurred during the last three seasons.

It is too early, however, to spend the money from this bonanza. It is too early to even plan on having a catch sufficient to assure enough money to get through next winter. The reason? The Japanese high seas fishery.

In 1964, the Japanese salmon fleets made an unprecedented change in the methods of operation and moved into the area between 175° east and 175° west longitude late in July and caught an estimated 1.8 million red salmon of Bristol Bay origin. Most of these salmon were immature, therefore, they were part of the run expected to enter Bristol Bay in 1965. The Japanese exploitation of these immature fish was a calculated effort to catch red salmon of North American origin.

While the taking of over a million immature Bristol Bay salmon by the Japanese does not mean that the fishery is doomed, it is an indication of what could happen. If the Japanese fishery operates as it has in past years—we have no assurance from the Government of Japan that it will not—we can expect to see several salmon motherships concentrated in the area west of 175° west longitude where a substantial portion of the Bristol Bay run will be concentrated. An intensive high seas fishery early in the season could catch perhaps 5 to 7 million fish from the Bristol Bay run, causing an economic catastrophe for many U.S. packers and fishermen.

It is necessary for the salmon packers to purchase equipment and set up the plants before the fishing season opens. They make their expenditures on the basis of the estimated pack. If the run does not materialize this investment is lost. The small catch of red salmon during the past 3 years has left the packers in a precarious financial position and many of them will not survive another season with a low pack.

The year 1965 is crucial for the U.S. salmon industry. The United States must take positive action on this problem. The unrestricted Japanese high seas fishery for Bristol Bay red salmon cannot continue at the expense of the American fishing industry. We cannot sit idle while an important sector to our economy is being destroyed by a wasteful fishery that is contrary to sound conservation practices.

During the years since 1953, the administrations have tried with only partial success to solve this problem in the International North Pacific Fisheries Commission. Similar efforts to solve it in the current renegotiation of the North Pacific Treaty have met with only limited success. I think this body must look to other methods for dealing with the problem. Serious consideration should be given to this legislation that will have the effect of protecting this segment of the U.S. economy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the Senator from Alaska and I could take all afternoon, and I believe with some justification, discussing the moral situation that is involved; not only the legal or the practical, but also the moral situation that is involved in this enterprise of the Japanese in regard to the Bristol Bay salmon.

Is it not true that the Japanese said, in the beginning, in negotiating the treaty, that they did not wish to take North American salmon stock?

Mr. BARTLETT. That is ever so true.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yet, because of a misunderstanding perhaps—though everyone thought it was right to place the line at 175th—we have found in later years that some of our salmon have moved over and have intermingled with Asian stock; and dispite the fact that the Japanese have always said they did not want to take our salmon, they will not cease and desist from taking those fish, even though the salmon belong to the streams of North America.

For the life of me I cannot see why they should take these two opposite, diametrically opposed views.

If the Japanese needed these few million salmon for their fish economy, there might be some discussion about the necessity of their taking the fish. However, they do not need these salmon at all. As a matter of fact, it is a very small, minute number with respect to their whole economy, dollar-wise. If the Japanese needed the salmon to eat, that would be another thing, because the Japanese do have a high protein diet; in fact, 30 percent of their diet is fish. What do they do with these salmon? They put them in cans and sell them, mainly in Europe.

The fishing companies do not need these few million Bristol Bay salmon to operate at a profit, because they are highly diversified. They obtain sufficient profits. For the life of me I cannot understand why they proceed to make an international issue of their taking some salmon that belong to North America, which, they have said all the time, they did not want to take. If they persist, they will deplete a resource which is one of the most important resources in Alaska. It means a great deal to our economy and very little to the Japanese economy. If they persist and continue to refuse to sit down and negotiate on a fair basis over a natural resource, which they know they are deteriorating, we must do something to retaliate.

I wonder what the Japanese would say if we sent a fleet off their shores to start depleting a resource that they have developed; namely, pearls.

Mr. BARTLETT. I believe the point the Senator is making is very appropriate and ought to be considered. Under the bill which he introduced a few minutes ago, would pearls be an article of commerce which would be considered?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Pearls are a natural fishery resource that the Japanese have developed by certain means over the years—through conservation and regulation—just as we have developed our salmon. I believe the duty on natural pearls now is only 5 percent.

Mr. BARTLETT. We buy a good many million dollars' worth of pearls from the Japanese, do we not?

Mr. MAGNUSON. We do. In 1962, about $18 million.

Mr. BARTLETT. Every year?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. Then we could consider textiles and all the other products. I cannot see why the Japanese insist on this small amount of fish, knowing that it is important to our economy and that it will destroy a resource that belongs to us.

Mr. BARTLETT. Is it not true that the duty on pearls back in 1934 was at the rate of 10 percent, and that now it has been lowered to 5 percent? However, under the terms of our proposal it can be moved to 15 percent.

Mr. MAGNUSON. It should be, if we cannot sit down and negotiate on a natural resource, as sensible people should be able to do, and if the Japanese cannot live up to what they said was their moral obligation. I do not know why they insist on doing this. Our representatives went to Tokyo about 30 days ago.

We asked the Japanese to sit down with us to see if we could work out something in respect to the North American salmon. I did not go over there, because I could not go, but I sent some people over there. The State Department sent some people. The State Department probably presented the strongest letter that I have ever read, written by Ambassador Averell Harriman, pointing out the importance of this subject. I understand that the Japanese refused to talk about it.

Mr. BARTLETT. Yes. Ambassador Reischauer met constantly with the delegation. He led our delegation. The Japanese would not talk. Is it not true that at the end of the first 10-year period, under the treaty we made with them, we began to talk about a renewal?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes.

Mr. BARTLETT. We have now held three rounds of negotiations, one in Washington, one in Tokyo, and one in Ottawa. Another round will be held soon. It will be the fourth round. We have gotten precisely nowhere because the Japanese are unwilling to talk about conservation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Alaska will recall that the treaty which established the International North Pacific Fishery Commission prohibits Japanese salmon fishing east of the 175th west longitude in the North Pacific Ocean.

The negotiators of the treaty clearly understood that the intent of the agreement was to protect from exploitation by the Japanese any salmon of North American origin. Research by the commission has proved beyond a doubt—and the Japanese scientists do not dispute this statement at all—that the Japanese high seas fisheries do exploit North American salmon, especially red salmon originating in the Bristol Bay area.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to finish my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield. The U.S. representatives on the commission have not been successful in changing this situation. As a result, the Japanese have taken nearly one-third of the catch of Bristol Bay red salmon during the last 10 years.

What kind of obligation or responsibility of a great nation like Japan does that sort of performance demonstrate?

The problem has its moral aspects. Our fishermen do not go out and fish these salmon because we desire to conserve those fish. We have rules. We have spent millions of dollars trying to keep the salmon run intact. Then the Japanese go out there and take not only the fish that are ready to come in but the immature ones, even though they have said over and over again, "We do not want to take your salmon."

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. What the Senator said is very true. An American fisherman does not go out on the high seas with nets and fish for salmon. Neither does a Canadian do so. Why does he not do so? In my judgment, there are two reasons why he does not. First, he would be in disobedience of the law if he were to do so. The practice is not permitted because it is against all conservation practices to fish for salmon on the high seas with nets.

Second, in so far as I know, not one American or Canadian fisherman has ever protested against that law. They desire to have restraints against fishing on the high seas with nets because they know that otherwise the resource would be devastated.

But how do the Japanese fish on the high seas? I will tell the Senate how they fish. They fish with nets which sometimes are several miles long. They catch thousands of fish in those nets at one time. Sometimes the nets get loose. They drift for goodness knows how long about the ocean, all the time catching unnumbered salmon. It is a menace in every way. It ought not be permitted any longer. We have been tolerant too long.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Not only have we been tolerant too long, but the time has come to start to think about our economic and other relations with Japan, when we find her morally violating a treaty which they entered into 13 years ago and persist in doing so. Every bit of evidence justifies taking some drastic action.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield.

Mr. BARTLETT. The Japanese have whaling fleets. They have been killing whales in the Antarctic for quite some time. I am informed that they have been killing whales to the point at which, if something drastic is not done within the next year or two, all the whales which once inhabited the South Polar regions in such great numbers will be gone forever. They must be restored. That will be the case because people who have never learned conservation measures and who do not care about them insist upon making a dollar today rather than making $5 every year for the distant future. That would be the case. They would make far more money if they saw to it, in company with us, that these stocks of whales were preserved. This is an endless resource, a resource that is renewable, and that can benefit mankind for all time if we are so willing.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I have in my hand a list of the imports of fishery products from Japan to this country. There must be 500 different fishery items on that list. There are about 100 special items. Some fish comes in fresh, some in brine, and some in cans. Japan does a big business with us on fisheries. We are willing to do that business with them. No salmon is involved because that is usually packed and sent to the United Kingdom. The United Kingdom and West Germany are Japan's largest customers. Japan does not need it at all. Every can that Japan sells means that the U.S. taxpayers have probably spent to conserve that particular fish the cost of the whole can. We continue to do it. We conserve the fish while they pick it up, can it, and take the price.

We are not talking about other fish on the high seas. Such fish belong to all the nations of the world. We are attempting to get some conservation rules with respect to those fish. But we are talking about the North American stock of salmon that we have spent time, energy, and a great deal of money to preserve. The Japanese are picking up even the immature fish.

They are taking those fish, despite the fact that they have always said that they did not want to do so.

There are many items included in this list of Japanese fishery imports. I do not desire to read all of them. They will appear in the RECORD. We allow them to bring in free fresh and frozen tuna, though not canned tuna. They sell quite a number of cultured pearls to us. Compared to the small amount of salmon we are talking about, the value of cultured pearls is large, indeed. But that small amount of salmon means everything to the economy of Bristol Bay and a great deal to the economy of Alaska.

I am sure that if we started to be unfair, as I think they are in the present case, with, let us say, textiles, which are a great part of the Japanese economy, cameras, binoculars, transistor radios, or any other of 100 items which I could name, Japan might have some reason to protest. But, so far as they are concerned in their fishery economy or their national economy, this item is nothing. Yet they still persist in a practice which will ruin the whole natural resource.

It is high time that we took some action. The State Department is becoming fed up with it. When the State Department becomes fed up with that attitude, I believe we are going a long way. I am sure that the administration is also, because here is an item that should have been settled a long time ago so that our general relations with Japan could have been much better.

Japanese officials wish to sit down and talk about airlines. They desire to land Japan Air Lines planes in New York. They wish to sell transistors and other things to us. I think that is fine, because we wish to have good trade relations. But it is pretty hard for the Senator from Washington or the Senate Committee on Commerce to look at this subject in that manner when we find them continually flaunting the salmon situation in our face and destroying a natural resource that we have paid large sums of money to keep alive.

I hope that Senators will read all of the items on the list to which I have referred, which contains fishery products by commodity description.

There appears also on the list tuna in brine, yellow fin tuna, and albacore, all of which products come in free. This is the largest part of their fishing economy. There were 52 million of albacore, 62 million of yellow fin, 10 million of yellow fin fresh, and over 10 million of yellow fin gilled and gutted, heads and tails removed. That adds up to millions in the tuna field alone, which we allowed to come in free. We do not impose any duty at all on those products.

On pearls there is a duty of 5 percent.

I wonder what they would think if we went over to Japan and started to dig around the area in which their pearls are planted. Their pearl industry is a natural resource which they have spent time and money to develop. They have done a fine job on it, as we have done with our salmon.

I am becoming thoroughly fed up with the constant statements of my Japanese friends: "We do not want to take any of your North American salmon." That is the basis of the whole treaty, but they go out and do it any way, ruining the Bristol Bay run. If the present practices continue, there will not be any run left.

Then they threaten us by saying, "Perhaps we shall withdraw from the treaty altogether." They can do so now. They can give a year's notice. There is a sort of legalized blackmail over this situation. I dislike to see the relations between Japan and the United States impaired over a dispute that should be settled, as to which the facts are indisputable, and as to which we can sit down, as reasonable people, and solve the problem before the whole Bristol Bay salmon run is completely destroyed and the economy of Alaska along with it.

Mr. BARTLETT. I thank the Senator from Washington.

Mr. President, I shall conclude by saying that the position of the United States in respect to the North Pacific fisheries was emphatically stated last fall by President Johnson, and before him, in the same general terms, by President Kennedy. I suggest to our friends in Tokyo that the time has come for them to realize that this is no idle matter so far as we are concerned; it is a very serious proposition, indeed.

FIRST NUCLEAR REACTOR IN SPACE

Mr. PASTORE. Mr. President, I am pleased to inform the Senate that the first nuclear reactor in space which the United States launched Saturday, April 3, is continuing to operate successfully and is exceeding its designed power levels. The SNAP-10A nuclear reactor was designed to produce approximately 500 watts of electricity. It has been in orbit now since Saturday, April 3, and data telemetered back to the ground indicates that it is now producing in excess of 600 watts of electricity.

The United States justifiably can be proud of being the first nation to place a nuclear reactor in space and to successfully demonstrate its operation in space. The U.S.S.R. has had a similar project under development—the Romashka 500-watt nuclear reactor—which they unveiled at the Geneva Conference in September 1964 but which they, to date, have not demonstrated in space.

The United States, I am pleased to say, was able to place its SNAP-10A in orbit and to operate it in space first.

My colleagues in the Congress, particularly, should take pride in this U.S. "first" for, had it not been for the Congress, this project would not have been carried out.

Mr. President, you may recall last year when the AEC authorization bill was before the Congress this project was not included. The Air Force, which was responsible for its flight test, had deleted the required funds from its budget. Although the AEC was willing to take on the responsibility of funding its flight demonstration, no money was included in its recommended budget to the Congress. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, after reviewing the matter very carefully, recommended that the flight test be undertaken and that sufficient funds be added to the AEC fiscal year 1965 budget for this purpose. Without dissent the Senate and the House adopted the Joint Committee's recommendation and authorized the project.

We, at the time, did not know that the Russians were working on a similar nuclear space project, the Romashka. When the Russians unveiled their project in the fall of 1964 they claimed to be ahead of the United States in conducting ground tests of their reactor. Had it not been for the recommendation of the Joint Committee and the initiative of the Congress, we would, in the near future, have been faced with one more example of being behind the Russians. Fortunately because of the action of the Joint Committee and the Congress, this was not the case.

This first in space is a very important one in our Nation's efforts toward the attainment of leadership in space. The success of any nation in the attainment of leadership in space is dependent on the development and use of nuclear energy in space. The Russians know it as well as we do as indicated by the public announcement of their efforts on the Romashka reactor last September and recent news reports from Moscow on continued efforts to upgrade the Romashka technology.

It is indeed assuring that the United States has thus far led in the first two pioneering steps in the use of nuclear energy in space—the first being the launching of a radioisotope nuclear powered navigation satellite in June of 1961 and the April 3 launch of a nuclear reactor powerplant into orbit.

A lot remains to be done to complete the development and adaptation of nuclear power supplies in space so that we can assure the success of our efforts in space. Our recent pioneering accomplishments give us a good start for our future efforts.

When the Joint Committee reviewed the status of the SNAP–10A project last year, we had the assurance of the technical personnel in charge that, if authorized, the reactor could be successfully flight tested in the spring of 1965. I wish to congratulate both the Government representatives and the representatives of private industry who cooperated in making the project a success—those in the Air Force, the AEC, the Lockheed Corp., and Atomics International.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I would like to commend the personnel of Atomics International and the Lockheed Corp., together with those in the Air Force and the Atomic Energy Commission, who were responsible for the development and successful launching and operation of the SNAP–10A nuclear powerplant—the first nuclear reactor in space. I particularly wish to commend my colleague, the senior Senator from Rhode Island, JOHN O. PASTORE, who, last year as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy primarily was responsible for getting this project reinstated.

For too many years we in the United States have bemoaned the fact that the U.S.S.R. has taken the lead in some areas of space technology. There are those who give lip service to the administration's announced intentions to be the leader in the exploration of space, yet whose actions do not support these objectives. Mr. President, we remember last year when the Defense Department took the position that there was no immediate requirement for the SNAP–10A project and when the Air Force funds for the flight test were deleted from the Air Force budget.

We recall also how the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Science and Technology were not willing for the AEC to fund the test flight. We also remember that it was the Congress, on the recommendation of the Joint Committee, that persuaded the executive branch to be more tolerant and insisted that the project not be canceled. At the time we did not know the Russians were also proceeding on a similar project.

In September 1964, at the Conference on the Peaceful Uses of Atomic Energy in Geneva, the U.S.S.R. exhibited for the first time its Romashka nuclear power plant—a ground test of a 500-watt nuclear electrical plant for space application. In its exhibit and accompanying film the Soviet Union asserted its leadership in this field because it had been able to complete preliminary ground tests.

Had it not been for the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, under the leadership of my good friends and colleagues, Senator JOHN O. PASTORE and Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, the United States today would not have chalked up this additional accomplishment. Had it not been for their leadership, instead of an American SNAP–10A reactor we, sometime in the not too distant future, would have been confronted with a Romashka-type Soviet nuclear reactor as the first nuclear reactor in space.

As a past chairman and as a member of the Joint Committee for more than 14 years, I have participated with my colleagues in initiating and supporting a number of programs that would not have been carried forward had it not been for our committee. I recall the difficulties we had and the obstacles we had to overcome in forcing the executive branch to move ahead on the hydrogen bomb program and the nuclear submarine program. I recall how a shortsighted decision within the Department of the Army would have terminated the promising development of the food irradiation program of the Quartermasters Corps had it not been for the intervention of the Joint Committee. I also recall that SNAP–3 isotope power source was placed on the shelf for more than 2 years, where it might still be today had not the Joint Committee taken the initiative. Through the efforts of the Joint Committee the United States in 1961 successfully launched the world's first nuclear isotope-powered navigation satellite which, I might add, still is in operation.

These matters show why I congratulate my good friend and colleague on the Joint Committee, the senior Senator from Rhode Island, under whose leadership last year the Joint Committee added to its fine record.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 12 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 7, 1965, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, APRIL 6, 1965

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer, using these words from Habakkuk 3: 18: *Yet I will rejoice in the Lord, I will joy in the God of my salvation.*

O Thou God of all grace and mercy, in these days we are acutely aware that there is so much of sorrow and suffering, of torture and terrorism in the world among nations and the members of the human family.

We penitently confess that we cannot understand the meaning and mystery, and the reason for all this brutality and violence.

Grant that we may never be tempted to feel that the spirit of righteousness and good will has completely departed from the heart of humanity and that the future will continue to be tormented by misery and heartaches.

Help us to encourage one another to cultivate the finer virtues and to look upward toward Thee in faith from whom radiates the light and warmth that brings peace and cheer to mankind.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 693. An act to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 5721. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file certain reports.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee on housing of the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit while the House is in session today during general debate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

T. W. HOLT & CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1218) for the relief of T. W. Holt & Co. and/or Holt Import & Export Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1218

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of

America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to T. W. Holt and Company and/or Holt Import and Export Company, the sum of $8,478.19. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of the claim of the said T. W. Holt and Company and/or Holt Import and Export Company against the United States for repayment of excessive customs duties erroneously collected by the Bureau of Customs on canned meat imports from Argentina, which were imported by the said T. W. Holt and Company and/or Holt Import and Export Company between December 8, 1948, and July 3, 1950, and on which the customs duties were liquidated between January 9, 1951, and January 6, 1953: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHILDREN OF MRS. ELIZABETH A. DOMBROWSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1291) for the relief of the children of Mrs. Elizabeth A. Dombrowski.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF JOHANNA GRISTEDE, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1356) for the relief of the estate of Johanna Gristede, deceased.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

CWO ELDEN R. COMER

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1374) for the relief CWO Elden R. Comer.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MRS. NATHALIE ILINE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1380) for the relief of Mrs. Nathalie Iline.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

THEODORE ZISSU

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1384) for the relief of Theodore Zissu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1384

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 33 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended (50 App. U.S.C. 33), with respect to the filing of claims and the institution of suits for the return of property or any interest therein pursuant to section 9 or 32 of such Act (50 App. U.S.C. 9 or 32), Theodore Zissu, a United States citizen, may within six months after the enactment of this Act file a claim for the return of certain property, namely, his interest as owner of 30 per centum of the stock of Industria Romana Mechanica si Chimica S.A., Bucharest, Rumania, the forge plant property and equipment of which latter corporation was vested by the Office of Alien Property under Vesting Order Numbered 46, effective July 6, 1942, and supplement to Vesting Order Numbered 46, effective May 11, 1943, and which forge plant property and equipment was subsequently sold by said Office of Alien Property; and that claim shall be considered on its merits in accordance with the remaining provisions of that Act. If no such return is made within a period of sixty days after the filing of such claim, the said Theodore Zissu shall be entitled, within one year of the expiration of such period, to institute suit pursuant to section 9 of said Act (50 App. U.S.C. 9) for the return of such property.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. HELEN VESELENAK

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1475) for the relief of Mrs. Helen Veselenak.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

MAJ. KENNETH F. COYKENDALL, U.S. ARMY

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1487) for the relief of Maj. Kenneth F. Coykendall, U.S. Army.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 1487

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Major Kenneth F. Coykendall, United States Army, is hereby relieved of all liability for repayment to the United States of the amount of $752.38 representing overpayments of active duty pay as a member of the United States Army in the years 1949 through 1962, which he received as a result of erroneous credit of service for longevity pay purposes.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Major Kenneth F. Coykendall, the sum of any amount received or withheld from him on account of the payments referred to in the first section of this bill.

No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GERTRUDE RESKIN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2155) for the relief of Mrs. Gertrude Reskin.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ROBERT L. YATES AND OTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2299) for the relief of Robert L. Yates and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the employees or former employees of the Department of Defense in the Messenger Service Branch, Brookley Air Force Base, Alabama, named in this section are respectively relieved of liability to the United States for certain overpayments of salary made to them as a result of administrative error during the period from May 29, 1960, through December 2, 1961. The net amounts of such overpayments (exclusive of payroll deductions for civil service retirement and Government service life insurance) were as follows:

Robert L. Yates, $675.07;
Edmond E. Skidmore, $796.86;
Prester L. Simmons, $676.75;
Sidney Sawyer, $675.07;
Joe Davis, Junior, $764.83;
Eugene C. Fortune, Junior, $677.45;
Ludy Anderson, $678.77;
James F. Copeland, $675.07;
Clarence A. Baker, $659.49; and
Samuel G. Crawford, $271.63.

In the audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for any amount for which liability is relieved by this Act.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to each person named in the first section, an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the claim of the United States for refund of the amount specified in the first section: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act for the payment of any one claim shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHIRLEY SHAPIRO

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2681) for the relief of Shirley Shapiro.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

OUTLET STORES, INC.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2924) for the relief of Outlet Stores, Inc.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

BRYCE A. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3075) for the relief of Bryce A. Smith.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ESTATE OF BART BRISCOE EDGAR, DECEASED

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3076) for the relief of the estate of Bart Briscoe Edgar, deceased.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CWO EDWARD E. KREISS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3634) for the relief of CWO Edward E. Kreiss.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3634

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Chief Warrant Officer Edward E. Kreiss, United States Navy, retired, is relieved of any liability under the Act of July 31, 1894 (5 U.S.C. 62), to pay to the United States all amounts received by him as a civilian employee of the Department of the Army from May 1, 1959, through December 14, 1962. In audit and settlement of the accounts of any certifying or disbursing officer of the United States, credit shall be given for amounts for which liability is relieved by this Act.

With the following committee amendment.

On page 1, following line 11, insert:

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Chief Warrant Officer Edward E. Kreiss an amount equal to the aggregate of the amounts paid by him, or withheld from sums otherwise due him, in complete or partial satisfaction of the liability to the United States specified in the first section and, notwithstanding the provisions of the Act of July 31, 1894 (5 U.S.C. 62), said amount shall include any compensation due him for the period December 1, 1962, through December 14, 1962, and lump-sum leave payments based upon the period of civilian employment referred to in this Act.

"SEC. 3. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT O. OVERTON, MARJORIE C. OVERTON, AND SALLY EITEL

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3638) for the relief of Robert O. Overton, Marjorie C. Overton, and Sally Eitel.

There being no objection, the clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3638

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to Robert O. Overton, the sum of $1,500; (2) to Marjorie C. Overton, the sum of $5,000; and (3) to Sally Eitel, the sum of $10,000, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States arising out of an incident occurring on December 25, 1946, in Indianapolis, Indiana, involving a vehicle of the Army Air Corps for which suit may not be instituted under the tort claims procedure as provided in title 28, United States Code: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act for the payment of any one claim in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RUSSELL D. HARRIS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3685) for the relief of Russell D. Harris.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 3685

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, notwithstanding laches or any statute of limitations, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Russell D. Harris, of Phoenixville, Pennsylvania, for retired pay under the Act of April 3, 1939 (53 Stat. 557; 10 U.S.C. 3687), or any other applicable law, and the said court is further authorized to determine whether the said Russell D. Harris was, at the time he was relieved from active duty in August of 1943, permanently incapacitated for active service and whether any such incapacity was the result of an incident of service as a commissioned officer in the United States Air Force incurred in the line of duty and not due to his own misconduct.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 3, after "States" insert "Army."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES MAROWITZ

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 1445) for the relief of Charles Marowitz.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

McKOY-HELGERSON CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 3137) for the relief of McKoy-Helgerson Co.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

STAIMAN BROS.-SIMON WRECKING CO.

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 2166) for the relief of Staiman Bros.-Simon Wrecking Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 2166

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That jurisdiction is hereby conferred on the United States Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Staiman Brothers-Simon Wrecking Company against the United States for such losses arising out of disposal numbered 2 PRD-313A, dated June 30, 1960, as are determined to be due in law and equity because of the difficulty of adequate inspection prior to bid, and because of negligence and mistake by the Government in providing inadequate and erroneous information with the invitation to bid as to sizes, quantity, and character of the property.

SEC. 2. Suit upon the claim referred to in the first section of this Act may be instituted at any time within six months from the date of the enactment of this Act and all defenses of the United States based upon provisions in the invitation to bid and contract regarding warranty as to quantity, size, and character of the pipe and barring claims based upon errors or omissions in the description of the property are hereby waived: *Provided*, That nothing in the Act shall be construed as an admission of liability on the part of the United States, and recovery, if any, shall be limited to such actual losses, not including unrealized profit.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, line 10, after the word "of" insert "alleged".

On page 1, line 10, after the word "providing" insert "allegedly".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. COL. PORTER F. SHELDON, U.S. AIR FORCE

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4026) for the relief of Lt. Col. Porter F. Sheldon, U.S. Air Force.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 4026

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lieutenant Colonel Porter F. Sheldon, 9047A, United States Air Force, Langley Air Force Base, Virginia, the sum of $1,727.00 in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement in addition to the amount he received under section 2732 of title 10, United States Code, for household goods and personal effects damaged or destroyed aboard the Waterman Line steamship DeSota, carrier under Government contract, which was involved in an accident in the harbor at Antwerp, Belgium, on January 16, 1963. No part of the amount appropriated in this Act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERT J. BEAS

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 4443) for the relief of Robert J. Beas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill may be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

CONVEY LAND TO HEIRS OF ADAM JONES, CREEK INDIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H.R. 70) to provide for the conveyance of approximately 80 acres of land to the heirs of Adam Jones, Creek Indian not enrolled.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H.R. 70

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to convey in fee simple all of the right, title, and interest of the United States and of the Creek Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma in and to land described as the south half northwest quarter section 5, township 10 north, range 15 east, Indian meridian, Oklahoma, containing 80 acres, more or less, to the heirs of Adam Jones, Creek Indian not enrolled, in the proportions as determined by the county court of McIntosh County, Oklahoma, case numbered 5375, as follows: Hattie Jones (wife), an undivided one-third interest; and Bobby R. Jones (son), Tommy Leon Jones (son), Carrie Lee Jones (daughter), Adam Jones, Junior (son), and Marietta Elciea Jones (granddaughter), each an undivided two-fifteenths interest.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This concludes the call of the Private Calendar.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 65]

Andrews, Glenn
Ashley
Berry
Bonner
Buchanan
Celler
Derwinski
Green, Oreg.
Holland
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
McCulloch
Mailliard
Miller
Morrison
Powell
Redlin
Roosevelt
Springer
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Thompson, Tex.
Toll
Tunney
Wright

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall, 408 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

SOUTH AMERICAN REGIONAL MEETING AT LIMA, PERU, OF INTERNATIONAL ROAD FEDERATION

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up the resolution, House Resolution 273, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 273

Resolved, That, notwithstanding the provisions of H. Res. 141, Eighty-ninth Congress, the Committee on Public Works is hereby authorized to send five of its members and two staff assistants to Lima, Peru, to attend the South American regional meeting of the International Road Federation from May 14, 1965, to May 24, 1965, inclusive.

Notwithstanding section 1754 of title 22, United States Code, or any other provisions of law, local currencies owned by the United States shall be made available to the committee and employees engaged in carrying out their official duties under section 190(d) of title 2, United States Code: *Provided*, (1) That no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend local currencies or appropriated funds for subsistence in an amount in excess of the maximum per diem rates approved for oversea travel as set forth in the Standardized Government Travel Regulations, as revised and amended by the Bureau of the Budget; (2) that no member or employee of said committee shall receive or expend an amount for transportation in excess of actual transportation costs; (3) no appropriated funds shall be expended for the purpose of defraying expenses of members of said committee or its employees in any country where counterpart funds are available for this purpose.

That each member or employee of said committee shall make to the chairman of said committee an itemized report showing the number of days visited in each country whose local currencies were spent, the amount of per diem furnished, and the cost of transportation if furnished by public carrier, or if such transportation is furnished by an agency of the United States Government, the identification of the agency. All such individual reports shall be filed by the chairman with the Committee on House Administration and shall be open to public inspection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know whether there are any counterpart funds in Peru?

Mr. YOUNG. The Member from Texas will yield to the chairman of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. MAHON. I believe other Members might speak as well, but there are no counterpart funds, as such, in Peru. However, there are funds which can be used for expenses of congressional travel, even though they are not technically counterpart funds.

Mr. GROSS. I was only hoping that this would not be in conflict with the injunction that tourism must stop, in the use of American dollars, until the deficit in the international balance of payments has been corrected. I hope this does not run afoul of that.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ACREAGE-POUNDAGE MARKETING QUOTAS FOR TOBACCO

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H.R. 5721) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for acreage-poundage marketing quotas for tobacco, to amend the tobacco price support provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina? The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messers. COOLEY, MCMILLAN, ABBITT, STUBBLEFIELD, DAGUE, and LATTA.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1965

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 7091) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow], and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill H.R. 7091, with Mr. HARRIS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, earlier in the session we had a supplemental appropriation bill, which provided $1.6 billion for the Commodity Credit Corporation.

This is a second supplemental appropriation bill for this session, and I trust it will be the last such bill until just prior to the end of the session when there may be a few items which will require attention; at least there usually are.

SUMMARY TOTALS OF THE BILL

The total amount in the bill is $2,125,833,083—a very considerable sum of money. The budget requests totaled $2,226,456,933, which means that we have suggested cuts aggregating $100,623,850.

Under the 5-minute rule we can discuss any items which may be of special interest to individual Members. For that reason we agreed on more limited general debate. Under the 5-minute rule we can entertain any questions and amendments with respect to the bill.

This bill is divided, as Members will note from the bill and from the report, into four titles.

In title I there is about $1,178 million included, which is what we might call, for the sake of a better term, the regular or ordinary supplementals. The precise figures, of course, are set out in the report; I am using approximate amounts.

Title II deals with funds, amounting to some $344 million, to give substance to the Appalachia program which passed Congress fairly recently. Some of us voted for it and some of us voted against it, but the Congress has spoken, and in response the Committee is recommending appropriations of $344 million for the implementation of that program. We made cuts of about $18 million in the budget requests. The authorization bill carried total authorizations of about $1.1 billion; the $344 million is just the first installment.

Title III deals solely with increased salary costs. Last year, we passed salary increase bills for the various branches of the Government, civil and military. The agencies of the Government were importuned to try to absorb these salary increases within the appropriations already made, insofar as possible, and some of the agencies did quite well in that respect. Overall, 42 percent of the military pay cost increase is being absorbed. About 35 percent of the executive branch general civilian pay increase was absorbed. So, generally speaking, I would say a fairly good job has been done in absorbing these additional costs brought about as a result of the actions of Congress in the last session. We have in the bill before us about $580 million to help cover the pay increases, the unabsorbed portions. Pages 54 and 55 of the report elucidate the situation on pay increases.

In title IV, we have what we have in nearly every supplemental bill, namely, the customary claims and judgments fund. In this case we provide about $23 million.

That is the summary situation on the figures.

MAJOR CLASSES OF ITEMS

Another and perhaps more instructive way to see the general makeup and dimensions of the bill is to look at it by major classes of items. About 29 percent of the bill, or some $609.3 million, is for pay raise costs.

In the Appalachia program there is about $344.3 million, or about 16 percent of the bill. For other new legislation, such as the Inter-American Bank Development Bank, there is a total of $338.6 million, or 15 percent of the bill. These three categories—all for new legislation—total $1,292.2 million, or about 60 percent of the total.

In mandatory type payments, such as public assistance grants, which has to be funded, we have about $452.5 million in the bill, or about 21 percent of the total.

Then we have had a series of emergencies and we have in the bill $87 million plus for these emergencies. This all adds up to 85 percent of the money in the bill.

The Small Business Administration came in for $100 million additional loan funds and we recommend that in its entirety.

Considering all of these items, 90 percent of the bill is for purposes such as I have just described.

Category	Approximate amounts in bill (millions)	Percent of bill total
(a) New legislation:		
Pay raise acts	$609.3	29
Appalachia	344.3	16
Other new legislation (including $250,000,000 Inter-American Development Bank	338.6	15
Total	1,292.2	60
(b) Mandatory-type payments (public assistance grants, mostly)	452.5	21
(c) Disaster emergencies	87.6	4
Total, these 3 classes	1,832.3	85
SBA loan funds	100.0	5
Total, above items	1,932.3	90

RESTORATIONS OF REDUCTIONS

It is sometimes said that Congress tries to present a good image to the country on its economy mindedness by making cuts and slashes in the budget during the session and then when the new Congress meets the following year, it proceeds indiscriminately to appropriate the funds which were reduced in the previous year. But that cannot accurately be said of this bill. However, it is accurate to say that we are restoring in this bill cuts previously made amounting to about $300 million, a relatively small sum when you consider the whole $100 billion-plus budget involving countless separate items.

In virtually every session—as far back as I can recall—there are a handful of supplementals representing restoration of reductions made in the previous session. This year is no exception in that connection but the number of instances is infinitesimal—only six, to be exact.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to my friend from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. So, once again we come right around the circle and find that some of the cuts last year were just as fictional as they could be. Here we are today with a deficiency appropriation bill to take up the slack of the cuts that were made last year.

Mr. MAHON. My friend is partially correct. Out of the hundreds of cuts that we made, as a Congress, in appropriation bills last year—hundreds of cuts here and there in various items in the appropriation bills—we are providing in this bill to make restorations in only six instances. I think that is not too bad. A couple of the sums are rather large; for example, grants for public assistance, $200 million. Last year we cut public assistance too deeply; we should not have cut it at all as it now appears—from hindsight. But there is not much we can do in the appropriation bill to regulate the obligations under this program. There were reasons behind the cuts, but hindsight says we cut too deeply and we are having to restore; not only a restoration, but additional funds as well in the case of public assistance. But it is correct that we do suggest some restorations. As I say, there is generally some of this in every session.

Mr. GROSS. I think we are all pretty well aware that last year was an election year.

Mr. MAHON. We are aware that last year was an election year, but we are by no means restoring all of the cuts that we did make. And if we do not try to make cuts, if we do not seek to achieve economy, we will never achieve it. And if we make only six restorations out of the hundreds of cuts that we made, all those that might possibly have been rerequested, it would seem that we are doing reasonably well. And as I said, this generally happens to a limited extent, election year or not.

INCREASES FOR PAY RAISE COSTS

Mr. GROSS. If the committee operates on this basis there is not very much economy. I am now referring to cutting funds. I would like to ask the gentleman about the increased pay costs. Yesterday it was repeatedly stated that one of the reasons for the size of that bill was that they had to take care of increased pay costs. When are we going to run out of that argument so far as appropriation bills are concerned?

Mr. MAHON. The pending bill applies only to the current fiscal year which ends June 30 insofar as pay act costs are concerned. The bill we had yesterday applied to the next fiscal year which begins on July 1 and goes for another year. So it is true that, other things being equal, the bill for next year will in many cases be higher than the bill for last year because of the pay cost factor.

Mr. GROSS. I suppose by the time this argument could conceivably be ended there will be another pay increase so that the Committee on Appropriations will be in here saying that the size of this bill is due in substantial part to the cost of the pay increase.

Mr. MAHON. Some of us voted for the pay increase; some did not. I did not vote for the pay increase. But the law of the land must be followed, the majority have spoken, and the employees and the military personnel must be paid.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMER. I would like to ask a couple of questions relating to the Appalachian Regional Development Commission appropriation, partially because of the testimony we had before the Public Works Committee relating to what the needs for the balance of this fiscal year would be and the needs for the next fiscal year.

Mr. MAHON. I am going to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the chairman of the subcommittee that handled the item, to respond to the gentleman's inquiry.

Mr. CRAMER. If the gentleman will yield, I understand in the testimony we had before the Public Works Committee relating to Appalachia it was to the effect that substantial funds would not be needed.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CRAMER. Substantial funds would not be needed for the balance of this fiscal year, and that approximately the figure, plus what you cut, around $10 million, was about what they contemplated would be needed mostly for fiscal year 1966, meaning starting July 1 of this year and going to July 1 of next year. But I see that the Committee on Appropriations is proposing including that entire figure in this supplemental appropriation rather than in the 1966 appropriation bill.

I would like to ask the reason, if there is any, for that approach.

Mr. THOMAS. The gentleman is correct in what he says. It is subject to a point of order. It carries funds beyond fiscal year 1965. The total authorization for administrative costs of the Appalachian Regional Commission is $2.4 million and we appropriated about $800,000. They have not spent that. They wanted to let this remain available through 1966 in order to take care of the big Commission—the 11 Governors—and the professional staff.

Mr. CRAMER. I cannot hear the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. This was to take care of the Commission composed of the 11 Governors and the Federal Cochairman. It goes beyond this year and that part of it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. CRAMER. That is, relating to the administrative expenses?

Mr. THOMAS. That is right.

Mr. CRAMER. Would the gentleman discuss the item relating for instance to to the supplemental grants-in-aid under section 214 in that the authorization provided for $90 million for the entire 2-year period?

Mr. THOMAS. May I request the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY] to respond to the gentleman's question?

Mr. MAHON. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROONEY].

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, would the distinguished gentleman from Florida kindly inform me as to the page to which he is referring?

Mr. CRAMER. Page 45 of the committee report where there is discussed supplemental grants-in-aid, Appalachian Regional Development, title II. Provision is made for the sum of $45 million, and the total sum authorized in the bill for a 2-year period is only $90 million. This is April and we have April, May, and June—3 months—and you are providing 50 percent of the 2-year authorization for a 3-month period.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I do not know how to answer the distinguished gentleman from Florida other than to say that the administration seems to be moving quite fast on this Appalachian program and they want the people of that area to benefit as promptly as possible. They want to obligate a good part of this money before this coming June 30. This not only applies to the $45 million to which the gentleman from Florida has directed our attention, but also to the $200 million for the Bureau of Public Roads and the $2.5 million recommended in the bill for grants for local development districts and for research and administration.

Mr. CRAMER. I appreciate that, and that was to be my next question. But, is it contemplated, then—let me ask it this way—that relating to the $45 million figure, that is grants-in-aid—that is the little APW, accelerated public works program—the public roads development, the $200 million, is it contemplated that there will be a substantial figure included in the appropriation bill for fiscal year 1966 for those 2 items?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. No.

Mr. CRAMER. That is precisely the point that I wanted to make.

What is being done here, I will ask the gentleman if it is not true, is that you are providing all of the money needed for the 3 months left this fiscal year and all the money for fiscal year 1966 in this supplemental so that it will not appear in the 1966 appropriation bill?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. This is so they can immediately get started. A great deal of the money contained in these items is in connection with construction work and they cannot proceed with that sort of program unless they have the funds in hand.

This would cover a 15-month period beginning with the passage of the bill, in this fiscal year and the entire next fiscal year—in each of these 3 instances in which the Congress overwhelmingly voted authorizations. For instance, in the Bureau of Public Roads the committee recommended the sum of $200 million. There is presently an authorization for expenditures of $840 million over a period of 5 years.

Mr. CRAMER. Over a 5-year period.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Over a 5-year period, yes. There are some plans but we cannot itemize all of them.

Mr. CRAMER. The testimony we had before our committee was to the effect that for the balance of this fiscal year inconsequential sums would be needed, but in fiscal 1966 they contemplated they would need around $100 million for the highway program. Now we come up with a proposal to finance through this supplemental another $200 million amount rather than including the largest portion of it in the 1966 budget.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We gave this request the same attention that we give to regular items in the 1966 budget. We held hearings on this supplemental, and the regular 1966 bill at the same time. The only answer I can make to the gentleman is that it is to get started on this Appalachian operation which the Congress so overwhelmingly voted.

Mr. CRAMER. In addition to that, may I ask a question further? I am not criticizing the fact that the program is in effect. The Congress voted it. I am calling attention to the fact instead of putting the money in the 1966 appropriation bill where it belongs, it is being put in the supplemental bill to cover all of 1966.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. It covers a period of a couple of extra months when it can be done in a sensible way, so there will be proper plans and wise expenditure of the funds.

Mr. CRAMER. The obvious reason is that this appropriation bill in 1966 will not properly reflect the expenditures in 1966, if we go back to the supplemental for 1965.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. This is on an obligation basis rather than an expenditure basis.

Mr. CRAMER. The gentleman from Florida does not feel that makes a substantial improvement.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. And it would not mean very much in the President's overall budget.

Mr. CRAMER. The sum of $322 million, which I understood in the presentation to our committee was part of the 1966 request, would be used in 1966.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. We are talking about $200 million plus $45 million, which is a total of $245 million.

Mr. CRAMER. It says that a total of $344 million is recommended for the various agencies involved for obligation to June 30, 1966.

Mr. MAHON. Let me say to the gentleman that the Congress approved the Appalachia program. The administration brought it here in one package covering the balance of this fiscal year, which is limited, and for continuation over to the next fiscal year. If there is anything wrong with this I cannot see it. This makes it crystal clear to Congress and to the country that in this 15-month period we are providing some $344 million. Why break it down, what good would that do? Here it is out on the table. It is a matter of saying "here is a program, and here are the funds." I do not get the gentleman's point at all.

Mr. JONAS. The only point the gentleman from Florida is trying to make, and I think the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee will agree is that this has been an arbitrary decision on the part of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, with the concurrence of the President, of course, to put this money back in 1965 so as to reduce the 1966 budget. He said that the Administration has discretionary power over whether to charge it to the 1965 budget or to the 1966 budget.

I submit they exercised that discretion by putting this money back in 1965 and that makes 1966 look better than it would have if part of the funds had been charged to 1966. If we just admit that we will get along.

Mr. MAHON. There is nothing to admit. This is as plain as anything can be, that here is a package for this program of $344 million, some of it to be obligated in 1965 and some in 1966. A decision had to be made to make it one package, to keep better account of it. The appropriation for the fiscal year 1966 will be less. It will be more for the current fiscal year. Everybody knows that. The thing that will affect the spending is not when it is appropriated but the rate of expenditure.

Mr. JONAS. Nothing is under the table. It is all open and aboveboard. But you cannot get around the fact that this is new money and is not expected to be obligated in 1965. The normal thing would be to put it in in 1966.

Mr. MAHON. We did not want to slow it down. It seems more orderly to do it this way. There have been numerous occasions where appropriations have been made to cover slightly in excess of 1 year.

In May of 1954 we did it for longer than a 12-month period. In 1955, we did it again. In 1956 and 1957, we did it again. There is a record of this kind of proceeding. I will include more details in substantiation from a memorandum which I hold in my hand. So there is nothing improper here. Here is the full appropriation, in one package, money. Let us take a look at it. If we are for it, we vote for it. If we are against it, we vote against it. In elaboration, I include a memorandum of precedents for appropriation availability beyond 1 year—14 to 16 months:

MEMORANDUM

We have the so-called continuing appropriations for construction of public works and purchase of materials requiring long leadtime, but I am not referring to that type—I am referring to what might otherwise be an annual item.

It seems sensible and timesaving to provide availability for 14, 15, 16 months in one bill rather than splitting the program into two shorter time periods and thereby necessitating going through the same thing twice within a matter of a very few weeks.

As examples, let me cite a few cases in recent years where this type of appropriation has been made:

The Third Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1954, approved May 11, 1954, contained an appropriation of $15 million to combat wind erosion, in the agricultural conservation program and provided that such amount be made available through December 31, 1955—approximately 20 months. The same bill also contained an appropriation of $55 million for school construction which was to remain available to April 1, 1955—10 months beyond the close of the fiscal year for which the appropriation bill primarily provided.

The Second Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1955, approved April 22, 1955, provided an appropriation of $200,000 for the Washington Regional Mass Transportation Survey and authorized that amount to remain available through June 30, 1956—14 months availability.

The Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1957, approved on June 21, 1957, provided $15 million for emergency conservation work and extending the availability of such amount through June 30, 1958. The same bill also carried funds for the entombment of the unknown American soldiers of World War II and permitted this amount to be available through June 30, 1958.

The Second Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1959, approved May 20, 1959, appropriated $500,000 for the Third Pan American Games and authorized the funds to remain available through June 30, 1960—a little over 13 months from the actual signing of the law.

The Second Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1961, approved September 8, 1960, carried funds for the 18th decennial census and provided that they remain available through December 31, 1962—27 months from the date of enactment.

The Third Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1961, approved on March 31, 1961, appropriated $500 million for the Federal unemployment compensation account and provided that it remain available through September 30, 1962.

The Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1964, approved June 9, 1964, provided funds for Alaska earthquake damage and carried language making them available through June 30, 1965.

The regular annual appropriation bill for Departments of Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare for the fiscal year 1965 was reported by the House Committee on Appropriations on April 10, 1964, and carried funds for the initiation of certain programs in the Manpower Development and Training area and provided that the amount in the bill was to cover a period of approximately 15 months. House Report No. 1316 of the 88th Congress on page 4 says: "The committee has simply attempted to be realistic in assessing the capacity of the program during the next 15 months."

It seems to me that there is ample precedent for this sort of thing and it seems sensible that we follow such precedents in this case at this time.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. In connection with what the chairman of the committee says, the bulk of this money is for roadbuilding construction. The weather has a good bit to do with it, too. The better way to do it in this instance is by appropriating $200 million at this time.

Mr. CRAMER. The Bureau of Public Roads testified before our committee that in the first 12 months they could not use over $90 million in order to accomplish the objectives of the bill, but under the proposal you have here, we find for 3 months of this fiscal year $200 million. I am saying this program should be properly appropriated for. I say what the gentleman from North Carolina had to say, that to put money for the 15-month period in a supplemental rather than putting it in 1966 where it belongs is not proper procedure.

May I ask a question? On page 42——

Mr. MAHON. Of the bill or the report?

Mr. CRAMER. Of the report, pertaining to the Appalachian regional development, the next to the last paragraph.

The appropriations recommended for the Soil Conservation Service, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, and the Farmers Home Administration in the amount of $23,150,000.

The point I am asking about relates to the authorization itself. The bill under section 203 of the Appalachian Commission Act authorizes for land conservation, erosion control, and so forth, a total for the 2-year period of not to exceed $17 million. Will the committee indicate on what basis it included a sum in excess of that authorization in the appropriation request?

Mr. MAHON. In working on this bill, the subcommittees that normally handle the work relating to an agency did the work and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTEN] who conducted the hearings on this item is best informed about it. Perhaps he might discuss this briefly in general debate, but he may wish to do so at greater length when we are under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say to the gentleman from Florida, only $7 million of the total that you are reading is included in that limitation in the Appalachia bill.

Mr. CRAMER. Would the gentleman indicate what the balance is?

Mr. WHITTEN. The balance has to do with Farmers Home Administration loans, the Soil Conservation Service and the watershed programs that are not subject to the limitation. But as to the limitation that the gentleman mentioned, we scaled that down to $7 million.

Mr. CRAMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas has consumed 27 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOW].

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes and now yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SAYLOR] for the purpose of asking a question.

Mr. SAYLOR. I would like to ask a direct question, Mr. Chairman, of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] regarding the language that appears on page 8 regarding the veterans' reopened insurance fund. It is very evident from the language that you are announcing here that there is such a thing as veterans' special term insurance. This is completely contrary to the act that was passed last year because in establishing the record, we made sure that there is no such thing as term insurance under the reopened veterans' insurance. I would like to know why we are going to transfer amounts from a fund which does not exist.

Mr. THOMAS. Would the gentleman from Pennsylvania be kind enough to read the language he refers to.

Mr. SAYLOR. On page 8, line 19, there is this language:

> That such amounts of the "Veterans special term insurance fund" as may hereafter be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be in excess of the actuarial liabilities of that fund, including contingency reserves, shall be available for transfer to the "Veterans reopened insurance fund".

Mr. THOMAS. All that that language does, I say to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, is to allow those funds—and you are not appropriating new funds by that language—but as I say this is to transfer excess funds to carry out the purpose of the new veterans' insurance act. It is the language of the Bureau of the Budget. There is no new money added here. It is a sincere and bona fide attempt to carry out exactly the purpose and intent of the language approved and passed by the Congress.

Mr. SAYLOR. But it is legislation on an appropriation bill; is it not?

Mr. THOMAS. I think you are right. It is a transfer of funds.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this is a large bill. It involves a great deal of money. I am not completely satisfied that it represents any compromise. I think further cuts could have been made and should have been made. I join with some of my colleagues on this side of the aisle and in looking at the large amounts that should have been in the 1966 budget—since we are appropriating here for 15 months—I do not think this is really in the spirit of a deficiency or a supplemental appropriation. But it has been done and we are going along with it.

Mr. Chairman, I think as we take this up item by item, Members who are more familiar with the bill will discuss them. I may want to say something further as to certain items under the 5-minute rule, but do not intend at this time to take any further time in debate on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington [Mrs. MAY].

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I wish to congratulate my colleagues on the Committee on Appropriations for their recognition of the responsibility of the Federal Government in their attention to the need for additional funds for various Federal agencies to assist the people of the Pacific Northwest in recovering from the disastrous floods of last December and January.

I have closely examined the committee recommendations as contained in H.R. 7091, the second supplemental appropriations bill before us today, and I feel that generally speaking the Committee has given the problem of the flood damage in Washington, Oregon, and California its most sympathetic attention so that the Federal agencies will have funds adequate to carry on their responsibilities.

Sections of my State of Washington were severely damaged as a result of the winter floods this year and I am sure the people of the State of Washington, as a result of passage of today's appropriations bill will be highly appreciative of this action. While it may not be possible for the Pacific Northwest to fully recover from the floods for some time to come, the assistance being made available through Federal, State, and local governments should be of immeasurable benefit in speeding this recovery.

Additionally I wish to compliment the committee on recommending the appropriation of $600,000 to permit an immediate start on construction of the lower Granite project on the Snake River in the State of Washington. An immediate start on lower Granite lock and dam should enable completion of the dam and powerplant by 1971 to prevent a potential power shortage in the Pacific Northwest and help meet the Bonneville Power Administration requirements at that time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LAIRD].

LAIRD AMENDMENT ON MILK

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to explain the purpose of the milk amendment which was placed in the bill in the full committee meeting.

Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to extend for 5 months—through fiscal year 1965—the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to make indemnity payments to eligible dairy farmers whose milk has been condemned for containing pesticide residues.

The enabling legislation for this program expired on January 31, 1965. The appropriation for fiscal year 1965, however, contained $8.8 million to finance the program. By January 31, 1965, only 250 payments totaling $300,000 had been made.

Therefore a number of eligible dairy farmers are the victims of an unusual situation where funds have been authorized for a program that has expired.

A number of bills, by Representatives QUIE, HORTON, WHALLEY, MATHIAS, SICKLES, and ABBITT, are pending in the House Education and Labor Committee. These bills would extend the authorized time for the program through June 30, 1967.

However, the delay in consideration of these bills will work an undue hardship on dairy farmers now facing sever economic loss.

In brief, a remedy is only a remedy if it is prompt.

This amendment would extend the legislative authority for the programs through fiscal 1965 and thereby make available the balance of the $8.8 million which has already been appropriated to correct this situation.

My amendment further carries out the amendment which I offered last year. It would appropriate no new money, but would take the funds from the poverty appropriation, which was made to the poverty administration. It seems to me that this is a far better use of the poverty funds than some of the uses that have been made of the funds. This is a poverty-prevention program.

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. JONAS. How far would the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin extend the time limit?

Mr. LAIRD. It would extend the time limit from January 31 to July 1, 1965. This is a supplemental appropriation bill, and it did not seem to me proper to extend the time beyond June 30 or the start of the next fiscal year.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAIRD. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi, the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee dealing with agriculture.

Mr. WHITTEN. Those of us who work with this subject matter are in accord with the gentleman from Wisconsin. He has properly described the situation. I believe it is a good proposal.

Mr. LAIRD. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN.]

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Chairman, I take this time to commend and to thank the Appropriations Committee for all the consideration given to the flood problems of my particular congressional district. I know the committee receives many requests. I just wanted the committee to know that I am most apprecative of the time the individual members have given to me, personally, as we brought the many problems of the flood stricken area to their attention. We are still in the recovery and rehabilitation process and will be for some time to come. In closing, I sincerely hope a similar disaster never strikes your own congressional districts.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire about the $1,858,000 to be made available to the Peace Corps.

From reading the hearings I got the impression, according to the statement of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. Passman], who quoted a statement by the Director of the Peace Corps, Mr. Shriver, that there were going to be stringent controls placed upon the administration of the organization. I am unable to understand why they are here for nearly $2 million in this bill.

I wonder if someone could help me out on how the administrative funds in the Peace Corps have been expended.

Mr. PASSMAN. It is not an easy job to defend this item. I should like to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the increased cost of the Pay Act of 1964 represents $658,000 of the funds Mr. Shriver is requesting that we transfer from other unobligated funds to the administrative expense of the Peace Corps.

Mr. GROSS. But did they not spend at an exceptional rate in the first few months of the fiscal year?

Mr. PASSMAN. It is true that almost from the beginning of this fiscal year the Peace Corps started spending out of the administrative expense fund at a rate that would prevent them from living within the limitation imposed by the Congress in the regular bill. Nevertheless, Mr. Shriver claims that these additional funds for administrative expense are necessary.

Mr. GROSS. Your subcommittee was assured, was it not, they would cut back on travel expense for one thing, and is it not a fact that a substantial amount of this money is to take care of increased travel expenses?

Mr. PASSMAN. May I say to the gentleman that it is most difficult to defend this item especially against the testimony given by these people last year. My feeble attempt to justify this would have to be limited to stating that there is a request to change the language so as to authorize the transfer of $1,858,000 within the 1965 Peace Corps appropriation to finance increased administrative and programs-support costs. Honesty is always in order. Certainly they assured us they would cut back on travel and other expenses, but evidently they did not make good on that promise.

Mr. GROSS. We had the issue of transferring funds before the House yesterday. I am talking about the attempt to write into the appropriation bill yesterday a provision for the transferability of funds. I said yesterday and I repeat today that I think the agencies and departments of the Government ought to live within the funds that they request for specific purposes unless some emergency develops.

Mr. PASSMAN. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Yes. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PASSMAN. May I say to the gentleman there is some defense for a request for the transfer of $658,000 to meet the mandatory salary increases called for by the Pay Act of last year. Although I certainly agree that this agency should live within the limitation placed at its own suggestion last year because the committee gave them every dime they asked for for administrative expenses.

Mr. GROSS. Now I want to get at something else.

Mr. PASSMAN. Of course, it is indeed difficult to defend Mr. Shriver's request. I hope the gentleman will not press me too far because if he should, then I would have to say that the Peace Corps is not my creature. But, if we are going to have these children or Peace Corps men scattered all over the world, doubtless some of them will become ill, and doctors will be needed to treat them.

Mr. GROSS. I want to ask another question. Can anyone tell me whether there are funds in this bill to man the automatic elevators in the New House Office Building? Has that money already been made available? I would like to know whether the House is now going to put elevator operators on fully automatic elevators where all you have to do is stick your finger on a button to get where you want to go.

Is it now proposed to compound the felony of extravagance in that building by putting elevator operators on fully automatic elevators?

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman made reference to a transfer of funds a moment ago.

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

Mr. MAHON. There was a limitation in the Peace Corps providing so much for administrative funds. We provide here that that limitation shall be lifted to the extent indicated on those administrative funds. That is not like transferring from one appropriation to another.

Now with respect to the elevator operators, I share the gentleman's hope that we will not have individual elevator operators on these new elevators in the Rayburn Office Building and here in the Capitol except perhaps for a few weeks until they get better adjusted. The elevators are not yet too well adjusted. New elevators always require some degree of adjustment. I understand that there is no plan made for elevator operators, although I cannot speak for the leadership of the House on that.

Mr. GROSS. I fail to find anything wrong with the adjustment of the elevators now.

Mr. MAHON. They are just about in shape, I think, but they do not operate with complete perfection, as I believe the gentleman knows.

Mr. GROSS. No, I do not agree with that.

Mr. MAHON. These people have been used temporarily in order to help get over this transition period.

Mr. GROSS. I understand they have operators on the other side of the House Chamber on those elevators. I am talking now about the 30 or 40 elevators over in the new building.

Mr. MAHON. Where we have no elevator operators at this time?

Mr. GROSS. And where we ought not to have elevator operators at any time.

Mr. MAHON. I agree with the gentleman. I do not think we ought to have operators over there except for a very brief period to see that the elevators are working well.

Mr. GROSS. If there were any such brief period, that brief period has passed.

Mr. MAHON. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. I am glad the gentleman agrees that operators are not needed on fully automatic elevators. I hope that if money has already been appropriated for this purpose that the Appropriations Committee will do what it can to see that it is not expended.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from New York [Mr. Robison].

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Chairman, I intend to support this bill although I am still not convinced that the bill should include moneys, on a 15-month basis, to permit the Corps of Engineers to charge any acceleration of their current program in the so-called Appalachia region to fiscal 1965.

As will appear from the hearings—page 58 of part 2—the only specific authorization for Corps of Engineers activity contained in the recently enacted Appalachian Act, was for it to conduct a comprehensive water resources study for Appalachia at a cost of not to exceed $5 million.

I have no objection to the allowance of the requested $1.7 million—which is contained in H.R. 7901—to permit the corps to commence that study, even though this sum is to cover a 15-month period. It is important to Appalachia for this study to be commenced as soon as possible, and there is no need for our Public Works Subcommittee to give further study to this specifically authorized project.

However, H.R. 7091 also contains almost $15.8 million to permit the corps, also on a 15-month basis, to accelerate certain existing projects of civil works in Appalachia, and to commence work on certain others in the same region. Aside from the question of whether or not this is sound appropriation policy, despite the precedents for so doing, it seems to me the corps request here should have been treated in the same manner as was the request for air pollution and water supply and water pollution control money that was disallowed by another subcommittee, as will appear from page 48 of the report, in order to consider such needs in connection with the regular requests by the Departments of Labor and of Health, Education, and Labor for fiscal 1966 itself.

A similar delay here would not have been detrimental to Appalachia in view of the fact that our subcommittee is already at work on the corps regular 1966 budget requests. We could also have assured ourselves, as I am not yet assured, that the corps can in this fashion, accelerate its regular programs and specific projects in Appalachia without delay or detriment to its programs and projects in other areas of the Nation.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I just want to take a moment of this time, if I may, to direct these remarks to the very able and fair-minded chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia. I did mention in the full committee, the gentleman will recall, that I felt concerned about the money included in this bill for some additional square feet of space for the site of the Central Library of the District of Columbia. I have not felt any softening of my attitude in that regard. So I wanted to take this moment to serve notice on the gentleman from Kentucky that I do propose at the proper time to offer an amendment to strike that amount from the bill.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL].

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to this one big item of $407.9 million for grants to the States for public assistance. I think it is very appropriate to point up this item since we are about to take up the medicare bill later this week. May I refer you to the hearings on this item before our Health, Education, and Welfare Subcommittee and the specific remarks of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Rhode Lsland [Mr. FOGARTY]. He expressed some concern when he said—and this is Mr. FOGARTY speaking:

> Because of the 1962 amendments that were supposed to reduce dependency, and because of the expansion of the vocational rehabilitation program, the manpower development and training program, the antipoverty program, and all of these other programs, we are appropriating large sums for, that are supposed to get people off of public assistance, we thought this program should start costing a little less. Last year Congress cut the request $200 million.

Dr. Winston, in testifying before the subcommittee, stated:

> Of the $407.9 million, $155.9 million represents an underestimate on the part of the Department.

He went on to say that this was due to an underestimation of the action of the States in the field of medical assistance for the aged. The Department also underestimated the amount for the program of Aid to Dependent Children—ADC.

So, here, Mr. Chairman, we have an item in the supplemental bill of over $400 million for additional grants-in-aid to the States for public assistance. This added to the $2.78 billion previously appropriated for this fiscal year brings the total figure to $3.187 billion. And still the figure continues to rise.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHEL. I am glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CONTE. The Secretary of Agriculture proposed to close the research center located in Philadelphia which has been concentrating its efforts on the study of maple sirup. This research center, which does not cost very much money, $2,000, has been very helpful to the farmers in my district in helping them to produce the finest maple sirup in the country, something to sweeten up the country a little bit.

I wonder what the bill carries for that center?

Mr. MICHEL. The gentleman's good work and representations to the committee are well known. We appreciate the testimony which he has given to us.

I am happy to advise the gentleman that there is enough money previously appropriated to take care of and to continue these research activities. As a matter of fact, in the report the committee recommends utilization research, of benefit to the maple sirup industry which returns about $10 million annually to some 10,000 producers, should be continued by some competent research agency, Federal, State, or private.

I assure the gentleman again that there are sufficient funds already appropriated to carry on that vital research.

Mr. CONTE. I thank the gentleman and I take this opportunity to commend the chairman of the committee and the distinguished ranking minority member on this side for this fine work.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute in order to raise a question with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CONTE].

The gentleman from Massachusetts made some statement here that I do not think he can back up. I feel that it should be corrected. He said that Massachusetts makes the best maple sirup in the United States. I question that and challenge him at any time to a contest. We will bring some maple sirup down from Ohio and I believe we can prove to the gentleman from Massachusetts that they do need a little research in Massachusetts in order to improve their maple sirup to bring it up to the standard of Ohio maple sirup.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts. I will have to yield to the gentleman since I have referred to him unkindly.

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Chairman, I do not want this colloquy to get all gummed up, but we certainly accept the challenge.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. LAIRD. I would like to state that we already have Wisconsin maple sirup right here in the Capitol.

Mr. BOW. I have been wondering what has been the matter with that maple sirup, and I would also suggest—some change be made to the excellent product of Ohio.

Mr. LAIRD. If the gentleman will yield further, it is about time that they brought some from Ohio and Massachusetts. I have been furnishing it too long.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. May I say I am glad that this controversy has arisen and in case you gentlemen need some judges, there are some real fine ones on this side of the aisle.

Mr. BOW. I thank the gentleman from Mississippi.

I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CALLAWAY].

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to announce to the House an act of the Georgia State Senate in tribute to Joe Bartlett.

Upon becoming a Member of Congress, one of the first men I meet was Joe Bartlett, reading clerk of the House of Representatives. I was immediately impressed with Mr. Bartlett's courtesy and willingness to help. Especially impressive is his knowledge of the House of Representatives and the Capitol, and his readiness to share this knowledge with me, with my family, and with visitors.

For a number of years Joe Bartlett has had a particular interest in American junior chambers of commerce, giving his time and efforts to many Jaycee groups. Each year Jaycees from all the Georgia clubs come to Washington for an intensive 2 days of briefings and instruction in Federal affairs, and each year Joe Bartlett has participated in their program.

Following their Washington seminar last spring, President James B. Haralson, of the Glenwood Jaycees, invited Joe to come to Georgia to be a judge in the 1964 Miss Atlanta Pageant.

This past February over 100 young Georgians came to Washington to attend the annual seminar. At their final meeting in the House Ways and Means Committee room, State President T. Malone Sharpe, presented to Joe Bartlett, and to his helpmate, "Jinny," the Jaycee President's Award for Outstanding Service.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am happy to say that Joe Bartlett has been further honored by a resolution of the Georgia State Senate.

The author of this resolution, Senator James P. Wesberry, Jr., served as a page in the U.S. House of Representatives some 15 years ago. His father, Dr. James P. Wesberry, Sr., a prominent Atlanta clergyman, has offered the opening prayer for the Congress on several occasions. They are both very enthusiastic admirers of Joe Bartlett.

This resolution is as follows:

S. RES. 72

A resolution of the Georgia State Senate commending Joe Bartlett; and for other purposes

Whereas Joe Bartlett is presently senior reading clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives; and

Whereas this outstanding and distinguished young man has for many years been active in civic, political, and military affairs of this Nation; and

Whereas Mr. Bartlett became in 1953 the youngest person ever to hold the position of reading clerk of the U.S. House of Representatives, and has the unique privilege of regularly being heard in both Chambers of Congress; and

Whereas Mr. Bartlett has been of particularly outstanding service to the members of the Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce, having appeared for the past 4 years on the program of the annual seminar on Federal affairs conducted by the Georgia Jaycees, giving his own time and talent during nonworking hours to assist the young men of Georgia in becoming more familiar with the history and operations of the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Georgia, That the Honorable Joe Bartlett, Reading Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives, is hereby commended and recognized for his many outstanding contributions to members of the Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce: Be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate is hereby authorized and instructed to furnish an appropriate copy of this resolution to the senator from the 37th Senatorial District to be presented to the Honorable Joe Bartlett.

PETER ZACH GEER,
President of the Senate.
GEORGE D. STEWART,
Secretary of the Senate.

It is fitting that the Georgia State Senate has honored Joe Bartlett in this manner, and I am happy to add my own personal commendations to this great American.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GERALD R. FORD] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Chairman, it was my privilege to present to Joe Bartlett the certified copy of the resolution adopted by the Senate of the State of Georgia commending our reading clerk for his special service to the young men in the Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce. This well deserved recognition came as a complete surprise to Joe who has always been willing to give of his time and talents in the promotion of a better understanding of the operation of our Government.

Joe's superb performance as a reading clerk in the House of Representatives is known to us all. All of us are also pleased to know that among his extracurricular activities he shares his knowledge and experience with others in an effort to develop a constructive interest in politics and government.

The special commendation which he received from the senate of the State of Georgia was a gracious tribute to Joe Bartlett and to the House of Representatives which he serves. All of us are proud of the work that Joe does within this Chamber and without. We commend him for extending his influence for good not only in Georgia but wherever he goes.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to join with my colleague from Georgia in paying deserved tribute to my friend, Joe Bartlett, our reading clerk.

I have known Joe for a long time—in fact, since he came here 24 years ago as a House page, at the tender age of 14. That was in the months just before Pearl Harbor.

Joe graduated from our page school, and joined the Marine Corps in World War II. When he returned from service in 1945, there was a vacancy in the position of chief page. Many thought Joe was too young for the job—only 19—but I appointed him anyway.

When the Korean war came along, Joe served again in the Marine Corps. And again he returned, there was a vacancy for which he was qualified—this time as reading clerk.

There were some 20 applicants for the job, and Joe was among them. I named a committee of three to interview the applicants, and to make a recommendation. The committee favored Joe, but they were afraid he was too young for the job.

But that was the only criticism I heard, so I appointed him to the job. He has been doing a fine job as our reading clerk ever since.

Now at the age of 38, I understand he is too old to be a member of the junior chamber of commerce, the organization which has honored him, but he is still a youngster to those of us who know him and appreciate him here on Capitol Hill.

I know that our friend, Joe Bartlett, has many more years of useful public service ahead of him. I want to join with my colleague from Georgia in congratulating Joe on this deserved new honor, and to wish him well for the future.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, those of us from Ohio are all pleased with the report just given us by our colleague, Representative CALLAWAY, of Georgia, in which he calls attention to a resolution adopted by unanimous vote of the Georgia State Senate on March 2, 1965, praising our senior reading clerk of the House of Representatives, Joe Bartlett, and commending him for his services to the Georgia Junior Chamber of Commerce and other civic organizations.

It has been my pleasure to know Joe since he was a good-looking, but shy, young boy who came out of the mountains of West Virginia to serve as a page in the Republican cloakroom of the House. I have watched Joe develop throughout the years. We were proud of him when he left the House to serve his country in World War II, and again during the Korean war.

In 1953, Joe was chosen as reading clerk of the House, the youngest man to ever serve in that position. Both in 1960 and in 1964 it was my pleasure to move his unanimous selection to the position of chief reading clerk of the Republican National Conventions of those years. As a result of his outstanding platform service in those conventions, he became known nationally.

But even before I knew Joe, I knew his father-in-law, the late former Congressman and U.S. Senator from Ohio, George Bender, and Mrs. Bender, and I have known his pretty little wife, Jinny, from the time of her birth. I have helped her eat many doughnuts made by her mother, the best doughnut baker to be found anywhere outside of the Seventh Ohio Congressional District.

So I join in congratulating Joe, his wife, and their wonderful little family upon the honor that has come to him from the great State of Georgia.

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, the people of Clarksburg, Harrison County, W. Va., are going to be mighty proud and pleased about this long-overdue recognition of the good works of Joe Bartlett.

Joe is a native son of West Virginia. He was born in Clarksburg, W. Va., and attended grammar school there. While attending Morgan Elementary School, he was selected to represent West Virginia at a school safety patrol convention in Washington. While in the Nation's Capital, he was singled out as "America's Typical Schoolboy Patrolman."

While he did not realize it at the time, this honor indirectly led to West Virginia's losing a good citizen and this House of Representatives gaining an extremely able officer.

As the result of his selection at the schoolboy patrol convention, Joe was given a 30-day appointment as a page, which evolved into a 24-year career of service to the U.S. House of Representatives

Joe's parents, Mr. and Mrs. F. Dorsey Bartlett, live on a farm south of Clarksburg. Recently they celebrated their golden wedding anniversary, and now they have time to sit back and contemplate with justifiable pride the many achievements of their five daughters and four sons. It will be a great satisfaction to them, I know, to learn of this fine tribute to their sixth born. And no one could be prouder at this most memorable occasion than Joe's lovely wife, "Jinny," daughter of the late George Bender, former U.S. Senator from the State of Ohio.

First and foremost, I congratulate Mr. and Mrs. Bartlett. I certainly congratulate Joe. But in so doing, do we not honor ourselves for his distinguished service to this House?

Mr. CALLAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAGUE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Chairman, it is a distinct privilege to associate myself with my distinguished colleague from Georgia in bringing to the attention of this House the signal honor that has been conferred upon our senior reading clerk, Joe Bartlett, by the Georgia State Senate.

Joe Bartlett is an unusual person who combines tact and courtesty with the fulfillment of the unusually exacting duties of his important office. In addition to being exceedingly knowledgeable in regard to pending legislation and House procedures, he has also become an authority on the history and traditions associated with the Capitol, and has developed a veritable storehouse of anecdotes associated with this House.

The resolution adopted by the Georgia Senate explores his extensive contributions in the field of civic and Federal affairs and serves to reveal the many-faceted personality of this dedicated public servant. The military side of his life, however, is what brought me into closer association with Joe since I have the same pride that he is always willing to display; namely, in our service in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Former marines around the Capitol know Joe as the founder and guiding light of the Congressional Marine's Club, an organization composed of people on the Hill who have worn the Marine uniform and who are joined together in holding high the torch of their devotion to the corps.

A private, first class, at the close of World War II, Joe was later commissioned from the ranks of the Reserve, and recalled to active duty in 1951. He presently holds the rank of major and continues his deep concern in matters having to do with our national security. His official records as a Marine reservist include the personal commendations of each of the past five Commandants of the Marine Corps—a unique distinction not enjoyed by many members of the corps, regardless of rank or grade.

All I have listed have been a few of the visible accomplishments of this versatile American. What I must not try to explore, because of the limitation of time, are those personal attributes that have endeared Joe to all who know him. A real gentleman, a courteous official, but withal a warm-hearted counselor, he remains one whom it is a great privilege to claim as a friend. Verily, in honoring Joe Bartlett, our Georgia compatriots have honored this House and each one of us in turn.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Chairman, I heartily concur in the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia in bringing this well-earned tribute from the senate of his State to the attention of the House.

As you know, Joe Bartlett, our reading clerk, is both my constituent and my longtime friend. He and his lovely wife, "Jinny," make their home in Chagrin Falls, Ohio, in the 23d District which I serve. Announcement of this tribute will bring much joy to Chagrin.

"Jinny" is the daughter of the late Senator George H. Bender and Mrs. Edna Bender, of Chagrin Falls. She was the Ohio princess in the 1951 Cherry Blossom Festival, and Joe, recalled to active duty with the Marine Corps, was assigned to be her escort. Love also blossomed and they were married. They now have two pretty little princesses, Linda Lou and Laura Lee.

Joe and his family always have been active in civic and community affairs. But service to the Members of the House of Representatives has been Joe's paramount devotion for nearly 24 years.

All of us, and many more, have been the grateful recipients of his help, his courtesy, his tireless efforts to serve this House and his Nation.

I am pleased to have this opportunity to express my admiration for our friend, Joe Bartlett.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McDADE].

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my gratitude at this time to the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Indiana, and to the members of the subcommittee, for agreeing to leave in this supplemental appropriation bill the full total of $11,800,000 to fight the problems of mine subsidence, mine caving, and underground mine fires. I particularly appreciate the action of the committee in not cutting this figure by $4,400,000. As I indicated to my colleagues, this $11,800,000 is essential to the welfare of a large number of Americans.

This present effort to solve the problems created by mine subsidences, mine caves, and mine fires is vital, not only to the people in my congressional district, but also to all those Americans who live in that part of our Nation where there has been a substantial coal industry.

As I have indicated in the record, the full thrust of this program can save millions of dollars for the countless Americans in these regions who are presently threatened with the loss of their homes. I stated to the subcommittee, as you may note in the hearings on this appropriation, there are perhaps no problems in the country more critical in nature, more deadly in result, and perhaps least understood than the problems which result from mine subsidences and underground mine fires beneath built-up areas in certain sections of Pennsylvania.

Of the amount requested in this appropriation bill an estimated $3,900,000 will be used to seal and fill voids in abandoned mine workings. These projects will include Wilkes-Barre No. 1 and No. 2 projects in Luzerne County; Scranton City No. 1 and No. 2 as well as the Pine Brook project in Lackawanna County and the Coaldale project in Schuylkill County.

Projects to control underground mine fires estimating $3,500,000 will be undertaken at Laurel Run in Luzerne County; Centralia in Columbia County; Shenandoah in Schuylkill County; Hickory Swamp in Northumberland County; Fairhaven Road and Buena Vista in Allegheny County; and Rostraver Township in Westmoreland County.

I believe that my colleagues on the committee exercised wisdom in deciding against cutting the appropriation by $4,400,000, and I wish them to know that they have the thanks of all the people who live not just in the 10th congressional district but those who live in other areas of Pennsylvania where these problems are critical.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may desire to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with the remarks that have been made about our very popular reading clerk, Joe Bartlett. Joe's work with the junior chamber has been outstanding. He is earnest, honest, able—a fine young American.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remaining time on this side to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. GIAIMO].

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this legislation, and at the same time would like to express my concern at the action which we are taking here in not appropriating $942,000 for the Civil Aeronautics Board for the continuation of the subsidy on helicopters. If this money is not appropriated, and it will not be under this bill, it means that the funds which we are not appropriating in the budget of last year will terminate probably in the month of April. It means that for the remainder of this fiscal year there will be no subsidy payments to three companies which are presently operating, the New York Airways, Chicago Airways, and Los Angeles Airways.

We are reaching the peak of the operation of helicopters and approaching the point where they will be on a self-paying basis. I am informed that by 1970 this will happen.

There is also a serious question of law involved as to whether or not there is an obligation on the part of the Government to make these subsidy payments as long as the present law is in existence. There is a question as to whether or not these companies, in the absence of payments, can come into the Court of Claims and demand payment from the United States.

I think we should concern ourselves with this problem, and study it carefully. Whatever action may be taken in the other body, insofar as these supplemental appropriations are concerned, at that time I would hope that the House in its wisdom will see fit to go along in restoring these funds.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

CAPITAL OUTLAY

For an additional amount for "Capital outlay," $971,000, to remain available until expended.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. DAVIS OF WISCONSIN

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 3, strike out lines 19, 20, and 21.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to delete from the bill an item of $971,000, the purpose of which is to purchase 22,000 square feet of additional land at the corner of 9th and G Streets in the District of Columbia for additional land for the site of the new central library.

The appropriation for the new fiscal year will include $800,000 for the planning of this building. The site was originally chosen based upon some recommendations of Booz, Allen, & Hamilton, who set out the criteria for this library site. They recommended that the site be 50,000 square feet. The actual complete site would have 76,000 square feet, and including that which is included in this appropriation, based upon the appropriation which the Congress made last year of about $2.5 million, the District authorities did proceed and procured 54,000 square feet. Then they ran out of money. But you will note that the District already has procured more land than the original consultants, Booz, Allen, & Hamilton had recommended as being necessary for the site of the central library. So what we are talking about here today is approximately $1 million to provide 70 additional parking sites in a very expensive area of downtown Washington.

First of all, we are not only spending this additional money to provide for the parking sites but we are taking some land of high assessments off the tax roll of the District of Columbia.

It probably will be said that actually we are not providing this money, that this money is all going to come from money already in the hands of the District of Columbia. I submit that this is fallacious reasoning because, as we are all painfully aware, we are called upon to use the funds provided by the taxpayers of this country, and the entire country, each year to supplement the funds that are raised within the District of Columbia, in order to keep the site of our National Government operating.

So I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we ought not, either through a false sense of ease or through the feeling that we ought to have additional parking spaces, appropriate almost $1 million to provide this number of additional parking spaces.

The building itself with the funds that will be normally required will include, or can easily include from 80 to 85 parking sites without spending an additional million dollars for that purpose. In fact, I think it is fair to say that the District officials had reconciled themselves to the smaller site that met the original criteria that had been set forth, and there was no request before this committee up until the time of our subcommittee hearings for any additional money for this purpose at all. It was something that came in as a kind of afterthought when the climate appeared to be such as to make it appear that the Appropriations Committee would look with favor upon this additional amount of money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. I read with interest in the hearings the questioning by the gentleman from Wisconsin who is presently addressing the House. The gentleman tried to ascertain how this parking lot would be available to those who used the library rather than becoming a public parking lot. I submit, in reading the hearings, there is no answer to the gentleman's question of how it could be held for use by those who patronize this new library.

I support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. At the time the original interrogation took place on that point, I would say to the gentleman from Iowa, it was obvious that there had not been any real thinking done on this problem at all—and it is a real problem because it is right in the downtown shopping area of the Nation's Capital and I do not think we have any obligation and I do not think we have any right to be spending public funds in order to provide a more convenient parking area for those who will be in the downtown shopping centers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the present library in the District of Columbia is located at Eighth and K Streets NW. This library is obsolete and has been obsolete for about 20 years. For the last few years, the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the District of Columbia has carefully studied the request made each year by the librarian and by the Commissioners for funds for a new public library. The present library was constructed in the year 1903 with Carnegie funds.

The District needs a new central library.

For the fiscal year 1965, a request was made again for funds for a site for a new central library. Our subcommittee and the Congress approved the amount of $2,351,000 to buy land at Ninth and G Streets for a new public library for the District of Columbia. The amount contained in this supplemental bill of $971,000 is District of Columbia funds, and is the amount necessary to buy the balance of the land to be used for the library. Every dime of this money is to be funded by the District of Columbia and no part of same is Federal money. The amount that was approved for the entire site in the 1965 budget was not sufficient to buy the necessary land for this building.

Here in the District of Columbia we have, I think, one of the best library systems and one of the best librarians in the United States. This is their money, and the people want to build a new library to take the place of a library that was built 62 years ago. As much as I dislike finding myself in disagreement with my able friend, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS], a member of the subcommittee, I say to you frankly that he is wrong, and this amendment should be defeated.

In addition to the $971,000 involved in this amendment, all of the balance of the funds contained in this supplemental bill for the District of Columbia will be funded by the District out of District funds. This site was carefully selected by a library board composed of outstanding citizens in our Capital City. This additional land is necessary for parking facilities and will then place the city in a position where an adequate building may be constructed.

The amount we appropriated in the fiscal year 1965, $2,351,000, was not ample to buy all the land necessary, and the $971,000 should now be approved.

I say frankly that it would be a mistake, and serious mistake, to build a building on a site with less land than is necessary. We will not build a central library every year in the District. Why not proceed correctly and do this job right? This library will have to last for a great many years.

It is true that during the hearings my good friend from Wisconsin inquired of some of the witnesses concerning parking facilities. That was the only question raised. There was no question of the money or the amount involved, but there was a question about furnishing parking facilities to some people who might be down at one of the stores making a purchase.

This is what was said to the witness:

> Mr. DAVIS. I think the only basic question I have, Mr. Peterson, is how we can assure that we are providing a necessary parking facility for library users or library staff, and aren't just providing a convenient parking place for the downtown shoppers in the Washington area.

During the hearings the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin was very much concerned about parking facilities. At no time did he mention the fact that the District of Columbia was spending its own money to build its own library.

If a person, who goes to a store, through mistake parks on this parking lot for a few minutes, it still will not hurt anything and should not stop this library. We can furnish guards if necessary.

I believe the people in the District of Columbia are entitled to this new library. For a period of several years this request was carefully studied and now is the time to act. We carefully considered it, and we thought it just and proper to approve it. We stand by our recommendation.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be defeated.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I yield to my friend from Wisconsin.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I appreciate this opportunity to make a few additional comments.

I am quite certain that when the distinguished subcommittee chairman made the statement I was wrong, he was referring to my judgment and not with respect to any of the facts which were submitted, because I believe the record will bear out that the statements I made are buttressed by the facts.

I do not want my colleagues to become confused that the issue here is whether we are going to have a new library for the District of Columbia, because that is not the issue at all. It is conceded that we are going to have this new library. It is conceded we are going to have it at a site at Ninth and G. It is conceded we already have acquired the land for the new library—in fact, more land than the Booz, Allen and Hamilton people designated as being necessary for the site of this library.

What we have gotten down to is whether we should spend nearly $1 million for 70 outside parking spaces and take valuable land off the tax rolls of the District of Columbia.

We may argue here, in semantics, that this is money which belongs to the District of Columbia because we are not increasing the Federal contribution, but the fact remains that we do subsidize the operation of the District of Columbia through funds taken out of the general treasury. We have done so not only last year or this year but every year. So it is not quite right to say that this is all money of the District of Columbia.

They have the money because we, last year, provided about $37.5 million to add to the money raised within the District of Columbia.

I submit, rather than taking this valuable land off the tax rolls, that the plans for which there are $800,000 appropriated in the 1966 appropriation bill may very well be used to provide, if this is necessary, for additional in-building parking spaces which will perform the same function without taking 22,000 square feet of valuable land off the tax rolls. I think that is basically what is involved here. So it is our money that is being talked about. It is not a question of depriving the citizens of the District of Columbia of any single library facility whatsoever. I think it is a question of judgment as to whether we ought to take this land off the tax rolls forever and deprive the District of Columbia of future sources of revenue it obviously so badly needs because of the requests that come to this Congress every year.

Thank you for giving me this time.

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me if this is a matter of 70 parking spaces, this money could be better used in other areas, such as in the schools or other parts of the District of Columbia. I support the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Kentucky, the chairman of the subcommittee, as to how a library might be located in this area of Washington if you did not have parking spaces. It has been my observation around here that most anything of value is tied to the availability it has to people who want to use it. I would be very happy to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky to explain as to what is involved as far as making the library usable.

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to say to my distinguished friend from Mississippi it would be a serious mistake to build a new central library with inadequate parking facilities. It would simply mean that those who go to use the library would have to park their cars at the curb. This additional space of 22,000 square feet, which will cost $971,000, will guarantee that those who use the new library will have a place to park their vehicles and go in and use their library in the manner in which it should be used. I say to you it would be a serious mistake to build a library building and not have a place to park cars.

Mr. Chairman, I know all down through the years here in the District of Columbia we have had parking lot controversies going on throughout the city. Why let this stop our central library? This is property owned by the taxpayers of the city of Washington, and this is their money. Our Capital City and the taxpayers here are entitled to this new central library.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman says that the parking lot is necessary because otherwise patrons of the library would be forced to park at the curb and use parking meters. How is it expected to control the parking lot? It is within reasonable proximity of the department stores. The gentleman from Kentucky asked: What if a few shoppers do park their cars there for a few minutes? Well, a few shoppers could park for a few minutes, then employees of the department stores could park their cars by the hour. Those promoting this project had no solution for the problem when they appeared before the committee. How is it proposed to handle this parking lot to serve library patrons?

Mr. NATCHER. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. NATCHER. I will say to my distinguished friend that if it becomes necessary, we will have a guard posted to see that those who drive in on the lot are going to use the library. Then you say we will have one more employee, and I say if this becomes necessary, I for one, will vote for a guard or guards. If one car owned by someone going to a store parks on this lot, once a week, then why stop the library project just because one violator drives on this lot.

Mr. GROSS. The point is simply this: if 70 cars are to be parked in this area costing $1 million, and the library operates from 9 or 10 o'clock in the morning until 9 or 10 o'clock at night, then it will require shifts of guards and run up the costs.

Mr. NATCHER. I would like to say to the gentleman, if it requires one guard or two guards, I for one would be in favor of building a new central library, and employing the guards.

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, if ever I have been convinced of the need for home rule in the District of Columbia it is this afternoon. Here we are, Members of the House of Representatives of the United States, arguing about where somebody who is going to a library is going to park his car, whether he is going to put a nickel or a dime in a meter, or whether or not we are going to have to have an extra guard to see that somebody does not get into a parking lot. I think the Congress of the United States of America has more important work to do. I think this is a prime example of the folly of denying home rule to the District of Columbia.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin) there were—ayes 33, noes 73.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 16:

"PEACE CORPS

"During the current fiscal year an additional amount of $1,858,000 shall be available within the appropriation for 'Peace Corps' for administrative and program support costs."

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the language on page 4, beginning in line 16 through line 20, that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and not within the legislative scope of this bill.

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman insists on his point of order, I concede the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman concedes the point of order; the Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

FUNDS APPROPRIATED TO THE PRESIDENT

DISASTER RELIEF

For an additional amount for "Disaster relief", $25,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed 3 per centum of the foregoing amount shall be available for administrative expenses.

Mr. RIVERS of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I have sought this time to call attention to an issue vital to all of us, vital because it concerns the full faith and integrity of this great legislative body. To adequately present this matter it is necessary to give you a brief account of the background.

Just a little over 1 year ago—on March 27, 1964—Alaska suffered the worst earthquake to ever strike the North American continent. The intensity of the shock measured 8.7 on the Richter scale. Over 30,000 square miles of south-central Alaska was in the direct shock area. This area has over 60 percent of the State's total population and produces over 55 percent of the State's total gross product and revenues. Never before has such a high proportion of a State's area of economic activity been so severely damaged by a natural disaster.

The Congress, with unprecedented speed, approved in one day an appropriation of $50 million to permit the Office of Emergency Planning to assist during the emergency period to minimize loss of life and property and subsequently to assist in the repair of public facilities.

President Johnson, immediately following this disaster, established the Federal Reconstruction and Development Planning Commission for Alaska and appointed a distinguished Member of the U.S. Senate, the Honorable CLINTON P. ANDERSON, as its chairman, to plan and coordinate the Federal effort in reconstruction of Alaska. The Governor of Alaska, William A. Egan, simultaneously established the Alaska Reconstruction Commission to plan and coordinate the State's efforts with the Federal Commission. These actions, both Federal and State, proved to be sound foundation measures underlying Alaska's recovery, which is still in progress. Studies in depth were made, and estimated losses of over one-fourth of a billion dollars were identified. This situation was rather staggering when weighed in the light of the fact that Alaska's population of only 250,000 was still in the transitional stage of assuming the many functions which the Federal Government performed prior to statehood in 1959. Thus it was decided that unprecedented legislation and other actions would be required by both the Federal and State Governments. First was Federal legislation authorizing grants to the State of not more than $23.5 million to enable the State and local governments to carry on their normal functions by covering revenue shortfalls and extraordinary operating expenses caused by the earthquake and resultant seismic waves. The first act of the Alaska Legislature was to authorize issuance of up to $50 million in State disaster bonds.

Then after several months of intensive investigation and study by the Federal and State reconstruction commissions, and congressional hearings, Public Law 88-451, cited as the "1964 Amendments to the Alaska Omnibus Act," was approved on August 19, 1964. These amendments, in recognition of the magnitude of the disaster, were designed to assist the recovery of Alaska, and restore damaged Alaskans to the role of taxpayers instead of only tax users. Many of the provisions of this act were unprecedented and recognized as such at the time of passage of Public Law 88-451.

One of the unprecedented items in this legislation was the amendment to section 57 of the Alaska Omnibus Act which provides for allocation of $5½ million of Federal funds for the retirement or adjustment of mortgages on homes which suffered earthquake damage above 60 percent to total destruction, except that the mortgagor must absorb at least $1,000 of the mortgage balance, and receive no indemnification of his aggregate payments, or equity, in the damaged or destroyed property; he, the mortgagor, to absorb that part of the loss. Other restrictions are to the effect that this procedure shall apply only on one to four family homes, no payment as to a single property to exceed $30,000. This legislation further requires 50-50 matching by the State of Alaska to carry out this mortgage retirement program, and provides that the State is to administer same in accordance with a plan to be submitted by the State and approved by the President.

These are the terms of the offer made by this Congress to the State of Alaska, and these are the conditions precedent to the binding of the Federal Government to the bargain. Now let me say that all of the conditions have been met. On call of Governor Egan, the Alaska Legislature convened in special session on August 31, 1964, and proceeded to authorize State participation in this mortgage retirement and adjustment program and appropriated $5.5 million in general obligation bond proceeds for the State to carry out its part of the program. Following this special session much study and work was spent by State officials in devising an appropriate and workable plan which would be adequate to meet with the approval of the President for carrying out the program. The last Congress adjourned before the plan was completed and approved, but early this year the plan was completed and approved, but early this year the plan was submitted, and was approved, and the President did get this needed item of $5.5 million into the budget, so the Federal Government may carry out its part of the bargain.

Now, apparently, a very regrettable misunderstanding has arisen. The Subcommittee on Appropriations for Independent Offices, under the chairmanship of our beloved colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], has found that there is no precedent for such relief to individuals, and that therefore "the committee has disallowed this item even though it is sympathetic to the plight of the individuals involved." My dear colleagues, this must be a misunderstanding, because last August the Congress made the policy decision involved when it adopted Public Law 88-451 at which time it fully knew it was blazing a new trail in regard to disasters and human values. In deleting this item for $5.5 million, the subcommittee must have overlooked the fact that the State had moved ahead during a period of months to meet the conditions precedent prescribed by this Congress, and that the State had met those conditions in reliance upon the offer made by this Congress, and that the 370 homeowners affected had relied upon the integrity of this Congress with many of them proceeding to finance and arrange for rebuilding this spring after the State had complied with all the conditions prescribed by this Congress and thereby sealed the bargain. The disallowance of this item must have been based upon a lack of knowledge of the facts and surrounding circumstances as I have narrated them, because I just do not believe that the committee would willfully advocate a breach of promise or embrace a standard of action and morality below that required under law of our citizens in the course of the pursuit of their contractual relationships. I am sure that the Members of this Congress including the members of the subcommittee want the citizens of this great democracy of ours to be able to believe in and have full faith and confidence in the integrity of this Congress and our Federal Government. I believe that even those in this great legislative body who think that the Congress made a bad bargain in adopting the Alaska mortgage retirement program last August, would, upon careful consideration, decide to back up the full faith and credit and honor of this Congress and the United States of America.

Mr. Chairman and Members, I submit this statement, without mincing words and from the bottom of my heart, I do this at this time without offering the appropriate amendment, in order to allow time for adequate consideration of this matter on the part of all of us, and with the hope and prayer that when this bill has gone through the other body and comes back to this House for final passage the referenced $5.5 million will have been restored, and the public reliance upon our good faith and integrity emphatically sustained.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, it is a source of great disappointment to many people in Chicago that the committee denied an additional $942,000 which had been requested by the Civil Aeronautics Board to assist in the orderly development of helicopter service in Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and in other parts of the country. It is our hope that the other body will restore this money.

The other body has held extensive hearings on this subject and while I do not intend to offer an amendment at this time in deference to the committee, it is our hope that the additional amount will be added by the other body and that our conferees, if this bill goes to conference, will not insist on withdrawing this additional amount from the bill.

The orderly development of helicopter service in these large urban areas is of extreme importance. We in Chicago are desperately trying to reactivate Midway Airfield.

The only way we can do that is to have good transportation between Midway and O'Hare Field, which today stands as the world's busiest airfield. Right now one of the best rapid links between Midway and O'Hare are the helicopters. It is true; we have been helping these helicopters over the years, and this is in the highest tradition of our country whenever a new form of transportation is developed.

The airlines of this country, for instance, had received substantial assistance in their early years from the Federal Government. We are now spending more than $50 billion of Federal funds for a national highway system. We have assisted with Federal help in developing many other forms of transportation until these systems got on their feet and were able to meet their needs. It is for this reason we should give the Civil Aeronautics Board the money it needs. The Board has made a very reasonable request, the CAB realizes that sooner or later the helicopter will have to stand on its own two feet. I think we can agree on that. The Civil Aeronautics Board has requested these additional funds be continued for the next 5 years in order to give the Federal Government an opportunity for an orderly phaseout of this program and let the helicopter service find other ways of sustaining itself.

Some have suggested that perhaps the major airlines may want to help these helicopter services continue their operations. I believe we can all agree on one thing: Those of us who travel a great deal know of the difficulty that we encounter in many of the major cities between the airport, particularly now with development of jet airports substantially away from the city, and the center of the city. Therefore, it is ironic that as the need for helicopter service increases in these areas, the Congress is pruning away at their very sustenance.

It is my hope the other body will restore this additional amount the CAB has requested. I renew my request that the conferees not press too hard in trying to remove it from the appropriation bill of the other body, if indeed the other body should approve the additional funds.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I should like to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman for Illinois [Mr. PUCINSKI].

Mr. Chairman, I am distressed with the action of the Appropriations Committee in eliminating the supplemental request of the Civil Aeronautics Board for $942,000 for helicopter subsidy for the balance of the current year.

The great Los Angeles International Airport, the third busiest air terminal in the world, is located in my district, and it is here that Los Angeles Airways, the pioneer scheduled helicopter airline in the world, is based.

If the action of the committee becomes final, the jobs of between 300 and 400 people in the immediate area of the Los Angeles International Airport are in serious jeopardy. Los Angeles Airways employs over 200 people, the majority of whom live in my district. In addition, a substantial number of employees of other companies who perform various aircraft supply services for Los Angeles Airways would also be affected.

It has taken 20 years to build this organization up to its present peak of service and technical competence so that it literally represents a national resource in the complex art of rotary-wing operations. It could not operate at the present time without the subsidy which the Board has found necessary. Therefore, discontinuance of the subsidy at this time would mean that the Los Angeles area would be without helicopter air service at a time when our surface transportation problems are daily becoming more acute.

This helicopter carrier performs a vital air feeder service between the airport and 14 other points in southern California.

Over 200,000 passengers and millions of pounds of mail and cargo were transported on this system in 1964. If this service were to disappear, many communities would be totally deprived of direct air service, and mail and cargo services would be substantially delayed.

The Civil Aeronautics Board has found, after careful study, that Los Angeles Airways and other subsidized helicopter operators should be able to attain self-sufficiency by the year 1970. Pursuant to the Board's program, the carriers have filed petitions for permanent authority on a subsidy-elimination basis over a 5-year period.

Los Angeles Airways and the other operators have been making constant improvements in their operating efficiency. In recent years, for example, Los Angeles Airways has experienced dramatic traffic growth, and seat-mile costs have declined with the introduction of turbine-powered helicopters.

In the Los Angeles metropolitan area, distances are great and surface transportation is time consuming, difficult, and sometimes unavailable. Air service which might in other parts of the country be performed by local service airlines is performed by Los Angeles Airways. I feel our air service needs are just as great as those of other areas of the country, and the position of the CAB seems reasonable.

This valuable operation has been developed without the expenditure of very large sums of Federal money. I think it would be most unfortunate to deny the funds at a time when the CAB has found self-sufficient operations to be a reasonable prospect. What is more, our unchallenged international leadership in this field will be jeopardized.

I hope, therefore, that if the other body restores the necessary funds, our conferees will go along for continuation of this very vital service in California.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MICHEL. I commend my colleague for bringing this to the attention of the House at this time. I concur wholeheartedly in what the gentleman says. This helicopter service in large metropolitan centers is a must for the present and who would deny that it will not be even more required in the future.

The Federal Government has an obligation in my opinion to encourage this kind of service as we did for many years with the trunk airlines and are still doing for the local feeder airlines. These large metropolitan air terminals serve the Nation as a whole and of course Chicago's O'Hare Field is practically the hub for the Nation in this respect. I believe we have to give these helicopter services ample time to find out the most efficient way to operate their service. The machines themselves are very costly and I for one have no qualms about our subsidizing their cost so long as it points the way to progress and eventually leads to self-sustaining helicopter service in the future and I believe we will see that day within a relatively few years.

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. UTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. UTT. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois. At Disneyland I believe we have the heaviest helicopter service in the country. It has taken a long time to build that service up. I use it regularly to go to Los Angeles and the area around Los Angeles. If it were destroyed, it would take a great deal of money to bring it back again. I congratulate the gentleman on bringing this to our attention.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. DYAL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support this bill but I am greatly disappointed in the denial of supplemental appropriations for helicopter service for southern California. It has taken almost 20 years to develop, construct, and make fully efficient this transport facility consisting of expert personnel, heliports, related ground facilities, and the aircraft itself. There is no way to suspend Los Angeles Airways operation without total destruction of the service, abandonment of facilities and the resulting loss of stockholder and Government investment.

This program has been tremendously helpful to the Ballistic Systems Division of the Air Force and related aerospace operations in southern California.

Aircraft are mortgaged under guaranteed loans from the Government and these loans have some 6 years to run. The honorable solution is to give an opportunity for a subsidy cutoff to Los Angeles Airways on a 5-year declining basis, and Los Angeles Airways history of declining cost fully supports this proposal. This is a CAB proposal.

Community long-term participation in heliport transportation includes 5-, 10-, 15-, and 20-year heliport leases in which our southern California cities and the operator have made major investments. Cities depend on the helicopter as a primary means of air transportation and these communities include Los Angeles, Anaheim, Newport Beach, Whittier, Pomona, San Bernardino, Glendale, Burbank, Riverside, and Downey.

In my own area the population served is more than that of Seattle, Wash., and the neighboring congressional districts south have a population similar to that of Oklahoma City and west in the Pomona Valley area is similar to that of Newark, N.J. These and many other areas would be eliminated from this service.

This is one of the major tax paying sources of the country and it will now be deprived of the air service which the CAB has said is required.

If Los Angeles Airways operations is discontinued what arrangements will be made for air service to communities which will then be deprived of direct passenger, airmail, and aircargo service? What equivalent service can we look forward to between these fast growing communities and the Los Angeles International Airport? Discontinuance of this service may cost many millions more for I can assure you some type of service will be required and if we revive helicopter service in California back to its present state the cost will be many times that which has been required to start it.

I commend the expertise of the Civil Aeronautics Board on this highly technical topic and commend their report to the House.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to pose a question to the chairman of the subcommittee on the subject that has just been raised by some of the other gentlemen. I should like to remind him that the San Francisco-Oakland area is now being served by nonsubsidized helicopter carrier. This carrier has recently purchased some of the most modern equipment. It is going further than that. It is going into the ground effects machine field being the first company in the United States to use Hovercraft. They had to get them from England under a special permit approved by DOD. This is nonsubsidized operations. The operators do need financial assistance as do other helicopter operators. I find no fault with what you are doing, but I should like the record to show that in the event subsidies are reestablished, the San Francisco-Oakland area is entitled to such a subsidy along with other carriers.

Mr. THOMAS. I do not see how the request of the distinguished gentleman from California can be denied. It is a common, even-handed treatment.

The Clerk read as follows:

VETERANS REOPENED INSURANCE FUND

All premiums and collections on insurance issued pursuant to section 725 of title 38, United States Code, shall be credited to the "Veterans reopened insurance fund", established pursuant to that section, and all payments on such insurance and on any total disability provision attached thereto shall be made from that fund, notwithstanding any provisions of that section: *Provided*, That for actuarial and accounting purposes, the assets and liabilities (including liability for repayment of advances hereinafter authorized, and adjustment of premiums) attributable to each insured group established under said section 725, shall be separately determined: *Provided further*, That such amounts of the "Veterans special term insurance fund" as may hereafter be determined by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be in excess of the actuarial liabilities of that fund, including contingency reserves, shall be available for transfer to the "Veterans reopened insurance fund" as needed to provide initial capital: *Provided further*, That any amounts so transferred shall be repaid to the Treasury, and shall bear interest payable to the Treasury at rates established in accordance with section 725(d)(1) of title 38, United States Code.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 8, line 7 to line 22 inclusive and on page 9, line 1 to line 6 inclusive as being legislation on an appropriation bill and not within the scope of the original language authorizing the reopening of veterans' insurance.

Mr. Chairman, the point of order which I have just made against the legislation on this appropriation bill has a very interesting history.

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs has consistently held hearings on the question of reopening National Service Life Insurance to the World War II and Korean group of veterans. Our committee has always considered the question on its merits and until the last Congress had voted in the Subcommittee on Insurance, under the chairmanship of three chairmen—Hon. John E. Rankin, Hon. Edith Nourse Rogers, and Hon. Olin E. Teague—to deny this reopening proposal. In the 88th Congress it was finally added as a nongermane rider in the other body to a non-service-connected pension bill. Certain high officials of the Veterans' Administration connived in this effort and brought forth a proposal which was presented to the conferees at the 11th hour. A proposal, I might add, which was very poorly worked out and which was only made workable to its present degree by the strong stand taken on the part of the House conferees.

The present Deputy Administrator of the Veterans' Administration and his associates, who must primarily bear the responsibility for this action, were instructed at that time as to the keen and continuing interest of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in this subject and particularly in the interest of the members of this committee who made up the conferees of what was finally enacted as Public Law 88-664.

Early in this session, February 17, 1965, to be precise, the Subcommittee on Insurance held a hearing on this entire question of reopening and no request was made to the subcommittee or the full committee, as far as I know, for any language along the lines presented today. The Veterans' Administration witness was given every opportunity to testify fully. The then Chief Benefits Director and now Deputy Administrator, Mr. C. F. Brickfield, stated, and I quote from page 51 of the hearings, "The financing of this reopening will be made through a revolving fund to be established in the Treasury. The initial working capital will be obtained by making a loan from the Treasury which will be repaid with interest as premium and other income becomes available." There was no mention made of any transfer from any trust fund or revolving fund nor any indication given to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs or the Subcommittee on Insurance that any such authority was needed or would be sought.

I can only draw the conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that the officials in the Veterans' Administration who have charge of this program and who are well acquainted with the continuing interest of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in this insurance program have decided for reasons best known to themselves to ignore the committee and endeavor to have this matter approved without reference to our legislative committee. This is highly irregular procedure to say the least, despite what the end result may be. It seems fair to say Mr. Brickfield and his associates desire to endeavor to flout the known interest of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in this program. I for one do not intend to stand idly by while such procedure takes place.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, may I be heard on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Chairman, I hope my distinguished friend will not insist upon the point of order. We all know of his deep interest in the veterans. The gentleman is outstanding not only in that field but in many other fields. His point of order is good if he insists on it. This is a transfer of funds. This is not an appropriation. Just be sure of your ground, that you are not going to come back to the Appropriations Committee 30 or 60 or 90 days from now and say "We have no funds." I do hope my distinguished friend will not insist on his point of order. It really serves no useful purpose.

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I must insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Saylor] makes a point of order against the language on page 8, beginning at line 7 down through and including the language on page 9, line 6.

The Chair understands the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Thomas] concedes the point of order.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Bureau of the Census

Registration and Voting Statistics

For expenses necessary for the collection, compilation, and publication of statistics on registration and voting, in such geographic areas as may be recommended by the Commission on Civil Rights, as authorized by section 801 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (78 Stat. 266), $7,500,000, to remain available until December 31, 1966.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the language on page 21, lines 2 through 9, and ask to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida [Mr. Sikes].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the language in this section goes beyond the period of time set forth in the bill H.R. 7091. The preamble of this bill states that it is a bill making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. The language on lines 2 through 9, page 21, proposes to have the funds, $7.5 million, remain available until December 31, 1966. There is no such authority in the basic law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, the proposed appropriation of $7.5 million contained in the bill for the Bureau of the Census is for the purpose of a registration and voting statistics survey covering the States of Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi, to provide a count of all persons of voting age and a determination of the following information for each such person: "(1) citizenship, (2) residence, (3) years of school completed, (4) race and color, (5) whether registered to vote in Federal elections, (6) whether voted in the most recent statewide primary election and general election in which Members of the U.S. House of Representatives were nominated or elected."

As appears at page 161 of the printed hearings on this pending bill, the following questions were asked and the following answers given concerning this requested $7.5 million appropriation:

Mr. ROONEY. What is the legal authority for this proposed activity of the Department of Commerce?

Mr. ECKLER. Title VIII of the Civil Rights Act indicates that the Secretary of Commerce shall promptly conduct a survey to compile registration and voting statistics in such geographic areas as may be recommended by the Commission on Civil Rights.

I believe we have included a full text of title VIII, section 801, in the material which was put into the record.

Mr. ROONEY. Where do you get the authority for the unlimited availability?

Mr. IMHOFF. We have no specific authority for that, Mr. Chairman.

In view of this, the gentleman from New York is reluctantly constrained to concede that the gentleman's point of order is well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from Florida makes a point of order against the language on page 21, lines 2 through 9.

The purpose of the bill is to make supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965. The language on page 21, line 9, is "to remain available until December 31, 1966", which goes beyond the purpose of the bill.

The point of order is sustained.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, the matter of an appropriation of $7.5 million has, under the action just concluded, been disposed of for the time being. However, there is but little doubt that we will have this item back before us after the Senate has concluded its action on the second supplemental appropriation bill. At that time the House will indeed be confronted with its moment of truth. Regrettably, it has been true in the past few years that almost anything can get approval in Congress if it has attached to it the name of civil rights. I believe that is true in this case. Yet I do not think for a moment that this item could get past the front door of the Capitol other than with the blessing of civil rights.

Let us look at what is proposed. The Chairman of the Civil Rights Commission wants a registration and voting statistical survey covering the States of Alabama, Louisiana, and Mississippi. He wants to provide a count of all persons of voting age with specific information on race and color and whether that person voted in the most recent statewide primary and general election. Apparently, this is considered a necessary preliminary to the takeover in those States by the Federal Government under the proposed universal voting law.

Amazingly, witnesses from the Department of Commerce under which this appropriation would be expended have stated that they have authorization only to spend $850,000. But they state further that all of that money could not actually be spent during the remainder of fiscal 1965. They would expect to spend $554,000 and to obligate the amount remaining of the $850,000 which could legally be appropriated for the agency. The ends to which some Federal agencies will go in an effort to spend money unnecessarily are beyond all comprehension. That is why I raised a point of order against the language of the bill which would have appropriated $7,500,000 from the Treasury for this useless expense.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Rural Community Development Service

Salaries and Expenses

For an additional amount for "Salaries and expenses", $35,000, to remain available until June 30, 1966;

Bureau of Public Roads

Appalachian Development Highway System

For necessary expenses for construction of an Appalachian Development Highway System, including local access roads, as authorized by the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965, $200,000,000, to remain available until expended;

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the necessary number of words.

Mr. Chairman, in reading the hearings there was considerable discussion of the $200 million to be made available for the building of roads in the Appalachia program. Is there anyone here as of this time who can tell us where these roads are to be located? During the hearings there was no information whatever as to the nature of the roads or where they would be located. Do I understand we are here today asked to vote $200 million without any regard to what kind of roads and the location?

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I gladly yield to my friend, the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. These roads are to be located in the counties in the States which make up the Appalachia region. I must regretfully say to the gentleman from Iowa that I cannot give him any further information than that because there must be agreements made with the States and their highway commissions to start this 2,300-odd-mile highway system plus 1,000 miles of local access roads. The committee sought to find out exactly where the roads were to be built, but until the locations are agreed upon both by the Bureau of Public Roads and the States and the amount of matching has been agreed upon, they could not tell us exactly where these roads will be located.

Mr. GROSS. I must say to the gentleman that it is with real regret I learn here today that the great Committee on Appropriations is now appropriating $200 million in this bill—which is not alfalfa where I come from—$200 million in this bill without knowing how and where the money will be spent except that it will be spent in a few counties somewhere and in some region of the United States.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I assure the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that $200 million is a lot of money along the Brooklyn waterfront, also. However, here we have the Congress, the House and the Senate, authorizing $840 million for this Appalachia highway program over a period of 5 years. This is the start of that program. If we do not do it now, it will catch up with us. So we held hearings on the matter and obtained as much information as we could. That holds true with regard to the regular appropriations of the Bureau of Pulic Roads under the regular highway program. The action of the Committee on Appropriations in connection with the regular highway program is merely the signing of a check in the amount of the bill presented to us, because the Bureau of Public Roads has contractual authority and has previously agreed with the States as to the amount of the cost of construction and the places where the roads are to be built.

Mr. GROSS. Perhaps I should not be surprised because Congress is also guilty of giving money to foreign countries to build roads which start somewhere and end nowhere, as in the case of one U.S. financed highway which ended on a mountainside in a foreign country. Maybe I should not be surprised at all that even here we are spending $200 million without knowing what State the money will be spent in or even what county it is going into.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the distinguished gentleman yield further?

Mr. GROSS. Surely.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. I should like to advise the distinguished gentleman that I am more in accord with his views than perhaps he suspects. I do not like and have never liked this way of handling the taxpayers' money. I think they should first come to the Committee on Appropriations and tell us exactly where and how much.

This is not the situation with regard to the regular public highways program. That is all done before they get to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I humbly suggest that perhaps some of these programs might be slowed down just enough so that at least a few Members of the Congress could be informed as to where and how much. I am glad to note the concern of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I should say to my distinguished friend that I do not know the wisdom of that, because here we have a program where we know that we are going to spend $840 million and the $200 million is anteing up part of the money to start it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that the portion of the bill now being read has to do simply with pay increases that have been provided the various agencies as heretofore explained, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read up to and through page 58, and subject to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. HALL. Reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the Chairman concerning line 19, page 34, which includes salaries of $79,000 for the Supreme Court of the United States. Can the gentleman assure us that this is just the increase in pay voted last year but does not include any additional salaries, which were proposed and defeated under suspension on the floor of the House in the past few weeks?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct. This does not include anything other than the general pay increases heretofore authorized.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. What is this item of $400 for an automobile for the Chief Justice?

Mr. MAHON. That is an increase in pay for the chauffeur, I believe.

Mr. GROSS. The language in the bill is misleading for it says, "Automobile for the Chief Justice, $400."

Mr. MAHON. No; the chauffeur received a pay raise, as provided by Congress.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The **CHAIRMAN.** Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The **CHAIRMAN.** The Clerk will read.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Chairman, a day or two ago the "Tax Foundation's Tax Review" reached our desks. This publication contains an excellent article by a distinguished Member of the other body, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] on "Modernizing the Congress."

This article lists various proposals that have been made in recent years to strengthen the fiscal control procedures of the Congress. In the list is one to limit the use of supplemental and deficiency appropriation bills to purely emergency needs.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my strong support for that particular suggestion. It seems to me the practice of backdating or postdating appropriations is misleading and the Congress and appropriation committees should establish firm rules in this regard so that expenditures can be identified by their proper fiscal year.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I support this measure, H.R. 7091. There are several items in this supplemental appropriation bill that are vital to the recovery of Oregon and other areas of the Pacific Northwest from the unprecedented damage brought about by the recent flood disaster.

First, $10 million is being requested for the program of emergency conservation practices under the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service. At the time of the Northwest floods, this emergency conservation fund was virtually depleted from responses to 10 earlier natural disasters throughout the country in fiscal year 1965. Latest estimates indicate that Oregon farmers and ranchers have suffered damage exceeding $75 million, of which $16 million is eligible under the program. In Oregon alone, applications for participating funds are expected to reach $11 million. I am greatly concerned that funds be made available as soon as possible to assist in this most vital conservation work.

The request for $25 million for the President's disaster relief fund is also most important to my area. These funds are desperately needed to carry out authorized Federal disaster relief programs of road rehabilitation, water control facility repair, debris removal, and other necessary work.

I also heartily endorse the committee's recommendations for appropriations to the Department of Interior, the U.S. Forest Service, and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. These funds are needed for programs of great concern to all of us who are interested in our Nation's natural resources and human needs. In these budget requests also there are items of great importance to the flooded areas of the Pacific Northwest. These include funds in the amount of $9 million for rehabilitation of roads and trails on lands administered by the Bureau of Land Management, both the public domain and the O. & C. grant lands. The Geological Survey needs $550,000 for replacement of stream gages. The bill also provides for $2,910,000 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs for the replacement of destroyed Indian homes, repair of irrigation structures and other facilities, and for road construction. The Public Health Service is recommended to receive $500,000 for Indian sanitation facilities. Facilities of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in the flood area require $1,125,000 for repair or replacement, and $517,000 is marked for similar use by the Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife.

Committee has recommended $6,200,000 for repair of facilities of the U.S. Forest Service in the flood areas, and $2 million for rehabilitation of forest roads and trails. These funds are of the utmost importance to the economic recovery of the region, since access to public lands and forests is essential to the life of the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. Chairman, the items I have just cited encompass the needs of Federal agencies to repair, restore and rehabilitate vital facilities damaged or destroyed by the flood disaster, and I urge the support of my colleagues for these appropriations.

In another area, Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to note that the Appropriations Committee has recommended that new studies be undertaken by the Corps of Engineers on the Smith River in California, the Klamath River in California and Oregon, and the John Day River in Oregon. The report of the committee recommends that these studies be financed from available funds of the Corps of Engineers.

I am particularly concerned that the study proposed for the John Day River be initiated at the earliest possible time. This valley was virtually devastated by two successive inundations in December and January. The Corps of Engineers has indicated that it needs authority to expend $5,000 in the remaining months of the present fiscal year, and I strongly urge that the record be made clear as to the intent of Congress in this matter.

These studies are of the utmost importance to the Northwest. Preliminary postflood reports sent me by both the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation show example after example where water control works more than paid for themselves in preventing downstream damage. If water regulatory facilities had been built on the three rivers just mentioned millions of dollars of damages and much human suffering would have been prevented. These studies must be undertaken at once.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, this bill, H.R. 7091, represents a tremendous effort on the part of the Appropriations Committee. May I offer my thanks to the chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and all the members of the committee for a job well done.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am more than pleased and gratified that the bill, H.R. 7091, before us today includes several projects which are of particular interest to the First Congressional District of West Virginia. Particularly, I commend the House Appropriations Committee for including within this deficiency appropriation bill $200,000 to begin preconstruction planning for the Burnsville Reservoir and Dam. This project has long been justified, in my opinion, by reason of the fact that there are frequent minor floods and periodic major floods in the Little Kanawha River Basin which also contribute materially to the floods on the Ohio River. The flood damages to be prevented by construction of the Burnsville Dam are about equally divided between the Little Kanawha River Basin and the Ohio River Basin. The project, in addition to its flood control features, will provide benefits for recreation, water quality improvement, and area redevelopment.

Also, I commend the committee for including $790,000 to further develop the potential of the recently constructed Sutton Reservoir. These funds will be used to develop additional access roads, sanitary facilities, parking facilities, and acquisition of additional land areas.

Without question, Mr. Chairman, each of these projects will further speed the development of south central West Virginia with respect to Glenville and Grantsville and many other smaller communities, provide peace of mind to these people which they have not had in many years because of the severe flooding conditions of the little Kanawha River. Also the additions to be made to the Sutton Dam are certainly applauded. In both respects, the recreation potential provided by these expenditures of funds in large measure will tend to help these areas meet the challenges that are ahead.

In addition to the above-named projects, this appropriation bill contains approximately $248 million for the Appalachian regional development program. Most significant of these funds is the $200 million which are available to the Bureau of Public Roads for the Appalachian development highway system. The remainder provides $45 million for supplemental grants-in-aid, and an additional $3 million to local development districts for research and demonstration projects all of which is a first step in getting this program underway. I am hopeful that the approval of these funds will permit all the eligible States to begin to plan so that the areas involved might begin to receive some immediate benefit from the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965.

I am happy to have urged the inclusion of these projects to various members of the House Appropriations Committee, and I shall support this legislation and commend it to my colleagues for their favorable consideration.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to express my disappointment with the manner in which subsidies for the helicopter service are being handled.

I support the program of the Civil Aeronautics Board for elimination of helicopter subsidy in 1970 and declining subsidy payments in the interim period. Under the Board's program the three carriers would receive a total of $11.4 million between January 1, 1966 and July 31, 1970. The average annual cost per carrier is less than the cost of 1 mile of highway constructed under the Federal highways program.

Without this limited subsidy support all of the knowledge, experience, and skill obtained in 43 years of collective operations may well be lost.

For instance, New York Airways is making substantial progress in its determination to become subsidy free. Only last month the Federal Aviation Agency gave approval to a new instrument flight device that has been developed over a period of 14 years specifically for use in the field of vertical flight.

Likewise, New York Airways is on the verge of commencing service from the world's first carefully conceived large city center building top heliport on the roof of the Pan Am Building in the Grand Central area of New York. The plans for this facility were commenced more than 4 years ago. It is expected to be in operation this summer.

New York Airways is a nationwide service, 46 percent of its passengers residing in cities and towns outside the metropolitan area. New York passengers to such cities as Pittsburgh, Detroit, and Cleveland spend more time on the ground than in the air. Even on a trip from Atlanta to New York surface time accounts for 44 percent of the total journey time. Its commercial revenues have increased 55 percent in the last 2 years alone. Cost per passenger mile decreased 28 percent in the same period. Its subsidy per passenger mile has decreased 38 percent in the last 2 years.

New York Airways is working with Boeing on a large tandem rotor helicopter capable of carrying 40 to 45 passengers at a cruising speed of 175 to 200 miles per hour. This machine, when it is in operation, will mean that New York and Washington will be linked city center to city center in an hour's flying time.

The total dollar amount of additional subsidy required for the final 4½ years of subsidized operations by the three certificated helicopter carriers is $11.4 million. The annual amount averages about $2½ million per year or 3 percent of the $82 million requested for all airline subsidies for the next fiscal year. I urge that this service be continued.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HARRIS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 7091) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1965, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the "ayes" appeared to have it.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 348, nays 62, answered "present" 1, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 66]

YEAS—348

Abbitt
Adams
Addabbo
Albert
Anderson, Ill.
Anderson, Tenn.
Andrews, George W.
Andrews, N. Dak.
Annunzio
Ashbrook
Ashmore
Aspinall
Ayres
Bandstra
Baring
Barrett
Bates
Battin
Beckworth
Belcher
Bell
Bennett
Betts
Bingham
Blatnik
Boggs
Boland
Bolling
Bow
Brademas
Brock
Brooks
Broomfield
Brown, Calif.
Broyhill, Va.
Burke
Burleson
Burton, Calif.
Burton, Utah
Byrne, Pa.
Cabell
Cahill
Callan
Callaway
Cameron
Carey
Carter
Casey
Cederberg
Chelf
Clancy
Clark
Clausen, Don H.
Clawson, Del
Cleveland
Clevenger
Cohelan
Conable
Conte
Conyers
Cooley
Corbett
Corman
Craley
Culver
Cunningham
Curtin
Daddario
Daniels
Davis, Ga.
de la Garza
Delaney
Dent
Denton
Diggs
Dingell
Dole
Donohue
Dorn
Dow
Dowdy
Downing
Dulski
Duncan, Oreg.
Duncan, Tenn.
Dwyer
Dyal
Edmondson
Edwards, Calif.
Ellsworth
Evans, Colo.
Everett
Evins, Tenn.
Fallon
Farbstein
Farnsley
Farnum
Fascell
Feighan
Fino
Fisher
Flood
Flynt
Fogarty
Foley
Ford, Gerald R.
Ford, William D.
Fountain
Fraser
Frelinghuysen
Friedel
Fulton, Pa.
Fulton, Tenn.
Fuqua
Gallagher
Garmatz
Gettys
Giaimo
Gibbons
Gilbert
Gilligan
Gonzalez
Goodell
Grabowski
Gray
Green, Oreg.
Green, Pa.
Greigg
Grider
Griffin
Griffiths
Gubser
Hagan, Ga.
Hagen, Calif.
Halpern
Hamilton
Hanley
Hansen, Idaho
Hansen, Iowa
Hansen, Wash.
Hardy
Harris
Harsha
Harvey, Mich.
Hathaway
Hawkins
Hays
Hébert
Hechler
Helstoski
Henderson
Herlong
Hicks
Holifield
Horton
Hosmer
Howard
Hull
Hungate
Huot
Ichord
Irwin
Jacobs
Jarman
Joelson
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, Pa.
Karsten
Karth
Kastenmeier
Kee
Keith
Kelly
Keogh
King, Calif.
King, Utah
Kirwan
Kluczynski
Kornegay
Krebs
Kunkel
Landrum
Langen
Leggett
Lindsay
Lipscomb
Long, Md.
Love
McCarthy
McDade
McDowell
McEwen
McFall
McGrath
McMillan
McVicker
Macdonald
MacGregor
Machen
Mackay
Mackie
Madden
Mahon
Marsh
Martin, Mass.
Martin, Nebr.
Mathias
Matsunaga
Matthews
May
Meeds
Miller
Mills
Minish
Mink
Mize
Moeller
Monagan
Moore
Moorhead
Morgan
Morris
Morse
Moss
Multer
Murphy, Ill.
Murphy, N.Y.
Murray
Natcher
Nedzi
Nelsen
Nix
O'Brien
O'Hara, Ill.
O'Hara, Mich.
O'Konski
Olsen, Mont.
Olson, Minn.
O'Neill, Mass.
Ottinger
Passman
Patman
Patten
Pelly
Perkins
Philbin
Pickle
Pike
Pirnie
Poage
Poff
Pool
Powell
Price
Pucinski
Purcell
Quie
Quillen
Race
Randall
Redlin
Reid, N.Y.
Reifel
Reinecke
Reuss
Rhodes, Pa.
Rivers, Alaska
Rivers, S.C.
Roberts
Robison
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Tex.
Ronan
Rooney, N.Y.
Rooney, Pa.
Rosenthal
Rostenkowski
Roush
Roybal
Ryan
Satterfield
St Germain
St. Onge
Saylor
Scheuer
Schisler
Schmidhauser
Schneebeli
Schweiker
Scott
Secrest
Selden
Senner
Shipley
Shriver
Sickles
Sikes
Sisk
Slack
Smith, Iowa
Stafford
Staggers
Stalbaum
Stanton
Steed
Stephens
Stratton
Stubblefield
Sullivan
Talcott
Taylor
Teague, Calif.
Tenzer
Thomas
Thompson, La.
Thompson, N.J.
Thompson, Tex.
Todd
Trimble
Tupper
Tuten
Udall
Ullman
Van Deerlin
Vanik
Vigorito
Vivian
Walker, N. Mex.
Watkins
Weltner
Whalley
White, Idaho
White, Tex.
Whitener
Whitten
Widnall
Willis
Wilson, Bob
Wilson, Charles H.
Wolff
Wright
Wyatt
Yates
Young
Zablocki

NAYS—62

Abernethy
Adair
Andrews, Glenn
Arends
Bolton
Bray
Brown, Ohio
Broyhill, N.C.
Buchanan
Byrnes, Wis.
Chamberlain
Collier
Colmer
Cramer
Curtis
Dague
Davis, Wis.
Devine
Dickinson
Edwards, Ala.
Erlenborn
Findley
Gathings
Gross
Grover
Gurney
Haley
Hall
Harvey, Ind.
Hutchinson
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
King, N.Y.
Laird
Latta
Lennon
Long, La.
McClory
McCulloch
Martin, Ala.
Michel
Minshall
Morton
Mosher
O'Neal, Ga.
Reid, Ill.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Roncalio
Roudebush
Rumsfeld
Skubitz
Smith, Calif.
Smith, N.Y.
Smith, Va.
Thomson, Wis.
Tuck
Utt
Waggonner
Walker, Miss.
Williams
Wydler
Younger

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Pepper

NOT VOTING—22

Ashley
Baldwin
Berry
Bonner
Celler
Dawson
Derwinski
Halleck
Hanna
Holland
Jennings
Jones, Ala.
Mailliard
Morrison
Resnick
Roosevelt
Springer
Sweeney
Teague, Tex.
Toll
Tunney
Watts

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Toll with Mr. Springer.
Mr. Jennings with Mr. Derwinski.
Mr. Tunney with Mr. Mailliard.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Berry.
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Holland with Mr. Watts.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Resnick.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Teague of Texas with Mr. Ashley.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Hanna.

Mrs. **BOLTON** and Messrs. **BROWN** of Ohio, **ABERNETHY, ADAIR, McCULLOCH, HUTCHINSON, KING** of New York, and **JONES** of Missouri changed their votes from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. **DUNCAN** of Tennessee changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. **MAHON.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore (Mr. LANDRUM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

CAMPAIGN MEDAL AND RIBBON FOR AMERICAN FORCES SERVING IN VIETNAM

Mr. **SIKES.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. **SIKES.** Mr. Speaker, I find that a campaign medal and ribbon have not been authorized for American forces serving in that troubled and faraway part of the world—Vietnam. This is a small token, but an important token of the appreciation that the American nation feels for those who wear our uniform and who daily are risking their lives to help the Vietnamese stem the creeping malignancy of communism. I trust that speedy action will be taken by the Department of the Army to authorize a medal and ribbon for service in that area.

The need for this recognition is no less than it was for our fighting men who served in Korea and in World War II. For those who are involved, the sacrifice is just as great and the risks, because of the vicious ways in which communism fights, may be even greater. If this recognition is not speedily forthcoming, I shall offer legislation to authorize it. I note there is pending legislation to allow certain members of the Armed Forces to accept and wear decorations of certain foreign nations, including South Vietnam. I think a ribbon and a medal from our own Government are more in order.

Mr. Speaker, those who serve under our flag in Vietnam are making an essential contribution to the dignity of man. This proposal to honor them is little enough, but it is recognition of the fact that the American Government and the American people appreciate their contribution to the preservation of democracy.

H.R. 2776—REPEAL OF NATIONAL ORIGINS IMMIGRATION QUOTA SYSTEM

Mr. **ANNUNZIO.** Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. **ANNUNZIO.** Mr. Speaker, Members of the Congress, I appreciate the opportunity to express my views concerning the urgent need to reform and improve our national immigration laws.

I come before you as an avowed advocate of the pending administration bill, which I have cosponsored by introducing H.R. 2776.

The subject of immigration and the laws regulating immigration is very close to my heart. My parents came to this country as immigrants 85 years ago. Many of my friends and close associates and thousands of my constituents are immigrants or children of immigrants.

So the hopes, problems, and frustrations of the people who have come to this country seeking a better life are all familiar to me. And the dreams of those who yearn to follow their family and neighbors to America are of special concern to me.

My experience with these matters has left me firmly convinced that the existing system for determining whom we shall welcome to our shores is unjust and unworkable. When, 40 years ago, Congress adopted the national origins quota system, it was in effect declaring that immigrants from one country are preferred to immigrants from another. The clear implication is that the quality of a human being is dependent upon his place of birth.

To my mind, no more obnoxious, racist idea has ever been incorporated into the statute books of the United States. The inevitable result is a system which practices the most vicious kind of discrimination. Out of an annual overall immigration quota of 156,700. The United Kingdom, Germany, and the Scandanavian countries are allotted nearly two-thirds of the places. Greece, Italy, and Poland, on the other hand, account for less than one-tenth of all quota immigrants. As a result, some countries have waiting lists of qualified applicants that will take years to process while others use only a small portion of their annual quota. Our present immigration policy has been designed with a view to exclude certain types or groups of people.

No one can argue with the concept that Congress must regulate the flow of immigration so as to protect the Nation's economy, health, and morals. We certainly do have a responsibility to set rigorous standards that will deny entry to persons who would not make desirable citizens. But, the qualities we seek have nothing to do with national origin.

Under the present law, however, Americans of southern and eastern European extraction are told that more of their kind are neither wanted nor needed. Their contributions to this country's development and their just claims to equal treatment under the law are ignored.

It seems strange to me that at a time when the Congress is taking vigorous action to insure that no American will be denied their full privilege of citizenship because of race, we still maintain an immigration policy which relegates millions of other Americans to second-class citizenship because of national origin.

The paradox is heightened by the almost universally agreed upon fact that the national origin quota system has not worked in practice. Aside from being unjust and discriminatory, it fails to come to grips with the realities of the modern world.

Time and again, Congress has been forced to compensate for the inadequacies of the present system by passing special immigration laws. In recent years, over 60,000 quota spots have been going unused annually. At the same time, increasing numbers of special nonquota immigrants have been admitted so that our total annual immigration is running nearly twice what the quota system is supposed to allow. Of this total only about a third has actually been controlled by the quota system. All of which clearly demonstrates the urgent need for a thorough overhaul of the whole system.

There are a variety of other ways in which the present immigration system works to the detriment of our national interest. While serving as director of the Illinois Department of Labor, I had firsthand experience in dealing with problems of labor shortages and manpower recruitment, and I can emphatically state that our present immigration policies aggravate these problems.

A recent editorial in the Chicago Sun-Times pointed out that in the Chicago area alone there are critical labor shortages of hand tailors, furniture refinishers, and cabinetmakers. Elsewhere in the country, there are insufficient numbers of diemakers, glassblowers, machinists, chemists, teachers, medical personnel, and many other important occupational categories.

The case of Dr. Gustavo Bounous comes to mind in this connection. A highly skilled medical doctor from Italy, Dr. Bounous came to America hoping to settle here. After a short stay in Indianapolis, his temporary visa expired and he was forced to move to Canada. Just last month, Dr. Bounous was awarded Canada's top national medical award for his work in helping to discover the mystery of how shock from bleeding can cause death. Here is a man whose great skills we turned away from our doors. This example could be multiplied endlessly, and I submit that America cannot afford this kind of brain drain.

Labor shortages could be rectified by bringing thousands of skilled workers to America from among the masses of people crying for admission. Yet they are prevented from adding their talent to our economy and we are prevented from enjoying the benefits of their skills by our bigoted method of immigrant selection.

If we need an immigration policy more suited to our modern manpower needs, we also need one that will better serve our Nation's foreign policy goals. Secretary of State Rusk's testimony on this point was very persuasive. Just within the last year, no less than a dozen foreign ministers among our friends and allies have personally complained to him about America's immigration policy.

Their grievance had nothing to do with the numbers of immigrants we admit. Indeed, we have one of the most generous policies in that respect of any nation in the world. Rather, it concerned the insulting, discriminatory features of our quota system. No other law on our books is as damaging to our national image abroad.

Surely a more rational basis for regulating immigration than our present confused and irrational system can be found. I believe that it has been found and that it is embodied in the administration bill.

By replacing national origin quotas with a quota reserve pool, that is assigned on a first-come, first-served basis, the bill puts all prospective immigrants on an equal footing to allow them a fair field and an honest race. The provisions facilitating the reunion of separated families show the concern for human factors that must underlie public policy in any civilized society. The priorities accorded immigrants with certain levels of skill, training, and education directly serve our own national interest. In sum, the bill substitutes order and justice for confusion and discrimination in a major area of our national law.

I can think of no more fitting step toward the truly Great Society than passage of this bill, and I urge the adoption of this vital legislation.

BRACERO LABOR FOR SUGARBEET INDUSTRY

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, today I received a communication from a Mr. Bruce Newkirk, superintendent of the Holly Sugar Corp., at Worland, Wyo., strongly protesting the action of the Secretary of Labor and indicating the disappointment of all management of the beet sugar industry to the attitude of the Secretary of Labor regarding bracero labor for the Wyoming sugarbeet industry. I quote from Mr. Newkirk's communication:

> We feel the entire sugar industry in Wyoming is at stake in this matter and we feel that the Secretary is taking a very dim attitude and is ill-informed.
>
> If California and the Southern States are in trouble with their perishable crops with their enormous labor pool, what can we expect in sparsely populated Wyoming. Domestic labor just is not available in this area of the type necessary for this kind of work.
>
> We are jeopardizing our second largest industry in Wyoming to satisfy theorists. Our people at Worland have been ahead of some areas in mechanization of field equipment, but we know we have not perfected this to the point of elimination of hand labor entirely.
>
> Even our union people at the plants are agreed we are creating an impossible situation in elimination of the bracero program at this time.
>
> In a period of a few years the transition may be complete to the point that braceros may no longer be needed, but the time is definitely not now and we are headed for terrible and serious trouble without braceros help.

Mr. Speaker, I put these remarks to the attention of my colleagues in the hope that the Secretary of Labor will relent an attitude which may spell ruin to the sugarbeet industry of the State of Wyoming. It is quite possible that the beets will be topped and loaded this fall without braceros labor but there will be no product to top and to load unless the braceros labor is available for work in the fields this spring in the State of Wyoming.

VOTING RIGHTS

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill on the subject of voting rights which I hope will receive the careful attention of the House Judiciary Committee as well as the Members of this House.

The bill which I am presenting will apply throughout the 50 States. In other words, where discrimination is practiced with regard to race or color in depriving eligible citizens of the right to vote, or where coercion or intimidation is exercised in order to prevent a citizen from registering or voting, this new legislation would be applicable. In addition, the bill would provide penalties for any person who makes false representations or engages in illegal voting and would penalize as well any who pay or offer to pay or who accept payment for registering or voting.

It is offensive to the American people for any qualified person to be deprived of the right to register or to vote. It is likewise reprehensible to corrupt the sanctity of the ballot by purchasing the votes of any citizens under threat of denial of public assistance or with promises of pecuniary benefits, including benefits from Federal appropriations.

The bill which I have introduced is patterned after that of my Republican colleagues of the House, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD], minority leader of the House, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], ranking minority member on the House Judiciary Committee upon which I serve.

The penalty provisions to which I have made reference are in addition to those found in the measure offered by these gentlemen.

In addition, I would like to point out that the measure which I have presented retains the authority of States to administer minimum literacy tests in which a sixth-grade education represents a conclusive presumption of literacy. A requirement is, of course, that a literacy test should be administered without discrimination on account of race or color.

The complaints of 25 or more persons alleging discrimination in any county or voting district would require the immediate appointment of Federal examiners to register qualified voters in any area where such discrimination is found to exist.

While the right to appeal to the local Federal court is assured, the measure provides for "provisional" voting to the end that no person shall be deprived of his right to vote while an appeal is pending. In other words, a full and adequate, as well as a convenient resort to the courts, is retained, while at the same time there is protection against delays in voting rights when frivolous or dilatory appeals are filed.

Mr. Speaker, the obligation of the Congress to debate and deliberate upon a great public issue was never greater than on the subject of voting rights for all eligible American citizens. We should provide full and adequate implementation of the 13th, 14th, and 15th amendments to assure all citizens of their equality before the law, the equal protection of the laws, and to guarantee their inherent rights to register and to vote without discrimination, without intimidation, and without coercion.

PROHIBIT TRADE WITH COMMUNIST NORTH VIETNAM

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, today I am joining in cosponsoring with the gentleman from Florida [Mr. ROGERS] legislation designed to halt shipments to or from the United States aboard ships engaged in trade with North Vietnam. I commend him for his work in investigating this problem, and I share his concern for an almost incredible disregard for the lives of American boys in Vietnam and for the American shipping industry which we are today subsidizing at a cost of $350 million per year.

North Vietnam is waging a brutal and relentless war against its neighbors to the south, but yet over 200 ships of so-called allies and neutralist nations have hauled cargoes of food and war material into North Vietnam. We permit those same ships to pick up the profits of our own trade in our own ports.

Figures show that our own merchant marine now carries less than 10 percent of U.S. ocean trade—the least we can do is to deny our cargoes to foreign shippers who help the Communist enemy solve their biggest problem—supplying North Vietnam. Through shipping into Vietcong territory, the Vietnam crisis continues to persist and Americans have been killed in greater numbers by the Communist Vietcong.

I frankly am surprised that the administration and the Department of State have not been more firm in their requests that Britain, Japan, Greece, Lebanon, Italy, West Germany, and other nations involved call a halt to free world sea trade with the Communists now engaged in open aggression in southeast Asia in defiance of their own agreements. Since this has not been done, I see no alternative other than Congress prohibiting cargoes to or from U.S. ports being transported aboard any vessel used in sea trade with Communist North Vietnam, and I urge action as soon as possible in this regard.

PLENTY OF DOMESTICS—OF SORTS

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, surely there are plenty of domestics—plenty to do all the jobs needed to be done in the United States—in our restaurants, motels, in orchards, and on our farms. And the domestics should have these jobs. And the jobs should pay a fair wage for the work they do.

Unfortunately, today there simply are not enough domestics, in the proper location, capable and willing to do the work, in restaurants and on the vegetable farms.

The efforts to reorganize our society and redistribute our work force is having some tragic and devastating effects on many small towns in rural areas.

The following editorial from the Salinas Californian touches upon one problem which the Department of Labor seems to ignore or intentionally neglect.

The big city police forces cannot control these transients when they stay home. How can anyone expect small towns to cope with these transients when they invade the rural areas? Is it fair to empty the slums into the small towns under the guise of offering employment which they cannot perform?

Plenty of Domestics—of Sorts

Daily it grows more apparent that Secretary of Labor Wirtz should have stayed in his nice insulated office in Washington.

It is obvious that he and his advisers in Washington had prejudged the California farm labor situation and his widely advertised survey was only window dressing.

His monotonous and unharmonious refrain has been "there are plenty of domestics to do the farm labor."

Of sorts, that is.

We have several hundred of them on Salinas skid row, and as the city council learned Monday night, the number of arrests of these transients has nearly doubled in the first 3 months of this year as against the same period last year. The same situation, which has become acute here only in the past few years, exists in Fresno and Stockton.

Salinas police, who have chalked up 2,269 arrests in the first 3 months of the year as against 1,293 for the same period last year, say the end is not in sight. Contrary to previous years when the transient invasion peaked in March, police believe that because of the failure of the Department of Labor to authorize supplemental foreign farm labor the situation will continue to get worse as these unfortunates pour in to fill the labor vacuum. Ostensibly these men are here to work, but usually it's only long enough for the price of a bottle.

Although most of these available domestics are arrested for drunkenness, there has been a sharp increase in the number of petty thefts, and, as the influx continues, there could be an outbreak of more serious crimes. This means an increased drain on public funds and increased taxes for an area already uncertain about the future.

The city council plans to send these figures to Secretary Wirtz, but judging from past performance we doubt if he wants facts.

He demonstrated this by labeling two labor camps filthy although both camps had been inspected and approved as meeting county and State health standards. Some of the alleged filth to which Mr. Wirtz alluded was the discarded wine bottles and debris brought in by available domestics. Braceros generally were clean and orderly.

He compounded his scattergun charges by creating a name for one of the filthy camps which happens to be the same as that of a reputable firm, which has no connection here.

Meantime, while Mr. Wirtz dallies in Washington, refusing to take action on supplemental help, the strawberry crop is ripening and appeals to the public for labor are not getting very far. Growers face heavy losses and the Salinas Valley faces further economic troubles.

JOHN FITZGERALD KENNEDY

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the House to a sermon in memory of the late President John F. Kennedy which was delivered in St. Matthew's Cathedral at a memorial mass on the occasion of the late President's birthday, on May 29, 1964. As one who was present on that occasion, I considered myself privileged when I recently came across a copy of this remarkable discourse. It was delivered by the Most Reverend Philip M. Hannan, vicar general of the archdiocese of Washington, who was a close friend of the President.

Bishop Hannan is well known to many of the Members of the House as the distinguished pastor of St. Patrick's Church and the editor in chief of the Catholic Standard. A native of the Capital, Bishop Hannan is one of the most outstanding members of the American heirarchy of the Roman Catholic Church. I am sure a good number of my colleagues know of his great work as an active leader in the John Carroll Society. Not only is he renowned as the pastor of a notable parish, not only is he an able journalist, but he has proven himself also as a scholar, holding as he does a licentiate in theology from the Gregorian University in Rome and a doctorate in canon law from the Catholic University of America.

Like the late President Kennedy, Bishop Hannan served his country heroically in time of war, for in 1942 he volunteered as a paratroop chaplain and served with the 505th Parachute Regiment of the 82d Airborne Division, where he was affectionaly known as the jumping padre. He continues to have a deep interest in the welfare of the paratroopers and, from time to time, returns to Fort Bragg, N.C., to participate in their military exercises.

As assistant episcopal chairman of the NCWC Immigration Department, he has for the last 5 years done remarkable work in dealing with the problems of those who have come to our country, often as the victims of persecution and tyranny.

Consequently, he has the deepest appreciation of the patriotic and human qualities of the late President, which he describes with such eloquence in this sermon. Seldom have I seen a tribute more perfectly stated or more richly deserved, and I am pleased to be able to bring it to the attention of the honorable Members.

The Most Reverend Philip M. Hannan, D.D., Sermon at the Mass for President John F. Kennedy, St. Matthew's Cathedral, Washington, D.C., May 29, 1964

Today we celebrate the birthday in the Lord of John Fitzgerald Kennedy. The ancient and beautiful phrase, used in the chronicles of the church, is appropriate for this singular occasion. For today, while we still mourn the absence of his vibrant personality among us, as Christians we take deep consolation from the knowledge that this personality, marked with the sign of the Holy Trinity, was destined to enjoy the company of his Creator and Redeemer, there to join the beloved children who awaited that joyful homecoming in Heaven. We rightly celebrate his birthday into this world also his birthday in the Lord. By Christian hope each man sees Christ's resurrection as his own. St. Paul expressed the thought of all when he said, "But if we have died with Christ, we believe that we shall also live together with Christ; for we know that Christ having risen from the dead, dies now no more, death shall no longer have dominion over Him" (Romans vi: 8–9). The Easter Mass, celebrating the victory of Christ, makes Christ's life our life, "When Christ, our life, appears, then you also shall appear with Him in glory" (Colossians iii: 4).

The occasion also invites reflection on the problem of evil. As long as there is freedom of the will there will be evil or the possibility of evil. Without freedom there is no moral world, only a mechanical world. Freedom and evil are intertwined. God permits evil so that good may come from it. St. Paul saw the problem in the sufferings of Christ, the evil inflicted on Him, including His death. He said, "We have not a high priest who cannot have compassion on our infirmities but One tried as we are in all things except sin. Let us therefore draw near with confidence to the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy and find grace to help in time of need."

The resurrection of Christ, our redemption, our hope—these are the triumph of good over evil. But possibly the most arresting example, the example closest to our understanding is the figure of the Pieta, Christ's mother receiving His body after the crucifixion. There is immense sorrow but there is also triumph. There is immense agony but there is also immense stature of spirit, of faith, of hope, of certainty of everlasting reunion and joy without end. Perhaps this is why the subject so evoked the genius of Michaelangelo. And it is also the reason why millions are so attracted and comforted by it.

Our faith, confirmed by every miracle since Christ's resurrection, assures us that the human personality lives on in Christ. The good is not interred in our bones; it lives forever in our triumph with Christ. The soul does not languish in a sterile survival after death. It achieves the fullness of its life in union with its Creator and Redeemer—participating in the life of God, knowing us with God's mind, loving us with God's heart, concerned about us with God's concern. Death provides the birthday in the Lord of a full life with Him.

Not only faith, but nature itself, speaks of eternal life. Just as material nature speaks of cycle and transformation, never of extinction, so our spiritual nature, the crown of creation, speaks always of eternal life. Thus the good performed by John F. Kennedy, his aspirations as well as his achievements, live with him and bring their reward.

Although John F. Kennedy abominated any pretense of superior virtue and readily admitted the human frailty to which all mankind is heir, his life presents a panorama of extensive achievements in God's cause: a youth of casually expressed but deeply felt devotion and loyalty to his parents and family; days of military heroism that were only the prelude, for all their greatness, to months of greater but hidden heroism in the hospital, buoyed and encouraged by his wife; the ceaseless quest for and final creation of a unique vocation of public service; his rugged and unrelenting campaign against any form of discrimination which never became tinged with the bitterness it was opposing; his restoration to high estate of the profession of politics by the application of Christian virtue to the work-a-day world of public office; his ennobling of the American family life by his keen interest and delight in his family and the spirit of Christian resignation to the death of some of his children; his strengthening of this country's strong and traditional faith in God by his unpretentious but practical exercise of his religious duties; particularly, his unique contribution to the fruitful system of separation and independence of church and State best typified by his praise of the encyclical of Pope John XIII, Peace on Earth, "As a Catholic I am proud of it, as an American I can learn from it." Probably, the field in which his adventuresome spirit soared the highest was the field of aid and development. Despite the complexities and procedures that inevitably tend to depersonalize any aid program, he conveyed to all his conviction that world problems are still individual human problems. Although his horizon was as wide as humanity, it was particular enough to touch every individual. He gave a new hope to every deprived man in the world and hope is the source of all striving and virtue. Thus he gave a new dimension to the American ideal of freedom and dignity for every soul. He typified the dignity of man in terms that all could read and admire. His dignity was not that of the austere and patronizing benefactor. It was human dignity clothed in its most attractive characteristics, a warm personality, a flashing and genuine smile, an unruly forelock, an amused grin, an undisguised interest in people, an Irish sense of humor. He was today's champion of every man. He was the leader of the free world, but freedom for him had wide and practical applications. He supported a freedom of the spirit that liberates man not only from political restraints but gives him the lever to free himself from the disease and crippling hunger that nullify his political freedom. To the free world he taught a new use of freedom, and to the world that aspired toward freedom he tried to give a meaning and purpose for the use of that freedom.

His greatest service to the cause of virtue was his steady refusal to posture as a person of piety. Posturing was alien to his character. Honors that bordered on such pretensions made him uneasy. In fact, he was dismayed at the honors paid to him when he attended Mass at the ancient Cathedral of St. Stephen in Vienna. Warmed by this experience, he took steps to avoid a recurrence of such honors. He was always manly, and virtue is allied to that as the derivation of the word itself from "vir," meaning man, attests. In this sense, he was the example of the words he spoke at the inauguration, "With a good conscience our only sure reward, with history the final judge of our deeds, let us go forth to lead the land we love, asking His blessing and His help but knowing that here on earth God's work must truly be our own." He can surely expect God's reward for the monumental work he accomplished in His service.

As we believe in the communion of saints let us not only thank and pray for John F. Kennedy's reward. Let us remember that he thinks of us—that we are linked in a union of grace far more effective than any efforts we could make for him when in this world. Tragically, we could not prevent his death. We can affect his life now. By our prayers, by our attendance at mass and reception of holy communion we can prepare to reap the promise of Christ, our Saviour, "He who drinks My blood and eats My flesh shall have life everlasting and I shall raise him up on the last day." We may not see his like on this earth, but with God's help we shall see him, far greater than he was on this earth, in the company of his Saviour.

The words of the preface of the mass which we shall shortly pronounce express best the unlimited hope of those, as John F. Kennedy, who died signed with the sign of the Holy Trinity, "For unto thy faithful O Lord, life is changed not taken away. And this earthly abode being dissolved a worthy habitation is prepared in heaven."

VOTING DISCRIMINATION

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WAGGONNER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members a clear, concise, and unbiased comment on the voting rights proposal which appeared in the Washington Star on Sunday, April 4, under the title "Voting Discrimination."

The editor has the courage to call a spade a spade and a discriminatory bill a discriminatory bill. It is heartening to those of us who have opposed this legislation from the first day it was presented to the Congress to have the Star on our side. All too often, when one of the southern Members calls attention to ill-conceived, punitive and unconstitutional civil rights legislation, he is branded as a racist and a demogog. It has come dangerously close to the point where Members who know this particular bill is unconstitutional, discriminatory, vindictive and a fraud upon the people, are afraid to say so for fear of reprisals from the extremist groups who demand immediate and uncontested passage of every piece of legislation bearing a civil rights label. This is not an appropriate atmosphere in which any legislation on any subject should be rammed through the Congress.

As the Star editorial points out, and as I stated before the Judiciary Committee on April 1, this measure is reminiscent of the Reconstruction era following the War Between the States. I urge every Member to read this editorial before he casts a vote on this infamous legislation and, with unanimous consent, I insert it here in the Record:

Voting Discrimination

Our basic objections to the administration's voting rights bill have already been stated. We think there is need for a reasonable literacy test, provided there is no discrimination in its application to would-be voters. The administration's bill, in one aspect, outlaws any and all literacy tests, and is designed to permit total illiterates to vote. The educational voting level is low enough now without enacting a Federal law to push it down even farther.

The second important aspect of this bill imposes its harsh and punitive provisions on any State which has a literacy test, and in which fewer than 50 percent of the residents over 21 are registered or actually voted in the 1964 election.

This bill contains other provisions which are reminiscent of the Reconstruction era following the Civil War. But the two which we have mentioned, taken together, offend one's sense of fairness. If enacted, in its present form, this bill would result in a legislative discrimination as bad or worse than the evil the bill is supposed to remedy.

Let's take the case of Virginia, which is brought under this bill because it requires a literacy test and, though more than 50 percent of its eligibles are registered, fewer than 50 percent voted in 1964.

What is Virginia's literacy test? As spelled out by Senator Harry Byrd in his recent statement, any person desiring to register must be able, without assistance, to give in writing the following information: His name. The date and place of his birth. His current residence. His occupation. And, if he has voted before, the county and precinct in which he voted. That is all.

Is this a test which opens the door to such obviously discriminatory requirements as being able to interpret to the satisfaction of some ignorant registrar sections of a State constitution? Is it a test which asks too much of a person who wants to vote on the important and complicated issues which face us today? We do not think so. Furthermore, the administration concedes that this is not an unreasonable literacy test, and that there is no evidence that it has been used in Virginia to discriminate against Negroes.

If this is so, why does the bill link a reasonable and nondiscriminatory literacy test to an arbitrary formula with respect to voting or registration percentages?

One explanation is that the statistics on registration are unreliable. But this is said to be true in West Virginia, which is not affected by the bill because it has no literacy test. What nonsense.

In addition to Virginia, the States covered by the bill are Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, Georgia, and Alaska. We are puzzled by the inclusion of Alaska, in which Negroes certainly are not discriminated against. There are few if any there. As to the others, we haven't enough information to pass judgment.

But it is our firm belief that this is a discriminatory bill. If its purpose is to protect Negro voting rights, it discriminates in favor of New York, which requires a rather strict literacy test but which has met the voting percentage standards. It also discriminates in the case of Texas, which did not meet the percentage-of-voting standard in 1964, but which does require a literacy test, although it is verbal in character and is called by some other name.

There have been reports that the administration's bill will be changed or modified in some unrevealed aspects. We hope this is true. We also hope that the bill, if modified, will be made applicable to Virginia (in which we have a rather special interest) on the basis of facts rather than fiction. And certainly not on the basis of some arbitrary formula dreamed up by someone who hasn't the faintest idea what the facts are. Or, if he knows, doesn't care.

AMERICAN COUNCIL FOR JUDAISM: WHAT IS IT?—WHO DOES IT REPRESENT?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many of our colleagues, particularly some of the newer Members, have asked questions about the American Council for Judaism.

The best and most complete answer to all inquiries on the subject is found in the factual study of the American Council for Judaism as issued by the New York Board of Rabbis on behalf of its 800 members. The New York Board of Rabbis is the oldest American rabbinic group of which orthodox, conservative, and reform rabbis are members. Their findings are reliable and authoritative.

I will not set forth the entire report but do direct our colleagues' attention to the following statement prefixed thereto, which reads as follows:

1. The New York Board of Rabbis, the largest representative rabbinic body in the world, with a membership of over 800 orthodox, conservative, and reform rabbis, reaffirms the position of the 3 major national rabbinical bodies in America that the American Council for Judaism does not represent any valid interpretation of Judaism. We repudiate its ideology and tactics as inimical and alien to the true spirit of Judaism. While we do not deny the right of that body to speak, we would fail in our elemental duty to truth and to our responsible position as the united voice of religious Jewry if we did not make it clear that the Council for Judaism does not speak in the name of our religious tradition, and that it does not speak for the religious Jewish community.

2. The American Council for Judaism has consistently misrepresented the Jewish people before the bar of public opinion. It has welcomed every opportunity to malign and impugn the integrity of Jewish institutions, organizations and causes; and it has consistently distorted and caricatured the precepts of Judaism which it purports to teach. Worst of all, in the most tragic era of Jewish history, it sought to deny to Jews fleeing Hitler's Europe a haven in Palestine, and undermined and obstructed the lifegiving work of rescue and rehabilitation carried on by the Jewish community.

3. Our factual study released today offers clear proof that the group calling itself the American Council for Judaism is neither American nor Jewish in spirit or in concept. It is revealed to be a political organization consisting, by its own claim, of less than one-half of 1 percent of American Jews which was organized in the first instance for the express purpose of denying the right of refugees fleeing occupied Europe to enter Palestine, at the very moment the Nazis were implementing the "final solution."

4. During the 20 years of its existence the activities of the council have consisted of an assault against the United Jewish Appeal, the major lifesaving instrumentality of the American Jewish community. They have attempted to impugn the patriotism of American Jews who have, together with other Americans, showr concern for the welfare of the people of Israel. They have had as their principal aim the incitement of prejudice against the State of Israel, thus contributing to tension and unrest in the Middle East, a policy we believe to be contrary to the best interest of both America and Israel.

5. Judaism, we believe, has sufficient breadth and depth to embrace varied points of view, but we solemnly declare that there is no room in Jewish life for Jews whose words and deeds would result in the destruction of the State of Israel, in the weakening of Jewish religious commitment, and in incalculable harm to the Jewish people everywhere.

6. We view with contempt the council's tactics of reviving anti-Semitic slanders of "dual loyalties." American Jews who have served their country in peace and in war need not defend themselves against such baseless, vicious charges. As Americans concerned with the survival of democratic values everywhere, we pray for the strengthening and survival of the State of Israel as a stronghold of democracy in the Middle East. It is thus in keeping with the best traditions of America to support Israel, or indeed, any other nation which strengthens the democratic and moral climate of our troubled world.

7. As religious leaders we are dismayed that the council's philosophy is one of complete negation: it would deny the existence of a Jewish people, it rejects traditional Jewish ceremonials, and scoffs at the basic American concept of the right of every citizen to help other peoples struggling for freedom. The council is an organization which claims to be "religious," yet it has no religious commitment. It claims to be "American," yet it misinterprets America as a monolithic structure where all cultural and spiritual variations must be obliterated. It purports to speak for Judaism, yet it is against every best interest of the Jewish community. It has no positive program of its own, but is founded on a platform of negation and hate.

8. The New York Board of Rabbis is confident that the American people will reject with contempt the political machinations of this small band of misguided individuals who suffer from insecurity and tragic self-hatred. Our love of God, our love of America, our religious commitment and the ties of our religious fellowship with Jews throughout the world—all enjoin us to continue our efforts to save oppressed Jews everywhere, and to extend the arm of brotherhood to the people of Israel who are bound to the people of America in a common commitment to the democratic ideals which stem from our Judeo-Christian tradition, upon which both America and Israel are founded.

COINAGE CHANGES NECESSITATED BY THE SHORTAGE OF SILVER

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANDRUM). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the Congress is today in the unfortunate position of waiting for the executive branch to tell us what we should do. For months we have been looking for the Treasury Department's findings and recommendations about the coinage changes necessitated years ago by the shortage of silver. I have addressed the House many times on this question, introduced bills to correct the situation and have sought to counsel with the Treasury Department for an early solution. In all instances, the Department has ignored the constitutional provision that it is the Congress' primary responsibility to provide for the coinage of money. Article I, section 8, is clear:

> The Congress shall have the power to coin money and regulate the value thereof.

The main point of my talk today is to urge the Congress to direct its thinking on the coinage question to the need for market control measures during the 2-year transition period. I fear the Treasury has avoided consideration of the need for, and means of establishing effective controls of silver during the changeover. In order to emphasize the need for this, I would like to cite some examples of the Treasury's faulty handling of the situation so far.

Two years ago we were told that by repealing the Silver Purchase Act, we would provide enough coinage silver for the next 15 to 20 years. Treasury maintained this position at that time, but now says the supply is so short that only 2 or 3 year's supply remains. Questions about the necessity for a review of the need for change in silver content were answered by an assurance that a report would be given to us in February. Two months have slipped by without an answer: In the meantime crash coinage programs are in effect and we are still not sure when we might expect the results of the Treasury's study.

As a Member of Congress interested in the timing and nature of the Department's recommendations, I have been given only excuses for not being kept informed of the progress of the study. However, a syndicated columnist assured her readers that she has definite information about the results of the Treasury's study. Her analysis is so oversimplified and her background facts so erroneous that it is difficult to believe that her sources are very reliable. However, if Miss Porter's articles represent a trial balloon on what Treasury may recommend, it becomes a question of a curious approach to legislative proposals. If Treasury is interested in the people's reaction to debased coinage, poll results released by our colleague, Mr. HUTCHINSON of Michigan on March 8 would be helpful. On page 4402 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Congressman HUTCHINSON published answers to his question about silver versus nonsilver coins. Only 34 percent of those replying were in favor of the latter alternative.

Another example of the apparent disregard of Congress role in coinage needs is that the Treasury Department has failed to report on bills pertinent to the change of our coin composition.

Finally, I would like to relate a personal experience. After continuous indications of my interest in the need for a speedy and well-considered conclusion of studies related to legislation necessary for a workable solution to the future coinage crisis, I not only have been informed that "it is not in the national interest" to reveal to the House Banking and Currency Committee what the nature of the Treasury's study is, but also have been refused an opportunity to view experimental coins struck during the study—coins, I might add, that I requested to be struck.

Mr. Speaker, I asked that the Treasury Department strike coins with a silver surface and a copper-silver interior. I arranged so that the alloys would be made available to them. I asked them to strike the coins in the present denominations so they could be observed for luster, ring, feel, and the general appearance of the coins.

Mr. Speaker, I have made repeated requests that I be allowed to at least see the coins that I asked them to make. In each instance, as recently as yesterday, I was refused this permission.

Such is the record of the Treasury Department's attitude toward Congress regarding legislation for coin changes.

Despite the vacuum-sealed cast of the Treasury's relation to Congress on the question of metallic composition of future coins, it is my sincere hope that a more openhanded disposition is adopted with regard to the control measures I spoke about earlier. I am sure every Member present would conscientiously confer with our executives about the probable effects of the various methods of conserving silver for our coinage. Last month the Legal and Monetary Affairs Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, under the able chairmanship of Mr. FASCELL, recommended that the "Treasury Department consider the advisability or necessity for legislation to prevent, minimize, or regulate the hoarding of, or speculation in, large quantities of coin, and the export and melting down of coin." The report also recommended that we direct Treasury to limit withdrawals of silver from its stock. Let us explore today some of the reasons for these recommendations and methods of putting them into effect.

It is evident that we must soon legislate a change in the silver content of dimes, quarters, half dollars, and dollars. When we do so, we must also provide the Treasury Department with means to retain its stock of silver, because it must defend its price below the melting point of present coins. Unless adequate and clear authority is given to the Treasury to control the sales of its silver, to prevent the melting, hoarding, and export of our coin and to eradicate incentives to speculate in silver, chaos will reign during the transition to a new coinage, whether the new coin contains silver or not.

Controls must be placed on the sales of silver within the country as well as over exports from the United States. In order to achieve these objectives a variety of tools should be placed into the hands of the Treasury Department. I will discuss some of the methods of accomplishing those ends.

First. End-use certificates: These affidavits on purchase of silver from the Treasury Department's stocks were required in the sales of free silver 5 years ago.

And, for those Members who are not familiar with the Treasury stocks of silver, we have at West Point in the State of New York slightly over 1 billion ounces of silver today. That silver has been used up to this point to back the silver certificates. There are silver certificates in circulation backed by this 1 billion ounces. Silver sales are really called a redemption of silver certificates. If you want some of this silver, you take your silver certificates to the assay office in either New York or San Francisco and demand, as is provided on the note face, that they give you the silver for that certificate.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. It is my understanding that there is in the vaults at this time about one and a half times as much silver as there is in the silver coinage of the United States.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I may say to the gentleman from Colorado my impression is that there is about 1.5 billion ounces of silver in circulating coinage, and a little over a billion ounces in the vaults of New York.

Mr. ASPINALL. It is possible at the present time to take a silver certificate any place in the United States and receive a silver dollar in place of that?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. It is not possible at the present time to receive silver dollars. It is, as I have stated, possible to go to the assay office in New York and San Francisco and receive filings or drippings of silver; seventy-seven one-hundredths of a troy ounce, for the $1 silver certificate issued on them.

Purchases are limited to bona fide users at a level consistent with their industrial needs. By supplying silver under these conditions to domestic consumers, there would be no legitimate market for melted coin, because there would be no economic incentive to acquire silver in that way. The likelihood that another nation could evaporate our Treasury stocks would also be avoided.

No clear authority now exists for the Treasury to reinstitute the requirement for end-use certificates, and for this reason I have provided language in my bill, H.R. 4184, for their reauthorization. Under that bill, there would be no revocation of the promise to redeem silver certificates, because sales of free silver are authorized. Over 5 years' industrial supply of silver is freed under the bill.

Second. Export licenses: It is conceivable that a higher market price would develop outside the United States if Treasury sales are limited to domestic consumers.

I might say that during last year over 50 million ounces of silver were exported to England. There were additional exports to other nations of the world. We are now a net exporter of silver. An incentive would be created to export our coin and silver bullion. By requiring licenses of legitimate exporters, the outflow of melted coin or other clandestinely acquired silver would be limited. Although export licenses may be authorized under the Export Control Act, I think a clear authorization should be made for the Treasury Department to administer such a program.

Third. Prohibition against melting, hoarding, and export of coins: Although the Treasury's stock of silver would be protected by end-use certificates, the nearly 2 billion ounces of silver in outstanding coin could be legitimately reduced to bullion for speculative holding. In order to prevent taking advantage of such a loophole, I think it would be advisable to explicitly prohibit these practices and assign a penalty for their violation.

Some objection has been raised to this proposal on the grounds that it would be unenforcible. I can appreciate the difficulty in drawing workable standards for enforcement, but I believe it is more logical to place coin melters and hoarders outside the law than to allow such practices without a sanction. Obviously, the legal principle of de minimis lex non curat would have to apply in order for such a statute to be reasonable.

Fourth. Elimination of the silver futures market: Increased interest in speculation in silver resulted from the appearance of silver futures on the commodity exchange in 1963. Reference is made to the interesting footnote 6 of Chairman FASCELL's report about tulipomania. It has been suggested that a reenactment of the 50-percent tax on silver bullion transfers be reenacted for this purpose. Although I believe it is extremely necessary to eliminate such speculation, I think a less drastic method should be sought. Perhaps a request from the Secretary of the Treasury would prove effective in this regard.

I might say that for 30 years we have not had a futures market in silver. The industry has gotten along very well without it, and I think it can continue. The silver futures market at the present time is having trouble justifying its own existence.

Fifth. Licensing of purchasers of silver: As an additional precaution to prevent a trade channel for melted coin, it would be advisable to establish a licensing procedure for purchasers of silver similar to that allowed for gold under 12 U.S.C. 95(b) and ordered by President Roosevelt in 1933 at the time he demonetized gold. Since that statute requires a declaration of national emergency by the President, I think separate legislation should be established for silver throughout the duration of the transition period.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman for bringing to the attention of the Congress this important subject of the dilemma in which we find ourselves because of the shortage of silver and the impending action which the Treasury may be attempting with regard to our coinage.

I had the privilege of taking part in the coinage shortage matter when I served formerly on the subcommittee on Legal and Monetary Affairs under Chairman FRIEDEL.

I had the privilege of hearing the testimony from the gentleman in the well presented to this committee. I think there are very few of us who realize we are facing a real crisis with regard to our coinage. The gentleman is providing a genuine service in bringing this subject to public attention and to the attention of the Members.

I am confident that some drastic change is going to be made and some action is going to be taken, and it should be taken by the Congress itself. Whether we are going to encounter the necessity of eliminating all silver from our basic coinage is, of course, a question for the Congress itself to pass on.

I have in my district a metallurgical corporation and a number of skilled metallurgists from whom I have been endeavoring to get advice as to what their recommendations might be to me, to the Congress, to the mint, and to the Treasury.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I wish to make an announcement. The originally scheduled Republican conference that was to follow adjournment has been moved from the House Chamber to the House Ways and Means Committee room at 3:45, so we would appreciate those of you being present who can be present.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCLORY. I would like to add this. I testified myself before the Legal and Monetary Affairs Committee and recommended to the committee a reduction in the amount of silver in the coinage or a gradual transition which might be taken in order that we would avoid as far as possible the disruption and the disorder which is going to result if silver is eliminated entirely from the coin.

The problems relating to the subject of U.S. coins are complicated and more complex.

The amount of silver available for use in coins is approximately 1,350 million ounces which is available on the market at $1.29 per ounce. In addition, silver from mine production amounts to about 250 million ounces per year. During the year 1963, 421.6 million ounces were employed in industry, the arts and crafts, and for coinage. In view of the fact that the combined consumption of silver is almost double that of the new production, it is quite apparent that the existing treasury supply will be substantially depleted within the next 3 or 4 years. Of course, when the stock of silver held by the Treasury is eliminated, the pegged price of $1.29 per ounce will be governed entirely by the market.

According to my information, as soon as the market price reaches $1.38 per ounce, the value of existing subsidiary silver coins in circulation will be greater when melted down and converted into bullion than as money. Obviously this would result in a substantial removal from circulation of our dimes, quarters and half dollars with a chaotic result beyond our comprehension. Indeed, it is suggested that except for the current Treasury Department policy of pegging the price of silver at $1.29 per ounce, silver would have a current market value today of $1.86 per ounce.

In considering alternative proposals which our Nation faces, it would seem appropriate to consider, first, encouraging increased mining of silver, second, eliminating silver from U.S. coins, and third, reducing the silver content of dimes, quarters, half dollars, and silver dollars.

First. Increased mining of silver: The combined production of silver from mining operations in the United States in 1963 appears to have been only 37 million ounces, with Mexico producing 43 million ounces, Peru 38 million ounces, and Canada 30 million ounces—with a total production estimated by the Bureau of Mines in 1962 at 242.4 million ounces. A 50-percent increase in silver production would seem to represent a monumental undertaking, particularly since our Nation could not directly affect silver production beyond our own borders.

Even if the amount of silver should be doubled or tripled in the United States, the supply would not be adequate to continue the existing silver policy relative to our silver dollar and subsidiary coins.

Second. Elimination of silver from U.S. coins: The elimination of silver from all U.S. coins would seem to pose problems of a most serious nature. The announcement of such a policy would undoubtedly encourage the almost immediate hoarding of all outstanding coins. In addition, I am informed that the effects upon the vending machine industry would be catastrophic—requiring the alteration of much equipment which is now in use—and would pose other difficult problems including the counterfeiting of coins having small intrinsic value.

Public confidence would undoubtedly be influenced by substitution of less valuable materials into U.S. coinage with risks of inflation emanating from this action.

Third. Reducing silver content of coins: While the prospect of reducing the silver content of U.S. coins would pose various other problems, including the probable hoarding of many coins which are now in circulation, it is obvious that at least this step must be taken. In order to avoid an immediate disappearance of silver coins in current circulation, it might be that a transition program of reducing the silver content of dimes, quarters, half dollars, and dollars over a 5-year period might avoid any sudden effects.

Gaging the need for coins in the future and considering the available silver supplies as well as the probable market value of free silver might indicate that an eventual silver content equal to one-half or one-third of that currently employed in silver coins would provide the long-range solution which the committee will be seeking. My information indicates that such solutions would avoid large-scale hoarding during the transitional period and would have little or no effect on the vending machine industry which has been developed in reliance upon a substantial silver content in these coins.

Recommendations: Accordingly, my principal recommendations would be for the gradual reduction of silver in dimes, quarters, half dollars, and silver dollars (if the minting of silver dollars is to be continued). In addition, I would like to see some reasonable steps taken for expanded operations in the mining of silver to the end that an adequate supply for coins as well as for the various industrial and artistic uses may continue to be available.

It is not clear from the statutes—title 31, United States Code, section 821 and the following—whether additional Federal legislation may be required in order to effect the recommendations indicated here. Such authority may already be vested in the President. However, the Congress should define our national policy.

Let me reiterate the significance of the present hearings and the important contribution to the Nation's welfare which can result from constructive and comprehensive recommendations by this House.

Because I am informed reliably, if some sudden action is taken or if some sudden announcement is made, with the possibility of an almost immediate disappearance of all existing coins into the hands of hoarders and others there might occur a great dislocation and a great impairment of the vitality of our entire retail system and our entire merchandising. Therefore, I know that some constructive and some positive and some comprehensive action is needed in order for us to prepare to meet this crisis and to survive that crisis without having serious disruptions. I commend the gentleman for his recommendations and his suggestions made to the House and to the Department of the Treasury.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MCCLORY], and the committee under the direction of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL], for the interest they have taken in this matter and for the information that they have compiled and put together with respect to the needs during the transition period with reference to the silver coinage problem. I also thank the gentleman for his generous remarks.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] for obtaining the floor this afternoon to bring to the attention of the Members the situation as it exists and the actions that we may be requested to take because of the critical imbalance that exists at the present time between the supply and demand for silver. The Honorable COMPTON I. WHITE, JR., in the period that he has been a Member of this body, has demonstrated that you do not have to be a veteran to be heard or to assume leadership.

Congressman WHITE not only represents a district in which mining, including the mining of silver, is important, he actively engaged in mining operations before coming to Congress. As a Member of the House of Representatives, he was assigned to the Interior and Insular Affairs and Banking and Currency Committees, which between them have legislative responsibilities for silver from the time that it is explored for and mined to the time that it is minted into coins or otherwise sold by the Treasury Department.

As a so-called freshman in the 88th Congress, our colleague recognized the need for action and, true to the tradition of his distinguished father who represented the 1st Congressional District of Idaho during the 73d through 79th Congresses and in the 81st Congress, alerted the other Members of this body to the need for legislation to meet the crisis that is now upon us while, at the same time, cautioning against legislation that would aggravate rather than alleviate the situation. I am pleased to associate myself in general with the position that Congressman WHITE has taken on the floor today and to assure my colleagues that, as a member of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee, he has been coordinating closely with his chairman and the ranking members of the committee.

In further support of the position taken by the gentleman from Idaho, I would like to make it clear for the record that I support the principle that we must retain some silver in U.S. coins even though it not be the percentage of silver presently contained in dimes, quarters, and half dollars. The maintenance of an intrinsic value is not only an important psychological factor in maintaining public confidence in our coins, but it has been demonstrated in other countries that the currency system weakens when there are no coins having intrinsic value.

Further, I have confidence that the mining industry will, given the proper incentives, increase its production of new silver. Part of the new production will come through the development of ore bodies that might be uneconomical to develop at the present price of silver.

A week ago yesterday, one of the most knowledgeable mining men in the country, Mr. Simon D. Strauss, vice president of the American Smelting & Refining Co., spoke to the New York Society of Security Analysts and discussed the entire range of problems involved in silver coinage with particular reference, of course, to the situation in which the United States finds itself today and the course of action that we should take. While I do not agree in every particular with Mr. Strauss, nevertheless I feel that he has made an invaluable contribution to this subject.

Under unanimous consent I include the text of Mr. Strauss' remarks at this point in the RECORD and recommend that all Members avail themselves of the opportunity to read this excellent paper:

"COINAGE AND SILVER"—AN ADDRESS BY SIMON D. STRAUSS, VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN SMELTING & REFINING CO., AND MEMBER OF THE SILVER COMMITTEE OF THE AMERICAN MINING CONGRESS BEFORE THE NEW YORK SOCIETY OF SECURITY ANALYSTS, NEW YORK CITY, MARCH 29, 1965

The tradition of equal time now seems firmly established on the American scene in matters of public importance. As spokesmen for the silver producers we appreciate the opportunity for equal time given us this afternoon by the Society of Security Analysts to discuss a problem that concerns not only the U.S. Treasury but every citizen—a change in the coinage system must concern everyone.

So much information has been published on silver production and consumption in the last few months that it seems unnecessary to repeat for this sophisticated group facts already well known. Instead of a detailed statistical analysis, we have chosen to display a number of charts that we believe make the position clear. These were originally prepared by the First National City Bank for its March economic letter. Obviously we will be glad to answer questions later on any aspects of the silver position.

Although agreeing that a substantial deficit exists between the supply of new silver and its present use, we feel the 1964 figures greatly overstated the extent of this gap. Last year stocks of silver held by the Treasury decreased 350 million ounces—about 200 million ounces being used for coinage and about 150 million ounces being issued to the public in redemption of silver certificates. At this rate of attrition, the stocks remaining in the Treasury's possession would be completely gone in another 3 years.

Why do we think the gap in silver supply is less than the 350 million ounces indicated by the 1964 experience?

First look at coinage. The average consumption of silver by the U.S. Mint in the years between 1950 and 1962 was about 50 million ounces annually. But in 1964 the mint consumed over 200 million ounces. True a larger supply of coins is required as the population grows, business improves, and reliance on coin-operated devices increases, but certainly that requirement has not quadrupled in the last 3 years.

Several factors coincided to inflate the 1964 demand for silver coins—as distinct from the need for coins. One was the issuance of the Kennedy half dollar. The public regards this beautiful coin as a commemorative medal, not a circulating medium of exchange. A second factor was the widely advertised shortage of coins in making change; this kind of fear feeds on itself, causing widespread withholding of coins despite exhortations to the contrary. A third was probably some hoarding of coins as a means of speculating on a future rise in the price of silver.

Giving proper weight to the country's growth in population and economic activity, a coinage rate of 100 million ounces annually would appear a generous estimate of normal mint requirements for coins of the present silver composition. If the silver content is reduced, then the normal annual requirement would obviously be reduced proportionately.

Industrial consumption in the free world is estimated to have been about 285 million ounces. Something over 50 million ounces was used for coinage outside the United States—making a total requirement of 335 million ounces excluding the U.S. coinage demand. The supplies available consisted of world mine production estimated by us at about 225 million ounces; an indeterminate amount of silver recovered from scrap and the melting of coins issued by countries other than the United States; plus 150 million ounces supplied by the Treasury to the public in exchange for silver certificates. Thus the total amount available to industry and foreign mints appears to have been well in excess of 375 million ounces.

Thus it appears that in 1964 coinage need was overstated by 100 million ounces and industrial need by at least 70 million ounces.

Instead of 350 million ounces, the current deficit in silver appears to be about half that amount. Thus, those who are projecting an early exhaustion of Treasury stocks based on present rate of demand are overlooking the buildup of stocks elsewhere. If some means can be found to bridge the gap in the U.S. coinage demand, much of this silver now being accumulated will come back into the available supply. There is a real distinction between demand and consumption which should not be overlooked.

Nevertheless, the deficit is still formidable. We agree that the present silver content of coins cannot be maintained. But a long-term decision should be made on the basis of sober appraisal of the real position. It should not be unduly influenced by last year's experience, which we do not regard as typical.

The Treasury's decision on a proper coinage alloy must be based on the national interest—what best promotes the economic well-being of the country.

Judged by this standard, the present coinage alloy has been an outstanding success. Only in the United States among the great powers have coins circulated without change in composition since 1792.

In that year, when Alexander Hamilton, the first Secretary of the Treasury, asked the Congress to authorize the minting of subsidiary coins containing 90 percent silver and 10 percent copper, he hit upon a composition that has met all the tests required for satisfactory coinage. Silver coins are attractive, durable, hard to counterfeit, and meet the psychological need of the public for a coin of real value that carries the ring of authenticity.

Unwittingly Hamilton also made possible the development 150 years later of a major new method of distributing goods. The automatic vending industry lowers the cost of putting merchandise in the hands of consumers. Its growth has been accelerated by the fact that the U.S. coin alloy can be tested in a way to minimize the threat of bogus coins—whether counterfeits, slugs, or foreign coins. Any coin can be tested for size and weight, but only a coin of metals with high electrical conductivity can pass a third test imposed by the coin acceptors used in vending machines.

It is doubtful that Hamilton even knew of the existence of the magic force of electricity, unless Benjamin Franklin happened to tell him about his experiment with kites. Thus the first Secretary of the Treasury could not have foreseen the usefulness of coins with the attributes of high electrical conductivity.

In the history of the Republic there have been only two or three occasions when silver coinage became scarce. One occurred during the administration of Andrew Jackson; a second during the Civil War. In both instances fractional paper currency was circulated as a substitute for silver coins. These notes of low value were held in contempt by the public, as is indicated by the derisive epithet of "shinplasters" by which they became known.

Today, after more than a century and a half of useful service, some people are urging the complete discontinuance of silver coinage. The situation recalls the remarks made by the late Sir Winston Churchill in which he described how, after leading the British people to victory in the Second World War, at the first postwar election he was summarily dismissed from public service.

The reasons given for discontinuing silver coinage are that this metal has unique characteristics which are prized by industrial consumers. The photosensitivity of silver salts makes it an essential for the film industry. Its high electrical conductivity gives it preeminence for contact points, certain limited wiring applications, and other electrical uses. Its high thermal conductivity is responsible for its selection in missile work. Its corrosion resistance causes widespread demand in surgical and dental fields. In combination with zinc or cadmium it functions with unrivaled efficiency, though at high cost, as a storage battery. In numerous alloys it is considered indispensable for brazing and other forms of metal joining. Its noble appearance and the ease with which it can be worked are responsible for its age-old use as tableware, as jewelry, and in the decorative arts generally.

The producers recognize the great utility of silver in all these applications. But it seems only fair to point out that silver also has unique attributes in coinage and to suggest that, if the economic utility of silver is so great, in the long run greater production must be encouraged by incentives. Following this initial presentation members of this panel will discuss some of the problems of increasing silver production. Suffice to say at this point that "we believe production can and will increase substantially and that its slow growth in recent years has been due to economic causes rather than lack of potential resources."

In urging retention of silver in coinage, two particular considerations emerge. We have already referred to the unique suitability of silver coins for the development of the automatic vending industry. It is quite true, of course, that the coin acceptors can be adjusted so that they will test coins only for size and weight and omit the electrical test. In that event coins of stainless steel, of nickel, of columbium, or of any one of numerous other substances that have been suggested could be used in these devices. But the volume of bogus coinage that would also be accepted would rise enormously.

It must be obvious that the more tests a coin device makes in accepting or rejecting coins, the less the likelihood that it will accept a bogus coin. On this ground alone, the vending machine industry is properly concerned over suggestions that a coin system be adopted that would eliminate the electrical test. Since they are experts in this field, we do not propose at this time to elaborate further—we feel that their views have been clearly and explicitly stated.

A coin with silver content, either alloyed with copper or clad on a copper core, will meet the vending industry's requirements. A solid copper coin would do so also, but would not satisfy the public on the grounds of appearance. Copper is too indelibly associated in the public mind with coins of low value such as the penny.

The second consideration—and we believe the paramount one—is the matter of intrinsic value. It is said that confidence in coinage arises not from its intrinsic value, but rather from confidence in the economic and financial structure of the country.

Gentlemen, confidence is a strange and delicate animal. It is not created by telling people they must be confident. It can disappear overnight—see the stock market crash of October 1929 as an outstanding example. Confidence is something that represents the trust and faith of a country's entire population—not just of a few experts in monetary theory. Great empires have fallen when public confidence has been withdrawn; small nations have triumphed over great odds when public confidence in their leaders has been established.

Perhaps we can make clearer what we are trying to say about confidence and coinage if a specific case history is cited. In this instance, the case history is that of France.

France is one of the great industrial countries of the world. Since the outbreak of World War I in 1914 it has had a checkered career; its prestige has waxed and waned; its currency has been subjected to enormous strains despite the wealth of its resources in people and in land.

Prior to World War II the French had abandoned coinage of intrinsic value. During the war the French suffered serious reverses militarily and economically. The French franc, which had been 20 to the dollar before the war broke out, dropped to 500 to the dollar in the postwar period.

When General de Gaulle assumed power at the end of the 1950's, he was determined to rebuild the confidence in the French people. Virtually the first economic measure he invoked was a revaluation of the franc.

He caused to be issued a new franc, equal in value to 100 of the old francs. These two coins illustrate that change. One is a 100-franc cupro-nickel coin minted in 1954. The other is a 1-franc nickel coin minted in 1960 which is exactly the same size as the older 100-franc coin and which today is its full equivalent. The two coins are entirely interchangeable although one carries the legend "100" on its face and the other carries the legend "1" on its face.

General de Gaulle reasoned that confidence in his country's currency could be rebuilt if people were dealing with a basic unit—the new franc—of some substantial value. In terms of U.S. currency both these coins are equivalent at today's rate of exchange to 20 cents.

Now, if silver serves no useful purpose in maintaining confidence in a national currency, there would have been no reason for the French economic authorities to revert to the minting of silver coinage when they revalued the franc. They could very well have issued a 5-franc coin of somewhat larger size than the 1-franc coin, in the same attractive metal that is being currently used for the 1-franc coin.

But, because the French recognize the desirability of rebuilding confidence in their currency, they decided to issue a 5-franc silver coin. This coin, somewhat smaller than our half-dollar, has a value in terms of U.S. currency of approximately $1 and it has a silver content that at today's prices is equivalent to approximately 40 cents.

A Frenchman can obtain a five-franc silver coin in exchange for five 1-franc nickel coins, or he can obtain ten 10-franc silver coins in exchange for one 100-franc paper note. There is little intrinsic value in the 1-franc nickel coin and no intrinsic value in the 100-franc paper note. But the fact that these denominations can be exchanged for coins of intrinsic value lends an aura of confidence to all French currency now in circulation. The Frenchman who has a 5-franc or a 10-franc silver coin has a virtual guarantee that he will not be subject to the drastic loss of purchasing power that he experienced with his currency during World War II.

The fact that this is available to him is enough to instill added confidence in the entire monetary system. Who can say whether or not this country will at some future date face the situation with which the French have had to cope for the last 30 years?

The lesson of history is that when currency of intrinsic value disappears completely from the monetary system of an individual nation, in due course the currency of that nation loses substantially all its value. This was true as far back as the ancient Greek city-states and the Roman Empire; it was true of Germany, Japan and Italy as recently as World War II.

Today, among the major states of the free world, only the British are without currency of intrinsic value in circulation. In 1946 they began replacing silver coins with base-metal coinage. To use a British phrase, it is still "early days" to judge the eventual success of the change.

The U.S. Treasury still holds more than 1 billion ounces of silver bullion. In circulation there is U.S. coinage containing about 2 billion ounces of silver. Some of this has been irretrievably lost; some is held by numismatists and cannot be recaptured. The great bulk of the silver in coinage, however, is part of the floating supply—it cannot be written off. In due course it will be available to be added to the supplies of newly mined silver—either to be minted into new coins of lower content or to meet the needs of industrial consumers. One cannot turn his back on this huge stock of silver and assume that it has forever disappeared from the marketplace.

The suggestion has been made that if the Treasury decides to mint new coins with some silver content much of the present coinage will go into hoarding. Perhaps. But it strikes us that if the public is told that the new coins will contain no silver at all, hoarding will occur on an even larger scale. The Treasury has no way of measuring in advance the public reaction to these two alternatives—nor can any one else be certain. Each individual holding the present coins will make the decision for himself. We fear that some difficult days do lie ahead—regardless of what the decision is.

Under these circumstances the right decision must be the sound long-term decision. And in our view, all the lessons of history favor maintenance of silver in the coinage.

In the last few days there have been renewed reports that the Treasury has already made its decision on coinage. To an outsider this seems doubtful. Different people in the Treasury have, in our opinion, different views as to a desirable solution. And it would seem logical that a final solution would have to

> undergo the review of the new Secretary of the Treasury, whose appointment has just been confirmed. This is what the Wall Street Journal reported last Thursday; to us it seems entirely logical.
>
> We are confident that the Treasury can find a formula under which it can design a new coinage alloy that will adequately meet the needs of the Nation, using the silver it still has in reserve plus the silver that in due course will be recaptured from coinage now in circulation.

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOSMER. As I understood it, the gentleman is really suggesting that we have some lesser silver content in our coins but retain some silver; is that his objective?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I say to you, Mr. HOSMER, that I have taken that position and the legislation I have introduced will have that result. However, what I am speaking about particularly here today is the matter of necessary controls which will be required no matter what change we have in order, to protect the existing coinage during any transition period.

It is my hope that we will have enough silver and enough time to continue our silver coinage. Under my bill there would be a two-thirds reduction in the silver content, or in other words, there would be 33⅓ percent of its present content of silver.

Mr. HOSMER. I have worried a great deal about the protection of the existing coinage from the effects of Gresham's law, too, during this substitute period, whether we are going to reduce the amount of silver or coin without silver. My own view is unlike that of the gentleman from Colorado. The presence of intrinsic value, metal of some kind, actually is not needed because most people look on coins as a matter of convenience rather than as an indication of wealth of some kind. Other countries have changed over to base metals for coinage without any severe shock to the foundations of their national economy or power. That, of course, is a matter of a difference of philosophy between us. But we do have this practical problem whether you reduce the silver content or go to base metal altogether of protecting this coinage that you have existing now and if you do not protect it, it is going to disappear over night and to see that we will not be going to shinplasters or anything else.

I would like to offer an idea that has been rolling around in my mind for some time, and that is that whatever the new coinage, whether it be coinage with reduced silver or of base metal, that something be included in it which we can include in that coin to keep its value exactly with that of the existing silver coinage.

It is a substance that is possessed by the U.S. Government alone. It is possessed in quantity. This substance is depleted uranium. One can take uranium of any percentage depletion of isotope U–235 down to practically zero and put a small quantity in a new coin of a particular percentage depleted uranium and establish a monetary value on that equal to the actual market value of silver, even if we pull off the $1.29 plug. Thereby we would insulate from the action of Gresham's law. We would be able to go through a transition period to new coinage without the disappearance of the existing coinage because the new coinage would turn out to be as valuable as the old coinage so long as there was established a monetary price on depleted uranium, which has already been done in the case of silver; so there no trick or treat about it at all.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. In one instance the gentleman seems to be saying we should not have an intrinsic value of coinage and in the other instance, he seems to advocate an intrinsic value of coinage.

Mr. HOSMER. I say that only to avoid the application of Gresham's law, the disappearance of silver coins during a transition period from existing coinage to a new coinage, whatever it is. That problem will have to be met, whether we reduce fineness in the new coins or eliminate silver altogether.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I am wondering also, if the gentleman's plan were enacted; would we get into the people carrying the coins be radioactive?

Mr. HOSMER. I am glad the gentleman brought that subject up, because the quantity referred to is of depleted uranium. Not only would it have no radioactive effect, but also it would have no toxic effect, as some metals do.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion. I should like to say that at the present time, throughout the world, not all countries are moving to debase coinage. I should like to have the gentleman take a look at the action of the Government of France, which recently issued a new 10-franc piece. The Government of Italy recently retired a 500-lira note and substituted a 500-lira coin which is 835 fine coin.

It would seem to me a discredit to the United States, when the President asked us to keep a 25-percent gold backing behind Federal Reserve notes, to go to buttons for money in the United States.

Mr. HOSMER. The only thing that protects the money is the existing U.S. Treasury offering of silver to all comers at its particular price. As soon as they stop that, the money will disappear.

Today, the Japanese come in and buy U.S. silver and take it back to Japan and mint coinage about 25-percent fine and thereby make a profit that the U.S. Government should be making on it. I do not see how we can let that kind of a situation persist long.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I say to the gentleman from California, that is why I am suggesting the controls I have enumerated today.

Mr. HOSMER. I do wish to make certain that the gentleman's reference to the French coin is in the context that whatever they put in those coins is protected by U.S. Treasury silver sales policy, which we have to maintain in order to keep up the value of our own coins. The French are getting a free ride on Uncle Sam. There is nothing wonderful about what they are doing.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. That is right. That is why I am suggesting the controls I have suggested today.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BURTON of Utah. I thank the gentleman from Idaho for the contribution he has made today in reminding Congress of one of its constitutional responsibilities—that is, providing for the coin system—and for reminding us that it is our job to set the value. I hope we will keep that in mind.

I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the gentleman. I agree that within a very short period of time something must be done. We must face up to the problem.

I for one—and I am sure this is true of other Members of this body—appreciate the leadership of the gentleman from Idaho in this field. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I thank the gentleman from Utah for joining with me.

Mr. KORNEGAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KORNEGAY. I wish to commend the gentleman from Idaho for his presentation here today.

I want to say that it certainly appears to me to be a timely discussion. I certainly pose as no expert in the field of silver or coinage, but I do recognize the expertise and leadership which the gentleman from Idaho has exhibited time and time again on the floor of the House in the area of silver. As he knows, I have always followed his leadership because I have confidence in the knowledge which he possesses in this very important area. I want to commend him again for bringing this important situation to the attention of the House.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I am very glad that the gentleman joins in the remarks.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to commend the gentleman from Idaho for calling this great issue to the attention of the Congress. I will admit to having been given a very liberal education on silver. I do believe that the proposals of the gentleman in the well ought to be given serious consideration by the administration as well as the Congress.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I thank the gentleman from Hawaii for his remarks.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to recognize my colleague, the gentleman from Idaho and his great ability in this particular field. I am happy to commend him on his presentation and to associate myself with him in his efforts with reference to this very serious matter.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. I certainly want to thank the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to repeat my hope that the Treasury Department will consult with the Congress before making its recommendations for coin changes and methods of conserving our dwindling supply of silver. I have extended to them a chance in every instance so to do, and I only hope they will do this with me.

BRACERO PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time to discuss, and I hope clarify, several basic facts relating to the importation of foreign agricultural workers. It is, I believe, essential that every interested party thoroughly understand and accept these facts if we are to get on with the vital job of developing and stabilizing an adequate domestic labor force for our great agricultural industry. I know I do not, and I am confident no one else desires to see crops rotting in the fields. I am certain, also, that the responsible people at all levels of government will give the Nation's growers every reasonable and necessary aid to insure the harvesting of this year's crops. But, the growers must make more than a token effort to deal with their own problems. And, in dealing with these difficulties, they, along with their proponents in Congress, as reasonable men, will come to understand the basic facts as they exist today.

THE BRACERO PROGRAM IS DEAD

The initial fact, which is apparent to all who want to see it, is that Public Law 78, the so-called bracero program is dead. This law, enacted for 2 years in 1951 and extended 6 times since, was a temporary wartime emergency measure. That emergency passed long before the law died and there can be no justification, if indeed there ever was justification, for that program or any program which breeds on the poverty in one country to perpetuate and extend similar conditions in our own country.

The 14-year history of this law is a story of poverty, human suffering and exploitation. It is the story of a system that emulates slavery in all its social, economic, and moral wrongs; a system that exists for the sole benefit and enrichment of a very small but powerful segment of our agricultural industry. It is the result of a philosophy which holds that an exclusive few have an inalienable right to cheap, tractable labor, and that this right exceeds all moral or legal considerations.

Over the years, Congress in its wisdom, came to recognize these great moral, social, and economic injustices being perpetrated upon American and foreign workers and saw fit to end this program but not without first giving growers, the users of braceros, clear and ample warning that they must look elsewhere for their labor supply. When Congress, in 1963, extended Public Law 78 1 more year, it did so with the clear and unequivocal warning that this extension was to be the final extension.

Many Congressmen, including some who supported Public Law 78 through its numerous extensions, stated flatly that this was the last time they would petition Congress for an extension of that particular act.

And, the chairman of the Senate Agricultural Committee, Senator ELLENDER, emphasized the warning when he stated:

> It is my belief that by giving this notice in advance, the proponents of this law will be warned that the Senate will not act again on this measure and they (the growers) must begin to look elsewhere for relief.

Public Law 78 is dead. It is dead because Congress determined that this barbaric, feudal practice, the wholesale importation of foreign labor, was not within the scope of American principles.

I have noted, with some concern, the mounting volume of compliments and criticism being directed at the Secretary of Labor, W. Willard Wirtz, for his policy with regard to the mass importation of foreign workers. I think it is important—no, an absolute necessity—to set the record straight in this regard.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RONCALIO. Mr. Speaker, I am listening with concern and with great regard to the statements of the gentleman from California. May I add that I am one of those whose voice has been added in the last month or two with genuine concern of criticism of the Secretary of Labor for taking the role of an advocate instead of going out and finding facts. I am happy to see that since these speeches were made from the well of the House the Secretary did in fact go out to the district referred to by the gentleman to get a firsthand report.

Now, I would only like to say this: I intend to remain in the Chamber and continue listening to the statement of the gentleman and be thus additionally informed. But I hope the gentleman will give us an opportunity to discuss with him—some of us who want not a new law, even though the law is dead, we recognize it is a way that we can continue a practice which we do not happen to feel is quite as barbaric as the gentleman from California says.

I would like to say further that any time you pay a human being salary and wages for work performed, I do not believe it can be called a barbaric situation.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman from Wyoming and I appreciate the spirit in which his remarks are made. However, I believe before I conclude my statement we will have covered some of the points which he makes.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I appreciate the gentleman yielding and I shall try very much not to interrupt the gentleman until he has concluded his statement. But, I would like to make this point.

The gentleman said several times that the bracero program is dead. As of now I think it is. I would also say that the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] can take with great pride almost full credit for having been the chief executioner.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks, but as he well knows, the defeat or the eventual phasing out of Public Law 78 was something upon which the Congress took action, although, indeed, my attitude and opinions and my advocacy of the elimination of this program are well known to the gentleman for whom I have a very high respect. As long ago as 1959 the gentleman will recall that, standing in the well of this great Chamber, amendments were offered to the bill which would phase out the program. They were offered first for a period of 3 years. Then they were offered for a period of 2 years, but they fell upon deaf ears. Members of the other body did the same thing.

I say to the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. RONCALIO] and some of the others who have just entered this great body, there is nothing new about this issue. The cries that we hear now about the intensity of the program are cries that we have been hearing over a long period of time. They could have taken these measures a long time ago.

But, Mr. Speaker, what I want to develop today is the point that there are adequate solutions to this problem and that we do not need to be overly concerned, providing certain measures are taken.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us review the situation. The policy to halt the mass importation of foreign labor, it must be clear, is not that of the Secretary of Labor. This was done by the Congress and the personalities apart, I am sure my good friend from California [Mr. TEAGUE] will agree that the action was taken by this Congress.

We heard Members who voted for the gentleman's request for a year's extension get into this well, one after another, and say they are going along with the gentleman's request and his colleagues who were supporting the year's extension, but that this was the last time.

Mr. Speaker, the record is replete with that, and in the interest of time, I have avoided detailing this.

So the point is that, we had adequate warning. It has been quite clear that the program is over and that the Congress has taken an express position on this subject. Any such criticism or compliments about the termination of this program, should not, I submit to you gentlemen, be directed to the Secretary of Labor, but to the Congress. For as has been suggested by many growers in many of the areas, if the Secretary of Labor should attempt through administrative action to reinstitute a program of mass importation of foreign labor, he would be doing so in direct opposition to the will of the Congress, as expressed in the actions that we have noted.

And, Mr. Speaker, let me make it very clear at this juncture that Public Law 414 from the Immigration and Nationality Act was not and is not intended as a substitute for Public Law 78. If it is used as such, legislative action will be necessary.

THE CROPS ARE NOT ROTTING—THEY ARE BEING HARVESTED

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to make this point, because I think it is absolutely vital and it is something that pervades this discussion whenever we get into it.

We hear the crops are rotting in the fields and are not being harvested. This is April 1965. These dire warnings of crops rotting in the fields for want of someone to harvest them so far is nonsense.

The simple fact is that the crops are being harvested and in some cases in advance of last year's harvest. To date, the only reported crop loss by the Department of Agriculture was the result of a freeze January 18. The Citrus Growers Mutual claimed a $4 to $5 million loss, a figure not yet substantiated. And, it is entirely probable that this figure represents the difference between the Department of Agriculture's October 1964 estimate of an 83.6 million box orange crop and the February 1965 revised estimate of 80.6 million boxes. In other words, the claimed crop loss might, in fact, be no loss at all.

Equally significant is that while growers were crying over labor shortages and loss of crops the juice concentrate plants in Florida were working at full capacity—24 hours a day, 7 days a week—and could not have processed additional citrus if available. I have ample newspaper stories to document the point that has been made.

Mr. Speaker, evidence that the crops are being harvested is conclusive. The orange crop in Florida is 44 percent greater this year than it was last. Despite this, 65 percent of this year's crop is already in, compared with only 57 percent a year ago. In terms of total production, there has already been 47,450,000 boxes of oranges harvested for this year compared with 28,668,500 boxes for the like period in 1964.

Nor has there been a crop loss in other States, including California where lettuce and lemons have been and are being picked. As recently as March 15, a State of California in-season report made clear that "market conditions, particularly in lettuce and green onions, have had a depressing effect on the level of employment." This "market condition" is the result of growers controlling production to protect prices.

In mid-February it was reported that growers in California's Imperial Valley had made a gentleman's agreement to harvest lettuce only four days a week in an effort to support prices. At that time a California Employment Service official reported that the "demand for lettuce was good, but because of a marketing agreement, lettuce was harvested only 4 days a week," and that the situation was expected to continue through mid-March, when some of the growers "will have finished cutting."

AMERICANS ARE AVAILABLE—THEY WILL DO THE WORK

In mid-March there were about 24,000 more American workers employed in agriculture than at the same time last year. The total number of Americans employed in agriculture at the middle of March was 290,400.

In California, about 8,000 more domestic workers were employed than at the same period in 1964 and Florida showed an increase of more than 7,000 in domestic workers for the like period a year ago.

There have been times this year when as many as 3,500 foreign workers already in Florida have been put on a standby and did not work because there was no work for them.

Mr. Speaker, these and other facts, I contend, clearly prove that Americans can and will do the work, given the opportunity, adequate pay and decent living and working conditions.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. I think it important that in arriving at the totals of Americans engaged in agricultural employment the gentleman should consider the number of foreign agricultural workers who are on the green program. I wonder if the gentleman can tell me of those there are in California engaged in agriculture in this season of 1964, and how many there were engaged in similar pursuits in 1964 and the years subsequent thereto?

These are pertinent facts to this discussion.

Mr. COHELAN. I think the gentleman asks a fair question in respect to the current figures. I do not have them available but I will be glad to supply them for the RECORD. I do have and expect to supply in the RECORD figures for 1964 which are specific and complete.

Mr. MOSS. Would not the gentleman say that the number of these green-card workers or the probable number classified as part of this increase of domestics should be known if we are meeting this labor need purely from domestic sources?

Mr. COHELAN. There has always been a very active traffic in this kind of labor in our State. I would presume that activity continues. The gentleman's question is a fair one, and I am sure we should deal with it in terms of statistics. I think we can get that for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, in response to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS], I have been advised by the Department of Labor that during the period extending from July 1, 1964, through March 24, 1965, the Secretary of Labor certified 387 requests for immigration from Mexico to work in agriculture in this country. I think this is an important figure to have, as the gentleman has suggested, and I think it is further and significant information that the need for farm labor is being met by American workers.

Mr. Speaker, in further response to the request for information made by the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS], I would like to provide additional data regarding the green-card workers in agriculture.

First, and this I believe is a very basic point, the green-card worker is now and always has been, for the purposes of employment statistics, counted as a domestic worker. Once a work record is established, he is entitled to unemployment compensation or whatever other benefits his type of work provides workers who are American citizens. As a result, the green-card worker is not counted separately and is considered available domestic labor.

Since July 1, 1963, every Mexican applying for a permanent visa to work in the United States has been required to prove that he has a bona fide job offer. The Department of Labor, through its affiliated State employment security agencies, must then check to insure that a labor shortage actually exists in that job classification and that the employment of this worker will not adversely affect U.S. workers similarly employed. On the basis of its findings, the Labor Department may either approve or disapprove admission.

As I reported earlier, between July 1, 1964, and March 24, 1965, there were only 387 Mexicans approved for agriculture work. This compared with 2,099 during the previous fiscal year.

The following chart shows the type of requests and the number approved from July 1, 1963, through March 24 of this year:

Type of request	July 1, 1963, to June 30, 1964	July 1, 1964, to Mar. 24, 1965
Total requests	17,461	20,373
Total approved	4,174	2,832
Nonagriculture requests	8,232	12,430
Nonagriculture approved	2,075	2,447
Agriculture requests	9,229	7,942
Agriculture approvals	2,099	387

Of the 2,099 agriculture approvals in fiscal year 1964, 1,738 were approved in the Dallas, Tex., office. Similarly, from July 1, 1964 to March 24, 1965, 328 of the 387 were approved in the Dallas office.

Furthermore, I have been advised by the U.S. Immigration Service, that the number of green-card workers commuting to the United States on a daily basis to work in agriculture is "negligible."

Mr. Speaker, when we consider the fact that the number of American workers employed in agriculture has increased by more than 23,000 over the figure of a year ago, and when we relate this figure to the very small number of green-card approvals during the last year, it is hard to escape the conclusion that Americans are willing to do farm labor and that more are doing it than ever before.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HANNA. I should like to refer back to the gentleman's remarks in terms of what was behind the action of the House. If I understood it correctly, the action of the House was an adoption of the Missouri plan in the sense of the Missouri slogan, "Show me."

I think it was the consensus of the House that we would never determine whether or not domestic laborers could do the work which was being done by the foreign laborers unless we did away with the bracero program, which many of us felt would return us to a good utilization of domestic labor.

At all times, if I recall correctly, there was in the forefront of the consideration and certainly in the forefront of my mind, that a high criterion of a showing of need was still a possibility of entry into the green card worker field in the 414 program. I am not saying to the gentleman that we have demonstrated what our need actually is, but I am sure the gentleman is not saying now that the Missouri plan has definitely shown that we have no need whatsoever for foreign labor. Is that correct?

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. As he knows, I admire him greatly and respect his interpretation. Indeed, I would be compelled to say that is the interpretation of many of our colleagues who are very interested in this problem in California, and who have an intense concern with this because of the character and nature of their districts.

My view of it is somewhat broader, although it does not completely exclude the possibility of the gentleman's interpretation. I feel primarily that the gentleman is quite correct in assuming what we are facing here is a question of labor supply price in a free American labor market. As the gentleman will recall from going through the debates and the discussions on this issue, we have in this country a great mass of human beings who are available for seasonal labor; who are by far and away the lowest paid people in our society; who are denied the protections of social insurance, unemployment insurance, and compensation insurance; whose average income is low; and who are the most helpless creatures we have in our entire society. In this particular area of work potential we even deny them their labor market.

I, for one, would feel it is high time we define that labor market and try to meet the requirements through the existing labor supply and through meeting the kinds of conditions that will shape up and hold an adequate labor force.

The gentleman knows, and I hate to keep picking on my own State because all of our colleagues from California know that our State is perhaps the most advanced State in the Union in its treatment of migratory labor. At this time it adds little to the discussion to go into detailed criticism of other areas in the country.

This is one of the ironies of the situation, and I am well aware of it. But I say to the gentleman, in California where we do have, and are having, an increasingly diminishing requirement for labor, the very interesting and significant fact is that those growers who have undertaken to provide decent housing and decent conditions, and the minimum requirement for labor in our State—and I could cite some of our great packing concerns that are involved in this—have not hired a foreign worker for many, many years. The gentleman knows this to be true. So my approach to this problem, in reviewing the entire situation, would certainly include the gentleman's interpretation as well as my own.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HANNA. I would just like to say to the gentleman, I hope that he counts this Representative as one who has a deep concern for the plight of these workers to whom he has referred.

But I would hope the gentleman agrees with me that those of us who have districts that are involved in agriculture in the State of California are appropriately concerned when the department of labor of the State of California comes with a report, as the gentleman knows they have come forward with such a report, that there will actually be shortages in certain specialized crops within certain sections of the State of California. I think the gentleman would agree that we are right to entertain some concern here, and the gentleman will agree further that we do not know what the facts are until the season has passed.

Mr. COHELAN. The gentleman will recall that at the outset I made this remark, and I want to underscore it. And I speak today in a tone of conciliation and of trying to get the hard facts out on the table: to get this thing aired and ventilated. As I said at the beginning of my remarks, "I am certain also that the responsible people at all levels of government will give the Nation's growers every reasonable and necessary aid to insure the harvesting of this year's crops."

At this point, Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to permit me to proceed with my statement since there are Members on the other side of the question who have not had a chance to speak.

At the peak employment season last year there were 1,236,500 Americans employed in agriculture throughout the United States. That is nearly twice the total number of foreign and domestic workers employed in either March, April, or May of last year.

I would like to insert at this point in the RECORD, charts showing the increase in domestic workers so far this year in various States:

Number of domestic and foreign seasonal farmworkers, United States, by month, 1963 and 1964

[In thousands]

	Domestic	Foreign
1963		
January	245.9	33.8
February	229.8	30.3
March	252.2	31.5
April	314.5	37.8
May	687.5	52.9
June	1,000.5	77.9
July	1,074.7	58.
August	962.9	71.2
September	1,024.8	105.5
October	959.9	97.9
November	437.9	54.0
December	278.4	41.1
1964		
January	249.3	29.4
February	248.8	26.5
March	267.3	26.7
April	342.5	38.0
May	696.1	51.9
June	998.7	69.9
July	1,236.5	54.4
August	1,050.2	68.7
September	968.3	92.8
October	944.5	80.8
November	517.9	53.6
December	312.1	40.3
1965		
January	279.8	15.9
February	278.8	14.4
March (Mar. 15)	290.4	16.4

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, Monthly Report on the Labor Force.

Employment on crops of major labor shortage,[1] California, by month, 1964 and 1965

TOMATOES

[In thousands]

	Domestic	Foreign
1964		
January	0.4	0.2
February	0	0
March	0	0
April	1.0	0
May	2.6	1.0
June	1.8	1.3
July	6.5	3.3
August	5.8	11.2
September	6.3	38.1
October	4.6	26.6
November	1.7	1.6
December	1.0	1.1
1965		
January	.8	0
February	.4	0
March	.4	0

ASPARAGUS

	Domestic	Foreign
1964		
January	0	0
February	0	0
March	1.8	0
April	4.5	3.5
May	4.3	3.7
June	1.4	4.2
July	0	0
August	0	0
September	0	0
October	0	0
November	0	0
December	0	0
1965		
January	0	0
February	.5	0
March	2.4	0

See footnote at end of table.

Employment on crops of major labor shortage,[1] California, by month, 1964 and 1965—Continued

LETTUCE [2] [3]

[In thousands]

	Domestic	Foreign
1964		
January	1.4	2.0
February	1.2	1.8
March	2.2	1.5
April	2.0	2.0
May	1.8	3.3
June	1.7	4.2
July	1.8	3.7
August	1.6	3.5
September	.7	4.7
October	1.4	6.4
November	.7	3.9
December	.9	2.3
1965		
January	2.4	.1
February	2.0	0
March	2.8	0

CELERY [3]

	Domestic	Foreign
1964		
January	0.8	0.6
February	.9	.5
March	1.0	.5
April	.5	.6
May	.4	.6
June	.4	.8
July	.3	.4
August	.3	.5
September	.4	1.2
October	.6	1.5
November	.5	2.1
December	.6	1.5
1965		
January	.9	.3
February	1.3	0
March	1.4	0

STRAWBERRIES [3]

	Domestic	Foreign
1964		
January	0.3	0
February	0	0
March	.4	.6
April	2.1	2.8
May	2.9	8.5
June	2.1	10.4
July	2.0	6.3
August	1.2	4.5
September	.7	3.7
October	.4	2.3
November	.5	0
December	.1	0
1965		
January	.1	0
February	.4	0
March	.1	0

GRAPES

	Domestic	Foreign
1964		
January	16.7	0.2
February	11.0	0
March	1.4	0
April	.1	0
May	5.4	.2
June	7.3	.4
July	3.0	.9
August	12.5	0
September	51.2	1.2
October	32.6	2.5
November	3.4	.1
December	6.2	0
1965		
January	18.1	0
February	14.8	0
March	3.2	0

MELONS

	Domestic	Foreign
1964		
January	0	0
February	.2	.2
March	.6	.4
April	.8	0
May	2.4	.1
June	3.2	.2
July	1.1	3.2
August	1.2	2.9
September	.5	1.6

Employment on crops of major labor shortage,[1] California, by month, 1964 and 1965—Continued

MELONS—continued

[In thousands]

	Domestic	Foreign
1964		
October	0	0
November	0	0
December	0	0
1965		
January	0	0
February	0	0
March	1.0	0

LEMONS

	Domestic	Foreign
1964		
January	0.6	2.8
February	1.1	3.4
March	1.0	3.8
April	1.1	4.6
May	.8	4.5
June	.6	3.6
July	.5	2.1
August	.3	.9
September	.3	1.0
October	.3	1.1
November	.2	.9
December	.4	2.0
1965		
January	1.5	0
February	3.6	0
March	4.1	.6

ORANGES

	Domestic	Foreign
1964		
January	4.2	0.4
February	3.6	1.0
March	3.3	1.2
April	2.6	1.2
May	3.8	1.2
June	.7	2.2
July	.8	3.0
August	.6	3.1
September	.6	2.7
October	.3	1.5
November	0	0
December	0	0
1965		
January	5.7	0
February	5.5	0
March	5.4	0

DATES

	Domestic	Foreign
1964		
January	(4)	0.3
February	(4)	.2
March	(4)	.3
April	(4)	.3
May	(4)	.3
June	(4)	.2
July	(4)	0
August	(4)	.2
September	(4)	0
October	(4)	.4
November	(4)	.5
December	(4)	.4
1965		
January	0.1	(4)
February	.1	0
March	.1	0

COTTON

	Domestic	Foreign
1964		
January	4.8	0
February	.7	0
March	0	0
April	0	0
May	11.6	0.6
June	10.6	1.1
July	3.7	.5
August	.9	.1
September	0	0
October	10.8	0
November	10.7	.1
December	7.4	0
1965		
January	3.4	0
February	0	0
March	0	0

Employment on crops of major labor shortage,[1] California, by month, 1964 and 1965—Continued

SUGARBEETS

[In thousands]

	Domestic	Foreign
1964		
January	0.3	0.7
February	.7	.6
March	3.3	.4
April	6.3	.8
May	4.5	1.4
June	1.6	2.0
July	2.1	2.5
August	1.4	.9
September	.8	0
October	1.3	2.1
November	2.4	2.6
December	1.2	1.0
1965		
January	0	0
February	1.3	0
March	3.2	0

[1] As indicated by substantial foreign-worker employment in 1964.

[2] Most foreign workers used in lettuce harvest and preharvest activities in 1964 were employed in the desert and the central coast areas. In the former, foreign-worker lettuce employment was between 1,000 and 2,000 throughout the 1st quarter, before trailing off in April. The fall season in that area began in September and foreign-worker employment in lettuce reached a peak of 3,200 on Oct. 31. Foreign workers were used in central coast lettuce activities from March to November, foreign employment reaching a peak of 5,200 in May. A few hundred foreign workers were used in lettuce activities in the San Joaquin Valley in October and November and somewhat more than 100 foreign lettuce workers were employed in the south coast from April to June.

[3] All employment figures for individual crops are as of midmonth. In the narrative discussion of the agricultural labor situation in California, employment figures relate to annual peak employment in the crop, which may not coincide with a midmonth.

[4] Less than 50 workers.

Number of domestic and foreign seasonal farmworkers, Florida, by month, 1963–65

[In thousands]

	Domestic	Foreign
1963		
January	53.5	14.3
February	59.7	13.5
March	67.0	12.9
April	60.6	10.6
May	57.1	5.3
June	32.4	2.7
July	38.9	1.1
August	24.9	1.0
September	28.3	1.3
October	34.3	2.6
November	44.0	9.7
December	49.7	11.8
1964		
January	54.2	12.3
February	58.1	11.2
March	59.7	10.4
April	57.9	8.8
May	54.2	6.8
June	36.1	2.6
July	36.0	.8
August	19.2	.6
September	22.2	.9
October	31.6	1.6
November	47.6	10.3
December	60.5	14.0
1965		
January	69.5	14.1
February	70.7	---------
March	66.9	9.1

Number of domestic and foreign seasonal farmworkers, California, by month, 1963–65

[In thousands]

	Domestic	Foreign
1963		
January	86.3	11.3
February	66.6	11.2
March	59.4	12.3
April	66.4	16.4
May	107.1	29.7
June	128.1	39.3
July	120.6	34.4
August	122.9	34.4
September	157.6	54.0
October	120.6	65.1

Number of domestic and foreign seasonal farmworkers, California, by month 1963–65—Continued

[In thousands]

	Domestic	Foreign
1963		
November	72.8	19.2
December	78.1	12.2
1964		
January	87.6	10.3
February	74.5	10.6
March	65.2	11.2
April	78.0	19.0
May	120.4	29.8
June	127.8	37.8
July	122.6	33.9
August	124.6	36.7
September	161.2	63.9
October	124.4	51.5
November	69.9	19.0
December	80.7	12.7
1965		
January	89.3	.9
February	83.0	0
March	73.2	.6

Estimated number of unemployed workers and rate of unemployment, California, by month, 1964 and 1965

[In thousands]

Month	1964		1965	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
January	469	6.8	519	5.9
February	499	7.3		
March	458	6.6		
April	394	5.7		
May	400	5.7		
June	448	6.3		
July	415	5.9		
August	403	5.6		
September	366	5.1		
October	355	5.0		
November	434	6.1		
December	423	5.9		

Number of domestic and foreign seasonal farmworkers, Arizona, by month, 1963–65

[In thousands]

	Domestic	Foreign
1963		
January	12.0	3.5
February	12.1	3.2
March	11.6	3.6
April	13.8	6.4
May	14.4	5.1
June	14.8	6.2
July	12.5	1.1
August	10.8	.6
September	11.6	2.2
October	14.3	6.0
November	14.9	8.1
December	17.3	5.6
1964		
January	14.2	3.1
February	12.3	2.3
March	12.2	2.8
April	13.5	6.4
May	15.4	4.6
June	17.2	4.8
July	13.9	1.0
August	11.4	.5
September	10.5	2.2
October	14.0	4.5
November	16.5	7.2
December	18.2	5.5
1965		
January	16.0	0
February	15.5	0
March	15.0	0

Acreage and production of major crops, Arizona, 1963–65

ACREAGE

	1963	1964	1965
Lettuce [1]	18,900	17,900	
Cantaloups [2]	17,500	19,700	

Acreage and production of major crops, Arizona, 1963–65—Continued

PRODUCTION

[In thousands]

	1963	1964	1965
Lettuce (1,000 cwt.)	2.930	2,506	
Cantaloups (1,000 cwt.)	2,249	1,970	

[1] Late fall crops.

[2] Spring crops.

GROWER COOPERATION LACKING

Mr. Speaker, there are many indications that a large number of growers have not and are not making a sincere effort to recruit and keep domestic workers. We find story after story in the newspapers emphasizing the lack of grower cooperation in efforts to recruit an adequate domestic labor force. The simple facts seem to be that growers do not want American workers.

Business Week magazine recently quoted the Reverend John Simmon charging some California growers with "systematically sabotaging the campaign, harassing new workers, whittling down new minimum wages, and using other devices to create the illusion of the inadequacy and incompetence of the American farm labor force."

I would like to cite one example showing the bad faith of many growers. It is the report of two men, Gonzalo Miguel Guerra and Ellsworth L. Garrett, who were recruited in Texas to work the citrus groves around Santa Barbara, Calif.

Both men, along with 21 others, had been informed of the great opportunities in Santa Barbara through a recruiting campaign conducted throughout the Rio Grande Valley by the Texas Labor Agency. Apparently, a beautiful picture was painted of citrus work in Santa Barbara. The men were told that workers were averaging $24 to $30 per day, and some even better. They were to be guaranteed $1.25 a hour and 50 cents per box for all over 20 boxes of lemons picked in an 8-hour day. They were told that no experience was needed.

These men arrived in Santa Barbara the 17th of March. They were taken from the bus which had brought them from Texas, handed a bed roll, and told they would be going to work the next day. But, before they could go to work, they would have to take a physical examination.

Now this physical examination is standard practice in California and is required by the insurance carriers to protect them against false claims resulting from previous injuries. And, in lemons, workers must also be checked for colorblindness. Importantly, however, these men from Texas, brought more than 2,000 miles from their homes, were not told of the physical examination before leaving nor was the reason ever explained.

Fortunately, none of the men failed to pass the physical. I do not know what would have happened to them had they failed.

The men were put to work in lemon groves, which they say were well picked over. At the end of 40 hours, some of the men were fired for failure to achieve the required quota of 20 boxes per day. In Texas, no one was told about a quota after 40 hours. At this time, most of the men working out of the camp were averaging 16 to 19 boxes per day. There were several there with experience in lemon picking but only two were averaging the 20-box quota.

The two men mentioned earlier were finally let go after 48 hours because they failed to make the quota. And they were let go with $1.24 net pay for 48 hours work, in a strange town, 2,000 miles from home.

Growers using these kind of tactics certainly cannot be accused of cooperation or interest in seeing that Americans are available to fill our farm jobs.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MOSS. I believe growers using those kinds of tactics are engaging in reprehensible practices and there is not a Member of Congress who would stand up to defend them. They are entitled to every bit of contempt we can have for them.

The gentleman is not contending, however, that they are typical of the growers in California?

Mr. COHELAN. I am indeed not saying so, but I say to the gentleman that they are all too common and that in those areas where this is happening we are having our difficulties.

One of my purposes in taking this special order this afternoon is to bring this out and to urge anyone in the industry throughout the United States who is adopting or using those practices to abandon them.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I certainly would join in urging any farmer and all farmers to refrain from and to avoid any improper practices. As the gentleman who comes from Sacramento so well stated, with scores of thousands of farmers these things are going to happen once in a while, just like once in a while a clergyman does not do the right thing—or a college professor, or a union official, or even a Member of Congress.

I will not take more time now. I will take a special order later, to offer statistics which I believe are completely at variance with the statistics being presented by the gentleman.

Mr. COHELAN. Notwithstanding the fact that the gentleman and I are known to disagree on this subject, I deeply appreciate the observation he has made and I sincerely believe he means it. I would think the evidence may show there are more such persons who may be active in the industry than the gentleman would like to believe. In any event, this is not, unfortunately, an isolated instance.

Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. ROYBAL. It should be noted that the Council of California Growers put out a newsletter dated March 29, 1965, entitled "Impressions: The Secretary of

Labor and the Black Sheep." The newsletter noted:

> The facts are that once again responsible California agriculture has been clobbered by the black sheep * * * by the "chicken neck profiteers" * * * by the operators of filthy, disgraceful, farm labor camps * * * by growers who, incredibly enough, did not have toilet facilities in their fields.

This indicates to me that the Council of California Growers admits that within its ranks there are individuals who do practice the procedures outlined by my colleague from California.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have the entire newsletter printed in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The newsletter is as follows:

IMPRESSIONS: THE SECRETARY OF LABOR AND THE "BLACK SHEEP"

This newsletter is written on the basis of our experiences and observations gained while traveling with U.S. Labor Secretary Willard Wirtz during his whirlwind tour of California. A tour, we might add, that consisted of 20-hour days by a man who appeared genuinely interested in getting all of the facts he could. Facts which he needs to have in order to make the very important decisions he must make. And to get agriculture to understand what he considers the very important facts that we in agriculture must understand.

Speaking very frankly, as indeed we must, if Secretary Wirtz decides to allow supplementary workers to come into California under Public Law 414, it will be because he really understands the problems faced by responsible growers, processors, suppliers, and others during this critical transitional period. It will not be that all the things he saw served to convince him that all California growers are really doing everything they can to fully utilize and maintain a qualified domestic labor force.

And the tragic thing is that this impression was created not so much by growers as by farm labor contractors, by "professional" camp operators including some county-operated facilities, and by others. Unfortunately there were some growers who did contribute to this overall impression. Not many, but enough. And their housing facilities, their lack of compliance with field sanitary facilities, etc., were so bad that—as is always the case—the entire industry got clobbered by the actions of these irresponsible segments.

Mr. Wirtz, the people of this country—and responsible California agriculture—believe that growers must play the game fair and square. And this means providing the type of decent farm labor camp facilities and decent field conditions that will help attract and hold domestic workers. Then if these things are done and still a legitimate shortage exists, then the case will have been honestly and fairly proven.

But as we said, this was not the overall impression which the Secretary gained. Nor was it the impression the members of his staff and press retinue gained. Nor was it the impression that the general public gained.

And this is tragic. For a great many individual growers, Farm Labor Association managers and their staffs—allied industry leaders and key officials from the Teamsters Union—and of course, your council worked their hearts out to bring together with Mr. Wirtz and his party the people and the facts which could accurately and honestly enable him to better understand the many ramifications of our growing crisis.

As was evidenced by the Secretary's extreme interest and request for immediate followup conferences with him in Washington, a much greater understanding of the issues by all concerned came from these discussions. But the overall impression gained by the Secretary, and by the public, was not good. And how much this impression will affect his final decisions can only be guessed at. And we don't like to guess.

We deal in facts. And the facts are that once again responsible California agriculture has been clobbered by the black sheep, by the "chicken neck profiteers," by the operators of filthy, disgraceful, farm labor camps, by growers who, incredibly enough, did not have toilet facilities in their fields.

And, we must add, we are going to continue to get clobbered unless we do something about it. And fast.

To begin with, it is obvious to responsible agriculture—as it is to the public and to the Secretary of Labor—that the type of things contributing to this adverse impression cannot be condoned.

Let's first go on record there.

Then on to the next step. If we, the individual farmer, fall into the category of the minority who would find it "inconvenient" for the Secretary of Labor, or a local or national TV camera to come into the housing facilities we operate, then we'd better start cleaning up. And now.

If we don't operate our own housing—as most of us don't, but do finance it through our farm labor association—then let's make certain that these association-provided housing and feeding facilities fall into the category that we'd be proud to see on national television.

And if we employ the services of a farm labor contractor, then let's make absolutely certain that that farm labor contractor isn't providing the type of housing, feeding facilities, and the like that Secretary Wirtz described as "making me ashamed that anything like this exists in this country." And let us hasten to say that we visited those facilities too. And there was no exaggeration by Mr. Wirtz on this—or any of the other points he made along these lines.

The same applies to those of us who live in areas where our local housing authorities operate facilities right out of the "Grapes of Wrath" era. Facilities such as the Linnel Farm Labor Center or the Cutler facilities, also a county housing authority operation. As you may have read in your local newspaper this is the place where "walking away from the communal lavatory in the center of a circle of ramshackle two- and three-room buildings overrun with barefoot children," Secretary Wirtz shuddered and said, "Did you see that?—God."

As employers, as the people for whom the farmworkers of this country really work, we can't pass the buck on to the farm labor contractor or anyone else. We may employ him to help us recruit, house, and train labor. But the ultimate responsibility for the workers is ours. And the buck stops here.

Most growers in this State already know this. Responsible members of this industry make certain that their labor contractor provides decent facilities and the like before they hire that contractor. And keep on that contractor and/or work with their local association to see that decent conditions are maintained both in the camps and in the fields.

But obviously some don't. And since all of us are hurt—and hurt badly—by the actions of those that don't, it should be obvious that it's up to us collectively and individually to see that the type of things that do exist that are wrong—are made right.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I think there is no question about it, if the gentleman will yield briefly. I think it is a fine thing that the Council of California Growers recognized this situation and are trying to clean it up. Since Santa Barbara was mentioned a few moments ago and it is in my district, it is my understanding that Secretary Wirtz, who spent a little time there a few weeks ago, found absolutely nothing to complain about in the labor camps in and around Santa Barbara and throughout my district. As a matter of fact, he was very complimentary about them.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii [Mr. MATSUNAGA].

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from California for taking this time to inform the Congress on a very vital issue which is still facing the Congress, although we thought we had this resolved a year ago. If the gentleman from California [Mr. COHELAN] is the chief executioner, I was happy to have been one of his followers, and I would say also that he was the chief executioner of an evil which needed to be executed.

Mr. Speaker, the last Congress took a major step toward dismantling legislation left over from past emergencies when it voted to extend the Mexican farm labor program only to the end of December 1964 and then to terminate it. There is a move now among well-intioned Members of this House to revive this program, and I rise to question its wisdom.

I come from a State which has had many years of experience with the problem of bringing in cheap labor from abroad to work on its farms. The State of Hawaii learned long ago that eventually it would have to rely on local labor, adequately paid and decently treated, to fill its needs.

Today the plantation fieldworker in Hawaii earns $24.10 a day, including fringe benefits. Contract labor is a thing of the past. Workers from Japan and the Philippines pass through Honolulu on their way to work on farms in California, but not on our plantations in Hawaii. We have sufficient labor, permanently resident in our State, to do our farmwork.

The administration now has a program underway to end poverty in America. Many Americans are poverty stricken because they cannot work or are unable to find work. But there are many who do work and still hover on poverty because they are paid such low wages.

I have heard it said about some of the unemployed in California that they will not do stoop labor on the fruit and vegetable farms of that great State. It is said that because they can get enough money to live on from relief they will not work. Therefore, we hear, we must revive the program for importing Mexican labor or run the risk of seeing crops rot in the fields.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if it is worse for crops to rot in the fields or for men to starve in our cities. On whom does it reflect, when we say a man will receive more on relief than he can earn cutting lettuce or picking cherries? Does it reflect on the man on relief or on the farmer who pays wages which will provide less than relief allowances? Should you cut relief allowances or raise wages?

The farms of California are no less rich and the farmers of California are no less able than the farms and farmers of Hawaii. Indeed, in all the world there are nowhere to be found farms like those of California. A substantial part of the fruits, vegetables, and other farm products on the tables of all America come from these fields and orchards. Hawaii in particular has been greatly dependent on California for its rice and fresh produce.

I cannot believe that the farmers of California cannot continue to operate without imported labor. What they are faced with now are withdrawal pains—the pangs of adjustment from an easy noncompetitive labor source to a competitive one.

I wonder how many realize that Public Law 78, which we are again being asked to revive, was public law of the 82d Congress, passed in 1951. This law was something left over from the Korean war emergency—and of doubtful necessity even then.

It has expired now. We have buried it, and it should stay buried. The governmental landscape is littered with lingering relics of past programs—still in operation years after the need has ceased.

In ending Public Law 78 we ended a subsidy—a subsidy at the expense of the poorest in America. We had been holding down the wages of American farmworkers by requiring them to compete with imported foreign workers. Now we have said to the farmer, "No more cheap foreign labor. The saving of American men and their families from idleness and poverty takes priority over the saving of your crops at their expense."

In short, Mr. Speaker, we are taking away the subsidy of cheap labor and throwing the farmer into the free, competitive market for American labor. It seems incongruous for many of our farmers, especially our fruit and vegetable farmers, who so long have denounced Government interference in the economy and have boasted that they sought no subsidy from the Government, to have to depend on a special treaty with Mexico to obtain cheap labor. This is a subsidy, Mr. Speaker, a subsidy paid for not by our taxpayers, not by the farmers, but by the American farmworkers who have paid for it now in low wages and in unemployment. Now the subsidy is gone—and American farmers must seek American workers to fill American farm jobs once filled by lowly paid Mexican labor.

The labor is there to find. Unemployment in America is over 3½ million. You do not need to bring workers from the interior of Mexico to work in our fields and orchards. They are plentiful in our American cities and towns and rural slums, looking and waiting for work.

The workers will come, Mr. Speaker, if they are paid enough. They will come if they are treated well, fed well, housed well. They will come if they are offered some continuity of employment, some hope for the future.

Let me say to the American farmers who seek a revival of Public Law 78: You will need to compete with other employment opportunities. You will need to offer a better hope for the future than remaining on relief. You will need to pay men and women enough to support themselves and their families. You will find it necessary to raise wages. This, of course, is the hard way, but it can be done. We did it in Hawaii. We did it through union organization and collective bargaining. But we did it.

The other States can follow our example. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the other States will follow our example if we do not again open our borders to the competition of the Mexican bracero or the influx of farmworkers from other low-wage areas. American workers using machines will replace Mexican hand labor. Jobs for Americans at American wages will replace jobs for Mexicans at Mexican wages.

In the long run, as our Hawaiian plantation owners found, well-paid, skilled labor is the cheapest. We are helping not only our American workers but our American farmers when we keep the border closed against a renewal of Public Law 78.

Poverty will never be ended in America while wages are kept to levels where a man cannot earn over $3,000 a year. For full-time employment this requires a rate of $1.50 an hour. For part-time work or seasonal employment, which is the case on most farms, more than $1.50 an hour must be paid. If wages which provide for a decent living are offered, the fields and orchards will be filled with men seeking to work.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that if the farmers of America will first offer $1.75 an hour and guarantee year-round work and can still show that they cannot get sufficient labor, it is then that we ought to consider revival of Public Law 78; but not until then.

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Hawaii for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, we were discussing a case. I want to pursue this a little further and I want to suggest to you that this is not an isolated instance. It is a pattern that emerges whenever you talk with people who have an intimate knowledge of agricultural work through the country. I think these same growers we have referred to—I will say as an aside, the proverbial bad guys, because not all growers are bad guys—who permit and support such conditions cry that there is a shortage of domestic workers and Americans will not do the work. The problem, I suggest to these people, is not a shortage of workers; it is a shortage of pay. It is a shortage of adequate housing and it is a shortage of decent working conditions. This need not be the case.

There are growers, although I suspect they are still in the vast minority, who recognize the importance of providing clean, livable housing and adequate facilities. These growers are not using foreign labor and have no problem, or very little, in finding agricultural workers.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Does the gentleman not realize that as desirable as this might appear of providing housing, if a man, say, who grows tomatoes on a few acres, needs 60 or 100 extra, supplemental harvest hands for 3 or 4 or 5 days out of the year, he cannot afford to supply those 60 or 70 or 100 workers with houses for the men and their families? It would cost a million dollars.

Mr. COHELAN. What is the gentleman suggesting, then? How is he going to get his labor?

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this problem is so much more complex than my very good friend [Mr. COHELAN] is making it seem, because prices in industry rely to a very large extent upon the lower end of the work force. We recognize the need to house these people in public housing projects, projects where we have substantially subsidized the housing, but you cannot take every 40-acre tract and build housing on the land to accommodate the workers. It is going to take far more than just leaving it to the individual grower.

The large corporate farmer, the one you have mentioned, some of the large packinghouses, have the resources for the continuing demands to permit them to undertake projects on the scale necessary.

But the great majority of the people that I represent are farming less than 40 acres and are not in a position to undertake that type of program.

Mr. COHELAN. May I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. MOSS] and to the gentleman from California [Mr. TEAGUE] that that being so, I feel that the same kind of ingenuity which these operators used in connection with the marketing of their crops and in the use of marketing cooperatives is that which can be employed to provide the basic requirements to get and to hold a working force.

Mr. MOSS. The gentleman is saying that industry is responsible for the public housing in our cities?

Mr. COHELAN. I will say to the gentleman that in the State of California, as he very well knows, our Governor has recently received funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity which are designed to encourage and to develop the proper kind of housing for the very type farm operators about which the gentleman is talking.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

In accordance with what the gentleman was just saying, in southern Santa Clara County, pursuant to the program, the Economic Opportunities Act, the farmers have gotten together and they are in the midst of planning for some very suitable and comfortable migrant housing for agricultural workers of which the Federal Government under the Economic Opportunity Act will pay 90 cents on the dollar and the other 10 cents will be put up by the community and by the growers and the farmers in that particular area.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman from California for his comment.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further just briefly?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I guess the fruit and vegetable farmers are finally getting in on the subsidy. For all of these years the fruit and vegetable farmers have not been subsidized to any material extent in any way, but I suppose this will now amount to a subsidy for them.

Mr. COHELAN. Except to the extent that they were able to get off-the-shelf labor from out of the country.

One such example is 33-year-old Leonard White, production manager and part owner of Flavor Pict Cooperative near Boynton Beach, Fla. Mr. White employs 600 to 700 Negroes, Puerto Ricans, and Texans of American-Mexican ancestry to harvest his tomato and corn crops. Mr. White, whose philosophy is, and I quote:

> Try to put up a good product, but not at the expense of poverty, misery and suffering of my workers.

This gentleman provides meals at $1.30 per day, free housing and many other benefits. He also developed an incentive wage plan that encourages workers to stay the full season and rewards those who do.

Mr. White recently told a Florida newsman:

> Sure, I could exploit these people and make a million like some farmers and then give a lot of money to charity and ease my conscience and get a lot of publicity, but that is not my way. I have found it takes a satisfied person to produce well and a happy worker is better in the long run.

No grower who has made an honest effort to recruit and keep American workers is going to suffer for lack of labor to harvest his crop.

It is entirely possible that limited use of foreign workers will be permitted this year during the peak harvest season, but I emphasize again, limited—and I warn those who may misinterpret these words that it will not happen in the same proportion in any future year. The growers have had more than a year to plan for this, to clean up their camps and improve their working conditions.

Everyone who is reasonable at all realizes that it takes time. But we also realize that unless preparation is made and work started these changes will never come about. Good farm management dictates prompt recognition of labor market conditions and immediate and appropriate steps taken to insure that workmen are available to harvest the crops. Failure to recognize these facts could readily cause economic disaster for some growers.

These are the conditions of a free economic society and each grower has a right to determine his own economic future. It is only fair to warn, however, that those growers who refuse to enter into the free labor market are making unnecessary problems for themselves.

The Department of Labor is committed to use all of its resources to insure an adequate labor supply for those growers who themselves engage in efforts to recruit domestic workers. Growers have a free choice in determining their economic future. The decision is up to them.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, there is another argument that the proponents of the use of foreign farm labor use that I would like to call attention to and one of the many inconsistencies in the growers' strange pattern of logic. For some time now the Florida citrus growers have engaged in a campaign to convince the Secretary of Labor that the very existence of their industry depends on labor imported from the British West Indies. They firmly contend that without this cheap, tractable labor, which cannot leave their jobs on threat of expulsion from the United States, it is impossible for growers to operate. They argue that to pay American workers enough to attract them would drive retail prices to impossible heights.

Interestingly enough, the industry takes exactly the opposite position concerning the importation of citrus fruits and products. With equal vigor, and I am sure, conviction, the Florida citrus industry has been waging a campaign with the U.S. Tariff Commission and Trade Information Committee urging that citrus be removed from the list of commodities subject to trade negotiations and tariff reductions. It is entirely possible that if they lost this battle, the housewife would realize a substantial savings in her citrus purchases.

Apparently the logical inconsistency of arguing for imported labor and against imported citrus does not get through to the grower. In the view of a citrus grower it is apparently wrong for U.S. oranges to compete in the market place with foreign oranges but a necessity for U.S. workers to compete for jobs with foreign workers, willing to work for wages and under conditions far below anything considered substandard in this country.

It is not my objective to criticize the stand of the citrus growers before the Tariff Commission, since, it is entirely possible that I would support their view. Rather, I wish to emphasize that the same standards and principles that apply to the importation of citrus products, should be applied to the importation of foreign labor.

I have heard frequent claims that wages sufficient to attract American workers would price these same citrus growers out of the market. For a moment, let us look at just what the field labor cost is per unit. Grapefruit, sold at retail for 8 to 10 cents apiece has a field labor cost of 0.2 to 0.4 cents apiece. Thus, if the grower were to double his field labor cost for grapefruit, it should not increase the cost to the housewife.

With oranges, selling at retail for 50 to 72 cents a dozen, the field labor cost is 1 to 2 cents a dozen. In like manner, to double the field labor cost of oranges should not increase the housewife's cost by more than 4 cents per dozen.

Examples of per unit retail costs and field labor costs per unit of selected farm products

Commodity	Retail price	Field labor cost per unit
Lettuce	23 cents a head	1 to 1⅓ cents a head.
Celery	15½ cents a pound.	0.3 to 0.5 cents a pound.
Lemons	24 cents a pound	0.6 to 1 cent a pound.
Dates	49 cents a pound	1 cent a pound.
Radishes	10 cents a bunch	1 cent a bunch.
Oranges	50 to 72 cents a dozen.	1 to 2 cents a dozen.
Grapefruit	8 and 10 cents apiece.	0.2 to 0.4 cent apiece.

Source: Farm Labor Bureau, U.S. Department of Labor.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker that the fiction and the myth that to pay a living wage to American workers would result in a skyrocketing of prices to the consumer is obvious. That is not the case, and I hope in the future this argument will not be used, because it is one without any validity whatsoever.

Mr. McFALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McFALL. I wish to commend the gentleman for his statement, and particularly the last couple of paragraphs in which he makes a statement concerning the ability of labor to apply throughout the country. I am interested in California, as is my colleague, and they should comply in good faith with the regulations.

The regulations the gentleman is talking about, the regulations which have been promulgated by the Secretary of Labor that I am refering to, are regulations promulgated on December 17 of last year in which the Secretary sets down very strict conditions under which supplemental labor supply would be available to those who complied with them under section 414 of the Immigration and Naturalization Act.

If the gentleman will permit me, I should like at this time to commend the Secretary of Labor, Willard Wirtz, for the tremendous job he is doing in a very difficult situation. I know he has not quite finished with the job. I hope that in a very short time he will have announcements available to us concerning this program and his lengthy investigation in California of the conditions that we have in that State. I do not know what sort of determination he is going to make, but I feel that it will be an honest and a fair one. I know that he is doing an exceptionally good job under trying circumstances.

I should also like to call to the attention of the Members some language in the report on this second supplemental appropriations bill which passed the House today, and which came out of the committee of which the gentleman and I have the honor to be members. It said:

> The bill includes $560,000, the full amount requested in order to establish an expanded program for recruitment and better utilization of domestic farm labor. The committee is convinced that this is an absolute necessity if a critical situation is to be avoided as a result of loss of foreign agricultural labor due to the expiration of the Mexican farm labor program and the tightening of regulations relating to importation of other foreign labor. The committee agrees that foreign labor should not be imported if there is capable domestic labor available to do the job. However, the timely availability of labor for the harvesting of perishable agricultural products is essential. Lack of it can mean bankruptcy for individual farmers and shortages and higher prices for consumers. Timely availability of labor under current circumstances cannot be assured with the domestic farm labor programs we have had in the past. The committee strongly urges that this matter be given high priority by the Secretary and all in the Department of Labor with responsibilities in this area.

I wish also to commend our Governor, Governor Brown, for the work he has done in this field, and the administration for establishing over $3 million in the antipoverty program which will provide labor standards, rest stops, and other accommodations for the labor force in California. I would hope that with the increased wages which have been brought about by the Secretary through regulation and with strict compliance on the part of the farmers in California, we will have an increased use of domestic labor.

I hope also that regulations will be promulgated shortly indicating that there will be a supplemental supply of labor, assuming that there is a good and fair compliance by agriculture in the State of California with that regulation. I have advised the farmers in my district that they should comply in good faith. I believe that they are. I feel if they do comply, then the supplemental supply of labor will be available to them.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman for his remarks. I know how concerned he is with the problem. I am especially pleased that he has interpreted my remarks correctly.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman from California for yielding to me. I also want to add my compliments and express my gratitude for the work the gentleman from California has done today in calling attention to the facts—the real facts that govern the problem with which the Secretary of Labor is wrestling at the present time. I think we are all proud of the work of the Secretary of Labor. I know this is a time of transition and of adjustment.

Speaking as one who represents an urban district, I think I can say with some confidence that consumers are prepared to pay for these slight increases in those cases that were so well described by the gentleman from New York, if that should be necessary in order to provide reasonable working conditions so that an adequate supply of labor can be procured from domestic sources.

But on this question of the supply of labor, Mr. Speaker, I should like to make clear that not all of the representations that have been made seem to reflect the true facts.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to a newspaper article that appeared recently in the St. Petersburg, Fla., Times. The story was written by Peter Kramer, a Harvard-educated newsman who lived and worked in the Florida citrus groves for a week. His tour of duty was at a time when Florida citrus growers were crying the loudest about their labor shortage. Mr. Kramer noted in his article that:

> From the published outcries of the large farmers and their representatives in Washington about the shortage of labor, I expected to find work easily. To my surprise, I could get only a part-time job at the Pioneer Growers Cooperative packinghouse.
>
> Told to report to work at 3 p.m. the next day, I complied but was kept waiting until 4 p.m. For 3 hours—at the rate of $1.25 an hour—I unloaded crates of vegetables from trucks. At 7 p.m. I was told I was no longer needed, to come back at 4 p.m. the next day—Saturday. On arrival Saturday I was told there was no work, to come back Monday. No apology was made for wasting my time. It seemed not to matter.
>
> When I asked the foreman about the lack of work, he said, "This cold weather's hurt us. There ain't enough work except for the guys that's been here regular. We've had to cut back."

This does not impress me as a situation where a labor shortage exists. In fact, it would suggest very strongly that there is a surplus of labor.

Mr. Speaker, I ask permission that this article be printed in its entirety at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The article referred to is as follows:

MIGRANT WORKER SERIES—I

(By Peter Kramer)

"I was better off back in 1938 than I now. They was only payin' 10 to 15 cents an hour then, but meat only cost 5 cents a pound, so at least you could eat it a couple of times a week. But not now."

The elderly, almost blind Negro sprawled on the steps of a rickety house in the laborers' quarters of a Bean City farm.

Two equally venerable companions—tattered patriarchs of their tiny community—sat beside him, enjoying brief interludes of sunshine during the cloudy, wind whipped afternoon. Around the trio, ragged children and half naked infants played in the dust amid ruins of cars and discarded tires. Strewn garbage lined the row of shabby huts. The blind man, acting as spokesman for the aged trio, went on bitterly:

"We's retired but we ain't got nothin' to show for a life of work. And our young people ain't makin' nothin' neither. It takes a top dog—specially if you's Negro—to get $1.25 an hour at them packinghouses. Only the top few get that. If you can drive a tractor you can make $77 a week—for a 10-hour day, 6 days a week.

"Worst is if you're just out in the fields picking. Take a plain celery cutter now. He gets $9.50 a day or he's paid by piecework. He can't do better than average $50 a week in a good week. And that's for 10 hours, too, with a half hour for lunch. By the time you leave the house and get home again it's 12 hours—6 a.m. to 6 p.m. That's a hard way to make a buck.

"On top of that, if you're black, you sure get the worst jobs and lowest pay, but they don't lower the prices none for you in the stores. You got to pay the same as everybody else.

"Seems like the Government ought to do something, ought to send someone down here to investigate. Otherwise we ain't gonna get nothin'. Trouble is, them people in Washington don't know what's really going on down here. So when them big shots scream about how they ain't got enough workers and how we's lazy and won't work like them offshore workers, how can the Government tell if it's the truth or not? Shoot, there ain't even enough work for the people that's here now. All that noise in Washington about them offshore workers is just so they can get more people than they need and keep pay low.

"Even when them Congressmen do come down here they only talk to the bosses and meet in big hotels. They don't come way out here and see places like this. Sure they pass laws. But it's making them stick that counts."

Rising, the old man beckoned me to follow and shuffled across the dirt road to his home—"a real slum house." He showed me the two dank, dark rooms where he, his wife and seven children lived on $65 a week, provided by a combination of social security, State, and county welfare aid and his aged wife's slim earnings of about $25 a week from agricultural work.

Fumbling about he produced a sheet of paper from the State Welfare Department, informing him his aid was being reduced because it was estimated the average agricultural worker could earn $6 a day and work 20 days a month.

"How can I buy books, clothes, and lunches for my kids so they can go to school and make better lives?" he asked plaintively.

Back outside, two strapping young men stood idly beside the wreck of a truck. They said they were idle because they were truck drivers for a local farmer, making $10 a day for as many hours but could only get work 2 or 3 days a week.

During the week I lived and worked as an agricultural laborer in and around Belle Glade, I heard the same story in varying forms over and over again from my fellow workers. Told always with a mixture of bitterness, resentment, and resignation, it boiled down to low wages for long hours of strenuous work, correspondingly high food and housing costs, irregular employment, lack of job security, and a consequent feeling of being forgotten, voiceless outcasts from organized society.

Negroes seemed worse off than whites with Latins—mainly Texas Mexicans and Puerto Ricans—somewhere in between.

In the Osceola migrant worker camp, run by the Belle Glade Housing Authority, where living conditions were better and less costly than elsewhere, a 67-year-old white woman, her face lined wtih resignation, told a tale similar to that of the old Negro's.

"When I came here in 1944," the north Florida native said in an almost toneless voice, "we was gettin' 50 cents an hour, but housing, one-room, sheet-tin shacks without water or bathroom, only cost $1.75 a week and you could work for part of it. Food was a lot cheaper, too. And it seemed you could always put away a little something.

"Now we pay $4.50 a week rent for them tin shelters. They's the same houses we was paying $1 for 20 years ago except they's older and in worse shape. They boil in the heat and freeze in the cold because there ain't no insulation. And if you lock them up tight in winter to keep warm, the warm air inside turns to water on the cold roof and they sweat on you all night. For food, we have to do a lot with pinto beans. Funny how prices always keep ahead of wages."

The woman said she couldn't live on her social security alone and had to work sorting radishes for Sam Senter Farms, Inc. She said she was paid 85 cents an hour and could get work only 4 days a week, "some days for 2 hours, some for 14."

Pointing up job insecurity, the woman told of two Negro employees who were fired for taking Christmas Day off—without pay—against instructions. "And they was two of his best and oldest workers, too," she noted.

My own experiences confirmed the bleak reality that lies at the center of the vegetable worker's persecution complex.

Applying for a job through the Florida State Employment Service in Belle Glade, I was worried my name might be known due to my stories on Florida's citrus pickers that had run in the Times the same week. I could have spared myself the concern.

Farmlabor placement man C. A. Brinks, Jr., never asked my name on the two occasions I saw him. He simply asked if I could drive a truck. When I said "no" and that I wanted to do agricultural labor he gave me a list of three packinghouses—since whites rarely do or are accepted for fieldwork—and the names of the people to see at two of them.

From the published outcries of the large farmers and their representatives in Washington about the shortage of labor I expected to find work easily. To my surprise, I could get only a part-time job at Pioneer Growers Cooperative packinghouse.

Told to report to work at 3 p.m. the next day, I complied but was kept waiting until 4 p.m. For 3 hours—at the rate of $1.25 an hour—I unloaded crates of vegetables from trucks. At 7 p.m. I was told I was no longer needed, to come back at 4 p.m. the next day—Saturday. On arrival Saturday I was told there was no work, to come back Monday. No apology was made for wasting my time. It seemed not to matter.

When I asked the foreman about the lack of work he said, "This cold weather's hurt us. There ain't enough work except for the guys that's been here regular. We've had to cut back."

Back at the Florida State Employment Service office, I asked Brinks if there wasn't something else I could do. He shook his head. "The freeze we had in mid-January really killed things here," he said. "We've sort of got to grow a whole new crop." He said there was no point in going over to the east coast or Immokalee because "things are probably even worse there. When the work's going, this is the center." He offered no suggestion as to how I might stay alive until the work "got going."

I sought a room at a large, rundown rooming house known as Rutledge's in Chosen, near the Pioneer packinghouse, but was told there was nothing available. The landlady added if anything opened up I could have a sleeping room with a bed but no water, bathroom or even a dresser for $10.30 a week.

At Mrs. Hill's shabby camp, run by the mother-in-law of Belle Glade Police Chief Charles Goodlett, I was told a tumbledown, furnished shack, without bathroom, would cost $15 a week. Garbage littered the camp, beside which ran a stagnant, reeking canal, covered with green scum and swarming mosquitoes.

I finally took a $3-a-night room at Fears Hotel in Belle Glade, for which I paid daily. On my last day, Mrs. Fears told me her books showed I owed 2 days' rent. We argued until I indignantly produced receipts I'd had the foresight to request. She apologized, saying she wasn't trying to cheat me and didn't run "a place like that."

I did not doubt Mrs. Fears' honesty, but the incident shook me.

For I could not help wondering, had I not had the receipts—which few agricultural workers would have requested—would Mrs. Fears have believed her records or me?

And had the police been called, whom would they have believed? An elderly, respected citizen, or a shabby migrant worker like me, without money, home, property or rights?

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. I think it should be pointed out, if I understood the gentleman correctly, that he was talking about packinghouse labor. Braceros are not allowed to be used in packinghouses but only in the fields. So the situation the gentleman cites in Florida would not, it seems to me, be pertinent to our problem with reference to harvest labor in the fields.

Mr. FRASER. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I think the problems here that are described are peculiar perhaps to the situation in Florida and not so much the problem in the State of California. But the fact that there apparently was a surplus of labor is the point that is significant here.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. It might well be that there was a surplus of packinghouse labor but there are a lot of people who will do packinghouse labor but will not do field labor and I feel that should be pointed out.

Mr. FRASER. I am one of those who subscribes very much to the free enterprise concept but when there is a surplus of labor and we know there are a million unemployed Americans today, it seems to me that when we cannot get a person to do a particular kind of work, the problem is that we are not paying that person enough. That is the simple fact and that has been the fact in terms of all the problems that this country has when we seek to employ people to do a particular kind of work.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COHELAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DYAL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me so that I may compliment the citrus growers in my own district for their efforts in the last years to retrain workers and to bring their prices and the payments they have made to workers up in order that they can move into this situation in an adequate way.

I feel also that I should compliment the Secretary who took time out of his busy day to talk to our grape growers and to listen to their problems.

I am one of those who feels definitely that the bracero program is all through—it is done.

I appreciate the remarks of the gentleman on this side, and I would like to associate myself however with the remarks of the gentleman from California [Mr. McFALL]. I feel we must be continually reassured when the crops are at their peak that then we are certain we will have adequate help to take care of the crops.

Mr. COHELAN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I think that the record we have made here this afternoon speaks quite adequately for itself.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. THOMPSON] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for a great number of years many of us from the so-called industrial States of the Northeast have conscientiously given our support to various types of legislation designed to aid the farmer. We have recognized that such things as price supports for farm products are not sectional or partisan issues but rather of national importance. The economic viability of the American farmer is of immediate concern to every American, and I think none here would dispute this.

But while we have exhibited such concern over the years for the welfare of the farmer, I am afraid that for the most part we have sadly neglected another vital aspect of the problem—and that is the welfare of the farmworker. And I refer especially to the migrant farmworker.

By allowing Public Law 78 to terminate, this body has indicated its awareness of some of the deficiencies among our American migrant farmworkers, but it has neglected to follow through with positive programs to improve the lot of what amounts to a sizable segment of our national work force.

In years past the plight of the migrant farm laborer would be briefly uncovered by a documentary television program such as "Harvest of Shame," or by occasional newspaper or magazine articles. The national conscience would be briefly pricked at the realization that the average migrant farmworker earns less than $900 a year, that he has almost none of the protections guaranteed other workers, that he is specifically excluded from minimum wage and overtime regulations, that he has no Federal protection of the right to organize and bargain collectively. Our national conscience would be pricked at these and other shameful facts, but little would be done about it.

Today, however, for the first time in many years, we are at the crossroads in our migrant farm labor problems. The expiration of Public Law 78 and termination of the use of offshore labor has resulted in wide attention being focused on the domestic farmworker. His capabilities, his willingness, his dependability, and above all, his plight, is being discussed, debated, and written about throughout the country, as well as here in the Halls of Congress. But it is primarily here in the Halls of Congress that the problem can be greatly alleviated.

There are bills pending before both Houses at the present time aimed at bettering the migrant's lot—bills on daycare, child labor, sanitation, and so forth. We have finally passed a law dealing with crew leader registration. But this is not enough. These American farmworkers deserve the legislative benefits of our national conscience every bit as much as do our industrial workers.

We have proved our concern for the farmer down through the years. The welfare of the domestic farm laborer is no less urgent. He is an American citizen. He has a family. He is a consumer. He has the right to expect the opportunity to share in our national affluence.

As I said, we are at the crossroads of this problem. The problem has been illuminated and dramatized by the recent visit of Secretary of Labor Wirtz to California where he found deplorable conditions and a blazing need for improvement. Now it is largely in our hands as to which road to take. As for myself, I favor the road leading to a stable, reliable, healthy farmwork force with a positive stake in the Nation's agricultural future.

I believe we can take that road by enacting legislation which will grant to the farmworker those benefits already enjoyed by the rest of the work force—minimum wage, proper housing, education and health facilities, the right to organize and bargain collectively—in short, the rights of full citizenship.

For the farmer, the grower, this is good business as well as good citizenship. The old maxim of value given for value received is no less true here than elsewhere.

I believe we have every right to expect the rest of the country to advocate these needed improvements just as they have a right to expect our continued support of the farmer.

As the welfare of the farmer is a national not a partisan issue, so is the welfare of the farmworker.

I hope this body will act on this pressing matter, and act now.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, Public Law 78 was enacted in 1951. The Korean war had created a temporary male labor shortage and it was necessary to import Mexican workers for seasonal agricultural labor. This shortage does not exist today. On the contrary, the State of California, which in previous years has used 63,000 Mexican nationals in our plantings and harvest, suffers from a pool of unemployed of more than 400,000.

I represent the easterly half of Santa Clara County, one of the fastest growing and most prosperous counties in the United States. Yet, in January of this year, the rate of unemployment in Santa Clara County was 8.3 percent as opposed to a national average hovering around 5 percent.

Amongst the families who have settled in Santa Clara County are large groups of people whose customary means of earning a living is in agriculture as farm laborers. The majority of these families are of Mexican-American descent. Santa Clara County is second only to the County of Los Angeles in the number of Mexican-American residents. The third is Alameda County, of which I represent the southerly one-half. Although exact figures are not available, the best estimates are that the Spanish-speaking population of the metropolitan San Jose area is from 75,000 to 100,000, of which perhaps 20,000 are farmworkers. They are fine people. I am proud to be their representative in Congress and an important part of my job is to protect their interests.

The bracero program of the importation of foreign agricultural workers continued even after the labor shortage of the Korean war no longer existed, and increasing damage was done to residents who normally earn their living as agricultural workers. The rate of unemployment of agricultural workers in my counties runs as high as 20 percent. Twenty-three percent of the welfare cases of Santa Clara County are of Mexican-American origin.

The Congress refused to extend the bracero program past December 31, 1964, and there is no doubt that the termination created serious problems for the 3 percent of the American farmers who have become accustomed for 14 years to having the Federal Government arrange for the periodic importation of low-cost Mexican labor. The Department of Labor of the United States and California authorities are energetically cooperating with the farmers in efforts to develop a satisfactory domestic labor force. The program has been successful as of this date and there is no evidence of serious crop loss because of the unavailability of satisfactory labor. The domestic workers are available. There is no shortage of manpower in our country to do this work. The difficulty is that the farming industry has not been exposed to the forces of a free labor market for 14 years and, therefore, has not developed wages and working conditions sufficient to attract an ample labor supply.

Today, agricultural workers are amongst the lowest paid and poorest sheltered workers in the Nation. They receive few of the benefits enjoyed by labor as a whole. Most live under pitifully degrading conditions. More than 80 percent of farmworker families live in dwellings which violate standards of health, safety, and comfort. Nearly 65 percent of the dwellings occupied by fieldworkers are dilapidated or deteriorated. Pit privies still serve 33 percent of the dwellings occupied by general fieldworkers. Thirty percent of the dwellings have no bathing facilities and 25 percent lack even a kitchen sink or running water.

Our job is not to extend Public Law 78 or to permit the importation of foreign workers under any other law. Our job is to make the fullest and most effective use of our domestic labor supply. To do this we need to reappraise farm wages, health and retirement plans, housing and all the other areas that concern working men and women.

No doubt a good part of agricultural work is difficult and unpleasant. But this is not the whole picture. The rest of the picture is that wages for this work have been less than that paid for other kinds of work which are just as objectionable. We have had increasing complaints against the importation of these hundreds and thousands of foreign laborers, being paid wage rates as low as 60 cents an hour, while more than 4 million American men and women are unemployed.

It is ridiculous to say that American agricultural workers will not do stoop labor. Domestic farm laborers will perform stoop labor, but not for stoop wages and indecent living conditions.

Mr. Speaker, the experiment of offering wages and benefits for farm labor which would be comparable to those available in industry has never been tried. But it is the clear intention of Congress that the farmers can never again expect Government authorization for the mass import of cutrate foreign labor to harvest American crops.

It is up to the farmers of America, assisted by the Government and labor organizations, to seek in good faith the development of an efficient, dependable, and permanent program to develop a dependable domestic force.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CROPLAND RESTORATION PROGRAM OF 1965

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HALL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which can well be called the Soil Restoration Act or the cropland restoration program of 1965. This is a bill which I have disseminated among many members of the House Committee on Agriculture, and even in the other body, but today's edition is revised, especially on page 8.

It is not presumptuous, after 15 to 18 months of work and research, for a Member from a rural area and who is privileged to represent those engaged in farming to submit such a bill, even though he may not be on that esteemed Agriculture Committee.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I realize fourfold that armies travel on their stomachs and that we must maintain our basic economy from our God-given resources in this Nation, if we are to continue to be successful in business, industry, defense, or any area which involves consumption of food and fiber stuffs.

There obviously is confusion about the handling of the farm problem in these days in the executive branch and the Department of Agriculture. Certainly, yesterday's Presidential message on the subject, and even the state of the Union message, indicated only a continuation of the same problems.

There is little agreement among the various farm organizations, and farmers continue to leave their homes. Therefore, I say it is propitious, if we have a solution, that it be advanced toward the solving of the farm problem.

The general purpose of this bill is so that the Secretary of Agriculture, in determining the price to be paid to the farmer for soil restoration, will always consider the supply of each commodity. When a surplus threatens, the price offered for a soil restoration crop will be higher, thus making it more profitable for the farmer to utilize a second market, or a restoration market, if you please. When shortage threatens, the price offered for soil restoration would be lower, thus providing an incentive for the farmer to shift from the soil restoration market directly back to the commodity market.

In fact, the Secretary of Agriculture could, contrary to the present practices of subsidizing those who turn farms into the conservation reserve or wasteland, let them grow up with winged elm or cedar or buck brush, and they could not be then put back into production for a long time. This would actually be declaring a privilege of restoring the soil in this program that I am presenting.

Under this program the farmer himself will have four options, which Members will note involve the consumer.

First. He can accept the Government offer for a soil restoration crop to be plowed under, thus enriching the soil for future generations, as well as nitrogenizing it, and other requisites.

Second. He can reject the offer at the time that the estimate is made per dry ton of cover crop and go ahead and produce on the commodity market.

Third. He can ignore the Government offer and after producing his "mother crop" grow a second crop in that same season.

Fourth. Finally, he may well elect to reject the first option and plow under, and then farm improved land, including pastures, not only this year but in future years; or he may do the selfsame each year.

I wish to state specifically, before getting into the body of this talk, that the cost, contrary to what some have estimated about the general farm bill, will be less than at present or less than under the bill the Farm Bureau has submitted, because at present we are considering that it will go into effect in 1966 and will be offset by the cost of the price support program and surplus storage being reduced.

This will easily eliminate the cost of surplus storage or production. Second, it could be blended into part of the administration program which advocates a long-term 40-million acre conservation reserve, because on the basis of samplings taken the length and breadth of this country, over $60 million will be placed in this cropland under the existing program on a voluntary basis, because it becomes profitable to the farmer. At the same time it is well worthwhile for the consumer.

Finally, this bill is not back door spending since the Committee on Appropriations has to appropriate funds under section 107(c) annually.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to present today an analysis and suggested solution to the farm problem of the United States. It is based on the last two chapters of a book written by E. M. Poirot, of Golden City, Mo., entitled "Our Margin of Life."

"Gene" Poirot is a member of the Southwest Missouri Farm Advisory Council, whose advice I have often sought for guidance and comments on farm issues.

I hope the House Committee on Agriculture will invite him to appear and to explain in detail the mechanics and the genesis of the solution I am suggesting for consideration by the Congress. The Kansas City Star, in reviewing his book last year, called it the best book on conservation in the last decade. But "Our Margin of Life" is much more than merely a book on conservation, as the two major farm editors in southwest Missouri will attest. It is, in my humble opinion, the most appealing and the most practical answer to our farm problem yet presented, and I believe it offers a basis for unified action, on which all major political parties and farm organizations can agree, along with the producers and consumers of farm products. I am offering it in bill form today and hope the House will take the time to give it the analysis and study required to make an informed judgment.

It would appear to me that we now have no "consensus" on the farm problem or laws thereunto, but most people agree there is too great a variation between income to the producer and his increasing costs as a consumer.

To solve this problem we must upgrade the producer's income, while at the same time restoring our soil and maintaining it as this Nation's margin of life.

Herein lies a program that for the first time considers the consumer as an integral part of this nationwide problem, and at the same time will not disrupt the entire basic economy of the rural community.

It can and will maintain family farms as a unit and in my opinion cost far less than present programs while eliminating costly surpluses, restoring our margin of life, the soil, for future generations, and stimulating the farmer to use his inherent and acquired know-how toward the ultimate goal of not only soil and water retention, but for utilizing the present state of technology. From such a program can come an end to the shift away from rural oriented communities toward our already overpopulated urban areas, better nutrition, and a new attraction at the rural level for industrial expansion in the food and fiber processing and distribution fields.

The correction of our previously futile efforts toward stabilizing the rural economy, as well as assuring food and fiber for the consumer, cannot come about by perfecting an imperfectable system. A new approach is needed, and I believe it is at hand.

Although this preview will be followed up with the details of the program, I suggest for consideration by the executive as well as the legislative branch of Government, the point to be made today is that the approach I offer is broad enough in scope to be applicable to the many and diverse areas of farming, and it is voluntary as well as profitable for the producer.

I am convinced it can stand the test of study and debate and urge that it be considered with a view toward implementation and further improvement if that be possible.

I earnestly urge its detailed consideration and adoption by all concerned. There is no pride of authorship in this obviously composite and cooperative effort. Mr. Poirot, a master farmer and soil scientist has shown the way. You all have a copy of his book. The Farm Bureau concurs in all but section 103 of the bill which it has not seen. Other farm organizations surely can have no objection when they have an opportunity to see the bill we are introducing today along with an invitation for all to participate and adopt for their own. The Department of Agriculture and the administration should hail it as a logical, long ranged, experience based and proved requisite for both eliminating our surpluses and excessive storage while conserving for future generations.

Today the farm problem is different things to different people.

To the farmer, the farm problem is essentially, low income, surplus accumulation of products, depleted soil, and a market limited to food and fiber production without his control over the cost of what he buys or sells.

To the consumer, the farm problem is the need to maintain an abundance of food and fiber, better in quality, reasonable in price and the assurance that the population explosion does not one day turn our surpluses into dangerous deficits.

To the rural economy the farm problem is to strengthen demands from the farms for supplies and services, and to maintain a flow of farm products in exchange for products from the other elements of our economy.

All of these problems can be solved for farmer, consumer and rural communities, if farmers are provided with a chance to produce for a "second" or alternate market, which buys a suitable farm product at a predetermined price in direct competition with the present market for food and fiber at the supply and demand price the consumer offers.

The second market of which I speak, and which is the nucleus of the program I recommend, is the soil restoration market. The shortcoming of the old soil bank plan was that we paid farmers merely for letting land stand idle, rather than giving him an incentive for restoring that soil for future generations.

In order to be effective for the farmer this "second market" should:

First. Buy tons of a suitable crop growing alone for one year which by its yield measures soil productive values and those added by the farmer.

Second. Buy the suitable crop at a definite preannounced price which is high enough to give the farmer the equivalent of "parity of income," "a minimum wage," or a "cost of production," but even more important high enough to keep the national agricultural productive capacity in line with the demands of our increasing population, now and projected.

To the farmer this means an increased net income from the fixed price per ton of the second market because production for it comes from his less fertile land. He also has a net income increase from producing food and fiber on his richer land where costs per unit are lower. He has freedom to produce for either market according to his judgment based on his costs of production and the prices offered for his products.

In order to be effective for the consumer the second market should:

First. Buy tons of a crop proving the degree of soil, restoration accomplished so as to encourage soil improvement for higher yields, thereby resulting in greater net profit to the farmer without a great increase in price to the consumer.

Second. Buy at a definite preannounced price high enough to encourage farmers to continue soil restoration for the present and the future to protect our soil potential to produce for more people in coming generations.

The consumer will then have abundance in proportion to his demand for it. Food and fiber grown on better fertilized land as measured by the yield of the suitable crop—now already known for most soils—will be higher in quality and in many cases nutritional value. The cost of this abundance will remain low to the consumer because the second market will control its price level. The farmer will make extra profits by lowering production cost per unit on the richer land. The money used in the second market, and the labor and management of the farmer will pay the cost of improving poor land to be used to produce for the consumer year after year in generations to come. This will assure the consumer abundance and better quality at reasonable cost for the present and the future.

In order to be effective for the rural economy the second market should:

First. Buy tons of a crop growing alone for 1 year which measures soil fertility and soil restoration. Both of these are to be done at the farmer's cost, for the purpose of increasing his yields so as to earn the higher per acre payment.

Second. Buy at a high enough price to give the farmer a net profit floor for his acres below which he need not go in shifting production to any other crop and which he can offer as security for any borrowed capital.

The local economy will be assured a continued farm demand for supplies used by the farmer and the farm family in the production of products for both markets. The productive capacity of the farms in the community will be maintained or increased as the demand by the consumer becomes greater. This increased capacity in the hands of the farmer cannot result in surplus accumulation as it does now. Any market buying a nonsurplus producing crop at a price high enough to result in a net profit, will prevent surplus accumulation in any product the consumer wants to buy, at a lower net profit to the farmer. If the nonsurplus crop bought in the second market causes the restoration of poor land, then in addition to the immediate net profit features mentioned above for the farmer, it will reduce his per unit cost of production. It will provide the consumer with abundance at a reasonable price and safeguard the rural economy all at the same time.

In actual practice for the Corn Belt the suitable crop could be sweet clover grown at the farmers expense occupying the soil alone for 1 year to be bought at $25 per dry weight ton—more or less—plowed under at any time the farmer may wish to sell it and grown on any amount of his acres of cropland in any number of tons he may choose to grow. Preliminary estimates indicate that a second market offering to buy a suitable crop at the price of $25 per ton would take out of production 20 percent—60 million acres—of our cropland at a cost near $2 billion and thereby eliminate the following: Cost of surplus storage, cost of giveaway programs, present acreage control costs, the cost of present soil improvement practices partly paid for by the Government, and other cost related to those programs providing Government financing to low-income farmers.

The cost to the Government for doing soil restoration this way is more than justified as a measure for protecting the health and food supply of all citizens. It is a long overdue attempt to hold the food producing resource of soil fertility at a level even now too low to be safe for supplying the needs of our increasing numbers of people. The cost of restoring this food producing resource becomes a ridiculous argument when we are already paying for the destruction of the mineral resources of coal, oil, rock, and so forth, by allowing a "depletion" figure up to 27½ percent of gross sales to be taken from income taxes as a cost item for those who mine these resources and who cannot return them for future use. The "second market" suggested here pays for returning our one indispensable natural resource of soil plant food, our margin of life by employing farmers to do so at a living wage income, a floor below which production for any food or fiber need not go.

Offering farmers, 43.4 percent of whom are already poverty stricken, an opportunity to do something of such real value for an earned profit, removes the sting of failure, revives hope, courage, pride, and the will to try again.

It is a far departure from present farm programs run by an ever-increasing number of people giving ineffective directives, enforcing restrictions, complicating participation, and earning more money than most farmers do; for administering crop control and a soil conservation program which has not worked. Its failure is emphasized by the facts that during the past 10 years farmers have produced 95.5 percent more products, used three times more plant food from our soil than that returned in fertilizer, suffered a 10.8-percent net loss of income, and have brought poverty to 43.4 percent of their families. New farm programs following the old path will add insult to already evident injury.

I call upon the Congress and the various farm organizations of the United States, plus the individuals interested as operators, consumers, or the entire rural economy, to address themselves immediately to the forthcoming bill based on restoration of the soil, and including soil restoration market so that we may maintain our balance of life in nature, predicated on the greatest basic God-given resource that any nation has ever known, namely its producing soil, toward maintaining our margin of life. We are indebted to the master farmer from the Ozarks, Mr. E. M. "Gene" Poirot, R.F.D., Golden City, who wrote the book by the same title, that was distributed to every Member of Congress last year by the undersigned and this year by Senator STUART SYMINGTON, the senior Senator from Missouri. I commend it to your earnest attention as the correct approach and ultimate victory over our staggering problem, if we are, in these days of increased national product and delivery means, to be not only a producer for our consumers domestically, but our brother's keeper the world over.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include the two principal newspaper letters to me concerning this particular bill, and/or the book "Our Margins of Life," Springfield Newspapers, Inc., Mr. Tom A. Ellis, farm editor; and from the Joplin Globe Publishing Co., Mr. Bob Cooper, farm editor. I think they will be worthwhile to all concerned.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SPRINGFIELD NEWSPAPERS, INC.,
Springfield, Mo., March 24, 1965.

Representative DURWARD G. HALL,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR DOC: Sorry I couldn't meet with you and Gene Poirot this past weekend when you were home, but at that time I had had no opportunity to go over the copy of the bill you propose for agriculture, nor to consider the amendments he would include. Last week was a busy one with Johnny gone a couple of days right at the weekend when things hum the busiest on a newspaper.

Doc, I think that while you and I are on opposite sides of the political fence, not to mention being several degrees apart in our whole political philosophy, we still have room for a lot of respect for each other's integrity and intentions. Now in the matter of this bill I think we are finding common ground. I've known Gene and his theories much longer—not necessarily any better—than you. We both think he has something that is really promising. Moreover, we both know that what has been tried in the past in the way of Federal agricultural policy has not worked too well—the pain may have been alleviated, but it was not cured after fair and long trial. Now here is something that might work; in fact, I'm convinced it will work if given a chance.

Moreover, I think the chances for this bill are better than at any time in years.

The President will call for greater land retirement and for longer periods of time, I understand, in his next message on agriculture. Leon Keyserling, architect of much of the Democratic economic policy of recent years, points out that America is not tackling the farm problem properly—and has not been—probably because the country does not really recognize what the problem is; suggests that we are worrying about surpluses when we should be infinitely more concerned about the future and its demands on what now appear to be the limitless capacity of our farmers to produce. Just as Gene has been doing, Keyserling is worried about depleting our great soil resources when we ought to be conserving and building them, and because we are pauperising the farmer to whom we must increasingly turn in the future in dependence for our very existence.

Now the time is ripe and Gene's plan is ready. I'm enthusiastic about your proposal to write it into law. I hope you will accept the changes he would incorporate. Here it appears to him—and I must agree—is the kernel of the plan; the thing that will keep the plan voluntary, yet draw in the farmer on a basis of commonsense and good business.

Therefore, the year-to-year flexibility proposes is essential—the Governor to slow down the agricultural machine when abundance threatens to become burdensome surplus, or to speed it up in years when leanness might become scarcity. It's a beautiful solution: purely voluntary, the threatened and incipient surplus incorporated back into the soil as a deposit for future sight drafts in time of need; a plan that will be cheap for the consumer and taxpayer.

The incentive to true conservation is there: it will pay the farmer to conserve and to build the productivity of the soil he conserves—actually to build marginal land to higher productivity even while it is lying fallow.

Now, Doc, you and I know what most Americans do not know, that soil depletion even in this enlightened age is still tremendous. Well, this is the time to tell America—the time when Americans after a national lifetime of apathy and indifference to conservation will be eager to hear and to heed. The population explosion is getting big headlines—we've published perhaps a dozen major stories on it in this still new year of 1965. That publicity will continue with ever greater emphasis.

Therefore, Americans are willing to believe now that that vague possibility of a dimly distant future shortage is no longer vaguely possible and in a dim future, but is actually and alarmingly almost on us, no further away than tomorrow. We mustn't let an alarmed America buy phony panaceas when we know a real cure is at hand.

I've gone to this trouble to try to convince you of my enthusiasm and my humble support. I honestly think that properly spearheaded by some one outside their ranks, this theory can be sold to farm organizations. (What can even the Farm Bureau find wrong in it when it fits its own policies of Government hands off and voluntary cooperation by the farmer? Yet, I warn you, that will be your toughest hurdle for you'll need the cooperation of all, and so help me, I've never known them to agree on anything.)

I may be a nasty critic, but I'm an honest one; and here is one case where I'll help you all I can. The only class of people for whom I have a soft place in my heart is the farm class—the poor, downtrodden, godawfully efficient, helpless sons of the soil.

Respectfully,

Tom A. Ellis,
Farm Editor.

The Joplin Globe Publishing Co.,
Joplin, Mo.

Dear Gene: Thanks so very much for the book. I shall treasure it for years to come and it will always occupy a prominent spot in my library.

Mr. Hall's farm program, as outlined in the draft you were so kind to permit me to read, is like a fresh breath of air after being in a smoke-filled room from several hours. Some of the points have been incorporated in proposed farm legislation of the past, but I have never witnessed so many good and realistic ideas in one message, specially your additions.

The flexibility feature is particularly appetizing, and the element of choice it leaves for the producer. The soil restoration principle is the "gizzard" of the whole thing, and I hope that we have become enlightened enough in agriculture that this much must, not maybe, be done.

The element of self-determination is involved (alien to most farm programs both instituted into law and just discussed in past years) in which you state in your notes the farmer can make a judgment on balancing off the Government route with the free market, or enterprise, avenue.

I first thought the idea of unlimited tons grown on any number of acres was a bit prodigious, but the force of market factors would rectify that provision within reasonable bounds. The point you make in a scale of values (p. 3) as to potential yield and incentive for even higher restoration qualities of the soil is well taken and caught my eye. This is further broadened in the proposed year-to-year adjustment in Government payment rate given in section 4 on page 3.

The words "incentive," "encouraging," "restoration," "soil improvement" indicate good soil stewardship resulting from agricultural know-how and acumen—and Dr. Hall should be commended to be interested enough and concerned to a degree to go to farmers for ideas. It makes me think, possibly there is a chance of sanity in modern, Federal farm programs. The program drafted by the Congressman, with your addendums, is a giant stride in that direction.

You will note I have little to add to the draft of the fine program; and, this is simply because I endorse the principles embodied in the proposed program. Any changes that I would suggest would be minor in content.

The program as outlined, again in contrast to so much of the past, is farsighted, inclusive, and takes into consideration our responsibility for preserving the soil for future generations, at less cost by the by than current methods, now ranging over $7 billion.

Thank you Gene, for letting me look this over. I found it edifying, informative, revealing, and encouraging.

Lang Rogers inspected it, too, before I sent it back. And thank you again for your book. You must be (or should be) very proud.

Very truly yours,

Bob Cooper.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and that all Members have 5 days in which to comment on this bill, if they so desire.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALL. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. Teague] who has had great experience on the Committee on Agriculture and in the farmlands of California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding. I want to compliment and commend the gentleman for his interest in still another field. The gentleman from Missouri, Dr. Hall, is certainly one of our most able Members. I had not realized before he had so much interest in and knowledge of the field of agriculture as he does. I have had a chance to make a preliminary review of this problem, and it seems to me this legislation has considerable merit. I thank him for bringing this to the attention of the Congress.

Mr. HALL. I thank the gentleman from California for his statement.

A REPORT ON CONSUMER CREDIT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. Hanna] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, we have taken this time to present to the House a report on consumer finance. As a member of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs of the great Committee on Banking and Currency, we have developed a growing conviction that all Members of Congress should be more fully informed on this subject. The many States which have provided for an Office of Consumer Affairs in recent years, and the action of our President in setting up such an Office in the White House is ample testimony that this field is commanding and receiving more attention from the executive branch. It should be of equal concern and receive as much consideration from the legislators.

In a recent release through the Editors' News Service, Mrs. Esther Peterson, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, is quoted as saying:

> The most pressing need for the modern consumer is adequate and accurate information throughout our volatile marketplace, fuller and freer flow of information is a need of all segments.

Mr. Speaker, it is a need here in this body as well. The dynamic, dramatic growth of consumer finance and its importance to, and impact on, our economy must be better understood by all of us serving in Government. We entertain some small hope that our colleagues will find this report educational. We hold no expectation that the material will entertain.

SCOPE OF STUDY

Total consumer indebtedness includes four major components: First, short and intermediate term installment credit; second, short and intermediate term noninstallment credit; third, mortgage debt; and fourth, security loans and policy loans—loans secured by cash value of insurance policies.

The first two components are commonly referred to as consumer credit.

The first is consumer installment credit. All four are called total consumer debt.

Our primary concern will be with consumer credit. Further, there is a certain unavoidable emphasis on consumer installment credit since a great number of worthwhile consumer studies limit themselves to this more specialized area.

There is some treatment of the other components of consumer indebtedness. The supplementary file includes a section attempting to place total consumer debt into perspective vis-a-vis other national statistics. Also, a section in the second half of the presentation considers some problems in the mortgage field.

Statistics and all other material are usually as up to date as possible. However, when recent events were not crucial to a particular study and when analysis had been done last summer, the material was not brought up to date.

A. GROWTH OF CONSUMER CREDIT

First. Long-term credit growth:

The amount of consumer credit outstanding has grown from $8.3 billion in 1946 to $76.8 billion at the end of 1964. Since 1950, growth proceeded at a rate of nearly 7 percent a year. Growth in recent years—1955-63—has been slightly more rapid, averaging 7½ percent a year.

Installment credit, especially automobile paper—auto production was 4.1 percent of GNP in 1964; 7,892,000 cars—sparked the consumer credit growth in the early postwar years—1946-55—and totaled nearly three-fourths of total consumer credit in 1955. Since the mid-1950's, the growing importance of installment credit relative to noninstallment credit has continued, though this relative growth has been at a much reduced rate.

Consumer credit growth in part reflects the dynamic change and rapid growth in the whole economy. But consumer credit growth reflects more than general economic growth since long-term consumer credit growth has exceeded overall economic growth. Equivalent to 7.5 percent of the gross national product in 1950, consumer credit outstanding was equal to 12 percent of the GNP at the end of 1964. As shown in the supplementary files, however, this rapid growth of consumer credit has been matched since the mid-1950's by the expansion of total net private indebtedness.

Consumer credit has grown so quickly for a number of reasons. The best analysis of the reasons for this growth deal with the installment credit field. Reviewing this material is probably the most convenient method for understanding the long-term growth of all consumer credit.

Consumer installment credit grew because it filled a need. Products were being developed that were attractive to consumers and amenable to mass-production methods but too costly to be widely purchased without extensive resort to types of financing other than current income.

The automobile played a central role in the development of consumer installment credit. Its relatively nigh price and its great attraction for consumers stimulated installment selling. Even before World War II the first finance companies were organized to handle the consumer paper generated by automobile installment sales.

The spread of installment credit thereafter can be explained, to a great extent, in terms of its growing social acceptability as well as its practicability as a method of financing. Each use of installment credit made subsequent uses easier. Financial arrangements for the extension of such credit were gradually improved and acquired increasing respectabiity in the financial world. Similarly, each additional person using installment credit made it more likely that other people would use it.

Once proved successful for one type of product, installment credit was inevitably applied to others. Thus the growth of installment credit reflects not only the growth in sales of goods suitable for financing in this manner but also the successive inclusion in its orbit of one type of product and service after another. Other important influences causing growth of consumer installment credit have been changes in maturities and downpayments; in proportions of sales that involve credit; in finance, insurance, and other charges; and in renewals, refinancing, and defaults. For a more complete explanation, see the analysis of the types of consumer credit later in this paper. Also, see the Federal Reserve, "Consumer Installment Credit," volume I, part 1, chapter 7, and pages 142-143.

Second. Growth in recent years:

The current period of consumer credit expansion began in mid-1961. Growth since then through 1964 has totaled over $20 billion. This is the largest dollar increase on record for any single continuous period of expansion. But, since the rise started from a much higher base than did previous expansionary movements, growth so far has increased the outstanding debt by only one-third, as against an increase of nearly one-half in the 1954-57 expansion.

(A) Installment credit has continued to be the most dynamic segment of consumer credit. It has grown 39 percent since mid-1961. Yet, like total consumer credit, installment credit's growth has not percentagewise been as steep as in previous periods.

As chart I shows, the usual pattern of past expansions—a phase of very sharp acceleration in both gross and net borrowing, followed by a leveling off--has not developed in 1961-64.

The latest upswing in extensions has been much less steep than its predecessors. Being comparatively gradual, it has not run so far ahead of the corresponding advance in repayments as during the upswings of 1952-53, 1954-57, and 1959-60. The maximum quarterly rate of debt increase, shown in the second panel of the chart, has been only 3 percent this time compared with peaks of nearly 5 percent in 1959.

Also, the yearly average increase in debt since 1961 has been moderate in relation to disposable personal income. Though these have all been years of relative prosperity, the rate of net debt formation has not differed significantly from the average for the entire period since 1950, taking years of expansion and recession together.

In 1964 expansion in consumer installment credit was $5.65 billion. Although this is a large rise, it represents a leveling off after the record $5.7 billion rise in 1963. This leveling off for 1964 is due mainly to four factors typical of the wide range of conditions on which the growth of consumer indebtedness depends.

First, the rise in sales of durable goods has not been fully matched in gross extensions of credit. Second, there has been no repetition of the bulge in personal cash loans that occurred a year ago last summer after statutory loan ceilings were raised in a half dozen States. Third, the uptrend in the flow of debt repayments has accelerated. For the most part this is the result of the pattern of extensions over recent years. In addition, collection ratios in some lines improved with the strong rise in consumers' disposable income which was caused to a great degree by the tax cut. Fourth, the automobile strike in late 1964 curtailed new car sales in October and November, and consequently slowed the extension of automobile paper during that period.

(B) Noninstallment credit has shown an increase of nearly 24 percent since mid-1961. Single-payment loans show the most active growth in this sector. They comprised almost half the total growth in 1963 though they total only a little over one-third the aggregate noninstallment debt outstanding. In 1964, charge accounts registered an increase of $430 million, their largest increase in the last decade.

B. TYPES OF CONSUMER CREDIT

Time and space rule against undertaking an exhaustive analysis of the various major types of consumer credit. For a good history and analysis of the major types of consumer credit, see the Federal Reserve Board study. Rather, this report will limit itself to an analysis here of present developments. Some particular issues—retail charge plans, college loans, and automobile financing—are considered in the second half of this report.

Tables 2, 3, and 4 do provide a general annual breakdown of the various types of consumer credit—both their absolute sums and the percent they represent of total installment or noninstallment credit. These self-explanatory figures clearly show the major long-term trends in types of consumer credit.

Auto and GAF credit: This fall the Federal Reserve Board did some interesting studies of various types of consumer credit, studies based on figures which included the first two quarters of 1964. One area of analysis dealt with the role of installment credit in financing sales of new and used passenger automobiles as well as sales of general merchandise, apparel, furniture, and household appliance stores. The nonautomotive lines mentioned are often referred to for convenience as the "GAF" group, from the initial letters of "general merchandise," "apparel," and "furniture."

TABLE II.—*Intermediate and short-term consumer credit, 1939–64*

[Estimated amounts outstanding, in millions of dollars]

End of year	Installment credit	Percent of total	Noninstallment credit	Percent of total	Total consumer credit
1939	4,503	62.3	2,719	37.7	7,222
1940	5,514	66.2	2,824	33.8	8,338
1941	6,085	66.4	3,087	33.6	9,172
1942	3,166	52.9	2,817	47.1	5,983
1943	2,136	43.6	2,765	56.4	4,901
1944	2,176	42.6	2,935	57.4	5,111
1945	2,462	43.5	3,203	56.5	5,665
1946	4,172	49.8	4,212	50.2	8,384
1947	6,695	57.9	4,875	42.1	11,570
1948	8,996	62.5	5,402	37.5	14,398
1949	11,590	67.0	5,715	33.0	17,305
1950	14,703	68.7	6,692	31.3	21,395
1951	15,294	67.6	7,323	32.4	22,617
1952	19,403	70.8	7,998	29.2	27,401
1953	23,005	73.6	8,238	26.4	31,243
1954	23,568	72.3	8,896	27.7	32,464
1955	28,906	74.4	9,924	25.6	38,830
1956	31,720	74.9	10,614	25.1	42,334
1957	33,867	75.3	11,103	24.7	44,920
1958	33,642	74.5	11,487	25.5	45,129
1959 [1]	39,245	76.1	12,297	23.9	51,542
1960	42,832	76.4	13,196	23.6	56,028
1961	43,527	75.5	14,151	24.5	57,678
1962	48,034	76.0	15,130	24.0	63,164
1963	53,745	76.9	16,145	23.1	69,890

[1] Includes data for Alaska and Hawaii beginning with January and August 1959, respectively.

NOTE.—Large "upswing" periods: 1947–50, 1952–53, 1954–57, 1959–60, 1961–63.

Source: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

TABLE III.—*Installment credit, by major parts, 1939–64*

[Estimated amounts outstanding, in millions of dollars]

End of year	Automobile paper	Other consumer goods paper	Home repair and modernization loans	Personal loans	Total installment credit
1939	1,497	1,620	298	1,088	4,503
1941	2,458	1,929	376	1,322	6,085
1943	355	819	130	832	2,136
1946	981	1,290	405	1,496	4,172
1947	1,924	2,143	718	1,190	6,695
1949	4,555	3,706	898	2,431	11,590
1950	6,074	4,799	1,016	2,814	14,703
1951	5,972	4,880	1,085	3,357	15,294
1952	7,733	6,174	1,385	4,111	19,403
1953	9,835	6,779	1,610	4,781	23,005
1954	9,809	6,751	1,616	5,392	23,568
1955	13,460	7,641	1,693	6,112	23,906
1956	14,420	8,606	1,905	6,789	31,720
1957	15,340	8,844	2,101	7,582	33,867
1958	14,152	9,028	2,346	8,116	33,642
1959	16,420	10,630	2,809	9,386	39,245
1960	17,688	11,525	3,139	10,480	42,832
1961	17,223	11,857	3,191	11,256	43,527
1962	19,540	12,605	3,246	12,643	48,034
1963	22,199	13,766	3,389	14,391	53,745
1964 [1]	23,255	13,599	3,364	14,902	55,120

End of year	Automobile paper	Other consumer goods paper	Home repair and modernization loans	Personal loans	Total installment credit
	Percent of total				
1939	33.3	35.9	6.6	24.2	100
1941	40.4	31.7	6.2	31.7	100
1943	16.6	38.3	6.1	39.0	100
1946	23.5	30.9	9.7	35.9	100
1947	28.8	32.0	10.7	28.5	100
1949	39.3	32.0	7.7	21.0	100
1950	41.3	32.6	6.9	19.2	100
1951	39.0	31.9	7.2	21.9	100
1952	39.9	31.8	7.1	21.2	100
1953	42.7	29.5	7.0	20.8	100
1954	41.6	28.6	6.9	22.9	100
1955	46.6	26.4	5.9	21.1	100
1956	45.5	27.1	6.0	21.4	100
1957	45.3	26.1	6.2	22.4	100
1958	42.1	26.8	7.0	24.1	100
1959	41.8	27.1	7.2	23.9	100
1960	41.3	26.9	7.3	24.5	100
1961	39.6	27.2	7.3	25.9	100
1962	40.7	26.2	6.8	26.3	100
1963	41.3	26.6	6.3	26 8	100

[1] May 1964.

TABLE IV.—*Noninstallment credit, by major parts, 1939–64*

[Estimated amounts outstanding, in millions of dollars]

End of year	Single-payment loans	Charge accounts	Service credit	Total noninstallment credit
1939	787	1,414	518	2,719
1941	845	1,645	597	3,087
1943	613	1,440	712	2,765
1947	1,356	2,353	1,166	4,875
1949	1,532	2,795	1,388	5,715
1950	1,821	3,291	1,580	6,692
1951	1,934	3,605	1,784	7,923
1952	2,120	4,011	1,867	7,998
1953	2,187	4,124	1,927	8,238
1954	2,408	4,485	2,003	8,896
1955	3,002	4,795	2,127	9,924
1956	3,253	4,995	2,366	10,614
1957	3,364	5,146	2,593	11,103
1958	3,627	5,060	2,800	11,487
1959	4,129	5,104	3,064	12,297
1960	4,507	5,329	3,360	13,196
1961	5,136	5,324	3,691	14,151
1962	5,456	5,684	3,990	15,130
1963	5,959	5,871	4,315	16,145
1964	6,206	5,099	4,520	15,825

Source: Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System.

TABLE IV.—*Noninstallment credit, by major parts, 1939–64*—Continued

[Estimated amounts outstanding, in millions of dollars]

End of year	Single-payment loans	Charge accounts	Service credit	Total noninstallment credit
	Percent of total			
1939	28.9	52.0	19.1	100
1941	27.4	53.3	19.3	100
1943	22.1	52.1	25.8	100
1947	27.8	48.3	23.9	100
1949	26.8	49.0	24.2	100
1950	27.2	49.2	23.6	100
1951	26.4	49.2	24.4	100
1952	26.5	50.2	23.2	100
1953	26.5	50.1	23.4	100
1954	27.0	49.5	22.5	100
1955	30.2	48.3	21.4	100
1956	30.7	47.1	22.2	100
1957	30.3	46.4	23.3	100
1958	31.6	44.0	24.4	100
1959	33.6	41.5	24.9	100
1960	34.1	40.4	25.5	100
1961	36.3	37.6	26.1	100
1962	36.1	37.5	26.4	100
1963	36.9	36.4	26.7	100
1964 [1]	39.2	32.2	28.6	100

[1] May 1964.

Installment credit finances about 27 percent of the total consumer purchases in the GAF lines.

Given the average relationships between sales and credit movements that prevailed in 1948–62, the Federal Reserve Board obtained some "calculated" values for credit extensions in the present period. Comparison of the actual loan volume with the calculated figures reveals that credit was used less intensively in the first half of 1964 than in 1963, relative to sales. This appears to have been true for autos as well as for GAF lines, but especially for the latter.

In another study dealing with automobile installment paper, the Federal Reserve found that there is a more widespread use of automobile contract terms that are accepted as the maxima—for new cars: maturity over 30 months, value of the loan representing more than 90 percent of dealer cost; for used cars maturity period over 24 months, dealer-cost ratio over 90 percent—but that there is no substantial tendency to breach these maximum limits. The reported percentage of contracts with maturities of more than 36 months, for example, is still well under 1 percent of the total, as it has been for years.

Personal loans: Personal cash installment loans have traditionally served to meet family emergencies such as illness or unemployment. The current trend, however, is toward the use of this type of credit for large expenditures of a more optional character. These include the purchase of household goods, as well as outlays for travel, education, and other personal projects and family occasions. Loans of this nature may now be more important in the total than are loans to cover emergency expenses.

During the summer and early fall of 1963 five States raised the maximum size of loans permissible under State small loan laws. During and immediately after the period when the changes occurred, the volume of personal loans increased sharply.

C. REPAYMENT BURDEN

The most frequently used index for assessing consumer debt burden is the level of consumer installment repayment relative to disposable income. With installment repayments reaching a record seasonally adjusted rate of $62 billion in 1964, repayments came to represent about 14 percent of disposable income—a record high.

The ratio moved above 12 percent on an annual basis for the first time in 1955, and during 1960 it passed 13 percent. It held at 13.6 percent through the first half of 1963 and at 13.8 percent in the latter half. In 1964, the initial effect of the tax cut last March was undoubtedly to reduce the ratio slightly. But with the total outstanding installment debt rising and with collection rates up as disposable income spurted, repayments quickly regained and increased their earlier relationship to income.

Factors causing this continued uptrend and possible future implications will be considered in the next two sections.

Ratio of installment credit repayments to disposable income

	Percent
1941	9.5
1950	8.6
1955	12.2
1960	13.2
1963	13.6
1964 (approximate)	14.0

Below is another helpful index. It considers all consumer credit outstanding—both installment and noninstallment—as a percentage of disposable income.

Consumer credit outstanding as percentage of disposable income

	Percent
1950	10.6
1955	13.9
1960	16.0
1963	17.3
1964	17.8

D. THE CONSUMER

Periods of rapid rise in consumer credit have always produced concern about the burden of this debt on the debtors and on the economy as a whole. There are, in fact, several kinds of burden that can be associated with consumer credit and it is important to distinguish among them, since they are of varying importance, have varying impact on the economy, and may call for different preventive or alleviating measures. For example, the burden that consumer credit places on a particularly unwary or unfortunate consumer should be differentiated from the burden it places on all consumers or the whole economy.

This chapter considers the burden placed on consumers in general. The next chapter deals with the consumer credit burden on the economy as a whole. The second half of the paper will be concerned with the burden on particular consumers or types of consumers.

A complete description of the general consumer population would require something approaching one of the Census Bureau's detailed descriptions of the whole population. A helpful general source: National Consumer Finance Association, Finance Facts Year Book. Fortunately, our needs are more limited. The burden consumer credit places on the general consumer population can be understood by seeking answers to three questions: First, how are consumers bearing the present credit burden? Second, why are they able to bear this burden without excessive difficulty? Third, what will this burden be like in the future? Note again that the best materials for analyzing the burden of consumer credit usually deal only with installment credit.

First. How are consumers bearing their consumer credit burden?

At present, the burden of repayments is being carried with little or no apparent rise in financial difficulties among marginal borrowers. In recent months the statistics of reported bankruptcies and delinquencies have taken a relatively favorable turn by comparison with 1963.

Consumer bankruptcies are not numerous in absolute terms and are geographically concentrated in a few States, but the general trend has been rather sharply upward for a decade or more. The sustained rise in the number of bankruptcy petitions that began in mid-1962 has slowed in recent quarters, however, and this spring a dip was reported for the first time in 2 years on a seasonally adjusted basis.

Delinquency rates on consumer loans at banks are dominated by cyclical conditions, but behind the cyclical swings that have occurred in the postwar period there was a broad downtrend through the mid-1950's. The present delinquency rate reported by a sample of banks is not far from the low 1957–59 average.

Reports on delinquencies on home mortgages suggest that consumers have met their repayment obligations about as regularly as a year ago, partly in response to more vigorous collection policies by many lenders.

Second. Why are consumers able to bear this burden without apparent difficulty?

An increase in aggregate consumer installment debt may be due to: First, debtors having borrowed larger amounts than earlier, and/or, second, an increase in the number of borrowers.

Much of the past rise in the ratio of installment credit repayments to disposable personal income can be explained by an increase in the proportion of consumers using installment credit. From 1952 to 1956, when the repayment-income ratio rose sharply, the proportion of spending units who reported owing some installment debt also rose—from 38 to 45 percent. See chart II. This proportion of spending units owing installment debt reached 48 percent by 1960, then declined to 46 percent in early 1962. From 1962 to 1963, there was a significant increase in the proportion of spending units with installment credit, with a higher proportion—50 percent—of spending units owing installment debt than ever before.

The latest figures of this type that I have are for 1963. The Survey Research Center of the University of Michigan surely has the 1964 figures and soon the ones for 1965. The trouble here is that the center delays publishing these figures for quite some time, revealing them only to their subscribers—it is quite expensive to subscribe. The center provides some immediate public releases, but they are too general to be very helpful. The Federal Reserve does have some arrangement whereby they receive reports relatively quickly. One might contact them. Specifically, call Mr. Harlow Osborne.

Ratio of annual installment debt payments to disposable income [1]

[Percent of all spending units]

	1954	1957	1959	1960	1961	1962	1963
Make installment debt payments	43	48	48	48	47	46	50
Payment-income ratio:							
Under 10 percent	15	15	17	18	18	16	17
10 to 19 percent	14	16	17	17	18	17	19
20 percent and over	13	15	13	12	10	12	12
Not ascertained	1	2	1	1	1	1	2
Make no installment debt payments	57	52	52	52	53	54	50
Total	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

[1] The numerator of the ratio for each spending unit is the annual installment debt payment rate of the spending unit as of January–February of the survey year (monthly payment multiplied by 12). The denominator is disposable income of the spending unit for the calendar year preceding the survey.

On the other hand, the proportion of individual spending units with a high debt-income ratio did not increase during the last decade. In the midfifties this proportion was higher than 1962 or 1963. In all these years the great majority of debtors used less than 20 percent of their income to repay their installment debt.

The latest data, then, suggest that an increased number of borrowers not an increase in individuals' debt-income ratios was the major cause of the higher debt-income ratio for the whole consumer population. Individual spending units are no more burdened than in the past.

Third. What will this burden be like in the future?

Demographic trends are an important consideration here. Installment debt is far from being equally distributed among the American people. Whether a family buys on the installment plan or not depends primarily on its income and its age. Installment debt is a middle and upper-middle income phenomenon. It is also more prevalent among younger people.

As for the income characteristic of debtors, one finds that low-income people as well as high-income people buy less frequently on the installment plan than the middle-income groups. Low-income groups lack the needed background of assets, and so forth, to qualify for such credit and, furthermore, buy fewer of the durable goods for which one normally uses installment credit. High-income groups have their usually substantial liquid assets and do not need to resort frequently to installment credit.

Age is also an important factor. Older families use the installment plan less frequently than younger families who are starting households, raising children, and who have lower liquid assets. As table IV shows, in 1963 among families with children the head of which was under 45 years of age, 72 percent owed installment debt and 42 percent owed sizable installment debt. The indebtedness of all American families was much lower, 50 and 27 percent, respectively.

Relation of installment debt to income and stage of life cycle, early 1963

[In percent]

Spending unit income in 1962	Proportion of all units	Proportion owing installment debt in each group	Proportion owing installment debt of over $500 in each group
Under $3,000	26	32	9
$3,000 to $5,000	20	53	28
$5,000 to $6,000	12	57	32
$6,000 to $7,500	13	62	37
$7,500 to $10,000	14	63	41
$10,000 to $15,000	10	53	35
$15,000 and over	5	30	23
All units	100	50	27
Married with children, head under 45 years old	30	72	42

According to the Bureau of the Census projections for 1965 and 1970, the most rapid rate of growth in number of households will be in those whose heads are under 25 years of age. These are mainly the families that will be formed as the young people born during the 1940's reach marriage age. Such young families, as we have seen, are likely to be frequent users of installment credit since their needs for household goods and automobiles generally exceed their ability to acquire these goods for cash.

These demographic trends suggest, then, that the past major reason for increases in the repayment-income ratio—greater proportions of the total population using credit—will continue to play its dominant role.

Can we expect that a larger number of spending units will have heavy installment debt burdens? First, we have seen that not only do more younger households use installment credit than the average household but that a greater proportion of them use it intensively. So, the expected increase of younger households should mean that a larger proportion of total households will have high repayment-income ratios. This does reflect greater consumer irresponsibility, but is simply a product of the demographic trends. Later, when the proportion of younger families in the population stabilizes or declines, the demographic trends will push for a decrease in the proportion of households with high repayment-income ratios.

A second factor—credit use patterns—might encourage a growth of families with heavy installment debt burdens. In recent years consumers have been making increased use of revolving credit and similar installment plans to finance their purchases of nondurable goods and services. The success of these plans makes it seem likely that consumers will make still greater future use of these plans. The question becomes by just how much will individual spending units increase their credit use because of changes in credit use patterns. Families with limited holdings installment debt might increase their holdings somewhat. But, though these new plans have been in operation these last few years, the number of consumers burdened with heavy installment debt has not increased significantly—if at all. There seems, then, little reason to expect that the future should bring a major rise in individual spending units' relative holdings of installment credit as a result of changes in credit-use patterns.

The predicted future rise in the debt-income ratio for the entire consumer population, then, should be caused primarily by a greater number of units using credit, or increasing their now small holdings of credit. Consumers as a group appear generally to have avoided excessively large burdens of installment credit. Chapter 1 of the second half of this paper is closely related to this chapter. It contains a great amount of material about consumer ignorance of finance rates. One might read that chapter before continuing on to the next chapter. What increase there will be in the proportion of families with high repayment-income ratios should be primarily a result of the increasing proportion of younger families in the population—a temporary phenomenon.

E. CONSUMER CREDIT AND ECONOMIC INSTABILITY

There exists a notion, rather general in our economic textbooks, that business investment and the Government's economic policy represent the only major dynamic forces making for better or worse times. This notion must be contradicted.

The consumer sector exercises an important influence on what happens in our economy, and consumers do so to a large extent by making tangible investment expenditures on credit. Although consumers receive their income from the business and Government sectors, the rate at which they spend their incomes does not depend on their ability to buy alone. Willingness to buy and willingness to buy on credit, may increase or decrease independently of income according to consumers' attitudes and expectations.

Although the impact of consumer credit on the economy has not been generally appreciated in economic theory, there have been some excellent specialized studies of this impact. The best is that done by the Federal Reserve Board in 1957. See the Federal Reserve study, part I, volume I, chapters 11 and 13. Later research and economic events seem to confirm the general validity of these findings. Again these studies have been limited to installment credit, but the reader should remember that, as explained before, such a limitation is not too restrictive because of the "spill-over effect" such analyses have on the field of total consumer credit.

1. GENERAL FINDINGS

A prime factor in business fluctuations: Although consumer installment credit has not been the principal cause in changes in the level of business activity, it has been a major factor behind such changes. The influence of consumer installment credit is probably equaled or exceeded by other credit-financed expenditures, such as those for business, plant and equipment, and for residential construction. However, these expenditures represent, in part, secondary responses to a rapid expansion of installment credit. In cases where changes in expenditures for durable consumer goods played a major role in the change in business activity, installment credit can be regarded as an important contributory factor.

A leading and amplifying force: Although not the principal factor in any cycle, consumer installment credit has been both a leading and an amplifying force in economic fluctuations. An impressive number of times credit extended appears to have moved ahead of other economic changes, that is, to have led at the turning points.

Time leads appear to have been longer in recoveries than in downturns. This differential experience may be due partly to the fact that consumer installment credit has been growing so strongly. But the lead record remains impressive even when allowance for growth is made.

A greater influence in booms than in recessions: The major influence of installment credit has been to add fuel to booms; it has less often been an aggravating factor during recessions. The Federal Reserve Board illustrates this with a number of periods of expansion in which installment credit buying contributed to a rate of sales of consumer durable goods that could not be sustained.

In expansion periods, easier terms in the form of longer maturities and lower downpayments have been an important stimulus. In periods of contraction, terms have been tightened less frequently and less than they were eased in preceding expansion periods. This is in line with the general tendency over the years toward more liberal installment terms.

Installment credit has also added to the overall credit demands during the major business booms. This has contributed to an expansion of bank credit and has intensified inflationary pressure.

Indirect influence by general credit market on installment credit: The evidence indicates that the influences of developments in the general credit market, including the effects of general credit and monetary policy, reach in some degree the consumer installment area. This response is most marked at the "wholesale" level and is evidenced by changes in prices, terms, and willingness with which funds are made available to borrowing-lending intermediaries as well as in changes in the availability of bank funds to their consumer credit departments.

At the retail level, concrete evidence of response in the quantity and terms of credit as a direct result of a change in general credit conditions is difficult to document apart from an apparent tendency for retail interest charges to rise, for standards of creditworthiness to stiffen, for downpayment-maturity requirements at least to hold the line, and for consumer lenders to cut back on their new business promotion efforts.

A recent study of new automobile finance rates suggests that general credit policy might have a greater impact on consumer automobile credit than is generally believed—Robert Shay, "New Automobile Finance Rates, 1924–62," 1963.

As the Federal Reserve Board noted in 1957:

> Unavoidably an important question must remain unanswered. That question is whether the response of the consumer installment credit area as a whole to changes in credit conditions, and in particular to general monetary restraint, is sufficient either in degree or in timing to facilitate a national economic policy directed toward sustained high and rising levels of activity without inflation.

2. THE RECENT EXPANSION PERIOD

Consumer credit's relatively moderate growth during the recent economic upswing suggests that at present it is not as an important element as it was during the 1954–57 expansion. However, this is definitely not to say that it is unimportant. Moreover, it may become more important as today's record-level consumer optimism promises increased consumer purchasing with consequent credit growth.

Some have already begun to fear unchecked credit growth. The Wall Street Journal recently called for a more restrictive credit policy—October 2, 1964, page 10.

In October 1964, the annual convention of the American Bankers' Association adopted a statement calling on monetary authorities to start bearing down promptly on the credit brakes to head off inflationary pressures—Wall Street Journal, October 29, 1964. Is this excessive concern? Possibly, but the destabilizing influence of consumer credit needs to be carefully watched, if not kept in check.

Robert A. Wallace, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, disagrees. He believes that "the credit expansion of the past 4 years came as close to ideal as one could reasonably expect"—Consumer Finance News, December 1964.

If one does conclude that there is a need for some controls over consumer credit, the next question becomes: How?

3. SOLUTIONS

The effects of general credit and monetary policy, as we have seen, do reach in some degree the consumer credit field. But there exists a real question whether these tools are sufficient.

If these general tools are not considered sufficient, the next alternative is for standby selective controls of some sort. And here, real argument ensues. The advantages and disadvantages of different types of possible control are hotly debated. The United States does have some experience with credit control—regulation W—but this experience was of an ambiguous sort that only intensified the conflict. The Committee for Economic Development suggests one major disadvantage of selective controls:

> Regulation of consumer credit terms might contribute to cyclical stability, but it would require a large and complex administration to be fully effective. The benefits to stability promised by such a system must be weighed against the cost and inconvenience of installing and managing it.[1]

Economist Marcus Nadler presents a favorable, well-reasoned article that interested persons might read. It begins with a convenient, short section of summary and conclusions—Federal Reserve Board, in the work cited, part I, volume 2.

F. SOURCES OF FUNDS

To meet the varying needs of the consumer, several types of consumer credit agencies have developed in this country. Generally each differs from the others in origin, background, methods of operation, and objectives.

Rather than try to cover all these differences plus analyze the present status of these agencies, this report will briefly highlight the character of each agency and then suggest something about the present consumer lending picture. A more complete analysis of each agency can be found in the sources noted below—Federal Reserve, in the work cited, part I, volumes I and II; House Banking and Currency Committee, "Comparative Regulation of Financial Institutions," 1964. The accompanying file contains statistics showing the relative strength of these agencies over the years.

1. DESCRIPTION OF THE MAJOR CONSUMER CREDIT AGENCIES

Consumer credit agencies can be classified into two broad categories, financial institutions and retail outlets. Financial institutions, which currently hold about 88 percent of installment credit and about 37 percent of noninstallment credit, include commercial banks, sales finance companies, consumer finance companies, credit unions, and miscellaneous lenders. Retail outlets include department stores, furniture stores, appliance stores, automobile dealers, and other miscellaneous lenders.

Commercial banks: Commercial banks play a multifaceted role in the consumer credit field. They loan money directly to consumers, buy installment paper from retailers and others, and loan money to finance companies and retailers.

Consumer finance companies: They specialize in small personal loans, often on an unsecured or signature basis. These companies operate under State small loan laws permitting charges higher than those allowed under the general usury statutes.

A 1963 survey found that the major reasons borrowers sought loans from these agencies were consolidation of existing obligations—39 percent of the loans extended—automobile purchases and repairs, and travel and education.

Sales finance companies: These companies purchase installment paper from others, usually retailers, rather than extending credit directly to consumers.

Credit unions: Credit unions differ from other major types of consumer lending institutions in that they are cooperatives. The cost of credit union operations is usually well below that for privately operated lenders doing a similar business.

Other lending institutions: Industrial loan companies, savings and loan associations, and mutual savings banks are the other types of financial institutions that engage in significant amounts of consumer installment lending.

Retail outlets: Retail dealers originate most of the installment credit extended to consumers for the purchase of goods. Most dealers, however, do not hold the contracts until they are paid off, but sell all or part of them to financial institutions, usually a bank or sales finance company. See chapter in second half of paper on automobile financing. Currently, retail dealers hold less than 1½ percent of automobile credit outstanding and 43 percent of installment paper for "other consumer goods."

2. PRESENT LENDING PICTURE

The Federal Reserve Board summarized the present lending picture up to September 1963 this way:

> The various lenders' shares of total installment paper outstanding reflect in part the general competitive positions of the institutions themselves in obtaining and lending funds. They also reflect indirectly the relatively greater strength since mid-1963 of demand for auto and other consumer goods credit and the stability of demand for home maintenance and repair credit.

Thus the rise in auto loan volume—which temporarily declined in October and November because of the work stoppages—was especially important to the commercial banks, which have more than half of their consumer loan business in this category. The recent lack of growth in home repair and modernization lending partly offset this advantage.

---

[1] Committee for Economic Development, "Report on Money and Credit" (1961).

Bank credit: Among the immediate sources of consumer credit, banks have been playing a progressively larger role ever since the end of 1955—which was their low point for the decade. By mid-1963 their share of consumer installment paper outstanding had moved up 4 percentage points and amounted to 41 percent of the total. The same fraction continued through 1964.

Besides lending directly to consumers and buying installment paper from retailers and others, banks make a substantial indirect contribution to consumer credit by lending to finance companies and retailers. It is estimated that about 10 percent of all consumer installment credit is thus indirectly bank financed, as against 20 percent of the all-lender total in 1952.

Directly or indirectly the banks still provide more than half of all the funds used in consumer installment credit, though their share of the total has moved down in recent years from a high near 60 percent estimated for 1952.

Other credit sources: Consumer finance companies have retained their one-twelfth share of all installment credit outstanding this year. Credit unions have moved up a little, and now hold more than one-tenth of the total. Retailers have been financing less and less of their customers' credit purchases in recent years, and this trend continued through the latest period.

Sales finance companies, supplying credit through auto dealers, mail-order companies, and other retailers, hold about one-fourth of all consumer installment debt. Their share of the total has declined a little in recent years, but it leveled off in the latter part of 1963 and moved up fractionally in early 1964.

Sales finance companies have benefited recently from the strong demand for auto credit—in which they have specialized—even though they have not kept pace with the banks in the auto field. In addition they have increased their share of other consumer goods paper outstanding.

Finance company funds: In mid-1964 finance companies of all types taken together held about $19 billion of consumer installment paper. The companies had obtained a little over three-fourths of this sum through borrowing. This was about the same proportion as a year earlier, but up significantly from the 70 percent estimated for 1961 and 1962.

Finance companies have made increasing use of the commercial paper market in raising short-term funds in recent years, as nonfinancial corporations have made a rising volume of such funds available. The paper market offers flexible rates and maturity dates, without the need to maintain compensating balances such as many banks require against direct loans.

The competition for these corporate funds has stiffened, however, with the step-up in borrowing by the finance companies, the rising use of certificates of deposit, and the increase in the Treasury bill rate. Rates on directly placed finance company paper maturing in 3 to 6 months have risen by half in a 3-year period—from 2.50 percent in mid-1961 to 3.75 percent this summer.

3. A QUESTION FOR THE FUTURE

The future might hold a major change in the consumer credit lending field; namely, the full-scale entry of mutual savings banks and saving and loan associations. Of course, many are already in the field to a substantial degree. Several saving and loan associations, for instance, are reported to be financing consumer goods and services through the use of open-end mortgages. The fear of other consumer lending agencies, however, is that the savings and loan associations will greatly expand their activity.

Robert W. Johnson, speaking before the National Consumer Finance Association's annual convention documented a number of moves by savings and loan associations which indicated that they are now seeking to expand their activity—Consumer Finance News, December 1964, page 6. Moreover, he offered the reasons behind this action:

> Faced with a continued influx of funds from savings and from monthly payments on mortgages, the savings and loan associations will find their mortgage loan funds piling up as home demand slackens. It seems inevitable that they will turn to the field of consumer credit.

The policymaker will have to decide whether increased competition is desirable or not in the consumer credit field. One danger that should not be overlooked is the possibility of harmful competition results from the problem of allocation of joint costs. As Mr. Johnson points out:

> Inexperience, coupled with a desire to gain a foothold in the consumer credit field, is very likely to cause these new entrants to price their consumer credit on a marginal cost basis, or even below their marginal costs.

No conclusion is in order here except to call for some study of this potential problem. This problem was brought to this writer's attention too late to do anything but to pass it on.

PART 2: SOME SPECIFIC ISSUES

This half of the report seeks to highlight some specific issues—from proposed legislation to major abuses—in the consumer credit field. Each chapter provides some brief analysis and suggests the location of supplementary materials. Each can decide which issues he considers particularly important and then proceed from the material here to further investigation.

A. CONSUMER IGNORANCE AND THE TRUTH-IN-LENDING BILL

Later chapters in this report will highlight some credit abuses which demonstrate that the consumer needs to know more about borrowing in certain specific cases. But one should rightfully ask first: What about the general situation? How informed is the general consumer population?

The Michigan Survey Research Center made a study of people's knowledge of finance rates on automobile purchases. The results were mixed. Precise knowledge of rates was quite poor. Thirty-nine percent of those questioned had little idea of what the rates were. At least a third of those who gave a specific answer believed the cost was lower than it actually was. George Katona, director of the center, feels this ignorance exists largely because the cost of installment credit is not a major consideration for the consumer. The crucial question for consumers using installment credit for automobiles appeared to be the size of the monthly payment.

Katona feels that interest rates and the cost of installment buying play a role in a different context:

> While the size of finance charges is of little importance in the first major decision (should I, or should I not, buy?), it is a significant factor in a second decision: Where shall I make the arrangements for time payments? Recent studies indicated:
>
> 1. The majority of consumers are well informed about where one can arrange for the financing of the purchase of a car.
>
> 2. The majority of consumers are capable of discussing the respective advantages and disadvantages of making the financial arrangements at different places.
>
> 3. The majority of consumers believe that the cost of installment credit is substantially higher if one makes the credit arrangements through a car dealer rather than with a bank.[2]

In another study two economists came up with even more unfavorable results than the Survey Research Center. They found that when they asked people what finance rates they had paid on their past installment credit transactions: about 7 percent of the sample gave reasonably accurate estimates of the effective annual finance rates paid; 11 percent estimated the approximate add-on or discount rate; the remaining 82 percent were unable to give rate estimates of reasonable accuracy—Juster and Shay, "Consumer Sensitivity to Finance Rates," National Bureau of Economic Research (1964). Though the study is quite technical, the summary and conclusions are quite worthwhile and relatively easy reading.

However, like the Survey Research Center, these two economists also concluded that:

> Despite the lack of rate knowledge, consumers seemed to know that certain types of credit are more costly than others.

It appears, then, that consumers are woefully ignorant of actual finance rates, but that they usually know which are the most desirable credit agencies and types of credit.

The question for the policymaker to decide is: Just how much more knowledge do consumers need? We hesitate to give any set answer here since much of the basis for any answer is personal and nonobjective—and, hence, of little relevance to the factual nature of this report.

It is at this point that Senator Douglas' oft-introduced "truth-in-lending" bill becomes a relevant consideration. The bill seeks to provide consumers with greater knowledge by requiring that all consumer credit contracts explicitly state the simple annual interest rate on the loan. What have been the predicted major consequences of this form of increased consumer knowledge. Proponents probably correctly believe that this bill will enable consumers to shop around for the best terms, to be more aware of what they are committing themselves to. The abuses mentioned in later chapters will supposedly be much less likely to occur.

---

[2] Testimony of George Katona before U.S. Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, on S. 750 (truth in lending), p. 1489, 1963–64 hearings.

Others warn, however, that increased consumer knowledge might have major disadvantages. George Katona believes:

> The most potent argument against the bill consists of the possibility that there would be a shock effect following its introduction. I believe that the bill, if enacted, would not depress the volume of installment buying permanently (because * * * the motives for installment buying are powerful and are not dependent on costs). Nevertheless, the disclosure of the true cost of borrowing might result in an unexpected shock for some would-be purchasers of durable goods with adverse consequences on the rate of purchases in the period immediately following the enactment of the bill.[3]

Economists Juster and Shay find that there would be increased consumer response to finance rates if these rates were specified in the credit contract. Disagreeing with Katona, they felt that disclosure should lead to a long-term slowdown in credit growth.

Specification of simple annual interest rates might lead, then, to major short-term maladjustments and a possible longrun decline in consumer credit. These possibilities need to be evaluated further.

Passage of the Douglas bill would have two other major consequences, usually considered advantageous. First, it might contribute to economic stabilization. The cost of credit is a stabilizing force in the economy. High credit costs in boom periods restrain credit purchases; low costs in periods of slack encourage credit buying. Yet the stabilizing effect of changes in credit costs depends on awareness by consumers that the changes have occurred. If buyers are ignorant of the true costs of credit, they are less subject to influence by cost changes.

Secondly, full disclosure of the consumer credit finance charges will also serve to invigorate competition among lenders. When borrowers are able to compare terms, sellers of consumer credit will be under more pressure to match their competitors' offers. This competition might be particularly useful in preventing fraud and deception.

B. LOW-INCOME GROUPS

Low-income groups appear to suffer under a credit system in which they are often literally exploited—see David Caplovitz, "The Poor Pay More," 1964. Also, some January 1965 articles in the New York Times claim that gangsters are much involved in these questionable lending practices. Yet, any attempt to improve their situation must realize that low-income groups present a unique credit problem. The credit system in fact—unethical and illegal as it might be—allows them to obtain credit when most legitimate credit lending agencies declare them "bad risks" and refuse to extend them credit. As one observer notes, "Society now virtually presents the very poor risks with twin options—of foregoing major purchases or of being exploited."

The longrun solution to this problem is obviously to end poverty. But this solution is far enough in the future that the policymaker must provide more immediate help. Given the basic needs of these people and our society's emphasis on consumption, it would be impossible to make low-income groups forgo major purchases until that faraway time when they might join the ranks of the middle class.

The best temporary solution appears to be action to minimize the most undesirable practices of the credit system faced by the low-income groups. Better laws and law enforcement offer some hope. Probably most important is the need to educate these people so that they understand the use of credit, the opportunities they have to obtain it, and their legal rights in regard to it.

C. AUTO FINANCING

This chapter is concerned with two particular issues in the automobile finance field: First, evidence of a takeover of automobile dealerships by finance companies, and second, dealers' reserves and kickbacks.

First, Edivence of a takeover of automobile dealerships by finance companies. We have found that evidence is either lacking or negative on the question whether finance companies are taking over automobile dealerships.

Evidence is lacking to the degree that we could not find material which showed finance companies buying car dealerships outright or exerting greatly expanded control over them. Of course, since dealers are quite dependent usually on outside credit to help them purchase their cars and to handle customer credit contracts, they have to pay much attention to the desires of their lenders. But this has always been so.

What evidence that was discovered seems to discount increased finance company control. First, since 1955, commercial banks and credit unions have expanded relatively their holdings of automobile installment paper, mostly at the expense of the sales finance agencies. Certainly credit unions and probably commercial banks are less likely to take over automobile dealerships owing to the very characteristics of these two lenders —although one should note that automobile dealers now hold a smaller percentage of installment paper than in the past, this must be taken in the context that their holdings have always been minimal in the last decade—3.6 percent of the total in 1955, 1.4 percent in 1963.

Second, the opportunity for sales finance companies to extend their influence seems further limited by the fact that automobile installment credit extensions appear to be rising a little less in the last year than would be calculated from past sales history. The more cash involved in sales the greater should be the dealer's independence.

Finally, we have a purely impressionistic belief—that is, cannot find concrete supporting evidence—that a good deal of lender competition exists today—competition which would give dealers greater flexibility in bargaining with lenders.

One related problem which might be further investigated deals with the captive finance companies of major automobile manufacturers. The captive finance companies—best example, GMAC—certainly help manufacturers control their dealerships. Historically, of course, new car dealers have been servile to wishes of the major manufacturers. One notes with interest that Chrysler Corp. announced last July that it will establish a credit company to finance dealer and consumer car and truck purchases. To be known as Chrysler Credit Corp., it will operate at both whosesale and retail and will end reliance on independent finance companies, making the parent corporation more competitive with other major manufacturers.

Second. Dealer's reserves and kickbacks. A consumer may finance his automobile purchase in two ways. First, he may arrange the terms of his credit contract with the automobile dealer who normally will sell the contract to a credit agency which collects the indebtedness. This is called sales, or indirect financing. Second, the borrower can arrange his credit directly with the credit agency, which is termed direct financing. Our interest is in the first category, indirect financing.

In indirect financing, after he has sold the customer's contract to a credit agency, the dealer has no further contact with the customer unless he has accepted some liability for the customer's fulfilling the contract terms. The dealer liability may range from full endorsement of the customer's note—full recourse—to no endorsement whatsoever of the customer obligation—no recourse.

What is of importance here is that the finance rate at which the credit agency discounts when purchasing contracts from the dealer is normally below the rate charged the auto purchaser, the difference accruing to the dealer. The size of the difference—called the "dealer share" or "dealer's reserve"—is affected by competitive forces as well as by the extent of the dealer liability for the borrower's repayment. Yet, although the size of the dealer share of the finance rate is affected by the degree of risk assumed by him, the fact that nonrecourse contracts pay a share to the dealer indicates that the payment reflects more than contingent liability. The dealer makes, in fact, a profit off the finance charges.

Along the same line, the purchaser is usually required to insure the automobile against physical damage during the life of the contract. The dealer frequently acts as an insurance agent for sales finance companies with wholly owned insurance subsidiaries, and when licensed as an agent, he may receive a commission—currently about 20 percent of the premium—for providing this service. So, the dealer again stands to gain from the credit contract.

Some justification is offered for this method of operation. First, since the dealer combines the cost of acquiring credit customers with the costs of acquiring automobile customers, it is likely that a substantial portion of the dealer share of the finance rate may be attributed to the dealer's strategic position as a middleman between the credit buyer and indirect financing agencies. Second dealers nowadays are likely to consider their return from finance charges as part of their overall income and, were this income eliminated, customers might have to pay more for cars through either higher prices or lower trade-in allowances.

---

[3] Testimony of George Katona, op. cit., p. 1491.

Yet, one might ask with some justification whether customers should be sold finance packages that include double profits—for both dealer and credit agency.

This dealer practice apparently is on the increase in the last two decades. In his exhaustive analysis of new automobile finance rates from 1924 to 1962, Economist Robert Shay found that the bulk of the finance rates charged consumers between the low 1936–38 level and that which existed in the late 1950's "appears to have been attributable to a rising dealer share of the finance rate"—Robert Shay, "New Automobile Finance Rates, 1924–62," National Bureau of Economic Research, 1963.

In 1958–59—the last years of this part of his study—Shay estimates that the dealer's share of finance rates on paper handled by the four largest sales finance companies was 23 to 24 percent.

D. MORTGAGE LENDING

Mortgage lending is usually considered separately from consumer credit. However, the volume of mortgage loans and its rapid growth give rise to some problems which might be of some interest.

First, the number of foreclosures on nonfarm residential properties appears to be steadily increasing over the long run. For example, of total FHA-insured mortgages on one- to four-family nonfarm homes, 1.08 percent were foreclosed in 1963 versus 0.28 percent in 1960—see supplementary file. There seems to be no rigorous analysis of the reasons for this rise, but the upswing does suggest a possible deterioration in the quality of mortgage credit.

Second, consumers appear to be increasingly mortgaging their homes to obtain funds for travel, education, or purchase of consumer goods. This reflects a wise policy in the sense that needed funds can usually be obtained through mortgages at an interest rate well below other types of consumer credit. But, is it desirable that consumers shoulder heavy mortgage indebtedness simply to finance present consumption of often questionable value?

Third, there are increasing reports of heavy lender competition in the mortgage market which can encourage risky lending practices.

FDIC Chairman Joseph Barry expressed the concern of many when he stated:

> In terms of customary past standards there has been a relative deterioration in the quality of (mortgage) credit extended.[4]

A fourth problem in the mortgage field deals with closing costs. Mortgage lenders are required to state the interest rate on each mortgage and the costs—"closing costs"—of making the loan. However, those costs which are not considered "incident" to making the loan often need not be included in the computation of the interest rate, though the borrower pays them anyway. The amount of many of these charges and whether they are included or not in the interest rate computation are matters which vary from region to region, and from agency to agency. See FHA study of closing costs included in the supplementary file.

Possibly some uniform policy might protect the borrower from excessive closing costs and also help him know just what rate of interest he is paying.

E. COLLEGE LOANS

It appears that the rapid expansion of private loan programs for college students is not without its problems. The President's Consumer Advisory Council recently declared that it was disturbed by the very high interest rates charged for college loans by some financial institutions and, especially, by the failure to disclose rates forthrightly. In a later interview, one of the Council members, Richard L. D. Morse, referred to a loan program offered students by a well-known finance company. The full charge, including insurance, amounted to 45 percent a year. Counting only interest itself, the rate was still 14.4 percent.

Possibly the recent expansion of the National Defense Education Act Government loan program, will reduce the area of opportunity for unscrupulous private lenders. But, surely, investigation of this undesirable lending practice would be helpful.

Some material can be found in the 1964 Senate hearings on the Higher Education Student Assistance Act of 1965, a bill introduced by Senator HARTKE.

The Consumer Advisory Council has recommended that: First, colleges and universities be more cautious in associating themselves in any way with such private loan programs; and second, the Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs be made responsible for publishing a careful analysis—including disclosure of loan cost and simple annual interest rate—of the existing major loan programs for students.

F. RETAIL INSTALLMENT SALES

Totaling $7.1 billion at the end of 1964, consumer installment credit at retail outlets—excluding automobile dealers—has doubled since 1955, a growth rate even faster than the growth of total consumer installment credit. Retail installment credit includes as its major components both the conventional installment plans and revolving credit accounts.

In revolving credit plans, a customer buys items by charging them to his own credit account which he continually replenishes by payments of a fixed monthly sum.

Throughout the Nation, service-charge rates on revolving credit accounts and conventional installment accounts appear to be consistent, the rate being a charge of 1½ percent on the monthly account balance. On an annual basis, this represents a service charge of 18 percent a year. This high charge raises real questions about retail installment credit.

First, are these charges justifiable? The National Retail Merchants' Association had done what appears to be an objective study of the costs to retail stores of customer credit services—see a copy of the report in the supplementary file.

The study findings indicate that providing credit in the department store field—the study was limited to this field—is a costly undertaking which offers no profit per se. Credit, a losing business venture itself, could only be justified as a selling tool. The individual consumer and general public might wonder if a "selling tool" need be so expensive.

Of course, the consumer has certain rights to buy goods on terms that he desires. This brings us to the second question, "Does the consumer really appreciate the cost of retail installment plans?" The hearings on the truth-in-lending bill revealed as great a consumer ignorance about this type of credit as about any other. Because of the often relatively small sums involved in retail installment credit, the consumer usually pays little heed to service charges.

In brief, then, are the rapidly growing high cost retail installment credit plans justifiable? And, if so, should not the consumers somehow be made more aware of the high service charges?

G. BANKRUPTCIES AND GARNISHMENTS

Bankruptcies and garnishments are relevant considerations in this report for two reasons: First, they often provide a rough measure of the quality of consumer credit; and second, they represent a serious problem for the consumers involved.

First, bankruptcies. Personal bankruptcy filings totaled over 155,000 for fiscal year 1964, a jump of nearly 60 percent above fiscal year 1960—see complete figures in the supplementary file. California has far and away the most filings—24,641 in fiscal year 1963.

As a measure of the quality of consumer credit today, this rapid rise in individual bankruptcy filings is not overly disturbing. The trend has been sharply upward for a decade or so. Besides, there are so many influences on the number of filings other than individuals' credit burden that it is impossible to relate with much accuracy the trends in filings to the quality of credit. For example, changes in State laws and procedures covering wage garnishment, collection practices, and personal exemptions can affect the rate of bankruptcy filings. Indeed, States with the highest incidence of filings reveal major differences in consumer credit conditions.

If one were to use the number of filings anyway as an indicator of general credit quality, recent events would suggest that there has been no deterioration in the quality of consumer credit.

The Federal Reserve Bulletin of September 1964 points out:

> The sustained rise in the number of bankruptcy petitions that began in mid-1962 has

---

[4] Wall Street Journal, Oct. 2, 1964, p. 10.

> slowed in recent quarters, however, and this spring a dip was reported for the first time in 2 years on a seasonally adjusted basis.

Bankruptcies become a very serious concern, however, when one considers them from the standpoint of the individuals involved. Bankruptcy proceedings are an expensive and socially painful process. Further, the proceedings often do not relieve the individual of his unbearable obligations. One wonders why more is not being done to counteract or at least investigate the rapid rise in the number of people who find it necessary to file bankruptcy petitions.

Efforts to improve the consumer credit market might be one means of alleviating the problem. Assistant Attorney General Leo Loevinger noted in 1962:

> It is reasonable to believe that the misuse of consumer credit has contributed to this rise in the bankruptcy rate and that the misuse of consumer credit is encouraged by the present practice of keeping the consumer in the dark as to the true cost of credit.

Second, garnishments. Garnishments and wage assignments are dealt with by State laws, but the wide-scale abuse of these procedures makes them a national problem.

Subject to varying State legal requirements, a lender who is unable to collect on debts owed him can in most States collect the money by forcing his borrower's employer to deduct some sum from the employee's paycheck. The real trouble here is that employers upon receiving garnishee notices will usually dismiss the employee if the employee does not get the notice withdrawn immediately. Employees would rather do that than be faced with the costly clerical work of making deductions—see the 1963–64 hearings on the "truth in lending" bill before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, page 24.

General figures on the extent of this problem would provide some index of the quality of consumer credit. However, we were unable to obtain such general statistics, if they exist at all. The problem does appear to be widespread. One Chicago study found that 3,000 workers a year in the city faced garnishment actions.

Surely, some review of the problem is needed, to aid those borrowers who are being hurt by present practices. Possibly, model legislation might be recommended. Better consumer knowledge of the costs of credit would probably help alleviate the problem.

H. STATE LAWS—AND WHY FEDERAL LEGISLATION?

Consumer credit is subject to both Federal and State regulations. Federal regulations include some control over advertising—FTC—and control over the lending practices of banks which are members of the FDIC or the Federal Home Loan Bank Board. It is the States, however, who do most consumer credit regulation. Yet, even in States with the most progressive credit legislation—New York and California are among these States—great inadequacies still remain in the laws. One glance at the great number of existing abuses in the consumer credit field reveals that present legal protection of the consumer leaves much to be desired.

Some recent events suggest that State laws are probably in line for thorough analysis and revision. The American Bar Foundation should have now completed or should be just completing a 2-year study of consumer credit. The study should suggest model legislation or at least the areas of need for legislation. Likewise, the National Conference of Commissioners on Uniform State Laws announced last June that it was beginning "an exhaustive study of the entire field of consumer credit for the purpose of drafting comprehensive uniform or model State legislation."

Yet, all this must be taken with a grain of salt. Although the American Bar Foundation and certainly the National Conference on Uniform State Laws carry a good deal of influence with State governments, the model legislation even when developed will have to follow a long and rough road before being enacted—if it ever is.

Investigation and possible legislation on the Federal level, therefore, seem imperative. While there is no valid case for limiting Government efforts in consumer credit to the State level, there is a strong case for further Federal action. First, the Federal Government has some jurisdiction in the field. Through its control over interestate commerce and over most banks and through its many other powers, the Federal Government has the power and consequent opportunity to alleviate many of the abuses that exist. In regard to Federal labeling or disclosure laws, Senator Douglas points out that we already have the pure food and drug acts, the wool and textile products labeling acts, the automobile price disclosure act, and the SEC full disclosure legislation.

Second, the States have often failed to do the necessary job of preventing the abuses that exist.

Third, the Federal Government has the clear responsibility for promoting economic stabilization. Credit regulations can be a major means of fulfilling this responsibility.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

PART I. AN OVERVIEW

A. Consumer credit outstanding has grown at a rapid rate in postwar years, easily exceeding overall economic growth. Installment credit expansion has sparked the growth. The present period of rapid expansion dates from mid-1961, and, though large, is not the steepest growth on record. For a number of reasons, credit growth in 1964 leveled off after record gains in 1963.

B. Installment credit extensions relative to sales in 1964 appear below what one would expect from past experience. Automobile paper terms are tending to become more liberal, but the trend is still limited.

C. Installment credit repayments as a percentage of disposable income reached a record high of 14 percent in 1964.

D. At present, it appears that the increased credit burden is being carried with little or no apparent rise in financial difficulties among marginal borrowers. Most of the increase in the burden can be explained by an increase in the proportion of consumers using installment credit, not by an increase in individuals' debt-income ratios.

The impending large growth in young households, who are big users of installment credit, and changes in the credit-use pattern lead one to expect a renewed rise in the proportion of consumers using installment credit and the proportion with high-repayment-income ratios. Both of these factors should contribute to a rise in the repayment-income ratio for the population as a whole.

E. Consumer credit has a major impact on the economy. It is a prime factor in business fluctuations, acting as a leading and amplifying force. Developments in the general credit market, including general credit and monetary policy, affect consumer credit in a number of ways. But, the question still remains whether present credit and monetary tools are as significant or timely an influence on consumer credit as the policymaker would desire. Some have proposed further controls of a standby, selective nature.

F. There are many different types of credit lending agencies and their importance fluctuates over time. A major problem facing these agencies today is the threatened full-scale entry of savings and loan associations into the consumer credit field.

PART 2: SOME SPECIFIC ISSUES

A. Consumers appear woefully ignorant of actual finance rates but usually do know where to shop for credit and the types of credit to seek. The policymaker must decide just how much more knowledge consumers need.

Senator Douglas has a proposal to provide consumers with much greater finance rate information. His proposal has a number of definite advantages but there is also the possibility that its provisions might cause serious "shock" effects in the short run and may even slow credit growth in the long run.

B. Low-income groups now face a unique credit problem—be exploited or forgo major purchases. Neither alternative, of course, is desirable. Some solution is needed.

C. Evidence is either lacking or negative on the question whether finance companies are taking over automobile dealerships. There is much evidence, on the other hand, that dealers are making substantial profits on the installment financing of automobile purchases.

D. Analysis of the mortgage market reveals a number of important problems. The number of foreclosures on nonfarm residential properties is rapidly increasing. Consumers appear to be using mortgage funds for new—and possibly questionable—purposes. Competition which might be excessive is appearing in the lender market. Finally, the whole problem of closing costs needs to be investigated.

E. Abuses in private college loan programs and the high "service charges" on installment credit accounts at retail outlets need consideration.

F. The increasing number of bankruptcies and garnishment actions call more than ever for a major investigation. These two matters often involve much personal suffering.

G. State laws regulating consumer credit are often quite inadequate and need to be revised. The Federal Government can and should play a more important role in the consumer credit field.

PROTECTION OF U.S. WALNUT TIMBER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DENT] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I appear here to add my voice to those of the American Walnut Manufacturers Association and others who are gravely concerned over the recent order of the new Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Connor, terminating the order of February 14, 1964, for the protection of the rapidly diminishing supply of U.S. walnut timber by slowing down export and domestic consumption of walnut logs.

I first learned of the situation created by export and import policies of this product and other hardwoods that lend themselves to the production of veneers, furniture, and other highly prized and exclusive wood products as chairman of an ad hoc committee that studied the "Impact of Imports and Exports upon U.S. Employment and Unemployment."

Prior to this and up until my election to the U.S. Congress I was a great believer in and follower of the so-called free trade movement. The idea that trade could have a serious effect upon the daily lives of many persons and a direct effect upon our total economy was never considered by myself and I venture to say hundreds of public servants and even millions of everyday Americans.

While I am no longer a free trader, as I understand this type of a person to be, I am a believer in the free exchange of goods and services between nations on an equitable and livable basis. I do not lay all the blame for our economic disease of unemployment at the door of our trade policy but I say that it is responsible for the major part directly and the rest of it indirectly.

Simple arithmetic and eighth-grade education tells us that you cannot ship raw materials to competitors who sell back to your own market or to your foreign market, yet in many cases they do both.

We will learn this the hard way. I dare say that most of our business and industrial leaders already know this simple economic fact but it is worth repeating, "you cannot sell wholesale, and buy back retail, and stay in business."

That is what we are doing with our great and exclusive walnut industry. American walnut trees take from 60 to 100 years to mature into the most valuable of all fine woods and yet this Nation thinks no more of this great natural and exclusive resource than it does of ordinary easy to get products that are available almost anywhere in the world.

It takes over 60 years to produce one American walnut tree. It just cannot be done simply by planting and waiting. It takes, Mr. Speaker, and Members of the House, a reminder from the poet Joyce Kilmer when he penned his poem "Trees"—"Only God can make a tree." I have never asked why this country was blessed with the only source of this great resource but perhaps it is one of the mysterious ways set up in order that every nation has something of its own.

When I first heard of the question raised on the walnut situation during the hearings on Mr. Connor's confirmation by the Senate, I addressed the attached letter to the new Secretary:

JANUARY 23, 1965.

Hon. JOHN T. CONNOR,
Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am sorry to have to make my acquaintance with you by way of a petition, but since matters are as they are, I have no choice.

I do hope we can get together at some early date on matters of such nature as trade, customs, and quotas.

Recently, during the hearings before the Senate committee, on your confirmation, the matter of walnut exports was unexpectedly worked into the proceedings.

As chairman, I headed an ad hoc committee that studied the question of imports, exports, and American jobs. Our report and hearings are available.

The problem of walnut and other hardwoods was given quite a detailed study and, I believe, this led directly to the hearings starting in 1963 which finally ended in the issuance of Bulletin No. 888 establishing a system of quotas and limits externally and internally for walnut harvesting and production.

I will not waste your time with details since I am sure both sides, the foreign interests and the domestic association will give you the details and figures.

Personally, I've tended to follow the line of protectionism in competitive products both as to export as well as import. While this may be an old-fashioned and out-of-date theory, I can't help but remember vividly my own coal, glass, and tool steel production in my district and the chronic unemployment due in a large measure to fixed U.S. costs against fluid and unrestricted foreign production costs.

It was clearly pointed out in the matter of walnut logs that unless a two-way covenant of restriction were imposed, this type of wood would soon be beyond help as a job-sustaining commodity.

I remember well the statement by the then Secretary, Luther Hodges. While he was an avowed freetrader, he had to make the following observation in fairness to the seriousness of the problem. Secretary Hodges said:

"We will keep a close watch on all phases of this program to see that our objectives are not frustrated, for example by a rise in exports of walnut veneer in substitution for exports of logs."

I understand from the industry that while our free-trading advocates have as their goal a world free of greed, want and tariffs as a means to world peace, we still have among us some persons who want profit in any way they can get it.

And so, Mr. Secretary, the great advocates of free trade are doing exactly what Secretary Hodges anticipated and warned against. They are increasing the export of walnut veneer manufactured here, but for purposes contrary to the needs of the industry and the U.S. economy.

All I ask is that you give full consideration to this problem, and please keep in mind that while I am opposed to free trade in products that create unemployment in any nation where imports kill off domestic industry, I propose and have always supported free and unrestricted trade within trade zones of equal cost and production standards.

I favor continuation of Bulletin No. 888 with a further classification of our position on veneers.

I do hope we can keep in mind the need for conservation of the American product—one of the few truly American industries.

With every kind regard, I am,
Sincerely yours,
JOHN H. DENT,
Member of Congress,

Mr. Speaker, one would hate to believe that the Secretary so new in his new position would really believe that a condition of 50-percent success—counting export cheating by foreigners which is acknowledged in the following correspondence by the Secretary himself—in a voluntary program he would kill the program.

What the Secretary is saying is that if a patient is dying and an operation to save his life has only been 50 percent successful with a few errors in the operating room—export of veeners—that it is no use trying to save the patient—stop all treatment. Now he really does not mean that—at least I hope he does not.

On February 24, 1965 I again wrote to the Secretary as follows:

FEBRUARY 24, 1965.

Hon. JOHN T. CONNOR,
The Secretary of Commerce,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY CONNOR: Sorry, I just received your note on export controls on black walnut.

I understand the decision has been made and all restrictions have been lifted.

I wonder if your investigation disclosed how much walnut veneer was made in the United States by foreign producers after they used up their export quota. It could be important.

With every kind regard, I am,
Sincerely yours,
JOHN N. DENT,
Member of Congress.

In response I received the following letter:

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., March 3, 1965.

Hon. JOHN H. DENT,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. DENT: Secretary Connor has asked me to answer your letter February 24, concerning the amount of walnut veneer made in the United States by foreign producers after they used up their log quotas.

We are unable to correlate the timing of veneer production with the date on which individual export quotas granted to the same companies were exhausted by actual shipments. I assume, however, that your question primarily relates to the net increase during the last year of veneer exports by foreign interests who may also have had log export quotas.

From confidential reports submitted to the Department, we estimate that walnut veneer exports in 1964 were approximately 520,000 board feet higher than in 1963. Of that amount approximately 390,000 board feet were exported partly or wholly by foreign-owned concerns which may also have had log export quotas under the control. These 390,000 board feet represent less than

10 percent of the roughly 4.5 million board feet by which domestic walnut consumption during the past twelve months exceeded the 15 million board feet target figure.

Thank you for your letter.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS G. WYMAN,

Domestic and International Business.

Now, my fellow Representatives, I can understand the Secretary's precise and to the board foot knowledge of domestic consumption but is it not farfetched to say that he has no figures except confidential figures on the exports of veneers that are used in U.S. quotas.

First of all why confidential, why not public? Who gave these figures in confidence? My father always warned me against persons who whispered in my ear confidentially.

I am convinced that the whole effort in the walnut problem has been made to take off controls come hell or high water. It does not matter to some people whether the walnut industry burns or dies by drowning. Frankly, I am afraid it will succumb to suffocation.

Another interesting point to be considered by all of us is that the walnut industry is being penalized for the "big sale" increased production, creating more jobs and adding to the gross national product.

Where, oh where, is there any logic or commonsense in such a situation. Certainly there is economic sense.

On one hand we are spending billions for upgrading our workers, rehabilitating depressed areas, pushing for a growth in the gross national product and in this case we are told "you are a bad boy—you got better than 100 percent in effort." No fooling, is this the same Nation that passed the poverty bill, Appalachia, the wheat and farm subsidies?

In the walnut industry you are penalized if you produce more than you are allowed not because you create a surplus; no, according to the Secretary's letter there is a danger of exhaustion of supply of raw material, but simply because we have to give foreigners part of our limited supply. This is different in the sugar business.

In the farm industry they are paid to keep producing even if the bins are full and we cannot even give the surplus away. It is true, there is some measure of control but it does not take a lifetime to grow a new crop. So controls are an assurance of income not curtailment of needed products.

Mr. Connor's first reply in the form of his release of February 12, 1965, expresses the most illogical and frustrating of all the reasons for leaving our walnut reserves unguarded against the profit pirates of the international trade world. Let me quote a statement made by Mr. Connor:

> Notwithstanding the industries' commitment to adopt one thirty-sixth inch as the commercial standard for veneer thickness, this was never done. After some weeks, the veneer cutters did begin to slice a thinner veneer, which they reported as one thirty-sixth inch but which field surveys have shown to average about one thirty-fourth inch. (Furniture manufacturers protested they could not use this thinner veneer, and for a long time failed to do so.) We now find that domestic consumption of logs for the control year has exceeded the 15 million board foot target by over 4.5 million board feet. On this ground alone there is sufficient basis for not continuing the controls, since the condition for their continuance was not fulfilled.
>
> The situation does not seem to involve the possible extinction of the walnut resource. On the contrary, walnut trees are constantly being planted and constantly maturing. Demand is for the moment exceeding new growth, but market factors will undoubtedly bring about a balance, ultimately, between consumption and growth. Among the important factors which could help to reduce domestic log consumption, for example, are not only price shifts, but increasing use of substitute materials.

It does not seem to matter to the Secretary that the veneer makers have to sell their product and the buyers balked for a long time. The Secretary should understand that selling drugs on a doctor's prescription with a captive patient is a lot different than selling in a competitive market with or without the doctor's orders. This coupled with the export of veneers by foreign agents buying for foreign uses adds to the overrun.

The moral of this is that if you cannot get walnut, you can use synthetics. Was not it Marie Antoinette who said, "Let them eat cake."

Let us go further and read a little more from this release of the new Secretary of Commerce.

> We now find the domestic consumption has exceeded the board foot target by 4.5 million feet. On this ground alone, there is sufficient basis for not continuing controls, since the condition for their continuance was not fulfilled.

Funny how he slips over the fact that while there was an overrun for perfectly logical reasons in any industry, there was a cutback from the year before by U.S. cutters of the same amount over 4 million feet.

Frankly, it begins to appear as though Mr. Connor's drug experience is coming into play and the American people are going to be given a dose of his potent tranquilizers so they will not feel or even mind when they lose their shirts or pants are taken off.

For me to waste your time and mine with the figures showing the decline of the source walnut trees would be presemptious. I therefore want to cover the parts of the story that affect you and me and representatives of the people of the American economy as it represents the welfare of our people present and future.

Certainly the loss of the walnut veneer industry would only be a drop in the bucket. With only 2,000 employees and a payroll of about $12 million, it is a peanut industry with the minds of our "think big and abroad" crowd. When you figure the 100 persons in the average walnut veneer plant it makes the industry a prime candidate for oblivion.

Incidentally this fits the overall goal of our trade policy as expressed by George Ball in the fight to pass the Trade Extension Act of 1962 when he said that we may as well face it, certain U.S. industries were expendable and would have to be replaced by more sophisticated productions.

Connor suggests the same thing, "use substitutes." Marie Antoinette substituted cake.

However, Marie found out, and George Ball will find out sooner or later, that substitutes never replace originals, they just displace them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not foolish enough to think that the walnut industry's demise will bankrupt the Nation. It would not but it will play hell with 2,000 families in the industry, the producers and their investments. It will certainly affect the welfare of the communities involved by way of taxes, economic growth and above all, will take from 6,000 other Americans the source of their incomes.

We will soon be called upon to work for the passage of a new Fair Labor Standards Act. It is needed and I support the effort. I do so, however, with my eyes open. I know it brings this industry closer to a serious situation since our fair labor standards are not exported with our logs but their labor standards are imported with the products they make from our logs.

Funny thing how a farmer thinks it is great to sell a walnut tree to a Japanese veneer cutter for more money than he can get from a U.S. veneer producer, but thinks nothing of asking the veneer people to pay taxes to subsidize his wheat crop, while he demands that Congress refuse admittance of competitive wheat at any price especially below his guaranteed subsidized price.

Maybe the answer lies in what a liberal, progressive, and high Government official once proposed to me as the answer.

He suggested we subsidize all products, including veneers of course, to export at a loss to the producer, pay the producer a "farm-type subsidy" buy up the surplus products and by this method keep everybody working and paying taxes to keep the plants running.

There is no question but what this would give us our share of the foreign market for veneers and of course sheds full of walnut since our U.S. furniture makers would be out of business unless we gave them an equalizer price subsidy such as we have given the U.S. textile industry so that he could compete with foreign producers.

Incidentally, figures now show that all the textile industry subsidy plan did was to give the textile industry a guaranteed profit.

Now these remedies sound fine but basically they are as unsound as trying to reach the moon on a broom carrying a slicing machine to bring home cheese out of which the moon is made—or is it?

While the U.S. veneer industry use of logs increased 3.18 times during the 6-year period between 1954 and 1960, the export of logs increased 1,700 times.

If we had at least limited exports to our own increased use it would have saved 8 million feet of prime walnut new logs. No person buying will see this much new walnut in this lifetime under our present operations.

The use of walnut is unlimited; only the supply determines its production of goods for use of the people.

The double standards of our trade policy will eventually spell the downfall of this Nation as both a trading nation and as producer of processed and manufactured goods.

Already we have become dependent upon foreign sources for much of our everyday consumer needs.

It is no laughing matter when 97 percent of all the fine china sold in the United States last year was imported, when great numbers of American kids ride, skate, swim, spin, jump, dance, listen, eat, drink, write, play games, clean their teeth, comb their hair, and everything but breathe with foreign-made products.

I challenge any Member of this Congress to take a family Christmas shopping list and try to fill it without losing his temper or at least his patience.

I was under the erroneous impression that the purpose of all governments, and especially ours, was to make our Nation strong and independent. Independence does not mean isolationism anymore than stopping the export of an expendable natural resource is a violation of fair trade relations.

Perhaps to you the relationship between the majestic and enduring American walnut tree and the everyday cutthroat competition of world trade is a figment of my imagination. Not so; and the facts will prove my contention that the American walnut tree is symbolic of all our trade agreements where we as a nation put the profit and the balance of trade above and beyond the true needs of the community and its peoples.

Let us look at the American walnut tree. After 60 or more years it is cut down and prepared for shipment. It can go two routes; to a foreign country or to a domestic processor. If we ship it overseas—the logger gets paid, the owner gets paid, the transportation gets paid, and finally, if it by accident happens to be an American ship, the sailors get paid.

From the stump to the faraway place, the U.S. economy benefits to the tune of about $300 and this is from prime veneer logs. Much less will be realized from the run-of-the-mill-type logs. You can bet the foreign buyers with their wage and tax cost differentials select only the best logs for their export.

Let us take a look at what happens when the logs are shipped to an American mill. All the above get paid except the shipping line. However, the transportation from the veneer mill to the furniture plant and other users more than makes up this loss, which is only a loss if shipped American. All of you know how slim our chances are of having logs shipped to Japan and other countries via U.S. ships. Of course, if under the AID program, maybe we will have a 50-50 chance.

Now that we are even, insofar as U.S. economy is concerned, let us go further with our U.S. veneer produced from a U.S. walnut tree with U.S. labor.

The logs shipped to a U.S. mill are processed along with other woods used in making veneers or are shipped as veneer for other manufacturers who use the veneer as a veneer without backup lumber. In either case the jobs provided are the same. From the veneer plants it moves to the furniture, cabinet, and panel manufacturers. The cuttings not suitable for veneers are shipped for stair rails, trim, frames, and other items that are fast disappearing from the American scene.

Now, when you realize that only 2 percent of veneered walnut furniture is walnut, and the balance other woods, you realize that for every walnut log consumed by our furniture industry it takes 49 other type trees to meet the needs of the industry.

What does this mean to the U.S. community? It simply means that for every logger that gets a job from an exported tree, 50 other American loggers lose 3 jobs. There is no argument in the claim that if we were not exporting the one logger would lose his job because every person except perhaps Secretary Connor knows that domestic and world demand for American walnut furniture far exceeds the supply.

Let us step further and figure how much the export logger contributes to the doctors, nurses, barbers, retailers, clothingmakers, car producers, farmers, workers in heavy and light industries making radios, TV's, air conditioners, and on and on and on.

And last but not least, how much does the export logger contribute to schools, churches, hospitals, spectator sports, charities, and on and on and on.

Let us look at figures that might help us grasp the situation. In 1961–62 we exported 8.5 million board feet of walnut, sold cut 17.5 million feet in our domestic market.

In 1963 we reached 14.3 million feet export and 23.5 million feet domestic. In 1964, without controls, the normal growth use factor would have forced U.S. producers to produce 26 million feet and the exporters using the same ratio of growth would have gone to 18 million feet.

However, in 1964 even with a voluntary cutback on thickness plus a charge against the United States for exported veneer we were forced to cut back to 7.3 million feet export logs and 19.5 million feet domestic.

If we did not have controls and if we had not allowed export of logs plus export veneer, the entire cutting of American walnut would have only met the needs of our own market. This certainly proves we have and are exporting jobs, wages, salaries, and service industries' earnings with every log we ship out.

Let us look at the next step that took place after only 1 year of controls. The exporters, the people who claim they are so necessary in our economy, had such a demand for veneer they contracted for veneer made here. However, they had the joker up their sleeves and export veneers were reduced to one-fiftieth of an inch thickness.

U.S. producers had to battle American users of veneer to try to sell our veneers cut to one thirty-sixth inch thickness in place of the one twenty-eighth inch formerly the standard for walnut veneers.

Foreign furniture makers thus make up for their higher priced veneers because they get more facings for their furniture and the unsuspecting buyer gets hooked.

The facts are there for all to see. We do not need to export logs. We can and do export furniture but you can see what is going to happen in this area of export trade with the ceilings off on walnut log export.

The wily and foxy trade boys would not quit right away but I will predict the end of the veneer export business and soon the furniture will go down the same drain.

The argument of the Secretary that this free sale and export of logs will help Appalachia is just so much hog wash. One good furniture plant will hire more people, contribute more to the economy than all the logs cut in Appalachia. If you want to help Appalachia, let Bendix start making their Japanese radios in Pennsylvania; let Studebaker go back to Indiana; let the Americans start drinking from glasses made in West Virginia, Ohio, and Pennsylvania; let the dinnerware makers in the pottery areas put the plates on our dinner tables; let our textile makers make our cloth; let our transistor and electronics workers put the guts in our TV's, tape recorders, and PA systems; let steel workers make our steel and our coal miners heat our homes, produce our power, and heat our institutions along with our domestic gas and oil producers.

Let Americans produce for our own uses, let our farmers produce our food and those of us working in our factories will pay them for full production and they can give away their surplus to needy people overseas to help them get on their own two feet.

That is where we all end up, on our own two feet as peoples and as nations; if not, we will all end up on our backs—there is no in between.

You try to sell a free trader the proposal that he run his home on the same theory and you will find out how he is with his own job and his own family's welfare.

I find that when I scratch a free trader with foreign competition he bleeds and screams louder than any protectionist I know.

One wonders how the same government could issue one order restricting sugar export sales that had not even taken place with a worldwide supply sufficient for all needs while in the same breath using the same provision of GATT, article XX(g) in the 1947 agreement to wipe out export restrictions on walnut, a short-supply resource and affecting no other countries' exports since we alone produce American walnut logs.

Testimony before the Hartke committee shows the double talk used to accomplish this, by no means an amateur trick.

You are not interested at this moment in the export of dollars but let me quote from a nationwide foreign products sales group. This will give you some idea of how the free-trade boys operate. They claim to be freetraders for the good of mankind—maybe they are, more power to them if they are—but I am of the opinion that mankind as they see it is the man who faces them when they shave.

Here is a little advertising that accompanies an offer to sell the following items:

1. Electric powered 8 mm. movie cameras—no winding—drop in loader—black and white or colored—for $4.40.

2. Jeweled calendar watch—Swiss movement—tells time and date—sweep second hand—gift box—water resistant—anti-magnetic—stainless band steel back—for $2.33 plus 11 cents for expansion band.

3. Tape recorder—4 transistors—complete with built-in powerful dynamic speaker—records—plays back, erases—rewinds includes microphone, battery, tape, reels, etc.—for $6.70.

4. Electric razor—product Swiss craftsmanship—shaped to shave the heaviest beards—maker guarantees full 2 years—complete with cord—head guard and brush—for $1.70.

These are only four of hundreds of import bargains you can get to make fantastic profits of over 200 percent if you want to go into business. Here are a few more:

Australian wool sweater	$2.00
Transistor radio	1.70
Cigarette lighter	.17
Electric carving knife	1.50
Binoculars	1.20
Teakwood chest	.90
Derringer pistol	5.74
Star sapphire ring	6.00
Electric hair dryer	1.37
Electric train set	1.36

Impossible—that is what you think. I thought so too, but I investigated further and then I came across the real free trade clincher.

This is the sales pitch showing you why it can be done, why it is being done, why we are losing our walnut industry and why we lost Studebaker, Bendix, Bell and Howell, and the hundreds of free and independent American firms that under the guise of helping our neighbors are bleeding our own Nation white; they are taking the gold out of our economic bloodstream and our kids will have limited choices of a career. They can go to school for life under subsidy, they can produce protected subsidized products, they can get a job in government, or they can inherit or marry accumulated wealth.

Of course it would not hurt if you happen to own some good export-import stock or invest in oversea American-owned facilities.

This is all good for a few but I guarantee the rest of us will be pretty much in the same ruts of poverty, not the same kind of poverty we are attempting to cure now, but a different type.

One of our first signs of the new poverty will be when we are told "to have only as many children as we can afford." From there on it is your guess as good as mine, maybe the child we did not have would have been Columbus or Einstein or Michaelangelo or for that matter you or me.

Sorry, if I get a little away from my import bargains and and how it is possible so I will close by quoting verbatim from the man's sales pitch which I have for your inspection, if you will not or cannot believe me:

Here's Why Import Profits Are Fantastic—You Can Cash in on These Low Labor Costs and Pocket the Difference

Compare the high cost of domestic labor with recent oversea costs:

Overseas labor costs so little

	Per hour
United States	$2.80
Japan	.56
Holland	.58
Italy	.65
Belgium	.73
Switzerland	.77
Great Britain	.80
West Germany	.85

Every dollar you spend for labor on overseas products is worth $4 here. According to reports furnished by the U.S. Department of Commerce and other reliable sources, the recent average price of skilled labor in various countries does not exceed the amounts shown above. Compare the U.S. cost of $2.80 with 56 cents an hour in Japan, or in other countries. It's easy to see why import pays so well. Compare the costs of Swiss watches, German tape recorders, Japanese transistor radios, hundreds of other imports, with the same domestic merchandise. There is no comparison. And often, the imported product has much more painstaking handwork.

My fellow Members of Congress, need I say more—this importer agent has said it much more eloquently than I could have and besides he knows what he is talking about. "It is good for business—his business."

ISSUES IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months I have been deeply concerned about Vietnam. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, I have had an opportunity to examine the issues which are at the source of the crisis and have come to appreciate their complexity. Like many of my colleagues, I have regarded it as important to respect the Executive's primary responsibility in foreign affairs. I have been moved by the President's awesome burdens in this field. I recognize his greater command of information.

But I suggest that we in positions of national trust cannot remain silent in the face of growing national anxiety. We have a responsibility to thoughtful and open debate about Vietnam. I respectfully suggest that it is wrong to maintain that in our democratic society we will do our country a disservice by discussing our present course of action. The absence of forthright dialog actually calls into question our national vitality and the strength of our representative institutions. It is clear to me that the people of this country are disturbed over the events in Vietnam. They want to hear debate, lest they be cut off from their leaders and the important decisions on foreign policy.

During the vibrant period from 1947 to 1949, when the groundwork for our postwar military and diplomatic policy was established, debates in Congress were frequent, spirited, and enlightening. They contributed to the formation of the Marshal plan and the Truman Doctrine. Why are so few voices raised now, when nothing less than our future commitment to Asia and world peace are at stake? To urge debate in Congress is not to suggest that the legislative body make foreign policy. It is to expose a maximum of ideas, a variety of thinking, to the open air. We owe it to our constituents to express our views, however mistaken we may sometimes be. I rise to speak today, then, out of a commitment to a free discussion of one of the vital questions facing the American Nation.

It seems clear that, when the administration decided to extend the war in Vietnam to the north, it knew the risks involved. The administration chose to undertake a policy, the consequence of which was, at best, uncertain. Indeed, on a number of occasions, the President himself suggested that nobody could predict the future with confidence. It was his judgment, however, that forces on the other side—in Peiping, Moscow, Hanoi, and the Vietcong—had to be convinced of our irrevocable commitment to South Vietnam and our refusal to be coerced into withdrawal. This constituted the broader political grounds for our decision to bomb the north.

Diplomatically we were determined "to do something to the other side we could stop doing" to improve the prospects of a settlement. I fear that what began as a principle for improving our bargaining position has simply become a blueprint for the escalation of the limited Vietnamese war into a general Asian war.

It has been 2 months since we began bombing North Vietnam on a regular basis. By this time, one administration spokesman was reported to have said in February, the Communists should by now have backed down. But they show no signs of doing so. On the contrary, their will to fight appears to be stiffer than ever and we have acquired no perceptible military advantage. As a consequence, I believe it is important to evaluate the effects of this policy in an effort to improve our posture in the future.

The real issue as of today looks to me like this. The bombings have produced very little.

A UPI news release follows:

SAIGON.—American military authorities here believe the war for control of South Vietnam remained at a stalemate during March, despite the intensification of airstrikes in the south and raids against the north.

Moreover, an American military spokesman said, "There certainly has been a continuation of infiltration in March," although the announced intention of the air raids against North Vietnam was to convince the Hanoi regime to halt the infiltration of men and arms into the south.

The spokesman said the number of American bombing strikes against Communist concentrations inside South Vietnam doubled in March as compared with previous months.

In spite of this increased use of airpower, however, the Government just managed to hold its own in the provinces outside those immediately surrounding the capital.

The point at which they would have forced Hanoi to negotiate—if, indeed, Hanoi does exercise its will over the Vietcong—without triggering direct Chinese or North Vietnamese intervention has continued to elude us. We seemed to have failed to take into account the deep resources of Asian patience. Meanwhile, we have risked greater escalation and ignored viable alternative policies. There are at least some reports which indicated North Vietnamese interest in useful negotiations. Our bombing may be suppressing that interest by making it impossible for North Vietnam to negotiate in honor.

Has the bombing then been in any way successful? Did the north really want to negotiate from the outset, as some have suggested? Was Ho Chi Minh himself anxious to negotiate, actually waiting to see the Chinese contention that America was a paper tiger proven wrong? Have the North Vietnamese been preoccupied with intraparty squabbles between moderates and Maoists and hence completely precluded from settling on any single policy? Have the Russians been quietly biding their time waiting to see us call China's bluff?

These questions and many others hold the key to our future in Vietnam. Our policy has acknowledged their validity but I construe President Johnson's remarks about the difficulty of predicting the future to mean that we may not really know the answers. Without knowing the answers myself, I see us involved in a frustrating war without apparent policies for resolving it. Something must be done and I would like to propose some alternatives to our current course.

At the beginning of any analysis, we must acknowledge that we are not fighting a monolithic Communist enemy in Vietnam. We face rather a complex, divided alliance, as much preoccupied with its own incoherence as it is with waging war on its enemies. That these divisions are the consequence of conflicting objectives has rendered even more difficult our devising a logical policy for dealing with our adversaries. But we must still devise a policy.

We think we understand the intentions of the Soviet Union, one member of the Communist alliance. Russia, it now seems clear, is unhappy at the extension of Chinese revolutionary influence into southeast Asia. Though I am not deceived by Soviet objectives, I think it is indisputable that Russia does not want a general nuclear war.

We are less clear about the nature and intentions of Communist China. Are the Red Chinese nationalists before Communists?—Asians before nationalists; is there no single answer? Perhaps by adopting prudent policies we can encourage them to be what we want them to be, which is—as a minimum—peace-loving.

Even if there is some truth in the argument that, as of now, the Chinese are primarily Asian expansionists, it does not follow that their expansionism is like Germany's in the 1930's or Russia's in the 1940's. Chinese interest and influence in southeast Asia—cultural, political and racial—is centuries old. It bears little resemblance to Russia's concern with, let us say, Berlin, or Nazi Germany's ambitions in the Balkans. Mao's revolutionary guerillas are vastly different from Hitler's Wehrmacht or Stalin's Red Army. We do not confront them in the same way. Mao's revolutionaries fight with ideological weapons, with which we oftentimes do not know how to deal.

However noble our motives and however reprehensible theirs, they use, along with a dose of terrorism, hope and the promise of a better future. Why have we—heirs to Wilsonian idealism and a great revolutionary tradition—forgotten how to use the weapons of that tradition? We know what China is—in reality, a threat to the aspirations of the southeast Asian countries. But we have failed to exploit that threat and have instead put ourselves, in the minds of many Asians, into the positions not of defenders of independence but of neocolonial aggressors.

We have also failed to exploit effectively the strains within the Communist alliance. We have an investment in Russia's strategy of peaceful coexistence. But we have played into Chinese hands by making it appear as if death-lock struggle is the reality of world affairs. We have not sufficiently encouraged the development of a pluralistic world communism of Titoist states balancing the two giants. Though military establishments since Caesar have operated on the principle of divide and conquer, we have not sufficiently promoted such divisions.

Ironically, our Vietnamese policy, while contributing to Communist unity, imposes enormous strains on our own alliance. Prime Minister Wilson, himself at work on creating a great society, faces increased dissension in his own party. De Gaulle's France, long a proponent of a negotiated settlement in southeast Asia, recognizes in our predicament a repetition of their own troubles of 10 years ago. We demand and receive the ostensible support of our allies. But we do not have their confidence. There is intense concern, deep skepticism, over our bombings. Will they force Hanoi to give up or will they escalate the conflict into general war? I do not suggest that this country base its policies on world opinion or the private doubts of our allies. I merely argue that these components cannot be ignored.

Our friends and allies, world opinion generally, and my own constituents have a right to expect clarification of our goals in southeast Asia. They urgently desire that we take the lead in seeking an honorable settlement in Vietnam. I do not accept the argument that we compromise our negotiating position by clarifying our goals. I think we suffer from a diplomacy of silence. I see no reason why this country cannot afford to talk openly and directly. The climate of distrust and suspicion—created by questionable military tactics and ambiguous diplomatic objectives—is hardly conducive to peace.

President Johnson opened a new chapter in our southeast Asian diplomacy at his March 20 news conference. His words deserve careful attention and highest praise:

> The real goal of all of us in southeast Asia must be the peaceful progress of the people of that area. They have the right to live side by side in peace and independence. And if this little country does not have that right then the question is, What will happen to the other hundred little countries who want to preserve that right? They have a right to build a new sense of community among themselves. They have a right to join, with help from others, in the full development of their own resources for their own benefit. They have a right to live together without fear or oppression or domination from any quarter of this globe.

The question now being asked throughout the world is: How do we recognize and provide for the honorable realization of these rights?

In my view, we must offer to North Vietnam an alternative to its present situation in southeast Asia. Those forces in that country which fear domination from China must be shown that there is an alternative other than domination from the West. We have to make it clear that Americans are prepared to feed Asians rather than fight them, clothe Asians rather than bomb them, and teach Asians rather than gas them. And we must show that we will promote and support a system of security in that area which counterbalances the threat of China.

No one should pretend for one moment that such a promise has a strong chance of realization. American presence in southeast Asia is as unnatural and resented as Chinese influence is historic and preponderant. Revolutionary communism, at least in its early stages, is often an attractive path for aspiring nations. But it is clear that America can produce no better policy than one which seeks to promote an independent southeast Asia with an ideology and diplomacy of its own.

There is a chance to take the first step toward this goal right now. Ho Chi Minh is an old Bolshevik, to whom Mao is as much a menace as America. He has carefully built up an industrial base which he is not anxious to lose. He has interests in trade arrangements with the economically complementary south. He is attracted by fuller diplomatic recognition. The prospects of growth through development aid and participation in regional economic plans is more compelling than the protracted attrition of the past 20 years. Ho Chi Minh is an old man, desirous of seeing some general advancement for his country after 20 years of war.

To offer him an alternative to Chinese domination, the United States must overcome an enormous legacy of resentment and hatred. Unless our offers of assistance are above suspicion, they will not succeed. We must be prepared, for example, to join in informal cooperation with Russia in formulating plans for the economic development of southeast Asia. Such coordination, besides promoting stability in southeast Asia, will improve relations with the Soviet Union. It will help isolate China and certain Chinese influence. It will advance the prospects for a system of international cooperation to assist in the development of the poorer regions of the world. I think it is crucial that this country make a commitment to a new deal for southeast Asia. We will, thereby, open up the doors to honorable negotiations for peace in Vietnam.

I urge, as a first step, that the United States cease, for the time being, its bombing raids in the north. At the same time, we might informally request from Hanoi a significant reduction of the incident level in the south. What I suggest is not a total cease-fire. This country will be able to continue its air reconnaissance, intelligence, and antiguerrilla political pressure. Hanoi will probably be unable to prevent isolated incidents of banditry and some insubordination in the Vietcong. But my plan represents a start.

This is diplomacy by mutual example—a process already begun between the United States and Russia by President Kennedy. There is no reason why such diplomacy cannot be extended to Asia. A temporary cessation of bombing will allow Hanoi to receive and initiate peace overtures without appearing to be under coercion. This country would be taking no irrevocable steps. Nor would such action compromise any particular military strategy since, for the most part, the bombings have always been political and psychological in character.

To the argument that such a move would demoralize the South Vietnamese Government, it can fairly be answered that this country has tolerated the impossible behavior of South Vietnamese governments for long enough. Sooner or later, even Saigon must come to accept peace.

During a period of a temporary military moratorium, the United States could pursue a full diplomatic offensive, in an atmosphere of open conversation. Channels heretofore closed might be opened. Proposals for settlement previously repressed might now be considered. And the talents of the country's and perhaps the world's most skilled political negotiator—Lyndon B. Johnson—could be released in pursuit of a settlement honoring this country's commitments, respecting Asian sentiments, and promoting world peace.

Mr. Speaker, I fear we are in danger of becoming the victims of our own diplomatic rigidity. I respectfully call for a policy of flexibility, a policy that will recognize peace within a framework of world security as our goal. I submit that there is more than one way to achieve that goal. I call upon those responsible for formulating our foreign policy to consider every possible alternative to bring the war in Vietnam to an honorable conclusion.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. I wish to commend the gentleman from New York for bringing to the attention of the Congress his thoughts on a vital issue which appear to have been seriously considered. I, too, was somewhat disturbed by the action that the President had taken in Vietnam and raised some questions during the briefing at the White House on March 2 with the President and the Secretary of State. At that time I was assured that every diplomatic channel is being kept open, in line with the suggestion that the gentleman has made, that we may negotiate for peace. The question is, with whom do we negotiate? It takes two to negotiate. We have been assured by the administration that it has made every effort to negotiate. But the only reply it has received from North Vietnam is a complete denial of any direction of or connection with the guerrilla warfare going on in South Vietnam. Under such circumstances, while I heartily agree with the gentleman now in the well of the House, that every effort toward a negotiated peace ought to be exerted, the question still remains, with whom do we negotiate?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I would call the attention of the gentleman from Hawaii to an interesting piece of news that just now came across the Associated Press ticker. It is marked "bulletin." It says: "United Nations, U.N. Secretary General U Thant was reported to have received a message from Red China's Premier Chou En-lai today suggesting that a solution to the Vietnam conflict was up to the parties directly involved."

This is, to me, somewhat interesting. Whether it is credible I would not even offer a suggestion. But there are many countries in the world—Poland, Switzerland, England, France, India, Canada—who are willing to act as middleman between the United States and Hanoi. Certainly, we have the burden of openly suggesting to the world that we are willing to negotiate with Hanoi to see if this matter can be ended. If the Communists come forward and say they are not interested, and if they say, "We do not want to negotiate—we want to pursue this matter because we are winning the war," then our conscience is clean. We can pursue them with our bombers or with whatever military policy is necessary with all the vigor at our command.

I merely say that a major effort on our part must be made before any large-scale escalation can be allowed.

Surely Russia and China have differences of opinion. There is, I believe, a conflict between them. I do not believe that Russia wants China to get into this thing in Vietnam.

Our moral obligation to ourselves and the next generation is to make a massive effort to negotiate in an honorable fashion. Perhaps we can say we will take a week off from bombing the north, or 2 weeks off, or whatever it may be.

If we are not willing to participate in at least a first step toward negotiation, then we must, of course, suffer the consequences.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. The gentleman is not suggesting that every effort is not now being made by the administration?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am sure that efforts are being made, but perhaps those efforts would be more fruitful with a reduction in bombing.

I, too, have been with the President and the Secretary of State and others.

It may be that there is another alternative. Perhaps if we stopped bombing for 2 weeks and announced that to the world, starting tomorrow or the next day, then we could put the burden on the other side, and they would have to carry the burden in the court of world opinion.

We must remember that we are really a great power, compared to the North Vietnamese. We can eliminate them in 12 hours any time we want. I believe that the fact that this has not happened is an indication the President has shown great restraint.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Again I commend the gentleman in the well for having given such considerable thought to this matter. I hope that his thoughts will be conveyed to the administration and that perhaps at a conference table, even with the President, his suggestion may be discussed.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I thank the gentleman for his participation.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. To me it is interesting that this apparent lack of full confidence in the President and the way he is handling this most difficult and complex problem in Vietnam comes from a Member of his own party rather than a Member of the opposite party.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Let me say at that point, there is no lack of confidence in the President at all. I am offering two suggestions.

First, there may be other alternatives, perhaps, from the ones the President's advisers have suggested to him.

Second, as I indicated in my opening remarks, I welcome this kind of discussion and dialog.

I have no lack of confidence. I suggest that, in my judgment, the President is one of the most skilled negotiators in the world. I urge him to put these talents to use in a field which requires all the skills at his command. I am offering a suggestion. I have not, by any manner of means, indicated I lacked confidence in the President.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Perhaps I was incorrect in my interpretation. I realize the gentleman said some very complimentary things about the President. I got the impression that by raising this point and making these suggestions, the gentleman had some belief or some fear that perhaps the President was not handling the situation in Vietnam as he should.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. That is not the case. I am suggesting there might be other alternatives. Perhaps this idea has come up before, within the President's council of advisers.

The fact that this suggestion comes from a Member of Congress—and other Members of Congress indicate similar thoughts—merely indicates that these things should be put on the table.

I welcome the gentleman's participation. I am certain it was not inspired by any partisan consideration in any way at all.

The point is that this kind of open discussion between the gentleman from California and myself and between the gentleman from Hawaii and myself is really a healthy thing. We have less information than the Executive has. We have less experience and skill. Yet, sometimes even a novice can come up with an idea which has merit.

That is the principal reason for my taking the floor today.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. EDWARDS of California. I compliment the gentleman from New York for taking this time this afternoon and offering his very thoughtful remarks on this difficult subject which plagues all Americans and indeed the entire world. By our having what we believe is an intelligent, thoughtful dialog on this immensely difficult subject, we do not indicate in any way that we do not have the highest respect and admiration for our President.

But this is the nature of our way of life. It is the nature of our free society, where our citizens, certainly not excepting Members of Congress, can stand up and discuss the great issues of the day. President Johnson would be the first one to want us to have such a discussion.

Now I would like to ask the gentleman from New York a question. He recently mentioned that the administration has come up with some affirmative suggestions, insofar as the problem of southeast Asia is concerned, so that the other side would know what kind of a world we have in mind for them in the event that hostilities cease and agreement can be reached. I am sure that the gentleman from New York and indeed all of the Congress would applaud the President's support of the Mekong River Basin program. This program of the United Nations which is supported by 25 nations is an example of the type of project which could assist these underdeveloped nations of southeast Asia on the road to economic viability. As the gentleman from New York knows, this project involved Cambodia, Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam and could be to these nations what the Aswan Dam is to Egypt and the Volta River Dam is to Ghana. It seems to me that this kind of affirmative approach to the Vietnam program would be a considerable help in arriving at a satisfactory solution.

Once again I want to thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me, and I assure him of my appreciation for his remarks.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for participating in this discussion. I know that the gentleman is aware of the fact that tomorrow night at 9 o'clock the President is going to speak on national radio and television from Johns Hopkins University. I am hopeful that he will amplify American policy in southeast Asia. It may be his remarks tomorrow night will be the beginning of a major peace offensive. There is nothing wrong in that. It is the man with all of the strength who can in good grace say to the other fellow, "Well, we can stop fighting." They know as well as we do that they do not measure up in the balance of power. There is no contest between us. But certainly the gentleman from California knows as well as I do, that the major threat to this society is a nuclear confrontation. Nobody really wants that. Maybe the Chinese would like to have some action along those lines, but so long as we in this Congress participate in making every effort to assure that this civilization is not ended by that kind of a confrontation, then we have done our job, and I think part of that job is once in a while talking about it as we are doing here today.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROSENTHAL. I will be happy to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleague from California [Mr. EDWARDS], in complimenting the gentleman from New York in making his presentation. I think it is a notable contribution to the dialog on this subject. I know in my own mail from home in the comments there and in the editorials in the newspapers and from a questionnaire that I have sent out it tends to suggest a consensus which would certainly support some of the provocative and, I might say, forward looking ideas that the gentleman has presented here today in connection with a peaceful resolution of a very painful choice for you and the President and our Nation and indeed the world. I want to thank the gentleman for his contribution this afternoon.

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

STATEMENT ON FILING OF BILL ON TAX-EXEMPT MUNICIPALS

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, today I have filed legislation which will put a stop to certain abuses in the area of municipal industrial financing. The bill amends the Internal Revenue Code of 1954. It denies to a corporation a deduction for payments—rental, lease, and so forth—made to municipalities on industrial plants financed by tax-exempt obligations. It also denies a deduction for interest payments made on mortgages which are so financed.

Under the code, the Federal Government does not tax the income received by the holder of a municipal obligation. This is as it should be in order to protect the fiscal independence of local governmental units from control by the Federal Government. However, in recent years, there have been permitted, in a number of States, an extension of municipal financing into new areas. In 28 States, it is now permissible for a municipality to issue an obligation—generally a revenue bond—in a few States they can be backed by the general credit of the municipality—and to use the proceeds for the purchase and construction of industrial sites. The procedure then is to lease or make some other arrangement with an industrial firm to use the facility.

Many communities using this type of financing do so in order to attract new industry. It has become a competitive proposition in some areas. The proceeds are never intended to be used for a bona fide governmental purpose, but solely to enable the community to offer a better "deal" to a corporation. The municipality permits its governmental tax exemption to be used for the expansion of a private company.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, such use of municipal financing is not in accord with the original intent of the exemption. This financing was to be used for genuine municipal projects, not for the benefit and subsidization to private industry.

In most cases, it is not a question of financial need as far as the corporation is concerned. Some of this country's largest and most financially stable corporations have become involved in this type of financing with a municipality.

Mr. Speaker, in a speech delivered on December 1, 1964, to the Investment Bankers Association, Mr. Frank L. Magee, chairman of the executive committee of the Aluminum Co. of America, indicated the dangers involved in continuing on the present course of abusing the exemption. I quote from his speech:

> First off, I believe municipal industrial financing is an abuse of the right of municipalities or States to issue tax-free bonds when these bonds are issued primarily for private benefit * * * this could well serve as the opening wedge for the Federal Government to eliminate the Federal income tax exemption for all State and municipal bonds * * *.
>
> A second danger I see in municipal industrial financing is that it is unfair to industrial neighbors and especially to other companies in a competitive industry.
>
> A third danger I see in the use of municipal industrial financing is the threat of Government ownership of industrial facilities.

I firmly believe that Mr. Magee knows from where he speaks. He heads one of the most prominent industrial establishments in the United States. As firm believers in an unsubsidized private enterprise system, I agree with him that there is no need for healthy and growing companies to force municipalities into providing financing for their private use.

It might be asked, Mr. Speaker, why I am favoring this approach, denying a tax deduction to the private company occupying industrial plant financed by tax exempt bonds, rather than removing the Federal tax exemption for such bonds. The reasons are these: My bill does not deny tax exemption to interest on bonds issued by a State or local government, which would be objectionable to local governments and to many organizations which recognize that tax exempt local government credit should not be used for the benefit of private companies. My bill would close the tax loophole by denying a Federal tax deduction to the private company which otherwise would benefit by the misuse of the tax exemption of a local government. This approach will not raise the constitutional issue of determining whether the obligation was incurred for a genuinely governmental function. The unfair advantage of a corporation being financed through municipal bonds would be removed.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that if we are to stem the headlong competition that is now going on in this field, the Congress must act soon to insure the integrity of the original tax exemption. It must be available for genuine municipal or governmental projects. We should not allow this distortion of the exemption to continue. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this legislation.

A MORE EFFECTIVE VOTING RIGHTS LAW

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KEITH] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I today have the privilege of joining the distinguished minority leader and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary in sponsoring a bill which is the product of their leadership and experience and the efforts of many other able Republican Members of the House, the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

This proposal is offered as a comprehensive and effective substitute for the administration bill, which has been recognized from the outset to be a proposal handicapped by many serious deficiencies and omissions and which, it is widely agreed, dangerously oversteps constitutional bounds.

The Ford-McCulloch bill, to which I am proud to add my name, is a fair and speedy remedy to racial discrimination in voter registration, and it will effectively insure the constitutional right to vote without overturning other important constitutional principles, and without penalizing areas which are not guilty of discrimination.

Its enactment would give us the tools to terminate unreasonable standards for registration and voting without interfering with the reasonable requirements and constitutional prerogatives of the various States.

I ask that the text of the bill, as I have today introduced it, be reprinted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. In brief terms, it would provide for the appointment of a Federal examiner when the Attorney General receives 25 or more complaints from residents of a county alleging denial of the right to vote on account of race or color. The examiner would be empowered to disregard literacy test requirements for persons who possess a sixth-grade education, or more, and could administer such tests for those not possessing this minimum education, so long as it was fair and reasonable.

Unlike the administration bill on this vital subject, our bill would reach discrimination wherever it exists, and would not, for example, exclude the entire State of Texas from its jurisdiction—a widely noted oversight in the administration-supported bill.

Our bill would also avoid the arbitrary percentage formula, whereby only those States and their subdivisions having literacy requirements where less than 50 percent of the voting-age population registered or voting in 1964 would be affected by the proposed law. This would mean that we would miss serious pockets of discrimination on the one hand, and on the other would unfairly penalize other areas where, perhaps, apathy, one-party domination or deceptive census figures may account for low registrations.

The Federal examiner under our proposal would be appointed by the Civil Service Commission. He would immediately determine whether complainants are qualified to vote. The States could challenge these determinations to a Federal hearing officer, also appointed by the Civil Service Commission, within 10 days. The hearing officer could be required to render his decision within 7 days.

Determination by the hearing officer that 25 or more persons are denied suffrage because of race or color establishes a "pattern" or practice of discrimination under the bill. Immediately thereafter additional Federal examiners and hearing officers would be appointed as necessary to register all other persons within the county who may be subject to discrimination.

All persons found qualified to vote would be entitled to vote. Those who are challenged would be allowed to vote provisionally until the appeal is decided by the hearing officer and court.

The administration bill does not provide the authority for provisional voting, which is included in our bill to encourage prompt determination of appeals.

The administration bill would eliminate literacy tests in some States, no matter how reasonable or how fairly applied, and would prohibit the future adoption of literacy test requirements by other States.

This is unnecessary and it goes too far. There is no reason for the Federal Government to attempt to invalidate the laws or ordinances of a State or local government in contravention of established constitutional principles. There is nothing evil or illegal about a literacy requirement, so long as it is not in violation of the 15th amendment—so long as it does not involve an element of discrimination, intimidation, or coercion.

This new bill deals with the fundamental problem of physical and economic coercion and intimidation, and in addition it provides for civil and criminal penalties against those officials who engage in such activities.

In conclusion, this bill offers a constitutional, comprehensive, prompt and effective remedy for disenfranchisement because of race or color. It is a strong and sound bill and in my opinion it is more thoughtfully drafted than the administration bill. It deserves enthusiastic, nonpartisan support.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of this bill at this point:

H.R. 7196

A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act shall be known as the "Voting Rights Act of 1965."

SEC. 2. (a) The phrase "literacy test" shall mean any requirement that a person as a prerequisite for voting or registration for voting (1) demonstrate the ability to read, write, understand, or interpret any matter, or (2) demonstrate an educational achievement or knowledge of any particular subject.

(b) A person is "denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote" if he is (1) not provided by persons acting under color of law with an opportunity to register to vote or to qualify to vote within two weekdays after making a good faith attempt to do so, (2) found not qualified to vote by any person acting under color of law, or (3) not notified by any person acting under color of law of the results of his application within seven days after making application therefor.

(c) The term "election" shall mean any general, special or primary election held in any voting district solely or in part for the purpose of electing or selecting any candidate to public office or of deciding a proposition or issue of public law.

(d) The term "voting district" shall mean any county, parish, or similar political subdivision of a State in which persons, acting under color of law, administer the registration and voting laws of the State.

(e) The term "vote" shall have the same meaning as in section 2004 of the Revised Statutes (42 U.S.C. 1971 (e)).

SEC. 3. (a) Congress hereby finds that large numbers of United States citizens have been and are being denied the right to register or to vote in various States on account of race or color in violation of the Fifteenth Amendment.

(b) Congress further finds that literacy tests have been and are being used in various States and political subdivisions as a means of discrimination on account of race or color. Congress further finds that persons with a sixth grade education possess reasonable literacy, comprehension and intelligence and that, in fact, persons possessing such educational achievement have been and are being denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote for failure to satisfy literacy test requirements solely or primarily because of discrimination on account of race or color.

(c) Congress further finds that the requirements that persons as a prerequisite for voting or registration for voting (1) possess good moral character unrelated to the commission of a felony, or (2) prove their qualifications by the voucher of registered voters or members of any other class, have been and are being used as a means of discrimination on account of race or color.

(d) Congress further finds that where in any voting district twenty-five or more persons have been denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote, as determined in section 6, there is established a pattern or practice of denial of the right to register or to vote on account of race or color.

SEC. 4. (a) Whenever the Attorney General certifies to the Civil Service Commission (1) that he has received complaints in writing from twenty-five or more residents of a voting district each alleging that (i) the complainant satisfies the voting qualifications of the voting district, and (ii) the complainant has been denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote on account of race or color within ninety days, and (2) that the Attorney General believes such complaints to be meritorious, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint an examiner for such voting district.

(b) A certification by the Attorney General shall be final and effective upon publication in the Federal Register.

(c) The examiner shall examine those persons who have filed complaints certified by the Attorney General to determine (1) whether they were denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote within ninety days and (2) whether they are qualified to vote under State law. A person's statement under oath shall be prima facie evidence as to his age, residence and his prior efforts to register or otherwise qualify to vote. The examiner shall, in determining whether a person is qualified to vote under State law, disregard (1) any literacy test if such person has not been adjudged an incompetent and has completed the sixth grade of education in a public school in, or a private school accredited by, any State or Territory, the District of Columbia, or the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, or (2) any requirement that such person, as a prerequisite for voting or registration for voting (i) possess good moral character unrelated to the commission of a felony, or (ii) prove his qualifications by the voucher of registered voters or members of any other class.

(d) If the examiner finds that twenty-five or more of those persons within the voting district, who have filed complaints certified by the Attorney General, have been denied the right to register or to vote and are qualified to vote under State law, he shall promptly place them on a list of eligible voters, and shall certify and transmit such list to the offices of the appropriate election officials, the Attorney General, and the attorney general of the State, together with a report of his findings as to those persons whom he has found qualified to vote. For those persons, possessing less than a sixth grade education, the examiner shall administer a literacy test only in writing and the answers to such test shall be included in the examiner's report. The examiner shall issue to each person appearing on such a list a certificate evidencing his eligibility to vote.

(e) A finding by the examiner that twenty-five or more of those persons within a voting district, who have filed complaints certified by the Attorney General, have been denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote and that they are qualified to vote shall create a presumption of a pattern or practice of denial of the right to register or to vote on account of race or color.

(f) Unless challenged, according to the provisions of section 5, any person who has been placed on a list of eligible voters shall be entitled and allowed to vote in any election held within the voting district unless and until the appropriate election officials shall have been notified that such person has been removed from such list in accordance with section 10. If challenged, such person shall be entitled and allowed to vote provisionally with appropriate provision being made for the impounding of their ballots, pending final determination by the hearing officer and by the court.

(g) No person shall be entitled to vote in any election by virtue of the provisions of this Act unless his name shall have been certified and transmitted on such list to the offices of the appropriate election officials at least forty-five days prior to such election.

SEC. 5. (a) A challenge to the factual findings of the examiner, contained in the examiner's report, may be filed by the attorney general of the State or by any other person who has received from the examiner a certified list and report of persons found qualified to vote, as provided in section 4(d). A challenge shall be heard and determined by a hearing officer appointed by and responsible to the Civil Service Commission. Such challenge shall be entertained only if made within ten days after the challenged person is listed, and if supported by the affidavit of at least two persons having personal knowledge of the facts constituting grounds for the challenge, and such challenge shall be determined within seven days after it has been made. A person's fulfillment of literacy test requirements, if not disregarded by the examiner as provided for in section 4(c) shall be determined solely on the basis of answers included in the examiner's report.

(b) A petition for review of the decision of the hearing officer may be filed in the United States Court of Appeals for the circuit in which the person challenged resides within fifteen days after service of such decision by mail on the moving party, but no decision of a hearing officer shall be overturned unless clearly erroneous. A challenge to a listing made in accordance with this section shall not be the basis for a prosecution under any provisions of this Act.

SEC. 6. Upon determination by the hearing officer that twenty-five or more of those persons within the voting district, who have been placed on the list of eligible voters by the examiner, have been denied or deprived of the right to register or to vote and are qualified to vote, such determination shall establish a pattern or practice of denial of the right to register or to vote on account of race or color. The establishment of a pattern or practice by the hearing officer shall not be stayed pending final determination by the court.

SEC. 7. (a) Upon establishment of a pattern or practice by the hearing officer, as provided in section 6, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint additional examiners within the voting district as may be necessary who shall determine whether persons within the voting district are qualified to register and to vote. In determining whether such persons are so qualified the examiners shall apply the same procedures and be subject to the same conditions imposed upon the initial examiner under section 4(c), except that a person appearing before such examiner need not have first attempted to apply to a State or local registration official if he states, under oath, that in his belief to have done so would have been futile or would have jeopardized the personal safety, employment, or economic standing of himself, his family, or his property. Such examiner shall in the same manner as provided in section 4(d), certify and transmit lists of persons and any supplements as appropriate, at the end of each month, to the office of the appropriate election officials, the Attorney General, and the attorney general of the State, together with reports of their findings as to those persons found qualified to vote.

(b) Persons placed on lists of eligible voters by examiners shall have the right to vote in accordance with the provisions of section 4(f) and 4(g).

(c) Challenges to the findings of the examiners shall be made in the same manner and under the same conditions as are provided in section 5.

(d) The Civil Service Commission shall appoint and make available additional hearing officers within the voting district as may be necessary to hear and determine the challenges under this section.

SEC. 8. (a) Whenever a person alleges to an examiner within twenty-four hours after the closing of the polls that notwithstanding his listing under the provisions of this Act he has not been permitted to vote or that his vote was not properly counted (or not counted subject to the impounding provision, as provided in this Act), the examiner shall notify the United States attorney for the judicial district if such allegation, in his opinion, appears to be well founded. Upon receipt of such notification, the United States Attorney may forthwith apply to the district court for an order of contempt. Whoever, acting under color of law, fails or refuses to permit a person to vote, notwithstanding his listing under this subsection, or fails or refuses to properly count such person's vote, or intimidates, threatens, or coerces, or attempts to intimidate, threaten or coerce such person for the purpose of preventing such person from voting under the authority of this Act shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(b) Whoever, acting under color of law, within a year following an election in a voting district in which an examiner has been appointed (1) destroys, defaces, mutilates, or otherwise alters the marking of a paper ballot cast in such election, or (2) alters any record of voting in such election made by a voting machine or otherwise, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

(c) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction of proceedings instituted pursuant to this section and shall exercise the same without regard to whether an applicant for listing under this Act shall have exhausted any administrative or other remedies that may be provided by law.

SEC. 9. Consistent with State law and the provisions of this Act, persons appearing before an examiner, shall make application in such form as the Civil Service Commission may require. Also consistent with State law and the provisions of this Act, the times, places and procedures for application and listing pursuant to this Act and removals from eligibility lists shall be prescribed by regulations promulgated by the Civil Service Commission. The Commission shall, after consultation with the Attorney General, instruct examiners concerning the qualifications required for listing.

(b) Notwithstanding time limitations as may be established under State or local law, examiners shall make themselves available every weekday in order to determine whether persons are qualified to vote.

SEC. 10. Any person whose name appears on a list, as provided in this Act, shall be entitled and allowed to vote in the election district of his residence unless and until the appropriate election officials shall have been notified that such person has been removed from such list. A person whose name appears on such a list shall be removed therefrom by an examiner if (1) he has been successfully challenged in accordance with the procedure prescribed in sections 5 and 7, or (2) he has been determined by an examiner (a) not to have voted or attempted to vote at least once during four consecutive years while listed or during such longer period as is allowed by State law without requiring reregistration, or (b) to have otherwise lost his eligibility to vote: *Provided, however,* That, in a State which requires reregistration within a period of time shorter than four years, the person shall be required to reregister with an examiner who shall apply the reregistration methods and procedures of State law which are not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act.

SEC. 11. Examiners, appointed by the Civil Service Commission, shall be existing Federal officers and employees who are residents of the State in which the Attorney General has issued his certification. Examiners shall subscribe to the oath of office required by section 16 of title 5, United States Code.

Examiners will serve without compensation in addition to that received for such other service, but while engaged in the work as examiners shall be paid actual travel expenses, and per diem in lieu of subsistence expenses when away from their usual place of residence, in accordance with the provisions of the Travel Expense Act of 1949, as amended. Examiners shall have the power to administer oaths.

Sec. 12. The provisions of this Act shall be applied in a voting district until, within any twelve-month period, less than twenty-five persons within the voting district have been placed on lists of eligible voters by examiners.

Sec. 13. (a) All cases of civil and criminal contempt arising under the provisions of this Act shall be governed by section 151 of the Civil Rights Act of 1957 (42 U.S.C. 1995).

(b) Any statement made to an examiner may be the basis for a prosecution under section 1001 of title 18, United States Code.

Sec. 14. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

Sec. 15. If any provision of this Act or the application thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the remainder of the Act and the application of the provision to other persons not similarly situated or to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

TELEPHONES ARE NO LONGER A LUXURY

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Stanton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, the President, in the state of the Union message, declared that he will submit to the Congress, during this session, legislation incorporating a "substantial cut in excise taxes." Luxury items such as jewelry and furs are most often mentioned for consideration.

However, Mr. Speaker, I submit that taxes on nonluxury items should certainly be given priority in any anticipated tax cut. Foremost of these nonluxury items is the present unfair excise tax on communications. To millions of Americans the telephone is more of a necessity than a luxury. Eighty percent of Americans now have telephone service. Eighty-six percent of these households have incomes of less than $10,000 and 20 percent are in the so-called "poverty group" with incomes of less than $3,000. Since nearly half of the revenue from this tax comes from business users, its elimination would mean lower prices for essential products and services. Therefore, I have today introduced a bill which would put more money into the pockets of U.S. consumers; initially through lower telephone rates and indirectly through lower prices. This is most important at a time when the Congress is considering legislation to take more money out of the pockets of millions of Americans through increased social security taxes. Therefore, I feel that this legislation is not only long overdue, but at this particular time is more vital than ever before.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, would repeal the excise tax on all communications. At the present time this tax is levied at the rate of 10 percent on general and toll telephone service, telegraph, cable and radio messages and leased wires and at 8 percent on wire and equipment service. The tax on telephone service was levied during the war to discourage use of the overloaded communications network. However, this tax is still in effect even though the wartime emergency has long since passed and it is the only household utility still subject to such a tax.

At a time when the Congress is giving consideration to a reduction in excise taxes we should give first priority to removal of the communications tax. We must delay no longer in removing these unfair and economically self-defeating taxes. Their repeal will give our citizens relief from this discriminatory tax and will give our economy a boost by putting more money in consumers' pockets. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members who are concerned about this matter to support such a tax cut. I know that I will receive great support from the Honorable Frances P. Bolton who has already introduced similar legislation.

The Congress has a moral obligation to the people to eliminate these "temporary" taxes levied for a special purpose so long ago. It is my hope that this session of the 89th Congress will fulfill this obligation by enacting my bill.

THE THREAT OF MANDATORY CONTROLS ON U.S. PRIVATE FOREIGN INVESTMENT

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. Curtis] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, an article in the March 24 Wall Street Journal discusses present administration thinking about ways to stiffen the now voluntary controls on U.S. business' direct private foreign investments.

In spite of reports that the voluntary approach seems to be working, Government planners are suspicious that, for several reasons, voluntary controls will cease to be adequate.

One fear is that businessmen, seeing the early effectiveness of the voluntary program in its first months of operation, will relax and begin to make large foreign investments without first consulting the Commerce Department, which is charged with administering it.

Another fear is that prominent firms will break line and make large investments which will loose a plethora of similar investment moves by other firms.

Both situations could conceivably occur, because Commerce Secretary Connor recently announced his decision to rescind the requirement for companies to obtain Commerce Department clearance for investments of over $10 million.

Secretary Connor should be commended for his effort to make this restrictive program administratively reasonable and palatable to the firms being imposed upon.

For there is no doubt that these controls on the legitimate transactions of U.S. businesses with oversea interests is opposite to the high tradition of U.S. international monetary policy. After World War II the United States pioneered in the creation of the International Monetary Fund, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—institutions that were to stand as the three pillars of an international trading and financial system characterized by the freest possible flow of goods and funds throughout the world.

Now, in 1965, U.S. Government planners are thinking of requiring Government licensing for new private foreign investments, and imposing tax measures that would increase the cost of capital used for foreign investment. These pernicious administrative devices, imposed in lieu of sound domestic monetary policies, would further impede U.S. earnings from foreign investments and further damage U.S. prestige as the world's financial leader. They recall the statement in the minority report of the Joint Economic Committee that "the President's program has created fears that White House requests for voluntary restraint will lead to compulsory controls should compliance not be forthcoming."

It is essential that existing controls be removed at the earliest possible time. New, mandatory foreign investment controls must not be considered, or imposed.

Under unanimous consent I place the article referred to in the Record at this point:

Dollar Controls: New, Compulsory Curbs on Investment Abroad Might Be Sought Later—Licensing, Restrictive Tax Are Possible if Firms Lose Zeal for Voluntary System—Indication of Early Success

(By Richard F. Janssen)

Washington.—Suppose President Johnson's gentle wand of "voluntary cooperation" by business fails to lastingly stem the balance-of-payments tide—what sort of rod should he wield instead?

The question is one that administration officials are loath to discuss openly, lest it suggest a lack of faith in their current efforts to hustle businessmen onto their gold-saving bandwagon.

But even now some officials fear their early success may be so dramatic that business zeal for restraining dollar investment abroad will wane dangerously next fall. And officials think they must somehow keep companies cooperating for at least 2 years. "If you want to have nightmares," confides one, all that's needed is to worry that one major company will "do exactly what you don't want," prompting the others to break ranks and spend dollars freely abroad in defense of their overseas interests.

So the idea of having some sort of compulsory measure in reserve is already a live one, being tentatively and privately discussed as long-range planning. To some Presidential advisers, the most logical next step would be to control American investment overseas through Federal licensing: projects ruled not in the national interest would be thumbed down. Others argue a restrictive tax would be better. Federal Reserve Chairman Martin talks openly of much tighter credit to hold investment dollars at home through higher interest rates, an approach apt to spark White House opposition as needlessly damaging to domestic economic growth.

EARLY SIGNS OF SUCCESS

The arguments may never have to be resolved, of course. So far, nearly all the obvious evidence is that the voluntary restraint program announced last month is succeeding. Since it took effect, Treasury Secretary Dillon told the House Banking Committee yesterday, there are "indications we are not running any deficit at all" and are running "possibly even a surplus" in the U.S. balance of payments. Early reports show banks dutifully avoiding foreign borrowers and both banks and corporations pulling back dollars from short-term investments overseas. Business leaders are praising the voluntary approach and Commerce Secretary Connor, its chief apostle, is all but boasting that victory is assured.

But Mr. Dillon has cautioned that "two swallows don't make a summer," and certain shreds of evidence aren't considered very reassuring. Many executives, it's reported, are sidling into Government offices offering "alibis" instead of pledges; a big aluminum company argued that it has to operate close to supplies of its raw material, bauxite, and to cheap hydroelectric power, both of which it says it can find only abroad. Some companies are seeking to bargain before making any promises, saying that if they're expected to buy up fewer companies abroad, antitrust enforcement should be eased so that they can buy up more companies at home.

Arguing it would risk disclosing business secrets, executives have beaten down Mr. Connor's request for advance reports on specific investments abroad; he's said to agree that by "being gentler" he will win a better response. "I hope he's right," another strategist adds a bit nervously.

BEHIND SOME CUTBACKS

Whether they're backing down or not, officials have been going out of their way to assure businessmen in recent days that they never intended an actual cutbacks in "direct investment" in foreign subsidiaries and factories this year below last year's $2.2 billion. All that's wanted, it's said, is to avoid letting such outlays climb again in 1965, after last year's $400 million rise.

Certainly, authorities are becoming reluctant to take all the cooperation pledges and progress reports at face value. Some companies can boast sharp curtailment of capital outflow since the President's February 10 announcement of voluntary controls only because they rushed unusually large sums abroad in anticipation of it, they say. Other companies which have backed out of commitments to expand abroad had a change of heart for purely business reasons, it's suspected.

The voluntary approach is the subject of grumbling in labor circles; moreover, critics say it amounts to letting business go on pretty much as usual while unions are under strong administration pressure to restrain wage demands in order to keep U.S. goods competitive abroad. To some small businessmen, complains the National Federation of Independent Business, any restrictions on investment abroad will only impel big U.S. companies to gobble up more firms at home, dealing "a severe blow to freedom of enterprise."

Paradoxically, the widely expected early demonstration of success in greatly slowing or even reversing the dollar outflow could in itself undermine the voluntary approach, one official worries. "The real problem may be that voluntary restraints work too well," he says; "by summer or fall the figures may look so good that everybody relaxes and we're right back where we were before."

FEARS OF BACKSLIDING

Most of the confidence that ultimate success will be adequate centers on banks' performance in curbing dollar loans abroad. "With banks we have a secret weapon—the Federal Reserve," one strategist smiles. Not only are banks accustomed to honoring the wishes of the Board running their portion of the program, but the bankers know the Board has an economic sanction over individual banks that the Commerce Department doesn't have over individual businesses; any recalcitrant bankers are apt to encounter a chilly reception, it's explained, the next time they must turn to their district Federal Reserve bank to borrow. If the banks show signs of backsliding, officials suggest, the only need may be to revive the preaching.

Mr. Connor's corporate campaign is ranked outside his own department as unlikely to prove equally enduring. It's true some outside officials are heartened now to find a number of companies expanding overseas with high-cost foreign borrowings rather than dollars, and others planning to dispatch sums for dollar investment over several years as needed rather than all in one lump. But these skeptics figure that after a year or so, executives will be chafing to proceed with postponed foreign projects.

It's increasingly clear, one official says, that the biggest help on the corporate front will be the initial impact of pulling dollars back from short-term European securities and the lingering but less dramatic benefit of not pouring fresh funds into such investments. There wouldn't be much of this without the threat of sterner moves in the background, one official contends, saying matter of factly: "Part of the incentive businessmen have to cooperate with us is that they know we can work out something less pleasant if they don't."

This prospect may also spur Government administrators to try to make the voluntary controls work. Incoming Treasury Chief Fowler is expected, if anything, to push harder than Mr. Dillon for success of the present system, for fear that the alternative of tighter money might hurt economic growth.

That stronger medicine will be used if the dollar drain fails to respond to voluntary restraints is almost a foregone conclusion. It has become perfectly clear, Treasury Secretary Dillon said recently, that the willingness of foreigners to hold additional dollars is nearing an end. Not only are foreigners edgy about how their holdings of some $25 billion tower over the U.S. gold stock of less than $15 billion, but they complain that dollars piling up in their banks are fueling inflation in their own countries and that the outflow from the United States symbolizes an often unwelcome increase in U.S. corporate influence over their businesses.

But almost any sterner steps, administration officials fret, would pose both political and economic perils. As one official sees it, to go beyond the present voluntary measures to compulsion might force President Johnson to take the line that, in effect, businessmen are a bunch of "blackguards" who ignore patriotic appeals. Though officials feel sure he would speak more softly than that, they fear any tougher restraints would seriously weaken current good feeling between the White House and corporate executive suites.

JOHNSON-MARTIN RIFT?

This alone could damage the economy, some analysts say, since businessmen have often cited their rapport with Mr. Johnson as one reason why their domestic expansionary mood is persisting so long. Any open rift between the President and Federal Reserve Chairman Martin could prove unsettling, they add, wondering how it could be avoided if the President stuck to his "easy money" convictions at a time when Mr. Martin found it necessary to tighten the credit supply. A big enough boost in interest rates, both camps concede, could indeed dampen domestic economic growth; the issue is whether it would do more harm than good.

If a real crackdown on corporate investment abroad does come, some Johnson advisers say it should be built on the framework provided by the Commerce Department's voluntary approach. At present, Mr. Connor is asking some 600 companies with sizable foreign dealings to report quarterly on their progress in pulling more dollars from abroad or reducing their dollar outlays overseas. Originally, he also planned to ask businesses to consult with him individually on any plan to invest $10 million or more in an industrialized foreign country; thus he and his staff would have had a chance to tell each cooperating company whether a particular venture would be in "the national interest" or whether they would rather see it postponed or pared. This idea has now been shelved as "unnecessary and unwise."

But if Congress agreed, the advance-notice idea could be revived—and capped with a decision on whether the company should receive a license to move investment dollars out of the country. Some White House confidants would extend the licensing system to all foreign borrowing in the U.S., though reluctantly, if something more must be done. "There's no use in plugging only one hole in a dike that has six holes," one says. Some officials also contend that this general compulsion might appear as a lesser evil to American bankers and businessmen who worry that both foreign and domestic competitors may take advantage of their own present willingness to cooperate in a purely voluntary program.

PROBLEM OF INEQUITIES

Other administrators shudder, however, at the thought of having to decide that one company, and not its rivals, should be allowed to buy a subsidiary in Belgium or to build a new plant in France. Anxious managements might be able to muster strong political pressure for a "yes" decision, it's said, making life more difficult for the besieged bureaucrats and adding to the inevitable inequities.

Deterring corporate dollar outflows through tax penalties appears much more attractive to some influential planners. The existing interest equalization tax would be their model. It's geared to add 1 percentage point to the annual interest cost a foreign borrower must pay here, discouraging some foreigners from tapping the U.S. money market through securities sales or loans but leaving the final decision up to prospective borrowers and lenders.

A similar levy on direct dollar investment abroad would also avoid detailed Government decisionmaking, its adherents argue, and offer a bonus besides. A natural selection process would take place, they say, as a company decides the extra cost of investing abroad would be worthwhile only when the project promises unusually large and early profitability. Thus, the U.S. balance of payments would not only benefit from a reduced outflow of dollars for direct investment but from the maximum return of profits later, the reasoning goes.

One possible method gaining some favor is to build such a tax right into the interest equalization law by ending its present exclusion of direct investment; under the law, a direct investment is one in a foreign company at least 10-percent controlled by the American investor. Less popular, so far, is a suggestion that some tax break be given to companies that cooperate; it smacks of just paying them to be public spirited, one official complains.

PROFESSOR MACHLUP ATTACKS ADMINISTRATION'S PROGRAM TO CURB CAPITAL OUTFLOWS

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in his recent testimony before the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, Dr. Fritz Machlup, professor of economics and international finance at Princeton University, was highly critical of the administration's so-called voluntary controls on private oversea investment. He strongly feels that the administration's hostile and indignant reaction every time a foreign government converts some of its dollar holdings into gold, coupled with its constant talk of the need to restrict capital outflows, creates unwarranted fears abroad about the dollar's integrity. These expressions of fear and alarm inevitably communicate themselves to foreign governments, which, in turn, then feel it would be prudent to convert even more dollars into gold.

Thus, Dr. Machlup recommends that we must be "more astute in persuading people here and abroad that their expectations or fears are unfounded." We must "reverse" the unfavorable expectations which the administration itself has done so much to create. This cannot be accomplished, he claims, by reinforcing the two kinds of fear that motivate much of the outflow of capital—the fear that the dollar may be devalued and the fear that the transfer of funds abroad may be restricted by direct controls.

The fear of devaluation has intensified, he believes, largely as a result of continued reluctance to remove the 25-percent gold reserve requirement for Federal Reserve notes. Dr. Machlup believes this strengthens the feelings of many foreigners that we are not prepared to use all our gold in defense of the dollar's external value.

Secondly, signs of reluctance or indignation to sell gold on demand causes foreigners to feel that we consider such outflows as weakening our position. As Dr. Machlup remarks, "If my banker frowned and sighed whenever I cashed a check, I would certainly not wish to keep my deposit with him. We ought to give up our gold not with reluctance and apprehension, but with an air of friendly nonchalance."

Instead of discouraging foreign gold purchases, Dr. Machlup feels we should take the opposite tack and invite dollar holders to buy as much gold as they wish. At the same time, he says, "we should insist that no one hold dollars just to accommodate us; dollars should be held only by those who really prefer interest-bearing dollars to sterile gold."

Professor Machlup goes on to cite a recommendation from the minority views in the 1962 annual report of the Joint Economic Committee, which suggests that the United States eliminate its guarantee to purchase "gold from foreigners at $35 an ounce or at any other predetermined price." In the minority view, the "termination of the guarantee to buy at a fixed price would be likely to sharply reduce (gold) speculation and, at the same time, stimulate a return of sizable amounts of gold to the United States." Dr. Machlup believes that such a policy would "forcefully increase" the willingness of foreigners to hold dollars instead of gold.

The introduction of governmental restrictions on the outflow of capital and the introduction of guidelines have both promoted fear of even more restrictions in the future. To "remove" this fear, we should try to assure businessmen that there would be neither direct controls or restrictions, nor any moral suasion, neither any obligation to make reports on foreign transactions, nor any publicity about nonconformance with official directives." If we succeed in doing these things, he believes, we should see a flow of funds returning from abroad.

In conclusion, Dr. Machlup believes that "guidelines" and exhortations for voluntary cooperation are tantamount to direct Government control. "Not since the NRA in 1933," he states, "has this country attempted in peacetime to transform the managements of private business into the lengthened arms of Government." If a corporation fails to cooperate with the administration's dictums, it becomes subject to criticism and adverse publicity. And corporate management, as Dr. Machlup notes, fears adverse publicity more than a fine of a few thousand dollars.

Under unanimous consent I place Professor Machlup's testimony in the RECORD at this point:

STATEMENT OF DR. FRITZ MACHLUP, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS AND INTERNATIONAL FINANCE, PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

(Before the International Finance Subcommittee of the Banking and Currency Committee, U.S. Senate, Mar. 17, 1965)

I suppose that we all have learned that no one can forecast the balance of payments of next year or any future period. Too often have the attempted forecasts by Government departments or private experts proved wrong. While we can usually know in what direction a particular event, measure, or change will affect the external balance, there are too many variables involved to permit reasonably accurate predictions of the net outcome. Our inability to predict does not reduce the significance of research and analysis in international finance. There are enough important connections and relations about which we know a good deal and may learn more.

THE SIZE OF THE DEFICIT

One thing that many have had a hard time understanding but have finally learned is that the accounting balance of payments may be calculated in many different ways and, hence, that the size of the surplus or deficit is not uniquely determined. In order to distinguish balances measured by different arrangements of accounts and items, experts have proposed a bewildering nomenclature by adding to the "current balance" and the "capital balance," a "basic balance," a "regular-transactions balance," an "official-settlement balance," an "overall balance," an "exchange-market balance," and a few more. While this may confuse the layman, it helps to make it clear to him that he cannot comprehend the issues involved.

There was a controversy between two administrative departments because the most widely publicized balance showed a greater deficit than would be shown under a different arrangement of accounts. In particular, if increases in dollar holdings of private foreigners were included in the regular capital balance as an inflow of foreign short-term capital, rather than treated as a way of financing a deficit of U.S. payments, the reported deficit would look much less threatening. The sound and fury about this issue is understandable only if one believes that important decisions in international finance are influenced by reports about the exact size of the U.S. deficit. Personally I doubt this. But those who believe it point to the fact that liquid dollar holdings by private foreign individuals, firms, and banks now amount to about $14 billion. The U.S. deficit in the years in which these holdings were built up would have been that much smaller had it been calculated by the method used by most European governments. Again, I do not think that statistical reporting or accounting procedures can ultimately affect the actual flow of funds among nations.

The greatest surprise to the layman comes with the statement that a deficit in the U.S. balance need not indicate anything about the position of the U.S. dollar and that, for example, the same deficit may at one time be a welcome relief of a world dollar shortage, but at another time an embarrassing deterioration of a dollar glut. The layman's shock can be mitigated by telling him that the demand for dollars to hold—the demand, that is, by private foreign parties and by official foreign authorities for liquid dollar assets in the form of balances with American banks or securities of the U.S. Government—cannot be seen from any accounting statement. There is dollar shortage when foreign authorities buy dollars with great eagerness and there is dollar glut when they buy dollars with reluctance; the balance of international payments may be exactly the same in both situations. And just as there can be dollar shortage with a deficit in U.S. payments, a dollar glut may exist with a surplus. The first situation, dollar shortage despite a U.S. deficit, existed in the early 1950's; the latter situation, dollar glut despite a U.S. surplus, may arise when the U.S. attains a surplus in its balance of payments while foreign parties, official or private, still feel that they hold more dollars than they want.

THE COMPOSITION OF THE DEFICIT

The worst misses in governmental forecasting were due to the fact that the officials concentrated on particular deficit items and believed that the deficit would disappear or decrease if these items were chopped down. But, alas, the balance of payments has behaved like the mythical Hydra growing more ugly heads for each head successfully chopped off.

In 1958 the "overall balance on regular transactions" showed a deficit of $3.5 billion. From that year to 1964, merchandise exports increased by $8.8 billion, private incomes from foreign investment increased by $2.5 billion, the sum of sales of goods and all services increased by $13.3 billion, military expenditures were reduced by $600 million, and the entire balance on current transactions improved by $5.8 billion. Yet the deficit in 1964, measured the same way as in 1958, was still over $3 billion.

Evidently the strong improvement of the current balance was offset by an increase in the deficit of the capital balance. The increase in net capital outflows looks especially bad if most of the inflow of foreign short-term capital is excluded from the net capital balance—and, as we know, the Commerce Department reports do not include the acquisition of liquid dollar assets by foreigners in the regular capital balance. But in any case, looking only at the movements of private U.S. capital, the changes in recent years are quite conspicuous. Comparing the same 2 years as before, the outflow of private U.S. capital increased from $2.9 billion in 1958 to $6.2 billion in 1964; that is, by $3.3 billion.

It may be tempting to take a sharp sword and chop off this particular head of the Hydra. Can it be done without causing substitute heads to grow? No one can be sure. It is quite possible that a forced reduction in the deficit on capital accounts will cause a reduction in the surplus on current accounts. If every dollar that is forcefully kept from being sent abroad for direct investment, portfolio, or other long-term investment, or for acquiring various kinds of short-term assets, were invested in the United States, in addition to what would be invested in any case, we should expect a deterioration of our current balance. On the other hand, if the dollars which are kept at home (because of the wishes of our Government) are then kept idle, or are kept from being created by the banking system, then the improvement in the capital balance need not cause a deterioration of the current balance. (Some analysts of "feedback effects" ask themselves what the foreigners do with the money they receive and cannot do if they do not receive it, but fail also to ask what the Americans do with the money which they are prevented from transferring.)

The interrelationships between the different accounts of the balance of payments are rather complicated, but this is no excuse for disregarding them altogether. Too often must we see that some of our official experts fail to anticipate these interrelations. The belief, for example, that a reduction in direct investments abroad will fully be reflected in an improvement in the balance of payments is naive.

My diagnosis, after examining the various items in the outflow of capital, leads me to the conclusion that a reduction of some items would lead to a reduction in the surplus on current account, whereas a reduction of other items would not affect the current balance. We shall come back to this point after looking at the breakdown of the U.S. capital account.

OUTFLOWS OF PRIVATE U.S. CAPITAL IN 1964

The statement of the Secretary of the Treasury before this subcommittee on March 9 gives, in table 8, the data on the outflow of U.S. private capital during 1964, both for the first three quarters (January to September) and for the entire year. It is important to note that the outflow picked up considerable momentum during the last quarter.

Direct investments had been $1.5 billion during the first three quarters. The figure for the year is $2.2 billion. This means that the outflow on this score was $700 million during the fourth quarter, which is an annual rate of $2.8 billion, or an increase of 40 percent over the annual rate of the first three quarters.

The purchase of foreign securities was $200 million in the first three quarters, but $700 million for the entire year. Thus, the outflow on this account was $500 million during the last quarter, which is an annual rate of $2 billion, compared with an annual rate of less than $267 million during the first three quarters. The increase is 650 percent.

Other long-term capital outflows were $800 million in the first three quarters and $1.3 billion for the entire year. This means an outflow at an annual rate of $2 billion during the last quarter, compared with an annual rate of $1.06 billion during the first three quarters. The increase is 89 percent.

The short-term capital outflow was $1.4 billion in the first three quarters, but $2 billion for the entire year. This means an annual rate of $2.4 billion during the last quarter, against $1.9 billion during the first three quarters. The increase is 26 percent.

It stands to reason that this enormous gain of momentum in the last quarter of the year cannot be entirely due to seasonal factors but occurred chiefly under the influence of expectational factors, probably in increased fear of a devaluation of the dollar and a fear of restrictions on the transfer of funds.

If it is true that the increase in capital outflow was motivated by expectational factors, one could draw the following inferences:

(1) Wrong expectations can often be reversed by pronouncement and actions that demonstrate the expectations to be unjustified.

(2) If expectations are reversed, not only will further capital outflow motivated by the wrong expectations be stopped, but capital may start flowing in the opposite direction.

(3) If a capital outflow is not expected to last but likely to be reversed, it would be inappropriate to desire a real adjustment of the balance of payments, that is, an adjustment of the flow of goods and services to the flow of capital.

REAL ADJUSTMENT VERSUS COMPENSATORY CORRECTION

Analysts of the balance-of-payments situation have long used the dichotomy between "adjustment" and "financing" a surplus or deficit. It is analytically more appropriate to distinguish three types of changes in the balance of payments: real adjustments, compensatory corrections, and temporary financing.

Real adjustments reduce or remove an imbalance through changes in relative incomes, prices, and resource allocations. Compensatory corrections reduce or remove the need for real adjustment in the long run, either through changing the current account by means other than the forces of real adjustment or by changing donation accounts and capital accounts. Temporary financing accommodates the excess demand or excess supply in the foreign exchange market until real adjustment is either accomplished or made unnecessary.

Most serious students of international economics adhere to the classical view that the current account should be made to adjust to the balance on capital account. To attempt the opposite, that is, to correct the flow of capital to match the balance in the flow of goods and services, is usually ineffective or inefficient. An exception to this rule, however, may be recognized with regard to purely speculative capital movements that are likely to reverse their direction in due course. Thus, if we believe that a large part of the present deficit on capital account is only temporary and reversible, then we should not insist on a real adjustment of the balance of payments. It would be wasteful to force a flow of goods and services to match a flow of funds that can be expected to be reversed in the near future.

The implications of these general statements for our analysis of the outflow of U.S. private capital are the following: To the extent that the capital outflow is induced by differences in the marginal productivity of investment here and abroad, we should not interfere with such outflow but should instead facilitate real adjustment of the current balance. To the extent, however, that the capital outflow is motivated by reversible expectations, we should not insist on a real adjustment but should instead promote the reversal of the expectations.

REVERSING THE EXPECTATIONS

We have not been very astute in persuading people here and abroad that their expectations or fears are unfounded. On the contrary, our behavior has been designed to reinforce the two kinds of fears that motivate the outflow of capital, the fear that the dollar may be devalued, and the fear that transfers of funds abroad may be restricted. Let us discuss what we have done to increase these fears and what we might do to reduce them.

The fear of devaluation

(1) Instead of freeing all our gold for export, that is, for the repurchase of our dollar liabilities, we have taken only a half measure and have left on our statute books the requirement of a 25-percent gold reserve for Federal Reserve notes. This strengthens widely held expectations to the effect that we are not prepared to use all our gold in the defense of the external value of the dollar.

(2) Whenever certain foreign monetary authorities have announced that they would use some of their dollar holdings for purchasing gold from us, we have responded with a frown. Yet, any reluctance or sign of indignation about an outflow of gold strengthens the belief of the people that we consider this as a weakening of our position. If my banker frowned and sighed whenever I cashed a check, I would certainly not wish to keep my deposit with him. We ought to give up our gold not with reluctance and apprehension, but with an air of friendly nonchalance.

(3) Our attitude concerning our gold holdings should change completely: We should invite all reluctant holders of dollars to come and buy as much gold as they wish; we should insist that no one hold dollars just to accommodate us; dollars should be held only by those who really prefer interest-bearing dollars to sterile gold.

(4) This preference for dollars over gold could be forcefully increased if we accepted the suggestion made in the minority views on the Annual Report of the Joint Economic Committee, 87th Congress, 2d session, 1962. According to this suggestion, the United States should eliminate its guarantee to purchase gold from foreigners at $35 an ounce or at any other predetermined price. In the minority view, the termination of the guarantee to buy at a fixed price would be likely to sharply reduce (gold) speculation and, at the same time, stimulate a return of sizable amounts of gold to the United States. If there is serious doubt that gold can always be sold to governmental and monetary authorities, the speculators' risk of loss from holding gold may be too great and he may convert it into dollars.

(5) A more effective policy for reversing expectations concerning the future of the dollar would be the acceptance of a plan which I presented in 1960. It consists in a gradual lowering of the price of gold, say, by 1 percent every quarter of a year. I shall refrain from discussing it at this point, because I know that the resistance to it cannot be overcome.

The fear of restrictions

While we have done badly regarding the fears of devaluations, we have done even worse concerning the fears of restrictions. In fact, we have created and promoted such fears.

(1) From some semiofficial quarters the possibility of governmental restrictions on the outflow of capital was suggested a few months ago. This was incredibly stupid.

(2) We have actually introduced "guidelines" and "challenges" which, if they are not regarded as restrictions, are widely considered as the first step toward restrictions.

(3) To reverse these fears we ought to tell every businessman that he should use his funds wherever business interests indicate. If we could possibly assure businessmen that there would be neither direct controls or restrictions nor any moral suasion, neither any obligation to make reports on foreign transactions nor any publicity about nonconformance with official directives, we would soon see a flow of funds returning from abroad.

RADICAL CHANGES IN OUR SYSTEM

Again and again in recent years have we heard warnings against "radical changes" of our monetary and economic system. All sorts of plans have been criticized and rejected on this score. There have been warnings against the complete removal of the gold-reserve requirements, against floating and even against a little more flexible exchange rates, against changes in the price of gold, against an international central bank and even against modest extensions of powers of the International Monetary Fund, etc., etc. I submit that any or all of these changes would be less radical than the change promulgated during the last 2 weeks in the issuance of "guidelines" by the Federal Reserve Board and the "challenges" to private business by the Secretary of Commerce. Not since the NRA in 1933 has this country attempted in peacetime to transform the managements of private business into lengthened arms of the Government. By calling on the business community—even if this is confined to 600 business firms—for voluntary cooperation we have taken an enormous step away from our system of free enterprise.

Protestations to the effect that these guidelines and exhortations are not prohibitions or binding regulations reveal a lack of understanding. Some think there is a great difference between outright prohibition of certain transactions under the threat of legal sanctions and mere exhortation against these transactions under the threat of publicity in the case of nonconformance. In actual fact, corporate management is more afraid of a threat of adverse publicity than of a fine of a few thousand dollars. Hence, I submit that the guidelines and the "program of voluntary cooperation" are in effect restrictions and regulations of private banking and private business. That there was no outcry against this radical change of our system of free enterprise indicates the degree to which our people's belief in fundamental values of our economic system has weakened and the belief in the benefits from a system of public regulation has grown stronger.

My lament for free enterprise will not strike many sympathetic chords. It will probably be regarded as an expression of the nostalgia, if not hysteria, of an old-fashioned libertarian. I am painfully aware of this. But my warnings against our present policy are not merely on these general grounds. They are also on the ground that our policy will be effective only if the adverse expectations about the future of the dollar are reversed—and in this case the interference with business decisions would be superfluous. Indeed, the reversal of expectations would be much more easily achieved if government did not feel compelled to resort to measures involving moral compulsion.

I conclude that the measures are either not necessary or futile. Their quick repeal would be more helpful than the most punctilious voluntary cooperation would be. For such cooperation cannot last if it becomes too expensive.

CONCLUSION

Where does all this leave me? Although I repeat that most forecasts of balance of payments are worthless, I shall attempt a diagnosis of the present situation.

The deficit of our capital balance includes large amounts of speculative, reversible movements. In my judgment the reversible portion is large enough for us to rely on this correction as one that would make further adjustments of the balance on current account unnecessary.

The reversible flow of capital depends on expectations regarding the future value of the dollar as well as the freedom of transferring dollars back and forth without any restrictions or inhibitions. If favorable expectations could be created on both these scores, I would be quite optimistic about the disappearance of the present dollar glut without resort to policies injurious to our economy or the world economy.

A STAMP IN COMMEMORATION OF CHARLES PROTEUS STEINMETZ

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PIRNIE] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, Friday, April 9, 1965, is an occasion of high significance, in my estimation, for it marks the hundredth anniversary of the birth of a man genius—a man of great heart and great mind—in the person of Charles Proteus Steinmetz, electrical engineer and inventor extraordinary.

During this entire week in my home city of Utica, N.Y., a centennial celebration is being conducted to pay honor to the memory of this man who, though gone, will not be forgotten. The pages of American biography contain nothing surpassing in dramatic impact the tale of Steinmetz' rise, from crippled eccentric and political rebel, to community leader and a man of exceptional civic value.

Born in Breslau, Germany, April 9, 1865—the son of a government railway employee—Steinmetz was from birth malformed, and when he reached full height he was scarcely 4 feet tall.

Excluded by physical condition from the enjoyment of many of the pastimes and companionships of normal childhood, Steinmetz turned with intensity to the world of books and ideas. The result of his efforts in this respect were truly amazing. Entering the University of Breslau, at the age of 17, he showed at once the most extraordinary grasp of mathematics, and a phenomenal knowledge of the stars. Before leaving the university he had written a treatise on astronomy which was adopted as a school textbook.

Politics was another field of concern to Steinmetz, who bitterly assailed the suppressive policies of the German central government. In the year 1888, shortly before he was to have received his Ph. D. degree, he published a series of political articles which so incensed the governmental authorities that he had to flee to Switzerland to escape imprisonment. The following year, in 1889, he came to the United States, here to continue his scientific work in a land where political freedom was recognized as equal in importance to technological progress.

Arriving in New York City, ill, penniless, deformed in body, and without prospect of employment, he would have been refused admission by the immigration inspectors had it not been for the strenuous and enthusiastic intercession, in his behalf, by an American friend. Enchanted by the country, at first sight, Steinmetz took out citizenship papers immediately, and set forth to prove his mettle in the land of opportunity.

Employed initially by a Yonkers firm manufacturing electrical apparatus, he was soon in command of an experimental laboratory. From this vantage point he developed several new concepts, his first major achievement being a valuable improvement on an alternating current single-phase motor, to which he applied the principle of hysteresis loss, or the loss by heat resulting from the magnetization of iron. The law of hysteresis sprang from this improvement. From that day forward every electric motor has been produced on the basis of Steinmetz' law which is, briefly, that every time the magnetization doubles the hysteresis trebles.

At the International Electrical Congress in Chicago, in 1893, Steinmetz announced another discovery: a new and simpler formula for altering current calculations which he described more fully in his work, "Theory and Calculation of Alternating Current Phenomena," published in 1897. As in the case of the announcement of Steinmetz' first great discovery, the second was also embraced by the scientific world, virtually without dissent.

In 1892 the General Electric Co. acquired certain patents of Rudolf Eickenmeyer, by whom Steinmetz was employed at the time. In consequence of the transaction, Steinmetz now became a member of the staff of General Electric. When the company moved its engineering department to Schenectady, in 1894, Steinmetz went along with the move, and thereafter, until his death, remained a resident of that fair city.

In the months that immediately followed, the General Electric engineering department began taking giant strides in the field of experimentation and discovery, especially in building alternating current machinery and designing alternating current systems, for which it won a reputation for reliability.

Steinmetz quickly became head of the General Electric calculating department and then, in 1910, head of the consulting engineering department, which he organized, and chief consulting engineer. The company gave him unrestricted latitude in his electrical experiments and researches, and authorization to draw as much salary as he wanted for his personal use. In response, Steinmetz revolutionized the method of electrical research by substituting laboratory methods, based on fixed mathematical principles, for the old practice of developing a theory and then building a model to test it. Nearly 200 patents testify to the resources of his inventive genius.

Of all Steinmetz' inventions the most valuable, perhaps, are the following: an arc lamp, patented in 1901, with enough special features to entitle the inventor to a certificate of merit from the Franklin Institute; a number of induction, polyphase, and other motors, generators, and dynamos; the mercury arc rectifier, and a system, patented 1905–10, of long-distance electrical transmission, embracing a solution of some of the most perplexing high voltage problems in the industry.

For 20 years Steinmetz conducted a study of transient electrical currents, with the object of developing effective lightning arresters. Meanwhile, he was turning out published material to an astonishing extent, enabling him to capture the imagination of everyone in his field. Nor was that all. In 1912 Steinmetz was appointed president of the board of education by the mayor of Schenectady—a position he was to hold through several succeeding city administrations, until his death, in 1923. In addition, he also served as president of the common council from 1916 to 1918, and as chairman of the city planning and park commission.

Charles Proteus Steinmetz was a man of many extraordinary notions, which rendered him eccentric in dress and habit. But when it came to thought and the utilization of knowledge, in the public interest, few others were a match for this most remarkable man. It is to the everlasting honor of the city of Schenectady that Steinmetz—one of the outstanding men of genius over the past century—should have graced the city with his presence.

I would like, at this time, to recommend the issuance of a postage stamp honoring the name and achievements of Charles Proteus Steinmetz—a wizard of electrical engineering, a genius of great magnitude, a warmhearted, courageous, all-around citizen, whose name stands forth as worthy of the highest honors that we, his fellow citizens, can possibly bestow.

NEW ENGLAND GOVERNORS STRESS NEED FOR WOOL IMPORTS QUANTITATIVE RESTRICTION

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, the six Governors from New England met in Washington today to discuss regional problems with the Federal executive departments and with their delegations to Congress.

One of the leading subjects of their concern is the problem of low cost woolen imports, which are taking a heavy toll of jobs in New England.

Governor John Chafee of Rhode Island made the presentation of the problem on behalf of the Governors and I include the text of his excellent statement.

This problem is of extreme importance to New England and New Hampshire. I have stressed them repeatedly in the past and done everything in my power to publicize them, to bring to the attention of the Congress and to seek remedial action at the Federal level. It is my earnest hope that the Congress will follow the suggestions of the six Governors who, incidentally, are evenly divided between the two parties.

The text of the statement follows:

PRESENTATION BY GOVERNOR JOHN H. CHAFEE OF RHODE ISLAND

FOREIGN IMPORTS

Low-cost imports are damaging to several New England industries but probably none is as hard hit with such grievous results—because of the many workers involved—as the woolen-worsted industry. In the past 10 years imports have soared from less than 5 percent to nearly 25 percent of domestic consumption. In Rhode Island alone this has cost us 50 mills and 15,000 jobs in that 10-year period. It's as equally serious in the other States with more closings in the offing if import relief is not obtained.

Wages in the countries which manufacture worsted-woolen imports vary from 9 cents to 73 cents per hour as compared with the U.S. average of $1.80 per hour in this industry.

On September 28, 1964, when visiting Providence, President Johnson said: "I share with our late, beloved President Kennedy the view that wool textile and apparel imports must be kept at reasonable levels. We have been trying to work out effective arrangements with other wool textile producing countries. Two missions have been sent abroad for this purpose in recent months. Thus far a multi-nation meeting has not been convened. But we intend to continue our efforts vigorously. I can assure you that we shall work hard at this problem. I consider it essential that the wool textile industry be restored to good health."

What the woolen-worsted manufacturers seek is an international agreement on quotas similar to that which the cotton industry has. This has been a major factor in the increased strength of that industry.

To get quotas on woolen-worsted imports requires executive department action. It is hoped the New England delegation will press the President on this matter as time is of the essence. These mills need relief very soon.

CLEVELAND HAILS NEW ENGLAND EDUCATION CENTER PLANNED AT UNIVERSITY OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure to congratulate the University of New Hampshire, its president, Dr. John W. McConnell, and its board of trustees for their planning and foresight, which culminated today in the announcement of a large grant from the W. K. Kellogg Foundation.

This grant of $1.8 million to construct a New England Regional Center for Continuing Education on the university's campus in Durham is a dramatic, pioneering step in regional cooperation. Using the new center at Durham as a hub, the six New England State universities will devote their resources to comprehensive planning to meet the major industrial, agricultural, maritime, transportation, recreational, and economic problems of New England.

The project is described fully in the following press release issued here today. I am inserting it in the RECORD because it is the beginning of a unique development in interstate regional planning. I commend it to my colleagues as an example of how citizens in New England are moving to help themselves with traditional imagination and independence.

WASHINGTON.—The W. K. Kellogg Foundation will provide $1.8 million to the New England State universities to help build, equip, and operate the New England Regional Center for Continuing Education at the University of New Hampshire in Durham, N.H.

The Kellogg Foundation and the six New England State universities announced plans for the unique center Tuesday. The facility will enable New England's 11 million people to pursue cooperative action on regional problems.

Plans for the center were outlined at a meeting here of the six New England Governors, the region's congressional delegation, and a number of educational leaders.

Although the Kellogg Foundation has helped establish centers for continuing education at seven other universities in the United States and England, the New England center at Durham would be the first to join several universities in the service of a major geographical region.

Established in 1930, the Kellogg Foundation has awarded $125 billion for projects in agriculture, education, and public health. Since establishing the initial center at Michigan State University, it has helped create centers at the Universities of Chicago, Georgia, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Notre Dame, and at Oxford (England).

The significance of the facility was stressed by Dr. Hollis A. Moore, Jr., director of Kellogg's Division of Education, who said: "The proposal is a pioneering venture: the first regional center for continuing education established on a base of interuniversity cooperation. In addition, the center has been planned with a very strong emphasis on the international dimension of continuing education. Both of these were persuasive factors in our favorable response to the proposal."

A small permanent staff, augmented by specialists in various subject areas from the cooperating universities, will devise and conduct the center's adult continuing education programs.

New Hampshire Gov. John W. King, speaking on behalf of the New England Governors, expressed pleasure with the Kellogg Foundation's commitment to the regional education venture. He said the project was dramatic evidence of education's interest in the political and social development of the region, and would make a significant contribution to the area's concern for human needs.

Sinclair Weeks, a member of the University of New Hampshire's Board of Trustees and a former U.S. Secretary of Commerce, said:

"New England's tradition is in reliance on State government and local resources to meet the needs of today's complex society. This calls for strenuous efforts in adult education so that we may develop better understanding and promote active interinstitutional and interstate cooperation in solving regional problems.

"The center will greatly facilitate New England's growth in quality of educational leadership, and will for the first time make the region's total resources—government, business, industrial and educational—available to a greater number of persons."

Through workshops, institutes, conferences and other informal study programs ranging from 1 day to several weeks in length, the center will stress activities that:

Give breadth to continuing education programs which supplement and complement those offered by New England's individual educational institutions.

Focus on the problems of individual States from a regional perspective, thus strengthening all New England.

Supplement formal study programs within the New England State universities by developing a reservoir of competent specialists in social, economic and political areas, and by providing continuing education for faculty members in their respective academic disciplines.

The objective will be to provide "an excellent, regionally oriented adult education program, through the pooling of resources, which none of the individual institutions could alone support."

Dr. John W. McConnell, president of the University of New Hampshire, told the group:

"Although the center will be an integral part of the University of New Hampshire's program, its ultimate goal is to provide the opportunity for all New England institutions of higher education, both public and private, to fulfill their simultaneous responsibilities toward State, regional, National, and even international aspirations.

"We envision programs which not only will give new emphasis to the service function of the land-grant university philosophy, with application to both urban and rural problems, but programs which will also stimulate an entirely new concept of 'service,' with instruction and research carefully integrated."

The planners of the center have already submitted more than 36 specific recommendations for programs in regional and international areas. The suggestions have been culled from conferences over the past 18 months with educational, governmental, and industrial leaders throughout the Nation.

Programs promising immediate gains in operation cooperation among the six States include suggestions that the center help develop a regional strategy for agricultural extension work, rather than the present State-by-State approach.

Long-range goals will include programs contributing to the economic revival of New England.

In the area of international studies, the planners propose an Atlantic community studies program which would develop short courses, conducted by international representatives in various fields, to acquaint American opinion leaders with programs and policies of the evolving relationships among European and other North Atlantic countries, Canada and the United States.

The Kellogg Foundation's gift includes $1.2 million to help the University of New Hampshire with initial construction of the center. An additional $600,000 will be shared by the six State universities as seed money to finance the development of experimental programs during the center's first 3 years of operation.

The University of New Hampshire will raise an additional $1.4 million from private sources including approaches to other foundations, through its Centennial Development Fund drive, and will seek a $500,000 legislative appropriation to complete first-phase construction.

The center itself will function under the policy direction of a proposed New England Regional Council on Continuing Education, through which each of the six States will contribute operating funds for the center and its programs.

In a complex of buildings to be erected on a site close to the heart of the UNH campus, the center will include:

A learning center, containing a variety of different-sized classrooms and auditoriums equipped with modern instructional aids, offices, and studios for New Hampshire's educational television station (WENH-TV).

A group of six housing units, each named for one of the New England States, to provide overnight accommodations for up to 244 persons attending the center's program.

A large dining facility to be operated in the manner of a New England inn.

An administrative building which will provide headquarters offices for New England regionally oriented organizations.

Next stage in development of the center will be the preparation of architectural drawings and specifications for the various buildings. Construction may get underway in Durham in late summer. No target date has yet been set for opening of the center's programs.

NORTHEAST AIRLINES: NEW ENGLAND GOVERNORS VOW TO MAINTAIN FIGHT

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. Cleveland] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, at the legislative conference of New England Governors with their congressional delegations today, Gov. John H. Reed presented a fine statement of New England's determination to preserve the strength of Northeast Airlines. This is the only major trunkline airline based in New England and it is an essential part of our economy. I endorse Governor Reed's statement wholeheartedly and offer it at this point for the Record:

I appreciate having this opportunity to briefly outline the current status of the air transportation situation as it affects our New England region. As we are all aware the New York-Florida route case of Northeast Airlines has now been returned to the U.S. Court of Appeals in Boston following the third denial on March 5 by the Civil Aeronautics Board of the airline's request for a permanent route certificate.

The matter of the New York-Florida renewal case of Northeast Airlines has for a number of years been one of utmost concern to the Governors of the New England States.

As far back as 1961, the Governors supported the airline's petition for permanent certification and called upon the Civil Aeronautics Board to establish adequate air service in the New England States.

It has been the firm opinion of the Governors that the New England area, especially northern New England, should be served by an airline with the established capability to provide direct flights between our region and points to the south.

We have always believed that the best interests of the region could be served by the granting of Northeast Airlines' application for permanent certification.

The New England Governors, meeting in Boston on December 9, 1964, passed a resolution reaffirming this position and stressing the importance to all New England residents that the total service of the airline be maintained.

We believe that the latest majority decision of the Civil Aeronautics Board, like the previous decisions, has been based on outdated statistics.

I am of the opinion that a rehearing is essential to a fair determination of the Northeast Airlines case. The two minority members of the Board agree with this position. The effect of losing the Florida route would be so severe upon Northeast Airlines that any final decision must not be based upon arbitrary findings.

Northeast Airlines is the only major trunkline airline based in and serving our region. It has long and valiantly attempted to provide adequate service against almost impossible odds. The airline is the only one operating in the State of Maine. Our larger airports are now receiving better service than in the past and we expect smaller airports, as they are improved, to receive better service from Northeast.

Northeast Airlines is now providing my own State with service to Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Washington and Florida. We believe it is imperative to our industrial and recreational growth to maintain this service.

I have, therefore, in the past and will continue in the future to fight for the survival of Northeast Airlines whose very life depends upon being permitted trunkline capabilities.

Northeast Airlines' problem is of concern to all of New England and I respectfully request the Members of the New England congressional delegation to give it the studied consideration which its seriousness demands.

The loss of Northeast Airlines would be a tragic economic blow to our region. Hopefully, strong and united support of the airlines now will prevent any such eventuality.

NO JUSTIFICATION FOR PRESIDENTIAL COMMISSION TO INVESTIGATE CLOSING OF VETERANS HOSPITALS

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Ayres] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, there can be no justification for a presidential commission to investigate the closing of many veterans hospitals except that it might provide the administration with a scapegoat. Certainly if such a commission might be deemed of importance, it should have been created before the Veterans' Administration made its ill-considered and cruel decision to close these facilities.

The chairman of the Veterans' Affairs Committee immediately called for exhaustive hearings on the necessity of this drastic action. Fifty competent witnesses were heard and the result must have been evident to all—the administration's action was in complete error.

The proceedings by the House Veterans' Affairs Committee and its determination to rectify this grave error was transmitted to the White House. It was only then that the heartless rule was admitted to have possible error and the commission was created. This attempt to circumvent the House Veterans' Affairs Committee is purely political in intent and is a face-saving gesture.

The House Veterans' Affairs Committee has always acted in a nonpartisan manner. At the outset of the just completed hearings, I assured the administration that I would abide by the evidence brought before us. That evidence left no doubt but that the ruling closing these hospital facilities was without justifiable basis.

I intend to ask House Veterans' Affairs Committee Chairman Olin Teague to submit the lengthy and comprehensive testimony of our witnesses to the presidential commission. On this testimony alone, the commission will be able to see the complete error of the administration hospital closing order.

The President can relieve the anxiety of thousands of veterans and their families by taking immediate action in rescinding the original hospital closing order. This matter is of too great an importance to lend itself to any political window dressing. The hospital closing order should be declared null and void now.

TO CREATE A NATIONAL CEMETERY IN OHIO

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Minshall] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, there has been no consistent effort to keep up with the growth of the veteran population in providing adequate national cemeteries for eligible veterans and their dependents.

The bulk of the 98 national cemeteries in the United States and Puerto Rico were established for Civil War dead. Only 17 were created after 1900. Only a few of them—Arlington and the cemeteries located near Denver, Minneapolis, St. Louis, and Portland, Oreg.—have adequate acreage to meet long-range future needs. The State of Ohio, with its huge veteran population, has no national cemetery at all.

A Disabled American Veterans survey reveals that location of present cemeteries is unfavorable for many veterans. Certainly this is true in Ohio. Last year the Ohio veteran death rate was 811 per month, an increase over the 770 per month average in 1963. As age takes its toll that figure will increase yearly.

We give those who serve in our Armed Forces, and their dependents, the legal entitlement to burial in a national cemetery. It is certainly thwarting the intent of that benefit if we do not also provide them with adequate cemetery space which is geographically in attune to present-day veteran population.

The bill I am introducing today to create a national cemetery in Ohio is identical to one introduced recently by my good friend, the Congresswoman from Ohio, Frances P. Bolton. Hopefully, this evidence of concern and support will help spur the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs to action on this and many other pending bills of like nature.

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XXXVI

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. Multer] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of our colleagues the 36th part of the continuing series on New York City in Crisis which has been appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

This installment concerns a study of the city's industrial and manufacturing problems. It appeared in the Tribune on February 24, 1965:

For New York, Another Grim Report

(By Barry Gottehrer)

At a crowded public hearing on the 1965–66 executive capital budget yesterday, Mayor Wagner accused a civic leader of being misinformed—only to learn shortly thereafter that it was he—and not the civic leader—who was misinformed.

The fireworks centered around the controversial and long-awaited Arthur D. Little study of the city's extreme industrial and manufacturing problems and preceded only by a few hours the sudden release—of the report.

The 97-page report titled "A Program To Meet New York City's Industrial Problems," warned that "unless the industrial environment of New York City is revitalized, the city will face continued loss of job opportunities in manufacturing (76,000 between 1958–63) and related activities, further decline in the tax base (from 1954 to 1962, the city's property tax revenues increased only 35 percent while general expenditures increased 56 percent); and increasing deterioration and blight of industrial space with hazardous conditions of employment and uneconomic operations.

The study also said that, unless New York City strengthens and broadens its industrial program, it will continue to lose companies in increasing numbers to other cities and States actively seeking new industry.

The study called for the establishment of a public development corporation (consisting of both city officials and private citizens) that would borrow funds to undertake construction of a major development (including rehabilitation) and would lease low-cost space to attract industry to the city.

The study also concluded that the city needs an industrial development program with three elements:

1. Financial assistance capable of implementing diverse projects.
2. Immediate and long-range research and planning activities to identify appropriate economic activities for the city, to insure the most efficient expenditure of time and effort on projects with long-range value.
3. Direct service activities for existing and new agencies.

Yet the release of the report was overshadowed by the one-scene drama, set in the second-floor Board of Estimate hearing room in city hall yesterday, and its aftermath.

Here's the way the drama unfolded:

John M. Leavens, executive director of the Citizens Budget Commission, speaks: "In April 1964, the city planning commission commissioned Arthur D. Little, Inc., to do a study on the feasibility of making a fresh start on the industrial redevelopment in New York City. The final report was delivered in December 1964. Since then, as far as the public is concerned, the report has been rigorously suppressed by city hall * * *."

Mayor Wagner speaks: "This report is not being suppressed by city hall. There has been no suppression at all * * *. Some of our commissioners, who have studied the report already, have some grave questions about it. * * * The fiscal commission (a temporary citizens' group named by the mayor to study the city's financial crisis) is studying it right now and I told Earl Schwulst (board chairman of the Bowery Savings Bank and chairman of the special commission) that we would not release the report until they finished studying it."

Mr. Leavens: "It is my understanding that the fiscal commission finished studying the report and returned it to your office 2 weeks ago."

Mayor Wagner: "Your understanding is a little off the beam. The special commission is still studying the report. When they're through with it, it's anybody's property as far as I'm concerned. I have no objection to the planning commission releasing the report at any time after the fiscal commission is through with it."

This took place at 11:25 a.m.

Yet within a few hours, it became abundantly clear that Mr. Leavens, who had taken a beating during the open hearing, had the far stronger case.

Amazingly, it was the mayor and not Mr. Leavens whose understanding about the status of the Little report was "a little off the beam."

According to Joseph D. McGoldrick, secretary of the temporary commission on city finances, Mr. Schwulst had sent a letter to Julius C. C. Edelstein, the mayor's executive assistant, outlining his impressions of the study and notifying the mayor that the commission was through studying it. This letter was mailed on February 6.

"Of course, we have a continuing interest in the business problems of the city," said Mr. McGoldrick yesterday, "but we were through studying the Little report before Earl Schwulst mailed the letter."

But yesterday, 17 days after Mr. Schwulst had written to the mayor's top aid telling him the commission was through studying the report, Mayor Wagner challenged the information of a civic leader who said exactly that.

The letter had not been lost in the mail. According to Leslie Slots, the mayor's press aid, the letter had been received by Mr. Edelstein on February 8, more than 2 weeks before yesterday's budget hearing.

And, according to this same aid, the mayor was totally ignorant of the existence of the letter when he made his statement at the hearing. "We get a lot of mail of all kinds every day," said Mr. Slots. "This letter is still not on the staff level. It's not ready for the mayor. That's not the point anyway. What the mayor was angry about was the statement that the city was trying to suppress the report. That's a pretty strong word—suppress. There never was any intention to suppress anything."

As late as 2 weeks ago, when the Herald Tribune's "City in Crisis" series first focused public attention on the Little report, there were doubts, even among some city officials, that the report would ever be released in its original form.

According to the Little study, the proposed public development corporation would operate in the following way:

"The corporation will be wholly owned by the city of New York. Its board of directors, under the chairmanship of the mayor, will include the policymaking department heads and probably some private citizens.

"A line of credit for the corporation will derive from the collateral of city-owned land—vacant, condemned, and underdeveloped—transferred to its control in return for a note. This land, not now used, will make it possible for the corporation to borrow outside the city's debt limit. By drawing on the line of credit made possible by the fluid land reserve (estimated at more than $100 million), the Public Development Corp. can borrow funds to undertake the construction of a major development (including rehabilitation), leasing space to appropriate industries.

"When the space has been built and leased, the project can be sold to a wholly-owned temporary industrial development corporation which, using the leases as a basis for borrowing, can borrow sufficient money from the conventional mortgage market, from State funds (such as those of the New York State Job Development Authority) and through the sales of income debentures to pay the Public Development Corp. for 90 percent of the project cost. The remaining 10 percent will be held by the Public Development Corp. as stock.

"After a stated period of time, possibly 15 years, the temporary corporation can sell the property to the tenants or other purchasers, returning it completely to the private sector and providing the city with full payment."

The department of commerce and industry has already taken something of a step toward keeping industry in the city through its creation of the New York City Industrial Development Corp. This private, non-profit local development company makes it possible for businesses to obtain financing through a $100 million revolving fund under arrangement with the New York State Job Development Authority.

The fund was announced in October 1963, and the department of commerce and industry reported that through the first of February it had been instrumental in keeping seven firms from leaving the city. These seven firms saved 1,000 jobs for New York.

Despite frequent and continued statements of the city administration boasting of the city's "throbbing economic vitality," the Little report paints a far more realistic—and disturbing—picture.

"The city's problems are of a magnitude and complexity experienced nowhere else in the world," said the report. "* * * By gaining a better perspective of the magnitude of this problem (the loss of manufacturing jobs needed by the generally low-income minority groups of generally limited skill), it is interesting to note that the unemployed in New York City outnumber the total labor force of the State of Delaware and that the nonwhite population of New York City, whose level of skills most require upgrading, outnumbers the nonwhite population of every State other than California and Texas."

Among reasons given in the study for the city's increasing loss of manufacturers are "urban growth, the age and obsolescence of industrial facilities and the high cost of improvements."

The history of the study dates back to June 1963, when Francis J. Bloustein, then acting chairman of the city planning commission; sent a 3-page letter and a detailed 10-page memorandum to Mayor Wagner. The subject of both—the city's growing business crisis.

"Industrial development in New York City is at the crossroads," read the memorandum. "Manufacturing jobs have been declining rapidly and steadily. Only in a limited sense can the current increase in white-collar employment be considered a compensating gain, since a large proportion of New York City residents are dependent upon blue-collar jobs. * * *

It is safe to say that unless valid solutions to these problems are reached, it will be impossible to check the rapid decline of industry in this city. Among other adverse results will be the hardening of business opposition to an urban-renewal program that appears to business to work against business and never for it. The economic consequence will be catastrophic in terms of lost tax revenue and mounting welfare costs.

FINAL REPORT

The letter and the memo both called for an immediate study of the problem. Yet not until 1 year later did the City Planning Commission announce that Arthur D. Little, Inc., of Boston, had a study of the problems and potential of industrial growth in New York.

A report, read the commission's newsletter, is scheduled to be completed in the fall of this year (1964).

The first draft (the study cost city taxpayers $30,000) was completed in September 1964, and, after consultations with various department heads, a final draft was, according to the City Planning Commission, completed last November. At this point, the Mayor and the Board of Estimate were briefed on the contents of the report.

Then, in early January, the final report—as it was distributed yesterday—was delivered to the offices of the City Planning Commission where, with the exception of copies distributed to top commissioners and the Temporary Commission on City Finances, it remained until yesterday.

At this point—and quoted in the "City in Crisis" series—a Planning Commission aid said about the report, "It's possible it may never be released for public consumption. There have been other reports and other studies paid for out of taxpayers' money that were finished but weren't made public for one reason or another. It's up to the mayor now. We're waiting for word from him."

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS—PART XXXVII

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article is a part of "New York City in Crisis," a series appearing in the New York Herald Tribune.

This installment concerns the crisis developing in the City University of New York. It appeared in the Tribune on February 25, 1965:

NEW YORK CITY IN CRISIS: CUNY'S DANGER—"EDUCATIONAL SLUM"

(By Terry Ferrer)

"Crisis conditions" in the city's public colleges, resulting from "unbelievable overcrowding, has reached a stage where academic standards are threatened," the Public Education Association charged yesterday. And, the PEA said, the main fault lies with the State, which is "shortchanging" the city's colleges by some $30 million this year.

Dr. Albert H. Bowker, chancellor of the City University of New York which runs those colleges, agreed that CUNY is threatened with lowered academic programs.

"We're operating at 120 percent of capacity now," Dr. Bowker said in an interview yesterday. "There isn't much more we can do with our existing plant, short of going year-round. We're really running from dawn to dusk at the moment. * * * Especially crucial for the students is library and study space, while faculty office space is almost nonexistent."

Both Dr. Bowker and the PEA, a 2,000-member civic organization, also agreed that the worst of the crisis is in the city's four tuition-free senior colleges, Brooklyn, City, Hunter, and Queens. In 1960, these four colleges enrolled some 87,000 full- and part-time students; this academic year, the total is more than 122,000.

In a 13-page indictment of the present financing of the City University, the PEA declared that "nothing short of an all-out effort by the city and State governments will suffice to relieve the situation."

The report was prepared by PEA's higher education committee, chaired by Ira Hirschmann, industrialist, diplomat, and, for 9 years, a member of the board of higher education, which has jurisdiction over the City University.

Mr. Hirschmann warned yesterday that the city was in danger of becoming a "poor man's educational enclave" and the "educational slum" of higher education in the State.

The PEA report declared that the State is "shortchanging" the city colleges by some $30 million this year, while pouring double the per student support into the State university, but it can and should do more.

The PEA said in its report that the State puts $1,400 behind each 4-year and graduate student in the State university, but only $700 behind each similar student in the City University. This "alarming practice," Mr. Hirschmann said, "could throw higher education in the city into chaos, confusion, and disintegration."

Actually, the City University backs each student with $1,575, but gets only $700 of it from the State.

"If State funds for 1964–65 were being allocated to the City University at the rate now being provided on a per-student basis to the 4-year colleges and graduate schools of the State University," the report said, "the New York City Board of Higher Education would receive between $55 and $60 million instead of the $29 million which it will get this year."

The PEA proposed that the legislature adopt a formula providing equal support for all 4-year and graduate students attending public institutions in the State, whether at the State or City University. The formula would be similar to the State-aid formula for public elementary and secondary schools.

Copies of the proposal have been sent to Governor Rockefeller and key legislators, the PEA said. The association expects to draft legislation in cooperation with Dr. Bowker for action at this legislative session.

Forty-three percent of the college-aged population in the State lives in New York City, the PEA pointed out. In the last 5 years, "lack of facilities has restricted enrollment rises in the senior colleges of the City University to 25 percent," the report said, "while similar increases in 4-year colleges and graduate centers of the State University have gone up nearly 49 percent." In 1960–61, the City University had 32,000 full-time students in its senior colleges, against 40,500 this academic year. In the same period, 4-year full-time enrollment in the State University jumped from 35,000 to 52,500.

"The city government," said PEA, "has not been in a position to provide the funds necessary for the enlargement of its public colleges to meet the full need. The State, on the other hand, with very great taxing powers, has been able to move rapidly in expanding facilities of the State University."

Fifteen of SUNNY's 58 units have been added in the last 5 years, generally "without the overcrowding that now characterizes city institutions."

The PEA also recommended that all 34 public 2-year colleges in the State be tuition-free, as are the seven in New York City. This could be accomplished by raising the State's support from its present one-third to two-thirds of the 2-year colleges' operating costs, and from one-half to three-fourths of the construction costs.

New York State is "well able to finance a strong system of public higher education, free at least through the 14th year," the PEA declared. "New York ranks No. 4 among all States in level of per capita personal income, being surpassed only by Nevada, Delaware and Connecticut. In 1962, it ranked No. 2 in personal income per child of school age (5 to 17). By contrast, it ranked 49th in per capita State expenditures for institutions of higher learning and 49th in percent of total State expenditures allocated to such institutions."

PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. Helstoski] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 33, I am recorded as not voting. Because I had previously committed myself to discuss certain problems of our district with the members of the Rutherford Chamber of Commerce, I was unable to be present during the rollcall. Had I been here, I would have voted to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4714, to amend the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964.

Also, Mr. Speaker, I am not recorded as voting on rollcalls Nos. 62, 63, and 64 held on Monday, April 5.

I was unable to be in the Chamber because of very important commitments which I had in my congressional district, which caused me to be absent from Washington.

Had I been in Washington, I would have been present to vote on the legislation being considered by the House.

On H.R. 980, to provide for the return of obscene mail, I would have voted "yea." I also would have voted "yea" on H.R. 7064, authorizing $1 million to build a chancery building for our Embassy staff in Saigon.

On the final bill under discussion in the House, H.R. 7060, the appropriation bill for funds for the Treasury and Post Office Departments, I also would have voted "yea."

NATURAL RESOURCES COUNCIL PROPOSAL

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. Ullman] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Record for April 5, Senator McGovern inserted the speech of New Mexico's distinguished senior Senator [Mr. Anderson] before the ninth biennial wilderness conference, San Francisco, Calif., April 2, 1965.

Senator Anderson's outstanding record as a great leader in the American conservation movement was cited by Senator McGovern.

Today I wish to join the Senator from South Dakota in noting my admiration of the lasting contribution Senator Anderson is making to insure continued progress in this Nation's natural resource endeavor.

I was particularly heartened and gratified by Senator Anderson's endorsement of the establishment of a Council of Resources and Conservation Advisers as proposed in the Senate by S. 938 introduced by Senator McGovern and in H.R. 4430 which I have the pleasure to sponsor in the House of Representatives.

It seems only yesterday that I discussed the need for such a council with our late President John F. Kennedy during his western "conservation" trip. The need for such a council is no less today than then—rather with the perspective achieved with the passage of only a few years we see the need to be more acute today. I heartily subscribe to Senator Anderson's words, and reiterate them to my colleagues, as he said:

> We have—as a nation—paid attention to resource problems on a crisis basis. We are alerted to the water crisis, the timber crisis, the pesticide crisis, the strip mine crisis. I have no question that it is the squeaking crisis which gets the oil. But it is the wisest way for a nation to develop and manage its resources for 190 million today and 330 million by the year 2000? I think not.
>
> A council of resource and conservation advisers might help to avoid the potential wastefulness of reaction only in the face of crisis. It might enable decision makers to take more initiative in advance of a severe resource problem rather than after it has ballooned to massive proportions.
>
> The council would be an arm of the executive branch, but it would serve all of Government in much the same fashion as the Council of Economic Advisers. The Council of Economic Advisers does not create national economic policy, but it gathers the information and does the advance thinking essential to the shaping of enlightened policy. It is still up to political leaders to create and implement tax and fiscal policy. By the same token, Members of Congress and Cabinet officers would still be left with the responsibility to make sound conservation policy.
>
> But the council of resource and conservation advisers would help chart the way toward appropriate conservation measures. It would let us know where we stand and where we should be heading.

CONGRESSMAN SWEENEY AND THE PARENTHOOD DERBY

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Vanik] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I have just received word that our distinguished colleague, Hon. Robert E. Sweeney, Representative at Large from the State of Ohio today became father of his 11th child, his third daughter.

This is just another testimonial to Ohio's progress as a growth State.

Congressman Sweeney now takes undisputed clear title to second place among Members of Congress in the parenthood derby.

The future strength and leadership of the Democratic Party is assured with our colleague Hugh Carey with a Democratic family of 13 children, our colleague Robert E. Sweeney with 11 children, and Honorable Robert Casey with 10 children.

THAT WAS THE WEEK THAT WAS

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Fulton] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULTON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, most Americans enjoy a good joke. Humor is one of the most commendable ingredients of the American personality.

Satire and irony, particularly when directed at persons in public life, may sting a bit but give us an opportunity to see ourselves, though in caricature, from another side.

At best this form of humor can be constructive and entertaining. At its worst it can be debilitating and vicious.

Millions of Americans on their home television screens recently witnessed an example of American humor at its worst.

I refer to the March 30, 1965, production of the NBC–TV program, "That Was the Week That Was."

As a southern Member of Congress, I believe I am aware and feel very deeply the problems with which the South and other areas of this Nation are faced. We want to solve these problems as quickly as possible and above all we want them solved in a spirit of community good will.

However, to hold up an entire region of the United States to public ridicule is to damage that spirit and the efforts to broaden it.

I do not pretend to speak for others but I am certain there are millions of objective Americans who share this view. One of these is Mr. Harris Martin, editor of "This Week" in Nashville, a publication of events and activities in Nashville, Tenn., "Music City, U.S.A."

Mr. Martin suggests the removal of the program from the air. I would not advocate this because I firmly believe in free speech and comment. This program of March 30, in my view, demonstrated a deplorable failure in responsible judgment. Such viciousness accomplishes nothing. It does create greater hostility, however, which does not improve but worsens matters.

Under unanimous consent, I insert Mr. Martin's editorial at this point:

To NBC–TV and TW–3—for Incredibly Bad Taste

Dear Producers, Directors, Performers, and Oh-so-Clever Writers, on "That Was the Week That Was": Your half hour segment on the NBC television network, Tuesday, March 30, was a classic example of ill-informed comment on the troubled-enough social scene.

From the opening "song," in which Nancy Ames attempted to keep notes and lyrics in some semblance of synchronization—through the poorly conceived attempts at devastating humor—your show was a prime-time example of TV's vast wasteland.

The low-point—in a show filled with high-school-skit mediocrity, was the set of lyrics which poked vitriolic fun at a large portion of the United States.

Standing before a rear screen projections of the Confederate flag, Nancy Ames played parrot for the creative wizards who dream up your pseudosophisticated garbage, and chanted a song which condemned all of the country south of the Mason-Dixon Line. This line, incidentally, begins around Baltimore, Md.

Based upon unfortunate incidents which have occurred in the South—(and in the North, and in Alaska, and in too many places), an entire segment of our country was ridiculed, on a major TV network, in prime time, with the apparent sanction of those who regularly spend much time and money, creating a network image.

It's doubtful that anyone connected with your show has firsthand, eyewitness knowledge of the South—other than possible participation in brief band wagon jaunts to currently headlined trouble spots.

Your long-range guns which point so easily South could be replaced by artillery of smaller caliber, aimed toward your own street corners.

You ask how long the country can do without products, produced in Alabama, like "axe handles, ham hocks, etcetera, etcetera."

Let's ask you a question. How long can the country do without "TW-3"?

And the sooner we start, the better.

—Editor.

NATIONAL FAMILY HEALTH

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Morgan] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the American Academy of General Practice Foundation is doing the country a great service by focusing its attention on the unmet health needs of the American family and the ways of meeting those needs. Scientific progress has revolutionized the practice of medicine and in this time of rapid change and high specialization we must make sure that the overall needs of the patient are not neglected. We need to put a lot more thought into finding the most effective way of meeting the many varied health care needs of the family. We must determine what kind of practitioner will best be able to provide basic medical service to the American family in the future and how best to train him.

To help bring these questions before the public eye, I have introduced House Joint Resolution 413 in the Congress to designate the week of April 9 of each year as National Family Health Week by Presidential proclamation.

I am sure that the American Academy of General Practice will continue to be a leader in the national effort to find better ways of providing the American family with comprehensive medical care. Conferences such as this one which bring together concerned and knowledgeable people from a variety of professional fields are doing much to clarify and solve the problems of unmet health needs of the American family.

FOREIGN AID

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. Fraser] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the next in the series of bipartisan meetings on foreign aid.

The meeting tomorrow, Wednesday, April 7, will focus on the issue of foreign aid and the problem of internal security and insurgency.

The speakers will be William S. Gaud, Deputy Administrator; Byron Engle, Director of the Office of Public Safety, and experienced in police administration in the United States and other countries; and William J. Mazzocco, Director of the Office of Vietnam Affairs, and specialist on the nonmilitary aspects of counterinsurgency, Agency for International Development.

Slides will also be shown.

This meeting, sponsored by three Democratic and three Republican members of the Foreign Affairs Committee, is for members only and will be held in the speaker's dining room at 3 p.m.

TWO BILLS TO EXEMPT CERTAIN GROUPS FROM EXCISE TAXES

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. McVicker] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Hawaii?

There was no objection.

Mr. McVICKER. Mr. Speaker, the Johnson administration has done a great service to the artistic and cultural life of our country by proposing legislation designed to aid endeavors in the humanities and the arts by financial contributions and by the establishment of a National Arts and Humanities Foundation. This proposal recognizes the principle that it is necessary to bring into better balance our commitment to science with our commitment to the arts and the humanities.

Much new interest in the performing arts has been shown in our country, yet there is still a great lag in artistic excellence and in the commitment of our people to its betterment. The proposed legislation that would establish a Humanities Foundation recognizes the principle that a society can no more ignore its cultural well-being than it can neglect the condition of its health or education.

Support for the performing arts must come from all directions, and especially from private sources and initiatives. States and municipalities must provide more impetus than they have in the past, and finally, the Federal Government has a limited but important role to play. The Humanities Foundation bill will do much to relieve the possibility of economic strangulation which the performing arts are presently facing. The Congress can give further help in the form of tax relief.

Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill which is designed to relieve some of the economic difficulties of our dramatic and musical groups. This bill would exempt live dramatic and musical performances from the admission excise tax by amending section 4233 of the Internal Revenue Code.

I am introducing another bill today which would also amend, clarify, and define the applicability of section 4233 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1854. This bill would exempt any admissions or amounts paid for admission, refreshment, service, or merchandise, which inure exclusively to the benefit of churches, educational institutions, community chest foundations, symphony and opera societies, National Guard and Reserve officers' organizations and war veterans organization, and nonprofit organizations which operate solely for the purpose of providing scholarships for study on the postsecondary level. I urge passage of these bills by the Congress.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. Dent (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 30 minutes, today; and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Rosenthal (at the request of Mr. Albert), for 60 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. Flood (at the request of Mr. Matsunaga), for 60 minutes, on April 28, 1965; to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the Congressional Record, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. Cohelan to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material and tables.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Teague of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. Saylor.
Mr. Bray.
Mr. Fino.
Mr. Laird.
Mr. Bow.
Mr. Pirnie.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. Matsunaga) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. McCarthy in two instances.
Mr. Dulski
Mr. Fisher.
Mr. Udall.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 693. An act to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 7, 1965, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

881. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting notice of intention to issue an Executive order having the effect of terminating the designation of certain countries as less-developed countries for purposes of the interest equalization tax, pursuant to subsection (b) of section 4916 of the Internal Revenue Code and Executive Order 11071 of December 27, 1962 (H. Doc. No. 139); to the Committee on Ways and Means; and ordered to be printed.

882. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill to amend section 1552(c) of title 10, United States Code, to provide for the deduction of interim earnings from the payments of active duty pay and allowances found due members or former members of the uniformed services as a result of the correction of their military records"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

883. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Export-Import Bank of Washington, transmitting a report that the Bank has issued a guarantee in connection with a contract of sale for the export of a rotary blast drill to Yugoslavia, pursuant to title III of the Foreign Assistance and Related Agencies Appropriation Act of 1965 and to the Presidential determination of February 4, 1964; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

884. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of increased cost resulting from acquisition of maintenance trucks produced by the Boeing Co., Seattle, Wash., for the Minuteman intercontinental ballistic missile program, Department of the Air Force; to the Committee on Government Operations.

885. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of followup examinations of reviews of right-of-way claims in the State of West Virginia Federal-aid highway program, Bureau of Public Roads, Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Government Operations.

886. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report of loss on business loan resulting from inadequate evaluation of borrower's bonding coverage requirements and from realization on collateral, Small Business Administration; to the Committee on Government Operations.

887. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Power Commission, transmitting a copy of "Statistics of Electric Utilities, Privately Owned," and a copy of "Sales by Producers of Natural Gas to Natural Gas Pipeline Companies, 1963"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

888. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation entitled "A bill for the relief of Lt. Col. Claude E. Tabor, Jr., U.S. Air Force"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MADDEN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 322. Resolution providing for the consideration of H.R. 6675, a bill to provide a hospital insurance program for the aged under the Social Security Act with a supplementary health benefits program and an expanded program of medical assistance, to increase benefits under the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance system, to improve the Federal-State public assistance programs, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 226). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 7151. A bill to amend section 104(s) of Public Law 480, 83d Congress, as amended, to require that 5 percent of the foreign currencies hereafter acquired by the sale of U.S. surplus agricultural commodities be set aside for the sale of dollars to American tourists abroad; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 7152. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Research and Development Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H.R. 7153. A bill to eliminate certain restrictions on the assignment of Government field personnel to duty in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 7154. A bill to permit variation of the 40-hour workweek of Federal employees for educational purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 7155. A bill to provide that contributions toward the reward being offered for the apprehension of those responsible for the recent bombing activities in Birmingham, Ala., shall be deductible for Federal income tax purposes, and that such reward when paid shall be exempt from Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 7156. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1920, to prohibit transportation of articles to or from the United States aboard certain foreign vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

H.R. 7157. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to include Michigan among the States which may obtain social security coverage, under State agreement, for State and local policemen and firemen; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 7158. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Joint Committee on Research and Development Policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DANIELS:

H.R. 7159. A bill to provide for the crediting for civil service retirement purposes of certain service rendered by civilian employees of nonappropriated fund instrumentalities of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DAVIS of Georgia:

H.R. 7160. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from assessing fees or charges for services, publications, or instruments, unless specifically permitted by law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 7161. A bill to amend section 161 of the Revised Statutes with respect to the authority of Federal officers and agencies to withhold information and limit the availability of records; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. EVANS of Colorado:

H.R. 7162. A bill to authorize the modification of the John Martin Reservoir project, Colorado, in order to provide a permanent reservoir pool for recreational and fish and wildlife purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD:

H.R. 7163. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALL:

H.R. 7164. A bill to establish a cropland restoration program and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H.R. 7165. A bill to amend section 1(14) (a) of the Interstate Commerce Act to insure the adequacy of the national railroad freight car supply, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7166. A bill to authorize the Interstate Commerce Commission, after investigation and hearing, to require the establishment of through routes and joint rates between motor common carriers of property, and between such carriers and common carriers by rail, express, and water, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7167. A bill to establish a uniform system of time standards and measurements for the United States and to require the observance of such time standards for all purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7168. A bill to amend section 204(a) (3) of the Interstate Commerce Act respecting motor carrier safety regulations applicable to private carriers of property; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 7169. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 with respect to certain registration fees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. IRWIN:

H.R. 7170. A bill to authorize the disposal, without regard to the 6-month waiting period, of approximately 50,000 tons of refractory grade bauxite from the national stockpile: to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 7171. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to deny deductions for certain payments for the use of, or interest payments on mortgages on, industrial plants financed by tax-exempt obligations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 7172. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 with respect to the tax treatment of wages of seamen in certain cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H.R. 7173. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Business Corporation Act and the District of Columbia Nonprofit Corporation Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H.R. 7174. A bill to amend the Fire and Casualty Act of the District of Columbia and to supplement the Motor Vehicle Safety Responsibility Act of the District of Columbia in order to provide for the indemnification of persons sustaining injuries or damages as a result of the operation of motor vehicles by financially irresponsible persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. O'NEAL of Georgia:

H.R. 7175. A bill to make permanent the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 7176. A bill to establish a Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. POWELL:

H.R. 7177. A bill to extend the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 7178. A bill to provide for an objective, thorough, and nationwide analysis and reevaluation of the extent and means of resolving the critical shortage of qualified manpower in the field of correctional rehabilitation; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 7179. A bill to establish a Department of Consumers in order to secure within the Federal Government effective representation of the economic interests of consumers; to coordinate the administration of consumer services by transferring to such Department certain functions of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, and other agencies; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 7180. A bill to authorize a survey for improving the channel at Pensacola Harbor, Fla., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. SKUBITZ:

H.R. 7181. A bill to provide for the commemoration of certain historical events in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. STANTON:

H.R. 7182. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the excise tax on communications; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WAGGONNER:

H.R. 7183. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, in order to make unlawful, as unreasonable and unjust discrimination against and undue burden upon interstate commerce, certain property tax assessments of common carrier property and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H.R. 7184. A bill to amend section 2401 of title 28, United States Code, to extend the time for filing tort actions by persons under the age of 21, or insane or mentally ill, or imprisoned on a criminal charge; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FEIGHAN:

H.R. 7185. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to provide that a survivor beneficiary shall not lose his or her entitlement to benefits by reason of a marriage or remarriage which occurs after he or she attains age 62; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MATSUNAGA:

H.R. 7186. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the cost of maintaining a retarded child in a professionally qualified custodial institution shall be deductible as a medical expense; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MEEDS:

H.R. 7187. A bill to conserve and protect Pacific salmon of North American origin; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MINSHALL:

H.R. 7188. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to establish a national cemetery in Ohio; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PATMAN:

H.R. 7189. A bill to amend the Clayton Act by making section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act, with amendments, a part of the Clayton Act, in order to provide for governmental and private civil proceedings for violations of section 3 of the Robinson-Patman Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PELLY:

H.R. 7190. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to make the interest equalization tax inapplicable to acquisitions before September 3, 1964, and to exclude from the application of such tax acquisitions of foreign stock acquired with funds held outside the United States on July 18, 1963; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINDSAY:

H.R. 7191. A bill to protect voting rights secured by the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 7192. A bill to protect voting rights secured by the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REID of New York:

H.R. 7193. A bill to protect voting rights secured by the 15th amendment of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 7194. A bill to protect voting rights secured by the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 7195. A bill to protect voting rights secured by the 15th amendment of the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois:

H.R. 7196. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ERLENBORN:

H.R. 7197. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 7198. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLORY:

H.R. 7199. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MICHEL:

H.R. 7200. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. AYRES:

H.R. 7201. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BATTIN:

H.R. 7202. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL:

H.R. 7203. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H.R. 7204. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H.R. 7205. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 7206. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CEDERBERG:

H.R. 7207. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.R. 7208. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DEL CLAWSON:

H.R. 7209. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONABLE:

H.R. 7210. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 7211. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 7212. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.R. 7213. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOODELL:

H.R. 7214. A bill the guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIFFIN:

H.R. 7215. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HOSMER:

H.R. 7216. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEITH:

H.R. 7217. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 7218. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the

Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LAIRD:

H.R. 7219. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H.R. 7220. A bill to guanrantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 7221. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MOSHER:

H.R. 7222. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIRNIE:

H.R. 7223. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. QUIE:

H.R. 7224. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REIFEL:

H.R. 7225. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REINECKE:

H.R. 7226. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROBISON:

H.R. 7227. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI:

H.R. 7228 A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of New York:

H.R. 7229. A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TALCOTT:

H.R. 7230 A bill to guarantee the right to vote under the 15th amendment to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McVICKER:

H.R. 7231. A bill to amend, clarify, and make certain the applicability of section 4233 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, relating to exemptions from tax imposed under section 4231 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 7232. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the tax on admissions shall not apply to admissions to any live dramatic (including musical) performance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINO:

H. Res. 321. Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the advisability and feasibility of a governmental lottery; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

180. By Mr. MORRIS: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, requesting the Congress of the United States of America to take appropriate investigative and legislative action in connection with the Tierra Amarilla land grant located in Rio Arriba County, N. Mex.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

181. By the SPEAKER: A memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to appropriating funds for the Corps of Engineers to carry on its current and proposed San Francisco Bay operations and also the studies into the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta region; to the Committee on Appropriations.

182. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Hawaii, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States extending heartfelt thanks for commemorating the sixth anniversary of Hawaii's admission to the Union; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHMORE:

H.R. 7233. A bill for the relief of Col. Frank D. Schwikert, U.S. Air Force; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.R. 7234. A bill for the relief of Alberta Hilda St. Cyr; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7235. A bill for the relief of Esther Chin-Kuo Soong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7236. A bill for the relief of Marrie Jane Whittaker; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CASEY:

H.R. 7237. A bill for the relief of Mutual Benefit Foundation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FINO:

H.R. 7238. A bill for the relief of Nicolina De Gregorio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATHAWAY:

H.R. 7239. A bill for the relief of Perouze Tentunian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MacGREGOR:

H.R. 7240. A bill for the relief of Martha Pilworm Kim; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7241. A bill for the relief of Elmer O. Erickson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 7242. A bill for the relief of Fay Brett; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin:

H.R. 7243. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Kathrina Knezevic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

157. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Perfecto Isidro, Zambales chapter, the Philippine National Red Cross, Olongapo, Philippines, with reference to presenting the claims of certain fish pond operators of the area whose businesses suffered losses when ordered to vacate a certain sector for use by the U.S. Navy before their stocks had matured sufficiently for sale; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

158. Also, petition of city council, Richmond, Calif., with reference to proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to permit any State which has a bicameral legislature to apportion the membership of one house of its legislature on factors other than population; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Overtime in the Post Office Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I subscribe to true economies, but oppose vigorously false economies. I do not fuss with the Appropriations Committee for curtailing unnecessary expenditures or for insisting on maximum economies. However, I do not subscribe to the theory that the Appropriations Committee is infallible in their judgment.

The Post Office Department requested sufficient funds for the Bureau of Operations to eliminate some 15,000 man-years of excess overtime. They proposed to accomplish this by the appointment of regular employees. This approach is nothing less than good management and would produce eventual economies.

Mr. Speaker, experience has proven that it is not efficient to employ excessive temporary employees or to work regular employees excessive overtime. In the first instance, it is a costly process training temporary employees and certainly because their employment is temporary they leave the post office for employment elsewhere whenever they can find permanent jobs. This vicious and costly cycle continues on and on.

In the second instance, it has long been known that employees performing hours of overtime are not as productive as during their regular hours of employment. Cost-conscious and progressive private firms found this to be true, and as a result have taken proper steps to eliminate excessive overtime in their plants. Certainly if this is true in the cases of companies operating for a profit, it is equally true in the case of the Government.

I regret that the Appropriations Committee did not provide sufficient funds to enable the Bureau of Operations in the Post Office Department to convert their temporary employees to a permanent basis.

The report states:

> Additional funds will allow about 1,300 positions to be used as an experimental program to reduce the excess overtime work by postal employees.

It is my contention that the time for experimentation has long since passed. The work exists—it is being done—either by temporary employees or by the use of excess overtime. Neither course is proper.

The solution is to provide sufficient funds so that regular clerks and carriers can be employed to do the work of the Post Office Department.

First International Hangar Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, during March 19–21 in my congressional district in Arizona, we established a first of which Arizonans and the Nation may be proud. Various aviation groups, the Tucson Airport Authority, the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Agency, and the Director General of Civil Aeronautics of Mexico cooperated to hold the First International Hangar Session. This project is significant not only because it is the first of its kind on an international basis, but because it should bear fruitful results in terms of our relationships with our Latin American friends.

Mr. Najeeb E. Halaby, Administrator of the FAA and Senor Ramon Perez Morquecho, Director General of Civil Aeronautics in Mexico, met with 500 pilots and representatives of general aviation from Southwestern States and Mexico.

Administrator Halaby inaugurated these fly-in-type hangar sessions soon after taking office. The Tucson meeting provided unprecedented opportunities for those citizens active in aviation in Mexico and the United States to meet face to face with local, State, and Federal public servants charged with the responsibility of regulating aviation. The session was an example of genuine government-to-people and people-to-government democracy.

I commend Mr. Halaby and Senor Morquecho for their initiative in making the meeting a success.

Those who attended the fly-in were provided answers to their questions and the reasons and the philosophy of the actions taken by each Government on both routine and controversial matters.

Senor Morquecho paid tribute to the Federal Aviation Agency and Mr. Halaby for contributions toward the advancement of aviation, including establishment of well-equipped airports throughout the United States and development of a common system of air traffic control and navigation aids for both civil and military aircraft. He cited the exemplary safety record of aviation in the face of an ever-increasing load of activity.

Mr. Halaby said in part:

> We chose this city as the site of the First International Hangar Session because we believe it symbolizes to a great extent the spirit of friendship and understanding between nations and between people which we are trying to further here today.
>
> We are grateful to the Tucson Airport Authority also for sponsoring us here today. We have found these hangar fly-in sessions to be extremely effective as a two-way communication vehicle between the Federal Aviation Agency and the public it serves. I might add that I personally have learned a great deal through these give-and-take sessions.
>
> All of our previous sessions, however, have been aimed exclusively, or at least primarily, at U.S. pilots. This is our first venture in the international area.
>
> I trust it is not the last, for I believe meetings such as this can help cement the historic ties of friendship and good will which bind the United States and Latin America.
>
> We are honored to have with us today my counterpart in the Government of Mexico, Senor Ramon Perez Morquecho. His presence here and mine emphasize the importance which both of our Governments place on informal meetings of this kind.

This First International Hangar Session served to resolve many local problems. In addition, it established a rapport between two major Government officials that will serve both countries well.

All of us benefit from better relations and an improved understanding of the problems of our Mexican neighbors. International air travel offers citizens of both countries a way to exchange ideas, learn each other's customs, and broaden understanding.

I congratulate the Tucson Airport Authority and its manager, Mr. Charles H. Broman, and Mr. James Vercellino, director of the Arizona Department of Aeronautics, and all of the Government and industry officials responsible for sponsoring this unique meeting.

Results of Poll in 39th District of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, after I became a Member of the House of Representatives, I gave high priority to preparation and distribution of a questionnaire for the men and women I have the honor to represent.

It was carefully constructed to permit expression of a wide range of opinions. It contains 12 multiple-choice type questions on important issues.

The questionnaire was mailed to all residents of the 39th Congressional District of New York in January and February.

During the weeks following the mailing, my staff and I were amazed—and highly pleased—by the responses. Approximately 10 percent of the citizens who received the questionnaire went to the trouble of filling it out, providing their own stamp and envelope, and returning it to my office.

Almost 12,000 citizens took the time to give thoughtful and discerning replies to the questions. Such a demonstration of responsible citizenship makes me want to try that much harder to be their thoughtful and responsible representative.

Many citizens not only checked the answers most closely in accord with their own feelings—but also added personal comments to further clarify their views.

I personally read each completed questionnaire as they flooded my office—and I feel that as a result I am much better acquainted with the people I represent. Their insights will give me guidance as I ponder complex and controversial issues in the months ahead.

Frankly, I am proud of the men and women I represent. They are very well read and well informed. They take seriously their responsibilities as American citizens. Their demonstration in responding to my questionnaire is eloquent testimony to the strength of our democratic form of government—which is indeed built on the premise of responsible citizenship.

To insure complete accuracy, I contracted with a private firm in Washington, D.C., Data Management, Inc., to tabulate the completed questionnaires.

The results are highly gratifying to me. They show that the people I represent desire a progressive, but prudent and cost conscious, Federal Government, as I do.

All costs incurred in connection with the poll—including printing, tabulating, and distribution of results to my constituents—have been borne by my Citizens Committee in Erie County, N.Y. The total of these costs was more than $1,500.

I especially want to call attention to the responses to two of the questions.

One of my questions sought to determine how my constituents feel about the problems of water and air pollution. More than two-thirds of those responding—69.6 percent—indicated that they favor strong Federal programs to attack these problems.

Another question concerned the desirability of polling constituents in this manner. A tremendous majority of respondents—92.8 percent—said they favor questionnaires.

I am planning to poll the citizens of the 39th District again during my present term in Congress.

I feel other Members of the House of Representatives may be interested in examining the responses—and for this reason I have requested permission to place the results, as compiled by Data Management, Inc., in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Results of poll in 39th Congressional District of New York

DOMESTIC ISSUES IN THE 89TH CONG.

1. MEDICARE

The administration will press for enactment of medicare legislation this session. Which would you prefer:

	Percent
(a) The President's program under social security?	34.1
(b) Government subsidized for over 65 citizens (AMA proposal)?	37.4
(c) No Government health insurance program?	20.6
(d) Other response or no answer	7.9

2. EDUCATION

The Johnson administration has asked for an additional $1,500,000,000 for colleges, secondary schools, and research. Do you feel that Federal aid to education should—

(a) Follow President Johnson's proposals?	44.9
(b) Be geared toward research?	11.3
(c) Be curtailed, with the States assuming a larger role?	34.4
(d) Other response or no answer	9.4

3. POVERTY

Congress will be asked to double the present $784,200,000 appropriation in the "war on poverty." Which do you favor:

(a) A total program, designed to wipe out poverty?	20.3
(b) Limited self-help program aimed at unemployment?	64.6
(c) No Federal activity in this area?	10.0
(d) Other response or no answer	5.1

4. LABOR

One of labor's primary objectives in 1965 is repeal of the so-called right-to-work sec. 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act, allowing the States to pass such laws. Do you—

(a) Favor such repeal by Congress?	21.5
(b) Oppose repeal; the States should retain this right?	48.0
(c) An amendment requiring a referendum by the States?	15.0
(d) Other response or no answer	15.5

5. POLLUTION

Water and air pollution are gaining increased attention by Congress. As pollution of Lake Erie waters and the air, by our industries, are major problems, do you favor—

(a) A strong Federal program to attack it?	69.6
(b) A State program?	14.6
(c) Local action only?	6.1
(d) Other response or no answer	9.7

FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND THE COLD WAR

1. VIETNAM

With regard to the administration's commitments in South Vietnam, do you favor—

(a) Escalation of the war?	26.3
(b) Maintain the status quo, encourage a democratic Vietnam?	28.1
(c) Withdraw American military personnel and make South Vietnam neutral?	29.8
(d) Other response or no answer	15.8

2. UNITED NATIONS

Indonesia's withdrawal and the cost of U.N. peacekeeping missions has brought the world organization to a new crisis point in its 20-year history. Should the United States—

(a) Give unqualified support to all General Assembly decisions?	3.7
(b) Follow a "hard line" regarding paying the U.N.'s bills?	57.8
(c) Expand the U.N. role as an eventual international peace force?	23.1
(d) Other response or no answer	15.4

3. CUBA

The Communist regime in Cuba continues to be a source of unrest and subversion in other Latin American countries. Do you favor an American policy which would—

(a) Encourage an exile invasion of the island?	20.0
(b) Continue to isolate Cuba economically and diplomatically?	52.8
(c) Ease Cuban-United States tensions while remaining vigilant?	14.9
(d) Other response or no answer	12.3

4. AFRICA

The civil war in the Congo and the problems of the new and emerging nations have raised questions about our African policy. Do you favor—

(a) Continued economic and technical support for all countries?	14.4
(b) Curtail aid to those countries critical of our policies?	53.1
(c) Refuse any possible military involvement and reduce current aid?	21.8
(d) Other response or no answer	10.7

5. FOREIGN AID

U.S. military, economic, and technical aid (including the Peace Corps) goes to more than 60 nations throughout the world. Do you feel such assistance should—

(a) Be continued, with more cultural exchanges as well?	39.9
(b) Be eliminated to neutrals and countries like Poland and Yugoslavia?	10.0
(c) Be drastically curtailed, limited to "pro-West" nations?	39.9
(d) Other response or no answer	10.2

[IMMIGRATION POLICY]

President Johnson has proposed elimination of the quota system in the U.S. immigration policy. The quota system gives larger immigration allotments to some countries than others. (Great Britain, France, and Denmark, for example, have relatively larger allotments than Italy, Poland, and Greece.) Do you favor—

(a) The President's proposal?	22.3
(b) No changes in immigration policy?	29.0
(c) Modification but not complete elimination of the quota system?	40.9
(d) Other response or no answer	7.8

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

The House Committee on Un-American Activities is again the subject of sharp controversy. Would you favor—

(a) Abolition of the committee?	11.9
(b) Transfer of its functions to the Judiciary Committee?	24.9
(c) Retention of the committee in its present form?	45.8
(d) Other response or no answer	17.4

CONGRESSIONAL POLL

Do you favor having your Congressman poll you for your views?

Yes	92.8
No	1.2
Undecided	6.0

The Science of Oceanography

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN R. LAIRD

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Speaker, the important new science of oceanography is coming more and more into its own each year. In the Congress, our colleague, the gentleman from California, Congressman BOB WILSON, is one of the most knowledgeable in this field. On March 10, he gave a very penetrating and thoughtful speech outlining the opportunities ahead in oceanography. He knows what is being done in this field by our Government and he has some highly constructive suggestions on how to improve what we are doing and to streamline the way we do it. He has introduced legislation which would carry out his ideas. I would like to include his recent remarks at this time:

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BOB WILSON, REPUBLICAN, OF CALIFORNIA, MEMBER, HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE, TO AIAA/USN MARINE SYSTEMS AND ASW CONFERENCE, MARCH 10, 1965

Ladies and gentlemen, needless to say, I'd rather be there enjoying San Diego's climate than here in Washington today. Being an enthusiastic chamber of commerce member I will bet 100 to 1 with the meteorologists present that the weather is better there than here.

Then, too, I would have thoroughly enjoyed welcoming each one of you personally to our dynamic growing area which has become a magnet for so many oceanographic and related scientific endeavors. It is fitting that many of you are identified with space activities, since San Diego, which developed the original Atlas booster and Mercury vehicles, has been vitally concerned with developments in outer space. And we likewise share a mutual interest in oceanography. The pioneering role of Scripps Institute of Oceanography and the expanded activities of the Naval Electronics Laboratory and other Federal agencies here become our credentials in this field. We accept with you the challenge of exploring and harnessing the power and benefits of the ocean and the unexplored lands beneath it.

It is fitting that many of the experts in the field of outer space are now turning their eyes from the distant stars to the oceans lapping at their feet. The unexplored depths of the sea have become known as inner space and to my notion that is a fitting name if for no other reason than it can help to explain the parallel problems that pertain to both areas.

In less than 10 years, man's experience has progressed in outer space from a simple grapefruit-sized satellite to actual manned space travel plus television surface contact with the Moon and the imminent closeup views of Mars.

There can be no question that progress in space has stemmed primarily from a concentration of interest by the Federal Government, which replaced a proliferation of interest both governmental and private. For my part I believe the vast potential of inner space holds so much more promise and potential than a trip to the stars that I am impatient to eliminate governmental diffusion. It is time to coordinate and channel the resources of the Federal Government into a program that will turn the plans and dreams of many of you into realities.

There is no question in my mind that the creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration under the Eisenhower administration—October 1, 1958—is the benchmark from which progress in outer space will always be measured. I believe it is time for the formation of a similar agency concentrating in the area of inner space.

I have introduced legislation again this year, similar to my original bill of last year, which calls for the formation of a National Oceanographic Agency. Under the peculiar techniques of nomenclature this would be known as NOA, a literation no self-respecting seadog could object to. NOA is needed if we are to realize the dramatic potential of oceanography.

As did its sister agency, NASA, the new NOA would absorb related functions from many different agencies of the Federal Government and give them a definition of purpose and concentration of programs that would produce far more progress for every dollar invested.

As a politician, let me give you some of the political reasons why oceanography has lagged on the national scene. Most departments and agencies of Government today look to Capitol Hill for specific sponsorship of their roles and missions. Committees of Congress are given the responsibility of overseeing the activities of these departments and agencies. For example, the Defense Department looks to the Armed Services Committee for guidance and legislative championing. The Commerce Department must gain the approval and, in fact, the support of the Commerce Committees. In most cases, the committee members become expert in these specific areas of interest and in doing so become champions of that particular cause.

Yet, poor little oceanography with its program parceled out among 22 different bureaus, including 9 departments or agencies, is truly an orphan with little chance to grow to meaningful maturity. Space exploration would have suffered the same fate had not it been for the formation of NASA, plus a new committee in Congress with primary jurisdiction over NASA's activities. With a champion on the Hill, you can be sure the cause of oceanography would advance more quickly, with more meaningful results.

Now I recognize that opposition to such a concept is politically inevitable. In the first place, many of the oceanographic activities in various bureaus, agencies, and departments have their own advocates within such units and resistance to change out of fear of the unknown is inevitable and even understandable.

NASA faced the same problem during its days of incubation. The military departments, for example, loudly protested the loss of some of their more exciting projects to a new nonmilitary agency. Other boards and committees threw roadblocks in the way but reason finally prevailed and NASA became a reality with attendant results.

We can expect and, in fact, are already experiencing doubts and verbal roadblocks to the formation of NOA. Yet, I submit that those who fear the unknown prospect of giving up oceanographic activities and prerogatives within a given agency are being provincial in their outlook. Such fears are for the most part unfounded. There is no intention to remove from the Navy Department, for example, those oceanographic activities that directly relate to military needs. There is no doubt in my mind that on the contrary the Navy will find that a combined agency will accomplish more in her behalf in military developments than she could, going it alone. Many programs that are integral within existing agencies would not be carved out of that agency, at least in most instances. For example, Navy, Air Force, and even Army still continue space research, although at a reduced level, despite NASA's prime role in this area.

Unfortunately, one of the major roadblocks to the adoption of a new agency is the matter of committee jurisdiction. The committees in Congress would likely be hesitant to approve by themselves the diminution of their authority in the field of oceanography. Frankly, I expect the creation of this new Agency to be bogged down in a legislative morass unless a clear-cut directive from the White House gives the proposal the solid footing it needs.

As a matter of fact, I am convinced that action in the field of oceanography leading to the formation of a new agency hinges to a great extent on Presidential sponsorship. The new Agency would be a creature of the executive branch of the Government; therefore, the Chief Executive must be the enthusiastic sponsor of a departmental reorganization plan involving oceanography. This does not mean the creation of a new Cabinet post, but it does mean a reshuffling of overlapping authority in this vital field if we are to have the necessary progress.

It is incredible to me that such an agency has not been in effect for years. There can be no question that the potential benefit to mankind far exceeds the probable benefit from space exploration. This is not to downgrade the exploration of outer space. I enthusiastically support research projects in this area, but the benefit to mankind in terms of material wealth harvested from the sea and the ocean floor makes Federal participation on a grand scale in this area a sound business proposition.

Perhaps this sounds like strange philosophy from a member of a political party that advocates less Federal action in most fields of human endeavor and more reliance on State and local governments. There is nothing incongruous about my position on this. In fact, it jibes very well with the classic interpretation of constitutional rights.

Clearly, the seas around our borders are a Federal possession, a Federal responsibility, and a Federal opportunity. Even the most conservative constitutionalists can fully support an all-out federally sponsored oceanographic program. This is not to say, of course, that industry or States or communities should not be encouraged to make their contribution to progress also. It is a big ocean and Uncle Sam should be the first to say "Come on in, the water's fine."

Federal participation in oceanography is heightened by the implications of modern military science. Control of the seas has always been a classic goal of the leading nations of the world. Up to recent times, this has meant control of the sealanes for surface ocean traffic.

All of us know now that the new dimension of depth has compounded the military problem and made so-called control of the sea ever so much more difficult. Competition among nations in this area has, frankly, been the greatest prod that oceanography has had in its lifetime. Much of the remarkable progress made in recent years must be laid directly at the door of the Navy and, to a lesser degree, the other military departments. Expenditures for deep submergence research, sonar, and ocean floor mapping have had a distinct military significance. The Honorable Robert W. Morse, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development, announced to Congress yesterday that the Navy's oceanographic program has increased 9 percent in the past year, and a request for $129 million is included in the new Navy budget for 1966.

This is a healthy sum of money. Why, then, my interest in making a nonmilitary agency the chief advocate of an oceanographic program? For one reason, the orphan, oceanography, has grown out of his adolescence and is ready for long pants. The military must, of course, continue to have a dominant role and interest in oceanography just as it has in space activities. We must not, however, fence off the oceans to give them the status of a battlefield, for this would deny to our people the maximum beneficial use of this enormous asset.

Right now I give full credit to the Department of Defense for its recognition of the need for coordination in this field. The Inter-Agency Oceanographic Committee, originated under the experienced and capable hands of Dr. Wakelin, and sparkplugged by Comdr. Bob Abel, has achieved remarkable results in tying together a lot of loose ends and eliminating at least some duplication of effort in this field. I must give credit to Adm. Denys Knoll, Chief Oceanographer of the Navy, and his predecessor, Adm. Ed Stephan, who despite their military leanings and the mission of their office, have had the good sense to recognize and foster nonmilitary potentials as they developed under their military programs.

Industry is awakening to the profit potential of oceanography and this is one of the healthiest and most encouraging signs of real maturity. When science, through its laboratory experiments and computations, develops processes and products that have a profit potential, all mankind becomes the beneficiary in one degree or another. I recognize that the interest of many defense industries is excited and spurred on by the prospect of additional Federal funds, but I am not critical of the interest. As a member of the Armed Services Committee of Congress I have seen many military-developed sinews of war become the muscles of commerce. Who can forget that the 707 or DC–8, that brought many of you to San Diego would still be in the dreams or on the drawing board of engineers and scientists had it not been for military necessity? Who can doubt that the military oceanographic programs of today will lead to a better life for future generations?

Getting back to the problems of arousing effective political interest and action in oceanography, I would like to point out to you that great interest has been shown in recent years by Members of Congress. In the 88th Congress, which concluded last December, over 50 bills were introduced to benefit the oceanographic program. Admittedly, most of them died aborning, but the fact that so many were introduced is a sign that progress is being made. If you will pardon an alliteration: With so many "political eggs" being spawned, at least a few are bound to make it back to the open sea. The efforts of Senator MAGNUSON and my colleagues, Congressmen HERBERT BONNER, of North Carolina, and ALTON LENNON, of North Carolina, HASTINGS KEITH of Massachusetts, TOM PELLY, of Washington, and especially GEORGE P. MILLER, of California, and WILLIAM MAILLIARD, of California, deserve your enthusiastic appreciation and support.

If you will allow me now to move from the political into the educational arena, I would like to make an obvious point regarding the importance of increased educational activity in this field.

It is amazing how few universities offer programs leading to degrees in ocean sciences or ocean engineering. I venture to say more courses in restaurant management or stage designing are offered to our young people. There can be no doubt that more textbooks have been printed on finger painting than oceanography. This is hard to comprehend, because no field could offer young people the exciting prospects of exploration, danger, sportsmanship, recreation, and remuneration as does oceanography.

James Webb, the Administrator of NASA, has taken a bold step in advocating grants of $25 million for predoctoral training in space research. Over 185 universities are working on NASA-sponsored research projects. An estimated 3,000 graduate students will be engaged in research and advanced training in space sciences this year. What a contrast with our own field of interest.

You and I have reason to be concerned about the unrealized potential of oceanography and the importance of a concentration of effort in this field if we are to make significant progress.

In conclusion, let me tell you today that I am optimistic for increased Federal recognition of your problem and a vastly expanded Federal interest and acceptance of responsibility. I would be less than human if I did not tell you that I am envious of your prospects for the future in this exciting and rewarding endeavor. Were it not for the 2-year contract which I recently received from the electorate, I might be tempted to join you. In lieu of this, I assure you of my continuing interest and emphatic support of your chosen profession.

Who knows, if my contract is not renewed, I may be knocking at your door for a job on the ocean bottom.

We Must Not Destroy the McCarran-Walter Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, a concerted effort is being made to destroy the McCarran-Walter Act as it relates to admission of immigrants, and make admissible hundreds of thousands of additional immigrants each year. I am convinced this would be contrary to the public interest. The Secretary of State has admitted that we already have one of the most generous immigration policies in the world, though he favors a few changes.

This effort to destroy our quota system and open the floodgates for new categories of admissions should be defeated. I expressed my views on this subject in testimony given to the House Subcommittee on Immigration of the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the distinguished member from Ohio [Mr. FEIGHAN] is chairman. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include that statement:

STATEMENT OF O. C. FISHER BEFORE SUBCOMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION, HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. Chairman, I desire to record my opposition to H.R. 2580. This measure would destroy our time-tested traditional national origins system of admitting immigrants from European countries. It would transfer from the Congress to the Executive the responsibility of determining how many immigrants would be admitted each year. It would give to a politically appointed commission power to decide who would be admitted and from what country they would come. This would create a bonanza for immigration lawyers and influence peddlers, and would not be in the public interest.

Unfortunately, the real purposes of this proposal are obscured in political motivations, emotionalism, claims of racial discrimination, alleged foreign policy embarrassments, and a contention that we are desperately in need of the skills of those who would be admitted under the new policy that is proposed.

Now, what are the real purposes of this bill? One man described it as a numbers game, and I think that is a fairly accurate description. The real purpose is to increase the number of people who can be admitted to this country each year. We might as well be frank about it.

The alleged discrimination is, of course, ridiculous. Since admissions from various European countries is now based upon the ratio of people from those nations who were here in 1920, it would be just as sensible to contend that the Italians, the Russians, the French, or others discriminated against this country because more of them did not choose to emigrate here prior to 1920. In other words, discrimination has no place in this discussion.

Likewise, the claim that the State Department runs into embarrassing situations because all nations are not treated alike, is, in my judgment, flimsy and very farfetched. Other nations, in their wisdom, impose certain restrictions on admission of immigrants, and so do we. That is their business, and we have our business to look after.

The same is true of trade policies. Some of our people did not like the Common Market when it was announced some years ago. Diplomats representing the member nations that comprised the Common Market could have reported to their respective governments that they were embarrassed by claims of discrimination from some of their foreign counterparts. But who would contend that those countries were for that reason under any obligation to rescind their trade restrictions which were imposed to serve their own self-interest?

The matter of immigration policy, as with trade policy, is purely a domestic issue, and has always been treated as such by all countries.

It could, of course, be contended that we discriminate against the English, the French, the Italians, and all quota countries because we admit people from the Western Hemisphere without any quota restrictions at all. In a manner of speaking, that is true. But that is a part of our policy, the making of which comes under the head of our own business. The fact, for example, that we admit an Argentinean without regard to any quota does not mean that we consider that South American as a better person than an Englishman who can be admitted only under a strict quota.

I mention this to illustrate how ridiculous is the discrimination contention. It simply has no place in this discussion.

The real question to be resolved is: Do we need more immigrants? We now admit about 300,000 a year. Frankly, I think that is too many, under present conditions. We already have 196 million people in this country. The U.S. Census Bureau estimates that at the present rate of growth we will have 372 million by the turn of the century. By the year 2000 it is estimated world population will approximate 6 billion, and that at the present growth rate it will pass 25 billion by 2070.

It is imperative that we consider our normal population growth, and the population explosion around the world, in the fashioning of immigration policies for the admission of more people to this country.

Mr. Chairman, I am constrained to question the good faith of those who insist this legislation is needed in order to be able to admit more skilled people. Again, I am convinced that is an excuse, not a reason. I simply do not believe very many people are sincerely concerned about supplying more trained and skilled people for our labor market. I have not heard that appeal coming from prospective employers. On the contrary, it comes from the politicians and organized selfish-interest pressure groups as an excuse to justify their desire to have our restrictions broken down so more people can be admitted. Besides, our present law contains the same preferential treatment for skilled people as is proposed in H.R. 2580. Yet I understand that only 2,500 immigrants were admitted because of special skills last year.

NEW IMMIGRANTS SWELL RELIEF ROLLS

Another reason we do not need to increase the number of immigrants is because of the burden they become to so many localities in terms of unemployment, housing, education, crime, subversive activities, and assimilation problems in some instances.

It must be assumed that most of our new immigrants are good people and deserving. But despite the screening, the records are replete with instances of bad characters who, though relatively few in number, manage to get in despite all precautions.

We are told there are 35 million in this country who are poverty stricken or are in that general category. We have scores of welfare programs, local, State, and Federal, the costs of which have increased astronomically in recent years. Yet, sponsors of this legislation want to admit more, a good many of whom would undoubtedly be added to relief rolls or would otherwise become burdensome. In other words, we have our hands full trying to handle our own problems with our 5 million unemployed and others who are in need of retraining, rehabilitation, and other types of help.

Now, what will the proposed increase amount to? Sponsors estimate it will be about 60,000 a year, bringing the total to about 360,000. If that is true, then why not put an overall ceiling of 360,000 on the total number who can be admitted in any one year, and write it into the law? I daresay sponsors would not stand for that.

The fact is that the increase will probably be substantially more than that if the bill is passed. There is simply no way of estimating the number of refugees, Asiatics, Africans, and others who would be admissible under the terms of H.R. 2580, because there is no way of determining in advance how many of the eligibles will choose to seek admission and how many of the applications will be granted. Estimates of the total increase run as high as 1 million a year. Perhaps that figure is a bit extravagant, but I will not be surprised if more than a half million come in each year under the Celler bill, if enacted.

In addition, we must assume that pressures for increases in the nonquota category will occur in the years ahead. Rate of population growth in Latin America is the highest in the world, and there is much poverty. It is estimated that the already overpopulated area of Latin America will double during the next 20 years. So we must brace ourselves for stepped-up pressures to admit more of those people.

The big increase under the Celler proposal would come primarily from Africa, Asia, and some from southern Europe.

Mr. Chairman, the far-reaching effect of this legislation is simply too important to be decided, or even influenced, on the basis of politics or emotionalism. We are playing for keeps. Once this bill is enacted, the die is cast.

We already have a good immigration law. It has stood the test of time. The McCarran-Walter Act, which reenacted the provisions now under attack, was passed over a Presidential veto on June 26, 1952, by a vote of 278 to 112 in the House and 57 to 26 in the Senate. I am convinced the vast majority of Americans want it retained. I recently submitted a questionnaire to every voter in my district, and included the immigration issue. The responses, which have been tabulated, revealed that 78 percent of my constituents are opposed to the proposed changes. There is a lot more grassroot opposition to this bill than the sponsors realize.

Mr. Chairman, in considering this legislation let us think in terms of what is best for America and its future. Are we to become the dumping ground for the surplus populations of other countries?

Above everything, let us keep control of immigration in the Congress where it belongs. Someone wisely suggested that it would be better to have a mathematician select who comes here, under a formula, than to have a politician do it, without any formula at all. With that I agree.

I respectfully urge the committee to reject this bill.

Internal Revenue Service Should Request Authority To Waive Interest on Underwithholding

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN P. SAYLOR
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. SAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, Internal Revenue Service Commissioner Sheldon S. Cohen is to be congratulated for the statement promising sympathetic consideration for those taxpayers suffering hardship in paying balances of 1964 income taxes because of underwithholding last year. The announcement would seem to concur with the concept of H.R. 4659, which I introduced in February to permit taxpayers owing balances because of underwithholding to spread payments over the coming 12 months without penalty.

Mr. Cohen cannot waive interest on unpaid balances, inasmuch as Congress alone has authority in this matter. I believe, however, that a request from Mr. Cohen would stimulate the Ways and Means Committee and both Houses to enact the necessary legislation before the April 15 deadline, and I am hoping that he will choose to make a request of this nature without delay.

My view is that the Federal Government was needlessly lax in failing to give proper notice that payroll deductions might not cover total tax bills as a consequence of the change in tax rates during the 1964 calendar year. Since introducing H.R. 4659 I have been informed by a number of employees right here on Capitol Hill that they were shocked in making up their tax returns to learn that deductions had fallen far short and that they are now faced with an indebtedness of serious proportions. If our own congressional staff members were ignorant of what was taking place, how in the world should we expect people back in our home districts to be aware of the situation?

I have seen a number of advertisements by banking and lending institutions offering to make money available—at regular interest rates—for taxpayers who need to catch up on their IRS bills before April 15. While it may be gratifying to stockholders of these business houses to experience increased activity in the loan departments, there is no justifiable reason why the Federal Government should allow its own negligence to create a minor boom of this kind.

Until Mr. Cohen made his announcement, there was a very serious question in regard to those who are not in position to negotiate bank loans. His lenience has apparently solved that problem, yet there still remains the matter of whether it is in propriety for the Federal Government to charge interest on the befuddled taxpayer who through no fault of his own will be in arrears with IRS beginning April 15. Mr. Cohen's approach would seem to answer in the negative. I hope that he will support this inclination with a request for a waiver of interest, and I trust that Congress will act with all haste to preclude the inequity that is at present in making.

Voting Rights Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER PIRNIE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. PIRNIE. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to join my colleagues in the introduction of a voting rights bill that, if enacted, will reflect sound progress, based upon uniform principles of law, in an area of paramount importance.

As I sat in this Chamber and listened to our President speak on this subject just a few weeks ago, I sensed that the Chief Executive was echoing the sentiments previously expressed by so many of us who had already registered strong support for legislative action to insure that the basic rights guaranteed the citizens of this Nation by our Constitution were not denied. When we passed the Civil Rights Act during the last session of Congress, we were hopeful that we had devised an effective means to combat the discrimination problem. But, as subsequent events have proved, that measure was not enough; something more is needed.

Following the President's recent address to the joint session of the Congress, a reporter stopped me in the corridor to inquire as to my reaction to the message. My immediate response was that "I hope Congress will be prompt and decisive in its action." Further, I said that I would be awaiting the administration's proposed legislation, hoping that it would effectively deal with the problem which now had reached a crisis stage.

The administration's bill was filed and I, along with many of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, was disappointed.

Mr. Speaker, I am not one of those individuals who say we must clear up this Southern problem. I believe that we must take action to eliminate the American problem of voting discrimination wherever it is practiced. Yes, it is a national problem and the action Congress takes should apply throughout the 50 States.

The administration's bill was drafted during a period of great tension and presented to the Congress at a time when emotions were high. At first glance, a number of people hailed the measure. I was not in that group. I applauded its stated objectives, but not its suggested methods. I could see that the proposal was deficient in several respects.

Since that time, we, on the minority side, have been working strenuously to develop a plan to correct the deficiencies in the administration's bill. What has emerged is being labeled as a constructive Republican alternative, but let me strongly emphasize that I am not seeking to affix a party label to the measure that is finally enacted into law. We are after headway, not headlines.

At this point, I would like to cite a few specifics from the bill which I have introduced.

A Federal examiner is appointed by the Civil Service Commission when the Attorney General receives 25 or more complaints from residents of a county alleging denial of the right to vote on account of race or color. The examiner immediately determines whether these persons are qualified to vote. Challenges by the State may be made to a Federal hearing officer, appointed by the Civil Service Commission, within 10 days, and the hearing officer must render his decision 7 days thereafter.

Determination by the hearing officer that 25 or more persons are denied suffrage because of race or color establishes a pattern or practice of discrimination. Immediately thereafter, the Civil Service Commission shall appoint such additional Federal examiners and hearing officers as necessary to register all other persons within the country who may be subject to discrimination.

The bill provides for an appeal of the hearing officer's decision to the local Federal Court of Appeals if made within 15 days. All persons found qualified to vote by the examiners shall be entitled to vote. Those who are challenged shall vote provisionally until the appeal is decided by the hearing officer and the court. Provisional voting will encourage a prompt determination of the appeal. The administration's bill provides exactly the same appeal procedure, except that there is no authority for provisional voting.

The bill provides that examiners shall disregard literacy test requirements for persons who possess a sixth grade education. But, Federal examiners under this bill will apply to all other persons a State's literacy test, provided it is fair and nondiscriminatory. The administration's bill requires the complete elimination of literacy tests in a few States or their subdivisions, caught in its net, no matter how reasonable the tests or how fairly applied. At the same time, the administration's bill permits other States to enact literacy tests in the future.

The bill deals with the problem of physical and economic coercion and intimidation. It permits registrants in a county in which a pattern of discrimination has been established to bypass local registrars, if they have reason to believe that they will be subjected to coercion and intimidation. In addition, our bill provides for civil and criminal penalties against those officials who engage in such coercion and intimidation. The administration's bill contains similar provisions except that the Attorney General must take affirmative action to waive the requirement that a person first appear before a local registrar.

The bill does not overturn constitutional principles by requiring States to establish their innocence. The administration's bill does do this by presuming a State or a political subdivision, covered by the bill, guilty of discrimination until it receives from a Federal court in the District of Columbia a declaratory judgment that it has not violated the 15th amendment in even one instance in the past 10 years.

The bill does not invalidate laws or ordinances of State and local governments in contravention of established constitutional principles. The administration's bill would require States and their political subdivisions, covered by the bill, to come to a Federal court for validation of their future laws and ordinances relating to voting requirements. Such is required by the administration's bill even though the laws and ordinances of the State or local community have never been found to be discriminatory.

In summary, I believe that the bill faces up squarely to the problem and offers a sensible approach to a prompt solution.

A Government Lottery as a Revenue-Raising Device

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL A. FINO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. FINO. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced a resolution to establish a select committee of the House of Representatives to study the advisability of using a Government lottery as a revenue-raising device.

I urge the Congress to establish this committee to investigate the lottery. Surely, the obvious trend toward the lottery device in this country indicates that the national lottery idea is at least worth investigation.

For my part, I am fully convinced that investigation of the lottery mechanism will indisputably prove its merit. I urge the Congress not to shrink from social and financial reality.

Remarks by the Honorable Richard L. Roudebush, U.S. House of Representatives, Sixth Indiana District, Before the Indiana Council of Teachers of English, Saturday, April 3, 1965, at Marian College, Indianapolis, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, my very able colleague from Indiana, Congressman Richard L. Roudebush, has led a long and active fight for the past 4 years in effort to obtain a commemorative postage stamp for the late Ernie Pyle, famed Hoosier war correspondent during World War II.

Congressman Roudebush has won wide backing and support for his campaign in behalf of an Ernie Pyle stamp.

This applause for Congressman Roudebush's efforts comes from a wide spectrum of American life, including millions of World War II veterans who recall Ernie's fine reporting.

Congressman Roudebush was recently invited by the Indiana Council of Teachers of English to present an address on the life and works of Ernie Pyle, a native of the congressional district which Congressman Roudebush represents in the 89th Congress.

His remarks concerning this great Hoosier are worthy of the attention of this entire body, and I include them in the Record at this point:

Remarks by the Honorable Richard L. Roudebush, U.S. House of Representatives, Sixth Indiana District, Before the Indiana Council of Teachers of English, Saturday, April 3, 1965, at Marian College, Indianapolis, Ind.

It is a genuine pleasure to be here today.

And, I wish to thank your president, Dr. James Mason, for his kind invitation to speak before the spring meeting of the Indiana Council of Teachers of English.

It was requested that I direct my remarks today to the life and work of Ernie Pyle, the famed Hoosier war correspondent who was killed during the closing days of World War II.

For nearly 4 years now, we have been seeking approval by the Post Office Department for the issuance of an Ernie Pyle commemorative stamp.

Ideally, the stamp should have been issued this month to coincide with the 20th anniversary of Ernie's tragic death on the tiny Pacific atoll of Ie Shima, located west of Okinawa.

In our campaign to obtain a commemorative stamp in honor of Ernie Pyle, we have contacted literally hundreds of civic groups, veterans organizations, and other interested persons throughout the Nation.

The support we have received has been encouraging.

More than 100 Members of Congress have written letters lending their support.

We have also gained the support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars which endorsed the stamp by formal resolution during their national convention last year in Cleveland.

Support from the journalistic field has also been most gratifying.

United Features Syndicate endorsed the stamp proposal with this comment: "During World War II it was our privilege to syndicate Ernie's column which was read religiously by families and friends of our fighting men in Europe and the Pacific. His ability to offer them a soldier's insight into the war, and the warmth with which he wrote of the ordinary foot soldier, endeared him to the Nation. Ernie was a journalist in the very best tradition, setting a high standard that reporters strive to emulate today."

The Wyoming Press Association, the Georgia Press Association—representing 225 newspapers—the Kansas Press Association, the New York Press Association, and the Maryland-Delaware press associations have all supported our efforts.

Mention should also be made of support from the American Council on Education for Journalism, the Pacific Stars and Stripes, the New York associated dailies, and Scripps-Howard newspapers.

Our campaign has also been endorsed by perhaps the most exclusive club in the United States—the Medal of Honor Society.

Chartered by Congress in 1958, the Medal of Honor Society limits its membership to persons who have received this Nation's highest military award—the Congressional Medal of Honor.

In a letter to Postmaster Gronouski, the society declared, "Ernie Pyle not only distinguished himself by writing brilliantly about the brave and noble deeds of our fighting forces overseas but added new stature to his profession by combining his unique and warm personal talents with responsible and objective reporting. In this manner his work contributed immeasurably to the morale of our troops as well as the men and women on the homefront."

In addition, we have introduced legislation (H.R. 1723) which provides for the issuance of a commemorative Ernie Pyle stamp.

As of today, the Post Office Stamp Advisory Committee, has not acted favorably on this 4-year effort in support of an Ernie Pyle stamp.

They are scheduled to meet two more times this year, and I have been told that the Ernie Pyle stamp could be on either agenda.

Thus far, I have been most restrained in my criticism of the delay in acceptance of this stamp, which incidentally, would be the first time a working newspaperman has been so honored.

I must admit, however, that I have not been exactly elated with the many times that Ernie Pyle has been overlooked.

Last winter it was discouraging, to say the least, when the Post Office Department announced it was honoring an Italian poet born 700 years ago, and a foreign political document signed 750 years ago.

And, I'm sure you have all seen the different birds and animals that adorn some of our new commemorative stamps.

I am an admirer of wildfowl, but I do believe a valid case has been made for the issuance of an Ernie Pyle commemorative stamp.

Like millions of Americans who went overseas in World War II, my interest in Ernie Pyle stems back to that period.

The life and work of this newspaperman had an enormous impact on millions of Americans.

No other journalist ever evoked such mass affection as was accorded him during his tenure as a national figure.

There was, of course, a reason for this.

He bridged a gap in the knowledge of the Great War and of the men who were waging it—a gap which was not appreciated until his reporting began to span it.

Many other war journalists were as enterprising, as brave, as impeccably accurate in their war dispatches as Ernie Pyle.

No other correspondents, however, told the story of the soldier with such insight and such moving sympathy.

And his personality so permeated his column, as it had done in peacetime with a smaller audience, that readers came to think of him not as a stranger, but as their friend—their friend Ernie.

As a GI, in Africa and Italy, I knew Ernie Pyle by reputation as a friend and a true chronicler of the war.

As a Member of Congress, for the Sixth Indiana District, I now represent the area where Ernie was born and raised in western Indiana.

Many of his friends and relatives still reside there, and these folks have been most helpful in our campaign to obtain a commemorative stamp.

Petitions requesting the Post Office Department issue a commemorative stamp, have been circulated in the small town of Dana, Ind., where Ernie was born on August 3, 1900.

"I wasn't born in a log cabin," he wrote in one of his columns, "but I did start driving a team in the fields when I was 9 years old, if that helps any."

Ernie's boyhood was not unlike that of thousands of Indiana farm boys, except that he was an only child and was left to himself a good deal.

There was no plumbing in the home where Ernie Pyle spent his boyhood. There was a backhouse, and Ernie took his baths in a washtub near the woodstove in the kitchen.

When Ernie was a child the lack of such things was not considered a deprivation by respectable Indiana farmers.

Ernie was educated at Indiana University where he majored in journalism.

He never graduated. After attending for 3½ years, he left in his senior year after his girl friend decided in favor of another man.

He was an excellent student at Indiana, became editor of the Daily Student and worked on the yearbook.

After leaving school, his first job was as a reporter on the La Porte Herald.

This was just a brief steppingstone for newspaper jobs in Washington, D.C., and New York.

While working on the Washington Daily News he met Geraldine Siebolds, of Minnesota, a Government worker in Washington, and they were married in 1926.

Fed up temporarily with the newspaper business, he drew out his savings and bought a model T roadster.

Ernie and his wife took a long trip, driving leisurely around the United States.

It was on this trip that he originated his "traveling" column.

From 1935, until the war broke out, Ernie and his wife traveled around the country, writing stories on every conceivable subject, and winning quite a reading public.

Ernie once estimated that they stayed in more than 800 hotels, crossed the continent exactly 24 times, flew in 66 different airplanes, rode on 29 different boats, walked 200 miles, gone through 5 sets of tires, and put out about $2,500 in tips.

His war reporting carried the same kind of homey and simple quality that made his travel column so popular.

Whether writing about a terrifying air raid in London, the Normandy invasion, or a group of soldiers talking about home, Ernie captured the image of the situation that gave his millions of readers back home in the United States a true picture of the war.

His reports earned him a Pulitzer Prize in 1943.

His two books, "Here Is Your War," published in 1943, and "Brave Men," in 1944, were both best sellers, and earned a fortune.

Admired by the public, GI's and officers alike, Ernie left the European theater before V-E Day to cover the war in the Pacific.

President Roosevelt had been dead only 5 days when Ernie went ashore on the tiny Pacific atoll of Ie Shima, on April 17, 1945.

Five miles square, the tiny island was, nevertheless, the scene of one of the bitterest engagements in the Pacific.

Three Japanese airstrips were at stake, and the 77th Infantry Division's official history of the battle records that not one Japanese soldier surrendered and did not stop killing until killed.

On April 18, Ernie rode toward the front line with a jeepload of troops looking for a new location for a command post.

A machinegunner opened fire from about one-third of a mile away, and Ernie was struck in the temple. He died instantly.

He was buried on the island, and the body was later transferred to Hawaii where it remains today, at the National Memorial Cemetery of the Pacific in Punchbowl Crater.

The entire Nation was saddened by the news of Ernie's death, and he received many posthumous honors.

It has been 20 years this month since his death, and he is still remembered by the men who fought in World War II, and millions of Americans who followed the war through his columns.

Today, as you may know, the journalism building at Indiana University is named in honor of Ernie Pyle.

I think it would be a fitting tribute to this great Hoosier to be honored by the issuance of a commemorative postage stamp, and I pledge to continue my efforts to do so.

Thank you for inviting me and God bless you.

The Buffalo Eye Bank & Research Society: 20 Years of Service to the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD D. McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on May 6 the Buffalo Eye Bank & Research Society, Inc., will celebrate its 20th anniversary. One of the first services of this type in the United States, the Buffalo Eye Bank has been a pioneer in the field and has made many important contributions to the development of eyebanking throughout the country. Furthermore, through its primary mission, the supplying of eyes for transplantation, it has deeply affected the lives of thousands of individuals from all parts of the Nation. For these reasons the 20th anniversary of the Buffalo Eye Bank is an event of more than simply local or regional significance. In honor of this occasion and in recognition of the hard work and dedication of the many citizens of Buffalo who have made the eye bank a success, I would like today to tell you a little of its history and its splendid accomplishments.

As many of you know, Lions International has a special and longstanding interest in sight conservation and work for the blind. Therefore, it is not surprising that members of the local Lions Clubs around the country were particularly excited by reports of successful corneal transplants that were being published in 1944 and 1945. The Buffalo Host Lions Club gave a great deal of thought to the ways it might be able to help the medical profession with this promising new development. After considerable discussion, it was decided that since there would be a tremendous need for eye donations, the club could perform a valuable service by soliciting such donations and finding ways to expedite eye shipments. That is how the Buffalo Eye Bank came into being.

When the eye bank was founded in 1945, there was only one other in existence, and it had been in operation only a few months. Therefore, since there was no well-established, experienced organization to which it could turn for guidance, the Buffalo Eye Bank had to develop its own standards and techniques. One of the first problems was how to insure the safe transportation of eyes to various hospitals. To meet this difficulty, the president of the Buffalo Eye Bank invented an eye shipper which immediately proved to be quite popular and is now in use in eye banks and hospitals throughout the United States and Canada. The importance of this device would be hard to overestimate for, as we can readily understand, very few emergency transplants could be performed if doctors were forced to rely on their own communities exclusively. In this type of surgery, timing is all-important. Eyes can be stored for only a few days; moreover, an injured patient can be kept waiting just a short time. In order that all donated eyes be used and in order that every possible patient be helped, the eye shipper is essential. For that alone the Buffalo Eye Bank deserves a great deal of praise.

The founders of the Buffalo Eye Bank felt that their most important task was to build up a large file of eye pledges. With the vigorous and enthusiastic help of local Lions Clubs, the eye bank has carried on an impressive public education campaign and has now accumulated more than 60,000 donor signatures. This month another of its regular biannual drives is being held, and the eye bank hopes to surpass even the 6,000 new pledges obtained in 1963.

While providing eyes for transplantation is its major service, the Buffalo Eye Bank & Research Society, as its name suggests, has wide interests and goals. From the beginning it realized the importance of continued research in eye surgery, and in 1949, with the cooperation of the University of Buffalo and financial support from the Lions Clubs, it dedicated a research and pathology department at the university. Three years later local Lions Clubs again aided the eye bank, this time in assembling a large and comprehensive ophthalmic library. While these volumes are the property of the Buffalo Eye Bank, the organization has wisely and generously placed them in the University of Buffalo Medical School library so that they will be easily accessible to students and researchers working in this field.

Two other services of the Buffalo Eye Bank have been quite helpful to groups attempting to establish similar organizations. One of these is its manual on eye bank administration. The other is its catalog of special equipment and supplies which is the only catalog of this kind and which has filled a real need for our country's growing network of eye banks.

We in Buffalo are very proud of the eye bank, not only for what it has done for people in our community but for what it is doing for the Nation. The Buffalo Eye Bank has played an active role in the foundation and development of the Eye Bank Association of America and serves as one of its six regional collection and distribution headquarters. It has pledged itself to continue to work for expanded eye-banking services and more efficient means of communication in the hope that with each succeeding year an ever-growing number of people will have their vision restored.

Today there are more than 80 eye banks in operation in the United States, and together they help restore sight to approximately 3,000 persons a year. While this is an accomplishment to be proud of, we must not forget that, according to official estimates, there are at least 30,000 more of our fellow citizens who are either totally or partially blind who could benefit from transplants—if corneas were only available. That is why it is so important that all of us who have been blessed with two good eyes take that simple but important step of signing an eye donation pledge. I can think of no legacy a man or woman could leave that would cause more joy than the gift of sight to someone who had lived in darkness—and no satisfaction greater than the knowledge that one's gift would so immeasurably enrich the lives of others.

For its 20 years of leadership and outstanding humanitarian service, we join today in congratulating the Buffalo Eye Bank & Research Society and its legions of loyal supporters, especially the Lions Clubs of the Buffalo area. We are grateful for the eye bank's many contributions, and we wish it continued success in the years ahead.

We also want to express our personal good wishes to Mr. Rudolph Spitzer of Kenmore, N.Y., whose vision and drive have helped make the Buffalo Eye Bank & Research Society the great institution it is today.

Doctor of Humane Letters to Hon. John T. Connor

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 6, 1965

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure last Saturday to accompany the Honorable John T. Connor, the Secretary of Commerce, to the campus of my alma mater, Ohio Northern University at Ada, Ohio, where he received the honorary degree of doctor of humane letters.

The Secretary's address at the founder's day convocation was an excellent statement of the problems that confront us, and I include it with my remarks as follows:

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY OF COMMERCE JOHN T. CONNOR

I am most happy to speak here at Ohio Northern at the kind invitation of President McIntosh and my good friend Dean Robert Fischelis, of your College of Pharmacy.

I have known Dean Fischelis through my own past connections with the pharmaceutical industry—connections which I have severed as a businessman but retained as a consumer. The headaches you get in government are no milder than those you get in business.

In a sense, although I am out of the drug industry, I'm still very much concerned with the health of the American people. Now it is their economic health that concerns me most urgently, rather than their physical well-being. But the two are closely related. A healthy economy requires a healthy work force, and good health is necessary for us to enjoy fully the fruits of our country's unprecedented prosperity.

So, as Secretary of Commerce, no less than as the former president of a leading pharmaceutical firm, I am interested in what is necessary to keep Americans healthy physically and economically. This is a big problem with many facets. And it is a problem that challenges each of you and this institution on the 94th anniversary of its founding.

I have mentioned the pharmaceutical industry because it is a link we share through your fine School of Pharmacy, but also because what Dean Fischelis and his faculty are doing here this weekend is symbolic of the challenge we face—whether we are in education or business or government or one of the professions.

I helped create the problem he and the Nation's pharmacists are facing. My former company spent—and is still spending—about $30 million a year to discover and develop new drugs. Other companies spend similar large sums to help create the biochemical armaments of the war on disease.

Together they have helped make American medicine the finest in the world—not only by providing the medical profession with more effective drugs, but by putting those drugs and the knowledge of their use into the hands of the physician and into the corner drugstore.

You can see the problem this rapid change creates for the pharmacist who has been out of school—even for a few years. Most of the drugs doctors are prescribing today were not on the market a decade ago. And most of the prescriptions the pharmacist will fill 5 or 10 years from now could not be written today. The drugs haven't been discovered yet.

And this is a problem that is appearing throughout our society.

There is an explosion of knowledge going on all around us. It's coming out of industrial laboratories and out of the laboratories of our colleges and universities.

And it's not merely an explosion of scientific knowledge—in the usual sense. It's much more than a rapid expansion of our understanding of the physical and biological aspects of our life. It involves the social and cultural areas as well.

The sociologist, the political scientist, the psychologist who left school a few years ago can't afford to be ignorant of what the computer, for example, is doing to his field of knowledge—any more than can the physicist or chemist. The same thing is true of the economist and the business manager.

And it's not just the computer hardware or any other advance in equipment that is responsible for the change. There are new ideas emerging in every field that are potentially revolutionary in themselves.

Our experts in the Department of Commerce, for example, are working to develop the idea of the noted Harvard University economist, Prof. Vassily Leontief, into an important tool of business and government policymaking. Computers are involved, but the important thing is the concept. And the result—called the "input-output" tables—is deceptively simple. It boils down to a set of tables that show in quantitative terms the complex interrelationships in our national economy. It shows how much business is generated in each segment of the economy by an additional dollar's worth of output anywhere in the economic structure.

Right now we don't know just what impact the development of these input-output tables will have. But you can be reasonably sure that the next generation of economists and businessmen and government officials won't be able to do its job adequately if it doesn't understand the use of this and similar economic tools.

Keeping abreast of one's field today is truly a lifetime job. Those of you who are students here have really only begun your education. You may never come back to Ohio Northern for a special course or seminar. But increasingly more and more college graduates will find it necessary to return to the campus—for postgraduate programs. Like the seminar on contemporary pharmacy being held here this weekend, these programs will be designed to bring you up to date and to broaden and deepen your understanding of the changing environment in which you work.

Businessmen are finding it necessary to strengthen their academic groundings in management techniques. They also are finding that periodic sessions on college and university campuses are very valuable means of broadening their understanding of the social and political changes that vitally affect their business operations.

So I think it is particularly symbolic that a seminar on contemporary pharmacy should be part of this annual founder's day observance. The best way you can honor the past of this great institution is to look to its future. And this is what you are doing.

Ohio Northern was born of Henry Solomon Lehr's desire to raise the level of competence of the poorly trained public school teachers in his region. He was trying to close the gap between what had been adequate—or at least tolerable—and what would be required of teachers in a burgeoning American economy. He dealt with the realities of the present—recognizing both the shortcomings of the past and the opportunities unfolding before our country and our people.

I think we must do the same.

President Johnson has summoned the American people to the task of building a Great Society. He has enormous faith in the idealism of our people and in their ability to respond to great challenges. But there is nothing "pollyannish" about his thinking. He recognizes that Government cannot hand out a Great Society to an apathetic people. He realizes that we must do this job together over whatever period of time it may take, and that most of the work must be done through private initiative rather than through Government action.

I personally think this calls for a new alliance of the campus and the company—of the academic and business worlds—in a sustained effort to cope with the problems and exploit the opportunities before us. I think such an alliance is especially needed in the field of education, manpower development, and employment opportunities.

I say "field" rather than "fields" because these are all aspects of a single challenge. You can look at it from different viewpoints. You can talk about the need to develop our manpower resources to meet the demands of an increasingly sophisticated economy. You can talk about the right of the individual to a job and an opportunity to earn his own livelihood. You can talk about his obligation to develop marketable skills, or about the obligation of government, business, and the schools to give him an opportunity to develop his productive—and human—potential.

But these are all part of the same ball of string. And you know the answer to the question: Where do you start to unravel a ball of string? You start anywhere.

The same thing is true of this problem of education, human development, and economic growth. You start where you are—whether you are in business, in a classroom, or in a position of public or community influence.

As a businessman and now as head of a Government agency charged with promoting economic development, I have been very much concerned with this problem of matching our manpower supply to the changing demands of an increasingly technical and rapidly changing economy.

The shifts on both sides are dramatic—on both sides of this supply and demand relationship. Not only is there continuing change in the kinds of jobs required, there is a big change occurring—as a result of the postwar baby boom—in the labor force available for these jobs.

The most dramatic change in job opportunities, of course, has been the decline in farmworkers—from 37.5 percent of all American workers in 1900 to only 5 percent in 1964.

The proportion of factory blue-collar workers, however, has risen only slightly. But there have been substantial changes within this group. The demand for unskilled workers has dropped sharply from 12.5 percent to 5 percent. The demand for skilled workers has risen from 10.5 to 14 percent, and the demand for semiskilled workers even more—from 12.8 to 20 percent of all workers.

The big growth has been in white-collar workers—from less than one in five workers in 1900 to nearly half the work force in 1964. The demand for professional, technical, and similar workers has nearly tripled. The demand for managers and officials has risen 50 percent. And the percentage in clerical and kindred jobs has increased fivefold since the turn of the century.

Today it is virtually impossible to get a job in a factory without a high school diploma, and it is even more difficult to get an office job without this minimum educational qualification. At a higher level, there is a great unsatisfied demand for top quality, highly educated people in virtually every field. In the Commerce Department, we are particularly concerned with the lack of advanced-degree people capable of doing engineering research and development—people who can bridge the gap between the basic scientific discovery and the production line.

On the other side of the picture, the labor force is growing faster than in the previous postwar period, and the composition of the labor force is shifting toward youth and inexperience.

Because of the baby boom after World War II, we had half a million more young people entering the labor force last year than the annual average of the previous 5 years. Between 1957 and 1962, the total labor force grew at an average rate of less than 800,000 a year. From 1962 to 1964, it grew by 1.2 million a year. And for the rest of this decade, the growth is expected to be about 1.5 million a year. This means we must create some 9 million new jobs—1.5 million a year—just to take care of the growth in the labor force through 1970.

And that doesn't include doing anything about the 4 million currently unemployed, or about the additional workers that would move into the active labor force if the prospect of finding jobs improved significantly.

Another major change in the labor force is the above-average growth in nonwhite—mainly Negro—participation. Although nonwhites make up only slightly more than one-tenth of the current labor force, they will account for roughly one-fifth of the growth in the labor force during the remainder of the decade.

This constitutes a major challenge for both education and business. These young Negro men and women must be equipped in our schools and colleges to fill the higher skilled jobs that will be opening during the rest of the 1960's and beyond. But they must know that the jobs—which formerly were closed to them—will be there and will be open to them when they are prepared to take them. This will require a close cooperation of business and our institutions of higher learning to identify and meet the special educational needs of these young people—including the urgent need to strengthen their motivation to obtain higher education.

Today the unemployment rate among Negroes in the labor force is about 10 percent—double the rate for the population as a whole. For teenagers it is triple the general rate, and for Negro teenagers, I understand, it runs on the order of 25 percent.

I am concerned about the manpower development problem from the business point of view. But, as a businessman, nothing gave me greater satisfaction than the knowledge that I was helping to create jobs for my fellow citizens.

I think most businessmen feel this way. And I think businessmen are ready to accept the challenge to work intimately with the educational institutions and governmental bodies in their areas to help create job opportunities for every pair of willing hands.

In providing an adequate education for every American, there is a role for each of us to play. There is a local community responsibility. The State has a major responsibility. Our churches and our private educational institutions have a big opportunity. And the Federal Government has an important supplemental role to play.

I think the President's education program deserves full business support. I am not worried about Federal aid supplanting local support or local control in education. The job we face in education is so big that we need all the help we can get. And, if education is among the most important business of our society—and I think it is—we need not be afraid of the American people losing interest in it at the local and community level.

At the same time, I think business has a special obligation to support institutions such as this. Variety in educational opportunity is an important support and safeguard of a democratic society. But it must also be quality education. And business corporations, as well as individual businessmen, who have the means, should make support of private colleges and universities one of their continuing obligations.

President Johnson pointed out recently that this is the richest and most powerful country that ever existed, and that the might of past empires was little compared with ours.

"But," he said, "I do not want to be the President who built empires, or sought grandeur, or extended dominion. I want to be the President who educated young people to the wonders of their world—the President who fed the hungry—and helped the poor to find their own way—and enriched the simple, daily lives of every family. And I want to be the President who helped to end hatred among his fellow men, and war among the brothers of this earth."

I think this is what we all want. I think we want to be part of the generation that helped make these things possible for all our fellow men, and for all the world.

The campus and the corporation represent two of our most important means of furthering this ambition for America and mankind. I think they must work together in mutual support and with common purpose to achieve our goals. I am confident that they can work together for the benefit of an enlightened and capable people in a free and prosperous society.

Thank you.